AUG 7 - 1951

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 96—PART 16

JUNE 8, 1950, TO AUGUST 4, 1950

(PAGES A4295 TO A5632)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1950

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Appendix

Some Recent Central Texas History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the year I was called on to assemble data for one chapter of a comprehensive history of central Texas. The title assigned to me referred generally to the last 10 years of our history and was directed primarily to those activities involving the Federal Government's relation to the welfare of central Texas. Since my service in Congress began on January 3, 1937, I have not strictly confined my observations to the 10 years just passed, but have in some instances reviewed events which had their inception a little earlier. In fact, the beginning of my congressional service seems to be a convenient breaking point in national as well as local history. The upward turn out of the depression of 1929 began just about this time. The "lame duck" amendment to the Constitution took effect with my first term. This amendment has made it impossible for Members of Congress to spend the time at home which they customarily did prior to its adoption. It was, of course, necessary if Congress was to deal with the ever-increasing volume of public business, but it has greatly reduced the opportunities of our Representatives to visit with their employers—the voters—at home. Central Texas covers a considerable area, but since my acquaintance is primarily confined to the six counties included in the Eleventh Congressional District, I have attempted to discuss only the area included in our congressional district.

Believing that this chapter of local history might be of general interest and contribute to our understanding of the importance of Federal and local relation, I include this article in the RECORD:

ONE HUNDRED YEARS AGO

The year 1950 marks not only the opening of the second half of the twentieth century, but for many central Texas communities it marks the one-hundredth anniversary of organized local government. Milam County was the only county in the Eleventh Congressional District organized under the Republic of Texas (1837). McLennan, Falls, and Bell Counties were all organized just 100 years ago, in 1850. All three were created largely from former parts of Milam County, although the eastern parts of both McLennan and Falls Counties were carved out of Limestone County. Coryell and Bosque Counties were each organized 4 years later (1854)—Coryell out of Bell County and Bosque out of McLennan County.

It is, therefore, entirely fitting that we should at this time review the development of this especially favored part of Texas. I refer to this area as especially favored not simply because of our rich river bottoms or black prairies; they are known to all, but there are other areas which possess even greater natural resources. I refer to our area as especially favored, because it was settled by and is still the home of the finest people in the world. In the final analysis, it is the people, not the physical aspects of the land, that determine a country's progress. Switzerland, with practically no material resources, has established a standard of living and of liberty which is the envy of Europe. Hainan Island off the China coast is, I am told, blessed with every gift of nature, but the people have never developed these riches. Those men and women who followed Sterling P. Robinson to found the Nashville Colony on the Brazos and the Little River were the kind of people who build empires. Fortunately for central Texas, we have continued to receive this type of people as our population has continued to grow for the past 100 years. The last decade has been no exception, although there has undoubtedly been a closer relationship between our prosperity and the activities of the Federal Government than ever before.

THE PAST 13 YEARS—PRICES AND INCOME

In 1937 cotton sold for 8 cents per pound as against 30 cents in 1950. Corn that now sells for $1.30 per bushel, then sold for 35 cents. Good steers that could then be bought for $40 now will sell for $200. There are those who still complain about acreage control, and undoubtedly there are individual cases of hardship, but by and large, no comparable period of history records such an advance in the position of our farmers.

In January 1937, there were thousands of unemployed laboring men in central Texas. Those who had jobs were barely able to pay their grocery bills. Today unemployment is almost unknown, and wages are the highest in history. Those grocery bills are far higher, it is true, but the average family is eating much better and with all is not spending any larger percent of its income on food than it did 13 years ago.

Certainly there are businessmen who are finding it difficult today, but the percent who are going broke is negligible. In the 1930's most businessmen were lucky to keep out of the bankrupt court. For years that court has had practically no cases. Last year our central Texas corporations and individual business generally enjoyed their most prosperous operations. Not only did old business prosper, new business developed on every hand Not only was 1949 a year of profits; reserves were built up, and plants were improved.

That central Texas is prosperous is attested by developments on every hand. That we should hold and expand that prosperity is the natural and proper determination of every citizen. That we should extend it to all groups of our people is our earnest wish. I am convinced that our present favorable position is in part, at least, due to the close cooperation which has existed between our local people and their Federal Government. The Congressman is the only direct link between the people and their Federal Government. The Congressman must seek to cooperate with both the local people for whom he works and with the administrative agencies or departments with whom he works. There is the finest cooperation from the people of central Texas. As a Congressman stays in Washington he becomes better and better acquainted with the bureau and departmental officials, and as he acquires more and more seniority, he finds himself in a continually better position to receive consideration for his district in Washington. It must be our effort to continue this cooperation, keeping in mind that all Federal assistance must be limited by the over-all Federal Budget which should and undoubtedly will be reduced. Therefore, while we possibly cannot look forward to another era of such pronounced Federal aid as in the decade just passed, our section can look forward to continued close cooperation.

MILITARY ACTIVITIES

Just where and how has this cooperation with the Federal Government helped to develop central Texas? Doubtless the field which first comes to mind is that of military activities. No congressional district in Texas, not even including San Antonio, experienced as much military development during the war as did our Eleventh District.

1. Camp Hood, now Fort Hood, located in Coryell and Bell Counties, near Killeen, Copperas Cove, Belton and Temple was one of the largest wartime cantonments. It is today probably the largest Group Force base in the United States. It provides employment for thousands of central Texas civilians and is vital to the business of many central Texas cities.

2. North Camp Hood in Coryell County near Gatesville, during the war was the site of a large concentration of troops; now headquarters of the Texas National Guard Encampment.

3. Connally Air Force Base in McLennan County near Waco, was an active training base known as Waco Air Field during the

war. It is now one of the 12 war training bases in the United States that have been made permanent.

4. Gray Air Force Base in Bell County near Killeen and Copperas Cove is a permanent tactical base.

5. Blackland Air Field in McLennan County at Waco was a wartime training field. It is now the Waco Municipal Field and is the site of a housing project operated by the city of Waco as well as providing housing for Baylor University.

6. Temple Air Field in Bell County at Temple was a wartime operating field. It is now known as Draughan-Miller Air Field and serves as Temple's municipal airport.

7. Bluebonnet Ordnance Works in McLennan County at McGregor, was an active shell-loading plant during the war. It employed thousands of people and served a vital purpose. Most of the factory buildings are today occupied by new industries which make a great contribution to employment in central Texas. Most of the 18,000 acres of land and the nonindustrial buildings have been transferred to the A. and M. College of Texas and constitute the world's largest agricultural experiment station.

8. McCloskey Army Hospital in Bell County at Temple was the largest of all the military hospitals during the war. It is now occupied by the Veterans' Administration and provides general medical and surgical services for central Texas veterans.

VETERANS' FACILITIES

The veterans of our district have not been overlooked. Along with the veterans of the entire United States they have received mustering out pay, and are now receiving a refund on their insurance payments. These payments have been largely spent with local firms, and have added their share to the tempo of business and employment. Central Texas veterans have taken full advantage of the educational provisions of the GI bill. Possibly some abuses could have been prevented if the bill had originally required higher standards of the schools as suggested by the Poage-Dondero amendment which was offered at the time of passage, but certainly our Government has made generous provisions for veteran education. In like manner, aid has been extended to the financing of homes for veterans. Preference has been given veterans in the field of Government employment.

The basic obligation of the Government to its veterans is to care for those who suffered loss of health or earning capacity and the dependents of those who lost their life in the service of that Government. To do this our Government has established a number of regional offices and hospitals. Central Texas has fared well in this regard.

1. Regional headquarters have been established in Waco. In 1937 any central Texas veteran had to go to Dallas or San Antonio to contact the Veterans' Administration. Today we have a regional headquarters in Waco, which occupies a six-story building, and gives the veterans of central Texas "at home" service.

2. Waco Veterans' Hospital has been enlarged until today it is approximately four times its 1937 size. It is the largest veterans' psychopathic hospital in the southwest.

3. Temple Veterans' Hospital (formerly McCloskey) is presently the second largest veterans' general hospital in the State.

4. Marlin Veterans' Hospital is just being completed. It affords veterans the same opportunity that civilians enjoy in the use of the benefits of the Marlin mineral water.

There are more Veterans' Administration beds in the Eleventh Congressional District than in all the balance of the State combined.

FLOOD CONTROL

While central Texas often needs additional water, its river valleys have long been subject to disastrous floods. In 1937 the Congress passed a resolution directing the Corps of Engineers to make a comprehensive survey of the Brazos River and its tributaries. Every acre of the Eleventh District is in the drainage basin of the Brazos. As a result of this survey, we have two great flood-control dams under construction and four more recommended. They are—

Under construction:

1. Whitney Dam on the Brazos, between Bosque and Hill Counties. This structure provides additional domestic and industrial water for the city of Waco and provides flood protection in Bosque, McLennan, Falls, and Milam Counties. It also provides cheap electricity for all central Texas.

2. Belton Dam on the Leon in Bell County. Benefits the cities of Temple and Belton by making available additional domestic and industrial water and provides vitally needed flood protection for Bell and Milam Counties.

Recommended by the Army engineers:

3. Waco Dam on the Bosque in McLennan County will benefit the city of Waco, McLennan and Falls Counties.

4. Proctor Dam on the Leon in Comanche County will benefit Coryell County.

5. Youngsport Dam on the Lampasas in Bell County will benefit the city of Belton, Bell and Milam Counties.

6. Lanesport or Georgetown Dam on the San Gabriel in Williamson County. Will benefit Milam County.

SOIL CONSERVATION

Important as is flood control, it is, after all, only a treatment of a symptom of a deep-lying ill. Soil conservation strikes at the cause of floods as well as at the cause of erosion. Soil conservation is essential if our country is to continue to produce the food and fiber needed by our people. The Federal Government has in recent years provided most important and effective aid in this respect although there are many who feel that Congress should have passed the Poage bill giving surplus dirt-moving equipment to soil-conservation districts. This bill was defeated, but some funds were made available for the purchase of such equipment. Central Texas farmers have been prompt to take advantage of Federal cooperation. It has been impossible to secure all the technical assistance we would like, but some of the specific examples of the importance of central Texas in the soil-conservation picture can be seen in the following:

1. State headquarters of Federal soil-conservation work located in Temple (moved there in 1939).

2. State headquarters of Texas State soil-conservation work located in Temple.

3. Central repair unit for Soil Conservation Service equipment at Waco.

4. Brushy Creek Experiment Station in McLennan and Falls Counties between Riesel and Mart. (One of two run-off experiment stations in United States operated by Federal Government.)

5. Blackland Experiment Station in Bell County near Temple has conducted run-off work on cooperative basis with State and Federal funds.

6. First Congressional District in Texas to have every acre served by organized soil conservation districts.

ROADS AND HIGHWAYS

Without all-weather country roads farmers cannot take advantage of many of the governmental programs that would otherwise aid them. Without modern highways connecting distant points, the Southwest could not have developed as it has. Within recent years the Federal aid road program has played an important role in central Texas. The Federal law provides:

1. Aid to the State for the construction of major highways.

2. Aid to the State for the construction of rural (farm-to-market) roads.

3. Aid through the State to cities for the improvement of highways through urban areas.

Central Texas has built hundreds of miles of Federal-aid highways, including vital units in every county of the Eleventh District. It has also received an especially large share of the farm-to-market road aid. The Federal program has made it possible to construct the new Brazos bridge at Waco and to build the new super highway through that city. It also contributed to the new four-lane highway through McLennan and Bell Counties. Central Texas was far behind in both roads and highways, but in recent years it has made outstanding progress. In the next few years it will probably surpass most sections of the State.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Probably no one thing has done more to make rural life attractive than rural electrification. Under this program the United States Government has loaned approximately a billion and a half dollars (largely to farmer-owned cooperatives) with a loss rate of less than two-tenths of 1 percent. The first such cooperative in the United States to get into operation was located in this district at Bartlett.

1. TheBartlett Electric Cooperative still serves farms in Bell, Milam, and Williamson Counties. There are three other local cooperatives located in our district. They are:

2. Belfalls Electric Cooperative at Rosebud serves parts of Bell, Falls, and Milam Counties.

3. McLennan County Electric Cooperative at McGregor serves parts of McLennan, Bell, Coryell, and Bosque Counties.

4. Limestone County Electric Cooperative at Mart serves parts of McLennan, Falls, and Limestone Counties.

Parts of the district are served by several other local cooperatives with headquarters in other counties, and the private power companies have, since the establishment of REA greatly increased their service in rural areas as well as in the cities.

In addition to the above, Waco is the headquarters for the Brazos River Transmission Electric Cooperative which is composed of 20 local cooperatives in Texas. This organization owns and operates an extensive system of generation and transmission facilities and has recently negotiated a contract with the leading private power company in the area whereby the facilities of both the cooperative and the private agency will be used to mutual advantage. The Brazos Cooperative recently constructed the Bob Poage steam plant in Bell County and is now doubling its capacity. Its existence has undoubtedly contributed materially to the 60-percent reduction in wholesale rural power rates which central Texas has enjoyed.

Thirteen years ago only two or three out of every hundred central Texas farms had electricity. Today between 80 and 85 out of each hundred enjoy it. No area has enjoyed greater development of rural electrification.

RURAL TELEPHONES

With the passage of the Poage rural telephone bill last fall, we may expect a period of development in rural telephone service comparable to the development of rural electrification. For two decades the number of rural telephones had decreased. Immediately after the war the first Poage telephone bill was introduced. Private telephone interests began to show some interest. The bill authorizes loans (similar to REA loans) to existing telephone companies as well as individuals and cooperatives who propose to give rural service. Central Texas is already feeling the effects. New rural connections are being made at a rapid rate. Several new systems (both cooperative and privately owned) from our district have applied for loans.

RURAL CREDIT

The various farm credit agencies have shown remarkable development and growth. The land banks and the production credit associations have both paid back all of the Government stock on which they relied so heavily a decade ago. They are now farmer-owned institutions. The Farmers' Home Administration has reorganized the old FSA and has helped thousands of worthy tenant farmers to become farm owners. Farm credit was never so plentiful or so cheap.

CITY HOMES

Those who have sought a source of reasonable credit for the construction of their own homes in our cities have not been overlooked. Probably four out of every five homes that have been built in Waco and in Temple, and to a lesser degree in some of the smaller cities, carry an FHA-insured loan. This Government program does not lend Government money. It simply enables urban home builders to pay a small premium and receive insurance for their loan. This has made adequate credit available with negligible losses. It has made it possible for an ever increasing number of our city people to become home owners, and has, therefore, along with the rural credit programs, helped to maintain that type of independent citizenry to which I earlier referred.

Fixing Rents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily News, Monday, June 5, 1950.

It is an outstanding evaluation of housing and rent-control problems as they exist in the city of Chicago.

The article should be read by every Member of Congress who is interested in equitable settlement of this most highly controversial issue.

FIXING RENTS

The favorable vote in the Senate banking committee indicates the likelihood of another extension of Federal rent ceilings—at least until after the elections. Thus a measure originally designed to prevent hardship in time of war will remain as a political means of favoring one group in the community over another.

How much one group has been favored is shown by the fact that nearly half of all landlords in Chicago has received no increases in rent since the "freeze" date in 1942. Inasmuch as the Federal Government will be legislating largely for the benefit of Chicago, some consideration for this group would be amply justified.

Governor Stevenson has made a preliminary move in the direction of State control, should the Federal law lapse. But it is uncertain whether the legislature would approve, and in any case the expense and the administrative difficulties are such that effective control is probable only if the Federal law is reenacted.

Statistically, it is possible to show that the housing shortage by which rent control was justified has improved very little. The Chicago Housing Authority, for example, asserts that 272,000 new housing units are needed in Chicago, with 111,000 of these to rent for less than $50 a month.

CHA has a backlog of 30,000 applications for its low-cost housing, and is said to be receiving 2,000 requests a month.

An independent survey of the Chicago housing situation shows that since 1940 only 12,672 new units have been created in the group renting for under $50 monthly. In the $50–$80 bracket there are 35,620 new units, and renting above $80, 27,879 new units.

Of these new rental units more than half were created by ingrowth, that is by the division of existing quarters.

Another way of showing what has happened under rent control is to note that there has been an increase of only 7.2 percent in the number of rental units, while the owner-occupied units are up by 35.5 percent.

In other words, few investors at present consider the construction of rental property to be a profitable place to risk their savings. It is no answer to this fact to point out that new construction is not subject to controls. The rent level approved by the control administration tends to set the market ceiling.

From individuals with a leaning toward Government controls on general principle is heard the comment that "private enterprise has failed to meet the housing problem, and Government must regulate the market until it does."

Such a failure should occasion no surprise. Private enterprise is interested in a profit. When it becomes profitable to rent houses, rental houses will quickly appear. Meanwhile, it should be observed that those who criticize the failure of private enterprise have built few houses out of their love for their fellow men.

The chart showing the number of landlords who are still receiving 1942 rents actually minimizes the figure. The figure is that of rental units, and, since it is the owners of larger buildings in general who have received increases, the number of landlords receiving no increases is greater than 43 percent.

The best argument for continued Federal control is that such an extension is more likely than State law to decontrol gradually by liberalizing the conditions imposed on landlords.

If any new Federal law is to take further steps toward a return to a free market, the group of property owners still receiving prewar rates have a clear case for consideration.

Statement by A. E. Eisenmenger, National Vice President of the American Federation of Government Employees, and an Expert in Meat Inspection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an article by A. E. Eisenmenger on the value of meat inspection to the people of America:

MEAT INSPECTION

We operate under the Meat Inspection Act of June 30, 1906, which requires every establishment offering meat for interstate or foreign shipment to be under inspection. The Meat Inspection Division is required to furnish this inspection; thus we have no control over the volume of our work.

Our force consists of: Veterinarian meat inspectors, laboratory inspectors, meat inspectors, perishable food inspectors, inspectors of imported meats and animal byproducts, and meat laws investigators.

Every animal slaughtered under Federal inspection receives ante mortem inspection. Animals found to be unfit for human consumption are condemned. Those considered doubtful are tagged "U. S. suspect" and slaughtered separate and apart from other animals passed for regular slaughter; these are carefully examined and disposed of accordingly.

After slaughter the head of every animal is carefully examined. The various lymph glands are viewed and incised for detections of lesions of diseases; the cheek muscles of cattle are slashed for detection of tapeworm cysts and the tongue examined for sores, lesions, and abscesses.

The viscera of every animal is inspected. Various glands are incised. The viscera, heart, liver, spleen, and lungs of every animal are viewed and palpated in order to detect any evidence of disease, parasitic infestation, or other abnormal condition.

Every carcass is examined for bruises, abscesses, infections, or other abnormal condition, as well as for being properly cleansed.

All condemned parts are kept under supervision until denatured or tanked. Cutting operations are supervised in order to see that bruises, abscesses, and other local defects are properly cut out and trimmed. The entire establishment is patrolled in order to enforce sanitary requirements.

United States inspectors have control of the various steps and methods used in the processing of lard, canning, smoking, curing, and sausage manufacture to see that no ill practices are used in violation of meat-inspection regulations. Samples of all ingredients such as spices, condiments, curing agents, etc., used in meat-food products are submitted for laboratory examination. Samples of finished meat-food products are likewise submitted for laboratory examinations periodically.

All labeling material used by the packing industry is approved by the Meat Inspection Division of the Department of Agriculture.

All products for export are reinspected before export certificates are issued. Likewise all import products receive a careful examination before being admitted into the country. Meat laws investigators investigate complaints, irregularities, and apparent and alleged violations of laws and regulations, governing meat inspection. Perishable foodstuffs inspectors examine for specification compliance and condition, meat and meat-food products, seafood, dairy products, eggs, fruit, vegetables, breads, and other perishable foodstuffs offered under contract with certain governmental agencies and perform various other duties.

Much of our work is performed on wet, slippery floors and subject to extremes of heat and cold. Our record of accidents and occupational diseases is one of the highest in all Government agencies. Our division has made an honest effort to keep personnel at a minimum, in fact in establishments working round the clock, our men work in two shifts of 12 hours each.

This Division inspected in the year 1949, 83,458,786 head of livestock and also supervised the processing of 13,381,083,144 pounds of meat and meat food products. In the fiscal year 1948, a law forcing packers to pay for meat inspection, was passed, causing a close scrutiny of all inspectors working at these establishments to make sure that the number of men was kept at a minimum. During this year, our force which was definitely thought to be the minimum necessary to conduct inspections consisted of 3,166 men. During the fiscal year of 1949–50, the number of men on our force was

reduced to 2,999. Due to the limitations of our budget, we were unable to make any replacements after July of 1949. This further reduction of 10 percent in appropriations will cut our force to 2,653 men which would make it impossible to give the packers the minimum of inspection service which the law requires; in other words this means that 513 inspectors less than in 1948 will have to carry the same or a greater workload in the same number of establishments geographically the same.

Commencement Exercises, Taylor Township Consolidated School, Martinsburg, Pa., May 26, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to deliver the commencement day address at the graduation ceremonies of Taylor Township Consolidated School, May 26, 1950.

The Taylor School is located in the famous Morrison Cove agricultural area in Blair County in central Pennsylvania.

The members of the graduating class came from farm homes and from pioneer families in central Pennsylvania.

My remarks in connection with the graduation exercises were as follows:

Members of the faculty, school board, parents, class of 1950, ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to accept the kind invitation to speak at the graduation exercises of the Taylor Township consolidated schools.

It is hoped that all of you who are graduating at this time will enter Morrison Cove High School with the determination to complete your high-school education, so that you may be better fitted for life when your school days are ended.

You are to be congratulated for your faithfulness in pursuing your studies and for passing the final examinations that found you qualified to enter high school.

The elementary school is the most important part of your education regardless of whether you enter college or not. The reason is due to the fact that education, like everything else, demands a strong foundation.

When you build a house, a bridge, or a building, it is necessary that it have a firm foundation, and the same is true when you seek to acquire an education.

You may have wondered during your grade-school classes why your teachers stressed the art of pronouncing words, of learning your tables in arithmetic, of correct spelling, and good penmanship. As you grew older and absorbed the lessons taught you, it was easier to understand why you had to learn the fundamentals of arithmetic and grammar so that you would be ready to understand, appreciate, and learn the many higher subjects taught in high school.

As you look back on the happy days spent in Taylor Township consolidated school and realize the many warm friends you have made during your school years, it is good to know that these friends you cherish will be your high-school chums during the next 4 years. These friendships you have formed are of an enduring nature, and as you grow older you will value them for the great part they have played in your life.

Years from now, when you hear the name of a school chum, you will recall the pleasant days spent at Taylor Township consolidated school. If your friends are successful in life, and since you hope to be equally successful, it will be a thrilling experience for all of you to proudly say, "I went to school with him or her."

These strong friendships formed during your grammar-school days should be likewise cultivated among all people with whom you come in contact. Therefore, try diligently to acquire the happy faculty of making and holding friends. We need all the friends we can make because life is a thrilling experience and it is a glorious feeling to have real friends who will share our joys and sorrows.

During your school days your parents and teachers have stressed the fact that honesty is the best policy. I hope you will always remember that truth, because a boy or girl who is dishonest lacks the necessary strength of character, and, as a result, his or her reputation suffers.

Character and reputation are necessary characteristics that you cannot ignore.

Your parents and teachers have tried hard to instill in your minds the value of character and the necessity of having a good reputation. It is said that "Character is what you are—reputation is what people think you are."

You can develop your character by entertaining lofty motives, being honest and upright, and practicing every day of your lives the Golden Rule of doing to others as you would wish others to do to you.

Guard well your reputation, for it is one of your priceless possessions. If you think such advice is silly or old-fashioned, you will find that your neighbors and friends do not agree with you.

Character and reputation are things that money cannot buy. Yet there are many persons who sold their good name for a few paltry dollars.

All of you are products of good American homes. Your parents have sacrificed much to clothe and feed you and to assist in your development as real American ladies and gentlemen.

They are prepared to continue to sacrifice for you in order that you may obtain a high-school education. Therefore, live up to their expectations and resolve that you will continue to honor your father and mother by never acting in such a way that your conduct can bring a blush of shame to their cheeks.

Your neighbors, relatives, and friends, as well as your parents, expect great things of you. Make certain that you make the best of your opportunities, and above all, do not let them down. They have great faith in you, and in your ability to forge ahead in your quest for an education.

Your teachers also have a great confidence in your ability and, as in grammar school, you will find your new teachers in high school just as interested as you are in your success.

Listen attentively to their advice as you enter your freshman year in high school, for your ability to learn new subjects will depend upon your will power and your determination to master your lessons.

The greatest teacher in the whole world can teach you nothing if you close your mind and refuse to cooperate.

High school is but a continuation of your happy school days here at Taylor, but it is not a 4-year excursion of fun.

You will find plenty of diversion and entertainment with high school athletic contests, class parties, and other high school activities that, coupled with your lessons, will aid in your development into manhood and womanhood.

If you elect to fiddle away your time, then you alone must pay the piper. The opportunity of making something worth while of yourself is within your reach, if you will display the necessary qualities of initiative and industry, and manifest an abiding faith in God.

As young citizens of this great Republic, you share with those of us who are older, the joy of living in the greatest Nation on the face of the earth.

Here in America we have a Nation that is the envy of the world. Your history books have told you of the God-fearing men and women who fashioned this Nation out of the vast wilderness.

America is still an infant in age when compared with other nations of the world. Yet it is the mightiest fortress of freedom in the whole universe.

In less than 200 years millions of modern farms and homes have been developed here in America. Our vast railroad system spans the Nation as it stretches through 48 States with their teeming cities and towns that house giant power plants, modern stores and factories.

We have more automobiles, telephones, radios, newspapers, modern highways, bathtubs, and other conveniences than any nation on the face of the globe.

The faith and industry of your forefathers are responsible for churches, hospitals, schools, libraries, and institutions of higher learning that by the thousands are found throughout the length and breadth of this fair land.

You young men and women are enjoying many of these facilities I mention, and yet you are just about to enter high school. What greater use you make of them will depend solely upon you.

Those of us who are older will, in time, retire from the scene of our activities and you will be expected to replace us.

You will be called upon to take over the reins of management of this beloved country, and its giant industrial and business enterprises.

You will vote for the kind of government you desire, you will operate our schools, hospitals, churches, colleges, run our railroads and manage our factories and other forms of industrial life.

There will be plenty of opportunities for you young men and young ladies, if you have the wisdom and foresight to make use of the golden opportunities your good parents have given you to obtain an education.

Whether you believe it or not, it is true that the want ads in the daily newspapers seldom have to ask for top-notch men and women. The reason is that a top-notch person has a good position and is not eager to leave it. His or her talents have been developed and are recognized, so that promotion always comes to those who are qualified.

The $10,000-a-year man is hard to find, because the position has already found him.

Therefore, make up your mind that whatever you set out to do, you will do it to the best of your ability. If you have that purpose in mind, it is as certain as night follows day that you will make a success of your undertaking.

As you leave Taylor Township Consolidated High School, after successfully completing the eighth grade, I wonder if you realize that you have now far more education than many famous people who were denied the opportunity to secure an education.

To illustrate the thought I have expressed, I want to read to you what Abraham Lincoln had to say in a personal letter to a friend before the Civil War, when he discussed the opportunity he had for an education.

These are the words of the immortal Lincoln:

"There were some so-called schools in Spencer County, Ind., but no qualification was ever required of a teacher beyond readin', writin', and cipherin' to the rule

of three. If a straggler supposed to understand some Latin happened to visit the neighborhood, he was looked upon as a wizard. There was absolutely nothing to excite ambition for education. Of course, when I came of age, I did not know much. Still, however, I could read, write, and cipher to the rule of three. But that was all. I have not been to school since. The little advance I now have upon this store of education I have picked up from time to time under the pressure of necessity."

So Lincoln looked back on the days of his youth—"I did not know much," he recalled. But he taught himself much later on after schooldays were over. That is the key to all education. Its aim is to make men wise. Some men, it is true, become wise without any formal education. Lincoln would never have been a fool even if he had not been able to read, write, and cipher to the rule of three, because he was observant, curious, and reflective.

But education, which means in its original sense merely the "drawing out" of one's abilities, was necessary to bring out the Lincoln who stands like a giant over the American scene. Lincoln knew that, and, since ready opportunity was denied him, he fought for every chance to read books, to meet interesting people, to do everything that would widen his horizons and open the broad world to his eager mind.

Read his words, and see how this man who as a youth "did not know much," yet he taught himself mastery of the English language. It enabled him to pass on to people of his own time, and down to us by the written word, the wisdom that came to him as education helped him to develop it. One has only to read his inaugural addresses, the Gettysburg speech, his letters and papers to realize that by his own naked efforts Abraham Lincoln made himself not only an educated but a wise man. He made use of the limited tools at his command, and by such effort his writings and utterances have become gems of thought and literature.

There is an age-old saying that "knowledge is power," and centuries of experience have borne out the truth of the maxim. However, it must be remembered that power is no guarantee to success. Between the two there is a deep gulf that can be bridged only by earnest persevering effort. You graduates should keep in mind that success is not measured by degrees of scholarship, but by what is infinitely more valuable—the moral victories achieved and the strength and nobility of character attained.

I have greatly enjoyed this opportunity to attend your first graduation exercises, and I am happy for the privilege of being with you and sharing your joy.

It is my earnest hope that you will heed the advice I have given you as you prepare for your career in high school.

If you abide by my counsel and rely on your parents and teachers for guidance, your high-school days will be happy and fruitful.

May God continue to bless and protect you and keep you close to Him is my fervent prayer.

The Creed of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include the words printed on a plaque which tells in a few words the creed of communism. Here is Mr. Albright's statement to me:

The purpose of this plaque is to teach the youth of America some of the liberties that they would lose should our country become a totalitarian state. This plaque, designed and written by Ernest Albright, box 505, of Shawnee, Okla., is being placed in the classrooms of the public schools as a silent teacher against this evil ideology known as communism.

The plaque is copyrighted and special permission is granted to Congressman BEN F. JENSEN for the purpose of inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

COMMUNISM

The Communists believe there is no God and that all churches should be abolished.

They believe that all commercial, civic, fraternal, and patriotic organizations, such as Rotary, Lions, Exchange, Optimist, and the Kiwanis Clubs; the chambers of commerce and trade organizations; the Masons, Elks, Knights of Columbus, Knights of Pythias, and the Odd Fellows; the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, United Spanish War Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Veterans of World War II; all school fraternities; the American Red Cross and the Salvation Army; should be dissolved and prohibited.

They believe that all medical and dental care, including hospitals, both private and public, all medicines and professional medical services should be placed under government control and administered under a central government agency.

They believe that all free labor organizations should be abolished and workers forced to join a federally controlled trade-union.

The Communists believe that newspapers, press services, magazines, and radio-broadcasting stations should be taken over and operated by the federal government, placing all news under a federal censorship board; and that public forums be abolished.

They believe that the federal government should take over all banks, stocks and bonds, investment houses, insurance companies; all public utilities, such as power, light, gas, telephone and telegraph companies, oil and gas fields; railroads, bus and air lines.

They believe that farm lands should be taken over and owned by the federal government and that all farmers be forced to work for the government as share-cropeprs.

They believe that the profit system should be abolished and that no citizen receive more than is needed for housing, food, and clothing.

They believe that all schools, both public and private, should be controlled by the federal government and administered by a central government agency.

The Communists believe that the Government of the United States should be taken over by force and ruled under a foreign dictator.

Our country became the greatest Nation on earth through private and free enterprise. Let us keep it free and great.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to insert here our creed which is already displayed in most every schoolroom in our blessed land:

THE AMERICAN'S CREED

I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

America, take your choice.

The Keyserling Touch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two articles which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of May 26 and June 1, the second of which serves to correct errors appearing in the first as to the views of the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Mr. Leon H. Keyserling, on the subject of the budget and the national debt. I hope and trust that both of these articles will be read carefully by business leaders and Members of Congress.

[From the Wall Street Journal of May 26, 1950]

THE KEYSERLING TOUCH

(By Vermont Royster)

WASHINGTON.—Leon Keyserling is a man persuaded that this country can lift itself to ever-higher prosperity by tugging on its own bootstraps. And Leon Keyserling is not a magician to be lightly dismissed.

The latter-day saint of the Keynesian economic order, he has changed a theory of compensatory spending into a plan for simply spending. This makes him a welcome patron for the politicians who would spend any way but much prefer to have their deeds sanctified.

And as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers and mentor to the President, he has already set out to perform this remarkable bit of levitation on the fulcrum of Federal deficit. Under his influence the administration will give a $5,000,000,000 tug on the bootstraps this year, a somewhat heavier heave next year, and the year following it expects to shove us toward prosperity with a really important deficit.

Just what constitutes a really important deficit in the minds of the uninhibited planners hereabouts is purely a matter of speculation. But it is quite evident that it is something bigger than a piddling $5,000,000,000.

If Mr. Keyserling, chief architect of this fulcrum for prosperity, has his way the most ardent spender will be satisfied. Mr. Keyserling is not a man of limited horizons.

The Keyserling economic philosophy is simplicity itself. It says that Government spending equals prosperity and without Government spending there can be no prosperity. Hence the more spending the better; and hence also the Government's debt is of minor importance. Indeed, if the Government runs a big enough annual deficit it will eventually get out of debt because the country will be just bursting with prosperity.

Stated thusly, the theory may sound like another California $30-every-Thursday scheme. Stated in economic argot, it can be made persuasive—it obviously has persuaded many persons—because it is the natural and

logical outgrowth of the Keynesian economic theories that dominated the early New Deal.

Britain's Lord Keynes argued that a government should run deficits in bad years to compensate for low business activity and once again balance the budget when times got better. Mr. Keyserling says: If government debt will lift the country out of a depression, why not keep it also in good times and so lift the country to even higher prosperity?

Mr. Keyserling simply carries Mr. Keynes to his logical conclusion, and the philosophy of the two of them is carrying the Truman administration just the way it wants to go. The politicians' desire to spend is now blessed with an economic theory.

The man who is giving the blessing is not an unfrocked economist dabbling in the spectacular. Leon Keyserling is not an economist at all. Born 42 years ago in Charleston, S. C., he studied to be a lawyer (LL. B., Harvard) and until a few years ago was known in Government circles as a lawyer and administrator in the second tier of the Government hierarchy. He was briefly a legislative assistant to former Senator Wagner and an attorney with the old AAA. Later he was General Counsel of the United States Housing Authority and of the wartime National Housing Agency. When the Economic Council was formed after the war Mr. Keyserling landed on it as an obscure and relatively unknown member. Today he is its Chairman and the Nation's No. 1 economist by appointment of the President.

But if Mr. Keyserling is not qualified as an economist he is well qualified as a practicing political philosopher and he is a skilled economic juggler.

From Harvard days onward he was a bright young man in the so called liberal circles. He has a pleasing appearance, a winning personality, and a sharp, quick mind. Subscribing early to the neo-socialism of the New Deal, he quickly mastered the patter of economics and he brought with him a gift for dialectical forensics. He could quickly discern what it was that the administration wished to do and then, as for a client, build a case to prove it the best thing to do.

It was the shrewdness that brought him to the top. Dr. Edwin Nourse, the former council chairman, had the habit of trying to mix tested economic principles with the administration's politics. Mr. Keyserling did not fall into this trap. He pronounces theories that conform with the politics, and so he fits into the chair very comfortably.

A number of people like to see him sit there. The professional politicians, of course, are pleased because his economic theories support the pork barrel of public works projects. But most pleased are the leaders of the CIO, because his argument that increased purchasing power is the key to everything, supports their arguments for higher wages, pensions, other social-security benefits, and the rest.

Now that Mr. Keyserling, as Chairman, is in a position to give a real test to his theory of the deficit fulcrum, he will not likely be deterred by small bears.

He will not be frightened by a big deficit any more than by a small one for the reason that he believes heavy Government spending is not just something for emergencies but is a good thing of and by itself. And he is not one, either, to quibble over too much of a good thing.

The rise of Leon Keyserling means that the administration will keep heaving harder and harder at the Nation's inflationary bootstraps. It does not seem to have occurred to Mr. Keyserling that even if we could do this trick, we would simply hoist our feet and fall flat on our face.

[From the Wall Street Journal of June 1, 1950]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

MR. KEYSERLING REPLIES

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

In the Wall Street Journal of May 26, Mr. Vermont Royster has written an article entitled "The Keyserling Touch" which completely distorts my views. It matters little that I have been done a personal injustice. But it matters much when the business community receives alarming reports which are entirely incorrect about the views of public officials. Such reports undermine confidence, prevent cooperation, and in the end will make businessmen distrustful even of valid criticism of public policy.

Mr. Royster says that under my influence there will be a $5,000,000,000 Federal deficit this year and efforts to create a really important deficit next year; that I want a deficit bigger than a piddling $5,000,000,000; that I believe in the more spending the better and that the Government's debt is of minor importance; that I go Lord Keynes one better by arguing not only for a compensatory deficit in bad times but also for a still bigger deficit in good times to keep us even more prosperous; and that I subscribe to the neo-socialism of the New Deal.

None of these statements is supported by anything I have ever said or written.

1. The Council of Economic Advisers and I personally from 1947 to 1949 repeatedly urged a budget surplus and reduction of the national debt in a period of high prosperity. We urged economy. We opposed the excessive tax reductions of 1948 which many of those who voted for them now regret.

2. Neither the Council nor I has yet recommended expenditures just to generate prosperity. Even in mid-1949, when many responsible groups were urging large new public expenditure programs to relieve unemployment, my position on the record was that Federal spending should not be enlarged for this purpose, but that instead we should rely on the strong recuperative forces within the business system itself. Economic developments since then have vindicated this position.

3. I believe that continued deficits over a period of years are dangerous. One reason for this, as stated so ably by Dr. Roy Blough in his recently quoted testimony before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, is that continued deficits might lead the public to believe that there were no economic limits upon Federal spending regardless of the real ability of our economy to bear these costs without damage.

4. While I do not believe it practical to balance the budget every year, I believe that over a period of years the Government should average a surplus and reduce the national debt. My repeated statements to this effect are indistinguishable in the main from the position of the Committee on Economic Development, as I understand it. On April 3, 1950, before the Economic Club of Detroit, I said:

"It is the objective of the Government, as I understand it, to balance the budget as rapidly as feasible. I think that the level of national income and general prosperity are now high enough to justify a balanced budget and a surplus for the reduction of the national debt. At the same time, our economy adjusts itself slowly to change, and the decisions on the tax side and the decisions on the expenditure side which have been made in the past would seem to me to make it unwise to try to achieve a complete budget balance overnight.

"Let me illustrate by one simple example. I might believe that, if taxes had been reduced by $3,000,000,000 instead of five or six billion dollars in 1948, we would now be closer to a balanced budget and our business system would not have been appreciably worse off if the tax reduction had been smaller. But it does not follow that I would believe that taxes ought to be increased by $3,000,000,000 now, because in the current stage of the economy the increase of taxes by $3,000,000,000 now would, I think, do a great deal more damage than if we had reduced taxes by $3,000,000,000 less than they were reduced 2 years ago.

"We ought to try to balance the budget as rapidly as feasible by moderation in tax policy, and by economy in expenditures. But the most important path of all toward a balanced budget is a resumption of the normal growth pattern of the economy. With profits being the most volatile part of the income structure, the drop in revenues which results when there is even a slight cessation of the upward movement of the economy affects the Federal budget very adversely. That is why I think we must always center upon those policies which will do most to resume the normal upward growth trend of the economy as the most important step toward a balanced budget. We should practice economy in expenditures in all those areas where this can be safely and prudently done."

5. On May 15, 1950, speaking in Chicago, I said the following:

"We all hope that the cost of the cold war can be reduced, and this should reduce the percentage of our total national output represented by Federal spending. * * * We should use some of that saving to expand programs of resource development and human security. * * * We do not look upon Federal deficits with equanimity."

6. I do not believe, and I have never said, that "the Government's debt is of minor importance." It is of enormous importance, and should be reduced. But I believe it more important not to relax the necessary efforts of the cold war next year than to balance the budget next year.

7. I have always stressed the primary importance of an economic environment which maximizes private investment and private business activity, instead of excessive reliance upon compensatory public spending. I submit in proof the following exhibits:

(a) In an article in the New York Times on June 8, 1947, I said:

"Too much trust [during the years just after 1933] was put in the idea that direct Government programs can be used to enlarge employment regardless of their effect upon the whole business system. To illustrate: The employment of 3,000,000 people on public works does not necessarily add 3,000,000 people to the net number of employed. It may add four million if its indirect consequence is to stimulate private employment by one million; or if may add only two million if its indirect consequence is to retard private employment by one million. When such hypodermics are given, the most important thing to watch is their effect upon the whole economy. The most serious insufficiency in our previous antidepression efforts, however, was that they did not place enough emphasis upon restoring balance within the enterprise system itself. * * * In peacetime three-quarters or more of national receipts and expenditures are attributable to consumer, business, and international transactions, while only about one-quarter or less are attributable to Federal, State, and local governments. Manifestly, the policies pursued within the enterprise system have more effect upon the Nation's economic health than any programs the Government may undertake, unless the Government should undertake to run the whole economy;"

(b) In Business and Government, the Fourth Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers in December 1949, which was written and signed by my colleague, Dr. John D. Clark, and me, it was said:

"This leads to the conclusion that compensatory public action can help to iron out minor fluctuations of the business cycle and must indeed be used if big ones develop, but the complete recovery from a substantial downswing depends primarily upon the revival of private investment. And because that revival becomes progressively harder to accomplish as the economy moves further downward, the main concentration of economic policy should be upon encouraging stability and growth within our free-enterprise system itself. * * * This approach is sometimes referred to as creating a climate favorable to business. * * * Insofar as any popular version of the Keynesian economics identifies it with the school which placed exaggerated stress upon compensatory action that school is neither representative of our own thinking nor in our opinion characteristic of any important segment of government thought today."

I am less interested in commenting upon Mr. Royster's equally incorrect insinuations that I had no contact with economics until appointed to the Council. Anyone genuinely concerned can find the record of my 20 years of continuous working interest in national economic problems and policies.

I trust that any commentary upon the foregoing will not resort to the familiar device of issuing new unfounded charges when old ones have been discredited, but instead will point out how Mr. Royster's assertions of May 26 and be squared with the record.

LEON H. KEYSERLING,
Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers, Washington, D. C.

The Tariff on Imported Fish Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me on June 8, 1950, to the Committee on Reciprocity Information:

THE TARIFF ON IMPORTED FISH AND FISH PRODUCTS

(Statement of Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, June 8, 1950, before Committee on Reciprocity Imformation)

I am a strong supporter of and have always fought for reciprocal trade agreements legislation but the ominous and very real threat of extinction cc fronting the fishing industry of New England warrants meticulous consideration and attention from this committee. Imports of foreign fish fillets are engulfing the domestic industry, a situation entirely unexpected and surely not anticipated when the duty on fish fillets was lowered to 1⅞ cents per pound in the 1939 Trade Agreements Act.

There is no need for me to remind you gentlemen that I represent the port of Boston, Mass., in the House of Representa- 1930 Tariff Act when I was a fledgling Contives. I remember well the passage of the gressman and it is my recollection that the majority of the debate centered around maintaining a tariff comparable to 25 percent of the import value of the fish. The specific duty established by that act was, in fact, approximately 25 percent ad valorem.

Our fishing industry has not enjoyed the benefits of subsidization granted by other nations to its fishermen. Our industry, therefore, has had to bear all the expense of converting fresh fish to fillets—because that is what the public demanded after the fillet was made available, and at the same time compete with a new basis for competition since foreign countries can ship any given quantity of frozen fillets into the United States without loss through spoilage.

The situation in the fishing industry is so disastrous that I myself aided in the passage of a resolution by the present Congress for a complete investigation of the industry. Extensive hearings were held in February 1949 before the Subcommittee on the Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives. The results of the hearings were printed in a document entitled "Problems of the Fishing Industry" and made available to the committee members which should be of invaluable aid to the genelemen on this committee. During the present Congress the House also passed House Resolution No. 174 requesting a report from the Secretaries of State and Commerce and of the United States Tariff Commission on the effect on the domestic fishing industry of increasing imports of fresh and frozen fish. The results of that request were published in House Document No. 18 which is also available for your use. These actions prove conclusively that the Congress is aware of the situation and feels that a remedy should be found. Such a remedy would be an adjustment of the present tariff on fresh and frozen groundfish fillets to an ad valorem rate more in keeping with other fish products.

The question that many of you will ask deals with the price to the consumer by a change from specific duty to an ad valorem duty. At the present moment, unfair competition exists because foreign countries can produce fresh and frozen fillets and export their produce cheaper than American industry can produce at our present high labor standard. By reverting to an equitable ad valorem rate of duty, it is understood the foreign country will be able to retain a sizable portion of the American market but will be forced to compete with our American industry on more even terms. American industry and labor are entitled to a fair chance and the right to reasonable protection in relation to job security and invested capital.

I am sure this committee will give careful attention to the representatives of the fishing industry who will be witnesses before you today to present expert and detailed testimony on the subject. I concur in their statements and urge you to give them a sympathetic audience with the view to a solution of their problem.

Curtailment of Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, in my hand I hold an editorial from the Waterbury Republican written on May 11. This is a daily newspaper printed at Waterbury, Conn., and it, in effect, makes the same inquiry contained in a petition signed by 1893 voters of that city which I displayed to the Post Office and Civil Cervice Committee on yesterday. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article that asked a very pointed question in regard to the postal delivery curtailment order issued by the Postmaster General on April 18:

NARROW ESCAPE

If a 1¼ percent reduction in post office appropriations means a cutting in half of the postal service, should we not be thankful that Congress didn't order a 2½-percent slash?

Here's what puzzles us about the necessity for cutting down on post-office service in order to save the relatively small amount of money Congress has asked that Department to do without next year.

The Postmaster General estimates that it will take an appropriation of $2,235,607,000 to make the post offices run as they should and to give all the service we have been accustomed to expect.

The House Appropriations Committee proposed to cut this expenditure to $2,207,-500,000—a drop of $28,107,000.

Immediately the Postmaster General announced that this reduction in revenue would necessitate a cut-back to one mail delivery a day, a general slowdown in the handling of postal matter, and the elimination of a number of other accommodations.

What would have happened if the proposed cut had been twice as great, a reduction of 2½ percent instead of about 1¼ percent? Suppose the House Appropriations committee had said the most we could spend to balance the post-office books next year would be $2,179,393,000?

Would that have meant that instead of one mail delivery a day there wouldn't be any delivery at all?

Labor's Statement on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there is appended the substance of an article from the publication Economic Outlook of the CIO Department of Education and Research issued in February 1949 which is particuuarly pertinent today. Working men and women have learned that we will all be better off as our country understands that the basis for its effectiveness, its power and its high standard of living is to be found in production and trade, and that as the economic condition of other free peoples are improved, ours will improve. We are here seeing in the ranks of labor a balanced and statesmanlike view on economic foreign policy which would have been unheard of in another day. There is much of the same kind of understanding in business. I hope that business and labor together can enlighten that remaining segment of each which still thinks in terms of the United States as a closed and insular market without understanding that the greatest opportunity for our

own people is in opening up the whole free world to trade and the opportunity to improve itself.

LABOR'S STAKE IN ECONOMIC FOREIGN POLICY

The United States foreign policy faces a difficult problem in 1949. The political phase of the problem is that of maintaining peace under tense conditions that prevail in many parts of the world. The economic phase is that of improving world living standards as a basis for political stability. American labor has a vital stake in both aspect of the problem.

The CIO believes that the only kind of foreign policy able to cope with this situation is one that strengthens the political and economic condition of freemen everywhere. The resolution on foreign policy enacted by the tenth CIO convention in Portland, Oreg., November 23, 1948, stated this clearly. "Peace and prosperity," it said "are indivisible. A sound, progressive American can give encouragement to the peoples of the world to improve their living standards and to widen the horizon of their political liberties. American participation in world affairs should be directed to the spread of democracy and to the establishment of economic conditions that will enable democracy to survive."

In line with these aims the CIO advocates an integrated foreign policy directed toward international cooperation: In the political sphere, through support of the United Nations and a strengthening of the democracies; in the economic sphere, through the European recovery program, the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the adoption of the charter for an International Trade Organization, and other measures to expand international trade.

LABOR'S STAKE IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Labor has a direct stake in international trade, not only because the United States is such a large exporter of the products of American labor, but also because most of the goods we import from other countries are essential to us to keep our industrial machines operating and maintain a high standard of living.

Exports mean the difference between prosperity and depression for many American industries. This is particularly true in industries such as electrical machinery and apparatus, transportation equipment, agricultural machinery, automobiles and trucks, rolled steel products, office machinery, and many others, for which exports absorb a large proportion of our total output. Some of this production is concentrated in a few localities which are largely dependent upon a single industry. For the United States as a whole, approximately 10 percent of our total industrial output is sold abroad, but the proportion is much higher for certain industries.

The United States Department of Labor estimates that, in the first half of 1947 (the latest period for which statistics are available), exports provided jobs for 2,400,000 nonagricultural workers, representing 5.6 percent of the total nonagricultural employment in the United States. The percentage of workers dependent upon exports was particularly high in steel works and rolling mills; coal mining and manufactured solid fuel; machinery, including electrical apparatus; and rubber. There were nearly three times as many workers dependent upon exports in 1947 as in 1939. This reflects the growing importance since the war of exports in our domestic economy. Average annual wages in the export industries have always been much higher than in industries protected by high tariffs.

American labor also benefits from agricultural exports because they increase the purchasing power of American farmers for the products of American industry. Approximately 10 percent of the total agricultural output of the United States is exported. Thus, nearly one-tenth of the total farm employment (there were 10,000,00 agricultural workers in the United States in 1947) depends upon export for its income. Farmers and city workers are interdependent. They prosper together or not at all.

But American labor also benefits from imports. Our huge American industrial machine could not operate at present levels without raw materials supplied by other countries. This became increasingly evident as wartime demands depleted our natural resources, particularly minerals. The United States Bureau of Mines reported to Congress, in May 1947, that our known commercial reserves of 24 major minerals were less than sufficient to supply 35 years of domestic requirements at current rates of consumption. Among these are such vital minerals as copper, lead, zinc, manganese, chrome, tungsten, mica, tin, bauxite, cadmium, vanadium, tantalum, asbestos, graphite, nickel, and petroleum. Reduced imports of such products would reduce our present industrial production, would create unemployment, and would raise prices to consumers on hundreds of products used in our daily lives.

In addition, a great number of products which are essential to the American standard of living must be provided by other countries. Tea and coffee for our tables, as well as pepper, pineapple, chocolate, sugar, and bananas, come from foreign lands. Wool for our clothing, hemp for rope, and rubber for a thousand uses, come largely from imports.

A sharp reduction in American foreign trade, both export and import, would reverberate throughout the entire domestic economy and would make it impossible to maintain full employment and high living standards in this country.

THE CHARTER FOR AN INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION

The charter for an International Trade Organization (ITO) represents an additional step toward the United States' objective of expanding world trade and stimulating world economic recovery.

The CIO is actively supporting the charter. Not only have we testified in its behalf; we also were represented at the Habana Conference a year ago which formulated its detailed provisions.

The charter does two things: It establishes rules that countries voluntarily agree to follow in their conduct of trade with each other. It creates an organization, composed of the governments of all countries that adhere to the charter, to administer these rules and to settle trade disputes.

The countries that worked together in the preparation of this charter felt that the existence of an agreed-upon code of fair dealing in international trade, and the existence of a permanent forum for the settlement of trade disputes, would make it possible for them to cooperate in an expansion of world trade. They felt that such an organization and procedure would help to avoid the kind of economic warfare between nations which prevailed in the decades between World Wars I and II. This economic warfare dried up international trade in the 1930's created economic disorder and unemployment in many countries, and contributed much to the economic and political instability that led to World War II.

The charter was formulated by the 57-nation United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment, at Habana, Cuba, November 21, 1947, to March 24, 1948. Fifty-four countries have already agreed to the text of the charter and are now submitting it to their governments for ratification. It will go to the United States Congress for decision as to action by this country early in the forthcoming session. What other countries do about the charter, which was sponsored by our own Government during the war, will be determined largely by action of the United States Congress now.

The charter rules cover the whole range of international economic relationships: Tariffs, quotas, subsidies, foreign exchange, customs formalities, cartels, commodity agreements, nondiscrimination, state trading, and the international aspects of foreign investments, employment and economic development. It pledges countries to consult with each other on any international trade action affecting another country. It obligates countries to negotiate for the reduction of trade barriers, thus extending to other countries the aims of our own reciprocal trade agreements program. It obligates member countries not to discriminate against the trade of each other, except in carefully limited cases which have been previously agreed upon. It obligates member countries to settle their international trade differences in accordance with the principles of the charter and the decisions of the International Trade Organization. Instead of the rules of the jungle, orderly and democratic procedures would now be applied to international trade.

The ITO respects the sovereign equality of all countries. It does not interfere in their domestic affairs. Each country has one vote. Decisions are by majority vote, unless otherwise specified. If a country is dissatisfied with a decision of the ITO, after following the specified procedures, it may leave the organization on 60 days' notice. Thereafter, however, it will not be entitled to the lower tariff rates and other benefits that member countries grant each other.

The charter, as an instrument to expand world trade, production, and consumption, is of general significance to American labor. Certain provisions are of particular interest to American labor; namely, those relating to employment, economic development, and cartels.

Under the charter, each member assumes a positive obligation to maintain "full and productive employment" within its territory by measures appropriate to its political, economic and social institutions. This principle is similar to that of the United States Employment Act of 1946. Countries agree that in solving their own production and employment problems, they will try to avoid measures that injure other countries. They agree that unfair labor conditions, particularly in export industries, create difficulties for other countries. They agree to cooperate with the International Labor Office in regard to fair labor standards. The ITO may not interfere in the internal affairs of member countries to put these principles into operation, because sovereign countries do not permit such interference, but it can lend experience and counsel to encourage members to observe these principles in their dealings with one another. It remains, of course, for actual practice to demonstrate how successfully these principles will be carried out. But it is surely a step in the right direction to obtain international recognition and agreement upon such principles.

THE CHARTER SEEKS TO AID UNDERVELOPED COUNTRIES

The charter recognizes another basic problem of profound implication for the future of mankind. This is the problem of economically underdeveloped countries.

There was a time, not so long ago, when economically powerful countries assumed a perpetual right to exploit the underdeveloped countries as they saw fit. Poverty, disease and misery were assumed to be the unquestioned fate of a large part of mankind. The Food and Agriculture Organization noted that before the war two-thirds of the world's population were undernourished. The time has come when the people of the underdeveloped countries are no longer content to

suffer their lot in silence. They feel that they should have a hand in their own destiny.

Two roads are open. With the cooperation of the industrialized countries, they may develop their production, raise their living standards, and broaden the horizon of their political liberties along the lines of democracy. The other road is an attempt by the industrialized countries to preserve the status quo, sullen resentment on the part of the have-nots against the haves, continued poverty, rejection of democratic ideas, and a turning toward totalitarianism. How long our kind of democracy, with its emphasis upon individual liberty and freedom could survive in such a world, no one can say.

From the United States point of view, there is every reason to improve the lot of the underdeveloped countries.

Developed countries mean better markets for our exports. For example, Canada, with a population of 12,000,000 people bought nearly twice as many American goods before the war as did South America, with a population of 84,000,000 people. In the prewar period, the United States exported more to Belgium and the Netherlands (with a population of 18,000,000 people) than to China and India (with a population of 850,000,000 people). As the underdeveloped countries improve their economic condition, wage levels in those countries rise. An improvement in the lot of labor in such countries, accompanied by a strengthening of trade-union movements, makes for fairer conditions of international trade competition among all countries.

Another aspect of the problem was stressed in a recent foreign report of the executive committee of the National Planning Association, which is composed of representatives of American labor, agriculture, and industry: "It is the good fortune of the free nations," says the report, "that a large proportion of the world's resources, especially of its undeveloped resources, falls within their sphere of control. A major strategic aim of the United States must be to seek a full development and use of these resources. Both technical and financial assistance must be available to this end. Assistance given by the United States for the development of these resources will make an important contribution to economic stability and to orderly and balanced trade relations."

The charter contains many provisions for stimulating progress of the underdeveloped countries. The ITO, when requested by a member, may make studies and advise members on projects for their economic development. Members must not place unreasonable obstacles upon the flow of capital, equipment, or technology to underdeveloped countries except for purposes of national security. The charter recognizes that international investment will stimulate economic development.

When an underdeveloped country wants to increase its tariff rates, to stimulate the development of a particular industry, the charter permits such action under an orderly procedure: The country must obtain the consent of other interested members if the product is covered in a trade agreement, or the approval of the ITO if the product is not in a trade agreement. In certain circumstances the charter permits countries to extend tariff preferences to each other, to broaden the market and to stimulate the development of a particular industry. Countries also may form customs unions to broaden the free-trade area of their market.

Under the charter participants also agree to prevent business practices affecting international trade which restrain competition and foster monopolistic control. When a member is injured by such practices of another country it may ask the ITO to investigate and recommend to the other country the steps necessary to curb such practices.

People are now aware how the prewar international cartels restricted international trade. Domestic monopolies often restrict trade, too.

The American or the Russian Plan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my privilege to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks made by the late Secretary of State, Bainbridge Colby, which displayed his foresight in opposing recognition of Soviet Russia. Mr. Colby, as I said, issued a masterly summation of the reasons why this Nation could not do business with Russia either economically or politically. Since that time, it has come to my attention that a young French philosopher by the name of Alexis de Tocqueville possessed more prescience.

Alexis de Tocqueville came to this country 120 years ago to see what progress the American people had made in the 50 years of our constitutional Republic. The young French philosopher apparently had given equal first-hand study to Russia, and the motives that guided the Russian people. Evidently, he appreciated that the Russians were basically imperialistic under the Czars as much as they are today under the Communist leaders. On his return to France, Alexis de Tocqueville had published in 1835 a classic commentary entitled "Democracy in America." The works of this French philosopher are little known to our people today, but many of his writings in many of his chapters in his commentary read as if they were written only recently. He wrote of what sort of despotism democratic nations have to fear, and two paragraphs with which he concluded his first volume were important then and are important now. These paragraphs are as follows:

There are at the present time (1835), two great nations in the world which seem to tend toward the same end, although they started from different points—I allude to the Russians and the Americans. Both of them have grown up unnoticed, and whilst the attention of mankind was directed elsewhere, they have suddenly assumed a most prominent place amongst the nations, and the world learned their existence and their greatness at almost the same time.

All other nations seem to have nearly reached their natural limits, and only to be charged with the maintenance of their power; but these are still in the act of growth, all the others are stopped, or continue to advance with extremely difficulty, these are proceeding with ease and celerity along a path to which the human eye can assign no term. The American struggles against the natural obstacles which oppose him, the adversaries of the Russian are men, the former combats the wilderness and savage life, the latter, civilization with all its weapons and its arts, the conquests of the one are therefore gained by the ploughshare, those of the other by the sword. The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends, and gives free scope to the unguided exertions and common sense of the citizens, the Russian centers all the authority of society in a single arm, the principal instrument of the former is freedom, of the latter servitude. Their starting point is different, and their courses are not the same, yet each of them seems to be marked out by the will of Heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe.

The Late John Gould Fletcher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, last month an outstanding Arkansawyer passed away. The citizens of the State of Arkansas mourn the loss of their leading man of letters, John Gould Fletcher, of Little Rock. The late Mr. Fletcher was a noted writer of free verse. He received the Pulitzer prize for poetry in 1939. He studied at Harvard and in England before his pen brought him fame.

Mr. Fletcher was tied to the State of Arkansas by "bonds of birth and tradition." He maintained an active interest in the arts and he spent many untiring hours fostering the interests of the Arkansas State Symphony, the Little Rock Art Museum, and the Arkansas Annual Art Show.

A beautiful eulogy to Mr. Fletcher appeared recently in an edition of the Arkansas Gazette. I would like to include as a part of my remarks this article about this great cultural leader of Arkansas:

JOHN GOULD FLETCHER

The cycle of John Gould Fletcher's life—his youth in Arkansas where the Fletcher roots go deep, his education in the East, his long expatriation in England, his ultimate return to the land that bred him—was not uncommon in his generation of literary rebels. It was in keeping with his time that he should have gained his first fame by striking down old poetic forms in his search for beauty, and for salvation.

"Life Is My Song," he wrote years later, coining a title for his autobiography. But life as he knew it was no simple lyric. In all his works there were overtones of personal tragedy, and of the greater conflict that raged around him. With his poet's eye he saw the changing social and economic concepts of the twentieth century in terms of the impact upon the spirit of man. And he discovered early that there was no final escape in art.

After years abroad John Gould Fletcher came home again. His literary reputation was secure; the critics placed him in the first rank of contemporary poets; he was in demand as a contributor to magazines and anthologies, and as a lecturer at great universities. To his fellow townsmen he often seemed a strange and lonely figure, but never a remote one. As Arkansas's leading man of letters—the greatest, in fact, the State has produced thus far—he concerned himself with all the arts. His standards were high

and he was no man to compromise; controversy boiled about him as he became a moving spirit in the affairs of the State Symphony, the Little Rock Art Museum, and the State art competition. Many of his contemporaries found him difficult to deal with, but none ever found him less than honest and none could fail to respect the vigorous opinions he unhesitatingly voiced.

The illness that led to his tragic death plagued him through those last years. His last major work, Arkansas, was published in 1947. It is in prose and is commonly called a history, and certainly it reflects scholarship of a high order. But John Gould Fletcher was a poet, first and last, and Arkansas more than anything else stands as an evaluation and a testament by an extraordinary sensitive Arkansawyer—as he insisted the term should be—who was tied to the State by bonds of birth and tradition, who loved it and feared for it, and who returned to give it his last years.

In Arkansas, John Gould Fletcher wrote:

"Though the people of Little Rock seem to have changed little in the last 50 years, a great transformation in external affairs has taken place around them. In Little Rock a few oaks still stand that were, possibly, acorns in the days of La Salle; but the human race has not developed in the way the oaks have done. The body of humanity has raced forward to a goal that the mind cannot master or grasp, and we live today at the center of an earthquake that became inevitable when, far off in the eighteenth century, James Watt saw the steam push upward the piston of his first engine. That earthquake may end by destroying Little Rock, along with the western civilization it fostered; or destruction may be avoided by recovering old spiritual foundations long lost in these days. We have been told that modern man is now obsolete; the question is how far can we avoid, in his downfall, the destruction of ancient and abiding man?"

The Cost of President Truman's Order Canceling 16,000 Veterans' Administration Hospital Beds Would Have Built and Equipped 3 New and Modern 200-Bed Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, recently the House of Representatives gave its approval to the restoration of 16,000 hospital beds ordered canceled by President Truman.

During the debate on the 16,000-bed bill much was said of the 18 military medical hospitals in the continental United States.

As a result of the debate on the 16,000-bed bill I wrote to Gen. Carl R. Gray, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and received the following self-explanatory reply:

MAY 24, 1950.

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VAN ZANDT: Thank you for the opportunity presented in your letter of March 30, 1950, to explain the position of this Administration on the use of certain hospitals being closed by the military services.

The Secretary of Defense on February 1st issued a statement announcing the closing or reduction in size of 18 military medical hospitals in the continental United States. Some of these were Army hospitals, some were Navy, and some Air Force.

On the 18, only 5 were to be closed. The others were to be continued, but reduced in size. The five to be closed are Murphy General, Waltham, Mass.; Valley Forge, Phoenixville, Pa.; Oliver General, Augusta, Ga.; Percy Jones, Battle Creek, Mich.; and the naval hospital at Long, Beach, Calif. All of these are general medical and surgical hospitals.

Murphy General Hospital and Valley Forge Hospital are both built on what is known as a horizontal plan, which means they are dispersed one- and two-story buildings with brick exteriors and frame interiors. Both are considered to be semipermanent and are not of fire-resistant construction. Both were built during the war years to meet the medical emergency of that period.

The main building at Oliver General Hospital was constructed in 1926 as a 300-room multistoried hotel building, and the balance of the buildings (approximately 256 buildings, including 33 ward buildings) are of cantonment-type construction added during World War II.

The main buildings at Percy Jones Hospital are of stone and brick construction, built about 1915, with temporary buildings added during World War II.

The naval hospital at Long Beach, Calif., is a multistoried main structure, built of concrete, with numerous temporary structures added to it to meet the war emergency. It was built in 1942. I have visited this hospital and in my opinion it has a well-designed core of permanent construction and would be acceptable in exchange for temporary buildings.

None of the hospitals being surrendered by the armed services is suitable for the care of neuropsychiatric patients. A careful survey has been made of the Oliver General Hospital at Augusta, Ga., and the Long Beach Naval Hospital, Long Beach, Calif., to determine whether those hospitals could be adaptable for use by the Veterans' Administration. As a result of these surveys, it has been determined that substantial savings to the Government with no decrease in the standards for veterans' care can be accomplished by the utilization by the Veterans' Administration of these two service hospitals. The Veterans' Adminstration has therefore been directed to take over the Oliver General Hospital and the Long Beach Naval Hospital not later than July 1, 1950. Plans for the Oliver General Hospital are predicated on reconversion of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Peachtree Road, Atlanta, from tuberculosis to a 225-bed general medical hospital. Oliver will be operated as a 500-bed hospital, 225 for tuberculosis and 275 for general medical and surgical beds. The Veterans' Administration hospital at Chamblee, Ga., will be closed as soon as possible after the Oliver Hospital is opened and will be completely deactivated by January 1, 1951.

The Long Beach Naval Hospital will replace the Birmingham General Hospital at Van Nuys, Calif., which is of temporary construction. This will permit the utilization of the Van Nuys property as the site for the new 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital which is authorized for the Los Angeles area. This new neuropsychiatric hospital will have a complete general medical and surgical section which will include a staff especially qualified to care for eligible paraplegic patients living in the San Fernando Valley.

In general, hospitals built or acquired by the armed services during the war were constructed with the idea that they were to meet a passing emergency. They were designed for rapid construction or conversion and the materials used in them were inferior and selected to avoid, insofar as possible, those items which were critically needed for prosecution of the war.

The type of hospital that best suited the emergency needs was designed on the horizontal plan. This type of hospital covers a large territory and consequently is highly inefficient in its use of personnel. I am sure you will agree that continued operation of the hospitals at Waltham, Mass.; Phoenixville, Pa.; and Battle Creek, Mich., under any conditions would in the long run prove to be an extravagance rather than an economy.

It should be kept in mind that during the war the armed services could secure practically unlimited manpower in their hospitals, while the Veterans' Administration is making every effort to keep its manpower requirements to a minimum. It is considered highly important, both because of the personnel problem and the excessive maintenance costs, that permanent hospitals which will provide a maximum in fire resistant qualities be furnished. For these reasons the hospitals being constructed by this administration are designed in compact plants with architecture of a vertical rather than a horizontal type to permit all elements being brought closely together for convenience of operation.

The information contained in exhibits A and B referred to in your letter has been revised to reflect current conditions. These revisions are attached.

The information relative to the neuropsychiatric-bed situation as given in my letter of August 4, 1949, revised as of February 28, 1950, is shown below:

Hospital	Available beds	Percent occupancy	Number awaiting admission	
			Service-connected	Non-service-connected
Coatesville, Pa	2,119	97.6	2	762
Lyons, N. J	2,522	97.8	----	483
Canadaigua, N. Y	1,700	97.1	----	506
Chillicothe, Ohio	2,155	98.7	----	59

The system totals for all Veterans' Administration hospitals at February 28, were as follows:

Type of hospital	Available beds	Percent occupancy	Number awaiting admission	
			Service-connected	Non-service-connected
Tuberculosis	7,892	90.9	4	1,767
Neuropsychiatric	50,365	96.8	19	8,433
General medical service	48,323	89.8	8	15,255
At regional offices	----	----	3	218
Total	106,580	94.1	34	25,673

On this date a total of 7,530 beds were reported unavailable, 1,251 beds in TB, 1,292 in NP, and 4,987 in G. M. & S. hospitals. Of these beds 3,712 were reported unavailable due to lack of personnel, 1,529 due to alterations or construction, and 332 for other reasons. There were no unavailable beds at the four hospitals you are particularly interested in, except 137 for Coatesville, Pa.

Nearly all new G. M. & S. hospitals now authorized include capacity for psychotic patients. The total building program as now authorized provides for an increase of some 8,000 beds for psychotic patients over the number now in operation.

Sincerely yours,

O. W. CLARK,
Deputy Administrator.

EXHIBIT A

Estimated obligations incurred on 24 eliminated hospitals

	Number of beds	Thousands of dollars				
		Total	Technical services		Site [1]	Other
			A/E contracts	Other		
Total (24)	11,171	$7,877	$4,809	$1,697	$1,351	$20
Assigned to C. of E. (19)	8,671	7,803	4,809	1,633	1,341	20
1. Americus, Ga. (TB)	250	301	239	62	Donated	
2. Charlotte, N. C. (GM)	500	305	175	65	65	
3. Chattanooga, Tenn. (GM)	500	376	284	65	27	
4. Decatur, Ill. (GM)	250	269	150	75	44	
5. Detroit, Mich. (TB)	500	430	275	79	76	
6. Duluth, Minn. (GM)	200	220	182	38	Donated	
7. El Paso, Tex. (NP)	500	426	295	74	57	
8. Gainesville, Fla. (NP)	1,000	957	654	266	37	
9. Grand Rapids, Mich. (GM)	200	287	190	65	32	
10. Greenville, S. C. (GM)	200	243	154	56	33	
11. Harrisburg, Pa. (GM)	200	288	158	60	70	
12. Houston, Tex. (NP)	1,000	1,419	522	190	687	20
13. Klamath Falls, Oreg. (GM)	200	326	184	124	18	
14. Mound Bayou, Miss. (GM)	200	207	129	76	[2] 2	
15. Norman, Okla. (NP)	750	517	430	87	Transfer	
16. Salisbury, N. C. (NP)	921				[3]	
17. Tallahassee, Fla. (GM)	100	244	162	57	25	
18. Toledo, Ohio (NP)	1,000	767	478	128	161	
19. Tupelo, Miss. (GM)	200	221	148	66	7	
Assigned to VA for design (5)	2,500	74		64	10	
1. Columbia, S. C. (addition) (GM)	200	16		[4] 16		
2. Memphis, Tenn. (NP)	1,000				[2]	
3. New York, N. Y. (CHR)	1,000	3		3	[2]	
4. San Diego, Calif. (GM)	200	55		45	10	
5. Thomasville, Ga. (GM)	100				Transfer	

[1] Obligations for sites in the main can be salvaged by the Government.
[2] Site not acquired.
[3] Plans and site used for another hospital project.
[4] Obligated by Corps of Engineers.

NOTE.—VA overhead costs are not included in the above figures.

EXHIBIT B

Estimated obligations incurred or to be incurred for specified categories of costs on 15 hospitals altered in size

	Bed capacity		Thousands of dollars				
			Estimated design costs			Estimated obligations incurred and to be incurred for sites	Estimated other obligations incurred prior to redesign
	Previous	Revised	Estimated obligations to be incurred for redesign	Estimated obligations incurred prior to redesign [1]			
				A/E contracts	Other		
Total (15) altered in size	14,445	9,500	$2,668	$3,511	$941	$6,432	
Assigned to C. of E. (10)	9,445	6,500	1,742	3,511	801	4,103	
1. Cincinnati, Ohio (GM)	750	500	[3] 149	164	48	[2] Donation	
2. Kansas City, Mo. (GM)	745	500		548	109	[2] 50	
3. Louisville, Ky. (GM)	750	500	[3] 150	266	80	[2] 8	
4. New York, N. Y. (GM)	1,000	1,250	558	25	23	[2] 2,978	
5. Philadelphia, Pa. (GM)	1,000	500	[3] 155	371	90	249	
6. Pittsburgh, Pa. (NP)	1,250	1,000		609	100	[2] 125	
7. Pittsburgh, Pa. (GM)	1,200	750	94	457	113	186	
8. St. Louis, Mo. (GM)	1,000	500	[3] 156	371	54	[2] 166	
9. Syracuse, N. Y. (GM)	1,000	500	[3] 155	410	98	294	
10. Washington, D. C. (GM)	750	500	325	[4] 290	86	[2] 47	
Assigned to VA (5)	5,000	3,000	926		140	2,329	
1. Atlanta, Ga. (GM)	750	500	150		2	[2] 250	
2. Chicago, Ill. (GM)	1,000	500	157		27	[2] 1,096	
3. Cleveland, Ohio (NP)	1,250	1,000	318		8	264	
4. Cleveland, Ohio (GM)	1,000	500	152		10	622	
5. Oklahoma City, Okla. (GM)	1,000	500	149		93	[2] 97	

[1] Obligations for topographic, subsoil and utilities studies as well as a substantial portion of the obligations for final working drawings and specifications can be salvaged by the Government.
[2] Site acquired.
[3] Redesign being accomplished by VA.
[4] Approximately $140,000 was obligated prior to cancellation of original A/Z contract; balance represents estimated settlement cost on current A/Z contract which is in the process of being canceled.

NOTE.—VA overhead costs are not included in the above figures.

Mr. Speaker, this reply from the Veterans' Administration shows how much it cost the taxpayers of America to make a saving of about $280,000,000 as a result of the 16,000-bed reduction order.

On the 24 hospitals eliminated by the 16,000-bed reduction program the Veterans' Administration had already expended $7,877,000; an additional $2,668,000 was spent in redesigning 15 hospitals making a grand total of $10,545,000 which is a loss sustained by the Veterans' Administration in putting the program into effect.

On the basis that it cost the Veterans' Administration $22,000 per bed in the construction of hospitals one can readily see that the money lost is just about sufficient to build and equip three modern Veterans' Administration hospitals.

If the decision of the President in canceling the 16,000 beds was in the name of economy the American people and the veterans in particular have been shortchanged.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the forty-fifth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

A lucky accident in the late summer of 1933 put me directly in the path of the United States-Soviet recognition proceedings.

It was considered very fancy in 1933 for a reporter to have the State, War, and Navy run. The White House, of course, was biggest of all, and the noisiest was covering Gen. Hugh Johnson, boss of the National Recovery Administration.

Johnson holed up in the then brand-new Commerce Department Building. And while the captains of industry waited humbly outside on hard chairs for a moment with him he would regale reporters with wonderful dirty stories while his special assistant, the charming Robbie, would fry onions and grill steak in the back room.

Shortly after August 1933 I was shifted from the NRA to the State, War, Navy beat.

As best I remember, the occasion involved a little unpleasantness between Johnson and the then Washington Herald.

Mr. Dick Lee was writing in those days a column for the New York News, with the now-famous title of Capitol Stuff, and the Herald used it.

Congress had just put the ax to prohibition and 3.2 beer was everywhere, pending the full return of Mr. Barleycorn.

Around the corner or Thirteenth Street from the Herald there was then a very fancy speakeasy, as illegal as it was fancy, also as widely known.

A jokemaster named Jack O'Hearn was proprietor and to some extent owner. Mr. Brian Brown, now a sedate family man whose artistry is nationally known, had painted

handsome murals on one wall depicting famous men in happy moods.

One day Mr. Dick Lee reported in Capitol Stuff a historical note to the effect that the Old Blue Eagle had put in at O'Hearn's for a snort (and why not, as who didn't), but had been refused admission.

As Mr. Lee told it, Johnson had waved telegrams from Henry Ford to prove his identity, had given out with his best cavalry brass basso with demands for right-of-way. And had got tossed.

Well, when the dust settled apologies were extended to all.

A member of Mr. O'Hearn's working force explained to Mr. Lee and others that it was just too bad, but in view of the unfortunate fact that the district attorney could close up this home from home if it became necessary—and so, fellows, it just didn't happen. Nobody knows what you're talking.

Therefore it looked as if the press services would do about all the news getting necessary for the Herald at NRA.

So I got on over to the new assignment of watching what happened among diplomats, generals, admirals, and all their fanciful interests.

In those days State and War shared the wonderful old monstrosity you can see now any time you pass by the White House going west. The facade was said to be "copied after Versailles." The main corridors inside were paved with black and white stone.

Stately colored gentlemen had small tables outside the principal offices, and with greater dignity than any ambassador they would rise and open the little swinging lattice doors for passengers in and out.

One of my fondest memories of those times was the huge scandal created among these highly proper and conventional guardians—most of them were deacons or lawyers and some were both—when the back door to the Secretary of State's office burst open and the Cuban Ambassador came flying out, with Cordell Hull right behind him using language that would encourage a sergeant.

Early in my mission there, I got to know a Maj. Dwight D. Eisenhower, around on the Army's side of the main corridor, who was military secretary to Chief of Staff Douglas MacArthur.

Upstairs on the third floor was a round-faced, pleasant career diplomat by the name of Robert Kelley, in charge of eastern European affairs.

Before long Mr. Kelley was to learn of the excruciating pain and misfortune that can come to a man for standing up and being right when the powers of the Presidency were wrong.

Robert Kelley was the first but not the last United States diplomat to be crushed by our own Government for being right on Russia. I will tell about that later.

And down in a little cubbyhole off the Secretary of State's main corridor, there was a smiling, noncommittal man bent on making a comeback.

He had already caused a sensation even before Mr. Roosevelt took office, by showing up in Europe as an unofficial ambassador, and now he was in full power.

He had two beautiful and elegant secretaries, and he had palace rivals all over the city, not to mention all over the building in which he worked.

He was gracious and polite to all callers, but he was clearly preoccupied with large duties.

His name was William Christian Bullitt and his mission was to organize for Mr. Roosevelt the details of Soviet recognition.

Government Policies Are Detrimental to the Coal and Railroad Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the many problems confronting the residents of my congressional district is the menace of existing Government policies to the coal and railroad industries.

The Government policy of subsidizing fuel substitutes such as hydro-power projects as well as the importation of foreign oil, steel, and coal is playing havoc with the economy of this Nation and in particular with the economy of central Pennsylvania.

This morning I testified before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which is authorized and directed to make an investigation of the cause or causes of increasing unemployment in the coal, oil, silver, zinc, lead, and railroad industries.

In my statement which follows I endeavored to impress the committee with the serious situation that exists in central Pennsylvania because of the importation of cheap foreign oil, and the need for immediate action by Congress or the President of the United States.

My remarks before the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare were as follows:

GOVERNMENT POLICIES ARE DETRIMENTAL TO THE COAL AND RAILROAD INDUSTRIES

Mr. Chairman, I want to express appreciation for the privilege of appearing before your committee and for the opportunity of emphasizing the great menace that existing Government policies represent to the coal and railroad industries.

My congressional district is one that depends upon coal for its lifeblood and when the miners are digging coal and the railroads are transporting it to market, we have a happy population.

In discussing the plight of the coal industry I recognize the differences that from time to time have existed between labor and management. Then, too, there is a natural trend on the part of the consumer to use substitute fuels for many reasons.

Anyone who has studied the coal industry has found that the industry's greater threat comes from policies of the Government of the United States. All of these policies have been formulated by Congress. Therefore, if any real contribution is to be made to the coal industry, Congress is its only means of salvation.

Before discussing how Government policies are destroying the coal industry, it is imperative that we realize how the demand for coal has fallen sharply from war and postwar levels.

Let me quote information on this subject from an article in the March 21, 1950, issue of the Wall Street Journal, written by staff correspondent Philip Geyelin:

"In 1947 exports to coal-short European countries and to Canada totaled 69,000,000 tons. Last year they were down to some 27,000,000 as European mines got back in full operation.

"In this country 3 years ago, coal was supplying 50 percent of the energy for homes and industry. By last year its share was down to 38.9 percent.

"The railroads have been taking less and less coal as they put in more oil-burning Diesel engines. In 1947 they bought 109,000,000 tons of coal. Last year they took less than 70,000,000 tons, a drop of 37 percent. More electric utility companies are finding it's an economy to shift to oil, too. They consumed only 80,000,000 tons of coal last year, compared with 95,000,000 in 1948.

"Meanwhile, householders have been swinging to oil at a rapid clip. Last year oil burner sales were up 39 percent over 1948, while factory shipments of warm-air coal furnaces dropped 47 percent. Where natural gas is available, this fuel is grabbing some coal customers, too.

"These shifts to competitive fuels are expected to continue apace unless the coal industry can lower the price of its fuel, industry observers believe."

In discussing Government policies and their threat to the coal industry let us consider the Tennessee Valley Authority, commonly called TVA. As of June 30, 1949, the Congress of the United States had appropriated for TVA approximately $767,000,000 with an additional appropriation of $49,500,000 made available as of July 1, 1949. If you total the cost of TVA to the taxpayers including interest and tax costs of TVA production that are not paid by TVA, you then have an over-all figure ranging from $884,000,000 up to $1,200,000,000.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the TVA, which operated at a total net loss of over $113,000,000, if interest cost of financing is charged to TVA for the period from 1934 through 1947, generated by water power more than 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. This production of electricity, subsidized by the Government up to $1,200,000,000 in terms of coal equivalent, amounts to about 8,500,000 tons. This amount of coal means over $44,000,000 in revenue to coal companies and over $23,000,000 in miners' wages, or an annual wage of $4,000 to 5,750 workers.

To the railroads the eight and one-half million tons of coal displaced by TVA means a loss of twenty-seven and one-half million dollars in revenue, with over $12,000,000 representing wages of railroad employees, or a salary of $3,600 a year to 3,333 railroad workers.

In addition to the TVA and passing over similar Government projects, we have the threat of the St. Lawrence Seaway project which has been in and out of Congress since 1914. The total estimated cost of this economic monstrosity has been placed at anywhere from one and one-half billion dollars to almost three times that amount, or three and one-half billion dollars.

These estimates of the St. Lawrence seaway were made prior to 1940 and must be increased to reflect price increases if a true cost as of today is to be shown. By increasing these estimates in the same proportion as wholesale prices of all commodities other than farm products and foods increased in January 1950 over January 1940, they range from three-quarters of a billion dollars to over $2,000,000,000.

It is recognized that the United States portion of the cost is more than half, and therefore the cost of the St. Lawrence seaway could easily cost the American taxpayer more than the TVA has cost to date, which is up to $1,200,000,000.

The St. Lawrence project as originally planned, looking at the power part of it only, would displace about five and one-half million tons of coal annually, which would mean a loss in revenue to coal companies of $28,-

000,000. Of this amount, almost $15,000,000 would be lost in miners' wages, or an annual salary of $4,000 to 3,750 workers.

From the standpoint of the railroads, they would likewise suffer a loss of over $18,000,000 in revenue, with about $8,000,000 of that amount representing a loss to railroad employees in wages, or a salary of $3,600 a year to 2,222 employees.

Another factor to be considered is the importation of cheap foreign oil, as well as any foreign oil. At the present time foreign oil is being dumped on our American market at the rate of 885,000 barrels a day and covers all grades and kinds of oil. This is an increase of 72 percent over the daily average in 1947.

Out of this total of 885,000 barrels, about 460,000 barrels are fuel oil, and this quantity is equal to 115,000 tons of coal per day. I do not claim that every barrel of low-priced oil from foreign countries displaces coal, but the great majority of the foreign oil imported does take the place of coal. Over a period of a year, this quantity of foreign oil displaces 40,000,000 tons of coal, which means the loss of $104,000,000 in miners' wages, or an annual wage of $4,000 to 26,000 workers. It also means the loss of $130,000,000 in railroad revenue, of which about $59,000,000 would represent workers' wages or $3,600 annually to 16,389 railroad employees.

Without doubt the flooding of the United States with this cheap foreign oil that displaces coal on the industrial power and heating market is rendering a death blow to the coal and railroad industries.

Since 1949 at least 177 coal mines have been abandoned or closed and nearly 18,000 soft-coal miners have lost their jobs.

To be frank, ghost towns are beginning to spring up in my congressional district and in other congressional districts where coal is mined. This development can be mostly charged to the Government's policy of permitting the importation of cheap foreign oil.

Let us look at the steel industry for a moment. Because of importers of foreign-made steel offering fast delivery at prices 10 to 18 percent lower than domestic vendors, our steel industry suffers, as does coal, from the result of our foreign-trade policy.

As I said in the beginning, Government policies are a menace to the coal industry and the present administration or Congress cannot deny this fact. If the Government wants to help the coal industry, let it cease the program of subsidizing hydropower projects, such as TVA and others. Let Congress shelve the St. Lawrence seaway project and let the administration restrict imports of foreign-mined coal, oil, and steel.

In connection with the imports of cheap foreign oil, President Truman has ample authority to restrict these imports.

Under existing laws he can renegotiate agreements with foreign countries regarding these imports. If he wishes he can put them on a quota basis and also increase the present excise tax on foreign oil from 10½ cents a barrel to its former tax of 21 cents a barrel. I join many Members of Congress in the recent proposal that the tax be increased to $1.05 a barrel to halt the inflow of this cheap petroleum.

I repeat, the President has the authority to take action as outlined when he sees that damage is being done by imports.

To be fair, Congress can also take action. It seems to me, however, the quickest means of correcting the situation is for President Truman to act in curbing the imports of foreign oil.

I saw the present situation developing months ago and not only did I address the House on April 21, 1950, but on May 2, 1950, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 199, a bill designed to create a Joint Congressional Committee on Fuel Policy. This joint committee is in no way related to President Truman's proposal for a congressional investigation of the coal industry, particularly, its labor-management affairs.

To the contrary my resolution is designed to provide an over-all study of the fuel policy of our Government, regarding the use of all fuels including coal, oil, natural gas, and at the same time to determine our natural reserves of such fuels.

The study will also include the Government policy of subsidizing fuel substitutes such as hydropower projects as well as the importation of foreign oil. Unfortunately, I have been unable to get any action to date by the House Rules Committee on my resolution.

The coal and railroad industries in my congressional district are suffering as the result of the Government policies I have outlined. It is my earnest hope that we can get action from the White House regarding the importation of foreign oil or from the Congress because the situation is so serious we cannot afford to wait any longer.

The Story of Packaging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, for some time, I have thought about packaging as a vital link in the chain of production and distribution of the multiple products of our versatile and prolific economy. I have been interested in the substantial progress already made in this field and curious about progress reasonably to be expected. The search for literature on the subject revealed the scarcity of material that constituted anything like historical continuity, completeness and outlook for the future. I am glad to have come across the Story of Packaging, recently written by Robert Sidney Dickens, president of Dickens, Inc., Chicago, package and industrial designers. Mr. Dickens is an outstanding contemporary industrial designer and he has set down the clear and complete story of packaging that I am glad to make part of these remarks for the information of many with interest in this subject.

THE STORY OF PACKAGING

(By Robert Sidney Dickens, president, Dickens, Inc., Chicago, package and industrial designers)

Today the farmer, laborer, technician, white-collar worker, professional man, and all the rest continue to perform their varied jobs which go to make up the American production team. It is their combined efforts which provide the United States with more food and more products than any other country in the world.

The United States stands alone in all the world as the only country which annually produces more of all types of food and goods than its people can consume. The high standard of living in the United States has given its people an enormous appetite, and in addition a very selective appetite which demands the exact product appealing to their particular taste.

While almost all the other countries of the world are faced with the problem of producing enough of the needed food and goods for domestic consumption, the United States annually battles but one basic economic problem—that of maintaining its high production in order that jobs will exist for all.

High production of meat and milk, tractors and toys, cars and candy, lipsticks and lemons, soap and shirts, beer and bicarbonate of soda is maintained only as long as America's mass merchandising genius can stay one step ahead of its huge productive capacity.

This merchandising genius is the sum total of all the combined efforts of the salesman, the advertising man, the big corporation head, the little corner grocer, and lots more. It is their team which must carry the ball after it is delivered. No whistle is blown for time out. Delay and uncertainty will permit the goods to cram the warehouses. The store shelves will overflow and all this eventually will be reflected in the no-help-wanted signs hung on factory walls.

Of all the links in the country's vast merchandising chain, one alone stands as sort of an unsung hero. Unsung, perhaps, because it behaves in the fashion of a silent salesman. It is everywhere and yet no one is particularly aware of its presence. Yet it continues in its own highly efficient if not dramatic way to help sell the food and goods which pour from the wheat fields, the orange groves, the dairy lands, and all the factories which make up the big industries of our Nation. This merchandising link is the common package which houses almost all the products manufactured.

The package as it exists today—whether it contains toothpicks or toasters, meat or milk, cigarettes or candy, lipstick or lace panties—just didn't happen. It resulted from the many years of research and effort of men who struggled to find ways to package the goods of a country whose unlimited production capacity demanded development of methods to merchandise its products with efficient alacrity.

Today a substantial share of the sales steam moving any product lies in the pulling power of the package. Package designers keep their fingers riveted to the pulse of the American consumer to create the right combination of color, typography, and trademark adorning the package which will inject the added sell into any product offered the American public.

But long before the package designer combined art with merchandising techniques to create such things as absolute product identity, impulse sales, and dramatic product displays which move American goods from store shelf to home, there were those whose inventiveness created the materials and machinery which produces the many types of packaging housing almost all the countless products sold.

Packaging as we know it today is traced to a series of early patents. From these erupted the packaging pioneers. The principles of canning date from 1809. It was then, Nicholas Appert, a French confectioner, experimented with food processing. He devised a method for keeping food for long periods of time in sealed containers. He sealed fish, fruits, cooked meats, and vegetables in glass containers and placed them in boiling water for a period of time. His sealing compound was reported to be a cement made of cheese and powdered lime which quickly hardened. It was both heat and water resistant. Appert won 12,000 gold francs for making it possible for Napoleon to carry supplies for his army on the way to

Moscow. A year later Durrand received the first patent for making tin cans.

William Underwood, the first American canner, began packing fruit and tomatoes in tin cans in 1821.

The first collapsible tube was made in the United States in 1840.

In 1864 Robert Gair, of Brooklyn, started to make folding boxes. They were made by scoring the blanks individually and then cutting the flaps, about 20 at a time, with a heavy knife. While examining a seed envelope job that had gone wrong in his plant, Gair accidentally discovered a way to cut and crease folding box blanks. The paper on the envelope had been cut through by type on the printing plates. Gair conceived the method of replacing printing plates on a press with rules and knives which would crease and cut the box blanks. This method today serves as the basis for the manufacture of folding cartons.

This was followed by Riegel's first glassine paper in 1873. One of the earliest set-up box companies was established that year.

The transformation from the cracker barrel to the supermarket started in 1896 when the National Biscuit Co. decided to market a soda cracker that would require protection from breakage and moisture instead of the old-type hardtack cracker. Hardtack crackers had been shipped in cracker barrels, thus the term "cracker-barrel days." For the new soda cracker, the biscuit company developed a folding carton lined with a waxed paper and a printed overwrap.

The packaging march was under way and mechanical development resulted as the natural byproduct of a new merchandising era. The advent and use of electricity brought countless developments, among them the first semiautomatic electrical weighing machine in 1894.

At the beginning of the twentieth century automatic machinery for the filling and making of cartons was developed. Paper box machinery also appeared on the packaging horizon about this time. Activity increased in the development of printing collapsible tubes and in bottle filling equipment. Old Dutch Cleanser first appeared in canned form in 1905. The first glass bottling machinery was introduced in 1908, rapidly expanding many industries, especially pharmaceuticals and cosmetics. Mechanized packaging had become fact.

Crowds gathered in Times Square in 1913 to watch a cigarette packaging machine in action. Five years later an automatic cigar making machine was introduced. The use of foils for bags, wraps, and boxes appeared at the same time and was followed rapidly by perfected sealing equipment and the introduction of plastics for packaging.

Another big step in food packaging came in 1930 when the first successful commercial package of quick-frozen foods was produced.

The foregoing represents some of the milestones in the packaging parade. Each new packaging machine was reflected in the increased production of industries affected. Each new development of a packaging material from paper bags to transparent plastics brought with it new ways to merchandise products to the public.

As more and more consumer products came out of the "cracker barrel" era, the need for the package designer began to evidence itself. Mechanical developments created the need for a new breed of merchandising designers who could put the required sell into the package.

For a long time the job of creating the design or exterior styling of the package fell to the fellow in the back room handy with a pencil. The art departments of advertising agencies gradually were called upon to create package designs for products they were selling. But the package designer of today was missing. His appearance sprang out of the still young profession of industrial design which began to attract attention in the thirties. Manufacturers at this time were searching new ways to put more sell into their products. The industrial designer had some answers and a new era of product design was under way. The industrial designer's job of styling the exterior appearance of the product gradually put new sales life in all products.

The added sell put in consumer products by the industrial designer and the mounting keenness of modern competition resulted in even greater emphasis on package design and the dire need for specialists to fulfill this function.

The industrial designer, possessed of a keen merchandising insight, soon realized the big selling importance of the package. As a result he began to direct a portion of his thinking to the package. A well-designed product demanded an equally well-designed package, he reasoned, and rightly so.

With the added impact of the product designer's thinking on packaging, a new profession began to take form—that of the package-design consultant.

As the package designer began to make himself heard in his own right, a whole new concept of the package developed. It was recognized as a mighty sales weapon and streamlined selling and mass merchandising began to wave its banner with revitalized fury.

A whole new set of package prerequisites were developed by the designer who looked at package creation through a many-faceted merchandising microscope and not just from the standpoint of making the package pretty as was done in early stages by the back-room artist.

Before the package designer begins to create the merchandising designs for a new package, he must gather an abundance of information from the manufacturer. The needed information flows from the sales, advertising, legal, production, and purchasing departments, as well as from top management, which today is realizing more and more the need for playing a part in package development if production levels and sales positions are going to be maintained or bettered.

The designer is concerned with a lot of questions. Some typical ones are:

What types of stores will sell the package?

What classes of consumers will buy the package?

How much of the selling will rest on the package's shoulders?

At what distance must the package be identified?

How is the package shipped?

What protective measures are required against temperature, moisture, etc.?

In what form is the package received in the manufacturing plant?

What are the filling and labeling methods?

What types of packaging machinery will be utilized?

Is the package immediately destroyed in the home?

Is the package used to store contents for the consumer until used up?

Is the package designed for reuse?

Where is the package stored in the home?

Does the manufacturer have a well-established trade-mark?

Does existing packaging of the manufacturer have a standard color scheme or a long-established type face?

What Government requirements exist as to size, labeling, etc.?

With necessary information in hand, the designer has several key objectives in designing the package. The package design must establish absolute product identity, display well, reproduce in all types of advertising and promotional material, provide pertinent information quickly to the consumer, stimulate impulse sales, help the sale of other products in the line.

Exhaustive consumer and retailer surveys are conducted often by the designer to determine the importance of each of the various factors that will be reflected in the package design. Such factors include color, illustration, and trade-mark. Paired comparison tests are made often of two completed designs for consumer reaction. The large expenditure required for mass packaging of mass-produced goods makes it vitally important that guesswork be eliminated as completely as possible from the projection of a new package design. Once a new design is completed and ready to go into production in the various packaging processing plants, large investment is made by the manufacturer in the various types of packaging materials that will contain his products. And more important, the new package must do the complete job of selling expected of it. If it falls short, the company's sales will soon reflect this merchandising deficiency. And it is pertinent to note that just as ineffective packaging of one company's products can hamstring its sales, ineffective packaging of many company's products could place a dampening effect on the country's economic health.

The Department of Commerce last year in a quarterly industry report on containers and packaging stated that: "The year 1949 saw more container users becoming alive to the need for distinctive packaging, and 1950 should see a continuation of this trend * * * the rewards for imagination and initiative, as applied to sales-producing packaging, will be greater than ever."

Container users, which in effect includes all the manufacturers of the country, are more alive to the need for distinctive packaging because top management has discovered the terrific merchandising impact of the package. This did not happen overnight and the educational cycle is not yet completed. Many manufacturers are still not truly aware of the big influence the package can have upon their sales. This is evidenced by the many packages on the market which actually possess negative sell and in effect act as anchors around the product's neck.

It is only in recent years that an annual packaging exposition has been held to graphically portray all the developments of this industry in response to management's desire to obtain more and more information. The wide industry attendance at the recent 1950 exposition evidenced management's desire to obtain better and harder hitting sales-producing packaging.

Packaging for the vast food industry has inspired the greatest achievements in packaging. What other industry is so highly competitive as the American food industry whose job it is to annually feed the best-fed nation in all the world?

Certainly this was recognized by Nathan Cummings, board chairman of Consolidated Grocers Corp., one of the largest food wholesaling organizations in the world, when he retained our organization to completely redesign packaging for the 2,000 items which go to make up the Monarch food line of Consolidated's Reid-Murdoch Division. The Monarch canned food line is the largest in the country. Its products are sold exclusively by independent grocers. Cummings recognized that the Monarch packages were sorely out of date and reflected the packaging traditions of a bygone day. After all, the Monarch line was 98 years old and its packages had never been the subject of a major redesign program. He believed the Monarch line could continue to compete successfully against the many brands sold in chain stores only if its packaging was geared to modern

food merchandising. While thousands of words have been written and published on the Monarch package design programs because of its importance, it is sufficient to note here that one of the biggest factors prompting redesign of Monarch packages was the modernization efforts being made by independent grocers throughout the country. New Monarch labels were needed to stand up under the impact of modern day self-service selling.

It is reasonable to presume that the surplus food problem which so often faces this country would be seriously heightened if the Reid-Murdochs of this country did not place emphatic consideration on the role of packaging in selling the tremendous quantities of food they pack.

And though this statement is presumptuous, it is given a lot of credence when you search out the results of surveys such as the one issued by the market research section of du Pont Co. The survey reported that fully two-thirds of all food purchases in supermarts stem from decisions made while the shopper is in the store. These decisions to buy while in the store are known as impulse sales. An impulse sale results only when the consumer's eye is trapped by the package.

Eliminate all the impulse sales and it is likely the consumer will still have enough to eat. But consider how reduced impulse sales would soon be reflected in the country's entire economy.

And this is but one industry—food. The same sort of impulse sales result in many other industries, including cosmetic, pharmaceutical, clothing, etc. In each of these industries packaging is doing a bigger and better merchandising job every year.

Conducting the package-design programs for the country's manufacturers has become big business. It has become the job of packaging specialists with titles like color technicians, design coordinators, etc. Their workshops have become their factories in which the package designs are created which will help sell the thousands of products lining store shelves and display counters throughout the country.

The job of designing the package has become big b siness despite the fact that only a handful of well-established package-design organizations exist. In many instances these firms are headed by men who as pioneers of modern merchandising package design have contributed greatly to packaging progress, just as did Nicholas Appert, the French confectioner, and Robert Gair, the Brooklyn box maker.

The package-design profession undoubtedly will expand in coming years as more educational institutions provide professional training and as existing package-design organizations expand, permitting the training of more apprentice designers. The growth of this profession also should be stimulated by industry's growing alertness to the package's place in modern-day selling.

Cognizant that the package designer was becoming more and more important as evidenced by the large packaging programs entered into by the giants of industry, our company last year began construction in Chicago of a design center costing $150,000.

The design center was projected as a clearing house of packaging information for all of industry. It was projected as a stimulating force to broaden the understanding of the package designer's role in modern selling. When its doors are formally opened this summer, the center will stand as a testimonial to the stature package design has achieved in the last two decades.

Further, the design center represented a business investment by package designers who had faith in the growing part they would play in selling the Nation's product. This faith was backed up by the solid statistics reflected in the annual reports of companies they had served and by the certain knowledge that the well-designed package would continue to stimulate the buying of the selective American consumer.

Hon. Frank G. Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, Arkansas' most outstanding jurist, Judge Frank G. Smith, was awarded the degree of doctor of laws recently by the University of Arkansas. Judge Frank Smith has distinguished himself over the years by having written more decisions than any other judge in the United States with the exception of one, Judge Walter Clark, the late chief justice of North Carolina. Judge Smith has a total of 3,225 opinions credited to his record.

During the 37 years Judge Smith served as a member of the Arkansas Supreme Court, he won election without opposition. Previously he had served as a circuit judge in the eastern Arkansas district comprising his home county of Crittenden and Mississippi, Poinsett, Cross, Green, and Clay Counties.

Judge Smith was born at Marion, Crittenden County, Ark., where he has extensive farm holdings. He visits Marion frequently. He is from one of the oldest families in eastern Arkansas. Judge Smith is the son of the late John Franklin and Martha Gidden Smith. Judge Smith's father, a Confederate veteran, settled in Crittenden County, Ark., shortly after the Civil War. Mrs. Lewis Barton, sister of Judge Smith, resides at Marion.

Eastern Arkansas as well as the whole of the State of Arkansas is proud of the outstanding accomplishments and public service of this native son.

I include as a part of my remarks an article that appeared in the June 4 edition of the Memphis Commercial Appeal. The text of this article follows:

HONORARY DEGREE IS AWARDED TO DEAN OF ARKANSAS COURTS

FAYETTEVILLE, ARK., June 3.—One of the honorary degrees awarded by the University of Arkansas in commencement exercises here Saturday night went to one of its earliest students who has made history in Arkansas law circles.

He is former Justice Frank G. Smith, now retired from the Arkansas Supreme Court. Mr. Smith, who is 78, retired from the bench last October 31 on his 37th anniversary as a member of the highest court in the State.

East Arkansas claims him as a native son. For it was in the town of Marion, Crittenden County, that Judge Smith was born, and where he also began his law career. It was while serving as a circuit judge there that he won election to the State Supreme Court. That was in 1912. Since that time has lived in Little Rock, with occasional visits back to his former home.

HAS LONGEST RECORD

Judge Smith has served longer than any other Arkansas justice on the State Supreme Court. He also is generally credited with having written the second highest number of opinions of any appellate justice in the United States. Only Judge Walter Clark, the late chief justice of North Carolina, is credited with having written more than the 3,225 opinions credited to Judge Smith.

The Arkansas justice served as senior associate justice for 15 years, although was never elected to chief justice. He proudly recalls that he was never opposed for reelection after his initial race in 1912. And in addition, he served in both houses of the State's general assembly before beginning his law career.

For such a record, the University of Arkansas conferred upon him here Saturday night the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Few alumni of the university probably would remember him now. Justice Smith said he believes he was one of the earliest students here, having attended in 1886 and 1887. He is not a graduate of the university. His other schooling includes Searcy College at Searcy and Davis School at La Grange, N. C.

In all, this former east Arkansan served on the bench a total of 43 years, including 6 as a circuit judge at Marion.

FATHER IN CIVIL WAR

He held the first term of court in the present Crittenden County Courthouse, about 1911, as he recalls. A plaque on the building bears his name.

Judge Smith's father, a Confederate veteran, settled in Crittenden County a few years after the Civil War. In 1872 Judge Smith was born. Much of the town of Marion, including the hotel and the bank, now stands on land which he once owned, but which he later sold.

"I've written opinions on just about everything," said Judge Smith, "and although I've experienced a lot, I'd rather not do any preaching to others in my profession. My career is ended."

Still feeling the effects of a severe operation about a year ago, the dean of Arkansas courts is forced to take life easy at his Little Rock residence, and is still under the care of a physician.

Actually, the last term to which he was elected—his fifth—does not expire until 1952. Appointed by Governor McMath to fill his place was Associate Justice Edwin Dunaway.

Another FBI Triumph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, my continued admiration for and confidence in Director J. Edgar Hoover, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, prompts me to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the New York Journal American of Friday, May 26, entitled "Another FBI Triumph." The editorial follows:

ANOTHER FBI TRIUMPH

Those Congressmen and Justice Department politicos who lend a hand to the Amerasia cover-up by charging the FBI with clumsy investigations should read the story of how the FBI tracked down Harry Gold.

It was exciting stuff, and a convincing demonstration of efficiency.

The FBI had one meager clue, a brief physical description that would have fit thousands of people—"short * * * stocky

build * * * round face." That was how Klaus Fuchs described the nameless man who served him as a go-between in the Russian atom-spy ring.

With that, and the assumption that the man might be a chemist or scientist, the FBI went to work. First laborious step was to scan the thousands of companies which had been issued permits to buy chemical materials.

Then Fuchs' own movements in this country were retraced. Tenants of the house where he lived in New York were questioned about his contacts. Looking into his trip to Los Alamos, FBI agents checked bus lines, airports, travel agencies, hotels, and garages.

Their painstaking quest finally netted a formidable list of 1,200 suspects. From that they were to pick one man—seemingly their work had just begun. How many man-hours were put in can only be guessed. But slowly and carefully they sifted the list down, to several hundred, to scores, then to a dozen, to six, to three, and finally to one—Harry Gold.

His answer to a trick question—whether he had ever been in the western part of the United States—trapped him. He said he hadn't, and the FBI showed him evidence that he had met Fuchs in New Mexico 5 years ago. Gold's alleged confession followed quickly.

If that's the kind of bungling the FBI does, the country can use a lot more of it—with no higher-up fixes to nullify the good work.

Hawaii and Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Meriden (Conn.) Record on June 6, relating to the important question of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii:

HAWAII AND ALASKA

Statehood for our two Territories has hung fire for a long time. The Senate Insular Affairs Committee is scheduled to decide next Monday whether to report favorably the bills already passed by the House 3 months ago. A majority of Republicans were in opposition to admitting Alaska but a large majority of both parties in the House voted for accepting Hawaii.

Hawaii had a population in the 1940 census that totaled more than any of our Territories except West Virginia and Oklahoma when admitted to the Union. Of course conditions are different in Hawaii because the "Caucasian" population is in the minority there. This probably accounts for the fact that more than two-thirds of the Representatives from the 10 States of the solid South voted against statehood. It is to be hoped the Senate will show less biased provincialism when faced with final decision. Hawaii has earned its star and will make a contributing addition to the family of the Union.

Alaska poses another type of problem. The population is comparatively small. The cost of statehood will be a greater burden. Many business interests in Alaska are opposed to statehood although their votes were in the minority when application for admission went to the Alaskan poll. But other Territories upon admission could count on the favor of practically all groups. Nevertheless, world conditions outbalance this division of Alaskan interests. The Territory is more important in the military defense of the Nation than any other applicant at the time of its admission. It is an absolutely vital area in any East-West struggle. Full partnership in the affairs of the Union is a constructive step in meeting the challenge.

Postponement of the issue, or failure to grant the application of either Hawaii or Alaska would be sure to be interpreted in international circles as evidence of American unwillingness to integrate areas possessed of substantial blocs of nonwhite population. The position of leadership held by the United States demands that this Nation set an example of cooperation between peoples of all kinds within our political organization.

High Cost of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the late Honorable William Lemke, Congressman from North Dakota, wrote the following speech to be delivered over KVOX, Fargo, N. Dak., Wednesday, May 31, 1950. During the day of the 30th, Mr. Lemke worked in his garden setting out some new flowers. In the evening he went back to his hotel, asked for his key, and while standing at the desk fell to the floor and died before he could be taken to the hospital. That speech, therefore, was never delivered, but I know Mr. Lemke's many friends in Congress and the thousands in North Dakota will be interested in reading his address, so here it is in full:

HIGH COST OF GOVERNMENT

We hear a great deal about high prices, high rents, and unreasonable profits—in other words, high cost of living. Let us find out just what brought about this condition. The truth is the high cost of living is the result of high taxes and the depreciated dollar.

It is the high cost of government. Our Uncle Sam is the greatest profiteer, the greatest extortionist. He now takes 57 cents on an average, directly or indirectly, out of every dollar that is earned and on which you pay Federal income tax. You do the toiling and he does the taking. His appetite grows and grows. If you are a working person, he does not trust you. He is afraid you might spend too much so he has inaugurated the withholding tax by which he grabs part of your wages.

Your Government compels your employer to withhold 20 cents for him out of every dollar you earn. Your Uncle does not trust you with this because he is afraid that you or your family might spend it before the end of the fiscal year. He takes no chances. He also realizes that what you do not see does not hurt, and he can get away with it easier by compelling your employer to act as his tax collector.

In addition to the Federal income tax there are the State and local taxes—and over a hundred hidden taxes. After you have paid these taxes, the few dollars you have left have less than 32 cents purchasing power as compared with the 100-cent dollar as late as 1939. With these depreciated dollars you are compelled to pay the hidden taxes. There are over 73 hidden taxes on a single hot-dog sandwich; 125 on a pair of overalls.

There are 8 cents hidden taxes in a quart of milk, 25 cents in a pound of steak, 5 cents in a loaf of bread, $5 in a ton of coal, $20 in a $60 apartment, $75 in a $150 refrigerator, $700 in a $2,100 automobile and $3,000 hidden taxes in a $10,000 home.

On top of this is the excise tax which your Uncle Sam makes the ladies pay for their lipstick, face powder and other cosmetics. If you smoke, your Uncle dips in heavily and takes many a puff in taxes. If you drink, he takes many a sip in taxes. If you take a ride on a train, he takes a ride with you by taking an additional 15 percent in taxes. If you sleep in a Pullman, he sleeps with you and takes another 15 percent.

If your wife buys a fur coat, he pulls out 20 percent of the fur for himself in taxes. If you and your children go to a show, your Uncle enjoys the play with you with a 20 percent tax ticket. Even the requirements of babies are taxed. So we could go on indefinitely.

Our Uncle Sam is also the greatest spendthrift. He has established an international WPA—making a good fellow of himself to sponging nations with your money. He is financing inefficient and, in some cases, dishonest and corrupt governments. He is handing out with a lavish hand that which you earn to domestic and foreign grafters and profiteers—one worlders. This is part of the good neighbor policy—point 4 in the President's program.

You are not only taxed to pay the expenses of your own government, but you pay over 21 percent of the total expense of running the Italian Government, over 14 percent of the French Government, and over 9 percent of the British Government. Worse still, for 2 years you were taxed to pay over 51 percent of the entire expense of the Chinese National Government. Then when Chiang Kai-shek was about to win, the Government, at the suggestions of pink Lattimore, deserted him and forgot all about the 51 percent you paid to help him win.

You are also taxed to pay a lesser percent to over 20 other sponging nations. This through the ECA, the International Bank, and the Export-Import Bank of Washington. All these dish out the American taxpayers' dollars to nations that are capable of taking care of themselves. Yet they play your Uncle Sam for a sucker. He has now become the gaudy Santa Claus of the world.

We spent over three hundred and eighty-seven billion to win World War II that other nations started and that we finished. This includes the $29,000,000,000 lend-lease to Great Britain, $11,000,000,000 to Russia, and billions more to other nations, and our own expenditures after we entered the war.

Our Government also squanders billions at home. However, it is not entirely to blame for the domestic waste and extravagance. States as well as municipal governments are constantly begging for projects, loans, grants, and handouts. They encourage the Government in grabbing more from you and returning less. If we are to stop deficit spending then the people must stop deficit begging.

The average person does not yet realize that the Government cannot give you one penny without taking at least two from you. You create the wealth that the Government spends. No law that we can pass will produce a single loaf of bread or a single pair of shoes. Through taxation we can distribute the wealth that you create, but we may also kill the goose that lays the golden egg—the producer.

In 1932 the Federal Government took only 23 cents out of every dollar of the total taxes collected, while the States and political subdivisions took the balance—the other 77 cents. However, by 1948 the Federal Government took over 74 cents, while the States and subdivisions took what was left—less

than 26 cents—out of every dollar. In 1932, the total Federal and State taxes amounted to $8,272,000,000. Of this the Federal Government took $1,891,000,000 and the States and subdivisions $6,381,000,000.

However, by 1948, the total tax was $54,517,000,000, out of which the Federal Government took $40,104,000,000, and left the States and subdivisions only $14,413,000,000. In plain words, the Federal Government is the hog that is fast crowding the little State pigs out of the taxation trough. If this policy is permitted to continue it will not be long before there will not be any State or municipal government worthy of the name.

In place of the Federal Government grabbing all the wealth created by the States and then distributing a large part of it throughout the world, would it not be better for the States to retain more of it for their own welfare? This in place of continuing to beg from the Federal Government. The time has come that the octopus, that is squeezing the income out of the people of the States by taxing them beyond endurance, has some of its foreign tentacles cut off so that some of this money is left and made available to the States.

We now know that high taxes together with the hidden taxes are the cause of our high cost of living. Rome fell when one-tenth was taken for taxes. The Federal, State, and local governments now take about 32 percent of all the earnings of all the people. They take 57 percent out of every dollar on which you pay income tax. No nation can long stand that kind of tax extortion. There will be a financial and political collapse unless some way is found to halt the ever-increasing tax burden.

Congress should not only repeal the entire war-excise tax but reduce the income tax and plug the loopholes through which tax dodgers escape. The President asked for a reduction in some excise taxes and at the same time asked for an increase in corporation taxes. I am satisfied, however, that there will be no great reduction—it is simply self-deception, leaving a few pennies in one pocket and taking all there is in the other.

The corporations will not pay this additional tax. They will pass it on to the producer and consumer in higher prices. That is what they do with all taxes. They act simply as the indirect tax collectors for Uncle Sam when he is too timid to do it direct. There should be a revision and simplification of our entire tax system. There should be but one or two taxes and they should be so direct that everybody could see how much of their earnings go directly to the support of their Government.

We are constantly urged over the radio, in the theater, and by the press to buy more savings bonds. It is doubtful saving on your part. These bonds will have to be paid by you and your children with interest, via taxation. It is more spending on the part of the Government. Every bond you buy puts the Government deeper in debt. There is a limit to which the Government can sell bonds, go in debt, and remain solvent. When you owe more than the value of your property you are insolvent—a bankrupt. What is true of you is true of your Government.

The American people have been taxed to rebuild gambling joints in Europe. They have been taxed to build roads throughout the world. They have been taxed to help foreign farmers and manufacturers to produce goods and sell them in our domestic markets. They have been taxed thousands of dollars for liquor so that our diplomats abroad may engage in booze and cocktail parties. They have been taxed millions for newspapers and periodicals that betrayed the Nation—sold America down the river.

All this under the false propaganda that these nations would stop communism. If they really wanted to stop the growth of communism then they should long ago have broken up their large landed estates. Unfortunately for the American taxpayers the aristocrats prefer to squander American dollars in place of bettering the conditions of their own people.

Let the taxpayer beware. Before we get through with the fiscal year 1951, the Government's expenditures will be well over $50,000,000,000. This equals $333 for every man, woman, and child, or $1,666 for a family of five. This is your annual tax bill. You will have to pay it directly or indirectly. Directly in income tax and indirectly on all that you wear, drink, or eat. The only thing that is still free is the air you breathe. Everything else that you use is saturated with hidden taxes.

Again, our national debt, with future commitments and obligations, is now $687,000,000,000. When we add the $20,900,000,000 of State and municipal debts then we have a total indebtedness of $707,900,000,000. This is twice the value of all the real and personal property in the United States. It is more than all the other nations in the world owe.

Every baby the moment it is born has a tax lien against it for some $5,000. It is a tax lien on all your property and on all your earnings, and the future earnings of your baby as well. For the average family of five it amounts to some $25,000. It will be collected from you in income tax and more than 100 unseen taxes.

In conclusion, may I state that we are living on borrowed money. We are depleting and wasting the natural resources that belong to the children of the future. Unless there is a halt to this international squandering, there will be a financial collapse—complete bankruptcy.

Martinsburg, Pa., VFW Post Dedicates New Home on May 30, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most progressive posts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is the D. Merl Tipton Post, No. 43, located at Martinsburg, Pa.

Although Post No. 43 is only 15 years of age its accomplishments are many, with the result that its presence in Martinsburg has been highly beneficial to that community.

On May 30, 1950, Post No. 43 dedicated a beautiful $50,000 VFW home which is a monument to the untiring efforts of the post membership and the ladies' auxiliary.

It was my signal honor to deliver the following dedicatory address in connection with the Memorial Day program:

Mr. Chairman, comrades, ladies and gentlemen, I have been signally honored by the membership of the D. Merl Tipton Post, No. 43, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in being invited to come here this afternoon and join in the dedication of this beautiful home.

The membership of this post and its auxiliary are to be commended for the time and effort expended in making this home possible. It can be truthfully said that this home has been constructed for the most part by the hands of the members of this post and its auxiliary. In other words, it is practically a home-made project.

In many communities throughout the Nation on this Memorial Day monuments are being dedicated in honor of those of our comrades who gave their all so that America could continue to be great and the American way of life perpetuated.

Truly this home is a living monument. It will stand in this community for years and years, serving not only as a citadel of patriotism but as a constant reminder to all of us of the heroic sacrifices of our comrades who died for their country in time of armed conflict.

It is fitting that we dedicate this beautiful home on this Memorial Day of 1950 because it affords us an opportunity to take inventory of our national greatness and the future of America.

We are reminded today that a strong nation—one whose powder is always dry—stands as a bulwark against tyranny. That fact is clear on this Memorial Day of the midcentury.

Today, with the powder of World War II still smoking we face the threat of another war. Our wounds have not yet healed, still we are talking of tomorrow's battles. Some nations are preparing for the Third World War.

Obviously, our greatest need this Memorial Day is to produce the formula which will win the peace—just as we produced the formula which won the war.

In the eyes of us who have fought America's wars, the greatest safeguard for peace is adequate preparedness. A strong, well-armed United States—and only a strong, well-armed United States—can stave off the attack of an aggressor nation. Many thinking Americans are wondering whether it is possible to keep the cold war "on ice" or whether it must, inevitably, develop into hot issues which will flare into open warfare.

Only a crystal gazer would hazard an answer. The VFW has no time for crystal gazing, but states, in a forthright manner, that possession by the United States of an imposing stockpile of atomic and hydrogen bombs will serve as an effective deterrent to war.

As a matter of fact, the national security committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars recently called for this Nation to continue the development of hydrogen bombs and atomic weapons. However, the committee urged it be made clear that these weapons would be used at no time except in retaliation.

The VFW also urges that we intensify our efforts in psychological warfare by extending the Voice of America broadcasts. These effective radio programs must be sharpened to serve as a wedge between the people of iron-curtain nations and their governments.

I repeat, it is mandatory that we wage peace as aggressively as we waged war. Certainly the prevention of war is as urgent as the fighting of war. We who fought our Nation's battles now demand bold, drastic action. We must take that action, otherwise Memorial Day will only mock our dead—not honor them.

The Russian aim, apparently, is not war, at least not in the foreseeable future. Judging from their established pattern, the Soviets hope to exhaust us economically and then destroy us by subversive force.

We Americans would do well to give heed to our position on the Soviet time table of aggression. No one could believe that America is immune from Red expansion.

In the 1930's we were aroused by the marching slogan of the Nazis: "Today, we rule Germany; tomorrow, the world." Bitter experience, the blood at Anzio, Normandy, and Iwo Jima, burned deeply in our

minds the significant lesson that tyrants love to brag about their plans.

On this Memorial Day, that lesson rings in our ears. It forces us to examine the boasts of our modern tyrants.

In every issue of Communist dogma, under the title "Problems of Leninism," published over the signature of Stalin, appears this basic belief: "We are living not merely in a state, but in a system of states; and it is inconceivable that the Soviet republic should continue for a long period side by side with imperialistic states." Stalin continued by saying, "Ultimately, one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile, a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet republic and other nations will be inevitable," he said.

That statement of Communist philosophy has been repeated many times since the close of World War II. The leaders of Russia have not only reiterated their goal of world domination, they have predicted the doom of all other political systems—especially capitalism.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee I know that Russia—which has declared America must eventually be destroyed—now has "a ground army greater in numbers than the combined armies of the United States and its allies; an air force whose strength, in nearly all categories, is now the largest in the world and growing relatively larger month by month, and the world's largest submarine fleet and an intensive submarine development and construction program."

The gravity of the situation is multiplied by knowledge of the fact that Communists operate an effective international spy system. If their leaders want peace, why are they arming so feverishly? Why are they spying so treacherously on other nations? In the considered opinion of many intelligent observers, Communist leaders have been outstandingly successful in whitewashing themselves before their people. Communist followers have been likened, accurately, to fanatics. They are militantly crusading in the cause of their godless faith.

In the past, the United States has been relatively safe from direct attack. But distance is no longer a protection from the powerful arm and smashing fist of enemy air attack. In the atomic air age, American bases in Alaska are only 5 minutes flying time from Russian soil. Waco, Tex., is only 18 hours away from Moscow for bombers which Russia is producing in quantity.

With these disturbing facts in mind, it seems to me that we Americans do not fully realize the danger. We are getting steamed up—we soon will be getting steamed up—over the 1950 pennant race. Yes, we watch our television, listen to our radios, and read sports pages.

But the arament race demands our attention too.

It is no longer a secret that behind the iron curtain an atomic explosion has occurred. Behind that curtain is the air power capable of delivering an attack against any part of the United States. And there is no sure defense against such an attack. Yet, by pursuing a course of obstruction, Soviet Russia has repeatedly demonstrated her unwillingness to work out, through the United Nations, a program of international control of atomic energy.

We must, then pursue a course of action which recognizes these facts. Clearly we must accept the position outlined by the Secretary of Defense, who stated, "Our watchword should be military security first, economy second."

However, we know from history that mere races for armed might do not prevent wars. So our insistence that the United States continue to seek peaceful solutions to the world's problems through the United Nations must not be construed to mean that we favor a weak, vacillating policy. Through forceful leadership in the UN, our country can demonstrate to the world our complete lack of aggressive designs, our sincere hope that, as one member of a world organization, we are working resolutely to achieve a permanent and responsible peace.

That, I am firmly convinced, is the goal our comrades had in mind when they took up arms against America's enemies. Today we pay them our finest tribute of rededicating ourselves to that goal.

Keeping Faith With Our War Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include an address I delivered on May 30, 1950, at the memorial services in Hope Cemetery, Worcester, Mass., at the GAR section, sponsored by the Willie Grout Camp, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War. The address follows:

I am deeply privileged and honored to join with you in these exercises of tribute to our war dead.

Since the Civil War, our people have set aside Memorial Day to pay homage to the memory of the departed heroes of all wars. Today, Americans are congregated in gatherings like this all over the Nation in remembrance of the sacrifices of the brave men whose blood has saturated battlefields in every part of the globe so that we might continue to breathe the clean air of freedom.

While we are especially dwelling upon our honored dead, this morning, we should be mindful also of those who are living and who are going through the rest of their lives carrying the dreadful scars and memories of the terrible days and nights of their war participation.

The United States will never cease to express the profound gratitude which moves our people of every class, race, and creed for the heroic unselfishness our veterans have demonstrated in every American war.

It is beyond the capacity of this Nation, great and mighty as it is, ever to adequately recompense those who gave so much for the privilege of American rights and liberty.

Their devotion to duty, their loyalty to American institutions, all their noble achievements comprise an illustrious record in the history of mankind. No words can truly describe their contributions.

Our departed comrades did not fight and die for a world of chaos and confusion, nor for fascism, nor for pagan communism with its tyranny over the minds and souls of men. They fought for liberty and their lives have served to shield, not only our own country, but the entire democratic peoples of the world, from totalitarian slavery.

By our presence here today we are availing ourselves of the patriotic privilege of rededicating, to the memory of our heroes, our services to the United States and what it stands for—freedom, justice, liberty, and democracy.

From time immemorial the human race has fought for liberty and freedom. However, it is in our own beloved country, thank God, that the greatest victory has been reached. Our Constitution, our principles of democracy, our representative form of government reveal the highest achievement of individual dignity and liberty known to man.

Persecuted peoples of every race and creed: from every nation in every corner of the globe have come to America to enjoy the fruits and blessings of a living democracy. It is these benefits and privileges that have been retained for us by the lifeblood of those who died in battle. We must not fail to preserve the glorious heritage they left to us.

This task calls for some great personal sacrifices on our part, but total sacrifice was the price our departed comrades paid for the blessings we now enjoy.

To show real appreciation of their sacrifice supreme, we must make every day a Remembrance Day. When the heroes we honor this morning gave their lives for us they also left with us the solemn obligation to keep America safe and the torch of freedom alight on this earth.

The challenge of this hour and time is the accomplishment of peace, in a confused and still war-weary world. The will of divine providence has placed upon America the heavy responsibility of leadership. We have never failed in war, and we must not fail in this crucial moment of our Nation's destiny.

We are not loath to deal in realities in time of war. When the perils of war surround us, when nations are engaged in mortal combat and men fight to kill, the purpose is clear and the issue is single. We must win the war; so much is certain, and that is sufficient to call forth the realism and summon the courage of an entire people.

But when the heat of battle is over there seems to arise an unwillingness to face the facts. With this unwillingness comes a human desire to accomplish, overnight, at a peace table, what has not yet been accomplished in all recorded history.

The problems of peace are equally as grim and urgent as the problems of war. If we do not remain alert to our duties, heroism gives way to lethargy, self-sacrifice to self-indulgence and national pride to national indolence. We must continue to exert our efforts for peace, for if we do not, we must inevitably accept the universal destruction of an atomic war.

At the same time, we must make it clear that we do not propose to stand by and see our war objectives frustrated, small helpless nations overrun, American democracy challenged, freedom everywhere threatened with extinction.

We in America are not warmongers, and we have never been militaristic, but we must remain strong and secure against the possibility of aggression, either militaristic or idealogical. America must be ready to meet every contingency. Our defense system, sustained always by the determination of our people and our great productive strength, must be maintained until we are able to prevail upon other nations to accept universal disarmament and judicial settlement of international disputes, as a substitute for the terrible destruction of war.

We cannot be blind to the fact that our country is gravely beset by threats of subversive movements. Subtle attacks, by propaganda and campaigns designed to undermine the faith of our people, are being directed against our form of government, our economic and political systems, our educational system, our civil liberties and, yes, even our social and family life.

These same radical groups are endeavoring by various means to spread discontent among our veterans, but their efforts are doomed to failure. Those, who fought for America in war, will protect and preserve America in peace. They will assume the vigorous civil leadership in our communities which is vitally necessary to combat the activity of these subversive influences. Our veterans can be depended on to wage unceasing opposition to communistic move-

ments because they who, above all others, have sacrificed so much for liberty, dearly appraise its true value.

Our beloved country has been called to a position of leadership in this atomic age; a leadership that is economic, political and social. In this position of leadership, we are faced with the responsibility of rebuilding bleeding, suffering humanity, everywhere, advancing the peace of the world, and retaining our own integrity.

The greatest tribute we can realistically pay to our departed comrades is to meet that challenge with unflinching courage and purpose. Let us, with the help of Almighty God, carry on the work of preserving freedom here and throughout the world in order to insure that our heroic dead shall not have died in vain.

Widow's Income Drops as Expenses Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, several Janet Joneses like those referred to in the accompanying article by Mr. Harry C. France, which under leave to extend my remarks I include below, have written me complaining bitterly and justifiably about the Government policies of recent years which have inflated their living expenses and reduced their income and standard of living. It is those on a modest fixed income derived from a pension, interest on savings-bank accounts, or small investments in Government or industrial securities who are hardest hit by the spending and taxing policies of the Federal Government. They have no organization or bloc to speak for them. We, however, as representatives of all the people should not be blind to their plight, so graphically portrayed in the accompanying article.

Pertinent, indeed, is the question which the author suggests be addressed to the Members of Congress: "What are you doing to remedy this bad economic situation?"

Unfortunately, the answer must be made that the present Congress has done nothing except make the situation worse.

In the 2 years of the last Congress, for the first time since 1932, the budget was balanced and a substantial reduction made in the public debt. This action served to stabilize the value of the dollar, which is so delicately responsive to fluctuations in Government policies. The advantage of this firmness in the value of the dollar was, of course, most apparent, as is always the case, to those of modest means. When the cost of groceries and milk, of a suit of clothes, a dress, or a pair of shoes goes up because the Government has pursued policies that require nearly two dollars to buy what one dollar bought a few years ago, it is the low-income and lower middle-income people that feel the pinch the worst, particularly if their incomes are relatively rigid and not adjustable to meet this boost in their cost of living.

On top of the benefits accorded those of modest income in the last Congress through the innovation of sound fiscal policies, they were also given a substantial reduction in income taxes and 7,000,000 in the lowest income brackets were completely wiped off the tax rolls.

In the present Congress, by contrast, the only tax relief so far accorded has been to the politically elect who foregathered in Washington for the inaugural festivities last year, when they were relieved of the usual admission tax, and to the even more select company of the chosen few who came to Washington this year to attend a political dinner.

Also in contrast to the action of the last Congress, red ink has resumed its flow in full force, with the result that we face for the 2 years an excess of expenditures over income of more than $10,000,000,000, with addition to, rather than subtraction from, our total national debt. That can mean one thing, and one thing only, according to inexorable economic laws, and that is another assault on the value of the American dollar resulting in a decrease in the amount of goods it will buy and an increase in the cost of living for every family in the land. No amount of optimistic talk or rosy promises about the future should be allowed to becloud the horizon when the picture of the past lies so clear and open before our eyes.

WIDOW'S INCOME DROPS AS EXPENSES INCREASE

(By Harry C. France)

Janet Jones, widow, asked me the other day: "Why is it that while my living expenses have been steadily increasing in recent years, the interest on my money has been steadily decreasing?"

It is a question that is puzzling people everywhere. This matter comes to my attention with astounding frequency. The reason is simple. The utter necessity for mortals (who don't have the command of a printing press to turn out money, à la the Government) to balance their budgets from year to year, imposes terrific economic hardships on widows and orphans and such like.

In the case of Janet Jones, I decided to get right down to bedrock. So I asked her: "Where do you carry your savings deposits?"

She named several banks. The first one (in New York City) is probably the largest savings bank in the United States. I went to that bank and received from the controller the following information:

1. In 1930—when Mrs. Jones made her first deposit—this bank was paying 4½ percent interest on savings accounts. In that year, the bank was carrying for its own investment $9,860,000 of Government bonds.

2. In 1935, her interest was down to 2½ percent and the bank's Government bond account was $64,434,000.

3. In 1940, interest had further declined to 2 percent and the bond account had gone to $174,510,000.

4. In 1945, Mrs. Jones received 1½ percent on her first $5,000 and 1 percent on the remainder of her deposit. In the meantime, the bank's Government portfolio has skyrocketed to $284,587,000.

In other words, in a decade and a half, the bank's holdings of Government debt had increased 2,800 percent and interest rates had declined more than 66⅔ percent. Furthermore, and in Mrs. Jones' case most tragic, her living costs had more than doubled.

If interest rates in 1945 were in line with living costs, she should have been receiving at least 9 percent on her money. She has been caught in the vortex of inflation and deflation. Her living expenses have gone through the roof and her interest income through the cellar.

Politicians, high and low, are going around the country telling the people that the country economically is all right. Well, the facts are, it isn't.

The shoddy wefare state that the politicians are promoting is uprooting the economic virtues—thrift and saving and enterprise—that have made America great. There are millions of good people in this country who are suffering the same economic pangs that Janet Jones is. They are being sold down the river.

In my quarter of a century in the financial world, the toughest problems I have had to face are those associated with growing costs and with lessening income.

I should like to suggest to any of my readers who are interested in this matter that they cut this article out and mail it to their United States Senator or Representative, with the following question appended:

"What are you doing to remedy this bad economic situation?"

I have nothing whatever against sound welfare. But when it ascends from the gutter and makes economic ragamuffins out of those who should be self-sufficient, it is time to speak out. If the Janet Joneses of America could be heard, the politicians might sit up and take notice.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas, Delivers Democratic Speech at Jefferson-Jackson Day Rally at Austin, Tex., May 27, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an excellent address delivered by the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, junior Senator from Texas, at the Jefferson-Jackson Day rally, at Austin, Tex., May 27, 1950.

At this rally, a cashier's check for $100,000 was delivered to Speaker SAM RAYBURN for the Democratic National Committee. This represented the proceeds of the sale of $25 tickets to raise the money.

Senator JOHNSON, in his speech, brought out a large number of wonderful points in favor of the Democratic Party and the Democratic administration the past 18 years that should not be overlooked. In fact, the people should be reminded of them every day between now and the election in November.

The address is as follows:

Fellow Democrats, I am proud we have with us tonight the heart and the soul of the Democratic Party—ALBEN BARKLEY and SAM RAYBURN.

Without their leadership, our last 18 years of uninterrupted progress under Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman would have been unlikely.

I am proud, as I know our honored guests are proud, to see this enthusiastic assembly of Texas Democrats.

Texas Democrats want to stand up and be counted for a safe world tomorrow—a Nation prosperous, prepared, and peaceful.

Texas Democrats want to stand up and be counted for a Nation of safe wages, safe profits, safe bank deposits, and safe securities; a Nation safe for initiative and safe for success; a Nation where thinking is safe; a Nation safe from aggression and safe for freedom.

In our Nation today, 58,000,000 men and women are employed—at a living wage. Workers in the manufacturing trades are making an average of $1.40 an hour; workers in our oil and gas fields are making $1.80 an hour.

Eighteen years ago, only half as many Americans had the liberty to work. Few of them had the liberty to make as much in a day as they make now in an hour.

Eighteen years ago, farm income in the Nation was $6,000,000,000; last year, it was $31,000,000,000—just 5 times more.

Eighteen years ago, cotton was selling for less than a nickel; today it is selling for nearly 30 cents a pound.

Eighteen years ago, wheat was selling for 30 cents; today it is selling for $2 a bushel.

Eighteen years ago, the price of beef cattle was $3; today the price is $21 per 100 pounds.

Eighteen years ago, east Texas oil was selling for 10 cents; today, the price is $2.50 a barrel.

Today there is more money in our banks, there are more bonds in our vaults, more roofs over our heads, more automobiles in more garages than ever before.

Our Nation today is better prepared than at any other time in our history.

For 4 years, we fought and defeated the greatest alliance of military might ever unloosed upon the world. For the past 5 years, we have held in check the most ruthless, most sinister and evil dictator of modern times.

These things didn't just happen. They happened because Roosevelt and Rayburn, Truman and Barkley led the fight for the Democratic Party, and the Democrats of Texas and the Democrats of the Nation have responded to every call and battled faithfully for the party of their fathers.

The people know that the Democratic Party is the party that fights for a safe world tomorrow, and for a Nation that is prosperous and prepared today.

The people know that the Democratic Party is the party of liberty. It is the only party big enough for Texans.

That is why good Democrats can and do and should speak their mind within the party. Democrats may disagree with Democrats, but good Democrats do not change their party or their loyalty because of those disagreements.

In the Democratic Party, a great leader like Speaker RAYBURN can approve a bill which another great leader, Harry Truman, vetoes. A great and faithful Democrat like ALBEN BARKLEY may resign his Senate majority leadership when a great President like Franklin D. Roosevelt vetoes a tax bill.

If Jefferson were still alive today, he would be proud of the liberty within the Democratic Party.

If Jackson were still alive today, I am sure he would be happy that Texas—the State which he did so much to bring into the Union—is still led by men of the caliber of Sam Houston—men like SAM RAYBURN.

Roosevelt, who loved Texas and Texans, would be proud of Texas as it stands today, an empire of Democratic Party strength.

Today the program of the people is being carried forward by the Democratic Party under the courageous leadership of President Truman.

Today Texas, as for 100 years, is a proud Democratic State, and the Democratic Party is the party for Texans.

Statement of the New England Congressional Delegation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include two letters, each signed by the entire New England delegation in the House, both of which are self-explanatory:

JUNE 1, 1950.

The Honorable DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SECRETARY: As members of the New England delegation in the House of Representatives, we have naturally been disturbed by the publication of figures which indicate that unemployment in New England continues to be more severe than in other sections of the country. At the same time, we have all received numbers of letters and visits from representatives of business concerns and employees in that area who are greatly upset at learning that the particular products which they are manufacturing have been singled out by the Committee on Reciprocity Information for possible further tariff reductions at the meetings contemplated in England at the end of September. Naturally there is uncertainty as to just what concessions might be made with respect to these products, and the industrialists in question are accordingly in no position to make any plans whatever with respect to their future operations and so help to mitigate the employment situation.

The problem outlined above is clearly aggravated by the fact that it is, as yet, impossible to assess the effect of the devaluation of foreign currencies upon imports which are competitive with the products of these industries. Those devaluations in themselves constitute a drastic cut in tariffs in most cases.

While we realize that the hearings before the Committee on Reciprocity Information have already begun and that the meeting at Torquay, England, has been scheduled, nevertheless, in the light of all the factors cited above, we earnestly request that the Committee on Reciprocity Information give full weight to these factors and that our Government settle at the earliest practical moment the continuing uncertainties by which many of our industries are seriously handicapped.

Most sincerely yours,

BATES, WILLIAM H., Massachusetts; COTTON, NORRIS, New Hampshire; DONOHUE, HAROLD D., Massachusetts; FELLOWS, FRANK, Maine; FOGARTY, JOHN E., Rhode Island; FORAND, AIME J., Rhode Island; FURCULO, FOSTER, Massachusetts; GOODWIN, ANGIER L., Massachusetts; HALE, ROBERT, Maine; HERTER, CHRISTIAN A., Massachusetts; HESELTON, JOHN W., Massachusetts; KENNEDY, JOHN F., Massachusetts; LANE, THOMAS J., Massachusetts; LODGE, JOHN DAVIS, Connecticut; MCCORMACK, JOHN W., Massachusetts; MCGUIRE, JOHN A., Connecticut; MARTIN, JOSEPH W., Massachusetts; MERROW, CHESTER E., New Hampshire; NELSON, CHARLES P., Maine; NICHOLSON, DONALD W., Massachusetts; PATTERSON, JAMES T., Connecticut; PHILBIN, PHILIP J., Massachusetts; PLUMLEY, CHARLES A., Vermont; RIBICOFF, A. A., Connecticut; ROGERS, EDITH NOURSE, Massachusetts; SADLAK, ANTONI N., Connecticut; WIGGLESWORTH, RICHARD B., Massachusetts; WOODHOUSE, CHASE GOING, Connecticut.

JUNE 1, 1950.

Mr. LEON KEYSERLING,
Council of Economic Advisers,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KEYSERLING: It was with great interest that the undersigned members of the New England delegation in the House of Representatives learned of your proposed study of the economic situation in New England as it relates to the fact that unemployment appears to continue more widespread in that area than in other sections of the United States.

In this connection we are enclosing a copy of a letter which we have today sent to the Secretary of State relating to the many protests we have received from business concerns in New England which have been advised that the products they manufacture are to be considered in connection with further possible tariff concessions at the contemplated meeting in England in September.

May we respectfully request that this letter be brought to the attention of the group of economists whom you have asked to assist you in your studies and that the specific problems which we have raised be considered and be reported upon by them in their forthcoming study.

Most sincerely yours,

BATES, WILLIAM H., Massachusetts; COTTON, NORRIS, New Hampshire; DONOHUE, HAROLD D., Massachusetts; FELLOWS, FRANK, Maine; FOGARTY, JOHN E., Rhode Island; FORAND, AIME J., Rhode Island; FURCOLO, FOSTER, Massachusetts; GOODWIN, ANGIER L., Massachusetts; HALE, ROBERT, Maine; HERTER, CHRISTIAN A., Massachusetts; HESELTON, JOHN W., Massachusetts; KENNEDY, JOHN F., Massachusetts; LANE, THOMAS J., Massachusetts; LODGE, JOHN DAVIS, Connecticut; MCCORMACK, JOHN W., Massachusetts; MCGUIRE, JOHN A., Connecticut; MARTIN, JOSEPH W., Massachusetts; MERROW, CHESTER E., New Hampshire; NELSON, CHARLES P., Maine; NICHOLSON, DONALD W., Massachusetts; PATTERSON, JAMES T., Connecticut; PHILBIN, PHILIP J., Massachusetts; PLUMLEY, CHARLES A., Vermont; RIBICOFF, A. A., Connecticut; ROGERS, EDITH NOURSE, Massachusetts; SADLAK, ANTONI N., Connecticut; WIGGLESWORTH, RICHARD B., Massachusetts; WOODHOUSE, CHASE GOING, Connecticut.

Why Small Business Has More To Fear From the Government Than From Big Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in extending as a part of my remarks a very able address by Mr. W. E. Borbonus, president of R–S Products Corp., of Philadelphia, Pa., which he made at the twentieth annual meeting in Hot Springs, Va., on May 15, 1950.

The complaint which Mr. Borbonus presents is typical of those coming from small business throughout the country. The statements made by President Truman that he wishes to help small business is certainly not borne out by the type of legislation proposed, by which he expects to accomplish this fact.

The address which I am inserting is certainly to the point and I am glad that the small business is not deceived by the political campaign speeches which are emanating from New Deal sources.

Nowadays it is fashionable for Congress and the administration to publicly whip big business under the guise of helping small business. The Great White Father in Washington is trying to make a case of ruthless competition of bigs versus smalls, and infers that dismemberment of large companies will automatically benefit small concerns.

I do not subscribe to this theory. I believe that in the very nature of business, small companies have an impregnable position in our economy and that big companies have no desire to invade these fields. I believe rather that small business has more to fear from Government than from so-called big business.

The administration pays lip service to the proposition that they want to help small business. Its pious concern seems to be nothing but a smoke screen to becloud the real purpose behind radical thinking in Government circles.

If it were really sincere in attaining these expressed goals, Government extravagances and deficit spending would cease. Our lawmakers would stop spending billions of dollars on needless pork-barrel funds to perpetuate themselves in office without regard to the ultimate and painful future consequences.

A genuine help to small business would be a revision of our tax laws to permit rapid amortization of investments on capital equipment.

I know one small company which needs a $30,000 machine tool. Because of high taxes, it cannot retain enough surplus cash and must borrow the money from a bank. The bank, having confidence in the management, is willing to finance the transaction for a period not to exceed 3 years. Our tax laws, however, make it mandatory to depreciate this equipment over 20 years, so that the small company must gamble on the 17-year differential.

If the principal should die in the interim, his estate must pay taxes, in cash, on the net worth of the company, including the undepreciated value of the fixed assets. Can you conceive any better way of drying up the capital goods market at the expense of small companies than this? No wonder small-business owners think twice before buying capital equipment which is necessary to competitive progress. And small wonder too, they want to merge with a large company, thus liquidating their own unlisted and frozen stock certificates for readily disposable stocks of the larger corporations.

The antitrust laws won't permit small competitors to reach economic agreements for their own prctection and benefit—unless, of course, they merge and the control of the two companies is under one head. Then everything is legal. Congress has been asked to give the FTC power to say just when companies can merge or sell out. Wouldn't we smaller companies then be stepping from "the frying pan into the fire"?

The tax laws are full of inequities, one of which is the 53 percent rate now levied on all income of companies earning $25,000 to $50,000. This differential should be eliminated. If $10,000 or more of income were exempted from taxation for all corporations, the small corporation would be benefited proportionately more than the large one.

Congress is considering another piece of political legerdemain, requiring the payment of taxes within 6 months after the end of the taxable year. Who do you think will suffer the most under this plan—certainly not the larger corporations.

Every thinking person realizes that our small corporations grow and expand through retention of earned profits. Where else can we expect to get needed capital when the Government imposes double taxation on the payment of dividends and then threatens us with a potential tax liability for keeping too large a percentage of earnings in the treasury to carry over lean years?

Admittedly, some horrible examples of tax evasion can be produced, but is it "cricket" to penalize every corporation for the misdeeds of the few? Is a blanket inequity justified to stifle prudent management of saving for a rainy day?

These simple suggested tax revisions would achieve constructive results for all business. No new bureaus or subsidies or preferential treatment would be required. No additional jobs for political hangers-on would be produced, but more men would be put to work in our factories where they belong and where additional wealth would be created instead of dissipated. Do not lose sight of the fact that so-called small business employs about 50 percent of all United States workers. Sensible tax laws would create many more jobs.

But perhaps we cannot expect common sense from our public servants when they spend $5,000,000,000 a year in excess of record-breaking income.

Perhaps we must wait for the millennium to arrive, before real unselfish Americanism replaces tawdry political ambitions.

In the meantime, let us beware of Greeks bearing gifts. Let us separate the wheat from the chaff and not be deluded into thinking that the Government will save small business from the giants. Instead, let's hope that we will be saved from the Government until it realizes that what we need in this country is more opportunity for free enterprise and less misguided self-appointed champions who hope to trap our votes by including us in their "come and get it razzle-dazzle."

Small business is the backbone of our industrial supremacy. Let's keep it that way.

Let's Get Back to Sanity in Government Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very, very happy that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service saw fit today to report a bill which would go along with the other body, substantially, in rescinding the reduction-in-service order of the Postmaster General—an order which could scarcely have been better planned to create resentment, anger, and protest in the hearts of American citizens.

Since all Members have been deluged with protest mail, I will not go into detail, except to point out that no city is more vulnerable than New York to the inevitable injustices of attempting to put this order into effect equitably. Since Monday my daily mail has been loaded with business houses in an area classified as residential, and who, as a result, get only one delivery late in the day.

One of the great defects of the order is that it falls most heavily on small organizations. In one instance, the refusal to accept mail after 6 p. m. or to deliver next day until around noon threatened the very existence of a small daily paper. I was asked, "Why doesn't that paper offer to pay the full cost?"

Aside from the fact that first-class mailing for this paper would greatly increase overhead, the paper loses all its value to subscribers if not received before 9 o'clock in the morning, and under this order subscribers would have been lucky to receive the paper first class at 4 p. m.

Under leave, I am inserting as part of my remarks the statement I submitted to the committee and also a letter I have sent to my constituents:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 7, 1950.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This statement is intended to express my strong support for any appropriate legislation which will restore to the American people the kind of public service from the Post Office Department to which they are entitled.

As you are aware, I am among the Members who have introduced substantive legislation to bring this about, but I have no special interest in my own bill. I am prepared to support any measure reported by your committee which will result in bringing back a measure of sanity in contemplating the problems of governmental service.

A democratic government does not exist to make a profit but to serve the people it represents. Its economy is not measurable in volume of dollars received and expended but in the efficiency of the services rendered to the people at their desire.

I am just as devoted to genuine economy, by which I mean efficiency, in the operation of the Government of the United States as the members of the Committee on Appropriations; and it is no derogation to their integrity to say that I regard my own position as more logical and real.

The people have shown that they want prompt, efficient, comprehensive postal service, and are willing to pay for it.

The problem of the committees having legislative jurisdiction is simply to see that the people get their money's worth in terms of man-hour production.

The baleful effects of the ill-timed, ill-advised action by the Postmaster General at the unilateral demand of a small group of members of the Appropriations Committee already are apparent.

At a time when the specter of unemployment haunts us thousands of postal employees in the lowest and least secure categories are being thrown out of work.

Small specialized publications depending on swift delivery service are being forced out of business (but the big newspapers and magazines are being protected and made more secure in their monopoly by special concessions).

Businessmen are being inconvenienced; residential areas are neglected (but nothing is done to decrease the handouts to big business and other groups in the form of different types of subsidies).

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I urge you to act, and to act promptly, in order that the whole Congress may have an opportunity to express its will, and through majority vote on the floor, express the will of the American people.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: This is to acknowledge your recent protest against the reduction in mail delivery service proposed by Postmaster General Donaldson.

I want to assure you that I agree with you, and more. This is foolish economy, and I shall fight it with every resource at my command. It can only have the effect of causing unemployment, which in itself has a bad effect on our economy. There are all types of subsidies for different interests—the farmers, the airlines, and others. Isn't it about time that we had a subsidy for the people of this country? The Post Office Department should not be a money-making department but should be subsidized by the Government in the interest of better mail and delivery service.

I am just as strong for genuine economy in government as anybody else. Genuine economy is getting full value for every tax dollar in terms of useful, efficient public service. The so-called Republican economy bloc in Congress has demonstrated that it is not trying to promote useful, efficient public service; it is only trying to cut those services under the guise of economy, so that big business and our wealthier citizens may enjoy a cut in their income taxes.

Forgive my not writing a personal letter to you; I have been overwhelmed with a flood of protest, and this form letter enables me to serve you more efficiently. Please feel free to write to me at any time; I always want to know your views on public issues.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Member of Congress.

Undersea Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following interesting and informative address on undersea warfare delivered by Rear Adm. Charles B. Momsen, United States Navy, on Armed Forces Day, May 20, 1950, at Joplin, Mo.

UNDERSEA WARFARE

(By Rear Adm. C. B. Momsen, U. S. Navy)

Undersea warfare is one of the three component parts of sea power, just as sea power is one of the three component parts of our national defense team. I do not want to give the impression that I am "beating drums" for undersea warfare to the exclusion of the other two elements of sea power—namely, surface and naval air—nor do I want to give the impression that I am advocating the support of sea power at the expense of the other two services.

As a matter of fact from my own personal experience, while commanding the U. S. S. *South Dakota* in support of carrier striking forces I learned that the functions of submarines, surface ships and airplanes are inseparable in controlling the sea.

It is unwise and unrealistic to support one naval function to the detriment of another; as unrealistic in fact as supporting one service to the detriment of another.

For the past 2 years, as ACNO for undersea warfare, it has been my primary responsibility to emphasize the importance of this phase of warfare. I have to live with it every moment of my time. I am fully cognizant of the danger of submarines and mines in the hands of a potential enemy and am fully appreciative of the many benefits that we may derive from the use of underwater weapons and craft.

When I say undersea warfare is one of the three component parts of sea power—I do not mean that the functions can be separated from surface warfare and air warfare. I will show you that antisubmarine warfare and mine defense require the use of all elements of the Navy plus generous assistance from the Army and Air Force.

As an example, Admiral Karl Doenitz expressed it this way: "The U-boat itself, with its extremely limited range of vision, was the worst possible medium of reconnaissance. The most vital and necessary complement to the U-boat, which was our main instrument of battle, was the aircraft."

The earliest recorded application of undersea warfare dates back to 332 B. C. It was during the siege of Tyre by Alexander the Great. The Phoenician Army, cut off from all sides, looked to the sea for reinforcements. A fleet of ships was brought in for this purpose.

History records that Alexander's men, using a diving bell, developed by Aristotle, entered the water just before a storm, cut the anchor cables of the ships, and caused them to be blown upon the rocks and destroyed.

The first submarine known to have actually operated was built by a Dutchman named Cornilius von Dribble. In 1620 he made a demonstration in the Thames River for the edification of King James I of England. He had a wooden craft propelled by oars projecting through the hull. The openings were made watertight with goatskin coverings. This craft, though crude, pointed the way to the ultimate development of the submarine.

In 1776 David Bushnell built the *Turtle*, financed by General Washington. The *Turtle* made an attack on the British frigate H. M. S. *Eagle* in New York Harbor. Sergeant Lee, the one-man crew, failed to attach his mine because he could not penetrate the *Eagle's* copper sheathing. The mine exploded on time, and, although it did no physical damage, the British admiral decided to shift his fleet to the outer harbor.

Robert Fulton invented a submarine in 1807, but as in the case of his predecessors, he was unable to arouse any sustained interest in his undersea vehicle.

During the Civil War some intrepid young sailormen in the Confederate Navy built several small submersibles called davids. With these they attacked and sank the U. S. S. *Housatonic* and damaged another Union ship in Charleston Harbor. Unfortunately, all of the davids and their crews were lost.

About 60 years ago John Holland, an Irish steam engineer, was hired by a society of Irishmen around New York to build a submarine. They believed that the submarine would be a weapon which would nullify British sea power. Their idea was surprisingly sound but was definitely premature.

Toward the turn of the century the storage battery was perfected and the internal-combustion engine was improved to a point where it was safe to operate in a confined space. These two factors provided what had been the missing requirements for practical submerged operations. In 1900 the United States Navy acquired her first submarine, a 70-ton vessel, built by John Holland.

In the following few years such developments as the steam torpedo, the Diesel engine, and the gyro compass made the submarine a true warship.

In spite of the general interest shown in the submarine by the major navies of the world, few naval authorities considered the submarine to be a factor of any appreciable significance in naval warfare.

The world's naval experts were rudely shocked one afternoon in September 1914 by the *Aboukir-Cressy-Hogue* incident. A force of three British cruisers was contacted by the *U–9*, a small German submarine, and the cruiser *Aboukir* was torpedoed and sunk. With the apparent attitude that "this cannot happen here," the other two cruisers stopped to pick up survivors and within the space of a little over an hour all three cruisers had been sent to the bottom.

The Germans went on to sink over 11,000,000 tons of shipping. They built a total of 365 submarines and lost 178.

After World War I the submarine was greatly improved. It grew in size, newer Diesel engines replaced the gasoline engine, better steel made stronger hulls and permitted deeper diving. The submarine torpedo was also improved to obtain longer ranges.

Germany, although under treaty restrictions, managed to construct between 30 and 40 new submarines prior to September 1939, and when World War II began, submarines again found allied shipping a soft target for their torpedoes.

During World War II the Germans built 1,162 submarines. Of these 751 were destroyed. More than 13,000,000 tons of shipping was sunk. Perhaps the greatest single factor contributing to the defeat of the submarine during World War II was radar. The reason for the effectiveness of the radar can be attributed to a tactical weakness of the submarine. The submarine operating submerged had to rely on a storage battery for power. When the storage batteries became exhausted it was necessary for the submarine to return to the surface, and by means of Diesel engines, recharge the batteries before submerged operations could be resumed. A submarine, while on the surface, is a very ineffective naval unit, and when it was discovered, particularly by aircraft, it did not have sufficient time to submerge and escape.

By 1943 the German submarine losses became so great that it was necessary for them to adopt a means of preventing discovery by radar. As a consequence, they adopted the Dutch developed snorkel. The snorkel consists of a vertical pipe extending up from the hull through which air may be drawn for supplying internal combustion engines with necessary air. The tip of the snorkel that was required to be above the surface of the water, presented a very small target and submarines were then able to keep their hulls completely submerged for days or even weeks at a time by using the snorkel. The adoption of this defensive measure by the German submarine reduced its mobility, not only in speed of advance, radius of action, but also in his ability to find targets. The submarine was also handicapped in his ability to navigate using celestial objects and to communicate with his own headquarters. While it is true that after the adoption of the snorkel, submarine losses were severely reduced, it is also true that sinkings of merchant ships dropped to about one-fifth of what they had been prior to this change. The use of the snorkel had little effect upon World War II.

If another war comes, submarines could be used against us for minelaying, attacks against shipping and naval units, as radar

pickets to give advanced warning of air raids, as troop carriers, cargo carriers, and guided missile launchers. The type of submarine to be dealt with would be an improvement over the World War II type. Germany, facing defeat of their special naval arm, developed this new type of submarine. In addition to the snorkel which I have described, the Germans developed new long-range torpedoes, streamlining their hulls, and increased the battery power which more than doubled their submerged speed. This increased speed enabled them to escape from surface ships and more effectively to attack convoys. It is significant that in streamlining to gain high speed the large caliber deck guns had to be abandoned, and if we are to face the high speed submarine in the future—we will not at the same time, be concerned with attack on ships by gunfire.

It is my opinion that while the snorkel is now an essential defensive device, it does not improve the striking power that the submarine enjoyed before aircraft.

Prior to World War I no serious thought was given to defenses against submarines. They were completely ignored as a minor pest. During the first few months of the war the use of speed, evasive tactics, and attempts to ram were the only antisubmarine tactics. Elementary listening gear was expeditiously developed for detection. Escorted convoys were formed and zigzagging was adopted. Depth charges fired by hydrostatic pressure were invented. The famous North Sea mine barrage, one of the most effective antisubmarine measures adopted, was laid after this country entered the war. Toward the end of World War I, submarine effectiveness was reduced by tremendous and overwhelming numerical superiority of forces to the point where we were able to ship enough men and material to France to tip the balance of the war in our favor.

Between World Wars I and II there was significant improvement in antisubmarine warfare methods. Echo ranging supersonic sonar was developed which provided both range and bearing of the submarine contacted. Depth charges and related fire-control equipment were materially improved. The development of long-range aircraft and the air-launched depth bomb added an important ASW agent to the future.

Those who thought of the submarine in terms of World War I believed that the antisubmarine warfare problem had been solved, but submarine development had not been standing still. At the beginning of World War II submarines were available that could make 20 knots on the surface and dive to 400 feet as compared to the 200 feet limitations of World War I. The additional depth was a significant improvement since the lethal range of a depth charge is in the order of 25 feet, and any increase in the third dimensional maneuverability of the target greatly complicates the problem for the antisubmarine-warfare vessel.

At the outbreak of World War II we quickly found out that our antisubmarine-warfare forces, equipments, and techniques were no match for the submarine and the stream of merchant ships diving into Davy Jones' locker took up where it left off in World War I.

Perhaps the first significant antisubmarine-warfare development was radar. As ships and aircraft become fitted with this new marvel of scientific development the curve of effectiveness of the submarine took a downward turn. The submarine's most effective form of action, the night surface attack, became denied to him. The submarine at this time still had to charge its batteries on the surface each night. Radar destroyed the security that darkness had previously provided for such charging operations and the submarine became hard-pressed to keep his battery up when in the vicinity of antisubmarine forces. The effectiveness of aircraft as an antisubmarine weapon was greatly increased with the advent of the target-seeking antisubmarine torpedo. Other antisubmarine methods and devices which were developed during this time were as follows:

1. Depth determining equipment on surface ships for more accurate depth settings on d pth charges.

2. Ahead thrown surface ship weapons activiated by contact, such as the "hedgehog" and "mousetrap."

3. High frequency direction finders, both ashore and afloat, to locate U-boat transmissions.

4. Influence mines planted at points of egress of submarines.

5. Aircraft bombing of submarine bases and assembly yards.

6. Expendable radio sono-buoys, a device to enable aircraft to track submerged submarines.

By the end of 1943 the submarine's position was becoming most difficult. More than 300 submarines were lost to aircraft (mostly land-based) and the Germans were forced to adopt new tactics to get away from the ever-present aircraft.

It is interesting to note that when aircraft became so effective against the submarine in 1943 the Germans countered by equipping their boats with strong antiaircraft batteries and for a while elected to stay on the surface and battle it out with the aircraft. While they had some success it was soon found that their losses were unacceptable and this line of defense was abandoned. I mention this because during our own submarine campaign in the Pacific a great deal of pressure was brought to bear to provide heavy antiaircraft batteries for our own submarines. Our submarines opposed this idea and it was not until the Germans abandoned it in the Atlantic that the antiaircraft proponents dropped it. It must be kept in mind that a submarine, unlike a surface ship, cannot afford to have its hull damaged, since even a small hole in the pressure hull may destroy the submarine's ability to dive.

In the future, defense against submarines will be along these lines:

Aerial bombardment of enemy submarine bases and building yards, if completely effective, would be a solution. Note that this requires carriers with their supporting ships and land-based planes with their supporting bases. Experience has taught us, however that in spite of great effort in bombing, only a limited number of submarines will be destroyed by this means. Bombing of U-boat plants during World War II resulted in the production loss of 152 out of 1,162 and 99,-265 tons of bombs were used.

Mining of harbors and channels if completely effective could prevent submarines from getting to sea. Mining requires aircraft, surface ships, and submarines. We are not so naive as to believe that this can be entirely successful and we feel certain that some would escape to the open sea, but a significant number will be sunk.

Next, we could place our submarines across the passages of egress to the open sea. This would require submarines and supporting air and surface units. Again, only a limited number of enemy boats would be intercepted.

Regretfully, we must face the fact that we would have submarines prowling the high seas searching out and threatening our merchant ships and fleets.

If they remain submerged at all times, making use of the snorkel, it would be very difficult for our aircraft and ships to discover them. Even so, extensive air cover, sufficient to keep the submarines submerged would produce important results in reducing their mobility.

When those which have overcome all of these difficulties do find targets, their capability to strike effectively is very great, for the range of the modern torpedo outranges our present detection devices.

It is, of course, our hopes to improve the effectiveness of each of the antisubmarine measures. We are always seeking better aircraft and better bombs with more accurate delivery in order to increase the number of submarines destroyed at their source.

We are continually improving mines to be used against the submarine.

In both fleets, submarines are especially designated to evolve the best techniques of destroying enemy submarines. It is well to point out that submarines operating in ambush in fixed positions are able to remain very quiet, whereas the enemy submarine intent upon reaching his hunting grounds is committed to movement and movement means noise. There results a battle of noise levels in which the antisubmarine submarine holds the high cards. We are now constructing a new type of submarine called the SSK-submarine killer. It is around this type that we propose to build the submarine defense against the submarine. I can say that from my own experience there is no foe that strikes more terror in the heart of a submariner than enemy submarines operating in the same waters. It is somewhat analogous to two blindfolded antagonists armed with baseball bats, each waiting for the other to break silence.

We must have sufficient antisubmarine warfare aircraft, both land based and carrier based, patrolling the infested sea areas to insure that submarines remain submerged continuously in order to reduce their mobility. We will require a large number of surface ship escorts to defend our convoys and task forces if they are located by enemy submarines.

We have plans for the defense of our harbors against the penetration by enemy submarines and other types of sneak craft.

This is the general picture of our various methods of dealing with enemy submarine threats. All of these methods will contribute to reduction of the threat. These methods involve the use of powerful striking forces—land-based aircraft (Navy and Air Force) advanced bases—amphibious forces including Marines and Army to take and hold advanced bases—logistic support fleets to provide beans, bullets, and fuel—submarines—patrol craft—in fact, all elements that make up a balanced armed force team.

The most difficult part of the problem that confronts us is defending ships from attack by those submarines which are able to reach their targets.

This part of the problem has been made most difficult by the recent increases in the effective range of the submarine torpedo.

There are three types of torpedoes:

A. Aimed.

B. Target seeking.

C. Pattern running.

During World War I and most of World War II the primary torpedo used was the aimed type. Since this torpedo once launched could travel only on a preset course, consider ble accuracy was required to solve the fire control problem in order that the relative motion of ship and torpedo would result in collision. Generally, ranges of not more than 1,500 yards were used. As a rule our detection equipment was capable of discovering the submarine before torpedoes were launched. Consequently, the antisubmarine ships had a fair chance of developing the first attack.

New types of torpedoes can be fired well beyond the range of detection. These are not accurately aimed but their hitting accuracy is obtained by other methods. The target-seeking type utilize the noise output of a ship's propellers to attract it to its target.

The pattern-running torpedoes are directed on a straight line to the vicinity of the target then through the operation of a cam, weave a preset pattern to cover a large area.

Either the pattern-running or the target-seeking torpedo can be fired from ranges far greater than the aimed type. Also, unfortunately, they can be fired beyond the present range of the ship's detection devices.

The question naturally arises, can we increase the ship's detection range? Radio and radar cannot be used under water. Magnetic detection has very limited ranges and is useful only in a restricted way. The mainstay of submarine detection is by sound.

Sound falls into two classifications:

A. Passive; and

B. Echo ranging.

Passive sound is merely listening for a source of noise. Great progress has been made in eliminating this noise source by silencing submarines and their machinery. Today, a submarine may, under certain conditions, proceed at a fairly high speed without making noise that can be heard at useful distances. Consequently, we must rely principally upon echo ranging for detection.

The speed of sound, traveling through water, is about 1,600 yards per second. It is the "about" that makes trouble, for the speed of sound varies with the temperature of the water. Except in rare instances, when the water is isothermal, that is, a uniform temperature—the sound beams travel along curved lines. A beam of sound energy aimed at a submarine a few thousand yards may miss it entirely because of this effect.

Many of our submarines operating against the Japs in the Pacific came home only because they took advantage of this phenomena and escaped detection below a temperature layer.

Today, our most serious problem in anti-submarine warfare revolves about this question of range of detection. We have a large number of research projects which deal with it. Until it is solved we will be certain to lose heavily against enemy submarines. On the other hand if we do solve it we will be able to drive submarines off the seas. I have reason to believe that we will solve this problem, and if my prediction is correct, submarining will become a mighty dangerous business.

Now let us turn our attention to another undersea-warfare problem—the mine.

Most people do not appreciate the terrible possibilities of the mine. Mines have sunk more ships per dollar expended than any other weapon. Of course it may be argued that mines can only be used in limited depths of water, but after all, ships must always go through such waters eventually before arriving at their destinations.

The old moored mine is still useful even though it can be easily swept. In the first place the mere presence of mines causes an enemy to divert a large part of his strength to provide and operate sweepers. Secondly, in areas where air cover can be provided sweepers cannot operate. In general, moored mines are used defensively.

Ground-influence mines, many varieties of which were developed in the last war, are much more difficult to sweep. Several influences are used to actuate the mine. The principle types are acoustic—magnetic—and pressure. The acoustic may take the form of a simple hydrophone. The noise of the ship's propulsion sets it off. The magnetic takes advantage of the natural magnetic field surrounding ships and the pressure used the pressure changes in water caused by ship's motion. All of these influences can be produced by artificial means for sweeping. When counters are used—that is a clock mechanism that regulates the number of times the particular influence must be produced before the firing mechanism functions—and when the combination of two or even three of the influences are employed—sweeping becomes a problem as complicated as opening a combination safe. It is time-consuming and the cost of the sweeping effort is all out of proportion to the cost of the mines.

Mines can be laid by aircraft, surface craft, and submarines. The aircraft is the best mine layer. It can penetrate enemy waters that ships cannot reach and it can replenish old fields which ships could not enter. On the other hand, aircraft can be observed and its mine drops can be spotted. The submarine is a most useful mine layer because it can do its dirty work unobserved.

That gives you a brief picture of the undersea warfare situation. There are many weapons and devices. New gadgets come and go. We are playing a very serious game of measures and countermeasures.

While undersea warfare is a most important part of the sea-power team, it cannot stand alone. No one type of naval craft holds its advantage very long. The aircraft needs support of the surface ship and the surface ship needs support of aircraft. The submarine, although more nearly independent than the others, can operate much more effectively if other friendly forces join him in a balanced effort.

In concluding, I would like to point out that our control of the seas could be seriously challenged by the underwater attack of torpedoes and mines. We cannot afford to give up this control, for by using the seas as international highways and denying their use by our enemies we are adding more than two-thirds of the earth's surface for our own purposes. With complete control of the seas—over, on, and under—we confine an enemy to his own land mass.

Memorial Day Address of Maurice Simmons, First National Commander of the Jewish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the RECORD the stirring Memorial Day address delivered on Sunday, May 28, at Temple Emanu-El, New York, by my long-time friend, Maurice Simmons, first national commander of the Jewish War Veterans, and chairman of the United War Veterans Memorial and Executive Committee of New York County:

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States holds its primacy as the oldest existing war-veteran organization in our country. Today its legions of the living are mustering throughout the land in their fifty-fifth annual memorial tribute to the heroic dead of America's wars. Shoulder to shoulder our comrades, black and white, gentile and Jew, battled to vitalize the humane ideals of our Nation. Let no bigot's venom besmirch their memory.

The Bill of Rights is the constitutional bedrock of our Government. It was designed by the founding fathers to buttress the fundamental freedoms of all our citizenry. As evangels we have exhorted all peoples to pattern their institutions on our charter of liberties. Have we ourselves kept the faith? Does every American enjoy full freedom of conscience, expression, and equality of opportunity? Are racial and religious groups segregated in social and locality ghettos? Do banks, insurance firms, and utility companies erase them from their list of employables? Are qualified students shackled by quotas and barred from prime schools of medicine and engineering? The most casual survey will unmask the polished Pecksniffians, the arrogant super-racists, and the sadistic reptiles from the lunatic fringe who have made a mockery of our Bill of Rights.

What nation has offered a haven to the surviving remnant of the blackest tragedy in the history of civilization? Even at this late hour senatorial pettifoggery is blocking legislation which offers a modicum of relief to the displaced persons. With the desperation of despair the shattered victims have sought and fought for sanctuary in the holy land of their Biblical forefathers. Small in numbers and destitute of adequate equipment, grimly but gloriously, on the field of battle, they crushed the phalanxes of the six surrounding Arabian kingdoms.

Israeli stands today as the only bridgehead of democracy in the Middle East, an impregnable barricade against the creatures of the Kremlin whose goal is the enslavement of the body and soul of mankind. Barely 2 years have passed since the birth of that Nation, and again the clangorous rumors of warfare shake its gates. Planes, tanks, artillery, and submarines from England are swelling the armaments of the feudal oriental warlords, but munitions are denied for the defense of reborn Judea. Britain's brazen and blundering Bevin whose public utterances have revealed him as a frustrated and embittered anti-Semite, cynically says that this mass of military matériel is needed for the maintenance of internal order. But what excuse have the striped-pants gentry in our own State Department to offer for parroting this inequitable and infamous policy of refusing arms for the protection of this bastion of democracy?

As Americans we believe in fair play both at home and abroad. We shall continue to give moral and material aid to our heroic brethren in Palestine despite the uncorighteous but timid and hypocritical tongues that dare charge us with a divided loyalty to our own beloved country. Is our fellow-American of Anglo-Saxon descent disloyal to the United States because he cherishes and supports Great Britain as the birthplace of his Mayflowering forebears? Is the patriotism of our fellow citizen of Irish origin to be impugned because he gave generously of his substance to the Irish Republic in its recent struggle to break the British yoke of imperialism? The American is a crossing and composite of diverse racial strains. Who in his innermost soul has not heard faint but familiar echoes from the almost forgotten cradleland of his ancestors? On this day of memoriam, let us hail the modern Maccabeans who from the fragile fabric of an ancient dream, fashioned a new nation, which in the words of Abraham Lincoln, was conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Annual Report of the National Commander of the Civil Air Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Air Patrol did a magnificent job during the last war, and it serves our country just as well in time of peace.

At its recent annual dinner on May 25, at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington, D. C., those present had the pleasure of listening to Eugene D. Chaney, senior at Branson, Mo., high school in my congressional district. This fine young man was

an exchange cadet student who visited England last summer, having been chosen because of his outstanding record.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the very interesting annual report of the national commander of the Civil Air Patrol, Maj. Gen. Lucas V. Beau, United States Air Force, recently made to the Congress of the United States:

NATIONAL COMMANDER'S REPORT TO CONGRESS

1. During the calendar year 1949, this headquarters maintained a continuing emphasis on the recruiting program for both senior and cadet members. Special emphasis was placed on readying the component wings toward their being able to perform the mission as laid down by Headquarters, United Air Force, in Air Force Regulation 45–49.

2. PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATION AND ADJUTANT

(a) The primary operational change of the Personnel and Adjutant Section of this headquarters during the past year was the establishment of the tridirectorate system. The Assistant Chief of Staff, A–1, Assistant Chief of Staff, A–3, Assistant Chief of Staff, A–4, and Assistant Chief of Staff, A–6, were redesignated Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel and Administration; Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations and Training; Deputy Chief of Staff, Matériel, respectively, with the Director of Communications assigned to Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations and Training. This change removed the Adjutant's office as a special staff office and made it part of the Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel and Administration.

(b) Inasmuch as this headquarters is of a dual capacity, in that the CAP functions and the Air Force activities are distinct, the Personnel Section is, of necessity, divided into two major components, namely, CAP personnel and Air Force personnel. At the present time, the CAP personnel section is maintaining records for the complete membership of the Civil Air Patrol which consisted of the following as of December 31, 1949:

(1) Total active male senior members	27,929
(2) Total active female senior members	4,832
(3) Total inactive male senior members	88,240
(4) Total inactive female senior members	24,095
(5) Total senior members (active and inactive)	145,096
(6) Total male cadets	12,059
(7) Total female cadets	3,420
(8) Total cadet strength	15,479

This means the CAP personnel section is maintaining records on 160,575 personnel.

(c) With the activation of the Fifty-second Wing of the CAP in San Juan, P. R., in November 1949, the Civil Air Patrol now consists of 52 wings, 124 groups, 727 squadrons, and 232 flights, for a total of 1,135 units. This is an increase of 230 units of the number reported as of December 31, 1948.

(d) In February 1949 a microfilming project was established to place on film a photograph of each senior member's application on file in national headquarters. The purpose behind this project is to eventually compile a mailing list of all active and former members of the Civil Air Patrol for promotional and financial purposes. During this same month, the Federal Bureau of Investigation changed their policy with respect to retaining fingerprint cards in their files. These fingerprint cards are now properly coded by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and are returned for file at this headquarters. During the month of May the microfilm project was completed, and 136,693 applications were microfilmed.

(e) The Air Force personnel section of this headquarters was maintaining records and administering to 75 officers and 100 airmen as of December 31, 1949. The main problem confronted by the Air Force personnel section throughout this reporting period has been the acquisition of qualified officer and airman personnel to fill position vacancies.

(f) In addition, the budgetary reduction of Reserve officers affected this command to the extent that four officers in the field were selected in November for release from active duty within 60 days and two officers were permanently suspended from flying status. Inasmuch as a prerequisite of an AF-CAP liaison officer is that he be rated, the close of this calendar year saw a loss of six officers in January 1950.

(g) During this reporting period 62 Air Force personnel were transferred out of the command and a total of 100 Air Force personnel were assigned. Losses for the most part were liaison officers in the field who had completed a normal tour of duty. However, the following losses took place in my staff at national headquarters: Col. James W. Thomson, formerly Chief of Staff, was assigned to the Armed Forces Staff College; my special assistant, Maj. George A. Davisson, was transferred to the detachment of patients at Walter Reed General Hospital. The majority of Air Force personnel assigned were, again, for the field. However, during the past year a public information officer, a new Deputy Chief of Staff, matériel, and an assistant air inspector were assigned.

(h) During this reporting period 22 airplane maintenance technicians, SSN 750–I were authorized this command. These airmen were selected and assigned to the various liaison offices in the field to maintain assigned aircraft where the liaison office was located at an unreasonable distance from an Air Force installation.

(i) As of January 1, 1950, it is not contemplated that any drastic changes in organization or operating policy will be effected, except as the further reduction in Reserve officers may affect those currently assigned to this command. The primary concern at the close of this reporting period is, as previously stated, the acquisition of qualified Air Force personnel and a concentrated effort to operate within the greatly reduced budget for the remainder of the 1950 fiscal year.

3. OPERATIONS AND TRAINING (A–3) ACTIVITIES

(a) Search and rescue: This was a very successful program throughout the year. CAP was very active during Operation Snowdrop when a total of 1,844 hours were flown in missions of all types. CAP pilots were credited with saving many lives during this operation. Two CAP pilots lost their lives while flying mercy missions in Nebraska during this operation. Other missions such as these requested by Air Rescue Service, police, and other agencies, covered a total of 7,441 flying hours, making a total of 9,285 hours flown during the year.

(b) Aeronautical rating program: There was a tremendous influx of CAP Forms 3A reaching this headquarters to meet the December 1 deadline on aeronautical ratings in order that they might fly the United States Air Force aircraft on loan to CAP. As of December 31, 1949, there were approximately 5,487 CAP Forms 3A processed by this section.

(c) European high school forum tour: This tour functioned very smoothly except for some adverse weather conditions at Dallas, Tex., which delayed take-off. Interesting and entertaining programs were held both at Dallas and Nashville, and the Civil Air Patrol benefited greatly by the tour, inasmuch as it brought the educators, State officials, and CAP people together to form a better understanding of the CAP program.

(d) Aviation Study Manual, book II: Art and copy work was completed by this section on the Aviation Study Manual, volume I, book II, and submitted to the Government Printing Office in May. The printing of the manual was completed by the Government Printing Office and delivered to national headquarters in August. Distribution to the various wings was completed in September. Reports submitted to this headquarters indicate more than 36 States are using the Aviation Study Manual.

(e) CAP Instructor's Manual, book III: Art and copy work on the Instructor's Manual was completed by this section and delivered to the Government Printing Office in August. Publication was completed in October and the manuals received in this headquarters in October. Distribution of 9,000 manuals was made to the various CAP wings.

(f) CAP Manual, book I: Delay was experienced in completion of book I due to the technical changes required, and processing of transcript material from the field. However, this project was completed by May 1, 1950.

(g) Reserve participation in CAP program: Reports submitted to this headquarters indicate the following figures for the last quarter of 1949:

October: Two hundred and seventy-three Reserve officers and Reserve enlisted personnel participating; 1,255 hours classroom training.

November: Two hundred and seventy-eight Reserve officers and Reserve enlisted personnel participating; 1,191 hours classroom training.

December: Three hundred and sixty-four Reserve officers and Reserve enlisted personnel participating; 1,355 hours classroom training.

CAP regulation 45–2, outlining the policy for ORC and ERC personnel participating in the CAP program, was published November 17, 1949, and an immediate increase was shown.

(h) Cadet exchange program: A highly successful cadet-exchange program was conducted during July and August of this year between Canada, England, France, and Switzerland. Twenty-six CAP cadets visited Canada, 25 visited England, 5 each to France and Switzerland, and a like number from these countries visited the United States.

(i) Drill competitive program: The team from the New Jersey wing emerged the victor in the national meet, held at Lowry Air Force Base, but was later defeated in the international competition at Toronto, Canada.

(j) Summer encampments: A total of 2,152 cadets attended summer encampments at 20 Air Force bases throughout the United States. Of this figure, 2,083 cadets completed the 2 weeks' training period.

4. SUPPLY AND MAINTENANCE (A–4) ACTIVITIES

(a) The Supply and Maintenance (Matériel) Section of the National Headquarters, Civil Air Patrol, increased its activities tremendously during the past year. This expansion in activity was due largely to increased CAP membership, a demand for specifically needed materials, and a greatly enlarged training program.

(b) The AF-CAP liaison officers stationed in each State, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, continued to help locate and act as distribution agents for many tons of carefully inspected surplus property, located at military installations and made available under Public Law 557, Eightieth Congress.

(c) Approximately 100 link trainers, over 200 trainer and liaison-type aircraft and spare parts for maintenance were donated to Civil Air Patrol by the Air Force in 1949.

(d) In addition to some 3,000 aircraft privately owned by Civil Air Patrol members and used in the program, the USAF has on loan to CAP over 300 liaison-type aircraft. Each of the 52 liaison officers is supplied with a multipassenger airplane, a 2½-ton truck, and a passenger vehicle for administrative use.

(e) Civil Air Patrol supply system was improved in 1949. This system is similar to

that which is employed by the Air Force, and therefore, provides training as well as protection of property. Supply accounts are maintained at the national headquarters to assure equitable allocation and distribution in accordance with requirements and requests.

(f) Under the provisions of Public Laws 627 and 829, action was taken on over 100 requests for real property consisting of Quonset-type huts, surplus buildings, airports, and other similar available real property which had become excess to the needs of the Federal Government. Over 400 Quonset-type buildings alone were made available and distributed among the various wings.

(g) Each wing was provided with one each SCR–399 radio transmitter, which was used as a basic set for the establishment of the national communications network. Surplus communications equipment was acquired from the various services in order to supplement these sets. Sufficient additional communications property has been secured by donation to maintain the present efficient national communication network and to provide expansion where needed.

(h) The maintenance and operation of all Civil Air Patrol property, aircraft, vehicles, real and communications equipment has been accomplished by the ingenuity and at the expense of the various CAP units. Air Force property which is provided for the sole purpose of accomplishing the Air Force liaison mission, of course, has been maintained by USAF. Continuous efforts are being made to train CAP members to be self-sustaining and to expect a minimum of aid.

(i) Regulations and directives have been written for all phases and procedures of supply and maintenance in accordance with Air Force policies. Close liaison has thus been established between the civilian auxiliary and the Air Force, thus providing effective training and coordination of effort.

5. COMMUNICATIONS (A–6) ACTIVITIES

(a) Rapid strides were made in the establishment and functioning of the radio net. Since the activation of the national radio station at headquarters, CAP, Bolling Air Force Base, the schedule has been operating regularly every Tuesday and Thursday night. Participation by regional and individual wing stations exceeded all expectations. In approximately 80 percent of all roll calls, we have 100 percent participation, including Hawaii operating direct with Washington.

(b) Three of the regional net control stations proved unsatisfactory, due to maintenance and operator trouble, and it was necessary to appoint another NCS which has worked out satisfactorily.

(c) Many of the wings experiencing a slump during 1948 have recovered in the past year and are taking an active part in the communications program as outlined in the CAP mission. There are three or four States yet to pick up, however. At the present time there is a sign of increased activity.

(d) The Crystal laboratory ground over 1,000 crystals for use on 2374 kilocycles, which were sent to wings requesting same. Although availability of crystal blanks for frequency 148.14 megacycles are limited, a quantity was obtained to install in the commanding general's aircraft, plus those assigned all liaison officers.

6. AIR INSPECTOR

(a) With the publication of Table of Distribution AF–TD (FAG–1–D) by Headquarters, United States Air Force, the authorized officer personnel was reduced from five to four and that of the airmen from five to three. While this reduction in authorized personnel made certain changes in our plan of operation as well as the complete curtailment of inspections of the several summer encampments, the schedule of annual inspections has been adhered to by this office.

(b) During the period covered by this report, this office made a total of nine special investigations concerning activities within the Civil Air Patrol.

(c) The period between January 1, 1949, and June 30, 1949, saw the annual inspections of 31 wings accomplished. During February 1949 the opportunity was presented for the observance of several of the wings working on the emergency caused by the heavy snowfall in the West, and in each instance they performed their missions in an excellent manner.

(d) Between July 1, 1949, and December 31, 1949 the annual inspections of 26 wings were made. Many of these were the second inspection given these organizations by this headquarters, and in every instance but one, considerable improvement was noted. Effective with the first inspection subsequent to July 1, 1949, a period of one week was allocated to each wing instead of the 3 days allotted during the fiscal year 1949. This has enabled the inspection team to inspect many of the subordinate groups, squadrons and flights. These visits have served a twofold purpose. First, it has enabled the inspectors to evaluate the sufficiency of supervision given these units from the wing level, and secondly, it has afforded the inspectors an opportunity to assist the unit commanders with their organizational, administrative and other problems. It is considered that the time and effort expended at this level of the wings will produce results of lasting value to the Civil Air Patrol program.

(e) It is contemplated that during the first half of the calendar year 1950 the annual inspections of the remaining 26 wings will be accomplished as per schedule.

(f) This section published an inspection guide for use by the organization inspectors at wing and group level. It was felt that this was a necessity due to the extremely low level of inspection experience obtainable at these levels.

7. OFFICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

(A) Congressional dinner:

(1) The Office of Public Information was in charge of the arrangements and operations incident to the holding of the annual congressional dinner and wing-commanders' conference held in Washington.

(a) The PIO wrote and presented speech material for the four main speakers at the dinner, planned and released publicity about the dinner and the conference, prepared and issued a brochure covering the national activities of the Civil Air Patrol.

(b) The Office of Public Information made the arrangements and carried out all functions of the congressional dinner for 724 distinguished guests of Civil Air Patrol. All expenses incident to these activities were borne by the national fund voluntarily subscribed by the wings of the CAP.

(c) In connection with the wing commanders conference, a press reception was held at the Statler Hotel in Washington, to which most of the aviation reporters and other members of the press, radio, television, and motion-picture colony in and near Washington were invited. Top officers of the CAP attended the meeting and became acquainted with approximately 75 guests invited by the PIO. Mimeographed brochures describing the background of CAP, its cadet program, and general aims were made available, as well as personal contacts for a broadening of the understanding of CAP.

(B) National magazines:

(1) Material on all phases of the CAP covering as many States as possible was supplied monthly to Air Trails, Skyways, Air Reserve Forces Review, Aviation News-Beacon, and others on a continuing monthly basis, while individual stories were supplied for approximately 25 additional nationally distributed publications.

(C) Civil Air Patrol public relations movie:

(1) Arrangements were completed with the Pictorial Branch of the Air Force Directorate of Public Relations to photograph (on a contractual basis) a 20-minute movie covering the CAP subject for use in presenting the program to civic groups and for recruiting purposes. Background photography was started by Air Force news-coverage units in Rapid City for summer encampments in California for sea-air rescue operation, in Colorado for winter search and rescue maneuvers and various other junctures of public-relations aspects, such as the departure and arrival of exchange cadets from other nations and the holding of national and international drill competitions. This motion picture is scheduled for release in the early summer of 1950.

(D) Radio and television:

(1) Radio: Good success was secured in this field, especially with Mutual Broadcasting System, including a 15-minute network show during CAP anniversary week in December.

(2) Television: A series of programs was spotted on the networks on a news-value or "name" basis, and considerable coverage was secured. However, this method was found unsatisfactory for presenting the CAP in its light as a training group for youths and a project to supply a weekly half-hour training and information television program was started by the PIO to be beamed directly into the homes of the Nation.

(E) National contacts with influential groups and organizations:

(1) The public information officer kept in constant and close contact with such organizations as the American Legion, which had refused to indorse the CAP program in 1948, and accompanied General Beau to the convention in Philadelphia where he remained during the convention and an endorsement of the CAP program resulted.

(2) Similar contacts and appearances also were made with various fixed-base operators' organizations to explain to them the operation of the CAP and to urge them to adopt CAP units on their fields, rather than to oppose the CAP units, which occasionally was being done by the fixed base operators due to the lack of understanding of the CAP objectives.

(3) Allied contacts and associations with groups and organizations in the National Capital were continued by the public information office.

8. Summation: I feel that the Civil Air Patrol is today upon the soundest footing it has been since its reorganization. The tremendous effort which has been expended to place our material in the secondary schools throughout the country is beginning to show dividends. The part this organization played in air rescue and under emergency conditions during 1949 did much to strengthen and expand the organization at local levels. I further consider that our radio net is so established that in the event of a serious disruption in communications anywhere in the country, it would function in a satisfactory manner. Continuing efforts are being made to further the entire program during the ensuing year.

LUCAS V. BEAU,
Major General, USAF, Commanding.

What's Going on in Germany?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the American people have a right to know what is going on in the American zone of occupied Germany, and I am very much

afraid that the American people will not like it when the full facts are known.

No sane person wants another world war; but German Nazis are not sane, and the situation in Germany today, where unreconstructed Nazis are being restored to political and economic power and American officials are defending and shielding them, is ominous in the extreme.

Responsible spokesmen for religious and labor and political groups, and I am not talking about liberal or radical or left-wing spokesmen, but about solid conservative people, have publicly stated that our denazification policies in Germany have failed.

A few days ago in New York the highly respected Rabbi Israel Goldstein preached a sermon on the subject, in the course of which he warned:

It is clear that if present trends are permitted to continue unchecked, the German people will revert to the status quo ante as soon as the occupation ends and will again constitute a threat to democracy, humanitarianism, and world peace.

Every objective newspaperman in Germany has warned and rewarned of the new resurgence of active antisemitism; even the High Commissioner has acknowledged that nazism is not dead, though he seems to do little to discourage its renascense.

One of the most amazing developments in recent weeks was the appointment of George N. Shuster, president of Hunter College, as the American High Commissioner for Bavaria.

Because I find myself in full agreement with Walter Winchell in his denunciations of this appointment—and of his warnings to the American people about the entire dangerous situation in Germany—I am inserting in the RECORD as part of my remarks Mr. Winchell's full column as published in the Washington Post of Tuesday, May 30—Memorial Day. My only regret is that Winchell, who has done so much to alert the American people to the dangers of authoritarianism, did not have space to go further in this column.

WALTER WINCHELL IN NEW YORK

CASE OF THE ABSENT-MINDED PROFESSOR

Sixty months have passed since VE-day. For almost as long we have been warning the American public (in this space and over the air) that official American policy is again leading Germany down the road to nazism and war. Our Government has neither denazified nor democratized Germany. One of the principal reasons for our failure is the State Department's talent for selecting occupation officials who are guilty of muddled thinking—to say the least—with respect to nazism and the responsibility of the German people for two world wars in one generation.

More than 3 years ago the American occupation forces ordered the German cartels broken up. But General Clay's assistant, Maj. Gen. William H. Draper (who was put in charge of the job), didn't see things that way. Last year an official United States investigating committee charged that Clay's top advisers had disobeyed United States Government orders to break up German monopolies. The committee placed the blame squarely upon Draper and his aides, Lawrence Wilkinson, Philip Morgan, Richardson Bronson. Wilkinson, then chief economic adviser to General Clay, had frequently declared himself "not in sympathy" with the allied occupation policy and pooh-poohed the committee's report as low comedy.

Now take (and you can have him) Benjamin J. Buttenwieser, Assistant United States High Commissioner for Germany. This gentleman was appointed to his post a bare 8 months ago, yet he came before the American public last week and dared not only to say that "nazism has been destroyed" (which claim is given the lie by every competent American reporter on Germany) but to excuse the return of Nazis to important positions in the political, economic, and educational life of Germany.

The other week we noted that in a book published 15 years ago Dr. George Nauman Shuster (prexy of Hunter College) had described Adolf Hitler as, among other things, "a greatly perplexed, honestly inquiring, and quite unsteady young man, a genial boss with a reputation for moderateness and kindliness." And we suggested that these sentiments undoubtedly "qualified" Shuster for his recent appointment as United States high commissioner for Bavaria.

Now comes a seven-page letter from Dr. Shuster, who says we misquoted him, and that he has an untarnished anti-Nazi record. Let it be said here and now that Dr. Shuster has frequently, over the years, made clear his opposition to all kinds of totalitarianism. But, at the same time, he has shown constant confusion with regard to the German problem.

We wish Dr. Shuster had said something about his book, The Germans, published in 1932. On page 262 of this volume the author (speaking about Der Fuehrer) said: "There is no doubt of his efficiency, or his bravery, or, in spite of inconsistencies, his integrity." (Webster's New International Dictionary defines "integrity" as: "Moral soundness, honesty, freedom from corrupting influence or practice.")

Here's the blitz: On May 11, 1933, Dr. Shuster delivered a lecture on Germany in which he said that Hitler was "no monster." According to the New York Staatszeitung, Shuster declared that had it not been for Hitler "bloody excesses inside Germany could not have been avoided."

In his letter to us Shuster said: "You have been induced to print that I said, in Strong Man Rules, that 'Hitler is our friend.' Now it is a fearful chore to reread a book one has written many years ago, but I have done so. There is no such statement in the book, or, indeed, in anything I have written."

Let's take a look at page 40 in Strong Man Rules, written by George N. Shuster in 1934: "Hitler is a politician of whom it might be said that if he had not existed, it would have been necessary to invent him. Hitler is our friend, the old soldier, destined to go down in history as a cross between Hotspur and Uncle Toby and to be as immortal as either. Hitler is not a German. Hitler is and has been a greatly perplexed, honestly inquiring, and quite unsteady young man. Those are a few of the plain facts."

Let's continue. From Page 41: "For from the beginning Hitler has been a political field marshal—a genial boss who discusses the smallest party maneuver in terms of the general staff and who begs his men to die bravely, though the action in sight is no more serious than taking up a collection." (Wow.)

Dr. Shuster will be responsible in his post for educating Germans not to make war again. But Dr. Shuster has excused Germany from responsibility for World War I. Look at this on page 37 of Strong Man Rules: "Taking away the few colonies which had been given to Germany was an offense against social ethics. Limiting the fighting strength (of Germany) was likewise so noble a service to humanity that it is quite beyond the comprehension of amateurs like myself. The final meaning of these deeds was that Germany would not have room in which to live." The old Lebensraum argument.

Dr. Shuster writes on page 56 of the same book: "Frankly, I think that the record tends to show the United States the most militaristic of western peoples. At least there is no other which has fought so many wars from which it could have abstained."

We repeat: Dr. Shuster is not a Nazi. He is an American professor of English who puts together pretty prose, even if sometimes he can't remember what he's written. He belongs in a college lecture hall, perhaps—but not in the post of United States Commissioner for Bavaria, where nazism was born and where German nationalism is now revived to a prewar pitch. Two wars too many have been fought—and too many men have died because we've been muddle-headed about Germany. The problem is simply too big for the Drapers, the Buttenwiesers, and the Shusters.

But not all Americans are soft headed. Eight United States Senators have introduced Senate Resolution Numbered 260 calling on the President to appoint a commission to investigate the terrible mistakes we've made in Germany. Please wire or write your Senator immediately to vote for this resolution. And enclose this documented indictment.

Transfers of Naval Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks made at the United States Navy Yard, Boston, on June 1, 1950, in connection with the first transfer of naval vessels—two reconditioned United States Navy destroyer escorts—to members of the North Atlantic Pact under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949.

It gives me great satisfaction to participate today in this ceremony of transferring two American naval vessels to the Netherlands Royal Navy under legislation worked out and steered through the House of Representatives by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member.

Twice in our lifetime the United States has gone to war in Europe because when it came to a showdown, concern for our own security required that we not permit the opposite shores of the Atlantic to come under the control of nations or forces that were a threat to us and to everything we believe in and stand for. We do not want to have to do that a third time. How can it be prevented in the face of that ruthless destroyer of human freedom which did not demobilize after World War II, but instead has been moving like a glacier across Europe from the east?

The Congress believed the way to get greatest security for the United States with the least drain on our strength and resources was to endeavor by all proper means to prevent further expansion of that power which has demonstrated itself hostile to us, and to help those friendly to us to recover from the strains of the last war and become as strong and united as possible.

What we are doing here today will bring assistance to a gallant and faithful ally, to be sure—but it is more than that. Transfer of these vessels, which were paid for originally and have now been reconditioned by the money of the American taxpayer, cannot

be justified—nor can our economic aid to the countries of western Europe be justified—except as it contributes to the security of the United States, as well as to that of the recipient country.

When the European recovery program—the Marshall plan—was being debated in Congress, some of us frankly stated our belief that in order to succeed it would require a military assistance program also. We could not expect the peoples of western Europe under the shadow of the Kremlin to go all-out in their efforts toward recovery, bring their savings out of hiding, and use them to expand their plants, build up their productive capacity, make more jobs for workers, until they could have a greater sense of security than they then had. The economic assistance program could not be an alternative to a military assistance program. Both were necessary if either were to succeed.

The western European nations could not recover without commodities, tools, and weapons, including such vessels as these, which only the United States was in a position to supply; but even with such assistance they could not recover without a most vigorous attack on their problems by themselves, collectively as well as individually.

For 3 years in World War I, each of the western allies insisted on its own completely separate military organization and command, and we all suffered disastrous defeats. Finally, under the pressures of necessity, we came under one commander in chief, Marshall Foch, and then we had spectacular victories. Again in World War II, we operated as separate nations at first. It was only when we came together under one commander, this time General Eisenhower, that we got full mobilization of the strength of all, and then we went to town.

In enacting the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, it was the view of the American Congress that neither Europe nor we could get maximum defensive strength in our present situation except by a plan for the defense of the whole area by all, not defense of each nation separately by its own forces. It is most gratifying that real headway has been made toward that objective, which the Secretary of State only yesterday described as balanced collective forces.

That means that these vessels are not going just to the Royal Navy of the Netherlands; in effect they are going to the navy of western Europe. In fact, they are not even leaving our own defense forces. They are joining and strengthening the defense force of the whole North Atlantic—which means of the United States, and of freedom, justice, peace, and decency in the world.

Letter to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter to my constituents:

DEAR FRIEND: I have received a great many requests for the speech that I made recently entitled "The Evils of Communism." The American Legion in their official publication, the Louisiana Legionnaire, is using most of this speech in a series of articles on Americanism versus communism. It might also interest you to note that the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, had the following to say in his letter which I quote:

"UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
"FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
"Washington, D. C., May 22, 1950.

"Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
"House of Representatives,
"Washington, D. C.

"MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I wish to express my sincere appreciation for your expression of confidence in my service as Director of the FBI, during the course of your remarks as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 19, 1950.

"It is highly gratifying to know that you approve of my administration of this Bureau and the manner in which we are discharging our responsibilities in matters affecting the internal security of our Nation. I was particularly pleased that you saw fit to give further dissemination to the views which I have expressed regarding the subversive threat which menaces our democratic form of government.

"My associates and I earnestly hope that the work of the FBI will continue to merit your confidence and approval.

"With expressions of my highest esteem and best regards,

"Sincerely yours,

"J. EDGAR HOOVER."

I thought that you might like to read this speech, which has created considerable interest, and I am therefore sending you this copy which I trust will be of interest to you.

Sincerely,

JIMMY MORRISON.

Mr. Lie Goes to Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article that appeared in New Republic of June 5, 1950, as follows:

MR. LIE GOES TO MOSCOW

In the middle of May a thrill of new hope ran around the world. Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations, had gone on a pilgrimage to the chief world capitals in the interest of peace. Moscow was the fourth capital to be visited, after which Lie promptly arranged to visit the other three (Paris, London and Washington) for a second time. He has not, as this issue of the New Republic goes to press, revealed the contents of his talk with Generalissimo Stalin, yet everyone is asking: Is there a real chance of ending the cold war? And if so, on what terms?

In Lie's mind, that question is certainly involved with the preliminary one, whether the Russians can be brought back to Lake Success. For many months, the important work of the United Nations has been almost at a standstill, because the Russians insist on walking out of every gathering at which representatives of Nationalist China are present. They do so on the ground that since the Chinese Communists now control the actual territory of the Chinese mainland, their Government should be the one represented in the UN. Whether the Russians are right or wrong in their position is less important, at the moment, than the fact that under the impact of this situation, the UN is moribund. But many experts in international law, while opposed to communism, believe that on this issue Moscow is both legally and morally right.

Trygve Lie also takes this position. Months ago he began working on a plan to replace the Nationalists with the Communists as China's representatives in the UN. To do this requires a favorable vote of 7 of the 11 members of the Security Council; 5 of these votes are already reasonably sure, and the other 2 could readily be obtained from among Ecuador, Cuba, and Egypt—if it were known in advance that the United States did not disapprove.

Two months ago, this American approval was taken for granted; but then a sharp change in the attitude of our Government was seen. We have suddenly begun to wage the cold war aggressively throughout the world. We now retaliate instantly whenever any of our diplomats are interfered with, in the iron curtain countries. We answer Moscow's abuse with equally strong language. At the London conference of the North Atlantic Council, we promised to shoulder a very heavy part of the burden of rearming western Europe, and strengthened our promise to fight if any Council nation is attacked. We are sending men, money, and military supplies to the southeast Asia areas threatened with Communist infiltration.

Among the causes for this new vigor in Washington is certainly Senator MCCARTHY and his false, but politically damaging charges of communism in the State Department. But beyond this, Messrs. Acheson and Truman are clearly convinced that the policy of getting tough with Russia works. They think it has worked in western Europe, Greece, and Turkey—assuming, as they do, that the Marshall plan is part of that policy. In particular, they think it has worked in Berlin. They feel that Russia is now on the defensive in Europe, and that this may account for her recent somewhat more conciliatory attitude, even though she continues to stymie the work of the UN.

What did Stalin say to Lie? The New Republic did not have a reporter under the table, but it is not hard to deduce the main points from the known facts. Stalin said Russia does not want to withdraw from the UN. The walkouts will stop the instant the Chinese Communists are seated. Russia does not want a shooting war. She would be happy to have the cold war end. She is prepared to discuss, with a view to agreement, every present obstacle to understanding—atomic energy, peace treaties, Berlin, mutual restrictions on propaganda.

To see what reality lies behind this attitude we must consider some of these questions separately.

Does Russia want to stay in the UN? There seems no doubt that she does. Russia has no sentimental feeling about the UN; Canada's Foreign Minister, Lester Pearson, is probably right when he says the U. S. S. R. opposes any real achievements in world progress by an organization dominated by capitalistic countries. Nevertheless, Russia finds the UN useful both as listening post and as propaganda sounding board. If she cannot, through it, achieve action favorable to herself, she can still prevent much unfavorable action which might be taken if she and her satellites were absent.

Does Russia fear a shooting war in the near future? The best guess is that she does not. The Russians believe that the western powers are most unlikely to fight unless attacked, and that therefore, for the present at least, the decision on war or peace is in their own hands.

Does Russia want the cold war to end? This one is difficult to answer. Moscow's only

test is whether the cold war aids or hampers the advance of communism throughout the world. Military preparations by the United States and other western powers are a glorified public-works project, bolstering up the capitalist economy, which the Russians have repeatedly said was on the point of collapse. The Marshall plan and the Truman Doctrine have checked the advance of communism everywhere they have been used, either by military means or by influencing the electorate. The burden of war preparation inside the U. S. S. R. is tremendous; and even in a country where public opinion need not be conciliated, the standard of living of the mass of the people cannot be pushed too low. On the whole, the Russians might therefore well believe their crusade would advance better without the cold war than with it.

Should we try to keep the Russians in the UN? Hysteria in this country is now so great that many people are frightened to answer "Yes," including Secretary Acheson and President Truman. Nevertheless that is the answer To accept former President Hoover's proposal, and expel the Communist bloc at Lake Success, is to say that agreement is impossible and atomic war is the only solution. It is also to demonstrate that you do not really believe in the power of western political and economic democracy to win their way in the world on their own merits. Our best and only hope is to keep the UN functioning, to use it as a vehicle for raising the standard of living among the impoverished millions around the world, to outperform the Communists everywhere. If we emphasize this side of the struggle, we can set the Russians back on their heels and turn the cold war into a triumph.

Senator McCARTHY might still go down in history as the man who started the third world war. We must not permit it. Trygve Lie, it is clear, has brought back from Moscow no magic formula, no peace plan which the West could or should accept in toto. The Russians are just as hard to deal with as ever, and that is very hard, indeed. Once we get them back in the UN, we are no better off than before they walked out. Nevertheless, Lie's plan for restoring the UN should be adopted—not as appeasement of the Russians but to keep open the door to the future, a door which must not be slammed shut to the sound of atomic bombs.

Tariffs on Foreign Corduroys Should Not Be Lowered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Committee for Reciprocity Information is meeting in the Tariff Building of Washington today to hear representatives of the textile industry on the question of the effect of lowering tariffs on cotton textiles. I appeared before this committee this morning to urge that present tariffs on cotton textiles, and particularly on cotton corduroys not be lowered.

To lower present tariffs on foreign corduroys would invite our foreign competitors in the corduroy-manufacturing business to help themselves to the corduroy market in this country and add to our growing unemployment.

I include, as a part of my remarks, the statement I made this morning in behalf of the corduroy industry of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama:

STATEMENT OF CARL ELLIOTT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF ALABAMA, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION IN WASHINGTON, D. C., JUNE 7, 1950

Gentlemen of the Committee for Reciprocity Information, I appear here in behalf of 350 corduroy textile workers of Aliceville, Pickens County, Ala., and 325 corduroy workers at Winfield, Marion County, Ala., and their employer, Alabama Mills, Inc., an Alabama company, which operates altogether three cotton textile mills in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, and in addition thereto operates four other cotton textile mills in the State of Alabama (at Clanton, Dadeville, Greenville, and Wetumpka).

I also appear here today on behalf of the Alabama cotton farmer who grows and sells the cotton which the Alabama Mills, Inc., and its employees manufacture into corduroys at Winfield and Aliceville.

Specifically, I appear on behalf of these people of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama to strenuously protest, and urge and insist that this committee not recommend that present tariffs on corduroys be lowered.

In support of my position I desire to call the committee's attention to the fact that the 350 corduroy workers at Aliceville, Ala., support 1,100 people, almost exactly one-third of the population of Aliceville; that the 325 corduroy workers of Winfield, Ala., support 1,000 people, one-third the population of Winfield; that in both cases these mills are at present by far the largest and most permanent industries of Pickens and Marion Counties; that both these mills have been laid out, designed, and mechanized by Alabama Mills, Inc., to manufacture corduroys; that the wages paid the corduroy workers at Aliceville amount to $17,000 per week, or to $884,000 per year, an average of $1.16 per hour; that the wages paid the corduroy workers at Winfield, Ala., amount to $16,000 per week, or to $832,000 per year, an average of $1.16 per hour.

I cite these figures to show the importance of these two corduroy mills to the economy of the Seventh District of Alabama which is predominantly rural, and which figures assume an added significance when I tell you that four of the nine counties of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama have been officially found by the United States Department of Commerce to have the worst unemployment situation in the entire Southeast. Marion County, in which Winfield is located is one of those four counties.

That information together with the impact of cotton acreage controls in the year 1950, and the fact that the boll weevil destroyed 50 percent of our cotton crop in the district last year makes it imperative that this industry be allowed to continue to operate without lowering tariffs on corduroys below the point at which they are presently fixed.

Gentlemen, I am sure that we are all impressed anew each passing day with the industrial genius of both labor and management in this country. Proof? Countries that are in competition with us in the corduroy business pay hourly wages as follows:

	Cents
England	54
Belgium	41
Netherlands	32
Germany	30
Italy	29
France	26
Japan	13

Against those figures Alabama Mills, Inc., pays its employees $1.16 per hour, and yet is able to compete, within a reasonable degree at least, for world markets. This is another example of the industrial genius of our people.

But we have reached the border line. We cannot continue to do this if tariffs on corduroys are lowered any more.

As a Member of Congress I have gone along, though with misgivings at times, with our program of Marshall plan aid to the countries of the world. I have felt that our efforts in that direction would bring new hope to the hearts of downtrodden and displaced peoples and enable them to withstand the godless aggressions of communism. But, gentlemen, in my mind I draw the line when we come to the point of exporting or giving away our jobs. A job is the most important thing in the life of the American citizen. Already we have 5,000,000 people unemployed. Thus our tariffs on corduroys and other items assume the utmost importance. Our national debt and the commitments of this Nation require that we maintain a high level of employment. Our millions for defense and foreign aid, development and recovery can only be given when we have jobs in this country. As long as our people have jobs I have no fear for our future.

The corduroy industry in the United States uses 142,000 bales of cotton each year, for which it pays the cotton farmer $25,000,000. This is about the average number of bales of cotton produced in my congressional district each year. Thus, we see the close tie-up between the cotton and corduroy. I hope this committee will not make any recommendation that will further squeeze our cotton market.

The corduroy industry and its employees pay some $13,000,000 in taxes each year. Against the background of an unbalanced budget, these figures again are of the utmost importance.

I have tried to emphasize generally the probable effect that lowering tariffs on corduroys would have on my congressional district.

To sum up:

1. Jobs would be taken from American citizens, who would be added to the growing body of the unemployed. There are no other industries in Aliceville or Winfield to absorb unemployed people from the corduroy industry.

2. The cotton farmer would lose at least a part of the market now afforded him through the corduroy industry. Foreign competition has the American cotton farmer groggy already.

3. If we are to reach the desirable position of having a balanced budget, we cannot afford to sacrifice the taxes paid by the corduroy industry and its employees.

I appreciate this opportunity to appear before this committee and give testimony against lowering tariffs on foreign corduroys.

Most Important Work in 17 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include the editorial entitled "Most Important Work in 17 Years," taken from the April 14, 1950, issue of the

Minden Press, Minden, La., which follows:

MOST IMPORTANT WORK IN 17 YEARS

Most important development in Webster Parish in the past 17 years has been the Soil Conservation Service's contribution to rebuilding rundown land. We remember how bleak hills stared us in the face, how raw red subsoil irked us and made us nervous for future generations. We remember how farmers toiled in the fields using less scientific methods.

With the coming of the Roosevelt administration a soil-conservation program was instituted. One of the first offices was set up here in Minden. From that day a new day started dawning for people in this section of Louisiana. It took a long time for us to get fully acquainted with what was under way for us. But we know now. We have traveled over sections of this terrain and have seen the changes made in farming and in agriculture in general. It has all been good.

Think of the low income of farmers who strived to make a living. The soil would not give up good crops—it was too poor and depleted. Now look on the same fields where the land has been properly tended and put to the best use it is suited to. That has meant more than we can measure in dollars and cents, for it means something also to posterity; it means much to our State and national economy and well-being. We were a Nation going down hill fast. If Roosevelt had done nothing except this one thing, his name would have gone down in history among the greats.

The job is not finished by any means, but it makes everyone proud of the soil-conservation work. It gives us new hope and inspiration. Another thing that makes us happy is the fact that organization is made up of able and trained men who know their business.

Therefore, we make a toast, "long may the Soil Conservation Service live and continue to bring new life to the people."

Commencement Address by Hon. James A. Farley at Seattle University and Introductory Remarks by the Very Reverend A. A. Lemieux

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the introductory remarks at a ceremony recently held in my home city of Seattle, at one of the fine universities of the country, Seattle University, the introductory remarks by the Very Reverend A. A. Lemieux, president of Seattle University, in introducing another fine American, Hon. James A. Farley, of New York, and also the commencement address by Mr. Farley.

There being no objection, the introductory remarks and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY THE VERY REVEREND A. A. LEMIEUX, S. J., PRESIDENT OF SEATTLE UNIVERSITY

It is a great honor and pleasure to present our distinguished commencement speaker to our graduates, their parents and their friends. There are many titles by which he might be presented. He could be presented as the distinguished public servant who has served his own State of New York as a member of the State assembly, who has served the Nation as Postmaster General and Cabinet member, who has served his own party for 35 years as chairman of both local and national committees. He could also be presented as an able businessman who has attained to the high office of chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation.

His finest title to distinction and claim to our respect, however, is contained in a tribute paid him by no less a person than the late President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt:

"I have known Jim Farley for a great many years and I have never known him yet to do or think a mean thing. * * * For a long time now—for a good many years, he has been taking it on the chin—taking it with a smile and not batting an eyelid, because, I think, in the back of his head he has had the idea that in spite of all kinds of unfair attacks, the American people, just like you and me, will read him for what he is, absolutely on the level."

The admirable combination of integrity, honesty, loyalty, and devotion to high Christian principle together with distinction in public service and high office in business makes our distinguished guest a most fitting choice as commencement speaker for the graduates of Seattle University. I proudly present a man who has been an honor to his church, to his profession, and to himself—the Honorable James A. Farley.

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, THE COCA-COLA EXPORT CORP.

When I received Father Lemieux's kind invitation to address you today, I was deeply conscious of my inadequacy, which feeling I perhaps can best illustrate by recalling what has become a family joke. Several years ago my son Jimmy startled me at breakfast one Sunday morning by fixing his 9-year-old eyes solemnly on mine and asked, "Dad, did you ever think, when you were a little boy like me, that some day you would grow up to be a great American?" After a bit of deliberation—I was then proudly in the United States Cabinet—I answered, "Jimmy, to tell you the truth, I don't think I'm a great American." He turned my answer over in his mind a moment and came up with, "Well, dad, neither do I." I need not remind you that it was Homer who said it's a wise child who knows his own father.

Although I hold 11 honorary degrees from various institutions, none more blessed than your own, I would gladly exchange them all for one such as you have earned in these halls, because my education stopped short of college. These degrees do not make me a sage or a philosopher. I am a businessman who used to be in politics. I am proud of both professions, because they deal with the ebb and flow of economic and human movements as they surge toward ends uncharted and clash in causes whose goals too often prove mirages for their sternest advocates.

For 35 years I was active in politics. For the past 6 years I have been an interested spectator on the sidelines, from which vantage point I learned much that escaped me when I was in the heat of the struggle. During most of my years in politics I was associated with business. In the past 10 years I have been identified as a businessman rather than a politician. In these later years I have been urged now and then to expound my philosophy of life. May I repeat, I am not a philosopher, except as the passage of the years promotes contemplation and reflection on the ways of life.

So when I realized that the time was at hand to think of what I should say to you today, I thought of the lessons I had learned from my two professions—service, honor, and liberty. I realize that this field is broad. In fact, it reminds me of the medieval scholar who announced his intention of writing an opus under the title "Of Everything Knowable and Certain Other Things."

Politicians come in for more abuse, year in and year out, than perhaps any other class of citizens, although businessmen in recent years have taken their share. Much of the criticism is deserved and a great deal is not. Politics has its share of conscientious, high-minded, incorruptible men. The proportion of scoundrels is small. And I have found there was more good in the worst political scoundrels than are dreamt of in everyday philosophy. On the good politician rests, in large measure, the success of our Government.

Politics can and should be a career of honored service. Good politics can and should be good government. As a class, politicians are gregarious; they are genuinely fond of people. They delight in serving people. Of course they hope for preferment by rendering service. But I can testify there is a genuine satisfaction in being of service to your fellowmen. To this day I am warmed when some one clasps my hand to give thanks for a favor rendered long ago. The favor may have been forgotten long ago by me, but it is good to find gratitude living on. This is as true of business as politics.

This can be translated to our daily lives. There is no greater joy, no deeper contentment than that which comes from doing good for others, whether it be family, friends, or even strangers. We pass this way but once but we can light the way for those who follow by the warm glow of golden deeds in any career we may choose and in our daily lives.

In giving service the politician has nothing to offer in the final analysis but his own word. This is true of business, but to a lesser degree because of material goods. If the politician tells the truth and keeps his word he gains the devotion of his friends and the respect of his enemies. Honest men may differ. Most progress comes from compromise. Compromise does not mean surrender of principles or ideals, but is the leveling influence of tolerance and understanding. The gap between compromise and surrender is as wide as that between honor and dishonor. Surrender is cowardly, and abject surrender of principles and ideals. It is willful departure from the truth.

As long as we give service, cleave to honor, and maintain dignity this country will be a land of opportunity for all. I do not hold with those who tell our youth that opportunities are dwindling. The morning sun of opportunity is just over the eastern horizon, not sinking in the west. It may be that you cannot amass a great fortune. Gold glitters, it is true, but it does not necessarily give off warmth, particularly of happiness and contentment. Virtue and peace of mind are more precious touchstones to happiness.

Returning to opportunity, free men do not for long willingly accept economic distinctions growing out of the chances of birth, environment, and opportunity. This is particularly true of America, the most favored nation in the world, and let us thank God for it. America was the first of all nations to set forth fundamental principles of civil government. This was done in the preamble to

the Declaration of Independence. Nothing in all history prior to July 4, 1776, approached it and nothing in history since has surpassed it. Lord Acton's tribute to this statement of principles is perhaps the finest. The British historian, who spent his lifetime in writing a history of human liberty, said that the history of human liberty was the history of that which "was not" until that last quarter of the eighteenth century in Pennsylvania.

You know the preamble by heart, but bear with me while I repeat it:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem likely to effect their safety and happiness."

In your time and mine Germany had its Hitler and Italy its Mussolini, and I say let Stalin profit by these examples.

It is well to look at this preamble afresh. Its principles affirm dignity of the human person. They affirm the rights that belong to that dignity. They affirm the sacredness of the rights. They affirm the primary function of government as the protection of those rights. They affirm the right of the people to change the government, not the government to change the people. They affirm natural law. And it must be remembered that they affirm God. They affirm there can be no sound civil government without the blessing of the Creator.

From the very beginnings of this country, the people of all races and nations of men came to this country seeking and finding opportunity to improve their physical and mental status. Here they found freedom from the ignoble experience of living and laboring for nothing more than food, shelter, and clothing. Here man conquered the elements. In my lifetime of three score years man has made more material progress than in the entire history of the world up to my time. He has invented machines which have set him free. His progress has been so rapid that he is now faced with the problem of controlling inventions that may destroy him if they are not wisely handled.

We glory in a free society. The lowliest worker and the highest official say more as freely as means allow. They are free to think their thoughts and speak as they please. The lowly worker can work to take the place of the official. He is free to seek for himself the opportunity to make the most of his toil, his genius, and his character. As Americans we are free men. True, we have some poverty, but not in the sense of poverty in Europe or Asia, crushing poverty from which no man may rise.

Americans were not given freedom. It is no gift from kindly prince or hereditary class or despot. The freedom of the American is his by his own seeking and vigilance. It is a gift he has given to all who came to these shores and one which by example he has given the whole world. God-loving men of many nations and races here met with destiny to create a society based upon liberty and justice. Here alone in the world is a man reckoned as a man for what he is, not what his father was. Here alone can any man chart his own course of life with the widest latitude to his genius, his will, his conscience, and his mind. He need consult no worldly master or government. What course he may take is between him and his Heavenly Master.

Is it any wonder then that no other nation has a comparable standard of life. Is it any wonder then that this Nation could play the role of arsenal to democracy in war and bulwark against communism in peace. No other nation has paralleled the inventiveness, the energy, the productiveness, the power, and the glory of the United States. And I say this is the teeth of whatever the Kremlin radio may broadcast. I credit the Soviets with only one invention: The most monstrous, terrible, ruthless, enslaving, and degrading form of government known to mankind.

And it must be remembered that no other nation in the history of the world has exhibited the charity, the patience, and the kindliness of America. We are truly a good neighbor. We are the big brother of the world. We make no discrimination between friend and foe or former friend and former foe. All receive our bounty to aid them in feeding their children, rebuilding their economies, and finding the path of peace. No other nation has better followed the divine injunction: "Suffer the little children to come unto Me."

We have not employed our might to enslave any people. We have not chained captives to the chariots of our production. We have taken no land. We have fought and we have forgiven. History offers no example of our role in Japan. During the war we crushed Japan, employing in the final days the most terrible weapon devised by man. At the close of the war we might have made slaves of the Japanese. That was not and is not the American way. Instead, we directed a task of rebuilding and recreation. From the ashes of feudal Japan is arising a nation rooted in freedom and justice. I honor my great and good friend, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, for it.

In Germany we have not had a free hand. The American way has been thwarted at every turn by the malign and sinister despotic menace that is the Politburo of the Soviet Union. Still we are making progress in Western Germany. Unhappily, in much of Germany there is neither charity nor aid and, as a result, peace trembles in a balance. Hatred can only breed hatred. The birds of prey do not hatch doves of peace. Slavery to the state cannot bring forth individual freedom. Until hatred dies and state slavery is abolished we can expect unrest in the world. In history human slavery has been more common than freedom. In most nations people have been servants to their rulers. In few have the rulers been servants to the people. But slaves may rise and liberty can grow.

We are now engaged in a great struggle with the forces of darkness, which have engulfed most of eastern Europe, much of Asia and whose Trojan horses lurk everywhere, including our own land. We know this struggle as the cold war. All of us fear that it may flare into a hot war. We pray that it may not. The outlook is dark and dismal. On every hand we hear doleful warnings that civilization is threatened. The air is full of sound and fury and fear. The world is facing a crisis. This crisis may come tomorrow, next week, next year, in the next decade, or certainly in your generation.

Let me speak to you as one for whom the sands of life are running lower. This crisis may not come in my time but it is certain to come in yours. I charge you be not afraid. Remember, each generation has had its crisis and each generation mastered its crisis in its own way. There is no crisis so great that it cannot be surmounted. Danger ahead always looms more terrifying than that which has past. Disaster is never as bad when it comes as it appeared to be.

The early Americans weathered bitter winds, the fury of savages, wasting illnesses, and gnawing famine. The founding fathers surmounted their crisis with fortitude and faith. The late colonial days were truly times that tried men's souls. This crisis was met with courage and perseverance which ultimately brought freedom and victory. But the Nation was not born yet. The new Nation was threatened with death before birth. This crisis was weathered by wisdom and compromise to give the world the greatest charter of government to spring from the mind of man. One hundred years ago came the crisis that threatened to rip the new Nation asunder and retard the fulfillment of the American standard of life immeasurably. That crisis was resolved by a cruel war which saw brother fighting brother, but without the savagery and blood lust civil strife has known in other nations.

Just before the turn of the century another crisis was resolved by war. In our century two world wars threatened destruction of mankind. In both wars American production, genius, valor, and manpower turned the tide. Even though we still have to conclude the peace of World War II one threat of dictatorship has been averted. Another looms and that is the crisis of your generation. I devoutly hope and pray that you may be able to resolve it without going to war. Generations before you have gone through wars, famines, disasters, depressions, confusions, deceits, and hysteria. We are still free. I say to you that you will go through this crisis and you shall still be free. No one has ever been able to put shackles on America and, under God, no one ever will.

Let us look at the crisis before you. In his haste to conquer the elements man has been neglecting the most important phase of his life—the spiritual. Man has learned a great deal concerning the behavior of material things in the universe. Thunder terrifies him not, nor lightning, nor the awesome mushroom of atomic explosion. At no time has man been so able to control behavior as he can today. His accomplishments have been so many and his pride so great that it is little wonder that he fancies himself a deity of sorts.

Too great an emphasis on things material has encouraged a nonreligious view. This has been encouraged by totalitarians. They would make the state, for their own immediate ends, the ultimate authority in men's lives. They abhor spirituality as they hate human freedom. They know spirituality and freedom go hand in hand. Dictators cannot live where religion and freedom flourish.

In his pride man has let his own behavior get dangerously out of control. It must be remembered that by the side of pride fell the angels. We know the rise of the materialistic as the growth of secularism. In your years at Seattle University, under the temporal and spiritual tutelage here, you have been armed for the state of war which threatens to destroy us and for which there apparently seems to be no peace. The world is wondering how this has happened. On every hand we hear people asking what has gone wrong? What can save us? Here at Seattle University you have been given the answer. The answer lies in a return to the grace of God, the grace which brought us freedom and liberty. Our civilization must not perish as others have done.

It shall not perish if Americans fear God and never forget the virtue of liberty. We must be ever vigilant against the enemy. We must teach the young from the first day of school that liberty is man's dearest treasure and that God is his dearest friend. We must beware of false prophets. We must not barter our liberty for false promises of security. Once we are enslaved the world may slip back into darkness for centuries.

By service and honor we achieve dignity. Freedom is the apex of dignity and our most precious heritage. Those of my generation this day pass on this heritage to you. We

do not give you wealth or security but freedom. You need not fear war nor other crises, so long as you guard liberty.

And guard it you must because it gives you the opportunity to make your own lives, to build your own careers, to rear your children, to think your own thoughts, to speak your own mind, and to worship the God who gives you the blessing of being a free American.

A Challenge That Dixie Should Consider

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator MUNDT Challenges Us," published in the Savannah Morning News of Savannah, Ga., together with a short statement of my own.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CHALLENGE THAT DIXIE SHOULD CONSIDER

Mr. President, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 18, I called attention to an item published in the Bay City Tribune of Bay City, Tex., indicating that if any remaining vestige of State's rights is to be maintained in this country and if national socialism is to be stopped it is imperative that southern voters reappraise the goals they seek and the methods by which such objectives can be secured. As a consequence of the remarks I incorporated at that time, on page A3744 of the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, some very interesting and encouraging correspondence has been reaching my office from points south and west of Washington.

In addition, a number of thought-provoking editorials from the pens of progressive southern editors have reached my desk, typical of which is the following editorial from the Savannah Morning News of Savannah, Ga., to which I shall call attention at the conclusion of these remarks.

Mr. President, while I was attending Columbia University in New York City years ago, I recall hearing the chant of gangs of street urchins who when caught in depredations would cry out, "Cheese it, the cops," and then while the policemen would scold and upbraid the small boys they would shout back in derision, "Sticks and stones can break our bones but harsh words never hurt us."

May I respectfully suggest to the fine, spirited voters of the South that votes and opposition candidates can break up the New Deal-Fair Deal program of imposing FEPC, socialized medicine, deficit spending, the Brannan plan, but harsh words, futile filibusters, and puerile plaints just will not do the job. Votes are what count. So long as the solid South votes solidly and predictably Democratic (New Deal-Fair Deal), no matter how sullenly or sulkily it offers up its kept votes to the city-machine bosses now controlling the Democratic Party, it is as certain as a Democratic majority in Arkansas that the trend to the left will continue.

A two-party election in the new republic of far off Turkey has just demonstrated how a break with the past can usher in a new era of freedom, Mr. President. Surely, the once proud and spirited people of Dixie will not forever swallow their pride, vote for the success of the forces which oppose them, and provide servile support for a party position and leadership which taunts and derides them. Sooner or later, I predict the people of Dixie who are among this Nation's best and finest will assert their authority by placing principle above party and by developing a two-party system which will restore once again the influence and importance of the South in determining the destiny of America. The following editorial from the Savannah Morning News, like the one which I received recently from the Roanoke World News, of Virginia, indicates that the day may not be far off when Dixie will enjoy a new birth of freedom.

[From the Savannah (Ga.) Morning News of June 4, 1950]

SENATOR MUNDT CHALLENGES US

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 18 last appeared an address by Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, South Dakota, which we wish every Georgian and every Southerner could read, and we are happy to reprint it on this page today in the belief that it vigorously upholds the contentions the Morning News has been making for a number of years.

We have frequently pointed out in these columns that because of an ill-advised loyalty to the memory of a Democratic Party which their fathers and grandfathers once supported—but which does not exist in power today—Southerners for the past 17 years have persisted in voting into office again and again a political regime that is no more the party of Jefferson than is the party of Lenin, Stalin, or Wallace.

Senator MUNDT, in his address, brings out this solemn truth with conviction and with force when he declares that, "Maybe the South really wants the FEPC and so-called civil rights legislation and socialized medicine and perpetual and prodigious deficit-spending. Maybe it wants for once and forever to put a complete and total end to the concept of State's rights. How can we know? It talks against these things—but votes for them."

That is the kind of thing the Morning News has argued. We have pointed out repeatedly, since the 1948 election, that if the seven Southern States which gave a majority to Truman had opposed him he would have lost the election. We have argued that, from a standpoint of principle, we in the South should recognize that the New Deal and Fair Deal do not represent and have not represented the true tenets of the Democratic Party.

We have suggested that what this section needs is to establish the two-party system in the South so that this region can obtain its rightful place in the political sun in Presidential election years. We are grateful to Senator MUNDT, therefore, for giving emphasis to our arguments.

Rural Nonfarm Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech entitled "Public Housing Current Issues—What Has Happened to the Rural Nonfarm Program?" delivered by the Reverend Thomas B. Keehn, in New York City, on April 3; and also a statement entitled "Rural Nonfarm Housing," made by the Reverend William J. Gibbons at the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, on April 26.

There being no objection, the speech and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC HOUSING CURRENT ISSUES—WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO THE RURAL NONFARM PROGRAM?

(Statement by Rev. Thomas B. Keehn)

The fate of the rural nonfarm public housing program is one of concern to all who helped achieve the great victory which approval of the Housing Act of 1949 represented. Now, almost 1 year after enactment of this law, virtually nothing has been done to implement the provision for rural nonfarm housing which is contained in it.

There are undoubtedly some good reasons for this delay. The definition of rural nonfarm is vague. The Census Bureau defines it as villages or communities under 2,500 population. Rural nonfarm, therefore, includes at least farm laborers, migrants, sharecroppers, tenants, part-time farmers who live in open-country areas or small villages. The estimate of the total number of such workers is uncertain, but it is clear that it is large and growing.

The most significant sociological fact of the last 20 years is the development of rural nonfarm areas. This has resulted from the spilling over from large cities, from the complexities of urban living, from technology and industry.

Housing programs to meet the need of rural nonfarm areas are not entirely new. There was both public and private recognition of the problem in the 1930's, particularly during the depth of the depression. The main motive at the time appears to have been a back-to-the-land movement. It was largely an experimental and a specialized approach to the housing problem for rural nonfarm areas.

It is said in many quarters today, including the PHA, that not much is known about the possibilities of housing for rural nonfarm areas. To some extent this is true. But after digging around in the files of the Department of Agriculture, PHA, and the libraries four or five suggestions based on experience of the past come to mind.

First of all, some study of the subsistence homesteads program developed by the Resettlement Administration and the Farm Security Administration should be made. A volume entitled "Place on Earth," edited by Russell Lord and Paul H. Johnstone, published by the Department of Agriculture in 1942 records the history of these projects. Many of them were not too successful but a great deal can be learned from the mistakes which were made. Some of them were, and continue to be, successful. Perhaps the most important one was the subsistence homestead project developed at Granger, Iowa, under the guiding genius of Msgr. Luigi Ligutti. Detailed reports and photographs on the Granger project are available from the National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

Another pattern, developed by the Resettlement Administration and Farm Security Administration and later on administered by the old Federal Public Housing Administration, was known as labor homes. During the period 1939–45 probably more than 2,000 of these labor homes were built. Here individual families were given small houses and plots of land from which they could secure some real income through gardening while also working during crop seasons on adja-

cent farms. These projects like the Subsistence Homesteads have been disposed of as required by acts of Congress. However, at least one of the labor-home developments was so significant that the families living in the homes established a cooperative and purchased the homes from the Government when they were put on the auction block. This particular project known as the Delmo Homes in southeast Missouri continues today as a successful and significant undertaking. Several agencies of the Congregational Christian Churches have had a continuing interest in the Delmo Homes and literature and a film strip are available describing the enterprise.

Undoubtedly, the most important housing program for rural nonfarm areas was the development of the migrant labor camps started by the Resettlement Administration in 1935.[1] Under this program 53 permanent camps were established, 115 mobile camps and 1 hospital for migrant workers. Acting in accordance with congressional mandate all of the mobile camps and the hospital have now been liquidated and only 43 of the permanent camps remain. It is the hope of those who have been working for the transfer of these remaining migrant labor camps from the Department of Agriculture to PHA for permanent administration that they will provide a good laboratory for experimentation in the field of rural nonfarm public housing. These camps have served the most disadvantaged group of people who come within the rural nonfarm category. As such they should have some preference over other groups in the development of additional rural nonfarm housing projects. It is, of course, obvious that the needs of all others who qualify under the rural nonfarm definition cannot be excluded from this program.

One of the most significant features of the migrant labor camps program was the development of garden homes in connection with some of the camps. These were small individual houses with half an acre or larger plots of land to which families graduated from the camps. The camps, though much superior to housing normally available to migrant farm labor, were nevertheless, impersonal, dormitory accommodations which have limited values.

The final pattern of housing developed in rural nonfarm areas was a phase of the original Housing Act of 1937. This provided for the construction of individual homes on small, presumably self-supporting farms. About 500 publicly owned houses of this type were built. This program did not prove successful and has now been completely liquidated.

From this accumulated experience of the past 15 years it seems obvious that something can be done in the development of a program for rural nonfarm public housing. Some of the experience has been good and some bad. But both should lead to better answers in any new projects which are undertaken.

It is understandable, of course, that this is a difficult and somewhat hard-to-define phase of the public-housing program. There are problems connected with personnel and priorities which must be given to other and larger aspects of the program. However, it should not be forgotten that Congress expects results in the field of rural nonfarm public housing. Perhaps it would be profitable to quote the provisions of Public Law 171, Eighty-first Congress, which pertain to this matter. Section 305 says:

"And provided further, That 10 percent of each amount of authorization to enter into contracts for annual contributions becoming available hereunder shall, for a period of 3 years after such amount of authorization becomes available, be available only for annual-contributions contracts with respect to projects to be located in rural nonfarm areas."

It should be emphasized that 10 percent of the funds available for public-housing projects can be used only in rural nonfarm areas. The report of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, No. 81, part 2, mentions the importance of this program. But nothing has been heard or seen about this program since the enactment of the legislation on July 15, 1949. Three publications of the Housing and Home Finance Agency which I have seen analyze the provisions of Public Law 171, but none of them mentions the rural nonfarm program. Because of the lower costs for housing construction in rural areas, probably 100,000 units of rural nonfarm housing can be built under this program.

Why should we be concerned about the rural nonfarm public-housing program? The first reason is that the law says so. The Department of Agriculture has made real progress in fulfilling its responsibilities for on-the-farm housing. PHA has made progress in the development of urban public housing. However, unless something concrete is done about the rural nonfarm public-housing program, it may be that the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Public Housing Administration will be embarrassed by questions from interested Congressmen.

Another reason for being concerned about the rural nonfarm public-housing program is that it is politically important. The Brannan plan, or any other price-support proposal, will not directly benefit the lower half of American agriculture. These groups can only benefit from welfare services like social security and housing.

From an economic point of view, preliminary studies in such places as California and Missouri indicate that unemployment has hit hardest in the areas where heavy concentrations of agricultural labor are located. In order to stimulate the economy in such areas, therefore, rural nonfarm public housing would be strategic at the present time.

In terms of a long range policy which will provide decent living for agricultural workers and mitigate the worst features of migratory labor, the development of rural nonfarm housing has a place of central importance. Here it will be possible to develop an economic structure balanced between agricultural labor, part-time farming and, in some cases, industrial work.

The original concept of including rural nonfarm housing in a comprehensive public housing bill was, we believe, a sound one. It is a most realistic approach to integrate the rural nonfarm housing program into the overall program as contrasted to the 1930's when agricultural labor was treated in special legislation which was vulnerable to periodic congressional review. This legislation keeps rural nonfarm public housing in the context of the total program. It means that the projects in rural nonfarm areas should be better related to the total economic and community life of the regions in which they are located. In short, the rural nonfarm public housing program represents good politics, good economics, good sociology and it is good for people. It is only to be hoped that eventually social security, education, health and other welfare legislation will treat those who live in agricultural regions in the same sensible manner.

I am sure that there are real friends of the rural nonfarm public housing program in PHA. They have been cooperative at many points in the past. But the fact of the matter is that up to the present nothing has been done. One meeting has been held in California to discuss rural nonfarm public housing. We understand that application blanks are in the process of preparation which will be sent out to local housing authorities asking them if they are interested in rural nonfarm public housing projects. But this is by no means enough. In fact, an application blank without technical help and advisers to local housing authorities may be worse than nothing at all. An adequate staff needs to be put to work in PHA immediately to develop sound plans for rural nonfarm public housing projects. They must study the history of the problem, some of which has been briefly mentioned here. They must come up with suggestions for a program within two or three months at the most which can be used advantageously by local housing authorities. They must have the kind of experts who can stimulate local housing authorities and help them find answers to their problems in this still new field for housing.

If this is not done, then it may well be that Members of Congress and some citizen organizations will find it necessary to take action. Most serious of all, thousands of people in agricultural labor and other affected groups will be deprived of the benefits of one of the most important pieces of social legislation passed by the Eighty-first Congress.

Rural Nonfarm Housing[2]

(Statement by Rev. William J. Gibbons)

Rural nonfarm housing projects should be tied in with rural development and the location of decentralized industry. In areas where new industries are moving in, and existing facilities are inadequate so far as housing is concerned, there is opportunity for building up rural communities which are both close to employment and still provide space, light and air for the family as well as possibility of owning some productive property.

The community in Granger, Iowa, illustrates the sort of development which I have in mind. Begun during the latter part of the 1930's, it was originally intended to provide rural nonfarm homesteads for persons employed in Iowa coal mines. Their part-time and none too certain employment in the mines would thus be tied in with healthful rural living and the ownership of a small acreage on which the family could raise some or most of its food. A representative rural community developed, with church, school, and other facilities. Subsequently the mines closed down, allegedly because of high production costs, but the rural nonfarm community remained. Today many of its workers are employed in an industry which has grown up a few miles away, while others commute by car or bus to neighboring towns. With the improvement of the highways now contemplated, it would not be too difficult for persons to live both cheaply and comfortably in Granger, and still work in Des Moines, which is some 20 miles away. It is worth noting that the model Granger community, whose houses were constructed at fairly low costs, does not have vacancies. If one family moves out, several more are on the waiting list.

---

[1] Since this address was delivered on April 8, 1950, Congress acted on legislation to change the administrative responsibility for the camps. Since their establishment, the camps had been administered by different agencies within the Department of Agriculture. Public Law 475, 81st Cong., approved on April 20, 1950, provides that on June 20, 1950, these camps shall be administered by the Public Housing Administration and eventually disposed of to local housing authorities.

[2] Some points concerning rural nonfarm in accordance with NCRLC thinking on subject, by Rev. William J. Gibbons, S. J., National Catholic Rural Life Conference, April 26, 1950.

Demand is much greater than the capacity of the community.

This sort of rural nonfarm project, tied in with nearby industry or business, should be duplicated in many parts of the country. Thus families can enjoy the advantages of decentralized living, one of which is the chance to supplement their income and standard of living by raising some of their food, and will engage in nonfarm work without serious inconvenience. The commuting time from Granger, for example, to Des Moines is actually less than that required from some suburban communities the same distance from downtown New York City.

Where surplus farm population exist, as in some parts of the South, the preferred answer would be the development of local industries and the building of communities like Granger. This is a more intelligent approach than encouraging people to go to already overcrowded cities, to uncertain industrial employment and perhaps relief. The rural homestead, thus understood, is really a cushion against depression. The family does not depend completely on cash income for its sustenance.

Were there located in some of the larger cities rural relocation services providing advice and assistance on such types of projects, a fairly large number of families eager for decentralized living and ownership of at least some land, would take advantage of them. There is need, of course, for thorough examination of transportation facilities, assurance of employment, adequate roads, churches, schools and shopping centers, in these projects. They must be planned carefully with State and county authorities if they are to succeed.

The development of rural nonfarm housing projects can also include operation of farm labor camps in areas where seasonal labor is accustomed to come.

Brannan Row With Newsman Over Eggs on a Comic Level

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Brannan Row With Newsman Over Eggs on a Comic Level," written by Phillip Warden and published in the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of June 8, 1950. In the article Secretary Brannan is said to have accused the Democratic National Committee of exaggerating his own exaggeration regarding the benefits of the Brannan plan.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRANNAN ROW WITH NEWSMAN OVER EGGS ON A COMIC LEVEL

(By Philip Warden)

An eight-page comic propaganda piece for the Brannan plan put out by the Democratic National Committee in collaboration with Agriculture Secretary Brannan was a highly controversial document in the Capital yesterday.

A reporter interviewed Brannan about the comic book and then wrote a story that Brannan acknowledged the Democrats were making "exaggerated claims" in the book about his farm program's benefits.

ISSUES STATEMENT

Brannan read the story, called his aides into a huddle, and 5 hours later issued a statement that he "obviously" had not "acknowledged that the Democratic National Committee is making exaggerated claims about the benefits of my recommended price-support program."

Brannan, who admittedly supplied the facts and figures for the comic artists, is depicted in the comic book. On one page he is quoted as saying that eggs would be 7 cents a dozen cheaper if his plan were in effect now.

"Under the administration farm program, retail egg prices would drop," Brannan tells the villain of the piece, a hefty, top-hatted figure, in the comic.

"That sounds good Secretary Brannan, but we gentlemen on Wall Street say, what will it cost the taxpayers?" says the villain.

Next, Brannan is shown standing at a blackboard on which he points to figures showing that a year's supply of eggs under the present system of price supports, including taxes, would cost $58.93 as compared with $51.30 under his plan.

Brannan acknowledged in his statement that he did not intend to make this a flat prediction that egg prices would be 7 cents a dozen lower if the plan were in effect.

WALL STREET BLAMED

"It is true that I did not predict that my recommendations would save 7 cents a dozen in eggs and that this was used for illustration purposes only," the Brannan statement said.

"It was thoroughly labeled in the picture book and cannot be twisted into a difference of opinion between me and the committee."

The comic book says the present price-support program which is costing the taxpayers more than $4,000,000,000 this year is the fault of Wall Street, Republicans, and the lobbyists.

On one page it attacks the "Wall Street gang" and assails Senator TAFT (Republican), of Ohio, whom it quotes as saying "the politics of the Brannan plan is based on the theory that the people can be fooled into believing that the Government owes them a living."

A spokesman for the Democratic National Committee said 100,000 of the comic sheets have been distributed and additional printings are expected as a result of yesterday's controversy.

Magic Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Magic Formula," published in the Moberly (Mo.) Message, of which L. G. Hardy is the editor.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

MAGIC FORMULA

The drive for economy which was supposed to have developed in the House hasn't and won't unless a whole lot more pressure than has yet been brought to bear is exerted on Congressmen.

I can't for the life of me figure out what Members of Congress can be thinking about in being willing to go along with the administration on its deficit spending program. Nor can I understand the attitude of the American people who sit back and do nothing, who aren't even willing to invest 20 minutes of their "valuable" time in writing a letter telling their Congressman and their Senators they want a balanced budget for fiscal 1951. I wonder just how valuable their time will be when the Federal Government has spent itself and all of us into bankruptcy.

Maybe I'm all wet. Maybe the fact that our Federal Government has been in the red for 18 out of the last 20 years doesn't mean anything. Maybe by some hocus pocus the bright boys who are running the Federal Government have discovered a magic formula under which our Federal Government can go on year after year indefinitely each year spending two to ten billions more than it takes in without going broke. That, I'm sure you will agree, would be quite a formula.

If the New Deal, Fair Deal, hand-out-state boys have such a formula, then everything is lovely and we can all sit back and enjoy the great prosperity these guys will provide for us.

On the other hand, if these birds don't have such a formula, then we are headed for trouble, mighty, mighty serious trouble, and every day we continue along the present course will make the day of reckoning just that much worse when it arrives.

It seems to me that it's up to each of us to make a basic fundamental decision, to decide between the magic formula and common sense, common sense being such things as 2 and 2 make 4 no matter who says so or what the circumstances may be; that a yard is 36 inches; that a ton is 2,000 pounds; that a gallon is 4 quarts; and that no individual, no family, no company, nor any government can go on indefinitely month by month or year by year spending more than it takes in without going broke.

If you decide that you believe in common sense rather than the magic formula then I think you should make another decision. You should decide as best you can how much it's worth to you and your family to have freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, freedom of opportunity and the right to vote.

Having decided in round figures—I'm not even asking you to take the moral and spiritual values into consideration—what these things are worth to you—you should then decide how much of your time and worldly goods you are justified in investing in an all-out effort to preserve constitutional government and freedom of enterprise in the United States.

Next I'd suggest that you spend a few minutes picturing in your mind what would happen if our Federal Government went broke. There isn't now anything behind the money in circulation in this country except the faith the people have in the ability of our Federal Government to fulfill its promises to pay. If they lose that faith, as they surely would if the government were unable to meet its obligations, your money would be worthless and all monetary values of every kind and character would be wiped out.

Without money to use as a medium of exchange, what would the city of Detroit, or any city for that matter, use to pay its police and firemen and how long could or would the police force or the fire department continue to function without pay?

Without money, how could you buy groceries, electricity, oil, coal, gasoline, clothing, or the hundred and one other things you now buy and pay for as a matter of course?

The foregoing gives just a small hint of what you and everyone in the country would be up against if our Federal Government

went broke. Think it over carefully. Think deficit spending through for yourself. If you do and come out where I believe you will, I'm sure you will immediately write to your Congressman and to both of your Senators, telling them in no uncertain terms that the budget for fiscal 1951 must be balanced.

Doctrine for Economic Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 9 (legislative day of Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, a short but to the point pamphlet entitled "Doctrine for Economic Freedom," by Franzy Eakin, published by Economic Accounting, Inc., Decatur, Ill. While I do not necessarily agree with everything in this pamphlet, I certainly feel that it is thoroughly worthy of close examination.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOCTRINE FOR ECONOMIC FREEDOM

(By Franzy Eakin)

THE REASON WHY

There are four conditions characteristic of our economic system which adversely affect the welfare of a large majority of the citizens. These are: (1) the unjust division of economic benefits; (2) the substantial and unjustifiable fluctuations of employment and production of goods; (3) the limitation of initiative and opportunity existing in the unduly large size of many business, Government, and labor organizations; and (4) the unrestrained exercise of power over large areas of activity by one or a few individuals.

There is nothing in our knowledge of the natures and capacities of human beings that suggests any possibility of evolving a society in which all elements adverse to the general welfare of the members of the society can be eliminated. On the other hand, there is considerable evidence that a substantial improvement can be made. Improvement in economic affairs would tend to reduce the unfavorable aspects of the four conditions named above.

The purpose, therefore, of this economic doctrine is to set forth objectives, principles, and actions which when accepted and activated will produce a better way of living for 80 percent or more of the American families.

URGENCY

Economic, social, and political problems created by wars and depressions are so severe that many people are demanding governmental action. Conflicts over the distribution of economic benefits are widespread. The doctrines of socialism and strong government are being proclaimed as the only solution.

Centralization of power in large governmental and economic units always produces waste and limitations on the initiative and freedoms of the people. Progress along this road tends to accelerate and end in a collective and totalitarian economy. Hence, a doctrine to achieve economic freedom and welfare by the principles of Christian justice and political freedom is urgently needed.

OBJECTIVES

The first major objective is to promote better living for families and individuals in these things:

1. Food, housing, clothing, medical care, schooling, recreation, and leisure in adequate quantities and qualities for an acceptable and rising level of living.

2. Freedom of choice in the selection of an occupation and a standard of living limited only by personal abilities to achieve personal desires.

3. Opportunity to strive for well-being and the pursuit of happiness in accordance with the general practices and attitudes of society.

The second major objective is to improve the political, economic, and social organization of the Nation. The political organization should fully express in form and action a Government of, by, and for the people. Economic activities should be in free enterprises with most capital goods privately owned and used. Certain capital goods should be owned by Government, such as Government buildings and other properties so used by the public that they should be acquired and maintained by taxation rather than by investments and sales of output. The social organizations and activities of the Nation should be characterized by the practice of fair dealing as taught by Jesus.

BASIC PRINCIPLES

Most human actions are motivated either by instincts or by beliefs. "As a man thinketh, so is he" is a true proverb. There are three principles which should be understood, accepted, and held as firm beliefs to guide our actions in economic and political affairs.

1. Contributive justice

A society is dependent for its goods upon the use which the members thereof make of the material and human resources available to them. Effective use of these resources produces the largest supply of goods. The members of a society are both its major resource and the activating force for the production of goods.

The society we desire must be free. The attainment of freedom for the members of a society and the effective use of human resources require a principle of human motivation which causes each to devote his abilities to the increase of goods. Such a principle exists in the concept, contributive justice, i. e., the duty and right of each individual to effectively use his or her abilities in the production of goods desired by the members of the Nation.

2. Distributive justice

A free society which practices social justice and fair treatment of its members and contributive justice for effective production must have a principle by which it determines appropriate division of the supply of goods produced by the effective use of its resources.

This principle, distributive justice, requires that the distribution of goods to members of the society shall produce the maximum state of welfare and happiness. In operation this principle will protect and reward all members who practice contributive justice. It will deny rewards to those who seek to gain well-being without making contribution in accordance with their abilities.

Thus, the principle, distributive justice, provides a guide to protection, reward, and incentive for each member of the Nation.

3. Representative democracy

A free society requires a system of political organization by which the will of the people may be expressed and made operative. Such a system can be effective when constructed on the concept of representative democracy.

The concept of representative democracy requires: (a) Appropriate units of people represented by an elected agent, (b) establishment of policy by the elected agents in accordance with the expressed wishes of the electors, (c) policy established for the smallest area within which the people can effectively administer the policy, and (d) policies which apply to more than one unit of population administered by agents within each unit under the coordination of a policy and agent for all the interested units. This arrangement of governmental units is well expressed in three classes: Local, State, and Federal. The required division of power and duty places responsibility first on local, then on State, and finally on Federal units.

This form of political organization and operation of a society is commonly designated by the term, "Republic."

ACTION

A number of new and revised economic policies should be adopted and made operative as rapidly as possible. The principal needs are these:

I. Participation by citizens in decisions as to use of resources and division of goods.
II. Stabilization of the money supply.
III. Incentive for capital formation.
IV. Personalization of savings.
V. Personalization of taxes.
VI. Farm policy.
VII. International trade agreements.
VIII. Control of power.
IX. Security for individuals.
X. Security for the Nation.

A brief discussion of these follows:

I. Participation by citizens in decisions as to use of resources and division of goods.

(1) An economic congress representative of all major groups of people should be convened and maintained to establish knowledge of appropriate incentives to production and adequate means to fair distribution of goods.

(2) Within each business enterprise there should be discussion among managers, owners, and workers of the application to the specific enterprise of the general rules formulated by the economic congress. Responsible labor unions are the best means for this in many enterprises.

II. Stabilization of the money supply:

(1) The banking system should be adjusted to a 100 percent reserve basis for demand deposits and an investment trust basis for time deposits.

(2) The debt of the Federal Government should be used as a basis for the 100 percent reserve system of demand deposits and money in circulation. The Federal debt should be managed as a long-term debt and the total thereof should be changed only as there is need for a change in the money supply and an outlet for financial savings.

III. Incentive for capital formation:

(1) All financial investments for capital formation should be deductible as a cost to determine taxable income in whatever amounts and at such times as the taxpayer may elect. This procedure applies to the taxpayer even though a corporation or some other entity is the agent used for the capital formation.

(2) Whenever private investors are unwilling or unable to finance needed capital formation, an incentive of governmental subsidies with the amounts determined by competitive bidding should be used to force the necessary capital formation.

IV. Personalization of savings:

Earnings of all corporations and other business institutions should be distributed to the owners so that they may decide how much should be saved or used for current living.

The retention of earnings by corporations forces savings upon owners regardless of their personal desires. The stockholders should be able as individuals to decide how

much to save and what use should be made of their savings.

V. Personalization of taxes:

(1) Taxes should be of only two classes.

(2) The first class should be related to specific governmental services performed for the direct benefit of a taxpayer. Taxes for support of these services should be determined by an equitable measurement of the benefits.

(3) All other taxes should be collected as income taxes on each family. Every family, regardless of the amount and source of income, should make a tax report and pay taxes on any income.

Gifts, inheritances, and discoveries should be considered as income. Cost of producing income and investments for capital formation (see item III.1 above) should be deductible from gross incomes to determine the taxable income. The amount of income should be adjusted to a per capita base and the tax computed by means of graduated rates.

VI. Farm policy:

Federal law should establish a price protection for farmers whenever unusual production creates an excess of supply. The degree of protection should decrease with the number of consecutive crop years that the excess supply is produced.

VII. International trade agreements:

International agreements should provide for the volume of trade necessary to assure an increase in the welfare of the citizens of the several nations. Such agreements should specify the general classes and quantities of goods and services which each nation needs and those it can export in exchange for needed imports.

A fund of international credits should be established in a world-wide clearinghouse sufficient to facilitate the trade provided for in the international trade agreements. The world-wide clearing fund allows the accounts of the several nations to be balanced on a multilateral basis. This credit fund should be so managed that during a period of a few years the settlements of each nation will balance even though during shorter periods there may be varying amounts of unbalance.

Each nation should maintain an international credit control agent to regulate by means of credit authorizations the activities of its citizens and government as they affect the volume of international trade. Each nation should use flexible tariffs and subsidies to balance its domestic prices with those of the nations with which international trade should be negotiated.

In these United States private enterprises should negotiate and execute international trade with the citizens and governmental agencies of other nations, subject to such regulation of international credits as is necessary to maintain control thereof.

Private individuals and enterprises in each nation may negotiate with the control agent for credits for investment in and unilateral transfer to other nations as gifts, settlement of interest and dividends, and similar purposes.

VIII. Control of power:

(1) Business enterprises, including labor unions, should be limited in size to assure that failure or stoppage of any unit will not seriously affect many persons not directly associated with the enterprise. The limitations should be specific as to investment, employees, number of associated units, or ratio to the total industry, whichever the owners may choose.

(2) Application of the above limits to labor unions should allow the union to be coextensive with the business enterprise. International unions should not use uniform contracts or contract dates nor should they make contracts with business enterprises. They should service local unions on an educational and advisory basis.

(3) Public utilities having a monopoly in any area should be subject to regulation which will protect its customers from excessive prices, inadequate service, or goods, and stoppages due to decisions of owners, managers, employees, or any representative of any of them.

(4) No level of government should engage in or conduct any form of business enterprise. Each level of government should regulate by law all business activities performed within its boundaries and across the boundaries of lower levels of government.

(5) The Federal Government should restrict its activities to policy making, national defense, and international matters. All other governmental activities—education, social security, natural resources, etc.—should be performed by the State and local governments.

(6) The Federal Government may use its taxing power and grants-in-aid to facilitate financing of activities required by Federal laws to be performed by State and local governments.

(7) The Federal Government may make laws respecting matters affecting all citizens, but administration of the laws should be by State and local governments subject to review and enforcement by Federal courts. State and local governments should be reestablished as responsible units of government for all activities within their area.

IX. Security for individuals:

(1) Federal laws should establish means for suitable schooling and training for all persons under age 22 and for retraining at older ages when the need results from accident or economic, social, or technological change. Federal laws should authorize payment of cost of changing residence when such change is made necessary by technological or economic developments.

(2) Federal laws should establish a policy of subsistence income protection during periods of inability to earn. Persons age 65 and above should be provided with incomes for a decent level of living regardless of previous or current occupation or other incomes.

X. Security for the Nation:

Political conflicts among nations and the destructive potentialities of atomic power require that two positive actions be maintained for national security.

First, an aggressive campaign of education both at home and abroad should set forth the principles and methods of the American way of life. It should also forcibly state our proposals for nations to live together in peace by mutual help and cooperative control of atomic power and other forces of aggression.

Second, a well-planned and adequately equipped defensive and offensive armed force should be maintained until through some form of world-wide cooperation the armed forces of all nations can be reduced to such levels as are required in each nation for internal security.

CONCLUSION

These are solid foundations for economic freedom:

An active and productive people who willingly apply their abilities to the resources at hand and who, under the incentive of suitable rewards, strive for greater effectiveness through discovery of new resources and better methods.

A fair distribution of the goods among the people so that well-being is enhanced and inequities are reduced.

The principles of justice—contributive and distributive—and of organization—representative democracy—afford a sound basis for effective actions to achieve the purpose for which our Nation was born, namely, that men might enjoy their "unalienable rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The Printing Press and the Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I hope that every person who carries an insurance policy, who hopes to live on an annuity, and those who are enjoying pensions, and the millions of people under social security, and those who are saving money for their old age in other ways, will read every word of this very factual speech made by Mr. Orval W. Adams, executive vice president, Utah First National Bank, Salt Lake City. I am inserting the speech in the RECORD under leave to extend heretofore granted:

THE PRINTING PRESS AND THE TREASURY

(By Orval W. Adams, executive vice president, Utah First National Bank, Salt Lake City)

(Mr. Adams declares there are real human rights bound up in the "body and soul money" accumulated over the years by hard-working, independent, self-reliant Americans, millions of which is in the country's savings banks. Maintains stored-up monetary value represents the returns from labor; and that its earner has right to protection as to its safety and security in substantial purchasing power, as to its right to be invested, and as to reasonable compensation for its services.)

Money performs three functions: A measure of exchange, storehouse of value, and a medium of exchange. In all three of these, or in any one, inflation can occur, and can do so at the same time.

In the first function—measure of exchange—loss of purchasing power in inflation can occur through debasement. In the second—storehouse of value—inflation can occur through the overissue of paper money—printing-press money, if you please. Printing-press money is money not created through the production of goods and services. Inflation in the third function—medium of exchange—occurs when human emotions or mob psychology become aroused, causing people, as the purchasing power of the dollar decreases and printing-press money increases, to invest their hard-earned money in goods; in other words, to flee from money into things.

THREE-HEADED INFLATION

Inflation has already begun in all three of these functions. Our elected Representatives are the only ones who can stay inflation's treacherous journey as it goes on to the forest-fire stage.

The Government, after 3 years of operating under a balanced budget, on August 4, 1949, resumed deficit spending, and at a time of full production, full employment, and collecting in the neighborhood of $40,000,000,000 in taxes. The deficit started out moderately at the rate of about $200,000,000. It is now well known that the deficit will exceed $10,000,000,000 in the next two fiscal years; and this $10,000,000,000 will be superimposed on an already existent $257,000,000,000 debt—and in a time of peace, mind you.

With Federal spending, therefore, out of control and the Government committed to arm the western democracies and provide assistance for rehabilitation on a world-wide scale, the dollar question surges to the front as the most vital issue.

With dollars divorced from redeemability in gold and a printing press anchored in the United States Treasury—and those in charge of the printing press devotees of the welfare state (or farewell state)—the United States of America is a victim, in the words of Virgil Jordan, who is the chancelor of the National Industrial Conference Board, "of government by subsidy, bribery, and robbery; a government willing to steal, and convert to fake money the savings of its citizens to satisfy its lust for ever-increasing power." He said also: "The welfare and protection promised for the future in return for votes can only be called the cruelest and most colossal fraud that has ever been practiced on a credulous people."

THE FORGOTTEN PEOPLE

Who are these credulous, forgotten people to whom he refers? I know. Sometimes we are moved to tears by the lamentations of politicians concerning the sad fate of some unidentified forgotten people. Scarcely have the politicians ever pointed out exactly who these forgotten people are, and for whose welfare they possess such grave concern. We bankers know and have identified them. They are not a myth. They exist. They are among us in flesh and bones—in our banks, owners of insurance policies, in building and loan associations. They compose the great middle class of America. They are not generally pointed out as being the victims if the onslaught of inflation is not curbed. They are not noisy or complaining. On the contrary, the real forgotten men and women have daily remained inarticulate. They have no organization, no pressure group. They issue no propaganda. They conduct no parades and make no fiery speeches or denunciations. They have no banners or implements. They have no controls, no press. They issue no publicity. They have no spokesmen, no defenders—not even us, you and me, nor their unofficial custodians, the bankers of America. They have no lobby in Washington. They are the unknown, defenseless savings depositors. Their number is legion. They represent the very backbone of our citizenship; truly they are the victims and bear the brunt of a blundering economy. They represent the class of thrifty investors, the men and women who, by rigid economies, by self-denial, from the sweat of their brows, have built up savings accounts, accumulated funds in insurance policies. It is their money, large and small, invested in innumerable business concerns throughout the land. They have practiced self-denial, scrimped and saved in the hope of providing themselves with adequate old-age security. It is the savings of these people that represents the seed corn of a government of freemen. Something must be saved for these people. If they are not saved, all of us are lost.

THE SAVER

Not so long ago I was at my desk in a savings bank. It was interest payday. A woman presented her passbook at the savings window. She was a woman dressed in gingham, with three little bashful girls by her side. After having presented her book for the purpose of having 6 months' interest credited to her account, she with her little girls made her way to the front door. As she passed my desk, I stopped her and said: "Lady, may I please look at your savings passbook?" She knew I was an officer and acceded to my request. In that book was a deposit of $5,000. Some little of the principal had been withdrawn. By request she told me whence the $5,000 had come. This was her story: Her husband, while in the line of his duty as a switchman, was killed. He had purchased a life-insurance policy in the amount of $5,000, payable to his wife, the mother of his three little girls. This fatherless family lived in a rented home. One of the girls was six; she was in school. The others were younger. The woman had drawn some of the principal, as well as the interest, and was doing some domestic work to conserve as much of her savings deposit as possible. Her earning ability, plus the $5,000, was all in the world she had to provide for herself and her three little girls. Imagine her predicament if through inflation this body-and-soul money should lose its purchasing power. The standard of living of this little family was dependent on the preservation of the purchasing power of this money. Education, hospitalization, culture, self-reliance were interwoven in these dollars.

All of us have heard the spellbinders say that there is no relationship between money rights and human rights. Would anyone dare take issue with me or you that human rights and purchasing power in this particular case are not one and the same? Is it not logical to assume that when purchasing power is destroyed, so also are human rights?

Here is another example: A man came into the bank. He was 68 years old, a bachelor. He had $10,000 saved. His accumulations were the result of many years of saving a little of his earnings. He owned a little home. For a living he sharpened saws, repaired locks, and made keys. I talked with him. He told me his life's story. At 65 his arm became afflicted with some kind of paralysis. I remember very well his having difficulty getting his savings passbook out of his inside pocket. It was fastened in that pocket with a safety pin. He was a thrifty man. He prized his self-reliance. Having self-reliance, he had accumulated this money so that in the days when his earning power would be lost to him he would not become a public charge. He was an unassuming fellow. Nobody knew that he had any money.

Would anyone argue with me that there were no human rights bound up in this body-and-soul money accumulated over the years by these independent, self-reliant Americans? Human rights and dollars are humanitarian blood brothers.

THE MILLIONS OF SAVERS

There are millions of such examples in the savings banks of this country. Practically all of our soldier boys carry life insurance, Government and otherwise. Visualize, if you will, the injustice that would be done to these boys if the insurance money so wisely provided should lose its purchasing power through uncontrolled inflation. It is within the power of the Government to forestall such a tragedy. Failure to do this would be nothing less than the betrayal of a sacred trust.

In primitive times labor was almost exclusively of the hands. Negotiations were between one man and another with no intermediary. The American dollar is that intermediary in our country. Rewards and returns were simple and tangible. Every transaction was complete in itself. This was when barter was the method through which exchanges of services and goods were transacted. Then came what may be termed "representative labor," and not until this time did any great progress occur in the world. Men began to acquire property as a result of their earnings. Property took the form of savings, representing the margin of value between earnings and living expenses. Investment of the margin was made in land or cattle or sheep at trading posts, or a cargo of salable articles. The flocks and herds of Abraham represented the results of labor. From them he drew a competence, sustained himself, and by careful management acquired an unusual measure of this world's goods.

As men worked and struggled with the slowly yielding forces of nature, it was with the purpose, first, of storing up wealth, and then either having their property earn for them or their savings produce an income for them as against the day when they themselves would no longer toil. The land would bring forth abundant harvests and the herds would provide milk and meat for food and wool and hides for clothing—every product being inherently and progressively representative labor. By this process man was enabled to obtain returns both from the labor which he himself performed with his own hands and from his talent or management proceeding from his own brain. He has found these servants aiding him in his work and adding to his resources. For those of this earlier day representative labor was deemed worthy of its hire. Eventually, money entered into the picture, as a convenient method of providing a medium of exchange, a storehouse of value, and a measure of value. Compensation for the labor of the individual assumed purely a monetary form. Likewise, money became the token of representative labor, the agency whereby return in the form of interest was produced. Primitive man in his comparative isolation fought to protect his property against usurpation. So modern man must defend the dollar, which represents the fruits of his earnings.

The stored-up monetary value, representing the returns from labor, becomes his servant. In behalf of this servant he has a right to ask that it be protected, first, as to its safety and security in substantial purchasing power; second, as to its right to be invested, and third, as to its reasonable compensation for its services. He realizes that under our modern economy money labors just as industriously and productively as does he himself. In this he finds incentive for progress and more abundant living for him and his family. This desire for progress, sometimes referred to as a profit motive, has actuated men from time immemorial. It will always be so. If the uses of money are to serve any good purpose they must be permitted to yield a margin of profit in the form of interest or dividend, as well as be protected in purchasing power. Nothing is more devastating to the morale of a thrifty people than to observe their investments grow idle and insecure.

In the physical world, floods and storms, winds and waves, heat and cold, constantly challenge the security of property. As for money, its safety and its opportunities for employment are determined by economic movements, by political decrees. The agencies of destruction to physical property are well identified and for the greater part understood. This is not the case with respect to the forces which affect the stored-up products of labor—money.

In thinking of money as representative of stored-up labor, let us consider your neighbor and mine as its possessor. It is they, individually and collectively, who hold the great material wealth of this Nation, even though some folks would have us believe it is owned by our large corporations. People who see their life insurance or their savings yielding less and less become disturbed. When their principal means of support is thus seriously diminished, they become distracted.

LIVING IN PARADOXES

One observes in this connection that we are living in a day of paradoxes. Ceremonious occasions are created to bewail the sad lot of the underprivileged and downtrodden. Men in high places lament the inadequate wages of the less prosperous. Sponsorship and advocacy of higher wages seem to bring those in public life both applause and promotion, and the expectation of being retained permanently on the public payroll. Yet here is the striking paradox. The very same agencies, the very same political leaders who are exhausting their strength of eloquence, and shedding tears

out of commiseration for the workers because their pay envelope is thin, will be largely responsible for the vanishing returns upon the accumulated savings of our workers—clerks, teachers, mechanics, miners, farmers, and others—who look forward to their savings continuing to produce not only an income for them but substantial purchasing power so as to supplement their personal earnings and secure well-deserved comforts and relaxation in their declining years.

Fifty-five million men and women with savings accounts, the millions who have holdings in building and loan associations, and the millions upon millions whose hopes depend upon the eventual purchasing power of the proceeds of insurance policies at maturity, should be at a loss to understand why humanitarians advocate drastic means of reducing unemployment, and at the same time direct their ingenuity toward lowering the earning power of the billions of saved dollars that many of our workers have toiled almost a lifetime to accumulate for themselves.

These millions of savers are the very salt of the earth. They look forward anxiously to the day when leadership in Government will be not only aroused as they are to the gravity of this whole situation but also have the statesmanship and courage to so legislate, even at the expense of their political future.

Bankers and insurance executives not mindful of their duty to muster all the influence they can to preserve the purchasing power and save what will be left of the American dollar will be in violation of their trust. They must bring pressure on their depositor army—these people who have the voting control—to wire, write, or telephone their elected representatives to forestall demon inflation which is already a long way on the road in its journey to destroy the hard-earned accumulations of the American people. Only they—our elected representatives—have this power, and only the people have the power and influence to force the issue with them.

In 1939 the American dollar was worth 100 cents. Today that same dollar is worth 59 cents; 41 cents, therefore, is wholly lost in purchasing power with the trend in the direction of more inflation. There is a law irrevocably decreed that as the public deficit increases, the purchasing power of the dollar decreases.

The American way of life can be destroyed bloodlessly through chaos and the dictatorship that will follow bankruptcy. American citizens will not willingly accept the establishment of a totalitarian state in this land. They will fight it—if they are able to recognize it as it creeps upon them. History records, I believe, that no solvent democratic nation ever went totalitarian. After all, a dictator is only a receiver for a nation gone bankrupt. Look across the seas for a moment. The men who now seem to control the destiny of all Europe were not self-elected. They were invited. They came into power at the breakdown of solvent governments. Their advent was made possible through economic exhaustion, the parent of national socialism.

Why was it that the black shirts were able to march upon Rome without resistance and take over the reins of government? It was Italy's debt that spelled her doom. It was not until the German Government and its political subdivisions had incurred indebtedness and assumed obligations far beyond their power to meet, it was not until their bonds and promises to pay had become worthless scraps of paper, that the Germans looked for and hailed the one who should come forward with a promise and a pledge to lift them out of their hopelessness, and that man came; but before he came, tragic inflation following national bankruptcy had taken its toll. That inflation did not come by government proclamation. It developed slowly, as it always does, until the final stages when it assumes the proportions of a prairie fire, consuming all the substance of the people. There remained a despoiled nation. Then came the emergency, then chaos, then the dictator.

Complete loss of purchasing power in its money, which in the final analysis is uncontrolled inflation, is the greatest tragedy that can happen to any civil state. We say, it can't happen here. Rather let us resolve to force that resolution into reality.

As the dollar decreases in purchasing power through increased Federal spending, those politicians responsible for the tragedy, and being in the majority, disregard the provisions in the Constitution to guarantee solvent government. When those protective provisions are ignored there will be nothing left to save.

One hundred and ten years ago Daniel Webster, in a eulogy for General Washington, said:

"Other misfortunes may be borne or their effects overcome; if disastrous war should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still under a new cultivation they will grow green again and ripen to future harvests; it were but a trifle; even if the walls of yonder capital were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley, all these may be rebuilt; but who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No; if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Colosseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful and melancholy mortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art, for they will be the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw—the edifice of constitutional American liberty."

EIGHTY-FIVE MILLION SAVINGS BOND OWNERS

There are 85,000,000 people owning Government bonds, millions having purchased the series E issues. These series E bonds purchased 10 years ago for $75 are now redeemable at $100. The $100 received by the purchaser today will not buy as much as the $75 invested 10 years ago and the purchaser is 10 years older.

The Government should upon all consideration, not the least of which is its own perpetuation, see that it handles its finances so that the people can have returned to them money which they trustfully put into its keeping in bond purchases, and the Government should see to it not that the money shall be returned merely in numerically equivalent dollars but in dollars that shall be of substantial purchasing power. This would be the most ordinary, the most common, and in a sense the lowest kind of money honesty. This representative republican form of government, as it now stands, is the last remaining citadel of human rights. We are the most blessed and favored of all people. Are we willing to maintain and perpetuate what we still possess, but what others have lost? What a solemn trust, because—

> "Humanity with all its fears
> With all its hopes of future years,
> Is hanging breathless on thy fate."

In the hands of our elected representatives rests our fate. Thank the Lord for the ballot box. Use it, fellow Americans. Vote to reestablish the gold standard. Gold is a gift to the world from an all-wise Creator. There is no substitute. There will not be. Without it as a base for national and international exchange civilization could not have emerged from its barter period of the Dark Ages. It is the only insurance against ruthless politicians debasing and corrupting the world exchanges and money systems of a free people. I repeat, it is a blessing from an all-wise Providence to prevent the tragedy that follows a debased, corrupted, and politically managed medium of exchange. The gold standard is the automatic watchman on the tower of the government of free men, to guard against the poison of totalitarianism entering the blood stream of sound money. No honest American will ever thumb his nose at Fort Knox.

We sing God Bless America. God grant that we vote to save America.

The Philippines and the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the lead editorial entitled "The Same Chatter We Heard About China," which appeared in the New Hampshire Morning Union of June 6, 1950. I commend this timely editorial to the attention of all Senators.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SAME CHATTER WE HEARD ABOUT CHINA

Many people are beginning to wonder if the Philippines are to be lost to communism in the same way that China was. Strangely enough, we are beginning to hear the same kind of chatter about the situation in the Philippines that accompanied the Communist advance in China.

We were told then that the Chinese Communists were not real Communists but agrarians bent on social reform, and that they were not satellites of Moscow. The Nationalist Government of Chiang Kai-shek was pictured as a monster of inefficiency and corruption, made up of men whose sole aim was to fill their own pockets and then get out of China.

The more recent events have proven that this propaganda, hatched and circulated by Communists and pro-Communists, was absolutely false and designed to promote Russian aims. The Chinese Communists have not turned out to be agrarians, but tools of Moscow, under Soviet direction and recipients of Soviet aid. While Chiang Kai-shek's government made grave mistakes, that was no reason for rejecting the only organized resistance to communism in China, and leaving China a prey to Moscow. Events have shown that Chiang failed more from lack of reasonable assistance than from anything else.

Today the same chatter has begun regarding the Philippines. The Philippine Republic is in trouble due to difficulties caused by the Communist-led Huks. The Huks are harassing the government, raiding villages, killing officials, and staging sneak attacks on the constabulary and the Philippine Army. It is the story of the Communist uprising in China over again.

And now reports have begun to hand out the same old pap we heard concerning China. We are told that the Huks are not real Communists, but only agrarians—peasants disgruntled over land tenure and taxation. President Quirino's government, we are told, is corrupt, and the strength of his military

forces is slowly ebbing away due to disunity, old vendettas among politicians whose chief aim is to advance their own personal ambitions.

It isn't difficult to guess the source of this propaganda. It has the same old Communist and pro-Communist inspiration that governed the chatter about China. And people in and out of the Government fall for it just the same. The Truman administration follows the same do-nothing attitude. It refuses to help hold Formosa, which is only 65 miles from the northern tip of the Philippines, and whose control by the Chinese Communists will multiply the strength of the Huks immensely. The real question today is not who these Huk rebels are or the mistakes of President Quirino; but whether the Philippines are to be kept out of Moscow's control, and it is high time that Washington did something about it.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by me on social security, broadcast over Pennsylvania radio stations on the week end of June 10–12, being No. 28 in a 5-week series of broadcasts by me to the people of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No one has yet, despite many efforts, discovered any fountain of youth. And no matter how well we are able to take care of ourselves, that day eventually rolls around when we have to recognize that our working days are almost over. To those who have adequate financial help, retirement can mean many more years of useful, pleasant living. To many, however, old age means only the loss of a weekly pay check and complete dependence upon children or public assistance for mere existence.

When we consider the scope of this all-important problem of old-age security or insecurity, the next major legislative program scheduled for vote by the Senate of the United States is most certainly one which affects intimately the lives of every American citizen. For the Senate will soon vote on proposals to change social-security legislation.

When the program was first enacted in 1935, it was attacked as just another New Deal plan for socializing America. Today, after 15 years of experience, this program, along with many other social reforms, has become an integral part of the American way of life and our free-enterprise system. No one any longer quarrels with the sound principle of protecting American families from economic distress. A self-supporting insurance system to accomplish this was sound in 1935, and it is sound now. But the fact remains that the program has had no major overhauling since 1939, and it has fallen sadly behind the times in terms of 1950 economic conditions. The main question now is, To what extent can we bring it up to date, and how far can we expand it to afford this protection to more people?

Thousands of people have written to me complaining of the seemingly long delay in getting final congressional action on the bill. I can sympathize most completely, because I am well aware of the hardships and the daily struggle of our older citizens who are trying to exist on painfully inadequate pensions. However, it is important to realize that this is an extremely comprehensive and complicated piece of legislation, which required 6 months of hearings in the House of Representatives and 3 months in the Senate Finance Committee, of which I am a member. And any hasty action on a measure as important and far-reaching as this could only be irresponsible action.

Since there seems to be so much confusion as to just what social security is, I think it is important to outline it briefly. Social security aims at providing a bulwark for our free-enterprise system by setting up a minimum basic protection against the loss of income due to old age, physical disability, or death of the wage earner. It does this in two ways. The first is an insurance system, self-supporting in operation, and financed by contributions from employers and employees.

And social security has a second approach in attacking this problem of helping those unable to help themselves—or at least, unable to help themselves sufficiently. Public assistance programs for the aged, the needy blind, and dependent children—though they are administered through State agencies—are financed to a large extent out of the general tax revenues of the Federal Government. Payments on these public-assistance programs are made purely on the basis of need, with the individual States setting their own qualifications.

The Federal Government's ultimate goal, under these social-security programs, is to include all of our people under the self-supporting insurance phase of the plan so that, in time, public assistance will no longer be necessary. The fact that today over 2,500,000 people are receiving old-age assistance benefits means that we have failed at least partially, in our efforts to do away with the need for public assistance. One of the reasons the number of old people receiving assistance still remains so large is the fact that today we have more aged folks in our country than ever before. But at any rate, it is evident that if we wish to achieve this ultimate goal of insurance protection eliminating the necessity for public assistance, two important steps must be taken; one, extension of persons covered under the program; and two, increasing of both the contributions and payments. And by so doing, we are attempting to provide basic economic security for the aged without perpetuating a system of public dependency.

This is what both the Senate and House are aiming at in their social-security revisions—increasing both the coverage and the payments. At present there are about 10,000,000 people over 65 and less than one-third of them are drawing social security. All told, the present law extends social security to about 40,000,000 working people in America today. The bill as passed by the House would put another 11,000,000 people under the old-age insurance program. Our Senate bill would add about 10,000,000 to the number already covered. Those likely to be covered under the new provisions are the self-employed, who earn over $400 a year and are not members of certain professions; workers for nonprofit charitable groups; domestic workers hired by the same employer for 2 days a week or more in a 3-month period; agent drivers engaged in distributing meat or bakery products, or laundry or dry-cleaning services; and agricultural workers earning at least $50 and working 60 days for the same employer in a 3-month period.

Including farm workers, incidentally, was a very controversial point in the Senate Finance Committee meetings. When the first social-security law was passed back in 1935, many farm employers protested against extending coverage to the farm workers, and as a result, the law excluded them. And many farm employers—stressing the part-time nature of their employees' work, and the fact that many of the farm hands are migratory workers—wanted all farm employees excluded again this time.

But there is little justification for such exclusion. Farm workers should be just as eligible for social security retirement insurance as any other group of workers. For one thing, at least a quarter of our farmers have contributed to social security at one time or another in the past—either by working in war plants, or as a result of off-season jobs covered by social security.

Interestingly enough, on this question of coverage, the committee soon learned that many groups of employers who had one time opposed any form of social security have now changed their minds and have requested coverage. These employers have learned that workers have grown security-conscious in the past 15 years, and that they are much more willing to work in an industry which is covered under social-security legislation.

In addition to doing a real job of placing many more workers under coverage, Congress is planning to increase benefits, both for those now receiving payments and for those who will retire in the future. Under the Senate committee bill, about three million persons currently receiving old-age and survivors insurance benefits would have their monthly benefits increased on the average by about 90 percent, as compared with about 70 percent under the House-approved bill.

The Senate bill is more liberal than the House bill, too, in determining payments for those retiring in the future. Future benefits, in both cases, are governed by the amount of contributions, but the Senate bill employs a more generous formula.

Unfortunately, the Senate bill fails to follow the House bill in providing for additional payments based on the number of years a worker contributed to social security. Without this increment, the person who contributes to the program for 45 years will get no more than one who contributes for only a year and a half. I most certainly intend to do everything I can to see that such a provision is added to the bill on the Senate floor because it just doesn't make sense not to permit the fellow who paid in more to receive more.

And I plan to make a serious attempt on the Senate floor to include another House provision which a majority of the Senate Committee decided to omit. I think it vitally important that this year's social security bill makes some provision for the permanently and totally disabled.

Almost every major retirement system in this country, whether public or private, provides to some degree for the premature retirement of those whose earnings are cut off prematurely by illness or disability. But private plans are extremely limited both as to scope and to coverage, since they only apply to injuries suffered by employees during working hours. And 90 percent of the accidents causing total permanent disability are not work-connected.

There's a close relationship, unfortunately, between permanent total disability and old-age, and such disability is most serious for those disabled in the years just prior to retirement. For one thing, rehabilitation, in such cases, is extremely difficult.

The way the law now stands, if a person has contributed to retirement insurance for a substantial part of his working life, and yet becomes disabled prior to retirement age, he's simply out of luck, so far as benefits are concerned, until that sixty-fifth birthday. So when a worker most needs help—when he is disabled and unable to earn a living—he finds himself deprived of protection. And furthermore, the disabled worker, since he is no longer able to work and to contribute to the insurance system, finds that his eventual benefits take a sharp cut.

I certainly would not want Federal social security to be the only kind of retirement

insurance people have. Government insurance and private insurance don't conflict—they serve two entirely different purposes. Government insurance is self-supporting through old-age taxes withheld from pay and I believe the Government has a duty to operate a self-supporting retirement insurance system with large enough benefits to meet people's minimum needs. But as things stand now, there are a great many people who don't have retirement insurance of any kind. Old-age assistance, like the other forms of public assistance, isn't self-supporting. It comes out of everybody's taxes, and today the States and the Federal Governments are spending five or six billion a year for public assistance to old people.

So social security can provide everyone with his minimum needs—but I think that is as far as the Government should go. As a matter of fact, private insurance companies have sold far more retirement insurance policies since social security began. For social security has made people think more about their future—and as a result, they have gone out and have bought private retirement insurance to supplement the benefits they will some day receive under social security.

I sincerely believe that these new amendments to social security stimulate initiative and thrift among American workers. And I believe that they will result—within the next decade—in a significant decline in the need for public assistance and in a growing sense of real security for all of our people.

The Amerasia Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of Thursday, June 8, analyzing and commending a speech on the Amerasia case delivered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCGRATH CAN'T ALIBI THIS

The last defense for the Amerasia scandal has now been exploded by Senator HOMER FERGUSON (Republican), of Michigan, and so completely that anybody can see and understand the whole thing.

See the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 2, 1950, pages 7990–7996, inclusive, for the detailed facts.

There Senator FERGUSON sets forth a precise and compelling analysis of the attempt by the Truman gang to smear J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI in order to excuse their own mishandling of a serious and important crime against the United States in time of war.

In excuse for the way the Amerasia evidence was used, the present United States Judge James P. McGranery, then an assistant attorney general in the Justice Department, said to a House committee in 1946:

"If we had not handled it in that way I do not think we would have had any case at all. None of the evidence was obtained in a manner in which we ordinarily would have obtained it. It was very clumsily handled."

What was the Amerasia evidence? It consisted of some 1,700 Government documents, and by now the attempts to say the documents were "unimportant" have been so thoroughly exposed there is no present need to run through the facts again.

The evidence also concerned the comings, goings, meetings, and movements of some six persons arrested by the Federal Bureau of Investigation on June 6, 1945, on charges of conspiracy to violate the espionage laws of the United States.

Of the people arrested, two held important positions in the State Department, one was an officer in the United States Navy and all had connections of importance throughout the Truman administration.

FIXED FROM THE START

It is obvious that the FBI's operations in this matter were carried out under J. Edgar Hoover's personal direction. Mere field agents do not rush out and arrest Government employees in the midst of a war on charges of conspiring to violate the espionage laws. That kind of thing involves the highest order of preparation and skill of handling.

More than that, Hoover's chief assistants have since testified on the point. They prepared for the Amerasia arrests with the greatest care and precision.

Yet what happened? No sooner were these people arrested than the charge was reduced—not by the FBI but by the Department of Justice which has the oath and obligation to prosecute evidence handed to it by the FBI—down to one dealing with conspiracy to embezzle and mutilate Government documents.

Right there, the thing begins. Why did the Department of Justice reverse the field on the FBI, which had made the arrests and sworn out the warrants and booked the prisoners?

And on from there, as all the world now knows, the case was watered and watered down from a high and serious espionage matter to a mere business of putting small fines against two people.

Why? Mr. McGranery's excuse is that the evidence was very clumsily handled.

Senator FERGUSON has shot that story as full of holes as a Swiss cheese. Lawyers who delight in seeing a masterly technical analysis of precedent and rules of law will enjoy reading his dissertation.

He produces the famous work Wigmore on Evidence, section 2184a. He quotes from controlling Supreme Court decisions, such as *Parts Manufacturing Co.* v. *Lynch*, and *Silverthorne Lumber Company, Incorporated*, v. *United States*, just to cite a couple, and on and on through the rest, in full exposure of the alibi for what it is.

He quotes D. Milton Ladd, Assistant Director of the FBI, who testified under oath:

"The Federal Bureau of Investigation secured no documents through any means during the course of this investigation except incident to arrest. They were all legally obtained."

Everybody knows perfectly well Mr. Ladd is telling the truth. And that anybody would be foolish, if not worse, to try making it appear otherwise. The Amerasia evidence was a major undertaking of the FBI. To suggest that J. Edgar Hoover would flub the technical necessity to get his evidence so it would stand up in court is to talk rot.

You can't alibi this Amerasia scandal, Attorney General McGrath. You may as well come on out with the nasty truth and get done with it.

Lie Proclaims 10 Points To Build Unified World Under Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of June 7, 1950, as follows:

LIE PROCLAIMS 10 POINTS TO BUILD UNIFIED WORLD UNDER LAW

LAKE SUCCESS.—United Nations Secretary-General Trygve Lie has proclaimed 10 basic points on which he believes a "universal world society" of peace and justice under law can be built.

These 10 points, reminiscent of the Fourteen Points of Woodrow Wilson, cover virtually the entire field of cold-war issues from atomic energy to east-west trade.

It is Mr. Lie's thesis that neither the threat of an atomic blitz nor the erection of mighty military alliances can bring lasting peace to mankind.

"The one common undertaking and universal instrument of the great majority of the human race is the United Nations," he declares.

"A patient, constructive, long-term use of its potentialities can bring a real and secure peace to the world."

GIVEN TO BIG FOUR CHIEFS

It was this 10-point program which he presented to Prime Minister Joseph Stalin in Moscow, President Truman in Washington, and the leaders of France and Great Britain on his recent peace mission to the Big Four capitals.

These are the points with an analysis of their significance:

1. Face-to-face meetings of presidents and premiers, or their foreign ministers, under UN Security Council auspices twice a year.

This is the project on which the Secretary-General has based much of his hope that a start can be made immediately in easing cold-war tensions.

Such periodic meetings of the Security Council are provided for in the Charter (under art. 28), but never have been held. Mr. Lie has said he hopes the first of these meetings will be held during this month or next, and those close to the Secretary-General say he has considerable reason for his hope.

Such get-togethers, the Secretary-General suggests, should be used for a general review at a high level of all UN issues, particularly those involving the big powers. Mr. Lie would limit the exercise of the veto power at these and all regular Security Council meetings.

DECRIES CIRCUS TINGE

He says the special meetings "should not be expected to produce great decisions every time; they should be used for consultation, much of it in private, for efforts to gain ground toward agreement on questions at issue, to clear up misunderstandings, to prepare for new initiatives that may improve the chances of definitive agreement at later meetings."

If the sessions were used in this fashion, it is clear that few, if any, foreign offices would object. But there is known to be considerable apprehension in Washington that big-name meetings of this sort, in the

full glare of world publicity, would be converted by Russia into propaganda circuses.

The UN's reply is that the same sounding board would be available to the western powers, and that they should not be afraid of losing a propaganda contest.

A subtler objection in some western circles is that the meetings might raise false hopes, and make it more difficult to get arms-aid appropriations through the United States Congress.

The UN's reply to this is that the risk should be taken, since no progress toward an easing of tensions will be possible unless negotiations are at least attempted. First, however, the China representation question must be solved.

SEEKS ATOMIC CONTROL

2. New efforts to find a workable plan for control of atomic energy—thus preventing its use for war and promoting its use for peaceful purposes.

Mr. Lie says quite frankly that "we cannot hope for any quick or easy solution of this most difficult problem." But he feels that "the only way to find out what is possible is to resume negotiations. * * *"

He declares that various suggestions have been made for finding a basis for a fresh approach. Of these, he cites two: A conference of atomic scientists to provide a reservoir of new ideas, and an interim agreement that would be some improvement over the present unlimited atomic arms race, even if it did not afford full security.

At present the Atomic Energy Commission and the Committee of Six—the Big Five and Canada—are stalled by a Russian boycott over China.

3. Steps toward disarmament, or at least toward bringing the armaments race under control.

"Up to now," Mr. Lie acknowledges, "there has been virtually a complete failure here and the immediate prospects seem poor indeed" because of world conditions. But he argues that "any progress at all * * * would help to reduce cold war tensions" and that therefore a renewal of negotiations should not wait until after other great political problems are solved.

In point of fact, a unit of the Commission for Conventional Armaments is currently considering an American plan for inspection, the sine quo non of disarmament plans. But Russia is boycotting this meeting also.

UN POLICE FORCE URGED

4. New efforts to set up a UN police force.

One basic reason the UN has been less effectual than its well-wishers have hoped is that it has had no physical power at its disposal—no army, navy, and air force as was originally planned at San Francisco and written into the Charter.

Mr. Lie says that although "basic political difficulties" are delaying a final solution, it should be possible temporarily to set up "a small force sufficient to prevent or stop localized outbreaks threatening international peace."

The mere fact that such a force existed, he argues, would make the Security Council a more effective peacemaking agency.

In the past, Russia has been the principal opponent of such a step.

5. Universality of membership.

The Security Council was deadlocked, prior to the Russian walkout, over the applications of 14 new members, 5 of them Russian satellites (which failed to win the necessary majority) and 9 others outside the iron curtain area (which Russia vetoed). The Soviets sought to engineer a horse trade. The question has been avoided in Russia's absence in order to forestall trouble later.

Mr. Lie suggests that Germany and Japan be admitted "as soon as the peace treaties have been completed."

AID FOR BACKWARD AREAS

6. A technical assistance (President Truman's point 4) program for underdeveloped countries, administered "largely through the United Nations."

Mr. Lie puts this in what the UN regards as its proper perspective when he refers to the "strong support" of the UN program by President Truman. The secretary-general says that with the UN in over-all charge, the program would be "planned and executed on a basis of equality rather than on a basis of charity." This is interpreted as an appeal for a generous allotment of funds, especially from the United States.

"Here lies one of our best hopes for combating the dangers and costs of the cold war," Mr. Lie says.

7. Wider use of UN agencies to lift standards of living, promote full employment, remove barriers to world trade, and contribute to economic and social progress.

This is a clear appeal to the Kremlin to join in the work of the UN specialized agencies. Of the 13 major agencies, Russia now is an active member of only three. Mr. Lie asks for more active support from all governments including the membership of the Soviet Union in some or all of the agencies to which it does not now belong.

RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

8. Wider observance and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms throughout the world.

Mr. Lie says the universal declaration of human rights clearly is destined to become one of the great documents of history. But more widespread conformity with its ideals is needed, he points out. He does not single out any countries he feels are laggard in this respect.

9. Use of the UN to promote peaceful advancement of colonial peoples toward a place of equality in the world.

This point is likely to cause considerable controversy in the countries which still possess colonies—notably Great Britain, France, Belgium, and the Netherlands.

"Old relationships," says Mr. Lie, "will have to be replaced with new ones of equality and fraternity. The United Nations is the instrument capable of bringing such a transition to pass without violent upheavals."

10. Use of the UN to speed the development of international law toward an eventual enforceable world law for a universal world society.

Here Mr. Lie has hinted at the goal of world government—the lofty ideal toward which many internationalists have hoped the UN would aspire. As specific first steps, he suggests ratification of the convention outlawing genocide, or race murder; greater use of the World Court, and codification of international law.

Report to the People of Pennsylvania by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a personal report by me to the people of Pennsylvania dated June 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

A revitalized social-security program should be law by late summer. Passage of this self-supporting measure, financed equally by employer and employee contributions, will rank as a major achievement of the Eighty-first Congress. Though the principle of social security was bitterly attacked as socialism when the initial legislation was enacted in 1935, it is now almost universally accepted, and the only real questions involve the extent to which the program will be expanded at this time.

To bring the entire program up to date—since the only substantial revisions previously were in 1939—the House passed liberalizing provisions last fall, and the Senate Finance Committee, of which I am a member, reported its recommendations to the Senate late in May. The Senate provisions differ from the House in many respects, some representing major improvements, and they aim primarily at increasing insurance benefits for those now receiving benefits (some 260,000 in Pennsylvania) and for all those who will retire in the future; increasing coverage to include approximately 10,000,000 more people.

If you now receive social security benefits, you should receive larger benefit checks by October or November. The new checks will be 60 to 100 percent larger, with increases averaging about 90 percent. Under Senate proposals, the average old-age social security beneficiary—now receiving about $25—will get $48, compared with the House-approved figure of $44.

If you now contribute to social security—but are below the retirement age of 65—your benefits on retirement will be greatly increased. Here are some of the facts:

If you make $250 a month or less, 1½ percent of your wages are withheld for social security. The Senate proposes to retain the $250 limit, but the House would tax earnings up to $300 monthly. The House increases contributions to 2 percent in 1951 while the Senate would not raise the wage tax to 2 percent until 1956.

Employers match employees' wage contributions in any event.

Future benefits are determined by your contributions. Thus, by taxing only $250 of monthly pay, a person averaging $300 or $350 monthly would get only as much in benefits as someone earning $250. This Senate feature discriminates against higher-paid workers.

Benefits don't increase with the length of an employee's service under the Senate proposal. The House bill, employing sound insurance principles, increases benefits by ½ percent for each year a person contributes to the retirement fund, and the present law calls for a 1-percent increase for each year of service.

By raising the Senate wage base and by continuing the present 1-percent increase for a year of service, benefits can be brought more in line with today's living costs. I will support such an amendment on the Senate floor. Here is a comparison of the benefits payable to a single man who contributed to social security for 20 years:

Average monthly wage while working	$100
Benefits under present law	30
Benefits under proposed amendment	60
Average monthly wage while working	250
Benefits under present law	48
Benefits under proposed amendment	87
Average monthly wage while working	300
Benefits under present law	48
Benefits under proposed amendment	96

If your job isn't presently covered by social security, it may be when the bill passes if you're your own employer, earning $400 a year or more—but certain self-employed professionals aren't included, nor are operators of farms; you're an agricultural worker, earning at least $50 and working 60 days for the same employer in a 3-month period; you're a domestic worker, hired by the same employer 2 days a week or more; you work for a nonprofit, charitable organization (other than religious)—but employees of religious organizations are covered if the employer agrees; you work for the State or local government, and don't have a pension now; you're an agent-driver, engaged in distributing meat or bakery products, or laundry or dry cleaning services.

I voted to report the bill because of the many vital improvements it made, but in doing so, I reserved the right to support additional amendments not adopted by a majority of the committee which will further improve the program.

Our Moral Position in World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Our Moral Position in World Affairs," delivered by me before the World Affairs Council of Philadelphia on June 7, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR MORAL POSITION IN WORLD AFFAIRS

It is an old saying that slave men win battles but that freemen win wars. The first part of this saying has already been proven true in today's cold war; for the slave men now stand astride eastern Europe and China; they threaten to infiltrate other huge areas; and they have learned how to make their own atomic bombs.

Whether or not the second part of the old saying—that freemen win wars—will be true for the present cold war remains to be seen.

If freemen do prevail—in the sense that the cold war leads not to bomb dropping but to a just and secure peace—the credit for this glorious achievement will belong with organizations such as the World Affairs Council and with people like yourselves here in the audience tonight.

The World Affairs Council is dedicated to the idea that we must all do something positive about peace—and I am convinced that affirmative, hopeful action is our only path to salvation.

The World Affairs Council, if I understand its mission, is opposed to passive protest, to apathy, and to futile hand wringing as America's answer to the global attack upon freedom. The council, on the contrary, has taken concrete steps to strike back, not with physical weapons but with ideas, information, and good will—the spiritual armaments which freemen instinctively prefer when challenged.

I understand that your council has, in the past year, arranged for numerous individuals to visit the United Nations; and that it has reached hundreds of thousands of people through public meetings, film showings, and radio programs. Even more striking, to my mind, is the council's success in encouraging no less than 33,000 Americans to engage in a letters-abroad exchange—that is, to correspond with citizens of foreign countries. Each such letter sent overseas, I estimate, serves to counteract and offset a whole column of propaganda in a Communist newspaper.

The many activities of the World Affairs Council show that here in Philadelphia you know that our country is engaged in a battle—not a shooting affair but a desperate and fateful contest all the same.

If you stopped me suddenly on the street and asked that I name the greatest of all threats to mankind, I would probably reply offhand, "Why, the atomic bomb, of course." But if you gave me a moment to think and reflect, I would change my answer and say, "No; the atomic bomb is not the greatest threat to mankind—it is the Soviet iron curtain."

I can explain what I mean by asking that you try, for a moment, to put yourself in the place of an average Russian—a Russian born since the Communists seized power and reared on the Kremlin's propaganda. If such a man were ordered to help prepare for an atomic offensive against the West, he would not hesitate to comply—because he has been taught to believe that the West seeks to do him harm, that the West is aggressive and imperialistic and treacherous.

But suppose now that this same Russian were given an opportunity to visit the United States and see for himself, first-hand, what the West in general and Americans in particular are really like. I think it is safe to say that he would experience a personal revolution and that his whole life-view and world-view would drastically change.

He would discover that our American proletarians drive to work in automobiles. He would observe that most Americans own a radio, a telephone, and indoor plumbing. Indeed, the gap between an ordinary Russian's pittance and the Crimean villas, limousines, and food delicacies reserved for the Soviet Communist elite would seem more striking than any income differences in America.

The Russian visitor to our country would find books in circulation that criticize the President of the United States and all his works. He would go to the movies and look in vain for a deep political moral. He might examine an American painting which utterly failed to dramatize the virtues of capitalism over communism. He might wonder how a modern government can possibly function without the assistance of secret police and concentration camps. He would witness a free election, a labor picket line, a trial by jury, and a baseball game at which the players seemed interested only in winning and not at all interested in enhancing the glory of the American state.

If civil liberties as such did not impress a visitor nourished on the Soviet philosophy of materialism, the right to organize, to lobby, to demand better pay, to quit one's job, to change residences, to elect officials responsive to popular desires—in other words, the convertibility of civil liberties into the hard currency of human welfare—might appear deeply impressive. Above all, the Russian visitor would learn how ardently and how sincerely ordinary Americans seek his friendship and his cooperation in establishing a secure peace as beneficial to him as to themselves.

It certainly would not be remarkable if our visitor, when he reentered Russia, spread what the Kremlin regards as disruptive ideas. Once he had asked himself why his own people, in light of the American example, should live at the dictation of a few self-appointed elite members, he would have become a democratic sympathizer—what the Kremlin would call a counter-revolutionary diversionist.

Such a Russian, if ordered to help prepare an atomic offensive against the West, could not put his heart into the work. Knowing that America seeks peace and friendship, he would wonder why atomic energy is not being regulated through the United Nations. He would resent the Kremlin's refusal to entertain the just control proposals advanced by the United States and endorsed by an overwhelming majority of the world's statesmen. He might even—if there were enough other Russians like him—bring successful pressure upon the Kremlin to accept atomic peace and thus put an end to the suicidal and accelerating armaments race.

I think this little example shows why the iron curtain is a greater threat to mankind than atom bombs. Atomic energy, for all its elemental and awesome power, is a mere physical force—and physical forces are morally neutral and indifferent. They can be used either for good or for evil. Human beings alone decide which it shall be. What transpires in the minds of men is a thousand times more vital than what transpires in the nucleus of the atom.

No wonder, then, that the Kremlin has raised an iron curtain to serve as a barrier against traffic in ideas. The Soviets, through this barrier, could pay no greater tribute to the strength of our invisible riches, the infectiousness of our belief in peace and freedom, and the validity of the principles which we hold dearer than life itself.

Save for the iron curtain, ordinary Russians would know of our good will toward them. They would have truthful information about America. They might long since have forced the Kremlin's hand in atomic energy negotiations. Today we would be looking forward, not to the hydrogen bomb, but to ever more dramatic instrumentalities for hurling the split atom against poverty and disease.

It is important to remember, I think, that not only atomic energy but the Marshall plan goods shipped to Europe are material, physical commodities. Like atomic energy, Marshall plan aid is itself morally neutral and indifferent. It can be used to feed a Communist as well as a Democrat.

The evidence shows that Europeans live in dread of a future war; that this dread lays a cold hand upon their efforts to help themselves; and that pessimism and mental uncertainty seriously affect the processes of day-to-day living. The paralyzing fear of world war III seems to make Europe a moral void which no quantity of material aid from the United States can entirely fill.

Thus, once again, we encounter the basic truth that the moral factors, the spiritual issues override and dominate whatever physical goods and forces we control with our hands.

I emphasize and underscore this point lest our values turn topsy-turvy—lest we place too much reliance upon merely material strength. To lose sight of the fact that we are a moral people, that we have—above all—a moral purpose to serve in the world, is to play into the hands of the Kremlin. Indeed, it is to imitate the Kremlin; for Communists are the ones who have made materialism into a religion. Being materialists, they fear our physical power, I am convinced, far less than that spiritual power which only a free democracy can generate and which baffles and confuses them and accounts for their cravenly iron curtain.

There is a downright military peril for America and the free world if we think too much in narrow military terms. Our moral

position in the world is transcendently important. It means more, infinitely more, than the machines we export under the Marshall plan and the B–29 airplanes we export under the military-assistance program. Where we should have given first emphasis to making known our moral attitudes and our basic dependence upon things of the spirit, we have left the world to speculate—we have largely taken for granted that our good faith would be recognized abroad despite the hymns of hate which communism has trumpeted against us for more than 30 years.

Do not misunderstand me. I am keenly aware that empty stomachs must be filled if minds are not to become victimized by evil philosophies. I am keenly aware that troops armed with pitchforks and broomsticks, however righteous the principles for which they fight, cannot halt an opponent armed with modern tools of war.

As a matter of fact, I am so well aware of the tribute that must be paid to Caesar that I am concerned about the adequacy of our effort in the field of atomic weapons. Less than one-fortieth of our total military spending since the recent war has been devoted to this purpose—and less than 1 percent of our total national budgets. To be on the safe side, the scale of our atomic program should be increased. In the field of civil defense against atomic attack, to cite another example, I favor sane and sober and realistic measures to reduce American vulnerability. Our people must be told what to do in case an atomic emergency should overtake us.

But beyond all else, we must work and strive for a just peace. We must test every possibility. We must travel down every avenue leading directly or indirectly toward our goal. Discouragement must not dampen our efforts but instead cause their flames to burn more brightly. As a moral people guided by conscience, we have no other choice.

In that spirit, several Senators and Representatives joined me yesterday in introducing a resolution before the Congress. This resolution springs from the dictates of our own personal consciences. We hope and believe that it voices the conscience of America.

Let me quote from the resolution itself:

"Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved in the Congress of the United States assembled,* That the Congress of the United States appeal to the peoples of the world to join in a great moral crusade for peace and freedom;

"That the Congress of the United States advocate and recommend an immediate special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations for the single purpose of stopping the armaments race by speeding agreement upon effective and enforceable disarmament and control covering conventional armaments, biological and chemical agents, and atomic and hydrogen bombs.

"Be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Congress of the United States, as tangible evidence of its good faith, pledge itself to appropriate and to make available to the United Nations—when an effective and enforceable system of world-wide disarmament and control takes effect—all sums which would otherwise have been spent upon weapons for a period of 5 years, such sums to be expended by the United Nations for peaceful development of atomic energy, technical assistance programs to underdeveloped areas, and general economic aid and assistance to all war-ravaged countries."

We, the sponsoring Congressmen, are convinced that the world's destiny is at a turning point. We hold that decent men must act, or events will act for them. We, the sponsoring Congressmen, resolutely oppose any sign of American weakness and any slackening of our Nation's firm determination to keep strong so long as the arms race continues. We just as resolutely advocate the most strenuous efforts to secure it those effective safeguards which will halt the arms race and harness nature's forces solely for human ennoblement.

In my judgment, nothing but good can come from our resolution. If the United Nations General Assembly holds an early meeting to discuss disarmament and control of atomic weapons, we may make progress toward an honorable and fair solution. If the plan set forth in the resolution is actually accepted, if the arms race is effectively stopped, if the iron curtain gives way, if an open world is achieved, the same money that we would have spent upon sterile weapons will be devoted, for a 5-year period, to helping others in a spirit of friendship and cooperation and good will.

If, on the other hand, our efforts fail, at least we will have continued to try, at least it will be recognized everywhere, even behind the iron curtain, that Americans are first and foremost a moral people, a people with a moral purpose, a people who scorn expediency and act according to high principles.

It is time for free men to speak out. It is time to call people everywhere to join in that crusade of the spirit which alone will establish a just and secure peace. It is time—while time remains—for free men to make known the profound sincerity of their desire for peace with justice—and their willingness to do their share and more in achieving it.

Axle of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for the past weeks we have seen Washington and particularly the Capitol visited by crowds of boys and girls from all over the United States upon sightseeing tours. We may have wondered whether these boys and girls, our citizens of the future have seen more than monuments and magnificent buildings. If this be all, we may have wondered whether these boys and girls might have acquired a deeper concept of the meaning of their country. It is most gratifying to me to realize that many of them at least saw beyond monuments and buildings. There comes to me the theme written by a young lad of 14 years of age, Heaton Dickson Buckley, of Jacksonville, Ill., following his trip to Washington. This so clearly mirrors the deeper thought of our young people that I feel it worthy to be brought to the attention of the Members of the House. The theme is entitled "Axle of Liberty" and is as follows:

When I got home from my trip to Washington, D. C., everybody wanted to know if I had had a good time, what I thought of Lincoln's Memorial, Jefferson's Memorial, Washington's Monument and the National Capitol. I wrote themes on the places just mentioned. I tried to put into words what I had seen, but for some reason I couldn't. I couldn't write about one particular thing because what I had seen could not be put under the heading Lincoln's Memorial and only Lincoln's Memorial or Jefferson's Memorial and only Jefferson's Memorial. What I had seen included all of them. I saw a vision, a picture, an idea of something which had not yet taken place.

Happenings can be and are divided into two different groups. They are past and present. Things which have not yet happened or have not yet come, are in the future. Thus, we have established three headings—past, present, and future. My vision was based on these three divisions of time or happenings.

When I observed the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials and Washington's Monument, I was not looking at monuments or a memorial to men but a memorial to the foundation of liberty. This foundation is a sturdy one.

When I visited the National Capitol, it was a thrilling experience and it stuck in my mind. Yet I couldn't, just as I couldn't with the others, write about the Capitol and tell what I had seen for it was also part of my vision. The Capitol is a living monument yet unfinished in the building of liberty. Much responsibility rests on the building at this point.

You say what part of Washington, D. C., represents the future? I'll tell you—nothing does. It's the past and the present added together that makes the future. The way in which we the stone layers of the present lay our stones of liberty will affect, in a strikingly large way, how this temple ends.

From this symbolic temple of liberty, we have a well-rounded picture of Washington, D. C.—not, in a sense, Washington the National Capital or Washington the city of beauty, but as Washington, an axle on which the wheel of liberty is and will be turning—a city that is the crossroads of liberty, past, present, and future.

Statement on Behalf of American Leather Glove Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement I made before the Committee for Reciprocity Information on behalf of the American leather glove industry.

I am appearing today to lend the weight of my voice in corroboration of the testimony which you will shortly hear presented by the representatives of the American leather glove industry.

It is significant at the outset that you will hear not only from the representatives of management, but also from the officers of the labor unions representing practically the total number of workers in the industry and from the elected representatives of the chambers of commerce of both Gloversville and Johnstown, N. Y., and the mayors of both of those cities. In the memory of anyone in the industry, this is the largest and most comprehensive representation that the American glovemaking industry and communities have ever sent to Washington to appear at any governmental hearing.

The reason for their expenditure of time, money, and effort is the result of their keen awareness that the future life of the industry is intimately dependent upon the

decision you make as to whether or not you will negotiate further tariff cuts on imported leather dress gloves when you meet with the representatives of other nations at Torquay, England, this September.

The industry in question is one of the oldest in this country. It was established here as the result of trade with the Indians in upper New York State in pre-Revolutionary days. The requisite skills in cutting and sewing leather gloves have been handed down by generations from father to son; and, in Fulton County, N. Y., alone, practically the entire economy of over 50,000 people is directly dependent upon the welfare and progress of this industry. This is also true of many small communities in the Middle West, throughout Wisconsin and Michigan.

Furthermore, as to the nature of the industry, it should be apparent to you, after listening to the various representatives, that it is exactly the type of industry which we should do everything possible to maintain in this country. It has had a history of amicable labor relations. It is operated on a factory basis, wih concomitant rules and regulations for the health, safety, and welfare of its employees, as established by the States of New York and Wisconsin, two of the most progressive States in the Union, especially as to beneficial labor legislation.

It is an industry which offers the worker a lifetime opportunity for employment. He is not discarded at mature age as are workers in the heavier industries, but retains his ability to earn a living and his dignity as an independent human being.

It was revealed by the survey made by the Aetna Life Insurance Co. that almost 70 percent of the workers are in the age group 36 to 87. It is important to note that this is the group in which we find all those people who are ordinarily well established in the community. By and large, they own their own homes, have families, and work at a skilled trade. Such people make up the backbone of our country, and it would not be consistent to force such people to break up their homes and move to larger industrial areas to begin their working life anew as unskilled laborers at lower wages; but that is exactly the prospect they must face if they are to be thrown into competition with the product of foreign labor.

Such was never the intention of Congress in 1934 when the representatives of the people delegated certain powers to the executive branch of the Government to negotiate with other nations from time to time on the question of raising or lowering the rates in our tariff structure.

During 1929, Congress conducted one of the most extensive and exhaustive hearings as to tariff rates to be set on every item in the schedule. At those hearings the opinions of the speakers for every industry were heard by the representatives of the people and translated into the much-maligned Tariff Act of 1930. It was conceded then that the rates so set were incorporated in the Tariff Act as a measure of protection for American industry, to equalize as far as possible the difference between the cost of direct labor abroad and similar costs in this country.

It must be conceded that the differential is great and that, unless some equalizing device is maintained year in and year out, it would be patently unfair to expect the American producer or the American worker to compete with the products of other countries, the earnings of whose workers reflect a lower conception of living standards.

There is no need for me at this point to go into the detailed facts and figures which point up the striking inequity inherent in bargaining away the tariff rates which we have to enable the leather-glove industry to survive as a unit of our economic set-up.

The leather-glove industry today is suffering the effects of other adverse conditions, such as the current fashion acceptance of fabric gloves, which has narrowed the market for leather gloves, leaving it all the more susceptible to the effects of under priced imports.

It is an industry which has no giant producers, but rather is made up of a comparatively large number of smaller companies which, over the years, have proven to be highly competitive; and, as a result, has given the American consuming public the finest value possible, as the result of its ingenuity.

The end product of these adverse conditions is seen in the deplorable condition of unemployment now being suffered by this industry, and it would be tantamount to the grossest economic injustice to ask the workers in this industry at this time to accept the results of even the smallest percentage of reduction in their tariff rates.

Since the matter is before you, I would take it upon myself to suggest that you negotiate for a higher tariff on leather gloves, rather than to give any consideration whatsoever to negotiating a single tariff cut. I say I would do that, except for the fact that I would in no way wish to jeopardize the precarious position of this industry today by even suggesting that the matter be broached at the bargaining table at Torquay. I would rather ask that you drop the question of lowered tariff rates on leather gloves from your agenda.

Real Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Natchez (Miss.) Democrat of June 6, 1950:

REAL FREEDOM

In his speech before graduates of the University of Mississippi, Oliver Emmerich, of McComb, went straight to the heart of this matter of freedom. The greatest problem of this decade, he said, is saving freedom—not freedom in aesthetic terms but common ordinary day-by-day liberty where a man stands on his own feet and the Nation leans on him.

Now, President Truman and all the proponents of Government working aggressively for the people can talk all they want about the new freedom, about democracy meaning security, freedom from want, freedom from fear and so on.

The real truth is that democracy has no goal; it is a way of life. Our republican form of Government was not established to bring about a certain state of affairs; it was established to prevent the bringing about of a certain state of affairs, i. e., oppressive Government.

It is true that throughout all history mankind has struggled for freedom but, it was freedom from restrictions on the individual, not the kind of pseudo-freedom in which the individual is made a cog in the wheel of society devoted to the elevation of all at the expense of a few.

It is the freedom, as Emmerich pointed out, for a man to stand on his own feet without our aid or interference from the Government. When Thomas Jefferson declared that government is best which governs least, he meant that whenever a government attempted to do more than the absolute minimum it tended to interfere in private affairs and to become oppressive.

The only freedom worth the use of the term is that state of affairs in which men are left alone by their government; when they are free not to do what they do not want to do, when they are free to starve if they wish, not work if they so desire, and when they are free to die without becoming the subject of some bureau or Federal agent who probes into private affairs before the casket has been laid in the grave.

Education Under the GI Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I received a letter the other day from a young Philadelphian, Ralph A. Dungan, Jr., telling me of his gratitude to the American people for the college course he has just completed under the so-called GI bill of rights.

I feel, Mr. President, that this young man, who spent 36 months in the Naval Air Corps, has spoken not only for himself, but for the millions of veterans who have been able to attend school under the GI bill after leaving the services.

He sees clearly that his newly acquired training will assist him throughout his life in playing the role of a responsible, active citizen in our democracy. He sees clearly that the American people wanted to make it possible for him—and for the other millions of young men and women who participated in our armed services—to have these opportunities to go forward with their educations which the war had interrupted.

So, Mr. President, because I believe Mr. Dungan has spoken for so many veterans, I wish to call his letter to the attention of Congress, and therefore ask unanimous consent to have his letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 7, 1950.

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MYERS: As you know this week marks for many young men and women the completion of a course of studies at the university level and the awarding of academic degrees. I am one of those whose good fortune it will be to receive a degree.

It is not without some sense of appreciation then that I look back on the past few years and forward also. I have been able to go through college under Public Law 346 and wish to express my appreciation to the Nation which has made this possible. I address this letter to you then as a symbol of those who have made my education possible.

To me the so-called GI bill was not something due those who served in the Armed Forces because such service is an implied obligation of citizenship. It was, however, a great indication of the thanks of our people for the time and other sacrifice made by many young men—regardless of its other

implications. And so it is at this time that I, as one of the beneficiaries of this great gift, wish to express my appreciation. This is a simple thank you to the citizens of the United States for having provided me an opportunity to get a college education. I might add that also due to their generosity I shall pursue graduate study for one more year.

Beyond the realm of gratitude one wonders what one can or will do with the talent and education which is given. This much can be said. I trust that the faith manifested by the Congress representing the people and the hard work of my teachers will bear fruit and it is my constant prayer that I shall be able to give in my lifetime in proportion as it has been given to me.

Sincerely,

RALPH A. DUNGAN, Jr.

The McMahon Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The McMahon Resolution," published in the New Haven Journal-Courier of June 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MCMAHON RESOLUTION

Senator BRIEN MCMAHON has joined with other Members of Congress in both parties to introduce a resolution to encourage "the peoples of the world to join in a great moral crusade for peace and freedom." This resolution implements the proposal made by the Senator in the Senate some time ago that the United States offer to transfer $10,000,000,000 a year for 5 years for armaments to world-wide peacetime developments through the United Nations, if other nations including Russia would cut their arms expenditures accordingly.

The resolution just introduced goes still further in proposing to transfer all United States armament funds to the UN "when an effective and enforceable system of world-wide disarmament and control takes effect." Such funds, no longer needed for armament, are to be expended by the UN "for peaceful development of atomic energy, technical assistance programs to underdeveloped areas, and general economic aid and assistance to all war-ravaged countries."

The McMahon resolution, referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of which the Senator is a member, will of course stir up extended debate both pro and con. The chance that Russia will promise in any foreseeable future to disarm seems remote indeed. Many will say with much evidence on their side that even if she did promise, the treaty would be worthless.

Senator MCMAHON'S idea, we infer, is to make a bold move in the war of ideas. Competent American observers have recently reported from Europe and Asia the disquieting news that the peoples of these strategic areas, in the main, are believing the Soviet propaganda against the United States as an imperialistic war-mongering nation. Such a resolution as Senator MCMAHON offers, if adopted by Congress, would put the United States officially on record as desiring peace and offering to help backward and war-ravaged countries through the United Nations with the huge sums that would otherwise go into an arms race.

"No nation can afford an arms race in the atomic era," Senator MCMAHON said in a recent interview and he quoted Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan of Pakistan, a recent visitor to the United States, as saying: "The people of the East believe that you are interested only in making war on Russia and not in the improvement of the way of life and the standards of living of the masses of the people of Europe."

Such a declaration as the Senator has now proposed would be a dramatic rebuttal by Congress to the propaganda contention that we are bent on war.

Suppose Congress passes the resolution. Would news of this action pierce the iron curtain and what would be its effect on rank-and-file Russians? We are confident that such electrifying news would pierce the iron curtain at numberless points within a few hours. As to the reception the Russian people would give to a bona fide offer to disarm and turn the maddening flow of wealth and energy into peaceful channels, George Kennan, long-time resident in Russia and counsellor to the State Department, has recently said:

"All you have to do is to listen to the stream of casual conversation among Russian people anywhere, on the streets, in the parks, in the public conveyances, to confirm that an impressive number of Russian people still believe profoundly in certain abstractions such as decency, honesty, kindliness and loyalty in the relations between individuals, whereas in the official mind these things are not supposed to be abstractions at all but only something relative to the pursuit of the aims of the party.

"But in the realm of the spirit, there is a moral life being led under the noses of the regime and despite anything the regime may do to stop it. Individual moral concepts cannot remain permanently separable from the problem of how man treats man within the framework of state power."

World War II historians have chronicled the fact that the Germans found millions of Ukrainians and other Russians in revolt against their masters in the Kremlin and as they advanced toward Stalingrad, they armed and organized whole divisions of these Slavs who hoped Stalin and his gang would be turned out.

Even the schemers and fanatics of the Politburo could not mobilize their own people against the west, much less conquer the world for communism, if the basic truth that American wants peace not war, could be planted in millions of Russian minds and hearts. Is this result impossible for the free west?

Alaska and Hawaii Statehood Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the Washington Daily News of Saturday, June 10, with respect to the Alaska and Hawaii statehood bills:

VOTE THIS SESSION

For more than a month the United States Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been sitting on the Alaska and Hawaii statehood bills.

Now the committee is reported getting ready to vote next week. Indications are it will send out either the two House-passed measures (one for each Territory), or two substitutes with minor revisions to meet some of the statehood opposition arguments.

It's about time. Further delay would be inexcusable. When it comes to fulfilling self-imposed obligations to foreign nations, this country has shown it can act fast. It should not thumb twiddle and dawdle over promises to American citizens.

The people of Alaska and Hawaii are American citizens. And statehood has been promised to them. Both the Democrats and Republican platforms pledged it. The National Conference of Governors and the Governors' Conference of the 11 Western States unanimously approved it.

Besides, there is the American tradition of granting statehood to Territories which have proved themselves worthy and capable of governing themselves.

More than a month ago President Truman said that "the need (for Alaska and Hawaiian statehood) is more urgent today than ever before. * * * By such action we will not only promote the welfare and development of the two Territories, but also greatly strengthen the security of our Nation as a whole."

The Senate committee should report out the bills next week, and the Senate's Democratic leadership should bring them to passage by an early vote.

Skinning a Cat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Natchez (Miss.) Democrat of June 7, 1950:

SKINNING A CAT

United States Supreme Court members demonstrated Monday that there is more than one way to skin a cat. Refusing to consider the Constitution—this is getting to be a habit, isn't it?—the Court majority decided that Negroes could not be banned from or segregated in railroad dining cars.

Basis for the ruling is the old Interstate Commerce Act which is a lot more ambiguous upon the subject of free enterprise than the broad terms of the Constitution. The act prohibits prejudice against any traveler.

Of course, this ambiguous phrase could mean or not mean a thousand different things, but in order to further the policies of the administration in power the Court applied it to eating facilities. And in so doing it put a strict interpretation on a loose phrase. They not only decided that a Negro should be allowed to eat in a dining car; they also decided that he could not be confined to one portion of the car.

Any schoolboy knows that there is nothing in the United States Constitution pertaining to dining cars. There is a great deal, on the other hand, pertaining to private property, but the Interstate Commerce Act and other acts have disregarded that.

The refusal of the Court to consider segregation in the light of the Constitution is a virtual admission on the part of the Justices that they do not want to endanger the

whole fabric of malicious legislation upon which our brand of socialism is built.

The Court even refused to use the Constitution as a basis for a ruling on segregation of Negroes in higher education. You get the point: the Court just ignores the Constitution.

Address of Cadet Donald E. Chaney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I find it a pleasure to include a speech given by Donald E. Chaney, of Branson, Mo., who is a cadet in the Civil Air Patrol. Donald is 18 years old, a native Missourian, and has been a member of the Civil Air Patrol for 3 years. Last year he was chosen by the Missouri wing and national headquarters to be one of 25 Civil Air Patrol cadets to represent this country on the exchange program between the United States and England. Gen. Lucas V. Beau, national commander of the CAP, heard Donald speak during a visit to the Missouri wing and invited him to speak at the congressional dinner.

I had the privilege and honor of attending the congressional dinner here in Washington and take this opportunity to commend Donald for an excellent speech and also to commend the Civil Air Patrol for the excellent work this group is doing:

General Beau, distinguished guests, and members of the Civil Air Patrol, when General Beau requested me to speak tonight, he asked for a 5-minute address on my experiences and impressions during my visit to England on the Civil Air Patrol exchange program; however, as a good many of you have had much the same experience as I, that is, traveling in a foreign country, I have chosen to dwell on my impressions rather than my experiences.

I think that the main thing that impressed me about the British people was the fact that they were a number of individuals. Before my visit to Great Britain, I had always pictured the people of that country as one individual, as John Bull, the man with the stovepipe hat and the union jack on his shirt front. Now, after my visit to the United Kingdom, when I think of the British, I think of a number of individuals of whom I had the pleasure of meeting while over there. For instance, there was Johnny Haw. John was one of the English air cadets coming to America on the exchange program. One day, before he left, we were walking through Uxbridge and he was pointing out to me the various points of interest when suddenly he said, "Don, it's a great idea, this idea of the air cadets of one country visiting another country. Just think of how many wars could have been prevented if the people of the two warring nations could have met, known, and have come to understand each other." I think the reason why our Civil Air Patrol exchange program is great is because it promotes understanding between nations, and therefore peace between nations. My trip to Great Britain was one of the greatest gifts of my life, not only because it gave me a broader education and more experiences, but also because it gave me a deeper understanding of the people of other nations, and made me realize that they are human beings just like myself, and therefore capable of blundering just as I do.

In closing, I would like to say this, that when the Royal Air Force flew us over in Germany, and we could look down and see the bombed-out cities and the fields pitted with shell holes, and we could see with our own eyes the destruction that had been heaped upon that country because it had been so foolish as to allow itself to come under the rule of a dictatorship; then, I appreciated more than I had ever before appreciated—the United States of America.

Hearings Before Select Committee on Lobbying Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following official verbatim transcript of hearings before Select Committee on Lobbying Activities of the House of Representatives, Tuesday, June 6, 1950:

HEARINGS ON THE SUBPENAS OF MERWIN K. HART, EDWARD A. RUMELY, AND JOSEPH P. KAMP TO PRODUCE CERTAIN FINANCIAL RECORDS (H. R. 298)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT COMMITTEE TO
INVESTIGATE LOBBYING ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C., June 6, 1950.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:40 o'clock a. m., in the caucus room, Old House Office Building, Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representatives BUCHANAN (chairman), LANHAM, ALBERT, BROWN, and O'HARA.

Also present: Benedict F. FitzGerald, committee counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Today, June 6, 1950, at this appointed time, Merwin K. Hart, Edward A. Rumely, and Joseph P. Kamp have been directed by subpena, issued May 25, 1950, and signed by me as chairman of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities by authority of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to appear before this committee and to bring with them certain records:

(1) The name and address of each person (includes any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other organization or group) from whom a total of $1,000 or more has been received by the council during the period January 1, 1947, to May 1, 1950, for any purpose, including but not limited to (a) receipts from the sale of books, pamphlets, and other literature; (b) contributions; (c) loans;

(2) As to each such person (includes any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other organization or group) the amount, date, and purpose of each payment which formed a part of the total of $1,000 or more.

The subpena was regularly served on these witnesses on the 26th and 27th day of May 1950, by Benedict F. FitzGerald (exhibits 1, 2, and 3, and the certified returns of such subpenas by Benedict F. FitzGerald). I am now offering these subpenas as part of the record.

(Exhibits 1, 2, and 3 were received into the files of the committee.)

The CHAIRMAN. The hearing today is of utmost importance. If the witnesses produce the requested and required information, the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities will continue its study of these organizations for the benefit of Congress and the people of this country.

If the witnesses fail to produce the required evidence and information, then this committee must determine what action it should take with reference to the information it may require to be necessary for the purposes of its investigation and report to the Congress.

Personally, and as chairman of the committee, I deem the information sought from these witnesses as absolutely necessary. In previous hearings some of the committee, including minority members of the committee, made a similar inquiry from witnesses and declared publicly that such information is important and necessary.

How could this committee function, study, and ascertain how lobbying activities influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation without the information such as we seek from these witnesses?

The Committee for Constitutional Government and Dr. Rumely are registered under the Lobbying Act. So is the National Economic Council and Merwin K. Hart. The Constitutional Educational League and Joseph Kamp are not registered. Dr. Rumely and Joseph Kamp have previously, in congressional investigations, declined to give congressional committees information sought by those committees. As a result of such noncompliance and perhaps defiance, of these two men, they were both indicted. Dr. Rumely was twice tried in the Federal courts. Joseph Kamp was tried and convicted for such defiance and his conviction has recently been upheld by the Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court.

The citizenry of the United States, Members of Congress, and the public press are ever watchful of the activities of this committee. All want to know, must know, and are entitled to know how Congress is influenced—what attempts are made to influence Congress.

If any organization, whether it be registered as a lobby or not, is doing an objective job to attain its particular ends and whether or not we agree with their purposes and motives, the men and women who support the organization financially have no reason to fear from this committee or from the Congress the recording of their names and their activities as a matter of public record.

If the lobby seeks the support of the public by indirection through the sale of books, pamphlets, etc., which influences, encourages, promotes, or retards legislation, Congress should know those facts and if by reason thereof a need for legislation arises, this committee may recommend such legislation.

No person or corporation, supporting any lobby, directly or indirectly, by contributions of money or otherwise, or by the purchase or sale of any book or pamphlet from that organization, affiliate or front, should have any qualms about having his name and amount of his contribution made public.

The sponsors and officers of such organizations should likewise have no fear of such publicity, particularly if their organization is formed and is carrying out its purposes in the spirit of the Lobbying Act passed by the Congress of the United States.

Regardless of the attitude of the organizations, their sponsors, their contributors and purchasers of the literature which they recommend or sell, and regardless of the affiliates or front organizations, this committee has a duty to perform. I, as chairman, have made up my mind to perform my duty as I see it. In all previous hearings,

I feel warranted in saying, that I have leaned over backwards trying to be fair and reasonable with all the organizations and the witnesses which appeared before this committee. I shall continue to act in that manner, but I must be firm. The laws of our country must be respected. Our subpenas must be respected. Congress must never yield, relax or surrender to any groups or organization or individual who tries to evade or avoid the requests of a congressional committee.

As a congressman and as a citizen, I mean to insist that the information sought in the subpenas in these instant cases be given to this committee. The dignity of the Congress and of this committee is at stake. If the witnesses refuse to honor the subpenas and refuse to produce the information and data requested, I shall do all that I can to enforce the powers of a congressional committee, whether it be by contempt proceedings against such recalcitrant witnesses or by charging such witnesses with a violation of the Statutes of Congress of June 1884 and June 1938. Statutes which declare it to be a misdemeanor for a witness to refuse to testify in a congressional hearing and make such witness, on conviction, subject to a penalty by fine of not more than $1,000 nor less than $100 and imprisonment in a common jail for not less than 1 month nor more than 12 months.

The first witness to be called this morning, is Mr. Merwin K. Hart.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, would the minority be permitted to comment on your statement?

The CHAIRMAN. On my statement?

Mr. BROWN. Yes. And on the situation which confronts us?

The CHAIRMAN. If it is relevant to the statement, yes.

Mr. BROWN. I certainly wouldn't attempt to make a statement here on any matter that was not relevant, either to your statement or the hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Brown, if you will yield for just a moment, I would like to record here the fact that we have a quorum present, and I shall announce the members of the committee and make acknowledgment of that fact as a part of the record.

Mr. LANHAM, Mr. ALBERT, Mr. BROWN, Mr. O'HARA, and myself. A quorum is thus present.

You may continue with your statement, Mr. BROWN.

Mr. BROWN. I have listened with great interest to the statement which you have just made, Mr. Chairman. I feel that the chairman and this committee want to be entirely fair in its conduct of any investigation. I served as a member of the committee in 1944, the Committee To Investigate the Conduct of Elections, in which the action was taken citing Joseph Kamp and a Dr. Rumely, as mentioned in your statement. One of these gentlemen, as mentioned in the statement, was convicted and the other, I believe, was discharged by the Federal courts after two trials. So that the committee had a 500-percent batting average.

I fail to see, however, Mr. Chairman, what that particular action of that particular committee has to do with this matter, except to perhaps somewhat prejudice the minds of the committee against the witnesses that are here today. Because of my realization, from the experience that I had in the previous committee sessions, and in the citing of the two men——

Mr. ALBERT. Will the gentleman yield for one observation?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. ALBERT. I think the matter set forth in the chairman's statement indicates that the witnesses should be well informed as to congressional procedures.

Mr. BROWN. Well, I am not so sure about whether they are well informed on congressional procedures or not. I am not sure whether or not our committee was well informed on congressional procedure. Seemingly the court in one case decided that we were well informed and the other case decided that we weren't so well informed.

That brings me to the reason why I have asked permission to make this statement. It seems to me from my past experience, which covers a few years, some 34 or 35 years of public life—I have dealt with some of these matters before—that we should be absolutely certain that we are on sound ground as far as any actions taken.

I notice that the chairman was very prompt, and I think properly so, to say that there was a quorum present here this morning. The Supreme Court has held that actions cannot be taken by committees where a quorum is not present; that is, in citing for contempt, and a few other things, such as perjury cases, and so forth.

I would like to make one or two inquiries to clear the record, if I may, and to make one or two comments. First, perhaps, the comments: I, as a member of the committee, have not been informed, except through the receipt of a copy of a petition filed in court, that someone mailed it to me, as to the issuance of this subpena, knew nothing about it, did not know that it had been issued, did not know and do not know as of this moment what papers were subpenaed, what questions were to be asked, or what papers were demanded, or anything about it.

As far as I know, and I have made some inquiries, I am not at all certain in my own mind that the chair has been granted any power by this committee—it hasn't happened while I was here—any power to issue a subpena and, according to the rules of the House and the Reorganization Act, the chairman acts only in an administrative capacity in the issuance of subpenas, unless he has specific instruction and authority granted to him by the committee. At least, that is my understanding of the law.

I want to be sure that the subpenas were issued properly before we get ourselves involved in any litigation or any great controversy.

I also do not know whether any action has been taken by a Federal court. I received a copy of some request for injunction. Whether action has been taken on that or not, I do not know. The fact of the matter is, I do not even have a list of the members of the staff serving this committee. I have not had any of the information upon which the actions of the committee have been predicated, until after they were presented here in the hearing room. Although the chairman has told me that I could avail myself of the staff, I haven't had that opportunity, for some reason or other; perhaps it is partially or, perhaps, all my fault.

But I want to be certain, first of all, that the committee has the authority——

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. Just a minute. I will complete my statement, sir, without interruption.

I want to be sure that the committee does have, and the chairman has had, the authority. I have protested in the past against staff members running around the country with blank subpenas, telling people that if they don't turn over their files or let them go through them, that they would be subpenaed.

I also would like to know, I would like to have before me, before we question these people, a list, copies of the subpenas, that I might see; I would like to know something about when they were served, by whom, and just exactly what it was that was requested. I think that we ought to have that, in order to predicate our case on sound legal bases.

I have completed my statement, for the moment.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. ALBERT.

Mr. ALBERT. On page 2 of the resolution under which this committee was constituted, at line 17, is the following——

Mr. BROWN. Inasmuch as I wrote that resolution, I know what is in it.

The CHAIRMAN. You didn't write that section, Mr. BROWN; I wrote it.

Mr. BROWN. I went over it.

Mr. ALBERT (reading):

"Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member."

Mr. BROWN. Will the gentleman give me an opportunity to be heard on that?

That is the usual form followed in the establishment of all special committees having investigative authority, but notwithstanding the wording, it has been the rule of the House, and it is a provision of the reorganization law, that that action taken by the chairman, as outlined in that resolution, is simply an administrative action, such as the president of a corporation may have, and yet a president of a corporation cannot sign a deed unless authorized by the board to do so.

I suggest you talk to the Parliamentarian of the House or the Speaker of the House on that question. If the committee has authorized the issuance of the subpenas, I think we are entitled to know it. I am just trying to be sure that we have a foolproof case, that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Lanham.

Mr. LANHAM. Is the gentleman representing the persons subpenaed here? It would appear so.

Mr. BROWN. No, I am not representing the persons subpenaed.

Mr. LANHAM. As attorney?

Mr. BROWN. Neither am I representing the other group.

I noticed, and read with great interest, the story on page 2 of the Washington Post, which seemingly indicates some of the officials of this committee have completely prejudged this case. Because of my concern, and because of my rather sad experience in previous cases, I am hoping that we can begin this thing on a sound basis, and know exactly where we are before we have to decide what we should do on any given matter.

Mr. LANHAM. Isn't it true that many of the questions the gentleman has asked will be proven on the hearing?

Mr. BROWN. Of course, it may be; but I hope that the gentleman from Georgia is not taking the position that the minority members of this committee have no right to be informed of what goes on, no right to know when subpenas are issued, or what the subpenas call for. I just don't believe that majority rule goes quite that far. That isn't quite the American way, as I have understood it.

Mr. LANHAM. During the three-quarters of an hour that the minority has held this committee up, you might have informed yourself.

Mr. BROWN. There have been many times when the gentleman from Georgia has not been present at all and the gentleman from Ohio has been present. The gentleman from Ohio may not be as important as the gentleman from Georgia, but it just happens that the gentleman from Ohio has a number of commitments that he attempts to take care of, and will stand on his own record, as far as that is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you care to make a statement, Mr. O'HARA?

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, the only thing I care to say is that I do not know of any meeting at which I was present when there was any authority given to issue blanket subpenas, or any meeting in which the Chair was authorized to issue subpenas. That is, at any meeting at which I was present.

That is all I care to say at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the resolution is very clear, as far as this point is concerned.

Mr. BROWN. The Chair does not care for the advice of the Parliamentarian of the House or of the Speaker of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already sought that advice.

Mr. BROWN. So has the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. ALBERT has cited the resolution. We will proceed.

Again, I want to note that a quorum is present, and I instruct the stenographer to record it, if any member of the committee leaves the room at any particular time during the course of the questioning of the witnesses.

Mr. BROWN. Well, of course, I don't believe that the gentleman has any detention warrants in his pocket; in fact, I hope not. But will the Chair also make very clear for the record as to whether or not the request of the minority for a copy of the subpenas will be complied with, so that we may see what was requested and what was subpenaed, and when it was issued, so that we may be able to, at least, prepare ourselves slightly for any examination that may be conducted?

Will the Chair answer that, on the record?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will see that you get the returned copies of the subpenas served upon these individuals, and I will furnish you with the two questions that are involved, in the statement that I issued here this morning.

Mr. BROWN. I want the subpenas; not a statement for release. I appreciate the Chairman's cooperation.

The CHAIRMAN (handing papers to Mr. BROWN). Note that they were signed by me, directing Benedict F. FitzGerald on May 25, and they were served, returned on the 26th, in the two instances; and on the 27th of May, in the other, in company with Earl Griffin, clerk of the committee.

Mr. BROWN. It is indeed a pleasure to be able to see these records.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Merwin K. Hart.

Will you step forward, please?

Who is this gentleman, please?

Mr. HART. My counsel, Mr. George Montgomery.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't think you need a counsel, Mr. Hart.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I think perhaps he does, Mr. Chairman. We came down on the assumption—I would like to make this statement, Mr. Chairman—we came down here on the assumption, of course, that your subpena had been validly issued; we never questioned that. To find that there is disagreement among the committee members on that basic fact is very surprising to us. Mr. Hart is quite ready to testify, but I think he is going to do it voluntarily. It appears that you haven't got the authority. In some way or other, you have exceeded your power in issuing the subpena. I want it clearly on the record that he is testifying voluntarily.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, sir.

Will you be sworn, Mr. Hart?

Do you solemnly swear that the statements you make before the committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God, to the last great day?

Mr. HART. I do.

TESTIMONY OF MERWIN K. HART

The CHAIRMAN. Will you give your name and address, please?

Mr. HART. My name is Merwin K. Hart. My home residence is New Hartford, N. Y. My office address is the Empire State Building, New York 1.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your official connection with the National Economic Council with offices at 7501 Empire State Building, New York City?

Mr. HART. I am president of the National Economic Council.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you or your organization registered under the Lobbying Act?

Mr. HART. We are.

The CHAIRMAN. A subpoena was issued on the 25th day of May 1950, by authority of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America commanding Benedict F. FitzGerald to summon you to be and appear before the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities of the House of Representatives of which I, Representative FRANK BUCHANAN, am chairman, and to bring with you such of the records of the National Economic Council as indicate:

(a) The name and address of each person from whom a total of $1,000 or more has been received by the Council during the period, January 1, 1947 to May 1, 1950, for any purpose, including, but not limited to (A) receipts from the sale of books, pamphlets, and other literature, (B) contributions, (C) loans;

(b) As to each such person the amount, date and purpose of each payment which formed a part of the total of $1,000 or more.

You were to produce these records before this committee in the city of Washington on Tuesday, June 6, 1950, at room 362, Old House Office Building at 10 a. m., where and when you were to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to this committee. Is that not so?

Mr. HART. Yes, sir. I am here in response to the subpena to which Mr. Montgomery has referred.

The CHAIRMAN. The subpena was previously received as exhibit No. 1.

You were given this subpena by Benedict F. FitzGerald on the 26th day of May 1950, at 11:30 a. m. That is so, is it not?

Mr. HART. Substantially so.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you the subpena with you

Mr. HART. I have.

The CHAIRMAN. So you are familiar then with the subpena. Do you wish to examine this copy?

Mr. HART. I assume it is the same, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You may examine it if you so desire.

Mr. HART. I don't believe that is necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Look at it, please, and state whether or not it is the same as you were served.

(A paper was handed to the witness.)

Mr. HART. It seems to be the same, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to be a copy of that furnished to you?

Mr. HART. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You are now before the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities at the time and place stated in the subpena; that is a fact, is it not?

Mr. HART. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you bring with you the records of the National Economic Council indicating—

(a) The name and address of each person from whom a total of $1,000 or more has been received by the Council during the period January 1, 1947 to May 1, 1950, for any purpose, including; but not limited to (A) receipts from the sale of books, pamphlets, and other literature, (B) contributions, (C) loans;

(b) as to each person the amount, date, and purpose of each payment which formed a part of the total of $1,000 or more?

Are they in this room in your custody?

Mr. HART. They are.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you turn them over to this committee?

Mr. HART. Yes, sir. After I have made a brief statement.

The CHAIRMAN. First, may we examine them?

Mr. HART. Well, sir, they are exactly in the form that you have requested, and when I have made a statement, I will turn them over to you.

The CHAIRMAN. Before you go into your statement——

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Before you make a statement, please: Are you willing to turn these over to the committee at this time?

Mr. HART. I am willing, after I have made the statement.

The CHAIRMAN. We want the records, as stated in the subpena. I ask you again whether or not you are willing to turn them over to this committee at this time?

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, the statement I wish to make goes to the heart of this whole investigation.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not asking for your statement; I am asking for the records.

Mr. BROWN. He states that he is willing to turn it over, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HART. I am willing to turn them over, after I have made a statement; but I do not want them to go out of my hands until I give them into your hands, and the reason is that there have been leaks from this committee to commentators on the air, and I do not want to have a repeat of that.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you wait until Mr. FitzGerald has a chance to examine them for me?

Mr. HART. He would have to read them all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. He can briefly look them over.

Mr. HART. If he will glance at them here, and bring them back to me, all right.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Be seated, please.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I am sorry. I want the record to show that you have refused to permit him to make a simultaneous statement.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not true. We will recognize you later.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. That is the opinion of the majority——

The CHAIRMAN. Will you be seated, please.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Under protest—I want that on the record.

The CHAIRMAN. We will give you a full opportunity, Mr. Hart, and will give your counsel a full opportunity.

(Pause.)

The CHAIRMAN. We want these statements right here.

Mr. HART. There they are.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you turn them over to me, Mr. FitzGerald?

(Documents were handed to the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. Do you care to make a statement?

Mr. HART. I do. Mr. Chairman, I ask you to keep——

The CHAIRMAN. You may make your statement.

Mr. HART. I ask you, sir, to keep those in your possession until I have finished my brief statement.

The CHAIRMAN. I shall.

Mr. HART. This committee by House Resolution 298, adopted August 12, 1949, "is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of (1) all lobbying activities intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation; and (2) all activities of agencies of the Federal Government intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation."

I have quoted, of course, from the resolution.

The National Economic Council concedes it to be a valid function of the Congress, or of either branch, to investigate lobbying activities. Throughout its 20 years' existence, the Council has worked to maintain the integrity and full independence of the Congress against encroachments from any direction. We consider the Congress to be the one great hope of maintaining freedom in America and national independence.

Representatives of this select committee recently spent some days in our offices in New York. Under protest, but under advice of counsel, we permitted them to take and photostat such documents as they desired. We hesitated to give them lists—

I say "hesitated"—we never refused, as has been stated in the newspapers—by your authority, Mr. Chairman, I believe.

We hesitated to give them lists of the names of our financial supporters and of the people who purchase subscriptions and printed matter from us; and while we were discussing this matter with your representatives, this subpena was served.

You said something, Mr. Chairman, in your opening remarks about recalcitrant witnesses. We have never been a recalcitrant witness.

I wish to say to the committee that the reason for our hesitation to give these financial figures which consist entirely of names of our supporters and of purchasers of our material is because we have grave fear that the material will fall into the hands of men and groups who, by their actions and words, have shown that they are willing to bring about the socialization and in some cases the communization of the United States.

These individuals and groups have called us "Fascists" and "anti-Semites." No name could possibly be more inappropriately applied to us than "Fascist;" for a Fascist government is one, as Italy was, where the government controls every detail of the lives of the people. This is precisely what we have always opposed.

The name, obviously, is applied to us solely as an epithet.

The CHAIRMAN. Continue.

Mr. HART. The name "anti-Semitic" has been applied unjustly to us. We think highly of that multitude of Jews, who we believe to be a majority of all Jews, who are Americans first; but, of course, we unhesitatingly condemn any groups, whether Jews or Christians, that are willing to use the Government and the resources of the United States to further an alien interest.

It is significant, Mr. Chairman, that about 3 weeks ago an organization known as Friends of Democracy, whose head was formerly an editor of the Communist magazine, The New Masses, put out a statement to its members and supporters announcing a systematic campaign to destroy the financial support of a number of organizations, including the National Economic Council. I am leaving here with the committee a photostatic copy of this document——

The CHAIRMAN. May I see it?

Mr. HART. Yes, sir.

(Document handed to the chairman.)

Mr. HART. The original of which is in my possession.

In it, this thoroughly left-wing organization, in speaking of a number of groups, including the National Economic Council, says:

"Friends of Democracy now has the answer to the question, 'Who puts up all of the money for all of the subversive groups?'

"A list of such contributors has been obtained and Friends of Democracy is in the midst of the project of approaching these contributors.

"Letters are being sent to the boards of directors of the corporations together with documented reports about the character of the subversive groups which these big corporation groups are supporting.

"Some of the meetings of the board of directors of these big corporations have already been attended, and about 150 will be eventually covered by minority stockholders.

"When this project is completed, Friends of democracy is certain that 70 to 75 percent of the support of these subversive groups will be eliminated."

That, gentlemen, from an organization, the executive head of it, whose nominal head, Rex Stout, is, as I say, formerly a member of the board of editors of the Communist magazine, The New Masses.

Mr. BROWN. May we have that name, again?

Mr. HART. Rex Stout.

Mr. BROWN. I think we also investigated him back in 1944.

Mr. HART. The men and the group I have mentioned above, who always attack and seek to smear groups like the National Economic Council, that aim to preserve the Republican form of government and the independence of the country, are typified by the group that has announced this systematic campaign to destroy part of the financial support we receive. This document of Friends of Democracy and the broadcasts of certain radio commentators, happening at the same time as the conduct of this lobbying investigation, clearly suggest that they expect to receive from this committee or its representatives information with which they can further their sinister purposes.

I wish to point out that the placing of any of these names in the record of the committee in open hearing will serve the purposes——

The CHAIRMAN. Continue.

Mr. HART. I would like to have your attention, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Continue reading.

Mr. HART. Will serve the purposes of the would-be smearers as well as though the names were given to them outright. And I protest that in the absence of honest ground for suspicion, none of these names and none of this data should be spread on the committee record. It is given you solely for the benefit of the members of the committee, as a part of the picture of what the National Economic Council is and what it does.

The National Economic Council has always worked openly. We are not ashamed of anything we have done. We have gained the confidence of a large number of the Members of Congress, as evidenced by the fact that nearly half of all the Members of both Houses read our material. If on rare occasions we have made inaccurate statements, we have promptly admitted it.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in obedience to the subpena I hereby deliver these figures into your hands. I believe it is possible for you and for your committee to prevent the leaking of any of this information into other hands. As an American citizen, I charge you with the responsibility of keeping them out of the hands of the enemies of American liberty.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. You may step down.

Mr. BROWN. Just a moment——

The CHAIRMAN. The next witness, Mr. Joseph P. Kamp.

Will you step up, please.

Mr. BROWN. I wonder if the chairman would extend to the minority the courtesy of their seeing the report that the gentleman submitted to the other side of the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

(Certain documents were passed to Mr. BROWN.)

Mr. BROWN. After all, this is still an American Congress, and the minority has some rights in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The next witness, Mr. Joseph P. Kamp.

Will the witness be sworn?

Raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the statements you make before this committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God, to the last great day?

Mr. KAMP. I do.

TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH P. KAMP

The CHAIRMAN. Give your name and address, please.

Mr. KAMP. My name is Joseph P. Kamp; my office address is 342 Madison Avenue, New York City; and my home is at 3 East Fifty-fourth Street, New York City.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your official connection with the Constitutional Educational League?

Mr. KAMP. I am executive vice chairman of the Constitutional Educational League.

The CHAIRMAN. And their offices are located where?

Mr. KAMP. 342 Madison Avenue, New York City.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you or your organization registered under the Lobbying Act?

Mr. KAMP. We are not.

The CHAIRMAN. A subpena was issued on the 25th day of May 1950 by authority of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America commanding Benedict F. FitzGerald to summon you to be and appear before the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities of the House of Representatives of which I, Representative FRANK BUCHANAN, am chairman, and to bring with you such of the records of the Constitutional Educational League as indicate—

(a) The name and address of each person from whom a total of $1,000 or more has been received by the league during the period January 1, 1947, to May 1, 1950, for any purpose, including, but not limited to, (A) receipts from the sale of books, pamphlets, and other literature, (B) contributions, (C) loans;

(b) As to each such person the amount, date, and purpose of each payment which formed a part of the total of $1,000 or more.

You were to produce these records before this committee in the city of Washington on Tuesday, June 6, 1950, at room 362, Old House Office Building, at 10 a. m., where and when you were to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to this committee. Is that not a fact as stated in the subpena?

Mr. KAMP. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you care to examine a copy of the subpena to see if it is the same subpena which has been served upon you?

(A copy of the document was handed to the witness.)

The CHAIRMAN. You were given this subpena by Benedict F. FitzGerald on the 26th of May 1950, at 11:30 a. m.; that is so, is it not—and is that a correct copy?

Mr. KAMP. It appears to me to be a correct copy; a carbon copy, probably.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have your subpena with you?

Mr. KAMP. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. You are now before the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities at the time and place stated in the subpena; that is so, is it not?

Mr. KAMP. I am.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you bring with you the records of the Constitutional Educational League?

Mr. KAMP. No, sir; I did not. I haven't had time to do the job that the subpena asked me to do; and, besides, I wanted the opportunity of presenting our position to this committee, our legal position.

The CHAIRMAN. You are here in response to the subpena?

Mr. KAMP. That is right, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But you do not have your records with you?

Mr. KAMP. That is right. I haven't had time to do anything like that. That is a job, that this calls for. Since I am not sure that the Constitutional Educational League comes under the authority of your committee, as set forth in your subpena, I wanted to have an opportunity of presenting my position to you, so that I might be informed by this committee whether or not, in its judgment, we do come within your jurisdiction.

The CHAIRMAN. You may step down.

Just a moment. If you were to be given time, how much time would you think necessary to furnish the material?

Mr. KAMP. Well, before I could begin to do the job, I would like to have the committee's statement as to how and why we come under the committee's authority. That was my purpose in coming here today. I read in the newspapers the statement of the chairman of this committee that the purpose of this hearing was to give the people who had been subpenaed an opportunity to tell this committee why we refuse to cooperate with the representatives of the committee who called at our offices. That was my purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all.

Mr. BROWN. Will the minority members be permitted to ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you very much.

If you were permitted to make a statement to this committee, as you have requested, and after you had completed your statement the committee decided that you did come under the law and that you should furnish this material, would you then be ready to furnish it?

Mr. KAMP. Then I would either have to furnish the information or suffer the consequences. I would be perfectly willing to, one or the other.

Mr. BROWN. On the other hand, if, after you had made your statement, and the committee decided that you did not come under the jurisdiction of the committee, the committee could, of course, withdraw its subpena; is that correct?

Mr. KAMP. That, of course, was my purpose in coming here today, sir. I felt quite certain that I could explain to this committee that under no circumstances did the Constitutional Educational League or its activities come within the purview of this resolution; and for that reason, I was quite confident that after I explained our position, that this committee would understand the kind of work that we do and the way in which we do it.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Kamp, I asked those questions only to clarify the record. I want to be absolutely frank with you and the committee. I have not had too good an impression of some of your activities in the past, but I do not intend to judge you on this matter because of things that you may have done in the past, that I disapproved of most heartily.

Mr. KAMP. Of course——

The CHAIRMAN. You may step down.

Mr. LANHAM. I have one question.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute, please. Mr. Lanham would like to ask a question.

Mr. LANHAM. You say you are here in response to the subpena. Do you refuse to give to the committee now the information asked for by the committee?

Mr. KAMP. No; I don't refuse.

Mr. LANHAM. Do you have it with you?

Mr. KAMP. No.

Mr. LANHAM. Do you propose to give it to us at any time?

Mr. KAMP. I do propose to give it to you when and if this committee can establish its right.

Mr. LANHAM. The obligation isn't on this committee to establish any right. We are a part of the Government and given the right to investigate lobbying. We have a right to this information. You are here this morning, but refuse to give it to us.

Mr. KAMP. I say to you, that we are not engaged in lobbying; therefore, do not come under your committee's authority, and that we respect the Constitution of the United States first.

Mr. LANHAM. Do you respect the subpena that has been served upon you?

Mr. KAMP. Yes.

Mr. LANHAM. You mean to comply with it?

Mr. KAMP. First, I respect the subpena. That is why I am here.

Mr. LANHAM. Do you intend to comply with the subpena duces tecum to bring these records with you?

Mr. KAMP. When and if it is established by this committee that it has a legal right to the papers and the records which it requests.

Mr. LANHAM. That is a legal matter that only the courts can decide. Do you have these records with you this morning?

Mr. KAMP. Of course, men of good common sense could always——

Mr. LANHAM. Answer my question. Do you have the records with you this morning?

Mr. KAMP. I have explained that. I explained at the beginning that it was impossible for me to have the records here, because the job called for in the subpena was beyond my ability to do in the period of time I had.

Mr. LANHAM. These records are on your books in your office. Did you bring the books with you?

Mr. KAMP. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. You may step down.

Mr. Edward A. Rumely.

Mr. RUMELY. I have my counsel, Mr. Burkinshaw, here. May I have him sit beside me?

Mr. BURKINSHAW. Neil Burkinshaw; B-u-r-k-i-n-s-h-a-w.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you be sworn, Mr. Rumely?

Do you swear that the statements you make to the committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God, to the last great day?

Mr. RUMELY. I do.

TESTIMONY OF EDWARD A. RUMELY

The CHAIRMAN. Give your name and address, please.

Mr. RUMELY. Edward A. Rumely; R-u-m-e-l-y.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your official connection with the Committee for Constitutional Government?

Mr. RUMELY. I am executive secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been with this committee, sir?

Mr. RUMELY. Since it was founded in 1937.

The CHAIRMAN. Where are your official offices located?

Mr. RUMELY. 205 East Forty-second, New York City.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you or your organization registered under the Lobbying Act?

Mr. RUMELY. We are, under protest.

The CHAIRMAN. Under protest?

Mr. RUMELY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. A subpena was issued on the 25th day of May 1950, by authority of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America commanding Benedict F. FitzGerald to summon you to be and appear before the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities of the House of Representatives of which I, Representative FRANK BUCHANAN, am chairman, and to bring with you such of the records of the National Economic Council as indicated:

(a) The name and address of each person from whom a total of $1,000 or more has been received by the Committee for Constitutional Government during the period, January 1, 1947 to May 1, 1950, for any purpose, including, but not limited to (A) receipts from the sale of books, pamphlets, and other literature, (B) contributions, (C) loans;

(b) As to each such person the amount, date, and purpose of each payment which formed a part of the total of $1,000 or more.

I have before me a copy of the subpena. Do you have your subpena with you?

Mr. RUMELY. I do; right here.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you examine the subpena to determine whether or not it is an exact copy?

Mr. RUMELY. This is a photostat of the subpena that was issued.

The CHAIRMAN. You have the original photostated?

Mr. RUMELY. I have the photostat of the original.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. RUMELY. Yes; that is a duplicate.

The CHAIRMAN. The copy is the same?

Mr. RUMELY. It is a copy of the same subpena.

The CHAIRMAN. And you are here in response to the subpena?

Mr. RUMELY. I am here in response to the subpena.

The CHAIRMAN. And you are ready to produce these records before the committee, as stated in the subpena?

Mr. RUMELY. I am going to produce a part of the records and withhold a part.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, this subpena was served upon you by Benedict F. FitzGerald, on the 27th of May, which I believe was on a Saturday; at what hour, do you recall?

Mr. RUMELY. Four forty-five. I agreed to accept it at that time. Friday—I think it was Friday.

The CHAIRMAN. Friday, at 4:45?

Mr. RUMELY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You are now before the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities at the time and place stated in the subpena; is that not a fact?

Mr. RUMELY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you bring with you the records of the Committee for Constitutional Government?

Mr. RUMELY. I brought a portion of the records that we will supply the committee. There are certain areas that you ask information on, which I believe are outside of your power. I would like to make a statement, while I am under oath and subject to cross-examination.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute, sir. What did you not bring?

Mr. RUMELY. The names——

The CHAIRMAN. As to points A and B?

Mr. RUMELY. I brought all on point A.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the receipts from the sale of books?

Mr. RUMELY. No, sir, not receipts from the sale of books. If you will allow me to make the statement——

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to ask you as to what you did bring, first.

In other words, you have brought everything under section (a)?

Mr. RUMELY. No. One moment. Section (a)——

The CHAIRMAN. The names and addresses?

Mr. RUMELY. No; not receipts from the sale of books, or the identity of purchasers of books. I don't mind giving the total income, but not the identity of the purchasers of books and literature.

Mr. LANHAM. Do you have the records called for by the subpena in your custody and/or in your office?

Mr. RUMELY. Yes.

Mr. LANHAM. Do you refuse now to comply with the orders of the committee directing you to produce these books and records—do you have them with you?

Mr. RUMELY. I have information on the people who contributed——

Mr. LANHAM. We didn't ask you for information. We asked you for books and records.

Mr. RUMELY. We have transcripts.

Mr. LANHAM. Do you have the books and records with you this morning in court—before the committee?

Mr. RUMELY. I haven't them here. My auditor brought some.

Mr. LANHAM. Do you have them here and are you ready to produce them for the committee?

Mr. RUMELY. No; I do not have the books of account. We have the transcripts of them.

Mr. LANHAM. I asked you whether you had the documents called for in the subpena, here before the committee this morning?

Mr. RUMELY. I have a portion of the documents called for.

Mr. LANHAM. You do not have all of the documents?

Mr. RUMELY. I do not have all of the documents.

Mr LANHAM. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all. You may step down.

Mr. BROWN. Just a minute. I am wondering if the gentleman will not be permitted to, at least, explain what he does have here, and what he doesn't have, and what he will furnish, and what he doesn't feel that he should furnish under this subpena. And then I have two or three questions that I would like to ask him. Dr. Rumely's face is quite familiar to me. I think he has appeared before other committees that I have been on.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. ALBERT, do you have questions?

Mr. ALBERT. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. O'HARA?

Mr. O'HARA. I join with my colleague, that the witness should be permitted to give that information. I have nothing to add.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed, Dr. Rumely, and make a statement in answer to the question of Mr. BROWN.

Mr. BROWN. I would like for him to make a statement as to why he feels the way he does. If the committee is in error, it should know it. We have a right to have his views on it; what he is going to furnish, and what he feels he shouldn't furnish.

Mr. RUMELY. May I have the opportunity of making a statement, while I am under oath, and subject to cross-examination?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. BROWN asked a question, as to what you brought with you.

Mr. BROWN. And I asked for a statement explaining what he brought and what he didn't bring.

Mr. LANHAM. I object to his reading any statement until he has produced the records that the committee has asked for. He is in contempt of the committee until he does produce those records, and I object to his reading any statement until he has accounted for the production of those records.

Mr. BROWN. I am really amazed and ashamed that this committee will not permit any citizen to say that he is furnishing certain material requested and why he cannot or feels he should not furnish other material.

Mr. LANHAM. I do not object to his stating what he is supplying. I want him to state that, but object to his making a long statement.

Mr. BROWN. I think we should be proud of our great Democracy, or our Republic, the way this committee has been conducted this morning.

Mr. LANHAM. He just wants to use the committee as a sounding board.

Mr. BROWN. I am afraid the committee has been used as a sounding board.

The CHAIRMAN. May we have order, please.

Mr. LANHAM. As long as he is in contempt of the committee——

Mr. BROWN. I don't know that he is in contempt.

Mr. LANHAM (continuing). I object to his reading any statement.

Mr. BROWN. I don't know whether he is in contempt of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. BROWN asked you a question, Dr. Rumely. I would like to have you give an answer to the question. Will you state it again?

Mr. BROWN. Yes. I would like to know what the records you are willing to produce are, and what records you feel you should not produce, and the reason therefor?

Mr. RUMELY. I am willing to produce the records of all contributions of $1,000 or more within the period designated; I am willing to produce the records of all loans within the period designated, except a few that related to the promotion of The Road Ahead, and advertising Fighters for Freedom, which has nothing to do with lobbying. I am not going to produce the names of people who bought books because, under the Bill of Rights, that is beyond the power of your committee to investigate.

Mr. BROWN. May I ask you this question——

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment, sir. Mr. LANHAM.

Mr. LANHAM. I have no questions.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you for your courtesy, Mr. Chairman. You have been very gracious.

I would like to ask you this question: Is your organization engaged in publication of books; is that part of the business of your organization?

Mr. RUMELY. That is the major occupation of our organization. We published 1,000,000 copies of Pettingill's three books.

Mr. BROWN. Pettingill?

Mr. RUMELY. Former Congressman Pettingill.

Mr. BROWN. Is that Samuel B. Pettingill, former distinguished Member of Congress?

Mr. RUMELY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROWN. Democratic Member from Indiana?

Mr. RUMELY. Yes. We found that the Constitution was not being studied. We took over the rights to the best editions, to the best volumes, selected by the American Bar Association. Up to that time, less than 100,000 had been published. Since we have had the copyright, 600,000 copies have gone out.

Mr. BROWN. Is it my understanding that you contend that this committee does not have authority to go into the publishing businesses of the country and to find out who buys books or who sells books? I am in the publishing business and I am interested. I want to be sure I am not a criminal.

Mr. RUMELY. That is exactly what we contend. We have given thousands of copies of Dr. Norton's book to colleges for them to give to their students.

Mr. BROWN. Is that the book on the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. RUMELY. On the Constitution.

Mr. BROWN. Dr. Norton?

Mr. RUMELY. T. J. Norton.

For example, Mr. Coles, the publisher of Spokesman's Review, William Coles, Jr., the publisher of Spokesman's Review——

Mr. BROWN. I know him personally.

Mr. RUMELY (continuing). Heard that Frank Gannett had been distributing this book to the schools of Rochester. He said, "I am going to give, every year, a thousand to twelve hundred copies to all the graduates of the high school in Spokane." He has been doing it every year; after his death, his son.

Now, your committee comes and wants us to reveal his name as connected with lobbying. What under the sun has distribution of a book to a high school to do with that?

Mr. BROWN. Don't you feel that if American youngsters are given information about the Constitution, that that might be terribly reprehensible in the way of influencing legislative procedure?

Mr. RUMELY. We felt it was meritorious.

Mr. BROWN. I don't feel that way, Doctor.

This other book you mentioned the Road Ahead, is that the book by—

Mr. RUMELY. John Flynn.

Mr. BROWN. John T. Flynn?

Mr. RUMELY. Yes.

Mr. BROWN. Who is John T. Flynn?

Mr. RUMELY. John T. Flynn——

Mr. BROWN. My memory is a little bad.

Mr. RUMELY (continuing). Is one of the—he writes frequently for Reader's Digest; he has published many books.

Mr. BROWN. Is he the same man that for many years was a columnist for the Scripps-Howard newspapers?

Mr. RUMELY. Yes. And he is a radio commentator.

Mr. BROWN. And how many of the Road Ahead books have been sold in this country?

Mr. RUMELY. The bookstores sold about 70,000. We took up the book in December and have sold in the 5 months 600,000 copies.

Mr. BROWN. Is there anything in that book that in any way attempts to influence the Congress on any specific piece of legislation now before it?

Mr. RUMELY. Not one word.

Mr. BROWN. Is there anything in that book that might be called subversive? By the way, is Mr. Flynn a subversive character—has he been connected with radical organizations?

Mr. RUMELY. Not one word that is subversive. It is highly patriotic, because it shows the manner of our marching into socialism.

Mr. BROWN. Has Mr. Flynn ever been a member—could we find out from the Un-American Activities Committee—or does the FBI have a large file on Mr. Flynn for subversive activities, do you know?

Mr. RUMELY. Not one word. On the contrary, he has a record of high patriotism.

Mr. BROWN. I am terribly interested, because I might have committed some sort of a hideous offense by buying 12 of his books and paying for them out of my pocket, to give to my friends for Christmas about a year ago.

It is your contention that, inasmuch as you are in the publishing business, that, as a publisher—I want you to get this question very clear: It is your contention that as a publisher, operating under a constitutional guaranty of the freedom of the press, that you are perfectly ready and willing to submit to this committee any information, any records that you may have, which you feel, or which the committee may feel, after you have had an opportunity to explain, in any way would come under the purview of the Lobbying Act, Lobby Registration Act, or under the purview of this committee, but that you do not feel that you can be compelled to report to anyone as to your activities as a publisher, only as it may be in the direction of influencing legislation?

Mr. RUMELY. That is true. That is an exact statement of our position.

Mr. BROWN. In other words—and I think the press of the country should pay attention to this—the Congress has a right to investigate and to look into, under this resolution, the activities of any publisher when it comes to attempting to influence legislation, perhaps the postal rate bill might be a perfect example, but that no one in the Congress has the right to inquire into the certain field that has been held sacred under the constitutional freedom of the press, that is, the right for you to publish books, magazines, newspapers, or whatever it is that you may publish legally, so long as they are not subversive or against the best interests of the United States?

Mr. RUMELY. That is exactly the position. I would like to say one word of explanation to Mr. BUCHANAN.

The CHAIRMAN. You answer Mr. BROWN's questions.

Mr. BROWN. I am asking that, because I understand, Mr. Chairman, by grapevine rumor, we don't get anything directly on this side of the table, seemingly, but by grapevine rumor I understand that this committee has been making inquiries into some of the editorials that bona fide publications have published in this country, and I want to protest against that here, publicly. As far as I am concerned, I want to announce, as a newspaper publisher, until I am locked up, I will continue to write and run the editorials that I deem wise, in my newspaper, and will not account to anyone. I am, therefore, trying to determine just exactly what this committee is endeavoring to do, whether we are interested in publications or whether we are interested in lobbying.

Now, go ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. Mr. LANHAM.

Mr. LANHAM. Could we get back to the question at issue?

Mr. BROWN. We have been right on it; dead center.

Mr. LANHAM. You refuse to produce for the committee this morning the names of persons to whom you have sold these publications?

Mr. RUMELY. Yes.

Mr. LANHAM. Does your charter give you the right to publish anything, the charter under which your corporation is organized?

Mr. RUMELY. Oh, yes.

Mr. LANHAM. Do you have the right to publish books?

Mr. RUMELY. Oh, yes. You have our charter.

Mr. LANHAM. When you say you publish books, magazines, things of that sort, just what do you do; do you actually do the printing, or do you simply pay somebody else to publish those books?

Mr. RUMELY. We distribute and pay——

Mr. LANHAM. You distribute and do not publish?

Mr. RUMELY. We do what all publishers do. Very few publishers have printing plants. Ninety percent of the publishers farm out the printing, and we do likewise.

Mr. LANHAM. As a matter of fact, you do nothing but pay for having the books printed and distributed?

Mr. RUMELY. We do exactly what all publishers do.

Mr. LANHAM. I am not asking what all publishers do. I am asking what you do, not what other publishers do. What do you do?

Mr. RUMELY. We select the manuscript, we pay for the typesetting, we work it from galley proof into page proof, and then when we have the page proof ready, we go to one of the rotogravure companies that print, and say, "Print for us 150,000 copies of this book"; we pay for it and put the book into distribution. That is the way all publishers do it.

Mr. LANHAM. How do you distribute those books—by congressional frank?

Mr. RUMELY. No, no. How we distribute them?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes. Haven't you distributed hundreds of thousands of these books through congressional frank?

Mr. RUMELY. Never.

Mr. LANHAM. None?

Mr. RUMELY. Never. In the Road Ahead, digest of which appeared in the February number of Reader's Digest, we sent out a million postcards and said, "If you want to stop socialism in the United States, read the condensation of John T. Flynn's great book in the February Reader's Digest." The result of that postcard was the sale—on the other side we said, "After you read the Digest you will want to read the whole book, which gives the names of the men who are carrying, and the organizations that are carrying, America into socialism"—the response was so tremendous that on the day after Lincoln's birthday——

Mr. ALBERT. I think you are going far afield.

Mr. RUMELY. He asked how we distribute. Then we put another 2,500,000 postcards out on the same line, but let the recipient pay the postage.

The CHAIRMAN. About 3,000,000 postcards altogether?

Mr. RUMELY. Three and a half.

The CHAIRMAN. Three and a half million?

Mr. RUMELY. Three and a half million postcards promoting that book; and a sold 175,000 copies. I would like to say——

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, you don't want to furnish to the committee the names of those who purchased these books?

Mr. RUMELY. No. We think that is beyond your power to inquire into.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to ask the gentleman, since he has gone far afield, where his activities during World War I were. He is getting far afield here.

Mr. RUMELY. What?

Mr. ALBERT. Where were your activities in World War I? You were getting far afield, anyway.

Mr. RUMELY. I was publishing a newspaper.

Mr. ALBERT. Who financed that newspaper?

Mr. RUMELY. Loans.

Mr. ALBERT. From what country?

Mr. RUMELY. There is no proof whatever that that paper was financed by the German Government. After the conviction the Attorney General, Harlan F. Stone, recommended to Coolidge, on the ground that we had been innocently convicted, that a pardon be granted, and when the jury saw the evidence that was suppressed 11 of the 12 jurors petitioned that their verdict be set aside, and President Coolidge did everything he could to right that wrong; and you have no business to bring that up here.

Mr. ALBERT. You are bringing up extraneous matter, too.

Mr. BROWN. Thank goodness that we don't engage in any smearing tactics.

The CHAIRMAN. I see that time is running out. You will be permitted to file your statement in full, Mr. Rumely.

Mr. BROWN. May I ask one other question?

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask this one question, this one further question——

Mr. RUMELY. Do you want the data?

The CHAIRMAN. I would be pleased if you would furnish to the committee those records that you have this morning. You have refused to give the names of people who have purchased books?

Mr. RUMELY. I will give you, Mr. BUCHANAN——

The CHAIRMAN. Under the terms of the subpena that has been issued to you.

Mr. RUMELY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all I wish to comment on at this time.

Mr. RUMELY. I want to read one sentence——

The CHAIRMAN. Will you turn that over to the committee——

Mr. RUMELY. I will turn that over to the committee, if you will let me make one statement, read one sentence.

Mr. O'HARA. Why can't he make the one statement?

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to see what he has.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, this committee cannot accept anything conditionally. If he is ready to produce, all right.

Mr. RUMELY. I am depending on your good grace.

(Some documents were passed to the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. We will let him make a statement.

Mr. BROWN. Certainly, there is such a thing as constitutional guaranty.

Mr. LANHAM. Not until he produces the records——

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, these two sheets here are all that you care to furnish at this time in answer to the subpena; is that right?

Mr. RUMELY. Yes, that is right.

Mr. BROWN. Is he going to be permitted to make that statement? I want to ask him what that court situation is.

Mr. RUMELY. You have 98 percent of the stuff your people asked for. They took packs of stuff from our office. We have been photostating for weeks.

Mr. BROWN. May I ask you, quickly, while this conference is going on: I understand you filed a complaint in the Federal court, asking for an injunction. What happened to that?

Mr. RUMELY. It is to come up for hearing tomorrow.

Mr. BROWN. You asked for an injunction against Louis Little and others in that petition. Someone sent me a copy. I don't know who sent it. I notice there are outlined the things that we requested——

The CHAIRMAN. No; they were not requested.

You were served with an abbreviated subpena of two parts, which has been put into the record. That was all that was requested of you this morning; is that not a fact?

Mr. RUMELY. That is all this morning.

Mr. BROWN. This morning. I am talking about this proceeding.

Mr. RUMELY. That is what they are asking for, in New Jersey.

Mr. BROWN. I guess freedom of speech doesn't even apply to members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. You are reading into the record there, Mr. BROWN——

Mr. BROWN. I am trying to find out whether or not this gentleman has given a mass of information to the representatives of the committee.

Mr. RUMELY. We have given everything on 24 points—25 points there—there are 25 points there, and everything on 24 points has been given.

The CHAIRMAN. These questions, of course, that were asked of you, you answered voluntarily—you were not under subpena; is that right?

Mr. RUMELY. With a subpena hanging over my head.

The CHAIRMAN. You were not served with a subpena listing 24 items?

Mr. RUMELY. It was shown to our attorney, and when Mr. FitzGerald came, he first served a subpena calling for those things, and I said, "Why, I gave you that voluntarily," and then he said, "I will serve the other subpena." And he says, "This short one"; but the subpena he first showed me called for the 25 things in that.

Mr. BROWN. Twenty-six here. Can we ascertain whether the witness and the organization has furnished all this material?

Mr. RUMELY. We have furnished that material to the committee.

Mr. BROWN. The subpena is only in connection with 2 points of 26?

Mr. RUMELY. That is right.

Mr. BROWN. All of this material, some having to do with the Members of the Congress, all of this material, you furnished all of that?

Mr. RUMELY. We furnished all of that. They went through the files. They sat for days going through the files.

The CHAIRMAN. But you have not furnished the committee with the complete list of things that you were subpenaed to furnish.

Mr. RUMELY. I have not furnished the committee the list of buyers of our books and a few loans we made to publish the books.

The CHAIRMAN. And you still refuse to furnish us with that information?

Mr. RUMELY. I have been advised by counsel not to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. You may file your entire statement.

That is all, as far as I am concerned, unless the other members have questions.

Mr. BROWN. I want to make it clear as to whether this witness is stating here under oath that he did furnish all this mass of material, all but two points?

Mr. RUMELY. I did.

The CHAIRMAN. Not under subpena.

Mr. BROWN. He has cooperated with the committee on everything else; that is what I was interested in ascertaining.

Mr. RUMELY. I did.

The CHAIRMAN. It is to his credit that he did furnish the committee with all the information with the exception of these two vital points.

Mr. BROWN. Doesn't he get credit for cooperation?

The CHAIRMAN. He did get that.

Mr. BROWN. I had an awful time finding out about it. If he gave 24 of these things, and it covers the whole water front—he was

asked about all the activities of the Members of Congress——

The CHAIRMAN. But the very vital thing requested——

Mr. RUMELY. The unconstitutional question, what you requested on that—you didn't get that.

The CHAIRMAN. You may file your statement, and step down.

Mr. RUMELY. Mr. BUCHANAN, may I clear one point: You said in your statement, yesterday——

The CHAIRMAN. No——

Mr. RUMELY (continuing). That the sale of books was a dodge. We sold——

The CHAIRMAN. I do not care to hear that, at this time.

Mr. RUMELY. We have sold The Road Ahead for 51 cents——

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Rumely——

Mr. BROWN. You read that in tomorrow morning's newspaper.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. LANHAM.

Mr. LANHAM. In connection with all this information——

Mr. RUMELY. I can save a lot of trouble if you will let me make that one statement.

Mr. LANHAM. On the question of producing information about books published, that has relevance to the issue, and we are in no way trying to control thought, or the publication of any book, but we are simply trying to get the facts about how you are attempting to influence lobbying. I want to read——

Mr. RUMELY. I am not——

Mr. LANHAM. Just a minute. I want to read from Mr. BROWN's questioning of Mr. Goodman, of the CIO, wherein Mr. BROWN asked the question, or made this statement [reading]:

"I notice that these booklets that you put out, you have a price of 25 cents each, and 20 for $5. Do the individual local CIO organizations purchase those, or do members purchase them, and is not the sale of booklets that is outlined here on exhibit B, where you say you get so much from books, and it was expended again; contributions and expenditures.

"Mr. GOODMAN. I am sorry, I don't see the item 'Sale of booklets' on exhibit B.

"Mr. BROWN. It says, 'From books.' That is all.

"Mr. GOODMAN. That is from the accounting books of the organization.

"Mr. BROWN. Oh, I see. I am wondering if you can furnish us, along the line that Mr. O'HARA has suggested, if you could furnish us with the number of these books that have been put out on the housing subject, not only the total different publications, but the amount or number of each issue, of each publication?

"Mr. GOODMAN. That one that you have in your hands was published in 1946 by a previous regime, and I would be glad to try to secure the facts. Good Shelter, one of which you have, was published in 1945. The green one in 1946. That one [indicating] in 1947. I would be glad to get the facts.

"Mr. BROWN. You understand what I am driving at. This is all material used to influence the action of the people and the Congress, either to get the people to put pressure on the Congress, or to put pressure directly on the Congress; whether good or bad, that doesn't make any difference."

Mr. RUMELY. I won't give the names of the people who bought books.

Mr. LANHAM. He seems to think you shouldn't be questioned.

Mr. RUMELY. Our books are not of the same kind.

Mr. LANHAM. As he says, it doesn't make any difference whether good or bad, it is a question of the distribution of books. If it is legitimate to ask Goodman of the CIO, it is legitimate to ask you.

Mr. RUMELY. Not the names of the people that bought.

Mr. BROWN. Now that the gentleman has completed a stump speech——

Mr. LANHAM. It is not a stump speech.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute.

Mr. RUMELY. May I give you one sentence?

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. I think you have had enough time.

Mr. RUMELY. It will save the time of the committee if I may make one statement, read one sentence.

Mr. BROWN. Be sure to shut people off, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to say something. I think we have gotten along very fine through these hearings. It sometimes becomes necessary, of course, for the chairman to calm things down.

I think Mr. BROWN asked for the floor.

Mr. BROWN. I thank you very much for the courtesy, Mr. Chairman.

The gentleman has mentioned a certain cross-examination that I made of Mr. Goodman, who was secretary, I think, of some CIO housing committee, in connection with certain housing-legislation activities. The pamphlets to which he referred were pamphlets in support of housing legislation and housing proposals then before the Congress. They were not books or booklets of general information. They were used primarily and only for the purpose of being distributed among those individuals who wished them, and were also presented to Members of the Congress in argument as to why housing legislation should be enacted. Therefore, I think, come generally under the law.

If you have any booklets similar to that, in which you have set forth the reasons why certain legislative proposals before Congress should be enacted, or certain legislative proposals should be defeated, and you have sent those out over the country wholesale, either as gifts or through other organizations, then I think this committee has an absolute right to demand information on them.

Mr. RUMELY. We have issued no such books.

Mr. BROWN. However, if your publication field were——

Mr. RUMELY. We have issued no such books.

Mr. BROWN. I want to make clear, for the enlightenment and education of the committee, that a publisher and a printer is oftentimes two different individuals. I have been both, in my life. Sometimes publishers also have printing presses, but most of the larger publishers don't have their printing plants.

The CHAIRMAN. At this point, will you permit the Chair to interrogate the witness?

You have in your own statement stated that you have published The Constitution of the United States, by Thomas James Norton, and The Road Ahead, by John T. Flynn. Two additional books, not mentioned by you, were published and distributed: Compulsory Medical Care, by Melchior Palyi; and Why the Taft-Hartley Law, by Irving B. McCann. In your own statement, you admit publishing those and distributing them.

Mr. RUMELY. Yes, sir; we are distributing them.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom?

Mr. RUMELY. The McCann book isn't yet printed, but we will be distributing it in 4 or 5 weeks.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom?

Mr. RUMELY. We have about 10,000 orders on hand.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, that is the purpose of the subpena——

Mr. RUMELY. We have orders for 10,000 copies of the book.

Mr. BROWN. That is about a Constitution adopted about 155 years ago; not about anything now before Congress.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. ALBERT.

Mr. RUMELY. Your investigation knocked down an order of 10,000 copies of that book to 50.

The CHAIRMAN. Which book?

Mr. RUMELY. McCann's book.

The CHAIRMAN. One order went from 10,000 to 50?

Mr. RUMELY. Yes, sir; because they heard you people were going to request the names of everyone who bought a hundred or more, and they said, "We will play safe."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Rumely.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Rumely, Mr. ALBERT has a question.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Rumely, you say you have already furnished to the committee everything except the names of the purchasers of your books and those who have made loans for the purpose of publishing books?

Mr. RUMELY. Yes, sir. Just for the express purpose of publishing the book or printing ads in Fighters for Freedom. It has no relation to lobbying.

Mr. ALBERT. Has the committee got all of your other records except those; does the committee have in its possession all other records except those?

Mr. RUMELY. Your committee has; yes. All that you asked for, except you will find in my statement what was excepted; and what I have told you is a fact, that we have declined to give the names of the quantity purchasers of the books; 90 percent, 95 percent are bought in quantities of 1 to 10; but, for example, a doctor in the West, with a big clinic, he bought a few thousand copies of John Flynn's book, and wrote to all his patients of 10 years, "If you will write me a postcard, I will send you a copy." If I drag his name in—he isn't lobbying. The FBI bought a big bunch of the Constitution book. How would they feel? They wanted their agents to know what was legal. How would they feel if we reported they were engaged in lobbying?

Mr. ALBERT. It is not a question of how they feel. It is a question of fact. We are trying to find out what you have done and what you intend to do.

Mr. RUMELY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all.

Mr. RUMELY. They got 350 copies.

Mr. LANHAM. If the doctors bought this book that you say you were publishing, against socialized medicine, they would be lobbying.

Mr. RUMELY. No. May I tell you what the book is? The book is a result of a 6 months' study in Europe by one of the greater European economists, to see what happened under compulsory medical care in every country. There isn't one word about socialized medicine in this country. It is a study of what happened in Europe.

Mr. LANHAM. You distributed because you wanted to discourage that sort of legislation, and a doctor, if he were to distribute it, would be getting it from you for that purpose, would he not?

Mr. RUMELY. We distribute it because we want to preserve private industry. I do it with enthusiasm, because I worked as a medical intern under the Bismark system, and I know how disruptive that kind of medicine can be.

Mr. LANHAM. I agree with you on socialized medicine. I am not in favor of it. But the point is, if you distribute this book, and if the doctors buy it and distribute it, they are engaged in lobbying, in an attempt to influence legislation.

Mr. RUMELY. They are certainly not. If building informed public opinion is lobbying, then our whole conception of freedom is wrong. There is a copy of that book here. Lock at it.

Mr. LANHAM. I don't want to see it now. I am dealing with principles. You are attempting to influence, indirectly, legislation that is now pending before Congress.

Mr. RUMELY. You have no right to go against—go into the field in which public opinion is made; you are out of bounds.

Mr. LANHAM. I understand that the jury held you out of bounds at one time. You say I am out of bounds.

Mr. BROWN. That is very gracious of the committee. We show all respect to witnesses.

Mr. LANHAM. I show all respect to all witnesses who show respect to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will adjourn, subject to call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 12 o'clock noon the hearing was adjourned, to reconvene subject to call.)

Decontrol of Rents at Dallas, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FRANK WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper articles and also an editorial from the Dallas News of May 22, 1950:

CITY DISSOLVES ITS COMMITTEE ON RENTAL ILLS

Rent control in Dallas is definitely a thing of the past. Even the city council's committee appointed to iron out disputes between landlord and tenant has been dissolved.

The committee, headed by realtor Roy Eastus, was appointed by the city council in 1949, when city council action, ratified by the governor of the State, decontrolled rents in Dallas.

The committee was to serve as a liaison group between landlords and tenants in case of complaints over rent increases as a result of decontrol.

Members of the committee, Mr. Eastus, W. A. McKinley, and Avery Mays, told the city council in a letter Tuesday that their work was done. They asked that they be relieved of committee duty. The council dissolved the committee and passed a resolution commending its members for their work.

In seeking discharge, the committee members stated:

"For some months we have had a constantly diminishing number of complaints, until, as of this date, we feel that both property owners and tenants are happy in their relationship and particularly in the fact that the production of housing units has increased so that within the past 9 months anyone can select housing accommodations to suit their needs and budget well in line with the general cost of living and in many instances below the increase of other necessities."

Committeemen told the council that as a result of their survey of rental units in Dallas, rents increased an average of 18.32 percent since decontrol. They added that 51.5 percent more rental units now are being advertised for rent than there were in the first quarter of 1949, and this, the committee said, indicated that there is no scarcity of rental units.

"The law of supply and demand will continue to work to adjust any rents which currently may be higher than a tenant is willing to pay," the committee concluded.

[From the Dallas News of April 26, 1950]

ONLY 18.3 PERCENT RENT RAISE FOUND HERE—DECONTROL COMMITTEE REPORTS ON SITUATION SINCE CURBS LIFTED

(By Allen Quinn)

Rent increases since rents were decontrolled in Dallas last June have averaged only 18.32 percent, a decontrol committee informed the city council Tuesday.

The committee based its statement on a survey of 2,445 rental units of all classes from $25 a month upward.

The report was made in a letter by Roy Eastus and W. A. McKinley, members of the committee, which was appointed by Mayor Wallace H. Savage. Mayor Savage read the letter to the council.

The letter said the committee had been "gratified to observe the fine response from property owners to hold rental increases to a reasonable amount commensurate with the housing and services offered." The adjustment "from wartime control to normal supply and demand was effected with a minimum disturbance to our citizens," the committee said.

Now, the letter said, "Anyone can select housing accommodations to suit their needs and budget well in line with the general cost of living and in many instances below the increase of other necessities."

The committee credited decontrol with the fact that more homes were built in the 9 months following decontrol than in the previous 9 months.

"This has resulted because of the individual property owner being willing to again go into rental housing units which was not being done during rent control," the letter said.

An analysis of newspaper advertisements, the committee reported, revealed 51.5 percent more rental ads in the first 3 months of 1950 than in the first 3 months of 1949. In March 1950, there were 8,036 rental units offered, compared with 5,080 in March 1949.

"This indicates that there is no scarcity of rental units in Dallas and the law of supply and demand will continue to work to adjust any rents which currently may be higher than a tenant is willing to pay," the letter said.

The committee asked to be discharged. The council complied and thanked its members for a splendid job.

Avery Mays was the third member of the committee.

[From the Dallas News of April 26, 1950]

DECONTROL OF RENTS SUCCEEDS IN DALLAS

Not only in Dallas but in all cities and States where the change has been made, decontrol of rents has been working smoothly. Relatively few rents have been raised, and those not unreasonably. Some have even been lowered. Congress should not be misled by the plainly dishonest reports that some bureaucrats are putting out on this subject. Officials in the rent-control offices, desperately trying to keep their jobs, have resorted to much misrepresentation on the effects of decontrol.

Testifying before a House committee, Mayor Wallace Savage showed that the average rise in rents in Dallas in the year since decontrol has been only between 18 and 19 percent, not the 55.8 percent claimed by Tighe Woods. This rise is small in view of the fact that during and after the war, when other prices were soaring, rents were held down more than any other costs except those of utilities. Dallas tenants are satisfied with their rents. They are not squawking. More rent property has been available here since decontrol than at any time under control.

The dishonesty of the Woods figures on rent rises following decontrol has been shown in many instances. In one small city in the Pacific Northwest, a committee of citizens surveyed every home in the official report. It found that the average rise was less than a third of that reported by Woods' office. The earlier report had included many vacant houses and others not rented but owner-occupied. In one instance it reported a raise in rent where the figure had been lowered. In others it based its percentage on prewar figures instead of those prevailing just before decontrol. No organization that stoops to such methods deserves to be kept on the public payroll.

Iowa Tops All Other States in Cattle Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Cherokee (Iowa) Daily Times:

IOWA TOPS ALL OTHER STATES IN CATTLE PRODUCTION

It may be a bit surprising to you that Iowa leads the world in cattle production, in spite of all that we hear about the cattle country of the West and South.

The Iowa Development Commission has rendered a real service in presenting the claims of this State to highest rank in this line, excelling even the State commonly designated as the cattle country. In a current bulletin the commission says:

"If you're looking for the cattle country, stranger, just swing out of the saddle right here. You're in it.

"What's that you say? That you're not far enough West, and there are too many fences, and it sure doesn't look like the range to you?

"Better look again, stranger. Because Iowa may not be the range, but it grows more cattle, and makes more money at it, than any of the range States. Or any other State for that matter.

"No, we're not just talking through our Stetson. We've been reading one of those reports, all full of figures, that the Department of Agriculture sends out every once in a while.

"And believe you me it shows that Iowa is the cattle country.

"You want some figures laid on the line? Well, try these. Last year Iowa sent 2,342,000 head of cattle to market. That's one-tenth of all the cattle marketed in the whole United States. Put 'em on the scales, and they weighed 2,386,000,000 pounds. That's one-tenth of all the beef sold in the country, too.

"Besides, they brought good money—$21.80 a hundred. Best price cattle brought anywhere, and a dollar a hundred better than the average. All told, they put $524,000,000 into the Iowa farmers' poke.

"You wonderin' about those Western States, where the longhorns used to cavort? Nary a one marketed more than a million head, stranger. California did, though. Montana, California, and Colorado are the only three where cattle ranchers took in more than $100,000,000 cash money and all three together didn't any more than match Iowa. You add up Idaho and Wyoming, New Mexico and Arizona and Utah, Washington and Oregon, and all their cattle money is just about what these good Iowa beeves sold for.

"You say we forgot about Texas? Stranger, brace yourself for a shock. Texas came pretty close, in numbers. Those big State ranchers sold 2,183,000 head of cattle, and a million or so calves. But when it came to getting paid, they just came in second. They made $124,000,000 less than these Iowa feeders did—about $400,000,000 in round figures.

"Still champeen? Sure, stranger, Iowa did the same thing the year before, only on a little smaller scale. These corn-fed cattle brought $503,000,000 in 1948, while Texas beeves sold for four hundred and fifty-four million.

"You say you'd like to settle down here? Well, just let Old Paint get acquainted with

this juicy Iowa alfalfa while we look over the prospects.

"Right now, the northeast part of the State has more cattle than any other section. Folks think there's 690,000 head on farms in 11 counties north and east of Waterloo. Pottawattamie County, down in the other corner of the State, has the most for any one county, though—a hundred thousand and more. Sioux County comes next, with 98,700. Nine other counties have more than 75,000 head—Clayton, Fayette, Winneshiek, Crawford, Tama, Benton, Clinton, Jones, and Linn."

Let Us Look at Some of Our Present Advantages in This Eternal Struggle of the Ages, of Light Versus Darkness, and of Hope Against Fear, Which Is Now Characterized in a World-Wide Struggle of Democracy Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. LIND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. LIND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address made by the Honorable Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, at the commencement exercises of the Pennsylvania Military College, Chester, Pa.

I was particularly intrigued by the press notices published with respect to this talk, and because of those notices I obtained and read the speech in full. Certainly Secretary of Defense Johnson's address shows that he possesses a true insight into the many vexatious problems with respect to the peace of the world. In this speech he has enunciated these problems with such clarity that I am taking this opportunity of making it available for reading by every Member of this Congress.

The talk was as follows:

THE BEACHHEADS OF 1950

I welcome this opportunity to take part in the commencement exercises of the Pennsylvania Military College and to become an honorary graduate of this, the second oldest military college in the United States.

Six years ago today young American soldiers, sailors, and airmen—perhaps some of you who are here today—were storming the beachheads of Normandy. It was D-day. It, too, was a day of commencement, the commencement of the long-awaited assault upon the most formidable fortress of history—the fortress of Nazi Europe. For some of those young men the very end came with that same commencement.

You young men who are going out into the world of 1950 face nothing so grim, nothing so portentous at this moment of your graduation, but you, too, have formidable beachheads to storm. The beachheads of 1950 are the bastions of cynicism, prejudice, and hate, spearheaded by the sinister forces of Communist imperialism. These I am confident you will break down just as decisively as did your predecessors who left this college in other critical years, because, in the conflict between the ideals of a democracy and the materialism of a tyranny, the natural forces of freedom and decency are bound to prevail.

No one can foretell with certainty whether we ultimately shall have to meet the challenge of Communist imperialism in grim battle or not. I certainly hope and pray we will not; and I am firmly convinced we will not if we exploit the military, economic, political, and psychological advantages that are ours. Communism has nothing to match us in any of these fields, and though it may seem to extend its influence here and there from time to time, its victories ultimately will prove hollow. In the long run, communism will fail as have all of its forerunners that paraded under other names but had no spiritual quality to support them. Man was born to be free and no slave state can shackle him for long.

Let us look at some of our present advantages in this eternal struggle of the ages, of light versus darkness, and of hope against fear, which is now characterized in a world-wide struggle of democracy against communism.

From a military standpoint, we can successfully meet every basic requirement. In the ingenuity and the resourcefulness of our men, in the quality of our weapons, in the capabilities of our industry, and in the spirit of unity of our people, we have just what it takes to wage and win a war, if necessary. When we add to ourselves our partners under the North Atlantic Pact and their capabilities, and our friends everywhere, even those temporarily in chains behind the iron curtain, we present a solid phalanx of strength that should deter designs of aggression.

We are not so strong, however, that we can afford to become complacent, indifferent, or overconfident about our national defense. Nor dare we think only in terms of our capabilities under complete mobilization, which may take weeks or months, and neglect our readiness to act effectively in an emergency at a moment's notice.

Our first duty is to have alerted at all times enough of an Army, Navy, and Air Force, unified under our own banner, and united with our partners, to make a quick, cheap, and easy victory over us impossible. That is the primary objective of our present national defense program.

We are striving in every way to become better prepared to resist such an initial assault of any magnitude, and simultaneously to launch a powerful counteroffensive of our own in devastating retaliation. Once an enemy becomes convinced that he cannot beat us, he will hesitate to start a war. And as far as we are concerned, our record in the interests of peace is clear. Everyone, every nation, without exception, understands that we shall never be the ones to open hostilities. We do not want to start a war, no matter what the promise of victory may be. We detest war and will do what we honorably can to avoid it. Nor do we want to live in a perpetual state of siege. We prefer to continue a democratic way of life, with a reasonable array of military might sufficient to deter war, rather than to exist completely mobilized for all-out war at all times.

Our political advantages over communism are just as formidable as our latent military prowess. Our traditional emphasis on the individual, on his rights, his freedom, his security, his happiness, is appreciated wherever men live, breathe, and hope. On our side are nations whose heroic struggles against despotism in any form are as old as their histories. No amount of propaganda against so-called decadent capitalism and warmongering America can succeed in keeping the truth permanently away from the misguided people who are temporarily on the other side. We have a spiritual political force on our side, and there is nothing in communism that can equal it.

On the economic side, we also enjoy a wide margin of superiority. Our own economy is sound. The economy of our partners and friends grows stronger every day. Thanks to the ECA and their own determined efforts, the postwar seeds of chaos, dissension, and poverty upon which communism thrives have been uprooted and scattered. We have brought to our partners capital, machinery, food and clothing, and other economic goods to hasten their recovery. Compare the record on both sides. While we give, Communist imperialism takes. We fill granaries; the Communists empty them. We equip factories; the Communists strip them. We open the doors to commerce, encourage communications and friendly travel; the Communists slam the door shut, restrict movement, and suppress news.

Why does a police state resort to iron curtains, restrictions, and taboos? Because it is afraid, afraid of itself, afraid of its own people, afraid of its neighbors, afraid of everyone, afraid of the sound of a shaken leaf. And that brings us to our great psychological advantage. Our conscience is clear. We are not afraid of anyone or anything. We realize, however, that a frightened nation is a dangerous nation, because fear and reason do not go hand in hand. A frightened nation, moreover, with mass-destruction weapons in its possession may become particularly dangerous. The way to meet its threat is to retain our poise and keep up our guard and not allow ourselves to develop any fright of our own. Let us continue to do all in our power to prove to the world that there is nothing to fear about America. Let us continue to convince all peoples by our actions that our intentions are honorable, that our aims are peaceful, and that we are sincerely eager to extend the blessings of prosperity far and wide. Let us at the same time make it just as clear that we shall resist aggression vigorously and decisively in whatever form it may come.

The class of 1950 marches out today into a dangerous world, yes, but life was really never without danger. The atomic age may seem an awesome age in which to take up your duties as citizens, but it is not so savage, so crude, nor so terrifying to man as was the stone age, or the bronze age, or the iron age. Indeed, the challenge to the spirit of adventure is greater today than it ever was, for man must now win the final mastery over the powerful physical forces he has brought under his control. He must find new ways of solving the problems of nations so that the giants of technology may serve to enhance and not to enslave mankind.

I am confident that you, the graduates of 1950, will meet the challenge of our times boldly and intelligently as only men can who have combined an education in the cultural aspects of man's eternal quest for truth, wisdom, and beauty with a training in the practical profession of arms. Your studies of history, literature, art, philosophy, and government have given you an appreciation of our country and our civilization, and of our sacred institutions with their emphasis on freedom, tolerance, human dignity, and fair play. Your training as soldiers here in the peaceful atmosphere of Chester, Pa., and the experience that many of you veterans of campaigns in Europe, Africa, and the Pacific have gained in battle, has made you realize, I am certain, the need of preparedness to safeguard our country and assure the perpetuation of our human ideals and national aspirations.

The military training you have enjoyed here at Pennsylvania Military College has taught you that even in a society of free men there must be discipline, responsibility, duty, and a respect for law and authority. You have learned how to obey and follow. You have learned how to command and lead. A good citizen and an effective leader must be able to do both and know when to exercise either.

The ROTC training here in many of our leading schools and colleges is a principal

source of strength in our national defense program. The Army, which pioneered the offering of military courses in our educational institutions, now provides training in 190 schools. The Navy has 52 such units. The Air Force has 127. More than 200,000 men are taking part in these programs, and out of that number we expect to get 16,000 new junior officers for the civilian components and the regular forces during the current year.

The quality of the men taking ROTC has been uniformly good, but the opportunities offered by the three services have not been uniform. It has generally been accepted that the naval ROTC student has enjoyed certain advantages that the other services were unable to offer.

In the interest of the spirit of unification that now permeates all three services, and in fairness to our students who are taking the ROTC course in a wide variety of higher institutions, I have proposed, with the approval of the President, an ROTC program to the Congress, which in general would extend the rights and privileges now available in the Navy to the Army and Air Force as well, and to provide parity among all three services.

Equality of opportunity for all men in our armed forces, officers and enlisted, and without regard to race, creed, or color, is the established policy of the Department of Defense, and we are moving steadily toward the full realization of our American ideal. Moreover, we are striving in every way to make sure that we get the right man for the right job. Our program of research and development seeks not only new weapons of great potentiality, but improved techniques in the selection, assignment, and training of the human beings that make up our forces. Modern testing and selection processes which have been used effectively in industry are being applied now to the mobilization and assignment of manpower.

Interesting studies are being made of the character traits and abilities which make effective leaders. Leadership may seem like an abstract quality, but up to a point, at least, it is found to be measurable, and hence something which need not be left to chance or to hit-and-miss methods of promotion. This is an important consideration in a military organization whose officers are expected to be real leaders.

Capacity for leadership is what Pennsylvania Military College has tried to develop in you during the last 4 years. Now the time has come for you to have that capacity tested. Whether you have no one to command but yourself, or find yourself ultimately at the head of a great industry or a whole army, the simple virtues of the free man will serve you well. Respect the dignity of your fellow men. Be fair. Be just. Be tolerant. Be strong. Be compassionate. Be loyal. Apply to yourself the wisdom of Plato, the great Greek philosopher, who held that man acts well only when he uses his mind and his spirit to regulate the turbulence of his senses and his desires and thus maintain personal moderation and political justice. Perhaps the best advice of all is the prophet Micah's: "To do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God."

This is good advice to nations as well as to men, and humanity should rejoice that the United States, decreed by destiny for leadership at this crucial time, is walking along that righteous path, which ultimately will bring the world to the full realization of freedom, peace, and prosperity. There are still bends in the road and dangerous obstacles ahead, but ours is the road of hope. Along that march there is a definite place for the class of 1950, and I know you will take your post with courage and with determination.

"Be strong and of a good courage. Fear not nor be afraid of them."

The bastions of 1950 are in front of you. I am confident you will take them in your stride—with great credit to yourselves and to our country.

Repeal of Contract Settlement Act of 1944

REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR WINSTEAD

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, in 1944, when the Contract Settlement Act was being considered in the House, it was my belief then, and I so stated on the floor of the House, that we were making a mistake to pass the bill as it finally became law. This bill took the Comptroller General out of consideration of contract settlements except in cases of fraud. He was, however, permitted to check to see if the totals balanced. At that time it was my belief that we certainly should have an audit of the settlement of war contracts.

During the war, when it was necessary to do everything possible to win the war and protect the lives of our boys on the battlefields, all of us were willing to do whatever was necessary to speed up production of armaments. At the time the Contract Settlement Act was enacted, billions of dollars worth of contracts were to be canceled and settlement made. Those who favored the present law argued at that time that it was essential that the contracts be settled immediately so that these wartime contractors could go into peacetime production, and it was on that basis that the Congress passed the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, which I opposed. The bill reported by my committee, and which I supported, made provisions for rapid settlement of war contracts and at the same time gave the Comptroller General the right to audit these contracts before final settlement was made.

I have introduced a bill to repeal the Contract Settlement Act, which I realize will come too late to recover much of the money that has been wasted as a result of the 1944 act. In 1944 I subscribed to the views of the Comptroller General and only recently he has brought out a report which shows a correctness of such views. I joined with the Comptroller General in pointing out that examples of extreme generosity with Federal funds, as well as fraud and collusion, must be expected, and in fact would be encouraged if it were openly advertised by law that there would be little, if any, chance of detecting overpayment after final termination settlement of contracts. But notwithstanding these facts, and other good and sufficient reasons expressed by the Comptroller General on numerous occasions showing a prior independent audit of settlements, showing to be both essential and practical, under the circumstances, the act was passed and left little independent audit by the Comptroller General. In complete disregard for the safeguards recommended by the Comptroller General, Congress passed this law authorizing the contracting agent, without prior independent audit by any other Government agency, to effect settlement of their terminated contracts. These settlements, in absence of disclosure of fraud, were made final and conclusive on the parties and could be reopened only by mutual consent. The audit functions of the General Accounting Office with respect to any such settlements were confined to that of conducting meaningless and ineffective examination thereof for the purpose of determining, after final settlement of termination claims by the contracting agencies, first, whether the payment to the war contractor was in accordance with the settlement agreement and second, whether the records transmitted to the General Accounting Office or other information warranted a reasonable belief that a settlement was induced by fraud. As I stated, and as the Comptroller General has pointed out, exclusion of recommended safeguards resulted solely from an apparent honest belief, however erroneous, that speed in settlement was paramount regardless of the cost to the Government. To insure successful prosecution of the war and to prevent economic chaos upon mass termination of war contracts at the end of hostilities, it was the view of the Comptroller General, and many of us on the Committee, that speed in effecting the settlements, while admittedly important, should be consistent with, and not to the exclusion of, proper safeguards against payments in excess of those properly due. On many occasions, those of us opposed to this act suggested that we could pay to war contractors a large percentage of the amount due so that they could convert to peacetime production. I believed, however, that by the Comptroller General's audit of these contracts we could save the Government literally billions of dollars. This fact is borne out by the Comptroller General's report which shows that as of April 30, 1950, they had examined 9,239 termination settlements covering payments to 2,836 contractors for the termination of 25,566 contracts, subcontracts or purchase orders. A careful examination of the evidence disclosed has afforded convincing evidence that, excluding indicated overpayments in such settlements due among other things, to error or carelessness—at least 549 of the settlements, or more than 5 percent of those examined, involving improper payments in excess of $20,900,000 were induced by fraud. These cases either have been, or are in the process of being, certified to the Justice Department. The other 95 percent, where no proof of fraud is apparent, all would indicate to have a strong possibility of at least excessive or improper payments. According to the Comptroller General's report more than 1 out of every 20 settlements examined were induced by fraud. Such a ratio, according to the Comptroller General, is unparalleled and unprecedented in the experience of the General Accounting Office. As he states, it can only be taken as overwhelming proof of the vast and unnecessary damage where the representatives of contracting agencies were authorized to audit themselves and pump out of the Treasury such amounts as they approved. I have pointed out under this Contract Settlement Act of 1944, the Comptroller General was virtually limited to cases where there was proof of

fraud. Yet in the examination, according to his recent report, of contract settlement investigations for fraud they have unearthed many instances of excessive, improper payments which cannot be said with certainty to have been induced by fraud. It was my argument when this act was being considered previously, and it is my belief now, that certainly we should have left open the chance to recover these millions and millions of dollars for the Federal Treasury. Whether or not such payments were induced by fraud, whether by honest mistake or whether by fraud with little evidence of fraud, these overpayments constituted no less a drain on the public purse and no less a hole in the pocketbook of the taxpayer, whether by actual fraud or by other reasons. The act of 1944, the so-called Contract Settlement Act, made General Accounting Office powerless to prevent or correct, or in the absence of fraud, even question excessive payments in termination settlements. No audit thereof was conducted for the express purpose of detecting overpayments. This added waste and extravagance was revealed only as incident to and as a byproduct of the examination of selected settlements for the authorized purpose of ascertaining whether fraud was involved. According to the recent report of the Comptroller General, out of a total of 9,239 settlements examined, overpayments were found in 1 out of every 13 settlements examined. This does not include other settlements as to which the auditors of the General Accounting Office have reported further overpayments but which have not yet been carefully reviewed and checked.

Mr. Speaker, I can only quote from the Comptroller General as follows:

> The sad story of operations under the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 is vividly shown by cold statistics. The contracting agencies have settled a total of 323,933 contracts. The General Accounting Office has examined 9,239 settlements covering 26,566 of these terminated contracts. Such examinations have disclosed apparently excessive or fraudulent payments to war contractors in connection with approximately 1,233 settlements, more than one out of seven examined, with an indicated loss to the Government exceeding $25,000,000.

If the same situation exists on the great number of contracts which they have not examined, the total amount of money can well be in the hundreds of millions of dollars. As I have stated, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to repeal the Contract Settlement Act. At this late date the repeal of this act cannot recapture much of the money which has been paid without being earned. I have offered, however, this bill because at the present time there is some basis for belief that some of the agencies of Government wish to have this Contract Settlement Act carried on into peacetime operation. Certainly we should profit by experience. While I, and other members of our committee at the time the Settlement Act was up in 1944, took the position then that it was absolutely essential to make an audit of these wartime expenditures of billions and billions of dollars, and while Congress took the other view and passed the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, and while subsequent events have proved the correctness of our view, certainly those who helped pass this act, which has cost us so much money, should join now to repeal the act in order that those who may wish to carry on such practices in peacetime would cease in their efforts to bring about the passage of an act which would give to the contracting agencies the right to audit their own affairs. I do not by this mean to make a broad indictment of the agencies of Government, but certainly if it is worth while in private business to have an independent audit, surely with the great multitude of operations on the part of the Government and its agencies, we should fully utilize the Comptroller General of the United States, whose office is an arm of the Congress and whose function is to make private and independent audits of operations of the various agencies. Certainly, the operations under the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 have proven the wisdom of having such an office as the General Accounting Office and there can be no excuse not to fully utilize it. I am going to urge the committee to hold early hearings on the bill which I have introduced. As Mr. Warren, the Comptroller General, concludes his report:

> By the repeal of the act the Congress has the opportunity of showing its determination that this and like prolific sources of waste be weeded out and destroyed. By this action, the Congress can show its resolute opposition to legislation which in recent years has had the effect of removing and circumventing the financial controls and checks of the legislative branch of the Government. By it, the Congress can serve notice that any proposed legislation which encroaches on its authority—either by making actions of the spending agencies with regard to financial matters final and conclusive, or by curtailing independent audit and control powers, will be soundly defeated. If such is the result, my criticism of the Contract Settlement Act and my reports on operations thereunder will not have been in vain.

Mr. Speaker, as I have stated, I and other members of our committee subscribed to this view at the time the 1944 act was passed. We believed then, and we believe now, that certainly the Comptroller General should have been permitted to have audited every contract which was settled. But, as I have pointed out, the act was passed. Now we should at least profit by our mistakes, repeal the act and get back to proper operation in government and, as Mr. Warren has said, and I firmly believe, by so doing we will prevent other agencies from coming in and trying to get the same type of control and we will say to the American people that we are going to see to it that the public business is run in a proper way and that payments out of the Public Treasury will be made on a correct and honest basis. We are not only going to try to prevent payments by fraud, but by overzealousness and overliberality and by negligence. We owe it to the people to repeal the Contract Settlement Act of 1944.

Hysteria of the Hisslings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the following article from the May 13 issue of the New Leader:

THE HYSTERIA OF THE HISSLINGS—A CASE OF POLITICAL NEUROSIS

(By Norbert Muhlen)

Memories of public life are notoriously short. Political events not personally experienced are scanned in today's papers, and forgotten by the time tomorrow's hit the streets.

Thus many people believe that rowdy congressional investigations are a new invention, a vicious weapon of the cold war. But congressional investigations have been ferreting out undue, illegal, and sometimes criminal group influences on the life and liberty of the Republic for more than three decades.

From 1909 to 1937, the suspicion that big money corrupted national politics led to at least a dozen such investigations of business leaders—from the Puqo Committee To Investigate the Concentration of Money and Credit through Teapot Dome to the Special Committee To Investigate the Munitions Industry (of which Alger Hiss was counsel).

These probes were frankly partisan affairs; for the most part, the Democratic and Bull Moose legislators were out to prove wrongdoings in the Republican administration. The investigating Congressmen and legislators were exempt from libel, and fortunately so. Otherwise they could not have financially withstood the interests they attacked. The fiery accusations and the cheap oratory that went with them often overshot their mark. At the time, they certainly seemed to do great harm to business, if not to the community at large. Often grave charges were leveled at innocents and reputations were smeared. But, as we can see today, all the noise did not harm the innocent victims, one of whom was Bernard Baruch.

These partisan investigations publicly aired every shred of suspicion, every conceivable bit of evidence. They led to several court convictions; a few financiers and high Government officials were sent to prison. New laws were drafted which forestalled repetition of the scandals; and the social climate, as well as the economic intercourse of the country, was revitalized in a cleaner and healthier way.

In recent years, the attention of congressional committees has been directed toward the infiltration and misuse of government by giant dictatorship rather than by big business. With the battle being run along partisan lines, its tough fighting has unfortunately sometimes clouded the Communist issue itself, which is equally vital for both parties. But the most abused of congressional committees unearthed the treason of Alger Hiss, whose guilt was finally confirmed by a court. And while that committee and other committees did attack presumably innocent people, those people received every opportunity to defend themselves publicly in the press and even in the committee rooms.

The investigation is directed against two groups of fraudulent Communist helpmates in government—first, the agents who are unfit according to law; and second, the fellow-travelers and dupes who seem unfit, according to common sense (for a while at least), to hold positions of political trust. The pres-

ent probe has followed the course which the prewar investigations of fraudulent big money had healthily taken. Although such investigations start rather late, are sometimes handled in unskilled, silly, and worthless ways, and have a lot of regrettable accompaniments, yet few Americans can have any quarrel with their main purpose and effect: To keep this country from being turned into a concentration camp, and to save freedom from being submerged by fear.

What is amazing is the extent to which many well-meaning non-Communists give emotional support to those suspected of Communist collaboration—and even to those who have been found guilty of high crimes. To the same extent, we find widespread hostility against the men, media, congressional committees, and courts of law who have been prosecuting those Communist collaborators. The passionate sympathy shown in some quarters for Alger Hiss is the perfect illustration of this attitude.

The excess of tears shed by some people for Mr. Hiss is sometimes explained as genuine charity for a sinner's tragic self-destruction. But why, then, do the same people exhibit such frantic hatred of the confessing and repentant sinner, Whittaker Chambers? A look at the Hiss partisans and Chambers-haters is most revealing. To explain the motives of the majority of Hiss's defenders, let us examine the argument heard most often in his defense. "Hiss," say his sympathizers, "has done only what was very decent and patriotic while he did it—he believed in friendship with the Soviets, just like everybody did at the time." Except for the fact that his special usefulness to the Russians led him to a friendship considerably closer than that of the average sympathizer, it is undeniable that Hiss played with communism when playing with communism was most fashionable, from the Ambassador down to the last little analyst. And for precisely this reason, the vast mass of former sympathizers and ex-fellow travelers identify themselves—subconsciously at least—with Alger Hiss.

But the conflicts and confusions which turned them into fellow travelers originally are still at work—inside them, now, when they have ceased being full-fledged fellow travelers. They have not yet solved their constant wavering between moral ends and immoral means. Because they believed in American democracy as well as in Communist comradeship, they still hold a muddled allegiance to a number of contradictory ideas. Their loyalty to America provokes their bad conscience, because of their past and, to some extent, present allegiance to ideas of the united front and wartime alliance. Identifying themselves with Alger Hiss, they feel that the public judgment on his guilt is a judgment on their own past guilt.

But they are unable to frankly admit their guilt as a thing of the past, which they have got over with and regret. Since, on the other hand, they have moved too far from procommunism to still proudly defend treason, they remain in an emotional quandary.

Chambers was able to do what these former sympathizers could not do. He finally and completely broke with his aberrations. He found a home in a new security. This was enough for the ex-fellow travelers. Having identified part of their selves with Mr. Hiss, they identified the other part with Mr. Chambers, and directed all their resistance against him. This is the psychological mechanism of exteriorizing transference and ensuing aggression, a mechanism which delivered the former sympathizers from their predicament. They could now hate the man who made a clean breast of his guilt—which was their guilt. And they would defend the man who was publicly convicted of his past doings—which were their doings.

There are two archetypes of the former fellow traveler of 1950. There is Mrs. Bleeding-Heart who, in the 1930's, joined so many committees for good causes whether they were run by and for Communists or not. Then there was Dr. Win-the-War, in the 1940's, who deliberately repressed his resistance to, and even courted, communism, while the strange alliance between the Babbitt and the Bolshevik lasted. These two are still articulate figures on the American scene when it comes to the defense of the past as an issue of the present. In the conflict between their new anticommunism and their past procommunism, they must, as the psychological textbook predicts, have recourse to rationalizations to defend their contradictory and irrational views.

Few people have the strength to revise their past opinions, even if they directly contradict their present views. So we hear again the old united-front and wartime-alliance slogans, in lusty discord with the present resistance-to-tyranny line. And these are fortified by ideas borrowed from the integral pacifists and civil libertarians (a group of watchdogs valiant and useful by themselves, though rather alien to the crowd of Hisslings). To defend the vestiges of procommunism in an anti-Communist society, the Hisslings rationalize that some procommunism—about as much as they themselves have practiced—must be part and parcel of our democracy. This, of course, is nonsense, but it helps political neurotics feel comfortable amid their conflicts and confusions. It also helps the Communist conspirators continue their present work.

Twisting their image of political reality until it fits into and confirms their conflicting political emotions, the Hisslings regard the investigation of suspects as a witch-hunt, the prosecution of legally indicted suspects as the persecution of innocent heretics. The guilt of the conspirators for slavery disappears in their minds behind the personal (and therefore incidental) depravity of a few anti-Communists, and the defamation of character and motives of all anti-Communists. The partisan investigation is transformed in their minds into nothing but a free-for-all between two parties for their own sake. In the end, they are completely able to forget that this country is defending itself—so far with restraint—against the agents of the concentration-camp state.

To repress the facts which would make a shambles of their carefully constructed defense mechanism, they have been supplied (from Communist Party sources) with a magic word. This word marvelously does away with all irritating insights. The word is "hysteria." Whatever is done in defense against the Communists is hysteria. When a New York teacher who lied about her Communist past is fired, the Hisslings call it persecution of free inquiry. When an applicant for a job with the supersecret Central Intelligence Agency is turned down for unknown reasons, the banal happening is described in a series of pitiful and insinuating articles designed to make the reader indignant over the injustice done his fellow man (as if every non-Communist had a right to be employed as a spy, and as if it were hysteria to pick the best man). A few isolated incidents like these are all the Hisslings need to prate noisily about hysteria in the United States.

Equally repressed in the minds of the Hisslings is the fact that the Communists—by their very doctrine—have to try desperately to get footholds everywhere including the camp of the enemy, including anti-Communists if you will. There is sufficient proof that they have succeeded here in this effort. The great amount of pro-Soviet propaganda appearing in conservative and even reactionary newspapers and magazines is ample evidence of this fact. Even Alger Hiss, let it be remembered, never joined a front organization or publicly extolled the Politburo. The investigation of Communist auxiliaries becomes hysterical only if one disregards this fact, and the facts of the planned Soviet aggression (as the Hisslings and their mentors try to do).

At its summit, the fellow-traveling propaganda for American submission to Moscow had taken in almost a third of our population. Given the tremendous turn-over of sympathizers with Communist aims over the last 20 years, almost one out of two Americans may at one time or another have been caught to some degree in the Communist web of lies. While many of them have completely recovered from their one-time mistakes, quite a few others still cling to the petrified ideas of their past, feel guilty about their conflict, and try to save their conscience by a relapse into new delusions. Just as they once clamored for Moscow triumphs leading to Yalta and Potsdam, they now clamor for the rights and privileges of the Communists to conspire in our midst without being hindered by investigations and eventual prosecutions. If they had their way, the consequences of their own present hysteria might be as grave as the consequences of their past delusions are today.

The Hisslings are always ready to yell hysterically about hysteria, and to rally behind any argument, man, or movement which obstructs the weeding out of Communist agents and influences on our politics. For their own delusions, dreams, and areas of ignorance concerning world communism, as well as present American reality, have not yet been weeded out.

The Cold War and the Vocation of Scholarship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Cold War and the Vocation of Scholarship," delivered by me at the commencement exercises of the University of Bridgeport on May 31, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COLD WAR AND THE VOCATION OF SCHOLARSHIP

I know I am expected to deliver a commencement speech, but I am not entirely sure to whom I should address these words. Ordinarily, my assignment would be clear enough—a series of remarks, preferably inspirational, directed at the graduating seniors.

Today, however, a commencement address could be directed as properly to the faculty and corporation of this great new University of Bridgeport, for it, no less than this graduating class, is at the start of its journey.

Unless things have changed since the time I was in college, I suppose that those of you about to receive your diplomas are bracing yourself for the inevitable moment when I say "I envy you graduating seniors." Well, I won't disappoint you. I do envy you—and I make no apologies for saying this.

I think I envy you—and I mean both this university and those now graduating—I envy you chiefly because your talents and energies are as yet uncommitted. You are not burdened by past sins of fault or default. Open

before you is a whole range of possibilities for action. For a fleeting moment, at least, you may survey the prospect before you, linger on the brink of self-commitment, and experience the pleasures of choice, relatively unhampered by past errors or present burdens. This, I assure you, is a luxury that you cannot enjoy for long.

Very soon you will make some commitment to the world—and heaven knows the world has urgent need for whatever you give it.

It is your fortune or misfortune—and I personally am certain it is your fortune—to start your journey at a time when both your personal destination and the destination of the entire human race were never more uncertain.

Of course, I appreciate that every generation tends to exaggerate its historical importance. In the deep and troubled apprehensions of today, there is nothing very new. We can easily find parallels for these forebodings in earlier periods. What is new about our time are the facts that give birth to our fears—these facts are ominously unique and real. This time, there is a wolf.

The overwhelming fact of our time is, of course, the atomic armaments race. Four years of incessant trying on our part—and on the part of all the free world—have failed to make the Soviet Union accept the just and effective international control plan that would mark the end of atomic armaments and the beginning of an era made immeasurably rich by the peacetime uses of this elemental new force. But it is not only in the arms race that we experience the brooding and omnipresent sense of danger that marks today's world. It takes tangible shape in tyranny's forward march in the Far East. We see it in the social cleavages and spiritual uncertainty of western Europe. We cannot even escape these harsh facts by seeking the consolations of philosophy. Our contemporary philosophers give us no refuge; they eloquently record the crisis of our time. Nor can we find comfort in our contemporary literature; our writers serve as sensitive barometers of the storm currents.

None of this makes me want to pity you. Even if this is a time of troubles, there is something bracing and majestic about these days. There is nothing petty or mean about the dilemmas we face. Queen Elizabeth and her adventurous subjects, I imagine, would have felt at home in this era, and Shakespeare—with his sure instinct for greatness—would have recognized these years for what they are.

"He that outlives this day, and comes safe home, will stand a tip-toe when this day is named * * *"

Even if Einstein's physics could make time turn 'round in an obedient circle and bring back some less demanding epoch, I doubt if any of you would welcome the change. I am confident, for instance, that none of you would switch places with the men and women who graduated in 1920. That year ushered in the decade when far too many novelists and publicists applied their talents to proving that life was a fraud and decency a sham. They demonstrated to their own satisfaction that integrity was a carry-over from some less emancipated time, that reverence was old-fashioned, that so-called intellectual honesty somehow took precedence over social honesty. They received from life—these spokesmen of the lost generation that finally found itself—very much what they put into it. They began by seeing through church and country and family—and ended up by seeing through themselves. It was as spokesman for that generation that T. S. Eliot said:

"This is the way the world ends, the world
ends, the world ends,
Not with bang but a whimper."

On this point, at any rate, there will be little argument. If our world ends, it will most emphatically be with a bang. It's a good time to be alive—if we can stay alive. Or, even more important, it's a good time to be alive, if we can preserve the things that make life worth living.

We are naturally interested in much more than the preservation of our physical selves. We want peace, but peace with justice and not peace purchased at the price of abject appeasement. We want our lives, but also those freedoms and dignities and gladly shouldered obligations that alone make life worth living.

Statesmanship, in other words, must have a dual goal—to prevent our physical extinction and to prevent the extinction of those liberties that make up our political and spiritual heritage. Unless we can somehow bring the armaments race to a halt, I must say in all honesty that I fear more and more abridgments of our freedoms. I make this prophecy with the profoundest regret; all my instincts toward freedom make me hope I am wrong. Yet, with the centralization, regimentation, and surveillance that threaten to become part of the cost of trying to avert an atomic or hydrogen Pearl Harbor, how shall we preserve intact our open society? How can we compete indefinitely with a police state without our own Nation being forced at the same time toward garrison existence?

No group has a deeper concern with this question than the guild of scholars. I speak not only of the universities and their staffs—the teachers, the research workers. I have in mind a far larger community—the fellowship of all those to whom free inquiry and truth-seeking and untrammeled speculation are as precious as life itself.

The more we are pressured to imitate our totalitarian rival the further do we move from the environment in which free inquiry flourishes.

Hence, even if they had no obligations to society in general, all those who seek after truth have the most practical kind of reasons for helping avert the evil prospect I have been describing. If we are realistic, I think we must admit there is only one way to keep our open society, and that is by halting the armaments race. It is not a few near-sighted or callous men who will subvert our freedoms; it is the relentless logic of a world of uncontrolled weapons of mass destruction—a logic that may demand more and more total and constant mobilization as the price of survival.

I admit that the great task of achieving a secure and just peace appears monstrously difficult, and I halfway understand when I see a few—a very few—members of our intellectual community tempted to throw in the sponge when they face up to the magnitude and stubborn nature of our international political problems. What has been described as a "failure of nerve" on the part of some of our university people takes various forms. It asserts itself, for example, in the doctrine of "This is not my responsibility." Those subscribing to such a view may say, "The Government got us into this mess; the Government must get us out."

I certainly am not here to assign responsibility for the fix we are in. If I were to try this, I would find the culprits, not in our own Government but in the Kremlin. But whoever it was that opened the seacocks, the fact remains that all of us are in the boat together and that the deep will claim everyone unless something is done. Just as atomic weapons recognize no frontiers, so also are they unimpressed by academic credentials. Diplomas are not warrants of immunity; keys of honorary societies are not shields against radioactive emissions.

Whether general catastrophe will be averted depends overwhelmingly on the conduct of our universities and the graduates they annually send forth to enrich our society. It was a philosopher who said that the vocation of scholarship bears the same relation to mankind as the cambium bears to a tree. The cambium, you may recall, is the fragile row of cells on which the tree's well-being depends. So long as it flourishes, so long as it is spared nature's or man's ravages, the tree will survive the greatest tribulations. Break the delicate tissue, and the tree withers and ultimately dies. It is the same with society. The university is our culture bearer. Preserve it, maintain its vigor, and the line of cultural continuity continues unbroken. Destroy the university, or let it falter in its great mission, and our society perishes.

You will not mistake my meaning. You will realize that I am not proposing to have our universities become little more than West Points in the cold war. Such a suggestion would smack of the totalitarian's attitude toward scholarship. It is police states that view knowledge solely in an instrumental sense, which see in universities only barracks for training soldiers for the further glory of the all-powerful state.

Unless we are speaking in the ultimate sense of its being used to attest to God and His works, the pursuit of knowledge is an end in itself and needs no further justification. It will be truly a disastrous day when all learning must pass the test of political usefulness.

But our intellectual leaders have always vividly recognized that freedom of inquiry is in no way related to social irresponsibility. When our Nation has been in need of their talents, the people of our universities have not hesitated an instant to make their great contributions to the common cause.

As our enemies learned to their chagrin in World War II, when the chips are down, when the free world is in trouble, the so-called impractical scholars become practical indeed.

Today, the free world is in trouble, and with the guarding of our democratic Nation more and more dependent on brain-power and less and less on brawn-power, there is need for our university people to examine their consciences and to ask themselves how they can best contribute to the defense of peace and liberty. Some are needed directly and right now on the firing line of the cold war—in our atomic-energy project, in our Defense Establishment, in our diplomatic jobs.

But of course the particular skills of most of you will argue for a less direct contribution to this general cause. Do not think, however, that your role will be less important for being indirect. Naturally, our national strength rests in great measure on the skills and diligence of our soldiers, our scientists, and our statesmen. In the ultimate sense, however, our future depends on our moral and spiritual strength. It depends on the vigor of our liberal institutions. It rests above all on the righteousness of the principles to which we pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

Hiram R. Gale, Last Surviving Member of the Grand Army of the Republic in the State of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written to me, dated May 16, 1950, from my American Legion Post in my home city of Seattle relating to the suggested name of Hiram R. Gale for the veterans' hospital. Hiram R. Gale is a distinguished citizen of my city, a former national Commander in Chief of the GAR, who has served not only his country, but our community for many years.

I have in my hands a pamphlet dealing with this distinguished citizen, which includes a poem written to him on his one hundredth birthday anniversary, and also includes an article by Mr. Gale himself entitled "What 99 Years of Life Has Taught an Old Vermonter."

I ask unanimous consent that these matters may be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF WASHINGTON,
Seattle, Wash., May 16, 1950.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In reference to your letter of May 8 I am attaching information pertaining to Hiram R. Gale.

We appreciate very much your taking care of this and if there is anything further we might do, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

FRED M. FUECKER,
Department Adjutant.

HIRAM R. GALE

Hiram R. Gale was born in Waterbury, Vt., November 8, 1846. In 1861, with his widowed mother he went to Galesville, Wis., where he attended Gale College—both town and college were established by Judge George Gale, brother of Hiram's father. During his stay in Galesville, Hiram also learned the printing and publishing business in the office of the Galesville Transcript.

On January 25, 1865, at the age of 18 years, Hiram enlisted in Company K, Forty-sixth Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and served, with the rank of corporal, until the close of the war. He served much of this time as clerk of the military court at Huntsville, Ala. Appointed to that position by Gen. Gordon Granger. Hiram's duty under arms was in patroling a certain distance along the railway and guarding the railway bridge that crossed the Tennessee River near Muscle Shoals, where he was under fire by Confederate snipers.

Returning to Galesville, after the war, he bought a half interest in the Galesville Transcript, which he sold out after about 5 years. He then taught two terms in Trempleau County schools. On August 10, 1871, he married Laura Ann Perkins, a fellow teacher. In 1873 he went to St. Paul Minn., where he worked 2 years on the Pioneer Press. In 1875 he bought the Republican Gazette, in Willmar, Minn., which he published for 12 years.

He visited Washington in 1887 and returned in 1889 to make his home permanently in this State. Laura Ann, his wife, had died in Willmar in 1879, leaving four young children, three of whom are still living. His second wife, the former Ida Rose Brown, accompanied him west in 1899. Locating at Allyn, Wash., Hiram was interested in platting the townsite and in publishing the Allyn Times.

In 1901, in company with his two sons, Charles and Edgar, Hiram established the Bremerton News, which he published for 20 years. During 1920 he entered the real-estate business in Seattle, and, also, for a few years published the Chief Seattle Tillicum, a commercial paper. His wife, Ida Rose, died in 1921. At the age of 100, the year 1946, Hiram retired from active participation in business.

Hiram R. Gale served as commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic in 1945–46. He served as commander of the Washington-Alaska department of the GAR in 1914–15 when there were 15,000 Civil War veterans in the State of Washington. Again in 1942, he was elected department commander, and has served in this capacity since, and will continue to do so the remainder of his life, being the only remaining Civil War veteran in the State and Alaska. He has served in almost every office of the GAR, both nationally and in this department.

During the past 40 years or more, Commander Gale has devoted almost his entire time to patriotic work and civic betterment. He has written many columns in his newspapers directed to the younger generation as well as addressing them in the public schools. During his hundredth year he addressed over 60 civic and patriotic meetings, including veterans in hospitals.

SOUVENIR PROGRAM—HIRAM R. GALE MEMORIAL

(Dedication of Medallion at Field Artillery Armory, Harrison Street between Third Avenue, North and Nob Hill, Seattle, Wash., 2:30 p. m., Sunday, May 30, 1948)

WHAT NINETY-NINE YEARS OF LIFE HAS TAUGHT A VERMONTER

(By Hiram Randall Gale, National Commander in Chief Grand Army of the Republic)

My philosophy of life has not materially changed since I reached maturity. The number of your true worth-while friends is a gauge as to whether or not you have the right attitude toward upright living; I have many friends of sterling worth. Therefore, having robust health, I enjoy life to its fullest as I always have, and I believe the older I become, the more inspiration I may be to others. I have never placed any value on wealth, a modest fortune and a reasonable competence makes for a happier and more useful life. I have no quarrel with those of other religious and political belief. I grant to anyone the right to shades of moral standard that differ from my own, except to hold my sincere friendship they must be strictly honest and ethical in their business dealings and in their contact with their fellow beings. We all have shortcomings; we should be lenient, knowing that others have faults that we do not have and we have faults, much worse perhaps, of which they are not guilty.

In accomplishments, for a worthy cause, and for the general welfare of our people, is the greatest satisfaction in life.

GLORY, GLORY, HALLELUJAH

(Words by Frances M. Haskell, past national president, ladies of the GAR)

Our eyes have seen the noble deeds
Commander Gale has done.
He fought to save our Union
And we love him, every one.
He faced the guns and cannon.
Oh he had them on the run,
For he was marching on.

Chorus

Glory, glory, hallelujah,
Hiram Gale, we glad we knew yuh.
And we take our hats off to yuh,
For you are marching on.

The following information about Louise Augustin, the 10-year-old girl who will unveil the medallion, has been obtained from her grandfather, Clinton S. Harley:

Louise Augustin is the great-great-granddaughter of Col. Soloman Peck Smith, who was with the One Hundred and Fifteenth Regiment of New York Volunteers, the famous Iron Hearted. Colonel Smith lost an arm in the war. He was chaplain of the Washington department of the GAR until his death in 1919.

Hiram R. Gale memorial committee: Reeves Aylmore, chairman; Wilbur W. Scruby, depository; Victor Zednick; Clinton S. Harley; Dr. Richard E. Fuller; Stephen F. Chadwick; Milton Dix.

PROGRAM

Reeves Aylmore.....Master of ceremonies
Bugle call (General's Splashes)...Hal Smith
Official bugler, GAR, Department of Washington and Alaska
Prayer.....Rev. W. A. Driver
The Star-Spangled Banner.....Theo Karle
Unveiling.....Louise Augustin
Solo (Old Soldiers Never Die)
Mrs. Edgar L. Gale
Introduction of James A. Wehn, sculptor.
Introduction of speaker.
Presentation.....Victor Zednick
Introduction of Hiram R. Gale.
Solo (The Sunshine of Your Smile)
Mrs. Edgar L. Gale
Song (Glory, Glory, Hallelujah)...Audience
Bugle call (Retreat).....Hal Smith

TO HIRAM GALE ON HIS ONE HUNDREDTH BIRTHDAY

A hundred years is but a day
In history, the poets say,
But what a day your years have been
Since first you came upon the scene.
Your century has seen more change
Than down through former aeons range;
From ox-drawn carts to streamlined trains,
Automobiles and giant planes;
From candles to the neon light;
From musket to the atom's might;
From wooden ships to hulls of steel,
Those huge leviathans that reel
Across the seven seas and bear
Their crews and cargoes everywhere.

Your youth was spent in simple joys,
The sports of happy girls and boys;
No picture shows or radio,
No soda founts to take your "dough,"
No regimented work or play,
No quarreling over 8-hour day,
No strikes or pickets in the way,
No price control or OPA.
Yet as you gaze back o'er the years
You see your share of smiles and tears;
The crash of wars, the din of peace,
As nations strive and men increase.
The banner that you fought to save
Still flies above the free and brave.

So your centennial, today,
We know still finds you bright and gay;
Your second century you start
With stalwart and courageous heart.

(From your long-time friend, Harold Otho Stone.)

Power From Peat Eases Eire Industrial Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED MARSHALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House a United Press dispatch published in a Trinidad, Colo., newspaper on May 30, 1950, announcing the mass generation of electric power from peat fuel in Ireland.

On several occasions I have attempted to impress upon the Members of Con-

gress the importance of research to more adequately develop our own great peat resources. The operation of this plant and the construction of others again indicates the advances which have been made in other countries and again stresses the importance of a sound peat development program in the United States:

POWER FROM PEAT EASES EIRE INDUSTRIAL PROBLEM

DUBLIN.—Irish engineers have seen the realization of a 30-year dream—the mass generation of electric power from peat, low-grade fuel of Ireland's prehistoric clans.

The occasion was the opening of a giant peat-fired generating plant at Portarlington, some 50 miles south of the capital. Huge presses rush the primitive fuel a million years nearer to being coal in the space of a few minutes, before it is fed into furnaces to drive electric generators.

The plant, opened by Ireland's minister of industry and commerce, Daniel Morrissey, will produce an additional 90,000,000 units of electricity annually for the nation's fast-growing industries. Two other plants are being built.

The peat-electricity process, revolutionary in this country, was the brain child of Sir John Purser Griffith, who, early this century, conceived the idea of putting the nation's primitive fuel to profitable use.

USELESS PEAT RECLAIMED

In dozens of bogs throughout Ireland, millions of tons of peat, or turf as it is known here, have lain unworked and useless for centuries, forming black spots on the nation's agricultural and industrial maps.

The only time in modern history when the bogs have been worked to any extent was during the war, when coal supplies from abroad were cut off and the nation was forced to turn to peat.

The new plants will consume upward of 1,000,000 tons of peat annually, giving a return in the neighborhood of 250,000,000 kilowatts a year.

Inaugurating the plant's official operation, Morrissey said the scheme marked an important milestone on the road to national economic recovery, and would serve a threefold purpose:

1. The winning of the one million tons of turf required each year would provide a living for thousands of persons. It thus would make a significant contribution toward easing the problems of emigration and employment.

2. Working the bogs would provide, in a generation, thousands of acres of land for agriculture or forestry which would otherwise never be brought to fertility.

3. Morrissey said he hoped the expansion of electricity would contribute toward the decentralization of industry. The availability of industrial power in the remotest parts of the country at prices as cheap as in Dublin would remove one of the major obstacles to inland provincial towns.

Curtailment of Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THURMAN C. CROOK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of June 9, 1950:

ECONOMY CUT-BACK IN MAIL SERVICE HAMPERS MANY SMALL CONCERNS—ORDERS ARRIVE LATE, SOME LOSE TRACK OF SALESMEN—THE MORNING MAIL AT NOON—OUTLYING FIRMS HARDEST HIT

A good many businesses, especially small ones, are handicapped by Postmaster General Donaldson's economy cut-back in mail service.

Orders and checks come limping in, days late, they complain. For some, the morning mail arrives around noon. Meantime, their customers at the other end of the mailman's route scream about poor service. And when the harried businessman complains to the post office folks, he may not get anything more than sympathy and a "Go write your Congressman."

A bill to rescind the Post Office Department's cuts in mail service was approved yesterday by the House Post Office Committee. A similar measure has been approved by the Senate committee. They now await action in both Houses.

"We're having a tough time contacting our salesmen," reports the president of Williams, Brown & Earle, instrument makers in Philadelphia. "Air mail and special delivery is reaching us 1 to 3 days later than before the restrictions. So we lose contact with our men. It took me 2 days by phone recently to locate one man. When I did, it was too late to consummate the transaction."

LATE FOR THE SALE

In Boston, a mail advertising service figures one of its clients, a woman's speciality shop, lost $50,000 in sales because a big ad mailing got held up. The ads didn't reach customers until 2 days after the close of the sale they were advertising.

San Francisco's Chamber of Commerce was caught short when it mailed out a batch of invitations to its anniversary dinner and they weren't received until after the banquet.

The Show of the Month Club, which mails to theater-goers in New York City and thereabouts, reports some of its tickets have been held up until after the performance.

Occasionally the delays are fantastic. A public relations firm in downtown Cleveland reports it took 4 days for a first-class letter to reach a client in suburban Cleveland. Gilliam Service of Boston found it took one piece of third-class mail (circulars, folders, and the like) 2 weeks to come from the Back Bay post office two blocks away.

Many of the Nation's businesses, however, report they've had little or no trouble with late letters and poky packages. Most big companies pick up their own mail at the post office.

ONCE A DAY

Hardest hit are the smaller, outlying outfits in residential districts where the mailman only rings once these days—likely as not, late in the morning. As one of these, a Long Island dairy equipment maker, puts it, "We're at a tremendous disadvantage when our nonresidential competitors can offer faster service on orders."

These residential area firms are supposed to continue getting two deliveries a day if local postal officials think the character and volume of their mail warrants it. But even if they convince authorities they're big enough to rate this extra service, they'd still usually get their first mail later than midtown competitors, post-office men in New York say.

Firms lucky enough to be in the business areas will get two or three deliveries a day, but they'll have to wrestle with the other postal cut-backs—fewer pick-ups at mail boxes, shorter hours at post offices, less night work.

Though the cut-backs have been much publicized as bold economizing, Washington postal chiefs are surprisingly vague about the results. Mr. Donaldson at first estimated his plan would save $30,000,000. Officials say now that the inefficiencies which have cropped up will trim that figure considerably.

Take a look at the District of Columbia's own post office. Mail folks there calculated the new plan would save from $700,000 to $900,000 a year. After 2 weeks' operation, they figure they'll be lucky to save $500,000.

National post-office functionaries aren't any clearer about the manpower situation. They say they haven't any idea how many mailmen have been laid off so far.

For businessmen already plagued by tardy mail, perhaps the worst is yet to come. At least, an official of the National Association of Letter Carriers, which is interested in preserving its members' jobs, claims the restrictions are being "put in gradually" and that local postmasters who are cool to the scheme seem to be stalling. July 1 is the deadline for getting the new plan into effect.

In Detroit, the cut-back to one-a-day delivery has been put into effect in only 7 of the 30 residential areas so far.

Folks who live in some San Francisco suburbs complain that pickups from corner mail boxes now are spasmodic and some days mailmen don't bother to pick up the letters at all.

One San Francisco lady called the post office Wednesday to find out why she didn't receive any cards on her birthday. She was told the mail load was so heavy the carrier became too tired to finish his route.

To many businessmen the slower service means rearranging their working schedules.

In Pittsburgh, a spokesman for the Koppers Co. says executives in the habit of dealing with all their overnight mail the first thing each morning now have to put this task off an hour or two until all the mail is in.

"Our business day has been chopped 2 hours as far as mail work is concerned," says an executive of a big oil company headquartered in New York. Employees in his office must get all city-bound letters up to the mail department before 3 p. m. if they hope to get delivery the next day.

Cold War Gets Hot—Our Policies Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our diplomats have failed to stop the rush of communism throughout the world. Only in western Europe have they had a fair measure of success. In Asia they have appeased the Communists resulting in the fall of China. Now, southeast Asia is under severe pressure. The Acheson theory now is to bring to bear the power of our armed forces which is a confession of defeat; this move is one of last resort.

Mr. Speaker, Gen. Bonner Fellers, retired, has made a valuable contribution to the thinking on the subject of communism and the cold war. Writing in Human Events for June 7, he deals with the subject of strategy and recommends a program of attack, chiefly psychological, supported by the most efficient air

force in the world. As part of my remarks I am including General Feller's article:

ON COLD WAR

(By Bonner Fellers)

Secretary Dean Acheson's unveiling of his balanced collective defense plan, last week, ushers in a new phase of European military aid. In spite of Mr. Acheson's suave peace reassurances, the cold war is assuming many characteristics of a hot war, including actual shooting. The iron curtain is the line of battle. On either side contending powers amass military might. Red forces claim readiness to resist attack. The administration insists that the presence of our weapons will lift European morale and deter aggression. As the cold war moves unswervingly toward deeper American involvement, it is time to examine its symptoms in the hope of finding a cure.

Possibly our greatest authority on the philosophy of war is the Prussian general, Karl von Clausewitz. His three volumes, on war, completed in 1827, have long been the infallible guide for professional soldiers the world over. Von Clausewitz' maxim, "The war of a community—of whole nations—is a political act * * * the political view is the object, war is the means," is well known, but it is not—at least in the United States—as well heeded as it should be.

Our leaders have failed to realize that the old Prussian master was not a mere worshipper of force at all costs. He stressed two indispensable spiritual values in war—an intellect possessing traces of inner light, which lead to the truth, and then the courage to follow this faint light. Finally, his observations have particular pertinence to our present cold war, and his warnings, if heeded, might yet prevent the cold war from developing into a real hot war.

II

Our interminable cold war with Russia closely reflects von Clausewitz' doctrine: "As one side dictates the law to the other, there arises a sort of reciprocal action, which logically must lead to an extreme. This is the first reciprocal action."

Early in the cold war Russia dictated the law: We reacted by endeavoring to parry her blows. Stalin threatened western Europe with Communist domination; we responded with the Marshall plan—a multi-billion-dollar program. Our allies feared the Red army; we reacted with a military assistance program—our second multi-billion-dollar venture. This assistance constituted our first reciprocal action.

The passage of these programs set up in Russia what Von Clausewitz calls "a second reciprocal action. * * * As long as the enemy is not defeated, he may defeat me," and "dictate the law to me as I did to him."

Russia responded by—

1. Amassing military might in west Poland.

2. Increasing and strengthening her Baltic installations.

3. Converting 40 percent of her industry to tanks.

4. Shooting down an American plane over the Baltic.

These Russian measures constituted the second reciprocal action.

It might be said that a reading of Von Clausewitz would have foreshadowed America's next move to meet Russia's military gesture. "But * * * the adversary does the same; therefore there is a new mutual enhancement, which, in pure conception, must create a fresh effort toward an extreme. This is the third case of reciprocal action * * *."

Specifically, the United States moved to—

1. Step up our Air Force appropriation by $350,000,000.

2. Call for a 2-year extension of the draft.

3. Dispatch B–29's to England; suggest A-bombs for allies.

4. Promise increased European aid.

It is obvious that Russia is forcing our hand. Many observers have been uneasily recognizing that something is wrong with our strategy. In the New York Times (June 1), Cyrus Sulzberger writes that American moves "represent, to a large degree, reflex action to Kremlin probing in the various geographical areas." Now, Von Clausewitz says: "War is a political act * * * the political view is the object, war is the means."

What is the political object? It is officially to save Europe. But from a purely military view, Soviet Russia's force, poised on the edge of western Europe, is insuperable. It is well known that her 200 divisions could sweep to the Pyrenees in less than 60 days. In short, Stalin has won a round in the battle of cold strategy. In the words of Von Clausewitz, he has chosen the time and place we are to fight.

Moreover, recognition of this state of affairs has had a highly negative effect on war-weary western European peoples. They not only realize the futility of ground forces holding their frontier, they also have grasped the fact that actually there is no frontier to hold—that the vast blue dome of the sky above is Europe's only frontier so long as Stalin's 16,000 combat planes can operate unchallenged. Accordingly, a desperate hope persists that American Air Force units, capable of neutralizing the Red Air Force, may be based in Europe. An abiding fear haunts our European allies that unless this is done during peace, Russia would be able to terrorize western European powers into neutrality. With the atomic bomb as a threat, Stalin could issue an ultimatum that if our allies refuse to be neutral, he will take out their cities as his first act of war.

Since our war objective is to save western Europe, how can we ask our allies to fight, if fighting means certain and immediate destruction? In short, Stalin has put us in an untenable position.

III

This position looms even worse, as we view the picture through the lenses of a politico-military expert like von Clausewitz. The enslaved Russian masses are restless under their own military occupation and a unifying agency is urgently needed. American tanks on the Rhine provide Stalin with a visible symbol, proving to his people that we are determined to destroy their "people's republic." This is the very ingredient he needs to solidify his people.

Our faulty program is assisting Stalin in his determination to cause our economy to collapse. In spite of our economic resources and terrific war potential, the cost of the cold war is growing prohibitive because the decision to hold western Europe's frontier is unsound in principle. No amount of lavish spending and flawless execution can compensate for this tragically faulty strategy.

Secretary Acheson, in his talk to Congress last week, does not spell it out when he says we and our partners "each take our respective share of the common burden," but his real message is—we pay the bill.

Reliable estimates would place the total cost of the announced European military-aid program at some thirty-five to fifty billion dollars. European powers are able to bear very little of this amount. At home our 1950 budget is already some $5,000,000,000 in the red, and other contemplated foreign aids have not yet begun. We are moving up to a $50,000,000,000 budget. Our cold war will eventually dislocate our economy.

Could this tempt us to start a hot war—when we might not be militarily ready—to stop this fantastic deficit spending once for all?

IV

But, we need not be maneuvered into hot war for we can win the cold one. To do this, however, we must have a clear, effective, overall strategy. Our present obsolete, piecemeal strategy is of European origin. It reverts to World War I methods by planning to engage the full weight of the Red army. It slights all fronts, except the European. It offers no assurance of success.

Our new strategy must be New World in concept. It must be one which is effective continuously. "Strategy," wrote von Clausewitz, "can never take its hand from the work for a moment." The new strategy must view Russia as an entity; it must promise success and provide effective pressure when and where required. Its parts must further the basic strategy. It must reflect the spiritual quality and the genius of the American people.

Our decisive participation in two world wars and our leading role in this cold war gives us the right to dictate a new world strategy.

To implement our new world strategy for peace we must—

1. Keep cold-war costs on a sound economic level by limiting foreign military aid; cutting present expenditures for our Army and Navy. Thus we would permit our national genius—an expanding free economy—to provide the real foundation for our whole effort.

2. Build without delay the best Air Force in the world, with, of course, adequate support by ground and naval forces. This, too, would reflect the productive genius and human resourcefulness of our people.

3. Improve intelligence agencies—the eyes of defense.

4. Insist that our allies form a United States of Europe; help them to eliminate the threat of civil war. Our military aid should be limited to equipment essential for internal security forces—in the hope of a paralysis of the fifth column.

5. Extend the Monroe Doctrine over South Korea, Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines—a positive stand.

6. Foster friendship with strategic Moslem countries. Possibly Libya offers the closest air bases, which we initially could hold, to Russia's vulnerable areas.

7. Make peace treaties with Japan and Germany with or without Russian assent.

Finally, and most important of all, we must project the truth through the iron curtain to put the Soviet Government on the defensive in its 30-year war against the Russian people. This transcends all other cold-war measures. Our psychological campaign against Japan worked in time of war; it can be made to work against Russia in time of peace. Truth is our inner light which we must help the Russian people to see and understand.

This suggested strategy in no way contemplates abandonment of our European allies. Rather, it is the only course which insures their survival if war comes. In American resourcefulness and genius for production—which could enable us to gain mastery of the air—rests our hope for peace and our insurance for victory should war come.

Returning to Von Clausewitz—"War does not spring up suddenly, it does not spread to the full in a moment." With sound strategy, there is yet time for us to achieve lasting peace.

(Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers (retired), West Point, 1918, DSM with oak-leaf cluster, was military observer with the British in Africa (1940–42) and on General MacArthur's staff as a ground officer (1942–46).)

National School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the national school-lunch program has done much to improve the health and well-being of the Nation's youth—not only in their physical development but in their educational progress.

These improvements are reflected in the statistical surveys based on both physical and mental tests conducted under controlled conditions. In both instances measurable benefits are clearly indicated where children are provided with an adequate and well-balanced lunch at school. Incidentally these improvements take place on all income levels, an adequate nutrition is not necessarily assured by the high income of the parents or the rise in the national income as a whole.

The increase of working mothers, consolidation of schools, greater travel time to schools, and food costs, make the school-lunch program the appropriate answer, at least in part, to the question of proper and adequate diet for our Nation's youth. Children who can pay are permitted to pay, and those who cannot pay the full price receive their lunches at no cost or at a reduced price.

The educational features of the well-balanced lunches served in our schools under this program cannot be overestimated. The child is taught what a good diet consists of and that instruction is transmitted to the parents and other members of the family during family conversations. The inculcation of good food habits in the youth of the Nation is beneficial to the dairy and agricultural interests of our country and is reflected in the Nation's food consumption.

The National school lunch program, in the 1948–49 fiscal year, provided a market for more than $200,000,000 worth of agricultural commodities. Of this amount, $169,000,000 were spent for commodities purchased locally by schools through normal wholesale and retail channels. The remainder was made available through direct purchase and distribution operations by the United States Department of Agriculture.

The total number of meals served during the 1948–49 fiscal year, was 1,120,600,000, of which 669,000,000 were complete "A" meals comprising one-third to one-half of the child's daily nutritional requirements of protein, vegetables, cereal, butter, and milk.

In 1949, the average cost of preparing all types of school lunches was 25 cents, of which the parents paid 14 cents, the Federal Government, 6 cents, State and local governments, 3 cents, and other local groups, 2 cents. The typical price charged children for a complete "A" lunch was 20 cents, which was slightly higher than the price charged the previous year.

The total cost of the school-lunch program in 1948–49 was $291,400,000, of which the Federal appropriation amounted to $75,000,000, or approximately one-fourth. The remainder was provided by State, county, and local governments, children's payments for lunches, and contributions of local groups and individuals either in cash, commodities, or services.

A part of the school-lunch fund was used to purchase 67,200,000 pounds of food which was distributed to schools by the Federal Government to supplement school meals and help make up for deficiencies of vitamin C, protein, and calcium in the diets of the children. Foods bought for this purpose were American cheese, nonfat dry milk solids, orange juice concentrate, peanut butter, canned tomatoes, and tomato paste.

It is of interest that school children were the major recipients of surplus commodities purchased by the Department of Agriculture to aid in relieving distressed markets. These foods, amounting to 219,000,000 pounds, were distributed among schools outside of the national school-lunch program, as well as participating schools. Surplus commodities included dried eggs, canned fruit, dried fruit, grapefruit juice, honey, orange juice concentrate, white potatoes, sweetpotatoes, and other vegetables.

It is estimated that school-lunch programs used more than 245,000,000 quarts of milk in 1948–49 for beverage purposes. Other dairy products, including milk used for cooking, butter, and cheese, are estimated to have been 170,000,000 pounds. Eggs used for school lunches amounted to 18,000,000 dozen; meat, 83,000,000 pounds; fruits and vegetables, 407,000,000 pounds; bread and other foods made from grain, 103,000,000 pounds; fats and oils except butter 24,000,000 pounds; and sugar 31,000,000 pounds.

The United States Department of Agriculture has informed me that their records disclose that food purchases totaling $2,512,236 were made locally by schools in Minnesota in 1949 in serving lunches to 152,520 children participating in the national school-lunch program. In addition, more than $600,000 of federally donated commodities were distributed to schools in Minnesota during 1948–49.

Because I am of the opinion that a pamphlet issued by the Production and Marketing Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, entitled "National School Lunch Program" will be of interest to my constituents I am inserting same at this point:

National School-Lunch Program

The idea of serving lunches to school children is not new. Long ago, in many communities, local groups recognized the need for school lunches. The programs they established were the actual nucleus for the present national school-lunch program.

Federal assistance first became available in 1933. The funds and technical aids thus provided greatly assisted in the development and expansion of locally sponsored programs. The development was further accelerated by the enactment of Federal legislation in 1935 authorizing the Department of Agriculture to distribute farm commodities to schools serving school lunches.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

The National School Lunch Act, which became effective June 4, 1946, places the school lunch program on a permanent basis. It states that the purpose of the program is to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children by encouraging them to eat more nutritious food. It does this by providing funds to assist in the operation of nonprofit school-lunch programs. The Department of Agriculture carries out the provisions of the act with the cooperation of State departments of education.

A COMMUNITY PROGRAM

School lunches are a community affair. Any group that is interested—such as a parent-teacher association, service club, or other civic group—may cooperate with school officials in starting a school-lunch program. However, the sponsoring agency, which generally consists of school officials, is responsible for the operation of the program in the school.

ELIGIBILITY

Both public and nonprofit private schools of high-school grade or under may apply for Federal aid. The program must be operated on a nonprofit basis. The lunch must be available to all children regardless of their ability to pay and without discrimination. Applications for participation should be sent to the department of education in the State.

The laws of a number of States prevent the State educational agency from administering any program in private schools. In such States, nonprofit private schools may enter into an agreement with the United States Department of Agriculture to operate a program.

CASH ASSISTANCE

Federal funds for the school-lunch program are apportioned among the States to be used in reimbursing schools for part of the cost of the food purchased. The amount each State receives depends on the number of school-age children and the per capita income of the State. Federal funds expended in a State for the purpose of reimbursing schools must be matched with funds from sources within the State.

Reimbursement from Federal funds is made monthly to the schools. The total amount of Federal aid that a school may receive depends on the amount spent for food, the number and type of lunches served, and the need for assistance as determined by the State agency. There is no reimbursement for meals served to teachers or other adults.

FOODS FROM USDA

Most of the food used in the school-lunch program is purchased locally by participating schools. However, under a provision (sec. 6) of the National School Lunch Act, the United States Department of Agriculture buys and distributes to schools—participating in the school-lunch program—foods of high nutritive value suitable for children's lunches.

In addition, the Department makes available from time to time foods which are obtained under authority of legislation aimed at widening the market outlet for farm commodities. These foods may be distributed to all eligible nonprofit schools whether or not they participate in the school-lunch program.

LUNCH TYPES

Children should get real enjoyment out of lunch at school. The lunch should be highly nutritious and it should be inviting and satisfying. As an incentive to the schools to provide this type of lunch the highest rate of reimbursement is given for

the type A lunch. It consists of the following foods:

1. One-half pint of whole milk as a beverage.
2. Two ounces of lean meat, poultry, fish, or cheese, or one egg, or one-half cup of cooked dry beans or peas, or four tablespoons of peanut butter.
3. Three-fourths cup of vegetables or fruit or both.
4. One or more portions of bread or muffine or other bread made of whole-grain cereal or enriched flour.
5. Two teaspoons of butter or fortified margarine.

The protein requirement of item 2 may be met by serving one-half the quantities of each of two of the protein-rich foods.

If a school has limited lunchroom facilities, it may contract to serve the type B lunch. This lunch provides but two-thirds as much food as the type A lunch. Where the type B lunch is served, children should be urged to bring additional food from home.

What is known as type C lunch consists of one-half pint of whole milk and is included in the program especially for schools without lunchroom facilities.

SUMMING UP

The primary purpose of the school-lunch program is to serve the Nation's school children a wholesome, appetizing lunch every school day. It is now generally recognized that these meals can make an important contribution to the good nutrition so vital during a child's growing and developing years. The end results are improved national health and increased consumption of the products of our farms.

For further information, write to your State department of education or to the United States Department of Agriculture, Washington 25, D. C.

Address of Hon. J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach hereto a copy of an address delivered by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, before the Grand Lodge of New York on May 2, 1950.

In view of the continuing threat to our country and to the world by communism, this important matter thus presented by the highest authority on the subject should be given the very widest publicity.

I am happy that the Southern Handkerchief Manufacturing Co. of Greenville, S. C., through its president, Mr. W. R. Thomson, has had the speech printed for general distribution.

ADDRESS OF HON. J. EDGAR HOOVER, DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, AT A DINNER OF THE GRAND LODGE OF NEW YORK, HOTEL ASTOR, NEW YORK, N. Y., MAY 2, 1950

(Here are the real facts about communism, from the highest authority in America. Every loyal American should know them. Read and pass on to others—Southern Handkerchief Manufacturing Co., Greenville, S. C.)

Most worshipful grand master, worshipful sirs, and brethren, I accept the grand lodge medal of distinguished achievement with gratitude and a deep sense of humility. As a Mason, I am deeply touched that you have chosen to confer this high honor upon me. As Director of the FBI, however, I realize that the team spirit, hard work, loyalty, and personal sacrifices of my associates in the FBI have made this recognition possible.

This Nation, carved from the virgin resources of a new continent, was founded as a God-respecting land of justice and opportunity. Many of the founding fathers were Freemasons. They worked fervently, amid most signal dangers, to create a New World where hate and prejudice, born of intolerance and bigotry, would not blight the lives of men and women. They hoped, through the beneficent influences of love, tolerance, and mutual respect, to weld the American people into an unshakable unity. These men, under the divine genius of the Supreme Architect of the Universe, did their work well. America, today, is a bastion of hope, giving courage, strength, and guidance to millions of people around the world. Freemasonry has, for centuries, meant constructive building, in the hearts of men, in the life of institutions, and in the souls of nations.

The virtue of tolerance and the ability to respect different opinions, beliefs and ideas, have enriched the life of America. Tolerance is the eternal virtue through which good conquers evil and truth vanquishes untruth. In the glow of tolerance the talents of all American—Protestant, Catholic and Jew, alien and citizen, flow harmoniously together in a common endeavor to erect, stone by stone, the magnificent temple of free government. Tolerance has given this Nation a vast reservoir of untapped strength to survive the perils of the present and to create the new world of tomorrow. The very virtues which intolerance and prejudice have repressed in many areas of the world have become fountains of strength, inspiration and achievement in America.

Many individuals and groups, however, both within and without the Nation, hate tolerance—they consistently abuse and defile it. In fact, these elements, the criminal and the subversive, are utilizing America's tolerance as a cloak to plan and to perpetrate crimes which, when successful, destroy the very tolerance which enable them to gain their victories.

These elements, which would destroy American liberty, are today at work in America. They desire, through impugning the rights of others, to establish the triumph of their own evil causes. The greatest crime in our Nation today is our toleration of crime. America's tolerance is predicated upon the premise of equality and justice for all, a tolerance which must be merited, cherished, and constantly practiced. When a minority group, by abusing tolerance, attempts to destroy the fabric of democracy, it forfeits its right to a Nation's tolerance. Tolerance toward tyranny is absurd. We, the beneficiaries of a heritage of tolerance, have a duty to defeat the criminal and the subversive, and thereby preserve for the future the constitutional liberties which have made this Nation strong, respected, and a refuge for the oppressed.

The times demand candid and forthright words. Communists have been and are today at work within the very gates of America. There are few walks in American life which they do not traverse. Their allegiance is to Moscow; their hopes are spurred by the writings of Marx and Lenin, not Jefferson, Madison, and Lincoln; their enthusiasm is whetted by expediency and deceit, not tolerance and brotherhood. Atheistic materialism is their idol; the destruction of the God of our fathers their goal. Wherever they may be, they have in common one diabolic ambition: to weaken and to eventually destroy American democracy by stealth and cunning. Theirs is an organization built and supported by dishonor, deceit, and tyranny and a deliberate policy of falsehood. They know that as long as the ideals of common endeavor, mutual respect, and tolerance remain alive they can never bring to fruition the Communist world revolution. That is why Communists consider America their No. 1 enemy. A strong America, materially and spiritually, is a constant beacon of light, buoying the hopes and aspirations of millions of men, women, and children crushed under the yoke of Communist tyranny which today controls the destinies of one-third of the peoples of the world.

The symbolic tools of all Masons, the square, the level, and the plumb, are hated and detested by the adherents of the hammer and sickle. The Communists possess a well-knit, closely disciplined, destructive force of approximately 55,000 members in the United States. In actual numbers, their membership may not be large, nor have the Communists polled at any time a large number of votes in an election. This has been cited by the ignorant and the apologists and appeasers of communism in our country as minimizing the danger of these subversives in our midst. The actual strength of the Communist movement in the United States is not something that can be accurately stated in just so many figures. It has to be measured largely by the general mass influence of the party and its program. We no longer measure the importance of revolutionary organizations by size. In some places where there are only one or two men, more results are obtained than where they have larger organizations.

But, behind this force of traitorous Communists, constantly gnawing away like termites at the very foundations of American society, stand a half million fellow travelers and sympathizers ready to do the Communist bidding. These individuals, though not identified as Communists, are extremely dangerous to the internal security of this Nation, because as hypocrites and moral swindlers they seek the protection of the freedoms which they constantly seek to destroy. They represent, for the Communist movement, a source of wealth: financial resources; the creation of valuable contacts; levers of social, economic, and political pressures; recruiting grounds for espionage information and agents. Moreover, they do their work anonymously, in front organizations, and wherever they can exert the greatest influence, each doing his share to the best of his ability. These individuals are difficult to detect. They are disdainful of the very tolerance which enables them to betray their country. They practice their double-dealing, double-minded, double-tongued, and double-faced tactics on all fronts of our American life whether it be in politics, in labor, in the press, in radio, in motion pictures, in the schools, or even in some of our churches.

The Communists have their membership concentrated in certain key areas of the United States—primarily in strategic industrial and population centers. This membership is coordinated through a national leadership and a dedication to an alien hate which looks abroad for its direction. If additional personnel, perhaps for a political pressure campaign, for infiltration into a labor union, or for a militant educational program, is needed, national headquarters of the Communist Party will peremptorily transfer members, temporarily or permanently, into the strategic area. Communist members, body and soul, are the property of the party. They scorn the standards of American democracy. They function like puppets on a string, ready at a moment's bidding to execute the will of the directing master—the Red Hitler at Moscow. The party thereby, through mobility, central direction, and the disciplined fanaticism of its converts can, at any given moment, achieve power and strength in a limited sector. At times, this pressure is so well organized and expertly supervised that the Communists

achieve gains out of all proportion to their numerical strength. That is the secret of Communist success; the tragedy of democratic resistance.

The thought of a Soviet United States is once revolting to every right-thinking American. We have seen the Communists at work and have observed the application of their principles sufficiently to know what would happen here if they succeeded in the attainment of their objectives. If every American faced the reality of what the fulfillment of the Communist objectives would mean to him—he would be inspired to work harder to protect and preserve the individual liberty and freedom which is part and parcel of our American way of life.

But the strength of communism is also its weakness and worst enemy. The Communists, by fanatically following the Marxist-Leninist philosophy, have reversed life—they are attempting to create through destruction, to gain victories by glorifying defeat. To build a "bright new world," they are degrading man, taking from him, idea by idea, thought by thought, attitude by attitude, the values of independent reasoning and truth seeking. The very ingredients of eventual success, intelligence, judgment, and moral reserve, are being systematically and ruthlessly denied him. In return, they infuse into him, idea by idea, thought by thought, attitude by attitude, the dialectics of materialism and secularism. The end result of this alien "reblooding" of thousands of men and women is to create a "Communist man"—a creature intellectually sterile, spiritually void and oblivious to the realities of life. This creation, "Communist man," on whom the Communists depend to conquer their future new world, is democracy's chief hope. This robot—thoughtless, lifeless, and senseless—eventually will be the shoal on which communism will flounder and die.

In these troubled days, a civilization is at stake. Each day, we come closer to an eventual hour of decision. The outcome of western civilization, the peace, security, and freedom of our children hang in the balance. Never was there a time when there was a greater need to put first things first.

The struggle for the preservation of our freedoms places a duty on every man, woman, and child in the Nation to do his bit in order that this Government of the people, for the people, and by the people shall continue to flourish. If each of us does his duty, the outcome is certain. The Supreme Architect will give us the strength, wisdom, and guidance to triumph against the onrush of Red fascism and atheistic communism.

President Truman Denounces Communism in Europe While It Is Being Imposed Upon the American People Here at Home

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a rather strange coincidence that while President Truman was out in St. Louis speaking against communism abroad, his administration was attempting to impose it on the American people here at home.

On yesterday the white children in the District of Columbia were driven from the swimming pools of Washington. One of those pools was surrounded by about 50 policemen, most of whom were Negroes—that was the one in East Potomac Park.

These pools have now been segregated for the Negroes, while the white children have been driven from them.

There never has been such rank persecution of white Gentiles, and especially of the white children, as is now going on in the District of Columbia. Untold thousands of white families are forced to move across the river into Virginia for their own protection, because real-estate agents of an alien race continue to sell homes and force Negroes into the white residential sections of Washington.

One policeman said to me the other day that the city of Washington was literally teeming at night with roving bands of little Negro hoodlums, who are robbing automobiles, insulting women, and perpetrating every kind of misbehavior you can imagine.

As I pointed out on the floor of the House the other day, one of the greatest blows ever dealt against our Armed Forces in times of peace, and one of the greatest victories Stalin has yet won in his cold war, was the issuance of the Executive order wiping out segregation in our Armed Forces.

They are now attempting to force their antisegregation program on to the white people in every section of the country, and especially upon the white people of the Southern States. When I say "they," I mean the leaders of this communistic drive, which is the so-called Anti-Defamation League, one of the most vicious Communist-front organizations ever used to stir race trouble throughout the country. The object of this drive is to force the amalgamation of the whites and blacks, and in that way destroy the white race. They think they can control the world.

That gang has been run out of every civilized country on earth, except this one, and they are headed for the same treatment here. The sooner the more intelligent members of their race wake up to this danger, expose this outfit, and get rid of it, the better it is going to be for them.

The President ought to realize that the white people in the District of Columbia, especially the white children in Washington, are entitled to decent treatment, which they are not getting.

He ought to realize that the white people of the Southern States, the best friends the Negroes ever had, are entitled to decent treatment, and not to have this communistic FEPC rammed down their throats, and that these attempts to force Negroes into the white schools of the South are doing the Negroes more harm than anything else that has happened since the War Between the States.

He ought to understand that white people throughout the Nation are entitled to decent treatment, which they would not be getting if this communistic program were written into law and that law enforced.

He ought to remember that the people who are being persecuted by this vicious program are the ones who have fought the Nation's battles in times of war and sustained its institutions in times of peace.

It is all right to denounce Russian communism at long distance; but it comes with poor grace to be attempting to impose it upon the American people here at home at the same time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Alaska and Hawaii—Sincere Effort Finally Underway To Fulfill Pledges of Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit an article by Doris Fleeson, columnist, which appeared in the Washington Star recently, as follows:

ALASKA AND HAWAII—SINCERE EFFORT FINALLY UNDERWAY TO FULFILL PLEDGES OF STATEHOOD

(By Doris Fleeson)

At long last a sincere effort is under way in the Senate to fulfill both parties' platform pledges of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

Next week Chairman O'MAHONEY will bring the statehood bills to a vote in Interior and Insular Affairs. The administration has made its own check and believes they will be favorably reported. Both have passed the House with a good margin.

Further encouraging news is that Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, one of the Senate's better cloakroom commandos, has agreed to lead the floor fight to put Alaska over. It is felt that when the Democrats get behind Alaska where Democrats are in the majority, Republicans will rally to Hawaii, which has consistently sent a Republican delegate to Washington.

A peculiar timeliness attaches to the statehood fight. The Senate will be debating statehood for the two United States territories fronting upon the Orient and Russia at the exact moment that Secretary of Defense Johnson and John Foster Dulles, State Department consultant, are in Japan working on the problem of a peace treaty.

NEGOTIATORS HAVE TASK

The task of the negotiators at Tokyo is to reconcile America's defense needs with America's democratic leadership of the free world. That leadership emphatically disavows territorial aspirations. It is precisely because America has no territorial aspirations that statehood for her territories has always been her goal, proclaimed by her Presidents and her major parties alike.

Aside from the question of justice to Alaska and Hawaii whose hopes have been long delayed, backers of statehood believe the entire Orient will vibrate to such an affirmative expression of American idealism. It will represent practical propaganda, they insist, for which communism can find no answer.

In the midst of the cold war it is not going to be possible to satisfy all Japan's desires for immediate independence. Statehood advocates argue that action now on the safer

frontiers of the two territories will provide Japan with a rational hope that when the iron grip of necessity is relaxed, they, too, will be wholly free.

LUCAS FACES HARD FIGHT

A favorable Senate committee vote will not bring statehood all the way home. Majority Leader LUCAS, who faces a hard fight for reelection, is allergic to putting any more controversial bills on the calendar. The weight of the administration, however, will be on him for this one.

Senator BUTLER, of Nebraska, ranking Republican on Interior, fears communism in Hawaii. He has been attempting to form an alliance of isolationists and Dixiecrats, his argument to the southerners being that four new Senators will mean dilution of the South's influence in the Upper Chamber.

Strongly opposing the Butler position is Hawaiian Delegate JOSEPH FARRINGTON, a popular and influential Republican whose wife is national committeewoman and president of the National Republican Women's Clubs.

Alaska does not suit the book of some Republicans. These include Senator TAFT, who complains it's too sparsely populated to maintain a State government and consists chiefly of Federal payrollers, all Democrats.

Second Anniversary of the Late Col. David (Mickey) Marcus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, June 10 is the second anniversary of the death of one of the great Jewish heroes of modern Israel, who was an American by birth and citizenship. The late Col. David (Mickey) Marcus, who was a resident of Brooklyn, N. Y., was killed on the field of battle in Israel on June 10, 1948, during the Arab-Israel war. In connection with the anniversary of his death, I desire to pay tribute to the memory of Colonel Marcus, who died a hero's death.

David Marcus was born in New York on February 22, 1902. He studied at the United States Military Academy at West Point, from which he was graduated in 1924, then served as a lieutenant in the infantry for the next 2 years. Marcus attended the Brooklyn Law School, from which he obtained an LL. B. degree, and passed the bar examination in 1927, and received a doctorate in jurisprudence from the same law school a year later.

He then served in a legal capacity, as follows: During 1929–30 he was an assistant attorney in the Department of Justice; during 1931–33 he was assistant United States attorney in the southern district of New York; from 1934 until 1939 he was first deputy commissioner of the New York City Department of Correction, and in 1940 became commissioner of correction under the late Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia.

When the United States entered World War II, Marcus reentered the United States Army, serving as judge advocate and provost marshal in the Twenty-seventh Division, and was later with the civil affairs division. He parachuted into Normandy on D–day, just 6 years ago June 6, 1944, and he was with the American troops during the fighting in Sicily. In the last year of the war, he served as legal aide at several important international conferences, including the meetings at Dumbarton Oaks, Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam. He helped in drafting the surrender terms for Italy and Germany, for which he was later awarded the Distinguished Service Cross. He was also the recipient of a Bronze Star Medal from the United States Government for gallantry in action, and in 1948 was decorated by the British Empire for his activities in World War II.

In the same year, 1948, Colonel Marcus went to Palestine as military adviser to the Haganah, the fighting arm of the Jewish community of Palestine which later became the Israel army. In Palestine, he helped lead the Jewish forces in their struggle for independence after the Arab states had invaded Israel. He instilled a spirit of modern warfare tactics among Israel's fighting forces and planned its military strategy. He was killed during the fighting on the strategic Jerusalem front on June 10, 1948.

Colonel Marcus is one of the great Jewish heroes to emerge from Israel's war of independence. In the history of modern Israel he will unquestionably be accorded a place of honor similar to that of Lafayette during the War of Independence of our own country nearly two centuries ago.

Last April, I introduced a bill in the House authorizing the Postmaster General to issue a special stamp in honor of Colonel Marcus. I trust that favorable action will be taken on my bill soon.

Statement of Hugh W. Cardon, First Vice President of the National Association of Employees of Collectors of Internal Revenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, on June 9, Mr. Hugh W. Cardon, from Birmingham, testified on behalf of the legislative committee of the National Association of Employees of Collectors of Internal Revenue, before the subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Cardon is first vice president of the national association, and is one of Alabama's most outstanding citizens. I commend for the consideration of the Members, his timely statement:

Gentleman of the committee, on behalf of the National Association of Employees of Collectors of Internal Revenue, please permit us to thank you for the opportunity of presenting a statement to your committee relative to matters you are considering which we feel are of vital importance not only to our membership but to good government as well.

The organization which we represent is composed entirely of employees of collectors of internal revenue. As you are aware, there are 64 internal revenue collection districts in the United States, including Hawaii, and our organization has issued charters to local units in 63 of these collectors offices. This fact is cited to show you gentlemen that the vast majority of collectors' employees are members of our association. Because our membership is composed entirely of individuals making their careers in the highly technical field of collecting Federal taxes and because of this variance of interest with other Federal employees, we are not affiliated with any other organization. The National Association of Employees of Collectors of Internal Revenue, which for the sake of brevity will hereafter be referred to as NAECIR, operates entirely on a mutual interest basis and as a consequence none of its officers receive any salary or monetary remuneration for their services. We do not employ a representative or a lobbyist or maintain an office in Washington for the purpose of attempting to influence Members of Congress on legislation either proposed or existing in which we have an interest. The members of NAECIR appearing before your committee have sacrificed a portion of their vacation time or annual leave granted to Federal employees in order to represent their fellow workers.

Our purpose in appearing before you, gentlemen, is to register opposition to the passage of the so-called Taber-Thomas amendment and the Jensen amendment to the current appropriations bill for the Treasury Department. Our opposition to these amendments is not based entirely on selfish motives, although it is estimated that the passage of the Taber-Thomas amendment would cause the discharging of more than 2,000 employees in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Those of our group who have and are making careers in our jobs with the Bureau of Internal Revenue would deeply regret the crippling or hampering of the present machinery of tax collecting which would be inevitable if either or both of the amendments referred to are enacted into law. We feel that the honest taxpayer who fully complies with our tax laws by filing correct tax returns would be seriously penalized by the reduction of the tax enforcement agencies of our Government.

It is a well-known fact that the Bureau of Internal Revenue with its present allotment of enforcement officers is only able to audit a very nominal percentage of the returns filed. The statistics clearly indicate that from the number of income-tax returns which are being audited, a far greater amount of revenue could be produced by the investment of additional appropriations for enforcement. For example, 8,451 deputy collectors during the fiscal period ending June 30, 1949, produced a total of $608,368,524 in escaped or delinquent taxes, or an average of $71,980 for each field investigator. During this period it is estimated that approximately one-fourth of the field employees were new and serving their probationary periods. As a consequence, they were not able to produce as much revenue as they were able to do after receiving the proper training and experience.

Administrative officials in the Bureau of Internal Revenue are well aware of the fact that a field investigator needs a minimum of 1 year's service before he is sufficiently qualified to perform the duties required of him. This training includes classroom schooling, work with older and experienced employees and compulsory courses in varied technical subjects relating to tax laws and accounting which the employee is required to pursue on his own time after regular working hours. Deputy collectors of internal revenue are required to possess at least a working knowledge of more than 50 different kinds and classes of taxes. This knowledge and the experience required to administer these taxes satisfactorily cannot be gained overnight or even in a few months. Statistics which are available in the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue

and which are submitted to him each month by the collectors' offices will clearly substantiate the statement that an employee's production record improves after the first year of service.

Should the Taber-Thomas amendment be enacted it would be necessary to first discharge employees with limited seniority, with the possible exception of those who would be protected because of past military service, and the Government would lose all the money and time which has been expended in schooling and training these employees. Too, the newspapers indicate the Congress is seriously considering the enactment of legislation which will extend the coverage of the social-security laws to domestic servants, permanent agricultural laborers, the self-employed, and other groups not presently subject to the social-security laws. It is further indicated that the Congress is considering the repeal of certain existing excise taxes and that these taxes may be replaced with new levies in new fields of taxation. Should these possibilities become realities, there is no doubt that the tax-collecting agencies of the Government would require additional personnel. Therefore it does not seem reasonable or good sound logic that the Congress could with one hand pass laws which would cause the discharge of trained and experienced employees and almost at the same time with the other hand pass laws which would create new taxes and require additional enforcement officers to administer the same. If these new tax laws are passed, it would appear to be sound economy to retain employees who are experienced in tax administration rather than recruit those who have no experience and whose capabilities are unknown. Doubtless fewer experienced employees would be required to administer new taxes and especially the extended coverage proposed by the amendments to the social-security laws than would untried and untrained new employees.

It will be recalled that a few years ago the Bureau of Internal Revenue suffered a reduction in its appropriation and a consequent reduction in its enforcement set-up. This cut was restored during the fiscal period beginning July 1, 1948. This reduction in enforcement personnel was definitely reflected in the production record of collectors' offices. For example, during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, and ending June 30, 1948, deputy collectors were able to collect 1,189,774 warrants for distraint, involving the collection of $280,183,603 in delinquent taxes, whereas, after the cut was restored, deputy collectors handled 1,432,541 warrants, involving the collection of $346,549,480 in delinquent taxes during the succeeding fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, or an increase in revenue from this one source of $66,325,877.

We feel that a reduction in the tax enforcement personnel of our Government at this particular time would be false economy. A few dollars would be saved in salaries and operative costs, but the revenues which these employees could have produced would far exceed the savings. For example, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, each field deputy collector in the United States averaged producing $71,980 in escaped and delinquent taxes. Should the House amendments be passed and the Bureau of Internal Revenue be required to reduce its enforcement personnel by a conservative estimate of 5,000 employees, then the possible loss in revenue would be approximately $360,000,000. This figure of dollar loss is also conservative, as it is based on the revenue produced only by field deputy collectors who investigate only the smaller individual income tax returns, whereas the reduction would extend to Internal Revenue agents and special agents who investigate corporation, partnership, fiduciary, and the larger individual income-tax returns, as well as estate- and gift-tax returns. The average production of these enforcement officers is logically much greater than that of deputy collectors who because of Bureau procedure handle only the smaller tax returns.

You gentlemen who have read the recent report of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, will remember that this group, after exhaustive study and hearings, recommended an increase in the enforcement personnel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue far in excess of its present authorized strength. This report was prepared by a bipartisan group of Members of the House and Senate, yet it was certainly nonpartisan in the recommendations suggested to the Congress for the more efficient operation of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

It is an accepted fact that the Bureau of Internal Revenue has been able to recruit over a long period of years a very high type group of employees due to the stable employment record of the Bureau. Many individuals have been willing to transfer from other Government agencies with a reduction in grade and pay in order to hold a job which would promise a security of tenure. This high type of personnel has been directly reflected in our production records and has given to the taxpaying public more efficient service than it would ordinarily have received.

In conclusion, we again plead that you gentlemen of this committee seriously reflect not only on the probable loss of revenue which could occur should you agree to the House amendments, but also the harmful effect on our body politic which doubtless would occur by giving an invitation to the tax evader to defraud his government, knowing that his return would not be investigated due to insufficient enforcement personnel. Gentlemen, please maintain and support an agency which is producing approximately 95 percent of the total revenue of our great country and help it to inspire respect for our laws by ferreting out and punishing the tax evader and at the same time protect the honest taxpayer who is already carrying too much of the tax burden.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EMPLOYEES
OF COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
AUBREY H. CHILDRESS,
Cochairman, Legislative Committee.
ROBERT DE CROES,
Member, Legislative Committee.
HUGH W. CARDON, *First Vice President.*

The Late Rufus Woods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a statement which is of tremendous significance. It records the passing of a great American, a great soul. His life was the development of one of the Nation's greatest assets and he lived it to the fullest. The world-famous Grand Coulee Dam was one of his dreams as was the total, the balanced and the proper development of the entire Columbia River. Rufus Woods was this man's name.

He had traveled extensively all over the world. When he passed, national columnists recorded the facts of his life. He was a national figure. My colleague, the Honorable HENRY JACKSON, placed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent column by Thomas Stokes on June 1.

Today I have the honor and the privilege of placing in the RECORD a statement from Wilfred Woods, the son of Rufus Woods, as he takes over where his father left him as publisher of the Wenatchee Daily World.

The statement follows:

LOOKING AHEAD

"In the great game of life, the moves on the checkerboard of time have been such that fate hath decreed that we reenter the newspaper field."

Forty-three years ago, a young man wrote this as he took over the reins of the Daily World.

Today, fate hath decreed that another young man take over the reins. Only this time the chariot is much bigger, and the race is swifter.

Rufus Woods belonged to one era. We are beginning another.

But what a heritage he has left us.

The wilderness transformed. Glorious opportunities ahead. This was his dream and his vision.

He has gone. But the dream and the vision live on.

To his last breath, his whole concern was the development of the region. Shortly before he passed, he roused in the night to tell of the marvels of the Grand Coulee Dam and the mighty Columbia River.

That was why he traveled to Toronto.

It was a delightful trip across the country. He apparently had recovered from his heart attack of January. Eager to get back into the harness, he had resumed his column and was in search of first-hand material for Daily World readers.

We went to Michigan for a new car, and then drove leisurely to Toronto. As always, he made many new friends en route.

His interest in the Province of Ontario was not new. Several years ago he had visited that area to study its unique public power system.

We drove to Windsor, studying power rates along the way. We visited London, home of the late Sir Adam Beck, father of Ontario electric development.

Then we motored on to Toronto, headquarters for the Ontario Hydro Commission.

The evening before his death, he and I crossed the street in downtown Toronto to telephone a friend of his, a former power commission member. The call was never made.

Before we reached the phone, he suddenly felt distressed. We hurried him to St. Michael's Hospital, four blocks away.

He was under a doctor's care within a few minutes. When mother and I returned to our hotel about midnight, he was resting easier, and in no apparent pain.

During the night he told attendants of the wonders of the Columbia Basin and the Northwest.

At 6:15 a. m. he suffered a second attack, and was put under oxygen immediately. At 6:40 he simply stopped breathing.

For him the game of life is over. And how he loved it. But the dream and the vision and the challenge live on.

So we take up the reins, conscious of our limitations. But dedicated to the same ideals.

We are building this Northwest of ours. As we in our turn try to play the game, we ask that same friendship and cooperation that you have so richly given across the years. (Wilfred Woods, publisher Wenatchee Daily World, June 6, 1950.)

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am including an editorial which I think reflects the great

soul and outstanding personality of Rufus Woods:

PEOPLE WANT TO KNOW YOU

Werner A. Rupp, our good friend who is editor and publisher of the Aberdeen Daily World and a lifelong friend of our late publisher, Rufus Woods, paid a high tribute to our departed friend who was buried today.

"Rufus talked to people whether he knew them or not on the theory that 'people liked you.' Some of his friends," Werner continued, "used to marvel at Rufus Woods' nerve in approaching people he had never seen before, but he said there was no nerve about it—just being interested and friendly. Whether big or little, he met them all on the same terms, and he could shout at Henry Kaiser as loudly as Henry could shout at him. The truly fortunates are the Rufus Woods', the Ernie Pyles', and all their kind. And it is a thing to hug to your heart to believe that people want to know you."

This tribute would be appreciated by Rufus, for it sums up so well his philosophy of life and his friendliness toward people. From the tributes we carry today from the President of the United States to our own Mr. A. J. Dear who has worked for him these four decades and more, they remembered and will long remember the good deeds and work Rufus has done.

On one occasion an important gentleman from the "grass roots" modestly asked Rufus to leave out his picture. Rufus came back with "we are not the least bit interested in a picture of you; what we want to recognize is what you represent." Rufus felt that every man had a great story and was important. He believed in the dignity of the individual; he had seen enough of Russia and its people to know what the other side could be like when people were treated as pawns and slaves.

He would say, "Don't take yourself too seriously," when stressing the importance of people, big or little. By such a philosophy it took him out of himself, opened a whole new world to him, brought him many friends and ideas. As one Reuben Fleet, builder of Consolidated-Vultee Aircraft Co., commented once, "The people who don't want to know you aren't worth knowing."

This desire to want, but more the knack, to make "people want to know you" was just one of the many fine qualities of our departed publisher and editor, Rufus Woods. It brought him more riches than all the material pleasures man could ever hope to amass. It gave our newspaper a unique individual personality, it gave the State and Nation a man who will long be remembered. Rufus was truly the empire builder.

Postal Cuts Retaliatory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 19, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a radio address recently made over several Michigan stations:

You know, of course, that your Congress is currently engaged in the difficult task of reducing excessive appropriations demanded by the Federal departments and agencies for the next fiscal year. Republicans and Democrats have joined to do this badly needed chore.

You must know, too, that Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson has put into effect drastic reductions in postal services to the public. Probably this reduction in essential services has inconvenienced you. Perhaps it has hurt your business. Possibly you have been upset by Donaldson's threat of still further cuts in postal services.

Now, has it occurred to you to ask why these things are so—why budget cuts ordered by Congress in the cause of Government economy are invariably followed by cuts in essential services rendered the people by Government departments and agencies?

There is a close connection between reduced appropriations and drastically reduced services—always services upon which the people depend for the conduct of business and for convenience in daily living. And what is the reason for this connection? Is it because the Government agencies lack the money wherewith to operate? Or is it because of politics?

Well, the House cut about $200,000,000 off the 1951 appropriation for the Post Office Department. The Senate showed signs of supporting the House in this reduction, as well as many others. So just after the House acted, and before the Senate could act, Donaldson cut down postal services. Now, as the time for Senate action on the omnibus appropriation bill approaches, Donaldson threatens still further cuts. What would you say is the reason for the reduction in postal services?

This politically motivated action by the Postmaster General to intimidate the Congress; to force the Senate to reinstate the cut in the Post Office Department appropriation, and to force the House to concur, is only a small part of a larger pattern. Donaldson did not order the reductions in postal services of his own accord. He got his orders from higher up. The whole pattern is made up of an attempt, by reducing services wherever budget cuts are made, to persuade the public to vent its wrath on Congress for practicing economy.

You will note in this instance, as in others less talked about, the reduction in services was ordered at the exact point where it would hurt the most. No effort has been made, for example, to cut down on needless Government publications or on surveys which serve no immediate purpose. In this connection, let me cite you the Agriculture Department pamphlet on the sex life of the watermelon, and the endless counting of migratory wild fowl by the Wildlife Service.

As you all know, the services rendered by the Post Office Department are among the most essential of all. They rank in importance along with the armed services, which are responsible for our national defense. This is so because communications, the sending of letters, of newspapers and magazines, are vital to the maintenance of our free institutions, to the liberty of the people. Without full information on all matters of public interest, self-government would be impossible.

For this reason, Congress long ago took all postal operations out of the hands of private companies, which once upon a time handled them with economy and dispatch, and made them a Government monopoly. It was felt that under no circumstances should any private agency be in a position to hold up the mails. Congress recognized the vitally essential nature of the postal services.

At the same time, Congress recognized the fact that postal services must be kept reasonable in price, so that always they would be within reach of all the people. Otherwise, the free dissemination of information, so necessary to self-government, would be hampered. As a result, never since its inception has the Government postal service been able entirely to pay its own way. Always it has been necessary to make up annual deficits by appropriations from the Government's general fund.

But in recent years postal deficits have been increasing at an unprecedented rate. They have grown so tremendously that last year the deficit was approximately $500,000,000. This has been due in part to vastly increased volumes of postal business at low rates; but only in part. More than anything else, the deficits have resulted from inefficiency in postal operations. And this inefficiency has been caused, not only by incompetence at the top, in the Postmaster General's office, but even more by antiquated methods and antiquated mail-handling machinery.

All Americans know that our tremendous industrial output, at low prices and substantial profits, is maintained almost solely because of enlightened management policies. Industrial management seeks always new and improved methods. When more efficient machinery is invented, the old machinery promptly is tossed out and the better machinery installed. What seems like waste, in fact, is the greatest possible economy. Policies like these are at least a quarter of a century overdue in the Post Office Department. But politics, nowadays, is not played that way.

To improve methods and install new and efficient machinery, even at a huge initial investment in order to create even greater savings, would reduce perhaps by half, the nearly half million employees in the postal services. This would reduce political patronage. It would cut off the power of the bureaucrats to control elections through control of the Federal payroll vote. It would reduce greatly the power of the bureaucrats to regiment the lives of a considerable element of the population. Certainly, no New Dealer or Fair Dealer, over the last two decades, when big postal deficits came into being, would subscribe to anything like this.

So it happened this year, when Congress told the Post Office Department to improve methods and cut costs, and when Congress cut the Department's appropriation request by only a small percent, that the Department retaliated, on a scale far greater than in the past. The Post Office Department politicians reduced mail deliveries, delayed the mails, delayed business and threw many thousands of men out of jobs. Home deliveries and mail pickups were reduced in number, and the post offices were closed at earlier hours. In most cities now letters must be posted before 6:30 p. m. or lose a day.

So here we have it: The old game of squeezing the people, to make them bring pressure on Congress to pay the losses. The Postmaster General even ordered postmasters throughout the country to give the service cuts wide publicity. Time was short. Congress must be made to jump through the hoop without delay.

Up to this point I have refrained from mentioning one of the chief causes of the enormous postal deficits. It might well be called the chief cause, in fact. Here it is. Last year the postal deficit, as I said before, was approximately $500,000,000. Of this $500,000,000 loss, more than $149,000,000, or nearly one-third, was created by post-free material sent through the mails by the executive branch of the Federal Government. Congress spent, all told, only $1,200,000 on franked mail, compared with the executive department's $149,000,000. These figures were given by Postmaster General Donaldson to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

What the Postmaster General did not say, but what everybody knows, is that this vast expenditure by the executive branch took the form of trainloads of post-free material—propaganda for socialized medicine, the Brannan farm plan, public housing, and all the rest of President Truman's program. Legitimate Government business mail was only a small part of the total.

Think of it. For each penny Members of Congress spent on franked mail, the executive department spent $3, almost all of

it to propagandize the people at public expense. All this propaganda was carried by the trains, the airplanes, and on the backs of mail carriers—all at the expense of American taxpayers. Yet those whose secret intent is to attack the Congress complain about the abuse of the franking privilege by Members of that body. No mention is ever made by these critics of Congress of the franking abuses of the executive department.

Now here is another angle to the wasteful spending by the executive branch of the Federal Government. While I am on the subject, it is worth mentioning. How much do you think was spent by the Government last year in travel allowances for Government employees? No, it was not $1,000,000 or even $10,000,000. It was $135,000,000. And this year's budget, to be spent next year, contained an item of $160,000,000 for this purpose.

There are approximately 2,000,000 persons on the Federal payroll. The expenditure of $160,000,000 of the taxpayers' money for travel allowances for these people would figure out to $80 for each employee. That is enough to pay a train fare between Washington and Los Angeles. But only a few Government employees get travel allowances. Therefore you can imagine the amount of running about by the favored few. It would seem that a few hundred thousand Federal employees must spend virtually all of their time on trains, airplanes, and boats. And John Q. Public, who has to save all year to get the price of a vacation jaunt to the lake shore, pays in his taxes the cost of all these trips.

It seems to me that all these things I have been telling you about lead to a single conclusion. The postal system is the perfect case which Socialists always cite to prove that socialism is better than free enterprise. Yet, the Post Office Department has come a monumental financial cropper, in the hands of those who are waging one of the most costly propaganda campaigns in all history in an effort to sell their socialistic schemes to the Nation.

Know Your Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous authority to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article by the Marine News, of New York, as follows:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS—WHAT FORMER PRESIDENT TAFT BELIEVED

In 1908, former President William Howard Taft said in an address in Chicago: "A commodity, raw or finished, is of little or no value until it has reached the place of its use. We cannot stop now in our onward course of utilizing the natural resources of our country. We cannot curtail or limit the production of our manufacturers. We must go on, for a contrary course means disintegration and decay. Transportation, then, is the question of the hour. How can we solve it? We must have recourse to our waterways.

"I congratulate this Congress on having brought the subject of waterways to such a point that the Representatives in Congress, from one end of the country to the other, recognize it as a subject that calls for action. They have not come to definite conclusions as to the policy that ought to be adopted, but they have come to the conclusion that some policy must be adopted with reference to the development of those instrumentalities which nature has furnished for the transportation of goods and for the controlling of railroad rates."

The former President had great constructive vision. We have said again and again that low-cost distribution is one of the unsolved problems of our economy, and that low-cost transportation will go far in solving it.

As the former President said, "We must have recourse to our waterways." Rational waterway development and maintenance must be continued.

MARINE NEWS,
GEORGE H. PALMER,
President and Publisher.

I'm Proud of America Because—

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the Columbia Heights State Bank has been running a series of advertisements in the Columbia Heights (Minn.) Record on the subject Why I'm Proud of America. The short, pungent statements were written by the bank's vice president, Herbert Woodward. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include several of them:

I'M PROUD OF AMERICA BECAUSE—

NO. 1—EVERYBODY IS EQUAL IN OPPORTUNITY AND BEFORE THE LAW

From the President of the United States of America on down—everybody has just one vote, is presumed to be innocent until proven guilty, can demand a jury trial, and can't be arrested without a warrant unless caught in the act.

The humblest shack or the biggest mansion can't be entered without a search warrant.

All children are entitled to a high-school education. Any boy can rise to the top; the opportunities are here. It's all up to him.

NO. 2—THE INTELLIGENCE OF OUR WORKERS

They are smart enough to know that labor-saving machinery makes high wages, that big production per man shortens hours, and that the boss must make money to meet the payroll.

Very seldom does a labor leader fall for European propaganda and try to restrict production or outlaw improved methods. Employers may not like John L. Lewis but he helped mechanize the coal mines so that an American miner produces four times the coal a British miner does.

NO. 3—WE ADMIT OUR MISTAKES

We tried to make a friend of Russia by giving her about anything she asked. It didn't work. So we got tough. That worked better—she quit her Berlin blockade. We'll switch back to friendship again if she quits being tough.

The same goes for our Government going into business. We've found it doesn't work. The bureaucrats run at a loss, boost taxes to pay expenses, then doctor their books to show a profit.

So we're switching back to private enterprise. It earns a profit, after paying taxes, or else.

NO. 4—WE ARE LONG-SUFFERING—BUT MAYBE WE'RE INVITING WAR

Our people know you must not be pushed around too long. That makes a bully believe you're a coward.

Russia is a bully. For too long the White House has led her to believe we were cowards.

If we had had Presidents like Teddy Roosevelt she wouldn't be shooting down unarmed American planes without even an apology. Did we avoid war by letting Japan sink the *Panay?*

It may be too late to avoid a real war. If so the White House, not the people, will be to blame.

The Late Representative William Lemke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a tribute written by Bill Skeels, secretary, friend, and close associate of the late Representative William Lemke, during the entire time that Representative Lemke so ably represented the people of North Dakota in the Congress of the United States. The article follows:

A TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM LEMKE BY W. O. SKEELS, HIS SECRETARY

Congressman William Lemke is no more. He died suddenly on a visit to Fargo on May 30, and was buried in Fargo on June 2.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MCCORMACK, the able and distinguished majority floor leader and Speaker pro tempore at the time of Congressman Lemke's death, in telling of how Congressman Lemke was able to as a wholesome persistent legislator obtain the passage of two bills for rehabilitation of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa and the Devils Lake Sioux Tribes of Indians, and one for the settlement of Alaska by veterans, on the Wednesday before his death, also paid the following tribute to him:

"Bill Lemke was a gentleman, honorable and trustworthy, a sweet character, bubbling over with an abundance of feeling and affection for his fellow man, particularly the sick, the suffering, the weak, the underprivileged, and those less fortunate than himself. He was a man who truly possessed nobility of mind and character. His life was an example of that. His position in this body as a legislator has been referred to, and properly so. He was one of the outstanding Members of this body."

Congressman William Lemke has been an able Member of Congress for over 15 years, and prior to that time he served his State with distinction in many capacities.

The laws establishing the Bank of North Dakota, the State-owned mill and elevator, the State bonding fund, the State hail insurance, and the fire and tornado fund, were created by bills drafted by the Honorable William Lemke, and enacted by the Nonpartisan League-controlled Legislative Assembly of North Dakota during Gov. Lynn J. Frazier's administration.

The amazing success of these State institutions are shining examples of what a State can do to curb monopolistic tendencies, and to assist private initiative and enterprise.

One of the first bills written by Congressman William Lemke, and introduced in Congress was the Frazier-Lemke farm-loan

refinancing bill which failed of enactment because it provided too much assistance for the farmers in the opinion of the loan sharks.

The Frazier-Lemke farm moratorium law enabled thousands of farmers to hold their farms during the terrible days of the depression. Congressman Lemke successfully defended this law in Federal courts and before the Supreme Court on innumerable occasions.

In introducing and securing the enactment of a bill providing for the establishment of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, Congressman Lemke paid tribute to a great American and gave the people of North Dakota a park that will continue to be a source of pride and pleasure to the citizens of the State.

Congressman Lemke fought for the constant improvement of the National Peace Garden located on the border between the United States and Canada.

When the lands of the three affiliated tribes of the Berthold Indians were inundated by the building of the Garrison Dam, Congressman Lemke secured a settlement of the claims of these Indians, and his record shows he was one of the best friends the Indians ever had.

Until Congressman Lemke's successor has been elected, I shall endeavor to keep the people of North Dakota posted through Doings in Congress as to what is going on in Washington.

The Leaders of the Chinese Government Have Been Friends of America; Would the Communists, Not One of Them Trained in This Country, Be Favorably Disposed to Us?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of June 9, 1950:

FRIENDS FROM CHINA

There is an impression in some quarters that the United States is being unreasonably stiff-necked on the matter of the recognition of the Chinese Communists and their representation in the United Nations. Secretary Acheson has been obliged once more to explain that United Nations work is being impeded, not by any American policy, but by the Soviet attempts at blackmail by boycott. There are, moreover, quite a number of different things that go into the American attitude. They are not necessarily overriding considerations, but they need to be understood if the American reluctance to take up the cause of the Chinese Communists is to be properly appraised.

The suggestion that the United States should bow to the Russian behest to "save" the United Nations means that we would be obliged to repudiate a Government that has been faithful and friendly, to welcome into the United Nations a regime that has been outspokenly hostile to us. One of the ways in which the friendship of the Chinese Government toward us has been conspicuously displayed is in the choice of representatives, both in relations with this country and with the United Nations, who are deeply and earnestly friendly toward the United States. Most of them have had a part of their education in this country and they have shown an enthusiastic understanding of and support of the good things that go into what we call the American way of life. The change that is urged upon us now means turning our backs upon these proved friends. Here, for example, are just a few of them:

Dr. V. K. Wellington Koo; ambassador since 1947. B. A., Yale; M. A. and Ph. D., Columbia; holder of many honorary degrees from American institutions; long a resident in this country.

Dr. T. F. Tsiang; head of the Chinese delegation to the United Nations. Ph. D., Columbia.

Dr. Liu Shih-shun; representative on Trusteeship Council; M. A., Harvard; Ph. D., Columbia.

P. C. Chang; representative on Economic and Social Council; M. A., Columbia; visiting professor at University of Chicago and University of Hawaii.

Dr. C. L. Hsia; alternate representative on Security Council; M. A., Glasgow; Ph. D., Edinburgh; for many years a resident of the United States.

Dr. Shuhsi Hsu; representative in "Little Assembly" and member International Law Commission; Ph. D., Columbia.

Y. C. Koo; executive director, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; M. B. A., N. Y. U.

Dr. Li Wei-kuo; representative on Far Eastern Commission; Ph. D., Columbia.

Liu Chieh; former minister-counselor; Washington; representative, Trusteeship Council; ambassador to Canada; studied at Oxford and Columbia.

Dr. Tan Shao-hua; senior minister-counselor, Washington; Ph. D., Chicago.

That list of 10 could be greatly expanded and the factor of close relationship with American education and warm friendship toward the United States would remain a constant.

No comparable group can be expected from the Peiping regime in which there has been every effort to exterminate American influence and a constant campaign to denigrate and vilify the United States. This country, therefore, can hardly be expected to look toward their advent at Lake Success with any great enthusiasm.

This phase of the problem is not the most important one. It shows, however, that there are more reasons than one for the American attitude.

The Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, "Neither rain nor snow, nor heat, nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds." But, the Postmaster General's order does.

Under leave, I want to insert in the RECORD my reasons for requesting that this order be rescinded:

The storm of protests I have received from residents of my district, added to my own personal analysis concerning the Postmaster General's order of April 18, prompted my introducing H. R. 8508 directing that this order be rescinded and directing also that the Post Office maintain such services as existed prior to the issuance of his order.

In his statement of May 11, 1950, the Postmaster General tells us that he is in agreement with the activities of the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress in their laudable efforts to reduce the expense of the Government. I want to go on record, emphatically, as one Member of Congress who cannot find after careful study, any saving by this order.

A great many of my colleagues evidently are of the same opinion, judging by the number of similar bills that have been introduced in an effort to restore our postal service as we knew it before Postmaster General Donaldson issued his order curtailing mail deliveries and other essential postal services. On June 8, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service reported H. R. 8195 to rescind this order. I support this bill and I will vote for the resolution to have this controversial order argued on the floor of the House.

Once and for all, a definite policy must be established toward the Post Office Department. It is the one department of the Government that truly represents a service department.

I have devoted a great deal of time to an analysis of this order particularly as it actually affects my congressional district. I am sure I can prove that my Tenth Congressional District of New York is an area most seriously affected. This is a residential district. What business houses we have in it are the neighborhood stores. They, too, will get but one mail delivery a day. Definitely, this will affect the purchasing power in the community. Their dependence on mail deliveries and on pick-up service is very important. Distances from carrier stations and transportation services vary. From my own home, using transit service at a cost of 20-cent carfare, to and from the post office would consume 1 hour's time. Waiting in line at the post office would add to this amount of time. This situation applies also in other metropolitan areas. Rural localities have but one delivery each day. They do not need any more. I have lived in a rural district where there is no delivery and where the people do not want one. Going for the mail is the most enjoyable of daily rituals. But it is in the cities that our former service must be restored.

A break-down of the Postmaster General's curtailment order will show too many changes that would prove damaging to the finest postal system in the world. Bear in mind that this system has been in existence as long as our Government and that it has improved with the years and with the progress of our Nation. Too many of these changes seem to me to be based on the Postmaster General's opinion. In his instructions to his postmasters, he orders a readjustment of city delivery routes so as to provide one delivery a day. He orders collection of mail from street letter boxes to be scheduled for a minimum number of collections to provide for the essential needs of the community. He states that it should be understood that neighborhood stores and professional offices do not require more than one delivery each day. Now that is a restricted opinion—restricted entirely to the Postmaster General. He goes on further to order deliveries of parcel post restricted to one delivery each weekday except in business areas in those instances where the volume of parcel post mail is so great that it exceeds the storage capacity of the post office. In other words, the number of parcel-post deliveries will depend on the size of the post office in the community and not on the needs of the community.

Here is the trip schedule of a carrier on the two-trip assignment under the recent order:

He reports for work at 6 a. m. Leaves his station at 8:10 a. m. He returns at 12:20 p. p. m. and leaves at 1:05 p. m. Returns to his station at 2:20 p. m. and his day ends at

2:30 p. m. Now analyze this. His first trip takes at least 3 hours in the morning, but the second trip—over the same route—must be covered in 1 hour and 15 minutes. That time must include his trip to and from his station. How much can be accomplished in this time? It is ridiculous to consider. In other words, there will be but one delivery a day even in business areas. Here is the one-trip schedule: The carrier reports at his station at 6:10 a. m.; leaves his station at 8:30 a. m.; returns at 2:15 p. m. and quits for the day at 2:30 p. m. All carriers must bring along their lunches or find restaurants en route. They must lunch from 11 to 11:30 a. m. My own letter carrier would not be within six city blocks of a restaurant at that time. Does the Postmaster General suggest that the carrier sit on the curbstone and unpack his lunch? And another thing—naturally, on the one-trip schedule, the sack of mail is heavier. We can break the mailman's back carrying it or we can allow him to deposit it en route. Where? In some unguarded hallway or on someone's front porch? Postal laws and regulations have always prohibited the mailman from leaving his sack out of sight. Great stress was laid on the necessity for such laws and regulations. Now, under the Postmaster General's order, postmasters are authorized to make relays to business places or well-protected porches of residences.

In the entire Brooklyn, N. Y., post office, which is a $21,000,000 office showing every indication of reaching the $40,000,000 mark, there is a total of 35 carrier stations. In my district there are exactly eight of these stations. In the 35 carrier stations in the Brooklyn post office, there were, prior to the Postmaster General's order, 1,745 carrier delivery routes. As a result of his order, every fourth route must be absorbed. Four hundred and eleven of these have been absorbed. The carriers for these 411 routes are actually our own displaced persons right here in America.

Let us take the entire picture of the delivery personnel. We have regular carriers, auxiliary carriers, and substitute carriers. These are civil-service personnel. The regulars are those with regular, assigned routes; the auxiliaries are regular carriers without any assigned routes; and the substitutes are those who are used to fill vacancies caused by sickness, vacations, and compensatory leaves for Saturday, Sunday, and holiday performance of service. But, under this new order, the regular carrier is absorbed into other carrier stations. He will be a floater. He will report to his newly assigned carrier assignment and fill in where needed. Some of these men have 25 years of service. Is this the treatment we should give them after those long, faithful years of hard work? They will not know where they will be assigned until they report each day. Is this efficiency? What confusion can result! The auxiliary carrier is one who must be given 8 hours' work a day. Many of them are being assigned clerical duties at the general post office. Approximately 300 substitute carriers have also been ordered to report to the general post office and, together with substitute clerks, will share the allotted substitute time. They must be given 3 hours' work a day. Most of the substitutes (at least 90 to 95 percent) are veterans with families. Eventually they can face extended leaves and complete dismissal as a result of these transfers to the city division. They have no pension plan, no social-security benefits on which they can rely.

Now, let's get on to this Post Office Department deficit, which, we are led to believe, has created the necessity for this curtailment in services and the resulting confusion. The Postmaster General reports a deficit of $551,529,528. He tells us, "The Post Office Department, like all other Government agencies, operates under appropriations allowed by the Congress. Congress actually fixes the amounts that may be expended for postal services. This Department, being a revenue-producing agency, is authorized by law to pay its expenses from its revenues. When the revenues are insufficient to meet the expenses, Congress authorizes the withdrawal of the necessary money from the general funds of the Treasury.

"This is a businesslike arrangement, as it enables the Department quickly to liquidate its obligations throughout the country from the money it takes in and to supplement the income with funds withdrawn from the Treasury, which obviously are secured from general taxation. The amount by which the postal revenues are insufficient to cover the expenditures for the maintenance of the service represents the postal deficit."

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, we find the following losses in the Post Office Department:

Second-class mail	$174,000,000
Third-class mail	129,000,000
Fourth-class mail	104,000,000
Registry, insurance, COD, special delivery, money orders, and postal notes	61,000,000
Free handling mail for all Government agencies	$37,000,000
Civil Service accommodations (not incidental to post office work)	2,000,000

Is this a deficit or does it represent the cost to the taxpayer for the services of the Post Office Department? The Postmaster General has referred to a businesslike arrangement. Does this look like a businesslike arrangement? We spend over one hundred and ninety-one million on the Labor Department; over four hundred fifty-nine million on the Department of the Interior; over six hundred and sixty-seven million on the Department of Commerce and over four hundred and seventy million on the Department of Agriculture. We do not call these figures deficits. They are the operating costs for these departments!

I do not believe in deficit spending any more than anyone else. And, I do not believe you can reduce expenditures by reducing efficiency. Why must the American public be penalized for this deficit by the recently inaugurated reduction in delivery and other postal services? On February 9, I voted to increase the rates on several classes of mails and services to increase the income from this mail and services by $131,340,000. You will note the date of this vote was 2 months prior to the Postmaster General's order of April 18. How can we now, in good conscience, ask the American public to pay higher postage rates for reduced services?

The Congress of the United States has a duty to the American public. It is time for a congressional board of inquiry to look into this situation and to report the facts to the public. I want to know these facts and judging by the mail I have received on this subject during the past month, so does every other taxpayer in my district.

The Inter-American Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, this year, the Inter-American Highway was officially opened from the United States border at Laredo to El Ocotal on the Guatemalan frontier—a distance of 1,618 miles. On the same day another celebration at Ciudad Juarez-El Paso marked the opening of the Christopher Columbus Highway by the Mexican Government. The distance along this highway from its terminus at Juarez to El Ocotal, by way of Chihuahua and Mexico City before joining the Inter-American Highway route, is 2,174 miles.

Mexico, in pushing these two routes between her boundaries, has given priority to the international trunk line, although to many of her citizens other internal highways must have seemed to be of more immediate importance. But it is not enough to congratulate Mexico on a job well done. We must hasten now to complete the road to the Panama Canal so that all concerned may reap the maximum benefits from this unifying link between American nations in which we have already invested considerable labor and material.

The distance from El Ocotal to the Panama Canal along the highway route is 1,605 miles and of this length all but 281 miles are passable over all-weather roads. An additional 42 miles can be transited in dry weather. This 42-mile stretch, which should be improved, is in Costa Rica. Of the impassable lengths, 25 miles are in Guatemala, 199 in Costa Rica, and 15 in Panama.

The Pan-American Highway throughout the Americas contemplates an additional 12,415 miles of all-weather road below the Panama Canal interconnecting the countries of South America, and of this 10,458 miles have been built. While it is, of course, desirable that the entire route be completed as soon as possible, we have an immediate concern with the completion of the few remaining miles through Central America because of our interests in the Panama Canal, our international commitments, and the investment we have already made in the road.

Fifty-one years ago, at the First Conference of American States, in 1889, the idea of constructing a railroad interconnecting the Americas was approved; but this plan never went beyond the survey stage. It was not until 1923, at the Fifth International Conference of American States held in Santiago, Chile, that a resolution was adopted calling for a study in the interest of developing an efficient program for the construction of automobile highways between the countries. Then, 2 years later, the Pan-American Congress of Highways was established and in 1929 the Congress of the United States appropriated funds for the participation of this country in survey work for the highway.

That same year there was held in Panama at the invitation of that nation the First Inter-American Highway Congress, attended by representatives of the six Central American States and the United States. This Congress recommended that within 5 years the countries involved construct a road suitable for vehicular traffic between Panama and the United States. During the next 4

years the Bureau of Public Roads reconnoitered a highway route and its report was published as a Senate document. In the first 10 years since the continental American Republics had agreed upon the wisdom of studying a Pan-American Highway, the route of the portion designated the Inter-American Highway, from Panama to the United States, was rather definitely laid out.

The next year, 1934, saw the first United States appropriation for construction when Congress made available $1,000,000 primarily for demonstration work. Mexico was carrying its full share of the project and in 1936 opened the 762-mile segment between Laredo and Mexico City.

That same year at the conference for the Consolidation of Peace, held at Buenos Aires, the Pan-American Highway Convention was signed. With the confirmation of this convention by the Senate and its proclamation by the President on September 16, 1937, the United States had undertaken a treaty obligation "to collaborate, with all diligence and by all adequate means, in the speedy completion" of an all-weather motor vehicle highway.

On April 28, 1941, Secretary of State Cordell Hull recommended the participation of the United States in the construction of the portion of the highway between the Panama Canal and Mexico, the Inter-American Highway. Congress enacted the necessary legislation in December of that year and $20,000,000 was subsequently appropriated. Work has since continued uninterrupted and the funds will be exhausted by the end of the current year.

In June 1942 the Army engineers, because of strategic needs, undertook to make the road passable for military vehicles but then in September 1943 terminated the project because the military need was no longer pressing. Just prior to the war this country embarked on the construction of a heavy-duty road from Chorrera to Rio Hato in Panama, over a portion of this same route. To complete the history, I should add that in 1943 Congress appropriated $12,000,000 for especially difficult work in Costa Rica and this sum is now exhausted. Let me emphasize that United States participation is limited to Central America.

To summarize, today, the road from the United States to the Panama Canal is complete over 2,942 miles of the total 3,223-mile route and funds for United States participation will be exhausted this year. On March 28 I introduced a bill, now before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, which would authorize the appropriation of $8,000,000 a year for the next eight fiscal years to enable the United States to cooperate with the Central American Republics in completing the highway between Mexico and the Panama Canal. Senator CHAVEZ has included a similar authorization in the Federal aid highway bill now being considered by the Senate Committee on Public Works, of which he is chairman.

Naturally, before proposing the legislation, I was convinced that in the interest of the United States the road should be promptly completed. Since we embarked on the project it has been our intention, as repeatedly indicated by the President, by the Secretary of State, by Members of Congress, and by Congress in its 1941 enactment, to build a through highway. The governments of the six republics—Guatemala, Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panama—consider that we are committed to the project and each of the six has recently offered our Government assurances of its cooperation toward the early completion of the work.

At the first conference of the Ministers of Public Works of Central America and Panama, the conferees recently issued a formal statement:

> That in order to undertake the completion of the construction of the Inter-American Highway, the countries represented at the conference are willing to contribute their respective quotas to underwrite the total cost of the highway within their respective borders, as soon as the United States of America should decide to continue its policy of cooperation with these countries to that effect.

They have further taken into consideration the cost and operation of maintenance of the highway by their statement:

> Understanding their unavoidable obligation to maintain the Inter-American Highway after completion in sound condition for its use, resolve that the countries represented at the conference should include in their annual budgets the necessary funds for the conservation of the Inter-American Highway in each of the sections corresponding to the respective countries (March 4, 1950).

But even if the record did not indicate our intent; even if the Central American states did not feel we were committed, I am convinced that the highway should be completed at the earliest possible date. Remember that during the war the Army felt, at one time, the strategic importance of completing the work. It was on July 23, 1942, that the Secretary of War advised the Secretary of State that the construction of the Inter-American Highway was an urgent military necessity. If it was then, it could be again. Submarines preyed on Carribean shipping in the last war. In the event of hostilities again another nation might disrupt commerce by submarine warfare in that area. In 1949 over half of the antimony ore imported came from Mexico. Sixty percent of the fluorspar, 85 percent of amorphous graphite and over half the zinc-bearing ores imported came from the area. In addition to these strategic and critical materials, others imported from Mexico and Central America include agar, castor oil, coconut oil, manila fiber, pyrethrum, copper, manganese, mecury, mica, platinum, strontium, tin, and tungsten. The defense aspects cannot be ignored.

One of the great links of the national transport system is the Intracoastal Canal that bends down to the border. Others are the major pipelines that span the Nation from the border. Completion of the Inter-American Highway will be another instance of further providing a concrete backbone, linking the nations, in the event of further aggression of a foreign power—all protected from sea raiders during a defense of this continent.

More important, perhaps, is the building of hemispheric solidarity. In this country we have seen how the automobile has overcome geographical and regional obstacles to our national solidarity. Repeatedly I have noticed at motor courts and hotels along the border communities in my district automobiles displaying registration plates of Oregon, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York. Yes; even Florida and California plates are seen on the roads through south Texas citrus groves. Occasionally we see an Ontario or some other Canadian plate. This intermingling of people from various parts of North America has acquainted the people of one area with those of another. It has acquainted people with the resources and problems of other areas of the country. Acquaintance first breaks down prejudice. Then it develops understanding. It is almost impossible to visualize all the advantages that can come when Panama and Costa Rica license plates will be seen in Nebraska and those from Maine and Oregon will be seen in Nicaragua. To hasten that day we must complete the highway to the Canal Zone.

The Inter-American Highway will open up the countries to themselves and to one another. This will stimulate trade and tourist traffic. Local surpluses and shortages can be better balanced. Practically every year there is a shortage of some staple such as corn, rice, or beans in some one of the Central American countries. An interconnecting highway with short-haul transportation will provide a cheap means of combating such situations in the interior.

The Honorable Edward J. Miller, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, stated that, "this will open up new areas to development, stimulating demand for American farm machinery and other products. It is not overoptimistic to predict that increased sales of United States manufactured products in the countries to be served by the highway will, in a few years' time, more than cover the costs of our contributions to the highway's construction. Any improvement in living standards will be done to the benefit of the United States as well as to that of the countries themselves. We import from those countries tropical agricultural products, noncompetitive in nature. We send them processed foods, textiles, and other manufacturers. In 1940, we bought 54 percent of their exports, while they purchased 75 percent of their needs from us. In 1948 we took 72 percent of their exports while 83 percent of their imports came from the United States. The total of our foreign trade with these six countries now amounts to over $400,000,000 a year as compared with approximately $80,000,000 before the war. The Inter-American Highway will be a vital factor in further increasing United States trade with Central America and Panama."

Completion of the trunk route will stimulate local road construction. These tributary highways will open new areas within the countries and stimulate demand for additional goods and equipment from the United States, particularly automobile parts and garage ac-

cessories. They will stimulate demand for farm machinery. The economic expansion of highway construction will create a permanent market for maintenance personnel. As such it helps stabilize the economy of these States which so largely rely on a few agricultural commodities for their foreign exchange. Improved highways will tend to lower transportation costs and so improve living standards within Central America.

The funds used will be largely spent in the United States—for road machinery, supplies, and professional help. Failure to complete the project now would practically constitute abandonment and would prevent realization of the full return on funds already spent.

The State Department has advised that there is no single matter in our relations with the six countries concerned which has a higher priority from their point of view. Better communications will help stabilize the economy and politics of these neighbors. It will eliminate the physical isolation which contributes to instability.

It is no exaggeration to say that the completion of the highway is a matter of crucial importance to each one of these countries, and to abandon this project would hurt our relations with those countries.

In giving our attention to the high priorities and the high costs of helping restore to stability the ravaged nations of the world and of assisting them to combat inimical doctrines and forces, we must not overlook the importance and relatively small cost of aiding the nations of the Americas to attain greater solidarity. Failure to carry forward work on the highway would be inconsistent with the point 4 program which Congress has recently adopted.

I repeat, we must complete the highway promptly for national defense, to provide an overland route to the Panama Canal, to protect our present investment, for our domestic interests, to foster hemispheric solidarity, to carry out our international commitments, and to improve our foreign relations. I know of no other project that is justified for so many reasons. Let us hasten its completion so that we may all partake of its benefits as soon as possible.

Rent Control Bill Should Be Passed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of June 12, 1950, entitled "Ending Rent Controls" gives a sane and balanced view applicable alike to those who wish to bring control to an end and to those who wish them continued. Failure to extend Federal rent control now will only involve the critical mistakes of 1946; what this editorial calls "one sorry experience with the sudden elimination of rent ceilings." This editorial commends itself to the sober consideration of every American regardless of his view on this subject. Problems have a way of responding only to facts, not rhetoric. Though we have an effective rent-control law in New York, the people of my city and State are deeply concerned with the general economic situation of the country and it is because of the grave danger of runaway rents that I favor strongly the extension of Federal rent control.

ENDING RENT CONTROLS

The Senate debate on rent controls, which was interrupted by Senator CAIN'S single-handed filibuster, is not fundamentally concerned with the extension of the rent freeze. The real question is the method to be used in liquidating controls. The country has had one sorry experience with the sudden elimination of rent ceilings, and while the housing situation has perceptibly changed for the better since then, and numerous areas have been decontrolled, the improvement has not been universal, and it is certain that grave consequences would ensue in many sections if the Federal law were merely allowed to lapse—as it will at the end of this month, unless Congress acts in the meantime.

Unfortunately, the techniques of gradual decontrol have never been seriously applied by Congress. The present Senate bill merely calls for the extension of the present act for 6 months, with a provision allowing cities to keep controls for another 6 months, if they see fit. The inadequacies of existing law and the divided mind with which Congress has always approached the problem have led New York State to set up its own system—and the superficial quality of senatorial discussions of the rent situation thus far in the session has amply demonstrated the wisdom of this course. Congress tends to substitute arbitrary dates and bureaucratic regulation for a well-thought-out plan of decontrol—those who, like Senator CAIN, want the law to expire altogether, run head-on into opponents who would freeze rents indefinitely, and the results are makeshift compromises which offer protection to neither tenants nor landlords.

It is probably too late, and tempers are running too high, to expect a scientific and equitable bill from the present Congress. While the administration has been expounding the virtues of the Fair Deal around the country, this acutely practical and urgent question has been left to take its chances in an atmosphere which certainly does not promise any fair dealing. But there is still time to prevent the whole rent structure from collapsing overnight. That opportunity, at least, should be seized.

Regulation of Bituminous Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. MARSALIS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. MARSALIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the House a bill to regulate the bituminous coal industry primarily by establishing minimum prices for coal at the mines. This bill is identical with that introduced in the other body recently by the senior Member from West Virginia. His bill has been favorably received by many of the coal operators, by labor, and, I feel, by the public in general.

It is apparent to every thinking American that the welfare of the bituminous coal industry is essential to the strength of the United States, both in peace and at war. It must be equally apparent that the industry is today not healthy. It is beset by adverse influences which, if permitted to continue without restraint in the public interest, will ultimately destroy the place of this industry in a prosperous national economy.

The basic trouble with the bituminous coal industry is its vast overcapacity to produce. During World War I, the industry expanded itself to take care of the enormous wartime demands for coal. A few years following the close of that war, overcapacity had resulted in complete disruption of the industry. Eventually, after years of ruinous strikes and untrammeled competition, Congress enacted a system for controlling the industry which worked to bring peace and stability to it. That control was allowed to lapse during World War II. Now again, the industry finds itself with enormous overcapacity and consequent labor unrest and unsettled price structure. It seems only the course of intelligence to act now to prevent a repetition of those conditions which, if left to run their course, will surely destroy this industry as a part of private economy of the Nation.

Curtailment in Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article that appeared in United States News and World Report of June 16, 1950, as follows:

WHY YOUR LETTERS ARE LATE

(Reported from New York, San Francisco, Chicago, Washington)

(After cutbacks: The mail still goes through, but it takes a lot longer. Slowdown hits both businesses and individuals. Fewer pickups; deliveries take the big toll. A letter that used to arrive overnight may be in the mails 3 days now. Some users are forced to skip the mailman; are turning to telephone and telegraph for all but routine correspondence.)

The United States mail today isn't what it was a month ago. It is in the process of slowing down, of becoming less dependable for people in residential areas and in many business sections.

Cutback in mail service now being made is the first on a broad scale in the peacetime history of postal service. Always in the past the Post Office Department has moved forward to give the public more and more service. It moved from horse and buggy, through the pony express, to the railroad, and then the airplane, all designed to speed delivery and make the mails bigger and better.

All of a sudden, after 175 years of progress, the Post Office Department is finding some

business users of its service telling their customers: "Don't depend on the mails." The reason is found in the uncertainty of pickup and delivery in some communities. Air mail in particular, is being delayed. A heavy investment in subsidy for air mail is nullified in part by curtailed pickup of mail. People often are paying a premium for service no faster than they can get through regular train mail.

Slower mail service, to date, is said to be bringing few complaints either to the Post Office Department or committees of Congress. Yet, a reporting job carried on in several cities of the country to get reactions of mail users turns up plenty of complaint from a large portion of sampled individuals.

People are talking and thinking of their troubles, even if they aren't making formal protests. Some volunteer to pay more postage if that is what it takes to bring back better service. Others just wonder what's wrong, and how long the curtailment will last.

What has happened, in brief, is that the Post Office Department, to save $70,000,000 out of a $2,200,000,000 budget, has cut home deliveries to one a day and stopped collecting mail after 7 p. m. in most places. It also has closed windows in post offices that used to take mail in the evening and on week ends. It has discontinued readdressing of letters misaddressed; cut parcel-post delivery to once a day, stopped fast handling of circulars, eliminated much night work that formerly speeded the mail.

These reductions now are in effect in about half the cities of the country; they will spread to the rest of the country by July 1. Larger businesses are meeting the situation to some extent by their own efforts. Some firms send their own pickup and delivery trucks to the post office.

Smaller businesses and individuals cannot do much to help themselves. Schedules were cut most in residential areas, where wives write the family letters and mail them in the evening.

Just to show the kinds of delay produced by the new system:

In Washington, D. C., the last pickup of mail in residential areas had been between 9 and 10:15 at night. Families wrote their letters in the evening, dropped them in the neighborhood box and knew they would go out that night. An air-mail letter to Chicago often was delivered the next morning, always the next afternoon, with 12 to 18 hours after writing. Nobody kicked about a 6-cent air-mail stamp for service like that.

Now, in Northwest Washington, the last pickup is between 6 to 7:30 o'clock. A letter mailed after 7:30 is not picked up until after 8:30 the next morning. It can't be delivered in Chicago until the following day, or 36 hours after writing, whether it goes by train, at 3 cents, or plane, at 6 cents. If it happens to miss the one Chicago delivery, it waits until the next day and isn't delivered until 60 hours—2½ days after writing.

Similar delays occur on mail starting out at the other end—Chicago, in this example. There, the last pickup from street letter boxes is at about 6:15 p. m. A typical exchange of a letter and its answer between Washington and Chicago could easily have been accomplished in about 36 hours under the old system. Now the exchange will require around 60 hours. Any little slipup can add another 24 hours to the delay.

In Los Angeles, mail dropped in a street box in the evening formerly was delivered in San Francisco the following afternoon. Now it gets delivered the day after that, at least 12 hours, sometimes 24 hours later.

A slowdown in personal mail may not be serious, as postal officials argue. But it is enough to throw a monkey wrench into family planning, at it often upsets habits and arrangements that kept people happy for years. A case in point is the man who received a certain check every Monday morning—he depended on it and so did his creditors. Now it sometimes reaches him on Monday afternoon or Tuesday, but once it did not arrive until Wednesday. By that time he was completely out of money and was having trouble borrowing.

Another case illustrates the kind of annoyance people find in the postal slowdown. In Washington, D. C., a man and his wife suddenly decided to go out of town for a week end. They had to notify the wife's parents in Florida. An air-mail letter would have reached Florida in time under the old system. With curtailed deliveries, that wasn't possible. A long-distance phone call had to be made. It cost about $1.50, where a 6-cent stamp would have served a week earlier.

Businessmen complain about a variety of higher costs resulting from slower mails. A fabric manufacturer in New York City had this experience: A mill located in Wilmington, Del., mails in a daily report at the close of business every afternoon. That report formerly was delivered to the New York office the next morning. Now it comes in the afternoon, or early the following day, and there is greater chance for a costly delay in company operations.

This manufacturer is going to use the telephone, since he can no longer depend on the mails. "Mail from our Chicago office," he says, "would normally come into our New York office the next morning or afternoon, via air mail. Now we get it on the second day after mailing. Regular mail reaches us Thursday, if it's mailed early enough on Monday. Our phone bills are jumping."

Even more serious than big telephone bills is the risk of losing orders until everybody gets acquainted with the new slow mail schedules. A Washington, D. C., firm tells this story: A customer in Cincinnati, Ohio, air mailed on a Thursday some specifications, requesting an immediate bid. His letter reached Washington Friday morning. Once it would have been delivered that afternoon; under the new rules it was held up, delivered Saturday morning when the District of Columbia firm was closed for the week end. By chance, an employee came by the office late that afternoon and found the customer's request. The staff had to come in Sunday to work up estimates on what turned out to be a $300,000 order. The company would have lost the order if the customer's request had not been found until Monday morning.

Reason for the cut in postal service is explained by Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson as follows: The House appropriated $2,207,500,000 for the mails in the year starting July 1. Expenses would amount to $2,277,000,000, if old standards of service were maintained.

"There is only one way to save the money," says Donaldson, "and that is by curtailing services. It is futile for critics to claim that the Post Office Department can make sizable savings any other way."

Many Congressmen privately applaud this effort to save money. But they aren't sure about the public's reaction. Legislation ordering the Department to restore service has been approved by House and Senate committees. This makes it available for quick passage, if public protests rise.

So far the most vocal complaints have been those of mail carriers, who dislike longer routes and heavier loads. That may not be true after effects of reduced service spread to every community of the Nation. A slowdown in the mails, the first in history, is irritating and often costly for most people and businesses.

Excise Taxes Affect Our Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herein an article published in the Detroit Education News, published at Detroit, Mich., and written by Mr. Gregory Battistone.

It deals with the subject of excise taxes and urges relief from such burdensome levies and especially as it affects articles used in the public schools of our country.

I share the opinion expressed in the article. It should be read by every Member of Congress.

URGES TAX RELIEF

(By Gregory Battistone)

We know that economic goods move from producer to consumer down a number of parallel and connected channels, passing from stage to stage through the hands of middlemen of various degrees and kinds and along various means of transportation to reach the hands of the consumer at last. Goods move uninterruptedly along the channels which have been dug for them only when appropriate price differentials are maintained all along the route. Temporarily goods may move without a satisfactory differential, as has been done since the war with the heavy excise taxes placed on certain economic goods to keep the buyer from demanding such goods, so that production of these nonessentials can be curtailed to make room for war materials. For this reason excise taxes were to be taken off 6 months after the hostilities terminated. We know, however, that the taxes still exist and the heavy burden upon the consumer is preventing him from demanding these articles that he would otherwise want. In this economic system who is the individual that loses? The businessman cannot sell his goods, therefore the manufacturer will not produce them, and the Government does not collect taxes that would be available on the sale and manufacture of these essential items. Even the President's message regarding taxes took notice of the great harm these continued wartime burdens were having.

At this very moment the bill to reduce war excise taxes is in the House Ways and Means Committee being studied and revised to meet the administration's program. Mr. Truman proposes to cut seven of these, including taxes on furs, jewelry, handbags, luggage, long-distance telephone and telegraph, transportation on freight and passengers, and toilet preparations. Nothing is being said about reducing taxes on admission to school activities, which are 20 percent taxed; or musical instruments for schools also taxed 20 percent. It is evident that both Republicans and Democrats concede that the Federal tax setup is a thing of patches that has long needed revision. I believe that it would be a great mistake to consider isolated tax inequities without reference to the whole body of war excise taxes. We who are in the field of education should see that every effort is made to promote any project that would better the educational processes for our American boys and girls. If the portion of the excise taxes affecting any element of our educational processes is repealed, millions of dollars now being taken from the schools would eventually be placed back into the educational processes. We must recall that school funds are not for private profit.

President Truman's Speech at St. Louis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of President Truman's St. Louis address made on June 10, 1950, denouncing the Soviet Union's tactics, as reported in the Washington Star of June 11, 1950:

I am happy to participate in the dedication of this historic site to the memory of Thomas Jefferson and the early pioneers and settlers of our westward expansion. The park which is to be created here will bear witness to our gratitude to Jefferson and the brave men who explored and settled the area of the Louisiana Purchase.

This park will commemorate a great act of statesmanship. When Jefferson purchased the Louisiana Territory, our country acquired a material basis for the kind of democratic society of which Jefferson dreamed. The abundant lands of the West made it possible for millions of families to settle on their own farms as freeholders and independent citizens.

Thus rural society of freemen fixed the democratic character of our institutions. After this, the country changed in many ways and was exposed to many dangers, but its democratic nature could never be shaken. The foes of democracy, whether they were the old Federalists, or the monopolists of a later period, or the adherents of new tyrannies and dictatorships, have not been able to prevail against it.

FOREIGN POLICY IMPORTANT THEN

We sometimes forget that we owe the Louisiana Purchase to Jefferson's wisdom and experience in foreign affairs. Foreign policy was a matter of first importance in Jefferson's time, just as it is today. The United States in those days was a new nation, and weak by comparison with the great European empires. Its continued survival as an independent country depended upon its having the good will and friendship of other countries.

Today, our foreign policy is that of one of the strongest nations in the world. But the future welfare of our country still depends upon our foreign policy just as it did in Jefferson's time.

This is true not only because the world has shrunk in terms of space and time—it is true also because in our day totalitarian tyrannies have sprung up in the world. These tyrannies, whether of the left or of the right, have threatened free institutions and free governments everywhere.

UNITED STATES IMPELLED TO TAKE LEAD

In this situation, our country has been impelled by the principles of freedom for which we stand, and by the needs of our national security, to take a leading role in the search for a just and permanent peace among nations.

We have taken the position of leadership that President Wilson wanted us to take after the First World War. Our aim today is the same as his aim was then—to establish a peaceful world order in which disputes between nations can be adjusted without bloodshed, and the individual can be sure of justice and freedom in his daily life. The creation of such a world order requires an international organization of free and independent nations, cooperating voluntarily in the maintenance of peace. It also requires collective action to prevent aggression.

We refused to assume our responsibilities as a Nation after the First World War. But by the end of the Second World War, we had learned our lesson.

AIDED INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Since that time, we have joined with other nations in the formation of a world organization to keep the peace. We have used our resources to aid the recovery of war-shattered economies. We have aided in carrying on international activities in economic, social, and cultural fields. We have helped to build a greater degree of international cooperation than the world has ever known before.

Our actions for peace have had the support of the American people without regard to political affiliation. Our foreign policy has been bipartisan, and I am confident that it will remain bipartisan.

The steps we have taken toward international cooperation offer real hope and opportunity to mankind. But they have not yet provided us with the assurance of a permanent peace.

The reason is clear. In the 5 years that have passed since the end of the war, we have been confronted with a new, powerful imperialism. We had hoped that our wartime ally, the Soviet Union, would join in the efforts of the whole community of nations to build a peaceful world. Instead, the Soviet leaders have been an obstacle to peace.

SOVIET SEEKS EXPANSION

By means of infiltration, subversion, propaganda and indirect aggression the rulers of the Soviet Union have sought to extend the boundaries of their totalitarian control.

With a cynical disregard for the hopes of mankind, the leaders of the Soviet Union have talked of democracy—but have set up dictatorships. They have proclaimed national independence—but imposed national slavery. They have preached peace—but devoted their energies to fomenting aggression and preparing for war.

The result of these tactics has been to spur the free nations on a greater co-operation and more vigorous efforts for the improvement and the defense of their own institutions. These efforts have been without parallel in history. Five years ago we would not have dreamed that such joint efforts as the European recovery program or the Atlantic defense program were possible in time of peace. Measures of even closer cooperation are now being planned and set up.

We have made good progress so far. Because of this progress, we are confident that we can establish the conditions necessary to a genuine peace. We know that the free world has both the will and the means to insure its own survival. But I would like to emphasize the difference between confidence and complacency. We cannot be complacent. Our ultimate success depends on sustained further effort. We have joined with other nations in establishing a new and stronger kind of international association than we have known before. But there is a long road ahead.

SOME WANT UNITED STATES TO QUIT

There are, of course, some people who are urging us to pull out of these joint efforts to achieve a lasting peace for the world. They point to the difficulties we have already experienced and the long road that lies ahead. They want us to reverse our foreign policy, withdraw from our cooperation with other nations and retire behind our own defenses.

These people are known as isolationists. They are dangerous not only to the cause of world peace, but also to our national security.

The isolationists take an upside-down view of our affairs. They want us to stop giving aid to free nations that are able and willing to make good use of our help. They ask us to give up in the very places where we are succeeding. They say that cooperation with friendly nations is too expensive—but they forget how much more expensive it would be to abandon our allies to the aggressor and try to defend ourselves alone.

Peace costs too much, they say. But their policy would permit free nations everywhere to be swallowed up one by one, and would leave the United States alone as the sole defender of freedom.

ISOLATIONISM ROAD TO WAR

Isolationism is the road to war. Worse than that, isolationism is the road to defeat in war.

The people who are striving to destroy our foreign aid programs and our programs for the common defense of the free nations, are striking at our own national security. They may not mean to do us harm, but they are as dangerous to our future as those who deliberately plot against our freedom.

Most of the American people know this. Most of us have enlisted in the struggle for world peace "for the duration." We are not thinking of deserting.

What we want to know is what progress we are now making in the struggle for peace and what we have to do in the future to achieve our goals.

In looking at the current world situation, it is plain that the present policies and activities of the Soviet Government are not contributing to peace. The Soviet Government is refusing to participate in the work of the United Nations. Representatives of the free nations are being forced out of the satellite countries. Soviet leaders are turning the school children of eastern Germany into the same kind of pitiful robots that marched into hopeless battle for Hitler.

REDS KEEP LARGEST ARMY

At home, the Soviet regime is maintaining the largest peacetime armed force in history, far greater than it needs for the defense of its own boundaries. The leaders of the Soviet Union, instead of using their resources to improve the well-being of their people, are devoting a massive share of those resources to the acquisition of further military strength.

We have tried to dissuade the Soviet leaders from this militaristic course, so unnecessary, so costly to their people and to ours, so antagonistic to the pursuit of peace. After the war we demobilized the bulk of our Army, Navy, and Air Force. In the United Nations we put forward proposals to share with the world the development of atomic energy and to prevent the use of the atomic bomb. We urged general disarmament and the creation of United Nations forces. But despite all those peaceful efforts Soviet armament has continued to increase.

These ominous activities of the Soviet Union, however, are being offset by the growing strength of the free world. The free nations are making steady progress in creating more satisfactory conditions of life for their people, and stronger defenses against aggression.

COMMUNISM FEEDS ON WEAKNESS

The strength of the free world is not to be calculated primarily in military terms. Economic, political, and moral strength are equally essential, because the challenge which confronts the free nations is far more than a military challenge. Communism feeds on weaknesses of whatever kind. Wherever the free nations fail to meet human needs and aspirations, they are vulnerable. In this sense, the Soviet threat is a challenge to the free world to live up to the principles it professes.

The free nations are meeting this challenge with vitality and energy.

Over a great part of the world the work of recovery and peaceful development is quickening its pace.

Our faith in the recovery of western Europe, expressed in the Marshall plan, has been justified many times over by the near miracle of production we have been witnessing. We have seen dramatic evidence there of the will to work. We have also seen resolute expression of the will to be free, and to unite in common defense.

TWO FACTS SHOWN BY MEETING

Last month the Secretary of State went to Paris and London to meet with representatives of our partner-nations in the North Atlantic Treaty. Those meetings demonstrated two significant facts: First, the nations of western Europe have grown much stronger and much more confident during the past year. Second, the nations of the North Atlantic Treaty are rapidly forging an effective partnership for a great purpose—to preserve their freedom and improve the lives of their citizens.

The recent proposal of the foreign minister of France, Mr. Schuman, is evidence of the growing community of purpose among the free nations. He proposed that the coal and steel resources of western Europe be pooled and utilized jointly for the benefit of all. This statesmanlike move, and the warm German response to it, are among the most encouraging developments in Europe since the end of the war. Meetings are being held now on the Schuman proposal and, if the details can be worked out, this plan will help to end the age-old rivalry between France and Germany and result in a far more peaceful and productive Europe.

In the sphere of defense, the decisions made at London give further evidence of the growing community of purpose of the North Atlantic Treaty countries. These countries are making plans to use their resources wisely so that military protection and social progress will both be maintained.

COMMON DEFENSE OF WEST

To this end, the treaty nations adopted the principle of creating balanced collective forces of the most modern and efficient type. This means that each country will contribute to the common defense of the North Atlantic area in accordance with a common plan, instead of trying to create a complete modern defense establishment for itself.

Such a balanced collective defense will be stronger and less costly than the old system of completely separate defense establishments. It will make it possible to provide the necessary military protection without imposing an unmanageable burden upon the economies of the member countries. Countries, like the United States, which have responsibilities for maintaining peace and security outside the North Atlantic Treaty area, will, of course, continue to maintain whatever defense forces are needed to meet those other responsibilities.

The conferences in Paris and London also dealt with the situation in southeast Asia. In that area, Communist agents are trying, under the cloak of nationalism, to destroy the independence of newly formed free nations.

The governments of these nations are resisting Communist encroachment and subversion to the best of their ability. We are now extending economic and military assistance to these countries to help them create the stability necessary to resist Communist pressure and to promote better conditions of life for their people. This aid to the countries of southeast Asia is designed to make it possible for them to work out their own destinies in cooperation with the other free peoples of the world.

UNITED STATES TO SUPPORT DECISIONS

The United States intends to do its part in supporting the decisions and implementing the plans developed at Paris and London.

The free nations of the world have all the elements of strength necessary to protect themselves from aggression. They are applying one of the clearest lessons of the two World Wars—that peace-loving nations must be strong, determined, and united, if they are to preserve the peace. The resolute efforts being made by the United States, in concert with other free nations, enable us to face with confidence the hazards of the future.

We cannot be complacent, because the dangers we confront are many and serious. On the other hand, we must not become hysterical. In all probability we shall be required to make substantial efforts for peace for many years to come. But our situation is strong, our strength is growing. We must remain cool, determined and steady.

Above all, I wish to emphasize that the objective of our efforts is peace, not conflict. What we seek is not domination over any other nation or people, but simply the creation of a just international order, applicable to all nations. We believe that this aim can be achieved when all nations seek it in good faith. We look forward to the time when all international differences can be settled peacefully, and by negotiation, on the basis of these principles.

In the language of the Charter of the United Nations, we are determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind.

The people of the world look to the United States of America as the strong bulwark of freedom, and to them we pledge that we shall work side by side with other free nations in order that men the world over may live in freedom and in peace.

Why We Are Losing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an article entitled "Why We Are Losing" by Bruce Barton, which appeared in the Washington Star of June 11.

Mr. Barton served with distinction as a Member of this House from New York. All of us who know him look upon him as a man of outstanding ability. He has so many accomplishments I would not attempt to enumerate them. But, above all else, he is a man of unimpeachable honesty and integrity and who has always placed his country's welfare above all selfish or political consideration.

This concise article by this great American expresses better than any words of mine what is in the mind of every thinking American. I commend it to your thoughtful reading:

WHY WE ARE LOSING

(By Bruce Barton)

Some of our leading internationalists now are telling us that we are losing the cold war.

We have lost all of China to communism.

Territorially we have lost much of southeast Asia; morally we have lost more. In one country at least, Indochina, we are hooked up with a rascal whom no self-respecting American would trust for 5 minutes with his daughter or his dough.

Politically our big gain is Tito, who is making trouble for the Russians—not because he likes us, or because we have succeeded in our policies; but because, as every student of history has tried to point out, despotism, seeking world conquest, always has carried the seeds of its own destruction.

Many reasons are assigned for our failures. Mostly, the experts say, we haven't poured out enough money or built up enough armies and air forces.

I have a different idea. The Kremlin is winning the cold war because Stalin and his associates are Russian who believe in Russia and Communists who believe in communism.

We are losing because our President and his associates do not believe either in the capitalistic system or in placing the interests of the United States first.

They say they believe in our system. But the President attacks it almost daily. The Attorney General, supposed to be the legal protector of all Americans, even including businessmen, spends much of his time seeking to discredit and destroy business. Our Supreme Court is hostile. A hundred bureaus and commissions waste our money and impede our work.

How can we expect to lead the world when our own leaders do not believe in what they are supposed to be trying to protect and extend?

In 1952 we may be wise enough to elect a President who will say to foreign countries: "Make no mistake about it. My first business is to uphold and strengthen the United States."

Slave Labor Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following two recent editorials from the Boston Record and Boston American commenting of my humble efforts in behalf of Massachusetts industry and admirably pointing up the dangers of current imports of slave-labor goods from iron-curtain and other countries:

[From the Boston Daily Record of June 6, 1950]

PHILBIN'S GOOD EXAMPLE

The success of Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN of Clinton in temporarily blocking the flood of slave-labor imports from Czechoslovakia heartens all New England workers, and it should inspire every Member of Con-

gress from our six States to give his district the same kind of representation.

As Congressman PHILBIN says, the shoe and textile workers of New England cannot compete with the Czechoslovakians without destroying their standard of living and, in many instances, without sacrificing their employment.

Furthermore, Czechoslovakia is one of the most obnoxious of the iron-curtain countries, and there is no justification whatever for the United States making her a stronger and bitterer factor in the cold war.

Too many New England Congressmen voted for the misnamed reciprocal trade treaties, which enable Czechoslovakia to treat Uncle Sam as if he were Uncle Sap.

Although these Congressmen were told again and again that they were actually closing mills and factories throughout New England and inviting another disastrous depression, they allowed themselves to be deluded by the internationalists in the State Department into voting for this exportation of American prosperity.

Decency and honesty should now compel them to follow the sound leadership of Congressman PHILBIN in minimizing the harmful effects of these nonsensical pacts.

[From the Boston Evening American of June 7, 1950]

PATRIOT REBELS

Aroused by the stupidity and short-sightedness of the bunglers in the State Department and other Federal agencies, with their habitual determination to play world politics at the expense of the American workingman, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, this week trounced the internationalists in a very much to the point speech in the House of Representatives.

"Today the stores throughout the Nation are filled with shoes made in Czechoslovakia by enslaved labor," he said.

"These shoes are shipped into the United States from behind the iron curtain and sold to importers at prices which are less than the American manufacturer must pay for leather and other materials and not allowing for the decent wages paid American workers.

"There is no question but that every pair of these Czechoslovakian shoes purchased in this country feeds good American dollars into Communist-dominated areas, encourages and builds up totalitarian labor methods, and undermines American prosperity and the free labor of our own shoe industry.

"It is estimated that more than a million pairs of Czechoslovakian shoes will come here this year. They will be dumped by an economy organized on totalitarian principles at below the American cost of production. In fact, some authorities state that they can be sold in American markets at half the price of American-made shoes.

"This constitutes a direct and extremely dangerous attack upon American labor, American business, and American prosperity."

Congressman PHILBIN is a patriot in resisting this cold war assault on our economy; but for some mysterious reason, he lacks the support of the entire New England congressional delegation, most of whose members voted for this exportation of American prosperity through the misnamed reciprocal-trade treaties, even though they had been told again and again that they were actually closing important industries in Lynn, Lawrence, Haverhill, and other cities.

Of course, Congressman PHILBIN is too polite to say so, but some of these other Congressmen and Senators who deserted the people back home in this outrageous manner are apt to find themselves in serious trouble in the next election if they do not succeed in shutting off the flood of slave-labor imports before the votes are counted.

Statement of Mr. C. R. Strackbein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach hereto the following statement of Mr. C. R. Strackbein, chairman, the National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, before the Committee for Reciprocity Information on May 25, 1950:

Mr. Chairman, my appearance before this committee is only in fulfillment of a formality. The Committee for Reciprocity Information is wholly incapable of carrying out the responsibility that has been placed upon it. This is not said in derogation or disparagement of the committee's personnel. Their individual and group competence may be of the highest. That is not the question.

The burden placed upon this committee represents what appears to be a studied disregard of the interests of those who are affected by what the Government does. Were it expected to perform conscientiously its exacting task, the committee would not merely hold hearings, which at best cannot produce for it the information which it needs; it would conduct extensive investigations in the field and particularly overseas. By failure to do the latter, one-half of the competitive equation is virtually ignored.

To attempt to make findings of fact affecting 2,500 items under the tariff in a matter of 2 or 3 months with limited personnel is a measure of the contempt in which domestic producers are held. This contempt has been carried to the point of vengeance—political vengeance.

Vengeance against what?

Against something that has almost completely disappeared from the scene, to be replaced by something else quite different.

The time has come when it must be made clear that the tariff is no longer, if it ever was, the mother of trusts, the favored instrument of the fatted and inefficient rich, or the means of beating down and gouging the consumer.

There was a time when the true liberal could rise in righteous indignation and thunder at the princes of privilege and the tariff in one breath; and it was done. The habit, indeed, became confirmed. It became so imbedded, in fact, that it has continued long after the conditions which invoked it have passed away. The studied indifference to the representations of interested groups in tariff hearings, while aimed at the old devils of privilege, falls in fact upon a wholly different group today.

Those who look to the tariff today are not the so-called robber barons of 50 years ago; not the trusts or monopolies or giants of mass production. On the contrary, it is the smaller producers, who lack the advantages of costly equipment, of expensive installations, and production-line economies. It is the workers in these industries as well as the owners who regard the traiff with favor—not for the purpose of building monopolies but as a means of protecting their wage standards, their employment, and the better conditions of work that they have achieved.

In order to do this they ask only that they enjoy competitive parity within this country, not a competitive advantage over imported products. This country already recognizes the value of free trade where the competitive advantage of the imported product is based upon superior resources of climate, soil, or minerals. Nearly two-thirds of our imports are free of duty. These products are largely complementary to our own economy and consist principally of raw materials that are not produced here or in which the advantage clearly lies with the foreign producer, as in the case of coffee and bananas.

However, where the foreign competitive advantage does not lie in this kind of superiority but is rather to be found in lower wages, not even the principles of free trade enjoin us to expose ourselves without defense. Those who would advocate doing so would certainly find equally good reasons for opposing national minimum wage legislation in this country.

Assuming that hundreds of industries in this country are concerned about the degree of tariff protection which will assure them competitive parity with imports, and assuming that the workers in these industries are similarly concerned, because of their stake in high labor standards and in continued employment, their interests are worthy of the most serious consideration. This consideration should extend to a thorough examination of the facts before reaching the conclusion that particular tariff rates are too high and therefore should be reduced.

There is simply no point in pretending that the present procedure satisfies the requirements of even the minimum consideration that should be given. What has been done to date under the trade agreements program by way of cutting tariffs has been effected on the leeward side of the storm, so to speak. The storm not having struck us face on during the past 10 or 12 years, the unwary make bold to assume that there will be no storm. Then they make sure that no one who disagrees with them can possibly escape until the storm is upon us and the splinters fly.

If these arbiters of the public interest guess wrong, the guess will have been theirs, since adequate guidance by facts was shunned although it was urged upon them. The injury, however, will fall elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman, the rule-of-thumb procedure of the trade-agreements program should be halted. The economy of the United States today is not the economy of 1939. The change is far reaching and its implications reach into unexpected sectors. Because of our exceedingly high national obligations we need and must retain a high national income, one of well above $200,000,000,000 per year. This requires a continuation of high prices, much higher production than that of 1939, higher employment and higher wages than those prevailing before the war.

All this adds up to a national condition that may be likened to an economic plateau. The consumer is no longer entitled to low prices on competitive imports when the lower prices are derived from lower wages, as they are in virtually all instances. Disregard of this injunction could undermine our great plateau and endanger our solvency, in a manner that was not present in 1939.

Nor is below-parity competition needed as a spur to technological progress or to prevent monopoly. Competitive imports strike at the smaller industries where competition is still very keen among the various units. Lowered duties would not hit the gigantic industries where the real dangers of monopoly power lie. In fact, reduced duties under present-day conditions, create a situation that is most conducive to the disappearance of small companies, sometimes through failure and sometimes through the absorption of the smaller by the larger enterprises; and therefore promotes business concentration and monopoly.

In view of the present reduced state of our tariff, and in view of the grim determination of the State Department to continue moving farther in the same direction, there remains one avenue of salvation.

Unfortunately the Department of State has sought to foreswear the use of this avenue. For reasons best known to that Department our Government has branded quotas as the worst form of trade barrier. Who commissioned anyone to utter such gratuitous condemnations before the world is not known. Nevertheless, it has been done—and with a degree of unwisdom that is startling.

Quotas in some forms may, of course, be very deadly to trade; but quantitative quotas as such need be neither deadly nor unreasonably restrictive, or restrictive at all. Quotas that would permit the importation of particular items in a given proportion to annual consumption would not be restrictive if the percentage of the market allotted to imports were based upon a representative previous period. In some cases it might be possible to grant a higher share of the market to imports than had been taken by them before.

The percentage quota would in some other cases permit the complete removal of a tariff without causing the injury that comes from a tariff that is too low while there is no limitation upon quantity. Specifically, the percentage quota would remove most of the price-wrecking potential of low-cost imports. If domestic producers were assured that imports, no matter how low their cost, could not capture more than a given portion of the market, they would lose their fear of such imports, unless, of course, the percentage to domestic production were high enough to determine the price level. This would seldom be the case.

The price structure of an industry is extremely important, not only to the owners of industry but also to the employees. This is especially true today because of the economic stilts upon which we are mounted. We are committed to a high national income as the only means of meeting our national obligations and commitments. Price deflation cannot be countenanced beyond a limited margin. The pressure of declining prices on wages and employment is quickly felt.

So long as our producers enjoyed a seller's market there was nothing to worry about except as a measure of precaution. That situation has changed in a very considerable degree. In a buyer's market, prices are vulnerable to low-cost competition, particularly if it is not known how large a supply can be offered at the low prices. If the supply is known to be limited, the threat loses its disruptive force. It is very probable that domestic producers would gladly trade certainty in the question of supply for a higher percentage of imports than have been coming in.

The producer, being also the seller, would feel that the buyer could no longer browbeat him in a buyer's market as he can do when there is no limitation to the supply.

The percentage quota would have the further advantage of restricting imports when they can do the most damage price-wise, i. e., on a declining market; and would share expanded business with the foreign supplier at a time when this can be done most conveniently.

Today the flow of capital into plant expansion may be narrowed in those industries where increased foreign competition is anticipated. This dampening of expansion plans would be removed by the certainty that foreign supplies could not capture the anticipated greater market at which the expansion was aimed. Thus the absorption of workers which is one of the functions of investment flow, could continue without hindrance from anticipated lowering of tariffs.

The percentage quota would also ward off any sudden voluminous dumping of goods upon this market by the processes of state-controlled trading, where costs are ignored. The use of dumping devices as a means of penetrating our market or for the purpose of gaining dollar exchange would be greatly restricted. There would be little point in using such methods since they could not lead very far.

Finally, this type of quantitative quota would go far toward meeting one of the weaknesses of the tariff. It is characteristic of the various nations that they differ among themselves in wage and competitive levels. Some countries more nearly approach our own wage standards than others. A tariff rate that is suitable to the imports of one country may thus be too high or too low with respect to other competing countries. Yet only one tariff rate is possible if discrimination is to be avoided and if descriptive classifications cannot be utilized to establish different rates.

Obviously the tariff rate on items that come from countries that countenance wages of 10 cents per hour would in some cases have to rise to what would appear to be exorbitant levels in order to establish competitive parity in our market. This could be avoided by the percentage-quota system, for reasons already given.

Mr. Chairman, the quota system here described would do no violence to our trade. It would provide for the expansion of imports as our own economy expanded. It would avoid the most direct threat which today hovers over our own economy on the deflationary side.

The dollar gap would yield more readily to this treatment than to a mere lowering of the tariff alone since the percentage-quota system would not menace our own economy as would unrestricted tariff reductions. The dollar gap will not yield its tyranny if our import potential is lowered by exposing a wide variety of our producers to deflationary pressure from abroad. The quota system would eliminate this pressure and thus retain our import potential, proofed against the shrinking effects of unfair competition in a buyer's market.

If such quotas are not utilized, we believe that the Torquay negotiations will be the exercise of unwarranted license in disposing of the economic well-being of hundreds of thousands of workers and indirectly of millions. This will be done in pursuit of a theory that is contradicted daily on the domestic front in the form of national minimum wage and agricultural parity price administration. It will be done in an atmosphere of conjecture instead of factual knowledge and will hasten the day when drastic remedial action must be taken.

Factory and Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a fine editorial entitled "Factory and Farm," appearing in the Boston Post of June 9, 1950, making reference to a splendid and effective speech made recently in the National House of Representatives by our able and distinguished colleague, Mr. LANE, of Massachusetts:

FACTORY AND FARM

Congressman LANE ir a recent speech in Congress made a well-reasoned plea that the Government, which is spending billions to aid the farmers, might well turn a modicum of this huge sum in the direction of the unemployed mill and factory workers in New England.

He does not ask for direct subsidy of the factory worker such as is being paid to the farmers, but merely that the Government, which is currently spending hundreds of millions or dollars in stockpiling raw wool, pork chops, and other things in the name of the defense program, could well spend a few millions in stockpiling such essential things as worsted cloth, which is more easily storable than the mountains of grain, raw cotton, and raw wool that are being piled up under the national-defense program.

Congressman LANE'S argument is backed up by a recent article in the Army and Navy Journal by Kenneth W. Marriner, Chairman of the Wool Industry Advisory Committee, Munitions Board, in which Mr. Marriner says that in the defense program of stockpiling wool, first place should be given to the stockpiling of the woolen garment cloth in order to meet the initial mobilization requirements. A diversion of some of the defense program millions to New England mills and factories on this ground would seem to be good sense as well as good economics in the present condition of widespread unemployment in the mill cities.

Equally pertinent and logical is the recent statement by D. D. Strohmeier, head of the Bethlehem Steel shipbuilding division, concerning conditions at the great Fore River works in Quincy, Mass.

At the launching of the great new S. S. *Independence* at Fore River, he said: "As you watched that great ship slide into her element you saw a busy shipway become idle. You saw another step in the creeping paralysis that is crippling the shipyards of this country. Not one keel for a sea-going vessel remains to be laid now. Yet we have only one-third of the passenger ships we had before World War II, and less than half the prewar troop lift capacity."

Meanwhile, Mr. Strohmeier said our Goverment is paying higher subsidies to assist Japanese shipbuilding than to our own. Here at Fore River is another place where the Government could wisely divert some of the defense-program money in the better interest of defense and to aid the national economy through a lean stretch as it affects these localities.

Polish-American Veterans of Massachusetts, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include herein my remarks made at the second annual convention banquet, Polish-American Veterans of Massachusetts, Inc., on Sunday, June 11, 1950, St. Mary's Auditorium, Lawrence, Mass.:

Veterans share an experience that can never be appreciated by those who never made the sacrifices required by military service in time of war.

That is why we find such loyal comradeship among veterans.

They faced suffering and death, not alone, but in the company of others. And there

they learned the complete unselfishness that is born in time of stress.

They hated the dirt and weariness and the unspeakable pain that is war, as all civilized men do. Yet, under that pressure, they learned to help one another in a way that they will never forget.

This precious feeling of comradeship in a great cause deepens with the years. Long after the painful memories of combat have lost their sharp edge, veterans remember not the personal fear and the personal suffering but the funny, the sad, and the inspiring incidents that took place when they were together. There is a kinship among those who served their country in time of peril that can never be found in the separate pursuits of civilian life.

And so, veterans form special organizations of their own to preserve the values which they found in reunions such as this. When exservicemen unite, they speak a language all their own, which even their wives can't understand, unless they served as WAVES or WACS or SPARS.

But the purpose of a veteran's organization is not simply to relive in recollection, those days of proven comradeship.

Veterans are the guardians of our Nation's security, its courage, and its ideals.

Their duty does not end when the guns are silenced.

They naturally want to blot the horrors of war from their memory as soon as they can, but they must not forget its lessons, or permit those who never knew its sacrifices to take such giving for granted.

Veterans have claims prior to that of any other group in our Nation, because they have contributed more than any other group. They have the right to expect that their wounds shall be given the best of care, that their disabilities shall be eased in part by compensation, and that a grateful Government shall help them to make up for the best years of their lives which they gave to protect those who stayed at home.

The United States is paying back these debts to its veterans.

But this is not enough.

This Nation must pay attention to our veteran organizations and the wisdom they have acquired in desperate defense of our fundamental beliefs.

It must listen to the realistic warnings that this Nation cannot afford to drift again.

You veterans know the heavy price that was paid to save our people from their indifference to the dangers abroad in this world.

You say that it must not happen in the future, and you mean what you say.

Until Russia proves by her actions that she is willing to cooperate instead of dominate, the United States and our allies must be ready and on guard against any possible surprise attack.

We want peace because, as a people, we have and are working at the job of settling grievances by reasonable adjustments and not by force.

We want peace because we know that war, hot or cold, is a drain on precious human and material resources.

We want peace, but not at the price of surrender.

The postwar record proves that we have given in on many occasions in the hope that Russia would make similar concessions. In fact, we have conceded too much, thereby encouraging the Communists in the belief that we are push-overs.

That policy has been rightfully consigned to the junk heap.

By now strengthening ourselves and our allies against aggression we are serving notice on Russia that it would be unhealthy to seek further conquests either by force or by trickery.

We are calling the turn on the Communists.

If they really want peace, the burden is on them to prove it.

The time has now come for them to make concessions, and to live up to them. High on the priority list of wrongs to be undone is the requirement that Russia withdraw all her personnel, both civil and military, from Poland and permit that heroic nation to breathe freely again.

The mistakes made at Yalta in yielding to the Russians, on the advice of our military leaders who underestimated our military strength and believed then that we needed Russia's help to knock out Japan, must be rectified.

Appeasement has never worked because it means retreat, retreat, retreat before an aggressor who believes it to be a sign of weakness and will continually press the other party to give in still more until nothing remains to give.

Appeasement did not work at Munich, Yalta, or in China, because Hitler and Stalin are vultures of the same feather.

As we learned in 1939 from Poland when that nation called a halt to appeasement and resisted the two dictators at the same time. Although outwardly crushed, the people of Poland still resist with the secret and patient determination to regain their independence, which neither time nor Communist propaganda can ever conquer.

In the heroic fight of the RAF, in the desert campaigns of north Africa, on the seas, and in the Normandy invasion, Poles who had escaped from their homeland were in the forefront of the counterattack.

In the bitterly contested, yard-by-yard advance through the rugged mountains of Italy, Polish divisions fought with the same courage and tenacity as their brothers and sisters who went down fighting in the ruins of Warsaw, or as their successors are doing in the Polish underground of today.

Proving that freedom is everybody's business everywhere.

Your countrymen were the first to understand this all-important fact. They fought for their homeland first, as any of us would, but they did not stop fighting when it was conquered. On every front around the world they joined with others who shared their faith, striving to recover that freedom which is every man's right, above the narrow distinctions of race, color, or creed.

There is one everlasting reminder that the fight for freedom is not limited by any frontiers.

That reminder nestles in the shadows of Monte Cassino, among the Apennine Mountains of Italy. Behind the thick-walled abbey on its crest, the Nazis were dug in, holding up the Allied advance. Even after American fliers had dropped 450 tons of bombs, the enemy could not be dislodged for 3½ months. Wave after wave of infantrymen crawled up its rocky slopes only to die before they could reach their objective, by the withering fire of its well-protected defenders.

The success of the whole Italian campaign was endangered by the resistance of this difficult key point.

It was then that the Allied commanders called upon the Polish divisions to do the impossible.

They took Monte Cassino at a price.

The green hillside is today dotted with the white headstones of 1,070 Polish soldiers who forfeited their lives to win one of the outstanding victories of World War II.

The monks are now rebuilding the ruins of the abbey on the top of Monte Cassino. And the tourists who stop to offer a silent prayer, linger in awe, wondering what inspires men to such courage in fighting for something that is far from home.

As veterans, we know the answer.

Peace is indivisible.

You cannot have some here and none there.

We seek not the peace of the graveyard nor the security of a jailhouse, behind an iron curtain.

We want a climate among nations in which people can go about their business without fear of betrayal, and with every possible choice of creative opportunity. To accomplish this, all nations must agree to a basic moral code supported by an international organization.

While working toward that end, we must be vigilant on defense.

There must be many people in Russia who give lip service to their temporary masters, while secretly yearning for the day when they can be friends with other peoples again.

Inevitably, these human needs of theirs must find expression.

There is plenty of evidence to show that the Communists are more worried about the Russian people than they are of the outside world.

In this we find hope and a guide for our policy from now on.

If we can reach through to the Russian people, as we must, there is a good chance that they will wake up to the deceits that have been practiced upon them by the Communists, and will liberate themselves.

As veterans, it is our responsibility to alert the American people and to devise ways and means by which all of us can help to bring the truth home to the Russian people.

Toward the day when Russia will be free, and Poland will be free, and all the nations of the world will live in the harmony of human fellowship for the rest of time.

Cullman County Farm Statistics for 1949; Reports of H. G. Pinkston, County Agent, and Mary Sue J. Gray, Home Demonstration Agent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, Cullman County, Ala., in the Seventh Congressional District, has over 7,100 farmers and farms—the largest number of any county in the State of Alabama.

Cullman County farmers are energetic and progressive. Their farm crops are diversified, and yields are above the Alabama average.

I am including as a part of my remarks statistical extracts from the 1949 reports of H. G. Pinkston, county agent, and of Mary Sue J. Gray, home demonstration agent:

AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

I. Soil management and water control

Number of acres terraced	8,500
Total number of acres properly terraced in county (this question covers all acres terraced in past)	44,916
Number of linear feet of drain ditch opened	48,000
Number of farm ponds constructed	45
Total acreage covered by water in these ponds	45
Number of irrigation demonstrations established	6
Number of acres involved in these demonstrations	11
Number of soil-preparation demonstrations	3,218

AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING—Continued

I. Soil management and water control—Con.

Number of planting demonstrations	2,670
Number of cultivation demonstrations	1,160
Number of harvesting demonstrations	3,150
Number of land-reclamation demonstrations	18
Number of acres reclaimed	72

II. Mechanical equipment

Number of tractors purchased	464
Total number of tractors on farms	1,000
Total number of corn pickers in county	1
Total number of seed cleaners in county	9
Total number of heavy-duty lime spreaders operating in county	26
Number of gin plants operating	42
Number of new gin plants this year	2
Number of gin plants making major mechanical improvements	18
Number of driers operating in gins	8
Number of new driers this year	3
Number of gins assisted in the better ginning of cotton	42
Number of bales ginned by those gins assisted	35,000

AGRONOMY

I. Perennial legumes

Kind	Acres planted	Seed saved	Estimated total acres now in county
Kudzu	12	0	800
L. Sericea	4,400	146,000	21,695
Alfalfa	2,000	0	2,481

II. Winter legumes

	Pounds seed planted 1949	Pounds seed saved spring 1949
Hairy and smooth vetch	275,000	30,000
Willamette vetch	265,000	----------
Austrian winter peas	119,000	----------
Crimson clover:		
(a) Common	75,000	70,000
(b) Reseeding	75,000	25,000
Caley peas	3,000	----------
Bur clovers	50	----------

III. Summer legumes

	Acres planted 1949	Seed saved 1949
Annual lespedeza not in permanent pasture	1,800	9,000
Crotalaria	5	----------

IV. Grains

A. CORN

	Number demonstrations	Acres	Average yield per acre
Special heavy fertilization, thick-spacing demonstration:			
(a) Adult	150	165	[1] 84.1
(b) 4-H	100	----------	[2] 94.18
Whole-farm demonstrations	6	36	67
Number of farmers hogging corn:			
(a) Special demonstrations	5	----------	----------
(b) Other corn demonstrations	15	----------	----------
Bushels hybrid seed corn planted in county	3,000	----------	----------

[1] 10 reporting to date.
[2] 20 reporting to date.

B. GRAIN SORGHUM

	Number	Acres planted
Estimated farmers planting	400	1,200
Farmers grazing off	15	----------

C. SMALL GRAIN

	Estimated acreage planted, fall 1949	Estimated bushels harvested, spring 1949
Oats	10,000	26,000
Wheat	350	2,000

V. Pasture crops

A. Improved permanent pastures:

1. Acres improved in 1949 by doing one or more of the following:
   - (a) Preparing land 3,400
   - (b) Liming 5,000
   - (c) Using phosphate 3,600
   - (d) Using potash 1,200
   - (e) Mowing 2,600
   - (f) Using O–14–10 3,600
   - (g) Seeding 4,500
2. Estimated acres of pasture that have had some kind of improvement up to now (1935–49) 18,000
3. Number of permanent pasture demonstrations now in operation 3,200
4. Pounds of seed saved:
   - (a) White clover 5,000
   - (b) Ladino clover 10,000

B. Farmers planting supplementary grazing crops for fall and winter grazing:

1. Crimson clover alone:
   - (a) Number farmers 800
   - (b) Estimated acreage 1,800
2. Crimson clover mixed with ryegrass or small grain:
   - (a) Number farmers 2,150
   - (b) Estimated acreage 6,000
3. Small grain alone for grazing:
   - (a) Number farmers 900
   - (b) Estimated acreage 4,500
4. Small grain in mixture with vetch, peas, ryegrass, etc., except crimson clover:
   - (a) Number farmers 2,850
   - (b) Estimated acreage 8,000
5. Caley peas:
   - (a) Number farmers 50
   - (b) Estimated acreage 50
6. Red clover:
   - (a) Number farmers 5
   - (b) Estimated acreage 12
7. Bur clover:
   - (a) Number farmers 5
   - (b) Estimated acreage 3
8. Estimated number acres winter grazing crops top dressed with nitrogen this fall 3,400

C. Farmers planting spring and summer annual grazing crops (soybeans, annual lespedeza alone, cowpeas, sudan grass, millet, etc.):
   - (a) Number farmers 340
   - (b) Estimated acreage 890

D. Farmers using perennials for grazing:

1. Alfalfa:
   - (a) Number farmers 300
   - (b) Estimated acreage 500
2. Kudzu:
   - (a) Number farmers 125
   - (b) Estimated acreage 400
3. Sericea alone:
   - (a) Number farmers 3,000
   - (b) Estimated acreage 9,000
4. L. Sericea-crimson clover combination:
   - (a) Number farmers 140
   - (b) Estimated acreage 400

E. Number year-round grazing demonstrations now in operation:
   (a) 2,200.
   (b) In how many communities: 36.
   (c) Number other meetings held re grazing crops, 73.
   (d) Attendance, 5,000. Grazing discussed in two series of meetings.

VI. Phosphate and lime

1. Superphosphate, 1,000 tons.
2. Basic slag, 6,000 tons.
3. Agricultural lime, 7,000 tons.

pH tests made: (a) adults, 45.

VII. UTD

1. Number active farms, 26.
2. Number new farms approved this year, 2.
3. Number meetings of demonstrators held: (a) field, 1; (b) office, 2.
4. Total number meetings held on test demonstration farms, 31.
5. Total number attending meetings on test demonstration farms, 900.
6. Tons of TVA materials used on UTD farms:
   (a) Triple superphosphate, 60,500.
   (b) Fused tricalcium phosphate, 168,600.
7. Tons of lime used on UTD farms, 90.

VIII. Cotton

Heavy fertilization (800 pounds per acre or more) demonstrations: Number demonstrations, adults, 25; acres, 100; average yield per acre, 300.

One-variety community associations:
(a) Number active, 21.
(b) Number organized in 1949, 12.
(c) Number with definite seed renewal plan, 21.

COMMERCIAL HORTICULTURE—PRODUCTION AND MARKETING

Product	Commercial acreage	Number of farmers assisted	Volume	Total value
Sweetpotatoes	5,000	1,200	[1] 800,000	$1,200,000
Irish potatoes	1,500	1,500	[1] 125,000	350,000
String beans	500	300	[2] 1,700,000	125,000
Strawberries	700	300	[3] 30,000	200,000
Tomatoes	800	300	[1] 100,000	120,000
Lima beans	500	50	[2] 1,500,000	150,000
Corn (green)	1,500	50	[4] 810,000	160,000

[1] Bushels.
[2] Pounds.
[3] Crates.
[4] Dozens.

BEEF CATTLE AND SHEEP

A. Beef cattle

Production:
   (a) Number of herds, 35.
   (b) Number of brood cows (all cows except those kept principally for milk production), 170.
   (c) Number farmers assisted with herd management problems, 22.

Purebred bulls:
   (a) Number bulls placed by breeds:
      (1) Hereford, 8.
      (2) Angus, 4.

Purebreds:
   (a) Number of purebred herds, 7.
   (b) Number of purebred animals sold for your producers by assistance of Extension Service, 5.

Disease and parasite and predator control:
   Number farmers assisted with cattle spraying, 18.
   Number cattle sprayed, 300.

Feeding:
   (a) Number adults feeding cattle, 75.
   (b) Number 4–H cattle feeding projects completed, 34.
   (c) Number 4–H cattle feeding projects started for 1950, 40.

Shows: (a) County shows: Number beef cattle shown, 34.

B. Sheep

Production of lambs and wool: (a) Number of flocks in county, 2.

HOGS AND WORKSTOCK

A. Hogs

Number of adult market-hog demonstrations, including hogging-off corn and legume grazing, 55.

Approximate dollar value of market hogs sold, $80,000 (county).

Estimated dollar value of hogs slaughtered for home use, $800,000.

Number farmers hogging-off corn, 10.

Number experiment-station tours involving hog production, 4; attendance, 1,700.

Number of 4–H Club members having market-hog projects, 25.

Number of 4–H Club members having purebred pig projects, 88.

How many hogs entered in purebred show and/or sale, 26.

Number of purebred hogs brought into county, 71. a. Sold out of county, 150.

Number of farms producing purebred hogs:

Durocs, 5; number produced, 71.

Hampshire, 10.

CIC, 70; number produced, 500.

Poland China, 6; number produced, 40.

Number of farmers assisted in cholera control, 2.

Estimated number of farmers using sodium fluoride for internal parasite control, 15.

B. Workstock

1. Production: (a) number broodmares bred, 8; (b) number of foals produced, 7; (c) number of mule colts and young mules brought into county to grow out, 73.

2. Jacks and stallions: number in county, 2.

3. Females: Brood mares of draft strain, 160 not bred.

DAIRYING

(a) Number of grade A dairies in operation, 17.

(b) Number of new grade A units started in 1949, 8.

(c) Total number of grade A dairies in county, 25.

(d) Number of farmers selling grade B or manufactured milk, 600.

(e) List of manufactuers in State buying grade B milk, 1, Deep South Creamery.

(f) Number of grade B milk routes in your county, 12.

(g) Number of farmers living on these routes who do not sell milk, 2,000.

(h) Number of farmers living on routes who sell milk, 600.

(i) Number of meetings held on dairying: (1) community, 36.

Number of registered bulls placed, 6; (a) number produced in county, 6.

Number of registered heifers placed, 80; (a) number produced in county, 80.

Number of milk cows placed (include registered), 15.

Do you have a dairymen's organization in your county, none.

Number of farms producing purebred:

(a) Jerseys, 15; number produced, 45.

(b) Guernseys, 115; number produced, 400.

(c) Other, 2; number produced, 43.

Disease and parasite control:

Number assisted in using phenothiazine for control of worms, 14.

Number of farmers using practice in county, 20.

Number of farmers spraying cattle for control of flies and lice, 700.

Dairy shows held in county, 1; attendance, 500.

Number of animals shown in county show, 87; (1) 4–H, 40; (2) other youth organizations, 8; (3) adults, 39.

TESTING—DHIA AND OFFICIAL

Do you have a 4–H Junior Calf Club: Yes.

(a) Number of members, 60.

(b) Number of purebred owned by 4–H members, 80.

(c) Number of grades owned by 4–H members, 170.

ENTOMOLOGY

Number acres of cotton dusted for control of insects, 18,000.

(a) Number acres of cotton sprayed for control of insects, none.

(b) Number pounds of calcium arsenate used, 20,000.

(c) Number pounds of 20-percent toxaphene used, 400,000.

(d) Number pounds of 3–5 mixture of (BHC, DDT), 120,000.

(e) Number of gallons of concentrated spray used, none.

(f) Estimated increase in yield of seed cotton per acre, 550.

Number acres of corn and grain sorghum damaged by worms, 5,600.

(a) Number pounds of poison used, 2,000.

(b) Estimated value of control program, $1,200.

Number cattle sprayed for control of flies and lice, 1,000.

Number cattle treated for control of cattle grubs, 375.

Estimated value of control program, $5,000.

Number treated for control of screwworms: hogs, 75.

Estimated value of animals lost and damage due to screwworms, none.

Estimated value of animals saved by treatment, $3,000.

Number of premises treated for rat control, 245.

4–H CLUB—GIRLS

I. Rallies and picnics and camps:

1. Number 4–H Club rallies held, 1; attendance, 2,000.

2. Number 4–H picnics held, 1; attendance, 95.

3. Number 4–H camps held, 1; attendance, 46.

II. Number 4–H neighboraides: (a) Boys, 68; (b) girls, 180; (c) total, 248.

1. Number neighboraides training meetings, 2; attendance, 23.

2. Number 4–H meetings held by neighboraides, 2.

3. Number adult neighborhood leaders for neighboraide groups, 56.

III. Number achievement days, 1; attendance, 2,000.

1. Number 4–H Clubs that observe Rural Life Sunday, 2.

IV. Number of county council meetings held, 4; attendance, 236.

HOME GARDENS AND ORCHARDS

1. Total number farm gardens (adult), 9,100.

Total acres in these gardens (not including potatoes, sirup, melons, peanuts), 2,900.

What do you estimate to be the cash value to the family of the average home garden (farm and nonfarm families included), $850,000.

2. Number 4–H gardens, 218.

3. Number home vegetable gardens produced by nonfarm families 1,000. (a) Acreage in nonfarm gardens, 200.

4. Truck patches primarily for family living:

Crop	Number of families producing	Total acreage
(a) Irish potatoes	3,900	1,800
(b) Sweetpotatoes	4,200	1,500
(c) Sirup (cane or sorghum)	100	70
(d) Melons, etc	3,200	250
(e) Peanuts (not for sale or grazing)	800	150

5. Fruits primarily for home use

Kind of fruit	Number of families	Units	Number who spray or dust
(a) Peaches and plums	4,850	[1] 10,000	450
(b) Apples	4,700	[1] 8,500	210
(c) Pears	1,000	[1] 1,800	16
(d) Grapes	2,550	[2] 8,000	
(e) Strawberries	350	[3] 70,000	
(f) Dewberries	48	[4] 12	

[1] Trees.
[2] Vines.
[3] Feet of row.
[4] Acres (plants).

6. Insect and disease control (in how many towns or centers are the following materials available):

Town or centers	Number
(a) Auburn approved garden dust	2
(b) Dithane spray	2
(c) Auburn approved peach and plum spray	2
(d) Auburn approved apple, pear, and grape spray	2

MARKETING

Cooperatives (do not include A. I. A.): Name, number patrons served, and type products handled:

Cotton Producers Association, 6,000; cotton.

Farmers' Marketing and Exchange Association, 6,000; farm supplies.

Freezer-locker plants; number plants in county, 1.

Sirup-manufacturing plants: Number of farm-size plants, 15; total gallons sirup, 7,000.

Fence posts and timber-treating plants: Number of plants in county, eight drum cold soak.

Canning plants: Number in county, one private commercial and three school plants; Plant 1, King Pharr Co.; plant 2, Holly Pond School; plant 3, Fairview School; Cullman High School.

A. FIELD CROPS

	Number of farmers assisted	Volume	Total value
ASSISTED IN SELLING			
(a) Feed crops:			
Corn	250		
Oats	25		
(b) Cash crops: Cotton	5,400		
(c) Seed crops for seed:			
Cottonseed	65		
Grain sorghum	10		
Small grains	12		
Lespedeza sericea	29	[1] 20,000	$4,400
Crimson clover	19	[1] 20,000	50,000
ASSISTED IN BUYING			
(a) Seed:			
Cotton	290		
Corn	1,300	[2] 800	8,500
Grain sorghum	25		
Small grain	70		
Alfalfa seed	300	[3] 25	30,000
Lespedeza sericea	175	[3] 30	15,000
Vetch	1,400		
Crimson clover	1,500		

[1] Pounds.
[2] Bushels.
[3] Tons.

B. LIVESTOCK (SELLING)

		Number	
Beef cattle	45	70	$17,800
Dairy cattle and calves	38	48	9,000
Hogs: Breeding stock purchased	71	71	

C. POULTRY AND EGGS

Broilers and fryers	54		
Turkeys	15		

D. Forest products

1. Number of farmers given timber marketing advice and assistance, 60.

2. Number of acres of woodland involved, 2,750.

3. Volume and value of forest products sold:

(a) Board feet of saw timber, 2,372,000.

(b) Amount, $58,920.

(c) Cords of pulpwood, 160.

(d) Amount, $1,600.

4. Number of timber operators buying selectively marked timber, 6.

5. Number of tracts selectively marked for demonstrations, 20.

E. Fish and wildlife

Fishponds (farm ponds suitable for fish), one-quarter acre or larger:

	Number	Acres
Constructed this year	45	45
Total constructed to date	290	290
Privately owned ponds, including club ponds	290	314
Ponds fertilized and managed properly	250	275
Ponds checked for balance	8	10

Fur-bearing animals:

1. Farms on which fur animals were trapped: Number, 250; total acres, 12,500.

2. Total annual income from furs, $9,000.

POULTRY AND TURKEYS

1. Broilers:

(a) Number commercial broiler projects, 1,400.

(b) Number broilers produced, 2,000,000.

(c) Total broiler-house capacity (one brood), 660,000.

2. Hatching eggs:

(a) Number of farms producing hatching eggs, 75.

(b) Number of hens in hatchery supply flocks, 7,500.

3. Turkeys:

(a) Number farms growing turkeys, 40.

(b) Number turkeys raised, 700.

(c) Value of 1949 crop, $4,450.

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

Number new community organizations this year, 6.

Total number communities with regular meetings (include old and new clubs), 13.

Number communities working for Auburn Commendation, 1 getting organized.

Number communities with community house, 1.

Number communities meeting in school, church, home, etc., 13.

Total number community meetings in 1949, 36.

Total attendance at community meetings in 1949, 2,365.

Number additional communities needed, 6.

Is some member of county staff assigned to attend and assist community club? Usually meet with group.

FOOD PRESERVATION

Adult:	
Number quarts of fruits, vegetables, and meat canned	126,329
Number pounds of fruit and vegetables frozen	16,750
Number pounds of meat frozen	18,621
Value of canned and frozen food	$74,968
4-H:	
Number quarts of fruit, vegetables, and meat canned	2,150
Value of canned and frozen food	$2,511

FOODS AND NUTRITION

Number of different foods demonstrations given: (a) Adult, 1; (b) 4-H, 1. Total times repeated: (c) Adult, 23; (d) 4-H, 5.

Number of clubs in which the material on cornmeal enrichment program was used: Adult, 26.

Check the methods used to create interest in the cornmeal enrichment program (mark with x).

Discussion in clubs, (x).

News articles, (x).

Contacted millers, (x).

HOME FURNISHING

Number of communities in which work was conducted, 24.

Number of families refinishing furniture, 65.

Number of pieces of furniture refinished, 934.

Number of demonstrations given on curtains for the home: (a) Agent, 23; (b) leaders, 1.

HOME MANAGEMENT—FAMILY ECONOMICS

Household pests (control):

Number of demonstrations given on control of household pests, 23.

Number of communities in which work was conducted, 23.

Equipment:

Number demonstrations on equipment given:

Cooking utensils, 23.

Number of demonstrations given by agents, 23.

Number of demonstrations given by leaders, 1.

Approximate number of major appliances purchased by club members, 347.

Letters of Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the June 5 issue of the Northern Virginia Daily:

LETTERS TO CONGRESSMEN

A midwesterner has put a reverse twist on the usual procedure of writing letters to Congress, and obtained a rather encouraging result. Individuals and clubs are often asked to add their names to form or group letters addressed to their Representative in Congress. Sometimes the promoters of this pressure method distribute form letters to be signed as is or paraphrased and sent to a Senator or Representative. The midwesterner referred to, did it another way; he wrote an individual letter and sent one copy to all the Members of both Houses. He also sent clippings from local papers bearing on the subject of his letter.

This letter writer received 65 direct replies from the Senators and Representatives, and notes from the secretaries of five others. Most of the respondents took the trouble to analyze the correspondent's letter and the newspaper clippings, and to comment on them. There is no way of knowing whether this correspondence project will be the cause of any action in Congress, or whether it changed any Member's mind about anything, but at least it stirred up thought and let the Congressmen know that the subject discussed was of interest to at least one voter. And perhaps it also stirred up some conversation in Washington.

It is not the intent of this editorial to suggest that everybody start sending letters to Congressmen. The lesson of this and many other experiences of individuals is that the personal letter, or telephone or personal call, from a constituent to his Representative in either House of Congress does demand and get the attention of those Representatives. Cynics may say that it is a waste of time to write to your Congressmen—and such it may be if writing consists merely of a signature on a form letter. But writing a sincere personal comment is not a waste of time—far from it. It is one of the most fruitful things a citizen can do.

Belief in Capitalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a column by a former very distinguished Member of this House, the Honorable Bruce Barton:

WHAT WE NEED IS A LEADER WHO BELIEVES IN CAPITALISM

(By Bruce Barton)

Some of our leading internationalists are now telling us that we are losing the cold war.

We have lost all of China to communism.

Territorially we have lost much of southeast Asia; morally we have lost more. In one country at least, Indochina, we are hooked up with a rascal whom no self-respecting American would trust for 5 minutes with his daughter or his dough.

Politically our big gain is Tito, who is making trouble for the Russians—not because he likes us, or because we have succeeded in our policies; but because, as every student of history has tried to point out, despotism, seeking world conquest, has always carried the seeds of its own destruction.

Many reasons are assigned for our failures. Mostly, the experts say, we haven't poured out enough money or built up enough armies and air forces.

I have a different idea. The Kremlin is winning the cold war because Stalin and his associates are Russians who believe in Russia, and Communists who believe in communism.

We are losing because our President and his associates do not believe either in the capitalistic system or in placing the interests of the United States first.

They say they believe in our system. But the President attacks it almost daily. The Attorney General, supposed to be the legal protector of all Americans, even including businessmen, spends much of his time seeking to discredit and destroy business. Our Supreme Court is hostile. A hundred bureaus and commissions waste our money and impede our work.

How can we expect to lead the world when our own leaders do not believe in what they are supposed to be trying to protect and extend?

In 1952 we may be wise enough to elect a President who will say to foreign countries: "Make no mistake about it. My first business is to uphold and strengthen the United States."

That mere announcement would clear the diplomatic air like a summer shower. Every foreign statesman, who, as a matter of course, is putting the interests of his own country first, would breathe a sigh of relief. "At last we have an American who makes some sense," he would say. "With such a man we know how to deal."

Such a President would add: "I believe with all my heart in the capitalistic system. I propose to make it so sound and so successful that no peoples in the world will be satisfied with socialism or communism."

My guess is that if Stalin were ever once convinced that we have that kind of leadership he would begin to worry. He would say to himself: "If these Americans are seriously planning to tackle their own domestic problems, build up their own economy, and quit frittering away their energies all over the world, that is dangerous. Maybe I'd better begin to think about peace."

The Plight of the Navajo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is to the credit of the House of Representatives of this Congress that a great deal of time and effort has been given to the consideration of the conditions and problems of our American Indian tribes, and that a record number of bills have been prepared and passed by the House of Representatives with the thought in mind of bettering the condition of our Indians. Most publicized of all of these efforts has been the one drawing our attention to the conditions of the Navajo-Hopi Indians of the Southwest.

Recently there appeared in the Cortez Sentinel, edited by Cal Beaber and published in Cortez, Colo., of my Fourth Congressional District, the following editorial which gives a current on-the-ground impression of the treatment of the American Indian by our country. This editorial is, in my opinion, worthy of the reading and consideration of my colleagues in Congress:

THE PLIGHT OF THE NAVAJO

Harry Goulding, operator of the Monument Valley trading post in southeastern Utah, has spent his life on the Navajo Indian Reservation and probably knows the tribe better than any other white man. According to him, he was born near Durango, drifted down to Farmington as a kid, then went west into the desert where he has lived since. He has always been in daily contact with the Indians and knows most of them by their first name.

Discussing the Navajo problem with this writer Saturday night, Harry's analysis sounds about like this: "It is a national disgrace the way the white man has pushed the Indian around. From the day of our first settlement on the east coast we have persecuted him. We finally backed him onto the worthless wastelands and here we have left him and his people to starve. We call ourselves Christians, yet we stand complacently by and watch entire families live in hovels unfit for the white man's hogs. We fill our bellies with the fat of the land while the Navajo starves. We provide good schools for our children and let the Indian youngsters grow up in ignorance. We do nothing to better their lot. We feel secure in the fact that we are good Americans and that this alone should compensate for the suffering we have imposed on a minority group."

Referring to the towns of the southwest, Harry says: "You people in Cortez and the other basin towns sit on your fannies and make no effort whatever to help 'my' people. Your farmers grow potatoes, beans, vegetables, fruit, and wheat to be marketed in areas that are highly competitive rather than look to the southwest where 63,000 Navajos are ready and eager to buy everything you can raise. Here is an almost unlimited market, yet it goes undeveloped."

Naturally this raises the question of what the Indian would use for money. Harry has an answer for this, too. First, he says every town in the basin should organize and unite in a general demand on the Congress of the United States to appropriate sufficient money to build roads across the reservation. This is the first great need, as it would permit development of the various mineral deposits to be found on the reservation. These include uranium, vanadium, coal, and copper. Developing this industry would give hundreds of Indians a chance to work and increase their buying power.

Secondly, the need is great for more vocational schools where the Navajos can learn to become skilled craftsmen. Harry says many of the young men have talents along mechanical lines which, if developed, would provide the white people some of the best carpenters, masons, etc., to be found anywhere. This would give them more income, more money to spend.

Third, the need for more hospitals is acute. Hundreds of Indians die annually for lack of medical attention. Nowhere in the world are people more neglected from this standpoint than on the Navajo Reservation.

Pointing out that we are sending billions of dollars to Europe for relief, Harry thinks the need urgent that demands on Congress be made at once. He points out that this body has set up a budget of $80,000,000 to be spent over a 10-year period but that when Superintendent Harper, of the Navajo Reservation, asked for $23,000,000 of it this year he was turned down by the House with a good chance for similar action in the Senate. Goulding believes the superintendent was conservative in his request and that it should be granted. But to quote the trader, "Unless you people do something to help there won't be sufficient funds to do much good; and most certainly there won't be a dime for the 'Navajo Trails Highway' you are working so hard to get."

So far as the proposed highway is concerned, Goulding is a real booster. He says it will put his valley within a 90-minute drive from Cortez and that it will make it easy for farmers to put their products into Indian posts, and for the Indians to get out in search of employment. It will encourage further development of mining by making ore hauls easier and cheaper; it will divert a vast horde of tourists through the Utah wonderland. All these things will contribute to the betterment of the Indian problem.

After talking with Goulding, we have come to the conclusion that Cortez might be the very spot to start a movement that would really bring help to the Navajo, with resultant profits to ourselves. It seems our chamber of commerce might find this its greatest chance for doing good. In fact we like the idea so well we would like to see a "Department of Indian Affairs" set up at once, headed by men who would give their time and energy to a plan that would bear fruit. Here may be a project that could dwarf to insignificance all work that has been done to date.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the forty-seventh article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

A little round man with a face like a smiling dumpling arrived in Washington on November 7, 1933, at 3:40 p. m. (e. s. t.) bringing disaster. His aliases were many, the best known being Maxim Litvinoff.

I was one of a shoal of reporters who went down to Union Station to see him and his company met by the United States Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, the President's confidential assistant, Louis McHenry Howe, and lesser dignitaries.

There was in Washington then a fat, red-faced old fellow named Kurt Sell, who represented DNB, the official German news agency.

There was also a thin, red-faced old fellow named Lawrence Todd, who represented TASS, the official Russian news agency.

It was one of our sadistic pleasures in the State Department pressroom to get Todd and Sell into arguments.

Todd was an American citizen by birth and long ancestry, a wizened Yankee whose favorite line was to argue that because his own forebears had been here before the Revolution, communism was the more acceptable.

How the one thing proved the other he never did say.

Sell, on the other hand, was a German of the Germans. To him the rise of Hitler in 1933 was a sign that Germany had proved its superiority over all of Europe. The fact that Hitler was no German at all but an Austrian of the most dubious past and prospect, he ignored as stolidly as Todd ignored the silliness of his own argument.

Just for the record, Sell went back to Germany when the war started. Whether he went voluntarily or was deported, I do not remember, but at any rate he never pretended to be anything but a German.

The last I heard of him he was grubbing around the ruins of Hamburg, busted and grumbling, but still a German.

Todd, on the other hand, is right here in Washington. Not so popular as he once was, not responsive to reportorial horseplay. I don't know whether he has even been in Russia.

Times have changed since that triumphant day in November 1933 when Todd led the parade of the press down to Union Station as old Kurt Sell snarled and grumped and shook his head—even took off his shoes—and refused to leave the pressroom. He was jealous.

Well, we all went down to the station. The train pulled in. Litvinoff came bouncing off, completely at home, sure of himself and at ease. Why not? He had his briefing before he ever left Moscow. It was going to be easy.

Behind him trooped several swart, short types who were ill at ease, indeed, rigid.

One was to remain in Washington and become famous for a number of things, then to die by Stalin's order in a plane over

Mexico City. His name, Constantin Oumansky.

Then came the reporters from abroad, Ferdinand Kuh, Knickerbocker, and the limping, English raconteur for the New York Times, Walter Duranty.

They were very haughty, and said little. They had secrets.

Presen. too, was one whose work had been well done. His name was Boris Skvirsky. To this day, the full record of his machinations here have never been found out.

He came here in 1921 as an observer of the Washington disarmament conference, a proceeding that resulted in the United States of America sinking the most powerful navy in the world and the other signatories graciously tearing up paper plans.

That performance told Skvirsky all he needed to know about instinctive American gullibility.

Charles Evans Hughes, who had been smart enough to refuse the Soviets recognition, was the architect of the disarmament fiasco. So Skvirsky knew there was still room for hope.

For 16 years, he played on the pacifist Senators of both Republican and Democratic Parties. He flattered and diverted them with tales of communism's good aims.

How Skvirsky was able to stay on in the United States of America, legally, has never been explained.

The only government of Russia that our Government recognized, the exiled Kerensky regime, could not furnish him credentials or even a job.

But all the time, he had a house at the corner of Massachusetts Avenue and Seventeenth Street, once occupied by, believe it or not, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts.

The night of November 7, 1933, he was triumphant.

Litvinoff was under his roof, a bust of Lenin dominated his little parlor and even the dilapidated rubber plant in the bay window looked like living. But in time, millions of people would die in consequence of the triumph Skvirsky celebrated.

Revision of the Tax Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, several years ago, I made the suggestion on the floor of this House that our tax laws were having the effect of doing away with the large typically American family. I do not believe the Ways and Means Committee has given consideration to the suggestion I then made of changing our tax laws so as to be fair with those people who have the large families. But this great committee is now holding sessions on tax changes and tax reductions; and I again present this suggestion to the Ways and Means Committee.

The day of the large family in America is rapidly passing. This fact is not accidental. It is a natural result of the studious application of unfair and onerous tax laws as they apply to the parents of those with five and more children. Our laws favor the possessors of the lapdog and the house-cat rather than those who wish to have many children.

I am one of six children in my own family; and Mrs. Brooks is one of five children. When we were coming up, families of five and six children were considered small to the point of not worth mentioning. A large family in those days was one with 10 to 15 and more children; and a father considered his wealth in children rather than in property.

Our tax writers may be smart mathematicians; but they certainly have failed miserably in their application of the principles of reproductivity of the race. The master minds who have written tax exemptions into our income-tax laws provide an exemption from taxation of each child equal to $600. This exemption for children is entirely too small. It is one of the tragic reasons why the day of the large American family has disappeared from this country. If we would restore the big family to its rightful place in our midst, we must offer inducements. We must increase the dependency income tax exemption to $1,000 per child; and we must give other inducements to the prospective father and mother to encourage them to embark upon the God-given duty of rearing a family. We may criticize the couples who desire a "poodle" dog or other family pet; but idle talk will not bring back a lost American institution—the big family. This will be done only by making easier financially the proper rearing, education and training of the youngsters. Income tax relief by an increase of tax exemptions for children is the best method.

I commend this thought to the Ways and Means Committee and to the Congress.

Prosperity Versus Adversity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the May 25 edition of the Waynesboro (Va.) News-Virginian:

The longer I live the more I'm convinced that prosperity breeds far more sin than adversity. Prosperity encourages man to forget God and the fundamental truths of life; adversity emphasizes man's dependence upon a greater Power and fills him with humility. Prosperity spawns selfishness. We become so drunken with our own apparent power that we bask in delusions of grandeur until we think of ourselves as deserving all things. The more we have the more we want is a trite way of expressing this itch to possess all.

Selfishness judges everything by its effect upon us. As we possess more we desire to give less. Yet an inexorable law of life tells us that the more we give the more we have. But prosperity sets us above fundamental law. We refuse to believe that any law operates without our express permission. I am not charging that all prosperous people are selfish. I simply affirm that it's much easier and more natural to be selfish if we are prosperous.

But selfishness is not the only evil with which life abounds. Hypocrisy rears its ugly head all too frequently. We say one thing; do another. A hypocrite is not so disturbed by sin as he is upset when his sins are discovered. A hypocrite strives to parade virtue while communing with evil. If he's not found out he believes he is all right. A hypocrite demands of others those things which he himself evades in private.

If there is a breakdown of citizenship standards; if there is a prevalence of the "gimmes"; individual man has but himself to blame. We give lip service to Christianity and democracy (they are twin brothers) but we delude ourselves into believing that ignorance, poverty, prejudice, intolerance, and passion must infest our social order * * * that there's nothing we can do about it. We pay homage to world peace and then shout for pacts and leagues to bind ourselves together against those whose philosophy is foreign to us. Only war can result.

We talk about equality but we accept privileges and favors with enthusiasm. One man cannot be privileged or favored over another in a democracy. All are, and should be, equal. We cry out against governmental subsidy for the other fellow. We accept it for ourselves. We demand governmental economy with one breath and plead for governmental expenditure in our own community with the other. Hyprocrisy is a burden under which humanity has staggered for all-time.

Nor can we excuse our frailties by saying, "Man is weak; he will ever be the way he is." If we think that, there is little hope for us. Unless man can progress and grow strong he has failed to lift himself above other animals. We must learn that fundamental truths apply to individuals as well as groups; apply to me as well as to you.

Dedication Ceremony, Feld Square, West Lynn, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include herein my remarks at a dedication ceremony of a new housing development at Feld Square, West Lynn, Mass., on Sunday, June 11, 1950. This ceremony was sponsored by the Veterans' Village Improvement Association in honor of the men who gave their lives in the service of our country in World Wars I and II and in whose honor the streets of the village have been named. The remarks follow:

Today it is our joyful privilege to see with our own eyes one dream that has come true.

There is no sweeter word in all our language than the one called "home."

It means shelter, comfort, convenience, and sanctuary.

Men accomplish more when they have a good home to work for. Their wives are happier and have more time to give their men real companionship when a bright and modern housing unit is entrusted to their loving care. And the children have a better chance in life when they grow up in clean,

healthy, and pleasant surroundings that are fit company for their eager spirits.

All growing things need light and air, and children need them most of all.

One of the problems of the age in which we live is the increase in juvenile delinquency. In too many cases it can be traced to the dark, unhealthy, and vicious environment of the slums in which unfortunate children get their first impression of the world. And the blight is on them before they come of age.

When they run afoul of the law, causing such harm to themselves and others that is oftentimes beyond repair, they blame society for the happy childhood that was denied them. Once upon a time we dismissed these accusations lightly, before we gained the knowledge that the responsibility for crime must be shared by society as well as the individual.

The family unit—its health, happiness, opportunity, and morale—is still the most important factor in the life of any community.

When it is weakened, the larger group called society also suffers.

We are learning, therefore, that we cannot afford to ignore the family and its problems.

Never before in our history have governments—Federal, State, and local—together with private agencies, faced up to these problems as they are doing today.

We see it in the pride of accomplishment shared by all these present at this dedication of a new housing project. I will not occupy one of these new homes, and neither will many of you. But we are glad for those who are settled down in their dream homes, both for their own sake and because of the fine addition which this makes to the progressive city of Lynn.

I do not mean to say that a Hollywood mansion automatically solves all the problems of those who reside within it. Husbands and wives still have to make adjustments as they build a new pattern of living. Bringing up children is a job in itself. Love, understanding, cooperation, sacrifice, these are the human values that are needed to transform a house into a home. And they cannot be bought at a hardware store.

But when all is said and done we must have the house before we can have the home. Not just any old house that depresses Dad when he comes home from work and makes him grouchy. Not a tumble-down shack that never seems to spruce up in spite of the long hours that Ma puts in trying to make it come close to "home beautiful." Not a transfer station where the kids merely eat and sleep and stay away from as long as they can because they are ashamed of it.

Deep down inside, all of us want a home that will be a credit to us. We want the comforts in it that make Dad want to enjoy them every spare moment he can get. And the conveniences that enable Ma to do her chores as if by magic—freeing her from the drudgery of old methods—so that she may have more time to share the warm, human companionship of the family circle. And the children? There is no problem of delinquency when they have a home that they love, where they are proud to bring their friends and have fun in a wholesome way.

Industrial engineers say that when some factories become 25 or 30 years of age they have seen their best days. They are no longer efficient because the layout does not reflect the efficiency process that is going on all the time.

But what about our living quarters? They must also keep pace with progress if their occupants are to enjoy a standard of living consistent with the year 1950 and not 1900 or 1890.

No person can work well, live well, or grow up well in housing accommodations that are breaking down. It is shocking to observe the number of places still occupied by human beings that have become fire and health traps through the years. They were built so long ago that no provision could be made for modern facilities, and they have become so dilapidated by neglect that it is impossible to renovate them. In these bleak, dangerous, and depressing hovels it is only natural that material neglect should undermine morale and lead to human neglect. Crime breeds in surroundings that offer no encouragement and no hope.

As a result of the backlog of housing needs that piled up during the slow-down thirties, and was increased during the war years when neither materials nor labor could be spared for this purpose, housing has become one of our most critical problems.

The Congress has been forced to take unprecedented action to meet this grave issue. Either that or see our growing families pile up in ever extending slum areas, where tension and frustration would cause people to deteriorate and lower the public morale upon which our security as a Nation depends.

Through the instrumentality of public housing—activated through Federal funds, but controlled at the local level—we have wiped out many slum areas and replaced them with new, clean, and serviceable accommodations which low-income people could not rent under normal conditions.

That these compelling needs of the people are being provided for without sacrifice of our basic freedoms is a tribute to the bold and creative ability of our Nation. It inspires us with continuing confidence in a way of life which has the flexible strength to take on any problem, no matter how new or difficult, and solve it in good time.

It is not the intention of your Government to be responsible for all housing. Recognizing the dynamic role which private enterprise plays in the building of our Nation, Government wants to give it every possible incentive to do as much and more of the job as private hands can accomplish.

The combination of public and private credit is a team that is stimulating the greatest boom in our history. In the first 3 months of this year builders started 270,000 dwelling units. This is at a rate of 60 percent more than the first quarter of last year. This indicates a yearly total far in excess of 1949, when 1,025,000 units were started.

Government aids to home financing have been liberalized again this year. The largest loan that the Federal Housing Administration will insure at 95 percent of its value, has been raised from $6,000 to $9,500. The maximum interest rate on FHA loans has been clipped ¼ percent, bringing it down to 4¼ percent. The highest amount that the Veterans' Administration will guarantee on its 4-percent loans to veterans has been increased from $4,000 to $7,500, and the time in which the mortgage can be paid off has been extended from a top of 25 to the new level of 30 years.

Moreover, United States Government money may now be loaned directly to veterans so that they may purchase their own homes. Two hundred and fifty million dollars have been authorized for Government purchases of mortgages from private lenders.

One in every three houses costing less than $20,000 has a Government guaranty or insurance on the loan. The GI bill of rights provides that when foreclosure is threatened, the Veterans' Administration may pay the holder of the mortgage the unpaid balance which is due him, together with interest, and then take over the loan.

To sum it up, there is more protection for both lenders and borrowers in the building of homes than we have ever had.

In whole and in part, debt covered by FHA and GI aids amounts to fifteen of the thirty-eight billion total outstanding.

Even without these new Government aids, credit is plentiful. Savings are mounting steadily in banks, insurance companies, building and loan concerns. Interest rates are lower, and lending institutions are attracted by the VA-guaranteed loans, which they regard as safe 4 percent investments.

Thirteen and one-half million veterans have not yet availed themselves of their GI home-loan rights. This encourages us to look forward to the day when a larger percentage of our people will own their own homes, with the privacy, the security, and the happiness that only such possessions can bring.

We want more people to have cottages which belong to them. Even in the great and overcrowded cities we would prefer to have each family own a paid-up share in a cooperative apartment project, for there is nothing like that feeling of independence to spur ambition. Without the drive of personal ambition, people are inclined to coast along, depending too much on others. The individual never becomes what he might have been, and the Nation as a whole suffers from this letdown.

To maintain this vital and productive independence so that people may buy and keep their homes it is necessary for us to develop ever-expanding job opportunities for our increasing population.

Foreign critics and a few home-bred cynics like to dwell on our weaknesses, to the exclusion of everything else. They are forever preaching that the United States is surely going to defeat itself by its excesses. But the Nation has the confounding habit of bouncing out of every crises more vigorous than before.

Remember just before the war how they claimed that American youth as a whole were weak and spoiled? The record of our citizen soldiers on all fronts dispelled that wishful thinking completely.

And the millions of marriages and millions of babies that have blessed this Nation in the 5 years since the end of the war, prove that most of our young people have the makings of pretty solid citizens who want to work and save and build good homes for their loved ones.

As a Nation we are often accused of showing too much interest in making a dollar as if this were some monstrous crime. If some other nations who sit on their hands while envying our progress would show a little more hustle themselves, they would find that they too could earn more. For money represents the productive energy of a country. We have a higher income in the United States, not because money rains from heaven, but because we have the freedoms to think, and work, and produce the good things of life, with a minimum of interference.

We have the tradition and experience of doing things for ourselves, and not waiting for other people to do them for us.

Dollars are simply the pay-off for individual effort, ambition, and thrift.

We have the most progressive system in the world. Take any city outside the United States of comparable size whose main industry is the making of electrical equipment and compare it with Lynn. Street by street it will not have a fraction of the automobiles, television sets, or any other commodity by which we measure material progress, as the people of your home town possess.

It will not have as many doctors, dentists, lawyers, engineers, or teachers.

And yet, during the past 30 years, it has become fashionable in certain quarters to play down our genuine accomplishments and prattle about the "left" philosophy over there, as if it were a productive discovery far superior to our own.

How misguided liberals can so twist the facts is beyond all reasoning and all evidence.

There are inequalities and deficiencies in our system, but we do not try to hide them. But—and this is the overwhelming fact—even with our weaknesses the United States is the wealthiest country that the world has ever known, and it has achieved a better distribution of that wealth without curtailing the legitimate freedoms of its people.

It is easy for anyone to point to successive periods in our history during which the financial group, or the industrial group, or some other group happened to be dominant.

That any one of these did not establish itself as all-powerful and above the public interest is proof that our way of life can adapt itself to new circumstances.

The system of checks and balances in our society preserve and stimulate all the good that we mean when we say "freedom."

We avoid the extremes of rigid dogma and degenerating anarchy.

Ours is the "right" way, as distinguished from the "left" way. Not only because it considers the individual as more important than the state, but because it is right in the sense of seeking justice and fair play, and because it has a moral foundation in keeping with the spirit of religion and the eternal truths which it teaches.

I do not say that we should ignore our weaknesses for that would be a bar to progress. But in this confused period of history the time has come for us to affirm the good in our experience as Americans, for there is so much in it for us to be proud and thankful for without any distortion of the facts.

The United States does not stand still. Neither does it stand on its head. It is moving forward on its own two feet all of the time.

There is no room in this country for those who would make us retrace our steps to the past or take us off the main highway on a detour that leads to the end of communism.

In the words of that wise elder statesman, Bernard Baruch, and I quote: "In the discusion of academic freedom, I beg you to remember that those who accept the Communist doctrine must also accept the Communist discipline. They may not deviate from the line. In democracy, we object to the slightest interference with the freedom of opposition; with the right of investigation, with researches into truth; or with conclusions freely arrived at. But we, as a country, reserve the right to prohibit teaching that is subversive, that is destructive of our form and spirit of government. We hold there is no academic freedom for those who are compelled to take orders from non-American sources, hostile to the spirit of our very existence. We refuse to surrender the right of self-preservation."

Self-preservation means food, shelter, clothing, jobs, education, and health service. It means these and many more. Put them all together and you find them rooted in home, a man's own home that is more important to him than any fuehrer, duce, or commissar.

Take the average American—Mr. John Q. Public. He is only a little guy, but he is independent and he does his own thinking. And he is the one stubborn fact against which all the Communist blandishments have no effect.

In the Kremlin they keep the lights burning late at night trying to figure some way to pull the wool over his eyes. But they scheme in vain. Mr. Average American has a home that is his, protected from unwarranted search or seizure. Whether he owns it or rents it, this home is his castle where his family comes first. When the swindler called communism raps on his door and asks him to abandon this haven for the stockade existence of an iron-curtain state, Mr. America gives his uninvited visitor the boot accompanied by no uncertain language.

Our Government, expressing the will of its people, is engaged in a large-scale program to prevent the expansion of Communist power in Europe, Africa, and Asia. In conjunction with other free nations, we are employing economic, political, military, and psychological methods to halt aggression.

But the citadel of our strength, in terms of production and morale, is here at home in the United States and in the millions of individual homes which make up this larger one.

This is the heart of the miracle that is America.

Decent homes and the better home life that is encouraged by them is the key to our strength. So it behooves us to work for a better framework for living both for our individual selves and for others.

This is what the Communists fear above all. For they cannot undermine or divide a great neighborhood of freemen whose dwellings and the spirit within them represent the proud achievement of human beings, husbands, wives, and children, rather than the impersonal products of an unfeeling state.

Six years ago this past week the Allied forces stormed ashore in Normandy in one of the most difficult military operations of all time. The beach where they first went in, under withering fire, has been given a new and typical American name—Omaha. As such, it will be forever known, when men speak of heroism above and beyond the call of duty.

Thousands of young Americans died to make that landing possible and to follow it up with the sweeping victory that liberated most of Europe, as their fathers and uncles fought and sacrificed over the same French countryside so far from home in the years 1917 and 1918 of this troubled century.

Why? Just for the savage lust to destroy, to conquer?

No.

These men were next-door neighbors of ours. They only asked for the chance to work and to rear families that would be a credit to themselves and to the community. But when alien forces gathered power and endangered their way of life, these men went forth to fight in defense of their human rights.

They yearned for the end of battle so that they could return to their beloved homes.

These men had faith, which is belief in the unseen.

We are trying to vindicate their faith, just as succeeding generations will do better because of the faith that they will inherit from us.

The city of Lynn is to be commended for conveying the lots in this development for the nominal sum of $10 to cover the cost of recording and of drawing up each deed. The city dug the cellars and laid the foundations and built the streets, thereby encouraging the veterans to get on with the job of building their own homes.

This is truly a veterans' village, because it houses 112 completed single dwelling units, occupied by men and women who gave distinguished service to their country.

Here they are starting out on a new and happier chapter of their lives, devoting themselves to the God-given task of being good citizens and good neighbors.

And as their children grow up, and are asked where they live, they will be proud to say that they come from Veterans' Village, whose streets are dedicated to the memory of heroes who died to give all of us another and a finer opportunity.

Purdon, Thorpe, Feld, Farrell, Moffett, Keslar, Starrett, Curran, and Coyle—to their immortal spirit we offer this fervent prayer: "You have won a far greater victory than that of any battle. For you have strengthened us in the determination to work for that peace and security for which you sacrificed. We are not only protecting the homes of the land you loved; we are building the ones you dreamed of, in your name, so that your last wish will come true. Rest in peace, for you have won a better chance for all the children of our United States."

To this we dedicate Veterans' Village on the one hundredth anniversary of the city of Lynn, in Massachusetts, United States of America, of this brave, new world.

The program was as follows:

Flag raising.
National Anthem.....Soloist
Frances Hart Wilson
Invocation.....Rev. John F. Mullin, S. T. D.
Band selection...Wm. P. Connery, Jr., Post 6
American Legion Band
Master of ceremonies
Hon. Thomas P. Costin, Jr.
Introduction by Charles T. Gagnon, president, Veterans Village Improvement Association.
Introduction of M. Henry Wall, general chairman of centennial committee, by Thomas P. Costin, Jr.
Remarks.....Mayor Stuart A. Tarr
Band selection.
Remarks.....Hon. Albert Cole
Band selection.
Remarks.....Senator Charles V. Hogan
Remarks.....John J. Cavanagh
Band selection.
Prayer for the dead..Rabbi Samuel Zaitchik
Hymn.
Principal address.....Hon. THOMAS J. LANE
Naving of deceased
Master of ceremonies
Ruffle of drums.
Firing of volley.....Post 291
American Legion drill team
Taps in fade-out.
Unveiling of plaque...Hon. THOMAS J. LANE
Benediction.....Rev. Richard Sweetser

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the forty-ninth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Maxim Litvinov was not permitted to waltz in and out of Washington, back in 1933, without some patriots doing their very level best to prevent his victory over civilization.

Even up to the very last minute, there was official opposition to the United States granting diplomatic status to the Soviet monarchy.

One of the bravest of the brave, indeed he sacrificed his chances of advancement in the struggle, was Robert F. Kelley, then head of the State Department's Division of Eastern European Affairs.

Litvinov had a week of trouble from Kelley before the steamroller finally went through

and recognition was officially announced November 16.

I well remember interviewing Kelley in those last days.

He was an ordinarily polly-mannered citizen, a career diplomat of the most correct style, of course, and above all faithful to his oath and duty.

As the trap was closing, it seemed to me he might blow up and really tell the inside story of the seething, desperate struggle within the walls that everybody outside knew about but nobody inside would confirm.

He never did. The most I ever got out of him was a single line of thought, repeated over and over. It was this:

"Go back to first principles. Secretary Hughes laid them down in 1920. They are still good. Will the Soviet guaranty and demonstrate they have met the tests Mr. Hughes set up?"

That's all he ever said, so far as I have been able to learn down to this day, to anybody execept his superiors in the Department of State. He was totally buttoned up to everybody else, more's the pity.

In the years since, I have never overlooked a chance to learn what was really happening on the inside between the professional diplomats Kelley represented and the gilded amateurs who were so sure they knew better.

The sum of the story is that Kelley put in the official files his declaration that Soviet promises were not worth the paper they were written on.

He foretold that Mr. Roosevelt could get anything out of Litvinoff he wanted in the way of promise but that performance would be otherwise.

He was a marked man from then on. Many were the circuses and the world-ranging adventures of the State Department in the Roosevelt dynasties, to follow. But Kelley was condemned to serve out his time in comparative oblivion.

I know another man who is still on active service, so I have to withhold his name to save him further harassment.

His crime was that he pointed out, and refused to stop pointing out, that Soviet actions and Soviet promises had never balanced and never would and for that matter never could, unless communism and all its works were utterly abandoned.

Finally, Constantin Oumansky, who was by then the Soviet Ambassador here, said:

"You will have to make up your mind. If you will only follow my lead in the State Department, I will see that your career is great. But keep this up and you will be ruined."

That, from a Communist Russian racketeer, to a high officer of the United States.

The man whose name I must not use, was a patriot and he spit in Oumansky's eye, almost literally. Result: his name was blackened both in public and in private.

People who are new at the inside study of communism's influence in our United States Government may not believe that story, may think it exaggerated, may think it somehow misses being just what it is. They are wrong.

You either played it the Russian way, or you were thrown out of the game.

The case of Robert F. Kelley is symbolic of the whole. He was the first, but not the last, American to be punished with all the deaths of ten thousand cuts that can come to a governmental officer who insists on stating the facts about Russia on paper for the official file.

Oh, yes, I must add some social notes concerning the Soviet recognition proceedings. The official published record of the occasion lists guests at Mr. Roosevelt's luncheon for Litvinoff on November 8, 1933.

All of the guests are obvious and easily accountable except two, the Honorable Dean G. Acheson and the Honorable Henry Morgenthau, Jr.

Acheson at that time was a mere Under Secretary of the Treasury and, as Roosevelt described him, "a bit of a lightweight." Morgenthau was nothing but Governor of the Farm Credit Administration. What business did they have there? Answer: They were the agents of Prof. Felix Frankfurter.

RFC Has Rendered an Outstanding Loan Service to American Business; Its Operations Have Not Cost the American Taxpayers One Penny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was created by the Congress in 1932, and in the approximately 18 years of its existence it has made loans to practically every type of American business.

That the RFC has been successful is borne out by the fact that it has repaid to the Treasury $308,000,000 as dividends on its operations. It is one Government enterprise that has never cost the taxpayers one cent.

The RFC has made thousands of loans to small businesses that could not otherwise obtain credit. These businesses, most of them going concerns at this moment, are making a fine contribution to our way of life. They are furnishing employment to our people.

I include a very able and concise statement on the RFC recently made by Hon. Harley Hise to a Senate Banking and Currency Subcommittee:

I am pleased to have this opportunity of discussing with your committee the lending operations of the RFC.

The RFC was created by the Congress in 1932. Since then it has made loans to practically every segment of business and commerce and has realized in connection with its operations a net profit of approximately $560,000,000. This figure takes into consideration deductions of salaries, interest, and other operating expenses since 1932 including the cost of non-income-producing services rendered American enterprises, and reserves for losses of approximately $100,000,000. From the profit realized by the Corporation we have paid $308,736,740 to the Treasury as dividends. In addition we have returned $400,000,000 of our original $500,000,000 capital to the Treasury. The operations of the Corporation have not cost the taxpayers a single penny.

The statute under which the RFC acts at the present time authorizes loans "to aid in financing agriculture, commerce, and industry, to encourage small business, to help in maintaining the economic stability of the country, and to assist in promoting maximum employment and production."

After extensive hearings the Buck committee issued its report with particular emphasis, and properly, that loans should be in the public interest. The committee was unable to indicate precisely what loans would be, as a matter of policy in the public interest. The loan to the Glenn L. Martin Co. was used as an example of one being clearly in the public interest, although the committee reports states, "In other cases, especially in the smaller loans, the interest of the public will not be so clear. * * * In the last analysis the determination of whether or not a particular loan will serve the public interest, must be left to the discretion of the Directors of the Corporation."

No significant changes were made in the Senate bill by the House of Representatives except that in the statement of purposes for which loans should be made, the House inserted the language "to encourage small business." It is obvious, in view of this history, that the Congress believed that loans made to small-business enterprises are in the public interest.

RFC considers that an eligible business enterprise is one which is privately owned and operated for a profit and engaged in the production, distribution, or sale of goods or the furnishing of services. There are certain types of enterprises, however, to which the Corporation does not makes loans such as concerns engaged in radio and television broadcasting, the production of movies, or enterprises publishing newspaper and periodicals for the reason that the Corporation does not wish to appear to be in a position to exercise control over or influence, even indirectly, concerns having an editorial policy or which are engaged in disseminating news.

We believe that it was the desire of Congress that the Corporation assist all eligible businesses, especially small enterprises, within the limitations and intent of the act and we undertake to do so. The possibility of financial assistance through normal channels on reasonable terms is carefully explored in all cases before a loan is approved.

Approximately 90 percent of all the business loans authorized by the RFC during the past 2 years have been in amounts of $100,000 or less. In this regard special attention is given to applications filed by small businesses. Approximately 8,000 to 10,000 such enterprises each month seek the RFC's advice and assistance. Every effort is made by the Corporation to find a sound solution to these business problems. Applications which are not approved in the agencies are carefully studied by the Small Business Division of the Washington office.

Loans made by the Corporation to small businesses have aided concerns in every State in the Union and in almost every type of commercial enterprise. We presented to this committee, under date of May 8, summary of loans made, to all classes of industry by States. It disclosed that 9,578 loans in a total amount of $981,779,311 were approved from January 1, 1948, through March 31, 1950. This contribution to the economic well-being of our Nation speaks for itself.

In addition, RFC by using its personnel trained in the solution of business problems can often render material assistance to small businesses by determining the crux of particular problems relating to management, operations, and accounting. Suggestions are made for possible solutions to the problems and sources are indicated from which expert technical and consulting assistance can be drawn. We feel that the aid given to small business has been of substantial benefit to the economic stability of the country and has materially contributed to full employment.

The business loan program of the RFC during the reconversion period following World War II substantially contributed to the prosperity of the Nation and helped check the downward cycle such as occurred after World War I. In three periods of our economic life—depression, war, and reconversion—this Corporation has played a major part.

Since the RFC has been in existence 53,829 loans in the amount of $4,235,150,000 have been authorized to business enterprises. Of

this amount $2,040,930,000 has been disbursed—$1,468,835,000 of these loans have been repaid.

At the present time there are outstanding 6,344 direct RFC business loans having a dollar amount of $523,870,000. Also there are outstanding 5,647 business loans in which the RFC participates with banks. These participation loans aggregate $124,875,000.

An important contribution to the economic stability of the country has been and is still being made by the RFC through the financial assistance which it provides to States, counties, municipalities and other public agencies toward financing projects, such as water works, sewer systems, transportation facilities, hospitals, bridges, tunnels, drainage facilities, irrigation works, airports, college dormitories, docks and a host of other projects undertaken by States and local governments. Most of these worth-while projects have been constructed in small communities which previously had been unable to obtain credit and large projects have been undertaken and completed which at the time could not be financed by the sale of bonds in the open market. This work has been carried on not only with great benefit locally, but on a self-supporting and profitable basis as far as this Corporation and the Government is concerned.

There are certain areas of the Nation at the present time which are classified as being in distress economically. Other areas are expanding beyond the ability of financial institutions to keep pace with developments. The ebb and flow of credit is therefore the result of conditions and through our 31 loan agencies we endeavor to render in cooperation with banks and other lending institutions financial aid intended to assist in maintaining the economic stability of the country. By maintaining production and employment we help sustain the consumer purchasing power of the Nation in conformity with the law and intent of Congress.

The exercise of RFC's authority affects directly or touches indirectly many fields of endeavor and interest. In fulfilling its statutory responsibility the Corporation has been criticized for being too liberal by some and for being too conservative by others. Some believe that the continuation of the Corporation is not justified since the cause for its creation, namely, a national depression of great magnitude, no longer exists. On the other hand several bills are now pending in Congress to broaden and liberalize our lending authority. Our daily contacts with applicants indicate a need for a continuance of the service of RFC in supplementing credit from private sources.

President Truman's Address Before Better Business Bureaus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the President before a dinner of the Better Business Bureaus, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., June 6, 1950:

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have this opportunity to talk to a group of businessmen from all over the country. I want to congratulate those prize winners, and I want to congratulate those who awarded the prizes. It certainly is a step in the right direction for the welfare of business and for the welfare of the country. I am particularly happy to meet and talk with a group of this kind, which is so deeply concerned with the relations between business and the public. It is important to the welfare of the Nation to have understanding and mutual confidence between business and the public which business serves.

It is one of the purposes of the better business bureaus, I understand, to help create that kind of relationship. And I think they have gone at it in the right way. Your bureaus have not relied on propaganda extolling the virtues of business. They have gone to work to clean out the shady areas in the commercial world. They have set out to give real meaning to their slogan: "Private enterprise in the public interest"—private enterprise in the public interest.

Some people talk longingly about the good old days of business. They tend to forget that business in those good old days was often marred by fraud, false advertising, and other sharp practices. I think these better business bureaus have made a wonderful contribution in virtually removing that old English common law phrase "caveat emptor."

Business in the old days did not have the ethical standards which it has now. The growth of high standards for business has been greatly aided by the better business bureaus. In this way, you men gathered here have done a great deal to strengthen our system of free enterprise.

There was a time when the slogan of this organization, "Private enterprise in the public interest," would not have been popular among businessmen. They would have resisted it as vigorously, if not quite as bluntly, as old W. H. Vanderbilt did when he said: "The public be damned." We have come a long way since that time. The tycoons of those days believed in the right of business to rule the rest of the community. They believed in the divine right of business in the same way that men used to believe in the divine right of kings.

But the belief in the divine right of business was completely discredited by the great depression, and it has never come back. Today, people know that no single group has the right to rule the whole community. We know that all our major groups—business, agriculture, and labor—must work together for the interest of all.

The prosperity of business depends upon the prosperity of the farmer and the wage earner. They are its customers. And if its customers are having hard times, business will suffer. Nobody knows that any better than I do. It is to the advantage of business, therefore, to see that the purchasing power of the other groups is kept up. That is a very simple truth, but it has taken some of our citizens a long time to learn it. Some of them have not learned it yet. But most of us have, and as a result our whole national economy is healthier and sounder.

At the same time that we have been learning that private enterprise must serve the public interest, we have been learning that action by the Government is necessary at times to help make the private-enterprise system work.

I know that you have been hearing a lot of charges lately about Government interference with business, about the undermining of the free-enterprise system, and about creeping socialism. In short, you have been hearing that the Government is doing everything possible to wreck every industry in the country.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The record shows that the Government action in recent years has been the salvation of private enterprise.

All you have to do is to remember the conditions in 1932 and compare them with conditions today. In 1932 the private-enterprise system was close to collapse. There was real danger then that the American people might turn to some other system. The private-enterprise system was in danger because it was failing to meet the needs of our people. The only way to preserve the private-enterprise system was to make it work. That is what we have been doing since 1932.

But how successful have we been? Let us look at the record.

Private enterprise today is strong and flourishing. Industrial production is three times what it was in 1932. Corporate business as a whole lost more than $3,000,000,000 in 1932. Today corporate profits, after taxes—after taxes—are at the rate of more than $18,000,000,000 a year. That very same condition could prevail today with the Government if the men responsible for our tax policy were realistic and would meet changed conditions in the world as we must meet those conditions.

I know there are some people who still don't believe that the policies of the Government have had anything to do with our present prosperity. That reminds me of a story I heard on my recent nonpolitical trip. It seems that there was a rock-ribbed old gentleman of a political persuasion shall we say somewhat different from mine. One of his friends asked him what man to vote for for President in 1952.

"Well," he said, "I would like to vote for Dewey."

"Dewey!" said the friends. "Why Dewey?"

"Well," he said, "I voted for him the last two times, in 1944 and in 1948, and business has never been so good as it is today."

My own belief is that the Government is entitled to part of the credit for the good times we are enjoying. I also believe that business is entitled to credit, and so are labor and agriculture. I think the great lesson we have learned is that we can all work together for our mutual benefit—that each of us has a proper part to play in keeping our economy strong and healthy.

Our whole economy has been strengthened by the progress which the Government has followed during the last 17 years. This program has included such measures as loans to business, bank deposit insurance, and regulation of security markets. It has included old-age and unemployment insurance, minimum wages, slum clearance, and low-rent housing. It has included resource development and progressive agricultural legislation. Such measures as these have given stability to the economy, they have broadened the distribution of purchasing power, and they have provided an economic climate in which private enterprise can and does flourish.

All this has been accomplished in the face of the greatest and most persistent campaign of propaganda that this country has ever known. This propaganda campaign has been directed against the Government action for the benefit of the people. It has been designed to undermine the belief of the people in their Government. It has tried to frighten the people away from using the powers of the Government for their own good. Year after year, it has asserted that the policies we were following would lead straight to disaster.

Why, just the other morning I saw in one of our local morning papers that the steel industry was proceeding at 101 percent of its capacity, and that the country was going to hell because they just couldn't do that.

This propaganda campaign has been backed by enormous amounts of money. But it has failed. It has failed to shatter the confidence of the people in their Government. It has failed to terrify businessmen or dampen their courage and initiative.

It has failed because it was essentially false. The plain fact, evident to every citizen, is that the policies we have been following have led not to disaster, but to progress and prosperity.

In spite of this fact, the campaign of propaganda is being stepped up this year. You know why, of course. They still don't believe in 1948. We are all being deluged with it. There are books, and columns, and advertisements, and pamphlets, and broadcasts, and chain letters, all telling us that the Republic is in peril, and that we are on the last mile, that socialism lies just ahead.

The funny thing is that this has all been said before. The current campaign is almost exactly like the campaign of the old Liberty League, back in 1935 and 1936. I was in that campaign, too, by the way. It uses the same old slogans, the same old scarewords, and the same old falsehoods. The only difference is that it sounds even more foolish now than it did 14 years ago.

On my recent nonpolitical trip, I noticed very, very little wreckage and ruin around the country. I saw no grass growing in the streets. Instead, I saw industrious, hard-working citizens, happy homes, new businesses, growing communities. I visited a part of the country that has experienced a phenomenal expansion and development in the last 10 years—due in large measure to the constructive policies relating to natural resources and agriculture that this Government has been following. I did not find socialism. I found a tremendous increase of normal, American business enterprise.

When I saw these things, I thought of the great changes that have taken place in this country in recent years. We have witnessed developments that make the outcries of the old Liberty League, and its present-day imitators, completely ridiculous. We have proved that the powers of the Government can be used for the good of the whole people. We have proved that the major groups in our country can work together for the good of all.

In the early 1930's our farmers were overwhelmed by debt and despair. Today, we have the most productive and prosperous agriculture in the history of the world.

In the early 1930's our labor-union movement was struggling for recognition. Today, it is the largest movement of free trade unions in the world, with a recognized place and responsibility in the councils of the Nation.

In 1932 our system of business enterprise was under attack and uncertain of its own future. Today, it is stronger than it has ever been before.

If you want this picture in a nutshell—our national output in 1932 was less than $60,000,000,000. Today, it is more than $260,000,000,000.

Since 1932 this country has progressed not toward socialism, but toward greater prosperity and freedom for all. The use of the powers of the Government for the good of all has not led to regimentation. Instead, it has released what Woodrow Wilson called, and I quote: "the splendid energies of a great people who think for themselves."

And in this period we have learned another great lesson. We have learned the lesson that there is a lot of room in our expanding economy. We have learned that if our economy continues to expand there is room for the legitimate activities and ambitions of us all.

This lesson, too, knocks the props out from under the arguments of the reactionaries, because their arguments are the arguments of defeatism. They are based upon a narrow vision of the future—upon a belief in a static and shrinking economy.

Let me give you just a few examples.

In the early days of the New Deal, social security was opposed by the private insurance companies, because they believed that it would take business away from them. Just the opposite has proved to be the case. The social insurance maintained by the Government has been a spur and a stimulus to the private insurance business. Today, there are 65,000,000 more private insurance policies than there were in 1936—a 50 percent increase.

Take another example—the private power companies opposed the building of hydroelectric facilities by the Federal Government. And I want to say to you that if those hydroelectric facilities had not been built on the Columbia and the Tennessee Rivers, we would have lost this war. They said that the Government dams would put the private companies out of business. But just the opposite has proved to be the case. Low-cost public power has helped to broaden the power market and encourage industrial growth. This has meant bigger markets for the private power companies, and they have increased their capacity from 32,000,000 to 50,000,000 kilowatts since 1933—nearly a 60-percent increase.

Today we have learned that these Government activities—such as social insurance and hydroelectric development—do not harm business. Instead, they increase the wealth of all, and in that way they increase the opportunities of all business.

We have an expanding economy now. We must continue to have an expanding economy. Every year sees a larger population of the United States. As our population increases, our needs increase.

Furthermore, our industry and agriculture can and should produce more abundantly every year. New inventions, new machines, new methods constantly increase the productivity of American industry. With these increases in productivity, the real wages of our workers can and should increase. They will then be able to buy more and to lead better lives. To satisfy their needs will require more business investment and more new independent businesses every year.

I have recently recommended to the Congress certain measures that will help to channel more private capital into smaller enterprises and new investments. These measures will help our economy to maintain a constant and steady rate of growth.

Congressional hearings are beginning next week on legislation to carry out these proposals. I very much hope the legislation will be passed before the Congress goes home. It will mean a lot to several million small and medium-sized businesses and to the people who are working for them.

There are some politicians and commentators who have been making fun of the idea that our economy has to grow continually. They have been calling it unrealistic and foolish. But it doesn't appear foolish to responsible leaders of business and labor. The General Motors Corp.—not necessarily a New Deal organization—and the United Automobile Workers recently signed a collective bargaining contract for a 5-year period, providing regular wage increases based on increased productivity. This kind of faith in our future is the answer to the gloom and despair offered by the present-day Liberty Leaguers.

A prosperous and expanding economy in the United States is necessary not only to provide an adequate standard of living for our growing population; it is also necessary to our paramount objective of peace and freedom in the world. That is an objective to which, above all else, we must dedicate our efforts and our resources.

The economic strength of the United States is an indispensable support of freedom in the world today. Our industrial production, which is roughly equal to that of the rest of the world combined, get that, our industrial production is roughly equal to that of all of the rest of the world combined; that production furnishes mighty assurance that the free world will and can defend itself. The margin of aid we are able to provide is essential to the economic health and military security of the peoples of the world who are working with us to secure peace and freedom and justice.

Moreover, a prosperous and expanding economy in this country is essential if the cause of freedom is to hold the allegiance of men in other countries. For today, the merits of our democratic system are being challenged by communism all over the world. The most persuasive argument the Communists have is not anything Marx or Lenin ever wrote, or anything Stalin ever said, but the depression which began in the United States in 1929. And the Russians have been waiting for another one ever since Potsdam. That depression weakened the faith of many men throughout the world in the ability of our democratic institutions to meet the needs of our people. That depression is still used by the Communists to shake the faith of millions in the way of life that this Nation represents.

If we are to win the struggle between freedom and communism, we must be sure that we never let such a depression happen again. I believe we can prevent it. I believe all groups in this country can move forward together in steady economic growth and progress.

We have to use our strength wisely in support of prosperity and peace throughout the world. This is a big job and we cannot expect to accomplish it quickly. But we are equipped, morally and materially, to do it. And we must do it.

This is our greatest challenge. We must meet it with confidence and with faith.

New York State Laws Affecting Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, since many New York veterans are not fully aware of the benefits and advantages guaranteed them under New York State laws, I wish to take this opportunity to include in the RECORD a brief, up-to-date summary of the pertinent facts and statistics.

In compiling this information, I have drawn upon the digest prepared under the auspices of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and am also indebted to Gilbert R. Sharp, Department of New York legislative chairman of the Disabled American Veterans, who was very helpful in supplying me with information:

BONUS

World War I. Amount: $10 for each month in active service; $150 maximum payments (time limitation on applications for benefits under this law has expired).

World War II. Amount: $50 for domestic service of 60 days or less; $150 for domestic service of more than 60 days; $250 for foreign service of any duration.

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

Burial: County allowance for burial of indigent veterans, their parents, wives or widows, and minor children. Burial may not be in potter's field. Relatives or friends may conduct the funeral.

Privilege of removal of bodies from potter's field or neglected or abandoned cemeteries to properly kept cemeteries.

Burial grounds: Counties may acquire soldiers' burial grounds and provide for their maintenance.

Soldiers' monument corporations may acquire by gift or purchase any lots or lands

in any cemetery to be used and occupied exclusively for the burial of soldiers and sailors and for the erection of suitable monuments or memorials therein.

Towns may purchase soldiers' burial plots in cemeteries and provide for their care.

Grave care and registration: Adjutant general's record of the burial place of soldiers, sailors, and marines includes the name and location of the cemetery and the location of the grave in the cemetery.

Perpetual care of soldiers' burial plots in Dutchess and Niagara Counties.

Headstones: County allowance for headstones for the graves of indigent veterans, their wives or widows or for the grave of a veteran left unmarked for 5 years by a suitable headstone.

CIVIL RELIEF AND WAR EMERGENCY PROVISIONS

Acknowledgments of written instruments executed by members of the armed forces of the United States, validity.

Administration of official oaths required to be taken and filed by public officers in or with the armed forces of the United States.

Evidence of death or other status of persons missing in action.

Fishing, hunting, and trapping by soldiers, sailors, and marines in uniform, without a license (effective until July 1, 1950).

In voluntary adoption proceedings the judge or surrogate may waive the personal appearance of a foster parent in the armed forces and married to the natural parent of the child if the natural parent has appeared for the required examination.

New York State Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act (effective until Apr. 1, 1948).

Powers of attorney granted by persons serving in the armed forces of the United States, effect of death.

Renewal of motor vehicle operators' and chauffeurs' licenses after termination of military service in World War II.

Suspension of powers of fiduciaries in war service.

Suspension of powers of trustees in military service.

Provision for the issuance of premarital certificates by medical officers in the armed forces.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Absentee registration by patients in Veterans' Bureau hospitals, and by the spouses, parents, and children of veterans who are inmates of State institutions for the care of such persons.

Absentee voting by inmates of soldiers' homes and United States Veterans' Bureau hospitals.

Absentee voting at general annual village elections by electors in the armed forces during World War II.

Proof of literacy pursuant to registration law.

Voting by the armed forces during time of war.

CLAIMS, ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS; SAFEKEEPING OF PAPERS

Public-record certification: County clerks, including those within the city of New York, shall furnish without charge, certified copies of discharge papers recorded in such offices.

Free copies of public records for wards of the United States Veterans' Bureau, under Uniform Guardianship Act.

Recording of discharges: Honorable discharges of war veterans may be recorded by county court clerks free of charge.

Safekeeping of discharge papers, etc.: Officers or soldiers may deposit their discharge papers, descriptive lists, muster rolls, etc., in the bureau of war records for safekeeping.

Service officers, etc.: Counties may employ county service officers to assist veterans and their dependents living in the county, in obtaining any Federal, State, or local award to which entitled.

Local veterans' service agencies shall assist members of the armed forces, veterans, and their families, in obtaining benefits to which entitled under Federal, State, and local laws.

The State veterans' service agency shall assist members of the armed forces, veterans, and their families in obtaining benefits to which entitled under Federal, State, and local laws.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS; QUALIFICATION FOR THE PROFESSIONS AND TRADES

Admission to State institutions of applied arts and sciences.

A veteran of any age may attend any of the public schools of the State upon conditions prescribed by the board of education and the attendance of such veteran shall be counted for State aid purposes.

Contracts for instruction in higher education for veterans of World War II to meet the emergency created by lack of college facilities (effective until July 1, 1950).

Credit for Federal rehabilitation course in architecture, on application of disabled veteran of World War I or World War II, for license to practice.

Federal aid for the education and training of veterans at State institutions.

For 7 years after termination of World War II residence requirements may be waived for nonresident veterans eligible for educational benefits under the Federal Servicemen's Readjustment Act for the purpose of admitting them to colleges as candidates for baccalaureate degree or otherwise, as may be determined by the board of higher education of the college under its jurisdiction.

Issuance of certificate without examination to practice ophthalmic dispensing. Application must be filed within 6 months after discharge from military service (applicable to persons in the Armed Forces on July 1, 1947).

Leave of absence to continue study, granted public employees who are veterans of World War II and eligible for benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. Such leave shall not exceed 4 years.

Power of industrial commissioner to make agreements for Federal reimbursement to the State of certain expenses in connection with veterans' training pursuant to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

Preservation of unused benefits of State scholarships held by those entering the military or naval service of the United States during World War II.

Protection of rights exercised under license issued by a board of education in the city of New York. Applicable to veterans of World War II. Application for renewals, etc., must be made to the license issuing authority by affidavit, within 6 months after discharge from military service.

Provision for the furnishing of educational facilities, such as classrooms, laboratories, libraries, offices, etc., together with transportation for veterans of World War II, teachers and employees, to and from the college or university where facilities are available.

Reduced rates on common carriers for veterans attending educational institutions pursuant to Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

Renewal of certain professional and practice licenses without examination, reexamination, fine, or penalty, within 3 months after termination of military service or, in the event of hospitalization in a veterans' facility, within 3 months after discharge from such facility (expired July 1, 1947).

Renewal of insurance broker's license after termination of military service.

Renewal of licenses of real estate brokers and salesmen without examination, after termination of military service.

Renewal of licenses to practice barbering after termination of military service.

Renewal of licenses to practice hairdressing and cosmetology after termination of military service.

Scholarships (1,200) for veterans of World War I and II. $450 a year and good for 4 years in any recognized college or university in the State. Examinations held the first week in May.

State scholarships at Cornell University; preservation of rights and privileges.

State war-service scholarships for veterans of World Wars I and II.

Temporary licensing without examination of designee of insurance agent or broker serving in the armed forces (effective until July 1, 1950).

The board of regents may indorse a Federal rehabilitation certificate as a license to practice any of the professions over which it has supervision.

The oath of office in open court required of all attorneys, may be taken by a serviceman before a justice of the court if the appellate division of the supreme court in the department in which such person resides is not in session.

Upon termination of military service any apprentice who was engaged in learning to practice as an undertaker, embalmer, or funeral director and whose training was interrupted by service in the armed forces, may resume such training and be admitted to the regular examination.

Veterans of World War II, who are applicants to take the bar examination, may receive credit toward fulfillment of the requirement of 2 years' college work for study and experience of educational value while in the service, subject to certain limitations.

Veterans of World War II who entered the armed forces before completing their law studies and whose duties prevented them from taking the succeeding examinations shall not be required to take the examination for admission to the bar.

Waiver of residence requirements for the purpose of admitting to certain colleges nonresident veterans of World War II who are eligible for educational benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Scholarships for resident children of soldiers, sailors, or marines who died while serving in the armed forces of the United States or as a result thereof, or children of certain other veterans who were residents of the State at the time of their demise. Amount: $350 per year maximum for tuition and an additional $100 per year for maintenance, per person. Such payments shall not be made to the same individual for a period longer than 4 years.

Scholarships (100) for children of deceased and disabled veterans. Four hundred and fifty dollars a year and good for 4 years in any recognized college or university in the State. Examinations held the first week of March.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Benefit rights under the Unemployment Insurance Act (Repealed Laws 1944, ch. 705).

Experience ratings given disabled veterans of World War I in original open competitive examinations in the civil service, State or local.

Extenson of time for public officer elected while in military service to file required oath of office.

Extension of age limit for appointment of armorer or superintendent of an armory, on application of certain veterans.

Federal vocational training credited disabled veterans of World War I in any competitive examination in the civil service of the State or of any civil division or city.

Payment of unemployment benefits to New York State veterans released from active military service on or after December 7, 1941 (Repealed Laws 1945, ch. 519).

Preference in the appointment of members of the veterans' affairs commission.

Preference to veterans in appointments and promotions in the civil service of the State and all of the civil divisions thereof (ratified on referendum November 8, 1949).

Preference to veterans in appointment, promotion, and retention in any branch of the civil service, State, county, or municipal.

Preference to veterans of World War I in the appointment of employees of the bureau for the relief of sick and disabled New York veterans, division of military and naval affairs.

Preservation of rights and privileges under the State employees retirement system, of certain federalized employees in military service.

Protection against removal from office of veterans holding positions in State, city, county, town, or municipality.

Reappointment of notaries public after expiration of military service in the armed forces of the United States.

Repayment of funds borrowed from retirement fund by members of the State employees retirement system upon entering the military forces of the United States during World War II.

Restoration of public employees to former positions without loss of seniority or other employment rights, upon termination of active military service in World War II.

Retention of membership in a pension or retirement system when term of office of an elected official, officer, or employee, State or local, expires during military service.

Retirement of veterans in the city of New York as provided by the administrative code.

The State director of veterans' affairs and three members of the veterans' affairs commission shall be veterans.

Unemployment benefits during industrial controversy.

War-service credit allowed veterans in computing service of employees in State correctional institutions for retirement benefits.

War-service credit allowed veterans of the Spanish-American War or World War I in computing service under the Police Pension Act in certain villages.

War-service credit for the purpose of qualifying as a volunteer fireman.

War-service credit to veterans of World War I, and to members of the National Guard called into service for Mexican border duty, in computing service for retirement of members in the Nassau County Police Department.

War-service credit to veterans of World War II under the State teachers' retirement system.

War-service credit to veterans of World War I and World War II and to members of the National Guard called into service for Mexican border duty, in computing service for retirement of members in the division of State police.

War-service credit to veterans of World War I and World War II, and to members of the National Guard called into service for Mexican border duty, as provided under the State employees' retirement system.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION, GARNISHMENT, ETC.

Pensions or other rewards granted by the United States or by a State for military or naval services, and certain personal property used in such service, are exempt from execution and from seizure in any legal proceeding.

GUARDIANSHIP; ADMINISTRATION OF ESTATES, ETC.

Bank deposits by custodian designated by administrator of veterans' affairs.

Nuncupative and holographic wills made by persons in actual military or naval service, validity. Admission to probate.

Uniform veterans' guardianship act with modifications. Provides for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

World War II bonus payments to a minor or mental incompetent.

HOMES (INSTITUTIONAL)

Admission of veterans, their wives or widows, mothers and dependent daughters, to the New York State Woman's Relief Corps Home (not applicable to veterans of World War II).

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

Commitment of an incompetent veteran to a Federal hospital under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

Commitment of an incompetent veteran of World War I arraigned before a magistrate in the city of New York, to a Federal hospital.

Detention of certain mentally ill veterans discharged for psychiatric treatment.

Patients at any United States Veterans' Administration facility or at any public tuberculosis hospital may fish without license within restricted areas.

Residence not lost by reason of absence from the State while serving in the Armed Forces, when residence is prerequisite for care and treatment in institutions for mental defectives.

Residence not lost by reason of absence from the State while serving in the Armed Forces, when residence is a prerequisite for care and treatment in a tuberculosis hospital.

HOUSING

Additional exemption on real property: Any seriously disabled veteran of World War II who has received assistance from the United States Government toward acquisition of a suitable housing unit with special fixtures or facilities made necessary by the nature of the veteran's disability shall be granted an additional exemption of $10,000.

Acquisition of real property for housing companies organized by or for veterans of World War II.

Emergency housing for veterans of World War II and their families (effective until March 31, 1950).

Preference to veterans of World War II in the selection of tenants in housing company projects.

Preference to veterans of World War II in the selection of tenants in State-aided public housing projects.

War demobilization emergency housing for veterans of World War II. (No projects may be initiated under this law after July 1, 1950.)

LOANS, CONTRACTS OF MINORS, ETC.

Bank loans, etc., pursuant to provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act authorized.

Removal of minority disability of veterans eligible for benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

MEDALS, ETC.

Campaign badges for service during Spanish, Philippine, and China campaigns.

Conspicuous service cross awards.

Service badges and ribbons for Mexican border service.

Service emblems and citations for World War II service.

Service ribbons and medals of honor for World War I service.

NATIONAL GUARD SERVICE

Retirement and pension of certain war veterans from the military or naval service of the State.

War service credit for time spent in active military service of the United States.

PATRIOTIC HOLIDAYS

Cities may appropriate money for observance of Memorial and Armistice Days, to be expended through veterans' organizations.

Leave of absence to veterans in public service of the State and local units on Memorial and Armistice Days.

Towns may appropriate money for observance of Memorial and Armistice Days to be expended through veterans' organizations.

Villages may appropriate money for the observance of Memorial Day. The money may be expended through veterans' organizations.

PENSIONS

Annual pension of $500 to blind veterans and their widows.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

Bureau of war records. Provision for the preservation and safekeeping of records and relics in the capitol.

RECREATIONAL BENEFITS

Corporations authorized to make contributions to the United Service Organizations (effective until July 1, 1950).

Soldiers and sailors in uniform during World War II admitted to horse and harness races at half price.

Towns adjoining military camps authorized to establish and maintain recreation centers.

RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Any person who, subsequent to the time of conviction, shall have served in the Armed Forces of the United States in time of war and shall have been honorably discharged, may be granted a conditional or absolute discharge from parole.

Counties may, upon application of an association of veterans' organization, make appropriations for the aid of disabled veterans.

County aid for an indigent veteran or his family.

General functions, powers, and duties of the State division of veterans' affairs and of local veterans' service agencies.

Municipalities and public corporations may lease property to agencies of the United States performing functions related to the war effort or to hospitalization, rehabilitation, and welfare of war veterans (effective until December 31, 1949).

Relief for sick and disabled veterans.

Veteran assistance, relief, and medical care for veterans and their families in their homes, administered through veteran organizations.

TRANSPORTATION, MOTOR VEHICLE, ETC., PRIVILEGES

Motor vehicles specially designed for the use of veteran amputees and furnished by the Federal Government are exempt from registration fees.

TAX AND LICENSE FEE EXEMPTIONS

Amusement tax: Soldiers and sailors in uniform during World War II, exempt from State tax on admissions to horse races.

Fish and game license: Free fishing licenses for blind veterans.

Income tax: Abatement of income tax of a member of the Armed Forces upon death in active service.

Exemption of military compensation received prior to July 1, 1950, from personal income tax.

For income-tax purposes persons in the Armed Forces who are not domiciled in the State, even if maintaining a permanent abode and spending in the aggregate more than 7 months within the State, shall not be deemed a resident (effective until July 1, 1950, or the termination of the war).

Returns for taxable years during which a taxpayer was in the military service of the United States shall be made to the tax commission within 6 months after separation from active duty or within 6 months after termination of World War II.

Motor vehicles: Registration without payment of fees of motor vehicles owned and operated by disabled veterans who obtained such vehicles from the Federal Government under the law which provides for furnishing specially designed automobiles to veteran amputees.

Professional licenses: Refund of fees paid for license by a private detective and investigator when inducted into the Armed Forces.

Property tax: Exemption of real property purchased with money collected by popular subscription in partial recognition of extraordinary services rendered by discharged veteran of World War II who sustained total or partial permanent disability if owned by the person who sustained such injuries, or by his wife or widow, or dependent father or mother. Maximum exemption, $5,000.

Property tax: Exemption of real property purchased with the proceeds of a pension, bonus, or insurance granted by the United States or the State of New York for military or naval services, if owned by the person who rendered the service, his wife or widow, dependent father or mother, or by his minor children. Such property not exempt from school and road taxes. Maximum exemption, $5,000.

Exemption of real property of veterans' organizations.

Peddler's license: Veterans or their widows are exempt from payment of fee for county license.

UNIFORMS

Unauthorized wearing of United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or National Guard uniforms is a misdemeanor. However, such articles as shoes, socks, shirts, ties, or scarfs, trousers, overalls, etc., from which buttons or insignia have been removed may be worn.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Conventions; reports of proceedings: State printing of reports of certain veterans' organizations.

Corporate rights, etc.: Endorsement of the adjutant general required on a certificate of incorporation which indicates that the proposed corporation is to solicit funds for or otherwise benefit members of the military, naval, or marine services.

Officers, coverage under the workmen's compensation law.

Powers of certain associations under the benevolent orders law.

Insignia: Makes it a misdemeanor for anyone, veteran or otherwise, to sell for personal gain or profit poppies, forget-me-nots, flags, or other articles sold for patriotic purposes, fraudulently claiming that such sales is for the benefit of an organization authorized to administer relief to veterans.

Unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, etc., of veterans' organizations declared a misdemeanor.

Meeting places, etc.: Armory privileges.

Cities may appropriate money to assist certain veterans' organizations in defraying expenses for rental or maintenance of rooms.

Municipal corporations may lease public buildings to veterans' organizations free of charge or at nominal rent.

Quarters in the capitol for Veterans of Foreign Wars and Disabled American Veterans.

Rooms in the capitol for the Grand Army of the Republic and United Spanish War Veterans.

Towns may appropriate money to assist certain veterans' organizations in defraying expenses for rental or maintenance of rooms.

Parades: Rights of veterans' organizations.

Patriotic holiday observance: Expenditure of city appropriations for observance of Memorial and Armistice Days by certain veterans' organizations.

Expenditure of town appropriations for observance of Memorial and Armistice Days through certain veterans' organizations.

Patriotic holiday observance: Expenditure of village appropriations through veterans' organizations.

Records, relics, etc.: Privilege of veterans' organizations to assist the adjutant general in the collection of records, relics, etc., for the bureau of war records.

Quarters in the capitol assigned to the Grand Army of the Republic and the United Spanish War Veterans may be used for the purpose of caring for relics and mementoes and for preserving the history of individuals who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps during the Civil War or the Spanish-American War.

Relief to veterans, etc.: Administration of veterans' relief and medical care through veterans' organizations.

County appropriations expended through associations or organizations for the aid of disabled veterans.

Functions of certain organizations in the administration of relief to sick and disabled veterans.

Tax exemption: Exemption of real property of veterans' associations.

VETERANS' SERVICE AGENCY

Division of veterans' affairs. State and local veterans' service agencies.

Reduction of General Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM PICKETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, on May 10 I spoke on the floor of the House in favor of an amendment to reduce the appropriation bill and the number of Federal employees substantially. After that speech was made the House passed the one-package appropriation bill for the next fiscal year to commence on July 1, 1950. The Senate has not acted on the measure at this time.

Under the House bill the following economies can be effected:

1. Reduced appropriations under President's budget estimates by	$925,624,504
2. Adopted Thomas-Taber amendment, further reducing appropriations by (This is the amendment of which I spoke on May 10.)	600,000,000
3. Adopted Jensen amendment estimated to make a net savings of	371,442,562
Total estimated savings in dollars below President's budget estimates by House action	1,897,067,066

The number of civilian employees on the Government payroll, based on the latest official estimates available, is 1,946,048 persons, not including the temporary personnel to take the 1950 decennial census. There has been a reduction of approximately 1,803,530 since the wartime peak. The House version of the appropriation bill calls for further reductions as follows:

1. Under the Thomas-Taber amendment from	125,000 to 150,000
2. Under the Jensen amendment an estimated	193,185 to 193,185
Estimated total reductions in Federal employee personnel under the House bill from	318,185 to 343,185

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the forty-sixth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

When playing on a weakness, never be delicate. If you are undertaking to flatter, lay it on with your biggest shovel. If you are threatening, make it really rough.

So taught Machiavelli, one of the most interesting and least understood of men. So also taught Francis Bacon, Machiavelli's English counterpart. What a pity they never met.

Maxim Litvinoff, the servant that Stalin assigned to deal with Mr. Roosevelt in 1933, well understood the lessons of statecraft taught by the masters.

Russia at that moment was in full revolt against communism. Stalin was on the rocks. Only Roosevelt could save him. The British were in the actual process of withdrawing diplomatic recognition from the Soviet government and if that were to happen, the end would be swift.

On the other hand, if the United States should grant diplomatic status to the Soviet Government after 16 years of refusal, that would be victory.

The revolution at home would fail. The British would not dare make any further trouble and Communist conspirators all over the world would be encouraged to follow Stalin.

Thus, the champagne corks flew in Moscow on October 13, 1933, for on that day a certain cable from the President of the United States was received by Mikhail Kalinin, president of the All Union Central Executive Committee.

Note, now, that Stalin's name will not appear in any of the official messages to be quoted in this chapter though all the world knew Stalin to be the real ruler of Russia so far as there was one. But who ever heard of "President" Kalinin?

Now for the cable that passed from Stalin's Puppet No. 1 to Puppet No. 8,069:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 10, 1933.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Since the beginning of my administration I have contemplated the desirability of an effort to end the present abnormal relations between the 125,000,000 people of the United States and the 160,000,000 people of Russia.

It is most regrettable that these great peoples, between whom a happy tradition of friendship existed for more than a century to their mutual advantage, should now be without a practical method of communicating directly with each other.

The difficulties that have created this anomalous situation are serious but not, in my opinion, insoluble; and difficulties between great nations can be removed only by frank, friendly conversations. If you are of similar mind, I should be glad to receive any representatives you may designate to explore with me personally all questions outstanding between our countries.

Participation in such a discussion would, of course, not commit either nation to any future course of action, but would indicate a sincere desire to reach a satisfactory solu-

tion of the problems involved. It is my hope that such conversations might result in good to the people of both our countries.

I am my dear Mr. President,

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. MIKHAIL KALININ,
President of the All Union Central Executive Committee, Moscow.

Thus the United States was embarked by a headlong and impetuous man on a venture that has led, step by predicted step, to a tragedy for the modern world.

The dangers foretold and forewarned by wise men all over the United States of America and Europe as inherent in the saving of Stalin from the disasters he had brought down upon Russia, have all come to pass.

Mr. Roosevelt is dead. Stalin lives and the people of the whole round world are paying the price of his survival.

When that message above quoted arrived in Moscow, Stalin knew exactly what to do. He assigned Maxim Litvinov to come over and negotiate a deal already settled.

The comical part was the laying on of flattery by the shovelful as so long before advised by Machiavelli. For Litvinoff gave out interviews that he would approach in considerable doubt as to the outcome. He announced he was bringing as bait—the stories actually used that word—orders for $500,000,000 worth of United States goods.

That, by chance, was the exact figure Speaker of the House Rainey had used a few months before after visiting Russia. Rainey had said we were losing half a billion a year in trade from nonrecognition.

Litvinoff came, so did recognition. But never the orders.

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include the forty-eighth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Here is an official document that tells its own story so eloquently that I submit it without further preliminaries:

WASHINGTON, *November 16, 1933.*

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to inform you that coincident with the establishment of diplomatic relations between our two governments it will be the fixed policy of the government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

1. To respect scrupulously the indisputable right of the United States to order its own life within its own jurisdiction in its own way and to refrain from interfering in any manner in the internal affairs of the United States, its Territories or its possessions.

2. To refrain, and to restrain all persons in Government service and all organization of the Government or under its direct or indirect control, including organizations in receipt of any financial assistance from it, from any act, overt or covert, liable in any way whatsoever to injure the tranquility, prosperity, order, or security of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions, and, in particular, from any act tending to incite or encourage armed intervention, or any agitation or propaganda having as an aim, the violation of the territorial integrity of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the bringing about by force of a change in the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its Territories or possessions.

3. Not to permit the formation or residence on its territory of any organization or group—and to prevent the activity on its territory of any organization or group—which has as an aim the overthrow or the preparation for the overthrow of, or the bringing about by force of a change in, the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its Territories or possessions.

I am, my dear Mr. President, very sincerely yours,

MAXIM LITVINOV,
People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Mr. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States of America, the White House.

No wonder, as witnesses have since sworn, Litvinov rubbed his hands together and laughed when he got back among his buddies at night after a day of negotiating with our team.

Litvinov's mission from Moscow was to get diplomatic status for the Soviet Union at all cost, promise anything, everything, but get it.

Stalin was drowning in a sea of blood. Communism was falling apart at the seams. Russia was sinking in famine and disaster. The Soviet concept of rule was at a natural end.

But Roosevelt accepted the representations above quoted as official Soviet good faith and told the people of the United States that recognition of the Soviet Union would be safe.

A few more protocols were exchanged, allowing United States citizens in Russia to have religious services and to be treated as well as anybody else in matters of civil liberty, and Litvinoff went home in a blaze of glory.

Now in the perspective of 1950, what do you think of Mr. Roosevelt's 1933 judgment? Either he was fantastically stupid or he was dishonest beyond all doubt and limit.

At the very time he granted Soviet recognition on the terms above quoted, there was in Moscow the organization I have described in this series as the Comintern, the general staff of the international conspiracy.

The stated and published aim of the Comintern, indeed it regularly announced that it disdained to conceal its aim, was world revolution to bring all of mankind under communism's reign.

As I have already recounted in this series, it had met in 1929 under the call of Joseph Stalin for the explicit and stated purpose of developing a revolution in the United States.

I have even told how the Communist organization in this country was put through Stalin's sausage grinder for daring to advise him against the revolutionary attempt.

In 1933, when Litvinov delivered that letter above to Mr. Roosevelt, the Comintern was in full effect. The Communists in the United States of America were fully organized and operating under its orders.

The facts on this were in Mr. Roosevelt's hands. I know men who put them there.

It was obvious to even the smallest intellect that for the promise to be real, communism would have to disband, go out of business everywhere in the world, including Russia, and literally commit suicide.

Yet, instead of throwing that above-quoted letter in Litvinov's face as a lie and a fraud, Mr. Roosevelt accepted it and called on the people of the United States of America to accept it as good faith between nations at peace. Why?

The Economic Cooperation Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on the 6th day of June a memorable address was delivered before the Maryland Historical Society on the over-all subject of the Economic Cooperation Administration.

This address was delivered by Mr. Howard Bruce, who, as we all know, was Deputy Administrator under Mr. Paul Hoffman during the first 14 months of the life of the ECA. Next to Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Bruce had more to do with the setting up of the ECA organization throughout the cooperating countries than anyone else, and no one is better qualified to speak on this important subject.

There is such a widespread misunderstanding throughout the country as to the origin, purposes, and spirit of the ECA that I feel that this splendid presentation by Mr. Bruce is worthy of wide reading. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mr. Bruce's address be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I have an estimate from the Government Printing Office which indicates that the manuscript of the address of Mr. Bruce will exceed by three-quarters of a page the two printed pages allowed under the rule without a statement of the cost, and that the cost of printing will be $225.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I am very happy, indeed, to be with you tonight, and I feel complimented to have my name added to the long list of distinguished Americans who, through the activities of your president, have addressed you in recent years.

At the suggestion of your president I am going to talk to you about the Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA), with which organization I was associated for its first 14 months.

WHAT IS ECA?

ECA owes its start to a speech by General Marshall in June of 1947 at Harvard University. I think it is safe to say that seldom in history has a 6- or 8-minute address had such far reaching and historical influence. I won't read the entire talk, but there is one paragraph that gives the key to the whole concept upon which ECA is founded:

"It is logical that the United States should do whatever it is able to do to assist in the return of normal economic health in the world, without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace. Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos. Its purpose should be the revival of a working economy of the world, so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist."

The immediate reaction was a proposal from Mr. Bevin, of Great Britain, to call together a meeting of representatives of all the European countries, including Russia. It is often forgotten that the absence of

Russia and her satellites from the European organization is not the result of any action on the part of the United States or the European countries. Molotov and his entourage attended the first gathering of European countries. After being present at meetings for about a week, he withdrew from the conference and prevented the attendance of representatives of any of the Russian satellites.

Apparently, the dictatorship in the Kremlin wanted not war and not peace. What they wanted was a condition of hunger, desperation, and chaos in the western European countries for this condition furnishes the fertile soil on which communism flourishes.

Out of the meeting of the European nations came a program that carried with it financial aid from the United States and also a promise of each participating European nation to put forth its maximum effort toward self-help and also its maximum effort toward mutual aid, with special emphisis on the well-being of the western European area as a whole.

Never was a program subject to the same amount of study as was the economic program for Europe. I think there were eight independent studies made by committees of Congress and committees from the executive departments. In all, there were some 7,500 pages of statistics and data on the Marshall plan program.

The countries that participate in the ECA activities are as follows: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany (Federal Republic), Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Trieste, Turkey, United Kingdom. Switzerland is the only one that receives no direct aid.

WHY IS ECA?

The explanations of the why of ECA fall in these categories:

First, some people say we are launched in this effort due to our natural sympathy with and desire to help other nations that are in dire distress.

Second, others say we have finally recognized the responsibility that goes with our position as the most powerful nation in the world.

Third, an explanation which is the most cogent is that the one great desire of this country is for peace and this country has concluded that the route to peace is to bring about the recovery of western Europe and the establishment in these countries of economic, political, and social stability.

The ECA countries have a population of something over 270,000,000 people, spread over more than 1,300,000 square miles and speaking 14 different languages. They are our ancestors.

Scientific knowledge and industrial development made their start in these ECA countries.

In the main, these countries have the same concept of liberty as we have in the United States. With many variations which, in some instances, almost approach exceptions, their governments all embody a representative system of government. The will of the people is the main source of power.

As a result of World War II, they found themselves, almost without exception, in a condition of economic chaos. Their trade was at a low ebb. Their standard of living and their level of production were far below their prewar levels. If this condition were not improved and improved rapidly, communism had a great opportunity to sweep across all of western Europe.

If the western European countries, by vigorous self-help, supplemented by our aid, could bring about real recovery, could raise their standard of living and assist in creating greater cohesion among the ECA countries, the probabilities were they would not go communistic and with this 270,000,000 people and their productive capacity maintaining a common front with the United States, the possibility of war would be greatly reduced.

WHAT WAS THE PROBLEM FACED BY ECA?

The task of restoration was enormous. western Europe had virtually to be rebuilt and reequipped. Agriculture had to be supplied with machinery, with fertilizer, with seeds and with breeding stock. Industry had to be supplied with new machinery, with raw materials and the innumerable components that go into industrial output. Existing housing had to be made habitable and additional dwelling units built for those who had been bombed out. Most important of all, the people had to be fed and clothed while this stupendous task of restoration was going on.

The hard currency reserves built up during prewar years, together with the proceeds from foreign investments, both of which, if existing, could have been used for the payment of goods required from foreign markets, had been liquidated by the war. Europe was at its lowest level, spiritually and economically.

Improvement of the situation in western Europe did not wait for the formal adoption of the Marshall plan. The studies, hearings and discussions that preceeded the setting up of ECA consumed nearly a year's time but, heartened by the promise of substantial help and by the immediate effect of temporary assistance made available through the Export-Import Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank and the interim-aid bil, western Europe threw into the struggle its remaining supplies of raw material and its small reserve of hard currencies, with the result that by the time the Marshall plan went formally into effect, there already had been some upturn from its low level.

HOW ECA OPERATES

The concept of ECA is different from that of other relief programs backed by the United States. Grants of aid by the ECA are made contingent upon certain performances of the recipient countries. ECA follows up the use of its money and checks the results achieved.

ECA makes available from its dollar funds specific amounts to each country for the purchase of specific lists of machinery, raw materials and other goods. These purchases acquired by the country are sold to its nationals, payment therefor being made in the currency of the country in question. This currency is then deposited in what is known as a counterpart fund.

As an example, France might secure 1,000 farm tractors. The American manufacturer receives payment for these tractors from ECA funds. The French Government or its agency delivers the tractors to individual farmers who make payment in francs. These francs find their way to a central bank where they are deposited in a fund, the ultimate use of which is subject to ECA approval.

In determining the use of the counterpart funds, ECA gives consideration first to the achievement and maintenance of internal financial and monetary stability. Subject to this basic consideration, the use of the counterpart fund is primarily directed toward the promotion of those types of productive activity that will achieve the maximum amount of economic recovery.

In certain countries where inflationary pressures have been strong, no part of the counterpart fund has been released for investment purpose because of the undesirable increase in inflationary pressure which such expenditure would involve.

In certain countries almost the entire amount of counterpart funds has been used for the retirement of debt.

In the over-all, however, about 60 percent of such funds have been used for the promotion of production, the largest amount having been channeled into electric power projects, railroads, coal mining, agriculture, and various manufacturing industries. A relatively small amount has been earmarked for such purposes as housing, the care of refugees, health and sanitary projects.

Five percent of all counterpart funds is reserved for the use of the United States to pay administrative expenses and to purchase strategic materials. Approximately $38,000,000 of such rare materials have been purchased for stockpiling with the use of the local currency. Additional amounts have been obligated but not yet expended.

You might really say, in effect, that ECA makes its money work twice. The dollars purchase materials unobtainable in soft money countries. The counterpart funds permit recovery by the expenditure of such funds in these soft money countries.

WHAT HAS ECA ACCOMPLISHED?

As a result of ECA aid and the strenuous and wholehearted efforts of the participating countries, the gains achieved since 1947 have been far greater than anyone had reason to expect.

The economic structure of western Europe has been largely restored. Production is again flowing in quantities greater than prewar. In the 2 years that have elapsed, western Europe has accomplished what most experts did not believe could be achieved in 4 years—if at all. This achievement is the result of hard work, capable planning, cooperative effort, faith, some luck, and a smaller number of American dollars than was at first believed necessary.

Before the Marshall plan went into operation, western Europe appeared to be next on the Communist list. They were concentrating their efforts on France and Italy where the large labor unions were dominated by Communists and were doing everything in their power to sabotage industrial recovery. They represented a large political element in the governments of both of these countries.

The effects of our assistance showed their results almost at once in the political developments of the past 2 years. During this period the communistic tide has receded in every one of the participating countries.

In 1948, the opening year of the Marshall plan operations, first in Italy and then in France, the electorate dealt the Communist Party decisive set-backs, breaking its power to sabotage legislation and strangle the processes of government.

Furthermore, in all of the elections held in Europe last year, the Communists have lost heavily. In Norway, all 11 Communist Deputies failed of reelection. In the first free west German election, not a single Communist won a majority vote. In Great Britain, 100 Communists sought office and each and every one of them lost.

Of the achievements on the economic plane, the most important are the breaking up of the principal bottlenecks that strangled productive activity in 1947. Transportation facilities, virtually destroyed, are again in working order. Industrial plants have been repaired and are operating. Industrial and merchandising stocks have been largely replenished. Many of the innumerable controls, allocations, rationing, and price controls that were necessary to the conduct of the war and to control the inflation that followed have been repealed.

At the risk of being boring, I must give you a few over-all statistics on the ECA countries.

Industrial production is now 24 percent above prewar and up 60 percent since 1947.

Steel production was 2,250,000 tons monthly in 1947. It is now 4,000,000 monthly.

Coal production was 31,000,000 tons monthly in early 1947. It is now over 33,000,000 monthly.

Electric power production was 14,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours in early 1947. It is now 19,000,000,000.

Motor vehicle production was 63,000 monthly in 1947. It is now 116,000.

Agricultural output has also grown spectacularly, rising 25 percent in 2 years to a figure which is only 3 percent below the prewar level. This gain is partly the result of improved weather conditions, but the greatest credit must go to the efforts of the participating countries and to the ECA. The farmers of western Europe in 1949 were in possession of far greater quantities of equipment of a superior quality than they had in 1947. Furthermore, they were being supplied with better seeds, with more fertilizer, and had learned improved techniques.

As a result of the increased production and continued imports from the United States and other parts of the world, the diet of western Europe has been restored in quantity to very nearly the prewar level. The quality, however, is still low and could stand much improvement. The variety of food available in most countries is still restricted. For the year 1949–50 the per capita intake of the average western European is estimated at 2,800 calories per day, as compared with 2,900 in the prewar years.

Optimistic forecasters predict that with a reasonably good crop year Europe's agricultural production should equal its prewar record.

In considering these statistics, it must be borne in mind that the population of the ECA countries has increased at least 10 percent since the prewar period, which means that considerably higher total production is required to keep living standards from falling.

STABILITY

Internal financial stability has, in large measure, been restored. The inflationary rise in prices has been stopped. Wholesale prices in March of 1950 were either the same or lower than at the end of 1948. The same statement is generally true of the cost of living. Tax revenue everywhere has risen. Budgets have been brought into better balance.

Where deficits are still being shown, they are being covered from noninflationary sources, long-term loans, or counterpart funds. Among the more significant recent signs of restored financial stability were the ability of the ECA countries to absorb the shock of devaluation carried through last September and at the same time avoid a new inflationary cycle.

There is no surer sign of restored confidence in the stability of prices and currencies than the price of gold. Gold which, during the inflationary period, sold in Paris at fantastic prices, has come back to a more normal basis. At present there is no difference between its free market price in francs and the black market price.

WHAT'S TO BE DONE IN THE NEXT 2 YEARS?

The problems facing the ECA in the countries receiving its aid fall into three categories:

First, much further increases in production.

Second, closing the dollar gap.

Third, integration between western European countries.

Increased production

I have outlined to you the problems that faced the ECA and the progress they have made toward a solution. However, the ECA countries are still far from their ultimate goal. Let me give you a few items of comparison:

The United States has a gross product of around $260,000,000,000 a year which works out to about $1,700 per capita per annum. A corresponding composite figure of all the ECA countries would show a gross national product of less than one-third of our $1,700. The two or three highest producing ECA countries are less than one-half per capita in their production as compared to this country. If you take the lowest producing countries in the ECA list, the disparity is much greater.

We have back of the industrial worker from 2½ to 3 times as much electric power as is available to each worker in the ECA countries. As a result, the productivity per man-hour in the United States is from 2½ to 3 times that in the ECA countries. With these figures before you, you can realize the tremendous progress that can still be made in Europe.

I think the momentum to increase production in the ECA countries is building up. Some of the projects financed by ECA are only just coming into production.

I think the gigantic productive machine we have in this country is the miracle of this age and the explanation of it lies in the type of our citizenry, their ambition, their restlessness, in our belief in competition and in the fact that up to this time there has been in this country a tremendous incentive in the reward of accomplishment. I believe we have more of these characteristics than our European friends.

We can help Europe greatly by the introduction of better methods and more efficient practices. This is the reason we are placing such emphasis on the technical assistance program which really consists in making available to Europe our techniques of production, both industrial and agricultural. There are, of course, visits from America to Europe but the most effective method so far has been the visits of teams of technicians from the ECA countries to this country.

Dollar gap

Since 1947 the total exports of European countries have risen 50 percent.

To understand the dollar gap, it must be borne in mind that dollars are used by participating countries only to purchase machinery, food, petroleum, nonferrous metals, chemicals and other articles that cannot be secured by the countries in question by the use of their own currencies. The need of these dollars is decreasing as the economy of the European countries improves but a sharp cut-off would simply mean that factories using dollar materials would either sharply reduce operations or shut down.

Intra-European trade as a whole has been restored almost to prewar levels. In 1947, the dollar gap was about seven and a half billion dollars. This figure should be materially reduced this year. The gap could be closed abruptly if exports from the dollar area were reduced to what Europe can now earn. This would call for such a drastic reduction of the level of European industry that it would mean a catastrophe for Europe and a severe dislocation of our own economy.

What we wish to accomplish is to bring about at a reasonably high level of trade, a balance between Europe's dollar imports and its available dollars earned through sales to hard-currency countries, plus the dollars earned through invisible channels. Expenditures of tourists represent a large contribution to these invisible earnings.

Integration

The ECA Act in effect calls upon the participating nations to forget nationalism in making the recovery effort. This, too, was an unheard-of departure from age-old custom. To fully grasp its implications, one has only to think back over European history. For centuries these nations have been political as well as economic rivals. They have no common language, no common monetary or financial systems and their cultural patterns are vastly different.

Over the years men of vision have dreamed of a united Europe, but these dreams have been dismissed as visionary. Now ECA, acting under the mandate of the Foreign Assistance Act, asks these nations to drop their ancient rivalries for their common good. In a tactful way, this action becomes, to some extent, a condition of receiving ECA aid.

The idea of peacetime cooperation among European nations is no longer the property of visionaries and idealists. It has moved into the realm of practical politics, with ECA acting as a catalytic agent of closer cooperation and efficiency. If the Foreign Assistance Act did nothing but this, it would rank among the history-making documents of all time.

ECA is now trying to accomplish in 25 months the readjustment of the European economy that would naturally require at least 25 years. Definite progress is being made. The formation of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), an association of the ECA countries organized at the start of the Marshall plan activities, represented a move toward unification.

The creation of the Council of Europe was a further forward step. Recently, the countries have agreed to immediately remove 50 percent quantitatively of the restrictions on trade between the countries, with a further commitment to reduce such restrictions on another 10 percent of trade when the European Payments Union has become effective.

This European Payments Union will really be the clearing house among the nations of Europe and with the recent concurrence of the United Kingdom, it should be effective in a very few months.

The Schuman proposal for the joint operation of the French and German industries, accompanied by invitations to other nations to join, is an important historical abandonment of economic nationalism, having at the same time political and military significance.

Travel restrictions in the form of visa requirements, currency restrictions, duties on purchases by tourists and frontier formalities have been substantially eliminated or greatly liberalized.

The decision at the recent meeting of the council of Foreign Ministers to build an integrated defense structure for the North Atlantic community as a whole is one more evidence of a movement toward integration.

One of the urgent problems that confronted the ECA at the very beginning of the Marshall plan was that of freeing trade among the participating countries from many restrictions, especially exchange controls of various forms that were strangling it.

The first device employed by ECA was the use of ECA dollars to finance lack of balance between European countries. This was known as the offshore purchases plan.

A second and more effective method was devised, under which allotments of funds were made to creditor countries conditional upon their advance of credit to debtor countries in the currency of the creditor. This was called the intra-European payments plan.

Recently, since the European countries have approached more nearly to a balance of trade, these countries, with ECA cooperation, have reached general agreement over what is known as the European payments union. This amounts to a limited form of clearing house between the participating countries.

Under this payments union, creditors and debtors will settle their net balances with the union instead of with individual countries. This plan will not involve any increased expenditures by ECA but it does mean that a certain proportion of ECA funds will be used by the European Payments Union in making settlements. The union represents a distinct forward step in the freeing of intra-European trade and in preparing the participating countries for the day when they must go it alone.

COST OF THE COLD WAR

When ECA was first created, the estimates were that $17,000,000,000 would be required for the restoration of a reasonable economy among the ECA countries. It now appears that the sum to be spent in the 4 years ending in 1952 will amount to not more than $15,000,000,000. This, of course, is a tremendous sum of money but to get a clearer perspective you must remember that the cost of World War II was $350,000,000,000 and if we add to that the continuing expense of pensions and benefits that grew out of World War II, the figure would be much higher. The $15,000,000,000, however, is a very small percentage of the cost of World War II. It really is about equal to 2 months' average expenditure during the last war.

If, in 1948, we had turned down the Marshall plan, no one can be sure just what would have followed but in all probability, such action would have meant that this country was electing to combat the sinister forces of communism without the aid of European allies who were potentially strong and who, with our aid, could be made powerful, both economically and militarily. In my humble opinion, as a result of such a policy, the United States would have become almost an armed camp, with added military expenditures far exceeding our contribution to the recovery of Europe. This would have resulted in great dislocation in this country and a weakening of our economic strength which is so completely essential in any war whether hot or cold.

If the efforts of ECA in western Europe are successful—and the progress so far is certainly encouraging—our $15,000,000,000 spent for the restoration of Europe would be the best investment that this country has ever made.

In addition to the vast direct gain from the restoration of western Europe, you cannot overlook the gain of having the ECA countries living under democratic governments, with free economies and a standard of living higher than that enjoyed by their neighbors beyond the iron curtain. The contrast with those neighbors which are the satellites of the Soviet will certainly be most desirable from our standpoint.

Now that I am no longer associated with the ECA, I feel I am at liberty to speak frankly about what I think of their accomplishment.

To begin with, I think the appropriation of the $10,000,000,000 which has now been spent on European recovery was a remarkable action.

Next, I think that the expenditure of this sum, practically without criticism, is almost a miracle. Even the opponents of ECA appropriations, when they open their arguments, almost always preface their remarks by speaking in the highest terms of the ECA's administration and handling of these very large sums of money.

The credit for this accomplishment and the credit for the high caliber of the ECA staff both here and abroad must go to Mr. Paul Hoffman.

From the beginning of the ECA organization, and incidentally, this organization was put together under tremendous pressure for speed, Mr. Hoffman has stood out for the selection of the very best type and best qualified American citizens that could be enlisted. Most of these men are serving at great personal sacrifice.

The result is that there is not only a high morale but also a crusading spirit among the leaders in the ECA organization.

Mr. Hoffman, himself, has idealism, great enthusiasm, a driving energy combined with hard-headed business realism. I have referred to him as the head of the ECA but more than that, he is the heart of the ECA.

He has such a high sense of dedication to the accomplishment of the ECA objectives that he has imparted this same spirit to the entire ECA staff. Whatever they accomplish, I am sure history will attribute in no small measure to Mr. Hoffman.

ECA activities represent a large element in the forces that this country is bringing to bear in the cold war.

Against the mighty power, the dictatorship, that rules by force and fear, there is opposed the United States and all the free peoples of the world.

We and our natural free allies are in possession of raw materials, industrial production, and other elements that make economic strength in a measure that is at least three times as much as those possessed by our opponents.

In resources of mind and spirit, the free world is far ahead of the communistic countries and is increasing in relative strength every day.

We have a civilization that affords the maximum enjoyment of living.

Resourcefulness, initiative, and spirit wither away and die under the totalitarian system. Under conditions of freedom, they flourish.

The only way we can lose is through appeasement, lack of unity, or blundering. I am not the youngest man here but I hope and believe that I shall live long enough to see this cold war won by the free countries and the world restored to a condition where our energies are devoted to increasing the standard of living and the well-being of people all over the world.

Brigham Young: A Fitting Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial which appeared in the June 2, 1950, issue of the Salt Lake Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FITTING TRIBUTE

Fitting tribute to the great and inspired leader, Brigham Young, was paid this week by State and Nation. In National Capitol ceremonies, participated in by the Vice President of the United States, Senators, Cabinet members, Justices of the Supreme Court, and hundreds of his followers, a monument was dedicated in his honor and placed in the Hall of Fame in the Capitol.

In earlier rites, his descendants, dignitaries of the LDS Church, and people of the State of Vermont, his place of birth, honored him by dedicating a monument to his memory at Whitingham. This monument is in a sense a tribute to a native youth, who early in life layed aside his glazier tools to cast his lot with a persecuted people in Ohio. From this humble beginning Brigham Young rose to national stature and today is considered one of America's greats.

When assassins struck down his beloved leader and prophet, Brigham Young, already endowed with the qualities of great leadership, stepped forward to guide a grief and poverty-stricken people across a thousand miles of wilderness to the heart of the Rocky Mountains. Still loyal and faithful to the concepts of true Americanism, Brigham Young, despite the fact that he and his followers had been harassed and spurned by high Government officials, raised the Stars and Stripes over a territory then a part of Mexico and claimed it for the United States.

This was not only a courageous gesture but it offered an opportunity for him to express the patriotism and stalwart characteristics which were his heritage from forefathers who fled religious persecution in the Old World to found a new home on the rock-bound shores of New England.

While monuments of stone may be raised to his memory, his greatest monument is this desert country in western United States which under his inspired leadership has been made to blossom like the rose.

His putting the practice of irrigation into effect has had far-reaching benefits, both within and beyond the bounds of this Rocky Mountain empire.

Highly practical, Brigham Young was also deeply religious and keenly interested in the welfare of his people. As a founder of Utah he wanted this new State to be a place where soul growth would never be hampered. He believed that men's lives could be bettered by better conditions for life. For this reason he instituted cooperative business ventures as well as encouraged the development of schools and other cultural organizations.

With such a record Brigham Young's greatness is not dependent on memorials or monuments carved in stone but at the same time it brings joy to the hearts of his people and Utahans generally that his work is being memorialized in marble and placed in the Capitol of the Nation that he did so much to make great.

Indian Rehabilitation in the State of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced House bill 8783, a bill to rehabilitate Wisconsin Indians. As a background to this bill I ask to include the following information to show the need for this legislation and how it will work out:

MEMORANDUM OF INFORMATION

General: Indian affairs in Wisconsin, exclusive of matters affecting the Menominee Indians, are administered by the Great Lakes Consolidated Agency, Ashland, Wis. The tribes represented are as follows:

The Bad River Band of the Lake Superior Tribe of Chippewa Indians.

The Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians.

The Lac du Flambeau Band of the Lake Superior Chippewa Indians.

The Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians.

St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin.

The Sakaogon Chippewa Community—Mole Lake.

The Forest County Potawatomi Community.

The Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin.

The Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Wis.

The Wisconsin-Winnebago Indians.

Population: The number of Indians living in the area is estimated as follows:

Tribe:	Population
Bad River Band	1,375
Lac Courte Oreilles Band	1,790
Lac du Flambeau Band	968
Red Cliff Band	689
St. Croix	241
Sakaogon (Mole Lake)	205
Forest County Potawatomi	319
Oneida Tribe	3,612
Stockbridge-Munsee	510
Wisconsin-Winnebago	1,520
Total	11,229

Land	Total area	Trust allotted	Tribal	Government owned
Bad River	74,752	60,627	1,578	12,547
Lac Courte Oreilles	54,699	41,006	510	13,183
Lac du Flambeau	33,426	27,504	4,509	1,413
Red Cliff	8,859	3,856	5,003	----
St. Croix	1,614	286	1,328	----
Sakaogon	1,680	----	1,680	----
Forest County	11,040	----	11,040	----
Oneida	2,655	735	1,920	----
Stockbridge-Munsee	15,327	----	2,240	13,087
Wisconsin-Winnebago	13,096	13,057	----	39
Total	217,148	147,071	29,808	40,269

Income: In 1943 a survey of 68,640 Indian families throughout the United States showed an average income per family of $1,071. Of this amount, 68.5 percent was classed as "earned" and 31.5 percent as "unearned." Low as this income was, it was considerably higher than the income of the Indians under the jurisdiction of the Great Lakes Consolidated Agency. The average income of 1,036 families, including members of the Bad River, Lac Courte Oreilles, Lac du Flambeau, Red Cliff, St. Croix, Sakaogon, and Forest County Potawatomi Indians was only $615 per family. Of this amount, 68 percent was classed as "earned" and 32 percent as "unearned." The average income of 1,057 families including members of the Oneida, Stockbridge-Munsee, and Wisconsin-Winnebago Tribes was somewhat higher, averaging $1,285, of which 69.9 percent was classed as "earned" and 30.1 percent as "unearned." The distribution of families by amount of family income received further points up the low economic status of these Indians.

Total number of families	Income class							
	$200 to $299	$300 to $399	$400 to $499	$500 to $749	$750 to $999	$1,000 to $1,499	$1,500 to $1,999	$2,000 and over
1,036	62	197	340	214	124	53	36	10
1,057	3	47	87	204	120	176	160	260

The source of income is indicated as follows:

	Native products	Arts and crafts	Agriculture	Private business	Wages	Other earned income	Total earned income	Total unearned income	Total individual income
Bad River	$8,000	$250	$12,175	$2,500	$83,000	$5,000	$110,925	$33,918	$144,843
Lac Courte Oreilles	11,000	160	16,213	6,600	40,200	1,000	75,173	32,027	107,200
Lac du Flambeau	8,128	1,256	4,139	26,700	26,677	----	66,900	40,975	107,875
Red Cliff	3,237	650	10,966	----	20,221	5,000	40,074	24,550	64,624
St. Croix	8,000	200	----	----	15,150	----	23,350	10,000	33,350
Sakaogon	2,035	490	2,500	----	10,500	----	15,525	7,880	23,405
Forest County	2,125	130	3,931	----	24,010	----	30,196	16,417	46,613
Oneida	----	----	90,000	----	354,460	----	444,460	201,800	646,260
Stockbridge-Munsee	----	----	12,500	----	62,326	----	74,826	15,925	90,751
Total	42,525	3,136	152,424	35,800	646,544	11,000	881,429	383,492	1,264,921

The unearned income includes State and county relief, pensions, relief from the Indian Service, social-security assistance, rentals accruing from leases and permits, and so forth.

GENERAL INFORMATION ON SPECIFIC GROUPS

Bad River: This reservation is located on the south shore of Lake Superior in Ashland County, Wis. In addition to the enrolled population, the resident population of the reservation normally includes an additional 350 people not enrolled. There are usually about 205 families on the reservation. When well drained and properly limed and fertilized, the soil produces good alfalfa. Clovers and grasses grow successfully. Root crops, cabbage, beans, and berries can be successfully grown when properly managed. The available fertility of the soil, however, is low. There are about 1,320 acres of farming land, 64,592 acres of forest and woodland, and 8,840 acres of marsh and wastelands. Most of the forest and woodlands are cut-over. The marsh area offers good opportunities for the development of a fur farm.

Lac Courte Oreilles: This reservation is located in Sawyer County in northwestern Wisconsin. There are usually about 220 families on the reservation. The soils of the reservation are variable, and soil depth usually is shallow. The soils are generally benefited by lime for legume crops, and respond well when fertilizers are applied. Crops are chiefly hay, pasture, and gardens. Beans are grown successfully. A tribal cranberry-growing project has been established recently. There are about 53,311 acres of forest land, 500 acres of open grazing, and 888 acres of other lands including agricultural areas.

Lac du Flambeau: This reservation is located in Vilas, Iron, and Oneida Counties in northern Wisconsin. There are about 170 enrolled families on the reservation. The soils for the most part are sandy, shallow, and light in texture, with peat areas and semibogs. Crops are chiefly potatoes, carrots, beans, and rutabagas. About 600 acres are agricultural lands, and the balance is either forested, swamp, or waste. Development of a cranberry-growing project is under consideration at the present time.

Red Cliff: This reservation is located on the shores of Lake Superior in northern Wisconsin. There are about 102 families on the reservation. The soils are mainly heavy clay loam inland, and a fine sandy loam along the lake shore. Shallow-rooted crops such as small grains, pasture grasses, clover, and other hay crops can be grown successfully. The principal crops grown are canning beans, berries, apples, and small grains. Approximately 58 acres are being utilized for farm and garden purposes. The balance of the area is either forest cut-over land or waste.

St. Croix: This reservation is located in Burnett and Polk Counties. The tribal lands were acquired under authority contained in section 7 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984, 986), as amended. Numerous groups belonging to the St. Croix Band are scattered over Polk, Burnett, Washburn, Barron, and Douglas Counties, but the lands acquired lie in Burnett and Polk Counties, comprising three separate communities. About 28 families live on the purchased lands. The total population of this band is unknown, but it is estimated that the total membership may eventually reach about 400. Agricultural development is limited. Subsistence gardening can be practiced. Potatoes, carrots, beans, and rutabagas can be grown successfully. Some of the lands probably could be developed as a cranberry farm.

Sakaogon: This reservation is located in the southwestern portion of Forest County, Wis. The lands were purchased with funds appropriated under authority of the act of June 18, 1934. About 106 Indians reside on the reservation, and the balance of the population reside elsewhere. It is estimated that the average family consists of about five persons. Approximately 255 acres of dry farm land provide garden spots and hay. Open grazing land totals about 200 acres, and the balance of the land is suitable for reforestation.

Forest County: This reservation is located in Forest and Oconto Counties. The area is of glacial origin and too rough for profitable farming. About 345 acres cleared of brush and partially cleared of stone and boulders provide garden spots. The average family consists of about five members.

Oneida: This reservation is located in the east central portion of Wisconsin, in Brown and Outagamie Counties. It is located in one of the best farming sections of the State with excellent transportation facilities and substantial growing markets. There are about 400 local families. All of the lands are classed as farming.

Stockbridge-Munsee: This reservation is located in Shawano County, Wis. Very little land has been brushed and stumped or cultivated. The chief crops grown are oats, hay, potatoes, and barley. Cash crops of beans and cucumbers are grown on a small scale.

Wisconsin-Winnebago: These Indians have no reservation. Their lands are homestead allotments on public domain, and 4,578 acres acquired by purchase and

paid for with individual trust funds. These Indians engage actively in the manufacture of baskets and beadwork.

General: Other than at Oneida, the opportunities for rehabilitation of these Indians through agriculture are limited. Their economic development will have to come from better utilization of their forest lands, subsistence gardens, growing of specialized crops such as cranberries, wild-life development, arts and crafts products, tourist enterprises, service industries, wage work, etc. The $10,000,000 authorized by this bill does not provide for the complete rehabilitation of these people, as many of them require assistance in addition to a source of credit. Adequate loan funds will, however, enable many of them to help themselves and become self-supporting.

The various provisions of the bill are explained as follows:

Section 1 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to undertake a program of basic economic and other improvements for the benefit of the Chippewa, Potawatomi, Oneida, Winnebago, Stockbridge-Munsee, and other Indians living in Wisconsin in the area administered by the Great Lakes Consolidated Agency. A land purchase and adjustment area will be required in some instances, to enable some of the Indians to make a living from the land. With the exception of the Oneida Indians, most of these people are not interested in agriculture. A well-rounded economic development program, such as is envisaged by this bill, would enable the Indians to become established in any type of legitimate industry in which they are interested, and from which they could make a living and become self-supporting. Until this is done the United States will not have discharged its responsibilities to these people.

Such portions of the program as cannot be accomplished through the loans and grants provided for in subsequent sections of the bill, or through tribal funds, would be financed through appropriations made under the general authorizations of law relating to Indian affairs. Section 1 would not expand these authorizations, but would establish for the Indians of Wisconsin—except the Menominee Tribe—a specific program within their general scope.

Section 2 authorizes the appropriation of $10,000,000 as a revolving fund to assist in carrying out the purposes of the bill. Any appropriations made under this authorization will be reimbursable to the United States, except the 20 percent authorized by section 5 for assistance on a nonreimbursable basis. Repayments made on loans from the revolving fund, and interest or other charges collected thereon, will be credited to the revolving fund and be available for loans for any of the purposes authorized by the bill.

This section also provides that individual Indians of less than one-quarter degree of Indian blood shall not be eligible for financial assistance under the various provisions of the bill. Such Indians are not eligible for loans from the revolving fund created by the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984, 986) as amended. It is advisable that provisions regarding the eligibility of Indians for loans from various funds made available for their assistance be kept as uniform as possible.

Section 3, subsection (a), authorizes loans from amounts appropriated under authority of section 2 to (1) Indian tribes organized pursuant to the act of June 18, 1934, and Indian tribes having a form of organization recognized by the Secretary of the Interior, and (2) individual Indians who are members of a tribe which has not received a loan under the provisions of the bill.

These Indians have received loans from the revolving credit fund created by the act of June 18, 1934, and have made payments thereon as shown below:

	Amount loaned	Amount repaid	Balance unpaid	Interest
Bad River	$11,000	$11,000		$374.61
Lac Courte Oreilles	100,000		$100,000	
Lac du Flambeau	15,650	15,650		750.74
Red Cliff	16,000	16,000		726.50
Oneida	9,000	9,000		409.75
Total	151,650	51,650	100,000	2,261.60

The amount available has been too small to take care of the needs of these people for financing.

Subsection 3 (b) requires that any loans made from amounts appropriated under authority of section 2 of the bill shall be reimbursed within 40 years from the date the loan is made. It also provides that no loans shall extend beyond June 30, 1994. The additional 4-year period between the maturity of a 40-year loan—if such a loan were made in 1950—and the outside limitation of June 30, 1994, is to allow time for appropriations to be made, and still permit 40-year loans. Any loan made prior to June 30, 1954, would require reimbursement earlier than June 30, 1994. The term of loans made subsequent to June 30, 1954, would, of course, have to be for a shorter period than 40 years in order to conform to the over-all requirement that the maturity date may not extend beyond June 30, 1994.

Forty-year maturities on loans are required in order to make sound loans for some purposes, such as the purchase of land. The Congress has recognized that 40-year maturities on land loans are justified in connection with the enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 284), as amended, as well as in many earlier laws, including those establishing the Federal Land Bank system.

Section 4, subsection (a), authorizes the various tribes of Wisconsin, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to acquire lands, surface rights, water rights, or interests in lands, including improvements thereon, and to exchange any lands owned by the tribes, including lands title to which is in the United States in trust for the tribes, for other lands of approximately equal value. It provides that title to any lands and interests therein acquired which are located within the boundaries of the reservation of each of the tribes shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the particular tribe acquiring the land. Title to lands and interests therein purchased, or acquired by the exchange of other lands, which are located outside the boundaries of the reservation of each of the tribes, shall be taken in a nontrust status in the name of the tribe acquiring the land, and shall be subject to taxation. It is not intended that the tribes will acquire any extensive land holdings outside the boundaries of their reservations. Most of the lands purchased outside the boundaries of the reservation of each of the tribes will be acquired by individual Indians with cash loans received from the tribes or from the United States as authorized by subsection 4 (b). It is desirable for the tribes to have authority to acquire lands outside the boundaries of their reservations and take title in the name of the tribe acquiring the land, however, as cases may arise involving land exchanges or adjustments where such authority will be needed.

Subsection 4 (b) authorizes the Secretary to make loans to each of the tribes for the purchase of lands by each of the tribes and to enable the tribes to make cash loans to their members for the purchase of lands. The Secretary also is authorized to make loans to individual Indians for the purchase of lands. Income received from lands purchased by the tribes, and repayments received on cash loans made by the respective tribes to individual members for the purchase of land, will be used to reimburse the United States for loans received by the tribes. Individual Indians will reimburse the United States for loans received for the purchase of land from the income of enterprises operated by the Indians on the purchased land, or from such other sources of income as may be available to individual borrowers.

Title to lands purchased by individual Indians with the assistance of cash loans from the tribes and from the United States will be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the individual Indian purchaser if the lands are located within the boundaries of the reservation of each of the tribes. Title to lands purchased by individual Indians with the assistance of cash loans from the tribes and from the United States will be taken in the name of the individual Indian purchaser if the lands are located outside the boundaries of the reservation of each of the tribes, and all lands to which title is so taken shall be subject to taxation.

The bill, in subsection 4 (c), authorizes the various tribes, with the approval of the Secretary, to sell any lands purchased with loans, and any other lands owned or acquired by the tribes, to their members. Such sales may be made on a deferred-payment plan. Sales of land to members will be made with maturities at the earliest practicable dates, consistent with the purchasers' ability to repay. The consent of the Secretary for sales of lands, title to which is in each of

the tribes unrestricted, will not be required after the tribe's loan from the United States has been repaid in full.

Subsection 4 (d) provides that all right and title, if any, of each of the tribes and all right and title, if any, of the United States in and to lands purchased by individual Indians with the assistance of cash loans from each of the tribes or from the United States under authority of subsection 4 (b), and such right and title to the lands sold by each of the tribes under authority of subsection 4 (c), shall be released to the purchaser at such time as may be prescribed by the terms of the purchase. The time so prescribed shall be not later than 15 years after the effective date of the purchase of lands located within the boundaries of each of the tribes. Thus, lands purchased by individual Indians with the assistance of cash loans under authority of subsection 4 (b) and which are located within the boundaries of the reservation of each of the tribes, and title to which at the time of purchase is taken in the name of the United States in trust for the individual Indian purchaser, will remain in such title status not longer than 15 years from the date of the purchase. Even though the loan with which such lands were purchased has not been repaid in full within 15 years from the date of the purchase, all right and title of the United States in and to the lands involved will be released to the purchaser at that time. Likewise, both the right and title of each of the tribes and of the United States in and to lands sold by each of the tribes under authority of subsection 4 (c) which are located within the boundaries of the reservation of each of the tribes, and title to which is in the name of the United States in trust for each of the tribes, will remain in such title status not longer than 15 years from the effective date of the purchase. Even though the purchase price has not been paid to the tribes in full at the end of 15 years, all right and title of the tribe concerned and of the United States in and to the lands involved will be released to the purchaser.

If the lands sold by each of the tribes under authority of subsection 4 (c) are located outside the boundaries of the reservation of each of the tribes, the time prescribed for the release of the interests of the tribe in and to the lands sold is the effective date of the purchase. Any lands sold and title to which is released to the purchaser under authority of subsection 4 (d) and which were not previously subject to taxation, will become subject to taxation upon release of the title to the purchaser.

Subsection 4 (e) provides that lands purchased by members of the tribes and lands purchased by individual Indians with the assistance of cash loans from the United States under authority of subsection 4 (b), and lands, title to which is released to purchasers under authority of subsection 4 (d), shall be pledged or mortgaged to the United States in trust for the particular tribe which made the loan, or to the United States in the case of loans made by the United States, as collateral security for any unpaid indebtedness of the purchaser to the tribe or to the United States, in such manner and upon such terms as may be approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The requirement of such pledge or mortgage may be waived by the Secretary if he determines that repayment of the purchaser's indebtedness to the particular tribe concerned, or to the United States, is otherwise reasonably assured.

Section 5 authorizes the Secretary to use up to 20 percent of the amounts appropriated under authority of section 2 of the bill to assist borrowers from each of the tribes, and individual borrowers from the United States, including purchasers of land on credit from each of the tribes, during initial periods of operations, and to assist members of each of the tribes and other Indians in their educational advancement. Very few of the potential borrowers have adequate working capital. They have little security to offer other than recoverable chattels or land purchased with loans, or the land purchased from the tribes. Generally, loans will have to be made on the basis of character, industry, and plans of the enterprise being financed. In many cases it will be necessary to furnish individuals with some subsistence during the initial periods of their loans. Nonrecoverable items such as feed and seed, in many instances, will constitute a higher percentage than could be considered a normal credit risk. Experience has shown that in rehabilitating low-income groups it is impossible to expect borrowers to progress if they are burdened with debts for unproductive expenses or if they have to leave the operation of their enterprises for extended periods of time to work for wages in order to supply themselves with subsistence. Such wage work usually is available only during the periods when their own enterprises need close attention. It is essential, in inaugurating a program for the Indians of Wisconsin, that they have a clear understanding that when a loan is made, or when they purchase land from the tribes, ultimate repayment therefor must be made. However, they should not be harassed by debts for nonrecoverable items which will make repayment very difficult and in some cases impossible. Rehabilitation has proved most successful where small grants are made to borrowers for subsistence and operating expenses during initial periods of operation of their enterprises. In the long run, grants are less expensive than losses on loans accompanied, as losses are, by discouragement of borrowers overladen with debt, forcing them to abandon their enterprises and a resultant failure of the effort at rehabilitation. These funds also will be used to assist Indians with educational expenses in conjunction with loans made for educational purposes.

Section 6 provides that borrowers from each of the tribes and individual borrowers from the United States, including purchasers of land on credit from each of the tribes, shall be required to give liens, to be effective only in the event a borrower is in default on payments on a loan or purchase, against any future per capita payments or other distributions of tribal assets, as security for loans received or for land purchased under a deferred-payment plan from the tribes.

Section 7 provides that tribal funds now on deposit or hereafter deposited in the United States Treasury to the credit of each of the tribes of Wisconsin—except Menominee—shall be available for advance to the tribes for such purposes as may be designated by the particular tribe concerned and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. This provision will grant to the tribes greater responsibility than they now have and will avoid delays in obtaining their funds for use in enterprises which are economically sound. The tribes may wish to use their own funds for purposes in connection with their economic development programs and to supplement the funds borrowed from the United States. If it is necessary to obtain an appropriation of funds from the Treasury account of the tribes each time such use is proposed, discouragement and loss of opportunity for use of the funds in specific enterprises easily may result. The following tabulation shows the amount of tribal funds subject to authorization as of June 1, 1950:

Bad River:	
Proceeds of labor, Bad River Indians	$499.80
Interest on labor, Bad River Indians	951.60
Total	1,451.40
Lac du Flambeau:	
Proceeds of labor, Lac du Flambeau Indians	214.59
Interest on labor, Lac du Flambeau Indians	652.19
Interest on proceeds of Lac du Flambeau Reservation	6,726.64
Proceeds of labor, Mole Lake Band of Chippewa Indians	50.98
Total	7,644.40
Lac Courte Oreilles:	
Proceeds of labor, Lac Courte Oreilles Indians	54,997.33
Interest on labor, Lac Courte Oreilles Indians	6,824.31
Total	61,821.64
Potawatomi: Proceeds of labor, Potawatomi Indians, Wisconsin	185.78
Winnebago:	
Winnebago fund, Wisconsin	1,798.06
Interest on Winnebago fund, Wisconsin	2,870.34
Total	4,668.40
Grand total	75,771.62

Section 8 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to prescribe rules and regulations with respect to loans made to tribes and individual Indians under the bill, loans, and sales by each of the tribes to its members, assistance provided on a nonreimbursable basis under section 5, and other matters covered by the bill.

The Marshall Plan and the Henry A. Wallace Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion recently in my State of North Dakota and elsewhere regarding the Marshall plan and other foreign-aid programs. One, which has been of particular interest recently, is the substitute for the Marshall plan, better known as the Henry A. Wallace plan, submitted by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] in the Senate of the United States on March 10, 1948.

In order to secure accurate information regarding the provisions of these two international programs, I asked the Library of Congress to make a comparison for me. Their report to me is very interesting, particularly with respect to the cost of the two programs.

The Wallace plan provided for the authorization of a 5-year program, with a total cost to the United States of $25,000,000,000, or $5,000,000,000 yearly. According to the report from the Library of Congress, United States funds would have been spent in both Communist and non-Communist countries alike, with the administering of these funds in the hands of an international organization.

The Library of Congress estimates that the Marshall plan will cost roughly $15,400,000,000. It is a 4-year program, with the administration and the decision as to how and where the money will be spent kept entirely with the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the report which I have received from the Library of Congress, together with the vote on the Taylor substitute, which is found in volume 94, part 2, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 10, 1948, on page 2460.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., June 5, 1950.

To: Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG (attention: Mr. Block).

From: American Law Section, Legislative Reference Service.

Subject: Senator TAYLOR'S substitute for the Marshall plan.

I

Senator TAYLOR'S substitute, introduced in the Senate on March 10, 1948, is summarized as follows:

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

The United Nations was established to take effective collective measures for the removal and prevention of threats to the peace, to develop friendly relations among nations, and to achieve cooperation in solving international economic and social problems. It constitutes "the world's last best hope for peace." But American foreign policy, embodied in the Truman doctrine, has weakened the United Nations through resort to unilateral, noncollective measures which attempt to employ the economic might of the United States to interfere with the internal political affairs of other nations and has thereby divided the world into hostile blocs. It is the policy of the United States to repudiate the Truman doctrine, to reassert our leadership in maintaining peace through the United Nations, and to provide aid through the United Nations for reconstruction and development of countries devastated by Axis aggression.

UNITED NATIONS EUROPEAN RECONSTRUCTION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

The President is "called upon" to request the Secretary General to convene a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and to instruct United States representatives in the General Assembly to propose the establishment of an organization of the above name within the United Nations. The administration shall include representatives of the United States and of the European members, and shall have the responsibility of administering and distributing a fund amounting to at least $25,000,000,000 over a course of 5 years. The fund shall consist of voluntary contributions from member nations, or quotas assigned by the administration on the basis of ability to pay. It shall be available for loans or grants to individual European nations for the relief of immediate human suffering, the restoration of agriculture, industrial development—especially in industrially backward nations, and for the promotion of economic cooperation and world trade. Priority in the allocation of funds shall be given to nations which suffered most from Axis aggression, regardless of the character of their political or social institutions and subject to no political or economic conditions, except such as are necessary to insure sufficient expenditure. The fund shall be used for no military or armament purposes whatever. Special attention shall be given to the establishment of an "ever-normal world food granary." Five annual appropriations of $5,000,000,000 each are authorized for the purpose of our contribution to the fund.

EMERGENCY AID

The President is authorized to make grants to the governments of European nations for the procurement of food and fuel and facilities for the production thereof, pending the establishment of the United Nations Administration. The above requirements as to the selection of recipient nations shall be applicable; $500,000,000 is authorized for such use, until January 1, 1949, or the organization of the United Nations body whichever is earlier.

REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS

The United States shall not in peacetime give or sell to any other nation any military or naval equipment, munitions, supplies, etc., or finance the purchase thereof by any other nation, except as the United Nations Security Council may otherwise determine. It is the policy of the United States to promote universal disarmament, and to that end, Congress calls upon our United Nations representatives to propose the immediate reduction of current military expenditures by all nations to 10 percent of the current rate.

II

As indicated in the foregoing, the plan was expected to extend over a period of 5 years (American appropriations to be authorized commencing July 1, 1948) and was to be entirely administered by the proposed United Nations agency, in which the United Staes was to have representation (apart from the interim aid in the form of Presidential grants). It would seem to be quite futile to attempt an estimate of the cost of the proposed plan on any other basis than that contained in the language of the amendment itself. As already seen, a minimum 5-year fund of $25,000,000,000 was contemplated, with an authorized maximum American contribution of the same amount. From the outset a period of 4 years was envisaged for the European recovery program, though no "attempt to bind future Congresses" was made. In the 2 years in which it has been in effect, some $10,000,000,000 has been appropriated by Congress for this purpose,[1] and the Economic Cooperation Act of 1950 (title I of H. R. 7797, the Foreign Economic Assistance Act of 1950, now ready for the President's signature) authorizes $2,849,000,000 for the third year, including an estimated unexpended balance of $149,100,000 (H. Rept. No. 2117, 81st Cong., p. 15). Appropriation and expenditure of this amount plus a comparable new amount in fiscal 1952 would result in a total 4-year cost to the United States of roughly $15,400,000,000.

The administration of Senator TAYLOR'S plan would probably not have been subject to the Russian veto. The United Nations European Reconstruction and Economic Development Administration would apparently have been established as a new specialized agency by the Economic and Social Council, under authority of the General Assembly and would operate beyond the jurisdiction of the Security Council (see arts. 24, 55, 59, 60 of the Charter). It is in the decisions of the Security Council on nonprocedural matters within its jurisdiction, that the veto power of the five permanent members is operative (see art. 27).

The record vote was 74 to 3 against Senator TAYLOR'S substitute. It may be found in volume 94, part 2, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 2460.

THOMAS PERRY,
American Law Section.

The result was announced—yeas 3, nays 74, as follows:

Yeas, 3: Langer, Pepper, Taylor.

Nays, 74: Aiken, Ball, Barkley, Brewster, Bricker, Bridges, Brooks, Buck, Butler, Byrd, Capehart, Capper, Chavez, Connally, Cooper, Cordon, Downey, Dworshak, Eastland, Ecton, Ellender, Ferguson, Flanders, Fulbright, George, Green, Gurney, Hayden, Hickenlooper, Hill, Hoey, Holland, Ives, Jenner, Johnson of Colorado, Johnston of South Carolina, Kem, Kilgore, Knowland, Lodge, Lucas, McCarran, McClellan, McGrath, McKellar, Martin, Maybank, Millikin, Moore, Murray, O'Conor, O'Daniel, O'Mahoney, Overton, Reed, Revercomb, Robertson of Virginia, Robertsor of Wyoming, Russell, Saltonstall, Smith, Sparkman, Stennis, Stewart, Taft, Thomas of Oklahoma, Thomas of Utah, Thye, Tobey, Vandenberg, Watkins, Wherry, Wiley, Williams.

Not voting, 19: Baldwin, Bushfield, Cain, Donnell, Hatch, Hawkes, McCarthy, McFarland, McMahon, Magnuson, Malone, Morse, Myers, Tydings, Umstead, Wagner, White, Wilson, Young.

So Mr. TAYLOR'S amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

---

[1] Foreign Aid Appropriation Acts, 1949, 1950, and special appropriation for Germany. See statement of Administrator Paul Hoffman, House Foreign Affairs hearings on H. R. 7378 and 7797, 81st Cong., pt. I, p. 11.

The Desire for Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a valedictory address delivered by Eugene F. McGarvey at the Stevens Institute of Technology, at Hoboken, N. J. This address is of great importance to young people, and I think it should be read by all Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A recent article in a well-known magazine has a point of interest which should be read by every college graduate this year. It is based on an account taken from Governor Bradford's history of the Plymouth Bay Colony.

When the Pilgrim Fathers landed in Massachusetts, it seems they first established a collective system of production and distribution. The common produce of the settlement was pooled in one storehouse and then later rationed to the individual settlers.

A WAY WAS FOUND

From the very start, this system proved to be a complete failure. The Pilgrims' collective effort, far from providing security for all, produced no more than a starvation diet for any individual. Soon faced with a bitter famine which threatened to follow a continuation of this plan, Governor Bradford was forced to take a new tack. As he relates in his history, he decreed "that they should set corne, every man for his own perticular, and in that regard trust to themselves. * * * And so assigned to every family a parcell of land."

The results, of course, were highly gratifying. Now that each one had to provide for himself, the entire settlement took an added incentive to its work, and shortly thereafter Governor Bradford was able to write, "The effect of their perticuler planting was well seene, for all had, one way and other, pretty well to bring the year aboute, and some of the abler sorte and more industrious had to spare and sell to others, so as any generall wante or famine hath not been amongst them since to this day."

The moral of this story would seem to need no elaboration.

This year the colleges throughout the country are graduating a class of 1950, which together with its predecessor of last June has been stigmatized probably as none other before. The class of 1950 is the group that wants security with a broad, bold, capital S. Several prominent magazines have printed surveys proclaiming this fact to its readers; personnel directors have already taken the fact as granted. And these people base their claims both on personal observation and on the statistical results of college campus polls.

"Gone," they will tell you, "is that classic seeking of a chance to take a chance." The youth of 1950 has turned his back on the free enterpriser and on what at one time was considered the great American dream. As one manufacturer put it, "I never saw a bunch that so wanted to make the free-enterprise system work, but they are interested in the system rather than the individual enterprise. They will be technicians—not owners."

Now there are several obvious reasons why this charge is being made against the 1950 group. The college senior of today still averages 2 or 3 years older than his prewar counterpart. Close to 70 percent of the graduates are veterans, many of whom feel they have had adventure sufficient for any one life. They are 30 percent married, who of necessity must limit their risks.

The 1950 graduates as a Nation-wide group are also said to be overspecialized and hence not equipped to take a chance. And mixed in as a leaven is the current fad for an ever-and-ever increasing amount of public security.

Whatever the reasons, the truth is that the current graduate is none too anxious to strike out on his own eventually, but is looking for a smug job that will pay dividends in safety and lifelong tenure. He will be perfectly content to work for someone else—preferably a very large concern. He desires a vast amount of training, but not as a jumping-off point to his own enterprise. In short, he lacks faith in the future and wants, above all things, economic security.

This is the picture painted of us on the eve of graduation. Whether for the most part the members of the class of 1950 will actually live their lives along these lines remains to be seen. It is not too late, though, to sound a note of warning against this indicated trend.

When the businessman claims that the new generation does not care to take a chance, he is thinking in terms of economic risk-taking solely. The danger, however, strikes much deeper than that. This security mentality—that feeling that "Well, I don't have to do it myself; it will be done for me"—can, if given the chance to grow, pervert our entire approach to life.

No, it is not only that the class of 1950 may not take risks in the realm of business—but that in our everyday lives, in our engineering work, and in the social life of our community, we may become sterile of all originality. The real threat is not just the passing of enterprise from the economic field—it is the possible loss of incentive in our whole field of living.

Economic security is surely a strong drive in a person's life. But if we are to allow a fear of the future to completely order our lives, to limit the growth of our personalities, and to rob our every opportunity, then security on these terms is indeed a hollow triumph. For in the end we shall have secured nothing of lasting value and lost much that is worth while in life.

First of all, complete security is an illusion. In this respect, it might be likened to the idea of perpetual motion. Both of these concepts would be wonderful, if they worked. But in practice neither does.

More often than not, as a result of his Maginot-line mentality, the most insecure person is the one who is forever playing safe. And unfailingly increased security is purchased only at the loss of some basic human freedom—which is too high a price to pay for a mirage.

Second, a generation that is security-conscious is in some degree refusing to make the act of faith without which effective living is impossible. In its members there can be little of that lust for life and experience of the joy of living, little of a sense of wide horizons or worlds to conquer.

And, finally, a generation that has been raised on security is in a poor psychological position to survive the inevitable shocks of life, no matter what is done to insure everybody against all conceivable contingencies. A crutch is well suited to a lame person, but if he persists in its use once he is healed, he remains in a sense always lame. Security is just such a crutch.

In the final analysis, the only safe guide to security—security of integrity—lies in the determination to pursue what seems to be a right course of action, regardless of the hazards involved, being fully aware that you may fail, but that the only real failure is the refusal to venture.

At the other extreme it would be very foolish to think that we can all hop into a snug spot aboard the free-enterprise caravan and just free wheel to security. Like any vehicle, the American system needs a motive force—and we are all, everyone of us, counted on for the drive to make it go. The Pilgrims found that out before it was too late. Will we?

The Great Moral Crusade for Peace and Freedom in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on June 7 Mr. Eric Sevareid, a distinguished news commentator of the Columbia Broadcasting System, made some remarks about the great moral crusade of which the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and several other distinguished Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives spoke in presenting a resolution to the Congress.

Because Mr. Sevareid's analysis conforms in many respects to thoughts which have occurred to many of us, and because Mr. Sevareid makes a proposal which deserves the attention of the Government and of the Nation, I ask unanimous consent to insert an excerpt from Mr. Sevareid's address over CBS in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Yesterday, a group of distinguished Senators and Representatives called for what they termed a "great moral crusade" for peace and freedom in the world. Many times since the war, the country has heard such pleas, all of which spring from the realization that, in the profoundest sense, war and dictatorships originate in the minds of men in the basic cast of their thoughts; in all these cries for action there is a note of desperation, as the world drifts apart and armaments pile up; and a note of frustration that somehow despite our far-flung soldiers and administrators, despite our elaborate information services—somehow we have not been able to teach democracy to masses of foreign peoples, have not even been able to convince enough of them of what we ourselves feel so deeply in our bones—that America does love peace. Every American who has lived abroad has experienced the maddening sensation of being unable to really convince others, with words, that despite our glaring, obvious excesses there is a great goodness in American life which governs our actions in the end.

Surely, there is a lesson in all this—a lesson which seems to be understood by only a few of the key men in the administration

and the Congress. It is, that we cannot export democracy like an attractively packaged breakfast food; we cannot advertise democracy with slogans and fancy four-color printing jobs, and expect it to take hold. The Voice of America broadcasts cannot teach American democracy; they can only keep other peoples abreast of the American story on each current event, which is, of course, of vital importance in spreading an understanding of truth. We can only export democracy in the form of seeds. The seed is the human mind, and the only seeds we can use are those that will grow naturally in foreign soils. In other words, the only lasting way to spread democracy abroad is to bring foreigners here—chiefly young foreigners, to live and learn in American towns and schools, and then send them back to their native soil.

The conviction is growing among responsible leaders here that this is where we have missed the boat; that immediately the war had ended we should have embarked on a big-scale program of importing foreign students for future export. Since 1945 something over 85,000 foreign students have studied in America, including the 26,400 who are here right now. This total is a respectable figure, and 26,000 equals the present enrollment of the largest American university. But in terms of the ultimate aim of teaching democracy and the American view of life, there are several things wrong with this—too many of these students are from South America and Canada, where, in world terms, history does not happen. Too many, around half, are older, graduate students; too many are here for only a year. And, above all, the total number is not half what it could be. There is room in the colleges now—that is not the real stumbling block; the real problem is money. Well, we could keep a hundred thousand foreign students in America for 2 years at far less cost than that of equipping one armored division of troops.

There is much evidence that the premise of this argument is sound. Nearly all American Rhodes scholars to Oxford retained an affectionate regard for England all their lives; nearly all American youths who studied on the left bank of Paris carried something of France in their bloodstreams thenceforth, and that counted when France and England reached their time of trial. If the United States retained great influence in China, despite our distance and the overwhelming odds against us, those thousands of Chinese returned students had much to do with it.

The moral seems clear enough—the sense of democracy is something that is bred in the bones, and the composition of bones is determined by chemicals in the soil.

Problem of Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an excellent editorial which appeared in the columns of the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., Saturday, June 10, 1950:

PROBLEM OF TEXTILE INDUSTRY

The problem of the textile industry in Massachusetts, and in the North generally, is not so much the fault of high standards existing here, as it is the low standards prevailing in the South. The South features lower wages, higher productivity, lower compensation (in most instances) for injured workmen, lower corporate income taxes, lower local taxation, lower living costs because of climate. At least, that's the impression we get from the majority and minority reports of the textile recess commission. And it must be admitted that all elements of the over-all picture shape up into something rather formidable in a competitive way. The South does have definite advantages over New England, and it doesn't do any good to gloss over that fact. And, since, according to the recess commission's findings, our industrial substance has been trickling away for some 25 years, it can be said that any measures we now take to arrest the bleeding are long overdue.

It is not hard to be wise after the event, but the migration of cotton, which began in the early twenties was the first symptom of the economic malaise which is now afflicting us. A geographic factor here operated to our disadvantage. The South grows cotton; ergo, manufacturers reasoned, why pay freight rates to ship it North, when it could be processed in the South just as well? Any hard-headed businessman would agree that the migration which has occurred up to now was more or less inevitable. It seems to us that at the outset the other advantages the South had to offer were of secondary importance—the cheap labor market, for example—because industrialists themselves had misgivings about the ability of southerners to adapt themselves to industrialization. When it became evident that there was little difference between the North and the South in this respect, the trend intensified and involved other industries.

Migration was essentially a matter of physics: the South represented a vacuum, industrially speaking, and the flow of industry into it was the result of natural laws having to do with the equalization of pressure. We take comfort in this analogy derived from physics; it means so far as we can see, that there must be a limit, that the South, no longer an industrial vacuum but still a low-pressure area, will not always have a competitive advantage. The redistribution of pressure is not solely a problem affecting New England. Other industries located in other parts of the country have been just as discerning with regard to the economic characteristics of the South and have acted accordingly. It is very plain, as a practical matter, that the South will have to reach the saturation point. It cannot accommodate every industry in America which is motivated by the understandable desire to increase its profits. It is very plain, also, that each new industry which goes South inevitably reduces the South's competitive potential. The recess commission's report indicates this. It says that the differentials between wages and productivity, while still an important factor, have narrowed in recent years. This, it seems to us, is a clue as to what will eventually happen in the South. To put it very plainly, the day will come, and is probably not too far away, when migration of industry will be accompanied by more risk that assurance of bigger profits, and may well result in individual economic catastrophe. As an historical matter, there has always been a flow of hope and capital toward vacuums, toward virgin territories, but there has always been a leveling off, too. That's why we'll never believe that Massachusetts or Lawrence is destined for ghosthood, now or ever.

Of course, this faith we have in the future of Massachusetts doesn't mean that all we have to do is sit tight and wait it out. No. While it doesn't seem that we should try to create a sort of low-pressure area here as a counter-measure against the attractions of the South, we should nevertheless do everything in our power to make industry think twice about leaving us. The profit motive, mainspring of our theory of government, causes migration. States cannot afford to disdain the profit motive, or the idea of free enterprise. If we accept the profit motive, and all that it involves, we've got to adjust our thinking to the realities. The best way to do this, it seems to us, is to visualize ourselves as partners in a business enterprise—Massachusetts, Inc.—which, like every business under our system, has to face the hostile eye of competition.

And what does this acceptance of the idea of competition involve? Well, according to the commission's report, something must be done about our corporate income tax to bring it in line with the tax structure of other—and competing—States. Furthermore, we must take into consideration that the barrel has a bottom, that further liberalization of workmen's compensation or unemployment insurance is a matter which must be approached with great "caution," as the recess commission's report states. When you get right down to it, our primary objective is the creation of more jobs, and anything which contributes to this end must not be ignored.

Potatoes Go to the Reds at the Expense of the American Taxpayers

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, it must be rather interesting to the American taxpayers to read through the morning papers that 100,000,000 pounds of surplus potatoes resulting from price supports at their expense have been sold to New York exporters for 1 cent a pound and resold to the Russians in eastern Germany at an attractive profit.

It seems rather strange that our Department of Agriculture has used this method of solving the surplus problem. It hardly makes sense that welfare organizations and tax-supported institutions should pay 5 and 6 cents a pound for potatoes, while they are being sold at 1 cent per pound to foreign exporters and then resold to the agents of Russians in Germany.

Do not forget. This is not a part of the ECA plan. We are spending billions of dollars under the ECA program, but up to this time we have not seen fit to include these surplus commodities in that program. Potatoes going abroad under ECA have been sold at market prices.

Still further, Mr. Speaker, I just do not see how our Government can justify selling potatoes at 1 cent a pound to New York exporters for the Russians while the War Department and the Veterans' Administration for its hospitals, and other Government-supported agencies buying food, continue to pay the regular price for potatoes. Housewives will draw a deep breath when they go to the grocery stores and pay market prices for potatoes when they realize that New York exporters are buying the same quality of potatoes at 1 cent a pound, to be sold at profits to people who are unfriendly to the United States of America. I think the whole situation is at least "screwy."

Brotherhood—Bulwark of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a very enlightening and instructive editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., under date of Monday, June 12:

BROTHERHOOD—BULWARK OF PEACE

Launching of the World Organization for Brotherhood in Paris has just provided an occasion for eloquent—and timely—expressions of the main political and spiritual concepts which underlie western civilization. These require more and more emphasis today.

But, above all, they must be emphasized as convictions, not of one or two nations but of an entire civilization. For nothing less than the preservation of an entire civilization can surely establish the physical, moral, political security of the individual in these times.

The need to widen the geographical area of physical defense has presented new challenges to human understanding. The most profound of these challenges may well be to find ways to build this wider security on a more durable foundation than military preparedness and economic collaboration.

The World Organization for Brotherhood, an outgrowth of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in the United States, promises to take a vital part in meeting this demand. The key to its usefulness is in its name—the word "brotherhood."

The United Nations, the Atlantic Pact, Western Union, Council of Europe, Schuman plan—these are devices, the machinery, of peace. Brotherhood is the will to use them for peace. That which widens, deepens, or elevates our recognition of brotherhood puts new and vitalizing forces back of the world's peace machinery. And it puts these same forces more and more in control of those agencies, like military alliances and economic programs, which otherwise tend to become merely negative or materialistic.

The World Organization for Brotherhood comes on the world scene at a moment when any physical sense of brotherhood is both discredited by such applications of it as occurred under Hitler and ruled out by the very necessities of the day. Not race or blood, as mankind is being forced to recognize, makes brotherhood, but ideas. When Dr. Arthur H. Compton spoke to his colleagues at Paris of the "brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God," he placed brotherhood on a purely mental and spiritual basis, recalling the statement made many years ago by John Young of Edinburgh, "God is the father of mind, and of nothing else."

To most beneficiaries of western civilization such concepts are familiar to the point of appearing platitudinous. Yet they are more familiar to the world as theories than in practice.

National leaders have often tried to create an illusion of brotherhood on the proposition that it is to be found in a common pursuit of material necessities or wants. But the notion that man is an economic animal has never been sufficient for his peace and liberty, and rarely supplied even his need for bread.

In the degree in which a true concept of brotherhood bases western civilization, that civilization can build enduring defenses against all isms that embody some merely material concept of brotherhood, whether it be that of blood and race or purely economic motivation. For in the pursuit of ideas and ideals, in the struggle to perceive his true relationship to his fellows by understanding his relationship to God as the source of all ideas and intelligence, man has repeatedly approached the kingdom of heaven and found needed things added.

1949 Narrative Report of H. G. Pinkston, County Agent, Cullman County, Ala., Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, Cullman County, Ala., has 7,100 farms—more farms than any other county in the State.

In a good year Cullman farmers produce over 50,000 bales of cotton—more than is produced in any other two counties in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama. In 1947 Cullman County produced 51,000 bales on 66,000 acres, which was more than the combined production of Fayette, Lamar, Pickens, Walker, and Winston Counties.

I include as a part of my remarks part I of the 1949 report of H. G. Pinkston, county agent of Cullman County:

ANNUAL NARRATIVE REPORT, H. G. PINKSTON, COUNTY AGENT, CULLMAN COUNTY, ALA.

(H. G. Pinkston, county agent, December 1, 1948, to November 30, 1949; Cecil G. Davis, assistant county agent, December 1, 1948, to November 30, 1949; P. A. Williams, assistant county agent, December 1, 1948, to July 1, 1949; Robert K. Leopard, assistant county agent, July 1, 1949, to November 30, 1949; Herman I. Keeton, assistant county agent, March 21, 1949, to September 16, 1949; Ernie O. Elliott, assistant county agent, November 1, 1949, to November 30, 1949)

FOREWORD

The Alabama Farm Program, Circular 337, published in November 1946, is the statement of the agricultural program of the people of Alabama, the school of agriculture, agricultural experiment station, and the extension service of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute.

The Cullman County farm program represents the thinking of the county extension council composed of community farm and home representatives, 4–H, representatives of business and civic organizations, the county governing body, and the county extension workers. It conforms to the State farm and home program which is based on available agricultural research plus the farm experience of our county people.

The county plan of work for 1949 was prepared early in 1949. Three main steps were taken in developing it. First, county extension workers attended a conference at which each specialist outlined the latest information in his field. This included their recommendations on what to do, how, when, and where to do it, all based on research of the experiment station. Second, a conference of county workers was held to review recommendations of specialists and the county farm program. The third step was the completion of the plan at a meeting of the county extension council, composed of farm men and women, representatives of business and civic organizations, the county governing body, and the county extension workers. The plan of work, based on the county farm program, emphasizes those parts of the program considered most important in 1949 by the county extension council.

This annual narrative report is prepared to cover activities, methods used, and results obtained in our county extension program as set forth in the county plan of work for 1949, including other projects and activities which were adopted and made a part of the plan during the year.

EXTENSION PERSONNEL

H. G. Pinkston, county agent; C. G. Davis, assistant county agent (extension, TVA, cooperative program); Robert K. Leopard, assistant county agent (4–H Club program); Ernie O. Elliott, assistant county agent (general extension program); E. Lynn Kidd, extension timber marketing specialist; Mary Sue J. Gray, home demonstration agent; Delia Garrett, assistant home demonstration agent; Elfredda B. Mann, secretary; Pauline B. Fowler, secretary.

P. A. Williams, assistant county agent in 4–H Club program, resigned effective July 1, 1949, succeeded by Robert K. Leopard, July 1, 1949.

Herman I. Keeton, assistant county agent, March 21, 1949, transferred to Franklin County, Ala., September 16, 1949. Ernie O. Elliott, assistant county agent, employed November 1, 1949, succeeded Herman I. Keeton.

EXTENSION ORGANIZATION

An effective program with farm people, as with any group, must be planned.

Not only are leaders utilized in planning the county program but they are most effective out in the various communities in putting the program into effect both with adults and 4–H Club members.

It has been the policy of county extension personnel to provide the people of Cullman County with latest agricultural-research information that would help them to do a better job of farming, to continue to develop a greater knowledge of, and interest in, agriculture on the part of all the people. The interdependence of farmers and business is definitely recognized by most individuals, a situation which makes for a more abundant life for all.

In carrying out the county agricultural program the following means have been employed: individual contacts, letters, circular letters, newspaper articles, meetings, tours, county beef and dairy-cattle shows, agricultural exhibits, farm visits, method demonstrations, special project demonstrations with livestock, field crops and woodlands, whole-farm demonstrations through unit test demonstration program, bulletins, pamphlets, and radio.

EXTENSION ORGANIZATION, 4–H

The program and activities of 4–H Club work in Cullman County has been built around an organization comprised of county 4–H Club council, local club officers, local club leaders, and parents. This helped greatly in promoting and carrying out 4–H Club work in Cullman County during the year.

The objectives of the 4–H program were set up in a county club yearbook, made in the fall of 1948 in cooperation with the county council, local leaders, and parents. This yearbook has been used as a guide in planning activities, project work, and special features of the club program.

There are 28 active 4–H clubs in Cullman County with a total enrollment of 1,209 boys.

An annual rally and achievement day was held during the month of April to make members better acquainted with each other, to promote good will among rural boys and

girls and townspeople, and to give recognition to accomplishments of outstanding club members.

A 3-day summer camp was held at Camp Kinlock in the Bankhead National Forest and was attended by 44 club members. These boys represented 22 clubs. Leadership and recreation were stressed along with a forestry demonstration.

PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND RESULTS—AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

A. Terrace construction and maintenance

Climatic conditions, general topography, and soil type make is necessary that constant stress be placed on conservation of our soil through properly planned water conservation and disposal system for each farm.

Cullman County farmers are well aware of this problem and are very cooperative with extension workers in this phase of the program.

Numerous farmers have been assisted with planning water-control systems and with survey work for terraces, farm ponds, and in a few instances, with drainage problems. Local leaders who have attended training schools, held by county personnel, in planning water-control systems and terrace line running, have given valuable assistance in this program. Best estimates give 8,500 acres terraced to date this year.

Effective control of surplus water includes the maximum use of vegetative cover for terrace outlets and also on open land not in row-crop production. Cullman County has more Lespedeza sericea than any county in the State. Alfalfa is also being grown by more and more farmers. These two crops, along with mixtures of perennial clovers and grasses, play a very important part in the control of surplus water. Increased production of livestock involving more and better pastures also helps with this problem.

B. Farm buildings

Many individuals have been assisted with problems and plans for new building construction, remodeling, and conversion of old buildings and with selection of sites for dairy barns, poultry houses, sweetpotato houses, and other farm buildings. Many farmers were also assisted with selection of proper equipment for dairy barns, poultry houses, and sweetpotato houses. Numerous individuals were furnished with blueprints for buildings and building equipment.

C. Farm machinery

With mechanized farming being practiced on more farms, extension workers are depended on more and more for assistance in the selection of proper farm machinery and equipment for the farm and home. Not only was assistance given in selection but assistance, when possible, was given in proper operation, utilization, and care.

D. Farm electrification

Work on farm electrification was devoted mainly to furnishing individuals with general information. Several hundred bulletins—Planning for Electricity on Alabama Farms—were furnished. Many of these were supplied to teachers in veterans' vocational agricultural program.

County extension personnel cooperated with the local REA cooperative in annual meeting, and extension personnel had an exhibit to demonstrate proper electrical equipment for the farm and home.

Work in agricultural engineering has been carried on through demonstrations, individual contact, news articles, radio, farm visits, bulletins, and other available published materials.

AGRONOMY

A. Land utilization

Wise use of land is the fundamental basis of a successful agriculture for Cullman County. Only through wise land use can all the forces of nature be made to most effectively serve our people.

There are certain agronomic crops which fit into our economy and which must have a place in a program of land utilization. Some of these, of necessity, require clean cultivation which intensifies to some degree the problem of soil conservation and improvement. Among these are cotton, corn, and certain small grain and hay crops.

B. Cotton

This crop ranks first as a source of cash income to our county. Farmers planted a much larger acreage to this crop in 1949 than last year, or some 90,000 acres compared to BAE figure of 74,000 acres for 1948.

Due to extremely unfavorable conditions throughout most of the growing season, the yield per acre will be very low or less than half the 1948 yield of 429 pounds of lint cotton. Continued rain throughout the spring, summer, and early fall and a very heavy boll weevil infestation combined to cause an almost complete failure on hundreds of farms and heavy loss on most of the remaining farms.

The county agent worked closely with seed dealers and officials of one-variety-cotton improvement groups in getting a reasonable amount of breeder seed and in saving a good tonnage of first-year seed from the 1948 crop for use in planting last spring.

Educational work on planting date, varieties, fertilization, and cultivation has been very effective. Late planting on the part of many farmers is still one of the major problems with this crop. Cotton diseases and insects, especially as mentioned previously, were a serious problem.

Cotton wilt is becoming more serious and farmers were advised relative to use of resistant varieties where this disease is known to be present.

Fertilizer, though much more plentiful, was not sufficient to supply all nitrogen and potash needed for this crop. This situation will apparently be largely, if not completely, solved by planting time next year.

In the program to control insects, the boll weevil in particular, there were several serious problems which presented themselves. Among these problems the most serious were:

(a) Farmers were generally unfamiliar with the boll weevil as it has been some 25 years since serious damage has resulted in this area from this pest.

(b) Continued rainy weather throughout the year.

(c) Extreme scarcity of weevil poison.

(d) Scarcity of equipment for applying materials.

The factors stated above, coupled with the fact that most producers, not being familiar with the weevil, continued to hope that weather conditions would improve and they would make a good crop, made the problem very difficult.

Several hundred farmers were able to secure poison early enough and followed a thorough control program. Where this was done a fair to good yield was made. Most of those who poisoned from six to nine times have produced better than a bale of cotton per acre while their neighbors are averaging less than a half bale. These demonstrations were well distributed over the county and were very effective in showing our farmers that the weevil can be controlled. Five thousand farmers were contacted in meetings, office calls, and by farm visits on boll weevil and other cotton-pest control. The press, radio, and circular letters were also employed.

Proper harvesting has been emphasized and the ginners have been tied in closely with the program to get maximum returns by proper harvesting and ginning. A meeting of ginners was held to discuss ginning problems and how ginners could help in making free cotton classing service available to their customers.

Twelve new community cotton-improvement groups were organized making a total of 21 in the county. This service has been very valuable in helping farmers get maximum returns from their cotton.

Extension personnel and county production and marketing administration officials have worked closely together in making support price program information available to farmers. We have also held a series of meetings to provide information to farmers relative to production quotas and other information needed by farmers relative to production controls in 1950. A total of 37 meetings were held to discuss this and to study adjustments needed for a better balanced agriculture.

Many farmers are faced with having to buy planting seed for next year's crop and also with the definite possibility of having a serious boll weevil problem unless we have a cold winter and favorable production season.

Though our farmers have suffered a heavy loss on this year's crop, cotton is essential to the agricultural economy of the county. It is a crop which the farmers know how to produce under normal conditions. They fertilize well (750–800 pounds of fertilizer per acre) and do an excellent job of cultivation. They have observed several hundred demonstrations on weevil control throughout the county and are making their plans to purchase poison early and avoid a repeat of this year's failure.

COTTON, 4–H

Cotton is one of the most popular projects carried out by 4–H Club members this year. This is to be expected, since a large acreage is planted to cotton each year. Club members are able to realize a cash return from cotton projects. Approximately 300 members have completed a cotton project.

Tax Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been asking for tax relief. There is only one real form of tax reduction which, of course, the Truman administration never mentions, and that is a drastic reduction in Federal expenditures.

The Truman administration is urging upon Congress the adoption of proposals that, if adopted, would completely make impossible tax reductions, but would increase taxes to a point that people would just become taxpaying slaves to a Frankenstein administration.

I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very revealing article published in the current issue of Look magazine which I hope will bring home to the taxpayers the futility of any promised tax reduction on the part of the spendthrift administration. I see that some prominent spokesman of the administration recommends an increase in corporate taxes to make up for any revenue that may be lost by excise tax reduction. This, of course, is just a misleading and highly deceptive recommendation, because the increased taxes on corporations would only be passed back onto the people, thus nullifying the effect of the so-called reduction in excise taxes. Appar-

ently the administration will not learn from past experience that when the tax load becomes too heavy more revenue can be obtained by moderate rates of taxation than from a further increase in taxation.

The article follows:

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT COSTS WILL SOAR TO SIXTY-FIVE BILLION A YEAR IF FAIR DEAL IS ENACTED

In the hot political campaign aiming at November's congressional elections, the taxpayer is being asked to ponder a question digging deep into his pocket.

The question concerns President Truman's Fair Deal. The voter must decide not just whether he wants it, but whether he wants it badly enough to pay what it would cost.

What would it cost?

According to what is perhaps the most qualified estimate issued to date, the Fair Deal in full operation would increase expenditures by $25,000,000,000 a year. It would add about 70 percent to the load of taxes the average taxpayer forks over to the Federal Government.

This has been calculated to mean that a family of three with an income of $3,000 a year, if its total Federal taxes were raised proportionately, would have to pay $863.17 of that amount to the Federal Government. That's over $350 more than the $510.75 such a family pays today. A family of four earning $5,000 would have to turn over $1,510.94, as against the $894.05 it pays at present.

Can the taxpayer afford this?

The Federal Government in the coming fiscal year already proposes to spend in excess of $42,000,000,000. This is almost $9,000,000,000 more than it spent 2 years ago. It is three times as much as the New Deal of President Roosevelt spent in any year before the United States entered World War II. It is almost 10 times as much as the Federal Government spent in 1933.

FAIR DEAL WOULD ADD TO PRESENT COSTS

But this huge expenditure includes only an insignificant part of the proposed Fair Deal costs. It represents primarily spending for existing programs. The cost of the Truman legislative proposals would be piled on top.

Yet little has been said about the cost of the Fair Deal in President Truman's campaign for Senators and Representatives who will support his program. He needs them because two Congresses—the Republican Eightieth and the Democratic Eighty-first—turned most of it down.

Instead of what the Fair Deal would cost, Mr. Truman concentrates on what it promises. He outlines a program broad enough to appeal to many people. It includes compulsory health insurance to provide "free" medical care; the Brannan plan for bigger and better farm subsidies; universal military training; an expanded social security system; river valley authorities to control floods and produce electric power; Federal funds for schools; the St. Lawrence seaway; financial aid for much of the world.

There is hardly a give-away plan around that Mr. Truman hasn't endorsed. Yet in none of the Truman speeches or messages to Congress has the future annual cost of all these proposals been estimated. Cost seems to have been the gold-plated skeleton in the Fair Deal closet. Legislators and others evaluating the Fair Deal have had to guess at what it would mean in cold dollars and cents.

Recently, however, the American people were given a chance to see exactly what Mr. Truman's proposals would do to their pockets. The estimate came, not from a Republican critic but, from a member of the President's own party—Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat of Arkansas. Senator MCCLELLAN is chairman of the important, Democratic-controlled Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. He asked the committee's staff of experts to ascertain what 15 Truman proposals would cost.

FAIR DEAL WOULD COST THE TAXPAYER $25,000,000,000

The astonishing conclusions of the McClellan study are detailed in the table at the end of this article. They show that the 15 Truman proposals would have an initial cost of more than seven billion dollars. In full operation, their annual drain on the Treasury would be over $25,000,000,000. Within 5 years, annual Federal spending for all purposes would soar to between sixty-five and seventy-five billion dollars.

Even these figures are conservative. In most instances, according to Senator MCCLELLAN, "they range closer to the lowest than they do to the highest estimates submitted in hearings on the different bills."

MANY ITEMS ARE NOT FIGURED IN STUDY

The figures, moreover, do not include the cost of many other proposed items, like the guaranty and loan provisions urged on Congress in the 20-year housing program; the Columbia, Missouri and Mississippi-Ohio valley authorities; the H-bomb; a New England power authority; federally subsidized college educations for needy students; and reclamation and irrigation projects which Mr. Truman has endorsed throughout the West.

If the President is given a green light by the next Congress for all of his Fair Deal, where will the money come from?

Taxes are already heavy. How heavy they are was shown in a speech not long ago by Representative HAROLD O. LOVRE, Republican, of South Dakota. In estimating what families pay in Federal taxes, the basis for the family tax figures on page 23, he said few people are aware how much they do pay.

For instance, a man making $60 a week, if he has a wife and a dependent child, loses about $150 a year from his pay envelopes for Federal income tax. He is probably aware of it, even though he doesn't see the money. But he rarely realizes that he forks over about $350 more a year to the Federal Government—some $30 for social security; about $200 as his share of corporate taxes (hidden in the sale price of goods and services) and many other varying amounts for such items as alcohol, tobacco, amusement, manufacturers' excise taxes, retailers' excise taxes, and taxes on transportation and communication. For a family of four with an income of $100 a week, the contribution to the Federal Government in income tax is about $350 a year; in addition to that, it must pay about $540 in other taxes.

Senator MCCLELLAN says that if the Fair Deal is enacted "the $25,000,000,000 in additional annual expenditures by the Federal Government, on a pay-as-we-go basis, will require additional taxes of $166 per year for every man, woman, and child in America."

He adds that, with present taxes, the "huge total of Government cost will impose a tax burden of $433 per capita on the American people to support the Federal Government on a pay-as-we-go basis. And based on current national income, and including State, county, and municipal taxes, the total tax-take from the American people will be about 40 cents out of every dollar they earn."

Soaking the rich won't do much to meet the cost of Truman's Fair Deal. Former President Herbert Hoover has said that if all incomes over $8,000 were seized they would cover less than 10 percent of actual and proposed spending by Federal and local governments.

As it is, the Government is already spending more than it takes in. It will go into debt at least $5,000,000,000 this year, and probably will do the same next year, bringing the public debt to the staggering peacetime figure of two hundred and sixty-three billion, eight hundred million on June 30, 1951.

To enact the Truman Fair Deal would mean, therefore, an increase of almost two-thirds in Federal taxes if we're not to go further into debt. Next November's elections will decide if that's what you, the taxpayer, want.

How cost of Fair Deal would add up

Proposed program	Estimated cost of program in the first year	Estimated annual cost of program in full operation
SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, EDUCATION		
National health insurance	$15,000,000	$7,000,000,000
Expansion of social security	250,000,000	6,000,000,000
Industrial safety program	3,000,000	5,000,000
Aid to education	300,000,000	500,000,000
National Science Foundation	15,000,000	100,000,000
National Commission Against Discrimination in Emyloyment (FEPC)	600,000	5,000,000
Special assistance for rental and cooperative housing	10,000,000	50,000,000
Labor Extension Service	3,000,000	27,000,000
NATIONAL DEFENSE		
Universal military training	600,000,000	3,000,000,000
Housing and public works	600,000,000	1,400,000,000
St. Lawrence seaway:		
Operating costs	8,000,000	30,000,000
Construction costs	100,000,000	100,000,000
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS		
Technical assistance to economically underdeveloped areas (point-4 program)	35,000,000	500,000,000
AGRICULTURE		
Farm parity program (Brannan plan)	5,000,000,000	6,000,000,000
NATURAL RESOURCES		
Commercial production of natural resources	11,000,000	400,000,000
Incentive payments for development of minerals	70,000,000	70,000,000
Total	7,020,600,000	25,187,000,000

FEPC Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on May 18, the gentleman from Mississippi made a speech in the House regarding the FEPC bill. That speech was chiefly a rehash of a speech he made 3 years ago on the same subject and that speech, in turn, was a rehash of a similar speech he made in 1945. The bill was described as communistic. Its supporters were called alien-minded. The concept of equality in employment was described as un-American. Yesterday, the gentleman from Mississippi made another speech. Again he tells us that FEPC is communistic. Now, what is this nonsense about the FEPC bill being communistic?

State FEPC laws have been on the books for 5 years. The New York and New Jersey laws were passed in 1945, the Massachusetts law in 1946, and the

Connecticut law in 1947. In 1949, with full knowledge of the successful experience in these four States, four more States enacted FEPC laws—New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Washington. Of the eight legislative chambers which voted for these laws in 1949, three were controlled by Republicans and five by Democrats. Were these legislators dominated or bewitched by Communists? Were the governors of those four great States dominated or bewitched by Communists? Of course not. They recognized that discrimination in employment is harmful to all citizens. They know, also, that FEPC legislation works.

The American people never have been and never will be fooled by charges that remedial legislation is communistic or socialistic. That charge was made against all the great legislation of the 1930's. It was made earlier against the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Federal Communications Act, and the seventeenth amendment. The RECORD for May 18, just three pages preceding that containing the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi, contains a quotation from an 1853 magazine which said of woman suffrage: "This unblushing female socialism defies alike the apostles and the prophets."

Are the people who support the FEPC bill alien minded? This form of legislation is entirely American. It has never been adopted or even considered in any other country. It rests on the fundamental American principle that when an evil is caused by the conduct of a few who refuse to change their ways, democratically elected legislators can and should make that conduct illegal.

The FEPC bill has the support of both great branches of our American labor movement, of religious bodies throughout the country and of outstanding businessmen. Are all these persons to be described as alien minded? Are we so to describe the distinguished Senators and Members of the House who have repeatedly sponsored and supported FEPC bills in Congress in recent years?

Frankly, I believe this sort of argument ill becomes a Member of this body. It can only rouse unthinking passions and divert attention from the real questions with which the American people have shown their active concern. Let us have no more reckless charges of communism and alienism. Let us confine discussion to the merits of the proposal.

Is the FEPC bill un-American? I have answered that question. The FEPC bill is supported by American citizens because they believe it will benefit American citizens. I embrace in that term, American citizens, all American citizens, regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin. Others may not. Some may believe that the sole function of our national Congress is to protect the interest of white citizens or Protestant citizens. No one will say so in so many words, but the gentleman from Mississippi has come close to it.

One part of the speech by the gentleman from Mississippi was devoted to what he regards as horrible examples of questions which the New York State Commission Against Discrimination has held may not be asked of prospective employees. If we were to read only the speech of the gentleman from Mississippi, we would be forced to conclude that business has been brought to a standstill in the Empire State, that New York City is a ghost town and that the few employers left are finding it virtually impossible to operate. Are the business enterprises of New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and the other FEPC States hopelessly shackled? A representative of the New Jersey Division Against Discrimination told the Senate subcommittee holding hearings on the FEPC bill in 1947 how former Governor Edison of New Jersey felt about it.

I am an employer—

Said the Governor—

an employer of thousands of people. I cannot see that this law hurts the employer. I see this law as a benefit to the employer because, as a large employer, I am interested in production, and, when I am interested in production, I should have the right to employ those people who can produce. This law gives me the right to employ those without worrying about the petty prejudices against colored employees.

At the same hearing, the chairman of the New York State Commission Against Discrimination had this to say on the subject:

It was urged during the debate on the bill that the adoption of such a law would drive industry from the State, but the commissioner of commerce of the State of New York indicates that this is not the case. In no instance has he a record of any industry leaving the State because of the enactment of this law.

The brief which the Massachusetts Fair Employment Practice Commission submitted at the same hearing said:

But I can say that we know of many concerns that have apparently widened their employment policy since the passage of the act. At least members of minority groups are now being hired by them, whereas previous to the Fair Employment Practice Act, they had the reputation of using at best a sort of quota system to guarantee that a few representatives of minority groups would appear on their payrolls. Now they seem aware that hiring should not be done on that basis at all but the best man should get the job irrespective of race, color, creed or national origin or ancestry. We feel that these concerns are glad to do this, and do not regard complying with the act as a hardship.

This was a part of the evidence that persuaded four more States to enact FEPC laws in 1949.

Discrimination in employment is a serious problem. It will not suffice merely to say that any effort to end it is communistic. The 1947 hearings showed that the wealth of the Nation would be increased $4,000,000,000 annually if we eliminated the difference between the income of Negroes and whites. The loss in national income caused by discrimination against all minority groups amounts to 8 to 10 billion dollars annually. That is why Eric Johnston, when he was president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, said that employment discrimination is a "fool's economy" which "tends to drag down the whole economic level." One of the results is increased crime and juvenile delinquency, sickness and accidents. The Nation pays a heavy price to maintain law, order and health in the slum areas to which minority groups are condemned. As the President's Committee on Civil Rights said:

The United States can no longer afford this heavy drain upon its human wealth, its national competence.

Ultimately, I am sure, the United States Congress will overcome the obstacles which have been placed in the way of this bill and enact it.

Life Depends on Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the March monthly letter of the Royal Bank of Canada, Montreal, Canada, dealing with the all-important subject of fresh water supply, so vital to human existence, which I am sure every one of my colleagues will find interesting reading. It follows:

LIFE DEPENDS ON WATER

We can live without house or clothing for months, we can live without food for days, but to live without water is figured in terms of hours and minutes.

It is something we seldom think about. Water is common, easily accessible, and cheap. It is cheaper than dirt; you can buy water in our cities, delivered by tap to your bath and sink, for about a nickel a ton, while just ordinary dirt fill costs from a dollar up, and topsoil comes at around $10.

It is only when a crisis occurs that we realize our dependence upon water. Even then we mostly take stopgap measures such as prohibiting the watering of lawns or shutting off the supply for a few hours a day, or, as in New York recently, going without shaving on one day a week.

In a paragraph, here are 10 of the most important uses of water, every one of which has been the basis of hundreds of volumes of technical writing: Moisture in the air makes organic life possible; drinking water is our greatest physical need; plants, from lowly lichens in Niagara Gorge to giant Douglas firs of British Columbia, grow only where there is water; the sea is the home of fish and of other food used by men; steam power and electricity depend on water; mechanical and chemical processes in industry need water; from earliest times, water has provided men with a means of transportation; water dictates the location of cities and farms; in the form of ice, water is used universally for cooling and preserving; water is the great determinant of political boundaries.

With so many demands upon it, there naturally is competition between one use and another. Sometimes municipal or provincial or Federal Governments must step in and establish priorities. They may prohibit street washing, or reduce withdrawal for electric power generating, or ration the supply to industries.

Our disregard of the importance of rainfall and water supply has become a dangerous influence in our civilization. It leads to

faulty economic ideas, confuses our thinking about colonization and immigration, blinds us to the consequences of building bigger and bigger cities, and leads us into wrong judgments about the location and prospects of factories.

Water is benevolent, when properly managed. It can be productive and will support prosperous communities if its flow is wisely used. Our water problems are the outcome of our efforts to adapt our physical environment to our economic and social needs, without reckoning sufficiently on nature's unchanging ways.

By drying up marshes and lakes we have destroyed the homes and breeding grounds of useful waterfowl and fur bearers. By clearing lake and stream banks of bushes we have exposed the water to sunshine, warming it so that it is spoiled for the best fish life. By denuding hillsides of trees we have increased water wastage and lowered the water level in great areas, making it impossible for the roots of food plants to find moisture. By inadequate management, we run short of water flow for production of electricity, as in Ontario last year, and of water depth for navigation, as in the Lachine Canal last year.

THERE'S BEAUTY IN WATER

We should not become so wrapped up in the utilitarian use of water that we forget its contribution to the beauty of our surroundings. Imagine the barrenness of a world without water!

Water is the source of all the changefulness we see in clouds, and the reflector of wonderful shades of light and shadow. Water modeled our earth's surface, chiseled our Canadian mountain crags into grace, and at the appropriate season throws a mantle of white around them. Every river that flows has something worthy to be loved, from the inch-deep streamlet beside a British Columbia mountain road to the massy and silent march of the St. Lawrence as it sweeps around Anticosti Island.

Poets, philosophers, and movie makers alike have chosen the banks of rivers on which to sing of love, to escape from everyday things into meditation about their high desires, and to stage drama amid beautiful settings. Everyone knows how much more pleasant a railway journey becomes when the train follows the course of a river. We have all seen how idlers in a town choose a bridge for their passing of time, or sit on the edge of a dock with their feet hanging over the water.

Charles Darwin, the great naturalist who gave his life to such studies as The Origin of Species, once wrote to his wife about falling asleep beside a brook. "I awoke with a chorus of birds singing around me, and squirrels running up the tree, and some woodpeckers laughing; and it was as pleasant and rural a scene as ever I saw; and I did not care one penny how any of the birds or beasts had been formed."

That is what brooks do to the observant person. They whisper an old tale, or give birth to a new one; they play a soft obbligato to a bird's song, or they chatter boisterously about things only they know.

But we, happy as we should be to linger, must occupy ourselves with aspects of water more serious and work-a-day.

IN THE BEGINNING

All the water available to man is derived from the condensed vapor of the atmosphere. An important step forward in the science of hydrology (which is concerned with the properties and distribution of water) was taken in recent years. It was recognition of the fact that the distribution and transport of water obey a fundamental law of equilibrium. This relationship is called the hydrologic cycle. It represents the balance of water that exists between (1) oceans, lakes, streams, and underground waters; (2) the solid part of the earth; and (3) the atmosphere.

Water is ceaselessly circulating from the earth to the atmosphere and back to the earth again. Evaporating from ponds, streams, lakes, rivers, and oceans, it forms water vapor in the air; this condenses to form clouds, and later falls back to the earth as rain.

Rain which falls on the land is disposed of in some or all of four ways: some evaporates directly, some is held in the surface soil and subsequently evaporated by plants, some filters through the top layers and passes to the rocky strata beneath, and some runs off into rivers and streams. The amount of rainfall available for the good of humanity is determined by the temperature, the nature of the land surface, vegetation, and other geographical features.

That part of the rainfall that is absorbed by the ground is of very great importance. It sinks down until it joins the vast underground reservoir of water that exists under practically all of the earth's surface. It is this ground water, as it is called, that feeds springs and wells and rivers. It furnishes water to plants by capillary action. It dissolves mineral matter out of the soil, thus supplying food to the plants.

The only way to get more water for our use is to intercept it in the runoff, and this is the prime feature of conservation.

It is obvious that there is little use in crying for rain if we then allow it to wash across our fields and make its quickest way to the sea along some river bed. Man's limited comprehension has wasted millions of acres of land, caused sharp drops in crop yields, starved cattle, spread deserts over the face of the earth, and devastated industrial areas.

CANADA'S WATER SUPPLY

Some persons have expressed the belief that our water supply is decreasing. Their opinion is based upon such facts as were revealed in Ontario surveys a few years ago. Within the last 100 years between 80 and 85 percent of once permanently flowing streams have become temporary, drying up for at least part of a normal summer.

But our earth's water resource is permanent and indestructible; it is the amount available at a place or at a time that is changing. Demand is rising in response to population growth, industrial progress, and rising standard of living. Such developments as air conditioning and the spread of rural electrification create great new needs for water.

These are legitimate changes. E. Newton-White expresses the opinion in his textbook Canadian Restoration that they could have been effected without damage or loss, if made wisely and carefully. But by removing natural barriers we have speeded the water movement so that it does not reach the ground-water reservoir. Water runs so fast across our land that it picks up soil and carries it away out of economic reach.

So, in spite of the fact that Canada is richly endowed with water resources, we have no room for complacency. We have 228,307 square miles of fresh water within our boundaries. Lake Superior, forming part of our southern border, is the largest body of fresh water in the world. We have great rivers. The Mackenzie, our longest, reaches 2,514 miles from Great Slave Lake to the Arctic Ocean; the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes provide a shipping waterway 2,338 miles long from the Strait of Belle Isle to the head of Lake Superior, the heart of the continent. Our seacoast is one of the longest of any country in the world, with 14,820 miles of mainland sea frontage and 34,650 miles of island frontage.

Enough, one might think, to minister to all human needs. Enough to give us the moisture that dissolves the oxygen we breathe, to liquefy the food we eat so that it can be digested, enough to supply our health and industrial needs.

But look at the demands made upon it. Three hundred tons of rainfall properly used are required to grow one ton of corn, and it requires 700 gallons a day to supply the demands of every person for food and the other necessities and amenities.

To bring all the needed water to cities is a tremendous undertaking. Ancient Rome had 11 aqueducts bringing a daily supply of 40,000,000 gallons to its 1,000,000 people. That was the same average per day as in Montreal in 1869, but today's water supply for Montreal averages 120 gallons per person per day, just about the same as Toronto's. New York needs 1,200,000,000 gallons a day.

WHEN WATER RUNS SHORT

There is, without doubt, a serious situation in regard to water in many parts of the world. Scarcity of drinkable or otherwise usable water is fast becoming the limiting factor in the expansion of agriculture and industry and the growth of communities. Many a city and town that only a few years ago had adequate reservoir capacity is finding that an unexpected increase in population taxes its water supply. The farmer finds that he must dig deeper wells. In some places, where water is drawn from artificial reservoirs, silt is being carried from eroded watersheds to fill up the storage capacity.

But we are very trustful. It is difficult to awaken interest in water conservation. We are, on the whole, much like the mouse in Gustav Eckstein's popular book, Everyday Miracle. This mouse would lean out under a water tap that was shut off, and return again and again, confident that sooner or later someone would turn on the tap and let a drop fall. Dr. Eckstein doesn't say it was the same mouse, but one mouse did come finally to drinking ink.

New York's plight of recent months is noteworthy only because it is on such a large scale. Many other cities suffer in a degree only less because of their relative size.

Around Baltimore the underground water level has fallen so low that a well must be drilled 146 feet deeper than in 1916. William Vogt, of Road to Survival fame, says "one of the most asinine wastes in history was in California's Santa Clara Valley." Artesian resources were tapped for irrigation, nothing was done to preserve the source of the water, and after about 30 years the water gave out. The last artesian well ceased flowing in 1930. With the supporting water gone, the valley floor itself sank 5 feet in 20 years, doing millions of dollars worth of damage. But nothing was done to help. In 1922 they voted down a $4,000,000 conservation plan, and in the 20 succeeding years they spent $16,000,000 for new wells and equipment. Not until salt water from San Francisco Bay started seeping into their pumps did they do something about getting rainwater back into the ground.

Instead of working from rock bottom up, and from the mountain top down, to build a sure supply of water, there are some who propose fantastic expedients. There's lots of water in the ocean, say some, so why not distill it? The answer is, in part, contained in a paper presented to the United Nations Economic and Social Council last August—cost. Estimates vary from 25 cents to $1.25 per 1,000 gallons. Take the modest estimate halfway between these figures, and New York's cost would be about $350,000,000 a year.

Others suggest the feasibility of collecting dew. That was a system used in ancient Britain, and dew ponds are still to be seen on the chalk hills. The suggestion was brought seriously before the United Nations Economic and Social Council last year, and the United States representative was forced to admit that dew was not recognized as a source of water supply even in the western arid regions.

THE OTHER EXTREME

An excess of water can be almost as bad as a shortage. Tropical rain forests and swamp land are unfit for permanent settlement. Even passing floods make life miserable for many cities and farm districts.

In recent floods, such as those in 1936 and 1937 at Port Hope, in 1937 at London, the 1946 overflow of the South Sydenham and other streams, and especially the 1947 floods in southwestern Ontario, there was considerable damage, besides hardship and interruption of communication.

In parts of the United States, nature's balance has been upset all the way from mountain top to valley floor, and the loss through flood and sedimentation averages $300,000,000 a year. Soil-depleting farm practices, the irresponsible cutting of trees, and general laxity in preventing erosion have contributed to flooding.

Even where there is abundant water, and not too much, men seem to be perversely determined to ruin it. They saturate it with millions of tons of filthy waste. Our coasts and our rivers are dotted with the rotting bathhouses and bathing enclosures of once beautiful beaches, where the signs read: "No swimming. Polluted water."

Safe water "in the raw" is available on a relatively small portion of our 3,690,000 square miles, mostly in the high plateaus and mountain ranges beyond the reach of settlement. Only there, where the water has been filtered in its passage through layers of virgin soil, or washed down from a melting snowbank or glacier, can a person feel quite safe in drinking from a spring, pool, lake, or stream.

The harmful effects of polluted water fall into three broad categories: dangers to human health, direct economic losses, and damage to recreational resources. The most important impurity, of course, is the presence of bacteria.

This is a national problem, varying in importance by river basins and by localities. In some drainage basins, municipal sewage contributes most to the impurity of the water, while elsewhere the damage is done by mining and industrial operations.

Obviously, it will not do to stand idly by while mountains of germ-ridden garbage are dumped into our waterways. Not only we, but game and fish suffer. Even irrigation water drawn from polluted streams may carry lethal germs to vegetable products and spread disease.

OUR OBLIGATIONS

It must be obvious by this time that natural laws impose limitations and obligations upon us. Whether it is convenient or not, whether it is politically expedient or not, water is going to run downhill and its destructive force is going to increase with the rate of runoff; water is going to become impure if we pour impurities into it; water tables are going to sink if we pump water out of them and turn aside the replenishment that is their due.

Even if nature were benevolent instead of rigidly and logically impartial, she could not restore the lost soil short of that infinitely slow process by which soil was formed in the first place from the foundation rocks of the world, nor can she overcome by her mild processes the rabid poisoning carried on so ruthlessly by human beings.

The classic examples of civilizations wiped out by their misuse of water and soil are the once mighty, now buried, civilizations of Babylonia and Assyria, and the colossal destruction wrought in the once rich soils of the vast regions of northwest China. Erosion destroyed or sapped all the Mediterranean civilizations, past and present, from Athens and Rome to Italy and Spain, to say nothing of the formerly fertile plains of north Africa where once flourished great Carthage.

We, in this day, are living in an age when world agriculture is not able to meet the nutritional needs of a rapidly growing world population. Much depends upon our capacity to cope with problems of deficient or excessive water supply.

NATURE'S WAY

A detailed study of irrigation must await another month. It is a matter of great significance in the Canadian west. Prodigies are being performed there, not only in great schemes affecting thousands of acres but in the building of little individual farm dams and dugouts. A whole new life is opening up for western plains farmers, a development which will take our whole 3,500-word space to summarize in a future article.

It is necessary, however, to draw from this present survey of the importance of water in our lives, some lesson and perhaps hint at a plan for water conservation. The plan we have in mind is nature's way.

The most damaging impact of civilized man on his environment is the shattering of the water cycle. In the wilderness of Canada, before the coming of the white man, there was built up a mutual society of balance among the waters, soils, grasses, forests, and all animal life.

How it operated is well told in Canadian Restoration by Mr. Newton-White: To this society each member contributed its powers of control and protection, and was in turn itself controlled and protected. In result the streams and rivers ran clear, cold, and constant, and carried away, with little disturbance, the surplus water left after all the demands of the natural reservoirs and animal and vegetable life had been satisfied.

But we have broken off our contact with nature, hiding behind our mechanistic, contraptions with a sense of security that is false. We harvest grain, grind flour, and bake bread by machinery and electric power, but forget that the materials of a pound loaf have used up almost 2 tons of water. We use square miles of corn either to eat on the cob or to feed our livestock, without remembering that an acre of corn in its growing season transpires 3,000 tons of water, equal to about 15 acres of rainfall.

In thinking about food, let us start with the one essential ingredient: water. In thinking about soil conservation, let us start with the element which is the greatest friend or most ruthless foe of soil formation: water. And in thinking about water, let us start, not at the tap or at the river mouth, but away back where the flow begins, on the mountain tops and the hillsides.

NO MEAN OBJECTIVE

Control and conservation of the water resources of our western plains—the breadbasket of the world, as we are fond of calling them—begins on the slopes of the Rockies. Serious depletion of forests there increases the rate of spring flooding and sends cascading down rivers the water that should seep into the ground to maintain our underground reservoirs.

There's no use in spending huge sums on river control and valley development unless it is accompanied by a thoroughly effective attack on the needless evil of forest devastation. Well-managed forests are the best of all soil and water holders. A record was kept of more than 100 storms in a period of 2 years on the Appalachian watersheds. It showed that the flow of water from deforested areas during floods ranged from 10 to 20 times greater than that from forested areas. Small streams from forested land are usually continuous, but streams often dry up between rains on unforested land.

Forests act as balance wheels. In the dry seasons the water stored in the soil dribbles out in springs and streams, and the water table is kept up in adjacent lands. Forests may not increase the total rainfall, but certainly they help to dispose of it more fruitfully than does land without forests.

This is not to say that we need go to the extreme of taking land out of agricultural use to be reforested, though some of this may be needed. A wise use of land is to be aimed at, in accord with its natural aptitude.

Huge dams and reservoirs are glamorous things. These monumental masses of concrete, as A. H. Carhart calls them in his article in the Atlantic of February, are expected to serve irrigation, control floods, and produce power—all good objectives. But with sick watersheds above, the days of such dams are numbered.

Conserving water nature's way is no mean objective. To unriddle the subtle aspects of the soil-water-plant-animal complex offers the natural sciences an exciting cooperative adventure. To persuade men of the wisdom of cooperation and forward-looking, slighting their immediate gain for the good of all, is an objective worthy of the best in the social sciences. To deal wisely with the varying needs of agriculture and industry in the present and for the future: that is a challenge to governments worthy of the best that is in them.

Jobs Are Few for Middle-Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to call to the attention of the Members an article by one of the most thoughtful labor columnists in the country, Murray Kempton, of the New York Post. I know from my own constituents that the facts he cites are not isolated examples; there are more and more middle-aged people with serious job problems. This is primarily a problem for business, which in a few instances has done it well by making special efforts to employ people over 40.

Unemployment, in those areas where it becomes serious, operates first with a pincer movement against the very young worker and the more mature worker. The first has trouble getting into the labor market; the second has trouble staying in it. We cannot ignore this for much longer. If our present unemployment insurance, social security programs, full employment measures are not enough, let us quit ducking the truth and start looking for some new answers.

The article follows:

JOBS ARE FEW FOR MIDDLE-AGED

(By Murray Kempton)

One of the country's biggest soft-drink companies wanted a special kind of mechanic the other day. He had to be a workman aged in his trade, experienced enough with a certain kind of bottling machine to tear it down and rebuild it even to the extent of making his own parts.

Even in these times men like that are at a premium. But the International Association of Machinists found one jobless mechanic with years of training. When the company's superintendent saw the man he was ecstatic.

But the personnel manager said, "No." The candidate was 52 years old and the company had just decided not to hire anyone past 45.

"What they wanted was a young man with 40 years' experience," says Tom Carey, secretary of the IAM's district 15 here.

Carey's union office has about 15,000 New York machinists under its jurisdiction and close to 1,400 of them are out of work. It's a sort of microcosm of the job shortage that's creeping up in New York and right now one of the least of district 15's problems is keeping its old-timers at work.

A machinist, Carey says, is comparatively young at 60. These men have skills that are hard to duplicate in the generation after them. The district's best workers are middle-aged. So far most of the district's unemployed members are young men with a single wartime skill.

Many of them lost their jobs in the little stamping plants which were among the major local victims of the 1949 recession. The metal-fabricating industry has lost 10 percent of its work force and it's unlikely to come back very soon. The laid-off men made as much as $2 an hour and there's no other job where they could earn nearly as much.

The backbone of district 15's old-timers is the machine-shop industry, a collection of tiny jobbing plants staffed by all-around machinists. A giant among them might employ 100 workers.

They're feeling keener competition. Many are working a 4-day week since Carey tries to sell the locals under his jurisdiction on sharing the work. These shops employ highly skilled men. Their pay rates and their overhead are up to the marginal point.

The climate isn't good for the small-business man no matter how specialized. Just the other day one hard-pressed shop lost a contract because it couldn't meet the competitive bid. Two large midwestern machine plants had come in and undercut it.

For the first time since the war district 15 has begun to keep a roster of its unemployed members as an informal hiring-hall system. As much as he can, Carey discourages the 48-hour week.

Still for all his talents many a machinist finds it hard to shift around after 45. The chief new handicap is the host of private pension plans. No company today wants to pay a man a pension unless it gets 25 years of work out of him first. The machinists' officers have even begun to wonder whether they do their membership any favors with this emphasis on pension plans.

So far these grizzled mechanics are lucky. It's still a handicap for a machinist to look too young. There are other jobs, however, in which looking too old can be a barrier to being hired.

Stephen Mayo Field, director of the State labor department's placement division, says that most stores won't hire a salesman older than 35. Nearly 40 percent of the city's business firms admit that they set formal age requirements and the State employment service says there are substantial barriers to women over 40.

The age handicap is worst in the white-collar field. Employers prefer younger accountants because they're cheaper, and younger salesmen because they can be more easily trained in modern techniques.

There are no real statistics on the age factor in unemployment. The best thing we have is a survey of the Rochester unemployed which the United States Employment Service did in February 1949. According to these figures the age of people unemployed 1 month averages about 30 but the age of those unemployed 6 months or more averages 50.

The middle-aged worker is desirable only when he has a definite skill or will take a service job. For most semiskilled industrial jobs, Rochester employers were setting an 18–40 age limit.

The reservoir of unemployed we are building up today is in large measure a junk heap of material which industry decided was obsolescent long before it was outworn.

Tax Deduction for School Teachers—Decision of United States Court of Appeals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in the tax case of Nora Payne Hill against Commissioner of Internal Revenue the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit handed down on May 19 a decision which is of vital interest to every school teacher in the United States. That decision overruled the ruling of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the decision of the Tax Court that a teacher who found it necessary to go to a summer school in order to hold her teacher's certificate could not deduct, as an ordinary and necessary item of doing business, the expenses incurred in taking such summer course.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief statement of the Nora Payne Hill case and the decision of the circuit court of appeals in that litigation.

There being no objection, the statement and decision were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

On May 19 last the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit handed down a decision in the case of *Nora Payne Hill* v. *Commissioner of Internal Revenue* which is of great importance to all school teachers in the United States. .The decision was handed down by a former distinguished dean of the law school of the University of Virginia, Judge Armistead Dobie, and concurred in by Circuit Judge Soper and District Judge Hayes.

That case grew out of the refusal of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to allow Mrs. Nora Payne Hill, a teacher in the public schools of Virginia, to deduct her summer-school expenses as business expenses in computing her net income for Federal income-tax purposes. Virginia and many other States require public-school teachers to take refresher courses to hold their certificates but notwithstanding the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code that "ordinary and necessary expenses" incurred by taxpayers in carrying on a trade or business are deductible, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue refused to permit school teachers to make such a deduction for expenses incurred in attending summer school.

While the tax involved in the Hill case was the small sum of $57.52, the principle involved was a large one both from the standpoint of equal justice as well as the effect upon a very large number of valuable but often poorly paid State employees. My constituent, Mrs. Hill, wanted me to introduce an amendment to the Tax Code to specifically allow the deduction in question, but I told her I thought we had all the law we needed if properly construed. My distinguished predecessor, Carter Glass, used to say that no one knew what the tax laws were until the Bureau of Internal Revenue had ruled. While we have an able and efficient Bureau of Internal Revenue, there have been instances in which policy has influenced its opinion of legal verities.

Instead, therefore, of introducing a bill for the purpose of clarifying congressional intent I advised Mrs. Hill that I knew a very able tax lawyer who would donate his services to her cause and recommend that she challenge the ruling of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in the United States Tax Court. That lawyer was Col. F. Weaver Myers, of the District of Columbia law firm of Hamel, Park & Saunders. For a number of years, Colonel Myers served on the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and for 10 years as a member of the Ways and Means Committee I worked with him in the preparation of 12 tax bills, during which time I became well acquainted with his ability and with his innate desire to see justice done. During the early part of World War II, Colonel Myers volunteered for service with the Army, was given a commission as a captain, and assigned to duty with the legal staff of the Army's Renegotiation Board. The work of the Renegotiation Board saved the taxpayers during the war period $5,000,000,000 in renegotiated contracts, and perhaps another $10,000,000,000 on contracts based upon principles established in those contracts which had been renegotiated. His work on that board was so outstanding he was promoted to major and then to lieutenant colonel, and when he resigned from the Army after the war to enter the private practice of law he was recognized as the outstanding expert in renegotiation of the entire defense establishment.

For the benefit of the thousands of teachers in the United States who will be affected by the decision in the Nora Payne Hill case, I have asked unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD that decision as rendered by Mr. Justice Dobie.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT—No. 6060—NORA PAYNE HILL, PETITIONER, VERSUS COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE, RESPONDENT

(On petition to review the decision of the Tax Court of the United States—argued April 13, 1950—decided May 19, 1950)

Before Soper and Dobie, circuit judges, and Hayes, district judge.

F. Weaver Myers (F. C. Niswander, and Hamel, Park & Saunders on brief) for petitioner, and George D. Webster, Special Assistant to the Attorney General, (Theron Lamar Caudle, Assistant Attorney General, Ellis N. Slack, Robert N. Anderson, and Francis W. Sams, Special Assistants to the Attorney General, on brief) for respondent.

Dobie, circuit judge:

"This is an appeal by Nora Payne Hill (hereinafter called taxpayer) from a decision of the Tax Court of the United States entered on September 7, 1949, affirming a determination of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that there is a deficiency in the income tax due by taxpayer in the amount of $57.52 for the calendar year 1945.

"During the taxable year and for 27 years prior thereto, taxpayer was engaged in the business of teaching school in the State of Virginia. During the taxable year in question, she attended summer school at Columbia University in New York City, for which she incurred expenses in an amount of $239.50, which she deducted in computing her net income on her Federal income tax reutrn for the year 1945. These expenses were disallowed upon the grounds that they were personal expenses and were not deductible for Federal income tax purposes. The only question for decision by us is: Was the taxpayer correct in deducting these expenses as ordinary and necessary expenses incurred in carrying on her trade or business? We think

this question must be answered in the affirmative. The reasonableness of the amount of these expenses is not disputed.

"The pertinent provisions of the Internal Revenue Code applicable to the issues involved are as follows:

" 'SEC. 23 (a) (1) (A):

" 'In computing net income there shall be allowed as deductions:

" '(a) Expenses.

" '(1) Trade or business expenses.

" '(A) In general: All the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year in carrying on any trade or business, including a reasonable allowance for salaries or other compensation for personal services actually rendered; traveling expenses (including the entire amount expended for meals and lodging) while away from home in the pursuit of a trade or business; and rentals or other payments required to be made as a condition to the continued use or possession, for purposes of the trade or business, of property to which the taxpayer has not taken or is not taking title or in which he has no equity.

" 'SEC. 23 (a) (2):

" 'In computing net income there shall be allowed as deductions: * * *

" '(a) Expenses.

" '(2) Nontrade or nonbusiness expenses: In the case of an individual, all the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year for the production or collection of income, or for the management, conservation, or maintenance of property held for the production of income.

" 'SEC. 24. Items not deductible:

" '(a) General rule: In computing net income no deduction shall in any case be allowed in respect of—

" '(1) Personal, living, or family expenses, except extraordinary medical expenses deductible under section 23 (x).'

"The pertinent provisions of the Virginia Code Annotated, 1942, applicable to the issues before us, are as follows:

" 'Title 11, chapter 33, section 660:

" 'No teacher shall be employed or paid from the public funds unless such teacher holds a certificate in full force in accordance with the rules of certification laid down by the State board of education: *Provided,* That, where a teacher holding a certificate in force is not available a former teacher, holding an expired certificate, may be employed temporarily as a substitute teacher to meet an emergency. * * *

" 'Title 11, chapter 33, section 786 (b) (3):

" '*Provided,* That no school board shall employ or pay any teacher, from the public funds unless the teacher shall hold a certificate in full force, according to the provisions of section 660 of the laws relating to the public free schools in counties.'

"The regulations governing the certification of teachers and the qualifications of administrators and supervisors in Virginia required for the renewal of a teacher's certificate that taxpayer present evidence that she had been a successful teacher, had read at least five books on the teachers' reading course during the life of her certificate and also must either—

"(a) present evidence of college credits in professional or academic subjects earned during the life of the certificate, or

"(b) pass an examination on five books selected by the State department of education from the teachers' reading course for the year in which her license expired.

"In 1945, taxpayer was head of the department of English and a teacher of English and journalism at the George Washington high school in Danville, Va. A master of arts of Columbia University, she held the collegiate professional certificate, the highest certificate issued to public school teachers by the Virginia State board of education. She was notified of the expiration of her certificate and that the certificate could not be renewed unless she complied with the regulations set out above.

"The alternatives required for the renewal of taxpayer's certificate were: (a) acquiring college credits or (b) passing an examination on five selected books. She elected (a) and attended the summer school of Columbia University. We hardly think it open to question that she chose the alternative which would most effectively add to her efficiency as a teacher. At Columbia she took two courses, one on the technique of short-story writing, which was right in her alley; another in abnormal psychology, which would be most useful to a teacher whose pupils were adolescents.

"It is clear that to be deductible as a business expense the item must be—

"(a) 'paid or incurred' within the taxable year;

"(b) incurred in carrying on a 'trade or business'; and

"(c) both 'ordinary and necessary.'

"As a corollary, the expenses must not be personal in their nature. We think taxpayer has completely satisfied all these requisites, so that the decision of the tax court must be reversed.

"In its opinion, the Tax Court stated:

" 'We cannot assume that public school teachers ordinarily attend summer school to renew their certificates when alternative methods are available. The record does not show that the course pursued by petitioner was the usual method followed by teachers in obtaining renewals of their certificates or that it was necessary so to do. * * *

" 'The record is devoid of any showing that petitioner was employed to continue in her position as teacher at the time she attended summer school in 1945 and made the expenditures in connection therewith for which she seeks a deduction. The inference may well be that she took the summer course to obtain a renewal of her certificate that would qualify her for reemployment. The expense incurred was more in the nature of a preparation to qualify her for teaching in the high school in Danville, Va.'

"Also, in support of its decision, the Tax Court quoted O. D. 892, 4 C. B. 209 (1921):

" 'The expenses incurred by school teachers in attending summer school are in the nature of personal expenses incurred in advancing their education and are not deductible in computing net income.'

"As to the first of these statements, we think it is quite unreasonable to require a statistical showing by taxpayer of the comparative number of Virginia teachers who elect, for a renewal of their certificates, the acquisition of college credits rather than the much less desirable alternative of standing an examination on the five selected books. The existence of two methods for the renewal of these certificates, one or the other of which is compulsory, is not in itself vital in this connection. If the particular course adopted by the taxpayer is a response that a reasonable person would normally and naturally make under the specific circumstances, that would suffice. Even if a statistical study actually revealed that a majority of Virginia teachers adopted the examination on the selected books, in order to renew their certificates, rather than the method of acquiring college credits, our conclusion here would be the same. Manifestly, the added expense of attending a summer school, in the light of the slender salaries paid to teachers, would deter many teachers from such a course, however strong might be their predilections in favor of such a procedure. We note that the statistical requirement does not seem to have been enforced in the cases subsequently cited in this opinion—cases, we think, far less meritorious than the one before us.

"Nor do we approve the reasoning of the Tax Court that the taxpayer's failure to show by positive evidence that she was employed to continue in her position as teacher when she incurred the summer school expenses should negative the deduction of these expenses. She did prove to the Tax Court that she had been continuously so engaged for consecutive decades. She had not resigned her position and no practical advantage would accrue to her upon a renewal of her certificate other than the privilege and power to continue as a teacher. Clearly, the very logic of the situation here shows that she went to Columbia to maintain her present position, not to attain a new position; to preserve, not to expand or increase; to carry on, not to commence. Any other view seems to us unreal and hypercritical. And taxpayer, in her petition to the Tax Court for a review of its decision, showed conclusively that when she went to Columbia University in the summer of 1945, she was then under contract with the Danville School Board to teach for the ensuing session of 1945–46 and that to carry out this existing contract she was obligated to renew her certificate by complying with the pertinent regulations.

"It is not necessary for us to brand as void O. D. 892, 4 C. B. 209 (1921), declaring that the expenses incurred by teachers in attending summer schools are not deductible. We think this does not, and should not, control when, as in the instant case, the attendance at summer school was undertaken essentially to enable a teacher to continue her (or his) career in her (or his) existing position. I. T. 3448, C. B. 1941–1, page 206, states:

" 'The dues paid by teachers to professional societies, the price of their subscriptions for educational journals connected with their profession, and the expenses of traveling and meals and lodging incurred in attending teachers' conventions in this country, if they are not reimbursed for such expenses, are considered ordinary and necessary business expenses and are deductible from their compensations as teachers in determining net income for Federal income-tax purposes.'

"Taxpayer here, which is true of teachers generally, could probably pursue her teaching career without being a member of a professional society, without subscribing to educational journals, and without attending conventions of teachers. Yet this taxpayer went to Columbia prompted by the necessity of renewing her certificate as a prerequisite to continuing her work as a teacher in the Danville School. And, in I. T. 3634, C. B. 1944, page 90, the Commissioner has specifically ruled:

" 'The initiation fee required to be paid by A to a labor union in order to obtain employment represents an ordinary and necessary business expense, and the amount of the fee may be deducted from gross income for the taxable year in which paid.'

"How much stronger in favor of deductibility and more persuasive are the facts in the case of the instant taxpayer?

"The Commissioner even seeks to hold against the taxpayer here her frank admissions that she enjoyed her courses at Columbia, that she welcomed this opportunity to increase her teaching efficiency, and that the renewal of her certificate (already the highest that could be granted) meant no further promotion, no added pay. Would the Commissioner have been more ready to grant the deduction to a venal teacher, who attended a summer school for the less laudatory purposes of a higher position in the educational hierarchy, or for an increase in salary? We hardly think so.

"Dictionary definitions of the words 'ordinary,' 'necessary,' and 'personal' afford scant assistance in the solution of our problem. Quite helpful, though, are the opinions in the decided cases. Frequently quoted is the observation of Mr. Justice Cardozo, in *Welch* v. *Helvering* (290 U. S. 111, 113):

" 'Now, what is ordinary, though there must always be a strain of constancy within it, is none the less a variable affected by time

and place and circumstances. Ordinary in this context does not mean that the payments must be habitual or normal in the sense that the same taxpayer will have to make them often. A lawsuit affecting the safety of a business may happen once in a lifetime. The counsel fees may be so heavy that repetition is unlikely. None is an ordinary one because we know from experience that payments for such a purpose, whether the amount is large or small, are the common and accepted means of defense against attack. (Cf. *Kornhauser* v. *United States* (276 U. S. 145, 72 L. ed. 505, 48 S. Ct. 219.) The situation is unique in the life of the individual affected, but not in the life of the group, the community, of which he is a part. At such times there are norms of conduct that help to stabilize our judgment, and make it certain and objective. The instance is not erratic, but is brought within a known type.'

"Said Mr. Justice Douglas, in *Deputy* v. *Du Pont* (308 U. S. 488, 496):

" 'One of the extremely relevant circumstances is the nature and scope of the particular business out of which the expense in question accrued. The fact that an obligation to pay has arisen is not sufficient. It is the kind of transaction out of which the obligation arose and its normalcy in the particular business which are crucial and controlling.'

"And Mr. Justice Black, in *Commissioner* v. *Heininger* (320 U. S. 467, 471, 472), observed:

" 'It is plain that respondent's legal expenses were both "ordinary" and "necessary" if these words be given their commonly accepted meaning. For respondent to employ a lawyer to defend his business from threatened destruction was "normal"; it was the response ordinarily to be expected * * *. Its (the Government's) argument is that dentists in the mail-order business do not ordinarily and necessarily attempt to sell false teeth by fraudulent representations as to their quality; that respondent was found by the Postmaster General to have attempted to sell his products in this manner; and that therefore the litigation expenses, which he would not have incurred but for this attempt, cannot themselves be deemed ordinary and necessary. We think that this reasoning, though plausible, is unsound in that it fails to take into account the circumstances under which respondent incurred the litigation expenses.'

"In *Hutchison* v. *Commissioner* (13 B. T. A. 1187 (1928)), and in *Denny* v. *Commissioner* (33 B. T. A. 738 (1935)), moving-picture actors were allowed as deductions expenses incurred in keeping themselves in first-class physical condition. In the Hutchison case, these expenses included 'massage treatments, physical trainer, rent for handball court and gymnasium facilities; and other minor items.' Again, in *Hempel* v. *Commissioner* (1947 P-H T. C. Memo. Service, Para. 47,163), and in *Thomas* v. *Commissioner* (1939 P-H B. T. A. Memo. Service, Para. 39,112), opera singers were permitted to deduct money paid to a voice coach. In none of these cases were the expenses so vital and so necessary for the continuation of the profession involved as were the expenses at issue in the instant case. Also, the expenses involved in these cases were more personal in nature than were the expenses with which we are concerned. Those taxpayers, too, were not required to prove by statistics how many moving-picture actors incur similar expenses to keep in physical condition or how many singers must resort to voice coaches.

"We are not impressed by the attempt of the Commissioner to dispose of these cases in his brief, wherein it is stated:

" 'Taxpayer cites and relies on *Denney* v. *Commissioner* (33 B. T. A. 738); *Hutchison* v. *Commissioner* (13 B. T. A. 1187); *Hempel* v. *Commissioner* (decided June 23, 1947 (1947 P-H T. C. Memorandum Decisions, par. 47,183)); and *Thomas* v. *Commissioner* (decided March 14, 1939 (1939 P-H B. T. A. Memorandum Decisions, par. 39,112)), as authority for her position that the expenses here involved were not personal and are deductible. None of these cases involved educational expenses, however, and so have no application to the issue presented here. All of these cases involved specialized training of little or no value outside of the orbit of the respective taxpayer's business. Moreover, in the Hempel and Thomas cases the particular question raised was whether the amount in question had been proved, not whether the expense had been shown to be ordinary and necessary.'

"We quote a trenchant critique on the decision of the Tax Court from Maguire, Individual Federal Income Tax in 1950, 35 American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 748, 762:

" 'As to the matters just discussed, *Nora P. Hill* (13 T. C. —, No. 41 (1949)), is an interesting decision, if scarcely an encouragement. The taxpayer, a Virginia public-school teacher, sought to deduct as an ordinary and necessary business expense for 1945 the cost of attending summer courses in Columbia University. Her teaching certificate, the highest granted by the State board of education, came up for renewal in 1945. Virginia law required for renewal of teaching certificates either the taking of professional or academic courses for credit or the passing of examinations on prescribed reading. The Tax Court denied the claim of deduction. Part of its reasoning was that because the Virginia legal requirements might be satisfied by pursuing either of the two alternatives, the showing was insufficient that what the taxpayer had done was the ordinary method of satisfaction. Another part of the reasoning was that the taxpayer had not explicitly shown she was employed to continue as a teacher at the time she took the summer school courses. Hence, said the court, it might be inferred that the taxpayer was seeking to qualify for reemployment as distinguished from merely maintaining an employed status. While these views seem hypercritical and are an invitation to the same teacher or another teacher to try again with more carefully detailed proof, the tone of the opinion hints at strong distaste for this sort of deduction.'

"Our conclusion is that the expenses incurred by the taxpayer here were incurred in carrying on a trade or business, were ordinary and necessary, and were not personal in nature. She has, we think, showed that she has complied with both the letter and the spirit of the law which permits such expenses to be deducted for Federal income-tax purposes. We do not hold (and it is not necessary for us to hold) that all expenses incurred by teachers in attending summer schools are deductible. Our decision is limited to the facts of the case before us. The decision of the Tax Court of the United States is, accordingly, reversed and the case is remanded to that Court with instructions to allow taxpayer as a deduction the expenses which she claims.

"Reversed."

The Forgotten Heroines of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Capitol Gist entitled "The Forgotten Heroines of World War I":

An interesting and revealing story of the Forgotten Heroines of World War I is given Gist readers by the following parts of an editorial in the National Tribune—The Stars and Stripes, entitled "Never Too Late" and excerpts from a letter received by Fred Burdick, Gist editor, from his sister, Mrs. Stace Griggs of Houston, Tex., who left her studies at Rice Institute to answer the call of Gen. John J. Pershing for preferably college girls who could speak French fluently to serve as telephone operators in France with the United States Army Signal Corps, and who received two commendations for bravery for sticking to her post when a Big Bertha shell nearly struck her office in Paris and when Pershing's First Army Headquarters at Quevilly, France, burned.

"We volunteered with the understanding we were to be part of the Army and were treated that way, subject to military orders and discipline; and yet, when * * * men received their victory medals and bonuses we were denied them. We were subject to dishonorable discharge but not honorable discharge.

"Many of our members of the Women's Overseas Service League could take advantage of veterans' hospitalization if they had military recognition. * * * One of our members committed suicide because she was ill and could not afford a doctor and hospitalization."

Salient excerpts from the editorial entitled "Never Too Late," in the National Tribune—The Stars and Stripes of April 13:

"Uniforms were issued to the young women of the Signal Corps and special military training was undergone. They wore regulation Army insignia with Signal Corps designation, subject to all regulations applicable to enlisted men. Pay was from $50 a month * * * from which the particular Signal Corps personnel had to buy their own uniforms.

"The Articles of War applied in every instance. Truly they were in every respect a part of our armed forces in World War I. * * * Covered in by instructions from GHQ to all officers and enlisted men and to the young women of the Signal Corps. * * * services clearly without precedent at that time. Their services completed, they were sent home—period. * * * without that piece of parchment entitled 'Honorable Discharge,' a fact that General Pershing deplored long before his death.

"They had no opportunity to insure themselves. * * * No bonus as was given other enlistees, no pension provisions against disability or old age. * * * Unlike the Yeomen (F) and the Nurse Corps of the Navy, they had no severance papers when they took off their uniforms.* * * That was over 30 years ago. * * *

"There cannot be more than 200 survivors. * * * World War II brought the Wacs, Waves and women Marines and Spars—all enlisted as were the pioneers who went abroad to help win World War I. The distinctions between these enlistees, under strict military supervision and discipline, and welfare units supported from private funds are clearly drawn.

"No status as veterans is requested (in H. R. 3716 by Representative MITCHELL of Washington and S. 871 by Senator TAFT, hearings on which will be held soon) although in all honesty this newspaper (National Tribune) believes those privileges should follow. * * * The women of the armed services in all wars should receive like treatment. * * * We believe a termination of the issue in favor of this vanishing group of loyal women will meet with universal approval. It is late, but it is never too late to make amends."

Persecution by Federal Communications Commisison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, in a very definite and emphatic manner, I called the attention of this House to my serious concern, as a person of Italian ancestry, to the action of the Federal Communications Commission in relying upon and vouching for—as a star witness—an intolerant and misinformed man by the name of Clete Roberts, who asserted that "no Italian south of Rome"—that no Italian out of 20,000,000 people—"was worth a tinker's damn; that they were all lazy and indolent, that they wanted the United States to feed them and think for them, and that none of these Italians would even say 'thank you' for the favors they received from our country."

As I stated then, I am more than proud that my own ancestors came from the southern part of Italy, and I know that other Members of this House who are of Italian ancestry are just as proud of this as I am. I resented these slurs and I know that all fair-minded Americans resent them.

I have sought to learn from the Federal Communications Commission whether it is its intention to continue to vouch for and support as worthy of credibility this particular witness who not only makes such ill-founded charges against the people of the south of Italy but who, while on the witness stand as an alleged star witness for the Federal Communications Commission, refused to apologize for these remarks or even to change them. In fact, this man Roberts contended that they were true and that he would stand by them. To my amazement, Mr. Speaker, and Members of this House, it appears that the Federal Communications Commission intends to use this particular witness again as one of its star performers. May I report that I have examined the record of his testimony and find that on cross examination he admitted that he had been fired from every good job he ever had, that he took papers and files from his employer's station without permission and refused to return them until subpenaed, that he intentionally disobeyed his employer's instructions behind his employer's back, hoping that he would not learn about these serious violations of employer-employee relationship. Furthermore, this alleged star witness, Roberts, admitted that he had been secretly on the payroll of an automobile promoter who has been indicted for grand larceny, and that while on this man's payroll he had engaged in promotional efforts to obtain money for the sale of auto franchises—these promotion efforts consisting in part of a pretense of an on-the-spot report of events as they were supposed to be seen, heard, and reported by a top radio reporter. The fact of the matter is that this promotional program, along with the questions and answers, were arranged beforehand with studied effort and intention to create this false impression that the public was listening to the noises of a busy automobile factory, when in truth and in fact the noises they heard had nothing to do with automobile production and were produced by banging on pipes with hammers to create this dishonest impression.

That such a witness cannot be worthy of belief was so obvious to me that I ask why does the Federal Communications Commission want to use such a man at al? What is involved in this particular proceeding that the Government of the United States should rely upon such a contemptible witness? As my statement of May 3 shows, I refer to the proceedings of the Federal Communications Commission against radio stations WJR of Detroit, WGAR of Cleveland, and KMPC of Los Angeles—the principal stockholder of these three outstanding stations being Mr. George A. Richards. In this instant proceeding the Commission is attempting to not renew the licenses of these three stations on the allegation that the news was "slanted."

With regard to this particular case, the opening statement of Hugh Fulton, the attorney for these radio stations, was sent to me and every Member of the Congress by order of the American Legion of the State of Michigan with the suggestion of the American Legion that it involved vitally important issues that should be known to every one of us here with the possible expectancy that Congress would want to investigate this particular governmental agency and its handling of this matter.

These radio stations have a long record of achievement and acceptance and support from the public. They are stations which for many years have been heard by tens of millions of people. Several former employees of one of these stations, including this contemptible defamer, have contended that Mr. Richards expressed opinions concerning phonetical questions and racial issues, and it is apparently the present position of the Federal Communications Commission that it is entitled to pry into the very private thoughts and utterances of Mr. Richards as testified to by former, and discharged, employees. It is on this basis that the Federal Communications Commission hopes to deprive these radio stations of their licenses, with complete disregard of the public acceptance and approval of these same stations which have been established over a period of many years. This is what Mr. Fulton characterized as "thought control" and this is what the American Legion is opposed to, especially as these stations have been in the very forefront of the fight against communism and have had a long record of support of principles and policies of the American Legion and other organizations determined to fight for the preservation of our American ideals.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to believe in the American people. I do not believe that they are so stupid that they cannot determine for themselves whether they agree with or resent any discrimination or biased remarks they hear in radio presentation of the news. Our vast listening audiences read newspapers and hear various radio presentations of the same news constantly, and they can be trusted to understand and to compare what they see and hear and judge for themselves. I do not believe that they require any agency in Washington to do their thinking for them. I do not believe that they approve of any agency in Washington snooping around among discharged employees for alleged private remarks, and I am sure that neither they nor we approve of a waste of the taxpayers' money.

I am very emphatic when I say that this type of proceeding should never have been brought, and that it does constitute an attempt on the part of the Federal Communications Commission to usurp to itself the power of censorship which this Congress expressly banned it from exercising. I consider it an unwarranted waste of money and time of the Federal employees and of the personnel of these stations to go into these matters which raise these most serious questions. It would seem to me that the Federal Communications Commission actually intends to usurp the power of censorship and thought control. It appears that they are trying to persecute and punish a station owner who has dared to have his own private opinions. If successful in this case, what other radio stations are marked for attack? Where will this censorship axe fall next? As an American citizen, and a Democrat, I believe that everyone should be given a statement of the charges against him and an opportunity to defend himself. My investigation into this particular case shows a denial of these essential rights. The Federal Communications Commission not only refused to furnish a statement of the charges against these radio stations, but has fought tooth and nail to prevent the facts from coming to light. All of our radio stations should be judged by what goes on over the radio and not by what some discharged former employee contends an owner would like to have had go out over the radio. Yet, in this particular case, the Federal Communications Commission refuses to admit that the newscast scripts of what was broadcast should be received in evidence, although these newscast scripts have been in its possession for months and have been photostated. Going further in this case, the Federal Communications Commission has even sought to prevent its own witnesses from being asked to authenticate the scripts which they themselves had prepared. One of the very interesting and pertinent activities of the Federal Communications Commission in this particular case is that after it had spent 2 years investigating this matter, which investigations proving to them that these stations were great radio stations, it not only refrained from introducing the evidence it knew existed in favor of these stations, in-

cluding the testimony of persons who have told the Federal Communications Commission that their charges were false, but it even refused to stipulate that the general programing of these stations was good and that these stations enjoyed the highest reputation in their respective communities for public service and good programing.

What is the situation now? After 2 years of suffering from the innuendos and inferences from the charges of these former employees, these stations had expected to have at least an opportunity of proving the facts which the Federal Communications Commission's own investigations should have caused it to produce for that purpose. More than 100 witnesses were prepared to testify on behalf of Station KMPC in Los Angeles. Many of them had made special plans to arrange their time and some of them had arranged to go abroad. I am now advised that the chief counsel for Federal Communications Commission insists that it was improper for the station to present these witnesses at this time, and this position from the counsel for the Federal Communications Commission after its own examiner, charged by the Commission with the duty of regulating and conducting the proceedings in Los Angeles had heard extensive oral argument from both sides and had denied this application of the Commission's counsel. At this point the Federal Communications Commission itself, here in Washington, reached out and interfered with these proceedings in Los Angeles by ordering a nine-day adjournment. This occurred despite the fact that counsel for the Commission had asked its examiner to adjourn the proceedings to permit such an appeal and had been refused such an adjournment; and this occurred despite the fact that the Federal Communications Commission in Washington did not know and did not have before it the oral argument and the facts which their own examiner had before him in Los Angeles.

Many of the witnesses for this station, some of them busy and important public officials, were in court on Monday morning, June 5, to testify for this station but their time was wasted. Some of them had very important personal plans that should not have been interfered with. As an example, the Reverend John J. Cavanaugh, president of the University of Notre Dame, had prepared to fly from Notre Dame to Los Angeles to testify for the station and has now notified the station that his religious and official commitments are such that it will now be impossible for him to testify until after his return from the holy pilgrimage to Europe.

I, for one, want to make it clear on the record that I thoroughly and completely disagree with the Federal Communications Commission in its handling of this matter. I know that it has been publicly and silently criticized by a number of the Republican Members of this Congress who see in these efforts of the Commission a possibility of censorship of thought control disadvantageous to them. I also wish to join with my colleague from Ohio, the Honorable STEPHEN YOUNG, who so ably pointed out on the floor of this House the other day that we Democrats are just as much opposed to this kind of ubiquitous interference as are the Republicans, and that we are just as much apt to be the victims of it, and that we are just as quick to protest it and to do all in our power to stop it. I would also like this record to show that I have personally contacted the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the Honorable SCOTT LUCAS, so that he would become familiar with the present machinations of the Federal Communications Commission in this case. As a party we should recognize the fact that the Italian-American groups throughout this country are alerted to the defamatory and ill-founded testimony of the witness Roberts whom I have referred to many times. Italian-American newspapers have already picked this up, and if this man Roberts is continued to be sponsored and supported by the Federal Communications Commission, we have very definitely not heard the end of it. In conclusion I want to heartily endorse the suggestion of Honorable STEPHEN YOUNG, Democratic Representative at Large from the State of Ohio, that the Speaker designate a committee of both Republicans and Democrats to confer with the Federal Communications Commission immediately and make a full report to this body as to the outcome of such a meeting.

Mme. Sun Finds Chinese Communists Are Not What She, Along With Snow, Lattimore, Fairbanks, and Company Portrayed Them To Be

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune of June 10, 1950:

ECLIPSE OF MME. SUN

The lot of the fellow traveler, once communism comes to power, is not always easy. Take the case of Mme. Sun Yat-sen, widow of China's revolutionary leader who for years served the cause in Chiang Kai-shek's own household.

Reports from behind the Chinese iron curtain say Mme. Sun has been placed under surveillance by her country's new Communist rulers. She is suspected of being involved in an anti-Communist plot.

Before the Nationalist collapse Mme. Sun openly boosted the Communist cause without fear of punishment by the Nationalists. She urged that feudalistic and autocratic Confucian teachings be uprooted from every nook and corner of our life and thought. She rebuked the United States for intervening in Chinese affairs. These and other critical comments were quoted at length in the dispatches of British and American correspondents who had no time for the Chiang regime.

There can be no doubt that Mme. Sun contributed materially to the Communist triumph. As widow of China's George Washington her opinions carried great weight with people of all classes. And as sister of Mme. Chiang she was free to say what she pleased. In fact, Nationalists often cited Mme. Sun as proof that the Chiang government permitted freedom of speech.

When the new peoples government took over China Mme. Sun was appointed one of six deputy chairmen in recognition of her contributions. Yet Communists have an infinite capacity for suspicion. Apparently they have concluded that no one so intimately associated with Chiang Kai-shek's family as is Mme. Sun can ever be fully trusted.

Has Mme. Sun actually changed her mind about the Communists? It is possible, of course. But if we must rely only on Communist news sources the truth may never be known.

A Message From Main Street, U. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the people out in Kansas from the district I have the honor to represent, are beginning to do a lot of wondering about this Government's financial policies. From the people who do business and pay their taxes up and down Main Street, and from those who make the Main Streets possible, the farmers, there is coming a chain reaction against this present attitude of our Government.

Harry Hopkins, right-hand man of President Roosevelt, is supposed to have once said, "Go ahead, the people are too dumb to understand."

These people may not know all the implications of the Amerasia case. The names Lattimore, Herrington, Jaffe, may not mean much to them at present.

They may not know that Trygve Lie, the Norwegian Secretary General of the United Nations, has followed the Communist line ever since he has been boss of the United Nations. They may not know that he was appointed to this office at the insistence of Joe Stalin. They may not know that this man, Trygve Lie, is sole boss of 5,000 employees of the United Nations. That he has been flying to Moscow, Paris, and European countries trying to get enough votes to admit Communist China into the United Nations. The above picture may be a little obscure to these people out home, but they do understand in our part of the country this basic idea: That you cannot spend more than you take in. They are worried about their bonds, their life-insurance policies, and their savings accounts. They are beginning to wonder what kind of dollars are going to be used to pay them off at the maturity date.

Mr. Speaker, these people know that money has two important functions—a medium of exchange and a storehouse of value. They know that now their dollars cannot be redeemed in gold; they also know that the Government printing presses are turning out billions in paper

money; and they also know that ones in charge of the printing presses are now devoted and promote constantly the welfare do-gooder state—all of which points the way that maybe their dollars are going to further decrease in purchasing power.

These people can see as of June 6, 1950, as shown by the financial statement of the United States Treasury, the public debt amounted to $256,196,540,430.06 and that the United States only owns $24,231,598,678.68 in gold.

With Federal spending therefore out of control and the Government committed to arm the European countries, spending three billions for give-away programs in Europe this year, and to provide additional millions for rehabilitation and social progress on a world-wide scale—this, to the people of my district and people of the Midwest, the dollar value surges to the front as a most vital issue.

Many have reached the conclusion that this so-called security and protection that was offered for votes will go down in history as the cruelest and most colossal fraud ever practiced on the American people.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. A. L. Shultz, of Topeka, Kans., a newspaperman of high standing and great ability, whose reputation extends far beyond the confines of the State of Kansas, recently wrote an editorial. He sets forth some alarming facts that to my mind does not show the state of the Union is good. His editorial is as follows:

This beautiful home of the brave and land of the free is likely to be putting chains on her liberty-loving American citizens if security programs now in serious contemplation become laws.

Security, as facts and figures prove, won't be an easy chair in a home of plenty in your declining years. The security you are due to get under the projected Fair Deal program and theories of welfare dreamers is penury in a busted country where those once valued dollar bills will represent the worth of a cigarette paper.

People who are cold, callous, and calculating and not given to fooling themselves don't smile when they hand you a blueprint of this reasoning. Their analysis is based on the same mathematical formula that is used on the offices of sound and solvent old-line life insurance companies. They have the old-age pension plan figured to a dime based on current individual incomes. In a very convincing way they prove that a welfare program which insures wage and salary earners a 50-percent retirement or pension guarantee at 65 will cost $62,000,000,000 more than the current worth of all the stocks and bonds listed on the New York stock exchange.

There are some staggering figures available in Washington these days if you just take a bit of time and explore the facts. They show that industry is paying the Government about $12,000,000,000 a year more than goes to stockholders who finance the operations of these branches of private business.

It is going to cost the people of these United States a nice, juicy $226,000,000,000 to underwrite a 50-percent pension plan for some 60,000,000 men and women who now receive a pay check. The calculation is based on retirement at the age of 65. It surely has alluring features when a person considers the comforts of going fishing on warm days and sitting around the steam heater when the weather gets cold. One great problem, of course, is the future supply of happy taxpayers.

Building up this stockpile of cash with which to insure continued payment of pension grants to the aged calls for a careful scraping of the old think tank. Even in these days when money is just about the cheapest commodity available, a total of $226,000,000,000 is no small sum to contemplate.

In order that you may know approximately what it means, all of the millions of shares of stock of the hundreds of corporations listed on the New York Stock Exchange, represent about $65,000,000,000. In round figures that is one-fourth of the amount needed to pay the pension bill which will be required for these 60,000,000 workers when they reach retirement age.

Further exploration of the Nation's vast reserves of wealth, show that by cashing all of the listed bonds at their face value, the country could scrape together another $123,000,000,000. With all of the listed stocks and bonds in the common jackpot, the people who are to enjoy these great benefits still need $62,000,000,000 to amortize this pension debt.

Conceivably you have one of those fertile minds which can foresee this fantastic Government plundering of private business and estates. Likewise you may appreciate pending raids on investments which provide payrolls, produce dividends, endow charities, and guarantee prompt payment of insurance to the widows. It now seems quite well to explore further. Just where will the Government look for future taxes? Who will meet the Saturday night payroll? Who can supply information as to the depressed value of a dollar at the time this happy, Nation-wide leaning on Government for living costs really gets into full swing? Just how will the wage and salary earner retain a measure of pride and self-respect which will inspire him to personal thrift and ambitious endeavor? After all, who is likely to want to work with 60,000,000 idle people devouring the fruits of his labor?

The calculated payments under the proposal for 50-percent pensions would amount to $43,000,000,000 a year in order to insure health and general welfare benefits with perhaps a bit of socialized medicine added. Uncle Sam may readily look ahead to some dismal days in collecting this money from private sources after tapping the taxpayers for a general annual expense grant of around forty billion bucks.

But don't let this column disturb your enjoyment of a cigarette, a cocktail, or a juicy steak. Get as much of living today as possible. The promise of bales of free circus money is the sole hopeful outlook for the future. The financial status of the Nation isn't something in the dim and distant future. In Washington, New York, and Philadelphia are many clear-thinking people who have economic road maps which show just where America's economic highway is leading.

This current national debt of more than $250,000,000,000 isn't just hay. Sure, it will be paid. How? With what? And what will that money be worth when measured by dollars saved for personal security or to protect a widow?

Most positively your widow will get face value on your life insurance policy. But it won't be the sort of money used to pay premiums during years when your earning power was at its peak. Payments will be in the sort of money represented by bales of bonds securing government indebtedness—bonds which risk companies were practically forced to buy under Washington political pressure.

The widow may even get her insurance check when she returns from the funeral. Next morning when mamma comes downstairs to a sad breakfast, there may be a visitor leaning on the door buzzer. The visitor will perhaps be from the Federal tax department. He will regret exceedingly that s~rrow has entered the little home. Sadly, he will hand the little woman a slip of paper. It will show in detail just how much of what papa left that Uncle Sam will take before mamma can start paying funeral expenses and buy groceries. That will be the family contribution to the great and glorified happy day which is so stoutly promised by people running government in Washington.

This thing is going to worry the Nation's lawmakers in no small measure. They are under pressure to increase the mortgage on America and her future. They must make good with pressure squads or suffer reprisals at the polls. If these lawmakers are brave, honest, and conscientious, they will vote to save the land they claim to love. Some of them will stand up and fight. Others are more concerned with reelection than with the business of insuring opportunity for their children and grandchildren.

Money for all of the promised ease and contentment comes from just one source—taxes. Once in 1932 when the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt was campaigning for President on a pledge of reducing taxes 25 percent, he asserted: "Taxes come from the sweat of the workingman's brow." They come from the same source today. The value of a dollar is measured only in sweat. With that yardstick, you can figure just what this fantastic program means in your own home.

Calhoun View Versus FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greenville (S. C.) News of June 12, 1950:

CALHOUN VIEW VERSUS FEPC

South Carolinians may note with interest that a doctrine propounded by John C. Calhoun has been brought forward as one of the reasons why such legislation as the fair-employment-practices bill should not be adopted by the Federal Government.

And this is being done, not by a southerner but by a writer in New York.

In his column on the editorial page of the Wall Street Journal, William Henry Chamberlin discusses the question of whether it is politically or morally desirable to use a congressional majority to push through legislation which is strongly resented by large minorities of the people. His conclusion is that it is not, and he compares it to the attempt to enforce prohibition in areas where such laws have little or no popular support.

He says of the effort to pass this FEPC law in Congress that it is now clear that what is involved here is an attempt to coerce, not a single State but a whole section of the Nation. Southern opposition to the FEPC principle is virtually unanimous.

And he remarks that in this matter of FEPC legislation "there is certainly a case for applying the 'concurrent majority' theory of John C. Calhoun, Southern statesman and political thinker of ante-bellum days. It was Calhoun's belief that the voice 'of each interest or portion of the community, which

may be unequally or injuriously affected by the action of the Government' should be consulted before the laws were put into operation. 'Each division of interest' in Calhoun's opinion 'should have either a concurrent voice in making and executing the laws or a veto on their execution.' "

Admitting that this doctrine could be carried to extremes, Mr. Chamberlin calls it a "useful antidote to that excessive concentration of power in Washington which today represents a grave danger to the Federal form of Government established by the Constitution." While he sees no danger today of State secession, "there is a danger that functions which properly belong to the States will pass into the hands of a centralizing bureacracy at Washington."

And Mr. Chamberlin is doubtless right in his prediction of the resentment and disrespect with which such a Federal coercive law would be received in the South.

His article is a potent argument against adoption of the law on the assumption that it is opposed only by a large minority.

But we think there is every ground to question the accuracy of the impression so often given that it is only a minority of the people who oppose such laws.

The very fact that in so many States, outside the South, such proposals have been rejected by legislatures suggests that the opposition, if accurately counted, would be shown to be a majority. It is, as a matter of fact, only a clamorous group of minorities in certain big and politically doubtful States whose demands for such laws are so vociferously heard. And it is because of their strategic political position that Washington politicians with an eye to electoral votes, profess to construe this as the voice of a majority. But who else besides these elements, and the politicians who cater to their votes, are demanding that the Federal Government adopt such laws?

Biggest Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the fiftieth article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on the infiltration of communism in our country:

BIGGEST STORY
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

This looks like a good time to pause for station identification and present a summary of the record that has been running here every day and Sunday, too, since April 25.

The fact is that I have undertaken to set forth a basic study of communism in action from its start down to the present, with special emphasis on its relation to the United States.

I laid it down at the start that the career of communism is the biggest news story of the twentieth century.

Fifty years ago communism was nothing. Today it is a world problem. How and why did this happen?

My argument is that communism is a problem not because of its own validity but because the twentieth century has been cursed and beset by a series of men in public office who had power too great for their sense of responsibility.

The worst offenders were Presidents Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt, so far as the United States is concerned. And that in turn has made enormous disaster for the whole of civilization.

To demonstrate this, I have expounded the Communist concept of civilization as set forth by Karl Marx, called by name scientific socialism.

I have shown how socialism is in fact just the same old tyranny that used to be called absolute monarchy, with no more brains, character, or natural chance of enduring success.

I have shown how this scientific socialism came to power in Russia not through popular demand but by collusion between the general staff of the German Army of 1917 and a set of fugitives from the police.

The Germans sent these back to the home country specifically to knock Russia out of the war as a balance against Wilson's shoving the United States of America in, against its own welfare and interest.

I have shown how this same scientific socialism failed as soon as tried and led Russia from horror to horror until the Nation was heaving into open revolt against Stalin in 1933.

Then, I traced out the evolution of communism in the United States of America, from the late nineteenth century crackpottery through anarchy, syndicalism, socialism, and college-campus imbecility, to a militant conspiracy which in 1929 was ordered by Stalin to get started on violent revolution in the United States.

But by 1933 the United States of America had in fact begun to get back its breath from the market crash of 1929–30 and the government most shaky in all the modern world was that of Russia itself.

Stalin's target one for 1933 was therefore, to obtain diplomatic recognition from the Roosevelt administration to save his own neck. He got it.

Now we come to the unfolding of the consequences, and they are bloody, bitter, expensive, and their end is not yet.

Item: The Communists' revolutionary plan for Germany in the 1929–32 period consisted of lining up with the rabble and scum of the cities calling itself the National Socialist (Nazi) Party, to destroy the Weimar republic. It won at that, then lost the spoils to the Austrian ex-corporal, Hitler.

Item: The Communists' infection of government in the United States of America, all the way from WPA theater projects up to the most secret-policy operations of the State Department.

Item: The Stalin whom Roosevelt rescued in 1933, just 6 years later pulling the trigger on World War II through his deal with Hitler.

Item: Stalin, rescued from Hitler by United States men, money, and power, again showing his gratitude to the American people at the infamous Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam Conferences.

The record also must tell how Roosevelt, Frankfurter, Hopkins & Co., with their eyes wide open, plunged from failure to failure and dragged the American people with them.

Congressional and other authorized investigative agencies began to pile up the known facts about communism in the public record as early as 1918. They have never stopped since.

The true story of communism's aims, actions, purposes, and performances is the best documented record of its kind in the history of humanity.

It is anybody's knowledge that will trouble merely to accept it, and the tragedy is that it always has been. But not until traitors in the United States and Great Britain went so far as to steal the atom bomb for Stalin, would you—very likely—begin to believe it.

Mr. Roosevelt, one day in 1933 when I was at a White House press conference, got very gay and poked fun at people concerned about communism. He said they were always nervously "looking under the bed."

Well, when you look under the bed and see a pair of large, blood-stained shoes and a gun—your stolen gun—what do you reason from that?

Thus endeth the first lesson.

American Aid for an American Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday afternoon, June 11, 1950, in Waltham, Mass., it was my privilege to take part in a parade, followed by a mass meeting in Hovey Memorial Hall, of more than 2,000 employees of the idle Waltham Watch Co., their families, friends, and neighbors.

The parade and mass meeting were held for the purpose of demonstrating united community interest in the continuing operation of the Waltham Watch Co. and prevailing upon the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to extend cooperation for this objective.

It was my pleasure to address the gathering at Hovey Memorial Hall and, in the course of my remarks, I reiterated my confirmed belief that the agencies of this Government were created for the primary purpose of serving and aiding, first and foremost, the citizens and communities of the United States.

In this regard, I earnestly hope that the RFC authorities will demonstrate a more cooperative attitude in connection with the reorganization plans for the Waltham Watch Co. that are now being considered by the Federal court in Boston and the interested parties.

I sincerely believe the Waltham Watch Co. should be assisted, through Government aid, as an essential unit in our national defense system and also in order to preserve the employment opportunities to which our American taxpayers are rightfully entitled.

The complete text of the address follows:

Over the past 3½ years during which I have been privileged to be your Representative in Congress, there have been several occasions upon which I felt impelled to compliment the people of Waltham on their possession of real American civic spirit. At no time has this quality been more clearly demonstrated than this meeting today to express the desire of your citizens and neighbors to unite in trying to help solve a vital community problem.

It is my deep conviction that whenever and wherever a group of constituents are gathered together in concern over a civic objective, involving Federal complications, your Congressman's place is in the midst of his people; that is why I am here to give you all the assistance I possibly can.

As every person here knows, I have been consistently fighting for the Waltham Watch Co. and employees, as well as the American watch manufacturing industry, since the day I entered the United States Congress. For 42 months, I have repeatedly spoken on the

floor of the House of Representatives, appeared before congressional committees, introduced authoritative evidence into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, complained to the State Department, and called upon the President of the United States himself to preserve the employment opportunities to which the watch workers of Waltham are rightfully entitled and prevent the disintegration of our watch industry because it is an essential factor in our national defense.

In February of this year, I introduced a bill, H. R. 7248, to specifically authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to extend financial assistance to business enterprises for purposes advantageous to the national defense. The immediate purpose of this bill was to resolve any doubt that the RFC has the authority to come to the aid of the American people through assisting in the continuation of our domestic watch manufacturing industry as a national security asset. I know your president, your civic officials, and other authorities, will testify to you of my persevering individual and cooperative efforts with them.

Next Wednesday, I am going to personally present, to the Committee for Reciprocity Information, my opposition to the present tariff policy on foreign watch imports into this country, which unjust policy, in my opinion, is the foundation reason for the extreme situation facing the American watch manufacturers today.

The source cure for the watch manufacturing difficulty is to place restrictions on the number of, and the manner in which, watch movements are allowed to be imported into this country from Switzerland. Because our watch employees and our watch industry went to war, the American watch business went to Switzerland. Permitting American employees and an American industry to be penalized because of their unselfish participation in war production work is a disgraceful blot on the State Department's conduct of international trade agreements and I shall steadfastly oppose this particular unpatriotic policy as long as I have breath to speak. I make that statement not only because of my intense concern for your welfare, but also because I feel it is a problem that embraces the lives of all American citizens.

Authentic testimony by competent experts is on record that the contributions of our watch workers and our watch industry were essential to the successful prosecution of the recent war. Furthermore, it cannot be disproved and it will not be denied that, in this atomic age precision instrument production is a key point in our national security system.

On January 26, of this year, I called to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives an article entitled "Watch and Clock Making Revives in the United Kingdom," which appeared in the Foreign Commerce Weekly, of the Department of Commerce, January 16, 1950. This splendid article, with factual detail, traced the history of watchmaking in the British Empire. It points out the said mistake Britain made in letting their domestic watch industry, at one time the greatest in the world, disintegrate. It develops, in convincing fashion, the story of how Great Britain found out, to their dismay, they had complacently neglected a national asset. This condition was vividly brought home to them during the last war. They recognized the mistake, and today the British watch-manufacturing industry is being revived through substantial practical aid from the Government itself. In commenting, in the Congress, on this article, I made the point that, so long as our State Department appears, in so many instances, to follow the British lead they would do well to imitate their policy with respect to our domestic watch industry.

It has always been my understanding, since I was in grade school, that the agencies of this Government were created for the primary purpose of serving and aiding, first and foremost, the citizens of the United States.

You and I and all the American people have been and are now generously helping to rehabilitate almost every country in the world. Our State Department and other Government agencies do not hesitate in continuing to ask for support of our foreign-aid program. It is true there are substantial reasons for believing such a policy will be beneficial to this country, but much of it is a real gamble.

There is no patriotic gamble in the objective we are striving for here today. We are merely asking for reasonable governmental cooperation with American citizens, in an American community project for the preservation of an essential national-defense industry to protect this entire Nation in the event of an atomic war.

Under these circumstances, I say to you, and to our Government agency officials, their first obligation, under our Constitution, is to the citizens of the United States.

I have asked our Government officials before, and I am very glad to ask them now, to immediately extend their full cooperation in maintaining your employment rights, in preserving an essential industry and in keeping the American people adequately prepared to meet any war emergency.

A Toast to the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following toast to the flag by John Jay Daly:

A TOAST TO THE FLAG
(By John Jay Daly)

HERE'S TO THE RED OF IT
There's not a thread of it,
No, nor a shred of it
In all the spread of it
From foot to head,
But heroes bled for it,
Faced steel and lead for it,
Precious blood shed for it,
Bathing in Red.

HERE'S TO THE WHITE OF IT
Thrilled by the sight of it,
Who knows the right of it
But feels the might of it
Through day and night?
Womanhood's care for it
Made manhood dare for it;
Purity's pray'r for it
Keeps it so White.

HERE'S TO THE BLUE OF IT
Beauteous view of it,
Heavenly hue of it,
Star-spangled dew of it
Constant and true;
Diadems gleam for it,
States stand supreme for it,
Liberty's beam for it
Brightens the Blue.

HERE'S TO THE WHOLE OF IT
Stars, stripes and pole of it,
Body and soul of it,
O, and the roll of it,
Sun shining through;
Hearts in accord for it
Swear by the sword for it,
Thanking the Lord for it,
Red, White, and Blue.

Disaster Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a copy of a letter written to me by Administrator Dillard B. Lasseter, of the Farmers Home Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, under date of June 9, 1950.

The Fourth South Carolina District, which I have the honor to represent in Congress, of course, is known principally for its textiles. I am reliably informed that we have more spindles and looms in operation than any other district in the country. In addition thereto, we have grown to be one of the very largest fresh fruit producing areas in the country. Unfortunately many hazards face the orchardists. This year, for instance, the late frost destroyed our entire peach crop. In spite of this great financial and labor loss, I have been impressed by the courage and independence of our farmers and orchardists. Although no great demand has been made for any governmental assistance, I thought it proper to make inquiry as to what provisions of law there were on the statute books under which loans might be had in this as in other disaster areas. I am grateful to Mr. Lasseter for the enclosed letter:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 9, 1950.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BRYSON: Reference is made to your letter of May 26, 1950, and our recent conversation concerning the serious damage to the peach crop in South Carolina this year as a result of adverse weather conditions and the apparent need among a number of growers for credit not available through other established sources to enable them to meet necessary operating expenses.

As you know, due to excessive rainfall and the unusually heavy infestation of boll weevils last year the entire State of South Carolina was designated on October 20, 1949, by the Secretary of Agriculture as a disaster area for the purpose of authorizing the making of disaster loans to eligible farmers and stockmen under the provisions of Public Law 38 (81st Cong.). Since that date, assistance has been available under this program to eligible farmers throughout the State who suffered damage from these disasters and who could not obtain needed operating credit from other established sources.

On the basis of information obtained through a survey of the principal peach-growing areas of the State, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, on June 8, 1950, authorized the making of disaster loans to eligible peach growers in South Carolina whose orchards were damaged by adverse weather conditions this spring. Though assistance under this program is available to eligible peach growers throughout the State, the heaviest damage to the peach crop occurred in the following counties: Chesterfield, Cherokee, Greenville, Spartanburg, Union, York, Laurens.

While this type of assistance is available immediately, it is not anticipated that there

will be any great demand for disaster loans by orchardists before August or September. Applications are handled by our local county offices. For your information we are glad to furnish this brief summary of the eligibility requirements and the basic policies that will be followed in the making of disaster loans:

"ELIGIBILITY FOR DISASTER LOANS

"Any farm owner, farm operator, or stockman in a designated area who has suffered damage as a result of a production disaster is eligible to receive a disaster loan provided he is unable to obtain from commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies, or other responsible sources, the credit required to continue his farming operations. Each applicant must certify that he has suffered damage as a result of a disaster and that he is unable to obtain the loan applied for from other credit sources. Before a disaster loan may be made the county committee must certify in writing that, to the best of its knowledge and belief (1) the applicant has suffered damage as a result of a disaster, (2) the applicant is unable to obtain the loan applied for from commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies, or other responsible sources, and (3) the applicant honestly will endeavor to carry out the undertakings and obligations required of him under the loan.

"LOAN PURPOSES

"Disaster loans may be made for the purchase of feed, seed, fertilizer, livestock, equipment to replace that destroyed by the disaster or to meet other essential farm and home operating expenses; for the pruning and spraying of orchards and other necessary expenses in connection with orchard management; for the replacement or repair of buildings, fences, drainage, and irrigation systems on individual farms, or for land leveling and the clearing of debris necessary as a direct result of a disaster.

"Disaster loans may not be made to refinance indebtedness, either secured or unsecured. Neither may disaster loans be made to refinance real estate indebtedness.

"RATES AND TERMS

"Disaster loans bear 3 percent interest on the unpaid principal, and are scheduled for repayment over the minimum period of time consistent with the borrower's ability to repay. However, in no case may the repayment schedule extend beyond the useful life of the principal items of security. Loans secured by liens on chattel property must be scheduled for repayment within 10 years from the date of the advance and loans secured by liens on real estate must be scheduled for repayment within 20 years from the date of the advance. Disaster loans made for crop or orchard production purposes are repayable when the income derived from the sale of the crops produced with such loans is normally received.

"SECURITY REQUIREMENTS

"Disaster loans are secured for the full amount of the loan, generally, by (1) a first lien on all livestock, farm machinery, and farm equipment purchased with proceeds of the loan, (2) the best lien obtainable on crops growing or to be grown (a first lien is required on crops financed through disaster loans), and (3) the best lien obtainable on as much of the livestock, farm machinery, and farm equipment of security value owned by the applicant at the time the loan is made as the loan approving official determines necessary to secure reasonably the disaster loan. Real estate security is required when advances are made primarily for improvements to real estate or in other cases where the taking of real estate security appears necessary to protect the Government's financial interest."

Neither the Farmers Home Administration nor the Department of Agriculture has authority or funds for the making of grants to compensate farmers for crop losses sustained from natural production disasters. The only payments which the Department has authority to make in such cases are those resulting from the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation's program which is administered in a limited number of counties. We want to assure you, however, that applications from eligible farmers for disaster loans will be given all possible consideration under our authorities with the idea of keeping those farms in production which, with this assistance, can be operated successfully.

Your interest and cooperation in this matter are appreciated and we shall be glad to furnish such additional information as you request regarding the assistance available under this program to eligible farmers in South Carolina.

Sincerely yours,

DILLARD B. LASSETER,
Administrator.

Repeal of War Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House the following telegram I received this morning from an outstanding citizen in my district:

PAXTON, ILL., *June 13, 1950.*

Hon. LES ARENDS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Please read on page 3 of this week's United States News and World Report Republic Steel advertisement. Then remember that the Congress and the administration promised in no uncertain terms that at the war's end all war emergency taxes, excise and et cetera, would be repealed. That promise is already 5 years in default. Please wire collect, stating your position on this and what you propose to do about it.

THE ROYAL BLUE STORE,
J. M. CARRINGTON.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken the time to read this telegram because Mr. Carrington properly raises a question that is being asked by all our people. He is quite correct. Many of the taxes burdening our people were imposed during the war. In fact, some of them were designed to divert materials to the war effort, with the revenue to be raised only a secondary consideration.

But our people still bear these taxes, notwithstanding that they were strictly war taxes and notwithstanding the emphatic promise of the administration that they would be removed when the emergency was over.

I have frequently urged that the Congress keep this promise to the people and that we give them much-needed tax relief. I do so again today. There has been some talk that President Truman will veto any such bill that would substantially reduce these taxes. That, of course, would be in keeping with his policy of extravagant spending. But if this Congress is responsive to the will of the people it would give the people this promised tax relief, any veto from the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

Summary of Aluminum Decision—Victory for the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the recent decision of Judge Knox of the United States District Court of the Southern District of New York was adequately described by the press. In my opinion, the decision was a decided victory for the Government.

There is set out herein a brief review of the antitrust litigation against Aluminum Co. of America and a summary of Judge Knox's decision, handed down on June 2, 1950, substantially sustaining the Government's position.

A. HISTORY OF PROCEEDINGS

1. THE FIRST TRIAL

On April 23, 1937, the Government filed a petition charging Aluminum Co. of America—Alcoa—with monopolizing the aluminum industry, particularly in the manufacture and sale of virgin aluminum ingot. The Government sought dissolution of Alcoa. After a 2-year trial the district court—Judge Caffey—found against the Government and dismissed the complaint.

On appeal the second circuit court of appeals reversed and found that Alcoa had a monopoly of the aluminum ingot market—appeal from the district court lay to the Supreme Court. That court could not muster a forum. The case was certified to the court of appeals for the second circuit—322 United States Code, page 716—in which full appellate review was vested by act of Congress—Fifty-eighth Statute, page 272. It withheld action on dissolution pending completion of the Government's disposal of its surplus war-built aluminum plants. The court held that the surplus disposal program might create such competition as to render unnecessary any dissolution or divestiture of Alcoa. The case was kept alive by court order pending the outcome of such program.

2. THE CURRENT PROCEEDINGS

On March 31, 1947, Alcoa filed a petition asking for a decree that the company had ceased to monopolize the ingot market, that competitive conditions had been restored to the industry as a result of the disposal of the Government's war-built aluminum plants, and for a dismissal or final disposition of the case.

On September 24, 1948, the Government filed a cross-petition alleging that Alcoa's monopoly continued, that competitive conditions had not been restored, and that Alcoa should be divested of such of its properties as would restore competition in the industry.

Trial was had on these two petitions before Judge Knox. Decision was announced on June 2, 1950.

B. THE DECISION OF JUNE 2, 1950

1. SUMMARY

The decision of June 2, 1950, resulted in a substantial victory for the Government. The court decreed the following:

(a) That competitive conditions have not been restored within the aluminum industry despite the Government's war-plant disposal program.

(b) That defendant's petition (which sought a finding that Alcoa no longer had a monopoly of the ingot market, that competitive conditions had been restored, and that the case be dismissed) should be and is dismissed.

(c) That the stockholders of Alcoa must dispose of their stock interest either in Alcoa or in Aluminum Limited of Canada.

Aluminum Limited of Canada is the world's largest producer of aluminum. Nine of the largest stockholders of Alcoa—representing ownership of 46.43 percent of the stock—own 44.65 percent of the common stock of Aluminum Limited.

(d) That the so-called "grant-back" provisions in the license contracts between Alcoa on the one hand and Reynolds and Kaiser, respectively, on the other, are inconsistent with the existence of effective competition and are unenforceable. As a part of the consideration for the sale to Alcoa of certain Government-built aluminum plants, Alcoa agreed to make available to Reynolds and Kaiser its patents and "know-how" on the manufacture of alumina and on certain processes in smelting and fabrication in return for an agreement by Kaiser and Reynolds to make available to Alcoa any technological improvements made by those two concerns in the future.

(e) Authorized Alcoa to acquire from the Government a new aluminum-reduction plant at Massena, N. Y. This new plant is located adjacent to an old reduction plant presently owned and operated by Alcoa. The old plant is to be kept in standby condition but not operated. The acquisition approved, therefore, is in the nature of a substituted facility rather than as an expansion of existing facilities.

(f) Denied domestic plant divestiture sought by the Government, but ordered the case to be kept open for a period of 5 years so as to permit the Government to renew its request for domestic plant divestiture in the event conditions in the industry warrant such action.

2. CONCLUSION

When viewed in summary the court's 180-page opinion holds:

(a) That Alcoa's conduct has so far failed to overcome the effects of the prior adjudication of monopoly that further appropriate action is necessary in order to safeguard the public interest.

(b) That the public interest may be adequately safeguarded—

First. By creating a fourth competitor through ordering a stock separation as between holders of stock of both Alcoa and Aluminum Limited, rather than by ordering a divestiture of part of Alcoa's domestic plant.

Second. By safeguarding against the failure of such fourth company to become an effective competitor in the domestic market by holding the case open for 5 years with the right in the Government to move for divestiture of domestic plant in the event industry conditions show such a need; by granting everything sought by the Government in the way of relief except domestic-plant divestiture; and by denying defendant's petition to dismiss the case and the fact that Alcoa no longer enjoyed a monopoly of the aluminum ingot market.

Finally, much praise is due to the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, and to its able head, Herbert A. Bergson, for their splendid handling of this case.

St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the annual beating of the drums in behalf of the St. Lawrence waterway is once again in full volume on the Washington scene. With the appearance of the crocus, colorful press releases flood the offices of Members of Congress urging the adoption of this extravagant, wasteful, and unnecessary program. By the same token I find it necessary to make this declaration in rebuttal of the proponents of the St. Lawrence waterway.

I notice from the record of the witnesses testifying before the committees concerned with this bill in both Houses that some new recruits have been won over to this fantastic plan. Certain of the steel groups, I observe, have changed their allegiance. The tremendous cost of the St. Lawrence waterway cannot be justified on making Labrador ores available to maintain our steel-making capacity in the Middle West. There is no doubt that there has been a diminishing of available ores from the Mesabi Range in Minnesota and that there has been a program of developing taconite as a supplement or substitute. However, the development of taconite is not of great urgency because of the development of the ore properties of the steel corporation of Venezuela. The demand for these higher-cost ores will be greatly diminished.

Every year since I have been a Member of Congress I have testified before the committee and addressed this House in opposition to the St. Lawrence waterway. Every year the proponents of this measure suddenly appear with a brand new and dramatic argument, a new answer, a new and supposedly irrefutable presentment. And just as regularly I feel that I can logically, factually, and in every way point out the fallacy of this current premise.

One year it was national defense, the next year it was amity with Canada, then it was water power, next it was water transport. Now the new angle is Labrador ore for the steel mills of the Middle West.

I am informed that the steel corporation studies indicate that they can bring ore from Venezuela and deliver it into the Pittsburgh and Youngstown districts at a cost comparable to the ores which they are now mining on the Mesabi Range. This means, of course, that the demand for Mesabi Range ore will be diminished and a greater time will elapse before there is any great urgency in the development of the low-grade iron-bearing materials.

As I visualize the situation, there will be a gradual exhaustion of the easily mined open-pit ores, a gradual increase in the higher-cost ores from underground mines and then a gradual building of plants to beneficiate the taconites, so that an economic balance will be established with gradually increasing cost of the ore.

I see no urgency or great need to bring Laborador ore to the Middle West for a very long time to come, and the tremendous cost of developing the St. Lawrence waterway cannot be justified on the necessity of making Laborador ores available to maintain our steel-making capacity in the Middle West.

This St. Lawrence waterway scheme has been under consideration more or less since 1933. By this time all the facts and arguments should be known. I am convinced that the scheme is without any economic or military merit. The seaway is an economically unsound and impractical scheme. This country cannot afford the huge cost of it. It would never be self-supporting, and no competent or informed person has ever thought or said that it would be.

Let us examine its economic merits. The most effective point in this argument, so its friends feel, is that it would be a seaway.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what it would not be. It would not be a seaway because of the insuperable difficulties.

Five years ago I said on this very floor, in this very month, that the proposed St. Lawrence project would be closed by ice at least one-third of the time. Ice and fog would seriously hamper its use approximately one-half of the time. It would be as much an ice way as a seaway. This is fresh water, and fresh water freezes solid.

Further, the project would be little used by seagoing vessels to any great extent. Not only because of the ice and fog I have just mentioned, which would stop any regular scheduled service, but the length and the slowness of the trip would argue against it. It is 2,200 miles from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the head of the Lakes. A series of locks and difficult currents would hamper the traffic. A peculiar type of construction of vessel would be required. These and other reasons have caused nearly all the steamship companies to state that they would not use the seaway. And this, mind you, is to cost about $2,000,000,000.

Now, for a moment, let us examine the military argument. No top-flight Army or Navy authority has given unqualified approval of the plan. Certainly, the project would be impossible to defend because of its vulnerability to modern bomb attack, and the locks and various canals. Further than that, it would be necessary to pin down a great mass of war equipment and personnel in a futile effort at defense of the area, and, more than that, keeping in mind what the French point of view was psychologically in depending on its Maginot line, it would be a serious thing, indeed, for us to depend upon the St. Lawrence seaway when its easy destruction might fatally affect our defenses.

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that no action will be taken in this session of Congress with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway, but out of an abundance of caution, and speaking as Representative of the great anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania, I find it necessary once again to take this time and present this argument.

"Home-Town" Welcome for Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Houston Press of May 29, 1950:

"HOME-TOWN" WELCOME FOR FARLEY

Every one of us who has paid out a nickel for a coke feels as though he has a stake in the festivities launching the new Coca-Cola bottling plant, a million-dollar project, on Bissonett. For coke is more than a soft drink, it is a national institution, the great American success story, which has passed beyond our borders to every land under the sun.

The stupendous success of coke, which a little more than 60 years ago was just a formula being mixed in a test-tube in Atlanta, is a symbol of American business which has no frontier as long as ingenuity and initiative survive. If the makers of Coca-Cola can do with a new product what they have done, then that success can be repeated again and again in other lines.

Coca-Cola is a big business that is small, one that is thoroughly localized and decentralized. The bulk of Coa-Cola profits go to the citizens of thousands and thousands of communities the world over who bottle and distribute it.

There is little doubt but what Coca-Cola, whose export business is run by James A. Farley, Houston's guest today, is a good-will builder in all civilized lands. With such close contact with a business run as Jim Farley conducts his export business, foreign nations cannot but help think well of things American.

All Houston joins in welcoming Jim Farley again. Mr. Farley needs no introduction. Houston is one of the thousands of home towns that Jim Farley, the genial square-shooter, has in this country and now, that he is in the foreign-trade business, in lands abroad.

Economic Assistance for Anthracite Coal Fields

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as part of my program of bringing aid and assistance to the distressed economic area of Pennsylvania, centered in the anthracite coal fields, I have encountered the necessity, as part of this plan, of enlisting the aid of the Federal Government in behalf of established industrial, manufacturing, commercial, and mercantile businesses now located in this area. I have introduced, therefore, today a bill to provide for the award of certain public contracts to bidders from areas of very substantial labor surplus where their bids do not exceed by more than 5 percent the most advantageous bids submitted from other areas.

Mr. Speaker, several months ago the President of the United States issued a directive to all Government agencies bringing to their attention the existence of certain distressed economic areas. The President urged upon these Government officials the importance of their doing everything possible to mop up unemployment pools centered in these various areas throughout the Nation.

It so happens that there are two separate and distinct kinds of distressed economic areas. The first type is that known as the chronic distressed area where unemployment is acute and the economy in a distressed condition over a long period of time. The anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania fall into this category and I speak at this time, of course, with particular reference to the extreme unemployment problem which exists and has persisted for a number of years in Luzerne County, Pa., in the Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton metropolitan area.

The second type of distressed economic area is that resulting from location of peculiar industrial problems of recent origin, although admittedly serious at this time. I have in mind the circumstances surrounding the present problems of New England.

I am pleased to say that the full cooperation of the Office of Domestic Commerce of the United States Department of Commerce, under the able supervision of Mr. H. B. McCoy, has been extended to me and to the people of my area in every way possible in the hope that this problem may be solved. Special task forces and teams of specialists from this Office have met with committees of the Wilkes-Barre, Wyoming Valley Chamber of Commerce and with leaders of the greater Pittston, Hazleton, and Nanticoke areas; bringing to the attention of businessmen of all categories ways and means in which the Federal Government might be of assistance. I have attended several of these meetings myself and have been impressed by the eagerness and willingness to cooperate between the local business people and the officials of the Federal Government.

I have been in touch with every member of the President's Cabinet, and with all chiefs of procurement having jurisdiction over such matters in the Federal Government here in Washington and in other field offices throughout those sections of the United States dealing directly with northeastern Pennsylvania. I have received communications at length and in detail from all the Cabinet members and procurement officers concerned assuring me of their understanding and realization of the extreme economic difficulties existing in the district I represent. I believe that these Government officials are doing everything reasonable and possible under the circumstances and under the law to bring to the attention of the businessmen in my area opportunities of which they might take advantage to obtain Government contracts and assistance to put more men to work and to increase their facilities, business, and production.

After a long period of time in meetings, conferences, and discussions with all the Government officials concerned with this problem, I am satisfied that under the existing law no practical aid can be rendered to these areas where there exists a very substantial labor surplus and where the unemployment of male labor far exceeds the danger mark to the national and local economy.

Under the present system of awarding contracts to the lowest responsible bidders, it is obvious at once that the manufacturing, industrial, and business interests in my area cannot meet the competition, fierce and widespread, in the field of Government contracts. If our people could meet this competition we would not be an economic distressed area and we would not have unemployment.

I have had much conversation with the Government officials concerned in the general area of procurement on the subject of negotiated bids. I find there are two schools of thought dealing with this matter with particular reference to unemployment pools and economic distressed areas.

One school of thought takes the position that by using the method of negotiation of bids to give preferment to bidders in these economic distressed areas it is feared such particularized and discriminatory help might affect adversely the general national economy which would be most ill-advised for the purpose only of aiding a very limited area. There is the other school of thought that says that may very well be, but the circumstances are so desperate some reasonable attempt should be made to solve this peculiar local problem in these few existing areas by extending preferment, instead of restricting the awarding of Government procurement contracts to the lowest responsible bidders on sealed bids.

The fact remains that nothing but discussion has resulted and nothing has been done. The procurement officers still operate within the existing law and regulations promulgated thereunder and Government contracts are awarded in the usual way.

The bill I have introduced today, Mr. Speaker, is another step in my carefully planned program to bring aid to the chronic distressed areas of this country and more particularly to the Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton metropolitan area suffering from acute and chronic unemployment for such a length of time and to such a high degree as to make it mandatory that the Federal Government extend directly, without delay, every reasonable means of assistance to this area in behalf of the general national welfare as well as the local benefit.

The chief industry of this area is the mining of anthracite coal. I have introduced already legislation with particular reference to this industry, first, calling for the erection of a great office building for the Bureau of Mines in Wilkes-Barre; second, calling for the stockpiling of anthracite coal for the purpose of guaranteeing employment and production in the anthracite coal fields; third, calling for the establishment of a $10,000,000 fund to create an anthracite laboratory and extensive research program for additional uses of anthracite coal; fourth, for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to grant a $5,000,000 loan to the local industrial fund for the purpose of building factories in the area in order to permit many outside industries to be established in the area; and, fifth, now this bill to give a 5 percent advantage on bids to bidders from this area as contrasted to bids received from other areas to Federal procurement agencies for the same purpose. The above-mentioned legislative program will be followed by two additional bills which I will introduce within the next week setting forth a specific plan of further aid to the chronic unemployed areas and to a more extended geographic area centered around the Susquehanna Valley.

Mr. Speaker, I have found it necessary to take upon myself the initiative in this matter because I have been advised by all of the Government officials who would know that no plans of any kind exist at this moment to bring practical, precise, and specific short-range and long-range aid from the Federal Government or in cooperation with the Federal Government and the local people through these economic distressed areas of the country.

I wish to emphasize that I have taken these steps after several years of long and careful study, research and consultation with non-Government and Government experts on these problems. I am offering a program of legislation not introduced off the cuff or on the spur of the moment, but with long and deliberate and painstaking, considerate judgment. Something must be done by somebody quickly so I have taken the "bull by the horns" and presented this series of bills constituting a well-planned legislative economic program.

In our eagerness to be of assistance to these economic distressed areas and to provide employment for the high percentage of unemployed men in the area and in all of our discussions and ideas to bring new industries from the outside into the area, we must not ignore and forget the many existing industries, businesses, manufacturing, industrial, mercantile, and commercial enterprises which are now the backbone of the economy which does exist and upon which the areas now live.

I would like to point out that these are many and vigorous, long established, well managed and successful, but because of the historic and traditional economic cancer which surrounds them they have been retarded from their full potential of development and employment, so at this time some precise and specific Federal guidance, aid, and assistance is absolutely necessary.

I feel I know the temper of the people of the United States well enough to feel satisfied that when this problem is made known to all the other areas of the Nation, they will not be so selfish to object to the Federal Government extending itself to aid a helping hand to this area and these people who, since the dawn of the Nation's history, have done as much as any other area or any other people for the general welfare of the national security and economy.

If fire, flood, or the common enemy visited upon this area of Pennsylvania, I know that the United States Government and the businesses and the sections of the Nation from one end to the other would empty their hearts and their purses to come to our aid. And so I repeat, Mr. Speaker, when our problems are known to our fellow Americans, there need be no fear in the Government departments that objection will be made to the Congress and the Government rendering special aid and assistance to this area and to these people so sorely in need. This is good business. It is good government. It is good Americanism.

The people in the local area have established their own industrial fund and are raising their own money by public subscription to aid in the solution of these problems, and are doing everything reasonably possible under the circumstances to help themselves. We are not looking for public assistance. We are not looking for a dole. We are not looking for a pair of permanent Federal crutches. We are anxious to take care of ourselves in our own way and in keeping with the American tradition, but just now we are in a tough spot and need a helping hand over a few economic hurdles until we can get on our feet and fight our way out of the economic doldrums, which we are anxious and eager to do and in which success we have supreme confidence.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced beyond a reasonable contradiction, after long and repeated conferences with all responsible procurement officers and makers of policy at all levels of the United States Government that no assistance under the present and existing law can be given to the people of our area on bids for Federal contracts unless some specific advantage in such bidding is, by statute, permitted to them; predicated solely and entirely on the fact that these bidders are from areas where a very substantial labor surplus exists and where the circumstances giving rise to this condition are chronic and as far as any existing program in the Federal Government is concerned, I am assured by all of the Government experts concerned with this special problem that this bill, allowing said bidders in this area a 5-percent advantage on bids submitted as contrasted to bids from other areas, will bring a speedy, practical, and effective solution to the problem.

Week of Weeks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Lake Charles American Press, published in Lake Charles, La., on June 11, 1950, as follows:

WEEK OF WEEKS

If weeks designated for special purposes were any criterion, the 7-day period just beginning would be a rather busy stretch of time.

Officially, it's flag week with Wednesday the one hundred and seventy-third anniversary of the day on which the Continental Congress adopted the red, white, and blue Stars and Stripes as the official emblem of the new-born Republic, then fighting for its existence.

The week of June 11–16 has also been designated Engineers Week to commemorate the work of the Corps of Engineers, in war and peace, during the past 175 years. In many sections of the Nation, the week will also be the occasion for honoring some of the engineer veterans—among them, J. R. Buchanan, field assistant at Lake Charles, for his 30 years of service with the United States Corps of Engineers.

The Louisiana sweetpotato industry has also picked this week to publicize the multimillion dollar crop, rolling to United States markets, by rail and truck from the heart of the Nation's yamland in Southwest Louisiana.

Industry's group in charge of promoting Yam Week, suggests that the best way to pay tribute to King Yam is to "Eat a Yam a Day."

The Corps of Engineers points to a proud history which dates back to the days of the American Revolution when Gen. George Washington was authorized to organize and equip that military engineering branch of the service.

Originally its duties were confined largely to warfare but since its official establishment by act of Congress in 1802 as the Corps of Engineers, this group of military and civilian engineers has undertaken far more peacetime work than that of a military nature.

Probably the most outstanding phases of its civilian work have been the rivers and harbors and the flood control operations carried on in practically every State in the Union—notable in this section are the Lake Charles harbor and deep water channel to the Gulf and the Intracoastal canal which stretches along the coast from Florida to the Rio Grande.

This year's Flag Day may just possibly be the last on which a 48-star Star-Spangled Banner is officially flown, for there is still the chance that the present Congress may act

favorably on measures to admit Hawaii and Alaska as the 49th and 50th States. That would necessitate adding new stars to the flag which has remained unchanged since 1912 when Arizona was admitted to the Union as the 48th State.

But whether our flag has 48 or more stars on its blue field, it always stands as America's proud emblem of freedom—a freedom purchased in blood on the battlefields of many wars. It has often been the sole hope of freedom from tyranny to millions of people in almost every corner of the world.

The memory of all that the flag stands for should arouse us to constant vigilance against forces both at home and abroad, which would lower Old Glory and raise the red banner of communism.

Those are things which all Americans should think of this week as we observe the 173d anniversary of the birth of the Stars and Stripes which has grown from a circle of 13 stars on its blue field to rows containing the present 48.

A Lesson From Lynn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following article which appeared in the Boston Globe, Boston, Mass., on Monday, June 12, 1950:

A LESSON FROM LYNN

Lynn's "century of achievement," which opened yesterday to mark the one hundredth anniversary of the city's incorporation, provides a reminder of the difficulties which were met not only by that Massachusetts community but the whole Nation during the century past. Those inclined in these postwar days of confusion and stress to take a short view of the resilience of the American character, might well pause while our neighboring city celebrates its own accomplishments, to recall the hazards encountered and surmounted during the span since 1850.

It is difficult today, without close exploration of our history, to realize how torn by passions and wrenched by feuds this Nation was during the 1850s; how hopeless the future seemed to many thoughtful citizens; how deep and bitter were the divisions among the population, North and South, the year Lynn outgrew her town government and set up in business under her new articles of incorporation as a city.

Abolitionism and antiabolitionism split families. The repeal of the Missouri Compromise seemed to many to presage absolute disaster for the Union. Lincoln, who was to save the still youthful Republic from wreck, though at the cost of a desolating Civil War, was still relatively unknown. Factions flourished. Europe watched, expecting the end of the American experiment.

Lynn's decision to step up her civic role in the midst of this turmoil, and embark upon the path of city government, signified, in its way, the underlying strength of the people and their stubborn confidence in popular government, local and national. Her "achievement" thus began simultaneously with her forward march into the new century. She is surely entitled to rejoice in her accomplishments this week.

Corporate Expenditures To Influence Public Opinion and Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to make a brief statement concerning a recent request made by the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities of which I have the honor of being chairman. Our committee has been quietly going about its assigned tasks since last fall. One of our most effective means of obtaining information has been by questionnaire letters. We have successfully sent letters requesting information to the following groups:

First. Five hundred and thirty-one Members of Congress.

Second. One hundred and sixty representatives of the press.

Third. Five hundred and fifty-seven writers, political scientists, and other specialists in the field of political science and pressure politics.

Fourth. Two thousand one hundred national associations.

Recently we sent a request letter to 166 business corporations asking for information about their expenditures having legislative significance. We asked about trips to and from Washington, maintenance of Washington offices, advertising on matters having legislative significance, money spent for printed or duplicated matter dealing with legislative matters and any other expenditures made to influence the passage or defeat of legislation, directly or indirectly.

I am happy to be able to say that the early returns on this questionnaire have been good. Most business organizations knew what we wanted and were willing to give it to us. I would like to quote some comments from the early replies of some of those who indicated they knew what the committee wanted, and were willing to give us the desired information.

Schenley Industries, Inc., replied:

We will be pleased to collect and submit the information requested.

Alfred Kohlberg, Inc., replied:

The information for which you ask is being prepared and will be submitted prior to June 15.

Mr. Kohlberg has already furnished the committee with a voluminous reply which appears to be a thorough answer.

Erie Railroad Co. replied:

Erie Railroad Co. will be glad to comply with the committee's request.

Delaware Power & Light Co. replied:

We will be glad to furnish the information requested and hope to be in a position to send it to you not later than June 15.

R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. replied:

As we understand it, your committee is making a study of activities intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation by Congress, and, consequently, it is our assumption that the information you request is intended to be limited along these lines. We are assuming, therefore, that it will not be necessary to supply information concerning such things as trips made to Washington by our officials, attorneys, or others pertaining to routine business handled with governmental agencies such as the Bureau of Internal Revenue, Department of Agriculture, Federal Trade Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, and others. We assume also that you are not interested in information relative to our maintaining a sales office in Washington or the expenses of sales representatives making trips to Washington. The company has made a number of gifts to charitable institutions, such as community chests, hospitals, YMCA, American Red Cross, Tuberculosis Association, March of Dimes, Heart Association, and others. It is our assumption that your inquiry is not intended to cover such items.

Wherever inquiries arose as to the scope of the questionnaire, they were clarified by telephone and personal contact with staff members. In order that all corporations who received the letter might have the benefit of the information given to those who were in doubt, I directed that a second letter be sent to the original 166 corporations. That letter reads as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON
LOBBYING ACTIVITIES,
June 10, 1950.

GENTLEMEN: With reference to my letter dated May 31, 1950, requesting certain information for the benefit and use of the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, the following points should be observed in clarification of the scope of the letter:

(a) Travel expenses: This item is not intended to cover expenses of trips to Washington made for the sole purpose of conducting sales or other business operations, nor is it intended to cover trips for the purpose of handling nonlegislative matters before departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government.

(b) Washington office: This item likewise is not intended to cover costs of a Washington office maintained solely for sales or other regular business operations, or for handling nonlegislative matters before departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government.

(c) Printed or duplicated matter: This item does not relate to material dealing with the administration of existing statutes which is distributed to supervisory employees. Expenditures, however, for duplicated or printed matter having legislative significance should not be limited to payments to the eight organizations enumerated in my letter of May 31, 1950, but should include payment to any other organizations which prepare or distribute literature on issues having legislative significance.

(d) Advertising: This item, of course, does not relate to ordinary business advertising, but to institutional or other advertising dealing with public issues having legislative significance.

(e) Contributions: This item does not relate to contributions to charitable or eleemosynary institutions.

If your company has any special problems with respect to my letter of May 31, 1950, that are not covered by the foregoing points, I shall be glad to help resolve them in a way that will provide the relevant facts for the committee's study without unreasonably burdening the respondents.

In some cases, I appreciate that additional time may be required to complete the preparation of information requested. I trust

that some sections, however, can be supplied by June 15, 1950, and that the balance may be supplied by June 30, 1950.

Yours very truly,

FRANK BUCHANAN, *Chairman.*

The cooperation of these corporations in the phase of our work will assist us materially in our efforts to clarify and strengthen the Federal Lobbying Act.

Settlement of World Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recently at the University of Tampa, in Florida, I heard Dr. Alberto Lleras, formerly president of Columbia, and now Secretary General of the Organization of American States, make a speech on the settlement of world problems. I take pleasure in having inserted in the RECORD the following interesting excerpts from Dr. Lleras' thought-provoking address:

Every day, both in this country and abroad, we hear it said that the United States lacks experience in international affairs, lacks a definite foreign policy and good judgment in the management of its relations with other countries. The fact is, however, that in that section of the world in which the United States has had occasion to work out its international course over the longest period of time and under normal conditions, it has produced a genuine masterpiece. In its inter-American dealings are to be found intelligence and elasticity, self-control and tact, and the courage to promote great ideals without fear of the consequences—because the difficult thing for a great power to do is to refrain from using its strength, substituting reason for force, without forfeiting its prestige. The inter-American policy of the United States not only has provoked no resistance, but it has been accepted with enthusiasm by the other nations. It has been worked out in close cooperation with the 20 other states that are members of our Organization, and if the rest of the countries of the world really want to know what is the ultimate objective of United States foreign policy, they need only examine the commitments this Nation has made in the Organization of American States and its behavior since 1933 in this part of the world, where every development can vitally affect its own interests and its own security.

This policy has not been arrived at overnight, and it has not always been in effect. It is the fruit of experience, and the final result of a courageous rectification. It is not usual for the world's great powers to correct their conduct, nor to learn from the experience of others. That is why the inter-American policy of the United States deserves such high praise. In its early days the intercourse between this country and the other nations of the hemisphere started out very much along the same lines as that of any strong state toward weaker neighbors—the use of military force, ruthless territorial expansion, armed intervention, economic penetration, diplomatic pressure. One section of public opinion here applauded these tactics which, to a certain extent, could be construed as a sign that the Nation had reached the status of a world power. Those were the days of manifest destiny. At that time all the nations of Europe dreamed of empire, and in the United States there were those who believed that the natural limits of its empire should, for the moment, be the two great oceans and the two poles.

Of course, from such a point of view the imperialistic exploits of this country were very successful. All the more credit is due, therefore, to the reaction in American public opinion that put an end to them. This is why today we are not witnessing the liquidation of one more empire, but on the contrary the United States has 20 sincere friends in the world who feel a sense of political solidarity with this Nation. It is thereby relieved of continental cares at a time when it must conserve its energies to decide its own fate as well as that of the world at large in these critical times.

The tremendous moral power of the United States in any type of cold war resides in the very thing that the skeptical and the timid regard as its greatest weakness: the fact that its international course cannot be arrived at through scheming, is not the fruit of secret understandings between experts, but is molded openly, haphazardly, in public places, with millions of men taking part who consider that they all have a right to express their opinions on the course to be followed by their country. The weakness of a democracy may appear to be very great in the face of its enemies that are able to silently plan their strokes, strategems, maneuvers, and war, without consulting anything but their physical ability to carry out their schemes. But that has been the way of all tyrants in the domestic order, and yet they have never succeeded in prolonging their personal domination or in perpetuating their systems after popular distrust had grown strong and the underdogs had a chance to learn how many they were. The cold war, and world war III if it should come some day, will be won in the end by that nation or group of nations that can inspire the greatest amount of confidence among the greatest number of men, and we know of only one system that has constistently succeeded in so doing: democracy.

Why is this? Let us select any country in the American family of nations, say the smallest and weakest of them all. Let us suppose that its territorial integrity and independence are threatened by the United States. It appeals to the Organization of American States for help, invoking the American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. Let us further assume that the other nineteen nations of America will bring in a verdict of guilty to the charge that the United States had violated the rules and obligations of inter-American intercourse, as would almost certainly occur. It is obvious that in such a case no physical sanctions would avail to check the aggressor. But have you considered what would be the reaction of United States public opinion in such an event? Can you conceive of the United States Government undertaking such a risky adventure; or any administration insisting on such a course against the will of the people?

Every land knows that in dealing with a democracy it need have no fear of aggression, nor of unpleasant surprises. That is why a system like the inter-American has such irresistible appeal, and if a similar one were adopted for the entire world, public opinion everywhere would vote overwhelmingly in favor of a system that guarantees freedom from fear.

There is one more characteristic of the inter-American system that we do not find in like degree in any other international policy. That is the principle of nonintervention that I have already mentioned. In my opinion the evolution of international life will be retarded until this principle is adopted for the entire world and followed faithfully, as in the Americas. The nations cannot be won over by merely offering them peace and security, for this can be promised by any power with the physical might to guarantee an alliance of the traditional and well-known sort, like the protectorate. Many nations have preferred and continue to prefer insecurity to the protectorate.

What would induce all the nations to give their sincere support to the international organizations would be an effective guaranty that no state or group of states would interfere in their domestic affairs. But this assurance, unfortunately, cannot be given as long as the veto is granted precisely to those powers that are in the position to interfere. On the contrary, the veto is a powerful weapon for intervention, a weapon that is superior to the military pressure of former days, because it is less dramatic and spectacular. Around each nation enjoying the veto is formed a sphere of influence that will inevitably attract other states wishing to share in that international advantage, even at the expense of their independence. Furthermore, collective international action against an act of intervention on the part of a nation armed with the veto is utterly out of the question. The American States, including of course the United States, can offer the world as their greatest contribution to the welfare of humanity, the example of a hemisphere from which intervention has been abolished, both in theory and in practice. The totalitarian states are interventionist by definition, by their very nature. They can only conceive of their own type of world, and they sincerely believe that they must incorporate other nations into their ssytem, whose final perfection will be reached when it embraces the entire world.

The United States can well declare, with the corroboration of 20 weaker nations loyally allied to it in an efficient international organization, that it is the practical champion of the principle of nonintervention, and it can invite all the oppressed nations of the world to look upon the inter-American system and decide whether they would not prefer something similar rather than that ominous liberation that has fallen to their lot. In describing the organization of which I happen at present to be secretary general, I should just like to say that if we wanted to produce an uncontrollably strong upsurge of feeling beyond those silent frontiers where all hope seems lost, we could not select a better or more legitimate spur than the transmission by the Voice of America to each of the countries behind the iron curtain of the discussions held in the sessions of our assemblies, where the 21 nations of the New World honestly practice international democracy.

Printing of Business Envelopes by the Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. WALSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, our Postmaster General, who has recently seen fit to curtail the delivery of mail throughout this country on a pretext of economy, is allowing a subsidy to exist within his own Department in the printing of envelopes.

Many business firms in our country are taking advantage of this Government service in the printing of business envelopes. The cost of these envelopes and the printing of the same is partially borne by the taxpayer.

For the life of me I do not see why the Post Office Department should print and sell envelopes to the general public at a loss to the Department and the taxpayer. This country is sufficiently supplied with fine men and women who are in the printing business, and a portion of their income is derived from the printing of letterheads and envelopes. Now we see that the United States Post Office Department is taking a part of this job away from the printer, the printing of envelopes, and yet this same printer, as a taxpayer, is forced to pay his share of the tax to help pay for the Post Office deficit that is partially brought on by the cost of printing envelopes for his neighboring businessman.

It is my view that the Postmaster General should correct this evil and at once. The Department should deliver the mail and let the printers do the printing.

Freedom of the Printing Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the June 10, 1950, issue of Editor and Publisher, makes clear that freedom of the press includes the printing press:

FREEDOM OF THE PRINTING PRESS

The first amendment to the United States Constitution guaranteed a free press.

In the language of the late eighteenth century, "press" referred to the mechanical device—then the "hand press"—which placed the ink impressions on paper. The first amendment was a guaranty to the people to be able to own and use a press without governmental interference.

Since then, through common usage, freedom of the press to most people has been transferred to our newspapers, books, and magazines—the product instead of the machine. Actually, the guaranty still applies to the physical equipment—the printing press—and neither the Congress nor the courts have ever said otherwise.

Now, a congressional committee investigating lobbying is seeking to force users of the printing press to divulge information on the amount of money spent and received, what press was used, who bought the books, etc. Such data is not only being asked of the Committee for Constitutional Government but from 166 business corporations. The latter inquiry is directed at those who have run copy dealing with public issues which might be the subject of Federal legislative action.

Every issue of every newspaper and practically every magazine carries editorials dealing with public issues which might be the subject of Federal legislative action. The committee might well ask those publications who their subscribers and their advertisers are. The issue is the same.

The Committee for Constitutional Government has availed itself of the right to use a printing press to print books on issues confronting the people just as other groups have done in the century and a half of our existence as a Nation. The 166 corporations, and many individuals, have availed themselves of the right to hire the use of a press and the services of someone else to print and distribute their views.

The current investigation of the House committee is an invasion of the guaranteed right of the American people to own, hire, or use a printing press without interference.

American Family Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech I made at a communion breakfast at St. Anselm's Church, Swissvale, Pa., on June 11, 1950:

The basis of our way of life is the family. Many who talk about democracy restrict their thoughts to individual freedom. And while I am agreed that the liberty of the individual is an essential factor in setting off our way of life from totalitarian living, I believe that the determining factor, whether we shall remain democratic or fall prey to totalitarianism, will be the status of American family life.

I like to think of the family as the unit we are all concerned with when we make basic political and economic decisions. For I know that if everything is all right with the American family, I need not have much concern with the future welfare of our great Nation. I am in agreement with the statement of the American hierarchy that the family is a divine institution. Attacks upon the family will prove disastrous. Attempts to weaken individual loyalty toward it will eventually destroy us.

None of us is a creature of the State. Nor are any of us lone wolves in the sense that we act naturally for individual selfish ends. We struggle within the most complex economic marketplace ever known to mankind to provide our families with the essentials of life. And we are happiest when we know that our families are content, secure, and healthy.

All of our tastes, attitudes, and personalities are molded by our family life. There are some who speak of governments dictating to citizens, but this is not possible where family life is stable and strong.

How important is family life in determining our tastes, temperaments, attitudes, and personalities? Home. Who knows any other word so filled with warmth and joy? Our formative years we spend in the bosom of our family. Family life is the child's world, and ever throughout his adolescence the youth returns to it as the anchor of his existence. Would anyone question what has been most responsible in molding the youth as he stands on the threshold of maturity?

And what does family life mean to mothers and fathers? Family life gives dignity and peace and security to the mother. It exercises an ennobling and steadying influence upon the father. In both mother and father it establishes and develops a real sense of responsibility and fosters their growth in selflessness, sacrifice, and patience.

The true strength of a government is the stability of family life within its boundaries. The family is the social cell. The family produces the citizen. While school is a strong aid to the home, good citizens must first be good persons. Virtue is the basis of good citizenship and virtue is best developed in a good home. No nation can be greater than its families. A nation with weak family ties is a weak nation; a nation with poor families, families with little hope, or disintegrated family life will fall easy prey to the false promises of communism. The best bulwark against communism is a nation with strong and healthy family ties.

The requisites for stable and healthy family life are these: (1) There must be permanence in its establishment and prospects; (2) it must be free from unwarranted intervention; (3) it must have economic security; (4) it must be religious.

I mention these because I want you to know that my concern with legislation in Washington is guided by these principles. I ask myself: Will this bill weaken or strengthen family life? And you would be surprised how much more satisfaction I derive from making decisions on this basis than do some of my colleagues who struggle with a complicated set of unknowns every time a bill comes up for consideration.

My concern is to make family life stronger. And I must admit that there are many dupes of the Communists today who believe they are operating in the best interest of their country by weakening family life or by keeping it down to a low level of existence.

For example, I am in favor of a large-scale housing program. How else can we have large families if housing is scarce? How can we have happy families if children must be raised in crowded tenements amid disease and squalor?

I have fought hard for extending and increasing the benefits of our Social Security program. Can we have a healthy and stable family life if the breadwinner is constantly wracked with worry about his job. Children derive their sense of security or insecurity from their parents. What chance do they have for peace of mind or peace of soul if parents are tense with economic worries?

I favor broadening and increasing old-age benefits. For I believe that our older citizens who have raised their families and have sent them forth into the world to repeat their job must be given the opportunity to spend their remaining years in dignity.

I am for all legislation which will strengthen the family institution. If I thought otherwise I would have no political focus.

Politics has meaning only as it benefits our citizens. Politics as a game of personal power and selfish personal considerations is like a mechanical heart. It may keep our political body running for a while, but in the end it will fail us.

Only by retaining our political focus on family life will we be providing an unfailing support for the vitues which safeguard the home and give nobility to the Nation.

Doom's Been Eating Well

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I do not think we can stress too often the contrast between the terrible verbal portraits of the prophets of economic doom in this Nation and our present and growing state of prosperity. This editorial from the June 10 issue of the distinguished independent newspaper, the Milwaukee Journal, cites the case of

Tom Girdler effectively. With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach the editorial:

DOOM'S BEEN EATING WELL

Tom M. Girdler, the steel magnate who preached doom and perdition and the loss of American liberties back in the 1930's, spoke out again recently at a meeting of the Controllers' Institute of America.

America, if you haven't guessed it, is still rushing headlong down the path of lost opportunities and lost freedom, according to Mr. Girdler. State socialism is closing the black curtain of the dark ages over the land that once promised liberty and justice for all. Grass is covering the streets and tyranny stalks the highways. Opportunity is lost. Freedom is a mockery.

The Louisville Courier-Journal took a look at the "good old days" that Mr. Girdler yearns for and the "dark ages" that he deplores. When Mr. Girdler took over the Republic Steel chairmanship in 1929, the entire steel industry was producing 56,443,472 tons. Total manufacturing income was $5,632,000,000 in the last year of the era, 1932.

Then came the decade of decadence in which liberty and opportunity allegedly flew the coop. At the end of the deluge, in 1948, steel produced 88,640,740 tons. Manufacturing income was $68,217,000,000. Steel income alone reached $8,653,000,000—or $3,021,000,000 more than all industry grossed in the last year of liberty, 1932.

As a matter of fact, corporation dividends of $6,495,000,000 in 1949 were $863,000,000 more than total manufacturing income of the year when freedom allegedly died.

Somebody sneaked opportunity in there somewhere. Or maybe it's just that Mr. Girdler has been too busy making money for Republic Steel to notice what's been going on or to revise that speech of doom he first started giving almost 20 years ago.

Miracle in the Thirty-seventh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, a miracle has come to pass in the Thirty-seventh Congressional District.

For the first time since your Congressman took office in 1939, a courageous newspaper editor has taken his life in his hands and dared speak a word of praise for EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

This marked man is the editor of the Chenango American and has braved the wrath of 20 printers' devils for writing a complimentary editorial in my direction.

From now on his name is mud so far as the hate-HALL journalistic fraternity is concerned. But he has broken the ice, and for such heroism should be recognized as a great patriot.

It takes real fortitude to brook the condemnation of the mighty newspaper dictatorship in Broome, Chenango, and Madison Counties, bound together as it is for the common purpose of smearing out of office the representative of the people.

The Chenango American is not a large publication, but this congressional district should thank its stars that an editor with as fair and brave an attitude as Mr. Oscar Swenson's exists.

His shining example of free American editorial comment makes one take heart when one considers the jungle of jargon and the maze of metaphors which the anti-Hall fourth estate is handing any American who now and then is fearless enough to express himself in my behalf.

The Chenango American is a great American newspaper. Pity it is that such strength of purpose this gallant weekly possesses cannot be magnified a hundredfold to counteract the viciousness and destruction being wreaked upon constitutional government in our section by the smug tyrants in the Triple Cities and their Oneida satellite who daily heave gooey jobs of printers' ink at the duly elected, making him the target of the greatest smear campaign in history.

In order to show freedom-loving Americans over the country as well as at home that fair editorial appraisal still asserts itself up our way, albeit seldom, I ask permission to insert the following editorial from the Chenango American:

[From the Chenango American of Thursday, May 25, 1950]

CONGRESSMAN HALL DOES IT AGAIN

You have to hand it to Mr. HALL. He gets things done for the home folks.

Our big city journalistic cousin (the Binghamton Press) speaks of Mr. HALL in a derisive manner, labeling him as "a mere errand boy."

Not having a finger in any political pie, and being just one of the home folks, we are grateful for having an errand boy in Congress who is willing to lend a hand to help the small guy.

It is a source of comfort and pride to know that our Representative from this district is not carried away with bigness to the point he forgets the little people's problems.

What Do You Know About the American Flag?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD the timely editorial What Do you Know About the American Flag? that appeared in the June 13, 1950, issue of the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald:

WHAT DO YOU KNOW ABOUT THE AMERICAN FLAG?

Tomorrow is Flag Day. In Pennsylvania, it is a legal holiday, elsewhere just an informally noted occasion for people to show the colors and maybe take out a moment to think about the idea it symbolizes. For proceedings in the District, see below in this editorial.

THE WORDS IN THE PLEDGE

What do you know about the flag? Do you know how it originated, how to display it properly? Could you say the whole Pledge to the Flag out loud by yourself, if you had to?

Here is that pledge and it is worth not only memorizing, but if you think about what it says, you cannot help being rewarded:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands; one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

That pledge, like the United States of America, itself, started out in an obscure way. But as the United States of America today is a nation that must be considered in the calculations of all the people on this earth, so also is the pledge to the flag repeated thousands of times every day all across our Nation. It has a mighty meaning and significance.

How did the pledge start? One Francis Bellamy on the editorial staff of the Youth Companion, in Boston, wrote it for the celebration of Columbus Day back in 1892. It caught on gradually with the whole country.

School children learn it. Luncheon clubs open their meetings with it. Civic organizations make it a formal part of their proceedings. Fraternal societies make it a binding part of their rituals.

It is simple and short, but it concentrates within it enough distilled power and dedication to keep any American's life on a true course, if he will but think of what it says, as he repeats the words.

The American colonies in revolt against Britain never had a flag in common, when they started out together. Some say the first flag to come close to our present design was raised by John Paul Jones from his ship, *Alfred*, on December 3, 1775.

WHO MADE IT FIRST?

General Washington displayed this same flag a month later, and somewhere in and around there grew the legend of Betsy Ross using Washington's pencil sketch for Old Glory, with stars and stripes.

Others argue that Francis Hopkinson, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, and designer of coins and paper money for the fledgling Nation, was the actual draftsman.

However that may be, Congress enacted a law on June 14, 1777:

"*Resolved*, That the flag of the 13 United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be 13 stars, white on a blue field."

It is in memory of that resolution that Flag Day is held every year. The exercises here in Washington will be in the Sylvan Theater at 3 o'clock featuring music by bands and a chorus.

Government employees, in the discretion of their office chiefs, will be allowed time off to attend without being charged for it. Many private companies follow the same rule.

Things you should know about showing and handling the flag are all set forth in Public Law No. 829, approved June 22, 1942, and are too many to repeat here in full. But certain of the points everybody should know and remember, in handling the flag at all.

RULES FOR THE FLAG

The time for showing the flag is from sunrise to sunset, except on special occasions when it is appropriately a part of some public ceremony after dark.

It should always be hoisted briskly and lowered ceremoniously, never any hesitation or halting of its movement.

The flag can properly be flown on any good weather day, but especially on legal holidays, days of ceremony such as States' birthdays and days of Presidential proclamation.

In a parade, the United States flag should be on the right of the line of march, or in a display of flags, in the center of the display.

It should never be draped across a car hood, or made part of a float in a parade,

but may be flown from its staff on a car or float.

It should not be used to cover a statue at an unveiling, and on a platform, if it is not raised on a staff it should be spread on the back wall as if it were flying, with the field of stars at stage right. When you fly the flag at half mast, raise it to the top, first, then drop it mid-way.

HOW TO SHOW REAL RESPECT

Never use the flag as drapery or festoonery, never dip it before any other flag, and always when the national anthem is played or the pledge to allegiance is given, turn and face the flag squarely with head uncovered (men), and right hand over your heart. Also for men, don't hold your hat in your left hand. In your right.

Finally, don't mark up a flag, or make sofa pillows or handkerchiefs of flags or anything like that, and if one does get spoiled in any way, don't leave it around. Burn it.

Those are the basic rules of appropriate treatment for the flag, as an object. To treat the flag with proper respect, as a symbol of all this Nation stands for, be American.

No American has any problem figuring out what that means.

Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BINGHAMTON, *June 6, 1950.*

Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR EDDIE: For a long time, I fell for the lousy smears your big enemies try to kill you off with but I want you to know I'm fed up with 'em.

From now on, you can count on me and I'm going to tell you why.

I used to sit in on a weekly "bull session" held by a couple of big shots and a few of their fawning hangers-on. About all it amounted to was a "Hate HALL" jamboree. You were the principal subject and the only target during the whole small talk.

All I say I fell in with them, because frankly I needed a job and I figured they were the boys to see. I played up to them and agreed you were all wrong until one day I asked them a favor.

Well, that was just too bad. They laughed at me for wanting too much, and called me a few nasty names and then promptly excluded me from their fraternity.

So, EDDIE, I'm in your corner now along with a lot of others who are sick of them and their broken promises and their do-nothing attitude, yes, and their silly hatred for you.

EDDIE, you've done more for this district in the 12 years you've served us, than all these pompous, overbearing rich guys have done or ever will do for anybody except themselves.

Why should the people here follow their lead in fighting you, when they never did anything for them and never will?

From where I sit, I can see the plans they are making and the money they are spending. The support being bought for their candidate is based on the vicious stories they've tried to make people believe about you.

You're right when you say they're doing just like Hitler did. When he wanted to get a man out of the way, his stooges gutted the man's character.

People have got a clear-cut opportunity to decide whether they want to keep the open-door policy you've given them for so long or go back to the old days of the bosses, when you had to go through a dozen different "influential" people to get an answer out of a Congressman.

So, EDDIE, here's luck to you. You've got the hardest fight this time because of the big money being put in against you. There'll be more of it than for all your other campaigns put together.

One thing they're doing which may kick back on them if people get wise. I mean the way they're trying to shut your friends up by scaring them. I've noticed a lot of it and I hope you'll put the people wise.

I'd rather see you in there, EDDIE, than the nincompoop they're behind, because, if he gets in, he won't have to fuss with the ordinary folks to keep his job. All he will worry about pleasing are the million-dollar babies.

Sincerely,

W. V. H.

Protect Our Own Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of us in Congress who are greatly concerned about the jobs of American citizens.

In my congressional district the principal industries are coal and railroads.

As long as I am in Congress I am going to fight to protect the jobs of coal miners and railroaders against the flood of cheap, foreign oil and goods that are a menace to the American workingman.

The following editorial from the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune, dated June 10, 1950, is a timely discussion of the subject:

PROTECT OUR OWN INTERESTS

In an important sense, the future of America has been placed in the hands of our State Department. International relations have come to be a dominant influence upon American life. They reach into every segment of living.

The cost of foreign aid, which never ceases, is costing Americans money through high taxation. And now, State Department policies affecting trade and tariffs are having their effect upon our economy.

For 5 years, our State Department has been intent upon its job of foreign relations. It has set certain objectives which from time to time have been changed.

But, it is apparent that in the setting of these objectives, it has held its collective eye attentively upon only these objectives and has tended consistently to judge its accomplishments within its own sphere, and without direct relationship to the effect of these policies upon our own country, regardless of how favorable they may be to other countries, and our relations with them.

In Washington there has been in progress investigation and hearings on the question of imports of foreign oil, which is flooding into this country in great quantities.

Coal and independent oil producers testified this week. But railroads also are deeply concerned.

Speaking for the welfare of his own district, in which coal and railroads are major industries, Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT the other day told the Senate investigating committee that nearly 18,000 soft-coal miners have lost their jobs and 177 mines have been abandoned or shut down since last year.

This condition, the Congressman said, "can be mostly charged to the Government's policy of permitting the importation of cheap foreign oil."

Early this year Mr. VAN ZANDT called attention of the House of Representatives to the fact that cheap foreign oil is being "dumped on the American market at the rate of 885,000 barrels a day. This is an increase of 72 percent over the daily average of 1947. And of this total, 460,000 barrels are of heavy fuel oil used to generate power. This quantity of oil is equal to 115,000 tons of coal a day.

"Over the period of a year, this foreign oil displaces 40,000,000 tons of coal which means the loss of $104,000,000 in miners' wages. It also means a loss of $130,000,000 in freight revenue to the railroads of the Nation, of which about $59,000,000 would represent the wages of 16,389 railroad employees."

The Altoona Congressman quoted Mr. Thomas Kennedy of the United Mine Workers as saying that the steady increase in imported oil directly affected 25,000 coal miners in 1949 and that the anticipated 1950 imports of foreign oil will affect 50,000 soft-coal miners this year.

Said the local Congressman, "I shall continue to oppose the administration's concept of reciprocal trade agreements that do not protect American industry. Instead, these trade agreements of the administration fail to recognize the peril in allowing foreign goods made by slave labor or cheap labor to be dumped in the United States and thus to deprive American workmen of their jobs in various industries."

The State Department opposes any change in this condition, for one reason that these imports help maintain friendly relations with other nations.

It is possible to think of many expedients for winning friends. Not all of them are feasible.

The American on the home front, concerned with America, must take heed to these things, because the State Department, and so much of official Washington, is preoccupied with lands across the oceans.

The combination of foreign economic and military support plus the competition with our own business which we have created in foreign industries plus the increasing importation of foreign products made with cheaper labor will become a burden too great for America to bear unless it is abruptly halted, and unless State Department policies are tempered by congressional and administration efforts to see that in our official endeavor to win friends and influence people abroad, we do not blindly crush our own people at home.

Representative VAN ZANDT is endeavoring to do his part in protecting American interests at home, where our primary interests, after all, lie. He has introduced House Resolution 199 to create a joint congressional committee on fuel policy, and opposes this administration laxity in killing home industries to cater to unlimited foreign policy.

Mining Industry Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SANBORN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement made by me before

the Committee on Reciprocity of the Tariff Commission regarding the situation in our domestic mining industry as it pertains to lead. We are treading on dangerous ground if we continue our policy of curtailment of domestic production and expansion of foreign production.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN SANBORN BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON RECIPROCITY, TARIFF COMMISSION, JUNE 1, 1950

Numerous miners from Idaho would be here today, I am sure, to express their strong objections to the inclusion of lead items in the forthcoming Torquay negotiations, if they had the funds for the trip to Washington, but the precipitous drop in the price of lead—one of the sharpest declines in history, from 21½ cents to 10½ cents—which has only recently been partially restored, has caused the small miners, at any rate, to husband their resources and, instead, they have asked me to give their thoughts and mine on the lead tariff.

Your Committee on Reciprocity Information has already received a statement filed on behalf of the emergency lead committee of 21 lead producers, a statement and petition that have received wide circulation in my State, and I hereby subscribe 100 percent to the position of the emergency lead committee on the lead tariff, which is, in substance, that rates higher than those in effect in 1930 are now called for to protect lead mining in the United States adequately.

I shall not take time here to duplicate the plea of the lead miners, already filed with you, but I do wish to make a few observations of my own.

In the first place, I don't think this critical period of the cold war, when the very future of our country is at stake, is any time to make a tariff adjustment in a war industry so important as lead. Tariff changes have long-range implications. Mining is a long-range industry. Mines cannot be found and developed overnight. Tariff cuts tear down and destroy mining; they don't improve it. They don't encourage capital to go into the hazardous business of mining. This reasoning seems so elementary to me that I am surprised even to see lead included as one of the items on the negotiable list for Torquay. I am confident the military authorities will bear me out that the job of rearming this country, and part of the rest of the world, requires all the lead production of which the country is capable, and that a sound and prosperous metal-mining industry is indispensable to the defense of the Nation. Congress has already declared itself in unmistakable terms as wishing to reduce our dependence on foreign sources of mineral supply.

Idaho ranks second in the Union in point of lead production. Idaho has vast unexplored areas awaiting the prospector's pick, and Idaho's great agricultural and mineral resources contribute an important share of the fundamental wealth of the country. Agriculture receives large-scale assistance from the Government. The mining industry receives no direct aid from the Government. Congress has been importuned at this very session, and at previous sessions, to grant specific monetary assistance to mining in the West. So far it has not done so. I don't think it will be necessary if the sound American incentive which the mining industry has long enjoyed—the tariff—is increased in conformity with the present position of the lead industry.

I contend that the reasons set forth so lucidly in the painstaking analysis of the Emergency Lead Committee petitioning the United States Tariff Commission for relief under the "escape clause" in the Mexican Trade agreement, are devastating in their logic. It is inexplicable to me why the Torquay Conference has included lead in its list of commodities to be subject to trading, in the light of the injury already suffered by the lead mining industry of my State, and elsewhere throughout the west, by virtue of the "coin clipping" or devaluation of foreign currencies. Devaluation of currencies has incontestably given foreign lead producers an indirect subsidy, besides wiping out the current tariff protection accorded the lead mining industry. The good people of my home State are unable to understand how the Committee on Reciprocity Information can, with a straight face, now consider a further cut in the lead tariff. If this is the end result of the Reciprocal Trade policy, then I feel sure Congress will wish to do something about it, when the act comes up for renewal. Congress can, at least, endeavor to protect American industry from the effect of unfair international currency manipulation.

I would like to take a moment to point out to your committee something that may be easily overlooked, as it has sometimes been in the past. The lead tariff rates to be effective must cover both the raw materials and finished products, otherwise loopholes will exist to undermine the basic protection given lead in ores and metal.

In other words, there should be compensatory protection on lead pigments and metallic lead products over the basic pig lead rates. Obviously, when one is raised, the other should be raised, and vice versa. I note, for example, that the storage battery industry and the lead pigment industry are both accorded roughly twice the protection given lead. This is wrong in principle and decidedly unfair in practice. I am also sorry to note that the storage battery industry is asking for complete removal of the lead tariff, despite the fact that it enjoys tariff protection of 20 percent ad valorem, or over twice the rate enjoyed by the lead mining industry. I note, furthermore, that the storage battery industry does not make any suggestion that its own handsome protection be removed or reduced. This utterly selfish attitude of the storage battery industry deserves to be rebuked. If we in the United States are going on a free trade basis, let's not confine it to the mining industry. While I am on the subject, I cannot help but remark that the automobile industry, which is held up as an outstanding example of how American enterprise can meet all foreign competition, enjoys a tariff protection of 10 percent ad valorem, unchanged since 1930. Again, this is greater protection than the lead mining industry receives. I may have more to say about this phase of tariff making on the floor of the House, for I cannot understand the philosophy of some great metal consuming industries, making the most profits in their history, desiring to exploit the domestic mining industry in their eagerness for apparently still greater profits.

I endorse the forthright stand of the Emergency Lead Committee in seeking to procure relief for the lead-mining industry through the escape clause of the Mexican Trade Agreement. Many eyes in Congress are going to be focused on the petition of that committee to see what disposition is ultimately made of it, and whether or not the escape clause really means what it says—an opportunity for industries that have been injured by foreign competition to receive prompt relief.

A cursory examination I have recently made in my State shows that lead-mining properties have been injured right and left. The Day mines shut down the Monitor and Carlisle mines last fall and operations at their other mines have curtailed. Operations at the Sunset Lease near Wallace were suspended last fall. The Highland-Surprise mine at Pine Creek curtailed operations quite drastically about a month and a half ago. Several of the operators in the Pine Creek district have during the last 5 or 6 months continued in operation by mining the high-grade ore only and curtailing quite drastically on development. I don't know how long they will be able to continue operations under these conditions, but it is not unlikely that they will pretty soon find themselves in the same position as the above-mentioned Highland Surprise mine. The John George Lease has discontinued all underground operations, and is now only working a few men on an old mine dump.

I speak in the interests of labor, as well as the lead miners in my State, in my appearance before you. I am anxious to do all I can to preserve the high wage scale currently being paid American lead miners compared with the wages paid in other parts of the world. I do not think the American lead miner should be subjected to competition from areas where labor is of the communistic slave type, or is paid a pittance compared with this country.

In conclusion, I cannot think of anything better calculated to intensify the resentment and bitterness which exists among the mining people in my State toward the foreign policy of the Government, with its solicitude for finding and equipping foreign mining, and to foster isolationism in the West, than for the Committee on Reciprocity Information to advocate a cut in the lead rate.

Proposing That a Civilian Congressional Medal Be Awarded Joseph Leib for Sponsoring Legislation That Saved the Government Over $36,000,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in the Nation's newspapers relative to the distinguished service rendered by Joseph Leib in behalf of the United States Government, particularly in sponsoring legislation that ultimately saved the taxpayers over $36,000,000,000.

Leib has labored tirelessly and without compensation for many humanitarian causes and as Robert St. John, noted radio commentator said, over NBC on December 8, 1943, "This young man has never received the recognition that he deserves."

We in America have always lived under the philosophy of giving credit where credit is due.

In this connection I believe that our Government has not rendered full justice in this case, and therefore, I respectfully propose for consideration awarding a civilian Congressional Medal to Joseph Leib, 3908 North Fourth Street, Arlington, Va., for distinguished and meritorious service to the United States Government beyond the call of duty.

Mr. Speaker, several articles have been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD giving an authoritative as well as a comprehensive account of the inci-

dents behind this case, which I believe corrborate the reasons for the abovementioned proposal.

On April 25, 1950, Representative W. KINGSLAND MACY, of New York, covered the matter in detail which appeared in the RECORD under the title: "This Nation should honor Leib for his crusade that saved the Government over $36,000,000,000."

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, on May 10, 1943, placed in the RECORD a statement regarding the activities of Mr. Leib "which contributed to the war effort."

And in the RECORD of January 27, 1947, Representative Raymond S. Springer, of Indiana, discussed the history and origin of the Truman committee and its relation to Mr. Leib.

The indexes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD list many other explanatory articles far too numerous to mention here.

Proper recognition for Mr. Leib's unselfish and splendid public service has long been overdue and it is respectfully hoped that action will be taken by the Congress to award one who has contributed so much to this Nation, not only in playing such a vital role in presenting legislation that saved the American taxpayers such a fabulous sum of money—but also for his untiring efforts in correcting defective production methods of planes for the Armed Forces and his work in aircraft accident prevention during the recent world war.

This activity alone saved many lives—for which every American should be duly grateful.

Calls for Curb on Shoe Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include recent news stories appearing in the Marlboro (Mass.) Enterprise and the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, as follows:

[From the Marlboro (Mass.) Enterprise of May 15, 1950]

CALLS FOR CURB ON SHOE IMPORTS—REPRESENTATIVE PHILIP PHILBIN DIRECTS ATTACK ON EUROPEAN PRODUCTS—MOVE MAY EVENTUALLY BE OF GREAT AID TO MARLBORO SHOE MANUFACTURERS; DENOUNCES SOVIET SHIPMENTS

MARLBORO.—Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of the Third Massachusetts District, today acted in defense of Marlboro shoe manufacturers when he called for immediate curbs on imports of shoes from Czechoslovakia. In a House speech, the Clinton Representative said the "'Soviet-dumped' imports constitutes a direct attack upon American labor, American business, and American prosperity."

Aware that the prosperity of several communities in his district depends largely upon production of shoes, Representative PHILBIN appealed to his colleagues to aid in protecting local manufacturers at the expense of Communist-dominated industrialists.

PHILBIN's remarks follow, in part:

"I am greatly disturbed about the growing imports of shoes coming into this country from behind the iron curtain and competing with our own American produced shoes.

"It is true that the well-being of many communities in my section of the country depends upon the shoe and leather industry, which employs thousands of workers at high wages.

"Today, in Boston stores and in stores throughout Massachusetts and the Nation, women's shoes made in Czechoslovakia are being offered to the public.

"These shoes are shipped into the United States from behind the iron curtain and are sold to importers at prices which are less than the American manufacturer must pay for leather and other materials and not allowing for the high wages paid American workers.

"There is no question but that every pair of these Czechoslovakian shoes purchased in this country, feeds good American dollars into Communist dominated areas, encourages and builds up totalitarian labor methods and undermines American prosperity and the free labor of our own shoe industry.

"It is estimated by the trade that at the present rate of imports, over a million pairs of Czechoslovakian shoes will come into this country in 1950. These will be dumped here by an economy organized on totalitarian principles at below the American costs of production. In fact, some state that they can be sold in American markets at half the price of American made shoes.

"I think that Members of the House will agree that this is a very serious and alarming situation. I have strongly protested it many times with appropriate officials of this Government. It is unconscionable in my mind that it should be permitted to continue when it can be shown clearly that these imports, these Soviet-dumped goods, constitute a direct attack upon American labor, American business and American prosperity.

"I am again urging that these imports be stopped at once in the national interest and hope that Government officials will move to this end at an early date."

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of June 3, 1950]

CZECH SHOE PROBE ORDERED

WASHINGTON, Saturday.—United States Commissioner of Customs Frank Dow has advised Representative PHILBIN, Democrat, of Massachusetts, that the final settlement of customs duties on imports of women's shoes from Czechoslovakia is being suspended until it is determined whether such shoes are being dumped on the American market.

PHILBIN recently wrote Dow, at the request of Maxwell Field, executive vice president of the New England Leather Association asking an investigation of whether the antidumping act of 1921 was being violated with respect to women's shoes from Czechoslovakia.

Dow said various investigations had been undertaken and in view of the facts developed, the final settlement of customs accounts to importers has been suspended.

IMPORTERS BOND

Until it is finally determined whether the Czechoslovakian shoes are being dumped, Dow told PHILBIN, such imported shoes are being released to importers only after they have put up special bonds protecting the Government in the event it is found that higher duties on dumped shoes are found applicable.

New England Members of Congress, particularly from Massachusetts and Connecticut, have complained that shoe imports from Czechoslovakia have been flooding the American market and causing unemployment in their States.

The Economies Made by Dismissal of 157,000 Civilian Personnel in the Defense Department Have Already Resulted in an Annual Saving of More Than One-half Billion Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the press of yesterday carried two articles which were particularly noteworthy. One was by Peter Edson, nationally known columnist and writer for the Scripps-Howard publications. The other, an Associated Press dispatch from Chester, Pa., told of an address made by the Honorable Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, before the Pennsylvania Military College located in that city.

I was most happy to note, Mr. Speaker, that two widely read Washington papers, the Washington Daily News which carried Mr. Edson's article and the Washington Evening Star, have again addressed public attention to the outstanding and proven qualities and abilities possessed by my good friend, Louis Johnson—not alone in the field of governmental administration, but in the field of statesmanship.

Mr. Edson, in his short article carried in the Daily News, told of the savings of a million dollars a day that are now being made in the administration of our national defense set-up.

In discussing the Management Advisory Committee, established by Secretary Johnson, and the work that it is doing, Mr. Edson stated:

The committee is shooting toward a savings of $2,000,000 a day * * * and ultimately hopes to reach a goal of saving $3,000,000 a day.

The savings—

Mr. Edson went on to report—

are made by closing down unnecessary bases, eliminating duplication, and reducing orders for supplies. * * * By good management of this kind, savings of from $700,000,000 to $1,000,000,000 are hoped for both this year and next.

Mr. Speaker, how well I recall that day less than a year ago and shortly after he took office, when Secretary Johnson told the congressional delegation that had assembled in the Pentagon for a conference on his projected economy drive of his ambitions to achieve the goal that Peter Edson today tells us in the press he has now attained.

There were some of us in this House who were in attendance that were not too happy when in frankness and candor Louis Johnson told of the economies that he proposed to effect by reducing operating costs and personnel in our individual congressional districts. Indeed, some openly scoffed when he said that he proposed to reduce "civilian personnel by at least 135,000 and by an annual rate of savings from the reduction of payroll and housekeeping costs alone to save well in excess of a half billion dollars."

Mr. Speaker, Louis Johnson has now made good on that one, too.

The actual figures as of January 31, 1950, show that the manpower economies in operation which had taken place since that time have already resulted in the dropping of 157,000 civilians from the payroll of the Defense Department.

Mr. Speaker, lest someone bring up the question as to whether these civilians have been replaced by military personnel, let me tell you all the record clearly supports the fact that not alone has Louis Johnson cut the civilian personnel in the Defense Establishment, but he has decreased military noncombat duties and put more enlisted men and officers in combat service and made them readied for the field.

Furthermore, that these savings are real is evidenced by the fact that despite our increased military strength as of this hour, the present strength will be maintained in 1951, and at the same time the 1951 budget request will be for about $1,000,000,000 less than was requested by Louis Johnson for the budget of 1950.

Mr. Speaker, June 6 was the sixth anniversary of D-day in Europe. D-day I shall always remember as "death day," the day that doomed 350,000 of American youth who crossed the seas to stop the hordes of the Nazi and the Fascist forces which threatened to overwhelm the whole world.

On June 6, 1950, at Chester, Pa., and on the anniversary of D-day, Louis Johnson delivered a talk to the Pennsylvania Military College. A more forceful, frank, open evaluation of the conditions that affect the peace and security of this Nation have never been spoken. So long as men like Louis Johnson are charged with securing the peace and the defense of this Nation, it will be achieved. Moreover, it will be had with a minimum of expenditures of the hard-earned dollars of American taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD the clipping taken from the Washington Evening Star:

JOHNSON IS CONVINCED COMMUNISM CAN BE HALTED SHORT OF WAR

CHESTER, PA., June 6.—Secretary of Defense Johnson said today he is convinced that "the sinister forces of Communist imperialism" can be stopped short of war.

Declaring that no one can foretell "with certainty whether we ultimately shall have to meet the challenge * * * in grim battle," Mr. Johnson added:

"I certainly hope and pray we will not, and I am firmly convinced we will not if we exploit the military, economic, political, and psychological advantages that are ours."

CAN'T MATCH AMERICA

In a commencement address at Pennsylvania Military College here the defense chief said communism has nothing to match America in any of those fields.

"Though it may seem to extend its influence here and there from time to time," Mr. Johnson added, "its victories ultimately will prove hollow. In the long run, communism will fail as have all of its forerunners that paraded under names but had spiritual quality to support them.

"Man was born to be free, and no slave state can shackle him for long," Mr. Johnson said.

Declaring that police states are afraid of themselves, their own people and their neighbors, Mr. Johnson said the United States has the great psychological advantage of not being afraid of any one.

MUST STAY ON GUARD

"But," he added, "this country realizes that a frightened nation with mass-destruction weapons in its possession may become dangerous.

"The way to meet its threat is to retain our poise and keep up our guard and not allow ourselves to develop any fright of our own," he said. "Let us continue to do all in our power to prove to the world that there is nothing to fear about America."

Mr. Johnson urged Americans to continue by their actions to convince all peoples everywhere that we are sincerely eager to extend the blessings of prosperity far and wide.

"Let us at the same time make it just as clear that we shall resist aggression, vigorously and decisively in whatever form it may come," he said.

WARNS AGAINST COMPLACENCY

"From a military standpoint," Mr. Johnson declared, "the United States can successfully meet every basic requirement. But," he added:

"We are not so strong, however, that we can afford to become complacent, indifferent, or overconfident about our national defense."

Mr. Johnson said, "America's political advantages over communism are just as formidable as our latent military prowess."

"Our traditional emphasis on the freedom, security, and happiness of the individual is appreciated," he added, "wherever men live, breathe, and hope."

Monopoly Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me over the National Broadcasting System, June 9, 1950:

MONOPOLY POWER

So widespread has been the interest in the hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, and so varied and voluminous has been the correspondence directed toward me as its chairman, that I believe the public interest would best be served by a direct presentation of the problems with which we are confronted.

The purpose of this subcommittee, let me make it clear, is to determine whether any revision of our antitrust statutes is required in order to insure the maintenance of free and competitive enterprise in America. Let me repeat this—the maintenance of free and competitive enterprise in America. The subcommittee has received the advice of distinguished citizens from all walks of life. We are now engaged in the careful examination of competitive conditions in important industries. We have just concluded an investigation of steel, and on June 19 we begin open hearings on the subject of newsprint. The successful curbing of monopoly power is of the utmost importance to the way of life of everyone of us. An essential freedom of American citizenship is the right to engage in business free of monopolistic restraints. Undoubtedly this is the reason that President Franklin Roosevelt stated that the "Sherman and Clayton Acts have become as much a part of the American way of life as the due-process clause of the Constitution."

The Sherman and the Clayton Acts are now under attack by some of the exponents of big business. Mr. Fairless, president of the United States Steel Corp., has referred to the antitrust laws as "a complete hodgepodge * * * which have been allowed to grow, like Topsy, for 60 years, and which cannot be reconciled even with each other." Our antitrust laws may well require revision and clarification. This is the job the subcommittee of which I am chairman has set out to do. Already two bills which amend the antitrust laws have been reported out of the subcommittee and have passed the House. But I am afraid that when some big-business men call for revision of the antitrust laws they really mean that these laws should be weakened. I disagree. I believe that the antitrust laws should be strengthened so that they may deal effectively with the problem of monopoly power.

Let me illustrate the problem of monopoly power. The United States Steel Corp. owns at least 51 percent of the high grade ore in the Mesabi region from which most of the iron ore for steel has been coming. If the United States Steel Corp. were to stop selling iron ore to its competitors, there would be a catastrophic situation in the steel industry. Some plants would have to be closed down and men would be thrown out of work. The steel corporation testified before my subcommittee that its policy was to continue selling iron ore to its competitors, but it also admitted that this policy, like all company policies, was subject to change. I do not say that this power will be abused, but the power is certainly there. One of the consequences of this power, as revealed before my subcommittee, is that the steel corporation has been able to give itself a 30 cents a ton discount on the ore which it sells itself—a discount so far only given to one of its competitors.

The United States Steel Corp. owns the principal railroad which must be used to transport the iron ore. The railroad is a bottleneck which must be used by the competitors of the steel corporation. This railroad makes more money than any comparable railroad suggested for comparison during the course of our hearings. In fact in some recent years, the steel corporation has made more money from its iron ore and railroad operations, than it has from all the rest of its steel-making facilities. In other words, the profit is greatest where the monopoly power is greatest, and where there is strategic control over competitors.

Monopoly power can be seen at later stages in the steel industry. Some of the big steel companies, not content to make steel, have integrated forward into the manufacture of finished and fabricated steel products. The result is that many small manufactures now find that they must buy their steel from steel companies who are directly competing with them. These steel companies hold the power of life or death over the small fabricators. By raising the price of steel, and holding down the price of the manufactured product, the steel companies can catch the small fabricator in a price squeeze and put him out of business. Companies of substantial size have been caught in this way. One fabricator from the west coast testified before the subcommittee that if the situation did not change, a majority of the fabricators on the west coast would have to go out of business. He testified that as a result of this situation his total payroll had dropped from an excess of $2,000,000 in 1949 to an estimated less than one million for 1950. The manager of one plant in Kokomo, Ind., testified that this firm had been caught in such a situation and as a result had entirely abandoned the manufacture of one product. He was struggling with a $7 a ton squeeze on his other product.

Now, I do not think it is an adequate answer to a situation of this sort to point to the magnificent record made during the

war years by large corporations or to claim that the large corporations are efficient or have contributed greatly to industrial progress. In steel, at least, the smaller firms are just as efficient if not more so than the largest company, and the record indicates that they have contributed just as much and probably more to industrial progress. And the credit for wartime production must go to small companies as well as to large. More than that, the monopoly problem is not to be treated as though an attempt to remove monopolistic restraints were an attack on business—large or small. It is not. On the contrary, it is only by removing monopolistic restraints that American business can remain free. Competition is the least regulation that business can expect, and, I should add, that it is also the best.

The few monopolists who dominate some branches of American industry ought to take warning from what happened to industry in Europe. Both France and Germany had laws against restraints of trade and in favor of free enterprise. But these laws were weak, and in addition were not effectively enforced. Monopoly power was permitted and came to be regarded as inevitable. Since competition could not be the regulator, the governments took over the controls. As a result, the cartel philosophy and the government control philosophy were merged. The way to prevent such a trend here is to show that monopoly is not inevitable and that effective competition is possible.

Monopoly power is, of course, a kind of governmental power. It is a power to fix prices. It is a power to put firms out of business or to permit them to continue when competition might force them into other fields. The important question about monopoly power is not whether it is used wisely but whether it is necessary at all. When prices are fixed either by a monopolist or by a government regulatory agency, people will always differ as to whether the particular price is fair. The prices set by OPA were not always regarded as fair. The important point is that for most American industry there ought to be no price fixing either by the government or by the monopolist. There is something wrong when leaders in the steel industry testify before two congressional committees that they set fair prices based on their costs and their concept of the public interest as though they were members of some public utility regulatory body. A short answer to such an industry ought to be that it is unfortunate when any firm or group of firms have the power to set the price. The real question then is whether such power is inevitable.

For most industries monopoly power is not inevitable. Where it exists, it is—in effect—the result of bringing separate units together under one holding company, sometimes with practically the whole continent between the plants. Usually it would be difficult to point to any additional efficiency resulting from the combination and frequently marked inefficiency results. The backward integration of such a combination into the sources of raw materials, either through outright ownership or exclusive arrangements, or connections with the sources for private capital may make it impossible for any newcomer to enter the field. These then become the areas of industrial concentration. These are the areas where the monopoly partners or oligopolies control. Here it is that three or four companies will control over 50 percent of the industry. The present antitrust laws appear inadequate to combat this situation. This is the area where legislative revision may be required. I do not believe that any automatic legislative test can be devised. Nor do I think that Government regulation through a supervisory or price regulatory agency is called for. To take that road is to back away from the ideal of free and competitive enterprise. But certainly some formula can be devised which will not impose Government regulation, will give due allowance to the requirements of efficiency and yet will call into question combinations which are attempts to secure monopoly power. This is the central problem in the revision of the antitrust laws.

Certainly for most industries such monopoly is not inevitable. In most industries there is no need for smaller companies to feel that they are beholden to a larger firm. There is no need for large firms to bring together completely separate plants located with almost the width of the continent between them until such additions amount to monopoly price-fixing powers. If our present laws are inadequate to meet this situation of monopoly power, then there is good reason for a legislative committee to investigate the possibility of revision of the law.

In any revision of the laws, consderation must be given also to international cartel agreements. The prototype of such cartel arrangements is the agreement which was made between the German I. G. Farbenindustrie and Standard Oil of New Jersey in 1929. This agreement was called by the parties a "full marriage." The agreement covered territories for the whole world and under it, Standard Oil agreed to stay out of the chemical business and I. G. Farben to stay out of the oil business. There were many such world-wide cartel arrangements about which the United States Government was not fully informed, to say the least, when the parties entered into them. For example, there was such a cartel agreement in the electric lamp industry. How such an agreement works can be seen from a memorandum written by the official of one of the smaller American lamp companies who was explaining why his company could not export lamps. He wrote as follows:

"I don't know whether I explained the situation to you, but the fact is that in the world at large the more important electrical interests, such as G. E., Siemens of Germany, Philips of Holland, etc., are closely bound together in a cartel with the result that they have entered into binding agreements, apportioning world markets between the respective companies. Accordingly, you can see that if the G. E. broke their agreement and allowed us to export into a foreign country which was assigned under the cartel agreement to a European manufacturer, that European manufacturer would have a claim to enter the American market in competition with us and probably could not be restrained from doing so. This is something which would probably not be to our advantage."

Now again, when such an arrangement occurs, the most important question is not whether the arrangement has a good or a bad effect. American citizens undoubtedly differ in their views as to tariff policies. The important thing is that this arrangement is comparable to a governmental imposition of a tariff and of export controls, but it is done secretly and beyond democratic processes.

Unfortunately such cartel arrangements are not things of the past only. Attempts have been made to revive similar cartel arrangements in important commodities. And this is a most dangerous development when our Government is spending great sums of money in an effort to reestablish industry in foreign countries and to bring about trade between them. Private arrangements can thus thwart the official policy of our Government. And such arrangements play right into the hands of those who assume competition and free enterprise are outworn ideas.

It may be difficult to fashion laws which can adequately cope with cartel arrangements which, while they affect the American consumer and are nurtured by American capital, take effect largely between foreign companies. We must recognize that for some products the American consumer is faced by restrictive arrangements—the details of which may not be fully known—but which are clearly in the cartel mode. I find it most disturbing, for example, to find that in 1944 the then president of the Newsprint Association of Canada, Mr. Charles Vining, described the newsprint industry as composed of Swedish, Finnish, Russian, and other national cartels, and called for Canadian industry to be organized in the same manner. Newsprint is most important to this country, because a free press depends upon an adequate supply. It is a challenge to legislative ingenuity and to statesmanship if American consumers are to be ruled by such foreign cartels. At the very least, some method must be found to make such agreements public. It is for these reasons that within the 10 days the Subcommittee on the Study of Monopoly Power will begin hearings on the subject of newsprint.

Much of the problem of concentration and of renewed cartelization which we face today is no doubt in part the product of a war economy. The First World War was followed by a wave of mergers and then the formation of cartel agreements. During the last few years there has been a renewal of a merger movement in this country leading to greater concentration in some segments of industry. Cartel arrangements seem to follow naturally after Government allocation programs which were necessary during the war years. Mr. Vining, the newsprint Canadian president of 1944, in fact described the wartime allocation system for newsprint as "a large-scale international cartel operated by Canada in collaboration with the United States, Britain, Australia and other countries." And undoubtedly there are some people who feel that during a period of the cold war such concentration and cartelization is inevitable.

But if the cold war is a contest between two systems, then it is imperative that our system of free and competitive enterprise be made stronger in the qualities which are indeed its real strength—namely, that it is free and that it is competitive.

Much criticism has been leveled against the work of the subcommittee as specifically motivated against big business. This is a complete misconstruction of the purpose of the committee. We are seeking ways of maintaining and strengthening a free and competitive society. We are proceeding through direct approach to determine the economic facts of life. I make no blanket charge against American industry. Most American industry is competitive. We must keep it so. I do not say the enemy of the American economic life is bigness. I say that monopoly power, however exercised, is. This is a problem that concerns us all, wage earner and management, public and private officials. And if the subcommittee succeeds in nothing else, by stimulating public interest and free and frank discussion, it will have served a most constructive purpose.

Annual and Sick Leave of Post Office Department Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution sent to me by the president, M. A.

Conly, of the Louisiana State Federation of Post Office Clerks of Coushatta, La.:

ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE

Whereas the employees of all branches of the United States Government, except the Post Office Department, enjoy the benefits of 26 days annual leave and 15 days sick leave annually; and

Whereas the employees of the postal service are limited annually to 15 days annual leave and 10 days sick leave; and

Whereas we believe that this is unfair and discriminatory; and

Whereas the conditions of employment in the postal service are rigorous, demanding a high standard of efficiency, with resultant wear and tear on the physical well-being of employees; and

Whereas the exhausting demands of postal toil are more arduous than in other Government departments: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Louisiana State Federation of Post Office Clerks in convention assembled in Baton Rouge, La., May 27–28, 1950, exert all efforts to remedy this injustice and discrimination by seeking the early enactment of legislation providing 26 days annual leave and 15 days sick leave annually for postal employees; and, be it further

Resolved, That such sick leave be allowed to accumulate without limit.

The above resolution was adopted unanimously by the convention delegates.

My Record in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN
SMALL BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS,
Chicago, Ill., May 8, 1950.

DEAR MR. BUSINESSMAN: In response to your inquiry about the record of Congressman EDWIN ARTHUR HALL during his service as a Member of the United States House of Repesentatives, I am glad to inform you, because I can do so with a knowledge of the facts.

As you know, the legislative work of the Conference of American Small Business Organizations takes me to Washington more frequently perhaps than most other businessmen and so I have had the opportunity of estimating the ability and character of many Congressmen and Senators, and to evaluate their services, especially to the business interests of the country. Also how each man is rated by his colleagues which is an excellent criterion as to whether a man is regarded as a statesman or a dud.

Although I do not vote in Congressman HALL's district, of which he is well aware, nevertheless when I have had occasion to call on him in Washington I have received the most friendly welcome, was made to feel at home and that he and his staff were at my service, and I believe every caller receives the same friendly treatment. I mention this to indicate that public office has not given him an exaggerated sense of self-importance, which so many men acquire and then forget who elected them to office. This modesty stamps a man's character.

In discussing legislation, I found Congressman HALL to be unusually well informed. I have found that he has voted according to what he considered to be the right thing to do, not according to pressure by lobbyists and selfish interests. It requires courage in public life to oppose powerful, selfish interests. Whether you always agree with him or not, this is statesmanship of a high order, and the most valuable kind of Congressman you can elect.

And he has been one of the best friends the small-business men have had in Washington, which he demonstrated many times and especially by his support of the policy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14, Eightieth Congress (which this conference wrote), by which, for the first time, Congress recognized small business as an economic entity on a par with the farmer and labor groups, and entitled to equal representation on appointive commissions, boards, and committees. This resolution has placed small business on the map.

I wish it were possible for me personally, to tell every businessman in the Thirty-seventh New York District that he should feel under obligation to Congressman HALL.

Cordially and sincerely,

FRED A. VIRKUS,
Chairman.

President Truman Declares, "There Is No Better or More Able Public Servant Than Finletter. I've Known Him Ever Since I Have Been in Washington. He Is Better Equipped To Be Secretary of the Air Force Than Any Man in the United States and That Is the Reason I Appointed Him."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is unnecessary for me to tell you that I have but recently returned from my primaries, and despite a campaign of vilification, calumny, and slander, I came out on top.

I am addressing my colleagues today in order to get off my chest something that has been bothering me for a long, long time. I want to talk about the character assassination being indiscriminately directed today at public officials of our Government here in Washington, D. C.

I have the highest respect for the opinions of my colleagues who sit on the other side of the aisle in both Houses and at both ends of the Capitol. I am on my feet, however, to express the lack of understanding on the part of my constituency as well as my personal contempt of and for any man who, regardless of his political creed or religious faith, will studiously engage in a campaign of smear, fear, hate, and suspicion.

Mr. Speaker, I have been through a great number of political campaigns, and, certainly, I never desire to see the day dawn when political victory can be had merely by recourse to such vicious practices.

It was a remarkable tribute to American statesmanship as well as womanhood when the Senator from Maine publicly and on the floor of Senate voiced her utter contempt and her inability to remain mute while listening to the vicious and unproven—or shall I even say untruthful charges—that are being leveled against some of the highest officials of our Government. Among those are many honorable men, well, long, and favorably known to us here in this House for their devotion to their country as well as their public trust.

Communism and fascism as political doctrines are no more obnoxious to any man than they are to FRANK BOYKIN. I have no truck whatever with those who would "socialize" or "federalize" or attempt to build a welfare state in these United States. Neither have I any patience with those who would yield up any portion of our national sovereignty or in any wise change the basic laws of these United States as laid down by the founding fathers—for any Henry Wallace concept of a one or of two world spheres of influence.

Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago while campaigning in Mobile, I determined to get these things off my chest, and I here, today, plead that in the light of these unsettled times of peace and security, that we Americans should get together in order to present a solid and a united front against the common enemy.

If there have been or are still any communistic rats or any other type of traitors to our good land in any department of Government, let us in smoking them out, turn the pitiless light of publicity upon them and their damnable, traitorous conduct, be they whom or what they may, but—let us stop the bitter charges such as have recently assailed our ears, a new charge leveled every day upon which the sun rises and sets, not one of which was ever corroborated and proven or even found to be other than half-truths if they contained any resemblance of truth whatsoever.

I have known John Peurifoy too long and too well for me ever to accept the mere say-so of any man in the whole world that he ever lent himself to any campaign to cover up traitors or disloyalty in the Department of State. I think it a crime to compel him or his associates almost daily to issue statements saying that the latest diatribe leveled at the State Department by its political traducers in the Congress was still another "untruth" made out of the whole cloth.

I noticed in the Washington Daily News that President Truman himself has been called upon to answer somebody who had recently written him with respect to a man representative of the finest type of citizenship in these United States and who, within the last 3 or 4 weeks at a great personal sacrifice, consented to accept the post in the Federal Government as Secretary of the Air Force under my good friend, Louis Johnson.

America has no more able lawyer or one possessed of a more judicial mind and temperament than Thomas Knight Finletter, soldier, barrister, lecturer, teacher, author, and an American to the core.

You now in this House—who knew America's first citizen, Cordell Hull, when he sat with us—know that Cordell Hull would have none but the finest of

American stock to serve him as a special assistant to the Secretary of State as Mr. Finletter did during the long, tortuous war years.

Mr. Speaker, it was no happenstance that Thomas Finletter was made a consultant to the United States delegation to the United Nations conference nor as Minister to Great Britain in charge of ECA operations. It was no accident that he was named as the Chairman of the President's Air Policy Commission which rendered a service to the Congress and with respect to the air defenses of these United States that was second to no investigational study ever made in behalf of the Nation's welfare and not excepting that of the Hoover Commission itself.

His service to his country as Minister to Great Britain in charge of economic cooperation was distinguished by virtue of the close scrutiny he continually exercised over the judicious expenditure of every dollar that had been provided by the Congress in accordance with the policies and principles laid down in legislating the ECA program.

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Finletter is the son and the grandson of judges and a veteran of World War I. He is known to all his associates as a hard-headed realist, caustic-humored, and possessed of a trigger-quick mind.

Someone once referred to Tom Finletter as the "little acid drop," but they who know him well are wont to say, "If only all the men with whom we had to do were like Finletter."

How significant was the article published on the Finletter Commission in the March issue of Fortune under the heading, "The aircraft industry, first line of United States security, will be healthy again if the Congress accepts the Finletter report."

In its review and analysis of that report, the editors of Fortune magazine, writing at great length, said in part:

The Finletter report accepts the belief of such knowing men as Secretary Symington and Tooey Spaatz that an Air Force in being assures an air industry in being. The aircraft industry in essence agrees, and accordingly greeted the report with expressions of pleasure. The report proposes, in effect, pumping $2,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 a year of new money into its shriveled arteries for some time to come. It deplores the current archaic procurement practices that govern aircraft orders and refers this back at the legislative branch:

"We recommend that the Services plan their aircraft procurement as far in advance as possible and that the Congress provide the legislative base for such planning. We recommend the placing of orders for planes for delivery over a 5-year period whenever possible. Further (but not with the unanimous approval of the industry's managers), the report proposes the creation of a Government Aircraft Development Corporation, which would be 'authorized to pay all or a portion of the development cost of cargo or other nonmilitary planes, components, navigational aids and safety appliances' that the Corporation would decide should be developed in the national interest and could not be developed by private enterprise." Still further, the report recommends that the air-transport companies be helped back to health by a restoration or increase of subsidies where needed in the carrying of first-class mail. * * * These last two recommendations, congressionally approved, could mean that the transport companies might again become effective customers to the aircraft-manufacturing industry in a measurable time.

Thus, the aviation industry, along the principles of the Finletter report, can unquestionably be restored to the level at which it must operate if national security is to be maintained. The industry is still actually in just as bad shape as it was 2 months ago, except that now it has hope. It still remains for the Congress to settle its, and the Nation's hash. Certainly the whole proposal is of an importance to the full rank with the Marshall plan, but what the Congress will achieve in its deliberations this Presidential year no one yet knows.

Mr. Speaker, is there any question as to why the American Legion, reporting to the American people in its annual convention held August 29, 1949, under its plank for air power, adopted the following resolution:

Air power is everything within the Nation that has to do with air. It includes air education, commercial transport, private flying maintenance facilities, research laboratories, and the Military Establishment for Air. No nation that merely has airplanes in the hands of professionals can be said truly to possess air power. A nation must also understand air power and its significance.

The job of the American Legion is to develop that "statesmanship of the air" within our own ranks. We must recognize that without a healthy aircraft-manufacturing industry, a financially stable air-transportation industry, and a genuine research program military aviation cannot be supported.

Therefore, the American Legion strongly advocates a succession of 5-year programs, reviewable yearly, for research, development, and procurement of aircraft for the Air Force and naval air arm for the purpose of maintaining the industry in a state of production capable of rapid expansion.

There is not a single provision in a copy of the brochure published by the American Legion entitled "Decade of Air Decision" that does not lend full and complete support to the findings of the report with respect to the Air Force and the air power necessary to the successful defense and peace of these United States of America made by the President's Air Policy Commission headed by Thomas Finletter.

Mr. Speaker, it was because President Harry Truman knew Thomas Knight Finletter that he exhibited some exasperation in answering a critic with respect to some organization to which Mr. Finletter was said to belong.

President Truman curtly and sensibly wrote his critic as follows:

All this howl about organizations a fellow belongs to gives me a pain in the neck. I'd be willing to bet my right eye that you yourself and I have joined organizations that we wish we hadn't. It hasn't hurt me, and I don't think it has hurt you any.

It seems to me that if you veterans would spend more time trying to find out the good points of a man in public office instead of trying to tear him down it would be much more help to the country.

There is not a better or more able public servant than Finletter. I've known him ever since I have been in Washington. He is better equipped to be Secretary of the Air Force than any man in the United States, and that is the reason I appointed him.

State of Goa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a synopsis of a speech by an expert on international relations and my friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas. Whenever Dr. Thorning presents his views on a subject of this character, he is careful to cite the facts and to make an appeal to all fair-minded citizens. In the present instance, it is certain that thousands of United States citizens of Portuguese descent are concerned about the future status of the State of Goa. Obviously, it is a matter that should be considered in the light of history as well as in the framework of respect for international law.

With respect to Dr. Thorning, it is gratifying to know that he has been invited by State Department officials to deliver the invocation on Monday, June 19, 1950, when a Washington monument will be unveiled in honor of José Artigas, hero of Uruguayan independence, when Secretary of State Dean Acheson and Ambassador José Mora, of the Republic of Uruguay, to the Organization of American States, will also be on the program.

The synopsis of Dr. Thorning's speech follows:

Addressing the graduating class of the Academy of Notre Dame of Maryland, the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs, a Washington quarterly, declared that the violent threat of India's Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, to engulf the Portuguese State of Goa, sacred to the Christian mission world, was an affront to the United Nations as well as a blow at an orderly, peaceful evolution of dangerous situations in the Orient.

Urging the young Notre Dame graduates to interest themselves in ethical solutions to international problems, Dr. Thorning decried the evil philosophy inherent in Prime Minister's Nehru's menacing announcement that Goa must come to India.

"Such a categorical statement," Dr. Thorning added, "simply means that, by fair means or foul, the Portuguese State of Goa, which for 450 years has been a focus of Christian life and worship on the immense subcontinent of India, must be swallowed up by an India, which, day by day, is drifting into the ocean of totalitarian Marxism. Only this week (June 4, 1950) an important Catholic news agency, the national edition of the Register, revealed a report indicating that Soviet infiltration in India is much more serious than has been admitted by Pandit Nehru or his colleagues in the Indian Government. While Kremlin imperialism rides roughshod over human rights in the Orient, left-wing secularist sympathizers in the United States and Europe continue to play the Soviet game by bleating about Western colonialism in the Far East."

"With respect to the Portuguese State of Goa, this secularist cry is a complete misnomer. Goa is a territory where there are no distinctions of caste, race, or religion. Each citizen of Goa enjoys the rights of personal

freedom. Thanks to centuries of Christian culture and glorious Portuguese traditions, the 650,000 people of Goa reject the notion of Indian annexation, whether forcible or as the result of political coercion. They know that they are sure to lose, not to gain, as has happened to the people of Soviet China. Nor are they blind to the horrors of the 'negotiated partition' of Christian Poland in Europe. Since Goa was the gateway of Christianity to India and to the Orient, this state, with its tomb of St. Francis Xavier, deserves the good will and cooperation of all believers, whether Protestant, Jewish, or Catholic. For this reason, thousands of United States citizens, many of them Americans of Portuguese descent, have held mass meetings in New York, New England, and California, protesting the aggressive designs of Indian politicians upon an important center of religious faith in the Far East. Every religionist is bound to respect the noble provisions of article 5 of the Portuguese Constitution. This reads as follows:

" 'Equality before the law means the right to seek and hold public office, according to personal capacity and services rendered, and the denial of any privilege of birth, title, nobility, sex, or social conditions * * *.'

"Goans have served as judges of the highest courts in Portugal; as university professors; as deputies in the national assembly; as physicians, lawyers, and diplomats. This is liberty, not Soviet slavery."

Coca-Cola Visitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle of May 30, 1950:

COCA-COLA VISITORS

Houstonians are pleased to have with them for several days James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., and other officials of the Coca-Cola Co., who are here for the formal opening of the new $1,000,000 bottling plant on Bissonnet Avenue.

The Coca-Cola success story is one of those epics of vision and enterprise that happen only in America. The huge new plant here can serve well as a symbol of it. The plant is one of the largest, finest, and most modern, but it is only one of a great number that dot the Nation and that steadily are spreading around the world.

Similarly the huge plant in Houston is a monument to business vision and courage. At the age of 86 J. E. Evans, president of the local company, has constructed this industry to serve 10,800 dealers in this area.

Not long ago a world traveler, speaking in Houston, reported the fact that Coca-Cola is supplanting the traditional coffee as the favorite drink of Egyptians and remarked that if he were a young man seeking the means of making a large fortune, he would try to swing the Coca-Cola franchise for India.

Jim Farley is pushing this typically American product in foreign lands. The company could not have obtained a better man for the job. He is an ambassador of good will wherever he goes, just as he used to be the magnetic wheelhorse of the Democratic Party in the days of Al Smith and during President Roosevelt's first two terms.

He is always welcome in Houston. Our citizens are glad to have with us also the company's president, Willian J. Hobbs, John Goodloe, secretary, both formerly RFC officials under Jesse H. Jones, who introduced his old friend Mr. Farley at the dinner Monday night; and the other high officials here for the series of events celebrating the opening of this great new Houston industrial plant.

Red China's Bid for Admission to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, on his return from recent meetings in Europe, Secretary of State Acheson is reported to have said that the United States would not veto Red China's bid for admission to the United Nations. I take issue with that stand. I insist that the United States must not permit the passage of a resolution legalizing the corrupt acts of the Soviet-inspired Chinese banditry. The Chinese Communists have committed crimes against humanity and human decency. It would make a mockery of the Charter of the United Nations and dash the hopes of mankind for a peaceful world to permit these international criminals to sit in respectability with the law-abiding peoples of the world. We have one problem in the Security Council now, with the Russian Government seizing every opportunity to confound the efforts of the rest of the world to maintain peace and encourage world progress. Shall we, by our lack of resistance to the admission of the Chinese Communists, permit the compounding of that problem? One obstructionist is able to cripple the effectiveness of the UN. What would two do to it?

We have witnessed the walk-out by the Soviet representatives from more than 25 agencies of the UN during the past few months because they could not get their way on this Chinese Red recognition issue. They are trying to blackjack the other members into accepting their position by this action. They do not seem to care whether or not the UN collapses. I say that the time for a showdown is here. The United States and the United Nations must not yield to these gangster tactics. To do so would be appeasement of the worst kind. I am unalterably opposed to permitting the Soviet Government to have another satellite sitting in the councils of the United Nations. My own position on this Chinese Red recognition issue was made clear as long ago as January of this year in a letter to the President. I should like at this point to include that letter in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT,
THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Since it is reported that British recognition of the Peiping Communist administration is scheduled to take place soon following the lead already taken for the British Commonwealth by India on December 30, 1949, a consequence of such action may be that other countries will follow Britain in recognizing the Peiping Government. May I respectfully express my personal views on this great question.

This situation naturally confronts the United States with a grave dilemma. The United States has a long-standing policy respecting recognition of governments which come to power through revolution or other internal change. It normally does not recognize such governments until three conditions are present. First, we expect the new political authorities to be in clear possession of the state. We also expect that their administration has the assent of the people or at least their acquiescence. Finally, and perhaps most important, we insist that the new government fulfill the normal international obligations and responsibilities which are incumbent on a sovereign state.

These conditions hardly obtain in China today. There cannot be clear possession while the Nationalist Government is still fighting back despite the tremendous odds with which it is confronted.

Do the Communists really have the assent of the Chinese people? True, there have been large defections of Nationalist forces to the Red armies, and the peasants in many areas have not opposed the Communist advance. But are these factors in themselves evidence of assent, especially in a country weary of more than a decade of continuous strife? When have the Communists in Peiping held an election and by what authority other than brute force do they style themselves masters of all China? There is much to indicate that the so-called people's government is bending every effort to conform to the wishes of Moscow.

The Chinese Communists show no indication to abide by even the minimum standards of international behavior which are applicable to all sovereign states. In the arrogance engendered by their sudden sweep to power, they have made clear that they will respect only such treaties between China and other countries as it pleases them to respect. They have, moreover, perpetrated what you, Mr. President, properly called "outrages" on private American citizens and official United States representatives who have remained in Communist-held areas. The arrest of Angus Ward, United States Consul-General at Mukden, on trumped-up charges is only one in a long series of brutal and despicable incidents involving Americans with which the Communists have stoked the fires of Xenophobia in China. How can there be recognition of a government that cannot even maintain minimum standards of human decency and hospitality in its dealing with foreigners? How can there be, moreover, recognition of a government which callously flaunts the basic international responsibilities of a sovereign state? Finally, how can there be recognition of a government which acts not in the interests of its own citizens but rather at the behest of a foreign master?

I urge, Mr. President, that our Government, which has successfully opposed communism in Europe, be not indifferent to the expansion of communism in China and southeast Asia. I respectfully hope and pray that our Government will withhold recognition of communism in China, despite what action England will take.

Mr. Speaker, have the Chinese Communists undergone a change of heart since that letter was written? Have they shown any respect for international decency? Have they demonstrated that they are acting in the interests of the Chinese people and not for a foreign master?

The answer is that they have not. They are still the same Godless group. They are still the same Soviet-inspired

bandits. We must not admit them into the company of the decent nations in the United Nations. We have never exercised the veto, but if ever a situation calls for its use, this is it.

Radio Address of Hon. John Taber, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WHAM, Rochester, N. Y., June 12, 1950:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, I was chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives in 1947 and 1948. During that period I spent, out of funds provided for that committee, about $150,000 a year. That was a larger sum than had ever been spent before but I got results out of that expenditure.

We created a staff of the ablest accountants in America and the ablest governmental and private research men in America. We had on our payroll personnel officers of large corporations. They went into departments, studied their methods of doing business and made known to the committee the real needs of the departments and agencies of the Government. They showed the departments and agencies how to do business in a businesslike way and to get better results for the time and energy that was put in.

Because I did this, in 1947 the Republican Congress was able to reduce appropriations $4,400,000,000 below the President's estimate and in 1948 we reduced his estimates $2,750,000,000. In addition to that, we were able to recover funds that had been previously appropriated and not needed by the Government amounting to $5,000,000,000. A total, over-all, of over $12,000,000,000.

Moreover, the cuts that we were able to make were made intelligently because we knew what we were doing and we still provided all the funds that were needed to carry the departments along properly but not wastefully, as had been the Democratic practice.

The result of our work was a balanced budget for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1948, and June 30, 1949.

I had some of the very best men in the House of Representatives on that committee and they worked hard and unceasingly and with a will to save. They were supported by some of the very ablest accountants and research men in America and these men were doing it as a matter of public service and not for the dollars received. These men who were accustomed to earning $100 a day were receiving from our committee $25 a day. One man alone found $500,000,000 in the Maritime Commission which they had planned to waste on things Congress had refused to approve, and we recovered it.

To save over $12,000,000,000 who would not spend $150,000? To give the country a balanced budget for the first time in 20 years, who would not spend $150,000? Needless to say, those who believe in reckless spending and destroying the United States do not like that record—it is too much in the interest of the plain people.

There has been a continuous campaign on the part of those who are opposed to honest government to discredit the work that we did and to turn the people against us, but I say to you now, that if the same methods were followed that were used in 1947 and 1948, we could again balance the budget and we could provide for every needed activity of the Federal Government.

The staff that we gathered together has been completely disbanded. Under the Democrats, the Appropriations Committee today depends on a reduced investigating staff composed of investigators borrowed from the executive departments of the Government. Now how much money do you think can be saved by having the bureaucrats investigate themselves? You know the answer as well as I do—virtually nothing will be saved. No outside, independent investigators are used and the research program which we set up in the Eightieth Congress has been completely abandoned.

I believe that with the aid of a small permanent staff and temporary services from a group of research people and some of the abler certified public accountants in America, the Congress of the United States could again balance our budget and stop the continued inflation which is bound to result from continued spending of dollars that we have not earned.

No one ever spent a dollar unless somebody earned it; the question now is whether or not the people who earn the dollars shall have the privilege of spending them or whether those dollars shall be spent by a group of entrenched bureaucrats whose only thought is how much they can spend.

The thing that has disturbed President Truman and all of his satellites the most is that the record of the Eightieth Congress was in the interest of the plain people, the labor unions, private industry, and the farmer. Those people who have been seeking all the time to place the farmer, the businessman, and the workingman under complete regimentation and Government control do not like anything which is in the interest of the plain people or which will protect the plain people.

It is about time for the people of America to wake up and to realize where their interests lie. Do we want free farmers, free workingmen, and free industries, or do we want a Hitler-controlled government with wages and prices fixed by a dictator and not by an agreement between the employer and the employee and the producer and consumer.

That is the issue and I think that the people will answer in favor of liberty.

Labor Leaders Protest Threat to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, many justified protests against the shipment of arms and war material to Arabia and the Middle East have come to my office. This attitude of our Government and Britain will eventually be disastrous to the young country of Israel. The following article from the A. F. of L. newspaper reveals that organized labor is alert to this international injustice and future danger to the peace of the world:

LABOR LEADERS PROTEST THREAT TO ISRAEL

AFL President William Green and CIO President Philip Murray told President Truman in a joint White House visit that organized labor feels "anxiety over the threats" to Israel and "the people of the Middle East through the heavy and needless armaments race now being undertaken by the governments of Egypt and other Arabic countries in the middle-eastern areas."

They issued a joint statement which said, in part:

"From authoritative newspaper reports and other trustworthy sources of information, we are convinced that the objectives of this drive toward militarism is a second war against the State of Israel.

"We regard this development as a threat not only to the new democratic republic of Israel but also to the hopes of the American people for stability and peaceful progress wherever possible in the world.

"Newspaper reports and other creditable evidence indicate that Egypt, Transjordan, Iraq, and the other Arabic countries unfriendly to Israel are receiving large supplies of armaments from the Government of Great Britain. We appealed to the President to make appropriate representations on behalf of our Government to Great Britain to discontinue supplying these Arabic countries with instruments of aggressive warfare obviously designed for use against Israel.

"We likewise appealed to President Truman, since the flow of arms to the Arabic countries still continues, to permit the sale of arms to the Israeli Government in order to meet the daily increasing threat to the security of the State of Israel.

"We appealed to the President for additional financial support for Israel. That small and new state has admitted—during the 18 months of its existence—365,000 Jewish immigrants. They have been liberated from displaced-persons camps in Germany, the ghettos of Arabic countries, and the increasing discrimination of Soviet satellite nations. The $100,000,000 loan of the Export-Import Bank which the President so generously supported is now virtually exhausted.

"We are hopeful that our Government will again support a new loan from the Export-Import Bank and the World Bank in order to make it possible for the State of Israel to cope with these manifold problems."

Are We To Allow Communists To Deprive the Free World of Rubber?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Star of June 9, 1950. It portrays just one of the many hardships we ourselves are bound to suffer as the result of our negative and defeatist policies in China and much of Asia since the war, with the Communist victories which such policies made inevitable. It is awfully late to start a rescue operation now of what could and should have been prevented; but better late than never:

DON'T FORGET RUBBER

Military, industrial and just plain pleasure traffic moves on wheels, and most of those wheels need rubber tires. For years, upwards of 95 percent of all the rubber used in this country—natural rubber it was then—came from southeast Asia.

Then, in World War II, Japan made us suddenly aware of our weakness in this strategic material by conquering our source of supply. American industry rose to the occasion, however, and by the end of the war was providing 87 percent of the new rubber consumed. This was synthetic rubber.

The comparative merits of synthetic and natural rubber are something for experts to argue about. But combined use of the two seems destined to be the pattern for some time to come.

At any rate, southeast Asia's natural rubber is still of prime importance to us.

Unfortunately, the areas supplying natural rubber lie squarely in the path of Communist expansion in Asia. Civil strife in such places as Malaya and Indochina has interfered with the desired expansion of production. In 1949, in fact, production dipped slightly below the 1948 rate. Forecasters differ as to what may be expected this year.

Moreover, there is the ever-present possibility that our policy makers will so bungle the cold war that all of the rubber producing areas of southeast Asia will be lost to us.

Partisans of both natural and synthetic rubber are concerned about this possibility—and the grave blow to American industrial and military strength which would result. Out of their varied and sometimes conflicting suggestions as to what should be done, at least four courses of action especially recommend themselves.

A thorough survey of United States synthetic production capacity should determine how greatly and how quickly it could be restored to wartime levels in case of emergency. One or two of the synthetic plants now in mothballs ought to be put back into production in a practice alert so that we may know just what can be done.

The rubber stockpiling program ought to be reexamined and fires lighted under those who have allowed it to lag. There's a slight surplus of natural rubber over what is actually consumed each year, and synthetic producers could step up their output.

The United States should—through purchases for stock piling, for instance—guard against any piling up of rubber on the docks in southeast Asia. Any appearance of glut of the world market would bring depression and communism to the producing areas.

Our Government should quit fumbling opportunities for pressing the cold war in Asia. Our policy—if you can call it that—in Asia has been a thing of fits and starts, of mere negative reaction to Soviet provocation.

We must match the Reds in initiative if we hope to save southeast Asia from Communist conquest and the area's rich resources from the Russian imperialist machine.

Congressman Heller Deplores Persecution of Catholics in Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is one of the deplorable facts of our postwar world that wherever the godless Communists have seized the reins of power in a victimized country, one of their first and basic aims is to demolish the independence of organized religions. Following upon the subjugation or liquidation of ecclesiastical institutions the materialist totalitarians then attempt by propaganda, so-called education, and intimidation to wipe the very thought and love of God from the hearts of those under their sway. In the countries of eastern Europe which have fallen to communism this inhuman process of destruction of religion is in full swing. Among the unfortunate victims of this persecution is the small state of Hungary.

Since the end of the war the Communists have been slowly strangling the political and religious freedoms of the Hungarian people. After they took over governmental power, the followers of Moscow concentrated their malevolent attention on the churches, both Catholic and Protestant, in an effort to wipe out their public influence and to smash their leadership.

The spiritual leader of the Catholics, who form approximately two-thirds of Hungary's population, Josef Cardinal Mindszenty was singled out for special vicious attack. That such a high dignitary of the church should have been made the object of persecution by the Hungarian Communists is unmistakable proof of their consummate contempt of religion. The trial of the cardinal and his subsequent sentence to prison and a horrible fate were such well-publicized events that it is unnecessary to enlarge upon them here.

Following the cardinal's conviction in February 1949, the Communists seemed to relax somewhat their assault on the church. But this was only a diplomatic maneuver in order, it is supposed, to give public opinion a chance to recover. But now it is reported—according to the New York Times of June 7—that the Budapest Communists are once more preparing for an all-out attack on the Hungarian Roman Catholic Church. The signal for this attack has been sounded in a report by the education minister, Joseph Revai, to the central committee of the Communist Party. Reprisals advocated in this report include the closing of a number of monasteries and convents, the dissolution of certain mendicant and teaching orders, and the intensification of anticlerical propaganda.

What this means is that the Communist steam roller is put in motion and is going to attempt to crush more of the religious rights of the Hungarian people.

When such outrages occur, there is only one course for decent Americans to follow. And that is to use all means in our power to oppose such base and infamous actions. The United States and other western countries should register the strongest official protests with the Hungarian Government and should widely advertise throughout the world the abhorrence they feel at these cynical onslaughts against human liberty. Protests should also be lodged with the United Nations with a view toward marshaling the ranks of world opinion against these Communist injustices. Finally, every effort should be made through the Voice of America and by other means to convince the Hungarian people of our deep sympathy for their plight and to bolster their morale in their struggle against these who we are confident will be only their temporary masters.

Two Men Named Cachules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. WALSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Paul Hillsamer, publisher and editor of the News-Herald, Marion, Ind., recently did an article regarding two brothers who are outstanding examples of just what America is made of. Two Greek boys that came to this country several years ago and, like so many of their fellow Americans who have immigrated from across the seas, have made a success of their lives, reared their families, and given to us who are native born a living example of true Americanism.

I know both of these men and know everything that has been written by them is the truth.

I ask the House membership to read this humorous, yet deeply sincere, article.

TWO MEN NAMED CACHULES

The greatest story ever told in this America of ours isn't the Revolution, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights. Neither is it to be found on bloody Platts Landing, in our sweeping farms, or our huge industrial plants.

None of these events, actions, or accomplishments—or the thousands more which rank equally with them—would or could have happened except for the assimilations of the millions of immigrants who for varied reasons chose to leave their foreign homes to seek a new life in the United States.

This is the story of two men named Cachules, Konistinos and Dimitrius Cachules. They're well known to us here in Marion. We call them Gus and Jim.

They were born in Greece. If they had chosen to move to Russia, Germany, or France, Spain, Poland or Italy they would have always been Greeks. But here they're considered Americans. In certain matters "Greek Americans," and all others "American." America assimilates, and that's why it's America.

This is only a little home-town article about a couple home-town boys. But please forgive a bit of editorializing as a preamble to the Cachules story.

Men are not cast from the same die. Some are good, and some are bad, America never has—and let's never commence—hated a man because he dips his hands in water before he prays, or wears a skull cap, or spells his name J-a-b-l-o-n-s-k-i rather than S-m-i-t-h. We have taken into this land of ours, people named Comorosky and Lazzeri, Cohen, Abramson, Riley, O'Leary, Zachopopolis, Gonzalez, and Petersen. From them we have molded a new nationality—American.

Jim (Dimitrius) and Gus (Konistinos) Cachules were born in Makrynista, Greece. Makrynista, a small town of approximately 5,000 population, is located in the province of Thessaly in north-central Greece. They were a part of a family of seven, the rest of whom still live in their native land.

Their father was a wine and olive-oil producer, living at the edge of town. They were, Jim says, neither poor nor rich. Money was scarce enough that the whole family worked in the family business and education ceased at the end of elementary school.

Gus, born in 1889, succumbed to the lure of America first. Dozens of younger men had emigrated, he says, and their letters home told glorious stories of the opportunities in

the United States. In 1907, when 18, Gus approached his father with a proposal that he be allowed to join the wave of emigration.

"My father was hard to convince," Gus stated. "At first he wouldn't hear of it. Then it was maybe. Finally, when he saw I was going anyhow, he gave his permission. I landed in New York City with $11. Now [laughing] I've got $12.

"Coming over, a bunch of us decided to go together to Augusta, Maine, to work in the cotton mills. I went along as far as Boston. By that time I had seen some New England mills and the guys who worked in them. I had no objection to working, but I did want to live to be 30. I left my companions and got a job in a restaurant. Didn't like that and went back to New York and later to Chicago. Eventually, I wound up in Freeport, Ill., working in a shoe shop for $15 a month. By this time it was 1909."

Jim, who is a couple of years younger than Gus, started his propaganda campaign against parental objections the day Gus sailed. It took 3 years but in 1910 the elder Cachules gave him permission to follow his older brother.

"Gus was in Freeport, so it was to Freeport that I headed," Jim relates. "On the train, if I bought something, I had to take a handful of change out of my pocket and let the seller pick what he needed. One of my biggest personal puzzles was why a nickel, which is worth less, was bigger than a dime. I still do not know.

"I got the same job as Gus at the same place and we stayed in Freeport several years. We came to Marion in 1913, just after the big flood.

"We've always been partners in our own business—cleaning, dyeing, shoe shining, and repair, pressing, hat renovation, and so forth—since that time. * * *"

The brothers have worked fantastic hours in the past, but have eased up to 9 hours a day now, although they still take turns at catching up back work on Sundays.

Neither saw his father again after the farewells of 1907 and 1910, the elder Cachules having died in 1924. Each however married on trips back home to see their widowed mother, Gus in 1925 and Jim in 1929. The mother passed away during the latter year.

They brought their wives to the United States and live in a large double house, which they own. * * *

The Cachuleses are Greek Orthodox Catholics. However, the nearest Orthodox Church is in Indianapolis and the two families participate in the activities of the local Episcopal parish.

"America has been good to us and we've tried to be good to America," Jim said. "We have worked hard, paid our bills, raised our families right as we see it. We don't drink and raise cain. I don't think Gus was ever drunk, but I was—I've got a background of sin.

"Our dad produced wine and olive oil and when I was about 10 I went down in the cellar one afternoon and started on a barrel of wine. I guess I was like a lot of those fellows you see on Saturday night, trying to bring a dry county by drinking it all. I couldn't finish the barrel, but I sure made a good start. I got plenty drunk and then my dad caught me. I was sick—both ends and the middle. That cured me and must have scared Gus."

That's the story of the Cachules's, Konistinos and Dimitrius. It isn't remarkable, it has been told thousands of times by millions of others. It's just the "can" in American.

House That Cokes Built

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Houston Post of May 31, 1950:

HOUSE THAT COKES BUILT

A local bottling works that can draw two former Cabinet members as the main speakers at its plant dedication, and bottler executives from many States, as Coca-Cola did at its dedication dinner Monday night, is indeed distinguished. Coca-Cola is an extraordinary enterprise in a number of ways.

Jesse H. Jones touched the keynote of the whole Coca-Cola epic in presenting James A. Farley, his old friend and colleague in Washington, when he said: "If I were President of the United States I would appoint Mr. Farley ambassador-at-large with carte blanche to go all over the world—and if he did I am sure there would be no war."

The former Postmaster General and chairman of the National Democratic Executive Committee is functioning unofficially in that capacity now, as chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp. Coca-Cola itself has become a sort of ambassador of good will for this country. During the war, peoples all over the globe became acquainted with its piquant taste, and for many of them Coca-Cola has come to symbolize the United States. Of course, Mr. Farley has been instrumental in cultivating the unique popularity of the beverage.

The new glass-house plant on Bissonnet, a masterpiece of Tellepsen Construction Co., is a thing of beauty. With its several hundred employees and its payroll of more than $1,000,000 a year, Coca-Cola is an important economic asset to Houston, as well as a giver of pleasure to the palates of Houstonians. The Post speaks the sentiments of the community generally in congratulating and felicitating J. E. Evans, president of the Houston Coca-Cola Bottling Co.; Lupton Thomson, Arthur Dew, next in command and sales manager, and all members of the Coca-Cola family, upon the acquisition of the new plant, and wishes them still greater success in the future.

Address of Clarence Manion, Dean of the College of Law, University of Notre Dame, at the Final Conferral of 1949 Awards of Freedom Foundation, Inc., at Town Hall in New York City on April 21, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished resident of the Twenty-third Congressional District of Illinois has called my attention to a particularly challenging address which deserves to be read by every Member of Congress and every other thoughtful American as well. I am indebted to the Honorable Paul F. Jones, Danville attorney and prominent in Illinois public life, for the text of the address which I am publishing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under permission granted by the House.

The speaker was Dean Clarence Manion, head of the College of Law at the University of Notre Dame, and the occasion was final conferral of 1949 awards by Freedom Foundation, Inc., at Town Hall in New York City, April 21, 1950. Dean Manion served as chairman of the meeting and delivered the keynote address. Present in the audience was former President Herbert Hoover, who said afterward Dean Manion's address was "the finest expression of Americanism I have ever heard," and he added, "I cheerfully adopt it as my credo."

Dean Manion's address follows:

Man is the most perverse of all the creatures of God. Of the multimillions of created things man alone is capable of deliberately denying and frustrating his own God-given nature. He not only has the capacity to do these unnatural things but he likewise experiences the constant urge to do them. Like a powerful magnet, this unfortunate temptation toward the unnatural, pulls man out of his God-ordained orbit of happiness into a convulsing maelstrom of confusion that at this moment threatens to shatter the surrounding and otherwise orderly universe.

The secret of this unfortunate eccentricity on the part of human nature lies in the God-given freedom of each man and of all men. With other creatures, the law of their nature is an inexorable rule that each must obey. From the lowly earthworm to the high stars in their majestic courses all things move only at God's command—all things, that is, but man. With him, this God-made natural order of conduct is a road he ought to travel but from which he is free to deviate occasionally, or from which he can depart altogether.

The great majority of men are far off the high road of their inherent nature. These scattered and aimless vagrants are forever colliding with each other. The wrecks of their collisions are piling higher and higher.

The disorder grows more and more intolerable. Man's God-given freedom has run amok. The universal cry now is for the immediate repression and restraint of man's freedom in the interest of man's security.

More than 250 years ago, William Penn, the founder of Pennsylvania, observed the strange perversity of human freedom and passed a sage judgment upon it which was good for his time, our time, and for all time. Penn said that, "Those men who are not governed by God must be ruled by tyrants."

Disorder, in other words, demands and will always get a force adequate to control it. The order of the universe is God's order. If man drives God out of the natural ordering of man's life, the resulting vacuum will suck in a tyrant to take God's place. The order produced by the tyrant will be a far cry from the free order which God ordained for man—but, as Penn said, we must make our choice. Permanent confusion in the world is intolerable. Man must either govern himself by the standard of God's commandments or be ruled by the iron fist of a Herod, a Hitler, or a Stalin. It is either self-government or slave government for mankind.

A hundred years after Penn's diagnosis of our choice, the founding fathers of the American Republic made the Penn formula official. With the first breath of its new

life, the United States declared that all men are created—that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights—among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and that to secure these rights, governments are instituted.

Thus in this great and official American directive, government is merely an agent for the preservation of God's gifts. American Government is calculated and designed to be an instrument of God's purpose. God gave us freedom. Government's job is to preserve freedom.

Our God-given nature thus requires us to be free do do right in the pursuit of that happiness which inevitably follows from such right doing. This natural freedom is as unalienable as life itself. It is not life merely, but life joined with freedom, that makes the mature human being.

By this token, and by the ordination of the founding fathers, life plus liberty adds up to an American citizen.

This is also the explanation for our complete and unique system of constitutions through which our governments, State and Federal, are deliberately and strictly limited against the possibility that they, or any one of them, may gravitate into despotisms.

American constitutional government was not designed to be a glorified and powerful source of bounties, blessings, and order. In the American system, God alone is the power, the glory, and the source.

After God, man is next in the American political line-up, while government is third and last in the procession.

In the American system government is a mere hedge against the possibility that men will use their freedom to injure other men.

How could such a weak, divided, and subdivided Government as ours be expected to keep order? The answer is that the founding fathers did not expect it to do so. James Madison, the so-called father of the Constitution, made this very clear when he expressed the determination, "To rest all of our political experiments on the capacity of mankind for self-government."

"What is government itself," he said, "but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels," he concluded, "no government would be necessary."

This is simply the converse of Jefferson's famous dictum that, "Those people are governed best who are governed least"—for from this it certainly follows that those people are best who require the least government.

Thus the men who designed the American constitutional system distrusted government as much as they trusted their own ability to govern themselves under God's commandments. They realized that the survival of our system would depend upon the strength of individual character rather than upon strong and streamlined government. They gambled upon the sustained quality of virtue in the average American citizen and this historic bet paid off at the astounding odds of more than a million to one.

Our glorious history shows that a free, conscientious, and virtuous citizenry, under a strictly limited government, can produce the most lavish material civilization that the world has ever seen, along with a constantly increasing standard of living for the individual citizen that is the envy of all mankind.

Today, the fate of civilization everywhere depends upon the sustained strength and solvency of all that is implied in the expression, "The United States of America."

If our power should suddenly disintegrate, the whole human race would soon be enveloped in a fog of torture and terror so excruciating that those who momentarily survive it, would envy those who did not.

While we stand firm, all human nature hopes and prays for ultimate deliverance.

It is precisely at this point that irony takes over. For, at the same time that it is the last best hope of the world, the American system is enervated by a growing loss of prestige at home. The one system strong enough to sustain all mankind is on the verge of a bitter home-grown battle for survival which now begins to look like the fearful and fateful Armageddon.

In the past 33 years we have faced and fought a succession of violent enemies all around the world. But, nowhere, on any of the many far-flung battlefields of the earth, have we ever encountered a foe half as deadly and one-tenth as menacing as the force now being recruited against us on every farm, in every factory, and all the schools and colleges of our land.

This army is being recruited from the ranks of American apathy and misunderstanding.

The curse upon our generation is the prevailing lust for power over our equals. That diabolical lust sparks the recruiting drive for the growing un-American army.

Everything is grist for this evil recruiting mill. In one place it is poverty, pride, or prejudice. Elsewhere it is revenge, envy, frustration of ambition, or hate. But always and everywhere, it is the passion for power that propagates the un-American lie in the fallow of apathetic ignorance and misunderstanding of America.

In the fertile soil of American freedom, rich with the seed of individual enterprise, the "powerbund" is busy sowing cockle.

Practically all that millions of young Americans are learning about their country now are ways and means by which our country should be fundamentally and radically changed. The insidious sowers of cockle tell our citizens in the factories, offices, farms, and stores that they are not free individual creatures of God, but congealed and exploited groups and classes, whose only hope lies in making war upon another equally congealed but entrenched exploiting class.

For the God-made person and for the morally responsible human being, the powerbund is rapidly substituting a man-made assortment of irresponsible indissoluble and altogether intangible groups—called by such names as capital, labor, management, agriculture, monopoly, business, and government.

In this rapidly developing collectivism of class-conscious groups there is no chance for the self-government of morally responsible human beings upon which James Madison relied. Responsibility in practically everything covered by the commandments is thus shifted from the person to the state, and the state, since it has no soul to be damned, may violate any of these commandments at will.

The door is ajar, and thus ready to swing open upon William Penn's terrible prophecy. The tyrant is waiting for his summons to take over the vacant throne of God in the heart of America.

This in summary, and in my judgment, points up the purpose as well as the name of Freedom Foundation.

It is a call to the people of our land, to each of whom the priceless gift of freedom was given by God and guarded by our constitutional system, to speak up and act up each in his own way and in his own work for America, to speak up and act up for God, for the God-given rights of the individual man, for the duty of each to live according to the moral law, for the American conviction that only good men can make a good society, and last but not least, for constitutionally limited government, tied down against the possibility of tyranny but empowered as Jefferson said, "To restrain men from injuring one another."

These distinguished American men gathered here today have done and are doing just this. To honor them, therefore, is a patriotic service of the first order.

The Critical Farm Situation in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

(In accordance with the permission granted to him on June 2, 1950 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7980), the following statement prepared by Mr. WILEY is printed in the RECORD:)

A DAIRY MONTH REPORT ON THE FARM SITUATION IN AMERICA'S DAIRYLAND

June is Dairy Month in Wisconsin. During this month, we honor the some 200,000 farms throughout America's dairyland which furnish nutritious, vitamin-rich dairy products to the Nation.

This is a good time to take stock of the dairy situation. It is a good time to point out that today the Nation is challenged to help prevent a terrible depression from hitting the dairy segment of our economy. Dairy prices are falling. Dairy expenses and costs are mounting. Danger signs are everywhere.

On July 1, the new oleomargarine law takes effect. This is the law against which we battled so long. Yes, this is the vicious law which other dairy State Senators and I helped prevent from being passed in the previous Eightieth Congress. This is the law which enables artificial oleo in effect to steal butter's natural yellow color in interstate commerce.

WE MUST BATTLE AGAINST PHONY PRODUCTS

On January 18, 1950, the Wiley-Gillette probutter amendment was defeated on the Senate floor by a vote of 48 for to 37 against. However, I promised that we would continue our battle for the Nation's dairy farmers. That promise is being fulfilled. We recognize that the battle of synthetic oleomargarine against natural butter was but the first in a long series of battles which we of the dairy industry are going to have to fight—against filled milk and filled cheese—against phony, synthetic products.

Unfortunately, the administration has given every encouragement to those crops which ruin America's soil—cotton, etc.—and has given but lip service to the needs of dairying which enriches the soil and enriches the Nation's health.

HUGE DAIRY SURPLUSES DEVELOPING

Even before the terrible oleomargarine law takes effect, we note that the dairy industry is plagued by a problem of tremendous surpluses. The dairyman wants to sell to the American consumer, but he wants to sell at fair prices.

At this time, the Agriculture Department owns approximately $125,000,000 in surplus dairy items, bought under the price-support program. This includes:

One hundred and thirty-seven million pounds of butter.

Two hundred and fifty million pounds of dried milk.

Forty-three million five hundred thousand pounds of cheese.

We recall the terrible days when the Nation's dairymen had to throw milk in the gutters because the farmer could not get his cost of production plus a reasonable profit. We do not want to return to those days.

If we increase dairy consumption, we can help wipe out the problem of surpluses. This can be done. It must be done.

DAIRY EXPENSES ARE HIGH

Dairy herds are now at a record level. There are a total of 3,804,000 cattle in the State of Wisconsin. And, too, let us never forget that the farmer only gets a comparatively small percentage of the consumer's dollar. The dairy farmer only gets 55 cents of the dollar which the housewife pays for dairy products. The rest goes for distribution expenses all along the line. Let us not forget that those distribution expenses have increased so that the dairy farmer has not been getting as much for his milk, butter, and cheese as formerly.

Let us remember, too, that expenses of the dairy farmer have continued at high levels: Feed expenses, machinery expenses, the costs of farm labor, taxes, fertilizers, and many other items of expense. But the administration says little, if anything, about that.

DAIRY FARMERS RECOGNIZE DEMOCRATS' BALONEY

We have a right to question the sincerity of the present administration. It says one thing to the dairy farmer and does another. It promises but does not fulfill its promises. It talks out of both sides of its mouth.

But it will not get away with it. The Wisconsin dairy farmer has sized up the situation and realizes the Democratic administration's insincerity. The dairy farmer can tell when someone tries to sell him baloney.

Let the administration try to talk itself out of these incriminating facts.

Let us ask these pointed questions of the administration:

How the Democrats broke their promises

1. If you are really for the dairy farmer, why is it that you promised before the November 1948 election that in the event that Democrats were elected to office, farmers' income would increase? How do you explain the fact that since the Democrats won the November 1948 election, farm income, instead of increase, has nose-dived? On my own farm in Barron County, Wis., income has fallen 25 percent, for example.

2. If you Democrats are genuinely for the dairy farmer, how do you explain the fact that it was a Democratic administration and a Democratic Congress which caused the enactment of the vicious oleomargarine law? How do you explain the fact that you are supposed to be the friend of the dairy farmer but yet you stab the dairy farmer in the back by this oleomargarine law?

Oleo fraud is not being prevented

3. If you are really a friend of the dairy farmer, how do you explain the fact that you have allocated such small amounts of funds for the Pure Food and Drug Administration for prevention of oleo fraud in the Nation's restaurants? How do you explain the fact that you have not allocated a sufficient staff to prevent artificial oleo from being pawned off on unsuspecting patrons as butter?

Strikes have cut purchasing power

4. If you Democrats are really the friend you pretend to be of the dairy farmer, why is it that you have tolerated ruinous strikes which have caused national paralyses and which have cut down on national income? Every time, one of these terrible strikes has struck—in coal, railroads, autos—the national income has plunged down. That means reduced purchasing power to buy farm products. That means bad news for the dairy farmer.

5. If you are really the friend of the dairy farmer, why did you propose to cut down on the size of parcel-post shipments to farms—shipments which are indispensable to the farmer because he lives relatively isolated from the cities?

We must break down barriers against milk

6. If you Democrats are really the friend of the dairy farmer, why do you not devote major attention to this matter of breaking down interstate trade barriers? Right now, more and more milk shipments are being restricted so that we of Wisconsin cannot, for example, sell our milk to other States because of phony health barriers which are set up against admission of these products. Why do you not devote some of your excess personnel to this problem?

We of Wisconsin know, for example, that we depend upon markets in all the other States of the Union in order to provide adequate consumption for our 15,000,000,000 pounds of milk. We ship 96 percent of our cheese out of the State. We ship two-thirds of our butter out of State. We must have these out-of-State markets, particularly for our fluid milk.

7. If you are really the dairy farmer's friend, why is there such a constant effort among members of the administration to cut out price supports on milk, butter, and cheese? Why do we constantly hear complaints from administration men about protecting the prices of these so-called perishable products? We notice that the administration never seems to complain about price supports on Southern products like peanuts, cotton, and tobacco; and yet we are constantly hearing complaints about price supports on products produced in the Republican Midwest.

Another challenge to Democrats on seaway

8. If you, the Democratic administration, are really for the dairy farmer, why is it that the Democratic Congress refuses to take action on the St. Lawrence seaway legislation? Under this bill, for which I have been battling many years, we in the Midwest would be enabled to ship our farm products at tremendous savings. But Democratic-controlled committees in the Senate and House refuse to take action on this vital St. Lawrence seaway matter.

9. If you are the farmer's friend that you pretend to be, why are you trying to slash protective tariffs?

At this time the Democratic administration is endangering the cheese industry by indications of a desire to slash cheese tariffs with the result that cheap foreign cheeses—which do not meet our high health standards—may pour into our country to compete with Wisconsin-made products.

And so the story goes, a story of insincerity.

The dairy farmer of Wisconsin and of the Nation is sick and tired of the double talk which he has heard from the administration. The dairy farmer can distinguish his friends from his enemies. He will not fall for the siren song of the present administration.

REPUBLICANS HAVE FOUGHT FOR DAIRYMEN

He knows that it was Republican votes which furnished the greatest strength in the battle for butter against oleomargarine. He knows that it is Republican votes which have provided the principal strength in the fight for the St. Lawrence seaway, that it is Republican voices which have always been among the foremost raised for protection of dairy prices.

The dairy farmer will not forget these facts when he goes to the polls in November. He will remember that the Republican Party has always been the friend of rural electrification, the friend of the cooperative movement, the friend of dairying, the friend of the agricultural segment of our economy. He will not forget that the Democrats broke their promise of 1948—the promise to keep farm income at a stable level. He will not forget that since electing a Democratic President to office in November 1948, his—the farmer's—income has nose-dived.

SENATOR WILEY INVITES ADMINISTRATION'S ANSWER

If the administration has the answers to these comments I have made, let it present them to the farmer. Let it cease making glib promises filled with huge generalities. Let it start working and fighting for dairying instead of cutting the dairyman's throat.

Yes, my friends, June is dairy month in Wisconsin. It is a good month as every month is a good month to increase consumption of vitamin-rich dairy products, and it is a good month to remember who the farmer's friends are and who are but the fair-weather, pretended friends of the farmer.

Address by Hon. William Benton, of Connecticut, at UNESCO General Conference at Florence, Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, a number of Senators on both sides of the aisle have been interested in the matter of the extension of services of information. The junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] recently delivered an address at the General Conference of UNESCO, at Florence, Italy, which I think is valuable enough to be printed in the RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM BENTON, UNITED STATES SENATOR, TO PROGRAM AND BUDGET COMMISSION, FIFTH GENERAL CONFERENCE OF UNESCO, AT FLORENCE, ITALY, JUNE 6, 1950

Mr. Chairman and members of the Program and Budget Commission, to my great regret, my duties in the United States Senate have prevented me from joining you earlier in this great and historic city, and in this conference which may well determine whether UNESCO has a reasonable chance to attain its high goals; and these duties will, I fear, prevent me from taking part in the concluding plenary sessions.

I like to think that these pressing legislative duties in Washington are, many of them, carried on in the spirit of UNESCO—that they are designed to advance the basic aim of UNESCO, the building of a just peace based on understanding. Thus in recent weeks the United States Senate has debated and approved the extension of the European recovery program. It has been discussing President Truman's point 4 proposals in which UNESCO is greatly interested. I have myself been actively sponsoring a Senate resolution which would give added impetus to the crucial role, in the attainment of peace, of honest and freely flowing information among nations and peoples. Hearings on this resolution will probably begin the middle of this month, which is itself an urgent reason why I must return. Part of my resolution calls upon the United States to propose to other member nations of UNESCO an acceleration of the work of UNESCO to the point where it has a chance to make a significant, perhaps decisive, contribution to peace. My colleague who is with us today, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, is one of the co-sponsors of that resolution. Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, has called this resolution the most important piece of legislation before the United States Congress.

What I should like to do in my one talk to you is to restate the great purpose and the great promise of UNESCO in such a way that it may have some influence on the recommendations you make to the plenary sessions.

I suppose I am entitled to be called a UNESCO patriarch. I took part in the constitutional conference in London, in the first and second general conference in Paris and Mexico City. Since then I have been an active member of the United States National Commission. I see some other white-bearded patriarchs of 1945 here. As becomes a patriarch, the position I want to urge upon you is—as it affects UNESCO's basic purpose—conservative and fundamentalist; it calls for a rededication to first principles. As it affects UNESCO's operating decisions, my position is radical and therefore, I hope, progressive.

It is a return to fundamentals to point out that, in UNESCO, education, science, and culture are not ends in themselves but means. It is a return to fundamentals to argue that every UNESCO project should be judged strictly by the relative potential importance of its contribution to peace—and I would add the directness of its contribution to peace. It is a return to fundamentals to protest that UNESCO is laden down with minor and diffuse projects which bear only remotely and indirectly on the pursuit of peace.

I said that I am a radical as to UNESCO's operations and methods. It is, I am sorry to say, now radical to argue that UNESCO should have a budget somewhat commensurate with the problem it is trying to solve. We talked in Paris in 1946 about the first year's budget as a "fledgling budget," a beginner's budget only.

As a return to fundamentals, may I remind you of article I, section I, of the UNESCO constitution?

"The purpose of the organization is to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science, and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law, and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peoples of the world, without distinction of race, sex, language, or religion, by the Charter of the United Nations."

One of the prime purposes of the United Nations, as set forth in its Charter, is the "realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms." Article 19, 26, and 27 of the Declaration on Human Rights, which was unanimously approved by UNESCO at the Beirut Conference, describe those human rights and fundamental freedoms. Article 19 declares: "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers." Article 26, after setting forth the basic right to education, declares: "Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality, and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance, and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace."

Article 27 sets forth the right of everyone "freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits."

Have we had those in UNESCO who deny these fundamental principles? If there are ever any such, they should not be permitted to deflect or retard UNESCO, by any techniques of boycott or obstruction, in its forward march toward the realization of UNESCO's great objectives.

The bitter fact is that the world is riven in a titanic struggle, a struggle for the minds and hearts of mankind, a struggle which goes straight to the center of UNESCO's reason for existence. There is no group of men and women, anywhere, who should understand as clearly as this group should, that the political struggle now raging in the world—the cold war, so-called—is an intellectual, a moral and an educational struggle—far more than it is a contest of military and economic potentials.

When the denial of intellectual freedom becomes a basic political tenet, when the denial in great areas of the world of the right freely to hold and impart ideas becomes a chief threat to peace, can UNESCO ignore such claims? One of the reasons I was willing to forego my responsibilities in the United States Senate and fly here to Florence was the question raised by Dr. Torres Bodet in his April report. He asked: "Can UNESCO remain indifferent to the pressures by which the minds of men are assailed from all sides?"

Can it indeed? Can UNESCO rationalize itself into frustration and impotence? This is the big issue of this conference. I was glad to read in the New York Times of May 26 that the Director General has argued for UNESCO's right to an active role in world politics.

For UNESCO now to ignore the present world-wide conflict for the minds and hearts of mankind would be comparable to a conference of physicians, sitting calmly in the center of a virulent smallpox epidemic—an epidemic which threatened to wipe out whole populations—discussing whether to launch a new medical journal.

How do the periodic purges of artists and writers, and the humiliating spectacle of scientists and scholars asking forgiveness for deviations, how do these square with the United Nations declaration that everyone has the right to hold opinions without interference? How does an educational system which methodically indoctrinates youngsters to believe that one society is supreme, and that other societies are imperialists and warmongers, and are doomed to collapse and defeat, how does this square with article 26 of the declaration, that education shall promote understanding, tolerance, and friendship among all nations?

Let us see to it that UNESCO is not devastated and devitalized. In view of the Soviet's attitude and record, the occasionally expressed theory that UNESCO must soften its policies so that it can be a bridge between the rest of the world and the U. S. S. R. is a chimera.

The world-wide situation that now confronts UNESCO is, indeed, an extraordinary situation. It calls for extraordinary measures—measures over and above the normal program and the normal budget—if we must resign ourselves to the notion that the present budget provides a norm. The extraordinary measures UNESCO must take should represent a constructive and positive affirmation of freedom; a rallying of the forces of freedom, for the sake of freedom; and particularly an effort to bolster the fundamental freedoms among peoples and in areas where these freedoms are threatened and in danger. The scale of the effort should be enormously expanded—proportionate to the degree of danger.

Fortunately the free world has tremendous untapped resources of faith and skill. Can UNESCO find a way to focus these resources? Can it embark on the world-wide educational program the world needs? Can it learn to use radio broadcasting in such a way as to bring home to hundreds of millions of human beings the glorious story of freedom itself? Can it learn to develop motion pictures which would dramatize for hundreds of millions the long struggle of humanity for justice, for the rule of law, for human rights and fundamental freedoms? Can it find ways to increase by 5 times or 10 times the world-wide exchange of students, writers, teachers, journalists, trade-union, and opinion leaders?

Such goals, under effective UNESCO leadership, would warrant a vastly increased budget. There is, however, still another way to finance them. That is through grants from private and public sources. If UNESCO will lay out the program the times demand, a bold and courageous program, I see no reason why the United States and other nations should not consider a special budget to finance special projects, as in the technical assistance program, which so closely parallels the objectives set forth in UNESCO's charter. I advocated such a course for the United States while I was a member of the United States National Commission, before my appointment to the United States Senate. I would like to find the leadership within UNESCO to persuade me to continue to advocate it, and even more energetically. If the United States builds the world-wide radio network which I am now advocating, in consort with many Senate colleagues, I would like to see the United States make available to UNESCO such facilities for UNESCO programing. I would like to hope other nations might do the same. Such cooperation will substitute for our present whisper—a fragile and insecure whisper—a voice with hope and faith, a voice for which the world is waiting.

I agree that the obstacles are many. But the way to overcome them is through bold and creative effort. Otherwise, UNESCO is doomed to mediocrity—a pedestrian role, however important to many of us, but insignificant in line with our mighty dedication of 1945 and our high hopes of our early years.

May I take Germany as an example along this same line? What valid reason is there why UNESCO should not concentrate its attention on Germany, an area crucial to the future of freedom? Germany, it seems to me, provides a major testing ground of UNESCO's willingness to face up to political realities. The Beirut Conference took a vital step forward when it authorized a UNESCO program for Germany, despite bitter opposition from a few countries. But the word "modest" is much too strong a word to describe the actual UNESCO program in Germany. I fear that, unless this program is greatly expanded, it will create within UNESCO one of the illusions to which UNESCO is prone, that when it has made a small effort, in a big field, and has something on paper, it is discharging its responsibilities. This, of course, is a dangerous illusion. It is particularly dangerous in the United States, where so many millions of people expect and want so much from UNESCO. Only last month, when I spoke at the centenary of our Connecticut college for training teachers, at New Britain, Conn., the dean spoke enthusiastically to me of the widespread work related to UNESCO. This interest has developed in thousands of our schools and universities, and among hundreds of thousands of our teachers and millions of our citizens. It is a very dangerous interest—subject to grave disillusionment—if UNESCO delivers a piece of paper on Germany instead of a program.

Mr. John McCloy, the Commissioner of the United States zone in Germany, has asked the Congress for $16,500,000 for re-education work during the next fiscal year in the United States zone. I do not like too well this word "re-education" which has been applied so often to Germany. What the Germans need is a real chance at self-education under the

enlightened leadership many Germans are themselves in a position to offer. Self-education is the most effective form of education. We can help create the conditions to make this self-education possible. We can help break down the isolation of German education and the isolation in which all Germans have been living since 1933.

General McCloy's $16,500,000 is three-fifths of the entire budget he is asking for his operation. It is more than twice the sum UNESCO is budgeting for its global activities, and I am sure it is not enough. Mr. McCloy is quoted as saying that the German people are more receptive to new ideas today than they have been at any time in the last 100 years. At the same time this period of special receptivity is not likely to last for more than a few years.

And what about the French zone and the British zone? Are the needs in them so different? If ever there was an opportunity for an extraordinary UNESCO project, it is in Germany today. Should not the international auspices UNESCO provides be more effective in all three zones than separate programs administered by the separate occupation authorities? And why should not the United States and other nations consider underwriting such a special project? I do not speak for my Government here and cannot. I do not know how far it would be prepared to go in turning over such a responsibility to UNESCO, or in underwriting the over-all cost. I merely know that I would be prepared to advocate a real underwriting if UNESCO had the leadership and had the plan. I regard this underwriting as far more important than the underwriting of any similar sum of money now proposed in the economic area.

I shall not attempt to outline an extraordinary UNESCO project for Germany. One of my own prejudices is in favor of a greatly expanded exchange-of-persons program which would permit German students, journalists, professional people and union labor and opinion leaders to study and observe in democratic countries. When I say greatly expanded I mean an exchange of at least 10,000 persons a year under UNESCO auspices. A trickle of such exchanges is worthless. It creates a dangerous illusion of progress.

Contrast what UNESCO is now doing in behalf of freedom in Germany with the evidence given in Berlin 2 weeks ago Sunday on what totalitarianism can do to the minds of youth. Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick, the distinguished foreign correspondent of the New York Times, who is a member of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, witnessed that demonstration in east Berlin. She writes of it: "Here they are, much as one remembers them in 1933—the same stance and gesture when the band plays, the same air of importance, the same plastic faces, empty and somehow piteous, waiting to be molded into anything the master sculptor decides. * * * The facile enthusiasms of youth are used or discarded only for the transition to complete dominion over the thoughts and the total exploitation of the energies of the young." In a later article, Mrs. McCormick writes: "It is realized more acutely than before that greater energy and imagination are needed to plant the seeds of freedom in the minds of the young, the only soil in which they will grow. * * * No better way could be found to spend American money in Germany than in a large-scale attack on the problem of a peculiarly malleable and vital youth."

Is UNESCO to accept the challenge of Germany? And of Japan? I ask these questions as a kind of final test as to whether UNESCO is to be worthy of its own constitution, and of the hopes so many men hold for it. I feel that here in Florence, here and now, may be UNESCO's hour of decision. In Dr. Torres Bodet, I feel that UNESCO has the extraordinary leadership it requires for the extraordinary efforts it should now put forth. Should we accept his leadership?

It may be truism that the foreign policy of any single nation is directed first to its own security. But in today's world there can be no security for any nation unless there is world-wide freedom.

We in UNESCO believe that the father and protector of all freedoms is the freedom to communicate. Thus the success of UNESCO is vital to the security of each of its member states, as well as to their joint security. I see no reason why each member state should not see in UNESCO a prime instrument of its own security, measured strictly in the narrow terms of its own defense. From this viewpoint, UNESCO becomes potentially as important as military and economic defense measures. If UNESCO could develop and present a few extraordinary projects—projects truly international in character—dramatic large-scale projects, could it not tap the resources, the interest and the devotion which individual nations give to their own security?

It is an awesome challenge UNESCO faces. Is the challenge a challenge to the impossible? We who believe in the power of ideas cannot concede it as yet. We must refuse to concede it. Although the forces which deny freedom and block understanding seem almost insurmountable, we are in fact better prepared and better equipped than any of our predecessors in the world's long struggle for freedom and peace.

We have all of us seen how the various totalitarian creeds that have emerged in varying times and places can and do inspire remarkable devotion among their converts. We are asked if democracy, and the vision of freedom, can match that devotion. Can we peacefully win men toward faith in human dignity? Of the 40,000,000,000 people who have lived on earth since the era of Christ, not more than a few billions have known freedom as we here understand it. As freedom has grown and spread, it has faced a series of stupendous totalitarian reactions. It has survived because it is an inspired faith. As it has inspired us, so can it inspire others when understanding is peacefully sought. Let us keep the good faith and add to it the good works of which we are capable.

Citation by the University of Wyoming on the Occasion of the Presentation to Hon. Lester C. Hunt, of Wyoming, of an Honorary Doctor of Laws Degree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on June 5 the University of Wyoming conferred upon the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] a doctor of laws degree. It was my privilege to serve with him at various governors' conferences at the time when he was serving as governor of his State and I was serving as governor of my State. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the citation by the University of Wyoming in presenting the degree.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION

LESTER CALLOWAY HUNT, responsible citizen, eminent dentist, distinguished chief executive of Wyoming, and able United States Senator.

A native of Illinois, he chose Lander, Wyo., as his permanent home in 1917 immediately after he received his degree in dentistry from St. Louis University. His career as a practicing dentist was interrupted by 2 years of service in World War I and by a period of postgraduate study thereafter at Northwestern University. Upon resuming his practice, he took an active interest in civic and professional enterprises and became recognized as an effective leader in both.

His talent for service in public affairs was first recognized when he was elected to the State legislature in 1932 as representative from Fremont County. From 1935 to 1943 he served with exceptional efficiency and originality as secretary of state. An appreciation of the custodial functions of that office, directed by a keen sense of historical values, led him to institute a search for the original draft of the State constitution and other documents of primary importance and to provide for their preservation and display. While secretary of state, he conceived and introduced the distinctive and popular "bucking-horse" emblem for Wyoming automobile-license plates.

As Governor of Wyoming between 1943 and 1949, he demonstrated repeatedly his gift for economical and constructive administration. He worked tirelessly for the conservation and wise utilization of the State's water and other natural resources and for the development of Wyoming industries. Among the Nation's governors he was accorded a place of leadership and won national recognition as a vigorous spokesman for the West. His genial personality and warm humaneness are reflected in his conviction that the establishment of the Jackson Hole Wildlife Park as a permanent source of pleasure to the people of Wyoming and the Nation is his crowning achievement as Governor.

As United States Senator from Wyoming since January 1949, he has continued to serve his State and Nation with wisdom and dignity.

We honor him for his personal and professional integrity, for his competence in citizenship, and for the distinction of his service in public affairs.

Plight of the Dairy Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have received from one of my constituents, Mr. Carl K. Peters, president of the St. Lawrence County unit of the Farmers Union, an interesting letter dealing with the plight in which the dairy farmers find themselves today.

While not necessarily subscribing to all the conclusions reached by Mr. Peters,

I feel that this letter deserves the attention of all those interested in the future of the dairy industry. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to insert this letter in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE COUNTY UNIT,
FARMERS UNION,
Canton, N. Y., June 6, 1950.

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEHMAN: With the farmers' return in their milk check at the lowest point since before World War II and with farm costs at a record high level, farmers find themselves in a desperate situation. This was the feeling of the membership of the St. Lawrence County Farmers Union at its meeting Monday night in Canton.

Milk prices are approaching the $3 level while feed prices are $4 a hundred. Whenever the milk price gets below the price of feed the farmers are headed for trouble.

Unless something is done the old story of depressions being "farm led and farm fed" will come true again. The proposed changes in the class III prices under the marketing order will not correct this situation. It will result in only a 3½-cent increase in the class III price. At the hearings in Elmira last spring the farmers union proposed changes that would have increased this price 25 to 30 cents a hundred. The handlers asked for a reduction of 25 cents per hundred.

Regardless of class price, the price that the farmer has to live and farm on is the price he gets in his milk check. The farmers union feels that no possible combination of class prices can relieve the present situation and that a return to the subsidy (production payments) system as practiced during the war and as proposed under the Brannan farm plan is now a necessity.

While farm prices are dropping, industries in general, and milk companies in particular, are making record profits, many farmers are having auctions and selling out. This trend endangers the future food supply of this country * * * but what other choice do the farmers have?

We urge you to do all in your power to help the farmers stay on their farms and to continue to produce the milk and other food products that are so necessary to the well-being of all people.

Sincerely yours,

CARL K. PETERS,
President.

The Government Potato Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from the Potato Growers of Wisconsin, Inc.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POTATO GROWERS OF WISCONSIN, INC.,
May 23, 1950.

Senator JOE MCCARTHY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: Keen and widespread concern has manifested itself in the past few months over the proposed changes in marketing order No. 60, which is the instrument by which the Government potato program is administered in Wisconsin and the three neighboring States.

At hearings held in Minneapolis and Lansing, hundreds of potato growers from the four States, as well as those from Iowa and Indiana, voiced their disapproval to the continuation of the present program and to the proposed increase in controls. At both hearings the proponents of the program were either members of the North Central Potato Committee, their alternates, or PMA chairmen or PMA committeemen.

The transcript of the testimony will show that almost unanimously, the growers who testified, that is, the actual producers of potatoes, were opposed to the proposed amendments and to any further effort on the part of the USDA to control production and marketing in the industry. I will not ask you to accept my comments on these matters as being factual but I do urge you to avail yourself of a copy of the transcript of the testimony, and upon reading it, the facts I have stated here will become plain.

Growers in Indiana and Iowa voted almost unanimously to be left out of the jurisdiction of the order and the related agreement. In spite of this overwhelming opposition from the actual growers of the crop, the USDA officials continue to insist that these two States be added to the present four-State arrangement. Minnesota and Michigan growers voiced their opposition at both hearings and Wisconsin representatives emphatically demanded that our State be withdrawn from the present agreement and that the growers in Wisconsin be allowed to grow and market their potato crop under a system based upon supply and demand.

You have already graciously acknowledged receipt of our resolution asking the Secretary of Agriculture to allow Wisconsin to withdraw and I have attached here a summary of the testimony presented by the writer at the hearings at Minneapolis and Lansing. Please note particularly the sections referring to the relative reduction in acreage and production in Wisconsin and that of our competing States such as Idaho, Colorado, Maine, and New York.

As a representative of the people of Wisconsin, potato producers in our State would be grateful if you would do two things:

1. Contact Senators and Congressmen from the other five States involved, state to them Wisconsin's position on the matter, and ask them to state to you the feelings of the growers in their respective States.

2. As soon as possible, join with the Representatives in Congress from the other five States in asking that the transcript of the testimony given at Minneapolis and Lansing be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

We will be most appreciative of your help and cooperation and I will be pleased to hear from you on the matter.

I want to express my thanks for your prompt handling of our request for statistics which we have received.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

CLIFF HUTCHINSON.

Bipartisan Foreign Policy in Partisan Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Bipartisan Foreign Policy in Partisan Politics," written by George H. E. Smith, and published in the magazine American Perspective. I have obtained from the Government Printer an estimate that the printing of the article will require approximately 2¾ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $225.50. Notwithstanding the cost, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY IN PARTISAN POLITICS

(By George H. E. Smith)

Bipartisan foreign policy is, at best, a loose alliance between the administration and a few prominent leaders of a section of the Republican Party for the purpose of reaching common action on selected undertakings in foreign affairs. It was born in World War II, nourished on ideals of international organization for peace and order, and reached its maturity on opposition to Russian aggression.

The factors which account for it are relatively simple. They are: (1) Patriotism in time of war with its over-arching demand for national unity; (2) the sense of crisis caused by Russia in Persia, Greece, Turkey, Czechoslovakia, and Berlin; and Russia intransigence in the United Nations, resulting in the development of a policy of containment; (3) similarity of aims in the party platforms; (4) the extraordinary character and leadership of Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG; and, correspondingly, the lack of other capable Republican specialists in foreign affairs.

A word about each of these. War, hot or cold, and a sense of crisis are old devices for unifying a people, and they readily inspire bipartisan action. The third factor—similarity of party platforms—produced a peculiar result in that it accounts both for support of bipartisan policy and for the criticism such policy encounters. Party platforms are couched in the appealing phrases of ideals and the good life. They fail to draw sharply the distinctions on means and methods which today are the real issues of party battle. Republican Senators and Representatives, finding themselves in accord with the broad aims of both parties expressed as policy by the administration, became strong supporters of bipartisan measures directed to the same ends. They were not willing to be placed in the position of being against good ends (a position which propaganda made miserable) and not able to take positions of sharp distinction from the administration on the means of attaining the good ends. Bipartisan policy thus succeeded wherever its application was possible by reason of emphasizing broad aims.

But other Republicans, directing their attention more to the means than the ends

and more critical of the administration's mistakes in foreign affairs, and made suspicious by the flagrant use of administration propaganda on almost every issue, domestic and foreign, became wary and critical of bipartisan measures. They are not isolationists, but they certainly believe that the center of gravity of American foreign policy must be first and foremost, the United States. Their objection to administration proposals rests upon the belief that too often the administration neglects the American for the international interest. Any administration measure, whether or not cloaked in bipartisan policy, draws their suspicions. These Republicans are constantly forming and reforming into different groups, depending upon the subjects at issue from time to time and causing considerable trouble to those sponsoring bipartisan measures.

By far the greatest architect of bipartisan policy, and responsible for much of its success, is Senator VANDENBERG. His sincerity and earnestness cannot be doubted however much the wisdom of his course might be challenged. His ideas on the current role America should play in the world are strictly the product of his own study and reflection on the posture of world affairs. His taste for elder statesmanship (bringing him dangerously close to the pitfalls of vanity) made it easy for the administration to accept him and to build him up. This does not mean that the State Department or the administration is solely responsible for his prominence and party leadership. He reached those places by the qualities of his own mind, heart, and character. He came by convictions leading to bipartisan policy through profound study of history and by more than a quarter of a century of experience and prominence in national politics. The administration merely recognized the quality of the man, the unfolding texture of his thought and his place of leadership in Republican circles. Accepting him as a key figure the administration catered to him as part of its own strategy, and thereby rendered him a disservice by feeding the suspicions of critics of bipartisan policy.

These critics, however, are equally to blame for the situation they disliked. Few of them were able or willing to master the field of foreign policy. Fixing upon administration lapses in one program or another, they made quick, spectacular sallies into the field, and then turned to other matters. They rarely followed through. Their preparation was woefully inadequate. They failed to explain their positions thoroughly or to draw sharp distinctions. Too often they dealt only in generalities, leaving themselves wide open to the isolationist label. Because of these shortcomings, their influence was confined to small groups while the bulk of their party colleagues turned to bipartisan leaders.

In sum, the factors of war, crises, the broad aims of party platforms, Senator VANDENBERG'S leadership, and the lack of other Republican specialists on foreign affairs among critics of administration policy, each contributed a part toward the construction of bipartisan policy.

What is the bipartisan foreign policy; what does it cover; what is excluded; and what are its shortcomings? According to Senator VANDENBERG, it is "national unity at the water's edge," brought about by "common action"—"the sum total of the contributions of both major parties." Elaborating further he declared:

"This common action does not mean that we cease to be Republicans or Democrats at home. It does not mean that we mute our criticisms of mistakes. It does not mean a fake unit devoid of popular consent. It means that we strive by consultation to lift foreign policy above partisan issue. It means that we attempt to hammer out the greatest possible measure of agreement so we can speak to the world, not as Republicans or Democrats but as undivided Americans."

The policy requires widest consultation to hammer out the greatest degree of advance agreement. It must always be based on full and accurate information. It permits traditional American debate. It applies only where cooperative consultation and mutual decision exist from start to finish. If these qualifications were followed to the letter, the area of bipartisan action would have been narrow indeed; and consequently the policy was blown up in the public mind beyond all definable limits.

In practice, bipartisan policy achieved the greatest possible measure of agreement between the parties by three techniques: (1) Inclusion of selected Republicans in consultations with Democrat administration officials (chiefly the President and Secretary of State) on policies and measures usually selected by the administration. But this was not on all matters of foreign policy, and not always from start to finish. (2) Furnishing some, but not all, information demanded by Republicans and such other information as the administration considered necessary to explain its proposals (much information was either denied or given out incompletely). (3) Inclusion of selected Republicans in some, but not all, international conferences and diplomatic negotiations requiring subsequent congressional action.

As its sponsors and practice explain it, bipartisan policy is not a full party partnership. The administration selected collaborators from Republican ranks whose prior opinions indicated general acceptance of administration aims.[1] It did not take all points of view in both parties and attempt to hammer out the greatest possible measure of agreement. The administration made no attempt to bring the full Republican leadership into cooperation as a genuine bipartisan policy would seem to imply, although Senator VANDENBERG was frank and fair on all bipartisan measures explained to Republican Party conferences. Perhaps the administration felt that Republican leaders such as TAFT, MILLIKIN, BRICKER, BREWSTER, WHERRY, and BRIDGES of the Senate, and JOSEPH MARTIN, CLARENCE BROWN, HALLECK, HINSHAW, JUDD, SHORT, and DANIEL REED of the House were either too politically minded or too insufficiently prepared in the background of foreign affairs. There is some cause in the latter reason, but certainly none on the ground of politics in a bipartisan policy, unless bipartisan means simply Republicans and Democrats of like mind sitting down together. But if it does mean that, and political opponents are deliberately excluded, then all the high-sounding talk of unity is beside the point.

Nor was the administration content merely to pass these men by; it sought actively to neutralize their objections to administration policy, and where that could not be done on Queensbury rules, the administration directed below-the-belt blows at them. The charge of isolationist to label those who did not readily follow the administration line was often effective but no more deserved than if applied to Dean Acheson when he wrote off China to the Communists. At any rate, bipartisan policy falls short of the unity it seeks or proclaims to the extent that the administration selects only friendly collaborators from the opposition camp, or excludes those who do not accept the administration line.

Bipartisan policy does not cover all subjects and areas of foreign relations but chiefly those on which congressional action is necessary. On many of the most important matters where the President or State Department could act without the necessity of congressional approval, little attempt at bipartisan agreement was made. Some of America's most distressing current problems stem from failure to uphold principles of the Atlantic Charter, from Yalta and Potsdam which, even at the war's height when unity was imperative, did not include bipartisan cooperation, through no fault of Republicans. Bipartisan policy did not include China, Palestine, or Japan. It was hastily invoked at the ninth hour in the case of aid to Greece and Turkey. With the exception of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, bipartisan policy barely touched United States relations with South America. It did not cover the German problem. Foreign policy and unity at the water's edge implies the whole of American relations on all topics and with all foreign nations and problems. To the extent that many are excluded, the procedure can hardly be said to be bipartisan foreign policy.

Nor was the administration completely frank in supplying information needed by Congress to form sound or enlightened decisions. Where it served the State Department's purpose, Congress was flooded with material, much of it plain propaganda. Otherwise, material had to be pried out of the administration with Congress often forced to go to extremes of public criticism to get results. Much information was completely withheld on specious grounds. Experience with trying to learn about secret commitments at Yalta, with trying to get Government files on Pearl Harbor and information on Bretton Woods Agreements, the British loan, the Italian treaty, and on reciprocal trade operations, and in trying to get the Wedemeyer report on China, does not speak well for the eagerness of the administration to give information. This was hardly the demonstration of good faith required of a genuine bipartisan policy.

What attitudes do Republicans take toward bipartisan policy? More Republicans accepted and supported the policy than opposed it. The reasons for this should be clear from factors already discussed. But what about those who opposed or criticized the policy? To many of these Republicans the bipartisan foreign policy continually operated in the smog of partisan politics. Time and again these Republicans were violently aroused by political tactics of Roosevelt, Truman, and other leaders of the Democrats. In these moments they looked upon bipartisan policy merely as a device to tie Republican hands on the most dramatic issues of the day while Democrats beat them over the heads on domestic matters.

A strong thread of this suspicion runs clear through the fabric of bipartisan policy. It began as early as the summer of 1940 when Roosevelt took two prominent Republicans, Col. Frank Knox and Henry L. Stimson, into his Cabinet. He also paid subtle courtship to Wendell Willkie, the Republican nominee. Roosevelt's "bipartisan" action threw the Republican Party into confusion and effectively removed the issue of foreign policy from the campaign. Since foreign policy was the supreme and most dramatic topic before the country at that time, its removal from the campaign left Republicans leaderless and determined the outcome of the election. To many Republicans, Roosevelt's careful selection of prominent Republicans who would support his policy and his timing of the move

[1] This is the basis, perhaps, for Senator VANDENBERG'S statement that bipartisan policy does apply to most contemporary basic principles. It should be noted here that Senator VANDENBERG reserved independence of action in accepting the assignment to the San Francisco Conference.

to coincide with the start of the 1940 campaign looked suspiciously like a partisan trick in a nonpartisan wrapper.

The thread of suspicion thus woven into administration foreign policy never ran out in subsequent years, but dimmed or flamed with the turns of war and peace. If it was important for the United States and for world peace to keep partisanship out of the negotiations for a world organization, why was it not equally important to do the same in the matter of other conferences where the world's fate was also at stake? Yet the Democratic administration eagerly courted Republicans for nonpartisan action at San Francisco, Bretton Woods, and Mexico City on matters of international organization, and flagrantly ignored Republicans in connection with Yalta, Tehran, Cairo, and Potsdam. If policy was to be nonpartisan or bipartisan as to Europe, why not in China and Palestine? To Republicans constantly importuned not to play politics with American unity or with the world's future, it was irritating to have their nonpartisan action selected for them by their political opponents.

Republican suspicion was also deepened by open affront in political quarters where good faith faced its highest test. After three war years of strong bipartisan support for administration measures, the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress took over and climaxed the record with achievements and a performance of unity rarely paralleled in any previous Congress. From this Congress came the European recovery program, the Greek-Turkish aid program, approval of four treaties of peace with defeated European nations, the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance for the defense of the Americas, aid to displaced persons in Europe seeking to come to the United States, official sanction and broadening of the Voice of America broadcasts, entrance into the World Health Organization, renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements program, and the highly significant Vandenberg resolution to strengthen the United Nations machinery for peace. The Eightieth Congress also approved other measures closely connected with foreign policy such as the national service law to strengthen national defense and a law to unify the armed forces.

Without Republican support none of these measures could have been passed. Indeed, a Republican Congress undertook to do the administration's work. Yet the 1948 Democratic platform virtually claimed a monopoly of these and other bipartisan achievements, While President Truman waged war on the Eightieth Congress as the second worst. In an address remarkably fair and restrained, Senator VANDENBERG described the Democratic platform as amazingly impertinent. Throughout the campaign Democrats made but slight reference to the bipartisan policy, giving substance to the charge of many Republicans that theirs was the role of pulling chestnuts out of the fire for their political opponents.

In order to make farm votes out of falling wheat prices, President Truman even denounced the Eightieth Congress for failure to approve the International Wheat Agreement when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, by unanimous vote of Republicans and Democrats, delayed final action on the treaty with a view to modifications more advantageous to the national interest, as was done in the next Congress. It was to be expected that Republicans would turn cynical about a policy which in the name of bipartisan unity silenced their criticism, demanded their support, denied them credit, and then used other foreign-policy measures to belabor them up and down the country.

Private suspicions broke out into the open when Democrats organized the Eighty-first Congress after their victory in the November elections. When an election year alters party membership in Congress, party representation on committees changes. Although Republicans had the power in the Eightieth Congress to dominate the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by fixing a party ratio of 8 to 5, they refrained from such an uneven balance on this committee out of deference to the bipartisan idea and fixed the ratio at 7 to 6, as near to equality as the division of a committee of 13 would allow. When the Eighty-first Congress convened under Democratic control, Republicans rightly expected this ratio to continue for the same high reason. But with lame excuses the Democrats upset the balance and fixed the ratio at 8 to 5, while they expressed much hope in words for a continuance of bipartisan support. This was interpreted widely as a "kick in the teeth" for Senator VANDENBERG and the death of bipartisan policy.

Still another example of flagrant partisan politics occurred in the case of John Foster Dulles. He had become one of the prominent sponsors of bipartisan policy when the critical period of peace making began, having been selected by Governor Dewey during the 1944 campaign to serve bipartisan policy at Secretary Hull's invitation. For 5 years thereafter he served without partisanship in many capacities. Appointed by Dewey to fill Senator Wagner's place, Dulles sought the Senate seat in his own right in 1949. Notwithstanding his loyal aid to the administration in matters of foreign policy, President Truman went out of his way to defeat him. As leader of his political party, President Truman cannot be criticized for activity in behalf of its candidates, but foreign policy presented a special case. Here, there was a conflict between gratitude for Dulle's services and the President's political sentiments. The conflict might have been resolved by a compromise in which the President left the New York election to the State parties, as many other Presidents have done in analogous circumstances; [2] but he preferred to ditch bipartisan obligations to insure another Democrat in the Senate.

To Republicans the incident was another proof that the bipartisan policy was simply a one-way street—all give and no take on their part. The strategy, Republicans reasoned, is to woo the opposition with expressions of patriotism and ideals of nonpartisan unity so long as their help is needed, but every device of partisanship is used to cut them down. If they win, attacks on them are dismissed as campaign talk and the courting is resumed, probably on the theory that if you can't lick 'em, take them over. If they lose, consign them to limbo. This, say Republicans, may be legitimate political warfare, but it cannot provide the good faith essential to nonpartisan support of the foreign policies of so hostile an opponent.

Here, then, is a considerable list of instances which give color to the charge of many Republicans that bipartisan foreign policy is urged by the administration mainly to induce prominent Republicans to "run interference" for their political opponents who make the goals, take all the credit, and scuttle on their bipartisan obligations.

One more inquiry: What are the advantages and disadvantages of bipartisan foreign policy to Republicans, Democrats, and the Nation?

To Democrats the policy is all advantage, no disadvantage. They have been free to pick the subjects, areas and times on which to collaborate. They were free to select Republicans as they needed them and to discard them when circumstances changed. On successful bipartisan action they have taken the credit, scarcely mentioning Republican contributions. On bipartisan measures which developed difficulties, the shared responsibilities tended to neutralize opposition critics. At all times they were able to split their opposition. Where Republican aims were similar to their own, Democrats did not applaud the national unity, but charged that Republicans had no program other than "me, too." Where Republicans differed from the administration, Democrats could denounce them for disunity in times of national crisis. Where bipartisan policy was incomplete (as in Palestine affairs) Democrats could play violent partisan politics on some foreign issues, as did Roosevelt and Truman, while using the plea of national unity to restrain Republican reprisals on other foreign policies. Finally, by neutralizing Republicans on some major measures of foreign policy. Democrats also neutralized much criticism on domestic matters because foreign and domestic affairs are inseparably associated. Democrats constantly held the advantage of a large section of Republican support while remaining free to denounce the Republican Party generally.

What disadvantages did the administration suffer from the policy? They had to take some Republicans into confidence occasionally; but what disadvantage does that hold if you can pick collaborators supporting your aims? Democrats had to accept some constructive improvements in their own schemes and suffer exposure to some new ideas. In order to show some good faith as well as support its own case, the administration had to give information incident to bipartisan measures. With Republicans having sizable numbers in both Houses in the Seventy-ninth, Eightieth, and Eighty-first Congresses, the administration would have been forced to give information (perhaps far more than it gave in collaboration) to gain legislative approval where needed. Viewed from almost any angle, bipartisan foreign policy was clear advantage to the Democratic administration which could well afford to make it a key strategy in handling Congress and in waging the party battle.

Republicans, on the other hand, gained a little but gave up much to bipartisan foreign policy. They had clear claim to patriotic motives. They gained the right to be closer to some unfolding events, and they received some information on policies and conditions without having to fight for it. But the price paid for this was a neutralization of criticism, a sharing of responsibility, and the loss of acclaim they might have gained for holding the administration to public accountability. A few Republicans gained Nation-wide popularity, some of it generated by the administration as an incident in strategy. Some political capital was made on matters outside bipartisan policy as in German problems, Formosa, and China.

On the debit side the items were many. Sore spots within the party were kept open, constantly irritated, and often widened. The wing of the party attracted by bipartisan policy actually helped to disparage in both foreign and domestic affairs the wing not so associated. The atmosphere for working out differences within the party was constantly clouded by the identification of one wing with the political opposition. The policy split party leadership. It confused party membership in the Nation because a policy of working with the Democratic administration was no substitute for a positive, independent Republican program. With foreign questions looming large in the public

[2] Democrats faced a similar situation when Senator VANDENBERG was up for election in 1946. On good authority it was stated that he received assurance that no active campaign would be waged against him, and the facts of his election (without the necessity of his campaigning) confirm this. While contradictory, from Michigan and New York elections can be plausibly distinguished, but the distinction casts reflection on the administration's good faith.

mind, a policy of collaboration on these matters removed more than half of the dramatic issues from Presidential campaigns. Many domestic issues were likewise compromised for Republicans through the close association between home and foreign affairs. Bipartisan collaboration prevented Republicans from passing from the statement of general aims in their platforms to a deeper analysis of methods where the real issues between Republicans and Democrats can be found. The bipartisan policy thus kept Republicans from drawing the basic distinctions between the parties and making them clear to the voters. In sum, bipartisan policy effectively tied Republican hands in the political battle.

Did the gains to the Nation warrant the loss of vigorous party debate? Senator VANDENBERG makes the point that traditional American debate is not stifled by bipartisan policy. This is open to serious question if Presidential campaigns and congressional debates are thoroughly examined. Granted that some debate took place, the assumption was always present that legitimate objections of administration policies were dissolved in the bipartisan collaboration, leaving critics with only illegitimate claims and on the outer fringe of decision.

Senator VANDENBERG mentions two advantages to the Nation: unified and swift decision at critical moments, and freedom to change administrations without affecting the continuity of foreign policy.

Are these advantages in all circumstances, and do they always depend upon the existence of bipartisan policy? In wartime there are critical moments and swift decision may be imperative, but bipartisan policy plays a minor role. It is itself largely a product of more compelling forces: a foreign foe, a nation mobilized, regimented and in the hands of a supreme commander, backed by the Army, a very efficient surveillance police, and the powerful force of patriotism. These considerations make for unity without special techniques such as bipartisan collaboration.

In peacetime, other unifying forces are at work. Bipartisan policy may be one of them, depending upon the circumstances, but it is not indispensable. In peacetime, a national administration is in office with authoritative constitutional powers to conduct the Nation's affairs. It can and does speak for America, but bipartisan support can make the voice stronger—only to a certain point. Swift decisions in peacetime are few and often unwise. Little of bipartisan policy required swift decisions. The people may want to change administrations precisely to break the continuity of an unwise foreign policy. A bipartisan policy making swift but unwise decisions or continuing unwise policies would be a greater danger to the Nation than the sharpest partisan opposition. Bipartisan policy does tend to soft-pedal criticism; and if its supporters increase, what becomes of the critical voice, the corrective force?

Foreign and domestic affairs are today so closely interwoven that any attempt to remove one set of issues from public debate would soon weaken debate on the other until the power to govern through a vitalized political system would be removed from the people altogether.

As a matter of fact, there has been considerable debate on foreign policies in Congress during the years of bipartisan policy. But it has been a curious kind of debate with Republican leaders who sponsored bipartisan policy achieving their ends through various forms of individual and small-group bargaining with the administration and then sustaining the understanding chiefly against their party colleagues. This makes for as much dissatisfaction as it gains in unifying the voice of the Nation. What is more, the value of public debate is lost.

What has been achieved by bipartisan policy which might not have been achieved without it? What Republican contribution to foreign policy depended solely on bipartisan understandings and could not have been achieved if Republicans acted as a completely independent opposition party? Would the idea for a United Nations have been rejected? Would Republicans have failed to get the idea of justice into the Charter? Would articles 14 and 15 have been rejected because they were inspired by Republican sources? Would the mistake of not connecting the Greek-Turkish agreement with the United Nations have gone uncorrected merely because Republicans among many others saw the glaring error and pressed the remedy? Would the suggestion for the Rio Treaty have been ignored? Would improvements in the ECA not have been made?

Some of these matters were possible because Republicans took actual part in conferences. Some (though not all) of the most important of these corrections, suggestions, and improvements came not through bipartisan machinery at all, but through vigorous Republican criticism by spokesmen outside of the bipartisan policy. Participants in the bipartisan policy took them into conferences with administration officials and committees, or pushed them on the floors of Senate and House. And they were adopted as most matters are adopted in the American system, that is, by compromise on sheer good sense or by the force of opposition. Had this practice been wider, as it certainly would have been without the restraints of bipartisan policy, the postwar course of foreign affairs might have been quite different.

Fair examination of the circumstances in almost every case shows that measures brought about by bipartisan collaboration could have been achieved had the parties remained strictly independent—the Democrats in power and Republicans in opposition. But far more important, by independent action, Republicans would have had stronger leadership, more freedom to criticize and debate, and greater force in their atempts to reach more effective policies in American foreign relations. Looking at administration foreign policy as a whole and the chaos it faces all over the world, the Nation, too, might have been better served by vigorous partisan debate unrestrained by bipartisan trappings.

(George H. E. Smith is a former staff director of the Republican Senate Policy Committee, a former member of the Yale faculty and collaborated in the writing of The Idea of National Interest and the Open Door at Home.)

A Committeeman Writes About PMA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article relating to the Production and Marketing Administration which appeared in the Farmers Union Herald of June 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A COMMITTEEMAN WRITES ABOUT PMA

(By Miles A. Nelson, county committeeman, Itasca County, Minn.)

The following is a letter originally sent by Mr. Nelson to the Minneapolis Star for publication in its Everybody's Ideas column. The Star, which has been conducting a vicious drive against the PMA, edited the letter down to a meaningless three paragraphs. To people like Mr. Nelson who take pains to get the record straightened out, it would appear that the Minneapolis Star does not want its captive readers to have the full truth in this and other controversies.

"There has been a lot of comment and some charges of political connections with our annual Production and Marketing Educational State meeting, of April 3 and 4, at St. Paul. This meeting was for the purpose of explaining the carrying out of the national conservation farm program. The grassroots of this program are the community committeemen and next in line are the county committeemen who, under the supervision of the State PMA officials, manage the program.

"Soil conservation, loans on farm products, sale of storage bins and various kinds of foods the Government may own, crop insurance, assisting the farmers in getting their fertilizers and lime, and also seeing that they use it according to the farm program are some of the various programs carried on by the PMA.

"This farm program is the most essential of any the United States Congress has to deal with, both in time of peace or war. Conservation of our soil, so that everybody can have food and clothes, is the building of prosperity in the United States of America.

"Experience has taught us that the income of agriculture in the country is the approximate income of labor and it is the buying power of labor and agriculture that make our markets for industrial and agricultural products.

"Here are some of the accomplishments of the AAA, now known as the PMA, since it was started. It has made 700,000 miles of terraces, 730,000 dams and reservoirs, 70,000,000 acres of contour crops, 200,000,000 acres of green manure and cover crops, 622,000 acres of tree planting, 37,000,000 acres of pasture and range clearing, 180,000,000 tons of lime, and 16,000,000 tons of phosphate has been bought and applied.

"The farm program has brought grains by the millions of bushels and other farm products by millions of pounds, dozens, and tons, through the county and community committeemen, for the Commodity Credit Corporation. On the perishable products the Government has lost millions of dollars, but on the grains they have made a profit of $600,000,000.

"All large industries have educational programs for their employees, and a program the size of the farm program has got to have the same. Consequently, we had our 1950 State annual education program, and as Secretary Brannan is the national head of the program, naturally, he should be the first one to head the program. The farm program while running under the Agriculture Adjustment Act was a success, practically every farm, big or small, was buying bonds or paying debts. Since this compromise farm plan took effect the farmer's buying power has been reduced around 30 percent. This comes about from the falling of prices for products they have for sale and the increase of prices of articles he must buy. This 30-percent decrease in the buying power of the farmers is already showing its effect in the cities, as we now have between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 unemployed.

"As Secretary Brannan has the responsibility of supervising the present farm program he sees that it is not working in the

line of keeping prosperity in the United States of America. So he wrote a substitute bill and at the April meeting he explained it to us. He also stated if anybody else would furnish a bill that would fulfill the same ideas as his bill he would be 100 percent for it.

"Immediately after this April meeting all kinds of accusations were made. Such as, it being illegal, and that it took a political stand. Well, this State is classified as a Republican State and both Senators THYE and HUMPHREY were invited to speak at our meeting. We often hear, 'Why subsidize the farmer, let him go by himself and have cheap farm produce.' Well, we had that in the Hoover administration. Even your editorial of April 6, 1950, did not make sense toward making a sound farm program to preserve prosperity of the country as a whole. Every place you go you find someone against subsidizing the farmer.

"The farm program means keeping our soil productive and buying power in the hands of all consumers, which in turn keeps labor and business in the cities from going on relief."

In Behalf of Senator McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Bridgeport Post on June 7.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN BEHALF OF SENATOR MCCARTHY

It is about time somebody said something in defense of Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, everybody's favorite whipping boy of the moment.

Let us begin by admitting that he may have made mistakes. His charges about the infiltration of communism in the United States Government, particularly the State Department, may have gone too far.

Let us say that some of his major charges have not been proved. But note this—they have not been disproved, either. They have been met with screams of rage or anguish, with violent denunciations almost as flagrant in tone as MCCARTHY'S critics charge him with being. But of proof, there has been very little offered to date.

In the meantime MCCARTHY has done the whole Nation a tremendous, indispensable service. He has aroused all of us to real danger that actually existed. He has stopped the conspiracy of silence which prevailed in Congress and in Government.

He has forced reluctant Congressmen and Senators to face the facts, and he has aroused the whole Nation with a determination to do something about it. All attempts at whitewash are now being resisted by solid public opinion. Thank MCCARTHY for that. We have already learned many amazing and shocking and indisputable facts about the state of affairs which existed in Washington, the only excuse or apology now being that the evil has ended. That remains to be proved.

All of this was concealed from the public in the past. MCCARTHY has brought it to national attention. It has been said of Communist Russia that she doesn't need to fight a war if she can obtain all her objectives without fighting which is exactly what she seems to be doing at this moment. Similarly, it might be said of the Communists in the United States, that they do not need to win an election if they can penetrate our Government from the inside and shape its policies by treason and sabotage.

To all of this we are now painfully alert as a Nation. Thank Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY alone, who risked the displeasure of his colleagues, who risked his personal career to lay these facts before us and arouse us to action.

In brief, he did something about it. If he overstepped the bounds at times it was because of the anger of an outraged American. There wasn't another man in the Government or in Congress who had the guts to do what MCCARTHY did and we give him credit for it.

Electricity: Public or Private

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, the June Monthly Letter on Economic Conditions and Government Finance, issued by the National City Bank of New York, contains a splendid discussion of public and private power.

Differing from most discussions of this character, it presents the argument on both sides of the public power subject and, therefore, I think it is worthy of perusal by the Senators and the public.

I ask unanimous consent to have it appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I find that the length of the letter requires a cost estimate from the Government Printing Office. I now have obtained such an estimate, and I understand that the printing of the letter will require two and two-thirds pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $218.68. However, this matter is of such importance that I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELECTRICITY: PUBLIC OR PRIVATE?

With President Truman's statements at Grand Coulee, Wash., and elsewhere on his western trip last month, condemning opposition by private electric-power companies to further public power expansion, and reiterating the Government's intention to press forward in this field, the controversy over the question of private versus public power promises to reach new heights of intensity.

In his speech dedicating the Grand Coulee Dam, the President blasted the "private power lobby" and "other selfish interests" for opposing river-basin developments, such as the Columbia, Missouri, and Tennessee, declaring—

"We will meet opposition from the private power groups. Many of them—there are, of course, honorable exceptions—do not want the energy of our rivers put to use as power and sold to the people at cost. * * *

"I am sure we will continue to overcome this opposition just as we already have done in building Grand Coulee—just as the people already have in Nebraska, in large parts of Washington and Oregon, and in other sections of the country, where they have decided to distribute power through the public bodies and cooperatives.

"The benefits of public investment must be passed on to the people whose tax money is being used. Those benefits must not be diverted for private profit. We will continue to fight and win for that principle."

Thus did the President fling down anew the gauntlet in what has been an increasingly bitter fight on both sides. On one hand protagonists of public power hurl denunciations of "private power lobbies" and "selfish interests." On the other protagonists of private power denounce the "public power lobbies" and cry "socialism." In this welter of charges and countercharges the public is either carried away by emotional appeals and catch phrases or left baffled and confused.

It may be well to stand off a little at this point from the clash of partisan forces and attempt to calm appraisal of some of the main facts and issues involved. Only in this way can the public properly evaluate these vast Federal programs, undertaken and planned, and try to form some considered judgment with respect to two main questions:

1. Can we as a nation afford Federal Government expenditures of such magnitude for these purposes on top of a Federal budget already swollen to huge proportions and running a deficit?

2. Should we as a nation pursue policies that put the Federal Government in direct competition with privately owned business in one of the major sectors of the economy?

GROWTH OF PUBLIC POWER

Construction of water resource and power projects by the Federal Government on a large scale has taken place almost entirely since World War I, although the original phase of large-scale construction on the Muscle Shoals project, now part of the Tennessee Valley Authority, was begun during World War I and completed in 1925.

Other projects followed, including Boulder Canyon authorized in December 1928 and commenced in 1930.

With the change of administration in 1933 expansion of Federal power projects really got under way, leading off with the creation of TVA in that year. Construction on Grand Coulee Dam was begun in 1934 as a WPA depression project. In the 17 years 1933 through 1949 the installed generating capacity of public power agencies increased more than fivefold, rising from 2,354,000 kilowatts, or 6.8 percent of the combined total of public and private capacity at the end of 1932, to 12,546,000 kilowatts, or 20 percent, at the end of 1949.

The accompanying table depicts this growth by various categories:

Generating capacity, by ownership

[Thousands of kilowatts]

Dec. 31—	Private	Public			
		Federal	Municipal	Other [1]	Total
1932	32,033	232	1,828	294	2,354
1941	36,041	2,871	3,158	834	6,363
1945	40,307	5,081	3,586	1,136	9,803
1948	45,313	5,526	4,078	1,546	11,150
1949	50,120	6,210	4,671	1,666	12,546

[1] Includes cooperatives, power districts, State projects, and noncentral stations.

ONLY A BEGINNING

Projected Federal budget figures for the fiscal years 1950 and 1951 indicate no halt in the upward march of expenditures on Federal power and water resource projects. In 1949 the actual expenditures totaled $702,000,000. For 1950 the President's January budget estimate gave $914,000,000, and for 1951 something over $1,100,000,000. These compare with less than $500,000 in 1948, and only $56,000,000 in 1932. The next diagram shows the steep increase since the end of the war in these expenditures, which account for a substantial portion of the budget deficits now impending for this year and next.

And evidently this is only a beginning.

According to the Hoover Commission task force report on water resources projects, present Federal programs contemplate expanding the federally owned and operated generating capacity to 45,968,900 kilowatts, or to more than the entire private generating capacity at the end of 1948. The report goes on to say:

"Altogether these authorized and projected construction programs envision an eventual 671 major power, flood-control, and irrigation projects within the continental United States. It is estimated that this ultimate program for multiple-purpose projects will cost in the neighborhood of $40,000,000,000."

From all this, and from statements by the President and other Government officials, it is clear that the present administration, like its predecessor, has embarked upon a program of public power development which is something quite different from the historical flood-control, navigation, and reclamation projects which, until 1932, had accounted for only a small portion of the electric generating capacity of the Nation, and which have always been recognized as a proper sphere for Government action. Federal generation and sale of electricity, instead of being merely a byproduct of these other activities, has become a primary consideration in the Government's location and design of many multiple-purpose projects.

ARGUMENTS FOR FEDERAL POWER

In considering the case for Federal power expansion, four principal claims appear:

1. That expansion of the private utility industry has been unequal to the growth of the country's need for power, hence that a great increase in Federal power is needed to avoid power shortages.

2. That river basin development, combining such varied objectives as power, flood control, navigation, and irrigation, is of such character and magnitude that only Government can undertake it.

3. That Government power is cheaper than private power.

4. That our great natural water resources ought not to be exploited for private profit.

POWER NEEDS AND PRIVATE CAPITAL

As for point 1, this is a question that probably no amount of debate could settle satisfactorily to both sides. It is true that since the war instances of enforced power curtailments and brown-outs cropping up in various localities have appeared to support claims that the private companies are unequal to the task of supplying power needs, and that Government must step in and relieve the shortage. The explanation of this goes back to the war when, in the face of tremendous increase in power demand, construction programs of utility companies were sharply curtailed by overriding priorities granted for war production. Only those generating units and other facilities absolutely necessary for the war effort were permitted to be built.

The result of this enforced curtailment of construction was a pent-up demand for power facilities at the end of the war which grew to huge proportions with the postwar boom in general business and vast increases in the use of all kinds of electrical appliances and equipment. Hampered thus by wartime priorities and unable after the war to get prompt delivery of needed equipment to provide for the greatly expanded demands for service, the utility companies could hardly avoid having to restrict power usage from time to time in some areas, particularly where unusual water shortages curtailed hydro output. All things considered, the record of the industry in maintaining service through power-pooling arrangements and running existing equipment to full capacity has been impressive.

Meantime, despite all handicaps, the private utility companies have been making rapid strides in catching up for ground lost during the war. In the 4 years ending December 31, 1949, some 9,800,000 kilowatts net of additional generating capacity was put into service, and construction is continuing at a rapid rate. The margin of reserve capacity was about 14.2 percent at the end of 1949 and is expected to be 15.6 percent by the end of this year. At the present time the power shortage has been met in all but a few sections of the country, notably the Pacific Northwest where threat of Government competition has been a potent factor deterring private capital.

That the utility industry is prepared and eager to meet its responsibilities for supplying the country's needs is shown by projected expenditures of $8,000,000,000 to $9,000,000,000 for expansion in the 7 years through 1956. The problem that is giving it most concern is that of public power and the expansion of Government-owned and operated projects in this field.

PROJECTS NOT SUITABLE FOR PRIVATE CAPITAL?

As regards the claim that river-basin development is of such character that only Government can undertake it, utility interests concede that flood-control, irrigation, or navigation projects are not productive of sufficient revenue to justify investment of private capital. The industry recognizes the propriety of the Government engaging in these fields, and the utilization of the power potentials incidental thereto.

What the private companies ask is (1) that Federal water resources projects should be economically justifiable, with realistic appraisal of benefits and costs; and (2) that river-basin development be not regarded as exclusively a Government function, and that opportunity and encouragement be afforded private capital to come in wherever possible, such as, for example, at Hoover Dam where local utilities share with local public bodies in leasing and operating the power-generating facilities on a long-term basis.

Involved in this whole controversy is the difficult question of cost allocation as between power and other aspects of these huge programs, the question of tax advantages, and the weighing of such intangibles as the benefits to the Nation at large of building these great Government projects in different parts of the country. It is easy to see that such developments have brought great benefits to the regions concerned. But much more difficult to gage are the "benefits" to the taxpayers in the rest of the country whose tax money has paid for the facilities in these favored areas.

That there is urgent need for better advance planning of water resources projects is pretty clear. Cost estimates after Congressional authorizations have been obtained have exceeded by 2½ to 5 times the initial estimates. Rapping the Corps of Engineers for practices "bordering on profligacy," the House Committee on Appropriations declared in its report on the general appropriation bill last March that "the averred necessity for major modification of plans, designs, and specifications after construction is begun on projects is clearly indicative of the fact that construction of numerous projects has been initiated before adequate surveys, plans, and designs had been developed." Such practice, the committee said, "is not proper stewardship of a vital and very expensive public function."

AN EXAMPLE OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Though private utility companies have built many big dams and power plants, the dedication last month of Pacific Gas and Electric Company's $62,000,000 Feather River project northeast of San Francisco was particularly interesting, coming as it did within a few days of the President's dedication of Grand Coulee. This project—part of a 6-year postwar development costing $750,000,000 and a product entirely of private enterprise—is said to be the biggest hydroelectric development begun and finished anywhere in the country since the end of the war. It consists of new power houses, two big concrete dams, and 10½ miles of 25-foot tunnel carved through granite. Construction has required 3 years with a peak working force of 3,000 men. It is an impressive illustration of the ability and readiness of the private utility industry to undertake major hydroelectric projects. There are many similar developments under private enterprise.

Yet, despite such accomplishments by the private power companies, the Hoover Commission task force report cited above points out regarding the Federal public power program:

"If brought to completion, these hydroelectric projects, plus all presently installed hydroelectric capacity, will exhaust a considerable portion of the further hydroelectric possibilities of the Nation. It should also be noted that generally the better hydroelectric sites in the United States have already been developed. Many of the projects now proposed to be built by the Federal Government are at remote locations involving relatively long distances from the load centers, and hence will require very substantial transmission investment."

The report goes on to say:

"Private utility companies are virtually precluded from developing new sites in major portions of the Nation because of Federal competition. The Federal Power Commission has demonstrated a reluctance to issue licenses for private companies to build at sites in areas where Federal agencies are contemplating construction, and private capital has demonstrated a reluctance to make heavy investments in areas where the Federal Government may establish a competitive project."

It was in protest against the kind of discrimination described above that Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board of General Electric Co., declared in an address at the Midwest power conference in Chicago last April:

"How many Americans know that right today, in our own country, the Interior Department of the Federal Government is trying hard to prevent the Federal Power Commission from licensing two private utility companies to develop certain hydroelectric projects in Virginia and California because the Interior Department wants to develop them itself with taxpayers' money? I am not suggesting—nor, I think, would anyone here suggest—that there are no power projects which the United States Government should undertake. But when a responsible private company is ready and willing to develop a project with private funds I confess both to a surprise and shock that a department of the Government should object on the ground that it plans some day to develop the same property with public funds."

CONTROVERSY OVER FEDERAL STEAM-GENERATING PLANTS

The President's signing of the first deficiency appropriation bill on May 24, 1949, marked a new phase of the public versus

private power issue. Included in this bill was an initial appropriation of $2,500,000 for the TVA to begin construction at New Johnsonville, Tenn., of a steam-generating plant for production of electric energy. Total cost to complete this plant is about $54,000,000. This was the first time that Congress had appropriated funds for construction in peacetime of a steam-generating station, output of which will be sold by a Federal agency for ordinary commercial purposes. Two other steam plants had been constructed by the Government in the TVA area, but under national defense measures, during Worlds Wars I and II. Several government agencies had tried on previous occasions to obtain funds from Congress for steam-plant construction, but until 1949 had met with defeat.

TVA stated that it needed additional generating capacity to supply the increased demand for power in its service area. It also contended that the additional capacity should be provided by construction of a steam-generating plant to firm up existing hydro capacity—that is, to provide additional sources of power which would be available in times of low water conditions affecting hydro generation. While it is customary in the utility industry to firm up a hydro system with steam-generating plants, the big question was: admitting the need for additional firm power, was it the Federal Government's proper function to build it or should it be supplied by alternative means?

At the Senate hearing on the matter in February 1949 it was pointed out by opponents of the proposed plant that additional firm capacity could be made available to TVA by a well-engineered program of power pooling with neighboring electric utility systems, ready and eager to work out such a program. Another alternative was the possible construction of the plant by a local electric system which would integrate the output with TVA. Neither of these alternatives was acceptable to TVA.

The important point in the controversy over the New Johnsonville plant is the establishment of the precedent that a Government agency, having possible alternatives, had the desire and got the appropriation to build a steam plant in peacetime to supply power for general distribution. If this is to be the accepted principle, why not a Government steam plant in every other area where Federal hydro developments require firming up?

Government agencies, by their subsequent actions, have already given the answer. Over the past 4 years the Southwestern Power Administration has requested funds from Congress to build a steam generating plant. Congress has denied these requests. Yet SPA now appears to have got what it wanted through a lend-lease deal with Rural Electrification Administration.

On January 31, 1950, REA approved loans aggregating $30,900,000 to two REA super co-ops for the purpose of building two steam generating plants and over 1,000 miles of transmission lines in Missouri and Oklahoma. SPA has contracted to buy the output of the generating plants and to lease and operate the transmission lines for a period of 40 years. Meanwhile, efforts of the private companies to negotiate contracts for the purchase of SPA hydro power have been unavailing. Through integration of the SPA hydro system with the private companies in the area would supply the firm power needed for distribution, Government agencies have again showed their desire to expand into the power business in spite of possible alternatives.

The fact that the SPA-REA lend-lease deal bypassed Congress is significant. Other deals of this type are pending in Virginia, Kentucky, and Texas. The question is, What is the limit?

EFFECT OF PREFERENTIAL POWER CONTRACTS

Aside from cases of the Government trying directly to prevent licensing for construction of private generating plants, and aside from the building of Federal steam generating plants, there are other means less obvious, but nonetheless effective, by which Federal power agencies are increasing the scope of their competition with private companies. The basis is found in preferential power contracts.

Under existing law available Federal power is sold first to so-called preferential customers, which include States, counties, municipalities, and nonprofit cooperative organizations. Only after their requirements are taken care of may any surplus power be sold to private enterprise, including electric-utility companies. Preference contracts are on a long-term basis—usually for 20-year periods. Because the requirements of preference customers, present and future, must be taken care of first, contracts with private enterprise are usually on a short-term basis—from year to year or even for shorter periods.

The damaging effect of this situation on a private-utility company is threefold: (1) the existence of a large Government power project in the area makes it inceasingly difficult for the private company to raise capital for expansion; (2) faced with this difficulty, the private company becomes dependent on external sources of power or running older equipment at capacity which is very expensive; and (3) available excess power for sale is largely in the hands of the Government power agency which sells it only on a short-term basis.

On top of these three factors is the threat of public acquisition of a portion of the electric company's properties or construction of duplicate facilities by a public body to operate in direct competition. Such a public body, of course, is financed by sales of tax-free bonds and qualifies as a preference customer for Government power. This is very attractive bait.

It is quite clear that the completion of new Government power projects may bring about a further expansion of various public entities formed to qualify as preferential customers. Such expansion has been and will become increasingly in direct competition with investor-owner utility companies, ready, willing, and eager to supply power needs of the area.

IS PUBLIC POWER CHEAPER?

We turn now to the third principal claim of public power advocates listed at the outset of this discussion—that public power is cheaper and is sold to the people at cost. The impression is conveyed that the Power Trust stands between the powerhouse and the consumer and takes a toll, or makes a profit which can be avoided only if the power is supplied by a public agency.

It is important, first, to realize that Federal agencies are primarily wholesalers of power. Certain large-scale consumers, such as aluminum plants, are served directly but distribution to the consuming public generally is done by municipal or county systems or cooperatives which must add to the cost of the Federal power, purchased at wholesale, their own operating costs and charges for debt service.

Public power rates, either at wholesale or at retail, are generally lower than rates which are charged by an investor-owned utility company. Electricity is generated by the same kind of machinery and distributed through the same kind of wire by private companies and public agencies. The principal advantages to the public power agency, in costs of doing business, lie in freedom from taxes and lower cost of capital.

Public power projects obtain funds by congressional appropriation, loans from the United States Treasury, or sale of tax-free bonds. Investor-owned companies get their money from the savings of thousands of investors who must pay taxes on the income they receive on their investment. Public power projects, moreover, are entirely relieved of income taxes. The so-called payments in lieu of taxes, often made by public power agencies, are supposed to compensate States, counties, or municipalities for taxes foregone as a result of use of the land by a public agency. Many of the larger local distribution systems pay tax equivalents around 5 percent of annual revenues, but the average for the country, according to the Federal Power Commission, is approximately 2 percent of annual revenues. In 1949, the Federal Power Commission reported payments of taxes by investor-owned utility companies in the aggregate amount of $786,789,000—equivalent to 18 percent of annual revenues. The tax differential in favor of public power systems is, therefore, about 16 percent.

A good illustration of the effect of the tax differential on competitive electric rates is found in a booklet prepared by Georgia Power Co. The electric department of this company was charged with taxes in the amount of $7,977,017.47 in 1948, or 16.04 percent of revenue from sales. In the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, TVA distributors charged their electric operations with taxes and tax equivalents amounting to $2,703,844, or 4.49 percent of sales revenue. This is equivalent to a differential of 12 percent which, if applied to Georgia Power Co. rates would reduce them to an average of 1.83 cents per kilowatt-hour as against TVA average rates of 1.200 cents per kilowatt-hour.

In numerous other localities comparisons would show the same result.

Although the tax differential alone can account for the apparent cheapness of public power, there are other factors of an intangible nature which increase the extent of the subsidies enjoyed by public power agencies. Among these are the sharing in numerous cases of a portion of operating costs with other public agencies or departments at the expense of taxpayers.

In short, the well-advertised cheapness of public power rates is a myth from a national standpoint. The taxpayer at large is called upon to shoulder the taxes that the public-power agencies escape paying, as well as to provide cheap or free capital to them. While certain areas which are beneficiaries of Federal power programs enjoy lower electric rates, they do so at the expense of taxpayers of the country as a whole. What one citizen saves on his electric rate, another citizen makes up in his tax.

EXPLOITATION FOR PRIVATE PROFIT

Finally, there is the assertion that the energy of our rivers should not be exploited for private profit. The President says "those benefits * * * must not be diverted for private profit."

This seems indeed strange doctrine to be preached to the American people, brought up as they are in the tradition of free enterprise and the right of every individual to strike out and make what money he can by putting his capital to work. This applies as much to whether he puts his money to work developing the great natural resources of our farms and mines as to whether he invests in transportation, manufacturing, or other forms of profit-seeking activity. Since when has the term "private profit" come to be invidious in this country? With statements in seeming disparagement of this essential characteristic of the free enterprise economy emanating from high places, it is not surprising that many people feel that, wittingly or unwittingly, our leaders are taking us down the road to socialism.

To be sure, the position of the private power companies as quasi-monopolies puts them in a different category from the average manufacturing or trading concern subject to keen competition on its doorstep. Here, however, the public interest is protected by the various public regulatory bodies which prescribe rates to be charged, types and amounts of securities to be issued, and

the classes of service to be rendered. Anyone who thinks these companies are in a position to "exploit" the people and build excessive profits knows little of the situation.

In all the controversy over electric rates there is a tendency to magnify the total cost of electricity in the consumer's budget. People forget that electricity costs less than prewar—one of the few things that does. In 1939 average annual residential usage was 89' kilowatt-hours for which the consumer paid $35.88, or 4 cents per kilowatt-hour. In 1949 average annual residential usage was 1,655 kilowatt-hours, and the bill was $49.65, or 3 cents per kilowatt-hour. The fact is that the American people are getting their electricity at a great bargain.

NEED FOR A PUBLIC POWER POLICY

That there is need for a Federal power policy that will dispel existing confusion and coordinate activities of the electric-utility industry and public-power agencies in some sound and workable way is clear.

A first step toward such a policy would be a better public understanding generally of the circumstances under which private utility companies operate to the end that references to "power trusts," "special interests," etc., would cease to be made and the entire subject brought under dispassionate review. An excellent statement of the facts appeared in the 1948 annual report of the Southern California Edison Co. from which we quote:

"Your company, under public regulation, is required to provide uniform and nondiscriminatory public service to all who comply with public rules and regulations. Your company is not as private in the sense of being free from public taxation, regulation, and control as are similar properties which are financed directly from the public purse. About the only feature which is private about your business is that it is financed by the savings of private citizens and not from the Public Treasury. From that point on the entire process of investing the funds, of generating, transmitting, and distributing the electricity to the ultimate consumer, the rates and conditions of service, are prescribed by government agencies. Although maximum earnings of your company are fixed by regulation, there is no guaranty of minimum earnings."

There probably are few people who believe that the Government should build no dam or develop any water resources, and whether or not one can accept in principle the Government's being in the power business, one must accept the importance in the power picture of the large output of projects built to date.

The answer to the problem would seem to lie in a unified development of the Nation's power resources in which, in the words of the Hoover Task Force Report, "the Federal Government cooperates with its citizens in the development of hydroelectric power, irrigation, and water supply projects instead of competing for markets." Aside from needed improvement in advance planning and fiscal accounting, and a clarification of the tax question, essential elements of such a program would include these limitations:

1. No discrimination by Federal licensing authorities against a responsible private utility company, able and willing to develop a power site, in favor of some public agency to do the job.

2. No additional Federal construction of steam generating plants or building of competing transmission lines.

3. No additional preference contracts for purchase of Government power. Power purchased by private companies would be sold to cooperative and other public bodies under rate schedules subject to regulation by existing authority.

The effect of these limitations would be to check further expansion of Federal activities in competition with private capital. The limitations would not hamper Federal agencies in proper development of water resources, providing flood control and navigation aids or irrigation where needed. Opportunity to participate actively in development of power resources at these projects should be given to the privately owned utility companies such as the arrangement at Hoover Dam.

There is every reason to believe that, with the proper coordination of effort, the power part of the water resources projects, both generation and transmission, can be done by private enterprise. Thus the net result will be not only reduced Federal spending, but lessened Federal competition with private capital and lessened risk of further drift toward state socialism.

Compensation for Railroad Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. WALSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, recently I expressed serious concern about the enormous waste of public funds paid out in the form of compensation for railroad mail service. In my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages A2902–A2903, I called attention to testimony of the Postmaster General himself that the railroads get paid for about twice the car space used for mail. I cited testimony of the chief law officer of the Post Office to the effect that the Postmaster General, and not the Interstate Commerce Commission, controls the service to be furnished by the railroads for mail. For the Postmaster General to say that he can do nothing about the immense waste of mail-car space, I stated is only half true.

I also pointed out the criticism made by the House Appropriations Committee of several instances wherein the Postmaster General has contracted to pay the railroads higher rates than those fixed by the Commission. And in that connection I referred to the law which permits the Postmaster General to make contracts with railroads for mail service at rates lower than those fixed by the Commission.

For the life of me, I could not understand why the Postmaster General would want to pay the railroads for twice as much service as was really needed if he had it in his power to decide how much service the railroads were to furnish—or why he would want to contract for service at rates higher than those fixed by the Commission, which is supposed to be the great expert on transportation rates.

Accordingly, I caused the introduction of House Resolution 547 to authorize and direct a thorough investigation into the transportation of mail by railroads.

The more I looked into the matter the worse I found the situation to be. In my remarks appearing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages A3486–A3487, I noted that the Postmaster General, in his April 17 order curtailing mail deliveries as an economy measure, pleaded that he was helpless so far as reductions in his railroad transportation costs were concerned. In sharp contrast to this plea, however, was the report of the General Accounting Office made to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee early this month, which I quoted in my remarks. I believe it is fair to say that the substance of that report is that instead of making full use of his legal authority to get the most service for the least possible cost, the Postmaster General is defying the law and actually overpaying the railroads.

The excerpts from that report which I quoted criticized as of questionable legality the practice of not requiring the railroads to return mail cars and allowing them to substitute other cars, thus "making it possible for the railroads to realize a greater income." The report showed how this practice is aggravated by the payment of passenger rates for substitute cars hauled in freight trains. It mentioned "numerous complex agreements, which assure the railroads full payment" not just for all cars returned empty after completion of a mail haul but even for empty cars not really returning but actually running empty in advance of a mail haul.

In this situation, I called upon the Comptroller General to make a full investigation of railroad mail service, and asked for support of my resolution.

Two days later, the Postmaster General gave out a statement to the press. He said that erroneous statements and specious arguments by those who have no responsibility in the matter have caused considerable confusion. Therefore, to clarify the situation, he issued what he called this factual statement.

The facts, according to this statement, are as follows:

There is only one way * * * savings in expenditures may be accomplished, and that is by curtailing existing services and reducing the number of people employed.

It is futile for the critics to claim that the Post Office Department by administrative action can make savings of sizable sums in any other way. * * *

It is also futile to say that the Postmaster General * * * should take some action to reduce the payments to railroads and airlines. * * *

The Postmaster General does not have authority to determine the rates of pay to the railroads for carrying the mail. That authority is vested in the Interstate Commerce Commission. * * *

The fact is that about 1 percent of the mail is actually transported in freight trains, mostly during the Christmas holiday period.

There is now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission a petition of the railroads for 95 percent increase in the rates paid for carrying the mail. This Department will present all of the information it has on the subject for the consideration of the Commission, and this presentation will include facts relating to the use of nonstandard equipment. In the last analysis, the Interstate Commerce Commission, not the Post Office Department, will determine the rates to be paid to the railroads for transporting mail. * * *

The accounting system and procedures of this Department are simple and effective. * * *

There is definitely no lack of accurate information in this Department on a current basis to keep the management informed concerning * * * the results of the financial transactions, particularly the revenues and expenditures.

I say this statement of the Postmaster General to the press is tantamount to an unwitting self-indictment. How does the Postmaster General justify contracts to pay railroads higher rates than required by the Commission, contracts whose necessity the House Appropriations Committee has questioned? He is silent. How does he justify the practice of permitting the railroads to substitute other cars instead of returning mail cars in order "to realize a greater income," a practice whose legality the Comptroller General has questioned? He is silent again. How does he justify the "numerous complex agreements, which assure the railroads full payment" even for empty cars not really returning but actually running empty in advance of a mail haul, agreements admittedly made regardless of postal officials' understanding of the law? More silence.

Does the Postmaster General deny paying passenger rates for freight service, or, if not, explain why he must do so? He does not. He says instead:

The fact is that about 1 percent of the mail is actually transported in freight trains, mostly during the Christma holiday period.

But in his report to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee on the repeal of the round-trip provisions of the Railway Mail Pay Act of 1916, he states, on page 17:

Recently collected information indicates that in a 6-month period the Milwaukee Road returned an average of 310 deadhead cars per month in freight trains. During the period October 18–24, 1948, the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad operated 13 extra freight trains from Union Pacific Transfer to Chicago, Ill., which carried 45 head-end passenger-train cars reported on the train consists as empty, 13 of which were listed on the railroad's affidavit for mail pay.

Who is guilty of erroneous statements and specious arguments now? How factual is a statement which is confined to the percentage of mail actually transported in freight trains with no mention of empty cars including many substitute cars, returned in freight trains at passenger rates?

If only 1 percent of the mail is actually transported in freight trains, why did not the Postmaster General point that out to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee in his report, especially since the General Accounting Office report finds that—

Many substitute cars are returned in freight trains and the trip is paid for at passenger rates (p. 2).

Much mail traffic moves in freight trains at passenger rates (p. 4).

Large quantities of mail are moved in refrigerator cars (p. 26).

Many cars of mail are moved in refrigerator and other kinds of freight cars on which passenger train rates are paid (p. 35).

Presumably this 1 percent figure is derived from Post Office Department accounting records which the Postmaster General, in his statement to the press, extols. Here is what the Comptroller General in his recent report to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee had to say about postal accounting records:

It is apparent after consideration of the significance of the more-than-50-percent rule, the same-unit rule, the balancing and pooling agreements, the substitution rule, and after study of the methods of space estimate, affidavits, emergency space authorizations, etc., that a clear, accurate picture of actual railway space needs is not presented by the Post Office Department's authorizations and the railroads' affidavits. It is not apparent that anyone really knows just what the total space actually used in railway cars is per day, week, month, or year. It would appear probable that no one will ever know as long as these complex, recondite, and unwieldy agreements, precedents, and practices exist. We have the paper authorizations and the affidavits which support them, but the actual mail needs are not reflected therein (p. 36).

The postal transportation service or the local post office has little control over authorizations for space on trains. Authorizations are based on the amount of mail claimed to have been transported during the previous month. The railroad's claim is based on estimates rather than precise count. The estimates of the baggageman or terminal employee are accepted by the Government and the deliveries are made by the post office to the terminal or transportation companies without prior determination as to the car footage that will be required. Further, the practice whereby the railroad or terminal companies load and unload mail without Government verification cannot be in the best interest of the Post Office Department. Railroad or terminal employees are taken on or released as the apparent needs require, and it would be to the advantage, accordingly, of each employees to raise the estimates of footage as high as possible to insure continued employment (pp. 20–21).

And here is what the Postmaster General himself told the same Senate committee in his report:

The elimination of the round-trip provisions will * * * save the Government untold amounts of excessive payments now being made because of the impossibility of adequately checking railroad claims for unused return cars (pp. 1–2).

The use of round-trip rates has resulted in the disbursement by the United States of large sums of public funds beyond the amount necessary to provide fair and reasonable compensation to the railroads, the payment of railroad claims not susceptible of adequate check, and the unnecessary operation of railroad equipment (pp. 2–3).

Substantial public funds are paid out upon the incompletely verified claims of the railroads. This method in the past has resulted in the payment of claims for deadhead cars which were not in fact operated as such (pp. 11–12).

The Department disburses large sums of public funds on claims of the railroads not subject to complete verification. This may result, and there is evidence that in some instances, at least, it has resulted in payments for which no compensation was in fact owing. * * * Railroad affidavits for pay which specify the cars operated in deadhead movements are normally submitted several, and sometimes many months after the operations have taken place. * * * Thus, unless a physical inspection is made of all head-end cars at the time of their operation and a record maintained the Department has no means of verifying the empty movements. Because of the impracticability of verifying the actual operation of all head-end equipment it may be necessary at times to make deadhead payments on the basis of railroad claims (pp. 15–16).

If the Postmaster General's statement to the press is factual, what is his report to the Senate committee which admits the devastating criticisms by the Comptroller General of Post Office accounting records and which, in fact, uses the inadequacy of those records as an excuse for making overpayments to the railroads? In his report to the Senate committee, the Postmaster General admits not only untold amounts of excessive payments, but, even worse, the payment of fraudulent railroad mail claims. Here is how he explains it, on pages 17–18 of his report:

The overpayments which may result from the necessity of accepting the railroads' affidavits containing deadhead mail pay claims is illustrated by a comparison of operational data for 11 selected carriers obtained from a field study for 1 week in October 1948 with the affidavits filed for the same period. Approximately 20 percent of the cars for which affidavits for deadhead pay were filed did not appear as having been operated in the information obtained from the field study. A check of these discrepancies conclusively demonstrates that in some instances wholly unwarranted payments of public funds have resulted under the round-trip provisions. In the case of several large railroads a substantial number of the sworn claims filed were admittedly incorrect. In some cases it was explained that some other car should have been claimed; in others, that the cars claimed were operated in other trains, including freight trains, or on dates different from those shown on the affidavits; and in still others that the incorrect claims were due to typographical errors. One large railroad, however, conceded that in a number of instances its claim was in error as no car was available which could qualify for deadhead pay. In this situation, if not in others, improper claims were clearly filed and paid. This situation would not have been uncovered except for the Nation-wide field study conducted in connection with the pending railway-mail pay case.

Most certainly do I agree with the Postmaster General that if the law requires him to do the impossible, it should be changed. But is he really as helpless to reduce his railroad expenditures as he makes out both in his statement to the press and in his report to the Senate committee? The General Accounting Office report says he is not that helpless. It states, on page 8, that—

Congress has established two necessary standards for the payment of railway mail service:

1. The service must be prescribed by the Postmaster General (39 U. S. C. 545).

2. The service is to be increased, reduced, or discontinued (necessarily by the Postmaster General) with pro rata reductions as the needs of the Postal Service required (39 U. S. C. 564).

This agrees with the testimony of the Post Office Department's chief law officer which I quoted in my earlier remarks, to the effect that the Postmaster General controls the service to be furnished by the railroads for mail. As a matter of fact, it appears from the GAO report on pages 31–32, that the Postmaster General started out in July of 1948 to exercise his control over railroad mail service in the form of a comprehensive plan for such service. The report states that he filed this plan with the Interstate Com-

merce Commission; and that the next step was "the establishment in the Post Office Department and promulgation to the railroads of the necessary rules and regulations to bring the plan to practical operation." "However," as the GAO report states on page 3, "no regulations have been issued under the plan." This is puzzling to me, especially since the GAO report also points out, on page 32, that—

> This plan would not eliminate the round-trip provisions but would work toward better control and greater utilization of the space paid for under the provisions.

In other words, if I understand the situation correctly, and I think I do, the Postmaster General is asking Congress to change the law because it is impossible for him to prevent overpayments to the railroads thereunder, whereas the fact is that he has substantial power to control his railroad expenditures, but it seems he is loath to enforce his control. I can find no explanation in his factual statement to the press which clarifies this situation for me.

Indeed, it further appears from the GAO report that it is characteristic of the Postmaster General to be loath to exercise such power as Congress has given him for the purpose of reducing mail payments to the railroads. On pages 8 and 9, that report shows that although the Postmaster General has power to negotiate with railroads not only for waiver of round-trip deadhead pay but also for lower rates than fixed by the Commission, such power has been exercised by the Postmaster General in the case of only one railroad. The GAO report then observes:

> The question logically arises as to the possibility of further amelioration of rates by the proper exercise of this authority of the Postmaster General to negotiate with competing railroads.

What does the Postmaster General, in his recent statement to the press, say about his power to negotiate for reductions in mail pay to the railroads? He does not even mention it. Instead he states, as a fact, that—

> It is also futile to say that the Postmaster General * * * should take some action to reduce the payments to railroads. * * * In the last analysis, the Interstate Commerce Commission, not the Post Office Department, will determine the rates to be paid to the railroads for transporting mail.

In brief, so far as career-man Postmaster General Donaldson is concerned, any reductions in railroad mail expenditures will have to be made by Congress or the Interstate Commerce Commission. "Curtailing existing services and reducing the number of people employed," as he states in his press release, is the one and only way that appeals to the Postmaster General so far as economies in postal expenditures are concerned.

For these reasons, I say again that the Comptroller General should be directed to make a full investigation of the railroad mail situation, and I again urge support for the passage of House Resolution 547.

Folly of Putting Eggs All in One Basket in Preparedness Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, a year and a half ago on January 17, 1949, I stated in the House that the Administrator's policy of "putting all our security eggs in European basket is a reckless gamble." That is becoming increasingly apparent, even to the administration, but at a time when one must fear it may already be "too little, too late." The grim prospects we now face, due to unrealism and confusion in top circles of our Government regarding the seriousness to ourselves of Communist gains in Asia resulting from our negative policies there, are described accurately in the following article by Constantine Brown from the Washington Star of June 11, 1950:

GLOBAL DEFENSE LACKING IN FAR EAST WHERE REDS STAND POISED TO TAKE OVER AREAS WHICH POLICY MAKERS DISREGARD

(By Constantine Brown)

Confusion and uncertainty are more prevalent in Washington today than during the darkest days of World War II. This is due to the hot-cold statements by those in responsible positions, from President Truman down.

No sooner had President Truman stated that the world is closer to peace than it has been in the last 5 years than Secretary of State Acheson told the American people that the situation is grave and unless we spend more billions for defense of our allies we may risk a catastrophe.

Defense Secretary Johnson, who last fall and winter started to trim the fat off the Defense Department, and proclaimed that we were fully prepared to repel at 5 a. m. any attack that began at 4:30, has discovered that by trimming the fat he had cut out a good deal of the lean meat.

Now Mr. Johnson has asked for more money from Congress and has presented a gloomy picture if Congress does not extend the draft bill for another 2 years.

The recent pessimistic statements by the Secretaries of State and Defense are flagrantly contradictory to the rosy views presented by the Commander in Chief, who is supposed to have as much pertinent information about what goes on in the world as his two cabinet officers. It is inconceivable that the State Department and the intelligence offices of the Armed Forces are withholding any pertinent information from the White House.

WEAPONS CAUSE OPTIMISM

In some quarters close to President Truman it is said that the latest development of weapons—such as atomic artillery and atomic heads for guided missiles—assure us that we can smash any attack from a Soviet Army. This, it is said, is one of the grounds of the President's optimistic views.

At the same time, however, Maj. Gen. Arthur W. Vanaman, head of the Armed Forces Industrial War College, has warned that our lack of industrial preparation makes a bleak and dangerous picture.

These contradictions from within the circle of the official family of the President—inevitable in an election year when voters like to hear good news and frequently overlook the bad news—are not as important actually as the tragic lack of our preparedness for a global defense.

According to Mr. Acheson's own statement, we now have a global diplomacy. But we do not have a global defense. We are building—or hope to do so within the next few years—a strong barrier to the Russians on the other side of the Atlantic. But we are leaving our rear wide open in the Pacific.

FAR EAST NEGLECTED

We are spending many billions to create a strong military force in Europe. But we are not doing anything to raise a barrier against the Russian drive in the Far East, except to create what our State Department experts describe as "better living conditions" for the hundreds of millions of people who inhabit those areas.

These experts contend that since improvement of living conditions in Europe has increased the desire of the western Europeans to resist a Russian aggression, the same thing must apply to the Far East as well. They overlook the fact that as much as we talk about equality between races, there is still a fundamental difference between the Asiatic and the western European outlook on life. Our policy makers refuse to believe that people accustomed to respect only force for thousands of years can change overnight and adopt the mentality of western peoples.

Neither President Truman nor his cabinet advisers nor the few Senators and Representatives whom he occasionally consults are conscious of the importance of the Far East. They regard that huge territory only as an area where we could help improve living conditions for the masses. But the strategic and military importance of that region escapes them altogether.

THINKING IN CENTURY TERMS

There are a number of officials in the State Department who know better. But unfortunately those officials, whose advice might have been useful, for a long time have been won over to the view that the corrupt Nationalist regime must disappear and make room for the Communists, who eventually may break away from Soviet influence and adopt a policy of their own.

These men may be right if we think in terms of a century, when Stalin and the Politburo may be only a memory. But from the viewpoint of stark reality about the defense and survival of the United States, they are as wrong as those who advocated appeasement of Hitler and later Stalin. They are as guilty as those who refused to consider the potential threat to Pearl Harbor and left the Pacific scantily defended in 1941.

It is obvious to most military students now that while the Russians are preparing feverishly for total war, they do not care to start the fighting in an area where they will have to meet real opposition. The aim of the Kremlin dictators is to destroy the western democracies which derive their main strength from the only remaining effective opponent of the Kremlin's plans—the United States.

TWO VIEWS ON FORMOSA

The ideologists in the State Department have nullified all the efforts of the Pentagon and Congress to prevent the Communists from conquering one of the most important strategic points in the Pacific—Formosa. They look at the situation in that island from a purely political standpoint and claim that it would be a mistake to support the Nationalist rump government even if sending military equipment would permit its forces

to resist a Communist invasion. The military men, who are not concerned with political ideologies, maintain stanchly that Formosa can resist indefinitely if we extend to its defenders even half the support the Russians are giving their Communist stooges.

These views have been made dramatically clear by General MacArthur, but they have failed to budge the "old China hands" in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department who formulate the policies which Secretary Acheson presents to the President. General MacArthur for some time has been a thorn in the side of the State Department and his strong conclusions are disregarded as coming from an old militarist who does not keep abreast of new trends in the world.

The administration has decided to spend upward of $23,000,000 for the defense of Indochina. It has done so with a degree of reluctance since the French Government has not shown itself willing to give the Indochinese the same independence which we forced the Netherlands to give the Indonesians. But since France is regarded as the main pivot of western defense, the administration could not refuse the request of the Paris government, particularly when Foreign Minister Schuman pointed out that his country could not effectively assist the defense of Europe unless America assumes the burden of providing arms and ammunition for the French forces in Indochina.

FRENCH CHANCES SLIM

In spite of this support, it is highly doubtful that the French will be able to hold Indochina. They have had some 150,000 metropolitan troops in that area since 1946 when Ho Chi Minh, the Moscow puppet, started his rebellion. During those years when the guerrillas could receive only smuggled war materials from Russia, the French were unable either to put down the rebellion or capture its leader. Now that the Communists have defeated the Nationalists in China and the Red army is poised in strength on the Indochinese border, the French chances are even less, in spite of the assistance that they already are receiving from America.

The natives who, like all Asiatics, recognize and respect only force, are impressed by the defeat of the "American-supported" Nationalists in China—a myth which is being exploited by the Red propaganda; by Britain's loss of face, and by the inability of their masters, the French, to destroy Ho and his guerrillas. The net result is that the overwhelming majority of Cambodians, Annamites, and Viet Namese are on Ho Chi Minh's side. Those who have not actually joined the guerrillas are acting as his spies, agents, and subversives in the areas where the French are stationed.

PAYING FOR BLINDNESS

Now that the Communists are in force at the French borders and also occupy the island of Hainan, which the Japanese took over in 1939 preparatory to the invasion of Indochina, the chances of saving the country are at best extremely limited. Our political men have failed to recognize the Soviet strategy of waging a war of conquest in the Far East and the west is paying for this blindness.

The situation in Malaya is less spectacular but equally bad. As soon as the Reds decide to make their final bid for Indochina the fate of Malaya, where the British have been fighting a guerrilla war for the last 2 years, will be sealed.

The military analysts, who are not moved by emotions, fear that once these last two western colonies in east Asia have fallen into the hands of the Kremlin through its usual stooges, the Indonesians will be in real danger.

We in this country sang the hosannas of a great democratic victory when the Dutch agreed to give the Jakart government its complete freedom. Theoretically it was a good thing. It would have been excellent and admirable if we lived in a period of peace and not a shooting war. Within a period of 25 to 50 years the Indonesians, carefully supported by the western nations, could have become a self-reliant nation. They have the population and the economic resources for it.

LOST PROTECTING POWER

Unfortunately they were cut loose from their protecting power in times of heavy storms. They are still at a safe distance from the Russians and their puppets, but if Moscow's plans are fulfilled in the next 12 months their chances of survival are very meager.

The stockade which we have begun building across the Atlantic may be well conceived. But we are left wide open in the Pacific, where in the last 3 years the Soviets, under our very eyes, have built up their strength by relentless pressure.

We now are putting all our eggs in one basket instead of distributing them wisely over all the areas from which we can be threatened. While openly and loudly opposing the Russians in the west we are yielding to them in the Far East because of the misconceptions of a handful of ideological advisers in the State Department to the effect that the Far East can and will be saved by the application of the point-4 program.

Rural Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Honorable ROBERT E. JONES, JR., on June 9, delivered an outstanding address on rural housing, to the Southeastern Housing Officials Conference at Virginia Beach, Va.

There is no one more informed on the subject of rural housing than Mr. JONES. He was, as you will remember, the author of the rural housing section of the 1949 Housing Act. His contribution to the cause of better homes for the farmers of America has brought him the high acclaim of all people who live on our farms.

The speech which Congressman JONES made at Virginia Beach is a good résumé of the first year's work under the rural housing program. It proves beyond contradiction that the Jones Amendment to the 1949 Housing Act points the way to the attainment of better homes on the farms of our country. I invite your careful reading of his address:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is a privilege to meet with you today, and to discuss with you some of the housing problems which we face here in the Southeastern States. I am aware that much of your own activities have centered on the improvement of urban housing; but the fact that you have asked me to talk on rural housing is to me a clear-cut indication that your interests are in improving housing wherever the problems may be found.

I am proud of the part I have been privileged to take in securing legislation which would permit us to help farm families just as you now help city people; yet I am humble when I realize that without the assistance and interest of folks like yourselves I could not have succeeded in planning, pushing through Congress, and obtaining appropriations for a program which would provide housing parity for farm families. Each of you, in your own way, has helped me and is continuing to help.

It seems scarcely necessary to review the history of rural housing legislation to a group such as this, but it does seem important to remind you that until 1949, it was practically impossible for the farmer to obtain assistance from the Government to construct a safe, useful dwelling on his farm. What legislation was available was almost exclusively tied into some farm-purchase loan program such as that which was administered by the Farmers Home Administration.

I felt, therefore, that I was pioneering an almost new field when I introduced H. R. 1376, a rural housing bill, into the legislative mill of the Eighty-first Congress' first session. And I was highly pleased when another legislator from the Southeast, a Senator from my own State of Alabama, saw fit to introduce a companion bill in the Senate. Our Jones-Sparkman bill was included as the farm title of the Housing Act of 1949, almost exactly as Senator SPARKMAN and I conceived it. It was intended to help the farmer who was unable to help himself through private credit, and I believe I can honestly say that in its first 6 months of actual operation it had done exactly that.

As you know, I come from a part of Alabama that is primarily rural, and I have long been aware of the urgent need for some Government assistance to farm families in my district, to help provide them with the same opportunities to acquire housing as you are providing for city families. During my early months in Congress, I devoted most of my time to a study of just how serious the problem really was, nationally and in the Southeast. When I was sure that the need I had found in my own district was widespread throughout the area and the Nation, I studied all the assistance that was available to solve that need, and then spent long sessions with various Government officials to write legislation which would broaden the service Government could give the farmer.

I am firmly convinced that title V—the rural housing title—of the Housing Act of 1949 is the very best which could have been written in this field because you folks told me how to use your experience and your methods. It is good because the Farmers Home Administration let me share in their experience, too. It is good because the solicitor's office carefully examined every line of it for legal bugs. And so our legislation, as it was finally passed, should contribute immeasurably to the improvement of farm standards of living.

Most farmers live on the land they farm, and their farms and their jobs are inseparable. That meant we had to consider more than just the construction which would be possible under the Farm Housing Act. We had to write into the legislation methods of appraisal which would include this human angle and the value of the land. A farmer should be able to make a success if he has a good farm and uses good farming methods, but it is doubtful that he would be able to repay his Government housing loan if the farm were inadequate, or if he lacked farming experience. Yet it is equally true that a good farmer on good land would be expected to do even better if he has adequate housing. The buildings on his farm are part of his tools of trade, not just a dwelling. It is his home and workshop combined, and we had to consider it as such.

For decades there has been a growing realization of the importance of adequate housing to the success of the occupant. Most of this recognition in the past has been in the part it can play in the health, social, or material welfare of the occupant. For at least 15 years we have had legislation which recognized that the public in-

terest requires special ways and means of enabling large segments of the population to gain access to better living quarters.

For the most part, however, the public has always associated inadequate housing or slum conditions with the cities. They have encouraged the work which you are doing because the city slums were eyesores which were plainly evident to many people. Congress, for example, has just taken steps toward approval of more than 2,500,000 in authorization for clearing city limits in the Nation's Capital. And I am glad of it. I've been in Washington long enough to know that it is needed. But I could take you to rural areas in my district—the Eighth District of Alabama, which covers the northern part of the State—and show you farm families who need housing as bad as, or worse than, any I have seen in Washington.

To help eradicate these rural slums, the Congress included in the Housing Act of 1949 a farm-housing title.

To me, the problems of rural housing are particularly acute here in the Southeast. I believe that every State represented here today has a tremendous stake in seeing this legislation works to the benefit of its citizens, for it will not only eliminate rural slums in those States, but will help bring a new prosperity to the Southeast. I'm sure you know that half the farming population is centered right here in the Southeastern United States, and that any legislation aimed to help farm families will have its greatest impact on your States.

Have you ever inspected any of these rural slums to which I refer? I know that you can see enough destitution in the city areas you normally serve, but go back into the rural areas if you want to see even greater distress. I know figures are tiresome things to hear, yet a few of them may indicate how great the farm problem really is.

Did you know that over a fourth of all rural houses in the South need major repairs? Because of rotting floors, sagging roofs, weak walls, or poor foundations, it seems improbable that many in this group could be repaired at all. I've been into farm homes in my district where the house had such a leaky roof that it was impossible for the family to place a bed where the rain would not fall on it. I've been in others where it would be impossible to properly heat the dwelling, even when the cracks and crevices were stuffed with rags.

In your slum areas you have large segments of a city which may be without toilets, bath facilities, or running water—yet the average for all city dwellers is high. Compare that average with the fact that only 18 percent of all farm dwellings have running water, and only 29 percent have any water at all inside their homes, even a pump. And in your city studies you think an area is a slum if the families must use outside toilets—but 9 percent of our rural dwellings have no toilets at all, inside or out. And better than 80 percent still use the outdoor variety.

Crowding is a sign of slum conditions, isn't it? Did you know that one out of every three farm dwellings—and it is almost one out of every two here in the Southeast—do not have a room per person?

But enough of statistics. I'm sure you have heard many of them and could add to my list. The prime objective of the Housing Act of 1949 was to eliminate just such conditions wherever they existed, in city or on the farm. That's why we have a farm-housing title in the 1949 legislation for the first time in this Nation's history.

We realize, of course, that the legislation is just a step in the right direction, not the road which will lead all farm families out of the wilderness of rural slums. And we in Congress are constantly attempting to improve the legislation and to broaden its base. The Housing Act of 1949 authorized Government aid to farm families unable to obtain credit from any other source. We felt, however, that it left out a large segment of worthy farm families in the middle-income bracket who might be able to get credit but couldn't afford the type of credit which private sources made available. For them a new provision was included as part of the most recent housing legislation. I'm sure you are familiar with that legislation, too, since most of it applies directly to you and your work.

There is always one question which city audiences ask whenever I have discussed rural housing, and so I imagine many of you may be planning to ask it, too. You've heard about the big prices farmers get for their produce, you pay high prices for the foods you buy at your store or market. Why, then, does the farmer need help?

Actually the people who ask such questions aren't too familiar with the hazards of farming, and have false conceptions of the actual earnings of our farm families. Did you know that half the farmers here in the Southeast have a gross farm income under a thousand dollars a year? And out of it they must pay their farm operating expenses and support their families. There isn't much left over for housing, and so the farmers continue to live in houses which become more ramshackle each year.

It is more than good social theory to give such farmers a better opportunity, it is good hard common sense. With more adequate buildings on his farm he can make more income, and be better able to afford other things he needs. With a home which is safe and sanitary, he will have less medical expense, or less lost time because of illness and accident. With a better home life, the future citizens of America—and 24 percent of them come from our farms, you know—will have a better outlook on life and will be less prone to listen to foreign ideologies.

The Farm Housing Act was particularly designed to help the farmer with a low gross income who might actually be considered a poor credit risk by his local banker. While most of the loan funds will probably be used to help farmers who are already able to repay, one section of the act makes it possible for the farmer whose income is presently inadequate to actually get a loan which will increase his income. This type of loan is based on the idea of working out a planned farming operation capable of supporting the family and repaying the loan, then forgiving the borrower's interest and even part of his principal, if necessary, during the first few years while he changes over to this new type of farming. If some of our cotton farmers, for example, can make more money by changing to dairying, the loan can help them to get the necessary buildings for a dairying operation, and make their payments lighter while they are getting started.

One of the principal groups which have been helped by this legislation is the returned veteran. Most of our former servicemen were away from the farm long enough to get rusty at their farming operations; and their service pay didn't permit them to save up much money toward buying a farm of their own or building themselves the homes they wanted. This legislation gives preference to veterans, and as a result most of the first loans have gone to former servicemen. They can get the safe, useful buildings they need at the same time they are building up their farming enterprise, not be hindered from doing a good farming job because they can't afford good housing.

Just how well has the Housing Act operated to date in our rural areas? The money authorized in the Housing Act of 1949 was made available by congressional appropriation about the 1st of October, and the first loan under the new program was made on November 17. I was pleased that it was in my own district, and in Senator SPARKMAN's old district, since we fathered the legislation; and I was pleased that both of us could be present when the disabled veteran who received the loan was given his check.

Since that time, almost $7,000,000 have been loaned farm families to provide them better housing; 75 percent of it in the South. Texas heads the Nation in the number of actual loans made, with almost 200—and Georgia is a close second with 180. Oklahama, by making 34 loans in one country—a grapes of wrath county, where housing was particularly bad—set a record for the most loans in any one locality to date. Sixteen States had made 50 or more loans, and every State in the Nation except Delaware and New Hampshire, has made at least 1. Approximately 20,000 applications were on file with the Farmers Home Administration on June 1, and about one-fourth of these had already been approved, subject to appraisal reports. The others are now being considered by county committees; and it is estimated that $25,000,000 will be loaned by the end of the fiscal year. Our House of Representatives, in passing the 1951 appropriation bill, included in it approximately $35,000,000 for rural-housing loans under this act.

What is the future of rural housing and rural-housing legislation? We in Congress are continuing to study carefully the various problems which exist in this field, and are writing amendments or new legislation to correct any defects which may develop. And we are listening with interest to the reports of the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration for progress which is being made in this field. We know that we don't have all the answers; but if constant study, constant work, and constant interest can find the complete answers, I can assure you we will find them.

And even though your own field is more properly that of urban housing, we are here today to learn from you as well as to report to you. We are sure that this session will develop many things which we can use to advantage in rural as well as urban housing; and we are sure that you will share them with us as you develop them.

The Tidelands Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the recent Supreme Court decision has made us realize more than ever before that the tidelands issue must be decided by Congress and that it should be decided as quickly as possible. From the viewpoint of the States, delay will no longer help.

In fact, it seems to me that perhaps the case of the several States has been prejudiced by the long delay awaiting action by the Supreme Court. Further delay will, I believe, mean the loss of ground and strength by those who believe, as I believe, that the mammoth central Government is about to put over a squeeze of more power by taking over the State-vested tidelands.

I shall not try here to dissertate upon the merits of the controversy. I have always been a firm believer in the fundamental rights of the several States and in strong and active local government. I have believed generally speaking the best government is that which is nearest the people. The tidelands have been

considered the property of the several States since the beginning of this Nation; and at this late date the claim of the National Government comes with poor grace.

My own State of Louisiana will, of course, receive a bitter blow if these lands adjacent to the normal boundaries of the State and submerged beneath the water are taken from it. More than any other State in the Union, Louisiana is affected. Our shallow waters extend out farther into the sea off the coast of the State of Louisiana than any other State. Our people have used the tidelands, I believe, more than the peoples of other States. We have used these lands for swimming, bathing and resorting, and fishing. We now are using them for the development of the minerals. I dare say that this is our real trouble.

We have discovered valuable oil and gas deposits in the tidelands off the coast of Louisiana. Had this not occurred, our people may have continued to use these lands for fishing, boating, resorting for a thousand years, and until the end of time, without Federal interference of our State claim to ownership. As it is now, the long arm of Washington is again reaching out, with its power and prestige and eminent domain and taking from the States that which has been recognized as the property of the States for a century and a half.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the tidelands bill will come to an early vote. I will fight that it be the channel whereby a disturbed and disputed title may be settled and whereby State ownership may be affirmed. I believe we can pass this measure through the House of Representatives and on to the Senate. But regardless of the results, it is my conviction that further delay will not help. It may weaken our cause.

A Noted Philosopher Discusses Prejudice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 5, the Supreme Court struck three damaging blows against racial segregation in the South. In three unanimous rulings, the Supreme Court struck down segregation on railroad dining cars, it ordered the University of Texas to admit a Negro to its law school and it similarly ordered the University of Oklahoma to remove restrictions against a Negro student in its school of education.

In a true democracy we cannot recognize or accept degrees of citizenship. The decisions just handed down by the Supreme Court help to clarify the law and our Constitution, and in so doing the highest tribunal of the land has performed a great service for our people at home and for this country's prestige abroad.

In connection with these very important rulings of the Supreme Court and the general need for extending human rights in this country to encompass all elements of our population, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to a very fine, penetrating article by Prof. Harry A. Overstreet, published in the Saturday Review of Literature, January 21, 1950. His article, The Gentle People of Prejudice, is as follows:

THE GENTLE PEOPLE OF PREJUDICE

(By H. A. Overstreet)

Dorothy Baruch, in the Glass House of Prejudice, tells the story of José Morales, a Mexican war worker in the Los Angeles area. José was proud of his war job. He had written his brother, who taught in the University of Mexico, that at last he had work in which he could use his knowledge and skill. One day, after finishing his shift, José took the bus home. When he got off at his street corner he saw some men standing waiting. They were strangers to him. He had never seen them before, nor they him. But they looked hard at him, and they saw under the light of the street lamp that he was slim and dark.

One of them cried, "Dirty Mexican." And then they were on him. They tore off his clothes. They beat him with chains and iron pipes. They left him naked and bleeding. His back was broken.

The next morning he died.

A story like this leaves one bewildered. How could human beings do so cowardly a deed? They had never seen the man before. They did not know what kind of person he was. But to them, apparently, he was some form of evil. And that was enough. They killed him.

It does not answer the question to call them hoodlums. In a railway station, a ticket agent deliberately keeps the Negroes waiting until the last minute of train time while he first serves the whites and then sits at his desk chatting leisurely with a pal. He intends to be infuriating. He sees the Negroes at the ticket window, and he enjoys keeping them waiting. He knows they are bitter and relishes their bitterness. He feels big. He is a white man. Let the damn niggers wait.

A woman with rooms to rent slams the door in the face of an inquiring couple. "I don't take any Jews here." She knows her words are an insult. She intends them to be. She feels important, righteous.

The terrifying thing about the cruelty of prejudice is that it justifies itself to itself. It was that way with Hitler's Nazis. To strike down an inoffensive old man, kick him, defile him; that was good, right, beautiful. It was what any well-disciplined Nazi ought to do. It was expected.

How do people get that way?

"Easy," said the poet, "is the descent to Avernus." The first slippery step down is the assumption of an unearned right.

The white man can eat where he pleases, live where he pleases, dance where he pleases, enter the occupation he pleases. He takes that right as his—an absolute one unrelated to his own merit or demerit. He does not need to give a thought to the fact that dark-skinned people do not have these rights, nor to the fact that they are denied them not because they are worse people but because they do not belong to the dominant group. They may even be better people—more intelligent, more reliable, more gracious and pleasant to have around. But the white man would be vastly surprised if someone were to say to him: "You cannot have those privileges of yours without earning them. It is on the record that you are an untrustworthy man; you are foul-mouthed, and you beat your wife. You'll have to be put in a Jim Crow car."

Justice is a relation between what an individual does and the rewards or punishments he receives. A culture begins to slip morally when it grants special privileges or denies them on grounds that have nothing to do with individual desert. An employer who gave higher pay to an incompetent official of the company merely because the two of them bowled together or hailed from the same town would be an unjust employer. Justice plays no favorites. The basic moral law requires that as a man is and does so shall he be judged.

Once the dubious principle is accepted that group privileges need have no relation to individual merit, the descent into immoralism is easy. The Nazis made that descent, with a cruel arrogance unmatched in history. No Nazi needed to give the slightest thought to the individual Jews he was herding into the freight car. They might be the noblest persons in the world or the most scoundrelly. So far as he was concerned, all human distinctions among them had vanished. "In the night," wrote Hegel, "all cows are gray." In the night of race prejudice all persons in the despised group are alike. When that happens there is no more morality.

Happily, not everyone who is afflicted with race prejudice goes as far down as did the Nazis. Most people who are prejudiced merely take this first slippery step down: as members of the privileged race they assume the right to have and to hold their special privileges irrespective of their own merit, and they deny these rights to others with a like disregard of individual worth. This may not seem a dangerous downward step to take since so many otherwise respectable people do take it. But note what it involves. Everyone who accepts for himself the special privileges that go with denying them to people of a subordinated race makes possible all the cruelties that arise out of such unjust discrimination.

Thus, for others less kindly disposed than himself, he makes possible the next downward step—scapegoating. A basic requirement of the moral life is to make sure that the person blamed is the person who merits the blame. Here again the Nazis were flagrant offenders. "It was the Jews who did it." That applied to all situations where the Germans, individually or collectively, had suffered frustration. Half-starved after World War I, unemployed, dispirited, ignorant of the reasons for their plight, bedazed by a mystic sense of their own greatness, Germans did not take the sturdy course of seeking out the real causes of their defeat and distress. Had they done so they might have found many causes within themselves. But it takes moral maturity to declare oneself in the wrong. The morally immature person finds it easier to put the blame on someone else. Children do this. "It was Johnny spilled the ink; he joggled my elbow."

Scapegoating is dangerous because it leads easily to violent acts. Where society condemns a certain group as inferior and rightless, it provides an area of permitted insult and cruelty. The man who has lost a business contract cannot go out and kick a white passerby; he might get kicked back. But in certain parts of America he can punch a Negro and call him a black bastard. The Negro has no right to hit back or even to answer back. So, in like manner, the poor white can take out his poverty-frustration on his more well-to-do Negro neighbor by joining with the night riders to burn the Negro's barn. The California "vigilante," burdened with his mortgage and his envy, can empty his revolver through the windows of the returned Nisei farmer. Scapegoating is

a way of releasing our own hurt feelings onto someone else.

After scapegoating, the next step down is not difficult: justifying one's acts by lies. The protocols of Zion were deliberately forged to prove the case against the Jews. To the Jew-hater, however, this was not dishonesty in the ordinary sense of the word; it was pious dishonesty. You had to make the people hate the Jews; so the end justified the means. But wherever evil means are used, no matter what the ends, they become a moral infection. The story of race prejudice is one long, sordid tale of the use of lies to support a hate.

The prevailing stereotypes about the Negro—that he is by nature shiftless, lazy, mentally inferior, lawless, sexually unsafe to have around—have no basis in truth whatsoever. The best that can be said against those who continue, in the face of disproof, to use these stereotypes is that they are self-deceived or ignorant or duped; the worst is that they are deliberate perverters of the truth.

Finally, the last slippery step down—and here again the Nazis provided us with the most shocking examples. This last step down is to make self-importance out of cruelty. It is bad enough for a person to be unjust, to take privileges for himself and deny them to others without regard to individual merit, to put blame on others when the blame rests elsewhere, and to justify all this by lies. But complete moral disintegration comes when to all this is added a glorying in cruelty and a sense of greatness achieved by inflicting it. The most nauseating parts of the testimony of the war criminals was their repeatedly expressed pride in what they had done. Low as men may fall, moral sensitivity remains as long as shame remains, but when, instead of shame, there is a glorying in foul deeds, the creature is no longer moral.

It is the willingness to hurt and be happy in the hurting that is the deepest condemnation of certain forms of race prejudice. The men who broke the back of José Morales and gloated in doing it were at the beast stage of life. But one does not have to break a man's back to achieve moral degradation. The ticket seller who enjoyed being cruel and made importance out of it for his own ego was himself already well on the way.

All of this will seem to have nothing to do with ordinary, kindly people who happen to have a streak of the anti-Jew or anti-Negro or anti-Japanese feeling in them. Such people would never for a moment descend so far as to do cruel things for the fun and the glory of it. Happily, these people are a majority even among the prejudiced. Why worry them? A little prejudice now and then might well be allowed the best of men.

Is the matter as unimportant as that? It might seem to be harmless enough for a man to say: "Well, I don't like Jews, that's all, and I surely have the right to choose the people I want to associate with, haven't I?" The answer to that, of course, is "yes." The right to choose the people with whom we wish to associate is undeniable. But if we choose (and exclude) on a principle which, when magnified, makes not only for injustice but for inevitable cruelty, then we are helping to create an evil, and, as willing creators of an evil, we have evil in us.

When I say that I have a right to choose the people I want to associate with, I make a true judgment if I imply that I make my choice in terms of the qualities of those I choose. But when I say that I don't want to associate with Jews, I actually imply something quite different. I imply that I don't even stop to consider them as individuals. I shut my eyes and say: "The whole bunch is not for me."

Magnify this: let every individual say to himself: "I choose my associates by first excluding a whole group of people whom I don't know and don't intend to know," and a cultural pattern is created that is fraught with the profoundest evil.

This is what ordinary, kindly people, with their seemingly harmless streak of racial prejudice, do: they permit the immoral principle of condemning people in the mass to take root in society. Once that principle takes root, other things inevitably follow. It becomes then a permitted thing to look down upon certain groups of people. When this permitted way of looking down becomes an established habit, the consequent habit follows: of regarding these despised people as permitted objects of insult and humiliation. Then the next thing follows: these people—because they are in effect rightless—provide an outlet for pent-up hostilities. They become whipping boys for those members of the dominant group who need to project their frustrations upon others. When society makes an area where hostilities can freely be vented on others it provides for its own moral disintegration.

He who permits evil commits evil. This is what makes for the haunting sense of guilt in our culture. Many a member of the dominant group will earnestly aver that he never intended it that Negroes should be insulted and maltreated on busses, in railroad stations, and on public streets; that he never intended it that Mexican-Americans should be brutally beaten up; that his heart is sore and ashamed when he reads of the defiling of Jewish synagogues by hoodlums. He did not intend these things. But he created the social sanction for these things. By adopting a twisted principle of human association he and the people like him opened the Pandora's box out of which have flown the intolerances and cruelties that have defiled our culture.

There is a deep wisdom in the negative clause of the confession: We have left undone those things which we ought to have done. The moral sickness that is in most prejudiced people of the dominant group is that they have learned to stand by and do nothing. They do not go to lynchings, but they do nothing to create a condition of human dignity that would make lynchings impossible. The reason why they do not create such a condition of human dignity is that in their heart of hearts they do not believe in the equal right of all human beings to human dignity. Deep and seemingly ineradicable in them is this twisted view of their fellow men. This is the intellectual and moral sickness in them. Out of this sickness comes their effortlessness, and out of their effortlessness come the revolting cruelties of our culture.

We have become familiar through psychiatry with one peculiar pattern of inertia: the inertia that comes from two conflicting and compulsive drives which, because they are conflicting, make it impossible for the individual to do anything. The irresistible force meets the immovable body within a human mind that cannot seem to throw the weight of decision on one side or the other. Out of such inability to resolve a conflict comes one pattern of neurosis: neurotic inertia. If we look long enough at this pattern it may afford us a peculiar insight into the kind of social inertia we have just mentioned. This type of inertia cannot technically be called a neurosis, but, existence in multitudes of citizens, it pulls down the standard of their common behavior and makes for an increasing obtuseness toward moral values. Caught between ideals that they cannot give up and habits and practices that are equally entrenched, they develop a protective unresponsiveness to events within their society that should properly fill them with horror and induce action. But they do not know how to act nor what price they might have to pay for action. Hence they cannot feel an appropriate responsibility for action. Consciously or subconsciously, the sense of responsibility is dimmed out in them. The power to feel is blurred. The issue is befogged by rationalization. The more often this inertia response is made, the more satisfactorily, in short-range terms, it reduces the conscious unhappiness and guilt of the person who makes it, and the easier it is to make it on the next similar occasion. So the guilt feeling is diminished on the surface, but the guilt remains and works its corruption at a deeper level of consciousness.

Thus it is the mild and gentle people of prejudice, with their compulsive effortlessness, who must bear the burden of the moral guilt. They have given the green light, and the legion of low hostilities has broken through on the run.

"The corruption of the best is the worst of corruptions." It is the college president who earnestly justifies the quota system who is inwardly corrupt, because, supposedly enlisted in the age-long struggle for human dignity (the great tradition), he rationalizes himself out of the struggle when it goes counter to the local mores and the prejudices of his board. It is the minister of the church who timidly suggests that Negroes go elsewhere who is inwardly corrupt, because he denies the Master he asks people to serve. It is the respectable people who would not dream of letting a Negro enter by the front door who are inwardly corrupt because they are willing to insult without even knowing that they insult.

What prejudice does to the prejudiced is, in subtler or in grosser ways, to work this inner corruption. This is the image we need to build of the people who claim white supremacy and Christian superiority. They are intellectually and morally sick people. What is worse, they are sick people who try to make their own sickness the measure of their society's health.

Fifty-fifth Anniversary Celebration Dinner of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Jewish War Veterans of the United States celebrated their fifty-fifth anniversary with a dinner at which this patriotic organization presented Mr. Louis B. Mayer, one of America's industrial leaders, with the golden medal of merit for his distinguished service on behalf of world understanding of America and American principles and traditions.

Many prominent people paid tribute to the JWV, to their guest, Mr. Mayer; among them His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, who delivered the invocation; the Honorable Owen Brewster, United States Senator from Maine; the Honorable Edwin C. Johnson, Senator from Colorado; Mr. Eric Johnston; Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, past commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, and the first midwesterner elected to this office; Mr. Jackson Holtz, present commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States; and a score of others whose names read like a roster of

America's leadership in the fields of industry, commerce, Government, and the Armed Forces.

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States was founded 55 years ago, and, with the exception of the Grand Army of the Republic, it is the oldest organized group of American war veterans.

This organization has regularly adopted resolutions advocating legislation to provide this Nation with a military and civil-defense establishment of sufficient strength and training to cope with any possible emergency. To speed the economic rehabilitation of all war veterans, they have repeatedly appealed for national conferences of business, labor, and governmental representatives so that a constructive program might be formulated to absorb the disabled and the jobless into the Nation's productive economy. They have consistently supported programs that would extend humane and judicious assistance to those deserving nations overseas whose struggles to establish free governments have been handicapped by hunger and illness, by inadequate shelter and lack of productive machinery. And from the very beginning of their existence as an organized group they have vigorously affirmed their opposition to totalitarianism of any kind by closing the doors of membership to believers in, or servants of political extremism, whether of the left or right.

In their unceasing efforts to establish an ideological beachhead in this country, ruthless and skillful totalitarian forces constantly seek to gain the support of minority elements in our population by passing themselves off as friends and defenders of the oppressed and persecuted throughout the world. The frequent attacks by Communist instruments in this country on the Jewish War Veterans of the United States attest eloquently to this organization's effective work of unmasking totalitarian pretenses and exposing the true doctrines motivating the scores of front groups who have sought to gain a foothold among the confused and troubled.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include some of the proceedings at this dinner:

INTRODUCTION OF CARDINAL SPELLMAN BY MR. CHARLES H. SILVER

We are indeed honored this evening by the presence of one of the great spiritual leaders of our times. It has been my good fortune to be associated with him in his untiring labors in behalf of a great hospital in this city. To know him is to grasp a true understanding of what is meant by the word "charity." For to him, charity means friendship, compassion, tolerance, and help for those who suffer or are in need. His philosophy is as broad as the philosophy of humanity in its noblest sense. He holds in his heart love for people of all races and creeds. I have been very fortunate in having the pleasure of his comradeship, his advice, and wisdom. Ladies and gentlemen, His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman.

INVOCATION BY HIS EMINENCE, FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN

As we give Thee thanks, O God, for the manifold glories with which Thou has vested our great and blessed America, thoughts reverent and profound dominate our hearts and we remember with love and gratitude those unnumbered millions of mighty dead who, at life's threshold, met death with courage firm and unafraid, to save for us, the living, our God-given heritage of liberty, justice, and peace. They were the mighty host whose outward passage will never know the gladness of return, who only from the ramparts of Thy heaven will see again the shrines their hearts held dear. They were our free, God-loving sons who fell asleep that godless nations might awaken, that enslaved men may live and walk in peace.

As we implore God's mercy on America's sons whom we have here gathered to honor this night, we pledge our plighted word that our dead shall not have died in vain. We pledge again to be true to the memory and uphold the honor of all our sleeping soldiers who throughout the life of our United States selflessly have spent themselves to make this Nation consecrate. Sorrow, pity, pride, hope, and faith well high in my own heart as I ponder the great and sacred trust our mighty dead have laid upon us, and I beg you, hearken to the voice of one of America's sons who pleads for all—America's Unknown Soldier:

"O ye who live and walk the earth today,
Think ye of me, think not I quiet sleep.
I am the witness of your present need,
I am the reason you may not retreat,
I am the trumpet calling you to wake,
Bravely to live, lest all that I have won
Should yet be lost; that painfully beyond
Our triumph dearly bought with blood and tears,
The anguished spending of a million lives
Should be in vain; and end again in war's
Beginning—bitter bartering of blood.

* * * * *

"O ye who live, lift up your eyes today.
Though mine are closed on time, I truly see
The wisdom and the glory of God's plan.
Each man permitted in some little way,
A minor part within one sacrifice—
Of us who died and you who yet must live.
What we did yesterday for you, must you
Now do for us, and bear the burden dropped
From out our dying hands. Lift up the torch
We now must needs put down and trust to you
Through all the years to come. Lift up this host—
America, the hope of all the world."

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY CHARLES H. SILVER

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States were cradled in the American way of life. When they came to maturity they grew in stature and influence because they were rooted in genuine American ideals. They are part and parcel of a system of society that has made this Nation great and glorious and that will never be changed by those who would try to tear down this system.

The boys of Jewish blood who stood beside their Christian comrades in the foxholes never asked those with whom they fought to what religion they belonged; and they, in turn, were never questioned about their faith. The men in the foxholes had a common religion—democracy. Yet each worshiped God in his own way.

The Jewish War Veterans who have emerged from the slime and dirt and heartbreak of the battlefields have now taken their place in the forums of peace. It is worth mentioning and repeating from time to time that these men who fought so valiantly so that democracy might survive are now engaged in another monumental struggle—the fight to create a peace that will banish the fear of the atom bomb and make the hearts of men and women glad that there is no longer any projects of wanton and needless slaughter.

I think that all of us—Catholics, Protestants, and Jews—may well be proud of the splendid record of the Jewish War Veterans. For what they have done is more than a tribute to these men of the Jewish faith; it is a reflection of the splendid faith which we of all races and creeds have in the strength and nobility of American democracy. It is democracy as we practice it in this country that has been a springboard for the vast strides that we made in so short a time and will continue to remain the motivating factor of our daily lives.

This organization, my friends, is now engaged in fighting every form of tyranny, bigotry, and intolerance. The Jewish War Veterans of the United States were among the very first to speak out boldly against Hungary's persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty and the oppression visited on the Protestant clergies in central Europe. They have been assailed by the Communists as tools of big business interests on the one hand and by Gerald L. K. Smith's anti-Semitic cross and flag on the other.

The Jewish War Veterans' service program, staffed by hundreds f professional and voluntary counselors, serves more than 110,000 veterans and veterans' dependents of all faiths. More than 30 percent of those who have been aided are non-Jewish. There, my friends, you have American democracy in action—action that is unfettered by any consideration of race, color, or creed. That is something that is worth fighting for and keeping so that we and our children and our children's children may enjoy the blessings of our glorious way of life.

We are engaged today in a struggle for the minds of men. We are trying to show those who do not share our philosophy of life that it is only in a democracy that man attains his full dignity as a human being. It is a tremendous undertaking. It is, I believe, too great for any individual to direct; what is required is a harmonious working of all forces striving in various directions to create a peaceful world.

Tonight the Jewish War Veterans of the United States are honoring one who is known throughout the land as a great patriot and who has earned the respect and admiration of his fellow citizens for his achievements as a worker in behalf of many worthy causes—Mr. Louis B. Mayer.

He has done much to bring about a world understanding of American ideals and principles and that, to my mind, is as important a job as any man can do these trying days. It is especially for this that we honor him this evening, an honor that has been well-earned. And I want to take this opportunity to add my word of tribute to those of the other speakers whom you will hear this evening.

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY MR. ERIC JOHNSTON

The inspiring work of the Jewish War Veterans program is so well known to all of you that no words from me could possibly gild the achievements which speak for themselves. The helping hand of the Jewish War Veterans is extended to all veterans irrespective of race, color, or creed. I am impressed by the fact that more than one-third of the veterans who have requested your aid and who have received it are not of Jewish faith but claim another religion. This is indeed evidence of a worth-while type of accomplishment.

I am one of those who has already adhered to the tenet that no man can believe in anything unless he practices his beliefs daily. Your work is evidence and proof that you genuinely believe in the brotherhood of all men, and this extends far beyond tolerance, for tolerance may mean that we merely endure our fellow men, and this is not enough in the world today. The people in

the world today want more than that. They want the opportunity to live so that they might know their fellow human beings. There should be the opportunity to live in brotherhood and in fellowship under the God that made us all.

The spiritual and moral implications of the Jewish War Veterans' service program appeals to me this evening because I want to talk to you a little bit about the moral and the spiritual necessity for revival in the world if we are going to furnish leadership.

We have been furnishing leadership in the world for the last 5 years, and now at the end of 5 years of leadership we are beginning to understand that money alone will not win friends and influence people. Something has gone wrong in what we thought was an air-tight program to pilot the world back to economic recovery.

We thought that the world needed food, clothing, and shelter. It did, and it does, and we were the people who had what it takes; so we loaded our ships with billions of dollars worth of all kinds of conceivable things which a war-wracked world needed and we sent these to the markets of the world.

In former times leaderships were exercised by one nation with force over another nation, but now those times have changed. The wheel of fate has completely spun around, and now the masses are more important than the classes. The opinions and desires of the masses of peoples must be attended to if you are going to furnish world leadership. We must recognize that the world is in a great revolution, not one revolution but a whole series of revolutions running concurrently. They are sweeping away barriers and traditions, knocking down borders so like Humpty Dumpty they can never be put back together again.

The people of the world are demanding that they have some idea of self-determination; they are demanding a greater brotherhood; they want a moral and spiritual revival, which they must have.

People who desire security are beginning to realize that they cannot find that security in steel, concrete, or uranium. That security depends upon the personality and the mentality of the man behind the push button. It depends entirely upon our understanding of our fellow man. The people of the world sense this and are wishing, desirous, of brotherhood of man.

America still believes in the brotherhood of man, but we must tell the world that. I find in America that our revolutionary movement is still a revolutionary movement. We are still in the test tube, still experimenting. A machine is scarcely off the drawing boards until we have a new idea for even a better one. There is nothing sacrosanct in production, and as a businessman I can assure you that in America we are always looking for better ways and better ideas. We do not believe in the static or the status quo.

Are we in America able to do this? I think we are. I find in America a great rejuvenation of moral and spiritual ideas. Not only is there greater church attendance than before but also people are searching back for the things perhaps which they missed some time ago. Even a square dance may be an evidence of that, or the youth's desire for opera music against jive and jazz. These are signs of America's moral and spiritual leadership, and we must give that to the rest of the world. Our material wealth is important, of course, but our moral and spiritual values have enabled us to make this material wealth, and the rest of the world must have the opportunity of knowing about it.

It seems to me that there was never a time when people in geography were thrown together under such favorable circumstances as here in the United States of America. It would look like the kindly Providence that had wrought this miracle was eagerly watching to see how man's capacity for grandeur was working out.

Can man, thus richly dowered with all these prerequisites, live up to his opportunities? Can we temper our spirit and elevate our soul to new and unprecedented levels of moral and spiritual leadership? If we can I can assure you tonight that we will be successful in leading the world to peace.

World Government Meets Opposition From Military Order of the World Wars

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 65, which provides for the substitution of our form of government for a super world government, is meeting strong opposition from all patriotic groups. Recently Rear Adm. William Rea Furlong, commander in chief of the Military Order of the World Wars, issued a statement on the subject of world government. As part of my remarks, I am including it at this point. It should be read by all Members:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM REA FURLONG, COMMANDER IN CHIEF OF THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WARS

I am the national commander of the Military Order of the World Wars and speak under the authority of a resolution passed by the order with 91 chapters throughout the United States.

The membership for which I speak is made up chiefly, almost entirely, of civilians who were Reserve or Regular officers of all branches of the Armed Forces who fought in one or both of the World Wars.

The order is concerned with the welfare of our Nation as a whole rather than with individual benefits. They pledge themselves to defend the integrity and supremacy of our National Government and the Constitution of the United States.

Instead of taking the time to speak on the details of each of the six concurrent resolutions now before the committee, since most of them advocate some form of federal union, Atlantic union, world federation, or world government, I will speak on what some advocate outrightly and others slide into gradually, namely world government.

These resolutions, like the statements of most world government enthusiasts, begin by declaring their loyalty to the United Nations but follow their statements with plans to change the United Nations into something else. The very means by which the United Nations have prevented wars, they would destroy. In place of international collaboration under the United Nations, they would substitute the force of a world army—ignoring entirely, that if a world army attempted to enforce a decree on a large nation whose vital interests are involved there would be more war, not peace.

The resolution most destructive to the United States is Senate Concurrent Resolution 56 whose companion in the House is House Concurrent Resolution 65.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 56 states: *"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

Let me state again the important part of the resolution: "A world federation with powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression." How much power do you suppose would be adequate to prevent aggression by the Chinese Communist Army; and how much power would have been adequate to stop Russia from taking Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the other countries she has taken? Quite a sizable army, navy, and air force, to which we would have been called to furnish a sizable contingent. The World Federalists, Inc., which is the most active group pushing these resolutions in Congress, declares that one of the provisions which should be incorporated in the world constitution itself, is a provision prohibiting the possession by any nation of armaments and forces beyond an approved level required for internal policing. The nation's armies are thus eliminated to make it possible for the world army to overpower any one nation. Germany was so reduced by treaty after the First World War to only 100,000 troops, yet it took the combined forces of several nations to supply power adequate to preserve the peace disturbed by Hitler.

When you consider that civil aircraft and a merchant marine are convertible to war uses and civilian organizations convertible into armies, it is plain that a sizable world force of all modern arms is necessary to force a nation to abide by a decision of the world government that went against the best interests of any large nation.

The resolution, to quote a part of it again, is "to preserve the peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

World Federalists state in their principles, that there is required a world legislature to enact laws, world courts to interpret the laws and to try and to sentence lawbreakers, and a world executive agency to administer and enforce the laws. The World Federalists state "world law should be enforced directly upon individuals."

The creation of a world legislature requires a major decision as to what would be the basis of representation and voting. On this the various groups favoring world government are not in agreement. The World Federalists state that representation should be based upon a formula recognizing all relevant factors such as population, economic development, educational level, and others, each representative to vote as an individual. I believe that no satisfactory agreement could be possible between any two nations or among all nations trying to assign each nation a number of votes by weighing its educational level, population, and economic development against that of all the other nations.

Another group in wording a model constitution for a world federal convention provides for the people of all states and nations to elect "one delegate for each million of population or fraction thereof above one-half million."

No doubt all groups proposing world government want to establish it on democratic principles; yet if the voting is one vote per nation or one vote per million people, many important differences among nations are utterly ignored, nor is it practicable to evaluate them, such as material resources, potential power, productivity; economic, social, and cultural development; technical ability; and advancement in ways of free government.

As the United States has less than one-tenth of the approximate 2,000,000,000 population of the world, it is very plain how

easily we could be outvoted. The proposed resolution provides powers to preserve peace. The World Federalists state that the world government must have "powers to bring about a peaceful change in the direction of a free, just, and prosperous world community." Both of those statements mean that world government must have powers which have heretofore been the powers of independent sovereign nations; and that to function as a superstate, even in a limited way, all or some of the powers of individual nations would have to be surrendered. It would call for a surrender or partial surrender of power to raise and maintain national armed forces; the right to tax; the control of immigration, trade, tariff, currency, monetary values, and fiscal policy, the power to regulate national production of industry and agriculture.

Once we have given to a world government limited powers, what is to prevent it from voting itself more powers? We have only one-tenth of the world's population, so having given up our Army, Navy, and Air Force, and not being able to secede, how can we prevent an increase in power voted to the world government?

Then will be attempted what the United World Federalists state they desire "a prosperous world community." It will be tried by leveling the United States financial position much more drastically than we now are doing it voluntarily to help the world.

Any thinking person can easily see that a superior, remote-control world government would soon change the standard of life in the United States. We have come to our standards through our free institutions and our own system of government. When our people discover what world government means, they will not consent to such a surrender of our fundamental rights.

As to the proposal of the world government enthusiasts to permit the world government to have direct power to tax, try, and punish individuals. I do not believe that many nations would be willing to delegate to a superstate the necessary powers to enable the superstate to control by force, the individual or the nation.

In pressing for this power there is danger that the work of international cooperation as carried on in the United Nations may be weakened.

The desire for this superpower stems from the excessive use of the veto by Russia in the United Nations. Yet there are many questions, such as tariff and immigration, the distribution of Fort Knox gold, the value of our dollar, the control of our production for export, on which the United States would use the veto if the vote were against our national interests. With China conquered by Communists and France unstable in that respect, the United States had better say less about elimination of the veto.

Our Ambassador at the United Nations, Warren Austin, says that although world government enthusiasts express loyalty to the United Nations they follow their statements with plans to change the United Nations into something else. The United Nations recognizes the dignity of nations, and through international collaboration it has worked to prevent wars, and has had considerable success, for example, in Palestine, the Dutch East Indies, India, and Pakistan. In the case of India and Pakistan a plebiscite has been arranged as a substitute for a bloody war between the Hindu of India and the Mohammedan of Pakistan embracing a population of 400,000,000, whose religious hatreds burn fiercely. I saw examples of their clashes when I was in India and know that this accomplishment of the United Nations has avoided great misery to thousands of people.

In addition to the avoidance of war, the United Nations is organized with subcommittees on economics and social conditions that assist mankind throughout the world to better living.

The Military Order of the World Wars stands firmly behind the United Nations as the international organization under which the nations should develop their future courses through mutual consent, compromise, and understanding; and not through force of a world government.

The world government proponents are realistic on one point, and that is that force is necessary to keep the peace. Peace in the Western World today is kept by the power of the 12 nations in the Atlantic Pact. The power represented by this group is understood by Russia and the Western World enjoys peace.

What then is the difference between power exercised under the Atlantic Pact and power by a world government? There is a vast difference. The Atlantic Pact is a voluntary association of 12 nations exercising the right of self-defense under article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. It was signed on April 4, 1949, and expressed their joint determination to provide through their own collective effort, the peace and security of the North Atlantic area.

The great difference between power exercised by world government and power exercised under the Atlantic Pact lies in the fact that we, the United States, are at liberty to make our contributions to the pact voluntarily.

We do not have a world legislature order us what to contribute and how much. We, ourselves, Americans, decide what America shall do and to what extent. We are able to reduce our force and our contributions when our friends get on their feet and we decide when that time arrives; it is not decided by the vote of a world legislature. We are still a free sovereign America. We have contributed much more effectively than had we been weakened by the reduction of our forces to that only sufficient for internal police. We have been able to contribute more effectively to the peace of this Atlantic region than had we dissipated our wealth through joining a world government of impoverished nations. In other words, the difference lies in our still retaining our sovereignty and independence. This enables us to grow in strength and to further the ideals embodied in our Constitution and our own political system. We can be an example of good government to nations politically immature. We still will have the right and ability to defend ourselves against aggression.

Are we willing to depend upon a superstate to see that the things we hold most dear are defended and that we will be protected from others by the world government? We would do better to rely on our own present strength and not surrender it.

The formation of a world government without Russia, in which each nation has only an internal police force must be most encouraging to Russia in her scheme for world domination. The world government army, made up of contingents from a great number of nations, trained in different countries, a mercenary, polyglot army, lacking the spirit and will to fight that comes in the defense of one's own people and country would make much easier Russia's goal of world government by Russia.

Let us not make conditions favorable for Soviet domination.

Both Lenin and Hitler seized power from newly set up democratic organizations and soon put down representation by the people. A new Stalin can arise where only the weak polyglot army exists.

The main argument by world government enthusiasts on the ease of setting up a world government is the example they give of the 13 separate Colonies agreeing on a Constitution and forming our Federal Union. Now that sounds easy but even slight examination shows the conditions not to be parallel.

The Thirteen Colonies had been under one government, the British Government, for over 100 years. Even the former Dutch colony at Manhattan and up the Hudson had been flooded by English speaking people from Connecticut. Except for 1 year, 1673, New York had been under English Government and English law since 1664, over 100 years before the Revolution. As early as 1675, to suppress one of the most extensive leagues of Indians under King Philip, the United Colonies of Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, took the war upon themselves and raised 2,000 troops.

Again in Queen Anne's war, 1702–13, over 6,000 troops, largely raised by the Colonies, fought together against the French in the Colonies and in Canada. And again in the French and Indian War of 1755 the Colonies joined in fighting a common enemy.

The people of the 13 Colonies had the same interests and aspirations. They were a composite unit of the same people with the same background, language, laws, culture, and educational level. Each colony was chiefly agricultural. There was no fierce economic competition between them as in the countries of the world today. Unity in language, religion and in law was the bond that made possible our Federal Union.

Now, compare that small group of 3,000,000 people of like institutions and religion with 2,000,000,000 people in 50 or more nations made up of people of different religions, laws, different languages and customs, and highly competitive in trade. Most of them are utterly incapable of understanding our dual form of Federal and State Governments. Even Englishmen cannot grasp fully how we can differentiate between the powers of Federal Government and State government, and retain the powers to each.

We have nothing to gain in amalgamating with a people so diverse from us in development of government and with many tongues, races, and prejudices. The United States has an expanding civilization of its own to maintain and to perfect; let us not join in a common lower level, but let us as leaders go on to new heights and guide the rest of the world by example and by the cooperation we are now so generously giving.

The proponents for world government have considerable success in frightening people with the atomic bombs if used in warfare.

In the First World War the Germans used gas warfare and the deaths suffered from being gassed were so terrible that after World War I the United States developed an efficient Chemical Warfare Service. By the time of World War II, our ability in gas warfare was such that the Germans did not use that destructive weapon; nor did we. I believe our possession of the atomic bomb will likewise prevent or deter any possible enemy who has it from using it, just as our knowledge of gas warfare prevented its use. As long as we do not disclose the knowledge of the atomic bomb or its improvements, we lessen the probability of its use even though the Russians may have it. It is well that its power was shown to Japan, just as the effectiveness of gas was shown in the First World War by the Germans and not used in the Second World War.

In our own United States, 70 years after we had established a more perfect union among people of the same language and religion, we fought a bloody civil war because a part of the Union wanted to secede. Do you suppose that any nation who disagrees seriously with a world law harmful to its own interests will not secede? And when the world army and navy and air force advance to put down the rebellion of a nation, will you call that peace? Suppose two nations such as the United States and Canada, who are highly advanced politically and economically, find that a world law passed by an overwhelming majority of an impoverished group of nations is disastrous to the

well-being of the United States and Canada. Will we sit idly by and accept the dictum of people less advanced, even though we will then have no army, navy, and air force? Or will we have spirit enough left in us to start over, build up our forces as best we can, and fight again for our independence?

Presumably the world army will be made up of contingents from participating nations. One thing that has delayed the formation of a world force under the United Nations has been a disagreement on the part of the nations of how the force will be made up. Undoubtedly, in a world army, we as a wealthy and powerful nation would have our quota of young men. In the discussions in the United Nations, Russia insists on each nation supplying the same numbers, man for man and item for item. How do you think our people in the United States will react to having their young men detailed to such a mercenary army and sent to fight the world over wherever the world executive directs?

In making up the world force, questions will arise as to who is to supply the air force, who command and train it, who supply the navy, where the army is to be stationed and trained, what advantage will that nation have that supplies most of the navy if not supplied as Russia asks, ship for ship.

Will a heterogeneous world force of many tongues and little spirit actually be able to enforce any world laws on nations with a large merchant marine, easily convertible to men of war, or enforce world law on nations with numerous civil airplanes easily convertible to war planes, or on a nation that has a large population convertible into an army?

I believe it is fortunate for the world that the United Nations has not been able to agree on the formation of a world army, because the use of force would lead to the end of the United Nations.

There is far more danger of rebellion and war under a superstate with an army that enforces a vote of a world legislature than there is under the United Nations, where the nations work together voluntarily in cooperation.

The United States, although founded by people with firm ideas of maintaining the freedom of the individual, has found in recent years a considerable threat to our freedom by the acts of Communists. The propaganda to change our Government has been inspired and carried on chiefly by foreigners who have come into the country, but who have not understood our system of government. They in their ignorance are frantically at work to set up a government under the principles enunciated by Marx, Lenin, and Stalin. Some of the operatives here are actually under the direction of Russia. Now if these foreigners with no official standing can have such a harmful influence upon our institutions, our Government officials, and even upon our legislation, it is readily seen how our freedoms and type of government can be more easily altered after we have given up our sovereignty to obey world legislation passed chiefly by vote of foreigners. Under world government the way for the triumph of communism will be made easier.

The general trend, except by Russia, has been away from outside government control as exemplified by the leading liberty-seeking people changing from a British Empire to independent commonwealths. They are able to cooperate and live at peace without setting up a supergovernment to enforce its will upon them.

As for the stand of the Military Order of the World Wars, the terrible consequences of the movement for world government has only recently been given serious consideration. It was inconceivable that so many persons could be induced to surrender their very rights and present condition of life on hearing a slogan of peace by a method that would give no peace. We have been aroused to the dangers only recently.

We declare our confidence in and support of the present policy of the United States to work with and through the United Nations backed by regional pacts of freedom-loving independent nations, not by unions or federations to whom we surrender our sovereignty.

This, we believe, affords the best way of saving succeeding generations from the scourges of war.

The following is the order's resolution:

"Whereas a number of organizations are actively promoting the adoption of a world federation or world government and have induced several State legislatures to adopt resolutions in favor of some form of world government with legislative, judicial, and executive powers over the individual nations; and

"Whereas certain Members of the Congress have introduced resolutions, which if passed, would formally declare that world government is a fundamental objective of American foreign policy; and

"Whereas such a consummation would impair the sovereignty of the United States, enabling remote control to subject the American people to servitudes in foreign interest; and

"Whereas the proposals of the advocates of world federation would result in the military impotence of the United States which is politically, economically, and militarily the only force in the world today willing and capable of maintaining free government and the freedoms of the individual; and

"Whereas the United States can be an example to less favored nations and can wield its greatest influence for peace by remaining strong and independent and advancing in government under the ideals of its own Constitution; and

"Whereas world government fundamentally presupposes that it will be founded on democratic principles under a representation in the legislative body and that members could pass legislation detrimental to American way of life and could enforce its laws by a world army; and

"Whereas the present voluntary association of governments in the United Nations offers the most practical means for resolving world problems in a manner to preserve the peace of the world without the attempt to apply military force by super world government: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Military Order of the World Wars recognizes the United Nations as the international organization under which the nations of the earth should develop their future courses through mutual consent, compromise, and understanding; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Military Order of the World Wars does oppose and with all its power will resist any form of supergovernment, as contrary to the essentials of liberty and national independence."

Flag Day Address of Rear Adm. Frank C. Dunham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD the Flag Day speech delivered in Kent, Ohio, on June 11 by Rear Adm. Frank C. Dunham. It was my privilege to attend the Flay Day program at Kent, Ohio, sponsored by Kent Lodge, No. 1377, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. At 1:30 p. m. a most impressive ceremony was held on the front lawn of the Kent Elks' Lodge and at this time a history outlining the origin of the flag was given. Participating in the flag raising and festivites were the Veterans of Foregn Wars drill team; Elks ritualistic service, Frank C. Hull, E. R., Kent Lodge 1377; F. Hazlett Strahl, leading knight, Ravenna Lodge 1076; Ben W. Yoos, loyal knight, Akron Lodge 363; A. H. Minter, lecturing knight, Massillon Lodge 441; Anthony Brelih, esquire, Salem Lodge 305; G. O. Wotring, chaplain, Kent Lodge 1377; K. G. Siedschlag, P. E. R., historian, Kent Lodge 1377; and J. K. Bransby, P. E. R., secretary, Kent Lodge 1377.

Following this and before the annual parade was held, as chairman of the day I had the great privilege of presenting the speaker, Rear Adm. Frank C. Dunham. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will find his remarks most inspiring.

Flag Day marks the anniversary of the adoption of the Stars and Stripes by the Continental Congress as the official emblem of the newborn United States of America. From that time on this flag has been the emblem of our country, alternately bathed in the sunshine of peace and besmirched with the blood of unwanted war. Adopted as the emblem of a new and struggling country, it floats today throughout the world as the symbol of a great world power.

I am not one who likes often to indulge in semantics but, in considering what I might have to say this afternoon, I consulted our old friend Noah Webster and found what I thought might serve as a proper text for my remarks. We recognize the Stars and Stripes as the emblem of the United States of America. Webster says that an emblem is "a visible sign of an idea."

The idea behind the creation of this country of ours is well known to all of us. It was born of religious persecution and lack of personal liberty. It had its early growth in the rigors and adversities of colonial times. It has continued to grow throughout the years by reason of the purpose which was and is its very essence. We find this purpose stated clearly in the preamble of the Constitution:

"In order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provided for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

The great Lincoln recalled the idea, the purpose, of which we are speaking, when he exhorted his listeners at Gettysburg to dedicate themselves to the task remaining to them to insure that "* * * government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

On Flag Day in 1917 President Wilson reminded us, "We meet to celebrate Flag Day because this flag which we honor and under which we serve is the emblem of our unity, our power, our thought and purpose as a Nation." Then he added, "It has no other character than that which we give it from generation to generation. The choice is ours."

When we consider the turbulence of the international climate in which we, as a Nation, are living today, we can see, we must see the grave responsibility which rests upon the present generation. Time was when we, as a Nation, could live and develop pretty much within our own borders

or at least within our own hemisphere. It was relatively easy then to set our own standards and ideals and to foster them without too much interference from outside sources. But time and progress in the fields of communication and transportation, and perhaps more significantly, developments in the art of warfare, have so greatly increased the ability of the modern state to project its military power effectively, as to change the whole concept of our international relations.

Unfortunately, the danger is not alone a physical one. It is an even more insidious one. It is an idea, an ideology, if you prefer, which threatens the very idea, the very purpose which has made us great. Make no mistake about it, there are forces abroad in the world today which would compromise our ideals; forces which would destroy that which has made us great—our national character which is our moral strength.

What is this thing which has made us great? What has given us this great strength? Is it our ability to convert our abundant natural resources into the sinews of modern war? Is it that we can take our young men from the streets and factories of our great cities and from our vast farming areas and make efficient soldiers of them? Hardly that. Germany, throughout her long history as an important European power, traditionally had the best armies of the world. We all know that she could not survive as a great nation. At least in her later years there was something lacking. What was it that was lost? I like to think of it as honest citizenship.

Of just what does honest citizenship consist? I need not enumerate the qualities which one expects to find in a good citizen. You good residents of Kent can name any number of persons whom you know to be good citizens. You know also that a good citizen of the community is a good citizen of the State, and a good citizen of the United States. But does it stop there? No. It is not wholly a matter of individual good citizenship. The real good comes from the association of good citizens. How often have we heard the remark, "That is a fine community," or "That is a nice town."—If you will permit me, I would digress to say that Ohio is a new place for me. I came to duty in Cleveland less than 5 months ago, and when I was asked to come here to speak today, quite naturally I inquired, "What kind of a place is Kent?" I am happy to say that to every query the answer came, "It is a nice city." I can only conclude that here you have a high percentage of good citizens.

Well-administered communities inevitably mean good State government, and so on. Thus is the influence of individual citizenship felt until the very character of the Nation is determined.

The state of the world today is such as to demand that we, as a nation, exercise our leadership in such a way as to give good citizenship a chance to develop among the peoples of the war-torn countries and of the backward areas of the world. No longer can we place the major emphasis on a favorable balance of trade or of payments. No longer can it be considered enough to prosper in a material way alone. Moral and spiritual values have come to play and must continue to play an increasingly important part in the course of our dealings among the family of nations. The several foreign-aid programs in which this country is now engaged are ample evidence that we are alive to the situation. We, as a nation, must practice good citizenship among the freedom-loving peoples of the world if we are successfully to combat the forces which are today arrayed against us.

This Flag Day is an altogether appropriate occasion upon which to consider these things. All too often, I fear, we think of Flag Day—and other patriotic holidays—as days on which to celebrate exclusively the deeds which have been done. Sometimes, I am convinced, we need to rededicate ourselves to the furtherance of our national aims and ideals. I am equally sure—and I know that you can agree with me—that there is no better day for such a reconsecration than the day on which we honor that emblem of our American idea, the grand old Stars and Stripes.

Adequate Communication Is Vital to American Economy

REMARKS
OF
HON. THURMAN C. CROOK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, adequate facilities for communication and transportation have always been recognized as very necessary in our growing economy. When we cause injury to either one of these vehicles, it is harmfully reflected in business, commerce, and industry, and more so in this modern atomic age of speed.

The Postmaster General asked for more appropriations to extricate the Department from ever-mounting deficits which have been yearly inflicted on said Department by charging numerous subsidies and expenditures against it, rather than the Congress making the necessary appropriations to defray said subsidies as it does in other agencies of Government, such appropriation has been flatly denied to date.

In this cut-back in postal services to check the growing deficits of the Department, many postal employees have been, and will continue to be, thrown out of work unnecessarily and the public is being greviously inconvenienced. Numerous fields of business and industry of my district in northern Indiana, have already brought to my attention the harmful effect of such an unwarranted procedure that now prevails.

Whenever every person, firm, industry, business of any type, publishers, and so forth, are willing to pay their fair share of the postal service and the Congress appropriates the necessary money to defray the cost of subsidies and even Federal rent charged against the Post Office Department, the postal deficit will vanish and we shall be privileged a continuation of our efficient and well-accepted postal service which we have enjoyed over these many years. To further cut said services, 10 percent across the board is a most dangerous line of procedure. It does not make sense, rhyme, or reason.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has, by a vote of 8 to 12, voted out Congressman MORRISON'S bill, one of 35 similar bills to rescind the Postmaster's edict for reduction of postal service. This action was taken in the absence of malice toward or condemnation of any head of a department or agency of Government. Said measure now rests in the lap of the House of this Congress and I, as one of the authors of such legislation, implore this Congress to execute remedial action in this grave matter that it may not be said that we Members of Congress blocked the avenues of the growing economy of our Nation, mistreated the workingman that has always given us such marvelous and efficient service, and impaired the morale of men and women that contracted with their Government in good faith.

Another Black Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I am the recipient of numerous letters from both industry and labor, registering protests against what they call the high handed and unwarranted action of the Select Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities.

Those who oppose the committee's conduct base their complaint primarily on the violation of their constitutional rights. In this respect the editorial published in the Chicago Daily Tribune may shed some light upon the right to complain about the attitude and tactics of the committee and its chairman. I call specific attention to the editorial entitled "Another Black Committee."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein the editorial entitled "Another Black Committee," published on June 15, 1950, in the Chicago Daily Tribune.

ANOTHER BLACK COMMITTEE

The conduct of an investigation in lobbying by a committee under Representative FRANK BUCHANAN, of Pennsylvania, has drawn deserved condemnation from other Members of the House. Mr. BUCHANAN has proceeded with little respect for normal congressional procedures of subpenaing witnesses and examining them or for the constitutional protection of free speech and a free press.

If anything approaching such high-handed methods were employed by a congressional committee dealing with suspected Communists or other subversives, there would be an immediate outcry from the liberal wing of the eastern press. Representative BUCHANAN'S activities, however, have been greeted with dead silence by these professed champions of due process and the inviolability of the individual.

It has been established by the officers of certain private organizations dedicated to the safeguarding of the American constitutional system that Mr. BUCHANAN has had the volunteer assistance in his smearing campaign of a poison pen outfit misnamed Friends of Democracy. This is a propaganda racket conducted by Rex Stout, a goat bearded mystery writer, once on the editorial board of the Communist magazine, New Masses, in association with Leon Birkhead, an ex-preacher, and one Avedis Derounian, a Levantine of many aliases, sometimes known as John Roy Carlson.

The principal interest of this crowd seems to be to advance the creeping New Deal revolution by assassinating the character of anyone manful enough to withstand its mud

guns and to defend a constitutional Republic. The New Deal recognizes that it has valuable auxiliaries in Stout, Birkhead, and Derounian, and has conferred upon them tax exemption for what contributions they can get by shaking the bushes, justifying this extraordinary boon on the ground that the outfit is engaging in an "educational" work.

It has become apparent that Mr. BUCHANAN'S interest in lobbying is confined to the activities of organizations which openly oppose the New Deal and call for a return to constitutionalism. One such group, in furtherance of the goal of acquainting the people with the New Deal's progress into socialism, appears to have published some books and to have assisted in the publication and distribution of at least one other—John T. Flynn's the Road Ahead.

Representative BUCHANAN has endeavored to represent these activities, which certainly are valid, as some sort of nefarious plot, and has levied upon the publishing agency a demand that it spread before him the names of those contributing to publication and those who purchased the books. This approach is in open contravention of the first amendment guaranteeing that the state may not abridge the right to a free press, and it would also appear to violate the fourth amendment governing security of person and property against unreasonable searches and seizures.

The further BUCHANAN proceeds, the more it is apparent that he has patterned his star chamber proceedings upon the model of the infamous inquisition into lobbying conducted by Senator Hugo Black in the early period of the New Deal. In that fishing expedition Black subpenaed the complete telegraphic correspondence of more than 1,000 specified persons and groups, piling up more than 5,000,000 copies of messages, which were then used to smear the opponents of the Roosevelt administration.

For this contemptible service Black was elevated by Roosevelt to the Supreme Court, despite his acknowledged former membership in the Ku Klux Klan, an organization whose terroristic methods conformed to his own.

If the House wishes to preserve respect for its integrity it will lay Mr. BUCHANAN and his committee away in the freezing compartment before they proceed to still greater outrages. Black finally came a cropper when, having been accused of violating the fourth amendment, he was severely taken to task by the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. If the House wants to spare itself similar disgrace, it will rebuke BUCHANAN for his illegal methods and strip his committee of all authority.

Loss of Tobacco Acreage in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following table showing changes in tobacco production in nine producing States during the last 30 years.

As you can see from the figures, West Virginia lost an enormous amount of acreage in that period. At the usual valuation of $500 per acre for tobacco land, the financial loss amounts to $3,280,000 in land values. That is a lot of money.

A large part of this acreage was lost because patriotic West Virginians went to work in war plants during the war and were unable to recover their tobacco acreage allotments when they returned.

A vast majority of allotments in West Virginia are already down to nine-tenths of an acre or less. Now a move is afoot to cut even this pitifully small allotment. I do not intend to allow that move to succeed. If anything, the allotments should be increased to allow our West Virginia farmers to regain some of their losses.

The table follows:

Acres harvested and pounds produced of burley tobacco, by States, for 1919 and 1949 and increases or decreases calculated in percent

UNITED STATES

State	1919 [1]		1949 [2]		Increase or decrease [3] in 1949 compared with 1919 in percent	
	Acres harvested	Production in thousands of pounds	Acres harvested	Production in thousands of pounds	Acres	Production
Ohio	25,000	20,676	13,800	17,940	−44.8	−13.5
Indiana	13,700	10,944	10,400	13,208	−24.0	21.1
Missouri	4,600	4,177	5,200	5,980	13.0	42.8
Kansas			200	205		
Virginia	1,800	1,499	12,800	20,160	611.1	1,246.6
West Virginia	11,400	7,695	3,200	4,384	−71.9	−42.8
North Carolina	2,500	1,412	10,800	15,552	332.0	1,014.3
Kentucky	287,000	241,080	315,000	384,300	9.7	59.4
Tennessee	15,500	12,865	82,000	98,400	429.0	662.8
Total	361,500	300,348	503,400	560,129	[4] 39.2	[4] 86.5

[1] From Tobaccos of the United States, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.
[2] May 1950 Crop Report, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.
[3] Calculated.
[4] Average.

Youth Molds Its Future as It Saves the Soil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the following prize-winning essay on soil conservation, written by James McDonald, a student of Warren County High School, Front Royal, Va., in the competition sponsored by the Lord Fairfax Soil Conservation District, comprising the counties of Frederick, Clarke, Warren, and Shenandoah:

SOIL CONSERVATION

The felling of the first tree by colonists in the New World was an act of great significance. It marked the beginning of an era of the most rapid rate of wasteful land use in the history of the world. Little land was plowed; the acreage under cultivation increased and farms grew larger. More and more ground was plowed. The range country was overgrazed and our pastures were not receiving lime and fertilizer. Grasslands, as well as croplands, were gradually being depleted. More and more the forests and streams were polluted.

When the rains came the loose soil mixed with the water. The water carried away the rich organic matter and topsoil, leaving the less productive subsoil. All this happened because the early farmers did not recognize soil erosion. It did not have to happen then and certainly not today.

The settlers worked as if vegetation were an enemy of man, soil, and life and removed it ruthlessly with fire and ax. What did it matter to them if a field wore out in a few years? No matter how much land was spoiled most everyone thought there would always be an abundance of good soil. At first, it had been almost black but now it was a light brown, due largely to soil erosion. This change meant the deterioration of the soil—our basic resource. It was a symptom of a slow sickness that would forever afflict our land and our way of life, if it were not corrected. It meant that much of the organic matter and fertility was gone and is still going. Thus, the land was attacked first by fire and plow and a lack of soil and water conservation measures. This started us on the road to soil conservation and away from devastation of soil and natural resources. Washington and Jefferson called attention to this in their day. Teddy Roosevelt called the first national conservation conference in 1909. He said, "When the soil is gone man, too, must go and it does not take long."

The Soil Conservation Service was established in 1935 as a branch of the United States Department of Agriculture with Dr. H. H. Bennett as its first and only chief. Dr. Bennett has been doing all possible to save the Nation's soil since the turn of the century. He has been invited to many foreign countries to show them how the Soil Conservation Service functions. Many put all the blame on the farmer for this destruction of soil. Many say the Government is fully as much at fault as the farmer. Had it awakened sooner our erosion loss wouldn't be three and one-half billions each and every year. Truly, today soil conservation is everybody's problem—it touches the lives of everyone. I am glad to be one of the several thousand pupils in the public schools of our Lord Fairfax Soil Conservation District who are trying to carry the gospel of soil conservation out into our fields and woodlands for greener fields, clearer streams, and lasting security.

What is the great need for soil conservation? There are some 460,000,000 acres of cropland and over 150,000,000 people—about 3 acres of cropland per person. The population increases and the reservoir of good soil decreases throughout the world. Yes, youth molds its future as it saves the soil. The answer is soil conservation.

No people in all history have such a wealth of climate, soil, timber, and water resources and of plant and animal life as we have, or I

should have said had. An average of 9 inches of topsoil covered what is now the United States. We now have only 6 inches. No nation has ever dissipated these resources as we have and survived as a nation. May we not learn a lesson from the tragic pages of history?

Just what is soil conservation? It's the using and conserving of the soil for the downright good of mankind. Why do we need to conserve the soil? Look at the tragic fate of ancient civilizations.

What is happening to the soil that we need soil conservation? Erosion. Wind and water are the chief tools of erosion. These two take about 3,000,000,000 tons annually, over $3,000,000,000 annually—enough for 3,000 $1,000,000 schools that are so badly needed. That's a lot of dough and soil. Virginia has lost 25 percent of its topsoil and we are a people of thrift and honest toil. A new attitude is imperative all along the line. Our public schools, too, must do their part. We have been slow in starting but we can put on a lot of speed if our education is correct.

What can be done to stop this terrible disease of the soil. Here are some simple and effective measures that are being applied in correct land-use patterns by those farming the conservation way here in the Lord Fairfax soil-conservation district. And why not be smart and turn losses into gains and protect our future with these sensible and tested practices—just good common sense plus some technical skill which is available in soil-conservation districts for the asking.

1. Good crop rotations. Built around good sods of grasses and legumes.
2. Crop rotations in alternate contour strips on sloping cropland.
3. Contour tillage. All farming operations on the level—on the contour.
4. Productive meadows and pasture of grasses and legumes.
5. Correct use of lime, fertilizer, manure, and crop residues.
6. Cover crops. Soil protection and enrichment.
7. Grassed waterways, drainage, diversions. Carrying surplus rainfall safely.
8. Farm ponds. Storage of rainfall on the farm, water for livestock and wildlife, fire protection, spraying, irrigation, fish, and recreation.
9. Woodland conservation and management for sustained yields of woodland products—protect from fire and grazing.
10. Vegetate galls and gullies, cuts and fills.
11. Wildlife protection and conservation. Vegetate borders for erosion control and wildlife food and cover—bicolor and sericea, also multiflora rose.

How do you go about your conservation farm plan? Talk it over with your county agent and your soil conservationist. Your soil conservationist will have a conservation survey map made of your farm. Study the map to determine the characteristics of your land and soil. Develop a land-use map. Your county agent and your soil conservationist will cooperate with you to devise the best conservation-farm plan for your own particular farm and circumstances and will help you to establish conservation measures that fit your farm. Inspire your neighbors to join in the fight on soil erosion. You wouldn't go up a hill if you could go around it, would you? The same with plowing and cultivating the land, don't plow up and down for that only enables the rain to wash the soil away. Stay on the contour—rows up and down do not fit a field that's round. Thomas Jefferson taught and practiced the art of contour farming for larger yields of better crops for better living.

Do you know how the Grand Canyon got the way it is now? At first it was only a small wash, soon it became a gully, and then to its final stage like it is today.

Virginia now plants 900,000 acres to row crops which is not suited for row crops and should be used for other purposes. Conservation farming is gradually correcting this. Nearly 15,000,000 acres are affected by erosion and more than 479,000 of these are severely gullied. Think what it will cost to repair this damage. We do not have even 1 acre to lose. Virginia needs more conservation badly—a good beginning has been made. It has been said, "Heaven couldn't have created a more beautiful land than Virginia."

All through the ages poor land has made discontented people and leads to poor government. So for goodness sakes, Virginia and the rest of the States, wake up and stop the annual loss of over 500,000 acres of productive soil before it stops all of us.

"THE SHAPE OF DREAMS

"This man has seen his acres stretching bare
And scarred beneath the wind and driving rain
And he has wondered with sick despair.
Now he has learned to cherish and to build
Restore the vigor that had drained away
And marveled as he saw the miracle
Of strong green sod replace barren clay—
And thought: If these poor fields can turn to green,
Love may yet flower in the hearts of men."

—*Mary S. Taylor, Lincoln, Va.*

Tariff on Textile Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution and newspaper article:

CITY OF CLIFTON, N. J.,
June 14, 1950.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed herewith please find certified copy of resolution adopted by the governing body of the city of Clifton on June 13, 1950, opposing further tariff reduction on textile products.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAM A. MILLER,
City Manager.

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Clifton, That this governing body go on record opposing further tariff reduction on textile products, inasmuch as at the present time there is high unemployment in the textile industries of our community and area, and further tariff reductions will definitely affect the standard of living of our citizens and taxpayers; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to President Truman, Senators HENDRICKSON and SMITH, and Congressman CANFIELD, and the committee for reciprocity information; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the industries of our area affected by the tariff reduction.

RIEVE FILES BRIEF OPPOSING TARIFF CUT ON TEXTILES

NEW YORK, June 6.—In a brief filed today with the Committee for Reciprocity Information, Emil Rieve, who is general president of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, has vigorously opposed further reduction in tariff rates on textile products.

In his brief Rieve declares that "an expansion of textile imports would have a highly unfortunate effect upon the workers in the industry," who, he points out, are "now suffering under the double impact of a high rate of technological change and intense competition among different fibers, processes, and products."

Citing the high unemployment in textiles during a period of general prosperity, Rieve argued that lower tariffs would cause further distress "without providing a substantial permanent market for foreign textiles in this country."

ELEVEN-POINT CONTENTION

The union leader, whose organization represents more than 400,000 workers—about a third of the industry—bases his argument on 11 points:

1. Unemployment is high in many textile divisions; alternative employment is limited in many textile areas.
2. Current technological and other changes are threatening additional jobs.
3. Some of the products on which the State Department has proposed tariff cuts are those which act as a stabilizing influence in the industry if they are not subjected to more foreign competition.
4. Textiles are by nature not suitable as a primary source of international trade.
5. Maintaining an adequate American textile industry is essential to the national standard of living and to national defense.
6. The American textile industry is one of the largest of the world's textile industries and should retain this position.
7. American textile tariffs have had few unfavorable effects at home or abroad.
8. The world textile picture is complicated by subsidies to industry in many foreign countries and to the producers of raw materials at home. A tariff reduction would have a harmful effect on American cotton and wool growers.

IMPORTS CAN HARM UNITED STATES

9. Tariff concessions should not be negotiated for products which are primarily supplied by nations not involved in the negotiations.
10. While a limited quantity of imports can contribute new ideas, fabrics, and designs, the volume should not be great enough to destroy segments of the American industry.
11. There is still no international code of fair labor standards in the textile industry to avoid competition on the basis of exploited labor.

Rieve's brief discussed each of these points in detail. Among the figures he cited is the fact that in the last 2 years turn-over of workers in the textile industry equaled the total annual employment. That is, 1,278,000 separations (layoffs, dismissals, and quits) were recorded in 2 years; total employment in the industry is 1,274,000.

This, he said, is evidence of the high degree of dislocation taking place in the industry under present conditions—which tariff cuts would intensify.

Communism Versus Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW JACOBS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to promote thinking among our young people on the dangers of com-

munism and the advantages of our democratic form of government, I sponsored a contest among the high schools of my congressional district and offered as a prize a week's trip to Washington to the person who wrote the winning essay on the subject. The decision as to the winner under the rules of the contest rested with a committee of the Indianapolis Bar Association. That committee conferred the honor on Miss Patricia Anne Feltz of 1214 South Talbot Street, Indianapolis, a student at the Sacred Heart Central High School, in Indianapolis.

In announcing their decision the judges said: "All of the contestants submitted very worth-while papers reflecting extensive research and surprisingly mature consideration." The other young people—each of whom won in his or her own school—were: Gene R. Simpson, Manual Training High School; Miss Allegra Henry, Southport High School; George Saar, Arsenal Technical High School, and Miss Jane Brady, St. Agnes Academy.

I would like to be able to make public the text of each of the five winning essays, as I believe a real purpose would be served thereby, but as space would not permit, I offer for printing in the RECORD the text of Miss Feltz' paper which reads as follows:

"Let the people know the facts and the country will be saved."—Abe Lincoln.

The above quotation is the dedication of my theme. In it is a ray of hope and encouragement, greatly needed by teachers, speakers, authors, editors, and newspapermen throughout the country, who valiantly fight the overwhelming flood of treacherous communistic propaganda invading our lives and seeking to choke our last foothold of freedom. It's up to you, the people of America, the leaders of the world, to decide which it will be, communism or democracy. We must resolve that godless communism is the worst thing that can happen to us, and that democracy, with all its imperfections, must be safeguarded at any cost.

"A spectre is haunting Europe—and America—the spectre of communism." [1]

Today communism is a dynamic political force, recognized as such, and because of its terrifyingly real power, and threatening subversive secretiveness, it is sickenly feared by the peoples of the world, except for many cocky Americans. Well organized and capable, its leaders are veterans in their business. They are intelligent and experienced leaders, in the fields of education, writing, and social service, as well as government and labor management. Fired with burning zeal and tireless energy, they are out to conquer the world for communism. "They have a world to win." [2]

World domination through a global revolution is the Communists' aim. According to William Z. Foster, the national chairman of the United States Communist Party, the Communists' target for tomorrow is America. In his book, Toward a Soviet America, he states his plan for an American Soviet Government. It will be organized along the lines of the Russian Soviets. We will join in a world Soviet union—a dictatorship of the proletariat.[3] Workers will organize Red guards. All parties (Democrats, Republicans, etc.,) will be abolished. Mr. Foster says that the Communist Party will be represented as the party of the toiling masses, and that its "establishment will mark birth of real democracy in the United States." The first rumblings of this master plan are now being heard. We cannot ignore them.

Communism is not, however, a comparatively new threat to our liberty. Karl Marx established the basis of the Communist Party over a century ago when he wrote his famous Manifesto of the Communist Party. In 1847 the International Communist League drafted Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels to write a platform. In two short months the first copy was published. At first it was nothing more than a propaganda pamphlet for a political party, but, what was first the passing thoughts of "another fanatic," now has become the keystone of a revolutionary blockade. It has become, along with the interpretations by Lenin and Stalin, a practical bible of the Communist Party.

In the opening paragraphs of the Communist manifesto, the authors maintain that the history of all past society is "a history of class struggles." [4] Throughout the ages, whether it has been freeman and slave, patrician and plebian, or lord and serf, there has always been bitterness and fighting between two classes of people, the wealthy who employ labor, and the common man who must sell his labor. Today these two classes are called capitalists and wage earners, but the manifesto gives them the names, bourgeoisie [5] and proletariat. Feeling that this constant struggle of the classes is the "root of all evil," the Communists desire to abolish, by force if necessary, the power of the bourgeoisie and set up the proletariat as the ruling class. They plan to do this by changing all existing conditions of society, which they claim are merely vehicles to advance the bourgeois power. Some of these revolutionary changes are discussed in the following paragraphs.

"The theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property. The distinguishing feature of communism is not the abolition of property generally, but the abolition of bourgeois property." [6] The manifesto maintains that the average wage-laborer receives only the minimum wages that is necessary for him to eke out an existence and keep him working for his capitalist employer, so any personal appropriation he can obtain for his earnings is so small that he cannot command the labor of others. "Communism deprives no man of the power to appropriate the products of society; all that it does is to deprive him of the power to subjugate the labor of others by means of such appropriation." [7]

Abolition of the family! This is another proposal of the Communists, because they believe that bourgeois marriage is in reality a system of wives in common, and what we do hypocritically concealed, they wish to bring out in the open, namely a legalized community of women.[8]

The Communists wish also to abolish countries and nationalities, because as the manifesto continues, the workingmen have no country.

As a final step in acting in contradiction to all past historical experience, the Communists desire to abolish all religion and morality, instead of constituting them on a new basis.[9] Martin Dies, in his book, The Trojan Horse in America, states that there are four propositions which are essential to the highest order of living.[10] These propositions are:

(1) Faith in Almighty God as our Father from whom we obtain the blessings of freedom and life;

(2) Respect for individual man as a living soul created to the image of God;

(3) Love of God and man as the only basis of a brotherly society.

(4) Confidence that spiritual forces, not material, must rule supreme in the affairs of man.

On each of these four propositions, communism takes an antireligious stand, Mr. Dies asserts. Communism denies the existence of God and the divine creation of man. They hold man to be nothing more than a cog in a government machine. Communism preaches hate and strives for its ends through hate. Communism is based on materialism, holding that spiritual forces are a delusion.[11] Therefore, in keeping with these theories, and to further their aim for abolishing all present conditions of society, communism chokes every splinter of religious belief and moral living.

In the final paragraphs of Communist Manifesto, Marx states the Communists' 10-point program of measures to be taken in the different countries. This includes the centralization of money, communication, industry, and so forth, in the government, the abolition of private property, a heavy graduated income tax, and establishment of industrial armies. As a conclusion Marx summarizes the Communists' position in relation to the present state of affairs and finishes with attractive, rousing slogans: "Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Working men of all countries, unite!" [12]

"A frequent recurrence to fundamental principles (is) absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty, and to keep a government free."—Pennsylvania Declaration of the Rights of Man, 1776.

We cannot successfully combat communism or any form of totalitarianism, unless we understand the meaning of democracy. To understand clearly what democracy is, we must know the source of our rights and the duties that these rights entail. Let us now review our knowledge of democracy and the American way of life.

Democracy, too, can tell a tale of years of struggle for its form of government. As early as 1215, charters of freedom have been fought for, and wrested from kings and governments. In that year the Magna Charta—the Great Charter—was written. Upon this foundation stone rests the liberties of both Englishmen and Americans. "A long line of great documents connects the root principles of Magna Charta with the American Bill of Rights. Our present liberties are the result of over 730 years of struggle for freedom, developed and broadened by reason and the experience of people in governing." [13]

One of these documents that is probably the most familiar to us is the Declaration of

---

[1] Marx, Karl, and Engels, Frederick, Manifesto of the Communist Party, Charles Kerr & Co., 1945.

[2] Marx, op. cit., p. 60.

[3] By proletariat is meant that group of wage earners who, having no means of production of their own, sell their labor power in order to live.

[4] Marx, op. cit., p. 12.

[5] By bourgeoisie is meant the class of modern capitalists, employers of wage labor.

[6] Marx, op. cit., p. 32.

[7] Marx, op. cit., pp. 33, 34, 35.

[8] Marx, op. cit., p. 39.

[9] Marx, op. cit., p. 41.

[10] Dies, Martin, The Trojan Horse in America, Dodd, Mead & Co., 1940, p. 238.

[11] Dies, op. cit., p. 238.

[12] Marx, op. cit., p. 60.

[13] The Bill of Rights of the United States, National Foundation for Education in American Citizenship, 1945, pp. 4, 5.

Independence. In it we are told of the natural and inalienable rights of men as equal creatures of God. "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed," stated Thomas Jefferson, author of this famous paper.

Even before the Declaration of Independence, other states had drawn up declarations of rights, for men were determined that the freedoms that they had fought for should not be lost, but be written down for all to witness. Thus we see that the American Bill of Rights was not a new idea, struck up overnight by a single mind or group of minds. The ground had been prepared for it a long time and many steps were to come before the Bill of Rights was accepted by the Nation as a whole. Truly it was the product of the stream of American history.[14]

At first, however, the Bill of Rights, as we now know it, was not included in the original draft of the Constitution. It was declared unnecessary because the new Government was to have only those powers granted it by the Constitution, and the Constitution did not give the Government powers which the Bill of Rights would forbid. As Hamilton said, "Why declare that things shall not be done, which there is no power to do?" This is not correct reasoning, however, because the Government does have the power to tax and without a Bill of Rights it could attack our free press by taxing undesirable newspapers out of existence.[15] Thomas Jefferson, away at the time of the drafting of the Constitution, upon learning of the absence of a bill or rights, wrote, "a bill of rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth." When the Constitution was submitted to the States for ratificaion, it was refused by the people because, although they wanted the Constitution as a symbol of their strength and unity, they also wanted a bill of rights as a symbol of their freedom.[16]

Under the mandate of the people, James Madison set to work and made a list of amendments numbering 9 out of the 124 suggestions that he had been given. On March 1, 1792, over 2½ years later, after many corrections had been made, enough States ratified it and Jefferson, then Secretary of State, notified the States of the passage of the amendments.

At first these amendments applied only to the National Government in its relation to the people, but later in the fourteenth amendment, the Constitution expressly forbids the encroachment of these rights by any State government. Now the American people have full protection against both State and National Government.

The American Bill of Rights known as the first 10 amendments of the Constitution guarantees these freedoms and rights:

(1) Freedom of religion, speech, and the press;
(2) Right to establish State militia;
(3) Quartering of troops in private houses;
(4) The security of persons against unwarrantable searches and seizures;
(5) Capital crimes;
(6) Criminal prosecutions;
(7) Trial by jury;
(8) Bails, fines, and punishment;
(9) Constitutional and "natural" rights;
(10) Powers reserved to States.

The fact that our Bill of Rights is not just words but effective legal protection is one of the distinguishing features of our form of government. Today our Bill of Rights is the supreme law of the land and courts are bound to give full effect to it.[17]

These guaranties of men's rights are "the very lifeblood of democracy," stated Senator William Borah, when addressing the Council of Foreign Relations some years ago. Continuing, he says, "We shall find our highest service, not only to our own people, but to mankind and to the peace of the world, in transmitting these principles unimpaired to succeeding generations. That is our supreme duty." [18]

"The last hope of human liberty in this world rests on us."—Thomas Jefferson.

Communism is attacking our democracy today. Like flooding waters, it is rushing upon us, wiping out our homes, our very lives, choking out truth, light, and God. Don't shrug your shoulders and say it can't happen here, because it is happening. Inward attacks are more to be feared than outward attacks, and our Nation is slowly rotting inwardly by a few bad apples. The Communists seized Russia with less than one-half of 1 percent of the total population and it is safe to say that there is a larger percentage of Communists and Communist sympathizers than this in the United States at this time.

"Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom, must, like men, undergo the fatigues of supporting it."—Thomas Paine.

Those who enjoy the blessings of liberty have the responsibility of preserving it not only for themselves, and their children but for their fellow citizens. It is the duty of a citizen whether employed or unemployed, rich or poor, to be loyal and true to traditions, principles, and ideals of his government.[19] Communism is constantly drilling us with the idea that the Government owes us a living, and that economic insecurity is the worst thing that can happen. Don't fool yourself. This country was founded by men who wanted liberty and freedom of worship not supporting governments and security. Ben Franklin said, "Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety."

Someone once said back in 1776 that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," because there is always someone seeking to encroach upon our rights in their search for more power. In a certain sense the very fact that we take freedom and the Bill of Rights for granted is a tribute to their permanency, but we have found it unsafe to take our liberty for granted. There have been attacks on our freedom, not only from our own Government, but also from foreign governments and elements in our own population, but whatever the crisis, we have guarded our rights jealously, and our liberty has survived. In just the recent war we have once more decided in favor of our form of government. "We shall not reverse that decision." [20]

Our noble concept of equal men with God-given rights has made the name of America synonymous with freedom. America, the land of the free. Let's keep it that way, whatever the cost.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Dies, Martin, the Trojan Horse in America, Dodd, Mead & Co., 1940.

Ebon, Martin, World Communism Today, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1948.

Keller, James, You Can Change the World, Longmans, Green & Co., 1948.

Laidler, Harry W., Social-Economic Movements, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1946.

Marx, Karl, and Engels, Frederick, Communist Manifesto, Charles Kerr & Co., 1945.

Moore, Jesse C., Our American Government Is the Best the World Has Ever Known, We Should Perserve It, Indianapolis, 1941.

Streit, Clarence K., Union Now, Harper & Bros., 1940.

PAMPHLETS

Cushman, Robert E., Our Constitutional Freedoms, Civil Liberties: An American Heritage, National Foundation for Education in American Citizenship, 1944.

Feely, Raymond T., S. J., Communism Today or Red Fascism, the Paulist Press, 1945.

O'Brien, Rev. John A., Ph. D., LL. D., the Struggle for Social Justice, the Paulist Press, 1945.

Pound, Roscoe, Liberty, National Foundation for Education in American Citizenship, 1945.

Sheen, Fulton J., Communism: the Opium of the People, the St. Anthony's Guild, 1937.

The Bill of Rights of the United States, National Foundation for Education in American Citizenship, 1945.

The Constitution of the United States, We the People, National Foundation for Education in American Citizenship, 1945.

The Sesquicentennial of the Bill of Rights, Library of Congress, Washington, 1941.

[14] The Sesquicentennial of the Bill of Rights, Library of Congress, Washington, 1941, p. 41.

[15] Cushman, Robert E., Our Constitutional Freedoms, Civil Liberties: An American Heritage, National Foundation for Education in American Citizenship, 1944, p. 5.

[16] The Sesquicentennial of the Bill of Rights, op. cit., p. 15.

[17] The Bill of Rights of the United States, op. cit., pp. 15, 16.

[18] Streit, Clarence K., Union Now, Harper & Bros., 1940, p. 67.

[19] Dies, op. cit., pp. 358, 359.

[20] Henry L. Stimson, Democracy and Nationalism in Europe, 1934, taken from Union Now, op. cit., p. 91.

Letters From Chicago Bankers on H. R. 8597

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the only Chicago member of the Banking and Currency Committee I have felt it my responsibility to request suggestions and expressions of viewpoints from the bankers of Chicago on pending legislation affecting banking operations. In following this policy, and in conveying to the membership of the House an epitome of Chicago banking opinion, I hope that I have rendered a service to my colleagues not without value in their consideration of banking measures.

The Banking and Currency Committee recently reported out H. R. 8597, and it is expected that this bill, which I understand was introduced by Chairman SPENCE at the request of the Comptroller of the Currency, will shortly reach the floor of the House.

From Lawrence M. Murray, president of Mellon National Bank & Trust Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., I received a letter, part of which follows:

This bill which is in the form of an amendment to section 5153 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. Code, title 12, sec. 901) was introduced at the request of the Comptroller of the Currency for the purpose of enabling national banks to accept deposits from various agencies and instrumentalities of States and political subdivisions thereof on an equal basis with State banks. It is important to note that the bill only attempts to

place national banks on an equal basis with State banks and does not in any way favor national banks over State banks.

The present section provides in effect that national banks may secure deposits of public moneys of a State or any political subdivision thereof. The term "political subdivision" has received at times a rather narrow construction with the result that a question has arisen as to whether various agencies and instrumentalities of States are political subdivisions and thus the right of a national bank to secure their deposits. Examples of such agencies and instrumentalities are housing, water, sewer, and airport authorities, irrigation and water districts, road and bridge commissions, and others too numerous to mention.

As you well know, the number of these agencies and instrumentalities has grown tremendously in the past few years as they have proven to be useful devices in carrying on the increasing activities of various governmental bodies. The total deposits of these various agencies and instrumentalities in banks has literally multiplied, and a very substantial part thereof are now in national banks.

If the narrow construction that has sometimes been placed upon the phrase "political subdivision" is to be followed, national banks in many instances will find it impossible to compete with State banks for these funds because in almost every case the State statutes under which these agencies and instrumentalities are created provide that their bank deposits must be secured. Also there are certain existing agencies which are admittedly not political subdivisions, and national banks have been unable to accept their deposits. It is for the purpose of correcting this situation and removing the present doubts which exist that the Comptroller of the Currency has requested the introduction of this bill. It also has been considered by the National Bank Division of the American Bankers Association and has its whole-hearted support.

A résumé of Mr. Murray's letter I sent to the presidents of the Chicago banks with request for comment.

From Carl A. Birdsall, president of Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co., of Chicago, I received the following reply:

CONTINENTAL ILLINOIS
NATIONAL BANK & TRUST
CO., OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., June 9, 1950.

The Honorable BARRATT O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I am glad to give you our thoughts in connection with H. R. 8597 about which you recently wrote us.

As a national bank we are interested in seeing that our position is kept on a competitive basis with State banks in our area and to that end we feel that the proposed bill is an improvement over the language in the present final paragraph of section 5153 of the United States Revised Statutes.

The bill has provoked some very interesting discussions in our bank of the definitions of the terms "political subdivision" and "governmental instrumentality." In the course of these discussions, it was suggested that you might want to borrow from the constitution of the State of Illinois the term "any public corporation" as an additional means of clarifying and broadening the power intended to be conveyed. The term appears in article 8, section 8, of our constitution of 1870.

Sincerely yours,
C. A. BIRDSALL, *President.*

Carl H. Zeiss, vice president and general counsel of the Northern Trust Co., wrote:

THE NORTHERN TRUST CO.,
Chicago, June 13, 1950.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Mr. Solomon A. Smith has referred to me your letter to him of June 5, submitting for comment a copy of H. R. 8597, presently under consideration by the House Banking and Currency Committee. I wish to express our thanks to you for the opportunity to give you our views.

Speaking generally, we, of course, want Illinois State banks to be on an equal competitive basis with national banks, and conversely it is only fair that national banks be on an equal competitive basis with our State banks.

For your information, we in our bank are strongly opposed to the preferring of one depositor over another by securing of deposits. In the case of the deposits of the United States and of the State of Illinois, these are sovereign bodies who have a preference over all other depositors in any event, which has been recognized by the Supreme Court of Illinois, and in securing their deposits they obtain nothing more than what they already have. So far as securing other deposits is concerned, we feel that from a long-time standpoint sound banking practice calls for the limiting of such preferences rather than increasing them.

You may be interested to learn of a situation in which our Illinois State banks are at a definite disadvantage from a competitive standpoint with the national banks. I refer to bankruptcy deposits. The national banks are authorized to secure these deposits. Bankruptcy deposits are essentially private deposits and Illinois State banks are not allowed to secure them. We do not, however, favor eliminating our competitive disadvantage by giving to Illinois State banks the right to secure bankruptcy deposits.

Again thanking you for your kind letter, I am,

Sincerely yours,
CARL H. ZEISS,
Vice President and General Counsel.

John C. Wright, president of La Salle National Bank, wrote:

LA SALLE NATIONAL BANK,
Chicago, Ill., June 9, 1950.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
Congressman, Second District, Illinois,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I have read with interest a copy of H. R. 8597 and feel that this is a constructive piece of legislation in the interest of national banks and believe it should have your full support.

Appreciate your thoughtfulness in submitting it to me.

Cordially yours,
J. C. WRIGHT.

Robert D. Mathias, president of Chicago National Bank, wrote:

CHICAGO NATIONAL BANK,
Chicago, Ill., June 8, 1950.

The Honorable BARRATT O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Thank you for your letter of June 5 asking our opinion regarding H. R. 8597. We are complimented that you would call upon us in this manner and urge that you do so again whenever you think the combined experience of the officers of this bank can be helpful to you.

We know of no conflict, and inquiry in various areas reveals no conflict, with regard to the privilege granted to State and National banks to pledge security in connection with the deposit of State and local public funds. It would be my opinion that Illinois national banks are not directly concerned with this legislation.

However, as a matter of general principle, it would seem equitable that national banks be accorded the same privilege that State banks enjoy by virtue of State laws wherein both State and National banks operate competitively.

Therefore, it would be my opinion that your support of H. R. 8597 would be in the best interest of all national banks.

Sincerely,
R. D. MATHIAS.

Guy A. Nelson, president of South Chicago Savings Bank, replied as follows:

SOUTH CHICAGO SAVINGS BANK,
Chicago, June 8, 1950.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: In respect of H. R. 8597, it is my belief that National and State banks should be on an equal competitive basis, that the intent of section 5153 is to place them on that basis in regard to deposits of State funds, and that funds of State instrumentalities are no different in this respect than State funds.

Therefore, it is my view that H. R. 8597 should be supported.

Very truly yours,
GUY A. NELSON, *President.*

Walter J. Riley, president of Chatham Bank of Chicago, wrote:

CHATHAM BANK OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., June 9, 1950.

Mr. BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress of the United States,
Second District, Illinois,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I am in receipt of your letter of June 5 which I have carefully read over and also copy of H. R. 8597.

I agree with the conclusion reached by Mr. Lawrence N. Murray and trust you will be guided accordingly.

Very truly yours,
WALTER J. RILEY.

From Carl L. Jernberg, president of South Side Bank & Trust Co., I received the following reply:

SOUTH SIDE BANK & TRUST CO.,
Chicago, Ill., June 10, 1950.

The Honorable BARRATT O'HARA,
Second District, Illinois,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We have your letter of June 5 regarding H. R. 8597. In connection therewith, we wish to advise that we are a State bank enjoying the privilege of accepting State and local government deposits upon pledge of acceptable assets. Accordingly, we are not particularly interested in the outcome of this bill other than to render our aid in a cooperative spirit with our national bank friends.

Yours respectfully,
CARL L. JERNBERG.

Joseph R. Frey, president of Lake Shore National Bank, wrote:

LAKE SHORE NATIONAL BANK,
Chicago, Ill., June 8, 1950.

Mr. BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress,
Congress of the United States,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Thank you for sending me a copy of H. R. 8597.

We of the Illinois Bankers Association have advocated no preference for any special group

of depositors and are of the opinion that public funds come in the same category.

I am advised that if H. R. 8597 should become law it would not be beneficial to Illinois banks.

Yours very truly,

JOSEPH R. FREY,
President.

M. R. Baty, president of the South Shore National Bank, wrote the following:

THE SOUTH SHORE NATIONAL BANK OF CHICAGO,
June 10, 1950.

Congressman BARRATT O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: The pledging of security by banks in order to obtain deposits of public funds is not in the public interest in the opinion of the writer and his associates.

Those who might as a matter of equity be entitled to a pledge of collateral against their deposit are not public officials. For years I have campaigned against the pledging of bank assets to secure public deposits and I do not at this stage of the game feel that I want to change.

This bank will pledge none of its assets to secure any deposit, be it public or private. The only exception that is made in this bank is in connection with the so-called war loan account. This bank sells several million dollars of United States savings bonds each year to residents in the South Shore. As a matter of simplification in handling this large volume of transactions, we have pledged with the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago as fiscal agent for the Treasury Department United States Government bonds. We do this against our better judgment and only in the interest of better serving our customers.

We cannot favor H. R. 8597. We disagree completely with the conclusions of the president of the Mellon National Bank & Trust Co. of Pittsburgh. If national banks must pledge their prime assets to retain certain deposits, they will be far better off to lose those deposits and retain their prime assets for pro rata security rather than for the security of one or more individual accounts.

Sincerely yours,

M. R. BATY.

Harry C. Hausman, Secretary of Illinois Bankers Association, stated his position as follows:

ILLINOIS BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, June 8, 1950.

HON. BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. O'HARA: Thanks for sending me with your letter of June 5 a copy of H. R. 8597, which was introduced by Chairman SPENCE. To us here in Illinois the provisions of this bill are purely academic. Our State banks are not privileged to secure one depositor in preference to another, except if the securing depositor happens to be the sovereign State of Illinois. None of the subdivisions are included in the exception.

Frankly our bankers and our State auditor's office over the years have been opposed to preferential deposits in banks. We feel that your money and my money should have the same protection in our banks that is given the funds of a school, district, township, city, or village, or county, and the laws of Illinois provide that purpose.

The bill in question states very definitely that a national bank may receive deposits of subdivisions of States or agencies or instrumentalities of governments and secure them to the same extent as is authorized by the law of the State in the case of State banks.

So you see, the bill does not in any way apply to Illinois, but the principle that it offers is not good to the general public.

Very truly yours,

HARRY C. HAUSMAN,
Secretary.

Rhode Island Laws for the Benefit of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the State of Rhode Island has long been in the forefront in the field of protective and beneficial legislation for our veterans. As a result of the great number of such laws, many veterans are not fully aware of the rights and benefits to which they are entitled. To clarify this matter, therefore, I would like to include in the RECORD the following digest of the Rhode Island laws granting rights, benefits, and privileges to veterans and their dependents, as of January 1, 1950. In preparing this material I have drawn upon the digest recently issued by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

Chart résumé of State laws granting rights, benefits, and privileges to veterans, their dependents, and their organizations—Rhode Island

Type of law	Résumé	Citation
Bonus	*World War I.*—Amount: $100	Laws 1942, ch. 1219 (Original enactment Laws 1920, ch. 1832).
	World War II.—Amount: $200 veterans' bonus; $200 merchant marine bonus	Laws 1946, ch. 1721, as amended; Laws 1947, ch. 1826; 1947 Ex., ch. 1981; 1949, ch. 2267.
Burial allowances and allied benefits.	*Burial.*—Provision for a firing squad for veterans' funerals	Laws 1947, ch. 1878.
	—— Provision for burial of indigent veterans at the expense of town or city. Burial may not be in potter's field. Relatives or friends may be allowed to conduct the funeral.	Gen. Laws Ann. (1938), ch. 655, § 1-3 (Administration changed by Laws 1939, ch. 660).
	Burial grounds.—Provision for the care of soldiers' burial lots in North Cemetery in Bristol.	Gen. Laws Ann. (1938), ch. 655, § 6 (Administration changed by Laws 1939, ch. 660).
	Grave care and registration.—Provision for the care of neglected and abandoned graves of veterans.	Gen. Laws Ann. (1938), ch. 655, § 9 (Administration changed by Laws 1939, ch. 660, § 87).
	Headstones and markers.—Director of social welfare shall have control and supervision of funds for decorating and installing metal markers on the graves of soldiers.	Laws 1939, ch. 660, § 87.
	—— Provision for headstones for soldiers' graves at the expense of town or city	Gen. Laws Ann. (1938), ch. 655, § 4 (Administration changed by Laws 1939, ch. 660, § 87).
Civil relief and war emergency provisions.	Acknowledgments of written instruments executed by members of the armed forces of the United States; validity.	Laws 1944, ch 1391.
	Adjutant general may act as plaintiff, etc., for person in armed forces	Laws 1943, ch. 1322.
	Administration of estates of members of the armed forces listed as missing in action, captured by the enemy, etc. Termination of conservatorship.	Laws 1944, ch. 1485; Laws 1946, ch. 1710.
	Evidence of death or other status of persons missing in action	Laws 1943, ch. 1357; Laws 1946, ch. 1709.
	Extension of hunting and fishing license held by persons in the armed forces; fishing and hunting by servicemen without license.	Laws 1943, ch. 1300, as amended; Laws 1945, ch. 1581.
	Legal residence for the purpose of divorce petition not affected by absence in the military service.	Laws 1946, ch. 1682.
	Motor vehicle operators' licenses continued during military service; renewal without examination upon return to the State.	Laws 1944, ch. 1425.
	Powers of attorney granted by persons serving in the armed forces of the United States; effect of death.	Laws 1943, ch. 1323.
	Refunds upon surrender of automobile registration plates after induction into the defense forces.	Laws 1942, ch. 1221.
	Suspension of fiduciary powers during war service	Laws 1942, ch. 1140.
Civil rights	Absentee voting by members of the armed forces; exemption from registration requirements.	Laws 1944, ch. 1470.
	Elimination of registration requirement for voting by members of the armed forces	Laws 1944, ch. 1390 (Constitutional provision ratified).
Claims; assistance in obtaining benefits; safekeeping of papers.	*Public record certification.*—Free copies of birth, marriage, or death records required in connection with actual or prospective service in the armed forces.	Laws 1942, ch. 1121.
	—— Free copies of public records for wards of the United States Veterans Guardianship Act.	Laws 1946, ch. 1711, § 16.
	—— Town clerks or registrars required to furnish, without charge to veterans or their dependents, copies of vital records for use in presenting claims to the United States or to the several departments of the local or State governments.	Laws 1942, ch. 1121.
	Recording of discharges.—Free recording of discharge papers	Gen. Laws Ann. (1938), ch. 653, § 1, as amended; Laws 1947, ch. 1847.
	—— Record of discharge once filed stands as evidence so long as the legal residence of the person remains in the State.	Laws 1944, ch. 1452.

Chart résumé of State laws granting rights, benefits, and privileges to veterans, their dependents, and their organizations—Rhode Island—Continued

Type of law	Résumé	Citation
Claims; assistance in obtaining benefits; safekeeping of papers—Continued.	*Service officers, etc.*—Department of social welfare shall prepare and prosecute before the United States Veterans' Administration all claims of World War veterans for compensation, disability allowance, insurance, and pensions.	Laws 1939, ch. 660, § 84.
	—— Officers of the Rhode Island veterans' home, formerly known as the soldiers' home, to prosecute pension and bounty claims without expense to claimant.	Gen. Laws Ann. (1938), ch. 654, § 5 (Administration changed by Laws 1939, ch. 660); Laws 1949, ch. 2166.
	—— Veterans' service centers in the cities and towns may give advice and assistance to veterans in securing benefits to which entitled under Federal or State laws.	Laws 1945, ch. 1585, as amended; Laws 1948, ch. 2107.
Educational benefits; qualification for the professions and trades.	Cities and towns authorized to provide special educational classes for veterans, particularly in the technical fields.	Laws 1946, ch. 1790.
	Master plumber or journeyman plumber may be granted a license without payment of fee and without further examination upon his return from war service.	Laws 1945, ch. 1661.
	Renewal of electricians' certificates, without examination, after termination of military service or before Dec. 31, 1947.	Laws 1942, ch. 1234, § 7 (7); Laws 1947, ch. 1918.
	Renewal of professional and occupational licenses, without examination, after discharge from military service.	Laws 1944, ch. 1453.
	World War II veterans may be allowed credit for assistance given in the embalming of human bodies while in the armed forces, as part of training required under the law of the State regulating the business of embalming and funeral directing.	Laws 1946, ch. 1722.
Educational opportunities for children of veterans.	Aid to children of veterans who served in either World War and who were killed in action or died from other causes, or who may be receiving any pension from such service by reason of being more than 50 percent disabled. No amount specified. Maximum period of time 4 years.	Laws 1947, ch. 1969.
Employment preferences, privileges, etc.	Benefit rights under the Unemployment Compensation Act	Laws 1941, ch. 1024, as amended; Laws 1943, ch. 1366; Laws 1944, chs. 1465, 1480.
	Certain racing associations in the State requested to give employment preference to veterans.	Laws 1944, p. 394, Res. No. 25.
	Disability compensation not to be deducted from wages received from the State	Laws 1939, ch. 685.
	Eligibility of veterans for appointment as firemen or policemen in any city or town of the State.	Gen. Laws Ann. (1938), ch. 652, § 1.
	Extension of time for filing certain claims with the Unemployment Compensation board.	Laws 1944, ch. 1475.
	Leaves of absence for State civil-service employees for the duration of the war emergency period. Reinstatement upon termination of such leave.	Laws 1942, ch. 1138; Laws 1943, ch. 1350.
	Military service not to affect tenure of teachers	Laws 1946, chs. 1717, 1775, § 7.
	Officers appointed by the director of social welfare to be in charge of the State's administration of veterans' relief, of graves' registration, and the commandant of the soldiers' home (designated as the Rhode Island veterans' home by Laws 1949, ch. 2166), shall each be a veteran.	Laws 1948, ch. 1997; Laws 1949, ch. 2166.
	Permanent status for veterans whose appointment to the classified service for a temporary or probationary period has continued for 5 successive years.	Laws 1949, ch. 2393.
	Preference in examinations for the position of veterans employment representative	Laws 1948, ch. 2000.
	Preference in State civil service	Laws 1939, ch. 661, § 11 (2); Laws 1943, ch. 1307.
	Preference to Civil War veterans in appointments and employment at the Rhode Island veterans' home formerly known as the Rhode Island soldiers' home.	Gen. Laws Ann. (1938), ch. 654, § 8; Laws 1949, ch. 2166.
	Preference to veterans in public departments and upon all public works of the State	Gen. Laws Ann. (1938), ch. 650, §§ 1–4.
	Provision for reinstatement of a veteran to former employment or position of like seniority, status, and pay. Request must be made within 40 days after honorable discharge from military service. Violations by any person, firm, or corporation subject to fine not to exceed $500.	Laws 1943, ch. 1351.
	Public office or employment not forfeited by enlistment in the military or naval service of the United States.	Laws 1940, ch. 850, par. 240.
	Reinstatement of public officers and employees inducted into military service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.	Laws 1941, ch. 987.
	Seniority employment rights for honorably discharged veterans of World War II	Laws 1945, ch. 1562.
	Separation pay for certain employees in the service of the State upon entering the military service of the United States; provision for reinstatement.	Laws 1943, ch. 1320.
	State employees on military leave with the armed forces blanketed into the State civil service without examination.	Laws 1943, ch. 1321.
	The advisory council for the Rhode Island Soldiers' Home (designated as the Rhode Island Veterans' Home by Laws 1949, ch. 2166) shall be composed of veterans.	Laws 1939, ch. 660, §89; Laws 1949, ch. 2166.
	War-service credit for purposes of computing retirement of State police	Laws 1944, ch. 1477.
	War-service credit to employees of the school and police departments under the law providing a pension or retirement system for the town of Cumberland.	Laws 1946, ch. 1753.
	War-service credit for retirement, pension, or other purposes, for any employee of the State, or any city, town, or political subdivision.	Laws 1942, ch. 2018.
	War-service credit under the State retirement system for school teachers	Laws 1943, ch. 1331; Laws 1948, chs. 2101, § 3, 2102, § 2 (5).
General extension of benefits	All benefits or privileges granted to veterans of any previous war are extended to veterans of World War II, including members of the American merchant marine.	Laws 1942, ch. 1220; Laws 1943, ch. 1308.
Guardianship	Exemption from payment of probate fees where the appointment of a guardian is for the purpose of receiving benefits of laws administered by the United States Veterans' Administration.	Laws 1945, ch. 1595.
	Uniform veterans' guardianship.—Provides for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.	Laws 1946, ch. 1711.
Homes (institutional)	Admission of veterans to the Rhode Island Veterans' Home (formerly known as the Rhode Island Soldiers' Home. Name changed by Laws 1949, ch. 2166).	Gen. Laws Ann. (1938), ch. 654 (Administration changed by Laws 1939, ch. 660, §§ 80, 85, 89, as amended; Laws 1939, ch. 679; Laws 1940, ch. 852); Laws 1949, ch. 2166.
Hospital benefits	Commitment of an incompetent veteran to a Federal hospital, under Uniform Guardianship Act.	Laws 1946, ch. 1711, § 18.
	For the purpose of erecting a hospital to accommodate disabled veterans, certain State lands may be conveyed to the U. S. Government or a payment of $50,000 may be made to purchase land for the purpose of establishing a Federal hospital.	Laws 1944, ch. 1395.
	Hospitalization of wives and children of men in the armed forces below the grade of commissioned officer; appropriation.	Laws 1944, pp. 496–497, Res. No. 129.
Housing	Housing for veterans and their families in Bristol and South Kingston (ch. 1840), and in Newport (ch. 1902).	Laws 1947, chs. 1840, 1902.
	Housing for veterans and their families in the city of Providence	Laws 1946, ch. 1750, as amended; Laws 1947, ch. 1859.
Laws on veterans' rights	Compilation of State laws relating to veterans; appropriation	Laws 1942, p. 558, Res. No. 27.
Loans, contracts of minors, etc.	Banks and other financial institutions may make loans pursuant to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.	Laws 1945, chs. 1634, 1656, 1657.
	Persons 17 years old in the armed forces may execute valid power of attorney	Laws 1943, ch. 1323.
	Removal of minority disability of veterans eligible for benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.	Laws 1945, ch. 1583.
Medals, certificates, etc.	Award of Rhode Island cross to an officer or enlisted man in the Federal service who distinguished himself conspicuously by extraordinary heroism in line of duty.	Laws 1945, ch. 1584.
	Credit for war service with reference to the award of service medals to members of the Rhode Island National Guard.	Laws 1940, ch. 850, title 12, pars. 230–232, as amended; Laws 1945, ch. 1534.

Chart résumé of State laws granting rights, benefits, and privileges to veterans, their dependents, and their organizations—Rhode Island—Continued

Type of law	Résumé	Citation
National Guard service	Credit for time spent in active military service of the United States	Laws 1940, ch. 850, title 1, par. 9.
Patriotic holidays and special days	Armistice Day celebrations may be held in armories	Laws 1940, ch. 850, title 6, par. 131.
Records, relics, etc.	Cities and towns authorized to prepare and post rolls of honor containing the names of persons in the armed services of the United States during the period of any war.	Laws 1943, ch. 1287.
	Record of death of any veteran must be transmitted to the division of soldiers' relief	Laws 1942, ch. 1121.
	Record of discharge once filed stands as evidence so long as the legal residence of the person remains in the State.	Laws 1944, ch. 1452.
	Resolution of sympathy to the next-of-kin of persons whose names appear on the official roll of the dead of World War II.	Laws 1944, pp. 391–392, Res. No. 24.
Recreational benefits	Armory privileges for men in the service	Laws 1941, ch. 994.
Relief and rehabilitation	City of Newport authorized to issue bonds in the amount of $100,000 for construction of public projects to provide employment for returning veterans of World War II.	Laws 1945, ch. 1615.
	Provision for the establishment of local veterans' retraining and reemployment committees and the establishment and maintenance of veterans' information service centers by the several cities and towns of the State for the purpose of furnishing full information to all veterans with respect to their rights and privileges under Federal and State laws.	Laws 1945, ch. 1585, as amended; Laws 1948, ch. 2107.
	Relief for veterans and their dependents; the families and dependents of servicemen	Gen. Laws Ann. (1938), ch. 654, §§ 6–7, 11, as amended; Laws 1944, ch. 1476.
Tax and license fee exemptions	*Fish and game license.*—Issuance of hunting and fishing license to a disabled veteran without payment of license fee.	Laws 1948, ch. 2019.
	Motor vehicles.—Exemption of disabled veterans from payment of fees for annual registration of and license to operate motor vehicles designed especially for amputees or those afflicted with paraplegia.	Laws 1947, chs. 1844, 1919; Laws 1948, ch. 2052.
	Peddlers' license.—Free license may be issued to veterans to peddle merchandise, junk, etc.	Gen. Laws Ann. (1938), ch. 365, § 15.
	Poll tax.—Veterans are exempt from payment of poll tax	Gen. Laws Ann. (1938), ch. 34, § 3, as amended; Laws 1941, ch. 981.
	Professional and occupational license.—Veterans are exempt from fee for license to act as an insurance agent.	Gen. Laws Ann. (1938), ch. 152, § 4, as amended; Laws 1940, ch. 854, § 3.
	Property tax.—Exemption from payment of interest on delinquent taxes during military service in World War II and for 6 months thereafter.	Laws 1943, ch. 1349.
	—— Exemption of property of a veterans' organization to the extent of $100,000 if actually used and occupied by such organization.	Gen. Laws Ann. (1938), ch. 29, § 2, as amended; Laws 1947, ch. 1920.
	—— Exemption of property of every Gold Star mother, to the amount of $1,500	Laws 1949, ch. 2288.
	—— Exemption of property of veterans or their unmarried widows, to the amount of $1,000 and an additional exemption in the amount of $1,000 to totally disabled veterans of World Wars I and II.	Gen. Laws Ann. (1938), ch. 29, § 6, as amended; Laws 1949, ch. 2383.
Transportation, motor vehicle, etc., privileges.	Disabled veterans exempt from payment of fees for annual registration of and license to operate motor vehicles designed especially for amputees or those afflicted with paraplegia.	Laws 1947, chs. 1844, 1919; Laws 1948, ch. 2052.
Veterans' organizations	*Amusements.*—Permits veterans' organizations to conduct the game commonly called "bingo" or "beano," under certain circumstances.	Laws 1941, ch. 1072.
	Conventions; reports of proceedings.—Annual appropriation to defray expenses of encampment of United Spanish War Veterans.	Laws 1941, ch. 1074.
	Insignia.—The unauthorized wearing or use of registered insignia, badges, etc., of veterans' organizations is subject to a fine of $20 for each offense.	Gen. Laws Ann. (1938), ch. 612, § 30.
	Meeting places, etc.—Armory privileges	Laws 1940, ch. 850, title 6, pars. 130–132.
	—— Quarters in State arsenal formerly occupied by the Grand Army of the Republic during its existence allotted to the United Spanish War Veterans under the same conditions and regulations.	Laws 1945, ch. 1632.
	—— Veterans' memorial building in the city of Providence shall provide accommodations for veterans' organizations.	Laws 1949, ch. 2382.
	Parades.—Associations of veterans may parade in public with firearms	Laws 1940, ch. 850, title 11, par. 218.
	Patriotic holiday observance.—Armistice Day celebrations may be held in armories	Laws 1940, ch. 850, title 6, par. 131.
	Tax exemption.—The real and personal estate belonging to or held in trust for an incorporated organization of war veterans to the extent of $100,000 exempt from taxation if actually used and occupied by such organization.	Gen. Laws Ann. (1938), ch. 29, § 2, as amended; Laws 1947, ch. 1920.
	Uniforms.—Exemption of members of veterans' organizations from the prohibition as to the wearing of uniforms.	Laws 1940, ch. 850, title 11, par. 220.
Veterans' service agency	Veterans' retraining and reemployment committees and veterans' information service centers in cities and towns.	Laws 1945, ch. 1585, as amended; Laws 1948, ch. 2107.

Address of Hon. Philip M. Kaiser, Assistant Secretary of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with your permission to extend my remarks, I am including an address by Assistant Secretary of Labor Philip M. Kaiser, Chief of the United States Government delegation at the full plenary session of the International Labor Conference on June 7.

On Wednesday, June 7, the Thirty-third International Labor Conference opened in Geneva. The first order of business was the election of a president for the Conference. Immediately after the name of the Indian Labor Minister was placed for nomination, the Czech, Hungarian, and Polish delegates rose and insisted that before the president was elected the delegates from Nationalist China be removed from the Conference. When the Chair ruled that this was contrary to the long-established procedure for objecting to credentials, the Czech, Polish, and Hungarian delegations withdrew from the Conference.

At this point, Assistant Secretary of Labor Philip M. Kaiser made the following speech before the full plenary session:

We have just witnessed another walk-out on the efforts of people and of Governments to expand the area of international cooperation for peace and social justice. This walk-out is one of many which have been staged to break down the international organizations which are the foundation of the efforts of all of us to achieve a lasting peace and to build a real society of nations. However, this particular walk-out is directed not only at the work and efforts of international organizations but at the laboring men and women of the world in whose name we are met here today. This walk-out, indeed, shows that the claims of these regimes that they represent the interests of laboring men and women are the clearest perversion of truth.

I submit that all member nations in this organization are obligated to assume their responsibilities of membership, the most elementary of which is to abide by the rules of this organization. This walk-out is symbolic of the grossest kind of irresponsibility toward this organization, the laboring masses of the world and the sincere devotion of those assembled here.

The withdrawal of the representatives of these several governments from this session of the conference is, in the opinion of the United States, evidence of the fact that they are more interested in propaganda tactics than in solving the human problem with which the ILO is concerned. This walk-out is of a purely political character, which indicates that Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary are playing politics with efforts to advance social justice. It is the evident intention of these governments to prevent this conference and the ILO from doing their normal work—work intimately concerned with the betterment of the conditions of labor of the masses of mankind. This flagrant action obviously contradicts the claim

of these governments that they are interested in solving the grave economic and social problems, of primary concern to working men and women, which beset the world today. If these governments were genuinely concerned with the many important problems which are before us they would have accepted the normal parliamentary procedure of the conference and assisted in the constructive work that is before us.

The United States, along with the overwhelming majority of other governments, does not indulge in boycotts and walk-outs because its views are not accepted. The United States will continue to cooperate loyally in the work of the conference and the ILO for the advancement of social justice and human worth. The United States believes all members should be willing to accept the will of the majority, as well as the long-established rules of procedure of this Organization. In the opinion of our Government a withdrawal of the representatives of Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia from this session of the conference is a violation of the implicit obligations of membership in the conference and in the ILO. These governments have an obvious duty to participate in the sessions of this body. The views of these governments on the question as to which representatives should represent China have no bearing on the primary responsibility and obligation to serve in an organ of which they are members and to which they have sent representatives.

This action must not prevent the conference from doing its normal work. No ILO member can by its willful absence impair the normal functioning of the conference or the validity of the decisions which this conference may take. The United States supports the fullest maintenance of the activities of the ILO and of the conference. In the absence of the representatives of Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia the work will not be impeded and this body will, I am sure, proceed in its normal fashion to carry on the important work which is entrusted to the conference under the constitution of the ILO.

One-Party Government in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared recently in the Curry County Reporter, a weekly newspaper, published at Gold Beach in Curry County, Oreg.:

LITTLE TO COMPLAIN ABOUT

We are hearing a good deal of yipping these days from Democrat and left-wing quarters about the evil things the one-party government has done to the State of Oregon. But when we size up the things this terrible one party has done for this State, how it has been kept on a pretty even keel financially, and at the same time caring for the needy, supporting its schools, carrying on an immense road-building program, etc., and compare all this with what has happened in our neighboring States of Washington and California, we find there is little to gripe about.

Both our neighbors are practically bankrupt, having listened to their crackpots and left-wingers until they find themselves in a condition which is considerably more painful than joyous.

Oregon's pathway, with its mounting population and growing demands upon the State finances, is not a flowery one, but it is considerably less thorny than it would have been had our officials and legislators, and the voters themselves, fallen for the schemes that have intrigued our neighbors. On the whole, most of the men charged with handling the affairs of our Commonwealth have worked for what they considered its best interests rather than playing to the galleries for votes. There is hope that they will continue to do so.

Lobby Committee Invades Right of People To Hire, Use, or Own Printing Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I recently noted that the so-called Buchanan committee to investigate lobbying actually is putting in peril one of our most cherished freedoms—the freedom of the press—in trying to probe into the affairs of several organizations, including the Committee on Constitutional Government. The following editorial from the June 10 issue of the Editor and Publisher, a noted and respected journal of the printing trade, confirms my alarm in no uncertain terms. I commend a reading of it to every Member of Congress:

THE PRINTING PRESS

The first amendment to the United States Constitution guaranteed a free press.

In the language of the late eighteenth century, press referred to the mechanical device—then the hand press—which placed the ink impressions on paper. The first amendment was a guaranty to the people to be able to own and use a press without governmental interference.

Since then, through common usage, freedom of the press to most people has been transferred to our newspapers, books, and magazines—the product instead of the machine. Actually, the guaranty still applies to the physical equipment—the printing press—and neither the Congress nor the courts have ever said otherwise.

Now, a congressional committee investigating lobbying is seeking to force users of the printing press to divulge information on the amount of money spent and received, what press was used, who bought the books, etc. Such data are not only being asked of the Committee for Constitutional Government but from 166 business corporations. The latter inquiry is directed at those who have run copy "dealing with public issues which might be the subject of Federal legislative action."

Every issue of every newspaper and practically every magazine carries editorials "dealing with public issues which might be the subject of Federal legislative action." The committee might well ask those publications who their subscribers and their advertisers are. The issue is the same.

The Committee for Constitutional Government has availed itself of the right to use a printing press to print books on issues confronting the people just as other groups have done in the century and a half of our existence as a nation. The 166 corporations and many individuals have availed themselves of the right to hire the use of a press and the services of someone else to print and distribute their views.

The current investigation of the House committee is an invasion of the guaranteed right of the American people to own, hire, or use a printing press without interference.

Address by Senator Knowland at the Connecticut Republican State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech I delivered last night before the Connecticut Republican State Convention, at New Haven, Conn.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and fellow Americans, it is a great pleasure to once again be in your State. I bring you a hands-across-the-continent greeting from California to Connecticut.

I feel certain that our two States are going to join with others to elect Republican gubernatorial and senatorial candidates this November. It is vital to our States and to the Nation that we do so. The control of the Senate may depend upon the two Senate seats Connecticut fills this year.

Tonight I wish to discuss with you some of the important problems facing us in our domestic life and in international affairs.

It is my strong belief that only with an informed citizenry can we solve the problems that confront us.

Within the last year two catastrophic events have taken place. These are the Soviet success in atomic development (as announced by the President of the United States on September 23, 1949) and the establishment of a Soviet-recognized Communist regime in China. Only in retrospect will we be able to finally determine which event will have the most far-reaching influence. Both have set off chain reactions that have not yet run their full course.

These events separately are sufficient to cause everyone who believes we should have a free world of free men to examine his own conduct to determine if he is making his greatest contribution toward freedom. The combined events make it mandatory that we do it.

Our economic system is tied with Siamese-twin attachments to our constitutional form of government. If one is destroyed they both perish. There is no need for either catastrophe to happen if we get off the perpetual defensive and take the offensive.

There are too many people who have had our hospitality or advantages joining forces with Moscow and her Communist Party allies in spreading their views on "what's wrong with America."

Those who believe in our system should start a crusade to tell "what is right with America."

We, of course, will not close our eyes to the liability side of the ledger, but as citizens with our feet on the ground and common sense gained from experience and observation we know that America's assets in freedom of religion, speech, and press, and in

agricultural, educational, fiscal, industrial, and governmental categories to mention but a few, greatly exceed our liabilities.

Seventy-eight million life insurance policyholders own policies with a face value of over $200,000,000,000.

Individuals who still believe that thrift is a virtue also own directly or through institutions for their account some $67,900,000,000 in savings institutions and $3,300,000,000 in the postal-savings system.

A substantial part of the $35,800,000,000 of time deposits in commercial banks is theirs. They also have a stake in annuities and pension funds amounting to an estimated $5,000,000,000 and a direct stake in the social-security system (Federal, State, and local) of $29,000,000,000.

We have a far greater number of stockholders, home and automobile owners than any other nation in the world.

To permit this solvent, going concern of ours to be liquidated by the strong-armed action of international communism or to consent to the voluntary bankruptcy proceedings of State socialism are both unthinkable and unnecessary. We need an alert and determined citizenry if the battle is not to be lost by default.

We must not let complacency destroy the spirit that has developed a great world power out of a small colony in less than 175 years. We must not build or depend upon military or economic Maginot lines.

This Nation has never been wedded to the status quo or ruled by the dead hand of the past. Our economic as well as our political system broke away from Old World patterns.

Shortsighted European-style capitalism built the gallows for its own execution by allowing and encouraging monopolies, cartels, low wages, and great aggregations of capital narrowly held.

The lifeblood of our system to the contrary is competition, productivity, good wages and widespread ownership of our economic structure.

We must continue to demonstrate to the world that here in America we have political and economic freedom. Here our people, since the founding of the republic, have looked forward to leaving to their children a better land than they themselves found.

The challenge we face is to meet the economic, social, and political needs of the twentieth century while we maintain free institutions under a constitutional Government.

Certainly security alone is not the whole answer. The most secure man is the one who has his clothing, food, medical care, and housing guaranteed for life—as an inmate of a State prison.

The basis for an expanding standard of living for our people rests upon labor and management pulling together and not apart. It also depends upon a square deal for the farmer as well as for the urban dweller. It requires a full realization that when any part of our economy is in distress the chain reaction that takes place will soon react on all other segments. The American farmer must not be so regimented that he becomes primarily a statistic in a Washington bureaucrat's office.

The sustained stability and progress of our American system of capitalistic free enterprise requires high real wages, sustained buying power for abundant markets, and maximum production at low unit costs.

American agriculture, labor and industry must not be undermined by the dumping of goods produced by low-paid labor abroad while outside markets are closed to our products by quotas, sterling bloc barriers, and outright discrimination.

In meeting the growing challenge of socialism and communism the dynamic American system must continue to demonstrate that labor, management, and investors all have a vital interest in maintaining our way of life.

High productivity and widespread distribution of that which our Nation can produce is more sound than the doctrine of scarcity brought about by stoppages of production or by governmental action.

Controls tend to multiply like rabbits. In the end they would destroy both the American economic and political system. The OPA would probably still be with us except for the election of the Republican Eightieth Congress.

A free economy can better bring about a higher standard of living for our people than any regimented economy of domestic origin or foreign import.

In the growth of our Nation there have developed powerful groups in business and in labor. Not all of them have recognized that with power must go responsibility. No man or group of men in the ranks of labor or business or government have the right to strangle the economic life of 140,000,000 Americans and by so doing endanger the entire free world.

The Government of the United States established economic traffic laws many years ago to protect our businessmen and consumers against unregulated monopolies. These were the antitrust statutes.

More recently the Government has sought to establish a national labor policy that would be fair and equitable, not alone to labor and management, but to the general public as well.

While some well-thought-out amendments are in order, they should be weighed in the light of their effect upon the entire population, and not just one part.

Our entire national economy must not be at the mercy of one man or small group who can give an order that will cause a creeping paralysis to close down our mines, factories, and transportation systems, and work a hardship on countless people. This is far too much power for any responsible man to want or for any irresponsible man to be allowed to have.

Our Federal Government is now so large that prudent officials and citizens must examine all increased costs to see if they will endanger the functioning of our economy or impair the solvency of the Government. We must find ways of eliminating duplication and waste so that we may better meet essential needs.

There are some in Government who apparently believe that if an individual spends his own money it is inflationary, whereas if the Government takes it from him and spends it such is not the case. This is economic nonsense and squirrel-cage thinking. Government spending has been and is a major inflationary factor. This administration will not hesitate to reestablish economic controls when and if they get the votes in Congress.

I make no claim that we can unscramble the eggs of Government finance, but I do maintain that we should no longer ignore the warning lights that have led to disaster when ignored elsewhere in the world.

We should balance our Federal budget and pay something each year to reduce the national debt, which now amounts to over $250,000,000,000. This should be done by prudent economy rather than by disruptive new taxes.

For the last 17 years the Democratic administration has had control of the executive branch of the Government, and during 15 of those years has had a majority in both Houses of Congress. It is significant, I believe, that during that entire period of time the Federal budget has been balanced only during the 2-year period of the Eightieth Congress, wherein the Republicans had a majority in both the House and the Senate.

In a period of 20 years the number of civilian employees of the Federal Government increased from 570,000 to 2,100,000. Federal expenditures have increased from $9,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 1939 to over $43,000,000,000 for the current fiscal year.

Next year, at the present rate of spending, there is another $5,000,000,000 deficit in prospect. Any business management that ran 16 out of 18 years in the red should be permanently retired. 1950 and 1952 are the years to eliminate both the red ink and the "red herrings."

Th problems facing us on the home front cannot be solved by Government alone. They cannot be solved by labor, management, or the farmer alone.

Government can best contribute to the creation of new job opportunities for our young men and women by creating a tax climate in which risk capital will be able to profitably invest in new large and small business enterprises.

Here in America, as Lincoln put it, we have "This last best hope of earth". Each of us has an individual and collective responsibility for its preservation. We are interdependent one on the other. An American economic collapse would bring despair everywhere except in Soviet Russia.

There have never been so many people in the entire history of the world who have had as large a stake, as much to gain or as much to lose, as the people of the United States of America.

Nor does history record a people who have been as unselfish in their possession of their power, their resources, and their good will.

In this century which is not yet half over they have sacrificed blood and treasure in two World Wars to prevent the destruction of free institutions on the continent of Europe. Few dispute the fact that all of western Europe and perhaps even Britain would today be behind the Communist iron curtain if it had not been for the firm stand taken by this republic and a considerable contribution of our resources to prevent the complete economic collapse of those war-torn nations.

Communism thrives on chaos. A rehabilitated Europe was the only chance for survival had by free institutions in that area of the world. While communism has been at least temporarily stopped in western Europe, it has made great gains in the Far East.

At the end of the war communism ruled less than 200,000,000 people. Today 800,000,000 are within the iron curtain.

Four factors relating to the ability of the western world to defend itself against Communist aggression are:

1. Industrial capacity.
2. Population.
3. Raw materials.
4. Territory.

Except for the first, international communism now has the edge in all the others.

Fifty years of friendly interest on the part of our people and our Government in a free and independent China and the overwhelming contribution made by our Army, Navy, and Air Force in the Pacific during World War II gave us the power, the prestige, and the opportunity for constructive action no western nation had ever before possessed.

This opportunity has been frittered away by a small group of willful men who held positions in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department and who had the backing of their superiors. They were aided by others in and out of Government who by design or ignorance helped to advance the cause of the Communists in China.

In Europe we finally stood up to communism in Greece, Turkey, Iran, Berlin, and Western Germany.

Knowing that communism thrives on economic and political chaos we gave economic aid through the ECA. With the North Atlantic Pact and the arms-implementation legislation, we have given moral and mate-

rial support for the protection of western Europe and the Middle East from overt aggression. In that area we have given hope and support to those advancing the cause of a free world of freemen.

Munich certainly should have taught us that appeasement of aggression, then as now, is but surrender on the installment plan.

The men in the Kremlin are as power hungry as the Nazis and their system is as destructive of human liberty as was Hitlerism with which they were bedfellows while Poland was being dismembered in 1939. They have, however, learned some new techniques.

In terms of ultimate destructive impact upon our free institutions, what difference does it make whether an American citizen such as Alger Hiss or Harry Gold betrays his country or whether our Nation is betrayed by Dr. Fuchs, an alien? What difference does it make whether the betrayal is done for pay or for love of the Soviet system? What difference does it make whether it is done by a card-carrying Communist member or by a pervert who, being in a key position, has been blackmailed to deliver state secrets? What difference does it make whether the secrets are stolen by a burglar from an office at night or whether they are carried out in daytime by a naive employee with a gold badge and a tarnished sense of responsibility? The end result is the same, and those who set the policies and were careless or tolerant or ignorant cannot escape their responsibility at the bar of American public opinion. Those who participate now in any cover-up or whitewash will be held to a strict accounting.

Communism is destructive of human liberty everywhere in the world. It is no less destructive in China or Korea than it is in the satellite nations. The pattern may differ slightly.

In Poland the opposition leader, Mikolajczyk, was forced to flee; in Bulgaria, Petkov was hanged; in Rumania, the King was given a 2-hour ultimatum to change the Government regardless of the constitution; in Czechoslovakia, Masaryk's life was forfeited when it became apparent that coalition with communism would not work.

Last November in Chungking a Chinese official put it clearly by saying to me, "Senator, there can be no real coalition with a tiger unless you are inside the tiger."

In Europe during the postwar period, we have had a foreign policy in which the Republicans and the Democrats have contributed to the initiation and formulation of doctrines that are understandable.

In the Far East during the same period, there has been no such bipartisan foreign policy. The Republicans in Congress were not consulted in the moves leading up to the bankrupt policy which now stands revealed in all its sorry detail.

The administration, and it alone, has the full responsibility for our share of the debacle which has taken place on the continent of Asia and which day by day and hour by hour is endangering the future peace of the world and the security of this country.

We stood up to communism in Europe and took substantial risks in so doing. For the fainthearted the putting into operation of the Berlin airlift presented much greater risks than giving aid to the legal government of China to enable it to hold the island of Formosa.

During the airlift we were flying our planes across territory controlled by one of the great military powers of the world. This Government supported the Berlin airlift at a cost of $154,568,800. This was not the only cost, for accidents took the lives of 31 of our men.

Had we backed down in Berlin, the Soviet Union today would have that city firmly within its grasp and might even have western Germany, if not all of western Europe. Certainly the yielding to international blackmail then would have increased the demands and made more arrogant the men in the Kremlin as an earlier yielding to Hitler at Munich increased his demands.

Our China policy has taken us to such a low point that prior to his return to the United States our Ambassador, Leighton Stuart, was confined to the embassy compound for weeks by the Communists. A consular official was beaten by the Red police in Shanghai, an American sailor and marine were held prisoners for 18 months, our consul general, Angus Ward, was restricted to the compound in Mukden for a year, and later thrown into a common jail; there are still American citizens in the Communist area of China who are prevented from leaving.

Yes; we have waited for the dust to settle, and the American people can now see the wreckage of the position once held by this great Nation in the Far East.

Alger Hiss at Yalta and the Amerasia Red network in Washington all contributed to losing in the Pacific that which our fighting men had won in 44 long and bloody months. It has been lost to the Soviet Union which participated in the Pacific war for 6 days.

Our long-standing far-eastern policy was first compromised at Yalta. We gave to the Soviet Union vital rights in Manchuria which were not ours to give and it was done without prior consultation with the Government of China. It was done without the consent or approval of the American Congress or the American people. It was done in violation of the open-door policy of John Hay and of Woodrow Wilson's concept of open covenants openly arrived at.

The Yalta agreement made Soviet domination of Manchuria and other border provinces inevitable. It made possible Chinese Communist domination of the balance of continental China. It also has opened the door to bringing the entire continent of Asia, with more than a billion people and vast resources, into the orbit of international communism.

In China, up to this very hour, the State Department and its apologists in Congress have been more interested in "saving face" than in saving freedom.

The representatives of our Department of State persistently tried to get the Government of the Republic of China to form a coalition with the Communists. When they refused, we placed an embargo against the shipment of any arms or ammunition to the legal Government of the country, while during those same months the Soviet army of occupation, in Manchuria as the result of the Yalta agreement, was turning over to the Communist forces large amounts of captured Japanese war stocks.

That the National Government of China made mistakes, has had "Benedict Arnolds" and men who betrayed their trust, needed no underscoring from us in the way and at the time it was done. Our own history also has examples of men who have betrayed their trust from Cabinet members down to ward bosses.

The United States has also been plagued with racketeers, highwaymen, and 5-per-centers at various times.

The basic objective our Government should have kept constantly in mind was to preserve a free, independent, united, and non-Communist China. State Department China policies have been directed toward a post mortem rather than a consultation.

Had China been a former enemy, like Japan and Germany, we would have been giving large amounts of supervised material help and sending many of our ablest military and civilian leaders to stabilize her currency, feed her people, and protect her from Communist aggression. Both of these former enemy countries have received more aid than our wartime ally, China. But the State Department policy has been to abandon free China, our wartime ally and friend, to the vultures of international communism.

In a very well written article in the January 7 issue of the Saturday Evening Post Joseph Alsop has this to say about State Department excuses as contained in the China white paper:

"But there is also one carefully concealed defect in the State Department argument. If you have kicked a drowning friend briskly in the face as he sank for the second and third times you cannot later explain that he was doomed anyway because he was such a bad swimmer.

"The question that must be answered is not whether the Chinese did their best to save themselves, which they most certainly did not. The question is whether we did our best to save China."

The new civilian Governor of Formosa, K. C. Wu, is a graduate of Princeton. He has had an excellent record as an administrator, as mayor of Shanghai, and as wartime mayor of Chungking. The people of Formosa are ably represented in their legislative body.

Gen. Sun Li-jen, the ground force commander on Formosa, is a graduate of the Virginia Military Institute. He is also in charge of their training centers which I visited. The morale of the men is excellent. The training program is very good. They do lack a sufficient supply of arms and ammunition for defense against the ultimate Soviet-aided Communist assault upon the island.

Like Mr. Chamberlain at Munich, there are some in this country and in Great Britain who believe that by appeasing the aggressive dictatorship they may change their way of life. This is naive, and such a viewpoint is dangerous to the peace of the world and the security of this country. If the United States or the United Nations gives Communist China full recognition, then every Chinese embassy and consulate in this and other western nations will become centers of Communist espionage and fifth-column activity, as in the case of similar Soviet establishments. At the peace conference with Japan the Soviet bloc will have another voice and vote to help destroy the job Gen. Douglas MacArthur has done in that country.

The signing of the Soviet-Chinese pact on February 14 is a Communist alliance. The secret sections have not yet been revealed. We may recall, however, that the secret provisions of the Nazi-Soviet pact were not disclosed until after Russia stabbed Poland in the back in 1939.

There are some American and British firms that are today sending oil and other supplies to the Communist regime, which strengthens it in the effort to destroy what remains of the Republic of China. There were firms, with State Department approval, which supplied scrap iron and oil to Japan in 1939, 1940, and 1941. It was used against our friends in China and ultimately against the American battle fleet at Pearl Harbor. While at Pearl Harbor, 8 years after December 7, 1941, I visited the wreck of the *Arizona*. In her hull there are still more than 900 American sailors. Commercial transactions paid in "blood" money, should not set our foreign policy.

The question is asked: Can anything be done at this late date? I believe that it can. While desperate, the situation is not more desperate than it was at the time of Valley Forge or at Dunkerque.

First, of course, we need a foreign policy in the Far East. There is grave danger that plans under discussion are another case of "Too little and too late." As a basis for a far eastern foreign policy, I suggest the following:

1. That we make clear that we have no intention of recognizing the Communist regime in China and that we will give some leadership to the free nations in the United

Nations in opposing the seating of the Communist representatives.

It is inconceivable that the free nations of the world will yield to Soviet pressure by seating the Communist regime of China in the United Nations. Such an abject surrender to the Soviet Union will be destructive of the ultimate objectives of the United Nations and a further encouragement of the Soviet walk-out technique which has been used on numerous occasions not only in the United Nations and its agencies but also in the Allied Control Council of Germany and in the Allied Council in Japan. Such a surrender to Soviet pressure will properly be acclaimed throughout the world as a great Communist triumph and will have a tremendous psychological effect throughout the entire world. It will dismay our friends and give a great lift to the Communist movements everywhere.

Our Secretary of State at the time he announced that our own vote would be against removing the representatives of the Republic of China and seating the representatives of the Communist regime in their place, also announced that we would not urge any other nation to vote for or against the proposition and that we would ourselves not use a veto. By these latter two announcements he largely destroyed the effectiveness of our own vote on the matter. He reminds me of the person who tells you during a heated political campaign that he is for you—quietly.

Why this shyness about taking a position of leadership among the free nations of the world?

We have not been so reticent on many other issues before the United Nations or on other issues in Europe to advance the cause of a free world of free men.

The State Department has permitted the Soviet Union in combination with Mr. Trygve Lie to put the United States, which has consistently lived up to its United Nations obligations, on the defensive. The nation which has consistently violated its obligations to the United Nations, by walking out of sessions when the other nations did not bow to their will, has been the Soviet Union. This needs to be made plain not only to the people of this country but to the people of the world.

2. Our policy itself, of course, will have to be set by our constitutional officers, the President, his advisers, and the Congress. Once we have a far eastern foreign policy there is great need for it to be coordinated in both its economic and defense phases. In that area of the world, so that the right hand will know what the left hand is doing, there should be selected as coordinator of American policies our outstanding soldier-statesman, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

3. We should give supervised aid to the legal Government of China now on the island of Formosa in the same way we have given it to the legal governments of Greece and Korea which have also been threatened by communism, and to whose request for aid we favorably responded. I have never favored giving unsupervised assistance.

There is a larger population on Formosa than in Greece or Australia. There are more anti-Communist troops on Formosa than in all the non-Communist nations of southeast Asia combined.

An aid mission headed by a man of the caliber of General Wedemeyer, with the rank of ambassador, could supervise the requests for aid, advise with the Chinese Government relative to the training of troops in the use of equipment, and make certain from a logistical point of view that the supplies were received at the points where they were needed.

Yes, America has come of age. We can no more return to a policy of isolation than an adult can return to childhood. We must assume our responsibilities as a great world power without whose active support there can be no adequate international system of law and order.

We need a dynamic American foreign policy. Liberty is still a greater force than slavery. Our own fight for freedom electrified the world.

Let us rekindle the torch. We must assume a moral leadership that we lost at Yalta. Let us make it clear to freedom-loving Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Rumanians, Latvians, Estonians, Lithuanians, Koreans, and Chinese that their desire for liberty is understandable to us.

The voice of America should become the voice of freedom. Each program beamed to iron-curtain countries should start with the ringing notes of the Liberty Bell from Independence Hall, Philadelphia.

We need new techniques to contend with communism's weapons.

Let us first make clear to the Soviet Union and her satellites that we and they are on a diplomatic quid pro quo basis.

The United States Government should serve notive that we will no longer tolerate our Ambassador and diplomatic officials being restricted to Moscow or satellite capital cities and occasional outside trips while theirs are free to roam from Connecticut to California and from Michigan to Texas.

We should make it clear that we will no longer permit five times the number of visas to be issued for Soviet citizens to visit this country as are issued to our citizens to visit Russia.

Neither friendship nor respect can be bought by individuals or by nations. An offer of $50,000,000,000 for an atomic truce may appease today's Barbary pirates for a time. It will not change their determination to destroy human freedom in Europe, Asia, or on the Western Hemipshere. To a blackmailer the offer of a gratuity today becomes the minimum basis for increased tribute tomorrow. Atomic disarmament without general disarmament will greatly increase the Soviet potential for conquest. Today they have the largest army and air force in the world. It is probably in excess of the combined forces of all the North Atlantic powers and possibly greater than that of the entire free world.

Of course, we should seek a just and lasting settlement of the cold war, but not by another Munich or another Yalta. Any settlement must include freedom from the tyranny under which millions of people suffer, in part at least, as a result of our past mistakes.

Neither this nor any other nation had the moral right to barter the lives of millions of men, women, and children into the godless hands of international communism. The Soviet Union has long since violated various parts of their wartime agreements with the West. To Polish and Chinese patriots a public repudiation of the Yalta executive agreement would clear the atmosphere and give them renewed hope and courage. This Government should forthwith denounce the Yalta agreement.

It was Lincoln who said: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history * * * the fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation * * * we, even we here have the power and bear the responsibility * * * in giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. We shall nobly save or we shall meanly lose this last best hope of earth."

If we use the same courage and common sense that motivated the men who sat in the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia, there is no foreign foe we need fear, there is no domestic problem we cannot solve.

One Hundred Years' Progress in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by me on the subject One Hundred Years Progress in Agriculture, at the annual convention of the National Fertilizer Association, at the Greenbrier, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., June 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE HUNDRED YEARS' PROGRESS IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I deem it an honor and a privilege to meet with you here today. You are here to find better ways of doing things—improved methods of preparing and handling your products—more efficient operations—more effective use of your materials—more and better results.

One of the peculiar characteristics of Americans—a characteristic which the people of many countries don't seem to understand—is this drive, drive, drive to find better ways of doing things. "Why the hurry?" "Why the effort?" they ask.

Some may overdo it at times, but I am proud of that American trait. And I am proud of this attitude of cooperation and sharing we have. You are met here today to help one another. If Bill Jones has found a better process for mixing your materials, he is here to share that knowledge with you. Not only that, but we have pooled our means to help Bill Jones find better ways of doing things—through our experiment stations and research centers.

In my visits to other countries of the world, this is another characteristic that stands out as American. I'm proud to live in a country where we can and do work together for the good of all.

When we look back and see how far we have come in the past 100 years—and when we compare how far we have come with the progress in many of the other countries of the world—I am even more proud of this American way of doing things. We haven't just grown old like Grandpa Tazewell, who lives way back up on Moccasin Run.

It was like this. Grandpa Tazewell had had a birthday. A hundred and ten. Up here in these mountains I don't reckon that is so unusual. But down in Louisiana we would consider that a "right smart of living."

Well, the story got out into one of the city dailies—buried on page 19, beneath a Smith Brothers cough drop ad, no doubt. But a sharp reporter picked it up and figured here was a good human interest story. So he made the trip back into the hills. Went as far as he could in his car then took the trail up the mountain side. Way back up in the woods he came upon two farmers discussing the merits of their "dawgs."

The reporter stopped to check on the directions he had been given at the last service station.

"Whatya wanta see ol' Tazewell fer?" he was asked.

Then the reporter went into a long spiel about the importance and significance of living to be a hundred and ten.

"Kain't see that that's so tarnation surprisin'. Most folks 'round here git old."

"But a hundred and ten. I wanta find out what he's done to live so long," exclaimed the reporter—getting just a little miffed at the seeming indifference.

"Done? He ain't done nothin' but get old. An' he's takin' a damn long time doin' that."

Well, I am proud that in this country in the past 100 years—particularly in agriculture—we have not been just "gittin' old." We are still growing. We are still improving. We are young. We are vigorous. There is hope ahead. There is more to be done—much more to be done. And there are better ways of doing what can and should be done.

There have been a lot of changes in your business and in farming in the past 100 years—a lot of changes—and most of them for the good of agriculture—and for the country as a whole. We have seen a lot of those changes. When I think back to the way we did things on the farm when I was a youngster, I am astounded.

Yes, we have come a long, long way in the last 100 years. Where were Omaha, Portland, Seattle, Los Angeles, Denver, and hundreds of other cities in 1850? They were mere villages and undreamed dreams.

Only 100 years ago, the land that now produces most of our bread was just the Great American Desert. Gold had been discovered in California the year before. The Mormon colony in Utah was only 3 years old. Settlements in Oregon and Washington were just getting underway. The great stretch of prairie west of the Mississippi was still just wide open spaces for the buffalo, deer, and antelope, and the hunting grounds for the "Redmen."

Down in my country cotton had become "king." But it was only in 1794 that a patent was granted to Eli Whitney for his cotton gin. In 1790—just a little over 150 years ago—we produced only about 3,000 bales of cotton in the whole United States. But 8 years after the cotton gin was invented, we produced 100,000 bales.

And that is just what I am getting at. We encouraged men like Eli Whitney to invent and then we encouraged the use of the better way of doing things he invented. It is that urge more than the natural resources or ambition or climate—or any other attribute or endowment—that has made us what we are.

It is in the Constitution. It is in the Declaration of Independence. It is in our hearts. It is the difference between us and the peoples of many other countries.

The importance of agriculture to the welfare of the whole country was recognized. And, that agriculture must be healthy, productive, progressive, vigorous, and sound. We learned that a prosperous society cannot long exist on a pauper farm population.

Just as the farmer who mines his soil cannot long remain prosperous, neither can the nation that mines its agriculture, remain strong.

For, too often, when the nation—or society—mines its agriculture, the farmers are forced to mine the soil. A vicious circle of "poor people make poor land and poor land makes poor people" is set in motion. Nonfarm groups may gain for a short time, but sooner or later when agriculture breaks down the whole economic structure comes tumbling on us. Society cannot pull down the pillars which support agriculture without damage to your business, without weakening the whole structure of business and commerce. Do you realize that some 65 percent of the new wealth created annually in this country has its origin in agriculture?

When agriculture crumbles, production drops off and people go hungry. I do not need to tell you, how much you depend on a progressive and prosperous agriculture.

But bleeding the land and the people on the land is an age-old practice still being used in many places. And do not think it cannot happen here. We have made a lot of progress under a program of working together to better our farming and our farmers, but there are a lot of people who think we are going in the wrong direction. They don't seem to realize that when we assist farmers in carrying out soil and water conservation practices, we are feeding back into our own bloodstream the red corpuscles of life and health and strength and happiness.

Just as the manufacturer puts a part of his capital back into upkeep and improvements or as the farmer turns under a cover crop or applies lime and phosphate, so we the people are putting something back into our food and fiber production plant through these farm programs.

And, I believe, it is that attitude of working together—of helping one another—of putting our shoulder to the other fellow's wheel when he needs help—that has kept all the wheels rolling along the way to a better life for more people.

Although it has been only in the last 15 or 20 years that we have come to realize the vital necessity of conserving our soil and water resources, some of our early leaders did recognize what was going on. And we did have the right attitude when the need became generally realized.

As early as the American Revolution, Jared Eliot—one of our pioneer conservationists—made this observation:

"When our forefathers settled here they entered a land which probably never had been ploughed since the creation; the land being new they depended upon the natural fertility of the ground, which served their purpose very well, and when they had worn out one piece they cleared another, without any concern to amend their land, except a little helped by the fold and cart dung."

We cannot do that any more. Our frontiers are no longer over the mountain or out West. What we have to last us the next hundred, next thousand, or next 10,000 years is under our feet.

I would like to bring this even closer home. Your work is more than just selling fertilizer to farmers.

One of the measures of progress is in the time required to accomplish a given task. Increasing the output and at the same time cutting down the time indicates you are moving ahead.

Another yardstick is the proportion of the population required to produce enough food for the rest of us.

You see, it is only when some of the people can be released from tilling the soil that we can build railroads and trains and skyscrapers and corporations and schools and fertilizer businesses. It is only when we do not have to have all our people spending all their time producing food that we progress.

But back in 1850—100 years ago—nearly 70 percent of the people in this country lived on farms. In 1820 one farm person produced food and fiber for himself or herself, and only a little more than a fourth of the amount consumed by another person.

When one yearns for the good old rugged individualism of the past, that is it. They tilled their own soil, milked their own cows, cut their own grain, with a scythe or cradle. And they often ground their own grain to make their own bread. Those were the good old days.

It developed a lot of character, and callouses. But the character it developed was the character that pushed ahead so that we do not have to do those things today. Do not forget that.

And do not forget that a lot of those oldtimers yearned for some imagined golden past—while others dreamed of a future and better ways of doing things. Yes, and, as today, a lot of people just went along, cussing the fellows who were trying to make things better.

But how much progress—how much civilization—is possible when all the time and energy are used up in just keeping the machine going. Just as Tony said, "Digga da ditch to make da mon—to buya da bread—to builda da muscle—to digga da ditch."

In contrast to that, do you realize that today in the United States less than 20 percent of our people even live on farms?

And do you realize this: that less than 20 percent of our population was able to produce enough food to provide 10 percent more food per person for 150,000,000 people than 25 percent did back in the thirties? Even more significant, that better diet was reaching down to lift the living standards of the lower income groups? I do not suppose the higher income groups ate any more or any better than they did before the war.

That is what I am talking about. This attitude of all of us moving up together. This recognizing the place agriculture—and the farmer—has in the whole scheme of things. Helping him to do a better job—so he can help us to do a better job.

You should provide assistance to help him improve his land with phosphate and potash and lime—so he can produce enough so you fellows can provide more lime and phosphate—and at a profit to both of you.

But we do not all see alike on that. There have been some long and loud wails from certain interests about the importance of the profit motive in industry as a stimulant to greater accomplishments and these same wails are coming from the same interests who scream bloody murder when farmers approve marketing quotas as a means of an orderly adjustment of production to market needs, and a profit as against the almost certain breakdown of price-support programs and ruinous prices if the advice of these interests were followed.

Is it regimentation when farmers hold a referendum and put into operation the marketing-quota machinery provided by Congress to bring about an orderly adjustment in marketing? Is it socialism, statism, and even communism to require one farmer to do what nine farmers have decided is in the best interests of all ten? And that is exactly where we are on the cotton referendum and a lot of the others—90 percent in favor—10 percent against.

What is democracy, if that is not it?

It is statism, fascism, totalitarianism when the few dictate to the many, whether that dictatorship comes from economic royalists in or out of government. It is democracy when the many can express their will through an organized government. But some of our people are not ready to accept that definition. To them it is democracy only when all decisions are in their favor.

Fortunately, the will of the people—at the ballot box and in our public meetings—has carried on. This has given us faith in the future. Instead of our agriculture settling into a pattern of penury, drudgery, and despair, we have moved ahead.

Do not forget that a hundred years ago nearly 70 percent of our people lived on the land. In China, today, 75 percent of the people till the land and try to eke out a meager existence from a sterile soil; in Pakistan it is 80 percent; in the once rich Tigris-Euphrates Valley, known as Mesopotamia, the land once supported a population of between seventeen and twenty-five million. Today less than three and a half million try to get along.

Why?

Why did not agriculture here continue to occupy the time and energy of 70 or 80 percent of the people?

A new country; abundant resources; energetic people.

Yes. But what about South America—new country; abundant resources; energetic people? The Spaniards and Portuguese were over there plundering the natives long before our forefathers came to North America.

But our ancestors had an attitude. They objected to the serfdom condition of the farmer in Europe; they were freemen; they were willing to help one another, but not to take edicts from a foreign ruler. Because most everybody was a farmer in this country in 1789, the men who met in Philadelphia were farmers. Farming was the foundation. Jefferson was a forerunner of our present-day conservation program.

They realized where their bread and butter was coming from. Only as long as we kept our agriculture strong could the Nation develop and achieve the destiny envisioned by the founders of our country.

That same attitude gave us a Department of Agriculture.

As a means of helping farmers produce more from their land, the experiment station law was passed in 1887. The extension service came in 1914. The Smith-Hughes Act creating the vocational agricultural work was enacted in 1917. In May 1933 the original Agricultural Adjustment Act was made law. It was declared unconstitutional in 1936, and the Agricultural Adjustment and Soil Conservation Act was passed, under which nearly all of our conservation work has been carried on.

I am proud to have cosponsored that law.

It established the agricultural-conservation program, administered by local committees of farmers, elected by their neighbors. There is one of these committees in every agricultural county and community in the country. And although they are on call 24 hours a day for 365 days a year, they are paid only for the time actually spent in administering the agricultural conservation program and other Production and Marketing Administration programs. In 1948 this averaged 23 days for county committeemen and 3 days for community committeemen in a year.

The Land-Grant College Act, granting public land to States for the establishment of colleges of agriculture and mechanical arts, was enacted in June 1862.

But when it comes to soil research, what makes the difference in soils—well, Europe has been way ahead of us. When our soil scientists begin delving into the collected data on soil chemistry and physics, they find a wealth of material in the archives of European universities and libraries.

But that is the trouble. It is in the universities and libraries. It is not out on the farms. Again it is that attitude toward agriculture.

I agree that machinery has helped to make it possible to produce the tremendous crops we have been turning out. The introduction and wide use of fertilizers have contributed much. So have chemicals—DDT, 2,4-D, and others. Improved strains have helped, such as rust resistant wheat and hybrid corn.

But it was because Eli Whitney saw a future for his cotton gin that he invented it. It was because Cyrus McCormick saw a future for his reaper that he invented it.

McCormick worked out the plan for the reaper, but it was patented by William Manning in 1831.

George W. Brown got a patent on a mechanical corn planter in 1853.

About 1885 Hiram and John Pitts developed the combine.

The grain drill came about a hundred years ago.

Charles Newbold patented a steel plow in 1797 but it was not until 1877 that John Deere began manufacturing the steel plow.

Tractors came into fairly wide use during World War I. But with rubber tires and improved models they have pretty well taken the place of horses and mules in most farming areas of the United States.

Then, as you are all aware, the mechanical fertilizer spreader is a fairly recent development. The Seymour patented broadcast lime and guano sower was first offered for use to the public in 1848.

There were only 400 lime spreaders in the country in 1900.

Those are a few of the high lights of development in the invention and wide use of machinery to improve farm production.

Looking over this impressive array of inventions, we may readily get the impression the rapid advancement of American agriculture is due to more and better machines.

But, let us look at the use of fertilizers:

In 1900 there were 395,000 tons of plant food used by farmers in this country. Fifty years later—that is last year—there were nearly 4,000,000 tons of plant food used. The present use is about 10 times what it was 50 years ago. I have used the term "plant food" because tons of fertilizer has little meaning when we consider the difference in composition.

Then the people who are promoting conservation will tell us that it was the cooperation of farmers in the agricultural conservation program and soil conservation districts that brought about the increase in production—the tremendous increase in yields per acre.

And they are tremendous, when you stop to think about it. Take the 1948 crop. That year the per-acre yield of all major crops was up 51 percent over the average for the 1921–29 period. Total production was up nearly 40 percent over the prewar average.

And that is why 150,000,000 people now can eat 10 percent more per capita than one hundred and twenty-five to one hundred and thirty-two million did back before World War II.

But all this is due to conservation on the individual farms with agriculture conservation program assistance and with complete farm plans in the Soil Conservation Service districts. And you will note that nearly all this increase in per-acre yields has come since our conservation programs started.

The record is impressive.

In 1949, nearly 3,000,000 farmers cooperated in the agricultural conservation program. That is more than half of the farmers in the country. Even more impressive is the fact that these farmers operated about two-thirds of the farmland in the country.

Up to January 1, 1950, approximately 800,000 complete soil conservation plans had been prepared in districts alone. These plans covered some 220,000,000 acres, of which more than 112,000,000 acres had been treated with needed conservation measures.

Up to the first of the year, detailed conservation surveys had been made on 322,000,000 acres and reconnaissance surveys helpful in farm planning on another 180,000,000 acres.

So you see the 51-percent increase in per-acre yields and the 40-percent increase in total production could be credited in a large measure to the conservation programs of the Government.

I do not have the figures from the fungicide and insecticide people but I am sure they could lay a good claim to the greater yields and total production.

And they are all right.

It was the improved machinery.

It was the greater use of lime and fertilizers.

It was the conservation practices and farm plans.

It was the hybrid corn and the Clinton oats—the balanced diets for cows and electric brooders for pigs.

It was 2,4-D and DDT.

It was all these and more.

But most of all it was faith. Farmers were not afraid to try these better ways of doing things. They had faith in a government of, by, and for the people. Faith in the future of the country as long as they had a say in the way it is run. Price supports had a lot to do with that. Farmers knew they could invest the extra amount required to use phosphate and potash. They knew that if they were successful their very success would not come back and crush them.

Our people at the experiment stations had the assurance that if they could find a chemical that would be effective in controlling disease and insects, there was a way to get this information out to farmers.

It is this whole thing—this attitude toward agriculture that has given us the progress we have made. Not only have we given farmers a green light to go ahead, but we have helped with a little lift and a shove here and there.

And why do we do it?

It is because a strong healthy agriculture, solvent, productive, progressive, is essential to the welfare of the rest of us.

Farming is not like the production of automobiles. A comparatively few companies have control of the production of automobiles. Production can be cut off overnight. But there are some 6,000,000 farmers, 6,000,000 separate plants. In most cases it takes a year to produce a crop—at least it is a year between crops. That would present a real problem to the automobile manufacturer, would it not?

Then most farmers do not have the reserves and credit of an automobile manufacturer. So instead of cutting down to keep prices up, the farmer tries to produce more to make up for the reduction in farm prices. Of course, after enough farmers went broke, you would get the reduced production. Not down to consumer needs, but way below. And a lot of the rest of us would go broke with the farmer.

You see, despite all the chemicals and machinery and conservation and hybrids, farmers cannot just turn on the spigot and run out just the right amount of wheat and corn and potatoes. Weather has a lot to do with it.

So, you see, if we are going to make sure we have enough all the time we will have to take chances on too much part of the time. Now, I ask you, Is it fair to put that full load on the farmer? Who benefits from that abundance? Not the farmer. Successful production may well mean financial failure down on the farm.

Since we all benefit from the abundance, why should we not share in the risk? Can you think of a better reason for price supports? In the face of this obvious situation, can you present any valid reason why we should not help carry the risk of abundance?

I am proud of the record our farmers have made. I am proud of the small part I have had in developing and sponsoring agricultural programs which have helped to make this record possible.

When we talk about governments, liberties, standards of living, systems, and so forth, I am a bit skeptical until I know how well people are eating, how well they are housed, how well they are clothed. To me that is a fair indicator of the effectiveness of a plan or government. It is a sort of end result of a lot of other things. If it does not help people to have more to eat—if they do not have enough—if it does not make them happier—healthier—better—then what good is it?

Then we are faced with the fact that only one-third of the world's people get enough of the right kind of food. One-half of the human race actually goes hungry. Hunger and famine and actual starvation still take the lives of millions of people.

In this country population has increased 19,000,000 in the past 10 years. And as abundant as our harvests have been we are not in any position to wantonly waste our resources.

If the per capita consumption of meats, especially beef, could be increased by only 10 pounds from the 145 pounds consumed in 1949 back to the 155 pounds consumed in 1947, and if fluid milk consumption could be increased from the 380 pounds per capita of 1949 to the 432 pounds actually consumed in 1945 we would have a ready market for all the forage from the 35,000,000 acres of land that should be taken out of wheat and cotton and corn and other allotment crops.

I have been in many of these countries where starvation stalks the land. It is not a pleasant memory. And does it not seem strange that in China where starvation is the ever-present specter that the Yellow River—one of the main arteries of the land—is the muddiest river in the world. It transports from its watershed as much soil every year as all the rivers of the United States combined. Bleeding to death, did you say?

But how much better off are we?

We are losing half a million acres of soil a year.

The Mississippi, the Colorado, the Columbia, the Potomac, and hundreds of other rivers are ceaselessly carrying our topsoil out to dump it in the ocean. There is only so much. Every year some of it is gone.

We cannot afford to let up on our conservation efforts.

And the reason we provide assistance to farmers to aid them in carrying out conservation practices is that it is effective—it gets the job done. The figures I gave you a moment ago show that.

And we are getting this erosion and depletion under control. I would like to have you see the cover crops and pastures which are keeping our fields green all winter. You are helping to do it, too.

The greener grass in New England. The dams in Nebraska. The contour farming in Texas. The strip-cropping in Montana. All are dividends on our investment in conservation through the agricultural conservation program and Soil Conservation Service.

The full grocery shelves are a more tangible evidence of the effectiveness of conservation to the consumer. And the promise of conservation farming is a continued abundance of agricultural commodities.

But all this has been so effective. It has carried us over the bumps so easily that a few people are beginning to think—some of them for personal gain—that we no longer need the good ship. Farmers should be able to walk on the water by now. Take the ship away, anyhow, and let's see.

Here is an example of what I mean. It is a letter that has been given wide circulation. Here is a part of it:

"You and I are victims of the most outrageous legislation ever enacted by the United States Congress—the farm price-support program. We are forced to pay exorbitant prices for food during a period of abundance, and we are taxed to the tune of more than a billion dollars annually for the privilege of paying these high prices. * * *

"In order to restore a degree of sanity to our approach to the farm problem you and I must unite with other like-minded persons in opposition to the present support program. To this end I have joint the Association for the Abolition of Farm Price Supports, Inc., and I urge you to do likewise. It advocates the gradual return to a system that permits the price of farm products to be set by a free competitive market. * * *

"If you believe that our farm program must be revised in keeping with our democratic system, you will wish to join the A. A. F. P. S. You can do so by filling out the enclosed membership application and sending it to the Association for the Abolition of Farm Price Supports, Inc., 341 Madison Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. The annual contribution for regular members is $1 and for sustaining members $10, but you can become an associate member without making a contribution.

"May I urge you to join this organization now, that we can make our opinions felt before the collapse of the present dangerous program brings the rest of our economy down with it."

This time it is price supports. It has been allotments and marketing quotas It has been the elected farmer committees. It has been paying farmers to carry out conservation practices on their own farms.

All right. We have come as far as we have because we refused to treat agriculture as it has been treated in other countries. We have come as far as we have because we have not only encouraged farmers, and given them the results of experiments and research, but we have actually helped them. And not because we wanted to do good to farmers because they have a hard life. But, because it is good for the country.

We may be living in more crucial times than we think. It may not be the atomic bomb that will bring destruction. We may bring it on ourselves. For we cannot remain the strong Nation we are with a weakened agriculture. We are what we are largely because of the attitude we take toward agriculture. Are we ready to change that now and go in the direction of the countries where their agriculture is where our agriculture was 100 years ago?

We have found a way that works. Not perfectly by any manner of means. But we are making progress. We have only so much land. Our population is increasing. But we have found that with the right attitude we can make our land produce more. We can improve the diets of our people. Are we going to turn back now?

Our farmers have been using the technological developments and the service provided through the Soil Conservation Service, the Extension Service, and land grant colleges, and the agricultural conservation program, to push into the production wildernesses that lie under our feet.

But have we been doing too much—too fast?

I do not think we have been moving nearly fast enough. We are just getting started. We have just scratched the surface, or more exactly, just started to protect our land in a few places. Our conservation needs are still far beyond what we are doing. In 1947 when farmers used some 3,000,000 tons of fertilizers, they were using less than half of what should have been used.

You see, this condition of a few surpluses no doubt is just a temporary condition. Once land is destroyed, the loss becomes pretty permanent. Once our topsoil has gone down the river—it is gone.

Now if we let up on our efforts to continue to push back the borders, the surpluses may be gone and our land, too.

Then, of course, there are those who say that it is wrong to limit production. A violation of some immutable law. Instead of adjusting production to the needs of the people, we are supposed to go on blindly producing all we can.

You know as well as I do that our Government cannot continue to support the price of unlimited production. And without price support, you know just as well that the country cannot afford what would happen to farm prices and to agriculture.

The average of farm prices now is below parity. The farm income—that is the net farm income—has dropped from eighteen billion in 1947 to fourteen billion in 1949. It is expected to drop another two billion this year. But nonfarm prices have not come down.

With that condition, do you think farmers would automatically adjust production to the right balance, if price supports were taken off and if we had no allotments or marketing quotas?

What does a farmer do when his costs stay the same and his prices are cut in half? You know what he did in the past. He tried to make up the loss in price with increased production. It did not work, because the increased production only further reduced the price and aggravated his condition. But I am not so sure he would not try it again.

And when you get farm prices on the skids, what happens all along the line? There is a chain reaction that starts right on Main Street of the farmer's home town. He cancels his order for a new plow or combine. He buys cheaper seed. He begins to cut corners. And, gentlemen, he buys less phosphate and potash.

And that process keeps cutting on back until it undermines our whole economy. Like erosion, it keeps gullying back through the field of our national security. It eats into our soil resources.

A farmer may know the value of lime and phosphate. He may understand what happens to his soil if he does not keep up the organic matter. He may be perfectly aware that if he keeps on, sheet erosion is going to take the cream of his farm.

But, if he is right up against the gun on meeting his running expenses, his taxes, maybe, the interest on the mortgage—his family has to be taken care of, not in the accustomed fashion—but when the doctor is needed, or the pump quits working, he meets these expenses if he can, whether he buys a ton of lime or not, or whether he seeds down the hillside to bluegrass or not.

We can talk all we want to about what he should do and what he should not do—but when he's up against it, he is going to do what has to be done now—and the rest will have to wait. I know. I have seen plenty of it.

And if we allow this abundant production—this surplus, if you please—to throw us into a tailspin now, I do not know how long it will take to gather up the pieces and build a strong country again. For a while, the country can prosper at the expense of agriculture. But when agriculture is allowed to crumble, sooner or later the whole economic structure will come tumbling down.

And looking into the immediate future for the fertilizer business, I see opportunities and problems. And maybe the problems are the biggest opportunities.

There is this 30,000,000 acres which we should take out of allotment crops and put into grass and legumes. That grass and clover will need a lot of phosphate.

And as I have said before, the farm income is down. Prices are down. Farmers are going to count their pennies a lot closer. Does that mean they will buy less fertilizer?

They need it just as much as they ever did. I think with this land coming out of allotment crops, they will need it more. But are they going to buy it?

For 1950—and for the years ahead—that is the big challenge to you.

And is selling fertilizer you are doing more than trading a sack of powdery dust for a few dollars. You are selling greener pastures, more milk in the pail, healthier kids, a stronger Nation. You are helping to build a more prosperous agriculture—and a more prosperous country.

But your fertilizers are just a part of the over-all picture. It all fits together when we are smart enough to see where all the pieces fit. And when we do not see, we have a distorted pattern—a hodgepodge of chaos.

With faith, with judgment, with cooperation, and a lot of hard work we can keep the wheels of progress in this great country turning. We can keep going on. We must go on or die—as a people—die as so many other countries have died.

But that means all of us pushing—and all of us pushing in the same direction. Ahead are many obstacles, many problems, but also many opportunities. And more power to you as you go out to meet them. What will another 100 years bring? It will

depend a lot on the road we take today—or whether we take a road. If we do as some people would have us do, we would sit on our tails and howl our heads off until the things which have made us what we are were wiped out.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is the day of our decision. Let us continue to go forward and keep agriculture in the forefront so that America will continue to lead the world.

Address by Governor Dewey at Annual Dairymen's Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the address by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, delivered at the annual dairymen's dinner, held under the auspices of the Jefferson County Farm Bureau Federation, at the Hotel Woodruff, Watertown, N. Y., Monday evening, June 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Farm income and farm purchasing power is mighty important in this State as it is in the Nation. Farm income and its purchasing power is important to employment and business for all of the people. This dairyland festival is a symbol of the production which represents more than one-half of the total farm income of the State of New York.

I am delighted to pay tribute to the dairy farmers of our State, their magnificent production and their devotion to good agricultural practices. I am deeply concerned, however, by the fact that our dairy farmers are not receiving fair wages for their time or their investment. For a number of years, I have been proud to count myself as one of the 60,000 farmers who produce milk in New York State and I know, as you do, that the amount of the monthly milk check makes the difference between black and red ink in the farm operation.

My only regret in coming up here to this festival is that there is very little for our dairy farmers to be festive about. Both as Governor of the State and as a dairy farmer, I feel that I have a right to get some things off my chest.

The cold fact is that the farmers who produce the milk and butter in our State—and in the whole Northeast, for that matter—are the victims of an unmerciful price squeeze.

Every dairy farmer wants to produce milk in volume and he wants the people of the State to be able to consume large quantities of this—the best food in the world. Every dairy farmer wants to sell at the lowest possible price consistent with staying solvent. Every dairy wants more and more consumers buying milk at the lowest possible price.

What the dairy farmers of our State have a right to complain bitterly about is that the Federal Government is pricing the dairy farmer into poverty.

Now, how does this come about?

We have seen the price of milk go down from $6 a hundred to less than $4 a hundred. That's a 33-percent cut in price. That should produce larger consumption of milk and every farmer wants to see that result. He also wants to see that his costs come down as his price comes down. Here's where the Federal Government comes in again.

As you know, one of the major costs of running a dairy farm is the grain that must be fed the dairy cattle. New York State has to import most of its grain from the Midwest. While the price of milk is falling, the price of grain has actually been rising in the past months because of Federal price support. You bought grain last month for $80 a ton and you can remember when you bought it for $30 a ton just 10 years ago in 1940. Every single item that the farmer buys has gone up and is continuously rising as a result of the inflationary policies of the Federal Government. The price of grain which can amount to from 25 to 30 percent of the total farm cost is maintained by the taxes you pay, by the taxes paid by the dairy farmers as well as the consumers, while the price of milk declines.

That is where the Federal Government has put the New York dairymen, and the poultrymen as well, between the upper and the nether millstone.

Just to be a little more specific, the price for milk has recently dropped from $4.30 a hundred last November to an estimated $3.27 in May, a decline of $1.03. Whereas we were paying $68 for mixed feed last November 15, we paid $80 last month.

There is something rotten—not in Denmark—but in Washington, which controls both of these prices.

I am speaking out this bluntly because I think the dairy industry is either being deliberately or ignorantly squeezed. It may be for the purpose of making the dairymen submit to the fantastic Brannan plan, or it may be simply because the present national administration doesn't care about the farmers of the Northeast.

Whatever the reason, here is the result.

Let me read you a letter from a dairyman whose farm is not far from here. It came to my desk not long ago. After pointing out that his price for milk will soon be less than $3, he goes on to say:

"Now dairy feed costs per hundred around $4. The problem is, How can I make a living? I work 18 hours every day. I have a son who is 16 years old but can't help me much, because he goes to school, and I can't hire anybody, because I haven't got the money to do so.

"We have 185 acres and 40 head of cattle, 20 milking and the rest dry stock. Now the price of milk has gone down further. I can't do anything, and I think I'll have to close the farm. I still haven't paid the taxes yet, and the situation is getting desperate."

Here is the tragic human distress caused by the bungling of a great national economic program.

Now, what are we to do about it?

I am a firm believer in milk-marketing orders. They represent the best method yet devised for pooling the receipts of milk sold in all classes and for fair and orderly handling of milk and stabilization of producer prices. The milk-marketing orders are a sound conception, because they are based upon the theory of cooperation between the Federal Government, the State government, and the producer.

What has happened to them?

In practice, the State is not even consulted on many of the orders that are issued.

Let me give you an example.

Just recently, a New York City attorney came to Albany on business with the State division of milk control. While he was there, he casually mentioned that a certain decision by the Secretary of Agriculture was about to be made public. Our State division of milk control knew the matter was under consideration but knew nothing of any decision. They learned officially of the decision which was signed on May 16, 6 days later when they received on May 22, a mimeographed form from their majesties, the Washington bureaucrats.

The State and Federal Governments are supposed to be equal partners in milk regulation. The State government knows our farmers' problems. But it is given the brush-off on major decisions.

Now what happened to the great purpose of cooperation with the producer? Federal hearings are capriciously denied, they are long delayed and they have been reduced to a farce. Let me give you one example. A hearing on a milk order began on August 16, 1944, and lasted 3 days. It was resumed September 20 for 6 days. Again, it was resumed on December 20, 1944. The order actually was issued August 1, 1945, nearly a year after the hearing had started when changed economic conditions had made all of the testimony out of date.

Now what else has happened to the Federal hearings?

I regret to say that they have been reduced by a cynical contempt for New York farmers to a simple political instrument to catch votes. I only need to recall to you what happened last year. There was a senatorial election. New York dairymen had repeatedly appealed for hearings and were repeatedly turned down. Then the Democratic candidate for United States Senate made his first up-State campaign trip. He suddenly remembered the dairy farmers and found out what was going on. What do you suppose happened? The Federal Government equally suddenly reversed itself and graciously consented to give the dairymen a hearing with indications of a very friendly point of view.

Who made the announcement? Was it the Secretary of Agriculture? Was it any of his deputies? Was it transmitted to the State of New York for announcement? No, it was made by the political chairman of the Democratic Party in the State.

When decisions of mighty economic importance, administered by a Government department are announced by a man who holds no public office, as a political gesture in the middle of a campaign, then I think I am justified in saying that the interest of the dairymen and the consumers of the State of New York are being treated with insolent contempt.

In addition to squeezing the dairy and poultry industry out of existence, the Federal Department of Agriculture now, in effect, orders the New York dairyman to go to a Tammany Hall clubhouse to learn whether his legal rights are going to be granted.

The payoff was just what was expected, you will remember. A hearing announced by a political leader for political purposes brought another rebuff, but not until after election. Insult has been added to injury and it's time it came to a stop.

There are a number of things to be done. I am sure you and I agree in believing in the fundamental principles of Federal price support for major crops. What we do not agree to is that one section of the country should receive high prices at levels supported by taxpayers' money while another section of the country has to pay both the taxes and the high prices to its own ruin.

A healthy agriculture in our State is vital to our well-being and to the health of our people. I earnestly hope that the farmers of this State will insist on four things:

First, they refuse to submit to being used as political pawns.

Second, the milk-marketing orders should be restored to the original concept under which the farmer was to receive respectful hearings and genuine cooperation.

Third, the rights of the State in participation in the hearings and orders should be restored and respected.

Fourth, the policy of squeezing the dairy and poultry farmer out of existence between ever lower prices for his produce and ever higher prices for what he buys should be brought to an end.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Now we turn to examination of the Communist conspiracy as it has operated in the United States since diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union.

That action of November 17, 1933, can be put down without any hesitation as a major turning point in world history.

It is far more significant than any Pearl Harbor, D-day, VE-day, VJ-day, or such as that. For if the Soviet Union had not been rescued by Mr. Roosevelt in 1933 Stalin would have sunk without trace then and there. And the root cause for World War II would have withered.

The evidence on that was clear enough at that time in spite of a propaganda fog to the effect that Russia would buy $500,000,000 worth of goods a year from us in appreciation of diplomatic status.

Of course, nothing like that ever happened, but instead the people of the United States were taxed for multiplied billions of dollars in supplies to save Stalin a second time, in World War II.

In grateful appreciation for all of which we now stand confronted with the state of affairs that is all so obvious.

In evaluating the job that our governmental officers have done with respect to communism for the last 20 years, it is necessary always to keep one fact clearly in mind:

At all times, the truth about communism was on the record for understanding by even the simplest mind.

Nobody, in public office or out, can ever say in honesty that he didn't have a chance to use good sense, didn't know the facts, or didn't know where to find the facts.

For instance, the New York State Legislature, on April 24, 1920, authorized a special joint committee under chairmanship of State Senator Clayton R. Lusk, to survey and report revolutionary radicalism, its history, purpose, and tactics.

This committee collected invaluable material on early communism in the United States of America. Then, as now, its four volumes of hearings made a solid base on which to build any judgment.

In addition to the Lusk report, there are several hearings by committees of the House and Senate of Congress between 1917 and 1920 filled with clear and specific material, particularly on things relating to foreign affairs and the conduct of the First World War.

As a matter of fact, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the entire 16 years preceding recognition, presents a clear and obvious set of facts. Against the facts, only arguments.

Then in 1930, a special House committee under chairmanship of Representative Hamilton Fish, who is now running for the Senate from New York, pulled together a most impressive summary of the material accumulated over the years. Special attention was given to communism in the United States, but the whole world record was noted.

All this was before recognition. After recognition, the volume of material grew at a phenomenal rate. This, I submit, is historical evidence that the Russians never for a minute lived up to the pledges in the protocols of recognition.

For instance, there is the record of the House investigation conducted from 1934 to 1937 under a resolution introduced by Representatives MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and DICKSTEIN, Democrat, of New York.

This was a very unskilled operation and was carried out with great concern lest the Roosevelt administration be put in a bad light by facts. But even so, the truth shines through.

And in several States the legislatures began soon after recognition to pile up the evidence of Communist activities within their local regions.

The Massachusetts Legislature, 1937–38, produced a very full record on Harvard University.

In 1940–42 the Rapp-Coudert hearings for the New York State Legislature made an invaluable study of the New York City school system. Whoever has examined that record is forever stopped from saying he doesn't know how communism works.

The Washington State Legislature, in 1947–48, pulled together the detailed story of operations in the Northwest, a most sensitive and important region, in view of its nearness to the Siberia-Alaska airfields.

California's Legislature got to work in 1941 and piled up the facts on Hollywood, Harry Bridges and the water-front campaigns, and parallel matters.

Some minor work was also done by the Wisconsin and Arkansas Legislatures.

But, of course, the biggest and most important record was that compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Washington Dairy Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, it has happened here in Washington, the Capital of the United States. It is a disgrace to the Nation.

By reason of the strike of 1,600 milk drivers and plant employees against nine dairies, thousands of children, aged, and invalids have been forced to get a doctor's certificate and present it before they can buy a bottle of milk. Many women and children and the sick who can secure a doctor's certificate just cannot arrange to do so.

The strike grew out of the demand of the employees for a 5-day workweek with 6 days' pay. It is not a question of who is right. This strike should have been averted.

Pictures in the paper show women and small children standing in line at dairies who, after securing certificates, have had to walk or drive long distances and wait their turn to be served.

Many doctors say they are so busy filling out certificates for emergency milk sales, they cannot take care of their practice.

TOO MUCH RED TAPE

Here is one of the plans the union milk drivers have agreed to. Assuming you cannot leave your home, telephone your doctor if you have one, asking him to issue a certificate for you, and then phone the police station. The policeman will call at the doctor's office for the certificate and turn it over to the dairy. A union driver will then deliver the milk. Is not this a frightful situation in what some proudly refer to as the Capital of the world?

All persons securing a doctor's certificate are urged to bring empty milk bottles to the dairies.

This will give you some idea of how government has broken down even in the Capital of our Nation, the greatest Government in the world, the officials of which are sending our representatives all over the world to tell other people how to put their governments in better shape.

This condition exists in Washington surrounded by great dairy herds producing an abundance of milk, much of it being dumped on the ground when the supply is too great to be processed through the creameries.

Maryland and Virginia dairy farmers who normally supply the Washington area with milk are losing $70,000 a day during this strike. Some sick and invalids may die for the want of this milk.

Those in power here in Washington should have acted in such a manner as to have prevented this strike or have stopped it at once. I urge the Congress to move at once to enact legislation that will permit the farmers of this surrounding area to deliver all the milk that is necessary into the District of Columbia. This can be brought about by legislation to lift the embargo at the District line.

More Money for Our Dairymen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DEAR FRIEND: For a long time, I have been trying to get $5 milk for our dairymen instead of the $3 we are now receiving, without any increase to the consumer.

But authorities are deaf to the cries of distress our farmers are raising.

To make things worse, certain big city interests are spending half a million dollars to defeat EDWIN ARTHUR HALL for Congress on August 22.

Unfriendly newspapers are grabbing all this money they can get their hands on in return for smearing my character.

They are mad at me because I want the dairymen to get enough for his milk to pay his cost of production and have a little money left over to live on.

The dairy farmer can't make ends meet with his present income.

Let me know if you think I am right in fighting for our forgotten farmer.

Then stick with me.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Your Congressman,

EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

Keeping Worthy of Old Glory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call:

[From the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call of June 14, 1950]

KEEPING WORTHY OF OLD GLORY

"Fling out, fling out, with cheer, and shout,
To all the winds our country's banner.
Be every bar, and every star,
Displayed in full and glorious manner."

These inspiring words in honor of our national emblem were written right here on the patriotic soil of New Jersey by one of its native sons, Abraham Coles, when our forefathers were joining the colors in the Civil War to restore unity to this war-torn nation and make it in deed as well as word a free nation of free men. And thanks to the inspiration of their valor and sacrifice to reunite our severed union and make it one nation indivisible with liberty and justice for all, that has imparted the same unquenchable spirit in their descendants, the Stars and Stripes fly high today on every flagpole in our still united land.

Nowhere else in the world does a nation's flag so truly express man's righteous urge for human liberty, for in the two greatest of all world wars it has led humanity to victory over the godless forces of tyrannical oppression. And just so today the Star-Spangled Banner represents the last great hope of war-wrecked peoples for freedom from further tyranny at the hands of more would-be world conquerors, whose agents fanatically worshipping the false god of communism plot night and day to overthrow and blot out our free democratic institutions. Truly has it proven the flag of hope and of liberation for all oppressed peoples; for on this Flag Day our national emblem flies over the hero graves of America's valiant sons on every continent, silent but eloquent proof of our immortal urge to preserve and fight to the death in the sacred cause of human liberty.

As we celebrate the one hundred and seventy-third anniversary of the Stars and Stripes today, it will be well to recall the words of President Wilson at the Flag Day celebration of June 14, 1914, when, speaking of our banner of freedom, he declared: "It is henceforth to stand for self-possession, for dignity, for the assertion of the right of one nation to serve the other nations of the world—an emblem that will not condescend to be used for purposes of aggression and self-aggrandizement; that is too great to be debased by selfishness; that has vindicated its right to be honored by all nations of the world and feared by none who do righteousness." Let us as a nation do righteousness to keep worthy of its glorious heritage.

Flag Day Address by Senator Kem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, last night in Philadelphia there was celebrated the one hundred and seventy-third anniversary of the birth of the American flag. Our colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], delivered a most able and eloquent address, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Mayor, fellow Americans, Independence Hall holds a place all its own in the history of human liberty. How many memorable scenes in the long struggle for freedom have taken place here. Surely no spot is more appropriate to gather together and pay humble tribute to the flag.

And so I was flattered to receive your kind invitation to meet with you in the historic city of Philadelphia on the anniversary of this not-to-be-forgotten day.

One hundred and seventy-three years ago today, the first year of American independence was nearing an end. Meeting at a time of great stress and discouragement, the Continental Congress decreed the Stars and Stripes should be the standard of the Republic.

Since that day in 1777, our flag of stars has come to symbolize everywhere the blessings of liberty. Throughout the world, it is recognized as an emblem of freedom, of peace, of justice.

Under its protective folds a hard pressed federation of American Colonies grew into a great Nation dedicated to freedom and opportunity. We who are so fortunate as to be able to point to Old Glory and say, "That is the flag of my country," enjoy a greater measure of happiness and prosperity than any people anywhere, anytime in the history of the world.

Sometimes we forget just what has been accomplished in the United States. We have only 6 percent of the world's population and 7 percent of its area. But Americans today possess 60 percent of all the telephones, 80 percent of all the automobiles, 51 percent of all the radios in the world. Under what has become known as the American way of life, the United States has made more progress in 150 years than the rest of the world made in 6,000 years.

The advantages Americans enjoy today were hard won. They are equally difficult to retain. Hundreds of thousands of men and women have died protecting our flag and the free institutions it represents. Twice within the lifetime of most of us here today our young men and women have gone out to fight for our liberties.

After World War I we believed we had emerged victorious from a war to end wars. But it was not to be. We destroyed the Kaiser, only to see Hitler rise to take his place.

In a few years, we again found ourselves in terrible conflict on a global scale. Once more the precious lives of young Americans were sacrificed in the cause of liberty. Our young men and women did the job well. They carried the Stars and Stripes to victory on the battlefields of Europe, Africa, Asia, and the torrid islands of the Pacific.

This time, they were assured, we would not fail to keep the peace. But today the grim figure of Joseph Stalin sits in the Kremlin toying with the peace of the world. Only five short years after the end of that second conflict—we face the dire threat of another war—which if it comes will be more dreadful than any the world has ever seen.

I. DANGER OF ARMED ATTACK OVERSHADOWED BY MENACE OF ALL-POWERFUL CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

The danger of an armed attack is real. Dire as it is, today western civilization is faced with another threat equally grave in its implications: Will the remaining free peoples of the world continue to control their governments, or will their governments gain control of the people themselves?

The issue is freedom versus slavery. It is a question of whether free people are to retain their fundamental liberties and human rights, or whether they will permit an all-powerful central government to tell them what to do, when to do, and how to do.

A. Communism and socialism

In Russia the die is cast. The light of freedom flickered out long ago behind the iron curtain. Now all is communism.

In the Western World the threat to freedom goes under a different name. It is called socialism. This should confuse no one. Socialism and communism are fruit of the same tree, and the roots of that tree are the theories of Karl Marx. There is this distinction between the two: the Communist would accomplish his objectives by means of force and violence. The Socialist wants to accomplish the same results without violence, by peaceful processes of infiltration.

B. Our Republic endangered by so-called liberals

Our Republic is endangered by those who would substitute for our free economy, a socialized planned economy. Radicals, who call themselves liberals without knowing the real meaning of the word, would weaken and impair the liberties which we have enjoyed under the Bill of Rights. They would replace them with bureaucratic regulations and dictatorial interpretations flowing out with monotonous regularity from Washington. They would subtract from our social, political and economic freedoms, and add to the size and power of the Federal Government.

To further their purposes, Government planners have usurped the name "liberal" and applied it to their creeds. In my book a liberal is one who wishes to protect the rights of the individual against all comers and at all costs. To label socialistic programs calling for new restrictions on the people as "liberal" is a plain prostitution of a good word.

And yet, we are presented these days with the strange spectacle of many who profess to be "liberals" asking for the greatest amount of Government control. "O Liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name!"

II. GROWTH OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT THREATENS TO DESTROY CONSTITUTIONAL BARRIERS TO TOTALITARIANISM

We Americans are fortunate in our dual form of government. Our Federal Union gives us a strong defense against regimentation. State faces Nation on the constitutional front. None of the nations which have succumbed to modern absolutism was equipped with our system of divided authority. Now a drive is under way to undermine, to break down, and to destroy this barrier to totalitarianism.

During the closing days of the convention which framed the Constitution, wise old Ben Franklin was asked what kind of a government was set up in the new Constitution. He answered: "We have given them a Republic—if they can keep it."

Our liberties are threatened today—by the growth in the size and power of the Federal Government. Washington bureaucrats are more and more injecting themselves and their agents into the affairs of our States, counties, cities, and townships.

A. Vast new proposals pending to extend activities of the Federal Government

Today Congress is under constant pressure to extend the scope and character of the services rendered by the Federal Government, particularly in the fields of health, housing, and education. New avenues of spending are constantly being opened up. The Eighty-first Congress has been under a barrage of proposals to increase the powers of the Government at Washington.

Three hundred and seven bills have been introduced providing for a wide range of new Federal grants-in-aid to State and local governments.

The grant-in-aid is a gadget under which the Federal Government collects money from the people under the taxing power and gives it to the States. Power-hungry bureaucrats look with great favor on the grant-in-aid as a device to concentrate authority in Washington. Large grants of money are offered to the States—usually on a matching basis—but with strings attached. And practically all of the 307 grant-in-aid proposals now before the Eighty-first Congress are fitted with strings—provisions to inject the Federal Government deeper than ever into State and local affairs.

The Council of State Chambers of Commerce has estimated that if all the new proposals for grants-in-aid before Congress were enacted into law, they would cost more than $3,000,000,000 the first year alone. By the sixth year their cost would reach $6,000,000,000.

Of course, none of the 307 bills provide an answer to the $64 question: Where would the Federal Government get the money?

We can safely assume that the adoption of the proposals would mean a further increase in Federal taxes or Federal deficits or both. This means, also, a further drain on the sources from which State and local revenue must come. We can hardly contemplate any of these alternatives with pleasure or satisfaction.

B. Governor Lee tells how Federal bureaucrats whip States into line

Last year during the governors conference at Colorado Springs, Governor Lee, of Utah, told what happened when his State refused to accept several million dollars of Federal aid. Governor Lee said an official of the Federal Bureau of the Budget called on him—wanting to know why the handout was rejected. This official warned that if Utah failed to accept all of the money made available, the Federal Government would move in and take over certain functions now performed by the State government. That's how Federal bureaucrats whip the States into line.

III. WE SHOULD RETURN TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

I am convinced that we are drifting in the wrong direction. We should return to the principles of Thomas Jefferson, under which America grew great and strong.

Thomas Jefferson was no starry-eyed visionary. He was a practical man of affairs. The one abiding purpose running through Jefferson's whole philosophy—his whole life—was that man should be free. He was convinced that once free, mankind would progress toward happiness and virtue.

"Thomas Jefferson still survives," said John Adams on his deathbed. May our generation justify his words.

To do so, we should return to the principles of local self-government. It is time for more government to be sent home, back to our county courthouses, our city halls, and State capitals, back to the grass roots, close to the village pump, where our people can control it and fit it to their own particular needs.

IV. WE CANNOT BUILD A STRONG AMERICA BY TURNING OUR PEOPLE INTO SITTING DUCKS

Several years ago, a benevolent citizen of Seattle, Wash., provided in his will a fund, the income from which is used for feeding the ducks on a nearby lake. Each day these ducks receive their handouts of grain. Now it seems that they have become so satisfied with their social and economic well-being that they have almost lost the power to fly with the wings that God gave them. They sit huddled about in the quiet waters of the lake from one feeding to another, waiting for the next distribution of free grain. Frank Holman, of Seattle, a former president of the American Bar Association, relates this story as a warning that we cannot build a strong and enduring America by turning our citizens into "sitting ducks."

V. HISTORY TEACHES US "HANDOUT STATE" DOOMED TO FAILURE

Three hundred and thirty years ago, the Pilgrims at Plymouth experimented with socialism. They established a system of community ownership. A common storehouse was built into which went the products of the colonists' toil to be distributed under a system of rationing.

How dismally this early "welfare state" failed is set forth in Governor Bradford's own history of the Plymouth Bay Colony.

"This communitie," he wrote, "was found to breed much confusion and discontent."

Faced with the prospect of starving, the colonists abandoned their experiment with government planning. They proceeded to set up a system of private enterprise and restored full private ownership of property to the colonists.

"This had very good success," wrote Governor Bradford, "for it made all hands very industrious, instead of famine, now God gave them plentie, and the face of things was changed."

Marie Antoinette, queen of France, suggested a "spending for prosperity" scheme some 257 years ago. The national debt of France soared, the monarchy collapsed, and Marie lost her head.

The Romans traded away the highest civilization of their time for government benefits. Today, the poet sings of the grandeur that was Rome.

In modern times, the sad experiences Great Britain has had with its experiments in socialism should serve as convincing proof of the folly of our embarking upon such a course.

VI. OUR PEOPLE CANNOT GET SOMETHING FOR NOTHING IN WASHINGTON

There are those who attempt to lull us into accepting Federal aid by implying that we are getting something for nothing, that it comes entirely from the Federal Government. A lady in Excelsior Springs, Mo., wrote me once: "Senator KEM, I am sure you will be for Federal aid to schools. It costs the taxpayers nothing. It is paid entirely by the Federal Government." The money the Federal Government spends can come from only one source, the pocketbooks of the American people. There is no magic pot of gold in Washington. Certainly our Government does not live on interest from its foreign loans.

Furthermore, the dollar taxed out of our citizens' pockets and sent to Washington is not any bigger when it goes back. The fact is that it is quite a bit smaller, because the political brokerage of the bureaucrats has been taken out. Many a dollar never finds its way back home. Poor little dollar. It never escapes the jingle, jangle, jungle of Washington.

VII. HEALTH, HOUSING, AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES, FOR THE MOST PART, SHOULD BE DEVELOPED INDEPENDENT OF FEDERAL CONTROL

We all want to see all Americans healthy, well educated, well housed. Most of us will agree that there are certain things the Federal Government should do to help reach these goals. Research, for example. The Federal program for cancer research is desirable, because without consideration on the Federal level, costly and unnecessary duplication may take place.

However, most of these activities should be developed through the vision and energy of our people working independently of Federal control.

A. Socialized medicine

We have achieved the highest standard of national health the world has ever known under our system of private medicine. Now there is a drive on to replace our system with socialized medicine—patterned after the British model, a proven failure. The idea is to give the Federal Government jurisdiction over every stomach ache. We would do better to improve our present system, rather than go overboard for a theory that has failed wherever it has been tried.

B. Federal aid to education

One of the "foot-in-the-door" spending programs now before the Congress calls for the Federal Government to extend $300,000,000 annually to the States for aid to education. In the event this bill is passed, Pennsylvania taxpayers would be obliged to pay $22,000,000 annually, for which the State of Pennsylvania would receive a little more than $10,000,000 in return. In other words, for every $2 the people of Pennsylvania would contribute to the Federal aid-to-education program, they receive in return less than $1 for their schools. This would be the beginning.

Obviously, from the financial standpoint alone, it would be better to keep your money at home and apply it directly to the improvement of your own school system.

But more important considerations are involved. We have learned from experience that Federal aid means Federal controls. The Supreme Court has ruled that the Federal Government may regulate that which it subsidizes. The Bible puts it more simply: "The borrower is servant to the lender." Just as surely as night follows day, if Federal bureaucrats are given authority to grant Federal aid to education, they will demand that they be permitted to determine how it shall be spent.

They would soon be deciding what shall be taught, how it shall be taught, and who shall teach. And then, as the next step, we may see in the United States a ministry of education and propaganda, from its headquarters in Washington, guiding the thinking of our school children in accordance with the political ideas of the party then in power.

In the 1920's the late Harold J. Laski, "father of British socialism," was asked to outline the steps that should be taken by American Socialists. One of the steps recommended by Laski was "grants-in-aid for social purposes, e. g., education to the States." The idea of the grant-in-aid he said, "is fundamental to the idea of the national minimum; and this, in its turn, lies at the heart of socialism."

VIII. STATES IN BETTER POSITION TO CARRY OUT NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS

As a matter of fact, our States are in a much better financial position to carry out improvements needed in health, education, and housing facilities. Our States do not face the possibility of bankruptcy. Most of them are now operating on balanced budgets. Many have sizable surpluses in their treasuries. The Federal Government, on the

other hand, has a public debt in excess of $256,000,000,000, and faces a deficit this year of about $5,000,000,000. The deficit for the next fiscal year has been estimated at $7,300,000,000. It is thoroughly unsound for the Federal Government to give aid to the States when the total debt of all 48 of them is only about $4,000,000,000.

The State of Mississippi is frequently cited by the sponsors of Federal aid to education as the State most in need of assistance. Here are the facts about Mississippi:

In the last 8 years it increased its teachers' salaries by 156 percent.

Mississippi has no actual indebtedness, for the money in her sinking fund is more than enough to pay all her outstanding bonds.

This money is invested in United States Government securities. This means that the State of Mississippi is loaning money to the Federal Government.

Under the circumstances, would it not be better to permit our State and local units of government to carry out the functions which have traditionally been theirs, and to decrease—not to increase—Federal expenditures?

IX. COMMUNISTS SURELY GLADDENED BY OUR SPENDTHRIFT POLICIES

It is said that the Russian strategy is to overcome us through bankruptcy. Surely Communists everywhere must be gladdened by our present spendthrift policies. They must be overjoyed by the fact that our monstrous national debt is climbing higher by the hour. Abraham Lincoln once said: "You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn." Today our Federal Government is spending more than it is taking in—and our troubles multiply by the minute.

X. WARNINGS AGAINST THREAT FROM WITHIN

A. Former Secretary of State Byrnes

Former Secretary of State Byrnes said recently: "We are threatened with the concentration in Washington of the powers of the local governments, including the police powers, and with the imposition of creeping, but ever-advancing, socialistic programs. Failure of State governments to provide more efficient government is generally due to the fact that the Federal Government has stepped in and monopolized most sources of taxation."

B. General Eisenhower

General Eisenhower has had this to say: "Very frankly, I firmly believe that the army of persons who urge greater and greater centralization of authority and greater and greater dependence upon the Federal Treasury are really more dangerous to our form of government than any external threat that can possibly be arrayed against us."

C. Bernard Baruch

And last month, Bernard Baruch, elder statesman and adviser to Presidents, declared that: "Freedom's greatest threat today is too much government, that all limits to Government action be swept away." Mr. Baruch asked: "Is there to be no line beyond which government shall not go, as it is in Soviet Russia, and becoming so in socialistic England?"

XI. THE PRICE OF GOOD GOVERNMENT

We have tried bureaucratic government from Washington. We have learned that it is always expensive, often inefficient, and, above all, that it is steadily creeping up and destroying some of our most cherished liberties.

If we are to ward off the threat which confronts us, we must rededicate ourselves to the preservation of the governmental structures erected by our forefathers—to the preservation of constitutional government.

We must exert every effort to curtail Federal powers, to demobilize bureaucracy, and to economize in government. Those who made our Nation the great Republic it is did not do so by plunging into debt or tinkering with dangerous theories of an all-powerful, handout state. They did it by thrift, by self-sacrifice, and by their courage to meet the stark realities of self-government.

We should not be misled into believing that we can preserve our American way of life by giving it lip service.

There are many eminently respectable people, who have the feeling that if they pay their taxes and obey the laws (most of them), and stand ready to sing lustily, "The Star-Spangled Banner," they are good citizens. Yet suggest to them that they should neglect their private business, or subject themselves to personal inconvenience or discomfort in order to hold public office, or to engage actively in the ward and precinct organization of their party, and they regard the idea as almost too preposterous to be mentioned. Perish the thought: They want good government—oh yes, they want good government—but they prefer to leave to others the task, not always agreeable, of doing something about it.

We cannot retain our freedom without paying the price of eternal vigilance. We must take an active, vigorous, determined stand against those forces which are ready to deprive us of our freedom once we let down our guard.

Let us keep our flag the symbol of strength, of freedom, of justice.

America is the best place on earth. As Lincoln said, "it is the last best hope." With God's help, let us make it so, let us keep it so.

As we gather today here in this cradle of liberty, hallowed by the blood of our fathers—

Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet, lest we forget, lest we forget.

Cambridge School of Radio, New York City, Presents Arguments for Statehood for Hawaii

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Cambridge School of Radio, 706 Seventh Avenue, New York City, conducted a broadcast on June 7, 1950, entitled "Should a New Star Be Added," in which the facts and arguments in support of the admission of Hawaii to the Union as a State are set forth unusually well.

The program was conducted under the direction of Mr. Rivera, the students' instructor. Those participating were: Mark Aiossa, Ralph Rizzuti, Louis Silvermintz, Thomas J. Hartnett, and Irwin Hoffman. The talks follow:

MR. HOFFMAN

Advocates of statehood for Hawaii contend the Territory has fulfilled every conceivable qualification for statehood, including those heretofore required for admittance to the Union, among which are these:

Hawaii's population of 525,477 currently exceeds that of six States, and almost equals four others. This is a greater number than that of any Territory when it was admitted to statehood, except Oklahoma. Secondly, more than 85 percent of the people in Hawaii are American citizens.

Hawaii is greater in area than the three States of Delaware, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. The five major islands, if superimposed on the map of the United States would extend from Washington, D. C., to Cleveland, Ohio, or from New Orleans, La., to Memphis, Tenn., or across the entire State of Oregon.

Hawaii has an experienced, intelligent electorate. It has a functioning, orderly government, one patterned upon a constitutional form of government since 1840. It has passed through a long period of territorial tutelage and probation, and has proved its capacity to conduct its affairs as an American commonwealth. The citizens of Hawaii, by free expression of their will, showed their overwhelming desire for statehood in a plebiscite in 1940.

Many of the children of the western pioneers were sent to school in Hawaii where there was an organized educational system in 1840, long before schooling was available in many States. Today there is one standard of education for Hawaii's 83,000 school children in each of the 185 public schools, both rural and urban. The school system of Hawaii has been successful in teaching people of many backgrounds the ideas and objectives of democracy.

By any economic yardstick Hawaii deserves statehood. It has a self-sustained economy and valuable resources. Hawaii's largest industry is sugar, with a normal production of 1,000,000 tons annually. This year the crop value will exceed $100,000,000. The production and canning of pineapple products is Hawaii's second industry, and is valued at $60,000,000. In 1947 Hawaii sent products to the mainland United States valued at $229,000,000 and purchased goods from the continental United States valued at $341,000,000. It had a prewar visitor's industry of $20,000,000.

In 1945 the value of real and personal property in Hawaii exceeded that of several States, and totaled more than any other Territory at time of admission to statehood. Its 38 banks had on deposit in 1946, $478,000,000.

MR. SILVERMINTZ

Hawaii is thoroughly American. The record of the Territory's participation in World War II leaves nothing to be desired. All elements of the island's population worked effectively and with enthusiasm for success of the American war effort. The record of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Battalion, the One Hundredth Infantry, and the oversubscribed war bond drives is eloquent testimony of the loyalty of the citizens of Hawaii to America. The Army, Navy, and FBI attest to this record and praise it.

Investigation of the statehood of Hawaii by congressional committees have been made on six occasions. In 1935 a House committee reported to Congress that it "found the Territory of Hawaii to be a modern unit of the American Commonwealth, with a political, social, and economic structure of the highest type." In 1937 a joint committee, among other things, reported "Hawaii has fulfilled every requirement for statehood heretofore exacted for Territories." Following both the 1946 and 1947 hearings, the congressional committee recommended immediate legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood. Early in 1948 Senator GUY CORDON, after exhaustive public hearings in Hawaii, recommended immediate passage of pending statehood legislation. In April public hearings were held in Washington to determine mainland sentiment. No witnesses appeared in opposition.

The President, the Secretary of the Interior, both major political party platforms, the Gallup poll, and nearly 95 percent of the

Nation's editors endorse statehood for Hawaii. Various national organizations such as the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Education Association, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Daughters of the American Revolution support statehood for Hawaii. The 1948 Gallup poll showed national sentiment 4 to 1 for statehood.

The Nation, as well as American citizens in Hawaii, feel the next logical move is for the Territory of Hawaii to become a State in the Union. The House of Representatives passed Hawaii statehood bill in June 1947. A fair consideration of Hawaii's case in the Senate can culminate in but one logical answer—statehood now.

MR. T. J. HARTNETT

Supplementing remarks of my two colleagues, here is what is necessary for steps to statehood:

The statehood bill is an enabling act. It authorizes the Territory to proceed with the formation of a constitution and a State government.

The enabling act must be passed by both branches of Congress. It then goes to the President, whose signature makes it effective.

Upon final enactment of the measure, the Governor of the Territory will call an election of the delegates to a convention for the purpose of drawing up a constitution. Upon approval by the convention, the constitution must be voted upon and ratified by the electorate of the Territory.

The constitution will then be submitted to the President. Upon approving it, he will issue a formal proclamation declaring Hawaii a State. As the final step, the Governor of the Territory will call an election for the purpose of choosing State officials.

As soon as the results of the election become official, the Territorial officers turn the government over to the newly elected State officers and the new member of the Union begins its career.

The Hawaii Statehood Commission has already named a committee which is at work preparing a preliminary draft of a constitution. The intention is to place it at the disposal of the convention delegates and thus facilitate their task of putting the document in final, official form.

MR. RIZZUTTI

What statehood means to Hawaii

Twenty-five thousand young men of these islands were drafted during World War II, yet neither they, nor their parents, had any voice in passing the draft law or in the declaration of war.

The great possibility of still another world conflict gives this fact vital revelance.

The citizens of the United States in Hawaii have paid Federal taxes in war and peace on exactly the same basis as the citizens of the States.

Yet they have no vote in levying the taxes or disbursing the revenues.

They can cast no vote for their President, or even their own Governor.

The can elect no Members of Congress; only a Delegate with a voice, but no vote in the lower House.

No taxation without representation.

No government without consent of the governed.

These traditional American principles, are as valid for Hawaii as they were for the Thirteen Original States.

The people of Hawaii seek statehood as the only means by which they may realize their full rights as American citizens.

They appeal for the support of every American.

They only ask in fairness that those principles upon which our country was founded, be recognized in their behalf.

Acheson's Talk Shows Military Thinking Is Dominant Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Star of June 14, 1950:

ACHESON'S TALK SHOWS MILITARY THINKING IS DOMINANT HERE—REVEALS NEGATIVE POLICY WHICH OFFERS DRIFTING AS ONLY COURSE TO FOLLOW

(By David Lawrence)

Every time Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, makes a speech endeavoring to outline America's world policy, he reveals unwittingly that the United States has no affirmative policy but solely a negative policy which offers watchful drifting as the only course to be pursued in the present critical situation in the world.

Mr. Acheson is so imbued with the military approach that he talks more like a secretary of war than a secretary of peace. His reliance is primarily on military strength despite some vague references to economic and moral power.

The analysis which Secretary Acheson made of America's position in his latest speech at Dallas reveals:

1. That the United States Government still fears Rusisa may make war but hopes to scare the Soviet leaders and deter them.

2. That the United States Government denounces appeasement and yet looks forward to meaningful negotiation.

OUTLINES FOUR COURSES

The Secretary said, for instance, that the international Communist movement does not create an immediate danger of war but is being used as a bludgeon and "does confront the world with the possibility that the Soviet leaders, whenever they feel that they are strong enough, may be tempted to make use of military force as an instrument of their policy—they may do this either generally, or in specific local situations."

Having stated that broad premise, Mr. Acheson then proceeds to outline the four alternative courses he sees ahead—and, incidentally, omits a fifth, perhaps the most effective of all.

The first course he describes as a move "to pull down the blinds and sit in the parlor with a loaded shotgun, waiting." He calls this isolationism and says it will not work.

The second course he mentions is "the policy of appeasement of Soviet ambitions." He says this is an alternative form of isolationism. He declares this would "encourage Soviet aggression—it would lead to a final struggle for survival in which both our moral position and our military position would have been seriously weakened."

The third course, which he said might have been considered by another type of government and in earlier times in the world, is "preventive war." This, he explains, would involve dropping atomic bombs on the Soviet Union now. He declares that "all responsible men must agree that such a course is unthinkable for us." He adds that this "would not solve problems—it would multiply them."

The fourth way of dealing with these matters, according to Mr. Acheson, is to work on them in cooperation with other nations, and by means of peaceful negotiations to resolve our differences.

Mr. Acheson makes the point that so long as the Russian leaders entertain hopes for early expansion into areas of weakness in the world, there is no likelihood of their entering into genuine agreements for the resolution of our common problems, or of honoring those agreements which we now have.

AGE-OLD ARMS THEORY

Then the Secretary concludes that a "prior condition" to "meaningful negotiation" is to convince the Russian leaders that they cannot profit from a policy of expansionism.

Added all up, this means that Mr. Acheson thinks military power sooner or later will scare the Kremlin into submission to America's viewpoint, and that later on they will make agreements which will be honored.

The assumption is that the Kremlin's men of evil will change from bad to good as they see the armament of the western allies build up. This is the age-old theory of military philosophy. It has never made converts to virtue. Instead, it has stimulated rival countries to build armament strength and thus keep the world constantly in fear of sudden war.

Another important course of possible action is not referred to at all by Mr. Acheson. It is that a line be drawn for all time between the Kremlin and the Russian people and that the latter be encouraged to manifest their power so as to change their government's policies or to change their government. The outline of this plan was given in these columns on February 15 last. It is the very policy which helped to shorten World War I. It would have helped to shorten World War II as a prelude to German surrender. But today, as then, military thinking here is dominant.

The United States of America Has Been Marked To Wear the Burdensome but Glorious Mantle of World Leadership. Today's Great Opportunity, in This Country, Is To Make That Leadership a Moral, Intellectual, and Material Model for All Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of including in the RECORD a copy of the address delivered by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, of Columbia University, on the occasion of the one hundred and ninety-sixth commencement exercises of the university.

General Eisenhower's statements are always clear and forthright. This address is no exception. It contains material worthy of the attention of every American citizen:

In these June days, throughout our land, members of graduating classes are, by the thousands, sitting through ceremonial addresses that concern themselves largely with advice. Much of it is doubtless good for the young graduate, who is presumably just embarking upon his separate journey through

productive life. He will enjoy success, it is usually implied, in the exact measure that he observes the precepts generously presented by the orator of the day. But you here have the distinction of graduating from Columbia University—which in itself obviously minimizes any need for last-minute counsel. Beyond this, I pretend to no wisdom which, if given utterance, could establish worthy guideposts for your safe and happy journey through the hazards and obstacles that you may encounter.

Moreover, if you so elect, you will forever have a far wiser and more understanding counselor than I—this university itself. Graduation is not separation—rather this ceremony and your diploma are meant to be additional threads in the ties of affection and understanding between you and your alma mater. Disruption of those ties would, I think, be unwise for the individual graduate—certainly it would be a defeat for the university, which can never reach full capacity for service unless each of its graduates is, also, its active and persistent supporter.

On Morningside Heights you leave something of your individual impress, just as you carry with you something of Columbia. You continue to be a part of this community. You have a consequent right to look, throughout your lives, to the faculties of this institution for that sympathetic and generous assistance that you would expect from any other member of your family. Just as these faculties have in the past helped you through academic intricacies, so will they always be ready to assist you in the complex decisions required in effective citizenship in a free country. Let me make clear that so far as these decisions involve moral rather than intellectual values—only you, yourselves, can be responsible. But the case is different where the critical factors are of such intellectual complexity as to challenge the capacity even of those who have spent their lives in study. In this latter type of question, help from Columbia's faculties can be important, because in the heritage of your generation is a whole series of disturbing political-social-economic problems.

World revolution, of which one objective is the elimination of the American system of government, is the announced purpose of powerful forces. But this threat is a no more critical danger than is to be found in the potential sum of erroneous answers to critical questions.

Among these are: How can we faithfully pursue the ideals of world peace and friendship when, with discouraging frequency, we see rejected and scorned proposals that seem to us logical, just, and fair? How shall we, in international affairs, assume a firm and unmistakable position in support of freedom and American principles, but without giving to any person a fair basis for the charge that we are truculent or provocative? How shall we maintain the costly military establishments necessary to international stability, yet avoid such stupendous expenditures that they may dangerously bleed the economy? How can we carry out necessary programs of rearming potential allies and still avoid fostering the false and dangerous belief that armed might alone can guarantee peaceful security? How shall we protect the Nation against insidious and even traitorous corruption in responsible places without endangering or reducing individual freedom or the civil rights of any person? How shall we escape the unbalanced national budget with its inflationary effects and consequent damage to the wages, savings, and security of the average man, and do this without neglecting any of the national functions that are essential to the Nation's safety and the health of our economy? How shall we preserve as the constitutional purpose of government the welfare of all our citizens but without making those citizens, or any significant part of them, unnecessarily dependent on governmental subsidy? Confronted by an ever-increasing complexity in human relationships, in economic interdependence among all parts of human society, how are we to chart a sane middle course in the conduct of our affairs that will secure to the individual the fullest measure of freedom and opportunity and, to the Nation, prosperity and strength and unity?

For none of these questions is there a pat and simple answer, even though the office seeker increasingly attempts to convince us that his own glib promises provide exceptions to this rule. The honest man must face the fact that the panaceas offered us are more often characterized by surface appeal than by deep-seated logic.

Moreover, by their nature, most of these questions will never be wholly and perfectly answered. But, unless there is constant progress toward solution that is in keeping with the essentials of the American free system, the whole order of things as we know it will pass, and those who come after you will live in a world we of today would never recognize—or accept. They could lose the free choice of religion, of occupation, and of dwelling place. They will not venerate the same values, respect the same historical figures or even live under the same concepts as prevail today. Educational institutions could, here, as they have in some other places become mere propaganda machines.

But, tragic as these developments would be, there is no reason to grow hysterical or to despair, if we are alert and determined. In the international arena, where complete isolation would be eventual suicide, we have loyal allies; even the least among them is not to be written off. Indeed, if, with them all, we can reach stronger and stronger unity of effort and dedication, based upon common moral standards and deep-seated aspirations, confidence in peace can be gradually revitalized, and the greatest fear of mankind steadily reduced. At home, we possess broad acres, a wealth of resources, a mighty material strength, a high level of professional attainment and general culture. These, rightly used, in conformity with the great vision of the Republic's founders, can raise ever higher the standards of living and culture which have already made America unique among the nations.

There is nothing wrong with America that the faith, devotion, intelligence, and energy of her citizens cannot cure.

Since no one man can, within a single lifetime, become fully conversant with all the skills and disciplines that bear upon these critical questions, none, by himself, can reach wise answers in all. Consequently, I deem you to be particularly fortunate in your continuing claim upon the advice of those who have been your teachers in Columbia.

But though these selfless, patriotic, and dedicated men and women can bring to you counsel—out of wisdom won through study and reflection—the solving of these problems becomes, with each passing day, more and more squarely up to you.

It is well that this is so. Each generation fortunately brings to its own affairs the freshness that is youth. Most profoundly do I believe that your attitude toward human differences in race, in color, and in creed is far more generous, far more understanding, than that in which I and my generation were raised. Constantly reappearing questions involving minorities, discrimination, persecutions—all these will be answered better by people who have grown up with them than by those who, looking backward, try to fit the circumstances of today into the patterns that they themselves knew when their own world was young. Your decisions in these matters, which are essentially moral—in that they involve right and justice and decency more than they involve material values—will measure the conscience of your generation. Thereby you will determine whether the world grows loftier and nobler in spirit, or whether it turns toward cynicism, immorality, and self-indulgence. And in this determination alone is probably the real answer to most of the world's troubles, for without constantly improving standards in personal, political, and economic morality, standards reflecting an indestructible faith in the Almighty, any other advancement will be transitory, if not illusory.

Determination to support and sustain the political and economic freedom of the individual does not, except in fuzzy minds or among those egoists who seek the right to dominate us—always, of course, for our own good—make us reactionaries. Americans have never been afraid to adjust procedures and methods to a changing economy. On the contrary, it has been clear from the beginning that our system fosters and requires adjustment to change; it demands growth that is rooted in the vitalizing, unending effort of free individuals to work out for the good of all the problems that confront them. Stagnation would be as disastrous to the Republic as would unwise innovations not rooted in the vital purposes of our national charter.

On the eve of its third century, this school enjoys an enviable prestige among the free universities of the world. Yet, in its heritage, as in that of all other things human, there is not one guarantee of permanence. An institution, like a man, can fall into self-satisfied lethargy, and end its days bankrupt in spirit and in energy. Or again, if, like the hermit, it should seek seclusion from the hurly-burly of everyday life in the surrounding community, it tends to become ingrown, both in idea and in product.

Columbia will remain an influential, dynamic, richly informed participant—an active partner—in the life of community, Nation and world. In her devotion to upholding the American Creed, she will not be deterred by the carping of self-appointed censors or by the name calling of jingoist and subversive. Your alma mater takes a vivid interest in all affairs of our time and seeks daily for ways and means to be more helpful to her students, past and present, to the individuals and organizations that support her—to the public at large. The Columbia family is dedicated to the driving out of ignorance, of the lies and half-truths of propaganda. The full truth, we believe, is the chief support of human freedom and of all eternal values.

We hope that for each of you the Columbia faith will be many times refreshed as you return here—to learn; to present problems you have encountered; to consult with your faculty as their partners in the working team of life, adding your practical experience to their intellectual insight; to join with your fellow-alumni in renewal of your loyalty. This is why we look upon today as a milestone for you and Columbia; not a day of separation.

I salute you as young people of faith, vigor, virility, and intelligence. The single word of advice in which I indulge myself is to urge that you be wary of any who may seem to belittle those shining qualities of youth, who more often urge you to be against something than for something, who timidly advise you to be cautious, sophisticated, safe. Safety is a byproduct of human vision and courage and progress; if sought for itself alone it cannot be found.

The United States of America has been marked to wear the burdensome but glorious mantle of world leadership. Today's great opportunity, in this country, is to make that leadership a moral, intellectual, and material model for all time. I am glad the opportunity is in your hands.

House Suffers Real Loss in Retirement of Frank B. Keefe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 13, I had the privilege of speaking over WHA, Wisconsin's State radio station, and its affiliated radio outlets. Because our distinguished and able colleague, FRANK KEEFE, who has announced his retirement from Congress at the end of this session, is a State-wide—indeed, a Nation-wide—figure, I used the occasion to pay a deserved tribute to his service here in the House. Some of the information contained will, I believe, prove interesting to FRANK'S many friends here on both sides of the aisle. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to insert the text of my radio talk in the RECORD:

Hello, friends in Wisconsin, I'm glad to be sitting in on your congressional forum once again. I hope this series is helping to bring your Congress closer to you. Sometimes I am struck forcibly by the smattering of information that folks in Wisconsin are able to get about what is happening in Washington. Those of us who are serving here in Congress are in close contact with the day-by-day developments of legislation, we live with it every day, and we become so familiar with what is before the Congress, that we falsely assume that the people back home share our interest in these matters.

But I fear this is not a correct assumption. After all, newspapers and radio can give only a skeleton report of what is happening in Congress. And quite naturally your chief interest is in your own affairs, your own farm, your own business. What is happening in Washington seems far away and of secondary interest and importance.

So I no longer am too surprised when some friend of mine, living in the Second District, writes me and urges me to support some bill that already has passed the House of Representatives as long as several weeks previously. Last year, I had printed, at my own expense, a four-page report showing how I had voted on every issue before the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, and showing whether or not I was present at each roll call of the House. I distributed several thousand copies of that report in the Second Congressional District, so that residents could have first-hand information as to my record. Congressman JOHN BYRNES, of Green Bay, did the same thing in the Eighth Wisconsin District. In addition, I have sent out mimeographed reports every 2 weeks, and have spoken each week over various Wisconsin radio stations on what I felt was the most important issue of the week in Washington.

But despite all these efforts, I realize that the average person back home has only a vague knowledge of whether or not his Congressman is representing him in Washington as he wants to be represented.

In this connection, I wonder today how many of the people of Wisconsin realize the loss our State and our Nation will suffer at the end of the Eighty-first Congress, when one of the most influential Wisconsin Members ever to serve in Congress retires voluntarily from the position he has so ably filled for 12 long and action-packed years. I refer, of course, to Congressman FRANK B. KEEFE, of Oshkosh, who has represented the Sixth District, that adjoins the Second District on the north. For reasons of health, FRANK KEEFE is retiring from Congress at the end of his present term, and will seek to regain his once-vigorous health in the more quiet and peaceful surroundings of his home community.

Few people who have not experienced congressional life can realize what a hard task it can be, for a man who is conscientious, who tries to study the many problems and proposed solutions before him, and who devotes all the time and energy that the job demands. Too often those of us here in Washington have seen the flag over the House Office Building lowered to half-staff, in tribute to some Member who has pushed himself beyond the limits of endurance, and paid the price with his life. Just recently, the Congress has suffered such losses in the sudden deaths of Congressmen Lesinski, of Michigan; Lemke, of North Dakota; and Church, of Illinois.

The first vote I ever cast for a Congressman was for FRANK KEEFE. At that time, I was teaching in Waupun High School, and because I was rooming on the Fond du Lac County side of the city of Waupun, I was in the Sixth Congressional District.

As a matter of fact, FRANK KEEFE almost became a permanent resident of the Second Congressional District in his early career. After graduating from the University of Michigan in law he came to Portage, Wis., and became associated with the law office of one of Wisconsin's outstanding attorneys, Daniel H. Grady. But later, FRANK KEEFE decided to strike out on his own and he moved to Omro, where he opened a law office, and in 1913 he became a resident of Oshkosh, which has remained his home ever since.

When he was elected to Congress, he was named in his very first term to one of the most important committees in Congress, Appropriations, and he has served on that committee ever since. He thus broke all precedents; never before had a first-termer been named to that committee.

Being a member of the Appropriations Committee virtually seals a Congressman behind a wall of silence, as far as committee work is concerned. Its sessions are closed to the public and the press reporters are not permitted to attend its deliberations. When the Appropriations Committee finishes its hearings and files a report, it is in newspaper language "old stuff." The report is large and the contents dry, not the kind of material that lends itself readily to headline making. But there is no more important job in Congress than that of serving on the Appropriations Committee.

During these years, Congressman KEEFE has served as chairman of our Republican delegation from Wisconsin, as well as representing Wisconsin on the policy-making committee of the Republicans in the House. He also has served on two other prominent committees. He was one of the Congressmen named to make the investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster, and a supplemental report which he wrote on that affair was highly praised by Historian Charles A. Beard. Congressman KEEFE also is serving on the committee to renovate the White House at the present time.

But it has been his work on the Labor-Federal Security Subcommittee on Appropriations that has brought him to most prominent attention in Washington. Much of the credit for Federal research projects in health problems, including cancer, heart disease, and arthritis, must be given to FRANK B. KEEFE, of Wisconsin. Just as the Wisconsin delegation usually looks to Congressman REID MURRAY, of Ogdensburg, to be our spokesman in agricultural debates in the House or Congressman LAWRENCE SMITH, of Racine, to inform on matters of foreign affairs, so has FRANK KEEFE been the first Wisconsin debater to take the floor in the House when matters affecting public health have been under consideration. He also has been one of the first to answer those who speak for socialized medicine plans.

In 1948, although this fact may not be well known in Wisconsin, there was some talk at the Republican national convention of a compromise ticket that would have included JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts, for President and FRANK KEEFE, of Wisconsin, for Vice President. It also was widely believed that if the Republicans had won the 1948 Presidential race, Congressman KEEFE would have been offered the post of head of the social-security agency, which probably would have led to a Cabinet position as Secretary of a new Department of Public Welfare.

All this goes to show that FRANK KEEFE is a recognized national leader of his party and serves to emphasize to Wisconsin how much of a loss our State suffers when a man of his prominence and ability leaves the field of public service. I think it will be interesting to listen to some excerpts from letters that were sent to the recent testimonial dinner held for Congressman KEEFE in Wisconsin.

Said W. Stuart Symington, a Democrat, who is Chairman of the National Security Resources Board: "Although we were on opposite sides of the fence politically, I know that FRANK KEEFE always has been a fine public servant—patriotic, forceful, and intelligent in his approach to the vital aspects of our national security in this air-atomic age." Now let me quote Dr. W. Palmer Dearing, Acting Surgeon General of the United States, who said that "both as an advocate of health legislation and as a friendly and constructive critic of the programs of the service, FRANK KEEFE has earned a permanent place on the roster of champions of better health." And United States Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, said "FRANK KEEFE has been one of the most outstanding Members of Congress. He is one of those rare individuals who possesses not only real ability and a keen understanding of public affairs, but he also has the courage of his convictions to speak out at all times."

Too often, Members of Congress never get to hear the opinions of their fellow Members. They die in harness, and so never get to hear the kind words that Congressmen express in memorial services for them. Perhaps some of those words are expressed in an effort to make up for our own failure to offer such expressions of appreciation while our friend was with us. In FRANK KEEFE'S case, he is merely retiring from the arena now because of ill-health, at a time when his personal popularity is high and there would be no question of his reelection had he entered the coming campaign for Congress again. It is well that we should take note, as FRANK leaves the Congress, of his services to our State and our Nation during the last 12 years.

Except for the self-satisfaction that comes with a feeling that you have given something of your life to the serving of your fellowmen, there is little recompense to being a Congressman. You are 1 of 435 Members, and unable by yourself to make much of an impression upon the laws of the land or the affairs of the world. Only a handful of men who have served in the House of Representatives in the previous generation are remembered today for anything they accomplished while Members of the House. Financially, there is little doubt but that men like FRANK KEEFE serve at a sacrifice. Since fame nor fortune seldom reward man for his services to the public, it is fitting that those of us who can should express the appreciation that the public should feel for his service.

Wisconsin has been a fortunate State, fortunate because nature gave us natural resources of untold value from which our industry, our agriculture, and our recreational business developed. But Wisconsin has been fortunate in another respect, in that she has produced many men and women who were giants like the mighty Norway pines of the upland forests. These men and women, at great sacrifice to their personal fortunes, at the expenditure of their energies and vigor, often at the cost of putting duty to State ahead of duty to family, have given of themselves to public service. Some of them, like Walter Kohler, Sr., and Oscar Rennebohm, have known success in private life before turning to public service. Some of them have devoted their lives to public service and grown in stature with increased responsibilities, just as did Robert M. La Follette, Sr. But all of them, by enhancing good government, have brought credit to Wisconsin and reflected glory upon themselves.

In that book of records in which the lives of Wisconsin's prominent citizens are written, there's room for a chapter devoted to FRANK B. KEEFE. But it is an unfinished chapter, for all in Wisconsin who know him well will join me in the hope that when he regains his health FRANK KEEFE may find further use for his talents and experience in public affairs in our Nation.

This is my last visit for 1950 on this congressional forum series, sponsored by WHA and the State radio network. I have enjoyed these visits with you, and hope that you have found these reports by several members of the Wisconsin congressional delegation informational and interesting.

Now until we shall have an opportunity to meet again, this is GLENN DAVIS, Representative in Congress from Wisconsin's Second District, saying good-by from the Nation's Capital.

A Report to the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SANBORN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, following is a report I made to the farmers of Idaho:

A REPORT TO THE FARMER

Four years ago you sent me to Washington to represent you in the United States Congress and I have tried to do just that. At the moment, I am serving on the House Public Lands Committee with membership on the following subcommittees: Public Lands, Irrigation and Reclamation, Mines and Mining, Interior and Insular Affairs.

As a member of these committees I have been instrumental in obtaining approval of much legislation helpful to the farmer and the Nation; and have been active and effective in keeping other legislation from being enacted. I have opposed the CVA legislation and the Brannan farm plan and am pleased to report neither has been reported out of a House committee.

Looking to the problems of the farmer from Washington I think you should know just how things look back in Washington. You should know that every effort is being made by the President and his departmental leaders to enact legislation to provide for a CVA. On his recent western trip he emphasized again his desire for such a plan. On every occasion that arises he requests Congress to approve the plan. You should know that the President and his department leaders have tremendous influence with members of their own party and exert this influence to achieve their own desires.

During this session of Congress the farmer has been made the political football by the administration and some Congressmen. He has been made the shock absorber for the mistakes of the Secretaries of Agriculture from Wallace down to Brannan. Earlier in this session of Congress, Senator LUCAS, Democratic majority leader of the Senate, said: "I'm sick and tired of subsidizing a few specialized groups who won't cooperate like the rest of the farmers." He was referring to the farmers who produce potatoes—particularly to Idaho farmers. Such statements do the potato industry in Idaho a great damage. We have spent years of time and effort with thousands of dollars' expense to develop a variety of potato superior to any other product and have set standards for marketing that has produced a reputation unequaled elsewhere. And the surprising part of it all is that Idaho has received less than 10 percent of the support given potatoes by the Government. And yet Senator LUCAS and Secretary Brannan would blame the farmer for the surplus of potatoes. Let's look at the record for a moment and see just who is to blame.

The record will show that potato farmers themselves have voluntarily reduced their acreage in each of the years from 1943 to 1949. Idaho farmers have cooperated and reduced acreages below the national averages. The blame for surplus potatoes belongs right on the administration and directly on the agriculture program of the Department. The record shows further that potato farmers suggested reduced parity payments long before the Secretary of Agriculture took any such action.

The obvious conclusion reached from the facts of the record is that such action by the administration was permitted to build public resentment against the present agricultural program and in favor of the much-publicized Brannan plan.

This plan will be a major issue of the campaign this year. The administration has come out wholeheartedly for this plan. This plan is nothing new. It was first conceived when Henry Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture. Henry Wallace did not have the nerve to bring this out before the people. It took the politician Brannan to bring the plan out. And he has already indicated that he will take to the stump for his plan to win votes. He has reminded us that he toured the country blaming the Eightieth Congress during the 1948 campaign. This year he is going to blame, not the Eighty-first Congress, because it is controlled by his own party, but selfish groups in the Eighty-first Congress.

This Secretary of Agriculture spends a great deal of time and taxpayers' money doing political work. In his new program he is trying to fool both the farmer and the consumer. He tells the consumer that this will enable him to buy agricultural products cheaper. Then he tells the farmer that he will pay him the difference between the market price and the 100-percent parity. The Secretary apparently believes that he can pull himself up by his own boot straps. It is estimated that if the plan were carried out to a logical conclusion it would require an appropriation each year of from ten billion to fifteen billion dollars.

Brannan has repeatedly said his plan will not bring regimentation. I will simply quote from the bill and let you be the judge. The following provisions of section 401 (b) on page 79 of the Brannan plan farm bill indicate otherwise: "Farmers engaged in the production of any agricultural commodity shall furnish proof as to their acreage, production yield, storage, and marketing of the commodity in the form of records, marketing cards, reports, storage or sales receipts, or otherwise as the Secretary may prescribe as necessary for the administration of this title.

"Any person failing to make such a report or keep any record as required by this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $500 and any such person making a false report or record shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

There seems little doubt that with the Brannan plan would come strong restrictive controls. It is not a guess, it is a fact. There would be no other way to control the plan and make it work.

Under the present program the Secretary of Agriculture has failed to take action to prevent surpluses. There is no assurance that he would take action under another plan. As I have stated previously the farmer cannot be blamed because the Secretary was caught with millions of bushels of potatoes, several million dozens of eggs, and thousands of pounds of butter while we imported these same products from other nations under the reciprocal trade agreements. Here are some of the imports while Brannan was accumulating surpluses of domestic potatoes, eggs, and butter:

During the fiscal year ending July 1, 1949, we imported in round numbers 552,600,000 pounds of potatoes, 3,500,000 dozens of eggs, 25,200,000 pounds of cheese, 542,000 head of cattle, and, in addition, 116,200,000 pounds of canned beef.

We imported 150,000,000 pounds of hides and skins of all kinds; 974,000,000 pounds of wool, all grades; 10,400,000 bushels of barley; 19,400,000 bushels of oats; 7,000,000 bushels of rye; 4,500,000 bushels of wheat, and in addition 82,000 100-pound bags of wheat flour; 70,000,000 pounds of nuts; 9,000,000 pounds of honey; 4,600,000 pounds of rice and rice products.

We imported 1,952,000 bushels of apples, 637,000 bushels of corn, 618,000 bushels of flax, 2,242,000 pounds of linseed oil, 19,291,000 pounds of onions, 239,050,000 pounds of tomatoes, 14,415,000 pounds of sausage casings, 15,475,000 pounds of pears, 57,395,000 pounds of barley malt, and 139,858 tons of bran and shorts.

During 1948 and 1949 we imported free of duty some $267,000,000 worth of furs, to compete with our fur farmers and trappers.

To add to this is the President's international point 4 program. Under this program we send farm machinery and equipment, and agricultural experts to backward nations. The American taxpayer, and that includes both consumer and the farmer, are paying for this—to build up competition for themselves.

The picture isn't good and if it continues the farmer will have only one recourse—to come to Congress and beg for an appropriation—a handout from an empty United States Treasury.

As a farmer serving you in Congress and the only farmer member of the Idaho delegation I have reported things as I see them. I have opposed the CVA and the Brannan plan because as a farmer I believe they are bad legislation and I believe you would do the same if you were here to cast your vote.

What Do They Want?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, as a further contribution to the current dis-

cussion of cuts in services by the Post Office Department and under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent editorial from the Christian Science Monitor:

WHAT DO THEY WANT?

Are the cuts in services by the United States Post Office Department necessary or not? Where does the blame for the situation lie?

Most obvious, perhaps, are the tactics of Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson. He is using an old administrator's device to head off as much as he can of the $29,000,000 cut voted by the House—translating money economies into service curtailments most likely to arouse quick public protests.

This may be effective politics. But it raises the question whether, with the more clearly defined powers given him by adoption of part of the Hoover Commission recommendations last summer, he might not effect economies less inconvenient to the public.

Yet it is true that the cuts he is making were supported in advance or even suggested by the House Appropriations Committee. And still more of the responsibility lies on the doorstep of Congresses, past and present, and of groups who make their influence felt in Washington.

The Post Office Department now has a deficit of some $551,000,000. It has proposed an increase in rates which should cut this by $131,000,000. The House has accepted it. But even if the Senate follows suit, it still would seem evident that Congress thinks of postal rates less as a schedule of prices for a self-supporting business than as a means of subsidizing transportation systems and the dissemination of information.

Rates paid carriers for handling the mails are not set by the Post Office Department but by law or other agencies, a year ago the President sent bills to Congress designed to take the postal service completely out of politics and to revamp its antiquated fiscal system—matters placed by exiting laws beyond power of the Executive to change. Congress has shown no enthusiasm.

In the light of all this, Senate committee bills and resolutions directing the Postmaster General to restore service as before don't make very good sense, nor do they seem likely to even come to a vote. It is manifestly up to Mr. Donaldson to do the best he can with what he gets. And we believe he can do some better by the public once the appropriations matter is decided. But the main thing is for Congress and the people to make up their minds what they want their Post Office Department to be.

The Communist Dupes Engage in Smear Campaign Against Hon. Edwin Arthur Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, there is a Communist cell operating in the Triple Cities and it is directing most of its abuse against the gentleman from New York, EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

This cell is using the same tactics in its fight on your Congressman that the Commies all over the Nation used against national figures like Fulton Lewis, Jr., Bing Crosby, Gabriel Heatter, and a dozen others.

They are writing poison-pen letters to the newspapers and banking on the hatred of some for your Congressman to publish them.

For years, I have been the number one target of these political sadists, who vent their spasms and vitriol upon me through the synthetic freedom of the press which is a convenient shield for their filthy tripe.

Of course they are too yellow to sign their names and therefore escape the righteous wrath which would be heaped upon their cowardly heads, should friends of mine be able to identify them.

They prefer the safer profession of gangsterism in prose, and shoot verbal missiles at me from behind anonymous security, to the glee of their shady well-wishers.

I have in my files about 100 hateful epistles written by these poison spewers, made public over the past 11 years, and designed to blot out your Congressman for all time.

Such letters would have long since erased me from the public scene and I would have been the helpless victim of these Communists, had I not designed ways and means to beat them off.

I knew the nature of these vipers and fought them back with every weapon at my command. Today I am fighting the battle of my career because they are swarming like punkies into my district and sniping and shooting at me with diabolical viciousness.

Their current dirty work is to try to undermine my following among the veterans of my district, who have always given me tremendous support. A recent poison pen was signed by one posing as a veteran who took pot shots at your Congressman and smeared him ostensibly from the veterans' angle.

They realize, of course, that they have a monumental task ahead of them. They know they are not playing with a Pollyanna.

The newspapers, in promoting these poison-pen attacks, become as dangerous to the elected Representative of the people as the Communist Daily Worker. What an odious part to play. What a disgrace to cut the ground from our American form of government because of the pressure of the passion of personal hatred and vituperation.

And so I say to my good friends back home who are fighting these un-American menaces: Stand by your Congressman.

It is EDWIN ARTHUR HALL against the millionaire political bosses.

He has done more for you than these enemies of the people or their stuffed-shirt candidate will ever do.

Take your choice—support your tried and true friend, EDWIN ARTHUR HALL or the pack of snobs whose big money is being spent to beat him.

Take your choice—support EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, who gives you prompt action when you write, or the stuffed-shirt who will answer only those writers in the million-dollar class.

Take your choice—support EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, who serves all the people regardless of race, creed, or color, or the monkey who dances to the organ grinding out the most mazuma.

Take your choice—support EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, who votes the way the majority wishes, or the puppet whose vote can be swayed by telephone calls from powerful editors or big-money magnates.

Take your choice—support EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, whose record of helping our veterans is second to none in Congress, or the man who states he doesn't need veterans' support to be elected.

Take your choice—support EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, who has fought for a high standard of living and low prices for all Americans, or a catspaw who never has and never will be interested in anybody but his big-shot playmates.

Take your choice—support EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, whose record of fighting for the thousands of workingmen and women in this district has made his name a household word, or the pompous snooty playboy who makes no secret of his disdain for the rest of us outside his small but select, plush-bottom circle.

Take your choice—support EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, himself a dairyman, who has fought single-handed for the dairy farmers of our section, or the creature who is taking money from the farmers' enemies.

Take your choice—support EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, who has never had any contact or traffic with the political bosses of this section, or the made-to-order candidate of the big boys.

Billions for Foreigners; Economy for Americans—In Their Mail Boxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure Members of Congress want to be informed of the reaction in various parts of the country to the Postmaster General's arbitrary order by which mail service has been seriously curtailed.

I submit the following article from the June 7, 1950, issue of the Canton (Ohio) Repository:

ONCE OVER
(By H. I. Phillips)
TAKE A LETTER, BUT WHY?

Maybe Washington had better put on all postage stamps the words, "Nothing on this stamp shall be construed as an offer to deliver or as an indication of a promise to consider an offer to deliver. This stamp is issued only as a matter of record."

With our mail service cut as it has never been cut in history, Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson is out with a warning that it will get worse unless Congress restores appropriations. The stamps get bigger, but the service gets smaller. The traditional motto, "Neither snow nor rain nor gloom of night stays these couriers from their appointed rounds" has definitely shifted to "Have patience. We will get to you ultimately." Over the post offices of the land there is a new sign: "Quiet Zone. Don't Disturb."

Serious mail cuts have just gone into effect and, unless Congress acts, more severe ones are just ahead. Whatzamattah? With Washington preaching efficiency to every nation on earth, it can't get your mail delivered on time. The country that pretends to teach "know-how" to the entire globe can't see that Aunt Minnie gets her "Having a good time: wish you were here" message from the vacation resort to Uncle Chidsey with anything like the speed of 50 years ago. Here we have Uncle Sam spending billions to improve the morale among peoples of Europe and Asia, but making it harder for lovers, shut-ins, relatives, and businessmen to get letters of comfort.

Congress makes the microphones reverberate with its desire to spread human happiness. It yells for the world to follow the American pattern, yet permits the American people to be cut down on routine mail service. As a nation we will promise at the drop of a hat to get any country out of a hole overnight, but we can't get a letter out of a street-corner mailbox that fast. We will restore the economy of France, supply dynamic aid to England, put Italy on its feet and take care of Greece and Turkey; but our own post-office system is too big for us to handle. Washington will send a billion dollars worth of supplies thousands of miles to Pakistan or Viet Nam, but getting a love letter to a girl 30 miles away is too big an economic problem.

What's wrong with this country? If there is one thing of which the American people have been proud for generations it has been the post-office system. Times might be bad, the pantry short of food, and the old man out of work, but the mail came through okay. The barbershop might be closed, the butcher burned out and the plumber missing, but the post-office windows were open and attended. Snafu might rule everywhere else, but there was comfort in the American street-corner letterbox with a schedule not subject to change without notice.

What? Yeah, the people have demanded economy. And the political leaders have promised it. But the only place we have been handed it is smack in the mailbox, the handmaiden of love, romance, business, friendship, and interstate brotherhood. The Marshall plan aid is going to the wrong people. Let's help the American Post Office Department and thereby bring cheer and comfort to all Americans who can read and write, and who rather like doing both.

WITH LUCK

Drop a letter in the mailbox—
Leave it with a sigh;
It will reach its destination
In the sweet bye and bye.

The Genius of Edison and America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Thomas A. Edison was one of the great men of the world as well as of America. He was born in my district at Milan, Ohio. Each year he is memorialized throughout the country, and I want to include a memorial sermon by Dr. Harry Taylor, pastor, Calvary Methodist Church, of East Orange, N. J.:

THE GENIUS OF EDISON AND AMERICA

I

It is apparent that increasing numbers of Americans are more interested in having than in getting. The passion for conquest that once characterized our economy is giving way to the desire for security. We are beginning to subordinate achievement to comfort. Less and less emphasis is placed upon toil, more and more upon ease. Enterprise has become for many a questionable ideal. Religious people are under mounting temptation to permit their sympathy for the needy to become the ally of the forces which are destroying initiative. We are in danger of forgetting that the Galilean who championed human brotherhood and ministered to the poor also worked at the carpenter's bench.

It is our civic and religious duty to ask ourselves seriously whether we condone, whether we contribute to, the drift away from excellent and zealous work. We sing lustily: "We are not here to play, to dream, to drift; we have hard work to do and loads to lift." Do we really believe it? Is it true that God created us to be laborers in His vineyard? Are we to use our talents? Will we be held accountable before the great Judge for the quantity and quality of our industry?

Our answer concerns not only ourselves but the entire world. Ours is the grave responsibility of privilege. The nations of the earth look to us for aid and for example. We have come to leadership through the grace of God, yet not alone by the grace of God; men and women without number have been coworkers with God, tilling the fields and mining the hills, buying and selling, building and tearing down, learning the secrets of nature, exploring the unknown, integrating facts, struggling with heart and mind and hand to secure maximum profit from the blessings of God. The greatness of America is divine favor and human accomplishment. Will we turn our greatness into maximum service in this hour of supreme responsibility? Now that we are recognized leaders, will we show the way?

The answer will be written in our deeds. Certainly, if we fulfill our responsibility the answer will be written partly in our love of God and in our moral purity. It will be written partly in tolerance and mercy and charity. It will be written partly in self-forgetfulness and sincerity. And as certainly, it will be written partly in our workmanship. We must be doers of the word. We must be stewards of God.

Therefore, in the light of our inclination to shun toil, the advice of St. Paul to young Timothy has special pertinence for us: "Be diligent to present yourself to God having proved yourself a workman unashamed" (II Timothy 11: 15).

II

Thomas Edison speaks similarly to us. After reading the story of his life we are so impressed by the versatility of his interests and abilities that it seems almost an impertinence to single out one reason for his greatness. He could do anything well. All the world was his intellectual parish.

In company with Ford and Firestone, Edison visited Burbank. The vistors were asked to sign a guest book. In a column there was the question, "Interested in?" Edison wrote, "Everything." It was neither jest nor boast.

A practical scientist, he was nonetheless concerned about politics, education and philosophy. He revered the human body as the most marvelous invention of the Almighty. When he lay dying, he plied his physician with questions about the drugs being administered. His love of humor was so notorious that persons from all over the world sent him their choice stories. The whole of creation was an absorbing detective story that he could not put down. Charles Steinmetz said that Edison was better informed in all fields of human knowledge than anyone else he had ever met. So it would seem perhaps impossible, certainly difficult, to say of any single thing: this is the genius of Edison.

But to the contrary. The secret of his greatness is so simple and clear as to be no secret to anyone who studies his life. He himself described his genius as 2 percent inspiration and 98 percent perspiration. He laughed at those who spoke in hushed tones about his wizardy. "All bosh," he said. "Clean hard work is what does it." Extraordinarily gifted? Unquestionably. Occasionally lucky? Perhaps. But his genius was a genius for prodigious and excellent work.

Let no one suppose that this means that his life was drudgery. Rather, he illustrated perfectly what Goethe discovered late in life: that happiness is to be found in work. Few famous men radiate joy as did Edison. His biographers concede wonderingly that he was once discouraged. Depression could not penetrate the armor of his activities. The nastiness of his foes merely amused him. Rarely did he feel hurt even when betrayed by associates. Early and late he raced to meet life's challenges, seldom weary, always enjoying himself tremendously.

Regarded on all sides as a magician, he held firmly that there was nothing mysterious about his work. He said that it consisted of three things: ambition, imagination and a will to work.

Ambition is a virtue that has been damned widely and loudly. No doubt the reason is to be found in the fact that it is a virtue which readily becomes a vice, and there are always those who would throw out the baby with the bath. Surely we are all aware that the higher the value, the more easily it is perverted. Ambition for Edison did not degenerate into lust for power or cruelty. For him, "Ambition was the spur that makes men wrestle with destiny. Heaven's own incentive." He wanted to succeed, but he did not, therefore, oppose or envy the good success of others. He loved to win, but he was a generous winner. He hated to lose, but he was a philosophical and gracious loser. He was stimulated by competition and spoke highly of its value for workers. Yet his competitive spirit was colleague to his concern for the welfare of others.

His courage and perseverance were in large part byproducts of his ambition. When we are anxious for great rewards we are not tortured by petty anxieties. At 67, Edison ended a brief vacation by complaining, "I simply must accomplish something now." He had opportunity at once. Shortly after his arrival home, his West Orange factory was destroyed by fire, and the tremendous task of starting anew faced him. Reaction? "I'll make a fresh start tomorrow morning." His associates testify that the "tragedy" made him seem years younger. A man-sized job was to be done, and so life was wonderful again. Nothing was impossible save to be without an impossible obstacle to overcome.

Yes, Edison was ambitious, magnificently, insatiably ambitious. And he had imagination to match his ambition. His genius, as everyone knows, was inventive.

If ambition is a virtue easily maligned, imagination is a power easily romanticized, a power too easily relegated to the realm of fantasy. No doubt imagination also has its disease; and its disease can be confused, by superficial diagnosis, with its health. Its health, imagination well and strong, is a power as realistic as visionary. Joseph the dreamer becomes Joseph the economist. Imagination which does not issue in practical results, somewhere, somehow, is degenerate.

Edison's imagination was no plaything. It was not escape from reality but seizure of reality. It was creative and constructive, a

consistently practical instrument. It was for him, as for all the great makers and doers, a power to see what and where and when and why. It was a God-given, Godlike ability to see what was not but what might be, to envisage goals and to create ways of attaining those goals. It was an intensely critical power to see what was wrong and how to correct it, what was missing and how to supply it.

Edison had the seeing eye. When a boy, he looked at a train. His fellows had done that. He saw it as an exciting means of transportation, as they did. But he saw in it what they didn't see: an opportunity to sell newspapers. He saw in the railway telegraph an instrument that could be used to multiply his sales. He saw in the baggage car a laboratory where he could carry on chemical experiments instead of resting between stations. He saw that electrical impulses made impressions on things and so he saw in the telegraph the basic theory for a stock-market ticker and the phonograph. He looked at cotton sewing thread and saw, not a household item, but something that might be used as a filament: a key piece in the puzzle of the incandescent lamp. He had the seeing eye. He saw what was not there yet.

Nor did he sit waiting for revelations. No doubt his powers of sight were far better than ordinary. But he saw as much as he did because he looked hard. He made it his business to discover. He saw nothing common without asking himself, what might be uncommon about this? His imagination, to paraphrase his words already quoted, was 2 percent intuition and 98 percent industry.

Which is to say, Edison's imagination, as his ambition, was largely the creature of his will to work. His love for work was his life. It was his genius. It was his greatness.

"He who has imagination without learning," says Joubert, "has wings and no feet." Edison realized the fact. So he bought books without end and read omniverously. Imagination and research. Laboratory experiment and library study. The combination was good scientific method. But Edison didn't read because it was the thing to do; he loved it.

There wasn't a lazy bone in his body. In earliest boyhood, he spent his spare time in a cellar laboratory. A few years later, after a long day's work selling papers and doing experiments in his baggage-car laboratory, he invested the late evening hours learning telegraphy. On his seventy-fifth birthday a reported asked him when he expected to retire. "Never," he said. On one of his gypsy vacations with Ford, Firestone, and Burroughs, Edison evidenced interest in the possibility of growing rubber in the United States. "Why don't you do something about it?" asked Ford. "I will," said Edison. "Immediately," And he did. At eighty.

He was a great worker. He worked day and night. He punched the clock like any of his employees; so it is a matter of record that he frequently worked a hundred-hour week. The list of his patents and inventions is so huge that we can scarcely believe that one man could have accomplished so much in a single lifetime. More than a thousand patents.

Why did he work so hard? Not for money. He enjoyed wealth. And he was a better-than-average businessman. But he made fortunes and spent them with unconcern. "It cost money to do research," he said. It took 10 years of frightfully expensive trial and error to get the "bugs" out of his storage battery. But that was what money was for. Making and spending fortunes to develop a complete system of electric generation and distribution, or sound movies, or a bigger and better way to process iron ore, was a delightful habit with him.

Why did he work so hard? Not for applause. Fame came to him as it has come to few men. And he reveled in it. In 1922, he was chosen (by newspaper poll) the greatest living American, Woodrow Wilson and Charles Evans Hughes running second to him. But he carried fame as he had carried adversity, with chuckling lightness. It was fun to be popular. But there is no evidence that he worked for glory.

Why did he work so hard? Because he loved it. He loved the doing. He loved the succeeding. His heart was in his job. His highest prize was excellence. St. Paul's advice was the will of his life: "Be diligent to present yourself before God having proved yourself a workman unashamed."

III

Such was the genius of Edison. And such has been the genius of America.

The World Council of Churches puts at the top of its list of important tasks the formulation of an adequate doctrine of work. Is work a curse, a punishment for sin, as the story of Adam suggests? Or is work an essential part of the blessing and dignity of man? Why should man work? To glorify God? To benefit humanity? Or, as Dorothy Sayers says in Creed Or Chaos, because God made man to be a workman, a skillful artisan; a delighter in work well-done?

The Sayers thesis, the true Biblical doctrine, has an example par excellence in Edison. He worked because it was his nature to work, because there was in him a divine urge to achieve excellence. To make and to make well, to do good and to do it superbly, this is the secret of happiness and of success. This is the business of being a man. Such was the genius of Edison. And such was the genius of America. Let us hope, and pray, and work that it will not be only the genius of an America that was.

But the Greatest of These Three Is To Care, and America Does Care (With Apologies to the Author of Ch. XIII, I Corinthians of the Holy Bible, by Hon. Clyde Doyle, Representative in Congress, Eighteenth District of California, June 15, 1950)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, though America speak with the tongues of men, and of angels too, and does not care, America is become as sounding brass, or as of tinkling cymbal.

And, though America have the gift of prophecy and understands all mysteries, and has all knowledge—even to the cracking of the atomic atom—and though America have faith, so that America could even move mountains—and if America does not care, then, it profiteth America nothing.

And, though America bestows all her goods to feed the poor and the hungry; and even though America offers her body to be burned, if America does not care, then it profiteth America nothing.

To care means to suffer long; to be very kind; to not envy; to be not too proud or to be puffed up; to not behave unseemingly; to not seek everything for her own account exclusively; to not be provoked and lose her head; to not think evil—even with those with whom we disagree at the United Nations.

Care despises iniquity and does not rejoice in it. Care rejoices in truth. Care beareth all things. Care believeth all good things. Care hopeth all good things.

And because America cares, America shall not fail.

But, whether there is prophecy, they shall fail; whether there be tongues they shall cease; whether there be knowledge merely, it shall vanish and disappear.

When America was a child she spake as a child; she thought as a child. But now that America is grown up, and is of full stature and in favor with God and men, America must put away childish things.

Then, America saw as through a glass darkly. Now, America sees face to face. Then, America knew only in part. Now, America must know—even as she is known in the neighborhood of nations. And America, yes—all nations—will be judged by God Himself.

And now abideth faith in America. And now abideth hope in America. And now abideth loyalty in America. And now abideth care by America.

But the greatest of these three is to care, and America does care.

Our Own Scotland Yard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under extension of my remarks I include herewith an editorial appearing recently in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, which accords just praise to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Nearly all real Americans will readily concur with the appraisal of this great organization contained in the editorial which follows:

OUR OWN SCOTLAND YARD

It would be hard to find a better example of FBI patience and diligence than is afforded by the case of Harry Gold, the local scientist accused of turning over atomic secrets to Russia.

For generations Britain's Scotland Yard has been held up as the top-notch police organization of the world. It has been glamorized in fiction, but it performed in fact. It is doubtful if it ever did a better job of needle-in-the-haystack hunting than the FBI did in the Gold case.

Beginning with 1,200 possible suspects, the FBI whittled down the list steadily over a period of months until Gold was singled out as the most likely suspect. Then came the climatic job of taking movies of the man, flying them to London and having them identified by the British traitor, Dr. Fuchs. What fiction could outdo that?

Not only has the organization through the years perfected the business of thorough search, but it has also safeguarded the constitutional liberties of Americans. Its files are not opened on the least provocation. It hasn't done any witch-hunting.

In addition, it is a clearinghouse for information on criminals the Nation over. Many of its investigations never come to light, and properly so, for they often involve innocent persons.

The FBI remains an investigating agency. Prosecutions are handled by other branches of the Justice Department. If they were as zealous as the Bureau of Investigation, more criminals would be behind the bars.

An Open Letter to the Postmaster General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, because the economy efforts of the Post Office Department are so much in the news at the present time, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to one phase of the problem overlooked at the present time. I refer to the post office policy of selling printed envelopes and printed post cards to users of the mails at less than cost, thereby depriving commercial printers throughout the country of this business. This is a matter that has long been a thorn in the side of the country's print shops, particularly the smaller ones where the loss of even small items of business is a serious handicap. I have received a copy of an open letter on this subject, addressed to the Postmaster General and published in the Chrisman (Ill.) Courier, one of the progressive weekly newspapers in the Twenty-third District. It is written by Stanley R. Kent, who, with his wife, Frances E. Kent, publishes the newspaper. Under permission granted to me by the House, I am including his letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that there may be a wider understanding of this matter printers rightly feel is of great importance to them:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. JESSE M. DONALDSON,
Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DONALDSON: Your recent order calling for drastic economy in the United States Postal Department is to be commended.

Whether or not it will help or hurt our mail service, I don't know. Some people say it will hurt, others say it won't.

That is beside the point. The main thing to me—and to millions of others—is that it is a step in the right direction toward economy in our Federal Government. Everyone knows that John Q. Public could certainly use some economy.

However, it seems to me that there is another very important thing the Postal Department could do to reduce its deficit each year. And that is: Get out of the printing business and stay out, and quit competing against private printers who have to help pay the taxes to finance the Postal Department.

It's a well-known fact that our Postal Department is not self-supporting. Public tax money is used each year to make up the deficit in the Postal Department.

Yet the Postal Department continues to print stamped envelopes for private business and individuals, and loses money on every transaction. I have been told several times that the Government loses money on stamped envelopes the Postal Department prints with a return address in the upper left-hand corner.

Very few private printers can afford to compete with the prices the Postal Department charges. If printers tried to compete, they would lose money, and soon have to go out of business.

Yet the Postal Department goes right ahead and loses money on this type of printing and depends upon the taxpayers to make up the loss. And it takes business away from the private printers who have to pay taxes.

It just doesn't make sense. If the Postal Department is sincere, and really wants to economize, here's a practical suggestion for doing so. How about it, Mr. Donaldson?

End of Racial Discrimination in the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an excellent article appearing in the New York Times for June 11, 1950, entitled "Taps for Jim Crow in the Services." The article is written by E. W. Kenworthy, executive secretary of the President's Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Forces. This article underscores the soundness of the recommendations of that committee, looking to complete integration of Negroes and whites in all branches of the armed forces, solely on the basis of capacity to do the task assigned and without prejudice or favor because of race or color.

The country has applauded this inspiring example of our democracy at work, and it agrees with President Truman's statement, on releasing the report of this committee, that "every American who believes sincerely in the Declaration of Independence owes them a debt of gratitude." The committee members, who joined unanimously in this report, were as follows: Chairman, Charles Fahy, associate judge, United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia; Lester B. Granger, executive director of the National Urban League; Dwight R. G. Palmer, president of the General Cable Corp.; John G. Sengstacke, publisher and editor of the Chicago Defender, and William E. Stevenson, president of Oberlin College. Alphonsus J. Donahue, president of the Donahue Sales Corp., originally on the committee, died last summer.

This article is especially timely because it points up the progress that would be reversed by adoption of the Russell amendment to the selective service bill, just reported from the Committee on Armed Services.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAPS FOR JIM CROW IN THE SERVICES—NAVY AND AIR FORCE TAKE THE LEAD IN EFFECTING A QUIET REVOLUTION WITHIN THE ARMED FORCES

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON.—For some time a quiet but effective revolution has been taking place in the Navy and Air Force. It has recently spread to the Army. The services, it is true, would not call it a revolution. In language somewhat less impassioned than Jefferson's, they would describe it as a program to secure maximum effective utilization of all manpower. The fact remains, nevertheless, that all manpower now includes Negroes. And that not only makes the new policies of the services revolutionary in themselves, but puts them in lineal descent from the Declaration of Independence, by general agreement a somewhat revolutionary document.

This revolution was hatched during the war in what Henry Stimson called the "dim, religious world of the admirals," and with the blessing and active encouragement of the late James V. Forrestal. It received voice and direction in July, 1948, when President Truman ordered that there should be equality of treatment and opportunity in the armed services without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin. And it has been presided over by a committee headed by Federal Judge Charles Fahy, which the President appointed to look into the racial policies and practices of the three services.

Actually, the revolution has been twofold. It is, first, a revolution in human economy, and, secondly, in human relations. As background against which to measure the nature and scope of the new programs, it is necessary to know what the services' traditional racial policies were.

Stated as simply and bluntly as possible, they were (1) that Negroes were not as intelligent as whites and were therefore incapable of mastering the more technical military jobs, and (2) that it was impossible to mix whites and Negroes in the same unit.

"The cranial cavity of the Negro," solemnly declared a prewar study by the Army War College, "is smaller than the white; his brain weighing 35 ounces compared with 45 for the white." From this "fact bearing upon the problem," the conclusion was drawn by another War College study in 1940 that "the Negro is far below the white in capacity to absorb instruction."

Navy anthropologists were of the same school, an admiral assuring the Secretary of the Navy in 1942 that "the white man is more adaptable and more efficient" than the Negro.

There was similar agreement on the military necessity for segregation. The separation of the races, the Army said in a public statement in October 1940, had proved "satisfactory over a long period of years," and "changes would produce situations destructive to morale and detrimental to the preparations for national defense." Because segregation on shipboard was not feasible, the Navy went even further: "The policy of not enlisting men of the colored race for any branch of the Naval service but the messman's branch was adopted to meet the best interests of general ship efficiency. * * * This policy not only serves the best interests of the Navy and the country, but serves as well the best interests of (Negroes) themselves."

Here is an illustration of how these attitudes have changed. I was having lunch last June aboard a destroyer tender at the Newport, R. I. base of Destroyers Atlantic Fleet. On my right was Comdr. T. H. Morton, skipper of the U. S. S. *Compton*. "Do you," I asked, "have any Negro general rating in your crew?"

"I don't know," the commander replied, "but if you don't mind getting dirty we can find out. My ship's alongside being readied for sea."

Scrambling over the disordered *Compton* we discovered a Negro serving as messenger of the deck, another working in a paint crew, a third—an electrician's mate—repairing cable on the bridge, a fourth lying on his back in bilge water in the stern and grunting as he packed a bearing. Altogether, there were six Negroes aboard the *Compton* in general service.

Back in the wardroom for coffee, the commander said: "Well, there you are. Didn't know I had 'em."

Across Narragansett Bay the next morning, I stood beside Commander Louis Kearn, the exec of the Essex-class carrier U. S. S. *Leyte*. The crew was drawn up in a double line the length of the hangar deck. Negroes were interspersed throughout the ship's complement. The *Leyte* was preparing to sail, and a Negro craneman was deftly swinging the Grumman fighters through the starboard hatch and depositing them lightly on the hangar deck.

"He's got rhythm," said Commander Kearn.

We went over the ship. There were Negroes serving as boilermen and enginemen, as fire controlmen in the carrier's nerve center. A Negro handled the forward elevator. On the flight deck a chief boatswain's mate was in charge of a white crew.

Later I talked with nine enlisted Negroes in the submarine school. Three had graduated that morning—one in the middle of his class, two in the upper third. The other six were in the incoming class. They were striking for a variety of ratings—boatswain's mate, yeoman, sonarman, radioman, electrician's mate.

Clearly a sea change had taken place in the Navy.

The explanation of this change is extremely simple and a credit to the Navy's good sense. Until 1942 the Navy had refused to accept Negroes for general service. When, under White House pressure, it opened general ratings to Negro volunteers, it insisted that they must be assigned to shore duty and harbor craft and could not be placed in crews of the fleet.

This policy, the Navy soon discovered, deprived the service of the skills of many highly qualified Negroes. Thereupon, as an experiment, it ordered Negroes assigned to 25 auxiliary vessels. When no trouble developed, the Navy opened all auxiliary fleet vessels to Negro general ratings, and in 1946 this policy was made applicable throughout the fleet.

As a result, Negroes are now in every Navy general rating, serving aboard all types of craft. There are no racial quotas for technical schools, and Negroes are attending the most advanced schools in the service. Although the Navy had held in 1942 that Negroes could not be put in position of command over white men, Negro petty officers and junior officers are now found in such positions—though still in small numbers.

The Army was not impressed with the Navy experience. If, the Army argued, Negro ratings in the Navy had formed 7 to 10 percent of general service, rather than 2 percent, the effect of integration might have been quite different.

The President's committee was not convinced that this Army percentage theory was sound, and in the experience of the Air Force it had a ready test at hand. When the committee first met, the Air Force had laid before it a new program which called for opening up all jobs and service schools on a basis of merit, and the gradual dissolution of existing Negro units. With the committee's approval, the Air Force put this program into effect in June 1949. Eight months later the Air Force asked the committee to appraise the results of its new policy.

At 8:30 on a mid-January morning I watched as Brig. Gen. James F. Powell, commander of Keesler Air Force Base in Biloxi, Miss., took the monthly review on the air strip. As the sun broke through wisps of fog rolling in off the Gulf, 15,000 men and officers marched past, the squadron color bearers dipping their pennants. In every squadron were Negro airmen.

This was not "token color." Keesler is the largest technical school in the training command, its students totaling almost 10,000. Enrolled at Keesler were 689 enlisted Negroes and 19 Negro officers—just over 7 percent of the school population. In the permanent party forming the base administration and teaching staff, there were 268 enlisted Negro airmen and 4 officers—5.5 percent of the housekeeping detail.

At Keesler the Air Force trains electronics officers, radar operators, observers, and repairmen, aircraft-warning officers, control-tower operators, air-traffic servicemen, weather engineers, and radiological-defense specialists. The courses are tough, the standards exacting, and rate of failure high.

So urgent is the need for men trained at Keesler that classes are run in three 6-hour shifts beginning at 6 a. m. and ending at midnight. I visited the classes on one shift. In every class—from the beginning courses in typing and Morse-code transcription up to courses for radar mechanics and electronics officers—there were Negro students.

I couldn't help reflecting that in an amazingly short time the Negro cranial cavity had expanded at a prodigious rate. I had occasion to think again about the capacity of the Negro to absorb instruction when, a few days later, I saw three Negro pilots at Williams Air Force Base in Arizona instructing in jet-fighter aircraft.

In the first 8 months of the new program the Air Force had transferred almost 75 percent of its 25,000 Negroes to formerly white units. Where, in June 1949 there had been only 167 racially mixed units, in January 1950 there were 1,301.

As a revolution in human relations, this was unprecedented. Even more significant from the viewpoint of Air Force efficiency was the revolution in human economy. In screening its Negro units the Air Force had discovered that anywhere from 12 to 37 percent of the personnel was qualified for technical-school training. With the abolition of the segregated unit they could now get this training and serve at the top of their bent.

In the six Air Force technical schools Negro enlisted students formed 6.5 percent of the total student population, as compared with an over-all Negro enlisted strength in the service of 7.2 percent. These figures give some idea of the quality of Negro enlistee the Air Force is attracting under its new policy. It also indicates how wide of the truth was the Air Force prediction that only a relatively small percentage of Negroes would be able to meet competition of whites.

What part has the Army played in this revolution? The Army's policy at the beginning of the Fahy committee's deliberations can be most effectively illustrated by the case history of Willie Mullen.

Mullen was a radio bug. He was also a Negro, and for Negroes radio opportunities in civilian life were limited. On June 27, 1947, Mullen went to a recruiting station. If he joined the Army, he asked the recruiting sergeant, could he get in the Signal Corps? And if so, would he be sent to the Signal School at Fort Monmouth, N. J., so that he could acquire the Military Occupational Specialty for Radio Repairman, Fixed Station?

The sergeant replied that if he enlisted for 3 years he could select the Signal Corps as his branch of service, and if he qualified he could go to Monmouth and take course 649 for radio repairman, fixed station. Mullen enlisted.

Mullen was bright above the average. He also had a capacity for leadership. The Army soon discovered that. Consequently, a year after his enlistment he was still at Fort Dix, assigned to duty noncommissioned officer and training recruits. Later he was transferred to Fort Riley where he served in a post overhead (housekeeping) installation.

After 15 months, during which time he had not progressed one step toward Monmouth and MOS 649, Mullen became impatient to the point of being rash. He wrote directly to the Chief Signal Officer in Washington. He ended his letter: "Since I am only an enlisted man, you probably won't answer my letter, but please do, and tell me how I can get my branch of the service. * * *"

Mullen was mistaken. A heart of brass somewhere in the Pentagon had been quickened, and a week later Mullen was on his way to Fort Monmouth with a personal godspeed from Signal Headquarters in his pocket.

Unhappily the course of study to which Mullen was assigned was not the one which would realize his objective. There was, it turned out, no "Negro quota" for course 649 in radio repair, fixed station; therefore, although he was qualified for 649, Mullen was assigned to course 648, a more elementary course in radio repair.

But Mullen was happy to be on his way and he did apply himself diligently, taking a correspondence course in addition to his studies at Monmouth, to the end that he finished with a superior rating. Now, Mullen assumed, he would progress to course 649. But when assignments were made, he was passed over. Again he sought justice at headquarters.

Back came the answer:

"At the present time there are no colored Signal units in which your service could be used as an MOS 649. Therefore no quotas are allotted for colored enlisted men in a pipeline status to pursue this course. * * *

"It is regrettable that such situations as these occur but"—

Mullen had one more round left, and he let it go: "I have an 80 average for elements of radio and one of my white friends had 76 and he got the 649 course. * * * My skin is brown, true, but as a citizen of the United States, and a member of the United States Army, I think I am entitled to any training I am qualified for."

The President's committee agreed with Mullen. Here was a man who, by the Army's own admisison, had the qualifications for radio repairman, fixed station. Yet because no Negro unit required this position, he was not permitted to qualify for it. Furthermore, the committee knew—what Mullen did not know—that at the very time he was denied admission to course 649 the Army was considerably under authorized strength in MOS 649.

To the members of the President's committee it seemed that a policy which produced the case of Willie Mullen made a mockery of both efficiency and justice. It made no sense at all.

Nor did it make sense that Negroes were denied the opportunities to attend 81 percent of the school courses open to recruits after basic training, and that, out of a total of 490 occupational specialties, there was no authorization for Negroes in 198 of these specialties. Such a policy not only penalized a man for having a brown skin, it penalized the Army itself, and the Nation.

After many months of negotiation and conference, the Army agreed that its racial policies denied equal opportunity to the individual qualified Negro, and thereby wasted skills. In January 1950, the Army accepted the recommendations of the President's committee and announced that henceforth all jobs and schools would be open to qualified personnel on a competitive basis without racial quota or restriction, and that Negroes would no longer be limited in assignment to Negro units and post overhead. Subsequently the Army also adopted the last of the committee's recommendations and abandoned the 10-percent limitation on Negro strength.

Mullen has since been enrolled in course 649—radio repairman, fixed station, at Fort Monmouth, N. J.

Inevitably the question is asked: What about social activities on post? What about service clubs, swimming pools, athletic teams, and dances?

For the Navy, social activities do not present much of a problem. At shore installations, a large part of the personnel is civilian, and men from the fleet take their separate ways during liberty.

The Air Force has largely ignored the question. Its new racial policy is limited to jobs, schools, assignment, promotion. Social matters are left to the discretion of the individual commander. And local commanders, for the most part, have left them to the judgment and initiative of the men themselves.

Only two rules govern social activities, both unwritten but explicit and understood by the men. The first is that no facility is racially restricted; this applies to all officers' and noncommissioned officers' clubs, movie theaters, post exchanges, and athletic teams. (Air Force commanders are scratching from their schedules any teams refusing to play against colored athletes.) The second rule is that troublemakers will get into trouble.

Within these two firm rules, the social situation remains fluid, and commanders generally permit the men to evolve the social pattern according to their own wishes and at their own speed. The pattern, as might be expected, varies from base to base. At some bases Negroes still have their own dances, though a few Negro couples may attend "white" dances. But at Williams Field, Ariz., there are no separate dances, and at the dance I attended, there was a large number of Negro couples.

The new racial programs of the services are not millennial. Much remains to be done. But I think it fair to say that they represent an unprecedented stride toward the solution of a problem that has embarrassed the Nation since its beginning.

As for the effectiveness of the program, let the white man and the Negro who are now living and working together in the Air Force say the final word.

I was sitting under a scrub pine with a young squadron commander in a space between the barracks at Keesler Field. A couple of pick-up teams—white and Negro airmen together—were playing volley ball. Around a horseshoe stake three whites and a Negro were loudly disputing the fact or nonfact of a ringer. I asked the captain his opinion of the integration program.

"Well," he said, "I may as well tell you that when the order came down last June to break up the Negro units, we didn't particularly like it. We knew it made sense. But we thought it would make trouble, too.

"But we haven't had any. I have tried to figure it out. Maybe it's because everything is now on an individual basis. If a Negro boy doesn't make the grade, he doesn't squawk any longer. He knows he's getting the same break as anyone else. Or maybe it's because trouble develops more between groups than between individuals. There are two pools here. One used to be for Negroes, one for whites. Now a few Negroes come over to the white pool. Quite a number of whites have started using the former Negro pool. Nobody said they had to—it's just nearer to their barracks.

"These men work together and go to school together. They eat in the same messes and sleep in the same barracks. So gradually they start having a beer together at the club."

The Negro was briefer. He was a sergeant, a flight chief at Lackland Basic Training Center in charge of 60 trainees, white and colored. He had been in the Air Force a long time. He said simply:

"There's never been anything like it."

Racial Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Who Knows Best?" from the Portland (Maine) Evening Express, relating to recent decisions of the Supreme Court involving race relations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OTHER MEN'S OPINIONS

WHO KNOWS BEST?

You can drive a horse to water.

But you can't make him drink.

The Federal Government can order the States to do thus and so in the matter of relations between the races.

But you can't legislate mortality.

It is possible that a majority of the people of the United States wish heartily that in the Southern States there existed no separation of races.

Such separation is practiced in the South, however. The fact may be deplorable. Yet it is the fact. The citizens of the Southern States in which separation of races is a fact undoubtedly prefer to work out their own problems of daily living, of daily contacts one with another, in their own way.

The Federal Government can say to them, of course, as it has now said through rulings of the Supreme Court of the United States, that:

1. There must be no separation of the races in railroad dining cars.

2. The State university of Texas must admit a Negro student to its law school, whether the majority of the people of Texas want this done or not.

3. The State university of Oklahoma must remove restrictions on a Negro student who has been permitted to study at the institution but has been humiliated by having had to sit apart and eat apart from white students.

Here in Maine, where we have no race problem (or where, at least we do not admit that such a problem could possibly arise) some citizens applaud these Supreme Court rulings.

If we lived in Texas or Oklahoma and had lived there all our lives and were working out problems affecting us in our own States and neighborhoods in our own way, however—

We might feel that States' rights didn't count for much, any more, when the judicial branch of the Federal Government could command us:

"The way you have been handling this problem is wickedly wrong. You must do it another way. The way we tell you to do it is the only possible right way. Obey this rule."

Would it have been better to have left the States alone, to work out their own problems in their own way?

Can you, having driven the horse to water, make him drink?

Arming Europe and Asia Will Not Insure Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, while everybody longs for peace the path to that objective is a rough one. It seems certain however that the present armaments race is leading civilization to destruction. There must be a way out other than by the show of strength and power between nations.

In the current issue of Between the Lines, its editor, Charles A. Wells, in his column X-Ray and Forecast, challenges Christian nations to meet the threat of communism on its own ground—psychological warfare. Guns will never destroy or subdue an enemy and Russia has recognized that fact. The time has now come to marshal the ingenuity of our people in this important contest. We can and will win by the application of the ideas expressed by Mr. Wells, which I include as part of my remarks:

X-RAY AND FORECAST

Everybody wants peace—even the Communists. In fact, the new Communist strategy is to start peace programs wherever they can and infiltrate established peace movements. Many readers ask, "How can we tell the difference between a Communist front peace movement and a sincere, genuine peace effort, worthy of support?" It is important to know, for many able and innocent people have been fooled.

Here is one sure test: Communist-front organizations, peace or otherwise, never condemn the evils of Marxism—they just leave a blank space there, omit all references to Moscow tyranny.

But no peace effort can go far without facing the threat of communism to human liberty and human rights which is a historic cause of war. Thus any worthy peace movement will be anti-Communist in its policy and program. Make sure the peace movement you work with has come out clear on this issue. If they will not, you have cause for suspicion.

On the other hand, a sincere peace movement need not urge war with Russia as a solution to the problem.

We make this point because there is also developing a powerful segment in and around our Government which believes that war with Russia—the sooner the better—is the only way to peace. These military-minded spokesmen are trying to lump the Communist-inspired peace movements in with the sincere anti-Communist programs—unless the latter come out for war with Russia as the only solution. Such a tactic,

although advocated by some of our top political and military brass, is about as hard on traditional American liberties as communism is itself. It will put a severe squeeze on such honored and respected peace movements as the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the National Council for Prevention of War, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and Quaker groups, all anti-Red.

But is not this all-out psychological preparation for war—fomenting hatred against all things Russian (when most Russians hate communism as much as we do, endeavoring to discredit all sincere peace movements, convincing the people that war is inevitable and all peace moves futile—a sad revelation of the intellectual and spiritual poverty of some of our leadership? Such a tactic shuts us off from all the possible paths of reapproachment and negotiation that can prevent war and lead to peace. This tactic has already blinded many people to the fact that the only real way to get at communism is on ideological grounds which is the very level upon which all Communist gains have been made. The seek-peace-through-war forces believe that you can only kill Communist ideas by killing the men with the ideas along with millions of other men, women, and children who are exposed to the ideas; that you can only protect cities from becoming Communist by blowing up the cities that have become Communist and destroying those whom the Communists are trying to infiltrate. Such an approach is as dangerous as communism itself, for both lead to the same thing—an impoverished, chaotic, tyrant-ridden world.

But the most serious handicap the anti-Communist peacemakers face is that most press and radio voices are subservient to the war influence, they are going with the big war parade, where the exciting headlines are, the profits in war contracts, medals, promotions, power.

Moreover the policy of protecting ourselves from communism by force of arms or military containment has not been so successful as the public has been led to believe. Columnist Walter Lippmann, while treading cautiously around military toes, has been denouncing the Truman doctrine of military containment as a failure, and holding that we simply cannot buy security by rearming others. Impoverished, still shattered and divided Greece has absorbed huge sums of American dollars, yet would quickly topple to the Reds if a real thrust should come. Our military concedes that. Some of our top strategists also concede that, after pouring out billions to rearm Turkey to protect our position in the Near East, our allies could only hold out barely long enough for us to move in and support them. These tacticians consider this plan of using Turkey as the battleground to hold Russia as the grand strategy; but other top brass disagree, worry because it gives Russia all the advantage of fighting close in while our lines would be disastrously overextended. So we have achieved no security there.

Western European nations are supposed to be enthusiastically joining us in a united military front under the Atlantic Pact, which is simply not the truth. The European nations fear Russia, but they fear war much more. There is not a one of them that is not yet struggling desperately to recover their economic life; another war will plunge them into absolute doom for generations to come. We are being led to believe that the French, English, Italians, Belgians, and others are getting ready to fight—and die if need be—to protect the capitalistic free society and the American way of life. But the plain truth is that millions of Frenchmen, Englishmen, and Italians, Scandinavians, and others intend to do no such thing. They are pulling back from us.

We are shipping some arms to Europe and our leaders are conferring with their leaders, but the Europeans are telling us they can pay for very little of the rearmament program. So we are facing the problem of paying the bill ourselves with our budget already in the red.

(For source material on European attitudes toward Atlantic Pact rearmament see: UN report from Geneva in the New York Times, May 29; United States News, March 17 and March 10; Scripps-Howard papers, May 12.)

So, with Europeans reluctant, if we do rearm them, can we trust them to fight with us, for us? Some of our own military leaders doubt this, are convinced the French and Italians will never fight for or with us. It will be the China situation all over again—with the people sick of war and war's poverty, we rearm them—they give up and the armaments fall to the Reds.

The true situation in Europe is highlighted by the French proposal to merge the French, German, and Belgian iron, steel, and mining industries. The United States has been demanding unity and economic cooperation in Europe, so we are compelled to be polite and seemingly friendly toward this proposal, but we will discover in a few months that the proposed west Europe industrial merger is an effort by European leaders to gain leverage, by pooling their heavy industries, to create a neutral European bloc, as an alternate to an all-out war program with the United States.

If France, Belgium, and west Germany pool their heavy industries and resources, they will snatch the weight of industrial leadership away from England, and stand as a formidable bloc of power between Russia and the United States, instead of being drawn deeper into the vortex of the East and West struggle.

The aim of the new European bloc will also be to restore the East-West European trade which our policy has frankly thwarted as we have sought to match Russia's economic isolationism with the integration of west European trade into our own economic world. But with American trade restrictions still holding the wall high and tight against European trade, European leaders discount our promises and are seeking the restoration of what they consider essentially normal European relations which means trade with the Communist East. So when the facts, stretching from Turkey to Norway, are brought into the open, how much security are we buying with all our vast military outlay?

Thus our leaders may at last be driven to exploit the long neglected nonmilitary methods of dealing with communism, which will meet the evil on the levels of its own most effective action by:

1. The utilization of the great new international Free Labor Federation which united millions of workers against communism in the western world and which, by effective propaganda and underground contacts, could riddle the iron curtain. (LBT, January 9, 1950.) But the big brass in business and in the military shy from letting labor take the lead. Thus little is done to develop this tremendous weapon against communism with its strategy of infiltrating the worker proletariate.

2. Greater use of the Voice of America, which, though crippled and neglected, has driven the Red tyrants crazy with its devastating thrusts. (New York Times, January 6; Associated Press, March 30.) Moscow has been thrown on the defensive by the fact that Russians and satellite citizens in droves seize every chance to escape the Red frontier as a result of the Voice. But Congress gives only pennies to the Voice, while powerful steel, textile, aircraft lobbies constantly prod Washington on war spending. No profits, military promotions, or medals are connected with the Voice of America—hence no lobby—no congressional concern.

3. Greater capitalization on this stream of deserters. We feed ourselves dizzy on their horror stories, but do nothing with the facts and significance of these desertions beyond the frontier. These facts could whip up jitters among the Reds, filling the air with news of folks swimming rivers, jumping out of trains, crash landing planes to escape the Red "workers' paradise."

4. We have done nothing to encourage or aid the large religious forces in Russia and satellite areas who are in constant conflict with Soviet powers and which are known to maintain a network of powerful anti-Red underground forces. It is the custom of many—especially some military figures—to pooh-pooh these forces, yet Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, top United States Army man and former United States Ambassador to Russia, has a stirring chapter in his recent book, My 3 Years in Moscow, on God Won't Stay Underground in Russia, in which he tells of the unconquerable spirit of millions of Russian Christians. Yet nothing is done to aid this force operating against communism inside the iron curtain. Don't let anyone tell you we can't get behind the iron curtain. As everyone associated with the diplomatic world will tell you, we have many espionage and counterespionage agents active around and behind the iron curtain concentrated, of course, on military affairs.

The United States excels in advertising and the arts of vivid portrayal and persuasiveness—with armies of able technicians in these fields. We have thus the resources, the weapons, the men to defeat the narrow thinking, technically backward zealots of Moscow in the field of human thought far more effectively and quickly than we could defeat them in war.

If our leadership, stung by the growing failure of militarism, really mean what they say when they call for a great moral crusade against communism—the world may yet witness the miracle of God working in the affairs of men.

Regional Problems of New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 15 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement headed "Toward a Prosperous New England." This was distributed at a breakfast this morning given by the six New England State CIO Councils for New England's Congressional Representatives. I feel it is a great tribute to the CIO Councils that they produced a paper of such statesmanship. It is my opinion that much more attention should be given by all those in Congress from the New England States to the common regional problems which are of deep concern to all six States and to Republicans and Democrats alike. New England has suffered from the lack of such cooperation on problems common to all. Too much has been heard of superficial alibis and panaceas, to explain where we are—and too little about the fundamental problems of transportation, steel, power, and so

forth, upon the solution of which depends where we are going.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWARD A PROSPEROUS NEW ENGLAND

I. LABOR'S STAKE IN A PROSPEROUS NEW ENGLAND

There is wide agreement that New England has a distinguished past. For many generations this region played a leading role in shaping the Nation's political, economic, educational, and cultural history.

But there is no such agreement about New England's future. The gloomier prophets assure us that our New England economy is "washed up"—it has passed its peak and is now on the road to steady decline and decay. Another group of prophets—equipped with rose-colored glasses—scoff at the idea that New England faces serious economic problems.

Our own view is that both these sets of prophets are wrong. New England does indeed face some very serious economic problems. Unless these problems are tackled with intelligence, vigor, and courage, New England's economic future will be as dark as her past has been bright. But with a sensible use of our great assets, and a concerted effort to overcome our liabilities, we believe that the New England economy can continue to expand—and her people can enjoy an ever increasing standard of living.

Working people, perhaps more than any other group, have a tremendous stake in seeing to it that New England prospers. The owners of a textile mill in Nashua or a shoe factory in Brockton may find it possible and indeed profitable to liquidate their New England holdings and move on to greener pastures. But the thousands of working families in Nashua and Brockton who depend on textiles and shoes for their food and shelter, and whose roots are deeply imbedded in New England soil, have no such attractive alternative. They and their communities are left stranded when their jobs move away.

New England is the oldest industrial region of the country and even today the most highly industrialized region. With only 2 percent of the Nation's land area, it houses 6½ percent of the country's total population and manufactures nearly 10 percent of the goods. Four out of every ten of New England's 8,500,000 people are gainfully employed. Of those employed, 4 out of every 10 are in manufacturing—almost double the average for the rest of the country.

Despite the poets and novelists, fewer than 5 percent of New England's workers are farmers—only one-fourth the average for the United States as a whole—and three out of every four New Englanders live in urban areas.

This means that when the Nation's industry slides into a mild recession, New England manufacturers, workers, and merchants are likely to be hit much more severely. This is exactly what happened in 1949. When unemployment rose to 9.9 percent for the country as a whole, New England recorded 14.1 percent unemployment.

Today although employment has risen markedly, the New England region still has the highest relative unemployment—9.8 percent, against a national average of 6.7 percent.

Add to this the fact that New England's key industries have been slipping badly in the last 25 years. Textiles and leather goods—once the main foundations of this region's industrial economy—have been migrating to other areas, leaving behind a trail of bitter misery for dozens of communities and thousands of families.

Fortunately, the decline of these older industries has been offset—at least in part—by a growth in New England's metal-working industries, which by now have become the backbone of the region's economy.

But New Englanders must face squarely the fact that our newer industries are today in danger of declining in the future just as our older industries have already done.

If this happens, not only New Englanders but all Americans will be the losers. Our Nation as a whole cannot hope to prosper if one of its major regions is going through the economic wringer.

Our goal must be a steadily expanding New England economy—with increasing jobs and incomes and living standards. This goal cannot and should not be achieved at the expense of other regions, but only in partnership with them.

II. THE OBSTACLES TO ECONOMIC EXPANSION IN NEW ENGLAND

New England's economic assets are well known. High on the list are (1) here abundant supply of well-trained workers, (2) a proud record of good labor-management relations, (3) labor and management skills, research facilities, and plant facilities which have contributed heavily to the development of new products and new production techniques, and (4) an attractive environment in which to live.

What we must examine with great care and candor, however, are the present economic handicaps of New England. Many of these fall under the heading of high production costs. In turn, many of these high costs are related to New England's geographical position—at the end of the Nation's rail line—and to her lack of native raw-material sources. New England must import from other regions most of the raw materials which her factories process and most of the fuel to run these factories. Similarly, New England must export a large part of her finished products to markets elsewhere in the United States and abroad.

This means that high transportation costs must be built into the costs and prices of New England manufacturers, placing them at a disadvantage in the competition with producers in other areas. The sharp rise in transportation rates since the war has intensified New England's disadvantage.

The stability and growth of New England's newer metal-working industries is threatened, for example, by high-priced steel which runs 5 to 13 percent above the prices paid by competing steel users in other areas. The high cost of coal and oil delivered in New England represents a further handicap. New England, incidentally, is the only industrial region in the country that does not enjoy the benefits of natural gas, even though our metal-working industries could make highly efficient use of this important and limited natural resource.

One of New England's most striking handicaps is the extremely high level of electric-power rates. The private utilities and their apologists, having failed in their efforts to hide this fact, are now trying hard to convince the public that high-power costs are unimportant and unavoidable. But this is obvious nonsense. Industrial power rates, more than 50 percent above the national average and the highest of any region in the country, are bound to place a heavy penalty on New England manufacturers and consumers alike. The sooner we stop kidding and start doing something to bring these exorbitant power rates down, the sooner New England's economic future will brighten.

Some of the causes of high production costs in New England have nothing to do with geography. One of the most important is the antiquated and outworn condition of many of our factories and machines. New England turned up in a recent survey with the highest percentage of over-age machine tools of all regions in the country. Half the tools are more than 10 years old, while one-third are over 20 years old. This is a sad record for an area which leads the country in producing machine tools.

There is a severe shortage of modern factory space. We have a surplus of old-fashioned, multi-story factories vacated by textile companies and the like, but these are not adaptable to modern production machinery and work-flow methods.

Closely related is the shortage of rich capital funds for firms seeking to create new production enterprises or to expand old ones. This curious shortage exists despite New England's abundance of capital funds, safely locked up in gilt-edged, low-risk forms.

Very fundamental to New England's economic difficulties is the psychology of stagnation displayed by many manufacturers, bankers, and other business groups. Though preaching loudly the virtues of private enterprise, they sit complacently on their outworn plants and fat bank rolls, refusing to engage in the risk-taking activities which are basic to the effective working of our private-enterprise system.

While complaining bitterly against the efforts of working people to achieve a modest degree of economic security for their families, these businessmen strive constantly for a false kind of security for themselves by avoiding healthy competition and capital risks. Meantime, their more progressive and wide-awake competitors in other areas are moving ahead and making the future more insecure for all New England.

III. A POSITIVE PROGRAM FOR NEW ENGLAND

There is no simple or magic formula which will guarantee New England's future prosperity. A complex pattern of positive actions are called for. It will take lots of imagination, hard work, and, above all, courage. No one group, private or public, can do the job alone. The strengthening of New England's economic foundations will require the close cooperation of Government, management, labor, and all other groups.

The first requirement is a fuller knowledge of the facts, and a better and broader understanding of those facts. New England's economic assets and liabilities must be examined with vigorous objectivity. Such an examination will suggest many fruitful courses of action not now clearly evident. We urge an immediate fact-finding survey of the New England economy—its resources, assets, and liabilities—undertaken jointly by the six State governments with Federal cooperation.

Meantime, however, these are already ample facts to prove the need for certain actions. The more important of these are suggested below:

1. Reduction of railroad rates and greater use of cheap water transportation.

2. A lower cost and more abundant supply of steel, by building a New England steel industry.

3. Reduction of electric-power rates and expansion of power supply, particularly by the development of hydroelectric resources and far more effective public regulation of utility rates. A comprehensive development of New England's water resources will bring other advantages as well.

4. Reduction of fuel costs by extending natural gas into New England. This will also permit the use of improved technology in many industries and the manufacture of a wider range of products.

5. Redevelopment of New England's older industrial cities and towns accompanied by a far more vigorous application of city and area planning.

6. A concerted program to construct modern factory space, especially in communities that have lost industry and are blighted by outmoded factory buildings.

7. A program to break capital fund bottlenecks by such means as industrial development foundations and if necessary by establishing State and local government credit facilities for private businesses seeking to expand.

8. Development of a program of public construction which together with private building will insure job stability in the construction industry.

9. Development of an agricultural stabilization program for New England farmers most of whom are unprotected and even adversely affected by the present system of farm price supports on basic commodities. Such a program should encourage a full flow of dairy products, fruits, vegetables, and other native farm products to New England consumers at reasonable prices while at the same time insuring a stable market and fair prices to New England farmers.

10. A broad conservation program including extensive reforestation and control of pollution which will protect and strengthen the forest, field, and water resources of New England.

11. Establishment of a New England regional government body designed to gather and analyze economic data, to engage in positive economic planning for the region, and to foster aggressive economic expansion policies and programs for business and government alike.

12. Strengthen and broaden the unemployment compensation programs of the New England States so that workers who are forced to become unemployed through no fault of their own will have reasonable protection against economic disaster.

We call upon business, farm, and other private groups, as well as New England and Federal Government officials and legislators to join us in this positive program. Together, and only together, we can give the people of New England a prosperous future by building this great region into a major asset rather than a menacing liability for our Nation's economy.

Put Up or Shut Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial published in the June 10, 1950, issue of the Tablet, well-known and respected Catholic publication. I commend a reading of this editorial to all Members:

PUT UP OR SHUT UP

Last week the address of Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH and the declaration of conscience signed by a number of Senators was given wide publicity. The general effect of Senator SMITH'S address and the declaration was only to confuse and bewilder an already confused and bewildered public.

The time for being naive about the substance of the McCarthy charges is long past. The Communist conspiracy represents a clear and present danger to the security of the United States.

Just two facts out of many—the presence of Alger Hiss in the position of high responsibility in our Government and the presence of close to a hundred perverts in the State Department—even though Hiss has been forced out and convicted and the perverts "fired"—justify a complete and thorough search for further evidences of the Communist conspiracy within the departments of our Government. That is the avowed objective of Senator MCCARTHY'S efforts. It was the avowed objective of the Senate resolution, unanimously voted, to investigate Communist activity in the State Department.

It is long past the time when the administration should have been busy actively removing the clear and present danger of the Communist conspiracy in the departments of our Government. This is not only the business of Senator MCCARTHY and those who support his efforts in the Senate—it is the business of every Congressman and Senator and of every member of the administration in Washington. They should all, every last man of them, be busy about that job.

They will not get busy about that job until sufficient pressure is brought to bear upon them from the masses of voters back home. Now is the time to put to each Congressman and Senator and public official the very pertinent question:

"If you don't like the way Senator MCCARTHY is going about the business of ferreting out evidences of the Communist conspiracy in our Government, how do you propose to go about it?"

It is time to put the direct question to each Congressman and Senator: "What are you doing about getting rid of Communists in our Government? It is your job as well as Senator MCCARTHY'S. What are you doing about it?"

It is time to tell every Congressman and Senator the plain truth. You have no right whatsoever to stand up and criticize Senator MCCARTHY unless you can offer some definite evidence that you are just as much interested in the job to be done as is Senator MCCARTHY. Put up or shut up. If you can't offer any better means of getting at the truth the American people want and are determined to have, stand clear and don't interfere with those who are honestly trying to get that truth.

If there is political capital to be made for one party or another, or for one individual or another, from the successful prosecution of an investigation to destroy the clear and present danger of the Communist conspiracy in our Government, why should anyone apologize for that? Such political capital is earned by genuine patriotic service in defense of the security of the United States. Why should it not be eagerly sought rather than scorned?

In the face of the clear and present danger of the Communist conspiracy it is the duty of every man in official Washington to use his best efforts to rid the Government of the danger of that conspiracy. If a man must apologize for the confidence of the people that comes with faithfully performing his duty, we are in a sorry state indeed.

It is time for every Congressman and Senator to put up or shut up. If he (or she) cannot offer any better way of reaching and destroying the Communist conspiracy in our Government than is being offered by Senator MCCARTHY, then at least, for the welfare of the United States, let him hold his peace and be silent.

Loans as Panaceas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Boston Herald:

LOANS AS PANACEAS

The Government has attempted to solve the housing problem, not by attacking the basic difficulties, but by an insured loan program. The result is a rising inflation in the building industry that threatens to wipe out any advantages in liberal mortgage terms.

Small business is also beset by problems, mostly Government created. Yet rather than attack the problems, the President has proposed a program that also leans heavily on insured loans. To this end he has recommended a still further liberalization of RFC practices that already border on the excessive, as witness the $37,500,000 Lustron loan.

If anything is sick, try a loan. It's good for man or beast.

The Brookings Institution has just published a tax revision program, called Taxes and Incentives, which explores the changes needed to give back to business the old urge to go ahead. In effect, it proposes a program designed to allow business a reward proportionate to the risk taken.

Such a reform would assure little business all the loan capital it needs, without any necessity for governmental intervention. There would be no question of imposing any of the bureaucratic direction that is the accompaniment of a Federal loan-insurance program. Government needs only to restore to business the incentives it has taken away.

Yet, the Brookings Institution report is only another voice crying in the wilderness. It is the reverse of the Truman tax program. It has no hope of adoption.

This is the situation that exists today. The considered findings of impartial economists like those of the Brookings Institution have no weight in practical politics. The President's Council of Economic Advisers is supposed to comprise three judicially-minded experts who will gauge the national economy and recommend the correct course. It is to laugh.

This is not by any means to condemn the whole of the President's small-business program. Mr. Truman's suggestion for Federal charters for national investment companies which, under private direction, would provide equity capital for business is excellent. It is an extension of banking practices which would be highly useful even under an incentive tax system.

But the rest of the President's small-business program is just the old Truman loan tonic, bottled up in RFC bond, to alleviate the pangs of taxitis. It treats but doesn't cure.

Direct From the Horse's Mouth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times last Sunday printed a jingle which I believe very well illustrates the type of profound observations the taxpayers are permitted to view from time to time by the high-priced experts of the New Deal.

I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

MARKET LETTER

"While it is true that market prices might be better in the future, it is also true that they might be worse."—The Securities and Exchange Commission.

Here is the dope, from the mouth o. the horse—Snatch it.
Pithily put, with acumen and force,
Here is the dope from the mouth of the horse!
If you've a tip from a different source,
Scratch it.
Here is the dope from the mouth of the horse—Snatch it.

ARTHUR KRAMER.

The President's Program Is a Race to National Bankruptcy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the House again has rejected the Republican proposals for real economy in the Federal Government.

Federal taxes now take about 27 cents of every dollar of income earned by the American people. Wartime tax rates carried over to peacetime operations in business, agriculture, and industry already are making it more difficult for millions of families to secure the everyday necessities of life.

The people of Illinois today are paying more than five times as much for Federal Government as for their own State government at home.

Yet the President seeks to purge from Congress those who resist more spending, more debt and larger deficits. Elected representatives of the people are publicly ridiculed as obstructionists because they will not go along on the Truman joyride to bankruptcy.

It would be possible, with determined White House leadership, to cut over $3,000,000,000 from the 1951 budget without curtailing national defense and without impairing or undermining a single item of essential Federal service to the people.

The Democratic leaders have turned their backs upon economy roll call after roll call. By their votes they have reaffirmed once more the guiding slogan of Truman Treasury-busting socialism, "tax and tax, spend and spend."

Today, economy and tax reduction are no longer partisan issues. Loyal Americans of all parties should be united as never before in their demand for governmental economy and a balanced budget in Washington. Citizens in every walk of life are truly alarmed by run-away spending.

The Democratic budget deficit this year is greater than the entire cost of the Federal Government, including the Army and the Navy, in the fiscal year 1928—a prosperous year. The whole Federal budget for 1928 was $2,933,000,000. But the Truman deficit for 1950 is now estimated at $5,700,000,000 or more—after allowing for $37,306,000,000 to be spent from tax collections.

It is a challenging fact for history that this mighty Nation, with all its great wealth and power, has had only two balanced budgets since 1932.

Those two balanced budgets were under the Republican Eightieth Congress.

For the fiscal years 1947 and 1948 we showed a Treasury surplus of $9,173,000,000 and reduced the national debt by $7,000,000,000 and reduced the burden of the American taxpayers by $4,800,000,000.

Those were the only balanced budgets in the entire record since 1932.

Since June 30, 1948—a span of barely 2 years—this spendthrift administration has converted the Republican surplus of more than $8,000,000,000 into a new deficit of more than $7,500,000,000.

Thirty-two Presidents in 156 years spent $179,620,113,645. One President, Mr. Truman, in less than 5 years has spent $191,081,394,191.

That is the course we are traveling under the President's policies. It is a course which leads to national bankruptcy. Only an America aroused—determined to clean house in the squandering bureaus in Washington—can reverse this disastrous course.

That is the great challenge before the Nation in 1950.

At the present time the Truman program is running into the red at the rate of $16,000,000 a day.

When the 1950 budget was sent to Congress, the country was shocked to discover that it carried Federal expenditures at the breathtaking figure of $43,300,000,000. The budget itself estimates the deficit for 1950 as $5,433,000,000 and a similar deficit for 1951.

Only 2 years earlier, in 1948, the total budget had been $33,800,000,000.

Here we have an increase of $9,500,000,000 in 2 years.

Responsible Democrats, no less than Republicans, were shocked by this increase of almost $10,000,000,000 in the Truman spending program in the brief space of 2 years.

The distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, a fellow Missourian, commented on the President's budget in these grave words:

> From every technical and statistical point of view, our fiscal situation is the most unfavorable in the history of the Republic.

Still, almost every Republican effort at economy has been beaten back by the administration forces in both the House and Senate almost every week. Yet new proposals such as socialized medicine, Government ownership of various industries, and other bills which would interfere with our free-enterprise system and regiment our people are constantly being advocated as well as vast expenditures for foreign aid in addition to the Marshall plan, such as the fantastic illusion that we can afford to rehabilitate all the backward countries all over the world.

Our storehouse of freedom is being robbed.

The potential cost of legislation for the 15 new programs proposed by the President for fiscal year 1950–51 has been estimated at $7,020,000,000 The estimated annual cost of the programs when in full operation will be $25,187,000,000. The prospect of this is frightening.

Let me emphasize that these are not my estimates. They are not estimates made by Republican critics of the administration, but are figures furnished by the executive departments themselves.

TAXES STILL AT WARTIME LEVELS

Taxes today are near the highest level in the peacetime history of the Nation. Yet the Truman strategy board has proposed new plans and programs to add another $25,000,000,000 a year to the budget, and that would mean a new tax burden of $166 a year for every man, woman and child in the country—and this at a time when we are carrying a Federal debt of $257,000,000,000.

This debt is an unseen mortgage of $6,500 on every family in America.

Thus have the Truman spenders mortgaged not only the lives of our children but our grandchildren.

This disastrous program started out 17 years ago as managed economy. But as the budget swelled from $4,000,000,000 a year to $10,000,000,000, and then to $100,000,000,000 a year during the war, the word "economy" did not sound exactly right as the name for what they were doing.

So they shifted to "national planning."

Next they had a season of "disinflation."

But the sorry truth is that we are living under a system of "managed debt."

The American people have been enslaved to debt.

The great party of Thomas Jefferson has become the party of spendthrifts of which he would not approve. Can you imagine Thomas Jefferson not recommending a balanced budget when times are prosperous? If we cannot live within our means at such times, when will we ever be able to pay off our debts?

Let me here and now correct a misleading argument that is being presented to the American people by the administration leaders. They are trying to tell you the reason for the deficit spending that is now going on is because we are fighting a cold war which will eventually lead to peace and be less costly than a hot war. May I call your attention to the fact that in the Republican Eightieth Congress during which was inaugurated the Marshall plan we appropriated more to fight the so-called cold war than we are called upon to appropriate this fiscal year. Yet at that time we put into effect the necessary measures to balance the budget and the other economies to which I have referred.

If you will think back over those 2 years, were you in any way hurt? Did you suffer any loss of Federal services? Did you not get along just as well or better than now when the Government is on this unprecedented spending spree and recommending increase in taxes?

If the Fair Dealers win one more election it will be a green light for their socialized program with its accompanying deficit spending.

We all remember President Roosevelt before he changed his mind, when in his memorable campaign speech at Pittsburgh, Pa., October 18, 1932, he had this to say about Federal spending:

> If a nation is living within its income, its credit is good. If in some crisis it lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily on reasonable terms. But, if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds, is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, extends its

taxing up to the limit of the people's power to pay, and continues to pile up deficits it is on the road to bankruptcy.

When that historic warning was sounded our Federal debt was $19,000,000,000, or $156 per capita.

Today the debt is $257,000,000,000 or $1,700 per capita.

A CRUSADE OF PATRIOTISM

There is a patriotism in this great land today which I am certain transcends all narrow considerations of party or faction.

As Americans we are guardians and custodians of a precious heritage. We must not stand idly by and see a band of reckless, desperate Fair Deal schemers in Washington dissipate our wealth and power.

Our good American common sense tells us that we can take no more out of government than we put into it, whether we measure our contributions in spirit, energy, work, or dollars.

It is no mere spirit of partisanship which condemns as wicked and un-American those hollow promises of something for nothing which high light the Truman program today.

A crusade of patriotism is forming in this favored land, this very hour, to redeem America from the hands of confused, faltering, bungling bureaucrats, and spendthrift party liners in Washington. Men and women are joining hands, regardless of party, in a new alliance of constitutional dedication, to restore the true pattern of honest representative government.

Only a strong and solvent America can hope to hold back the dark night of godless communism. Bankruptcy and ruin are Stalin's aims for America. The Truman deficits are water on Stalin's wheel.

We must not fail in 1950.

Security Must Be Won

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, in these latter days it seems we can too often find abundant reasons for feeling that many of our high school and college graduates seem to be led to the belief that security in their years ahead will come automatically from the Government at Washington. And so it is refreshing to read an editorial in the Somerville (Mass.) Journal quoting with approval from the recent baccalaureate address to the graduating class by the distinguished president of Tufts College, Dr. Leonard Carmichael. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial as follows:

SECURITY MUST BE WON

In his baccalaureate address to the graduating class at Tufts College last Sunday afternoon, Dr. Leonard Carmichael uttered words which might well be taken to heart by all of this year's graduates, both high school and college.

"Security," he said, "is a prize which is to be won, rather than a sort of chocolate sauce poured out indiscriminately upon all individuals everywhere from a central bureaucracy."

He pointed out that under our democratic capitalistic system there are rewards for diligent and effective mental and physical labor, and that the whole American way of life is a challenge to the individual to give of his best.

Implicit in his words is a warning against the infections of political systems which are built on daydreams, which promise security to all if all will but submit to a philosophy that the state knows best, and thus the state will do the thinking for all and place all in the niche each is to occupy in furthering the dream of the state.

From the graduates of this June will come the leaders of the Nation in years hence in government, science, religion, the professions, industry, and business. Into their hands will be delivered the keeping of our democratic capitalistic system which, Dr. Carmichael said, as practiced in the United States has made more progress toward Utopia more effectively than any other socio-economic system in the world. And this progress has been achieved in accordance with the ethics and the teachings of organized Christianity and with real freedom for the individual.

Such a system is worth preserving, worth bettering. May this year's graduates be aggressive in perfecting our system and not yield to the daydreams which promise security and happiness only if the individual submits his freedom of thought, freedom of choice, and freedom of opportunity to a so-called all-wise state.

"Charges Against State Department Unsupported by Facts"—Harold Russell, National Commander, AMVETS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an address delivered by Hon. Harold Russell, national commander of the Americans Veterans of World War II, at the commander's dinner held in the Broadview Hotel, on Saturday night, June 3, 1950, as the climax to the State convention of Illinois AMVETS.

Mr. Russell's remarks follow:

The United States today is the principal champion of democracy, the only serious obstacle in the path of those who would enslave human beings.

Today the United States is the only remaining great nation of the world that is powerful enough through the vitality of its people, its natural wealth in resources, its productivity and its geographical position to insure that the things we fought for as veterans of the greatest war in history are finally realized.

Today mankind faces its greatest decision. Are we to be pawns of the state as individuals or are the states to serve individuals?

Today let us make no mistake about it. We are at war with Soviet Russia, ideologically, politically, economically, in fact in every way except in the strict military sense, and there is great danger that the final decision may have to be again in the field of battle.

You all realize that; but there are some people in our country who do not realize that there are many ways of losing a war. There are many methods used by those who would impose totalitarian states upon us that are just as dangerous as war and result in the enslavement of peoples.

We saw in the rise of Hitler how he deceived and enslaved his people by the insidious and treacherous system of pitting German against German, race against race, religion against religion, until finally a tightly organized minority party in Germany forcibly captured control of the government and enslaved the people of Germany.

That principle is divide and conquer and it is used not only by the Nazis but by the Communists. It is a cheap and bloodless victory if successful, and even though eventually there has to be a military decision it weakens desperately those nations that are divided.

Today in this country there is a real pincer attack being made on us by Soviet Russia through its treacherous stooges and through, unhappily, our own misguided zealots who either sympathize with the Communists or play into their hands by making reckless, unprincipled attacks on vitally important Government institutions such as our State Department.

Either arm of this pincer movement is deadly in its threat to our national security, to the morale of our Nation and to its effectiveness in approaching the most serious problems of foreign policy and domestic policy we have ever faced.

Our Nation and people, wishing to believe well of their neighbor nations throughout the world, were unschooled and unready to believe that the Communists would try or at least make a successful effort to infiltrate our Government, our industries, or our labor, but the bitter school of experience has taught us that they will try and unless we are exceptionally alert can accomplish a serious infiltration. Their success in at least one instance has been dramatic and we deplore the softness and naivity of the responsible Government officials in allowing such instances to occur. But we've seen the lines hardened against them; we've seen security systems put into effect in our State Department backed up by our FBI under J. Edgar Hoover, with a growing feeling of confidence that at last we've taken the measure of the enemy. Our lines have hardened, our people have faced the problem and have drawn together to combat it.

But at this very moment when, faced forward, we are successfully stopping this infiltration, we are suddenly attacked from the rear by another type of approach, the other arrowhead of the pincer movement in this country.

This attack is made on the very people who are doing a tremendous job in stopping infiltration, of guarding our sensitive areas in Government. The fact that the attacks may be well-meaning and patriotic in nature makes no difference in the effect of such attacks. Many of those who have been soft toward the Communists have been well-meaning too but are just as dangerous to us as though they were members of the Communist conspiracy.

We, as AMVETS, have done everything we can to strengthen our Nation against the inroads of communism. We helped to formulate the original Mundt-Nixon bill and have supported it in its new version now in the Senate. We have successfully kept Communists out of our own organization to the amazement of many who know how difficult that is. We have voiced our alarm at the complacency of some of our Government agencies who seemingly have been slow to realize the great danger of infiltration.

But we view with just as much alarm this other type of attack; this attack that results in a division of the American people; suspicion; distrust; and a weakening within our own ranks. Let's examine for a moment the recent attacks on our State Department which have so shocked and amazed the American people; and caused confusion and distrust of our Government in many foreign countries who are joined with us in the fight for freedom of the individual against the spread of Communist totalitarianism.

Almost all of the recent charges hurled at the State Department have been unsupported by facts. When pressed for facts, the Senator most responsible for the recent onslaught has in effect said to the responsible officials and the investigating committee "I say this is true, now you go out and prove it." Normally, public reaction to such an unfair branding without supporting evidence would be so damaging to the instigator of the attack that he would hardly dare make it, but, due to the Alger Hiss case and the growing realization on the part of the American people of the infiltration tactics of the Communists, there is a much greater readiness to believe and support such an approach than the approach itself warrants. Largely because of the Hiss episode and other facts relevant to it, there is a certain lack of confidence on the part of the people that guilty individuals will be properly exposed and prosecuted even when found. Despite the Hiss example which tends to demonstrate that such a feeling may have some grounds, it was the exception to the rule.

Actually our Government has—when compared to the governments of other democratic countries—been surprisingly successful in keeping Communists and their sympathizers out of high places; but at any rate at least in the State Department, one of our most sensitive agencies, there is now a very elaborate system to prevent Communist infiltration and that system is manned by competent men whose integrity is unimpeachable. Many of them come from the ranks of conservative republicanism, for example. This State Department security system provides for a very elaborate investigation of every applicant for a position in that State Department. When the facts are all gathered concerning such an applicant, these facts are evaluated by a board of men whom not even the State Department detractors have dared to impugn as to motive or integrity or good judgment; if an applicant gets by this security system in the State Department, his record is then turned over to the FBI for a further check by them. In the event the FBI turns up facts of a derogatory nature, again the evaluation board has all of those facts before them to protect the State Department against the employment of individuals too dangerous for sensitive positions in our Government. Granted that this system has not always existed and even as long as it has existed may not have been perfect, still it is about as good a system as an agency can adopt and it is manned and headed by competent people. It deserves public confidence. It seems to me, however, that there is a basic need for something further.

All of these agencies and their security systems are under the executive branch of our Government and there is no system for recourse by our legislative branch in case certain facts or suspicions come to them which would tend to reveal that something had leaked through the executive security set-up. At present the legislative branch has these alternatives: they can either report their suspensions to the executive branch of the Government and trust it to act in accordance with good judgment and the security of the country or they can create a public hearing which is too often undemocratic in the sense that it labels before it investigates and go about clearing the situation up by creating public pressure.

It seems to me that we could do much toward solving this dilemma if we created a subversive activities commission, four of whose members should be appointed by the President of the United States, four by the Senate of the United States, and four by the House of Representatives; provided, however, that the political affiliations of such commission members be divided—six Republicans and six Democrats to represent our two major political parties and make the board nonpartisan. This commission would be charged with investigating subversive activities in our Government at the request of the President or Members of our Congress. Their records should be open to both the President and representatives of our legislative branch. We could then expect that when a Senator or Representative had some founded suspicion there were subversive activities in any agency of our Government, this body would be in a position to get the facts and report them back before any public branding was done. At the same time it would act as a check on administrative agencies by the legislative branch and calm fears that political motivation might tend to whitewash subversive individuals.

With such a commission, not unlike the one used in the now famous Canadian atomic spy case, the public would have added protection against (1) subversive infiltration of our Government agencies and (2) unfounded and unfair attacks made perhaps for political reasons unfairly branding individuals or agencies subversive, thus sowing seeds of distrust both at home and abroad and advancing the cause of those who seek to divide and conquer.

We are faced with the greatest problems the United States has ever faced in the most troubled world ever known; we must join hands and meet these crises united. Let us approach these dangers without hysteria; let us approach them with fairness to the individual; let us approach them with the cool, wise judgment that has led our Nation to occupy the most powerful position of any nation in the world today.

As veterans of the greatest war in history—let us insist on this American way of meeting our country's problems.

Graduation for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of June 14, 1950:

GRADUATION FOR HAWAII

It is fitting that on the fiftieth anniversary of the formal organization of the Territory of Hawaii, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee should be putting the finishing touches on the bill to enable Hawaii to graduate to full statehood. All indications are that the committee will report out favorably the bill which already has twice passed the House. Whether it receives a place on the calendar then will depend on how vigorously it is pushed by the Senate leadership. In view of the tremendous amount of work that has preceded the various hearings on the bill, we think it ought to be considered a "must" obligation and put to a vote.

It is scarcely necessary to reiterate that Hawaii qualifies on every point—loyalty, education, population, fiscal responsibility, even the extraordinary participation by her electorate in voting. Never has statehood been so close. All that can be asked is that the Senate as a whole be given a chance to consider on their merits the Hawaiian statehood bill and the companion piece for Alaska. June 14, which is also Flag Day, is an appropriate time to give some thought to the importance of these two outposts of Old Glory.

Wasteful and Extravagant Spending Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a speech I made recently over the radio on the present reckless spending policies of the Government:

Friends of the radio audience, this is your Congressman, WILLIAM S. HILL, speaking to you from Washington, D. C.

I have touched on the seriousness of the debt and deficit spending policies of the Government before. Now with the end of fiscal year at hand for Government business, it seems timely and appropriate to again discuss the wasteful and extravagant spending policies of your Government and the dangerous fiscal policy we are following. I have been doing everything within my power to halt this breakneck spending, and the House of Representatives was successful in rallying sufficient strength recently to knock $2,000,000,000 off the omnibus appropriations bill for domestic expenditures. It was a bitter fight for the economy-minded Members of the House but we won out. This $2,000,000,000 slash did not touch the expenditures for our national defense, for veterans affairs, or interest on the national debt which is increasing this year because of the deficit spending policies. It is estimated that the Nation will be between five and six billions further in the red at the close of the fiscal year, June 30, 1950. This will increase our national debt to more than $256,000,000,000.

Do you realize that the average family of four persons is now paying $31.60 a week in taxes. Just think of that. Most of these taxes are hidden in the products and services you buy. The consumers pay four times more taxes now than they did 10 years ago, with 80 percent of the tax load being borne by persons making less than $5,000 a year. So don't let anyone fool you that it is the big fellow that carries the tax load.

To show you to what extent this spending burden has increased and that it threatens our national solvency; let me point out the following facts. In 1947 your Government took $39,000,000,000 out of the taxpayers' pockets and spent it; in 1948 your Government spent $42,000,000,000; in 1949 the bill for running your governmental affairs was $40,500,000,000—a grand total for 3 years of $121,500,000,000. You had to help pay that bill before you could spend or save anything for yourself.

Now the tax load you are paying isn't sufficient to meet the present high cost of the reckless spending policies which are being carried out. As I said before, the Nation is going to be between five and six billions deeper in the red at the end of this fiscal year, and the same amount is forecast for

the coming fiscal year. From the looks of things, the President's budget will amount to more than $43,000,000,000 next year. So you see, that despite the efforts of some of us to fight for economy measures, we do not have the present support or control of the reins of government so that it is possible to wipe out this deficit spending and balance the budget. But with increased support from the public which is demanding economy in Government, we can ultimately achieve that goal and get back on solid ground.

There are more than 200 different taxes today concealed in the price of a new car. These taxes amount to one-fourth of the cost of the car. The price of a loaf of bread covers 150 hidden taxes. Eight cents in taxes is hidden in the price of a quart of milk, and 25 cents is the tax bill included in the price of a 75-cent pound of meat.

I recently talked about the 50-cent dollar that the high cost of Government and inflation have brought about. This fact has been confirmed by the official Bureau of Labor Statistics report. After a survey conducted by the Bureau in 56 cities throughout the Nation, it was disclosed that the housewife who bought a $1 worth of groceries in 1939 now pays $1.95 for the same basket of groceries.

Another interesting fact to substantiate this statement about the 50-cent dollar of today is: in 1929 Federal expenditures were $121 per family; in 1939 Federal expenditures were $250; in 1949 Federal expenditures were $980 per family. These are more figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. If you jotted those figures down in your mind's eye, a quick total shows that the cost of Government for you and your family has increased tremendously. In fact, the figures are shocking. At the same time this Government agency released other figures to show that the cost of living has increased more than 100 percent in the 10 years from 1939 to 1949. Simple arithmetic shows you have now a 50-cent dollar in your pocket.

One-fourth of our national income now goes to pay the cost of government—Federal, State, and local. This means that the average worker is working 3 months each year for his government. Other spending proposals are before the Congress calling for greater expenditures. Greater expenditures mean greater taxes. That means a bigger bite out the family purse and more time spent working for the Government. If we double the cost of government, double the amount of time that must be spent to pay its cost, what will become of the workingman, the businessman, the farmer, and the others who are digging down deep now to keep the wheels of government turning. Will they turn to the Government for help to keep going? That is what happened in Germany, in Italy, and in Russia. It is taking place in England today.

Will the United States become the next nation to become socialized through taxation? I do not believe so. An aroused public, facing the terrific cost of government, the heavy tax load, the number of working days necessary to pay this heavy cost, will rebel. The public will demand a return to sensible governmental programs designed to help our economy and not cripple our freedom to progress.

Know Your Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the privilege granted to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit an article published in the Washington Post of June 14, 1950, entitled "Know Your Waterways," as follows:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS—AIDS TO LOW-COST DISTRIBUTION

Proper distribution of the Nation's products among its people is one of the principal domestic problems of the Nation. Low cost water transportation is an essential in its solution. Many bulk materials, commodities, agricultural and manufactured products widely used can be moved by water at lowest costs. Access to the seas and the Great Lakes, to the intracoastal and inland waterways are great commercial advantages. Such low-cost transportation is possible for many locations now without it; only initiative and development are necessary—exemplified by Houston, (Tex.) with its ship channel to the Gulf. Cyrus Eaton, widely known industrialist and capitalist, said before a Senate subcommittee on November 8, 1945: "I would like to know who was responsible for putting it (a steel plant) 40 miles away from water."

When continued development of our waterways will strengthen the Nation, benefit the people, and aid other systems of transportation through transshipment, why should reasonable appropriations for such improvements be bitterly opposed from certain quarters year after year?

MARINE NEWS,
GEORGE H. PALMER,
President and Publisher.

Alarm Over Reckless Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, right now the Treasury Department is conducting another bond-sale campaign. People—prospective purchasers—are greatly concerned over the value of this investment in view of the present deficit-spending program of this administration. It was the Eightieth Congress—Republican—that showed the only balanced budget in 20 years. It is obvious to everybody that there is no intention on the part of the Democrats to work for economy.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including two letters, one from a friend and constituent, Mr. Fred Wirt, and the other a letter from Mr. E. F. Bartelt, Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Department. Both letters are extremely interesting and I commend them to the Members:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
FISCAL SERVICE,
Washington, April 28, 1950.

Mr. FRED A. WIRT,
Racine, Wis.

DEAR MR. WIRT: For the Secretary, receipt is acknowledged of your letter of April 20, 1950, concerning your purchase of United States savings bonds in relation to the fiscal policies of the Government and the purchasing power of the dollar.

Both President Truman and Secretary Snyder have persistently urged reduction of Government expenditures wherever consistent with the national safety and welfare. They also advocate maintaining revenues at sufficiently high levels so as to achieve a surplus of receipts over expenditures to be used to reduce the public debt. Further, they believe it to be essential that our fiscal policy contemplate not only a surplus of revenues over expenditures, but also a surplus achieved at the lowest level of expenditures which is consistent with our needs.

Of the total estimated expenditures of $42,400,000,000 called for in the President's budget of 1951, nearly $30,000,000,000 (71 percent) result from expenditures for preserving our national security and paying the cost of past wars. These costs can be summed up in four categories: National defense, veterans' expenditures, interest on the public debt, and expenditures for international programs. Of the $12,500,000,000 remaining, $11,200,000,000 is for domestic programs essential to our national welfare, and $1,300,000,000 is for general Government costs.

In connection with your reference to the purchasing power of the dollars which may be received in redemption of savings bonds at maturity, it should be borne in mind that changes in the price levels have no different effect on the dollars with which United States Government securities are repaid than on the dollars with which other securities—corporate stocks and bonds, mortgages, and so forth—are repaid. While it is, of course, possible to place money in some forms of investment in the expectation that they would appreciate in value, thus hedging against higher prices, there would also be a corresponding speculative risk. When comparing United States Government securities to other forms of investment, therefore, it is necessary to consider, not only the possible rate of return and appreciation in value which may accrue from other forms of investment, but also the security of income and safety of principal offered by United States Government obligations.

Secretary Snyder, in his statement of February 3, 1950, before the Ways and Means Committee, discussed at some length the fiscal position of the Government and measures which he feels should be taken to assure continued sound Government fiscal operations in the years ahead. You may be interested in the facts presented in this discussion, and we are pleased to enclose a copy of the statement and the accompanying charts. Also enclosed is Secretary Snyder's speech before the United States Savings Bonds Conference on March 29, 1950, in which he discussed the important role the savings bond program plays in promoting the economic stability of our Nation as well as in securing the financial independence of individual citizens.

Very truly yours,
E. F. BARTELT,
Fiscal Assistant Secretary.

MAY 29, 1950.

Mr. E. F. BARTELT,
Fiscal Assistant Secretary,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BARTELT: A trip out of town has delayed commenting on your letter of April 28, replying to mine of April 20 in which I pointed out that a $750 investment in a D bond, April 1940 brought back in 1950 the equivalent of only 500 1940 dollars.[1]

You make several statements which I believe are open to serious question. You write: "Both President Truman and Secretary Snyder have persistently urged reduction of Government expenditures wherever consistent with the national safety and welfare."

Why then all of the many messages from the President to Congress advocating measures which involve higher Government expenditures?

[1] Based on Bureau of Labor Statistics wholesale prices (1926=100).

For 18 years out of the last 20 (1931–1950) the Federal Government has operated in the red. Only in 1947 and 1948 did the administration spend less than it received in revenue.

Federal deficits not in millions but in billions are anticipated in 1951 and 1952, with every indication of more deficits to follow.

You say: "Further, they (President Truman and Secretary Snyder) believe it to be essential that our fiscal policy contemplate not only a surplus of revenues over expenditures but also a surplus achieved at the lowest level of expenditures which is consistent with our needs."

They certainly do not act as if they believed in a surplus of revenues over expenditures.

The Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, in April, estimated the 1950 deficit to be 6.7 billion and 1951 deficit at 7.3 billion. These promise to be the greatest deficits ever incurred by the Federal Government when Americans were not fighting on battlefields. To incur such huge deficits when the Federal debt is approximately 258 billion (over $1,700 for every man, woman, and child) is unbelievably reckless, especially when the world situation is as unsettled as it is today.

You then explained that "The total estimated expenditures of forty-two billion and four hundred million called for in the President's budget of 1951, nearly thirty billion (71 percent) result from expenditures for preserving our national security and paying the cost of past wars."

As for cost of World War II, Government expenditures were unjustifiably increased by—

1. Time and a half and double time for overtime for the men and women who stayed at home.

2. The demand for unconditional surrender of Germany.

3. Orders to the American army not to take Berlin or Prague when they had every opportunity to do so.

4. Failure to obtain at least a corridor into Berlin.

5. Winning the war against Japan (largely to preserve China as an independent nation) at a cost of thousands of lives and billions of dollars, only to lose China to communism by inept and inexcusable bungling.

While on the subject of foreign affairs may I point out that national security expenditures at home and abroad have been greatly increased by the destruction of German factories and resulting inability of the German people to stage an earlier economic comeback. Mention should also be made of the crisis which seems to occur every time Congress is about ready to consider an appropriation bill. It is indeed strange that for 15 years there is always a domestic or foreign crisis whenever a big appropriation bill is about to come up for congressional consideration.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, points out that in 1948 actual expenditures for domestic-civilian (exclusive of veterans and interest) amounted to six billion and nine hundred million or 20 percent of the total while the President's request in 1951 was for twelve billion and two hundred million for domestic-civilian purposes—this amounting to 29 percent of the total. It certainly looks to this individual as if there is no desire in high places in American Government to balance the budget; to live within its income; to reduce the debt and thereby insure financial stability in the future.

If the world situation is as serious as we are led to believe by administration requests for huge appropriations for national defense, foreign assistance, etc., it is financial folly to be asking for and spending such enormous sums for domestic purposes.

On the other hand, if the world situation is not as serious as we are led to believe then there is no justification for the proposed military expenditures. In either case efficient conduct of Federal Government would do away with deficits and permit the Government to operate in the black.

Unless the Federal Government changes its present fantastic fiscal policy the dollar will continue to decline in purchasing value. People who over the years have invested in life insurance, Government bonds, savings accounts and other dollar investments will have less and less to live on when they retire. Employees will strike for pensions and welfare benefits only to find later on that they cannot receive what they anticipated. Widows and orphans will meet with increasing difficulties in meeting their expenses.

Taxation in this country is now confiscation for a large percentage of the population. Any effort to balance the budget by increasing taxes will simply add to the high cost of living for people in all walks of life. The suggestion of higher taxes is a "gold brick" which may fool some of the people now, but more and more individuals are waking up to what is happening to the purchasing value of their dollar.

As we travel the road of enormous Government expenditures, confiscatory taxation, huge Government deficits, we depart farther and farther from the highway America traveled so far, so fast and so well from the adoption of the Constitution down to recent years. The freedom of individual opportunity, the foundation on which this country was built, goes out the window as we indulge in financial excesses.

With this letter I am sending an extra copy of Fiat Money Inflation in France. If you have not read it recently may I recommend early and careful reading. During the decline of the purchasing value of the franc as described by White there were several occasions when the French Government thought they had discovered a new road to business prosperity. The financial result, however, was complete financial disaster.

Very truly yours,

FRED A. WIRT.

P. S.—Since Congress continues to pass appropriation bills, any one of which could be drastically reduced, they, too, have participated in the dangerous financial policy now pursued by the Government. Therefore, I am sending a copy of this letter to Senators ALEXANDER WILEY, JOSEPH MCCARTHY and Congressman SMITH of Wisconsin.

Graduation for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I ask permission to include a copy of an editorial from the Washington Post of even date, as follows:

GRADUATION FOR HAWAII

It is fitting that on the fiftieth anniversary of the formal organization of the Territory of Hawaii, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee should be putting the finishing touches on the bill to enable Hawaii to graduate to full statehood. All indications are that the committee will report out favorably the bill which already has twice passed the House. Whether it receives a place on the calendar then will depend on how vigorously it is pushed by the Senate leadership. In view of the tremendous amount of work that has preceded the various hearings on the bill, we think it ought to be considered a must obligation and put to a vote.

It is scarcely necessary to reiterate that Hawaii qualifies on every point—loyalty, education, population, fiscal responsibility, even the extraordinary participation by her electorate in voting. Never has statehood been so close. All that can be asked is that the Senate as a whole be given a chance to consider on their merits the Hawaiian statehood bill and the companion piece for Alaska. June 14, which is also Flag Day, is an appropriate time to give some thought to the importance of these two outposts of Old Glory.

A New Threat to the Plywood and Lumber Mill Workers of the Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, an almost unbelievable thing happened here this week. ECA announced it is going to buy about 9,000,000 feet of high-grade Douglas fir peeler and sawmill logs and ship them to Korea.

ECA is going to buy these logs with American tax dollars. It will give the logs free to the Korean Government. Koreans then will manufacture these high-grade logs into plywood and lumber and sell this plywood and lumber in competition with the products of American plywood and lumber-mill labor.

How can American labor compete with the Koreans under these conditions? The Koreans pay nothing for the logs which ECA ships to them. In addition, Korean laborers will receive 61 to 86 cents a day for their labor, as compared to the $1.70-plus hourly average wage prevailing in the Oregon-Washington lumber industry. A Korean has to work about 2 days to earn as much as an American woodworker receives in an hour.

MANY TO BE HURT

There are 56 plywood plants in the three Pacific Coast States, 29 in Washington, 22 in Oregon, and 5 in California. These plants employ 18,500 workers and have annual payrolls of $66,000,000.

Exporting high-grade logs to Korea to be manufactured there into lumber and plywood by low-paid oriental labor will jeopardize the incomes of these 18,500 plywood workers. Also, the export of these logs will jeopardize the incomes of tens of thousands of millworkers.

The very fact that this call for bids for 9,000,000 feet of high-grade logs has been issued by ECA indicates that other orders for logs may be placed later. If there is no protest against this new policy of exporting raw materials we need here at home to sustain our own American industries, the next order for logs for shipment to the Orient for manufacture there may be even larger than this first one.

UNSOUND IN MANY WAYS

Any way you look at ECA's proposal to buy up and ship first-grade logs out

of the country to the Orient for manufacture there looks absurdly senseless.

First of all, we should keep these logs in this country for processing by American workers in American plants. This country cannot remain strong unless we maintain employment at peak levels. If we do not remain strong, we will not remain free. It will profit us nothing if we undermine and weaken our own economy in our effort to help others.

Time and time again, defense authorities have said the forest product industry is a defense industry and that its plywood and lumber is essential to America's defense as well as her peacetime economy.

High-grade Douglas fir logs already are scarce. If ECA buys up large quantities of them and ships them to Korea these high-grade logs will become even more scarce than they now are.

With ECA bidding for these scarce logs with tax dollars the price of logs will be forced even higher than those which now prevail. Since the cost of logs amounts to 40 percent of the cost of manufacturing plywood, ECA's contribution to raising log prices will make building materials even higher in price. If we do not avoid getting prices too high, lumber and plywood may be priced out of the market. That would mean less home building and we need and want home home building, not less of it.

WHY AMERICAN LOGS?

Why ship American logs all the way across the Pacific Ocean from Oregon and Washington to Korea when Japan, which is only a few hundred miles from Korea, has an abundant supply of timber. Indicative that Japan is one of the great timbered areas of the world is the fact that prior to Pearl Harbor she was a great producer of pulp and paper and that in 1938 she produced 1,100,000,000 square feet of plywood, or almost one-half as much as the entire American output. If Korea needs logs to manufacture plywood and lumber, why does she not get her logs from nearby Japan? The answer, of course, is that ECA will give her American logs free whereas Japan wants to be paid for the logs she supplies.

SHOULD WITHDRAW BID CALL

I have laid all of these facts before ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman. I have urged him to withdraw his call for bids for 9,000,000 feet of high grade western Douglas fir logs which are scheduled to be opened June 28.

I have asked that the ECA staff investigate the facts before buying up and shipping these already scarce high grade logs out of the United States to the Orient.

My letter to Mr. Hoffman, Administrator of ECA, follows:

JUNE 14, 1950.

Mr. PAUL G. HOFFMAN,
Administrator, Economic Cooperation Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: ECA Requisition No. 89,570-6247-I, under which ECA is inviting bids on approximately 9,000,000 feet of choice old growth Oregon-Washington fir logs for shipment to Korea to be manufactured there into plywood and lumber, has just been called to my attention.

I hasten to protest as vigorously and emphatically as I know how to this new policy of using American dollars to buy up scarce American raw materials for export to a foreign country to be manufactured there by low-paid oriental labor into finished products.

This policy, in my opinion, and I am sure that of every citizen who knows western forest resources problems, is unthinkably absurd. If carried out this policy will further deplete a raw material resource which already is becoming increasingly scarce. It will mean the loss of jobs for many western plywood workers and sawmill workers and will undermine the domestic economy of our American wood-producing areas.

I point out that lumber and plywood are important defense materials in wartime, as well as valuable to our peacetime economy and that shipment of already scarce, choice old growth logs out of the country for manufacture abroad will undermine the possibilities of the American woodworking industry to do the job it must do, should the United States become involved in another war.

Before irrevocably committing ECA to this program of exporting old growth fir logs to the Orient, I urge upon you that you consult the National Security Resources Board for its opinion on this policy. I am confident that this Board, whose responsibility it is to study defense needs, will be as emphatically opposed to exporting choice old growth fir logs, as I am.

Canada, even now, has an embargo against the shipment of old growth peeler fir logs into the United States, which indicates the importance Canada places upon preserving her old growth timber for manufacture by Canadian labor.

I point out further that the State Department even now is considering reducing the present tariff on American plywood at a conference to be held in Torquay, England, in September. If this plywood tariff is lowered, as is now being considered, the American market will be increasingly flooded with Canadian plywood. Canada will be able to do this because Canadian plywood manufacturing costs are much lower than in the United States.

I point out that if the ECA engages in competing with plywood and lumber manufacturers in buying up logs for export to the Orient, log prices in this country, which are already high, will be further increased, thereby adding to lumber and plywood manufacturing costs since the price of raw materials are important in the costs of manufacturing plywood and lumber.

I sincerely hope that the ECA will withdraw its call for bids on old growth Douglas fir logs for export to the Orient. I hope that ECA before any action is taken will consult the National Security Resources Board and the industry for their views on this most important policy—important to the industry, to its employees and most of all to the wartime security of the Nation.

Furthermore, American workmen cannot compete with oriental low-wage and low-living standards, and in exporting these logs ECA will, in fact, be exporting the jobs of American workers. It is bad enough to open our markets to the influx of goods from low-wage foreign countries, but is infinitely worse to export our raw materials to low-wage countries to be manufactured there at starvation oriental wages into finished goods to compete with similar goods produced by American labor under American standards.

I do not know at this moment what the wage rate in Korea is but I presume it is very close to the wage rates prevailing in the forest-products industries of Japan. The wage rate in the wood-production industries of Japan last year was 223.7 to 256.8 yen a day, which in United States dollars means 61 to 81 cents a day. In short, a Japanese woodworker has to labor 2 days to make as much as American workers are paid for 1 hour's work.

I am certain that this policy of exporting choice old-growth fir logs to the Orient for manufacture there into finished products by low-wage oriental labor will arouse widespread and bitter protests from the entire west coast lumber areas. This can be prevented by withdrawing the call for bids on these logs and pursuing an investigation of the problems involved.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL V. MACK,
Member of Congress.

Oleo Birds Come Home To Roost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, all is not well in the camp of those who fought the battle for the Oleo Trust a few months ago. Those Members who carried the fight for the dairy farmer charged that the big Oleo Trust would put the "little boys" out of business once repeal became effective. That is the real situation today, Mr. Speaker, and I am not joining the "I told you so" chorus to be mean, but only to keep the record straight.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an article by Earl Richert which appeared in the Washington News entitled "Oleo Price War":

OLEO PRICE WAR

(By Earl Richert)

The oil's a-boiling in the margarine industry as Jubilee Day approaches—July 1—when all Federal taxes on margarine go off.

Instead of being one big happy family, a price war is on as margarine manufacturers jockey to get their brands in favorable market positions.

Some of the smaller companies complain they are being squeezed by the price competition of the larger concerns.

Many of the people who pushed the margarine-tax-repeal bill through Congress express deep concern over the developments.

They fear that the result will be to force many concerns to raise prices to make up their losses soon after tax repeal becomes effective. This, they say, will make it appear that the dairy forces were right. Dairy spokesmen contended that the margarine makers would raise prices after taxes were repealed and the consumer would get little, if any, benefit.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, who led the margarine fight in the Senate, said that from what he could learn, a dog-eat-dog situation exists within the margarine industry.

He said he had been told some concerns are using 1-cent sales to sell extra pounds; others have started offering premiums, and some have arranged to rebate to grocers the Federal taxes paid on margarine delivered before July 1.

He also said many firms apparently had not raised margarine prices in line with the recent increase in the prices of cottonseed and soybean oils, which are ingredients of margarine. Some smaller firms which do not have large financial reserves cannot withstand such competition, he said.

"I deplore this situation," Senator FULBRIGHT said. "It's a very bad thing to have happened.

"What will happen is that many of these companies which now are apparently selling at a loss will eventually have to raise prices. Prices of margarine should have been adjusted upward along with the price of oil."

The Bureau of Labor Statistics shows there has been an over-all increase since February of about 1 cent per pound in the retail price of white margarine. But margarine spokesmen in Congress say this is not enough to cover the increased price of the oil ingredients.

They fear, too, that the current situation will put steam behind a resolution introduced by Senator HERBERT LEHMAN, Democrat, of New York, to investigate the margarine industry from a monopoly standpoint. If the price war continues long enough, it is said, many small manufacturers will be forced out of business and the field will be left to the large concerns.

The Lehman resolution is pending in the Senate Judiciary Committee. The New York Senator also is sponsoring a resolution to have the Agriculture Department investigate the effects of margarine tax repeal on agriculture.

Subversives in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following radio address made by me over several Michigan stations on June 4, 1950:

Millions of Americans are asking sharp questions concerning the attitude of the Truman administration toward Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY'S charges that various Government departments, and especially the Department of State, are infested with Communists and fellow travelers; also that nearly 4,000 moral deviates in Federal Government jobs are bad security risks, even though all of them may not as yet have fallen prey to Communist blackmailers.

At first many in Washington were inclined to believe that Senator MCCARTHY had bitten off more than he could chew; that conditions are not as bad as his charges might lead one to think. But as more and more of the things he told the Senate Investigating Committee, were shown to be true, opinion in Congress veered in favor of MCCARTHY.

The question now among most Members of Congress, as elsewhere throughout the country, no longer concerns whether MCCARTHY can make his charges stick; the question now concerns whether the administration is trying to cover up one of the worst scandals in the history of the American Republic. From what I have seen and heard myself, I believe this latter question can be answered in the affirmative.

The administration and its political hangers-on is, indeed, trying frantically to cover up a scandal that is likely to result in a complete repudiation of that section of the Democrat Party which subscribes to Fair Dealism in any of its manifestations.

Senator MCCARTHY'S charges are not mere political maneuvering. They are in fact the expression of a patriotic anxiety for the survival of his country and its free institutions on the part of a red-blooded, two-fisted American; the kind who went out and risked his life in defense of this Nation. The same cannot be said of a majority of those who seek to controvert his charges. Not all, but entirely too many of them are slightly doubtful characters, whose war records are political rather than military.

Senator MCCARTHY is an able lawyer, with a keen legal mind and extensive experience on the bench, both State and Federal. He is obviously not a man to make charges without facts to back them up. On the other hand, only too often his opponents have demonstrated in past years a willingness to let partisan political considerations outweigh the public interest.

When Senator MCCARTHY said that "No matter how much MCCARTHY bleeds, this matter shall be pursued until the truth is made known," he meant exactly what he said. He spoke as a patriotic American—not as one who would play politics at the risk of national security. Perhaps he is content to leave that for those who have sought to investigate him rather than the charges he has made, and is continuing to make.

State Department officials, and some even higher in the administration, are crying to Heaven that MCCARTHY is bent on destroying the confidence of the American people in their Government. They cry with equal distress that he is destroying the confidence of free nations abroad in this country's ability to handle the Communist threat within our own borders, to say nothing of helping them to fight it within their own.

Why did they not think of these things before? Why have they embraced so much of the Communist ideology in their legislative proposals? Why have they coddled and protected Communists and fellow travelers in Government during and since the war? Why are they now seeking by every means within their power to conceal from the American people the evidences of their guilt in this respect? Do they think for an instant that anything can destroy the confidence of free Americans in their free Government? Or are they skulking and covering up with full knowledge that every new revelation is destroying solely the confidence of the American people, and the other free peoples of the world, in them as public officials who have betrayed their trust?

Now the State Department and the President himself, challenge Senator MCCARTHY to offer some actual proof of the charges made before the Senate Investigating Committee. They tell the world that he has accomplished nothing. Well, let us see about that. Just what has he accomplished?

He forced the State Department to discharge 91 homosexuals, and brought into the open the Washington police records of nearly 4,000 other sex deviates, a major portion of whom work for the Government; he reopened the scandalous Amerasia case, and he forced the American people to realize that for more than a decade there has been coddling of Communists and fellow travelers in Government service. He made it known beyond any question that some Communists have been occupying key positions of trust in Government.

The disclosure of homosexuals in large numbers on Government payrolls was not a political action by police officials; the names of these people and their records are down in black and white in the police files. There can be no argument about it. How can anyone doubt that in the murky depths of this immoral cesspool within the Federal Government, subversion has been and is now almost as prevalent as the perversion which makes its practitioners such easy prey for blackmailing Communist espionage agents? You know the answer to that just as well as Senator MCCARTHY knows it.

In forcing a complete reopening of the notorious Amerasia case, MCCARTHY rendered perhaps what is the most conspicuous service of all. In so doing, he carried to a victorious conclusion a fight that I and some other congressional Republicans have been waging ever since the autumn of 1945. It is a victory of the utmost importance, because this case provides the key that can, and now I believe will, open the door on the whole dirty mess of wartime connivance between American officials and Communist spies in the United States.

It would serve no purpose at this time to repeat once more the story of how this case was hushed up in 1945, after the FBI had arrested six people, including three Government employees, and three persons connected with the Amerasia magazine. Most of you know how the case was switched from one Federal grand jury to another; how evidence was gathered by the Counter-espionage Office of Strategic Services and the FBI was suppressed in large measure; how by reason of this only three of the six were indicted, and the indictment of one of the three was quashed at the request of the Department of Justice; and how the remaining two were let off with small fines at an early morning court session of which no public notice had been given.

Most of you are aware, too, that the Amerasia case did not involve the mere borrowing by an innocent magazine editor of a few unimportant Government documents, as those who seek once more to hush up the affair would have you believe. There were 1,900 documents, many of them involving national security in wartime. Some of these documents outlined the disposition of the Chinese Nationalist armies then fighting the Communists. Others contained the plans developed by the American high command for bombing Japan; and, mind you, this was long before Japan surrendered. Still another document contained vital information on the atom-bomb development, at a time when even high Army and Navy officers, to say nothing of the American people, knew nothing of it.

In the course of their fight to keep the Amerasia case alive, and ultimately to defeat those who would prevent the use of this key to knowledge of the whole Communist espionage conspiracy, Republicans in the House of Representatives, by their insistence, forced an investigation of the case by a House Judiciary subcommittee in 1946. This investigation was held behind closed doors. Thereafter the subcommittee sealed up and suppressed the record of the secret hearings. The Democratic majority of the committee issued a report on the investigation, which was in effect a whitewash for the Amerasia defendants. This, in spite of the fact that two of them had refused to defend themselves and had paid fines in Federal court.

Still later, when Republican Members demanded to see the record of this investigation, they were told that the record was lost. But it was not lost. Recently it bobbed up again in the Judiciary Committee files. Then a week ago the Amerasia case got so hot that the Democrat who was chairman of the investigating committee was forced to spread the record of the investigation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where everyone may read it. The record shows that no whitewash of the Amerasia defendants was warranted. At the same time, the committee Democrats attempted to show that a Republican had asked to have the record suppressed. This attempt was squelched by influential Congressman GENE COX, of Georgia, who chided his fellow Democrats with a statement on the House floor that the Amerasia case smells higher to heaven every time it is stirred up.

There is evidence, in the form of a statement by a witness before the Judiciary Investigating Subcommittee, to show that during the time the record of the investigation was suppressed, one or more portions of the

record had been removed. Apparently the name of at least one famous individual, who was involved as a conspirator in the Amerasia case, had been eliminated. This undoubtedly is the man recently referred to by Senator McCarthy, when he said that presently he would name an internationally famous man in connection with the affair.

When things like this happen, or when there is even good reason to suspect that they have happened, can anybody doubt that an all-out effort is being made to conceal from public knowledge one of the worst scandals ever permitted by a Federal administration in the history of the United States? In the light of these things, why should anyone believe otherwise than that a house-cleaning job was done on the State Department loyalty files before they were finally opened to the Senate investigating committee?

You may be sure, that before long, and in the end, the disclosures of Communist infiltration of the Federal agencies, the disclosures of connivance in wartime between Communists and high officials of Government, will serve to blast out of public office many who have succeeded in the past in winning the trust of the American people. When that is done, the United States will be stronger than ever, and more than ever will possess the admiration and confidence of the entire world, thanks to Senator McCarthy.

Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, here is the Flag Day speech which I promised and proposed to deliver yesterday. Since the House was not in session yesterday, I am including the speech as an extension of remarks:

A few days ago I drove to Mount Vernon, that place which to the world is a place of pilgrimage, where the grand and the simple folks come to reverence the memory of a man who was great, not because he was brilliant, but because in a critical time he was level-headed and brave; a soldier and statesman, an American, far-seeing and self-forgetting; strong in body and spirit, true to his country and himself, Virginia's first citizen, George Washington. Kings come to his grave to learn of him.

I drove back up the Potomac to Arlington. There I stood under the white-pillared portico of an old southern mansion on that historic hill which overlooks the Potomac. As I looked toward the Capitol, I thought of the passions which were raging under the dome dedicated to liberty and the preservation of democratic institutions back in those days when Robert E. Lee made his momentous decision to take no part in any invasion of any of the Southern States. I thought of him, not as a southerner, but as that greatest of all military strategists and leaders; as an American whose rare ability and whose devotion to a cause are the heritage of all his fellow citizens, north and south, east and west, in Minnesota and Texas and in Vermont as in Virginia.

On my way to the Capitol I stopped and looked once again at that classic memorial where sits the marble statue of Abraham Lincoln, who needs no monument. The rugged, honest, steadfast perseverance and stanch Americanism of this man stand as examples and objectives which the Nation, and all of us as individuals, may well try to emulate. Unwavering in his loyalty to the fundamentals of the American Government, his genuine respect for the Constitution and his grave concern for the destiny of the Republic ended only with his death.

I looked down the river toward Mount Vernon, and across the river at Arlington, and once more at the Lincoln Memorial, and I thought and said, and say again, these three, Washington, Lincoln, and Lee, are three of our greatest Americans.

Then I started for the Capitol around the Tidal Basin. My attention was attracted to the marble memorial to Thomas Jefferson. Thomas Jefferson, thought I, that man who was and still is the greatest and most influential exponent of both liberalism and Americanism.

He too needs no memorial, for his memory is enshrined in the heart of every American. He it was who formulated the creed of Americanism. He stands out and forever will stand out as the most integrally and truly American among his contemporaries. Thomas Jefferson was and is the greatest political philosopher of America and one of her greatest sons. He who as one of the founders of the Republic wrote the Declaration of Independence, and, as the statesman he was, added Louisiana to the Union, will never be forgotten. Right it is that he take his place with Washington, Lincoln, and Lee.

Justly has it been said of him that he was the greatest prophet of government and expounder of human rights that the world has produced. His extraordinary influence on the development and growth of liberalism and democratic ideas throughout the world cannot be overestimated, nor can the extent of his contribution to the growth of democracy be measured or comprehended. For such ascendancy as was his there is no parallel in English politics. "To match Jefferson you would have to roll Benthan and Cobden and Gladstone into one," says Hirst in his Life and Letters of Thomas Jefferson.

Most people do not appreciate the fact that exactly the same kind of men and women, determined, sure dogged; possessing the sterling qualities of honesty, perseverance, thrift, and a serious conception of life's responsibilities—just that same type it is which talked about, fought for, and wrought out the principles of civil and religious liberty which are the foundation of all free institutions.

These forebears of ours did not attempt to indulge in oratorical expressions when they insisted in inserting in their Bill of Rights the statement that a "frequent recurrence to fundamental principles, and a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, industry, and frugality are absplutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty and keep government free."

They were not theorists, neither were they philosophers. They had the innate, intense, and ineradicable notion that a man had a right to be free, to be secure; and they undertook to pass on to all their posterity that freedom and security here. So they opened schoolhouses, built churches, made laws that suited their consciences, and secured the rights of individuals.

They meant exactly what they said, and they said exactly what they meant, and, as a consequence, from those little green hills and valleys I love, and from those humble, unpretentious homes which are found in my State and yours, there have walked out, and there will still walk out, through all the splendid history of the days to come, men and women whose deeds have changed and will change the map and the current of the history of the world, whose accomplishments are the possession and the proud heritage of us all. For after all is said and done, while we talk and act like easterners, westerners, northerners, and southerners, we are not, but, rather, are Americans; and we may insist proudly but modestly, with Algernon Sidney, that "Where liberty is, there is our country."

The danger is that millions of Americans do not realize the gravity of the situation in which a republican government finds itself today. It is not vested with any inevitable immortality. It has died before in history. All this can happen here, may happen here, is happening here—and on this continent and in this generation. No price we may be called upon to pay will be too great to prevent it, for history proves and experience teaches that in the long run a republican form of government is safer and superior to a dictatorship.

St. Paul said he was a citizen of no mean country. The Romans challenged the world with the slogan "I am a Roman." What, then, should be the attitude and the state of mind of every American when he takes time to consider the vastness of the domains, the type and multitudes of peoples, and the wealth of all kinds, over which fly the Stars and Stripes of his country today. To no man or woman in the long history of mankind and the story of world conquest in the rise and fall of nations has it ever meant so much as it now means to you and me to be able to say, "This is my own, my native land."

The call to good citizenship and patriotism, as reduced to its lowest common denominator, is as loud and strong, if not louder and stronger, today than ever before. Never before have we come to a crossroads such as that at which we as Americans have now arrived.

Our only safety lies in our knowing and understanding and being fully informed with respect to the facts. It is our responsibility to be so informed. It is our obligation to ourselves and to posterity.

There are certain ideas and ideals of the civilization for which we stand, the destruction and obliteration of which we as Americans will not tolerate wherever that road of determination may lead us.

The basic principles at stake are those on which this Nation was founded and for which our forebears fought and died in order that we might be free. Our heritage of democratic idealism is criticized and challenged today by totalitarian and authoritarian forces whose theories, ages old, have always been repugnant to us. They cannot coexist with our democratic theories and with our way of life.

The totalitarian countries do not want our kind of government, and experience teaches that democracy cannot be imposed by force.

No man knows what lies ahead of us as a nation or as individuals. We are pledged by all that is good, and honorable, and holy, to maintain the ideals of democracy. We are committed to something more than keeping possible invaders from our shores.

We are bound by our love of life, and are on our sacred honor to keep alive in this Nation those ideals which have made America great. We should dedicate ourselves anew to an unending determination to make this country one in which all men shall have equal rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We should consecrate ourselves to the end that this Government of ours shall continue to establish justice and make secure the blessings of liberty. We should highly resolve that this Government of ours shall not perish from the earth.

"To what new fates, my country, far
And unforeseen of foe or friend,
Beneath what unexpected star
Compelled to what unchosen end?

"Across the sea that knows no beach
The Admiral of Nations guides
Thy blind obedient keels to reach
The harbor where thy future rides.

* * * * *

"I do not know beneath what sky
Nor on what seas shall be thy fate
I only know it shall be high;
I only know it shall be great."

The Stars and Stripes. Your flag. What does it signify to you? Let me tell you that its stripes, straight and true, now as in the day of its adoption by the Continental Congress, point to the original American thrust against tyranny. Its field of stars, representing a constellation, has expanded to reveal the greatest aggregation of self-governing States on the face of the earth.

The flag should remind each and every one of us of the noble and glorious traditions of our country. It waved at Lexington, conquered at Bunker Hill and Kings Mountain; ensanguined but glorified with fratricidal blood, it was raised at Chickamauga and Chancellorsville and Gettysburg. It flew from the masthead of the *Oregon* as Clark sailed around the Horn, and was triumphant with Dewey and Sampson at Manila and Santiago; at Belleau Wood, Chateau Thierry and the Argonne, and in countless battles across the seas it led the way to victory, inspiring our soldiers and sailors to uphold the honor, prestige, and glory for which it stands.

The symbol of a constitutional democracy assuring all protection of the personal liberties of the humble citizen, it stands—the guardian over the security of a vast domain of incredible wealth, the while it is the protector of our firesides and our altars.

As the symbol of the heart and soul and patriotic consecration of the people of a very great nation, it typifies a century and a half of magnificent history and is of a value inestimable and immeasurable.

Our flag is what we make it and keep it. It means only what we make it mean. It must be fought for and rededicated day by day. There is room under the American flag for change and growth. The revolution from which it was born was our first forward charge in man's age-long struggle to loose himself from every form of involuntary servitude. The times in which we live today call for an abiding faith in democracy and in the American traditions of self-government. There is no room beneath the flag of freemen for the solution of our problems by any other method.

There is no banner in all the world that carries such hope, such promise, such grandeur of spirit as the Stars and Stripes. It was made by liberty, and for liberty, and carried in its service. But never once in all the world has it been made to stoop to dictatorship or despotism, nor shall it ever be. It is no painted rag. Hopes in its folds are embraced, and in them are emblazoned our whole national history.

It is the Constitution.

It is the Government.

It is the free people who stand in the Government on the Constitution.

Address at Moravian Seminary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the commencement exercises at Moravian Seminary:

I am very grateful for your invitation to participate today in the commencement exercises of Moravian Seminary.

This is not only an honor, which I appreciate, but also an opportunity to share with you for a day in the tranquillity that pervades these historic halls.

Here, in the calmness of this academic atmosphere, in a background of long-standing tradition, we may view the world objectively. And here, too, we can find the wellsprings of faith and inspiration from which to renew our strength in meeting the urgent problems of our day.

Too often in the rush and preoccupation of everyday life—with current events pressing their demands upon our time and attention—we are prone to forget the past, its influence upon the present, and the lessons it points as a guide to the future. I am reminded that among the wise inscriptions on our National Archives Building in Washington there is one which says: "What is past is prologue." The stage has already been set by those who preceded us before we come upon the scene in this life.

Too often we forget the debt we owe to our forebears of generations past—those pioneering souls who made it possible for this Nation to attain its present greatness, and for us to enjoy its freedoms.

The founders of this great institution—the oldest women's seminary in the Nation, in fact older than the United States—were among those hardy early settlers. The victims of religious persecution among the displaced persons of their time, they found in this land a haven where they might worship God in their own way.

Even before the Revolutionary War their missionaries carried the gospel to the Indians. They established this city of Bethlehem, then merely an outpost on the borders of the wilderness, and the neighboring community of Nazareth.

No doubt the heroic story of Count von Zinzendorf, of Bishop Spangenburg, and of their little band of Moravian followers, is familiar to most of you, but its significance lies in their contribution to making possible the progress which America and its people have achieved since that time.

Thanks to those who laid the foundations we have attained the highest standard of living of any nation on earth. But more than that material achievement, we have demonstrated the practical possibility of our democratic way of life.

We have shown the world that men and women of varying faiths, of different nationality backgrounds, and of many racial strains, can live and work together in peace and harmony.

Of course we have not reached the millennium. There are still imperfections and some injustices in our economic, political, and social systems but we have advanced further along the road to the ultimate goal of the brotherhood of man than any other people.

Is it too much to hope, is it too high to aim, for a similar pattern of peaceful living on a universal scale? Those aspirations were embodied in the establishment of the United Nations 5 years ago.

We learned, bitterly, after the First World War, the lesson of our negligence in that respect. We disarmed quickly and to the point of weakness where we were a tempting target for the forces of aggression. We spurned the League of Nations. We turned our backs on the rest of the world.

This time after World War II, we helped to create an instrumentality designed to safeguard the peace and security of the world. Fifty-eight other nations signed that Charter with us.

But scarcely was this venture launched, barely had we beaten down the world-conquering ambitions of the Nazis and Japan than a new threat to peace appeared. Our former ally, Soviet Russia, set out upon a campaign of aggression and conquest, and bolted the United Nations. It dishonored agreements; it flouted international law.

By military and economic pressures, by subversion, by propaganda, it extended its borders and brought small surrounding nations under its sway.

In 1941 the Kremlin ruled some 193,000,000 people in the area of 8,500,000 square miles. Today 755,000,000 people and 16,000,000 square miles of the earth's surface are within the power of this new aggressor whose announced objective is to communize the world and make every other nation a creature of Moscow.

America came out of World War II stronger in a material way, and in principles, than any other country. Inevitably the leadership in world affairs, and in safeguarding ourselves and other freedom-loving people from this mad, ruthless, and terroristic threat, devolved upon us.

We emerged to our present position not through war of conquest, not through ambitions of empire or designs upon the territory of others but in the fateful sequence of events which witnessed the decline of other nations which once might have blocked the Soviet alone.

Under the Truman doctrine we took action to halt the Communist advance in Greece. We blocked it in Turkey, in Italy, and in France.

Through the Marshall plan of economic aid, we helped to rehabilitate the war-stricken nations of Europe, restored their economy and their strength and their will to resist.

Under the Atlantic pact and the mutual defense assistance program we are helping them to arm against potential attack by this new aggressor.

All these things we have done, yet striving meanwhile to assure peace. The danger of war does not arise from policies which we and other democracies of the world are pursuing. We will never take the offensive in a shooting war. The United States is continuing to faithfully observe the accepted tenets of peaceful international relations and the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

But we have no way of knowing or predicting what is in the minds of those who control the Government of the Soviet Union or what they will do next.

The so-called cold war that has been raging for these many months is being carried on not only on the diplomatic front, in the economic field, and in the area of military preparations, but also on the levels of psychology and ideology.

The one thing we do know is that our greatest weapon—more powerful than any bomb that man can devise—is the force of truth, embodied in the basic and eternal principles that have prevailed for more than 2,000 years.

These we find in the Ten Commandments, in the Golden Rule, in the Sermon on the Mount; in our own Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution with its Bill of Rights.

For those ideals men have fought and died. Some of those men who died at Brandywine for those ideals of individual freedom and human dignity are buried on the green acres of your school.

Those principles are timeless and apply to all mankind. Through them we can inspire other peoples and impel them to action.

Our greatest hope for peace for you and for succeeding generations of Americans is in the spiritual and moral leadership which we offer to the world. It must be, however, a dynamic philosophy, a living tradition, to which we ourselves are true.

From your studies of history you know that the great nations of this world, those that have exerted the most marked influence for good, are those whose leaders were men of vision with great spiritual qualities.

The dictators, the tyrants, have their brief innings, fall into limbo, and are remembered only for the evil they did, but the product of the work of moral leadership lives on. The might and the wealth of many great nations have vanished—but the vision of the teachings of Jesus is a potent influence in the world today.

The real issue in the present conflict is the battle of our living spiritual philosophy against the materialism of communism which denies the existence of God. Mark how many thousands of churchmen have been arrested in Communist-dominated countries.

The campaigns of the Communists against the clergy show clearly their fear of spiritual truth, their fear of the strength and durability of spiritual leaders. In this way, indirectly, the Communists acknowledge that the churches are spiritual strongholds that stand against their efforts to enslave mankind.

The members of the Politburo—the little band of men who rule the Soviet empire—themselves understand only the language of a greater military force and will bow to superior might. That is why, so far, they have been deterred from actual war. But for their subjects, for the millions whom they control under the lash of police power in their own and their puppet police states, they fear the power of spiritual truth.

I lay special stress upon these thoughts because I realize it is not easy for you, who go out today into the stream of our national life, to contemplate the thought that humanity faces the possibility of self-extinction by superbombs. It is only to the higher principles of faith in the Lord that we can turn for a solution of our problems. The potential condition, the idea that weapons with horrendous powers of instantaneous destruction are in the making, we must face calmly and realistically. We must neither permit ourselves to fall victims to an enemy's psychological warfare of panic, nor bury our heads in the sands of ignorance.

You are a wiser generation than those who went before you. Having lived through the period of World War II, you realize that should another war come, with all its brutality, horror, and suffering, there will be no real victory for anyone, even those who triumph in battle. Civilization as we know it will be the loser.

"What, then, do we have to look forward to?" you may well ask, and "What should be our goals?"

Economically the opportunities in the United States are unlimited. Vast new frontiers have been opened up by developments in atomic energy, chemistry, in communications, and in other fields of the sciences, business, and professions.

American economy is geared to an expansionist program. Its population is increasing. The number of family units is increasing even more rapidly. The demands for consumer goods will go on. Our human, economic, and natural resources are rich, and our national income is at its highest level in history.

On the score of your ability to find your place in the world of affairs and to achieve success I have no doubts. But the major concern of your generation should be not on the material side of life but with how to solve the social and political problems of the day. And I mean political in its broadest, not its partisan, sense.

The first step in an effort to solve the social and political problems of our own country and of the world is to become well informed on those problems. We must learn to approach those problems with an open mind and intellectual willingness to understand the personal and social problems of other individuals, other groups, other nations.

And, above all, to take an active part in public affairs by fulfilling our duties as citizens. For, although we cherish the rights that are our heritage, those rights also carry with them responsibilities and duties.

It is a duty to register and to vote in order to have a direct voice in the determination of the policies which we want to see carried out by our elected officials.

It is all well enough to speak of our individual liberty as precious but it must be guarded zealously and constantly—not by others, not by someone else, by each and every one of us day by day in our personal actions and our public interest.

We must satisfy ourselves, in our own hearts, that we are giving more than lip service to the principles which we profess.

Only in that way, in the spirit of generous service to our fellow men, can we justify the sacrifices of the past. Only in that way can we assure success in the greatest task ever faced by any generation of man in the fight to preserve peace in the world.

Corps of Engineers, United States Army, Celebrates One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary, Friday, June 16, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, Friday, June 16, is the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, and I think that it is quite appropriate that the Congress should take cognizance of this auspicious occasion.

We have heard encomium on the floor of this House for the Corps of Engineers time and again. However, it is not amiss on this anniversary of this fine organization to recall again the glorious history, traditions, achievements, and accomplishments, both in war and in peace, of the Army engineers.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps, we in the lower Mississippi Valley, and especially in Louisiana, have been closer to the Corps of Engineers than other parts of our country due to the fact that since 1824 the fine and able men who composed this organization have been constantly fighting devastating floods that come down upon us each year through the Ohio, Illinois, Mississippi, Red, Arkansas, White, St. Francis, Ouachita, Atchafalaya, and other rivers, and although handicapped by meager and intermittent appropriations to carry on the fight they have never hesitated nor wavered in their interest, determination, and effort to protect the lives and property of our people.

Mr. Speaker, with the help of the Congress, the Corps of Engineers have done much to protect us from recurring disasters, and while their plans are about to come to fruition, and it is estimated within 3 years the major portion of their program for carrying the floods safely through Louisiana to the Gulf will be in sight, this cannot be accomplished without the continued generosity and responsibility of the Congress by making available the necessary appropriations to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Congress will provide these critically necessary appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, if this is done, the Corps of Engineers shall have accomplished one of the greatest works in the history of the world, and for the first time in our history, we will feel secure and the lives and property of our people will be safe.

Mr. Speaker, it is not for me to eulogize the Corps of Engineers for they know how we feel about them. They have been devoted to our cause; they have a warm spot in our hearts, and we are grateful to them and to the Congress for all that they have done for us.

All over the United States this anniversary of the founding of the Corps of Engineers is being celebrated, and I would like to include with these remarks an article from the New York Times of June 11, in commenting on this occasion, as follows:

ENGINEERS TO CELEBRATE—ARMY CORPS TO MARK ITS ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY ON FRIDAY

The Corps of Engineers will mark its one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary on Friday.

On June 16, 1775, the Continental Congress, acting on the request of Gen. George Washington, resolved that there should be appointed one chief engineer and two assistants.

General Washington named Col. Richard Gridley of Massachusetts as Chief Engineer. Colonel Gridley's first job was throwing up the defenses at Bunker Hill. His second was to throw down his shovel and join in the fighting that followed.

Today, the Army engineers still stand ready to build fortifications, supply lines, and every known type of national defense, and when necessary serve as infantry.

During the last war the corps reached a strength of more than 750,000 men. Of this total, more than 500,000 were overseas.

Mr. Speaker, from the New Orleans Times-Picayune of the same date, I also would like to include an article by Hal R. Yockey, regarding the one hundred and seventy-fifth birthday of the Corps of Engineers, giving interesting historical facts about the Army engineers, especially in respect to their work and accomplishments in Louisiana and the lower Mississippi Valley. The article follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIVE OF UNITED STATES ENGINEERS' 175 YEARS SPENT CURBING RIVER

(By Hal R. Yockey)

This week an outfit which has spent 125 years making a good neighbor out of 12,000,000,000,000 gallons of truculent water celebrates its one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary.

The organization is the Corps of Engineers and the giant it has subdued—but never hopes to tame is the Mississippi River system that drains 41 percent of the land area of the United States.

The New Orleans office of the engineers, one of the oldest in the United States, will formally mark the anniversary at 2 p. m. Friday when more than 1,000 of the 2,000 district engineer employees will be given service certificates for having worked from 10 to 30 years for the corps.

Their total service put end to end would be an infinitesimal part of the age of the

Mississippi, but since 1717 when the French engineer de la Tour put up the first earth embankments along the river in New Orleans, man has devoted an enormous amount of effort and money to make restive a rogue river.

The history of the engineers in the district began nearly 50 years after the appointment by the Continental Congress in 1775 of a chief engineer at a salary of $60 per month and two assistants at wages of $20 per month each.

BEGIN FLOOD FIGHT

It wasn't until 1824 that Congress decided to put peacetime military engineers to work on the job of conservation and development of streams. Congressional authority saw the corps almost simultaneously begin removing snags, boulders, and other obstructions to navigation in the Mississippi near New Orleans.

With the job came the plagues of the South's swamps—chills and fever, the poxes, yellow jack, and cholera. Knee-deep in mire, cutting their way with machetes, the engineers began the task of protecting cities and settlers from the devastation of almost annual floods.

Headquarters for engineers before the War Between the States was at Ship Island, off the Mississippi Gulf coast.

And in the days of preparation for the struggle that pitted State against State, the Government adopted a rather frugal attitude.

For example, in one of the letters from the War Department Lt. John C. Palfrey was authorized to hire a surgeon for men stationed on the island, at a rate of pay not to exceed $80 per month and his board.

The Army then pointed out that it is "important to exercise the most rigid economy (and) * * * it is suggested that the person engaged would perform in addition the duties of clerk. If the two duties could be combined in the same individual a considerable saving could be effected."

AWAKE TO PROBLEM

The New Orleans river and harbor district had a timely birth in the reconstruction days, when the levee system that existed before the war had been practically destroyed.

But establishment of the district office here in 1867 by Brevet Brig. Gen. M. D. McAlester did not stem the Mississippi's rampages. From October 1866 until October 1874, in the State of Mississippi alone 107 miles of levee buckled into the bloated river in its annual rampages.

It was in that era that the public first became dimly conscious of the fact that flood control was a national problem. Politicians seized upon it, and in State and Federal elections it became a campaign issue.

Tangible results came with creation of the Mississippi River Commission in 1879. Men of national prominence were named to the Commission, including Gen. Benjamin Harrison, later President of the United States, and Capt. James B. Eads, builder of the jetties at the mouth of the Mississippi.

LEVEES BOLSTERED

While the act creating the Commission required it to prepare plans to prevent destructive floods, the earlier appropriations usually restricted levee construction and repair to such work as was a part of the navigation improvement plans.

The coordinating effect of the commission soon began to be felt as the levee program advanced. Breaches were repaired, other levees raised and strengthened. The year 1898 found the South passing its first flood year without a crevasse. The good luck held until 1903.

Floods, though their destructive force cost residents of the South millions of dollars, served as the impetus for better protective measures.

The havoc in the lower valley caused by floods of 1912 and 1913 helped to bring in the concrete mattress-revetment program of 1914 and the first Flood Control Act of 1917.

Under the act, the levee system reached a fair state of completion when the flood of 1927, the greatest on record in the Mississippi Valley, topped the earthen walls, crevassed them, and forced the Nation to admit that flood control was truly a national problem.

ONLY ONE BREAK

The Flood Control Act of 1928 put the sentiments of the Nation into print and added floodways, cut-offs, and dike construction as means of achieving lasting flood protection.

The engineers believe that the act has passed the test of time. In the 23 years following the great flood of 1927, there has been only one main levee crevasse. And the crevasse, in Baton Rouge last year, was of the freak variety, they point out. It took place after the river had fallen considerably from a crest that was not too high by comparison.

Rapidly the Mississippi River system is nearing completion. In July the district here will open bids for construction of the Morganza floodway-control structure. With all of the Atchafalaya levee system above Morgan City well on the way to completion, and plans for flood control below Morgan City well on the way to completion, and plans for flood control below Morgan City to run concurrently with the control structure, award of the contract will set the completion date for the floodway.

BILLION YARDS

Brig. Gen. Peter A. Feringa, chairman of the Mississippi River Commission, and Col. Charles G. Holle, district engineer here, have set January 1953 as the date for completion of the floodway which has been advocated for more than 20 years.

And from my district in Jennings, La., in the Mermentau-Sabine Basins, comes this proclamation from the mayor, on the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Corps of Engineers:

PROCLAMATION

To all to whom these presents shall come, greetings:

Whereas June 16 marks the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the establishment of the Corps of Engineers—United States Army by the Continental Congress; and

Whereas from that day to this, through their zeal, courage, and resolute spirit, this splendid body of trained engineers has crossed the seas and bridged the rivers to reach our enemies in times of war, and in times of peace has improved and opened the Nation's harbors to world trade and labored to harness our rivers for protection against floods, for the generation of hydroelectric power, and for the extension and advancement of water-borne commerce; and

Whereas the activities of the Corps of Engineers in the Lower Mississippi Valley, and in particular in and around the city of Jennings, have been an important factor in the development of this country and community, particularly through the efforts of the Corps of Engineers to protect the lands and the lives behind the levees and to develop to the fullest our inland waterways that will continue to furnish protected passage for increasing quantities of raw and finished materials so vital to the United States of America both in time of war and in time of peace.

Now, therefore, I John L. Conner, mayor of the city of Jennings, do hereby proclaim the day of June 16, 1950, to be Engineers Day and urge the citizens of this city to pay homage to their past accomplishments, to their honored dead, to their mighty war efforts, and pledge our support to their progressive and constructive works during our years of peace.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the city of Jennings, to be affixed.

Done at the city hall in the city of Jennings on this 8th of June in the year of our Lord, one thousand nineteen hundred and fifty.

JOHN L. CONNER,
Mayor.

Prosperity Revenue Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I am extending my remarks and calling attention to the bill today introduced entitled "Prosperity Revenue Act," and include excerpts from an article entitled "That Tax Is Here Again" by Mr. S. Burton Heath, distinguished journalist and Pulitzer prize winner, which was published in Nation's Business for March 1949. Mr. Heath has left us, in this article, a priceless legacy, the story of Joseph in Egypt, calling attention to the shocking fact that our Tax Code is communistic, that we are taxing private enterprise out of business as directed by Marx in the Communist manifesto. Mr. Heath begins:

What a boon it would be if some Congress would come up with a revenue act that was not only just and simple—but logical.

And ends:

There's no reason why we shouldn't have such a law * * * except lethargy or political cowardice.

Fundamentally, there is only one tax problem, to wit—collect enough revenue to balance the budget and maintain the credit of the United States.

Fundamentally, there is only one source of income, private or Government, to wit—current production. At what point in the economic process can the tax revenue be bled off, with the least harm to the process?

Fundamentally, there is only one taxpayer—the individual person, the one who works. There is only one taxpayer. Why should it be more than one tax?

Business does not and cannot pay taxes; it passes them on and collects them from the taxpayers—the people. When we tax business we do not know who is paying the tax; we have lost control of the impact of the tax. The experts say that it is easier to collect the revenue by many taxes than from a single tax; that more revenue can be had by picking the taxpayer's pockets with hidden taxes than by taxing him honestly and openly. I believe in honesty. What is the best way to tax the taxpayer, directly and honestly?

The bill which I am introducing today, by request, is a sincere attempt at the logical answer to this question. This bill supersedes H. R. 6135 and H. R. 6453, preliminary drafts, which I introduced,

by request, last year. May I suggest that the Committee on Ways and Means, now engaged in revising an unsound tax code, might do well to pause in their arduous labors long enough to read and grasp the significance of the prosperity revenue act. In the words of Mr. Heath, it will "tax us with the least possible damage to the American economic system."

THAT TAX IS HERE AGAIN—WHAT A BOON IT WOULD BE IF SOME CONGRESS WOULD COME UP WITH A REVENUE ACT THAT WAS NOT ONLY JUST AND SIMPLE BUT LOGICAL

(By S. Burton Heath)

Congress is tinkering again with what ought to be entitled "An act to redistribute the national income, promote the sale of headache remedies, encourage cheating by usually honest persons, and for other purposes."

There is not the slightest rhyme or reason to the breakdown between taxes you can deduct and taxes you can't. You can memorize the list—or you can ask the collector, who will look up the answer in a commercial tax service and tell you.

It seems that the first income-tax law was suggested by a Canaanite immigrant psychologist, economist, and administrator named Joe, who became the first commissioner of internal revenue.

You'll find the story in Genesis XLI, verses 34 through 57, and Genesis XLVII, verses 12 through 26, if you want to check my free-hand version of the tax devised by Joseph, great grandson of Abraham, and twenty-third generation descendant of Adam and Eve.

You remember how Joe's brothers got so jealous of his coat of many colors that they sold him to the Midianites, who in turn sold him to Potiphar, a captain in Pharaoh's guard. Perhaps you remember, too, that he interpreted Pharaoh's dream to forecast 7 years of bountiful crops followed by 7 years of famine.

"Tell you what you do, Pharaoh," Joseph told the emperor. "You find yourself a discreet, wise chap"—and here I picture Joseph standing a bit straighter and looking his wisest and most discreet. "Make him commissioner of internal revenue. Let him appoint collectors all over Egypt. During the 7 fat years let them levy a 20-percent tax on income and crops."

Pharaoh took the advice. He made Joe commissioner, gave him a lot of gold jewelry, ordered that in future parades Joe should ride in the carriage just behind the royal equipage. Also he gave him Poti-pherah's daughter, Asenath, for a wife. This put Joe in the social register, because Poti was a priest, and priests were the only class who rated high enough to be exempted from the income tax.

Commissioner Joe and his collectors gathered so much grain that they gave up any effort to keep track of it. Then the drought came, bringing famine, and the Egyptian people went to Pharaoh and asked for bread. He sent them to Joseph.

"Joe's the boss," Pharaoh told them. "You do what he tells you, and I'm sure he'll see that you don't starve."

They got grain from Joseph, but they paid for it. They paid so much that in the first year Joe got all their money, and took it to Pharaoh's house for safekeeping. They paid so much that in the second year he got all their horses, their sheep, their cattle, and their asses. Came the third year, and they were back again.

"You've got all our money, boss," they said, "You've got all our cattle. The only things we have left are our land, our bodies, and empty stomachs. Take our land, buy our bodies, and give us bread."

Joe took them up. He bought all the land of Egypt for Pharaoh, and the people he moved to cities from one end of the borders of Egypt to the other end thereof.

Until I went back and reread this, I had thought of Joseph as a wise man who taught the Egyptians to save when food was plentiful, in order to eat when it became scarce. He was, and he did. He gave them social security. But there it is in Genesis, all spelled out, that he did this through an income tax, in such a way that when it was all over the government owned all the money, all the land, all the livestock, and the bodies of all of its people except Joseph and Asenath and the priests.

Thereafter Joseph permitted the Egyptians to sharecrop on the land they formerly owned, using the cattle that once were theirs, so long as they gave Pharaoh 20 percent of everything they raised.

It is conceivable that Karl Marx read Genesis before he drafted his famous Communist Manifesto, with its 10-point program to wrest by degrees all capital from the bourgeoisie. His first point was ending the private ownership of land. His second was a heavy progressive or graduated income tax.

Nobody accuses Congress or the administration, past or present, of deliberately seeking to communize this country.

But Egypt's experience demonstrates what an income tax can do. Karl Marx announced frankly what extreme socialism thought it could and hoped it would do. Every taxpayer knows how painful, how onerous, how discouraging bad income-tax laws can be.

Is it too much to suggest once again that Congress toss this very unscientific law out the window and give us a new one?

Is it too much to ask that the new law go back to first principles, raise the necessary money in a simple, equitable, scientific manner?

Is it too much to hope that we can get a law that will tax us with the least possible damage to the American economic system?

There's no reason in the world we shouldn't have such a law. No reason that I can imagine, except lethargy or political cowardice.

A Constitution for Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, on May 16 last I was accorded the opportunity to appear before the House Committee on Public Lands and to express my views with respect to the legislation which would enable the citizens of Puerto Rico to frame a constitution of their own.

To my mind the people of Puerto Rico have definitely established their right to self-government and should be permitted to organize their own constitutional government. Under the unanimous consent granted me, I include herein the remarks made by me before the Committee on Public Lands on this matter:

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to be here this morning and to have an opportunity to speak before this committee on behalf of H. R. 7674 which would permit the people of Puerto Rico, at long last, to participate more fully in the heritage which we call democracy.

During the more than 50 years that Puerto Rico has been under the American flag, we have acted, although slowly, in living up to our treaty obligations to decide the political status of Puerto Rico. Indeed, for many years after the initial steps Congress did almost nothing at all.

In 1900 Congress created a temporary civil government for the island under a measure known as the Foraker Act. In 1917, a permanent civil government was accorded by the Jones Act which retained most of the provisions of the original Foraker Act and added some others. Since then, there have been a number of changes to the organic act, mostly minor until the last few years when Congress has seen fit to give Puerto Rico some really significant grants of greater self-government, such as the right to elect their own Governor and name most of their own public officials.

Now, for the first time, this committee is charged with the responsibility of considering a bill which would grant to the people of Puerto Rico the authority to organize a constitutional government of their own choosing within certain well-defined boundaries and limitations specified by Congress.

To my mind, this is the wisest step which Congress could take, not only from the point of view of doing what we should have done before to fulfill our obligations for Puerto Rico but also to demonstrate to the democratic world as well as to that part of the world which does not yet follow the democratic way of life, that the United States really believes in democracy.

I am sure that all those present here today can see that such a practical demonstration of the principles of democracy will strengthen and elevate our position before the United Nations. For this country is signatory to the United Nations Charter calling for united efforts toward obtaining self-government for dependent people as rapidly as they are able to assume the responsibility of self-government. That Puerto Rico is ready is demonstrated by the record of the present administration under the able leadership of Governor Munoz-Marin, the first elected Governor of Puerto Rico.

Last November, I was a member of a subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee which went to Puerto Rico to look into the advisability of extending social security to that island and to the Virgin Islands. We held hearings down there and we went out and studied the living conditions of the pepole. We saw what the insular government is trying to do by way of industrialization and better agricultural practices and my modern social legislation to better those living conditions.

The insular government is doing its level best to act as rapidly as possible in removing people from the slum areas and in creating jobs, building new industries, raising wages, eradicating slums, building public housing projects, and much more. What they call their self-effort, their "Operation Bootstrap," is a magnificant thing to see in action.

It has been said, "They are moving mountains in Puerto Rico." They really are. They are moving mountains of obstacles and with unbelievable dispatch. Progress is showing through everywhere.

Our subcommittee went to Puerto Rico under the chairmanship of Representative SIDNEY CAMP. Upon our return, we recommended unanimously, as the result of our investigation, that social security be extended to Puerto Rico on the same basis as in the States.

Before we could make such a recommendation, we had to look carefully into the tax system in effect in Puerto Rico. We learned that prior to the ceding of Puerto Rico to the United States, Spain had granted a considerable degree of self-government to Puerto Rico under a charter of autonomy. With this charter of autonomy, Spain granted also a great measure of self-determination in the matter of taxes in Puerto Rico. Consequently, Puerto Rico had its own tax system

which was continued by the Foraker Act in 1900 and by the Jones Act in 1917. This practice of giving Puerto Rico self-determination, tax wise, has been a consistent, and in my opinion, a wise policy of the United States. Indeed, any deviation from that policy would constitute a precedent, insofar as Puerto Rico is concerned.

The subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee found that the primary source of revenue in Puerto Rico is made up of excise taxes collected on a large variety of articles. These taxes yielded $40,700,000 in revenue in the fiscal year 1948–49. Income taxes on individuals and corporations rank second as an important scurce of revenue in Puerto Rico. During the same fiscal year, $26,400,000 was collected from such source.

Taxes on real and personal property ranked third and yielded $3,300,000 to the insular government in fiscal year 1948–49. In addition, the local municipal governments collected $7,000,000 in property taxes.

Nine million six hundred thousand dollars were covered into the insular treasury from customs, duties, and taxes imposed on products shipped to the mainland to balance Federal taxes paid on those products when produced on the continent. Rum and tobacco made up $7,400,000 of this amount.

Puerto Rico, for 14 years, has had a state insurance fund to protect the workers against accidents suffered in the course of their work. Three million nine hundred thousand dollars in premiums were assessed on payrolls amounting to $227,000,000 in 1947–48.

An unemployment-insurance law protecting sugarcane workers against seasonal unemployment went into effect last year. The sugarcane industry and the insular treasury worked together in evolving the necessary payroll and tax return forms. Between January 1 and October 31, 1949, the payroll-tax collections totaled $1,800,000. Five thousand four hundred and fourteen employers reported during that period and more than 22,000 returns were processed.

The report of the subcommittee has this to say about the tax system: "We call attention to these various tax programs in order to substantiate our position that existing insular tax programs have already laid a foundation for the collection of the Federal employment taxes. In our opinion, the collection of these taxes will present no insurmountable administrative difficulties, and the experience of the insular treasury, together with familiarity with similar taxes by both employers and employees, will be of great assistance."

H. R. 7674 does not alter the present tax relationships between Puerto Rico and United States. The Congress should insure to Puerto Rican citizens that they will not be placed in a discriminatory position or given a submerged status tax-wise. I believe it is significant to point out that in 1946, there were only 4,000 persons in all of Puerto Rico with taxable incomes exceeding $2,000 per year. In this connection, I should like to emphasize that Puerto Rico has a population in excess of 2,000,000. The average income is less than half the average income of the lowest income State.

The internal revenue laws of the United States do not extend to Puerto Rico, and if they did extend, these facts make it lucidly clear that when all is subtracted and divided and finally totaled the United States could not hope to realize much revenue from levying Federal income taxes in the island.

Also it must be remembered that Puerto Rico bears a substantial local tax load, which, combined with the collection of excise taxes in the island, constitutes a sizable tax burden.

Considering that there is no provision in the Puerto Rican income-tax structure for the splitting of incomes of husband and wife, it is seen that Puerto Ricans have a substantial tax burden which, in its entirety, is not substantially different from that of mainlanders. I might say in closing that the Treasury Department of Puerto Rico has undertaken an all-inclusive review of the insular tax system, including its implications on the economy and the determination of who, in the final analysis, pays the taxes in Puerto Rico and who ultimately benefits from public expenditures.

In a statement before the Ways and Means Committee in connection with the extension of social security to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, Sol Descartes, treasurer of Puerto Rico, on November 17 of last year, said: "We are striving to find the middle course which would encompass the highest possible tax contributions of the local economy compatible with the extension of economic incentives to expand production and the investment of local savings in local economic expansion.

"As Governor Muñoz-Marín pointed out, this is an extremely difficult problem. It has not been solved in the most advanced industrialized nations."

During the past few years Puerto Rico has accomplished considerable simplification of its excise taxes. Additional measures have been formulated toward that end and are ready for trial.

So we see, gentlemen, that in a field of self-government in which Congress long ago granted Puerto Rico a free hand and full rein, they have done an effective job. I feel sure, and in this opinion I have many colleagues, that Puerto Rico will strive just as industriously and equally as effectively in the other fields of self-government as they are extended to them.

Du Bois (Pa.) Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution Celebrates Fiftieth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to take part in the program of the Du Bois (Pa.) Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution when its fiftieth anniversary was observed on June 14, 1950, at the General Pershing Hotel, Du Bois, Pa.

In addition to the membership of the Du Bois chapter, representatives of the State and National DAR were present together with delegations from central Pennsylvania chapters.

My remarks for the occasion were as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, TWENTY-SECOND DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE DAR LUNCHEON JUNE 14, 1950, AT THE GENERAL PERSHING HOTEL, DU BOIS, PA., CELEBRATING THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DU BOIS CHAPTER OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Madam Chairman and members of the Daughters of the American Revolution, I have been highly honored by your kind invitation to speak to you on the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Du Bois, Pa., chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

I consider it a double honor to have the privilege of joining with you in welcoming your State regent, Mrs. Thomas Henry Lee.

The Daughters of the American Revolution have established themselves as true champions of Americanism. At your annual meetings in Washington you never hesitate to speak out against those economic planners in government who are united in a design to lower this country into socialism.

At your last meeting in Washington you called for a Nation-wide reaffirmation of faith in this country's heritage and vigorous opposition to subversive influences. At the same time you pointed your finger at phony liberals in our midst and warned the American people that these left-wingers are threatening the American system in economic affairs.

I congratulate you for your courageous action and your determination to awaken the American people to the dangers confronting our Nation.

This is Flag Day—a day of very special significance to all Americans. I say special significance, because there is today a growing disrespect for our national emblem. There are some who boldly suggest that we discard Old Glory and replace it with a new banner—the emblem of a world government.

For example, one of the so-called intellectuals who is preaching the doctrines of world federation told an audience a short time ago, in Syracuse, N. Y., that we "must haul down the American flag—haul it down, stamp on it, and spit upon it." Yes, that is the kind of doctrine which is being preached by pinksters and parlor bolshevists who have the audacity to call themselves good Americans.

They tell us it is old fashioned to respect and revere the Stars and Stripes. They scoff at our reverence for the flag and what it stands for.

On this Flag Day, it is appropriate that we pause to take stock of how far some of our so-called patriots have departed from the good old American way. We should also consider quite carefully some of the ideas being advanced by these so-called Americans, and examine them in relationship to the principles for which our flag has stood since its adoption 173 years ago.

Yes, the advocates of world government are demanding that we tear down Old Glory, that we renounce the noble precepts of American freedom it has symbolized for nearly two centuries, and that we offer up our country on the altar of fear and surrender. In effect, they are saying: "We can't survive as a Nation; we must forget about the United States as such, and become citizens of some idealistic world state which would be controlled by God knows whom."

In their pinkish minds things have gotten so bad that if you prefer liberty to death, you are accused of nationalism. If you speak of the Stars and Stripes and the good old American way of life, you are accused of waving the flag.

The thinking American who loves and appreciates his country and what it stands for, is fully aware of what would happen were we to renounce our national identity and become part of some dream state. He knows that there are traitors among us—agents and adherents of a foreign dictatorship—who are waiting for a show of weakness and the opportunity to seize our Government as a subordinate unit of a world state, which would be an easy mark for Communist domination.

If we as a Nation embrace the doctrines of world statism, immigration bars could be let down, permitting hordes of spies and snoopers to swarm to our shores. Our Army, Navy, and Air Force would be destroyed and would be replaced by the sort of police force the world government might determine is needed for internal security. Thus we would be a helpless Nation.

But thank God that so long as the American flag flies, and so long as we are the masters of our fate, we have the means of controlling the traitors who mistake liberty for license. The eternal vigilance of every American citizen, together with the vigilance of our own security agencies, such as the FBI, can keep tabs on those who exploit our freedom. But the FBI, which is purely an investigative agency, cannot do the complete job. We need an alert Department of Justice to prosecute promptly and vigorously all subversive elements in our midst.

While we keep an eye peeled for those who smear Old Glory by their acts, we must also guard against the slackers who betray the flag by failing to fulfill their obligations as American citizens.

These are the gloom-mongers who complain about everything that happens in Washington but rarely take the trouble to go to the polls and vote. These fellows are the first to demand justice in a court of law, yet dodge jury duty when called upon to serve. They are the ones who deplore conditions in the public schools but resist paying taxes. They are the remote, detached, indifferent people who live for themselves alone, never giving a thought to the obligations that go hand-in-hand with citizenship.

Every American worthy of the name should participate actively in the affairs of government, keeping informed about public issues, joining political parties, pressing for desirable legislation to improve the lot of all Americans, voting faithfully and intelligently at all elections, be they national, State, or local.

Yes, as true Americans, we must vigorously back the efforts of civic-minded educators in the public schools to prepare our children to cope with the thorny problems ahead.

As fathers and mothers, we have a solemn duty to join parent-teacher associations in our neighborhoods. Through them, we must insist that our youngsters get thorough training in Americanism—the kind of training which will enable them to appraise and energetically resist ironclad dogmas taught by "pink" educators in an effort to place the state above the individual.

We must stop the kind of instruction which world government boosters would give our children. Make no mistake about it—world government is being exalted in some of our schools. Through some of the clubs and organizations supporting world government, many of our school children are being taught to look favorably upon the idea of a superstate. It is our duty to make sure that young minds are not filled with propaganda of this kind; that our children are not taught to mock our precious heritage of liberty and freedom.

If we are to fulfill our obligations, we must share the burdens of those who have known suffering and misfortune through no fault of their own. That means providing for the poor, the stricken, the aged and handicapped. It means seeing that the men who served our country so faithfully in time of war are cared for in peace.

But above all, if we are to keep the privileges that have made us the most fortunate people in the universe, we must stand ready to defend our country and our flag in times of national emergency. While we enthusiastically support the efforts of the United Nations to establish world peace, we cannot close our eyes to the present dangers that loom all around—the dangers of communism and world government.

Our security, as well as the security of all liberty-loving mankind, depends upon our ability to ward off aggression from within and without. This means military preparedness with a large effectively unified Army, Navy, and Air Force.

And while we're talking about responsibilities, let's not forget our basic obligation to live up to the ideals and principles symbolized by our flag. All of us are agreed that the denial of any American of his constitutional rights is a shattering blow to our democratic institutions and a threat to our own freedom.

But while we take care that no shame shall come to Old Glory at home, we must be equally alert wherever the flag flies abroad. The American flag will be seen in many, many countries because our Nation is a participant in the North Atlantic Pact. In Japan and in occupied Germany the Stars and Stripes are raised over peoples laid low by their own brutality and lust for power. We do not yet know the complete effect of defeat upon the Japanese. Unfortunately, we do know that defeat of the Nazis on the battlefield has not resulted in the end of nazism.

Flag Day is an excellent time to take a long searching look at the facts, examining the bad along with the good. It is a good time to single out and rise up against the forces that would divide us and sap our strength whether through outright treachery or inadvertent acts of betrayal.

Our forefathers call out to us; the spirits of our heroic dead beckon us from far-flung burial fields; millions of tortured souls cry out to us from behind the iron curtain—all caution us to be vigilant of our liberties, to protect them jealously and guard against those who would enfeeble or destroy them.

The challenge is before us. We have had ample warning of the parlor Bolshevists in our midst. Flag Day is an excellent time to resolve to do something about these shyster Americans.

With that thought in mind let us on this Flag Day, June 14, 1950, rededicate ourselves to the principles for which our flag stands and which if preserved will guarantee that Old Glory will continue to fly high over "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

On Ending Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I am inserting in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article by Lewis Haney, professor of economics, New York University, which appeared in the New York Journal-American:

ON ENDING COLD WAR

(By Lewis Haney, professor of economics, New York University)

The thing that is ruining us financially is this never-ending cold war. In the name of defense, we are inflating our currency to a point where the nickel no longer buys anything such as a shine, a carfare, or a phone call. And we can't pay our public debt.

As a Nation, we are strictly insolvent. The only way in which we are better off than others is that they are more insolvent than we are.

Why then, does the cold war, which is putting us deeper and deeper in the red, go on and on?

I think the answer is twofold: (1) The Communists hope by keeping up the war to disrupt our Nation and ruin us—also to pick up power over countries as they have in China. (2) Truman and his cronies like it because it gives them great power and lots of money.

Even some businessmen and labor leaders like it because they benefit by war preparation. The farmers get price support partly for reasons of national defense.

Accordingly I think that the way to end the cold war, and so get back to the ways of peace, is to end the hopes of the Communists and their sympathizers that we can be divided and ruined. At the same time we could end the hopes of the politicians in power that they can go on spending and spending and electing and electing.

The first thing to do is to get ourselves straightened out on the subject of one world. Then we will have to understand more clearly our own socialistic trend. The two things are tied together.

One plain fact is that there are two great, fundamentally opposed ideologies in the world. As long as this is true, there must necessarily be not one world but two. One first step would be to recognize that there are two worlds and to establish an orderly working arrangement on that basis.

To this end, the main means is to establish unity within our own world—the western or free world. As long as we are so divided that the Communists can hope to wreck us internally, they will keep up the cold war.

How can we get unity here? Only by agreeing on fundamentals. We can and must agree that our world is based on the maximum freedom of individual choice compatible with the general and long-run interests of all of us as a society. Fair competition, private investment, private enterprise and collective bargaining between the individual employer and his employees—these are the fundamentals of our system.

These being agreed upon, we must next outlaw communism both as a political party and as a doctrine to be taught. We should at once eliminate both Communist spies and saboteurs and Communist teaching and preaching. Thus we may attain unity in the fundamentals of economic and social theory and policy. This would destroy the hopes of the Communists both here and in Russia. The cold war would be won.

The place to win the cold war is right here at home. The way to do it is to make the United States united.

What sense does it make to call for one world and at the same time two Americas?

Why cry out against guilty by association, while proclaiming that those whose acts (reflecting their thoughts) have divided our country are innocent by assertion?

Communism is a system of thought—an ideology. It is revolutionary socialism. As long as it is libelous to call a man who believes in communism a Communist the cold war will go on.

Report on Coffee of the Gillette Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Hanson's Latin-American Letter dated June 7, 1950, which refers very illuminating to a report filed by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REPORT OF THE GILLETTE COMMITTEE—A SPECIAL MEMORANDUM

The Gillette committee has admittedly been one of the most disruptive influences in Brazilian-American relations of the past

decade from the short-run point of view. But the recommendations which the committee brought out on June 9, 1950, constitute the most constructive report that has appeared in the field of inter-American economic relations in many a year. The recommendations were released at a time when there was being fomented in New York a heavily financed campaign to "bull" the coffee market and to mislead the public as to the coffee situation. Washington is fully informed on the New York activity, with the appropriate agencies alerted. The campaign is certain to force a second investigation of the coffee situation. Such an investigation will pull the plug on the short-sighted policies now being adopted in Latin America in the pattern that has always ended in financial disaster for Latin America. And such an investigation will harm every member of the American coffee industry, including the great majority of coffee firms which are unknowingly contributing to manipulation that will harm them immensely in public relations and in the performance of their legitimate function of selling as much coffee as possible at the lowest possible price.

It is vitally important that you understand the situation that is developing. Whether you are in the coffee trade, or whether an investor or exporter concerned with the financial stability of the coffee-producing countries, the tactics adopted by certain elements in the coffee industry concern you deeply. This memorandum is directed toward an understanding of the problem.

The price of coffee today is too high. This is the opinion of Republican and Democratic members of the Senate Agriculture Committee, of the executive branch of this Government, and of leading radio commentators and press observers with a wide audience. There is a difference of opinion only on what to do about it. The Congress has an obligation to the American people and is accordingly disturbed by prices that are, on the testimony of the coffee industry itself, horribly out of line with demand and supply factors. The executive branch is equally sure, on the basis of reports from the field, that the price is out of line and artificially maintained, but it has been less concerned. Many State Department officials have felt that this is an easy way to subsidize foreign countries. Accordingly, they have not been concerned with the fact that there is no legislative authorization for a half billion dollars a year gift to be paid by the American consumer. In fact, this same element went around Washington boasting that the rising price of rubber, coffee and other commodities was solving the dollar-gap problem—and that if this be the work of cartels or market manipulators, more power to them.

Unfortunately, the solution has gotten out of hand: (a) Market reaction in the form of substitutes and reduced consumption follows soon upon attempts to bleed the American market. (b) There is evidence that the full returns from such pricing are not yielded to the producing countries. (c) Domestic reaction has exposed the State Department to criticism that might well wreck its whole foreign economic program. Accordingly, the Latin Americans can no longer count on State Department support for concealed subsidies on coffee in the amount of $5,000,000,000 per decade, and the attempt of speculative interests in New York to revive the theme by suggesting that such subsidies stimulate exports is doomed to quick failure. For you must look at it the way an American looks at it: If we want to sell more merchandise by interfering with free-market pricing and letting prices be boosted indefinitely, there is a quicker method than concealed subsidies to foreigners. The quicker method is to pay American farmers $20 per bushel of wheat and $8 per peck of potatoes, and pay 82 cents per pound for copper from our own mines, and purchasing power for cars, tractors and television sets will quickly rise. Our economy cannot stand that kind of economics.

The Gillette committee found that the rise in coffee prices was attributed to two sets of factors: (1) A group of legitimate market influences such as uncertainty over the extent to which consumption would be affected by sudden rises in prices, a narrowing of the surplus of exportable supply over demand accentuated by incompetent crop reporting, a short period of heavy hoarding fed by forces which the committee was unable to identify sufficiently to get Justice Department action. (2) The second group of factors constitute the structural background of trading: Exchange regulations that seemingly provided an ideal set-up for taking advantage of the public under just such conditions, tax exemptions that stimulated foreign speculation, manipulation of the flow of stocks onto the American market by the Colombian Federation.

The committee recommended on the second set of factors: Creation of suitable contract stipulations and discouragement of speculation by the exchange; taxation of gambling gains by foreign speculators; regulation of the activities of the federation to the extent that it functions within United States jurisdiction. There is no debating the desirability of these recommendations. Surely a foreign speculator earning millions in the United States should not go free of taxes while an American with a family to support on $2,000 per year has to pay income taxes higher than many Latin-American countries impose even in high brackets.

But it is the findings on the first set of factors which are even more important to the future of the industry. Every factor which the industry advanced piously as justification for the fantastic rise in prices has now been reversed: Consumption has supplies immensely, production is coming along better than expected, supplies at the start of the new crop year are going to be much larger than expected. But coffee fails to fall significantly. Coffee on June 12 was 75 percent higher than on the same date of the previous year. It advanced 3 percent from May 12, 1950, to June 12, 1950. By its own testimony the industry stands convicted therefore in the eyes of the committee of obstructing the working of demand and supply factors to bring coffee back toward the levels that prevailed a year ago. Which provides adequate reason for a new investigation. Unfortunately for the industry, it is entering upon tactics which will force the launching of such an investigation later in the year.

A conservative financial journal (Barron's) notes this week that "consumers are to be convinced that they like high coffee prices." And propaganda has been slowly gathering force that is intended to discount the sharp and undeniable drop. in consumption and that is intended to conceal the large availabilities of coffee relative to demand. Meanwhile an effort would be made to divert supplies from this market, and the precarious financial solvency of Brazil and Colombia would be jeopardized in a final effort to set excessively high price floors for coffee.

For these tactics, the Gillette committee has provided only an outline of the defense weapons that a new investigation would unveil fully: The committee has recommended that no more ECA financing be provided for coffee. The next step is obvious. If coffee is too expensive for the American consumer, it is too expensive for the nations now living on the United States dole. Assistance could be scaled down to any nation that feels so rich that it can afford to outbid the American market for coffee. You will recall that 5 years ago New York was wailing that OPA did not permit it to pay as much for coffee as did the "wealthy" nations of Europe and that purchases of some 2,000,000 bags by Europe made it urgent that the United States drop OPA regulations lest we be deprived of coffee completely. It was a completely phony argument at the time, of course, since we were the only major market available.

It is even more ridiculous today to think that Europe can afford coffee at prices 75 percent higher than June 1949. ECA was quick to heed the concern of the Gillette committee about pressure on coffee resulting from ECA financing last fall, and the Danes and others undoubtedly remember how abruptly their requests for dollars with which to buy coffee were treated. This nonsensical business of European competition for coffee at current price levels can quickly be taken care of by a congressional committee any time it sees fit. And that time might be accelerated if the campaign to "bull" the market proceeds as now planned.

The Gillette committee has made it clear that in good conscience this country cannot finance a campaign against itself and its consumers, and that this refusal to finance the campaign may actually be in the interest of Latin America as well. If a country has so much money that it is ready to gamble its financial solvency on speculative ventures in holding up the price of coffee at ridiculous levels or in holding stocks off the market in amounts of $100,000,000 at a time; if a country is willing to jeopardize its balance of payments position by risking collapse in toto in the event of a good crop; in either case the Gillette committee seems well advised in suggesting that the United States Government must henceforth introduce this consideration when any application for loans comes up. The more the market is "bulled," the longer prices are held at artificial levels not justified by demand and supply factors, the more likely is it—new investigation or not—that pressure will be exerted on the executive branch to avoid supporting directly or indirectly the coffee speculator.

The recommendation that the United States support the efforts of all nations to expand coffee production was to be expected, in view of repeated assertions by Latin-Americans before the committee that their production could not keep up with consumption. It was a mistaken public-relations line that we warned about at the time, and the Latins might do well to stop harping on their inability to meet American needs. The grave they are digging is their own. Presumably, any failure of coffee prices to return to the level dictated by demand and supply would result in acceleration of assistance to other areas to expand production. Similarly, the recommendation that consumers conserve coffee and avoid waste by following the recommendations of the American Home Economics Association rather than those of the Pan-American Coffee Bureau was to be expected. Implementation could consist in vigorous consumer activity by the Department of Agriculture, whose Virginia extension station had already brought in recommendations, arrived at independently of the Home Economics Association, that call for use of 25 percent less coffee per cup.

Some time ago we urged American members of the coffee industry to disassociate themselves from any effort to "bull" this market, from the viewpoint of their own relations with Washington and with the public. If you are going along with the new campaign, here are some suggestions that will be extremely useful later on: (a) Keep a record of any contribution or dues or fees paid for organizational activity, with a note as to whether you were aware of what the money was to be used for. (b) If any public statements are made by members of your firm, keep photostats for submittal to investigators; full files of public comments and of the development of public opinion on coffee are being kept in Washington. (c) Keep unusually detailed records of your profit per pound of coffee. (d) Have a good lawyer with you when you come to testify.

And a final note: Stop knocking Senator GILLETTE and Senator AIKEN. They have a duty to perform for all the people, and they perform it.

P. S.—United States imports of coffee:

Monthly average, March–April 1950:	
161,000,000 pounds	$68,500,000
Monthly average, 1949:	
243,000,000 pounds	66,100,000
Monthly average, 1939:	
163,000,000 pounds	11,600,000

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the national Rural Electrification magazine of June 1950.

This tribute paid me by one of the finest organizations in America is greatly appreciated.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C.

Memorandum.

Subject: Determination, Without Fear, by Clyde T. Ellis, executive manager.

MINOT, N. DAK., May 23.—On a tulip-covered plain here I saw a new day dawn for North Dakota. Senator MILTON R. YOUNG turned the spade of sod that began construction of a new kind of co-op generating plant, to serve the farms and ranches of about half the State. This afternoon I saw hope radiating from many eyes of folks like you and me who had worked, waited, and prayed for this dream-come-true. Now they can have abundant electricity without restrictions on its use—low-cost power delivered to their distribution co-op load centers.

This co-op generating plant differs from the others. Bureau of Reclamation transmission lines would have ultimately been built here when Fort Garrison Dam is completed about 1956. Last year North Dakota rural electric leaders came up with a plan to ask Congress to approve these Bureau lines now and let their generating co-op use them, at a fair charge, until Garrison is producing power. Then the co-op and the Bureau could make a power-exchange agreement helpful to both, enabling farmers to purchase both firm and dump hydro power at low cost. The Bureau could purchase off-peak steam power and conserve water to firm up more hydro power. Result: More power at lower cost for all concerned.

Furthermore, Ottertail Power Co. would cooperate by wheeling some power from the Bureau line to isolated co-op load centers.

But how could anyone expect Congress to approve such a plan? Hadn't the 1950 budget lacked any such line? Hadn't the House passed the Interior appropriation bill without it? Hadn't the previous Congress killed the Havre-Shelby line, needed just as badly up the river in Montana?

But consider these factors: (1) the local power company was agreeable; (2) the entire North Dakota congressional delegation favored the plan; (3) rural electric leaders of this State are resourceful and determined; (4) and—most important of all—able, effective Senator YOUNG was on the Interior Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

MILT YOUNG deserved all the praise he got today and at the State association meeting here yesterday. He put that line in last year and saved it when practically all efforts to deliver Federal power to rural electrics in other States were being killed.

LEBANON, MO., May 25.—En route to Mississippi I stopped off here to attend Laclede Electric Co-op's annual meeting. This town's power system is municipally owned and friendly. The local paper gave the meeting good publicity. Business leaders wanted to know more about us and invited me to their Rotary luncheon. I quickly found that the co-op's manager, Jack Haugh—who is also president of the Sho-Me Power Co-op—is a big man in this town.

After I made about a 10-minute speech, we used the Phillips plan of audience participation. Telephones again got more attention than any other topic, as at the North Dakota State meeting. But these folks also want White River hydropower, though they have no Senator YOUNG on the committee. Furthermore, all Missouri power companies are fighting desperately for Sho-Me Power Co-op plans to obtain adequate integration with SPA.

JACKSON, MISS., May 26.—What a meeting! Co-op directors and managers, municipal leaders, county agents, members of the legislature, editors, college professors and even the dean of Mississippi State's College of Agriculture.

This is public-power progress day in Mississippi—TVA public wholesale power for north Mississippi and farmer-owned co-op power all over.

Between four and five hundred people turned out. Sponsored by the rural electrics and broadcast over the State, this meeting is evidence of a supreme effort to achieve better understanding and coordinated cooperation among all groups interested in farm problems.

Mississippi farmers want telephones, too. In south Mississippi they want a reasonable wholesale power supply. They want a generating plant, interconnected with TVA in the central part of the State. (Mississippi power companies which are fighting the co-op plant have power exchange agreements with TVA.)

Two things have blocked the co-op application for months: (1) Power company opposition, including a last-minute power company offer to do better by the farmers, and (2) the power co-op's inability to arrive at a satisfactory power-exchange arrangement with TVA.

Mississippi leaders feel that if this power company offer is to kill the power co-op, the company would first be required to show that its "kiss of death" rate offer is both compensatory and nondiscriminatory; otherwise it probably would be of short duration. They don't think the company can make such showing. They do think they may be able to come to terms with TVA.

Toward the end of the meeting, however, saddening word was brought by one of Mississippi's rural electric leaders from Washington that the Senate Appropriations Committee is considering an amendment to prohibit Government transmission lines and co-op generating plants except under unworkable conditions.

Mississippi, like most other States, unfortunately does not have a Senator YOUNG on the Senate Appropriations Committee.

In each, the Flickertail State, the Sho-Me State, and the Magnolia State, I got the feeling that our elected farm directors and our managers of rural electric systems are determined as never before to do more about solving their own rural electrification problems. The road may be rougher, but it will also be straighter, and there will be more steam.

Newspapers Recognize Jensen Amendment No Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I have urged the other body to reject the so-called Jensen amendment which, by disrupting orderly personnel practices of navy yards, would make the operation of these industrial plants not only very difficult but exceedingly costly.

In testimony prepared for the Appropriations Committee I criticized the amendment on the ground that it "can only result in the waste of Federal funds, in confusion among both employees and administrators, and in an undoubted slow-down in the all-important defense program."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the following editorials from the Bremerton Sun and the Seattle Times printed in the RECORD for the information of the Congress:

IT'S EVERYBODY'S FIGHT

As noted in an article on today's front page, United States Representative HUGH B. MITCHELL is well cognizant of the devastating, far-reaching effect of the Jensen amendment to the Federal appropriations bill for 1951. He will testify against it before the Senate Appropriations Committee and asks all Bremerton interests to join forces with him in battle.

Those who feel, as does the Sun, that the Jensen proposal is unsound and ill-advised should express themselves by letter to Members of the United States Senate, including Senators CAIN and MAGNUSON, of this State. All Senators can be reached by writing them in care of the Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C. (The Bremerton Sun, May 25, 1950.)

INDISCRIMINATE AX SWINGING CAN'T BE CALLED ECONOMY

Federal economy is both desirable and necessary, as this column repeatedly has emphasized. But the means to attain this end must be properly weighed.

The right way is a conscientious effort to eliminate extravagances and the abundant number of overlapping agencies which plague the national scene.

The wrong way is represented by a couple of riders attached to the 1951 omnibus approporiations bill when it passed the House of Representatives. These, the Thomas-Taber and the Jensen amendments, depict the kind of blind ax swinging that can deal irreparable harm to our structure of government.

The Thomas-Taber amendment would make blanket, across-the-board cuts in Federal department personnel—10 percent in nonmilitary agencies, 2 percent in the military departments.

The Jensen amendment, even more ill-advised, would permit filling only 10 percent of the vacancies resulting from any cause

in Government departments during fiscal 1951.

It is hard to understand how supposedly enlightened representatives of the people voted for such procedures. It should be noted here, to the credit of Representative HUGH MITCHELL of the First District, that he was opposed.

Indiscriminate personnel cuts, such as the Thomas-Taber rider demands, are bad business by any measure. Unquestionably there is wide room for cutting Federal payrolls, but such cuts must not be made without appropriate consideration of their interference with Government functions. The cost could easily be greater than the savings in such haphazard procedure.

The Jensen amendment has the hue of political expediency. It provides a supposedly "painless" way of reducing Federal employment, by restricting hiring to fill only 10 percent of vacancies. But it fails completely to take into account the rate of retirements, normal worker attrition in various agencies, and the effect on military installations where workloads are seldom stable.

William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, has properly classified the two amendments as "indefensible." We agree wholeheartedly with him that the House has taken the easy way out, without attempting to find where Government economies are desirable.

In taking up a fight on this legislation, the Puget Sound Naval Base Association and the Bremerton Chamber of Commerce are not attempting to serve selfish ends. They are attempting instead to preserve high order and morale in the Federal service, for these are completely bad and blundering amendments. Disguised as economy measures, they strike indiscriminately, with equal effectiveness, at the foundations of every national service agency, everywhere in the land.

The Senate, we trust, will display the wisdom to discard these ill-fashioned riders into the legislative ashcan. (The Bremerton Sun, May 24, 1950.)

SUCH PAYROLL SAVINGS MIGHT PROVE COSTLY

Republican Congressmen from this State voted with a large majority in the House of Representatives for an amendment to the omnibus appropriations bill designed to reduce the number of Federal employees. The State's two Democratic Representatives JACKSON and MITCHELL voted against it.

The amendment, as it is understood here, would prohibit the filling of more than 10 percent of the vacancies occurring in a given Federal department during the 1950–51 fiscal year. In other words, if 50 employees were dismissed by a department, not more than 5 of the vacancies created thus could be filled during the year. The provision was proposed by Representative JENSEN (Republican), of Iowa.

Congressmen who opposed the Jensen amendment, chiefly Democrats, pointed out that it might have the effect of discouraging dismissal of inefficient employees. A department executive would hesitate, they contended, to dismiss, say, 10 less desirable employees because they could not be replaced by more than 1 with better qualifications.

At that time it was not foreseen that this provision might have an adverse effect on certain types of Federal agencies, such as some in the Seattle area. At the Bremerton naval shipyard, for example, it is not unusual for large groups of workmen to complete their part of a construction or repair project and be replaced by others of a different trade. If, as an instance, 500 shipfitters were to be laid off after finishing their work on one ship, it would be possible to hire back only 50 of them when all 500 might subsequently be needed for another job.

It would be necessary to keep all 500 on the payroll, though they might be idle, so that they would be available when needed. The purpose of the provision, to economize by reducing the number of Federal employees, would thus be defeated.

That, of course, is a hypothetical case, but it is illustrative of how the amendment might conceivably operate. It suggests that this State's delegation in Congress might be well advised to reconsider the Jensen amendment in this light, particularly with a view to determining its possible effect on Federal payrolls in this area. If it would in fact have a disadvantageous effect on such Federal establishments as the Bremerton yard, the defect should be corrected before the omnibus appropriations bill and its amendments are passed by the Senate. (The Seattle Times, May 29, 1950.)

HARDLY AN ECONOMY BILL

The Seattle Times has joined with us in questioning the advisability of the Jensen amendment to the omnibus appropriations bill for 1951. This amendment would restrict Government hiring to 10 percent of the number of vacancies occurring during the year, and would result in irreparable damage to military installations where workloads, and payrolls, are subject to constant adjustment.

The Times makes a point that the amendment would not encourage economy, as intended, because it would influence various agencies to hesitate in reducing their staffs because of the rigid restriction on replacements. An agency conceivably might carry 100 incompetent employees because, once discharged, it could legally hire only 10 able workers to replace them, and thus find itself sorely understaffed.

While it is true that the Jensen amendment would apply only to fiscal 1951, it would set a strong precedent for future years. Good sense dictates that it be eliminated from the appropriations bill by the Senate; its pretended virtue as a painless method reducing employment is overbalanced by its many apparent defects. (The Bremerton Sun, June 1, 1950.)

Elks Flag Day Celebration Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, on June 14, 1950, at the Elks Flag Day celebration, at Lancaster, Pa., the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] delivered a notable address. It is an eloquent tribute to our flag and all it stands for. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As we assemble on this memorable anniversary to recall the proud history of the Stars and Stripes, the call "Wake-up America" should go forth to every nook and corner of our land.

It is most appropriate for a lodge of the Benevolent and Protective Order of the Elks to combine the celebration of Flag Day with a program proclaiming a new awakening of patriotic Americanism.

It is likewise appropriate for the Elks to take leadership in patriotic exercises. The Elks is a typical American society. Belief in Almighty God and loyalty to the flag is the keynote of its doctrine.

The flag, the Holy Bible and the antlers are found on the altar of every Elks lodge. They signify patroitism and love of country, brotherhood and devotion to God; tolerance and good will. Our flag symbolizes the ideals of American freedom. The Bible is the foundation of our form of government.

Lancaster holds an important place in our Nation's history.

Here in our hour of trial the retreating Continental Congress set up the seat of our Government.

Here strong, patriotic, and religious men developed agriculture, industry and culture not surpassed any place in the world.

Your Conestoga wagon was the beginning of our magnificent transportation system. It was the forerunner of the assembly line plan of industrial production.

We can almost hear the creak of the prairie schooners rolling westward over the mountains, and across great rivers and wide prairies to push civilization to new frontiers.

The Pennsylvania rifle, which defended the Colonies against the savage, procured much of their food and was the weapon which attained their independence, was a Lancaster County product.

Your deep religious convictions, carrying out the tolerant ideals of William Penn, had much to do with the peace and good will of this Colony and the Commonwealth.

You have always taken an interest in government. This has given you faith in government because it is your Government.

With all its magnificent American characteristics, Lancaster is a proper place to discuss our country—its glorious past and what dangers we must overcome to preserve its greatness for the future.

The Star-Spangled Banner was born 173 years ago in the City of Brotherly Love. It was designed to represent the ideals of the United States. It symbolizes courage, thrift, sacrifice, hard work, independence, tolerance, and the love of God.

The heroes of American independence were willing to make any sacrifice in order to have freedom of the individual. Those God-fearing and deeply religious men and women considered freedom of the individual as God given. They realized that freedom can be retained only by continual work and sacrifice.

Since our flag was born, our Nation has expanded from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Through God's mercy and guidance we have been victorious in foreign wars for righteousness and justice.

We have developed our great natural resources for the benefit of all mankind. We have broken up the prairies and turned them into gardens of production. We have felled the forest and with the timber we have built homes, school houses, and churches.

Our workmen are the most skilled; our farmers the most productive; and our management the best of all nations of the earth. Our commerce has been extended to every corner of the world.

This has given us a living standard never attained by any people. We have more schoolhouses, more churches, more research foundations, more hospitals, and higher medical attainments than any other country of all history.

Our people own more homes, more life-insurance policies, more savings accounts, and more automobiles than any nation in the world.

As a people we have a right to be proud of the record of the United States and its industrial, cultural, and spiritual attainments.

We have less than 7 percent of the world's population and area, yet we produce one-third of the world's goods.

There are many countries with soil just as fertile and with natural resources more

abundant than we possess. Yet, in less than 200 years the United States has made more progress than any other nation in all history.

What has been responsible for our unparalleled achievements? Why have we surpassed other nations with equal or greater population and natural resources?

What does the United States possess that other nations do not have?

It is individual freedom. It is the right to work at the job of our choice. The right to retain the results of our enterprise, courage, and resourcefulness. The right to take part in our Government. The right to worship God as our conscience dictates.

In the American plan of government our Republic was established on the proposition that human dignity and individual freedom are divine blessings bestowed upon all mankind by the Creator of the universe.

Our government was based upon the premise that all men are divinely endowed with certain unalienable rights and among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

The founding fathers put particular stress upon the pursuit of happiness. They never attempted to guarantee happiness.

In adopting the Bill of Rights they did not propose to establish freedom of speech, press, assembly or religion or to protect the right of property. The founding fathers recognized these rights as God-given.

They sought to protest them from violation or encroachment by an all-powerful central government. They feared that the concentration of power in a central government would destroy the freedom of the individual.

Now—what is our situation today? What dangers confront us? To what extent have we departed from our time-honored plan?

We live in a time of confusion and uncertainty. The world is filled with strange philosophies.

They are those who would destroy freedom of the individual and would impose the slavery of state socialism.

We have those who would sell the secrets of our Nation to our enemies.

We have those who violate the law in order that they may secure certain selfish gains.

We have chiselers, gamblers and racketeers.

There are those who expect government to care for them. There are those who are not loyal to any government.

We have those in public life who emphasize the characteristics of greed, selfish ambition and ingratitude.

Any of these things can destroy America.

An ancient philosopher said, "An ungrateful man is never an able man". I am wondering if this does not also apply to nations.

Do we appreciate what we have received?

Let us briefly consider some of the trends in our country.

There is a trend toward a strong centralized government. To a large extent it is the result of indifference and neglect of our civic duties. We pay our taxes and give little attention as to how the money is spent.

Nineteen million Americans receive a regular check from government. Almost 8,000,000 work for government.

We have too many pressure groups demanding that the Government money be spent for sectional or regional advantage.

Through the demand for new functions, services, and frills in government, our Government has grown so big and costly that it endangers our freedom of action.

Let us consider some figures.

In 50 years the cost of government has increased more than fortyfold while the population has just a little more than doubled.

In 20 years the national debt has increased more than 15 times. On a per capita basis, State debts have increased 62 percent since the end of World War II.

In 20 years the number of Federal employees has increased more than three times.

All levels of government now cost the people of the United States about $65,000,000,000. More than one-fourth of all our production goes to govern ourselves. We pay 13 times as much for government as we do for education. We pay 40 times as much for government as we contribute to all our churches.

We are asking government to support our prices, to make us loans, to guarantee our investments, and to support a large part of local and State government.

We must always remember that when the Federal Government contributes money it takes a large measure of control.

With control goes restriction on local authority and initiative. It eventually means complete control. The liberties of the individual are taken away.

As an example of what centralization of government can do—Great Britain, 100 years ago, was the best example of stern individualism of any nation in the world. It carried the flag of freedom on all the oceans of the earth. Now a Britisher cannot repair his house without the consent of government.

People say it cannot happen in the United States. They said it could not happen in Great Britain. But it did happen. It can happen in America. Socialism creeps up on us like a seductive drug.

We are going toward a socialistic state.

Any American can see the drift.

That is why it is so important to wake up America to the dangers to American freedom.

What course should we pursue?

First. Every American must take an active part in government. That means taking part in politics. We must vote and vote intelligently at every election. Too many of us try to evade our responsibilities.

One of the greatest dangers confronting our form of government is that too many cities are controlled by political machines. They vote. The rural people fail to vote.

Second. We must all willingly obey the laws of God and man.

Racketeering, gambling, and law evasion are destroying the moral fiber of our country.

Third. Government must keep out of business. It must not compete with private enterprise. No government has ever been able to manage business as well as individuals. Look at the plight of Great Britain.

Fourth. Every American must be gainfully employed at wages sufficient to maintain the American standard of living. The best security for the American worker is a good job at good wages.

Fifth. Americans must be prepared to make certain sacrifices. It has become necessary for us to help the economy of many struggling democracies. Americans must remember that we must defend the ideals of America against the ideology of Russia, either in a cold war or a hot war.

The ideology of Russia is communism. Communism denies God. It destroys individual freedom.

To preserve the American ideal, based upon God and individual freedom, we must be strong materially, sound financially, and of great spiritual attainments. We must encourage other free nations believing in the same ideals to join us economically, materially, and spiritually.

We must remember that we cannot depend entirely on military preparation. We must combine all of our great strength—military, economic, political and spiritual. Here at home we must have high moral principles and strict observance of the law.

We must have a stable currency. We must cut down the cost of Government and stop inflation.

Every subversive and disloyal element must be eliminated.

Our freedom is too precious to be lost through indifference or neglect. Therefore, I repeat, if we are to help save America we must all interest ourselves in politics, because the kind of government we are to have is decided at the ballot box.

We need a deeper understanding of practical, patriotic politics—the kind of political activity that is based on the highest standards of morality, honesty, sincerity, and love of country.

With those standards as our guide we can spread the gospel of true Americanism. We can help to wake up America. We can arouse in the Nation a new spirit of dedication to the flag and the ideals symbolized by the Star-Spangled Banner.

It's great to be an American. Let us have the courage to be real Americans.

Let us have pride in the past and look with confidence to the future.

Let us put our trust in the sovereignty of God rather than the sovereignty of an all-powerful central state.

Missouri Laws for the Benefit of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the summary of the Missouri laws granting rights, benefits, and privileges to veterans, their dependents, and their organizations as compiled by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives, revised to January 1, 1950, as follows:

Chart résumé of State laws granting rights, benefits, and privileges to veterans, their dependents, and their organizations—Missouri

Type of law	Résumé	Citation
Bonus	World War I. Amount: $10 per month, $250 maximum payment. Time for filing applications with the adjutant general expired Dec. 31, 1947.	Const., art. 4, § 44b; Rev. Stat. Ann. (1943; Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), § 9577.1–9577.26.
	World War II. Rejected on referendum	Laws, 1947 v. 2, pp. 455–457.
Civil relief and war emergency provisions.	Acknowledgments of written instruments executed by members of the armed forces of the United States, validity.	Rev. Stat. Ann. (1948), §§ 1948, 3410–3411.
	Soldiers or mariners may dispose of wages or other personal property as by common law or by reducing the same to writing.	Rev. Stat. (1943), § 543.
Civil rights	Absentee registration and voting by members of the armed forces	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), §§ 11474a, 11478a; § 11524.1–11524.12.
	Voting rights of inmates of soldiers' homes and hospitals	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), § 11469.

Chart résumé of State laws granting rights, benefits, and privileges to veterans, their dependents, and their organizations—Missouri—Continued

Type of law	Résumé	Citation
Claims; assistance in obtaining benefits; safekeeping of papers.	*Notary services.*—The State service officer is authorized to administer oaths in connection with claims against the United States or any State.	Rev. Stat. Ann. (1943), § 15085.
	Public-record certification.—Certified copies of discharges shall be furnished to veterans, in certain counties free of charge.	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), §§ 13187.2, 13408.18a.
	—— Custodians of records are required to furnish free of charge, to veterans or their dependents, copies of any public record for use in connection with claims against the United States.	Rev. Stat. Ann. (1943), § 15077.
	Recording of discharges.—Discharge shall be recorded free of charge	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, (1949), § 15077a.
	—— Recording of discharges in certain counties	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part. 1949), §§ 13187.2, 13408.18a.
	Service officers, etc.—The State service officer directed to disseminate among veterans information concerning their rights under the laws of the United States and to aid veterans and their dependents in prosecuting claims against the United States or any State, benefits to which they may be entitled.	Rev. Stat. Ann. (1943; Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), §§ 15083–15086, 1508A–1508F.
Educational benefits; qualification for the professions and trades.	Educational and training institutions for World War II veterans. Acceptance of Federal funds for on-the-job training.	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), §§ 10525, 10608.5.
	Public accountant certificate may be issued to qualified applicant upon termination of active military service.	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part. 1949), § 14911j.
	Renewal of barbers' certificates of registration after termination of military service	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), § 10132.
Employment preferences, privileges, etc.	Benefit rights under the Unemployment Compensation Act	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), § 9423 (a) (r).
	Preference to veterans in the State highway department service	Rev. Stat. Ann. (1943), § 8748.
	Preference to veterans, widows and wives of disabled veterans, under the State merit system.	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part. 1949), §§ 12851.16, 12851.24, 12851.44.
	The State service officer shall be a veteran	Rev. Stat. Ann. (1943), § 15083.
	War service credit to firemen and policemen under any retirement pension system	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part. 1949), §§ 9542.3, 15078.1.
	War service credit un er the public school retirement system	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), § 9577.73.
Guardianship	Uniform Guardianship Act with modifications. Provides for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran. to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), § 607.1–607.22.
Homes (institutional)	Admission of Confederate veterans, their wives, widows, and orphans, to the Confederate soldiers' home.	Rev. Stat. Ann. (1943; Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), §§ 15128–15134.
	Admission of veterans of the Mexican War and of the Civil War and their wives to the Federal soldiers' home.	Rev. Stat. Ann. (1943; Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), §§ 15136–15141.
	Voting rights of inmates of soldiers' homes	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), § 11469.
Hospital benefits	Commitment of an incompetent veteran to a Federal hospital, under Uniform Guardianship Act.	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), § 607.17.
Loans, contracts of minors, etc.	Authority to make loans guaranteed under Servicemen's Readjustment Act	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), § 374.4.
	Removal of minority disability of veterans eligible for benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), § 374.1–374.3.
Medals	Award of medals for service in the World War, Spanish-American War, and the Mexican War.	Laws 1919, pp. 76–77.
	Awarding of the meritorious service medal to individuals who have performed meritorious military service which reflects honorably and creditably upon the State of Missouri.	Rev Stat. Ann. (1943), § 15080.
National Guard service	Credit for time spent in the military service of the United States with reference to service medals.	Rev. Stat. Ann. (1943), § 15081.
Records	Records in certain counties of all residents therein who have been in the armed forces of the United States.	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), §§ 13187.2, 13408.18a.
Relief and rehabilitation	Acceptance of Federal funds for on-the-job training	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), § 10525.
	Duties of State service officer	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), § 15084.
Tax and license fee exemptions	*Income tax.*—Donations to posts or organizations of war veterans exempt from tax	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), § 11349.
	—— Federal disability benefits exempt from tax	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), § 11348.
	—— Filing of income-tax returns and payment of income taxes by members of the armed forces deferred.	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), § 11354.1–11354.2.
	—— Military compensation not exceeding $1,500 exempt from tax during World War II. No exemptions allowed for any taxable year after 1947.	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), § 11348.1.
	Professional licenses.—Registered architects and professional engineers exempt from payment of renewal fee after termination of military service in World War II.	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), § 10139.14 (note).
	Property tax.—Members of the armed forces exempt from payment of penalties due on delinquent taxes.	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), § 11085.
Veterans' organizations	*Insignia.*—Unauthorized wearing or use of insignia, badges, etc., of any military or ex-military organization declared a misdemeanor.	Rev. Stat. Ann. (1943; Cum An. Pocket Part, 1949), §§ 15462–15465.
	Meeting places, etc.—Armory privileges	Rev. Stat. Ann. (1943), § 15064.
	Tax exemption.—Donations to posts or organizations of veterans exempt from income tax.	Rev. Stat. Ann. (Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), § 11349.
Veterans' service agency	State service officer	Rev. Stat. Ann. (1943; Cum. An. Pocket Part, 1949), §§ 15083–15086, 15086A–15086F.

City Council of Chicago Urges Federal Communications Commission To Reconsider Freeze Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Emil V. Pacini, who ably represents in the City Council of Chicago the great tenth ward, most of which is in the district of the Honorable JAMES V. BUCKLEY, and a part of which is in the district which I represent, is sparking the fight of the people of Chicago to maintain that city as a center of television manufacturing and broadcasting. I am happy to join with my colleague, Mr. BUCKLEY, and with the other Members of the Chicago delegation in urging upon the Members of the House a careful reading of the resolution adopted yesterday by the City Council of Chicago and which forcibly sets forth the meritorious contentions of the people of that city. The resolution follows:

REQUEST TO FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION TO RECONSIDER ITS DENIAL OF CITY OF CHICAGO'S PETITION FOR MODIFICATION OF COMMISSION'S FREEZE ORDER OF SEPTEMBER 29, 1948

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO AT A REGULAR MEETING HELD JUNE 14, 1950

Whereas the City Council of the City of Chicago on January 20, 1950, adopted a certain resolution declaring it to be the sense of the city council that the public interest of the people of Chicago required that all necessary and appropriate steps be taken to obtain authorizations for the operation of additional television stations in Chicago and the utilization of all seven of the channels allotted to Chicago by the Federal Communications Commission rather than only the four channels currently in use; and

Whereas pursuant to the direction of the city council by the implementing resolution of March 24, 1950, the corporation counsel of the city of Chicago filed with the Federal Communications Commission on behalf of the city a petition requesting that Commission to modify its freeze order of September 29, 1948, to permit the processing and granting of applications for additional television stations in the city of Chicago so that authorizations for the operation of television facilities be granted for all seven channels allotted to Chicago; and

Whereas the citizens of this city recognize the necessity of maintaining the city of Chicago as a center of television manufacture and broadcasting, as reflected in an editorial in the Chicago Daily News of April 12, 1950, as follows:

"Be fair to Chicago

"Some weeks ago the city council adopted a resolution directing an appeal to the Federal Communications Commission for more television stations in Chicago.

"The resolution, introduced by Alderman Emil V. Pacini, certainly represents the interests of the people of Chicago. Corporation Counsel Benjamin S. Adamowski has been quoted as promising prompt action in conformity with the resolution. We hope he acts vigorously as well as promptly.

"At present there are only four stations in Chicago, though seven licenses have been granted in New York and seven in Los Angeles. The population of the Chicago area far exceeds that of Los Angeles. Moreover, the population of Chicago has an unusual interest in television because this city is one of the great centers of television manufacture. It is, besides, a city which originates many excellent programs and which has the facilities to produce many more.

"The discrimination against Chicago results from enforcement of the FCC freeze order of September 29, 1948. It was designed to restrain expansion of the business until color broadcasting is installed.

"This development is not imminent. There is no reason why Chicago people should suffer meanwhile from an unreasonable discrimination."

And whereas the Federal Communications Commission on May 31, 1950, denied at that time the petition of the city to modify its freeze order of September 29, 1948, and is continuing its general proceeding and study instituted more than 2 years ago with the ultimate objective of formulating new rules and policies affecting the radio and television industry; and

Whereas certain applications for new and additional television stations in Chicago were filed with the Federal Communications Commission prior to its freeze order of September 29, 1948, and are presently pending, and a great saving of time could be accomplished if the Commission would permit the processing of these pending applications, including hearings thereon where required, concurrently with the hearings in the rule-making proceedings, in order that final decisions may be rendered thereon simultaneously with or immediately after the termination of the rule-making proceedings; be it

Resolved, That the corporation counsel of the city of Chicago be and he is hereby directed to file promptly on behalf of the city of Chicago a petition with the Federal Communications Commission requesting a reconsideration of the petition of the city for a modification of the freeze order of September 29, 1948, and specifically requesting the Commission to permit the processing of all applications for additional television stations in Chicago that are presently pending, in order that all possible time may be saved and final decisions rendered thereon either simultaneously with or immediately after the termination of its rule-making proceedings; and the corporation counsel is further directed to take any and all steps necessary or expedient to obtain such relief; be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be and he is hereby directed to send a copy of this resolution to Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS and Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, to each Representative from the State of Illinois in the Eighty-first Congress, and to the chairman and members of the Federal Communications Commission in Washington.

Imports From Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Victor Riesel, whose syndicated column Inside Labor appears in more than 200 American daily newspapers, for months has been writing against the importation of goods into the United States from Communist Russia.

Columnist Riesel pointed out that this trade provides the Soviets with American dollars which she employs to buy from other nations such materials as iron, cast iron, steel, copper, zinc, electrical equipment and other things which strengthen her war-making potential.

Mr. Riesel in a recent column said, and correctly so, that the Treasury Department has the power and the authority to stop these imports because these Russian goods are produced in whole or in part by slave or forced labor. He thinks, and so do I, that the Secretary of the Treasury should use these powers which he possesses to prohibit further imports of Russian canned crab, furs and other Soviet goods into the United States.

During the early months of this year 59,000 cases of Russian canned crab meat came into this country from Russia. There is every indication that Russia will, unless prevented from doing so by the Treasury Department, continue to ship more of this crab into the United States. If she does, our American crabbing industry will be ruined, for its fishermen and cannery workers cannot compete with Russia's slave labor.

For 10 weeks I have been seeking to have the Secretary of the Treasury ban further imports of this Russian crab meat into the United States. A 1930 law says the Treasury can ban imports that are produced in whole or in part by slave labor. The Treasury for 10 weeks has been saying it is investigating the matter but so far no decision has been arrived at by the Secretary of the Treasury as to what he will do about these imports and nothing so far has been done by the Treasury, after 10 weeks of investigation, to block these crab imports. Meanwhile, more and more Russian canned crab is coming into the country to further undermine the prosperity and employment of our American crab fishing industry.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a recent column by Mr. Riesel which appeared in more than 200 newspapers. The Riesel column follows:

INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON.—On a clear day, from this hotel room, you can see the United States Treasury Department, but seeing isn't understanding. And until I can lift the fog from around some of its policies, I'm going to keep asking these questions:

Why, if President Truman says the Soviets are preparing for war, are we providing the dollars in trade to help them prepare?

Why are we permitting a small dollar-happy importing crowd to buy almost $150,000,000 worth of slave-labor goods from Soviet Slave Satellites, Inc., each year? According to vital data we've just dug up here, the Russians are using those 150,000,000-dollar bills to buy metal and electrical equipment to bolster their army and home economy.

The Treasury Department can order our ports shut to slave stuff without 15 minutes' preparation. Why doesn't it?

Now, just so that you know from whence some of the hot stuff comes which the Soviets may throw at us, let me be very specific, with grim statistics right out of congressional files:

For this stuff the Soviets paid in good, hard United States dollars last year.

From Belgium and Luxemburg, the Russians' purchasing commissions picked up $45,600,000 worth of iron, cast iron, steel, copper, zinc, electrical equipment, boilers, mechanical appliances, and machinery. I have the exact tonnage here, but let's not clog this query. The Treasury Department need only ask someone such as Congressman MACK of Washington for the details. Incidentally, it might answer his letters, too.

From the United Kingdom, the Russians have picked up $83,500,000 worth of machinery, electrical generators, machine tools, metalworking apparatus, locomotives, ships, and electrical equipment.

From France, the Kremlinites trucked off with $27,400,000 worth of machinery, transportation equipment, steel-mill rolled stuff, and rubber products.

Stacked up against this information, it is clear that Congressman MACK's demand for a ban on imports from iron-curtain countries—to slash Russia's dollar supply—should not die a musty death in congressional records. At least, let's know why we're permitting the stuff to come in from Sovietland.

Is there a good reason? If we need these materials which we import from iron-curtain areas, why shouldn't they be purchased elsewhere—from lands which aren't preparing to throw shrapnel into some of our nicest boys?

Dealing with the slave-camp champs complicates our entire economic life—just when we're in the midst of some highly complex worrying about how imports from our friends abroad are wiping out thousands of jobs.

As Representatives TOM STEED, Oklahoma, and MACK put it to me, if Congress is angered by this whole intricate problem of foreign imports it will shut our ports to all foreign goods. Then we'll just cripple those friendly nations who actually need our dollars to rehabilitate and democratize themselves.

There's considerable pressure here from unions and management for just such a move—and the heat comes from men on both sides who are fighting for the existence of their industries and thousands of jobs. For example, the assault on oil imports has been intensified by reports to John Lewis of lost jobs and growing poverty in the mine patches.

Last year, you discover here, each coal digger paid an average income tax of $264. This year, even with the union permitting all sorts of shifts and overtime to make up for the recent climactic coal strike, the average miner will not make enough money to pay any income tax. At least 1,000 mines have been shut. Scores of thousands of diggers now are back on the 1- to 3-day week. At least 25,000 are totally out of work, along with 25,000 railroad workers who hauled the black stuff. And the mine union leaders blame oil imports for this cataclysm in coal.

Many smaller industries are hard hit by imports from friendly nations, whom we're rebuilding. There's been a big parade here of such union-management men as leaders

in the wallpaper industry, who reveal that because a British wallpaper craftsman earns between 42 and 48 cents an hour, and his counterpart in the United States gets a minimum of $1.70 an hour, 2,000 jobs have disappeared in what was once a 5,000-man industry.

There are literally scores of industry leaders testifying to similar sufferings. Congressman STEED points out that some 250 Representatives now have the heat on them to do something. If at least the Soviet imports aren't curbed, the White House may find itself with a runaway Congress on foreign policy next year.

Why Won't the Newspapers Publish Letters Like These?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters received by me:

EDDIE IS THE VETERANS' FRIEND

Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR EDDIE: Here is one vet who isn't swayed by the poisonous letters in the papers, and there's lots more of us too.

We were great guys when we went away in 1941 and 1942 and the sky was the limit.

Some people are talking different now and the veteran gets a chance to tell who his friends really are.

I know one thing, you've never let us down since the war and you treat us the same as you always did. Now that you need us, we vets aren't going to let you down with our votes either.

I remember when I was in Guam, how I was desperate to hear from home and finally appealed to you, Mr. HALL. You got after the War Department and the mail came through pronto after that. I still am grateful to you.

You also looked after my wife and baby when she wrote you to hurry up her allotment checks. You always got action.

Most of the boys at the Post feel the same way I do. You've done favors for everybody and I can tell you they're not letting you down even though your enemies are putting on the heat.

Good luck, and God bless you, Mr. HALL.

E. N.

LETTER FROM ENDICOTT JOHNSON WORKER PRAISES HALL

Hon. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank the Lord the people in Endicott Johnson have someone in Washington like you to speak for them.

I got your letter telling me what you're doing for us by trying to keep up the duty on shoes from Japan. I'm sure glad to hear about it.

Every worker here is anxious to keep a job and we know we can't if they let down the bars for a lot of foreign shoes. Our people are liable not to have a place to work if they flood the country this way.

Keep up the good work you're doing for us up here.

Best of luck.

Your friend,

Z. F. J.

DEAR ED: In the name of the forgotten boys of World War I, I want to thank you for voting in favor of the veterans' pension bill.

If they were all as interested in us down there as you are, we would have had our pensions by this time.

Most of World War I vets are reaching the age where they're beginning to show signs of going down the other side. They aren't the men they used to be and they want to take it a little easier. A lot of them are too sick to work.

I know what you're up against this time, ED. The politicians want to lick you and put somebody down there that will please them.

But I'm with you and so are a bunch of us.

Your friend,

J. J. H.

American People Understand True Nature of Chinese Red Regime and Oppose United States Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Gallup poll from the Washington Post. Despite the tremendous propaganda in favor of the Chinese Communists to which the American people have been subjected for years, an impartial poll still shows that their instincts are fundamentally sound in opposing our recognition of the Peking regime. Despite such public opposition our State Department is acquiescing in attempts to achieve back-door recognition through admission of the Communist regime to the United Nations.

THE GALLUP POLL—UNITED STATES ATTITUDES TOWARD CHINESE REDS FOUND HOSTILE AS EVER

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., June 1.—Although Britain's Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin is urging that Red China be given a seat on the UN, American attitudes toward the Chinese Communist regime are just as hostile as ever.

The latest survey by the American Institute of Public Opinion finds, for instance, that diplomatic recognition of the Chinese Reds by the American Government is opposed by a vote of more than 2 to 1.

"Do you think the United States should recognize the new government in China—that is, do you think we should send an ambassador and have dealings with this government in China?"

The vote:

	Percent
Favor recognition	16
Opposed	40
No opinion	9
	65
Not familiar with China situation	35
	100

A similar survey in November 1949 showed a ratio of 20 percent for recognition, 42 percent against.

The administration's China policy has been singled out for attack by a great many Republican leaders. They argue that we might have been able to prevent the fall of China into Communist hands if we had followed a different policy, and that if Republicans had been consulted by the administration in dealing with the problem of China the outcome might have been different.

So far as the general public is concerned, the term "bipartisan foreign policy" is little known. Only one voter in every four knows what the phrase means or refers to.

The term refers to joint determination by Republican and Democratic leaders of our actions and policies in dealing with other countries.

The 26 percent familiar with the term were asked:

"Do you think it is a good idea or a poor idea to have a bipartisan foreign policy?"

The vote:

	Percent
Good idea	21
Fair or poor	3
Don't know	2
	26

"Would you say that we now have a bipartisan foreign policy, or not?"

Here is the over-all vote and the vote by parties:

	Republicans	Democrats	All voters
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Yes, we do	10	9	9
No, we do not	21	9	14
Don't know	3	3	3
	34	21	26
Not familiar with term	66	79	74
Total	100	100	100

Industrial Opportunities and Problems in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent a district in the deep South—the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama.

Both in and out of Congress, in recent years, it has been my pleasure to become acquainted with some of the many fine advantages which the South possesses—advantages which I predict will make her in the years to come the industrial hub of this Nation.

Even now the South is enjoying the highest income in its history. But present income is only a fraction of what it will be when this Nation discovers its vast potential.

Alabama is wonderfully blessed with water. Yet, the hand of development has barely touched its rivers. By way of illustration, the great Warrior-Tombigbee River systems, which traverse a part of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, and whose tributaries reach their arms into every county of the district, can be considered as one of our greatest resources. The projected movement of iron ore from Venezuela and other South American countries into the Birmingham steel district makes the further development of these rivers imperative. The connection of the Tennessee and Tombigbee becomes a "must" in the interest of national defense.

Yes, Alabama's annual rainfall of 50 inches, gives it abundant water for navigation purposes, for hydro-electric power development, for industrial and domestic uses. We are living in an age in which the water resources of this country are assuming an ever increasing importance. Early this year there was organized in Birmingham, Ala., the Southeastern Resources Development Association with emphasis on the development of the water and land resources of the Southeast, and with like emphasis on their conservation and proper use. Hon. P. O. Davis, director of the Extension Service in Alabama was elected president of the association. In his column, Along the Way, in the June 1950 issue of This Month in Rural Alabama, Mr. Davis makes a comparison of the abundant water resources of Alabama, and of the comparative lack of water resources of one of our Western States. Under the permission heretofore granted me I insert Mr. Davis' article, which points up Alabama's water advantages, at this point in the RECORD:

ALONG THE WAY

(By P. O. Davis, director, Alabama Polytechnic Institute Extension Service)

A good way to learn is by comparison. And I like to compare Alabama with other States. Last month I did this in New Mexico.

My first impression concerned their rainfall. At Albuquerque, where we visited the annual rainfall is 8 inches compared with 50 to 60 inches in Alabama. Their State average is about 12 inches.

A friend there told us that from last September to the first of this May they had one-half inch of rain, including snow. But they were not greatly concerned. In fact, they are adjusted to little rainfall and make efficient use of water.

Everything that grows well must be watered. Lawns, for example, are watered daily unless water is rationed, in which case lawns are allowed to parch.

ONE HUNDRED TO ONE

I saw one big block of land which supports about one cow per 100 acres. I wondered if a cow could do that much walking. Some of them do.

This 100 acres reminded me that in Alabama we are looking forward to 1 acre carrying a cow most of the year, and some acres are now doing it. That New Mexico land would do as much as ours with our rainfall. Lack of water is their limiting factor.

My visit to New Mexico was caused by a river improvement project near Albuquerque. The Federal Government is building a dam above the city for flood and sediment control and irrigation.

Most water which feeds that river comes from snowfall in the mountains at the source of the river. Snows melt in the early summer, freeing the water to rush back to the sea. It is a foamy mess. Each State served by this river gets its portion of the water, under an interstate agreement.

Their rivers are dry most of the year. As we stood and looked at a dry river, I thought of the Alabama, the Tombigbee, the Coosa, the Tallapoosa, the Tennessee, the Chattahoochee, the Warrior, and other Alabama streams which flow every day in the year.

ALABAMA'S ADVANTAGE

We do very little irrigating in Alabama, but we should do more and more. In this way, we'll avoid much damage by temporary droughts. Pastures, as well as vegetable crops and other plants, can be irrigated to good advantage in Alabama.

In addition to irrigation and flood control, our rivers provide navigation, which they don't have in those western streams. Their water supply is inadequate.

There are very few trees in that country. Most of them are on the mountains, which rob the clouds of their moisture, and along the streams. In fact, rivers out there at this season of the year are marked by a few trees and grass growing along the river or in the river bed.

Most of their agriculture is by irrigation; but in some parts of the State they have enough rain for dry-land farming. Grains and livestock are their major farm products.

After seeing what they can do with so little water, I marvel at the opportunities which we have in Alabama.

With wise use we can have conservation, not only of water, but of land and other things. Minerals, of course, are consumed and gone, but not so with land, with water, and also with trees and other plants if we keep the land producing wisely.

Mr. Speaker, the land resources of the South together with its high rainfall and abundant water, its fine climate, and long-growing season has caused at least one of the Nation's economists to predict for the South 25 years of sustained general farm prosperity. This prediction is, of course, based upon a continuing growth of population, a continuing growth of better eating habits, farm efficiency of production, and development of proper marketing programs and techniques. At this point I insert an editorial from the April 26, 1950, issue of the Decatur Daily entitled "Ahead for the Farmer":

AHEAD FOR THE FARMER

The South is in a period of farming adjustment. Cotton controls, plus mechanical labor, plus Government incentives, plus scientific farm training place the South very definitely in a period of farm adjustment.

So, recognizing these factors, what's ahead for farming in the South? The San Antonio Express sees the future in bright light, saying:

"Though, in the years just ahead, the American farmers will face some difficult readjustment problems and other troubles will probably develop, the underlying trends point to 25 years of sustained farmer prosperity.

"An outstanding authority in the field—Dr. O. V. Wells, who heads the United States Bureau of Agricultural Economics—contributes that opinion to the current Farm Journal. He cites certain factors which apparently justify his optimism:

"1. The country's population should increase from 150,000,000 to 175,000,000 by 1975.

"2. The typical American today eats better by some 10 percent than before the war.

"3. Farm efficiency has increased to where no more cropland and fewer workers produce bigger crops today than the farmers produced 25 years ago.

"4. Increasingly, the farmers are learning to work together on both their production and their marketing programs.

"Taken together, those trends obviously spell prosperity for the farmer. Against those factors, Dr. Wells poses two big questions:

"1. Can this Nation maintain employment at present high levels through the next 25 years? Dr. Wells thinks it can.

"2. Will the farmers be able to sell one-third of their cotton, grain, and tobacco abroad, as they have done for some years past?

"That one is not so readily answered, but Dr. Wells points to Europe's growing population and to its potential buying power, as normal production shall be resumed and trade barriers shall be lowered.

"In effect, Dr. Wells concludes that the Americans can keep and build up their export markets, if they only play their cards right. He believes they have economic sense enough to do that."

Mr. Speaker, we not only have a challenge to develop our agricultural marketing processes, but the same is true with regard to marketing our industrial products. Such industries as we have are sometimes criticized for relying too much on local markets, when with other sales approaches we might be able to capture more national and even international markets. At this point, under permission granted, I insert an editorial from the May 29, 1950, issue of the Montgomery Advertiser entitled "Some Friendly Criticism" which deals with the general problem:

SOME FRIENDLY CRITICISM

Some of the things the South needs to do to make the most of what it has are given in a publication of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta. It reprinted an address by Robert D. Calkins, director, general education board, on marketing southern products.

It is widely recognized that the South is going places, standing at the beginning of an era of development. That is just the point Calkins makes; in spite of substantial advances, we are so far merely on the threshold. There is still plenty to learn.

The South, Calkins says, is sacrificing today over $20,000,000,000 a year for being without the skill and ability that would make it prosperous: "If the South were abreast of the rest of the country, incomes would be at least 50 percent higher than they are today."

On the asset side we are credited with an abundance of poorly used resources; some pockets of capital—more than we suspect; and a people fundamentally as able as any to be found anywhere.

As to the needs: The first requisite is listed as purpose, determination. To fire more promising leaders with enthusiasm to spend their lives in the development of the southern region by building up industry and trade.

We are reminded that southern leaders go north and west and do great things. But by no means all the talent moves out: Somehow the latent talents of those who remain must be released. For southern people have had so little so long that they do not realize what they are capable of.

Calkins emphasized that the South's destiny depends primarily on its own people: Southern people alone can or will make southerners prosperous. Outsiders may help. They can be induced to contribute capital and know-how and other forms of assistance, but fundamentally what the South reaps it first must sow, and what it does not sow itself it will not reap.

A basic southern handicap was given as the fact that, with some challenging exceptions we have not gotten away from the antiquated marketing system that relies on others to process and distribute our products. And many of the industries that process Southern products look only to local markets, with no widespread interest in the potentialities of national or international markets

"In a sense," Calkins declared, "too many southern firms having something to sell are saying, in effect, 'Sure, we have a good product. Why don't you find out about it, come down here and buy it?'" We are reminded that if New England and the Midwest had followed such low-pressure sales methods they would never have gotten where they are.

Another handicap cited in the marketing of southern products is the frequent irregular quality, irregular and undependable supply. Attention is called to the contrast in the marketing job on southern pecans and California walnuts.

Virginia, we are reminded, produces marvelous Smithfield hams, but the rest of the country rarely sees them: "If California produced Smithfield hams, Virginians would eat more of them than they do now."

The South, of course, cannot change overnight from an agricultural to an industrial and trading economy, full-fledged and with all the aptitude of more experienced areas. That we are on our way should not cause complacency, or make us fail to appreciate intelligent and friendly criticism.

Calkins sounded a hopeful note on the need for selling the South to the Nation as a whole: "The rest of the country is fed up with discouraging attacks that give the impression that the South is hopeless. It will welcome news of what is really being done to carry the South forward. * * * Show the world what is really being done to remedy the cause of criticism and criticism will then become less of a popular fad."

Mr. Speaker, another rich resource of Alabama, and particularly of the Seventh Congressional District, is its coal. Alabama's coal field covers a wide area, but I will confine my remarks to the coal resources of the Seventh District of Alabama, Walker, Marion, Winston, Blount, and Cullman Counties have large coal deposits. Lesser deposits are found in Fayette County, and still lesser deposits in Franklin County.

The coal of the Seventh Congressional District, though of generally good quality, is in thin seams, and most of it must be washed in preparation for market. Our mine owners generally are progressive, and our mine workers are as efficient and productive as can be found anywhere. However, thin seams, the necessity for washing, and the expense of washing makes it extremely difficult for our mines to compete with those, for example, of West Virginia, Kentucky, and Illinois, that operate on thicker and cleaner seams of coal. An example of the operation of these factors is that the number of people engaged in mining in Walker County, Ala., has decreased from approximately 6,000 in 1948 to 1,500 in 1950.

Thus the coal industry in the Seventh District of Alabama is now going through a period of painful readjustment, the consequences of which are high unemployment, dislocation, and suffering.

The problem is one of seeking new and diversified industries for the district, in which labor, management, and capital all have a great stake. The problem is also one of finding new and practical uses for our millions of tons of untouched coal.

Dieselization of the railroads has cut off what up to now has been an important coal market. Oil and natural gas as sources of domestic heat are taking their toll of the market. The reopening and improvement of European mines has cut off our export market. Thus, we grope for new markets that will again provide employment for our miners. A ray of hope can be found in the experiment in underground coal gassification now being carried on at Gorgas, in Walker County, by the United States Bureau of Mines and the Alabama Power Co., which, we hope will produce practical results.

Another ray of hope for our coal industry can be found in the experiments being carried on at Louisiana, Mo., by the United States Bureau of Mines, which have for their objective the conversion of coal into gasoline at such prices as will enable the gasoline so produced to compete with gasoline made from natural petroleum. I personally believe that these experiments hold great hopes for the coal industry of the future. At this point I insert an article from the May 24, 1950, issue of the Tuscaloosa News entitled "Gasoline Converted From Powdered Coal":

GASOLINE CONVERTED FROM POWDERED COAL

(By Howard W. Blakeslee)

LOUISIANA, MO.—A new demonstration of making gasoline from coal was begun here Monday by the United States Bureau of Mines.

Each day about 100 tons of coal, ground nearly as fine as talcum powder, is converted into about 150 barrels of gasoline, plus 50 barrels of useful oils. This is done by adding hydrogen.

This demonstration aims to show that synthetic fuels made from coal can, when needed, supply the oil and gasoline necessary to America's future economic welfare and military security.

The demonstration also is designed to show that these new fuels offered the coal-mining industry an escape from diminishing returns and will insure the coal miners steadier work.

This gasoline can be made at the mines for year-round sale. The Bureau of Mines says this process should lower the costs of mining and transporting coal, which will be turned into oil and travel by pipeline instead of railway.

The plant here is an American version of the coal hydrogenation process long used in Europe, but shows how synthetic gasoline can be made more cheaply than abroad. This is the first plant in the United States. It covers several acres of ground, but is only demonstration size. A full-scale plant would produce 10,000 to 30,000 barrels a day.

This work is done as future insurance at the direction of Congress. The Bureau of Mines does not predict when the synthetic fuel may be as cheap as natural gasoline.

But the Bureau reports that its coal gasoline might now be made in a full-scale plant, using $3.12 a ton coal, for 14½ cents a gallon, including a small profit. Comparable grades of gasoline are selling at 11 to 15 cents a gallon. All these figures are tank-wagon prices.

Cheaper coals can make good gasoline at 11 to 13 cents a gallon. Dr. L. L. Hirst, chief of the coal-to-oil demonstration, estimates that one of the cheaper coals tested would produce gasoline at 8 cents a gallon, not allowing for profit, interest, or selling costs. Byproducts help make this low price. This is a Montana strip-mine coal that cost $1.50 a ton.

Dr. James Boyd, Director of the United States Bureau of Mines, says:

"On a limited scale, by taking advantage of low-cost coal near good markets, as well as the sale of valuable chemical products, a few plants might be commercially successful now."

A plant making coal gasoline by a different process will go into operation later this year. This plant will burn coal in pure oxygen live steam. The process makes a gas which is then treated about the same as natural gas to make gasoline.

Mr. Speaker, the industrial development of the South is in its infancy. Yet the meager progress made thus far has contributed immeasurably to increasing the income of our area. If this income is to be increased further we must all, whether engaged in management or labor, in business, farming, mining, Government, or whatever our occupation may be, work together to advertise and sell our resources, our capabilities, and our possibilities to the Nation. When industry learns what we have to offer it will come to us. Mr. W. O. Dobbins, director of the Alabama State Planning Board recently made several observations that are of interest. I include an article from the May 25, 1950, issue of the Birmingham Post-Herald, which quotes Mr. Dobbins:

GET UP AND GET, LESS TALK TERMED NEED IN SOUTH—W. O. DOBBINS LISTS AREA'S OPPORTUNITIES

MONTGOMERY, ALA., May 24.—The South needs less talk about corn pone and molasses and more about her abundant natural resources, a public planning expert said today.

"We're sitting right in the middle of undreamed of opportunities and that's all we're doing—sitting," said State Planning Director W. O. (Bill) Dobbins.

Dobbins, who is vice president of the National Association of State Planning and Development Agencies, advocates a "get up and get" promotional program to help get the South's story across.

"What we need is an alert, go-getting organization that will pick up the ball and run with it," he added.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of industrial and agricultural development is brought home to us when we realize the present great need in Alabama for better schools, including buildings, libraries, laboratories, and better pay for our teachers. Our old-age-pension program in Alabama must be improved. Better public-health facilities, preventive sanitation and medicine, medical care for our indigent people, more medical research—all these are desirable, and necessary for an advancing people. These goals call for additional revenues which come from the taxes paid by those who earn wages and salaries. New industry, additional jobs, more money in circulation—these will combine to enable us to achieve these goals.

In closing, I desire to insert an editorial, The Job Comes First, from the April 26, 1950, issue of the Decatur Daily:

THE JOB COMES FIRST

We would like to do lots of things in the South, and we are going to do lots of things in the South for the betterment of our people, our section, and the whole of the United States.

But the first thing we have to keep in mind from an economic point of view is that the job comes first.

All other economic blessings follow. For when your people make a good living they can pay reasonable taxes for the support of the many other things that come under the head of improved public services. Without a job they can't.

And unless an economic balance is maintained, unless there are thousands more at work in industry in the South, you can wrap up your plans for public betterment.

The improvement starts with a job. Don't forget it, keep your eyes on that factor, help to keep the eyes of your community on that economic truth.

Farm Legislation—Historical Background

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an editorial that appeared in the Los Angeles Times on March 1, 1950. This editorial by Mr. Irving Ramsdall, editor, contains important historical information that we should have in our efforts to find a solution to the problem of farm surpluses and at the same insure if possible a fair return to the farmer for the foods and fibers that he produces:

BACKGROUND OF THE HOT POTATO

The dismal history of farm legislation was sketched out here yesterday in its earlier chapters—from the Farm Board of the Hoover administration, which foundered in the depression, to the first Agricultural Adjustment Act, which was knocked on the head by the Supreme Court in 1935.

For a moment the court's decision caught the New Dealers with their ideas down. They were under the necessity of finding a device whereby the farmers could be given something in a way that would not injure the constitutional sensibilities of the nine old men.

EVADING THE COURT

They came up finally with the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. Benefit payments were still to be made on the basic commodities, as under the AAA, but the money was not to be raised by a special discriminatory tax. The crop control feature, which the Supreme Court also had found unconstitutional, was avoided through employment of a new gimmick: payments were to be made as reward for soil-conserving and soil-building practices. The soil-conservation gesture had merit and was long overdue, and it had some good results under the act. But it was not put forward on its merits; it was a screen for production control.

Incidentally, the Republicans had a finger in the AAA as in previous farm aid schemes. In 1936 they proposed a conservation payment plan to be financed with 30 percent of the tariff revenue. With their processing tax recently outlawed, the New Dealers were glad to be shown to a source of money that would not be disputed. Farm payments derive in part from the tariff revenue to this day.

THE AAA OF 1938

The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act didn't pan out. The droughts of the mid-thirties helped prices, but 1937 was a bumper year and the new law could not cope with the surpluses. The depression had lifted a little, but now it settled in again, almost as deep as in the beginning.

So in 1938 another Agricultural Adjustment Act was passed, and much that was put into that law is still with us. Parity came to the fore again, with wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco and rice established as basic commodities, to be supported at minimums of 52 to 75 percent of parity. The Commodity Credit Corporation was authorized to make nonrecourse loans to producers of such crops. The farmer could borrow from the Government up to the parity percentage of his crop. If the market price went up he could sell the crop at a profit and repay the loan. If it didn't, he kept the Government money and the Government took over the crop. The law provided for acreage allotments, marketing quotas and crop insurance.

This was the law whence sprung Henry Wallace's dream of the ever-normal granary. The crops which the Government acquired and stored in years of surplus would be released in lean years. Farm prices would be stabilized forever.

But it didn't work that way. Henry Wallace's granary filled, but no lean years came to empty it. Moreover, all farmers didn't raise basic commodities—e. g., many California farmers didn't—and of those who produced other crops, many could not share, even indirectly, in Government largesse. Farm prices, on the average, didn't rise as was hoped; after the sweep of 1936, Mr. Roosevelt lost some farm States in 1940. And in 1940 Mr. Wallace's granary was bulging with 8,700,000 bales of cotton and 750,000,000 bushels of wheat and corn, with no customers in sight.

Then the war bailed the Government out. By 1943 we were importing grain from Canada and Argentina. Prices soared far above the golden dream of parity. As the fever of production rose, the reasons for the AAA of 1938, with its allotments and supports, temporarily disappeared.

THE POTATO SCANDAL

But other reasons for paying farmers out of the Federal Treasury quickly appeared. The OPA was set up to hold consumer prices down, and at controlled prices the farmers were not eager to produce the necessary quantities of such foods as dairy products and meat. So they were given a subsidy as an incentive to production. Farm prices were permitted to rise with the pressure of war demand, and the Government paid the farmers the difference between their higher prices and the prices fixed by the OPA for consumers.

This plan still seems wonderful to Secretary of Agriculture Brannan. He wants to pay the farmers the difference between the prices they got in wartime and the prices they can now get in the market. He wants to fix this feature permanently in farm legislation. It is the heart of the Brannan plan.

Another subsidy was introduced to increase war production, and this one was the direct cause of the current potato scandal. It is called the Steagall amendment to the AAA of 1938 and provides for 90 percent of parity support for 14 products, including potatoes, eggs, hogs, chickens, dairy products, etc. This amendment is still operative.

Without considering demand, and within his acreage allotment, a farmer can produce any of these things to the utmost capacity of his skill and facilities. The Government will "loan" him a good price for them, even if it has to burn them or fill great caves with them.

There has been some postwar tinkering with farm legislation, but the task faced by Congress is in the main to correct the laws passed before and during the war. What can and should be done will be discussed next.

A Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Los Angeles Times, Mr. Irving Ramsdall, has some ideas for a farm program. These were expressed in an editorial that appeared in his paper on March 2, 1950. I commend it to all Members who are interested in this segment of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I am also including a copy of a letter by a friend and constituent, Mr. G. B. Gunlogson, who answers the editorials in question. It is thought-provoking and presents the views of many people on this subject:

[From the Los Angeles Times of March 2, 1950]

IDEAS FOR A FARM PROGRAM

In two installments the history of the farm laws has been reviewed from 1930 almost to the present. They have been comically inept and cruelly delusive and their authors have been variously men of great good will and political cynics.

THE CHRONIC DISEASE

None of the laws has cured the chronic economic disease of American farming—surpluses. Under the pressure of war demand and the incentive of subsidies the disease recurred with a critical peak after the fighting stopped. Since 1939 farm production had increased by one-third, but American consumption had increased by less than one-sixth. Foreign relief and the Marshall plan drained off the surpluses for a while, but everybody knew that farm production couldn't continue on a war basis forever.

Senator AIKEN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, thought something ought to be done right away to guide agriculture back to normal, and it is interesting to note that at the time (1948), "normal" had come to mean some kind of Government price support. Eighteen years of tinkering with the farm problem had made price support an almost constitutional right.

The technicalities of Senator AIKEN'S proposal are difficult and they need not be dwelt on. It was made law, and the farmers immediately complained that the new sliding scale of parity payments, based on supply, was a bankruptcy price. Mr. Truman made "hay" with this law in the 1948 campaign. It was a Republican law. Moreover, the House Banking and Currency Committee, Republican-controlled, had disapproved a proposal for the building of new crop-storage facilities at a time when two of the largest grain crops on record were lying around. Mr. Truman did not fail to point this out. In November the farm States elected him President.

BRANNAN'S PROPOSALS

It would be unfair to say that Republican virtue was defeated by farmers greedy for Government largesse. The Aiken law would have economized on payments to farmers, but it did not correct the basic defect of the price-support device. It didn't solve the surplus problem; the Government would still take the surpluses in return for "loans" which the farmers didn't repay.

President Truman had to fulfill his election promise, and he did it gorgeously in the Brannan plan. This would put the farmer in the position of the queen in a hive of bees, with all the taxpayers busy in his behalf. He would always get wartime prices for what he produced. There would be a free market in food prices and the consumer would be able to buy more cheaply than he has bought for a long time. But he would pay the difference between his low price and the farmer's high price in taxes. The Government would still take over surpluses.

The Brannan plan compounds all the evils of other farm legislation and adds more. It would not cure the basic disease of surpluses.

Well, what should be done? What could the Republicans do?

In the first place it should be recognized that a farm program that accepts surpluses as a necessary evil will never solve the problem. It perpetuates the farmer's dependence on government and makes farming a matter of politics rather than economics.

The farmer is going to insist on price supports that will keep him from bankruptcy. It has been accepted as a principle by both parties since 1930 that keeping him from ruin is a national responsibility. But it is not necessary to buy up all the surpluses he may produce in order to keep him from going bankrupt. John Brandt, president of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, stated the case:

HELPING THEMSELVES

"The Nation needs adequate farm production to meet the requirements of the domestic market. For this production the farmer is entitled to a parity price that will give him equality of income with city workers. Surplus production, however, is the farmer's own responsibility, and he should pay the cost in supporting plans for surplus disposal. This is the onl way out that can be lasting."

One of the major defects of most of the farm laws has been exclusive support of so-called basic crops, and the Aiken law is no exception. This has tended to increase surpluses in these crops. A good farm program would encourage diversity and this would result in better use of the land and a better national diet, as well as in a reduction of the surplusage in corn, wheat, cotton, etc.

Such a program would not have to be directed by the political hand of a Secretary of Agriculture. Through their own organizations the farmers are competent to do many things for themselves. They have done very well with their Federal land banks and their marketing cooperatives have been successful. Mr. Brandt's milk cooperative is an outstanding example; the fruit growers' cooperatives in California are others. The Government could encourage more of these without manipulating them.

The farmers are uneasy about being clients of the Federal Treasury. They are politically wise, and they know that agriculture cannot be conducted forever as a general expense of Government, like national defense. They feel they are entitled to a fair share of the national income, fairly earned. The party that shows them the way to it will win the farm States, and this is the chance for the Republicans to win back what they lost in 1948.

JUNE 14, 1950.

Mr. IRVING RAMSDALL,
Editor, Los Angeles Times,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. RAMSDALL: Thanks for the editorials and your letter. This is the most lucid summary of farm legislation and farm programs I have seen. It is a contribution to the thinking on the subject and I am sending the same on to Congressman SMITH. Mr. O'Donnell's comments also seem pertinent.

You ask for my ideas on the subject. I don't think anyone can have any ready-made answer or formula. Rather, I think there are certain principles which should guide the working out of this program.

This is all the more important because the problem is complicated. There are several hundred farmers' organizations in the country in addition to the politically powerful horizontal organizations—the Farm Bureau Federation, the Grange, and the Farmers Union. There are organizations representing dairy, livestock, and poultry farming, orange, peach, cherry, potato growers, etc., Each has its own special interest and is pressing for special benefits. One thing that might be worth thinking about, perhaps, is a federation or an over-all organization in which each of these would have representation.

Then, we have the world situation, world politics, world crops, and, above all, conditions in our own country must be taken into consideration in formulating policies respecting production.

However, the problem of balancing production with demand in any commodity calls for business judgment and acumen. The first guiding principle should be more business thinking and less political thinking. Heretofore, it has been 90-percent politics and 10 percent business.

Second, farmers themselves are directly concerned and are certainly qualified to work out the basic problems for agriculture and they should be permitted to approach the task without first being doped by propaganda and promises by politicians and sponsors of various panaceas.

The Secretary of the Department of Agriculture should not be permitted to implement the ideologies of a few men into policies that may lead to economic control and manipulation of the entire farm industry.

Almost every bureau in the Department of Agriculture has become infested with political propagandists expounding various social and economic theories. One Secretary after another during the last 15 years has used the office as a political powerhouse and as a springboard from which to launch himself into even higher politics and more power.

Soil conservation, a worthy social and national objective, has been adapted as a trading stock by various agencies dealing with farmers. Their activities are often conflicting and the whole system needs simplification. The greatest progress in soil conservation will have been made when individual farmers come to realize that when soil washes down the gully they are losing the most valuable part of their property, and this is largely a matter of education.

On the matter of cooperatives, it would be a good thing to do away with the term "cooperative" for all marketing organizations. Call them associations. Marketing associations have a very definite place, but I believe that some of them need house cleaning and reorganization. I must agree with Mr. O'Donnell that some of our cooperatives have gotten out of hand and, in fact, out of the hands of the rank and file of farmers.

If ever we can start over again, we should strive for enough of political and intellectual honesty to confess that, as of now, the prime purpose of farm legislation is to subsidize voters and buy votes. In this it has been successful, however, weird its wastes and how misguided its guidance. Having confessed, we might then take an economic and strategic outlook.

Sincerely yours,

G. B. GUNLOGSON.

Pennsylvania Coal Mines Are Being Forced To Close at an Alarming Rate

---

REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on May 2, 1950, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 199 providing that a joint congressional committee on fuel policy be created for the purpose of establishing a national policy on all fuels, including coal, oil, and natural gas.

At the present time we have two committees of Congress—the Neely committee in the Senate and the Steed committee in the House—investigating unemployment in coal, railroad, and mineral industries.

Both of these committees have received testimony to the effect that governmental policies, as they relate to importation of foreign oil and the subsidizing of hydropower projects, are ruining the coal industry and are having an adverse effect on the railroads.

While these two congressional committees continue their investigation cheap foreign crude oil is still being dumped at an increasing rate in this country, and as a result the coal and railroad industries are suffering greatly. In some areas of the Nation the distress is more pronounced.

In western Pennsylvania, according to information from the State mine inspectors' reports in January 1948, 506 mines operated and employed 55,009 men.

In January 1949 the number of mines operated dropped to 469, with 52,415 persons employed.

In January 1950 there were but 370 mines operating, with a total employment of 47,796 men.

During 1949 the following mines closed in western Pennsylvania:

Mine name	Company	1948 tonnage	Number of men employed
No. 8 mine	Castle Shannon Coal Corp	361,578	493
Jefferson	Jefferson Coal & Coke Corp	96,231	103
Jamison No. 2	Jamison Coal & Coke Co	660,256	654
Poland	Hillman Coal & Coke Co	370,156	425
Midland	Pittsburgh Coal Co	265,472	171

Also in this area, the Pittsburgh Coal Co. recently announced that it was curtailing operations at its Lindley mine. The Hillman Coal & Coke Co. announced that its Washington mine has been closed until further notice.

In central Pennsylvania 25 mines with a yearly tonnage of 1,598,413 tons employing 1,921 men have closed down since January 1, 1949. Following is a list of the mines closed in central Pennsylvania since that date:

Mines closed in central Pennsylvania area since Jan. 1, 1949

Mine name	Company	Tonnage	Number of men employed
Cooper	Mays & Mays	10,288	16
Rattlesnake	Nugent Mining Co	23,742	33
Bona No. 2	Walburn Coal Co	20,050	17
Friends No. 2	Friends Coal Co	15,836	24
Logan No. 3	Johnstown Coal & Coke Co	113,467	153
Logan No. 6	do	78,967	106

Mines closed in central Pennsylvania area since Jan. 1, 1949—Continued

Mine name	Company	Tonnage	Number of men employed
Sonman Shaft	Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates	225,571	263
Sonman Run	Portage-Kittanning Coal Co	39,316	52
Penna. No. 9-B	Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Corp	94,692	151
Cymbria No. 2	Butterworth Fuel Co	4,975	14
Woodland No. 3	Deringer Fuel Co	18,744	23
No. 2	McCombie Coal Co	41,294	60
Dutch Run	Clearfield Bituminous Coal Corp	59,239	45
Springfield No. 1	Springfield Coal Corp	38,488	64
Imperial No. 3	W. O. Gulbranson	88,317	73
Superior No. 1	J. O. Clark Heirs	24,460	47
Superior No. 3	do	27,500	43
Juliette No. 7	Juliette Coal Co	167,649	104
Virginian No. 15	Berkey Coal Co	20,860	24
Pfeister	Lynn & Ploucha Coal Co	6,804	8
Orpha	James Coal Mining Co	45,577	67
Victor No. 18	Peale, Peacock & Kerr	47,180	63
Victor No. 9-10	Carrolltown Coal Co	51,186	96
Sagamore	Rochester & Pittsburgh Coal Co	270,056	279
Delta No. 2	Duncan-Spangler Coal Co	64,155	96
Total, 25 mines		1,598,413	1,921

Source: The Central Pennsylvania Coal Producers' Association, Altoona, Pa.

Looking at Pennsylvania as a whole, from the standpoint of coal production, here are a few facts.

In 1949 for the period from January to May 50,996,000 tons of coal were mined. For the same period during 1950 the amount of coal mined dropped to 36,437,000 tons, or a net loss of 14,500,000 tons of coal.

Mr. Speaker, coal mines are closing in Pennsylvania and miners and railroaders are losing their jobs. Ghost towns are developing and the economy of Pennsylvania is being seriously affected.

As I mentioned, this condition results from Government policies that permit the importation of cheap foreign oil and the subsidizing of substitute fuels that result from hydropower projects.

Mr. Speaker, I have called upon the President of the United States and requested that he employ the authority he has to stop the importation of foreign oil.

I have appeared before the Senate and House committees that are investigating unemployment in the coal and railroad industries.

I have written to the chairman of the House Rules Committee asking for immediate consideration of my House Concurrent Resolution 199 that establishes a joint congressional committee which, after a thorough study, will recommend to Congress the adoption of a national fuel policy.

Despite my efforts the situation is becoming more acute and good Americans are not only losing their jobs but they are also losing their shirts.

Immediate action is what we need in curbing the importation of cheap foreign oil. We also need the establishment of a national fuel policy that will protect the American workman and the American industry from the unfair competition caused by foreign imports made by slave labor and which threaten seriously the livelihood of every American workman.

Occupations and Professions of Members of the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Library of Congress has furnished me with a detailed analysis of the profession, or vocation, or trade followed prior to coming to Congress of the present 435 Members of the House and 96 Members of the Senate.

For the information of the general public, as well as Members of the Congress, I submit the following figures which the Library of Congress compiled:

Occupations and professions of Members of the 81st Cong.

Occupation or profession	House	Senate	Total
Accounting	3	0	3
Agriculture	18	7	25
Banking	8	2	10
Business and/or manufacturing	37	10	47
Civil service	3	0	3
Dentistry	2	1	3
Editing and/or publishing	30	6	36
Education	24	6	30
Engineering	1	2	3
Investments	3	0	3
Law	244	58	302
Legislation	1	1	2
Labor	8	0	8
Medicine and surgery	7	0	7
Pharmacist	1	1	2
Public official	10	0	10
Real estate and/or insurance	16	0	16
Secretary, congressional	5	1	6
Social welfare	3	0	3
Miscellaneous	9	1	10
Vacancy	2	0	2
Total	435	96	531

History and General Research section, Library of Congress, Apr. 7, 1950.

The people of this country will, within the near future, have another opportunity to go to the polls and make a determination as to who shall constitute the personnel of the Eighty-second Congress. It may be that our people have lost so much interest in Government and in the so-called two-party system, that in the coming primary elections we may find that no more than 25 to 35 percent of the people will vote.

It may be that in the forthcoming November general election, at which time the people will have the privilege of selecting 435 Members of the House, and about 32 Members of the Senate, that no more than 35 to 45 percent of the eligible voters of the United States will exercise their high privilege to vote, and thus substantially determine the type of Government which shall prevail in this country during the next 2 years, or perhaps for the next 25 to 50 years.

For all practical purposes, it can be stated that under our representative form of government, the Congress—House and Senate—which now deals with laws pertaining to agriculture, industry, finance, public relations, industrial relations, and the right to grow this and sell that, and live here and travel there, is Government. By this I mean to say through actions of the House and Senate the most intimate details of your entire life are now being reduced to rules and regulations which govern over your thought and action. If this is not Government, just what is Government?

In days past when the personal affairs of the people were so completely handled by themselves, the Congress did not have much to say about these very personal matters. But those old days are gone. Now each day promising politicians who are not too honest in their presentations to the voting public, stand before the voters and promise most everything that can be imagined to practically every minority group. These promises, if fulfilled, have to be paid for through the tax burdens of most of the other citizens, instead of being paid for by the men who make the promises.

In the first place, if a representative form of government is to be a success, and one which the people themselves can reasonably bear, it is necessary for the eligible voters to go to the polls and vote and thus participate in the selection of the personnel of the Congress.

In the second place, if the voters are really concerned about the type of person who is to sit in the Congress and impose taxes upon them and vote for or against far-reaching proposals which will seriously interfere with the individual liberty and individual dignity of the citizen, the voters must pay considerable attention to the qualifications of the men or women who present themselves to be elected to the Federal legislative body.

In this general connection, I present for the record a clipping taken from one of the papers published in my State of Michigan:

CURRY DECRIES PUBLIC'S APATHY—CANDIDATE ADDRESSES RALLY AT ALMA

Robert J. Curry, Saginaw attorney, who is seeking the Republican nomination for Representative from the Eighth Congressional District, Friday night at Alma deplored the apparent general apathy toward Government.

The rally at Alma's IOOF Hall was the terminal for a 40-car Curry caravan that also visited Hemlock, Merrill, Breckenridge, and St. Louis. A band also was in the caravan.

Discussing Congressmen in general, Curry declared that "nine-tenths of them could not earn a comparable salary in private life."

He said competent men have not been sent to Congress and that most of the lawyers acting as Congressmen are of the "third or fourth rate quality."

He urged his listeners to study the background and qualifications of candidates and select the most capable man.

Curry was introduced by J. David Sullivan, Alma attorney and justice of the peace.

FRED L. CRAWFORD, incumbent, and Saginaw County Representative David E. Young, also are seeking the GOP nomination.

Mr. Speaker, here is a man who aspires to be elected to Congress from the Eighth Congressional District of that great State. He has expressed some rather caustic views with respect to the qualifications of the personnel mentioned in the tabulation prepared by the Library of Congress. What Mr. Robert J. Curry, of Saginaw, Mich., has to say when he makes the observation to the effect that most of the lawyers acting as Congressmen are of the third- or fourth-rate quality, I am sure will be of particular interest to the 302 members of the bar who are now also Members of the Congress: And furthermore, in view of the fact there are so many Members of both House and Senate who have participated in building our agricultural and industrial and financial empires, and who have been very successful in various undertakings, who down through the years and presently make very substantial contributions to the Federal tax box, may also be interested in observing that Mr. Curry in referring to them points out that nine-tenths of them could not earn a comparable salary in private life.

Mr. Speaker, here is a clear illustration of how necessary it is for voters to leave no stone unturned in ascertaining exactly to what extent men who seek membership in this body are qualified to fill the job. If Mr. Curry, who has never served in the Congress is correct in his analysis, that is something for our people to be concerned about. On the other hand, if Mr. Curry, who has spent many years in the practice of the law, substantially specializing in divorce and criminal cases, is in error, that, too, is something for the Members of the present and future Congresses to bear in mind.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials from the Washington Post, one dated June 18, 1950, and the other dated June 19, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of June 18, 1950]

RFC: NOT NEEDED

The $400,000 loan made by the RFC to a Florida concern that went bankrupt before the full amount had been advanced is currently under investigation by a Senate Banking Subcommittee headed by Senator FULBRIGHT. Interest in the transaction is heightened because one of the company's directors is reported to be a close personal friend of President Truman as well as of the RFC examiner who recommended the loan. There is no proof that politics or friendship was responsible for the decision to lend, yet the public will suspect the contrary. Nor is it a foregone conclusion that the RFC will have to take a loss on the loan. However, the evidence unearthed by the committee inquiry in the course of a prolonged investigation into the lending activities of the RFC does throw a revealing light on the nature of the political and social pressures brought to bear on the agency and strengthens the case for its abolition.

As an emergency lending agency the RFC unquestionably performed a highly useful function by helping to stabilize the economy during the depression of the thirties and the war years. At present, however, there is no emergency necessitating its continuance. For credit is abundant, interest rates are low, and private banks and financial institutions are able to meet all legitimate demands for loans. Recognizing that the RFC has outlived its usefulness, both Eugene Meyer, its first chairman, and Jesse Jones, his successor in office, think that it should be liquidated. In a letter to the Fulbright committee Mr. Jones recently declared that the RFC should be given "a decent burial, lock, stock, and barrel." Mr. Meyer, when testifying before the same committee last year, stressed the fact that the exceptional grants of power conferred on the agency can be justified only by extraordinary and exceptional conditions. In an emergency the dangers of abuse are outweighed by the need for action to relieve economic distress.

Instead of increasing the RFC's lending powers, therefore, as the administration recommends, and indefinitely prolonging its existence, it should be directed to suspend operations, although it might be desirable to retain a skeleton standby organization that could be reactivated in case of need. Moreover, a strong and competent staff should be enlisted for the process of liquidation, in view of the large amount of assets held by the institution. As a permanent institution it is superfluous and also potentially dangerous. For even under the most efficient and conscientious management there is always danger that a Government lending agency like the RFC will be drawn into politics, play favorites and waste the money of the taxpayers.

[From the Washington Post of June 19, 1950]

MORE ON RFC

Senator FULBRIGHT hit the nail on the head when he said that the President's plan for transferring the RFC to the Department of Commerce is untimely. Before changing the status of that agency, Congress should decide whether it is to remain in existence, and whether its lending powers should be enlarged as the President recommends. In our opinion the answer to both questions ought to be a positive "No." The Hoover Commission in its report on Federal business enterprises warned that direct Government lending "opens up dangerous possibilities of waste and favoritism to individuals and enterprises. It invites political and private pressure or even corruption. Emergencies may arise in depression, war, national defense, or disaster which must be met in this way. But direct lending should be absolutely avoided except for emergencies." This statement clearly indicates that the Commission favored curtailment of RFC activities, though it did not go as far as its task force, which recommended liquidation of the RFC.

Even if Congress should decide to prolong the life of the RFC, its transfer to the Department of Commerce or any other Government department would be most unwise, since there would always be danger that the head of the designated department would further his political objectives, at the expense of sound lending policies. Secretary Sawyer's argument that the financial operations of the RFC should be coordinated with the nonfinancial business-promotional program of the Department of Commerce actually emphasizes the dangerous potentialities of the proposal to put a financing agency under the supervision of an official not trained to deal with financial problems. Instead of making for greater efficiency and economy, the transfer would, to quote Senator FULBRIGHT, "enhance the central powers of government" and contribute "to the destruction of our traditional system of checks and balances."

Where Is Baron von Spiegel Today?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, by chance I ran across this letter which appeared in the columns of the New Orleans States. It tells a most interesting story and I thought perhaps the Members of this House would like to read it.

The writer, Jimmy Aldige, worked for me as a young reporter when I was city editor of the New Orleans States in the late thirties. Subsequently he entered the armed services of his country and served with distinction. At the moment he is connected with Loyola University's great radio station WWL in New Orleans.

The Baron von Spiegel, to whom he refers, was German consul in New Orleans.

Perhaps many Members of this body will recall the incident to which Mr. Aldige refers in his letter.

It was before America entered the war. As a reporter, young Aldige went to interview Von Spiegel who made the remark that Germany would not forget her enemies and listed the United States as one of them.

Von Spiegel subsequently denied the statement but young Aldige stuck to his guns, and the matter became one of international importance.

When the German submarines played havoc in the Gulf of Mexico at the mouth of the Mississippi River, which is in my district, there were many people who believed then, and still do believe, that it was Von Spiegel and his knowledge of

the area which was the basis for the successful raids upon American shipping.

Many people today have forgotten Von Spiegel and the incident of his outburst against America but certainly not Jimmy Aldige. It was this memory which caused him to write his letter to the editor of the New Orleans States on the occasion of the anniversary of that interview.

It is indeed a very human letter and one of more than passing interest.

Here is Mr. Aldige's letter:

WHERE IS BARON VON SPIEGEL TODAY?

EDITOR, NEW ORLEANS STATES:

Dateline—June 14, 1940.

Ten years ago today I met a man whose name was Von Spiegel.

And June of 1940 was little different from this year's. It was warm, sultry; and the sweat poured down Von Spiegel's red face as he shook his knotty finger at me and shouted:

"Germany will not forget that when she was fighting for her very existence the United States did everything in its power to aid her enemies."

Prophetic words.

For in June of 1940 the United States was still some 17 months away from Pearl Harbor. But this Von Spiegel, Nazi Germany's consular representative to the southern United States, foresaw even then hostilities between his country and ours.

Recondite is the fact that he chose a young New Orleans States reporter to deliver the hot blast of words. Me. * * * So on that June day 10 years ago I sat and listened while the Baron von Spiegel poured out words of hate and fury.

June 14, 1940, France was crumbling, her malequipped armies were fleeing before the juggernaut of Nazi might. Paris fell that day to Hitler.

Von Spiegel was boastful when he proclaimed that his country's fighting machine would overrun western Europe—then turn and conquer the British Isles.

The German baron, World War I submarine commander, lashed out at the American Red Cross, which he said was not aiding German wounded. He raved about Nazi air power, the mighty Wehrmacht, German submarines.

So I finally had my story and bid Baron von Spiegel good day. Even the city editor congratulated me, despite subsequent denials by the good baron that he had uttered such fantastic statements.

Date line, June 1942.

German submarines were operating in the Gulf of Mexico, their torpedoes speeding death and destruction to United States merchant vessels. A United States now at war clamped down and few of the stories hit the front pages.

But even in June 1942 there were many who believed that Von Spiegel was leading that wolf pack of Nazi subs in Gulf waters—waters he must have charted during his years as consular official at New Orleans.

Date line, June 1945.

Hitler is dead, V-E day is past. * * * The wehrmacht is whipped. The luftwaffe forever grounded.

Baron Edgar von Spiegel is reported languishing in a Marseilles, France, jail, awaiting trial on numerous charges by the Free French.

And in June 1945, I, too, was in Marseilles, assigned to a United States Navy troopship which had crossed half the world from Manila. But I didn't know until later that Von Spiegel was a guest of the Free French.

Date line, June 14, 1950.

As I sit here pecking away at the keys, I am wondering where Baron von Spiegel is. Ten years haven't erased from my memory those words which the Nazi baron shouted at me.

If Von Spiegel hasn't forgotten, maybe he is wishing that Germany had—10 years ago.

JAMES ALDIGE.

Exemplar for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem, Exemplar for Peace, by James Patrick McGovern, which appeared in the Chaplain, a journal for Protestant chaplains.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXEMPLAR FOR PEACE

America, more famed in war than peace,
With greater power the body's than the soul's,
Traditionally the pioneer whose goals
To conquer nature's forces never cease.
Let your virile manhood mellow now
By growth of mind and spirit linked with might;
Seek new truth and beauty, learn more light
Of peace, of happiness, and then know how
To live and reap the grain that brawn has sown,
Refine the crude, let substance be not all
For which strong hearts are set lest a deep pall
Of vain and selfish strife makes them disown
Their heritage of loved democracy
While communism spreads its leprosy.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

Investigation of Price of Coffee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Your Coffee May Taste Better This Morning," which appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal, June 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR COFFEE MAY TASTE BETTER THIS MORNING

A group of dogged Senators who set to work on a suspicion of funny business in the coffee market now tell the country that things are just about as bad as they thought. To get their evidence, it took a lot of digging in a muddy and sometimes apparently bottomless morass of confusion, which is more the work of men than of nature. The Gillette committee investigating high prices of coffee reports finding evidence of speculation and manipulation and calls for (1) reform of trading practices and (2) antitrust action by the Department of Justice.

This may seem to the housewife a roundabout way to get cheaper coffee for her breakfast table. But at least she has the satisfaction of knowing that cheaper coffee is possible, according to the committee, there being no shortage. Senator GILLETTE and his associates say large stocks are held in this country by foreign coffee interests—hoarded and sequestered, in fact, to keep prices up.

The report comes as no surprise after the steady parade of revelations by the committee the last 8 months. There were such tidbits as Senator GILLETTE's charge last December that heavy November speculation on the New York Coffee Exchange cost American coffee drinkers around $670,000,000. A little later the finger was put squarely on Brazilian traders who kept buying futures, thus standing to profit as prices went up, while being close to sources that could manipulate the supplies so that prices could not possibly go down.

What the country principally learned about coffee was that it still doesn't know much about coffee and about the mysterious collusions in the market. The Gillette investigation has been highly educational, particularly on the point of convincing coffee consumers that they should not accept too casually the reports of too much rain in one spot, too little in another, and all working to cut the crop and raise the price. It may be hard to count the coffee beans in Brazil and Guatemala, but the Senators found it quite easy to spot the gentlemen who were cleaning up on the basis of weather reports and such. The suggestion that there ought to be a law, or better use of the law in hand, will draw applause from 50,000,000 breakfast tables.

In the Nation—A Great Public Figure Is Passing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to have my remarks inserted in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the New York Times of June 2, 1950. The title of this editorial is "In the Nation—A Great Public Figure Is Passing."

IN THE NATION—A GREAT PUBLIC FIGURE IS PASSING

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, June 1.—The news that Representative JAMES W. WADSWORTH will not stand for reelection in the Forty-first Congressional District of New York calls to mind many a notably parliamentary struggle in which his wisdom, courage, and integrity were devoted to a high patriotic concept which rose above any partisan consideration. So often did Mr. WADSWORTH occupy this uncrowned height in Congress that he came to be recognized as the conscience of the House which, though it might evade, it admired and respected.

But one day in particular emerges from the haze of memory—August 12, 1941. On that day Pétain commanded the beaten French to collaborate fully with Hitler; Berlin announced the defeat of the Soviet armies west of the Dnieper in the Ukraine; and, alarmed by the growing aggressions of

Japan, the United States and Great Britain warned the Japanese war party to keep its hands off Thailand.

On that day, with Pearl Harbor less than 4 months away, the House was debating the bill to extend by 18 months the military services of those already taken by the draft. This passed by 1 vote, 203 to 202. Opposed were 135 Republicans, 65 Democrats, and 4 of the assorted minorities. In favor were 182 Democrats and 21 Republicans. It was to these latter Mr. WADSWORTH made the plea without which, in the opinion of many watchers of the event, the draft extension would have been rejected on the ground that the administration, to win the election of 1940, had misrepresented the draft law as a brief and passing need.

As a young legislator from Livingston County, speaker of the New York Assembly in the first decade of this century, a two-term Senator who was defeated for a third because he steadfastly declined to compromise then unpopular principles, and Representative since 1932, Mr. WADSWORTH made many distinguished public utterances. But probably none will assay as importantly as that of April 12, 1941, in the judgment of history.

THE ARGUMENT

He began by pointing out that, since the whole army was only slightly more than 1 percent of the population, it must be the most efficient army for its size, if we can make it so. Taking as an example the Twenty-seventh Division of the New York National Guard, he showed that subtraction from Army cadres in training of those in selective service who would be returned to civil life by defeat of the pending bill would wreck them as a team for at least 8 to 10 months. He spoke as an expert on this practical aspect of the issue, and the listening House well knew he rated that status.

Then he turned to the world situation, saying in part:

"Hitler has carried the ball from the beginning of this terrific game. * * * He has gained ground on every play * * * and there are no rules in the game as he plays it, much less a referee. You see his activities today plus the activities of Japan. * * * Against whom was the alliance between Japan and the Axis Powers primarily directed? Against the United States, have no doubt about it. And that alliance was made after we passed the selective-service law.

Look at the far eastern situation. Is it not of more concern to us today than it was a year ago? See what the Japanese are doing. Every sensible man knows that our vital interests are menaced."

THIS IS THE WHOLE QUESTION

Turning to the Republican side of the House, Mr. WADSWORTH described the consequences in Europe and north Africa of the fall of France, forecast what would follow if Russia, then fighting alone, was conquered, and assured his colleagues that, when Hitler felt ready, the signal will go to Japan. Quoting Mark Sullivan that "America is not moving toward war, war is moving toward America," Mr. WADSWORTH concluded his appeal by saying:

"We are trying to do something from day to day which will discourage anybody from attacking the Western Hemisphere. The fend-off policy accounts for the acquisition of the island bases. So it accounts for the occupation of Iceland and Newfoundland. Would this House vote to retire the Marines from Iceland today? I think not. * * * We do not dare take chances, not for one moment. It is conceded that if legislation of this kind is not passed the defense of the United States will be seriously weakened for many, many months.

This is the whole question before us, as I see it. * * * My prayer is, Mr. Chairman, that our decision shall be made in the interest of the safety of the United States."

Among the 20 Republicans who repaired that day to the standard Mr. WADSWORTH raised 10 are no longer Members of the House because of death, retirement, or transfer to the Senate (Mrs. SMITH of Maine). In the mortuary list the name of Representative W. G. Andrews, of Buffalo, is outstanding for service to the same cause. Still in the House are ANDERSON, of California; FELLOWS, of Maine; GAMBLE, of New York; HALL, of New York; HINSHAW, of California; KILBURN, of New York; Mrs. ROGERS, of Massachusetts; TABER, of New York, and WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts. Their presence in the small but essential company of April 12, 1941, is worth remembering. And their names are worth noting again, as the Representative from the Forty-first New York prepares to leave the public service.

Transmission of Gambling Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, a report on transmission of gambling information recently was issued from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the United States Senate.

An apology is offered for any personal reference, but for 16 years I was secretary of the National Association of State Racing Commissioners and I was secretary of the Kentucky State Racing Commission for 13 out of the 17 years prior to the time I resigned both positions to become a Member of Congress. The State racing commissions are set up to regulate racing in States in which it is legalized. Within the limits of the powers delegated to them by the States, the racing commissions are law-enforcement agencies. Officials and agencies of government and committees of both Houses of Congress have promised to cooperate with State governments.

Off-the-course betting or oral betting, since the first State racing commission was created in Kentucky in 1906, has been in conflict with the laws which created these commissions and the regulations which the commissions have adopted. At the recent highly publicized hearings into illegal gambling operations, it appears that most of the information has been furnished by the operators of handbooks. Naturally, since their views and operations are directly in conflict with the policies and the regulations of the racing commissions of 25 States where legalized racing is conducted, this has filled the air with a smoke screen of misinformation.

The bill (S. 3358) which has been reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the United States Senate, sets forth its aim to aid the respective States in coping with off-track race betting. Instead, however, what the bill actually does is to stop the publication of legitimate sports information in newspapers. The chief fear that has served to defeat Federal legislation on this subject up to now has been that eventually it might lead to censorship of the press and interference with legalized racing, but S. 3358 as now written actually starts with this.

The States which have legalized racing count on parimutuel taxes as a vital source of revenue. Obviously, they have drained this source as far as they dare. The total amount received may not seem large in comparison with Federal revenue figures, but it is very important to these States.

Racing news is defined in S. 3358 as gambling information if it is transmitted before a race. One other suggestion that had been made before this bill was drafted was that there should be a time lag of 1 hour after a sports event before publication or broadcast of any news. Restriction of information of this kind would not handicap a handbook, but would distress the sports fan, censor the press, and work to the injury of legalized racing and the States which receive revenue therefrom. In this connection, I am reminded of a story frequently told in Kentucky about a Chinese resident of the beautiful and law-observant city of Cynthiana who undertook to run a handbook. When friends tried to tell him about time variations, he said:

You can't fool a Chinaman. Two o'clock Cynthiana—2 o'clock all over the world.

He almost went broke trying to prove his theory.

Any kind of time lag or delay is just playing into the hands of the well-informed syndicates and bookmakers.

The report from the Senate committee undertakes to show that betting at tracks is "economic folly." The report undertakes to oversimplify what happens to $16 if it is in the hands of a man who attends the races for 5 days and bets $2 on all 8 races each day. If 20 percent is extracted in take-out—which includes State taxes—each time a wager is made, at the end of the 5 days his $16 will be gone. Even as bad a handicapper as I am, I believe I could pick one winner in 5 days. The report makes no allowance for that possibility, but, of course, there is an "element of uncertainty" about horse racing.

State racing laws were enacted not to permit betting, because racing and betting already existed, but they were enacted to limit and control this feature so it would not ruin the sport. Furthermore the same old arguments against the parimutuel system that are now revived were made in 1906 and later by bookmakers who oppose these legalized restrictions.

It is obvious that every legalized race track looks upon illegal, off-course operations as outlaw competition. Every State racing commission has regulations to curb such activities. Legalized racing is "a horse of another color." I cannot imagine the stony heart and steel eye and cold blood of a man who would not get a kick out of witnessing Middleground come down the stretch a winner in the grueling test of the courage, stamina, and speed of the thoroughbred in the Kentucky Derby, or seeing Hill Prince reverse the tables on him in Maryland to

win the wreath of black-eyed Susans at old Pimlico.

Be that as it may, I hope that the public will not swallow hook, line, and sinker all the misinformation that has been developed on this subject. A plain statute aimed only at information for handbooks is all that is required, constitutional, or advisable. Handbooks are clearly defined in the statutes of the different States. Such legislation would give to mayors, circuit judges, district attorneys, chiefs of police, law-enforcement officers, and others all the assistance that they need to uphold the laws that their States already have and which they already are sworn to enforce.

You could kill every horse in America, quit the publication of every newspaper in this country, raze every press box, and make a bonfire of all the sport pages, and organized commercial gambling scarcely would be affected. You recall the ancient proverb of those who burned down a house in trying to roast a pig. It is appalling to see this attempted in the United States in this enlightened age.

Under unanimous consent, I include with these remarks a telegram from the distinguished chairmen of three of the outstanding racing commissions of the United States to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate. A copy of this was sent to me. Included also is an editorial from the Lexington (Ky.) Herald dealing with this subject:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 14, 1950.*

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Vice President, Vice President's Office, The Senate, Washington, D. C.:

As members of the committee on legislation of the National Association of State Racing Commissioners, comprising the commissions of all States in which pari-mutuel wagering on horse racing has been legalized, we respectfully request your opposition to Senate bill 3358, entitled "A bill to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communications facilities." This bill would prevent all publicizing or advance discussion of racing events. It would place restrictions on legitimate reporting of racing as a sport which is not imposed on any other sport, thereby making invidious discrimination against racing which yields enormous revenues to 25 States in which wagering on such events is legalized. If the wagering public is unable to obtain legitimate and essential information respecting racing it would unquestionably disastrously affect legalized wagering.

There are already adequate statutes in all States where bookmaking is illegal to curb the practice if the statutes are enforced. The district attorney of New York County is now giving active evidence in support of this point.

This bill would prevent millions of persons interested in horse racing as a sport from access to news items which are commonly reported for all other sports and would restrict reporting of actual facts about activities sanctioned by law in most of the States. It is our considered opinion that the bill would in no way restrict the illegal activities of bookmakers who would undoubtedly be able to obtain through illicit channels the information forbidden to the public by the bill.

STUYVESANT PEABODY, Jr.,
Chairman, Illinois Racing Board.
EARL J. MOYER,
Chairman, Nebraska State Racing Commission.
ASHLEY T. COLE,
Chairman, New York State Racing Commission.

[From the Lexington (Ky.) Herald, June 17, 1950]

GOING TOO FAR

A copy of a report on the transmission of gambling information from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate is a treatise on the whole subject of gambling. The treatise or so-called report undertakes to establish the fact that speculation in any form is economic folly. Of course it is. No one contends that there is any chance to make 6 percent with safety at the races, but by the same token, motor travel is economic folly in many instances. Will Rogers said that if everyone who was not actually going somewhere stayed off the roads there wouldn't be any travel congestion in America.

There are many who go to the Dakotas to hunt birds that cost them $25 each and many a mess of fish has cost the nimrod enough to buy a television set which purchase, except in the case of a taproom, would still be economic folly. There is an element of unrequited expense connected with a lot of things running all the way from baseball to grand opera. The problem is whether Federal legislation is advisable, necessary, and constitutional.

The report touches upon this subject lightly in covering a wide range of philosophy on the art of speculation. The report even goes out of its way to emphasize the speculative feature that originated so respectable an industry as insurance. However, instead of recommending a specific statute to forbid the illegal transmission of information for unlawful purposes, the committee report threatens the press with censorship. This great Nation has gone through two wars in the lifetime of many of us without censorship of the press. The committee comes to the amazing conclusion that any information about horse racing is gambling information before the race takes place but not afterward. Of course, restriction of legal information of this kind would simply be playing into the hands of the bookmakers and the big gambling syndicates which are under cover anyway and do not rely upon the Associated Press or the United Press or the International News Service. The report inferentially pictures the Associated Press, which is the greatest news-gathering agency in the world and a cooperative association of newspapers, as the confederate of Frank Erickson, Frank Costello, James J. Carroll, and other lesser lights.

The complete elimination of racing news from the press would handicap the handbooks but little, but it is obvious that once censorship starts it will not stop with such things as the weights to be carried by horses in racing events. The censorship will continue to everything from the stock market to the corset ads. Furthermore, the whole trend of this report seems to be to show that horse racing is only a small element in the play of the professional gambling syndicates. The numbers racket, far larger, would go unrestrained.

This bill, however, would let the wheel of fortune spin as long as it isn't legal and doesn't get in the newspapers.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in agricultural areas there is general interest in the soil-conservation program and how it is working. One often hears the queries, What is being accomplished? What is the goal? Under leave I am including here, the last annual report made by Mr. William R. Newnam, the able chairman of the Kent Soil Conservation District, which operates in a typical agricultural community of the Eastern Shore of Maryland. It may serve to help in answering these questions:

1949 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE KENT SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT

The supervisors of the Kent Soil Conservation District herewith present their report for activities during the calendar year 1949. acres were received. This compares favor-

In 1949, 46 applications covering 7,125 acres were received. This compares favorably with the 1948 figures in which 31 applications, covering 4,822 acres, were received.

In 1949, 37 farm plans involving 9,824 acres were developed. In 1948, 29 farm plans, covering 7,962 acres, were developed.

In 1949, 12 farm plans involving 2,262 acres were canceled. In 1948, 20 plans covering 4,498 acres were canceled. These cancellations were due to death of owners or sale of property.

From these figures it appears that the activities of the Kent district are not complete even after 11 years of continuous activity.

In 1949 approximately 10,850 acres were benefited by planning. During this period, conservation practices were applied to the land on approximately 7,341 acres. This represents 70 percent as much application as planning which is somewhat better than average. We have never felt that 100 percent of our planning would be applied although it never hurts to hope.

The technical assistance offered by the Soil Conservation Service has been invaluable. This assistance consists of the one-third time of the district conservationist, one work-unit conservationist who does the engineering and farm planning and two aids. If this staff can be permanently maintained in the county, it should be able to adequately handle the requests for service.

We did feel at one time that conservation work would gradually decline as the years went by but this does not appear to be the case.

More and more farmers are asking for assistance in carrying out their conservation farm plan and additional farmers are requesting assistance after seeing the benefits on their neighbor's farms who are in the program.

Respectfully submitted.

W. R. NEWNAM, *Chairman.*

One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary, Army Quartermaster Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Col. Hubert Lee:

[From Atlanta's Suburban Reporter, East Point, Ga.]

THIS WEEK

(By Col. Hubert Lee)

The Quartermaster Corps of the Army will proudly celebrate its one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary on June 16 and in

this area attention will naturally center on the Atlanta General Depot, which played a vital part in winning World War II and in the uneasy period of peace since.

The QMC might be compared with a vast department store, supplying the needs of soldiers wherever they are stationed. Food, clothing, tents, stoves, hardware, soap, showers, and thousands of items for equipping and feeding troops.

Maj. Gen. Herman Feldman, the present Quartermaster General, in a colorful Horatio Alger fashion, advanced from the ranks from private to general by his own great ability and ambition. He enlisted in 1907, and is one of the Army's great.

Col. Clyde Massey, the commanding officer of Atlanta General Depot, served as a brigadier general in World War II. A West Pointer, he graduated from the Point in 1924 and from the Air Service Primary Flying School the following year; the Cavalry School in 1930, and from the Command and General Staff School in 1942, according to "Who's Who in America." In 1947 he graduated from the Industrial College of Armed Forces and later was assigned to head up the important industrial mobilization district of the QM, a part of the Atlanta General Depot, in Atlanta. Last Spring he was assigned the QMC's choicest post, this of commanding officer of the Atlanta General Depot.

It takes the abilities of a score of top administrators, industrialists, merchants, accountants, and allied pursuits to be a successful commander of a general depot. It compares on a smaller scale with the Department of Defense. The AGD is made up of all the technical services of the Army, Quartermaster, Signal Corps, Chemical Warfare, Ordnance, Engineers, Medical, and Transportation. All have supply missions at the depot, with the exception of Transportation Corps. It takes a lot of tact and generalship to coordinate proud services and to head up a command that is made up largely of civilians under Civil Service. It also requires a lot of wisdom to appraise motives as well as facts when having command responsibility, for the tradition of "don't let the 'old man' know about this" is as old as the Army.

United World Federalists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Illinois State Journal and Register:

UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS

A coming event of importance will be the visit of Raymond Swing, newspaper correspondent and radio commentator, who will lecture in the Knights of Columbus hall here Thursday under auspices of the local chapter of the United World Federalists.

The United World Federalists, an organization in which Mr. Swing has been greatly interested since its inception a few years ago, has a distinguished list of local and national sponsors including many well-known Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant leaders. Both capital and labor are well represented. The organization is nonpartisan and nonsectarian.

The UWF is altogether in the clear from the standpoint of motives and objectives. It is in no sense a Communist-front organization. It seeks to maintain an open door policy toward all nations in respect to active cooperation according to the rules and limitations of the organization.

The organization strives to establish within the amendment provisions of the United Nations, a permanent instrument for the maintenance of world peace, the development of world security and the constructive cooperation of all nations in the advancement of the common good. The limitations it would place upon national sovereignty are not crippling limitations. Nor are they such as would be harmful to the dignity and honor of any participating nation.

It should be apparent to all students of world affairs that unless some sort of mutual understanding is developed among the nations, the present armaments competition, with its attendant fear and hysteria can lead to but one result, total world war on an unprecedented scale and the destruction of all semblance of free democratic processes, which would mean the destruction of civilization, itself.

Certainly all possible steps should be taken to bring every nation within the orbit of world influence for peace and confidence. Should that fail, then machinery should be available, within the amendment provisions of the United Nations, to bring any war-like nation or nations to the bar of a world court. At least, the conscience of just and liberty-loving people will have been kept free from the stain and guilt of having been a party to armed aggression and world domination by any nation or group of nations bent upon global tyranny and control.

A Memorial to Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

A MEMORIAL TO HONOR

"Ill fares the land to wandering ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay"

One hundred and seventy-four years ago a new nation was born. To its life men pledged their sacred honor.

They declared certain inalienable rights and wrote them into a Constitution of the United States. This document was the first in history to give full stability to contractual responsibility, thereby making possible America's great industrial growth by credit expansion.

One hundred and fourteen years ago another new nation was born through sweat and blood. It too adopted a constitution which men again pledged their honor to defend.

For 9 years this nation of Texas fought off from her borders those who would invade her homes, while over her tidelands her navy battled those who would take over her sea coast.

In 1845 the Republic of Texas accepted the invitation of the Congress of the Republic of the United States to become a State in that Union. These acts were performed with honorable motives by honorable men.

In surrending her sovereignty as a republic the free and independent nation of Texas made certain terms regarding her public domain, which were accepted by the Congress of the United States. These terms and agreements became a part of the sacred contract between honorable representatives of two honorable governments. Has that contract became a scrap of paper?

We can understand why nations of different peoples disagree with one another and go to war over less provocation, but in a civilized and Christian nation of kindred bloods it is difficult to reconcile or condone dishonor among brothers.

If this sacred agreement stood among honorable Americans for 100 years, why is it now circumvented?

Is it not strange that in a disturbed world we ourselves cannot keep contracts with one another? How can we face skeptical nations with stained hands and expect them to keep their agreements with us?

Has the lure of wealth, opulence, power so saturated our beings that even as nations we seduce all that is honorable? Has "wealth so accumulated that men decay"?

How much further can we go until confidence is destroyed in the oath men take on the Bible as with upraised hand they swear to defend all that is sacred in our dealings with one another—in the Constitution of our Nation?

Gentlemen, if that time has come, then we bring these words as flowers to the dead dreams of a once great people and lay their fading sprays over the remnants of a broken pledge and a shredded contract between a nation that once had honor and the republic of Texas. If these conditions exist, then we, as ordinary citizens, offer these thoughts as our memorial to the honor that once was.

Fertilizer Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, a letter recently written by Mr. Fred H. Gaston, Alpine, Tex., to Mr. William G. Holman, Washington, D. C., contains some statements that strongly support the effort now being made by the Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH to secure the appointment of a special committee to study the health and economic phases of present methods of fertilizer manufacture, House Resolution 323.

Some of the statements made, and sworn to by Mr. Gaston, are so serious in their implications as to incline me to ask that this letter, and Mr. Gaston's affidavit, be inserted in the RECORD for the information of other Members of Congress.

Mr. Gaston's letter reads as follows:

ALPINE, TEX., *June 15, 1950.*

Mr. WILLIAM G. HOLMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOLMAN: I was glad to receive a copy of H. R. 3045. I believe the time has come to subject chemical fertilizers to more rigid regulation.

I have read your paper with considerable interest and am surprised to learn that the Federal Government has allowed a few fertilizer manufacturers to acquire a monopolistic control of the phosphate market, and that the leasing of public lands on which are found the principal potash deposits, to a few corporations, has enabled them to acquire control of 80 to 90 percent of the potash in this country.

I fully agree with you that "monopoly is in the saddle, booted, and spurred," and that the farmers are completely at the mercy

of these ruthless corporations. Although the biggest potash mines in America are almost at my very door (on Government land, obtained at negligible cost), my letter to the big plant near Carlsbad, contemplating carlot purchases of potash, had to be forwarded to Wall Street before I received the following reply:

"Our entire production of potash for the year June 1, 1950, to June 1, 1951, has already been committed."

My efforts to obtain phosphate rock have thus far been unavailing, having elicited no reply whatever.

I have discovered that in irrigated fields, the increasing use of artificial fertilizers has reached a point where the costs wipe out the potential profit. Moreover, the land, like a user of narcotics, requires larger dosage from year to year, to maintain an average yield. Such artificial stimulation is attended by actual soil depletion and destruction of the original topsoil, accompanied by development of hardpan. Earthworms and subsurface animal life—the bacteria and countless micro-organisms which build humus and preserve tilth—tend to disappear entirely with the continued use of strong chemicals. Thus our soils are being ruined by chemical fertilizers.

Let me know whether any Texas Congressmen are opposed to H. R. 3045 and what I can do to help your worthy undertaking.

Very truly yours,

FRED H. GASTON.

The STATE OF TEXAS,
County of Brewster, ss:

Subscribed to and sworn to before me, M. L. Hopson, a notary public, in and for Brewster County, Tex., by Fred H. Gaston at Alpine, Tex., this the 15th day of June A. D. 1950.

M. L. HOPSON,
Notary Public, Brewster County, Tex.

Thirtieth Anniversary of the Churchill Tabernacle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members of Congress will want to join with me in extending best wishes to the Churchill Tabernacle which recently celebrated its thirtieth anniversary and to its pastor, Dr. Clinton H. Churchill.

The history of this church, located in Buffalo, N. Y., is one of considerable struggle and a great amount of hard work over the years. The church has overcome all difficulties to attain its present high position in the community. It typifies the continuous effort of the American people to establish religion in our country and I know that Dr. Clinton H. Churchill will be pleased to know that during this year of celebration, we extend to him and his parishioners every wish for future success.

I am proud to acquaint the Members with the successful achievements of this fine congregation and of its pastor who has been its guiding light. Dr. Churchill is known as a gifted pulpit orator whom ordinary people can understand—and do. He continues to strive to accomplish the great spiritual objectives of the gospels in a world rife with confusion and turmoil. If the prospect of achievement generally has been bleak at times, he has been undiscouraged.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am herewith including a history of the Churchill Tabernacle which is such a splendid, well-documented, and concise portrayal of its accomplishments that I believe it will be of interest to all:

THE CHURCHILL TABERNACLE

It would be impossible to tell the story or reveal the work of the Churchill Tabernacle, in the city of Buffalo, N. Y., without relating the Christian experience of the man whose name the tabernacle bears. It is, therefore, especially appropriate, at this time, when he is celebrating the thirty-third anniversary of his conversion and his Christian ministry, to recite this story of the man whose influence in bringing so many people to Christ has been so far-reaching.

From an executive position in one of the city's prosperous business enterprises to the humble pastorate of an obscure church was the change made, in his life and career, by Dr. Clinton H. Churchill, the man who was destined to become the prime factor in one of the most extensive and successful movements for the advancement of Christianity in the history of this Nation.

With his resignation from big business came, of course, the loss of a good income and with his acceptance of a small pastorate came a correspondingly small salary and that only in prospect. The loss of a big business it was, in a worldly sense, but it was the acquisition of a bigger business position, in a spiritual sense. A big drop, the world would call it, in the pursuit of dollars, but a big climb upward it was, as a matter of fact, in the pursuit of souls. It takes plenty of nerve, in this world, to toss away a well-paying job and a sure business future, but Dr. Clinton H. Churchill had it; he had more than that; he had faith and conviction and, once imbued with the spirit, there was no stopping him.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt commended and encouraged Dr. Clinton H. Churchill on his Christian work in a letter from the White House, and stated that "in religion lies the hope of our country and the world."

Today the internationally famous Churchill Tabernacle, on Main Street near Utica, in the city of Buffalo, stands as a monument in perpetuity to the worldly sacrifice made by a young Buffalo businessman, to his conversion to Christianity, to his faith, to his indomitable perseverance to the cause he had chosen to serve, and to the loyal and unselfish cooperation and support of the men and women who gave generously of their time, their talent, and their means to make the tabernacle and the work a reality.

That there could come such a change and so suddenly and so completely in the life of a young man who had been enjoying all the worldly pleasures that this life can provide would be considered by most people a miracle, and a miracle it was; but, as Dr. Clinton H. Churchill has explained to thousands and thousands of listeners, since that memorable night in 1917, when he accepted Christ during the Billy Sunday revival in Buffalo, such a miracle can be worked in the life of anyone.

Following his conversion, on the night of February 21, 1917, Dr. Churchill was invited to give his testimony in a church packed with people, most of them old friends and former acquaintances, the church where his mother long before had taken him to be baptized. It was the old Linwood Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, and Dr. Churchill was presented to the large assemblage by the Reverend Dr. Charles Drake Skinner, the pastor. So simple and yet so powerful was the young man's story of his life and his conversion that it moved deeply all who heard it, and the news spread rapidly throughout the city, and Dr. Churchill was called upon again and again to speak before all kinds of groups and organizations. In his own heart the young man was pondering whether to remain in business and serve as a church member or to consecrate his entire life and energy to the service of the Lord. He had worked his way up from the position of a clerk to that of an executive in the city's largest department store. Still in his twenties, he experienced still greater success when he became vice president and assistant manager of the insurance business which had been established by his father, D. F. Churchill, more than 30 years before. It was while holding this position that he attended the evangelistic meetings that were being conducted in Buffalo by the late Reverend William A. (Billy) Sunday. It was at one of these meetings, on February 21, 1917, that the young businessman was converted to the Lord Jesus Christ.

Dr. Churchill continued telling his story to ever increasingly large gatherings of people, and on August 1, 1917, he was appointed pastor of the North Delaware Methodist Episcopal Church, where in the following November he preached his first sermon, which, after all, was once again the story of his conversion, but it packed the little church with folks who had heard of it and were anxious to hear it from the young convert's own lips.

At the time that Dr. Churchill accepted the pastorate of the North Delaware Church the building was unfinished and unfurnished, located on land owned by the Methodist Union of Buffalo, N. Y. It had been started by a small group of godly people, and at that time was without membership and was in need of funds to meet its indebtedness and to complete and furnish the building.

The young pastor, undaunted, applied himself to the task and the necessary funds were provided, the church building was completed and furnished, and the dedicatory services were held on November 12 of that year. The work prospered and, within 2 years, the church building was enlarged and a basement was put under the entire structure. For 3 years Dr. Churchill continued as pastor of this church and, during this time and the ensuing 2 years, he pursued his theological studies. Along with his work as pastor, he completed the divinity course of the Methodist Episcopal Church and, during this time, he took special work at the Biblical Seminary in New York. For more than 2 years, 2 hours each day, he was tutored by Dr. Charles Drake Skinner, who formerly had been president of Cazenovia Seminary and who was an excellent teacher. In October 1918 Dr. Churchill was admitted on trial to the Genesee conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; in October 1920 he was admitted to full membership in the conference and was ordained a deacon in the church; in the fall of 1922 he completed his divinity course and was ordained an elder in the Methodist Episcopal Church; all this time the young evangelist-to-be was engaged in full-time Christian work.

It was on Easter Sunday, April 4, 1920, that Dr. Churchill resigned his pastorate of the North Delaware Church. It has become very evident that his service was to be in the broader field of evangelism. Following a series of conferences with prominent business and professional men, the Churchill Evangelistic Association was organized, which later was succeeded by the Churchill Tabernacle. Humbly enough did the work start. For the first 2½ years there was no permanent meeting place, no home that the movement could call its own. There was a small room in the Calumet Building, in Chippewa Street, where the workers met with Dr.

Churchill and from which they went to various churches and communities for the purpose of holding revivals. During that time more than 20 evangelistic campaigns were conducted and more than 7,500 men and women of all ages dedicated their lives to God. Hundreds of family altars were established and churches that had become lukewarm and listless were rekindled and made to glow again with godly enthusiasm.

The work grew and so did the necessity for larger quarters, and the ever-increasing number of people interested in the success of the work felt that there must be an adequate place for meetings and worship and where the evangelistic effort could be better concentrated and systematized. So, on June 1, 1922, the association purchased the store and office building, with adjoining vacant land, on the southwest corner of Grant Street and Lafayette Avenue. It was not long before a beautiful tabernacle occupied the property. The dedication was held on October 22, 1922.

In that tabernacle the work could be and was done on a much larger scale. Large evangelistic campaigns were conducted not only at home but in cities and towns that extended from Connecticut to Kansas. Thousands of souls were saved. Christians received a new vision of spiritual realities and young people were led to make definite decisions for Christian service. The work kept on growing so that, within a few years, it became very apparent that that tabernacle was not sufficiently large.

Therefore, larger quarters, more centrally located, were sought and quite significantly, it would seem, the new and present tabernacle was erected on the site where, years before, the evangelist's father had started his insurance business which developed into the company from which he, the young evangelist, had resigned his executive position to enter the Christian ministry. The structure that housed the insurance business on Main Street, near Utica, before its expansion, and its removal downtown, was razed to make way for the new tabernacle. Later additional property adjoining and in the rear of the site was acquired.

The purchase of the site of the present tabernacle was made on August 12, 1924. On October 13, the same year, ground was broken and on Easter Sunday, April 12, 1925, 5 years from the beginning of the work, the present massive and beautiful building was dedicated. Here on Buffalo's Main Street, with its frontage of 135 feet and its depth of 250 feet passed daily and nightly by thousands of people, this great house of God proclaims its messages to all wayfarers, whether on foot or in car. Upon an immense electric cross, seen for many blocks along Main Street, is the illuminated motto, "I am the way, the truth, and the life." On the tabernacle's huge, illuminated clock, that gives the time of day and night to all who pass, is the admonition "Take time to know God," and across the portals of the building appear the words of Christ, "Have faith in God," cheering the millions of passing motorists who in these years have traversed Buffalo's principal traffic artery which, as part of State Highway 5, is an important and heavily traveled link in the chain of motor routes that connect the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts and, from Albany, tie this district with the southland. Many are the gospel workers, missionaries, and ministers who have dedicated their lives to Christian service as a result of the tabernacle's ministry. The world's foremost evangelists and preachers have occupied the pulpit of the Churchill Tabernacle.

Today at home and abroad the Churchill Tabernacle is continuing to carry on its beneficent work. In far-off Africa, India, China, and South America, and in closer Cuba and Alaska, its missionaries are laboring in the cause of Christ.

The Churchill Tabernacle was one of the Nation's pioneers in religious broadcasting. It was back in 1925 that the Churchill Tabernacle started broadcasting its Sunday services. In 1925 the tabernacle built its own radio station WKBW, which, it may be interesting to note, consists of the first letters of Well Known Bible Witness. WKBW has always been the largest and highest powered radio station in western New York. It operated on 1,000 watts of power. Later the Federal Radio Commission increased the power to 5,000 watts, and in 1941 the Federal Communications Commission increased WKBW to 50,000 watts. The tabernacle's broadcasts have brought letters of appreciation from every State in the Union and from every Province in the Dominion of Canada. Hundreds of thousands of men and women have visited the Churchill Tabernacle and have worshiped in it, coming from all sections of the United States, from all over Canada, from every country in South America, from Europe and the remote parts of the globe.

The Boston Post featured an article with photographs of the work of the Churchill Tabernacle and the great religious service performed by Dr. Churchill. It stated that the tabernacle is a powerful church organization for evangelism built by a man with more than his share of business ability and executive energy.

It was in October of 1929 that one of the larger national networks provided an hour's time every Sunday night for the Back Home Hour service to be carried over their facilities. This gave Nation-wide scope to the sermons of Dr. Churchill and the music of the Churchill Tabernacle.

The tabernacle register, which greets the visitor as he enters the auditorium, contains the names of most of these people, the great and the lowly, who have joined in praising God in what is acknowledged to be one of the world's greatest and most prolific spiritual workshops.

The Churchill Tabernacle is the corporate name. In 1934 the Churchill Evangelistic Association, which had been incorporated in 1920, was succeeded by the Churchill Tabernacle, the latter being then incorporated, under the religious corporation laws of the State of New York, as a free church, governed by a board of trustees. The founder of the work is the pastor of the church. Since its incorporation as a free church, there have been more than 1,600 members received into fellowship and not a week passes without its quota of men and women, old and young, making their decisions for Christ. Since the establishment of the Churchill Tabernacle, by means of its great seating capacity for the local congregation, it has been conservatively estimated by those familiar with the work that more than 100,000 decisions have been made for Christ; an astounding number and what an achievement.

As for the tabernacle's ministry of music, it was under the able direction of George E. Gowing, the dean of his profession in this part of the country, who, among his many fine achievements, trained the choruses for the never-to-be-forgotten Billy Sunday campaign of 1917. It is the largest church choir in the city; it has a singing membership of more than one hundred splendid voices; it has functioned without a break since its organization back in 1922—that is 28 years of continuous service, a proud record indeed. It has always been on a strictly volunteer basis, not a paid singer in it. Always white robed, it makes a strikingly attractive appearance in the loft that arises back of the pulpit. Its gospel songs have carried to the city mansions of the affluent, to the wayside shacks of the poor and to the speeding cars of traveling motorists on the highway everywhere in eastern United States and Canada. Mr. Gowing, for a quarter of a century music director at the tabernacle, 81 years old on his last birthday, today is the honorary director of music of the Churchill Tabernacle. His successor and active director of the music department is Prof. Robert J. Hughes.

For years the Churchill Tabernacle has enjoyed the largest Sunday evening congregations in the city and also the largest prayer and fellowship meetings in the city, held every Tuesday night at 7:45. The tabernacle's intercessory prayer group meets every Wednesday afternoon and receives the preceding week's requests for prayer that have come from people all over the land who have listened to the tabernacle's radio programs. This group of consecrated men and women takes the prayer requests received to the throne of grace. Throughout the years thousands of testimonials of answered prayers have come to this group from every section of the United States and Canada.

During a period of 4 years the Christian Practice Class of the Churchill Tabernacle traveled from house to house throughout the city, giving their testimony for Christ and presenting free copies of the Gospel. These volunteers called at almost every home in this city, and, as a result, multiplied hundreds accepted Christ as their Saviour. In the summertime young people of the tabernacle hold street meetings throughout the city, and have thereby interested countless numbers in active Christian service. The Tabernacle Sunday School has in its membership enrollment the very young and the much older; in fact, it knows no age limit; and its membership is decidedly cosmopolitan, representing many different nationalities.

The Young People's Fellowship is actively engaged in the work of evangelism, and every Sunday its members visit the hospitals, where many conversions have resulted.

There is a social side of the Gospel, and that is not forgotten by the Churchill Tabernacle. The Young People's Fellowship has its social gatherings for the clean entertainment of youth. The tabernacle has seen that the cities less fortunate are given food and clothing and, wherever possible, those who are out of work are assisted in obtaining employment.

The present Sunday schedule of the Churchill Tabernacle is one of the most intensive and extensive in Christian work. Its activities start with the King's Morning Hour broadcast, begininng at 9 a. m., Sunday school, morning worship and sermon, Young People's Fellowship evening worship, and ending with the Back Home Hour, broadcast from 10 to 11 p. m.

Each month the Churchill Tabernacle publishes a monthly magazine, the Churchill Tabernacle Evangelist, which is edited by Dr. Churchill. This Christian publication is circulated throughout the United States and Canada and in the various mission fields. The tabernacle publishes its own hymn book, Tabernacle Service Songs, which contains one of the finest collections of recognized Gospel songs in the world. This book is used at every service in the tabernacle, by scores of small churches throughout the eastern part of the United States, and in the homes of thousands of radio members who attend the tabernacle services regularly by means of the air waves. The Churchill Tabernacle recognizes the fact that Christianity is primarily a religion of songs, and it encourages its radio congregation to join with its local congregation at all services in the singing of the great hymns of the church.

And so today the Churchill Tabernacle, having completed 30 years of Christian work, which began with the conversion of a young Buffalo businessman, Dr. Clinton H. Churchill, 33 years ago, goes forward unceasingly in the progression of the preaching and the practice of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Today, at home and abroad, the Churchill Tabernacle stands as a lighthouse for the spreading of Christ's Kingdom on Earth, that all

who walk may see a living testimonial to Christ's power to give and direct his disciples, today, as of old he directed them.

Billy Sunday left a torch with Clinton H. Churchill that has not dimmed through the years but has grown brighter with each passing day.

Charley Makes the Wheels Go Around

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, Billy Hill is leader of Broome County Republicans in name only. The real boss is Charles W. Kress.

These two men have been close friends for years. Their last joint political enterprise was a Kress boom for mayor.

This year they are busier than ever, lining up support for their stuffed-shirt favorite for Congress.

Hill's persuasion is being used openly with his public avowal that he will vote for the Kress candidate.

I learned today that Kress will use his convincing talents under cover by "persuading" the free agents in this primary to get out of the race. Whether he is doing this directly or by proxy can be better told by the free candidates.

There is no use warning Messrs. Westfall, Bond, and Morrissey of the wiles and sugared tones, the assurances and promises they will receive to retire from the field.

If they have not already been approached, they will be. The sky will be the limit for each one, if he will only get out of the race and leave the field clear for the hand-picked favorite.

I can assure them of one thing, however. After they do what the big boys want them to, there will be no payoff. That will be conveniently forgotten, because the big shots never pay off.

One of them may be asked, "Get out of this race and we'll get you a job in Albany."

Another may be contacted with, "Get out of the race and we'll make you assemblyman when so and so quits."

The suggestion to the third may go, "You're just the type our fair-haired boy can use as a secretary."

No dice, boys. You will never cash in, either with the promised job in Albany, the proffered assembly seat, or the congressional secretary's post.

So do not let anybody kid you out of this race with promises they cannot and will not keep.

But let us return to the Hill-Kress team.

As long as Charley Kress calls the signals, no one can challenge Hill's power. Dissatisfied people have griped to me about the present leadership.

There is nothing anybody can do, is my answer. Kress holds the balance of power, and will reign supreme while Hill is the front man.

I guarantee, however, that as long as the people want me in Congress, neither Kress nor Hill nor any other millionaire can push me around or run the affairs of my office.

And it will take more than all these wealthy moguls put together to force their stooge down the throats of the people of Broome County and the district.

Auxiliary of Morgan-McDermott Post, No. 7, American Legion, Tucson, Ariz., Presents Hand-Made American Flag to Treasury Secretary John Snyder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Tucson, Ariz., upon the visit of the replica of the Liberty Bell to Tucson in behalf of the Nation-wide campaign to sell United States Savings bonds, prepared a scroll and signed the same reaffirming their faith in the principles of America. The women of the auxiliary of the Morgan-McDermott Post, No. 7, American Legion, made a silk American flag which is to hang permanently with the bell at the State Capitol at Phoenix, Ariz.

When Treasury officials heard of the scroll and the flag presentation they asked that a duplication be made of the flag to hang permanently in the dome of the Treasury Building in Washington, D. C. The flag and the scroll were presented by Mrs. Vera Thomas, representing the auxiliary, and Fred Dragonette, Pima County chairman for the sale of United States Savings bonds. The flag may be seen in its permanent location in the Treasury Building and the scroll, including the names of the citizens in Tucson who signed it, are herewith included:

In Tucson, Ariz., May 19, 1950, 174 years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America, the people of Tucson reaffirmed their faith by publicly adopting the following declaration:

"We, the people of Tucson, Pima County, Ariz., United States of America, upon the occasion of the visitation of the Liberty Bell, and, in the light of current events, and the confusion existing in the minds of men, have reexamined the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights of the United States of America, and we find these to be the greatest documents ever conceived by mankind for their mutual benefit, and we hereby reaffirm our belief in the principles expounded therein, and, for the support of those principles, with abiding faith in the protection of Almighty God, we mutually pledge, as did our forefathers, our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Signed by the following:

E. T. Houston, Wm. J. Pistor, Samuel T. Adams, J. O. Niemann, Charles A. Brady, Forrest G. Priser, William H. Codd, Phil J. Martin, Jr., Joy Bagshaw, Ethyl J. Thorp, Bernice Worek, Elsa B. Hanna, Loveless N. Gardner, Carl M. Hitt, Albert Hesselberg, Viva Jean Craig, Bertha L. Basurto, Lorraine O'Neal, Bovard Tomlinson, Helen V. Mazurick, Alfia Hutchinson, Mary F. Bottlemy, Leigh O. Gardner, Theresa V. Stockham, Eloise Jeter, W. L. Scudder, May Dewey, Ellen Rose Buchanan, Bernadine R. Ocon, George P. Wheeland, David W. Olson, L. H. Wixson, Clara Garcia, Harold W. Woolis, Robert L. Wooton, Mildred C. Goldsborough, Ralph R. Guthrie, Paul E. Laos, B. A. Aros, Warren Walker, E. D. Herreras, A. R. Aros, Alfred B. Hobbs, Cruz H. Delgado, Bernice Keenan, Jack De Schalit, Charles R. Jaloski, I. S. Sonkin, James M. Hennessy, Jr., Donald E. Macpherson, Hazel Horne, Frank Eyman, Frank Keefe, Joe Weinzapfel, Ben D. Benites, Paul G. Denney, Dora Montano, Alice M. Birdman, Betty Ann Arnold, Lorraine Franklin, Leon H. Tyer, James C. Herron, Hortense Norton, Jean Belcher, P. H. McNeill, Kenneth C. Yeazell, John P. Kietzman, Willis H. Campbell, Gene C. Reid, Humberto F. Rivera, Merrill Biggs, John F. Rauscher, Fresia H. Lopez, Norman B. Harrington, John F. Caarls, E. S. Navarro, Sr., Lewis H. Adams, Lona C. Shields, John Evert Alexander, James W. Hawks, Paul G. Yeazell;

William Gardner, Bryan T. Small, Eloise S. Blake, Richard A. Kittle, Sophia Valovage, Sally Spiewak, Sophie Balodimas, Herman Erickson, Glenton G. Sykes, Mabel M. Auclair, H. T. Pearson, Vivian Wolford, Willis M. Wilson, Walter T. Childs, Jack D. Clothier, Wesley B. Heller, Vernon N. Marklund, John R. Shriver, Art E. Stearns, Byron L. Wylie, Betty Louise Cross, Helen A. Wilson, Shirley M. Forquer, Alex R. Garcia, Teresa Oakey, Doris W. Caprio, Margaret J. Nichols, Louise B. Burns, Pat Schaffner, Vivian Kringle, Jessie Valencia, Frances Ross, Ella B. King, George H. Daum, Blanche G. Webb, Ruth C. Mincks, Dean Westover, Manuel Cajero, Florence O. Albaugh, Helen Waters, Mercedes Stone, Jacob Sweeney, Charles J. Hoffman, Irene Horstman, Ruth E. Williams, Edith Marta, Romelia Gomez, Florence Olson, Bessie Rosen, S. M. Warner, Lorette R. Klumph, Leo A. Kilcullen, C. V. Budlong, Andrew Adams, Roger O'Mara, Margaret G. Randall, Vinita Potter, Lee Little, Ben L. Slack, Mrs. P. H. Ross, Louis J. Felix, Raymond J. Hock, Robert D. Morrow, Edgar Goyette, J. Homer Boyd, Mrs. G. M. Gibbens, Jonathan L. Booth, George B. Taylor, John Paulos, George A. Damron, James Pung, Arthur Lopez, Thomas E. Dickens, Johnnie E. Bayliss, Paul W. Bartholomeaux, C. F. Stoody, Yvonne Collins, Amalia Estrada, Anna B. Gendron, Betty M. Mack, Minnie Switzer, Bessie Robbins Wilkins, Viola J. Randall, Marguerite Redmon, Jno. H. Thomas, William A. Burns, Benjamin F. Soffe, B. S. Soffe, Jr., Shirley E. Arter, Orland Fiandaca, Fred Dragonette, Oren R. Frasier, Marie E. Burns, John C. Phebus, John J. Gekas, Charles J. Hostetter, Milton A. Semoff, Roydon L. Lebrecht, John F. Steiger, Frank S. Minarik, Stewart H. Weston, Ira V. Haskell, Robert Nathanson, Archie Gardner;

George W. Russell, Sidney Kaye, A. H. Atkins, Ruth C. Atkins, William S. Hatten, J. R. Whiting, Jr., L. S. Raymond, Ransom Powell, Albert J. McLean, Lynn Waddell, Marty Anderson, Bettye J. Omar, Betty Hagan, Frank Morales, Laura Carrigan, Linnie Riddle, Melba L. Brown, Thomas Collins, Camille Sudano, Lucile W. Herbert, Marjorie Riddell, Charles W. Herbert, Audrey E. Beckley, Dorothy E. Jarvis, William D. Kussman, Pete Balestrero, Harry Fortier, Betty J. Weese, John Thurman, Maurice Koonce, Robert F. Beckley, Lucy Velez, Mary Gerdenics, R. C. Plumstead, Cynthia Muck, Alice E. Wilson, Lucille Van Brundt, Hannah M. Howard, Georgia Gibbens, Ethyl J. Thorp, W. M. McClain, William P. McConnell, Charles B. Neville, Forrest J. Rye, Grace Stafford, Lois Wilson, Robert M. Soffe, F. Soffe, C. J. Nichols, Vera B. Thomas, Harold A. Patten, A. B. Sieh, Mary Kay Ellingston, A. Hood, Louise L. Crawther, Joe McAllister, W. Fisher, Zora Soberay, Ray Steven, Violet Sigourney, H. L. Marshick, Christ T. Heotis, M. Freeman, J. Tristani.

Know Your Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under prior permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I wish to include an article by the Marine News, New York, published in the Washington Post of June 16, 1950, as follows:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS—WHAT FORMER PRESIDENT THEODORE ROOSEVELT BELIEVED

In 1908 former President Theodore Roosevelt said, when transmitting a preliminary report of the Inland Waterways to the Senate, that "Our river systems are better adapted to the needs of the people than those of any other country. In extent, distribution, navigability, and ease of use, they stand first. Yet the rivers of no other civilized country are so poorly developed, so little used, or play so small a part in industrial life of the Nation as those of the United States. In view of the use made of rivers elsewhere, the failure to use our own is astonishing, and no thoughtful man can believe that it will last.

"The development of our inland waterways will have results far beyond the immediate gain to commerce. Deep channels along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts and from the Gulf to the Great Lakes will have high value for the national defense.

"A channel is no deeper than its shallowest reach, and to improve a river short of the point of effective navigability is a sheer waste of all costs.

"The improvement of our inland waterways can and should be made to pay for itself so far as practicable from the incidental proceeds from water power and other uses. Navigation should of course be free. But the greatest return will come from the increased commerce growth and prosperity of our people. For this we have already waited too long."

While there has been much development since 1908, a vast amount remains to be done before our natural inland and intracoastal waterways, unparalleled in all the world, can yield the benefits to the Nation that they should.

Corps of Engineers' One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOYD TACKETT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proclamation of the Governor of Arkansas:

Whereas Gen. George Washington appointed Col. Rich Gridley as Chief Engineer of the Continental Army on June 16, 1775, during the preparation of the Battle of Bunker Hill, thereby creating the Corps of Engineers; and

Whereas the Corps of Engineers has a long record of military accomplishments in all wars that have threatened our American people and their chosen form of government; and

Whereas the Corps of Engineers has carried on, at the direction of Congress, a great program of civil-works development which has provided us with the greatest system of harbors and waterways in the world, and since 1936 has conceived and is constructing, on a Nation-wide basis, flood-control works freeing millions of Americans from the fear of floods; and

Whereas these activities have contributed to the general welfare and prosperity of the State of Arkansas: Now therefore

I, Sid McMath, Governor of the State of Arkansas, do hereby proclaim the week, June 11 to 16, 1950, as Corps of Engineers One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary Week, and call upon the officials and the people of the State of Arkansas generally to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, and otherwise give expression to the good will and esteem which the State of Arkansas and its people cherish for the Corps of Engineers.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Arkansas.

Done in office at Little Rock this 12th day of June 1950.

[SEAL]

SID MCMATH,
Governor.
C. G. HALL,
Secretary of State.

Taxation of Cooperative Business Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the National Federation of Independent Business, I am including herewith a statement made by C. Wilson Harder in connection with the taxation of cooperative business organizations.

I call the results of the various polls to the attention of my colleagues:

The National Federation of Independent Business is opposed to the continuation of the unfairly preferential status—in taxation and responsibility to our antitrust laws—bestowed on, and maintained for, cooperative organizations by our Federal Government.

The opposition of the federation to the preferential status of cooperatives is based on the almost unanimous personal opinions of its tens of thousands of members from all over the Nation, as expressed on mandate ballots since 1944 and given directly to Members of Congress. For instance:

During December 1944, all federation members over the Nation were asked their opinion on the Federal-tax status of cooperatives competitive with small and independent businessmen. Eighty-eight percent of federation members called for the taxation of cooperatives in the same fashion and to the same extent as competitive small and independent business corporations were taxed. Ten percent indicated they were satisfied with the then existing status quo. Two percent refrained from giving any opinion on the subject.

During April 1947, all federation members over the Nation were asked their opinion whether Congress should subject cooperatives to the same regulations, on taxation and other matters, that then pertained to small and independent businesses. Ninety-four percent of federation members called for Congress to subject cooperatives to the same regulations as applied to independent business. Five percent indicated their satisfaction with the then existing status quo. One percent refrained from giving any opinion on the matter.

During June 1948, all federation members over the Nation were asked their opinion on H. R. 6423 (80th Cong.), a bill that would have subjected cooperatives to the antitrust laws the same as small and independent businessmen are subject to those laws. Ninety-seven percent of federation members called for Congress to make cooperatives fully subject to these laws. Two percent indicated their desire for a continuation of the cooperative antitrust exemptions. One percent refrained from giving any opinion on the matter.

During August 1949, all federation members over the Nation were asked for their opinion on H. R. 5064 (81st Cong.), a bill that would compel cooperatives to pay Federal taxes on their incomes in exactly the same fashion and to the same extent as small and independent business corporations are compelled to pay Federal taxes on their incomes. Ninety-six percent of federation members voted in favor of this bill. Three percent opposed it. One percent refrained from giving any opinion on it.

During March 1950, all federation members over the Nation were asked their opinion on H. R. 7343 (81st Cong.), a bill that would compel cooperatives to pay Federal taxes on their incomes in exactly the same fashion and to the same extent as small and independent business corporations are compelled to pay Federal taxes on their incomes. Ninety-seven percent of federation members voted in favor of this bill. Three percent opposed it.

During April 1950, following House Ways and Means Committee decision to ask for a withholding tax on corporate dividends, all federation members over the Nation were asked whether it was their desire that the same type withholding tax be applied against dividend and patronage refunds declared paid by cooperatives. Ninety percent of federation members declared their desire that such a withholding tax be enacted on dividends and patronage refunds declared or paid out by cooperatives. Eight percent were opposed to enactment of such a withholding tax against cooperatives. Two percent took no position at all on the matter.

In all of this, it must be understood clearly that the majority of the members of the National Federation of Independent Business are not opposed to cooperative organizations as marketing methods. The National Federation of Independent Business favors free and fair competition between all methods of marketing. The only consideration it asks for its members and all other independent businessmen is that no special and unwarranted preferentials be shown by Government or any other agency to one form of business over another.

The National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., renews its demand that our law makers repeal all the preferential advantages now enjoyed by cooperative organizations so that independent business may compete with them on an equal basis.

C. WILSON HARDER,
President, National Federation of Independent Business.

The Weapon Needed To Combat Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the leadership of the Senate to program for immediate Senate consideration the Mundt-Ferguson-Nixon bill, S. 2311, which passed the Senate Judiciary Committee by a vote of 12 to 1.

If every American citizen would have the opportunity to read the speech of our colleague, RICHARD M. NIXON, which was made in the House of Representatives on January 26, 1950, entitled "The Hiss Case," I strongly believe the general opinion would be that our existing laws are not adequate to cope with the Communist activities within our borders.

The Communist threat is not a partisan problem, or at least it should not be. Both Democrat and Republican citizens alike loathe the thought of their tax money being used to pay the salaries of subversive Government employees. The American people today are bewildered, frustrated, and confused by all the recent pro-and-con newspaper editorials and radio broadcasts on the various spy cases. Our people are not satisfied any longer by the whitewash tactics being used by our present administration. The Hiss case is but one good example.

The time is ripe for calling a spade a spade and letting the chips fall where they may. The Mundt-Ferguson-Nixon bill undertakes to do four things:

First. To make unlawful a conspiracy "to perform any act which would substantially contribute" to the establishment within the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship under foreign control.

Second. To require the Communist movement in the United States, in view of its foreign-directed character, to operate in the open rather than underground.

Third. To cut the threads which bind the international Communist conspiracy together by restricting international travel of members of the American section of the world Communist movement.

Fourth. To protect the integrity of our Government by denying government employment to members of the American section of the world Communist movement and by protecting the security secrets of the United States against agents of a foreign government or the Communist movement.

The central provison of the bill is a requirement that Communist political organizations and Communist-front organizations shall register with the Attorney General of the United States. Registration shall include the name and address of the organization; name, address, and duties of its officers; and an accounting of funds. These provisions are substantially the same as now prevailing for the Republican and Democrat parties.

The purpose of the registration is to expose the Communist movement and protect the public against innocent and unwitting collaboration with it, and to expose and protect the public against certain conspiratorial and destructive acts which are declared unlawful.

Acts which are declared to be unlawful in this bill are:

First. To conspire "to perform any act which would substantially contribute" to the establishment within the United States of America of a totalitarian dictatorship under foreign control.

Second. For an employee of the Government to communicate without authorization to another person whom he knows or has reason to believe is an agent of a foreign government or a member of a Communist organization, any information which he knows has been classified as affecting the security of the country. Foreign agents are also penalized for receiving or attempting to obtain such information.

Third. To conceal the fact, when seeking office or employment under the United States of America, that a person is a member of an organization which has been legally found to be a Communist organization.

Fourth. To hold any nonelective office, or employment under the United States of America when such a member.

Fifth. To apply for, or to use, a United States passport when such a member.

Sixth. To fail to file reports which it is his legal duty to file, if a person is an officer of a Communist organization, or to make false statements in such reports.

Seventh. To become or remain a member of a Communist political organization if a person knows that the organization has been legally required to register and has failed to do so.

Eighth. To mail Communist publications, or to broadcast or televise a Communist program, for a Communist organization, without identifying the source or sponsorship.

I do hope this proposed legislation becomes law during this session of Congress, and if we find later that this law does not effectively control the Communist movement in the United States, I, for one, will support legislation to outlaw the Communist Party.

Whom Shall We Send?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of Thomas A. Edison, who was born in my district, a sermon was delivered on his one hundred and third birthday, February 11, by Rabbi Avraham Soltes, of Temple Sharey Tefilo, East Orange, N. J., describing him as one of the greatest benefactors of man, and it is included herewith:

WHOM SHALL WE SEND?
(By Rabbi Avraham Soltes)

One of the characteristics of Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday America observes this week end, the characteristic that has made him so beloved among our people, has been the humbleness of his origin, and the undaunted spirit with which he faced the obstacles and failures with which his rough path through life was strewn. The mere mention of his name conjures up visions of a rude log cabin in the heart of a wilderness, remote from the advantages of culture and civilization; the words "young Lincoln" summon up pictures of a gangly youth in shirt sleeves splitting rails, of a poorly clad boy avidly reading borrowed books in the flickering light of a fireplace; the Lincoln-Douglas debates summon before our mind's eye scenes of a platform on which the barbs of his rustic humor and wit were dulled by the polished armor of an experienced adversary; the words "Mr. Lincoln" personify a tired man, heartsick with the burdens and miseries of people at war with their own brothers, yet determined "that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom" and "that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this earth."

Abraham Lincoln personifies for America one of the noblest examples of its resilient spirit—the boy who rose from a log cabin to the highest honor our Nation can bestow. Yet, if his example were rare, if such achievement deserved attention simply because it seemed to defy the laws of nature, like those of performers in a circus sideshow, or the miracles performed by the canonized saints of a church, then Lincoln's apotheosis would serve the very opposite purpose from which the annual retelling of his life story conveys to every American man, woman, and child; that nothing in this land lies beyond the realm of possibility to even the humblest of its citizens.

For the American saga is rich in stories like Lincoln's, stories of boys from modest or underprivileged homes who rose above the handicaps of their environment or their physical defects to attain to distinguished achievement in the life of their country and mankind.

This week end, for example, marks the one hundred and third anniversary of the birth of another young boy who came up out of the great Midwest, with negligible formal schooling and unknown antecedents, yet whose life story has been woven into the fabric of the great American legend, and whose name symbolizes light and understanding to the hearts of men: Thomas Alva Edison. At the early age of 12 he secured a job as newsboy on the Grand Trunk Railway, and being lifted by the ears from the platform into the baggage car he sustained injuries that led to permanent deafness. From such scorched soil there sprouted a fertile personality whose manifold contributions to civilization are represented by a harvest of almost 1,200 patents that have brought a comfort, efficiency, and culture unknown to monarchs, into the home of the average citizen. Contemporary life is inconceivable without the telegraph, the telephone, the radio, moving pictures, phonograph recordings or the incandescent electric bulb, yet all these were either created or basically improved by the unabating curiosity and ceaseless energy of this one man.

And the wonderful thing about the achievements of Thomas Edison, the quality in them that is of the profoundest value to us ordinary mortals, is contained in the fact that he was not a genius in the sense of a Mozart, from whose gifted brain there seemed to flow creative invention with almost effortless abundance. Edison's genius was of the type referred to repeatedly by many writers,

notably Carlyle, as "an infinite capacity for taking pains," or the words of Jan Walaeus: "Genius is an intuitive talent for labor." Edison himself consistently pointed out that "the experiments of a laboratory consist mostly of finding that something won't work," and he spent years of constant and unrelenting experimentation to track down the secrets of the universe that nature seems to guard so zealously against human discovery.

Herein, it would seem to me, lies the profound message of his life for our day: As a result of the inventions of Edison and others, men, today, are freer from the bondage of their hands than they have ever been in the history of civilization. That is to say, "motors substitute for muscles in a thousand new ways," and man's mind is free to direct the work of a multitude of hands that infinitely multiply his own limited physical capacities. Yet so many of us utilize this newly won power simply to foster increased indolence and decreasing pride in our creative possibilities. If we need not use our wits to gain our daily food as did our pioneer grandfathers, we simply cease to sharpen them; if prepared foods and machine-made clothing are easily acquired at a shop around the corner, we cease to learn domestic arts; if the movies and the radio and television provide smoother entertainment than one can improvise in his own neighborhood, we see no need to develop amateur dramatic societies, barber shop quartets, or nonprofessional orchestras; if digest magazines are designed to bring you all the news and literature in quick capsule form, we stop reading the originals.

In so doing, we are defeating the very purpose for which these conveniences were developed: We are freeing man from the chains of jungle drudgery only to imprison him in a zoological cage, wherein all his physical needs are meticulously cared for, but his creative, imaginative instincts become entirely atrophied. While releasing the body from servitude, we are imprisoning the mind in a lassitude born of its idleness. For the purpose of freeing man from routine responsibilities, the purpose of making higher caliber culture available through phonograph and film and radio to the average man is to stimulate him to more noble achievements, to raise his standards of appreciation, that his own creativity may attain to a loftier level than did that of his fathers. As Mr. Edison said:

"The wheels of progress have worked results which might be called miracles. But their greatest service has been to raise the thinking capacity of society. If there is one evil in the world today for which there is no excuse it is the evil of stupidity."

Yet, wherever we turn today, to whatever artisans or manufacturers we speak, we hear the same complaint: Young people seem to feel that by simply pressing a button they may have the world at their service; there is no need for the expenditure of effort; there is no pride in artistic craftsmanship; the attainment of any skill which requires perseverance is not considered worth the exertion. They hear stories of fantastic success and wait idly for their ship to come in, unaware that success is merely a crown that must rest upon a brain and a body if it is to possess regal significance.

It is for this reason, it seems to me, that the life and outlook of Thomas Edison is so significant in our present impasse. For he, the practical, self-educated man of affairs, did not—as he might have done—cease active participation and retire after developing any one of his numerous patents, living off its profits, in comfort, for the rest of his years. To the day when his final illness overtook him, Edison was at work in his laboratory, seeking to tear the veil of mystery from the processes of nature. The profits from one invention were invested in experimentation to develop others, though they often proved costly, time consuming, and were eventually doomed to failure.

Why, then, did he behave in this unusual fashion? What motivated this singular man, any one of whose multifarious achievements would have satisfied a lesser spirit, to strive unceasingly to advance man's knowledge, to no apparent personal gain?

From a study of his diary and comments on life, one discovers two corollary answers to this question. First of all, to Thomas Edison was given, perhaps because of the hardships of his youth, the deep insight to perceive that the apparent curse of mankind "with the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread" is in reality our profoundest blessing. "The pleasure of idleness is one of the great superstitions of the world," Edison said. "The coming of limitless cheap power, as it will one day come, will not change that inherent vital principle so deep in humanity, which is the mainspring of evolution. However limitless such power, however easy of application, no human being can live long without work."

And elsewhere he wrote: "I have been asked what a man over 70 can do to keep occupied. The trouble is that a man who can't keep busy didn't take interest in a great number of things when he was mentally active in his younger years. If he had done so, he would find plenty to occupy his time. * * *"

The ancient Hebrew sages recognized this truth when they said: "The Biblical injunction 'And thou shalt choose life' means thou shalt choose a trade," or elsewhere: "He who does not teach his son a trade, is as if he had taught him robbery." These wise scholars, who spent their days acquiring the wisdom of the past, recognized the deep significance of creative activity as a stimulus to continuous development; there were blacksmiths, carpenters, astronomers, among them. For in life there is no standing still; one either uses his muscles or his talents, or they atrophy. Stay abed for any length of time, and walking becomes an effort; suspend his practice for a single day, and the virtuoso is unprepared to perform. And the greatest of satisfactions given to man—fashioned in the image of God his Creator—is to look upon the completed creation of his own painstaking handiwork and exclaim with God: "Behold it is very good."

But I believe that Edison, in common with all men of vision, had yet a more profound reason for his refusal to cease working until "the doctor brings in the oxygen cylinder." All men reared in progressive civilizations, receive when they are born, a rich legacy that has been handed on to them by the generations that have passed. The poorest infant born today as a public ward of a hospital is richer by far than the greatest Pharaoh of Egypt or the wealthiest Czar of Russia. So each of us, if he possesses any sense of equity, of human graciousness, of noblesse oblige, is determined to pass on a heritage to posterity that is as fully enriched and developed as we are capable of making it. As John Ruskin has said:

"When we build * * * let it not be for present delight, nor for present use alone. Let it be such work as our descendants will thank us for, and let us think, as we lay stone on stone, that a time is coming when those stones will be held sacred, because our hands have touched them, and that men will say, as they look upon the labor and wrought substance of them: 'See! This our fathers did for us.'"

Edison ingenuously expressed himself thus:

"As human beings are now constituted, it is impossible for them to be very happy. The only ones who are continuously happy are the ones who, having little ambition, do small things of little importance. * * * If I had not had so much ambition, and had not tried to do so many things, I probably would have been happier, but less useful."

And so this "unassuming tinkerer" became, in the words of Marconi, "One of the world's greatest benefactors," bringing the glow of light, the shimmer of music and the scintillation of the screen into the life of every man.

Today, 103 years after his birth, it is this message which his spirit still communicates to us from beyond the Great Divide; that in our generation there may be found young men, as there have been in every generation, who stand ready to accept the call to serve mankind in the spirit of young Isaiah, of whom we read in today's Scriptural portion: "And I heard the voice of the Lord, saying:

'Whom shall I send
And who will go for us?'
Then I said: 'Here am I; send me.'"

Industrial Expansion in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, last week throughout Alabama emphasis was placed on the industrial growth of our State by a wide observance of Industry Days.

An article in the Birmingham News by staff writer Irving Bieman graphically describes the industrial expansion in Alabama:

ALABAMA IS TAKING GIANT STEPS UP INDUSTRY LINE, MAKES VOICE HEARD AFAR

(By Irving Beiman)

Back in the thirties the South was termed "the Nation's No. 1 economic problem."

The South, and particularly Alabama, has outlived that description.

The cold facts show Alabama has taken giant strides up the economic ladder.

Industrially speaking Alabama now has a voice in the national picture that is listened to. In many fields, the State has advanced more rapidly than the rest of the South, or the Nation as a whole.

For example, Alabama-made products were valued at $2,049,600,000 in 1949. That was three and one-half times the $547,700,000 value of manufactured products in the State in 1939. The 1949 record was achieved despite coal and steel strikes which cost the State an estimated $100,000,000 in production values.

That is one of the things Alabamians are being told during the 3-day Alabama Industry Days program, which ends tomorrow.

In 158 communities over the State the story is being told.

Industry simply means changing what you have into something to be used or consumed. The farther it is taken along this line, the more valuable it becomes, because of the number of man-hours of work spent.

Thus the term "industry" can apply to work done in farming, mining, on raw materials, construction, manufacturing, processing, in utilities, finance, trade, service, and distributive groups.

Alabama has a lot to brag about.

Forty percent of the foundry iron used in the entire Nation comes from the Birmingham district.

The State's population has risen only 3 percent in the last 10 years, but income from the iron and steel industry has gained 240 percent. Alabama now stands at the top of all Southern States in the manufacture of ornamental and structural steel.

The State's 98 metal-making plants employ more than 44,000 workers.

In addition, fabricated-metal manufacturing has increased 256 percent since 1940.

Few people know Alabama ranks third among the 48 States in the production of lumber.

Alabama is the leading tree farm State in the Nation. The State now has 325 tree farmers, more than any other State in the Nation.

These tree farmers took in almost $30,000,000 last year for their raw timber. Some 3,000 Alabama sawmills cut and dressed that timber for a total price of more than $100,000,000.

Not only does the growing and cutting of trees make for a flourishing lumber industry, but also for a rapidly growing new industry in Alabama—the making of furniture.

In 1949 the South produced 70 percent of the hardwoods of the Nation, and Alabama ranked high in the cutting and finishing of these woods.

Alabama had 94 plants making furniture last year. They had sales of $11,500,000, a gain of 203 percent over the 1939 total.

Alabama is developing a stone, clay, and glass manufacturing industry of large proportions.

These products range from cement and plasters to pottery and glass mirrors. With 185 plants engaged in this industry, Alabama last year produced stone, clay, and glass products valued at $55,000,000, a gain of 217 percent over the 1939 figures.

Alabama helps feed the world.

The average resident rarely thinks of the food industry in Alabama as being of national importance.

But in 1949 the food industry in Alabama was a $250,000,000 industry, and it is still growing. This was an increase of 342 percent in 10 years.

Stand-outs were meat products valued at $50,000,000; grain products valued at $55,000,000; bakery goods totaling $30,000,000; bottled beverages worth $31,000,000, and canned foods worth $35,000,000.

Then, of course, Alabama residents raised and ate many more millions of dollars worth of food.

With the industrial world watching operation of the $32,000,000 Coosa River Newsprint Co. mill at Childersburg, Alabama has climbed higher on the ladder in the field of paper making and the processing of raw paper into finished products.

Among the largest suppliers of papers in the Nation are the Coosa River plant, the Gulf States Paper Corp., at Tuscaloosa, and the International Paper Corp. plant at Mobile.

There were 15 paper-making plants in 1949, with sales of $105,100,000, a gain of 236 percent over 1939.

The importance of this growing industry is evidenced by the civic developments running into millions of dollars which have been made at Sylacauga, Talladega and Childersburg as result of establishment of the Coosa River plant.

New streets and roads have been built, water and sewerage systems extended, new schools and hospitals built, housing developments by the dozen are springing up, churches, libraries, playgrounds and parks are appearing in numbers.

There is more.

For instance, there were 69 machinery-manufacturing plants, with sales of $36,100,000 in 1949, a gain of 668 percent over 1939.

Industrialists say Alabama has been pitifully lacking in this type of industry, and even yet has barely scratched the surface of possibilities along this line. But a nest egg has been laid.

There were 10 electric machinery-making plants here in 1949, with sales of $3,500,000, a gain of 117 percent over 1939.

There were 31 plants in the transportation equipment manufacturing business in 1949, with sales of $53,300,000, a gain of 394 percent over 1939.

Alabama had 12 instrument-making plants in 1949, with sales of $700,000, a gain of 250 percent over 1939.

There were 56 plants engaged in miscellaneous manufactures in 1949, with sales of $3,700,000, a gain of 185 percent.

In non-durable-goods manufacturing, Alabama had 1,169 plants in 1949, with sales of $1,103,100,000, a gain of 225 percent over 1939.

Alabama had four tobacco-manufacturing plants in 1949, with sales of $2,800,000. The 1939 output of manufactured tobacco was negligible.

In 1949 Alabama had 146 plants in the textile business, with sales of $432,600,000, a gain of 249 percent over 1939.

The State had 104 plants manufacturing apparel in 1949, with sales of $50,300,000, a gain of 388 percent over 1939.

The State had 233 plants in the printing and publishing business, with sales of $31,700,000, a gain of 205 percent over 1939.

There were 134 chemical-manufacturing plants in 1949, with sales of $116,700,000, a gain of 166 percent over 1939.

There were 23 petroleum-coal products plants in 1949, with sales of $68,500,000, a gain of 158 percent over 1939.

Alabama now has six rubber-manufacturing plants, which had sales of $59,500,000 in 1949, a gain of 576 percent over 1939. Production is still small but the State has made good progress in rubber and rubber-product manufacturing.

Alabama has six leather-manufacturing plants. They had sales of $4,500,000 in 1949, a gain of 55 percent over 1939.

This is Alabama industry.

The industry days celebration will show the State's citizens what Alabama has done for its residents. It will show the rest of the Nation what Alabama has to offer manufacturers and people elsewhere who may be interested in living in—and making money as others have done—in Alabama.

Title to the Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include House Concurrent Resolution 22, adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana and sent to me by the clerk of the house. It is of general interest and is as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 22

Concurrent resolution memoralizing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation restoring to the State of Louisiana and other coastal States title to the tidelands

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has handed down a decision decreeing that the title to the Louisiana tidelands is vested in the Federal Government; and

Whereas this decision has the effect of depriving the State of Louisiana of millions of dollars in mineral and fishing rights in its coastal waters; and

Whereas the tidelands have been regarded historically as belonging to the respective coastal States: now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of Louisiana (the house of representatives and the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact appropriate legislation restoring to the State of Louisiana and other coastal States title to the tidelands; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each Congressman and Senator from the State of Louisiana.

Statement of Purpose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 24 in Washington, D. C., the representatives of 60 national organizations attended a dinner meeting at Pierce Hall to hear Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt speak on the need for continued and increased United States support for the United Nations. Spokesmen for the major interest groups represented at the dinner reaffirmed support for the United Nations as the world's best hope for peace.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to present the statement of purpose for the dinner and a list of the organizations attending the dinner:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

In 1945 the entire world was deeply moved when the fledgling United Nations was launched. Hope for world peace, for the elimination of war in the future stirred the hearts of all mankind. Once again the finer motivation of humanity had become apparent and was helping to lift the problems of our day on to a plane where they could be solved through international machinery created to study and solve them. The horrors of war and destruction were fading into the background. High hope and expectation were the order of the day.

In 1945 the United Nations was declared to be the cornerstone of the foreign policy of all nations. Organizations and the individuals making up those organizations believed in and expressed their faith by committing themselves to help nurture the United Nations so that it might grow and take its rightful place as the arbiter between nations and between peoples.

In 5 years the United Nations has prospered and has used as its tool the weapon of world public opinion, bringing it to bear successfully many times and thus averting more difficult problems. It has been asked to find answers to Gargantuan problems whose origins and complexity have developed over centuries and for which there are no easy answers. Undoubtedly far too much has been asked by the people of the world of this new organization, for they are impatient and afraid, fearing that some irretrievable mistake will be made by careless men which will lead the world down the road to a war from which it may be impossible to return.

Partly because of this impatience and fear, but also because in these first 5 years, the forces of cynicism, skepticism, and ignorance have been kept dormant due to the initial enthusiasm for the United Nations, there have been appearing just now, a growing number of attacks upon the very foundation of the United Nations. The United Nations is now faced with its greatest test, that

of finding some method by which world tensions may be decreased. In a time like this it is to be expected that the opposition forces will become more vocal. This opposition fails to realize that in spite of anything that can be done there is only one physical world and being so there must be machinery to study and solve the problems of one world.

In spite of these cynics and skeptics, in spite of the outspokenness of the slowly dying isolationism, millions of people in all countries still believe in the universal idea as portrayed by the United Nations.

Because of this faith, more than 30 national organizations are sponsoring a dinner for Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt on May 24 at Pierce Hall, Sixteenth and Harvard Streets NW., Washington, D. C. These organizations feel that it is the time for all who believe in the United Nations to speak out and confess their faith so that the dying forces of isolationism may be counteracted forcefully in their expression of distrust of the United Nations. No one in this country is in a better position to be the voice of the believers in the international idea than is Mrs. Roosevelt.

These 30 sponsoring organizations and more than twice that number who have been invited to participate in the dinner represent millions of Americans. The breath and width of religious faith speaks out in these groups through Judaism, Catholicism, and Protestantism as do nearly all other major public opinion-forming groups, the veterans, farmers, educators, women, and a real cross section of the voice of labor.

Representatives of these organizations maintain their faith in the United Nations and firmly believe that the vast majority of their constituent members believe as they do. It is not their belief that because the United Nations is now faced with its most difficult task, that the time has come to cast the organization aside or split it into many parts. They believe the American people truly and sincerely want the United Nations to succeed and will help it to do so if the leadership is provided.

These organizations look upon the United Nations as a medium through which our Nation can assist less fortunate people to have better things whether it takes the form of higher living standards, better health, more opportunities for individual growth or greater democracy through greater respect for the individual person. The specialized agencies of the United Nations are cases in point. The World Health Organization is helping to solve some of the problems of health and disease. The FAO is working on the problem of hunger and starvation. The other specialized agencies are no less significant as far as the part they play in the search for new and dynamic answers to the problems which have plagued the world and been the cause of war.

Like the millions they represent, these organizations want to see our Nation and its Congress exercise responsibility to the United Nations, providing the dynamic leadership where possible and providing with real liberality, its fair share of the necessary funds, without which the United Nations cannot function.

It is with faith in the United Nations that these organizations look to the future. They expect to exercise what influence they can to help it grow rather than to destroy it. For the purpose of reaffirming their faith in the United Nations and that alone, they have joined together to speak as one voice as sponsors of this dinner.

List of organizations attending dinner for Mrs. Roosevelt, May 24, 1950, follows:

Amalgamated Clothing Workers, American Association for the UN, American Association of Social Workers, American Association of University Professors, American Association of University Women, American Civil Liberties Union, American Council of Learned Societies, American Council on Education, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Federation of Labor, American Friends Service Committee, American Home Economics Association, American Jewish Committee, American Library Association, American Unitarian Association, American Veterans Committee, Americans for Democratic Action, AMVETS, Association for Childhood Education.

B'nai B'rith, Brethren Service Commission.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Catholic Association for International Peace, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Church Peace Union, Congregational—Christian Church, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Council of State Governments.

Department of State.

Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, Federation of American Scientists, Friends Committee on National Legislation.

General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Japanese American Citizens League, Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

League of Women Voters, Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod.

Methodist Church, Women's Division.

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, National Association of Women Lawyers, National Conference of Christians and Jews, National Council of Catholic Women, National Council of Jewish Women, National Council of Negro Women, Inc., National Council of Protestant Episcopal Churches, National Education Association, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, National Fraternal Council of Negro Churches in the United States, National Jewish Welfare Board, National Science Teachers Association, National Women's Trade Union League, Northern Baptist Convention.

Presbyterian Church, United States of America.

Textile Workers Union of America.

United Council of Church Women, UN Day Committee, United States National Student Association, United World Federalists.

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

Young Women's Christian Association of the United States.

Katy's Head Wants Less Rail Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun:

KATY'S HEAD WANTS LESS RAIL REGULATION

OKLAHOMA CITY, May 26.—Relaxation of statutory regulations governing railroads and restoration of competition as a recognized regulator of rates were called for today by Donald V. Fraser, president of the Missouri-Kansas-Texas lines.

Addressing the Southwest Shippers' Advisory Board Mr. Fraser said regulation should be confined to examining, and, if necessary, correcting charges of discrimination.

He said that the major railroad problem of subsidized competition is beyond the powers of railroad management, and must be solved by the American people themselves, particularly the users of transportation.

"If the problem is not solved," he added, "the continuation of this unsound economic governmental policy can lead to government ownership and eventual socialization of the entire transportation industry."

Judge Jeptha F. Barbour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the State of Mississippi was shocked and saddened last week when it learned of the passing of one of its most distinguished and best-loved sons, Judge Jeptha F. Barbour, of Yazoo City. Judge Barbour lived a useful and productive life, and served his people well, both in public life and as a private citizen. He was honored many times and in many ways by his people, and our State will long remember his achievements.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include editorial tributes to the memory of Judge Barbour appearing in the Yazoo City (Miss.) Herald, and in the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion Ledger, respectively:

[From the Yazoo City (Miss.) Herald]

JUDGE BARBOUR WAS OUTSTANDING CITIZEN WHO WILL BE MISSED

Many friends in Yazoo City and County and throughout Mississippi were saddened Saturday when it was learned that Judge Jeptha Fowlkes Barbour had died suddenly at his home here.

Mr. Barbour was an outstanding citizen, one who gave generously of his time and his talents to worthwhile causes both for his county and State, and was always a large contributor to worthy causes, particularly those of local application. He did not like the spotlight, nor did he seek publicity for what he did in the name of charity, but many paths have been made more smooth and many burdens lightened by his generosity.

Judge Barbour was strongly partisan in whatever he undertook, and threw himself wholeheartedly into everything he sponsored. He was a strong believer in the principle that every citizen should interest himself in candidates for public office and seek out the best men for the places to which they are to be elected. In his active years he was a power in politics locally and throughout the State, espousing the causes of his favorites and contributing both time and money in their behalf.

Judge Barbour was a brilliant lawyer, and his ability was respected throughout the State. He served out an unexpired term as circuit judge, a position to which he was appointed by the late Gov. Paul B. Johnson upon the elevation of Judge Julian Alexander to the supreme bench in this district. However Mr. Barbour did not care for elective office himself and refused to place his name before the voters for election to the full term. He preferred active practice to judicial robes.

For more than 35 years he has served as attorney for the Illinois Central Railroad, being retained in that position after his retirement from active practice due to his knowledge of railroad problems in Mississippi and his skill in fighting its battles in the courts.

We feel that we have lost a friend whom we have known since childhood and one who never betrayed our confidence and trust.

[From the Jackson Clarion Ledger of June 13, 1950]

JUDGE JEPTHA F. BARBOUR, SR., EMINENT JURIST AND CITIZEN

Judge Jeptha F. Barbour, Sr., of Yazoo City, was one of the most brilliant of the criminal lawyers practicing in Mississippi in modern times.

The knowledge and experience he gained as such helped make him one of the most efficient of the judges who have sat upon the circuit court bench of this district, avoiding errors that would have favored or handicapped either the prosecution or the defense in criminal cases.

His great store of knowledge and experience, however, was reinforced by a judicial temperament which not only moved him to try to be fair and just but also gave him the patience so necessary to a judge to achieve that end.

Judge Barbour truly was one of the most outstanding, most respected, among his generation of members of the Mississippi Bar. His eminence was recognized over the State and beyond its borders.

He took an active interest in politics for many years and wielded influence in both district and State-wide campaigns.

This distinguished judge and attorney, however, also was active and influential in civic affairs. He was a loyal and active member of the Presbyterian Church, serving for many years as a member of the board of deacons.

His private life was serene and unblemished, he being a devoted husband and father. His last year of life, spent in a wheelchair, was saddened by the death of his son, Jeptha F. Barbour, Jr., last March, after the son had revealed the abilities and the ambition to follow in the father's footsteps.

With many others who admired and respected his professional attainments and personal character, while cherishing his friendship, we feel his death to be a loss to the State, and sympathize with those whose heavy personal loss it is, the members of his family.

Matter of Fact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my extension of remarks a frank, courageous and challenging article, entitled "Matter of Fact," written by Joseph Alsop and appearing in the Washington Post of June 19, 1950.

The views of Mr. Alsop should not be ignored. They are worthy of deep attention and consideration.

In his frank and courageous presentation of the world situation, as he sees it, and as I interpret his views, as expressed in his article, he is making a strong, in fact, an urgent appeal for future peace through the United States and other still remaining free nations doing now in their national defense the things they ought to do.

His article is a courageous challenge to us to do the things we should do now (and other free countries as well) to preserve our freedom and other countries their freedom, as well as to assure future peace for the world.

Mr. Alsop also has the courage to state what will happen if we and other free countries fail to act now.

I have repeatedly said that the only respect the Communists have is for that which they fear, and the only thing they fear is power greater than their own.

The best assurance of safety, and of future peace, is for the United States and the remaining free countries of the world to develop now greater power on land, on sea, underneath the sea, in the air, in the field of science, in every respect than the Soviet Union and its satellite nations. An above all, this includes our moral strength in affirmative expression and action; all creeds recognizing the necessity of concerted action against the common challenge.

This article of Joseph Alsop is timely. It calls upon us to "stop, look, and listen," and then to proceed and act with courage to preserve our heritage.

Whether one agrees with his article or not (and I do with the substance of his article), Mr. Alsop is to be congratulated for having the courage to express his views constituting a grim warning and a challenge to the remaining free peoples of the world.

His article is a clarion call for action now, and for victory and success without war; it is a grim warning if action is not taken now, war and grave danger in the near future confronts the entire world.

MATTER OF FACT

EUROPE 1950: SURRENDER?

(By Joseph Alsop)

We have perhaps 3 or 4 years to enjoy ourselves, if we go on with business-as-usual, politics-as-usual, and self-delusion-as-usual. The joyride, one hopes, will be very agreeable. But at the end will come a big bang, or more likely a small, self-pitying whimper. And our world, the free world of the West, will then come to an end.

Such is the best summary this correspondent can offer, of all the mingled experiences of a long expedition of inquiry abroad. It is offered despite a belief that, unlike Hitler, the masters of the Kremlin do not want a general war, because of the inner weaknesses of the Soviet system. The danger now, in fact, is much less a general war than an enormous surrender, which will give the Kremlin all the fruits of victory without a shot being fired.

Only a very simple act of imagination is necessary, in order to understand this danger which hangs over us. First, you must imagine a Soviet Union with its war preparations completed, having a substantial stock of atomic weapons, an impressive strategic air force, a vast army, and every other auxiliary of military power. Second, you must imagine that this great Soviet military power is confronted by a half-armed America, and above all by a western Europe without serious defenses in the air or on the ground.

This will be the world rather soon, unless the western nations take drastic measures to rebuild their defenses. Moreover, this intensified defense effort must begin at once if it is to show real results by the time of danger, 1953–54. No one should be misled on these points by the barrage of soothing lies, about new weapons to be produced 5 years from now and so forth, that is emanating from the politics-as-usual experts in Washington.

The consequences of this new world situation—of unchallengeable Soviet strength confronting irredeemable Western weakness—are also mathematically predictable. After all, it is only a little more than a decade since Hitler took the Rhineland and Austria, the Sudetenland, Czechoslovakia, and Danzig, without firing a shot. Hitler did all this simply by inspiring the terror that saps the will to resist. In the new world situation that is now arising, western Europe in the fifties will be Czechoslovakia in the thirties.

Even now, the Kremlin strategists are already preparing for the time when, as they hope, they will be able to terrify Europe into submission. They are transforming the western Europe Communist Parties into simple paramilitary groupings, with the sole function of creating disorder and division at the most useful moment. They are using all means, like the Partisans of Peace with their terror propaganda about atomic warfare, in order to foster in Europe a mood of appeasement and submission. They will certainly create this mood, if the United States now abdicates as leader of the West in order to go on a national joyride.

Our allies will then grow bitter against us. And we shall grow bitter against ourselves, as the real meaning of our act becomes apparent. The whole Atlantic alliance will be rent with recrimination and rendered impotent to act, even before the final crisis.

Even now, one can envision the form this final crisis may take. Assume that western Europe remains defenseless, and that the existing deterrents, such as our strategic Air Force, are rendered ineffective by Soviet rearmament. If the present line is held in the Far East, the first move will then probably be a new Soviet blockade in Berlin. There will be no airlift to answer this blockade, because the Soviets now have the power to disrupt the airlift by radar-jamming. There will be nothing to do, except abandon the Berlin position, or send an armed convoy into the city, or threaten the Soviet Union with atomic bombardment.

Anyone who recalls the first Berlin blockade, and the horrified response to Gen. Lucius Clay's project for an armed convoy, can predict the future choice. The nations of western Europe, in the very shadow of the new Soviet power, wholly open to Russian atomic attack, half-paralyzed by their sense of weakness and wholly alienated from this country, will violently protest against any war-like measures. Disunion will beget inaction, even in Washington.

And so the crucial frontier post will go—first Berlin; then Vienna (just to drive the point home); and then Yugoslavia (which the Kremlin can overrun without fear of general war, when the west is both feeble and disunited). These mounting demonstrations of Soviet strength and western weakness will in turn beget new waves of defeatism and despair in the West. Somewhere, then, the front will break.

One cannot now foresee which of the western allies will be the first to sign a nonaggression pact with Moscow; to introduce democratic elements into its government, and to adopt a policy of neutrality, which will mean total disarmament. One can be certain, however, that this will happen. One can be certain also that if the front breaks anywhere, it will break almost everywhere. Eventually, then, while the voices of the appeasers sound louder and louder in Britain and the United States, western Europe will be gobbled up.

This is not nightmare. This is what can happen, and what will happen if this country does not quickly take the lead in a great effort to rebuild the defenses of the West. No one will be to blame but ourselves, for no one else is capable of thus taking the lead. And when we have let all this happen, we shall have to pay the price for it.

Every strategic and political and economic advantage we now have will be lost with the loss of western Europe. A Soviet empire infinitely richer in resources, infinitely greater in industrial potential, will tower over us. We shall only be able to preserve our independence by transforming our society into a permanent armed camp. Or, if we do not like this unpleasant choice, perhaps some of the American leaders who are sabotaging the western defense effort may be induced to come forward as the Pierre Lavals of this future they are so actively preparing.

Current Federal Deficit and Unbalanced Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely address delivered by our colleague, Representative CHESTER C. GORSKI, of Buffalo, N. Y., at the Democratic Political Institute held at Colgate University on Saturday, June 17, and in which he and I were both privileged to participate:

A "balanced budget" we all agree is a good budget. It is one in which receipts show a surplus over expenditures. There has been a general acceptance by the public of the above fact. Everyone has been demanding economy in the Federal Government. Economy is what your Representatives want and a sincere effort is being made to bring about such a program.

Today expenditures are estimated, for the fiscal year, to exceed $42,000,000,000. The National Association of Manufacturers recommends a budget not to exceed $33,000,000,000. This they claim would amply provide for defense expenditures, veterans care, foreign commitments, and would not impair essential Government services. With existing world conditions as of today it is extremely difficult to evaluate essential expenditures.

The Federal budget is the best document an American can read to give himself an insight into how his Government is functioning and the aims it has in view, yet, very few people have ever bothered to examine it. On the other hand, these same people are extremely willing to voice their opinions about the need for a balanced budget and about the tremendous size of Government expenditures. Hardly anyone has explored the question of whether our relatively young, still expanding, economy can support a balanced budget. Or what the alternatives might be to the existing budget. We are first impressed by the enormity of the Federal budget. We see that expenditures are estimated to exceed $42,000,000,000, and that receipts will reach only $37,000,000,000—leaving us with a deficit of $5,000,000,000. But since the rest of the document lacks political "sex appeal" we inevitably stop at this point.

I propose that we take a little time to explore the situation and to discover why Government spending is 10 times what it was in 1939.

In 1951, nearly one-third of all budget expenditures will be required to meet the costs of the defense program. There are still many who feel that the sum is not enough. Early in 1948, the Nation began to take steps to adjust its defense strength upward to meet the changed international conditions. For this reason the cost of the national-defense program increased. One of the major problems confronting officials who assemble the budget is the outlay necessary in preparing for a war we hope will not come. We must not only have in readiness a well-trained, well-equipped potential fighting force, but we must have in readiness a stockpile of critical raw materials.

Another $4,700,000,000 is needed to meet the present commitments in the international field. The European recovery program and our expenditures for Government and relief in occupied areas of Japan and Germany will account for most of this total. It is felt that such an amount is not too large a price to pay for supporting an American foreign policy which will create political conditions necessary for world peace, and our own national security. In addition to aiding the free nations of Europe in their programs for economic recovery, the United States is providing military assistance to nations which have joined us in the Atlantic pact for mutual defense, and to certain other nations.

It is estimated that $6,100,000,000 will be spent for veterans' programs in fiscal year 1951. Medical care, pensions, and readjustment benefits under the GI bill will be provided for 19,000,000 veterans.

Five billion six hundred million dollars are earmarked for interest on the national debt. This includes only the payment of interest, not retirement of the debt itself.

These four programs—all of them related to past wars, or our efforts to prevent future wars—amount to $30,000,000,000.

The remaining $12,500,000,000 are devoted to the other expenses of the Government, including the development and conservation of natural resources, the promotion of health, welfare and security, housing and community development, education and general research, agriculture and agricultural resources, transportation and communication, finance, commerce and industry (which includes business loans, rent control, export control, and the regulation of business), labor which includes unemployment compensation and placement activities, and the cost of running the Government. Contrary to popular belief, only a small part of the expenditures are spent on Federal personnel. Scarcely more than 10 percent of the budget is allocated to Federal civilian payrolls.

May I at this time bring to your attention legislation that was voted by the House of Representatives which would, as its proponents state, provide for a sweeping cut of 10 percent below the President's budget estimates in salary payments to civilian employees of Government agencies and departments and a 2-percent reduction for the Department of Defense.

There's a right way and a wrong way to economize, and the House chose the wrong way when it voted for the Taber-Thomas and Jensen amendments which is what I have reference to.

Some of the cuts had already been incorporated in the omnibus appropriations bill, but the sponsor of the amendment confessed he didn't have time to go through the bill item by item. He believes his proposal would take care of the Government's needs. The demoralizing effect of such unorthodox and irresponsible methods of budget paring as the House was stampeded into approving is obvious.

I have applauded and voted for certain selective reductions in expenditures from the floor, such as outlays for rivers, harbors, and flood control. Members of the House are in a position to pass judgment on appropriations of this sort, as well as on minor items in the omnibus appropriations bill. But it is utterly indefensible to vote over-all cuts from the floor which apply indiscriminately to most of the executive establishments in disregard of the effect, and, in fact, without the possibility of determining the effect of such cuts on individual departments and agencies. Some of them might be able to stand a cut without substantial impairment of efficiency; others might be seriously crippled.

As I have previously stated I would like to see the budget balanced. I do not believe that our Government should operate on an unbalanced budget or on a deficit. May I state that the Republican Party is responsible for the deficit this year. Had it not been for the Eightieth Congress, we would have a balanced budget now. When the Eightieth Congress came in, the first thing that was done was to make excise taxes permanent.

Under the law that was passed by the Congress in 1943, when wartime excise taxes were imposed principally for the purpose of drawing off or pulling off excess buying power for the purpose of preventing inflation, it was written into that law that these taxes would expire automatically 6 months after the official end of the war as declared by the President of the United States. The President, Mr. Truman, on the last day of 1946, declared the end of the war for that purpose. Therefore, the excise taxes would have expired on June 30, 1947, but during the Eightieth Congress, on January 16, a bill was introduced to make the excise taxes permanent. In other words, to take out that limitation that they should expire on June 30, 1947. The President had asked for one year's time to survey, investigate, and determine the excise taxes that should be taken off entirely, those that should be reduced, and those that should be retained. Why didn't the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress agree to a year's study of these excise taxes? They rushed their bill through the Eightieth Congress. The Congressmen who did not want the excise taxes could not offer any amendment to the bill because it came to the floor under a gag rule—no amendments could be offered. Therefore, the excise taxes were frozen on the people first, then a bill was passed to have tax reduction for the rich of $5,000,000,000 a year, and that bill was passed finally two or three times after being vetoed and finally the veto was overridden. That causes the deficit today. Had it not been for that tax-reduction bill we would have been in the black this year and next year. We have an unbalanced budget and a deficit because of this "class" tax-reduction.

The President, and the executive branch of the Government, on their part, are engaged in concrete efforts to insure that expenditures will be made in the most economical fashion. The President is himself promoting a program for Government-wide management improvement which will result in greater efficiency in operation and greater economy in spending.

Thus the two arms of the Government—the legislative and the executive—are seeing to it that you—the citizen—get what you want—and get it at the lowest possible cost to you.

One Hundred and Seventy-five Years Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit a copy of an editorial from the Southwest Citizen, of Lake Charles, La., in connection with the

one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, as follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIVE YEARS OLD

Today is the one hundred and seventy-fifth birthday of the United States Army Corps of Engineers. For many years the corps has performed an intimate service for this area. Much of our progress and many of the facilities we value most highly are their handiwork.

There was a move some time ago to revamp the corps, transferring some of its functions and much of its authority to another Government department.

We see no need for this. We do not feel that any of the work they've done here could have been done any better, any cheaper, any quicker than the Army engineers did it.

Americans living along our coastlines and navigable streams and those who reside in areas susceptible to flood probably have a greater awareness of the value of the corps than those not closely associated with, and even dependent upon, their work.

If there had been gross inefficiencies or financial scandals directly attributable to the corps, there might be some logic in reorganizing its entire set-up. But the fact is, it has performed admirably and sometimes has been blamed for mistakes that were not primarily its fault. It has often been handicapped by grandiose ideas of various project sponsors and inadequacy of funds.

But we think that, in the 175 years of its existence, the Corps of Engineers has done a remarkably fine job. It is one of the few branches of the military that is directly useful to the average citizen in time of peace as well as in war. Indeed, it might even be said the corps' peacetime functions contributed more of a lasting nature to our national welfare than has their wartime work.

We believe little can be gained by rocking the boat now. As long as the engineers are doing their present commendable job, obeying the wishes of Congress—the agency, which is, after all, answerable to the people on individual projects—they should be subject to as few administrative changes as possible.

We feel sure all southwest Louisiana will join today in wishing them the very best on their one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, I would also include an article which appeared in the New Orleans Times-Picayune of June 16, written by Tinette Lichenstein, also in connection with the one hundred and seventy-fifth birthday of the Corps of Engineers, as follows:

ARMY ENGINEER CORPS

EDITOR, THE TIMES-PICAYUNE:

This Nation should be applauded for its public recognition of the valuable Engineer Corps, United States Army, even if it has taken the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary to designate Engineer Day and Week. This group is one of the greatest protective civic benefits to this country.

It has been said this is the oldest organized military unit in the United States. The first Chief of the United States Engineers was Richard Grigley, appointed by Gen. George Washington, himself a surveyor, on June 16, 1775.

For a time these men were interested during peacetime principally in river and harbor work and conditions. Later in exploration, roads, bridges, mapping, surveying, construction of canals, conservation and development of streams for navigation, flood control, development of hydroelectric power and allied uses of water, beach erosion control, and administration of laws to preserve and protect the navigable waters of the United States.

The New Orleans district, established in 1867, has been fortunate in having for its assigned district engineers many men distinguished for their ability, service, and achievements.

I recall since 1927, as splendid district engineers: Maj. W. H. Holcomb, Col. Wm. F. Thompkins, John N. Hodges, Col. Clark Kittrell, Col. George H. Hudson, during World War II, Col. Leonard E. Gallagher, Col. DeWitt C. Jones, Col. John R. Hardin.

At present we have Col. Charles G. Holle as district engineer, known nationally and internationally, who has been awarded the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster for services on the Panama Canal Zone during World War II; the second award for services as executive officer to Gen. Raymond H. Wheeler, the United States Chief of Engineers in Washington.

TINETTE LICHTENSTEIN.

NEW ORLEANS.

Housing for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a booklet which I wrote some time ago entitled "Wanted: A Dollar's Worth of Housing for Every Dollar Spent," together with a statement by me regarding the publication of the booklet and letters from a number of the better-known publishing houses to show the difficulty we had in attempting to get this booklet put out at a price anywhere near the 35 cents per copy for which Lustron was willing to sell it.

There being no objection, the statement, the booklet, and the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY

In this article I took the vast conglomeration of housing legislation on the books at that time and tried to explain in the simplest language possible just how the average GI could take advantage of this legislation. This was written over a 2-year period of time and as far as I know it was the only time that anyone had attempted to put all of the housing legislation together and explain it in terms simple enough so that those who are most in need of the benefits of this legislation could fully understand what their rights thereunder are, etc.

After having written this booklet the question arose, of course, as to how to make it available to the vast number of young people who were affected by the housing shortage and almost completely in the dark on the type of Government aid available and how to get that aid.

I first discussed this with some publishers, but found that it would be impossible to put the booklet out at a very low figure. I then took the matter up with a number of the largest prefabricating housing companies. The Lustron Corp., which at that time was putting out what I considered a very excellent prefabricated house, agreed to put this booklet out at a price not to exceed 35 cents a copy, which certainly brought it within the range of anyone desiring this information. Lustron, of course, added to my booklet its own material covering Lustron homes. This, however, was not intermingled in any way with my booklet.

I note recent news stories to the effect that my booklet was a promotion booklet for Lustron Corp. I call attention to the fact that there is nothing in my material which in any way could be considered a promotion for any particular prefabricated house or any other type of housing. It deals strictly with general information which I consider of value to young men trying to buy or build a home.

I made a contract with Lustron to receive 10 cents a copy for the first 100,000 and 5 cents per copy thereafter. I note that the elements of the press which have been rather vigorously opposed to my fight against communism in the Government are now objecting to the fact that I received an income from this booklet. I want to call attention in this connection to two things, namely:

1. As far as I know every Senator has a source of income outside of his senatorial salary. Some Senators have radio stations, others practice law, others deal in natural resources, such as oil, coal, etc., some others have a sizable income from speaking, and others from writing.

2. Apparently none of the Senators consider receiving this outside income improper, nor do I.

This booklet was sold to the company with which I could make what I considered the most favorable contract, both as to royalties and also as to keeping the price down within the range of any prospective home owner.

I also call attention to the fact that at that time there was nothing to indicate that Lustron would be forced into bankruptcy. In fact it had the possibility of ultimately becoming one of the largest and most successful manufacturers of prefabricated housing.

I understand that some of the other manufacturers of prebuilt housing are interested in the contract which Lustron now holds. That contract calls for keeping the book up to date until 1952. I hope that the receiver makes an attempt to dispose of this contract to some prefabricated housing company, or some other individual or company which will make it available to the young people seeking a home.

I am sure that the Senators will agree with me that while passage of what to the nonlegal mind is very complicated housing legislation is an important step, another important step is that everyone who is entitled to the benefits under that legislation should know exactly what he or she is entitled to in language they can understand. That information this book provides.

Incidentally, the booklet is not completely up to date at this time, in that it was written during the years 1947 and 1948 and completed after the passage of the Housing Act of 1948, but before the Housing Act of 1949. I hope to bring it up to date within the next few months—as soon as I get some brief respite from the present campaign to clean the Communists out of the Government.

Incidentally, I note the intimation by some that Lustron purchased this booklet not because they felt it was worth 10 cents a copy, but in order to curry favor with the administration so as to get an extension of their loans, etc. The ridiculousness of anyone attempting to curry favor with this administration by working with MCCARTHY is too apparent to bear comment.

WANTED: A DOLLAR'S WORTH OF HOUSING FOR EVERY DOLLAR SPENT

(By JOE MCCARTHY, United States Senator from Wisconsin, vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Housing)

INTRODUCTION

My contribution to this booklet would not be possible if it were not for the thousands of Americans from every walk of life who, during the last two years, have explained

their particular housing problems to me. Because they took the time to talk with me during my 30,000 mile tour of the country in connection with the hearings held by the Joint Committee on Housing, because they took the time to write to me, to call on me at my office, to invite me to participate in round-table discussions on the housing problem in their communities, they have given me a broad insight into the questions about housing in most people's minds.

Because of this, I believe I know you, the reader, and your housing problems.

First of all, you're married, probably have a family and definitely want and need a reasonably priced place to live. Your income is modest and you have to watch where the dollars go in these days of high prices. You want to know what price house you can afford to buy. You've probably managed to put aside some savings—not much—for a down payment on a house, but you're not sure how much of a down payment will be required under various Government loan plans. Whether you're a veteran or not, but especially if you are a veteran, you know the Government offers you some help in securing a home loan, but you're not exactly sure what it is or how to go about getting it. You have heard the Government is doing something about increasing the production of low-cost housing and you wonder just how successful this program is going to be, just what your chances are for securing a more reasonably priced place to live.

You've probably read many newspaper stories, magazine articles, and perhaps a book or two, and spent many hours talking over this subject with friends and neighbors, and the sum total of most of what you have learned has still left you groping for the actual facts—the dollar and cents facts.

If I am right, then you're the man I'm talking to.

The Joint Congressional Committee on Housing closed its hearings in Detroit one afternoon last year. I walked out of the Federal Building that afternoon thoroughly convinced that everyone in Detroit, like everyone in Pittsburgh and Cleveland—and, as it turned out later, in every city we were to visit—had one big gripe that overshadowed every other daily living problem. Housing. It was scarce and it was expensive, yet it was a basic necessity no one could do without.

I walked out of the building, down the gray stone steps past some spectators and witnesses who had appeared at the hearings that day, and crossed to the curb.

"Taxi."

Suddenly a small woman stepped between me and the waiting cab.

"Just what do you mean anyway?" she demanded.

"Lady," I apologized, "the cab is yours. I didn't see you."

"I don't want your cab," she scolded. "I want to know what you mean wasting taxpayers' money holding all these housing hearings. I know how you can solve the housing problem."

Maybe this is it, I thought.

"How?"

"Pass the right laws," she told me triumphantly.

Then she turned and walked off.

If the problem of high building costs and scarce living quarters could be solved as easily as the lady from Detroit believes, then these problems should be solved to a much greater extent today than they are because of the 1948 Housing Act and other housing laws. While these laws have helped materially, the truth is that a vast number of people do not understand how to apply to their own housing problems the many advantages offered by this legislation. I know that Members of Congress have received nearly as many letters on housing in the last three months as they did in the months preceding the passage of the Housing Act. These letters asking for help on individual housing problems outnumber the mail received on any other subject.

To those of us in Congress who have made the housing question our special study, these letters clearly indicate there is a vast lack of understanding of existing housing legislation and the assistance these laws offer the individual. And they point up the fact that, contrary to the impression of the lady in Detroit, there is more to solving the housing problem than simply passing the right law. The right laws help, of course. But they aren't everything. It is equally important that all those affected by a law understand it so they can take advantage of their rights under it.

Unfortunately, the Housing Act and other housing laws do not explain themselves. They deal with home financing, which is a highly specialized and complicated subject with a vocabulary all its own. The reason that no adequate and simple explanation has yet been given is that those who know these laws best have been so close to the housing problem that they tend to explain the solution to it in the complicated legal terms which they learned in the process of studying the problem. It is not particularly unusual that in solving the many small, individual housing problems Congress had to do it in a big, rather general way. But it is indeed a strange paradox that because of the necessarily complicated and legal way in which we had to solve the problem, we seem to have overlooked explaining this solution in terms of the small individual problems which we sought to overcome.

A short excerpt from the new law will give you an idea of what I mean.

"Title II amendments: (1) Section 203 (b) is amended by striking out in paragraph No. (3) the following: 'of the character described in paragraph (2) (B) of this subsection' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'on property approved for insurance prior to the beginning of construction.' (j) Section 203 (b) is amended as follows: (1) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) (C), inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the word 'or' and adding the following new paragraph: '(D) Not to exceed $6,000 and not to exceed 90 percent of the appraised value, as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance'."

Obviously this law does not explain itself to the young man who has a housing problem. It is written in technical language for the Government agencies that will administer the law. Members of Congress are aware of this and recognize the need of a simple explanation of this law to the man whom it was designed to help. In fact, many of my colleagues have urged me—because of my work with the Joint Committee on Housing and because of my part in drafting this law—to attempt such an explanation.

GENERAL AIMS OF HOUSING ACT

The two principal objectives of the Housing Act are (1) to make credit more easily available to veterans and others who desire to build or purchase lower-cost homes, and to tighten up, to some extent, credit on the more expensive homes so that scarce materials and scarce labor will be concentrated on the construction of lower-cost housing, and (2) to get a national standardization of building codes and standardization of measurements in the building industry so as to reduce building costs. A thorough study of the housing situation and the conditions which created it convinced our committee, and ultimately the Congress, that these two objectives would have to be made realities if we were to alleviate that phase of the housing shortage affecting the greatest number of Americans.

Our country-wide hearings revealed that the present housing emergency was brought about largely by three factors: (1) During the war years scarce materials and labor were used almost exclusively in connection with the war effort. This put us far behind normal home production. (2) Since 1940 there has been an increase in population of 15,000,000. (3) In the last 2 or 3 years a vast number of new families have been created by the marriages of returned veterans. There is also the special problem of returned veterans who were away during the time rent controls and tenant-eviction limitations were imposed. While rent controls have served a good over-all purpose, they worked a hardship on returning veterans, many of whom were frozen out of adequate renting quarters and forced to double up with relatives or live in trailer camps or other unsuitable quarters.

The purpose of our congressional hearings, however, was not to reassure ourselves that a housing problem did exist. We wanted to find out what obstacles were in the way of creating more housing for that group of people most seriously affected by the housing shortage and what could be done through legislation and other means. The higher-income families, obviously, were not seriously affected. The middle-, lower-middle-, and very low-income families, however, were faced with a real and serious problem. They were the families we had to help.

The Housing Act of 1948 provides assistance for the middle- and lower-middle-income families. Unfortunately, no agreement could be reached on what should be done for the very low-income families—those who since the beginning of time have been inadequately fed and clothed as well as inadequately housed because they are not financially able to provide for themselves. Their housing problem, of course, is not a new one. It has always been with us.

The present housing emergency, of course, reaches far beyond this very low-income group. It includes those stable wage earners who neither want nor need Government-owned and taxpayer-supported housing—that is, public housing—but who desperately want and need a dollar's worth of housing for every dollar they spend. Their problems are really the emergency phase of the housing situation. Congress agreed on what could be done for this group—the middle- and lower-middle-income families—and this is the vast group for whom the Housing Act was designed. Because there was a disagreement over the issue of public housing, Congress could not agree on what should be done for the very low-income group who have always, not just at present, had a housing problem. This group will, of course, indirectly benefit from the Housing Act, for in making it possible for a man to build and purchase a medium-priced house, certain low-cost living quarters will thus be vacated and made available for occupancy by lower-income families.

During the hearings we found that this subject of public housing was greatly misunderstood. Relatively few people understood what was meant by "public housing," nor did they understand what group public housing is intended to serve nor what group actually is served by the 190,000 public-housing units now in existence.

Obviously there is much low-cost housing aided by the Government that is not public housing. In the Housing Act of 1948, for instance, every Government aid is directed toward the production of low-cost homes and rental housing, yet no public-housing program was adopted. Public housing refers solely to Government-owned and operated, and taxpayer-supported housing.

Contrary to popular impression the 190,000 public-housing units in existence today are not being used to supply housing where the need is greatest in the lower-income group—the question of greatest housing need is not the controlling yardstick for selecting tenants. For example, our hearings brought to

light one illustration of this in Detroit where a war widow and her four children were kept out of the public-housing project and thereby public-housing units in existence today are forced to live in a one-room basement apartment heated by a kerosene stove because the public-hearing rules for selecting tenants screened her out as ineligible. She was not a stable wage earner.

Through misfortune this widow is unable to pay for adequate living quarters for her family and is not in a position at present to become what is termed a "stable" wage earner. Yet under the present rules for selecting tenants she is prevented from living in Government housing which taxpayers support for what is generally thought to be the purpose of taking care of cases such as hers. The initial reaction to a case such as this is criticism of those in charge of the public-housing program. However, in fairness to the Public Housing Administration, it must be pointed out that they are following the congressional intent as it was so clearly demonstrated on the floor of the Senate last year—namely, to make public housing available only to stable wage earners and exclude anyone getting any form of public assistance, such as relief, widow's pension, etc.

Without going into the merits of any particular side of this issue of public housing, I would like to point out the three different lines of thought on this subject because the inability of Congress to reconcile these different views prevented action on what I consider a vitally important phase of the housing problem.

First, there is the group that believes, as someone stated on the floor of the Senate, "Public housing should not be made into a poorhouse." This group believes that only the stable wage earners in the lower-income group should be allowed to live in Government-owned and taxpayer-supported housing. This principle is applied to the operation of public housing today.

Second, there is the group that believes those people financially unable to provide housing for themselves, should not be cared for in housing provided by the Federal Government. This, they say, is a problem for the local municipality to handle as a relief problem, just as local relief provides food and clothing for people unable to provide these necessities for themselves. This group, however, does go along with the idea that it is the job of the Federal Government to cut costs of building wherever possible and to make liberal loans available for the construction and purchase of lower-income homes.

Third, there is the group that believes that tenants for government-owned housing should be selected solely on the basis of greatest housing need, regardless of whether their income is derived from wages, relief, or widows' pension. They believe public housing should serve those people in greatest housing need who, through misfortune, like the Detroit war widow, or lack of ability, have never been adequately housed or fed or clothed, and who keep slum areas thriving because they cannot afford other housing. By stressing that public housing should serve those in greatest housing need, this group does not advocate that the prospective tenant with the smallest income should receive priority. The number of children in the family, the health of the children and of the wife, and many other things should be taken into consideration. For example, a family with an income of, say, $2,000 and seven children and a sick wife, living under slum conditions, certainly would have a greater housing need than a healthy childless couple making $1,400 a year. This third group believes that tenants should be chosen solely on this basis so that government-owned and taxpayer-supported housing will solve a serious social welfare problem as well as a currently aggravated housing problem.

If the thinking of this third group is followed, it will, of course, cost more to administer public housing and the success thereof will depend to a certain extent upon the whole-hearted cooperation of welfare organizations, church groups, and civic minded people.

I, personally, go along with this latter line of thinking and submitted an amendment to this effect to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. The amendment, however, was rejected in favor of a compromise which provided that discrimination against those receiving public assistance of any kind be stopped and that the question of greatest housing need be given "due consideration" when selecting tenants.

The case of the Detroit war widow may, at first blush, seem unusual, but nevertheless it is essentially typical of the housing problem with which a vast group are faced. She, and many others like her in the lowest income group, present a social welfare problem, the handling of which Congress unfortunately did not agree upon. Something should and must be done for this group by Congress at once.

Getting back to what has been done in the Housing Act of 1948, there is some really worthwhile assistance given our vast middle and lower-middle income group. That is, the clerks, salespeople, storekeepers, office workers, teachers, nurses, machinists, carpenters, factory workers, and especially veterans. The people who can pay from $4,500 to $11,000 for a house of their own or a modest amount for monthly rent, comprise the greatest number of Americans, and this group receives direct help with their housing problems from this new law.

This bill is dedicated to the idea that every man with a steady job and good credit should be able to own his own home if he desires. To make this possible the act briefly does the following things:

1. Makes more liberal government insured and guaranteed home loans available to veterans and others interested in buying or building lower cost homes that meet good construction standards.

2. Provides easier bank credit for the home buyer by authorizing the Government to broaden its secondary market activities and purchase one-half of the FHA-insured and GI-guaranteed home loans made by banks and other leading agencies after April 30, 1948.

3. Provides for the creation and government-insured financing of housing cooperatives. In addition, it provides for necessary advice and help to the group in forming the cooperative, planning the site and dwelling units, etc.

4. Provides liberal government insured loans for large scale rental housing projects and fixes the maximum rents thereon.

5. Provides a yield-insurance program which guarantees a 2¾ percent return to those who put their own money in the erection of large scale rental housing. This aid is available only if rents are fixed to yield approximately 3½ percent. The maximum rent in this type of project would vary in different sections of the country.

6. Prohibits discrimination by landlords against families with children by requiring a signed statement from builders and investors that the rental housing they erect with the benefit of Government-insured loans will be open to families with children. Builders and investors who refuse to sign such a statement are automatically barred from receiving Government-insured loans, and those who obtain such loans and later discriminate against families with children will be guilty of criminal offense.

7. Liberalizes government insured loans for the mass production and marketing of low cost prefabricated housing and establishes insured credit for builders utilizing the economies of large-scale site production in the production of low-cost homes.

8. Provides more liberal government insured loans to home owners for the purpose of remodeling and modernizing their homes so as to create additional rental units.

These are the immediate aims of the Housing Act. The act also makes a start on two problems which are concededly the greatest bottlenecks in the housing industry—(1) the failure of communities to improve and modernize outdated and unnecessarily complex building codes, which not only differ from city to city, but also within large metropolitan areas; and (2) the failure of the building industry as a whole to standardize measurements and methods for the assembly of home-building materials and equipment. The aim of the Housing Act in setting up a unit in the Housing and Home Finance Agency to do research leading to the adoption of standardized codes is to encourage cities and towns to do away with old-fashioned specification codes and to adopt simple performance codes. And the purpose of that section of the Housing Act authorizing the H&HFA to conduct studies to develop the application of standardized dimensions and methods for assembly of home-building materials and equipment is to encourage the building industry to accept and apply standard measurements to their operations. Both of these improvements will greatly reduce building costs and will enable home builders to take advantage of many new building ideas.

The aids offered by the Housing Act also encourage the use of the expansible house idea by those who want to start out with a low cost home with one bedroom and add extra rooms later as their family and income increases.

In addition to these aids, a separate bill provides for direct Government grants and aid in building special homes for veteran wheel-chair cases—the Government to supply all plans free of cost to the veteran plus one-half of the total cost of the home on homes that cost up to $20,000.

The important and pertinent questions still unanswered now are how to get the liberal loans provided for in the law: how much of a loan can be secured; how to become eligible for these loans; what are your chances of getting lower cost rental housing provided for in the new act?

HOME-LOAN PLANS

First, let's look at home loans and see how you can secure a more liberal loan for the purchase of a reasonably priced house. The Government does not make direct loans. How then does the program operate?

Congress has authorized the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration to insure or guarantee the payment of certain home loans made by private-lending institutions. This means FHA or VA, in effect, promises the lender that you will repay your home loan in full. With the Government standing behind your debt in this way, the security on the loan is more desirable. Therefore, the lender is not only more willing to make the loan, but also to make a larger loan than he otherwise would make.

A comparison between a conventional home loan and one that is insured by the Government will illustrate this point. National banks, for example, are limited by Federal Reserve law in the amount of a conventional home loan they can make. They can grant a first loan for no more than 60 percent of the value of the house, and under certain conditions this limitation is even lower. This means you must pay a minimum of 40 percent of the value to the builder as a down payment. However, one type of FHA-insured loan, which will be explained later, would enable such a bank to make a loan for as much as 95 percent of the value of the home. FHA will insure this amount on certain loans. Such a loan would call for a down payment of 5 percent of the value instead of 40 percent.

You will notice that I use the word "value" rather than "purchase price." You, who are experienced home owners, known that frequently there is a variation between "value" and "purchase price," with the result that in the case of a conventional first loan the amount of down payment might be upped from 40 to 50 or even 60 percent.

In the case of a house selling for $10,000—even assuming that the purchase price and the value were the same—this would mean a down payment of something more than $4,000. Few new families are able to make so large a down payment. As a result, thousands, if not millions, who want to own their own homes are forced to continue as renters.

When FHA insurance or a VA guarantee is attached to a home loan, however, the banks are able to lend a larger amount of money on a mortgage. This in turn means that down payments are reduced in amount. And this reduction of the down payment, in the case of Government loans, makes it possible for many home seekers to purchase homes who would otherwise be unable to do so because they lack sufficient cash reserves to make a large down payment, even though they could meet the monthly payments on the loan out of their incomes.

Naturally, the FHA and the VA in giving this added security to a loan, ask that certain requirements be met: (1) the home for which the loan is being sought must measure up to practical standards of construction; (2) the amount of the loan, in the case of FHA, must be determined and governed by the value at which the home is appraised—that is, the estimated value not the purchase price, the amount of the loan, in the case of VA, depends on the purchase price of the home and this cannot exceed VA's estimate of reasonable value; (3) the terms of the loan—the repayment period and the interest charged—must conform with the law as set forth in the rules of FHA and VA; (4) the applicant must be financially able to carry the loan. These are simple, fair, and protective requirements.

How is such a loan secured? The person seeking the loan advises his bank, building and loan association, or private lender that he is interested in an FHA-insured or VA-guaranteed loan. The lender then makes the proper application to the FHA or the VA.

FHA LOAN PLAN

The FHA plan of insuring home loans works like this: an FHA representative first appraises the value of the home and checks it from the standpoint of practical performance and durability.

One type of FHA-insured loan is made on homes on which an FHA commitment is secured before the start of construction and on which several FHA inspections are made during the construction. Another type of loan insurance is made on homes which FHA inspects and approves after construction is completed. For convenience's sake I will refer to the first type of homes as "new" homes and the second as "existing" homes.

After the construction is approved according to FHA standards, the appraised value of the home is set. "Appraised value" means the probable value of the home over a period of years, not simply the current cost or purchase price. The amount of any FHA-insured loan depends on the amount at which the home is appraised.

In the case of a new home, the appraised value of which is not over $6,315, the FHA will insure a loan up to 95 percent of this appraisal, or $6,000. If the purchase price of the home is the same amount at which FHA sets its appraisal—which, incidentally, is an indication of a good buy—the down payment required would be $315

If the purchase price is higher than the amount of the appraisal, the down payment would have to be increased beyond $315 by the amount of the difference between the appraisal and the purchase price.

In insuring the type of loan just described, FHA would require that the terms covering the repayment period be not more than 30 years and the interest rate charged by the bank or building and loan association be not more than 4½ percent, plus the one half of 1 percent charged by FHA as mortgage insurance premium—in all, 5 percent.

The monthly payments covering principal, interest, and average FHA mortgage insurance premium would be $31.92.

If FHA sets its appraisal at $7,000 on a new home, FHA will insure a loan up to 90 percent of this amount, or $6,300. Such a loan can run for not more than 25 years and have an interest rate, as in the previous case, of not more than 4½ percent. The monthly principal and interest payments, including average FHA mortgage insurance premiums, would be $36.60.

If the new home is appraised at an amount over $7,000 but at not more than $11,000, FHA will insure a loan made by a lender up to 90 percent on the first $7,000 of appraised value, and up to 80 percent on the amount of appraised value over $7,000. For example, let's say the FHA appraisal and the purchase price are the same, $11,000. This means the bank can lend as much as $9,500 and secure FHA insurance to cover that amount in full. FHA insures 90 percent of the first $7,000 of appraised value, or $6,300, plus 80 percent of the next $4,000, or $3,200, for a total of $9,500. This would mean a $1,500 down payment. The terms would be 25 years, 4½ percent interest. The monthly payments, including principal, interest and average FHA mortgage insurance premium, would amount to $55.20.

In the case of a new home valued at more than $11,000 but not over $20,000, FHA will insure a loan up to 80 percent of FHA appraised value. If the appraisal is set at $20,000, FHA will insure a loan anywhere up to $16,000. The monthly principal, and interest payments, including average FHA mortgage insurance premium, on this maximum FHA-insured loan would be $92.96.

The type of FHA-insured loans made on existing homes—those inspected and approved by FHA after construction has been completed, whether the home is actually new or old—can be secured for as much as 80 percent of FHA appraisal. The appraisal, however, cannot exceed $20,000. Thus the maximum FHA-insured loan available on an existing home would be $16,000—or 80 percent of the maximum $20,000 appraisal.

The monthly payments per $1,000 of loan would be $6.57 for interest, principal, and average FHA mortgage insurance premium.

This type of loan, on an existing home, cannot run for more than 20 years and, as in the previous examples, cannot carry an interest rate of more than 4½ percent.

One other type FHA-insured loan is available, but is specifically limited to small, basic-type homes, stripped of nonessential features but with complete living facilities, for lower income families. The type of home on which this loan is available can be built in many small communities, rural and semi-rural, on the margins of cities and farther out in the country, but it is unlikely that it could be built in urban areas within the cost limits set by the loan terms.

On these basic-type homes, if constructed under FHA inspection, the FHA will partially insure the lender against loss on a loan for not more than $4,500, which cannot exceed the appraised value of the house without the land. The land is not covered by the loan and must be paid for or otherwise financed (but not with a second mortgage). To be eligible for this loan you must have an equity of at least 5 percent of the appraised value of the entire property.

On this loan plan, the monthly payment, including principal, interest, and average FHA mortgage insurance premium, is $6.75 per $1,000 of loan. For example, on a maximum $4,500 loan, the monthly payment would be $30.38 over a period of 20 years.

Certain basic principles apply to all of these FHA-insured loans. If kept in mind, these principles can be helpful to you in selecting a home on which you can secure such a loan.

First of all, the lower cost of the home, the more liberal the FHA-insured loan.

Second, the most liberal FHA loan insurance is offered on homes inspected and approved by FHA during the construction period.

Third, the way to secure a loan as close as possible to the maximum amount which FHA will insure is to select a home the price of which is well within your ability to repay. The lending agency takes this into consideration first and foremost in its decision on the amount of a loan it will make. It is generally considered safe to buy a home costing approximately two-and-a-half times your yearly income. This amount, of course, is for the average-size family and can be decreased or increased according to other considerations such as family expenses and bank savings.

Fourth, another way to secure a loan as close as possible to the maximum amount which FHA will insure is to find a good buy. That is, a home worth its asking price. Every loan—Government insured or not—is based on the appraised value of the home, not on the purchase price. Your loan will mean more to you, will mean less of a down payment, if the appraised value and the purchase price are closely related.

GI LOANS

A VA-guaranteed home loan is available to any veteran who served at any time between September 16, 1940, and July 25, 1947, and who was honorably discharged after at least 90 days total service or for service-incurred disability in less than 90 days.

Before guaranteeing a loan, however, the VA must determine that the purchase price of the home does not exceed reasonable value, taking into consideration present building costs. Congress provided this safety-gauge for the protection of the veteran.

If VA approves the purchase price, it then is willing to guarantee as much as 50 percent, or $4,000, whichever is less, of a loan made on this home. It will guarantee a loan only if it does not run for more than 25 years and does not have an interest rate of more than 4 percent. The monthly payment on a maximum VA guaranteed loan would be $5.28 per $1,000 of loan.

To illustrate a VA-guaranteed loan, let's take a house priced at $8,000. The purchase price, of course, must be approved by VA. If the lending agency is willing to make a loan of say $7,500 on this home (it can make an $8,000 loan), VA will guarantee 50 percent of the loan, or $3,750. This means that while the bank, or building and loan association or other lender, as the case may be, is lending the $7,500, it is taking a risk on only half that amount or $3,750. The VA assumes the risk on any loss up to one-half of the loan.

The amount of the loan you can secure will depend, of course, upon the lender's confidence in your ability to repay the loan and upon the lender's appraisal of the home's value.

Over and above guaranteeing 50 percent of a loan made by a lender to a veteran, the VA will make one payment of 4 percent of the amount of the guarantee, to be credited to the veteran's loan account. If VA guarantees $4,000 of a veteran's loan, it will pay $160 to the credit of the loan account.

COMBINATION FHA-VA LOAN PLAN

In addition to a straight FHA-insured loan and a VA-guaranteed loan, a combination of the two loan plans is available to veterans in order to provide a more complete Government guarantee on a loan.

This type of loan is secured in the same way either a straight FHA-insured or VA-

guaranteed loan is obtained. Application is made to a bank or building and loan association or other private lender, which in turn files your application for a combination FHA-VA loan, or as it is technically known, a combination 505–A loan.

The amount of the first mortgage on which FHA insurance is available varies. The lending agency may be able to secure anywhere from as much as 80 to 95 percent FHA insurance coverage (depending upon the value of the home), on the amount at which the home is appraised. The amount of the second mortgage, which can be covered with a VA guaranty, cannot exceed 20 percent of the purchase price. Under the law, therefore, the veteran purchaser is entitled to obtain financing up to, but not to exceed, of course, 100 percent of the purchase price. In practice, down payments, somewhat lower in amount than would be entailed in either a straight FHA or straight VA loan, are commonly required.

Let's take one example of a combination FHA-VA loan. A veteran interested in buying a new FHA-inspected and VA-approved home, appraised at a value of $7,000, talks to his local bank about getting a loan under the combination plan. Under the maximum benefits of this plan, the Government will insure a loan covering the entire amount of the appraised value if the bank is willing to advance this amount.

The maximum FHA insurance can be anywhere from 80 to 95 percent of the value of the home. In this particular case, we will say FHA insured a loan for 80 percent of the value, or $5,600, and the VA guaranteed a second mortgage for the remaining 20 percent, or $1,400, making a total of $7,000. The total monthly payment covering both loans, including principal, interest, and FHA mortgage insurance premium, would be $39.93.

Whether this example fits your particular situation or not, the principle of it remains essentially the same for any combination loan.

CONSTRUCTION LOANS TO INDIVIDUALS

All the loan plans explained above can be used only on the purchase of a home. They are "permanent financing" loans. If you are planning to build, rather than purchase a ready-built home, you will need to secure a "construction" loan from your bank before you start building to meet costs of labor and material. The Veterans' Administration is authorized to guarantee construction loans for veterans. The Federal Housing Administration, on the other hand, does not insure construction loans as such on individual homes. However, a conditional FHA commitment on a permanent loan can be secured before you start construction and will make it easier for you to secure a construction loan from your bank.

At first glance, this may sound confusing. How can a conditional commitment on a permanent FHA-insured loan help you get a construction loan? The answer is simply that the bank is more willing to make the construction loan when it knows that this loan will be picked up by an FHA permanent financing loan as soon as the home is completed. The reason it is necessary to secure an FHA commitment prior to construction is that in this way you can be certain FHA will insure a loan and for a stated amount after the home is completed. By checking your plans prior to construction and inspecting the home during construction, FHA can determine that the home measures up to the standards its requires of all homes on which it makes loans.

Whether you are a veteran interested in securing a VA-guaranteed construction loan, or a nonveteran interested in securing a preconstruction FHA permanent loan commitment, be sure to have your plans and specifications submitted through your bank to either the FHA or VA before you start construction work Only in this way can you secure a VA construction loan or an FHA commitment.

The disbursements on a VA-guaranteed construction loan are made during the course of construction of the home. The final execution of an FHA permanent loan, of course, is made only after the completion of the home.

COOPERATIVE HOUSING PROJECTS

Because of the unprecedented housing shortage, many people have expressed a growing interest in the formation of a cooperative housing association as a means of providing satisfactory homes for themselves. Special attention was given to cooperatives in the Housing Act in the hope that through group action and Government assistance, veterans and others would be able to overcome the difficulties they were encountering in attempting to solve their housing problems as individuals.

The Housing Act provides more liberal Government insured loans to cover the construction of such projects. In addition, the Housing and Home Finance Agency offers considerable technical advice to cooperative members and groups interested in organizing cooperative housing projects.

It is possible to secure an FHA-insured loan for the purpose of constructing the cooperative housing project that will not only cover the construction period, but will also take care of the long-term permanent financing angle of the purchase.

Veteran housing cooperatives can secure an FHA-insured loan for as much as 95 percent of the cost, based on costs prevailing as of December 31, 1947. Under this provision, the loan (attributable to dwelling use) cannot exceed $8,100 per dwelling unit, or $1,800 per room, if this is more feasible. The total mortgage may in addition include provision for appropriate nondwelling facilities.

Nonveteran cooperative groups can secure an FHA-insured loan up to 90 percent of the value of the project.

In launching such a project, FHA should be consulted in advance on plans for site development and construction. An option to purchase the site should be obtained before filing of application for insurance.

Separate and apart from these cooperative housing provisions in the Housing Act, the Veterans' Administration will guarantee one-half of a loan up to 100 percent of the purchase price. This guaranty can cover a cooperative project during the course of construction. It is required, however, that all units be sold to veterans in advance of the issuance of the guaranty, so that in practical effect, each unit must be subscribed for by a veteran in advance of construction. The VA guaranty covers 50 percent, or $4,000, whichever is less, of each individual loan.

All plans for the formation of the group, the method of operating as a group, plans for site development, and specifications for the construction of the homes to be built must be presented to and discussed with local FHA or VA officials as the first step in organizing such a housing project so as to secure the full benefits provided by the Government. It is also important to ascertain that the cooperative set-up meets the varying needs of the members and conforms to State laws.

These various liberal loan plans I have just described look fine on paper, of course. Some of you, however, have found that actually getting such a loan is not as easy as it would seem in view of the fact that the Government is assuming the major part of the risk involved. The banks, despite the FHA and VA insurance or guaranties, in many cases are not willing to make loans. This has been caused by the fact, in part at least, that many lending institutions have tied up as much money as they can in long-term housing loans. Banking laws require that a part of every bank's assets must be kept liquid—that is, readily converted into cash in the event that depositors want their money.

The very length of time which you have to repay your home-financing loan means that the bank or other lending institution is limited in the number of home loans it can make. In addition, there has been some unwillingness to make home loans recently because of reductions in money supply, which have been designed to curb the spiral of ever-higher prices. The result is that interest rates have gone up on other types of loans, making them more profitable than the almost riskless home loans, which I have described.

How did the Congress attempt to meet this problem? It provided that the Federal National Mortgage Association could buy FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgages on homes from private lending institutions. This would release money to them to make new home loans. However, the Federal National Mortgage Association may only buy one-half the loans made after April 30, 1948.

If this measure continues to prove inadequate insofar as home financing is concerned, it will be necessary to provide, through congressional action, either a 100-percent secondary market for certain classes of FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed loans or some other method of making these loans actually available in all cases in which the home or the construction plans have been approved by FHA or VA and the loan applicant has a steady job and good credit.

Your main housing problem may not be one of securing a loan to purchase a home. It may be one of fighting high prices and costs. You're interested in finding a comfortable, low-cost place to live—whether it is an apartment or a home.

I recall one such gentleman who appeared before the congressional hearings. He sat through 2 days of the hearings, waiting his turn, and in those 2 days all the witnesses who appeared before us talked about the problems of getting adequate loans to finance the purchase of homes.

When he was finally called he started out by saying, "If you don't stop working on the angle of financing homes at their present costs, you might as well forget the whole thing. The real reason people are having so much trouble is that costs are too high. Where can you find a low-cost home today?"

In answer to the question posed by this witness, let me point out that by making it easier for prospective home buyers to purchase low-cost homes and more difficult to secure loans to purchase more expensive homes, the Housing Act, in effect, forces builders and prefab manufacturers to build for this low-cost home market—to cut their profits and concentrate on cheaper homes. In addition to this, the new Housing Act also provides for FHA insurance of construction loans on such low-cost housing and FHA insurance of loans for low-cost rental housing.

In addition to these provisions in the Housing Act, the Joint Committee on Housing did much to break the supply bottleneck so as to direct scarce materials to low-cost housing. We brought to light the activities of gray marketeers in building materials and, in fact, went into this price-hiking racket, to the extent that one of the gray marketeers has been sentenced to 5 years, under State law, for criminal activities in connection with gray marketeering, and is now under a Federal indictment on 32 counts. This has had a substantial effect in scaring off other gray marketeers and in keeping costs down.

Private industry—the carpenters, plumbers. painters, builders, and mass producers of housing—can, of course, build the lower-cost homes needed. One of the reasons why private industry has not met this great demand for low-cost housing is that there have also been many buyers more than willing to pay

high prices. Most builders have naturally concentrated exclusively on the more expensive homes. There is more profit in this kind of building. But with liberal Government-insured loans restricted to lower-cost homes, builders, mass producers, and prefab manufacturers will now be forced to concentrate on the production of lower-cost homes.

Other reasons for the scarcity of low-cost homes, which the congressional hearings brought to light, were: (1) The builder's inability to secure loans large enough to enable him to take advantage of the savings in large-scale building, using mass production and prefabrication methods, etc., either partially or entirely in the construction of homes. If he were able to embark on such projects he could pass the savings on to the buyers. (2) The builder's inability to leave the higher-priced bracket in building because of high costs of materials and outmoded building codes, which also add to costs. (3) The manufacturer's inability to secure adequate loans which would enable him to go into large-scale prefab housing. (4) The investor's reluctance to take a chance on the low returns offered by low-cost housing projects. Another bottlenecking factor holding up the construction of low-cost homes has been the expensive practice of sloppy subcontracting which is possible when buyers are more concerned with getting a home than with the cost of getting one.

RENTAL HOUSING LOANS

To encourage the construction of rental projects the FHA is now authorized to insure mortgages on these projects up to 90 percent of the estimated cost as of December 31, 1947.

To be sure that such rental projects fit into the lower-price bracket, certain limitations are imposed. Estimated costs cannot be higher than those prevailing on December 31, 1947. No mortgage can be obtained for a rental project if the average mortgage per family unit is more than $8,100. Rents are regulated for the duration of the loan regardless of the Rent Control Act.

In addition to making this loan insurance available only to builders of rental projects, Congress has further set up the stipulation that this loan insurance can be made available only to builders who will not discriminate against families with children. In our investigation we found that many builders were taking advantage of liberal Government loans to build rental housing and then barring families with children. In fact, in a number of areas, "No Children or Pets" signs were the rule rather than the exception.

In order to encourage the construction of large-scale rental developments, the amount of such FHA-insured loans can go up to $50,000,000 for States, municipalities, and nonprofit corporations.

HOME-CONSTRUCTION LOANS

To encourage the mass construction of low-cost for-sale homes, the FHA is now authorized to insure construction loans to a builder (who is mass-producing low-cost homes) up to 80 percent of the value of the home. The loan amount to be covered with FHA insurance, however, cannot exceed $6,000 per dwelling. These loans are available only to builders engaged in large-scale modernized site construction jobs where 25 or more houses are involved.

To encourage the construction of low-cost homes where the builder is constructing an individual home rather than embarking on a large-scale project, the FHA is authorized to insure a loan to such a builder for 85 percent of appraised value, not to exceed $6,000.

MODERNIZATION LOANS

To encourage home owners to remodel or convert their homes into two-family or larger apartments, the FHA is authorized to insure construction loans for such purposes up to $10,000.

PREFABRICATION LOANS

To encourage the manufacture of lower-cost quality prefabricated or mass-produced housing, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make loans up to 75 percent of the cost of a factory and machinery in which to manufacture such houses.

In addition, prefab manufacturers can secure Government-insured loans for the purpose of initial working capital. This enables the manufacturer to meet operating costs as they arise and will obviate the necessity of holding up production until funds are available from the final sale of prefab homes. Government-insured loans are also available to dealers for the purchase of prefab homes. These provisions of the Housing Act were designed to assure the availability of low-cost quality prefab housing for families of moderate incomes and to assure that there would be no gaps in meeting the needs of prefab producers.

YIELD INSURANCE

To encourage investors to supply all the capital out of their own funds—rather than borrow by means of a mortgage—for the construction and operation of rental projects for families of moderate incomes, the Government will guarantee an annual minimum return on their investments. The return guaranteed is an amount not to exceed 2¾ percent on the investment. This is available only if rents are set to yield a minimum of 3½ percent, but the yield may be higher if the rents charged still meet the needs of the moderate-income family. The purpose here, of course, is not only to attract investors to the moderate-priced apartment field, but also to give the apartment dweller more value for his money.

STANDARDIZATION OF CODES AND MEASUREMENTS

To cut down the high costs of building and building materials, the Housing and Home Finance Agency is authorized to conduct technical research to develop and promote the standardization of building codes and the standardization of measurements.

To explain this further, the building industry is 50 years behind the times and is operating under methods requiring unnecessary expenditures of time and money because of its regulation by codes that are different in every community.

There are at present roughly 2,500 different metropolitan codes specifying how houses must be built in those 2,500 different metropolitan areas. For example, a house that is acceptable in Madison, Wis., may not be acceptable in Cleveland, Ohio. A wall may be a satisfactory wall in Chicago, but not in Los Angeles.

To give you an idea of present difficulties which prevent the savings possible under a standard code, let's take an example by using the most expensive room in most houses—the kitchen. A kitchen lends itself readily to prefabrication. One of our largest automobile manufacturers saw the possibilities in this and decided to undertake the large-scale manufacture of complete kitchens. Assembly-line techniques would be developed; prices would be cut in half; complete kitchens in a variety of colors and sizes would be marketed like automobiles. But the project was abandoned when a survey revealed that the company would have to hire 2,000 different staffs of lawyers to lobby in the various communities for code changes, and even if the lawyers were hired there was no guaranty that they would be successful in getting codes altered.

A simple standard performance code would mean that materials would be acceptable on the basis of performance. Thus any new heat-resisting material would be acceptable, not on the basis of its content but on the basis of whether it would resist heat to a degree that makes it reasonably safe.

Standardization of measurements would mean all buildings would be designed in multiples of a certain number of inches. One plan, known as modular coordination, provides that all building measurements be in multiples of four inches. This would encourage mass precutting of everything that goes into a house, which would ultimately very materially reduce home-building costs.

The building industry is practically the only big industry in our country which does not have any standardization of measurements. The railroad industry, years ago, standardized measurements to save costs. The electrical-appliance industry, years ago, standardized the measurement of electric fixtures in order to save costs and simplify replacements. Even dress manufacturers have designed a standardization of sizes and basic pattern measurements. But the building industry still operates on custom-built methods. Every piece of wood is tailor-cut for a house.

The new Housing Act authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make extensive studies in this field of building codes and building measurements, and to assist in the standardization thereof. No Federal law can be passed to force a city to adopt an up-to-date standard building code. Information and aid is now available, however, to those progressive and thoughtful communities who wish to adopt up-to-date codes, and there is no longer any excuse for any city to have time-worn, restrictive, cost-raising codes.

Just what are your chances for getting a dollar's worth of housing for every dollar you spend? I wish I could say that the Housing Act of 1948 by itself could bring about this situation. A realistic study of the whole housing picture, however, makes it obvious that no single law can accomplish this. It would be like trying to establish a permanent peace by simply passing a single law. There are intangible and constantly changing conditions which have an effect on housing and whether or not you get your money's worth. And there are certain factors tied in with the housing picture which the Federal Government does not have the right to touch. For instance, Congress cannot simply pass a national standard building code, nor can it force the building industry as a whole to agree upon some standardization of measurements, even though these two things are absolutely essential to obtain lower cost homes. The adoption of a simple standard building code is a local matter, which the residents of cities and towns throughout the country must persuade their municipalities to adopt. In the Housing Act of 1948, however, Congress does make it possible for communities to do this with a minimum of expense to themselves and with the benefit of complete and expert advice from the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

There is another problem which the Federal Government cannot put its finger on and regulate in order to give you a dollar's worth of housing for every dollar you spend—and that is just how builders and investors will use their productive facilities.

The Housing Act, however, does much to encourage the construction of the price homes and the type of rental housing most needed today.

The Housing Act is not a cure-all to the housing problem. Just as a consultation of the best specialists in the country cannot cure a sick man overnight, the Joint Committee on Housing knew that it could not solve the housing problem overnight. But we have been able to diagnose the case and at least prescribe some aids to bring the housing situation back to health.

Congress has not given every citizen a home of his own with a white picket fence around it, nor has it put the Government in the business of home building or in the business of mortgage banking. What it has done is to remove some of the obstacles in the way

of low-cost building for sale and for rent, and give you some help in securing a home of your own. It gives a sense of direction to the vast industry which employs lumberjacks and mortgage bankers, factory workers, and building material dealers, carpenters and contractors, bricklayers and engineers, plumbers and architects. It attempts to point this great building effort—that is the daily job of so many of our citizens—toward the type of homes most needed today.

By directing scarce materials, labor, and financing toward lower-cost living quarters, it hopes to ease the critical housing situation.

In seeking to solve the problem in this way it is necessary that those affected by this new law understand it and know how to take advantage of it.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FREQUENTLY ASKED ABOUT FINANCING YOUR HOME WITH FHA-INSURED AND VA-GUARANTEED LOANS

Here are questions which Government officials are called on most frequently to answer about housing problems of individual home seekers:

Question. Does the Government lend a citizen money to build or buy a home?

Answer. No. Loans are made by private financial institutions. The Federal Housing Administration insures financial institutions against loss on approved mortgage loans. The Veterans' Administration guarantees the lender against loss on a certain portion of loans made to qualified veterans.

Question. How does this protection of the lender help the man who wants to obtain a home?

Answer. This protection provides security for the lender without which, otherwise, he might not be in a position to grant the loan. It also results in more liberal terms to the borrower, bringing him ownership within reach of a greater number of families.

Question. Who may apply for such loans with a reasonable chance of getting them?

Answer. Any responsible person with a steady income, good credit and a reasonable ability to pay it back may seek an FHA-insured loan. Eligible for VA-guaranteed loans are veterans who served at any time between September 16, 1940, and July 25, 1947, and were discharged under conditions other than dishonorable after at least 90 days of total service (or for service-incurred disability in less than 90 days.)

Question. How big may these loans be?

Answer. VA will guarantee up to 50 percent, but not more than $4,000, of a GI loan to buy, build or improve a home for the borrower's own use. FHA will insure a loan up to $16,000. If you are a veteran, you may obtain a combination FHA-VA loan for as much as $20,000, with FHA insuring 80 percent of it on a first mortgage and VA guaranteeing 20 percent of it on a second mortgage.

Question. How are the loans repaid?

Answer. In monthly installments.

Question. What does each monthly payment include?

Answer. A portion of the principal, interest (on what you still owe), and one-twelfth of the annual mortgage insurance premium (one-half of 1 percent a year), plus fire and other hazard insurance premiums, and taxes.

Question. If I wish to pay off my FHA-insured loan in a lump-sum before it has reached maturity, will I be penalized with a charge?

Answer. There is no penalty charge providing there is no refinancing involved—in other words, providing you have not incurred another loan to pay off this FHA-insured loan.

Question. What is the down payment?

Answer. The down payment is the difference between the price of the property and the amount of the loan you can get on it. For instance, if you pay $7,000 for a property and get a loan on it for $6,300, the down payment is $700. This does not include closing costs, covering legal, filing, and similar fees.

Question. Does the FHA plan apply only to a new home?

Answer. No. If an existing property meets FHA requirements it may be bought on the FHA plan, but the down payment must be at least 20 percent.

Question. What property standards are required?

Answer. First, the property must be suited to the borrower's income and within his ability to pay. The FHA also requires sound construction, good design, and desirable neighborhood—standards which tend to give the borrower a satisfactory long-time investment.

Question. What are the location requirements?

Answer. Generally the property must be located in a neighborhood which makes provision for convenient transportation, nearby schools and parks, police and fire protection, and adequate utilities, such as electricity, gas, telephone service, water, etc.

Question. Where do I apply for either an FHA-insured or a VA-guaranteed loan?

Answer. In the case of an FHA-insured loan, you can apply to any lending agency approved by the FHA—bank, building and loan association, savings and loan association, etc. You can contact your local FHA office and secure a list of these FHA approved lending institutions in your locality. If there is no FHA office in your locality, write to Federal Housing Administration, Washington 25, D. C., for the list. In the case of a VA-guaranteed loan, you can apply to any bank, savings and loan association, building and loan association, mortgage loan company, or other private lender.

Question. What special FHA assistance is available to veteran or nonveteran cooperative housing groups?

Answer. Veterans and nonveterans can secure liberal FHA insurance for construction loans as well as for permanent financing by forming a nonprofit housing corporation. Veteran groups may secure FHA-insured loans for as much as 95 percent of cost (based on costs prevailing on December 31, 1947); and nonveteran groups may secure FHA-insured loans for as much as 90 percent of the estimated value of the project.

Question. Does the loan for the cooperative housing project cover only the actual dwelling units or can it take in streets, drainage, park and playground, shopping center, and other facilities?

Answer. The project can include the community and commercial facilities that the FHA may consider adequate to serve it. Streets, utilities, and similar facilities are properly included.

Question. How do I go about organizing a cooperative housing corporation?

Answer. Check with your local FHA office for technical advice and assistance.

Question. Can't something be done to prevent landlords from refusing to rent to families with children?

Answer. Something has been done in the Housing Act of 1948 to prevent this from happening where the housing has been constructed with the aid of Government-insured loans. Under the Housing Act, an individual or firm borrowing on an FHA-insured mortgage for the purpose of building a rental housing project, must certify under oath that in the selection of tenants he will not discriminate against families with children and will not sell unless the purchaser also certifies that he will not discriminate against families with children. Any landlord who violates this oath, after having received an FHA-insured loan, is guilty of a criminal offense.

Question. How can I obtain a handy checklist of things I should consider about the home I'm buying or building?

Answer. Here is an excellent one compiled by the National Housing Agency:

Property details:	*Satisfactory*	*Unsatisfactory*
Foundations	☐	☐
Walls	☐	☐
Roof	☐	☐
Floor	☐	☐
Insulation	☐	☐
Storm windows and screens	☐	☐
Heating equipment	☐	☐
Wiring and outlets	☐	☐
Kitchen equipment	☐	☐
Landscaping and drainage	☐	☐
Utilities: water, gas, sewers, electrical, etc.	☐	☐
The neighborhood:		
Nearby homes	☐	☐
Zoning laws	☐	☐
Schools and stores	☐	☐
Transportation	☐	☐
Fire and police protection	☐	☐

Financing:	*Amounts*
1. Price	———
2. Estimated value	———
3. Mortgage amount	———
4. Interest rate	———
5. Number of years	———
6. Prepayment privilege	———
7. Down payment	———
8. Closing charges, title search, etc	———
9. Size of monthly payment on mortgage	———
10. Monthly payments on taxes and assessments	———
11. Monthly payments on insurance	———
12. Total monthly payments (add items 9, 10, 11)	———
13. Upkeep and repairs	———
14. Probable fuel cost	———
15. Probable utility cost	———
16. Total monthly cost (add items 12, 13, 14, 15)	———

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION REGIONAL OFFICES

The veteran needs only his discharge or separation papers to establish his eligibility in applying for a VA guaranty on a GI loan. The lender will handle all further contacts with the VA which may be necessary. No veteran should hesitate, however, to consult the Veterans' Administration on problems which may bother him in connection with his purchase. He may seek whatever information he needs from the loan guaranty departments of the VA regional offices throughout the country. They are located as follows:

Alabama, Montgomery, 400 Lee.

Alaska, Juneau, Goldstein Building.

Arizona, Phoenix, 137 North Second Street.

Arkansas, Little Rock, Federal Building.

California, Los Angeles, 1380 South Supulveda Boulevard; San Diego, Box 1111; San Francisco, 49 Fourth Street.

Colorado, Denver, 1108 Fifteenth Street.

Connecticut, Hartford, 95 Pearl Street.

Delaware, Wilmington, Dravi Building.

District of Columbia, Washington, 1825 H Street NW.

Florida, Miami, 3300 Northeast Second Avenue; Pass-A-Grille Beach.

Georgia, Atlanta, 105 Pryor Street NE.

Hawaii, Honolulu, P. O. Box 3198.

Idaho, Boise.

Illinois, Chicago, 336 West Adams Street.

Indiana, Indianapolis, 36 South Pennsylvania Street.

Iowa, Des Moines.[1]
Kansas, Witchita, 3801 South Oliver Street.
Kentucky, Louisville, 1405 West Broadway.
Louisiana, New Orleans, 333 St. Charles Street; Shreveport, 501 Ockley Drive.
Maine, Togus.[1]
Maryland, Baltimore, St. Paul and Fayette Streets.
Massachusetts, Boston, 17 Court Street.
Michigan, Detroit, Guardian Building.
Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1006 West Lake Street.
Mississippi, Jackson.
Missouri, Kansas City, 1828 Walnut Street; St. Louis, 415 Pine Street.
Montana, Fort Harrison.[1]
Nebraska, Lincoln, Veterans Building, Twelfth and O.
Nevada, Reno.[1]
New Hampshire, Manchester, Hoyt Building.
New Jersey, Newark, 20 Washington Place.
New Mexico, Albuquerque, 115 South Third Street.
New York, Albany,[1] Watervliet Arsenal; Brooklyn, 35 Ryerson Street; Buffalo, 151 West Mohawk Street; New York, 252 Seventh Avenue; Syracuse, 500 South Saline Street.
North Carolina, Winston-Salem, 310 North Fourth Street.
North Dakota, Fargo.[1]
Ohio, Cincinnati, 206 East Sixth Street; Cleveland, Cuyahoga Building.
Oklahoma, Muskogee, Second and Court Streets; Oklahoma City, 1101 North Broadway.
Oregon, Portland, 208 Southwest Fifth Avenue.
Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 128 North Broad; Pittsburgh, 107 Sixth Street; Wilkes-Barre, 19–27 North Main Street.
Philippine Islands, Manila, APO 900, care Postmaster, San Francisco, Calif.
Puerto Rico, San Juan,[1] P. O. Box 4424.
Rhode Island, Providence, 100 Fountain Street.
South Carolina, Fort Jackson.
South Dakota, Sioux Falls.[1]
Tennessee, Nashville, White Bridge Road.
Texas, Dallas, Love Field; Houston; Lubbock, 1612–20 Nineteenth Street; San Antonio, 307 Dwyer Avenue; Waco.[1]
Utah, Salt Lake City, 1710 South Redwood Road.
Virginia, Roanoke, 211 West Campbell Avenue.
Vermont, White River Junction.[1]
Washington, Seattle, Seventh Avenue and Olive Way.
West Virginia, Huntington, 824 Fifth Avenue.
Wisconsin, Milwaukee, 342 North Water Street.
Wyoming, Cheyenne.[1]

SIMON & SCHUSTER, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 22, 1948.

The Honorable JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: Our editors have considered your proposal for a handbook on housing and I am sorry to report that we do not feel that it falls within the limits of our publishing activity.

An entirely informational pamphlet such as you describe, aimed at a rather specialized market of prospective home builders, would not seem to be suitable for our comparatively small and generalized publishing list.

Thank you for thinking of us in connection with this material, which is being returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

ORRIN KEEPNEWS.

---

[1] Denotes Veterans' Administration Center.

WORLD BOOK CO.,
Yonkers, N. Y., March 10, 1948.

Mr. JOE MCCARTHY,
Joint Committee on Housing,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCCARTHY: Our publications are entirely in the field of education—textbooks, teacher's books, and standardized tests. We are not set up to publish or market a book such as your Handbook on Housing. It is with regret that we have to reply unfavorably because the sample chapter is a most able and interesting presentation.

We appreciate your considering us as possible publishers. The introduction and sample chapter go back to you with this letter.

Sincerely yours,

A. P. SPEAR.

MCGRAW-HILL BOOK CO., INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 11, 1948.

Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY,
Vice Chairman, Committee on Housing,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: We have now had a chance to study the publication possibilities on your handbook on housing and I am sorry to report to you that it is our opinion that it could not be handled on a commercial basis.

It has been our experience that a book that would sell for only a dollar or a little more simply does not allow a publisher enough margin to enable him to recoup his investment in it. Furthermore, we realize that this topic is a particularly timely one and therefore information concerning it should be made available in a relatively short period of time. Conditions in the book-publishing industry today are such that it would take at least 9 months to produce an adequate size book and it might well be that the market would disappear by that time.

We do appreciate the importance of the problem that is facing the Congress and the important investigation of the facts that has been made by the Joint Housing Committee. We wish that we could see some method of aiding your work.

Perhaps a suggestion would be of some help to you. It is my feeling that a manuscript such as the one which you are preparing would be better fitted to publication as an article or a series of articles in a widely circulated periodical. May I suggest that, if you have not already considered this media, that you do so.

I am returning your introduction and sample chapter and wish you all success in making other publication arrangements. We deeply appreciate the opportunity that you have given us to consider this material.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. TAYLOR,
Editor, College Department.

DUELL, SLOAN & PEARCE, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 11, 1948.

The Honorable JOE MCCARTHY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: We were much interested to receive your letter of March 5 addressed to the editors of Essential Books, one of the departments of this firm. Mr. Duell and I would be very much interested to see the manuscript you are getting ready for publication as soon as it is possible to do so. It may be that the elements of time and price will create very difficult, and almost insuperable, problems for your publisher. Nowadays it is virtually impossible to bring out a new book at the price of $1, unless of course the publisher has real assurance of bulk sales in advance. Apart from this, there is the difficulty, which all publishers face, of getting books into the market swiftly enough; the process of book manufacturing has been slowed down by various forces and circumstances, and we therefore usually plan a publishing schedule of 6 months from the date of delivering the final manuscript to the publisher to the date of delivery. When I say "we," I mean to speak in general terms and not of this particular firm's activities.

I do hope that we may look forward to the privilege of seeing your manuscript and considering it for publication.

Very truly yours.

CHARLES A. PEARCE,

WILCOX & FOLLETT CO.,
Chicago, Ill., March 16, 1948.

Hon. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: Our editor in chief has turned over to me your introduction and sample chapter from a Handbook of Housing. There is a feeling here, particularly in our sales department, that such a book as you propose would have a wide sale.

However, there is one problem that disturbs us. Talks with the loaning departments of some of our banks would seem to indicate that the changes in rules and regulations come so fast that it would be impossible to put them into a book which would be useful for more than a few months.

Perhaps, however, we have a little the wrong idea of exactly what you are planning to do. We are much interested, and if you can give us more information, we should be able to work out an arrangement that would be mutually satisfactory for the publication of your material.

Sincerely, yours,

D. W. FOLLETT.

THE GREYSTONE PRESS,
New York, N. Y., March 8, 1948.

Senator JOE MCCARTHY,
Joint Committee on Housing,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: Thank you very much for telling us about your book on housing. As you may know, we recently published an excellent book in this field called A Home of Your Own, and it is very likely that your new book would be an excellent follow-up. Therefore, we'd be happy to give your manuscript our very serious consideration, if you would be kind enough to send it on.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK DRIMMER,
Editor.

THE GREYSTONE PRESS,
New York, N. Y., April 7, 1948.

Senator JOE MCCARTHY,
Joint Committee on Housing,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: Recently you wrote us about your new book on housing, and we expressed interest in it. This is to inform you that our interest continues and we'd very much like to read part or all of it when available.

Here is a copy of our latest catalog. It will give you a picture of what we're doing.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK DRIMMER,
Editor.

How To Raise Real Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

SENATOR WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development released on June 14 an extraordinary report outlining a 10-point plan to double the real income of the average citizen, over the next 30 years, through the steady growth of our private-business system. The report is entitled "How To Raise Real Wages." The American people can take hope from the conclusion that real wages can be doubled in the next 30 years when this conclusion is sponsored by such a distinguished group of industrialists and business leaders, and when this conclusion is based upon the thorough research, the careful analytical study, and the long and painful meetings and discussions—for which the Committee for Economic Development has become known—and which account for the influence of its research reports and policy statements.

In particular I congratulate my good friends and former associates on the Research and Policy Committee, the subcommittee who so generously gave their time and energy to the preparation of this important statement on national policy for the Committee for Economic Development: William A. Patterson, chairman, president, United Air Lines; Clarence Francis, chairman of the board, General Foods Corp.; Jay C. Hormel, chairman of the board, George A. Hormel Co.; Eric Johnston, president, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc.; Thomas Roy Jones, president, Hart, Schaffner & Marx; Fowler McCormick, chairman of the board, International Harvester Co.; Reuben B. Robertson, president, the Champion Paper & Fibre Co.

I have received from the Government Printing Office an estimate that the printing of the report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will require five pages, at an estimated cost of $410. Even though the printing of the report will exceed the ordinary two-page limitation, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO RAISE REAL WAGES

In the last 50 years real wages per hour in the United States have increased more than threefold. Today the average employee receives about $1.33 an hour. Back in 1900 the average was about 43 cents an hour in terms of 1949 prices. This represents an increase of approximately 2.5 percent per man-hour per year. Allowing for changes in prices, an hour's work of an average employee today can buy more than three times as much in goods and services as an hour of work 50 years ago. Broadly speaking, real wages determine how well workers are able to live. Hence, the problem of raising the standard of living of wage earners is primarily one of raising real wages.[1]

As a matter of fact, the gain in real income has actually been greater than can be indicated by mere figures of real wages. The quality of goods has improved, and the variety of goods has greatly broadened. Today men obtain light from electricity instead of kerosene or candles; they obtain transportation from automobiles instead of horses; the speed and comfort of railroad trains have been greatly improved; goods reach the consumer fresher, better-preserved, and cleaner than was possible before modern refrigeration and packaging; and the standard of living includes many things not available several generations ago, such as telephone service, air transportation, radio, movies and air conditioning. People have also taken part of the gain in real income in the form of more leisure; average hours of work have decreased by nearly one-third since 1900. One of the best indications of the kind of gains which are not reflected in output per man-hour is the increase in longevity. Life expectancy at birth has increased about 17 years since the beginning of the century.

The gains in real wages should not becloud the fact that there are many persons who still have small earnings and who present special problems. Some of these persons are doing work for which there is not a strong demand; many of them have been handicapped by physical disability or lack of training. Nevertheless, the evidence supports the conclusion that the rise in earnings has been general and that, particularly in the last 15 years, small incomes have increased by considerably greater percentages than large incomes.

It ought to be possible to raise real wages in the future as rapidly as in the past. This would mean that in slightly less than 30 years from now the real wages per hour of the average worker would have doubled.

How has the rapid rise in real wages in the past been achieved? Are the methods that have made possible the rise in real wages likely to be equally effective in the future? Are there serious obstacles in the path of a continued increase in real wages? What can be done to encourage the rise in real wages?

II

The great increase in real wages during the last several generations has been made possible only by a large rise in production per man-hour. Production, of course, includes all the operations required to get goods into the hands of final users. Consequently, it includes retailing and wholesaling quite as much as mining, manufacturing, or transporting. Fifty years ago output per worker per man-hour (in terms of 1949 dollars) was about 50.5 cents. Today it is about $1.83.[2] The output of 50.5 cents per manhour in 1900 and of $1.83 in 1949 was the joint product of labor and capital. From this output employees had to be paid wages, the providers of capital had to be paid interest, rent, and profits, and the Government had to be paid certain taxes, such as corporate income taxes and various excise taxes.

[1] Real wages are what money wages can buy. If money wages double while the average price of consumer's goods also doubles, money wages will buy no more than formerly. Hence, real wages will not have changed. On the other hand, if money wages remain the same, and the average price of consumer goods falls by half, money wages will buy twice as much as formerly. Real wages will have doubled.

[2] The figures on output per man-hour refer to all workers, self-employed as well as employees.

The rapid rise in output per man-hour has been directly achieved by four principal methods: (1) There have been many revolutionary or near-revolutionary changes in processes of production; (2) workers have been given much more capital—plant, equipment, and material—to help them produce; (3) there have been important advances in the health, training, and skill of the labor force; and (4) there have been great improvements in methods of management.

1. Improvements in production methods: It is significant that a rapid succession of important innovations has been necessary in order to produce an advance in output per man-hour of only 2.5 percent per year. During the last 100 years there has been a whole series of revolutionary or near-revolutionary changes in methods of production. Some of these changes in methods have been general and have been applicable to a great many industries. Others have been specific and have been expressed in particular kinds of machines, processes, and materials.

Undoubtedly the best-known general method of increasing output is the substitution of mechanical energy for human or animal energy. During the last 50 years mechanical energy used per man-hour in industry increased sevenfold. The application of mechanical energy has been facilitated by the great increase in the use of electricity during the last half century, and by the development of the internal-combustion engine which was virtually unknown 50 years ago. Another important general change has been the application of the moving belt to manufacturing. Still another has been the development of interchangeable parts. This makes possible great increases in productivity because it permits greater subdivision of labor and the use of specialized machines.

Examples of specific changes in methods are found in a multitude of new and improved machines, such as coal-undercutting machines, various earth-moving machines, cranes, magnets, mechanical mixers, rotary printing presses, the revolutionary types of machines that have been developed in the glass industry, and a number of office machines, such as typewriters and computing machines. There have been developments of important new processes, such as the Bessemer process of making steel and later the open-hearth process, welding, and the heat treatment of steel; important developments in materials, such as aluminum, rayon and many plastics; and, in addition, radical improvements in abrasives. Progress in technology has not been confined to industry. There have been improvements in the breeding of plants and animals, such as the development of hybrid corn, and improvements in methods of cultivation, such as the greater use of fertilizers. The improvement of methods has also been extended to distribution, including various ways of increasing the productivity of labor in this field. Among these devices have been the substitution of fixed prices for bargained prices, the development of the bargain basement for the quicker movement of slow-moving items, the development of mail-order selling, chain stores, self-service stores, and vending machines.

An indication of the scale on which the community has attempted to discover and use new technical knowledge is furnished by the rapid increase in the number of technical personnel and in the expenditures on industrial research. The census reports that in 1900 there were 8,847 chemists, assayers, and metallurgists and 43,239 technical engineers of all types. By 1940 there were 60,000 chemists and 278,000 technical engineers of all types. In 1920 about 300 laboratories with 9,000 employees were engaged in industrial research. By 1940 there were 2,200 laboratories with more than 70,000 employees.

Technological advance depends upon progress in pure research as well as applied research. There is no way of measuring the amount of pure research, but the great increase in the number of persons engaged in it indicates that the growth has been rapid. Most scientists are of the opinion that the amount of pure research is still too small in relation to applied research.

2. Increase in capital per worker: The development of new methods has required great increase in capital per worker. Between 1900 and 1949, for example, capital per worker in the United States (after allowance for the change in the price level) increased by nearly 50 percent. The average amount of capital per worker in America today is about $10,600. This represents the original cost less depreciation at 1949 prices for all equipment, real-estate improvements, and inventories. It includes publicly owned capital, such as roads and public buildings, as well as privately owned capital. To increase capital at this rate, with the labor force growing as rapidly as it has during the last 50 years, has required that about a tenth of the net national product be devoted to expanding plant, equipment, and inventories. Had the community not been willing to devote this proportion of the national product to increasing the plant, equipment, and materials per worker, the gains of advancing technology would have been only partly realized.

3. Improvements in the health, training, and skill of the labor force: Part of the great rise in output during the last several generations is attributable to the fact that the labor force has steadily improved in health, training, and experience and has contained a steadily growing proportion of skilled and semiskilled persons. The shorter workweek has also tended to increase output per hour, by reducing fatigue. Education has been broadened, too: Since 1890 the number of students in high schools has increased 9.5 times as fast as the population of the country and the number in college 3.5 times as fast. Between 1910 and 1940 professional persons increased from 4.4 percent to 6.5 percent of the labor force and clerical workers from 10.2 percent to 17.2 percent. On the other hand, the number of people engaged in unskilled labor dropped from 36 percent of the labor force in 1910 to less than 26 percent in 1940.

4. Improvements in methods of business management: The efficient use of modern equipment and methods has required great advances in management. When factories consume huge quantities of raw materials every 24 hours, when finished products consist of hundreds or thousands of parts that must fit together with close tolerances, when the work force consists of thousands of men in scores of occupations, a well-designed managerial organization staffed by well-trained men and equipped with accurate sources of information is necessary to see that everything is on hand when needed and that the flow of production continues smoothly and in proper balance. The managers of 100 years ago would not have had the techniques and assistance necessary to administer enterprises which are as large as those in modern industry and which consume materials as rapidly. Records and reports have been developed to keep top management informed as to what is going on and what operations cost. Particularly important has been the great increase in the number of staff positions in industry. Only since 1900 have staff positions become numerous. Now all large concerns have substantial technical staffs to help the line officers run the enterprise.

The realization of the gains from improvements in methods and increases in capital per worker has been made possible in considerable measure by large movements of labor from less productive industries to more productive ones. This means that the parts of the economy in which output per man-hour was highest are also the parts of the economy in which employment and production have risen most rapidly. Especially large has been the movement of labor from agriculture to nonagricultural industries. Had workers not been willing and able to move from less productive employments to more productive ones the community would have failed to achieve much of the increase in production made possible by improvements in methods and increases in capital. In other words, the ability and willingness of labor to move from one industry to another has made possible much of the rise in real wages.

III

What can be done to raise the general level of real wages? Any substantial rise in real wages can be achieved only through an increase in productivity. At present, the national income is roughly divided into three parts. A little less than two-thirds of it goes to employees in the form of wages and salaries. about one-sixth of it goes to the self-employed, and somewhat more than one-sixth of it goes to owners of property in the form of corporate profits, interest on indebtedness, and rental income of real estate.[3] The two-thirds of the national income that takes the form of wages and salaries includes, of course, the compensation of executives and technical employees as well as the compensation of workers in the shop. In 1948, however, the compensation of employees receiving $4,800 or more represented only about 9 percent of the earnings of all persons employed in nonagricultural industries (exclusive of public service). The income of the self-employed is partly compensation for labor and partly compensation for the property used by them in their businesses. Since the amount of capital per worker used in the small nonagricultural concerns operated by the self-employed is less than average for industry as a whole, most of the compensation of the self-employed would undoubtedly be regarded by them as payment for their services.

It is obvious from the above figures that the real wages of employees cannot be increased greatly by taking income away from either the self-employed or the owners of property. Consequently, any large rise in real wages can come only from more output per man-hour. If real wages are to rise as rapidly in the future as in the past, the output per man-hour must rise no less rapidly than in the past. In order to double real wages in the next 30 years, output per man-hour will need to rise at the rate of about 2.5 percent per year on the average.

Equally plain is the fact that a large gain in output per man-hour, such as doubling output per man-hour during the next 30 years, cannot be achieved by attempting to get men to make a greater physical exertion. There are some places where men are deliberately not producing as much as they easily might, but the average worker does a fair day's work. Hence, the large increase in production necessary to make possible a substantial rise in real wages will have to be brought about in the main by the use of (1) better methods, (2) more capital, (3) better training of workers, and (4) better management. To these four basic ways of increasing output should be added a fifth, namely more interested workers.

[3] The principal reason why wages and salaries form only about two-thirds of the national income when the hourly earnings of individual workers average about four-fifths of output per man-hour is that about one-sixth of the national income is represented by the income of the self-employed.

1. Improvements in production methods. The rate at which methods of production are improved depends in the main upon the progress of technological research. It has been pointed out that these improvements have been great and numerous—many of them revolutionary. For output per man-hour to continue to rise as fast as in the past, a continuation of important technological discoveries is necessary. Fortunately, the outlook for rapid technological progress is good. The industries of America are better equipped than ever before with technical employees and laboratories. Expenditures on technological research have been growing rapidly. They were nine times as large in 1940 as in 1920 and they are twice as large today as they were in 1940. Important new areas of research are being opened up. The biological field, with its improvements in the breeding of plants and animals and its advances in nutrition, is an example. Competition between enterprises tends to encourage expenditures on research, since the more one concern spends, the more its rivals must spend to avoid being left behind.

Research work in the universities has had a substantial growth and undoubtedly will continue to grow rapidly, despite the financial problems of the universities. It is particularly important, because much of it represents research in pure science upon which technological progress is based. An important recent development has been the growing contribution that the Government is making to research. Some of this takes the form of financial grants to universities, but most of it is done directly, by public agencies. It is estimated that the Federal Government currently spends a billion dollars a year on research, three-fourths of it in the field of natural sciences and military research. The investment of billions of dollars in atomic energy is the most dramatic instance of governmental support of research. The Department of Agriculture, the Public Health Service, the Bureau of Standards, and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics are examples of important governmental research agencies.

2. The needed increase in capital: It is not possible to foresee accurately how much additional capital would be needed to double output per man-hour in the next 30 years. The answer will depend, among other things, upon the rate at which population and the labor force grow, upon the proportions in which the population elects to divide its income between leisure and product and among different kinds of product, and upon the rate and character of improvement in production methods.

There is every expectation that the rate of population growth will be slower in the next 30 years than it has been in the past. This should make additions to the stock of capital go farther in raising output per man-hour. We shall not have to devote so large a share of our new investment to providing new entrants into the labor force with the same amount of plant and equipment that other workers have. We shall be able to use more of our new investment for increasing capital per worker.

How much increase in capital per worker will be needed to provide a given increase in output per man-hour will depend upon the nature of inventions. The relation between the increase in total capital per worker and the increase in output per man-hour has varied over time. In some decades—the 1920's and 1930's—output per man-hour increased much more rapidly than capital per worker. In some earlier decades output per man-hour increased less than capital per worker. Whether doubling capital per worker in the next generation would double output per man-hour is uncertain.

It is clear, however, that a rapid increase in the stock of capital will contribute to a rapid increase in output per man-hour. To get a rapid increase in the stock of capital will require a large amount of saving. Over the past half century the Nation has saved and invested about a tenth of its total net product. All present indications suggest that the community will continue to be willing to save this proportion. Thus, the outlook for total saving is favorable to continued growth in output per man-hour.

It is not sufficient, however, that the community should be willing to save. More important is the willingness of the community to make its savings available directly or indirectly for investment. And especially since progress will require investment in new methods and new products some investors must be willing to bear these risks. Satisfaction of this condition is less assured, and a more serious problem for public policy, than the adequacy of the total supply of savings.

3. More capable workers: The proportion of persons who go to high school or college may be expected to continue to increase. This means that a larger part of the population will have a good fundamental education. Training courses within industry are spreading, and more and more companies are providing special training departments to meet their needs. Formal apprenticeship is growing, not diminishing, as many people feared a few years ago. Training within industry is not confined to manual workers but is rapidly being developed for executives at various levels and for technical workers. Continued improvement in the health of the labor force may be expected. All in all, the outlook is good that the labor force of America will gradually become a more able group of men and women.

4. Improved managerial organization and methods: Within the last generation the field of management has become an important area of research. Schools of business are investigating problems of organizational structure and administrative methods. Regular and organized discussions of managerial problems are fostered by a variety of organizations, such as the American Management Association, the Society for the Advancement of Management, and others. Within business organizations, managerial structure and methods are under more or less constant review. The improvement of administration has been aided by the development of more orderly methods of making important decisions, by improvements in the methods of selecting personnel, by the invention of many kinds of record-keeping equipment that enable administrators to keep more completely informed than ever before about operations and costs, by the development of improved methods of timing operations and setting wage rates. In all of these fields the opportunities for important additional progress are bright.

Opportunity to increase output by better managerial organization and methods exists in government no less than in private industry. At the present time, the Federal, State and local governments employ in civilian positions about 5,800,000 persons and there are about 1,500,000 more persons in the armed services. About one out of nine members of the labor force is in Government service. The Federal, State and local governments also consume more than $17,000,000,000 of goods and services produced by private industry. When the Government uses such large quantities of labor and consumes such large quantities of materials, it is important that the Government conduct its operations efficiently. The more output that the Government gets from a given quantity of goods and services, the larger will be the number of persons available for work in private industry and the greater will be the quantity of goods available for consumption by individuals and business enterprises.

The purposes for which the Government uses men and material also affect the level of incomes in the community, including real wages. Many Government expenditures, such as those on roads, bridges, dams, irrigation works, flood control, river and harbor improvements, are in the nature of investments. Whether they yield a small or a large return (or any return at all) depends upon whether the projects are well chosen and well designed. There is always the danger that large outlays will be made to win the political favor of particular communities, even though the expenditures yield only a small return in terms of convenience and real services. As society becomes more complex, the functions and responsibilities assumed by Government increase. Where needed services are provided more efficiently by Government than by private industry, real incomes are increased by the Government's providing them. To the extent that Government undertakes functions which can be conducted more efficiently by private measures, real incomes and the general welfare are adversely affected. There is need for a more general understanding of this fact.

5. More interested workers: Employees who have an active interest in their work can make important contributions to improvement in production methods. Moreover, employees themselves need the opportunity to be interested in their work in order to make their lives more meaningful and satisfying. Seeing that workers appreciate the significance of their work and are interested in doing a better job and in improving the methods of work is one of the responsibilities of management.

The great progress being made in methods of management supports the belief that the interest of employees in their work can be increased. The problem of arousing interest is made difficult in some industries by the highly specialized and routine nature of many individual jobs. Nevertheless, the men whose work is routine can become interested in the performance of their departments or their divisions. Likewise, there are opportunities to show each worker how the quality of his work affects the quality of the final product and the service that it gives the customer. The interest of all employees can be promoted by regular arrangements through which men may suggest improvements in methods and products.

IV

Although the outlook for increases in output per man-hour is good, it is desirable that steps be taken to encourage such a rise. The demands for more production are large and compelling and come from many different directions. The most important demand for more output comes, of course, from the huge unsatisfied needs of people for goods. The average family among the fifth with the highest incomes spends about $7,200 a year on consumer goods. If the same standard were to be extended to the remaining families, the annual output of consumer goods would have to be doubled. If the lowest three-fifths of the families were to spend on consumer goods as much per family as is now spent by the second highest fifth—about $4,000 a year—the total use of consumer goods in the country would be nearly 30 percent larger.

A strong demand for more output comes from the need for increased support of those members of the community who are not able to work. These people consist, in the main of two groups—the elderly and the disabled. There are about 7,600,000 persons above 65 years of age who are neither earners nor wives of earners. A large number of these persons live on meager incomes provided through pensions or old-age assistance. In addition, there are about 3,700,000 other persons of working age who are temporarily or permanently unable to engage in a gainful occupation or to follow other normal pursuits. Larger incomes for the elderly and the disabled mean larger claims on the output of the producers in the community—the more than 60,000,000 persons who are in the labor force and the 30,000,000 housewives who are also producers. Hence, if increased support for the elderly and disabled is not to retard the rise in real wages, the increase in output of industry must be accelerated.

The need for more output is intensified by the heavy expenditures which the United States is compelled to make on national defense and on military aid to other countries. This means that less production is available for consumers and for increasing the productive plant of the country—though some of the expenditures for military purposes have important civilian applications.

In view of the large and growing demands for production, the country needs to take special steps to encourage more output. How can the community be encouraged to increase the amount of capital per worker and to improve methods of production? How can the rise in the efficiency of the labor force be stimulated? How can improvements in managerial methods be encouraged? How can a more interested labor force be developed? There are a number of ways that seem particularly promising in achieving one or more of the above objectives. Ten of these will be discussed here.

1. Stabilize the growth of industry and avoid serious business recessions: The real wages that workers earn in the course of a year depend upon their opportunity to work steadily. Every business recession, therefore, reduces the purchasing power of the total earnings of the members of the labor force and thus the real wages of the average member of the labor force. Of course, the fact that prices usually drop more than hourly earnings may raise the purchasing power of an employed worker's pay. Since the labor force in the community is growing, maximum real wages cannot be obtained unless the number of jobs increases as fast as the labor force. This means that the achievement of maximum real wages requires steady growth in the number of jobs.

Recession in business means more than a reduction in real wages because of loss of immediate opportunities to earn. It means that future earning power is less than it otherwise would be because the capital, and, in consequence, the productive capacity, of the country is growing more slowly. Depressions are characterized by a sharp drop in expenditures on investment. Indeed, these are the kind of outlays that drop most of all. The drop in expenditures on new investment means that the building of new plants is curtailed and that the buying of new equipment is greatly reduced during periods of business recession. The plant of the country is allowed to become a little older and a little more out of date than it otherwise would be.

The effect of the unusually severe and prolonged depression of the thirties upon production capacity is roughly indicated by the fact that between 1919 and 1929 total equipment and real-estate improvements in the United States (at cost less depreciation expressed in 1929 prices), increased from $177,000,000,000 to $228,000,000,000, or about 28 percent, whereas in the depression decade of the thirties, the increase was only from $228,000,000,000 to $237,000,000,000 or less than 4 percent. The problem of how to maintain stability is a broad and complicated one—too complicated to be examined here. It has been discussed elsewhere by the CED, and the CED has recommended policies that

should contribute substantially to improving the stability of business.[4]

2. Reduce seasonal unemployment: One of the most promising ways of raising real wages is by reducing seasonal unemployment, thereby increasing the number of hours worked in the course of a year by the average employee. The ways of reducing seasonal unemployment vary from industry to industry. In some cases, the most practicable method is through stockpiling goods in the off-season; in other cases, dovetailing the production of articles with different seasonal peaks is more feasible. Many enterprises have done much to reduce the seasonality of operations, but the possibilities for further progress are great. This is a problem for which management must accept an increasing degree of responsibility.

3. Improve the quality of business births and reduce the infant mortality among business concerns: The progressiveness of the economy and the rate at which methods of production are improved depend in large measure upon the vigor of competition. The vigor of competition depends upon many conditions. One of these conditions is the number of new concerns that are trying to get started each year and the stiffness of the competition that the new concerns are able to give the well-established ones. The fact that new concerns are attempting to break into business and to get customers for themselves tends, of course, to make the economy more competitive. Whether the gain in competitiveness is great or small depends upon whether the new concerns are well managed and well financed or whether they are so badly managed and so inadequately financed that they go out of business in a short time.

The problem of improving the quality of business births is a many-sided one. It is a problem to which the business schools of the country might well give more attention. In the past they have shown more interest in training men to be employees than to be business owners. Most of the material in the courses and most of the textbooks assume that a man is an employee in a large or fairly large establishment rather than the operator of his own business. Fortunately, many business schools are broadening their material to cover the problems of owner-operated businesses, and they should be encouraged to continue to do this.

Reducing the mortality among newly established concerns is also a many-sided problem. Furnishing capital and advice to new concerns seems likely to become a business in itself, and it may become an important one. If furnishing capital and advice to new enterprises can be developed into a successful business, the mortality among new concerns will be somewhat reduced and successful ones will be able to grow more rapidly. Stabilizing the growth of industry and avoiding severe business recessions would undoubtedly increase substantially the number of new concerns that survive, for recessions are particularly hard upon newly established enterprises.

Several reforms in the corporate income tax would be particularly helpful to new businesses. One such reform would be to permit business losses to be carried forward 5 or 6 years instead of only 2 years as at present. Many a new concern that begins to make a profit after 2 or 3 years of losses is compelled in effect to pay taxes out of capital. Since most new businesses are small, they would be particularly helped by elimination of the "notch rate" in the corporate income tax which has the effect of compelling corporations with net earnings between $25,000 and $50,000 a year to pay income taxes on any additional earnings at a higher rate than corporations making less than $25,000 or more than $50,000 a year.[5]

4. Reform the tax system to make risk-taking more attractive. The country is not suffering from a lack of savings and, despite very high rates of taxation, it does not seem likely to be short of savings in the foreseeable future. But too small a part of the savings of individuals is being put to work financing projects which involve substantial risks.

Savings may be invested either in well-established concerns in more or less stable industries or in new and unproven ventures. Investments in new enterprises using more or less untried processes, bringing out new types of products, or trying to develop markets where there are not markets now are particularly useful because progress can be made only by that kind of experimentation. Such investment, however, is particularly hazardous; the new process may not work, the new product may not appeal to potential customers, or the new markets may be very expensive to develop. In order to be progressive, therefore, an economy needs a good many investors who are willing to take risks that are of large but uncertain magnitude in the hope of earning large rewards. This does not mean, of course, that savings should be put into hazardous ventures without thorough investigation and without an attempt to reduce uncertainties to a minimum. It is bad for the economy, however, for the tax system to influence the choice of savers between relatively secure investments and relatively venturesome ones. Insofar as possible, the tax system should avoid imposing special burdens upon hazardous ventures. A tax system which artificially causes would-be investors to prefer safe investments discourages pioneering, makes the economy less progressive, and therefore retards the rise in the standard of living.

The present tax laws discourage individuals from investing in newly established concerns. The CED has issued several policy statements which recommend reforms in the tax system to diminish the discouraging effect of taxes upon enterprise.[6] Since the tax collections of the Federal Government are equal to about one-sixth of the net national product of the country, defects in the tax system are likely to have serious consequences. The very fact that the Government needs large amounts of revenue means that great care should be taken to eliminate features from the tax system that are bad for enterprise.

5. Stimulate more rapid replacement of equipment: One of the lessons that recent experience in Britain, France, and other countries has taught the world is that failure to keep equipment up to date seriously limits the productive capacity of a country. Nowhere is business so ready as in the United States to scrap equipment that is still usable but is less efficient than new equipment. Many plants in the United States, however, would be better off if they replaced equipment even more rapidly. In some cases failure to do this is attributable to lack of capital; in other cases, to inertia or lack of awareness of the savings that might be achieved. It is desirable that the income tax law permit more flexible arrangements in the rate at which new equipment is charged off. Such arrangements would encourage faster replacement, raise the productive capacity of industry, and help to increase real wages. These arrangements would be particularly useful in encouraging the purchase of equipment that is likely to have a shorter economic life than a technological life—when the duration of the market for products made on the equipment is uncertain and probably short.

6. Increase the imports of the United States relative to its exports. In 1949 the exports of goods and services from the United States (exclusive of income of investments of foreigners here or of Americans abroad) exceeded imports into the country by nearly five billion dollars. This excess of exports over imports is a substantial drain upon the United States, particularly in view of the fact that it does not for the most part represent the acquisition of income-earning assets abroad.

The country has had good reason to provide ways of financing this excess of exports over imports. The relations of the United States with other countries would be improved, however, if Americans were to increase their purchases from abroad to the point that gifts from this country would not be necessary. No country feels very comfortable about receiving gifts. Every country, however, is glad to have customers. And no customer would be more welcome than the United States. This country makes such a wide variety of goods and offers them at such attractive prices that all countries are glad of the opportunity to earn dollar exchange and thus to increase their ability to buy in the American market.

The increase in imports involved is small as compared with our total output. Total imports would still be less than 5 percent of total domestic production, a lower ratio than in the twenties.

In part, we can receive payment for our exports through increased travel by our citizens abroad, and through increased use of shipping services provided by other nations. In part, payment can be made through the acquisition of income-earning assets abroad. Some of the goods received in exchange for our exports will consist of items which do not compete with our own products. In part, payment will involve increased imports of goods which may produce some dislocation of industry in the United States—some contraction in those industries that compete directly with imports. Some labor and capital may need to move into industries that are not losing markets to foreign countries.

The necessity for labor and capital to shift from one industry to another is not new—it frequently arises as technological progress occurs or as demands shift. And, although there are costs to raising imports relative to exports, there are greater costs involved in exporting more than is imported. An excess of exports means that the United States has less to consume and that real wages (and other incomes as well) have less purchasing power than they would have if every dollar of exports paid for a dollar of imports. An increase in imports, by reducing the need for foreign aid, would help to make possible reductions in tax rates and increased incomes after taxes. Moreover, unless our imports increase, United States exports will decline when foreign aid ends, thus reducing employment in our most productive industries.

Hence, the Government should continue to encourage the increase in imports. We should continue selective reduction of American tariffs as part of American policy looking

[4] See Toward More Production, More Jobs and More Freedom (1945); Taxes and the Budget: A Program for Prosperity in a Free Economy (1947); Monetary and Fiscal Policy for Greater Economic Stability (1948), statements on national policy by the Research and Policy Committee of the CED.

[5] For further discussion of small business problems see, Meeting the Special Problems of Small Business, a statement on national policy by the Research and Policy Committee of the CED, June 1947.

[6] Taxes and the Budget: A Program for Prosperity in a Free Economy (1947); Tax and Expenditure Policy for 1949 (1949); Tax and Expenditure Policy for 1950 (1950), statements on national policy by the Research and Policy Committee of the CED.

toward a freer trading world.[7] Customs regulations should be revised in order to encourage imports. Since American distributors know the needs and tastes of American consumers better than foreign manufacturers can be expected to know them, and since the costs of distribution are less when goods are imported by an established organization that is buying many kinds of goods abroad, American distributors should be encouraged to increase the number of their buying offices abroad and to expand the operations of these offices.

7. Provide more employment opportunities for older people: The demand for labor in the long run is not limited, although the number of jobs at a given time may seem to be limited. Hence, employment of more older persons who want jobs means more output and a higher standard of living for all. If the working life of a person is extended by 3 to 5 years his lifetime output and earnings are substantially increased. The proportion of older persons in the population is growing and will be considerably greater in 20 or 30 years than it is today. Consequently, it is becoming increasingly important that older persons who prefer work to retirement be given an opportunity to work. Otherwise the output of the economy will fall substantially short of its potential and the burden of supporting retired workers will be heavy.

For at least 60 years the proportion of older persons in the labor force has been declining, and the usual age of retirement today is less than it was in 1890 or 1900. The decline in the proportion of older persons in the labor force has been the result of many causes, most of them beyond the control of the individual worker. Among these causes have been the shifts from a predominantly agricultural to a predominantly industrial economy and from self-employment to wage employment. The war brought about a substantial rise in the proportion of older persons in the labor force, and there are signs that the trend toward earlier retirements may have been checked. Management in many companies is making increased efforts to provide jobs for older workers. Increased attention should be paid to this problem.

8. Improve the incentives for efficiency among the rank and file of employees: The interest of tens of millions of employees in doing their best is bound to have an important effect upon the output of industry. Consequently, it is important for managements and unions to be sure that employees have ample reason to be eager and interested.

A survey of incentives in American industry would undoubtedly reveal great areas in which adequate incentive for rank and file workers are lacking. Indeed, there is reason to believe that the spread of seniority rules in the last 10 or 15 years has seriously weakened incentives among the hourly-rated employees in many branches of industry. Many seniority rules provide for promotion by straight seniority—that is, if ability is sufficient, the man with longer service gets the promotion. Length of service is undoubtedly entitled to substantial consideration, but ability and efficiency also have strong claims. In many contracts between unions and employers these claims are not adequately recognized. Workers are entitled to protection against favoritism and the abuse of discretion by supervisors. Nevertheless, management should retain the right to recognize ability and efficiency in making promotions among hourly-rated employees.

In many plants incentives for efficiency could be improved by changes in the methods of payment—such as replacing day work with piecework or other methods of payment by results. Such changes would be in the interest of the entire community as well as in the interest of the workers who would increase their output and their earnings.

9. Develop regular methods of drawing upon the knowledge and training of the labor force: As the work force becomes better educated and better trained, it becomes more capable of being a source of new ideas concerning ways of increasing production, improving quality, and cutting costs. It is easy to overlook the contribution that can be made by eager and interested workers. Suggestion systems and similar arrangements draw on the knowledge, experience, imagination, and inventiveness of workers. They are not novelties in American industry. From now on, such arrangements will be more important than ever, because the labor force is becoming a better source of ideas.

10. Abolish make-work rules and featherbedding: Fortunately, make-work rules have not become widespread in American industry and many unions are opposed to them. Nevertheless, they are serious in some industries. Some unions have introduced them as a device to absorb part of the workers who would otherwise be displaced by technological changes. In specific cases, temporary arrangements of this sort may be defended, but such arrangements are to be sharply distinguished from permanent make-work rules. Rules that force the wasteful utilization of labor are a burden to the entire community because they reduce the output of goods. Unions would find it advantageous to agree to abolish present make-work rules in return for wage increase. The union members as a whole would be as well off and the community as a whole, including the workers in other industries, would be better off because the output of goods would be larger.

In planning policies to raise real wages, the country should bear in mind that high productivity per man-hour, and hence high real wages, may be achieved today by methods that increase the difficulties of getting high output per man-hour, at some future date. A simple example is fishing by methods that destroy large quantities of young fish that have not reached commercial size. Another example is overgrazing of western grassland or plowing by methods that cause soil erosion. It is estimated, for example, that about 25 percent of the cropland is being damaged by a rapid rate of erosion. In many cases, a change to methods of production that will avoid reducing the future productivity of the country can be made with little or no loss in present output per man-hour. In other cases there is serious conflict between the short-run and long-run interests of the community in more production. Methods which would make possible the greatest possible output per man-hour in the long run may limit immediate output per man-hour.

Each generation has to decide for itself how much regard it will show for the well-being of future generations. It is not easy to decide how much production to sacrifice today in the hope of getting more output in the long run. On the one hand, the country must take account of the fact that raw materials are being consumed at an enormous rate. Even if output per man-hour rises no more rapidly than in the past and if population increases at a moderate rate, it appears that this country will consume more raw materials in the next 30 years than it used in the entire 150 years since 1800. On the other hand, some advances in technology make accessible new supplies of raw materials or make available substitute materials. The community must decide in each case whether to use methods that limit current output per man-hour but conserve raw materials for future use or whether to get the greatest possible output now and to count on technological advance to make available new sources of raw materials or substitute materials in the future.

V

The conclusions of this survey of the problem of increasing real wages may be summarized briefly. Success in raising real wages is in the main a matter of increasing output per man-hour. It is also a matter of keeping people steadily at work. The past record of the economy in raising output per man-hour has been good. The advance in pure science, many important technological discoveries, a great increase in capital per worker, a better educated and skilled work force, and better methods of management have made it possible for output per man-hour to treble during the last 50 years. The record of the economy in providing steady work has been uneven. More of the time employment has been high, the severe depressions have come from 10 to 20 years apart—1873–77, 1893–97, 1920–21, 1929–33. Between these severe depressions there have been declines of lesser magnitude.

The outlook is that the economy will continue to have good success in raising output per man-hour. There is reason to believe that improvements in the banking system, changes in the monetary system, developments in fiscal policy, and new economic institutions, such as unemployment compensation, have reduced the susceptibility of the economy to recessions. Only time will tell, however, how much real progress has been made. In judging the outlook for increases in real wages, allowance should be made for the fact that the amount of output going to nonworkers and the amount required for defense may substantially increase.

Fortunately, American conditions and institutions on the whole are favorable to economic progress. The country is remarkably well equipped to improve technology. During the last 10 years there has been an enormous expansion in the support of research by the Federal Government. There are a number of large enterprises in industry, particularly in the electrical industry, communications, chemicals, and petroleum products which are financing research on a considerable scale. The support of research by industry is growing rapidly and spreading to new fields. Specialized research institutes that do work on contract are increasing in number. There is vigorous competition in the economy between products and processes—between steel, aluminum and plastics; between paper and glass; between cloth and paper; between welding and machining; between welding, forging, and moulding; between railroads, airlines, buses, and trucks. There is a tradition of rapid scrapping of equipment. The volume of savings is large. The large number of business enterprises—4,000,000 outside of agriculture and 6,000,000 in agriculture—tends to make the economy dynamic. It is true that most of these enterprises only imitate the methods of more progressive concerns. Nevertheless, a multitude of places exist where new ideas may be

[7] Footnote by John D. Biggers: "I cannot agree with the statements that 'the Government should continue to encourage the increase in imports' and 'continue selective reduction of American tariffs.' In my opinion actions taken along these lines tend to create artificial and unsound benefits for some American and foreign interests at the expense of other American industries and American workmen. I believe experience will prove that they cause undesirable domestic dislocation without commensurate national gain. Furthermore, I am convinced that such policies constitute subsidies to foreign nations and deprive them of their incentive to be self-sufficient. Gifts never seem adequate to recipients; motives are suspected and over a period of time ill will results."

tried out, where problems may be solved in new ways. If a new method works, it is bound to be imitated. Since there are so many places where an improvement may originate, enterprises must be on the alert to improve their methods and products. This adds to the competitiveness of the economy. Finally, the American market is a large one and the rewards reaped by the most successful concerns are correspondingly large. Thus the incentive to be progressive and superior is great.

These fundamentally favorable conditions for advance in productivity indicate that the country has a good opportunity to raise real wages as rapidly in the future as in the past. The great rise in real wages in the past, and the gains in productivity that made it possible, have not come about automatically. And future advances will not be rapid unless we have many important scientific discoveries, good management in industry, and wise public policies. Particularly in this day and age when the operations of the economy depend so largely upon the policies of business, trade unions, and the Government; managers, trade-union leaders, and public officials alike have a responsibility to encourage more production and thus to make possible a continued advance in wages. Mistakes in policies might easily be costly and would retard the rise in real wages. Since public policies affect industry on a far greater scale than ever before, the need for Government policies that encourage production is especially great. If the leaders of industry, labor, and Government have a deep concern with raising real wages, if they plan with foresight and wisdom, the success of the country in advancing wages should be no less in the future than in the past.

Building Citadels of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am pleased to include the acceptance speech which my esteemed friend, Mrs. Hiram C. Houghton, delivered after she had been elected president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs at Boston, May 29, 1950.

Dorothy Houghton's home is in Red Oak, Iowa, a beautiful little city located in the Seventh Iowa District, which I have the honor to represent in the Halls of Congress.

I am happy about the well-deserved and high honor which has come to Dorothy, and we of the Seventh Iowa District are proud to claim Dorothy, her good husband, and family as our neighbors and friends.

Dorothy Houghton has the ability, character, and high patriotic purpose to lead her great organization forward for the good of every American and all peace-loving people of the world. This she can do and will do with the blessing and help of every good American.

BUILDING CITADELS OF FREEDOM

(By Mrs. Hiram C. Houghton)

I am profoundly moved by the trust that you have placed in me by electing me to this high office. There are no words which can adequately express, on an occasion like this, the sentiments which spring up within the human heart. Blended with the sense of joy which comes, is the sudden realization of the responsibilities which are incumbent upon such an office. This sense of the obligations which the leadership of this great organization entails is enhanced by the knowledge that, during the 60 years which have passed since the inception of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, it has been singularly blessed with competent, self-sacrificing and honored leadership. This knowledge of the distinguished leadership of the past, adds still greater challenge to those of us who are called upon to assume that leadership now and in the years to come.

I accept this post, fully cognizant of the responsibilities, the opportunities, and the challenges which accompany it. I also accept this post very conscious of my own shortcomings and limitations, and fully aware that only with the loyalty and cooperation of you and the clubwomen you represent, will the goal we seek be reached. I pledge to you, our leadership in the federation, here in convention assembled and to every member in every club, the dedication of such strength, talent, and ability as may be mine toward the accomplishment of the lofty objectives of our great organization.

I should also like to express my appreciation, from the deep places of my heart, to members of my family for their generosity and understanding, for the sacrifices they will make in sharing wife and mother with this organization for 2 years. Without their help their love, and their devotion, I could not stand in this place tonight. I shall be an Iowa commuter recognizing every cloud up in the air as I go back and forth.

As I look out over this great audience tonight, I see America at its very best. You have come from far and near, from all over this great country of ours, and from lands across the sea—to meet and understand each other—women from all countries—in a way that could not happen in any market place or forum. Each one here has made some contribution for the welfare of humanity. To see you gathered here is a dream and a vision come true, women who as leaders in their communities have become world leaders.

To you here assembled and to the members of the federation, I further pledge that we will appoint the ablest women in our organization to the department, division and committee chairmanships and that all will be experienced in the work to be done and will do it tirelessly and with vision and energy—the finest representatives of our federation family.

I intend that there will be a maximum of continuity in all of our programs and projects so that as we dream dreams and plan for the future, we may build on the firm foundations of past achievement. Nothing of value will be uprooted but rather continued and implemented. What could be finer than "mobilizing for peace," or "building better communities at home and abroad," themes developed by the retiring administration? Only we shall go further in mobilizing our moral and spiritual forces for peace and make our communities citadels of freedom.

In our organizational set-up, we hope to have a structure that will be streamlined and up-to-date. For instance, by changing the name of the American home department to family living, by putting citizenship into a public affairs department, by having a division of gerontology (planning life after middle age). We hope to have a division on economic development which will include the study of the Hoover Commission report, taxation, investments, and other financial interests important to women. We hope to have a new department of communications with a professional public-relations director, including radio and television, motion pictures, and press and publicity.

We expect to do away with duplication and endeavor to become more efficient. We hope to bring our program to you this fall by the officers of the federation going directly into your States to hold workshops. The first issue of the General Federation Clubwoman will be a directory, and a handbook, explaining the duties and purposes of the officers, department, division and committee chairmen of the General Federation. It will picture for you the goals of this great organization so that every club member will be fired with enthusiasm to do her share in combining her efforts with those of women in all parts of the world.

In September, a group of 35 official representatives of the General Federation will make a goodwill tour to Europe, visiting our clubs in seven countries. The purpose of the trip will be two fold—to personalize the hands of friendship we have stretched across the sea during the years, and to discover by observation and discussion how the federation can best serve these clubs in other lands. The Council of International Clubs, too, will be expanded and programs developed to meet the specific needs and interests of those clubs and their countries, and will be printed in their languages. Let's use our beautiful headquarters in Washington as a gathering place of freedom-loving people with clubwomen coming in to study our Government; with young people—not winning beauty contests or popularity votes but our best girl citizens in each State to come to Washington and get to know her own Federal Government; forums of organized womanhood; foreign delegations visiting us shall be welcome; we shall talk as friends and learn to know each other.

You have given me the great honor and privilege of visiting all of this Union. During the last 3 weeks I have made a circle of Utah, Nevada, Arizona, and New Mexico. When I stood at the rim of the Grand Canyon in the beauty and vastness of that place, I longed with all my heart that Mr. Truman, Mr. Stalin, Mr. Acheson and Mr. Molotov, might stand there in their conferences and negotiations—for surely, beauty is next to divinity, and right and fair decisions would be made and we would bring to reality the dream of one world.

This past week it has been my great privilege to visit Maine, with its coastal beauty; New Haven, Conn., with its renowned Yale University; and Providence, R. I.—so near to the cradle of America. Then, in between, I was in the great Middle West—in Ohio, Wisconsin, Missouri, and Nebraska. As I have flown over this country from coast to coast I have said over to myself many times, "America the beautiful, God shed His grace on thee and crown thy good with brotherhood, from sea to shining sea." In talking with people everywhere I am constantly struck by two things—the first is our personal freedom and the richness of the opportunity which is ours; the second is that most of us take it all so much for granted. We need a primer of democracy to teach us again the faith and ideals of our forefathers and to instill in us the passion and crusading spirit that was theirs.

So as I pledge my service to you, I ask that you will pledge your support to me for the next 2 years, when we are at the half-century mark, either fumbling at the lock of the golden age or facing world destruction. Whichever it will be depends very much upon the women of our country who carry the torch for the women of the world. A woman from Germany came last year to live with the women of Georgia. At the end of her visit she said, "If the women of my country had had the same opportunities and freedom that you women in America have (instead of

the back to the kitchen movement of Hitler), there never would have been World War II." What a challenge to us. Let us remodel our confused world. We have the machinery to do it with ready-made audiences, consisting of millions of trained minds eager for the opportunity to adopt and to promulgate the plans now in the minds of scientists, industrialists, political leaders, educators, ministers, artists, and philanthropists, who sense the vital need of all mankind for wider opportunity to contribute to knowledge such as would prompt deeper friendships and lead to a merging of the faith of yesterday with confidence of today in the ability to foster comradeship and brotherliness among all nations.

Unconsciously the General Federation of Women's Clubs has been preparing for this very test, through its cooperative efforts to know the women of all countries through the work of various departments of study. This activity has made it plain that nothing short of real comradeship can drive away fears and jealousies.

The admonition handed to the average remodeler is that nothing usable is to be destroyed. Living up to the changing demands of time is a test of the progressive mind which faces the necessity of remodeling opinions with determination and courage. A new idea in the world of affairs in like manner implies a demolition of the unusable that room must be available to those who bring glad tidings of a closer international understanding.

The stability and effectiveness of the hundreds of programs being presented by enthusiastic chairmen toward the lasting qualities of the GFWC as a force for lasting peace which the world is slowly taking into account, but which still needs constant call for laborers in the field to accomplish: (1) A strengthening of the American home; (2) equal opportunities for education for all children and young people; (3) every woman a participating citizen, voting, holding office, women working for women; (4) energizing the fine arts—communities singing, putting on plays—women creating together from early childhood through the later years all the fine arts; (5) a consciousness of the welfare of every person in the community—looking after the housing and jobs for all of our people on the local level; (6) a lively interest on the part of every woman in current events; (7) a direct interest—legislation—every woman corresponding with her Senators and Congressmen.

Let us eliminate lethargy, political sleeping sickness, apathy. Wake up, clubwomen. We have power unlimited. Let's use it.

My faith in the women of this country is deep and profound, and I truly feel that we can accomplish anything that we put our minds to do as we go into this administration as into a crusade—revitalized, reunited, and joined by millions who share our cause. Let us rededicate ourselves to the principles of liberty and the prevention of creeping socialism, remembering the courageous women of Australia, New Zealand, and Britain who mobilized to rescue their liberties. They worked to rescue their liberties; we are working to preserve ours.

There are 2,000,000 more women than men in our country, which makes us realize that we, the women, can save our Republic if we but awaken to the insidious Communist propaganda and statism which are spreading throughout our country, our institutions, and our Government. However, it is a known fact that, of the 150,000,000 people in the United States of America, there are only 1,000,000 Communists and fellow travelers, leaving 149,000,000 loyal Americans who may be counted upon to hold positions of responsibility and importance.

Today, when the loyalties of many in high places in our Government are being doubted, surely there are enough in the 149,000,000 other Americans to fill the positions of high responsibility and trust in our country. I suggest that, at the end of this outstanding convention here in Boston, we see that history repeats itself and that we, by our actions have another Boston Tea Party, when the tea of socialism, communism, and every other "ism" contrary to Americanism be dumped into the sea. Let every delegate to this convention, as she returns to her home, resolve to redouble her efforts to build a better community, to meet the needs in her town or city, to fill in the gaps in our democracy so that there will be no breeding places for any other "isms" in our beloved land. Then you will be a crusader for peace. Remember the words of Phillip Brooks of Old Trinity Church, also here in Boston, who said, "Many men fret themselves into nameless graves, while here and there a great unselfish soul forgets himself into immortality." Such immortality will be yours. Many men and women of America must work now to meet this great moment with the last full measure of devotion so that future generations will rise up and call us blessed. The best way we can pay our debt to the past is by making future generations indebted to us. Right now we need this Bill of Rights.

A BILL OF DUTIES FOR FREEMEN

"Guard all the freedoms of democracy as you guard your life, but never forget that to abuse them is to destroy them.

"Don't ask Government to do anything you can do for yourself. The bigger the government, the smaller the people.

"Don't rely on somebody else to do your thinking for your. Democracy demands mental alertness from those who deserve to have it.

"Protect your own right to be wrong by a decent respect for the opinions of others.

"Strive for new ways of spread the benefits and ownership of our industrial democracy and to give everyone a greater sense of participation and accomplishment.

"Remember that a classless society is the essence of democracy. A class struggle is its mortal enemy.

"Heed the rule of democracy that it works best from the bottom up. When it works well at the community level, it will function smoothly at the top.

"Remember that change and experiment are the foods on which democracy thrives, but don't renounce a proved good for a glib promise.

"Remember that the bargain-counter days for democracy are over, and that our democracy is on display before a questioning world. Each of us is its custodian."

Paul Revere, on the 18th of April, saw the lantern hang aloft in the belfry of the Old North Church that gave him the signal to spread the alarm for the country folk to be up into arms. When he made his cry of defiance and not of fear, a voice in the darkness, a knock at the door, and a word that shall echo forevermore. The fate of a nation was riding that night. The modern men who awakened us are Dean Acheson and Herbert Hoover, who have told us to mobilize our moral material resources and to do it quickly. These are the modern Paul Reveres who have seen the sign in the belfry tower and, due to fast communication and transportation, didn't have to ride the horse at midnight, but have told us over the radio and on television that we must wake up, and be at it just as Paul Revere wakened the people.

Our clubwomen have an unequaled opportunity in their communities, because they are leaders, because they have an effective organization, to make every neighborhood in this great country of ours an outpost of democracy, a citadel of freedom—a citadel whose spires reach the Most High, whose beams radiate to the farthest corners of the earth.

I speak with all the seriousness which I possess when I say that the next few years in our history will be the most trying in the records of mankind. We enter these years in the midst of the most gigantic civil war man has ever known. It is not a civil war confined within the boundaries of one nation—it is rather a civil war confined within the narrow limits of a tiny planet, called Earth. Upon this tiny planet, two and a half billion members of the human family make their homes. Today, this tiny homeland—the Earth—is engaged in a colossal struggle to determine if mankind shall be slave or free. It is a struggle in which there can be no compromise. It is a struggle to the death—the death, either of the philosophy of the slavery of the individual, or of the philosophy of the freedom of the individual. There is no half-way point in this earth-wide civil war; no middle ground upon which mankind can vacillate nor waver in his allegiance. Either every individual stands for human freedom or for human slavery. The line is clearly drawn—the pattern is unmistakably plain.

We must go farther in this civil war than our organization has ever gone in all its history—we must not only clarify the issues—we must take definite steps to marshal our forces as women to bring about better understanding among the peoples of the world, and I am against the coddling of the Communists. So I propose that we offer to the President of the United States, the services of our organization to meet any task he cares to lay upon us. I would like to choose for his approval 12 of our leaders as a group on which he could call at need to implement the desires of all of us for better understanding among ourselves and the other nations of the world. I have suggested the number, 12, because that number has a biblical tradition. That would be apostles of peace, messengers of good will—women who love peace as passionately as they hate war, who by their honest and sincere leadership, with intellectual clarity and moral courage, would direct our united effort to serve with four goals: (1) To keep on revitalizing Europe; (2) To give moral support to Asia; (3) To prepare ourselves for the saving of our country, even if it is stockpiling against Russia; and to strengthen all America to lead the world to a perfect peace.

You remember the Chinese proverb. "Under heaven there is but one family." We have come a long way since the time of every family's own little world. What happens anywhere in the world is our business. It has taken bitter experience to teach us that the whole world is our backyard, so that barriers are down in the minds of women and they can hold neighborly, backyard fence conversations with their sisters everywhere. Because we have made such a good start in our own organization in building better understanding, as witness the presence of so many international delegates at this convention, we feel that this group of 12 women, in cooperation with other women's groups in this country and overseas, may become minute men for the protection of the individual liberties and freedom of the human spirit.

If the services of this commission of women should be accepted, we must undergird their efforts with our prayers. The world needs the power of prayer which each individual heart can give.

Something there must be that we love more than ourselves. Some good there must be beside material enrichment and the lust for power and position. Some reward there must be on earth, founded on good will, selflessness, and the innate dignity of the human spirit. To feel this way, we must

step up one more rock—to elevate our sights and push out our horizons.

"I held a part of heaven in my hand
Today because I climbed a shining hill.
(You of the valley will not understand,
But if you've lived on mountain-tops, you will.)
No mortal stature ever reached so high,
But I was all there is of earth and space
Because I climbed a hill and touched the sky
And felt its blueness on my lifted face.
I was a God-child with new wings to wear,
New Wings so wide their feathers brushed the dawn.
They silvered all of everything: the air
I breathed, the living ground I stood upon.
How dark the world! How dull all worldly things!
Today I wore an angel's listing wings!"

Time is running out; the means are at hand to destroy ourselves unless somehow we can share the miracle of the revival of the love of good and throw off the black coat that shrouds the human spirit and let in the sunlight of honor, humility, decency, and courage, and walk erect in the sight of God.

Therefore, let us work, not with trembling hands but with serene and glorious faith in American ability to prove herself worthy of her destiny, with fresh courage, reawakened patriotism, passionate loyalty and courageous action. Let us build citadels of freedom.

Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under prior authority to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit a letter transmitting a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 22, of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, regarding the recent Supreme Court decision in connection with the tidelands and memorializing the Congress to enact legislation to restore the tidelands to the States to whom they rightfully belong.

Mr. Speaker, I also request that the resolution referred to be printed in the RECORD.

The letter and resolution follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
STATE OF LOUISIANA,
Baton Rouge, June 16, 1950.

Congressman HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LARCADE: We are pleased to transmit herewith a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 22, which has been adopted by the house.

With very best wishes, I remain,
Very truly yours,
LEE LAYCOCK,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

House Concurrent Resolution 22

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation restoring to the State of Louisiana and other coastal States title to the tidelands

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has handed down a decision decreeing that the title to the Louisiana tidelands is vested in the Federal Government; and

Whereas this decision has the effect of depriving the State of Louisiana of millions of dollars in mineral and fishing rights in its coastal waters; and

Whereas the tidelands have been regarded historically as belonging to the respective coastal States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of Louisiana (the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact appropriate legislation restoring to the State of Louisiana and other coastal States title to the tidelands; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each Congressman and Senator from the State of Louisiana.

Letter From Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Edward Menhennett, Binghamton, N. Y:

BINGHAMTON, N. Y.

Hon. EDWIN A. HALL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This letter is to inform you that your record in Congress here in my Thirty-seventh Congressional District and is very pleasing to us all. You have always tried to study every measure you voted for, before voting. You have always answered every letter that was written to you and you are not so big that you ignored anybody. The rich smoogers who are trying to dethrone you are vampires and paid politicians. And Ed, you have never forgotten us old folks.

Hoping you will continue to serve us in Congress for many years to come, I remain
Sincerely,
EDWARD MENHENNETT.

Commencement Address by the Vice President of the United States at the University of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very worth while and thoughtful address delivered by the Vice President at the commencement exercises at the University of Connecticut, at Storrs, Conn., on June 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President and members of the class, I am greatly complimented by the invitation to deliver your commencement address on this occasion.

Every man or women who makes bold to address a graduating class is under great obligations, as well as some embarrassment. He is torn between the temptation to use the graduating exercises as a springboard from which to leap into the discussion of some public problem, or to offer some practical suggestions that may be of value to the class itself.

I shall be happy and satisfied if I may speak to you in a practical way about the problems that face you and will face you as citizens of the American Republic.

You have gone through the allotted course which brings you to this event. You have had your associations and you will have your memories. You have been and will be influenced by them both. They are a part of the curriculum of a college education, no less than the textbooks through which you have struggled.

Everyone who emerges from a college or university, or even a high school, assumes a greater obligation than is assumed by those who do not enjoy this privilege.

Commencement day is frequently referred to as the beginning of one's active life. But this is inadequate and inaccurate. We have been living from the day of our birth in the realities of actual life. The first period may have witnessed our building of castles in the air, but they are a part of our life and have played their part in the anticipation of an idealistic, if not always realistic, prospect for the future.

In your studies, and in all studies which man must make, there must be a realization of the difference between knowledge and wisdom.

The facilities for the attainment of knowledge have multiplied in the last half century to such an extent that we consider it as the most prolific half century in the world's history in the attainment of knowledge. We have learned more about the secrets of nature. We have learned more about the sciences, the arts, the intimate relationships between one part of nature and another, and we have made greater progress in applying this knowledge to the practical affairs of life than in any other similar period in history.

When I graduated four and one-half decades ago, the class orator advised us that man had about reached the end of his growth in inventive genius. He told us that nearly everything had been done that could or ought to be done; that all the great books had been written, and all the great mechanical devices had been perfected. Yet, since that pessimistic prediction, the inventive genius of man has outstripped all previous periods, and the literary attainments of this period have, in many respects, had similar advancements. The automobile, the airplane, the radio, wireless telegraphy, the Diesel engine, and many other inventions, which have transformed the habits of life and thought among all our people, have been brought forth. More great books, in the way of biography, political science, medicine, and literature in all its branches, have been produced since that day than in any similar period of history.

Our class orator was not the only pessimist. Fifty years ago a prominent American made the statement that while electricity was interesting and its discovery was a new departure as a sort of fad, it could never be perfected or used for any broad or general purpose.

Nevertheless, the use of electric power has been so extended and multiplied as to rapidly

take the place of coal and timber, and other power-giving elements of nature. Through its use, the human voice is enabled to circle the globe, and great advancements in the cure of physical diseases are due to the use of electricity.

In the field of medicine such progress has been made in research and the application of remedial treatments, that the span of human life has been practically doubled.

We dwell in the rarefied atmosphere of inventions and progress which makes it seem sometimes possible to reach out the hand and touch every nation and every planet in the firmament.

The later years of this half century have brought us the discovery of atomic energy and hydrogenic energy, the use of which may determine the course of civilization.

These energies have always been in existence, just as electricity, but man has been tardy in their discovery and in their use, and the great problem that faces humanity today is whether this knowledge will be wisely used or used for the destruction of man and his accumulated works through the centuries.

These examples could be multiplied as proof of the fact that we now have greater facilities for the rapid acquisition of knowledge than ever before.

This wealth of knowledge and of opportunity places upon the educated man and woman an intensified obligation to bring this knowledge to the attention of all the people and diffuse it among them as widely as possible, in order that they may enjoy whatever advantage it may bring to them in better qualification to render the decisions which they must render in regard to the policies of our Nation, both domestic and international.

The obligation to society that now rests upon the educated man and woman is greater than ever before, because it involves fundamental and sometimes fatal decisions as to the course of society and of history.

During the last year of the war, especially with Japan, the President of the United States rested under a terrific obligation for a momentous decision involving the question of whether the atomic bomb should be used to hasten the conclusion of the war, although it meant widespread destruction of lives and property. It was a terrific decision for any man to make, but he decided that it was better to use it to bring to a successful termination a bloody war, than to have it prolonged for probably a year, costing infinitely more lives and more property than was involved in the use of this weapon. And this whole situation may require other tragic decisions on the part of governments and of society as a whole.

We have the knowledge in regard to atomic energy. Other nations are seeking it, and some may have it. And it seems tragic that the peace of the world and the fate of nations may rest upon the rapidity with which one or all nations secure this weapon, either for defense or for aggression.

We desire to use it only for defense. Other nations may wish to use it for aggression, but we cannot afford to be caught with our lamps untrimmed and our house out of order. But, what a tragedy to mankind it is that selfish and ambitious nations, ruthless and godless, make it necessary to devote the use of this great and powerful energy to the uses of destruction, rather than for constructive purposes to enable all men to live more happily and contentedly and without the fear which now grips the world.

There are many other fields in which men must draw the distinction between mere knowledge and its use for wise purposes. We believe that God placed this and other great powers in the hands of man, and gave him the intellectual capacity to discover and develop these and other natural resources.

This is not only true of the mysterious elements of nature, but it is true of many fields where knowledge is in the possession of the average man and woman. It applies to the development of our natural resources, the reclamation of arid lands, the conservation of our soil and mineral deposits, the latent power lying in the bodies of our navigable streams; research into greater markets, and uses for the products of the soil; the greater development of international trade to give employment to the millions of workers, whose products must find markets if they are to have employment.

But these things must be carried on through the cooperation of mankind with one another, and through the cooperation of mankind with their governments, which are symbols of organized society.

Every educated man and woman must make available to others the knowledge which the State has enabled him to acquire, either through taxation or through private benefaction. There was a time when the education of children was regarded as a private affair. That time passed a century and a half ago. We have long recognized that the public has an interest in the education of every child. We know now that whatever raises the standard of life anywhere, raises it everywhere, and, by the same token, whatever lowers it anywhere, lowers it everywhere. We are under a greater obligation than ever before to defend our democracy, our way of life, our traditions, our freedoms, our free enterprise.

But Government cannot be unconcerned in regard to these developments, because, as the complexity of our lives has increased due to the inventive genius of man, government has been compelled, more and more, to offer its service in the guidance of a great people and in their protection in the enjoyment of their rights. This increase in governmental activity is criticized and objected to by many honest people. But, it would be difficult to point out any activity, which they have demanded of their Government, and which it has accepted, that they would be willing to abandon. It is difficult to turn back when a people are on the march.

We are confronted today with a divided world. For more than a century and a half, we have been devoted to democracy and to the individual rights of men, women, and children. We have always advocated, and still believe, that governments are created for man, and not man for governments. We do not believe that man is a mere insignificant cog in a great, giant wheel, juggernauting over the world and riding ruthlessly over the individual freedoms which we have come to cherish, in order that there may be created or maintained a system of statism that makes a man but an atom and a pawn.

Government is organized society in motion. It is the only agency of the people having authority to enforce its decrees. But, that does not mean that Government should be the master of the people. It means that it should be their servant, responsive to their will, constantly on the alert for opportunities to be of service and guidance in the theory and practice of democracy to all the people.

Through all these agencies and all these activities, we must keep our country strong, not only from a military and naval standpoint, but also from an economic, moral, intellectual, and spiritual standpoint. We must constantly endeavor to make our people realize that ours is the best form of government and the best way of life yet devised by the brain of man; that it is worth defending and preserving and handing on to the generations to come, not only here, but, through our influence and example, in all parts of the world.

We have learned the hard way that we cannot be prosperous if the rest of the world is prostrate; that we cannot be free, if the rest of the world is enslaved.

In view of the tragic divisions which have been created, for one reason or another, among the peoples of the world, every educated man and woman rests under a more profound obligation to preserve, defend, and advance the lot of free existence, than ever before in history. No matter what your occupation may be, no matter whether on the peaks of achievement and publicity, or in the shadows in the valleys between these peaks where the light of publicity seldom penetrates, you will rest under that obligation and that challenge.

You are emerging from a great institution of learning, in which every citizen of your State and of the Nation is profoundly interested. It is gratifying that more graduates have been turned out by colleges and universities in 1950, than in any previous year of our history. It is gratifying that every worthy institution is bulging to its complete capacity with students searching for the knowledge and equipment necessary to enable them to play a full part in the shaping of our destiny and the elevation of the standards of society.

You have come to this day through the sacrifices of many people, including the taxpayers and your own friends and relatives. I feel profoundly certain that this obligation has not escaped your attention, and that you will, in the future, render to that society, which has made this day possible, that service for which you have been equipped and which the world awaits.

Our Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Our Farm Program," which I delivered before the Western Region Farm Bureau Conference at Fort Collins, Colo., on June 17, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FARM PROGRAM

For the last several months we have been hearing a great deal about farm surpluses. Newspaper and radio accounts of the Government's price-support operations have tended to create the impression that agriculture is confronted with huge, unmanageable stocks of deteriorating farm commodities. Many of these accounts apparently have been based on a misunderstanding of the facts. The impression they have created in the public mind is to a large extent, false. As farm organization leaders, you have a responsibility to see that the facts are made clear to the public.

What are the facts? In the first place, agriculture is going through a period of readjustment. As you well know the war made it necessary for the Government to encourage a greatly expanded production of many farm commodities just as it was necessary to expand the production of ships, planes, guns, and other war essentials. After the war ended, we asked farmers for an even greater production of some commodities, so that the United States could prevent starvation

in war-torn areas and help to bring about the economic recovery of these areas essential to the development of a permanent peace. Today, 4 years after the end of the fighting war, we have reached a point where domestic agricultural production coupled with declining foreign demand due to increased production in other countries has built up our stocks of some farm commodities to the point that we now need to adjust our production to a more normal basis. This is the first year since the end of the war that we have had acreage allotments or marketing quotas in effect, except on such comparatively minor crops as tobacco and peanuts, plus an unsuccessful attempt to control the production of potatoes.

Agriculture is just now finding itself in the position that many other war-stimulated industries found themselves in at the end of hostilities 4 years ago. The Government spent billions of dollars liquidating war contracts with industry. Is there anything scandalous about spending some funds—a very much smaller amount—to help agriculture adjust to a postwar basis? Of course not.

Incidentally, I believe you will be interested in knowing how little we have really lost on price supports. This subject came up on a recent radio broadcast in which I participated with Congressman COOLEY, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee and others. Mr. COOLEY pointed out that a total of $10,000,000,000 has been invested in price-support programs since 1933. These operations have resulted in losses totaling $713,000,000 and profits totaling $217,000,000, or a net loss of $496,000,000. Mr. COOLEY went on to point out that potatoes have accounted for $355,000,000 of the total lost and that only $141,000,000 has been lost on all other commodities in 17 years. That is a very excellent record.

In the second place, our so-called surpluses are not merely as large as the public apparently thinks they are. We do have relatively large stocks of some farm commodities, but these stocks are not all surpluses. Farmers do not control growing conditions and cannot make crop yields come out exactly in line with needs every year. We need some reserves of food, feed, and fiber to meet unexpected requirements and to tide us over in years when we may have short crops due to unfavorable weather or other conditions. It is only when we have more than we need for current use and reasonable reserves that we can say we have a surplus. This situation prevails today for a very few commodities.

The public's concern over farm commodity stocks apparently arises primarily out of the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation has invested Government money in reserve stocks of some commodities through the price-support program. Most of the stocks owned or controlled by the CCC consist of storable commodities. On March 31, 1950, the CCC had a total outstanding investment of $4,020,909,000 in price-support program loans and inventories. Almost $3,000,000,000 of this total sum was invested in three storable commodities—corn, wheat, and cotton. The remaining $1,000,000,000 was also largely invested in storable commodities or commodities which had been converted to storable form.

It now appears that we will carry over approximately 450,000,000 bushels of wheat, 950,000,000 bushels of corn, and 7,500,000 bales of cotton this year. This is more corn than we have carried over at any time in the past, but we are consuming more corn than was the case before the war. Our prospective wheat carry-over is substantially less than the stocks we were carrying in 1941 and 1942. Our cotton reserve is far below the 13,000,000 bales we carried over in 1939. In the case of these three commodities, the supplies we have today should be viewed as "reserves" rather than "surpluses." The same thing is true in the case of most of our other storable commodities.

Please do not misunderstand me. I am not advocating that we continue to pile up reserve stocks. I am merely saying that the stocks we now have are nothing to be alarmed about. In fact they may prove to be a real blessing. As you people here in the West know only too well, crop production is getting off to a slow start this year. The Department of Agriculture's estimate of the winter wheat crop fell 121,000,000 bushels from December to April and another 74,000,000 bushels from April to May. As it fell, the carry-over began to look less like a liability and more like an asset.

It looks like we will reduce our wheat carry-over somewhat in the coming marketing year. And unless yields turn out unusually favorable, we may also cut into our reserve supplies of corn and cotton. We should not forget that farm production has been unusually high for several years, because weather conditions have been generally favorable. Despite a few bad crop years for individual commodities, it is probable that we have had more consecutive favorable growing seasons since the beginning of the war than in any other comparable period on record.

Our present supply of corn exceeds a normal supply by only enough to last our population for 67 days. Our cotton supply exceeds normal by only enough to meet our domestic and export needs for 93 days. Our wheat stocks are above normal by only enough to meet our needs for 112 days.

Reasonable reserves of storable farm commodities are the best insurance consumers can have against shortages and unreasonable prices, because the prices of farm products skyrocket when supplies fall short of needs.

A single year of the kind of weather we had in 1947 would wipe out our present reserve stocks of corn. The short 1947 corn crop caught us without adequate reserves. I am sure that everyone can remember the resulting difficulties. We had a feed-conservation program. Even so the production of meat and other livestock products went down and prices went up. We had meatless days and poultryless days. Both farmers and consumers suffered. This was only 2 years ago—our memories are short, aren't they?

The publicity which has developed out of the Government's price-support operations on potatoes and eggs has tended to magnify the surplus problem. The potato and egg programs are both carry-overs from the war period when high-level price supports were established for certain commodities to stimulate increased production.

The Government's stocks of dried eggs probably represent a real surplus as far as our domestic economy is concerned since these stocks consist of dried whole eggs—a product for which there is little demand in this country. The best thing we can do with these dried eggs is to try to find a home for them abroad. Incidentally, this surplus of dried eggs could have been avoided if Congress had enacted legislation to permit a reduction in the support price of eggs 2 years ago. It is to the credit of the American Farm Bureau Federation's poultry committee and various other poultry industry groups that you recommended a program that, had it been followed, would have avoided many of the difficulties encountered with egg surpluses.

I suppose that everyone has heard that we had a surplus of potatoes, but I doubt that many people realize that this surplus consisted largely of low-grade potatoes. More than 80 percent of the surplus potatoes which the Department of Agriculture purchased under the 1949 price-support program were No. 2 potatoes. The surplus of No. 1 potatoes was very small.

The principal reason we had a surplus of potatoes is that potato yields have been increasing at an unprecedented rate. In each of the last three crops for which individual farm goals have been established the national planted acreage of potatoes has been less than the acreage goal which potato producers were asked to plant.

The acreage planted to potatoes in 1949 was the smallest since 1878. If the acreage planted to potatoes in 1949 had produced a yield similar to the 1945 yield of 155 bushels per acre, which was the record high yield harvested up to that time, we would have had a shortage. However, the 1949 crop actually averaged 211 bushels per acre and we had a surplus. You can't charge that to a farm program.

From time to time we hear it charged that the farm program is forcing consumers to pay unreasonable prices for the necessities of life. These charges originate with the uninformed, with those who would abolish all price supports, and with those who want to convince consumers that they would get a better deal if production payments were substituted for price supports. Regardless of where they originate, the charges that the farm program is keeping food prices high in America are false. As a matter of fact, food is relatively cheap in this country.

It takes fewer hours of work to earn the money to pay for food in America than in any other major country in the world. For example, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that it takes a worker 4 minutes to earn the price of a pound of flour in the United States; it takes 13 minutes in Chile; 20 minutes in France; and 52 in Russia. To earn a pound of butter it takes 32 minutes work in the United States; 45 minutes in Canada; 146 in France, and 542 in Russia.

The fact that food prices are higher today than before the war is evidence that the value of the dollar went down during the inflation which resulted from the war. It is not evidence that consumers are worse off than they were before the war. As a matter of fact, when the increase in consumer incomes is considered, consumers are better off than they were before the war.

In 1935–39, consumers spent 23 percent of their disposable income for food. Currently, they are spending 27 percent; however, they are eating better. If the American people ate the same varieties and per capita quantities that they ate in 1935–39, that food which cost consumers 23 percent of their income in those years would cost them only 19 percent of their income today. I wish the newspapers would play that up and give the farm program a rest.

Food prices have already come down substantially from the postwar highs. At the prices prevailing in July 1948, the annual retail cost of a market basket of food for a family of three average consumers was $712. In March 1950, the same quantity of food could be purchased for $615. During this period, when the retail cost of an annual food supply for a family of three was falling $97, the net farm value of this food fell about $76 while charges made for services performed after the commodities left the farm declined less than $22. This illustrates the point that lower prices to farmers don't necessarily result in substantially cheaper food for consumers. The price of bread actually increased slightly during a recent 18-month period in which the price of wheat fell more than 30 percent.

Consumers should expect to pay a fair price for food—just as they expect farmers and ranchers to pay a fair price for the things they buy.

The farmers and ranchers of the West have a real stake in improved diets. The fruits, vegetables, and livestock products which you produce are commodities which will be used in greater abundance if we can get consumers to upgrade their diets.

We know from experience that consumer demand for meat goes up when consumers have money to spend. At the time of the great meat shortage 2 years ago, consumers actually were eating 20 pounds more per capita than they ate in 1935–39. They wanted more partly because they had more money, and partly because certain other com-

modities such as automobiles were hard to get. Now that other commodities are available, we have to work at the job of making people want an adequate diet ahead of other things that are competing for the consumer's dollar.

No area of the country stands to lose more than the West from a campaign to convince consumers that food prices are high because of price supports and that a good diet isn't worth the cost. You and I know that there are no price supports on meats or on many of the other products that you produce, but many consumers do not know this. Statements that the price support program is forcing consumers to pay unreasonable prices will react just as quickly against the consumption of the products that are unsupported as against those which have supports. You should take immediate action to counter the misdirected efforts that are prejudicing consumers against farmers, and leading them to believe that food is costing them more than its worth.

An upgraded diet, which includes increased consumption of livestock products, can help agriculture in a number of ways. Livestock production provides an outlet for grains which might otherwise become surplus. It takes about seven times as much land to feed people if we feed our grain to livestock and eat meat and dairy products than is required if we eat the grain in more direct form ourselves. Livestock production promotes increased acreages of grass and hay. A grasslands agriculture is easy on the soil and helps to conserve it. Besides, livestock production offers the farmer a chance to get a larger percentage of the consumer's dollar, since the farmer ordinarily gets a larger than average part of the consumer dollar when it is spent for livestock products.

Consumers ought to be willing to pay reasonable prices for a good diet. It's worth the money. It is not the responsibility of the Government to "pick up the check" for a part of every citizen's grocery bill. There is, however, a legitimate place for programs such as the school-lunch program, and perhaps a limited food-subsidy program based on need such as the food-stamp plan, which we experimented with on a limited basis before the war.

Price-support programs have undergone a gradual evolution in the more than 20 years since the Federal Farm Board made its futile effort to stabilize farm prices by surplus purchases. At the present time support operations are largely governed by the Agricultural Act of 1949. The basic principles of this act are that price supports should be used to help farmers adjust production to effective consumer demand, and to assist farmers to get a fair price in the market place.

The present law is based on our entire experience with farm price-support program. Prior to 1940, price supports were mandatory on only three commodities, corn, wheat, and cotton, although some others were supported. Except in the case of corn which had a flexible schedule of supports, support levels were discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture, subject only to the limitation that cotton and wheat must be supported within the range of 52 to 75 percent of parity. As a matter of practice, supports were generally set near the bottom of this range.

When the war broke out and it became evident that we were going to need increased supplies of many farm commodities, Congress sent price supports to war by passing the Steagall and Bankhead amendments. These amendments raised the support level for the basic commodities to 90 percent of parity and provided that prices of nonbasic commodities should also be supported at not less than 90 percent of parity whenever the Secretary of Agriculture found it necessary to ask for increased production. Farmers were promised that this protection would be continued for two full calendar years after the end of hostilities. We all know that this program made an outstanding contribution to our war effort by providing farmers with an incentive for all-out production of the products most needed in the war effort.

The end of the war stimulated a widespread discussion of postwar farm policy among farm organizations and Government agencies, which are concerned with farm policy, the Congress, and the people generally. It was agreed that a new program would be needed when the wartime authority for 90 percent of parity supports expired, because it was felt that the prewar level of supports was too low and that the 90 percent program would stimulate a greater production than could be absorbed by the postwar economy. We had early evidence of this when the 1946 potato program rolled up a cost of more than $90,000,000.

As Secretary of Agriculture, I set up a postwar farm policy study committee within the Department of Agriculture and requested numerous subcommittees to make a study of the entire postwar farm outlook and to develop recommendations for a postwar farm program. As a result, the Department was ready with carefully considered recommendations when the Agriculture Committees of the House and Senate began their own studies in the spring of 1947. Time after time I appeared before these committees to urge that Congress enact legislation providing for a workable, long-range farm price-support program.

Our thinking in the Department on price supports at that time was summarized in a statement which Carl C. Farrington, then Assistant Administrator of PMA, presented to the House and Senate Agriculture Committees on October 7, 1947. Speaking for the Department and with my full approval, Mr. Farrington said:

"Our committee spent a great deal of time studying this question in light of our past experience and arrived at several general principles which we believe should characterize future price-support programs.

"First, a high degree of flexibility, both as to support levels and methods, is essential in view of differences between commodities and constantly changing conditions that cannot be foreseen.

"Second, mandatory loan and purchase operations probably should be limited generally to storable commodities. Mandatory loan and purchase operations on perishable commodities inevitably lead to dumping and waste.

"Third, the minimum support level should be considerably below the general level of prices sought to be achieved over a period of years. This would allow price to influence the allocation of resources among different commodities and bring about basic shifts in the pattern of production. However, there should be discretionary power to establish price supports of any commodity above the mandatory level in order to encourage needed production shifts and better meet the basic food needs of our people.

"We have given much thought to the percentage of modernized parity which might be used as a minimum price floor. Our studies indicate that 50 percent of parity, for example, might not be high enough to act as an effective stop-loss mechanism and 90 percent might force us into a completely managed agricultural economy."

Although the statement I have just quoted does not indicate the range of price support that the Department considered desirable, it was my belief that a range of 75 to 90 percent of parity would be about right.

While the Department of Agriculture was making its studies, the leading farm organizations were also studying the question of postwar farm policy. Naturally, I was gratified when the three general farm organizations—the American Farm Bureau Federation, National Grange, and National Farmers Union—also came to the conclusion that postwar price supports should be flexible even if one organization has other ideas now. The principle of flexibility was written into the law by the Agricultural Act of 1948, and was carried forward in the Agricultural Act of 1949.

The reasoning behind flexible price supports is simple and completely defensible. We ought to make price suports consistent with consumer needs for a commodity. If supplies are short, we can afford to raise support levels so as to encourage the production of increased supplies. If supplies are excessive, we ought not to make it difficult for farmers to adjust their production by holding out an incentive price support at the same time we are asking them to cut production. With flexible price supports, we avoid pricing ourselves out of domestic and foreign markets at times when we most need expanded markets. By encouraging farmers to shift production to commodities which are most in demand and by stimulating increased consumption in times of large supply, flexible price supports help to keep Government controls to a minimum. At the same time, flexible price supports are designed to keep the tax cost of the price-support program within reasonable limits, and thus help to avoid jeopardizing the public support for our farm program.

As one of the authors and possibly the principal author of the Agricultural Act of 1949, I am proud that it was enacted by a bipartisan majority of the House and Senate. I hope that there may never come a day when I will not be rough and vigorous on Republicans who fail to do their duty by the farmers of this Nation, and I will assuredly campaign for the Democratic Party with vigor this fall and in every election as long as I am physically able to, but I have never believed that farm legislation should be a partisan issue. Good farm legislation requires the best efforts of both parties.

I am also proud of the fact that the 1949 act was based on the recommendations of responsible farm organizations. I believe firmly in the desirability—in fact the necessity—of farmers speaking through the farm organization of their choice. What better guide does the Congress have as to what farmers are thinking than the recommendations of constructive farm organizations whose policies are democratically developed? The Congress needs this assistance. Farmers and ranchers can't afford not to provide it.

Although it contains much that is meritorious, the Agricultural Act of 1949 is not perfect. The major defects of the law are that the final version postpones full application of the flexible provisions until 1952, and provides a double parity standard for the basic commodities for 4 years. The act continues the wartime 90 percent of parity support program on the basic commodities through the current crop year. It provides for flexible price supports within the range of 80 to 90 percent of parity on 1951 crops and flexible supports ranging from 75 to 90 percent of parity for 1952 and subsequent crops.

Flexible-price supports were authorized for the nonbasic commodities effective with 1950 production, and the Secretary of Agriculture's announcements of 1950 programs indicate that he is using this authority to adjust support levels to the conditions prevailing with respect to the various commodities.

Under the dual parity provision of the act, the parity prices of the basic commodities are to be the higher of the parity prices computed under the old and modified parity formulas. I recognize that this double standard is completely indefensible. It would have been better to have let the new parity formula come into effect on all commodities last January; however, it is probable that less damage has been done than appears on the surface. The dual standard currently affects the parity prices of

only three commodities—corn, wheat, and cotton. It is to be effective for only 4 years, and economists believe that the two standards may gradually move closer together during that period.

As you well know, the American Farm Bureau vigorously opposed the postponement of flexible supports and the double parity standard. When we are able to look back a few years from now, I am sure that the wisdom of your organization's position will be clearly evident.

I hope that none of you leaders belong to the "why don't ya" school. That's what I call the group of people who are continually asking "Why don't ya do this?" or "Why don't ya do that?" with farm-program legislation.

Several Members of Congress just know that they could write a really good farm bill. I'm confident that the American Farm Bureau Federation feels that it could improve the act of 1949, but it isn't as easy as some people seem to think to do what you would like to do legislatively. I am glad that you people have recognized that fact by recommending that the Agricultural Act of 1949 be given a fair trial even though you do not entirely agree with all of its provisions.

Let us look at why we find certain provisions of the 1949 act the way they are. On July 5, 1949, Senator THOMAS, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, appointed me chairman of a subcommittee consisting of ourselves and Senators HOEY, HOLLAND, AIKEN, YOUNG, and THYE to hold hearings on the Brannan plan. After the hearings were completed, it was evident that the subcommittee had an overwhelming disposition not to report the Brannan plan bill, but that it was about equally divided as to what it wished to do other than that. We polled the committee, after the House passed the Gore 90-percent bill, and learned that three members desired to report the House bill just as it came to us; three were at least willing to experiment with the suggestions I had made for revising the schedules in the Aiken Act to provide for a range of 75 to 90 percent of parity. The seventh member, Senator THOMAS, generally speaking, was in favor of the Brannan plan, and lacking support for that, in favor of even higher support levels than those carried by the House bill. It was evident that we would have to move with extreme caution if we were to meet the demand that certainly did exist for new legislation without destroying the flexible features of the 1948 act.

We decided to try to draft a bill. There has been a great deal of fun poked at the number of drafts we wrote before we finally got a bill. I make no apology for that. If we had not made the effort that we did to reconcile conflicting views within the subcommittee, the probabilities are that the Senate would have passed the House bill and that we would not yet have permanent price-support legislation. In order to get the subcommittee together on a bill, it was necessary to put in a provision continuing the existing 60 to 90 percent of parity mandatory support program on potatoes. If we had not done that, we would have lost two votes in the subcommitee and would have lacked the votes to report a bill providing for flexible supports.

It was also necessary to postpone the application of flexible supports to the basic commodities by providing for a 90 percent of parity support program on the 1950 crop of any basic commodity for which marketing quotas or acreage allotments are in effect. While I would have preferred to make the flexible provisions of the bill fully effective this year, I do not believe that the 1-year extension of 90-percent supports for the basic commodities is too bad. It was a rather inexpensive way to get out of a bad situation. It was repeatedly pointed out that a lot of wheat which would be harvested in 1950 had already gone into the ground, that plans were already being made for many other crops, that it would be tough to force farmers to take a cut in acreage and a cut in the support level at the same time, and that we would not do too great an injury if we continued 90-percent supports for 1 year, provided that we then had something to tie to and didn't have to pass new legislation the following year. Our difficulties generally arise out of the fact that we get caught in a jam and have to get something through and therefore, have to compromise in order to get action. Now we know that if we don't touch the bill at all that we willl have the possibility of flexible price supports between 80 and 90 percent in 1951 and that in 1952 the full range of flexibility between 75 and 90 percent of parity will be available as originally provided in my bill. I say that is some gain. I would rather have had the gain without the losses, but I have never found any way that you can operate that way unless you have the votes.

Even after we had succeeded in drafting a bill which was satisfactory to the subcommittee and the full Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, we were a long way from our goal. I am sure you remember the difficulties we had in getting the bill through the Senate.

Senators YOUNG, of North Dakota, and RUSSELL, of Georgia, representing an old alliance of wheat, cotton, peanut, and tobacco growers, offered an amendment providing for 90 percent of parity supports on the basic commodities whenever acreage allotments or marketing quotas are in effect. The Senate first defeated this amendment by a narrow margin. A motion to reconsider resulted in a tie vote, whereupon the Vice President broke the tie in favor reconsideration. A second vote on the amendment resulted in a tie, which was again broken by the Vice President voting for 90-percent supports. In my opinion, that destroyed the usefulness of the bill. It meant, as far as I was concerned, that we would be saddled with high rigid supports for years to come and our side bathed the Senate in a flood of oratory. I don't know how many votes were changed or what beneficial results came from careful consideration of the possible bad effects of these high supports, but at least when I made a motion to recommit the bill to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with a requirement that it report a bill back to the Senate wihin 48 hours, the motion carried by a substantial majority.

As you know the committee subsequently reported the bill back without the Young-Russell amendment, and when this amendment was again offered from the floor, we were able to muster enough votes to defeat it.

When we went to conference with the House, we again ran into great difficulties. One difficulty was that the House conferees did not contain a majority favorable to the "prevailing sentiment" expressed by the House when it passed the Gore bill. There were also difficulties on the Senate side. We were four to three on almost every vate. Senator LUCAS and I, from the Democratic side, and Senators AIKEN and THYE, from the Republican side, stood together. It would have been a little easier on us if there had been a larger numerical superiority for the "prevailing sentiment," but I do not complain since the Senate group at least was able to represent the "prevailing sentiment" of the Senate and held to it in almost all of the votes even though I found myself in a pretty dismal minority on one or two occasions.

When we met, the first demands of the House conferees were far beyond anything carried in either bill, far beyond what the Senate had passed, and far beyond what the House had passed. In fact they started out by asking for 90 percent rigid price supports on virtually all commodities for 5 years. Most of us recognized that 5 years would either destroy all possibility of our maintaining an agricultural program or would fix 90 percent as a permanent program for years to come.

In the days and nights of wrangling and interminable conferences which followed, it was openly suggested not once but several times that if I could be kicked off the conference committee, there might be a possibility of reaching agreement. Mind you, the rules by which conference committees operate provide that the "prevailing sentiment" should be represented in the conference committee and yet the House conferees who did not represent the "prevailing sentiment" of the House steadily insisted to the Senate conferees that if they could get me kicked off they would be able to override GEORGE AIKEN and SCOTT LUCAS and come forth with a bill that would have written rigid 90 percent of parity supports into the law for 5 years to come, and would have put that level of support on virtually every agricultural commodity that had ever been supported. I say that because at one time the House conferees voted to put in hogs, turkeys, chickens, eggs, and a number of other commodities at straight 90 percent of parity and the Senate conferees temporarily voted to agree.

I voted with the minority and after I had appealed to one of the Senate conferees, who had voted for the motion that he was outside the instruction given him by the Senate because the Senate had twice voted down such a motion, he changed his vote and the House proposal was rejected. We came out that close to having a conference bill submitted that not only would have carried all the high supports that the bill now carries, but would have added hogs, chickens, poultry, eggs, and many other items, in addition to a frequently expressed desire to require the support of dairy products at 90 percent of parity.

It seems to me that the history of the development of the Agricultural Act of 1949 clearly illustrates the oft-repeated statement that all legislation is a compromise. Farmers and farm leaders need to understand that an idea must travel a long road to become a law.

When issues are controversial and the going is tough, Members of Congress need the help of constructive farm organizations, which are equipped to develop sound recommendations through democratic processes, and furnish the factual information which is so necessary both to the Congress and to public understanding. Farmers working within the framework of their own organizations can make many of the compromises—and make them better—then will be the case if they have to be made on the floors of Congress.

Although price supports are an essential part of a sound farm program, we should not let price-support discussions distract our attention from other important and related questions.

A high level of foreign trade is essential to the continuing prosperity of American agriculture, for our ability to produce many commodities far exceeds our present domestic needs. Present foreign-aid programs will not continue forever. If we expect to continue to find export markets for our products after ECA, we must be prepared to accept imports so that other countries will be able to pay for the things we send them. If we lose our export markets, producers of all commodities will soon be in "surplus trouble," as the producers of export crops inevitably will shift part of their resources to production of domestically consumed crops even though this market is already amply supplied.

American agriculture also has a real stake in the maintenance of a high level of industrial employment. Urban people are the

farmers' best customers. Farmers can't be prosperous if their customers are unemployed or receiving low wages.

We need to strive constantly to improve nutrition both as a means of strengthening our country generally and as a means of providing better markets for farm products. Farmers and ranchers, in cooperation with processors, distributors, college people and others who are interested, should develop programs to promote the upgrading of diets.

Finally, we need to continue and intensify our efforts to increase the efficiency of our production and marketing efforts. Marketing, in particular, is an almost untapped field for progress. Continued and expanded research in this field will pay real dividends to both producers and consumers.

My last word is as a westerner to the farmers of the Rocky Mountain West. We know the heritage of our country. We know how riflemen and riders carved out an empire in our high country. They did it because they had faith in their ability to stand pretty much alone—without the full protection of courts of law or citadels of learning. They were a rugged lot, and we are heirs to their tradition.

We must have some of their desire to expand, to build a new country, to make land. The Farm Bureau is not as active in some of these States as it is in the corn belt or in the land of cotton.

I hope every Farm Bureau member may live again some of the western history and may carry his claim into unexplored areas and virgin timber. You belong to a distinguished company and you will be serving yourself and those who follow if you strengthen the Farm Bureau in your State and thereby in your Nation.

I live beside you and am a Farm Bureau member. May we all do our farm job and our farm organization job better in the years to come.

Seating of Communist China in the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and myself on the seating of Communist China in the United Nations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is our firm belief that America wants peace with honor. Appeasement is surrendered on the installment plan. We believe that our security and the cause of a free world of freemen depend on vigorously resisting Soviet pressure in the United Nations on the question of seating the Communist regime in place of the Republic of China.

We handed Manchuria to Russia in the Yalta Agreement, and that launched the Red conquest in Asia. We abandoned the free peoples of Poland and Czechoslovakia when we acquiesced to rigged elections and that lowered the iron curtain over eastern Europe.

What have these concessions gained us? Nothing. We have bought only more cold war tension and more terror. One by one the countries of the world are falling under the Kremlin's dictatorship. Russia is preparing for war. The Soviet Union is spending more on armaments than all of the free world combined, including the United States.

If we concede on China, we will be asked to yield next on Indochina, Korea, India, Burma, Siam, the United States of Indonesia, and the Philippines. Do we wait until, one by one, all the non-Communist countries of Asia have gone under the hammer and sickle? Do we wait until we are completely isolated or, perhaps, we are asked to concede Hawaii or Alaska?

The new isolationists are those who betray this country's friends by sacrificing them to Soviet sponsored international communism rather than give them our support. Eventually, if the process continues, we will be isolated, alone against a communized world.

The issue over seating Red China—which means expelling our wartime ally and longtime friend, Nationalist China, one of the United Nations' founding members—is a crucial test in total diplomacy. Secretary of State Dean Acheson has used that expression. Only the Soviet Union, however, has used total diplomacy. While we have wavered, the Kremlin has moved ruthlessly to grab what it wants.

Now Russia wants another vote in the Security Council. UN Secretary General Trygve Lie conveniently cooperates in a scheme to deliver it.

Lie says the Communists represent China's people. That is not true notwithstanding Soviet propaganda. The Communists do not represent China's people. China is the victim of a treacherous invasion, incited and directed from Moscow. Has Trygve Lie forgotten the quislings in his own Norway? Communist agents don't represent China any more than the Nazis represented Norway when they overran Mr. Lie's country.

The United States must not acquiesce in this move to seat Soviet China in the United Nations. To do so would be contrary to the principle of nonrecognition of conquests which Henry L. Stimson laid down when the Japanese conquered Manchuria in 1932. We stood by that principle when the quislings drove the government of which Trygve Lie was foreign minister out of Norway. We supported Mr. Lie's government when it had fled into exile and we helped put it back in power.

Do we quit now, drop total diplomacy and go back to Chamberlin appeasement diplomacy at a moment when the future peace of the United States is at stake? There is grave danger that the Soviet Union may destroy the United Nations by holding a gun at the head of each free nation with a dictate "do it our way—or else."

Lie says the China issue is obstructing progress toward peace through the United Nations. This is camouflage. Russia is obstructing progress toward peace. There would be no issue if Russia accepted its obligations under the United Nations. But Russia refuses to abide by the UN Charter. Lie says, in effect, if Russia will not accept the rules of the UN, the rules must be changed. He adopts the same insidious tactics as the Communists themselves and becomes at least their tool, if not their actual ally.

What Lie proposes is more than mere craven appeasement. It is surrender, abject capitulation. The only support Lie has a right to expect is from the Comintern—not from the United States or the other free nations. Russia wants to apply the police state to the UN. If we yielded to that we would be selling ourselves out and with no assurance, even at that price, that peace can be preserved.

On this issue, Russia has the United States backed to the wall. Any sign of weakness now would cost us more loss of prestige and further impair our leadership of the anti-Communist forces of the world.

This has been slyly calculated in Moscow. China is not an isolated issue. Her position in the United Nations is part of the whole world situation in which peace is so precariously balanced. It cannot be separated from the subjugation of eastern Europe to Soviet dictatorship. China's peril cannot be separated from the peril of other countries in Asia, Latin America, Europe, and the Near East from Russia's armies and Russia's international agents.

In his rebuke to Lie, Secretary Acheson has taken the realistic view that the impasse in the United Nations is the result of Soviet Union's unwarranted attempt to coerce the UN. This is good, as far as it goes.

But does it go far enough? Secretary Acheson repeatedly has said the United States will vote against seating Communist China. Will he now carry his convictions to a logical conclusion? Will he agree to help organize the free nations to resist Soviet blackmail? To use the veto, if necessary?

Russia has exercised the veto at least 40 times, including vetoes of applications for membership by Ireland, Austria, Finland, Italy, and other countries. Soviet China is another new applicant. Soviet China was created by Russian's imperialist aggression. It was created by conquest of the forces backed by the Kremlin. There is precedent for a veto of Soviet China's application. There also is urgent necessity for it.

We endorse the foreign-aid program for countries which stand with the United States for peace and freedom. It is only simple logic, however, that our wealth and our arms cannot be handed to powers which ultimately might use them against us. It is too dangerous. We are sure the American people agree that those countries which wither under the pressure of Soviet total diplomacy now are ultimate threats to the peace we are paying a very high price to preserve.

We, the undersigned, therefore declare this to be our policy:

1. We affirm Mr. Acheson's repudiation of the Lie pressure proposals for seating Soviet China in the United Nations.

2. In order to lend support to our Government and help strengthen its total diplomacy, we believe that we should consider carefully before giving further United States aid, economic or military, to any nation which betrays its democratic interests under pressure from the Soviet Union, its satellites or agents.

3. Unless Trygve Lie at once withdraws his proposals for seating Soviet China, we ask that the Government of the United States instruct its representatives to the United Nations to seek the selection of an impartial Secretary in place of the Soviet partisan incumbent. His efforts, if successful would open, through the UN, a side door for more Communist agents to enter this country. He has exceeded his authority. He has endangered both peace and the structure of the United Nations, causes he professes to advance.

4. Unless the Soviet Union ends its boycott of the United Nations and ceases its arbitrary and obstructionist tactics, we recommend that the United States use its veto power, if necessary, in the issue over China's representation. We deplore the necessity even to consider using the veto. However, the Soviet Union is attempting to subvert the UN into an instrument for its own imperialist ambitions. In the fact of the Soviet's clear plan for conquest, there is no other alternative on this issue.

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senator.
STYLES BRIDGES,
United States Senator.

Speech at Wisconsin Republican State Convention Nominating Senator Wiley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, one of the vitally important developments which occurred in the Nation in the past 2 weeks was the Republican State Convention held at Milwaukee, Wis., on Friday and Saturday, June 9 and 10. On those dates an outstanding slate of national and State officers was selected by the elected delegates to the GOP convention.

It was with particular pleasure that I noted that on its very first day the convention selected by acclamation the present senior Senator from Wisconsin, the distinguished former chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. WILEY], for its official endorsement. By this action the Republicans of Wisconsin indicated their appreciation of the services which have been rendered to them so faithfully by the senior Senator of their State.

The delegates further demonstrated the complete unanimity with which the Senator's efforts have been acclaimed by Republicans of Wisconsin and by independent-thinking citizens not formally identified with any political party.

I am glad to note that the Republican State convention also nominated other fine GOP leaders including the able son of a great Wisconsin Governor, Mr. Walter Kohler, Jr., to run for the governorship.

I congratulate the Republicans of Wisconsin on their wise designations. I am sure, and I believe that my colleagues in this great body are sure—my Republican colleagues certainly are sure—that their action constitutes a firm basis on which the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] will be reelected this coming November along with the entire GOP slate.

The nominating speech at the convention for our colleague was delivered by a leading attorney of Wisconsin, Mr. Suel Arnold. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of this well-justified nominating speech, and that it be followed by the text of an editorial carried in the Monday, June 12, issue of the Janesville Daily Gazette and excerpts from an editorial in the La Crosse Tribune, of June 15, 1950, both endorsing the nomination of the Senator from Wisconsin.

There being no objection, the nominating speech and the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY PRAISED IN NOMINATING SPEECH BY ARNOLD

(Following is the address given by Suel O. Arnold, prominent Milwaukee attorney, when he nominated ALEXANDER WILEY for another term as United States Senator at the State publican convention held in Milwaukee, which was largely attended):

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentleman of the convention, I want to present to this convention for endorsement for the high office of United States Senator a man whose ability and qualifications are greatly needed in this period of stress and challenge.

He possesses common sense and the ability to work and to serve.

He has a wealth of experience in law, business, farming, banking, and in public service.

To obtain his education he worked in sawmills, painted houses, reported on a small newspaper, sold books, clerked in stores, sold life insurance, and even washed dishes for his board when he attended the university.

He is a man of character, dependability, and understanding—a humble man who has raised a fine American family of four children.

In the Senate he is regarded by his associates as a man of judgment, one who gets along with his fellows, and gets things done.

He is an independent thinker who wears no man's nor group's collar.

He is ready to listen but not to be dictated to.

He is an American who has fought the synthetic idea of socialism and communism down through the years.

Two and one-half months ago he told the Democratic administration at Washington: "Quit trying to smear Senator MCCARTHY. Start furnishing him and the rest of us the facts about subversives employed in Government."

Mr. Chairman, wherever you go in the State and meet the people, Democrats and Republicans, laboring men, farmers, businessmen, veterans, professional men, school teachers, clergymen, and women; these folks will tell you of the assistance this man has rendered with their complex problems that center in Washington.

This man whose name I shall present to you has a working philosophy of life and a grasp of the economic and political problems confronting this Nation all of which makes him needed as a servant of the Republic in the Capital of the Republic.

You know his ability to express himself on the vital issues.

You have confidence in him; you know the history of his advent in politics when the fortunes of our party in this State were at low ebb; and you know the leadership he has shown. The man whom I nominate for endorsement has served this State and the Nation with distinction for two terms in the United States Senate.

His rich experience and the seniority he has earned are part of the outstanding qualifications he offers to the Wisconsin electorate.

In his second term in the United States Senate he became chairman of the powerful Judiciary Committee—the first time in the Nation's history that this position was ever held by a Wisconsin citizen.

In this position which is reserved for the Nation's ablest lawyers and lawmakers, he achieved the remarkable record of reporting more legislation than any man in either House of Congress. He has won the respect of the bench and bar of the Nation, his colleagues and the citizens of Wisconsin.

Ranking high on the important Judiciary Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, his return to the Senate insures Wisconsin an important voice in the council of the Nation.

He is a lifelong Republican, permanently dedicated to the sound Republican principles of economy in Government; of a sound foreign policy; and a Government that is the servant of the people and not the master.

Farmers of the State know him because he understands their problems and has served their interests well. In the Eightieth Congress, he successfully fought to preserve the dairy industry in Wisconsin by preventing the repeal of the tax on oleomargarine. He stopped the bill to remove the tax on oleomargarine in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, and led the fight against repeal. For 30 years, he has been a dairy farmer, owning and operating his own farm.

Small-business men of the State know him because he has been a small-business man who understands their problems and who has always served their interests well.

Both labor and management in the great industries of the State know him because in his approach to their problems, he has been fair and judicious.

I give you for the endorsement of this convention our United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin.

[From the Janesville Daily Gazette of June 12, 1950]

WILEY ENDORSEMENT SETS NATIONAL PACE

The public generally is ignorant of what might happen if Senator ALEXANDER WILEY of Wisconsin and six other Senators now facing the election test, are not sent back to the Senate. Fortunately, Wisconsin Republicans saw the need and endorsed ALEXANDER WILEY for reelection in November.

With the present schemes of the administration aiming toward spending of billions for a number of socialistic ventures, the only hope of keeping this country from a $75,000,000,000 budget is to retain Senators and Congressmen who are known to be sound thinkers.

Unless these men are returned to the Senate there is little hope of keeping the administration from running hog wild, jumping the Federal budget by whatever number of billions fits their Brannan plans, socialized medicine, business financing, Federal-dam projects, federalized steel industry, and so forth.

Senator WILEY has proved his worth in the Senate. He serves Wisconsin well. More important, he serves the Nation as a leader in our national legislature. He should be returned to the Senate.

[From the La Crosse Tribune of June 15, 1950]

The necessity of returning Senator WILEY to Washington is as obvious as anything could be. Wisconsin and the Nation need WILEY in the position of leadership to which he has risen.

The socialistic ventures of government must be met with men of WILEY's rank and stature in Washington, to keep the administration from running hog wild with an array of Brannan plans not alone for the farmer, but for medicine, business financing, federalizing the steel industry, ad infinitum, until there would be no end to funneling money for most every purpose conceivable.

Independence Bond Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech delivered by the Honorable William J. Storey, mayor of Dover, Del., on June 14, 1950, at the launching of the Independence Bond Drive in our State.

I call particular attention to Mr. Storey's timely warning that Congress should give more consideration to the taxpayers of the Nation and think less of finding new ways of spending their tax money for the purposes of political expediency.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Cobb, distinguished guests, and friends, it is a distinct privilege to welcome the arrival of the replica of the liberty bell—the national symbol of the current independence bond drive—on behalf of the people of Dover.

Liberty and independence are highly significant words to all Delawareans. They are engraved on the great seal of our State. We are all familiar with Delaware's contribution to that part of our Nation's history which prompted the tolling of the bell at Independence Hall at Philadelphia on July 4, 1776. In light of history, therefore, it is most fitting that a replica of the liberty bell, the symbol of the liberty and independence of our Nation won for us by our forefathers, Delawareans and all, should be placed in the capital city of the first State in the Union.

We can always be grateful for the foresight and the action of those 30 Delaware patriots who on December 7, 1787, ratified the Federal Constitution, thereby giving to Delaware the honor of being the first State in the Federal Union. We are told that Thomas Jefferson once wrote to John M. Clayton making reference to our State and saying in substance, "the position that Delaware occupies in the Union is equivalent to that of the diamond in the coronet of States." The pages of history of our State furnish ample justification for our State's designation as the Diamond State, by Jefferson. On every occasion when the liberty and independence of our Nation have been threatened, Delaware has met its full obligations unselfishly and gloriously.

The Independence bond drive is now in progress. It is for each of us to generously and patriotically respond and keep our State high on the roll of honor. We should help to see to it that our Nation shall have sufficient financial resources to adequately prepare for our defense and preserve this great Nation for ourselves and our posterity. But at the same time I believe that the citizens of this Nation have a right to insist, and should insist, upon a policy of more prudent and economical handling of our Nation's finance. It is high time that official Washington, including the Congress, should give more consideration to the taxpayers of the Nation and think less of finding new ways of spending tax money for purposes of political expediency.

Yes, liberty and independence are highly significant words to Delawareans and Americans. While preparing to remain free and independent of foes from without, let us make certain that we do not enslave ourselves, as the result of policies promulgated and practiced within our Nation.

Mr. Cobb, we are delighted to have you and your staff with us today, as well as the replica of the Liberty Bell, and I trust that our people will become sufficiently inspired by the presence of the bell to generously invest in the future of our Nation.

I respectfully urge everyone who can to participate in the Independence bond drive to the end that we shall all remain free.

Tariff on Lead and Lead Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony of CHARLES W. VURSELL, of Illinois, before panel B, of the Department of Commerce against further reduction of tariffs on lead and lead products:

Members of the committee, I appear before the committee today to express my interest and concern over the fact that lead, by-products and derivatives therefrom are scheduled for tariff consideration in the negotiations to be held in September at Torquay, England.

I want to express my opposition to any further consideration on the part of those who may represent our Government at this meeting to the lowering of import or tariff duties on lead or any other by-products.

I am interested in this matter as it will affect such producers throughout the Nation, and particularly because of the depressing effect any lowering of tariffs will have on lead and by-products mined and processed in Illinois.

There is produced in my district the major part of fluorspar, which is also lead bearing, mined in the entire United States. Because of the lowering of import duties under trade treaties now in effect, production has greatly declined in my area, and a large number of miners are now unemployed.

Any further reduction in import duties will consequently lower production and processing of these minerals, throwing more men out of employment and work a great hardship on the entire industry.

I should like to point out to the committee that during the war, in an effort to stimulate a greater production of lead and its by-products, many mines were subsidized in an effort to get greater production. I would further like to point out to the committee that at the present time many marginal mines throughout the Nation have closed down, and others will close down in the near future. The result, more thousands of employees will lose their jobs, doubtless many of them will go on unemployment rolls at a great expense to our Government.

Further, that legislation was brought before the Congress some 2 months ago to widen and continue subsidies for lead-bearing ore-producing mines, calling for many millions of dollars annual expense which failed to be approved by the House of Representatives.

Those advocating this legislation argued that such subsidies were made necessary because of the tremendous increase in imports of lead and its derivatives. I would like further to point out that the great increase in fluorspar and lead products imported into this country from Mexico and other countries has driven the prices down to the point where many mines have closed throughout the Nation, causing widespread unemployment.

As an illustration, Mexican lead sales in the United States have increased from 28.9 percent in 1946 to 60.2 percent in 1949. This shows that Mexico has made the United States its major outlet for lead with relative increase in lead exports to the United States to a total of 500 percent since 1930.

It should also be noted that Canadian lead sales in the United States since 1930–39 have increased from 2.4 to 39.9 percent in 1949. Over 40 percent of the lead produced in Canada since the war is being diverted into the United States market. This condition will become worse because Canada has the largest and richest lead mines in the world.

Our imports from Australia have increased during the same period from 1 to 14 percent; an increase of 17 times the amount of lead imported in the last 20 years.

Peruvian lead sales in the United States have increased from 29.1 percent in the same period to 124 percent.

Chilean lead sales to the United States have increased from 12.2 to 94.5 percent.

And lead sales from Yugoslavia into the United States have increased from 2.7 percent in 1947 to 53 percent in 1949.

The importation of lead and byproducts to the United States from all countries with which we have trade agreements have greatly increased because of the devaluation of the British pound and related currencies throughout the world, greatly aggravating this situation and has had the effect of greatly reducing our protective import duties all of which could not be foreseen when the duties were fixed under prior trade treaties.

With the lead industry absorbing this additional impact, it must be admitted that instead of further considering any reduction in imports anticipated at the Torquay meeting, it would seem that the responsibility rests upon those representing our Nation to make use of escape clauses and seek higher import duties rather than considering any further reductions.

I hope in the wisdom of this committee that you will recommend against any further reductions of tariff duties and exert your influence in favor of increasing duties in the interest of our Nation.

In the interest of national defense, it would appear to me that we should try to encourage the expansion of our domestic production so that in the event of war we will not, to too great a degree, be placed in the position of having to depend on foreign imports which could be greatly reduced or completely cut off by the submarines of an unfriendly nation.

Truman's Abrupt Veto of Basing-Point Bill Aids Local Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, yesterday there appeared in the Washington Evening Star a very timely article entitled "Truman's Abrupt Veto of Basing-Point Bill Aids Local Monopoly," written by Mr. David Lawrence. I heartily subscribe to the article, and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 19, 1950]

TRUMAN'S ABRUPT VETO OF BASING-POINT BILL AIDS LOCAL MONOPOLY—DISTRIBUTION PRACTICES UPSET BY REACTIONARY ADVISERS TO PRESIDENT

(By David Lawrence)

President Truman's veto of the so-called basing-point bill is a typical example of how Government is run nowadays.

For more than a year now, a bill which was passed by both the House and the Senate has been the subject of a prolonged attack by a small group who have held up action on the conference committee report. Finally, 2 weeks ago, it went to the White House.

The measure itself had the endorsement of the Attorney General and the Secretary of Commerce and the two leading Democratic antitrust legislators in the House and the Senate—Representative CELLER, of New York,

and Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, both of them chairmen of important committees dealing with monopoly in business.

Not a word had come from the administration that it disliked the measure. Then, just as the bill would have become law in the absence of any action by the President, a veto message was sent. There are not enough votes to enact the bill over the veto. It is a safe assumption that the President never wrote the veto message, and it may be doubted whether he understands the complex economic controversy that has developed about the legislation.

AUTHORS NOT REVEALED

Somehow a veto message was written for him backed by pressure groups and advisers whose identity isn't revealed to the public. The result is that a confusing Supreme Court decision, seeking to correct ambiguities, is now the law of the land. It upset the distribution practices of the past by concurring with a Federal Trade Commission attack on methods of pricing which include freight costs. The effort of Congress to clarify this point has failed because a politically minded President accepts the recommendations of a reactionary clique.

The proponents of the veto are claiming that monopoly has been defeated. Quite the reverse is the truth. Local monopolies have been encouraged and the total price to the consumer will rise.

The President's veto message represents a milestone in the economic life of America. It fixes the theory of the protective tariff and the theory of monopoly price as a permanent part of the Democratic Party platform and makes a mockery of the idea that the leadership of the party is today liberal. It has turned the clock back to the reactionary days of the 1920's and has encouraged monopoly and price gouging instead of competition from which the consumer would benefit.

Some of the Democrats and Republicans who voted for the bill did so on the mistaken expectation that branch plants would be built in their areas and that the large companies would be forced to do this in order to retain the volume of business previously enjoyed. Since they could not ship into these areas and set their price to cover the freight, it has been argued that they would have to establish a string of plants. This made local politicians look eagerly for new industries. The opposite will happen.

CAN'T AFFORD NEW PLANTS

The larger companies cannot afford at present-day costs to build branch mills or plants, so they will leave the local areas to the local monopolies. Likewise, the latter will not give the consumer the benefit of nearness to a mill. They will set their prices as close to the freight barrier as they can. It's the vice of the old protective tariff over again.

Some of the Democrats are saying that perhaps the President's message will put a restraining hand on the Federal Trade Commission and that the latter will not prosecute those firms which attempt to compete by absorbing a part of the freight rate. This merely emphasizes the trend in the administration, which is to grab more and more power and decide each case as it suits the politics of the region. The lawyers who lobby before Government agencies will have more and more cases. The businessmen of America will not know from one day to another just what they can or cannot do about absorbing freight rates.

All this will add to the inflationary spiral and make remote an American distribution system at lower prices—the most necessary factor if the purchasing power of the dollar is to be increased and real wages are to be raised. It's certainly an odd thing to find a so-called liberal administration lining up on the reactionary side of American economic policy—to protect monopoly and penalize the consumer.

Economy Record at Westover Air Force Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take just a minute to call the attention of all Members of Congress to an economy record that was recently achieved by Westover Air Force Base, located in Chicopee, Mass.

More than 5,000 Westover personnel participated in the program designed to cut the taxpayer's outlay for the Armed Forces by reducing operating costs among military air transport service bases.

Westover savings were substantially higher than any other base in the Atlantic division. Col. J. E. Barzynski, Jr., the base commander, and all the personnel at Westover deserve the gratitude of the Nation for their splendid achievement.

I believe I have the correct figure when I say that Westover personnel saved the Nation approximately $1,421,000.

I believe that tremendous saving should be brought to the attention of the country and I know all Members of Congress of both parties will join with me in congratulating Westover personnel and expressing the Nation's gratitude for the great saving they have made.

Loss of Export Market for Wheat Flour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the head-in-the-sand, ostrich-like policies of the Truman administration on foreign trade are threatening another American industry and further increasing unemployment. This time it is the flour-milling industry that is being placed in serious straits through loss of export markets.

Since 1947, over 100 American flour mills have been forced to close, throwing thousands out of jobs. Employment in the flour-milling industry is down sharply according to the Department of Labor. But this does not tell the whole story, with the remaining flour mills operating at 63 percent of capacity, it is estimated that 75 percent or more of the employees are working less than a 5-day week. Many of the smaller mills are running only 3 days a week. Reliable sources estimate the reduction in take-home pay by workers in the flour-milling industry has been reduced a third to a half in the past year. The principal reason for this condition is the loss of export markets.

The policies of the Truman administration on the export of American flour have made it possible for Canada to take over aggressively the American export market. In 2 years, 1948 and 1949, Canada increased her flour exports by nearly 25 percent while the United States exports declined nearly 88 percent. A further decline can be expected this year. The export flour market in the Philippines was formerly divided 85 percent to the United States and the remainder to Canada and Australia. These figures today have been reversed. Likewise we are losing our markets in Central and South America.

The Truman administration promised the American farmer, flour miller, and laborer, an increased share in export markets for wheat and flour, with the approval of the International Wheat Agreement. This promise has not materialized. As of June 13, 1950, the United States had exported 63 percent of her International Wheat Agreement quota, while Canada had shipped 83 percent of her quota. The requirements for Germany and Japan, for which the American taxpayer is paying the bill, will be shared with Canada and Australia, further reducing our wheat and flour exports.

Our wheat and flour exports, under the International Wheat Agreement, are subject to a subsidy paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the terms and conditions they prescribe. It is entirely within their power to put our flour millers, mill workers, and the wheat farmers on a basis whereby they can meet Canadian competition in world markets. So far they have refused to take this action while our millers and their employees are idle and our historic foreign markets are lost. Apparently the Truman administration has adopted a "fifth freedom" for the American laborer—freedom from employment.

Tariff on Raw Wool and Mohair Should Not Be Reduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement made by me on yesterday to the Committee on Reciprocity Information, United States Tariff Commission:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee for Reciprocity Information, I desire to make a brief statement to the committee in opposition to any reduction of the tariff duties on raw wool and mohair if

those subjects should be considered in the forthcoming trade-agreement conferences at Torquay.

On May 25 Mr. Byron Wilson, representing the National Wool Growers Association testified here and very ably, I think, sounded the warning of the repercussions to the growers that might in the long run result from a further reduction in tariff protection on imported wools. And today I wish to associate myself with the views expressed by Mr. Wilson.

As has been pointed out, the domestic wool industry in this country is presently in a very healthy condition. And the same goes for mohair. But it is recognized that these are not normal times. Everyone knows that, so far as the wool and mohair industries are concerned, the present situation is abnormal and the market price for domestic wools and mohair will level off in time as the supply is increased and conditions change.

Now, keeping in mind that the tariff on most fine wools was reduced 2 years ago from 34 cents to 25½ cents per pound, clean basis, I earnestly feel that any further reduction following this very brief period would be unnecessary and wholly unjustified. With the world demand as strong as it now is, it would seem that we can reasonably expect an increase in wool production in the foreseeable future and also a leveling off of the abnormal demands around the world.

The present low tariff on wool is certainly no impediment to world trade. The strong demand and high prices readily absorb the duty that is imposed at this time. So there can be no compelling reason to tamper with the tariff rates now in effect by reducing them and thereby jeopardizing the future stability and prosperity of this vital domestic industry. Indeed, in normal times we know from experience that the present protection is inadequate to bridge the gap between the cost of production abroad and here in this country.

And that, I understand, is the purpose of tariff—to act as an equalizer between our own cost of production and that of other countries. And we know that in the case of wool and mohair there is a vast difference. It has been pointed out that our information on costs of producing wool in Australia, for example, is very inadequate. In that connection, I have some figures here that, while not current, are indicative of the wide disparity of production costs between this country and the Commonwealth of Australia. An official Australian breakdown of such costs was made back in 1940, the latest I have been able to find. At that time the cost of producing a pound of wool was found to be 13 cents per pound, while at the same time the cost in this country, according to figures compiled by the Tariff Commission, was 31 cents.

In other words, it is reasonable to assume that the cost of production in this country is more than twice what it is in Australia. That accounts for the considerable advantage the Australian grower enjoys over his American competitor. The advantage comes in lower wages, lower cost of production. And under these rather extreme conditions which pertain to wool production, and which have always been the case, American growers in normal times must, of course, have some sort of protection if they are to survive. That would certainly be the case when the world supply equals or exceeds the world demand—and a sizable portion of that demand is right here in our own American mills.

Therefore, if the tariff protection on wools is to assume a degree of competitive parity with imports, it is hard to see how a further reduction can be justified.

We know from experience what the disastrous effect of low protection may have upon a domestic industry. I refer to the case of mohair which weathered a 2-year market stalemate, which was finally relieved only a year ago. The Department of Agriculture in its reports repeatedly referred to the depressing effect upon the domestic mohair market of the heavy postwar imports of coarse competitive wools from Argentina and Uruguay. Those wools were coming in practically tariff free. Our growers were helpless while that was going on. Many of them went out of business. In a 2-year period nearly one-third of our angora goats was liquidated. Then a shortage of the coarse wools in Argentina occurred. The prices down there began to rise. And demand for our mohair was promptly felt. Except for the shortage that developed in South America, we know that many of our domestic producers of mohair would have been bankrupted and driven out of business. And they have reason to be concerned about what may happen in the future.

I mention this to illustrate the effect of inadequate tariff protection as applied to either wool or mohair.

In conclusion, I again respectfully urge that in the interest of a stabilized and prosperous wool and mohair industry here at home, so essential in our economy, no further reductions in duties on foreign imports be considered this year. It is utterly impossible to know what the supply and demand situation around the world will be 2 or 3 or 4 years from now. And it is the history of tariffs that they are reduced from time to time but are never increased.

I wish to express my gratitude for this privilege of appearing before this distinguished group and giving my views on the subject I have discussed. Your courtesy is appreciated.

What Right Has a Citizen to Own a Home?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, a determination is made by our citizens when they go to the polls and vote for the Members of Congress. It is then the responsibility of Members of Congress to make another determination when they stand on the floor of the House and cast their votes as to whether or not the expenditures of government shall be restricted to "actual necessities and within an aggregate sum for which taxes can be assessed without crippling the economy of the people."

As a matter of fact under our form of government and the way Congress operates in both House and Senate, the Congress substantially is the Government. I make this observation because of the fact that under the broad powers of the Federal Government, which were granted to the Congress by the respective States when they accepted the Federal Constitution, the Congress can enact laws which directly affect the daily lives of the people.

During recent years a number of such laws have been approved by the Congress and upheld by the courts, and I refer to the OPA law; the rent-control law; the controls exercised by the Securities and Exchange Commission; the old Agricultural Adjustment Act; the Wagner Act, which was repealed; the present Taft-Hartley Act; the Fair Labor Standards Act; and many others which I shall not list at this time. In addition, we now have before us several proposals which, if they receive the approval of the Congress, will further and more effectively control the actual daily lives of our people.

But in none of these laws above-mentioned has the Congress yet dared to go so far as to say where a citizen shall live; that is, whether in the city, or in the country, or in one specific State or another, or how he shall live, or when he may live. As a general rule by far the majority of our people still assume that every citizen has a right to live where he can best perform his daily work and thus fulfill the obligations of his employment; and that he also has the unquestionable right to live in what might be termed a reasonably priced home, or under a shelter which costs a great deal of money if he has the funds with which to finance it. As a matter of fact, our citizens have proceeded on the basis a citizen may choose his place of abode.

Down through the years Members of Congress—Republicans, Democrats, and others—have assumed that they had the unquestioned constitutional, moral, and social right to live within the city, or county, or within the metropolitan district during such time they were serving their constituency and attending the sessions of Congress.

It is a recorded fact that scores of the Members of Congress have down through the years owned their homes in the vicinity of the Nation's Capital, as well as such other homes or property as they might have desired to own and operate in their respective districts.

It is, of course, a recorded fact that some Members of Congress refuse to live in the so-called commercial hotels or rented apartments or homes located directly within the city limits, and, of course, there are those who own their homes directly outside the Federal District.

There is, however, a disposition on the part of some people to question the right of a citizen to own property as above outlined. Specifically, there is a gentleman by the name of Mr. Robert Curry, who resides in the city of Saginaw, Mich., and who aspires to become a Member of the House of Representatives, and who, I am informed, has taken action along the lines which I shall now outline. It appears Mr. Curry would dictate to a citizen just how or where said citizen may live. From what source does Mr. Curry derive such a philosophy? Can it be he would have the Congress enact laws which would so interfere with a citizen's rights? Would Mr. Curry have public opinion rule as to where and how a man shall live? Mr. Curry is a lawyer of long practice. Will he answer this question? If citizen A is elected to the Congress and is without financial means to own a home, would Mr. Curry plead said citizen would be disqualified to represent his district? Or if the citizen owns two or a

dozen homes, would he plead the citizen less qualified to serve his district?

This past week there showed up in Washington a group of so-called undercover young lawyer-investigators from Saginaw who I am informed were sent here by either Mr. Dave Young or Mr. Robert Curry.

On the basis of the report which has been submitted to me by previous and present office employees, these young men first stated they were representing Mr. Dave Young; and later they changed their story to the effect that they had been sent here by Mr. Robert Curry.

From additional information which has been placed before me, it appears the purpose of the visit of these legal scouts was to obtain photographs of where my family lives when we are in Washington; what was paid for the home, and whether it was purchased for cash or on a part-time basis; and whether such taxes as have been assessed against it have been paid. On what basis does Mr. Curry or Mr. Young, assuming either was involved, make it their business as to where any citizen lives unless for the purpose of interfering with the home life of the citizen?

This action on the part of whoever sent these young men to Washington, whether Mr. Curry or Mr. Young, is very typical of the tactics used by CIO leaders when they import goon squads into an area to create trouble. The snooping around by these goon-squad investigators in connection with my personal home is similar to the Ku Klux Klanner's disregard for the sanctity of the home. If Mr. Curry or Mr. Young dispatched this group, which I understood ranged between three and seven individuals, it is an illustration of how far he and his CIO leadership backers propose to go in setting up a straw man to be knocked down. It all smacks of the Russian program of telling a man where and under what conditions he may live.

One of the spokesmen for the CIO has informed me that Mr. Curry has pledged himself to go along with a repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. The CIO leadership proposes to control the next Congress. Recently I was informed by one of organized labor's officials here in Washington they propose to have $14,000,000 to spend in the coming election. I suggested they spend it all in the Eighth Congressional District. I here renew that invitation.

If Mr. Curry, with his CIO backing, can take over the Eighth Congressional District, let that fact be determined in the forthcoming election. With the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act with Mr. Curry's support, the country and millions of fine American union members would again be subjected to the injustices and inequities of the old Wagner Act. If we can believe recent reports of union officials and industrial leaders, there is now substantially full employment and the highest wages of all times are being paid. In the light of this, we must necessarily accept the general proposition that the Taft-Hartley Act is not a slave law.

If it be that Mr. Curry is now approaching the campaign on the basis of prosecuting an American citizen for the ownership of property, instead of dealing with the far-reaching issues before the country, it all illustrates how his long years of specializing in certain phases of the law places an extraordinary burden on him at his age to enter the national arena in this hour of galloping human events.

Mr. Curry, according to the Saginaw News, recently observed "that most of the lawyers acting as Congressmen are of the 'third- or fourth-rate' quality." And, "discussing Congressmen in general, Curry declared that 'nine-tenths of them could not earn a comparable salary in private life.'"

Before Mr. Curry equips himself to intelligently discuss the sweeping events of the day and the issues now before the country, he may find that in his appraisal of the present Congress he has erred. The well of the House and the present technical issues before the people take the measure of any man, regardless of his capacity. To the extent Mr. Curry has for so many years specialized in certain phases of the law, he will find that far different from the catch-as-catch-can dealing required in handling the highly diversified problems which the White House constantly sends to the Congress.

I can well understand that Mr. Curry, the great technical lawyer, certainly does not want to discuss issues unfamiliar to him and such as:

(A) Compulsory national health insurance.

(B) Mr. Truman's plan 4 program—for the purpose of diffusing to the other countries of the world billions of dollars of the American citizens savings.

(C) The Brannan farm plan.

(D) Expansion of social security.

(E) The nationalizing of steel, railroads, and communications.

(F) The further appeasement or aggressive opposition to the program of the Communists in the United States, the Far East, and western Europe.

(G) The retention of military and naval bases in Japan if a Japanese peace treaty is to be agreed upon in the near future with or without Russia's consent.

(H) How far we shall go in retaining our foothold in the Philippines, as against the aggressive inroads made by the Communists.

(I) The questions involved in permanently arresting the growth of the Federal debt in peacetime with full production and employment as related to reduction of taxes, or an increase in the tax burden on the people, or the reduction of the cost of Government generally, or a continuing program of deficit financing and consequent inflation.

(J) A continuation of rent controls and Federal public housing.

These are the issues which not only Mr. Curry and Mr. Young but all other candidates seeking election to the Federal Congress should discuss. All candidates seeking election to the Congress should make their positions on these issues absolutely clear to the voting public. In turn the public, before voting, should specifically inquire and obtain from candidates direct answers to these questions.

So, Mr. Curry and Mr. Young, let's you and I discuss the type of government we propose to impose upon our people should we be elected to the Congress.

The Age That Disturbs the Laborer's Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THURMAN C. CROOK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, I know of no more disturbing factor in the scheme of this world's affairs than the twilight years of men and women when they are forced into retirement from their active service by virtue of the fact that they have passed a certain milestone on the pathway of life.

After a very comprehensive study of this disturbing situation, I find too frequently most valuable men and women, assets to an industry and our growing economy, if you please, have, upon reaching a certain age, been discharged from employment, causing inestimable damage to their morale and a weakening of the foundation of human resources which has always been a bulwark of our Republic and cherished American way of life. Such a practice that bears fruition of discouragement and a loss of an active lease on life, when men and women are yet capable of rendering valuable service, should never be tolerated.

The philosophy of Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of the Labor Department, pertinent to this matter is well predicated in the following words, and I fully subscribe to his way of thinking.

The Secretary says:

> I would like to help change popular prejudices with respect to older persons. There is a disposition to think people have grown old merely because they have passed a certain birthday, without reference to their health and vigor. There is a widespread notion that, at a fixed time, older workers should give up their places to younger ones, and that, without reference to productive capacity. And this is having a direct and bad effect on the employment situation.
>
> It is harmful economically, and it is harmful to the national morale. We need the devotion of all our people if democracy is to win out. We must do nothing to let any segment of our population feel rejected or unwanted. The spirit of older workers was never so high as during the war when employers went into old folks' homes, recruited their residents for essential jobs, even designed jobs around them. If we could achieve full employment in wartime for destructive purposes, we should be able to achieve full employment in peacetime for constructive purposes. That means we must utilize all the skills of all our workers, old and young.
>
> Our economy should function so that the capacity and devotion of all our people can be put to good use. That is full employment. Full employment is a situation where there are jobs equal to the number of people seeking work.
>
> We must strive to make the hope of full employment a reality, leading to a $300,000,000,000 national production in 1954, as pictured by President Truman, in his economic report.

Fair Deal Intimidation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of June 16, 1950:

FAIR DEAL INTIMIDATION

The chairman of the special lobby investigating committee of the House of Representatives apparently has embarked upon a one-man campaign to intimidate the opponents of President Truman's Socialist program. FRANK BUCHANAN, Democrat, Pennsylvania, has sent questionnaires to 166 of the Nation's biggest and best-known corporations demanding detailed data on all expenditures they have made since January 1, 1947, which might influence public opinion or public policy on national issues.

Other members of the committee have noted that corporations whose officers are pets of the administration, such as Consolidated Vultee, the Henry Kaiser enterprises, and Ed Pawley's oil interests, were not included in the list. Neither has there been any attempt to investigate expenditures by labor unions to influence public opinion nor the publicity activities of Government agencies in behalf of programs in which they are interested.

Moreover, Chairman BUCHANAN has made it clear that he is primarily interested in contributions by corporations to such organizations as the Committee for Constitutional Government, the Foundation for Economic Education and the Economists National Committee for Monetary Policy which have been conducting vigorous campaigns against deficit financing, Government management of the economy, and the high tax and free spending policies of the administration.

At the outset it must be recognized that Congress has virtually unlimited power to investigate, and that this power cannot be arbitrarily curtailed without impairing free, representative government. A number of questions have been raised about BUCHANAN'S conduct, however, which require consideration.

First there is the question of BUCHANAN'S right to issue the subpenas on his own initiative, without even consulting other members of the committee. That is obviously a question for the House of Representatives to decide. Whatever the House may have intended when it authorized the invesigation, it should take into consideration the fact that conferring subpena power on one individual, rather than a majority of the committee, would be a sure way to invite dictatorial conduct.

A more serious question is raised by the character of the information sought by BUCHANAN. His attempt to find out how much has been spent for advertising and publicity in opposition to such policies as deficit financing and such proposals as socialized medicine and education has been assailed as an infringement of the constitutionl guaranties of freedom of speech and of the press. This is an issue which, if pressed, ultimately would require determination by the courts.

One organization already has applied for an injunction to restrain BUCHANAN and the committee from attempting to obtain any information regarding expenditures for books and advertising. Some corporations have flatly refused to provide the committee with any information as long as there is doubt of BUCHANAN'S authority to demand it.

If BUCHANAN'S efforts to intimidate those who are opposed to the administration's policies and programs are upheld, either by Congress or the courts, the American people can say good-by to free speech and a free press. That is how far along the road to dictatorship we will have come.

It would be unfair, however, to put all the blame on BUCHANAN. We should remember that this lobbying investigation was instigated by President Truman himself. We should also remember that, according to the President's own definition, lobbying is a vicious activity of selfish interests when it is conducted in opposition to his programs, but it is a public service when it is designed to favor those programs.

We have often observed that dictatorship is essential to the success of socialism. But dictatorship cannot be established without intimidation of the opposition and suppression of the right to criticize. Maybe it is later than we realized.

Somebody Is Getting a Selling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hoosier Farmer:

It is strange that so many references, criticisms, and questioning opinions are being made—all with an air of innocence and coincidence—about the merits of current price-support legislation as it is being administered through the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

At the time of the American Farm Bureau convention, newspapers published the regular weekly survey by Dr. George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion. There is nothing unusual about his report and the fact it was published. What was unusual was that the entire survey appeared to be a clever, biased indictment of present price-support programs. It was headlined: Public Frowns on United States Egg, Potato Buying.

This is the way the biased questions were asked, according to the report, and probably accounts for the biased answers:

"The Government in Washington is now buying up large quantities of eggs to keep the market price of eggs up and insure a fair income to poultrymen. What is your opinion of this Government egg-price-support program?

"The Government in Washington is now buying up tens of millions of bushels of potatoes to keep the market price of potatoes up and insure a fair income to the growers. What is your opinion of this Government potato-price-support program?"

Then after reporting that 61 percent of the people disapproved of the egg-price-support program and that 58 percent disapproved of the potato-price-support program, the following statement was made by Dr. Gallup, which we question as being biased and misleading to millions of consumers, who could get the mistaken opinion that the so-called Brannan plan would be simpler and cost less:

"The issue of farm-price subsidies is expected to be one of the major questions in the new session of Congress which begins in January.

"The cost to the consumer of subsidies, in the form of high prices, is one of the factors which led Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan to propose the so-called Brannan plan. Under this plan, farm prices would be allowed to seek their own level, without any Government supports. The Government would then make up the difference to the farmer between the price he gets for his product and the parity price.

"The Brannan plan, which seeks to accomplish the double purpose of low prices to consumers but good income to farmers, has aroused a controversy in farm circles. A fight over the measure is expected in Congress if President Truman recommends the Brannan plan in his message on the opening of Congress."

Coupled with this example of implied criticism, regardless of whether or not it was intentional, have come many stories recently in newspapers and magazines about the costliness of current price support operations of the CCC.

One commentator recently said farmers got more than $3,000,000,000 in subsidies last year from CCC. Of course, it is never pointed out that these figures are based on the assumption that all commodities under Government storage and purchase agreements have no value or are lost.

But, this is not the case. The CCC has handled billions of dollars worth of commodities since it was created and has lost relatively little. For several years, it actually operated at a net profit. Of course, the CCC does have the risk of losing money on its operations, but it is misleading to assume it will lose its entire investment until it actually has.

Could it be that Brannan plan advocates are using innocent, uninformed persons and agencies to create dissatisfaction with present legislation in the hope of getting a socialistic plan for farmers?

Capitol Stuff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John O'Donnell, from the New York Daily News of June 15, 1950:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 14.—On Monday of next week the dapper young Congressman DICK NIXON, of California, fresh from his victorious campaign for the GOP senatorial nomination, will pitch to the House a package of pure political dynamite with the fuse burning. It will take a brave Democrat to stamp on this one.

NIXON, who in the Senate race is opposing the New Deal glamour girl, HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, will introduce a bill demanding a congressional investigation of the Veterans' Administration action in closing down hospitals as a so-called economy measure.

It was NIXON who, as a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, finally smoked out Alger Hiss and the newly indicted William Remington of the Commerce Department. Now he's coming back to the Capitol, spitting on his hands and getting ready to build a new fire under the administration's britches.

WORRIED DEMS BEGIN TO FEEL THE HEAT

This blaze, like the one NIXON kindled under Hiss, will burn from coast to coast and

already such worried Democratic Senators as FRANCIS MYERS, of Pennsylvania, and BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut, are beginning to feel the heat.

NIXON, himself a veteran of 4 years in the United States Navy in World War II, and thousands of other veterans are now convinced that the Truman administration is trying to give the ex-servicemen the old heave-ho. The vets are turning Republican. The exhibit of dirty Kansas City politics NIXON may be able to dig out of the VA in this new investigation stands an excellent chance of changing the course of the whole November elections.

The immediate cause of NIXON'S anger is the action of the VA in closing down the Birmingham General Hospital at Van Nuys, Calif., in a dry, comfortable climate, and moving some 1,500 patients, including paraplegics and TB victims, to the fog-bound naval hospital at Long Beach. Some of the paraplegics, depending upon Birmingham treatment for their lives had built special houses at Van Nuys to enable them to move around in a limited fashion.

But Van Nuys is in a solid Republican district represented by the veteran legislator CARL HINSHAW, who is counted as a shoo-in come November. Long Beach is represented by the Democratic CLYDE DOYLE, who is in for a tough fight. And the administration recently shut down a navy yard and the navy hospital at Long Beach. DOYLE needed help.

While this is the local situation which is touching off NIXON'S new campaign, it is symbolic, and the angered vets throughout the country who are getting the old brush-off already are reacting violently.

"STUBBORN MAN," VETS' NAME FOR TRUMAN

The usually calm and friendly (to the administration) publications Army Times and Vet-Times, published in Washington and reaching more than 200,000 subscribers, took the hide off President Harry Truman editorially in the June 3 issue. The mail has been pouring in cheering the editors on.

The editorial, Stubborn Man, gives more than a straw in the wind, so far as the thinking of the angry veterans is concerned. The editor starts off recalling that Truman refused point blank to see three disabled vets, two of them paraplegics and one a TB patient, who flew to Washington from California to protest the closing of the Birmingham Hospital.

"There is no valid reason why the President of the United States should not have given audience to these maimed men of World War II," the editor wrote." He could have listened to their story and still refused to interfere with the closing of the outmoded Birmingham Hospital.

"As a matter of fact, had he done so, we would have admired him for sticking to his guns."

The President's complaint that he was not going to yield to any pressure was tossed aside as wholly invalid.

"Could it be," the editor asks, "that the President's consideration for veterans is gaged by force of numbers, or by their physical ability to make their own way to the polls?

"Last year, after he had flown thousands of miles to Miami and De Moines, Iowa, and visited Philadelphia to attend the national convention of the Veteran of Foreign Wars, AMVETS, and the American Legion, he refused to cross the street from the White House to look in on the nearby convention of the Blinded Veterans' Association. He refused either to speak to the veterans or to look at the exhibits of their handiwork."

POLITICAL HACKS ALWAYS WELCOMED

The editor noted cynically that the war-blinded are few in number and can't turn up many votes, then said bitterly, "or maybe the robust and healthy President is allergic to men who have lost control of their limbs or lost their sight in the service of their country."

The White House doors are "always swung wide open when some political hack blows into town from Missouri," the editor writes. "We don't think the President's stature has been increased by the latest exhibition of his renowned quality of stubbornness. He first refused to discuss the case of the paraplegics when screen and radio star Frances Langford boarded his train while he was campaigning for votes in the West last month. He is standing on that decision."

Then here is the snapper which was sent to the more than 200,000 servicemen and vets all over the United States, and in Europe and Japan:

"We are becoming weary of this stubborn quality in our President. We wonder if it is not this same quality of unreasonable stubbornness which is responsible for the prolonged stalemate in the cold war—for our failure to move forward on the road to peace in the 5 years stubborn Mr. Truman has been President."

Some 15,000,000 men served in the Armed Forces in World War II. If Nixon and other Republicans can tap these votes heavily there will be a host of refreshing new faces around the Capitol after November 1950 and after November 1952.

One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in a public-affairs bulletin entitled "Natural Resources Activity of the Federal Government," compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, a comprehensive and informative article on the work of the Corps of United States Army Engineers.

On June 16 the Corps of Engineers celebrated its one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary. The long history of the Corps of Engineers dates back to the beginning of our country; in fact, it was established by a resolution of the Continental Congress on the day before the Battle of Bunker Hill was fought. To my mind, the long record of public service of development and improvement of the natural resources of our country, of the defense of our freedom and liberties in time of conflict, of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, is unequaled in the annals of history.

I attach herewith, as a part of my remarks, excerpts from the article above referred to:

The Corps of Engineers, United States Army, dates from June 16, 1775, the day before the Battle of Bunker Hill, when the Continental Congress resolved: "That there be one Chief Engineer at the Grand Army and that his pay be $60 per month. That two assistants be employed under him, and that the pay of each of them be $20 per month."

On March 11, 1779, the Continental Congress resolved "that the engineers in the service of the United States shall be formed into a corps and styled the 'Corps of Engineers'."

In 1783, the Secretary of War reported that the Army engineers had accepted the commutation of 5 years' pay in lieu of half pay for life. The following month the Continental Army was dissolved, and the small Corps of Engineers mustered out of the service.

Consequently, when the Congress in 1793 decided to fortify certain harbors along the eastern coast, it was necessary to appoint engineers from civil life. These appointees were principally Frenchmen, a few of whom had served in the Continental Army and remained in America. The following year the combined Corps of Artillerists and Engineers was established. A number of the civilian engineer appointees received commissions in the Army and remained on duty in connection with the construction of harbor defenses.

The combined corps was short-lived. On March 16, 1802, the Congress authorized the President to organize and establish a Corps of Engineers, and stated, "That the said corps * * * shall be stationed at West Point, in the State of New York, and shall constitute a military academy * * * that the principal engineer * * * shall have the superintendence of the said military academy, under the direction of the President of the United States."

Thus, a single act of Congress created the Corps of Engineers as a permanent branch of the Military Establishment and established the United States Military Academy.

During the first half century of the Nation's life, the engineers of the Army became a key unit in the development of the country's resources. They blazed the trails, protected the migrating settlers and constructed the roads. Engineer officers were loaned to private enterprise to assist in the construction of railroads. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad between Baltimore and Pittsburgh was constructed by such Army engineers and former graduates of the military academy.

In 1852, Congress placed river and harbor improvements "under the superintendence of the Secretary of War." Flood control, the development of hydroelectric power, beach erosion control, and the administration of the laws for the preservation and protection of the navigable waters of the United States were added to the civil works responsibilities at later dates, some quite recently.

In 1866, the engineers were relieved of responsibility for supervision of the academy at West Point.

During World War I, the engineers were called upon to construct new ports, railways, highways, bridges, and fortifications, and to operate sawmills, quarries, and factories. Between 1916 and the end of the war, the corps was expanded from 256 officers and 2,200 enlisted men to 11,175 officers and 235,000 enlisted men.

Under the Defense Act of 1920, which became the fundamental military law of the United States, the Corps of Engineers was reduced to approximately 600 officers and 4,000 enlisted men. But the events which followed 1939 demanded an enormous increase in this strength.

In World War II, it became the third largest branch of the Army, with a wartime strength of more than 750,000 men. In the 5 years between July 1940 and the successful conclusion of hostilities, the Army built nearly 3,000 command installation projects and 300 major industrial construction projects, at a total cost approaching $11,000,000,000. This unprecedented construction

took place in the United States alone. Overseas construction equalled the Zone of Interior program in extent and pace, if not in total quantity.

When hostilities ceased, the engineers' military responsibilities changed. It is still the primary mission of the corps to meet the engineering requirements of the Army. But today, these requirements include troop housing and hospital construction in occupied areas and at overseas bases, and a continued supply of such engineer equipment and materials as must come from the United States.

The Corps of Engineers, United States Army, was first called upon to undertake public improvement of the Nation's navigable waterways by an act of Congress approved April 30, 1824. Since that beginning, civil responsibilities have been assigned by laws of Congress, and the funds for these civil works functions have been appropriated separately from the funds of the Army. At the present time, the potential civil construction program (projects that have been authorized by Congress, but for which all funds have not, as yet, been appropriated) totals approximately $5,000,000,000.

The Civil Works Division in the Office, Chief of Engineers, is responsible for the supervision of these civil functions. Responsibilities in the fields of navigation, flood control, development of hydroelectric power, beach-erosion control, and administration of laws for the preservation and protection of navigable waters are effected through 47 districts, grouped into 12 regional divisions which, in the United States, conform roughly to watersheds. The territory in which the Corps of Engineers maintains its civil-works program includes the continental United States, Alaska, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Hawaii, the Philippines, and other Pacific islands.

The continued assignment of civil works to the Corps of Engineers was not prompted alone by a desire on the part of Congress to develop the natural resources of the country. Congress purposely considered the advantages which such an assignment would bring to the Nation's Military Establishment. This decision has been maintained through the years, and continues to be a strong feature of our defense program.

With the increasing growth of the Nation, the need for controlling, conserving, and utilizing the resources of our rivers has become more and more evident. Problems and potentialities of the river basins which were relatively minor considerations or nonexistent in a sparsely settled agricultural country have become increasingly important to a growing industrial nation.

During the first session of Congress, an act was passed to improve the safety of navigation by the marking of harbors and waterways. The Swamp and Overflowed Land Grant Acts of 1850 may be regarded as the initial efforts of the Federal Government in river-basin development. Large areas of public lands were turned over to the States, subject to the requirement that they would be improved by drainage or the establishment of flood protection. Initial cognizance of flood control as a problem of national interest occurred in 1879, when the Mississippi River Commission was created by Congress.

In 1888 Congress appropriated funds for surveys to determine the extent to which the arid regions of the United States could be reclaimed by irrigation and for selection of reservoir sites for the storage of water, and directed that this work be performed under the jurisdiction of the Geological Survey. Congress passed, in 1902, the initial Reclamation Act, under which Federal reclamation activities are being carried on in that part of the United States west of the ninety-seventh meridian.

The Federal Power Act adopted in 1920, introduced a degree of Federal regulation of the development and distribution of hydroelectric power, under the administration of the Federal Power Commission. The passage of the Flood Control Act of 1928, following the severe Mississippi Valley floods of the previous year, established the present comprehensive plan for flood control in that valley.

Meanwhile, in 1925, Congress had authorized the Secretary of War, through the Corps of Engineers, and the Federal Power Commission to prepare an estimate of costs for survey of the rivers in the United States "with a view to the formulation of general plans for the most effective improvement of such streams for the purposes of navigation, and the prosecution of such improvement in combination with the most efficient development of the potential water power, the control of floods, and the needs of irrigation." These estimates were submitted to Congress in 1926 (H. Doc. No. 308, 69th Cong., 1st session.). The River and Harbor Acts of 1927 and 1928 authorized surveys of nearly all of the rivers of the United States.

The great majority of these "308" river-basin surveys were completed by the Corps of Engineers during the ensuing 10-year period. After a series of destructive floods in various parts of the country, Congress gave increased consideration to the Nation-wide scope of the flood problem. The Flood Control Act of 1936 established flood control generally throughout the Nation as a Federal activity and authorized a large number of specific flood-control projects to be constructed and maintained by the Corps of Engineers. This act also recognized the need for runoff retardation and soil-erosion prevention in river basins and made the Secretary of Agriculture responsible for such improvements. This act, with subsequent acts in the years 1937, 1938, 1939, 1941, 1944, 1946, and 1948 provide the basic legislative authority for flood control and related river-basin improvements throughout the United States.

The great natural resource represented by the soil of the river basins is not a permanent asset unless carefully guarded and maintained. Wasted and eroded lands of old countries and in some parts of America point to what may be anticipated if our soil and other resources are not preserved. The destructive forces of flood, speeded up by unwise development and exploitation, have already created serious conditions which can be rectified only at great cost over a long period of time. Great remaining undamaged resources, however, can be conserved at reasonable cost for the benefit of present and future generations.

Navigation has been important on the rivers of America ever since the Colonial period. Rivers largely controlled the course of settlement until the advent of the railroad. A river-bank location was a prime essential for effective operations in manufacturing, commerce, and trade, and in the commercial agriculture so dominant in the Middle and Southern Colonies.

Development of hydroelectric power has become an increasingly important potentiality of the rivers of the United States. Hydroelectric power developments which have been constructed by private interests, municipalities, and by the Federal Government has an aggregate present installed capacity of 17,127,000 kilowatts. On the basis of studies of possible river-basin development, the Corps of Engineers, in cooperation with the Federal Power Commission has estimated that the feasible water power which remains undeveloped on all the rivers of the United States, except the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes connecting channels, would permit the installation of an aggregate capacity of 79,965,000 kilowatts. Much of this potential power would not now be economical for physical and economic reasons and it may never be practicable to develop all potential power.

Danger Recognized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal of June 17, 1950, entitled "Danger Recognized":

DANGER RECOGNIZED

Even the Democratic Members of the House-Senate Economic Committee recognize the dangers to the economy of the United States inherent in the financial program espoused by President Truman.

In a report on his economic program they generally endorsed his 12-point plan, presented to Congress early in the session, but they sharply criticized the continuance of deficit financing in a time of prosperity.

"In years of such booming business, the Government should not be incurring deficits, the seven majority members of the committee observed in their report. This is a sharply differing statement from those usually made by Democratic supporters of the President and may presage a belated awakening to what should be self-evident facts by the members of the majority party.

The majority's call for a critical examination of the present level of Government expenditures is something that opponents of the administration have been clamoring for and attempting to bring about for a long time. It is ridiculous that a Government should go on piling deficit upon deficit in a time of prosperity. If we cannot balance the budget in times like these, what can we expect to happen if hard times ever do come to the country?

If the Government is ever called upon to face a serious crisis of unemployment and reduced wages we can expect the present four and five billion deficits to soar to many times their present size unless an abrupt stop is put to policies that breed deficits in years of prosperity.

We can expect, of course, no change in the attitude of Mr. Truman and his close advisers. They are committed to deficit financing and even the criticism and disagreement of Members of Congress of his own party can hardly be expected to bring about a change.

Gradually, however, more and more people are coming to recognize the fallacies of the dangerous policies of the President. This trend has now even penetrated to the top echelons of the Democratic Party. If it continues there may yet be hope that we will see the administration come to its senses.

The danger is that if we wait for such an occurrence, the damage may already have been done. The only solution is to force a sound financial policy upon the administration through the weight of public opinion. The switch of Democratic minds on deficit financing may be a sign that some progress toward such an end is being made.

Concerning Equitable Treatment of Postal Subsidies to Air Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] is chairman, has been holding extended hearings on H. R. 2908, a bill which would carry out the recommendations on reorganization by separating the Post Office Department from any consideration of subsidies to airlines.

As a member of that subcommittee, I have followed the testimony with interest and attention. Without predicting what kind of legislation will finally be recommended to the House, we have certainly learned a great deal about the operation of the subsidies and their effect on domestic mail service. Numerous witnesses have been heard, among them spokesmen for the CIO Maritime Committee and for the Pan-American Air Lines.

For your information, and for the information of the House, I include in the RECORD as part of my remarks the text of a letter dated June 9, 1950, from Hoyt Haddock, executive secretary of the Maritime Committee, to an official of Pan-American World Airways System:

JUNE 9, 1950.

Mr. ROGER B. DOULENS,
Pan American World Airways System,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOULENS: I have your letter of May 26, taking exception to my presentation before the Transportation Subcommittee of the House of Representatives on May 24, wherein I opposed the proposal that United States airlines operating on foreign routes be treated differently than the domestic carriers in the bill, H. R. 2908, to separate subsidies from air-mail pay.

I gather that the essence of your objection is that Pan American Airways has made no such proposal and is all for the separation. If that is so, I am very glad to hear it, and hope that you will support the separation bill now before the Transportation Subcommittee of the House Commerce Committee, H. R. 2908, and its companion bill, S. 1431. However, from the previous statements made by Pan American Airways, I understood that Pan American was interested in a different type of separation for its own operations than that contemplated for the domestic lines.

President Truman, the Hoover Commission, the House Post Office Committee, the Senate Appropriations Committee, and the genuine separation bills, H. R. 2908 and S. 1431, all call for separating the concealed subsidies now paid to airlines from the Post Office Budget. By separation, they mean that the present $125,000,000 air-mail payments of the Government should be separated into:

1. A compensatory mail rate, to be paid by the Post Office to the airlines for services rendered, such rate to be based upon the cost to the airlines of rendering these services, plus a fair and reasonable return.

2. Any payments over and above (1) should be considered subsidy, to be brought out in the open, and to be paid from the appropriations of the Civil Aeronautics Board and not the Post Office.

The proposal which Mr. Trippe made at the Senate Commerce Committee on June 23, 1949, to which you referred in your letter, is very different from the separation called for in the above legislation and recommended by the above-mentioned authorities.

On page 1907 of the hearings before the Senate Commerce Committee pursuant to House Resolution 50, June 28, 1949, Mr. Trippe recommended that the compensatory mail rate for American flag carriers operating over foreign routes should be that established by the Universal Postal Union. This is of course a very different kettle of fish than the compensatory mail rate, based upon cost, called for in the genuine separation bills, H. R. 2908 and S. 1431, to separate subsidies from air-mail pay. Far from removing the concealed subsidies in the Post Office budget now paid to the air lines, this recommendation would keep them there, under a different name of course, and perhaps even raise them. For example, it is my understanding from the statistics which I have received from the Civil Aeronautics Board, that in 1949 Pan American World Airways received from the Post Office an average of $2.37 per ton-mile of mail carried, an amount, which includes the concealed subsidies. Under Mr. Trippe's proposal this charge of $2.37 on the Post Office, far from being reduced, would be set at the UPU rate of $2.86 a ton-mile, and furthermore Pan American would be entitled, under Mr. Trippe's proposal, to additional operating subsidies over and above the $2.86.

This amounts to attempting to turn the separation reform into something very different than what was intended, and the economies to the taxpayer and the greater responsibility to be achieved by bringing these subsidies out in the open rather than hiding them in the Post Office budget would be voided.

That the present rate of $2.37 per ton-mile is considerably in excess of a fair compensatory mail rate based upon costs is evidenced by a comparison of your mail revenues with your other forms of traffic:

Pan American World Airways revenues—year ended September 30, 1949, according to CAB:

	Per ton-mile
Passengers	$0.73
Express	.39
Mail	2.37

It is thus easily seen that at present the post office is being compelled to pay a mail rate to Pan American which is much higher than a fair compensatory rate would be. Obviously, it is unfair burden for the post office to have to pay over three times the passenger rate for mail, a type of traffic which does not have to be solicited, advertised for, nor fed, nor fussed over en route. A comparison with the freight rate shows an even greater disparity, with the post office having to pay six times the express rate for mail, a type of cargo which requires no solicitation and which is delivered and picked up by the Federal Government.

Instead of reducing the present post office mail rate to a compensatory mail rate based on cost, as would be done in the case of domestic carriers, Mr. Trippe's proposal would lift the charge to the post office even higher, and then would add on top of that some additional subsidy.

The Universal Postal Union rate at present covers only about 3 percent of American air mail going abroad. It is a rate devised to cover only the odd situation where the United States wants to move United States mail but does not have a United States airplane handy to move it. It would be ridiculous to make this odd rate cover the other 97 percent of our air mail going abroad, which is United States mail on United States aircraft.

Furthermore, Mr. Trippe's proposal would be discriminatory in two ways:

(a) A domestic airline having no international routes might be at a considerable disadvantage competing against another domestic airline which could draw large subsidized mail pay through its international division.

(b) In comparing what our international airlines would have gotten under Mr. Trippe's proposal during 1949, as compared with what they actually would get in mail pay, we find that every airline would have lost except Pan American, which would have gained $3,000,000, and American Overseas Airlines, which would have gained $47,000.

The only places where I know of Mr. Trippe's proposal having found expression in legislation have been in the "chosen instrument" bill supported by the Pan American in 1947 and earlier for the purpose of legislating that there should be just one United States airline to operate on foreign routes. This bill was not favorably acted on by either the Senate Commerce Committee or the Senate and received a good deal of unfavorable comment in the press and among the general public.

We are opposed to continuing the present practice of concealing anywhere between $30,000,000 and $60,000,000 a year of airline subsidies in the Post Office budget: (1) because these concealed subsidies add heavily to the postal deficit at a time when cuts are being made in the mail services to the public, and (2) because under an irresponsible and hidden system these concealed subsidies can be used as a weapon by management against labor.

As I noted in my statement, the Hoover Commission recommended the separation reform for the air transportation of both "domestic and foreign air mail." We believe the separation reform should be applied equally and fairly to all parts of the air transportation industry. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

I am amazed by your statement that "so challenging, in effect, were Mr. Trippe's recommendations to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, that they form, in large part, the basis of that body's report on separation affecting international carriers."

Does this mean, in effect, that Pan American Airways is boasting that it writes, "in large part," the reports of a committee of the United States Senate?

Very truly yours,

HOYT S. HADDOCK,
Executive Secretary.

Politics First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal of June 16, 1950, entitled "Politics First":

POLITICS FIRST

The same situation apparently exists in England as prevails in this country—the party in power is more interested in advancing its own fortunes than in doing what is best for the nation.

The proclivity of the Truman administration for the playing of politics is an old

story. What the political effect will be has always been the first consideration of the administration rather than the protection and security of the Nation. This has been particularly true regarding the revelation of Communists and Red sympathizers in high posts in Government. Unfailingly there has been an effort to cover up rather than an attempt to drive them out.

The same sentiment now has been revealed in England. The Labor Government of Great Britain has opposed British participation in the Schuman plan not on the grounds of what such an amalgamation of coal and steel production would do to the country but because it would require the Labor Government to cooperate with non-Socialistic governments of western Europe.

This policy on the part of the Labor Government has even been denounced by their fellows of the Socialist Party of France. What would happen if the United States, which has not yet entirely embraced socialism, would refuse to cooperate with Britain because her government is in the hands of the Socialists? England would be in a sorry shape indeed if it were not for American assistance, a fact which some of the British can very conveniently forget.

The Schuman plan is something that the United States has been working for and urging for a long time. It requires a great deal of sacrifice on the part of the French and their willingness to submit to such a plan is a most hopeful sign. The British refusal strikes a most sour note and raises grave doubts as to the wisdom of giving further help so long as the short-sighted Labor Government remains in power.

Perhaps, from a British standpoint, it would be wisest for England not to take part in the coal and steel pool, but certainly the proposal should not be rejected on mere political grounds The British Socialists have demonstrated a serious weakness in their ability to govern through their action of the past week.

More Bust Than Trust

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of June 1, 1950:

The Government's suit against the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. may arrest or reverse a grotesque trend in American trust busting, a trend that is more bust than trust. For the suit, with its attendant publicity, is bringing home to the people three extraordinary developments in monopoly prosecution:

1. The antitrust laws are so diffuse and vague in their interpretation that no business can know right from wrong until the Supreme Court says so, and then only until the next case comes up.

2. The antitrust laws are being used to protect competitors rather than competition.

3. The consumer is no longer a prime concern; he takes second place to small businesses, jobbers, inefficient competitors who might be injured by a big company.

These things have been going on for some years. But they have been revealed only in complex cases involving rigid conduits, cement, wholesale gasoline, salt, and so on. The A. & P. case hit the American home where it hurt, in the food budget. It is bringing to light the absurdities that have been concealed in legalisms and gobbledygook.

There was the Morton Salt case. Here the Supreme Court decided that a company that granted discounts for quantity purchases might be guilty of injuring competition if there was only a reasonable possibility of such injury. Obviously this would protect the small retailer who could not buy salt in quantity, but what protection it affords the consumer is impossible to discern. Anyhow, Justice Jackson sagely observed in his dissent that the effect of the decision was to make any quantity discount illegal if the Federal Trade Commission decided it was.

Then there was the Indiana Standard Oil case, in which the company cut its price to certain gasoline jobbers in order to meet the competition of another company. Some of the jobbers passed the cut along, and Indiana was in the soup, because it shouldn't have sold to price-cutters, or so the FTC decreed. But now, as Lowell Mason of that commission points out, the Attorney General is threatening to throw a lot of oil companies in jail because they refuse to sell to price-cutters. They're criminals if they do, and criminals if they don't.

It has been decided illegal for a company to charge the same prices as its competitors, even if there is no conspiracy whatever to do so. Yet to undersell a competitor may bring prosecution also.

The result of all this is that companies are completely in the dark as to what is legal and what is not. But more ominous yet is the evidence that the antitrust laws are being used as the implement of a social philosophy which undertakes to restrict the rewards for business competence and daring. Harry A. Toulmin, who has just completed a seven-volume treatise on the antitrust laws, observes that "It is wise to consider that these laws are equally useful to the most rigid reactionary and the most extreme socialistic and communistic minds."

Something of this deviation to the left in antitrust legislation has come to public attention in the A. & P. suit. As Harold Fleming says in the Harvard Business Review, "American business had better take its case to the public, as A. & P. has done. It is licked in all the courts but one—the higher court of public opinion."

New Federal Fiscal Control Procedures on Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. F. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Herbert J. Miller, from Tax Review for May 1950:

NEW FEDERAL FISCAL CONTROL PROCEDURES ON TRIAL—PERFORMANCE BUDGETING, CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS MEASURE, USED FOR FIRST TIME, POINT WAY TO ECONOMY

(By Herbert J. Miller)

Invoking of two noteworthy Federal fiscal procedures has made (and promises to make) 1950 a year of unusual importance in Federal budget history. While so far experience with these procedures—performance budgeting and the consolidated appropriation bill—is still fragmentary, their utilization through the first half of the year is properly the subject for evaluation at this time.

When the President presented to Congress in January his new-type budget for the fiscal year 1951 (beginning next July 1), it was widely hailed as an example of what could be accomplished by following the Hoover Commission's recommendation that the Federal Government use a simplified, performance-type budgetary document. And, while it did not hew as closely to the line the Commission had suggested and represented only in part the plan offered for a performance budget, it nonetheless was a real step in the right direction. As such, it offers some clues to its future value and effectiveness.

In offering this remedy for the out-moded budget style (as one way to bring efficiency to the Federal Government), the Commission said:

"Under performance budgeting, attention is centered on the function or activity—on the accomplishment of the purpose—instead of on lists of employees or authorizations of purchases. In reality, this method of budgeting concentrates congressional action and Executive direction on the scope and magnitude of the different Federal activities. It places both accomplishment and cost in a clear light before the Congress and the people."

Performance budgeting is not a new procedure. Essentially, it calls for the presentation of, and the substantiation for, the expenditures of Government by program, so that the cost of each program or project can be weighed in terms of estimated performance, then later checked to disclose actual performance and cost.

Under performance budgeting, the objects of expenditure, i. e., personnel, supplies, etc., are subordinated to the program to be achieved. This has caused some difficulty and aroused some criticism from Members of Congress because the detailed schedules of the objects of expenditures were not available to the same extent as formerly.

However, this criticism, while justified in most cases, was not a weakness of the performance budget technique, because in no sense does it eliminate disclosure of those objects of expenditure, the building blocks of the program structure.

Rather, the failure was due more to inadequate accounting and reporting. Both the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and the ranking minority member have recognized this and have given warning on the subject, a warning which deserves the immediate attention of both Congress and the executive branch.

ACCOUNTING REFORM IS KEY

More specifically, in referring to the lack of appropriate accounting information and the need for improved accounting, the House Appropriations Committee report on the 1951 consolidated appropriations bill comments:

"The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government recommended a very extensive revision of the form in which the Federal budget is presented to the Congress, and the 1951 budget, as presented, is an effort to comply with the recommendations of the commission. Much improvement over the old form has been made, but only the first steps have been taken.

"It will require 2 or 3 years to realize the full benefit that should flow from the structural revisions undertaken pursuant to the commission's recommendations. In its full fruition it is hoped and expected that the better presentation of data will enable the Congress to appropriate more intelligently and provide funds more nearly in line with actual requirements.

"This can be accomplished only if the budget data are so directly related to the

accounting data available in the agencies as to make possible a close check on cost of operations. Some of the schedules in the budget for 1951 meet this test. Others are so written as actually to result in lessened facility for consideration by the Congress as compared with the old system.

"Some of the schedules are so drawn as in reality to make the budget justification notes submitted in support thereof purely a series of essays with price tag attached. Frequency it is no possible to compare workload data and past year costs with estimated future requirements. Unless these schedules are revised in such form as to adapt themselves to appropriate accounting systems, the Committee on Appropriations will be confronted each year with the task of comparing an estimate of requirements for the future with an estimate of expenditures in the past, rather than being able to compare estimates of future requirements with actual costs of past operations.

"The Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Director of the Budget have undertaken a joint program to improve accounting processes in the Government. In this effort lies the success or failure of the performance-type budget. It was not expected that the 1951 budget would furnish cost data for the current and past years inasmuch as most agencies of the Government are operating antiquated accounting systems which do not produce the kind of cost information which is required. But if the new method is to succeed, immediate attention must be given to modernization and improvement of accounting systems, and the schedules presented in the budget must be so written as to provide a basis for proper accounting. * * *"

It is clear then that experience to date with the performance budget technique indicates that improvements in the form and contents of the budget, must, in many instances, await reform in the governmental accounting system.

In this connection it is well to remember that the Hoover Commission cited the following five major deficiencies in the present accounting system:

1. There is no formal accounting plan for the Government as a whole.

2. No one is charged with the duty of developing such a plan.

3. There is no one who would have the power to install such a plan and compel compliance with its provisions.

4. The statutes make no provision for either a complete accounting system or a chief accounting officer to direct accounting activities.

5. The auditing functions under the Comptroller General are so involved at present with accounting and other administrative matters, they fail to operate effectively.

A PROMISE HELD OUT

It should be pointed out, however, that so far one (but the only one) important congressional action looking to improvement of governmental accounting since the Hoover report was made, is contained in the National Security Act amendments of 1949. If a laboratory of detailed, objective appraisal of performance budgeting, teamed with real accounting control, is wanted, the Department of Defense offers it today.

The only present official hope for improvement along the accounting line lies in the cooperative effort now under way involving the General Accounting Office, the Treasury, and the Budget Bureau.

To the extent, then, that the 1951 budget followed performance budgeting practices, it was a real improvement in over-all presentation and shows the promise it holds if accounting facts can supply the details of past cost performance—the one way to review and to justify proposed expenditures.

To turn to the other facet of 1950's Federal fiscal progress, the consolidated appropriations procedure, it is noteworthy that the Hoover Commission's Fiscal, Budgeting and Accounting Task Force recommended that the number of appropriation bills (from 10 to 12) be reduced to one or two. This supported the proposals made by Senators BYRD and BUTLER several years ago, as well as the Senate action approving a concurrent resolution to combine all appropriation bills into one.

Chairman Clarence Cannon of the House Appropriations Committee, invoked this procedure with the result that the consolidated appropriations bill passed the House and is now before the Senate.

AN IMPORTANT TOOL

While it is not a completely consolidated bill (since certain appropriations are not in it) it is another important experiment in appropriation history which bids fair to become more important as experience in its use is gained by the Congress.

To date, some critics of the procedure have based their criticism on the fact that the bill as it passed the House did not confine expenditures to the total of estimated revenue. Of course, the procedure is no guaranty of such a result. Actually, the bill is only a tool for the use of Congress. The bill covered only $30,613,000,000 of budget requests for appropriations and contract authorizations for fiscal 1951, out of a total of $43,607,000,000. The $12,994,000,000 not covered consisted primarily of interest on the debt and items of proposed legislation requiring authorization by Congress, such as foreign aid, aid to education, etc. Items of the latter type will be considered under the bill in the Senate—if the authorizing action has taken place.

The economy record established by the House in this first experiment with the consolidated appropriations technique applies only to the $30,613,000,000 of budget requests considered in the bill. As reported by the Appropriations Committee to the House, the bill contained an estimated reduction of $1,500,000,000 below budget requests. Amendments to the bill in the House both increased and decreased the amounts reported by the committee. The increases approved totaled $485,000,000, of which $406,000,000 was for defense. Specific decreases totaling $35,000,000 were approved, in addition to the Taber-Thomas and Jensen amendments.

The Taber-Thomas amendment (adopted 274 to 112) requires an over-all reduction of $600,000,000 in appropriations and contract authorizations in the bill as adopted by the House. These are to be achieved largely through placing limitations on amounts estimated in the budget to be spent for such administrative categories as civilian personnel, travel, transportation of things, communication services, rent and utilities, printing, supplies, equipment, lands and structures and other contractual services. The limitations are based primarily on percentage reductions, largely excluding the department of defense.

Over all, the cut below the total budget estimates for these purposes exceeds the $600,000,000 paring required under the Taber-Thomas amendment; but the Appropriations Committee already had made reductions in some of these areas, so that it is not possible to determine at this stage, how close the limitations will come toward realizing the projected $600,000,000 savings. Representative TABER, however, it is said, has pointed out that if the limitations are not sufficient to realize the $600,000,000 cut, the wording of the amendment would then require additional restrictions within the affected areas.

TANGIBLE EVIDENCE SHOWN

The Jensen amendment, directed solely at reducing Federal civilian personnel costs, provides that not more than 10 percent of vacancies occurring in the ranks of civilian personnel shall be filled during fiscal 1951 (with certain stated exceptions, notably defense).

Representative JENSEN, of Iowa, sponsor of this amendment (adopted 201 to 185), estimates that if put into action it will result in savings of approximately $371,000,000 in the next fiscal year. However, there is still some question as to the extent to which this amendment will overlap the limitation on civilan personnel costs under the Taber-Thomas amendment.

Taking into consideration then the $1,500,000,000 cut made by the Appropriations Committee, the specific increases voted during consideration of the bill and allowing for the reduction under the Taber-Thomas amendment, it appears that the bill as passed by the House is about $1,700,000,000 below comparable budget estimates. This omits, however, any possible savings under the Jensen amendment where the estimate of savings runs between zero and $371,000,000.

To those who regard reduction of Government expenditures as a drastic need, these amendments are offered as tangible evidence of the efficacy of the consolidated appropriation technique because it is unlikely such reductions would have been approved had appropriations been presented in their former hit-or-miss, piecemeal fashion.

To others, the cuts are too drastic, unfair to some departments, meat-ax techniques, and shots in the dark. But here again, much of this attack is based on the fact that too little is known about the possible definite effect the amendments will have if applied. Again, this is more evidence of a faulty accounting system which fails to reveal what is necessary for either good management or effective legislative control of expenditures.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

Probably the most definite defense of the consolidated appropriations procedure comes from Representative CANNON, who, in a speech before the House (as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 22) made the following comments about the values of the technique:

1. It permits an earlier report of appropriations to the House.

2. It contributes to a more thorough consideration and processing of estimates and appropriations.

3. It protects the bill against amendments increasing appropriations or adding new appropriations.

4. It tends to keep Members on the floor (during consideration of all appropriations under one bill).

Enlarging on this point, Representative CANNON said:

"Under the old system, large bills were frequently passed with a scant two dozen Members present, and proponents of increases in appropriations, by carefully timing their attendance, could put through amendments which would not have been agreed to with more Members present. In fact, one of the few objections voiced against the omnibus bill is that it irks Members by keeping them on the floor. I think there will be general agreement that the taxpayers would rather irk the Members a little—at, say, a million dollars per irk—during the consideration of the one bill than to pay the additional taxes due to the absence of Members in the pursuit of their official duties elsewhere."

5. It unquestionably retrenches expenditures.

6. It prevents logrolling.

7. It visualizes at a glance the outline of national income and expenditures and centers the attention of the country on the national fiscal picture. "The omnibus appro-

priation bill has made the entire country definitely deficit conscious."

8. The reception of the bill in the Senate also justifies the consolidation of appropriations in one bill. "Heretofore it has been difficult, if not impossible, to make such comparisons [between revenue and deficit estimates in connection with expenditures], as no one knew until the last bill passed both the House and the Senate the aggregate amounts involved."

Finally, it is of significance that of the cuts so far voted very little has been done to reduce the functions, or programs, of Government; rather the reducing has been more in the field of administrative management costs and covers the scope explored by the Hoover Commission. However, there is evidence that Congress has taken a sterner attitude on adoption of new functions and programs.

Up to the present there is no question that greater cuts could have been made in functions and programs, but at least the consolidated appropriation measure—as a bold and new step—helped bring the entire Federal fiscal picture into focus and thereby proved its intrinsic value.

As further experience is gained in its use it is to be hoped that the vitally needed reforms in Government accounting will develop with it and give Congress the facts it must have to use this fiscal tool in the most effective fashion. To do otherwise, when every precaution should be taken to safeguard our national solvency in the face of deficits and mounting national debts, would be tragic indeed.

Address by Hon. Oscar Ewing Before National Committee for Labor Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to introduce as part of my remarks the able and impressive address of the Honorable Oscar Ewing, of New York, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, delivered before the second national conference of the American trade-union council, National Committee for Labor Israel, at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington, D. C., Sunday, June 18, 1950.

I am proud of this speech as a professed and persevering Zionist with great hope for the future of that new republic which, although I have never visited it, seems to me a second homeland; I am proud of this speech as a Democrat, because a leader of my party in a high place has shown an understanding of the problems of Israel and of the problems of labor in Israel that demonstrates real study and knowledge and sympathy; and I am proud as an American that a spokesman for America thus holds out the hand of understanding friendship.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that Members of this great House, the legislative forum of the greatest and most powerful and one of the oldest of human democracies, will read with the same sympathy and understanding the words of Oscar Ewing, and will bear in mind that Israel, the youngest of the world's democratic governments, is but the reincarnation of the oldest—the ancient Jewish state, which so profoundly influenced the thinking of the founding fathers of America.

It is pertinent to add that the American trade-union council is the common meeting ground of the very backbone of American democracy in action—the organized-labor movement. Here is an organization in which both craft and industrial unions, with all their divergent aims and procedures, can and do come together in friendship and unity for the furtherance of the democratic processes on every front:

I am glad to meet again with the friends of labor Israel. One does not have to be a Jew to be counted among Israel's friends. It is enough, I think, to stand for human freedom, human dignity, human progress. These are the aims of every democracy. They are the aims of the labor democracy of Israel. Any man who stands for freedom, dignity, and progress is inevitably a friend of the people of Israel, as of all free nations. That is why you are here today. It is why I am here.

Earlier this year, I visited Israel and I saw for myself what was happening in that little strip of land by the shores of the Mediterranean. I saw the energy with which the people were planning, and working, and building, creating for themselves a homeland where they could be happy, and prosperous, and proud. I saw the cities and the farms, the workshops and factories, the highways and hospitals and bridges and schools. I caught the spirit of enthusiasm and devotion which is the hallmark of that new republic. And I saw the enormous problems which remain to be solved—economic problems, social problems, educational problems, political problems, international problems—which have piled one on top of the other to harrass the people of Israel. But I saw beyond these problems, to the core of truth: which is that the people of Israel are determined to solve every one of these problems. You and I know that they will carry out their determination.

Everywhere, during my visit to Israel, I saw the handiwork of the Histadrut. In agriculture, in labor, in industry and commerce, in cultural activities, and in the social services, the Histadrut is stamping its trademark on the life of the nation. It is a good trademark. It is the union label of Israel. It stands for a new, free, democratic way of life, "made in Israel."

HISTADRUT TAKES LEAD

For us in America it is hard to appreciate how deeply the influence of the Histadrut really goes. We have strong labor unions, and we are proud of them. But in Israel the Histadrut covers approximately one-half of the entire Jewish community.

I was especially impressed to find that the Histadrut was taking the lead in integrating the Arab minority into the economy of the country on an equal basis. There are something like a hundred thousand Israeli Arabs today, and 52 percent of the working people among them are in the Histadrut. They are being taught the new western ways of living and working. At the night schools they are learning Hebrew and modern skills. In the end they will be able to participate in the nation's work on an equal basis.

You have a right to be proud of what the Histadrut is doing for its Arab members. In spite of the tensions of the past, and in spite of the coolness that still exists between Israel and her neighbors, the great goal must be peace—peace in the Middle East, and peace throughout the world. To achieve peace in the Middle East it will not be enough for the Arab nations to learn how to get along with Israel. It will be just as necessary for the Jews of Israel to learn how to get along with the Arabs. I believe that the Histadrut program for its Arab members is a step in this direction, and for this reason it has an importance even beyond what it does for the welfare of the individual people concerned.

PART OF ZIONIST DREAM

All this, as I see it, is part of the great dream of the young Zionist immigrants who came to Palestine from eastern Europe a generation or more ago and founded this great democratic labor movement. They sought to establish there a Jewish commonwealth rooted in the soil and free of the social defects of the countries whence they came. Today, so soon after the birth pangs of the nation, it is already possible to say that their dream is coming true. They have built an aristocracy of labor, but they have put all the people into that aristocracy. And they have avoided the dangerous trap of totalitarian blandishments.

I have read the text of the resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Histadrut last month, when the organization decided to withdraw from the Communist-controlled World Federation of Trade Unions, because—in their own words—"the existing WFTU is no longer the general and comprehensive body to which the Histadrut was affiliated," and that "in these circumstances it is not possible for the Histadrut to continue to remain a member of the WFTU."

Here in America we have built our Nation. It is strong. It is secure. It is self-confident. It has marked out the path of democratic progress which it intends to follow. Thus it was altogther natural that we should abruptly and unhesitatingly reject communism.

RIGHT AND COURAGEOUS CHOICE

But in Israel the people are only at the beginning of the road. Their greatest strength lies in their spirit. Their security lies largely in their few hundreds of thousands of pairs of hands. Their confidence lies mostly in their own ability to solve the pressing problems that confront them. Their future is not yet clear, in the way that America's future is clear.

Yet, without any pressure from the outside, the leaders of democratic labor in Israel made their choice. I say it was not only the right choice but also the courageous choice. And I say we should salute the Histadrut for having had the wisdom and courage to make clear this forthright rejection of communism.

I have never been impressed by the fears and doubts of those critics of Israel, who have warned us, from time to time, that there is a serious danger of communism in the new country. It is a ridiculous fear, an irrational doubt. There are too many Jews in Israel who have suffered at the hands of one form of totalitarianism to want to experiment with another form. There are too many intelligent, informed, sophisticated men and women in Israel to be taken in by the hypocritical promises of the Communists. And there is too powerful a tradition of fundamental democracy, of individual worth, of independent thought, among Jews for them ever to accept the regimentation of communism. In America our citizens of the Jewish faith have contributed vastly to our industry, our professions, our culture, and our American civilization—and their contribution has helped to create the liberal society which flourishes here despite the rantings of certain Senators and certain newspapers which should know better.

CREATING A HAPPY LAND

Halfway across the world, the citizens of Israel are building a labor democracy which has no truck with totalitarianism. They have a national ideology which cannot, by its very nature, go along with the Moscow line. But they are also creating something that is even more important than ideology—a new society in the Middle East where people can be both free and well-fed, both happy and well-clothed, both self-governed and well-housed. In short, they are working to create a happy land. In a happy land there is no communism.

It will take a long time. It will take hard work. But that is the way the people of Israel are heading.

In recent months, I understand, the Histadrut—which is not only the largest union but also one of the largest employers in Israel—has been placing more and more emphasis on increased production by each worker. It is obvious that, for its very survival, the industries of Israel must produce more high quality goods with less waste, that they must more fully utilize the imported raw materials purchased with the country's meager supply of foreign currency.

This is a new kind of battle of production. I suppose it is inevitable that the first skirmishes in this battle should be in the field of speeding up the individual production of the individual worker. But in the long run, I suggest, it will be far more important to pay attention to the greater technical efficiency of the individual worker. We in America, who have something to teach the world about productivity, have found that individual efficiency is more important than a speed-up. It produces more, because it speeds up the whole production line. In Israel, this will mean greater emphasis on teaching workers how to do their jobs even better than before, how to attain greater skills. I am glad to report that, at the request of the Israeli Government, the United States is shortly sending to Israel an expert on industrial efficiency to advise with employers and workers on improving methods of production without having to resort to the speed-up.

UNITED STATES HELP IN EDUCATION

This is an immediate problem of education. There is also a long-range problem of education, as the country fills up with children from many lands, speaking many languages, having many different habits, and coming together in the schools. The educational problems in Israel have become increasingly difficult, and have not yet been solved.

When I was in Jerusalem, I met with officials of the Ministry of Education, who asked that the Federal Security Agency send over a mission of educators to survey their problems and give them advice on how to solve these problems. I can now report that such a mission will leave for Israel some time this summer, with the cooperation of the Department of State. We consider this mission so important, as a token of our desire to help other democratic nations raise their living standards, that I have asked the Commissioner of Education, Dr. Earl J. McGrath, to head this mission.

When the point 4 program comes into operation, there will of course be many ways in which we shall be able to help Israel further. We are out to bolster the forces of democracy in every land—and in the Middle East this means both Israel and the Arab countries—by providing technical assistance in the fields where we have something to teach.

In Israel, for example, there is a unique health problem created by the arrival of immigrants from countries in which health standards are low. Medical personnel and facilities are greatly in demand for the clinical programs set up to treat these immigrants. But the general health situation, on the other hand, is remarkably good, and I was greatly impressed by the sanataria and hospitals I saw, as well as by the health program of the Histadrut itself.

POINT 4 PROGRAMS AN EARNEST

These official missions, these point 4 plans of the Federal Government, are an earnest of our intention to help Israel and all our country's friends. But they do not take the place of the voluntary actions of private citizens. Our country is a free-enterprise country, and it will always be so. Now, free enterprise means many things to many men, and I can assure you that it does not mean the same thing to me that it means to some of my Republican friends in the Congress of the United States.

To me the work your own organization has done to raise money in behalf of the cause of labor democracy in Israel is a true and vital form of free enterprise. You have certainly been enterprising in your fund-raising, and you have given freely. The plain truth, however, is that Israel counts on you for even more than you have already done. That country, that nation of people from everywhere, that land of hope and desperation, that experiment in human liberty, can only survive if it can get through the next few years of travail. It depends upon all of us for help, for solid, tangible help, to see it through. We cannot let the experiment fail.

It is too important to all of us, to America, to Western ideas, to human freedom, to the men and women and children of Israel, to fail. We who are in this room today, as patriotic Americans who believe in the dignity of the human being, will not allow it to fail.

Jobs for Puerto Ricans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have worked and hoped that the people of the United States would take a more friendly attitude toward American citizens of Puerto Rico and make available more jobs within the United States and particularly in the Central West. For too long a period we have concentrated too many Puerto Ricans in the vicinity of New York City. This has been very bad for the Puerto Ricans and also for the people who are desirous of being friendly to them.

Now I think the ice is broken. Our good people in Michigan and Ohio are this summer employing some 5,000 agricultural workers from Puerto Rico. These people can be kept busy in the fields of Michigan and Ohio until the Puerto Rican sugar-cane crop is ready for attention this coming fall or early winter and then return to Puerto Rico.

I submit for the RECORD a press release dealing with this subject:

SAGINAW, June 10.—Signing of contracts with two major airlines for air transportation of 3,687 Puerto Ricans in the next week has averted a major labor crisis in Michigan field crops, the Farmers & Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association said today. Speedy results from the cables by Congressman FRED L. CRAWFORD to Puerto Rican Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marin "saved the day," Association officials declared.

Two flights each by Eastern Airlines and Pan American Airways are due to arrive today, bringing a total of 234 workers in modern four-engine air transports.

By June 12 operations will be at a peak with 509 workers arriving daily. It is the largest mass air movement in the history of agricultural labor.

Thirty-two survivors of the plane crash in the sea off Miami arrived here by bus today bringing the total of arrivals to date to 1,430. Of the 5,117 workers on hand or scheduled to arrive by June 17, approximately 4,500 will be assigned to growers of the Michigan Sugar Co.; 350 to growers of the Monitor Sugar Division and 200 to the growers of the Lake Shore Sugar Co.

Two cablegrams to straighten out the transportation difficulties arising out of the air-sea disasters were sent to Gov. Muñoz-Marin by Representative CRAWFORD. As a result Governor Muñoz-Marin interceded with the major airlines in behalf of the workers.

Representative CRAWFORD made this statement: "As a result of these cables supported by agreements now in effect between Eastern Airlines and Pan American Airways and Michigan Field Crops, Inc., I am fully satisfied that all farm labor will be delivered in ample time to meet field requirements of Michigan growers. The Governor of Puerto Rico, fully cooperating with the representatives of Michigan Field Crops, Inc., and the airlines, has assured me that he will take all necessary steps to expedite the movements of the workers.

"In addition to these assurances and benefits there is reason to believe that Michigan Field Crops, Inc., under their capable management now is receiving the very best transportation service available to the American people, and this is because of the high operating efficiency of Eastern Airlines, under the leadership of Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, who has no superior in the field; and Pan American Airways, which is recognized by the United States Government as the top operator under the American flag, insofar as global operations in connection with our national defense is concerned.

"With all parties fully cooperating, this operation should prove mutually beneficial to American citizens in Michigan as well as in Puerto Rico, and with all parties completely on the alert, this whole undertaking should open the way for great benefits in the future."

Representative CRAWFORD pointed out that Michigan agriculture is securing a source of raw labor—"important in this period of full employment"—and that Puerto Ricans, who are United States citizens, will receive relief from pressure of population problems both in the island and in New York City.

Arthur A. Schupp, association executive secretary, stated that the expeditious manner in which the labor crisis was handled reflected the thorough understanding of Congressman CRAWFORD with problems confronting both American agriculture and industry, and his long study of problems of Puerto Rico and attempts at solution thereof.

Amerasia Secrets Must Come Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD,

I include the following editorial from the Peoria Star of June 16, 1950, entitled "Amerasia Secrets Must Come Out":

AMERASIA SECRETS MUST COME OUT

For several weeks we have expressed the opinion, now and then, that the secrets of the Amerasia scandal, suppressed by the Truman administration for 5 years, must be revealed. We also believe that the names of people in high places will be unpleasantly if not scandalously involved, and it is probably because of this that the secrets are so carefully guarded. Another reason probably is that the administration prefers to shelter guilty persons or persons who made mistakes, rather than suffer the political consequences of their exposure.

Almost incredible barriers have been placed in the way of a thorough and honest investigation of the Amerasia case. Such careful guarding of official secrets must have the sanction of the President. But even the power of the President of the United States is obliged to bow to a superior power, public opinion and the will of the people. "Amerasia" today is as much of a byword as "Teapot Dome" was in the twenties. The people are demanding the truth and they are going to get it.

This is confirmed again by the demand of 21 Senators that the Amerasia investigation be taken from the Tydings committee, which has been mixing whitewash instead of digging for facts. The 21 Senators ask that the Senate Judiciary Committee conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the conduct of the Justice Department in failing to prosecute the Amerasia case with vigor.

The demand of these Senators is tantamount to repudiation in advance of any report on the Amerasia case that may be made by the Tydings committee.

Can the administration continue to resist successfully this growing demand for the full truth about the Amerasia case? We do not see how.

Evils of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid address, "Evils of Communism," made on May 30, 1950—Memorial Day—by Rev. Father Harold Martin, of Massena, N. Y., at the Aswegeatchi Town Hall, in Heuvelton, N. Y.

The address follows:

Friends and neighbors, we are gathered this afternoon to pay homage to our departed soldier dead. We owe a debt of gratitude to the men whose bodies lie beneath the white crosses throughout the world—to those who are living victims in a world strewn with crosses of greed and hate. Little confidence have we in United Nations conferences and the utterances of so-called statesmen shouting freedom which is only for home consumption. We have no confidence in stooges of puppet governments and their weasel words. And the reason we have no confidence is that these governments lack the sense of justice, freedom, and fair play for which our hero dead sacrificed their lives. We hope they have not sacrificed and died in vain.

Now, to me, the only solution seems to be prayer, penance, and sacrifice. Prayer, penance, and sacrifice is the message, which I read from the tomb of the soldier dead.

How sacrifice? Behind the Stars and the Stripes and the cross of Christ, we see the termites of communism boring into the foundation of democracy, and enslaving the innocent people of the world. You sacrifice by exposing and rooting out this menace in your own locality. Some newspapers and certain movies are actual dangers confronting American youth and the morals of our land. Let us sacrifice by becoming militant leaders striving under God to bring about better conditions for the betterment of our neighbor and our community. They urge us, these hero dead, to use the most effective form of sacrifice and that is to perfect our own lives, getting rid of sin and trying to live real Christlike lives.

THOUGHTS FOR THE LONELY

Memorial Day is a precious day and in the midst of the laughter of the world there are many who are lonely today. While the nation bears the loss of the soldier dead, it is the dear mother, the wife, the child who bear the cross that hovers over their graves. We will be mindful this Memorial Day of those families who have been visited by God's angel of death, knowing that we can never find peace of heart and mind until we learn that we must surrender our wills to the will of God. As God may give, so God may take. Life must come and go, whatever weather may prevail, or how the rivers flow. It is not ours to question Him, to murmur or complain, or criticize Him for the tears that mingle with the rain.

Our sorrow and our tragedy are His divine command, and the deepest darkness we must try to understand. God rules the whole wide world and all the universe He made. And, if we love and honor Him, we need not be afraid. And if He wants us to be sad and undergo a loss, then let us do His holy will. And let us bear our cross.

Yes; something precious has been taken from my life, dear mother, wife, and child; but for better or for worse it is not for your poor earthbound eyes to see. Neither time nor thought will ever ease your regret * * * but resignation will make it possible to carry on with some measure of dignity and satisfaction.

There was one who walked on this earth. He was man yet God and He said that no greater love hath man than a man lay down his life for his friends. He demonstrated these words by His sacrifice on Calvary.

Yes; our soldier dead have laid down their lives for their friends in the hope of peace; not to the god of war, but to the Lord of peace.

And now, my dear mothers, wives, and children of the soldier dead, let us, meekly, through our tears, look up to the God of all consolation, who has said, "Come to Me all ye who are heavily ladened and burdened, and I will refresh you."

On this Memorial Day, let us as a people pledge ourselves anew to those God-given principles upon which our Nation was founded. Let us resolve to protect our country and its blessed institutions from the enemies within with as much determination and courage as we have fought and defeated those from abroad. America needs to reawaken and place its trust in God in order this this Government of the people, for the people, and by the people shall never perish from the earth.

READS CARDINAL'S AMERICAN CREED

In conclusion I would like to read to you the American Creed as written by that outstanding God-fearing, God-loving, and peace-loving American citizen, prince of the Catholic church, Francis Cardinal Spellman:

"I believe in America: In her high destiny under God to stand before the people of the earth as a shining example of unselfishness, devotion to the ideal that has made us a great Nation; the Christian ideal of liberty in harmonious unity, builded of respect for God's image in man and every man's right to life, liberty, and happiness.

"I believe in America: For the blood in the veins of America, our heart's blood, comes from the wounds of many peoples, chaliced in humanity's name upon the altar of liberty.

"I believe in America: Not because of the tremendous resources of her fields and mountains, rivers and lakes, valleys, and plains, but rather because America has been, and must ever continue to be, the beacon of liberty, the hope of the oppressed, the refuge of the weak, the pledge and the proof that man can live with man in mutual respect, following God's law, voiced in man's conscience, and in mutual esteem, based on the responsibility of democratic life.

"Lastly, I believe in America: Because I believe in God and God's providence that has been over us from the earliest days of our beginnings. Believing in God, I am confident both of His merciful forgiveness of our national sins and His awareness of our national virtues. Believing in God's providence, I am confident of our high resolve that this fair land, the visible setting of the vast, immaterial soul of the American Nation, shall never lose its initial consecration to the common Fatherhood of God, so that we and our children's children shall live in peace and harmony among ourselves and with our neighbors.

"In this America, I believe; for this America, I live; for this America, I and millions of others stand ready to die."

Displaced Persons Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on June 6, 1950, I had occasion to comment on the displaced-persons bill, which happily has now been enacted into law. I pointed out, at that time, the need for the study of the problem of overpopulation of certain European countries. And I also called attention to a statement made by the three Foreign Ministers on May 14 on the need for an international conference to study this problem—and to consult with experts of other interested governments, particularly Italy and Germany.

It is interesting to note that in today's editorial of the Washington Post Mr. Schuman, of France, stresses the need for such a world conference. The article is worthy of reading, for it indicates that plans for the solution of this problem of overpopulation may well be worked out. And, significantly, emphasis is placed on the need for an immediate relaxation of the population pressures in Germany and Italy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial:

[From the Washington Post of June 20, 1950]

SCHUMAN NO. 2

Robert Schuman, ceaseless and patient crusader for the removal of Franco-German conflict, has come up with another initiative

aimed at the same goal. He has asked the United States and Britain to cooperate in summoning a world conference to relieve the population pressure in western Europe. The idea is as valuable as it is obvious. Yet it has been bandied about for almost 4 years without provoking action. Originally a French concept, it was brought up by Bidault as one of the members of the Council of Foreign Ministers meeting in Moscow early in 1947, but nothing was done. Last May 3 this newspaper asked what had happened to the proposal, saying:

"A unifying idea in the world of today would be a comprehensive emigration-immigration policy of relieving Europe's surpluses in such open spaces, as say, Australia, Oceania, and Brazil. Here is something new, something that could capture men's imagination, something that would unify, something in which a host of nations east and west have a common interest, something that would create a diversion from the present descent into war."

Ten days later at a meeting of the Foreign Ministers, Schuman revived the project, and Messrs. Acheson and Bevin agreed upon a study. Possibly Mr. Schuman feared that this would lead to another interment; at any rate, he is now making a direct appeal to the United States and Britain to join with France in sponsoring a world conference.

If this appeal turns out to be fruitless, Mr. Schuman would be well advised to call a conference himself, as he did on the pooling of the heavy industry of western Europe. For a favorable environment does exist. There is a much more hospitable reception to immigration nowadays in such have-not areas as Australia, Oceania, and Brazil. The main haves are western Germany and Italy, and in the latter country the human surplus constitutes the nation's major problem. If the haves and have-nots could be brought together, emigration of excess workers might be organized in the manner advocated by Bidault. A significant role could be played in such a transfer of people by American capital. Mr. R. G. Casey, who is well remembered from his days as Australian Ambassador in Washington, has immigration within his province in the Menzies ministry, and he is reported to have said that room is available in Australia to immigrants with tools. Well, tools are an American specialty. They were supplied for war and there is no reason why they could not be supplied for peace. Here is an opportunity for post-1952 activity—and one that Mr. Gordon Gray, now engaged in wrestling with the so-called dollar gap, might explore.

Relaxation of population pressure in Germany and Italy would constitute a fundamental grapple with reconstruction. It would help to keep Italy democratic. It would assuage any residual fears in France about pooling their heavy industry with Germany's. It would lessen the stresses and strains in western Europe, and keep eyes turned west, instead of east. Only some such solution can offset the only victory that Hitler scored, i. e., the demographic one.

It All Depends on Whose Ox Is Being Gored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial column by Marquis Childs as it appeared in a recent issue of the Washington Post.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the right of a committee of the Congress, of either House or as the joint commission of both Houses, to inquire diligently into affairs affecting the public interest has been established beyond any effective challenge.

The only question that has arisen which is still somewhat less than fully settled is whether or not there is any limit, in law, as to the nature of the questions put to witnesses.

Witnesses appearing before congressional committees and testifying under oath are relieved of penalties, save only those of contempt and perjury, by the privilege extended to their testimony. At one time, until the statutes were modified, that privilege was so absolute that a man might boast of the most atrocious murders, if he so desired, and his words could not even be used as a basis of future investigation.

Witnesses appearing before committees have plead lack of jurisdiction of the committee, and occasionally the courts have seemed to regard the mandate extended by the House as a delimitation.

Other witnesses have relied on the protection of the first and fifth amendments to the constitution against inquiries as to their political affiliation. The weakness of this protection seems established by the most recent decisions of the Supreme Court; and, by the same token, the refusal of certain witnesses before the Committee on Un-American Activities to produce certain financial records, on the plea that the officers under subpena had no responsibility for those records, failed to protect them.

A NEW AND WEIRD DOCTRINE

Out of those hearings has grown a new and weird and dangerous doctrine used to attack anyone who has shown the courage of standing by his convictions, at least if those convictions have anything but a reactionary tinge.

That is to assert that the man who refuses to answer a question directed to him as to his political affiliation convicts himself by that refusal; and, on the other hand, when a man does answer a question of doubtful propriety but of proved legality and denies an allegation of affiliation or sympathy with a subversive organization, it is asserted that he has convicted himself because that is a subversive technique.

Perhaps no organizations have done more to develop and circulate this doctrine than the Committee for Constitutional Government, the National Economic Council, and the so-called Constitutional Educational League, which now refuse, through their principals, to disclose to a properly constituted committee of this House information of grave moment to the public interest and completely relevant to the inquiry. It will be recalled that it was once said of the Constitutional Educational League that it is neither constitutional, educational, nor a league—and that was 13 years ago in another investigation in which the witness, Joseph P. Kamp, now reposing in District Jail for contempt of Congress, was equally recalcitrant and barely escaped contempt citation.

NOT JAILED FOR IDEAS

It makes a difference whose ox is being gored.

When people of liberal or radical ideas are on the stand, these extreme right-wing groups froth at the mouth and would deny the liberals any constitutional rights; but now, when the right-wingers—and I use the word as an euphemism—are being gored there are equal screams that their rights are being violated.

In general, I agree with Marq Childs, and I am very glad that he wrote the column.

But I want to point out that neither the officers of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee or Joe Kamp are being jailed for their ideas; they each committed an overt act of defiance against constituted authority of this House. Their jail sentences grew out of contumacious conduct which, in turn, sprang from the ideas which motivated them, and in Kamp's case which he actively propagandized; but it was not for the ideas they were jailed or called as witnesses.

It was for refusal to answer questions about their activities in the field of ideas. Like Marq Childs I do not like to see the right of any person, right or left, to hold and preach his ideas put to challenge, but when they are questioned by a congressional committee on a proper and relevant subject their duty is to answer fully and truthfully.

Mr. Childs' column follows:

LOBBY INVESTIGATION—POSSIBLE CONTEMPT ON THE RIGHT

(By Marquis Childs)

Sooner or later it was bound to happen. Organizations of the reactionary right have come up against the same kind of treatment meted out for a considerable time by Congress to organizations of the extreme left.

The Committee for Constitutional Government faces possible contempt action by a House committee investigating lobbyists and their sources of revenue. Dr. Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary of the committee, has refused to produce records showing who paid the costs to send out vast quantities of propaganda including John T. Flynn's book, The Road Ahead.

This case would seem to parallel closely that of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, which is on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations. That committee refused to produce its records showing how it was financed. Eleven committee members were sentenced to from 3 to 6 months in jail. Having finally exhausted all legal appeals, they are about to serve their sentences, thus ending nearly 4 years of dispute.

The Committee for Constitutional Government is just now at the beginning of what may prove to be a similar development. Rumely has refused once to produce the records sought by the Lobby Committee.

But the committee plans a second and carefully prepared hearing at which he again will be called upon to produce the private records of his organization. The purpose is to make plain, if he refuses, why a citation for contempt is inevitable. Rumely, in other words, will be put publicly in the position of defying a duly constituted committee of Congress.

The Lobby Committee, headed by Representative FRANK BUCHANAN, of Pennsylvania, has ambitious plans that go beyond this.

Members of the staff believe it will be possible to show a carefully worked out and well-financed plan to destroy the Democratic Party, or more accurately the Fair Deal section of the party, using the Flynn book as the chief weapon of propaganda.

Indications are, according to committee investigators, that 10,000,000 copies have been distributed thus far in addition to magazine reprints. The Committee for Constitutional Government is reported to have sent out 670,000 copies, and the American Medical Association 1,500,000.

According to present plans, Flynn will be called to testify. He is to be asked about reports that he entered into a contract for a large lump-sum payment to write the Road Ahead, which is a denunciation of most of the measures associated with the concept of the welfare state.

Lobby Committee investigators have evidence indicating that several wealthy individuals in Texas and Colorado, who are personally paying for the distribution of large numbers of the Flynn book, are also supplying funds to aid Senator MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, in his attacks on the State Department. The MCCARTHY help is being funneled in part at least through the Nationalist China lobby. If current leads can be proved up through further investigation, the committee intends to look into that lobby, which has generally been considered to be the most flourishing and "well-heeled" in the whole roster.

Under attack, the Committee for Constitutional Government is making a loud outcry about the violation of the rights and freedom guaranteed under the Constitution. A letter appealing for funds quotes the Bill of Rights: "Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech or of the press" and, again, "the right of people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable search and seizure."

Interestingly enough, this same Bill of Rights and other constitutional guaranties were invoked by the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. In repeated appeals, the same arguments in behalf of the right of privacy and the right of free speech were raised.

An important distinction can, of course, be made—the Anti-Fascist Committee is linked by the Attorney General to communism and the Communist conspiracy. But the fact remains that the contempt charged against the Anti-Fascist Committee appears to be based on the same refusal to produce private papers that the Committee for Constitutional Government may eventually be found guilty of.

I do not like to see people put in jail for their ideas or their political beliefs, whether they are of the extreme right or the extreme left. Such a precedent is exceedingly dangerous to all of us who cherish the freedoms that have made this Nation great. It is dangerous in particular because freedom is indivisible. If you jail the members of one unpopular group for its ideas, sooner or later you will jail another unpopular group and finally all who dare to think and to speak.

Commencement Address of Mr. Wilfred Sykes at Lincoln Memorial University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM B. FUGATE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. FUGATE. Mr. Speaker, on June 5, 1950, Mr. Wilfred Sykes, chairman of the executive committee, Inland Steel Co., Chicago, Ill., delivered a commencement address at Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, Tenn. As a member of the board of trustees of the university, I was present and heard Mr. Sykes speak and was profoundly impressed by the timely and sound counsel which, out of a most successful life, he gave to the members of the graduating class.

Wilfred Sykes was born in Palmerston, North New Zealand, educated in Australia, and graduated in engineering at the University of Melbourne. He began his engineering career in the electrification of gold mines in South Africa. He came to the United States in 1909, to join the engineering staff of the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co. Later he was associated with the Sheet & Tube Co., and the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co. In 1923, he was employed by the Inland Steel Co. for the electrification of their steel mills.

In his steady advance in the field of electrical engineering, Mr. Sykes invented many processes, obtaining scores of patents which have revolutionized the electrical industry. In World War I he had charge of designing electrical equipment for the United States Navy. He is a recognized authority on electric hoists for coal mines, and electric drives for rolling mills.

A long-time member of many professional societies, this pioneer inventor, engineer, and industrial leader has served as president of the Inland Steel Co., and since 1949 has been the chairman of the executive committee. Notable as a civic and educational leader, he has been president of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, a trustee of the Glenwood Manual Training School, and of the Illinois Institute of Technology in Chicago to which he has given much time in planning its present great expansion program. Recently he was given the Washington award for 1950 for his invention of electrical machines and steel processes, for advances in industrial administration and cooperation and counsel to State and college. This notable award is an honor conferred by his fellow engineers in recognition of accomplishments which preeminently promote the happiness, comfort, and well-being of humanity.

Because of his contribution to science, industry, and educational enterprises and his humanitarian activities, Wilfred Sykes was given an honorary degree of doctor of laws by Lincoln Memorial University during the exercises of the morning.

His address follows:

I feel it is a privilege and a pleasure to address this graduating class of the Lincoln Memorial University because I feel a certain kinship with the men and women who have attended this institution. I was reared in Australia under pioneer conditions, and very early in my life learned that if I was to achieve any success at all, it would be only through my own efforts. I quickly found I would have to stand on my own feet. I imagine that a great majority of you are very much in the same position, and I think it is your good fortune that it is so. Whatever you may accomplish you will have the great satisfaction of knowing that it was through your own efforts, and you owe nothing to anyone. And I know nothing that so frees the soul of man as the feeling of independence that comes from self-accomplishment. Such an individual "looks the whole world in the face; he owes not any man."

When I asked Dr. Kincaid what I should talk about he replied, "Speak from your heart." I propose to speak simply about problems as I view them in the light of my own experience.

From now on you are starting along the long road of life, and it will bring you many and varied experiences. As one who has traveled along this path a long way, and perhaps not unsuccessfully, I shall set forth some of my observations which may be of some guidance to you as you begin your journey.

To the young graduate the world will bring many disappointments. Many will be trivial, but some perhaps of such importance as to affect your whole career. But we must not be controlled in our outlook by disappointments because there will be many opportunities. Apart from unsatisfied material wants, many ideals and illusions will be shattered, and they will all leave some mark on your mind. However, they must be appraised in their proper perspective and not allowed to deter you in your chosen way of life. If we look at life in that way, in the long run the road will be one that will lead to enduring happiness.

Thomas Jefferson said, "I am among those who think well of the human character generally. I consider man as formed for society and endowed by nature with those dispositions which fit him for society. I believe also that his mind is perfectible to a degree of which we cannot as yet form any conception. It is impossible for a man who takes a survey of what is already known not to see what an immensity in every branch of science yet remains to be discovered. And it is still more certain that great fields are yet to be explored to which our faculties are equal, and that to an extent of which we cannot fix the limits. I join, therefore, in branding as cowardly the idea that the human man is incapable of further advances. This is precisely the doctrine which the present despots of the earth are inculcating and applying, especially to religion and politics." I I have quoted Jefferson because we have been told by many in high political favor that during the last 20 years this country has reached, or is reaching the limit of development under a system of individual freedom of effort, and that in the future we must be more and more controlled by political authority in all our efforts in business or otherwise.

Thomas Jefferson again said, "Thank heaven, the American mind is already too much open to listen to such impostors, and while the art of printing is left to us, science can never be retrograded. What is once acquired of real knowledge can never be lost. To preserve the freedom of the human mind and the freedom of the press every spirit should be ready to devote itself."

I have referred to Jefferson because he saw clearly at the beginning of the Federal Government that individual freedom was the foundation for the success of the newly born nation, and he also held that "that government is best that governs least."

I have referred to the great satisfaction of self-achievement, but many are bewildered by the complexity of the surrounding world, and really don't know how to start. Perhaps the greatest asset that a young man or woman can have in starting out in life is a definite objective. Unfortunately, many young people give little thought to what they really want to do. We all, of course, want to achieve material success as quickly as possible, but the real success of life is much more than just making a comfortable living. It is the satisfying of that inner spiritual drive which makes all of us want to feel that we have done our part in life

and not be just drones. When I was a young man over 40 years ago, a member of a small graduating class in electrical engineering, I knew exactly what I wanted to be. I had known for a long time. I was going to be an electrical engineer, and with only meager opportunities in those days, in a remote country, I set out to acquire some knowledge of the subject. I quickly found that it wasn't so much what instruction I could receive in college that counted as education, but what I was prepared to put into it in the way of hard work that enabled me in some measure to achieve success in my chosen profession.

What is it that brings one man success in life and failure to his brother? With few exceptions it is not extraordinary mental capacity. The answer is that some men succeed because they cheerfully pay the price of success while others, though they claim ambition and a desire to succeed, are unwilling to pay that price. The price of success is to use all your courage to force yourself to concentrate on the problem at hand, to think of it deeply and constantly, and to study it from all angles. It is surprising how often the problem becomes easy if the attack is carried through with determination. It is necessary to have a high and sustained determination to achieve what you plan to accomplish, not only when conditions are favorable but also in spite of adverse circumstances that may discourage a less determined individual. It is necessary to refuse to believe that there are any circumstances strong enough to defeat you if you are sufficiently determined. This is, of course, the hard road to travel, and that is why so many men and women never reach success, but yield to the siren call of the rut and remain in the beaten paths that are for beaten men. Nothing of note has ever been accomplished without constant endeavor and the ceaseless application of the lash of ambition.

These remarks would seem to indicate that life will be all work and no play. That is not so because in your work there can be the greatest satisfaction—much more than can be obtained from idly following some amusement.

You may ask, "How do I start to climb the ladder?" In my own experience I have found a very simple rule that has for me rapidly opened the door to opportunity. Apart from enthusiasm for your job and a desire to do your task well and efficiently, mental preparation for advancement is of the utmost importance so that when the opportunity comes along you will be prepared to step into a job calling for greater responsibility and knowledge.

According to the laws of mechanics you cannot raise yourself off the ground by pulling at your bootstraps, but psychologically you can raise yourself by pulling at your mental bootstraps. The simplest way to do so in my experience has been to figure out how to do the job of the man ahead, and then dream up ways of doing it better. This will lead to mental maturity which will not be unnoticed by those to whom you may report, and you are more likely to have the opportunity to go ahead if you are mentally prepared to take the step. But beyond this, if you have the ambition to progress, you must also have the courage to take the responsibilities that go with greater opportunity. In all organizations management is continually on the lookout for young men who are ambitious and who can step into jobs of greater responsibility. However, we find that while some have reasonable ambition, they do not have the mental maturity or the courage to accept such additional responsibility. Therefore, they must be passed by.

In spite of what I have said, I do not want you to get the impression that progress in your vocation is the only measure of success that you should have. You must be a well-rounded human being, and you should be an asset to your community. It is axiomatic that no success can be achieved without character. Character implies honesty of thought and deed. The best rule that I know for keeping one's feet on the ground and guiding one's actions is never to be dishonest with oneself. Many are, and fool themselves into the belief that a ready tongue and a brazen bluff may be substitutes for knowledge and ability. It doesn't work. We have plenty of these people in the business world, and sometimes for a short period they are pointed to as examples of great success. They flash like a nova in the sky, but they fade just as quickly.

In your relationships with your fellow men I think you should remember that we generally find people pretty much as we conceive them to be. If you think of your associates as being honest and trustworthy, and act toward them in such a manner, you won't be fooled very often. Occasionally your fingers will be burned, but in the long run those who betray your confidence will be the losers, and not you. If you treat everyone with suspicion, then you are going to be a very unhappy man, devoting your time to foiling imaginary plots, instead of attending to your own business. Your attitude will be reflected by those with whom you associate, and you will neither receive nor deserve their confidence.

I urge that as opportunity offers you take an active part in your community. In the beginning it may be only helping to raise funds for some association or charity, but a conscientious effort to do your share will bring attention and opportunities of which you may have no conception. If you are going to live with your fellow men you must also take your part in promoting the common welfare and take pride in your community activities.

However, beyond your participation in community affairs there is a greater field in which you should take a very real interest. The government's relationship to our economic organization, especially that of the Federal Government, will affect your future perhaps more than any other factor, and, indeed, perhaps more than all other factors. The proper relationship of government to economic affairs has been a topic of perennial discussion. When our Nation was founded in 1776 it was the chief theme of that great fundamental work on economics, Adam Smith's The Wealth of Nations, published in that year. No subject was of more concern to the men who framed our Constitution than this relationship.

With the passage of time, and the changing circumstances of the world and the development of new political ideas, brought about especially during the last 25 years, the significance of government in our economic affairs has greatly increased. During the last few decades with the growth of the ideological doctrines of fascism, communism, and socialism, and the various offshoots in this and other countries, all issues regarding the function of government in relation to our economy have been intensified. Our American concept of the function of government, until about the last 20 years, was that government should be thought of as a referee. By laws and through the courts it restricted the freedom of the individual and prevented him from injuring or taking unfair advantage of others and from harmful acts that would affect the people generally. Otherwise, it left the individual free to follow his own course in life, to own property, and to use his initiative to progress in whatever way he desired. It was this freedom that provided the incentives that brought about the great technological and business developments that have made us the leading Nation of the world. Today all noncommunistic nations look toward America for aid, either in the form of food and goods or technical assistance. The Communists, if anything, are worse off than the others. Yet, there are many politicians in our midst who want to change the system that has made all of these bounties ours and to lead us along the path that has brought the once great and proud nation of Britain to little more than an existence level. Her people have been robbed of that initiative and self-reliance that were once their great characteristic and which led to the opening and development of the unknown world in the period preceding this century, thus creating the once great British Empire.

All extensions of governmental functions restrict individual liberty and tend to reduce all to a common level under the rule of bureaucracy, no matter what guise it assumes.

All over the world governments have tried to take over new functions and control of the individual. They say they will achieve stability, provide full employment, protect citizens from every vicissitude of life, iron out business cycles, and make prosperity permanent. These attempts of government have always failed and are now failing all over the world. We can say with historical accuracy that no nation has ever succeeded in accomplishing these objectives because in such attempts they necessarily destroy individual initiative and the incentives which have been the mainspring of all progress and prosperity.

To carry out these idealistic objectives means, of course, that there must be such control over all social and business life that we have socialism. We don't need to look further than Britain and some of the British Dominions, such as Australia and New Zealand, to realize the destructive effect that these controls have exercised on the will of the people. I don't believe that in these United States our people want to follow the path that has brought so much misery to so many nations. Unfortunately, there are powerful political elements still following the damnable philosophy that people can be bribed with their own money so that they may perpetuate themselves in power. If you look around, you will see numerous efforts to do so. Subsidies given to various groups at the expense of the Nation at large are undermining the free economy of the country and producing artificial prosperity for the favored ones, which inevitably will have to be paid by us all. For instance, 3,000,000 farmers receive direct subsidies, largely for doing what they should normally do in their own interests, and we all pay the bill.

I think, therefore, that all of you should take the keenest interest in the effect of government upon the Nation as a whole, and not in relation to individual groups, because in the long run your own welfare is controlled by what happens to the country at large.

I should like to conclude by again quoting Thomas Jefferson. In 1821, when an old man he said, "When all government, domestic and foreign, in little, as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will render powerless the checks provided of one government on another and become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we have separated." By this, of course, he was referring to the then British Government. And again he says, "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap we should soon want bread."

Members of the graduating class of Lincoln Memorial University, you are taking a new place in the world in which government has assumed, even during your lifetime, an importance wholly unimagined a generation ago. I think I have said enough

to indicate what our problems may be and why it is necessary to be ever vigilant to preserve those things that have made this Nation strong. However, times change, and we should be eager to improve our social system and correct such weaknesses as may exist without destruction of those elements that have proved their worth in the past.

May you achieve every success in your various careers, and build a happy and useful life on the foundation that you have laid in this institution.

Clear Channel Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest and best civic and professional organizations in the country is the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association. Among the resolutions adopted by them at their recent annual convention is one pertaining to radio service. For the RECORD I offer a copy of this resolution:

We are informed that the State Department of the United States is considering treaties with foreign countries that would restrict the Federal Communications Commission in such a way that clear channel stations, which mean so much to us who live outside of cities, would be badly curtailed if not entirely silenced. Bills carrying out such policies are also pending in the Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this association vigorously protests against such restrictions, whether by treaty or statute, and, in self-defense, urges the Congress to take positive action that might be required to prevent destruction or curtailment of our clear channel radio service; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately forwarded to all Members of the Congress from Texas and Oklahoma, to the Secretary of State, and to the Federal Communications Commission.

The British "No"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "The British 'No'," which was reprinted as a public service by the International Latex Corp. in the Washington Post of Monday, June 19, 1950:

THE BRITISH "NO"

Britain's Labor Party seems to have slammed the door on any hope that the crystallization of the Schuman plan would find the British Government ready to join the combine. The party's executive committee rejects the plan out of fear of a supergovernment. It would be rash, nevertheless, to jump to the conclusion that the decision is final with Britain. The Schuman plan has excited a lively interest across party lines there. All the Liberals are for it, and, though they have only nine seats, they still have a following which gave them 2,500,000 votes at the last election. Favorable, too, is a sizable segment of the Conservative Party. Even the Laborites are (or were) divided, for, in spite of the xenophobic Mr. Bevin, Premier Attlee was quick to accept the principle, and he probably voiced the view of some of the rank and file. Doubtless, however, the party in Parliament will close ranks behind its executive committee. In that event the Schuman plan may present the parties in Britain with an issue at a time when to all intents and purposes issues have been set aside in a kind of informal understanding giving all the appearance of a coalition. Such a development would be highly significant in view of the slender Labor majority.

POWER-MAD PLANNERS

It is clear from this decision that the Labor Party is under the dominance of economic planners who are simply applying the logic of their position. Planners don't like to share control. They are the boss of society. With rigid powers over the home market, allocating raw materials, factory space, machines, labor, and investment, they must keep up barriers between themselves and the outside world lest "chaos" (meaning freedom of choice) be introduced into the domestic system. Thus imports from abroad and currency relations with abroad have to be controlled. To be sure, the Labor Party says the plan might be considered favorably if all the European countries were Socialist. But this is plainly an excuse for nonparticipation. The game was given away at a recent conference of the Socialist Parties in Europe at Copenhagen. At that meeting the British Labor Party alone maintained that the proposed steel and coal authority should be intergovernmental, so that its decisions would be in fact the subject of dickering among delegates and not made in its own name. What would that mean? Clearly a Europe committed to a jealous group of rival planners all determined that, whatever else happened, their own populations would be fully employed. Under such auspices Europe would be foredoomed to chaos.

ORATORY FAILED EUROPEAN UNITY

Mr. Schuman's concept is dramatically opposed to British Labor's. What he envisages is a board that is supranational, not international. It would make such decisions as what plants to improve and what plants to shut down for keeping abreast of an expanding market. The test would be the most economical use of resources, so as to bring down prices and sell the product in Europe and abroad. But the subsidiary decisions of buying and selling would be made by the market—something that planners cannot tolerate. This is the economics side of the Schuman proposal. It is, however, the politics of the proposal that is the main and exhilarating element in it. Mr. Schuman decided that oratory has had its chance of bringing unity to Europe and has failed and that the time had come for action—and action at the point of crucial contact. He finds that the Laborites in England have never bothered to grapple with the unity problem, or to take it seriously. They forget that both the French and the Germans have provided for the partial abandonment of sovereignty in their constitutions, and that the Schuman plan thus amounts to implementation.

UNMASKING SOCIALIST LIP SERVICE

Mr. Schuman has brought the divergences in Europe to a head; he has presented the British with a choice. The Labor party has made its own answer—and this is that unity is merely an ideal to which to give lip service, not one to be realized. It wants room to pursue its own autarchic policies, which, in the final analysis, mean an effort to get prosperity at somebody else's expense. With this decision the Labor Party will stand convicted of trying to recreate the world of Dr. Schacht which brought on the last war. The question remains to be answered whether the British people will agree with the Labor Party. Now more than ever Mr. Schuman's hand needs to be upheld by the United States, lest the French, with Britain out of the combination, yield to fear of German predominance, and back away from pursuit of an initiative which is the only statesmanlike action to come out of Europe since the war ended.

Statement Before Committee for Reciprocity Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a very well prepared and instructive statement of Jack Barry, executive manager of the Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce, Inc., Lawrence, Mass., before the Committee for Reciprocity Information on June 19, 1950:

My name is Jack Barry. I am the executive manager of the Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce, Inc., an organization of more than 500 industry, business, and professional men of Lawrence, Andover, North Andover, and Methuen, Mass.

We live in an area where two-thirds of our manufacturing labor force is employed in the woolen and worsted weaving industry. The economy of the greater Lawrence area is largely based upon the payrolls of these textile mills and the condition of the textile industry is a matter of deep and continuing concern to each of the 128,649 people who live—work—and do business in greater Lawrence.

In the first 6 months of 1949, we suffered sizable unemployment in the textile industry. At the peak of that distress period we had 23,900 workers drawing unemployment compensation. In the first 6 months of 1949, the division of employment security of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts paid over $12,000,000 in unemployment insurance benefits to jobless workers in greater Lawrence. The impact of these conditions on the four communities of greater Lawrence was felt by all—and felt most severely by the textile workers whose jobs were wiped out by market conditions in the textile industry.

We have slowly recovered from last years' economic crisis but both old and new threats to our textile industries keep us sensitively aware of the danger of a recurrence of high unemployment. In the belief that this committee will not disregard entirely the impact of Government foreign-trade policy on any area of the United States if the facts are presented to you, I have been asked by our members to bring to your attention the hard facts of our situation.

A resolve of the Great and General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (the correct title of our State legislature) on July 8, 1949 created a special committee relative to the investigation and study of the textile industry and to prevent the removal thereof from the Commonwealth. In more simple language our State legislature created a commission to find out why the textile industry was leaving Massachusetts and what could be done about it.

On May 12, 1950 the commission issued the attached report from which I shall quote only the most important portions. First, some statistics on employment in the textile industry. The peak of employment in the Massachusetts textile industry was 235,000 persons in 1923. Employment in the industry declined steadily to a low of 96,000 persons in 1932, shot up to a wartime peak of 142,000 persons in 1948, but has since dropped off to 113,000 workers in Massachusetts textile plants at this time.

The reasons for this drop in employment were studied by the commission and the following factors emerged as being of importance in this situation:

(a) Costs of materials.
(b) Workmen's compensation insurance.
(c) Unemployment compensation.
(d) Corporation taxes.
(e) Power and fuel costs.
(f) Freight costs.
(g) Wages and costs of labor.
(h) Productivity.
(i) Labor legislation.
(j) Labor relations and labor supply.
(k) Costs of construction and maintenance.
(l) Technological developments.
(m) Management factors.
(n) Management opinion.

Minor importance was placed on costs of materials, power, and fuel; of major importance were taxes, costs of social legislation, wages and cost of labor, productivity, and labor legislation. The recess commission concluded that, "The evidence presented to the commission indicates that except in times of great demand the textile industry is capable of producing more goods than domestic and foreign markets are able to absorb. Obviously the concerns with higher manufacturing costs in normal times are unable to compete successfully and as a result tend to be forced out of business."

The conclusions drawn by the recess commission continue, "At the present, except in a few more specialized lines, competitive advantage lies in areas other than New England, so that the trend of the industry away from this area can be expected to continue unless the factors causing our competitive disadvantages be eliminated or substantially reduced." This is hard fact number one. Greater Lawrence textile plants are high-cost producers in comparison with out-of-State textile plants. We are in a fight for survival in greater Lawrence right now and we have been slowly losing this struggle to the other States where both production costs and earnings on capital invested are much more favorable.

When the first copies of this report on the textile industry in Massachusetts became available we immediately called a pint-sized New England town meeting. Representatives of business and industry, professional men, local leaders of union labor and representatives of local and State government sat down together to discuss our common problem. Two legislators, who were members of the special commission, told us the story behind the story of the textile industry report. We all agreed that the facts of this report were inescapable, that the problems of Massachusetts textile plants could only be solved by cooperative action, and that we had in greater Lawrence the collective wisdom, courage, and judgment both to recognize our competitive handicaps and to take the needed action to reduce these handicaps.

Thus does a community whose principal industry is in difficulty act to aid that industry. But we have another threat to our woolen and worsted industry that is beyond our power to control—a threat which may also materialize and drive our principal industry out of greater Lawrence into other sections of the world where production and operating costs are lower. This threat lies in the administration policy of encouraging still further reductions in the tariffs on imported woolens and worsteds. Greater Lawrence was deeply concerned with this problem last year when H. R. 1211 was being debated in Congress and we have a deep and continuing concern with this problem this year when plans are being made to further reduce import duties on woolen and worsted fabrics.

Textile workers wages in greater Lawrence are high with an average hourly rate of $1.32 for textile workers. The special commission report states that a 12 cents per hour wage differential exists between northern and southern mills. In addition to this basic hourly wage differential of 12 cents per hour, the special commission found that fringe benefit costs were 6 cents per hour higher in our Massachusetts mills, thus making a total differential of 18 cents per hour between Massachusetts and out of State mills. The special commission report concludes on this point that, "The commission finds that one of two major factors, and probably the major factor in causing competitive disadvantage to the textile industry in the Commonwealth is wages and the cost of labor."

Lower wages and lower labor costs in other areas of the United States were found to be causing the migration of our textile industry from Massachusetts—and from greater Lawrence. We have been exporting jobs and pay rolls from Massachusetts to other States and have been doing this for a number of years because of lower labor costs in other areas. The results of this export program are reduced employment and lowered payrolls—and a lowering of the general business level in greater Lawrence.

Gentlemen, if we in greater Lawrence are in a deadly competitive cost situation because of an 18 cents per hour differential in wage rates between Massachusetts and competitive States we cannot expect to meet at the same time competitive costs based upon the much larger wage differentials that exist between American and foreign textile producers. We beg of you not to export any more jobs of greater Lawrence textile workers to foreign nations by further reducing import duties on woolen and worsted fabrics at this time.

We are engaged—all of us in greater Lawrence—in a desperate struggle to retain our principal industry which is the weaving of woolens and worsteds. Cold, hard facts show that competition from other areas of the United States must be met if we are to reverse the trend to migrate away from greater Lawrence. We can only meet that competition by each of us making a sacrifice in a place where it hurts.

But we cannot meet the price competition of foreign imports, too, and hope to survive as a textile manufacturing center. Thus we ask of you, give us a chance to first meet our domestic competitive problems; an opportunity for our management, labor, and the communities to work together to reduce costs to a level where our mills can meet and beat costs in competitive States; before you further encourage foreign imports.

We in greater Lawrence have accepted the challenge of America's competitive conditions and—God willing—we shall meet that challenge. But, we beg of you, give us an opportunity to do this before you force us to meet the greater challenge that increased imports of lower-priced competitive woolen and worsted fabrics will present. The manufacture of such woolen and worsted fabrics has created employment that allowed 28,000 textile workers in greater Lawrence to enjoy American standards of living. The economy of the greater Lawrence area with its 128,649 people rests largely upon the continuance of those textile workers' pay checks. We cannot afford to export any more jobs for textile workers from greater Lawrence either to competitive States, or to foreign countries!

We, therefore, respectfully request that no less than the present levels of import duties on woolens and worsteds be maintained to protect the jobs and the economy of the four Massachusetts communities in greater Lawrence for whom I speak today.

The Stepinac Case and Religious Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in the interests of religious freedom which constitutes so vital a part of our democratic way of life in this country, and in furtherance of the concept of freedom from religious persecution which is being so ruthlessly stamped out in the countries behind the iron curtain, I spoke last night in behalf of a Christian religious leader who has been imprisoned now for 3 years. I refer to the Yugoslav Catholic leader Archbishop Stepinac. Yesterday it was a Catholic, today it may be a Protestant minister, and tomorrow a Jewish rabbi. And solely because they worship the faith in which they believe.

When Fordham University radio station WFUV invited me to speak about Archbishop Stepinac, I readily accepted the invitation because I realized it was an opportunity to speak up for religious tolerance. I delivered my address over that radio station on Monday, June 19, at 7:30 p. m., in New York. It is as follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, I was very happy to be able to accept the invitation of Mr. Francis Griffith, president of the Committee for the Liberation of Archbishop Stepinac, to deliver this brief talk about a noted and great Yugoslav Catholic leader. It is a great privilege to be accorded this opportunity to support the strenuous efforts of so many people in this country to liberate Archbishop Stepinac from his imprisonment at hard labor on trumped-up charges of a dictatorial regime.

It is now more than 3 years since Archbishop Stepinac has been imprisoned. During these 3 years a significant change has taken place in Yugoslavia, a change which we all regard for the better from the political point of view and which has been encouraged by our own Government. I refer, of course, to the parting of the ways between Tito's regime and the Kremlin in Moscow. During the past year or more, Tito has shown a

growing inclination to cooperate with the western democracies, and particularly with the United States.

What concerns me a great deal—and should concern all of us who are truly and seriously interested in religious tolerance and the freedom to worship the faith in which we believe and whose tenets we practice—is the fact that, up until this time, Tito has made no effort to extend to his people the right of religious freedom, the right to worship their God in accordance with the dictates of their conscience. In this way, he is still following the slavish practices and dictates of Moscow. The leopard has not change his spots, as some would have us believe.

To me, the Stepinac incident is a tragic commentary on our times and a true indication of the godlessness and degradation of a regime which refuses to recognize the meaning of religious freedom. It ignores the fatherhood of God and destroys the dignity of man. It is a continuation of the miserable struggle against those who remain loyal to their faith. In short, the Stepinac affair is a cold war weapon in the hands of a ruthless regime to eradicate and annihilate all traces of religious tolerance. It is practiced in Yugoslavia. It is practiced with equal vehemence in Hungary, in Rumania, in Poland, in other satellite countries, and, worst of all, in Soviet Russia itself. It is practiced against Catholics, against Protestants, and against Jews. No man with religion in his heart is immune from this persecution. No man who openly espouses his faith is able to avert the wrath of the dictators.

Most of us will probably recall the facts of the Stepinac case. Nearly 4 years ago, on September 11, 1946, Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac, Catholic primate of Yugoslavia, was suddenly arrested by Yugoslav officials. He was accused of having committed "crimes against the people" and being the "center of terrorist opposition to the government." The prosecutor then asked the court's permission to conduct a criminal investigation on which an indictment could be framed against the clergyman, and I do mean "framed" with all the invidious connotations of the colloquial use of that word. In less than 2 weeks he claimed to have completed his investigation.

By the end of September the archbishop was brought to trial on charges of "collaboration with the enemy and subversive activities." During a 3-hour appearance on the witness stand he insistently declared: "I do not consider that I have ever betrayed my country." In an impassioned speech, shaking his finger at the court, he told the court in clear and unmistakable words that "as the Communists fight for the materialistic theory, so have we the right to fight for Christianity."

During the days of that trial, the free world was following with great anxiety the developments in the case. No one, outside of the Communist cohorts in eastern Europe, was in the least impressed with the charges and accusations brought against this devoted prince of his church. Not only was the validity of the evidence seriously questioned in all free countries, but it was fairly obvious that the trial had strong political motives. Characteristic of such opinion in our own country was an editorial in the New York Times of October 3, 1946. From which I quote:

"The propaganda trial of Archbishop Stepinac in Zagreb has no more relation to justice than that of General Mikhailovitch. The defendant is only a target through which the poisoned arrows of the prosecution are aimed at a larger objective. * * * No one outside of Yugoslavia doubts that the verdicts of the four-man court, at once judge and prosecutor, is already signed and sealed. But the churchman, dragged to the bar, is proving more formidable than he was when free. He is unafraid, unbroken, and seems careless of the fate reserved for him. He refuses to defend himself as an individual, but defends his right to exercise his ecclesiastical functions among his flock. * * * The trial of Archbishop Stepinac is the heaviest weapon against the church, Tito has yet rolled out. If the lessons of religious history mean anything, he is merely making a martyr, whose spirit and influence he cannot kill."

Yes, that verdict was signed and sealed in advance. The court merely went through the routine motions of a trial. On October 11, 1946, the official verdict was handed down: 16 years' imprisonment at hard labor, and the loss of his civil rights for a period of 5 years. Such is the totalitarian concept of justice. Archbishop Stepinac was immediately rushed off to jail and he has been kept behind bars ever since.

His story has been told and retold many times since his imprisonment and martyrdom. Even at the expense of possible repetition I must mention certain facts about him. He was born 52 years ago near the city of Zagreb, the son of a Croat peasant family. In the First World War he served in the Austrian Army on the Italian front. He was taken prisoner and was subsequently allowed to join the Serbian Army and fought against the Germans at Salonika, Greece. Several years after the war he went to Rome to study for the priesthood and was ordained in 1930. In 1934 His Holiness Pope Pius XI named him coadjutor to the archbishop of Zagreb, and upon the latter's death in 1937, Stepinac succeeded him as archbishop.

But there is much more to his life than these simple facts. His views as a church leader have special significance to us in these days. Archbishop Stepinac was among the first great church dignitaries who, before World War II, lashed out against the Nazi master race theory and condemned the execution of hostages and concentration camp inmates as inhuman and anti-Christian.

As a member of the Jewish faith, I was extremely interested in the efforts exerted by the archbishop in aiding Jewish refugees who were fleeing from Nazi-controlled areas to Yugoslavia. The New York Times of October 9, 1946, published a lengthy letter by the Reverend Stephen Lackovic, who was secretary to Archbishop Stepinac in the years 1941 to 1945, in which interesting details are described of the archbishop's efforts to aid the persecuted peoples of all races and all creeds.

As early as 1934, when Hitler first began his persecution of the Jews of Germany which drove many of them across the face of Europe, Stepanic offered material help and protection to many of these victims. As the Nazi subjugation of Europe continued and persecution increased, the archbishop increased his aid to the persecuted. In 1938 he established a relief committee to aid these Jewish refugees by supplying them with material help, as well as providing them with the necessary means to leave Europe before they were overtaken by the oncoming Nazi hordes.

Shortly after the Nazis occupied Croatia, they demanded of the archbishop the names of all Austrian, Czech, and other Jews his committee had helped to escape. The archbishop and the officers of the committee refused to do so, whereupon the secretary was arrested by the Gestapo. Then followed the introduction of the Nazi racial laws depriving the Jews of Yugoslavia their freedom, property rights, and often of life itself. All sorts of indignities and humiliating practices were heaped upon them.

Archbishop Stepinac protested against this affront to the dignity of man. His vigorous protests continued unabated even though he was repeatedly warned that he was stirring up tremendous personal enmity. Notwithstanding his vigorous efforts to protect the Jews, they were soon rounded up by the Nazis and sent to concentration camps. Archbishop Stepinac did not give up his efforts to save those unfortunate victims. He asked the help of the Holy Father, Pope Pius XI. Soon a new way was found to save many hundreds of Jews. Passports were forwarded to the archbishop from Rome granting admission to South American countries for many Yugoslav Jews, who were then smuggled out of Yugoslavia and by way of Italy were sent to the Latin-American countries.

Later, other ways were found to aid the refugees. The archbishop established contacts and used his influence with the International Red Cross and with certain members of the resistance groups, whereby arrangements were made to slip out Jewish children from Nazi-dominated Europe. Through these efforts, children were taken out of several countries and moved by devious ways across Spain, Rumania, and Turkey toward Palestine and other free countries. Many of those refugees are today citizens of the State of Israel, of our own beloved United States, and of other free lands.

Through the International Red Cross, the archbishop used his influence to try to alleviate the conditions in the concentration camps. His own episcopal residence and many church buildings were used for hiding and protecting the fleeing and persecuted Jews. Near Zagreb there was a home for aged and sick Jews. When the young Jewish workers who cared for the aged in the home were deported to concentration camps, leaving the aged and the sick helpless, Archbishop Stepinac ordered the Catholic sisters of his diocese to maintain and care for the unfortunate people in that home.

I have purposely dwelt at length on this phase of the archbishop's humanitarian efforts to help his fellow men, even though they were not of his faith, for several reasons. First, because this phase of his activity is not well known to the general public in this country. Second, because it best illustrates that he is a man devoted to God, to truth, and to justice. He was not afraid to speak up against the crimes of Nazi Dictator Hitler as he spoke up later against the crimes of Dictator Tito. Third, because in an age when religious tolerance and religious freedom were being attacked on a wide front in many parts of the world, Archbishop Stepinac fearlessly raised his voice in behalf of the downtrodden and the persecuted who were of a different creed. Few men in these cynical days would have the courage and the valor to speak and to act in the way Archbishop Stepinac did in the trying days when he faced his tormentors. During his trial at Zagreb, Archbishop Stepinac told the court: "My conscience is clear." Something which Tito of Yugoslavia cannot say.

While our Government followed the Stepinac case fully, it has never taken any official action in the matter. But back in 1946 the relations between the United States and Yugoslavia were strained and any action taken then would probably have resulted in a complete break of diplomatic relations between the two countries.

Today, the situation is vastly different. we are on very friendly terms with Tito. The Yugoslav dictator has been double-crossed by Moscow. He is anxious to keep the friendship of the United States, but he still has not learned the lesson of religious freedom.

The only excuses that can be offered for entering into alliances with totalitarian governments are that our national security require them or that by them we may teach the democratic way of life which is the only

Godly way of life. The first concept of such life is freedom from religious persecution.

It is for these reasons that I am happy to support the work of this committee. Renewed efforts must be undertaken at this time through every instrumentality of our Government to secure the early release of Archbishop Stepinac. I believe that the conscience of the world is still very much alive. Unless we continue our efforts with the same faith, zeal, and determination of Archbishop Stepinac, none of us can join him in saying: "My conscience is clear."

Jobs for Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared recently in the Boston Post, Boston, Mass.:

JOBS FOR AMERICANS

The recommendation of a Senate group that all employees of American embassies and consulates be United States citizens is one that should be followed and with no delay. There are plenty of Yankees who would like nothing better than a chance at foreign service, even in the smaller positions to which foreigners have been appointed. Outside of the security questions involved, there is the fact that many American men and women are finding it harder and harder to get employment, especially in something which they want. There is no doubt that when these jobs are opened up to native Americans, officials will be swamped with applications for duty overseas. Replacement of all aliens in these jobs will offset a lot of espionage activities and at the same time will give local persons a chance to see some of the world.

Federal Deposit Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a talk I made over Station WJZ and affiliated stations on June 16, 1950:

As a member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, I was tremendously interested in an editorial that recently appeared in the Hartford Times. It was substantially like other editorials that have appeared in papers throughout the Nation. Permit me to quote briefly from it:

"The soundest and most widely accepted original New Deal agency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, continues to deserve unqualified approval.

"In its latest report the FDIC states that not one of the more than 100,000,000 depositors served by the insured banks has suffered a loss from bank failure in more than 6 years.

"Total assets of all insured banks have reached an all-time peak of $170,000,000,000. These banks include about 13,436 commercial banks and mutual savings banks.

"The feeling of security which this insurance system has engendered has made the thought of bank failures almost academic. In the words of Chairman Maple T. Harl, 'This record of solvency and stability is without parallel in the Nation's history.'

"An important aspect of FDIC's usefulness is that it works as a preventive. When the people know their deposits are safe, they don't start runs on banks. Thus the sense of panic does not spread because it does not even get a start."

My remarks tonight are particularly timely because there will be a bill coming up soon for House consideration that provides for certain changes in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation law.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which gives you this security, came into being early in the first Roosevelt administration. Like all New Deal legislation, this law was originally attacked as a fetish an innovation and as a revolutionary scheme which would soon socialize and nationalize banking in this country. Those who used those epithets are ashamed to be reminded of them.

Instead of this being a step toward nationalization or socialization of banking, actually it has immeasurably strengthened private banking interests, big and small. FDIC was merely a new application of very old insurance principles which had their beginning some 4,000 years ago.

All safe insurance rests upon two primary concepts. First, insurance can give protection only when it is supported by reserve funds established by the insurers, mainly out of that which is contributed by the insured, in the nature of premiums. Secondly, successful operation of insurance requires constant vigilance on the part of the insurer by way of preexamination and reexamination in order to guard against the hazards that bring about losses. And to preserve the fund out of which the losses must be paid. If you will bear those two concepts in mind, you will understand the full import of the two features of the proposed legislation that must be correctly dealt with, lest we destroy the very instrumentality sought to be saved thereby.

Federal deposit insurance protects every one of the 104,000,000 deposit accounts in insured banks against loss to a maximum of $5,000. No matter whether you are a housewife, business executive, merchant, garment worker, or laborer, you benefit from this protection.

The bill I refer to will increase this insurance coverage from $5,000 to $10,000. This will mean that 986 out of every 1,000 depositors in insured banks will have every dollar of their funds protected. The other 14 will be protected for the first $10,000 in their accounts. That prompts the question: How much will this cost me? The answer is simple and reassuring. Not one penny. Federal deposit insurance has not cost the depositor or the taxpayer a single penny since it began 16 years ago.

Insured banks pay annual assessments on their deposits in the insurance fund. These absorb the insurance losses, take care of operating expenses and build a surplus to take care of future losses.

The banker-sponsored bill to revise the statutes covering Federal deposit insurance would cut the annual assessments for deposit insurance protection approximately in half. This proposal must seriously concern every depositor in an insured bank. The situation is well summed up in a recent column of the League Reporter, published by Labor's League for Political Education. The editor there asks the question: "Is bank deposit insurance being destroyed?" And makes this answer: "Many people recall the disaster that befell millions of bank depositors in the late twenties and early thirties. The blow fell hardest on small depositors. Most big ones took care of themselves; they were on the inside. But the little fellows took the rap. The losses suffered by these small depositors never can be fully established.

"Sixteen years later there is apparent approval on all sides to a move which may permit the same thing to happen again. Congress now is considering a bill to cut in half the assessments banks pay to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for protection of depositors. In fact this bill already has passed the Senate. The full meaning of this bill is not generally understood. It is a blow at the protection now given depositors under the FDIC.

"In 1933 the banking system collapsed in a heap, resulting in the banking holidays. It was during this period that the FDIC was created. It was designed to protect the great mass of small depositors. To get the plan going the Government bought $150,000,000 of FDIC stock and $139,000,000 was purchased by Federal Reserve banks. The plan was conceived as a mutual system. Assessments were to be paid by the insured banks to build up the insurance fund and to provide a source of income to meet losses.

"The FDIC has been successful beyond the most optimisitc predictions. In its 16 years of operations, it has built up the fund to $1,200,000,000 and has repaid to the Treasury all the money paid in for capital stock purchased by the Treasury and the Federal Reserve banks. It has stabilized the banking system so that not one depositor has suffered a loss in any insured bank in more than 6 years.

"Apparently this does not mean much to the bankers. They are now pressuring Congress to cut in half the assessments they are paying for protection of depositors. Some even have demanded complete elimination of the insurance premium. This despite the warning of the FDIC that there is grave doubt the insurance fund of $1,200,000,000 is sufficient to protect depositors in all circumstances. The insurance fund would be pitifully small should a period of severe financial stress take place.

"If such disaster should occur, would the bankers object to FDIC's being subsidized to help bail out the banking system? Obviously not.

"Deposit insurance has proved an outstanding success in protecting depositors and bankers. If the bankers do not pay for it, depositors or the Government must. This attempt to gain an indirect subsidy should be opposed strongly in the interest of depositors.

"One of the surest ways to kill FDIC is to kill protection for depositors. That is what the assessment reduction would do."

That ends the article which appeared in the official newspaper of Labor's League for Political Education. I question the wisdom of reducing the premium that banks pay for Federal Deposit Insurance. These premiums certainly are not a burden on the banks. Their earnings are high and times are good. The insurance fund for depositors' protection should be built up in good times so that there will be no doubt about the ability of FDIC to weather any financial storm no matter how severe. It is only sound business judgment to accumulate reserves in times of prosperity for protection in times of stress.

I don't mean to imply that there is any immediate or foreseeable danger of a depression affecting the banks. Last week there were 209 business failures reported in the United States. Not one was a bank, and there has been no failure of an insured bank in more than 6 years. But deposit insurance is big business. Recent statistics show that during 1948 there were 61,000,000 ordinary life insurance policies in force with an aggregate face value of $132,000,000,000. Meanwhile,

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation protects 104,000,000 accounts which total $153,000,000,000.

I anticipate no period of stress in the immediate future that would wipe out the FDIC surplus—I simply urge that banks continue to build that surplus during good times so that the fund will be adequate should there be a lull in our present period of prosperity.

While seeking to increase the amount of coverage from $5,000 to $10,000 per account, which I approve, the banks seek to cut the insurance premiums which they are required to pay by about 60 percent. The premium now is only one-twelfth of 1 percent. If it is cut as proposed the 60-percent cut will constitute additional profit taxable to the banks of which about 38 percent will be paid into the general funds of the United States. The other 62 percent will remain for division among bank stockholders. It is being penny wise and pound foolish for the banks to attempt at this time to save a measly thirty-one one-thousandths of 1 percent. The savings to each bank will be comparatively small but it will be like washing the cement out of a dike, a few grains at a time Eventually the dike will collapse and our protection will be lost.

In 16 years with a premium of one-twelfth of 1 percent, FDIC has built up a reserve fund of $1,200,000,000 against potential liabilities of $153,000,000,000. No private insurance company is permitted to operate on so small a reserve. Let us continue to build the FDIC reserve as at present for at least another year or two, then review the situation in the light of our new experience with the increased coverage. That is sound business practice. That is the practice which our banks should follow in the internal management of bank affairs. They should ask no less of FDIC.

There is another section of this new bill that I deem to be of great importance. It is the provision authorizing FDIC to examine more of the banks it insures. There is only one way that these insurance funds can be protected from excessive losses and that is to give FDIC the right to inspect the risks it is required to insure. By this means it can keep the banks sound and prevent many losses which otherwise would occur. For some undisclosed reason, however, FDIC has been severely restricted in its examination privileges. The banks that FDIC may examine have only 15 percent of the deposits. In other words, although FDIC is duty bound to protect depositors in all insured banks, it can examine banks having less than one-seventh of the deposits. If it deems it necessary to examine any of the other banks, some 6,900 in number, FDIC must pursue an extraordinary red-tape operation of applying to several other agencies for permission.

That is like making a fire department get the permission of the mayor before it may put out a fire. The permission undoubtedly would be obtained eventually, but in the meantime the house probably would have burned to the ground. This is of the utmost importance in rescuing a bank in difficulty or in preventing it getting into difficulty. A delay of several days, or several hours, sometimes is the difference between a saved bank and a closed bank.

If FDIC is to protect depositors, why should it not be provided with every reasonable means to do so? It alone is responsible for depositors' protection, no other banking agency is called to account if a bank fails. How, then, can there be any question about giving FDIC full examining authority as to all its insured banks? I submit, there is no sound reason why FDIC should not be given this precautionary authority. It will be a safeguard not only for FDIC but for the depositors, and that means either you or someone in your family. I intend to urge the House Banking and Currency Committee to give FDIC the full right of examination. It is necessary in the depositors' interest, even more than in its own.

We all must remember that although bank difficulties are not now a serious threat, they are not entirely a thing of the past. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has paid out $350,000,000 to protect 1,350,000 depositors of 412 insured banks during its 16 years. Twenty-five of these banks, with 260,000 depositors, requiring advances of over $77,000,000, have been in New York. Isolated banking troubles are bound to occur, but with a sound FDIC depositors no longer have to worry, and that is the important thing.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, born of depression, has done more than any other agency during its short 16 years to prevent depressions. Much credit is due to the efficient management of the Corporation. I want to pay public tribute to its Chairman, Maple T. Harl, to his associate directors, and to his very efficient, competent, and loyal staff. Let us go forward with FDIC and help it make additional benefits available to depositors in insured banks.

Dedication of the Andrew A. Casassa Memorial Overpass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include herein the remarks made by me at the dedication of the Andrew A. Casassa Memorial Overpass in Revere, Mass., on Saturday, June 17, 1950:

One of the great battles of the Revolutionary War took place in a neighboring community, and this is its anniversary day.

At Bunker Hill the men of colonial times fought to free themselves from the domination of an alien government in which they had no voice. They also fought against the intolerance which goes hand in hand with tyranny.

They won the right and the opportunity to govern themselves.

That was the beginning.

Now that they were on their own, they had to learn how to make freedom work. This was not easy. The walls of class and race and creed that separated human beings from one another since ancient times did not melt away overnight.

But neither were they rigidly maintained in the new-born United States that came into being after the Revolution.

The people were free, and they set themselves to the task of tearing down those walls of prejudice and intolerance, habit by habit.

The United States opened its arms to the poor and oppressed of all nations. They came by the millions with hope and resolution in their hearts. They were determined to make good, both for themselves and for the young country that believed in them.

Here, for the first time in history, people of different languages and cultures had the God-given chance to work together and learn together.

It was not easy at the start, for they were strangers to one another. Those who first settled this country were inclined to be suspicious of the different customs and beliefs of those who were immigrants also, but of a later date. And the newcomers were shy, fearful of offending those who were established here. That is, until they became established, too.

From the experience of my own forefathers, I know that the Irish immigrants suffered humiliation, until they earned the confidence and respect of their neighbors which came about through mutual understanding.

It was the same with the Jewish people, the Italians, and many others.

To be honest about it, you and I can recall when a humiliated racial group of one generation, when it had become assimilated, was apt to make another racial group that came later feel second-class for a time.

Happily, those days of so-called seniority, when a man's Americanism was rated by the boat his ancestor's came over on, whether it was the first, the middle, or the last, is gone. For the boats are still coming over, and we will continue to welcome new blood, limited only by our ability to create opportunities for all of our people, and by our proper concern for the national security.

The material strength which enabled us to survive in victory through World War II was the direct result of our freedoms and the high morale which they build. Our Nation is strong in its human faith because it unites the best in every race and every creed.

The proof of that is in this dedication of a living monument to a typical American, the late Andrew A. Casassa of Revere.

I knew Andrew in the Massachusetts Legislature, and I admired him because he came up the hard way, where courage shapes ability and genuine leadership.

And I know that his vital spirit, symbolic of the energy and the confidence that is so truly American, would rejoice in the honor we are paying to the accomplishments of his lifetime.

His community and his State are perpetuating his fondest wish, and in his name. He believed in government as the servant of the people, and he was ever eager for government, in every way possible, to assist in the forward march toward a better future.

Through this modern monument, which gives useful daily service to thousands of people, we are taking his name into that future.

A man like Andrew Casassa, whose zest for life was never dimmed by the infirmities of advancing years, does not die. His heartbeat is merely transferred to others, inspiring them with the enthusiasm and the will to do all things better.

This is his memorial overpass.

In ways beyond our understanding Andrew Casassa will be in our company as we travel onward through that great adventure of participating in the developing American life.

Democracy and Odd Fellowship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herein an address delivered by the Honorable Edward M. Sharpe, Sovereign Grand Master, IOOF, on the subject Democracy and Odd Fellowship:

I wish to congratulate the leaders who have made it possible for the membership of our order to participate in paying homage to the Unknown Soldier.

I fully appreciate the task before me in audibly expressing what is in your hearts.

It is my hope that something will be said here that will further the cause of world peace. It is a well-known fact that world conditions following the close of the second World War are not what many of us had hoped for. Instead of all nations joining together as a unit to relieve the suffering caused by the war, we find a disunity of purpose and a preparation for a third conflict which, with modern weapons for destruction, may cause the candle of civilization to be extinguished.

The world realizes that out of the recent world conflict there have emerged two powerful nations, namely, the United States and Russia; Russia controlled by a form of government known as communism, and the United States of America with a form of government known as a democracy.

It is well known also that these two forms of government are in opposition as to their methods of governing. In a democracy, the people, through their representation, control the welfare of its people. In a democracy policies of government are projected and tested in the political arena. This philosophy is inherent in our Declaration of Independence, which holds that "Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Our forefathers had the courage to found a nation that was conceived in the spirit of freedom and nurtured by the ideal of democracy where the rights of the individual still reign supreme. These rights are proclaimed in our Bill of Rights which has become a part of our Constitution. Under the Bill of Rights we have freedom of speech; freedom of the press; freedom of religion and freedom to assemble for the purpose of discussing our mutual problems. As a result of these precious rights our churches, schools, homes, and fraternities have had freedom for growth and have become a part of the warp and woof of the social and economic life of the Nation.

I believe it was Lycurgus, the Spartan lawgiver, who once said, "Citizens are the best walls of a free city"; but we should remember that we who believe in democracy cannot remain passive in the confidence that communism has no future. Self-government is not a luxury on which men may grow fat and indulgent. Democracy can lose if those of us who believe in it remain indifferent and neglect our personal responsibilities for its security and growth.

Ours is the responsibility to make democracy work every day in the year. Our duties are not vague. They are the every day tasks right before us in our homes and in our communities. As we face the future we must be awake to our traditions, conscious of our local needs, aware of our world obligations and ever striving to find a way to live in peace with all humanity. Our responsibility is clear; we must ever champion the cause of liberty of the world. In the present hour we face a crisis. It is not one which military forces alone can protect us from. The hour calls for steadfastness and faith in order that America may emerge triumphant and continue its leadership in world affairs.

It is with a great deal of pleasure for your leader to say that for more than a century and a quarter our order has been measuring up to its responsibilities as a fraternity and as a part of our form of government. We have builded and maintained 66 homes for our aged members; we have cared for the widow and educated the orphans. In more recent times our services have expanded to the extent of building hospitals, recreation camps, provided hospital beds and formed groups of blood donors, as well as maintaining a home for the training of the blind. We have now become a recognized asset to a great many communities. Through our activities in caring for the aged and the orphans, we have hastened the day when governments, both National and State, have enacted legislation to carry out in a larger measure those humanitarian services which we have been rendering for more than a century. We claim no small amount of the credit for the enactment of this legislation; moreover, we have expanded to the utmost our material resources, as well as our human resources, for the protection of those principles upon which our Government was founded.

As we view world affairs we cannot help but realize that the crying need of the hour is leadership. Leadership by men who are intelligent and courageous, men who are familiar with our system of Government, men with a due regard for the experiences of the past and a proper appreciation of our obligation to the future, men who look upon communism and other like isms as destructive of our liberties and institutions. Men who so revere our form of Government with its privileges and obligations that they are willing to give ungrudgingly of their time, efforts, energies and talents to preserve it in all its vital principles.

The kind of men needed to continue and improve our democracy are also needed in our churches, schools, and fraternities. In this hour of peril to American ideals, may we remain true to the fine traditions bequeathed us by our forefathers. In this time when opportunity and need for service presents the greatest challenge that has ever come to us, may we rise to the occasion of preserving our democracy and thereby cause the candle of civilization to burn brighter. As your leader I have visited many States and provinces. I have heard the roar of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans; I have traveled through our green valleys; I have seen the beauties of our highest mountains and have been deeply moved and impressed by the majesty of America, but all these are secondary in the knowledge that in Odd Fellowship we find a kind of friendship typified in the story of Jonathan and David.

Soldier, we are about to say farewell for another year, but before doing so let us publicly acclaim that the services you have rendered and the sacrifices you have made have given strength and virility to our democracy and our order. Rest peacefully in the knowledge that Odd Fellowship is ever alert to its obligation and will preserve those principles of living for which you made the supreme sacrifice.

Letter From a Russian Flier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD a letter from a Russian flier as printed in the Washington Post of June 16, 1950, and carried in the column of Walter Winchell.

This letter should be read with interest and sympathy. It presents the viewpoint of a Russian individual who wishes to become acclimated to the American way of life:

LETTER FROM A RUSSIAN FLIER

(Lt. Peter Pirogov of the Russian Air Force and his navigator, Barsov, escaped in a plane to the United States zone of Austria 2 years ago. They requested asylum as political refugees. Barsov later demanded being sent back. He was executed at Kharkov Prison on November 7.)

DEAR MR. WINCHELL: I want to thank you very much for your mention last Sunday of the news you had received about my erstwhile comrade, Anatole Barsov. Naturally, I myself have had no direct information, though there were plenty of contradictory rumors this past year.

In a way I am glad that Barsov is gone. I am certain that, before death released him, he suffered a great deal—spiritually as well as physically. I am saying this because I know that, despite everything that has happened and the humiliating indignity of his crawling back on his stomach to the Soviets—Anatole Barsov had wanted freedom. After all, he had gambled his life to attain it.

And that is the real reason for my writing to you—apart from thanking you for your interest in the case. Please do not be angry if I say that being a drunkard was not enough reason for Barsov's change of heart. That's too easy an explanation for a tragic act. There are, as I see it, two reasons for his going back, apart from the purely personal characteristic of emotional weakness.

The first is that it is terribly difficult for us, who have never known anything but the Soviets and their entire life system, to adjust ourselves to America—and freedom. I know whereof I speak. I too find it difficult. I find it difficult to make decisions of my own, to think them through logically, by myself. I've been used to others making decisions for me—in everything from early morning till bedtime. It's easy, you know. One doesn't have to think. One isn't really responsible. Well—it takes a long time and we need help.

Mr. Winchell, that is one of the great tragedies which we, the "nonreturners," the fugitives from the Soviet Union, are facing when we come here. We need help—not to get jobs. That's being done for us and we are grateful indeed. No, we need help in learning what this democracy is all about, how to live it, what to do with ourselves. We need friendship and understanding. We know it is hard and we know that sometimes Americans find us pretty tough to deal with. I am sure some of the people I've worked with think that of me. But somehow I don't seem to be able to help myself—I never knew anything different. So that, Mr. Winchell, is one reason. We are terribly lonely spiritually.

Anatole Barsov was given a job in Bridgeport, Conn. He knew few people—fewer still who understood the problems we are wrestling with. And he succumbed.

The second reason is more fundamental still because it involves not simply us, as individuals, but everyone of you, the whole American people and even the world.

And that is the bitter realization of most of us who escaped from a system whose horror you will luckily never truly understand because you have not experienced it—that Americans are not really interested in hearing our stories. That they are a little tired of all those Russians who tell us of slave labor camps, the NKVD and such. We, on the other hand, everyone of us, is aching to tell the story. Not because we want to be heroes but because we have a feeling that, once the free world outside learns what bolshevism is really like, it will find the strength and the knowledge and the ability to defeat it. Bolshevism can only be recognized, I feel, by what they are doing to the people in daily life. And that no one can tell, except those who have lived it.

Everyone of us is anxious to play his part in the fight for the freedom of the world and, with it, the freedom of our own people. We'd like to be your partners, your allies, and we are deeply unhappy when we are

left outside. Again, Mr. Winchell, I know what I am speaking about. It happened to Barsov, it happens to most of my friends—it is happening to me too. Things did not go so smoothly for me. Like Barsov, I am now working in a factory. I would be completely happy in my job if I had been sure that, with my book, Why I Escaped, I had done a small part of the fighting for freedom that I long to do; if I could feel that many, many Americans had read it, had believed me, and thus had come a little closer to the meaning of bolshevism.

Please forgive me this long letter. Somehow, as I sat down to write you a thank-you note, I couldn't stop. I wanted to pour my heart out. If that's typically Russian—then you'll have to bear with me. I am a Russian; I express my thoughts and feelings as a Russian, and I do so very much want you—and through you, the American people—to understand what we are facing.

PETER PIROGOV.

Socialism Threatens Our Freedom and Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address I made recently discussing the threat of socialism and bankruptcy facing our liberty-loving people under existing governmental policies:

SOCIALISM THREATENS OUR FREEDOM AND ECONOMY

Mr. Speaker, the twin figures of socialism and bankruptcy are knocking at the door of our Republic. If they gain entrance, the future of this Nation and its ideals, are lost. This is no idle statement. The facts speak for themselves.

Legislation is before the Congress, introduced by the President's left-wing supporters, following his call for such proposals as socialized medicine, socialized housing, socialized agriculture, and socialization of the production and distribution of goods.

If all of this legislation were enacted by the Eighty-first Congress, controlled by the Democrats, this Nation will be farther down the road to socialism than Great Britain. Moreover, the tremendous spending programs proposed by the President will lead us into bankruptcy and financial ruin.

This is not a pretty picture. But it is the truth. Only the proper sunshine and light through the windows of good government can dispel this cloudy picture. Action is necessary. The support and demand for a quick stop to all of this silly business by the people of our Nation can accomplish the ends desired and save our country. The future can be bright and filled with golden opportunity. But it cannot be achieved by following the dark paths of socialism and mounting public debt.

Let's take a look at the socialistic proposals advocated by the President. Introduced by Senator MURRAY on January 5, 1949, Senate bill 5, socialized medicine, estimated to cost this Nation $23,000,000,000 annually within a 10-year period. This scheme is not new—it has been tried by many countries in the past. The present bill plans to start collecting from the taxpayers 3 years in advance of their receiving any assistance from the socialized-medicine program—3 years to tool up for the job.

It is necessary to search carefully behind the propaganda now flooding the country, put out by the supporters of compulsory health insurance, to discover what it really means. Even the New York Times, the Nation's staid and respected Democratic newspaper says: "This is the most radical reform yet to be broached by the Truman administration." They even resorted to political fakery to sell their medical quackery to the American people labeling the bottle compulsory health insurance instead of socialized medicine, which it really is.

The Federal Security Administration tells you you would get this compulsory health insurance for free. But don't forget you pay whether you use the medical services or not. There is always a joker in these socialistic schemes. In addition to paying for someone's unused aspirins and your neighbor's bellyache, think of the number of bureaucrats and file clerks who will be placed on the Federal payroll. You will pay their salaries and expenses—in taxes—to have them help hand out the pills and dispense the red tape necessary for you to receive any medical attention. The socialized medicine advocates never tell you about that.

There are roughly 160,000 physicians and surgeons providing medical service in the United States—the best in the world. Doctors take a personal interest in their patients. You may have the one you wish and be as confidential in your relations with him as you may desire. But let this socialized medical program get its foot in the doorway and you will be sent to the hospital a Federal worker indicates, and to a doctor they select. If you don't like it, that is just too bad. The Government will still take its bite out of your weekly pay check to carry on this fake medical program.

In our country today 60,000,000 persons are protected through voluntary health insurance. It is estimated that 40,000,000 carry hospital insurance; 17,000,000 have surgical expenses covered; and 6,000,000 additional have some other kind of medical care and insurance.

Let's place more emphasis on these voluntary plans and try to develop them before we accept some socialistic plan which would wreck our entire medical and health program. I am not interested in having other people pay for things to be supplied to me for "free," if you see what I mean. I am certain the public has no taste for this kind of political medicine.

So much for the Murray bill and compulsory health insurance which is, in any language, socialized medicine.

Now, let us discuss the socialization, production, and distribution of goods as provided in the Spence bill, H. R. 2756, which was introduced in the House of Representatives on February 15, 1949. First, remember what the Chief Executive asked Congress for on January 5, 1949. He recommended, among other things in his state of the Union message, that legislation be enacted for the following purposes:

To authorize priorities and allocations for key materials in short supply; to provide stand-by authority to impose price ceilings for scarce commodities which basically affect essential industrial production or the cost of living, and to limit unjustified wage adjustments which would force a break in an established price ceiling.

To authorize an immediate study of the adequacy of production facilities for materials in critically short supply, such as steel (he even advocated the Government taking over our steel factories); and, if found necessary, to authorize Government loans for the expansion of production facilities to relieve such shortages, and furthermore to authorize the construction of such facilities directly if action by private industry fails to meet our needs.

Compare these demands by the Chief Executive with the action taken by the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress which wiped out the OPA. We all remember the sigh of relief which went up when its 76,000 oppressive controls over business and our economy were removed. These controls were choking the life out of business. Our housewives were frantic unwinding the red tape and regulations the Government had imposed making it virtually impossible to feed, clothe, and shelter one's family. Now the President wants the Eighty-first Congress to restore these rigid controls by enacting the Spence bill. It is in the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The author of the bill is also chairman of the committee. It would vest in the executive branch authority to: enter into contracts with private industry for research and development related to essential materials in short supply; purchase such materials at home or abroad; make loans to private industry and to States and municipalities for the purpose of expanding productive capacity; construct, expand, and rehabilitate plant facilities; establish, in cooperation with industry and with the approval of the Attorney General, plans under which materials and facilities in short supply could voluntarily be allocated and made subject to priorities without violation of the antitrust laws; establish a mandatory system of priorities and allocation for materials and facilities in short supply; control imports of certain fats and oils and rice and rice products, and establish and adjust maximum prices for commodities.

What about the farmer? There is something for him too in this socialistic planning. It is the Brannan plan which was not conceived by the farmer or his farm organizations but by the political leaders of the CIO and other labor organizations. They are seeking a political coalition between labor and the farmer at the farmer's expense. Remember, the farm population is only 20 percent of our national family.

The bill S. 1971 is the Brannan-plan bill in Congress. It was introduced in the Senate by Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma, on May 31, 1949. The Secretary of Agriculture says it is the Brannan plan. In a letter to Congressman KEEFE, of Wisconsin, the Secretary says, and I quote from my photostatic copy of that letter dated April 3, 1950: "It is a fair statement to say, that, if enacted, S. 1971 would put into effect the farm income support legislation that the President and I have recomended."

Briefly, here is what this revolutionary plan for controlling farm production and operation would do. It sets up an entirely new and radical price-support policy. It limits the number of units of production on each farm to 1,800. The bill states: "The term 'farm' means the land constituting a farming unit as determined by the Secretary, taking into consideration the use of common-work stock, equipment labor, management, and other pertinent factors. * * * A maximum of 1,800 comparative units of agricultural commodities per farm shall receive price support in any one calendar year * * * for the purpose of this provision, a comparative unit of corn shall be 10 bushels and for other agricultural commodities it shall be that quantity of the commodity the value of which at the price-support standard equals the value of 10 bushels of corn at the price-support standard."

Let me call your attention to some of the penalties and jail sentences which are spelled out in the bill. It says that all farmers must keep such books and records and make such

reports as may be required by the Secretary; and that if they fail to keep these reports and records they will be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction fined not more than $500. If they make a false report or record they shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction fined not more than $1,000 and imprisoned for not more than a year. What is the farmer to do, plant his potatoes in the light of the moon and harvest them in the dark so he won't be caught with an extra bushel or two should nature bring on a heavy crop?

Then there are the various spending programs to soak the taxpayer and control the amount of money he can spend or save. The Government would rifle his pocketbook to pay the cost of these socialistic programs and continue this unprecedented peacetime spending.

While making a visit to my district last fall, I predicted that unless the President's reckless spending budget of $42,000,000,000 was cut drastically by the Congress, this Nation would plunge nearly $6,000,000,000 in the red at the end of the fiscal year. This statement has been confirmed by the President's economic advisers. We will face a similar deficit in 1951. A continuation of an unbalanced budget during prosperity is only skating on the thin ice of bankruptcy. When it breaks the Government's credit will plunge into the sea of economic chaos. We will drown in the waves of despair.

At the beginning of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, I pointed out three ways the President's budget could be cut by $6,000,000,000 and the war-time excise taxes repealed. This would have given us a balanced budget, reduced taxes which continue to choke our economy, and strengthen our national credit. The House was successful in knocking $2,000,000,000 off the omnibus appropriations bill without interfering or touching funds for national defense, veterans' affairs, or interest obligations on the Federal debt. This cut was achieved over the opposition of the Democrats.

What a strange contrast to the accomplishments of the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress. It cut taxes for the first time since 1933; removed 7,500,000 persons in the lower income bracket from the tax rolls along with 1,500,000 blind and lame persons, and those over 65 years of age; it balanced the budget for the first time since 1930; cut Federal expenditures; paid over $7,000,000,000 on the Federal debt, and started running the Reds out of the Government.

Let's halt this slide down the slippery road to socialism. We must remember the ideals and achievements obtained under our representative form of Government. We must save the Republic.

A political philosopher not long ago summed up in strong words and in clear concise language what our political philosophy should mean to us: "That man is a sacred personality, created by God, that as a spiritual being he is of supreme greatness. Our forefathers formed this Government on the following tripod of principles. First, it was to be a constitutional representative government. Second, we were to enjoy free private competitive enterprise. Third, it was to provide civil and religious liberty. If any one of those is weakened or broken the entire structure falls.

"They also taught that government receives its power from the consent of the governed. They held that it is the purpose of government to create in man the highest form of free personal responsibility. They further taught that the function of government is to interfere as little as possible in the affairs of the people, acting only as an umpire to insure that fair play and the rules of decency prevail and that life, liberty and property are protected. In other words, the chief function of government is as an agent of justice to prevent anarchy. That is the philosophy of government in which we were reared. That is the fundamental political philosophy that made this country."

Socialism is no bogey man hiding in the closet. As you can see, by these three socialistic programs— they are real, live issues introduced by the present party in power. Let's rise up in our righteous indignation and smack them down as freedom-loving individuals. Only a free people and a free economy can achieve the great destiny which lies ahead for this Nation and the world.

A Blueprint for National Defense

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago, May 26, 1949, the House Committee on the Armed Services launched the B–36 investigation pursuant to House resolutions introduced by Chairman CARL VINSON, of Georgia, and myself.

The investigation was for the purpose of clearing the air of ugly rumors and disturbing reports which concerned high Government officials in the Defense Establishments, and which were having a serious effect on the morale of our Armed Forces and undermining the confidence of the public.

These ugly rumors and disturbing reports, which first appeared in reputable newspapers and magazines revealed an attack not only on the B–36 procurement program, but also cast suspicion on officials of the Department of Defense, unification of our Armed Forces, and the strategy of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Chairman CARL VINSON, after consulting with committee members, decided that the investigation should be divided into two phases. The first phase covered the investigation of the B36 bomber program, while the second phase concerned unification and strategy.

Many weeks were consumed in holding hearings on both phases of the investigation. The testimony was lengthy, contradictory, of a highly technical nature, and occasionally sarcastic and heated.

Top civilian secretaries of all branches of the armed services, high-ranking officers, representatives of industry, and others, appeared as witnesses.

The committee's task was not an easy one. It required long hours in studying testimony and evaluating it.

At the conclusion of the public hearings, the committee went into executive sessions and after a period of time issued two separate reports, one on the investigation of the B–36 bomber program, and the other on unification and strategy. Both reports are important public documents of a highly informative nature, and warrant reading by every person interested in our national defense.

The first report titled "Investigation of the B–36 Bomber Program" clears the air of ugly rumors and disturbing reports by exonerating the various officials mentioned in newspaper and magazine articles, and from other sources of any misconduct as alleged.

On this point the committee report has the following to say:

CONCLUSION ON ITEM 1 OF THE AGENDA

It is the unanimous judgment of the committee that the B–36 bomber was selected and procured regularly, based on an honest conviction that it is the best available aircraft for its purpose in the defense of the United States today, and that there is not a scintilla of evidence to support the charges, reports, rumors, and innuendoes which have been the subject of inquiry under item 1 of the agenda. In order that there might be no delay in clearing all those who have been unwarrantedly or erroneously charged, this judgment was made public by the following resolution adopted unanimously by the committee at the close of the hearing on August 25, 1949:

"There has not been in the judgment of the entire committee one iota, not one scintilla of evidence offered thus far in these hearings that would support charges that collusion, fraud, corruption, influence, or favoritism played any part whatsoever in the procurement of the B–36 bomber.

"There has been very substantial and compelling evidence that the Air Force selected and procured this bomber solely on the ground that this is the best aircraft for its purpose available to the Nation today.

"At this time we feel that the Nation should know that the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Symington, the leaders of the Air Force, and Mr. Johnson, the Secretary of Defense, have come through this inquiry without the slightest blemish and that these men continue to merit the complete confidence of the American people in their past actions and in the future" (pp. 32 and 33, House Rept. No. 1470, 81st Cong.).

The second report titled "Unification and Strategy," reveals a most extensive study of the problems of our national defense.

As a result, the committee unanimously adopted 32 recommendations and by a vote of 23 to 8, the thirty-third recommendation respecting the removal of Admiral Louis E. Denfeld was approved.

The 33 recommendations are contained in the following summary of the views of the House Armed Services Committee:

1. All testimony presented was based on the committee's agenda and rendered at the committee's request. Personal views of the witnesses were solicited. Criticism of the witnesses for presenting their frank views under these circumstances is unworthy and a disservice to the Nation's defense.

2. The witnesses would have been subject to censure had they failed to present their convictions to the committee on the subjects covered in the committee agenda.

3. The national objectives proposed by General Bradley [Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joints Chiefs of Staff] appear to the committee to be sound, but should not be assumed by the military leaders. The Secretary of Defense should initiate a study in the National Security Council to provide a firm statement of principles upon which the Joint Chiefs of Staff may rely as an official expression of their civilian leaders.

4. The Secretary of Defense should initiate a study in the National Security Council on the relationship to the national objectives of atomic warfare and present strategic planning for the use of atomic weapons, and the appropriate committees of Congress should be fully informed of the decisions reached in order to place the legislative and appropri-

ations problems of national defense in their proper perspective before the Congress.

5. In view of the terrible destructiveness of modern weapons, the Nation can no longer afford lackadaisical planning or complacency as to its defenses. For an indefinite time, the Nation must maintain sound, modern, alert defensive forces capable of anticipating and dealing with a sudden enemy attack.

6. Intercontinental strategic bombing is not synonymous with air power. The Air Force is not synonymous with the Nation's military air power. Military air power consists of Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps air power, and, of this, strategic bombing is but one phase. The national air power consists of the military air power of the various services plus commercial aviation plus the national industrial and manpower resources pertaining to aviation.

7. Navy leaders are not opposed to strategic air warfare but do oppose strategic bombing if, by the term "strategic bombing," is meant mass aerial bombardment of urban areas.

8. There is possibility of serious damage to the Nation's defense if too much joint planning is concentrated on individual service questions of a highly technical nature during the formative period of unification. The committee has strong doubts that it is a service to the Nation's defense for the military leaders of the respective services to pass judgment jointly on the technical fitness of either new or old weapons each service wishes to develop to carry out its assigned missions.

9. Difficulties between the Air Force and the naval air arm will continue because of fundamental professional disagreements on the art of warfare. Service prejudices, jealousies, and thirst for power and recognition have had only a bare minimum of influence on this controversy.

10. The committee expects the services to resolve their professional differences fairly and without rancor and to perform their professional duties, not only with efficiency and effectiveness but also with dignity, with decorum, and with full receptivity to one another's professional judgments.

11. A political body cannot of itself reach, through deliberative processes, final answers on professional military questions, but must depend upon and encourage a continuation of the process of exploration, study, and coordination among our officers of the several services to preserve a satisfactory doctrine of defense, to have ready applicable plans, and to devise units, suitably equipped, to meet the most probable circumstances of any emergency. The significant thing is to insure that the national-defense structure insures adequate consideration of all professional views, especially during these early days of unification.

12. The Committee on Appropriations should make a thorough analysis of present and projected aircraft procurement to verify whether or not the present and planned level of procurement will support the required air power for the Nation.

13. A closer relationship should be established between Marine Corps aviators, the Army Field Forces, and the Air Force for the development of sound close air-support tactics and techniques. The Secretary of Defense should require the prompt establishment of a joint training center for this purpose.

14. There should be joint training activities between tactical aircraft of the Air Force and Navy to resolve questions of relative performance of these aircraft.

15. All services have been at fault at one time or another in the unification effort. There are no unification Puritans in the Pentagon.

16. Prudent administration of unification, sensitive to the many imponderables of spirit and emotion and service loyalties, can greatly ease service tensions and difficulties over the years that must pass before cross education of the services will truly produce the "one-armed-force" concept. Hasty decisions and brusque dismissals of honestly held service views will aggravate these tensions and difficulties.

17. Cross education of the services holds the ultimate key to the perplexing problems of interservice relations. A much greater concentration of effort is needed in this field.

18. There is no justification whatsoever for barring naval-aviation personnel from strategic air command activities of the Air Force. This is not in the spirit of unification, despite the provocations that may have occurred in the past to produce this situation.

19. Joint training centers should be established in all areas of greatest interservice controversy to remove lack of understanding, which breeds suspicion, rivalry, and questioning of motives. This should be done in air matters, amphibious warfare, ground-support aviation, airborne troops.

20. There should be an augmentation of interservice war games to resolve such questions as the Banshee versus the B–36 in order to eliminate or at least reduce the tensions between the services, as well as contributing to their combat readiness.

21. The committee firmly supports unification, but emphasizes that it is a concept requiring definition. Blind support should not be given to "unification" as a word. Its meaning should always be examined to determine whether the particular concept being applied or proposed is the proper one.

22. Civilian control of the Nation's armed forces is integrally a part of the Nation's democratic process and tradition; it is strongly supported by the committee. But in supporting civilian control of the armed forces the committee does not mean (1) preventing free testimony before congressional committees by members of the armed forces, or (2) the relegation of the United States Congress to a bystander role in issues pertaining to the national defense.

23. The Joint Chiefs of Staff structure as now constituted does not insure at all times adequate consideration for the views of all services. The committee will sponsor legislation to require rotation of the position of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff among the services after a 2-year term, and to add the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a member thereof.

24. The committee will ultimately reexamine the entire Joint Chiefs of Staff structure to determine whether the structure, as amended as proposed in this report, insures adequate consideration of all service views.

25. The evaluation of the B–36 is properly within the province of the Joint Weapons Systems Evaluation Board. Future mass procurement of weapons should not be undertaken until the recommendations of this Board, except in time of emergency, are available to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

26. The Air Force holds the primary responsibility for conducting strategic bombing. It has maintained that the B–36 bomber is its foremost weapon to carry out that mission and that the B–36 can do its job. The committee holds that the Nation must rely upon the judgment of its professional leaders in their respective fields in matters of this nature—and that the Nation's leaders in respect to weapons of the Air Force are the leaders of the United States Air Force.

27. The committee deplores the manner of cancellation of the construction of the aircraft carrier U. S. S. *United States*, but, because of the pressure of other shipbuilding programs at the present time and the existing budgetary limitations on the Navy Department, will withhold further action—for the present—as regards the construction of this vessel. The committee considers it sound policy, however, for the Nation to follow the advice of its professional leaders in regard to this subject in the same manner as has been heretofore done in respect to the B–36 bomber. In the committee's view, the Nation's leaders in respect to naval weapons are the leaders of the United States Navy.

28. The appropriate role of the Joint Weapons Systems Evaluation Board is to evaluate weapons after they have been developed, not to instruct the services what types of new weapons they will or will not develop.

29. The committee will sponsor legislation to require, within reasonable limits, consultation by the Secretary of Defense with the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives before appropriated funds are withheld by administrative act.

30. The Appropriations Committee should augment its staff in order to keep in intimate touch with the development of national defense budgets, thereby easing the stresses and strains in the Pentagon and keeping the Congress adequately informed on basic national defense planning as reflected in budgetary plans.

31. The management committee of the Department of Defense should be placed under the direction of the comptroller of the Department of Defense on all fiscal and budgetary matters.

32. The appointment of a career military officer as chairman of a committee composed of civilians on the Assistant Secretary or Under Secretary level is an unfortunate and undesirable precedent which inverts the civilian-control concept so closely identified with unification.

33. The removal of Admiral Denfeld was a reprisal against him for giving testimony to the House Armed Services Committee. This act is a blow against effective representative government in that it tends to intimidate witnesses and hence discourages the rendering of free and honest testimony to the Congress; it violated promises made to the witnesses by the committee, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of Defense; and it violated the Unification Act, into which a provision was written specifically to prevent actions of this nature against the Nation's highest military and naval officers.

As the result of the recommendations of the House Armed Services Committee, legislation is now pending in Congress to put in effect some of the proposed reforms.

Now that the B–36 investigation is history and the two committee reports are public documents containing valuable information on the subject of national defense, future strategy and the manner in which unification is working, the question may be asked—Was the investigation worth while?

Unbiased persons in various walks of life have made the following interesting comments on the result of the B–36 investigation.

David Lawrence, well-known editor and columnist, in the May 9, 1949 issue of the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star, said:

Considerable progress has been made toward unification of the armed services as a result of the recent controversy.

Not only has each service now a clearer idea of its duties and functions, but recognition of the autonomy of each service has actually been achieved inside the Joint Chiefs of Staff. No merger and no consolidation of armed services was contemplated by

the law, but a policy of integration and coordination was specifically encouraged and that's what is being developed at last.

What is most important, too, is that a working relationship between the defense dollars available and defense needs is being clearly defined—perhaps on a more business-like basis than ever before in our history.

Ray Tucker, widely known columnist, in his syndicated column of May 20, 1950, said:

The real answer for the shift is a kindly but stubborn gentleman from Georgia. He is Representative CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and the lower chamber's acknowledged expert on naval needs. * * * When Mr. Truman and Mr. Johnson, neither of whom match Mr. VINSON, in their actual knowledge of the needs of military establishment, discovered that the House preferred his advice to theirs, they backed down. That is the simple background story of why they marched up the hill and down again * * * Two other men, however, deserve credit, according to Mr. VINSON. They are Adm. Forrest P. Sherman, who succeeded Admiral Denfeld as chief of naval operations, and Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, a naval reservist and former head of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. * * * Mr. VAN ZANDT's contribution was his demand for an investigation of published charges that Secretary Johnson and former Under Secretary Symington were favoring certain airplane companies with which they had been associated, directly or indirectly, in giving out bomber contracts. The Pennsylvania Congressman took care to say that he himself was not making these charges. He noted that they had been bruited in newspapers and magazines, and he thought it would clear the air for the Armed Services Committee to look into the matter. Chairman VINSON agreed and the ensuing inquiry disclosed that the Truman-Johnson program would have given us an unbalanced air force and naval set-up. Both men were cleared, of course, of the ugly charges.

Melvin J. Maas, national president of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association, Washington, D. C., in commenting on the B–36 investigation, said on March 6, 1950:

The Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association, after reading the report of the House Armed Services Committee, "Unification and Strategy," with special reference to the treatment of the Navy and Marine Corps by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, feels that this has cleared the air and produced salutary and most beneficial results to the national defense as a whole.

While the congressional investigation was initiated by certain charges relating to the disturbing rumors about the procurement of the B–36 planes and while these rumors were not verified, the subsequent searching inquiries into the strategic concept of the long-range bombers to the exclusion of amphibious operation, was most timely. The outcome of the whole inquiry has clarified both military and civilian thinking on the subject.

The result of this investigation has been of tremendous importance in putting an end to certain attempts to destroy the Marine Corps as a potent force of the national defense team. We in MCROA feel that the Nation's interests are thereby better served. We have no doubt that the investigation conducted by the committee has made a most valuable contribution to the future security of our Nation.

Herman J. Reifsnyder, editor of the Altoona, Pa., Altoona Mirror, in the August 20, 1949 issue, said:

The probe has therefore done two things. It has dispelled the fog of rumor and the cloud of suspicion, and assured the people of this country of the integrity of high defense officials. And it has again emphasized that the right to inquire into the conduct of any public official exists in Congress, and that no innocent man need fear the outcome of such an inquiry.

Mr. Davis Merwin, publisher of the Daily Pantagraph, Bloomington, Ill., on June 1, 1950, had this to say:

The report of the House Armed Services Committee is the first broad, impartial, and authoritative approach to the subject of national defense. It contains a quantity of thought-provoking observations and conclusions not yet publicized. It will eventually make history.

Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, military editor of the New York Times, said in the April 7, 1950, issue:

The report of the investigation offers some wise comments of enduring importance in the development of our defense policies. * * * The current defense debate ought to be read against the background of last fall's hearings, which, as time goes on, assume an evermore important place as a milestone in our postwar defense policies.

Numerous other comments of a favorable nature have been voiced concerning the B–36 investigation.

In general, the House Armed Services Committee is supported in its 33 recommendations to solve our problems of national defense and in its statement that unification is here to stay.

Chairman CARL VINSON and my fellow Members of the House Armed Services Committee are to be commended for the manner in which they conducted the investigation authorized by the Vinson-Van Zandt resolutions.

The investigation definitely helped our national defense by clearing the air of ugly rumors and disturbing reports, clarified the problems of unification and strategy, and proved that Congress can be depended upon to support policies of national defense, as long as they conform to the framework laid down by Congress in exercising its constitutional role—to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

Memorial Address by the Reverend Arthur J. Riley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Worthy Tribute to Blessed Memories," delivered by Rev. Father Arthur J. Riley, historian of the Knights of Columbus, at Memorial Day observances in New Haven, Conn.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORTHY TRIBUTE TO BLESSED MEMORIES

Each year on Memorial Day we pause that we may look back into history in a very personal way, to pay fitting tribute to those who have died after so living that they left us a precious heritage. Because of their gift we wish to do more than just give passing remembrance of the fact that they lived. We seek to pay especial attention to the care of the graves where they rest, confident that this act of devotion will help us to keep them more clearly in our memory. Many set flowers thereon that this touching practice may show a love of them, even though they have gone beyond. In a special way we pay honor to those whose efforts in time of strife have guaranteed that this country of ours should continue in existence and should have the proper chance to develop. We demand that the memorials erected to their memory be fittingly cared for, as these children here have done and for which they deserve such credit. We hold services at the graves of these war dead, we have parades to honor their achievements, we call upon orators to phrase in worthy words the story of these deeds. Thus we remind ourselves that we have not forgotten their "last full measure of devotion."

A beautiful part of these public ceremonies includes the bugler's call of the poignantly lovely taps. The final, the touching farewell to a departed comrade in arms, it is our musical tribute of affectionate regard, the melodic medal of distinction for services well rendered, the sweet and sad goodbye. On many of these programs, as here tonight, that first call is followed by another, not so much an echo from distant hills as a Godspeed from across the veil that separates us from them in eternity. It is the reminder from those war dead that we are to cherish deeply what they paid so heavily to win.

As these honored dead thus speak to us, they insist that they were of the same clay as we, that they had the same hopes, the same ambitions, the same loyalties, yes, even the same weaknesses. They were not supermen, heroes of a different cast. They were just those we knew and loved, grandfathers, fathers, brothers, sons, uncles, cousins, friends, those next door, down the street, in the neighborhood. They little understood the science of strategy, they were no authorities on international relations or power politics, they did not even appreciate to the full measure the scope of the freedoms they had to defend. They were given a job to do, to save their country as they knew it and served it and loved it, so that they and others might have the opportunity to make it better. And that job they did well.

For those beyond the grave there is today no long roll call of the many engagements in which they fought. Nor are there arguments of military strategists over the relative importance of these various battles. Neither do historians remind them of the American blood which has been spilled on all five continents and upon innumerable isolated outposts of the world. They are now beyond the cruel cynicism of those who sought to barter these achievements at a peace table in coldly calculating fashion. They are even beyond the voices of silver-tongued orators who glamorize the deeds and thereby rob these of their true value. To describe these achievements merely as battles fought, as victories won, as territories occupied, the true

significance of these deeds as the acts of living men is lost; through the loss is the failure to appreciate properly how great were the contributions of these war dead. They must speak to us from beyond the grave to set these deeds in proper light.

Now that they are at rest, eternal rest, to which God in His infinite mercy has called them, they can calmly and quietly remind us that there is no glamour, no beauty, in war. They would insist to us that it is ugly and drab and stark and bitter. They would emphasize that it is composed of fear and loneliness, of fatigue and sweat, of tears and blood. They would then sharply bid us remember that they want from us the full realization, as best we are able, of the price they paid. Almost casually they were taken from their routine of work and play; they left home and family, school and business; they laid aside their plans and ambitions and perhaps were never to take them up again; they ripped months and years from their lives and they could never put them back. They went into camps where they met and overcame the irritating adjustments and the deadly routine. And they went into battle where they suffered the gripping uncertainty, the gnawing loneliness and the icy fear. They fought and suffered and perhaps died under strange skies, on far-away battlefields, with death lurking in a thousand forms. On Virginia's coastal plain, in Pennsylvania's hills, on Tennessee's mountains, in Louisiana's bayous, across Georgia's red clay they fought; at Puerto Rico's San Juan and in the Philippines' back country; on the French farms in muddy trenches and in French forests under grim trees; from Casablanca to Bizerte, from Sicily and Anzio up the long range of wintry Italian mountains, from Norman beachheads and Marseilles' welcoming port, again across France and Belgium, deep into Germany with its rubble from the blasted cities; yes, and island hopping from the nightmare of Guadalcanal and the hideous swamps of the Solomons to the fury of Okinawa and Iwo Jima on to blasted Japan; yes, on these and a hundred more bloody and bitterly contested fields they fought. They heard the ping of bullets, the chatter of the machine gun, the whine of shells, the roar of cannon, the drone of the bomber, the fury of combat. High above the enemy's territory they fought in confining cockpits or in cramped bomb bays, as they incessantly dodged pursuit planes and stabbing searchlight beams and whistling antiaircraft shells and deadly bullets. Below the water's surface they fought from lurking submarines, far inside the enemy lines, anxiously awaiting possible discovery and the eventual depth bomb. On ugly freighters, low-flying tankers, pitching destroyers, rakish privateers, swift cruisers, ponderous landing craft, fleet aircraft carriers and mighty battleships, they roamed the broad surface of the ocean to seek little known ports and unknown dangers, ever alert for the screaming dive-bomber, the silent torpedo, the blasting shell, the flash of ignited gasoline or the blinding flame of exploding powder. Would that this told the story. But no words of any orator can tell that story; no painter can put it on canvas; no movie camera, even with sound equipment, can catch it. For all these cannot bring in proper focus the tense emotional drama as living men fight bitterly that they may live and by living eventually win the battle of today, the engagements of the morrow and the war of the generation.

The war dead are now beyond that stark bitterness, that drab ugliness, that frenzied fury, as these are but the memories of yesterday for all their comrades and are but the cold words, almost devoid of meaning, to those who were not there. Today all is quiet. The campaign battle flags are now in museums. The uniforms are upon hangers. The gleaming ribbons are in treasure chests and the medals are in boxes tucked away. The seething rage and the joyous exultation have calmed to quieter emotions. The bloody battlefields seem so peaceful. Now from the war dead at rest comes the reminder that everything for which they fought has been left to us; with it is the caution that we remember the price they willingly paid because it was their duty.

What are these heirlooms of which they are so proud? From beyond the grave these war dead rejoice that American children can play games instead of practicing martial exercises. They exalt that American children can attend school and choose their careers instead of being designated to fill a role in a planned economy. They are happy that the tattling of American children is but childish pique and not the vicious informer's tale to bring torture and death—yes, and worse—to their relatives and friends. They smile proudly that American children can even read comic books rather than grimly pore over party literature. They beam at honest criticism of the Government in the newspapers and magazines in place of sickening adulation of party leaders from fearful lips. Their eyes flash with delight as they hear boys and girls tell their dreams of a future in which they can chart their course of life instead of having to submit their ambitions and energies to the ruthless whims of a power-crazed theorist. They listen contentedly while a judge upbraids the illegal tactics of a too zealous prosecutor of a vicious criminal instead of fawningly congratulating a lying minion of the State for presenting a perjured case against a broken man whose only crime was honest difference of opinion. They nod approvingly as men and women angrily disagree over the merits of candidates seeking office instead of stolidly listening to the glorification of a hand-picked group which alone can be elected. They hum quietly as these same disagreeing men and women proudly and freely cast ballots for their choice and calmly accept the decision of the majority instead of sullenly going to the polls to vote for men to whom they will pay only grudging honor because these latter but cravenly do the bidding of a dictator. Their hearts fill with rapture as they see people leaving churches with glowing faces instead of skulking beneath midnight blackness to fulfill traditional worship to the God they love. The war dead are pleased with all these—and the more pleased because they fought that they and we might enjoy them.

From beyond the grave, too, these war dead tighten their lips as they still see squalid slums, insanitary and unhealthy, and even unjust working conditions, inadequate hospitals, incompetent schools, degrading prisons, insufficient recreational facilities. Their eyes fill with bitter tears as they hear angry, stubborn, greedy words from both sides in industrial disputes, words which needlessly postpone the achieving of the harmony so necessary. Their faces are grim as they listen to the termites gnawing away at our freedom by using the inflammatory words that breed tension and bring trouble. They shake their heads in disapproval as short-sighted people promise a freedom that only fetters because it ignores the greatness of the American way which cost so much free sacrifice. And their whole carriage grows rigid with anger when they see public officials and employees selling honor for a pittance of gold, betraying justice for paltry graft, or short-changing the country for personal ambition. Of such deeds in their own lives they are now bitterly ashamed as they now recognize the price paid that these freedoms might be had. Of such deeds in the lives of others they are, quite properly, gravely fearful. And this heritage, too, they have left us.

This then is the message the war dead from their home with God bid me bring you tonight. Since no words of mine can match their deeds, or even adequately describe them, they have bidden me describe all too briefly the America they loved and the shoddy actions they now deplore. They, however, make no demand of us as we did of them. They simply ask us to look at this America, to love it as they did, to be willing in our turn to defend it as they did. That is what they, the war dead, ask us on a day dedicated to their blessed memory, in every city, town, and hamlet in the land, at every military and naval post manned by Americans in the four corners of the world. Since the immortal Lincoln, four score and 6 years ago in dedicating the battlefield cemetery at Gettysburg, assured that "the world would never forget what they did here," Americans have thrice left the country in other wars, each more terrible than the one before. Even now ominous clouds hang on the horizon, indicating an actual cold war, perhaps forecasting—we earnestly pray God, no—an imminent shooting conflict. One would surely be pardoned a slight wonder whether the world has forgotten the deeds of the war dead as well as the orator's words. There is the gnawing worry that the tribute paid is not quite worthy of the blessed memory of these war dead.

Despite the description of the beauty of the American freedoms, we ask, Must it be true that only in time of war can we have a reasonably satisfactory national income whereby our people can rather generally enjoy the minimum comforts of civilization? Must it be true that only in day of battle are the distinctions of race, color, and creed set aside? Must it be true that American generosity and neighborliness are taken from their wrappings of self-sufficiency only in wartime? Must it be true that only fear of bombing awakens us to the value of freedom and to the call of freedom's demands? Must it be true that only in time of crisis can we be aware of the glaring inadequacies in the social and economic spheres of so many people? Must it be true that we can spend lavishly for offense and then niggardly spare only a pittance for defense? Must it be true that we can almost casually mobilize the concentrated efforts of scientists at unbelievable expense to prepare weapons of death while in calmer days we can deny these same scientists the opportunity on a similar scale to develop these discoveries for healing mediums? Must it be true that elaborate charts for wartime action can be prepared with meticulous care while we later fritter away these hard-won victories as we muddle along toward a vague peace? Must it be true that we are to let these war dead down because we are willing only to defend what they left to us?

Thus frankly question, we can only in decency answer "No" in ringing tones. We cannot take refuge in the cowardly defense that we are but a handful—and what can we do. We who shout that "No" are all decent Americans. Together we can do what is required. We can count the cost, even in blood and sweat and tears, light as we place it against their last full measure of devotion. To each of those who made the supreme sacrifice and whose gold star of memory is hung upon the sad hearts of mother, father, wife, sister and brother, we can give earnest assurance that they have not died in vain. To each of those who returned we can give similar assurance that we shall not forget. Our earlier allegiance to the flag with the white bars of purified courage, with the red stripes of pulsing energy, with the gleaming stars of

beckoning destiny and with the blue field of eternal hope guaranteed our continuing loyalty to the achievements for which these war dead fought. As we live worthy to join them, who gave so much, willingly, wholeheartedly, we pay the only fitting tribute to their blessed memories. As decent Americans, shouldn't we pay it?

Atlantic Chain Reaction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanmious consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid article by Servan Schreiber, a staff member of the independent Paris paper Le Monde, which appeared in the June 11, 1950, edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATLANTIC CHAIN REACTION—PLAN FOR STEEL POOL MAY BECOME MAJOR POLITICAL ISSUE FOR WEST

(By Servan Schreiber)

(Mr. Schreiber, a staff member of the independent Paris paper Le Monde, is in the United States on a 3-month travel and study fellowship.)

The Schuman-Monnet plan to pool Europe's steel and coal has been widely applauded, both in Europe and America, as being a wise step in the right direction. What is meant by that?

Why a wise step? Because it has the appearance of being both efficient and limited in scope. It appears, in other words, to be a perfect example of the so-called functional approach as opposed to the too ambitious and complex political approach. Instead of proposing a complete and rapid political merger of the different national sovereignties, it proposes only to forge one link between nations, paving the way for more and more of such links in the course of time.

Why in the right direction? Because it has been generally accepted for the last 5 years that European union was the one goal that the efforts of the west should aim at. The Schuman plan appears, at long last, as a most important step toward the integration of Europe.

Now, for these two reasons the first American reactions have been (1) a sense of relief that for once America could have the role of a spectator and not the major protagonist in a scheme for strengthening the west, and (2) a bitter dissatisfaction with the unresponsive British attitude to the proposal.

But in the last few days, as a result of the first concrete discussions and debates on the implications of the plan, the whole project begins to appear in a completely new light. Not that it is less important than previously thought, but on the contrary that it is infinitely more far-reaching. Instead of involving a limited functional problem in a purely European framework, it is probably going to become a major political problem for the whole Atlantic community.

The core of the proposal is, simply enough, to pool the steel and coal industries of France and Germany (and eventually other nations), this pool being administered by a commission tentatively called the High International Commission. This seems at first typically functional and calling for a limited and well-defined abandonment of sovereignty.

But let us go into it. In each country today—France for instance—the responsibility for the basic industries (both nationalized and privately owned) lies with a governmental department. In France, the Ministry of Industry and Commerce is responsible for determining, in accord with the different parties involved, the level of employment, the policy for wages and social security, the coordination of financial developments.

Now these are the roles that the High Commission must take over. So if it means anything it is going to mean a superministry, headed by a superminister.

From there on, two courses are theoretically open. Either this superministry is going to be independent and all-powerful over its domain, once the members have been nominated by the national governments concerned. But that would be very clearly the first and ominous step toward a "managerial" society, in complete opposition to our present democratic principles.

Or the ministry must be responsible for its actions and policies to a political elected body, as in any democratic framework. Now that political body cannot be, evidently, a mere juxtaposition of the different national parliaments. That would paralyze the action of the minister, and render meaningless the whole project. So there must be a huge supernational parliament set-up to which the superministry will be accountable for its acts.

The third step follows logically. If there is an executive power and a legislative power, there must clearly be a way out of any possible conflict between the two, which means the necessary creation of a sort of supreme court.

These logical and inescapable developments of the original and seemingly limited proposal have already been suggested last week by several students of the plan. In particular, the Frenchman, Jean Maroger. Others have already proposed the Strasbourg Council and the International Court of the Hague for the legislative and judicial roles. But for different reasons, they are not considered adequate.

Finally, the outcome of the study is that either the proposal is going to mean nothing, or it involves the setting up of the whole new political federative framework on top of the different national units. Which leads, inevitably, to three important conclusions:

1. There is no such thing as a purely functional approach. Any serious functional proposal, like the French one, leads inescapably to a complete political approach. Abandonment of sovereignty cannot be, in the long run, limited or circumscribed. It is a chain reaction.

2. That explains the hesitant British attitude. They could accept commiting themselves to a limited project, if there was one (like the European Payments Union), but cannot accept complete political merger in the European framework. Why? Because Europe is too small for the British problems, it cannot be a sufficient basis for a stable community.

3. This finally brings the question back to Washington, contrary to previous expectations. An industrial and well-defined link between France and Germany was entirely welcomed. But the eventual growth of a complete political unity, truncated to continental western Europe without Britain and the United States, as it is now, is a very different thing.

At the very moment when an Atlantic merger of interests is in the making on three levels—foreign policy, military integration, economic coordination—a regional unbalanced development, with its probable third force implications, could provoke a complete disequilibrium.

On the other hand, the Schuman plan cannot be dropped, because it is perhaps the most imaginative and constructive step of recent years. So the only way out of this dilemma may, very conceivably, appear in the next few months to be that the Schuman approach must be enlarged to the whole Atlantic community. Which leads today, on both sides of the ocean, some political planners for the first time—and not merely the prophets or the poets—to examine concretely the advent of Atlantic union.

So the Schuman-Monnet eventual chain reaction is both political and geographical. It may, of course, die because of those high implications. It may, on the other hand, precipitate in the near future a complete unity of the west.

Fair Economic Weather

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., recently:

FAIR ECONOMIC WEATHER

Another business scare seems to have vanished in air. Once more the economists are flying their brightest flags; some even profess to see fair economic weather clear through 1951.

This year, of course, there's been no serious downturn in business activity like that in 1949. The biggest storm warning was the unemployment figure, which kept mounting until by February it hit better than 4,600,000.

There was talk of 5,500,000 out of work by fall and higher totals later. The great labor federations were getting ready to demand huge public-works programs to take up the slack.

Now its all different. Unemployment has fallen to around 3,000,000. Actually, more than 2,700,000 additional workers are employed today as compared with gloomy February. But the United States labor force is growing swiftly and many of those who have found jobs are new workers.

The Federal Reserve Board has just struck a cheerful note. It foresees continued heavy demand for automobiles, homes, and the durable products that go with the home—furniture, iceboxes, stoves, and the like.

If the Board is right—and it has a lot of company in this forecast—the solid basis exists for maintenance of high-level business activity for many months.

Does all this mean we can stop worrying about a depression? We've shrugged off so many false scares since the war ended that no one could be blamed for thinking maybe we can stay out of trouble for a long time.

And perhaps we can. Some experts point out that the foundation for much of this encouraging growth of business lies in two fundamental facts: The marked increase in population and the still greater rise in the number of new family units.

It is this latter, especially, which helps account for the unprecedented demand for housing and household goods. New homes are being formed at an almost unbelievable pace, and the end of the upward trend is far out of sight in the future.

Yet, with all this healthy growth, we still ought to exercise reasonable caution in viewing the future. Prospects are good; yes. But we have to remember that the economic system we live by is a delicate machine with many interlocking parts. A break-down anywhere can spread rapidly to other places.

That doesn't mean we shouldn't maintain our optimism. It simply means we should be on the watch for signs of maladjustment—should move in quickly to repair the damage before it can hobble the whole economy.

Apple Growers Shun Government Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news article regarding action taken at a meeting of apple growers held in Boston.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPLE GROWERS SHUN UNITED STATES SUPPORTS AND SEEK NEW OUTLETS

BOSTON.—The apple industry believes its future lies in more aggressive promotion and opening of new markets, rather than in a Government price-support program.

Individualistic growers of Delicious, Macs, Jonathans, Baldwins and other varieties, gathered here for their national convention this week, urged crop support people in Washington to forget the apple industry if they have any plans for extending the program in their direction.

Apple growers fear and would keenly resent Government intervention, said John Chandler, retiring president of the National Apple Institute. If the Government should support the price of apples the whole effort of the industry to stimulate greater use of the fruit would go by the board, he declared.

The apple orchards are an independent cult and would rather stand on their own feet, said Walter G. Martin, of Wapato, Wash. Only a small minority is taking the position that "so long as growers of other crops are aided, why not the apple growers, too," according to Truman Nold, executive secretary of the Institute.

Processors of apples who are expected to take about one-third of this year's estimated crop of over 110,000,000 bushels, were urged to embark on a more aggressive sales program.

John P. Peters, an apple grower, of Gardners, Pa., reported that the advertising program adopted by two packers from his State, who put up more than half of the apple products in the United States, is encouraging. Business they obtain is new business and not taken away from anyone else, Mr. Peters declared.

Washington growers, who accounted for 24 percent of the national crop last year, contributed $667,000 to an advertising fund at the rate of 5 cents per 100 pounds of apples shipped.

Over recent months 80 percent of the apple growers in western New York have signed up for an apple promotion campaign. They will contribute 1 cent per bushel.

In Virginia, growers take the position that if they accept a Government hand-out they have to accept Government controls. And they don't want controls.

The apple industry must create its own markets, said R. B. Graves, of Syria, Va., who cited the success of his State's growers in pushing the sale of apple juice—flash, or quick pasteurized, with nothing added to the fresh product. The Virginia growers are going to contribute 1½ to 2 cents a bushel to a promotional fund.

West coast growers say an ice-cream-like product called Freem, made with apple pulp, gelatin, and other ingredients, could open up a good market for apples if this product were properly exploited. Sale of apple juice in vending machines offers a good outlet, they assert.

The industry is excited over the prospects for frozen apple juice concentrate. Reuben G. Benz, of Yakima, Wash., chairman of the apple institute, warned growers that they cannot base their hopes on the success of the citrus growers. The public has to be sold on using frozen apple juice concentrate, he declared.

The whole apple industry looks at the citrus growers with envy and hopes that a similar experience can be had with apples, Minard Farley, Jr., representing the Michigan Apple Commission, said.

Let's Protect Our Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement made by me on June 2, 1950, to the subcommittee of Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is CARL D. PERKINS, Representative from the Seventh Congressional District in Kentucky.

According to the latest statistics on bituminous coal production, Kentucky was the third largest producer in 1948, producing 13.8 percent of all bituminous coal mined in the United States. With this fact in mind, I wish to put a word against the flood of imported oil which is currently arriving on the eastern seaboard.

The unemployment problem is steadily growing in the coal fields in Kentucky, and mine operations are constantly closing down. Mines in the Big Sandy district in eastern Kentucky produced 276,910 tons of coal in the week ending May 20 compared with 332,510 tons for the same week of last year. These figures were announced by the Local Operators' Association and appeared in the Pikeville Daily News of May 31.

The Hazard coal fields for the same period showed a reduction from last year from 144,950 tons down to 99,500 tons. These same coal fields during the year 1948 were even producing a much larger tonnage than they were for a comparable period during 1949.

The operators throughout eastern and southeastern Kentucky have shown much concern over the seriousness of the situation that has been brought about by the importation of fuel oil. On April 12, 1950, Mr. B. F. Reed, secretary treasurer of the Turner Elkhorn Mining Co., wrote me as follows:

"Many of us in the Big Sandy ship coal to Newport News for transshipment to New York and New England points. We have been practically run out of that market. In the past year we have lost more than 60 percent of the business that we previously had and that we have had for 25 years. It is the best market for Big Sandy coals that we have had. Foreign oil is pouring into these ports, and we have lost customer after customer. We can't possibly compete with it, even if our wages were half of what they are now. Unfortunately I think our own Government has encouraged this importation, and it is going to be a man-sized job to change it."

Again on May 9, Mr. B. F. Reed further wrote:

"Our own company has involved in this question an annual tonnage of 75,000 tons of coal. This tonnage is equal to 12,500 days of labor. Our average year is about 230 working days, so our tonnage involves the loss of jobs of 55 men."

On April 15, 1950, Mr. David L. Francis, a large coal operator in eastern Kentucky wrote:

"The unrestricted importation of foreign oil is becoming an increasingly serious threat to Kentucky's economy. While I live and maintain an office in West Virginia, my company's mines are in Floyd County, Ky., and my business interests are there. As you well know, Kentucky's basic industry is coal. If you as our Representative allow the international policies of the State Department to permit foreign oils to be dumped into this country at the continuing increasing rate of the last year, it will establish a backlog replacing not only coal but also domestic oil, which in turn will push both of these products inland at lower cut-rate prices which may be sufficient to capitulate the entire coal industry into a period of severe depression and losses. When coal goes broke in Kentucky, the rest of the State will go broke."

Mr. George S. Ward, secretary of the Harlan County Coal Operators' Association, on April 21, 1950, wrote me as follows:

"The bituminous coal industry in the United States, and particularly that segment in Kentucky, is greatly alarmed over the dumping of foreign oil on American markets. I am informed that Government reports show some 900,000 barrels a day were imported during the month of January. This is equivalent to approximately 145,000 tons of coal a day; and, 145,000 tons a day would run the Harlan Field 3 days a week. If this situation is permitted to continue, it means the closing of mines for want of business, disruption of the American domestic oil industry, and will seriously hamper the transportation industry. We are facing a crisis and it appears the only remedy is Congress. American industry should be the first consideration."

I am vitally concerned about this matter because of the large number of coal miners who are being thrown out of work simply because coal companies cannot sell coal to large consumers because these consumers such as steam-generating companies or chemical industries are resorting to residual oil instead of coal for heating purposes.

It has been brought out in these hearings that the major portion of the huge quantities of foreign oil reaching these shores consists of residual fuel oil. This residual fuel oil is being dumped on our eastern seaboard after the gasoline has been extracted from the crude oil either in the Middle East, Venezuela, or Latin America. In other words, the companies producing the crude oil have already taken their first profits from their product and can therefore offer cut-throat competition in the only country where there is as large a market as ours.

What I am concerned about, however, is the fact that the competition is offered in

those industries where we can ill afford it, namely, our coal and oil industries. It is being estimated that currently 35,000 coal miners have been thrown out of work or will be out of employment during 1950. If this irresistible foreign oil competition is to be continued, a dismal picture will result.

We have a direct loss of manpower in a crucial industry. We have a direct loss of income in an industry which cannot afford to lose money with resultant effects on the home life and consumer industries interested in the welfare of these coal miners; we have a direct loss in production facilities because it is easy to close a coal mine but not as easy to open it up for maximum productivity. We have a direct loss in the maximum efficiency of those railroads engaged in the direct hauling of coal, which hauling is being cut down because of the lesser demand for coal. We have also the direct loss in the utilization of a natural resource of which we have a super-abundance, namely coal.

I ask you of what use will our billions of tons of reserve coal be if we have no maximum exploitation of such reserves, especially in the event of an emergency when the use of substitutes such as oil has been cut off.

I wish to stress one fact to which insufficient importance has been attached; namely, we are living in an era of the highest productivity in the history of our Nation, yet, at the same time, we find one or two industries, such as coal and oil, being affected, in gigantic proportions, by competitive oil coming in from outside. Thousands of men highly skilled and possessed of a technical ingenuity developed through contact with these industries are being lost to the industries, through no cause of their own. It is very easy to say that these highly trained men could be reeducated for other industries. I assure you that this is a proposition that is much easier propounded than worked out in substance.

I am an ardent supporter of our reciprocal-trade-agreements program. Likewise I have supported the European recovery program because we all realize that our democracy benefits when we assist other nations in building a sound economy when those nations share our views in promoting the principles of a democratic form of government against communism.

I also supported these programs because they stimulate international commerce and because a high volume of commercial activity is far preferable to the stagnation of a depression.

However, in our trade-agreements program we would be justified in protecting our basic industries.

Before I get into that, when President Roosevelt first sent a message to the Congress on the reciprocal-trade program in 1934 he made this statement:

"The exercise of authority which I propose (to enter into tariff-reducing agreements) must be carefully weighed in the light of the latest information so as to give assurance that no sound and important American interest will be injuriously disturbed. The adjustment of our foreign-trade relations must rest on the premise of undertaking to benefit and not to injure such interests."

It is my contention that the importation of residual oil contravenes every word in those sentences used by President Roosevelt when he transmitted that message to the Congress in 1934.

As you know, we signed a general agreement on tariffs and trade at Geneva in October 1947. This general agreement supersedes other trade agreements previously made. I find in article 20, comprising the general exceptions, that the United States will be perfectly justified in adopting a measure which relates to the conservation of exhaustible natural resources, if such measures are made effective in conjunction with restrictions on domestic production or consumption. The question hinges here on the meaning of conservation of natural resources. Many people think that the word "conservation" means "abstaining from the use of"; others take the meaning to be "the orderly exploitation of natural resources."

I think the latter meaning is the one with which most people are concerned today, namely, "the orderly exploitation." I wish to submit, therefore, that the inordinate flood of foreign oil is impeding us in the orderly exploitation of our natural resources of coal and oil. Already we have seen many mines and strip-mines closed. Already we have seen that many marginal oil and gas fields cannot be exploited at prices competitive with foreign oil; and lastly, new exploration so as to add to our reserves of exhaustible natural resources cannot take place.

With this fact in mind, I think we will be perfectly justified in taking whatever action necessary to correct this situation, in the event the executive branch of our Government fails to do so.

What I cannot understand about this whole thing, countries in western Europe, such as Belgium, England, or France, the coal that underlies the Ruhr Valley, and the coal in the Ardennes in Belgium, the coal miners there only average perhaps a ton or a ton and a half or two tons per man, and those people over there, with their standard of living much lower than ours could use a lot of this residual oil without being in competition with the industry and also in many of their industries the people lack sufficient fuel. Why these companies bring it to our seaboard and dump it all in America is perhaps because they can make greater profits, which no doubt they do make. Now some limitation should be placed on these companies, that is, if we intend to preserve our coal industry and to keep a sufficient number of coal miners available in the event another war comes along, and in order that we may have a healthy economy.

Senator NEELY. Congressman, have a number of mines closed down in both the Hazard and Big Sandy fields in Kentucky?

Mr. PERKINS. That is true. However I am not able to name those mines, but from newspaper reports from time to time I feel very confident that several mines and probably hundreds of mines have closed down in those areas.

Senator NEELY. How many days a week are the miners now working in eastern Kentucky?

Mr. PERKINS. I can answer that question, but before I do I should qualify my previous answer and state in those hundreds of mines, most of them are, of course, truck mines that have been operating and now have no market for the coal. Many of the mines in the Big Sandy Valley and in the Hazard coal fields, that is outside of the captive mines, are now operating only 1 and 2 days a week, and I think the Elkhorn Coal Corp. which employs thousands of men is only running an average of 3 days a week at the present time.

Senator NEELY. Congressman, am I justified in believing that you attribute this closing down of mines and loss of employment in your mining industry to the cutthroat competition of foreign oil?

Mr. PERKINS. You are. That is precisely what I believe.

Senator NEELY. In your opinion, has the over-all result of the competition of imported foreign oil been beneficial or injurious to the general welfare of the State of Kentucky?

Mr. PERKINS. It has been injurious to the general welfare of the State of Kentucky.

Senator NEELY. Thank you very much, Congressman, for your very valuable statement.

Attorney General McGrath Answers Communist Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish at this time to incorporate a speech by the Honorable J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States, delivered at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner of Nebraska Democrats at the Fontenelle Hotel in Omaha, on Saturday, May 27, 1950.

In sharp contrast to the reckless charges being made by certain persons in official life in Washington, Mr. McGrath presented a clear-cut portrayal of the successful efforts of the State Department and other departments of our Government to stamp out communism in every form.

Mr. McGrath's address follows:

I am going to talk to you tonight about human freedoms and what your Government is doing to protect those freedoms against those inside our borders and those outside our borders who would seek to deprive us of those freedoms.

I want to state some very plain facts at the beginning:

As a servant of the Government, sworn to uphold our Constitution, and as a Christian and as an American citizen, I am unalterably opposed to the godless, slave philosophy of communism.

So is our President and the leaders of his administration.

We are fighting communism at home and abroad.

We are aggressively working to prevent disloyal persons from infiltrating our Government.

But at the same time we are trying to protect the rights of the individual in this loyalty check program.

The President does not want a gestapo in the United States, nor do you and I. And I can assure you that J. Edgar Hoover has no desire to have any police state secret police duties imposed upon the FBI, and such duties will not be imposed on that organization at the direction of President Truman or at my direction.

I want to make the record clear that I hate communism, and that I will fight it as long as there is a breath left in my body.

With this out of the way, I would like to go back a few years and see how we arrived at the point where the Attorney General of the United States feels impelled to make the statements that I have just made to you.

It was 5 years ago last Wednesday that a man named Heinrich Himmler—remember that name—clenched his teeth on a tiny glass phial and ended his own life with cyanide rather than stand trial before an international tribunal for his crimes against humanity.

Five years. Five short years. And, yet, the other day when I thought of the events of these last 5 years I had to pause a moment before I could remember Himmler's name.

Yet Himmler, in his lifetime, was one of the greatest threats to human liberty and, in fact, to human life itself, since Attila the Hun.

Under the guise of protecting the security of the German Reich, Himmler was responsible for the outright slaughter of millions—literally millions of innocent people. All that was necessary to condemn a man, a woman, or even a child was an unsupported accusation of communism or even that the victim was of Jewish descent.

Five years ago Russia was our ally. The free peoples of the world looked forward optimistically, hoping for the quick defeat of Japan and the birth of a brave new world in which freedom and human happiness would be the controlling factors. We foresaw a brave new world from which war as a means of settling international disputes would be eternally banished.

The necessity of fighting as soldiers alongside the Russians against the oppression and evil of the Fascist hordes had erased from our minds the realization that the evils of totalitarianism marked communism as well as fascism and nazism. In the exuberance of victory we dismissed temporarily the thought that in obliterating one evil we still would continue to face the same evil in another guise.

Himmler, whose name 5 years ago was anathema to all, is nearly forgotten now. His name lies moldering with his bones. But his deeds still make the crippled forms of millions of persons harried and tortured in Europe, and his lethal methods are responsible for the mournful emptiness of whole areas in which inhabitants were totally destroyed.

Himmler was the apotheosis of the secret police. He was the killer who moved in darkness with no need for an honest trial, before he executed his victims. He was the protector of the security of Hitler's Reich.

Himmler, as Hitler's agent, was the foe of the so-called decadent democracies; but the German Reich, under Hitler, did not fear the democracies. It had contempt for the peoples of the world who believed in the rights of man.

But the Nazis feared communism.

The Fascists feared Communists, for they recognized in them the same singleness of purpose, the same brutal, cynical debasement of man in the interest of the totalitarian state.

Himmler used the methods of the secret police to combat the efforts of the Communist underground. He used the brutal, direct methods of human eradication. Of mass murder. Better that a thousand innocent die than to have one Communist escape, was the philosophy of Himmler and Hitler.

There was no recourse to law. There was no need to prove anything. There was nothing except the trumped-up charge, the mockery of a trial and the scaffold, the firing squad, or the ax.

The Fascist hordes of Hitler, the Gestapo of Himmler, have been destroyed. Hitler and Himmler themselves are dead and are almost forgotten.

Now the enemy whom they fought so bitterly and with such brutality has supplanted them. The secret police tactics of the Communist have taken the place of the secret police tactics of Himmler.

I can see no difference in their methods.

Yet I do not feel that the free peoples of the world would wish to lay down one single portion of their liberties to combat these forces of darkness. The defense of freedom, of the America we love, from the subversion of our enemies cannot be achieved by embracing the methods of Himmler.

If our democracy is not to die by its own hand, it must not adopt the secret police tactics of the Nazis to combat the secret police of the Communists.

There is no difference between Fascist slavery and Communist slavery.

Oppression in the name of freedom is as hateful as slavery under any other name.

If our democracy is to survive, it must survive as democracy—not as something else.

Yet right now there are individuals who for one reason or another would have us embrace the methods of the secret police and wrong innocent men and women in the name of national security.

There are those who are being goaded by a hysterical fear of possible war, who are being frightened by the implications of the possession of an atomic weapon by our enemies, people who are willing to allow witch hunts and frantic name calling to endanger our national liberties.

I say that this does violence to the principles for which our country stands. It does violence to the Bill of Rights, which is the very foundation stone of our human liberties under the Constitution.

We cannot substitute the police state method for existing laws and procedures, as do some who have criticized the present loyalty investigation program and grossly misrepresented it. Let me tell you how it works.

All of us agree that the people of the United States have a right to expect that those who operate the machinery of their Government are completely loyal to the United States. The maximum protection must be afforded the United States against infiltration by disloyal persons into the ranks of its employees. Yet equal protection from unfounded accusations of disloyalty must be afforded loyal employees of the Government. These objectives are being met in the employee loyalty program which is being carried out under President Truman's Executive order of March 21, 1947.

I would like you to understand clearly the procedures which the President has prescribed for the administration of the employee loyalty program.

An investigation is conducted of every person entering the civilian employment of any department or agency of the executive branch of the Government. When preliminary investigation reveals derogatory information with respect to the loyalty of an applicant, a full field investigation is conducted.

A full field investigation also is conducted of applicants for such positions as are designated by the head of a department on the basis of the best interests of national security.

Standards for the determination of the loyalty of employees are provided by the order. The President's order provides further that in the administration of the loyalty program, the head of each agency shall appoint one or more loyalty boards to hear loyalty cases arising in that agency and to make recommendations with respect to the removal of any employee of the agency on grounds relating to loyalty.

Each employee who is charged with being disloyal is, by the Executive order, given the right to a hearing before a loyalty board in his agency, a hearing at which he may appear before the board personally, accompanied by counsel or other representative of his own choosing, and present evidence on his own behalf, through witnesses or by affidavit.

When information concerning the loyalty of an employee is placed before the loyalty board of an agency, that board, in instances where this action is justified, draws up charges in writing. The accused is informed in writing of the nature of the charges in sufficient detail, consistent with security considerations, to enable him to prepare his defense.

The hearing before the board of the agency is informal and in private. The board may arrange for taking depositions and interrogatories on behalf of the respondent on demand. The board makes its determination in writing, signed by all members, a copy being presented to the respondent.

The respondent has the right of appeal to the head of the agency that employs him. He also has the right of appeal after that to the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission.

These procedures provide for the protection of loyal employees, as well as for the protection of the Government. They assure that the civil liberties of Government employees shall receive the fullest protection consistent with the responsibility of the Government to assure itself of the loyalty of its employees.

These are the methods of democracy. These are the methods which have been used and are being used to protect our Government from infiltration by subversive enemies or fellow travelers. These are the methods used to do these things and at the same time preserve and protect the basic human rights of the individual which our Constitution guarantees.

This program has established that only in a small fraction of cases, less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the persons checked, has there been found any reasonable ground for belief that a Government employee was disloyal. That is a wonderful record and attests to the high caliber of character among our Federal employees. It demonstrates too that your Government has been alert to the danger.

Final checks of governmental employees now show that not one single person who has been finally adjudicated as disloyal under the loyalty program is employed by the Government at the present time.

This administration has not only been alert to the danger of Communist infiltration of the Government; it has also fought communism at every turn. The Department of Justice of which I have the honor to be the head has fought communism with action—not with words.

It was this administration, the Department of Justice, which prosecuted and obtained convictions of 11 Communists in New York. These men constituted the Communist politbureau for the United States.

The Department of Justice has been successful in obtaining convictions against 16 alleged Communists in California and 7 in Colorado, on charges of contempt in refusing to testify before a Federal grand jury.

Within the past 2 years it has successfully prosecuted 34 Communists in Washington for contempt. It has successfully prosecuted Marzani, Howard, Coplon, Bridges, Hiss, and many others for crimes related to Communism.

The Government has commenced action to revoke the citizenship of Harry Bridges on the ground that it was obtained by fraud. I can tell you that the Department of Justice has under investigation the cases of 700 more citizens for the purpose of determining whether steps should be taken to cancel or revoke their citizenship on grounds involving subversive activities.

There are already 2,000 or more deportation orders to countries beyond the iron curtain. Eighty-eight were issued on grounds involving communism. Apparently no one has much use for a caught Communist because their countries are generally refusing to issue passports to them.

And in passing I might point out that only 2 of these 88 persons entered the country since 1932.

Let me point out another aspect of this problem.

It is part of our fundamental strength in America that we have always approached basic decisions from an idealistic or even from a religious outlook. As a matter of basic self-respect, most Americans have lived by the rule that calls upon each man to do unto another as he would have done unto him.

Belief in this has given us more than the strength of force and it offers us more than the strength which scattered pinpricks of disloyalty or espionage fifth columns of underground enemies can ever muster against a free and prosperous nation, where every man lives secure in the knowledge that he is free to believe and worship and talk as he pleases.

If we ever abandon those beliefs and substitute for them the belief that the state is more important than the citizen, that the rights of the individual do not matter if the state feels that it must take away those rights for its own security, then we shall have surrendered to totalitarianism without a gunshot. We shall have done to ourselves what no totalitarian army could impose upon us by force.

If we ever deprive those who disagree with the majority of us from advocating their views (not by treachery or by force and violence but by peaceful means), if we ever take this step we shall have turned from bravery to cowardice.

We shall have said: We do not stand confident that our way of life is the best way and can stand on its merits. We stand afraid of new ideas and we shall by force and punishment impress our ideas upon those who oppose them.

Let us then examine current events which are pushing us toward this evil goal. A man need not be literally put into the stock to be pilloried. He can be pilloried by headlines; by charges delivered under immunity which deprives the victim of the basic right of recourse through the courts; he can be pilloried by charges which appear on page one and are followed by refutations which appear next to the cooking hints in the back of the newspaper.

And let us all ask ourselves this question: If I carelessly or unjustly accuse my neighbor of being a thief and he is aquitted in the court, can the damage of my careless accusation ever be undone? Can my neighbor ever escape the whispers of the malicious few who will say "Oh, yes; he was acquitted, but where there is smoke there is usually fire."

Can any citizen in this entire United States who stood by and did not rase his voice and say to himself, "I will follow the dictates of prudence and I shall wait and see what happens and what appears to be the popular position when all of this is over—that is the position I shall take; can any citizen who has done this look into the mirror and say to himself: "You are a friend of democracy and a foe of communism?"

No. A moral issue of major importance is before us. The time to stand up and be counted is while the issue is before us, not after it is settled.

Let us consider some forms of guilt by association.

Suppose I am opposed to the selling of comic books to children and I join a group which states that it is organized to carry out that purpose. If it later turns out that Communists were active in that group I can be charged with guilt by association. Unless I am willing to accept the damage this will do to my reputation I am deprived of my right of opposition to comic books.

Suppose I like to go to parties and meet strangers. I am facing "guilt by association" right there unless I hire a detective agency to screen all the guests in advance.

Even suppose I am a Member of Congress and it turns out that the electorate of some district has sent to the Congress a Communist or one whose views closely follow the Communist pattern. Am I not then vulnerable to the guilt by association smear?

Suppose I am a Government official. Suppose on the basis of my convictions on the facts at hand that I decide a certain course of action is a wise course and advocate it publicly. Suppose in the light of events 10 years later, it turns out that this particular policy has not been successful or is outmoded and someone then says that I advocated that policy to aid communism. If I want to protect myself against this sort of possibility I have to become a spineless jelly fish and take no positive position on anything. It might turn out to be bad 10 years later.

The association technique is a dangerous one because the only way to avoid it is to do nothing, say nothing and believe nothing.

Let's consider a further example. If, God forbid, within my lifetime our free American democracy should be supplanted by some other form of government, this speech I am making today could be resurrected by "loyalty investigators." It would prove that I advocated the (it would then be) un-American program of democracy.

But it is not I alone who would suffer. Any of you who had ever joined with me in a social gathering, who had ever been on the same side of any issue with me—you also would be suspect. And you could be "convicted" under the unfair, illogical, and indecent technique of guilt by association.

Let me talk of more subtle form of the guilt-by-association smear. Here is how it works. The accomplishments of the administration in combating communism by orderly and legal methods are cited—not to reassure the public as they should be cited—but to frighten the public.

Let's say that you are out to "get" a person we will describe as quarry A. You don't have anything definite against him. But you make a speech in which you cite suspicious circumstances you say exist concerning the activities of quarry A and in the same speech you mention the names of convicted Communists or of persons convicted of espionage. Then you mention the number of persons who have been removed from Government employment as the result of loyalty investigations. Quarry A may be completely innocent, but after he is baked into this rhetorical blackbird pie, which is duly headlined in the press, the damage to him and to his reputation had been done.

Now this sort of thing has happened to American citizens within the last few weeks.

And whether or not these people finally prove to be innocent or guilty, the basic damage is that these things have been done to American citizens and they are things that are done in police states but should not be done in a democracy.

But a step has been urged that goes even further to endanger the rights of the individual than anything done thus far. That is the suggestion that unprocessed investigation files—the files that contain not only facts, but unevaluated reports, gossip, malice-based falsehoods—be opened to the public prints through the channel and use of congressional immunity.

I do not believe that this is going to happen. But the fact that such procedure has been seriously suggested indicates the extent to which hysteria has swept some of us a way from the sound and democratic practices of fair play and respect for the rights of the individual.

Currently the files of the State Department on cases questioned in the course of the Senate investigation are being examined. But the unprocessed files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation have not been opened.

The preservation in the strictest confidence with respect to the FBI files on any question is the single most important element in operating a loyalty program, if it is to provide effective security for the Government and justice for the individual.

The disclosure of these files would not only destroy the whole loyalty program but would seriously damage the unparalleled efficiency of the FBI. Information is given to the FBI in confidence, and the FBI is sworn to respect that confidence. Breaking that confidence would not only greatly embarrass and even endanger the informants but would gravely impair the FBI's ability to get future information from other confidential sources. Opening these files would reveal FBI procedures and methods. It might reveal secret information vital to our national security and of great value to our enemies.

Disclosure of the contents of these files might do grave injustice to the reputation of innocent persons. This is true because the FBI files contain not only proven information. They necessarily include unverified charges, gossip and statements, as well as mere suspicions which upon further investigations may be found to be either true or untrue.

If these files should be opened it would mean that an attempt would be made to retry all the cases already presented to the loyalty boards. This would violate the principle of double jeopardy. And it would be heartless as well as needless, for decisions have already been reached on these cases by a fair and impartial board of bipartisan Americans—loyal and distinguished Americans of all political persuasions.

As I told you earlier, we have sound and tried legal procedure for loyalty investigations. That loyalty system is headed by a Republican of highest personal integrity and reputation. No responsible person has accused this group of bias or disloyalty or of whitewash.

Yet the implication of the charges which have created the present noise and confusion is that this loyalty program is not functioning and that the supreme loyalty board is itself disloyal or inefficient, or both.

Let us all ponder this implication, for I believe it is an implication that none of us desires to make.

I am not alone in my concern over the matters I have discussed. This deep concern is shared by the President and by responsible leaders of both parties.

But in the excitement and fury of the chase, in the noise created by those who have, in the heat of debate, put political considerations ahead of basic American principles, we have strayed a long way from those basic principles.

For in the matter of preserving our basic human freedoms and training our sights—not against one another—but on our common aims and aspirations, it is later than we think.

Yet we need not and must not go over the abyss into totalitarianism by adopting police-state methods to escape Communist police-state serfdom.

We need to be calm.

We need to anchor ourselves to our traditions of law and justice and fair play.

We need to have not only a faith in our God but also a faith in our fellow man and in our public servants and a confidence that the spirit of fair play that has guided every step of our national life must not be abandoned now.

In the last few months I have traveled the length and breadth of this vast continent of ours. I have seen Americans of all races and creeds and colors in all sections working at their jobs, worshipping at the churches of their choice, speaking their minds without fear or terror, cherishing their loved ones in a Nation where the home is most important, and the Government remains the servant of the people.

After what I have seen and heard, communism does not frighten me and it should not frighten you, so long as we retain our sturdy faith in God and in the mankind God created.

Losing Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address to the graduating class of Baylor University College of Medicine, which was delivered by Mr. H. R. Cullen, of Houston, Tex., and which was carried on the editorial page of the Houston Post, Tuesday, June 13, 1950.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that I need not call the attention of the membership of the House of Representatives to the outstanding record of Mr. Cullen as a citizen and philanthropist. His generosity, his faith in true American principles, his courageous leadership in the fight to retain the foundations of democracy which have made this Nation great, are well known to his fellow citizens.

This address by Mr. Cullen contains some observations which I believe should be read by the entire membership of the House:

LOSING COLD WAR—PATRIOTS MUST RALLY TO SAVE NATION FROM SOCIALISM

It was, indeed, a pleasure to be present this evening in Dr. Bertner's apartment, when Dr. White conferred upon Dr. Bertner the honorary degree of doctor of laws. He well deserves the honor, for I think he is a great doctor, a great citizen, and a very brave man.

I am also happy that Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, Chief Medical Director, Veterans' Administration, is with us this evening, and is also to receive the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

It is a privilege, an honor, and a pleasure to address the graduating class of Baylor University College of Medicine. You are graduating from a great school. It is a major institution in what is to be the greatest medical center in the South.

You are going out into a marvelous mixed-up world. You will take your place in it just as we are moving out of one era into another. It is a world that stands at the crossroads, one road sign pointing to the unfolding of fairy tales of science—wonderful inventions and discoveries never dreamed of in my younger days; another sign pointing to atomic war and the end of civilization. You will face all kinds of fateful questions, such as have never challenged mankind before; and no one seems to know the answers for sure.

The great changes are not all in the field of science. You went through medical school with the idea of entering a noble profession and practicing it with dignity and independence. But now, as you finish your schooling, you are threatened with possibly having to go to work for the Government—not in an honorable profession, but as a mere cog in a political bureaucracy.

That's what has happened to the doctors under the Britain's Labor-Socialist government; and now our socialistic administration at Washington is trying to do the same thing to you.

As proof of this, President Truman recently sent Oscar Ewing over to study the British system of socialized medicine, so he could come back and sell it to the American people. His report, painting the English national health plan in glowing colors, was in strange contrast with what other American observers have told us about what a tragic mess it is.

Because the medical profession is the first one marked for nationalizing by the Socialists, you graduates have a vital interest in this adminstration's plans. So I think it is fitting and timely to remind you of the dangers into which our country is drifting. The threat of socialized medicine is just one part of a program to change our entire system of government and our way of life. If one part succeeds, the others will. Your professional career is at stake in defending them all. Whether you like it or not, you will have to join with the political forces that oppose these things, and embrace the philosophy of sound democracy, or else you may lose the opportunity to succeed as a private practitioner of your own profession. You will become a hired hand of the Government.

We are losing the cold war. Both socialism and communism are gaining on us. Why? Because, to state the plain, unvarnished truth, in my opinion, Truman and his forces do not believe in our form of government and our free enterprise system. At least, they do not give evidence of it. The administration at Washington is working in every way to change our democratic plan into a welfare state, which means socialism, and ultimately, I believe, a totalitarian state.

Only last week we had a smashing example of this, in the Supreme Court's ruling on the tidelands. This Court, appointed by Roosevelt and Truman, held that the offshore oil lands of Texas belong to the United States, after more than 100 years' acknowledged State ownership. The decision was in the very teeth of the Treaty of 1845, in which the United States Congress by resolution solemnly declared that Texas should retain her public lands as a State of the Union.

If they can take the tidelands from the States, they can take the coal lands, or the coastal fishing grounds, or the oil and gas lands, or the ports and inland waterways, or anything of value.

A few weeks ago, President Truman vetoed the Kerr bill, to exempt independent natural gas producers from regulation by the Federal Power Commission. Congress passed the bill because the Federal Power Commission had threatened to classify independent gas producers as public utilities and thereby regulate their rates, even though they sell their gas in the field at arm's length to piplines, and have no public utility functions.

The results of the gas-bill veto will be Government regulation of natural gas rates. And if you can fix prices of gas at the well, you can fix prices of anything, anywhere.

You probably know of the Truman administration's all-out efforts to saddle Federal control on the Nation's educational system. You know how it is trying to perpetuate rent control, a wartime emergency measure, and how it seeks to bribe the people of their votes with public housing, cradle-to-grave social security and other socialistic ingredients of the welfare state.

And do you know what genocide is? Well, it is not in the dictionary, but is a newly coined word meaning the extermination of racial, religious, or political groups, such as the Nazis perpetrated in Germany and the Soviets have practiced behind the iron curtain.

The United Nations adopted a resolution making genocide a crime and providing for its punishment by an international court. President Truman approved it a year ago and asked the Senate to ratify it as a treaty. The Senate may act on it any time.

The American Bar Association has made a careful study of the genocide proposal, and has found that under its terms an American could be arrested, carried to a foreign land, and tried by a foreign court for killing one person. In fact, he wouldn't even have to kill a person; if he were an officer or member of any organization which caused mental harm to members of a racial or religious group by barring them from membership, or otherwise discriminating against them, he is subject to prosecution for genocide.

The genocide treaty, if ratified by the Senate, will take precedence over our State and Federal laws and constitutions; it will tie us up with the European nations in one respect, as the Federal Unionists propose to tie us up with them to one government, with one army, one currency, one tariff, and, naturally, one flag. In such a union the United States would probably have not more than 25 percent of the votes; so we would have to accept the alien ideas and philosophy that would be forced upon us by the European majority.

All these things are cut from the same cloth by our socialistic leaders. But the most alarming thing about our plight is their attitude toward communism. They deny all charges of communism in the State Department, calling them red herrings. Secretary of State Acheson publicly declared that he would not turn his back on Alger Hiss, the convicted traitor. The Department has defended others who have been proved Communists by congressional investigators and State prosecutors.

Of course, all this is very pleasing to "Good old Joe" Stalin, as our President has called him. Stalin rubs his hands with pleasure to see us spending ourselves into bankruptcy with billions of dollars' worth of vote-buying hand-outs and defending his agents in our Government. He has a great fifth column in this country which is being trained in the underground for future use. Should Russia pull another Pearl Harbor on us, this fifth column could destroy our cities and millions of people in a few minutes with atom bombs. And who would be to blame?

We are losing our self-respect and the respect of the world. If we want to regain it, we must stop this appeasement of the Reds, this socializing of our country, this futile attempt to bribe the nations of Europe to hold the line of democracy and free enterprise.

Only one thing will check this creeping blight that is spreading from the banks of the Potomac out over our great Nation. That thing is the concerted action of all good, freedom-loving Americans at the ballot box to elect men who will stand up for our form of government and our way of life. That includes not only politicians, not only professional and business people. It is the fight of the churchman as well as the layman.

It is time that men and women of all religious faiths and creeds put aside their man-made dogmas and stand shoulder to shoulder in their common cause, for it is a fight for survival. Our freedom is at stake—freedom of speech, freedom of enterprise, freedom of the press, freedom of religious worship. If we lose the struggle, our pulpits will be taken over by the most cruel pagan of our time, as has been done in the countries overrun by the Communists.

I congratulate each of you graduates, and wish you great success and happiness as you begin your life work. You have a high privilege to minister to suffering humanity. That same privilege also is a solemn responsibility, a sacred obligation which you have assumed. I know you will not fail your trust.

Polish Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to hereby submit for the information of Congress a resolution unanimously adopted by the Polish-American Congress, Inc., during patriotic ceremonies on May 28, 1950, in the city of East Chicago, Ind., organized to commemorate the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of Poland's constitution.

The resolution again sets out and reiterates the conditions of the long fight which will not end until the Polish nation has won its just reward in the securing of an independent self-government.

We, the citizens of the United States, assembled here on this 28th day of May, 1950, to commemorate the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the May Third Constitution of the Republic of Poland, basing our postulations on the interallied declaration of the Big Three—the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, signed in London on January 13, 1942, do hereby resolve:

We, Americans of Polish extraction, descendants of national heroes, Kosciuszko and Pulaski, pay homage to the authors of the May Third Constitution.

Ever faithful and ready to defend the Star-Spangled Banner of the United States and its democracy, we hereby call attention of American public opinion, of our President Harry S. Truman and of our Government to the injustices and crimes committed on the Polish Nation during the World War II and its sanguinary aftermath, and we do hereby demand that the United States Government, through its representative to the United Nations, institute these historically and morally justified, and in present cold war, highly necessary actions:

a. Lay claim of warrant and annulment of the unjust and predatory acts conceived at Tehran and Yalta and executed in dark games of power politics without the consent of the American and Polish Nations, yet committing Poland and other European nations behind the iron curtain into communistic slavery;

b. Initiate establishment of an international tribunal to punish war criminals guilty of the most shocking genocide of our times, namely, of the barbaric murder of 15,000 Polish soldiers in Katyn, Ostashkov, and Starobielsk; and insist that such tribunal should take into consideration proofs of guilt painstakingly gathered by the Polish Government in London;

c. Insist on freeing 140,000,000 people now living under communistic yoke in mideastern Europe, and especially on liberating Poland;

d. Enumerate these following conditions as the basis for peaceful settlement of international disputes and tensions:

1. Withdrawal of the Soviet military forces to the boundaries of 1938;

2. Sincere and effective application of the Atlantic Charter into all international relations;

3. Rendering justice to Poland and bringing her back to the family of nations—free, independent, and indivisible.

Thoroughly acquainted with the dangers of Soviet aggression bent on subjugating the whole world into communistic slavery, we ask all those in authority as well as the whole American Nation to be ever vigilant and in readiness to repulse enemy's attacks.

We extend words of sincere admiration to our brothers and sisters in Poland, for their heroic fight against German and Soviet occupation.

We honor all Poland's heroes who fought with undiminishing courage and laudable persistency against the barbaric foes, and who, today, despite persecution, do not recognize the government of Stalin's hirelings.

Summoning the entire Polish Nation to continue firmly, strongly and perservingly the watch on the ramparts of their land, including the regained territories in the west, and ancient Polish provinces in the east, insidiously seized by Asiatic hordes with reckless consent of the allies.

We, Americans of Polish descent, heirs to the heroic and lofty ideals of our forefathers whose battle cry forever was: "For your liberty and ours", promise to follow in their footsteps, devoted to the ideals of liberty and ready to do everything in our power to restore freedom to the Poles and to all other nations now oppressed and enslaved.

We pay tribute to the heroic and victorious Army of the United States and of Poland which during both World Wars fought on all world battlefields for freedom and democracy.

East Chicago, Ind., 28th day of May 1950.

Committee of Resolution:
REV. LOUIS MICHALSKI, *Chairman.*
VINCENT KENDZIORA,
ALEX PIKULA,
W. BOGUSLAWSKI,
JULIA TOLPA,
LOUIS JANISZEWSKI,
VICTORIA BASINSKA.

Passed and acclaimed unanimously by all participants.

BENJAMIN J. LESNIAK, *Presiding Officer.*
JOSEPH WIEWIORA, *Secretary.*

Bringing Home the Bacon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., on Tuesday, June 20, 1950:

BRINGING HOME THE BACON

Comparisons of commodity prices in the various countries of the world mean little unless they are related to wage rates. In other words, it is the ability of the workman to bring home the bacon that counts.

The United States Department of Labor has calculated the minutes of working time required to earn enough money to buy a pound of bacon in 10 countries. It is a revealing example of the superiority of our living standards as against those of the rest of the world.

The average American worker works 30 minutes for his pound of bacon. His equivalent in Canada works 45, and in Great Britain, 53. In Ireland he must put in 96 minutes. Finally, the Soviet Union—that wonderful worker's paradise—is last on the list, with 466 minutes of work needed for that precious pound of bacon. The Communist workers see bacon at long, long intervals, if at all.

These enormous differences are principally due to the economic and social systems under which men work. In the United States we have a free economy. That pound of bacon is one of the products of a highly efficient, extremely competitive industry which can live and prosper only if it meets the needs of free consumers. The same thing is true of everything else we buy, whether it be an automobile or a pair of shoes or a ticket to a movie. The fact that only a free economy can produce abundance for the masses of the people can't be repeated too often.

1933 and 1950: A Contrast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. KRUSE, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the June 6, 1950, issue of the Fort Wayne Journal Gazette:

1933 AND 1950: A CONTRAST

The American people will never forget that bleak March 4, 1933, when the Democratic Party came to power in Washington under the dynamic leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The country was in the grip of the most devastating depression in its history. An army of 14,000,000 unemployed was pounding the pavements looking for work. And there was no work.

Desperate farmers—armed with shotguns—were resisting court orders of foreclosure upon their land. These farmers were not outlaws. They were simply in the last stages of emotional panic. They had no place to go.

A chain reaction of bank failures was sweeping over the Nation. No investment was safe.

Millions were hungry, ragged, and down at the heel. The heart had gone out of America. The will to achieve was paralyzed. The economy was frozen.

So dawned March 4, 1933.

Every ear was glued to the radio at noon that day. A new President was taking the oath of office. Would he bring hope or death of hope?

Then that confident, reassuring, intimate voice came booming over the airways: "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

And the Nation arose as one man to meet the challenge of the new leader for action, action, action.

When night fell on March 4, 1933, a turning point had come in American history. There was supreme faith that democracy had not failed. There would be no revolution by desperate, lost, and forgotten men. The great dream of Washington and Lincoln had not vanished.

In the days which followed, a beaten Nation rose from its sackcloth and ashes. The legislative machinery hummed day and night to liquidate the depression and put the feet of our people on the road to security and prosperity.

That was 17 years ago. In between lies the record of the Democratic Party. Remembering the dark and terrible days which soon disappeared, let us honestly admit that every American family and every American business has profited by the things which have been accomplished during this period.

Today the standard of living is the highest it has ever been in the history of the Nation. The number of gainfully employed is at an all-time high. Business looks ahead with confidence.

The Democratic Party does not claim credit for all that the free men and women of our mighty land have achieved since 1933. It does claim to have been the political instrument which made possible the conditions under which these achievements were accomplished.

What a contrast between 1933 and 1950.

Democrats the Party for War—The Republicans Must Be the Party for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there is a real danger that my beloved Republican Party is missing the boat on the most important issue before the people of the United States—that of peace or war. In the brief span of 33 years the Democratic Party has taken this country into two major wars and today we are on the brink of another. How long will the people follow this kind of leadership? But where is the leadership in the Republican Party that should be out in front in opposition to another global Democratic war?

Mr. Speaker, by leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article by Mr. David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Star on June 20, and it should be read by every Republican Member of Congress:

GOP SEEN MISSING BIGGEST ISSUE—DESIRE OF PEOPLE FOR PEACE—DEMOCRATS HAVE BUNGLED QUESTION; STANDPOINTS TO INEVITABLE WAR

(By David Lawrence)

The Republican Party has missed the biggest issue of the year—the desire of the American people to avoid a third world war.

The Democrats, on the other hand, have bungled the same question and gotten themselves into a rigid position the logic of which points to inevitable war.

The other day Republican spokesmen said they have four main issues in mind for the coming campaign—opposition to the Brannan plan of farm subsidies, opposition to deficits and excessive spending by the Federal Government, removal of burdensome excise taxes, and a program to get rid of communistic influences inside the Government.

These by themselves will affect different regions of the country in various ways, and none of these issues is likely to cut across the whole voting population as would the issue of war and peace.

The Republicans by their denunciation of Communists in the Government have won some votes, but they also have placed themselves in the position of being indifferent to ways and means of attaining international peace.

DEMOCRATS SENSE ISSUE

The Democratic administration is beginning to sense the importance of the issue, and the official line which all speakers have just been ordered to take is to emphasize the word "peace" as much as possible. This, however, is transparently artificial. The truth is the administration has been telling the American people now for several months that any agreements with the Kremlin are not worth the paper they are written on. Last week Secretary of State Acheson at Dallas said that when the leaders of Russia were eventually impressed by our armament and economic program, there could be meaningful negotiation. This clearly indicates negotiation some day with the same group in the Kremlin.

If the Soviet Government, on the other hand, cannot be relied upon, then all talk of negotiation of any kind is futile. This, of course, is what the military men in Washington privately believe and have been saying for some time. The Kremlin is building up its armament, and in the last few days new figures on Russian expenditures for arms have been published that indicate that the armament race is on in earnest.

Where is the administration going? If it isn't really interested in the agreements the Kremlin would negotiate, and if it speaks of negotiation in the dim and distant future only as a gesture for political reasons, it is evident that the real policy of the Democratic Party is "watchful drifting." This is one of the most dangerous of all policies, since it leads to such hardening of positions as to make war seem inevitable.

So interested has the administration been in recent months in selling Congress on the idea of more arms spending that it has not dared to play up the peace angle or the negotiation idea for fear that Congressmen would not vote the money. With Congress about to adjourn and appropriations fully approved, there now can be more talk, at least, of peace.

REPUBLICANS ASLEEP

But that's where the Republicans have been asleep. They could have pressed the administration to define its policy clearly. They could have attacked the overemphasis which has been placed by the administration on arms spending, and the underemphasis which has been placed on the negotiation idea or peace planning.

The Republicans, however, have become so interested in developing an anti-Communist crusade that they have overlooked the biggest hazard of all—the way an arms race leads to war and the failure of the administration to make any constructive suggestions as to how, without an actual war, it can ever get America out of the dilemma it has gotten into.

The Republicans could have insisted on a cut-off of all parleying or jockeying with the Kremlin and they could have urged, instead, the formulation of a program that would appeal to the Russian people so that the latter would in due time see the wisdom of repudiating their leaders. The satellite countries are fertile ground for such appeals.

But nobody—neither the Republicans nor the Democrats—has come forth with a program that could really appeal to the Russian people or to the peoples of the satellite countries, who in the last analysis will decide whether they want to fight another war.

Postal Curtailment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received hundreds of protests from the First Congressional District of Indiana against the curtailment of postal service by the reduction of personnel in an effort to comply with the post-office budget. These protests are not coming only from my district, but throughout the whole State of Indiana and other States.

Congress should take steps before adjournment toward reinstating the former efficient postal service to the American public.

The following is a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of East Chicago, opposing the curtailment of postal service:

Whereas United States postal service is recognized as American business and the basic communication system of the American life,

Whereas the recently ordered curtailment of mail service will result in a below standard service and will mean a subsequent dismissal of thousands of loyal postal employees, which will create a hardship on their families as well as themselves;

Whereas the Common Council of the City of East Chicago is deeply interested in the maintenance of efficient and full-time postal service in order to safeguard the proper conduction of business and personal communications: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of East Chicago, That said common council go on record as being in opposition to any curtailment of postal service and that the President of the United States, Congressman RAY J. MADDEN, Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER, and Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART be requested to apply their efforts toward the prohibition of any such curtailment in postal service.

Adopted by the common council this 12th day of June 1950.

FRED SAVIANO,
President of the Common Council.

I hereby certify this to be a true and accurate copy of a resolution adopted by the Common Council of East Chicago, Ind., on June 12, 1950.

CONRAD DANIELSON,
City Clerk.

And There Is No Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the the following editorial from the Union Banner, Fort Worth, Tex., for June 9, 1950:

AND THERE IS NO APPEAL

If it is possible for those who have gone beyond to look back on this mortal sphere, then surely those thousands of our forefathers who gave their lives for the "lost cause" are writhing in their Confederate graves because of the rulings of the Supreme Court of the United States earlier this week.

Bigotry? We do not think so. It goes much deeper than that. It heralds the passing of an era. For the Federal Government to confiscate the natural resources of the sovereign States and by legislation to enforce the intermingling of the races is against all concepts of what we of the South for generations have been taught to believe right and wrong.

Surely, if Jefferson and Jackson were alive today, they would enjoin the use of their names by the party they helped found in the manner they are being used today.

Flag Day Address of the Honorable Peter Campbell Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. VINCENT QUINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, traditionally the steps of the State Capitol at Albany, N. Y., are the scene of the Flag Day ceremonies sponsored by the Albany Elks Lodge. All of the city's civic and patriotic organizations take part in this celebration. The principal speaker at the exercises this year was Peter Campbell Brown, assistant to the Attorney General of the United States.

Under the unanimous consent granted me, I include herewith his remarks on that occasion in the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, exalted ruler, members, and friends of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, ladies and gentlemen, I deem it a high honor and a distinct privilege to be here this afternoon to participate with you in publicly honoring Old Glory, the emblem of our great Republic. The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks has a long and great history of community service, but I know of no more noble task which they have performed than that of arranging and holding these annual public meetings on Flag Day to focus the attention of all Americans on our banner of freedom and all that it symbolizes. We are prone to take so many of our precious heritages for granted that it is good now and then to pause and ponder over these precious possessions and give gratitude to the Almighty who has preserved them for us.

Betsy Ross, when she designed the Star-Spangled Banner, could not have foreseen the radiance and the glory that those stars on the wave of blue and red would cause to reflect so brilliantly in later decades, for today our country stands preeminent among the nations of the world. Without the slightest doubt the United States is looked upon as the guiding light on the road to peace, which this world so much needs today. That is why the noble work of your great organization has so tremendous a significance at this time.

Your order since its founding, and especially since it has assumed its present name in 1868, has always endeavored to utilize the spirit of association which in all ages has induced men to join together, not only for the pleasures of mutual enjoyment, but for the attainment of some common purpose for which the support of numbers is necessary and to stress patriotism among the more than 1,000,000 members now on your roster. In the preamble to your constitution you have made one of your purposes for existence the very noble objective, namely, "to quicken the spirit of American patriotism." You have truly carried that provision into full effect and may you so continue.

Your sponsorship of the celebration of Flag Day is particularly significant this year when your National Service Commission is performing such effective work in arousing your million members in the conduct of the Wake-Up America program. Through this program you have succeeded materially in awakening all Americans to the challenge of these perilous days and showing the world that our freedom means much to us. As your eminent Grand Exalted Ruler Emmett T. Anderson has recently said: "Our splendid benevolent and patriotic fraternity should take the lead in every community in every city and ask every citizen to rally around us and give ample demonstration of their faith in America. Let's make this program * * * a credit to ourselves and prove that Elkdom is Americanism and that it truly is our heritage."

One hundred and seventy-three years ago, the Continental Congress of the then infant independent United States of America resolved that the flag of the United States consist of 13 stripes, alternately red and white; that the Union be symbolized by 13 white stars in a field of blue, representing a new constellation. That constellation has grown and grown and today that flag represents not only a new constellation on this hemisphere, but a constellation of a free world standing in majestic dignity against the free sky, spreading faith in the minds of men and giving enslaved people throughout the world courage and hope, in the coming of a world which will bring peace and contentment to all mankind. That is why your efforts with respect to Flag Day observance have such potent significance to the welfare not only of our country, but to the entire world. Programs such as these, conducted in a manner such as has been the custom of your order, are a genuine demonstration of the solidarity, of the unity, of true patriotic Americans.

This is not only manifested in Flag Day observances but also in many other fields of patriotic endeavor sponsored by your benevolent order. Your motto of "Every Elk Buy a Bond" is the best answer to be given to our foes from without and within.

But Flag Day is indeed Elkdom's greatest day. And your Albany Lodge, ever in the forefront, has at all times taken a leading part in mobilizing with vigor and enthusiasm the patriotic spirit of our citizens. This meeting today is but another manifestation of your significant contribution to real Americanism.

As you all know, the world today is in the throes of chaos and confusion. There is fear in the hearts of many as to the events of the morrow. Technological progress and mechanical advancements have been very rapid. The world has been narrowed in space and in time. We are all neighbors, all of the peoples throughout the world. We have as yet not learned to live as neighbors. Especially may this be said of some in the family of nations. Many of us continue to forget that today happenings in any distant corner of the world affect us here in America. The welfare of all humanity is affected by the welfare of any group of people. And so it is important for all of us to observe a day like Flag Day, to reflect upon what that flag symbolizes and what that symbol can contribute toward bringing about a world of peace.

What does this flag symbolize to mankind today? To the world everywhere the sight of Old Glory carries hope, revives faith, renews aspirations and reinstates dignity in the human soul. This country is viewed by most mankind as the arsenal of those moral and spiritual values which alone can bring the kind of world we all desire—a world of peace, and liberty, and justice—brotherhood, prosperity, and happiness. No wonder the hearts of men swell with pride, with a lump in the throat of each of us as we hear the strains of the Star-Spangled Banner at any occasion anywhere in the world. Have you ever looked into the faces of men and women as they rise to the strains of this soul-inspiring song? I have done so on many occasions, greatly impressed with the manifestations clearly visible in the faces of all; of pride and awe, of joy and reverence, of ecstacy and determination. Wherever that Star-Spangled Banner flies it proclaims liberty to all and guarantees to all who claim its protection the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We must, however, never forget that to keep this flag waving in the breeze, continued vigilance on our part, on the part of every citizen, man, woman, and child, is required. In truth, the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. We must ever be alert to protect it from being hauled down, for at all times there are sinister forces within and without our shores who are doing everything possible to tear it down and plant instead the banner of tyranny, slavery, and oppression.

Today the forces of good and evil in this world are waging a mortal struggle between freedom and slavery. Tyranny is imposed upon many people in the name of democracy. The Communist threat to our way of life is real and imminent. The denial of God and the subversion of the individual to the will of a state is in its very essence hostile to our system of Government. What is more dangerous and disconcerting are the methods which these traitors to our country have adopted to penetrate into our system.

This threat to our system of Government is directed at us not only from abroad, but from within our own boundaries. The perils to this Nation are not confined to a foreign foe, though that peril is indeed great. There are many who, though cloaked in the guise of respectability and patriotism, take advantage of the democratic privileges and immunities which they would deny to others if they had the chance. They are doing everything to create disunity and dissatisfaction with our institutions. They would tear to shreds our Star-Spangled Banner if they could do so, and they would succeed unless we determine to do everything possible by lawful and constitutional means to eradicate them completely and effectively from within our own ranks.

You probably have seen or heard of some fantastic stories about the alleged infiltration into, or the alleged capture of, our Government and our country by Communists. Were we living in a less anxious period of the world's history, I would not even take time to mention it.

You may rest assured that the Federal law-enforcement and investigative officers of your Government—the FBI under the dynamic leadership of that great American, J. Edgar Hoover, and other official agencies charged with the responsibility for our internal security—are alert and active day and night.

However, I do want to emphasize that while we are fully determined that there shall be no Communists or other subversives in our Government, we are equally as determined to have no gestapo witch hunts—that the basic civil rights of the individual will be securely protected and defended as guaranteed by the fundamental law of the land.

Our free America that we inherited must be handed down in like manner to the future generations.

I am confident, however, that so long as we have organizations like yours, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, these stealthy invaders of our American way of life will be squelched with vigor and completeness. So long as we have such a group of loyal and patriotic citizens to mobilize our thoughts and our aspirations to the preservation of this great flag of our country, we can be safe, though, I must again admonish you, we cannot relax. Let us this day consecrate ourselves to the realization of the true signifinance of those stars spangled on that banner. Let us also dedicate

ourselves and resolve to do all in our power to make this flag symbolize what it always has symbolized—liberty and freedom to all mankind; let us renew our determination to be ever alert and on the watch for those who would desecrate it; let us again swear that the allegiance which we pledge to it from day to day shall be real, sincere, and effective.

Let us remember that this star-spangled banner has been preserved for us unblemished and untarnished by the blood and tears of our countrymen. Our ancestors, as well as many of us—our sons and daughters, brothers and sisters—bled for it at Bunker Hill and Valley Forge, at Gettysburg and Bull Run, at Chateau-Thierry and the Argonne Forest, at Okinawa and Iwo Jima, in Normandy and at Bastogne. Let us resolve that the sacrifices of those dear and loved ones shall not have been in vain.

And, finally, let us ever be mindful that our flag and all that it reflects and stands for can only be preserved by a strict adherence to the moral and spiritual principles which can only be achieved through the fear of God and through the teachings of our various religious faiths. Let us remember that only through the teachings of God and His precepts can we attain the moral and spiritual stamina without which no effort in this material world of ours can be successful.

If we do this, we can proclaim to the world—liberty, justice, and prosperity to all mankind—as we exclaim with assurance, "Our flag—long may it wave."

Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes Would Help Business and Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, with national attention properly directed toward current proposals on tax revision in the Congress, I desire to call to the attention of my colleagues an informative article written by a prominent businessman in the Twenty-third District of Illinois. The article was published in the form of a "guest editorial" by the Danville (Ill.) Commercial-News. The author is Paul S. Millikin, president of the Paul S. Millikin Co., operator of a retail furrier establishment and other enterprises. Mr. Millikin points out with clarity the crying need for repeal of the wartime excise taxes.

Under permission granted by the House, I am including the text of his statement, as follows:

REPEAL OF WARTIME EXCISE TAXES WOULD HELP BUSINESS AND PUBLIC

(By Paul Millikin)

"During the next few months, the public press, many magazines, and the radio will very likely carry announcements, news items and opinions to the effect that the fur excise tax will be reduced during the year." A 1950 headline? No. This statement was issued by the Retail Furriers Emergency Committee, October 17, 1946.

The war was over and what was considered a wartime necessity lingered on. The same press, magazines, and radio are still carrying similar announcements—and why? Simply because these same taxes are still news; because you and I are still paying wartime tax on so-called luxury items such as furs, leather goods, cosmetics, jewelry, and many others. Most of us know that these articles are necessities, if we are to keep the American standard of living on its present plane.

We are not in position to say what the unjust cost has been to the purchasers of these items, in dollars and cents; but we do know this same wartime tax is, and always has been, a discriminative measure. For instance, the little girl to whom it is greatly important to dress warmly and remain healthy in order to keep her job, and who can only afford to buy a $100 coat, must pay a 20 percent Federal excise tax. At the same time, the woman who has several fur coats, but who chooses to buy a lovely fur-trimmed cloth creation may pay two or three times as much for it as for a lower-priced fur garment; but if the fur trimming costs less than three times the cost of the cloth shell in any particular garment, no tax at all is demanded.

All through the law we feel there are many other inequities and certainly many inconsistencies.

What has the continued publicity relative to the repeal of the excise tax done to business? Every few days someone in Washington will issue a statement which starts a rumor that repeal is imminent. How many people will go out and make a major expenditure after reading such a statement? We might go a little further and say, "What does this do to Government revenue from sales?" From profits come income taxes; from decreased sales comes less excise revenue. This seems to us a vicious circle which will continue to decrease Government income from taxes and defeat its own purpose rather than to provide tax money.

It is interesting to note that from July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949, furs and jewelry in particular sustained serious decreases in sales volume. In other words, sales in furs fell from $400,000,000 to $310,000,000 and other commodities on which excises are levied were affected similarly, but our personal subject is the excise-tax effect on the fur industry.

Remove the entire excise tax from furs alone and that industry will begin employing many more furriers and workers to manufacture many more coats to be sold at a reasonable profit. There is every reason to believe that the tax coffers will be more quickly filled with income tax from such profits than they will from the present excise tax which so many people are now refusing to pay, as shown by decreased dollar sales volume. You can't dangle a possible tax reduction before 150,000,000 people, year after year, without injuring business and causing serious unemployment.

Now what about the purchaser? Supply and demand govern price. At the present time, fur coats are priced at the lowest in years. If and when this wartime tax is repealed in part or in whole, there will naturally be a considerable upturn in fur retail sales due to increased demand. The manufacturers will not have the number of coats on hand to supply the demand, because of the fear of sales resistance by Miss and Mrs. America so long as the tax remains.

This consequent increase in retail sales could easily cause a price increase which could cost the purchaser more than the present tax. All this sounds like going round and round, doesn't it? In our opinion there is only one sane and sensible action: To restore business, to put the employees of these large industries back to work and to let the Government tax come directly from the seller rather than from the purchaser. The answer is this: Cut out some of the Government spending by our wasteful politicians in Washington; then we would not need excise and other exorbitant taxes.

If the Government would watch its own spending as carefully as present-day taxes force businessmen to watch theirs, it wouldn't have to point with pride to saving $1,000,000,000. It could easily save 25 to 50 billion.

Just as a suggestion, let everyone join the legion of obstinate men and women. Let's repeal all excise taxes, now.

The Right Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, there is an aphorism which says that "every question has three sides—my side, your side, and the right side." I might well add to this with the observation that somewhere in there also is the wrong side.

Just whose is which, appears to be the point at issue in all the current goings on over the notorious Amerasia case, involving a number of key men in Government with wartime spying back in 1945. Almost everybody professes some confusion of mind over the matter. But I think it is not so complicated, if one looks at it objectively.

My side is the side taken by Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin. It is the side also of many others in both House and Senate. The other side is that taken by the State and Justice Departments; and some say, the Tydings committee, or some of its members, at least.

Now whose side is the right side, and whose the wrong side? Well, that is a good question, according to the grand jury in New York City which investigated the Amerasia case briefly and announced its findings a few days ago. Evidently the jury seized the opportunity, just before its adjournment, to give the case a quick treatment, once over lightly.

This grand jury came up with the astonishing conclusion that both FBI and officials of the Justice Department did exactly the right things in exactly the right manner, with respect to the Amerasia case, from start to finish.

Everybody in Government was, and now is, pure as the fresh white paint on your Aunt Maria's house in springtime. Everything was, and still is, for the best in the best of all possible worlds. Or so it would seem from the first movement in the grand jury opus.

But let me point out to you that the FBI all along has insisted that it prepared an air-tight case against all of the six persons arrested in the Amerasia case. The FBI keeps on insisting that its case against these people should stand up in any court in the land. At the same time, the Justice Department swears that mishandling of the case by the FBI at the outset made it impossible to get indictments against three of the six accused by the FBI, while it was necessary to quash the indictment against one other.

Let me remind you further that the Justice Department says this alleged mishandling of the case by the FBI made

it impossible to present all of the evidence in court. The result of this failure to set forth all of the evidence enabled Philip Jaffe, of Amerasia magazine, and Emmanuel Larsen, of the State Department, to get off with small fines, instead of prison sentences. As a subordinate bureau of the Justice Department, it was only to be expected that the FBI would refrain from the obvious retort.

In this connection, you should remember, too, that Andrew Roth, a high-ranking officer in the Naval Intelligence Bureau, was not even indicted after his arrest by the FBI. Yet it is public knowledge that copies of confidential Navy documents, made in his own handwriting, were found among the documents stolen by the Amerasia conspirators. Some highly unpleasant revelations have been made, as well, concerning why Kate Mitchell, an Amerasia staff member, was not indicted after her arrest.

These are the reasons why I stand here today to voice my utter amazement and my deep misgivings at the action of the New York City grand jury. Obviously this body acted on insufficient information, and possibly on information of such nature as to be entirely misleading. It must have done so, at least with respect to its whitewash of all Government officials involved in prosecution of the Amerasia case. But I am glad to say in the end the grand jury gave some hint of its real feelings in the matter.

The jury findings stated in effect that the administration's so-called loyalty-screening program is of little or no value, and that espionage laws are so badly drawn as to present what amounts to an open-door policy for enemy agents. The findings included also a direct demand that the Justice Department and its FBI Bureau bare every detail of the Amerasia case, from start to finish.

Certainly this second movement of the grand jury opus cannot be construed, even though administration propagandists have strained to do it, as exoneration of anybody; not even of Congress, which may have a job to do on the espionage laws.

The grand jury continued with an indictment, moral although not legal, of both sides in the Amerasia controversy for resorting to subterfuge and half-truths. Maybe so. But let me remind you again that thus far the administration has succeeded in bottling all of the real evidence supporting Senator McCarthy's charges in departmental and FBI secret files. Those which have been released were documents left after the files had been house-cleaned in advance. The Senator from Wisconsin is doing only what he can and must to bring concealed evidence into the open.

It was significant that the grand jury took pains to note that an Assistant Attorney General from the Justice Department sat with it throughout its consideration of the Amerasia case. Senator McCarthy was not there; neither was anyone from the FBI; and the Justice Department in effect was one of the Government Departments under investigation. More than one grand juror has said that what have been called explanations by the Assistant Attorney General caused a violent split among the jurors concerning just what their findings should be. Some of the jurors must have smelled the corruption.

The grand jury said that if the laws governing espionage had been different, "the prosecution procedure would have been entirely different." If this is so—although I doubt if it bore any weight in the actual handling of the Amerasia case before two different grand juries and one Federal court—then let me say again that Congress would do well to get busy and drastically revise those laws.

The grand jury said, too, that among the factors the Justice Department had to consider were "certain legal procedures which, if followed, might have revealed to the enemy information that it was essential should be withheld." Now let it be recalled that the cases of the Amerasia defendants did not reach the grand juries until after the end of hostilities. The overt enemy had been defeated; even some of the most highly secret documents stolen by the Amerasia conspirators had lost their significance. Enough of them, anyway, to uphold the prosecution.

One is compelled to wonder if the secret information that it was so essential should be withheld related solely to the corruption, the lack of patriotism, and even common morality, on the part of too many people in key positions, within the Government Departments.

Can We Long Endure?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to insert the following editorial from the Brundidge (Ala.) Sentinel in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CAN WE LONG ENDURE?

We all know that our democracy has been sold down the river to ourselves for a pittance.

The sale of the Birmingham Age-Herald to the Birmingham Post, following the merger of the Atlanta Constitution with the Journal brings us faster to the realization that we are fast falling into a world of big business. No room for the little boys. Everything regulated by the Government. The fewer newspapers we have and those in chains and regulated by a few, make it easier for the few to dominate the many.

Every common man knows that the United States cannot endure on artificial doles, cotton supports, price regulation, artificial jobs, watered production. Yet we are so involved that we cannot stop. If we took the price supports away from cotton and peanuts we think we would go bankrupt.

Our Government is going in debt a million dollars a day in order to squander millions on each and every little pressure group in order to keep its votes. The theme is, "Get it from the Government, they have plenty to spare. They can tax the rich and give to us."

Years ago we fought socialism. Today we have it.

Today we fight communism. Russia is just sitting back, nagging and waiting while we become more bankrupt, self-satisfied, and more dependent on government, which is getting more complex and bureaucratic.

Shall we wake up? Or just get what we can—and let tomorrow take care of itself?

Plebiscite Should Decide Security Council's Line-Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, let me join with the editorial department of the Saginaw News, of Saginaw, Mich., in protesting against the United States lending its support to the idea of giving Russia comfort and aid by allowing that country its second Security Council seat through the machinery of Communist China.

There is now ample evidence available to show to our people that Russia has already received from our State Department entirely too much aid and comfort insofar as Russia's progress in China and the whole Far East is concerned.

Secretary Acheson's proposals that we do some three things preparatory to reaching an agreement or working basis with Russia fails to square with his other proposition to the effect that any agreement made with Russia is of no avail unless it proves to be of special benefit to Russia. Why give Russia other advantages when our people are being so terribly taxed to arm other countries to oppose Russia. If we are against Russia's program, let us be wholly against her.

PLEBISCITE SHOULD DECIDE SECURITY COUNCIL'S LINE-UP

Reports filtering out of Washington, in the wake of UN Secretary General Lie's peace conferences with top United States officials, indicate a plan has been developed under which the United States will sit on its hands while the Chinese Communists replace the Nationalists on the UN Security Council—a shift which Lie told UN members yesterday is essential for progress toward world peace.

According to United States News & World Report, Lie talked to President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson, and was told the United States will vote against seating the Communists. "But the United States considers that the question of which Chinese Government is to occupy China's seat in the United Nations is purely a procedural matter and, as such, is not subject to a veto. Under the UN Charter, only matters of substance are subject to a veto by the powers. The United States agrees with Russia that the Chinese Nationalists should have no right to exercise China's veto power on such a question involving their credentials."

It's a slick plan and undoubtedly will result in giving Joseph Stalin what he wants—a second Communist seat on the Security Council.

Five of the council members—Russia, Britain, Yugoslavia, India, and Norway—already have recognized the Communist re-

gime and probably will vote to seat it on the council. The other members are Nationalist China, the United States, France, Egypt, Cuba, and Ecuador. The latter five have not recognized the Communist regime, but France is reported sympathetic toward Lie's plan, hoping that a truce in the cold war will end Communist troubles in France and the fighting with Communist rebels in Indochina.

It's all too reminiscent of dealings with Hitler and Moscow's own prior performances to leave Americans with an easy feeling.

Why is Stalin so insistent on getting a second Security Council seat? That body under the UN Charter alone was granted power to keep the world at peace—forcibly if necessary. It is composed of five permanent members—the United States, Russia, Britain, France, and China—and six other members named by the UN Assembly on a rotating basis.

Stalin at first would have no part in it unless each of the Big Five was granted power to veto Security Council actions. This the others granted and have lived to regret. Then, after the Communist armies had swept across mainland China, he refused to participate on the ground that the Nationalists no longer were lawful representatives of the Chinese people.

It may be that Stalin is hopeful of getting not only two but three seats eventually on the Security Council. Then, if he reversed himself and got the veto rule abolished, he would be in a good position to use the UN machinery to further the Communist cause. The United States would find it difficult if not impossible to withdraw from a peace organization which it had been chiefly instrumental in building.

We believe the question of seating the Chinese Communists on the Security Council should be treated as one of substance rather than procedure, and that the United States should take a determined stand against seating the Communists until there is proof that they actually represent the wishes of the Chinese people.

There's nothing illogical about demanding that the Communists permit a UN-conducted plebiscite to determine whom the Chinese people want as their representatives.

The Communists undoubtedly would reject such a proposal. But the United States then could readily justify its veto of any move to seat the Communists on the Security Council until an honest plebiscite had proved their right to China's seat.

A truce is not to be desired which can only be expected to expose us to greater danger.

McCulloch To Visit Citizens at Each Courthouse in District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that a Congressman should be in his district to visit and confer with his constituents as often as time will allow.

When Congress adjourns in the summer I expect to return home and to be available for conferences with residents of the Fourth District in the court house of each county seat between 9 a. m. and 4 p. m., in accordance with the following schedule:

Lima, Allen County: Monday and Tuesday, August 28 and 29; Wapakoneta, Auglaize County: Wednesday, August 30; Greenville, Darke County: Thursday, August 31; Celina, Mercer County: Friday, September 1; Troy, Miami County: Tuesday, September 5; Sidney, Shelby County: Friday, September 8.

No appointment will be necessary. Any problem or opinion touching official duties will be a proper subject for conference.

Of course, I will be glad to see residents of the district, in my Piqua office, during the time that the Congress is not in session, except on the days scheduled above.

The Primary Purpose of Our Air Force Is the Prevention of War—Next Is That We Have an Air Force Destined for Counterattack Having a Striking Power Sufficient for Its Purpose—That Is the Indispensable Element of All Defense and Our Hope for Averting War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, a Republican leader remarked to me in the cloakroom just the other day: "FRANK, despite all the economies and the good work that Louis Johnson is doing in the Department of Defense, it seems that the only thing that certain vocal members of our armed services are concerning themselves with * * * is to dream up new ways of spending the taxpayers' money. Pretty soon," he continued, "we are going to hear of some Army-Navy or perhaps State Department official telling us of a new proposal to secure the defense of this Nation by fortifying the moon."

Mr. Speaker, in making that statement, my colleague was merely voicing his opinion as to the utterly asinine, ridiculous, and foolish things that we have been reading about—new missiles, push-button warfare, and what-not talked about by frivolous military men which they infer has been or will the day after tomorrow be perfected by the Army and the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to admit that our colleague was more or less justified in making that statement. You can hardly pick up a newspaper but what you read of some new fantastic idea—devastating antitank weapons, deadly antiaircraft devices, atomic artillery, guided missiles, bullets with atomic warheads, and what-not. Devices that we are led to feel will change the whole course of modern warfare. Those of us here in Congress who have taken the trouble to make inquiry with respect to these things have been definitely told and know that it is all a lot of "hooey" and "boloney"—that all they want is more money for this or for that project.

The Defense Department under date of June 2 flatly denied that we had developed warheads for artillery shells and guided missiles. Furthermore, they denounced published stories to this effect "as utterly dishonest" and added that the recent similar stories about developing a baby atom bomb "belong in the same category."

Mr. Speaker, not alone did the Department of Defense so report, but the New York Herald Tribune quotes our good friend and colleague, the Hon. JAMES VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, a member of both our Armed Services Committee and our Joint Congressional Atomic Commission as stating that "his group has never been told that the Atomic Energy Commission was working for the ultimate development of atomic shells and missiles."

Of course, the Research and Development Board, as well as the armed services, are spending the millions of dollars which this Congress provided them to improve and perfect, insofar as possible, the defenses of the United States and, of course, that Board is spending them by and with the aid of the United States Army, Navy, and Air Force.

It does not help the defenses of this Nation one whit to talk about building rockets that you can shoot to the moon or of building new man-made planets, which, when completed, will be shot off the earth, anchored permanently in the heavens, and when the earth turns around and the United States of Soviet Russia are directly underneath the planet, our military will then drop beer bottles or atomic bombs or anything else on the Russians.

The newspapers of the past few days have been so full of such moonshine that it certainly was pleasing to read in today's press a safe, sane, understandable, and truthful comment as to our air defenses written by a great American with respect to this question, and I mean none other than Thomas K. Finletter, Secretary of the Air Force.

There is no question of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that these things are being spread in order to influence the members of the Armed Services Committee and the Congress in general, with respect to certain appropriations or legislation which has to do with appropriation bills or "roles and missions" that might be subject or will shortly become subject to debate in this House. While I am sure that few, if any, of our members are or will be taken by any such things, it does seem a shame that the press and taxpayers are bamboozled and the Secretary of Defense is called upon to make repeated denials of ridiculous and outlandish claims with respect to new armaments or weapons that have been perfected.

We all remember when but a few months ago some naval officer, appearing before the committee, said something to the effect that they could explode an atom bomb on one end of the runway at Washington National Airport with him

standing on the other, and he wouldn't even feel a gentle breeze nor would he be in any serious danger whatever—and that testimony, Mr. Speaker, was given under oath before the Armed Services Committee.

If we would believe what is now being told us, it appears they can now put a little atomic energy in the end of a bullet and kill everybody in sight. We now have all sorts of gadgets such as Don Winslow, Buck Rogers, and Captain Video, use in the comic strips and on television, for flying to the moon.

Speaking of the moon, Mr. Speaker, I expect that one of these days we shall see a proposal made by some of these great Sunday scientists that we appropriate money with which to fortify the moon in order to defend these United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to note that the Air Force has not sinned in this respect. Despite all the vituperation and charges—disproved by this House—that have been hurled against it, the Air Force just goes ahead doing its job, quietly and effectively, and, from what I understand, insofar as research and development are concerned, unquestionably abreast of every development of any of the other services and in every field.

Mr. John G. Norris, byline writer of the Washington Post, in writing on the address made by the Secretary of the Air Force, Thomas K. Finletter, to the graduating class at the University of Pennsylvania, wrote in part as follows:

Mr. Finletter made it plain that he will be a team player for a balanced defense force and not a special pleader for mighty air power.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Finletter's maiden address made to that class was just the kind of a frank, honest, conservative, and realistic talk that we in Congress want to hear from our top-flight executives and can always expect from Tom Finletter.

It has a ring of honesty, sincerity, and straightforwardness; it is entirely lacking in bombast; it appeals to one's intelligence, and, at the same time, it evidences the Secretary's sense of responsibility for the great job that he has in hand.

When Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, lost Stuart Symington, it seemed to many of us that our great air defenses had lost "Mr. Air Force" himself. There is no gainsaying the fact, however, that the wisdom and sagacity that has always characterized President Truman's appointments has given to the Air Force in its new Secretary a man of exceptionally proven abilities who merits the fullest confidence of the Congress and the American people.

The American people know that their first line of defense today is the United States Air Force. Furthermore, our people are not afraid of coastal attacks by a nonexistent Russian Navy or of Russian Communists' tanks rolling ashore in these United States to lead infantry attacks against our great centers of population, but they do fear Russian attacks from the skies.

The merest school child knows that the immediate peace and security of these United States rests with the United States Air Force, the atom bombs that are at this moment in our stockpile, and the proven ability of our great intercontinental long-range B–36 bombers, to deliver the bombs almost upon a moment's notice, not alone upon strategic points in any enemy territory, but upon any possible advance of the Russian hordes that now stand with their bayonets bristling on the borders of western Europe.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I insert into this day's proceedings a news article by John G. Norris, well and favorably known to many of us here on Capitol Hill, together with a copy of an address delivered by the Honorable Thomas Knight Finletter of the Air Force about which Mr. Norris so realistically reported.

The article and address follow:

FAVORS BALANCE—DEFENSE AIM OF FINLETTER IS TEAMWORK

(By John G. Norris)

In his maiden speech as Secretary of the Air Force, Thomas K. Finletter yesterday made it plain he will be a team player for a balanced defense force—not a special pleader for mighty air power.

Addressing the University of Pennsylvania commencement exercises in Philadelphia yesterday, Finletter gave what was obviously a considered expression of his national defense views—a policy speech to set the tone of his administration of the Air Force.

Since appointed Secretary in mid-April, Finletter has given no interviews, held no press conferences, and made no speeches. Aides told inquiring reporters he "wants to get his feet on the ground first."

"We must not have each service carrying out its assignments all by itself with a sharp division of responsibility such as used to characterize the operations of allies," said the United States Air Force Secretary. "Each task calls for the integrated effort of all three services, so as to get the maximum combined striking power of all the services in the carrying out of the agreed-upon work. Loyalty to a service, however important, must be subordinated to the interest of the country."

In a scholarly address outlining his views on security, Finletter declared that the most important element of the defense team must be "a defensive counterstriking force of unquestioned power."

"To fail to have on hand and to build for a striking force which will command real respect is to play with the safety of the country and of the free world," he declared.

Finletter, who spoke after receiving a doctor of laws degree from his alma mater, stressed that the primary need for our maintaining strong defenses is the prevention of war. Declaring that the "curve of military power is rising everywhere," he declared the United States must keep pace.

He also raised and discussed one of the main issues of the Air Force-Navy row on Capitol Hill last year—the Navy charge that planning for mass atomic bombing of an enemy's cities as a major plank of our strategy is immoral. This has been raised by some thoughtful citizens, and must be carefully considered, he said.

"I do not believe that the moral position of the United States will be judged by the kind of weapons we have in our arsenal or the kind of strategy and tactics we use," Finletter declared. "I believe our moral position will be judged by the vigor with which we push our efforts to achieve peace.

"There is no merit, moral or otherwise, in having a defense force which is no good. • • • We would be faithless to our duty to ourselves and to our friends and allies of the free world if we were not to have a military force which would make it very plain to all that it would be a mistake to break the peace."

ADDRESS OF THOMAS K. FINLETTER, SECRETARY OF THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

I shall talk this morning about some of the military problems which are facing this country. It is a sign of the troubled times in which we live that I feel justified in talking on this subject to an audience of young men and women as they finish their university education. I do so only because of the high importance of this subject to the future of the Nation and to those who will be the Nation in the years to come.

The United States has been driven reluctantly into its present policy of building a strong military force in peacetime. We have not adopted this policy of our own free will but because we have been forced to it by the actions of other nations. It is, therefore, very important that we understand why we are arming; and this is the main point I want to make to you today. We are arming for peace. We hope and pray that none of these military machines will ever be used. It is and must be the great purpose of our country to eliminate war as a human institution—to build an unbreakable and enforceable peace under law.

Unfortunately our efforts to get rid of the institution of war by developing the United Nations to this end have as yet been unsuccessful. We, therefore, have had to try at the same time the next best policy—the policy of being so strong in relation to our possible enemies that they will not start a war against us or the free world of which we are so important a part. This has been called the policy of peace through strength. It is a good way of putting it. This policy of peace through strength does not mean that we should shirk in our drive for peace in all the other ways available to us—above all in the United Nations. On the contrary, it means that the policy of military strength must be a shield back of which we can do the other things, in the economic, political, social, and moral and spiritual fields, which, let up hope, some day and some day soon will create a world without war.

I shall concentrate this morning on the military aspects of our defense policy; but in doing so I must repeat that I do not minimize the high importance of our economic and political policies in the building of our defenses and in furthering the cause of peace.

The free world cannot exist unless it is founded on a healthy economy and on close political cohesion. The Marshall plan, the work of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, the Mutual Defense Assistance Pact, and our point-four program have gone far and will go further in the building of a strong economic and social base for the free world. The North Atlantic Treaty has created a greater political solidarity in western society than has ever existed before. These are indispensable parts of a total policy of which the military is but one element.

Looking at the military side alone—since that is the work with which I am presently concerned—it seems to me that the primary purpose of our Defense Establishment is to have in being and ready for immediate action a force so strong that it will stand as a compelling deterrent to a nation which would break the peace.

A clear understanding and uncompromising pursuit of this primary purpose is vital to our planning. In every choice as to how our defense dollars are to be spent I would test by the formula: which course will set up the greater deterrent to an enemy who might be thinking of attacking us? Only with the greatest reluctance would I spend money for something that was to be used

after a war was well under way; for our purpose is to stop it from getting under way. This, I am sure, is what General Eisenhower had in mind when he said in his final report as Chief of Staff in February 1948 that "What we are able or not able to do within the first 60 days of another war will be decisive in its determination of our ability to carry the war to a successful conclusion." And a similar principle was stated recently by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Louis Johnson, when he said: "Our * * * philosophy of defense * * * does not require that all the men and all the munitions necessary to conduct all out war be ready in full capacity at all times. What we seek first by way of preparedness is a force of sufficient strength to deter aggression and to make impossible the defeat of America by any blitz attack of any dimensions."

Unless this idea is thoroughly understood throughout our Nation and by all other free nations, we run the danger of being complacent on the one hand or on the other of accepting the inevitability of war.

Let me suggest three principles which I believe should guide us in our military policies. First there must be a peacetime force in being, so composed and trained, and so ready for immediate action, that it will be the deterrent to aggression we want it to be.

This necessarily raises the question of the composition of this force; and this means that we must examine not only the general purpose of this force—the prevention of war—but the specific tasks the force must carry out if, God help us, war should come.

In broad lines, these tasks are, as I see it, the defense of the territory of the United States; the carrying out of our obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty and the Rio de Janiero Pact; and the defense of the other vital interests of the free world.

But in talking thus exclusively of defense I must emphasize that a purely defensive tactic will not achieve our purpose. History teaches that even the most powerful defense cannot win a war; it can only postpone defeat. We must have in being a defensive counter striking force of unquestioned power. No one of the defensive tasks of which I have spoken can be carried out by defensive tactics alone. Because of the nature of modern weapons the counter stroke is the indispensable element of the defense.

If I emphasize the importance of this defensive counter stroke, I do so with no attempt to arrogate to any one Service a special position of importance in our Defense Establishment. On the contrary each major military undertaking is a joint task. In one task, the primary responsibility must be that of one Service; in another task, another Service will have primary responsibility. But, and this is the second principle which I regard of high importance, in each of these strategic purposes the joint task concept must prevail.

By joint task concept I mean figuring out what has to be done and then seeing how the combined Army-Navy-Air Force team can best go about doing it. We must not have each Service carrying out its assignments all by itself with a sharp division of responsibility such as used to characterize the operations of allies. Each task calls for the integrated effort of all three Services, so as to get the maximum combined striking power of all the Services in the carrying out of the agreed-upon work. Loyalty to a Service, however important, must be subordinated to the interest of the country.

This principle of the task extends, it seems to me, to all the arrangements for the defense of the free world. Not only to those arrangements within each nation but also to arrangements among the nations which have decided to act in concert.

There is a third principle which seems to me to be of high importance and that is that we must plan ahead. I think it is often not sufficiently recognized how fast things are changing in military techniques. It has been said several times in the past that there is an acceleration in the process of history; that the slow changes from, say, the beginning of the Christian Era to the Industrial revolution were stepped up sharply during the period from the industrial revolution to the present time; and that the present period, which could be called the period of the acceleration of applied science, will show a rate of progress, if that is the word for it, geometrically greater than that of any time of the past.

Certainly so far as military matters go these prophecies have been justified. The law of acceleration by squares which Henry Adams talked about in 1909 in his Rule of Phase Applied to History is with us in pressing terms.

What this means to us now as a practical matter is that the military striking power of other nations which we will face in the future will be more powerful than those of the past and those of the present. This in turn means that we must calculate our plans accordingly. We therefore must plan ahead, with an eye on our future force and its future needs and with the best appraisal we can make of the weapon techniques in the future, especially those of our possible enemies. It is difficult, in fact impossible, to calculate exactly the power of an enemy in the future. But the effort must be made and our present plans year by year must always be with reference to the future striking power of our possible enemies as this striking power changes, and I fear increases, year by year.

To be sure present needs must be considered, but from the point of view of our planners, present needs are less important than the future needs. For, whether we like it or not, what we have now is what we will have to use to take care of our present needs.

But what we do this year will determine what we will have at a time in the future when the circumstances will be different than those which we are now facing. It takes a long time to build the instrument of modern war. It takes 4 to 7 years to bring a plane from the drawing board to production. We did not use a single plane in World War II which had not been designed before we entered the war.

It seems to me that this principle of future planning is of the highest importance in the building of our Military Establishment.

It is obviously impossible for me to give you a concrete estimate of the power we need in this force in being. My belief though is that until the world political scene changes for the better (which we cannot assume in our present planning) the integrated strength of the west, of which the United States is the keystone, will have to be increased. The curve of military power is rising everywhere, with our enemies as well as with our friends and ourselves. We must keep the power of the United States and the Atlantic community in peace with this rising power of our enemies. We cannot keep our striking power and that of our allies of the west on the same level as it is now while the striking power of our enemies goes up. For—and let us understand this very clearly—the very essence of this policy of peace through strength is that the strength shall be adequate. There must be no compromising with this principle. To fail to have on hand and to build for a striking force which will command real respect is to play with the safety of the country and of the free world. And I stress, because of its importance, that in the building of this striking power the emphasis must be on the force in being ready for the moment a war would start—not the force which would come into action only later as part of a long war. We must not lose sight of our primary purpose—the prevention of war. And next I emphasize that the force destined for counterattack, having a striking power unquestionably sufficient for its purpose, is an indispensable element of all defense and of our hope for averting war.

I cannot leave this point without again emphasizing that it is regrettable that our western society, whose purpose is peace and whose wish is only for a peaceful world, should be compelled to devote so much of its effort to a military force. But this is, as I have said, indispensable, if we are not to succumb through weakness. And if we show the necessary determination and sacrifice during the years to come we can hope for the day when all this military force will become unnecessary and when the west can devote itself to its true inner purpose.

It is fairly easy to state the policies we should follow. But we will be doing ourselves a disservice if we do not face the fact that it will require the greatest determination and wisdom of which this country is capable to do these things.

The difficulty comes mainly from the need to do things in ways which cannot look to the past for guidance. The French historian-philosopher Taine has said that the institutions and policies of a country are not built by the free will of the people but are dictated by the character and history of the nation. This notion may be too deterministic for our American way of thinking—for Americans do not easily accept the proposition that things which ought to be done cannot be done. But we would deceive ourselves if we did not recognize that the task before us requires us to change ways of doing things which are deeply imbedded in the past and to cut new paths through an uncharted and uninviting terrain.

In the acceleration of history in which we now are the past has lost much of its adequacy as a guide. What has happened is, it seems to me, that while science has been running ahead at a fantastic rate the institutions and policies by which man governs himself have moved ahead only slightly. For this reason the usually wise way of getting guidance from the past and of adapting it to the slightly differing conditions of the present will not work today. We can look to the past, to be sure, for some help, but the conditions of today are and the conditions of tomorrow will be so radically different from those of yesterday that it may usually be said, at least in matters political and military, that to rely in major part on the ways of the past is almost sure to produce disaster. And if there is any truth in that statement of Taine of which I spoke a moment ago—that the past and not man's reason is the controlling thing in shaping his political decisions—we must view with concern the novelty and seriousness of the problems which lie ahead.

There is another difficulty which is deeply rooted in our traditions and in the spiritual nature of our Nation—the apparent inconsistency of asking a free people devoted to peace, with no wish toward their neighbors but good ones, to keep in being when no shooting is going on, a military force so strong that it can defend itself against a nation led by an aggressor authoritarian government.

Already this conflict of ideas—the need to prepare for war when in fact we want peace—is confusing some of our citizens. The power of a modern military establishment is appalling; and to give us further pause, the role of defense now consists in major part of counter attack.

Some thoughtful citizens have felt that the violence of the defensive counter stroke which we have been building raises deep questions of morality—of the rightness of the United States in preparing for an act of such destructive power.

This is a point of view which is not lightly to be put aside. Any challenge to the morality of United States policy must give concern to anyone who has even the smallest relation to that policy. Therefore when I

say that my own conviction on this subject is definite, I do not mean that I have reached it lightly.

I do not believe that the moral position of the United States will be judged by the kind of weapons we have in our arsenal or the kind of strategy and tactics we use. I believe that our moral position will be judged by the vigor with which we push our efforts to achieve peace.

There is no merit, moral or otherwise, in having a defense force which is no good. Nor is there the slightest sense in trying to make of war a bearable business. But if anyone can say truthfully that we are not doing all we should to eliminate war as a human institution then we would have cause to worry about our moral position.

I have little sympathy with the idea that we should not be ready to defend ourselves if despite all our efforts to achieve peace we are attacked. Indeed I conceive the morality to be the opposite. I believe we would be faithless to our duty, to ourselves, and to our friends and allies of the free world if we were not to have a military force which would make it very plain to all that it would be a mistake to break the peace.

I have emphasized the difficulties of the tasks ahead. But I would give a misleading impression if I did not close with a statement of faith that these tasks can be accomplished.

Already the United States has made a 180-degree turn from its old isolationism. And I think it is fitting to point out that we have done remarkably well with the new responsibilities for leadership which have been forced upon us. There is no reason why we cannot go on at the same or even a faster pace to break through the obstacles between us and our goal. We have—let us not forget—one great thing on our side—the wish of the ordinary man everywhere for peace. Surely it is not too much to hope that some day this deep urge of humanity will win through. No government, however dictatorial its rule, can forever block the will of the people in their urge to stop the evil of war. The goal is there before us. It is a goal that can be reached.

At another crisis in the history of our country, a great, perhaps the greatest, Philadelphian saw the sun of hope and was proved everlastingly right. As the draft Constitution was being signed in Philadelphia in 1787 Benjamin Franklin, looking toward the presiding officers' chair at the back of which a rising sun happened to be painted, observed to a few members near him that painters had found it difficult to distinguish in their art a rising from a setting sun. "I have," said he, "often and often in the course of the session, and the vicissitudes of my hopes and fears as to its issue, looked at that behind the president without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting, but now at length I have the happiness to know that it is a rising and not a setting sun."

Platform Adopted by the Ninth Biennial State Convention of the Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York State, June 17, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted me by unanimous consent of the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following platform adopted by the ninth biennial State convention of the Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York State, June 17, 1950:

The election campaign of 1950 brings the people of our State and Nation to a major crossroads. Twenty years ago the first Democratic Congress since the administration of Woodrow Wilson was swept into office by a people sickened by the callous selfishness and disinterest exhibited by the Republican Party in the administrations of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. Heartened by the renewed interest taken in the problems of the people by a Democratic Congress, the American people in 1932 swept the New Deal of Franklin D. Roosevelt into public office and responsibility. In the five administrations of Government by the Democratic Party under President Roosevelt and President Truman, our party has justified the faith and trust of our citizenry, and has led the fight to make secure and real the democratic ideal at home and abroad.

This November the Republican Party, in the last throes of survival, is making a desperate effort to snatch the control of the Congress from the American people. In the coming campaign, our citizens must determine whether they will permit the great progressive gains of the last 20 years to be overridden and undermined by the party of privilege. We feel confident that the people of the State of New York, mindful of the record of accomplishment in the public interest of the Democratic Party, will, once and for all, reject the party of Hoover and Dewey, and will, by a decisive vote, return HERBERT H. LEHMAN to the United States Senate and a great Democratic delegation to the House of Representatives.

During the many administrations of Alfred E. Smith, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Herbert H. Lehman at Albany, our people were proud of New York State's position of leadership among all the commonwealth of our great Republic. Albany was the laboratory where the great works of the New Deal and the Fair Deal were cast and molded. In the past 8 years, our State has yielded its position of eminence and, under the backward administration of a Republican governor and a Republican legislature, has degenerated to the point where the political candidacy of a perennial candidate for President has been substituted for the public interest as the concern of the oppressive rulers at Albany.

In the coming campaign our citizens will have the opportunity of substituting a vigorous and alert Democratic governor and legislature at Albany for do-nothing Deweyism. We have no doubt that when the people speak we will find that they have done this by a resounding majority.

Our party has never been coy or hesitant in letting the people know where it stands in the vital issues that concern them. In that tradition, we of the Affiliated Young Democrats have always sought to state plainly and in no uncertain words our position and that of our candidates. Once more we do so.

NATIONAL ISSUES

1. The United Nations: We affirm our full support of the United Nations, and advocate a policy of strengthening it so that it may make and enforce wise judgments, and keep the peace of the world. We call upon our representatives in our national, State, and local governments to give it full support so that it may lead the world to lasting peace and international democracy.

So that the United Nations may become an effective instrument for lasting peace, we urge that the veto be abolished, and that it be equipped with an international police force.

We urge that all nations be admitted to membership in the United Nations so that its powers may be effective. To that end, we urge the immediate admission of countries such as the Irish Free State and Portugal.

2. National defense: We have no illusions that until the United Nations has an effective international police force to maintain peace, the United States must possess the most effective and complete armed forces in a state of readiness. To this end, we advocate the maintenance of our Navy, Air Force, and Army on a basis of readiness for action. We cannot economize with national defense. We advocate the construction of large, modern carriers for our Navy, and the mobilization of adequate and modern air groups for our Air Force. We strongly support the maintenance of six active divisions of the Marine Corps, so that we may meet all emergencies.

3. Atomic energy: Our Nation should possess the most advanced and the most effective weapons. To that end, we advocate the development and stockpiling of A-bombs, H-bombs, and such more advanced weapons as may be developed. We believe that the peaceful application of atomic energy should be of immense benefit to all the peoples of the world, and we advocate that the program of the Atomic Energy Commission in this direction be continued. We, once again, subscribe to the Baruch plan for international control of atomic energy.

4. Foreign aid: We are well aware that the battle for the democratic way of life cannot be waged by Americans alone, but that we must have the support of the free peoples of Asia, Europe, and Africa. To that end we advocate the renewal of the Marshall plan and the President's point 4 program.

5. Colonialism: We continue to believe that the principles of the Atlantic Charter should be made living reality for all the peoples of the world, and that all peoples should determine their own destiny and have self-government. We urge that our Government do all that it can to accomplish this. We advocate immediate statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, and American citizenship and organic acts for Guam and American Samoa. We urge that the right to vote be restored to residents of the District of Columbia.

6. Communism: We abhor communism in all its manifestations, and we commend our national administration for seeking to root it out. We are opposed to the employment of any Communist in our national, State, or local governments. The danger to our democratic way of life does not come only from abroad. There are some misguided citizens and aliens who call themselves Americans who have lent themselves and their energies to the foreign doctrine and the foreign aggressors who seek to stamp out democracy in this country. We cannot afford to have an American Gottwald or an American Quisling, and we must take all steps that our Constitution permits to see that we do not have one. At the same time, we must apply traditional American methods in ferreting out and removing such hostile persons. It is clear to us that the members, both open and concealed, of the American Communist Party are, in fact, the willing agents of a foreign government committee to interference in our domestic affairs. We must deal with them as such.

7. FBI: We applaud the Federal Bureau of Investigation for its heroic accomplishments and urge that it receive all appropriations necessary to perform its duties.

8. The CVA and the MVA: We advocate the establishment of a Columbia River Authority and a Missouri River Authority so that, like the TVA, they may conserve our natural resources and help our people to a better and more secure life.

9. Labor: We advocate the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, and the enactment of sound labor legislation discriminating against neither management nor labor, but preserving the principles of democracy and equity. We urge strengthening the Department of Labor and returning to it many of

the functions of which it has been stripped.

10. FEPC: We oppose discrimination and segregation in all its forms. We advocate the enactment immediately of the Federal FEPC law, and of an antipoll tax law.

11. Federal health insurance: We are aware that no American family with an income of $5,000 can afford serious illness. We strongly believe that the ability of any person to have adequate medical care should not be dependent on his financial condition. We urge the enactment of a Federal health insurance law, which will protect all of our citizens against the ravages of serious illness, and which will assist States and local communities in providing adequate hospitals and medical facilities.

12. St. Lawrence seaway: We again endorse the program for a St. Lawrence seaway, and full development by New York State of the water power facilities thereby provided. Too long has this important project been neglected. In connection therewith, we favor the preservation and development of the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls.

13. Court martial reform: We support legislation for a complete reform of the courts-martial system of the Armed Forces, and we urge the enactment of laws that will bring real justice into military and naval justice.

14. SEC: We support the Frear bill for the extension of the Securities Act and the Securities Exchange Act to corporations having assets of $3,000,000 and more than 300 stockholders.

15. Social security: We continue to support extension of the social security program to provide full protection against old age, illness, and economic misfortune for everyone with benefits adequate to provide at least a minimum of health and decency, regardless of earnings. We advocate extension of the Social Security Act to segments of the population now barred from it.

16. Stockpiling: We approve the program of stockpiling critical and strategic materials, so that in time of emergency our Nation will be adequately prepared.

17. Veterans: We oppose the efforts being made to cut down the hospital benefits available to our veterans. The soldier and the sailor who responded to his country's call should not, when sick and disabled, lack necessary medical care and attention.

18. Housing: We again advocate prompt and thorough action by both Federal and State Governments in promoting public housing programs so that all citizens in need of homes will be able to procure them.

19. Strengthening of the antitrust laws: Strengthening and modernization of the antitrust laws are long overdue, and we urge the immediate enactment of such legislation.

20. Voting: We believe that the right to vote should be extended to all citizens 18 years of age and over. The same qualifications should govern the obligation to fight and the right to participate in the selection of government.

STATE ISSUES

1. Education: We favor immediate action to increase State appropriations for higher education until they meet the needs of the citizenry of the State and until they compare favorably with the per capita appropriation of other States. We favor increases in teachers' salaries to compensate for the increased cost of living.

2. State finances: We favor the utilization of any surplus funds, built up largely by tax revenues from the larger cities of the State, to meet the increasing financial burdens of those cities in this period of inflation. The State must make an equitable division of State revenues with municipal governments, and admit the cities of the State to the legitimate share of the taxes paid by them.

3. Motor vehicles: We are opposed to the use of revenues obtained from gasoline taxes and automobile license fees for purposes other than the development and maintenance of an adequate system of highways. We urge that the discriminatory gasoline tax in favor of nonautomotive users of gasoline be abolished, and that industrial users of gasoline be subjected to the same tax as motorists. We oppose a use tax on automobiles.

4. Legislative representation: We demand an end to the gerrymandering which the Republican Party has foisted on the State, and to the intolerable situation under which the people of the city of New York, constituting more than a majority of the State, and providing more than two-thirds of the State's income, are denied equal representation in either house of the legislature.

5. Recognition of women voters: Although they constitute more than half of the electorate, there are few major State, city, or county offices which women hold. We advocate the nomination, election, and appointment of qualified women to a fair share of city, State and county offices, and we call upon Democratic leaders in this State to give such representation to women on the ticket to be presented this fall.

6. Garage rents: Residents of the city of New York have had imposed upon them a 315 percent increase in garage rentals. We call for the elimination of this abuse by the extension of rent control to garage rentals.

7. Extension of unemployment insurance benefits: The benefits of unemployment insurance should be extended to classes now excluded from them.

8. Divorce: We have repeatedly called public attention to the scandalous and shocking conditions existing in our divorce courts. A commission should be created by the legislature to make a study of all our laws relating to marriage, the family, and divorce so that we may have constructive laws permitting the salvage of broken marriages, so that fraud and perjury may be driven from the courts, and so that the public morals and confidence in the courts may be strengthened. On this commission should be representatives of all faiths, professions, and groups concerned with marriage and the family.

9. Reorganization of the courts: Our present court structure is archaic and inefficient. Some courts are overloaded with work and others have little to do. Calendars are crowded and the administration of justice is inefficient. Proposals and studies have been made to reorganize our court structure to eliminate its inadequacies. The legislature should proceed with the enactment of a court reorganization bill promptly.

10. Narcotics: We favor the enactment of a law providing for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts by State agencies, and the taking of steps by the State to eliminate the traffic in narcotics.

11. "Little Hoover Commission": Enactment of bill for "Little Hoover Commission" to be patented after the Federal Hoover Committee, which is needed in the State of New York.

12. Permanent personal registration: It is urgent that the State legislature pass a bill for permanent personal registration in New York State.

Radio Address of Hon. Helen Gahagan Douglas, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to include the following excerpts from a radio broadcast I made from Los Angeles, Calif., Sunday, May 14, 1950:

I stand squarely on the platform of the Democratic Party—and I am proud of it.

I not only believe in that platform, I helped build it. For 10 years, I have served in the high councils of the Democratic Party. I have been a member of the Democratic National Committee. I have served as vice-chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee of California. For 6 years, as a Democratic Representative from California, I have been working to write into law the the platform I have helped fashion.

I believe that we can build a lasting peace and that we can promote security and freedom at home. I believe that we must promote security and freedom at home if we are to achieve a lasting peace.

I believe in our democratic Government and in the principles on which it was founded.

I believe that our political system is the most advanced form of government in the world and that together with private enterprise, it has given us more freedom and a higher standard of living than any other system in the history of the world.

I believe it is a good thing to own your own home, your own farm, your own business and to have a good job at a decent wage. I believe we must make it possible for more people to own their own homes, their own farms, and their own businesses.

Employment is now at a peak, but we still haven't enough jobs to meet the needs of a growing population. I believe we must expand the opportunities to create new jobs.

We have a political system that is immediately responsive to the needs of the people. But if every democratic effort to meet these needs and to avoid future problems is to be dubbed antidemocratic, pro-Socialist, pro-Communist, we will dig the grave of this free-enterprise system. Yes, and even of freedom itself.

If every attempt to clean out slums, to promote programs to permit families to own their homes and their own farms; if every program to stimulate free enterprise and create new jobs; if every attempt to build sound security for old age and adversity; if every attempt to develop and conserve our natural resources for all the people is to be throttled by being called socialistic and communistic, we create the frustrations that lead hopeless men to foresake democracy.

The way to keep communism out of America is to keep democracy in it.

I believe in the separation of the powers of Government—legislative, executive, and judicial—as provided in the Constitution of the United States. That is why I have voted consistently against the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Those who make the laws should not be given the power to suppress opposition to those laws or to judge citizens in trials by headlines and under cloak of congressional immunity.

These are the first steps toward totalitarianism.

We cannot protect freedom by destroying the checks and balances that have preserved it for 150 years. That will not protect freedom, nor, let me add, will it preserve the prestige of the American nation in the eyes of the world.

In totalitarian countries, men trade aspirations of freedom for promises of bread and security. In our democratic country, we can have bread and security and freedom for everyone. Not to understand this basic difference between democracy and totalitarianism is to fail to understand the threat of communism throughout the world. To ignore this difference is to abandon the greatest weapon in the hands of democracy, as we seek to stop the spread of communism.

I repeat, the way to keep communism out of America is to keep democracy in it.

I believe that the responsibilities and opportunities of full citizenship under the Constitution should be shared equally by all, without regard to race, or religion, or color of skin.

I believe that the needs of the people are paramount to those of special interests seeking privilege and profit at the expense of the general welfare.

I believe in encouraging our industrial society to its highest efficiency and at the same time preserving those essential freedoms of choice and action which our Republic was founded to protect.

I believe that government should be ever alert to the needs of the people, should seek to better their health, to extend their opportunities for education, should concern itself with the problems of old age and insecurity, should act to maintain a steadily advancing economy without valleys of depression or mountains of inflation.

I believe that government should be ready and able and willing to assist in replacing slums with decent homes for families with incomes too low to afford such homes without help.

I believe that government should protect us from want in periods of unemployment, that government can and should protect small businesses from strangulation by monopoly and coercion.

I believe that government can and should protect the rights of working men and women as full partners in our industrial society.

I believe that government can and should assure an adequate return to our family farmers for their crops, including perishable crops, and should protect consumers from inflationary prices.

I believe in the kind of government that will develop our rivers and mineral resources and will reclaim our desert lands, so that we and our children may have a more abundant life.

I believe in foreign policies which give aid and confidence to free governments and hope and leadership to people ground down by the heel of totalitarianism. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I helped write and carry through the House the Marshall plan and the military-aid program.

These are some of the things I have fought for as a Member of the House of Representatives. They are things which I will fight for in the Senate of the United States.

There are people who from lack of faith in themselves and in their fellow citizens say that this program is too much to hope for—impossible of achievement. To them I say, look back at the miracles which the people of our country have brought about. I believe that a free people that has come so far, so fast, cannot fail in its plans for a great future.

I believe in our American democracy. I have faith in the ability and strength of the people of this country to win new victories over fear and insecurity. I trust their rightness and their decency to create a nation and a world in which brotherhood is a fact and not a name.

American Policy in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] on Senate Resolution 260, at the annual convention banquet of the Department of New Jersey, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, at Asbury Park, June 17, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Commander, despite the very gracious introduction to which I have just listened attentively, wondering a bit who the next speaker would be, I feel that I need no introduction to my assembled comrades of two great wars. In this distinguished company, I feel assured that I do not speak in the voice of a stranger.

At the outset of my remarks, may I say that I am greatly honored by the privilege which is mine tonight. It is always a privilege to be with men who have faced the fire of the enemy in the cause of freedom, justice, and liberty.

It is always a privilege to be with one's fellow citizens anywhere when they join to dedicate themselves to high principles and purposes.

And as I look upon this assemblage tonight, I see a group of patriots gathered to dedicate themselves anew to a greater America—an America where all who have served in its cause whether in peace or in war, but particularly in war, stand ready to pledge themselves further to the preservation of the United States of America, its Constitution, its glorious and precious institutions, its internal security, its economy and all of the things which will give it strength and stability to guide and if necessary to enforce the way to a just and lasting peace.

The sort of peace which is so necessary if this great civilization is to survive.

There are many facets to this road to peace—some lie here on the home front, others lie in the foreign fields.

They are all important but time will not permit me tonight to discuss them each in detail.

So like the traveler who after his travels wants to know something of where he has been, I shall concentrate on one area and that, namely, Germany and our responsibilities there.

Just 5 years ago allied armies under American leadership decisively broke and defeated Hitler's terrifying military machine. We thought then we had defeated more than an armed force. We thought we also had defeated a monstrous way of life and our one high resolve was that this was to be a military victory which would prove to be infinitely more than a military victory.

The triumph of our arms signalized an end to Hitlerism, to racism, and to the sort of ruthless national ambition which can never be satiated.

Five years ago we did not have to be reminded, as indeed I do not have to remind those of you who are active in the Jewish War Veterans, of the inescapably damning consequences of apathy and indifference to hyperaggressive German nationalism. We here tonight know the monumental tasks of rehabilitation and salvage occasioned by the ravages of nazism.

For the past half decade we necessarily have been absorbed in repairing ruins, in shifting and resettling displaced populations, in rebuilding bodies and in restoring hope.

Our efforts to create new and more fruitful modes of living have had to be delayed, put off while we reconstruct what the Nazis caused to be torn down.

Immediately following the war we announced denazification, demilitarization, decartelization, and most importantly, democratization as our mineral goals in Germany.

I certainly have no quarrel with those aims; indeed, I laud them today as I praised them at the time.

We realized that the conditioning of a people to democracy—a people who had previously been infected with a ravaging totalitarian madness—could not proceed until we had extirpated the last vestiges of those influences which deadened its moral sense and destroyed even the faintest glamor of humanity and civilization.

At that time we did more than talk, for we promulgated a denazification statute and we instituted a series of denazification tribunals. We went further. For a while we made it impossible for Nazis or their associates, big and little, to qualify for high government posts. We ostensibly embarked upon a campaign to rid the German school system of every remnant and relic of Hitlerism.

According to occupation officials, we were devising educational techniques for instilling in the German people, and especially in the youth, a devotion to democratic practices and a dedication to democratic ideals.

From all that I have said thus far it is evident that we came to Germany with the avowed intention to "educate for democracy."

It would, of course, be unrealistic to expect any nation with such an authoritarian background to become democratic in the American sense of the word in the short period of 5 years.

Democracy, concededly, is not something which can be stuffed willy-nilly into the mind, but our Government has had every chance, at the very least, to tell the Germans the historical facts about Germany's policy in the period intervening between World War I and World War II and to explain from a democratic point of view the relationship which must exist between the individual and the state if free government is to exist.

Apparently we have completely failed to do this. The German people today lack understanding and perspective. They are apparently as ignorant of free government, as politically unsophisticated and as historically naive as if they had been tutored within the rigid and narrowly drawn lines of Nazi doctrine. And, indeed, why should they not be?

For the fact is that they have been instructed by many of the same teachers who were engaged in the schools and academies and universities during the Hitler regime.

According to the statement of the director of the educational and cultural relationship division of our own military government, the appointment of former Nazis to the teaching staffs of schools and universities is still taking place at a steady and unfailing rate, with 2 percent to 4 percent of the former Nazis being returned each and every month. Therefore, it would seem evident that we have failed to provide adequate educational materials or a properly oriented school system.

As a result, German youth has no regard and no use for democracy and remains violently nationalistic and anti-Semitic. Their heroes are still von Treitschke, von Bernhardi, von Hindenburg, Ludendorff and others associated with pan-Germanism and ideas of the Herrenvolk.

Teachers who deviate from the Nazi pattern are repudiated as traitors by German young folks who still admire the disciplined regimentation of the Nazis and condone and approve as necessary the atrocities and excesses of that regime.

I hesitate even to discuss decartelization. It has become a term more appropriate to jest than to sober discussion.

The scuttling of decartelization rather than the cartels, the sudden reliance on trusts by some of our occupation authorities, have left Germany in the viselike grip of the industrial combines which for generations

have directed its fortunes and destiny. Our decartelization effort has been discredited among Germans as well as among ourselves.

The roster of those who have been returned to important administrative and executive positions in the industrial and commercial life of Germany reads like a listing of Hitler's industrial advisers and financial wizards.

The top men responsible for Germany's economic life, men like Abs, Maltzan, Dinkelbach, are mainly former Nazis. It is as if we had deliberately sought out the least reliable Germans for the most responsible positions.

All this information, however, is poorly documented and there has been no real study into this problem by impartial observers and our public opinion has been molded by reports from those who themselves have taken leading roles in our military and civilian occupation efforts.

In an attempt to get the true facts and to gain a real insight into this subject, seven of my colleagues in the Senate and I introduced Senate Resolution 260, calling for the President to appoint at the earliest possible opportunity a bipartisan commission to inquire into the breakdown of American foreign policy in Germany.

The State Department has not yet determined its position on Senate Resolution 260, and while I have received many letters from Americans in Germany commending me for joining in this effort, the High Commissioner himself has indicated that there is no need for such an investigation and states that his staff has a firm grasp of the situation and is taking all the necessary steps to preserve the fruits of our hard-earned military victory.

But, on this issue, of all issues, it is imperative that the American people be appraised of the facts. Actual operation of the occupation program has been concealed behind a curtain of official reports and memoranda, of "authoritative" opinion and uncontradicted rumor, of intermittent official statement and sporadic comment.

Perhaps intelligent efforts are being made to redirect and reorient the German people from an attitude of self-aggrandizement and self-pity to an understanding of democracy and a willingness to cooperate. Perhaps the German economy is being democratized and combines and cartels eliminated as effective agents in the German industrial scene. Perhaps plans for the remilitarization of Germany are shadowy myths, misleading and untrue.

Perhaps efforts are being made to dispel anti-Semitism, to control and restrict the vile and anti-Semitic canards of the extremist press, to search out and punish those who have desecrated Jewish cemeteries, who have mobbed and beaten Jewish DP's and who have vandalized Jewish businesses.

Perhaps there is a well-integrated plan for obtaining the cooperation and active participation in internal German affairs of forward-looking and democratic elements within Germany, in whom alone resides her potential as a peaceful and productive state.

Perhaps as a consequence of these efforts Germany is well on the way to stability, to democracy, and to restoration in the family of nations.

But if this is the case, then surely there is nothing to withhold and the American people are entitled to see what is being done under the sponsorship of their Government, in reconstructing an area which classically has been a source of demagogic and militaristic infection.

Our concern in this issue is understandable, and our apprehensions reasonable.

Therefore, if the occupation program has failed in its mission, lost its energy and purpose, if it lacks plan and direction, then certainly it is our affirmatve obligation to assess it accurately, to determine its accomplishments and shortcomings so that we might revise our procedures and techniques, better to achieve our aims, better to attain a stable and productive Germany which can be a source of security, rather than a menace, in this chaotic world. The American people should demand nothing less than this.

Many of us have become increasingly troubled by the apparent willingness, even eagerness, of some members of the occupation hierarchy to woo the vanquished, to curry favor with the most extreme rightist elements of postwar Germany, who are virtually indistinguishable save in the color of their shirts from the Hitler Nazis, in the vain and wistful hope that in the eventuality that the cold war erupts into world war III, these groups and individuals can be persuaded to cast in their lot with us, to take our side and add strength to our hand.

To accomplish this end, occupation authorities have reportedly tolerated and sometimes endorsed fantastic plans for restoring German military might and for reinforcing the position of the new "strong men" in German industry and German politics.

These men are, of course, past masters at this game.

It took us long enough to learn that we couldn't do business with Hitler.

Must we start over from the beginning to learn that we can't do business with the motley crew which spawned Hitler and was spawned by him, with his henchmen and sidekicks?

When will we understand that extremists of the right, like extremists of the left, are treacherous, disloyal, and wholly self-seeking?

When will we learn that they will use us and exploit our friendship when it serves their ends and repudiate us completely when our paths are antipathetic?

The dangers of an eventual union between a Germany dominated by such elements and the Soviet Union must not be minimized.

Such a development has historical precedent in the 1939 Hitler-Stalin pact and the logic of the present situation now rising to haunt us is that the same rapprochement can happen again.

As a democratic nation, we must look for support from democratic peoples.

The proper, the only way to enlist German assistance against any aggressor is not by encouraging the ambitious and authoritarian right, but by assisting and strengthening a democratic middleground in Germany, by building a democratic association of small-business men and workers, and by returning to local office persons of unquestioned democratic affiliation and aspiration.

The American people have grown uneasy over the conduct of the German occupation and insist upon clarification by learning the facts.

At the end of the road of any failure in this field stands the apparition of a renazified Germany.

It is later than we think, for Germany is the heart of the European problem and today both the neo-Nazis in the West and the Soviet controlled "people's army" in the East are in arduous training for "Der Tag."

In place of the program that began by sincerely trying to wipe out nazism and bringing democracy to Germany, there is now a resurgence of German nationalism which is but a thinly disguised nazism.

We must find out why this has been allowed to happen, and how it happened. Now more than ever there is urgent need for full study and investigation of our occupation policies and practices. Until this is done, and unless this is done, the prospect in regard to Germany, for the United States and the Western democracies, is grave and frightening. We must draw new occupational plans. We must draw better plans. What we cannot do is fail—in this or any other major national or international venture.

Presentment of Conclusions of Grand Jury Investigation Into Espionage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Whereas the undersigned constitute all the members of the December 16, 1948, special Federal grand jury of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, impaneled to inquire into espionage and subversive activities; and

Whereas this Federal grand jury has heard a volume of testimony concerning the activities of many men and women, associated with or having knowledge of a continuing conspiracy against the security of the Nation; and

Whereas this testimony and evidence have led this special Federal grand jury to certain conclusions it deems proper and important to be brought to the attention of the executive, legislative, and judicial departments of the United States Government for such action as may be necessary or appropriate, the undersigned members of this grand jury respectfully show and allege as follows:

1. The safety of this Nation and its institutions is being jeopardized because:

(a) The underground activities of Communists in this country, organized in a continuing conspiracy and using effective techniques to extend their influence beyond their ranks, have greatly increased during the last 5 years; and because

(b) The Nation, confronted with an entirely new situation in its history—a situation in which for the first time the loyalty of certain of its own citizens has been diverted to a foreign ideology—has not as yet devised adequate means to combat this menace; and because

(c) There has been and is now a concerted attempt on the part of many, both Communists and disloyal Americans aided by "fellow travelers," to conceal the truth from the American people.

This conviction was arrived at by the grand jury after an experience in which it came face to face with the evil that is communism. Its substitution of the false for the true as the standard of judgment has introduced into human affairs a new attack on man's integrity.

The American people cannot afford to tolerate evil of this character, particularly in their Government, nor, on the other hand, can they deny their fellow citizens those civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution. But among such civil rights is not the right to be employed by the Government and the people are correct in demanding that all entrusted with the welfare and safety of the country be above suspicion.

2. This grand jury in a presentment submitted on April 26, 1949, warned the American people against the prevelance and increase of espionage activities. It specifically stated that existing laws applicable to espionage are "inadequate and unrealistic." It stated that these laws were loosely drawn. The grand jury now repeats that such laws are riddled with loopholes. Previously it recommended that new legislation or the amendment of existing legislation be enacted promptly. The grand jury now repeats that

recommendation. Such legislation—the internal security bill which embodies satisfactory provisions—has already been passed by the House of Representatives and is now in Senate committee. It should be speedily brought to passage and made the law of the land.

3. The grand jury, in the same presentment, stated: "Having seen at first hand the difficulties in arriving at the truth concerning espionage violations, when witnesses have been alerted by publicized charges and countercharges, the grand jury recommends that all investigating bodies conduct their inquiries into espionage in secret." It repeats that recommendation. The latter does not imply that when such investigations are completed secrecy should thereafter prevail. It does imply that the half-public, half-secret operation of any investigatory agency is both confusing and harmful; and that no permanent good can be served unless a conclusive report is presented to the American people which will be convincing in its thoroughness and its honesty.

4. The grand jury system was anciently established as the representative of the people, to insure law and order and to protect the people against injustice, maladministration, and lawlessness. The grand jury is vested with the broadest and most unlimited powers, and has no legal responsibility for its decisions, unless corruptly made, to any public officer or to any branch of the Government. It not only can but it must conduct inquiry into violations of the Federal laws on its own initiative and, acting alone, it has the power of subpena. Where it knows evidence exists which has not been presented to it, its duty is to order such evidence produced.

The very existence of this grand-jury system is a bulwark of independence. The grand jury's purpose is at once to ferret out the guilty and to protect the innocent whether the former is shielded by powerful influences or the latter is unjustly accused.

This grand jury has been surprised at the prevalent ignorance of its functions, an ignorance that apparently extends into areas where the grand jury's cooperation should be sought. The individual citizen himself in or out of the Government not only has the right but the obligation, when he has evidence of the law's violation, to present this evidence to a grand jury.

By law, this grand jury expires on June 15, 1950, after serving its maximum legal term of 18 months. It believes this time limitation is wisely established for no group should be longer entrusted with such powers. But the experience and insight which it has acquired have been valuable adjuncts in its deliberations and in the establishment of a record available to any successor grand jury. From such experience, this grand jury is convinced that a similar body should promptly be impaneled so that it can immediaely equip itself with the necessary knowledge to assay all evidence of espionage and subversive activities presented to it.

This grand jury, therefore, strongly recommends the impaneling of a new grand jury in the Southern District of New York to carry on both the work which now remains uncompleted and that which will arise in the future.

5. In its 18 months, this grand jury has had an intimate insight into the operation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and has come to have the highest regard for the efficiency, the thoroughness and the honesty with which its affairs are conducted under J. Edgar Hoover. In the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Nation has one of its most potent agencies to protect its security. The present Congress should be commended for its recent action in strengthening the hand of Mr. Hoover in this vital work.

6. The grand jury is not convinced that the loyalty boards established by the Government are sufficient protection against the infiltration of Communists or of the Communist-inspired into governmental departments.

It is further convinced that the security of the country is not adequately protected if a loyalty board limits its inquiry involving governmental employees to a determination of the individual's loyalty. Cornelius Vanderbilt Whitney, on his retirement as Secretary of Commerce, called public attention to this inadequacy and stated that, since all governmental departments "today deal with secret information," each and all their employees should be good security risks, and hence should be screened by standards that include "the company they keep and stability of character."

The grand jury endorses Mr. Whitney's position and recommends that Congress study means to insure against the Government's employment of any individual who is "a poor security risk"; and meanwhile repeats that no citizen is invested with the right to work in Government.

7. This grand jury has been greatly disturbed by certain court procedures in recent trials concerning communism and espionage. The maneuverings of defense lawyers have not only violated the decorum of judicial procedure but have furthered the Communist objective of establishing anarchy by undermining respect for the courts. Yet in pre-trial and trial hearings of espionage cases, such attorneys under existing law are often in a position to force on the prosecution the dilemma of choice between not proceeding or proceeding at the expense of revealing information injurious to national security. This choice is particularly grave when the Nation is at war.

The grand jury recommends to the proper authorities that a competent and exhaustive study be made by legal experts to determine if this situation cannot at least be mitigated.

8. The grand jury has been shocked at the lack of cooperation shown by certain lawyers who have appeared before it as witnesses, who refused to answer questions on the ground of self-incrimination, and who disregarded their obligation as citizens to further the ends of justice. If such a position is taken by any governmental employee, he or she would be, ipso facto, dismissed. Lawyers are officers of the court.

The grand jury, repeating its recommendation of April 1949, urges the judiciary and bar associations to take measures to disbar lawyers who refuse to answer questions on grounds of self-incrimination before judicial bodies, grand juries or governmental boards of inquiry.

9. The grand jury, acting on its own authority, instituted an investigation into the Amerasia case. In the time legally available to it, it has not been able to conduct as exhaustive an inquiry as it would desire. It has examined a number of witnesses, always with counsel of the Department of Justice present.

The grand jury, sworn to secrecy, may speak to the American public either through an indictment or a presentment and hence now advances the following conclusions:

(a) The Office of Strategic Services, which precipitated the Amerasia case, acted in a responsible manner.

(b) The officials immediately concerned between that time and the arrests of the six accused, acted in a responsible manner. The Federal Bureau of Investigation properly performed its duty, a duty which was not only conditioned on bringing criminals to justice, but on the equally important considerations of thwarting further crime and protecting national security.

(c) The grand jury has found no evidence that any official acted improperly in regard to the delay in the arrests.

(d) The grand jury has also found no evidence to indicate that the Department of Justice was remiss in its prosecution of the case. If laws governing espionage had been different, the grand jury believes that the prosecution procedure would have been entirely different. Other telling factors involved certain legal procedures which, if followed, might have revealed to the enemy information that it was essential should be withheld. The determination of many of the legal issues involved, in particular the admissibility of evidence, would require a long and intensive study.

(e) The number of Government documents seized is not important, save as a demonstration that precautions against their theft from governmental departments were entirely inadequate. It is important, however, that a certain number of these documents pertained to national defense and that others of a different nature, in the hands of the enemy, would have aided it.

(f) The grand jury believes that the American people have been poorly served by the compounding of confusion through disclosures of half-truths, contradictory statements, and so forth, in this and similar cases.

(g) The grand jury believes that, at this juncture, it would be salutary if the Department of Justice would issue a public statement of the details of its handling of the case beginning with the time of the arrests, including a complete list and description of all documents or papers found in the office of Amerasia by any Government agent or in the possession of those arrested; and the reasons for the various steps taken by the prosecution.

10. As Special Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, Thomas J. Donegan has served this grand jury, as he did its predecessor, from the day of its impaneling to that of its discharge. It has always been cognizant of his high purpose, his unquestioned probity, his unremitting zeal, and his devotion to duty. His knowledge of communism and the laws relating to the prosecution of espionage and subversion is expert. The country owes him a debt of gratitude.

11. Now, therefore, the grand jury respectfully petitions the court to accept this presentment and order it filed, authorizing the foreman and the secretary of the grand jury to send copies of it to the Members of Congress and to the proper officers of the executive department of the Government, and to permit such other use as may properly be made of this document.

Dated, New York, N. Y., June 15, 1950.

John Gilland Brunini, Foreman; John G. Kilbreth, Assistant Foreman; Hugh V. Doran, Secretary; Robert L. Barrows; Joseph P. Christianson; Mrs. Evelyn Zorn Dingwall; James Sumner Draper; Raymond C. Fowler; Robert Frese; G. Leonard Gold; Henry E. Grant; Harold C. Hahn; Richard Brown Jones; Murray Kanner; Francis Keally; Samuel B. Leight; Sidney Leshen; Herman E. Nathan; Bernhard K. Schaefer; Harry Scherman; John Schreiber; Siegfried Stern; Wheeler Williams.

How To Get From Behind the Eight-Ball—A Guided Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address given by Hon. HUGH D.

SCOTT, JR., Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, at the University of Iowa, May 23, 1950, on the program of the Institute of Public Affairs of the University:

The call of the revivalist—"What shall we do to be saved?"—suggests a question the Republican Party should be asking of itself: "What shall we be to be saved?" To be saved for its true purpose in the body politic a Republican program in this dynamic era must comprise a combination of social and economic principles. These principles are found in an examination of what Republicans have done and of what modern conditions require Republicans to do, in keeping with its function as the party advocating individual responsibility within the framework of a government of limited powers.

I am fed up to the point of nausea with the frothing cliches of Republican antiques, antediluvian draw-backs, who foam with gripes against "me-tooism" and think it adequate merely to aver that they are for liberty and against socialism. So are we all, but these fuddy-duddies operate upon the principle that enough of such drips will wear away the incumbent stones.

Talk of "me-tooism" without more, without some clear unequivocal undertaking to do something about the Nation's insistent needs, simply misses the mark, makes a target rather than a marksman of the speaker, immobilizes thought and action. The answer lies rather in the courageous presentation of constructive alternatives. In such fashion may opposition to unwise proposals be intelligently countered.

Let's illustrate how to oppose intelligently: We have to prove that our program is better than their program. Our way is better than the Truman way. For example: Your own doctor is better for you than Government doctors. We don't want our pills from the politicians but we recognize that the health of our people can and must be improved. Therefore we favor the Kansas plan, where the community helps to set the young doctor up in practice, the medical schools bring refresher courses to his door. We favor the Alameda, Calif., plan, where the medical association guarantees that no person shall go without good medical care regardless of his means. We favor the extension of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield services, the expansion of the United States Public Health Service to remote and inaccessible areas, the expansion of private and public research into the causes of disease, Federal aid in hospital construction, the expansion of medical and nursing educational facilities. These are good and desirable Republican objectives and they are the answer to Truman's quackery about compulsory state medicine.

Let us think of Government as a great wheel, moved by the common force behind it of millions of people. The purpose of those of varying viewpoints is to change the direction of the wheel to paths right or left, but never to retard the forward motion of government itself. To turn the wheel backward might well crush to the ground many of those massed behind the wheel. Our job as advocates of Republican directions must be to convince people that motion in our direction is to their interest, that it is forward motion and that it moves toward the protection of the public welfare. This is far different from the squirrel-cage philosophy of the lock-step state.

Mr. Lincoln put his concept of government in phrases which we accept as Republican doctrine. The objects of such a government, he said, were:

"First. To elevate the conditions of men;

"Second. To lift artificial weights from their shoulders;

"Third. To clear the paths for laudable pursuits for all; and

"Fourth. To afford all an unfettered start and a fair chance in the race of life."

What more can man ask of government?

In a minute I'm going to talk about that Republican program. But let's mention first just a few of the things which are wrong with Mr. Truman's concept of Government. He's just come back from a nonpolitical tour, in the course of which the beer trucks in Chicago were whacked with a levy of $45 apiece to help pay for the Jefferson jubilee whingding in machine-dominated Chicago. Mr. Jefferson must be turning in his grave—Whirling Tom, they probably call him now among the eternal shades. Everybody who was maced for a donation to pay for that incredible exhibition of a political machine skylarking at the taxpayers' expense, was promised an equivalent tax exemption. These special privilege exemptions of course will be made up from the general tax revenues, which High Tax Harry refuses to reduce.

The President on his $250,000 tour glibly recalled the Teapot Dome scandal of the 1920's. For those of you who came in late, this involved wrongdoing on the part of Republican office holders. How did Republicans handle this corruption in their midst? A Republican President fired his Attorney General and released all the files to the Senate. Republican Senators vested Democratic Senator Walsh with investigative powers to assure complete public confidence in a fair and open inquiry. Republicans recognized the wrong, said so, and took action to punish the wrongdoers. Has President Truman fired any corrupt public office holders? What is his record on the release of files to Congress? Can you imagine Truman taking the investigation of Communists in Government away from Senator TYDINGS, son-in-law of Joe (Mission to Moscow) Davies, and turning it over to Senator TAFT or Senator FERGUSON? Don't be naive.

For all of the concern shown by this administration, the State Department and other Government agencies would have continued indefinitely to be a safe haven for the Quislings, the quibblers and the queers. They flourish in the fetid climate of this corrupt and complacent double deal.

So far as awareness of danger to the national security is concerned, Speaker RAYBURN was right when he said recently, "It is unfair for a man in a responsible position to make irresponsible statements." Could he possibly have had in mind a remark made in 1948 when the rest of us were well aware of Soviet aggressive expansion, through the gobbling up of 11 nations, the remark by President Truman: "I like old Joe (Stalin). He's a decent fellow?"

Was there ever a time in our history where one could call a roll of names with such unsavory implications of corruption in Government as those I am about to name? Here they are, without further comment: John Maragon, Tom Pendergast, Murray Garsson, Andy May, Gen. Bennett Myers, Mayor James A. Curley, Kenneth Romney, Carl Aldo Marzani, Alger Hiss, Gen. Harry Vaughan, Henry Julian Wadleigh, Assistant Treasury Secretary Harry White, Harry Bridges, Edward F. Prichard, Jr., Judith Coplon, Noel Field.

Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, attempting to minimize Democratic responsibility for machine corruption, was reminded on the Senate floor this month that he had once written a book in which he said that the Democrats couldn't possibly be a party of reform because of their close alliance with corrupt city machines.

Mr. Truman spoke, on his tour, of the little shadow that followed him about. There are plenty of little shadows following you about, Mr. President—shadows of corruption ignored, of chicanery protected, of criminals freed, of traitors covered or undiscovered.

Now to a more pleasant subject: The constructive alternatives of a Republican program for action in mid-century America.

Senator MARGARET SMITH, of Maine, summarizes the Republican approach in just 89 words:

1. Reducing taxes.
2. Balancing the budget.
3. Fighting deficit spending and Government waste.
4. Fighting communism here instead of complacently condoning it.
5. Making foreign policy truly bipartisan instead of merely rubber-stamped.
6. Fighting and exposing something-for-nothing deception, whether it be socialized medicine, socialized farming, or hidden taxes.
7. Preventing either management or labor from getting too much power at the expense of the public.
8. Maintaining an adequate social-security system that does not limit opportunity nor discourage initiative and saving.
9. Opposing any curtailment of veterans' benefits.
10. Smashing the filibuster on civil rights.

No other political party can make that statement—much less the Democratic Party.

But how do we know Republicans will perform what they promise? How about a look at the record?

Let's look at what was done by the Republican Eightieth Congress. Then let's consider what was pledged in the Republican 1948 platform and the record of the Republicans in both the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses.

We reduced taxes after Mr. Truman three times had interposed an unjustifiable exercise of his veto power.

We enacted a sensible and realistic Labor-Management Relations Act (the Taft-Hartley law) over Mr. Truman's hysterical veto and despite determined administration veto. Labor relations and man-hours worked have markedly improved since, and as a result of the passage of that law.

We balanced the Federal budget for the first time in more than a decade and a half, and despite all of the efforts of a spend-thrift administration to block that endeavor.

We enacted literally scores of laws for the benefit of veterans and their survivors and dependents after Mr. Truman had declared that the veterans' program had been practically completed.

We insisted upon the elimination of the poll tax as a requisite for soldier voting after both Mr. Truman and Vice President BARKLEY (then Senators) had voted against this proposal.

The Eightieth Congress kept faith with the American people. The Eighty-first Democrat Congress is proving daily that it has no intention of following that example. Now let us review some of the promises which we as a party made to the people by the adoption of the 1948 platform.

We pledged an attack on the basic causes of inflation, an attack which has never been made seriously and honestly in recent years because the Truman administration has been willing to risk the destruction of our Government itself rather than offend any of the special-interest groups it has bribed with public money for votes on Election Day. We recognize that the high cost of living is merely another way of saying high cost of Government—HCL, HCG; that a situation in which the people pay more in taxes to be misgoverned than they pay for food is one which cannot last long. Every time the sun sets we go in debt another $16,000,000. How long can this last?

We promised the maintenance of Armed Forces adequate to insure national security.

We promised an adequate privately operated merchant marine and the expansion of privately operated air transportation and communication systems.

We promised a healthy Federal financial system and an intelligent separation of the taxing fields between the Federal and State and local governments.

We promised protection and encouragement of small business.

We promised continued guaranties of the basic rights of working men and women, both organized and unorganized.

We promised basic legislation in the interests of agriculture.

We promised progressive development of the Nation's water resources for navigation, flood control, and power. We promised conservation of our natural resources and the stockpiling of strategic and critical raw materials indispensable to the security of the Nation.

We promised a comprehensive reclamation program—and the appropriations voted for that purpose by the Eightieth Congress proved that we meant it.

We promised additional legislation for a realistic and adequate adjustment of veterans benefits.

We promised an adequate housing program, including provision for local slum clearance and low-rent housing where needed.

We promised an expansion of the social-security program—and voted for it in both the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses.

We promised—and the Republican record, unlike that of the opposition, proves the sincerity of this promise—legislation to protect the civil rights of our citizens. In the Senate, 33 out of 39 Republicans supported cloture last week; only 19 out of 45 Democrats did so. I hope there will be another vote to give the 9 Democrat absentees a chance to come out of hiding and to stand up and be counted.

We promised an unremitting fight against communism through the vigorous enforcement of existing laws and the enactment of such new legislation as might be necessary.

These were some of the promises we made to the people in our 1948 platform. We made those promises deliberately and honestly and, in my opinion, we will keep them as soon as a Republican Congress and a Republican administration has been returned to power in Washington. And Republican Members in Congress, though a minority, are living up to those promises.

If the two-party system is to be maintained—and it will be—it is important that the lines between the parties be drawn clearly and unmistakably. The American people are entitled to a choice. It is up to us Republicans to give it to them. Then will the people say: "The Republicans are working for us. Let's work for them."

What's to be done about the job of winning friends and influencing voters? In 1940 there were cast 27,000,000 Democrat and 22,000,000 Republican votes for the presidency; in 1944, 25,000,000 Democrat and 22,000,000 Republican; in 1948, 24,000,000 Democrat and 22,000,000 Republican. The Democrats were losing voters but we weren't picking them up. Meanwhile, the number of nonvoters has increased steadily until in 1948 52 percent of the people didn't even maintain their status as citizens first class, by going to the polls.

In 1948, when the Democratic donkey romped in first, we Republicans were slaughtered by the jawbone of an ass, not because we were Philistines but because we were looking the other way. We weren't toiling in the vineyard where the votes hung, ungathered, on the vine.

In the Congress we are short about 12 votes of a majority in the Senate and 90 votes in the House. Nevertheless, with sublime disregard for accuracy, Harry Truman blames us for the shortcomings of his government. We, on the other hand, can present affirmative programs of our own until we are red, white, and blue in the face, but they'll do neither the Republic nor the Republicans any good unless we have Republican majorities in 1950 and 1952 to put our program into effect.

The only way to do this is to get people registered and to get out the vote of every person who will agree with us that the only road to good, decent government and to government we can afford, is to turn the rascals out and give the ship of state a real overhaul from keel to brightwork.

There is nothing much that young people can do to reform the old roguery of this administration. But, there's a great opportunity and a thrilling challenge to provide new ways, new men, new methods. The one vehicle at your hands—and a good one—is the Republican Party.

Let me leave with you, in closing, the adjuration of a great popular fighting Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt: "It is only through labor and prayerful effort, by grim energy and resolute courage, that we move on to better things."

The Heart of the Amerasia Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

THE HEART OF THE AMERASIA CASE
(By George Sokolsky)

The excitement over the Amerasia case is at long last reaching into all segments of the American people. And there has been no advantage—political or personal—in the various attempts to suppress it.

The Amerasia case involves espionage in time of war and our people are not so supine as to condone that.

May I, with due humility, say that for 5 years now, with calendar regularity, I have sought in this column to keep this issue alive. During March and April of this year, I wrote more than 20 articles on the subject until some of my editors thought that I was playing a broken record—and wrote me so. Then Frederick Woltman of the Scripps-Howard newspapers and Bert Andrews of the New York Herald Tribune did magnificent journalistic jobs, fighting against prejudice and distortion. And on the air, Fulton Lewis, Jr., displayed great courage and ingenuity comparing favorably with the mouthpieces of falsehood and suppression.

And it would be unjust not to mention the risky role played by Senator JOE MCCARTHY, who put himself way out, until one of his senatorial colleagues described him as a mad dog.

Well, JOE is not a mad dog. He is a fighting Irish marine.

When he started, he did not have the facts. He could not have had them. They were hidden in the archives of Government. He risked telling half the story, so that the whole of it would be forced out. His was the task of saying to the people that while he could point out the goal, he was not sure of the steps leading toward it.

It is curious that most of us have forgotten that, just as it has been forgotten that he refused at the start to mention names until the files were opened.

It was Senators LUCAS and TYDINGS who forced him to produce sample cases to justify his charges. And once they were produced, the same Senators smeared Joe MCCARTHY for doing what they demanded he should do. Maybe that is why they demanded names.

All the shenanigans of the administration and the State Department, all the byways they followed, all their promises to investigate and their failures to investigate, their attempt to throw the blame on J. Edgar Hoover and James Forrestal—all this mattered little, for the people have wanted the whole story. And no matter what is done about it, the people will never be satisfied until the whole story is told.

And the story did not begin or end with the Amerasia case. It goes back to 1934, at least. It can be taken back to 1948, if we had the time, but 1934 is a good date to start, and if the American people really want the whole truth, they must take their investigation back to 1934, one year after Franklin D. Roosevelt recognized Soviet Russia.

The American-Soviet agreement of 1933 was immediately broken and the proof is in several places, but the easiest to get at is the organization of the Harold Ware cell in Washington, which came into existence only one year after Roosevelt and Litvinov reached an agreement.

Alger Hiss was a member of that cell. So was Harry Dexter White. So were many others who attained to high positions in our Government.

If an investigation were to start there, the whole picture could be uncovered, showing an activity from, at least, 1934 to 1950—an activity of espionage, of infiltration in government, of the corruption of our policies.

This can be proved and it is to the benefit of our people that it should be proved conclusively, letting the chips fall where they may. Many may get hurt who were only foolish, but individuals must not count. It is the Nation that needs saving.

It is too late for anyone to attempt to cover up. Even if each one who now shouts for the truth were smeared or sued for libel, or imprisoned, the truth will come out. For others will arise to demand it. The politicans may save time but they will not save themselves.

Therefore, why not forget politics and remember America?

Censorship of News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the Associated Press story of last Sunday, as printed in the New York Times, reporting its semiannual survey of censorship and conditions affecting the flow of news throughout the world. The story brilliantly characterizes censorship as "a disease that feeds on conflict and thrives in confusion," and reports the unhappy fact that it has "gained increasing power over the free flow of information across frontiers in the last 6 months."

Through the United Nations, through UNESCO, and through special conferences such as the Conference on Freedom of Information in Geneva in 1948, when I had the honor to serve as chairman of the United States delegation, I feel the United States should press with ever-in-

creasing vigor for removal of barriers to the free flow of information throughout the world. Senate Resolution 243, on which I hope hearings will be held within the next 2 or 3 weeks, states as the first of its six points "maintenance, through the United Nations and through our own diplomacy, of a steady and steadily increasing pressure in behalf of world-wide freedom of information"—and sets this objective up at the highest level of national policy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENSORSHIP FOUND ON RISE IN WORLD—SURVEY BY ASSOCIATED PRESS SHOWS TIGHTENING OF NEWS CURBS IN PAST 6 MONTHS—SOVIET STILL MOST RIGID—IRON CURTAIN COUNTRIES EXPEL WESTERN REPORTERS—SOME MID-EAST CONTROLS EASED

Censorship, a disease that feeds on conflict and thrives in confusion, has gained increasing power over the free flow of information across frontiers in the last 6 months.

For the past several years the Associated Press has conducted a semiannual survey of censorship and conditions affecting the flow of news throughout the world. The latest survey has just been completed.

This study shows that some controls have been removed, notably in the Middle East. On the debit side of the ledger it shows new or greatly tightened restrictions in areas populated by hundreds of millions of the world's peoples.

In the iron curtain countries of Europe a new weapon has been called into play against foreign correspondents, particularly those representing American and British news services and newspapers. It is the charge of "unobjective reporting," and it is being used to oust representatives of the world's free press able to analyze as well as report news events.

These are the highlights of the Associated Press survey:

SOVIET ORBIT IN EUROPE

In the Soviet Union censorship is still rigid and often mischievous. The Soviet Government, while in complete control of its own press, exercises the most drastic censorship in the world, and indications are that it has become even more drastic in recent months. Dispatches of foreign correspondents not only are suppressed or delayed, but often are cut so as to render them meaningless or distorted. The western press corps in Moscow is reduced to a few correspondents.

The Soviet satellites in Europe—Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland are gradually sealing themselves off from the West, through expulsion of western correspondents and the hounding or jailing of nationals who work for the western press. Even with no direct penciling of dispatches, the pressure is strong against what are now called unobjective—that is, unfavorable—dispatches.

Rumania, which has not admitted a western correspondent in 2 years, arrested Leonard Kirschen, a Rumanian who served as Associated Press correspondent, in April. Bulgaria ended the Associated Press news gathering facilities in that country in April and efforts to reach Dimiter Mishev, a Bulgarian who was Associated Press correspondent in Sofia, have been unavailing. Czechoslovakia has expelled a number of western correspondents, including the last American representative in Prague of the Associated Press, and maintains pressure upon the Czechoslovak nationals now filing from there. Dana Adams Schmidt of the New York Times, the last American correspondent in Prague for an individual newspaper, left the country fearing arrest. Poland has expelled the last representative of Reuters, a British news agency, and today there are only two western reporters remaining in Warsaw.

OTHER EUROPEAN NATIONS

France has no censorship, although there have been instances of monitoring of foreign correspondents' dispatches for interested officials. There is political and military censorship to some degree in French Morocco and Tunisia. In the Saar, former German territory occupied by France, some officials have attempted to bring pressure on correspondents.

In western Germany neither the occupation powers nor the Germans exercise censorship. Early this year contradictory and often untruthful statements by Bonn Government spokesmen aroused correspondents, but the Government information service has been improving. The western allied high commission is often secretive and vague, forcing correspondents frequently to depend upon news leaks. Since the influx of civilian State Department employees, officials increasingly restrict news sources. Most top United States officials are accessible to the press, although the often resort to off-the-record discussion. The British channel information through an official service. The French traditionally deal with small favored groups of reporters, predominantly French. The armies of all three powers slow the news flow with red tape.

As for eastern Germany, the Russians and German Communists say there is no censorship, but the party line serves the purpose. Communists hold the top press jobs and lose them if they stray from the party line.

Spain still has rigid censorship of press, radio, books, movies, and even art exhibitions. Foreign correspondents are censored after the fact—that is, press attachés abroad send back articles thought to be anti-Spanish, for which a correspondent can be expelled. One correspondent escaped expulsion this year after strong intervention by the United States Embassay. Portugal's press is wholly under the thumb of the government, but there appears to be no censorship on outgoing news.

Belgium, Luxemburg, and the Netherlands have no censorship. In Belgium the government can act against distribution of news deemed to endanger the security or financial stability of the state. Official information is often hard to come by in Belgium.

Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Finland have no censorship.

Yugoslavia's press is controlled. There is only a threat of after-the-fact censorship on outgoing copy.

Italy and Switzerland have no censorship. Greece has no censorship now on foreign or domestic copy. Military censorship ended with the Government victory over the Communist guerrillas.

BRITISH COMMONWEALTH

There is no censorship. Some restrictions are imposed from time to time in colonial areas in times of disorder, but there has been little or no interference with outgoing copy.

South Africa, now dominated by the race-conscious Nationalists, has a bill pending to outlaw "disruptive organizations." It contains a clause aimed at the Communist press and might make possible control or even suppression of any offending newspaper. Parliament has approved a commission to study the affairs of the press. There is no control of outgoing news, but at least one member of the government favors it. Correspondents have received an admonition not to file "unfavorable" stories.

THE MIDDLE EAST

In Egypt the censorship imposed at the outbreak of the Palestine war became most stringent, but it has been relaxed in the last 6 months and now applies only to stories concerning the royal family. Even in this respect correspondents now have more latitude, particularly since the victory in January of the Wafdist Party.

There is no censorship in Turkey, but a newspaper can be punished for harming "the dignity of the nation."

Syria imposes censorship occasionally, and the cable office demands a second copy of each outgoing dispatch. It goes to the Government press office for scrutiny. There is some pressure on local correspondents.

In Lebanon there is censorship locally, and upon nationals serving foreign agencies, particularly with regard to communism and local political strife. Visiting foreign correspondents can file freely.

Iran's censorship is capricious and linked with charges of corruption. Stories that might embarrass Iran abroad frequently are stopped. Non-Iranian correspondents rarely encounter trouble, but local representatives of foreign agencies meet resistance at the sources of news.

Jordan maintains close censorship on copy filed either by foreign or local correspondents. A close check is kept on any news concerning King Abdullah.

Israel's censorship, imposed during the Palestine war, has been neither tightened nor relaxed since the war ended. All copy must get the stamp of the military censor before leaving the cable office. The Government says this is done because there has been no final peace settlement.

FAR EAST AND ASIA

With the Communist conquest of China, western on-the-spot coverage ended. Hong Kong Chinese papers say sources of their reporters were arrested recently in Canton and held by the Communists for reeducation. Nationalist China has no direct censorship on outgoing dispatches.

In Indochina the French-sponsored Viet-Nam government, under emergency decrees, imposes political censorship on the French and Viet-Namese Press. Outgoing dispatches filed by French correspondents often are delayed or stopped. A number of correspondents have been refused entry.

Burma's censorship is rigid. The trend is toward tighter restrictions, particularly on the domestic press. Censors study outgoing dispatches, and this requires correspondents to be cautious.

Indonesia, Thailand, India, Pakistan, and Ceylon have no cenorship. Since the Indian-Pakistani agreement on the treatment of minorities, the tendency to delay or withhold news has cleared up. In Kashmir, princely state disputed by India and Pakistan, there have been restrictions on gathering of news from official sources.

Singapore and Malaya impose no censorship on outgoing and incoming dispatches, but indirect censorship at the sources of news is attributed to the current Communist-terrorist emergency.

The Philippine Republic has no censorship or restrictions. News of the Hukbalahap rebellion has been filtered through the defense department, but there are no indications of any news suppression.

Japan's press is responsible to Gen. Douglas MacArthur's headquarters for accuracy and avoidance of anti-American statements. Only the Communist press violates this stricture. There is no formal censorship either by the government or the occupation. However, an increasing number of lesser occupation officials show reluctance to discuss controversial subjects. Headquarters is increasingly sensitive to press stories. Military authorities still try to funnel news through a Public Information Office.

In South Korea United States officials are far more willing to talk to American reporters than in Japan. The Korean Government retains post-publication censorship

over Korean papers, none over foreign correspondents. North Korea, Russian-occupied, has a controlled press.

LATIN AMERICA

Argentina's press is free in theory but not in practice. The Perón Government exerts pressure through its control of the distribution of newsprint. Editors of La Prensa and La Nacion, the two most influential opposition dailies, are under criminal charges of "desacato" (disrespect toward the President) because they published remarks of an opposition congressman who since has fled to Uruguay. The rest of the press either supports President Perón, is carefully neutral, or has been forced to close for a variety of reasons. Foreign correspondents file freely, although required to register with the Under Secretariat of Information. Incoming United States magazines often do not reach their destinations. They cannot be sold in Argentina because the Government will not give permits for the dollar exchange.

The congressional committee investigating anti-Argentine activities has not yet officially lifted an intervention under which it stationed federal police in news agency and newspaper offices in a search for sources of anti-Peron funds. Thus, while the police have been withdrawn, the threat of further investigation remains.

Colombia has censorship on local newspapers and foreign dispatches. Bolivia is under a state of siege, and controls communications. Paraguay has no open restrictions, but personal liberties there are precarious. Peru now has mild censorship. Venezuela's military government exercises local censorship.

Chile, Uruguay, Ecuador, and Brazil have no censorship now, and do not have except in abnormal situations.

Censorship in varying degrees continues in Honduras, Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, and Guatemala. Cuba and Costa Rica have no censorship. Mexico has no actual censorship, but newspapers never criticize the Government as a whole. An intervenor or censor is maintained in news agency offices at the expense of the agencies. The one in the Associated Press bureau shows up briefly each morning. He cannot read English.

Communism and Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address on socialism and communism by Mr. E. C. Coleman, grand master of the Grand Lodge of Masons of Tennessee, in Memphis, Tenn., delivered on May 10, 1950, as reported in the Nashville Banner.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MASONIC LEADER SAYS IT'S TIME AMERICANS STAND UP, BE COUNTED

Declaring that Masonry cannot any longer hide behind the landmarks of the fraternity on the basis of communism and socialism being a controversial political subject, E. C. Coleman, grand master of the grand lodge of Tennessee, said recently that the time has come for Americans to stand up and be counted.

Speaking at a district meeting here May 10, the Masonic leader said that "so far as I am individually concerned, it makes no difference to me whether he be a Democrat, a Republican, or a Dixiecrat, if he believes in and is willing to stand up for and be counted as an American citizen in full support of our constitutional way of life and believes in the existence, the rule, and guidance of the Supreme God, then he is good enough for me."

Mr. Coleman's address follows, in part:

"Each Masonic meeting is like a candle lighted before the shrine of freedom. Never in all the history of the world, as I read it, has there been a more bitter spirit of unrest. Victory in global warfare should have brought joy and rejoicing instead we are facing strife, disappointment, confusion, and chaos.

"The Council of the United Nations, dedicated to international harmony, unhappily staggers through a series of selfish maneuvers; labor facing undreamed-of heights in the standards of living, turns aside to follow leadership seemingly bent on beating industry to its knees, the industry that has made the material progress of this country the dream of the world. Industry in turn clings to the arrogance of an outmoded past.

"Compromise, founded on mutual respect, brotherly love, and affection would open the doors to untold riches. You and I were taught and some of us received learning in the little red schoolhouse on the side of the hill, to the effect that we enjoyed citizenship in a Nation founded upon a written document known as the cornerstone of our Government. We call that document the Constitution.

"We were taught further with a fierce determination and a courage as faith that this document guaranteed to each one of us equal opportunity, an undispensable ingredient in a democratic government. But I fear I detect a withering decay and a loosening of the bonds of moral fiber, personal integrity, and individual pride. I fear that I detect a general softening of personal aggressiveness, like a faint ripple of a brook, yet holding the possibility of becoming the roar of the Niagara Falls, that the spirit of equal opportunity is not enough. Equal opportunity is a challenge to success through hard work, but now many are seeking lightly or blindly a guaranty of equal wealth without the drudgery of the effort.

RIGHT TO BE COMPLACENT

"To the man who demands the right to be smugly complacent and cheerful, I may sound gloomy and if so, I plead guilty to the indictment. It was a gloomy occasion when our country was challenged by the insane, fanatic, totalitarian countries that 12,000,000 young Americans, the cream of our our generation, marched off to war and into the four corners of the globe.

"Everywhere they went they planted the flag of our country as a symbol of freedom. More than a quarter of a million of these young stalwarts were left on foreign soil, in the parching sands of the shores of North Africa, under the waving poppies of the Flanders, in the gumbo mud of New Guinea, and under the volcanic dust of Okinawa. These Americans were sacrificed upon the altar of freedom and more than 2,000,000 others were wounded, their health broken for the sake of our freedom and democratic government.

"They were entitled to a life of happiness and the protection of our Government the same as you and I. They worshipped each his own God, but they demonstrated conclusively for all time that Americans were not afraid to die. But the sacrifice of these men offers a challenge of great significance, the challenge is, Have we as Americans learned how to live? This meeting and every other Masonic meeting should attempt to answer the challenge more concisely and more conclusively than ever before.

"I feel it is fitting that I should make my position clear with respect to politics, due to the fact that the time has come in our country when any man who openly raises his voice against the evils of socialism and communism is branded as a politician and I wish to state here and now that I am not a politician and have no designs in that direction and that the statements which I shall make are based wholly upon my honest conviction as your grand master, as a member of the church, and as an American citizen. I do have a strong feeling and conviction that masonry cannot longer hide behind the landmarks of the fraternity on the basis of communism and socialism being a controversial political subject. It has come to the time that we must be Americans and so far as I am individually concerned, it makes no difference to me whether he be a Democrat, a Republican, or a Dixiecrat, if he believes in and is willing to stand up for and be counted as an American citizen in full support of our constitutional way of life and believes in the existence, the rule, and guidance of the supreme God, then he is good enough for me.

WAY OF LIFE THREATENED

"Our fraternity, our churches, and our American way of life are threatened as never before by the isms of Europe, all of which originated from and are a part of the philosophies of Karl Marx, who declared that religion was an opiate of the masses. So in view of the dangers that confront us and our heritage and our cherished institutions, we can no longer pass them by with indifference, especially when we consider that socialism actually started in Britain in 1883 and that the idea did not actually take hold until 1905, and that socialism controls England today.

"And that communism actually took hold in 1917 in Russia, at which time its supporters consisted of a few soap-boxers like Lenin, who was in exile in Switzerland, Stalin exiled in Siberia, Trotsky, editing a little radical paper in New York. Now communism controls one-half of Europe and is making rapid progress today toward communizing Asia and the Far East. So it is high time that we as Masons begin to seriously consider the danger to our way of life and stop worrying about hurting the feelings of the 14 men of the Kremlin. We had better start worrying about the attitude of our own people and their tendency to adopt an ideology of communism and socialism. To understand these foreign philosophies of government as compared with the American concept and ideals and teachings of Masonry, which is almost reiteration of our Constitution which protects the dignity of the individual, I want to give you briefly a summary of the principles of Masonry, of socialism, and the American way of life:

"1. Masonry is a system of mortality and inculcates fidelity and brotherly love.

"2. It dignifies the worth of human personality and honest industry in any worthy occupation.

BUILDS FRIENDSHIP

"3. It builds lasting friendship among men in all lawful and honorable vocations of life, the merchant, the farmer, the banker, the doctor, the clergyman and industrialist, and the laborer.

"4. It satisfies man's desire for wholesome fellowship and brotherhood in which there are no big I's and little you's.

"5. It is strictly a character-building agency, though in no sense is it a reform society. Its goal is to make good men better men.

"6. It provides opportunity for creative leadership in the practice of friendship, relief, service to God, to our country, and to our fellow man.

"7. Its highest aspiration is to rationalize in daily living the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

"Now as compared with the foregoing ideals of Masonry, let's compare briefly seven basic principles of the Socialist element designed for America:

"1. Establish schools for the training of Socialist leaders, speakers and teachers.

"2. Never call a program or an idea 'Socialist.' Talk in terms of pensions, compensation, health insurance, and welfare, but never, never socialism.

"3. Launch the program a bit at a time. Do not frighten people by showing them the whole program at the beginning.

"4. Assure the common people that their rights will be protected. Tell them that whatever is done will be for the well-being of the common man, the little fellow.

"5. Capture the labor unions and through them destroy the liberal parties.

"6. Use the liberal parties until they have served this purpose, then cast them aside.

"7. Work through schools, churches, fraternal organizations and clubs. Never miss a chance to plant the seeds of discord with the old system and create love for the new.

"Brethren, item four in the proceding outline of the Communist gets very close to me because I belong to that common group, the ordinary man, the little fellow, but I do not need or want any socialistic help in making a living or getting on in life. I want none of their heaven-born Utopian programs. Our way of life guaranteed by our Constitution, which our forefathers gave us at a great cost and sacrifice, is good enough for me and it is good enough for you. Those who are dissatisfied with living in this free country of ours should be deported and live under the communistic and socialistic rule of other countries. They are unworthy of the name of an American citizen.

THE AMERICAN WAY

"Now, briefly, the American way, which is also the Christian way, the Masonic way, includes free speech, free press, free assembly, freedom to worship, free enterprise, freedom to live as one wants to live within the law, freedom from fear of government oppression on the part of law-abiding citizens, freedom from want greater than any society has ever known, freedom to work without having to pay tribute for the privilege or to serve as a slave. Freedom to start small, work hard, economize, grow and prosper in a land of dreams, the hope for millions of oppressed people throughout the world, in a land where individual liberty gave individual initiative the right of unlimited expression and achievement in a land where a Henry Ford could start in a little one-room shop and build an industrial empire giving direct work to a quarter of a million people and indirect work to that many more. In a land where Thomas Edison, a George Westinghouse, and Alexander Graham Bell could turn ideas into wealth and enjoy the accumulation of their efforts and thereby provide conveniences of life to millions of other people.

"Now let us take a look at conditions in Britain under a socialistic government and that is what it is, regardless of what it is called, and I am sure that we all have a tremendous sympathy for these people. I know that I have, but my sympathy is based on their long years as a nation and not for the present Socialist government. My sympathy is based on the fact that they did wrest the Magna Carta from a tyrannical king and that they did develop the fundamental principles of freedom, but after all we cannot get too much encouragement and certainly very little solid nourishment from looking back at their finest hours.

BRITAIN'S PLIGHT

"After 5 years of peace, Great Britain is the only major nation in the world today with strict rationing and price control of most of the necessities of life with a tax rate that is almost unbelievable and if you were a British citizen, tonight you would be carrying a rationing card for the necessities of life and if you were a British citizen tonight with a wife and two children with an income of $2,800 a year you would be paying the national government $288 in taxes. In America, with the same dependents and the same income, persons only pay $26 to the Federal Government. If you were a British citizen tonight you would be assured government care from the cradle to the grave. Every baby receives $16 at birth and at death the government participates to the extent of $80 in the funeral expenses. The rich no longer pay the bills for the poor. There are no rich. No longer does industry pay its millions in taxes, the government owns the industry and operates it at a deficit.

"It is interesting to know what is happening in Britain, but the matter of greatest importance is for us to ask ourselves the question, 'Are we learning our lesson from their experience?' Upon our answer to that depends the future welfare of this Nation, its people and its institutions. We are constantly being offered planned economy measures and we will continue to have them, but we must remember this, that no matter how well they read on paper, nor how good they sound from the mouths of politicians, inevitably they lead to stagnation and ruin, and the British people are constantly saying to America today, 'Never let the socialistic camel get its head in the tent of American free enterprise, the last stronghold on the face of the globe for the preservation of free democratic government.'

"If we accept the philosophy that the government will take care of you, we will be betraying the whole heritage that has been founded for us here in this Nation during the past 170 years. If we ever accept the planned economy and the so-called welfare state, it will make all our battles for freedom from Bunker Hill to Iwo Jima, nothing more than a travesty and a farce.

"Some will say that it was our natural resources that made us the greatest country in the world. We do have many resources, but other countries have many natural resources also. If our resources were the answer, Brazil would have more automobiles than any other country because she has vast potential oil lands, some of the world's richest deposits of iron ore, and is the original home of natural rubber. Yet, Brazil has one car for each 172 persons while the United States has an automobile for every 5 persons and the automobiles the Brazilians have are imported.

"The Socialists say that the poor get poorer under our economic system and that the rich get richer. This statement is just 100 percent falsehood. It is a popular delusion that completely lacks foundation in fact. The rate of increase in wealth among the common people in the United States has been one of the most significant facts in all human history. For instance, in 1900 there were only 6,000,000 savings-bank depositors in the United States. In 1946 there were more than 50,000,000 depositors and the total amount of saving deposits with a comparative increase in insurance policyholders has been increased in like proportion to the bank depositors.

DANGER TO MASONRY

"Someone will perhaps say that I am a radical and am overzealous in thinking in terms of constitutional government, Christianity, and Free Masonry. But I am sure that I do not realize the full dangers and I do not believe that any other American citizen realizes fully the dangers that confront the American way of life. Now to give you some absolute proof of my contention with respect to the dangers of socialism and communism and I say socialism, because it is the very last step that can be taken in the atheistic direction of communism before becoming a full-fledged card-carrying Communist.

"At the grand master's conference of North America, held in Washington in February, no less authority than Melvin Johnson, supreme grand commander of the Scottish Rite bodies of the northern jurisdiction of North America, made the statement that only last year he was invited to Britain for the purpose of participating in a discussion wherein the grand lodges of England propose to break off Masonic relationship with all American lodges who openly condemn socialism and communism. So far as I know, up to this time, no Masonic relations have been broken. But I can state to you openly and frankly that while I serve as grand master of the grand lodge of the great State of Tennessee, that if the grand lodge of Britain deems it advisable to break off relationship with the grand lodge of Tennessee because of our open condemnation of socialism and communism, they have my permission to do so immediately, because I, as your grand master, will never condone any idea or thoughts of socialism or communism and to do so would be a betrayal of trust to you and to the Masonic fraternity of Tennessee."

Tariff Policy Uncertainties Seen Unsettling to Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Tariff Policy Uncertainties Seen Unsettling to Industry," written by Howard Huston, and published in the New York Journal of Commerce of June 20, 1950.

I have been informed by the Public Printer that the article will exceed by one-third of a page the ordinary 2-page limitation, and that it is estimated that the printing of the article in the Appendix will cost $191.34. Notwithstanding the fact that the article slightly exceeds the limit of two printed pages, I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TARIFF POLICY UNCERTAINTIES SEEN UNSETTLING TO INDUSTRY—NEW TRADE PROPOSALS HELD REAL THREAT TO ORGANIC CHEMICAL UNIT—ADMINISTRATION'S PROGRAM VIEWED AS IMPERILING FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM IN THIS COUNTRY AND UNDERMINING OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE STRENGTH

(By Howard Huston)

The history of the organic chemical industry is such that it has always had to be acutely aware of chemical developments in foreign countries.

In 1914, for all practical purposes, no organic chemical industry existed in the United States. When supplies of chemicals, however, were cut off from Europe, there began the slow struggle for the creation of a domestic organic chemical industry. Following the First World War the need for protective tariffs was recognized by President Wilson, but it was not until 1922 that a tariff bill was passed

under which there has grown up the chemical industry as it exists today.

At the present time, however, there are three important matters concerning foreign trade policy which are before the Congress of the United States and any one of these will deeply affect the future prospects of the industry. These are the proposals for the reduction of chemical tariffs under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the hearings which are being held looking toward the approval of the Havana Charter setting up the International Trade Organization, and the proposed Customs Simplification Act of 1950.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

The chemical industry in the United States is considerably disturbed by the rise of a strange doctrine in Washington which holds that, in order to encourage imports from Europe, it may be necessary for certain legitimate American industries to become expendable victims of the cold war. Indeed, serious injury to, or even bankruptcy of, American firms seems to be no ground for cutting off foreign imports.

The textile industry, the watch industry, the tanning industry, and others are already realizing that, spurred on by Washington, Europeans are taking a large slice of their markets. Undoubtedly the drive to close the dollar gap is increasing imports. Equally it is very evident that it is stirring up an old-fashioned tariff squabble.

The industrialist in the chemical industry in the United States does not generally believe that any amount of management ingenuity can compete against labor rates in Europe which are one-sixth to one-third of the labor rates that are paid in the United States.

In the appearance of many chemical executives before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, the theme has in most cases been the same—that to reduce American tariff rates on chemicals would weaken the chemical industry, you weaken our national defense—thus automatically strengthening the military potential of unfriendly nations.

It is not generally realized how fully the chemical industry is integrated—how the chemical industry must be integrated both technologically and economically if it is to furnish those indispensable materials required by all major industries, if it is to operate efficiently, and if it is to be subject to full-scale mobilization in time of emergency.

Many parts of this industry are dependent one upon the other. In many cases chemical manufacturers are themselves big customers of other chemical manufacturers. By-products are an extremely important element in the chemical industry. To take away part of the industry, therefore, you may well disrupt the whole of the balanced structure.

IMPORT PRESSURE INCREASING

The problem is a very real one because foreign competition is already making itself felt in the United States. Plants in western Germany, according to the Chief of the Economic Cooperation Administration to western Germany, hope to slash their dollar gap and increase their production by negotiating tariff cuts at the session to take place at Torquay in September.

American industrialists are, on the whole, long-suffering and they are anxious to do their part to promote international trade, but they do not believe that it will be for the best interest of the world to adversely affect our domestic market. It is something of a paradox that money paid by American industrialists through Washington to ECA should be used to encourage the building of plants in Europe which will take away those industrialists' markets.

William Rand, president of Monsanto Chemical Co., said recently:

"Even though the organic chemical industry might be able to compete with foreign competition on a fair trading basis, it cannot hope to survive the inroads created by state trading, slave labor, devaluation, artificial exchange rates, and other unorthodox practices. Actual production costs mean nothing to a totalitarian state or to a nation famished for American dollars."

EFFECT ON EMPLOYMENT

Not only the chemical industrialists, but the labor leaders as well are worried about the unemployment which will inevitably follow if there is any considerable reduction in chemical production. H. A. Bradley, president of the A. F. of L. International Chemical Workers Union, recently sent this telegram to the chairman of the Committee for Reciprocity Information:

"Change in tariffs for medicinal and pharmaceutical chemicals and most other chemical products at the present time will affect job security of 600,000 employees in this important industry. In order not to impair jobs of chemical workers and the national security, the forthcoming international conference must not lower tariff rates of chemical products. We deem this matter of vital importance."

Emil Rieve, president of the CIO Textile Workers Union, recently expressed the opinion that it would be better for the United States just to give away any surplus goods it may produce than to "buy foreign goods at the cost of unemployment at home."

LABOR-MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

The organization of the National Labor-Management Council is significant because its purpose is to consider problems arising from foreign trade and from laws and legislative proposals pertaining to it and to securing co-operative action in dealing with such problems. The organization has the participation of both labor and management. O. R. Strackbein, its president, recently stated:

"The object of the tariff is to prevent our wage and labor standards from crumbling under the onslaught of foreign competition which finds its advantage in lower wages and poorer working conditions."

The American chemical industry does not ask that any margin of advantage be conferred upon it. It does ask for competitive parity with imports. With constantly increasing wage rates, with constantly increasing minimum wages, with the necessity of keeping a high level of national income to carry the tax burden, it becomes increasingly evident that only a fair tariff can maintain this parity.

As more imported chemicals come into the United States, there will, of course, be less outlay for plant expansion, there will be less new investments in capital goods. Thus, another avenue of worker absorption will be narrowed and another source of taxation closed. There is a great awakening to the need of a new approach to the import question. This approach has the great virtue of concerning itself with one of the more important phases of import competition, the effect on our workers and our living standards.

The success and effectiveness of the chemical industry has been measured by the quality of performance and the findings of its research workers in the laboratory. Intensive research accounts for the constant development of the industry and its increasing contribtuion to health, comfort and the national defense.

The growth of research in the chemical industry has been extraordinary. In the last 10 years it has increased over threefold. Staffs of highly-trained chemists, engineers, physicists, mathematicians and specialists of many other types are not only essential to the production of existing products, their improvement and new discoveries, but all of these men must be paid out of the sales of existing products.

THREAT TO DEFENSE STRENGTH

A lowering of tariff rates will stimulate imports and reduce sales. This inevitably means a reduction in research staffs and it means that many of the younger men would no longer find the field of chemistry attractive as a career. We cannot afford at this period in our history to dissipate one of our most valuable national resources—a kind of resource that cannot be restored overnight—a type of industrial machinery that cannot be started with the throwing of a switch.

Modern war is technological combat in which all aspects of technology are involved. A loss of any of our research abilities would be serious enough in time of peace, but it would be tragic if war should come.

General McAuliffe has pointed out that so long as this country can keep ahead of a potential enemy in the field of chemistry, there may not be another war. This is certainly true and so long as our chemical industry is allowed to go ahead unhampered, the unhampered progress and expansion of the past few years will continue. So far as the growth of this industry is hampered by the encouragement of foreign producers to take its domestic markets, just so far do we run serious risks to our national security and our economic stability.

It is repeatedly pointed out that there exists an escape clause whereby the Tariff Commission can give assistance to any industry which is threatened with extinction. That this assistance is more theoretical than real is attested to by the fact that there have been 16 applications filed under the so-called escape clause with the United States Tariff Commission under which industries seek relief from excessive imports.

Of these 16, only one advanced beyond a preliminary study stage. This was an application protesting the influx of clothespins and on this the Tariff Commission recommended to the President that nothing be done. All of the other applications were dismissed by the Commission as being without merit.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION

The Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives has held hearings during the past month on House Joint Resolution 236, a resolution which proposes that Congress approve the International Trade Organization Act.

There seems to me little doubt that there is almost complete unanimity in the chemical industry on the belief that we should have world-wide economic cooperation. There is almost equal unanimity in the belief that this cannot be secured through the International Trade Organization.

The original concept first published by our own State Department in 1945 was generally approved by most of the students of international relations. As negotiations proceeded, however, at London, at Geneva, and at Habana, the original concept and purpose was almost lost and the document which is now before us shows clearly that the interests of the participating nations were so divergent that there has emerged only a document of compromise. Its adoption could only result in confusion and a weakening of the position of the United States.

WORDING SEEMS AMBIGUOUS

One of the greatest objections to the charter is that it tries to solve too many economic problems in too great detail. Its ambiguous wording conceals a lack of real agreement on principle. The Manufacturing Chemists' Association, the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association, and the Chemical Alliance have all gone on record through briefs and oral presentations in opposition to the Habana Charter.

Dr. Elvin H. Killheffer, in his able appearance before the board, said:

"The most serious disagreement of all concerns a planned versus a free economy. The charter is a catalog of what governments will do. The members of the proposed international bureaucracy called ITO are governments. The charter recognizes state controls and ownership and state trading. This,

in turn, requires state planning, and all of this is state socialism, the antithesis of private enterprise, which we in the United States believe in."

LIBERTIES SEEN PERILED

The charter in its present form calls for a planned international economy, an international economy in which the rules and regulations for the international distribution of products made by American industry will be promulgated by an administrative board of the ITO.

This means that we will be forced to abandon many traditional American principles. In place of these we will have to accept planned economy and full-scale political control of production, trade, and monetary exchange.

The principles of free, private, competitive enterprise are not found in the charter. Yet these principles are the basis upon which our country has operated during all its history and upon which are founded all of the liberties of the American people.

The escape clauses are of such a nature that they will apply to almost every other country, but they will not apply to the United States. In the document as it is now before Congress it does not generally forbid quota restrictions, it does not eliminate preferential tariffs, it does not remove discriminatory practices in world trade, it does not make impossible intergovernmental commodity cartels; and the imposition of quantitative import restrictions for the purpose of promoting economic development or restriction is permitted.

GAINS HELD ONE-SIDED

All of these are granted to other countries for the purpose of promoting economic development of reconstruction, as a means of correcting balance of payment difficulties and other exceptions which could lead to widespread discrimination and could be a source of irritation and damage to the trade of any nation discriminated against.

There are many other objections to the charter because it does not properly safeguard the interests of the United States. The charter could be amended without the assent, or over the dissent, of the United States. Since the charter carries authority for extensive exceptions and special dispensations, this might become a grave danger to the trade and economic well-being of the United States.

WOULD SIGN BLANK CHECK

Under the provisions "to foster and assist industrial and general economic development, particularly of those countries which are still in the early stages of industrial development," the United States would for all practical purposes be signing a blank check. These provisions might impose enormous financial burdens upon us and might become a dangerous drain on the resources and productive system of the country.

On the other hand, we would be obliged to grant all member nations access on equal terms "to the markets, products, and productive facilities which are needed for their economic prosperity and development." This might well oblige us to supply other countries with capital funds and productive facilities. It would not even give us the right to deny free access to our markets to countries who do not cooperate in good faith in promoting economic progress and peaceful relations among the nations of the world.

EFFECT ON INVESTMENTS

The charter does not provide adequate safeguards for the protection of foreign investments. These provisions are written almost entirely from the point of view of the recipient country. Such investments might be expropriated or notionalized. In fact the charter tends to remove such protection as private investments can enjoy.

In this connection it should be noted that the charter states "the members recognize that international investment, both public and private * * *." The use of the word "public" in this connection is particularly interesting. Certainly this opens up the possibility of investments being available through governments and recognizes once again the concept of controlled economies.

Books could be written on the ITO and the present proposed charter. Because of the fact that the language is so ambiguous and that there was no clear meeting of minds, it would be almost impossible for any group of men to arrive at an agreed interpretation of the charter.

ITO AND PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

If the United States accepts this charter, it will commit itself finally and irrevocably to the acceptance of a political and economic heresy that will make for the destruction of private enterprise and the dissolution of individual liberty.

The reasons why the chemical industry opposes this charter are well set out in the statements submitted by the SOCMA that say:

"It is our firm opinion that the charter in its present form will:

"1. Allow discrimination against the United States.

"2. Promote socialism.

"3. Increase difficulties for balance of payments.

"4. Risk national security.

"5. Surrender to others a great part of control of tariff policies.

"6. Create world bureaucracy, forcing us to abandon many of our Federal laws to do this.

"7. Offer our exhaustible natural resources to others under terms which may be very unattractive to us.

"8. Provide no definite protection for American foreign investments, except in the very few countries with which the United States has treaties of commerce dealing explicitly with such matters."

CUSTOMS SIMPLIFICATION ACT

On May 1 there was introduced into Congress H. R. 8304 which had for its avowed purpose the simplification of United States customs procedure. This bill was introduced by the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and was referred to that committee for its consideration.

This bill, which is commonly called the Customs Simplification Act of 1950, proposes to amend certain of the special and administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, some sections of the Internal Revenue Code and some paragraphs of the tariff rate schedules which contain administrative regulations.

It is claimed for the bill that it will reform customs procedures so that the importing of all sorts of goods, not just chemicals alone, will be easier and cheaper.

To the extent that this bill is actually a customs simplification act, it is generally supported by the chemical industry, both through its trade organizations and by individual companies.

RATE-MAKING SECTION

There are, however, to be found in this bill certain extraneous matter which has no relation whatsoever to customs simplification, which in fact goes into rate-making procedure and which should have no part in a simplification bill of this kind.

These provisions are found in sections 13 and 14 of the proposed bill. They eliminate the American selling price as applied to articles 27 and 28 of the present Tariff Act and propose to substitute for it a complicated plan of arriving at the tariff rates to be applicable on competitive products.

It will, in fact, take years to get the basic data upon which to make the computations which will result in the equivalent rates based on export value and in the meantime, during these years, there will be two bases for valuation paralleling each other, the new export value and the American value.

FOREIGN SET-UP

This is highly unsatisfactory to the organic chemical industry and is being strongly opposed. The manufacture of these chemicals abroad has been principally in the hands of a few large companies in the United Kingdom, Switzerland, Germany, France, and Italy. Some of these manufacturers are now located within Russia and the satellite countries. Japanese and German production is being rapidly restored.

Export as well as domestic prices for these products are rigidly controlled. They have been manipulated in the past and there is every reason to believe that they will be manipulated in the future. It becomes plain, therefore, that there is no firm basis for establishing an "export value" in a commercial sense for these products. Such export values in these countries have been, and it appears probably will be, arbitrarily fixed for the purpose of underselling like products in the United States.

OTHER OBJECTIONS

Export value will also be subject to the fluctuation of foreign exchange and the variety of prices for the same product in different countries.

In neither of these situations is there an adequate remedy in the proposed administrative procedures which will permit appropriate values to be made and duties assessed accordingly.

On the other hand, American valuation makes for certainty and assurance with respect to the protection available to domestic producers. Such valuations are based on fact as brought about by competitive conditions in the United States. Under this arrangement, the United States has been successful in building up an organic chemical industry which is vital to the United States in times of peace. The loss of it, or any of its closely integrated elements, would be tragic in time of war.

DANGERS TO THIS COUNTRY

The industry as a whole does not believe that the Tariff Commission can successfully apply section 14, because there are at the present time literally thousands of products manufactured in this industry which are classified under paragraphs 27 and 28 of the Tariff Act. To list them alone is an enormous task. To arrive at their export value, which is a requisite in figuring an ad valorem equivalent, would seem to be impossible because of the absence of imports of the great majority, unless the Commission, without question, accepts the statement of foreign manufacturers or exporters as to such export value. It is clear that this would in itself be a risky and dubious procedure.

Recently, the Imperial Chemical Industries of England purchased an American company and the Ciba Co. of Switzerland has started to erect a plant in Toms River, N. J. These companies will probably make finished dyes by purchasing intermediates here from domestic producers, or by importing intermediates from Europe, dependent upon their relative costs.

It would appear that these operations might well be patterned after those of General Aniline Corp. when it was owned and operated by the German I. G. cartel. It would appear reasonable to expect that other European manufacturers might adopt similar programs.

If these provisions affected only the organic chemical industry it would in itself be serious enough. Actually, however, it goes far beyond that. The ultimate effect would be great on the textile industry, the

tanning industry, the agricultural industry—in fact all of the consuming industries in the United States.

The seriousness of this matter is already recognized by labor, in particular the A. F. of L. They are not only opposing tariff cuts under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, but have recognized that matters of the nature mentioned in this article have become a sizable and major matter of importance to them. They recognize the danger to the 600,000 chemical workers in the United States.

The chemical industry is ready and willing to lend its support to the Customs Simplification Act of 1950 to the extent that it really simplifies customs administrative procedure. This is not the case in articles 13 and 14 of the proposed act and they should be deleted therefrom.

Golden Anniversary Response of William D. Hassett, Secretary to the President of the United States, a Member of the Class of 1900, Northfield High School Alumni Banquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the golden-anniversary response of the Honorable William D. Hassett, Secretary to the President of the United States, a member of the class of 1900, at the Northfield High School alumni banquet, held in White Hall on June 17, 1950.

The pay-off for service rendered comes from sources unsought and from those least expected to say anything. Will Hassett, native Vermonter, and resident of my home town of Northfield, Vt., the Secretary to the President of the United States, went to school to Mrs. Plumley 2 years, and to me 4 years. What he said follows:

It is difficult to gather one's thoughts together on an occasion like this. I have waited 50 years for this night.

Although I have not until now attended a high-school reunion since the long-ago night when the class of 1900 separated in old Concert Hall, I do not come as a stranger This is the return of the native.

These reunions are happy occasions. They give one an opportunity to hear once more the kind voices of friends long missed and to feel the warmth of old associations and the nostalgia for other days which comes inevitably with gatherings of this kind.

Old Father Time has on the whole dealt kindly with us. Of the class of 1900 all survive save four: Eva Buzzell, Katie McCarthy, Alice Winch, and Harry Dunsmoor. Happily, of the 10 remaining, 4 are here tonight: Leon Roys, and his charming bride of a year after us, Mildred Ellis; Eliza Roberts (Mrs. Stewart); Florence Loomis (Mrs. Welch); and the speaker. Here we are with hearts young and gay hoping to meet our mornings face to face and to find at last our twentieth year. After all, we live by illusion; and, anyway, those who keep golden anniversaries as the shadows fall westward must hold fast to the illusion of youth and to all the other illusions they can lay hold of.

There is one absentee tonight whose place at a Northfield High School reunion no person can take. The graceful and gracious greeting which we have all received from our old principal, Vermont's present distinguished Congressman—is a happy reminder of his affection for the school and all the old boys and girls.

The exacting duties of Mr. PLUMLEY's position detained him in Washington with Mrs. Plumley, another devoted teacher and friend of this school. Our happiness would be complete if they were here tonight. But they have a golden event of their own later this summer and my wager is that they will celebrate it in Northfield, Congress or no Congress.

CHARLES PLUMLEY was our principal through all the 4 years of the course of the class of 1900. To tell of all we owe to his dynamic leadership and of our affection for him would require an occasion which we all trust will be long, long deferred. I do not intend to turn this into a rehearsal of our Congressman's funeral sermon. Neither he nor I nor any of us want that discourse for a long time to come.

The public service will be the poorer when our one-time principal leaves the national House of Representatives at the expiration of his present term as a Congressman. There, like his distinguished father, Frank Plumley, he has upheld the best Vermont tradition of patriotic service. You see, over about the same length of time Mr. PLUMLEY and I have had Government jobs in Washington. Pennsylvania Avenue, as you know, is a long street. Charles works at one end of it and I at the other. Now I am sure all of you will agree: It is far better for us to work at opposite ends of the street than to work both sides of the street. That is fatal in politics or in anything else. Outside of business hours our Congressman and I are on pretty good terms. There may in some years be a hiatus for two weeks immediately preceding the 1st of November. But by and large our relations remain about what they have been for 60 years or so.

Well, though Charles and I have been working at opposite ends of the street for a good many years I venture the opinion that we have one experience in common. This experience found apt expression years ago in a remark made by the late Senator James Hamilton Lewis, of Illinois, to my present boss.

"You must not feel too humble," said Senator Lewis to Senator Truman of Missouri, then a new Member of what we all believe is the greatest deliberative body in the world.

"You see," said Senator Lewis, "you spend your first six months wondering how you got into the Senate. After that, you wonder how the other Members got there."

I think that reflects the feeling of both Charlie and me.

Now Abraham Lincoln was a very wise man. Lincoln stories are a legend. They always point up a powerful truth by the power of analogy.

Lincoln used to tell a story about a certain king who wanted to go hunting and asked the prime minister if it would rain. The prime minister told the king the weather would be fair. Setting out, the royal party met a farmer riding a jackass. The farmer warned the king it was going to rain. The king laughed, went on his way, and no sooner got started hunting than a heavy downpour drenched him and his party. He went back to his castle in a rage, threw the prime minister out and called for the farmer.

"Tell me how you knew it would rain," said the king to the farmer.

"I did not know, your majesty," replied the farmer. "It's not me, it's the jackass. Whenever it is going to be wet the jackass puts its ear forward. That's all. I knew the jackass was right."

The king sent the farmer away and had the jackass brought to him and put him in the place of the prime minister.

"It was here," said Lincoln, "that the king made a great mistake."

"How so?" piped up one of the listeners.

"Why," said Lincoln, "ever since that time every jackass wants a government office."

Now I do want to say in passing that every jackass doesn't get a government job these days, although it has become harder and harder to get good men because of the public abuse they are exposed to which helps to destroy our faith in our Government, in ourselves, and in each other.

Closely associated in our affection for our principal is our devotion to a great memory—a memory all of us hold in reverence and in benediction. All those who were in school at the turn of the century are thinking tonight of the great and good woman who was guide, counselor, and friend of every one of us through all our 4 years together in high school. Miss Badger was a truly remarkable teacher, an inspiring teacher. Firm in principle—holding aloft for all to follow the torch of idealism, and never deviating from the highest standards of conduct and of life—gracious always, ever kind and considerate, filled with optimism about the good that lay hidden somewhere even in the worst of us, she was also and above all a worshipper at the shrine of beauty.

Who could ever forget those pictures of the world's great paintings with which she used to line the walls? Equally memorable is her critical list of the dozen world masterpieces. From Rome 25 years after leaving high school I sent her a post card reporting failure to find the Sistine Madonna in the Sistine Chapel. She wrote from her then home in Los Angeles a mild rebuke and intimated that I was not a credit to her teaching ability. She told me to look for the Sistine Madonna in Dresden. Happily, this I was able to do and beheld that glorious work where it was a shrine of pilgrimage until old Joe Stalin and his unholy band of robbers carried that and all the other treasures off to Moscow. Through those years when my work took me overseas I always made a special effort even at a sacrifice to go out of my way in order to see the originals of those paintings which to her had been a lifetime inspiration. All this I duly reported to her, to her great delight, despite the fact that she only gave me "E" for effort in my first quest for the Sistine Madonna.

One could linger over the name of Miss Badger but time puts limitations. For myself, I am proud in this company to make humble acknowledgment of my debt to this great soul—a debt which it is difficult to estimate and impossible to repay.

I am sure my old classmates and others of our contemporaries will remember the radiantly beautiful Lulu Bingham Hurlbut. It brought me great happiness within the last month to receive a telephone call from Mary Bingham Hurlbut—the youngest—inquiring if I would like to see Lulu Bingham's children. So we had a fine visit. The son, John, is a distinguished member of the bar and of the faculty of a great university, and the two daughters happily have inherited the beauty and charm of their wonderful mother.

Miss Anna James, of St. Albans, sister of the one-time principal, was another devoted teacher. Mrs. Lovell and Miss Agnes Dooley, Northfield's greatly gifted soprano, taught music.

I suppose it is natural for old-timers to remind their juniors that discipline was sterner in the old days. And much can be said in favor of strict discipline, too, even if it isn't always popular with the youngsters. Dr. Samuel Johnson in his day was an ardent believer in the homely adage

about what happened to the child if the rod were spared.

One day Boswell observed to Dr. Johnson that there had been a decided relaxation in corporal punishment in the great English public schools.

"Yes," observed Dr. Johnson, "and I understand there has been at the same time a great falling off in efficiency in the classics—so that what the boys gain at one end they lose at the other."

I repeat Dr. Johnson's observation for whatever value it may have for our superintendent, Mr. Gallagher, or our principal, Mr. Crane.

From all I hear both of these estimable educators in their faithful labors for this community are exemplifying the highest tradition of our Vermont schools. With these new friends it is a privilege to greet such old-timers as former Principal Finnessy and my friend of more than half a century, the perennial Dr. Hewitt, distinguished alike as pulpit orator, poet, essayist, and lecturer. Flanking Arthur on the other side, even as in the old days, is Joe Denny, whose presence also adds something of the flavor of other days. It seems to me the arrangements for this alumni banquet have been admirably carried out by President Davis and our secretary, Mrs. Peterson.

Well, Northfield was a pretty good place to be born in and to grow up in. In our high school days there still prevailed in Northfield a venerable and beloved figure who was always the friend of the high school and of every movement to advance the general culture of the community. His influence for good extended far beyond the confines of the Congregationalist Church, of which he was pastor for 40 years and more.

Dr. Hazen was a member of a family distinguished for generations in church, in state, and particularly in the field of education. This quiet and saintly man was always a faithful supporter of the Northfield schools and many of us will remember with gratitude his daughter, Miss Martha Hazen. Just out of Mt. Holyoke where all the women in the Hazen family went, Miss Hazen was our Latin teacher.

To Dr. Hazen we owe the Northfield Public Library. I was in my fifteenth year and an eager listener in town meeting when Dr. Hazen made a very modest proposal that the town appropriate a small amount of money for a free public library. His proposal was instantly endorsed and in a few weeks the library, which his benign influence had thus brought into being, was opened.

It was housed in one room in the old Paine block which you remember had been turned around from its old position by the Main Street bridge and faced East Street. Most of the books went up in smoke when the block burned a year or two later but the library as an institution survived.

I remember also that the first librarian was Mrs. Roxana Orcutt Edgerton, with Miss Nellie Brown alternating. The rule was that a patron could take at one time one work of fiction and two "serious" books. Eldridge Dunham and I were among the first patrons and those excellent ladies used to let us browse around as we would and carry out books by the armful.

The years have passed and I have at different times been a reader in the British Museum in London, that treasurehouse of the British Empire, and in our own great National Library in Washington. May I recall to those of you who knew Mrs. Edgerton and Miss Brown that I have never anywhere received greater courtesy or more helpful cooperation than those two excellent ladies extended when our Library had its modest beginning on East Street. In the presence of many here who knew all three I speak belatedly this word of grateful appreciation of Dr. Hazen, Mrs. Edgerton and Miss Brown.

Now, of course, this occasion calls for advice. It shall be brief.

To my classmates I say: Let us all believe that our Castle of Enchantment still lies ahead.

To the graduates I offer the warning: Avoid all the mistakes your elders have made and profit from the bad examples we have given.

To my fellow voters in this community—no advice. I would, however, like to offer some reflections on the future of our public schools. Our schools now as always are our greatest asset.

For years now I have heard about our school-building problem. I have read of the many meetings held for discussion of this paramount issue. The only thing all seem to be agreed on is that we must have greatly expanded facilities if the boys and girls of Northfield are to be properly housed and sheltered for their schooling.

This town has never defaulted in its obligation to the schools. The citizens in all the generations encompassing the 165 years of the town's existence have never sidestepped their duty toward the education of the boys and girls of Northfield.

Let us take a backward glance. In the spring of 1785 three young pioneers, Amos, Nathaniel, and Ezekiel Robinson began clearing their farms on the East Hill. The same year Elijah Paine built the first mill. The other pioneers came, too. They felled the trees and established farms.

Like the GI's of today—God bless them—they observed the scriptural admonition to increase and multiply. In a surprisingly few years there were lots of little Robinson boys and girls, and boys and girls of the other settlers, ready for school. Best of all, the school was ready, too.

I believe the first school was established in the Loomis neighborhood, over toward Berlin Pond. This school was named not for our classmate, Florence, but in recognition of her honorable forebears who contributed their full quota of scholars.

The second school was opened near Amos Robinson's farmhouse and was probably very near the site of the schoolhouse in the Dillingham district. Perhaps I should observe in passing that the Dillingham school is named for the excellent Dillingham family rather than for our favorite member of it—Abbie.

Come right down Mill Hill with me and we will find that the South Village did not neglect its obligation to establish a school. The Dennys would have seen to that. Then Center Village, of course, had its own school at an early date. Stanton Richardson, the first selectman of Northfield, who cleared the Goodrich farm and the grand Averill family could fill several schools. On the West Hill, the Doles needed facilities for the training of their numerous progeny in preparation for sending so many of them to Norwich University.

So the schools multiplied. Wherever the need appeared the schoolhouse was built.

Remember also that a hundred years ago the old Northfield Academy was established on a site familiar to us all as the academy was the forerunner of the high school. In our present difficulty—I hope it has not reached the stage of controversy yet—I think we can gather resolution and strength and inspiration from the past. Surely this generation will not default on an obligation which has been met so nobly by the citizens through all our history.

Someone may mention the matter of cost of a new high school building. That is, of course, important. If the estimates run high let us remember the remarks made in the House of Representatives at Washington 50 years ago by Speaker Reed. Some Congressman complained in alarm that for the first time in our national history the Congress of the day was appropriating a billion dollars.

"But this is a billion-dollar country," said Speaker Reed, and that silenced the criticism.

Our schools must not be neglected. The boys and girls of the rising generation are a billion-dollar asset.

Mr. Speaker, this man Hassett, who said the foregoing; as a boy was what he is now, a compendium and an encyclopedia of information—a "Boswell to any Johnson."

It has been a pleasure to both my father and me to have had a friend from the home town at the news desk, in the press gallery and at "the other end of the Avenue" to whom we could talk neighborly, while respecting the dividing line of partisanship, asking no favors and granting none.

Incidentally, the fact I went to school to his sister Mame and with his sister Nell and taught another sister Noan, never has dulled the contact we have had, nor lessened the tightness of the bond of friendship which always has obtained.

I pay my tribute to his ability and his accomplishments and the deserved recognition accorded him by two Presidents of the United States.

Address of Hon. J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of my colleagues the very splendid address made by our great and distinguished Attorney General, the Honorable J. Howard McGrath, at the Hotel Statler in New York City on June 15, 1950. The occasion was a gala function at which the fur industry gathered to honor an outstanding citizen of my district, Sol Vogel. Mr. Vogel has won world-wide fame, not only as a designer, but as an American devoted to everything that is traditionally good in our community. He has won his mark among men by dint of unselfish and untiring service.

Attorney General McGrath's remarks are as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I consider it a great honor and deem it a distinct privilege to be here this evening and participate with you on this happy occasion. I am pleased to share with you the acclaim which is being given to your eminent member, the world-famed designer, Sol Vogel.

In awarding a plaque to a man of his artistic ability, you are not only paying tribute to a personality who has contributed so much to the success of a very important industry in our economic system, but are giving impetus and encouragement to uncontrolled creative art, a treasured asset in a free world.

The spirit of association has in all ages induced men to join together for the pleasures of mutual enjoyment, but more often for the attainment of some common purpose for which the support of numbers is necessary.

This is reflected in your meeting here tonight. Mr. Vogel, with his artistic creations and designs as well as with his publications, has manifested the opportunities available in a country like ours where individual merit can be recognized, encouraged, and rewarded.

I say this because the events of the day necessitate a re-emphasis of that aspect of our American way of life, which is now threatened by enemies from within and without. Only yesterday Americans everywhere were observing Flag Day. In about 3 weeks we shall all be celebrating Independence Day. This day, coming between those two most significant and yet closely related national days of observance, it is well to pause and reflect somewhat on their significance with respect to current events in world affairs.

When on June 14, 1777, the Continental Congress adopted the stars and stripes as the emblem of the United States, it did so by an enactment which set forth that the Congress resolved: "That the flag of the United States be 13 stripes alternate red and white; that the Union be 13 stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation." Little did those brave men dream of the eventual size of the new constellation which was to blaze forth to the world in the years to come. Little did they realize that in the next 173 years that constellation would grow to 48 stars and would become to the world the aura of stars of hope and inspiration; the insignia of liberty and freedom; the only refuge of the oppressed and enslaved; the ultimate in happiness and joy.

Throughout our entire history that star-spangled banner has been a flag of battle and a flag of peace. Wherever it has waved, it has inspired the hearts of men to brave and courageous deeds. It has instilled in the souls of people reverence and awe for the dignity of the human being. It has resurrected faith in the ultimate goodness of mankind. It is today the proudest symbol of liberty on earth. It is indeed a flag of justice under the law and is the token of those institutions by which free men can live. It is the flag of liberation; and I am confident, as someone has said, that it "will never fly at half mast over dead ideals."

Dictators dread and fear it; and freedom-loving people who must be the guardians of their own liberty cherish it.

There is no more precious possession today than the privilege that can accrue to any individual who may claim the protection of this flag. The enslaved people of the world look upon it as the guardian and emblem of the possessors of those moral, spiritual, political, economic, and social values which alone can bring to them, the peace and freedom they so sorely need and pray for. The sight of Old Glory is a proclamation to the world that rights, privileges, and immunities of a free people can be protected and respected, regardless of nationality, racial, or religious affiliations.

And yet, the privileges which this flag provides for us have their corresponding responsibilities. This flag is meaningful to us also as the symbol of our heritage which is very precious. We are the heirs of all generations that preceded us. They preserved that flag and all that it symbolizes, with blood, sweat, and tears, through bitter sacrifices and triumphant joy, through dark depressions and bright prosperity, through war and peace. Pomp and circumstance are not sufficient in marking such days as Flag Day or July Fourth. This banner of freedom must be transmitted on to future generations, unstained and unblemished, carrying under its folds the same privileges and protectives so that generations to come will bless us as we bless the generations that have gone. Moreover, the transmission of this flag untarnished and unmarred will mean a better and safer world for our children, and our children's children, and generations to come, not only in our own country, but everywhere else in the world.

As you and I sit here this evening, we are not unmindful that these are confused and troubled times. To be sure, there have been other confused and troubled periods in the history of the world, but certainly there has never been a period in which the consciousness of the confusion and trouble was so widespread and so insistent. Our vastly multiplied means of communication bring the mood of the world home to us from hour to hour. The atomic age with its H-bomb, supersonic devices, and other mechanical and technological achievements has served to confuse mankind.

Also, we are confronted today with a threat of an alien philosophy of life which if left unchecked will mean the destruction of all civilization. The world is divided into two forces. On the one hand there are the forces of freedom and liberty. On the other, those of darkness and slavery. We are threatened by the totalitarian dictators who would crush the individuality of human beings and herd them into an indistinguishable mass to be the automaton slaves of a superstate.

The great mistake made by most Americans is, as Monsignor Fulton J. Sheen has recently indicated, the thought that communism is an economic doctrine only. While the Communists do have their economic system they are primarily not interested in economics. They are determined to impose upon mankind a different philosophy of life; a philosophy in which man is dehumanized; where the human personality is of no significance; where the state is no longer seen as existing for man.

The threat coming from the countries behind the iron curtain is one of the greatest challenges in the history of the United States. The great oceans east and west which have guarded our ventures in popular government for three centuries have lost their power to protect us. Technological and mechanical progress has exposed our shores to all the storms of the world. The entire universe has become one small neighborhood. As a great historian and political scientist (De Toqueville) wrote 115 years ago, we rely "upon personal interest to accomplish ends, and give free scope to the unguided strength and common sense of the people." On the other hand, communism centers all the authority of society in a single arm. The principal instrument in our society is freedom—in their society, servitude.

In confronting this struggle the American people must face this challenge courageously as they have met every other challenge to their existence as a free people. In view of the nature, cunning and strategy of the adversary, nothing short of the best will suffice. We must show to the world that democracy works efficiently and that democratic institutions can bring peace and happiness to mankind.

We have already made a unique contribution to the world in the manner in which we have shouldered our responsibility for the personal liberty of the individual, and in the practical way we have worked out the consequence of liberty in the idea of opportunity. From our American heritage, material as well as spiritual, we have found the means to construct an interpretation of democracy which can be reinterpreted to encompass a global meaning. We have learned the art of human relationship with respect to our neighbors who may be different in race, creed, nationality, or idiosyncrasies.

From its very beginning, American history is a continuous story of immigrants coming from older lands arriving here with inherited ideologies, but which they later modified in the process of adapting themselves to new conditions and new experiences. Colonial settlers were immigrants who came to this hemisphere to live with others who were not of their own kin. People of diverse stock and of different viewpoints and experiences learned how to live with one another competitively, but in self-interest as a united nation.

In this country there is no aristocracy of race, of color, or of creed. The American of today is the result of the contribution of each and all constituent groups and elements integrated to make up our civilization. Some of you here may have been immigrants yourselves, certainly many of you are sons of immigrants. But we all take pride in the contribution which these newcomers have made to the economic, social, and political development of our country.

The fur trade need not be reminded of its contributions to the economic leadership which this country enjoys today. Your industry has had a most potent influence on the explorations of a vast geographical portion of our Nation. In fact, the development of our great northern Territories was almost entirely due to the pioneering and business sagacity of fur traders. Lee M. Friedman, an eminent president of the Jewish Historical Society, has so aptly described what, for example, immigrants of the Jewish faith have contributed to the development of the department store, the retail and wholesale trade, and particularly in the clothing industries. All I need mention are names like Isador and Nathan Straus or R. H. Macy, Adam Gimbel, and Marcus Fechheimer. No wonder Professor Morison, of Harvard, commented in his Oxford History of the United States that—

"Human dignity owes much to the Hebrew organizers of the garment trades who wiped out class distinctions in dress."

That contribution to our democratic way of life is most meaningful. We must carry on these processes if we are to discover the road to peace. There is no objective more important today than to rediscover the road to peace. To date that road has been insufficiently traveled. What is more disturbing it has not yet even been clearly charted. There are before us insuperable obstacles which must be hurdled. However, we must be mindful that in the past our Nation has met and conquered other serious obstacles.

To chart that road to peace accurately we must first and foremost provide economic stability in our own country. As President Truman said in a speech delivered just about a year ago:

"It is a prime belief of the Communist philosophy that our kind of economy is doomed to failure. The Communists predict that our prosperity will collapse—bringing the rest of the free world down with it. But they are wrong—just as wrong as they can be.

"We know more today about keeping our economy strong than we have ever known before. We know how to strengthen our economy through the expansion of production and the purchasing power and the improvement of standards of living. We understand that constantly rising national output, increasing real wages, and a fair income for our farmers are basic elements of our economic strength."

The economic foundations of our democracy must be preserved. Free enterprise must be maintained. Labor, agriculture, and management must reconcile their differences for the common good. Without ceasing and without fearing both social speculation and invention, we must have economic stability and security. Unemployment and fear of unemployment have always been the threshold to dictatorship and the resulting loss of democratic liberties. Science and technology must be utilized to raise the standards of living for all people. The prosperity of the world depends upon the prosperity of the United States. And in that prosperity your industry plays a vital role.

Equally important is the protection of the civil rights of all individuals. There is no

room in this country for bigotry and prejudice.

There are inscribed over an entrance of the building in which the Department of Justice is housed, the following words:

"Justice is the great interest of man on earth. Wherever her temple stands there is a foundation for social security, general happiness and the improvement and progress of our race."

That justice must be preserved for all of our people.

That is why all democracy-loving people hailed the most recent decisions of our Supreme Court. I am referring, of course, to those cases where the Supreme Court affirmed unequivocally the right of individuals to be free from unreasonable discrimination in such matters as dining-car service or university graduate-school education.

It is not enough in this day and age to give lip service to democratic ideals. We must close the gap between democracy in theory and democracy in practice.

Our President has been an ardent and undaunted champion for civil rights in this country. As he said on June 29, 1947:

"We must keep moving forward, with new concepts of civil rights to safeguard our heritage. The extension of civil rights today means, not protection of the people against the Government, but protection of the people by the Government."

As Senator from Rhode Island, I introduced the civil-rights bill to which the President and his administration are committed. Their purpose is to close the loopholes in present civil-rights statutes. Moreover, I am doing everything possible to establish in the Department of Justice a separate Civil Rights Division, headed by an Assistant Attorney General—a division adequately manned and financed so that whatever statutes will be enacted can be enforced to the full extent of the law. The Department of Justice, as in the past, will continue to enforce whatever laws are extant; and thus make our people realize that the sacred Constitutional rights and privileges sought to be preserved constitute the very essence of democracy and the very heritage of every American. Unless effectively secured to every individual, these rights will soon be lost to all.

Every act of racial or religious discrimination is in a sense morally treasonable, because such acts give aid and comfort to the enemies of our institutions. The Communist propagandists have found such discriminations to be the best tools for peddling their spurious wares.

We must recognize that the true essence of the present world's troubles is largely spiritual. Morally we have not kept pace with our technological and mechanical progress. We need to seek a spiritual rearmament of the world. It was encouraging to read the recent observations of that great New York Times foreign correspondent, Drew Middleton, who wrote on June 4, 1950:

"The age of the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb of the ultimate materialism, has not yet convinced the intelligence of Europe that things are more important than thoughts, that ideas are not the ultimate weapon of mankind against evil."

We have a God-given set of values. This we inherited from our ancestors who bled, fought, and died to preserve it for us. We are faced today with a deterioration of the spiritual fiber in this world. We must not continue to permit further disintegration. Let us heed the words of our great President when he told a convention of the Augustana Lutheran Church a week ago at Washington, the following:

"We have become the leaders of the moral forces of the world, the leaders who believe that the Sermon on the Mount means what it says, the leaders of that part of the world which believes that the law is the God-given law under which we live, that our traditions have come from Moses at Sinai and Jesus on the Mount.

"* * * We have moral forces in the world which do not believe in a moral code, that even go so far as to say that there is no supreme being, that material things are all that count. * * *

"Material things are ashes if there is no spiritual background for the support of those material things."

In the genuine spirit of Flag Day and Independence Day, let us resolve to reaffirm our faith in the dignity of man. Let us be mindful of the fact that there is a basic goodness in the consciousness and instincts of mankind. Is it not better to make sacrifices now and strive for a world of peace with justice than to fight later an unwelcome war for mere survival? Our type of world will triumph only if we deeply believe in it to the exclusion of all compromises and surrenders to demagogues. We need faith and determination to strengthen our modern spiritual frontiers.

It is not enough to pay tribute to the flag and to our democratic form of government. Such a day as Flag Day must serve as one for the reconsecration to these ideals by deeds rather than by words. Let us pledge anew our allegiance to the flag, and to that republic for which it stands. Let occasions of this sort be a time for public proclamation and redeclaration of our unflinching faith in American institutions: Unequivocal confidence in our form of government, and our free economic system.

Let us resolve that we shall transmit our star-spangled banner, and all it symbolizes, to our descendants as it is enshrined now in our hearts.

Let us remember that only by a strict adherence to the moral and spiritual principles, which can only be achieved through love of God and through the teachings of our various religious faiths, can we attain the spiritual stamina which the world needs now more than ever. Only through devotion to these principles can we acquire that abundance of faith, hope, and understanding which are necessary to the ultimate triumph of the forces of good over the forces of evil.

Let us pray for the wisdom and vision to comprehend our complex world, for the sagacity to discover the means of obtaining brotherhood for all men, now and in the future. With the aid of divine providence a greater, brighter, and happier America and a world of peace and abundance will be achieved. In the poet's formula, let us—

"Press God's lamp close to our breasts,
Its splendor soon or late will pierce our gloom."

Deficit Spending Means Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Star of June 7, 1950:

LOWER DEFICIT

The Federal deficit for the fiscal year ending June 30 had been expected to be $5,400,000,000. The record for the first 11 months now indicates that the deficit will be around $4,000,000,000.

Revenues are holding up well. Many expenditures which were authorized have not yet been made. Business continues to boom in many lines.

The reduction of $1,400,000,000 in the deficit is some consolation, of course. But to have any deficit at all in these prosperous times is a reflection upon Government policy. If the debt ever is to be reduced, it must be done when employment is high.

The stock answer of the administration is that we are engaged in a cold war which necessarily means extraordinary expenses. It is true that economic and military aid to other nations must continue. Still, the large part of the budget devoted to war-connected expenses has held practically steady since 1947. The other expenses have gone up each year.

There are times when a country may increase business activity by going into debt. But we do not need that increased activity now. Congress already has voted so much encouragement in the way of mortgage guarantees that housing is being built at a record rate and the prices of lumber and other construction materials have shot up again.

Wholesale prices and farm prices both have risen by 4 percent since February. Employment is up after a slight dip. In such circumstances, deficit spending means inflation.

Despite the deficit, the administration and many Congressmen have been advocating new spending plans for so-called welfare. Presumably the low-income families would be benefitted by those programs, if voted. But the resulting inflation could be far more damaging than the benefits received by a few.

When World War II started, the country had a large number of employed and a lot of resources lying around. The cold war is being intensified when we have relatively few unemployed and when some materials are in short supply. The proper remedy is to cut public spending. A day may come when we will need the money which the Federal Government could save now.

Showdown in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Showdown in the Pacific," which appeared in the June 19 issue of Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOWDOWN IN THE PACIFIC

To a degree unknown in any previous generation the future of American enterprise is tied up with how well or ill this country conducts its foreign policy. Whether in the polite language of the diplomats we talk about internationalism, or whether we say that in a fit of absent mindedness the United States has acquired an empire, this proposition is basic.

This week in Tokyo four men whom Americans have reason to trust and to respect will sit down at a conference which can have profound effect in strengthening the weakest segment of this country's foreign policy—its relations with the Far East. They are Republican John Foster Dulles, Defense

Secretary Louis Johnson, Gen. Omar Bradley, and Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Officially they are in Tokyo to work out a peace treaty with Japan. Actually, as General MacArthur has indicated, their talk will range the Pacific. Particularly will it center on the island of Formosa, technically still part of the Japanese Empire and last stronghold of Nationalist China.

"DIRTY WEATHER ABOUT"

In the words of Conrad's famous story, Typhoon (which blew up incidentally near Formosa Straits), there is some dirty weather knocking about this area. In the opinion of most military experts, the Chinese Communists on the mainland must storm Formosa in the next 6 weeks if they wish to take it this wear. Even if the attack is put off, as General MacArthur now hopes, the island is a glittering prize in the struggle between communism and civilization.

Lying along the line of sea communications between Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines, larger than the combined areas of Massachusetts and Connecticut, and possessing a population of nearly 8,000,000 (more than Australia), Formosa remains of immense importance. Last week, even before the conference began, General MacArthur let it be known that its fall to the Reds would be a fatal blow to American prestige everywhere in the Pacific.

General MacArthur's forthrightness on this point comes as a welcome relief in view of the hedging of the State Department. It is now 6 months since the combined Chiefs of Staff in Washington came to the conclusion that Formosa should be held and that a military mission should be sent to the island forthwith. That conclusion was overruled on January 5 by President Truman on the advice of Secretary of State Acheson. Instead of military supplies, Mr. Acheson promised some economic assistance which seems to have amounted to little more than sending some fertilizer.

This fertilizer policy of Mr. Acheson, which apparently is still United States policy, has been riddled by such men as Senators TAFT, KNOWLAND, SMITH, and by former President Hoover. They have emphasized the vast inconsistency of this country's spending billions in Europe to stop communism while letting its case in the Pacific go by default. To the bleating cries of Senator CONNALLY, that aid to Formosa would mean war, they and others have pointed out that the United States is risking war every day in other parts of the globe. It did so with the Berlin air lift. It did so in Greece. It did so last Whitsuntide when it stood up to the German Communist demonstrations. The whole Truman doctrine and the Atlantic Pact are founded on the calculation that positions of strength will deter aggression, that positions of weakness invite it.

But more than this. Time and stubborn fact seem to have undermined two great State Department fallacies. These are that Formosa is not worth holding and cannot be held by aid to Chiang. Two weeks ago Admiral Radford, chief of the Pacific Fleet, flatly denied the first proposition, stating that loss of Formosa would jeopardize our other bases. As to the effectiveness of all-out military aid to Chiang there is evidence that if rendered promptly 6 months ago it could have turned the trick and that even now it could be decisive.

THE ACHESON LINE

For the forces of free China are by no means spent. Chiang has an Army in being of roughly 200,000 men. He is possessed of a small navy, and it is conceded on all sides that a cross-channel Communist leap would be extremely hazardous. After all, the English Channel, only 20 miles wide, stumped Hitler. The Formosa channel is 100 miles. The great danger to Formosa is from the air. The Chinese Reds have some 35 modern Russian jet fighters with Russian pilots. Chiang, on last reports, had none. These, however, could be supplied rapidly were this country willing.

Why then does the State Department hold back in this elementary step? More than it likes to admit, we suspect, it is still influenced by those who recklessly hold that Chiang should not be supported on political grounds. This was the line of the disgraceful State Department white paper which placed full responsibility for China's disaster on its leadership and completely exonerated the United States. It is also the line of the Owen Lattimores and of the Amerasia group.

But this whole line not only distorts history (Chiang was fighting communism when Mr. Acheson was, diplomatically speaking, in knee britches), but it totally overlooks what the State Department is doing in the rest of Asia. If Chiang is "corrupt," what of Siam? If Chiang is "reactionary," what of Bao Dai whom we are backing to the hilt in Indochina? Ever since the United States intervened in Greece it has, or should have, outgrown the idea that it can only support governments which are letter-perfect. If we are to play our part as order-keeper for the world, we shall have to back our friends where we find them. And, on the record, Nationalist China is the friend of this country, and Communist China is its declared enemy.

TIME FOR A CHANGE

Thus, the issue of Formosa raises the critical question as to how serious the State Department is in carrying forward the cold war which it never stops prating about. The exercise of power by the United States is bound to face this Republic with cruel dilemmas. But, as regards Formosa, there is a mounting case for action. There is a military case because the island is strategically important. There is a practical case because, for better or for worse, Chiang commands the only Asiatic anti-Communist force in being. There is a moral case because we cannot let this territory pass to Communist hands without giving up basic principles.

This is the truth which apparently General MacArthur has put his finger on. As the conference in Tokyo progresses one can only hope that ways and means are found to implement a new policy and are brought home to Washington. And here history, if we will let it, may be given guidance. Speaking of the Open Door, John Hay said in effect: "The moment the United States declared itself the rest of the world paused and finally came over to our ground."

The Open Door policy involved risks, but as developed by Hay, Stimson and Cordell Hull it at least had stature, integrity and honor. Today we need its counterpart and it is not to be found in Mr. Acheson's "letting the dust settle" or "fertilizer for Formosa." In the last analysis it is up to the President to decide and to act. But if he is true to the great policy of Containment, which bears his name, his course should be clear.

Business in New York Under FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, certain members of this body are continually and vociferously denouncing FEPC as a "communistic piece of legislation which is being rammed down the throats of the American people." They keep warning and threatening the rest of the country that if FEPC is enacted it will hurt all States as it has hurt the State of New York. The people of this country will not be fooled by such accusations the only purpose of which is to confuse and divide our people.

I commend to your attention a preliminary report which has just been issued by the Census Bureau on its 1948 census of business for the State of New York. It demonstrates how irrational is the argument that business in New York has been hurt since the State adopted FEPC. Here are the very interesting findings of the Census Bureau:

From 1939 to 1948 retail, wholesale, and service establishments in New York showed a tremendous expansion in dollar volume of trade. Retail sales in 1948 showed an increase of 161 percent over 1939, when the last business census was taken. Wholesale sales volume rose in the same period by 188 percent, while the service trades receipts increased by nearly 200 percent.

At the same time employment over the 9-year period rose comparably. In the retail establishments the number of employees increased from 587,180 in 1939 to 760,587 in 1948; in the wholesale trade employees increased from 300,324 to 381,395, and in the service trades from 151,911 to 214,478.

If this can be called hurting or injuring New York State, then we do not mind such pain, and would like more of it. I am certain other States will be happy to follow the example of New York and enact FEPC locally, and eventually also nationally.

President's Civil-Rights Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Successful Fayetteville Negro Leader Opposes President's Civil-Rights Plan," written by Jack Crosswell, Daily News staff writer, and published on June 18, 1950, in the Greensboro Daily Times, of Greensboro, N. C.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUCCESSFUL FAYETTEVILLE NEGRO LEADER OPPOSES PRESIDENT'S CIVIL-RIGHTS PLAN

(By Jack Crosswell)

FAYETTEVILLE, June 12.—"Negro businessmen in the South have excellent chances for success if they have the ability and drive to render reliable service," says James McLauchlin, Negro trucking contractor at Fayetteville, who heads a thriving concern.

"The customer buys service and quality," he commented, "and the smart buyer searches for bargains and not colors of skin."

McLauchlin, a deacon in the Negro Baptist Church of Fayetteville, began his business venture on a "shoestring and a prayer" 5 years ago. And it has paid off well.

Today he is considered one of the most prosperous small businessmen in Cumberland County and owns a grocery store, an

auto repair shop, and a sand-gravel company, in addition to his trucking firm.

When asked if being a Negro hurt him in business, he replied: "A company from the North was the only one to ever refuse me a contract because of my being black.

"Although I operate on a competitive basis with several white concerns, I manage to get my share of the local hauling contracts," he added.

However, the road up for McLauchlin has not been paved all the way. He received little formal education and gained most of his knowledge through practical experience and night study.

He was born on a farm near here 40 years ago and attended Cumberland County schools until he decided to "start out on his own" in 1928.

"Getting a job in those days wasn't easy," he recalled. "The depression was here and there just wasn't any work to be found."

He got his first job as an unskilled laborer with a building firm. He dug ditches, mixed cement, poured concrete, and shoveled gravel long hours each day for $1.50 per week.

LEARNED TO REPAIR MOTORS

His next job was with a plumber. He served as a plumber's helper for about a year before getting a job driving a dump truck.

It was on this job he learned how to repair motors, bid on contracts, and sell sand. "I worked for a good man that was willing to teach me all he know," McLauchlin commented.

Five years ago, McLauchlin said some people advised him not to open up a business in the South. "They kept saying for me to go North," he remarked.

He laughed, "I went North—to New York—and saw some of the worst slums I've ever seen. I came straight back to Fayetteville and bought a dump truck with the money I had saved up."

His business, sparked by the postwar building boom, rapidly increased, and he had to buy more trucks and hire more men. It was during this rush that he bought a store, an auto repair shop, and started selling sand and gravel.

In addition to his business, McLauchlin is active in church and civic work. He also takes an interest in political races.

OPPOSES FEPC PLAN

He rates the late President Roosevelt as the greatest friend the working man has ever had in the White House. Yet, he is opposed to Truman's FEPC plan.

McLauchlin believes more good would be done if the money intended for FEPC were used to improve the living conditions of the Negro and to help him get a better education.

"North Carolina has made great progress in racial relations without outside interference. I have never been denied the right to vote," he said.

His greatest ambition is to see his son, Bobby, 12, finish school and become a physician. "The Negro race needs competent and conservative professional men who will be a credit to us," he proclaimed.

Poems by Floyd Chatham Genter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two poems, one entitled "Prayer for America," the other entitled "Lest We Regret," written by Floyd Chatham Genter, of Schenectady, N. Y.

There being no objection, the poems were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAYER FOR AMERICA

Father above, whose spiritual light,
Enlighteneth nations to choose aright,
We offer a prayer to Thee, now made
For America, dauntless and unafraid,
Rich in tradition, heritage, and lore,
By blessings from Thee, from shore to shore,
To keep Thy law, Thy will fulfill,
Her course pursue, suffer no ill.

Father of lights, to Thee we pray,
Bless America's manner from day to day,
Star of the West, its influence bear
To nations o'er seas, in grip of fear;
As we pray, "Give us our daily bread,"
"Good will, good neighbor," help us to spread
To nations afar, in war's false glee,
Keep America sane, we petition Thee.

God of nations, Christ, and the ages,
God of Scripture's sacred pages.
Inspire in America, blest from her birth,
Such reverence for Thee from men on earth,
Such pride in her duty and privilege given,
Such faith in her calling as undertaken,
Her example proven, other nations o'er;
Peace may be chosen, war no more.

God of nations and God of men,
Give statesmen knowledge to exercise, when
A world in commotion, in frenzy fraught,
Innocents destroyed, lives distraught,
Descend Thy might upon us, please,
Thy Grace to shame men's hard decrees,
Till o'er this land and lands afar,
Peace comes forever, law, guiding star.

Father, Almighty God on High,
Help those willing to suffer or die,
That ply the sea or travel the air
Defenders of our liberties, rare.
Comfort the homes bereaved that mourn,
And hearts of parents sad and torn.
And all the people ready to give
Their lives, their fortunes, that freedom live.

Father of Abraham, discerning our needs,
Father of races, faiths, and creeds
Here commingled, as never else known,
Let passions burn out before reason's throne;
Loyalty, truth, service engraven
Upon all hearts, as here we leaven
The mixed bloods and culture rare,
Shield America, Father, with tenderest care.

Christ of all life, Conquerer of death,
Breathe o'er America a healing breath;
Vice and wrong and crime to cease,
Work and plenty and joy increase;
Worship of Thee, pure and good,
America known for brotherhood;
Brotherhood based on each man's worth,
Man, noble man, and no one serf.

God of all powers, as mankind strives,
Imbue in our people more perfect lives;
The distressed uplift from poverty's thrall,
Thy infinite love bestow on all,
While sin and greed, as tares we burn,
Thy bounteous riches received in return.
Till men shall rejoice from sun to sun,
Thy rulership own, "Thy kingdom come."

Eternal Father, we ask of Thee,
America's destiny, forever free;
Her rulers chosen by freemen's choice,
Governed by statute, not autocrat's voice.
Faith in our mission, grant us ever,
And America united ne'er to sever;
America preserved by godly men,
Men in God's likeness, amen, amen.

—*Floyd Chatham Genter,*
SCHENECTADY, N. Y.

LEST WE REGRET

Lest we forget, Father on high,
Far, far beyond the starry sky,
And yet so near that people's hearts
Their every need to Thee imparts,
Their faintest call, in thought, in prayer,
Reaches Thine ear to for them care,
In perfect trust in battle sweat.
God reign within—lest we regret.

Lest we forget, Father of power,
We sing, "We Need Thee Every Hour."
Help us to hold like a bird awing
To every tried and trusted thing.
That time has proven, that God gave
To man in birthright, thus to save.
Throughout the gloom of battle sweat
God, help our faith—lest we regret.

Lest we forget, Father in Heaven,
Those days when civilization riven,
And ancient rule of tooth and nail,
Like beasts that prowl the forest trail,
Men, growth of ages would tear down,
And man and art and lovely town
Be crushed to dust; in battle sweat
God, give us strength—lest we regret.

Lest we forget, Father of thought,
From out whose Mind the worlds were wrought,
Let Thy great Mind our pattern be,
As Divine laws we clearer see.
Uphold free standards; righteous, grand,
Bless freemen in their final stand
To call on Thee, in battle sweat,
Thy Mind to prove—lest we regret.

Lest we forget, Father of wealth,
Thy riches vanish not by stealth
Of robber, thief, who'd steal away
Our treasures for eternal day,
Teach us as daily in Thy sight
That wealth of mind and mine, and right
To Thee belong; in battle sweat
To justly use—lest we regret.

Lest we forget, Father of Might,
Who upheld ancients in the right
And power didst just warriors lend.
We plead again Divine Aid send
To break Satanic influence strong,
To subdue sin, and war, and wrong;
Throughout our test in battle sweat,
God, gird our loins—lest we regret.

Lest we forget, Father of light,
That gave to man the beauteous night,
The evening stars, the moon, the seas,
The fragrance of the orchard's breeze,
And other worlds and other suns,
Help us to vanquish land-set guns
And submarines; in battle sweat
God, wisdom give—lest we regret.

Lest we forget past battles fought,
Lest we forget how Freedom's bought,
Lest we forget fond parents' fears,
Lest we forget poised airplanes' gears
Raised in freemen's, Justice's name
Aimed to avenge past patriots slain,
God, help us, by our battle sweat
To conquerors be—lest we regret.

Lest we forget our valiant dead,
The anguish of all those who've bled,
The wounds of soldiers—they who died,
The brawn of sailors—each who vied
With others to keep high our flag,
Who never faltered, did not lag;
Lest we forget their battle sweat,
God, all we'd pledge—lest we regret.

Lest we forget the voice of men,
Who counselled master courage, when
Gunfire swooped down from the sky,
Who even said, alone, they'd die
Fighting in streets, against the foe,
And vowed they'd fell the tyrant, so
World Peace would come from battle sweat
Let's aid their cause—lest we regret.

Lest we forget, ages of time,
The weighty sins, the wars, the crime,
The millions dead, untold wealth lost;
Men, nations ruined, rebellion's cost

The earth despoiled, the willful cause
Man's breach of Heaven's and Nature's laws;
Men, penitent; there is chance yet
God's will to do—lest we regret.

Lest we forget our deep desire,
That Ruler's minds, agreed, aspire,
To justly rule throughout the earth,
Each, Godly, all, their spiritual birth
Prove, Wars outlawed! God help us claim
Men, nations, cleansed in Jesus' name;
Peace, outcome of all battle sweat
Victorious thus—we'll not regret.

—*Floyd Chatham Genter.*

SCHENECTADY, N. Y.

Let Us Ratify the Genocide Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the scheduled discussion of the Genocide Convention in the very near future, and the great interest which this matter has aroused throughout our country and the world in general, I desire to place in the RECORD two items dealing with the question. One is an article by the noted columnist, Marquis Childs, published in the Washington Post, June 21, 1950; the other is a news item from the New York Times of the same date.

Both articles present highly significant observations concerning the reasons for outlawing the crime of genocide, which is defined as mass murder or mass extermination of racial groups. As the leader of the democratic forces in the world, and the Nation whose words and opinions are most influential toward the good of humanity, it is extremely desirable that the United States should ratify the Genocide Convention at an early date, in this way continuing its traditional policy of world leadership for the benefit of all mankind.

The articles are as follows:

[From the Washington Post of June 21, 1950]

GENOCIDE CONVENTION

(By Marquis Childs)

REASONS TO OUTLAW MASS MURDER

One of the characteristics of the strange time in which we live is an almost pathetic belief in the power of law to change the nature of human society. Particularly here in America we are at times inclined to endow the mere fact of the adoption of a law with a kind of magic.

This was most forcibly illustrated, of course, in the prohibition law of the twenties. We are still suffering from the aftermath of that noble experiment in eradicating ancient human habit by a prescription written down in the law books. Gambling is another ancient habit that breaks through the barrier of law with frequent, violent, and destructive consequences.

In the end of the session jam now looming up as Congress looks hopefuly toward getting away, one issue may come in for a lot of debate. That is the treaty the Senate has been asked to ratify incorporating the Genocide Convention already approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Genocide, by dictionary definition, is the use of deliberate, systematic measures toward the extermination of a racial, political, or cultural group. The UN Convention outlawing genocide grows out of the conviction that the racial crimes committed by the Nazis against whole peoples can be prevented by a statute having the sanction of the UN behind it.

Those crimes were so monstrous, so deliberate, so scientifically carried out that it was hard for the civilized world to take in what has happened. In his moving novel, The Wall, John Hersey has tried to show what these mass crimes meant to individuals caught in the horror of scientific liquidation.

But the Genocide Convention, intended to outlaw this horror, has produced opposition and doubt. The American Bar Association has taken a stand against it in the belief that it goes so far as to supersede our own laws here at home.

Similar opposition has developed in the South. The New Orleans States recently devoted a series of editorials to showing why the Genocide Convention should not be adopted. In these detailed and carefully analytical articles it was pointed out that provisions of the convention go so far as to make it conceivable that an American citizen might be ordered before an international court and convicted of a "crime" that he could not, or would not be punished for, in the courts of his own State.

For example, one of the acts forbidden under the convention is "causing serious bodily or mental harm to members" of a national, ethnical, racial or religious group as such. This is so broad, the editorials point out, as to infringe on certain basic American guaranties, such as the right of free speech; putting in the hands of an international tribunal the right to determine whether American citizens should, or should not, continue to live under these guaranties.

The Genocide Convention may go too far. There are those who would like to add clarifying language to the resolution ratifying the treaty, in order to make sure that extreme interpretation is not intended.

But if the extremes are modified, it seems to me that mass murder should be outlawed by the only international body with authority to take such a step—the United Nations. The Genocide Convention ratified by the members of the UN would, I believe, have the sanction of the great mass of peoples everywhere.

The objection is raised that such a statute cannot be adequately enforced, and particularly behind the iron curtain where slave labor camps, and the terrible cruelty of enforced migration of peoples are in the Nazi pattern. But it will, nevertheless be a beginning and an aspiration.

Law has always represented aspiration as well as reality. Laws forbidding murder of one individual by another individual evolved out of primitive society, when the sanction against murder grew strong enough among enough people. Law and order have been a slow and painstaking growth, and so inevitably will they be on the international level.

Next month the International Labor Office of the United Nations is expected, under the urging of the American Federation of Labor, to initiate an investigation into Russia's slave-labor camps. Some of the gruesome facts of the harsh slavery, to which millions are subjected, will be spread before the world, provided this inquiry is earnestly carried out. It may not be possible to punish those who are guilty of such mass crimes. But against the background of a treaty ratified by most of the nations they will be found guilty before the bar of world opinion.

[From the New York Times of June 21, 1950]

UNITED STATES URGED TO BACK GENOCIDE TREATY—TAYLOR, FORMER PROSECUTOR AT NUREMBERG, WARNS US AGAINST LOSING PRESTIGE ABROAD

This country's prestige in Germany and Japan will suffer a devastating blow if the Senate rejects the genocide treaty adopted by the United Nations, Brig. Gen. Telford Taylor declared yesterday.

The former prosecutor in the German war crimes trials spoke at a luncheon of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. One thousand persons attended the meeting under the auspices of the men's and boys' wear division of the conference.

General Taylor, who is now practicing law in this city, commended the group for its support of the genocide pact, which is pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The pact would make mass murder of any religious or racial group a crime under international law.

To explain his conviction that United States approval of the treaty was essential, General Taylor repeated a comment a German official had made to him at the end of the Nuremberg war crimes trials.

"He said the trials simply proved that there was one law for Germans and another law for everybody else," General Taylor said.

This comment takes on special significance in view of the tenor of most of the objections that have been raised against the treaty in this country, he went on. Opposition has centered around the point that approval of the treaty would limit United States sovereignty, he said, and specifically that it would leave United States citizens open to prosecution by an international court.

"Our failure to ratify the treaty on such grounds as that would be a devastating blow to our foreign policy and undermine our prestige abroad," General Taylor said.

Rejection of the treaty would have a particularly strong impact in Germany and Japan, where we have been parties to international trials of former enemies, he added. We would, in effect, be proving that the German official was right, he said.

Another speaker was Dr. Francis P. Corrigan, political adviser on Latin American to the United States mission to the United Nations. Ralph Schneider, president of Broadstreet's and chairman of the men's and boy's wear division of the conference, presided.

Mrs. Samuel W. Halprin, president of Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, sent a telegram yesterday to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee members urging that the committee recommend ratification of the genocide pact. "The heinous crime of genocide," said the message, "which destroyed many millions of human lives, both Christian and Jewish, is a blot on our civilization."

Why Are American Communists So Enthusiastic About Trygve Lie?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Counterattack, the weekly bulletin of "facts to combat communism" which is published by an organization consisting largely of former FBI agents. The adulation of Mr. Lie by left-wing forces can only create uneasiness regarding his disinterestedness, especially in view of his known activity years ago in a Communist trade-union set-up in his native country, which set-up in turn was a part of the trade-union affiliate of the Communist Inter-

national. Lie's present activities suggest that the Soviet Union knew what it was doing when it supported him for the Secretary-Generalship of the United Nations and opposed our candidate, Lester Pearson, of Canada. The article is mostly regarding Communist wheels within wheels:

AMERICAN COMMUNISTS HAIL TRYGVE LIE

When the UN Secretary-General returned from his Washintgon-London-Paris-Moscow peace mission on May 25 he was greeted at Lake Success by two organized reception groups.

The UN Staff Association reception had no great significance. It was the routine-type reception for a big official by his subordinates.

But there was another organized reception that did have great significance. It was put on by Communist-front officials and members.

The Congress of American Women, International Workers Order, American Slav Congress (all on Attorney General's List), the National Labor Conference for Peace, American Labor Party, Harlem Trade Union Council, Women for Peace (one of the newly created "peace" fronts), and several other Stalinist-line organizations were represented in the delegation.

According to Communist Party (CP) press, Trygve Lie "was almost submerged in a sea of flowers" as members of the group pressed bouquets on him.

It would have been surprising if such a group did not greet Lie. In the conduct of his office he has frequently taken stands and made recommendations that favored Stalin Russia. As a result, he is a favorite of CP and crypto-Communist press. He is leader "Mr. UN," "massive," a toiling peace leader—always referred to in a friendly, sympathetic way.

This praise and adulation of Lie has been stepped up since he made his proposal to seat Communist China in the Security Council. And when he decided to make his peace trip it grew to even greater proportions. Every move and comment he made was noted and praised.

The Daily Worker, CP national newspaper, says Lie's mission "has stirred hundreds of millions" of people, that the world applauds it.

VITO MARCANTONIO, New York Congressman, who heads Communist Party-line American Labor Party and is a Daily Worker hero, has presented a resolution in Congress to invite Lie to appear before the House and state his peace proposals.

Henry Wallace now says that Lie is "World Citizen No. 1." He has suggested that Trygve Lie peace demonstrations be organized in every city in the country and that peace resolution be sent to Lie from all parts of the United States.

And Lie sent greeting to Chicago's Communist-inspired Mid-Century Conference for Peace. Speakers at the conference praised him.

Communist Party press was indignant at cool reception given Lie in Washington. President Truman, it editorialized, was "contemptuous of peace." And it has castigated Secretary of State Acheson because his line "collides with the line of UN Secretary-General Trygve Lie at every point; in fact, Washington tried in vain to prevent Trygve Lie from even starting on his peace mission."

Whether or not the last statement is true it is an open secret that Washington, with good reason, was displeased with timing of Lie's mission.

This was because the timing could help only Stalin. The Cominform is pushing its peace-propaganda offensive as never before. Lie's mission conformed to the Cominform line and helped Soviet propaganda.

And it coincided with Secretary of State Acheson's visit to London and Paris to strengthen the North Atlantic Council in an effort to protect free Europe from further aggression by Stalin. Because of this it destroyed much of the propaganda value of Secretary Acheson's trip. State Department evidently regarded it as a very effective counter-propaganda move.

Johannes Steel, pro-Communist ex-radio commentator, now writes a Global Gossip column for the Daily Compass. Much of Steel's gossip concerns what is being said and done in higher circles of the Communist world. But he occasionally gives other interesting bits of information.

Steel reported this week that Trygve Lie has told his intimates that North Atlantic Pact cannot work out militarily. The biggest political factor in Europe today, Lie says, is a growing united peace front of all elements that is even more powerful than the Comintern's (Communist International's) great popular front movement of 1936.

Fact that Lie was once a member of Comintern gives this statement great significance. He must know that this peace movement is insincere and Communist-led, that it is designed to weaken the democracies, and yet he goes along with it and does all he can to promote it.

Lie has said that the China question is the No. 1 problem in the UN. But it is quite obvious that Stalin Russia is, and always has been, UN's biggest problem. The China problem is secondary, an outgrowth of Soviet intransigence, of Stalin's determination to have his own way.

Lie, when he returned from Moscow, said that Stalin Russia wanted the UN to work—but as he made his statement Russia was boycotting the UN and refusing to abide by its regulations.

And on the very next day the Netherlands Embassy in Washington confirmed the discovery of a Soviet plot to disrupt the operation of the International Refugee Organization, a UN affiliate.

As UN secretary-general, Lie should be completely impartial. He should do everything possible to help UN operate effectively according to accepted principles of international law and the UN agreement. Russia is now violating that agreement. All his efforts, therefore, should be bent on persuading the Soviet Union to cooperate in the UN and abide by the rules.

But instead of doing this, Lie is concentrating his efforts on persuading other nations to seat Communist China and appease Stalin.

So it isn't strange that Lie was well received in Moscow, that on his return he spoke in glowing terms of the great progress made there, and that the Communists hailed him at Lake Success.

Fulton Lewis, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Charles Van Dervander, which appeared in the New York Post for today, June 21, be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is an article which merits the attention and consideration not only of the Members of Congress and every man in public life, but also of the American people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAZI FILES SAY FULTON LEWIS, JR., OFFERED ADVICE TO HITLER IN 1940

(By Charles Van Devander)

WASHINGTON, June 21.—Fulton Lewis, Jr., top Washington commentator for the Mutual Broadcasting System, is pictured in official records of the Nazi Foreign Office as a volunteer adviser of Hitler in 1940, the Post learned today.

The German documents relating to Lewis are among a mass of official papers captured by the United States Army in 1945. They are now in the possession of this Government.

One report, written by Kurt Sell, then press adviser to the German Embassy in Washington, transmitted a suggestion—attributed to Lewis—as to how Hitler might bring the war to a quick and satisfactory end. Sell, who was head of the Washington bureau of DNB, German news service, identified the Mutual broadcaster to his superiors as a close personal friend and as an admirer of Germany and the Fuehrer.

The time was late July 1940, France had been knocked out of the war. England, left to face the Nazi Wehrmacht alone, was recovering from the Dunkerque evacuation and preparing against the threat of imminent invasion. Winston Churchill had just become Prime Minister.

Lewis' reported suggestion, as transmitted to Berlin by Sell, was that Hitler should publicly appeal to President Roosevelt to bring pressure on Churchill to end his senseless and pigheaded resistance.

LEWIS DENIES IT

Today Lewis denied playing any such role.

"I never made any such statement, and I didn't believe any such idea," Lewis told the Post. "My radio scripts of the time will show that I didn't advocate any such idea."

Of Sell, he said:

"I certainly can't be responsible for what a defensive German secretary in a defensive position reported to his government.

"A great many people liked Kurt personally but hated his nazism," he added.

Lewis said he had a letter from Sell, written before the Nazi died several years ago in Portugal, denying they had discussed such a proposition. Lewis said Sell sent the letter voluntarily after being asked about the incident by a newspaper columnist.

Lewis said Sell also referred to his application, then pending, for admission to the United States.

"I told him," Lewis said, "as a matter of fact, I'm not sure whether I ever replied to his letter or not—but it was obviously impossible for him to get back at that time—or at any time."

The Nazi Embassy official reported that Lewis said he had discussed the idea with several serious-minded people, who were not otherwise identified but who apparently wholeheartedly approved.

Lewis added, according to Sell, that President Roosevelt doubtless would reject such a Hitler overture with incivility, but that nevertheless it would make a great impression in the United States and in South America.

The message from Sell was transmitted not from Washington, where it might have been intercepted, but through the German Embassy in Habana. It included a draft, attributed to Lewis, of the telegram which it was proposed Hitler send to F. D. R.

On the date of the message July 26, 1940, a wartime meeting of the foreign ministers of the 21 American Republics was in progress in Habana. Lewis, representing MBS, was

there along with many United States reporters. Sell was present as an observer for the Nazi Government.

Lewis admitted being in Havana then.

"However," he said, I didn't even see Kurt at the conference, and I hadn't seen him for some time before that. If you recall, the German Embassy at that time was taboo to any decent-minded person."

Sell's memorandum to Berlin said the meeting had provided opportunity for "unrestrained conversation with a large number of North American delegates and journalists." Without exception, he said, they regarded war between the United States and Germany as inevitable and imminent.

The text of the message continues:

"In full recognition of this actual or presumed situation, Fulton Lewis approached me yesterday. Lewis, who has been friendly with me for 12 years, highly respectable, an American journalist admiring Germany and the Fuehrer, a political commentator with Mutual Broadcasting * * * declared that the people wanted no war, but were rather defenseless against Roosevelt's refined tactics, especially now that he has made Congress a yes-apparatus without a will of its own, by means of a cornucopia of gigantic contracts to all individual States.

"He therefore requests to be allowed to expound the following idea, which he has discussed with several serious-minded people: have the Fuehrer send a telegram to Roosevelt of not more than 200 words (recent speech of the Fuehrer was too long for the average American * * *) of approximately the following content:

" 'You, Mr. Roosevelt, have many times turned to me with appeals, and have constantly expressed the wish to see a bloody war avoided. I have not declared war on England, but on the contrary have consistently emphasized that I do not wish to destroy the British Empire. My repeated invitations to Churchill to be reasonable and to arrive at an honorable treaty of peace have been stubbornly refused by Churchill. I know that it will go very hard with England if I really order total war against the British Isles. Therefore, I request you, for your part, to approach Churchill and to talk him out of his senseless pigheadedness.'

"Lewis added that Roosevelt would naturally answer with incivility and animosity; that didn't matter. But upon the North American people and, above all, upon South America, the appeal will make a deep impression and in no sense would be interpreted in serious-thinking circles as weakness."

In the closing paragraph of his message Sell attributed to Mutual's star Washington commentator a desire—if Churchill could not be induced to surrender—at least to improve Hitler's public relations in the Western Hemisphere.

The Lewis suggestion was sent to Berlin at one of the darkest hours of the war for the foes of Nazi oppression and aggression. Relatively few people then believed that England could withstand an all-out German air attack and the expected cross-channel invasion. The defeatists did not, however, include either Franklin D. Roosevelt or Winston Churchill.

F. D. R. already was pressing plans to furnish Great Britain all aid short of war. Churchill, only a month before, had rallied his countrymen and ispired freemen all over the world with his famous speech in which he declared:

"If we can stand up to him—Hitler—all Europe may be free and the life of the world may move forward into broad, sunlit uplands. * * * Let us therefore brace ourselves to our duties, and so bear ourselves that, if the British Empire and its commonwealth last for a thousand years, men will say: 'This was their finest hour.' "

Address of Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, addressed the Air University graduates at Maxwell Air Force Base, in Montgomery, Ala., last Friday. General Vandenberg's authoritative and challenging address was a grave warning of threats from without the Nation and an encouraging report of plans and preparations within. The picture he so graphically portrayed was both alarming and reassuring—alarming in its implications and reassuring as regards our capacity to successfully meet all likely developments.

General Vandenberg paid tribute to those who helped to build the Air University, and especially to General Kenney, the present commanding general, to General Fairchild, who did so much for the Air University, and the other fine officers who are continuing the splendid work of training officers of the Air Force.

His address follows:

This is the fourth annual graduation of the senior school in an institution that has already created its own tradition. The doctrines and tactics taught here during the twenties provided, during the last war, the signposts to victory. Insistence on clear thinking left its mark on all graduates. Those who attended the old Air Corps Tactical School—the predecessor of the Air War College—were not the sole beneficiaries. All levels of command were influenced by its graduates.

General Fairchild, who planned and worked with me for the rebirth of this institution on a larger scale, named it the Air University. He followed a farsighted plan to have the schools of this university carry on that relentless search for truth and understanding which produced our western civilization.

General Fairchild was a man of great faith. He believed that the best methods for defending our civilization can be discovered by the same kind of study and thought that produced it. He believed that the soundest discipline, even for military men, is to be found in the forthright search for sound conclusions based on hard facts.

The existence of this institution became a great source of satisfaction to General Fairchild. It is now one of the many living monuments to his efforts. It is the kind of monument he would value most. Just as the Air Force was fortunate in the services of a man like General Fairchild, so has this institution been fortunate in his successors here. General Kenney, who has a famous war record and remarkable capacity for leadership, has continued to broaden and expand its usefulness. And I could not discuss the Air University or the men responsible for its success without reference to the commandant of the Air War College, Orville Anderson. No man can study under or near General Anderson and fail to be stimulated by his vigorous logic, and his insistence on creative thinking and freedom from dogmatism.

No great institution can long succeed without leadership of men like those, who think profoundly and accurately. The Air University has many men of this type, who—like General Sanford of the Air Command and Staff School—were carefully selected as leaders and educators. We are confident that through their efforts such leaders will be produced.

In today's complicated world it is not possible to succeed by instinct alone. Thinking and acting must always be combined. Whether your course of study here has been worthwhile—whether it is worth the investment you and all of us have made in it—can be determined only by your actions after you leave.

You are now well aware that the Nation and the services have some very serious problems to solve. It is necessary that you recognize the difficulties that stand in the way of their solution. But if you believe those difficulties insurmountable, then your knowledge and understanding will be of little value.

I must admit that the knowledge we share has impressed upon all of us that the responsibilities of the Air Force today are extremely heavy. We believe that the resources available to us are inadequate to meet these responsibilities, and we have said so.

But if all our knowledge, our arguments, and our pleas fail to produce all the support we need, we still cannot accept the possibility of failure.

A way must somehow be found, within our national means, to prevent the destruction or even the mutilation of our Nation. And a way must somehow be found to prevent the collapse of any major portion of our western civilization.

Until such time as war may become a certainty we will not abandon our hope for peace. The superior quality, the impressive performance, and the obvious readiness which the Air Force can achieve may effectively discourage aggression.

As Mr. Finletter, the Secretary of the Air Force, said recently:

"It seems to me that the primary purpose of our Defense Establishment is to have in being and ready for immediate action a force so strong that it will stand as a compelling deterrent to a nation which would break the peace."

Even if we should be attacked in force and heavily damaged, the Air Force and all the services would resist and strike back as long as any means whatever remained. For defeat or surrender to the ruthless forces that threaten us is unthinkable.

It is obvious that no matter how heavy or difficult our responsibilities, they must and will be discharged.

There is no escape from the fact that the responsibilities of the Air Force have greatly increased during the past year. We now have a dual responsibility for complete readiness to defend and to attack at the same time. In the performance of either mission there is no room for the slightest failure or even for the slightest delay. Our initial efforts may well be our decisive efforts.

In all our plans and actions we must carry the burden of one tremendous fact. Others are slow to face this fact and slow to share the burden, but no sophistry can conceal its truth. During recent years the effectiveness of weapons against targets in the air has increased only slightly. But the effectiveness of airborne weapons against targets on the ground has been multiplied by hundreds.

Air forces can exploit this fact, but air forces are also its victims. We no longer point out the tremendous potentialities of air attack merely as a warning to others. We have ourselves become targets within the range of the initial enemy attck, as well as of attacks in the later phases of any possible war. Airplanes and bases on the ground

are now, as always, prime targets in air warfare. Their vulnerability, along with that of everything else on the surface of the earth, has increased tremendously.

Anxiety for the safety of our cities and industries is inevitable. But it should not obscure the fact that the most effective defense against air attack is a counterattack.

The enemy's striking force, like our own, can be most readily destroyed on the ground while it is being refueled, replaced, or rebuilt.

The success of this counterattack will ultimately determine the success of our defense. It will also determine whether or not our surface forces and those of our allies can hope for successful action. The air has no boundaries and neither has the job the Air Force has to be able to perform in the use of it. If there are any military responsibilities today that are greater than ours, I do not know what they are.

I do not see how we can tolerate the existence of such an incredible creature as an irresponsible Air Force officer. The words "irresponsible" and "Air Force officer" should never be used together except on papers indicating relief from duty.

The developments of the past year have added to the urgency of all our efforts. This urgency is not directly related to the theoretical possibility of war. It arises principally from the increasing difficulty of building and maintaining the strength necessary to preserve peace.

The strain of which we are all so conscious cannot be taken lightly. It is a real strain. No one can safely predict that it will decrease. We must learn to live with it.

We can do this only if the inevitable strain is equalized to a considerable degree among us all. We cannot expect to carry on our rolls the faint hearts, foggy minds, and weak spirits that tax our sympathies and patience. If we hope to be able to perform our mission we must, above all, do everything possible toward finding and keeping the strong men who will help us. And we must do everything possible toward eliminating the weak men who would hinder us.

It is true that often our problems and responsibilities seem overwhelming, even to the strong men who struggle with them. Occasional discouragement is inevitable. Occasional impatience and other symptoms of frustration are normal. In fact, there is a peculiar danger that results from our working so close to the threat that worries the whole Nation.

We have to be constantly alert and ready for the worst, even though others may relax in some degree and perhaps hope for the best. We have to prepare now for present dangers, as well as future dangers. The privilege of speculating heavily on possible developments of the unknown future is not ours. We are tempted to become unbearably impatient with those who are slow to recognize and face the threats we have to guard against. I cannot justify this slowness, but I must remind you that nothing we can do or say will completely overcome it.

Everyone acknowledges that the Air Force is in a position of tremendous importance today, but other people feel important too. Other people, especially the other services, have missions that may appear less urgent and critical than ours. But each mission, and each portion of a mission, is somebody's responsibility. To that man, it is the most important mission of all.

For this reason changes occur slowly, perhaps too slowly to keep pace with our desires. But impatience is a virtue only when it produces positive and beneficial action.

We have always to exhibit modesty, patience, and restraint—and this is in addition to our other duties.

I have said that occasional symptoms of strain are to be expected. But for any member of the Air Force to view our tasks as hopeless is to follow the counsel of despair. That is a luxury we cannot afford. Our duties are such that no relief is possible. The Air Force is no place for the man who feels that the job cannot be done. If we cannot protect this Nation and its allies against devastation, who can? If we cannot drive home a crippling blow into the vitals of an aggressor—what then can save the Nation from disaster?

You have been allotted, as experienced officers, an important portion of a load that cannot be shifted. Certainly, it cannot be transferred to your seniors, for they are just as heavily involved. You can hope for help from your juniors but only if first you train them well. The junior officers of the Air Force must be able to pick up an increasing share of the load. It is part of your job to make them capable.

We need the disciplined optimism of younger men as well as the realism of those who are older. They, too, can learn that the intelligent recognition of difficulties is just as necessary as it is uncomfortable. It will have two results—worry and work. I recommend that you emphasize the latter, for there is plenty of work to be done.

But in all of our work, through inevitable drudgery, dislocation, and confusion, let us never forget the purpose of our efforts. Along with the patience, modesty, and restraint we must maintain, let us never forget our high challenge. Wherever we are, our frontier is above our heads, and it extends above and over any aggressor who dares break the peace. There are no barriers between us and any enemy, and the hours that separate us are few. Our job is to be ready to meet an aggressor anywhere, at any time, in any strength. It is to be able to fight first and most desperately, all the way from the heart of our own Nation to the heart of an enemy nation. Our job is to be able to penetrate and inflict a mortal wound on the aggressor.

If our strength should prove not sufficiently impressive to prevent an attack, our first task will be hardest of all. We will have to prevent defeat in the air battle during the first few weeks of war. If we fail, the efforts of others cannot be supported. If we succeed, the road to ultimate victory will be clear.

Certainly we are entitled to share with other Americans all hopes and aspirations for enduring peace. We can even look forward to a future free from continued crises, dead lines, and unusual demands.

Whether war or peace is in store for us, the burdens we are now assuming will somehow be relieved. No faith in the future can justifiably be higher than ours. After all, we share the common hopes and common fate of all Americans.

But by our own hands, if they are firm hands, we can lift those hopes. And we hold in our hands the Nation's first and boldest bid for victory if open warfare is forced upon us. Whether we can win will depend, in some degree, upon the intensity and the steadiness of our efforts today.

You have now been educated in the details of most of our hopes and fears. You will go back to your duties knowing the worst—and also the best—that the Air Force can tell you.

Will you be discouraged or inspired to greater efforts by your new knowledge? What will be your influence on the junior officers and the airmen you must guide? Many of our hopes for success will depend upon your answers.

The Security of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in view of the tremendous concern of all liberty-loving Americans over the internal and external security of our great country, I believe it appropriate to review some of the measures which we have taken to assure the safety of our country against Communist aggression from abroad or infiltration from within. By way of introduction, however, I think it essential to reiterate the fact that the Russian leaders have proclaimed ever since the Red Revolution the inevitability of conflict between communism and the free democratic nations of the world. It is under these conditions that we struggle for peace. Despite this, some of our people still fail to recognize this struggle. Only the other day I had a letter from a very intelligent lady in my congressional district complaining very bitterly because of the international situation, and asserting and believing that it could all be worked out by a meeting between Stalin and the leaders of the democracies.

I fervently wish, Mr. Speaker, that our problem lent itself to such an easy solution. Unfortunately it does not. And those who think that it does, simply do not understand the basic conflict of Communist philosophy and democracy. The only solution is a strong prepared America with strong prepared allies capable of defending itself both at home and abroad.

I believe that this conclusion can be buttressed even by a casual study of the recent history of the Soviet Union which indicates the unwillingness of the leaders of that nation to risk a war—despite their beliefs in the inevitability of conflict—unless they feel that victory is assured. An examination of the documents seized by this government after the collapse of the Hitler regime in Germany proved conclusively that Stalin did everything conceivably possible to avoid a war with Hitler and that even after Hitler marched across the Soviet frontier, it was several days before the Russians counterattacked in the vain hope that war with Germany could still be forestalled. In Berlin a year or so ago when the Soviets clamped on a blockade of that German city, that blockade ended when the western allies showed their determination to stay. In that ruined city only recently all of the bombast heralding the Communist display on May 28 came to naught when the Soviets recognized that we meant business in suppressing any march into the western sector of Berlin.

The evidence thus indicates that we must rely upon preparedness if we are to prevent a third world war. A weak America will assure war. The wishful thinkers who believe that by executing a new

treaty or by holding another conference the cold war will end just do not understand and know the Russian threat.

If the politburo desired peace all that it would have to do would be to live up to the treaties which it has already executed and broken time and time and time again. If we have not learned this lesson then we have learned nothing and we are ripe indeed for Soviet plucking.

I am convinced, however, Mr. Speaker, that the vast majority of the Members of this body recognize that we are in for a long struggle. I believe, too, that they recognize that the American people must continue to make sacrifices if we are to preserve our country and its great institutions guaranteeing freedom of religion, of press, assembly, and of free enterprise.

It might be well, therefore, to review for a moment some of the steps which we have taken both at home and abroad to build up the strength of our country and its allies. As everyone knows we are faced with tremendous Federal expenditures these days, but a breakdown of those expenditures shows that over 70 cents of every dollar is going to pay for past wars, to prevent another war, or to be prepared in the event one should occur. Outlays for defense and related items total about $31,000,000,000 per annum. These outlays are broken down approximately as follows:

Department of Defense	$14,000,000,000
Economic Cooperation Administration, military assistance program and other international programs	5,000,000,000
Atomic energy program	900,000,000
Veterans' Administration	6,000,000,000
Interest on the public debt	5,500,000,000
Merchant Marine, U. S. Coast Guard, airports and aviation	500,000,000

Despite these colossal sums in our defense program we are not seeking to match the Russians man for man or gun for gun, but we are seeking to stay well ahead of the Russians in superiority of weapons, training of manpower and production potentials. Thus we are attempting to build a modern, powerful airforce, a navy equipped with the latest submarines and other sea and aircraft necessary to maintain our lines of communication, and an Army capable of rapid movement with the latest weapons. We are building a defense team. In this connection we have made funds available for erecting a radar network to protect our country from attack from the air; and recently the free world has been heartened by the announcement of the perfection of a smaller atomic weapon as well as many other new devices for warfare on land, sea, and air.

Despite the tremendous expenditures by our people for armaments, these expenditures are much less than the sums being spent by the Russians for similar purposes. As a matter of fact were we to spend the equivalent of our national income as that now being spent by the Soviet Union, our total would be about $60,000,000,000 per annum. That, of course, is why our industrial and production potential is so vital and so important because that potential is our secondary defense. That, too, is why we must remain qualitatively superior.

Mr. Speaker, I have invariably, since coming to the Congress 10 years ago, supported all measures to maintain the strength of our armed services. I remember some of the early struggles over lend-lease. I vividly recall the night when my one vote extended the draft. But our defense must include the other free peoples of the world. We have, therefore, sought to weld together the free peoples of the world in a common coalition against the Communist aggressors. In this coalition are the seeds of peace without war.

The beginning of this joint undertaking was the enactment by the Congress in 1947 of the Greek-Turkish program. This, however, was a piecemeal program with no chance of success if applied in a similar fashion to each country being threatened by Communist techniques in western Europe. It was at this point that Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and I introduced a resolution for a free and united Europe. Without being immodest, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the public discussion which accomplished this resolution had much to do with the eventual enactment of the Marshall plan. Everyone is familiar with the operation of that plan which has certainly saved western Europe from communism and which is now forging a strong alliance of the free peoples of that continent.

I will not trace all the steps leading to a united Europe but one of the outstanding developments of our times was the announcement recently of the so-called Schuman plan which calls for the pooling of the resources of western Europe and despite the Socialist Party pressure to the contrary, the British Government must go along. The Marshall plan itself has been followed by the Atlantic Pact and the military assistance program. This cooperation on the part of the free peoples of the world is every bit as important as our defense and arms programs. The Communists use as principal weapons fear, confusion, tension and threats. By these methods they have subjected eastern Europe. But the 270,000,000 skilled people of western Europe have within themselves, if they act together, all the economic and military resources required to prevent further Communist aggression. And by this integration western Europe becomes self-sufficient without further burden to the American taxpayer.

Of equal importance is the new program of using the great facilities of private enterprise in this country for the development of the backward areas of the world. This is known as the point 4 program. It has tremendous possibilities and it is similar in its operations to the good neighbor plan which has been in effect in the Western Hemisphere for 10 years or more. It contemplates using American genius in industry, agriculture, medicine and commerce. Hand in hand with this program moved the furtherance of the reciprocal trade treaties making it possible for the democracies to carry on commerce with one another without the stifling barriers of high tariffs. The people whom I have the honor of representing, Mr. Speaker, recognize the great importance of these measures to the Port of New Orleans.

There is, of course, one very dark cloud on the horizon of our foreign policy and that has been our colossal failure in China and the Far East. It is in this area where we must forge a strong policy which will prevent any further Communist aggression in that area. It has been in the Far East where we have suffered our greatest set-backs and it is there where we face the gravest challenge of the moment.

I have supported these programs not because of humanitarian reasons, as commanding as they are, but because I am convinced that they are necessary for the security of our own beloved country. I wish that I did not have to do these things. I realize that they call for the expenditure of large sums of money, but our country today is the strongest, the most powerful, the wealthiest Nation on the face of the globe. With strength and power go responsibility. We tried isolationism for most of the first half of this century and that policy resulted in two frightful world wars. In my judgment a return to isolationism will assure a third world war without the strength of allies elsewhere in the world. If ever a policy is bankrupt, isolationism is.

Mr. Speaker, without transgressing the bounds of modesty I feel that my support of these programs has been justified. I am particularly pleased with the response which I have had to some of my efforts. I recall that on February 13, 1949, in the House of Representatives, in supporting the resolution which we passed condemning the Hungarian trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, I said among other things:

> The trial of Cardinal Mindszenty has shocked the entire free world. The Communist government of Hungary before and during the trial employed the usual totalitarian technique of legal form and procedure, plus brutal maltreatment, suppression, and violence to destroy the rights of a great church leader and to violate the dignity of a human being.

I am quite proud of a letter which was addressed to me a few days later from the archbishop of my church, His Excellency Joseph Francis Rummel, of New Orleans, when he said:

> May I compliment and thank you for the excellent statement which you made before Congress on the iniquitous trial of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of Hungary. It is also inconceivable that a government should proceed upon so gross a violation of individual human rights as has actually been evidenced by the piecemeal reports that have come out to us from behind the courtroom curtain. Equally inconceivable is the deafness, blindness, and hardness of heart that would justify the communistic government in Hungary in carrying out the cruel sentence pronounced against the cardinal in the face of the universal indignation that has been expressed by so many leaders of men and of human opinion. It will always redound to your credit and honor to have arrayed yourself among the latter in the statement before Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has also conducted a war against domestic Communists. The Committee on Un-American Activities has had my full and active support. I was pleased several days ago to receive a letter from the chairman of that committee, the Honorable JOHN S. WOOD, in which he said:

Your consistent support of the Committee on Un-American Activities in its efforts to expose and eradicate subversive influences in America and thus help to uphold the committee, has been a source of personal gratification to me, as I am sure it has to your constituents and all liberty-loving people in the Nation.

In recent years we have voted in the Congress to cite Communists who were in contempt in the Un-American Activities Committee. Recently a group of Hollywood writers were sent to the penitentiary as a result of this action by the House of Representatives. Earlier the secretary of the Communist Party was also sentenced as was Gerhardt Eisler. At the same time it was through the work of this committee that the Hiss case was broken. The FBI has done an amazing job in connection with subversive activities. Only this week, in the light of this work, we have provided in the Congress for 400 additional FBI agents. The Coplon trial, the Bridges trial, the sentencing of the 11 Communist leaders in New York, are the direct result of the work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This great organization has always had my full support.

In this connection I am the sponsor of two bills which I consider very important. On March 9, 1949, I introduced H. R. 3358, a bill to combat un-American activities by requiring the registration of Communist-front organizations. I believe that you will be interested in the preamble to this legislation which is now pending before the House:

SEC. 2. As a result of evidence adduced before the various committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, Congress hereby finds that—

(1) The system of government known as totalitarian dictatorship is characterized by the existence of a single political party, organized on a dictatorial rather than a democratic basis, and by an identity between such party and its policies and the government and governmental policies of the country in which it exists, such identity being so close that the party and the government itself are for all practical purposes indistinguishable.

(2) The establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in any country results in the destruction of free democratic institutions, the ruthless suppression of all opposition to the party in power, the complete subordination of the rights of individuals to the state, the denial of fundamental rights and liberties which are characteristic of a democratic or representative form of government, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of religious worship, and results in the maintenance of control over the people through fear, terrorism, and brutality.

(3) There exists a world Communist movement which, in its origins, its development, and its present practice, is a world-wide revolutionary political movement whose purpose it is, by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups (governmental and otherwise), espionage, sabotage, terrorism, and any other means deemed necessary, to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in all the countries of the world through the medium of a single world-wide Communist political organization.

(4) The direction and control of the world Communist movement is vested in and exercised by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country.

(5) The Communist dictatorship of such foreign country, in exercising such direction and control and in furthering the purposes of the world Communist movement, establishes or causes the establishment of, and utilizes, in various countries, political organizations which are acknowledged by such Communist dictatorship as being constituent elements of the world Communist movement; and such political organizations are not free and independent organizations, but are mere sections of a single world-wide Communist organization and are controlled, directed, and subject to the discipline of the Communist dictatorship of such foreign country.

(6) The political organizations so established and utilized in various countries, acting under such control, direction, and discipline, endeavor to carry out the objectives of the world Communist movement by bringing about the overthrow of existing governments and setting up Communist totalitarian dictatorships which will be subservient to the most powerful existing Communist totalitarian dictatorship, and among the methods commonly used to accomplish this end in any particular country are (A) the disruption of trade and commerce, (B) the inciting of economic, social, and racial strife and conflict, (C) the dissemination of propaganda calculated to undermine established government and institutions, and (D) corrupting officials of the government and securing appointment of their agents and sympathizers to offices and positions in the government.

(7) In carrying on the activities referred to in paragraph (6), such political organizations in various countries are organized on a secret, conspiratorial basis and operate to a substantial extent through organizations, commonly known as Communist fronts, which in most instances are created and maintained, or used, in such manner as to conceal the facts as to their true character and purposes and their membership. One result of this method of operation is that such political organizations are able to obtain financial and other support from persons who would not extend such support if they knew the true purposes of, and the actual nature of the control and influence exerted upon, such Communist fronts.

(8) Due to the nature and scope of the world Communist movement, with the existence of affiliated constituent elements working toward common objectives in various countries of the world, travel of members, representatives, and agents from country to country is essential for purposes of communication and for the carrying on of activities to further the purposes of the movement.

(9) In the United States those individuals who knowingly and willfully participate in the world Communist movement, when they so participate, in effect repudiate their allegiance to the United States and in effect transfer their allegiance to the foreign country in which is vested the direction and control of the world Communist movement; and, in countries other than the United States, those individuals who knowingly and willfully participate in such Communist movement similarly repudiate their allegiance to the countries of which they are nationals in favor of such foreign Communist country.

(10) In pursuance of communism's stated objectives, the most powerful existing Communist dictatorship has, by the traditional Communist methods referred to above, and in accordance with carefully conceived plans, already caused the establishment in numerous foreign countries, against the will of the people of those countries, of ruthless Communist totalitarian dictatorship, and threatens to establish similar dictatorships in still other countries.

(11) The recent successes of Communist methods in other countries and the nature and control of the world Communist movement itself present a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions and make it necessary that Congress enact appropriate legislation recognizing the existence of such world-wide conspiracy and designed to prevent it from accomplishing its purpose in the United States.

In addition to this, Mr. Speaker, I am the sponsor of legislation, which has already passed the House of Representatives, prohibiting the picketing of our Federal courts. I quote from the official report by the Committee on the Judiciary in connection with this legislation, which is now pending in the Senate, and which I am hopeful will be passed within the next several weeks:

The picketing of courts is a practice which has been recently developed and has appeared in various cities throughout the United States. It appears from the information made available to the committee that the technique of mass picketing has been employed solely in connection with the proceedings involving alleged Communist Party members or sympathizers. Specific examples disclosed that the number of pickets has ranged from 300 to 750 in such cities as San Francisco, Los Angeles, and New York. In these instances the committee is informed that the participants carried picket signs, distributed literature, and overcrowded the corridors and courtrooms of the building.

Another technique employed in this picketing of the courts is the loud chanting of slogans by members of the picket line. On one occasion in San Francisco a sound truck was employed outside the building which was being picketed, and it created so much noise that it seriously hampered those inside the courtroom in hearing the testimony.

The continuance of such conditions would inexorably lead to the undermining of the dignity necessary in our judicial proceedings. More important than the detraction of the dignity befitting a judicial proceeding is the possibility that should such a practice continue unchecked, it cannot help but bring about a disrespect for law and constitutional government under law. The essence of the Federal judiciary has been the impartiality and independence under which it functions in the orderly administration of justice. However, the nefarious practice of picketing courts can but lead to the destruction of those two fundamental qualities.

It is the opinion of your committee that such practices must not only be condemned but must be stopped immediately; and, therefore, this bill is designed to make such a practice a crime where it impedes, obstructs, or interferes with the court.

Recently the New Orleans States commented on this legislation in part as follows:

The picketing of the courts was the most flagrant example of a flaunting of American court procedure. Such action has no place in fair trials; it imputes judicial integrity; it might intimidate officers of the court or witnesses. It is an alien thing, and the sooner it is no longer allowed, the better off our courts will be.

Judge Medina sentenced two or three defendants to contempt of court for their behavior in the precincts of his courtroom, but he never took issue with those who derided his court, the jury system or the trial procedure on the outside.

There are many judges and lawyers who believe as he apparently did: That his powers of contempt did not include actions outside his immediate ken. But there can be no doubt that his court was condemned time after time, day after day, all in keeping with orders transmitted through the Communist network from Moscow.

So shocking was the action of the Reds in their picketing that bills were offered in the Congress—bills which originated through a local member of the bar, Mr. Cuthbert Baldwin—by two Louisiana Congressmen: Senator ELLENDER and Representative BOGGS. The Boggs bill was passed by the House, but the Ellender measure was held up in the Senate by the objection of one man: Senator LANGER of North Dakota, when Senator ELLENDER asked that his bill be taken up by consent.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I trust that you will pardon the references which I have made to my own role as a Member of this great body in preventing the spread of this modern, atheistic, godless slavery. In fighting communism we must not be overwhelmed with fear, nor must we fall for the Communist trick of denouncing and smearing honest and patriotic people. Most of all, it seems to me that we must recognize that this great land of ours, working with the free peoples of the world, has within itself the means to prevent a third world war and to stop Russian aggression. In the psychological warfare which is part of the cold war nothing can be more beneficial to the Soviets than the general belief in America that we must have a war.

Our country today, if we continue to face the issues of the times with courage and vision, if we continue to attack the social and economic problems of the twentieth century, if we insist on maintaining a good climate for competitive enterprise in America, if we continue to encourage the expansion of free enterprise in order to provide employment and a higher standard of living, will overcome this menace.

In short, if we keep our economy strong, keep open the door of opportunity in America, the security programs under way at home and abroad will assure the survival of our great democracy.

Polish-American Veterans of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include herein the following remarks made by me at the second annual convention banquet, Polish-American Veterans of Massachusetts, in St. Mary's Auditorium, Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday, June 11, 1950:

Veterans share an experience that can never be appreciated by those who never made the sacrifices required by military service in time of war.

That is why we find such loyal comradeship among veterans.

They faced suffering and death, not alone, but in the company of others. And there they learned the complete unselfishness that is born in time of stress.

They hated the dirt and weariness and the unspeakable pain that is war as all civilized men do. Yet under that pressure they learned to help one another in a way that they will never forget.

This precious feeling of comradeship in a great cause deepens with the years. Long after the painful memories of combat have lost their sharp edge, veterans remember, not the personal fear and the personal suffering, but the funny, the sad, and the inspiring incidents that took place when they were together. There is a kinship among those who served their country in time of peril that can never be found in the separate pursuits of civilian life.

And so, veterans form special organizations of their own to preserve the values which they found in reunions such as this. When ex-servicemen unite, they speak a language all their own, which even their wives can't understand unless they serve as Waves or Wacs or Spars.

But the purpose of a veteran's organization is not simply to relive in recollection those days of proven comradeship.

Veterans are the guardians of our Nation's security, its courage, and its ideals.

Their duty does not end when the guns are silenced.

They naturally want to blot the horrors of war from their memory as soon as they can, but they must not forget its lessons or permit those who never knew its sacrifices to take such giving for granted.

Veterans have claims prior to that of any other group in our Nation, because they have contributed more than any other group. They have the right to expect that their wounds shall be given the best of care, that their disabilities shall be eased in part by compensation, and that a grateful Government shall help them to make up for the best years of their lives which they gave to protect those who stayed at home.

The United States is paying back these debts to its veterans.

But this is not enough.

This Nation must pay attention to our veteran organizations and the wisdom they have acquired in desperate defense of our fundamental beliefs.

It must listen to the realistic warnings that this Nation cannot afford to drift again.

You veterans know the heavy price that was paid to save our people from their indifference to the dangers abroad in this world.

You say that it must not happen in the future, and you mean what you say.

Until Russia proves by her actions that she is willing to cooperate instead of dominate, the United States and our allies must be ready and on guard against any possible surprise attack.

We want peace because as a people we have and are working at the job of settling grievances by reasonable adjustments and not by force.

We want peace because we know that war, hot or cold, is a drain on precious human and material resources.

We want peace, but not at the price of surrender.

The postwar record proves that we have given in on many occasions in the hope that Russia would make similar concessions. In fact, we have conceded too much, thereby encouraging the Communists in the belief that we are push overs.

That policy has been rightfully consigned to the junk heap.

By now strengthening ourselves and our allies against aggression we are serving notice on Russia that it would be unhealthy to seek further conquests either by force or by trickery.

We are calling the turn on the Communists.

If they really want peace, the burden is on them to prove it.

The time has now come for them to make concessions and to live up to them. High on the priority list of wrongs to be undone is the requirement that Russia withdraw all her personnel, both civil and military, from Poland and permit that heroic nation to breathe freely again.

The mistakes made at Yalta in yielding to the Russians, on the advice of our military leaders who underestimated our military strength and believed then that we needed Russia's help to knock out Japan, must be rectified.

Appeasement has never worked because it means retreat, retreat, retreat, before an aggressor who believes it to be a sign of weakness and will continually press the other party to give in still more until nothing remains to give.

Appeasement did not work at Munich, Yalta, or in China because Hitler and Stalin are vultures of the same feather, as we learned in 1939 from Poland when that nation called a halt to appeasement and resisted the two dictators at the same time. Although outwardly crushed, the people of Poland still resist with the secret and patient determination to regain their independence, which neither time nor Communist propaganda can ever conquer.

In the heroic fight of the RAF in the desert campaigns of north Africa, on the seas, and in the Normandy invasion, Poles who had escaped from their homeland were in the forefront of the counterattack.

In the bitterly contested yard-by-yard advance through the rugged mountains of Italy, Polish divisions fought with the same courage and tenacity as their brothers and sisters who went down fighting in the ruins of Warsaw, or as their successors are doing in the Polish underground of today.

Proving that freedom is everybody's business everywhere.

Your countrymen were the first to understand this all-important fact. They fought for their homeland first, as any of us would, but they did not stop fighting when it was conquered. On every front around the world they joined with others who shared their faith, striving to recover that freedom which is everyman's right above the narrow distinctions of race, color, or creed.

There is one everlasting reminder that the fight for freedom is not limited by any frontiers.

That reminder nestles in the shadows of Monte Cassino among the Apennine Mountains of Italy. Behind the thick-walled abbey on its crest the Nazis were dug in, holding up the Allied advance. Even after American fliers had dropped 450 tons of bombs, the enemy could not be dislodged for 3½ months. Wave after wave of infantrymen crawled up its rocky slopes only to die before they could reach their objective, by the withering fire of its well-protected defenders.

The success of the whole Italian campaign was endangered by the resistance of this difficult key point.

It was then that the Allied commanders called upon the Polish divisions to do the impossible.

They took Monte Cassino at a price.

The green hillside is today dotted with the white headstones of 1,070 Polish soldiers who forfeited their lives to win one of the outstanding victories of World War II.

The monks are now rebuilding the ruins of the abbey on the top of Monte Cassino. And the tourists who stop to offer a silent prayer linger in awe, wondering what inspires men to such courage in fighting for something that is far from home.

As veterans, we know the answer.

Peace is indivisible.

You cannot have some here and none there.

We seek not the peace of the graveyard nor the security of a jail house, behind an iron curtain.

We want a climate among nations in which people can go about their business without fear of betrayal and with every possible choice of creative opportunity. To accomplish this, all nations must agree to a basic moral code supported by an international organization.

While working toward that end we must be vigilant on defense.

There must be many people in Russia who give lip service to their temporary masters while secretly yearning for the day when they can be friends with other peoples again.

Inevitably, these human needs of theirs must find expression.

There is plenty of evidence to show that the Communists are more worried about the Russian people than they are of the outside world.

In this we find hope and a guide for our policy from now on.

If we can reach through to the Russian people, as we must, there is a good chance that they will wake up to the deceits that have been practiced upon them by the Communists and will liberate themselves.

As veterans it is our responsibility to alert the American people and to devise ways and means by which all of us can help to bring the truth home to the Russian people.

Toward the day when Russia will be free and Poland will be free and all the nations of the world will live in the harmony of human fellowship for the rest of time.

Wickersham Fights for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am interested in setting forth as a matter of public record the things that I have done in behalf of the veterans of World War II. Pursuant to that thought, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief résumé of my work in Congress toward extending to the veteran the benefits he rightfully deserves.

I was one of those who originated the idea of terminal leave pay for veterans to ease the financial shock of their transition from war to peace. I labored to secure the passage of the bill including that idea. That bill passed.

I strove for the passage of the first GI bill of rights. It was a great satisfaction to me to be able to stand up and be counted among those who fought for and won additional schooling for veterans.

I worked to secure the best medical care—not just "adequate" medical care—for veterans and for their dependents.

I have made it a daily rule to do all within my power to cut red tape, to increase services and the speed with which those services could be rendered to the veteran and his loved ones by the Veterans' Administration.

I have been a constant battler for loans for veterans—not only because they have served their country well in her time of need—but because they are the key to Nation-wide prosperity in peace.

I have helped to make legislative adjustments in their insurance so that they may feel more secure, so that they will have fewer worries about the financial well-being of their families, as they grow older.

I have stood behind every appropriations bill which would help them to get the assistance they deserve.

When there have been individual hardship cases, I have introduced private bills to see that those unnecessary hardships are removed.

This record of accomplishment for the veteran was not written in a day. It meant experience on committees and appearance before committees. It has required close to 100 percent attendance at all sessions of Congress. Mr. Speaker, I am truly proud to look back at this record of achievement.

Crawford Gets Speedy Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article by William F. Pyper:

CRAWFORD GETS SPEEDY ACTION—PUERTO RICO GOVERNOR PERSUADED BY BUDDY

(By William F. Pyper)

WASHINGTON.—When the Puerto Rican government agreed to let its citizens fly into Michigan's sugar-producing area, the Saginaw Valley, it was making a considerable financial sacrifice.

The whole thing started when a plane load of Puerto Ricans on their way to Saginaw went down in the Atlantic, drowning 28. Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín canceled further nonscheduled flights.

It was estimated some 30,000 acres of beets would be lost if the area failed to get the imported labor. Had that loss in domestic production been realized, Puerto Rico would have gained a high percentage of the sugar quota allocation which would have had to be made to offshore production areas.

Nevertheless, Governor Muñoz was persuaded to rescind his order to the extent that some 3,600 Puerto Ricans are being flown into the Michigan area, and thereby hangs an interesting tale.

Muñoz is a bosom buddy of Representative FRED L. CRAWFORD, of Michigan, Republican, who represents the district where most of Michigan's sugar beets are grown. As a matter of fact, virtually everyone in Puerto Rico is extremely friendly to CRAWFORD, ranking Republican on the House Public Lands Committee, because he has sponsored so much legislation in favor of the possession. But having friends in Puerto Rico is of little help when you run for reelection in the Eighth Michigan District—ordinarily.

Here is one place where such a relationship paid off to the district of a Congressman who had made a nonpolitical contact. Governor Muñoz probably wouldn't have bowed to any other Member of Congress, it is reasonable to believe, but when Representative CRAWFORD called on him for help, he was quick to take action.

He sacrificed a possible economic gain for his island, and possibly subjected his people to the danger of future crashes, but he did what Representative CRAWFORD asked. Two commercial airlines were pressed into service as an airlift, and presumably the Michigan crop will be saved. Puerto Rico probably will lose some sugar business, but it has been able to help the district of its great friend.

The cultivating of Michigan's $14,000,000 sugar-beet crop swung into high gear today.

Michigan Field Crops, Inc., flew 5,300 Puerto Ricans from their native land to spend the summer in Michigan fields and the last of 93 plane loads arrived Sunday.

The Puerto Ricans will work on other Michigan farms after harvesting the sugar-beet crop, and will be flown home in late October.

Trees Grow in Minnesota Where Sand Blew in 1942

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a very enlightening and instructive article written by Russell Asleson, brilliant staff writer of the Minneapolis Tribune, on the subject of trees and soil conservation. The article appeared in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune, issue of June 11, 1950. It follows:

NINETEEN THOUSAND TREES GROW NOW WHERE SAND BLEW IN 1942

(By Russell Asleson)

GARY, MINN.—Alfred Wiger, Ulen, Minn., farmer, is the grandfather of East Agassiz soil-conservation district.

The title stems not from age but from affection. Ever since he became a member of the district's original board of supervisors in 1941, he's acted as its unofficial ambassador of conservation. He's now the board chairman.

"I get a kick out of farming now that I can see beyond my own furrow," says Wiger.

He plans his vacations to take in the national soil-conservation districts convention, no matter where it is held in the United States. He also attends the Minnesota meeting, where 2 out of the last 3 years he's been on hand to receive a $200 award for East Agassiz district as winners in the Minneapolis Star and Tribune soil-conservation contest.

Wiger is a farmer by vocation and a conservationist by avocation. It wouldn't take much to reverse that.

He was seeding small grain the day I came calling at his farm near Ulen.

We drove to Twin Valley and picked up Einar Henrikson, district conservationist.

"It's always windy in this area and some of the soil is light," Einar said as we drove toward Gary. "Our main problem is wind erosion. That's why we emphasize tree planting and windbreaks so strongly in our program."

"You wouldn't think that land was just sand dunes 8 years ago," said Wiger, pointing to a fine stand of evergreens, some more than 8 feet high. "That's the Gary planting I always talk about."

The even rows of about 19,000 trees are an impressive sight. As we walked through it, rabbits scampered away and pheasants whirred into the underbrush.

"This is a quarter section of land that had been overfarmed and overgrazed," Einar explained. "It just developed into a wasteland. It was in ideal shape to blow, and it did just that during the dry years."

Residents of Gary, about a mile away, were alarmed over the miniature dust bowl on their doorsteps. Some 40 acres had developed into active, blowing dunes of sand and were working toward Highway 32, which runs from Gary to Fertile.

The land was tax delinquent. George Landsverk, Norman County agent, and townspeople of Gary went to work and soon had the land deeded over to the town with the stipulation that it be developed into a forest and wildlife area.

Villagers of Gary furnished the labor. Men, women, and school children all took part. Rudy Gysland, local mail carrier, rounded up trucks and straw for the planting bee.

Today the small forest is overrun with wildlife. Pupils use it as an outdoor classroom to study different trees—red cedar, jack pine, Norway pine, green ash, white spruce.

Boy Scouts and 4-H groups make additional plantings each year. This year, they intend to put in fruit-bearing trees and annual food patches like cane and millet for wildlife.

Cracker-Barrel Caravan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following editorial which appeared in the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., recently:

CRACKER-BARREL CARAVAN

It is not enough to have a good product in this competitive world of ours. That stuff about the world's beating a path to your door if you manufacture a better mouse trap is an economic fallacy. The first thing you've got to do, if you believe that you have developed a better mouse trap, is cry it from the roof tops (merchandising). Then you've got to wrap it nicely in pretty paper garlanded with ribbons (packaging). If the world doesn't start coming to your door after that, well, your mouse trap isn't so hot.

Although it is sort of reversing the process by going to the world's door, the Hoover Commission's cracker-barrel caravan, which will be in Lawrence June 26, is cannily exploiting all that is known about the arts of merchandising and packaging. The Hoover Commission, after much research, came up with some good ideas on the subject of Government spending, or, rather, Government economy. And those ideas, as excellent as they are, could have died in the apathy which has smothered so many other excellent ideas, if the better mouse-trap policy of marketing were adopted. Instead, it was decided to put the show on the road as the cracker-barrel caravan. And, if the caravan doesn't embrace all that's best in the way of both merchandising and packaging, we'll go on record as opposing judicious handling of public moneys.

The caravan is a lobby on wheels. Besides its mobility, it differs from other lobbies in another respect: the only ax it has to grind is the economy ax. And the economy it is seeking to sell to the American people is not niggardly, penny-pinching economy, but the sort of economy which is a healthy result of efficient and intelligent management of public affairs. It wants to eliminate archaic duplication of function and, to accomplish this, advocates nothing more heretical or revolutionary than simple streamlining. If we can cut a few million bucks off the budget that way, and still have a vigorous central government, how can there be any serious objection to it? As a matter of fact, streamlining would tend to conserve governmental strength by cutting down the resistance it encounters as it moves forward.

Remember, economy doesn't have to be mere penny pinching; it can be just a matter of getting the same thing for less money.

Open Letter to Chancelor Adenauer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach a stirring summary of the argument against German or European neutrality in the struggle for a free world. Titled "An Open Letter to Chancelor Adenauer," and written by Matthew Woll, chairman of the A. F. of L.'s Free Trade-Union Committee, it was sent on June 7:

[From the International Free Trade Union News of August 1950]

OPEN LETTER TO CHANCELOR ADENAUER

His Excellency, KONRAD ADENAUER,
Federal Chancelor, Federal Republic of Germany, Bonn, British Zone, Germany.

MY DEAR MR. CHANCELOR: The Free Trade Union Committee of the American Federation of Labor has consistently championed the cause of democracy in Germany. We have repeatedly and vigorously demonstrated our faith in the working people of Germany as a determined opponent of every form of totalitarian tyranny and as a bulwark of liberty in your country. Nor have we hesitated in recent years to advocate energetically that Germany should, as soon as possible, be returned as an equal to the community of free peoples. It is in this spirit that we now write to you.

According to press reports on your address delivered at Cologne on May 21 (New York Times, May 22, 1950):

"A united Europe including Britain will never be strong enough to endanger either the Soviet Union or the United States, the Chancelor said, but would be strong enough 'to throw its weight on the scales in favor of peace.' The Chancelor warned that tensions between the Soviet Union and the United States may lead to an explosion 'exterminating' Europe and declared that the way to prevent this was to organize and unite Europe."

This pronouncement has profoundly disturbed all Americans who attach great importance to the development of friendship and close cooperation between the United States and the reborn democratic Republic of Germany.

ECHOED BY UNITED STATES ISOLATIONISTS

We are fully aware that similar ideas have been expressed in other European countries. We are convinced that such notions are false and dangerous to the cause of human freedom and world peace. In this connection, Mr. Chancelor, you will be interested to learn that these wrong notions are not strictly European. In our own country, the hard-bitten isolationists have time and again propagated practically the same course. The only difference is that America's isolationists preach that the United States should not get involved in any tensions on the European continent.

In your Cologne address you implied that the Soviet Union and the United States were equally responsible for the threat to the peace of Europe. Hence, you proposed that a united Europe be developed to throw its weight on the scales in favor of peace. Apparently, you have a twofold objective—to impose peaceful policies on the United States as well as to contain Soviet Russian aggression.

The reasoning underlying this approach flies in the face of and is in complete contradiction to all the facts of recent history. Only highly unjust and utterly harmful conclusions can flow from this false axiom and wrong reasoning. And when I say harmful in this instance, I have in mind particularly the best interests of the German people themselves. Moreover, it was directly to them that you addressed yourself. Nor am I unmindful that it is especially their attitude that you hoped to influence.

If there is any American responsibility for the present critical international situation, it is due solely to the fact that at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, our Government was too ready to make concessions to the Soviet Union. Our diplomatic representatives then entertained a noble but misguided hope to establish genuinely friendly and lasting peaceful relations with Russia. There is not the slightest foundation in fact for the notion that the present tension between America and the Soviet Empire was at any time caused or provoked by any aggressive action or move by the United States. The record of history confirms our contention beyond challenge.

Back in 1943, you will recall, our country was cooperating closely with Russia as an ally in war. We were then producing and turning over billions of dollars of military supplies and food to the Russian Army and people in the bitter struggle against our common enemy, Nazi Germany. But even then, before the war was over, Russia had already launched upon a course of high-handed unilaterial action hostile to the fundamental interests of all free peoples. Yes, back in 1943, Moscow launched its initial move for the creation of the present all-Communist puppet regime in Warsaw when it broke off diplomatic relations with General Sikorski.

STALIN'S "GLEICHSCHALTUNG"

The Russian policy of swallowing small nations and setting up satellite regimes, in violation of all agreements with her wartime allies, was not in response to any act of aggression or imperialist move by the United States. The Kremlin pursued the same strategy when, during its partnership with Hitler, it gobbled up the Baltic States, carved up Poland, and waged its imperialist war against the Finnish people. After the Second

World War, the first deterioration of Russian-American relations came when the Soviet Union set up, by force of arms, satellite regimes in the eastern European countries. Thereby imperialist Russia violated her solemn pledges that the people of these lands would be accorded the possibility of holding free elections and enjoying fully all democratic rights and liberties. Would you, Mr. Chancelor, say that the United States was guilty of creating tension in Europe when it refused to say "yes" to such gleichschaltung practices by Stalin?

Would you say that when Moscow suppressed the German Social Democrats in the eastern zone—at the close of 1945 when the western powers were cooperating loyally with Russia in the four-power control of Germany—America was causing tension in Europe? Could you say today, even with the slightest justification, that the United States is fostering tension when it demands democratic rights for the people of eastern Germany and refuses to recognize the puny puppets Pieck and Grotewohl?

Could anyone with the slightest respect for the facts fail to realize that the decisive turn for the worse in the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union came when Stalin decided to prevent at all costs the success of the Marshall plan? And why was the Communist International resurrected under the name of the Cominform if not to sabotage European recovery and world reconstruction? Would you have the German people—or any other people—believe that the United States was guilty of provoking tension or being aggressive against Russia when it decided to give generous help to Germany and other European countries willing and ready to make every effort to rebuild their economies?

I am sure, Mr. Chancelor, that you realize even more than we do that the next phase of the tension came when the Russians set out to grab western Berlin by organizing the barbarous blockade against the freedom-loving people of that great city. Surely you do not think that the United States should have abandoned the heroic population of Berlin to the Soviet slavedrivers so as not to be criticized for or guilty of causing tension in Europe.

We beg you, Mr. Chancelor, to tell us what the United States should or could have done in the afore-mentioned circumstances to avoid the charges of those who, by insinuation, implication or accusation, now blame it for the existing tension in international relations. Would you today say that America should have refrained from lending full support to the creation of the German Federal Republic? Or should America have refused to sign the Atlantic pact for strengthening the defenses of western Europe? Should the United States instead leave Europe isolated and defenseless to face helplessly the gigantic Soviet army which, alone among the military forces of the big powers, has continued on a full-war footing since the cessation of fighting in the Second World War? Have you forgotten that in 1945–46, as a result of total American demobilization, even the maintenance of a United States garrison in Germany was then a problem? Does not this striking contrast between American and Russian aims and actions demonstrate that it is folly to equate the policies of both powers and to blame them both indiscriminately for the present world tension and the plight of Europe?

We are therefore completely at a loss to comprehend your failure to realize that it was not America which has provoked tension and anti-Soviet plans in Europe but that it was the helplessness and despair of Europe which finally aroused active American sympathy with, interest in, and support of the understandable and laudable desires and determination of the plain people of western Europe to defend their liberties and resist Russian aggression. How could you then, Mr. Chancellor, even to the slightest extent, draw a sign of equation between the aggressive policies of the Russian totalitarian dictatorship and the constructive and peaceful course pursued by a great American democracy which has dedicated itself to international harmony and human progress?

FULL DEMOCRATIC UNITY—OR WAR

The history of mankind, especially from the dark days of the degrading Munich Pact to date, has taught the more than 8,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor that today peace cannot be preserved anywhere in the world unless the principles of democracy are defended everywhere and unless the democratic forces, regardless of race, religion, language, or location, strengthen and unite their ranks. The policy of world-wide democratic unity and strength against totalitarian aggression offers the one and only possibility of preventing the calamity of war. Today, as yesterday, the policy of appeasement of such aggression offers no possibility whatever of avoiding the catastrophe of an international conflagration.

In this light, it is equally clear that all policies of appeasement by the United States would not reduce international tension but would, on the contrary, aggravate it by encouraging and, in effect, if not always in intent, actually aiding Soviet aggression and expansion. It can be underscored with full justification that it is only America's final break with appeasement that has saved western Europe from being overrun and seized by Stalin's armed hordes. Surely, Mr. Chancellor, no matter how attractive the notion of "neutrality" might seem, you must realize that it is not the United States but democratic Germany and the rest of western Europe which would immediately have to bear the crushing burden and pay the terrible cost of an American policy of appeasement. Surely you realize that American appeasement of Russia would have meant no Marshall plan, no military aid to the European democracies, the abandonment of Berlin and all of western Germany to the vile and venal tools and toadies of Stalin, the Piecks, and the Grotewohls.

We of the American Federation of Labor have supported and will continue to support the idea of a united Europe. We want this united Europe to be strong, prosperous, and self-supporting. We do not want to impose our help on Europe. We have helped Europe because of our conviction that she needed our help and because her free peoples have urgently asked us for our assistance.

You spoke of a Europe "strong enough to throw its weight on the scales in favor of peace." Do you mean a Europe strong enough to defend herself against Soviet aggression? This would be highly welcome to all Americans. The American people, no less than the people of Europe, abhor the idea of a third world war. If the United States participates in the defense of Europe, it is only because we are vitally interested in the preservation of European democracy and world peace and because we and the responsible European statesmen think that Europe is not yet in a position to defend herself and, solely through her own forces, successfully resist an attack by Soviet totalitarianism.

Or do you envisage the throwing of the European weight on the scales in favor of peace to take the form of a European deal with the Soviet dictatorship—a deal whose aims would include the acceptance by the United States of an appeasement policy? We deny the possibility of any policy of European neutrality in the conflict between totalitarianism and democracy. If the ties of solidarity between the democracies of Europe and American democracy were severed, both parties would suffer from it—but Europe and not America would be the principal loser. After all, there is still an ocean and not only the Elbe River between Russia and America.

NIGHTMARE OF NEUTRALITY

A neutral western Europe would be a western Europe left alone to confront Soviet aggression, unable to maintain her democratic institutions, to say nothing of resisting and defeating the Russian armies should they march. Soviet totalitarianism would have as little respect for western European neutrality as Hitler had for the neutrality of Belgium, Holland, Denmark, and Norway. Whoever thinks that he can stop Soviet aggression by assuming a detached and distant attitude in regard to the United States does not understand even the most elementary traits of Soviet totalitarian imperialism.

There is one other point that must be clear to you. America has no aggressive aims. We do not desire to conquer any country, annex any part of its territory, or undermine or destroy its independence. America is not seeking war to destroy any economic or political system so as to impose a new and a different economic or political system on any people. As you very well know, the case with Russia is just the opposite. It is aggressive and expansionist, as the German people know so unfortunately well. It has already conquered and annexed several countries and is planning to conquer and destroy the independence of others. Moreover, Russia alone among the powers runs and finances a special world-wide machine for the purpose of subverting, through fifth column activities, the governments of free nations so as to sabotage and paralyze these countries from within in order to make them an easier target for eventual military attack and conquest from without by the giant Russian military war machine. We refer, of course, to the infamous Cominform and the notorious so-called World Federation of Trade Unions.

Last but not least, we must draw your attention to the mounting and disturbing evidence that certain German industrialists are most anxious to engage in trade relations with the countries behind the iron curtain. This eagerness to do business as usual with Russia has been growing despite the fact that for the Soviet Union foreign trade is not buying and selling but primarily a method of political infiltration, subversion, and blackmail. We find it highly significant that those who are incapable of adopting in international relations a policy inspired by firm and consistent adherence to the principles of democracy should be the very ones who are identical with those who try to prevent democratic German labor from carrying out the reforms which it advocates in order to assure a solid basis for political and economic democracy in Germany.

I know and appreciate your devotion to the cause of western civilization. I am sure that you will consider this letter to you as motivated solely by our wish to help the defense of that civilization against its most deadly enemy and as an effort to contribute, through forthright discussion of possible regrettable misunderstandings, to better the friendship between the American and the German people.

Sincerly yours,

MATTHEW WOLL,
Chairman, Free Trade Union Committee, A. F. of L.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a very timely editorial which appeared in the Columbia of June 1950. This magazine is one of the largest Catholic magazines in the world:

IT'S TIME FOR US TO TAKE A WALK

Former President Herbert Hoover, in a recent address, suggested that "the United Nations should be reorganized without the Communist nations in it. If that is impractical, then a definite new united front should be organized of those peoples who disavow communism, who stand for morals and religion, and who love freedom."

Mr. Hoover's suggestion makes sense. In the minds of people who insist that words mean what they are supposed to mean, there really never has been any such thing as the United Nations. To recall a phrase once applied by Mr. Hoover to another ill-fated project, the United Nations may have been an experiment noble in motive but it has not been, and does not promise to be, any more than that. The worm was in the apple from the beginning.

The argument against abandoning the United Nations, as now constituted, is based on the theory that some organization, however ineffective and misused, is better than no organization at all. Those who hold this position live in hope that the masters of Communist Russia and associated captive nations will eventually "go straight." That could happen; and Joe DiMaggio could fail to get a base hit from now until Labor Day. The possibility, in either case, is not something you could hand your neighborhood bank as security for a slight loan.

The Communist record is one of solemnly signed and cynically broken agreements. On past and current performance there is no basis for expectation that they will turn from muscle and murder to sweet reason. Mr. Hoover mentioned their record of more than 35 violations of formal agreements in the last 12 years, plus about a dozen violations of the letter or spirit of provisions of the United Nations Charter.

Everybody—even the liberal innocents—now knows that Stalin's government has continually violated the terms of the agreement under which the United States gave recognition to the U. S. S. R. in 1933. Everybody knows now that Stalin's mob hates us and every free people and works only to destroy us—no lie or treachery barred. So we pick up the tab for a lump of United Nations architecture in New York where we can have our throats cut in air-conditioned comfort. Why?

Does anyone still think the one world idea means to the Communists anything other than a whole world enslaved to them? Does anyone think the Communists in the United Nations will ever play on the level? Isn't it odd, in view of the stated purposes of the United Nations, that Mr. Acheson, of the United States, Mr. Bevin, of Great Britain, and Mr. Schuman, of France, should arrange a private meeting to dream up ways and means of defending their own and other non-Communist countries against the aggression of one of their so-dear—guess who?—associates in the United Nations?

The trouble with the present United Nations organization is that the chickens carelessly invited the skunk to help them plan their house. The skunk will never work wholeheartedly for the welfare and security of the chickens. It is not the nature of beast to do so. Mr. Hoover simply suggests that "us chickens" abandon a dangerous association. Why not?

The fact is that the Soviet Union has its own private set-up of united slave nations, and the purpose of this instrument is the subjugation of the free world. As a means to that end, they maintain membership in the United Nations. Whenever it will create disorder or impede progress in the deliberations of the United Nations, they take a walk. It's time Uncle Sam, and those who have roughly similar ideas about decency and freedom, took a walk.

Mr. Hoover has suggested the direction of our stroll: "A new united front * * * of those peoples who disavow communism, who stand for morals and religion, and who love freedom." The departure of our unpleasant guests from behind the iron curtain need not leave vacancies in the buildings now rising in New York; the vacant chairs and offices would be available for, among others, the delegates from Spain and Ireland—countries now blackballed by the fastidious thugs in the Kremlin. Stalin and company, who are said to have trouble understanding us, would understand that.

It may be remarked that not all of us needed to be reminded of the facts of life by Mr. Hoover. Three years ago, before the cold war got into the headlines, the supreme council, meeting in Boston, adopted this resolution:

"Whereas it has been the unvarying policy of the Soviet government of Russia to sabotage in the councils of the United Nations measures designed in good faith to expedite and assure the recovery of the world from the most destructive war mankind has yet suffered;

"Whereas the Soviet government has constantly waged, and has now intensified, a campaign of lies and vilification against our own and all other governments that have attempted to live peacefully in freedom from the Communist dictatorship;

"Whereas the Soviet government through its accredited diplomatic representatives, by the employment of spies and the exercise of organized terror, has been and now is engaged in undermining liberty here and everywhere on earth;

"Whereas the Soviet conspiracy has established beachheads of corruption and disloyalty among employees of our Government, among the members of our labor unions, among the ranks of American citizens engaged in the practice of the professions, and in the education of our children; and

"Whereas the Soviet government is, in fact, an enemy power openly committed to and aggressively working for the destruction of our Nation: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the supreme council of the Knights of Columbus urges the leaders of our Government, and our representatives in the Government, to take all measures necessary to defeat the purpose of this enemy Soviet government to extend to our free America the barbarous tyranny it imposes upon its own people and the peoples of the kidnaped Balkan and Baltic Nations; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That, since the Soviet government cannot by its nature be responsive to appeals to decency or justice, as we understand those terms, we strongly oppose any resumption of the policy of appeasement which made us unwilling accessories in the enslavement of the Soviet's captive satellite nations."

Events of the past 3 years have emphasized the accuracy of the supreme council's statement of the situation. In the light of the facts, isn't it time we decided that the United Nations, with Russian dressing, is a well-intentioned, but indigestible, experiment?

Does the Ownership of Real Estate Disqualify a Citizen To Serve in the Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under our form of government wherein a Federal Constitution was first created, and later accepted by the States, the Congress was given very broad powers. Particularly, were these powers extremely broad when they relate to the matter of interstate commerce.

As an illustration of the breadth of some of these powers, I refer to the Securities and Exchange Commission Act; the old OPA law; the present Social Security Act; the Fair Labor Standards Act; the Taft-Hartley Act; the Rent Control Act, and still others that could here be listed. We have pending before the Congress many other proposals which, if enacted into law, will more terribly and intimately control the lives of our people: I refer to the Brannan farm proposal; and compulsory health insurance to which I am opposed.

But, in none of the laws above-mentioned has the Congress yet dared to say where a citizen shall live; that is, in the city or rural area; or in what State he shall live generally, or where he may live as he pursues his life as a peaceful citizen.

As a general rule, by far the majority of our people still assume that every citizen has a right to live where he can best perform his daily work and thus fulfill the obligations of his employment—private or public; and that he also has the unquestioned right to live in what might be termed a low-cost home or a higher-cost home if he can afford it. As a matter of fact, our citizens have proceeded on the basis that they have a right to choose their place of abode.

And I am not here talking about the question of legal residence which the law now and then defines, and very properly so.

For years I have maintained a home and legal residence at 543 Millard Street, Saginaw, Mich., and also have used a part of that home as an official congressional office. By doing this the Federal Government has not had to furnish, at its cost, office space for the congressional office in the Eighth District of Michigan.

Down through the years scores of Members of the Congress have owned homes in the vicinity of the Nation's Capital, where they have resided during the sessions of the Congress. And today many of them do.

Mr. Speaker, there are some, however, who question the right of a citizen to own property in the vicinity of the Nation's Capital and at the same time represent a congressional district; and all on the grounds that he should not own a home outside his congressional area. Suppose an elected Member was without the means to own a home anywhere: Would that in itself disqualify him to serve his constituency? Of course not. Would the ownership of property in one or all the States of the Union disqualify him to serve in the Congress? If so, then we have a rather unique form of government, and, of course, such ownership would not disqualify the citizen for serving in the Congress. Private property rights under our Constitution have been, until recent years, something held very dear. Insofar as I am personally concerned, any man who questions my right or that of any other citizen to own property in any State of this Union will have my opposition on that point. Whoever wants to inquire into my personal conduct while I am acting as a public servant may do so, and without any opposition from me. That is the public's business. I submit for the RECORD the following editorial:

GOP CONGRESSIONAL RIVALS PREPARING FOR SLUGFEST

Congressman CRAWFORD looks for mud slinging from his primary-election opponents. He has charged that either Robert J. Curry, Saginaw attorney, or State Representative David E. Young, of Spaulding Township, sent a "goon squad" of investigators to Washington to gather information about his personal affairs.

There are limits of decency beyond which no candidate for public office should go. But there are many factors which must be added up to determine a candidate's or an incumbent's fitness for office. To serve in Congress, one must be able and prepared to serve his country effectively; to serve his district in every way consonant with national welfare; and to so deport himself at all times as to reflect credit upon his district and country.

No public official can divorce his personal affairs from the public interest. Personal corruption inevitably leads to official corruption. Public officials must avoid both evil and the appearance of evil.

Mr. CRAWFORD, in the nearly 16 years he has represented the Eighth District in Congress, has served his country and district well. This newspaper has differed with him at times but he has made exhaustive studies of subjects within his scope and has not hesitated to speak out sincerely and boldly after getting the facts.

Yet Mr. CRAWFORD has no valid basis for protesting a study of his personal affairs by primary-election opponents. If these affairs measure up to the standard which applies to all public officials, he has nothing to fear.

The same applies to his rivals. Anyone who raises the question of personal fitness had better be pretty certain of his own standing. Otherwise the campaign is likely to degenerate into a spectacle of mass political suicide, letting a Democrat take over the Eighth District's seat in Congress—which would be no tragedy for the people if the Republicans' personal records could not stand up under ruthless investigation.

At any rate, the Republican rivals seem to be getting steamed up for the red-hot contest that was forecast, with the public in a good position to get pertinent facts.

Meat Inspection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Alfred D. Stedman from the St. Paul Pioneer Press of June 18, 1950:

With dismissal notices to seven Federal meat inspectors at South St. Paul and 346 nationally, the biggest set-back in 46 years of fighting for pure food and public health is threatened by a House slash in meat protection under the guise of Federal economy.

This came to light Saturday as rumbling protests from health, consumer, farmer, labor, and animal health sources promised an all-out Senate battle to reverse the House decision.

Unless reversed by the Senate, critics said that decision will mean crippling cuts in the force of United State meat inspectors that help meat packers guard the public against exposures to tuberculosis, tapeworm, anthrax, undulant fever, and other meat-borne diseases of people.

Those critics go clear back to the Teddy Roosevelt administration and the bitter fights against enactment of the pure food laws in 1906 and the later legislative efforts to drive from office Roosevelt's great pure food pioneer, Harvey W. Wiley, for a precedent for the present attack on public health and food protection.

The cuts, added to those made in the past year, will reduce the Federal meat inspection force nationally from 3,166 a year ago to 2,653—a reduction of 513 men or nearly 20 percent—critics estimated.

A victory by Representative JOHN TABER, New York Republican leader on the House Appropriations Committee, and others contending that Government services cost too much, the House decision has alarmed the guardians of animal health as well as human health. This is because the meat inspectors detect and report to State livestock sanitary authorities, animal health officials, and private owners evidence of incipient outbreaks of animal epidemics like hog cholera, Bangs disease, and bovine tuberculosis.

Farm spokesmen with whom this writer talked declared that Northwest livestock producers share with meat consumers a tremendous stake in maintaining public confidence in the safety and wholesomeness of meat products.

While asserting that undoubtedly large-scale economies can be made in the United States Department of Agriculture and deadwood personnel weeded out, some of these declared that slashing the public health and animal health regulatory forces is about the last place such economizing should be done.

Representative TABER, the victor in the House fight, also has led in battles to cut the rural-electrification program and other Federal programs to help farmers or their co-ops.

The American Federation of Government Employees, AFL, has taken a hand and Paul Young and A. E. Eisenmenger, national vice president, of South St. Paul, both have just returned from Washington conferring with Senators in behalf of reversing the cuts.

The South St. Paul cuts of seven thus far are from a total force that had been pared to 92. These do not include cuts at Austin, Albert Lea, or other Minnesota meat-packing cities.

Crowning of the State Laurel Queen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excepts from an address delivered by me at the ceremonies of the crowning of the State laurel queen, at Wellsboro, Pa., on June 16, 1950.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a real pleasure to come into this wonderful Pennsylvania region of great natural beauty and surpassing scenic splendor.

It is a great honor to welcome the representatives of 67 communities who have been chosen by their schoolmates to take part in these delightful ceremonies.

In the coronation of the State laurel queen Wellsboro centers attention upon its splendid spirit of civic enterprise. It demonstrates the enthusiasm of its fine citizens for community and regional progress.

Here in Tioga County the American tradition of pride in the past and faith in the future is a vital and living force guiding your efforts toward greater achievement.

It is appropriate on occasions such as this to consider the elements which have contributed to Pennsylvania's greatness and to discuss the course we must take to reach higher economic, political, and spiritual attainments.

Penn's Woods—27,000,000 acres of almost unbroken woodland—was one of the great forests of the world. It attracted freedom-loving people from every colony and many nations.

Here was a vast area of rich natural resources, a region of fabulous wealth awaiting the brain and brawn, the energy, skill, and determination of courageous, hard-working men and women.

Here was a land of liberty and opportunity.

Here every man was free to grow and prosper, to retain the fruits of his initiative and toil, free to build for the future of his children and free to worship in a manner which brought him closer to God.

Upon that foundation, strengthened by good will, tolerance, and deep religious convictions, America has made more progress in 200 years than any nation of all history. Our living standards and our cultural and spiritual attainments have far exceeded those of any other country. More of the good things of life have come to more people in America than any other people in the annals of mankind.

These achievements were not gained because we had a greater population or richer national resources than other nations.

They are ours to enjoy because the American plan of government recognized freedom of the individual as the God-given right of every citizen.

The virgin forests which covered the hillsides and mountains in the early days are gone. But in place of that great natural resource there is a new growth of timber.

Conservation has replaced wasteful methods, creating a new source of wealth and a continuous supply of lumber to meet the expanding needs of industry.

We have State forests in 39 of our 67 counties. It surprises many people to learn

that 15,000,000 acres, a little more than half of the area of Pennsylvania, is covered by big forests. The same is true here in Tioga County, which is more than 55 percent woods.

We should all be proud that second-growth timber has been developed into a great business through private enterprise without subsidiaries or any other form of government help.

It is a business comprising 1,800 separate industries in Pennsylvania. It gives employment to more than 65,000 people with total wages amounting to $162,000,000 a year. It supplies wood for pulp and chemicals and lumber for a great variety of uses in manufacturing and construction.

I mention these impressive figures because they have deep significance for all of us and especially for the youth of our State and Nation.

Upon the young men and young women about to assume the obligations of citizenship I should like to impress this outstanding truth.

All the vast industrial and agricultural development of our Commonwealth is the result of individual effort by men and women who risked their savings in productive enterprise.

These builders and producers did not look to the government for financial assistance. They did not expect the government to do things for them that they should do for themselves.

All they asked was opportunity. They interested themselves in government because they knew they could succeed and prosper under good, sound, economical, and honest government.

The history of our Commonwealth is a record of good times and times of grave difficulty.

In the course of our development natural resources have been exhausted in many localities. In some instances this had a disastrous effect, resulting in ghost towns such as Scotia, once a great ore center, where Andrew Carnegie began his climb to wealth and fame. Pit Hole, in the oil country, is only a memory, although it once was a city of 20,000, teeming with life and vigor. Another is Pine Grove Furnace, where munitions for George Washington's army were produced.

But many Pennsylvania cities and towns which suffered calamity through floods and fires present a brighter picture.

Even though whole communities were practically wiped out they have come back, through the fighting qualities, the stubbornness, ingenuity, and resourcefulness of the people.

Among the cities that have lived and grown great despite floods and fires are Pittsburgh, Johnstown, Williamsport, and many others.

How were they able to accomplish these miracles?

To my mind it was because they were free to plan and work without government interference, because the people were not hampered by controls and restrictions imposed by an all-powerful central government.

Unfortunately in recent years, the trend in America has been in the direction of centralized authority, which is the road to a Socialistic state.

When we reach that point in our national affairs there is no retreat. Individual freedom will be lost never to be regained.

What are some of the developments which clearly indicate the trend toward socialism? I have listed some of them as follows:

1. Socialized medicine—It has been used in Great Britain with such tragic results.

2. Socialized agriculture—The Brannan plan would place every farm under bureaucratic control of production and marketing.

3. Socialized housing will take away from free enterprise control over this important part of our economy.

4. Deficit financing will destroy the value of money and wipe out savings.

5. Increasing cost of government and excessive taxation will cut down the American standard of living.

These trends must be stopped.

How can it be done? Where can we turn for guidance?

First and foremost we must have faith, faith in God, faith in ourselves, and faith in our country.

We must return with deeper devotion to the teachings of the Bible. We must preach and practice the Golden Rule, the Ten Commandments, and the Sermon on the Mount.

We must place more emphasis on moral and spiritual values and less on material gains.

We must reject and drive out the godless and churchless philosophy of communism and every other subversive element which would destroy human rights and all freedom.

We cannot have security by resolution or laws. Security is produced by work, thrift, and sacrifice.

Our paramount need is patriotism, courage, and faith.

I ask our young people to keep in mind the great truth expressed by America's first commoner, Thomas Jefferson, who said: "That nation is best governed which is least governed."

Let us here in the United States work and fight to preserve the plan of government which has made it possible for us to move forward to leadership in the world.

Appointment of a "Watchdog Subcommittee"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I made today with respect to the basing-point bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator ED C. JOHNSON (Democrat, Colorado), chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, today announced the appointment of a watchdog subcommittee to follow the activities of the Federal Trade Commission in eliminating existing confusion with respect to the validity of freight absorption and competitive pricing practices.

Under section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, Senator JOHNSON said, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has the duty to "exercise continuous watchfulness" over the activities of the Federal Trade Commission. The Senator added that his committee would not shirk this important responsibility.

Senator JOHNSON pointed out that in his message vetoing the O'Mahoney pricing bill the President recognized existing confusion with respect to these matters and said that "clarification of the antitrust laws can be expected when decisions are reached in a number of cases under consideration by the Federal Trade Commission and the courts." The Senator expressed the view that while this was contrary to the constitutional duty of the Congress to make the laws, it does place a new responsibility on the Federal Trade Commission and points the finger at the source of the present confusion.

This watchdog subcommittee who will ride herd on the Federal Trade Commission, the Senator announced, will be composed of Senators ED C. JOHNSON (Democrat, Colorado), chairman; FRANCIS J. MYERS (Democrat, Pennsylvania); HERBERT R. O'CONOR (Democrat, Maryland); HOMER E. CAPEHART (Republican, Indiana); and JOHN W. BRICKER (Republican, Ohio).

In announcing this watchdog subcommittee, Senator JOHNSON pointed out that the veto message emphasized that freight absorption and other competitive pricing practices were now legal; that confusion with respect to their validity had been clarified to some extent in recent public statements by the Federal Trade Commission; and that the President had in effect admonished the Commission to further clarify the law in this respect. Senator JOHNSON said he felt that the frequent shifts in position of the Federal Trade Commission, particularly its early approval and later disapproval of the O'Mahoney bill, had destroyed public confidence and required continued close day-by-day watchfulness over its activities in this field.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee chairman quoted from a recent public statement by Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY (Democrat, Wyoming), author of S. 1008, that: "I am glad that in his veto message Mr. Truman has enabled me, by the language I have quoted above, to say to the business community that, in my opinion, they need not fear adverse action by Government agencies when, by individual action, they engage in competitive production, distribution and sale of the commodities in which they deal." Senator JOHNSON said he hoped this assurance might be pledged directly by the Federal Trade Commission to American businessmen and give them a measure of comfort since by the veto positive assurance had been denied them by law.

Whether or not new legislation will be necessary in the Eighty-second Congress, Senator JOHNSON said, will depend upon how the Commission responds to the overwhelmingly expressed demand of both Houses of Congress and the clear implication in the President's veto message of a need for assurance to businessmen of their right to engage in competitive pricing practices including the absorption of freight.

Senator JOHNSON said he proposed to ask the Federal Trade Commission to submit to the subcommittee copies of all orders, decisions, briefs, pleadings and other papers which may hereafter be publicly filed in any of the pending cases referred to in the President's veto message. In a further effort to clarify the situation, the Senator said he would transmit a series of questions to the Honorable James Mead, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, with the hope that forthright answers which in view of the President's veto message the country has every right to expect might give businessmen further assurance of the legality of their competitive pricing practices. After receipt of the answers to these questions, the Senator said he proposed to hold public hearings wherein the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission would be the first witness. Senator JOHNSON's committee will report to the Eighty-second Congress the progress or lack of progress in clearing away the confusion and uncertainty referred to in the President's veto message, uncertainty which the Senator emphasized "stands as a roadblock to the growth and expansion of our industrial economy."

Debts, Deficit, and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on June 16, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States, delivered a most timely address, on the subject of Federal finance, spending, and taxes, before the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, meeting in Chicago.

I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information and consideration of the Members of this body.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEBTS, DEFICITS, AND TAXES

It is a pleasure to address the Junior Chamber of Commerce. We owe to you a debt for the support you have given to reorganizing the executive machinery of the Government. There are even more reasons for public appreciation of your organization which I will mention later.

Some of your officers asked me to speak on the relation of Government expenditures, deficits, and taxes, to jobs and to national life.

THE FIVE QUESTIONS

They propounded to me five questions:

1. Who pays these taxes?
2. Can taxes be sufficiently increased to meet these deficits?
3. Will deficits not lead to more inflation?
4. Can expenses be reduced?
5. What stands in the way of reductions?

It is these five questions, plus the activities of the different breeds of collectivists, which plague the American people today.

Before I attempt to answer these questions, I will make a few preparatory observations.

Today we are blessed with some kind of prosperity. Whatever kind it is, we all want stability without inflation. We want a system that finds jobs for 1,000,000 new workers each year.

DEFICITS IN GENERAL

In 1932 I did the suffering from an unbalanced budget. The reverberations of a European panic had pulled the tax revenues out from under us, and we were compelled to make large recoverable loans to support our credit structure. Outside these subsequently recovered loans our modest deficit was about $1,000,000,000. In the midst of this grief, Mr. Roosevelt, in denouncing our deficit, made an uncomfortable remark to the effect that, too often, liberal governments have been wrecked on the rock of deficits. However, we only heard this remark once.

About this time, Lord John Maynard Keynes came up with his new intoxicant of deficit spending in years of unemployment. It had a good political flavor. Having got the habit, we keep drinking in times of presumed prosperity. With the exception of 2 years in the Eightieth Congress, we have had deficits and increasing debt for all 17 years since Keynes helped us out.

The consoling answer of the inebriated is that there is really no such thing as Government debt. They say, "We owe it to ourselves." Any government which follows this will-o'-wisp will sometime break its neck over the precipice of inflation. Some have already done so.

DEFICITS IN PROSPECT

We cannot appraise these questions without using facts, figures, and the word billions. But, to be sure the billions I mention are free of political bias, I use only those from Democratic Senators.

Senator HARRY BYRD says that if we include all Federal expenditures, both in and outside of the President's formal budget, they will amount to about $44,000,000,000 for the present fiscal year, with a deficit of about $5,000,000,000. Our State and local expenditures amount to about $15,000,000,000. That would be around $60,000,000,000 of various current Government expenditures.

Beyond this Senator MCCLELLAN calculates that, if all the recommended Federal legislation is passed, it will increase the annual Federal expenditures by twenty to twenty-five billion dollars more. Senator MCCLELLAN is against this phantasmagoria of the Promised Land which he so well appraised. Even without this phantasmagoria, the Federal deficit will probably be greater next year, and there are also powerful urgings to State and municipal governments for increased expenditures.

WHO PAYS THE TAXES?

The first of your questions was, Who pays the taxes? Here we enter a land of twilights and illusions. We can illuminate it somewhat if we divide the taxpayers into the sheep and the goats. The sheep are the families who have a gross income of less than $7,000 a year before taxes. The goats are those who have a gross income of more than $7,000 a year. Various studies show that almost 80 percent of governmental revenues come from the sheep. It also shows that each sheep family on the average pays about $1,400 a year in taxes and deductions. Therefore even the $7,000 top figure for the sheep is not $7,000. Your second question was:

CAN TAXES BE INCREASED TO MEET THESE DEFICITS?

I suppose taxes could be increased until the whole population can no longer buy enough food or clothes. The real question is how far our people can be taxed and still have jobs and a decent standard of living. We can apply four tests as to whether the patient can stand any more tax mixtures.

First. Because of the average $1,400 annual taxes on the sheep families, a large number of them are already prevented from reaching the standard which the Labor Department insists is "desirable."

Second. But how about the goats who have gross incomes of more than $7,000 a year? The answer is easy. If the Government confiscated their entire personal incomes, it would not pay the present Federal deficit—and that does not include Senator MCCLELLAN'S phantasmagoria of a Promised Land.

Third. One of the illusions of our times is that corporation taxes come from the stockholders. Sometime the American people will realize that corporation taxes are passed on to the customers, which are the sheep. Otherwise the corporations would in the end go bankrupt.

Therefore, any substantial increase in taxes must come by shearing more from the sheep.

Fourth. It is my belief that even present taxes are so draining the savings of the people into the Government as to undermine new jobs for the future. It is possible to calculate the present Government take as theoretically over 60 percent of the people's savings after deducting the cost of a possible decent standard of living. If the phantasmagoria described by Senator MCCLELLAN came into action, the Government take would be over 80 percent.

The fact that taxes have already definitely shrunken venture and equity capital for small business would seem to be proved when the Government proposes to furnish such capital. Never before, in 165 years, did small business depend on Government. Small businesses are the plants from which big business grows.

That is also proof that the Government is becoming more and more the source of capital and credit. To which the Socialists applaud.

Big business can finance itself by borrowing money, especially while the Government is inflating credit. But big business only employs about 25 percent of the working population.

The answer to the question, "Can our economy stand substantially more taxes and still make substantial progress?" is just simply no, unless you believe a collectivist state is progress. Your third question was:

WILL DEFICITS LEAD TO MORE INFLATION?

Financing Government deficits by borrowing, if continued long enough, has only one end—inflation. That has been proved by a dozen nations.

We ourselves have already decreased the purchasing value of the dollar by over 40 percent and we are still creeping along that road. The 5-cent telephone call went a few weeks ago and the 5-cent fare had already gone, and the 5-cent candy bar has shrunk even more lately. A new round of inflation is now appearing in direct or indirect wage and salary increases and rising commodity prices.

If we keep on this road, we are certain to reach the President's ideal of $4,000 a year to every family. But it will not have $4,000 purchasing power.

To this question of further Government borrowing to meet deficits, my answer is that it is the road to disaster for every cottage in the land. Your fourth question was:

CAN WE REDUCE EXPENSES?

To that, the answer is yes.

The first move in that direction is to stop the phantasmagoria described by Senator MCCLELLAN in its tracks. That is easy if we take a holiday in new Government services until the deficit is overcome. No doubt many things the Government can provide are desirable. Most every family would like to add desirable things to its living. But getting them by borrowing money is the way the old homestead was lost. Most families shy off that method. And the Government should be even more shy, or it will come to a bad end.

The second and most simple device to reduce expenses is for Congress to cut proposed expenditures to the very bones of necessity; also to supend the sports of log-rolling and pork barrels.

We are generally told that these enormous Government expenditures and deficits are mainly the inheritance of the war and cannot be helped. It is true that of the present budget of $44,000,000,000, about $32,000,000,000 go to pay interest on the debt, veterans, national defense and subsidies to other countries to keep them comfortable in the cold war. Those items have been increased by only 15 percent in the last 3 years.

To get some look at expenditures not created by the wars, and to avoid any partisan flavor, we may start from a Democratic fiscal year of 17 years ago. This nonwar part of the Government has increased expenditures 400 percent in 17 years and 50 percent in the last 3 years. No amount of claims that the purchasing value of the dollar has decreased or that the population has increased can explain these increases.

REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

The third way to reduce expenses is the more efficient organization and the cutting out of waste in Government on the lines proposed by the Reorganization Commission.

Through the cooperation of the administration, the Congress, the citizens committee,

and such organizations as yours, we have already made substantial progress in these reforms of the executive branch of the Government.

The major accomplishments are unification of the Armed Forces, reorganization of the State Department, unification of the general services, reorganization of the Government merchant marine.

They represent big money. In addition, a number of minor reforms have been accepted.

MAJOR REFORMS STILL TO DO

We still have many major reforms to accomplish. They include our proposals:

To reorganize the whole civil service into an honest-to-goodness career service based on merit with justice and encouragement in promotion. The experienced chairman of our task force unhesitatingly stated we could save 10 percent of the Federal payroll. That would be a little item of $600,000,000.

To put the budgeting and accounting of the Government on a business basis. There would be many savings possible if the Government could see itself in the mirror of an adequate accounting system.

To organize the post office into a modern business concern, with management free from politics. With this reform and some increase in rates to special commercial users, I believe its deficit of half a billion could be overcome.

To reorganize the structure of the Departments of Treasury, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, Interior, and Housing so that each of them has, cheek by jowl, the agencies devoted to a related major purpose. That would fix responsibility for policies, create checks and balances, eliminate overlaps, competition and waste inevitable in activities now scattered all over the Government. The chairman of only one of those task forces said that $300,000,000 could be saved by that one unification.

To unify the Government Hospital Services so as to save $400,000,000 or $500,000,000 of unnecessary construction now authorized; at the same time to provide better medical service and better preparedness for war.

And there are scores of other reforms which are pointed at greater efficiency for less money.

These recommendations were founded upon 2 years of study by 18 task forces comprised of independent leading men and women of experience whose reports, recommendations, and reasons are open to everybody.

These reforms are in the lap of the gods in Washington and the pressure groups at home.

WHAT STANDS IN THE WAY OF REDUCTION OF EXPENDITURES?

The next question is, "What stands in the way of these reforms and reductions?"

Over 25 years ago I served on a Commission of Reorganization of the Executive Branch. I saw those reforms go to their burial with the following remarks:

"Practically every single item has met with opposition from some vested official, or it has disturbed some vested habit, and offended some organized minority. It has aroused the paid propagandists. All of them are in favor of every item of reorganization except that which affects the activity in which they are specially interested. In the aggregate, these directors of vested habits and propaganda surround Congress with a confusing fog of opposition. Meantime, the inchoate voice of the public gets nowhere but to swear."

Here ended that funeral sermon of 25 years ago.

But we are doing better this time than 25 years ago, as we had little public or congressional support at that time.

Among our public supporters, the Junior Chamber of Commerce has given its fine energies to educating the misguided lay members of obstructing pressure groups, and yours is a splendid, intelligent appreciation of what economy in government means.

I may take a parable from Dr. Flemming. A Boy Scout scoutmaster was calling the roll of his troop as to what good deed each had performed during the week. All passed except four. The scoutmaster told the four to go at once and come back in the afternoon, each with a good deed to report. When they returned, the first replied that he had helped a lady across the street. The second, third, and fourth made the same reply. The suspicious scoutmaster inquired if this was all about the same lady. The first boy replied, "Yes, sir. She was on the wrong side of the road. It took all four of us to get her over."

PROBLEMS DEEPER THAN REORGANIZATION

But the problems which face us in fiscal questions are deeper in American life than reorganization of the executive departments.

We need to make an appraisal of some of the forces which produce these dangers from expenditures, deficits, inflation, and drainage of savings into the Government.

It is possible to denounce public officials for all these dangers and ills. But do not overlook the fact that public officials get elected because they satisfy their constituents. Among their constituencies are the special groups who want something from the Treasury. Many of them are on guard to protect their members from losing established privilege. They all wear the clothing of public interest. They are active in electing their man while the other citizen sleeps.

We bitterly fought special privilege in business. This idea of special privilege in groups is a more modern development.

There are probably 200,000 voluntary associations in the United States of some kind or another, most of which give voice for or against something of public importance. Except for the collectivists, they are one of the essential foundation piers under the American system of life. They perform millions of services in developing public understanding and public action. They also serve the country by neutralizing each other before congressional committees.

The number of associations interested in increasing or preventing the decrease in Government expenditures is very small, probably not 50 of much consequence, but they are a powerful minority.

Nor do all these pressures come from the voluntary associations. The municipalities press the State governments and the State governments press the Federal Government.

If such an unexpected thing were to happen as all these groups keeping their hands off expenditure questions and these reforms in government for 12 months, both in Washington and in the election districts, the Congress would do a great job not only in decreasing expenses but in the common interest of the Nation.

MORALS AS WELL AS ECONOMIES

There is something else involved in all this problem.

Out of the war, as from all wars, the Nation has had a spell of moral and spiritual sickness. It has been a period of great cynicism. With the lowered moral resistance of this period, unfair burdens have been placed on the people by particular groups. Too frequently do we hear a repetition of the excuse, "They got theirs; we will get ours," or Ben Franklin's remark about "God helps those who help themselves."

But if Ben were alive today he would say, "Free men were not created by drives of pressure groups on the Public Treasury."

CONCLUSION

Nations must inevitably suffer from their mistakes. But their survival depends upon their will, their courage, and their moral and spiritual fiber. If these qualities live, then unbalanced budgets and ideological disputes can be but a passing froth on the surface. The rise of American civilization was out of a people of such qualities. It has been sick but it is not in its decline and fall. All around us we see signs of moral and spiritual strength in the oncoming youth.

There is a difficult word I could use—atavism—that is, the latent qualities which we inherit from our ancestors. They are coming back. Your organization is one of their expressions. In your leadership of American youth lies the hope and confidence of our country and of my generation.

Social Security Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Good Start on Social Security Revision," which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD START ON SOCIAL-SECURITY REVISION

Overwhelming Senate approval of a bill to broaden the coverage and benefits of the social-security system is a long step toward furnishing the kind of program of individual protection the country needs.

It is obvious that there are shortcomings in this bill, just as there are in the House version. Some large groups are still left outside social-security protection. It is likely that emphasis on old-age pensions has led to insufficient consideration of the needs of other groups needing aid.

And it is evident, too, that there is still a dangerous difference between the readiness of Congress to vote increased benefits, and its willingness to vote for a proportionate strengthening of the financial foundation of the entire social-security system.

But these deficiences, while they point to the need for a serious study of the entire problem of social security, do not outweigh the manifest gains in the measures now before a House-Senate conference committee.

Broadening of the coverage in the old-age pension system seems no more than simple justice. There is palpable discrimination in any program which affords workers in certain lines protection and denies it to others.

This injustice would be cut down by the measure passed by the Senate. The 35,000,000 now covered by the old-age pension system would be increased by about 10,000,000, including the large group of self-employed, farm workers, and domestics now outside the scope of the law.

Of more immediate effect is the provision for increasing the payments to present beneficiaries of old-age pensions by an average of almost 90 percent.

The estimated 2,900,000 persons now living on these pensions have been suffering considerable hardships because of the rise in prices in recent years. While their cost of living rose sharply, their income from pension payments, established back during the depression, stood still.

If any system for protecting the aged is to be worth while, it is perfectly clear that the benefits cannot fall so far behind the cost of living that the subsistence of those dependent upon it is threatened. Virtually

doubling the pension payments is a big jump, but it is big only because Congress did not deal with the problem earlier.

But it is equally clear that there must be a close relation between the financing of social security and the scale of benefits, or the entire program will be in jeopardy.

The Senate went part way toward meeting this problem by agreeing with the House that the ceiling of income taxable for social security purposes should be raised to $3,600. The tax, under the Senate bill, will stay at 1½ percent until 1956.

This may be all that is warranted at this time. It should be pointed out, however, that the increase in tax revenue to support the system is not so great as the increase in benefits. And with larger numbers of people reaching retirement age, the perils of that approach are manifest.

Questions of proper financing of the social-security program should receive a high priority in the study of the entire problem voted by the Senate. Careful attention will have to be paid to other problems, such as more complete coverage, only partially solved in the present legislation.

On a broader basis, the study ought to deal with the vast and complicated questions posed by the growing number of older persons in this country. It should recognize that these are not just questions of financial aid, but more importantly of finding ways by which elder citizens can continue to contribute to their own support and the country's best interests.

But necessary as this survey is, Congress is showing wisdom in acting now to meet the more pressing needs of social-security revision. There should be no delay in getting this measure finally enacted into law.

The Great Betrayal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Great Betrayal," appearing in the June 19 issue of the Omaha Morning World-Herald. This editorial covers the same subject as that dealt with by the Honorable Herbert Hoover in his address, which has just been inserted in the RECORD by my colleague [Mr. WHERRY].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT BETRAYAL

Rarely does Herbert Hoover speak of the days when he was President of the United States. The depression which he did not cause, and of which he was the principal political victim, is not a happy subject.

But in Chicago, where he spoke to the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce the other night, Mr. Hoover rolled back the years to recall a campaign issue of the election of 1932.

Mr. Hoover's administration had piled up a deficit of $1,000,000,000. Tax revenues had fallen off. The Federal Government, in this desperate time, was spending more than it took in in its efforts to stem the depression.

"In the midst of this grief," as Mr. Hoover phrased it, "Mr. Roosevelt announced the deficit. He made an uncomfortable remark to the effect that too often liberal governments have been wrecked on the rock of deficits."

And there was the worried Mr. Hoover sitting in the White House, listening to his campaign opponent talk of deficits, striving ineffectually to answer and, worst of all, knowing that Mr. Roosevelt was completely right about the dangers of overspending.

Mr. Hoover's elective political career was ended for all time that November, and the man who had promised to cut spending by 25 percent and balance the national budget rode into office with almost hysterical acclaim from a frightened people.

It is proper that Mr. Hoover should recall the political history of 18 years ago. His detractors who have tried to blacken his name by dwelling on the unhappy details of the depression have always conveniently overlooked the fact that Mr. Roosevelt was going to save the country by putting it on a sound economic basis.

Instead, what followed was "the great betrayal": the cheapening of the dollar, the political philosophy of spend and elect, the greatest deficits, and the greatest public debt any republic has ever endured.

The quarter-trillion-dollar debt which was built up in the years following Mr. Roosevelt's election was due partly to the war, as apologists for the spenders like to point out, but also largely to the spending policies that became the way of life of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

When Mr. Hoover speaks it is not only to bring up the lesson of the bitter past but to point the road to a secure future for his countrymen. He warns his fellow Americans to resist the minority pressure groups which he says are trying, and so far successfully, to spend the United States into bankruptcy.

The road to which he points is the road of self-denial, and in 1950 it takes patriotism and high purpose to follow it. But follow it the Republic must if it is to escape the disasters of the route upon which the spenders set forth in 1932.

Mr. Dewey's Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Dewey's Decision," from the Philadelphia Inquirer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. DEWEY'S DECISION

The wisdom of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey's decision not to seek reelection to a third term, being based on considerations of the state of his health, is not to be challenged. Our regret that such a course is necessary is profound. It is shared by great numbers of Americans of every political affiliation.

To the people of New York State the decision means the loss of a competent and courageous administrator who, through two terms in office, has served their interests with exceptional skill and energy. They, unquestionably, will miss him most.

It is not yet clear to what extent Mr. Dewey's valuable services at the national level are to be curtailed. He has said that he will continue to be active in public affairs. It is to be hoped sincerely that he will be able to do so and that he can remain in the forefront of progressive Republican leadership.

It is to Mr. Dewey, perhaps more than any other individual, that millions of Americans looked for a restoration of sound financial policies in the Federal Government and for broad, forward-looking policies both for his own party and the Nation. We can ill afford to lose the services of such a citizen.

There is a real hope that Mr. Dewey, who is 48 years old, will be restored to health by a rest from the terrific labors to which he, in common with many public officials, has been subjected over a period of 20 years. May he soon be able to return to aid in the struggle for sound government which he has so courageously waged in the face of overwhelming odds.

Competition of South American Copper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of June 22, 1950, entitled "Copper Trouble," and a letter from Carlos Reyes, press attaché of the Chilean Embassy, published in the Washington Post of June 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of June 22, 1950]

COPPER TROUBLE

Latin America, which is already seething over the coffee report of the Gillette subcommittee, is also worried over the possibility of a tax on copper exports to this country. Unless Congress acts before June 30, a tax of 2 cents a pound on imported copper, suspended during the war, will go back into effect. This tax, which is promoted by legislators from mining States, would be a severe blow to Chile, where copper is the main product, as well as to Peru.

Chile has not been altogether liberal in her treatment of the American firms which make up the copper industry there. For instance, she imposes heavy taxes which must be paid in dollars, yet an unrealistic exchange rate penalizes the companies on their plant expansion. Nonetheless, there are several important reasons why in our domestic interest the reimposition of the tax would be unwise. This country requires about 1,195,000 tons of copper annually. Domestic production accounts for some 890,000 tons, leaving the balance to be imported. To impose a tax amounting to $40 a ton might be to increase the cost of our own imports and provide a heyday for speculators. The tax is particularly questionable at a time when domestic production does not meet consumption and when this country is seeking to add to its strategic stockpile. Nor is there economic reason for the tax, which was contrived during the depression when prices were low and miners out of work.

From Chile's standpoint the disadvantages of the tax are obvious. It probably would curtail an important source of dollar income to Chile. The practical effect would be to encourage unrest in a country which has

been striving for stability through democratic means. The tax would harm the position of President Gonzalez Videla, who recently completed a tour of this country, by giving a handle to the extremists anxious to spite the United States.

The roadblock established by mining State Senators is most effective in the Senate Finance Committee, where the restoration of the tax has been tied to a scrap metal bill to increase the difficulty of defeat. However, the House has a good chance to act by passing the Patterson bill, which would suspend the tax for another 2 years; the Senate could then approve this bill separately. It is not too much to ask that legislators take a mature look at our foreign policy and the injury ill-considered measures can do to patient effort at understanding.

COPPER VERSUS COPPER

Your June 3 editorial, Coal versus Oil, contained an interesting comment on the adverse effects which would follow the restriction on petroleum imports from Venezuela. Your comment is quite correct and should be adopted as a general doctrine of an economic character, with vast political scope.

With slight modification, this comment could be applied to the excise tax on foreign copper. The United States produces about 800,000 metric tons of copper per annum, and consumes around 1,100,000 tons. It must import for current consumption and reserves around 300,000 tons. In the event of war it must import more than 500,000 tons annually.

During World War II, Chile, which is the second largest producer of copper in the world, exerted a tremendous cooperative effort and furnished the United States this half million tons annually at a low price, fixed by the United States Government. Thus, Chile made a great economic sacrifice for the war effort. She even mobilized thousands of agricultural workers, who were moved to the mines in the north of Chile to increase the production of copper to its maximum.

Notwithstanding all these vital considerations, there is now noted an effort to reestablish the excise tax of 2 cents per pound on imports of foreign copper. The United States Congress, which has approved aid in the billions of dollars to other countries (for sound reasons), has shown no disposition to enact legislation which would impede the automatic reestablishment of the excise tax on July 1.

Chile, a friendly nation, and the principal foreign source of supply of copper for the United States, will be the one most damaged. The Administration understands the situation perfectly, and has brought it to the attention of the Senate Finance Committee by letters approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The large consumers of copper in the United States have shown that the tax will bring about an unjustified additional rise in the price of industrial products containing copper: Automobiles, radios, washing machines, electrical installations, etc.

If a war should occur, the United States would be obliged to call on Chile, in the first place, and on Peru and Mexico, in the second place, to produce the largest possible quantity of copper. But these nations may not understand why the United States in peacetime burdens an essential product; nor may they understand precisely what is meant by "continental solidarity." They may fail to understand, also, the purpose of all the pan-American literature. We are already seeing the profound reaction of the coffee-producing countries of Latin America.

Therefore, it would seem urgent to insure the adidtional sources of copper of Latin-America for the normal needs of United States industry and for emergencies. It would seem, also, that it is not politically wise to menace the basic products of Latin-American countries, which receive their largest dollar income from the sale of copper, coffee and oil.

CARLOS REYES,
Press Attaché, Chilean Embassy.
WASHINGTON.

Extension of the Draft Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 21, referring to the extension of the Draft Act.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T IMPERIL UNITED STATES DEFENSES: EXTEND THE DRAFT ACT

It seems almost impossible to believe that Members of Congress will permit the draft registration law extension to drag beyond Saturday's dead line on the present act. Yet the danger that this might occur has now become a matter of only hours away, with the Senate—the chief battleground of the measure at present—scheduled to take the extension bill up late today.

In addition to serious legal and administrative complications that are almost certain to arise if there is a gap between the termination of the existing law and the enactment of another, there are grave possibilities affecting national security to be considered.

Congress' halting approach on such questions as this on various occasions has fed the Communist propaganda machines with damaging material. It has strengthened ideas held in the Kremlin that our democratic processes are too awkward for the maintenance of continuous polices in defense or in other areas of national and international activity. It has likewise disturbed the peoples alined with us in the stern struggle against Red infiltration and threats of aggression.

It is always true that when some dire crisis comes upon us our people and their legislators rush to meet it. But we have had too many experiences to demonstrate that waiting until peril is at hand involves terrible consequences. Pearl Harbor is an unforgettable reminder of that fact.

Senator RUSSELL has attempted to overload the draft-extension bill with a segregation amendment. It is unworthy of a great nation and should be swept away. The imperative duty of Congress is to complete action on the extension. If it is not done before the present act dies, 11,000,000 or more men may have to be registered all over again, while the existing skeleton selective-service organization would have to be recreated at great expense and with great trouble.

This is not a draft bill, but a registration bill, under which no calls to service would be made except in emergencies and under careful restrictions. But the continued existence of the registration measure is a vital requirement to preserve our security. This is no time to delay or to juggle with such an essential part of the defense of America.

Assistance to Distressed Economic Areas

REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as part of my program of bringing aid and assistance to the distressed economic area of Pennsylvania, centered in the anthracite coal fields and more particularly that part of said area known as the Wilkes-Barre-Hazelton metropolitan area, I find it necessary to enlist the aid of the Federal Government in behalf of the industrial, manufacturing, commercial, and mercantile interests of this part of the country and to further assure not only the local, but the national general welfare and security.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced, therefore, on this day a bill "to foster economic development in areas of chronic unemployment."

Thus far my legislative program for this purpose has been composed of measures to deal with specific short-range needs and so it is now necessary to present as part of the program, legislation creating specific long-range needs.

The chief industry of the chronic distressed area in northeastern Pennsylvania is the mining of anthracite coal. I have introduced legislation with particular reference to this industry: First, calling for the erection of a great office building for the Bureau of Mines in Wilkes-Barre to center in the field the administration of the Government's participation in this industry; second, legislation calling for the stockpiling of anthracite coal for the purpose of guaranteeing employment and production in the anthracite coal fields; third, legislation calling for the establishment of a $10,000,000 fund to create an anthracite laboratory and extensive research program for additional use, fuel and nonfuel, of anthracite coal; fourth, legislation giving a 5-percent advantage on bids to bidders from this area as contrasted to bids received from other areas by Federal procurement agencies for the same purpose; and fifth, requests to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to grant a $5,000,000 loan to local industrial development funds for the purpose of building factories in the area in order to permit outside industries to be established in the area.

And so today, Mr. Speaker, I introduce this bill as a further step in providing a necessary element in a total program for an economic rehabilitation of the anthracite industry. I realize full well that there are some other sections of this country suffering from the grasping paralysis of chronic unemployment, and so it is that the legislation I introduced today is of such a nature that these distressed areas shall receive prompt and effective attention.

Mr. Speaker, the district which I represent is part of the larger anthracite area of Pennsylvania which shares a plight similar to that of other areas in the country where, over the years, people

have made their livelihoods from the forests and from the mines, but where, because of conservation difficulties, the depletion of resources or the exhaustion of economically exportable resources or changing conditions with reference to markets and technology, these people have suffered serious economic distress over a long period of years, during many of which, in other parts of the country, employment and business conditions have stood at high and satisfactory levels. These areas are the "chronically distressed areas" of America. They have become widely known as such in the press, in governmental circles, and by the public generally. The anthracite area of Pennsylvania is only one of them. There are other such areas in the cut-over lands and the copper mining districts of upper Wisconsin and the upper peninsula of Michigan. There are other such areas in southern Illinois and southern Indiana. Over the years these areas and their problems have been studied and restudied by private groups and by governmental groups. Yet in these years of unprecedented postwar employment nationally, the people of these areas have in very large numbers remained unemployed and in dire economic distress. Unemployment benefits have become exhausted and the burden of direct relief upon State and local governmental units has continued to rise to heights very nearly beyond the capacities of both governments to carry.

Mr. Speaker, why with all of the studies of these areas of chronic economic distress and with all the expenditures of State and local and Federal Government in these areas, why with all the attention they have been given, do these conditions exist? I suggest that it is because we have not approached the problems of these areas in a fundamental way. I suggest that our efforts to date have been superficial and piecemeal. I suggest it is because we have made studies without making the appropriate arrangements for implementing and translating into reality the findings and recommendations of those studies. I suggest, above all, that we have failed to create a new economic base for these areas where the old economic base has failed as an adequate support for their populations.

Mr. Speaker, the persistence of chronic and substantial unemployment in these areas of the country is a problem for all of us. It causes a burdensome and unproductive drain on the financial resources of local, State, and Federal Governments. It deprives the Nation of the productive contribution of a substantial portion of its population. It restricts the market for goods and services produced within and outside such areas. It constitutes a demoralizing influence on their youth and their aged. It threatens to impair the stability of social and economic institutions in such areas.

Mr. Speaker, this is a national problem for it affects the security and welfare of all of our people. To be sure it is not solely a national problem, or even solely a governmental problem, but it is imperative that the Federal Government proceed forthwith to do its part in effecting a solution. In order to reduce unemployment and to stimulate expansion of business and industry, and, develop private employment opportunities in such areas, it is imperative that the Federal Government in cooperation with local and State governments, and with representatives of agriculture, business, labor, and the public generally, review and reorganize its own activities into comprehensive and integrated plans, projects, and programs, which will, when supplemented and complemented by other governmental and private efforts, correct basic economic maladjustmens which led to chronic unemployment; create factors favorable to private economic expansion, and promote the long-range development of resources within these areas.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to foster "economic development in areas of chronic unemployment." This bill provides for the creation within the Executive Offices of the President a council on chronic unemployment areas, consisting of the Secretaries of Defense, Agriculture, Labor, Interior, Commerce, the Federal Security Administrator, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. By designation of the President, one of these members would serve as chairman. It will be the duty of this council, in cooperation with agencies of local and State governments, and with representatives of agriculture, business and labor, and the general public, to prepare comprehensive and integrated plans, projects, and programs for the economic rehabilitation of our areas of chronic unemployment. Under my bill, the council will prepare its plans, projects, and programs, through commissions to be established in each of those areas to be composed of representatives or agencies sitting on the council and to be charged by citizen members from the areas to be designated by the President. Within a year following the establishment of the creation of a commission in an area of chronic unemployment, the council would report to the President on the plans, projects, and programs for the given area and the President will transmit their report, together with his recommendations, to the Congress. The bill requires that the plans and programs developed by the council to the area commissions be based on further analysis of the economic potentials of the areas and upon thorough study of the maladjustments creating and resulting from chronic unemployment. The bill provides further that the council make recommendations as to ways and means of carrying out the recommended Federal plans, projects, programs, including among other things, legislation, administration, and financial requirements.

Mr. Speaker, there are important facilities and services within the great departments of Government concerned with the domestic economy of the United States, which can be brought to bear effectively on the problems of our areas of chronic unemployment.

In the Department of Commerce there is a storehouse of specialized knowledge with reference to the development of new business and industrial enterprises. In that Department also we have a storehouse of economic data and personnel skilled in the use of that data for purposes of determining the economic potentials of our areas of chronic unemployment.

In the Department of Agriculture we have great programs directed toward the conservation of our soil and forest resources. In the Department of Interior we have other programs concerned with the conservation and development of our mineral and water resources, and of our scenic resources. In the Military Establishment we have other programs dealing with the development of our water resources and still other activities related to our national defense, which can be of great benefit to our areas of chronic unemployment. In the Federal Security Agency we have great national programs in the field of health and welfare. There are programs and facilities and service elsewhere in the Federal Government, which can be brought to bear upon these problems. What I am suggesting is that we marshal and mobilize all of these efforts into a single, unified, and effective attack upon the basic problems of our area of chronic economic distress. Out of such a concerted and unified effort and as supplemented by nongovernmental efforts and the efforts of State and local governments, I am sure that we can take a long step forward toward a permanent solution of the problem I have been discussing. We can renew the economic base of these areas. We can provide new opportunities for business and industrial enterprise and employment.

Mr. Speaker, there is one further and all-important provision in the bill which I am submitting. It provides explicitly that there shall be plans and programs for laboratory and economic research directed toward a determination of the opportunities which exist in these areas for new business and manufacturing enterprises, but I am suggesting further that provision be made for the financing of such enterprises with private capital. The bill which I am introducing will permit the Secretary of Commerce to charter development corporations in areas of chronic unemployment and elsewhere when the need exists. It will be the purpose of these corporations to assist in financing new business and industrial opportunities revealed in the research undertakings, which the bill provides for. These area development corporations will be authorized to sell common and preferred stock to financial institutions, corporations, or individuals. They will be authorized to borrow money and to use debentures, bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness in raising their capital. The bill provides that the RFC is authorized to purchase prior lien bonds issued by these corporations and to purchase their common and preferred stocks under appropriate limitations. These corporations, in turn, may purchase the securities of any business in areas of chronic unemployment and to make loans to unincorporated businesses.

The bill further authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to waive the collateral requirements in considering applications of business in chronic unemployment areas under corporation sponsorship. The waiver of collateral

requirements shall be limited to one business in each line of activity unless the area commission certifies otherwise.

Any security issued by the Corporation, a portion of which is purchased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, shall be exempt from the provisions of the Securities and Exchange Commission Act of 1933.

In order to further encourage private capital to invest in chronic unemployment areas, corporation assets shall be exempt from taxation for a period of 5 years and stockholders in a corporation shall be entitled to a credit against their Federal income tax equal to 20 percent of the amount of the dividends received from such corporation.

Mr. Speaker, here then at least is a plan. Here is something for the proper administrative agency of the Government concerned with these matters. This is something into which all parties concerned, and at all other levels, can sink their teeth. My experience in the participation in drives conducted by the chamber of commerce and local industrial development funds makes it clear that the raising of funds in accordance with various plans in chronically distressed unemployment areas is difficult indeed.

I would like to make it very clear that the people of these areas and their local leaders in civic, industrial and business matters extend themselves to the limit to be of help to themselves and to their communities. Of necessity, because of the very circumstances which exist, they cannot at this time, pull themselves up by their own boot straps.

I feel that particularly the establishment of these area development agencies, with local and national participation, will do much to encourage the flow of local risk capital into, first, the construction of facilities as an invitation to new industry and, second, for the development of existing industry.

What Does the Republican Party Stand For?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an address by Mr. James S. Schramm, chairman, Iowa Republican Finance Committee, at the State University of Iowa, May 23, 1950, on the program of the institute of public affairs of the university.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT DOES THE REPUBLICAN PARTY STAND FOR?

Before discussing "What the Republican Party Stands For" it might be helpful to consider for a moment how the great body of Republican (or Democrat for that matter) thought and principles are developed. The pronouncements of no one person nor any group of persons at any given time can be taken as an accurate definition of Republican principles. From the very beginning, party principles and policy have grown and developed from two main sources. First, there is the legislative and executive record of Republicans elected to public office. This, of course, is the most significant point of origin of party principle. The other is the formal, official statements of principle—the platforms, written every 4 years at national Republican conventions.

Here, I should like to say something about party platforms. We hear a lot of talk and criticism of platforms. They are vague. They straddle issues. They are designed to get votes and make promises which are not fulfilled. No one honestly can deny at least the part truth of these charges. But this is as it should be and must be in American politics. In Europe, political parties are clearly identified, even by their names, as Conservative, Liberal, Socialist, Communist, Labor, or what not. There is never a question as to what a party in Europe stands for. The American political tradition is very different. It is typical of American social life and custom. Our political parties, like our fraternities and sororities, our churches, clubs, and civic organizations are composed of people with different social, economic, and political backgrounds and points of view. This is one of the best traditions and customs of American life. We join organizations and get along with each other despite many minor differences of opinion. The essence of this ability to harmonize our relationships with one another is compromise. Not wishy-washy acquiescence to any crackpot idea, but intelligent give and take with our fellow men.

Nowhere is our good American talent for compromise more essential than in our political parties. The success of an American political party depends very largely upon its ability to advance the cause of good government with the least possible antagonizing of the majority and minority groups of voters. Thus it is, that party resolutions and platforms are argued, struggled over, fought out, and finally adopted—with compromise on the part of all and with complete approval of none. They represent the highest type of free American discussion and negotiation. They are influenced by every interested voter, by deliberations in precinct caucuses, county conventions, and State conventions. If and when either of the two major political party platforms are written to completely conform with the opinions of any one group of people, it will mark the end of that party—the end of the two-party system and the end of our free republican form of government. So much for party platforms.

Now a word about party principles as pronounced by elected public officials. We have seen that party platforms must be couched in general terms and be subject to somewhat varying interpretations. This properly permits elected officials to place their own and their constituents' interpretation on the various planks. No official is worth his salt, who doesn't have and express his own opinions in his campaigning and in office. If he fails to represent the views of his constituency, he will be defeated and he should be. Many elected officials represent an electorate which does not share the views of the party platform and they generally will vote contrary to the majority of their party. The Southern Democrats are a famous example. Party regularity is an ideal goal, but will never be completely attained. Thus we see that there is bound to be, and should be some discrepancy between party platforms and the individual voting record of party officials. One hundred percent consistency not only is incompatible with the American political tradition, but would spell the downfall of our free democracy.

The foregoing facts of life regarding the American political scene are among the most misunderstood and sometimes confusing truths, faced today by persons inexperienced in politics. Until these facts are understood and accepted, the so-called independent voter will continue to feel frustrated and dissatisfied with American politics.

Reflecting upon what I have said thus far, some of you may be thinking that I shall never be able to address myself to my announced subject "What Does the Republican Party Stand For", but you're wrong. I'll tackle that one right now—in simple, direct language which everyone can understand. Somehow or other the notion has gotten around, and I think I know who started it, though I'm amazed at how many innocent people have accepted the planted falsehood as truth, the notion that the Republican Party has no positive, aggressive program. Some clever opponents of ours slyly ask the question, "Why don't the Republicans present some constructive legislation instead of simply opposing everything the administration tries to do?" The answer is very clear, but not often enough given. The Republican Party is the minority party. All proposed legislation must enter the hopper through legislative committees, all of which are dominated by majority party members. There is about as much chance today for Republican-sponsored bills to get to the floor of the House or Senate as for President Hancher to turn the administration of student social activities over to a committee composed of Iowa City tavern operators. It just can't happen. A minority party has but one role to play. It must oppose. It must stand up and be counted against all proposed and existing legislation which it believes harmful to the welfare of the people. It must use every means within its power to prevent such bills from passing. It also must criticize and point out publicly every failure and shortcoming of the executive branch of the Government. By this very opposition, the voters easily can deduce what the party stands for.

Here is what the Republican Party stands for, and by like deduction, what the majority party is against. I give it to you in ten short sentences.

The Republican Party stands for:

1. Safeguarding liberty against socialism.
2. Reducing taxes.
3. Balancing the budget.
4. Eliminating Government waste—utilizing Hoover reports.
5. Fighting communism here.
6. Providing fair market prices on farm products, aided by price supports—cooperative marketing, soil conservation, reclamation, rural electrification—no Brannan plan.
7. Continuing and improving Taft-Hartley law to increase protection of Union members, management, and public.
8. Extending old-age insurance benefits—adequate Federal-State programs for needy—without unreasonable tax burdens, or socialized medicine.
9. Protecting rights of veterans and minorities.
10. Developing a united American foreign policy for peace—limited foreign aid, world trade without undermining American living standards.

To those who say party platforms are vague, too long, and not understandable, I submit that I have just given you a less than 100 word authentic digest of the recently written official restatement of Republican principles. And to those who say "That's all very well, but does the Republican Party stand for these things?" let's look at the record item by item.

1. Safeguarding liberty against socialism: The trend toward socialism in our Government is denied by no one, nor is the fact that the Republicans have led the oppcsition to socialized medicine, socialized farming, and socialized thinking. Individual liberty has

long been the watchword of Republican legislators.

2. Tax reduction: The only tax reduction given the American people in a generation was by the Republican Eightieth Congress—the only Republican-controlled Congress in the last 20 years.

3. Balancing the budget: The only real and effective fight that has been made against deficit spending is the fight made by Republicans. You can count the frugal Democrats on about three fingers.

4. Government waste and the Hoover reports: Republican endorsement and support of the Hoover report, designed to eliminate waste and overlapping inefficiency, is well known to all. Unfortunately, it is also well known that the Democrat-dominated bureaus and agencies flatly refuse, more often than not, to curtail, retrench, or demobilize their vast civilian forces. And may I point out that there is a vast difference between the recommendations for reorganization of Government made by the Hoover Commission and most of those reorganization proposals of President Truman. Republican legislators are voting against Mr. Truman's reorganization recommendations, which propose vesting more unchecked power in the hands of the President.

5. Communism: The fact that we out here in Iowa are somewhat removed from the present centers of Communist activity in America and thus less aware of the immediacy of the threat, in no way reduces this danger. Republicans are leading the difficult and often thankless struggle to rid our Government of Communist sympathizers.

6. Agriculture: The Republican Party created the Department of Agriculture and has always struggled to keep it out of politics. We have fought for a sound, long-range farm program, introduced the Hope-Aiken bill, and oppose such night-before Christmas fairy tales as the so-called Brannan plan.

7. Labor-management: Republicans created the Department of Labor. Republicans passed the Taft-Hartley Act to prevent management or labor from getting too much power at the expense of the public. Republicans will continue to lead the way in improving this legislation, as needed, in the interests of all the people—not just one segment.

8. Social security: It was Republicans who first adopted a valid old-age-assistance program in Montana, 12 years before the Federal Social Security Act. Republicans have repeatedly supported in their voting sound programs of social security.

9. Veteran and minority rights: The Republican Eightieth Congress passed more favorable legislation for veterans than any other Congress in history. The civil rights of minority groups have been espoused as continuously by the Republican Party as they consistently have been filibustered by the Democrats.

10. Foreign affairs: The Republican Party and its foreign affairs spokesmen have striven hard to make our foreign policy bipartisan, but to no avail. More than ever, Republicans are excluded from a voice in policy formulation, and are called in only after decisions have been made. Despite this clear unwillingness on the part of the Democrats to establish true bipartisanship, the Republican Party stands ready and eager to cooperate on a true bipartisan basis if given the opportunity to do so.

Now, having spoken briefly on the 10 major points of the most recent official statement of Republican principles and having identified the Republican record on these issues, may I take a few minutes more to elaborate on some of these issues which are of special interest to Iowans.

The first of these has to do with agriculture. The Republican Party has always been in the forefront of the advocates of a sound long-range farm program. The record of the Eightieth Congress and all other Republican-controlled Congresses is clear. We believe in a farm program which will provide a fair price for the farmer's products in the market place, aided by a system of flexible price supports and by reasonable protection against the dumping of competitive commodities produced by underpaid foreign labor, to the end that the farmer's standard of living will be in tune with the contribution he makes to the national economy. We believe that any long-range agricultural programs must be economically sound and have a minimum of Federal controls because such controls lead only to nationalization of agriculture. Dependency of farmers upon the Federal Treasury for most of their income would make the farm subservient to the State. Farm policies must be in the interest of the farmer, consumer, and national economy. We are unalterably opposed to such grandiose schemes as the so-called Brannan plan because we believe that such a plan would bankrupt the Nation. We strongly favor high prices to the farmer and low prices to the consumer. But we are very sure that the Brannan plan could never achieve this end, except through national bankruptcy.

The recent proposals made by the Agricultural Farm Policy Council of 30 dirt farmers in Iowa, working in conjunction with the Republican Veterans' League, is typical of the positive, aggressive Republican attitude toward farm problems. I commend the study of these proposals to any of you who may be harboring doubts as to what the Republican Party's attitude toward farm problems is.

Another major issue of importance to Iowans and in which the Republican position is crystal clear is that pertaining to labor-management relations. Here may I quote directly from the recent statement of Republican principles and objectives, the section on labor-management relations.

"Industrial harmony and justice are essential to the country's well-being. To that end, Government should encourage and promote free collective bargaining. On management and unions falls on equal responsibility to act in good faith toward each other and toward the country.

"We favor: (a) Continuation of the Taft-Hartley law because it has restored equality between employer and employees, guaranteed the right of collective bargaining, the recognition of unions and the right to strike, while protecting the rights of the public and the union members. Under this law union membership has increased to new highs, wages have risen to record levels, and strikes have decreased.

"We favor: (b) Continuation of our efforts to enact such improvements in the law as have been shown to be necessary to accomplish its purposes more effectively. We deplore the action of the administration in playing politics in this vital area of human relations, thereby blocking the enactment of necessary amendments to the law—many of them proposed by labor organizations."

Because too few people actually know what the Taft-Hartley law stands for, may I take this opportunity to set forth its 10 main points?

1. It stops Nation-wide strikes which affect the health and safety of the public.

2. It prevents Communists from getting control of the labor movement.

3. It guarantees free speech to employees, employers, and labor leaders.

4. It gives everyone the right to work.

5. It stops violence and destruction of property.

6. It stops unjustified secondary boycotts.

7. It makes both employer and union responsible for their contract.

8. It stops jurisdictional strikes which arise out of quarrels betweens unions.

9. It prevents the misuse of union dues and welfare funds.

10. Workers do not have to pay political debts to labor leaders.

The Republican Party believes that the Taft-Hartley Act is the best labor-management legislation obtainable up to this time. It agrees that there may be room for refinement and improvement and stands ready and willing to propose and support such modification of the Taft-Hartley Act as is found to be consistent with the objectives of fair labor-management relations and in the public interest.

While farm programs and labor-management relations may be the most generally pressing problems for many Iowans, neither of these has the implication of long-range good and evil for the young people of Iowa that fiscal problems have. Before ending this presentation of what the Republican Party stands for, let us give some thought to the Republican position on Federal finances.

By clever innuendo and irresponsible implication, high-salaried public-relations experts and ghost writers have tacked a lot of labels on the Republican Party. We are called the party of special privilege; we are charged with being opposed to welfare—the welfare of the people; we are called isolationists; we are charged with calamity howling. Here are attempts at twisting the truth and misleading the people not unknown to the propaganda machines of the Nazis, the Fascists, and the Communists; not that I would deny that some few Republicans (about as many as can be found among the Democrats) do deserve such labels. But, again, let us take a truly honest and objective look at just what the Republican Party does stand for in the realm of Federal finance, for most of these charges relate to Government income versus expenditures. The simple truth is that we stand for living within our income—living as well as we possibly can—with all the benefits of health, social security, adequate housing, soldier's pensions, high farm income, low consumer prices, guaranteed wages and income, and prosperous world neighbors, but living within our means. Although we have not had a Republican administration in nearly 20 years, Republicans, by and large, have endorsed and supported every program for the public welfare which could be justified, in terms of cost versus money available. We believe most emphatically, however, that the time has come to call a halt to Federal spending without regard to the costs. The public debt has reached such proportions, and under the continued domination of Democrat Party spending philosophy would gain such new heights, as to place an insurmountable tax burden on the backs of every young person of college age and under in the United States. Make no mistake, it is not the old or even middle-aged person who will suffer most. It is rather you young people and your children who have and shall inherit this burden.

Yes, we Republicans believe in welfare; that is why we insist on counting the costs. The carefree college student who recklessly spends his whole semester's allowance in the opening days of school is bound to be unhappy and, indeed, perhaps hungry the rest of the term. So is the nation, which spends without regard to its income, inevitably headed for trouble. Welfare must be a continuing condition of reasonable soundness, not a lavish abundance today and starvation tomorrow. There is a great difference between the state of welfare and the welfare state. The welfare State (and State is capitalized) is a paternalistic, all powerful government which says to the people, "We will take care of your every need, give your government complete authority over your lives and you will have nothing to worry about; the government will see to

your welfare." No such welfare state has ever survived nor has its people known well-being. The Republican Party is unalterably opposed to the welfare state. On the other hand the state of Welfare (and Welfare is capitalized), is that condition wherein people are truly well—well physically, economically, psychologically, and spiritually. The state of welfare can only be achieved when the people control the government. When individual initiative is encouraged, when justice and good will prevail, and when the government is in the hands of responsible and able men who are more concerned for the long-range welfare of the people than for the retention of their own power and authority. The Republican Party stands for that kind of a state of welfare.

We also believe in freedom; not the illusory freedom of fairy tales; not the freedom from responsibility, freedom from work, freedom from thought, nor even freedom from anxiety. These are the essence of human achievement and happiness. We believe in freedom from tyranny, from the tyranny of confiscatory taxation; freedom from all unnecessary government dictation and control; the freedom of mind and spirit which comes to people only when they have full confidence in their government; yes, when they have faith in the integrity, competence, and solvency of their government.

Now, do you know what the Republican Party stands for? I have explained how party principles are developed. Have listed the 10 high lights of our philosophy. I've elaborated on the more important principles of Republicanism. And I hope that whether you are Republican, Independent, or Democrat, henceforth you will never falter when asked what the Republican Party stands for. Ours is a very positive and very forward-looking program. We invite all who believe in the great American tradition of freedom, to join the party of Abraham Lincoln and work and fight for the principles which motivated his life, and which guide the Republican Party today.

Terror by Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the tricks and techniques of conspiratorial communism are almost as limitless in number as they are ruthless and unscrupulous in nature. Commander George N. Craig, of the American Legion, a great and courageous American, in the July issue of the American Legion Monthly, calls attention to some of the devices now being employed by Communists in this country to intimidate, indoctrinate, and inactivate the patriotic citizens of the United States of America.

This is an article every freedom-loving American should read and ponder. It suggests something that each of us can do in our own home towns to put an end to some of the terrorism that Communists and their dupes are now engendering right here in our own country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TERROR BY LAW

COMMIES NOW USE LAWYERS TO INTIMIDATE DECENT AMERICANS WHO DARE TO STAND IN THEIR WAY, BUT THE LEGION AT THE POST LEVEL CAN STOP THEM COLD

(By George N. Craig, national commander, American Legion)

Terror was the watchword for anyone who dared talk out against the Communists 20 years ago.

The Reds had goon squads, gangs equipped with blackjacks and knives, and they used them to beat into a bloody pulp the men—and the women, too—who opposed their plot to take over America.

In the mine fields of West Virginia, in the steel mills of Pennsylvania, in the automobile plants of Michigan, and the garment factories of New York, it was a rare day that someone was not found in a crumpled, bleeding heap. And that someone was always a person who had stood up against the Communists.

Concentrating as the Stalinists were then on organizing the foreign-born, their terroristic tactics were designed to spread fear among the susceptible, panicky people they were working on. They were devised to create the legend, "It doesn't pay to fight Communists." That such tactics were effective can be seen from the success the Reds had in gaining so much control in the American labor movement.

Today, the Reds have changed their strategy.

The Communist Party knows that the average American of the year 1950 cannot easily be frightened by threats of bodily harm. Instead of using physical assaults, the party, therefore, is now resorting to something even more sinister—legal beatings-up—as a means of intimidating anti-Communists.

No word of this has yet hit the headlines, but I can reveal that a well-organized machine of Communist legal goons are now operating in every section of the United States. Like the old gangs of strong-arm men, the machine has just one objective—to scare off opposition to the Reds' plans.

This Communist legal juggernaut swung into action recently in a little community on the outskirts of New York City. Its victim was a plain, ordinary American whose sole crime was that he objected to domination of his town's government by a group led by Communists.

What happened was this.

A long-time resident of this New York suburb suddenly awakened to the fact that a clique of alleged "liberals," led by a small but efficient core of Communists, had taken control of the town's affairs. By shrewd politicking, these people had placed their men in office as city manager, as police commissioner, and, even more insidious, as head of the local school board.

The old-timer didn't like it.

He got up at a town meeting and declared, "This town is under the thumb of a gang of pinks and Reds and it's time that the real Americans here did something about it."

Minutes later, this old-timer was approached by two men of the Communist-led faction whom he knew to be lawyers. One of them shoved his fist in his face.

"You've just committed a vicious slander," he said, "and unless you retract it publicly, we're going to sue."

"Go ahead and sue," he replied. "What I said is true and you know it."

"Maybe so," the lawyers said, "but you'll still have to hire lawyers to defend you and before we're through with you, it'll cost you every cent you have."

Like any citizen confronted with the threat of a lawsuit, the old timer was alarmed. He felt sure he could substantiate his charges but he knew he couldn't afford the big fee a lawyer might ask to defend him. Such a trial, he knew, might drag on for months or years. And supposing the "Commies" won.

At the next meeting he rose and withdrew his statement.

The significance of this retreat was not lost on others at the meeting and a budding rebellion against the Reds collapsed. Today that New York town of 10,000 people is still under the sway of the Red-led clique.

The two lawyers who threatened the old-timer were, of course, part of the Communists' legal steamroller and their blackmailing approach was typical of the techniques it employs.

This Red legal machine is used throughout the country, in big cities and small towns, to intimidate individuals, organizations, and even newspapers who oppose the Stalinists.

But that is not all it is used for.

It is used to aid Communist spies and conspirators escape punishment for their admitted crimes.

It is used to discredit the courts and the democratic code of justice.

It is used to plant Communist lawyers in high Government posts so that they can commit espionage in behalf of Soviet Russia.

The activities of this machine are so widespread, and so menacing, that immediate steps to offset them are imperative.

What is desperately needed, in my opinion, is a remedial program consisting of two equally important points. One provides for the legal profession itself to clean house. The other calls for the rallying of all lawyers within the ranks of the American Legion to help in the fight against communism. Under its terms, lawyers' committees would be established in every post to protect good Americans from legal persecution by the Communists.

That something must be done, and soon, is certain.

Here are some actual case histories of how the red legal juggernaut has been functioning:

In a small town near Chicago, a veteran demanded the ouster of a confessed Communist from the city council.

The next day, this veteran, who was earning less than $75 a week as a bank teller, was sued for $50,000.

In filing their suit, the Communists deliberately saw to it that it received wide newspaper attention. Just as they expected, the bank for which the veteran worked didn't like this publicity and discharged him.

Out in the Midwest, a young businessman started a campaign to oust a known Communist from his position as the city welfare administrator. This businessman knew that the Communist in question was utilizing his post not only to aid other Reds but also to discriminate against non-Communists in real need of relief.

Within 10 days after he had launched the drive, this businessman, who was the head of a small, struggling factory, received a letter from a left-wing lawyer. It was a threat to bring suit against his company for alleged infringement of patents.

Before he even had a chance to reply to the letter, the businessman got a telephone call. It was from the left-wing lawyer.

"If you'll drop your campaign," he said, "we'll drop our suit. If you won't, we'll take your business away from you."

The businessman told him, "Go to hell." As a result, his concern is now tied up in the courts.

Nor is it solely laymen who have suffered.

When the police of a southern city tried to halt an illegal Communist-sponsored parade the commie stooges intentionally created such a row that they had to be arrested.

Less than a week afterward a half dozen policemen had been served with papers in a false-arrest suit.

Right now Paul Robeson and some of his fellow left-wingers have a $2,000,000 damage suit pending against the law-enforcement authorities of Westchester County, N. Y. That, you'll recall, is where the commies provoked two shocking riots.

The extent to which the Communist legal machine will go was illustrated even more vividly in Connecticut a few weeks ago.

The editor of a small newspaper there who had been vigorously crusading against certain Communist organizations was visited by a delegation of three lawyers from nearby Hartford.

"We've come to ask you to halt these attacks on our organizations," they said.

"You're wasting your time," the editor told them.

"Then we'll sue you for $1,000,000 damages."

"Go ahead and sue," the editor said.

"You're forgetting something," the trio of attorneys stated. "Under Connecticut law we can attach all the property and funds of your newspaper in a case like this. And we can freeze them until the outcome of trial. That means you won't be able to use your bank account or anything else for months and maybe years."

Although this editor has continued his fight on communism, he has been having some sleepless, worrying nights lately.

The Reds' lawyers have moved in on anti-Communist writers and publishers, too.

When Eugene Lyons, the noted author, wrote a book exposing the subversive methods of the Communists, Reds all over the Nation bombarded the publisher with threats of suit.

One fellow traveler actually filed suit, and, despite Lyons' objections, the publisher backed down before the threats of the fellow traveler's lawyers and agreed to make revisions in the text of the book.

The fellow traveler didn't stop there.

He went so far as to try to prevent book wholesalers from distributing the book.

"We'll sue you too," his lawyers told the book wholesalers, "unless you stop handling this book."

They brought so much pressure that several wholesalers became frightened, too, and ceased distributing the book.

Harassing tactics of this sort are, however, only one use the Communists make of their legal machine.

They constantly utilize it to protect party followers from paying the penalty for their subversive acts.

To do this, they maintain a regular pool of high-priced lawyers, each of them skilled at taking advantage of all loopholes in American law. These lawyers are always on call for the defense of Reds who get into trouble. So strict is party discipline that they will drop any other client they may be representing, no matter how high the fee, to defend anyone the party designates.

Time and again, these machine lawyers have succeeded in getting Communists out of blatent jams.

Scores of alien Communists have been saved from deportation by their tricks. Hundreds of Communists have successfully avoided answering the questions of congressional probers because of their legal stratagems.

The congressional Committee on Un-American Activities was so outraged by the testimony of one of the Reds' lawyers, Maurice L. Braverman, of Washington, D. C., that former Congressman John McDowell, Pennsylvania, exclaimed bitterly:

"It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that an attorney, too, is a traitor to his country."

Nothing is too extreme for some of these lawyers to do. Character assassination is, for instance, one of their specialties.

Mervyn Rathborne, a reformed Communist who used to be president of the CIO American Communications Association, found that out when he was called to testify at the recent trial of Harry Bridges for perjury. The defense counsel went to such lengths to discredit Rathborne's statement that Bridges, the left-wing stevedore leader, had lied when he said he had never been a Communist, the prosecuting attorney had to protest.

The defense, he complained to the court, had badgered and threatened Rathborne and referred to him as a burglar, a drunkard, a gambler, a thief, a liar.

The Reds' lawyers do more, though, than just put up a defense for accused commies. They also are ultra-skilled at making every trial serve as a vehicle for Stalinist propaganda.

The trial of the 11 top leaders of the American Communist Party on charges of conspiracy to overthrow the United States Government is a graphic example of this.

Knowing that the evidence was preponderantly against the defendants, their attorneys set out to milk the trial dry for propaganda purposes. They turned the case into an "agit-prop" device—a means for creating agitation and propaganda. They used the trial to cast reflections on the American jury system and the fairness of American judges.

As part of this plot, the Reds' lawyers made their grandstand charges that Negroes and Jews were excluded from Federal jury rolls—an accusation that was completely disproven but which made for 2 months of headlines.

As part of this plot, the Reds' lawyers adopted heckling, obstructionistic tactics which thereatened to convert the trial into a circus. They did everything in their power to exasperate Judge Harold R. Medina and make him declare a mistrial. Their efforts were so flagrant that they resulted in jail sentences for several of the lawyers for contempt of court.

It is significant, incidentally, that Vincent Hallinan, chief defense counsel for Harry Bridges, was also held in contempt by a Federal judge for employing the same type of courtroom conduct.

In both cases, the object of the attorneys appeared plain—to break down public confidence in democratic judicial processes.

The most sinister of all uses made by the Communists for their legal machine is the infiltration of the Government for subversive purposes.

Congressional investigators have discovered how this plot has operated.

The Communist Party laid the groundwork for it back in the thirties by getting jobs for party lawyers in such Federal agencies as the PWA, the WPA, the AAA, and the old NRA. The lawyers they planted there saw to it that other Communist attorneys were hired, and they helped each other get placed in sensitive spots throughout the Government.

That was how Alger Hiss obtained his high-ranking post in the State Department and was able, according to the sworn testimony of Whittaker Chambers, to act as a spy for the Soviets.

The Communist underground in Washington was full of these lawyers. In it, according to Chambers' sworn testimony, were left-wing attorneys like Nathan Witt, Lee Pressman, and John Abt. When these three and the others were asked whether they were members of the Communist Party, they refused to reply.

To answer this simple question, they said, might incriminate them.

The injury that men like these have done, and still may be doing, to the security of the United States is enormous.

There is yet another major use which the Reds make of their legal machine. It is one of their chief instruments for subverting labor unions.

In every union in which the Communists have any influence, they always seek to get one of their lawyers appointed as the organization counsel.

"Communist lawyers," states an official congressional report, "serve as the direct channel between the Communist Party and the union. Although not elected by the membership and not responsible to it, they often exercise monopoly control of collective bargaining and union policy.

"They are responsible for all kinds of legal tricks to perpetuate the control of Communist officials and stifle all opposition."

How does the Red legal juggernaut function?

At the top, in total control, is the party's politburo. Next in command are the party heads in the various States and cities. Under policies laid down by the Politburo, these local Communist chieftains decide what cases they want their lawyers to handle, what individuals or groups they want them to assail.

How does the Red legal machine recruit its forces?

The party makes it a special point to enroll lawyers in preference to any other group. It maintains a regular lawyers' fraction inside the organization. Today, insiders say that more than 5,000 of the party's 55,000 dues-paying members are lawyers. Typical of them is Harry Sacher, who has been identified as a party member by Louis Budenz.

The force of 5,000 attorneys, moreover, represents only a part of the party's legal strength. In addition to it, the party can also count on the help of thousands of fellow-traveling lawyers.

The principal mechanism utilized by the Red legal machine is the "front organization."

More than 20 separate legal "fronts" have been established by the party precisely for this purpose. These range all the way from the All-California Conference for Defense of Civil Rights and Aid to Labor's Prisoners to the Oklahoma Federation for Constitutional Rights and the Committee for Citizenship Rights.

Typical of them is the Committee for the Defense of Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. It has been described by the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities as "drummed up by the Communist Party and its fellow-travelers to defend known Communists from charges of perjury, contempt of Congress and the courts, immigration and passport fraud, illegal registration, and other violations of law."

Also typical is the International Juridical Association. The New York City Council has said that it is "devoted to the defense of the Communist Party, Communists and radical agitators * * * not limited merely to legal research but to sharp criticism of existing governmental agencies and defense of subversive groups."

The two worst of these Communist legal "fronts," unquestionably, are the Civil Rights Congress and the National Lawyers Guild.

The Civil Rights Congress is an outgrowth of the International Labor Defense, or organization officially branded "The American section * * * of the Red International Aid." Formed in Detroit on April 28, 1946, this Civil Rights Congress, it has been found, is "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party."

The National Lawyers Guild is even more dangerous because it has been able to camouflage its Communist connections.

Formed as an organization of lawyers ostensibly interested in raising the standards of the bar, the Guild succeeded in enrolling thousands of non-suspecting lawyers, men of the calibre of Judge Ferdinand Pecora, Joseph D. McGoldrick and Nathan Margolf,

the Solicitor to the United States Department of the Interior.

Although all three of these men, and many others, have since quit in disgust over the organization's adherence to the Communist line, the Guild still maintains its facade of respectability.

Just how much this outfit has been able to dupe the public came glaringly to the surface only a couple of months ago.

The exposé occurred when an enterprising Washington correspondent asked the Senate Judiciary Committee, how it determined the qualifications of persons nominated for Federal judgeships by President Truman.

"We get the advice of outside organizations," committee officials declared.

"What sort of organizations?" the correspondent inquired.

"The National Lawyers Guild," the committee said.

Incredible as it may sound, the all-important Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate was consulting with an organization named by Earl Browder himself as "a Communist transmission belt" as to who should sit on the Federal bench.

So far, all endeavors to fight the Communist legal machine have failed. When a move was made in the California legislature to compel lawyers to take loyalty oaths, the machine licked it.

It is with this in mind that I am calling for the adoption of the two-plank remedial program which I outlined earlier in this article. The need for it is urgent.

Under this program, the legal profession itself would whack down on Communist lawyers who make a mockery out of the Canons of the professional ethics of the bar.

The grievance committees in the various local bar associations must move to disbar any lawyers who deliberately try to sabotage the American system of justice.

Grievance committees in most bar associations have this right, and it is up to them to use it.

Such a move would not deprive Communists, or anyone else, of the legal protection to which they are entitled under the American Constitution. It would simply prevent Communist lawyers from sabotaging the Constitution.

At this very moment, the legal profession is—and knows it is—under fire for its disregard of the public. There is, in the words of Glenn R. Winters, editor of the Journal of the American Judicature Society, "an estrangement between attorneys and the public."

The bar can do much to ease this estrangement by acting against the type of lawyers who most discredit it.

As a lawyer, I call on the bar to act now.

But even that will not be enough.

What also is needed is legal protection for the average American who believes it his patriotic duty to stand up against the Commies.

That is why I, as national commander of the American Legion, am calling on lawyer-members of the Legion to join the battle against the Reds.

I urge that each Legion post organize a committee of lawyers from among its own membership who would be prepared to give advice to any Legionnaire tangling with the Red legal machine. They would tell what is safe, and what is legally unsafe, for him to say and do. They would tell him how seriously to take the threats of the Red lawyers and how much attention he need pay to their blackjacking methods.

If a Legionnaire learns that a public official in his town is a Communist and wants to make it known, he could discuss the matter first with his post's legal committee. He could find out how solid is the evidence he has, and whether he has the right to air it. This will safeguard him by keeping him from making charges he can't make stick.

Equally important, the legal committee would be ready to defend any Legionnaire unjustly attacked by the Communists.

What if there are no lawyers in a Legion post?

Then the post should enlist the aid of prominent anti-Communist lawyers in town. The post should explain the threat of the Communist legal machine and ask these other attorneys to serve on a voluntary basis. I am certain that they will be glad to help.

Both these steps, the clean-up of the bar and the establishment of Legion legal committees, are essential if the Red legal juggernaut is to be stopped from continuing to trample on the civil liberties of America and genuine Americans.

Knight With a G-String

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Knight With a G-String," by Gen. Wendell Westover. This article appeared in the June issue of the Reserve Officer.

For 2 years General Westover served as the executive for Reserve and ROTC Affairs Department of the Army. A veteran of the two World Wars, General Westover was recalled to active duty in 1947 at the request of General Eisenhower, who desired his services in relation to promoting the postwar Army Reserve Corps program. In November 1949 General Westover requested return to inactive duty to resume direction of his extensive business interests in Albany, N. Y.

This is a report made by an officer who should know what is going on in the Reserves. As I feel strongly about the Reserves, I am of the opinion that the action to consolidate the Reserves into an organization part and parcel of the Armed Forces is still a long way off.

Unless some positive action is taken immediately, the Reserves will be hurt immeasurably in that its plans will fail for lack of action.

The article follows:

A KNIGHT WITH A G-STRING

(Times have changed; modern minutemen cannot gallop to arms through the rubble after a sneak attack on our cities; they need the armor of being readied prior to attack. Clothed only in the current g-string support, our Army Organized Reserves are an unrealistic security delusion)

(By Brig. Gen. Wendell Westover, Army of the United States)

"Mission * * * to furnish * * * (1) units effectively organized, trained, and equipped in time of peace * * * and (2) additional trained personnel (individuals) * * * for augmentation of the AUS." Thus reads the current postwar policy for the Army Organized Reserve Corps. There is no validity in the statement that the Army does not want a Reserve. It does want one. It has to have one; even in present peacetimes, there are more Reserve officers on duty than there are Regulars.

The question is: what kind of a Reserve? Has the Department of Army reversed the priority of the ORC missions?

During the winter of 1948 our military planners stated: (a) "Never again will our Nation have months of relative immunity after the outbreak of war to mobilize, train, and equip an effective fighting force," (b) "* * * only the ready can validly hope for victory," (c) "* * * among the many lessons of the last war * * * the necessity for a ready Reserve."

During the spring of 1950 we have been informed of the cold war that "the situation is worsening." What progress have we made during the intervening period? This summary is presented as informative, and with the conviction that citizens as reservists and citizens as taxpayers, provided with maximum unrestricted information, may intelligently further the national security.

If it be critical, let it be understood that the criticism is not aimed at individuals as such, but at accomplishments within their peacetime duties. Nor is there intended a challenge of sincerity by virtue of membership in the regular establishments. On the contrary, superlatives of my admiration for caliber and accomplishment, and optimum ties of friendship, apply not to civilians or reservists, but to regular officers, active and retired, and dead in the service of their country.

Substantial progress in the advancement of Reserve programs has marked the last 2 years. Certainly there has been caused an acceleration of attention to Reserve matters. Why then my impatience? Because who shall know that we shall not be attacked tomorrow, or a month hence? Who can guarantee time to accomplish an optimum practicable strength with which to either prevent aggression against us, or minimize the risk of losing a war if we have too little, too late? Calculated risks can be falsely premised upon concepts contaminated by tradition.

Defense Secretary Forrestal's Committee on Civilian Components (the Gray board) was appointed in November 1947 because scores of thousands, weary of World War II action and concerned that weakness would end the armistice, raised the issue of expedition with respect to our postwar military organization.

The majority of witnesses before the board held that: (a) The National Guard is basically a State force; that in any future war the continental limits of the United States may well become a theater of operations, causing governors to retain them for protection of their own areas; (b) that no interval may be safely assumed between M-day and D-day.

What happened? The board unanimously agreed that with the Nation's security as its objective, among basic principles were: (1) Administration and training of the Reserve forces are as important as administration and training of the Regular forces; (2) members of the Reserve forces and of the Regular services are entitled to equal treatment under equal circumstances and, to this end, all true disparities between Reserves and Regulars and among Reserves should be eliminated; and (3) an effective Reserve program will require a substantial portion of the funds available for the National Military Establishment.

Weeks of hearings, months of collation and evaluation; submission of the report to the Secretary of Defense, announcement it would be considered, classification imposed upon a 20-foot shelf of testimony, and silence.

By fall the inertia brought about an Executive order by the Commander in Chief directing that World War II experienced personnel of the Reserves be utilized to the maximum interest of the national security and in such manner as to engender participation by citizens already having burdensome responsibilities.

Following the consternation evident when his reelection permitted insistence that the order be carried out, attention was shifted from the preparation of justifications for delays to actually assigning in excess of 60 officers out of the Pentagon's thousands to full-time duties with the task.

A special assistant to the Chief of Staff (retarded in his effectiveness by lack of service with ROTC, NG, or ORC) was designated. An expediting committee was established which met weekly for several months. By that time so many meeting hours were consumed with reports as to why curative action had not been possible that no time remained for consideration of additional problems, and the frequency of the assemblies was reduced. The special adviser, however, impatient with the embarrassment of responsibility, finally obtained a command decision to employ all staff divisions in an effort to prepare a coordinated plan quickly.

In the meantime, an ad hoc committee was appointed to restudy the troop basis of the ORC and National Guard, composed of officers and civilians of high stature in their fields—the Byrnes committee. This Mohammed tackled a mountain of National Guard politics, and, assisted by self-secured Reserve commanders and the defection of the ROA member, laid an egg so putrid that the Commander in Chief said, in essence, "I won't approve it—if I must forget artillery and learn truck driving, to hell with it."

Actually, the relegation of the ORC to low man on the totem pole was protested primarily because their resulting mission was beyond reasonable capability. To require 60 percent of World War II combat experienced officers of the arms to shift MOS in order to acquire assignments to well-supported units, appears not only unrealistic but not in the interest of security. To make one component essentially a service-type organization, except for a pool of individuals, ignores their experience as well as their interests.

Part of the camouflage was the prominence given ORC divisions. Many of their commanders, anxious to retain command but shrinking from contributing more than a modicum of time, maintained that their units did not desire nor could progress beyond cadre strength, this despite the fact that a substantial number of subordinate units had done so without the assistance in facilities, equipment, and training that would have eased their problems. With full knowledge that under approved policies these ORC divisions are training units only and will not be mobilized as such, the commanders persist in withholding from their subordinates the information that they are in reality members of units afforded low priorities of support (equipment, camp training, and pay) which are destined to furnish individuals for the secondary mission of the corps.

There, exposed, is a fundamental cleavage between enthusiastic, active Reserve officers, and the common consent of the senior ranks.

A hundred thousand Reserve officers who did the fighting in the recent war desire a unit concept. Reserve units are required in readiness before even our key Regular divisions may be effectively combat-employed. But officers in key planning and command positions say of the ORC, "No matter what the terminology, they are a pool if war comes." The recently announced new Reserve program, containing few combat-type units of any size, was firmed over the protests of those who do not believe in the unit concept for the ORC and frankly expect it to fail. (What better impetus toward failure than through such tongue-in-cheek support?)

Ironically enough, the final pressure that expedited the new program came from an external cause: the creation of the Civilian Components Policy Board in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The heat was put on to get the program wrapped up before it could be too closely scrutinized by that higher authority.

Yet even that group was subject to threat of investigation. DEWEY SHORT informed its chairman, at a hearing before his special committee of the Congress appointed to look into the inertia with respect to Reserve affairs, that monthly reports of progress must satisfy his committee and further, he thought it high time to hear the Army refer to the ORC as "our Reserves," he was tired of hearing, and feeling the implication, of "the Reserves."

Without command follow-through at all levels, the DOA attitude toward the ORC becomes a variable, depending upon individuals' inclinations. Although it is now deemed essential that every Regular, during the course of his career, have service with Reserve components, all too few have had such orientation in the past. Is it not more accurate to say that the system is responsible for any lack of cooperation?

In face of a restless international situation and our admitted shortage of military manpower, let alone trained manpower, readied in the minimum of time, what justification for discarding willing volunteers who are still in their thirties and physically fit? Why, with an emergency stated by high authority to be staring us in the face, do we limit the number who can earn promotions to any grade, and thereby discourage many who should be rewarded for maintaining proficiency? The approved answer is that we have a surplus to our needs. Is it not fair to ask whether those needs encompass the required ZI defenses, the multiload of expedited training when time is at a premium, When we shall have no respite after M-day to prepare in accord with past schedules? We are informed that mobilization has a governor imposed by facilities, equipment, transportation, etc. Well, since the enemy of the future will not permit us such a timetable, let's solve the problem. One way is to comply with War Department policies of 1945-46 as amended: Reserve units in readiness.

Ah, but that requires funds beyond the amount available. Yes; it does require funds beyond the 2.7 percent of the Army's 1951 fiscal limiting figure; but what of the mentioned Gray Board basic principle that the Reserve program will require a substantial portion? Isn't it logical that when an over-all deficiency in funds exists that a higher proportion be expended on the more economical Reserves who are already trained?

The accusation has been made that emphasis upon the Reserve component indicates lack of appreciation of the over-all picture. Such reasoning would appear not only to demand a violation of mission but a travesty on economy.

One can scarcely quarrel with a JCS decision with respect to the number of divisions we can deploy within a given period after M-day; training is a minor hurdle compared with equipping, clothing, housing, feeding, and transporting. But no command prerogative can convince this American that the NG possesses any God-given right or patented ability to progress untrained levies faster than can be equally supported ORC after M-day.

Nor, in fairness, should the blame for making of the ORC, in its primary mission, a housekeeping organization (there are ample opportunities for its individuals under its secondary mission) be placed on the Army. The NG Bureau, the NG Association, the NG AG Association, and all its friends and supporters, stood adamantly upon the contention that by law (the National Defense Act, as amended) and by recent legislation (the phrasing they inserted in the Selective Service Act) the NG troop basis was inviolate and no adjustments necessary to use war experienced Reserve personnel in terms of their MOS's was permissible. Only a few lonely voices were raised against the decision; among them, the Executive for Reserve and ROTC; another, the unwelcome and only tacitly obeyed voice of the Commander in Chief. And there you have it: the Regulars did not let the Reserve down, the guard won out.

Should the Reserve be good losers, in the interest of national defense, or should they insist on a review of the facts to determine whether unilateral cut-backs on the ORC, without comparable reductions from an over-expanded National Guard troop basis, is not prejudicial to the national defense?

It ill behooves one whose staff played such a major role in translating field requirements for active participation into realistic elements of the new Reserve program, to deny its merits—and that is not intended. However, there are certain aspects, both inclusions and omissions, which warrant examination.

The pluses in the program are many. A firm troop basis is established; the Department is finally committed to a plan; with some gaps it is a complete over-all package; it specifies high priority to first-needed units; it subtracts impractically small units; it has the backing of Army field force command follow-through.

The actual effects of the new program will become apparent as information and understanding percolate to lower echelons in the field. Since, with respect to units, other than training units, the program permits only those required to support the 25-division program in high priority and since the National Guard troop basis (1) includes virtually no service-type units, but (2) has been allocated many former Organized Reserve Corps units such as cavalry, antiaircraft artillery, etc., it will become apparent that substantially more than half the Reserve officers of the Army will either lack assignment opportunity, be forced to transfer to a service branch, or accept a rare vacancy in one of the Organized Reserve Corps divisions, none of which are scheduled for mobilization and are perpetuated as training units as a sop to their commanders.

A successful curtain of secrecy has been maintained over the penalties to the Reserves caused by allocation of funds and equipment to National Guard divisions not included in early mobilization plans. Policies now provide like support for National Guard divisions irrespective of their mobilization timing; in consequence many receive equipment for their low-priority status at the expense of Reserve units with higher priority status. Such procedure is subject to a valid challenge in the national defense interests.

Furthermore, care has been taken that the Congress not understand that the cost of equipment to ready many of the service-type Reserve units required to enable the combat deployment of Regular and National Guard divisions is several times greater than the cost of equipping National Guard combat-type units, yet no budget adjustments have been recommended.

A potential bright spot is the facilities bill before the Congress, designed to provide facilities for the Reserve components of all services with maximum economy by virtue of joint use.

No action, however, has been taken by either the Department of Defense or the Departments to increase releasing Government-owned facilities to civil use. In Buffalo, for example, a structure adequate for all the Reserves, was sold at a fraction of its cost, and about $1,000,000 of taxpayers' money will be required to erect a substitute. Opportunities for scores of millions of dollars savings have been allowed to lapse

through inertia which can only be explained by lack of assistant secretaries for Reserves.

Logistical support is to be limited to TA–85 equipment, even for units declared essential to the 25 divisions program. If M-day and D-day coincide the aggressor forces will have the problem of resisting a barrage of training aids.

Of all the ORC problems probably the most difficult is that of holding and augmenting its enlisted personnel. Yet the Department of the Army has steadfastly refused to urge upon Congress that provisions with teeth in them be included in the postwar act. The Selective Service Act not only accelerated voluntary regular enlistments to a point where compulsion was suspended, but caused enlistments in the National Guard to keep abreast of its phased expansion. Denial of intent to delay ORC growth until the NG might reach its targeted strength would be welcome but astounding.

Surpluses in the higher grades (if national security can admit a surplus of trained, competent, experienced, mature officers) have been spotlighted. Forced attrition has been recommended. But the lifeblood in the perpetuation of the ORC—the imput of junior officers—has been garroted. Insufficient funds have been urged of the Congress to enable the targeted production from ROTC. (It is understood that the Office of the Secretary of Defense is now taking this in hand.)

The new Reserve program was designed as a package; many of the implementing regulations have been published; but one of the essentials to its success which is reiterated when requirements are discussed—funds—has been deferred. Only a portion of the funds requisite to accomplishments of the program have been requested of the Congress. Will the Army contribute a substantial amount from its own approved funds to make up the deficiency, as did the Navy in 1948? Time will tell. A program without adequate implementation is destined to fail.

Implementation of the program demands assignment of additional administrative personnel. The allocated overhead is out of proportion to the size of the business. And further development of the program demands assignment of the most experienced and competent officers at planning levels. What of a business which periodically traded its production superintendent with the sales manager, the comptroller with the employment manager; which replaced the vice-president with the shop foreman and augmented its board of directors with the President's favorite bridge partner? Career management may well assist the average officer, but how can we afford to make a training school out of our top-policy planning sections? Just how many Chiefs of Staff need we develop?

Nor does the Navy method seem applicable. As Congressman VINSON recently remarked, the Army has had authority and responsibility for the Reserves for 35 years; how long should one wait for success?

It should be evident that the Reserve components picture is not a simple one; its problems are complex; there is no sure approved solution. This much is clear, however; during the last 2 years an increasing appreciation of the importance of nourishing the essential strength of the Reserves has become evident, not only in the halls of Congress, but in the corridors of the Pentagon.

On the legislative side of the Potomac the Reserve Officers' Association states its object "shall be to support a military policy for the United States that will provide adequate national security and to assist in the development and execution thereof."

The question has been frequently raised as to whether all the activities of the association could stand the test of evaluation under such a definition of its object. Few understanding people will deny the justice and assistance to security arising from increased participation caused by drill pay and retirement benefits. Yet, because so few are broadly informed, it appears important that current emphasis be placed behind "to assist in the development and execution" of security.

What other agency is so well prepared and so free to speak informedly in the interests of national security? The opportunity of educating the public generally is unique; the responsibility for such a contribution should be seized by every member.

The association has not been selfish, component-wise. One of the most recent, and certainly most important, influences it has brought to bear in favor of the Regular Establishment was its support of the Career Compensation Act. A Reserve officer was responsible for its being placed on the Consent Calendar and being brought to a vote in both Houses before the close of the last session.

Receptiveness toward suggestion and recommendation by the association on the part of Pentagon officials, however, has frequently been influenced by traditional prerogatives and self-efficiency. Good citizens as well as good salesmen will subscribe to "washing dirty linen in private," provided, however, that it gets washed.

Habitually the Department of Army extends a welcome mat to those who call to praise. Those who call to recommend a change may expect a courteous assurance that the matter will be considered. A second call will generally bring recital of sustained interest, handicapped by unavoidable delays. Inasmuch as the average time consumed in staff "studies" with respect to Reserves runs from 3 weeks to several months; it's a fairly good gamble that stalling matters that are difficult or require allocations of funds, spaces, or similar support will defer the matter until another group of wishful-thinking officers of the ROA are inducted.

When the association has no requests, it is in excellent standing. When it is persistent, no matter how sincerely convinced of the over-all benefits, it is described in terminology never associated with mixed company.

Granted a legitimate contention, it would appear beyond justifiable criticism to propose in private, to recheck in private, to state an end date—and then, if action is not forthcoming, unhesitatingly place the matter before congressional or public opinion. To follow such procedure in peacetime where there is a divergence of opinion has ample approved precedent; to fail to follow through will all too often perpetuate inertia.

Critics are often advised to put their own house in order. Would it be embarrassing to tabulate what percentage of ROA members have requested assignments, especially to T/O and E and T/D units, what percentage are participating in training, how many have earned unit command? In view of the proclaimed desires for full consideration, dare one ask how many Members have read the National Defense Act, the Compton Report, the Selective Service Act, or are aware of the nature, mission, manner of appointment, or even the existence, of the "Section 5 Committee"? How many who insisted on identification cards have initiated action to receive them?

The Reserves in war were militant fighters; in time of peace when their survival may well rest upon full development of an optimum security they have a citizen's right to militant insistence. And they hold their association officers responsible for differentiation between compromise and appeasement.

One of the most energetic, field-liaison informed, competent staff divisions in the Department of Army, composed of Reserve officers augmented by Reserve-experienced regulars, prepared during 1948–49, hundreds of staff papers and designed a thorough Reserve program.

Many of these recommendations have been challenged as the personal views of the former executive for Reserve and ROTC, and not in accord with certain senior Reserve commanders. That is a true, but inadequate, statement. The personal views of the executive were the consensus of over 19,000 interviewed reservists, 340 unit instructors, 96 ROTC institutions, and several thousand ROTC students.

If the senior commanders are not in accord, it might be well for them to conduct a little lower-echelon liaison themselves. They also dwell on the fact that only because of the efforts of the Executive were their ORC divisions not arbitrarily stripped of their personnel to permit filling up the high-priority support units for the 25-division program, to say nothing of recognizing the desire of large numbers of their junior officers for support in progressing their units as promised them when initially assigned.

How many reservists know of these recommendations, their nature, their practicability, the essence of their concept? Granted a certain portion necessarily safeguarded for actual security reasons, why should not the voluntary participation in our security program, the citizens who must perform the extra-curricular work in peacetime, the proven leaders, scientists, production experts, personnel organizers, financiers, sales promotion men, and educators, be denied knowledge of the actions of their representatives in this democracy?

All those records are on file in Department of Army, including the Executive for Reserve and ROTC Affairs' Final Report to the Secretary of the Army, dated November 15, 1949; protected, of course, as a member of the Civilian Components Policy Board says, "by classification proportionate to their potential embarrassment."

Reservists have demanded responsibility; they now have been afforded a firm program. If we accept the challenge (those permitted) and do more than duty requirements, the demonstration of performance should earn improved status. It is also time to delete the joy riders, the existence of whom must be admitted.

Yes; the Regular Establishment definitely wants a Reserve—but its kind of a Reserve. We'll attain our kind only by sound strategy, competent tactics, alert technique, and unrelenting will to do; our kind, if we deserve it.

Times have changed; modern Minute Men cannot gallop to arms through the rubble after a sneak attack on our cities; they need the armor of being readied prior to attack. Clothed only in the current G-string support, our Army Organized Reserves are an unrealistic security delusion.

I believe in the United States of America; I believe in the democratic way of life; I believe in the two-party system; I believe in unification, not restricted to the military services but embracing all citizens who will be direct participants in the next war; I believe in the competency of the average professional and business man to contribute greatly to military planning; I believe in one armed force and in an end to traditionally assumed prerogatives of intelligence for senior officers; I believe in telling the whole truth; I believe that without greatly augmented and radically accelerated development of our Organized Reserves we stand to lose a war.

If this be treason, make the most of it.

Attitude of Organized Labor Toward Recent and Coming Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Wednesday, June 14, Mr. William Green, the honored and respected president of the American Federation of Labor, addressed a dinner meeting of the Liberal Party of New York and spoke on the attitude of organized labor toward the recent and coming political elections. It was a very fine address, and I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to insert it into the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The political future of labor in America will be determined by the extent of our political activity now. That is why I made certain to come here tonight, even though I had to travel all day from Buffalo to keep this engagement, for you in the Liberal Party are setting the pace for all of labor in America when it comes to political action. You have demonstrated at the polls the political power and influence that can be exerted by labor once our membership is made aware of the importance of registering and voting. You have proved the simple fact that it is possible to get results by getting out the vote.

If we can duplicate your success throughout the Nation next November, I am confident that we can elect a new Congress that will promptly repeal the discredited Taft-Hartley Act and adopt our full program of vital, social-justice legislation.

These objectives are all important if we hope to continue along the road to progress for all American workers. Another Congress like the Eightieth and Eighty-first may set us back for many years to come. Labor can no longer afford to trust to luck on election day. Labor must vote.

As you know, Labor's League for Political Education, which is the political arm of the American Federation of Labor, is conducting a Nation-wide drive to prevail upon our members and their friends to register and to vote in the congressional elections.

Labor's league has set up its organization in almost every congressional district. With the help of local union officials in the 50,000 local unions under the banner of the American Federation of Labor, membership lists will be checked against the registration rolls in every industrial center and union members who have failed to register will keep getting reminders until they fulfill their duty as citizens.

At first glance it may seem surprising that we should have to go to so much trouble and expense merely to prevail upon our members to register and to vote. One would suppose that good union members would keep informed on political developments affecting their welfare and would be only too eager to act on their own volition without the need of persuasion.

Unfortunately there exists a chronic lack of interest among the voters of this country in so-called off-year elections. Without the dramatic excitement and fanfare that go with a presidential election, it is extremely difficult to bring out anywhere near a full vote. Our great handicap is the apathy with which the general run of voters regard congressional contests.

In my opinion, that apathy can be dispelled by an intensive campaign of political education, such as the American Federation of Labor has been conducting by means of radio programs, publications, and State and regional meetings throughout the Nation.

One encouraging sign that the voters can be aroused over congressional issues was manifested during President Truman's recent cross-country speaking trip. Just as he did in his successful 1948 campaign for reelection, the President took advantage of every opportunity to enlarge upon the failure of Congress to carry out his program for social-justice legislation. Each attack of this kind was greeted by an enthusiastic response from the huge crowds that turned out everywhere to hear the President. Unquestionably there is a strong and very bitter undercurrent of resentment among the American people against the reactionary groups in Congress who have blocked action on programs to meet human needs.

If we can keep that resentment alive during the coming campaign, the results on election day may turn out to be as much of a surprise to the political experts as were the 1948 results.

One factor against us is the lack of any clear lines of demarcation between the two major political parties. Both the Democratic and Republican Parties have strong reactionary wings. I defy anyone to discover any visible differences in the political philosophy of a Taft Republican and a Byrd Democrat. They look alike, they talk alike, and they vote alike. In spite of their opposing party labels, they represent the same species of predatory political vulture. Eagerly they do the bidding of big business and fanatically they oppose every measure for the satisfaction of human needs.

In view of the record of this Eighty-first Congress, we know now that our victory in 1948, when we wrested control of Congress away from the Republicans, was not enough. We now face the task of breaking up the coalition of Taft Republicans and Byrd Dixiecrats, which is one of the most sordid and shameful political alliances in our national history. We must break it up. We must expose its members to the public as bankrupt of decent principles and barren of political honor.

For my part, I do not see how the Democratic Party can tolerate the Dixiecrats in its ranks any longer. The Dixiecrats brutally sought to knife the Democratic Party in the back during the 1948 campaign when they deserted President Truman and ran a presidential candidate of their own. Their obvious and vengeful purpose was to split the Democratic vote and assure the election of a Republican President. After that failure, the Democratic Party meekly took the Dixiecrats back into the fold and rewarded their betrayal by bestowing upon them important committee chairmanships in Congress. Since then, the Dixiecrats have shown no signs of reform. They have boldly and aggressively torn the Democratic Party's platform into shreds. They have treacherously joined forces with the Taft Republicans to defeat the major planks of President Truman's legislative program. Their political disloyalty reeks to high heaven.

In view of these incontrovertible facts, the Democratic Party has nothing to gain and everything to lose if it continues to shelter the Dixiecrats. I predict that if they muster enough courage to read the Dixiecrats out of the party, the Democrats will gain tremendously in public prestige and more than make up in the rest of the country the few votes they may lose in the South.

As for the Republican Party, it must make up its mind whether it wants campaign contributions or votes. If the Republican Party continues to follow the political philosophy of Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, it will undoubtedly be richly subsidized by big business, but it will never win a national election. Surely any political party ought to realize after 20 years that it is futile to offer the American people a do-nothing policy. Surely even the Republican Party ought to realize by now that it can never win an election so long as it deliberately alienates the support and the votes of the Nation's workers.

Because of the obvious deficiencies in both major political parties, it is only natural that our thoughts should turn to the possibility of the creation of a labor party in America, a party which would be whole-souled in its devotion to liberalism and progress. This would be an ideal solution, if it were practical. However, there are so many obstacles in our path that I cannot see any hope for success of a labor party on a national basis at the present time. We must first unite the ranks of labor into a single, powerful federation. We must first establish more friendly relations with the farmers of this country and dispel their prejudices against the trade-union movement. In fact, we must undertake a long-range public-relations program to demolish the propaganda lies so widely circulated against labor. We must acquire and develop our own instruments of public information so that we can bring home the truth to the American people as a whole with a voice powerful enough to be heard and respected everywhere.

As yet, we are a long way from the day when the establishment of a labor party in America would have any chance of success. And so, we must bend every effort to perfect the two major existing parties, because they are the machinery we have to work with. We must prove not only that we have the votes, but that we can bring out the votes. I have no doubt that sustained and repeated political successes on our part, will soon convince both major political parties to heed our voice.

To achieve such results, we must work hard. We have the votes and now we have the organization to make certain that they are registered and counted. We also have on our side the common sense of the American people. They have no love and no respect for political leaders like TAFT and BYRD who know the price of everything and the value of nothing. They want a Government with a heart, with a sympathetic interest in the problems that beset our daily life—and if we all do our part in the coming political campaign, we can help to elect such a Government.

The Year of the Smear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach an editorial, The Year of the Smear, from the June issue of Machinists' Monthly Journal. The title itself expresses disgust for the kind of verbal assassination now being practiced both in Washington and elsewhere in the country. The editorial is a clear call for discussion of the issues

instead of namecalling both individuals and legislation.

THE YEAR OF THE SMEAR

Collectivism, police state, soft socialism, regimentation, hand-out state, welfare state, bureaucracy, etc., ad nauseam.

These and other startling expletives are fast becoming a standard part of our smear vocabulary, and our smear vocabulary is fast becoming more confusing. (By smear vocabulary is meant the use of terms intended to be derogatory without any definition to show why the term is derogatory. A handy device for one having a weak argument.)

Although these terms are heard most often in the political arena they are all economic terms and they are only used in the heat of political argument to create fright and hatred.

The same devices are used by those on the other side of the political and economic picture except that the terms are then "fascism," "nazism," "Francoism," "Peronism," etc.

Each extreme—extreme right and extreme left—will smear those of us in between with these terms, and there are many of us who would qualify under this system to the term "Communist-Fascist," to prove a point with the ridiculous.

That either of these extremes can make headway in our America is unthinkable, and to many of us unimaginable, but that is not the point of this editorial. The point we desire to make is that we must guard against being influenced by the use of these terms.

They have no basis in fact and describe nothing that is understandable. Their use is the device of the unscrupulous (whether right or left) and they are used only by those who believe that the people cannot reason and must be influenced by bigger and better lies.

The extreme rightists refrain from using the terms used by the extreme leftists and vice versa. The International Association of Machinists is justly suspicious of this neglect because it condemns and is unalterably opposed to all forms of totalitarianism whether right or left.

Any reform that calls for any form of totalitarianism is taboo on our books and we don't care what it may be called. We feel that it is demanded that such a warning as this be circulated because we feel sure that we can get so excited against one form of totalitarianism that we will fall blindly into some other hidden form and no matter how it is sliced we do not want any part of any such form.

The I. A. of M. has no intelligentsia. Whatever wisdom we possess as an organization is the sum total of the wisdom of our membership and our membership is composed of average people who were not born into special privilege and to whom the problem of living and improving is of the utmost importance.

Our judgment as an organization in meeting the problems of the day is based on our joint wisdom gained by study and experience. We can look to our own record to find out the quality of our own judgment.

We have learned from experience that there are many things that we can accomplish together that would be utterly impossible as the result of individual effort. We have learned this in our efforts to improve our lot in the shop and from the results we can study of both types of endeavor.

We have learned that a community functions better with a local established government and that groups of these local governments can accomplish more in a State form.

Also we have learned that a Federal Government composed of the various States can accomplish many things that could never be accomplished by the individual States.

To specify a few of the activities where this is true we mention the police, fire, water, sanitary, and other departments of a local government which do not lend themselves to individual effort nor to exploitation for private profit.

This is true in the State in connection with highway development and maintenance and the control of traffic regulations in the public interest, among other things.

The Federal Government is set up to do things for the people that cannot be done, or cannot be done as well, by the States working individually.

Examples are the post-office system, a national system of highways, national flood control, conservation of forests, and the control of erosion and the development and preservation of navigable streams.

Thus it is that we have used the intelligence with which we have been blessed by a divine providence and have set up for ourselves the necessary formal governments and, through them, we do things for ourselves that would otherwise be undone and often be impossible.

This has been the case since we had governments on this continent and is the rule rather than the exception in the United States. Many things are being done today along the lines of general welfare because we, as a people have just arrived at the point where we feel their necessity and recognize the fact that only a Federal Government can handle the matter.

However, even though it is as simple as that, we have those charming expletives (mentioned earlier in the editorial) pointed at such activities as control programs that aim to cover an entire river valley in the prevention of floods, erosion and deforestation from natural causes.

We have the same names applied to social security, railroad retirement, unemployment compensation, a national health program, a fair labor standards act and other much-needed social reforms for the little people.

These reforms have long been needed and have been advocated for a long time by forward-looking citizens and groups, but the opposition from large industrial and financial groups has been successful in applying pressure where it was most effective in preventing their enactment.

Now that public feeling has been aroused, and these reforms are becoming more widely desired, we find the forces in our society, who have most to be thankful for as the beneficiaries of a helpful Government, in violent opposition to making the welfare more general.

Trace the source of the expletives mentioned before and you will find money that is part of the profits of an enterprise that is, or was, made possible by gifts from the Federal Government, either outright cash or in the form of a special subsidy.

The same terms of opprobrium could be applied to such help from the Government to such favored enterprises as there is not the slightest difference in the thinking behind the terms.

If it is socialistic for instance to set up a Federal insurance, to which affected employers and employees pay taxes to cover the bill, it is socialistic for the Government to pay excessive prices for mail contracts on the airlines and to extend below-cost mailing privileges to the commercial magazines and press of the Nation.

Millions of dollars of our tax money go for this and other purposes and, in our opinion, there is nothing wrong with the practice of Government giving aid to necessary enterprise. We think that this is a normal and practical function of a Federal Government in the public interest.

It is very easy to fall in love with terms such as "free enterprise" and "free economy." This is much easier than falling in love with the term "profits." It is difficult to associate the word "free" with the word "profit" yet from listening to many of the vocalists who use the expletives (mentioned before) one can only gather that "free enterprise" and "free economy" are synonymous with "profits."

The proof of this lies in the fact that there is no criticism of any act by the general public in the way of public ownership and control of anything unless there is something in it that can be done by private citizens for private profit.

In other words profit is a holy thing which must not be interfered with by the people even though they could do the same things for themselves and serve themselves better.

And whenever someone cannot see through this reasoning and insists on thinking that the people can and should own and control many of these necessary activities there you have, according to them, a Commy or a fool who is the tool of the Commies.

What we object to vigorously is the distinction that these privileged groups would set up in which anything that assists big business is proper but anything that attempts to alleviate the load of the little people is socialism or some other smear term.

NLRB Deserves Bow for Fine Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, on June 16, 1950, I read a very interesting editorial which appeared in the Seafarers' Log praising the fine work of the NLRB.

This refreshing editorial points up the magnificent job performed by the National Labor Relations Board in the controversy between the Cities Service Oil Co. and the Seafarers' Union.

I commend it to the reading of my colleagues:

NLRB DESERVES BOW FOR FINE JOB

We of the SIU believe we have been among the most vociferous critics of bureaucratic agencies in our Government. We have blasted numerous agencies over the past years whenever maladministration, inefficiency, or injustice has marked the conduct of their affairs.

On the other hand, we have been quick to acknowledge the efforts of any branch of the Government that has performed ably. True, these plaudits have been few and far between, because the occasions when they were justified have been rare.

This week the personnel of the Second Regional Office of the National Labor Relations Board has provided us with one of those rare occasions. Naturally, seafarers are overjoyed at the victory scored at the NLRB hearing in the case of the Cities Service Oil Co.

We're not losing sight of the fact, however, that this victory was made possible by the sweat and toil and intelligent application of the law by the Board's highly competent staff.

Under the direction of its Chief Law Officer, Miss Helen Humphries—who, incidentally is widely respected as one of the most able labor lawyers in the field—the NLRB staff literally labored day and night for months amassing the voluminous data springing from the charges leveled against the company.

As the Government built its case, Field Examiners Aaron Wiseman, Clem Culls, and Arthur Younger pieced together the threads of evidence of the law's violation.

And before that, staff members like Field Examiner Sam Hacker practically worked around the clock, hopping from port to port under adverse conditions, including the company's refusal to offer the minimum cooperation coming to a representative of the Government in carrying out the provisions of our Nation's laws.

In the preparation and in the presentation of the Government's case Joseph Jenkins and Chester Migden had wrapped up the details in an airtight package.

The results of the Board's handling of the Cities Service case, which, it must be remembered, was among the most unusual ones on record, speak for themselves. The company's capitulation on the fourth day of hearings, which were expected to run for weeks and weeks before all the testimony and evidence could be introduced, is a tribute to the effectiveness and thoroughness with which the Board people tackled the case.

It might be said that their efficiency thus saved the United States taxpayers considerable money. In our opinion, the work of Miss Humphries and her staff on this difficult case was a masterpiece of expert legal workmanship.

We sincerely wish that our Government was endowed with more people to efficiently carry out its functions like those of the NLRB's second regional office.

The Hysterical Fringe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, there has been an unfortunate attempt to interfere with the House Lobby Investigating Committee's study of who pays the bills for the ultrareactionary organizations of Edward Rumely, Merwin K. Hart, and Joseph Kamp. With permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach an editorial from the June 17 issue of the Milwaukee Journal, a distinguished independent newspaper, which clearly sets forth the right of both Congress and the American people to know who finances what the editorial calls the hysterical fringe:

THE HYSTERICAL FRINGE

Three men who have had a long history of "saving America from socialism" and of activity in the country's extreme rightist groups are tangling with the House Committee on Lobbying Activities.

The committee wants to know who is paying the bills for the organizations the men represent. The trio claims that their funds are their own business.

The men are Edward A. Rumely, of the Committee for Constitutional Government; Merwin K. Hart, of the National Economic Council; and Joseph Kamp, of the Constitutional Educational League.

The Committee for Constitutional Government has been barraging Congressmen with bitterly anti-New Deal propaganda. It reported having spent $620,632 in 1949, the second largest amount spent by groups reporting under the Lobby Act. It did not, however, list its contributors and makes a point of asking contributors to limit gifts to $495 to stay under the $500 limit above which the law requires reports. Rumely has sought an injunction to keep the committee from digging into his records to find out who his supporters are.

A look at the background of any of these men gives proof that it is in the public interest to know who their supporters are—just as it is to know who supports Communists and similar groups.

Rumely has a long record with hysterical extreme rightist groups. He was convicted after World War I under the "trading with the enemy" law for having concealed the fact that money he used to buy a paper had been furnished by the German Government. He served a month of a year and a day sentence and was later pardoned by President Coolidge. He has tangled twice before with Congress over revealing his supporters. Before the recent war he was connected with several rabid isolationist groups.

Hart needs no introduction as a rabid isolationist and a dabbler in the lunatic-fringe group. He has been an advocate of racism and has been called one of the native Fascists. Kamp has a somewhat similar record, most recently as an indiscriminate accuser of anyone not a strong conservative as a Communist.

These men represent interests that could be as dangerous to American freedom as communism. That is not as true now as it was before World War II, for dictatorship from the left has replaced that from the right as the major foe. But their basic philosophies and past activities have been out of step with Americanism.

The Nation has a right to know where these men get their support and who their contributors are. We have a right to know it as surely as we have a right to know who pays his allegiance to Stalin. Congress should push its right to get that information. As Chairman BUCHANAN of the House committee said of their refusal to report their contributors, "the dignity of the Congress * * * is at stake."

So are the interests of the American people.

Public Service and Award of Honorary Degree of Doctor of Humanities to Representative Charles E. Bennett, of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, last week a well-deserved honor came to our friend and colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT]. The University of Tampa awarded to Representative CHARLES BENNETT the honorary degree of doctor of humanities. It is a well-deserved recognition of the fine public service of our colleague. While he is serving his first term in the House, his zeal and thoroughness to work out the complex problems of the hour, his attentivenesss to duty, his sincerity of purpose, his loyalty to American traditions, his fine personality, and his hard work have in this short time caused those with whom he has been associated to recognize his real sterling worth and ability, to admire his fine qualities, to be proud of his public service, and to welcome his friendship. We in Florida are quite pleased at this recognition and wanted to share the good news with our colleagues in the House. Hence, my purpose in placing this statement in the RECORD that CHARLES E. BENNETT's other colleagues may know of this recognition. The statement and citation accompanying the award is as follows:

[From the Minaret of June 2, 1950]

HONORARY DEGREE DOCTOR OF HUMANITIES

CHARLES E. BENNETT, though yet a young man, your record of achievement is an inspiring example of the rewards of faith, courage, and diligent industry. As a student of law, your accomplishments were noteworthy; as a patriotic citizen, you demonstrated your love of your country by volunteering as a private in the United States Army and by devotion to duty therein advancing to the rank of captain; and furthermore, after engaging the enemy in combat for a length of time sufficiently long enough to merit a respite and return to your country, you remained to lead the native Philippines in warfare against the enemy. For this heroic service our grateful country decorated you with one of its most significant medals reserved for heroes—the Silver Star.

It is difficult for most of us to understand the strange and somewhat stern workings of fate. We know it was not easy for you to understand why after surviving the many hazardous experiences of warfare in the South Pacific, you should be stricken with the dreadful polio which has killed or crippled so many thousands in recent years. But by your intrepid faith and courage, you won this battle also.

After a long period of hospitalization you returned to your beloved Florida to engage in another and different kind of contest. In war you fought for the preservation of democracy. In peace you campaigned for more efficiency and honesty in Government. The people of the Second Congressional District demonstrated their faith in your integrity and ability by electing you to the State legislature in 1941. You rewarded their faith in you and they elected you to the Congress of the United States. You discharged your duties so faithfully and intelligently in this much more responsible position that your constituency have only recently reelected you to the national House of Representatives.

CHARLES, we do not honor you, you have honored us by your presence here tonight, and you have inspired the members of the graduating class of 1950 by your timely message.

I, therefore, by virtue of the authority invested in me by the University of Tampa, and with the approval of the State board of education, bestow upon you the honorary degree, doctor of humanities with all the rights and privilege appertaining thereto.

In Gratitude to Watson Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 8, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to extend by hand in highest praise and grateful thanks to the Honorable Watson B. Miller, who, until June 9 has been our Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization.

I deeply regret his departure. The exigencies and difficulties of the position of Commissioner of this Service are profound and requiring, and the loss of Mr. Miller's excellent capacities will indeed be felt as a loss to the public service,

Mr. Miller was blessed with sympathy, understanding, and level-headedness. Like the prophet Micah, he believes that we must "do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly."

We wish him well whatever his situation may be.

Foreigners Take Our Dollars by the Billions; Now the Ranks of the United States Army Are Thrown Open to Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, twice today has the House of Representatives voted to subordinate the welfare of the people of America to foreigners all over the world.

It is a procedure that is becoming all too common.

First of all, the House voted to spend nearly $129,000,000 on international organizations of various shades and colors. That represents an increase in spending for this purpose of nearly $1,000,000 despite repeated statements both in and out of Congress that many foreign countries have made substantial progress toward economic recovery.

Despite this recovery, despite the steadily increasing burdens of American taxpayers, they are made responsible for providing almost $129,000,000 or bearing the burden of nearly 50 percent of the cost of supporting these international organizations.

To questions of what, specifically, have these international organizations accomplished for the spending of millions of dollars in the past, the answer is silence and plenty of it. No one can challenge the fact that millions of dollars of this authorization will go down the drain, as millions have in the past, for payment of salaries to political favorites and to subsidize the travel expenses of a horde of "do-gooders."

When will it become apparent to some people in Washington that the people of this country are carrying on their backs a public indebtedness of more than $280,000,000,000?

Then the House of Representatives proceeded this afternoon to open wide the ranks of the United States Army to some 2,500 foreigners. Great secrecy seems to prevail as to why it suddenly becomes necessary to shatter the immigration quotas and start hiring mercenaries for the Armed Forces of America.

It is admitted these first 2,500 are to be trained as specialists. That undoubtedly means a majority of these foreigners will, in the shortest space of time, be made noncommissioned officers. What a great boost it should be to the morale of Americans in the armed services to see these alien foreigners enjoying the financial benefits and privileges of noncommissioned officers.

Let it be remembered that only a few weeks ago Secretary of Labor Tobin warned of a bleak employment outlook for more than a million and a half college and high-school graduates, turned out of American educational institutions in the past few days. With approximately 4,000,000 unemployed prior to this exodus from the educational institutions, does it make sense to load the Army enlistment quotas with foreigners? It is just possible that many thousands of American boys will be compelled to enlist in the Armed Forces as a means of providing a livelihood for themselves.

It's about time we started thinking and acting in terms of America and Americans.

The Forgotten Heroines of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Capitol Gist entitled "The Forgotten Heroines of World War I," including excerpts from an editorial in the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes:

An interesting and revealing story of the forgotten heroines of World War I is given Gist readers by the following parts of an editorial in the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes, entitled "Never Too Late," and excerpts from a letter received by Fred Burdick, Gist editor, from his sister, Mrs. Stace Griggs of Houston, Tex., who left her studies at Rice Institute to answer the call of Gen. John J. Pershing for preferably college girls who could speak French fluently to serve as telephone operators in France with the United States Army Signal Corps, and who received two commendations for bravery for sticking to her post when a Big Bertha shell nearly struck her office in Paris and when Pershing's First Army Headquarters at Quevilly, France, burned.

"We volunteered with the understanding we were to be part of the Army and were treated that way, subject to military orders and discipline; and yet, when * * * men received their Victory medals and bonuses we were denied them. We were subject to dishonorable discharge but not honorable discharge.

"Many of our members of the Women's Overseas Service League could take advantage of veteran's hospitalization if they had military recognition. * * * One of our members committed suicide because she was ill and could not afford a doctor and hospitalization."

NEVER TOO LATE

Salient excerpts from editorial in the National Tribune-The Stars and Stripes of April 13:

"Uniforms were issued (to the young women of the Signal Corps) and special military training was undergone. They wore regulation Army insignia with Signal Corps designation, subject to all regulations applicable to enlisted men. Pay was from $50 a month, from which the particular Signal Corps personnel had to buy their own uniforms.

"The Articles of War applied in every instance. Truly they were in every respect a part of our armed forces in World War I, covered in by instructions from general headquarters to all officers and enlisted men and to the young women of the Signal Corps—services clearly without precedent at that time. Their services completed, they were sent home—period—without that piece of parchment entitled, 'Honorable Discharge,' a fact that General Pershing deplored long before his death.

"They had no opportunity to insure themselves. No bonus as was given other enlistees, no pension provisions against disability or old age. Unlike the yeoman (F) and the Nurse Corps of the Navy, they had no severance papers when they took off their uniforms. That was over 30 years ago.

"There cannot be more than 200 survivors. World War II brought the Wacs, Waves, and women Marines and Spars—all enlisted as were the pioneers who went abroad to help win World War I. The distinctions between these enlistees, under strict military supervision and discipline, and welfare units supported from private funds are clearly drawn.

"No status as veterans is requested (in H. R. 3716 by Representative MITCHELL, of Washington, and S. 871 by Senator TAFT, hearings on which will be held soon) although in all honesty this newspaper (National Tribune) believes those privileges should follow. The women of the armed services in all wars should receive like treatment. We believe a termination of the issue in favor of this vanishing group of loyal women will meet with universal approval. It is late, but it is never too late to make amends."

Middlesex County, N. J., Catholic War Veterans Oppose Closing of Birmingham Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a resolution of the Middlesex County, N. J., Chapter of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States adopted on May 10, 1950, at New Brunswick, N. J., expressing opposition to the order closing Birmingham Hospital in Los Angeles, Calif., and the transfer of patients from there to Long Beach Naval Hospital and urging that every effort be made to the end that the said order be countermanded. The resolution in full follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE MIDDLESEX COUNTY CHAPTER OF THE CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas an order has been issued for the closing of the Birmingham Hospital in Los Angeles, Calif., and the transfer of patients to the Long Beach Naval Hospital; and

Whereas 40 paraplegics and 5 quadraplegics—disabled in both arms and legs—from Birmingham are students of the University of California at Los Angeles and 12 of them, either own their homes near Birmingham or are building, while 11 live with their families on the campus or at the hospital; and

Whereas all of those living away from the hospital have to return there frequently for treatments; and

Whereas the closing of the Birmingham Hospital and the transfer of the patients to

the Long Beach Naval Hospital will require them to travel 30 or more miles through heavy auto and truck traffic; and

Whereas the transfer will cause such paraplegics and quadraplegics, and other patients who are students of the University of California at Los Angeles, undue hardship and inconvenience in obtaining an education and receiving necessary medical treatment, and cause irreparable injury by the loss of an education to those who will be unable to continue their studies by reason of this transfer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Middlesex County Chapter of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States assembled in session on this 10th day of May 1950, in the city of New Brunswick, County of Middlesex and State of New Jersey, That we oppose the order closing Birmingham Hospital and the transfer of patients to Long Beach Naval Hospital, and every effort be made to the end that this order be countermanded; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Hon. Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; Hon. H. Alexander Smith, United States Senator from New Jersey; Hon. Robert C. Hendrickson, United States Senator from New Jersey; Hon. Charles A. Eaton, Congressman from the Fifth District of New Jersey; Hon. James C. Auchincloss, Congressman from the Third District of New Jersey; Nicholas J. Wagener, commander of the national department, Catholic War Veterans of United States; Michael A. Genovese, commander of the New Jersey State Department of Catholic War Veterans of United States.

MAY 11, 1950.

JULIUS W. BONK,
Commander, Middlesex County Chapter Catholic War Veterans.

Attest:

JOHN PAPP, Jr.,
Judge Advocate, Middlesex County Chapter, Catholic War Veterans.

New University Honors President, United States Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the Habana Post, Habana, Cuba, on June 18, 1950:

NEW UNIVERSITY HONORS PRESIDENT, UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR

Degrees of doctor of honoris causa were conferred by the Catholic University of St. Thomas of Villanova on President Prio, United States Ambassador Robert Butler, and Father Lorenzo Spiralli, OSA.

President Prio made the closing speech, in which he said the award of the first honorary degree of the new university was tantamount to linking his name with what would surely be the enduring glory of that institution, and was therefore a very great honor.

"As if this were not enough," he continued, "the honor conferred upon me today is increased because it is linked with that which is also conferred on Ambassador Butler, an American diplomat whose principles, capacity for action, and exemplary conduct constitute the best propaganda which a powerful nation can make against those who attack it as imperialistic. Men like Ambassador Butler are demonstrating in the countries where they serve their nation their desire to contribute toward its greatness both at home and abroad.

"In the face of conduct like that of the Ambassador of the United States in Cuba, the interested propaganda of those who paint our neighbors as always looking for conquests is helpless, because we see them acting in a weak country with the high aim of considering it a brother nation in ideals and noble aspirations for human betterment."

Developing Air Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include a very pertinent and informative article entitled "Can You Walk Away From a Plane Crash?" by Mr. William S. Friedman, which appeared in the April 30, 1950, edition of the magazine, Parade.

The subject of air safety in this modern age is an increasingly important one. Both the air industry and Government should be encouraged toward intensive research to find ways and means to eliminate, as much as humanly possible, the death gamble in air travel.

The article follows:

CAN YOU WALK AWAY FROM A PLANE CRASH?
(By William S. Friedman)

What are your chances of living through the crash of a giant, modern airliner?

"Not very bright," say the experts, candidly.

In the grim crash of a British Avro Tudor transport in Wales last month, 80 persons lost their lives. Only three survived.

To students of air safety, the Wales tragedy was notable because it set a new casualty record. That so few of the plane's occupants survived was no surprise at all.

As a matter of cold fact, the grisly statistic was right in line with general crash experience.

These experts know that while United States scheduled airlines, for example, boast a casualty rate as low as one fatality per hundred million passenger miles, your chances for survival if and when a crack-up does occur are only 1 in 35 to 40.

Short odds? Indeed. But they are odds widely—if quietly—accepted as characteristic of the aviation industry.

For a long time major emphasis of air safety campaigns has been aimed at preventing accidents.

If you don't crash, you don't get hurt. So let's stop crashes. Logical? Sure. But does it go far enough?

Definitely not, say some of the experts. There's a growing feeling that the prevention approach to air safety is inadequate.

Airplanes are growing bigger. Their increasing complexity is an invitation to human error and dangerous mechanical failure.

WHEN CRASH PREVENTION FAILS, STURDIER DESIGN CAN SAVE LIVES

What is needed, these same experts argue, is some revaluation of plane design concepts which will shorten the odds for the undertaker when error or failure catches up with a plane load of passengers.

Experience has demolished the legend that the sudden stop which accompanies a crash is, of itself, fatal (Parade, July 10, 1949).

Casualties in plane crashes stem from two principal sources: fire and localized impact.

Impact-actuated, fire-control systems have been found to be effective. In fact, the three survivors of the Wales crash owe their lives to such a system. The entire crash area was sprayed with gasoline, but the system, actuated by the impact, turned off all the switches and turned on the fire extinguishers.

Protection from localized impact is a tougher matter. How can you keep the body from hitting or being hit by a death-dealing surface?

The answer boils down to (1) stronger fuselages, (2) seats that do not break or tear loose, and (3) seat belts and fastenings that can withstand impact.

Four-fifths of all air-crash deaths, according to an Australian Government study, are due to head injuries. In theory, a shoulder harness would offer excellent protection. In practice, it is clumsy.

What about seating passengers backwards? Then back and head are amply supported. The United States Air Force and the RAF tried it during the war.

Unfortunately, crash consciousness seldom exists at the airplane design stage. Let's face the fact: competition for performance and pay load overshadows planning for crash protection.

There are those who argue that planes, to be reasonably crash safe, would be too heavy to fly economically.

There are planes which incorporate most of the safety requirements for a crash impact of 30 times the force of gravity. One is the Burnelli lifting fuselage.

The section containing crew, cargo and passengers is like a thick wing. Passengers are surrounded by the strongest parts of the plane.

The Burnelli design proved its crashworthiness the hard way. An aileron, improperly fitted, tore out as a test model was negotiating a high-speed turn and the ship cartwheeled into the earth at 200 miles per hour.

The wings and tail were shredded, the engines thrown 800 feet and three-quarters of a mile respectively. Still, the crew were uninjured, and the passenger compartment was virtually undamaged.

A successor to this type, produced in Canada as a load-carrying "bush" plane, has outperformed conventional designs in its weight and power class.

The Burnelli may not be the only solution to bettering the odds for crash survival. But, in the words of one expert, "It shows what can be done."

Remarks of Gen. Omar N. Bradley at Commissioning Exercises at the A. and M. College of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed an honor for Texas A. and M. College to have in attendance such a distinguished officer as General Bradley at its commissioning exercises of Reserve officers on June 2.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the remarks

of General Bradley at this occasion as I know you will be inspired by what he had to say:

Dr. Bolton, Colonel Boatner, distinguished guests and friends at Texas A. and M. there are two important ceremonies today.

One of them is graduation, and the awarding of degrees for accomplishment in the academic field. The other is this ceremony: The awarding of commissions to new second lieutenants in the Army and the Air Force of the United States.

It is a great privilege to be able to participate in both of these ceremonies with the Aggies for whom I have had a life-time of admiration and respect.

Any American citizen would be proud to stand here with the president of your college, the commanding general of the Fourth Army, General Irvine of the Twelfth Air Force, and the other distinguished guests. However, I must admit that my greatest pleasure is derived from participating in this important exercise with 306 second lieutenants—citizen-soldiers pledged to the defense of the American people.

Having already served with some of you young men in the Armed Forces, I have a great respect for your past accomplishments.

Having worked for a second lieutenant's commission at another well-known military school—West Point—I have a pretty good idea of the great effort you have already put into this achievement.

Having served 35 years as a commissioned officer in the Armed Forces, I have a pretty good idea of the problems and the privileges that lie ahead of you in the service of your country.

In your future lives as leaders in civilian life and as leaders in your simultaneous military careers, you will be called upon to utilize your best talent and exert your greatest energy. The road ahead for the United States does not look like an easy one. Fortunately the young men being commissioned here today have had the rare privilege of attending a first-rate military college, and at the same time attaining a first-rate education in the sciences and arts.

Everyone in the United States recognizes the unique quality of the combined military and civilian education offered at Texas A. and M. It has a school of military science, with a dean, who represents the school on the top-faculty level. The military program is so integrated with the rest of the college, that it supplements the instruction of other schools in the college in preparing young men for civilian and military leadership. The training that you men have received, as part of your military education, builds the same leadership that will characterize the outstanding man in either civilian or military affairs.

(a) Further advantages of training in a military college.

(b) Chance to place more responsibility.

We have only to review the history of the past 10 years, and the headlines of the morning paper, to realize that our Nation will require the best combined civilian-military leadership in order to guide the world to the peace and security that the world must have.

In my opinion, the great advantage of a military education stems from the character-building qualities of such training. Any leader in the Armed Forces of a democracy must have an unimpeachable reputation for integrity, and a full knowledge of human relations. For this task as a military leader is to inspire the discipline that brings success on the battlefield, without jeopardizing the dignity of the individual.

The essence of military education is the constant solution of problems. The end result of the military educational process is a well-rounded man who knows how to analyze a problem—make an estimate—evolve a plan of action—and intelligently exercise the command, and the leadership, to solve the problem satisfactorily with the men and materials at hand.

The young Confederate general, and the first president of Texas A. and M.—Lawrence Sullivan Ross—whom you honor on your programs today, exemplified these qualities of combined military-civilian leadership so necessary in our form of democratic living.

With such examples, you men can aspire to real accomplishment.

Your families, your friends, and the capable instructors you have here at Texas A. and M. can well be proud of you today. I am sure that the Aggies who have served their country before you, in war and in peace, are with you in spirit and will watch your progress with great pride.

May I commend you for the work already done, and congratulate you upon your achievement, and wish for you continued success in your future civilian and military careers.

A Scrap of Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have carefully followed the legal and legislative action on the tidelands question were disappointed and shocked to learn of the 4 to 3 Supreme Court decision which denied Texas of the ownership of the tidelands which it has owned and controlled for these many years since coming into the Union. We have legislation pending which would clarify this situation and restore the control of the tidelands to its rightful owners, in this case the people of Texas, and it is my sincere hope that either the Supreme Court will reconsider its recent decision or that corrective legislation will be enacted into law which would prevent the United States Government from taking over State property without just compensation.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial entitled "A Scrap of Paper," which appeared in the Italy News-Herald, Italy, Tex.; I also wish to include a statement entitled "A Memorial to Honor," which was presented by Mr. Walter E. Long at the fourty-fourth annual convention of the Texas Chamber of Commerce Managers Association. They follow:

[From the Italy (Tex.) News-Herald]

A SCRAP OF PAPER

A few years back when Hitler was overrunning Europe the charge that he considered treaties merely a scrap of paper was frequently heard. The violation of treaties on his part was considered a crime of no little consequence. The United States Government has now shown it too considers a treaty nothing more than a scrap of paper and worthy of recognition only insofar as it benefits the United States. What we refer to, of course, is the treaty of annexation whereby the Republic of Texas became one of the States.

Among provisions of this treaty was one allowing—no; requiring—the State of Texas to retain those public lands which belonged to it as the Republic of Texas, the revenue from such lands to be used for the retirement of debts owed by the Republic of Texas. Had the Republic of Texas refused to have accepted these terms the United States Senate would have refused to confirm the treaty.

For 100 years this treaty was observed. Texas paid off her indebtedness; she built fine schools and colleges and a magnificent capitol building with returns from this public land she was forced to retain. No one wanted any part of what was considered valueless wasteland. Then oil was discovered on this land and covetous eyes began casting about for a means of bringing this land under the domination of the Central Government in Washington. When oil was discovered beneath the territorial waters of the State of Texas the greedy politicians moved in. Here was land that was unoccupied. Here was property that could never be owned privately. Here was land with a potential high value that might be claimed and the claim was made.

The subservient Supreme Court of the United States has upheld that claim, ignoring all arguments to the contrary; ignoring land grants dating back hundreds of years; ignoring the treaty by which Texas became a part of the Union; ignoring everything except the fact that an administration that wants these lands had named the members of the Court to the bench.

Texas' able attorney general, Price Daniel, has conducted an admirable defense of the Texas position, but it's hard to win a ball game when the umpires are appointed by the team that is determined to win at all costs. He is going to continue to fight for that which is ours, but it appears hopeless to fight through the courts any longer. The fight must now be carried to Congress where a reaffirmation of the treaty of annexation should be sought.

The question that keeps arising before us in this entire matter now is the status of Texas as a State. If one part of the treaty is invalid isn't it all? And if all the treaty is invalid it stands to reason then that Texas is an independent republic. Somehow or other that idea doesn't sound nearly as bad as one might expect, either.

A MEMORIAL TO HONOR

(By Walter E. Long)

"Ill fares the land to wandering ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay."

One hundred and seventy-four years ago a new Nation was born. To its life men pledged their "sacred honor."

They declared "certain inalienable rights", and wrote them into a Constitution of the United States. This document was the first in history to give full stability to contractual responsibility, thereby making possible America's great industrial growth by credit expansion.

One hundred and fourteen years ago another new nation was born through sweat and blood. It too adopted a constitution which men again pledged their honor to defend.

For 9 years this nation of Texas fought off from her borders those who would invade her homes, while over her tidelands her navy battled those who would take over her sea coast.

In 1845 the Republic of Texas accepted the invitation of the Congress of the Republic of the United States to become a State in that Union. These acts were performed with honorable motives by honorable men.

In surrendering her sovereignty as a republic, the free and independent nation of Texas made certain terms regarding her pub-

lic domain, which were accepted by the Congress of the United States. These terms and agreements became a part of the sacred contract between honorable representatives of two honorable Governments. Has that contract become a scrap of paper?

We can understand why nations of different peoples disagree with one another and go to war over less provocation, but in a civilized and Christian nation of kindred bloods it is difficult to reconcile or condone dishonor among brothers.

If this sacred agreement stood among honorable Americans for 100 years, why is it now circumvented?

Is it not strange that in a disturbed world we ourselves cannot keep contracts with one another? How can we face skeptical nations with stained hands and expect them to keep their agreements with us?

Has the lure of wealth, opulence, power so saturated our beings that even as nations we seduce all that is honorable? Has "wealth so accumulated that men decay"?

How much further can we go until confidence is destroyed in the oath men take on the Bible as with upraised hand they swear to defend all that is sacred in our dealings with one another—in the Constitution of our Nation?

Gentlemen, if that time has come, then we bring these words as flowers to the dead dreams of a once great people and lay their fading sprays over the remnants of a broken pledge and a shredded contract between a Nation that once had honor and the Republic of Texas. If these conditions exist, then we, as ordinary citizens, offer these thoughts as our memorial to the honor that once was.

Destruction on Our Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THURMAN C. CROOK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, today we think of the horrors of war. We know the great human sacrifices, bloodshed, injuries, and loss of natural, financial, and human resources it has always caused, and it is our continuous desire to build for a just and lasting peace for the world.

Yet, as we so build, it is appalling to think that we, here at home in our great Republic, tolerate a continuous and ever-growing disastrous war on our public highways. During the year 1948 there were 32,300 deaths caused by automobile accidents and 1,150,000 injuries that did not prove fatal. What does this mean over a period of 10 years? Multiply these numbers by 10 and stretch your imagination in considering the financial cost in hospitalization, medical care, incapacitation, property loss, and human misery resulting from this war, and you will have just a slight idea as to what it means.

Daily I am growing more cognizant of the necessity for a uniform national control of automobiles within the various States. Some method of regulation must be designed for protection of life and definite responsibility for property damage in case of automobiles accidents. No law will ever completely solve our trouble but, by eliminating the numerous existing differences in State laws, with the burden of administration vested in the respective State organizations, we certainly can afford a very substantial protection of life and property.

Engineers have excelled in building safety features in our automobiles; engineers have done marvelous work in the construction of our fine highways, installing about every safety feature known to man; mechanics are skilled in keeping our cars in the best of condition; but no mechanic has yet learned to safely adjust the nut that too frequently sits behind the steering wheel. Records reveal most accidents are caused by habitually careless drivers, and the automobile, having become an acute interstate problem should be controlled by uniform, national regulations, and the various States held responsible for the administration of the laws pertinent thereto.

One suggested Automobile Responsibility Act has been brought to my attention by Mr. R. T. Acre, president, the Men's Club, Madison Avenue Christian Church, of Covington, Ky., I quote:

Permanent, metallic, serially numbered carrying case for driver's license, billfold size; spaces provided for punching this case for every traffic violation.

Two citations, suspension of license for 3 months.

Three citations, suspension of license for 1 year.

Four citations, suspension of license for 2 years.

Five citations, suspension of license for 5 years.

Six citations, suspension of license permanent.

Overtime parking exempt from above regulations.

Suspension of license for driving while intoxicated, term to be based on the accumulated number of violations; prison term for driving while license is invalid.

Uniform license period March 1 to March 1, inclusive; confiscation of license plates of vehicle responsible for an accident, replacement made with standard Government plates, a different color used for every accumulated accident; all States to use a standard color scheme (except name of State); these plates nontransferable and used 6 months into the new license period; a duplicate license to be issued at the time plates are exchanged; punishment by a prison term for both the car owner and the purchaser for traffic in vehicles and final sale without the original license certificate; special records preserved at county registration office.

Evidence of insurance covering property damage and personal liability before license plates are issued, such issuance to be for a specified minimum amount and to cover the license period. Permanent record at registration office stating the policy number; name of company issuing contract; policy noncancelable, must be transferred with the ownership of vehicle.

Mr. Speaker, such proposed legislation is food for serious thought. May we in sincere cooperation in this matter design a workable plan that will check the disastrous war on our highways.

Drive carefully. The life you save may be your own.

Socialism Bankrupts Britain—Address by Mr. Harry Barr, a Former Citizen of the United Kingdom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the blighting effects of socialism in Britain was not realized by the great majority of the English people. Little attention was paid to the Fabian Society, which set the tempo for the present economic debacle in that fine country. But slowly and steadily that great industrial empire of the nineteenth century was undermined by politicians who sought political and economic power. The story of the use and fall of England is an open book today and can well serve as exhibit A to the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harry Barr is a valued friend and constituent and a vice president of the J. I. Case Co. at Racine, Wis. On May 18, 1950, he delivered an important address at Monmouth, Ill., on the subject of know what you are buying. Mr. Barr was born and educated in England, but he is now a loyal citizen of this country. His remarks on the present situation in Britain are most timely. I shall include it as part of my remarks:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it seems quite appropriate to me that the subject of my remarks tonight should be Know What You Are Buying. That is a fundamental duty of purchasing agents—and that is my profession.

I hope that, when my remarks are concluded, those of you who do not already consider yourselves purchasing agents will have decided that you are in the same business as I am—even though what you are buying is less specific than steel or coal or lumber.

All of us are buyers.

One of the things we are buying, and about which I am going to speak, is government.

In order to bring out clearly the worth of what we are buying, and the dangers of getting an inferior substitute at greater cost, I would like to give you some idea about what another group of purchasers has been getting for its money in another country—one to which we have felt strongly tied for many obvious reasons. I am speaking about Britain, where I was born and educated, and from which I migrated as a young man, and whose vicissitudes I have carefully followed. I am speaking from first-hand observations made there last summer.

It will be necessary to go back a little into history and sketch for you some of the events which have led to the present situation over there. Perhaps by this brief history I will be able to help you to more clearly evaluate a comparison between the situation in Britain and here, and from this comparison draw conclusions as to a bill of goods which a certain group is trying to sell you.

Britain's rise to a world power was based on the discovery of the steam engine and the use of steam power, and the fact that she had plenty of coal. During the nineteenth century she had more efficient production, led the world in manufacturing, and made and sold goods all over the world. Trade in

Britain was free; there were no tariffs on foreign goods; and, lacking raw materials, she brought them in from all over the world, manufactured them, and resold them in the world's markets. Her ships sailed the seven seas made safe by a huge navy that put down piracy, charted the oceans and seas, and made them safe for navigation for everybody. She was the world's most important banker; her citizens invested capital in foreign countries, the proceeds of which came back to Britain. Her banking, insurance, manufacturing, and shipping were in private hands. The Government maintained law and order, not only at home but abroad; and a British citizen was safe in almost any part of the world. But the cost of maintaining her huge navy and paying for previous wars fell heavily on the taxpayer, and her income-tax rate went up tremendously.

Shortly after the turn of the century there came rumblings that all was not well. Other countries, and particularly Germany, were underselling Britain in the world's markets, and even in her own country. Had Britain at that time had the courage and foresight to diagnose the situation correctly, and done the proper thing to correct it, she could have been a prosperous nation today.

But Britain didn't take the necessary steps to correct a dangerous situation. Her people chose what seemed the easier way. That's where socialism entered the picture.

In the latter part of the nineteenth century a group known as the Fabian Society was organized in Britain. I would refer you to John T. Flynn's book, The Road Ahead, for a full explanation about that society. Its sole purpose was to socialize the country.

One of its platforms was that taxes should be levied on those best able to pay. To a nation whose people were burdened by what seemed then to be heavy taxes, these catchwords were fascinating.

Industry was a fruitful source of taxation, and the tax collector and also some managers of industry refused to consider that reserves for replacement of obsolete machines was a proper charge against manufacture. A machine once bought was considered to have a useful life until it wore out. The managers of industry, therefore, did not seek to reduce their costs by replacing obsolete machines with modern ones that would reduce cost; and in this they were aided and abetted by labor, which had the mistaken belief that a machine that would reduce the man-hours or labor cost in a product was something that would cause unemployment and therefore should be resisted.

Instead of taking a stand on this, the manufacturer sought to protect his costs by making agreements with his competitors not to sell below a certain price, and in return the different manufacturers were to be protected in certain markets. This is the so-called cartel system by which competition is stifled and markets are protected and divided.

Whenever a competitor showed up that was independent, a price war would result; and often the solution to it was to cut the new manufacturer in for a share of the trade at agreed-upon prices, and thus split the business available to each into smaller shares. This enabled the inefficient manufacturers to still sell at a profit without the costly process of tearing down and rebuilding obsolete high-cost plants, or replacing them or tools with something more modern; and some of these agreements were entered into with labor sitting in and agreeing on a wage scale.

This couldn't happen in our country because of the antitrust laws on the books, and it is the fundamental difference between our manufacturing and selling and theirs. In this country we have continually sought to widen markets by reducing prices, and thus make more goods available to everybody, and it has brought us the highest standard of living of any country in the world.

But to go back to the cartels: Where competition got too tough, as in the case of shipping, the Government subsidized British shipping. Then other countries subsidized their shipping. There would be rate wars, and afterward the matter would finally be resolved by international agreements dividing markets at agreed-upon rates.

But none of these things got at the root of the trouble, which was the necessity for modernizing the factories and reducing costs so that goods could be sold at lower prices and thus get into the hands of more people; and also to reduce the cost of Government so that people would have more of their own money to spend. The result was more government and more taxes, and still higher prices, and a lower standard of living.

I mentioned the Fabian Society a few moments ago. Don't misunderstand how it operated. When the society was first formed its members naturally found the liberal party and the trade-unions to be the groups where their arguments seemed most plausible.

So, when trade-unions decided to take a more active part in the Government, they were encouraged to start an independent labor party, and the Fabian Society worked through it.

There is a distinct parallel between that period of Britain's history and our own times. Here those with socialistic ideas are working through a political party. Time will tell whether they will engulf that party and make it their own, or whether they will be responsible for establishment of a separate political organization.

Several times in the past 25 years the Labor Party won a majority in the House of Commons. These people were so ambitious that in 1928 a general strike was called, by which the trade-unions sought to put over through pressure their political platforms which had been thwarted in the House of Commons. The public reaction to this was immediate: the public manned and ran the essential services in spite of the strikers. During the strike the tactics of the Communists—so closely allied to the Socialists—were plainly evident to the voters. The Labor Party was defeated and the Conservative Party was reelected to the control of the House.

But, again, there was failure to diagnose the problem correctly, and correct those things which would have put Britain back on its feet as an industrial nation. Instead of trying to cure the causes for unemployment, the Government set out to ameliorate the effects of unemployment by more so-called security, and similar machinery. So the longer the application of the cure was delayed, the sicker the patient became.

The labor group, dominated by Fabians, or Socialists, demanded more and more interference with business by the Government. They reasoned that unemployment was caused by the profit motive of business, and that if profits were taxed away, prices could be reduced. They reasoned also that if Government ran the industries it should be able to reduce prices because there would be no profit.

The House of Commons passed socialistic laws which the House of Lords rejected. Then, to cure that situation, the Prime Minister had the King create an additional number of peers from the Labor Party to outvote the stubborn conservative House of Lords.

Does that sound like familiar tactics to you? Do you remember how President Roosevelt, after the Supreme Court had declared the NRA and similar laws unconstitutional, attempted to pack the Supreme Court? Do you remember the catchwords—the smear words—of "a constitution fitted to horse-and-buggy days" and "the nine old men of the Supreme Court," and so forth? This smear technique is an old reliable weapon of the Socialists and the Communists.

Whatever can be said of the former make-up of the House of Lords, it was a check on unwise legislation that was introduced at a time of mass hysteria. It stood in the way of socialistic planners and, since they had the power in the House of Commons, they had the House of Lords rendered impotent. Thus Britain lost one of its bulwarks, and the task of the Fabian society was made much easier.

Then followed the use of a time-tested technique of politicians—they blamed everyone but themselves when things went wrong. The attack on the profit motive became more vociferous—demands were made that higher taxes be imposed to do away with profits.

I would like to point out a fact which all of you know—that the only way industry gets any money at all from the goods it makes is to sell them. Therefore, any taxes levied against industry must be paid for in the prices at which goods are sold. What Britain needed then was to produce goods at lower prices, make more available, and put more men to work. Instead, the higher taxes placed on industry only increased the selling prices, dried up markets, and lost others to foreign competition that could undersell the British.

That was the situation at the beginning of the Second World War. Certainly one must pay tribute to that quality in the British people that makes them magnificent in a crisis. They come to a decision quickly; and, disregarding any odds that are against them, stand as a united and determined people who would sacrifice anything else than bow to the tyranny of a foreign foe.

The war was a gruesome one for them, and most of them were buoyed up by the spirit that they were fighting to make this a better world to live in. And during the war an endless stream of political propaganda was fed to the soldiers and their families based on the theme of making the country a place fit for heroes to live in. When the war was over there was to be jobs for all, security from the cradle to the grave, free medicine and medical care, assistance to build homes, etc.; and all of this could be had by voting for the Labor Party. It sounded good, and British labor voted for it, and so did British veterans.

Socialism wasn't mentioned in these promises and the voter didn't know he was voting for it. So the Labor Party was voted in, not by an absolute majority of the popular votes, but the party got enough of the votes so that it had a large majority of the seats in the House of Commons. Immediately it proclaimed that it had a mandate from the people to enact into law all of the Labor Party's platform.

You've heard that before, in our own country. Do you remember when President Truman, elected by a very slim majority, boastfully proclaimed, "This is a mandate"?

Thus do we have party candidates who get less than a majority vote running the Government and claiming a mandate from the people. I think this probably stems mostly from civil servants or bureaucrats whose main interest is to perpetuate themselves in office; and to do so by thinking up new items of Government and things for them to do. For example, in this country the President appointed a man to administer social security, and then we find him advocating greatly broadening the policy.

The Labor Party (it should be labeled Socialist Party) then started to carry out its platform to nationalize banking, transporta-

tion, mining, and to adopt such measures as compulsory medical services, etc. With its large majority in the House of Commons, it could ride roughshod over the opposition; and with no written constitution such as we have, there was no check on what it could do.

It nationalized the Bank of England, the railroads, airlines, trucks, and other forms of transportation, the electric power plants and gas plants. It adopted compulsory medical services. It extended rationing and price control. It closed normal market exchanges and made the government the buyer of bulk goods such as metals, rubber, oils, wheat, meat, and other foods. It controlled exports and imports by licensing. It even controlled labor, and can tell a man where he can work. It controlled agriculture and the planting, harvesting, and marketing of crops. It controlled housing and rents, building and building repairs. It froze salaries and wages.

Now let's see how it is working. Did the elimination of private profit reduce the cost to the consumer or benefit the consumer in any way? After the government took over transportation, it raised fares and freight rates with no betterment of service. Gas and light bills were immediately increased; and coal prices went up three times; and it is only after the third increase in the price of coal that the industry has shown a small profit. Nowhere that I have found did the elimination of profit give the consumer a lower price.

The losses now being incurred are not being paid by the owners of business. Instead, they are accumulating in the form of public debt.

Temporarily the British wage-earning class is better off than the rest of the people. If we take the income left after paying income taxes, we find that since 1938 the income of the wage-earning class has increased 12¼ percent, while the income of those dependent on salaries has decreased 12 percent, and industry's income has decreased 17½ percent.

Not only does the average wage earner get higher wages in proportion to the other classes, but in addition gets social services costing $128.80 per year; and for these services pays security taxes of $32.20. The other $96.60 comes out of the rest of the taxpayers' pockets.

But the 12¼-percent increase that he gets does not begin to offset the increase in the cost of living, and he cannot with these increased wages buy anything like the amount of goods he could before the war. To further aid him, the Government has subsidized the cost of the workingman's clothes so that the price of those items has been kept down. It is only by comparison with the other classes that he is better off. Probably a better way of saying this would be that he has not been hurt as much as the other classes.

Over half the British budget goes to welfare. The total cost of this at the normal rate of exchange would be $5,400,000,000 per year. Since the pound has been devalued, the cost in United States dollars now would be $3,172,000,000; but, of course, the devaluation of the pound doesn't make the British cost any lower to them.

To pay for these things the British Government has had to tax and tax. The Government now takes 43.5 percent of the national income, and surtaxes on incomes in Britain go as high as 97½ percent. Obviously that is not taxation; it is confiscation. The middle class is being slowly bled to death, and rich people are being reduced to a state of poverty. As their incomes are being drastically reduced, there is obviously less for the tax collector to take, and more and more the taxes will have to bear down on the wage-earning class for there will soon be no other source to tax.

A large part of the cost of welfare goes for subsidizing the cost of food. The Labor government buys up food supplies and then sells that food at less than cost. The farmer is subsidized to give him a higher price for the foods he produces, but with the subsidy goes complete regulation. The farmer is told what he may produce, and his crops must be sold through specified Government channels.

But while higher prices are being paid to the farmer the cost of foods to the consumer is reduced—again by means of a subsidy. The cost of this is being partially met by our Marshall plan dollars. When that aid is withdrawn the entire costs will have to fall on the British taxpayer, and the result will have to be that these social services will have to be curtailed sharply or the nation will be absolutely bankrupt.

The three chief elements in British socialistic planning were:

1. A welfare state with government guarantee of economic security to all citizens for a redistribution of wealth, which is being carried out through taxation.

2. Planning and controls. Government direction of economy in order to achieve full employment; fair shares for all; and higher export.

3. Nationalization, public ownership, and operation of industry.

Economic planning is carried out by a minister, but final decisions are made by the cabinet, which is made up of labor members of Parliament. The opposition groups are not represented.

During the war controls were set up, and when the labor government came into power, it simply continued these controls, without which it could not operate. The Prime Minister is Mr. Attlee of whom Mr. Churchill said: "Mr. Attlee is a very modest man, but, indeed, he has a lot to be modest about." But the British have no guaranty that some day a man will follow Mr. Attlee who is not so modest, who is a ruthless dictator, and the seeds for his taking over are already sown and the machinery is all at hand.

I have tried to paint a picture for you of the gradual socialization of Britain. It started slowly, and has become almost complete since the Labor Party went into power at the conclusion of the war. But the issue of socialism as such was never voted on by the British people. It came in by stealth, masquerading as welfare, fair shares for all, redistribution of wealth, taxes based on ability to pay, etc. But that course leads to the loss of freedom by the individual which he has traded in for a mess of welfare pottage.

Let's take the case of the British citizen. Approximately half the days he works his pay goes to the Government for taxes; the other half is his—for what? To do with as he pleases? To a certain extent, yes; but with certain Government limitations because almost everything he wants to do is controlled by regulation.

Let us take the matter of a family car. Do you consider an automobile a necessary part of American family life? The socialistic planners at the helm in Britain apparently think otherwise, for the British citizen has to pay a 66⅔-percent purchase tax on the purchase of a new car.

Suppose he would like to take the family for a Sunday afternoon drive, or a vacation trip. The Government says: "Sorry, no gas." The Government permits the purchase of only enough gasoline to drive 6 miles per day, or 180 miles a month, and on the gasoline the Britisher pays a tax of 21 cents a gallon. Think of that. The tax alone is as much or more than we have to pay in some States for gasoline plus State and Federal taxes.

Would he like to have a party and bring his friends in for dinner? He can't do this because food is rationed and he could not acquire enough food to feed his friends. Each day, to keep her family going, the wife has to stand in line (queuing they call it) to try to buy what little meat there is available in the stores.

The British housewife has been reading about American kitchens, and hearing about them from the soldiers who were stationed in Britain in the war; and, believe me, they are the envy of everyone over there. She would like a new stove, refrigerator, and washing machine. They can be bought; they are not rationed; but 100 percent purchase tax is levied by the Government. This is in accordance with the theory of taxing those with the ability to pay. How about an electric toaster? Same thing.

Let's surprise mother on her birthday with some new dishes; the ones we have are broken and chipped and look shabby. The storekeeper tells us that only plain china is available. But what about all the decorated china for which Britain is famous? That is reserved for the export market. Only rejects are available for the domestic market.

What about buying your wife a new cashmere sweater? Scotland has been famous for these for generations. Sorry, these are reserved for the export market. All that is available to you is a plain woolen one. Same thing on good woolens and tweeds.

We decide to take a holiday in France where food is plentiful and goods can be bought, and you make arrangements to buy some francs because you cannot take out of the country more than £5, which is $14.40. And there, in the shop windows, you find to your amazement the cashmere sweaters, the chinaware you could not buy, candy, and other luxuries you had to go without for many years because they were rationed, and you buy the cashmere sweater. Finally you come back to the customs, and you find that you now have to pay 100 percent purchase tax on the sweater. This is "fair shares for all," taxing those with the ability to pay.

Do you want to make a minor repair to your house? You must first of all fill out a long and lengthy questionnaire, and you had better answer all the questions, because to the answers that you give, the examiner will score a certain number of points. The points will be added up to determine whether or not there is essential need, and if not the application will be denied. But if it is shown that there is need, then you will be given a priority based on the importance of your need compared with that of others, the final permission to be issued to you when others with better priority have been taken care of.

Don't go ahead and do it without the permit. They can put you in jail, and they can make you undo what you have done. One man built a house with his own material and his own labor; but because he did not get a permit, he was fined and ordered to tear it down.

The people do not like it; are sick and tired and fed up with it. I know; I've been there recently. They read that Belgium, Holland, and France have removed most of these restrictions; and that even in Germany which was supposed to have lost the war, gasoline can be had and there is more food to be bought.

The Britisher starts to reason "I thought we won the war. Surely the government can give us more food." And you are right in your assumption, but last year it cost the taxpayers over a billion dollars to subsidize the cost of food to hold down prices. He isn't told that the reason he can't have more food is because of the subsidy, and that the subsidy has taken such a big bite out of the taxpayers' money. As long as the subsidy exists, to give them more food on

rationing would mean that much more deficit in the budget. If the subsidy were removed, the cost of food would go up. If the cost of food went up, wages would have to be increased; price controls would have to be changed for food, for restaurant prices, for hotel prices, for rents, for hotel rooms, in fact for practically everything.

It sounds like an awful mess, and it is. I could go on with examples for hours, but nowhere can I see any real hope which would indicate that they are going to get out of their troubles. The Government never admits its mistakes; it blames them onto other causes.

But tragic as that situation is, a greater tragedy would be if we were to follow their example. We have the same forces at work in our country. The Fair Deal is just another name for "fair shares for all," and offers to seduce the voter in the same manner in which the British voter was seduced.

Right at this point I would like to repeat a statement, made recently by the president of a typically great American institution—Benjamin Fairless of United States Steel. He said:

"I do not fear communism because every passing day proves its utter failure. The American people know that if communism were really working successfully there would be no need for police state oppression, phony trials, and slave-labor camps behind the iron curtain.

"I do not fear fascism because it has killed the three great nations which adopted it. The American people want no part of any economic system that feeds only upon war and conquest.

"I do not fear outright socialism because, in Europe today, socialism itself is living on the dole, and America is the only country on earth that is able to foot the bill for it. No American taxpayer is likely to fall for that kind of an economic system, at least until he has found some other nation that is rich enough, and generous enough, to indulge him in his folly.

"But when somebody in Washington starts telling me how much he loves the free enterprise system and how he proposes to save it from itself, I shake in my very shoes. I wonder why it is that these self-appointed saviors of our national welfare always seems to miss the point—the one magnificent lesson that should be apparent to anyone who looks about him at the world today.

"The point is, gentlemen, that our American system of free competitive enterprise is the only one left in the world that is not controlled by power-hungry politicians; and whether you call it the Square Deal, the Fair Deal, the New Deal, or just plain Federal regulation, the fact remains that once the dead hand of politics gets its convulsive grip on American business and industry, free competition will be strangled and our economic system will be no different—and no more successful—than those noble experiments which are crumbling into dust in Europe."

The history of England is a long record of the people wresting from their monarch dearly bought freedoms and abridging the monarch's right to oppress the people. They have finally succeeded in having a monarch who reigns but does not rule. But now having rendered the monarchy impotent as far as oppressing the people is concerned, they appear to be engaged in a conspiracy to give back some of the dearly bought freedoms to a majority in the House of Commons, and have lost the check imposed on the House of Commons by the House of Lords. It is a strange thing that people will surrender powers to put them into friendly hands when they should never surrender those powers under any circumstances. The caressing hands of today may become the strangling hands of tomorrow.

Do you think that you want to help keep this country from going the same way as Britain? You can, but it will mean some sacrifices on your part—but they would be the best sacrifices you ever made.

Encourage your representatives in the council, the State legislature, and Congress to fight for reduction of taxes. If they won't, then find someone else who will, and make sure that they are against Federal aid to anything, no matter how worth while you may think that one of your pet projects is. For every pet project you have someone else is against, but has another pet project of his own, and you will end up by all the pet projects being voted on.

If you have the right representative, support him with your time and talent, and if necessary with your money. When he has the courage to vote against the bureaucrats, encourage him, write him, and let him know, and do not be misled by false prophets. Prosperity can only come from work. You must produce something before it can be consumed. There is no other way.

Above all, make sure your Government is your servant. If not it will become your master, and you will be a slave to it. Preserve intact your American Constitution and Bill of Rights. It was designed to protect you and your liberties and your rights. Don't let anyone amend it to take away any of your rights and thus lose you any freedom; and don't be passive. Talk, work, and act to guard your freedom. Don't vote for anyone who would deprive you of any of these. And always exercise your right to vote, and influence others to do so. Don't be deceived or seduced by vain promises. Your heritage of freedom is yours. Yet you may lose it by indifference or default. You may sell it to politicians to buy glittering promises as have the people of Britain, only to find the glittering promises are false. But be firm and resolute—no one can take away your freedom if you guard it and fight for it.

All-American Conference To Combat Communism Moves Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, many Americans have frequently said, "Communism is the greatest threat to our freedom and our homes. I wish I knew something that as an individual I could do to help counteract and defeat its Godless, tyrannical conspiracy."

Well, Mr. President, a new association of organizations has now come into being which provides a clear-cut, definitive program whereby all those who actually want to do something to defeat communism can find specific work to do right in their own communities. If the will to resist communism and promote freedom is there, the new All-American Conference to Combat Communism has a specific program to recommend for the cooperative support of local citizens whether they live in a town of one thousand or a city of more than several million people.

An article from the July 1950 issue of The American Legion Monthly tells the challenging story of this new organization and suggests what is being done to advance its program.

Interested individuals or organizations should write to Mr. W. C. "Tom" Sawyer, national secretary of the All-American Conference to Combat Communism—his address is 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL-AMERICAN CONFERENCE TO COMBAT COMMUNISM MADE PERMANENT IN MEETING OF 60 NATIONAL GROUPS AT CHICAGO—MILITARY ANTI-RED FRONT FORMED BY LOYAL AND PATRIOTIC ORGANIZATIONS WITH MEMBERSHIPS OF 80,000,000; DETAILS IRONED OUT AFTER LEGION CALLED FIRST MEETING IN NEW YORK

Presenting a solid front against the menace of communism and other subversive and un-American movements, delegates from 60 of the largest organizations in the United States perfected a united, militant organization in a 2-day meeting at Chicago on May 13–14. The new organization, with a potential fighting power of 80,000,000 individual members of its constituent groups, clearly defined its purpose in its name—All-American Conference To Combat Communism.

The Chicago meeting was held to finish the work of the Legion-called all-American conference which met at the call of National Commander George N. Craig in New York City on January 28–29, of this year. Despite the handicaps of a railroad strike and the impending visit of the President of the United States to Chicago, some 120 delegates from 60 organizations responded to the roll call. After two full days of debate and discussion, ironing out details of organization and the adoption of a strong, virile statement of purpose and policy, the new patriotic conference came into official existence by unanimous vote of the cheering delegates. National Commander George N. Craig of the American Legion presided at the sessions until the election of the interim officers who will serve until the next meeting to be held at Buffalo, N. Y., on November 18 and 19.

DR. POLING ELECTED CHAIRMAN

Dr. Daniel A. Poling, New York City, eminent churchman, editor of the Christian Herald, author and radio commentator was elected national chairman for the interim period. Elected to serve with him as vice chairmen were:

Mrs. Marie L. Sheehe, Rockford, Ill., national president, the American Legion Auxiliary; Lewis G. Hines, Washington, D. C., special representative, American Federation of Labor; Rev. Father John A. Cronin, Washington, D. C., National Catholic Welfare Conference; Dr. Frederick C. Fowler, Pittsburgh, Pa., president, National Association of Evangelicals; Alexander T. Wells, New York City; past president, Lions International.

W. C. "Tom" Sawyer, Indianapolis, Ind., and Mesa, Ariz., Americanism director, the American Legion, was named as secretary, and J. George Fredman, Jewish War Veterans, Jersey City, N. J., was elected treasurer.

An executive council of general conference members was elected to assist and advise in the affairs of the conference. This group is composed of Miss Olive H. Huston, New York City, executive director, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; Robert W. Hanson, Milwaukee, Wis., editor of the National Eagles Magazine; Paul Wamsley, Buffalo, N. Y., past president, National Education Association; Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, New York City, executive director, American Jewish League Against Communism; Senator Jack B. Tenney, Los Angeles, Calif., member of the Cali-

fornia Legislature; Rear Adm. Charles S. Stephenson, M. C., United States Navy (retired), Washington, D. C., national medical director, Disabled American Veterans, and Gerald M. Cahill, Washington, D. C., Association of Motion Picture Producers.

United States Senator KARL MUNDT, Madison, S. Dak., was named as an associate conference member.

PLANS FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION

Organized to combat communism and other subversive elements, which include by name such ideologies as fascism and nazism, on a scale and with a vigor never before attempted, this first permanent organization meeting outlined comprehensive plans for immediate action. The conference authorized an interim budget of $50,000 and, as an independent unit, will have its own headquarters and its own staff.

The All-American Conference, as visualized by the founders in the Chicago meeting, is a voluntary body through which the efforts of the member groups will be coordinated, and thus made more effective. The constituent organization members will maintain their own autonomy and freedom of action in their own fields. Membership fee was fixed at $100 for each member body.

When that section of the organization plan was adopted, Mrs. Elsie G. Jones, Indianapolis, Ind., representing the Mothers of World War II, rose from her place on the floor and presented a check for $100. Thus the Mothers of World War II became the first officially paid-up member of the organization.

POLICY STATEMENT

The statement of policy adopted by the newly created conference comprised a blueprint of activities featuring educational programs at the grass-roots levels in the local communities to develop a greater appreciation of the blessings and dividends of the American way of life; of exposing Communist activities; of meeting Communist propaganda with better American counterpropaganda; of sponsoring aggressively annual observances of "Know Your America Week"; of protecting American freedoms through aiding all Americans to become more alert to the personalities, purpose, programs, and front organizations of the Communists in this country, and making widest use of the press, radio, movie screen and television in fighting communism.

The conference will also establish a national clearing house to collect, prepare, and distribute through its member organizations or by its own direction, printed material, motion pictures, radio and television scripts, speeches and articles to portray dramatically the values and virtues of free American institutions. It will also publicize, expose, check, and prevent secret infiltrations into American institutions by Communist agents. The objectives of the conference will be further promoted by a series of national, State, and regional meetings.

CRAIG'S EFFORTS RECOGNIZED

The Chicago meeting was the outgrowth of the meeting sparked by National Commander George N. Craig, held in New York last January, whose purpose was to join all foes of communism into a single, unified and effective body. The American Legion, through National Commander Craig, carried the burden of organization through the months. When the All-American Conference objective had been realized, the Legion became one of the participating organizations, with voice and vote on equality with each one of the other constituent members.

Recognizing National Commander Craig's leadership in bringing about the united anti-Communist front, he was unanimously elected honorary national chairman.

On taking over the gavel to preside over the concluding session, after a stirring prayer for divine guidance, Dr. Poling said:

"This marks the first dynamic new unity of the American people to carry the fight to communism everywhere in the United States. We have mobilized here today a mighty task force to wipe out every Communist beachhead in our land."

DONOHUE AND GITLOW SPEAK

At the dinner meeting on the evening of the first day, the principal speakers were Ben Gitlow, former secretary general of the Communist Party who broke with Moscow in 1929, and F. Joseph Donohue, Special Assistant United States Attorney General, prosecutor in the recent perjury trial of Harry Bridges and two associates in San Francisco.

Donohue said that the Communists are persecuting the witnesses who testified against Bridges. He spoke of their plight, and pointed out that the Government was dependent under present defective legislation on the testimony of ex-Communists to secure convictions.

"Of the 10 Government witnesses who testified against Bridges, 6 are now out of work as a result," he said. "These witnesses who testified have no one to whom they can turn for help. The Reds know this, and when someone else comes up for trial it will make it more difficult for the Government to find witnesses." He further said that French Communists adopted a resolution not to unload any ships employing any of the witnesses who testified against Bridges.

Gitlow, who recently participated in the demonstration in Mosinee, Wis., portraying what would happen to American communities under Communist rule, told the gathering that this demonstration was one of the first effective steps taken by the American people in the psychological warfare against communism.

"If other similar efforts are successful, we can wipe the Communist May Day off the map," he said. "If the lessons learned in Mosinee are followed, the United States can convert May Day from a Communist symbol into a holiday for the propagation of Americanism."

Mr. Gitlow asserted that American Communists are Moscow's fifth column in the United States, and said further that the Communists already have a highly trained military corps.

STATEMENT OF POLICY ADOPTED AT CHICAGO BY ALL-AMERICAN CONFERENCE TO COMBAT COMMUNISM

The constituent bodies of the All-American Conference to Combat Communism supports wholeheartedly the basic liberties which are assured by the Constitution of the United States—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and freedom of religion.

They will continue to strive for equal justice for all citizens without discrimination on grounds of race, color, national origin, faith, or creed.

They will strive, in all areas of life, to strengthen American democracy and thereby demonstrate its moral and spiritual, as well as economic, superiority over any totalitarian regime, whether it be Communist, Fascist or Nazi.

The Conference recognizes that its functions are informational, educational and advisory.

The immediate, specific, and united task of this Conference is to unite in one all-American organization those groups of good repute desiring to coordinate their activities in a Nation-wide crusade to defend and promote our freedoms and to expose and curtail communism and other subversive elements in this country. The All-American Conference proposes to carry out its campaign through National, State and local efforts. It will stress the use of effective means of education and publicity directed at the local grass-roots level by the cooperative leadership of the groups which are associated in the National program of the All-American Conference.

This conference recognizes that communism, fascism, and nazism and all other forms of un-Americanism are equally abhorrent, and each is destructive of the rights and dignity of the individual. Therefore, we pledge our efforts to combat all as inconsistent with the democratic way of life. While we are equally opposed to all, we recognize the clear and present dangers of communism and the necessity of meeting it with a positive and militant program as described herein, and whenever fascism, or nazism, or other forms of un-Americanism threaten all or any segment of the American population we likewise will meet it with the same positive and militant program.

Letter From Hon. Samuel A. Weiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter received by me from Hon. Samuel A. Weiss, Judge of Common Pleas Court, Pittsburgh, Pa. Mr. Weiss, a former Congressman from Pennsylvania, is certainly no stranger to most of the Members of this body. His letter is self-explanatory:

JUDGES' CHAMBERS,
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS,
Pittsburgh, Pa., June 16, 1950.

Hon. HARRY DAVENPORT,
Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR HARRY: Pursuant to our conversation in Pittsburgh, I am herewith submitting some pertinent facts regarding the character of Attorney Louis Little of the Allegheny County Bar Association, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Louis Little has a reputation of one of the finest lawyers at the bar, with an unimpeachable integrity, and an honorable lawyer. He has never been known to be identified with any communistic or subversive organizations, and I give you the following additional facts as to his loyalty as an American:

There was a petition filed requesting this court to grant an injunction in the case of *Marko Milasinovich et al.* v. *The Serbian Progressive Club, Inc., of Wilmerding, Pa.*, at No. 1214, October term, 1948, and also requesting the appointment of a receiver, alleging principally that the club was dominated by Communists that had infiltrated into the leadership of this corporate club. Attorney Louis Little represented the club, the defendant. The first hearing was held September 27, 1948; the second hearing was held September 28, 1948, and the evidence conclusively established that with 260 members in the club 8 were known Communists, among them two or three were the leaders in Allegheny County. Following the hearing on September 28, 1948, I called the attorneys into my chambers and threatened to grant the injunction unless the club purged itself of all Communists in its organization and an election to be held on or before November 1, 1948. Within 10 days, Attorney Louis Little came to my chambers and informed me that it appeared that there were Communists in the organization which he represented, and that he could not in good conscience

continue to represent the defendant organization, and asked my permission to withdraw his appearance as counsel for defendant. I informed him that was his privilege and that it met with the approval of the court, and he orally and formally withdrew as counsel for the defendant organization. * * *

This clearly establishes the true qualities of an upright and outstanding lawyer whose honor and integrity are respected by the bench and the bar of our great community.

I am enclosing a few newspaper clippings that appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, and in fairness to Attorney Louis Little, these matters should be incorporated into the record. These facts speak clearly for themselves.

With best wishes always, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

SAM.

JUDGE WARNS CLUB TO PURGE ALLEGED REDS—WILMERDING SERBIANS SAY CLUB FUNDS FELL FROM $26,000 TO $625

Common Pleas Judge Samuel A. Weiss threatened Wednesday "to clean house" for the Serbian Progressive Club, of Wilmerding, unless the club itself purges "known Communists" in an election prior to November 1.

The judge's informal order came after agreement to his terms by opposing counsel in a hearing on an injunction suit brought by five members of the organization.

Plaintiffs charge that officers of the club have been using the club and its funds to aid Communist groups and ask an injunction calling for these actions:

ASK OUSTER OF OFFICERS

Suspension of officers' power to impose fines and expel members, refuse officers the right to spend club funds, impound club records, prohibit use of the clubrooms at 135 Watkins Avenue, Wilmerding, for "Communist or subversive activities," and oust the officers.

Named as defendants are Nicholas Stocker, president; Marko Godich, vice president; Milas Inovich, vice president; Dela Magarac, financial secretary; Milos Zivkovich, treasurer; Charles Kluko, recording secretary, and seven trustees.

Plaintiffs are Marko Milasinovich, Juva Tomich, Eli Macut, Peter Vranich, and Marko Zivkovich.

Vranich, who lives at 25 Prospect Street, Turtle Creek, told the court that the club officers have donated large sums to Communist organizations, thus depleting the club treasury from $26,000 to $625 in 2 years. Organizations which got the gifts included the American Slav Congress, branded by the attorney general as "disloyal," the member said.

COURT TO RULE ON ELECTION

"The witnesses testified that Godich, the vice president of the club, is secretary of the International Workers Organization and chairman of the membership committee of the Communist Party in Western Pennsylvania," Judge Weiss asserted.

"I told them that Godich is going to have to step out or I will have to remove him," the judge added. "They also claim that there are from 8 to 15 Communists in the organization, and they must go too," he said.

The hearing was continued to November 1 "when the court will decide if the intervening club elections have been satisfactory," Judge Weiss reported.

COURT ORDERS REDS OUSTED FROM SERB CLUB—JUDGE WEISS NAMES RECEIVER ON PETITION OF WILMERDING GROUP

The Serbian Progressive Club of Wilmerding was placed in receivership yesterday by Common Pleas Court Judge Samuel A. Weiss, in order that the club could be "cleansed" of its Communist activities.

Judge Weiss issued his orders in the form of an injunction granted five anti-Communist members of the club who filed suit because they were displeased with the way things were run.

STAISEY NAMED

As receiver the court appointed Leonard G. Staisey, assistant district attorney, who will take over the following administrative tasks:

1. Audit membership, accounts and financial records.
2. Prohibit any and all meetings of Reds in the club.
3. Expell all Communists who now are members of the club.
4. Reinstate all former members who were thrown out because of anti-Communist views, and admit to membership all those whose applications were turned down because they were anti-Communist.
5. Hold an election within 90 days.

TO REPORT BACK

In addition, Staisey was ordered to make a complete report to the court when the club has been "cleansed" at which time control will be given back to the membership.

In his decision, Judge Weiss noted that the club had been taken over by Marko Godich, who, he said, was a national Communist leader of Serbians in America. He listed 23 members and officers who have been named as Communist Party members, and cited the fact that considerable of the club's funds had been given to Communist-front organizations.

Anti-Red members who brought the case to court were Marko Milasinovich, Jovo Tomich, Eli Macut, Peter Vranich and Marko Zikovich.

Old Glory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place in the RECORD the following editorial by Harry H. Schlacht entitled "Old Glory," which appeared in the New York Journal-American and other newspapers from coast to coast:

OLD GLORY

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

I am Old Glory. I am the strength of our country. I am the badge of our Nation's greatness. I am the emblem of its destiny.

I am the soul of America.

I stand for the fatherhood of God. I stand for the brotherhood of man.

I was hallowed by heroes from Bunker Hill to Iwo Jima.

I have been heralded with tears of joy. I have been heralded with songs of deliverance.

Wherever I float are the glories of mankind.

I tell no stories of crushed liberties. I tell no stories of sorrows from the oppressed. I tell no stories of the suffering of the conquered.

I have made tyranny tremble. I have made freedom rejoice.

I wave before your eyes as a bright gleam of color.

I am the symbol of yourself. I am the symbol of your devotion to the United States.

My stars and stripes are bright with your cheer, brilliant with your courage, because you made me out of your hearts.

You are the makers of Old Glory. You may glory in its making.

On this your birthday, Old Glory—flag of our country—we pledge you our hearts and homes, our nights and days, our lives and fortunes, and our sacred honor.

May Americans now and forever reap the full fruition of happiness and freedom under the star-studded Spangled Banner.

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands; one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

The Japanese Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago the United States of America brought Japan into the modern world. And once again the United States of America is at the crossroads in determining what course it shall pursue with reference to the future history of relations between the two countries.

Today there has developed two schools of thought in official Washington circles dealing with this problem. It appears that the State Department upholds one position and the other is proposed by the Department of Defense. It appears further that these differences are basic and fundamental. The State Department suggests that the position of the United States in Japan will diminish in direct ratio to the length of time our troops are there in occupation.

This line of reasoning argues the necessity for the signing of a peace treaty as soon as is reasonably possible. The State Department apparently does not object to the discussions taking place within the Department of Defense having to do with the necessity for maintaining troops in Japan, but feels that the negotiation for such bases can well take place after the signing of the treaty.

Regardless of the differences of opinion existing within the Department of Defense with reference to the Japanese problem or any differences of opinion that may exist between the Department of Defense and the Department of State on this problem, it seems to be pretty generally agreed among all parties, including the other Allied Nations participating in the occupation, that whatever international pact develops with reference to Japan, it should give the Japanese some assurance of support and, at the same time, provide the other nations of the Pacific area with a guaranty against Japanese aggression.

The successes in China of communism as an international force in addition to the rumbling in southeastern Asia growing from the same cause, when placed alongside of recent internal disorders in Japan, would all seem to call for a more particular analysis of the Japanese occupation by the United States Govern-

ment than seems to be available at the moment.

Obviously, the United States of America has a vital interest in the maintenance of democratic institutions in Japan and in the development of such economic, social, and cultural conditions in that country as will contribute to the further establishment and growth of democratic institutions. It is essential that these circumstances and objectives be coordinated with American foreign policy as it touches upon not only the east by the conditions in the west as well.

There has been introduced in the Senate recently a resolution calling for such an examination of the policy and interests of the United States with reference to the occupation in Germany. That resolution has great merit and, at the same time and for the same reasons, Mr. Speaker, I submit this resolution with reference to Japan.

Mr. Speaker, I am by no means satisfied that the primary danger to the security of the United States is the conquest of western Europe by the Soviet Union. I recognize the danger of that menace and the importance to our way of life that it be contained. I feel, however, that the center of gravity in world events has shifted from old and tired and decadent western Europe to the sprawling, brawling peoples and nations of Asia and the Pacific, and I feel that there the center of gravity will remain for at least the next 100 years in shaping the course of world history.

Forest-Fire Control in Jefferson County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, an essay contest on the subject, Forest-Fire Control in Jefferson County, Mo., has recently been completed. This very commendable effort was sponsored by the Jefferson County Farm Bureau, the Ozark Protective Association, with the cooperation of the extension service, the forestry people, the schools both public and parochial, and many local citizens. As expressed by the local county extension agent, Earl T. Steele, of Hillsboro, Mo.:

It isn't possible to measure the effects of this contest like you can measure the production of a dairy cow; however, indications are that it is a fast and easy way to educate our people.

Mr. Steele informs me that the United States Department of Agriculture Yearbook, Trees, was the principal source of information for the 169 boys and girls, including both elementary and high-school students, who participated in the contest.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the essay written by Carol Wilson, of the Grandview School. Carol's essay won first place among the elementary-school essays. I also include the winning high-school essay written by Raymond Lee Urfer, of the Hillsboro High School. I commend both Carol and Raymond for work well done and urge continued and increased effort by local groups in dealing effectively with our No. 1 problem, the conservation and proper utilization of our soil and water resources:

FOREST FIRE CONTROL IN JEFFERSON COUNTY
(By Carol Wilson)

By the twenty-first century Jefferson County is going to be a mass of rocks, poor soil, timberless and also worthless.

Now, when you drive or walk along the country roads and also highways you see some things that are pleasing, and some that aren't. By that the explanations are that most of the timbered land, has burned lately and is still black, ugly, ruins of once valuable timber. The other explanation is that the forest fires have been there and the seedlings that haven't burned have just begun to get green and start sprouting. This also shows some signs of progress in the production of more timber. Both of these explanations should and could be made much better.

There should be more lookout towers especially in heavily timbered areas, so that they could get to the fires quicker. Then the fire could not get a head start and would not destroy so much valuable timber. There should also be more thought of educating the people by lectures, radio broadcasts, news articles, circulars, posters, and bulletins. There should also be a heavy penalty for starting forest fires purposely and accidentally. We must also improve our methods of fighting forest fires by getting more and better machinery, and having more able men.

Another thing that would help Jefferson County forest fire commission would be to have an organization by the farmer. They could have meetings and start a forest fire fighting squad. With the farmers being near the wooded areas they could help the rangers in many ways. They could be a relief squad or be able to fight forest fires when there was a forest fire that got too much of a head start. Many farmers would be willing to help because it causes their land, timber, and wildlife great damage. There could also be an organization for children concerning forest fire control in Jefferson County, because the boys and girls of today will be the men and women of tomorrow.

By an experiment the seventh and eighth grades of Grandview School have proved that forest fires cause floods and soil erosion. In the experiment we went to Mr. Albert Brinley's farm where there had been a recent forest fire. We measured off two areas of land 5 feet by 5 feet, on sloping land. One area was burned by a recent forest fire, the other was on land that hadn't burned. We poured eight gallons of water on each, which was approximately equivalent to one inch of rainfall. After 30 minutes we observed it. It had soaked three inches in the unburned areas. In the burned area, it soaked one inch, which proved forest fires cause much runoff which causes floods and soil erosion.

We also observed the vegetation on burned and unburned land. We discovered there is much more grass and small trees on the unburned land.

There are many sportsmen of today and there will probably be more in later generations. But if we don't start conserving our forests, there will be no more great sportsmen, because our forests will be gone.

Every year thousands of dollars worth of forest timber is burned. There is enough timber burned by forest fires each year to build 215,000 frame houses.

The United States Forest Service records an average of about 200,000 forest fires every year. Such fires as these ruin an average of 40,000,000 acres of forests.

The flood dangers to the valleys will be decreased. The wildlife will be more plentiful, and thus adding to the sport and enjoyment of all the hunters.

Wake up people of Jefferson County and put forth every effort to the country's fire prevention, so our hills will be green again.

FOREST FIRE CONTROL IN JEFFERSON COUNTY
(By Raymond Lee Urfer)

While driving along in your auto, have you ever noticed a billow of smoke in the distance? No doubt it was a forest fire. I hope, when you saw it, you remarked to your companion on how much damage this fire was really doing. Or maybe you, yourself, did not realize. Probably it meant thousands of dollars wasting away at the hands of a big, red monster, breathing fire and flame of destruction.

Maybe you are wondering, Why prevent forest fires? Here are a few reasons.

1. Fire destroys timber.
2. Fire destroys small growth.
3. Fire damages pasture.
4. Fire causes floods.
5. Fire destroys property.
6. Fire ruins fishing.
7. Fire destroys wildlife.

Remember, fire destroys birds, instead of insects and so does not reduce the number of insects.

Now you ask, "How can we prevent forest fires? Here are fire causes:

1. Debris burning.
2. Incendiary fires.
3. Incidental lumbering fires.
4. Lightning fires.
5. Railroad fires.
6. Campfires.
7. Smokers' fires.
8. Miscellaneous fires.

There is the time when there should be no burning. Never burn on dry, windy days or in the hot part of the day.

When burning, burn on a spaded area making sure that the edges are kept clear of inflammable material.

As your duty to keep America green you should know these rules, of what to do in case of fire.

1. Get someone on the fire quickly as possible.
2. Upon arrival at fire, immediate action should be taken.
3. Make every effort to determine the cause and preserve all evidence discovered.
4. Hit the fire hard and stay with it until under control.
5. Make sure all work done on a fire is permanent.
6. Make sure the fire is under control by 10 a. m. the following morning.
7. Keep posted on all activities of fire.
8. When possible to do so, control the head of the fire first.
9. Whenever the fire is too hot for action on the head, control action should start on the flanks, working toward the head.
10. Keep a close watch for spot fires.
11. Make sure the fire line is kept clear of all inflammable material.
12. Be prepared for emergency.

So tragic is this fiery monster, that it destroys an area as large as Indiana each year. There is an average of 170,000 fires a year. In 50 years there would be no forests. This is possible since one forest fire starts every 3 minutes in the United States. Enough saw timber is burned every year to build 86,000 modern homes.

Wouldn't the prices be high if you had to buy everything in metal or glass? The paper

for packaging is made from trees which will be burned. Our trains couldn't run without wooden cross-ties.

Would you like to go on a picnic in a bed of ashes? No. So think of this. You may live in a modern fireproof structure with luxuries galore. But don't you like to relax in the quiet outdoors?

Jefferson County has a total of 427,000 acres. Of this, 270,000 acres, or 64 percent is timber. This could easily be part of the area as large as Indiana.

All the facts I have mentioned are caused by forest fires. So, come on, people. It is your duty to keep America green.

A Program for Liberals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 22 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Wednesday evening, June 14, I was privileged to address the sixth birthday dinner of the Liberal Party of New York. I spoke on a Program for Liberals. I request the unanimous consent of the Senate to insert the speech into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEHMAN AT ANNUAL DINNER, LIBERAL PARTY, HOTEL COMMODORE, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 14, 1950

We stand today at one of the major cross roads of history. These cross roads are so vaguely marked that we may easily lose sight of the direction from which we have come and the way along which we must now travel.

We must realize that if we choose the wrong direction, in either domestic or international affairs, we will be entering upon an avenue from which there may be no turning back. The wrong road may lead us ultimately to a disaster from which neither this country nor mankind will ever fully recover.

I do not mean to be a harbinger of doom. That role is better played by those who for the past 20 years have been regularly predicting calamity as a consequence of virtually every piece of New Deal legislation and even of measures designed to insure our own security and the survival of the free world.

I mean merely to emphasize the deadly seriousness of the present crisis and the incalculable responsibility which you and I, and all the citizens of America, hear today for the future not of our country alone but of all the world.

I do not think we will take the road to disaster and destruction. I have too much faith in the good sense of the American people and of mankind. I know that we can find the way to peace, to justice, and to security for ourselves and for all men.

I need not tell you—you have been told so many times—how hard the road is and how many sacrifices we will all be called upon to make. These generalities are meaningless unless they are supported by specific and concrete programs justifying the sacrifices and staking out the hard road ahead.

First of all, I should like to devote a few moments to a discussion of our broad principles—the guideposts by which we may find our way.

We liberals do not, like the proverbial gooney bird, proceed with our eyes fixed upon the past, so that we know only where we have been and not where we are going. Rather we say, in the words of Thomas Jefferson, that "as new truths are disclosed, institutions must advance also. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy, as civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of their ancestors."

The key word in this statement by Jefferson is the word "truths." We search continually for the truth, for facts; we form our conclusions on the basis of these facts.

We say with Patrick Henry, "For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth—to know the worst and provide for it."

When the facts, established by relentless inquiry, indicate error in our programs or in our policies, we change them. We modify our proposals in the light of the conditions actually existing, insofar as we can determine those conditions.

We seek no utopia. We seek to solve the problems of the present, and to anticipate the needs of the future. We do not try to solve all the problems of our descendants, but only to preserve for them the freedom and opportunity to solve their problems as we are trying to solve ours.

We are not doctrinaires. We are bound neither by Karl Marx nor Adam Smith. The magnificence of our tradition lies in the fact that the men whom we most highly honor—Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt—left behind them no legacy of doctrine to limit and control our actions today. Their legacy was of principle and of method—the principle of humanitarianism and the method of progressive democracy.

Our liberal philosophy does not mean that we automatically discard what is old and established. It does mean that we must constantly reexamine the adequacy of our institutions, and adjust them to new imperatives and new circumstances.

What does this mean in terms of current programs? I think we can summarize these briefly in terms of what we are against and what we are for.

We are opposed to discrimination against any man, woman, or child because of his race, creed, color, or national origin. We are for a broad and comprehensive civil-rights program assuring to every single individual all the rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

This means not only FEPC, antilynch legislation, abolition of poll taxes, and elimination of discrimination in the armed services, it also means the protection of the rights of all minorities and all individuals against oppression by other individuals, or by groups, be they majorities or minorities.

It means, among other things, statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, freedom of choice for Puerto Rico, protection of the proper rights of Indians and Mexicans and Filipinos and Japanese in our Southwestern and Western States.

In regard to labor, we are for the protection of the rights of democratic labor unions to organize the unorganized and to represent their membership in collective bargaining.

We are opposed to oppressive and restrictive practices either by employers or by workers. We are for collective bargaining in good faith between unions and management.

All of this, added up, means that we are against the Taft-Hartley Act. We are for a labor act which will promote stability in labor-management relations, and recognize the legitimate role of organized labor in our society.

In the interests of our farm population, we support all measures necessary to preserve the natural resources of our soil and the social resources of a sturdy and thriving farm population.

Depressions in America are characteristically farm led and farm fed. Let the day never come when we forget the fact that our economy is based as surely upon a prosperous agriculture as upon a prosperous industry.

Nor can we fit the farmer into the same mold in which we have cast our industrial workers and our businessmen. We must seek a formula for our agriculture which will maintain fair prices for farm products and will provide security for our farm population against some of the hazards of harvest and weather, as well as against sickness and old age. We must expand for the farmer both his market and his opportunities to enjoy the benefits of twentieth century civilization.

We are against monopoly and the stifling of competition. We are for all measures necessary to promote increased productivity, by big industry as well as by small business. Productivity in our economic system is based on free and fair competition.

We are for security for business and for businessmen, as well as for the other elements in our economy and our population.

We are for the welfare state—not an unlimited welfare state, not a paternal state, not a state which takes care of the people, but a state which serves the people.

We are for a government which provides the social protections essential to free all our citizens from the paralyzing anxiety of insecurity.

We are for Federal aid to education, for aid to the physically handicapped, and for all necessary forms of aid to children, mothers and other elements of our population unable to fend for themselves.

We are for a program that will provide adequate medical care to every man, woman and child in America at reasonable cost.

We are for government aid in the construction of housing, so that all our people may have adequate shelter at prices they can afford. Until that objective is achieved, and while the housing shortage still exists, we are for the control of rents at a fair and reasonable level.

We are for the eradication of slums and other conditions which breed ignorance, crime, disease and unrest.

Our horizons are broad and expanding. That is why the reactionaries oppose us. They know we will never be permanently content with the status quo. We are forever pressing forward and discovering new horizons. We meet needs as they arise and in accordance with our means and our circumstances.

I have cited many programs and have indicated by inference many more. Undoubtedly men of little vision will continue to accuse us of seeking to bankrupt the United States and of proposing expenditures that are beyond the means of our people.

I am unalterably opposed to expenditures or programs which are beyond our means. I am unalterably opposed—as I hope you all are—to extravagance, waste and inefficiency in Government. I believe my long record in public life proves this.

I would pare nonessential Government expenditures to the bone, but I would approve and support all expenditures which are required as investments in the health and welfare of our people, in the future of our Nation, and in the peace and security of all mankind.

Sixty years ago a Republican Congress voted appropriations amounting to the then unprecedented sum of a billion dollars. "This is a billion-dollar Congress," the critics cried. The Secretary of the Treasury, Charles Foster, replied, "But this is a billion-dollar country." And today America is not a billion-dollar country, but a multibillion-dollar country, a country with a national income of $250,000,000,000, a country with 50 percent of the industrial production of the entire world, although we are only 7 percent of the world's population.

As President Truman has pointed out: Free our people from the fear of insecurity, expand our national horizons, and we will double, treble, and quadruple even our present limits! And we will have the means with which to support the programs I have described, and more besides.

If we have faith in ourselves and in our country, if we have any understanding of our own history, we will realize that to expand our national income and increase our national wealth, we must expand and increase our investments in the welfare and well-being of our people and in the resources of our country.

We must have a dynamic and expanding economy to meet the expanding needs of an expanding population. In such an economy, there is no real unemployment problem. Jobs are created by ever widening demand. Purchasing power keeps pace with production. In such a system, Government expenditures keep pace with the national income.

These are our principles and programs in domestic affairs. The problem is to reconcile these programs with the problems we face abroad.

On the international front the way is much less clear.

We must always recognize the rights of other peoples and other nations. We must be ready and willing to cooperate with them in achieving for all men the goals we seek for ourselves.

We know that we cannot be an island of prosperity in a boundless sea of misery. That is impossible, as well as immoral.

But our entire outlook on world affairs, as well as on our affairs at home, is complicated today by the threat of a dynamic and aggressive force, as insidious as it is unscrupulous, seeking to overthrow our way of life and to fasten upon mankind a regimen of totalitarianism and terror.

We must combat this force. We must combat it with every resource at our command. But we dare not combat it by imitating it.

We must stand or fall by the use of those means which have made us great, and by devotion to those principles by which we live.

Recognizing the perils we face, accepting the difficulties we confront, we can still take comfort in the fact that where men are free to inquire, to doubt, and to differ, they are also free to work together, with the energy and inspiration born of freedom, to overcome their obstacles and achieve their purposes.

These are the goals and principles to which we, as liberals—with a small "l"—subscribe. We may not altogether and always agree on all of the means intended to achieve these purposes. That is our prerogative and our blessing as liberals. But we do pledge ourselves, in the future as in the past, to move toward these objectives, and to move in accordance with basic principles of democracy, and in ways of freedom.

In whatever contests we may be engaged in the future, we will carry these banners, and under them press forward to victory.

Address of Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a very commendable address made by the Governor of Illinois on the occasion of the dedication of Stevenson Field at Farmersville, Ill.:

This is an unusual occasion for me. A governor has many things happen to him—some good, and some not so good—but it isn't every day that he has an athletic field named for him. If my chest expansion seems a little greater today, if I act like a man who is flattered by the honor you have done him, you will understand why and I hope forgive me.

I am well aware that this community enterprise and this celebration today do not represent a tribute to any individual. Rather it seems to me, they are a tribute to everyone in your community and especially those whose leadership—whose courage and vision and energy—were responsible for setting this project in motion. No civic improvement of this kind comes about except through the expenditure of a great deal of mental and physical effort on the part of citizens who might have said, "Why should I bother?" We have here a demonstration of what can be done when enough men and women in a community, even a very small community, are willing to work long enough and hard enough for the things that make for a better town and for a richer community life.

And so I say that in dedicating your new recreational center today you are not just honoring me, you are honoring yourselves. When Reverend Schuette wrote to me several weeks ago asking that I come here today he told me of the origin of this project, how the businessmen of Farmersville had seen the need for this and other improvements, and had formed a businessmen's association to take the initiative in bringing them about. He pointed out that proper facilities for play and organized recreation would be a deterrent to delinquency among the young people of this community. I was much impressed by the sincerity of his written words, and as I read his letter it occurred to me that he was expressing in simple, forceful terms a concept of responsible citizenship which is so vital in our free society, and doubly important in these days when democratic ideals of self-management are being challenged throughout the world.

He was saying in effect that a group of men had met together and decided to make Farmersville a better town. They would do this on their own initiative, using their own resources. They were not appealing to Springfield or Washington, but were setting out to solve their own problems in their own way. This is the community spirit, the self-reliant local action and local pride, which built the towns and cities of America. Here is an object lesson in responsible citizenship in the best American tradition.

I wish that we could have a deep-rooted revival of that type of active, affirmative, citizenship everywhere. The cross-currents of our national life and of world affairs are such that there was never a more urgent need than now for Americans to assume a responsible, individual role in public affairs.

Too often laymen take too lightly, or ignore entirely, their obligations as citizens. Millions fail even to vote, let alone take any active part in the civic affairs of their community, State, or Nation. The word "politics" has too often become an epithet, yet politics is government and government is everybody's business. As our Nation increases in population, as modern life grows more complex, there is danger that control of government will become further and further removed from the people.

This danger takes on added significance when we realize that big government, by comparison with previous standards, is here to stay. Our Government is the largest enterprise on earth. Its greater centralization has been inevitable because of the growing complexity of domestic problems, and because of our enlarged responsibilities in world affairs. The problem now is to keep government from getting so big, so unwieldy, and so powerful that it will get out of the hands of the people. Government in our country must always be the servant of the people, never the master of the people.

The best way to keep that from happening is for us never to lose sight of the fact that while government always will be bigger than it used to be, the people still have it within their power to shape the course of government. They can elect better men and women to public office; they can compel greater efficiency; they can insist upon honesty in government. They can do these things through the power of the ballot, by informing themselves as to men and issues and by expressing themselves in elections—and by taking a more active interest in public affairs between elections.

The fact that we have grown into a nation of great influence, with the highest standard of living for all the people the world has ever known, does not mean that the responsibility of the individual has diminished in any way. The individual citizen still is the cornerstone of our way of life. Vigilant public opinion is still the most potent influence in our democracy.

There is another important way in which the people can counteract the trend toward bigger government, and help keep its control in their hands. That is to combat the tendency to shift responsibility to higher levels of government—from the individual to the local government, from the local government to the State, and from the State to the Federal Government.

We must realize that in the long run we get only what we pay for; we do not get something for nothing in government or in anything else. The more we do for ourselves, the less demand there will be upon government to do it for us. If the communities shift part of their normal responsibilities to the State or Federal Governments, their State or Federal taxes will be higher and their control over the spending of their tax money will be further from their hands. It is as simple as that.

I am not saying that it has not been necessary for the Federal and State Governments to assume responsibility for some of the functions of government formerly performed locally. This has been necessary, for a variety of reasons both social and economic, because some of these problems clearly affected the welfare of all the people and thus transcended local geographical lines.

But because it has been necessary for the Federal and State Governments to step into such fields as public health, social security, welfare, transportation, communications, housing, and the like, it does not follow that the responsibilities of local communities and individuals in those fields have ended. All of these governmental programs require a great deal of local initiative and participation if they are to be effective. Indeed, local obligations have in a real sense increased, because the community which fails to participate, which fails to keep pace with the times, will soon find itself far back in the parade and its young people turning elsewhere when the time comes for them to choose where they are to live and work and rear their families.

Most certainly, if we are to retain strong local government, the communities must look to their own resources for such purely local improvement projects as you have undertaken and those which you have in contemplation for the future. The building of good schools, good streets, adequate playgrounds, hospitals, and the other things that make a good city, is not something for which you can look wholly to others. These things come about through local concern, translated into local action. It always has been that way, and it should be. If you do not take it upon yourselves to do these things, no one else will do them for you.

This, then, is one of two significant signs which I read in what is happening here—a strong and growing sense of citizen responsibility translated into local action. The other sign is perhaps less tangible, but equally important. That is the healthy community attitude which this enterprise reflects toward the problem of law enforcement and the training of your young people to have a wholesome respect for laws and for the rights of others.

Juvenile delinquency, about which we hear so much these days, is not a new problem. It is an old problem, but so much publicity and emphasis have been placed upon it in recent years that we are apt to get the impression that an epidemic of juvenile misbehavior is sweeping the Nation. The national statistics are incomplete and unreliable, but the best available information does not justify any such broad generalization.

Yet we do know that juvenile delinquency is a serious social problem, in big cities and small towns alike. It is also a complicated one with varied aspects, often hidden causes, and certainly with far-reaching consequences. And we also know that delinquency among young people is closely related to the attitude of the community or the neighborhood in which young people live.

If there is respect for law in the community, children naturally develop the same attitude. If parents and other adults indulge in law infractions or are cynically tolerant about the actions of others, children are quick to sense the spirit and join in it. Delinquency rates invariably are highest in communities which have a tradition of lawlessness, and where there is an absence of constructive influences.

Therein, I believe, lies the basic value of this recreational center. It will afford your boys and girls of all ages not only a place where they can expend their natural energies in athletics, but it will demonstrate to them that their parents and their community are really interested in their welfare and in giving them the immeasurable benefits of wholesome childhood and youth. Thus its worth cannot alone be measured in its usefulness today, but in the effect it can have in shaping the lives of your young people for the future. Of course, I frankly confess that I hope that Stevenson field nurtures better athletes than Stevenson. And maybe some better politicians than Stevenson would not hurt us either.

One further point should be mentioned: If this project has the effect of keeping even one boy or girl from a life of crime, if it keeps even one young person out of the State penitentiary, it will have been a good investment. Last year the cost of maintaining the State penal institutions of Illinois was $804.31 per prisoner. To keep one prisoner in the penitentiary for 20 years at that rate, costs the people of Illinois over $16,000. That is to say nothing of the other costs of whatever crime he committed, to the victim or victims of the crime, the cost of his arrest, the prosecution and trial, and the loss of productive years to our society and economy. And so a community playground, recognized by every authority as a constructive influence against juvenile crime, can only be judged a sound investment even by the cold dollars and cents yardstick.

In this instance I hope that it signalizes the beginning of a new and bright era of progress for your community. Only recently you have had the good fortune to become the site of a large new industrial enterprise. This should and no doubt will mean much to this entire area in the years ahead. As you grow in size and economic stature, I hope that you will experience a parallel growth in civic enterprise and the responsibilities of citizenship of which I have been speaking. If you do not do this, and fail to grasp the opportunities within your means, you will have only yourselves to blame. But if you do, you will be building for a sounder, happier future for your children and theirs. And from what I have seen today I am pretty confident that you are on the right track. I congratulate you heartily on what you are doing and wish you all possible success in the months and years ahead. And I am deeply touched by the honor you do me in associating my name with this fine example of community self-betterment.

Address of Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am herewith including an address by the Honorable James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at the Communion Breakfast of the Holy Name Society of St. Anthony's Church, Batavia, N. Y., on Sunday, June 18, 1950:

WE DO BELONG

From the beginning of our history, there has been an attitude of hostility to catholicism among certain people and in certain areas in this Republic. Throughout the nineteenth century this attitude would occasionally flame into violent activity. Yet it has never been a major factor in the United States. Bigotry remained on a minor key—a movement usually associated with backward areas and backward people. This type of anticatholicism has often been linked with prejudice against the Negro and the Jew, but throughout our history it has been rejected by the mass of our people and has remained an annoyance rather than an obstacle to the progress of the faith.

Recently there has appeared a new and potentially more dangerous type of anti-Catholicism. It is found in pseudo-intellectual circles. It has found a spokesman in Paul Blanshard, who has turned it into a best-seller book. This boook claims that Catholics do not belong in the United States; that they are an alien body out of sympathy with her political interests; that they owe their major allegiance abroad; that they profess and seek to impose on all an ethics which is both out of date and contrary to the interest of our people. They are closely controlled by their hierarchy and perverted in their youth by a system of parochial education that does not allow them to see the realities that exist. Woven into this pattern of rather common allegations are the older and more popular charges reminiscent of the books of yesteryear. Blanshard's volume may be called "Maria Monk With Footnotes." It has all the apparatus of scholarship which it employs to argue cleverly some very hackneyed claims.

Lest you think I exaggerate the extent of this debate at present, may I call your attention to an article in the May issue of Harper's, by Daniel W. Brogan, the eminent historian of Cambridge University. Professor Brogan, who is not a Catholic, and is known as a British expert on American history, finds considerable cause for concern in the present attitude toward Catholics of America. Toward this resurgence of anti-Catholic feeling we have several alternatives. We could ignore it, but I do not believe that is wise.

Rather, this morning I would like to make a short excursion into the history of Catholics in the United States. It is this history which both asks and answers the question, "Do we really belong in the United States?" For only if we understand the place and role of Catholics in the history of the country can we feel confident in the face of this new attack.

Little need be said about the early and romantic role of the missionaries and explorers. You who live in upper New York State need not be reminded of the great role played by the Jesuits in bringing the glories of this section to the knowledge of the outside world. In the Midwest, Far West, and the South, the first pioneers of this country were Catholics and often priests. This tremendous effort had some result in winning the attention of Europe to the New World, but the future lay with the English settlements along the Atlantic coast and it was from them that the future Republic was to spring. In those colonies Catholicism was only a fragment, ordinarily discriminated against. Yet there was a core of Catholics in Maryland and a few groups elsewhere.

Everything in the history of America appeals to the European as incredible, from the writing of the Constitution to the airlift and the Marshall plan. Americans have never ceased to be a thing of wonder to those across the seas. It is a marvelous story, but one of the most spectacular features of it is the development of a Catholic church from these humble beginnings. Catholics came into this country as poor immigrants, into an atmosphere that was originally hostile, and they derived from many different nations and spoke many different tongues—yet from these weak elements there has been forged the magnificent body of 27,000,000 adherents that has won the respect of many and the sharp hostility of some.

Catholics played an important role in the American Revolution, beyond what one could expect from their numbers, and there was a decided improvement in the attitude toward them as a consequence. In 1783, the year of the Peace of Paris, it is estimated that there were 15,800 in Maryland, 7,000 in Pennsylvania, 1,500 in New York, and 200 in Virginia. Beyond these small concentrations many Catholics who had come into the New World had been lost to the faith. Catholics then represented about 25,000 out of the 4,000,000 people in the newly freed Colonies. They were served by 24 priests, all of them in Maryland and Pennsylvania; all of them Jesuits before the suppression of the society. Eleven were native Marylanders, five English, five German, and three from other European countries.

It is curious that an ecclesiastical organization was set up for these scattered bodies of Catholics before a political organization was achieved by the successful revolutionaries. In 1774 John Carroll was made Prefect Apostolic with jurisdiction over all Catholics in the newly liberated land. In 1789 he was made Bishop of Baltimore and all the United States. We have been singularly blessed in many aspects of our history but nothing was more fortunate than the selection of the first bishop of the new republic, who has given a definite tone to all our subsequent development. John Carroll came from a distinguished American family which was closely identified with the Revolution. He himself, had been sent to Quebec as a negotiator during the course of the war. He was known to Washington who admired him and he was a great friend of Benjamin Franklin. He was a sincere democrat who felt that the interests of religion could best be served in an atmosphere of freedom. Admired by all his contemporaries, he laid a solid foundation for the future of the church.

From the time of Carroll to today, four general characteristics can be discovered in

regard to Catholics in the United States: They fitted into the new republic and democratic temper of the United States. The history of America is distinctive in that there has been no conflict between the church and state in this country. From the beginning, Catholics became full supporters of the democratic institutions. Bishop Carroll himself insisted, before accepting nomination as bishop, on an election among his fellow priests. Out of the 29 signers of the Constitution 2 were Catholics, Charles Carroll and John Fitzsimmons; three Catholics were elected to the First Congress and these played an important role in the formation of the Bill of Rights. When the Bill of Rights appeared as a result of the work of the First Congress, Bishop Carroll delivered a strong affirmation of this charter of American liberties.

This devotion to the political ideas of the new country was characteristic of Catholics throughout our history. It was noted by Alexis de Tocqueville, who visited this country in 1831. De Tocqueville's two volumes, Democracy in America, are still considered the most perceptive story on the political foundations of our country that has yet appeared. This nineteenth-century Frenchman visited America with a burning curiosity to discover the ways of democracy. He was deeply interested in the relations of religion to this new political form. His work has much to say about Catholics in America. He noted that there were more than 1,000,000 Catholics in the United States and he declared that they were the most stanchly democratic element in the Republic. He found them devoted to their religious duties and equally enthusiastic about the freedom that existed in the New World. This enthusiasm was found both in the clergy and laity. He tells the story of attending a mass meeting arranged by Catholics in New York City in 1831, in favor of the Polish revolutionaries who were then in revolt against the Russian Czar. The meeting was opened by a priest who asked God "who helped us triumph over hateful oppression" to give the same rights and freedom to the Poles. He concluded, "Arouse the French Nation from the apathy in which its rulers retain it, that it may go forth again to fight for the liberties of the world."

De Tocqueville observed that in no country did the Christian religion retain a greater influence over the souls of men than in America. All clergymen are devoted to civil liberty, and while remaining aloof from party strife, they exert enormous moral influence over public affairs. All Americans are agreed that religion is indispensable for republican institutions, and an attack upon religion would gain no popular support. Those in France who attack religion do not act in the interest of democracy: for despostism may govern without faith, but liberty cannot. Democracy without religion would be impossible. And while European nations who do not enjoy liberty are sunk in unbelief, in America one of the freest and most-enlightened nations in the world, the people fulfill with fervor all the outward duties of religion.

In the early period the scattered groups of American Catholics were completely dependent on their coreligionists abroad both for funds and for clergy. It was France that provided the major help to the struggling American church. During the course of the French Revolution a considerable number of emigre clergy made their way to the new land and provided some of the outstanding leaders of the American church In 1801 there appeared the following advertisement in a French newspaper for the American mission: "We offer you: no salary; no recompense; no holidays; no pension. But: much hard work; a poor dwelling; few consolations; many disappointments; frequent sickness; a violent or lonely death; an unknown grave." The extraordinary fact was that the advertisement was successful.

Even more important was the missionary aspect of the American clergy. Bishop Carroll was one of the earliest American figures to capture the vision of the indefinite American expansion across the continent. He foresaw that some day the new Nation would expand westward and was anxious to provide clergy for the settlers who were beginning to pour across the Appalachians. As early as 1785 priests were sent across the mountains to Kentucky. The diocese of Bardstown was the first settlement in the west and Bishop Flaget went there in 1808. He traveled by foot and on horse, and arrived there to find a few log cabins that were used as chapels for his scattered flock. A friend of his in France had sent him as a gift a French cookbook on the occasion of his consecration. The good bishop wrote a letter of thanks after arriving at his new diocese, which included all the territories of the West. "He was grateful," he said, "for the cookbook but it was hardly a practical gift to a man who had no bed, no home and none of the materials for a comfortable existence." Yet, by 1850 his diocese was divided and a new See established at Vincennes in Indiana under Bishop Bruete. Almost as early as the pioneers spread westward new dioceses were established. The importance of this is obvious. We might have remained a small body along the Atlantic seaboard had it not been for the vision of these men who made enormous sacrifices out of limited means to expand the church westward.

One other interesting aspect of the American church has been the important role played by women. The Ursulines were established in New Orleans at the very beginning of the colony. Bishop Carroll arranged for several religious orders to be established in the new States on the Atlantic seaboard, and from the very beginning these dedicated women were active in providing educational and social services. The conversion and activities of Mother Seton created a distinctively American community, the Sisters of Charity. They were of inestimable assistance in building a pioneer church. As Catholics spread westward, the nuns followed. One of the most interesting biographies of recent years was published by Scribners and related to the extraordinary story of Sister Blandina. This young nun, who had come from Italy in the years before the Civil War, went with a few of her companions to Kansas. At a time when medical facilities and even doctors were totally absent, this courageous woman established a whole series of hospitals, moving ever westward with the tide of population. Some of the finest medical establishments along the Santa Fe trail owe their origin to this pioneer woman. In the city of Washington there is a magnificent statue, "Nuns on the Battlefield," constructed by a grateful republic to commemorate the humanitarian services of the religious orders of women who nursed the wounded and provided hospital care during the Civil War.

While the original Catholics were largely of British stock they were reenforced by successive waves of immigration from the Old World. Each of these national groups contributed something very vital to the ensemble of American Catholicism. While there were inevitable frictions, on the whole the various national bodies managed to merge harmoniously and to produce in this country a church that was truly Catholic in the sense that it was made of men of all nations. In this respect the Catholic Church in the United States more actively reflects the general cosmopolitan character of people than any other religious body.

Unlike certain European countries, the Catholic Church in the United States has never lost the loyalty and affection of the workingman. Preeminently an emigrant church, it was always the church of the poor and even the location of its buildings indicates the overwhelming predominance of laboring men in its ranks. Catholic leaders played a major role in the formation of the labor movement in this country and still provide a major proportion of its leadership. These men have been able to retain their Catholic faith as they endeavored to improve the economic conditions of their fellow laborers. Only once in this country has there been danger of divorce between labor and Catholicism which has been characteristic of many European lands. During the rise of the Knights of Labor the Archbishop of Quebec petitioned Rome to condemn the group as a secret society. The American hierarchy, led by its great spokesman, Cardinal Gibbons, again took the side of the labor organization. Gibbons traveled to Rome personally, interceded with the Pope, and managed to prevent any condemnation. More than that, it is generally conceded that Gibbons' defense of labor organizations played an important part in the preparation for the great encyclical of 1891.

It is clear that American Catholicism has been perfectly at home in this great land. It is a defensible proposition that were one to choose one's role in the long course of human history one might prefer to be a Catholic and an American in the twentieth century. Our advantages as Catholics are obvious. Catholicism gives us a philosophy and purpose in life that permits us to live in peace with our fellowmen and to observe the eternal law of God. It is of great importance for us that we preserve this twofold heritage and hand on to our children the same great objectives that are ours. In order to do so, two practical suggestions might be made: We must be conscious of our advantages and of the fundamental teaching of our faith. A national magazine occasionally ribs modern advertising under the heading: "What is it selling?" It gives some specimens of contemporary advertising, humorously pointing out how hard it is to decide the objective of the display. We must know what we are selling—the fundamental purpose of this great material structure that is American Catholicism.

We must win moderate opinion to a reasonable appreciation of our role in America. The vast majority of our fellow Americans are reasonable and unprejudiced men. They have forever resisted appeals to bigotry. We can be confident in this judgment provided we demonstrate to them both historically and by our conduct the value of our ideals. I believe we should discard the term "those outside the church," because it carries the implication that those who do not agree with us can all be lumped together. We must distinguish between the vast body which is fair and the few who descend to bigot attacks upon us.

The record of World War II sparkles with heroic proofs that the Catholic who is true to his faith is, for that very reason, all the more true to his country. Many such proofs are known to all. Here is one that may not be so familiar: Father Conway was a young priest in Philadelphia who had spent his 5 years in the ministry in working with the boys of his parish. He entered the naval service as a chaplain immediately after Pearl Harbor, and after his training period he was assigned to the Marines. His division was chosen to take the beachhead at Saipan, and Father Conway went in with the first wave. As the troops hit the beach the other divisional Catholic chaplain, who was with his men a half mile down the beach, noted that the landing barge which contained Father Conway had been hit by a direct shell from a hidden Japanese battery. The other priest knew that Father Conway was carrying the Blessed Sacrament and ran up the beach under fire to see if he could be

of help. When he arrived at the destroyed barge there was nothing but a mass of human pulp. He could not even find a body which he could anoint with the oil of Extreme Unction. Looking around the area, he did find, about a hundred yards away, a black mass kit with the hand of Father Conway, severed at the wrist, still clutching the instruments of his sacred calling.

We do belong.

People of Norway Welcome Mrs. F. D. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robley Cramer, of the Minneapolis Labor Review, under date of June 15, 1950:

MRS. ROOSEVELT UNVEILING STATUE SAYS SYMBOLIZES UNITED STATES-NORWEGIAN FRIENDSHIP

(By Robley Cramer)

At Oslo, Norway, on June 7, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt unveiled a granite statue of her late husband, the greatest of all Americans and the most outstanding leader of World War II, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

This statue showing the high esteem in which Franklin Delano Roosevelt is held by the people of Norway as he is by the vast majority of Americans and of people all over the world, was being unveiled in Norway at the very time that the smear artists and the mush interests of the United States were conniving, conspiring, and framing to besmirch the memory of this grandest of all Americans.

As Mrs. Roosevelt pulled a cord that disclosed the sculpture of the late President Roosevelt, 30,000 persons including 78-year-old King Haakon and longshoremen on flag-decorated ships, stood in silence while a band played Hail to the Chief.

This event that marked the close friendship existing between the people of Norway and the people of the United States has been practically suppressed by the press of the United States.

Even the New York Times that usually leads in gathering and presenting the news in a manner commensurate with its importance, put a scant half-column story of this event of momentous world importance on an inside page.

This, the most prominent mention given to the unveiling of the statue, appeared to be the most space given this important event by any daily so-called newspaper.

The ceremony at the unveiling was impressive but simple. The statue shows F. D. R. sitting with a scroll of the Atlantic Charter in his hand.

This task is as superfluous as "trying to introduce the rising sun," said United States Ambassador Charles U. Bay in presenting Mrs. Roosevelt.

Mrs. Roosevelt expressed her deep gratitude to the Norwegian peopple for having so honored the memory of her husband. "I hope that the statue will always stand as a symbol of the cooperation and brotherhood of the people of the United States and the people of Norway," Mrs. Roosevelt declared. "And as an everlasting evidence of their devotion to that inspiring ideal of justice and freedom for all," Mrs. Roosevelt added.

It was apparent that Mrs. Roosevelt was deeply affected by the warmth of the welcome she had received from the Norwegian people as she told her appreciation of the site of the monument which makes it overlook the harbor of Oslo as it is located before the walls of the fortress of Akershus.

The monument stands about 50 feet over the side of the quay and discloses President Roosevelt in a customary position with a cape flung on his shoulder as he looks to the west over the fjord of Oslo.

Before the statue was unveiled, Crown Prince Olaf, who was designated high patron of the memorial committee, spoke about his personal friendship for President Roosevelt and lauded him in the most glowing terms as a great benefactor of humanity.

Mrs. Roosevelt was seated with King Haakon and Prince Olaf during the program.

The esteem in which the people of Norway held F. D. R. and the love and devotion which they felt for him wee beautifully shown by Chief Justice Paal Bergformer of the Norwegian Supreme Court who was chairman of the memorial committee.

The chief justice committed the monument to the eternal care of the city of Oslo. On behalf of the people of Oslo, Mayor H. E. Stokke, in eloquent remarks accepted the charge.

The statue was sculptured from khaki-tinted Norwegian granite and is somewhat larger than life size. The sculptor is Stinius Fredriksen, one of the most famous of the famed Norwegian sculptors. He did the statue as the result of winning a public contest to determine who the sculptor should be in 1947.

Maintenance of Peace in the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1950.

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TAURIELLO: The joint declaration by the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, relative to the Near East, which was made public by the President on May 25, is a significant document which may lead to the establishment of peaceful relationship between Israel and its Arab neighbors if honestly carried out.

Your kind and effective cooperation in urging our State Department to take action for the purpose of promoting peace and tranquillity in the Near East is deeply appreciated.

The said declaration, as I analyze it, contains the following points:

1. For the first time in modern history the Big Three, the United States of America, England, and France, agreed on concerted and coordinated action in that sensitive region of the world—the Near East. It is a wholesome substitute for the pursuit of the hitherto policy of unilateral action resulting very often in conflicting action. It imposes collective responsibility.

2. The calling for a pledge on the Arab countries and Israel to refrain from any and every aggressive or warlike action against one another as a condition precedent to the future delivery of arms should serve to discourage the Arab warmongers.

3. The pledge by the Big Three to place Israel in a condition of equality and parity with the Arab states with reference to delivery of arms, and the establishment of a balance of arms between them, if honestly carried out, should serve as an encouragement toward establishment of permanent peace between the Arab states and Israel.

4. The unequivocal declaration by the Big Three of their "opposition to the development of an arms race between the Arab states and Israel" implies a policy of vigilant watchfulness obligating the Big Three to stop the shipment of arms whenever the threat of such an arms race manifests itself.

5. The Big Three pledged themselves to take immediate and joint action whenever and wherever a threat to peace in that section of the world may appear. They agreed to take such joint action within and outside the United Nations. The term "outside" is most decisive. It implies speedy and prompt action by the Big Three to prevent a threat of aggression from being converted into actual aggression.

Like any other similar document this declaration will not execute itself. It is as strong as the reliability of its authors and no more.

We assume and we must assume that the Big Three—the United States, England, and France—acted and will continue to act in good faith.

However, in the light of past sad experiences and disappointments, we must rely upon the vigilance of the friends of Israel like your good self to see to it that the Department of State carries out honestly the terms of the said Big Three declaration.

As you well know, the past record of the Near East Division of our Department of State is one of unfriendliness to Israel. The Bevin line dominated.

Your noble services to the cause of Israel will always be remembered. The Jewish people are a grateful people; they never forget their friends.

You, dear Congressman, have proven yourself to be a true and tested friend.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes.

Sincerely,

ELIHU D. STONE.

Half Wish To Leave England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the following editorial from the Winchester Evening Star of Winchester, Va.:

HALF WISH TO LEAVE ENGLAND

A recent survey by the British Institute of Public Opinion indicates that 48 percent of British adults under the age of 30 would like to leave England and settle in another country. The majority of older people, those over 30, say they are content to remain in England.

Oh, for the glories of socialism. The Socialists have been in power for 5 years and apparently 48 percent of the young people would like to leave their homeland and settle elsewhere. Could it be that the young men and women of England feel that their

liberty and individual initiative is being destroyed and that the fruits of regimentation are not as sweet as the Socialist leaders have led them to believe?

Concerning present-day England, the London Times writes:

"In England today there is no incentive to bold undertakings. Today it is safer to be a bureaucrat than a maker, and the young men know it. Socialism is competition without prizes, boredom without hope, war without victory, and statistics without end. It takes the heart out of young men. It is not only politically false, but morally destructive."

Social Security, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial taken from today's New York Times:

SOCIAL SECURITY, 1950

Nine months ago the House of Representatives expressed its conviction in no uncertain terms that the Social Security Act of 1935 was inadequate to meet present-day needs. It passed a bill designed to remedy this situation, in part at least, by the one-sided margin of 333 to 14. The Senate has now demonstrated that it fully shares the attitude of the House on this question by passing a companion measure with only two dissenting votes.

The most obvious shortcomings of the old-age insurance system, it has long been recognized, have been the low level of benefits provided and the incompleteness of its coverage. The average benefit payable under the 1935 law is $26 a month. That figure was too low even when measured in terms of the dollar of 15 years ago. It is pitifully insufficient today, with living costs 70 percent higher than they were in 1935. These defects in the system have had much to do with the rise of our jerry-built system of old-age assistance, financed jointly by Federal, State, and local governments, and differing only in minor respects from home relief. They have also accounted in considerable measure for the spawning of some 10,000 private pension plans by industry in recent years. While the public has nothing to say about the form that such plans shall take, it is the public, of course, which in the last analysis has to support them.

While the House and Senate bills look in the same direction, they differ in a number of important details, and these differences will have to be adjusted in conference committee. In the matter of benefits, about 3,000,000 workers now retired would see their monthly checks from the OAIS increased under the Senate bill by an average of 90 percent. The average primary benefit—payable to the retired worker without dependents—would be stepped up from the present $26 to $49. (This compares with an increase in the House bill of about 70 percent.) For persons retiring in the future, alternative formulas are provided, but here, too, the benefits would be roughly double those paid at the present time. The Senate bill provides coverage for self-employed persons as a general proposition. Such workers would pay a rate of 2¼ percent. Specifically exempted from such coverage, however, would be such groups as doctors, lawyers, engineers, and similar categories.

In addition to its more obvious deficiencies in the way of benefits and coverage, the 1935 law suffers from the depression psychology which obtained at the time of its enactment. The principal evidence of this is the fact that it tended to put a premium on the early and complete retirement of the worker. Thus, it provided that a retired worker would have to forfeit his benefits if he earned as much as $15 a month. The new Senate bill concurs with the House measure in raising this figure to $50.

At present workers covered by the OAIS are taxed only on the first $3,000 of annual income. Both the Senate and the House bills would raise this base to $3,600. The two measures differ, however, on how much the tax rate should go up, and when the rise should be introduced. The House measure would increase the rate from the present 1½ percent for employer and worker to 2 percent effective January 1951. The Senate, on the other hand, would freeze the rate at the present level until 1956. Even if the mark-up in the tax rate is deferred, however, the advance from $3,000 to $3,600 in the income base means a rise of the individual's tax liability from the existing $45 to $54 a year.

More important than the specific provisions of the two bills now passed is the evidence brought out in the debates on the legislation that congressional leaders do not regard the changes now provided as representing in any sense the last word on the subject. Along with its own bill the Senate this week passed a resolution providing $25,000 for the Senate Finance Committee to make a study of further social-security revision. The wording of this resolution reflects a very real awareness of the ultimate desirability of a social-security system which would emphasize universal coverage on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Address of Brig. Gen. Julius Klein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, at a recent dinner commemorating the fifty-fifth anniversary of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, its past national commander, Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, and other distinguished American citizens paid tribute to a great American, Mr. Louis B. Mayer. Mr. Mayer was guest of honor and recipient of the gold medal of merit of that organization in recognition of his distinguished service on behalf of world understanding of America and the American way of life. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks by Brig. Gen. Julius Klein:

Mr. Johnston, I know your inspiring message will live with us for many years to come. Your Eminence, distinguished guests, we are all deeply inspired by the invocation given to us by a Prince of His great church, His Eminence, Cardinal Spellman. I believe the prayer that he delivered here tonight will be inscribed in our records and will be repeated and repeated for many generations to come like the beautiful prayer written at Iwo Jima by the chaplain of our faith, Rabbi Gittelson. Those two prayers, I am sure, will become popular with veterans wherever they are. We are grateful to His Eminence for being with us tonight. We are not unmindful during the crucial days, to tell our people in the Old World the Holy Father raised his voice in protest against the Hitler terror. We're not unmindful of his late colleague, Carl von Faulhaber, Archbishop of Munich, and head of the Catholic Church in Germany, who never failed to raise his voice against the tyranny and dictatorship of Hitler's regime. We are grateful to His Eminence for being with us tonight. My comrades, this is a very pleasant occasion for me. During the evening, I shall have the pleasure of presenting to you, those who are sitting in front of you, citizens who represent various parties and branches of our Government, and of our Armed Forces.

It is a great thrill as an old soldier, and as a veteran to stand before my fellow comrades of all faiths, and as a spokesman of 800,000 comrades of our faith, to have the pleasant mission of presenting the highest honor of the Jewish War Veterans to one who has earned many high honors in the past. We have received scores of beautiful messages. I desire to read a few at this time:

Former President Hoover wires: "Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, N. Y. I regret a long-standing public engagement prevents me from attending the tribute to my old friend Louis B. Mayer. I wish to join in all good words about him. He is all good."

Gen. Douglas MacArthur cables: "Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, N. Y. When you acclaim Louis Mayer please add my voice. The great of the earth come and go—some recognized—some not. I am glad your distinguished organization did not fail in its judgment tonight."

The Honorable Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, writes:

APRIL 6, 1950.

General JULIUS KLEIN,
Chicago, Ill.

MY DEAR GENERAL: It is with a good deal of regret that I am unable to accept your invitation to join you in honoring Mr. Louis B. Mayer on April 12 at the Waldorf when Louis Mayer will receive the Medal of Merit of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

Unfortunately, on that day the President is entertaining the President of Chile, and I am, of course, committed for that dinner here in Washington.

Louis Mayer is a great and loyal American. He has contributed much to the cause of America, and specifically to the cause of defense. I would be with you except for the commitment here. Please give to Louis Mayer my affectionate greetings, and say that the honor being paid him is well deserved.

With kindest personal regards, believe me,

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS JOHNSON,
Secretary of Defense.

The Honorable ROBERT A. TAFT, United States Senator from Ohio, wires: "Brig. Gen. Julius Klein, Jewish War Veteran of the United States, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, N. Y.: Urgent official business here in Washington keeps me here. Regret it is impossible for me to be with you tonight. Mr. Mayer richly deserves the award which has been tendered him by JWV of United States in recognition of his continuous contribution to the comprehension of American principles by means of dissemination of these principles and ideals throughout the world through the medium of motion pictures. I wish you would extend my congratulations to him and also tell him I am sorry I cannot be with him and his many friends on this occasion. I also wish you would extend my

good wishes to your distinguished guest, His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman."

Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, writes:

MARCH 7, 1950.

Mr. JACKSON J. HOLTZ,
National Commander, Jewish War Veterans, United States of America, New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. HOLTZ: I am delighted to learn that Mr. Louis B. Mayer is to be awarded the 1950 gold medal of merit of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, in recognition of his contributions to the American motion-picture industry. Like so many industries which are a part and parcel of the American way of life, the movies are financed and operated by private funds. Nevertheless, they are among the best ambassadors for democracy we have. For in a way of their own, they bring a breath of America to the peoples of other lands.

As one of the outstanding leaders of that industry, Mr. Mayer has always been identified as a champion of the American way of life and the free dissemination of democratic principles and ideals.

I should be grateful if you would tender him this message of my appreciation for his accomplishments.

With all good wishes to you both for continued success.

Sincerely,

OMAR N. BRADLEY,
General, United States Army.

Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Chief of Staff of the United States Army writes:

APRIL 12, 1950.

JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, N. Y.:

It is a pleasure to send heartiest congratulations to Mr. Louis B. Mayer on the occasion of his receiving the 1950 Gold Medal of Merit of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

Mr. Mayer and the industry which he so outstandingly represents have made great contributions to the Army and to our country, and I am happy to add my thanks to those of the many others joining to pay him this tribute.

J. LAWTON COLLINS,
General, United States Army.

Fleet Adm. C. W. Nimitz wires:

"Brig. Gen. JULIUS KLEIN,
"Jewish War Veterans,
Waldorf-Astoria Hotel,
New York, N. Y.:

"The motion-picture industry of America is one of the most effective mediums for promoting world understanding of our concepts of democracy and the ideas and ideals of a free and democratic form of government. Along with this great opportunity goes the responsibility of fostering friendship and good will between peoples and nations. Through the astute and far-sighted leadership as exemplified by the distinguised and beloved Louis B. Mayer, this challenge has been accepted and material progress has been effected.

"I take this opportunity to extend to a great American my heartiest congratulations on the signal and well-deserved honor accorded him tonight.

"Fleet Adm. C. W. NIMITZ."

Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, United States Air Force, retired, wires:

"Mr. LOUIS B. MAYER,
"Jewish War Veterans of the United States,
Waldorf-Astoria Hotel,
New York, N. Y.:

"The Jewish War Veterans of the United States selected wisely in awarding you its gold medal of merit for 1950.

"The motion-picture industry, which is indebted to you for many of its advancements, has an outstanding record of achievement in World War II and is continuing to serve the country by keeping American informed and alert to world conditions. Through the motion picture, the advantages of our democratic way of life are vividly portrayed to thousands of freedom-loving peoples around the globe. Your contributions to this great industry have helped to make this possible.

"Best wishes.

"CARL A. SPAATZ,
"General, USAF, Retired."

Mr. William Randolph Hearst wires:

"L. B. MAYER,
"Care of Julius Klein,
Jewish War Veterans,
Waldorf-Astoria, New York, N. Y.

"DEAR MR. MAYER: I wish to congratulate you on receiving the distinguished honor of the Gold Medal of Merit and congratulate the Jewish War Veterans on having so notable a representative. I am sure you will have a glorious evening.

"Sincerely,

"WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST."

His Excellency, E. N. van Kleffens, Ambassador of the Netherlands Government to the United States wires:

"Brig. Gen. JULIUS KLEIN,
"Jewish War Veterans, Suite 100,
50 West Seventy-Seventh Street,
New York, N. Y.:

"The arrival in Washington of a deputation of Netherlands shipping interests makes it necessary for me to be here in Washington and Wednesday. To my greatest sorrow this prevents me from having the pleasure of joining you at dinner that evening. I regret this all the more since Mr. Louis Mayer was such a kind host to the Prince of the Netherlands during his recent stay in Los Angeles. May I ask you to be so good as to express my regrets to all concerned at being thus unexpectedly prevented from attending.

"KLEFFENS.
"Netherlands Ambassador."

The Honorable IRVING M. IVES, United States Senator from New York wires:

"Brig. Gen. JULIUS KLEIN,
"Jewish War Veterans of the United States,
Waldorf-Astoria Hotel,
New York, N. Y.:

"I regret exceedingly my inability to be with you this evening to join in paying tribute to Louis B. Mayer. I do appreciate, however, the opportunity to express my long time and earnest admiration of the eminent and distinguished contribution which Mr. Mayer has made to a fuller comprehension of American life. It is not easy to entertain and it is difficult, much more difficult to entertain so wholesomely and rewardingly in the medium which Mr. Mayer has selected. For this reason I am gratified to salute Mr. Mayer on this occasion. May his work and his health and his success continue undiminished in the future. With kind personal regards, I am,

"IRVING M. IVES,
"United States Senator."

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I have the great privilege of introducing one of Mr. Louis B. Mayer's devoted friends and admirers, a statesman of high caliber who adds great distinction to our Congress, the Honorable EDWIN C. JOHNSON, United States Senator from Colorado, who has been kind enough to come here to witness the tribute paid Mr. Louis B. Mayer by the Jewish War Veterans and to add his own tribute. I give you Senator JOHNSON. [Applause.]

Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON. I congratulate the Jewish War Veterans on their choice of a distinguished American to whom to present the badge of merit tonight. And I congratulate the Honorable Louis B. Mayer, the recipient of the honors and tributes of this splendid patriotic military organization for his worthiness to receive them.

During the past weeks, I have thought it necessary to say some ugly things about Hollywood. I have wanted Hollywood to assume its tremendous responsibilities in this hectic world.

Always I admire the pastors of our churches and the educators in our schools who are mankind's greatest benefactors. But the artists in our films are great educational leaders too, if they only realize it. They reach millions and influence them greatly. Millions of impressionable youth adore and emulate the film stars.

Motion pictures have been the life's work of Louis B. Mayer. From the first he has been a stalwart proponent of wholesome films which will lead mankind further up the scale of righteous thinking and righteous living.

There is nothing wrong with Hollywood today which more Louis B. Mayers in that industry would not cure.

Louis B. Mayer, I salute you as one of God's rare gifts to a troubled world.

General KLEIN. Thank you Senator EDWIN JOHNSON. I concur, as does everyone in this hall and the American people, with your words. I should like to amend your remarks, however, with your permission, of course, that not only the film industry but the country could do with a few more Louis B. Mayers.

It is now my great privilege, ladies and gentlemen, to call upon a great friend of mine and a great friend of Mr. Mayer; another distinguished Member of the United States Senate who wishes to add his tribute to our guest of honor.

As a matter of fact, this distinguished statesman had no idea he was going to be called upon to speak. He came here only as a guest, to witness the tribute paid Mr. Mayer. I am sure, however, that he welcomes the opportunity to add his accolade to those already presented and to tell us what he sincerely thinks about the number one man in the film industry. I have the pleasure to present to you the Honorable OWEN BREWSTER, United States Senator from Maine.

Senator OWEN BREWSTER. Mr. Toastmaster, Your Eminence, and Mayer friends, Greek cities vied for Homer dead, through which Homer living begged his bread.

Here tonight, however, Americans everywhere claim a share in Louis B. Mayer.

There is scarcely a home in America that has not been affected by the standards of entertainment established by our distinguished guest.

While Maine is farthest removed from California, the State of Maine yet claims priority as being the first United States soil upon which Louis B. Mayer set foot when he came to this land of curs as a country boy.

Whether or not the motion picture industry shall elevate or debase mankind is the continuing struggle between the better and the worse elements in this great enterprise. No influence has been more pronounced on the side of good in the movie industry than the one who is honored by the Jewish War Veterans here tonight.

The presence of His Eminence Cardinal Spellman, is sufficient testimony to the uplifting influence of our honored guest, because of the staunch stand of the church against the desecration of this great medium to the debauchery of mankind.

American has grown into a more and more united land as we have laughed and wept together before the magic of the screen.

No strain upon our imagination is required to see the contribution which may be made to world-wide unity and peace.

The rest of the world can come to know America as it really is with its unfolding revelation of the brotherhood of man and the Fatherhood of God.

Mankind will not be saved by bullets and bayonets nor by diplomatic doubletalk but rather by the heart-felt sympathy and understanding that will flow from mutual sharing of our sorrows and our joys.

Divine dispensation will be revealed in the humanity of man.

In this growing understanding the moving picture is playing a vital role.

Louis B. Mayer long ago saw the vision of its possibilities and has converted this vision into a reality that will forever serve.

Wars will cease and the brotherhood of man be established as we come to recognize the humanity and humility that is common to us all.

The vast range of interests that revolve about the life of our honored guest have never taken away his common touch nor his profound interest in the welfare of his country and the world.

The life of Louis B. Mayer may well serve as an inspiration for the youth of all the world.

Leadership to better things is the crying need of the world today. To lead and not to drive is the lifeblood of our free institutions.

The leaders in our various enterprises are the beacons of a better day.

We see in them the better self we seek ourselves to be.

In the words of one of the great Jews of all time—some of us believe the greatest man that ever lived and the very embodiment of the divine—I, if I be lifted up, shall draw all men unto me.

Draw, not drive, is the story of the life of Louis Mayer and the ideal we may all seek to embody.

As General Klein so aptly expressed it, it is a great thrill to be able to present the highest honor of the Jewish War Veterans to one who has earned so many honors in the past. We who are Mr. Mayer's close and devoted friends gathered here to pay him tribute should not withhold our gratitude to General Klein, past national commander of the Jewish War Veterans, for his devotion to this outstanding organization, and his untiring work to make this evening the brilliant success it is.

All thoughtful Americans are profoundly grateful to the Jewish War Veterans for this fitting recognition of one of the great Americans of our time.

General KLEIN. Now, Mr. Mayer, we come to the most important phase of the evening. The Gold Medal of Merit, the highest distinction that our organization has to offer, has very rarely been awarded in the last 55 years to a private citizen, Mr. Mayer. You are now in the company of such illustrious men of American history as Teddy Roosevelt, General Pershing, Woodrow Wilson, Admiral Sims, and a soldier's general of World War II, Gen. Omar N. Bradley. Mr. Mayer, I am keenly aware of this great privilege. I've enjoyed being your friend for more than 25 years, but tonight I experience with you one of the greatest thrills of my life. You have earned this award. We are proud to give it to you. In honoring you we are honoring ourselves, and may the good Lord bless and keep you for many years to come, so that this great Nation of ours can continue to benefit by your leadership.

Mr. Mayer, it becomes now my privilege to read to you the citation on which the award of the Jewish War Veterans for the 1950 Medal of Merit dictates:

"The Gold Medal of Merit of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America to Louis B. Mayer for distinguished service in behalf of world understanding of America and the American way of life. An outstanding exponent of American freedoms, an unwavering foe of all who would assail this Nation's liberties, Louis B. Mayer has provided distinguished leadership in the growth and progress of a free American industry which has brought wholesome entertainment, education, and inspiration to the world's millions and has served as one of the great channels for international dissemination of American ideals and principles.

"Awarded April 12, 1950.

"JACKSON J. HOLTZ,
"National Commander."

Lynn Centennial Solemn Mass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a sermon delivered by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Cornelius T. H. Sherlock, superintendent of schools of the archdiocese of Boston during the centennial solemn Mass of Thanksgiving in St. Mary's Church, Lynn, Mass., Sunday, June 11, 1950:

It is impossible for me to start any address from this pulpit without expressing, briefly, at least, my immeasurable joy in being with you. In this city and in this very parish I spent 16 of the most pleasant years of my life. Returning is like coming home, home to the loved pastor and dean who guided me, through my infant days in the priesthood and became the companion of my later years, home to priests whose qualities stood far above the crowd, the sharers of my priestly work and priestly joys. It is coming home to sisters and pupils, to men and women whose kindness to me is graven deep in my heart, quite beyond the power of time to erase.

We have gathered this morning to celebrate the completion of 100 years of history, a century in the story of the incorporated city of Lynn. Our hearts are filled with joy, and overflowing with happiness that a great city, moving forward through the decades, now stands fair and, thus far secure, at the gateway of its second century. The joy and exultation is quite in order but there are serious aspects to our observance. The time is one of appraisal as well as of celebration. The moment calls for consolidating our thinking as well as singing the joys of the occasion.

Have you ever sat down to wonder how it is we have cities and States and governments? It might be well for us to conjecture a little as to how governments came into existence.

We have a saying that man is a social animal. That is a very inadequate definition of man. It disregards the fact that man has a soul as well as a body, that he is made on a pattern that is divine as well as human, and that he has a destiny that transcends this world. At the same time the definition does describe man in part. He is a social animal.

MAN NEEDS FULL SOCIETY

We can easily think of man as he appears in a family—father, mother, and children. The more we look at man, however, the more we see that he was never meant to live alone. He has physical needs. The little family group is not equipped to withstand the attacks of enemies. Man needs friends, if for nothing else than for protection. But man by his nature has mental powers, beyond the mere animal. He thinks and reasons. Communication is a natural development of man. He needs friends with whom to exchange thoughts. Man has a conscience and spiritual needs that are fulfilled in a society, larger and higher than the family.

And so it is that we find man naturally seeking the society of his fellows, banding together with his neighbors to form the State, a higher and stronger society than the family unit.

However, in the family a certain unity was obtained because the father, by the nature of the family, held an authority to protect and direct the group. In the state it was likewise necessary that there be someone (or several) above the others who might bear the burden of government and might have the authority to govern. No society can hold together unless this authority be strong and clear. So we say that the people by one device or another, choose a ruler or official, and then that God gave the ruler the authority to govern.

The Catholic holds that government has its strength in no mere contract, a handing over of authority by people to a ruler, nor on the other hand that the one governing rules by any divine right, but rather, that the officials, being properly appointed, God gives them the right and authority to govern for the common good.

This is a very important point for Catholics to understand. There are those around us who hold that we should be good citizens because of some implied agreement of ours, that as a matter of honor or decency we should obey the laws. Some hold that government at best is a convention entered into for mutual advantage and that it is fitting that we conform to governmental regulation.

That we feel is inadequate. The fact is that actually we have no choice but to be good citizens in every sense because it is God's authority that is being exercised by officials of government. On the other hand we hold that government responsibility is no mere following of man-made laws in the administration of the city or state but a tremendous responsibility directed by the laws of God from whom all power derives.

IMPRESSION MORE THAN FINANCIAL

I have often meditated upon the values of your Catholic schools in the life of the community. Here, for example, about one-third of the children and youth of elementary and secondary school age are in Catholic schools. Those who are financially minded think of this as a tremendous saving to the taxpayer of the city. That is true. But when men skilled in government and in education, commend your schools, as they so frequently do, I like to think that they peer more deeply into the work these schools are doing, and are impressed with the philosophy of civic, social and religious life that is not only found as part of a course of study but that really permeates the atmosphere of your classrooms and prepares outstanding citizens for the civic life of the community.

There is a point, which at the moment threatens to overwhelm me in this day of atomistic philosophy and secularistic thinking. At a time when articulate people, taut with emotion, are shouting about erecting barriers between church and state, when it is the fashion to try to measure all things by material standards, a host of people gather here in the old parish of Lynn to open a civic celebration with prayer and sacrifice.

And yet this is the most logical thing in the world. Just as nature and reason bid us all to worship God as individuals, so individuals, gathered together in the civic community are no less bound to the will of God, from whom all power, including civil power, comes. Government can never be, in truth, secular. It, like ourselves, depends upon God for its very existence. "Unless the Lord keep the city, he watcheth in vain who keepeth it."

As religious-minded men and women we must question ourselves about the present and the future. What must we do to assure another century of real progress in the civic life of Lynn?

First we must be careful, during the week ahead, to give proper value to the many things that will be emphasized in the celebration. There will be those who will judge the felicity of this city by the increase of bank deposits during the years. There will be others that will find the sole criterion of the city's success in a graph of the city's manufacturers. There will be those who will drive through the streets of the municipality and will say, "Look at the buildings we have built. This tells the story of our success." All of these will be partly right but their measuring will be, to say the least, incomplete.

RIGHT ATTITUDE KEY TO HAPPINESS

It is people who make up the city. It is boys and girls, men and women who walk its streets, shop in its stores, suffer and recover in its hospitals, who laugh and weep in its homes, who play on its grass plots and pray in its churches. These make up the real city.

It becomes a matter of primary concern, for those who love their city, to see to it that the citizen of tomorrow will have right attitudes toward all those things that call upon the characters of men.

If you love your city you want its children to be sound in their attitudes toward life. You want them to display the charity of Christ, to love their neighbors, white, black, yellow, and brown, because Christ loved them. You want children of justice and honesty, whose outlook is frank and whose actions honorable. You want your city filled with youth who will sacrifice for the common good, who will work and not be idle, who will persevere and not capitulate in the face of force or injustices. You want young people who will look upon government in the light in which we have painted it, not as an arbitrary mechanism to be circumvented whenever possible. You want citizens of real piety, devotion, who put their supernatural destinies before all other values in life. These are the things you want—if you love your city.

But these attitudes are learned primarily in your own homes. We know that the basic structure of character, the fundamental attitudes which appear in the characters of men and women, are laid down with considerable finality before children have reached school age.

It is parents who teach these fundamental things and schools and churches merely build upon their teaching. If you take this responsibility toward your city and your children seriously you will see to it that your children are well trained before they ever reach school.

GOOD HOMES KEY TO HAPPINESS

You will not form these citizens of tomorrow by only preaching to them or by formal teaching. But by providing good homes where honesty and perseverance, where charity and justice, where obedience and devotion and prayer are the natural ingredients of every day living, your children will, by the very nature of learning, take in their virtues with the air they breathe and display these qualities in their youthful and adult lives. As the children of Lynn are today, so will be the Lynn of tomorrow.

Yes, we ourselves, with God's help, are the builders of the city. The example of our lives among our fellows exerts an influence we can never measure. Those who associate with us in business or in play are always changed for having known us. We have responsibilities as citizens, to lead others to a better way of living for having known us and ultimately, to lead others closer to God by the force of good example. These, I believe, are some of the implications of the centenary of Lynn.

On this June morning, halfway through the twentieth century, we pause to wonder at the goodness of God, whose divine generosity showered so many graces on this beloved city of Lynn through a hundred years of its municipal life. Mindful that we can never pay the debt we owe we are highly resolved that in the years to come, we will so live that we shall lead those about us closer to the feet of God. Ours is a vision of excellence that sees a wonderful city whose citizens are happy because they are good, whose children will find in the conformity of their civic lives with divine laws and counsels, the pledge of eternal citizenship in the city of God.

Christ and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I think it well for Members of the House to have an opportunity to know the thinking of our fellow citizens throughout the country on matters of public interest and especially on today's problems of world import. In the June 15, 1950, issue of the Rifle Telegram, I have found a most excellent article by a very dear friend, Rev. Otto B. Duckworth, of Rifle, Colo. As a lay scholar, Reverend Duckworth has given a great deal of time and thought to the organization and operation of the United Nations. I am sure that his article Christ and the United Nations will be of great interest to all who can find the time to read it:

CHRIST AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(By Otto B. Duckworth)

I should like to begin this article by quoting from Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen's scholarly book, Peace of Soul: "Modern man has locked himself in the prison of his own mind; and only God can let him out, as he let Peter out of the dungeon. All that he himself must do is to contribute the desire to get out. God will not fail; it is only our human desire that is weak. There is no reason for discouragement. It was the bleating of the lamb in the thickets more than the flock in peaceful pasture which attracted the Saviour's heart and helping hand. But the recovery of peace through His grace implies an understanding of anxiety, the grave complaint of modern man."

Modern man is alive to the fact of a sickness in the world. So great is this sickness that to some it means doom, to others just a continued unsettled and unhappy world situation. Neither one of which affords a bright picture for man who is so eminently successful in his mastery of the forces of nature and in his use of the power which has resulted therefrom.

Modern man sees all about him his materialistic world, the world of his creation—the product of his machine—and has a suspicion that is an alien and an enemy. Man finds that this child of his which was to be his pride and joy and comfort has become a problem child; unpredictable and incorrigible, knowing only the material values but nothing of the spiritual. As modern man sets out to do something about correcting some of the evils that have resulted from this materialistic order, he finds himself confronted with an ever-mounting pile of related problems and soon confused turns away from the search, a problem himself, seeking some escape mechanism to forget it all. Future historians will probably refer to this age as the age of escape mechanisms—for in reality the escape mechanism has become the god of our day, as men seek a sort of perverted Nirvana.

The weakness of man's position today is that he is looking for his answers to his problems at the wrong place. Man assumes that all of his difficulties and conflicts arise in the fields of politics and economics and that he can therefore find the answers there. This is, of course, an error and a grave one. There are no purely political or economic problems. There are only human problems, problems arising at the point of human contact, or human association. Man has not yet learned to live at peace with his fellows. These problems are then carried up into and manifested at the political and economic levels and so seem to have arisen in these realms; but this is an error to repeat myself.

So the place to look for answers to all these problems is at the level of human association—where society begins and ends. When we enter this field, this realm, we can point to a positive authority, a definite margin in human conduct. This authority is Christ, the author of life and truth. There are none, I suspect, who will refute this statement. The solution then, to our problems, arising from our association one with another are to be resolved by Christ's principles. To begin with Christ gives us a positive position and frees us from dealing with the relativism of surface evaluations.

The title of this article is "Christ and the United Nations." Let us examine the title briefly to learn what we mean by this connection. The United Nations is two things: an attitude (concept) and an organization. As an attitude it is two things; Christian and democratic. It is first, just as Christian as the New Testament, beginning with the song of the herald angels when they sang on that first Christmas evening of peace on earth and good will toward all men. Beginning with the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus began to teach that God was a Father, a Father to all men; that all men were, therefore, brothers, one family comprehending all races; that life was to be found and enjoyed in and through serving others and not in being served; that forgiveness and love were the greatest virtues; that the individual (each individual) was of supreme worth in the sight of God. As Jesus' disciples went out teaching and preaching these high principles and to make converts they began to lay the foundation for the future of democracy in the world. As these first disciples made yet other disciples and as these began to practice the virtues and principles of the Christ way in the world there began to be expressed at the political and economic level a newer and higher way of life which today we describe as the democratic way. That is to say that democracy is Christianity in practical application. If there had been no Christianity there could have been no democracy.

As the number of Christians grew in the world and as the procedure of democratic practice were refined more and more, this new way of life became the challenger of all other political expressions. So far had this democratic process evolved and developed by the year 1861 that Lincoln could say of it, as it was expressed here in America, that it was the last best hope of earth. These words of President Lincoln were of course true as even a casual reading of history will reveal.

Standing at Gettysburg later, when the Union arms had secured for posterity that better way of life, Lincoln could say, that "this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that Government of the people, by the people, for the people

should not perish from the earth." These words of Lincoln were factual and prophetic. The people of America rose to the challenge and proceeded to perfect and enlarge upon their democratic freedom until this Nation became the mecca and guide light of the peoples of the whole earth. Not only did millions seek to come to our shores but there went out from our shores those who taught the democratic way of life so effectively that it became the dynamic that led some 25 nations to adopt democratic constitutions, most of them patterning after our own Constitution. May we call attention to this fact, that in every instance where any country became democratic and patterned its political life after our own, the Christian missionary had been there before and taught the people how to live together as children of a common Father. Thus President Lincoln's prophetic words are proven to have been correct.

Today there are those who paraphrasing Abraham Lincoln, are saying that the last best hope of earth is the United Nations—the United Nations that so few people know the truth about or seem to care to know the truth about. This statement above is true, oh, so very true because the United Nations is positively democratic and to this extent that it is a projection and expression of the American concept and practice at the international or world level. It will not require too much study of the institutional functions of the United Nations organization to prove the point. The United Nations Charter begins as our Constitution begins, with these words, "We the people," in this latter instance we the people of the United Nations. Following on through every phase of its organizational effort the UN expresses the American concept of equality, freedom, and opportunity for all men to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—all men, not some nations or any particular nation, but all men everywhere. The people of the United States have more to gain through the successful function of the United Nations than any other people on the earth—for the United Nations is the United States lifted to world level.

If the United Nations should fail of its purpose in the world it will not be because of any wrongness of concept or lack of completeness of organization but rather because of a wrong attitude on the part of the people of the earth, because too great a sector of the informed have no real interest in building a universal community.

Reduction of Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I present for the attention of the House, an open letter addressed to me in the columns of the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call last Friday, June 16, by Miss Helen Galbreath, society editor, with a copy of my response:

[From the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call of June 16, 1950]

AN OPEN LETTER ON SUBJECT OF EXCISE TAXES

TO OUR CONGRESSMAN:

Within a short time you will be called upon to vote on the proposed reduction of excise taxes, and the women of moderate means will be most interested to know how you vote, since they feel this burden most.

These taxes were a wartime measure and the war has now been over 5 years, which makes their continuance a fraud on the taxpayers, especially on my fellow women who are even taxed for the powder and oil which they use for their babies.

What does a rich man care whether he pays $5,000 with or without tax for his wife's mink coat when he can buy $250 suits and overcoats, $1,000 hunting outfits for himself, $500 evening gowns for his daughter, $5,000 paintings, $2,000 oriental rugs, rare antiques, and many other real luxuries for his home, all tax free. At the same time a working girl who must face all kinds of winter weather every morning and sorely needs a fur coat must pay $40 excise tax on a $200 fur coat.

According to statistics recently published by the Fur Age Weekly, there were 260 mink manufacturers in 1943. These increased to 560 in 1949; 312 rabbit coat manufacturers in 1943 but only 147 in 1949. This tells the story of who can afford to buy furs today.

Have you ever looked in your wife's or sweetheart's handbag? Lipstick, powder puff, compact, hand lotion, billfold, all are taxed, including the handbag, not forgetting wedding or engagement ring, earrings, bracelets, brooches, etc.

Supposing, honorable sir, a relative from home would visit you in Washington, would you expect her to check in at the Mayflower Hotel with her dresses and lingerie over her arm, and her other things in paper bundles. The tax continues high on all luggage.

You know very well that luggage, watches, handbags, cosmetics, baby oil, are everyday necessities, not luxuries.

What is this? Is Congress continuing to gang up on us women? The excise tax is a definite burden on the middle class and the poor to such an extent that they just have to do without many real necessities which are now taxed. It is undemocratic, unjust, and discriminating and hits those people most who can least afford it.

Is this the Fair Deal promised by our President to those people who voted for him?

Hoping for your support of our plea, I am,

Sincerely,

HELEN GALBREATH,
Society Editor.

JUNE 16, 1950.

Miss HELEN GALBREATH,
Society Editor, the Morning Call,
Paterson, N. J.

MY DEAR MISS GALBREATH: All I want is a chance to vote.

That is my answer to your open letter in this morning's Call urging me to vote for relief from the high wartime excise taxes which impose a special hardship on women.

It was almost 18 months ago that I first urged such action and last year, when it become apparent the House Ways and Means Committee was not inclined to report a bill permitting House action, I signed the discharge petition on the Speaker's desk. This requires 218 signers to force a bill onto the floor and, unfortunately, proponents have been unable to get that number.

You ask me the question, "Have you ever looked into your wife's handbag?" I'll say I have and I want you to know that every argument you have given me relative to the taxes on lipstick, powder puff, compact, billfold, hand lotion, etc., has been presented to me a thousand times by the owner of that handbag and, I will confess, with a little more emphasis than you used in your letter. And believe you me, I am not arguing with anyone that luggage, watches, handbags, cosmetics, and baby oils are luxuries.

It looks now as if we will soon have a relief bill and when it passes it can be chalked up as a victory for the women of America and a boon to business.

By the way, do you mind if I call your letter to the attention of the House next week?

With all kind wishes, believe me,

Very sincerely,

GORDON CANFIELD.
Member of Congress.

Know Your Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Marine News:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS—HOW THE MONEY HAS BEEN SPENT

The total amount spent by the Army engineers for waterway improvements since the first expenditure in 1822, 128 years ago, is approximately $3,300,000,000. What has the money been spent for?

First, for the development and maintenance of the great seaports of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, Charleston, Savannah, Jacksonville, Tampa, Mobile, New Orleans, Beaumont, Texas City, Port Arthur, Galveston, Houston, Corpus Christi, San Francisco, San Diego, Los Angeles, Portland and Seattle, and many smaller ports handling a tremendous tonnage in the aggregate. Waterway improvements are vital to the life of the Nation during peace or war. Of 95 cities with populations greater than 100,000, 62 are on harbors and navigable channels improved by the Federal Government.

Second, for the development of the Great Lakes waterway system, incomparable in all the world, with its harbors, locks and channels. The major port cities are Duluth, Superior, Two Harbors, Marquette, Milwaukee, Chicago, Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, Erie, and Buffalo. The Great Lakes waterway system can easily be called the life line of America.

Third, for the construction of an intercoastal waterway system, stretching along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts from Boston, Mass., to the Mexican border, more than 2,600 miles. With the exception of the canals across New Jersey and Florida, this great waterway will soon be complete in its early stages. In time it will be one of the most valuable sheltered waterways in all the world. With feeder channels, its potentialities are unbounded. The Gulf section, already of inestimable value, grows in importance yearly. Of 36 American seacoast ports handling more than 3,000,000 tons in 1947, nine ports along the Gulf coast handled 157,720,364 tons with an average of more than 17,000,000 tons per port.

Fourth, the development of the Mississippi, Ohio, Illinois, Monongahela, Allegheny, Hudson, Delaware, Cape Fear, Tennessee, Santee, Savannah, St. Johns, Alabama, Tombigbee, Black, Warrior, Pearl, White, Calcasieu, Neches, Missouri, San Joaquin, Sacramento, Columbia, and other smaller streams. They are arteries of commerce playing a growing and important part in the commercial and industrial life of the Nation.

What other expenditure of $3,300,000,000 has meant so much to America?

Our Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARRETT L. WITHERS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. WITHERS. Mr. President, in these troublesome times we sometimes fail to note the mature thinking of our young college students. I should like to call attention to a paper written by Miss Joan Stewart, of Covington, Ky., a student at Sweetbriar College, Sweetbriar, Va. She writes of our Constitution and the unity it brings to our people. While we may not necessarily agree with all she has written, it is gratifying to know our young folks are giving serious thought to serious matters.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Governments, like clocks, go from the motion men give them; and as governments are made and moved by men, so by them are they ruined, too. Therefore, governments rather depend on men, than men upon governments."—William Penn.

If our Constitution were submitted tomorrow to a plebiscite, would it be accepted or rejected by the American people? To answer "No" sounds almost preposterous, but an affirmative reply snaps us to our senses. Considering the ignorance of the American public as a whole when it comes to any knowledge of the actual content of our Constitution or its fundamental political philosophy, we wonder just why there would be strong sentiment in favor of a document few read and still fewer understand. It is because the Constitution means to the average man the unity of the Republic. He knows that in some mysterious way it holds together a people who inhabit a vast continent and who number over a hundred million. Thus, we see that the extent of the average American citizen's interest in the Constitution is to realize that it means political and economic unity, and as a citizen of the United States, he is entitled to a power, prestige, and protection such as no other nation at the present time can offer its citizens.

The mere existence of this profound instinct of unity does not mean that the Constitution is safe from attack, for while the people would affirm it in its entirety as the organism of indissoluble unity, it is when attacked in detail by superfluous amendments that our most priceless heritage is endangered.

Our Constitution has been profoundly modified by public opinion—actually a truer organ of democracy than the ballot box. As a result, many of its essential principles have been subverted, and others today are being threatened by direct attack. Therefore, it seems to me that our trouble comes not from within the Constitution, but from the complexities of present-day society which have become so very advanced that they almost smother out our most valuable democratic institution. The real problem, then, lies in adapting democracy to the changed conditions of society.

The greatest and most noble purpose of the Constitution was not alone to write the relative powers of the Nation and the States, but also to maintain in the scales of justice a true equilibrium between the rights of Government and the rights of an individual. It did not believe that the State was omnipotent, yet it proclaimed its authority within wise and just limits. It defended the integrity of the human soul. In other governments, these fundamental decencies of liberty rest upon the conscience of the legislature. Under the American Constitution, they are part of the fundamental law, and, as such, enforceable by judges sworn to defend the integrity of individual as well as State.

How can we say, then, that the time has come when the best interests of our country require a new constitution when, as it stands, it is the creation and the creature of the people themselves, as absolute sovereigns? Our Constitution is a direct emanation from the people, and until they decide otherwise, the United States is "an indissoluble Union of indestructible States." This stands out as one of the many unique features of our Constitution that distinguishes it from any previous inventions in the art of government.

Another example of direct attack upon the Constitution concerns the Bill of Rights, which has preserved our country as the land of the free for the past 150 years. Our highest duty is to conserve it for future generations. Again we have fallen down on the job. Because of its freedom of speech, foreign propagandists spread their false doctrines among our citizens. Because it upholds a free press, millions of Nazi articles and magazines condemning our American way were delivered right into our very homes during the last war. Because it stands for religious freedom, many speakers use the radio to breathe hatred against followers of other creeds.

In supporting our Constitution as our most precious heritage, I am not overlooking the fact that certain parts of several articles put an unnecessary damper on the flexibility of our democracy. Article 1, section 2, which concerns election of members of the House of Representatives, would be much more valuable, it seems to me, if the term of the Representatives was changed from 2 to 4 years. As it stands now, the Representatives elected for a 2-year term have just become settled in their offices when it comes time to move along. If they could be elected for a 4-year term in the presidential election year, they would be entering office with the President; and their relationship with the executive department would become much closer. I definitely think this change would be very vital in legislative-executive dealings.

Another example is article V, which provides for an amending process. We have no method of amendment that could be used in a crisis; what we must do is to remove the present ambiguities, inordinate difficulties, and prohibitive delays. This could possibly be corrected by compelling Congress to submit a proposed amendment to the people if one-fourth of the State legislatures propose such an amendment within any period of 3 years. Still another reform I would suggest is one frequently advocated—the abolition of the electoral college. The framers of the Constitution put forward the college as a device for indirect election; the people were to choose their best judges of intellect and character, and these men were to choose the President. However, since they were chosen to make a single decision, they were not selected for themselves, but for their specific promise. The electoral college, in my opinion, by a perfectly natural evolution, has now become a needless intermediary and is no longer needed.

Two other defects, comparatively minor but still requiring immediate action, concern procedure in the Senate. I strongly advocate abolition of the filibuster in Senate debate. Actually, the filibuster is an unnecessary nuisance, but by using it a minority group has the powerful capacity to block important legislation. I think an hour limit, like that in the House, would curb the endless discussion and still not actually deprive the Senators of their long-guarded free discussion. Another phase of Senate procedure that needs attention, in my opinion, is that of amendments and riders. House rules governing amendments to bills are much more strict than those of the Senate. A proposed amendment in the House must be pertinent; the Senate, with the exception of general appropriation bills, is free to add unrelated amendments to bills. These attached bills are called riders, and if the President signs the more important bill the rider automatically becomes valid. I think the same rule that applies in the House should hold for Senate procedure also.

Let me point up once again that, while I do think the flexibility of the Constitution could be improved a great deal by revising certain articles, I am very much against tampering with any of the basic principles of the document.

Our Nation's Constitution is the only remaining barrier in the entire world against those who would take from the people their several freedoms and human dignity.

It has been pointed out that the Constitution is now 162 years of age, and that in 1963 it will be 175 years old. In terms of the ordinary vision of a generation, 175 years seems to be quite a long span of time. But actually, 175 years in the life of any nation, as well as 175 years of modern history, is really a very short period. Let me point out that the basic precepts which guarantee protection, security, and freedom as assured by our Constitution actually dates as far back as the year 1215 at which time the great Magna Charta was successfully demanded of King John by the English Barons at Runnymede. So the fundamental principles and basic ideas for government of a society and nation, which we enjoy under our Constitution, are more than 700 years old. More than that, our Constitution is actually a refinement of the great Magna Charta, although the individual rights extended by that great charter of liberties are the same today as they were more than 700 years ago.

We all know of the attacks being made upon our Government both from within and without our borders. Even now there are charges in Washington that communistic influences are at work in our State Department. This is a very serious thing, because it is generally accepted that Communists are hell-bent on complete destruction of our country. It is a simple question of whether the American people want to retain their freedom, liberty, human dignity, individual initiative and enterprise, or forsake all these things and accept the ideology of either communism or socialism, both of which destroy these precepts.

Only America stands between the Soviet Union and world conquest, and only our Constitution remains a barrier against it. Time does not wear down nor eat away the eternal truths of the Constitution. Instead of fading with age, the glory of the Constitution takes on new splendor wih the passing of the centuries.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beck, John M., The Constitution of the United States, New York, George H. Doran Co., 1924.

Bloom, Sol, The Story of the Constitution, Washington, D. C., the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission, 1937.

Hazlitt, Henry, A New Constitution Now, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1942.

Wise, James F., Our Bill of Rights, New York, Bill of Rights Sesquicentennial Committee, 1941.

Accomplishments in Italy Under Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD eight brief articles I wrote while in Italy with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. SMITH] as Congressional Adviser to the United States delegation at the UNESCO Conference which has just concluded in Florence. These articles were distributed to the newspapers by the North American Newspaper Alliance, and were written at the suggestion of my friend, Mr. John Wheeler, president of NANA, and a distinguished resident of Connecticut.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VULCAN TURNS TURBINES, AND VOLCANIC STEAM YIELDS 1,000,000,000 KILOWATT-HOURS OF POWER A YEAR FOR ITALIAN INDUSTRY

(By Senator WILLIAM BENTON)

LARDERELLO, ITALY, June 10.—On the invitation of Paul Hoffman, ECA Administrator, I have taken time off from my duties as one of the two Senatorial Advisers to the UNESCO conference in Florence to see what the Marshall plan is accomplishing in Italy.

My first stop is at this remote point in the Tuscan Mountains, about 40 air miles south of Florence. Here I have been shown through a gigantic power plant which is the only thing of its kind in the world.

There is no dam with falling water; there is no steam boiler fired by coal or oil; there is no Diesel engine throbbing away to turn the generators. Yet the turbines turn day and night, producing 1,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power a year.

This power plant is run by natural volcanic steam. The steam is produced by fires deep inside the earth. The Italians say that Vulcan turns the turbines.

With the aid of United States equipment designed to drill oil wells, bought with Marshall-plan funds, the Italians have punctured the earth's crust at Larderello and brought up enough volcanic steam to generate one-twentieth of all Italy's electric power.

Geologists are now pinpointing new volcanic steam reserves in other parts of Italy. Soon Italy hopes to double its power from volcanic steam.

To stand, as I stood, in the great building filled with purring turbines and generators, and to know that the energy that turns them comes from the burning belly of the earth, gives one an eerie feeling. Outside, in the narrow valley surrounded by high mountains, pools of boiling water bubble and hiss like Macbeth's witches' caldron. Here and there jets of steam make their way to the surface. A similar natural phenomenon is said to have helped inspire Dante to write his inferno.

The workmen at Larderello, however, are not so impressed with Dante as they are with the modern spectacle when the drilling rig pierces through the final stratum of rock to the underground caverns of steam.

The steam blows in with a deafening roar and the pent pressure makes the earth quiver like the platform of an antiaircraft gun. Workmen who move in to tame the geyser sometimes lose their hearing. The caps and valves for the geyser have been prepared in advance. Soon after capping, the steam is producing current for Italy's factories and electrified railroads.

The steam vapor is heavily saturated with borax, carbonate of ammonia, and other chemicals. After it has raced through the churning turbines, it is condensed in eight giant towers, shaped like hour glasses. These towers are about as tall as six- or eight-story buildings, about three or four to a block. In them the water is evaporated and the chemicals are refined. Last year Larderello produced 10,000,000 pounds of chemicals essential to Europe's medical, insecticide, and general manufacturing industries.

ECA'S AIM IN EUROPE: TO TAKE WORK OFF MEN, ONTO MACHINES—EACH AMERICAN WORKER BACKED BY SEVEN HORSEPOWER—EUROPE'S WILL GET FIVE BEHIND THEM, DOUBLE PREWAR

(By Senator WILLIAM BENTON)

LARDERELLO, ITALY, June 11.—Imaginative Italians experimented with the use of volcanic steam as industrial power as long as 75 years ago. But production of electric power on a significant industrial scale began only a few years before the war.

The Italian drilling equipment, however, could not pierce deep enough to reach the full reserves of the underground steam. The new United States drilling rigs financed by the ECA are the kind that American oil companies use to pierce the earth for thousands of feet.

The only limit to the development of Italian volcanic steam from now on will be the amount that nature has provided.

Volcanic power is more important to Italy than it would be in the United States. Italy has no really good or cheaply mined coal. Nearly all her first-class waterpower sites have been harnessed, and 90 percent of her total electrical energy comes from water power. Yet the rainfall is not evenly distributed over the year, and in such periods of drought as occurred in 1949 factories must close down or run on reduced shifts.

By contrast, Larderello's output of power is steady and dependable. Dr. Alfredo Mazzoni, director at Larderello, tells me that for each kilowatt of installed capacity, Larderello turbines turn out 700 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year.

To remedy Italy's 90 percent dependence on uncertain water power, the ECA is aiding in another way. It is helping finance the construction of a number of new steam-power plants, operated by coal. Under construction at Naples is a new steam-power plant costing $9,393,000. Of this, the ECA is contributing $6,143,000.

A similar one is going up at Palermo, and another near Rome. Others are projected at Genoa and Piacenza and in the Venice area. When this power program is finished, I am told, the electrical energy behind the Italian economy will be almost double what it was before the war. And the ratio of water power to steam power will have been brought down from about 94 percent before the war to 75 percent. Even in periods of drought, it is claimed that most of the factories will go on as usual.

All the Marshall-plan countries are aiming at similar goals in electric power. During the Marshall-plan period, some are installing more power capacity than they had installed in all the previous years since the electrical age began.

A year ago Paul Hoffman said that there are seven horsepower behind every American worker, but only two-and-one-half horsepower behind the European worker. The Marshall plan aims to raise the horsepower behind the European worker to nearly five. This is the way to take the load from the bowed back and the gnarled hands of labor and place it where it belongs—on machines.

In a sense, Larderello is a symbol. Ancient peoples were awed by the strange jets of natural steam in the Tuscan hills. There is awe in Italy now. There is awe among those who know, even though the number is all too small. Not awe of Vulcan or of Pluto, or of sybils or oracles who used such phenomena as stage settings for their mumbo jumbo, but awe at the miracles men can perform in converting a geological curiosity into a first-rate economic benefaction.

ECA EMPLOYS 175,000 ITALIANS, SENATOR WILLIAM BENTON REPORTS, ON RECLAIMING 8,000,000 ACRES TO PROVIDE FARM JOBS FOR 500,000

(By Senator WILLIAM BENTON)

NAPLES, June 12.—Here in southern Italy and in Sicily, with Marshall-plan aid, has been launched one of the greatest land-reclamation and improvement programs in history.

Driving from Rome to Naples I could see one after another of these projects already under way. Swamps are being drained, irrigation dams are being built and irrigation ditches dug, new farm roads are being constructed, the mosquito pest eliminated, and farmhouses built on land now tilled by laborers who live 6 to 10 miles away.

The Pontine marshes are being cleaned in a way Mussolini never dreamed of in his wildest propaganda speeches. They must be made fertile and productive if Italy's teeming millions are to have food.

Two hundred and forty land-reclamation projects have been launched or are planned over the face of Italy. A total of 8,000,000 acres of land will be brought into cultivation for the first time or will be cultivated more intensively.

In a country with 2,000,000 of its 46,000,000 people unemployed, this work means a great deal, and the new land means food and life itself. During the construction period these projects are giving jobs to about 175,000 men, and the improvements should result in permanent farm jobs for 500,000.

In Sicily, I covered most of the island in a low-flying plane. With me was Ed Corfitzen, agricultural specialist of the ECA mission in Italy. He explained to me that ECA is paying nearly 100 percent of the cost of these reclamation projects the first year, and will pay 60 percent in succeeding years.

The costs are being met by ECA counterpart funds—a term that needs explanation. Most of the ECA dollar aid comes to Italy in the form of wheat, coal, oil, machinery, and other such commodities. They are paid for by the United States Government with the dollars appropriated by Congress for ECA, and they are delivered to the Italian Government free of charge. But the Italian citizen pays for them in his own money—lire. These lire accumulate in the counterpart fund. They are then used by mutual agreement between the Italian Government and ours for land reclamation, public works, power plants, the rebuilding of railroads and highways, and for similar purposes.

Besides reclaiming the land, ECA funds are helping reorganize the Italian equivalent of our county farm-agent organization, to provide insecticides, increase the fertilizer supply, supply tractors to replace oxen and burros, improve the strains of dairy and beef cattle, and introduce better strains of seed.

ECA BRINGS BENEFITS OF SCIENCE TO ITALIAN FIELDS, SENATOR BENTON REPORTS—IS ALSO RESPONSIBLE TO SEE THESE GO TO WORKERS ON LAND, NOT MERELY TO ABSENTEE LANDOWNERS

(By Senator WILLIAM BENTON)

NAPLES, June 13.—More than 200,000 acres of Italian farmland have been planted this year to hybrid corn seed, which will increase the yield at least one-fourth. Most of this hybrid seed corn came from the United States.

ECA funds have been advanced to raise in Italy the hybrid seed it will need for future years. This seed will be tailored, under the supervision of plant geneticists brought from the United States, to fit the exact soil and climate conditions of the corn-raising sections of Italy.

While great progress is being made in land reclamation and farming techniques, much is still to be done about land reform. The unemployed look across at the underfarmed land and wonder what to do.

Some of them have engaged in upside-down strikes. They move in on the land and do work that needs to be done but which has not been offered them. They strike for work instead of refusing to work and this is indeed upside down by American standards.

They present the bill to the owner or to his on-the-scene representative, but usually they get no pay. The Italian Government will have to come to grips with the age-old land interests if this problem is to be solved.

The absentee owner will not change his ways. Often he looks on work with contempt. We must put our faith in the farmer himself, who often labors 14 or 15 hours a day in the fields and in the long trek to and from the village. He must be educated beyond the present 3 years of schooling and he must be given incentive and rewards through the increasing productivity of the land in which he increasingly shares.

James D. Zellerbach, retiring chief of the ECA mission to Italy, was speaking the sentiments of most Americans when he referred in a recent speech to the responsibility to see that the value being added to the land through the reclamation and improvement program carried out with assistance from the Government and the lire fund be shared with the men who work the soil. Surely it violates the American spirit and the American goal for a free and democratic Italy to let this value accrue to a few who have inherited these vast estates and who all too often do nothing to improve them and who don't even live upon them.

The Communist threat to Italy seems to be subsiding, largely through the improvements wrought with ECA aid. The Communist threat or a Fascist threat may arise again unless the underlying causes are removed. The peoples of Europe are entitled to the fruits of modern science and technology, and if they do not secure them through the operation of the democratic process, it is likely they will continue to press for them in another.

The communism of Italy has been that of the empty bellies; the hope for Italy's future is that the belly can be filled and that democracy and capitalism can take root and flourish.

POPE SENDS BLESSINGS, LOVE TO AMERICAN PEOPLE, IN AN AUDIENCE WITH SENATOR BENTON

(By Senator WILLIAM BENTON)

ROME, June 13.—This is holy year and more than 3,000,000 pilgrims are expected to file through the ancient streets of the Eternal City.

They are here now in great numbers—the rich who come by air or luxury liner and the poor who sit up all night on the hard benches of third-class coaches or come in old jalopies that will scarcely stand the strain.

Many march through the city in long queues, chanting the litanies and viewing the sacred facades of Rome's four handsome basilicas. Many make a point of seeing the catacombs, relics of the early days when Christianity was driven underground.

To get to Rome in holy year, one German woman rode a white horse all the way from Munich. Many Italians, lacking bus or train fare, make the journey over the hot Italian highways on foot.

On days when His Holiness Pope Pius XII appears in the basilica of St. Peter's to canonize a saint or to give his benediction to the faithful, the crowd gathers hours in advance. When His Holiness appears, robed in pure white and borne on the golden throne, the people break into cries of "Viva il Papa." Many who have come from far away to see the head of their faith break down and weep.

I have had the privilege of a private audience with "il Papa." Mrs. Benton and my 19-year-old son Charles, accompanied me. An audience with the Pope is a very impressive ceremony, full of pageantry and historic significance. This was my second. In 1935, Mrs. Benton and I had our first with Pope Pius XI, but on that audience there were 20 or 25 others present with us.

On this morning we spent about 10 minutes alone with His Holiness. This was perhaps because of the UNESCO Conference at Florence, at which the Vatican has five representatives, and which I am serving as a Congressional Consultant. Or, more likely, it was because I am a United States Senator and because my State of Connecticut contains more than 250,000 persons of Italian birth and descent.

We were advanced to this Vatican meeting through a series of a dozen or so rooms, going forward room by room, waiting a moment or two in each while the people ahead of us progressed slowly toward the last room of all. Each room was beautifully decorated with priceless paintings and tapestries and works of art. In each were guards in brilliant multicolored uniforms, with gold-encrusted swords and halberds.

The Pope gave each of us a little silver medal with his likeness, struck to commemorate the holy year. Sometimes he gives, instead, a rosary—a white one for girls and women, a black one for boys and men. And the Pope blesses each one.

As we left, the Pope was due in the great Basilica of St. Peter's for one of his twice-weekly appearances. Thousands of people lined up awaiting his entrance. My wife and son promptly joined them, while I had to go to speak to the American Chamber of Commerce at Luncheon.

His Holiness, as we left, told me to give his affection, blessings, and love to the people of Connecticut and to the whole American people.

NEW AND OLD BLEND HARMONIOUSLY AS ITALY BUILDS NEW SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC STRUCTURE ON BARNACLES OF PAST—MUCH NEEDS TO BE DONE ERE FUTURE OF DEMOCRACY ASSURED

(By Senator WILLIAM BENTON)

ROME, June 14.—The little orchestras play in the cafes, and the boys in the street whistle a pretty postwar tune, How Lovely Is Rome. Rome, especially since the war left its horrible mark on Vienna and Budapest, is probably the most beautiful capital in Europe.

Here the new and the old blend into a harmonious contrast to be found nowhere else. The tall bronzed ruins of the baths of Caracalla form a backdrop for street after street of modern apartment buildings. An endless file of streetcars, trucks, and automobiles race through the scarred arches of the Gate of Mitronia or of San Giovanni and out Via Appia Antica, over which Caesar's army brought back its slaves and spoils.

The new Italian Republic is also a study in contrasts. Upon a social and economic structure that preserves many barnacles of the past, it is trying to build an edifice which resembles democratic capitalism as we understand it.

America is trying to help this democratic effort in every way possible. Never before in history has any conquered people been treated so generously.

America has already given to Italy, through postwar relief, interim aid, and the Economic Cooperation Administration, the stupendous total of more than $3,000,000,000.

Under this stimulus, Italy has made a remarkable recovery. Industrial production is above the prewar level. Agricultural production is climbing toward the prewar figure. Fiscal stability has been achieved—at least temporarily—and some of the refugee capital that fled to South America and other countries is now coming back.

On the street you see almost none of the shifty-eyed young men who used to spot Americans and offer them 10 or 15 percent above the official lire rate for their dollars.

Yet the most thoughtful people I encounter do not seem to think that Italian democracy is yet firmly on its feet.

There are many things that need to be done before the future of democracy is assured. And not all the danger comes from the Communists.

One thing sadly needed is the reform of the Italian tax system. The major source of revenue now is a compounded sales tax—the Italians call it a transaction tax—which adds 12 to 20 per cent to the price of most things that the citizen buys. A bill is in the Italian Parliament to substitute an American-style income tax, but progress toward its enactment is slow.

Meanwhile, Italy lives under a tax system that throttles enterprise and suppresses the purchasing power that the economy has to have if it is to prosper. The poor people pay too large a share of the taxes and have little left with which to buy what they need and want.

ITALY'S PROGRESSIVE LEADERS NEED ALL THE ENCOURAGEMENT AND SUPPORT UNITED STATES CAN GIVE THEM

(By Senator WILLIAM BENTON)

ROME, June 14.—During my brief stay in Italy, I have tried to let the Government know how we in America feel about the problems they will have to solve before Italian democracy will be firmly established. I spoke of the urgent need for tax reform to the American Chamber of Commerce for Italy at a luncheon they gave for me. At a press conference here, I said, "It is manifestly unjust for us in the United States to be taxing our people and sending money over here when people of comparable income in Italy don't pay comparable taxes. We want to help Italy but it is essential for Italy to help itself by developing a tax system that is socially just and economically workable."

In the same way I have spoken out for land reform. In Italy, 80 percent of Italian landowners own less than 5 acres each. But one-half of 1 percent of the landowners own one-third of all privately owned land.

Some of the large estates are undercultivated and produce far less than they should. The owners often live in the city and seldom if ever see their land or their farm laborers.

Again, there are land-reform bills before Parliament—and even a token law on the

books—but the problem of land reform is as yet essentially unsolved.

Industrial competition as we know it in the United States hardly exists in Italy.

European business requires bigger markets, so that competition will develop, improving products and lowering prices. The European public welfare requires anti-trust laws, to prevent the easy and soft monopolies which have no incentive to seek maximum efficiency and which gouge the public with high prices. The Italian business monopolies prefer the easy road of small volume and wide profit margins to the American road of big volume and low prices. They do not yet believe that the latter road can be more profitable to them—as it is to the public.

At a dinner in the handsome renaissance Villa Madama the other night, I talked these problems over with Prime Minister Alcide de Gasperi.

Here is a man I admire. He had the courage to stand against fascism when few of his countrymen did. He is a patriot, a scholar, and a Christian gentleman.

I told him that Italy needs, in my judgment, to turn on more pressure for essential reform if democracy is to be made secure. I told him that many Americans think they have a right to ask for this in return for the tax money they are sending to his country.

I did not find Prime Minister de Gasperi resentful of my candor, but apparently appreciative.

Luckily, we have in Italy an ECA mission which is alive to these problems. David Zellerbach, an old friend of mine as a trustee of the Committee for Economic Development, has done a splendid job as ECA administrator in Italy.

Zellerbach is being succeeded now by Lee Dayton, a tall, lithe, dynamic young man of 46. Dayton was born in a section hand's cottage in a farm village in Idaho, and he has made his way by sheer energy and ability. His sympathies will be with the masses of the Italian people, and yet he will meet Italian industrialists on the common ground of a seasoned businessman. Dayton means to make the last 2 years of the Marshall plan in Italy count. He means to finish the structure for which a solid foundation has been laid.

I think the United States is prepared to carry through. I hope the Italian Government will have the strength and leadership to do its part. I fear that the Italian political leaders will not get much help from the landowning aristocracy, and I also fear that many greatly needed progressive reforms will be opposed by some powerful elements in the business community. The progressive leaders thus need all the legitimate support and encouragement we can give them.

Communism's Losing Out on Italian Labor Front

(By Senator William Benton)

Rome, June 15.—The Italian Confederation of Free Labor Unions, born of a consolidation of two anti-Communist federations, now numbers 35 to 40 percent of organized Italian labor.

When I visited the headquarters, the union's executive committee and regional directors from all over Italy were there. In one room a group of agricultural workers were seeking guidance. In another room men were balloting in an election of shop stewards. Everywhere there was evidence that decisions were democratically reached—the symbol of difference between this confederation and the Communist-dominated general confederation of Italian labor.

The Confederation of Free Labor Unions reflects the courage and determination of three men—Giulio Pastore, the lively, literate, versatile president; and Giovanni Canini and Enrico Parri, his principal lieutenants.

Many of the ideas that have changed the course of history were conceived in jail, and Pastore and Canini both have spent a good many of their recent years in prison. They were in the black books of the Fascist police before the war, and during the German occupation they were even more definitely proscribed.

When the American Army came into Rome in July 1944, it found Pastore and Canini occupying adjoining cells in the Regina Coeli Prison. Released from prison, Pastore eventually became the leader of the LCGIL (Libera Confederazione Generale Italiana Dei Lavoratori). Canini became national secretary of the Streetcar and Bus Workers' Union and later formed the Italian Federation of Labor.

A few weeks ago the organizations headed by Pastore and Canini merged into one anti-Communist union with a total membership of about 1,600,000. The Communist-dominated General Confederation of Italian Labor claims 4,300,000 members and is usually credited with about 3,000,000 bona fide members.

The anti-Communist forces are growing steadily, while the Communist confederation is losing ground.

The greatest single reason for the change is the improvement that is being wrought in the Italian economy with the aid of Marshall-plan funds. Communism, at both the labor and party level, is a counsel of desperation, and the Italians are no longer desperate. They face a future of hope.

Labor experts in the American Embassy in Rome and in the ECA work day and night to encourage the movement to democratic rather than Communist unions. These men are not theorists but are experienced union leaders representing a cross-section of American labor.

Some American labor unions are making a direct contribution to this effort. The International Ladies' Garment Workers Union is a good example. At Palermo, the ILGWU supports an orphanage giving refuge to some 270 sons of Sicilian seamen who lost their lives in the war.

Just now the rumblings of revolt in the Communist-dominated labor ranks are increasing. It would be unwise to call it Titoism, because the Italians have too many differences with Yugoslavia to want to form any sort of common front with Tito. But the Communist labor camp shows signs that even if it is going to remain Communist in doctrine, it wants the direction to come from Italians and not from Russians.

In politics, even more than in labor, the Communists are on the defensive. Two years ago the village of Rocca Massima, not far from the Anzio beachhead, had 200 card-carrying Communists. With the general economic recovery, many of these dropped out of the party. Recently with the aid of $23,000 worth of lire from the ECA counterpart fund, Rocca Massima completed a new pipeline to bring in a water supply and end a 3-mile trek for water carried in copper vessels.

By the time the village finished celebrating, the Communist organizer in the town called his few remaining followers together and led them en masse into the Christian Democratic Party.

No seasoned observer in Italy thinks the fight against the Communists is over. But if Italy can continue to improve its economic position and can successfully tackle such problems as land reform, tax reform, and monopoly prices, the outlook for a permanent, decisive victory over the Communists should be assured.

Address of Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at the Celebration of the One Hundredth Anniversary of Leechburg, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the address delivered by me at the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of Leechburg, Pa., on June 18, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and my fellow Americans, it is a great honor to address this celebration of a century of achievement.

In the course of world history, recording the rise and fall of nations, few governments have lived that long.

How thankful we should be that this young land of liberty, in which we live as free men, is the oldest and most powerful Republic in the world.

How fortunate we are that we enjoy a greater measure of individual freedom than any other people on earth under the oldest written Constitution in the world.

An anniversary such as this is an historic milestone on the road of progress. It marks a time when we should review our accomplishments of the past and plan for a greater future.

It is also a time when we pay tribute to the stalwart men and women who built our Nation, our State, and our homes.

For a moment let us turn back the pages of history. One hundred years ago Zachary Taylor, one of the great military leaders of the Mexican War, was President of the United States. William Freame Johnston, of your own Armstrong County, was Governor of Pennsylvania.

The population of the United States was a little more than 23,000,000. Pennsylvania had about 2,300,000 people and Armstrong County less than 30,000. The population of Leechburg was approximately 200.

There were 31 States in the Union. We had just been victorious in the war with Mexico, extending our national frontier to the Pacific. An army of fortune hunters joined the rush to the California gold fields.

The people were pushing westward in search of new homes and new opportunities. We were in a period of expansion, building new industries, opening mines, and developing transportation.

The Pennsylvania Canal system was open the full distance from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh. It cost about $40,000,000, a stupendous sum in those days.

This venture of government in business was so badly managed and proved so unprofitable that it almost depleted the State treasury. It placed the whole economy of the State in danger of destruction.

The result was action by the general assembly abandoning the project and directing that the State-owned transportation and utility facilities be sold. Further legislation was enacted forbidding the State to engage, directly or indirectly, in any corporate enterprise.

It was not until 1913 that the bonds which financed the system of public works were finally paid off.

There should be a lesson in Pennsylvania's experience for those who are advocating nationalization of power, transportation, and other basic industries.

Meanwhile the railroads were pushing ahead and in 1852 the Pennsylvania Railroad was completed from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh.

As we recall those early days we should pay homage to the great men who contributed so much to the development of this part of Pennsylvania.

Courageous soldiers, resourceful businessmen, fine farmers, skilled craftsmen, and outstanding men of the professions and the church carried out the ideals of the founding fathers.

Some of the industrial leadership we have today goes far back into the past. It points to the power, the energies, and the services of the pioneers that are the background of southwestern Pennsylvania's greatness.

Those enterprising and self-reliant men were more than distinguished leaders in our economic life. They were active in the church, politics, military service, and in the great cultural fields of education, art, and civic works.

They came up in the American way. They knew how to work. Some of them were immigrants. They came to America to find freedom and opportunity. They never neglected America. They never lost the faith in the future of our country. The longer they lived the greater was their faith in this Republic and the stronger their support of its principles.

Many honored names stand out brilliantly in the building of southwestern Pennsylvania as the greatest industrial and cultural empire of the world.

Among those who should be mentioned are O'Hara in glass, the Olivers in ore, Mellons in banking and diversified industry, Carnegie in steel, Jones in iron, Frick in coal, Lockharts in oil, Thompson and Rogers in transportation, and so many others.

We must not forget the preachers and teachers like John McMillen, Joseph Stockton, Robert Bruce, Samuel F. Langley, Elisha MacCurdy, William H. McGuffey, and Bishop Matthew Simpson. Some of these leaders of religion and education crossed the mountains with the soldiers and trappers to build log school houses and places of worship.

The achievements of such men reflects the courage of the founding fathers, their love of liberty, their faith in God.

The United States has become a powerful Nation because the men who conceived it found guidance in the teachings of the Holy Bible.

Love of liberty and devotion to God sustained and supported them in the trials of building and defending this country.

They planned a government on the proposition that human dignity and individual freedom are sacred blessings, bestowed upon all mankind by the Creator of the universe.

Our Government was established upon the premise that all men are endowed with certain unalienable rights and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The founding fathers placed particular emphasis upon the pursuit of happiness. They realized that no government can guarantee happiness. Happiness can be gained only through our own effort.

In adopting the Bill of Rights they did not propose to establish freedom of speech, press, assembly, or religion, or to protect the right of property. The founding fathers recognized these rights as God-given. They sought to protect them from violation or encroachment by an all-powerful central government.

Their whole plan was to give men freedom and opportunity. Under that system we have made marvelous progress in less than 200 years. A trackless wilderness has been converted into fertile lands and splendid cities. Great transportation systems and industries have been created.

Hospitals, educational institutions, and research foundations have been established. More than 266,000 churches, cathedrals, synagogues, and temples have been erected. We worship in them as our conscience dictates.

We have developed our skills and resources until we receive more of the good things of life than any other people of all history.

Have we been grateful for all these blessings? Do we appreciate what we have received?

What is the trend? Are we drifting? Do we know our destination?

Let us briefly consider some of the trends in our country.

We have drifted into a powerful, centralized national government. This was feared by the founding fathers.

What is the reason? Have the American people lost their capacity for self-government?

To a large extent it is the result of indifference and neglect of our civic duties. We give too little attention to how the Government spends the money we pay in taxes.

We are continually asking for governmental hand-outs. Twenty-two million Americans receive a regular check from government. Almost 8,000,000 are on the payrolls of local, State, and Federal Government.

Too many of our people support demagogs for office who offer benefits and gifts to be paid for with the people's money.

We have too many pressure groups demanding that government money be spent for sectional or regional advantage.

Through the increasing demand for new functions, services, and frills, our Government has grown so big and so costly that it endangers our freedom.

Let us consider some figures.

In 50 years the cost of government has increased more than fortyfold, while the population has just a little more than doubled.

In 20 years the national debt has increased more than 15 times.

Debts of State governments since the war have increased 65 percent.

We are asking so much from government that some men seeking office consider it good political bait to offer to spend more and more of the people's money.

We all want new things, but first we must ask: Can we afford it? Who will pay the bill?

Taxes for local, State, and Federal Government all come from the same pocket. We must always remember that the cost of government is paid by the sweat of brain and brawn of those who work.

Don't be misled by the promise of security. We cannot have security through resolutions or laws. Security is achieved by work, thrift, and sacrifice.

Our founding fathers when they framed this Government, knew that centralized government could destroy initiative, opportunity, and individual freedom.

Unless we awaken to the danger we will have socialized medicine, Federal control of education, Federal regulation of agriculture, and Government competition with business and industry. When those functions are controlled by bureaucrats in Washington, then the freedom of the individual will be lost.

I now want to give you what I consider some startling figures.

Local, State, and Federal Government cost us $65,000,000,000 per year. This is more than the cost of food. It takes 28 percent of all our national production just to govern ourselves.

Crime costs us $15,000,000,000 a year.

Alcohol costs us another $9,000,000,000 a year.

For education we spend only $5,000,000,000 per year.

We contribute to our churches less than $1,500,000,000.

I have discussed present-day conditions in our Government at considerable length because they have a definite relationship to church, religion, and our way of life. In America, the people are still the Government.

While the church and state must be separate one cannot live without the other.

The weakening of the moral fiber of the people has been responsible, in a large measure, for the spread of Communist and socialistic philosophies in many parts of the world.

In our own country these poisonous doctrines have made their influence felt only among those who have ignored or turned away from the teachings of the Bible.

Civic responsibility is always weakened where religious teaching is neglected.

What are we Americans to do in order to stop the advance of destructive and Godless philosophies?

If we are to save America and to preserve our sacred freedoms we must crusade for a return to the fundamental principles of religion and freedom of the individual.

To hold the line in America we must have a strong, courageous self-reliant, God-fearing people. We must have a strong, militant church and a strong, solvent government. We must have a total mobilization of all the moral forces.

Men and women of the church should take an intelligent, patriotic, and militant part in government. That means taking part in politics, because clean, honest politics is the foundation of good government. It means helping to elect to office men of integrity and upright character, dedicated to public service rather than personal power or gain.

We must wage relentless war against the racketeer, the chiseler, and the law evader.

We are meeting in the twilight of the holy Sabbath day. It will do us all good to refer to the religious background of the settlers of this Nation.

Through all American history there runs a golden thread of deep religious conviction.

A prominent South American visitor was asked to explain why the material progress of North America had so outstripped South America. This was his reply:

"The people who settled North America came here seeking God. Those who came to South America were in search of gold."

The seeking of God started with Columbus. One of his objectives was to spread religion all over the world.

The spirit of religion guided the Pilgrims to the New England coast. In framing the Mayflower Compact they started with the words: "In the name of God. Amen."

The illustrious founder of Pennsylvania, William Penn, said, "If we are not ruled by God we will be ruled by tyrants."

General Washington knelt in prayer in the snow at Valley Forge. That humble submission to divine will has been an inspiration to every generation of American soldiers.

Dr. Franklin suggested devotional exercises in the convention framing the Constitution.

Firm reliance on the protection of divine providence is set forth in the Declaration of Independence.

With these magnificent examples before us we should be guided by the courage and faith we get from God's Word. We must learn the truth through study of the Holy Bible.

Horace Greeley once said:

"No Bible reading nation ever becomes mentally or socially enslaved."

I am happy to congratulate Leechburg on 100 years of splended progress. May your next 100 years be even greater than the century has passed into history.

Leechburg and Armstrong County have prospered because of your rich natural resources and the hard work and God-fearing attitude of your people.

The annual value of the products of your farms, mines, and manufacturing is more than $200,000,000 per year. That is a magnificent record. You have used your material sources well. You have attained great cultural and spiritual advancement.

In closing let me remind you that America was settled and developed by the ax, the rifle, and the Bible.

The ax represents hard work and thrift.

The rifle represents courage and sacrifice, in the defense of our great ideals.

The Bible is the truth, the foundation of our Government and the guide to our actions.

Let us continue to practice American ideals.

The late Congressman Sol Bloom, a great authority on the American Constitution, was so right when he said: "God and one is a majority."

Let us all be a part of that majority.

Presidential Parsimony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Presidential Parsimony," published in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENTIAL PARSIMONY

President Truman told his press conference yesterday that he is opposed to a 70-group Air Force. The reason: We can't afford it.

When the Federal Treasury is operating in the red it's usually encouraging to find the President saying we can't afford something. Under present circumstances however, a few questions might be raised.

Congress is approving a bill to provide the Commodity Credit Corporation with $2,000,000,000 more for use in the Government's farm price supporting operations. The CCC already has some $4,000,000,000 tied up in surplus butter, eggs, wheat, and other items. The new legislation will permit it to raise the total to $6,750,000,000. Can we afford that?

The Government has a group at work trying to determine what to do about aid to Europe after the Marshall plan is due to end in 1952. The thinking appears to be in the direction of more money. Can we afford that?

A vast new Government-subsidized housing program is getting under way this summer. To try to provide some low-rent homes from high-cost construction the Government would spend, eventually, several hundred million dollars a year. Can we afford that?

Mr. Truman has proposed that the Government ought to expand much further into the electric power business, through the building of several dams. That obviously would cost hundreds of millions of dollars. Can we afford that?

These are some examples of vast Government spending that we suggest Mr. Truman look at if he really has a desire to be parsimonious.

Veto of the Basing-Point Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Business Seen Ruled by Bureaucrat Whim, Not Law of Congress." The article is by David Lawrence, and deals with the basing-point bill and the Presidential veto. I think it is a good article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS SEEN RULED BY BUREAUCRAT WHIM, NOT LAW OF CONGRESS—BASING-POINT BILL VETO LEAVES MANY WONDERING IF THEY DARE TAKE RISK

(By David Lawrence)

Businessmen suddenly have discovered this week that they are not governed by the laws of Congress any more but by the whims of fallible bureaucrats who can construe laws as they please.

The oft-quoted phrase—"a government of laws and not of men"—has become obsolete with the recent veto message of President Truman on the so-called basing-point bill.

All over the country, in commodities ranging from candy to tooth paste and from steel to paper, the producers are wondering if they dare take a chance and absorb a part or all of the freight rate in quoting a delivered price.

The President, in vetoing a bill which attempted to clarify the matter, virtually substitutes his own judgment of the meaning of the law for the judgment of Congress and the courts.

STATEMENT BY O'MAHONEY

Perhaps the most illuminating statement of what has happend is given by Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, Democrat, who championed the bill that the President vetoed. The Wyoming Senator, who was undoubtedly trying to be constructive and to smooth over the chaotic situation produced by the President, said some things in his recent statement which emphasize the government-of-men-rather-than-laws doctrine.

"I have read with satisfaction the President's words: 'Thus it is quite clear that there is no bar to freight absorption or delivered prices as such.' I take this to be an expression of the desire of the President of the United States that the Federal Trade Commission should not bring any proceedings against any seller who, by individual action, without combination or conspiracy, adopts either of these practices.

"I commend this presidential construction of existing law to all businessmen and particularly to all processors in the West and in the South and indeed everywhere in the United States who desire without restraint of trade or unfair methods of competition to quote delivered prices or to absorb freight by individual action in order that they may reach the markets they must reach if we are to have competition.

"Businessmen will note the following statement from the veto message of the President: 'I recognize that businessmen have been concerned lest they be penalized for perfectly sensible and appropriate competitive action. I believe their concern is unwarranted'."

TRANSPARENT HYPOCRISY

"These words likewise should be an encouragement to businessmen who desire to compete by the pricing methods mentioned in my bill and should also be a clear indication to all Government agencies that there should be no process against 'perfectly sensible and appropriate competitive action' involving freight absorption or delivered prices which the President says are not illegal 'as such.' That is the objective my bill sought to attain."

But how can the President indicate to an independent agency—indeed, to a quasi-judicial commission, such as the Federal Trade Commission is supposed to be—just what suits it may or may not bring? And how can any businessman rely on such transparent hypocrisy? For certainly it may be predicted that if a large company like United States Steel tries it, there will be a lawsuit just the same.

The fact of the matter is that the President has frustrated an attempt by Congress in an important matter—quoting delivered prices—to exercise its rightful power in regulating commerce. Nobody knows now what is lawful or unlawful. Competition, which is the essence of the American system, has been prevented and local monopolies encouraged. It certainly should make a real campaign issue in certain areas of the country where prices will gradually begin to rise as the buyer has to pay extra for the freight on nearly everything he buys.

Oklahoma Veterans' Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. WILSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert in the RECORD a tabulation of the laws of the State of Oklahoma pertaining to veterans and their rights, benefits, and privileges. This tabulation is prepared to show the type of law, a résumé of its terms and the appropriate citation.

Chart résumé of State laws granting rights, benefits, and privileges to veterans, their dependents, and their organizations

OKLAHOMA

Type of law	Résumé	Citation
Burial allowances and allied benefits	*Burial.*—County allowance for the burial of indigent veterans. Burial may not be in potter's field. Relatives may be allowed to conduct funeral.	Stat. (1941; Supp. 1947), title 72, § 31-32.
	Grave care and registration.—Cemetery and graves of soldiers now located on property of Union Soldiers' Home placed under supervision and care of the adjutant general.	Stat. (1941), title 72, § 165.
Civil relief and war emergency provisions	Acknowledgements of written instruments executed by members of the armed forces of the United States, validity.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 16, § 35; title 72, § 50.1-50.4.
	Administration of estates of members of the armed forces listed as missing in action, captured by the enemy, etc. Termination of conservatorship.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 60, § 361-367.
	Extension of operators' and chauffeurs' motor vehicle licenses during active military service in the armed forces of the United States; expiration date, Jan. 1 following discharge from the service.	Stat. (1941), title 47, § 288a-288b.
	Hunting and fishing license not required of members of the armed forces during World War II and for 6 months thereafter.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 29, § 67c.
	Preservation of status of legal newspaper forced to suspend publication by reason of owner's induction into the armed forces.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 25, § 106-112, as amended; Laws 1949, p. 213.
	Proof of death of person in the military, naval, or maritime service of the United States	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 58, § 713.
Civil rights	Absentee registration and voting	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 26, §§ 91-92, 343, 345.1-345.16.
Claims; assistance in obtaining benefits; safekeeping of papers.	*Notary services.*—No fees may be charged by any public officer for administering an oath nor for the giving of a certificate needed in procuring any pension, bounty, or back pay.	Stat. (1941) title 28, § 5.
	Public-record certification.—County clerks are required to furnish copies of record of discharge papers free of charge.	Stat. (1941), title 72, § 22.
	—— County court clerks and the registrar of the bureau of vital statistics are required to furnish copies of vital records, orders in guardianship proceedings, etc., free of charge to veterans or their dependents for use in perfecting claims against the Bureau of Pensions or the United States Veterans' Bureau.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 72, § 23
	—— Free copies of public records for wards of the United States Veterans' Bureau, under Uniform Guardianship Act.	Stat. (1941; Supp. 1947), title 72, §§ 106, 126.16.
	Recording of discharges.—Honorable discharges of returned soldiers and sailors shall be recorded by the clerk free of charge.	Stat. (1941), title 72, § 21-22.
	Service officers, etc.—The War Veterans' Commission shall give assistance to all honorably discharged ex-service persons of all wars and to their dependents.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 72, § 63.3.
Educational benefits; qualification for the professions and trades.	Awarding of diplomas, certificates, or degrees to qualified seniors of high schools or colleges called into military service.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 70, § 1108.1-1108.2.
	Contracts for and use of fees and allowances available through any Federal agency for the education and training of veterans.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 70, § 2059.
	Public-school privileges to those unable to complete the twelfth grade while of legal school age by reason of service in the armed forces.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 70, § 1202.
	Registration privilege of nurses having prior military service	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 59, § 554.
	Renewal of embalmers and funeral directors licenses	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 59, § 396.5a.
	World War II veterans actually engaged in watchmaking for a period of at least 5 years prior to induction into the armed forces entitled to certificate of registration without examination.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 59, § 776 (4).
Educational opportunities for children of veterans.	Appropriation for the support and education of destitute minor children of veterans. Such children may, after becoming of age, continue eligible to receive assistance for a period not to exceed 3 years, if attending a school or college approved by the Soldiers' Relief Commission.	Laws 1947, p. 676; Laws 1949, p. 762-763.
Employment preferences, privileges, etc.	Employees receiving salaries paid from the veterans training revolving fund shall be veterans or close relatives of veterans.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 72, § 66.3.
	Exemption of World War II veterans from the statutory requirement that a candidate for county superintendent of schools must have taught school for 18 months during the last 5 years prior to such candidacy. Such veterans, however, must meet the other statutory requirements.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 70, § 21.
	Leaves of absence for public officers and employees and for persons in private business during active military service. Reinstatement without loss of seniority, status, or efficiency rating.	Stat. (1941; Supp. 1947), title 72, § 46-48.
	Leaves of absence for railroad employees compelled to enter military service. Reinstatement with full seniority and without an interrupted service record.	Stat. (1941), title 40, § 185.
	Preference in appointment of memorial hall custodian	Stat. (1941), title 73, §§ 34, 40.
	Preference in the selection of members of the War Veterans' Commission and employees of the State Veterans' Department.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 72, § 63.2-63.3.
	Reemployment of persons who left positions with the State, or any county, city, town, or school district to service in the armed forces on or after Sept. 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of World War II.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 51, § 25.1-25.3.
	Reinstatement of members of fire departments in cities and towns within 90 days after termination of military service, without loss of status or seniority.	Stat. (1941), title 11, § 391-395.
	Reinstatement of public officers and employees without loss of seniority or other employment rights, upon termination of service in the armed Forces of the United States. Applicable to persons called into Service under the Selective Service Act of 1948.	Laws 1949, p. 618-620.
	Status under the Employment Security Act	Stat. (1941), title 40, § 214 (Repealed Laws 1945, p. 134); Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 40, § 215 (f).
	War-service credit to highway patrolmen under the retirement and pension plan	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 47, § 381.7.
	War-service credit under the teachers' retirement plan	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 70, §§ 965.4, 965.8 (1) (b).
Exemption from execution, garnishment, etc.	Members of the Armed Forces shall not lose their homestead exemptions on account of their absence in the service during World War II and for 6 months thereafter.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 31, § 9.
	Money received by a disabled veteran as a pension is exempt from execution or attachment.	Stat. (1941), title 31, § 7.
Guardianship	Court costs not required in any proceeding to appoint a guardian to approve or authorize the ward to enter the Armed Forces.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 58, § 782.
	Uniform Veterans' Guardianship Act.—Provides for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent veteran or the minor child of a veteran, to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.	Stat. (1941), title 72, § 71-121; Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 72, § 126.1-126.23.
Homes (institutional)	Admission of veterans of World Wars I and II to the Oklahoma Veterans' Home established on the site of the Oklahoma Confederate Home and the Southern Oklahoma Hospital. Transfer of property held by the board of trustees of the Confederate Home and certain other institutions, to the War Veterans' Commission for the use of the Oklahoma Veterans' Home.	Laws 1949, p. 620-622.
	Property formerly part of Union Soldiers' Home transferred to the control, supervision, and management of the State board of public affairs for the benefit of the State. Cemetery and graves of soldiers placed under the supervision and care of the adjutant general.	Stat (1941), title 72 § 164-165.
Hospital benefits	Admission of veterans to the separate ward building established in the central Oklahoma State Hospital at Norman. Use of revolving fund for care of patients.	Stat. (1941; Supp. 1947), title 35, §§ 161-167.1.
	Appropriations made for the hospitalization of war veterans in the veterans' ward at the university hospital shall be expended under the supervision of the War Veterans' Commission, formerly known as the Soldiers' Relief Commission.	Laws 1947, p. 690; Laws 1949, p. 762.
	Maintenance of the Soldiers' Memorial Hospital and the Oklahoma Central State Hospital; use of funds.	Stat. (1941), title 72, §§ 55-57, 59-60.
	Provision for hospital care of tubercular ex-service persons and minor dependents at the Oklahoma State Veterans' Hospital. Expenditure of funds designated as the Oklahoma State Veterans' Hospital revolving fund.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 72, § 54-54.2; Laws 1949, p. 710-711.
Loans, contracts of minors, etc.	Any State banking association may make loans under authority of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 6, § 108b.
	Removal of minority disability of veterans eligible for benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 72, § 49.1.

Chart résumé of State laws granting rights, benefits, and privileges to veterans, their dependents, and their organizations—Continued

OKLAHOMA—continued

Type of law	Résumé	Citation
Medals, certificates, etc.	The Governor authorized to execute appropriate scrolls on behalf of the State and its citizens expressing appreciation for the patriotic services rendered by citizens of the State who lost their lives in defense of the country during World War II.	Laws 1945, H. J. R. 24.
Meeting places, memorials, etc.	A room in the historical building set aside and designated as the Soldiers' Relief Commission room for use of the commission.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 53, § 15.1.
Pensions	Pensions to Confederate veterans or widows. Widows may be transferred to the old-age assistance rolls upon attaining the age of 65 years, provided the amount to be paid will exceed the amount allowed under the Confederate pension law.	Stat. (1941; Supp. 1947), title 72, § 131-142.
Relief and rehabilitation	Emergency financial aid to veterans of World War II, their wives or widows. Payments or loans to be made from the War Veterans' Commission revolving fund.	Laws 1949, p. 762-763.
	On-the-job training for veterans.—Control and disbursement of the veterans' training revolving fund.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 72, § 66.1-66.3; Laws 1949, p. 757-759.
	Rehabilitation of handicapped persons.—The Soldiers' Relief Commission authorized to enter into contracts with educational institutions for the establishment of training courses.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 72, § 68.1-68.2.
	The War Veterans' Commission directed to do and perform all acts necessary or proper to afford emergency, temporary and permanent relief for all honorably discharged ex-service persons of all wars of the United States and for their dependents.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 72, § 63.3.
	Use of the "S. R. C. Revolving Fund" for emergency financial aid in the maintenance or support of World War II veterans, their wives, or widows, or minor dependents.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 72, § 67.1-67.3; Laws 1949, p. 757-759.
Tax and license fee exemptions	*Gift tax.*—Exemption to veterans' organizations	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 68, § 1043.
	Income tax.—Deferment of collection of tax and filing of returns by persons in the armed forces, until 6 months after termination of military service or 6 months after termination of World War II.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 68, § 914.
	—— Military compensation not to exceed the sum of $1,500 in any 1 year (Dec. 7, 1941, to end of war) exempt from income tax.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 68, § 878 (b) (5).
	Inheritance tax.—Exemption of war-risk insurance, adjusted service compensation, proceeds from any Federal bonus, pension, etc.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 68, § 989c (6) (a, b, c).
	Peddler's license.—Hawking and peddling privileges available to needy or disabled veterans without payment of privilege tax.	Stat. (1941; Supp. 1947), title 72, § 1-6.
	Professional and occupational license.—Exemption of certain veterans from payment of license fee or tax to give illustrated lectures, magic-lantern exhibitions and similar entertainments.	Stat. (1941; Supp. 1947), title 72, § 1-6.
	—— Exemption of licensed embalmers and funeral directors from payment of renewal fees during active military service in World War II.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 59, § 396.5a.
	Property tax.—Exemption of $100 (household goods, tools, livestock, etc.) and in addition thereto $200 on other personal property of members of the armed forces of World War II, Civil War veterans, both Union and Confederate, and veterans of any war in which the United States participated as a belligerent, and to all widows of such veterans, who are bona fide residents of the State.	Const., art. X, § 6; Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 68, § 15.2 (12).
Veterans' organizations	*Insignia.*—Unauthorized wearing or use of badges, pins, or insignia of veterans' organizations is a misdemeanor punishable by fine of not less than $25 nor more than $100 or by imprisonment for not more than 30 days.	Stat. (1941), title 21, § 1514.
	Meeting places, etc.—Armory privileges	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 44, § 231.3.
	—— Authorizes Logan County to transfer disused jail property for the use of veterans' organizations.	Laws 1921, ch. 193 (local).
	—— County commissioners authorized to lease, rent, or donate any room in the courthouse for use of veterans' organizations, for socials, reading room, etc.	Stat. (1941), title 72, § 41.
	—— Rooms in the historical society building for the use of veterans' organizations	Stat. (1941), title 53, §§ 13-15.
	Privileges, duties, etc.—Assistance in the selection of members of the War Veterans' Commission.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 72, § 63.2.
	—— Copy of annual audit required to be filed with the Secretary of State	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 72, § 63.2.
	Tax exemptions.—Exemption from gift tax	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 68, § 1043.
Veterans' service agency	War Veterans' Commission (successor of the Soldiers' Relief Commission) and the State Veterans' Department.	Stat. (Supp. 1947), title 72, § 63.1-63.4.

The President's Veto of Basing-Point Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the basing-point bill prepared by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I think a reading of the statement would be of interest to Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S VETO SAYS: "THERE IS NO BAR TO FREIGHT ABSORPTION OR DELIVERED PRICES AS SUCH"

(Statement of Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, sponsor of S. 1008, at a press conference following receipt of the Presidential veto)

If I do not have a law, I have a veto message which, in its more significant parts, asserts the correctness of the view for which I have contended.

There were two issues presented by S. 1008, namely whether or not delivered prices and freight absorption per se are illegal; and whether or not a mere change of price by a competitor could be used as the basis of a Government prosecution without prima facie proof of the illegal effect provided by the Robinson-Patman Act.

On the first issue I have read with satisfaction the President's words: "Thus it is quite clear that there is no bar to freight absorption or delivered prices as such." I take this to be an expression of the desire of the President of the United States that the Federal Trade Commission should not bring any proceedings against any seller who, by individual action, without combination or conspiracy, adopts either of these practices.

I commend this Presidential construction of existing law to all businessmen and particularly to all processors in the West and in the South and indeed everywhere in the United States who desire without restraint of trade or unfair methods of competition to quote delivered prices or to absorb freight by individual action in order that they may reach the markets they must reach if we are to have competition.

Businessmen will note the following statement from the veto message of the President:

"I recognize that businessmen have been concerned lest they be penalized for perfectly sensible and appropriate competitive action. I believe their concern is unwarranted."

These words likewise should be an encouragement to businessmen who desire to compete by the pricing methods mentioned in my bill and should also be a clear indication to all Government agencies that there should be no process against perfectly sensible and appropriate competitive action involving freight absorption or delivered prices which the President says are not illegal as such. That is the objective my bill sought to attain.

It is to be noted that the President has stated in the veto message that the Federal Trade Commission and the courts now consider a great number of factors in determining whether there has been an unlawful conspiracy to fix prices in a particular case. "Among these factors," he says, "are the operation of freight absorption and basing-point systems as they affect pricing and competition." The President refers to systems. My bill referred to individual action, so here again we have a clear indication that there is no danger where individual action is involved so far as the President's purpose is concerned.

Finally, with respect to price discriminations, the President says:

"At the present time a principal test of unjustified price discrimination under the Clayton Act is whether the effect 'may be' substantially to lessen competition."

This gives Presidential emphasis, it seems to me, to the provision of the Robinson-Patman Act which defines what an unlawful price discrimination is. It is the same definition which I placed upon the Robinson-Patman Act, namely a discrimination the effect of whch may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

Therefore, I draw the inference from the President's message that sellers who reduce prices for competitive purposes without any

prima facie proof of existing danger of substantially lessening competition or tending to create a monopoly are not jeopardized under the President's interpretation of existing law. Inasmuch as my whole purpose was to secure a statutory declaration of existing law to clear away uncertainty, I am glad that in his veto message Mr. Truman has enabled me, by the language I have quoted above, to say to the business community that, in my opinion, they need not fear adverse action by Government agencies when, by individual action, they engage in competitive production, distribution and sale of the commodities in which they deal.

The Conflict in the National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials, all dealing with the conflict of jurisdiction between the National Labor Relations Board and the general counsel, as follows: First, from the Journal of Commerce of June 8, 1950, entitled "NLRB-Denham Dispute Concerns Issues Vital to Management"; second, from the Wall Street Journal of June 8, 1950, entitled "A Crippled Labor Board"; and third, from the Washington Post of June 11, 1950, entitled "Denham as Lawmaker." I feel sure that any of my colleagues who have not read these editorials will find them very illuminating.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Journal of Commerce of June 8, 1950]

LABOR RELATIONS—NLRB-DENHAM DISPUTE CONCERNS ISSUES VITAL TO MANAGEMENT

WASHINGTON.—Management in big and medium-size industry could be making a serious mistake in laughing off as just another bureaucratic tussle the deep-rooted dispute between the NLRB and its general counsel over how far the Board must probe into the labor affairs of little business.

The constant public squabbling between Robert N. Denham and the five-man Board has tended to obscure fundamental issues of real significance to management. Employers who are certain that because of the scope of their operations the NLRB would assert jurisdiction over them anyway aren't particularly interested in the fate of the one- or two-horse outfits which Denham contends are as much within the NLRB's jurisdiction as the large ones.

They are missing a couple of essential points:

1. The busier the Board has to be with insignificant business operations—and there are thousands and thousands that conceivably could be brought in under Denham's interpretation—the less time it will have to expedite cases brought by other management.

Loud squawks over NLRB slowness in deciding cases helped pass the Taft-Hartley Act and have only recently begun to subside. Meanwhile, Congress is waving its economy knife at the Board's appropriations; the House money bill pending before the Senate would force Denham's office to fire more than 100 employees—mostly in the field.

MAY BROADEN SCOPE

2. The broader the Board is allowed or forced to spread its protective and punitive arm into the far reaches of the business community, the deeper its fingers might also probe. There is no guaranty, statutory or otherwise, that this Labor Board or the next one would not regard it as its duty to assert jurisdiction not only over small business, but also over small-scale violations of the law that it presently tends to slough off as too insignificant to warrant the Board's taking its eye off the main job.

That's just fine, some management groups will declare in the mistaken belief that only labor unions would feel the pinch. The Taft-Hartley Act has privileges and punishments for both sides, and the employer is as vulnerable to the latter as he is eligible for the former.

What is involved in this entire dispute boils down to a question of how far the Federal Government should—must—not go in establishing and effectuating public policy for labor relations in the United States.

CRYING TOWELS NEEDED

If the Government really is going to go as far as Denham apparently believes it must, perhaps we'd better be prepared with a large supply of crying towels for those employers—large and small alike—who feel the Government is already too deeply entangled in their hair.

The anomalies of the situation are well pointed up by Denham's insistence that while he can and will prosecute unfair labor practice charges in the building industry, he cannot and will not attempt to conduct representation elections in it.

For at the same time, he has refused repeated entreaties by labor and management in the longshoring and shipping industries—particularly on the west coast—to let their hiring practices alone, too.

Granted the two industries have their own peculiar characteristics and problems; but they both are the unwilling victims of the fluidity of their own employment practices which, as the Taft-Hartley Act now stands, make the conducting of representation and union-shop elections almost impossible.

NUDGES DENHAM

The Labor Board itself, to be fair about the matter, hasn't come up with any better solution of its own. But it has at least got the jump on Denham by reminding him in public that no one but Congress—and certainly not the NLRB—many conceive and make the laws.

The Board is giving the screw another vigorous turn in a brief it made public today. It points out—by quoting such authorities as Senator TAFT and other framers of the present law—that Congress, (1) wants only one—not two—public policies on labor, and, (2) would rather the Board stuck to the important cases.

Until Congress decides otherwise, the NLRB apparently will go on rejecting those cases the settlement of which would not effectuate the policies of the act.

[From the Wall Street Journal of June 8, 1950]

A CRIPPLED LABOR BOARD

In the opinion of the National Labor Relations Board, things are going on in the building-construction industry which the Taft-Hartley law forbids. But there is nothing the Board can do about it beyond protesting, because the same law provides that the Board's general counsel doesn't have to take its orders unless he feels like it. That leaves the Board without even a seeing-eye dog to lead it into court.

What the Board is worried about is the practical application of union-shop conditions in the building trade without the formality of a Board-supervised election on the subject. The Taft-Hartley law sanctions union-shop agreements only if and after a majority of the employees affected have said on the record that they want one.

General Counsel Denham's position is that the working force of any building contractor is shifting and scattered; that it is therefore difficult if not impossible to obtain an election verdict which continuously expresses the real attitude of a majority of the workers for a given contractor. So he has asked the Board to give its approval to his wholly practical interpretation of the law.

But the Board has replied, in effect, that if any provision of a law given it to administer is found unworkable it becomes the duty of the Board to report that fact to Congress, "rather than to change the law ourselves by administrative exemption of a single industry." At the same time the Board acknowledges that as long as its general counsel may "exercise his exclusive discretion" as to proceeding against the execution of an unauthorized union-shop contract, the Board is helpless in the matter.

It has seemed to this newspaper that, generally speaking, General Counsel Denham has been more reasonable and practical in the part he plays in administering Federal labor laws than has the Board. In this particular case, however, we regard the Board's position as sound. It is not the business of an administrative body or of a single independent administrator to amend an act of Congress by ignoring any of its provisions. Such action in a particular case, no matter how well it may be or may seem justified by practical considerations, would set a dangerous precedent.

No doubt the Board can make its own report to Congress about the workability of certain provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, with or without Mr. Denham's help. And while it is reporting on that point it could say something about the anomalous position of an administrative agency whose legal officer is permitted by law to go his own sweet way. So far as this newspaper is aware there is no parallel to Mr. Denham's status.

[From the Washington Post of June 11, 1950]

DENHAM AS LAWMAKER

Experience has shown that it is impracticable to apply the union-shop election provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act to the building trades because of the shifting character of employment. Nevertheless, as the Washington Post stated in an editorial on December 10, 1949, "the NLRB has no authority to exempt either unions or employers (in the construction industry) from the provisions of the law, however impractical it may prove to be in actual practice. What the NLRB can do is to send recommendations to Congress. If such recommendations should lead to piecemeal modification of the extreme and impractical portions of the Taft-Hartley Act, that would be a notable victory for common sense."

General Counsel Denham, of the NLRB, has set about amending the law on his own responsibility by announcing that he will not attempt to enforce union-shop provisions in case of the building construction industry as fully as elsewhere. That means, presumably, that if employees are discharged pursuant to an unauthorized union-shop contract, the general counsel may decline

to bring charges of unfair labor practices against the employer, and the Board itself will be unable to conduct hearings to find out whether the law has been violated. In other words, it will be deprived of the opportunity to enforce the law or to try to do so.

The Board has taken a firm stand against this sort of high-handed action on the ground that it "would tend to vary or nullify the plain language of the present statute." If the union-shop provisions of the act are unworkable in the case of the construction industry, then, General Counsel Denham is reminded, the remedy lies in reporting the fact to Congress, rather than in changing the law by administrative exemption of the industry. If Mr. Denham is permitted to get away with this kind of usurpation of lawmaking powers, he will set a dangerous precedent that Congress may have cause to regret.

The conflict between the Board and the general counsel, now out in the open, involves many other important issues of policy. As a result, both labor and management are confronted with a double standard provocative of confusion and uncertainty as to their rights and responsibilities. Rejection of the plan for reorganizing the NLRB by abolishing the office of the general counsel and assigning his functions to the Board emphasizes the necessity of replacing Mr. Denham by an official who will cooperate with the Board instead of obstructing its activities and impairing its efficiency as a regulatory agency.

Letter of Appreciation From Displaced Persons Settled in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, some days ago a group of former displaced persons who have been resettled in the United States called on me in my office. They were a fine-looking group of people, such as might be found in any American community. One distinguishing characteristic was their passionate sense of gratitude at being in America. The other day I received a letter from one of them who had acted as group leader. He referred to himself and to his fellow immigrants as present-day pilgrims. Shining through the lapses in language in this letter is a true and moving eloquence. It is so touching that I should like to introduce it into the RECORD and ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that it be printed in the Appendix exactly as I received it.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

315 EAST 209 STREET,
BRONX 67, NEW YORK, *June 7, 1950.*

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: May I express my deep appreciation for your kindness in your receiving with much very much attention the group of the present day pilgrims. It was a demonstration for the greatness of our country. For its genius of government by the consent of the people.

You noted the little girl, Miriam Eichel, in the evening of that day we celebrated her elevent birthday. Thought of her father who was gassed in the crematories of the cursed be the memory Hitler. She grew up in the wilds of Siberia, where her mother was cutting down trees. There in snow she laid, wrapped in rags, fed with sour bread and rain water. Now, she is our conutry, attending our public schools visiting with the Senator of the Empire State. Is it not wonderful?

In the same group was a couple, Mr. and Mrs. Anshel Borjakovsky, 629 West 136 Street, New York, N. Y. She had a beautiful daughter, who would be now fifteen years old, she is not among us now. In the empire of Stalin, there was no bread for the daughter of the Borjakovsky. She died of hunger. The parents worked, begged, stole, still they could not have enough food to keep their daughter alive. On a field of White Russia, mother had to dig with stick a grave for her daughters eternal rest. Will they ever be able to down their sorrows? Miriams mother who survived the slave camp of Stalin is in a happier condition, she will live to see her daughter mature under the sunny skies of America.

You noted the special mark of the pilgrims the burned numbers on their hands. This will stay with them to the ends of their days.

They were glad to hear about the DP bill, because it will make possible for their friends to share the blessings of America.

God bless you for the wisdom in giving them the kind hand.

Sincerely,

DAVID BERKINGOFF.

Antistrike Legislation and the Switchmen's Strike—Telegrams from Residents of Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD 30 telegrams coming from various sections of the State of Kansas, with reference to antistrike legislation and the switchmen's strike which is scheduled to be called on June 25.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BREWSTER, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*

Hon. ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please take action at once to head off Switchmen's strike called for June 25. If they strike the Rock Island Railroad will be paralyzed. We still have 55 cars CCC wheat to ship before harvest and harvest will be here in 10 days with a good crop.

COFFEY GRAIN CO.
CHAS. R. COFFEY.

ARLINGTON, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*

Hon. ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:

The reported switchmen's walkout during harvest would result in serious loss to wheat growers. Please contact executives for immediate solution in behalf of constituency.

THE COOPERATIVE EXCHANGE,
JERRY N. HINSHAW, *Manager.*

WICHITA, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*

Hon. ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Reports indicate railroad strike next week. Hope you will do all in your power to prevent. Understand Rock Island only railroad serving Wichita. Your attention appreciated.

WICHITA UNION STOCK YARDS CO.,
DAN C. SMITH, *President,*

COLBY, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*

Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Switchmen's Union of North America has called strike on Rock Island and four other Western railroads at 6 a. m., June 25. Urge enactment appropriate legislation to prevent such strike to protect interests of the public.

COOPER GRAIN, INC.

GALVA, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*

Hon. ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
Senator, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

A strike causing the shut-down of the Rock Island Railroad will stop our elevator operations and cause loss to wheat farmers in our territory. A strike is unwarranted and unjustified.

ANTRIM GRAIN CO.

TOPEKA, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*

ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge your support to stop the railroad strike.

TOPEKA FOUNDRY & IRON WORKS CO.,
G. L. BYEEE.

ARLINGTON, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*

Hon. ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Heavy harvest in Arlington. Community railroad service desperately needed. Halt strike immediately for national interest.

THE ARLINGTON ELEVATOR CO.,
A. J. WARTA, *Manager.*

CANTON, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*

Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

If switchmen's strike called will block our elevator and seriously affect movement of grain. Will appreciate any immediate action you may take to avert this strike.

M. D. FISHER,
Canton Elevator Co.

WICHITA, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*

The Honorable ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Scheduled strike June 25 of Rock Island switchmen will cause great damage to us and the economy of this State. Suitable legislation compel both sides to accept recommendations President's Emergency Board essential to protect public interests.

CARROLL M. WILLIS.

HUTCHINSON, KANS., *June 23, 1950.*

Hon. ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Present threatened rail strike illustrates imperative need immediate legislative action outlawing strikes in essential industries and

services where public interest is involved. I hope you will make every possible effort to remedy this condition and to prevent this strike.

J. P. O'SULLIVAN,
President, the Hutchinson Foundry & Steel Co.

HUTCHINSON, KANS., *June 23, 1950.*
Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Proposed strike of switchmen on Rock Island lines will have disastrous effect on the current wheat harvest and otherwise seriously interfere with agriculture and industry in Hutchinson and southwest Kansas. We urge you to take all possible legal action to avert this strike and to secure an equitable settlement of the issues under existing legal powers.

WENDELL S. HOLMES,
President, Hutchinson Chamber of Commerce.

HUTCHINSON, KANS., *June 23, 1950.*
Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We vigorously protest the railroad strike called for June 25. As pertains to the Rock Island, as will partially paralyze our market and the largest industry in the State. We urge immediate steps be taken to protect the rights of large majority of people against small minority.

H. C. JENNINGS,
President, the Hutchinson Board of Trade Association.

HUTCHINSON, KANS., *June 23, 1950.*
Hon. ANDY SCHOEPPEL, *Senator,*
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We would appreciate anything you can do to prevent switchmen's strike being called Sunday. Also your support of legislation avoid these cripping strikes.

J. S. DILLON & STORES CO.,
By JOHN L. CRAWFORD.

WELLINGTON, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*
Hon. ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Please avert if at all possible impending switchmen's strike on Rock Island Railroad and other involved lines.

NATIONAL FURNITURE MANUFACTURING CO.

WICHITA, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*
Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Rock Island Railroad advises they will be compelled to cease operations if switchmen's strike threat is carried out. We and many others have suffered irreparable loss and damage as result of recent strikes on Santa Fe and Missouri Pacific, and now again we must bear additional losses if Rock Island ceases operation. How long must public suffer such hardships and losses before corrective action is taken? Urge you exert every effort to enact legislation to protect public against further losses resulting from railroad strike.

THE KANSAS MILLING CO.,
R. WARD MCGILL, *President.*

TOPEKA, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*
ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Orderly transportation and distribution of goods again threatened by railway. I urge your active support to congressional action that will outlaw such threat to public welfare.

E. C. KIESWETTER,
W. A. L. Thompson Hardware.

INMAN, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*
Senator SCHOEPPEL,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.:

Do everything possible to prevent switchmen's strike. Enact legislation to prevent future strikes.

FRIESEN GRAIN CO.

LIBERAL, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*
Hon. ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
United States Senator from Kansas,
Washington, D. C.:

Railroad switchmen's strike will stop all Commodity Credit Corporation and private movement of grain. Will cause shut-down our food processing plant. Urge you do all possible to prevent strike at this time.

LIGHT GRAIN & MILLING CO., INC.

MULLINVILLE, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*
Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Threatened shut-down of Rock Island Railway will be serious here. Harvest just starting, and cars are needed to handle crop. We need your help.

THE EQUITY EXCHANGE.

LIBERAL, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*
Hon. ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Pending railroad strike scheduled for Sunday a. m. will seriously impair our operation, since we are located on Rock Island Railroad only. This season of year when we are moving sizable tonnage perishables due to increased demand from wheat harvest our territory. Anything you can do to ward off strike will be greatly appreciated.

BLAKEMORE BROS. GROCERY CO.,
DON ZOOK.

NORTON, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*
Hon. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urgently request that Congress take immediate steps to enact legislation to prevent the threatening railroad strike which is set for Sunday, June 25. In the face of harvest, a walk-out on the Rock Island Railroad will deal this community a fatal blow, as we have only Rock Island facilities to ship wheat.

Thank you.

RALPH REICH GRAIN,
By A. E. SCHAFER.

KISMET, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*
Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Box car situation very acute here. We are protesting railroad strike effective June 25. We are asking relief.

KISMET EQUITY EXCHANGE.

WELLSFORD, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*
ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
United States Senator, of Kansas,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand switchmen's strike if carried through will tie up C. R. I. & P. Sunday. Situation critical. Urge that you do all possible to avert this or any new strikes called during harvest.

DUNBAR GRAIN CO.

KISMET, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*
Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Grain car shortage very acute here. We protest railroad strike June 25. Your efforts for relief of situation asked.

MCCOLLOM GRAIN CO.

TOPEKA, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*
Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Railroad strikes are a continual menace to the health and welfare of our residents. We have approximately 100,000 depending on the city as their only source of potable water. The city supply depends on the regular delivery of lime, alum, and fuel oil. The railroads are the only practical means of transportation. Any influence you can use to provide a method of settling these disputes without tying up the operation of the railroads will be appreciated.

LLOYD B. SMITH,
Water Commissioner.

TOPEKA, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*
Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
Washington, D. C.:

Work stoppage railroad employees scheduled for Sunday will seriously affect plant operations. Our tract facilities serviced by Rock Island. Urge immediate action by legislative or executive branch to avert this stoppage and prevent future occurrences.

W. V. HASKELL,
Beatrice Foods Co.

PRESTON, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*
ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:

We bitterly oppose the threatened strike of switchmen on June 25. Urge immediate legislation to stop it. Will hurt farmers and businessmen severely. Good crop to be saved.

UPPENDAHL GRAIN CO.
PRESTON CO-OP GRAIN AND MERCANTILE.
GRIER GRAIN CO.

RAMONA, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*
Hon. ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Strike called for 6 a. m. Sunday AFL Switchmen's Union of North America; suggest immediate legislation prevent same. Harvest due full swing next week. Severe car shortage here.

R. K. CHANDLER, *Manager,*
CO-OP ELEVATOR CO.

INMAN, KANS., *June 22, 1950.*
Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.:

Protest threatened switchmen's strike. Will disrupt our plant at Buhler and Inmans; favor legislation to prevent further tie-ups.

BUHLER MILL ELEVATOR CO.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *June 22, 1950.*
ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
Senate Office Building:

Switchmen's Union of North America has announced its intention to strike the Rock Island and four other roads June 25. This in defiance of emergency boards recommendation. The undersigned is a traffic and transportation association of flour mills located at Kansas City and numerous points in Kansas including points on Rock Island, some of which are served by Rock Island exclusively. We believe switchmen's action arbitrary and shows disposition to ignore orderly processes set up for protection all concerned. Public interest is paramount to that of a few switchmen and such a condition should not be tolerated. We do not favor oppression of labor but they should abide by the same rules as others. We urge such action by Congress as necessary prevent this strike.

KANSAS-MISSOURI RIVER MILLS,
J. W. HOLLOWAY,
Executive Secretary.

Fulton E. Lewis, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Appendix of the RECORD the second in a series of articles by Mr. Charles Van Devander, as well as an editorial entitled "If Fulton Lewis Had the Story," which were published in the New York Post on Thursday, June 22. Members of the Senate will recall that I placed the first of the series on Mr. Fulton E. Lewis, Jr., in the Appendix of the RECORD on Tuesday. Mr. Van Devander's second installment and the editorial merit serious attention by Members of the Congress and by the American people.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Post of June 22, 1950]

TOP NAZI OFFICIAL DESCRIBED LEWIS AS "FACTUAL, FAIR"

(By Charles Van Devander)

WASHINGTON June 22.—Hans Thomsen, top German Embassy official in Washington, described Fulton Lewis, Jr., to his superiors in Berlin just before Pearl Harbor as a radio commentator whose attitude toward Nazi Germany was "factual and unprejudiced."

"He attempts to support the isolationist line in his commentary on foreign affairs," Thomsen said in a secret code cable to the German Foreign Office on August 8, 1940.

This message, along with other official Nazi reports relating to the Washington commentator of the Mutual Broadcasting System, was among a mass of German documents captured by the United States Army in Berlin, and which are now in the possession of this Government.

Thomsen's appraisal of Fulton Lewis was written in response to a direct request from Nazi officials in Berlin, who wanted to know how much weight the radio commentator carried here.

Two weeks earlier Lewis had been quoted in a dispatch sent from Habana by Kurt Sell, press adviser of the Washington Embassy. Sell said that Lewis had approached him with a suggestion that Hitler publicly appeal to President Roosevent to get British Prime Minister Churchill to call off his "senseless" and "pigheaded" resistance to Germany.

Lewis has denied to the Post that he had any such conversation with Sell.

One Schmidt, apparently the man of that name who was then head of the press office in Berlin, promptly cabled Thomsen asking for his views "concerning the importance of Fulton Lewis."

Thomsen, as chargé d'affaires, was the top Nazi representative here in the absence of Ambassador Hans Dieckoff, who had been recalled to Berlin—permanently, as it turned out—for "consultations."

In reply to the inquiry from Berlin, Thomsen said that the suggestion attributed to Lewis undoubtedly was "well meant," but that Lewis was not, in himself, very important.

Thomsen's message, found 5 years later in official Nazi files in Berlin, said:

"The following may be said concerning the importance of Fulton Lewis, Jr.:

"L. is one of the younger news announcers of the well-known radio company, the Mutual Broadcasting System, has enjoyed a particular success of late, and is a close personal friend of Sell.

"He attempts to support the isolationist line in his commentary on foreign affairs. He takes an attitude toward Germany which is factual and unprejudiced, so that the proposal in question was certainly well meant.

"On the other hand, L. does not have as much political significance as some leading American commentators. The proposal in question, therefore, probably arises mostly from a desire on the part of the personalities involved to gain attention. Similar proposals are frequently made to the Embassy by well-meaning but uninfluential persons."

Thomsen advised against any appeal to FDR to act as mediater between Hitler and Churchill. In so doing, he apparently took his lead from the unenthusiastic tone of Berlin's response to the suggestion credited to Lewis.

Thomsen told his superiors in the Foreign Office that attacks by President Roosevelt against the Nazis had been stepped up in an effort to obtain passage of a Selective Service Act, and to "divert the attention of American voters * * * during the political campaign in order to further Roosevelt's reelection."

His message to Berlin concluded:

"In view of the internal political situation and the atmosphere of hatred against us a mediation appeal to Roosevelt at this time would be exploited primarily as a sign of German weakness and of a fear to undertake a military assault against England.

"Moreover," he continued, "Roosevelt would be made to appear in the eyes of the American voters as the best qualified international mediator, recognized even by the Fuehrer himself, and this would likewise strengthen his chances for election."

[From the New York Post of June 22, 1950]

IF FULTON LEWIS HAD THE STORY

In this newspaper yesterday Charles Van Devander disclosed that secret Nazi files now in the possession of this Government report that Fulton Lewis, Jr., offered free advice to Adolf Hitler in the crucial months of 1940. As we read Van Devander's dispatch and the supplementary report published in our news columns today, one thought continually recurred. What would Fulton Lewis, Jr., radio's golden voice of reaction, have done if he had gotten a comparable story on a liberal commentator? Would the air waves have been big enough to hold him?

Let us elaborate the fantasy. Let us imagine that Lewis had just obtained a document from the secret files of the Russian Embassy reporting that a liberal commentator (we'll call him John Doe) had approached the Russians in 1940 outlining a plan to end British resistance to nazism. Remember that was the era of the Nazi-Soviet pact when Moscow echoed Berlin and all its agents were crying for an end to the imperialist war. Suppose Lewis now found a secret cable message from the Russian Embassy to the Kremlin which contained these passages:

"In full recognition of this actual or presumed situation, John Doe approached me yesterday. Doe, who has been friendly with me for 12 years, highly respectable, an American journalist admiring Russia and Comrade Stalin, a political commentator with a major broadcasting chain * * * declared that the people wanted no war, but were rather defenseless against Roosevelt's refined tactics, especially now that he has made Congress a yes apparatus with no will of its own * * * (Doe therefore requests to be allowed to expound the following idea, which he has discussed with several serious-minded people. Have Stalin send a telegram to Roosevelt of no more than 200 words (recent speech of Stalin was too long for the average American) of approximately the following content:

"You, Mr. Roosevelt, have * * * constantly expressed the wish to see a bloody war avoided * * * therefore, I request you, for your part to approach Churchill and to talk him out of his senseless pigheadedness."

"Journalist Doe added that Roosevelt would naturally answer with incivility and animosity; that didn't matter. But upon the North American people, and above all upon South America, the appeal will make a deep impression and in no sense would be interpreted in serious-thinking circles as weakness."

We are sure that Lewis would not have conceded any possible complexities in the story. He would have run, not walked, to the nearest microphone and presented the findings as conclusive evidence that commentator Doe was a Russian agent who had consorted shamelessly with the Russian Embassy and volunteered free counsel to the Kremlin. He would have interpreted any denials as proof of guilt. He would have cried treason and no questions asked.

Since we reject the Lewis thought-process we do not contend that Lewis was a Nazi agent. Our guess is that he was a misguided embittered isolationist who foolishly believed he could save humanity by helping Hitler bring England to her knees. He may even have advanced his peace formula in less formal terms than the captured documents suggest. We do not know. We reserve final judgment until all the returns are in. But, to quote Lewis' favorite approach in damning men on lesser evidence, we believe the country has the right to know the full story. As he has said so often in recent months, let's open the files to the public and find out everything the Nazis had to say about Fulton Lewis, Jr.

Letter From Constituent—Antagonism of the Mid-York Weekly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a constituent:

MADISON COUNTY, N. Y., *March 18, 1950.*
The Honorable EDWIN ARTHUR HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have noted the antagonism of the Mid-York Weekly, published at Hamilton, N. Y., by Robert C. Roberts, against you. I cannot understand it. Mr. Roberts is the Republican county chairman as you know, and he has been very bitter against you. It is no doubt a concerted action to beat you at the primaries in order to put in a man who will bow to the boss and whom they can control.

The Mid-York paper has bought up a lot of papers and they no doubt have in mind the control of our next Congressman. I may say with truth that the county chairman is not popular with the general run of the people and anything that may be done to counteract him would be received with great satisfaction by the electorate.

Sincerely your friend.

M. C.

Development of the Cumberland River by the TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the development of the Cumberland River in Tennessee by the Tennessee Valley Authority represents one of the cherished hopes of the people of my State. In this connection, the President has called upon the Tennessee Valley Authority to make a survey and report of the possibilities of the development of the Cumberland by the TVA—an interim report of this survey has recently been made by the chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include a letter from President Truman and a copy of this interim report, together with an editorial from the Nashville Tennessean, dated June 23, last.

The letter, report, and editorial follow:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 21, 1950.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EVINS: In my letter of February 2, 1950, I advised you that the Tennessee Valley Authority had been requested to bring up to date its report of February 27, 1945, on the relationship between the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers (H. Doc. 107, 79th Cong., 1st sess.).

I am enclosing, for your information, a copy of an interim report on the subject, which I have received from the Tennessee Valley Authority. It seems to me that a revaluation of the plans and methods of development of the resources of the Cumberland River is necessary but I am sure you will agree that submission of my official report and recommendations to the Congress, together with such legislative proposals as may seem appropriate under sections 22 and 23 of the Tennessee Valley Act, should await completion of the Tennessee Valley Authority study.

Very sincerely yours,
HARRY S. TRUMAN.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, Tenn., February 27, 1950.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In your memorandum of January 20, 1950, you requested that we bring up to date the report which we made in 1945 on the Cumberland River and its relationship to the Tennessee River.

In our 1945 report we stated, as our general conclusions, that the Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers exhibit generally similar characteristics, that the Cumberland can and should be developed on the same intensive basis as the Tennessee, and that for most economical and effective results structures on the Cumberland should be designed, constructed, and operated to meet the needs of an integrated system embracing both the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers. We believe these conclusions are still sound.

However, developments in the Cumberland Basin since 1945, together with currently important problems concerning it—which, in our judgment, relate primarily to the type of projects to be built on the lower Cumberland below Nashville, and to the operation of existing and future projects in a manner which will produce the greatest possible benefits—will require a restudy of the situation before we can submit a new report in accordance with your request. We shall, of course, proceed with such a study as rapidly as possible in order to make whatever contribution we can toward helping to find a solution of existing problems, and to that end are requesting the cooperation of the Corps of Engineers in furnishing to us and reviewing with our engineers such field data and other material as the Corps has collected with respect to the area involved. We do not plan to carry on basic field studies, though such studies, either by the Corps of Engineers or TVA, may become necessary if data already collected by the Corps prove inadequate. Pending completion of a full report, we are submitting this interim statement summarizing in general terms the existing situation with respect to development of the Cumberland River Basin and the nature of the principal problems as we now see them.

Of the projects proposed for the Cumberland River Basin, Dale Hollow Dam has been completed by the Corps of Engineers, and Center Hill and Wolf Creek Dams are nearing completion. These three dams, all of which are located above Nashville, will produce substantial quantities of electric power in addition to affording flood-control benefits. Since the TVA power service area has for some years included most of the Cumberland River Basin, the TVA system is the logical outlet for power generated at projects located on the Cumberland River and its tributaries. In recognition of this fact, TVA and the Department of the Interior, which under the Flood Control Act of 1944 has responsibility for marketing power generated at hydroelectric projects operated by the Department of the Army, have entered into an agreement providing for sale to TVA of electric power generated at the Dale Hollow, Center Hill, and Wolf Creek projects. Power generated at Dale Hollow is now being delivered in accordance with this agreement. In addition, a memorandum of agreement has been entered into between the Corps of Engineers and TVA which provides, in general, that the Corps of Engineers, which is responsible for operation of the projects, will, insofar as consistent with flood-control requirements, schedule releases of water in accordance with TVA's requests in order to make electric power available to the extent and at the times most advantageous from the standpoint of TVA's over-all power system needs.

With regard to the problem of future project construction in the Cumberland Basin, the principal question relates to the most desirable method of developing the lower portion of the river. The plan recommended by the Chief of Engneers in House Document No. 761, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session (1946), and authorized by Congress in the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946, calls for construction of two low dams in this portion of the river at the Eureka and Dover sites, located, respectively, at approximately 32 and 88 miles above the river's mouth. These dams, in conjunction with a third low dam to be constructed at the Cheatham site at mile 146, would provide a 9-foot navigable channel from the mouth to Nashville. They would not provide either flood-control benefits or electric power. Preemption of this section of the river for low dams at Eureka and Dover would of course prevent, at least in the foreseeable future, construction of a high dam which might be capable of producing substantial flood-control benefits for the lower Ohio and Mississippi River as well as large quantities of electric power. For this reason, we believe other possible methods of development should be thoroughly reviewed before construction of the two low dams is begun.

Prior to submission of the Chief of Engineers' 1946 report, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors recommended, and the Chief of Engineers submitted to the Governors of Kentucky and Tennessee for comment, a plan for construction of a high dam at mile 30.5 which would have been operated for navigation and electric power, with the pool level maintained at all times between elevations 370 and 375. This plan of construction and operation would have produced virtually no flood-control benefits, and would have made impossible the use for agricultural purposes of any reservoir land below elevation 375. According to testimony of the Corps of Engineers before the Congress, this preliminary recommendation was dropped, and the proposal for the two low dams was substituted, because of opposition by some of the residents of the lower Cumberland Valley and the Governor of Kentucky to the inundation of the considerable acreage of agricultural land which the high dam plan proposed by the Corps of Engineers would have entailed. A representative of the Department of the Army testified before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors that: "A high dam at Eureka would be economically justified from the standpoint of power. We believe, however, that sufficient power projects are in view right now to take care of the power demand" (hearings before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives on the Improvement of the Cumberland River and Its Tributaries, Kentucky and Tennessee, 79th Cong., 2d sess. (1946), p. 19). Similarly, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors stated in its final report that "the Board is of the opinion that the need for water power in the area is not now of sufficient importance to outweigh the local objections to the high dam" (H. Doc. No. 761, 79th Cong., 2d sess. (1946), p. 7).

In our judgment, other possible plans of high dam construction and operation should now be given full consideration in the light of existing conditions. The power supply situation in this area is greatly different from that which existed when the statements quoted above were made in the spring of 1946. Since that time, vastly increased demands for power have resulted from rapid extension of rural electrification, from increased domestic and commercial use of electricity, and from expansion of various defense facilities. By 1953, the power demands of the area are expected to increase to double the peak levels reached during World War II. Demands have been increasing at a particularly rapid rate in the case of municipalities and cooperatives in western Kentucky and northwestern Tennessee for which Kentucky Dam is the nearest present source of power. Development of the power potentialities of the lower Cumberland would help to serve these growing loads. In addition, provision of a new major source of power on the lower Cumberland, in conjunction with improvement of the river's navigable channel and control of its floodwaters, might be expected to stimulate industrial development in the immediate vicinity of the dam similar to that now taking place near TVA's Kentucky Dam.

It is highly probable that further study may indicate the feasibility of so constructing and operating a high dam as to flood permanently less land than would be necessary under the high dam plan originally recommended by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, while at the same time affording flood control benefits to the lower Ohio and Mississippi River basins which were not included in such plan.

TVA, in responding to requests by the Corps of Engineers for comments on preliminary drafts of their 1946 report, suggested as one possibility in this connection that a study be made of the feasibility of constructing and operating a high dam on the lower Cumberland for flood control as well as for navigation and power, with normal pool level between elevations 354 and 359, and in accordance with a plan which might include provision for a canal approximately two miles in length connecting the reservoir created by the dam with Kentucky Reservoir on the Tennessee River. Copies of our correspondence with the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget concerning the matter are attached for your information.

It seemed to us that this proposal, if found after investigation to be feasible, might offer definite advantages in that, with normal pool level maintained between elevations 354 and 359 instead of between 370 and 375, reservation of that part of the reservoir above elevation 359 for flood storage might add substantial and strategically located protection against floods on the lower Ohio and Mississippi Rivers; and with the portion of the reservoir above elevation 359 not inundated except during great floods, which normally occur only during the winter and early spring, some 30,000 acres of land above this elevation might still be usable for agricultural purposes during non-flood periods, as similarly situated land is now used for such purposes in TVA's adjacent Kentucky Reservoir.

Interconnection of the reservoir created by a high dam on the lower Cumberland with Kentucky Reservoir might enhance the value of both projects by affording an opportunity to take advantage of diversity in stream conditions in the two rivers by transfer of water from one to the other through the canal when either flood control or power considerations warranted; and by making it possible for vessels to move from one river to the other through the canal instead of going the roundabout way through the Ohio River, thereby saving some 63 miles and two lockages.

The feasibility of such a plan could, of course, be determined only after a careful study which should include not only this but other possible plans of development which might be employed. Such a study might show that some method of developing the lower Cumberland different from any yet suggested would prove the most advantageous. We think particular attention should be given to possible methods of development which would maximize multipurpose potentialities in this portion of the river, taking into account navigation, flood control, agricultural production, power generation, and other factors.

With regard to operation of existing and future projects on the Cumberland to produce maximum benefits, it is our belief that the present method of operation, which involves use of fixed layers of reservoir capacity for flood control and power, respectively, throughout the year, might well be reexamined. We think consideration should be given to alternative plans of operation which might, for example, involve reservation of a larger portion of reservoir capacity for flood storage at the beginning of flood seasons, and a larger portion for power generation and other uses as flood seasons pass. This plan of operation is used on the Tennessee River and yields both larger flood control and larger power benefits than could be realized by adherence to fixed layers of reservoir capacity throughout the year. Such a plan of operation, if applicable in the Cumberland Basin, might be expected to produce similarly larger benefits without any increase in costs or operating expenses.

We believe, also, that consideration and study should be given to the possibility of planning and scheduling future construction in the Cumberland Basin on a basis which will take full account of anticipated growth in power needs in the TVA power service area, so that new generating capacity in the Cumberland Basin will be provided on a schedule adjusted, so far as possible, to predictable load increases on the TVA system. Since the TVA power system is the logical outlet for power generated at future as well as existing projects in the Cumberland Basin, we think it evident that such adjustment of construction schedules to expected increases in TVA's power loads would be highly desirable from the standpoint of over-all economy and efficiency.

We shall proceed with our study of the above and related problems, relying largely on data made available by the Corps of Engineers, and shall forward a final report to you as speedily as possible.

Faithfully yours,

GORDON R. CLAPP,
Chairman of the Board.

[From the Nashville Tennessean of June 23, 1950]

BEFORE ANOTHER SUMMER

Publication of President Truman's letter to Representative JOE EVINS and the Tennessee Valley Authority's interim report on the Cumberland River should indicate how rapidly the status of the people's cherished project is advancing.

The President's comments on the first phase of TVA's report on the Cumberland were to the point:

"It seems to me that a reevaluation of the plans and methods of development of the resources of the Cumberland River is necessary, but I am sure you will agree that submission of my official report and recommendations to the Congress, together with such legislative proposals as may seem appropriate under sections 22 and 23 of the Tennessee Valley Act should await completion of the Tennessee Valley Authority study."

President Truman's choice of the wording "reevaluation of the plans and methods of development" in the light of the conclusions drawn by TVA in its interim report would indicate a determination on the part of the Chief Executive to make sure that nothing shall be allowed to impede a maximum of the river's resources.

The Chief Executive left no doubt in his remarks that he waits only the completion of the full TVA report before announcing himself officially to the Congress on the subject of the Cumberland. The report, TVA officials have said, will be completed in the late summer or early fall.

Section 22 of the TVA Act to which his letter referred provides for surveys to be made by TVA along the Tennessee River drainage basin and "such adjoining territory as may be related to or materially affected by the development consequent to this act."

Section 23 authorizes the President to recommend to the Congress further legislation based on the findings of such surveys.

The letter from the President to Representative EVINS is the manifestation of interest in the future of the Cumberland River which Mr. W. C. Jackson, president of the new Cumberland Valley TVA Association, and his associates have been anticipating. It lifts the future of the Cumberland into a new perspective.

The President's letter should serve as a dramatic stimulant to an intensification of effort among the peoples of the Cumberland Valley, who can now see that TVA on the Cumberland is more than an appealing possibility. That possibility has ripened into an eminent probability within the grasp of the hundreds of thousands of middle Tennessee and central Kentucky citizens who recognize its significance to the national defense and to their future way of life.

The long and uphill battle to give TVA an opportunity to help citizens of the Cumberland River realize to the fullest their natural heritage quite obviously is reaching toward a climax.

The President's letter should serve as notice to members of the Cumberland Valley TVA Association, who were pioneers of the movement, and to the 117 other groups inside the valley who have expressed their warm support that the time has arrived for a closing of ranks and a final advance to the goal.

TVA on the Cumberland obviously is a dream to be realized before another summer, and that will not be too soon for the safety of the Nation and the power needs of our region.

Major Foreign and Domestic Issues—Interview With Senator Smith of New Jersey

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a transcript of an interview which was broadcast yesterday in the Washington Report series of Station WMTR in Morristown, N. J., in which I discussed major issues of domestic and foreign policy now before Congress.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJOR FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC ISSUES FACING CONGRESS

Senator SMITH. Good afternoon. Congress has been a busy place since I last participated in Washington Report early in April, so I have quite a lot of ground to cover.

ANNOUNCER. Perhaps you could begin, Senator SMITH, by giving us what you consider the high lights of congressional action in the past 3 months.

Senator SMITH. I'd be glad to. Of course, I won't attempt to cover the whole range, but there are a number of positive steps we have taken which I have been very much interested in.

First, a good deal of progress has been made in reorganization of the Federal Government. Last March the President sent to Congress 21 reorganization plans, largely based on the reports of the Hoover Commission. The Senate disapproved five of those because they did not follow the Hoover recommendations, but the other 16 have already gone into effect. We still have a long way to go in reorganization, but I think the progress up to date is very good and will result in improved economy and efficiency.

Our second outstanding achievement was final passage of the new displaced-persons bill. This was a real bipartisan achievement. The new law, which the President signed a few days ago, removes the discriminations that gave us so much trouble in the first law. It also provides for admission of enough D. P.'s, I think, to clear up the original displaced-persons problem which we have had in Germany since the end of the war.

A third accomplishment I wanted to mention was the final enactment last month of

the National Science Foundation bill, in which I have also been greatly interested for several years. In my judgment the Science Foundation will be a tremendous boon for progress in fundamental science, which is so important for our national security and peaceful welfare.

We have also had some very important foreign policy matters before us, and I'd like to discuss them for a few minutes before I finish. But right now Congress is working on two vital issues in the field of domestic welfare, so perhaps we'd better discuss them first.

ANNOUNCER. Which two issues do you mean, Senator SMITH?

Senator SMITH. The first is the bill to extend Federal rent controls, which is now in conference between the two Houses. The second is the bill to broaden the social-security system.

ANNOUNCER. You voted against the Federal rent control extension, didn't you, Senator?

Senator SMITH. Yes, I did, and I was on the losing side of that issue. But I'd like to take a minute to say why I voted as I did, because I think the issues have been somewhat confused. A good many of the advocates of continued Federal rent controls made it appear that anybody who opposed the extension either didn't know about the continued housing shortage in certain areas or was simply hard-hearted and didn't care. They seemed to assume that if rent control was necessary anywhere in the country it must be Federal control.

I entirely disagree with that assumption. I know perfectly well that there are some areas in the country, in fact right in our own State of New Jersey, where the housing shortage is still acute and rents should continue to be controlled. But in my judgment the States and local communities are perfectly capable of handling these problems, and they must assume the responsibility. The war emergency is over, and we must get the Federal Government out of war-emergency controls.

It's quite true that I voted consistently for Federal controls during the war and in the immediate postwar period. But my basic position hasn't changed at all. In those days the housing shortage was a national problem, and if rents had gone sky high in any key community they might have thrown our whole economy out of gear. Fortunately, that situation is a thing of the past.

I think I can sum up my position very simply. One of the great virtues of our American system is the sharing of powers and responsibilities between the Federal Government and the States. In a matter like rent control, which in normal times is obviously the responsibility of State governments, the States must show a willingness to assume that responsibility where further controls are needed. Otherwise our American system will lose its vitality and degenerate into a top-heavy centralized bureaucracy in which all the decisions are made in Washington.

ANNOUNCER. When it comes to the social-security field you take a different position, don't you, Senator SMITH?

Senator SMITH. Yes, because in my judgment social security is an entirely different kind of problem. We have a centralized, national social-security system, and I want to see it improved and extended.

ANNOUNCER. How does the social-security problem differ from that of rent control?

Senator SMITH. It differs in that a sound social-security system can't conceivably be set up except on a Nation-wide basis. I'm talking now about the so-called old-age and survivors' insurance program, which is the heart and soul of the whole system.

I think the necessity for a national system becomes clear if you believe, as I do, that the only acceptable system is one in which the individual makes regular contributions during his working life and receives benefits accordingly when he dies or retires. This is the so-called contributory principle on which our social-security system is based. Its great virtue is that, while it provides a minimum of security for everybody, it also provides incentives for hard work—because the higher a man's wages and the longer he works the greater his benefits will be. I contrast that with the flat-rate pension schemes of the Townsend variety, in which everybody gets a pension at a certain age whether he works or not, so that there is no incentive to work. In my view the incentive principle is absolutely essential, and that means we must keep our contributory system.

ANNOUNCER. But isn't it possible to have a contributory system on a local basis or in industrial plans?

Senator SMITH. Yes, but if you depend on employee insurance plans or State plans, you run into at least two difficulties. In the first place, in a small plan it is very difficult to keep enough reserves to prevent the system from going bankrupt. We had experience to prove that in the railroad retirement field during the depression, and more recently in the United Mine Workers insurance funds, which actually had to suspend payments for a while last year. In the second place, a contributory system which is less than Nation-wide in scope puts a penalty on the worker who changes his job or his residence. It means that he forfeits all his rights in the system and has to start in all over again somewhere else. The very nature of the problem is such that if you are going to have a sound contributory system it has to be a universal national system.

ANNOUNCER. Would you say the same of health insurance, Senator Smith?

Senator SMITH. Definitely not. Health insurance is entirely different. For one thing, there is no disadvantage in health insurance in moving from one system to another. The first day you are covered in a health-insurance plan you are entitled to just as many benefits as if you had been covered all your life. Furthermore, putting health insurance on a national basis—especially if it is compulsory, like the so-called Ewing plan—would involve administrative problems which would be perfectly staggering. It would require policing the entire medical, dental, and nursing professions, all the hospitals, and all the patients. I think it is an utterly fantastic scheme and I have always been opposed to it. The health problem can be more effectively handled on a State-by-State basis with Federal grants-in-aid where necessary.

ANNOUNCER. Then would you say, Senator SMITH, that each one of these welfare problems has to be considered on its own merits rather than as part of an over-all pattern?

Senator SMITH. Certainly. What I think we need is a balance of responsibilities between the States and the Federal Government. I would like to see the States and local communities take care of all the problems that they are equipped to handle. In normal times I consider rent control as one of these. There are some problems in which the States need Federal grants-in-aid and cooperation, such as health and education; and there are a few problems, like that of financial security in old age, which are the natural and sole province of the Federal Government.

We must get away from the doctrine that the only avenue to welfare and progress is a single, powerful, centralized government. As far as I am concerned, that is not a liberal doctrine at all. It is an invitation to disaster.

ANNOUNCER. Senator SMITH, you mentioned some problems in the field of foreign affairs which you wanted to discuss.

Senator SMITH. Yes, I would like to conclude with a word on these foreign problems because we have some very important decisions ahead of us.

For some time I have been deeply concerned with what I consider a dangerous trend in the development of our foreign policies. More and more we seem to be thinking in military terms and in terms of containing communism by the sheer weight of our weapons. The result of this is that we spend less and less of our time and talents on positive, peaceful, constructive activity abroad.

The way the North Atlantic Treaty has been working out is a good illustration of this. The treaty originally provided not only for military cooperation but also for cooperation and positive action in other fields of endeavor, including the economic and psychological fields. It recognized the great spiritual values of our western heritage, which we hold in common with the nations of western Europe. Last summer I voted to ratify it because I felt it would be a powerful force for preserving and promoting the positive values of our way of life.

But so far it hasn't worked out that way. The conference in London last month seems to have concentrated almost entirely on the problem of military defense. Now, I know that is an extremely difficult problem and it must be faced. But I insist that if we consider the military side as the whole issue we will fail utterly to meet the basic spiritual and ideological needs of a free world and we may well end up in the very world war which we are trying to avoid.

ANNOUNCER. What do you propose that we should do, Senator SMITH?

Senator SMITH. I think we should keep in mind two fundamental principles. The first is that we cannot effectively oppose communism in the world by military means alone. The most powerful weapon of the Communists is not military power but an appeal to the minds of men, and a cynical exploitation of human poverty and misery. We must devote a great deal more of our imaginations and energies to facing these issues of poverty and misunderstanding. We cannot build our strength unless we do this.

The second principle is that a real American foreign policy cannot be based on mere opposition to communism. The problems of poverty and ignorance are genuine problems in their own right, and we must view them as such. Other peoples are beginning to get the impression that America is helping them simply in order to use them as pawns in the cold war against Russia, and that that is our only motive. Naturally they resent this and they fear getting involved in a conflict of power between America and Russia. We must convince these people—in Europe and Asia alike—that we are genuinely interested in their problems, and that we consider the solution of those problems as essential to the building of a just and peaceful world.

ANNOUNCER. Didn't you introduce a bill along these lines recently, Senator SMITH?

Senator SMITH. Yes; I joined Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, in sponsoring a bill to establish a bipartisan commission to study our foreign economic problems after the end of the ECA. I think this is critically important. Economic cooperation among the free nations is at the very basis of any genuine, constructive, long-range foreign policy, and I am afraid that our planning is lagging badly in this field. I think we will have to discontinue large-scale financial assistance to other nations, but we must find just what foreign economic policies we are prepared to cooperate in. The commission Senator SALTONSTALL and I propose would represent Congress, the executive branch, and the pub-

lic and would submit recommendations shortly after Congress reconvenes next year.

The vital question is: After ECA, where do we go from there? We must plan ahead in the economic field and in fields which will reach out and mobilize the moral and spiritual forces of mankind. Congress must take a share in this planning. The peace of the world depends on the constructive steps which the United States is able to take. If we are to survive, we must get away from reliance on mere military power or the mere expenditure of money. We should put more heart and imagination into our foreign policies. We must accept the challenge of building positive peace together with the other free peoples of the world.

And now I see my time is up. This is Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH reporting from Washington.

Comment on Recent Address by Senator Smith of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to the junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] by the publisher of the Standard Times, of New Bedford, Mass.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 7, 1950.

Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: I wonder if you would be interested in frank comment by a journalist and fellow Republican such as myself in connection with your statement to the Senate June 1 on the subject of policies in Congress on communism.

I first read the story of your statement in the New York Herald Tribune June 2 in New York and without knowing about our comment on same in the Standard-Times as per the enclosed editorial of June 3.

I like, in instances of such radical departure from accepted policy as your statement of June 1, to give myself time to try to digest and really evaluate what has been done before coming to a decision.

Frankly, now, several days following your statement, had I been writing our editorial, I would have criticized what you did even more severely.

For one thing you charge some of your fellow Republicans with selfish exploitation of fear, bigotry, ignorance, and intolerance. With noticeably less vehemence you describe the attitude of the Democrats as weighted with complacency to the threat of communism here at home and, additionally, with being guilty of obviously staged, undignified countercharges.

Thus, your attack seems primarily directed at your fellow Republicans, your comment on Democratic tactics seemingly being present only to give a nonpartisan front to your charges.

President Truman quite readily moved into the wide opening you made with the telling remark "he did not want to make any comment as strong as that (your own) about the Republican Party."

Further applause which greeted your statement from Democratic sources was:

Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS (whose main function has been to thwart the efforts of his committee) commented to the effect that Senator SMITH had been temperate and fair.

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN commented to the effect that Senator SMITH had brought home the inequity and danger of trial by accusation in a way none of us can pass over lightly.

Entirely absent in support of your statement is the comment of any Republican except the six originally associated with you and one additional, Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH. Here it is only fair to say that the Republicanism of many, if not most, of your group has been subject to severe challenge owing to the consistency with which they have voted with the Democratic majority in this session and others.

Perhaps most shocking of your statements is the following: "A Republican victory is necessary to the security of this country, but I don't want to see the Republican Party ride to political victory on the four horsemen of calumny, fear, ignorance, bigotry, and smear."

Is it possible that you do not realize that such a statement, coming from you and endorsed by seven other Republicans, affords the most valuable campaign material for President Truman and the Democrats which could possibly be provided by an opposition party?

Even more important, I wonder if you realize in your wild swing to hit a happy medium in the anticommunism drive, you have not only smeared some of your fellow Republicans, but have effectively slowed down and blunted the drive itself.

The whole program of the Democratic administration, led by Truman, has been to cover up communistic connections of their party, past and present.

Spearheading his campaign of 1948, as of course you know, was Truman's "red herring" charge against the Republicans on the communism issue, one of the most outstandingly successful deceptions ever committed in a Presidential campaign.

All the Democrats now have to do to justify the cover up with which you so mildly charge them is to quote your own words attacking Republicans who are trying to ride to political victory on the four horsemen of calumny, fear, ignorance, bigotry, and smear.

Incidentally, but most important, who are the Republicans to whom you refer in the above comment? Obviously, of course, Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY would be one but who are the others?

I have studied the record most carefully and find not a single Republican Senator depending on fear, ignorance, bigotry, and smear in connection with the communism issue.

Obviously you are not referring to but one member of your party as attempting to "ride to political victory" on the afore-mentioned four horsemen. By my count, you need five instead of four horsemen.

Certainly it is fair to say that in leveling such charges against Republicans and failing to identify them you are, indeed, smearing the entire Republican Senate membership with the exception of the seven Republicans of dubious faith who have associated themselves with yourself in your statement.

Apparently you give no thought to the all-important fact that it is Senator MCCARTHY who, perhaps swinging wildly at times, still is responsible for the attention this issue, which you describe as most grave, now is receiving in Congress and the country, including your own emphatic but related and, I believe, misguided interest.

Equally important, who are to blame if Senator MCCARTHY's charges in some instances remain neither proved nor disproved? Surely you would be one of the first to admit Senator MCCARTHY's failure to prove all his charges, to say the least, is due in part to the most systematic cover-up of evidence in the history of the country.

This cover-up by President Truman, Senator TYDINGS, and others (including orders given by the President to every branch of the executive government forbidding releasing of evidence in public hearings) you refer to as complacency and obviously staged and undignified, mild, indeed, in all conscience.

As newspaper publishers we have seen Senator MCCARTHY, starting from scratch so to speak, picking up threads of evidence which this newspaper brought out in a series of articles on Amerasia and other cases early in 1947, and, with the studied opposition of every element of the Democratic Party, bring this issue to the point where not only has it attracted your attention, though in a detractory way, but has become the burning issue in the whole country from one end to the other.

Of course, he has not been able to prove every charge, certainly in some instances because the evidence has been completely suppressed. But do you realize that a very considerable percentage of his charges have been completely proved, even over the dead body, so to speak, of Democratic resistance?

Do you realize also the efforts of the Truman administration have not only been directed toward discrediting the whole McCarthy campaign but that in some instances, fully revealed in the news, have been directed toward attempting to get witnesses to retract important statements previously made bearing on the Amerasia and other cases?

It is a tragic thing, Senator SMITH, that you have in your ill-advised and, in our opinion, very poorly thought-out efforts to "save your country" attacked your fellow Republicans in language which you will never be allowed to recall or forget by Truman and his Democratic following.

Equally regrettable is the fact you have but a pat on the wrist for the real culprits, the Democratic administration.

You have accomplished nothing in your unrealistic effort to solve this dilemma, but have contributed immeasurably to the success of the Democratic administration's efforts to suppress the truth.

You will soon see that when the President and his cohorts go to the country on this issue you will have become the outstanding witness for the defense.

You have afforded President Truman and his Democratic supporters validity from a most surprising source, the Republican Party, to his red-herring charge.

Very truly yours,

B. BREWER, *Publisher.*

Senator McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, if you have had trouble understanding the latest development in the investigation of Senator MCCARTHY'S charges, that is not surprising.

The apparent calm since Senator MARGARET SMITH'S speech was broken by the appearance of a booklet from the State Department, bitterly attacking Senator MCCARTHY. Then came the apparent recantation of Emmanuel Larsen, who had told the story of strange Communist influence over our foreign policy several years ago.

One very tough fact persists: The admitted fact that hundreds of top secret documents from the State and Navy Departments were found by the OSS in the office of an obscure magazine advocating the Soviet line in our foreign policy. We are told now they were not really very important. But it is admitted that somebody stole something from somebody, and that something concerned our national security.

Now comes Mr. Larsen, a former State Department employee, convicted in an American court of conspiracy to secure confidential documents in the Amerasia case. One other was convicted. Four others involved were not prosecuted. Mr. Larsen is going to be reexamined by the Senate Investigating Committee. The State Department offers to give Mr. Larsen legal aid and protection against the questioning by Members of the United States Senate. The taxpayers will pay for the investigation by the Senate as well as the attempt to defeat the investigation by the State Deparment. For this protection Mr. Larsen is changing his testimony by saying he did not have any proof that John Service was a Communist. Of course not. Few have any proof except former Communists or the FBI.

The public has long since lost interest in legal disputes about proof of card-carrying Communists. The people want to know whether the State Department is in truth Communist or Socialist. Are the measures it advocates and the disposition of the people's rights Socialist or Communist?

They want to know if the Social Security Department is not even worse than the State Department—much fuller of Socialists and Communists. It is vigorously advocating socialized medicine, extension of social security, and the centralization of education in Washington. These exact measures Norman Thomas and Earl Browder advocate also. One calls them Socialist; the other Communist.

Are the Communists and Socialists in the Department of Agriculture just as bad and still more numerous? Do the disciples of Henry Wallace possess that Department from top to bottom? It has already socialized the production of our food. It fixes prices. It exploits one group and enriches another by taxation. It proposes the Brannan plan. It burns potatoes, rots eggs, and spoils the corn.

MCCARTHY has raised the one question we are all interested in: "Has America herself been sunk deeply into socialism or communism in domestic affairs as well as in foreign policy?" The questions go beyond Poland and China.

Indeed Senator MCCARTHY has touched off something which we have hardly begun to understand. Who is masterminding all this?

The conspirators now under attack in a single Department of State believe they can kill off Senator MCCARTHY by the old tactics of divide and conquer. They tried to draw off the left-wing Republicans. They even tried to make bad blood between Senator MCCARTHY and Senator WHERRY, the minority leader. They are clever and unscrupulous. But they will not win because the Senate and the House are too experienced to be fooled by them. The Members know, too, that they may be picked off one by one if they fail to stand together against a common enemy. They will stand together. They will ferret out the evil men and their evil measures in our Government.

Social Security Improvements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Social Security Improvements," published in the New York Herald Tribune of June 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS

The expected improvements in the Federal social-security law have been voted by the Senate with only two dissenting votes. Old-age and survivors insurance is extended to an additional 8,300,000 people, including nonfarm self-employed, except for certain professional groups, agricultural, and domestic workers and persons in several other miscellaneous categories. Payments to the nearly 3,000,000 now receiving OASI benefits will be increased by an average of 85 to 90 percent and eligibility requirements are liberalized, which will mean that about 700,000 additional beneficiaries will be added to the rolls in 1951, but there remain approximately 9,500,000 present aged who are technically unqualified for coverage. The bill raises taxable incomes from $3,000 to $3,600 but retains the present 1½ percent tax rate for employees and employers, although for the newly included self-employed the tax rate is 2¼ percent. However, beginning in 1956 successive increases in the tax schedule are provided up to 3¼ percent at the end of 20 years. The Senate bill now goes to joint conference to be reconciled with the House measure passed last year.

The Senate hearings and debate on social security this year have been particularly valuable. They revealed awareness of the inadequacies of the present program which, despite the new improvements, still leaves the elderly mainly reliant on the relief payments provided on a Federal-State basis, since a large part of the aged population is excluded from the basic law because of the nature of their employment or the legal eligibility requirements. Senator CAIN, one of the two dissenters, has called for a new study of the entire social security problem to be made in the next 2 years.

Certainly, the criticisms voiced during the hearings and debate prove the necessity for a complete reevaluation of the basic approach to social security embodied in the present law. Particularly worthy of professional study is a plan recently proposed by Senator BUTLER which would provide a universal floor of protection for the aged and for dependent children without the objectionable means test assistance feature of the present program. It would operate on a year-by-year basis rather than attempting an actuarial approach. It is predicated upon a universal pension of $50 a month to each person aged 65, but the pension for those whose income exceeds $600 a year would be reduced by $1 a month for every $50 or more of annual incomes received. By a special old-age income tax to be reported along with the regular income tax most of the costly social security bureaucracy now engaged in recording and filing every wage payment received by insured workers would be eliminated.

Entirely novel in conception, Senator BUTLER'S plan is one that certainly merits further study by Congress. Though the country will properly approve the changes in the present system indicated by the Senate action, the basic inadequacy and unsoundness of the present system remains to be dealt with constructively. Such a study as Senator CAIN has proposed should be the next step taken.

The Racine, Wis., 100-Piece Boy Scout Band Concert at Sylvan Theater, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Department of the Interior press release relating to a special concert to be held at the Sylvan Theater, Washington Monument grounds, today at 8 p. m., by the Racine, Wis., 100-piece Boy Scout Band.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[U. S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, National Capital Parks, Washington, D. C., June 23, 1950]

The Racine, Wis., 100-piece Boy Scout Band will play a special concert at the Sylvan Theater, Washington Monument Grounds, on Monday, June 26, at 8 p. m., Irving C. Root, Superintendent, National Capital Parks, has announced.

The band, said to be the finest Boy Scout musical organization in the world, will be sponsored by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin. Roland Olsen, of Racine, will conduct the concert. The band, under the supervision of Arthur M. Gruhl, of Racine, will stop in Washington en route to the International Boy Scout Jamboree which opens at Valley Forge, Pa., next week.

Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Altoona Tribune of June 17, 1950:

WARNING

If any further proof were needed to show the dangerous ground upon which those walk who urged "Atlantic union," "world government" and such similar inept international propositions, the blunt revelation by the British Labor Party statement against the Schuman plan for European economic cooperation and unity should suffice.

For some years a powerful element of international businessmen and others of a more impractical and idealistic turn of mind have been advocating union between America, Britain, France and other anti-Communist countries.

Such plans as "World Government, Inc." and others of like sentiments have been proposed, under which a "supra-government" composed of representatives of these various nations, should be set up. There would be a common currency, common military, economic, and, even under some suggestions, common political systems.

As in all such international propositions, European nations have been content to sit quietly by while crack-brained Americans have come up with all sorts of costly ideas for raiding the United States Treasury for Europe's benefit.

Little has been said either for or against these union-now theories by any person of influence in any of the major countries which would be involved.

Yet, in this country, this small but influential group of internationalists, willing to put our own national interests aside, have been promoting actively a congressional campaign to bring about official American action that would initiate such a federation of nations.

Driven by grim necessity at last, the French have offered their proposal, set forth by Foreign Minister Schuman, for a European steel and coal pool to be directed by an international council of European nations.

Yet, the British Labor Party manifesto makes it plain that the Labor Party, which is in effect the Government, will not subscribe to such a plan for economic unity unless it is developed under the rules of socialistic planning.

This is a blunt revelation. It throws new light on the international situation. It shows definitely that Britain at least is not willing, for herself, to sacrifice any of her sovereignty under any circumstances except those laid down by her own labor government.

This action makes advocates of union now in this country look extremely silly, because it is proof positive of what all patriotic Americans have been saying about such plans * * * that Europeans will agree to any plan for the division of American sovereignty or resources, but will not agree to any such plans that affect their own.

France, under tremendous pressure of circumstances, has broken away from the usual pattern, but the opposition she will face is indicated by the British reaction.

Prime Minister Attlee's hurried efforts to soften the manifesto are not very convincing. While it is true the top leaders were not present for the issuance of the paper, the Labor Party spoke through its document, and the Labor Party is the British Government, not just Mr. Attlee.

Further, the labor manifesto bears out in detail the attitude of the British all along on matters relating to European cooperation.

The British have been strong proponents of American plans for cooperation, where most of the cooperating is done by us.

The Schuman plan puts it squarely up to west Europe, and the British turned it down flatly.

Mr. Acheson, American Secretary of State, takes a characteristic State Department attitude on British affairs. He evades the issue.

He said he considers the statement strictly a party issue, not one of government.

But, the action of the British Government to date shows that the Labor statement expresses the real convictions of the Attlee government.

Above all else, Britain is struggling to regain her position in world trade, her position once made so strong by her far-flung empire. In no instance have the British shown willing cooperation with American suggestions for more cooperation between the European countries.

Proponents of union-now plans are shown the European attitude, which is deeply entrenched—do it our way, along lines of socialistic planning.

That is the ultimate result which would be attained if the officials of the American Government and of Congress were to forget their duty to their country and set its progress aside in favor of a federation whose end purpose would be the liquidation of the United States of America.

Greece Asks Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Greece Asks Justice," by Soterios Nicholson, published in the Atlantis for June 25, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREECE ASKS JUSTICE

(By Soterios Nicholson)

WASHINGTON.—Greece is an ailing nation. Three years of struggle have taken their toll. The nation's symptoms have been diagnosed and we can diagnose them again for emphasis. But the treatment and the long hoped for cure, recovery, have not been reached. In fact, they are a long way off.

What are the ailments which have wracked the Nation's physical strength sapping the people's courage? They are many. But the most important ills can be traced as the aftermath of year after year of financial and physical battering. First, it was the Italians, then the Germans, a Communist coup d' etat attempt which failed and then what now is called the infamous civil war.

The greatest symptoms, and perhaps the cause of all of Greece's ills has been the wholesale destruction of lives and property for which this continual fighting is responsible. It is estimated by reliable international authorities that some $5,500,000,000 was the cost for the war and occupation. This staggering sum represents the total prewar income of the Greek people for 10 years. It is said that Greece lost in that time what the nation's people gained in the four generations since the national liberation from the Turks in 1821.

The Greeks valiantly fought the enemy during all these years, firmly rooted in the belief that when the war was over and the country liberated from its conqueror's yoke, Greece would be given the means to rehabilitate the nation. But no sooner had that thought become the hopeful and permanent fixture in men's minds than another threat occurred. Drawn into a new and different struggle, the nation almost ended its democratic life at the hands of the Greek Communists. These traitors almost took over the reins. These were the same guerrillas who were believed to have been in league with the soldiers who fought against Hitler. But it was soon established that these bands had done little or nothing to fight the invader.

Unfortunately, a number of Allied leaders were misinformed and led to believe the guerrillas performed an invaluable service in aiding their countrymen in the battle against the Communists.

However, some men like Winston Churchill, for example, did not accept the theory that these men were democratic heroes fighting for lofty ideals. But even Mr. Churchill could do little to keep the balance of power in democratic hands. It soon became apparent that his opposition at home and his unaided hand abroad would combine to force him to a minor and forfeited role in Greece. Nevertheless, the British soldiers who did arrive in the country, plus the remarkable ability of the Greek gendarmes in the nation, managed to rescue the country from the revolution and the Russian rule. But even then it was clear that Greece could not survive by remaining free or recover economically without help from the outside.

There was a great lag in the thoughts, actions, and material benefits among the seven and a half million people in Greece. The first flow of American aid did little to offset that lag in economic strength. Due both to misinformation and the infiltration within the Government of quisling employees and Communist officials, the administration of the American program got off to a faltering start. Goods were dumped without thought and reason on ports ruined by war. Matters were aided when the Government was dissolved. But the prime stumbler—lack of funds—prevailed. This lack of funds was worsened by the loss of expected indemnities, inability, and unwillingness, to overtax the people, and the periodic printing of currency, call back of paper money, and the inevitable bite of inflation.

Another attempt to right the house was made in 1946 when elections were held and the political situation somewhat cleared. But hopes were dashed by increased taxation and the disappearance of expected funds. In the meantime, the Communist campaign was renewed and intensified. By 1947, the situation was critical and President Truman extended aid to Greece. The so-called Griswold mission was not the success one could hope for. Against the factors of deep wants, the mission, unaware of the basic needs of the Greek people, tried to balance the situation with what help the American Congress permitted. It was not enough, and while Governor Griswold and his staff did an excellent job, their limited operational plan and the misunderstanding of the situation

by Americans allowed a new failure to come into being.

While the faith was there, the Greek situation was much worse than the ECA workers could imagine. People were at the point of semistarvation and amidst this almost insurmountable situation the Communists grew in strength and daring.

But the miracle of the postwar era happened. American aid continued. The 4-year plan, geared to recovery, began to make its effect felt. Military aid and perseverance told the story—strengthening of the defending forces and the eventual defeat of the Communist guerrilla army. The silent factor in this battle of the Greek people against the invaders was the funneling of all aid into the nation's military forces. This conversion was taking place while the other Europeon countries took advantage of the Marshall plan aid for economic reconstruction. Despite this, Greece did accomplish some reconstruction. Greek ports and the Corinth Canal were restored. Railroads again were put into operation. New airfields were built. Homes, schools and hospitals were rebuilt and new ones dot the Greek landscape. Refugees, captured during the civil war, have been repatriated. The health program of the nation has progressed. All these successes were accomplished during the time when disorder prevailed. Men at work were hampered by guerrilla bands. Roads were mined and reconstruction completed during the day was destroyed by the bandits at night.

What now is Greece's need? The call by the Greek people is not basically an urge for more American funds. The need is more basic. What is needed is moral support from the United States so that the nation can obtain recognition of its rights by the United Nations.

The Greek nation suffered overwhelmingly and nearly jeopardized its sovereignty by giving civilization and democracy almost its life's blood. For these sacrifices, Greece asks that justice be accorded it. Greece who stood up on the field of battle to fight off the hungry dictators, Greece who asked no quarter but gave the Russian tools the battle of their lives and Greece who begged for help and turned this assistance into victory.

Greece's request before the nations of the world can be summed up in one sentence: The aggressors must pay for the destruction caused in Greece. The nation does not ask for charity but for justice.

Rio Grande To Halt All Its Trains if Switchmen Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Rio Grande To Halt All Its Trains if Switchmen Strike," published in the Rocky Mountain News, of Denver, Colo., on June 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIO GRANDE TO HALT ALL ITS TRAINS IF SWITCHMEN STRIKE

The Rio Grande Railroad will make no attempt to operate any trains if the threatened switchmen's strike materializes, A. E. Perlman, general manager, announced yesterday.

Official notice of the strike, called for 6 a. m. Sunday, was received today from the Switchmen's Union of North America, Mr. Perlman said.

All trains which cannot reach their final terminals by that time will be annulled, he said.

The Rio Grande also announced there would be a cut of an undetermined amount of the some 1,500 office employees of the railroad in the event a strike occurs.

The railroad will continue to accept nonperishable freight, subject to delay, according to Mr. Perlman.

He said that so far the railroad has received no official notice of the threatened strike by conductors which is scheduled for July 11 and 15.

Meeting of Boy Scouts at Valley Forge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "American Boys at a Shrine of Freedom," appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer for June 25.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN BOYS AT A SHRINE OF FREEDOM

It is not often that metropolitan Philadelphia is privileged to welcome a group of visitors with whose worthy aims and lofty ideals it is so fully in accord as is the case with the 47,000 Boy Scouts and leaders now converging on Valley Forge from all parts of the United States and many foreign lands for the Second National Scout Jamboree.

The unanimity of this greeting is an accolade to Scouting. But it is more. It is a recognition that the principles of patriotism and honor upon which this American youth movement is squarely based are principles shared almost universally in this historic area of the Nation.

The encampment of these boys on the green hills of Valley Forge from June 30 to July 6 inevitably will evoke comparisons with the sordid spectacle provided a month earlier by the Communist youth rally held in Berlin. It is a comparison we welcome.

What other method could bring so sharply into focus the contrast between the sinister motives of the cynical politicians who manipulated the one, and the voluntary nature, the freedom of thought and action, the high idealism of the other? It is this contrast, we believe, that constitutes one of the most significant aspects of a jamboree which promises to be unusually rewarding both to the participants and their hosts.

It should require nothing more than the memory of the dictatorial harangues, antireligious in spirit, to which the boys and girls in Berlin were subjected to remove the last doubt that the Communist-youth movement and Scouting not only have nothing in common but are, in fact, in diametric opposition.

Religious groups of many faiths sponsor 47.1 percent of all Scout units, while civic organizations sponsor 25 percent, school groups 16 percent and community groups 11.3 percent. Here is indisputable evidence of the nature of Scouting and of the men who give so generously of their time and energies to the development of healthy and balanced citizens through its many activities.

There will be found at Valley Forge little of the regimentation, the goose-stepping precision, the ironclad controls that so shocked western observers of the Berlin demonstration. Instead, we may be sure, it will be a spectacle of thousands of young Americans who are not the puppets of any clique of conspiring politicians enjoying themselves in an inspiring and exciting setting.

However green the grass and foilage at this season, it will be an unimaginative Scout indeed who fails to visualize the scene at the encampment as it must have appeared in the winter of 1777–78 when George Washington's ragged army shivered over campfires.

Every moment of the jamboree will bring a new reminder of the sacrifices made by earlier patriots to win—and then to preserve—the freedoms which make possible such a gathering of youths as this. It is not too much to hope that every boy will return to his home with a greater appreciation of American history and a higher valuation upon the privileges and duties of citizenship.

Between the opening of the encampment next Friday night, when President Truman, who is also honorary president of the Boy Scouts of America, will address the Scouts, until camp is broken a week later, the youths will participate in and witness a series of special events which, in the broadest terms, will depict the American heritage.

For them it will be an unforgettable occasion—an intensive refresher in the lessons of patriotism which they have learned in their home communities.

We who welcome these lads to Valley Forge will share to an extent their pulse-stirring experiences. We wish for them an encampment that will contribute to their health and happiness, and, above all, to their allegiance—and ours—to the principles of good citizenship which underlie the Boy Scout movement.

What Kind of a Government Have We?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, what kind of Government have we?

It was a Republic. Some call it a democracy. Increasing numbers say it is Socialist. That makes people see red. Some want a mild form. Many others say we have got too much of whatever it is we have.

Let us call the world's most noted witnesses—men who have made it their life work to know the answers to these questions.

America's greatest living Socialist, Norman Thomas, has headed the Socialist Party ticket in the last six Presidential elections. He first ran on the Socialist platform of 1928. He and his platform got just 267,420 votes out of 37,000,000. In the depression year of 1932, his Socialist vote rose to only 884,781. Franklin D. Roosevelt won that election on a budget-balancing traditional American platform. But Mr. Thomas tells us that in 4 years "Mr. Roosevelt had in some fashion carried out our immediate demands."

In his article entitled "Republicans and Democrats Are Stealing From My Socialist Platform," Mr. Thomas observes:

What changes the years have brought. Indeed what changes in the platform and position of the Republican Party.

Speaking of the 1948 Republican platform, he says that—

in 1928 it would have been regarded by Mr. Hoover and his followers as socialistic. The Democratic Party would have held the same opinion.

In closing he writes:

As I look back on the years, I could be reasonably content with progress, except for our failure to cast out the demon war.

In effect he wrote: I presented honestly the Socialist program to the people. They rejected it. I got less than a million votes after 25 years. But the old parties took the American people into socialism without their suspecting it. My work is finished. A few days ago he said:

I do not expect to run for the Presidency again.

America's outstanding living Communist, Earl Browder, has also spoken. Twice the Communist Party presidential candidate, he knows what Marx taught socialism to be. In a recent pamphlet he tells us that—

State capitalism leaped forward to a new high point in America in the decade 1939–49. It became overwhelmingly predominant in every major phase of economic life, and changed the face of politics. State capitalism has progressed further in America than in Great Britain under the Labor government, despite its nationalization of certain industries, which is a formal stage not yet reached in America; the actual, substantial concentration of the guiding reins of national economy in governmental hands is probably on a higher level in the United States of America * * * than in Great Britain.

The general trend to state capitalism signifies a yielding of capitalist private ownership for more socialized forms of the economy and results in a more socially organized economy. * * * Each important measure of state capitalism is a part of the whole movement which results in the Socialist transformation. * * * State capitalism is the invasion of planned production and points the way to socialism. * * * The United States Government has emerged as the greatest trust of all, the supertrust whose economic operations dwarf the largest private corporation. * * * The trend to state capitalism marked the final monopolistic stage. After monopolistic capitalism the only higher stage possible is the fully socialized society.

The late leader of British Socialists, Harold J. Laski, has told us:

Since it is the Socialist belief that the central principles of the New Deal have come to stay, the Socialist government in Britain can have the confidence that America will advance in a collective direction and at an increasing tempo.

England's leading advocate of economic communism, her War Minister, John Strachy, says:

The present United States administration is one of the most left-wing governments of the world today.

He recently told American students at Oxford that—

Outside the United Kingdom and the Scandinavian countries, the United States administration today is probably more to the left in general economic policy and point of view than any of the governments of western Europe.

So the world's greatest living authorities on the subject have settled the issue.

Are you going to do anything about it? If you want to recover liberty you will find 70 percent of the people want to join forces with you. If we will unite and act in time we can win the battle against this sneaking, creeping socialism advancing under false colors in America. If we recover it for ourselves and our children, the rest of the troubled world will strive to overthrow their Socialists and dictators.

Then the dawn of peace will appear.

Operations of the National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article from the June 17, 1950, issue of Business Week magazine, which analyzes the operations of the National Labor Relations Board, particularly in connection with the recent labor disputes in the electrical industry. The article is aptly entitled "Peaceful Revolution." It demonstrates, in my judgment, the importance of democracy in collective bargaining.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with the above-designated article, a release issued by the National Labor Relations Board on June 23 giving an analysis of its operations for the month of May 1950.

There being no objection, the article and statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Business Week of June 17, 1950]

PEACEFUL REVOLUTION

The biggest jurisdictional dispute in the history of any United States industry has been going on for the past 6 months.

It started last November when the CIO booted out its United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers (UE) on the ground that it was under Communist leadership. After the expulsion, the CIO chartered a new union, the International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers (IUE-CIO). And it backed its new organizatiozn in a drive to take members and contracts from the UE.

CIO's aim: to take jurisdiction over labor in the highly unionized and far-flung electrical manufacturing industry.

JURISDICTIONAL PROBLEMS

Some of the most costly and exasperating labor problems American employers have had to face have grown out of so-called jurisdictional disputes. Usually, they involve one union fighting with another for the right to represent a group of employees. Sometimes, management feeds the flames of such a conflict by preferring one of the unions and encouraging it to do battle.

But in its pure form, a jurisdictional scrap flares through no fault of the employer. He is consigned to the role of innocent bystander who catches the Sunday punch. Helpless to do anything about it, he is caught in the middle of a fight which may rage for years—and has in a significant number of cases.

RECENT MIRACLE

So it is something of a miracle in labor relations that recent happenings in the electrical manufacturing industry haven't wound up in strike statistics, production losses, or corporate deficits. The story is best told in the table at the left; it shows election results of balloting conducted by the National Labor Relations Board, November through May.

What has been happening does not make a simple tabulation. Once the jurisdictional dispute over more than a quarter-million electrical workers became an open fight, more unions moved in, trying to carve out something for themselves.

For NLRB, the whole thing has been a mess. But the board can take great credit. It has handled the dispute in a way that has let employers continue to run their plants, kept workers out of clashing picket lines.

WHAT'S TO COME

The fight isn't over yet. A number of elections are still to be held. That may cause trouble—because NLRB has had to cut its staff for economy reasons and some balloting may be delayed. And a simmering jurisdictional dispute can boil over into a strike if a decision isn't reached fast.

Serious contract negotations will begin now that the unions have been certified as bargaining agents. That may lead to deadlocks and strikes. But that kind of trouble is easier to handle than what management might have faced if the fight had been a union free-for-all.

AND IN 2 YEARS?

To date IUE-CIO is clearly ahead as bargaining agent. But the Taft-Hartley act provides that a union's representation rights may be challenged after a reasonable time. NLRB has held that 2 years is a maximum amount of reasonable time. So in 2 years, the electrical manufacturing industry will have to go through all this again. And it will continue to have to do so until the field is abandoned by all but one dominant union, or until NLRB has authority to fix bargaining rights for a longer period. Neither of these things is likely to happen soon.

[National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D. C., June 23, 1950]

NLRB STATISTICAL SUMMARY FOR THE MONTH OF MAY 1950

The National Labor Relations Board today reported the following highlights of accelerated case activity during the month of May:

1. The number of petitions for union-shop elections continued to rise, for the fourth successive month, to the highest point in the past 16 months. Unions filed a total of 693 petitions for union-shop elections during May 1950.

2. The number of decisions issued by the five-member Board in Washington had risen, for the fourth successive month, to the highest point in the past 21 months. The Board issued 267 decisions in May 1950.

3. The number of collective-bargaining elections continued to rise, for the fifth successive month, to a total of 706 during May.

One hundred seventy-two thousand five hundred and seventy employees were eligible to vote in these elections, the greatest number in any one month under the Wagner Act or Taft-Hartley Act.

ACTION BY BOARD MEMBERS

Of the 267 decisions issued in May: 23 involved unfair labor practices; 239 involved petitions for collective-bargaining elections; and 5 involved petitions for union-shop authorization elections.

ELECTION CASES FILED

Of the 1,523 petitions filed during the month: 696 were petitions for union-shop authorization elections; 1 was a petition for union-shop deauthorization election; 41 were petitions to decertify unions; and 785 were petitions for collective-bargaining elections.

Of the 785 petitions for collective-bargaining elections 44 were filed by employers; 417 were filed by A. F. of L. affiliates; 158 were filed by CIO affiliates; 161 were filed by independent unions; and 2 were filed jointly by A. F. of L. and independent unions. (Information concerning three was not available at this time.)

Of the 696 petitions for union-shop authorization elections, 412 were filed by A. F. of L. affiliates, 132 were filed by CIO affiliates, 143 were filed by independent unions, and 2 were filed jointly by A. F. of L. and independent unions. (Information concerning 7 was not available at this time.)

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ELECTION RESULTS

Seven hundred and six collective bargaining elections were conducted in which 172,570 employees were eligible to vote; 91.5 percent of the eligible employees cast valid ballots.

Of the 157,828 valid votes, 90.5 percent or 142,853 were cast in favor of representation for the purpose of collective bargaining.

Of the 339 elections in which A. F. of L. unions participated, they won at least a majority in 218 instances. They failed of a majority in 110 elections, in 11 elections the results were indeterminate.

CIO unions participated in 361 elections and won 186, lost 165 and in 10 elections the results were indeterminate.

Of the 275 elections in which independent unions participated, they won 125 and lost 139; in 11 elections the results were indeterminate.

DECERTIFICATION ELECTION RESULTS

Eight elections, six of them based upon the consent of all parties, and two ordered by the Board, were conducted upon petitions by employees asserting that an incumbent labor organization no longer represented a majority of employees. Three hundred and seventeen employees were eligible to vote in these elections. Two hundred and ninety-nine, or 94.3 percent of them, cast valid ballots.

Of the 299 valid votes, 65.9 percent, or 197, were cast against unions.

Of these eight decertification elections, seven resulted in decertification of the union; in one case the union was continued by a majority vote of the employees.

UNION-SHOP AUTHORIZATION ELECTION RESULTS

Five hundred and ninety-four union-shop authorization polls were conducted. Five hundred and thirty-seven were based upon the consent of the parties.

Eighty-three and eight-tenths percent of those eligible to vote in the union-shop authorization elections cast valid ballots.

Of the 63,726 valid votes, 91.3 percent, or 58,214, were cast in favor of authorization of a union-shop provision. In each case the ballot offered employees the choice of voting "yes" or "no" on the following question: "Do you wish to authorize the union named below to enter into an agreement with your employer which requires membership in such union as a condition of continued employment?"

The union shop received the support of the majority of employees in 97.8 percent, or 581, of the 594 elections. Three hundred and four of the five hundred and ninety-four polls were won by A. F. of L. affiliates; 123 were won by independent unions; 154 were won by affiliates of the CIO.

PENDING BOARD DECISIONS ON HAND

At the end of May, 399 cases were in Washington pending decision by the Board members, as compared with 407 cases pending at the end of April. Of the 399 cases pending decision on May 31, 142 involved unfair-labor practices.

The nature and results of collective bargaining elections conducted for the month of May 1950

Participating unions	Total number of elections	Winner				Indeterminate	Total eligible voters	Total valid votes	Valid votes cast for			
		A.F. of L.	CIO	Unaffiliated	No union				A.F. of L.	CIO	Unaffiliated	No union
Total	706	218	186	125	156	21	172,570	157,828	11,396	80,747	50,710	14,975
1-union elections:												
A. F. of L. alone	235	161			66	8	8,512	7,712	4,830			2,882
CIO alone	138		94		43	1	25,379	22,847		15,944		6,903
Unaffiliated alone	69			49	18	2	3,166	2,753			2,048	705
2-union elections:												
A. F. of L.-A. F. of L.	11	11			0		1,038	980	820			160
A. F. of L.-CIO	44	24	16		3	1	6,190	5,515	2,494	2,762		259
A. F. of L.-unaffiliated	27	12		12	2	1	2,716	2,524	1,260		1,064	200
CIO-CIO	2		2		0		390	361		361		0
CIO-unaffiliated	144		68	50	20	6	117,591	108,134		60,247	44,162	3,725
Unaffiliated-unaffiliated	1			1	0		64	60			55	5
3-union elections:												
A. F. of L.-A. F. of L.-CIO	1	0	1		0		78	67	31	36		0
A. F. of L.-A. F. of L.-unaffiliated	1	0		1	0		149	138	51		73	14
A. F. of L.-CIO-unaffiliated	19	10	2	3	3	1	4,955	4,578	1,901	964	1,616	97
A. F. of L.-unaffiliated-unaffiliated	1	0		1	0		45	44	9		34	1
CIO-unaffiliated-unaffiliated	13		3	8	1	1	2,297	2,115		433	1,658	24

Dewey Fine Citizen and Public Official

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dewey Fine Citizen and Public Official," from last Thursday's Washington (Pa.) Observer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEWEY FINE CITIZEN AND PUBLIC OFFICIAL

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey has announced that he will not be a candidate for another term as chief executive of New York State. In his announcement he stated that his health was such that he did not feel he should seek the high office again.

Governor Dewey has established one of the finest records of any public official of recent years. The smarties will regard him as dumb for not having taken advantage of opportunities to increase his power. Those who regard raids on the public treasuries as the mark of liberalism will regard him as a reactionary.

Mr. Dewey has been anything but reactionary. He has not hesitated to provide money for necessary services, but he has not used the public treasury on extravagant proposals of doubtful value just to create jobs and build up a political machine. He refused to stoop to conquer.

Westbrook Pegler, about the hardest critic of public officials, says in way of tribute:

"Anyway, Mr. Dewey retires with honor and self-respect and we owe him much. His wife never grafted a nickel under any pretext nor in any guise. You can frisk the State payrolls in vain for any worthless, indigent, genteel bums of his morally dependent kinnery."

Governor Dewey first attained fame as a district attorney in New York City. He proved during his years in that office that the racketeers can be arrested and convicted if public officials sincerely try to do so.

It was on the strength of his fine record as a district attorney that he was elected Governor of New York.

There has been no breath of scandal during the years he has served as chief executive of the largest State of the Union.

It is true that American citizens rejected Mr. Dewey twice when he was a candidate for President of the United States. That is not surprising. This seems to be an era in which men of good character are not wanted in public office.

Few men have achieved as much in public life as Governor Dewey. He started in life as a comparatively poor boy. He sold newspapers and magazines in his boyhood and worked his way through college. From Michigan he turned to the Nation's metropolis and there his ability, integrity, and willingness to work won him fame.

His retirement may be temporary. It is to be hoped so for his ability is needed now as never before. Even if he retires to private life permanently, he has earned the accolade of "well done good and faithful servant."

Pullman Conductors Call Nation-Wide Walkout for July 11

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Pullman Conductors Call Nation-Wide Walkout for July 11," published in the Rocky Mountain News, of Denver, Colo, on June 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PULLMAN CONDUCTORS CALL NATION-WIDE WALKOUT FOR JULY 11

CHICAGO, June 22.—The Order of Railway Conductors called a strike of all pullman conductors for July 11 today in the latest move by railroad unions which may bring widespread walkouts by mid-July.

The Switchmen's Union of North America, A. F. of L. has ordered a strike of 4,000 members this Sunday against five western and midwestern railroads.

The conductors, together with the big Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, also threaten a walkout of 250,000 members by July 15 in a demand for a 40-hour workweek.

MAY STAGGER WALK-OUT

However, officials of the conductors and trainmen said today the mid-July walk-out, if it comes, may be called only against a few carriers rather than on a Nation-wide basis.

The strike call for 2,200 pullman conductors was separate and distinct from the walkout threatened jointly by other conductors and the trainmen.

A. G. Wise, general chairman of the ORC's pullman committee, said the union was willing to postpone the strike if President Truman invokes machinery of the National Railway Labor Act and names a fact-finding board.

Such a procedure automatically would delay a strike on pullmans for 60 days.

Mr. Wise said the chief issue at dispute was a demand of the pullman conductors for a reduction in the total basic hours worked each month from 225 to 210.

COULD IDLE 60,000

Other conductors, the trainmen, and the switchmen want a reduction in the workweek from 48 to 40 hours without loss in pay.

The switchmen called a strike for 6 a. m., local standard time, Sunday against five roads—the Rock Island, Chicago Great Western, Great Northern, Rio Grande, and Western Pacific.

A complete shut-down of the five roads would idle some 60,000 other employees. The Chicago Great Western today joined the Rock Island in planning to halt service if the strike is called.

The Western Pacific imposed an embargo, effective at midnight tomorrow, on livestock and perishables.

But the Great Northern, a big road with 28,000 employees which operates in 10 States, announced that it would do the best it can to operate despite a strike.

Chairman Francis A. O'Neill, of the National Railway Mediation Board, arrived in Chicago and was expected to begin efforts to head off the threatened strikes.

The trainmen and conductors rejected recommendations of a Presidential fact-finding board, which on June 15 proposed that the 40-hour week be extended only to some 75,000 members of the 2 unions in yard service.

The unions are now free to strike July 15 at the expiration of a 30-day cooling-off period.

However, trainmen's president W. P. Kennedy and conductor's chief F. H. Nemitz raised the possibility that the Nation may not suffer a crippling general strike.

Mr. Kennedy said the unions may strike against only a few railroads. He added, however, that the unions have wide latitude under the Railway Labor Act and could strike against one or all of the major carriers.

Labor Producing Sugar

REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under the Sugar Act the Secretary of Agriculture has the power, authority, and funds to fix the minimum wage for labor.

I am including some correspondence in regard to this situation:

MARCH 23, 1950.

Hon. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SECRETARY: I have been very interested in the wages provided for agriculture labor in general and the Sugar Act in particular.

It always seemed to me that the price-support law was the farmers' minimum wage. I understand, through correspondence with the Department of Agriculture, that a Secretary of Agriculture, not you, fixed the minimum wage for labor as low as 25 cents per hour in the Virgin Islands, 29 cents per hour in Puerto Rico, and 32 cents per hour in Louisiana. While the minimum wage for sugar workers may not have been so much out of line when we had a 40-cent-per-hour minimum wage, with the present minimum wage of 75 cents per hour, do you not think that the minimum sugar wage should be adjusted?

I have discussed this problem with my friend and colleague, Hon. CLEVELAND BAILEY, of West Virginia, a member of the Labor Committee, and also Mr. Hugh Mitchell, with the American Federation of Labor.

It appears to me that the beet and cane companies are taken care of under the act with the money raised from the processing tax, but I never could figure out why this same line of thought and reasoning is not extended to the men that work in the fields producing the sugar. In other words, Mr. Secretary, I have always felt that the sugar would taste just as sweet if the men that work in the fields had legislative protection comparable to other groups.

I will appreciate your kind consideration of this question.

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., May 5, 1950.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of March 23, and your conversation with Mr. Joseph T. Elvove on April 4, concerning wages provided for agricultural labor, particularly workers employed in sugar beet and sugarcane fields, and your request for data on payments to producers under the Sugar Act and excise tax collections.

We appreciate your fine attitude in regard to the workers in the sugar industry. The Department has the responsibility of making fair and reasonable wage determinations for sugar workers and in making these determinations must take into consideration the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948 as passed by the Congress.

To review briefly the background of the wage provisions of the act, wage determinations for persons employed in the production, cultivation, or harvesting of sugar beets or sugarcane have been issued each year since 1937. These determinations provide that workers shall be paid at rates as agreed upon for such work but not less than specified minimum rates determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable. The act requires that these determinations be made after investigation and after public hearing on the matter. The act also provides that the Secretary shall take into consideration the wage standards established by him under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, and differences in conditions among various producing areas.

You will observe from the foregoing that the Congress has specifically directed that certain standards be taken into consideration in making fair and reasonable wage determinations. The primary standards which have been considered are (1) prices of sugar and by-products, (2) income to the producers from sugar beets or sugarcane, (3) cost of production, (4) cost of living, and (5) relationship of labor costs to total costs. The most important of these factors, of course, is the income standard, which determines the ability of producers to pay wage rates. The price of raw and refined sugar is the major determinant of income per ton of product. As you are aware, sugar was the last commodity to be decontrolled. Since October 1947, the price of sugar has declined by about 0.75 cent per pound with resultant decreases in producer income. Further, the significant decline in molasses prices has contributed to lower producer returns. In contrast, the wage rates provided in wage determinations for workers employed on sugar beet and sugarcane farms have not decreased since 1947, except in Puerto Rico where wages are tied to the price of sugar. In areas other than Puerto Rico it has been possible to maintain the level of wage rates in spite of decreased returns to producers primarily because of the increased use of mechanical aids in the production of the crop and resulting cost savings.

You are correct when you state that the minimum wage established in wage determinations is 25 cents per hour in the Virgin Islands, 29 cents per hour in Puerto Rico, and 32 cents per hour in Louisiana. In addition, the minimum hourly rate in Florida is 45 cents per hour; in the sugar-beet area the minmum hourly rate is 60 cents for summer work operations and 65 cents for harvest work; and in Hawaii it is 80 cents per hour. The rates shown are for unskilled workers; proportionately higher wages are paid to workers of higher skills. In most areas a large share of field work is performed on a piecework basis. In such cases workers earn from 25 to 100 percent more than the minimum hourly rates shown above.

In addition to the above cash payments, producers in all domestic areas except Hawaii are required to furnish laborers, without charge, the customary prerequisites. These usually consist of housing, garden plots, and, in some cases, medical services. In Hawaii the labor unions demanded and received as part of the wage rate the cash equivalent of perquisites.

It would appear that variations in hourly wage rates in different producing areas were contemplated by the Congress in writing the labor provisions of the act, since we are specifically directed to take into account the differences in conditions among the various sugar-producing areas. That there are wide differences in conditions among the several domestic sugar areas is shown by the following estimates of man-days of agricultural labor required per ton of raw sugar produced: Hawaii 3.4; sugar beets, 4.6; Louisiana, 10.2; Florida, 10.9; Puerto Rico, 15.2; Virgin Islands, 20. In view of the foregoing, and in view of differences in other significant costs, it seems clear that there are sufficient variations among the several areas to warrant differences in minimum-wage levels.

Any significant increases in minimum-wage rates to sugar beet or sugarcane workers under present income levels of producers would require the adoption by producers of corresponding economies in other cost elements, most of which, because of the current high levels of prices paid by farmers, would have to be accomplished by more extensive use of machine methods of production. While increased efficiency within the industry is desirable, further technological change is a long-term process and, of course, will result in fewer employment opportunities for workers.

Unquestionably, the industry has enjoyed higher returns as a result of the payment and quota provisions of the act. Labor has also shared in these benefits through the wage determinations which assure workers of a proportionate share of the income of the industry based on the standards set forth, particularly the standard of ability to pay. Further, workers are assured of payment of the minimum wage or the wage agreed upon, whichever is higher, through wage claim procedure administered by the field office of the Production and Marketing Administration. We are constantly conducting surveys and investigations relating to costs of production, labor performance, and other data which are useful in the development of the wage determinations and other purposes of the act.

On the matter of revenues and expenditures authorized by the Sugar Act of 1948, the most recent data show that sugar-tax collections by the Bureau of Internal Revenue during the 1949 fiscal year totaled $76,174,356 while customs receipts (taxes collected on direct consumption sugar entering the United States from off-shore areas and foreign countries) were $4,139,161, a sum of $80,313,517. Sugar Act payments made to about 86,400 sugar beet and sugarcane producers under the 1949 program totaled $61,430,750. The estimated payments by area were as follows:

Estimated Sugar Act payments, 1949 program

Sugar beets	$27,847,545
Mainland cane	7,400,000
Puerto Rico	17,680,000
Virgin Islands	65,586
Hawaii	8,437,619
Total	61,430,750

From the above it will be noted that revenues exceeded expenditures for the period by about $19,000,000. Although there is no direct relationship under existing legislation, between the sugar taxes collected and the funds appropriated by the Congress for sugar conditional payments, the effect of the tax collections is to more than offset the expenditures for conditional payments.

We are enclosing a table showing the sugar beet and sugarcane wage rates for the period 1934–37 prior to the operation of the Sugar Act with comparisons with wages received in more recent years.

Please be assured of our continued efforts to administer the sugar program in the best interests of all parties concerned.

Sincerely yours,

WESLEY MCCUNE,
Executive Assistant to the Secretary.

Sugar beet and sugarcane wage rates per hour, 1934 to 1937, with comparisons

[Cents per hour]

Year	Sugar beets	Louisiana	Florida [2]	Puerto Rico [3]	Virgin Islands [4]	Hawaii [5]
1934	17	14	15	10	6	20
1935	19	14	15	10	6	21
1936	20	15	15	11	8	24
1937	23	15	15	12	11	26
Average	19¾	14½	15	10¾	7¾	22¾
1938–40 average [5]	35	17	18	13	[6] 15	27
1949	62½	32	45	29	25	80
	Percentage increases					
1938–40 over 1934–37	77.2	17.2	20.0	20.9	93.5	18.7
1949 over 1934–35	216.5	120.7	200.0	169.8	222.6	251.6
1949 over 1938–40	78.6	88.2	150.0	123.1	66.7	196.3

[1] Since most work in this area is performed on a piecework basis an hourly rate series is not available for the years 1934–37. For these years the general farm wage per day without board is used converted to an hourly basis. Hourly rates are established in wage determinations as shown for 1938–40 and 1949.
[2] Adult male harvest worker.
[3] Average wage—all workers.
[4] Adult male unskilled worker.
[5] First 3 years affected by Sugar Act wage determinations.
[6] 1942—first year of wage determinations under Sugar Act.

MAY 15, 1950.

Mr. WESLEY MCCUNE,
Executive Assistant, Office of the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of May 5 in answer to my letter to the Secretary on March 23 in regard to the Sugar Act.

I wish to call your attention to the fact that I just do not feel that it is exactly in keeping with the situation to try to blame the Congress because we still have a 25 to 32 cents per hour minimum wage in this Sugar Act. I called attention to my first letter to the fact that this minimum wage was not so much out of line when we had a national 40 cents per hour minimum wage, but it surely is out of line in relation to the 75 cents per hour minimum wage.

I also wish to call your attention to the fact that in your letter you list the Hawaiian Islands as having an 80 cents per hour minimum wage but from my information this was not prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture but came as the result of other influences not confined to the position taken by the Secretary. With all of the talk we hear about slave labor existing domestically and in foreign lands, I am more convinced every day that something should be done about this 25 to 32 cents per hour minimum wage that is prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Sixty to sixty-five cents per hour provided in certain areas is comparable to the hourly wage returns provided under the support-price program for people providing other products. If a few cane producers are provided $25,000,000 a year subsidy by the 53 cents per hundred processing tax, it appears to me that the administration is in rather an embarrassing position if they maintain that 25 to 32 cents per hour is a sufficient wage for the workers in the cane fields. As I understand it, the processing tax provided more than ample funds to be distributed to the growers, but as to the matter of fairness, I cannot see why this 25 to 32 cents per hour minimum wage is fair to any group of Americans. The sooner the situation is corrected the sooner I will believe we are sincere in our interest of operating on the basis of the greatest good for the greatest number. Pointing fingers at the slave labor in the Taft-Hartley law will not be the answer to this by anyone who takes time to study this situation.

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., June 22, 1950.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This will reply to your letter of May 15, 1950, to Mr. Wesley McCune which is in further reference to wage rates established for agricultural workers covered by wage determinations under the Sugar Act of 1948.

In our letter to you of May 5, 1950, we endeavored to point out that while there are differences in the minimum wages of workers in the several domestic sugar producing areas, such differences are necessary, in large part, because of the vast variations in the economic conditions and cultural practices. We believe these variations can be readily seen by inviting your attention to the statement attached showing estimated production, crop value, and field worker requirements for the 1948 crop in the several areas. You will observe, for example, that in Hawaii there are employed about one-tenth as many workers as in Puerto Rico to produce a crop not greatly different than Puerto Rico in a normal year, even though the Hawaiian crop requires from 4 to 12 months longer to mature than in Puerto Rico. Obviously, under these conditions, productivity in Hawaii is much greater than in Puerto Rico and the Hawaiian industry can afford to pay wages considerably above those paid in Puerto Rico. Although not shown in the statement, it is significant to note that the aggregate income of workers in the various areas constitutes a very important percentage of the total value of the crop. For example, in Louisiana, it is estimated that 45 percent of the total crop value is paid to agricultural workers; in Florida, 48 percent; in Puerto Rico, 47 percent; and in the Virgin Islands, 90 percent. We believe also that you might be interested in certain other significant variations in the several areas.

In the sugar beet area the majority of producers operate small farms on which sugar beets constitute an important part of the rotation system along with alfalfa, potatoes, beans, and other crops. The average sugar beet acreage per farm is about 15 acres. The labor supply utilized on sugar beet farms is made up of local workers as well as a large number of migrant Spanish-American workers who are employed during peak seasons from May to July, and from September to November in all areas except California where the seasons are somewhat earlier. The sugar beet industry has made important strides in mechanizing the harvesting of the crop as well as the summer work operations. New machinery is being developed and it is expected that within the next few years labor requirements will be reduced significantly. While costs have not declined appreciably because of the high prices of farm machinery and other cost elements, certain savings will probably accrue to the producers over a period of years. Wage rates paid to contract

workers in the sugar beet area increased steadily from 1941 to 1947 and have held constant since then in spite of the reduction in the income of producers resulting from a decrease in the price of sugar of about three-fourths cent per pound.

In Louisiana, sugarcane operations are carried on by a number of large-scale operators and approximately 5,500 farmers who produce less than 100 acres of sugarcane each. In this area sugarcane is the predominant crop throughout the Sugar Belt since there are few alternative uses for sugarcane land. The labor supply is composed of workers who are residents of the farm or the local area in which they are employed, although during the harvesting season many workers are brought into the area from neighboring States. The peak seasons of employment in Louisiana are from September through December and from February through June. Mechanization of both the cultivating and harvesting of the sugarcane crop has been possible on large-size farms. In addition, there is considerable custom work of harvesting on smaller-size farms. On the majority of farms, however, producers are unable to utilize machine methods of production because their units are too small. Such farms may require only two or three hired workers during the harvesting season. While the mechanization of the crop has resulted in some cost savings, it has been accompanied by such problems as the delivery of stale cane and cane which contains excessive quantities of trash. This has resulted in lower recoveries of sugar by the mills and lower payments to producers. In recent years the sugar industry in Louisiana has experienced rather extreme economic dislocations. The Department has been cooperating with the industry in an effort to improve to the extent possible its economic position. Wage rates have increased since 1941 and have been held constant since 1947 in spite of reduced income to producers.

The sugarcane industry of Florida is composed of three large processor-producers and about one dozen independent growers. These growers average approximately 300 acres of sugarcane each. There is practically no alternative use for sugarcane land in this area since the high investment per acre in sugarcane equipment and growing crop does not permit shifting to other crops. Producers have developed new methods of production with respect to cultivation and the loading of sugarcane. Mechanical harvesting of sugarcane in Florida has not been possible because of the heavy tangled growth and the softness of the ground upon which sugarcane is grown. Man-hour requirements of producing the crop have been reduced since prewar years and at present may have reached the maximum point of decline. In this area growers have been unable to obtain domestic workers for sugarcane work and have relied heavily on the importation of workers from Jamaica and the Bahamas. Minimum wage rates have increased from 18 and 20 cents in prewar years to 45 and 55 cents in recent years. In this area most producers pay in excess of the minimum rate for all types of labor, and since most of the hand work is performed on a piecework basis, workers' earnings are considerably higher than the minimum. Only one producer has a labor-union agreement with field workers. This producer is located in the central part of the State in an isolated farming area.

The sugar industry of Hawaii is composed of 28 large plantations and about 1,500 adherent planters who produce approximately 10 percent of the crop. With the exception of pineapples, there is no other economic use for the land areas of Hawaii. Historically, Hawaii has been an area of labor shortage, although at present there is some unemployment throughout the islands. The industry has made remarkable strides in the mechanization of the crop and in the introduction of new varieties of sugarcane which give high yields per acre of both cane and sugar. Costs other than labor in this area are high because of the heavy investments in equipment and the land rental system under which the industry operates. The most significant change in wage rates in Hawaii was in 1945 when the industry negotiated for the first time a labor contract with the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union. This contract, which provided a wage of 43½ cents per hour, plus the furnishing of perquisites by producers, has been improved until at present the minimum rate is 80 cents per hour, although perquisites are no longer furnished by producers. The industry has been able to pay these higher wage rates because of the extensive improvements in productivity noted above. However, those sections of the island which are unable to mechanize effectively are currently in some financial distress. We understand that a group of four plantations is presently considering ways and means of eliminating their sugarcane production operations. As a result of mechanization, the labor force has been reduced from 26,500 in 1945 to about 23,500 in 1949. Of the latter group, 12,000 are field workers. Those workers employed in the Hawaiian sugar industry obtain almost year-around employment because of the nature of operations in that area.

In Puerto Rico there are approximately 14,000 producers, of whom about 12,500 harvest less than 50 acres of sugarcane each. Since there is presently no other economic use for sugarcane land in this area, Puerto Rico has essentially a one-crop economy. As you know, it is also an area of surplus labor supply. During the grinding season which extends from January to July, workers receive reasonably steady employment, but during the so-called dead season the majority of workers obtain only two or three days' work per week. While there has been some reduction in the man-hours required to produce the crop in this area in recent years, the industry is unable to mechanize effectively because of the serious impact that mechanization would have on labor employment. The Puerto Rican Government has been giving serious attention to this problem in an effort to develop other industries which would provide employment for workers. Wage rates in Puerto Rico have always been relatively low. Labor unions have been active in this area since 1934 and at present the predominant union is the General Confederation of Workers of Puerto Rico, although there are several other unions among sugarcane workers in the island. The C. G. T. agreement covers roughly one-half of the workers employed in sugarcane fields and their agreement for 1950 provides a wage which is 1¼ cents per hour higher than the wage provided in the wage determinations under the Sugar Act. In this area wages are tied to the price of sugar so that there is some fluctuation in wage rates as the price of sugar increases or decreases. In addition to labor union activity in the island, the Puerto Rican Government has provided a minimum wage board whose functions include the establishment of minimum wages for sugarcane field workers. The decree which is currently effective provides essentially the same wages that are provided in the Sugar Act wage determinations.

In the Virgin Islands there are about 500 small producers and the Virgin Islands Company, a Government-owned corporation, produces the majority of the sugarcane. In past years the operations of the Virgin Islands Company have been designed to provide work opportunities to the residents of the islands. The Company has lost significant sums of money each year. Most of the independent producers do their own work, perhaps hiring several hands during the harvest season and when their crop is in, will work for the Virgin Islands Company. There is no alternative use for land in the Virgin Islands. Mechanization of the crop has been limited to the use of tractors and certain other fundamental labor-saving devices. Further mechanization would have serious implications for the local labor supply. In this area wages have customarily been quite low. It is an area of low rainfall and low yields of sugarcane. You undoubtedly are aware of legislation passed by the Congress in 1949 which was designed to improve the economic condition of the Virgin Islands. There is one labor union in the Virgin Islands which negotiates wages with the Virgin Islands Company. While there is no formal contract in existence, the union is active in protecting the rights of workers.

From the above data, we believe you will agree that consideration of differences in conditions among the several producing areas, as provided in the Sugar Act by the Congress, is a pertinent and practical consideration in establishing wages for agricultural workers. These conditions are inherent in agriculture under current conditions. For example, general farm wages throughout the United States as of April 1, 1950, ranged from 38 cents per hour in the Southeast to 97 cents per hour in the Pacific Northwest, with an average wage for the country of 70 cents. These rates are without room or board and include both unskilled and skilled farm workers.

We are, of course, very interested in improving the standard of living for all sugar workers. On the other hand, however, our many responsibilities under the Sugar Act are such that if wages generally are increased to any considerable extent in areas such as Louisiana, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, such increases ultimately will have to be compensated for by higher sugar prices or improvement in productivity if the industry is to be maintained in accordance with the mandate of the Sugar Act. It appears inevitable that if wage rates are increased to keep pace with an unrelated wage standard, those farms which cannot meet the requirements of improved productivity to reduce costs within the framework of present prices and income must, of necessity, go out of production.

With respect to the Fair Labor Standards Act, we believe it significant that the Congress has not yet deemed it appropriate to include agricultural workers under the minimum-wage provision of that act. It is also significant that the act contains special provisions which would prevent the application of the 75 cents per hour minimum wage for industrial workers in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, thus recognizing the labor problems of those areas.

We trust that this somewhat fuller explanation of the problems inherent in determining wage rates for domestic sugar-producing areas will be helpful to you in understanding the need for adjusted minimum-wage rates to conditions within each of the separate sugar-producing areas. We feel that it is impossible at the present time to make any general revision of the wage scale without creating serious economic problems in the areas affected. We are confident that as time goes on it will be possible, through the medium of the Sugar Act, to raise the living standards of workers in the sugar areas. You may be assured that we shall continue to administer the wage provisions of the act in such a manner that labor will share in the benefits of legislation designed to protect the domestic sugar industry.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary.

Estimated production, crop value, and fiel d worker requirements for domestic sugar producing areas for 1948 crop

Item	Louisiana	Florida	Hawaii	Puerto Rico [1]	Beet area
Acreage harvested	*273, 941	*35, 233	*100, 042	*336, 285	670, 000
Production:					
Cane or beets (tons)	[2] *5, 459, 637	*1, 010, 327	*7, 542, 613	*9, 541, 232	9, 024, 611
Sugar (tons 96° raw sugar)	*399, 072	*78, 805	*835, 107	1, 108, 261	1, 316, 127
Value of crop: [3]					
Raw sugar	$44, 376, 800	$8, 763, 100	$92, 863, 900	$123, 238, 600	$145, 686, 100
Molasses	3, 186, 500	686, 000	4, 667, 600	4, 627, 500	5, 333, 958
Government	6, 500, 000	827, 000	7, 630, 000	15, 300, 000	23, 500, 000
Total	54, 063, 300	10, 276, 100	105, 161, 500	143, 166, 100	174, 520, 058
Number of farms	6, 200	25	30	13, 650	31, 429
Number of field workers	50, 000	5, 000	12, 100	115, 000	80, 000
Average man-days worked per year per field worker	83	169	235	141	79
Yield per harvested acre:					
Cane or beets (tons)	19. 9	28. 7	75. 4	28. 4	13. 5
Raw sugar (tons)	1. 5	2. 2	8. 3	3. 3	2. 0
Percentage of sugar produced to cane or beets processed	7. 31	7. 80	11. 07	11. 62	14. 52
Man-days per acre	15. 3	24. 0	28. 4	50. 0	9. 2
Man-days per ton of cane or beets	. 77	. 84	3. 8	1. 76	. 68
Man-hours	6. 93	7. 56	3. 04	14. 08	6. 12
Man-days per ton of raw sugar	10. 2	10. 9	3. 4	15. 2	4. 6
Weighted average minimum wage per day of field workers [4]	$3. 32	$4. 12	$6. 90	$2. 46	$5. 62
Weighted average prevailing wage per day of field workers [5]	$4. 22	$5. 14	$8. 44	$2. 52	$6. 75

*Actual.
[1] 1947-48 crop.
[2] Gross weight. Net weight is 5,256,644.
[3] For comparability between areas 96° raw sugar valued at 5.56 cents per pound (average duty paid price for calendar year 1948); molasses valued at 9.7 cents per gallon (season's average price for Louisiana molasses) with estimated premium added for beet molasses.
[4] Based on time rates in wage determinations.
[5] Based on daily earnings of workers on time or piecework rate basis, exclusive of the value of perquisites for all areas, except Hawaii. For the beet area, the rate shown includes not only earnings of hand workers but also the earnings of workers in operations for which specific rates are not established in wage determinations.

NOTE.—These data were taken from the best available source but their accuracy varies from area to area. However, they are believed to be sufficiently reliable to present a general picture of area comparisons.

Source: Sugar Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture, November 1949.

Mr. K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HUTCHINSON: I thank you for your letter of June 22, 1950. Your letter of explanation is informative, but the following facts still remain:

The Secretary of Agriculture has the power to fix the minimum wage. It is fixed as low as 25 cents to 32 cents per hour, the same as it was when the minimum wage for industry was 40 cents per hour. The increase in the minimum wage to 75 cents per hour for labor has not been reflected in the minimum wage to labor in the sugar industry, although the Secretary has the power and authority to do so. Am I to come to the conclusion that your administration wishes to pose as the great friend of labor and insist on a 25 cents to 32 cents per hour minimum wage when you have the power and authority to do what is fair and right about it?

We hear much political talk about slave labor. Do you know of any lower wage scale in the United States than that fixed by this administration under the Sugar Act, or of as low as 25 cents to 32 cents per hour that a member of President Truman's Cabinet fixes it?

I have spent considerable time over the years in an effort to have farm labor enjoy some of the privileges and advantages afforded all labor, and I am at a loss to understand why the administration does not do something about it so long as they have the power and the authority to do it.

I thank you for your letter of explanation, but your letter does not answer the question as to why you do not do something about it.

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

When there was a 40-cent-minimum wage the 25 cents to 32 cents per hour was not so much out of line. With the 75 cents per hour minimum wage now in effect, do you not agree that a new adjustment of the minimum wage in the sugar industry should be effectuated?

The rural people do not have social security, unemployment insurance, and other legislative protection afforded other groups of labor. Some farm owners producing some farm commodities have a minimum wage in the form of a support price which in reality is a minimum wage. This is reflected in a 50 cents to 75 cents per hour minimum wage for the farm operator.

The hired farm labor has only one minimum wage and that is under the Sugar Act. This is as low as 25 cents to 32 cents per hour. The Secretary of Agriculture fixes this wage scale.

Are we to assume that this administration wishes to have a 25 cents to 32 cents per hour for one group of labor that is to be denied social security, minimum wage, and unemployment insurance? Until this Sugar Act is adjusted one is compelled to think this is the fact.

Red Invasion of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker: 1914, the murder of an Austrian archduke in Serbia; 1941, Pearl Harbor; 1950, Korea.

These three events are widely spaced in time and distance. Yet the pattern is the same. In each case a totalitarian aggressor struck at the peace of the world and at the basic liberties of the American people. In each case, the wealth of these United States was being thrown away, and our national strength was being sapped, by Deal politicians. In each case, this Republic had been given ample warning, and in each case this Republic was unprepared militarily for the tragedy which followed.

We had from 1914 to 1917 to prepare for World War I. Only a few months shortly before Chateau Thierry, President Wilson said that the American people were "too proud to fight."

We had from 1938—after the betrayal of Munich—to prepare for World War II. Americans were still drilling with wooden guns, late in 1941. President Roosevelt said, only a few short months before Kasserine Pass, that he hated "wa-ah," and that no American boy would fight in a foreign conflict.

We had from 1945 to prepare for the Korean emergency. Only a little over a week ago, President Truman said this Nation was never more distant from war since 1945.

What will the policy of the Acheson-Truman axis be in meeting the Red invasion of Korea?

Will Korea be abandoned to the Reds?

Will Asia be abandoned to the Reds?

Will we admit Red China to the United Nations by refusing to use once the veto which the Kremlin has used so often?

Will we employ twentieth century Hessians to fight our battles, or will we send more American boys to the Orient to die?

The American people are entitled to the answers to these questions, not next year, after the November elections, but now.

Let us forget about point 4.

Let us concentrate on point 1—the protection of our Constitution, the perpetuation of our way of life, and the preservation of our God-given liberties.

Address of Col. Melvin J. Maas, USMC, to First Postwar Convention, MCROA, May 5, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD the address of Col. Melvin J. Maas, United States Marine Corps Reserve and president of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association at its annual convention held in Washington, D. C.

Colonel Maas needs no introduction to the House of Representatives where he served with such distinction for so many years. Neither does he need an introduction as a Marine because his fame

with that elite Corps is as well known as his outstanding wartime exploits.

It is a pleasure for me to bring to the attention of the Congress the able and hard-hitting address of our former colleague and I know his words will receive every consideration by this body:

The first postwar national convention of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association meets significantly in Washington. We meet at a momentous time. Whether we are meeting during a short interlude between World War II and world war III or whether our meeting is in the early stages of a difficult but ultimately new era of world peace remains to be seen.

Certainly the times are unsettled, troublesome, and the future uncertain, to put it most mildly.

Not only is our own future, but likewise the future of modern civilization at stake in the outcome. A third world war now will most surely tear this old earth to pieces, literally and figuratively. There are few who believe that the world can survive such a catastrophe.

Therefore, the responsibility that has been thrust upon this generation is enormous and not a little frightening. Can civilization and our generation in particular produce the leaders capable of a solution other than dissolution? As citizens and especially Reserve officers, what is our responsibility, and what is our opportunity to contribute constructively to a correct answer?

Obviously, we can't all sit in the White House, nor in diplomatic posts, nor in the Congress. Does that mean that there is nothing that we can do? Does that mean that we have no direct responsibility? Not at all.

In addition to exercising our cherished right of franchise wisely by the most painstaking, unselfish support of the best candidates available for public office, there is much more that you and I can do. Our contribution does not have to be spectacular nor world shattering to be effective.

Perhaps the most important contribution we can make in these momentous days is to so conduct ourselves as to be an inspiration to our neighbors at home and abroad. We can do this in such a public-spirited manner as to give new hope to the hopeless, new courage to those who are placing their hopes upon us, and as an example to our own chosen leaders, inspiring or shaming them, if necessary, to act above petty partisanship, self-interest, political advantage, and to think and act only in the interest of the Nation's and the world's greatest good. Unless we act in our Nation's best interest, this Nation cannot make its maximum contribution to world peace and security. In order to have democracy strong in the world, the United States must be strong.

The great issue confronting us as we meet today, here in Washington, the most important spot in the world at present, is the survival of the world as we know it.

If we fail, civilization may very well be set back thousands of years. If we survive intact, then the world is bound to take great strides ahead again, to new, broader, and finer standards for all civilization.

Specifically, what can and what must you and I do about it? If our mission is not to be dramatic and heroic, then what is it?

To marines the answer should be comparatively simple, even though the task itself may not be. One of the real secrets of the Marine Corps is that every marine does his appointed job every day, and to the best of his ability every day. That is what is needed now. Specifically, you and I as officers of the Marine Corps in reserve must strive to develop ourselves to our maximum capabilities as marines. We must so train and prepare ourselves so as to fill the gap between the professional Marine Corps, and the Corps commitments, in its part of providing balanced national security. As the Corps strength is reduced, we Reserves must put out extra efforts to be so well prepared that in event of an emergency, we Reserves can make up for the diminished effectiveness of the regular Corps. Our obligation is to see to it that the Marine Corps, one way or another, is capable at all times of fully meeting its obligation to national defense.

That may involve our making strong independent representations to the highest naval authorities or to the Secretary of Defense, yes, even to the Commander in Chief.

Failing in these steps, we may have to go direct to the Congress, or even to the people.

One of our jobs is to take up where the Marine Corps has to leave off in properly interpreting to those who can act the necessary requirements to permit the Marine Corps to do its required part in the over-all job of providing adequate national security. While we are marine officers, we are yet unrestricted free American citizens, with all of the inherent American's right of free speech, appeal to Congress and with the sacred right of protest.

It is the manner in which we exercise these rights and obligations, that will determine our real usefulness. It is the way in which we conduct ourselves, when disagreeing with Government officials, that will determine whether we are setting a proper example at home and abroad of the right way to demonstrate the superiority of democracy.

If our campaign to correct or improve the effectiveness of the Marine Corps, including its reserve force, is conducted with dignity, we will be making a real contribution, both to national security directly and to the cause of democracy indirectly.

To be dignified does not mean that we cannot be vigorous and very positive in our actions. It does mean keeping the ultimate objective always as our goal, rather than mere winning a fight or of being noisy just to show our dissatisfaction. It also means that when the final tribunal to which we may appeal renders a verdict, whether it is one we like or not, that we gracefully accept the decision and carry on from there.

It is never a surrender to accept majority decisions in a democracy.

As Marines, we can put such sincerity and such devotion to duty into our training programs, that we inspire in our fellow marines a desire to reach maximum competence as marines. We can thereby set such an example in devotion to our country and its security that we will inspire both officials and the public at large in their obligations to this Nation and to the world at large.

One of our opportunities and obligations is to see that every step is taken to provide the most adequate reserve possible. Since in time of war, the major dependence will have to rest upon the reserve forces of each service, this Nation must have the finest professional military services, and a large well-trained and equipped reserve for each service. A paper reserve just won't do. One of our jobs is to study the factors that enter the recruiting and maintaining of an adequate-sized reserve.

Let us, after sincere, searching study, advise the leaders in the military and the Congress what specific measures are necessary in order to induce civilians to become part-time soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen in time of peace. We should know. It is our duty to tell those in authority so that they may take appropriate action.

Much in this direction has been accomplished, largely at the instance of organized reserve officers; but much, very much in fact, remains to be done.

I intend to outline what I believe to be the principal steps necessary at this time.

First I want to make some comments upon the recent training exercise conducted in the Puerto Rican area. I believe that this maneuver will be of especial interest to you.

Portrex was unlike any ordinary war game or maneuver. It was an umpire-controlled training exercise. It was publicly stated that it was not intended to prove or disprove anything.

Any attempt at evaluation of the biggest peacetime joint airborne-amphibious exercise must keep its stated mission in mind.

That mission was fourfold.

1. To provide training for personnel and units of the three services in the planning and the execution of joint operations.

2. Examine the validity of current techniques and procedures for joint operations, and to accumulate knowledge and data concerning the principles governing a joint amphibious-airborne operation.

3. Service-test the capabilities of new items of equipment for their suitability in joint operations.

4. Provide training for the defense forces in the Caribbean command.

To get any sort of a picture of this gigantic exercise, the arbitrary assumptions made in advance for planning purposes must be set forth.

1. That a state of war existed between the United States and a major enemy nation (known as "aggressor").

2. The island of Vieques represented an area of a large continental land mass (theoretically it was a peninsula connnected to Europe and Africa).

3. This area was well garrisoned by the enemy in strongly fortified positions.

4. Enemy ground forces were supported by short-range tactical aircraft and a sizable submarine force.

5. The United States had decided to attempt a seizure in the Vieques area in order to develop a base from which a strategic air campaign might be projected.

6. The amphibious assault was launched from continental United States territory adject to Vieques.

7. The airborne invasion was launched from friendly territory adjacent to Vieques.

8. The seizure involved major land, sea, and air operations.

In order to give the maximum training benefit to all participating personnel, (and all in all, the whole exercise involved 80,000 people), the usual procedure of ruling out further participation by troops, ships, tanks, etc., that had been deemed captured, killed, or destroyed, was not employed in Portrex. Such troops or equipment were merely ruled out of action for very short periods—at most a few hours. To do otherwise would have denied further training to a large numbers of those for whom the training was designed. While this method gave a maximum training to individuals as such, it eliminated much of the realism, and also drastically affected the training of unit commanders.

Since troop, air, and sea commanders had the continuous full utilization of all of their equipment and personnel regardless of theoretical casualties, they lost much of the problems inherent in the realities of actual combat where replacements were not immediately available.

The enemy had but nine operating submarines; and yet, with snorkel-type subs, even in this limited number, he was able to so harass the invasion (United States) naval forces, that few ships would ever have reached Vieques, and certainly no supply ships and very few troop transports. Certainly, no assault would ever have taken place on Vieques by the use of the tactics, techniques, and procedures of the last war, which were the standard for this operation.

The theoretical use of atomic bombs by either side was ruled out by the Joint Chiefs of Staff just a few days before the operation began, though both sides had plans for using A-bombs until their arbitrary prohibition. This ruling certainly eliminated a

most important part of the training necessary for modern warfare.

The strategy, planning, and operations of the aggressor forces (the enemy), were excellent and far more realistic than those of the invader.

The aggressor, well entrenched on Vieques, and under the leadership of "Big Brother," a dictator whose picture bore a striking resemblance to Joe Stalin, employed all manner of psychological warfare, including pictures of seminudes as enticement to desertion from invaders' forces.

They followed the typical pattern of totalitarian propaganda-honeyed promises and terrifying dire threats.

The aggressor air force, consisting of a Marine Corps fighter group, and the Air National Guard of Puerto Rico very successfully harassed invasion air force bases and approaching sea forces.

Aggressor troops lived and operated under full field combat conditions. They made extensive defense installations on Vieques, and the combat area was disturbingly reminiscent of many island operations in the Pacific in World War II.

The assault on the beaches on D-day was a disappointment even as a "show." There were so many assimilated conditions that it couldn't go off as a spectacular exhibition. The troops themselves did very well—extremely well, in fact, when it is realized that more than half of the enlisted men in the exercises were not in the Army on the first of December of 1949—only 2 months before.

The landing craft carrying the assault forces were about a half-hour late in reaching the beaches.

The paratroops had been dropped behind the lines on time, though about half of them would have been wiped out in the drop operation. After hitting the ground, most of the rest would have been killed or captured by the enemy, who swooped down upon them in high-speed motorized and armored equipment. To further complicate the paratroops' troubles, through an error, their artillery got dropped behind the "enemy" lines. This, plus the bad timing in the arrival of the beach assault forces, would probably have spelled the doom of the invasion. For some reason, as yet unexplained, no close air support was used in the landing upon the beaches. It took the assault forces a fatally long time to get up off the beaches and into the interior. They had difficulty in breaching the barricades when they did surmount the moats.

This prolonged operation, without supporting artillery, and without airplanes to keep the defenders pinned down, would have, of course, proved fatal in an actual assault.

The greatest failure to show up in the exercises, however, was the almost total breakdown of communications. "Aggressor" forces were able to jam the radio at will, and finally they broke into invasion communications, and succeeded in using the radio to trick the invasion forces into unwittingly directing his artillery against his own troops.

An unplanned and unexpected 12-hour armistice had to be ordered at one point because of a breakdown in supply lines. One regiment went without food or water for 24 hours. This ceased to be a game any more for those poor devils.

Among my personal observations and conclusions, I would list prominently the following:

1. There will be no more large-scale or massed amphibious operations in the future against enemy-held territory.

2. The use of slow transports and supply ships is impossible against modern submarines.

3. The use of paratroopers against defended ground positions is merely mass suicide. Slow-moving air transports are sitting ducks even for ground defenses, let alone fighter planes. Paratroopers in the drop are helpless against infantry fire of any kind—machine guns, rapid-fire weapons, and even the rifles of individual soldiers. The attempt to reform into units on the ground and to recover and utilize their dropped weapons is impossible against an enemy who has fast-moving armed vehicles.

4. Airborne-amphibious operations will have to be relatively small in each instance, with any pin-points to be taken and consolidated into usable area later.

5. The amphibious phase will have to develop entirely new techniques. The first waves will probably have to come from a considerable distance and the assault forces landed from flying boats, using inflatable rubber landing craft. The element of surprise is still the most important singie effective weapon in amphibious attack. The second move ashore will have to be made from ships, but in armored landing craft capable of going through the water up on the beach and of keeping on going through the barricades and into the interior before the forces can be formed on the ground as infantry troops.

6. This operation will have to be supported by airborne troops landed behind the lines to divide and pin down the forces immediately defending the beach. This, however, cannot be done by paratroopers. It will have to be done by low-flying helicopters who can come in below the effective range of the radar screens, land the troops and equipment, and then immediately leave the area.

7. We will still have to seize enemy territory, but new and far more effective tactics, techniques, weapons, and equipment will be needed than we employed in the last war.

8. Portrex appears to give the edge to defense, but no one ever won a war by defense alone. In the end, a war must be carried to the enemy, and his capacity and will to make war destroyed.

I strongly recommend that representatives of the civilian components be assigned in generous numbers in all future training exercises, particularly on the staffs, and throughout the subordinate commands. The use of Reserve troops is not necessary, but certainly the utilization of Reserve officers of all ranks and of all services is most desirable, and, in fact, essential if we are to have a rounded team of Regulars and Reserves.

It was stated at the official critique that the main benefit of the exercises would be to learn by the mistakes made. On that basis, an enormous benefit should come from Portrex.

Operation Portrex has special significance to Marines as from this exercise came two views that have been rather widely expressed by a number of observers at Vieques during Portrex, especially by news correspondents.

One view was that Portrex appeared to be an attempt to demonstrate that the Army and Air Force could successfully conduct amphibious operations without the use of marines. There were no marines used in the amphibious phase of the operation. However, the writers were quick to point out that if this were the intention, it had boomeranged, as by all standards, the amphibious phase of the exercise was far from successful. To practically all correspondents present it was a "flop."

The other view, expressed by many correspondents, was that whether the amphibious assault was a flop by accident or by design (many hinted it gave evidence of being intentional) that the result would be seized upon as proof that the day of amphibious operations was over, and that adequate ground defense and intercontinental bombing now constitute our only military requirements.

Either conclusion, if sustained, would mean the end of the need for a Marine Corps.

As an official observer at Portrex, representing the Civilian Components Policy Board in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, I wish to advise you that neither conclusion is even remotely justified. First of all, this was not a war game, conducted by trained, experienced amphibious experts. No real comparison is possible as to how Portrex was conducted and how it could be done by the latest methods developed by the Marine Corps.

Since this was a training exercise, I interpret the fact that marines were not employed in this particular exercise as meaning only that the marines are so well experienced in amphibious operations that they didn't need the training of Portrex.

My conclusions from Portrex are that we will need joint air-amphibious operations more than ever in event of a future war, but that we will have to be capable of infinitely better techniques, with far more capable equipment and new and radical tactics.

I also came to the conclusion that our Reserve forces will have to be much more realistically trained than at present, and far better qualified for instant mobilization than now planned, as the cost of military success in a battle of the future will be fantastically heavy in casualties as compared with the past.

All this indicates that the Marine Corps is more needed than ever before. We are assigned by law, as well as tradition, the job of developing the tactics, weapons, and procedures of amphibious operations. Portrex has proved that it can't be done successfully as a part-time job nor merely as a side issue in the training program of the other services. Successful air-supported amphibious operation requires the full-time live study of the subject by a corps of experts engaged exclusively in this subject. The Congress has assigned that as the Marine Corps mission.

To give the Marine Corps the Reserve it needs, capable of enabling the Marine Corps to meet its mobilization assignment, requires that much still be done.

A modernized basic Reserve Act is needed to replace the 1938 act, under which we still operate. Since I was the congressional author of that act, I can frankly discuss its shortcomings to meeting today's situation.

It was designed to meet the conditions with which we were faced in the thirties. It is not adequate to produce an atomic-age Reserve.

Among the features necessary in a new basic Reserve Act are such things as providing that the date of commission should be final for all, Regular and Reserve, peace or war; that when mobilized the Reserve should disappear for the duration of the war, and during that time everyone serving in the corps should be just Marines, with only one set of laws and regulations applying to all.

Promotions of Reserves in peace as in war should be on a parity between Reserves and Regulars; that in peacetime Reserves in at least equal numbers should sit in on all boards that deal with Reserves, policy, promotion and separation; it must provide a term contract for Reserves serving on active duty in time of peace, with separation only upon cause, adequately heard, and with severance pay when not due to any fault of the reservist.

We must be provided with adequate training centers, realistically equipped with modern weapons for our training.

Volunteer training units were not thought of before World War II. Now they constitute a vital, important part of the Reserve. Adequate courses for their training must be provided. This means that modernized lectures with suitable training aids must be devised and furnished.

Included in the list of things necessary to create and maintain an adequate, capable Marine Corps Reserve, I would also list a far more liberal policy in regard to distribution

of vacancies in the upper grades in the Reserve. The Marine Corps has by far the smallest percentage of Reserve officers in the upper grades of any of the four services. This must be adjusted if there is to be a proper incentive for any of our Reserve officers to stay in the Reserve and really prepare ourselves for wartime service.

We, on the other hand, must really dig down, and do a job of preparing ourselves so well that we convince the leaders of the corps that we are capable of holding higher rank in a larger proportion that we now have. It must be a two-way street. If more of our numbers expect to reach higher rank, it is up to us to provide more Reserve officers, capable of filling such ranks in time of peace and war.

There is another matter which I wish to mention. Very recently Congress enacted a new law known as the "Uniform Military Justice Code Act." It modernizes and codifies court martial procedure for all four services. However, there is a provision in the bill, which could be, at some future time, so interpreted and administered as to gag all Reserve officers, even those in volunteer Reserve. I know that Congress has no such intention in this law, and I am sure that none of the present officials in the Department of Defense would so use it, but I caution all of you to be alert to any evidence of any attempt to invoke this one provision of this new law in any such manner as to constitute an unwarranted gag.

The provision to which I refer is one that applies the full military criminal code, with court martial proceedings involved, to any Reserve officer who is conducting his training under written orders. This code provides a court martial for even criticizing certain public officials, including the President, the members of the Cabinet, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Congress. Weekly drills of the organized Reserve, meetings of VTU's and correspondence courses are not now conducted under written orders. Any attempt, however, to issue written orders for the purpose of subjecting Reserves to this gag must be immediately exposed, protested, and reported to Congress.

To settle the future status of the Marine Corps and to assure that it will in effect be the potent aggressive force necessary, there are three steps which are essential:

1. The commandant, who as head of the Marine Corps, is the top amphibious expert in the defense team, must sit as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

2. There must be full representation of Marines on all joint staffs, committees, and from the "little chiefs" down.

3. The law should establish that the minimum strength of the Marine Corps should be not less than 6 percent of the combined personnel strength of the armed services.

This past year has been a significant one of great progress for all Reserves. For the first time, we are given official recognition in the highest echelon, for I want to assure you that the agency set up by the Secretary of Defense in his office to see that the Reserves receive proper recognition and consideration, the Civilian Components Policy Board, is turning out to be a potent, genuine factor in the National Security Councils. This is not "just another board." The CCPB is a high-level agency, ranking just behind the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is not a debating society. It is a powerful action board. It sets policy for the services. On major matters, it is advisory to the Secretary of Defense, and its advice goes directly from the Board to him. On all other matters, its action is final, and establishes policy for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. This Board, made up of two Reserves for each Regular, has never been overruled yet by the Secretary of Defense.

Here at last, Reserves, is your opportunity to be heard by a really high-level agency in the military councils of the Nation.

This Board resulted from our long efforts to be represented in the highest councils. We now have it. At last you have the opportunity to have your views go directly to the top, to be given full, fair, and sympathetic consideration by your own representatives. Ladies and gentlemen of the Reserve, we have arrived! From now on, it is up to us. With a President and a Secretary of Defense who themselves are Reserve officers, we are "in the family."

I am very happy to report several other very optimistic developments in our general efforts to aid in the security of the country.

First, I want to assure you that the Marine Corps, led by General Cates and General Silverthorn, fully understand our efforts, our difficulties, our problems and that they are most sympathetic and cooperative in aiding us in achieving our objectives. In my opinion, the Marine Corps is way ahead of any other Regular military service in its consideration of and leadership in a Reserve program.

In return, working as a partnership, we have produced a Marine Corps team—Regular and Reserve—that today presents the only military service fully capable of taking the field and meeting its military commitments upon mobilization.

Secondly, I am most happy to assure you that the movement to abolish, or whittle away the Marine Corps has failed and that we and the country are assured by no less than our Commander in Chief and the Secretary of Defense that an effective, adequate Marine Corps with its own air arm intact, will be maintained as an integral part of the United States security forces. Mr. Truman and Mr. Johnson have assured us, the Congress and the country, that the Marine Corps is here to stay.

Fifth Rail Union May Strike in Wages Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Fifth Rail Union May Strike in Wages Dispute," published in the Chicago Tribune of June 24, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTH RAIL UNION MAY STRIKE IN WAGES DISPUTE

(By Anthony Wirry)

The railroads faced a possible strike by a fifth union yesterday as the Railroad Yardmasters of America (AFL) took preliminary steps which may lead to a walk-out July 15.

In a formal statement, the yardmasters denounced as "disgraceful" a fact-finding board recommendation reducing the workweek of the yard employees from 56 and 48 hours to 40 and increasing hourly pay rates 18 cents an hour. The yardmasters protest that the boost does not maintain the take-home pay of the longer workweek, asserting that a 30-cent raise is necessary.

SEES STRIKE POSSIBILITY

Asked what significance the yardmaster's protest has, M. G. Schoch, president, said, "This definitely raises the possibility of a strike by the union on July 15 or thereafter."

Other unions which have in the last 3 days scheduled or threatened strikes are the Switchmen's Union of North America, Order of Railway Conductors, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and the pullman conductors. Like the yardmasters, the switchmen, ORC, and BRT, are protesting the fact-finding board's recommendation. The pullman conductors have a separate case, proposing a reduction in the basic work month from 225 to 210 hours.

The most acute dispute involves the switchmen who have scheduled a strike for 7 a. m. Chicago time tomorrow against five midwestern and western railroads, including two Chicago lines, the Rock Island and Chicago Great Western. The others are the Great Northern, Denver & Rio Grande Western, and Western Pacific. All but the Great Northern are planning a complete shutdown if the switchmen actually walk out. This includes suburban and through service.

ISSUE FREIGHT EMBARGOES

Although peacemaking efforts continued the National (Railway) Mediation Board reported that by early afternoon it had been unsuccessful in arranging a bargaining conference between the disputing parties.

Meanwhile the carriers that plan to close down issued freight embargoes and started to curtail passenger service. The Rock Island and Great Western announced that most of their trains will start their final runs out of Chicago this morning and early afternoon.

The Burlington, although not included in the strike call, will be affected indirectly. Under present plans, the line will run its California Zephyr to Denver, Colo. From there the train normally is taken to San Francisco, Calif., by the Denver and Rio Grande and Western Pacific, two of the strike-threatened roads.

What happens from Denver west depends on the latter two roads, the Burlington said. Otherwise passenger and freight service generally will be normal. With the Great Northern continuing operations, the Burlington's connections with that line will not be disrupted, it was said.

Population Increase, Higher Pay Level Next

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Population Increase, Higher Pay Level Next," which appeared in the Tulsa Tribune of June 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OKLAHOMA LOOKS AHEAD—POPULATION INCREASE, HIGHER PAY LEVEL NEXT

WASHINGTON, June 15.—Oklahoma's collective pocketbook will be puffed up nearly twice as much annually before the next census—if the State can just catch up with the national rate of increase in its total number of residents and what they make.

This is the outlook for Oklahoma in building up its population and income through the coordinated development of its natural

resources. The program has the joint support of State and Federal agencies, and is about to be tied up in one package through the forthcoming comprehensive survey of the Arkansas, White, and Red Rivers.

From 1930 to 1949, the State showed a net loss in population of nearly 4 percent, according to Bureau of Census estimates, compared with a 19-percent gain during the same period in the United States as a whole.

Oklahoma's population loss should be considered in connection with the below-average paychecks in the State. Per capita income payments in Oklahoma in 1948 were estimated to have been $1,029, while Mr. Average American cashed in $1,410.

This indicates that the economic opportunities in the State have not been sufficiently attractive to hold the earlier level of population, let alone provide for the natural increase, the Department of Interior Review states flatly. This situation of population migration would not continue if, through the better utilization of its natural resources, the State could expand its economy so as to support an increasing population at a standard of living comparable to the national average.

Interior experts have it all figured out how Oklahoma can step up its total real income not less than 70 percent in the next two decades.

This goal can be reached if the present population in Oklahoma can show the same rate of increase as the rest of the Nation, and the per capita income payments to individuals can reach the national average of 1948.

In the past, the economy of Oklahoma has been based largely on farming and oil. In 1947 cash receipts from agriculture amounted to about $650,000,000 and that year the value of oil and gas at the well was estimated at $300,000,000. Manufacturing payrolls accounted for only 8 percent of individual incomes—about one-third of the national average.

The agricultural economy of the State is not expected to support a much larger population. The idea is to increase the production per acre through improved practices and conditions, and thus raise the standard of living. A start already has been made in that direction.

Progress is also reported in the drive to greater industrialization which can absorb more people. The 1947 Census of Manufacturers by the Department of Commerce shows that after adjustment for changing prices of manufactured goods value added by manufacturing in the State increased 84 percent between 1939 and 1947. The number of workers went up 47 percent.

If the farmers in the western part of the State get more dollars in their pockets they open up a market for the manufactured goods in the East. In turn, prosperous urban communities provide a larger market for the expansion of truck and dairy farming. Factories also can utilize the raw materials from the farms.

New agricultural prosperity hinges greatly on soil conservation, coupled with irrigation in the West and flood control in the more humid eastern section. The great multiple-purpose dams of the East regulate the water flow, and, at the same time, provide a growing source of power to turn the wheels of industry.

Oklahoma is also blessed with great fuel resources—coal, gas, and oil. It will be an easy matter to install additional steam generating plants to keep pace with the industrial demands.

Cheap water transportation is being charted to speed up the tempo of business activity. The approved plan for navigation of the Arkansas River would bring barges up the stream as far as Catoosa. This would make Tulsa the distribution point for all kinds of merchandise and appliances.

It is a dream for greater prosperity and happiness, but it also can become a reality, so say the State and Federal builders.

Rail Strike Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Rail Strike Threat," from the San Francisco Chronicle of June 24, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAIL STRIKE THREAT—FIVE ROADS MAKE FINAL PLANS FOR IMPACT OF WALK-OUT BY AFL SWITCHMEN TOMORROW—WESTERN PACIFIC WILL LAY OFF 4,500 WORKERS; SOUTHERN PACIFIC CANCELS JOINTLY OWNED TRAIN; GREAT NORTHERN WILL TRY TO OPERATE

Five western and midwestern railroads—including Western Pacific—made final preparations yesterday for a strike of AFL switchmen set for 6 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Four of the lines have ordered freight embargoes and plan to halt operations completely if the walk-out is called on schedule.

The fifth, the Great Northern, continued to accept freight. It said it would attempt to continue operations despite a strike.

In San Francisco, Western Pacific officials gave final orders that will mean the lay-off of some 4,500 employees, including 2,500 in the bay area, with start of the strike.

Office employees in Western Pacific's general headquarters, at 526 Mission Street, were told to report to work Monday for their final tour of duty.

SOUTHERN PACIFIC TO CANCEL TRAIN

Southern Pacific, which is not involved in the threatened strike, announced it will cancel its Golden State Limited, which runs between Los Angeles and Chicago, if the walk-out occurs.

The tentative cancellation was ordered because the Rock Island Railroad, which jointly owns the Golden State with Southern Pacific, is scheduled to be struck.

Frederic B. Whitman, president of Western Pacific, said that the strike, if called, would be one of the most indefensible work stoppages ever imposed on a long-suffering public.

He said the strike decision by switchmen shows a shocking disregard for the welfare of practically all of their fellow employees who will lose their earnings while the railroads are closed down.

DAILY LOSS ESTIMATE

Whitman, at a press conference in his offices, said the strike would cost the railroad approximately $125,000 a day in freight revenue and $8,000 a day in passenger revenue.

It would curtail 10 percent of all mainline passenger and freight transportation normally moving out of San Francisco, he said.

Western Pacific said two small subsidiary lines, employing no AFL switchmen, will continue to provide freight service to California's upper San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys, even if the strike takes place.

The lines are the Sacramento Northern and Tidewater Southern.

In addition to the switchmen's strike, the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, the Order of Railway Conductors, the Pullman conductors, and the Railroad Yardmasters of America all are threatening walk-outs.

WORKWEEK DEMAND

The switchmen, trainmen, and conductors are all demanding a workweek reduction from 48 to 40 hours with no reduction in pay. The Pullman employees want their 225-hour month reduced to 210, without a pay cut.

The yardmasters are asking a reduction in the work week of yard employees from 56 and 48 hours to 40 with no reduction in pay.

The strike threat timetable yesterday looked like this:

Switchmen—Strike on five railroads set for Sunday.

Pullman conductors—Strike on a majority of the Nation's sleeping car equipment could come anytime after July 11.

Trainmen and conductors—Strike on 300 of the country's class 1 railroads could come any time after July 15, but probably will hit only a few, so as to avoid a national emergency.

Yardmaster and yard employees—Strike on the majority of railroads on July 15 or very soon thereafter.

In addition, the New York Central is threatened by a strike of four railroad unions in a pay dispute affecting 8,700 workers.

The scheduled run of the Burlington Railway's California Zephyr will be affected by the strikes. Although the line is not involved in the strike call, the Zephyr normally travels over the tracks of two strike threatened railroads—The Denver and Rio Grande and The Western Pacific—in the run between San Francisco and Denver, Colo.

Request for Study by Tariff Commission of the Effect of Imports of 10 Agricultural Commodities We Now Have in Surplus Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, 37 Members of the House of Representatives have joined in a letter to Secretary of Agriculture Brannan urging that he immediately exercise the authority that he now has and request a study by the Tariff Commission of the effect of imports of 10 agricultural commodities that we now have in surplus supply. Such a study is necessary in order that the President may take advantage of "escape" clauses in the various reciprocal trade agreements. Upon completion of the study it is urged that the Secretary of Agriculture recommend that import quotas and penalties be set by the President that would prevent further dumping of these commodities on American markets. The letter is as follows:

JUNE 24, 1950.

HON. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We, the undersigned, all Members of Congress, urge that you im-

mediately proceed under the authority granted you in section 22 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and request the President to direct the Tariff Commission to make studies as to the effect of imports of the following agricultural commodities: cheese, dried-milk powder, corn, barley, oats, dried beans, potatoes, pork, pork products, dried and shell eggs, and grapes.

We are informed that the following figures, taken from reports of the Department of Agriculture, reflect Commodity Credit Corporation's stocks and imports during the fiscal year, as of April 30, 1950. The figures on stocks, we understand, do not reflect the collateral for loans which matured as of May 1, 1950, which in many instances would greatly increase the size of the inventory.

Commodity	Unit	Imports		Stocks	
		Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
Cheese	Pounds	35, 691, 000	$16, 776, 000	26, 894, 000	$8, 982, 000
Dried milk	do	7, 186, 000	592, 000	343, 571, 000	43, 318, 000
Corn	Bushels	559, 000	1, 127, 000	254, 659, 000	389, 664, 000
Barley	do	11, 781, 000	18, 006, 000	28, 874, 000	41, 265, 000
Oats	Pounds	17, 476, 000	13, 197, 000	10, 767, 000	3, 385, 000
Dried beans	Pounds	7, 253, 000	589, 000	472, 628, 000	42, 128, 000
Potatoes	do	526, 184, 000	10, 875, 000	28, 699, 000	514, 000
Pork	do	908, 000	103, 000		
Pork products	do	8, 306, 000	5, 613, 000		
Shell eggs	Dozens	3, 665, 000	1, 675, 000		
Dried eggs	Pounds	2, 784, 000	1, 944, 000	99, 728, 000	119, 755, 000

When the Tariff Commission completes its studies will you recommend to the President that he take the necessary steps under the escape clause of the various reciprocal trade agreements to prevent a repetition of the Canadian potato dumping fiasco, and on the other commodities set such quotas and penalties as will permit the utilization of our own stocks. Action should be taken now, if our American farmers are to be assured stable markets and prices. It will also greatly reduce the cost to the taxpayer of the price support program while assuring the American market to the American farmers. May we be assured of your cooperation?

Very truly yours,

CHARLES H. HOEVEN, Iowa; REID F. MURRAY, Wisconsin; ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT, California; HUBERT B. SCUDDER, California; BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa; ROY O. WOODRUFF, Michigan; WILLIAM S. HILL, Colorado; JOHN PHILLIPS, California; HAROLD C. HAGEN, Minnesota; KARL STEFAN, Nebraska; WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, Ohio; THOMAS E. MARTIN, Iowa; FRANK FELLOWS, Maine; JACK Z. ANDERSON, California; FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota; FRED R. CRAWFORD, Michigan; JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Michigan; KARL M. LECOMPTE, Iowa; HENRY O. TALLE, Iowa; THOMAS A. JENKINS, Ohio; A. L. MILLER, Nebraska; LAWRENCE H. SMITH, Wisconsin; RUSSELL V. MACK, Washington; J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Ohio; CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska; CHARLES W. VURSELL, Illinois; AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Minnesota; LESLIE C. ARENDS, Illinois; FRANK A. BARRETT, Wyoming; JOHN SANBORN, Idaho; H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota; RICHARD M. NIXON, California; WESLEY A. D'EWART, Montana; CLIFF CLEVENGER, Ohio; CECIL M. HARDEN, Indiana; GLENN R. DAVIS, Wisconsin; PAUL CUNNINGHAM, Iowa.

Nation-Wide Rail Tie-Up Threatens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Nation-Wide Rail Tie-Up Threatens," published in the New Orleans Times-Picayune of June 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATION-WIDE RAIL TIE-UP THREATENS—SWITCHMEN TO STRIKE SUNDAY AGAINST FIVE LINES

CHICAGO, June 21.—AFL switchmen Wednesday called a strike for Sunday against five big western and midwestern lines. The carriers said a Nation-wide tie-up is threatened for July 15 by a walk-out of two other unions.

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific, one of the five lines named in the switchmen's strike call, said it will shut down completely Sunday if the men go out. The Rock Island operates an 8,000-mile rail system between Chicago and the west coast. It also serves the southwest.

The AFL Switchmen's Union of North America also called a strike for 6 a. m. local time Sunday against the Great Northern, Chicago Great Western, Denver & Rio Grande Western, and the Western Pacific lines.

The carriers said the switchmen's union and the big trainmen and conductors' unions notified them they were rejecting wage and hour recommendations made June 15 by a Presidential fact-finding board.

RESTRAINED UNTIL JULY 15

The switchmen's union can strike legally at any time, having complied with all peace machinery of the Railway Labor Act.

The trainmen and conductors are restrained from striking before July 15 by a 30-day cooling-off requirement of the Railway Labor Act.

There was a chance that some other roads named in the switchmen's strike call would not attempt to operate.

Daniel P. Loomis, chairman of the Association of Western Railroads, said before the Rock Island announcement that he understood some of the railroads planned to shut down.

The Presidential Board recommended a 40-hour week and 18 cents hourly pay boost for 75,000 railroad yard employees but denied wage raises for 125,000 trainmen and conductors who man the trains.

The Board's ruling applied specifically to the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and the Order of Railway Conductors. In a separate case the Board recommended a 40-hour week and 18 cents hourly pay increase for 4,000 yard workers represented by the Railroad Yardmasters of North America.

The trainmen and conductors did not set a strike date. They will meet in Chicago July 10 to consider future action. They cannot strike legally until July 15, when the 30-day cooling-off period required by railroad law expires.

The Board did not hear the switchmen's case but recommended to President Truman April 19 that the findings in behalf of other yard workers be applied to these employees.

REJECT BOARD'S FINDINGS

The switchmen's union rejected this recommendation and has been legally free to strike since May 19, when the 30-day cooling-off period ended.

The yard workers represented by unions had asked 40 hours work at 48 hours pay. In addition the 125,000 operating employees represented by the trainmen's and conductor's unions had demanded a sliding scale of pay rates depending on weight of locomotives and reduction of the basic day on passenger trains from the present 150 miles or 7½ hours to 100 miles or 5 hours.

Arthur J. Glover, president of the AFL switchmen's union, said his group represents 25,000 workers. However, the carriers said the trainmen and conductors' unions represented 95 percent of the Nation's railroad switchmen.

The carriers said in a statement they had offered to adopt the Fact-Finding Board recommendations, which the Board estimated would cost about $40,000,000 a year.

Leaders of the trainmen's and conductors' unions did not comment immediately.

State Irrigation Plans Stalled by High Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "State Irrigation Plans Stalled by High Costs," appearing in the Tulsa Tribune of June 19.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OKLAHOMA LOOKS AHEAD—STATE IRRIGATION PLANS STALLED BY HIGH COSTS

(By Malvina Stephenson)

WASHINGTON, June 19.—Oklahoma has only one Federal irrigation project—the W. C. Austin project in the southwest corner of the State, but many more are needed, if the droughty plains are to be converted into a garden spot for farming.

The bottleneck in this development is the cost, because farmers simply cannot pay out the projects in the required 40 years under the present reclamation laws. A number of proposals have been advanced to ease up the financial load on water users.

Representatives of the National Reclamation Association and western congressional forces began a concentrated drive in 1942 to modify and liberalize antiquated reclamation laws dating back to 1902. However, no general revision has been possible to date, because the opposition from the industrial east, coupled with economy advocates and various other critics, have multiplied the normal difficulties of completing major legislation.

The general objective is to whittle down the costs chargeable to water users and to extend the period of repayment. This can be accomplished in one stroke by amending

the general law. Requirements can also be liberalized satisfactorily on a basin-wide basin, but this means separate legislation.

One of the first goals is the establishment of the so-called basin-wide accounts. This means that the benefits of all projects in the area can be added up and balanced against the total costs. For example, the excess power revenues in the eastern part of Oklahoma could be applied to reduce the costs of beneficial irrigation projects in western Oklahoma which otherwise could not be financed by the farmers.

The Department of Interior report cites a definite need for irrigation to stabilize and increase agricultural production throughout the State, but the water problem is acute in the more arid western Oklahoma for both municipal water systems and farming.

As a result the piecemeal approach, on the basis of individual projects, is being resorted to for certain emergencies, until some general legislation can be passed.

Only a few days ago, Oklahoma Senators THOMAS and KERR introduced a special bill to authorize the Fort Cobb project on Pond Creek. This project would open up a new water supply to Chickasha and Anadarko, and provide irrigation for 9,000 farm acres. Under the pending legislation, the Secretary of Interior would be authorized to extend the customary period of repayment adjusted to the financial ability of the cities and the farmers.

The Bureau of Reclamation report shows the Fort Cobb project would cost $15,998,510, with an annual cost of $496,570 and annual benefits at $799,500. The over-all project was found to be feasible if the interest from the municipal water loan could be used used to subsidize the irrigation project. However, under the present formula, the irrigation costs would block the whole project.

The Fort Cobb project is essentially for irrigation and municipal water supply, but it also offers benefits from the standpoint of flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife.

Under the present laws, costs assignable to irrigation, municipal supplies, and power must be paid back to Uncle Sam—they are termed reimbursable costs. The costs traced to flood control, navigation, and fish and wildlife are considered national benefits and do not have to be repaid locally.

The proposed revision calls for the establishment of additional nonreimbursable costs. The broader the base of costs which do not have to be repaid, the easier it will be for farmers and cities to take on new projects.

Under the new plan, benefit credits also would be set up for recreation, silt and pollution control, public health, and other functions determined to have general national advantages. For example, the farmers insist that they should not bear the full costs of a project which provides a recreation center for many outside citizens.

The W. C. Austin project, irrigating 50,000 acres, was made possible by WPA grants which brought the repayment within the reach of landowners. A decade ago, other projects appeared possible under the revised reclamation laws, and detailed studies were conducted for the Englewood project on the Cimarron, Canton project on the North Canadian, Mangum project on the Salt Fork, and Fort Gibson on the Grand River, the latter recently recommended for private development.

However, postwar construction costs have killed hopes for these projects on the present formula. The Canton and Washita River projects are given the priority. However, the entire program is stalled until and as soon as western forces can break the legislative bottleneck in Washington.

Fourth Rail Strike Set by Pullman Conductor Unit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Fourth Rail Strike Set by Pullman Conductor Unit," published in the Chicago Tribune of June 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOURTH RAIL STRIKE SET BY PULLMAN CONDUCTOR UNIT

(By Anthony Wirry)

Another railroad union threatened a strike against the railway industry yesterday, making four groups that have taken such action in the last 2 days. A fifth union, the Railroad Yardmasters of America, has a strike call under consideration.

The latest group to schedule a walkout was the pullman conductors division of the Order of Railway Conductors. A. G. Wise, executive vice president of the ORC and general chairman of the pullman conductors, announced his union would strike against all railroads at 7 a. m. (Chicago time) July 11. Earlier the union had scheduled a strike for April 17, but canceled it when the National Mediation Board intervened.

SEEK CUT IN WORK MONTH

The strike, which may be headed off by the appointment of a fact finding board, was ordered to enforce union demands to reduce the basic work month from 225 hours to 210 without a cut in pay and to provide certain changes in working rules. If the 2,200 members of the union actually walk out, they would halt all pullman service, disrupting many rail operations in the current heavy vacation travel season.

The other unions involved in moves against the carriers are the Switchmen's Union of North America, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and the Order of Railway Conductors. Although the trainmen and conductors said only that they were prepared to walk out on or after July 15, the switchmen actually scheduled a strike for 7 a. m. (Chicago time) Sunday against five midwestern and western railroads.

Among these are two Chicago lines, the Rock Island and the Chicago Great Western. The others are the Great Northern, the Denver & Rio Grande Western, and Western Pacific.

NEGOTIATIONS AT STANDSTILL

Developments in this dispute appeared to be at a standstill. The mediation board, from its headquarters in the Palmer House, said no meetings between the unions and the carriers were held and none had been scheduled by mid-afternoon. The Rock Island and Western Pacific announced no freight embargoes or other curtailments, although they said earlier they planned complete shutdowns if the switchmen actually walked out. Neither was there any announcement by the Great Western. A report that the strike had been postponed until July 9 was denied by the union.

The switchmen called the strike to enforce a demand to reduce their workweek from 48 to 40 hours without a cut in pay. The railroads have offered the 40-hour week and a pay boost of 18 cents an hour, but the union insists a boost of 30 cents is necessary to maintain present take-home pay.

TRAINMEN REJECT OFFER

At press conferences in the Congress Hotel, W. P. Kennedy, president of the trainmen, and F. H. Nemitz, president of the conductors, also spurned the railroad offer and said they were "ready to use economic strength, if necessary, to enforce a fair settlement of the issues."

The railroad offer is the same as the suggested by a fact-finding board last week, but Kennedy termed the proposal ridiculous and a step backward.

The Greatness of Samuel Gompers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article written by Matthew Woll, which appeared in the May issue of the American Federationist:

THE GREATNESS OF SAMUEL GOMPERS

(By Matthew Woll)

The significance of the pioneer is seldom fully recognized in his own lifetime. Even those who are closely associated with him and share his purposes have difficulty in grasping the full extent of his achievement. In a sense, this is inevitable. It takes time for the effects to accumulate and become visible in their true dimensions. Time reveals something more; it provides the final test of the pioneer's social value. It enables one to see clearly, after the mist of contemporary doubt and controversy has lifted, whether or not, and to what degree, the pioneer has benefited society.

I am thinking, of course, of Samuel Gompers. All of us who were fortunate enough to be associated with him in the American Federation of Labor recognized that he was a natural leader, uncommonly wise, vigorous, consistently constructive, and passionately loyal. We respected and had great affection for him. Perhaps we sensed his stature, I am not sure. In any event, there it ended. One simply does not regard an associate, however superbly gifted, as an historic figure—especially one who liked to be addressed as Sam.

It is now plain, however, that Gompers belongs with the great figures in American history. He was the effective pioneer on a major frontier of our national life. In founding the modern American labor movement, he opened a vast new area for democratic growth and human betterment.

The social value of what he accomplished, once frequently disparaged or altogether denied, has now risen above dispute. Indeed, it continues to rise from year to year, as the labor movement becomes more powerful and emerges ever more clearly as the Nation's principal force for democratic progress.

This development would have gratified Gompers (although he would have minimized his own importance in it), but it would not have surprised him in the least. It was his great and constant conviction that the trade unions are the only hope of our civilization and the only power whose mis-

sion it is to evolve order out of social chaos, to save us from reaction, brutality, and perhaps barbarism.

These words appeared in a report he made to an A. F. of L. convention more than a half century ago. I suspect that many people regarded them as an absurd exaggeration. Nor could such a judgment be sensibly held against him. The potentialities of trade unionism were then not nearly so apparent as they were later to become. It took extraordinary perception and understanding of society to see them, and an indomitable faith to believe in and work for them, as the leader of a minority, against what at times was close to being the united hostility and scorn of the then dominant elements in society.

Gompers, of course, had both the perception and the faith. They make him, as an individual—completely apart from his tangible achievements as president of the A. F. of L.—a source of continuing usefulness to all of us.

Not long ago I read the proofs of a pamphlet our Gompers Centennial Committee is publishing which consists of quotations from his writings and speeches. Many of them I had read before, some more than once; yet I found them both illuminating and inspiring. They are rich with wisdom and an abiding belief in the future of organized labor and democratic institutions.

Gompers was, in a real sense, a prophet. Although often accused by radical critics of being narrow and shortsighted, he saw far beyond them and his times; and what he said and wrote, except on specific and transient issues, still has the power to inform and elevate. I, for one, should like to see this pamphlet, and others already published or in preparation, not only in every trade-union office but in every library and school, where they will provide students and the public at large with a new and deeper understanding of our organization and of democratic principles and values.

The fact is that our observance of the Gompers centennial has already had valuable educational results. It has called attention to the founder and first president of the A. F. of L. as one who has made a distinctive contribution to American life, and it has made many people aware, through an examination of Gompers, that the A. F. of L., in action and belief, has always moved in the main stream of American democracy. The point has been emphasized in magazine articles, on the radio, and in literally thousands of newspaper stories and editorials. And many more are in the offing.

As chairman of our Gompers Centennial Committee, I have had the opportunity to watch the effects of our work radiate outward across the country, reflecting itself in speeches by prominent public men, discussions in local civic groups, institutes for university students and teachers, and in letters requesting information written in the youthful scrawl of school children. The usefulness of this, I believe, is incalculable.

Everywhere, I think, there is a growing recognition of the validity of Gompers' democratic philosophy and policies, by which the A. F. of L. has constantly been motivated. One sees it vividly in international affairs, in the recent formation of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. It is a guiding principle of the ICFTU that there can be no unity with labor organizations that are merely the controlled tools of the Soviet dictatorship and its satellites.

Dr. Selig Perlman, long an intelligent and sympathetic interpreter of labor affairs, observed not long ago that the highly constructive role recently played by American labor leadership in strengthening the spirit of the unionists in western Europe, in their struggle to avoid being reduced to mere Soviet tools, would have been impossible without the Gompers tradition. He observed also that the formation of the ICFTU might eventually be seen as the beginning of the recognition of Gompers as the leading intellectual not only of American labor but of free labor throughout the world.

One sees this recognition of Gompers making headway even in circles where there is what might be called a vested intellectual interest in resisting it. I have in mind those liberal intellectuals who for years insisted that Gompers was reactionary or at best antiquated in his beliefs, but who are now beginning to realize that he was neither.

I do not make this reference in any disparaging sense. On the contrary, I regard the change as a sign of intellectual health and courage. It is not easy for people who deal, one might say professionally, with ideas to acknowledge that some of the ideas with which they have been closely identified have been even partially wrong.

But the fact is that events in the quarter-century since Gompers died have provided overwhelming proof of the rightness of what he advocated. It was the fashion in some circles, for example, to berate Gompers for his refusal to allow the A. F. of L. to become allied with any political party or to organize one of its own. "We must be partisan for a policy and not for a party," Gompers declared. The logic of events has compelled nearly everyone to acknowledge that any other policy would be destructive of the very ends it proponents claimed it would achieve.

As an article in The New Republic, once the fairly exclusive preserve of supporters of the Labor Party idea, noted recently, the A. F. of L. policy of "rewarding your friends and punishing your enemies" is "today the official policy of both the A. F. of L. and the CIO, and is more throughly accepted than at any time in American labor history."

On the central issue of our time—democracy versus totalitarianism—Gompers realized at once what was involved. Long before most people, he saw and pointed out that communism was incompatible with democracy. He led the A. F. of L. into the fight against communism while many people were still beguiled by its humanitarian pretensions.

It is significant that he did not believe this entitled him to very great credit. The man who saw the trade-unions as the only power whose mission it is to evolve order out of social chaos, to save us from reaction, brutality, and perhaps barbarism could not, obviously, have acted otherwise.

Four Rail Lines Preparing To Stop Trains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FORREST C. DONNELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Four Rail Lines Preparing to Stop Trains," published in the Dallas News of June 24, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR RAIL LINES PREPARING TO STOP TRAINS—SWITCHMEN TO STRIKE SUNDAY IF MEDIATORS FAIL TO HEAD IT OFF

Four western and midwestern railroads went ahead with plans Friday to shut down operations in advance of a threatened strike Sunday of AFL switchmen. A fifth road says it will try to keep its trains running.

The National Railway Mediation Board worked quietly to head off the walkout set for 6 a. m. local time, but gave no word of progress.

Meanwhile, highway patrolmen were assigned the responsibility of preventing violence at the strike-beleaguered American Enka Corp. rayon plant near Morristown, Tenn.

Safety Commissioner Sam T. Neal said he had decided against asking Gov. Gordon Browning to send in National Guardsmen.

FOUR LINES TO STOP

Neal's decision had been awaited since four men were wounded Thursday in two outbreaks of gunfire, one of several violent flare-ups that have marked the 13-week-old strike.

Governor Browning and Adjt. Gen. Sam T. Wallace went to the plant Thursday with 75 highway patrolmen to restore order.

In the rail dispute, the Rock Island, Chicago Great Western, Western Pacific, and Denver & Rio Grande Western have announced they will not attempt to operate if the switchmen strike.

The Great Northern said it expects little difficulty because only 60 of its 1,200 switchmen belong to the AFL Switchmen's Union of North America, the union that called the walk-out. The other switchmen are members of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

Spokesmen for the railroads, however, say a walk-out of switchmen and yard workers represented by the trainmen and Order of Railway Conductors may be called July 15. The unions have not set a date.

PAPER STAYS IDLE

These unions have rejected a June 15 report of a Presidential fact-finding board that turned down their demands for a 40-hour workweek at the pay they now get for 48.

Other labor developments:

The New York World-Telegram and Sun, which has not published since June 13, announced it would remain shut down Saturday. Pickets of the striking CIO American Newspaper Guild said mechanical department employees ignored a management appeal to return to work.

In Pittsburgh some 3,000 striking AFL milk drivers considered a "new and better wage-and-hour proposal" for ending their 15-day strike against 67 dairies in Pittsburgh and 7 surrounding counties.

A representative of the National Mediation Board resumed efforts in New York to settle a dispute over back-pay claims involving four railroad unions and the New York Central Railroad. The dispute affects 8,700 union members in NYC service east of Buffalo, N. Y.

Soil, Water Programs Indicate New Boom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Soil, Water Programs Indicate New Boom," appearing in the Tulsa Tribune of June 16, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OKLAHOMA LOOKS AHEAD—SOIL, WATER PROGRAMS INDICATE NEW BOOM

(By Malvina Stephenson)

WASHINGTON, June 16.—Giant strides are being made toward the production of great new power supplies, but it is estimated that the presently scheduled facilities still will not meet the growing demands of Oklahoma and the Southwest.

In other words, there is plenty of room for both private companies and public agencies in the field of electric power in this region. The comprehensive plan of the Southwest Power Administration calls for a cooperative arrangement with the private utilities to exchange services.

The present evidences of cooperation underline predictions the Southwest is on the threshold of a new boom.

An era of good feelings is foreshadowed by the recent contract between SPA and the two Oklahoma private utilities, now pending before the Secretary of Interior for final approval. Congressional forces expect to bring about the approval of some kind of contract, but the Secretary's report omits this specific problem.

Referring to the general plan of the SPA, the Interior report terms it "so flexible that it can be modified or adjusted to adapt it to almost any conceivable method by which the Government develops the water resources of this area and to the changing pattern of the need for electricity as the industrialization of the Southwest increases."

The Grand River Dam authority, a State agency, also in the power business, at the moment is forging ahead in its campaign to bring new industry to Oklahoma. Reinforced by the output of a new steam plant, the GRDA is about to land a multimillion-dollar branch factory and his nibbles from a number of other eastern industrialists.

Private and municipal utilities, according to the Oklahoma State Planning and Resources Board, reported plans in 1945 for postwar expansion of generating facilities, mostly steam and internal combustion, amounting to upward of 74,500 kilowatts. An increase of 100 percent in capacity is planned by private utilities in a 10-year period.

The completion of Fort Gibson, Tenkiller Ferry, Oologah, Markham Ferry, and Eufaula flood-control dams in Oklahoma now under construction or authorized for construction by the Corps of Engineers, is expected ultimately to add some 259,200 kilowatts of generating capacity. An additional generating unit could be installed at Denison Dam in the near future. Still other projects with planned generating capacity of 190,000 kilowatts are under investigation by the corps.

According to the scheduled construction of the Department of the Army the total capacity available to the SPA by the end of 1953 will be 451,000 kilowatts. This is nearly as much as all the systems, private and public, could generate in all of Oklahoma in 1943.

The increase is to be obtained by the installation of an additional generating unit at Norfolk project and by the completion of six reservoir projects now under construction. By 1955 the total goes up to 583,000 kilowatts, and after 1955 to 903,000.

This total does not include the hydroelectric capacity which may be installed in the dams on the main stem of the Arkansas. The Keystone, recently authorized near Tulsa, the Webbers Falls, and the Short Mountain have a proposed initial capacity of 125,000 kilowatts, but the SPA recommends a restudy of these projects to increase the power potentialities.

Primary electric power and energy to be available to the SPA by the end of 1953 already has been obligated to certain rural co-ops and municipally owned utility systems whose need for such service is termed urgent. Conservative estimates of future loads show that total requirements of all rural co-ops in the area will exceed the electric capacity as the Government hydroelectric projects are completed.

Future needs apparently are not overrated, judging by past increases. For example, the REA formerly estimated the average monthly needs per farm at 50 kilowatt-hours, but the actual use is already twice that much, and some farms take up as much as 5,000 kilowatt-hours. Records show that farms which have had power the longest use the most.

Per capita use of electric energy more than doubled in Oklahoma from 1940 to 1948, compared to a two-thirds increase for the United States percentagewise, the greatest increase in any customer classification has occurred in the farm-and-rural class having grown 900 percent from 1935 to 1944.

The combined commercial and industrial classification accounts for by far the largest block of energy consumed. This group used 70 percent of the total energy sold to the ultimate consumer in 1943.

As the new boom gets underway through the soil-and-water program, business and industry is expected to swallow up the vast new supplies of electric power.

Strike Threat Reduces Los Angeles Rail Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FORREST C. DONNELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Strike Threat Reduces Los Angeles Rail Services," from the Los Angeles Examiner of June 24, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRIKE THREAT REDUCES LOS ANGELES RAIL SERVICES—PASSENGER, FREIGHT RUNS INTO CITY CUT; NEW WALKOUT CALLED

CHICAGO, June 23.—Midwestern and Western railroads, threatened by a switchmen's strike scheduled for Sunday, began shutting off passenger and freight service today.

The Rock Island system scheduled final runs today for some through passenger trains between Chicago and Los Angeles, Kansas City, and Memphis. Others will stop at points short of their usual destination.

EMBARGOES

The Chicago Great Western and the Western Pacific have prepared embargoes on freight shipments that cannot reach their destinations by the strike deadline—6 a. m. local standard time Sunday.

The Denver & Rio Grande will cancel all operations. The Great Northern announced it will try to maintain service.

The Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad announced today's west-bound California Zephyr will run from Chicago to Denver. From there it normally is hauled by the Denver & Rio Grande Western and Western Pacific to San Francisco.

What happens from Denver west, the Burlington said, depends on operating arrangements of the two other roads.

DEMANDS

The switchmen seek a 40-hour week with 48 hours pay.

The National (railway) Mediation Board worked at heading off the strike, but no progress was reported.

No progress was reported, either, in the threatened July 15 walkout of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and the Order of Railway Conductors.

Another strike call was issued yesterday—this one by the Pullman conductor's division of the Order of Railway Conductors.

They set their walkout time for July 11. But provisions of the National Railway Labor Act may delay this threatened strike.

Forgotten Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an item that relates to certain veterans. I commend the reading of this item which appears in the Disabled American Veterans Semimonthly, issue of June 15, 1950, to the membership of the House:

FORGOTTEN MEN

Congress has a strange way of practicing illusive economy—especially when approving funds for administering veterans' benefits. This fact was clearly displayed last month as the House passed the current appropriations bill. One section in particular of the House-passed bill represents the utmost extreme in misguided economy.

By squeezing funds to operate the War Claims Commission to a mere trickle, legislators threaten to lengthen the already drastic delay in compensation payments to former prisoners of war. The Commission is presently receiving claims from former prisoners of war at the rate of 12,000 a week. Yet, because funds are so limited that only 11 adjudicators can be hired, payments can be approved on only about 280 of these claims. That means more than 11,000 unprocessed claims are piling up each week.

If the House had approved the budget estimate of $800,000 for operating the War Claims Commission during fiscal year 1951, the number of claims paid each week would have been raised to about 2,150. Instead, the figure was whittled to $537,900, which means less than 500 claims can be paid each week. At this rate it will take over 10 years to complete the payment of war claims.

And whose money are these economizing Congressmen saving by delaying legal payments to several thousand sick and dying men who spent agonizing months and even years of torture in enemy prison camps? That money actually belonged to the very enemy who so flagrantly violated the Geneva Convention during the last war. The $40,000,000 now deposited with the War Claims Commission is derived from the liquidation of enemy assets. Not one penny being used to pay war claims, including administrative expenses, comes from the American taxpayers' pocket.

Loyal American citizens who fought to the last on Bataan, who were tortured, starved, and forced to labor at bayonet point, and survivors of those who were executed illegally on the snowfields of Germany, certainly deserve better treatment by their own Government.

In the past 5 years since the end of the war, a great number of former prisoners have died as a result of maltreatment in enemy prison camps. The life expectancy of additional thousands was drastically shortened by sadistic enemy torture. Why, then, senselessly delay compensation payments to these men?

Congress is rightfully appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars to rehabilitate this Nation's former enemies and bring them into the fold of freedom-loving and democratic nations. It can certainly appropriate a few thousand dollars of former enemy funds to justly pay the cost of eliminating totalitarianism.

Believing in this Government's sense of justice, for which they fought, we hope the Senate will recognize the inequities of such legislation and make proper adjustments before passing the appropriations bill.

Rail Yardmasters Join Strike Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FORREST C. DONNELL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Rail Yardmasters Join Strike Threat," published in the New York Times of June 24, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAIL YARDMASTERS JOIN STRIKE THREAT—FOUR OF FIVE WESTERN ROADS THAT FACE WALKOUT OF SWITCHMEN TOMORROW SET FREIGHT CURBS

CHICAGO, June 23.—A fifth unit of railroad employees, the Railroad Yardmasters of America, A. F. of L., today raised the possibility of a strike, which could take place on or after July 15. It denounced as "disgraceful" the June 15 recommendations of the Presidential fact-finding board in its case.

Meanwhile, efforts by the National (Railway) Mediation Board to avert the strike set for 6 a. m. Sunday by the Switchmen's Union of North America, A. F. of L., against five Midwestern and Western railroads, were unavailing.

Francis A. O'Neill Jr., chairman of the board, said he had been in touch by telephone with the parties to the switchmen's dispute, but reported tonight that nothing is cooking. He has been here since Wednesday trying to arrange mediation conferences to head off the scheduled strike.

A spokesman for the switchmen said tonight that he could see "nothing in the picture that could avert the strike."

The projected walkout involves 4,000 switchmen. It is directed against the Chicago Great Western, the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific, the Great Northern Railway, the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad Co., and the Western Pacific.

FREIGHT EMBARGO SET

All except the Great Northern have said that they would not try to operate if the strike became effective Sunday morning. They have announced freight embargoes accordingly.

A spokesman for the Great Northern said today in San Francisco that all but 60 of the road's 1,200 switchmen were members of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and that consequently the road expected to operate with little difficulty in the face of a switchmen's union walk-out.

The other rail-employee units presenting a strike threat are the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, the Order of Railway Conductors, and the pullman-conductors division of the Order of Railway Conductors.

The pullman conductors, numbering about 2,200, are the only other group besides the switchmen to have set a strike date—6 a. m. standard time on July 11. Their projected strike may be headed off for at least 60 days by the legal machinery of the Railway Labor Act.

UNIONS ASSAIL, ROADS AGREE

All the unions involved have issued statements denouncing the report on June 15 of a presidential fact-finding board. It recommended that 75,000 yard service employees be put on a 5-day, 40-hour week as of October 1, with a pay increase of 18 cents an hour.

The board also recommended the same thing for the yardmasters, with the difference that it did not propose to maintain their take-home pay of the yardmasters at the full 48-hour level. In that case it was estimated that added opportunities for overtime work at time and a half would make up the difference in straight-time pay.

At the same time, the board turned down demands of the trainmen and conductors on behalf of 125,000 road service trainmen and conductors for basic wage increases, including the proposal for reduction of the basic work month from 225 to 210 hours.

The switchmen's union dates its 30-day cooling-off period from April 19, when the board reported to President Truman that its recommendation in the switchmen's case would be the same as that arrived at in the cases of the trainmen and conductors, which was covered in the June 15 report. Thus the switchmen have been legally entitled to strike since May 19. They had set strikes for May 23 and June 1 against 10 railroads, but postponed them at Government request.

The railroads, represented by the Association of Western Railways, have agreed to the fact-finding board's recommendations.

Rights of the Individual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a very fine article on Rights of the Individual. This was written by Nelson H. Cruikshank, and appeared in the May issue of the American Federationist:

RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL
(By Nelson H. Cruikshank)

From the beginning, in America, we have accepted as a self-evident truth that the individual has certain rights and that these rights are inalienable.

There is the right of each individual to enjoy and exercise the rights that are common to all human beings regardless of race or creed. The American Revolution was fought to establish this principle. And later the rededication of our Nation to this principle was written in the blood of brothers in the conflict of 1861–65.

In America there is also the right of each individual to follow his own intellectual and spiritual light. Men for centuries have realized that there can be no progress in the human family if its individual members are not accorded the right to think independently and to depart from the commonly held view. Civilized society has recognized that there are values in the exercise of this individual right and that the values accruing to the group from pioneers in the world of thought are so great that society can better afford to give freedom even to the heretic and the occasional screwball than it can to suppress all nonconformity.

It is at this point that much confusion arises today about Communists and communism. We are confronted now with the necessity of preserving our freedom against the program of aggression to which the Soviet Union and the Communist Party are openly committed. The danger arises when we confuse free thought with communism. This confusion is abundantly illustrated in such a work as John T. Flynn's the Road Ahead, where, by reporting the avowed dedication of the Communists to civil rights and public ownership and citing the adherence of other organizations to like principles, he succeeds in casting doubt on the loyalty of such genuinely American organizations as the Federal Council of Churches and the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union.

We do not condemn communism because of the ideas which individual Communists hold or profess to hold on economic and social questions. I hope in America we will never condemn men for ideas. We condemn communism because it demands a loyalty of its adherents that is in conflict with loyalty to our own Government and our own people.

The right of individuals to think for themselves and take action to improve their condition inevitably involves the right to form and join organizations dedicated to those same ends. Individual right is inseparable from the right of groups and organizations to act. This was succinctly stated about a hundred years ago by John Stuart Mill in his classic treatise, "On Liberty." Wrote Mill: "From this liberty of each individual follows the liberty, within the same limits, of combination among individuals; freedom to unite for any purpose not involving harm to others."

This right of the people has been recognized in America. But today it is sometimes threatened. For example, in some areas of the country the right of working people to organize is denied. Too large a portion of labor's energies has to be devoted to fighting repressive measures, such as the Taft-Hartley Act and similar measures passed by many States, which are designed for the purpose of denying working people the very right to participate in an economic organization of their own free choice.

In our own democracy there is also the right of the individual to have free access to information. Relatively speaking, we have done fairly well in this direction. Certainly we have done better than Russia and other totalitarian nations, where there is no free press at all. But we need to learn that a press that is free from government control is not necessarily free from other controls.

The right of an individual to have access to important information on which his decisions as a citizen in a democracy must be made is far from achieved when he must rely for such information on a press which finds news only in conflict.

It is easy for us to see that there is no freedom of the press where truth is defined as that which serves the purposes of a police state. It is not so easy for us to see that we have not achieved complete freedom of the press where truth is defined as only that which increases circulation or guarantees fat advertising revenues.

We have long accepted the idea that every generation has to be prepared to defend individual human rights. We are now learning that rights must not only be fought for but they must be thought through in each new generation.

The complex nature of our society puts individual rights in a new setting. It is easy to see that my individual right to swing my fist ends where the other man's nose begins, but we are living in such a strangely new, complex society that it is not easy to ascertain the once obvious fact of where the other man's nose begins.

It is now possible for a businessman in Chicago or San Francisco to make an investment that will take the milk from a workingman's doorstep in Mississippi or Georgia or even in Europe or Africa. It is now possible for a delegate to a labor convention to cast a vote that will deprive a workingman of a living wage in Europe or Asia.

We agree that a teacher should be free to follow his own light. The students, in turn, should be free to require that their teacher assure them it is his own light that he is following and not the line laid down by a political power.

In our strenuous efforts to preserve the liberties of our democracy against those of aggressive totalitarianism, we must hold fast to the methods of democracy. The fight for the preservation of individual rights demands tireless, unrelenting vigilance and devotion. It also demands a tough-mindedness. In fact, one of our chief charges against totalitarianism is its defeatism—its surrender in the struggle to maintain the inner discipline required by the harder ways of the democratic process, an ignoble submission to the easy way, an unworthy relinguishing of personal and individual moral discipline in favor of the easy discipline imposed by the leader.

Dictatorship may give the appearance of stern discipline, but in reality it is the easy way accepted by tired minds and those who have lost their spirit.

Democracy is the hard way, but we willingly take up its burden because we have faith that for us and our children it is well worth the struggle.

While Discussing "Fronts"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach a study of the remarkable interlocking character of the directorates and agents of the scare propaganda fronts. It demonstrates clearly the relationship between those who supported the infamous Liberty League in the thirties and those who now support its ultrareactionary fellows. The article is titled "While Discussing 'Fronts'" and was written by R. E. Porter. It appears in the June issue of the Machinists' Monthly Journal:

WHILE DISCUSSING "FRONTS"

(By R. E. Porter)

This will probably go down in history as the era of the big flood in propaganda. We're being inundated from every direction by outfits trying to save us from all sorts of foul fates and dire dangers.

Judging from the Niagara of propaganda, we're heading for statism, collectivism, socialism, communism, labor bossism, and other dark and dismal forms of doom here in free America. Vast numbers of organizations, richly financed, are rushing in every direction to save us.

Scare propaganda isn't new to this country by any means. But the current era of bugaboo bellowing on a monster scale can be said to have started in the thirties with the establishment by big business of the American Liberty League.

THE AMERICAN LIBERTY LEAGUE

Those were the days when the New Deal was getting under way. Moguls of business were frightened. Their control of the Nation seemed threatened. To keep their grip they launched a vast campaign of propaganda under the Liberty League's auspices. Just like their counterparts of today they tried to terrify the people into believing their freedoms were being destroyed by "that man" in the White House.

Money was no object in conducting the drive. As revealed later by a Senate investigating committee headed by Hugo L. Black, now a member of the Supreme Court, the league collected $500,000 in one year—1935.

With a big staff at headquarters in Washington and branch offices elsewhere, the league deluged the country with literature and sent out an army of speakers to fight New Deal measures, particularly the Wagner Act. It made a big noise, but the League's own excesses finally discredited it.

As revealed by the Black committee, hundreds of businessmen wrote out fat checks for the League. The du Ponts and their associates headed the list, giving the mammoth sum of $356,000 out of $1,100,000 collected by the League and its allied organizations in a period of 18 months.

Though the League died, its odor lingered on, in a whole brood of similar outfits spawned thereafter, many of which are operating now.

Among them are the notorious Committee for Constitutional Government, the Fascist-tinted National Economic Council run by Merwin K. Hart, the misnamed Tool Owners' Union, various fake small-business organizations, and many others of high and low degree.

Money contributed by the du Ponts or officials of their companies is to be found in the coffers of most of these newer outfits, and a lot of the old Liberty Leaguers are in key positions or on boards of directors of the current propaganda mills.

An outstanding example is the case of Alfred P. Haake, who calls himself an economist. He was the Liberty League's director of State organizations. His affiliations now are legion.

He's on the National Industrial Information Committee, the propaganda arm of the National Association of Manufacturers. He's on the national advisory committee of the Tool Owners' Union, for which former Congressman Fred Hartley is the $20,000-a-year lobbyist and president.

The TOU was termed "Fascist" by a New York State board which rejected the organization's application for incorporation.

Haake is also a trustee of the self-styled National Small Business Men's Association, which spent a fortune on big newspaper advertisements glorifying the Taft-Hartley Act and smearing organized labor.

Just recently, the House Small Business Committee, headed by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, branded the association as a "phony" and showed it was financed, not by little merchants, but by the big oil companies and other corporations which are leading members of the NAM. It's just another of the many fronts fighting all progressive legislation.

"SPEERCHUL" MOBILIZERS

Among other tieups, Haake is on the advisory committee of a queerly-named outfit called Spiritual Mobilization, with headquarters in Los Angeles, which is trying to line up churchmen against "the mortal-God pagan state—against collectivized medicine, education, housing, etc." This is the church front of the propaganda machine against the Fair Deal.

Haake's associates in Spiritual Mobilization include DeWitt Emery, $18,000-a-year lobbyist and president of the National Small Business Men's Association, and Alfred W. Hawkes, former president of the NAM. This is just one of many examples of the interlocking directorates guiding the reactionary propaganda organizations.

Many other links can be shown. Edward F. Hutton, Wall Street broker, a former $20,000 contributor to the Liberty League, is one of the angels of Merwin Hart's National Economic Council, a rabid antilabor and antiliberal group.

A few years ago Hart, in one of his circular letters to members, advised that citizens should keep handy "one or more guns in good condition with a reasonable supply of ammunition" to protect themselves against the "potential danger" of a coup by nameless leftists.

Hutton is likewise the chairman and a financial angel of the new Freedoms Foundation, a sort of super propaganda vehicle against the "perils of socialism" supposed to exist in Truman's Fair Deal.

Then take Raoul E. Desvernine, once chairman of the Liberty League's notorious committee of 59 corporation lawyers who back in 1935 issued an opinion branding the Wagner Act unconstitutional and advising employers to defy the law. He's on the governing board of the Tool Owners Union.

Or take Lamar Fleming, of Houston, an official of Anderson-Clayton Co., world's biggest cotton operators. Fleming, a contributor to the Liberty League, is on the board of the Committee for Constitutional Government, and the Texas chairman of that committee's affiliate, Fighters for Freedom.

As has been pointed out in the Machinists' Monthly Journal before, the Committee for Constitutional Government is the most vicious of the many lobby and propaganda outfits opposing all social reforms. One of its main figures is Frank Gannett, chain newspaper publisher.

COG ADMITS 600 GRAND

In reports filed under the lobby registration law, this committee admits to spending $600,000 a year. It has poured out more smear literature than any other propaganda combine. One broadside it distributed called for "repeal of all Federal laws on wages, hours of labor, collective bargaining," etc. At the same time, it has been clamoring for new union-busting legislation stiffer than the Taft-Hartley Act.

The committee's new subsidiary, Fighters for Freedom, has a corps of slick promoters going around the country soliciting funds to "help save our liberties from the stealthy advance of socialism." The FFF has also plastered newspapers with full-page advertisements raising the Socialist scare for all it's worth—and it's worth plenty judging from the way the money rolls in.

An exhaustive checkup would undoubtedly reveal much more about the interlocking directorates in the propaganda racket, how the organizations interweave and who lays down the line.

All sorts of outfits are cogs in the transmission belt, each assigned to work some particular segment of the population. A sample is the lofty-sounding Life Insurance Policyholders' Protective Association. The front man in that group is Robert E. Smith, once a propagandist for the Power Trust.

Despite its name, it has little to do with insurance. Its main object seems to be the spreading of the same kind of scare propaganda as the other organizations, but concentrating among policyholders.

NAM ANNUAL BUDGET

Thus, Smith has showered the persons on his mailing lists with broadsides calling upon them to "fight to save the Taft-Hartley Act."

By some magic that law protects the value of all insurance policies, at least so Smith claimed. And, of course, Smith has busily pushed the line that improved social security, health insurance, and other progressive legislation would jeopardize every policyholder in the land.

Besides the big variety of such organizations operating nationally there are a myriad of local groups, too—all going in for the same propaganda and all attempting to persuade suckers to part with their money in the name of rescuing American liberties from those terrible Socialists in Washington. New ones keep sprouting constantly and they flourish like the green bay tree.

Of course, the National Association of Manufacturers, with a $5,000,000 annual budget, runs about the biggest propaganda mill of them all, but it operates less raucously and a little more subtly than the others. It carries on also through many front organizations.

At hearings before the House Lobby Investigating Committee, Prof. Stephen Kemp Bailey, of Wesleyan University in Middletown, Conn., urged that the committee endeavor to find out whether the NAM is a "holding company for a variety of seemingly independent pressure groups, and a conditioner of rural opinions."

We think the committee might go further, if its authority will permit, and determine whether a central cartel controls all of the propaganda organizations and pulls the strings. Such an inquiry would be both illuminating and valuable from every standpoint.

Francis D. McGarey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, all of Brooklyn, no, all of New York, today is grieving the untimely passing of one of its most outstanding citizens. Francis D. McGarey passed to his eternal reward on June 23 after a protracted illness. It was my privilege and pleasure to have known and worked with Surrogate McGarey as a lawyer, a public official, and as one of the hardest working members of our civic and philanthropic community. He served with distinction in every public office he held, starting as a member of the Board of Aldermen of the City of New York, to which he was elected after having served in World Was I as a lieutenant in the United States Army. After 11 years of service in that body he was named the best qualified member of the board. Then he successively served as counsel to the New York City Board of Transportation, counsel to the joint legislative committee to investigate utilities, delegate to the State constitutional convention, justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York and, since 1942, as surrogate of Kings County. He had also served as chairman of the Kings County Democratic law committee. He was the confidant and adviser of the late Frank V. Kelly, Kings County Democratic leader, and of Borough President John Cashmore, who is now the Brooklyn Democratic leader.

The posts he held in civic and philanthropic organizations are far too many to mention here. Suffice to say he was a past grand knight of Loyola Council, a Knight of St. Gregory, a Knight of Malta, and Equestrian Knight of the Holy Sepulchre. He was active in the National Urban- League, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, and the American Red Cross. He was in the forefront of every movement to eliminate racial and religious prejudices wherever they cropped up, whether in employment or anywhere else.

He was a true American in every sense of the word. Often at an early age he was compelled to earn his own livelihood while educating himself. Despite the dual task he was an excellent student. He graduated from law school at the top of his class.

He was respected by all who knew him and loved by all his intimates.

To his widow and children we extend our sincerest and most heartfelt regrets with the knowledge that the sweet memory of a loving husband and devoted father and of a real man will help assuage their grief.

Jeopardizing the Paper Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, taken from the Green Bay Press-Gazette of June 21, 1950, is a note of warning that should be heeded by those in charge of the administration of our trade agreements program. It is also a warning to the Congress of the need for legislation restricting the authority of the President in negotiating changes in our tariffs.

JEOPARDIZING THE PAPER INDUSTRY

In September at Torquay, England, it is presently proposed to make further room in the American market for foreign products, including practically every known kind of paper from cellulose wadding through filtering and cigarette papers down to various paper boards, combination sheets and envelopes and even paper not specially provided for.

There should be no confusion about the controversy which America faces since Administrator Hoffman of the Economic Cooperation Administration has conceded that the full effectiveness of the proposed agreement will mean unemployment in American industries which are unable to compete with foreign industries making comparable merchandise. But announcement has been made that the rigors of unemployment and the hardships of displaced labor will be mitigated either by a special form of unemployment relief or a migration of the unemployed into other fields of employment. That might mean that paper mill workers in Wisconsin who appear to have steady, lifelong jobs, may be offered employment in plants building bombers or developing atomic fission, work that does not necessarily promise to be continuous.

The paper industry is America's sixth in value of its products. It should not be jeopardized without a full and complete understanding by the people of the country, and particularly those directly interested, in the aim of the Washington regime and the curious way it is attempting to secure it.

Present tariffs upon paper are very low. There is none upon newsprint. Going back to 1948 for the latest obtainable figures, we find that the total value of imports of all kinds of paper and pulp into this country was $710,000,000, of which nearly $700,000,000 was duty-free pulp and newsprint. The main, if not the exclusive, gainer by dropping the present tariffs upon certain paper products would be Canada. So the excuse that we want to furnish dollars to Europe has no application to this industry.

But the harmful chain reaction of crippling our paper industry is more far reaching than most people from the comfort of their easy chairs will envision.

First, there will be a blow to our scientific forestry industry. The usefulness of the 20,000,000 acres of woodlands now under technical forest management designed to insure a constant crop of raw materials will be materially lessened. Present purchases of pulpwood from small landowners, who cut on their own woodlots, total $250,000,000 per year. That item will be endangered and may be lost. It is a valuable source of income to thousands of relatively small landowners across the country.

Shrinking our paper industry is going to be a body blow at the railroads and railroad men. The transportation systems today bring in a tonnage to the paper mill that is estimated at about five times as great in the mass as the product shipped out. And the railroads will miss that tonnage.

Paper mills are also important purchasers of coal and chemicals. Coal, in fact, moves up this Fox River all summer long. That coal is brought to Green Bay by great water carriers and in the winter by railroads.

So far as we have gone it is obvious that shrinking the payroll at the paper mills will shrink the payroll somewhat in all industries dealing heavily with the paper plants.

But when you lame a natural industry that has built itself up laboriously through the generations a wound of the spirit is inflicted in addition to the wound of the flesh. The productive capacity of our paper industry has been growing not only because the country is growing but because resourceful research departments have been finding new uses for the product. Instead, therefore, of new paper mills, construction in that line will probably be abandoned and the gigantic paper mill machinery that sometimes takes 2 or 3 years to construct will be abandoned, too.

The purpose of taking away from our own paper industry the market which it has made for itself is inviting self-punishment and sacrifice without any possible offsetting gain.

It is true that America far exceeds any Nation in the world in industrial development. Human freedom was one of the prime factors that made this country great. But also that greatness was assured by our national encouragement of such industries as can create products at reasonable costs.

Once upon a time—and this is not a bedtime story but rather a sad chapter in our history—we labored hard at Washington for what was called a reciprocity treaty. Reciprocity is a nice word. It implies mutual helpfulness. By our reciprocity treaty with Canada in 1913 we put newsprint on the free list. When we did so we had 70 newsprint mills in this country. Today we have 13. Did Canada put newsprint on the free list? Canada still levies a duty of 12½ percent on newsprint.

Unfortunately the blow back there in 1913 was lightened by the war, and so we missed a chance to learn a great lesson.

The men that are playing with the delicate machinery of industry better watch their steps more carefully; that is, unless we are to be forever at war.

National Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming inescapably clear that any national program calling for compulsory, tax-paid medical care is not only unnecessary in the United States, but is also contrary to the interest and express wishes of our citizens. The evidence is compelling that our Nation's existing voluntary institutions for health care are proving capable of meeting national needs and are providing for our people the most rapid rate of health progress in the history of the world. These voluntary institutions are showing themselves adaptable to current circumstances, and there is every reason to expect that they will make the maximum contribution to future progress in medical care in the same way they have fostered our Nation's astonishing past achievements in this field.

Here are a few typical facts to illustrate America's rate of health progress—a rate equaled by no nation in the world. Since 1900 the life expectancy of a new-born baby has gone up from 49 to 68 years—an increase of 19 years. In the same half century the national death rate has gone down from 17 per thousand to 10. In 1948 the mortality rate of infants reached a new low of 31.8 deaths per thousand live births. In the same year the maternal mortality rate was 1.1 per thousand—only one-fourth as high as the 4-per-thousand rate that prevailed as late as 1940.

Mortality statistics tell only part of the story. Under our voluntary institutions, we have had also an astonishing record of progress in health-care facilities. Since 1909 the number of hospital beds in the country has increased from about 420,000 to 1,400,000. The number of American doctors in relation to population exceeds that of every nation in the world with the exception of refugee-filled Israel. The problem of better distribution of doctors is important, but it, too, is being solved under our wonderfully adaptable voluntary system. For example, in my State, Missouri, more than 350 new doctors have been located in rural areas since January 1946. This better distribution of medical men has been achieved by cooperation between the State medical association and individual communities needing physicians' service.

Perhaps the most amazing development of our health care system has been the phenomenal growth of voluntary prepay medical care insurance programs in recent years. These programs, both commercial and nonprofit, have made it possible for millions of Americans to budget in advance the major cost of illness by small, regular and easily manageable insurance payments.

The rate at which Americans have enrolled in such voluntary health insurance programs is one of the most striking social phenomena of our times. Seventy million Americans are currently enrolled, and, by the end of this year, the number is expected to reach 77,000,000. All of these will have insurance for hospital costs; 50,000,000 will be insured for surgical costs and 21,000,000 for medical costs.

Every month sees rapid progress by these voluntary health insurance programs in extending benefits, in providing individual coverage, in making possible protection against the cost of long or catastrophic sickness and in providing protection for the aged. The cost of voluntary protection is proved to be well within the reach of a vast majority of citizens.

It is on the basis of facts like these that the American people have come to the conclusion that no compulsory Federal program of tax-paid and Government-directed medical care program is necessary. I understand that more than 10,000 representative citizens organizations—National, State and local—have gone on formal record in opposition to compulsory health insurance. Included in these groups are all three major veterans' organizations, the principal farm organizations and the General Federation of Women's Clubs—representing 5,000,000—to indicate but a few. Moreover, the legislatures of 15 States have passed resolutions in opposition to the national compulsory health insurance proposal.

The conclusion of the proposition is clear. Federal compulsion in the field of health and medical care is unnecessary and impractical. The American people recognize this fact—and they do not want an expensive, burdensome tax-supported bureaucratic national compulsory health insurance law.

Knights of Pythias Reaffirm Devotion to Free Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution unanimously adopted at the last meeting of the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts, Knights of Pythias. This is a fine, patriotic American organization, and is a strong supporter of the principles expressed in the resolution, which follows:

Be it resolved by the Grand Lodge, Knights of Pythias, of the Domain of Massachusetts, That it hereby reaffirms its devotion and support to the American principle of free government of all the people, and its unrelenting opposition to communism and all other isms which are contrary to our free government.

Let Us Look at the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an article by Frank C. Waldrop published in the Washington Times-Herald on June 25, 1950.

In this article the American people are given in brief form an account of the strength of communism in our midst. It should alert every loyal citizens to be on guard against this insidious and Godless philosophy which seeks to destroy our Government by violence and bloodshed.

COMMUNISM
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Now we turn to a survey of evidence on communism by the second witness ever to appear before the House Committee on Un-American activities.

This witness, like the one who preceded him, fails to fit into any propaganda type-casting.

The first witness on communism, as I have already mentioned, was the president of a labor union and he filled the record with specific, exact, documented and detailed support of his charge and warning that union labor must kick out communism from its ranks or suffer.

It is a matter of historical fact, known to everybody, that union labor did not, from 1938 to 1947, do its patriotic duty to shun and avoid and even make attack on communism. Result:

The clause in the Taft-Hartley law, inserted by national demand, requiring all labor union officers to take oath that they are not Communists.

Further result: Not to this day has union labor fully recovered the Nation's confidence that once it had, and yet wilfully threw away because it would not accept the evidence on communism given by one of its own, John P. Frey, president of the metal trades union, A. F. of L.

Now we come to witness No. 2. Neither does he turn out to be a larded and plush representative of the few. He is not a pompous clubman come to sound windy generalities against the radicals and the labor skates.

On the other hand, he is a spry, modest, scholarly sort of gentleman who couldn't possibly be more precise or exact or particular in what he says.

He comes on to testify in the afternoon of Tuesday, August 16, 1938. What is his name? Walter E. Steele. Whom does he represent? He answers:

"For the National Republic, and as chairman of the American Coalition Committee on National Security, and 114 organizations that are listed in my statement, and I am appearing at the special request of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Reserve Officers' Training Camps Association of the United States."

Whereupon, he inserts into the record the 114 organizations that had authorized him

to speak for them. The estimated total number of Americans he represented in that appearance, he puts at something like 20,000,000.

What of it? Merely to emphasize once more that in 1938 there were plenty of people in this country aware and concerned, as to communism.

They were not talking about communism in Russia, either, as I shall show, but about communism in the United States of America. The land of the free and the home of the brave.

They were anxious to interest the Federal Government in the matter and have it stop these enemies within our gates.

There wasn't any atom bomb to steal, in those days.

But such as there was to be had the Communists were making off with it and the 20,000,000 above-mentioned were present before the House Committee on Un-American activities, in the personality of Walter Steele, to call attention.

What did Walter Steele have to tell the House Committee on Un-American Activities?

Item: "An effort will be made to prove to you that the un-American forces in the United States have attained a membership and direction of over 6,500,000 people."

Item: "You will be shown that these movements are highly centralized in control and direction * * * from Moscow. It will be shown that while communism viciously denounces Wall Street, they are not averse to using Wall Street's families in their schemes and that they play with more money annually than many a Wall Street banker."

Item: "It will be shown that while denouncing what they term the capitalist controlled press, Communists have the largest monopolized press in the world."

Item: "We will show that over 25,000,000 pieces of propaganda have been let loose in the United States during the last two years by the Communists and their mass movements, and this does not include their many periodicals."

Item: "We will show you that the 75,000 composing the members of the Communist party direct are but a small portion of all the Communist forces in the United States, and that they have a direct following and influence of over 800,000 in the New York district alone."

Such were some of the opening premises laid down for several pages of hearing text. And then the cross-examination for nearly 300 pages.

Did Mr. Steele make his case? Why don't you read the full record and find out?

It would reward anybody honestly wanting to know whether communism's true character was available on the public record in 1938.

But for those who haven't the time for that, more details here as we go along.

Jasper, Ala., Housing Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, recently, Hon. CARL ELLIOTT, my colleague from the Seventh Alabama District, spoke at the ground-breaking ceremonies of the Jasper, Ala., housing project. Since Mr. ELLIOTT's speech points out the great progress that has been made in the Seventh Alabama Congressional District in housing, I include it as a part of my remarks.

It is interesting to note that the Jasper project was the first public-housing project in Alabama approved under the Housing Act of 1949, and the first one on which construction was begun. The Seventh Congressional District of Alabama today has the largest number of housing-project approvals of any district in the Southeast, and in the last few days another distinct honor came to the Seventh District of Alabama when the first rural nonfarm projects in the United States were approved for the towns of Guin and Reform.

Having had a small part in the enactment of the Housing Act of 1949, I am delighted to see the progress being made in Alabama. It is evident, however, that the credit, in a large measure, for the success of the housing program in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama is attributable to the alertness, energy, and devotion to duty of CARL ELLIOTT, the Congressman from that district.

JASPER, ALA., HOUSING PROJECT

Mr. Chairman, home folks, distinguished officials of the Public Housing Administration, and my friends of Jasper, Walker County, and the other towns and counties of the Seventh Congressional District who are represented here:

It is one of the greatest privileges of my public service to be with you today, as we break ground for Jasper's own public-housing project, made possible under the Housing Act of 1949, which I, as your Representative in Congress had the privilege of helping to enact. Today, we see our legislative efforts in the field of public housing, spring into life in Alabama.

As a matter of fact, the Representatives of no State in this Union have played a greater part in making possible this housing project, and hundreds of projects like it all over this country, than have the Representatives of our own State. The responsibility for guiding this law through the United States Senate was largely borne by our own Senators, LISTER HILL and JOHN SPARKMAN. Congressman ALBERT RAINS, of the Fifth Alabama District, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives had a large part in formulating the Housing Act of 1949. Congressman BOB JONES, of the Eighth Alabama District is the coauthor of the provisions of the act provided for rural housing.

But, to go back further, my friends, the leadership for the original United States Housing Act, passed in the late thirties, was furnished by an Alabama Congressman—the Honorable Henry B. Steagall. And that measure passed the House of Representatives under the gifted guidance of our own former Congressman, my distinguished predecessor, the Honorable William B. Bankhead, Speaker of the House of Representatives. In recognition of his former leadership in this field, it is peculiarly fitting that we name this project the William B. Bankhead Homes.

Just as I assumed my share of the legislative responsibility for the enactment of the Housing Act of 1949, under which this project will be built, I have been highly gratified that the people whom I have the honor to represent, have taken the lead in making this program a living reality.

This project, for which we break ground today, is the first public-housing project to be built in Alabama, under the Housing Act of 1949.

But, that is not all: Projects have been approved for, and will shortly be built in Russellville, Red Bay, Oneonta, Cullman, Hamilton, Winfield, Cordova and Haleyville.

An additional project of 60 units has already been approved for Jasper.

Applications have been filed by Reform, Berry, Guin, Boston-Brilliant, Sulligent, Carbon Hill, and other towns in our district.

The Seventh Congressional District of Alabama has more projects approved, and more applications pending than any other congressional district in the Southeast.

We are proud of this achievement.

At the same time our rural housing program is making progress. The second rural home loan in Alabama, under this program, was made a few weeks ago at Russellville, in Franklin County.

This present public housing program is new, and even though much misinformation has been circulated about it, its basis is sound.

In the first place it is a local program. This housing project was initiated by your city commission, which set up a housing authority for the city of Jasper. This housing authority did the preliminary spade work and made its application.

It advertised for bids, and awarded the building contract to Construction Engineers, Inc., a local contractor.

Local labor will build the project. Local people will furnish the materials which go into its construction.

Local people who meet the tests prescribed by the law, will live in these homes. The project will be administered and managed by your local housing authority.

When the costs of this project have been repaid to the Federal Government, these houses will be owned by Jasper as one of its capital assets.

This housing program is as local as your public health program, or your public school program.

In this program the Federal Government extends the long arm of credit to your local housing authority, by guaranteeing the repayment of bonds, which your housing authority will sell to private investors.

This is much on the same principle that your Government guarantees FHA and GI mortgage loans under which program more than 10,000 homes were built in Alabama last year.

It is also much on the same principle that your Federal Government through the Federal Home Loan Bank system guarantees the savings of millions of our people who invest their savings in housing through First Federal Savings and Loan Associations.

The public-housing program is one that requires a degree of cooperation that only a great democratic country such as ours could provide.

The city gives a tax exemption, makes streets, sewage, and other utilities available, and for that it may be reimbursed up to 10 percent of the shelter rent. The local community through its housing authority builds and operates the project.

The local housing authority selects the tenants and fixes the rentals in accord with prevailing local conditions, to meet the needs of the people of our towns who are most in need of shelter. The difference between the rents so fixed and the amount necessary to pay the bonds sold to finance the costs of construction, is paid as a subsidy, within the limits fixed by the statute, by your Federal Government.

Some subsidy will usually be necessary, but we must remember that this program is one that deals with the conservation of human resources, and the human values which our Nation receives in return far outweigh the cost of the subsidies.

If I were called upon to list some of the human values that make this program worth while, I would list them as follows:

1. Better housing will insure better health for our city.

2. Less crime and juvenile delinquency.

3. Lower costs for police and fire protection.

4. The inspiration of better surroundings.

Finally, and of utmost importance, this program means that the children rehoused in such an invironment as will be provided by these William B. Bankhead homes will grow up and become better citizens.

Citizenship is the cornerstone upon which our Republic rests.

The home is the bulwark of our way of life. In the heart of the American home is found the virtues that have made this country great.

The home is the foundation stone of free enterprise.

It is our first line of defense against communism.

It typifies the strength that is inherent in Americanism.

It is the castle in which we conserve all that is best in our way of life.

When we build new homes, when we provide better homes, we strengthen our Nation.

Through the medium of our homes, and a stable family life, we of this generation will transmit to our children a civilization of opportunities that will allow them through their enterprise to pursue their dreams.

Another Bogey Goes Who-o-osh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach a magazine article which clearly indicates the real need for national health insurance and the growing national understanding of that need. The article is "Another Bogey Goes Who-o-osh," by Ruben Levin, and appeared in the June issue of Machinists' Monthly Journal.

ANOTHER BOGEY GOES WHO-O-OSH

(By Ruben Levin)

Agrarianism, anarchism, bolshevism, communism, socialism, syndicalism—those are among the scare words used throughout American history to block social reforms. The scare campaigns have usually slowed up the changes, but have seldom prevented them.

In each struggle over some particular reform, there came a time when the "ism" attack lost its punch, when the opposition began cracking and ultimately started embracing what it earlier viewed with horror.

That was true, for example, of workmen's accident compensation. Many employers fought bitterly the idea of assuming any financial responsibility for the maiming, the crippling, the killing of workers on the job. They cried that this was socialism.

NOT SOCIALISTIC NOW

In due time, however, more and more employers saw the light and swung from resistance to support. Accident compensation laws swept through the States. Now, you never hear anyone brand this system of benefits for injuries as socialism or any other ism.

It was much the same with the reforms of more recent years—that is, old age pensions, unemployment insurance, minimum wages, and a host of other laws calculated to protect the weak and ease some of the hazards of life. All were smeared as socialistic, but eventually were accepted as part of our American way.

Right now the same kind of hobgoblin campaign is being conducted against progressive legislation backed by organized labor and largely embodied in President Truman's Fair Deal program.

Health insurance, disability insurance, Federal aid to education, the Brannan farm plan, river authorities of the TVA type, and other measures—all constitute socialism, or statism, or the welfare state in the eyes of reactionaries and standpatters.

Taft-style Republicans and Byrd-stripe Democrats alike have been leading the smear drive. Richly financed propaganda organizations of all kinds are spreading the same line. Newspapers and magazines are devoting columns to the scare stuff.

Health insurance has perhaps been the main target. More money has been poured out to put over the bogey of socialized medicine than on almost any other issue. The American Medical Association alone is spending two to three million dollars a year to frighten the people into believing that a system of prepaid medical care, financed by payroll deductions on employers and employees, would somehow deliver us over the precipice into the abyss of socialism.

However, as in the battle over workmen's compensation and other long-overdue reforms, there has recently been a very significant turn of the tide. It came when the magazine magnate, Henry Luce, publisher of Time, Life, and Fortune, emerged with a new line on the issue of health insurance.

Luce would hardly rank as a Liberal. He's a prominent Republican, a pillar of big business, a baron of the publishing world.

Apparently, however, Luce has come to the conclusion that the GOP can't stage any comeback by being purely negative, that it can't win over the voters by merely yelling "socialism" at any and all legislation that the people need and want.

This new line is particularly apparent in articles on health insurance carried recently both in Fortune and in Time. These articles, while critical of certain features of the Truman health-insurance program, concede that some program must be offered which will enable the mass of people to receive adequate medical care at reasonable cost.

THE FORTUNE CRITIQUE

These articles take the ground right out from under TAFT and his cohorts who counted on making socialized medicine one of the big issues of the 1950 election campaign.

Most effective of the two articles is the one carried by Fortune, the $1.25 a copy magazine of the business elite. It is entitled "Health Insurance Is Next," written by Russel Davenport, close associate of Luce. Congressman A. J. BIEMILLER (Democrat, Wisconsin), a leader in the House in the battle for health insurance, was so impressed with it that he inserted the piece in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so reactionaries in the House and Senate would not miss it.

BIEMILLER let it be known he could not agree with many of Davenport's conclusions, "but his facts about the urgent need of some kind of national program are impressive."

"There is nothing radical about the author," the Wisconsin Congressman stressed. "His most prominent political activity was managing Wendell Willkie's Presidential campaign in 1940. He is a Republican.

"So is Henry Luce, whose wife, Clare Boothe Luce, served as a Republican with considerable prominence in the House of Representatives.

"This article marks a great forward step in our understanding of the state of the Nation's health. We now have groups in both political parties who realize that this serious problem is beyond political boundaries. They differ as to methods, but there is no real difference of opinion that something must be done by Government action."

Fortune declares flatly that the present medical set-up doesn't meet the people's needs.

"Some portion of the people, those who can afford it, get the best possible medical care," says Fortune. "But another portion get this kind of care only when they are lucky, or if they make a tremendous financial sacrifice, while still a third portion do not get it at all," the magazine declares.

"And the disconcerting fact," it adds, "seems to be that the second and third groups, added together, constitute more than half of the population.

"The American Medical Association itself observed in 1939 that families with incomes under $3,000 a year could not afford to pay the costs of a major or chronic illness.

"If this figure were adjusted for the rise in the cost of living, it would today be close to $5,000 a year and would apply to about 80 percent of the population."

In other words, 80 percent of the American people are unable to meet the expense of a serious or continuing sickness.

Very frankly, Fortune predicts that those who advocate a national system of insurance "will certainly win the backing of the people in the long run."

"For the threat of medical costs looms over the average American family in a truly sinister way," the magazine says.

"The threat does not lie in the average cost but in the fact that a serious illness may drive the cost for a particular family up into the thousands of dollars. Hence, the doctor is avoided, symptoms are concealed, and diseases that might have been prevented had they been detected at the outset are permitted to develop into irreparable human tragedies."

The magazine riddles the publicity claims made by the AMA for existing voluntary insurance plans. While about 65,000,000 people are allegedly covered by some of these plans, "the coverage of almost all of these policies is very inadequate."

"Virtually all of these people are covered for hospital benefits of some kind, though often meagerly," the magazine points out. "Only about half are covered for surgery. And a pitiable 5 percent are covered by relatively comprehensive plans.

"We must find out how to deliver reasonably adequate medical care at a cost that anyone can afford."

Short shrift is made by the magazine of TAFT's "pauper" medicine plan—which would give aid only to those who sign a means test that they're too poor to pay. Such a scheme completely fails to meet the problem, Fortune stresses.

The magazine finds flaws in the Administration program, and it goes on to advocate what it dubs a "progressive Republican plan" sponsored by such senators as IVES, of New York, and FLANDERS, of Vermont.

That plan, like the Administration proposal, would be national in scope, but would have the Government step in to extend the voluntary plans to all persons by a system of subsidies, rather than inaugurate its own universal health insurance system.

Whether one plan or the other is better may be a matter of argument. The hierarchy of the AMA and Taft-Byrd reactionaries oppose both. Organized labor generally is convinced that the administration plan is clearly the best.

Be that as it may, the Fortune article accomplishes this much—it lays the ghost of socialized medicine, shatters an issue Senator TAFT had hoped to exploit in 1950, and marks a turning point in a struggle which is bound, sooner or later, to end in a victory for real national health insurance.

Radio Address by Col. Robert R. McCormick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, Col. Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher of the Chicago Tribune, has spent considerable time touring the world, meeting the rulers and leaders of many foreign countries. The first-hand knowledge and observations gained on these tours is set forth in two addresses which were broadcast over the Mutual Broadcasting System and radio stations WGN and WGNB on May 20 and May 27, 1950.

I am pleased to call attention to the address broadcast by Colonel McCormick on May 20. The facts and comments contained in this address are exceptionally interesting and informative.

I submit that the clear and concise analysis of conditions as he observed them in the nations visited by him can be of substantial value to the Members of Congress in particular, and to the people of the United States in general.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the radio broadcast made by Colonel McCormick on May 20, 1950, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

I

The broadcasts on my various world travels have been so well received that I have decided to extend my observations of world affairs for the benefit of those who have not or could not take trips similar to mine, and have not, therefore, undertaken the reading which they inspired.

Let me again clear up a misapprehension that our Government was borrowed or developed from that of the English. Nothing could be more mistaken. It was a revolution from the English.

Our great philosophers, for the most part Virginians, had studied all governments and read all the books on the subject. They borrowed what they thought best and freely improvised the remainder.

The least ambitious form of international jointure is that proposed by "Union Now" with Great Britain. It has been extended by General Omar N. Bradley to include Canada.

The suggestions are at variance with the present trend. Eire has obtained its independence, and Northern Ireland something akin to statehood, to which Scotland, Wales, and even Cornwall, aspire.

The British Empire has broken up into what is called the "British Commonwealth of Nations" and the "crown colonies."

Taking first the so-called white countries, we come to Canada, whose instrument of government is an act of the British Parliament. Canada is carrying on largely in violation of this instrument and is split on racial and religious lines between French Catholics and English Protestants, with the members of other races not playing an important part in the government. The Governor of Canada enjoys a semi-regal status as the representative of the King, highly flattering to the women privileged to curtsy to him. The Canadian army and navy are very resentful at their treatment by British superior officers.

Australia and New Zealand have achieved the power to make and alter their own constitutions.

The Governors of Australia and New Zealand are appointed by the Crown to give the same social loyalty as is found in Canada, and to give an appearance of respectability to socialism as in England. The Governor of South Africa is a South African politician appointed by the British Government.

There is a further act of the British Parliament which says it will not legislate for any of the Commonwealth nations without their consent.

Australian and New Zealand troops were involved in the surrender of Singapore and did little in the war against Japan. Australian ships were involved in the catastrophe of Savo Island and of the Java Sea under British and Dutch admirals. Australian workmen toyed with the unloading of American transports so that American soldiers, who saved Australia, had to unload their own boats.

As of war times, Australia was utterly unstable, both militarily and civilly. What its future will be, and what the future of New Zealand will be, cannot be known.

South Africa was conquered from its residents in 1902, and a self-governing act of parliament was passed soon afterward. Until recently, through the leadership or defection of General Smuts, the English element has dominated the government, but recently the Dutch have come into power. They are ultranationalistic. For years they ruled German Southwest Africa under a mandate from the League of Nations. Afterwards it was conferred upon them by the UN. Now South Africa claims to own it, with responsibility to nobody else. South Africa is only a white nation in the sense that it is a nation ruled by whites. The great preponderance of its population is black and extremely dissatisfied with its white rulers.

In these white nations, as in the mother country, there is no bill of rights, no guaranty of private property, or of freedom from arrest and imprisonment without trial. Britain has a number of crown colonies and protectorates with varying degrees of self-government and of colonial tyranny.

Coming now to the colored nations—India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon—they obtained their separation from the British Empire by different degrees of civil disobedience and rioting. In turning them into Commonwealths, England split India into three governments, India, Pakistan, and Burma. India calls itself a republic, with a president and a very complicated government. India has written itself a constitution of nearly 400 sections; far too many, of course, to operate.

Pakistan, with a smaller population, elected to remain a commonwealth as a defense against India, with a British-appointed Governor who, in fact, is a descendant of the Mongol conqueror Akbar. The Government of India is Hindu. The Government of Pakistan is Moslem. Both countries encourage polygamy. There have been frightful massacres of one race by another, and the armies of the two countries are facing each other in dispute over which shall annex Kashmir. Both of these countries are in diplomatic relations with the Soviet.

Burma calls itself a union and has a republican form of government, which up to the present time has not been able to exercise control over the whole territory against the Communists.

Ceylon is a commonwealth with an English governor. It is the richest small country in the world and permits polyandry.

The life of these successor countries to the British Empire has been too short to indicate what the future may have in hand for them. The same is true of Egypt, which has won its independence from England, except for troops occupying the neighborhood of the Suez Canal and the Sudan. Its constitution is an exceedingly evil instrument, devised by Europeans, which has been chosen as the model for the constitution of the world government.

The British commonwealths have preferential treatment for one another and against us.

East of Burma lies Siam, a dictatorship with a religion very unlike Christianity. Adjoining Siam are Malaya, in rebellion against the British, and Indochina in revolt against France. Communism is strong in both of them as a rallying ally against their despots.

What Indonesia, rebelled from Holland, will develop into, remains to be seen.

Greece is a constitutional monarchy, modeled somewhat on the English style.

It is interesting to note that the written constitutions of all these countries are modeled on the former constitution of Great Britain, which is unwritten, and not at all after our written Constitution, the oldest one in the world, "whose success," as Sir Henry Sumner Maine said, "has blinded men to its novelty."

Very few people in Great Britain, or in its commonwealths, have ever read the American Constitution or the history of the United States. It has been British policy to confine all knowledge to things British. This has been sowing the wind for, as the British Constitution has completely broken down, we cannot expect much from its successor constitutions.

Other oriental countries outside of the iron curtain are Turkey, the most stable nation next to our own; Saudi Arabia, a medieval, pastoral country ruled by a paternal dictatorship, whose king has taken a wife from each tribe; Iran and Iraq, oriental monarchies attempting self-government.

Fragment countries around Palestine are Lebanon, Syria, and Transjordan.

A prime difficulty in these countries is that their political education has been entirely along English lines. They have never learned about the principles of freedom as set down in our Declaration of Independence, Constitution, and Bill of Rights, nor do they understand the great safeguard that comes from having most of the powers of government reposing in the States and certain limited ones delegated to an imposing Central Government.

Turning now from the governments modeled after the English plan, we come to the countries south of the Rio Grande, which for the most part took our Constitution as their model. Ten of them—El Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Panama, Brazil, Uruguay, Chile, Bolivia, and Cuba—are observing American liberties, but eight of them—Argentina, Peru, Colombia, Venezuela, Paraguay, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and Nicaragua—are dictatorships. It is expected that Guatemala will become a Communist dictatorship shortly.

The difficulty that the South American states have had in following the principles of our Constitution is that the Spanish-Americans have not found in their language the writings of the great American philosophers—Wythe, Mason, Henry, Jefferson—and the writers of the Federalist papers. Not understanding the philosophy upon which the Constitution is based, it is not so easy to follow them instead of the example of the conquistadores. It is to be noted that Spanish and Portuguese America broke up into 20 governments and that there is no movement for union among them.

The Philippines, which we did actually educate, have been going backward rapidly since the death of President Roxas. Japan is functioning under the control of General MacArthur. There is no guessing what she will do after he leaves.

Turning now to western Europe, we find that Portugal and Spain are dictatorships and, therefore, backward economically as well as politically. Italy and France are in flux. They may go Communist. We are spending billions upon them theoretically to

keep them from communism; really, perhaps, for the benefit of the 5-percenters. Belgium is split almost in two on the question of the king, and the government of Holland is almost as fragmented. Years ago they tried to adopt our constitutional ideas, but they have slid back of late. The principle of the divorce of the church and state is out of the window.

My observation in Denmark was that the leading politicians, if not the people, would welcome Russia.

Norway and Sweden I did not visit, but they are under the shadow of the iron curtain.

Excepting for the countries of northwestern Europe, literacy is very low, the Indian successor states' illiteracy running above 80 percent. What this means in attempted constitutional government is obvious.

I think it is plain to all who have read the above that it will be many years before the nations of the world can learn our political philosophy, and equally plain that we are not going to give up our liberties for their dictatorships, tyranny, and immorality.

Letter From Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter which I have received from Hon. Herbert E. Gaston, Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON,
Washington, June 20, 1950.

The Honorable BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPENCE: You asked me to comment on a newspaper release sent to you by the National Association of Manufacturers expressing opposition to your bill, H. R. 8083, which would authorize the Export-Import Bank to use a portion of its existing lending authority to guarantee American private capital to be invested abroad against the limited risks of inability to convert earnings and capital into dollars and against expropriation by foreign countries without prompt and adequate compensation.

The significant and, to me, very disappointing feature of this press release is that it does not appear to represent any actual study of what has been proposed, but is a mere repetition of uninformed criticisms that have been published and repeated at various times. This is illustrated by the statement that it is the considered opinion of the NAM that any such guaranties by the United States Government are wrong in principle, since they shift the responsibility of encouraging and protecting American private investments abroad from the countries in which the American-owned enterprises are located to the government of the country whose citizens provide the capital.

In fact, there will be no such shifting of responsibility. Instead there will be a greater concentration of responsibility upon foreign countries for the protection of American investors than there has been heretofore. It has been repeatedly stated by those in the Government who have been concerned with this measure that no investments will be guaranteed without a general treaty or other satisfactory arrangement with the country concerned as to investments in general as well as an agreement with the Export-Import Bank with respect to the treatment of guaranteed investments. If there is a method by which a measure of greater responsibility by a foreign government can be assured than by general and specific agreements with the United States Government, covering not only investments in general but the specific investments to be protected by the guaranties, I do not know what it might be.

We have constantly said that so far from desiring to lessen the responsibility of the foreign governments with respect to American investments, the proposal implicit in this legislation is that the responsibility of the foreign government with respect to American investors and American investments shall be increased.

Somewhat the same obstinate ignorance of the proposal is illustrated by the statements that "It is the belief of the NAM that if these guaranties are to be restricted to new investments, to certain types of investments, to investments made in selected countries, or are otherwise discriminatory, there will be a dangerous tendency to set up a new, preferred class of American investor and, in the event of exchange difficulties, a preferred class of creditor, as the guaranteed claims would have the full weight of the United States Government behind them."

It has been repeatedly stated that it is not proposed that investments on which returns have been guaranteed by the Export-Import Bank will take superior rank to service on existing investments. On the contrary, it has been very unequivocally stated that our purpose is that the service on a guaranteed investment shall "take its place in line" behind other unguaranteed claims of similar class and that there will be no agreement, request, or pressure that these claims be serviced ahead of existing claims and existing investments. If there is delay in remittance, the Export-Import Bank will pay and take over the claim and for that service it will charge a fee sufficient to defray its costs.

Most obviously this then gives the Export-Import Bank and the United States Government a more definite interest than now exists in obtaining prompt and full service in dollars as well as protection against seizure without full compensation for all investments existing or to be made in foreign countries where the Export-Import Bank may find it possible to issue guaranties.

Substantially the same error is repeated by the authors of the document in the statement that guaranties of the sort proposed "would end to deprive foreign nations of the incentive to correct errors of financial and economic policy that may have impeded the entry of new foreign investment funds." The tendency, in fact, would be exactly in the contrary direction, since guaranties would not be issued as to investments in any country which did not invite investment and reveal a willingness to correct errors of financial and economic policy impeding the entry of new foreign investments funds. One of the basic purposes of the legislation is, in fact, to create a new incentive to correct such errors of financial and economic policy and thereby create a powerful stimulus toward the development of underdeveloped areas through the investment of United States capital and coupled with it the entry of United States managerial and technical talent.

It certainly has not escaped the attention of many members of the National Association of Manufacturers that the lending activities of the Export-Import Bank have constantly been employed over a period of 16 years to assist foreign countries in improving their financial condition and correcting disorganized financial situations wherever they may exist. Not only have requirements for improvement in fiscal and monetary management accompanied foreign loans, but the Bank has repeatedly come to the rescue of American exporters by substantial loans to avert and clear up arrearages in payments.

The bill, H. R. 8083, does not provide any new Government funds to be employed by the Export-Import Bank. It simply empowers the bank to use up to $250,000,000 of its present lending authority in the form of guaranties which will supplement its loans. It has been made plain in testimony before the congressional committees that the guaranties will be used substantially in the same way in which the bank's loans are now employed; that is, in ways which will promote the productive development of foreign countries and in general to increase their dollar-earning capacity. Where the dollar-earning capacity of any underdeveloped country is increased by an amount greater than the required service payments on a loan or on an investment of private funds, obviously existing American investors in that country are benefited and not injured. It is the intention of the Directors of the Export-Import Bank to administer this new act when it becomes law in exactly that way.

The discrimination to which reference is made in the NAM's release will be discrimination as between productive and nonproductive investments, as between sound and unsound investments, and as between countries and areas requiring and able to support new productive investment as against those which are not able to support it. This is exactly the kind of discrimination which the Export-Import Bank has been practicing in the 16 years of its history, with results which, I believe, are pretty generally applauded rather than criticized by American manufacturers and American businessmen.

The American system of democratic government and control of capital by free private enterprise has made this country great. The future history of the United States will depend, in no small measure, upon how well private capital meets the challenge of great economic responsibility thrust upon our country in its new creditor position of world leadership. Great vistas of new opportunity lie ahead in economic development abroad, especially in the less well developed areas of Latin America, Africa, the Near East and Far East. With such development will come greater social and political stability, and higher standards of living for the peoples of the world, including ourselves. As standards of living increase, there grows, inevitably, the opportunity for new high levels of trade, mutually profitable to those abroad and to American business, labor and agriculture. Increased purchasing power abroad will create new jobs at home. If private capital fails to take the responsibility thrust upon it by the new world creditor position of the United States, then world circumstances may force the assumption of more responsibility by governments.

Let it be repeated also that this is not a proposal to guarantee to private investors "their money back" from foreign investment. There is no plan or offer to insure against ordinary business risks, but only against the two special hazards mentioned in the legislation: inconvertibility of foreign currency at the time it is offered and the risk of seizure without fair compensation. All the other hazards of business, and particularly of business in a foreign country, will be carried by the investor.

Some have asked what assurance there is that the guaranty program will be administered in the way I have outlined. The answer is simply that this seems the sensible and prudent way to administer it. The Bank has had broad powers in the past and possesses them today, powers to do many unwise acts. It could today under the law guaranty without qualification an issue of

foreign securities up to the full limit of its lending power. It has not done anything of the kind, simply because it has not seemed wise for it to do so. It has not been accused of abusing its powers. It has a commission to promote the commercial interests of the United States and must be judged on the record as to whether it has done that duty faithfully and intelligently.

It is our conviction that no legislation—on guaranties or any other matter—could be so specific as to guard against unwise administration.

It is also our conviction that your guaranty bill (H. R. 8083) will add substantially to the bank's power to promote development in lands in need of development through the investment of private funds, private initiative, private managerial ability, and private technical knowledge, and by that means will give added guaranties for the survival of a free world.

Sincerely,

HERBERT E. GASTON,
Chairman.

Articles in Seattle Times Tell of TVA's Constructive Role in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the South today is a land of change and progress, and the constructive role of the TVA figures largely in that progress. More jobs, new businesses, agriculture, and a stronger democracy are the creative results of TVA in the South. The Seattle Times has done a very useful service by publishing two articles by news writer Bem Price on the TVA as a positive and important factor in the changing South.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times of June 18, 1950]

THE CHANGING SOUTH—TVA HAS DRESSED DIXIE WITH NEW HOMES, GREEN FIELDS, HAPPIER CHILDREN

(By Bem Price)

KNOXVILLE, TENN.—As a youngster, it was a rare summer that I wasn't in some part of the Tennessee River Valley, mostly around Decatur and Athens, Ala.

I can remember seeing a weather-worn farmer becoming nauseated and shaking with malarial chill on the courthouse lawn at Athens.

My father's penchant for exploring back roads took me over miles and miles of road lined with broad cotton fields—and shacks.

"I JUST COULDN'T BELIEVE"

Mostly, though, I remember the children. I just couldn't believe one who told me he had never seen a picture show. And I remember the snarling answer I got from another when I asked if it was fun to pick cotton. I asked because I could see no other reason for a child to pick cotton.

There was a time, too, when I sneaked off to lunch with a forbidden friend who lived in a slum area back of the old Decatur jail. I remember the meal was turnip greens, cornbread, and water.

And once, driving to Nashville during the depths of the depression, I remember seeing children going home from school. It was winter, and there wasn't a warm coat in the lot.

"THEY DON'T LOOK HAPPY"

My remark to my father was: They don't look happy. His answer was my first inkling that all was not right in the South.

I just have driven through much of the Tennessee Valley. It is a changed, green valley. My major impression and the one that counts most with me: The children look happier and they stand straighter.

Behind this new look on the land lies the mighty Tennessee Valley Authority, humming with the vigor of 17,000,000,000 kilowatts of electric power annually.

In the land where play was something only for the relatively rich, some 8,000,000 persons now find recreation annually and another 2,000,000 go to look at the great dams.

On its 28 great lakes ply some 10,000 pleasure craft. The TVA estimates that more than $150,000,000 annually is spent in the valley by tourists.

But there's more to TVA than that: In the uplands of the Cumberland and Great Smoky Mountains, the electric washing machine has become a symbol of prosperity.

Down on the once-eroded dusty flatlands, the story is told in rolling green fields, indoor plumbing, factories, barges, tractors, and dynamos.

FIVE THOUSAND NEW ENTERPRISES

Into the 122 valley counties spread through 7 States have poured more than 5,000 new enterprises since 1932.

Just last summer the TVA celebrated the planting of its two hundred millionth seedling from its own and State-owned nurseries on 250,000 acres of burned-over and abandoned lands and on farms.

About 80,000 farms in the valley are being rebuilt as testing demonstration farms through the cooperation of the Agriculture Extension Services and the TVA.

In terms of floods alone, the TVA with its water-control program along 670 miles of river has proved invaluable.

FLOOD CONTROL SAVES MILLIONS

At Chattanooga, where the river bends and where in flood times the water once piled up with disastrous results, James P. Pope, TVA director, estimates the saving at $43,000,000 since 1933.

"And," Pope said, "there were similar savings along the whole river."

And, Pope points out, this flood control has gone hand in hand with control of the malaria-bearing mosquito. Where once an estimated 30 percent of the population was afflicted with malaria's general malaise, the figure now is less than a tenth of 1 percent.

This backing up of waters behind nine great dams on the Tennessee has made the whole interior of the South one great inland port. Barges ply the waters with cargoes from and to Pittsburgh, Minneapolis, Houston, Mobile, St. Paul, Chicago, New Orleans, St. Louis, and Cincinnati.

SHIPPERS ARE SAVING

Pope estimates that shippers on the river are saving about $4,000,000 annually in shipping costs for the 500,000,000 ton-miles now traveled—an increase of 800 percent over 1937.

When TVA first started back in the depression years only 3 percent of the farms in the valley and the uplands were electrified. Now the figure is 70 percent—or about 300,000 farmers.

With the influx of industry, the improvement and diversification of farms, the purchasing power of the people has climbed tremendously.

In 1948 alone the people in the seven valley States bought more than $50,000,000 worth of electrical appliances.

Worn-out land has been enriched by 3,000,000 tons of TVA produced and distributed fertilizer, not including the commercial products.

If you drive the valley, watch for the new homes, the new schools, and green pastures and the new children. They are standing straighter.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times of June 19, 1950]

THE CHANGING SOUTH—TVA PROVIDED TOOLS AND DECATUR, ALA., CAME FROM NOTHIN' TO SOMETHIN'

(By Bem Price)

DECATUR, ALA.—This is the town that Barrett Shelton, newspaperman, says came from nothin' to somethin' in 15 years.

The story goes back to the depression year 1933 and Decatur was without hope.

But let Shelton, editor and publisher of the Decatur Daily tell it.

"The one major industry we had, which had kept 2,000 men at work, closed. Another industry, which in earlier years we had subsidized and brought from New England, went bankrupt.

"A third industry, manufacturer of hosiery, went to the wall from poor management and bad times. Seven of eight banks in our county closed.

"Our farm situation: We had only one crop—cotton—and cotton was 5 cents a pound. Lands were selling for taxes. The people were ill-housed, ill-clothed, and out of hope.

"Into this dismal setting came David Lilienthal, then a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Four of our citizens who had been hopeful of improving conditions met him. We were almost hostile, for he represented another way of thought and another way of life.

"Our conversation might be summarized thusly: 'All right, you were not invited, but you're here. Now what are you going to do?'

"Dave leaned back in his chair as he said gently and firmly, 'I'm not going to do anything. You are going to do it.'

"He went on to tell us something we never knew before; that TVA would provide the tools of opportunity—flood control, malaria control, navigation on the river, low-cost power, test-demonstration farming to show how our soils could be returned to fertility.

"Our townspeople needed jobs, our farm people needed a month-by-month payroll, rather than a once-a-year income from harvesting one crop.

"Our first step was to form a chamber of commerce and we decided a packing plant would be the first venture. We persuaded the local ice company to put in packing facilities when there wasn't as much as one wagon load of hogs in our whole county. We are now producing our own livestock to meet the demands of this market."

MILK OPERATION BEGUN

"We then turned to milk, formed a little corporation with paid-in capital of $15,000. We told every stockholder to forget his investment. The first week the plant was in operation, there was a total supply of 1,800 pounds of milk.

"Today the milk-production peak is at 60,000 pounds and we have just started. The stockholders never failed to receive 6 percent and just recently that little plant paid a 100 percent dividend.

"Along about that time we got some help from the outside. Navigation on the Tennessee River made it possible.

"The impact was tremendous. Farmers could grow grain because there was now a daily market.

"These industries, land builders and man builders, could never have been pictured in the minds of a defeated people, of a people who in the year before TVA saw an uncontrolled river wash away the best soil.

"Today there is a market for cotton, corn, wheat, livestock, milk, timber, small grains, and truck crops. Fifteen years ago we were dozing in the sunshine waiting for that once-a-year payroll brought by cotton.

LAND BUILDING DID IT

"Today the cash income from all farm products in the area surrounding Decatur is $43,000,000. Land building did it. Flood control did it. TVA, with other State and Federal agencies, and determined people did it.

"By 1940 there were 61 manufacturing firms in Decatur, employing 2,834 people with an annual payroll of $3,159,000.

"By 1948, the industries numbered 87 and employment was 5,204 with an annual payroll of $12,605,000."

Ruhr Steel Goes East—At What Price Integration?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following articles that appeared in the summer issue No. 35 of the publication of the Society for the Prevention of World War III:

AT WHAT PRICE INTEGRATION?

Mr. Robert P. Martin, correspondent for the Overseas News Agency in Japan, reports that Japanese steel interests are most unhappy about their inability to sell steel rails to Communist China. They are peeved at the fact that German industrialists have received permission.

"It's not in Japanese character," Mr. Martin was told by the president of one Japanese steel company, "to demand changes in American policy as the Germans have done."

We are not in a position to psychoanalyze the Japanese character, but we do know that this steel magnate is certainly on the right track insofar as the Germans are concerned.

From time to time we have cited instances where German demands have been transformed into Allied policy. In this connection, a development that bears watching is the present campaign for the economic integration of western Europe. The Society for the Prevention of World War III has gone on record in favor of genuine integration which "could accomplish much in establishing a healthy economic and political climate under which the people could live without fear" (November-December 1949, No. 32, Prevent World War III).

We have recognized that economic integration under certain conditions would bring a measure of prosperity to Europe and strengthen American security. But we have shown that under present conditions the desire for the unity of western Europe is being exploited by the Germans for purposes which have nothing in common with its praiseworthy objectives.

In our previous discussion of this problem we said: "If all economic restrictions and controls were lifted from present-day Germany, she could easily surpass the industrial power of any of her neighbors. This is the Germany which the Germans and their spokesmen elsewhere recommend as becoming part of a federalized Europe. What harm could result? Well, just put one wolf among a flock of sheep and the answer becomes clear."

Sensing that many of the nations of western Europe suspect German motives on this score, Chancelor Adenauer decided to be more blunt. On April 3, 1950, he told the American press that western Europe must be integrated: "I do not mind saying," he declared, "that America should use its power far more with the Europeans who are resisting their own unification." Three days later the New York Times ran an editorial echoing Adenauer's suggested method of bringing about unity. The Times said that the United States might have to "use pressure on the hesitant European governments to speed up the process of unification."

Why the need for pressure if the principle of integration is assumed to be supported by most people in western Europe? If pressure is the only way to achieve such unity, then there must be something wrong.

Some may say that white castor oil is probably not a very palatable potion; it does a great deal of good once it is taken, even if pressure is required. But can we compare the nations of western Europe to a bunch of children who just don't know what is good for them?

Adenauer admitted in his same statement to the press that unity was being held up because "the French really fear the Germans." But is it only the French who fear the Germans? Does Dr. Adenauer think that the English, the Belgians, or the Dutch are waiting with open arms? The real truth, of course, is that all of the nations of western Europe fear the Germans. Nor is this fear an irrational mood which will pass away by the wave of a wand. It stems from generations of living next door to the Germans; of being forced into economic dependence on German industrial might; of being the victims of German aggressions and brutalities. There is hardly a household in western Europe which has not lost a loved one due to the Germans' embrace. As though Dr. Adenauer is not aware of these facts.

Even such a stalwart of integration as Paul Reynaud, former Premier of France, declared that the unification of western Europe could eventually result in German domination, without proper safeguards. Dr. Adenauer's reasons for desiring unification are the very same reasons which strike fear in the hearts of Germany's victims. They instinctively feel that German enthusiasm for integration is based on the hope that it will eventually result in western Europe becoming a vassal to the lords of the Ruhr. Chancelor Adenauer sensed this too when he scolded his neighbors. He tried to disarm their fears by saying that "Germany is weak and helpless." A weak and helpless Germany, according to Dr. Adenauer, should cause no anxiety among Germany's neighbors.

That sounds like good common political and economic sense. But is Germany weak and helpless? One would not think so judging from the boasts of Ludwig Erhard, the economic brain-truster for the Bonn government. Erhard has come out for the free convertibility of all currencies including the deutschemark. Aside from the fact that this is a clumsy effort to play up to the Americans, Erhard's proposal would seem to show that the Germans have reached a point in economic strength where they have no fear of convertibility. It must mean that the German economy is fully equipped to support such a plan. Is it not peculiar that a Germany which is supposed to be weak and helpless can undertake such a course of action?

Below the surface it is even clearer that Germany is far from weak and helpless. Her steel production today is at a rate exceeding the limit of 11,100,000 metric tons of steel. This feat was accomplished within a very short period. Indeed, the rate of German production is greater than that of France and would overtake the English once the go-ahead signal is given. Does this sound like helplessness?

The swift come-back of the German steel industry is reflected in other sectors of the German economy. Recently the International German Electrical Combine issued its financial statement, which showed that it was in a very healthy position. In spite of the loss of assets in the eastern zone, the company disclosed that present assets are very substantial "due to the existence of very extensive hidden reserves amassed before World War II" (New York Times, April 3, 1950). These vast holdings were employed between 1945 and 1948 to set up new factories in nine west German cities.

Foreign and domestic orders are plentiful and guarantee production for a long period of time. The board of directors announced that all former obligations to creditors would be met. The strong position of this electrical trust is reflected in stock-exchange quotations of its shares which are rising steadily.

Commenting on the position of this company as well as most of German heavy industry, the New York Times said: "Despite the gigantic war losses, most German industrial companies rescued far more than was originally thought possible."

This is not a picture of Germany which is weak and helpless. Fundamentally, the Germans are in a very strategic position economically, and they hope to forge ahead at the expense of other nations. Integration under these conditions would be a bonanza for the Germans. When Chancellor Adenauer advocates integration, he is thinking of what advantage Germany can obtain from it. He said that much when he declared that it was not logical that the Germans should have to buy some steel for its reconstruction from France. No, indeed, this is not German logic which has it the other way around—namely that the French and other western European countries should remain dependent upon the German Steel Trust as in the past.

This is the German idea of integration, and is diametrically opposed to the unity of western Europe as conceived by those who want a better distribution of the productive forces of Europe, which would prevent any one nation from dominating the Continent.

The power of Germany today has been hidden from public view. Most Americans are still probably under the illusion that Germany is weak and helpless. But the real truth is coming to the surface. It was described by Mr. James Reston, one of the most able of the New York Times political analysts, on April 26: "It is now recognized in official quarters that the potential economic and military power of Western Germany is so great that it is likely to dominate any purely western European economic or military organization."

This is the cold fact without the window dressing of the pro-German apologists. It tells what fate awaits those who nibble at the German bait. The Germans have a proverb: "Die groessten Kaelberwaehlen sich den Metzger selber" (the biggest calves select their own butcher).

NOTE.—The above article was written prior to the announcement by French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman of his proposal to pool the coal and steel industries of France and the Ruhr.

Since the information dealing with the Schuman plan is of a general nature, we shall withhold judgment until more details are available. However, there are certain points which have come to the surface which deserve immediate consideration.

For one thing, the attitude of the French people toward this plan is of vital importance. The American press has reported very little as yet on the French reaction. It should be noted that the foreign affairs committee of the French Assembly split 17 to 17 on a test vote over the plan. It remained for the chairman of the committee to cast a deciding vote in favor of Schuman's proposal. If this vote is any reflection of French public opinion, it would show that the Schuman plan will meet resistance on the part of

substantial sections of the French population—regardless of political ideology.

The fears of the French on this score were even admitted by Monsieur Schuman himself. As reported in the New York Times, Monsieur Schuman stated that because of the revolutionary nature of the plan it could come only on French initiative, and that it would have been fatal if it even had been suspected that the plan originated anywhere but in France.

We know that there are very powerful cartel interests in France which have sought some kind of agreement with their counterparts in Germany. On the other hand, as mentioned in the above editorial and in a previous one, the Germans, too, have been pressing for their brand of integration for many months. Some of the leading Ruhr industrialists who were Hitler's stanchest supporters have been working quietly behind the scenes toward that end. Indeed, during the war, when the Germans occupied France, there was a sort of integration between the German Ruhr and French Lorraine.

Having closely observed the Germans and their activities since the end of the war, we are inclined to believe that the basic principle underlying this plan is of German vintage.

In the article Whither Western Europe, published in No. 31 (September 1944) of Prevent World War III, the German plan to acquire a substantial share in the western European steel industry, while giving France a share in the German steel industry, was outlined in some detail. In this connection, we should like to point to some comments made by an experienced student of world affairs, Mr. Walter Lippmann. While stating that the American Government should give support to the Schuman plan, Mr. Lippmann made the following comments: "In taking the decision to make the proposal, the French Government must have realized that this meant the revival of the political and economic influence of Germany in Europe. In any such equal industrial regime as the French are offering, the Germans are bound by their technological and administrative gifts and discipline to play a leading part."

He further admitted that "in a Franco-German partnership the Germans will acquire such independent power that they can have a foreign policy of their own." Mr. Lippmann's observations can only confirm our fears that the Allies will repeat the same stupidities which characterized our policies toward Germany after World War I. We will probably be compounding these blunders in view of Mr. Lippmann's own admission that the Schuman proposal will give the Germans a greater opportunity to evade security controls in doing business with the East.

As we stated, these are preliminary observations and must await more detailed information.

Ruhr Steel Goes East

Writing in a recent issue of the weekly New Leader, Irving Brown, American Federation of Labor representative in Europe, made this significant statement: "The new German Drang noch Osten is on the way. This time the drive to the east extends to the very shores of the Pacific Ocean. For the Russians are now attempting to win the battle of the Ruhr via China and thus conquer all of Germany. In addition to the markets of eastern Europe, Ruhr industrialists cannot but cast longing eyes on the great and vast areas of primitive, underdeveloped China now resting in Communist hands."

Mr. Brown hits the nail on the head. As a matter of fact, the western German industrialists, despite their alleged opposition to communism, are casting, as Drew Middleton recently stated in the New York Times, "yearning glances toward trade with the East." In recent weeks these yearnning glances have taken a very definite form. "Business is business and has to come first" is obviously the leitmotif. The Soviets, on the other hand, know this very well and they don't leave a stone unturned in their efforts to woo these German Ruhr industrialists.

In one of his columns from Frankfurt, Germany, Joseph Alsop, in the New York Herald Tribune, reported the following significant episode:

"At a recent dinner in Dusseldorf this correspondent found that all of the seven big industrialists at the table were being almost daily besieged with generous business offers and flattering Soviet words by eastern German emissaries of the Soviet high command."

Other reports supplement this information. For example, Newsweek magazine's Washington bureau stated:

"Diplomatic reports from Moscow claim that during the recent negotiations the Russians have demanded and obtained Chinese agreements to a scheme under which the Soviets would have a complete monopoly of all trade between Germany and China. These reports stress the presence in Moscow of a strong German economic delegation and indicate that some members of the delegation may have taken part in the negotiations with Mao. The only previous indication that the Soviets might be toying with this idea occurred during a November steel-industry conference in Dusseldorf, when German technicians from the Soviet zone emphasized the importance of China to Germany's heavy industry.

"These reports stress that a Russian monopoly on trade with China could, under the guise of interzonal German trade, secure for Soviet-occupied Manchuria heavy industrial equipment from Western Germany. Also, the bait of Chinese orders could be used to win over the Western Germany industrialists to the Soviet side. Western Germany, the Ruhr especially, would find the prospect of trade with China most alluring."

Perusing the German press during recent months, it is interesting to note how much attention the western German newspapers are giving the problem of German-Chinese economic relations. The Sueddeutsche Zeitung on March 28 significantly titled such an article "Germany and China—Natural Commercial Partners." The story reports the arrival of Communist buyers in Frankfurt and expresses the hope that the Chinese-Soviet Treaty of February 14, 1950, will undoubtedly have good results for Germany. The article furthermore states that one of the main objectives of this Chinese-Soviet treaty was to further Stalin's efforts to gain the western German industrial capacity for his own goal.

It should be noted that the Sueddeutsche Zeitung is being published in Munich in the American Zone. Nevertheless, the Americans are being asked openly to promote German-Chinese business relations. The most significant phrase in this article reads as follows:

"The Americans should, in due consideration of the security factor, promote direct German-Chinese commerce in line with their policy of strengthening the Western German economy." On the other hand, eastern German politicians cleverly play up the economic situation in Western Germany and urge the West German leaders and industrialists to look to the East for their export. According to the Sueddeutsche Zeitung of March 9, 1950, one of the eastern German Communist bosses recently stated:

"We are ready to help the West German population. Our first requirement is for them to fight against the dependency of western Germany upon American imperialism. We have given the order to our export minister to sign a commerce treaty with the People's Republic of China. The possibilities of deliveries of western German firms have been taken into consideration."

As we stated in our leading editorial of the previous issue of Prevent World War III, the big stakes at present are the Chinese markets. In order to do a profitable business with Communist China, German conservative Ruhr industrialists and their friends have been begging the western allies to stop dismantling and to help them to rebuild German industry. The situation is perhaps best clarified by what J. Emlyn Williams, of The Christian Science Monitor, recently wrote from Bonn. Wrote Mr. Williams:

"West Germany wants the Western Allies' money, but not their instructions." This is perfectly true and nothing better indicates these trends then the recent resumption of negotiations between West German Government representatives and eastern zone representatives for the lifting of the embargo on steel shipments from the Ruhr to the Soviet zone—contrary to Allied wishes.

In this connection, we quote from a recent Associated Press dispatch from Berlin:

"East Germany is in the midst of a grandiose Communist 2-year plan that vitally depends on steel. A long-term embargo would have spelled ruin for the plan."

Ernest Leiser in a report to the Overseas News Agency recently stated that United States officials in Berlin angrily charged that a curtain of silence has been lowered around the talks by which the West German Federal Republic is now seeking to conclude a new trade accord with the Soviet-controlled government of East Germany. Wrote Mr. Leiser: "It would be only common sense as well as common courtesy for the western Germans to keep the Americans posted on the status of negotiations * * * In rebuttal, the Germans insist they are under no obligation to present the agreement for United States inspection until it is signed, sealed, and delivered. They accuse the Americans of 'unwarranted interference' in the 'limited area of sovereignty given us under the occupation statute.'"

Furthermore, in another dispatch from Berlin Ernest Leiser calls attention to the illegal smuggling of goods and machine tools from western to eastern Germany:

"Substantial quantities of goods sent by the United States to western Germany under the Marshall plan are being smuggled illegally across the zonal borders to the Soviet-controlled East German state.

"A sweeping investigation is now under way to find ways to plug those leaks, or to force the West German Federal Republic to do so. However, economic analysts here estimate that as much as $20,000,000 to $30,000,000 worth of goods is now slipping from the western zones into East Germany without authorization, annually. Of that, as high as $5,000,000 may be Marshall-plan goods."

The most dangerous factor by far in the whole situation is emphasized in the following part of Ernest Leiser's dispatch:

"There is good reason today to believe that a number of industrial magnates in the Ruhr are making a secret, calculated effort to circumvent the western Allied order limiting production of steel in the West German Federal Republic to 11,100,000 tons a year.

"Their method is as dubious politically as it is devious economically. The Ruhr industrialists are building up the steel-producing capacity in Soviet-controlled eastern Germany by exporting the machines and machine tools needed to construct plants there. Their reward is reportedly a secret accord which gives them a share of the increased capacity."

And Leiser adds:

"The most reliable information available indicates an enormous jump during the past year in the steel output of the Soviet zone of Germany. A year ago production was at a negligible 450,000 tons, far below that

needed for the zone. Today it has risen to a rate of more than 1,000,000 tons annually, still a small figure, but phenomenally higher than before. The target for 1950 is 1,350,000 tons and early in 1951 a plant is expected to be completed in Brandenburg which would raise total output to nearly 1,750,000 tons.

"A good deal of that increase, American economic analysts declare, can be attributed directly to the shipments which the industrialists of the Ruhr have sent to the Soviet zone in the framework of a general trade agreement between the Federal Republic and East Germany. It has become obvious that those shipments have included not simply raw steel ingots or finer steel products as envisaged, but actually the machines and tools with which the East Germans can make steel."

The usually well-informed Overseas News Agency correspondent concludes his dispatch by pointing out that these dark maneuvers by the western German industrialists are even more significant in the light of present German pressures to get the steel ceiling lifted well above the present 11,000,000 ton level.

How the Germans are using blackmail tactics against the West in order to further their own interests is documented also by a significant editorial of the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung of April 1. This editorial contains the following message:

"Germany was always the bridge between the East and the West. * * * The Allies are not able to come to an accord with the Russians. * * * What is then more natural than for us in view of the present pressures to say: If until now, within the framework of world events, the others were not able to make an intelligent agreement, then it is our duty finally to arouse ourselves in order to obtain at least an economic understanding. * * *

"In doing so we will not turn to the little bosses of the eastern zone but directly to the big boss in Moscow. There is where decisions are being made. It is true that according to the occupation statute foreign policy discussions must be conducted through the three High Commissioners. Therefore we will have to take the road of private mediation and thus try to arrange economic agreements between Germany and Russia, which nobody can refuse us in view of the fact that our life is at stake."

The Yalta Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

LONDON, S. W. 7, *May 30, 1950.*

Congressman ROBERT HALE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C., U. S. A.

MR. CONGRESSMAN: It was with great satisfaction that I have learned of the joint resolution, introduced by you in the House of Representatives, to the effect of "declaring that the Yalta agreement is no longer binding on the United States."

The Polish Government in exile has never recognized the validity of the Yalta agreement, which is morally wrong and politically inexpedient.

As a consequence of Yalta and of other agreements expressing the policy of appeasement the Polish nation has lost its independence, and what is left of Europe is threatened by Russian Communist imperialism, which of late has also gained momentous advantages in the Far East.

The repudiation of Yalta is therefore an indispensable part of any new policy tending to the liberation of Poland and of the other nations enslaved by Soviet Russia, and to the preservation of peace.

As a member of the Polish Government in Exile I wish to express to you my warmest thanks for having introduced this timely and wise resolution.

Yours sincerely,

M. SOKOLOWSKI,
Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include a very pertinent and informative listing of benefits which have been made available to veterans:

I. Compensation for service-connected disability.
II. Pension for non-service-connected disability (World War I or II).
III. Pension for non-service-connected disability or age (Spanish-American War group).
IV. Vocational rehabilitation.
V. Education and training.
VI. National service life insurance.
VII. United States Government life insurance.
VIII. Loans guaranteed or insured by the Veterans' Administration.
IX. Out-patient medical treatment.
X. Out-patient dental treatment.
XI. Prosthetic appliances.
XII. Hospitalization.
XIII. Domiciliary care.
XIV. Seeing-eye dogs, electronic and mechanical equipment for the blind.
XV. Automobiles or other conveyances. (Those who lost, or lost the use of, one or both legs, result of war service, application before July 1, 1950.)
XVI. Special housing.
XVII. Correction of discharges.
XVIII. Correction of military and naval records.
XIX. Review of retirement cases.
XX. Mustering-out pay.
XXI. Homestead preference.
XXII. Civil-service preference.
XXIII. Readjustment allowance for unemployment or self-employment.
XXIV. Reemployment.
XXV. Employment.
XXVI. Naturalization preferences.
XXVII. Compensation for service-connected death.
XXVIII. Pension for non-service-connected death (World War I or II).
XXIX. Pension for non-service-connected death (Spanish-American War group).
XXX. Social-security death benefits.
XXXI. Reimbursement of burial expenses.
XXXII. Burial flags.
XXXIII. Burial in national cemeteries.
XXXIV. Headstone or grave marker.
XXXV. Six months' death gratuity.
XXXVI. Educational opportunities for children of veterans.
XXXVII. Homes (institutional).
XXXVIII. Exemption from execution, garnishment, etc.
XXXIX. Loans, contracts of minors, etc.
XXXX. Medals, certificates, etc.
XLI. Meeting places, memorials, etc., veterans' organization.
XLII. Pensions.
XLIII. Tax and license fee exemptions.
XLIV. Guaranteed loans to widows of veterans, and widows of veterans of World War II, either in service or of service-connected disability (Public Law 475, housing, moderate-income families, 81st Cong.).

Esperanto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include a series of three articles which appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel on May 30, 31, and June 1, 1950, in the column entitled "Jaunts With Jamie," pertaining to Esperanto, the international language.

For many years linguists of various nations have expended their efforts to devise and establish an international recognition of a common, universal language, which would further the cause of universal understanding. From among these international languages, Esperanto alone remained and is acquiring wider recognition each year.

At present, Milwaukee is the headquarters for this international language in the United States, where the activities of its proponents are ably directed and stimulated by Prof. Stanley A. Klukowski. The Universal Esperanto Association has representatives in every civilized corner of the world, and its object is to obtain universal acceptance of the language. Periodicals and reviews are printed in that language, and it is constantly being used by teachers, stamp and coin collectors, and scores of other groups with international interests.

The following articles ably explain the background, the objectives, and the advantages of Esperanto, and I would therefore like to call them to the attention of my honorable colleagues:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel of May 30, 1950]

MILWAUKEE AND ESPERANTO

Well sir, it's amazing what goes on in Milwaukee. For example: Our city is the Esperanto center of the United States. Located here is the Interlanguage Foundation and the Usona Revuo is published here, a monthly magazine in Esperanto with world-wide circulation.

As schoolboys we had to learn among other facts we quickly forgot, that Esperanto was the result of a Russian's efforts to create an international language. But I thought it was as dead as peewee golf or an old love.

Such is far from the truth as Prof. Stanley A. Klukowski will tell you if you give him half a chance. Klukowski is the sparkplug of Esperanto in Wisconsin and I suspect in America, for that matter.

He introduced and taught Esperanto for 2 years at Beloit College, where it is now an

accredited course. At present he is instructing teachers who will later conduct courses in Esperanto at Catholic high schools and colleges.

GIVE A LISTEN

Now you may not be any more interested in Esperanto than I was when I called at the professor's home, 3233 South Springfield Street, but hang on and I'll tell you an astonishing story.

Klukowski is a barrel-chested man of medium height. His receding hair and horn-rimmed glasses give him the appearance of the scholar that he is. He is volatile, excitable, and even pugnacious on the subject of Esperanto.

He had the stage all set for me. A table was covered with Esperanto books, pamphlets, brochures, posters, and even stamps. There were scores of letters from all over the world written in Esperanto.

I wasn't too impressed. Besides, I had a chip on my shoulder. "What's wrong with English as an international language?" I demanded.

"Which English do you mean?" he said with disarming calmness.

WHAT IS ENGLISH?

He had me. I just looked dumb and he went on, "The King's English, American English, or Old English? Even the Linguaphone people have courses in two kinds of English. Then, of course, there are the regional dialects. England has more than we do.

"The thing that's wrong with English," he continued, raising his voice a little, "is the same thing that's wrong with every other national language. In English grammar the rules and the exceptions total 654. Twenty-two hundred in French and from 300 to 1,000 in other national languages.

"Esperanto is based on root words. There are only 16 grammatical rules and no exceptions. The entire grammar can be mastered in 2 hours. Leo Tolstoy (War and Peace and Anna Karenina) learned it in 1 hour." As they say in radio, he was really punching his commercial.

"There are 158 primary words, part of which are 45 correlatives, 83 prepositions, and 37 affixes. When one learns 100 words of Esperanto he has a working vocabulary of 3,000 words. This is because of the flexibility of the suffixes and prefixes."

By now he was using his right forefinger like a dueling sword and was chasing me around the table.

"It takes only one-twentieth of the time to learn Esperanto that it does to learn a national language. It is the clearest and most exact language in existence. One word means just one thing. It is completely phonetic. One letter has one sound. Every word is written as it is spoken and pronounced as it is written.

"Here's an example of English, 'Can you open a can?' Such a duplication of sound and such a variance of meaning of words spelled the same way could never happen in Esperanto.

"Now," he said, "have I answered your question, 'What's wrong with English as an international language?'

"Indubitably, sir," I said.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel of May 31, 1950]

MORE ABOUT ESPERANTO

Prof. Stanley A. Klukowski thinks the best thing that's happening to the world is Esperanto and has little patience with anyone who is indifferent to this phenomenon.

"Do you know," he demanded, "the world has 2,796 languages to contend with? How can we hope for world understanding unless we have a common language as a means of communication.

"Esperanto is the only one of 350 attempts at an international language to survive, including basic English. Today nearly 20,000,000 people in all parts of the world speak, read, and write Esperanto."

I think we should interrupt Professor Klukowski for a moment to give you his background. He was born 54 years ago in Warsaw, Poland. At an early age he met Dr. L. Zamenhof, a Polish-Russian physician who had devised Esperanto and had adopted the pseudonym of Dr. Esperanto.

When I told Klukowski that the need for a common language in Poland must have been terrific and that within a radius of 100 miles many languages must have been spoken, he exploded.

"One hundred miles. Why in Warsaw in a single block there were Poles, Russians, Germans, Lithuanians, Jews, and others, all speaking their own language and all suspicious of each other because they had no means of communication.

"Matter of fact 'Esperanto' comes from the Latin word 'sperare' which means 'to hope.' That was what inspired Dr. Zamenhof to devise an international language—the hope of a better understanding."

HE STARTED AT 14

Klukowski learned Esperanto at the age of 14 but lost interest in it as he continued to learn national languages. He speaks Polish, German, Russian, and has a working knowledge of all Slavic languages. He apologizes for his English which he speaks beautifully, but with a slight accent, and says he never studied it.

He came to the United States to write for Polish papers and at one time contributed to 42 of them in nearly as many countries. A prolific and skillful writer in his native language, Klukowski has written seven books of prose and poetry which have received high praise. He has just completed his eighth book, now in the galley-proof stage, a 336-page textbook on Esperanto.

The professor's interest in Esperanto revived in 1937. More than ever he saw the need of an international language, and preferably a neutral language, as the basis of international understanding.

World War II increased this interest. He had three sons in the service, two in the Air Corps and one in the infantry. Two of the boys are graduates of the University of Wisconsin and the aviator, who won the Distinguished Flying Cross, is now studying for his doctor's degree at the University of Paris.

THIS IS THE PROBLEM

"Knowledge of a second language is a valuable cultural asset," declares Klukowski, "but with Esperanto it is much more than that. Dr. Bjorn Collinder, professor of Finno-Ugrian languages at the University of Upsala, Sweden, and visiting exchange professor of the universities of Indiana and Minnesota in 1947–48, says, 'If the world were not governed by as little wisdom as it is, Esperanto would already have been introduced in the schools of all lands. If one asks me how the world language problem should be solved, my answer is: It is solved already in Esperanto. The problem is only to get the solution accepted by those who are in power.' "

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel of June 1, 1950]

WHO USES ESPERANTO?

"Pope Pius XII, speaks Esperanto," says Prof. Stanley V. Klukowski, Wisconsin's leading Esperanto enthusiast, "and the Vatican radio frequently broadcasts programs in Esperanto."

Klukowski went on to give us more facts about this international language which upward of 20,000,000 people speak.

Stalin speaks Esperanto although this language has been taboo in Russia since the war. Brazil insists that its state functionaries know Esperanto and many foreign governments send out reports of international interest in this language.

Several of the continental European radio stations broadcast daily, and British stations frequently, in Esperanto. A group of foreign wireless stations known as the World Relay League uses Esperanto for testing because of its clarity and exactness of meaning. Foreign radio amateurs communicate with brother hams in neighboring countries in Esperanto.

The United Nations has issued the Declaration of Human Rights in Esperanto.

Esperantists do not claim universal use of their language will end wars, but that world peace does depend upon a better understanding and that such an understanding is only possible by using a common language—preferably a neutral language because every nation is intensely proud of its own tongue.

FRENCH BURN LINGERS

A case in point, according to Klukowski, is that French was long the language of diplomacy. When it was not used at a meeting of the League of Nations, France got mad and introduced the veto which is now plaguing the United Nations.

"This fact," says Klukowski, "gives added significance to the recent action of President Vincent Auriol, of France. He petitioned the United Nations to use Esperanto for world communication."

The Universal Esperanto Association has representatives in every civilized corner of the world. Its object is, of course, to get universal acceptance of the language. More than 100 Esperanto periodicals are printed.

An international medical review is published in Esperanto. Stamp and coin collectors make use of this language as means of communication as do teachers and scores of other groups with international interests. Each Boy Scout who learns Esperanto receives a merit badge.

Among the religious groups interested in Esperanto are: The Christian International League, International Catholic Association, and the Esperanto Quakers' Association.

Business firms are invading foreign markets with Esperanto. Among them are Dutch, Scandinavian, and British airlines, summer and health resorts. Klukowski showed me elaborately colored brochures and one-sheet posters printed in Esperanto.

WE'RE BEHIND

"Only the United States lags," he said sadly. "Forty-five years ago the State of Maryland included Esperanto in its schools, but not much was done about it."

"Three years ago," he continued, "West Virginia attempted to attract foreign tourists to the State by publishing a guide book in Esperanto. But it was a mimeographed affair and a feeble attempt alongside the beautiful printing jobs the Europeans and South Americans are doing."

Klukowski showed me some of the classics which have been translated into Esperanto—Dickens, Goethe, Papini, Shakespeare.

"Don't they lose some of their beauty in the translating?" I asked.

"No," he replied, "they become even more beautiful. In Esperanto you can express every shade of thought and meaning in exact words. You do not have to do it by inference."

Then he showed me a Bible printed in Esperanto. He turned to Genesis 11: 1 and translated the verse, "Upon the entire earth there was one language and one tongue."

Foreign Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to have printed in the RECORD some observations and recommendations that Mr. O. M. Strackbein made in a communication to Hon. Gordon Gray dealing with foreign trade. Mr. Strackbein is an authority on this subject and represents many persons who are vitally interested in some phases of foreign trade:

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS PRESENTED TO HON. GORDON GRAY, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT, BY THE NATIONAL LABOR-MANAGEMENT COUNCIL ON FOREIGN-TRADE POLICY, JUNE 19, 1950

We understand that your mission as special assistant to the President includes the shaping of our foreign-trade policy, especially as it is influenced by the continuing dollar gap and the coming expiration of the congressional grant of aid to the European countries under the Marshall plan in 1952.

Our interest in the character of this policy is direct and vital. The conditions under which competitive imports are admitted into this country are of the utmost importance to us. We wish to place special emphasis upon the conditions under which importation of competitive goods takes place.

These conditions can determine whether imports will be helpful to our economy, indifferent, or injurious; whether they can be absorbed by the market with a minimum of disruption or whether they will break the price structure, depress wages, curtail employment, and lead to stagnation and retrenchment of industry by throwing cold water on investment and expansion plans.

Obsession with the idea of removing the dollar gap and overeagerness to balance our foreign trade account by the simple device of increasing imports can endanger millions of jobs in this country and reduce the flow of money into job-producing investments to the point of wrecking the possibility of an orderly expanding economy.

On the other hand, imports need not be restricted, much less reduced, in order to avoid the potential injury which we call to your attention.

This will become clear if we inquire into and analyze the manner in which foreign competition makes itself felt.

If the imported goods are noncompetitive but complementary to our economy they are of no concern to us so long as they remain in that category. Some 65 percent of our imports are and long have been of that character and they are free of duty.

Therefore we are concerned only with 35 to 40 percent of our imports. In the remainder we practice free trade.

The imports that do compete with domestic products are not all on the same competitive footing. Many imports, after payment of duty, enjoy a distinct price advantage in this market; others do not, but succeed in attracting consumers at higher prices than those offered by domestic producers. These are foreign goods that have a special prestige value. Quality wines, perfumes, and some shoes are of this character. However, these do not represent large volume imports and cannot be depended upon to close the dollar gap. Lowering of the prices on such goods would probably damage their prestige and shrink their sales.

Consequently we are concerned principally with the goods that enjoy a distinct competitive price advantage in this market. These are the goods that compete with a wide miscellany of domestic industries ranging from small to medium in size. The foreign competitive advantage in such instances resides almost altogether in the lower wages prevailing in other countries in comparison with the United States.

They are not, on the other hand, the goods that are mass-produced in this country. In such goods we have generally succeeded in out-producing other countries. Our higher wage rates are offset by our higher productivity and the combination leads to relatively low unit costs.

Why do we, both labor and management, fear foreign competition that is based principally on a price advantage?

The answer should be obvious. Labor fears the wage competition. This is better understood when labor's concern over the damaging competitive effects of sweatshop wages in our own country is recalled. Labor knows that employers who pay fair wages are at a competitive disadvantage if they must sell in the same market in competition with goods that enjoy a price advantage derived from lower wages. It knows that the higher wage levels are menaced by the lower rates; that the employers who pay the higher rates will be under severe competitive pressure to lower their wages and that in any event wage increases under the circumstances are out of the question. Recognition of these facts led to the enactment of national minimum-wage legislation.

Industry's ownership and management fear such imports because of the pressure they exert upon the price level and because of the difficulty of measuring the domestic market for their own goods under the circumstances. If the affected industries were monopolistic in character, the foreign competition might be looked upon as a distinct favor to the consumer. However, the industries that are faced with foreign competition are not the concentrated, gigantic industries that thrive on mass production. They are the smaller industries in which competition is keen and the number of companies in operation quite high.

Fear of competitive imports as destroyers of the price structure is most justified in a buyer's market. In a seller's market, such as ruled in the postwar era to varying degrees in this country, fear of low-priced competition is without foundation, except as a precautionary view of the future.

In a buyer's market the threat or actuality of low-priced foreign competition disrupts the market and disturbs wages and employment (1) because the potential supply of the goods available for shipment at low prices is not known; or (2) because a large volume is known or thought to be available.

Under such circumstances the wholesale domestic buyers who deal in both domestic and imported products hold the whip hand over the domestic producers. When these wholesale buyers send their buying agents overseas, the domestic producers are seized with uncertainty and fear. They may be wholly in the dark about the transactions of these roving buyers and the degree of their success in finding suitably low-priced supplies. Meantime, the domestic wholesalers can play on the fears of the domestic producers and extract price concessions from them.

What happens to domestic production under such circumstances? The production planning department receives the depressing news from the sales estimating department, and trims the production schedules accordingly.

At this point labor feels the impact. Not so many hands are needed to produce the reduced output. In time the domestic producer, in order to obtain some business, begins to trim his prices. Now he has less production at lower prices and this reduces the money return out of which wages are paid and profits realized.

As he reduces his prices he may soon learn that his foreign competition can still underbid him. It is then that he calls for increased tariff protection. The seller's market is now a receding memory. The future looks exceedingly dark in view of the fast-developing foreign competition. This has not yet been fully tested but is destined to grow more intense.

If the domestic producer now finds that his Government as a matter of policy seeks to increase imports by lowering the remaining protection, he is faced with a most difficult question. He must balance the possibility of shrinking sales at lower prices and possible bankruptcy against the hopes of liquidating in time to save a part of his assets. His other hope is that his Government will institute such conditions of importation as will assure him competitive parity in the domestic market or limit the imports to a predetermined percentage of domestic consumption.

In some cases, as where imports come from countries of widely different competitive levels, a single rate of duty will not create competitive parity. A rate that would be appropriate to the imports from countries of relatively high labor standards would be too low to offer protection against low-standard countries, while rates that would be high enough against the latter would be excessive against the former.

Under such circumstances quota limitations, based upon a previous representative period of imports and provided with reasonable elasticity to accommodate changes in production, would remedy the deficiency of the tariff and at the same time remove the disruptive features of low-priced competitive imports described above. If the quantity disposable for shipment to this country were known in advance, the fears of domestic producers could be allayed. They could plan production with greater confidence and proceed with such expansion and other plans as they might have, without distraction from the unknown impact of imports.

Quite certainly many industries would be glad to accept a greater volume of competitive imports than those presently flowing in if they had the assurance that the quantity would in any case not exceed a fixed limit.

Quota limitations would not be suitable to all products. In some instances the administrative burden would be excessive. Where the tariff is not deficient in the manner described above and where it can be adjusted to create competitive parity between imports and domestic products in our home market, the tariff need not be supplemented by quotas.

Quotas should not be condemned in principle merely because they may be used as highly restrictive devices against trade. We hope that in advising the President you will find it desirable to lift the broad condemnation of quotas as expressed by the Department of State. The dogmatic rejection of all quotas because some quotas are undesirable has no place in foreign trade administration.

Closely related to the foregoing is the general lack of detailed knowledge of foreign production that has characterized the tariff-reduction program since its beginning.

This deficiency has led to tariff reductions by a procedure that cannot be characterized much higher than rule-of-thumb. There has been wholly inadequate information on exactly those competitive factors that most perturb and disturb domestic producers. Only fragmentary data are on hand on foreign enterprises that produce for export to this market. Too little is known of the equipment and machinery, its character in

terms of productivity and obsolescence or its embodiment of modern technology. Not enough is known of the potential output for export. The extent of modern installations and to what degree they will lead to still lower costs; wage rates in particular industries and relative productivity of labor compared with our own—these and similar factors that determine competitive potentials are too much in the dark.

One reason for this deficiency of information lies in the instructions under which our foreign commercial representatives, i. e., commercial attachés, trade commissioners, and consuls, operate. They have been keyed to determine and report on the market, actual and potential, for American products abroad, and on market trends and development. Fuller and more complete types of reports are being rendered but not so systematically that they can be relied upon. The lack of data for proper tariff-adjustment procedures is therefore very pronounced.

We have overseas many hundred of commercial, labor, and agricultural attachés, trade commissioners, and consuls. Under appropriate instructions their reports could produce much information of the kind that is now lacking.

We hope that you as adviser to the President on foreign trade will call to his attention the deficiency of which we complain and urge that a remedy be instituted through a revision of departmental instructions to Foreign Service personnel.

Unquestionably the European phase of the dollar gap is not the limit of your commission. The Japanese phase should be coordinated with the European since only mischief can come from consideration of the one without the other. An impressive number of the import items from Japan are competitive with those from Europe. If the West or the East seeks to preempt our market, through failure of coordination, great embarrassment may follow. The United States is only one market. Its absorptive capacity is not unlimited.

We strongly urge that you set in motion the much-needed coordination of the ECA dollar-gap plans with those of the supreme command of the Allied Powers for the rehabilitation and recovery of Japan.

O. R. STRACKBEIN,
Chairman.

Education in Its Full Meaning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the appendix of the RECORD, I include a commencement address made to the graduating class of the Riverhead School at a banquet tendered to them by the alumni on Saturday, June 24, 1950, at Riverhead, Long Island, N. Y.:

One of the penalties of inviting a speaker to speak is not alone does he accept, but more often than not chooses his own subject, and even though he is given an assigned topic, either by design, some vagary or quaint conceit, he invariably talks on the subject nearest his heart.

Thus if I were committed to talk on either cannibals or that strange modern musical manifestation known as "be-bop," I would doubtlessly by comparison and allusion wind us by talking about government. I might remark, for example, that both cannibals and politicians observe ancient and locally acceptable formulas for destroying and assimilating their honorable enemies. Or if I discussed be-bop—that is if I know what be-bop is—and I think it is that jumping jangle that is so very unlike traditional wistles-able things made of octaves and notes with flats and sharps and semi-quavers and piannissimos—I might remark: That the old barber-shop-chord type of government in which the legislative, executive, and judicial departments made a quartet with the electorate singing bass, is being drowned out by the random dischords of be-bop bands comprised of noisy pressure groups.

And now, having warned you and shown you how my mind is really tethered in the field of government, I might say I was not assigned a subject this evening. I have, however, carefully chosen one sufficiently broad to permit me to range the span from the departure of Adam and Eve from the garden to the very day of the graduation of those honored here tonight by the alumni. My subject is education.

The emphasis in religious training has long been laid on morality but if mankind is to continue to make this agony of evolution worth while, secular education as well must be trended to make all other things secondary collaterals to a sense of values.

Education began, the Old Testament tells us, with the bestowal of a latent knowledge of good and evil. Education, I think, is the process by which this perception is heightened; the medium through which recognition must come, and in its final analysis, education is no more. Beyond that point conduct controls. Beyond that point integrity and restraint must take over and give practicing proof that lessons learned have been integrated into that rare amalgam of instinct, awareness, and intelligence we know as judgment.

Education, you may protest, is more than a knowledge of good and evil. And having so recently passed a series of examinations unpopularly known as regents—and incidentally, I personally did not prepare a single one of them and plead innocent, regent though I be—having recently passed these exams so full of exact figures and unalterable facts, I know exactly what you mean. But these things—the long history lessons, the syntax, the nicety of tenses, the complicated formulas that may lay the ground work on which one here may climb up in nuclear physics to evolve a formula that would make the atom bomb as much a relic as the crossbow—these so-called subjects are instrumentalities, mere workmen's things out of education's tool box, like the slide rule or the crucible, or that good friend, the eraser.

Erudition, as I see it, is a mere byproduct of education. Our technical know-how, world-astonishing as it is, is also a byproduct. That which we are seeking to develop is a mature individual. When we have done that, the educator's job has been done. Perhaps I should say it will have been done when we can mentor individuals into responding maturity, for we cannot examine our collective conscience today without being appalled by our universal shortcomings. There are times we all know the mood of depression, lightened with puzzled hope, which prompted Goethe to write his friend Zelter that it was "hard to understand how a man could endure the world for 40 years when he had seen its absurdity even in his youth. A part of the riddle seems to be answered by the fact that each one of us has something of his very own which he hopes to develop by letting it exercise itself."

"This curious element in our being," as Goethe goes on to describe it, is the only thing that makes it worth while to even attempt the onerous process of educating.

It is this basic urge that concerns itself with good and evil, or with right and wrong as we term good and evil when they interfere with man's established custom or recognized privilege. This basic urge encompasses our sole hope for advance. Within us there lies so great and awe-inspiring a potential for development, that it seems to me unless we foster and further it, there is little point in multiplying in perpetuity. We might as well be fossilized immediately like pre-Neolithic flies in the amber of time and be considered in eons to become anthropological curiosities by some new and different specie that will take over this globe now allotted to us as our share of the universe.

We dare not continue to constrict our spiritual growth. The comprehensiveness of the need for perfecting it is patent; the manner of perfecting it is anything but comprehensive. It narrows to the individual as does birth itself, and like birth it is tortuous and slow. The first requirement of the newborn that is to continue to live on, is hunger—hunger for air and sustenance. Without that innate hunger, death follows fast. And so it is with the true objective of education. Unless we do that which the Bible urges—"hunger and thirst after righteousness"—all our amassing of encyclopedic lore will avail us little.

This is the first elemental of our quest, and fundamental in it is the need for discrimination. If we were truly discriminating, if intelligently and fastidiously we chose the best each time we had a choice, there would be no need for talk of antidiscrimination. True discrimination would preclude intolerance.

True discrimination by the populace would prove the importance of the individual, clarify his rights and assure their continuance. True discrimination would fix upon the mode of government under which these rights would be protected, for in the ultimate analysis, this is the sole function of government.

Since the capacity of man for understanding, like everything else in this most delightfully variable of worlds, runs not merely in small arcs but great parabolas, there will never come a simultaneous meeting of all minds, and thus opinion will line up in majorities and minorities. The rabid concern proponents of good government exercise for the rights of the minority, and the very willingness of the majority in America, at least, to recognize and project those rights, is admission of the fact that the majority is not always so sure that in having the greater part of the mass with it, it has the best of the mass.

To quote Goethe again, he said, "Everything that is great and wise, is confined to a minority. It is unthinkable that wisdom ever be popular. Passion and prejudices may be, but reason will always be the possession of the excellent few." While I am not wholly concurrent with him and look hopefully to education to narrow the divergence of views, as a worker in public affairs I come more and more to realize the popular is not always the good, propaganda to the contrary.

We have gone a long way into civilization, far enough to realize by reviewing history that we in America have as fine a framework for life and growth as any nation has ever devised.

It is of the utmost importance to the future of the world that we understand this in all its rounded significance. So long as we do thoroughly understand it here in America, we will not be attracted to foreign isms that are at best pseudo-political since they wish only to use government as a force to distribute property and power and enforce manners and modes. We have a form of government that warrants preserving, and if we are educated to the point where we can truly evaluate it, we will not permit it

to be destroyed or jeopardize it by theoretical forays into ideological back yards.

Not too long ago I chanced on The Life of General Francis Marion, the Revolutionary hero known as the Swamp Fox as written by Horry and Weems, and found therein a paragraph or two I thought aptly contemporaneous. In speaking of the Minute Men, General Marion, the Carolinian, attributes their courage in a day when education was dearly bought, to the free schools of Massachusetts. "To a man they have been taught to read; to a man they have been instructed to know, and dearer than life to prize, the blessings of freedom."

Marion goes on, "In short, my dear sir," he says, "men will always fight for their government, according to their sense of its value. To value it aright, they must understand it. This they cannot do without education * * * and the more perfect the government, the greater the duty to make it well known. Selfish and oppressive governments, indeed, as Christ observes, must hate the light, and fear to come to it, because their deeds are evil.' But a fair and cheap government like our republic, 'longs for the light, and rejoices to come to the light, that it may be manifested to be from God,' and well worth all the vigilance and valor that an enlightened nation can rally for its defense.

"And, God knows, a good government can hardly ever be half anxious enough to give its citizens a thorough knowledge of its own excellencies." Marion goes on, "For as some of the most valuable truths, for lack of careful promulgation, have been lost; so the best government on earth, if not duly known and prized, may be subverted.

"Ambitious demagogues will rise, and the people through ignorance, and love of change, will follow them. Vast armies will be formed, and bloody battles fought. And after desolating their country with all the horrors of civil war, the guilty survivors will have to bend their necks to the iron yokes of some stern usurper, and like beasts of burden, to drag, unpitied, those galling chains which they have riveted upon themselves forever."

These words of Marion's seem stirring to me. There is a quality of civic excitement about them that activated so many Revolutionary patriots, and this, coupled with his desire to let the people know prompted me to read them to you.

Today on all sides there is great hue and cry for an informed public opinion. This is an estimable objective, but information alone is not enough. Hitler possessed all sorts of information but he lacked high purpose. His evil animus subverted information to wicked use. Knowledge without a sense of values is worthless, or so I believe, and if you who are now about to go forth in the world to other schools or to take up your places in this workaday world, will do me the honor of weighing my words, I shall be as gratified as I am pleased at the privilege that has been mine in wishing you well and addressing you and Riverhead's earlier graduates here tonight.

Forgotten Men in Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article by Holman Harvey entitled "Forgotten Men in Our Veterans' Hospitals," appearing in the May 1950 issue of the Reader's Digest. Our disabled veterans who are patients in veterans' hospitals need more than the medical care the Government gives them. They need the healing that only family love and attention can provide. I invite the reading of this article not only by all Members of this body, but by all Americans.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORGOTTEN MEN IN OUR VETERANS' HOSPITALS[1]

(By Holman Harvey)

Tens of thousands of men, heroes of our wars, are lying today on the white cots of veterans' hospitals all over this land, shamefully deserted by their families.

On a tour of Veterans' Administration hospitals, I sat by the bedsides of scores of these forgotten men. I talked with indignant doctors, nurses, and hospital chaplains who know the story. I checked the official visitors' lists where the appalling neglect is a matter of record for anyone to read.

Lying in a VA hospital in the South is a broken young son of our country who was decorated for extraordinary heroism at Anzio beachhead. He collapsed from exposure and was invalided home with tuberculosis. His fiancée phoned once, but never came to see him. Of his three brothers and three sisters and their wives and husbands, eight live within 30 miles of the hospital, four within 60 miles. Not one has ever visited him during the 6 years of his illness. Would it interest his former fiancée and his deserting family to hear that Lieutenant Corridan is winning his fight against tuberculosis—and neglect?

Other soldiers can't take the neglect so well. Pfc Joe Haisen kept telephoning his absent family, without result. Recently he turned over quietly on his cot and died. I have the story from his roommate: "Joe didn't care any more what happened to him. He had a wife and three kids, and two brothers. They never came to see him. Not once. He lay there brooding over them for months on end. On the last day, he raised up and said, 'What the hell, Artie, am I such a bad guy?' Everybody here liked Joe. He could have got out of here, in time. How can a fellow's own family do this to him?"

"Butch" Anders, a noncom with the United States Ninth Army at the Rhine, was shot up, as he says, "to hell and gone." Three married brothers and an only sister, his sole remaining relatives, have not been near him since he came home on a stretcher 6 years ago. "How do you feel about it, Sergeant?" "Pal, they've got their own lives to live, haven't they? Who's kicking?" (The hospital record: "Patient acutely despondent.")

When visitors are expected at VA hospitals, the patients who are able to walk gather restlessly at the windows. They stand and watch the road, following each bus and car as it arrives. It is a rending sight to see.

Later, at some of the beds, there will be warmth and gay chatting. Other men in the ward lie and look on for a while, then turn over to wonder where their families are today. Some turn over to cry.

The most neglected of all veterans are the 51,000 men still in VA neuropsychiatric hospitals. Forty percent at one hospital had had no visit from a family member or friend for over a year. Many were even less fortunate.

In these VA mental hospitals are many finely gifted men who broke under the shocks of war. Among them is Edward Clarkton, a casualty of World War I. He was a graduate of one of the great European art schools, and today the walls of his midwestern hospital are embellished with scores of magnificent murals which he has executed over the years of his illness. He is a man of courtly and delightful demeanor. One loyal sister visits him twice a year. Three married brothers and another sister never come. "Why certainly," he said, "I should like to see them again. I often think of my boyhood when we were all together, and I wonder what they are doing now—but I simply don't hear."

Seven relatives of Corp. Jack Craine have not visited him in 5 years, although living only 40 miles away. Jack is a grade-A hero of Patton's Third Army, with many decorations. Since shrapnel got Jack he has been staging a comeback in an NP hospital—without family help. "The boys really get a kick out of having visitors," he said. "But I can't expect my folks to come 40 miles each way, can I now?"

In another hospital Carter Macklin kept writing to 11 brothers and sisters without ever getting an answer, until he decided he'd just stop breaking "my" arm over them. Carter will be discharged soon. His wounds are healed, but he will carry another scar—inflicted by his own blood kin.

In a New England TB hospital I talked with five young women. Very gay, they crowded into the small room in pajamas and dressing gowns—an Army nurse, a marine girl, and three wacs. Four of them had come back from overseas expecting to be married. "Our boy friends were the first to drop away," they said. "They don't even write us any more. Well it's better to find out now than later." All five are due to recover.

Fear of visiting a TB hospital is widespread. For those who wish to see a relative or friend, here are the facts:

All entrance halls, reception rooms and corridors are continuously charged with powerful germicidal solutions. Into these public spaces, no patient is allowed unless tested negative. Each has undergone a rigid course in personal hygiene. None will offer to shake your hand, none will approach within 2 yards of you. VA physicians agree that the chance of contagion under these highly controlled conditions is less than is encountered daily in public conveyances.

Many families have a genuine fear of visiting a neuropsychiatric hospital. It is a survival of the old dread of madhouses. For their benefit, here are the facts, confirmed by official statement and this writer's personal investigation:

A small minority of patients are violent, but only for limited periods of 'active" distress. They are segregated in locked wards. But the great majority of NP patients are mild. To their open wards and visiting rooms no violent patient has access. Among them you will often find a gentleness of manner seldom met with in the outside world. Many are in pathetic need of family affection.

Families may be encouraged to know that scores of Smith College girls volunteer to attend the regular NP patients' dances at Northampton, Mass. No unpleasant experience has ever resulted.

Perhaps the most unforgivable neglect is on the part of families who regard it as a "family stain" to have a member in an NP hospital. Since visiting might disclose the fact, they stay discreetly away. Well, one of President Truman's top advisers has a son in a VA mental hospital, and visits him at every opportunity. Only petty people could feel otherwise.

The neglect of the older men in VA hospitals is wounding to witness. There is a

[1] Although the cases here disclosed are based on first-hand data, names and minor details have been altered to protect the anonymity of men who contributed information in confidence in the belief that other veterans might benefit.

World War I man, now 54, who fell in the Battle of the Marne. He staked his son to a higher education. The son is today a professor of mathematics at a distinguished university. In the past 7 years, he has neither visited nor written his father.

A 71-year-old veteran of the Spanish-American war has a son who is today a successful businessman, and a married daughter. Both are within easy driving distance of his hospital. His daughter visited him once 13 years ago. His son has never come. Out of kindness, the hospital authorities have led him to believe that his children have returned to Ireland, his birthplace.

Twenty-four years ago another World War I soldier who fought with the Three Hundred and First Engineers in France received his last note from his family. No Christmas presents ever arrive. A Navy yeoman, now 48, has lived 21 years without a visit from two sisters who live in the same Western State. A 53-year-old veteran of the Three Hundred and Fourth Cavalry has an only brother who has not been near him in 12 years.

But there are heart-warming contrasts. One wounded vet is visited at least once a week by his wife, children, niece, or friends. A bartender at Holyoke, Mass., comes with his wife twice weekly, like clockwork, to visit his son at the Northampton hospital. They bring him delicacies and reading matter, and take him on outings. "These visits," said the mother, "mean more to me than anything I do, or could do." A devoted sister makes the long trip from Kansas to Northampton every 6 months. And for 7 years an aged mother traveled by bus 150 miles, twice a month, to visit her son.

Furthermore, 36 national organizations (Veterans' Administration Voluntary Services) carry on year-round programs. They shop for bedfast men, deliver personal messages, write letters. The Gray Ladies of the Red Cross stage surprise bedside parties on birthdays of thousands of neglected vets. Thousands of American men who live near VA hospitals all over the country have volunteered, through the VAVS, to devote an evening or two every month to visiting patients. They play games with them or read to them; many have made lasting friendships. Anyone who wishes to help may do so by applying to any VAVS organization. The Veterans' Administration in Washington will gladly supply information.

But volunteer generosity cannot take the place of family love. On this coming Memorial Day, when the Nation will honor its soldier dead, may deserting families suffer a change of heart and resolve that their living relatives no longer shall be numbered among the forgotten men in VA hospitals.

A Letter to Congress From the American Public Power Association—President Finley Discusses Issues in Public-Private Power Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of a letter that was sent by S. R. Finley, president of the American Public Power Association, to the Members of Congress. In this letter he discusses some of the basic issues in the public-private power controversy:

A LETTER TO CONGRESS FROM APPA—PRESIDENT FINLEY DISCUSSES ISSUES IN PUBLIC-PRIVATE POWER CONTROVERSY

In these days of national nervousness about public questions, upon which there are divergent views, it is heartening to observe the growing sentiment among Members of the Congress to make a determined effort to end the controversy concerning publicly generated and privately owned electric power. The desire to end this controversy is shared by the American Public Power Association, which includes in its coverage over 700 publicly owned power operations in 32 States. However, we feel, just as we are certain that every Member of the Congress does, that the basis for settlement of this question should not sacrifice long standing principles of public policy established to protect the public interest. I refer to the preferential rights to federally generated power given by law to public and nonprofit bodies, a policy reiterated time and again by congressional act and which is now under attack.

To many Members of the Congress, it has been very cleverly made to appear by representatives of private electric utilities that the contract between the Southwestern Power Administration and the Texas Power & Light Co., made some 20 months ago, was a pattern which should be adopted in future contracts for the wheeling and disposition of federally generated electricity. Based upon this contention, an attempt has been made to establish as a fact that the proposed power contract between two Oklahoma private utilities and the Southwestern Power Administration, is not being approved by the Secretary of Interior because the Government wants to build transmission lines with the idea of eventually taking over the operations of privately owned electric utilities. In furtherance of this erroneous conclusion, additional statements have been made that those concerned with protecting the public interest and with the administering of public power want to nationalize the entire private electric utility industry, and from there, to take an additional step which would include the nationalization of all basic industries.

This would be an alarming picture if it were true. However, it is very far from the actual facts concerning the situation. In the first place, the Texas Power & Light Co.-Southwestern Power Administration contract was by no means the first wheeling or interchange contract for the handling of federally generated power. Additionally, it is not the last contract which has been made. Also, it has in it, some provisions that many feel do not preserve the public interest as to the preferential right to federally generated power, long ago set out as a policy of the Congress to be given to public and nonprofit bodies.

There are many "wheeling," or interchange power contracts in existence between public and private agencies. Three important ones have been made since this so-called Texas contract. I refer to the Bonneville Power Administration-Montana contract, and the two contracts between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Otter Tail Power Co. and the Northwest Public Service Co. None of these three "wheeling" contracts, nor others in existence prior to the execution of the Texas contract, challenge or destroy the preference given to municipal and cooperatively owned power systems to purchase federally generated power. They protect the public interest and continue the established policy of the Congress, which is not provided for in the Texas contract, nor made a part and provided for in the proposed Oklahoma contract.

The real intent and purpose behind the Oklahoma contract insisted upon by the private utilities, now being held up by Secretary Chapman, and quite properly so, is to destroy by precedent the preference that the Congress has given in the purchase of federally generated power and to work toward the destruction of this important policy. All subterfuge by the privately owned utilities in this connection has been discarded. They have come out in the open attacking this preference clause and advocacy of this action was promoted by the Edison Electric Institute, and by Kinsey M. Robinson, president of the Washington Water Power Co. in a speech before the United States Chamber of Commerce on May 2, 1950. There is no mistake as to the intention in this respect.

Our association, after careful study and much discussion, has issued a statement as to its views on Federal power policy and made recommendations on the generation, transmission, and sale of Federal electric power. These have been incorporated in the enclosed pamphlet which states our considered views upon this important question. Expressed very simply, our association's position is, that if those owning transmission lines, with excess capacity in such lines, will not agree to a simple lease of this capacity, for the purpose of carrying federally generated power to those having preferential access to this power (sec. 5, Flood Control Act of 1944), then the Government should construct such lines as may be necessary to give full force and effect to these preferences. The important point is that this preferential right, so much in the public interest, should be preserved and not bargained off as a basis for transmitting the power. We do not advocate forcing those owning tranmission lines to become carriers of federally generated power if they are unwilling to do so. However, we do not agree that such unwillingness should prevent access to federally generated power by those having a preferential right to it, and be a means of destroying this important policy.

The American Public Power Association does not advocate the nationalization of the private electric utility industry. The charge that those of us administering public power projects are part of a scheme to nationalize this industry, and to eventually socialize other important industries, is utterly without truth and foundation in fact. In a recently published booklet, Government by Authorities, the United States Chamber of Commerce holds up the specter of complete socialization of our economy at the source as the motive of those who believe Government regional authorities can best develop and preserve our natural resources. This conclusion is likewise incorrect, unfair, and a figment of some zealot's imagination.

In common with many Members of the Congress, our association is very much in favor of a settlement of this continuing controversy between so-called public and private power views. However, we do not believe that a settlement should be bought at the expense of the rate payers, and by bargaining away for it the preference rights to federally generated power, which have long been established by congressional act and policy, and which are so clearly in the public interest.

A Tribute to Miss Helen Dalgleish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, during my recent visit at home, I had the distinct honor and pleasure to participate

in a unique Memorial Day ceremony, which was held at the Eugene Field School of Milwaukee, Wis.

Amidst the children of the school, their principal, teachers, parents, and friends, there stood a figure of a gray-haired lady, who, long ago, had initiated the Memorial Day program at the Eugene Field School and who was completing this year a half century of unselfish and devoted work in the field of teaching.

As the ceremonies honoring our departed dead came to an end, the children and everyone else assembled turned to pay special tribute to the gray-haired lady—their own Miss Helen Dalgleish, who devoted her life and all her efforts to the task of instilling in the hearts of her pupils the priceless virtues of humanity and patriotism, and gave the children the knowledge and the understanding of the world in which they were growing up.

Miss Helen Dalgleish began her teaching career in 1900 at the Morgandale primary school in Milwaukee, and in 1904 came to the Eugene Field School where, for 4½ decades, she molded the characters of the prospective citizens of our community. Her accomplishments can never be measured, nor ever adequately rewarded.

On this golden anniversary of her work, I wish to join the legion of her pupils, present and former, their grateful parents, and her many friends, paying tribute to Miss Helen Dalgleish.

Mr. Speaker, in further testimonial to this exceptional teacher, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech delivered at the Eugene Field School by Milton Potter, former Superintendent of Milwaukee Public Schools, who himself has contributed many years of unselfish efforts in the field of education. I believe that his remarks concerning the important work of our teachers, who, I may add, have not, and are not, adequately rewarded, merit the attention of the Members of Congress.

Mr. Principal and devoted faculty of the school named for the great lover of childhood, in St. John's gospel, chapter 12 verse 24 the Master says something like this: "Verily, verily I say unto you, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground, it abideth alone, but if it be buried it bringeth forth much fruit".

On my father's farm Memorial Day tasks included the bringing down from the attic the previous field corn which we had carefully selected in October from the very choicest of the crop. In the spring we buried it because of its excellence, that come fall again its abundant fruit might gladden the heart.

This Memorial Day is no season of sadness. The choicest of Miss Dalgleish's heroic young dreamers have laid down their lives for you citizens of tomorrow. You rightly throng this playground to honor them whose bodies are buried on foreign shores or in Milwaukee cemeteries. God rest their souls.

Furthermore you crowd this Eugene Field School yard to honor Helen Dalgleish who started these services so long ago. That seventh child of a large Milwaukee family began flower gardening as a tiny tot of six. Her father was a florist—a flower lover with a green thumb. Her heritage makes for sobriety, conceived in all things, thrift and the constant care of children—an embodiment of religious faith unselfish and serene.

For 50 fabulous years her garden of rosy childhood has paused with her each morning for a quiet moment when children and teacher joined in silent prayer for inspiration for the day.

Now at her retirement we sincerely hail her personally as a most precious corn of wheat, basically a teacher, modest, quiet, happy, and effective without desire to impress or to seek for glory.

She has been buried in her educational duties throughout the half century. Methods and modes came and went; she maintained her belief in herself, the teacher, in human values, in the soundness of each child's growth in a happy industrious atmosphere. She was not easily swayed by new and untried doctrines. She weighed and evaluated each in the light of experience and in heartfelt understanding of the capabilities of each of her young charges.

No one ever came between her and the children in her classroom. They were ever young together, still are, and always will be. She established the habit of happiness in diligent work and justful striving each for his own best. Day by day she built into them the best of habits and attitudes, ideals of sincerity and industry, helpfulness and eternal gratitude for our young war heroes. As men and women her great family of former pupils carry with them her good counsel, her deep understanding, her forgetfulness of self. She will go on through the years useful and fruitfully occupied—this splendid woman ever young as one of her colleagues said the other day, "She can't really retire, she is too young."

John S. Service Too Gullible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an item appearing in the Washington Evening Star of June 24, 1950, written by Constantine Brown, Washington's able and dependable news analyst. His analysis of the record of John S. Service should be read by every Member of Congress:

EVEN IF INNOCENT, JOHN S. SERVICE IS TOO GULLIBLE TO HOLD HIS JOB

(By Constantine Brown)

John S. Service, the personable Foreign Service officer, showed in his 7-hour cross-examination before the Tydings subcommittee that he is too gullible and naive to remain in any post involving security in the State Department, even if all the evidence said to exist against him fails to stand the test of the courts or is, in fact, erroneous.

Without knowing anything about Philip Jaffe, the editor of the obscure magazine Amerasia, he volunteered in 1945, according to his own testimony, to call on Jaffe and supply him with classified information.

This is without precedent in the annals of the State Department. Foreign Service officers and other employees of the State Department, as in all Government agencies, do not seek out reporters, editorial writers, or even editors and provide them with information.

The only exceptions are soreheads and persons who are on the point of being dismissed. They peddle their wares to newsmen in order to satisfy their grudges. This was not the case of Mr. Service, however, who was rising rapidly in the State Department.

Mr. Service was trapped into meeting Mr. Jaffe. He admitted under oath that he did not like that gentleman after their first meeting, because Mr. Jaffe failed to return a number of so-called personal reports which he had borrowed from Mr. Service and promised to give back the next day.

SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN HYPNOTIZED

Yet Mr. Service seems to have been hypnotized by Mr. Jaffe. Instead of saying curtly to this new acquaintance that he wanted his documents back immediately, he permitted Mr. Jaffe to carry them to New York. Moreover, he provided him with a radio monitor's report, which during the war was classified.

In nearly 40 years of reporting, this writer has never encountered an official as considerate and helpful as Mr. Service was toward Mr. Jaffe, an alleged editor who had no standing in the newspaper or magazine field.

Background material on confidential matters is available, of course, in Washington. But unless this background data is intended by higher-ups to be leaked to the press, it is given to a reporter only after officials know him intimately and trust him.

According to his own testimony, Mr. Service had never heard of Mr. Jaffe nor had he ever seen the Amerasia magazine. Yet he was gullible enough to loan Mr. Jaffe a number of classified documents—regardless of Mr. Service's own interpretation of what classification means—without taking even the routine precaution of asking security officers of the State Department who Mr. Jaffe was. If he had done so he would have learned that at the time he returned from China for reassignment the Jaffe gang already was under strict surveillance and arrests were imminent. Instead he inquired casually of Lt. Andrew Roth, who also was arrested in June 1945, whether Mr. Jaffe had any Communist affiliations. Roth replied emphatically that he had none.

STILWELL TALK CITED

In private talks with some of his colleagues at the State Department Mr. Service attributed his error of judgment to the fact that Lt. Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell, his superior, had admonished him not to sit back quietly when he got back to America but to tell as many people as possible about true conditions in China.

Why Mr. Service, who stated under oath that he did not like Mr. Jaffe, continued to see him is a matter which the Tydings committee has not been able to clear up yet. But even if Mr. Service proves his contention that he simply made an error of judgment, he would seem to be a poor security risk.

Silent, Efficient, Ever on the Alert—Men and War Craft of the Air Force Are Flying the Heavens Every Hour of the Day and Night—Nothing Has Been Left Undone To Secure the Peace and the Nation's Economy by All Who Fly the War Craft of the Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, there is far, far too much war talk in this country

today to make for a healthy outlook for world's peace either at home or abroad. We hear far too much bombast about secret weapons, atomic warheads, anti-aircraft attack guns, rockets, and guided missiles. It is generally understood in Washington that much of this talk stems from the last vestiges of service rivalries projected by them in jockeying for position and a bigger share in defense appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and, for that matter, the Congress itself are in no manner contributing to the war talk. Furthermore, the American people believe President Truman when he says, "I would rather have world peace than be the President of the United States." It is heartening to hear of and observe on every hand evidence of how completely the Honorable Louis Johnson not alone reechoes the peace sentiments expressed by our President, but gives his all in bringing about that ever-to-be desired goal.

Mr. Speaker, this talk was inspired by a article which I read in the Washington Times Herald of Monday morning, June 19. The article carrying a Berlin, June 18 Associated Press dateline, quoted Dr. Arthur L. Compton, one of the leading scientists engaged in developing the first atomic bomb as having said:

Russia's A-bombs do not present any great advantage for war within Europe itself. But, if retaliation is required from the United States, located as it is across the ocean, the atomic bomb is of great advantage—it is at present the engineer's best answer to the problem of delivering a powerful blow on a selected target at great distance.

The United States for the present is presumably better equipped with atomic weapons. * * * Their chief usefulness is in fighting an enemy far from the home base. As far as destructive effect is concerned it is cheaper to produce chemical explosives than atomic explosives. * * * The damage done by each atomic bomb used against Japan was no greater than that done by flights of several hundred airplanes dropping conventional bombs.

Mr. Speaker, what Dr. Compton said but yesterday supports the many statements that have been made here on the floor of this House in the Nation's press and over the air—that America's first line of defense is now the United States Air Force. Moreover, it supports what I have long contended; that the great weapon of defense upon which the peace and security of this Nation today depends is the United States Air Force long-range intercontinental bomber, the B–36. This machine which traveling at a speed of more than 500 miles an hour, is capable of carrying a payload of atomic bombs from bases located here in the United States across the Arctic wastes or either ocean, and after dropping their bombs at any one or all of nearly 100 strategic locations in America's one potential enemy's country, can return to their home bases practically free from detection or successful interception by enemy planes.

Mr. Speaker, let any potential enemy make even a sneak attack upon our country and we know that in a mere matter of minutes after their gas tanks are loaded, the Air Force B–36's will be rushing down their air strips, their courses set for enemy targets. In but few hours a veritable deluge of bombs will be dropping from their bowels or bombing bays that will not alone paralyze, but render ineffective and virtually pulverize all strategic locations of any nation imprudent enough to make such an attack.

Mr. Speaker, those were the defense objectives which we in this Congress sought when we established the autonomy of the United States Air Force. They were the objectives sought by the Joint Chiefs of Staff when they assigned to the Air Force, among others, the role and mission to carry out strategic bombing.

I here make public statement that every man in our Air Force, that great infant arm of our military services, from Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, USAF, to the newest airman, have earned the commendation and respect of the American people and their Representatives for the faithful way in which they discharge the great trust that we reposed in them some 18 months ago.

Silent, efficient, ever-attentive to their bounten duties, the warcraft of the United States Air Force is flying the heavens every hour of every day and night. No stone has been left unturned to develop the highest possible efficiency among its pilots, bombardiers, radio men, and the others who fly the warcraft of our Air Force.

It goes without saying that each succeeding day has not alone seen greater performance obtained from the various types of Air Force fighter, pursuit, and bombing planes, some of which have long since exceeded the speed of sound, but their protective armament against enemy action has been signally improved, while at the same time greater maneuverability, higher altitudes, improved communication facilities, and safety devices now find the aircraft of the United States Air Force unsurpassed by any other military aircraft in the world.

In his press conference in Berlin yesterday, Dr. Arthur Compton said in part:

However, when a blow is to be struck more than a thousand miles away, it is less difficult to send a single plane with an A-bomb or guided missile than to send some hundreds of planes with conventional bombs.

That knowledge with respect to the efficacy of long-range bombing is not new to this Congress or to those who are charged with the operation and administration of the United States Air Force. It was in order to be able to send a single plan carrying the atom bomb, coursing through the heavens at a height beyond the reach of land-based antiaircraft artillery, that the B–36 was developed.

Thank God, due to the foresight of Stuart Symington, Louis Johnson, General Vandenberg, and last, but not least, the late General Fairchild, by and with the aid of the Armed Services Committee and this Congress, today we have a fleet of B–36's together with a stockpile of atom bombs which if, God forbid, we are ever compelled to use as a measure of defense, would almost instantaneously cripple and destroy the ability of any enemy to continue warfare upon our people.

Mr. Speaker, air power is truly peace power, and the laurels of victory will for a long time to come rest upon the banner of that nation which maintains supremacy of power in the air.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include herein the very short article cabled from Berlin, carrying Dr. Compton's comments.

That article reads as follows:

A-BOMB WORTH LITTLE IN EUROPE, SAYS COMPTON

BERLIN, June 18.—Dr. Arthur H. Compton, who helped develop the first atom bomb, declared tonight that Russia's A-bombs do not present any great advantage for war within Europe.

"But if retaliation is required from the United States across the ocean, the atomic bomb is of great advantage. It is at present the engineer's best answer to the problem of delivering a powerful blow on a selected target at great distance," he said.

AGREES WITH CHURCHILL

Expressing agreement with Winston Churchill's statement last year that western Europe would already have come under Russian domination except for the A-bomb, Compton added:

"The United States for the present is presumably better equipped with atomic weapons * * * (Their) chief usefulness is in fighting an enemy far from the home base. As far as destructive effect is concerned, it is cheaper to produce chemical explosives than atomic explosives. The damage done by each atomic bomb used against Japan was no greater than that done by flights of several hundred airplanes dropping conventional bombs.

"However, when a blow is to be struck more than a thousand miles away, it is less difficult to send a single plane with an A-bomb or guided missile than to send some hundreds of planes with conventional bombs."

MUST THINK TWICE

"Since all nations equipped with A-bombs are vulnerable to atomic attack," Compton said, "this situation will make each nation think seriously before engaging in any type of action that would call for armed retaliation."

"We should keep ourselves armed with atomic weapons until Russia gives firm evidence that she will not attempt by military action or pressure to force her control upon those whom we undertake to protect," he continued.

Hon. James F. Byrnes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, this morning I desire to call attention to an apt

comment on a great American, James F. Byrnes, which appeared in the columns of a distinguished writer, John Temple Graves:

Picture of James F. Byrnes as a portent in America's skies is no amateur photography by southerners alone. Indeed some southerners are too close to the picture to appreciate its fine points.

"The election of James F. Byrnes as Governor of South Carolina," writes national columnist, George Rothwell Brown, from Washington, "could mark the turning point in America's headlong rush into State socialism under Roosevelt and Truman." If Byrnes wins, says Brown "he will devote himself during the next 2 years to the creation of a solid block of States—not parties—for united resistance to Federal encroachment. * * * and to the insidious undermining of the American conception of government by the European theory of an all-powerful superstate."

To bring together in this ideal the American majority who believe in it means breaking down barriers between Democrats and Republicans, between southerners and now meaningless loyalists, and, yes, between liberals and conservatives. Only so great a name as James F. Byrnes could do that and only so fine a political talent as his could make a patriot's weapon of what was brought together. That is why the several organizations over the country with noble intent but no fame should be standing by for a signal from South Carolina.

Resolution Urging That Investigation of Charges of Communist Infiltration in State Department Go Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members of the House will be interested in a resolution approved by the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce relating to the current investigation of charges of Communist infiltration in the State Department. The resolution reads as follows:

Resolution relating to the current investigation of charges of Communist infiltration in the State Department

This board is increasingly concerned about the persistent charges of Communist infiltration of our State Department.

We are not concerned about who appointed whom; that is beside the point, and we are sure neither a Democratic or a Republican administration would knowingly appoint a Communist to a position in the State Department.

We are not concerned about the partisan politics which is no doubt evident in both the exaggerated accusations and the suspiciously self-righteous defense.

Neither are we primarily concerned with the approach to the problem, although that has an element of importance.

What we are concerned about is the question that has been raised, and which has the possibility of leading to a lack of confidence in our State Department.

The State Department itself says that some 326 loyalty cases are now pending in its loyalty files, 257 of which have been pending for more than a year. Since January 1947 202 State Department employees have been fired, 111 of them because of their loyalty and security standing, and 91 for moral reasons.

In the present investigation someone is, or someones are, decidedly wrong. Someone is, or someones are, lying. We know now that Alger Hiss lied and sold our Government down the river for years; we do not yet know what his treason will cost us.

What we want is the truth, and necessary action, regardless of who may be involved or embarrassed or where the chips might fall.

Treason, or blundering, the results of which may be just as disastrous, in our State Department are matters of life and death to all of us. We must have unquestioned security here, above all places, and we must have unquestioning confidence in that security.

America, and particularly our State Department, has no place for Communists or fellow travelers, or members of Communist cells, or State Department advisers who fit into the pattern of the international policies of the Communists.

We therefore urge upon our Congressmen and Senators that they employ every possible means to insure that the investigation will go forward, not with "persecution" or partisan political advantage in view, but with honesty, fairness, dispatch, and absolute thoroughness.

Tribute to Army Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Press Democrat of Santa Rosa, Calif., for June 15, 1950.

This editorial presents a well-deserved tribute to the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army for the excellent work it has done in building up the resources of the redwood empire, of California.

In particular, it singles out for praise the district engineer for the corps in the San Francisco district, Col. Fremont S. Tandy. In inserting this editorial in the RECORD, I would like to add my own personal tribute to the engineers and to Colonel Tandy:

CONGRATULATIONS TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The Corps of Engineers, United States Army, is playing the role of a modern Paul Bunyon in the development of the redwood empire.

Particularly during the past year that Col. F. S. Tandy has been district engineer, projects to increase the wealth of the empire, add to its stability, and promote its economic development, have made notable progress.

The engineers' recommendations for the vitally important Coyote Valley Dam near Ukiah, plus channel straightening along the Russian River to decrease flood damage, have been approved by Congress.

A comprehensive project for a string of harbors along the north coast has been prepared with the hope of favorable action by Congress. The harbors would extend fishing grounds and give greater protection to fishermen, adding to the wealth of ocean food which can be harvested for families throughout the United States.

Meanwhile, the Corps of Engineers goes ahead with less dramatic, but equally important, work of keeping rivers and harbors open to navigation, and working on other projects which are necessary for the continued prosperity of the region.

This week marks the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Corps of Engineers. We want to take the opportunity to salute the corps and Colonel Tandy, its energetic and friendly district engineer.

The Brannan Plan Condemns Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bureau County Republican of June 22 entitled "The Brannan Plan Condemns Itself":

THE BRANNAN PLAN CONDEMNS ITSELF

T. K. Cowden, of the department of agricultural economics, Michigan State College, has prepared a summary of the contents of the much-talked-about but seldom-explained Brannan plan for agriculture.

Bureau County farm folks, through their farm bureau and otherwise, have voiced their objection to the philosophy of the plan.

This newspaper, which thoroughly opposed subsidizing farmers to assure cheap food, believes that the harshest indictment of the plan is the professor's objective analysis of its provisions. His summary of the provisions follows:

1. The Secretary shall make available price supports to producers of cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, whole milk, chicken eggs, farm chickens, hogs, beef cattle, and lambs. (NOTE.—The House version included peanuts and wool in the list. The Secretary is given authority to make loans on other commodities.)

2. The price supports are to be made effective through loans, purchases, production payments, and other operations.

3. The level of support is at the price support standard. The Secretary may reduce by not more than 15 percent the price supports on whole milk, eggs, chickens, hogs, beef cattle, or lambs if he determines the price support standard for these commodities is too high in relation to the price and support levels of feed.

At this point we digress from Professor Cowden's scholarly and complicated analysis of the technique used in arriving at the income-support standard and translating it into the support price of a particular commodity and merely report that, for 1950, using wheat for an example, he showed that the ratio of the income-support standard, the dole, that is, to 1940–49 average cash receipts would be 1.25. In other words, the support standard would be 25 percent above average cash receipts in the 10 years when farm prices were highest in history.

Going back to the analysis, the following additional points are summarized:

5. If producers disapprove marketing quotas, there will be no price support for that commodity.

6. The bill provides that compliance by producers with acreage allotments, production goals, marketing practices, and conservation and good land use practices as prescribed by the Secretary may be required as a condition of eligibility for price support.

7. The Secretary can exceed the support levels if it's in the national interest to increase or maintain the production of a commodity.

8. The bill provides that a maximum of 1,800 units of agricultural commodities per farm shall receive support in any one calendar year. A unit is 10 bushels of corn. If marketing quotas are in effect on a commodity, a producer may receive support for the full amount of his quota, even if it exceeds the 1,800 units (the House bill does not contain the limitation on size of business) but no support on the other commodities produced on his farm which are not under quotas.

Don't you squirm too at the discretion proposed for the Secretary who has been so indiscreet?

Resolutions of the Seventeenth Annual Encampment, Department of Alabama, Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 6, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am always glad to receive and welcome the expression of the views of our veterans, which reveal their constructive thinking and planning, not only in matters relative to their personal benefits, but to our country as a whole. They, as veterans as well as citizens, contribute much in the general operation of affairs of our Government and country, and their opinions and ideas are worthy of our consideration.

At the seventeenth annual encampment, Department of Alabama, Veterans of Foreign Wars, held at Mobile, Ala., recently, the resolutions adopted by the organization show the study and interest in public affairs shown by the members and officers of the VFW, in maintenance of our medical and hospital services by the Veterans' Administration; providing adjusted-service compensation for veterans of World War II; providing for veterans who have chronic tropical diseases, and maintenance of veterans' employment service and Alabama State employment security agencies. Under permission heretofore granted me, I insert Resolution No. 6, Resolution No. 7, Resolution No. 10, and Resolution No. 15, adopted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

Resolution 6

Whereas the Hoover Commission on Government reorganization has recommended transfer of all medical services and hospitals of the Veterans' Administration to a United Medical Administration; and

Whereas, this would result in identifying the medical and hospital needs of the veterans with the needs of nonveterans authorized such services by the Public Health Service, Bureau of Indian Affairs hospitals, Bureau of Prisons hospitals, etc.; and

Whereas this would be the first step toward depriving our disabled veterans of that special status which has been theirs since the founding of the Republic; and

Whereas such a consolidation would inevitably result in reducing, if not eliminating altogether, the medical and hospital services now authorized disabled veterans who have been unable to establish service-connection: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Seventeenth Annual Encampment of the Department of Alabama, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held at Mobile, Ala, on June 11 to 13, 1950, That the national legislative service be directed to oppose any legislation or reorganization plan which would directly or indirectly transfer the hospital and medical services of the Veterans' Administration to a United Medical Administration or to any other Federal agency, now existing or to be established.

Adopted this the 13th day of June 1950 by the seventeenth annual encampment, Department of Alabama, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

L. D. OWEN, Jr.,
Department Commander.

Attest:

T. H. WALKER,
Department Adjutant.

Resolution 7

Whereas millions of young men were inducted or enrolled in the Armed Forces of the United States during the period of their lives most important to the foundation of their future economic security; and

Whereas this economic dislocation resulted in a financial impairment which may take many more years to alleviate; and

Whereas the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, was designed to accomplish an effective rehabilitation of the veteran which would make up for the economic dislocation suffered as a result of the war; and

Whereas it is a fact that because of age or economic reasons more than one-half of the veterans of World War II will be unable to obtain any substantial benefit from the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and at the same time a minority of veterans will each receive benefits of several thousands of dollars: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Seventeenth Annual Encampment of the Department of Alabama, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held at Mobile, Ala., on June 11–13, 1950, That the President of the United States and the Congress be petitioned to enact legislation which would provide an equitable adjusted-service compensation for veterans of World War II of $3 per day for home service (maximum $3,500), $4 per day for overseas service (maximum $4,500), plus an additional $500 for a wound or wounds received in combat; and be it further

Resolved, That all tangible monetary benefits received by any veteran pursuant to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, be deducted from such adjusted-service pay.

Adopted this the 13th day of June 1950, by the Seventeenth Annual Encampment, Department of Alabama, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

L. D. OWEN, Jr.,
Department Commander.

Attest:

T. H. WALKER,
Department Adjutant.

Resolution 10

Whereas some of our veterans who served in the Pacific theater have during such service contracted tropical diseases, and due to difficulty of proving claims or such diseases not being evident until the lapse of a period after service have not been awarded compensation for the same; and

Whereas S. 775 and H. R. 3057 are now pending, which will be of benefit to veterans who have chronic tropical diseases contracted during wartime service: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Department of Alabama, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in encampment assembled does hereby endorse said bills and request the passage of the same by Congress and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all Members of Congress from Alabama.

Adopted this the 13th day of June 1950, by the Seventeenth Annual Encampment, Department of Alabama, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

L. D. OWEN, Jr.,
Department Commander.

Attest:

T. H. WALKER,
Department Adjutant.

Resolution 15

Whereas the Veterans' Employment Service and the Alabama State Employment Security Agencies have been most active in the support of the community-service programs of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; and

Whereas these agencies that continuously attempt to promote greater employment opportunites for veterans—especially disabled veterans—are seriously confronted with the problems of reduced personnel and an increasing flow of applicants for employment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Department of Alabama, Veterans of Foreign Wars, in annual encampment in Mobile, Ala., commend the leadership in these agencies for their attitudes and efforts on behalf of our disabled comrades and other veterans despite heavy curtailments of operating funds; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge our national legislative officer to continue to exert every effort possible that may convince Congress that the work of these agencies must not be diminished and that copies of this resolution be sent to our national headquarters and to the entire Alabama delegation in the United States Congress.

Adopted this the 13th day of June 1950 by the seventeenth annual encampment, Department of Alabama, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

L. D. OWEN, Jr.,
Department Commander.

Attest:

T. H. WALKER,
Department Adjutant.

The Faith of Our Fathers—Address by William Jennings Bryan, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address recently delivered before the Democratic Luncheon Club, of Los Angeles, by William Jennings Bryan, Jr., the

son of the beloved "Commoner." The title of this address is "The Faith of Our Fathers," and it is worthy of study and reflection by all readers of the RECORD. His speech deals with the cold war and how best to wage it. He points out that no war is really won until the underlying causes, the ideals and philosophies which move men to violence, have been removed. And he points to the first paragraph of the Declaration of Independence as the heart and soul of the ideal of our democracy. He warns that ideas once they are created can be developed, explored, and amplified, but there is no such thing as the collective mind.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FAITH OF OUR FATHERS

(By William Jennings Bryan, Jr.)

Some 15 years ago, I gave an address before the Democratic Luncheon Club of Los Angeles, Calif., entitled "The Trends of Government."

In that talk, I reminded my audience of the great Greek philosopher Aristotle's classic definition, of the cycles through which any government of long duration is apt to pass, in order to suggest an historic parallel with current events, and to point out the most significant political fact of that time. In that talk, the fact was emphasized, that the cycle of democracy that was born of our American Revolution, the principles of democracy, which for 150 years, had been growing form of government, and which had swept like a tide round the world, had been checked; and that the trend of government had turned back, toward the tyranny and oppression of the super state; and that communism, and fascism, and nazism, were in the ascendency.

But then, few in America were concerned with that ominous trend. What happened in Europe was of no consequence here. You all remember what people in high places were saying, What if Ethiopia was overrun by the Fascists, and what if Hitler did take over in Germany? Was that any reason we should become involved in entangling alliances? No, we had problems enough of our own, and we would work them out in smug isolation.

And yet, a few short years later we were plunged into global war, when the Axis Powers launched the most brutal and sanguinary and destructive conflict in all history, in an attempt to force their totalitarian ideologies upon the rest of the world.

That war was the acid test of our democratic processes. Against us were arrayed the totalitarian powers, directed by their supermen and their superplanners, with absolute power and control over the lives and productive resources of their nationals, and the conquered and enslaved populations of half the world.

Here in America, without compulsion and without sacrificing our liberties, we performed miracles of production and operation. In that struggle, we proved to the world, that a democracy could send an endless stream of supplies and material to its allies, and at the same time implement and wage a victorious war, in every section of the globe. The tremendous productive power we had generated as free men, under our American democracy, turned the tide of battle to victory.

That is something we must never forget, when the theorists in our midst begin to prate of the weaknesses of democracy, and the inherent efficiency of the totalitarian state and its planned economy.

Neither must we ever forget that it was only through the grace of God, and the courage of our earthly allies, we were given the necessary time to mobilize our manpower and resources for production. In this day of atomic weapons and supersonic planes that is something that just won't happen again.

I wish we could believe that we won the late war, and that we have laid the foundations for a permanent peace. True, the enemy was defeated in the contest of arms, and the threat of physical conquest was removed, but no war is ever really won, and no peace is ever secure, until the underlying causes, the ideals and philosophies that move men to violence, have been removed. Have we yet been victorious over that spirit of conquest?

On the contrary, the so-called cold war that smolders round the globe, and threatens daily to break into flame on a dozen fronts, is but another phase of the titanic struggle that still goes on to control the spirits and minds of men and their social and economic thinking.

It is an insidious struggle, too, this battle for men's minds, for it is impossible to gage the ebb and flow of the tide of victory. In physical war you can at least count the dead, and the loss of terrain and matériel, but there is no way you can judge the death of the spirit of freedom in the minds of men, until it is too late.

What we are really witnessing today is a life and death struggle between two ideals of government. It is a struggle for supremacy, between two basic philosophies of government that are diametrically opposed. On the one side are the Communist groups (and I may say here, that throughout this discussion, I shall use that name as the symbol of all the others). It makes no difference whether they call themselves Communists or Fascists or Nazis or Socialists or a "people's government"; they are in varying degrees, those groups who believe that the state is supreme, that man lives for the state, and must do the bidding of the state, which must own or control the means of production, and which plans the destinies of all its subjects.

On the other side are the groups who believe in a system of government based upon the dignity of man, who believe in the institutions of private property, and individual enterprise, and a free market, in other words, who believe that the rights of the individual are supreme, and that government is ordained by him, to serve his own purposes, and must remain his servant, and not his master.

That is the issue that confronts America today, and we had better understand its political implications.

Our American democracy, has carried this fundamental philosophy further than any state in history, and under this system we have become the most powerful nation in all the world.

Here we stand, a democracy that has grown from a handful of Pilgrims, seeking freedom of worship in a wilderness along the eastern seaboard, into a nation of 150,000,000 people.

A nation, which with but 7 percent of the world's population, has 45 percent of the world's total wealth, and a national income greater than that of all Europe.

Forty million Americans own $55,000,000,000 in savings accounts, $40,000,000,000 in homes, and $30,000,000,000 in farms and livestock and agricultural equipment.

We own: 54 percent of all the world's telephones, 84 percent of all the world's autos, 50 percent of all the world's radios, 92 percent of all the world's bathtubs.

An amazing record of material gains, but even that is dwarfed by our social and cultural achievements.

A hundred years ago, men and animals did 70 percent of the work; the workweek was 70 hours; workers' pay brought about 27 cents an hour measured in today's dollars. Today in America men and animals do only 6 percent of the work. Machines do all the rest. The workweek has been nearly cut in half.

Labor has the right of collective bargaining; we have freedom of religious worship; freedom of speech and universal suffrage. We have gone a long way toward social security. Education is free. Our public school system and private institutions of learning, are the best in the world. We have, with 7 percent of the world's population, 52 percent of the world's total school enrollment. One could add to this list indefinitely, but why go on.

Certain it is, that no other nation in history, has ever achieved so much for so many. The fact of America, and the civilization for which it stands, gives the lie to all the claims of communism, that it provides the more abundant life, and that is precisely the reason we are hated and feared, by all the forces of communism today.

The enemy know full well, that as long as the ideals of democracy flourish anywhere in the world, that their communist ideology is insecure, even among their own people, for they know that as long as the light of liberty burns bright in any land, the eyes of men will turn toward it, and men's hearts and minds will yearn for the freedom it symbolizes.

So it is not surprising to see the "iron curtains" and the "bamboo curtains" come down or to witness the suppression of religion, the strictures upon education, the suppression of free speech, the censorship of news, the deliberate campaigns of misinformation and perversion of truth that are the inevitable implements of the Communist state." These are the weapons of defense. The truth and freedom of thought are the last things they want their people to have.

Make no mistake about our position as a nation, and our responsibilities in this chaotic world. Indeed, we are the last great bulwark of democracy.

As long as we are too strong for conquest, and as long as we can maintain our free-enterprise system and our American standard of living, just so long will we maintain our position of world leadership and preserve for posterity the blessing of the liberties we now enjoy.

Whether we like it or not, we will be engulfed in this struggle to the bitter end, and we had better understand the forces with which we contend. It would be fatal to discount the intelligence and resourcefulness that are arrayed against us.

The Communists know full well that there is such a thing as national bankruptcy and that there is an ultimate limit to the productive capacity of any people, even though they are the greatest nation on earth. They knew, too, that there is somewhere a limit to what any nation can expend abroad, without a blighting effect upon its economy at home.

They know also that our civilization is based upon an ever-expanding economy that relies upon individual initiative and the profit motive to provide more and more work for more and more people, and more and more goods for public consumption. They know that disaster is swift to come when initiative is destroyed, when production lags, and business slows down, and people are hungry and unemployed.

In short, they know that when our economy fails our faith in democracy fails with it, and when our democracy fails their battle is won.

I do not believe one needs to be an intellectual genius or an economist or political

scientist in order to understand the political implications of this world situation, or that we need to be taken by surprise as the war strategy unfolds.

Perhaps we would find it a lot easier to understand if we could adopt the logic of the village half-wit who found farmer Brown's horse. When he was questioned as to how he found the horse within minutes after a reward was offered for its return he said, "Why, that was simple. I just said to myself, if I were a horse, where would I go? And I went there, and there the horse was." We need to use a little more horse sense as we look at the world of today.

If we will just say to ourselves, "If I were the leader of the forces of communism, what would I do?" a lot of things that are going on in this world today, would begin to make sense. Why, if you were the enemy, on the international scene, you would adopt a policy of attrition, a deliberate policy of creating a recurring series of political crises, which would demand, as a matter of self-defense, the aiding and arming of allies, and the unending expenditure of our material resources, and the piling up of the national debt. Our expenditures for European relief, and for military and diplomatic defense, already amount to more than thirty-four billions per year.

Here at home, on the domestic scene, you would leave no stone unturned to break down our economy, and bring on a depression. You would organize your Communist cells, on every possible level of our social and industrial life. You would sabotage industrial peace, and foment slow-downs and sit-downs and strikes, to cut down production and increase unemployment, to wipe out profit, and stifle initiative.

In schools and in churches and colleges and minority groups, you would spread your insidious doctrines; you would encourage government to take over more and more of the perogatives of free enterprise; you would turn class against class, and encourage racial hatred. To divide and conquer, would be your strategy; to create confusion and doubt over the integrity of government and fear and discord and discontent among our people, would be your daily goal.

Many of these things, go on in America today, and it would be shocking to know how much is Communist inspired. The list of known subversive groups, would fill a good-sized book.

We of the present generation, bear a grave responsibility to mankind. For many decades, this struggle has been working to a climax in our time. It is not primarily a struggle of nation against nation, but of people against people, ideals against ideals—it is a battle to win your mind and mine. Day after day, and hour by hour, we are called upon to make the decisions that will decide this momentous issue.

Never in history, has there been such a desperate need for straight thinking on government, and a clear understanding of what our democracy is. There just is no antidote, for all the alien propaganda to which our people are constantly exposed, except an abiding faith in our American institutions, and a firm conviction that they provide a greater measure of benefits, than any form of government ever devised by man.

So, let's take another look at American democracy, and try to understand the spiritual basis, of the ideals under which it was created.

These ideals, are expressed in the first paragraph of the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Such were the ideals for which our forefathers fought the war of independence. It is no mere figure of speech to say that America was the "cradle of liberty," for in that struggle for independence there was born the kind of democracy of which men had long dreamed, but had never before achieved.

The Constitution itself is replete with reservations of powers to the States and to the people. In construing it, our courts have held time and time again that every power is reserved to the people that is not, either in express terms or by necessary implication, given up by them and vested exclusively in the Federal Government. The most vital words in the entire document are to be found in the Preamble itself: "We the people, in order to form a more perfect union * * * and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution."

And yet the ink was scarcely dry upon the Constitution, when at its very first session, the Congress passed the first 10 amendments, known as the Bill of Rights, and presented them to the States for ratification. These expressed further limitations and reservations upon the powers of government, and defined in specific terms certain rights of the people, certain liberties, upon which even the Government could not infringe.

We owe a debt of eternal gratitude to Thomas Jefferson, who did more than any other man to write into our organic law the freedoms of the common man. He was unalterably opposed to statism in any form. Even in his declining days, 30 years after our Nation was born, he still wrote of his faith. He must have had the statists in mind, when he wrote: "It is sometimes said, that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he then be trusted with the government of others?" And witness the gentle irony of his conclusion, "Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question."

And history has always answered. It has answered with the Hitlers, Mussolinis, and Stalins, and Quislings, and horrors of Pearl Harbor, and Lidice, and Auschwitz, and Buchtenwald.

It has been an unending struggle, but there the laws stand, the principles of American democracy are now the law of the land. But that does not mean that our liberties are secure.

I want here to challenge the statement that is so often made, that the Constitution guarantees our liberties, for it does nothing of the kind. We know from our own experience there is sometimes a vast difference between the letter of the law and the spirit in which it is carried out. If we could just change men's hearts by passing a law, how simple our problems would be.

No; they cannot be changed in that way. The laws can state the rules and regulations to govern human conduct, but they cannot force men to carry them out, for no law can change human nature. No law can create patriotism, or the desire for equality or justice, or a passion for freedom, for these are spiritual attributes that are born of the ideals and hopes and aspirations that exist only in the hearts of men. There is no guaranty of your freedoms, except that power, which comes from a spiritual determination to achieve the equality and justice and good will, that our Constitution seeks to create.

The only reason we have our Constitution today is that the blessings of liberty were more precious than life to the men of that generation, and they were willing to fight and to die in order to gain them. The same dauntless spirit of '76 that inspired the men of that day is the only thing that can preserve them now. I sometimes wonder how many of us have lost that spirit today.

Thoughts have to begin somewhere, and there is no fact in all the realm of science, or of literature, or of music, or the arts, that is not the product of individual thought.

This spiritual freedom is the vital essence of American democracy. I think it is even more than that; I believe it is a part of the Creator's plan for the upward progress of the human race.

This philosophy of spiritual freedom is the thing that communism denies, and inevitably destroys, and that is all we need to know to understand the specious sham of all its doctrines. It makes no difference whether they follow the pattern of a Marx or Engels, a Trotzky, a Lenin or a Hitler, or a Stalin; or whether they talk of communism, or socialism, or fascism; their objectives are all the same.

They seek to construct a Frankenstein state, to control and coerce, to take over business and industry, and the means of production, to take over the distribution of the products of labor, and make every man dependent for his very existence upon the dictates of the masters, of the omnipotent state. This is no step forward in human relations.

This was the dream of tyrants before the days of Genghis Khan. It is a brutal doctrine, that can only live through force and violence. It is a philosophy which leads back to the darkness from which man through the ages has painfully groped his way, and not toward the welcoming dawn of a better day.

Our principles of democracy express a philosophy of government that inspires an abiding faith in the ultimate triumph of right. It justifies hope and confidence in the betterment of human relations; for all things are possible where man's spirit is free to create.

There are no insoluble problems in a society where every man is equal in political power and even the lowliest citizen is still free to think and act and give of his individual efforts to make democracy live; for all things are changeable save the inherent and unalienable rights of man.

Can there be any doubt but that the minds that can split the atom and unleash the physical force that can destroy the human race, can develop the spiritual forces that will enable men to cooperate and to live together in peace?

The main thing that is wrong with our country today is that we of this generation have taken our freedoms too much for granted and have failed to assume the responsibility that is ours to see that our democracy works.

We have failed in many respects to achieve the equality of opportunity our principles have sought to create or to soften the social impacts a free competition entails. We believe in democracy, but we view with dismay many of the things that go on in our country today. Things that go on because we have been too much concerned with material progress to give much thought to our spiritual needs. We seem to have forgotten there is as much need for social stability and tranquility as there is for progress or reform.

There is no other thing as important to the individual citizen today as that we shall keep our liberties, free and unrestrained.

How can this be done, you say, in this day and age, when we are beset with the most baffling political problems on every hand; when every issue is so clouded with propaganda that only a Solomon can tell where the truth lies? Well, I believe there is an infallible guide.

Our democracy is not just a sterile belief. Nor is it just a set of lofty ideals we can lay away on a shelf and only take down on special occasions. It expresses the precepts of a way of life, to govern our daily dealings with our fellow man.

I believe there is a right or a wrong slant to all political problems, depending upon whether they lean toward the strengthening or weakening of our free-enterprise system and that we must judge all such problems by the tenets of our political faith.

If you believe in democracy whenever you have the opportunity for political action you will ask yourselves: Does this law or this policy work for the benefit of all of our citizens, or does it give preferences to only a few; does this political action delegate to any authority the power to unduly restrict my individual action in the pursuit of life, liberty, or property, or any other freedom that is mine under the law? If you believe that it does, then you had better do something about it.

Every single citizen must exercise his political franchise on every occasion if democracy is to live. That is your own responsibility and no one else can do it for you. There is no other road to freedom.

This is what Thomas Jefferson had in mind when he wrote: "Where every man is a sharer * * * and feels he is a participator in government, not merely at an election, one day in the year, but every day; when there shall not be one man in the State who will not be a member of some of its councils, great or small, he will let the heart be torn from his body sooner than his power be wrested from him by a Caesar of a Bonaparte."

Jefferson never lost faith in the common people. After the first 30 years of our national existence he still wrote: "I have no fear but that the result of our experiment will be that men may be trusted to govern themselves without a master" (1828).

Jefferson believed that the institution of private property was founded on our natural wants and the God-given right to acquire it, according to our individual abilities without violating the similar rights of others; he believed that no one has a right to obstruct another; that justice is a fundamental law of society and that a majority oppressing an individual is guilty of a crime and abuses its strength and by acting on the law of the strongest, breaks up the foundations of society."

Yes; if our democracy is to be triumphant in this struggle we must make our political action conform to the principles of our political faith. The only day that America need fear is the day when faith in our democracy shall depart from the hearts of our people.

There is no greater satisfaction in human experience than to make a personal contribution to the furtherance of some great cause. The opportunity calls you today and every day to make your contribution to the greatest cause of all, for the cause of freedom is the cause of all mankind. It comes to us consecrated by the blood of all the martyrs and the endless silent legions of the dead who gave their lives that we might have it.

What we need in America today is an old-fashioned, grass-roots revival of the unconquerable spirit of 1776. We need a revival of the spiritual inspiration that will rekindle the fires of patriotism and to send us onward in this battle with our hearts singing the old hymn we sang in the days of yore: "Faith of our fathers, holy faith, we will be true to you until death."

You, my friends, are the only ones who can make this revival a reality.

The Genocide Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I am about to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a number of editorials from the New Orleans States with reference to the Genocide Convention, but I ask first that the nine provisions of the convention be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the provisions of the convention were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION — THESE NINE PROVISIONS TELL WHAT IT IS ALL ABOUT

The General Assembly approves the annexed convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide and proposes it for signature and ratification or accession in accordance with its article XI.

The contracting parties having considered the declaration made by the General Assembly of the United Nations in its resolution 96 (1) dated December 11, 1946, that genocide is a crime under international law, contrary to the spirit and aims of the United Nations, and condemned by the civilized world;

Recognizing that at all periods of history genocide has inflicted great losses on humanity; and

Being convinced that, in order to liberate mankind from such an odious scourge, international cooperation is required;

Hereby agree as hereinafter provided:

Article I. The contracting parties confirm that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and to punish.

Article II. In the present convention genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious groups as such:

(a) Killing members of the group;

(b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;

(c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;

(d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;

(e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

Article III. The following acts shall be punishable:

(a) Genocide;

(b) Conspiracy to commit genocide;

(c) Direct and public incitement to commit genocide;

(d) Attempt to commit genocide;

(e) Complicity in genocide.

Article IV, persons committing genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in article III shall be punished, whether they are constitutionally responsible rulers, public officials, private individuals.

Article V, the contracting parties undertake to enact, in accordance with their respective constitutions, the necessary legislation to give effect to the provisions of the present convention and, in particular, to provide effective penalties for persons guilty of genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in article III.

Article VI, persons charged with genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in article III shall be tried by a competent tribunal of the State in the territory of which the act was committed, or by such international penal tribunal as may have jurisdiction with respect to those contracting parties which shall have accepted its jurisdiction.

Article VII, genocide and the other acts enumerated in article III shall not be considered as political crimes for the purpose of extradition.

The contracting parties pledge themselves in such cases to grant extradition in accordance with their laws and treaties in force.

Article VIII, any contracting party may call upon the competent organs of the United Nations to take such action under the Charter of the United Nations as they consider appropriate for the prevention and suppression of acts of genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in article III.

Article IX, disputes between the contracting parties relating to the interpretation, application or fulfillment of the present convention, including those relating to the responsibility of a State for genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in article III, shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice at the request of any of the parties to the dispute.

Social Security System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "More Victims," published in the Somerset (Pa.) Daily American on June 23, 1950.

There being no objections, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE VICTIMS

The Senate has added 10,000,000 to the number of victims of the social-security hoax.

These ten million are perfectly helpless against the fraud which Congress designs to perpetrate against them.

When Pennsylvania set up its workman's compensations it gave employers the privilege of insuring with private concerns or with the State. There were some employers who found difficulty in obtaining compensation insurance with private concerns and some simply could not obtain such insurance. To meet this situation, the State set up a fund.

But the Federal Government gives its victims no such alternative. It sticks its hands into the pocketbooks of the workers and grabs its take. Then it sticks its hands into the treasuries of the employers of the workers and grabs an equal amount.

Freedom?

Where is there any freedom in that sort of a racket?

What the worker is promised is totally inadequate for his needs in the evening of his life and with the money going straight into the general fund of the Federal Treasury, all the worker has for a guarantee that the promise for which his money is filched will benefit him is a stack of I O U's with which the Government replaces his money.

Meeting With Truman Climaxes Visit of Browdy to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct to the attention of my colleagues the following article, which

appeared in the June 1950 issue of the New Palestine:

MEETING WITH TRUMAN CLIMAXES VISIT OF BROWDY TO WASHINGTON

(By Murray Frank)

WASHINGTON.—ZOA President Benjamin G. Browdy paid a memorable 2-day visit to the Nation's Capital June 1 and 2, which was climaxed by a half-hour meeting with President Truman in the White House. When he emerged from the conference, he was all smiles, confident and pleased beyond words with his visit.

Mr. Browdy was accompanied to the White House by his good friend, Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Brooklyn, Democrat, who also served as Mr. Browdy's host during his 2-day stay in Washington. Originally scheduled on the White House visiting list for 15 minutes, the time flew so fast and the conversation was so lively and interesting that nearly a half hour had passed before they became aware of the time. But President Truman did not dismiss his guests so lightly. Just as Browdy and MULTER arose to take their leave, the President summoned the White House press photographer and the "one more, please" boys had a field day.

Speaking to the correspondents who surrounded him in the White House reception room later, Browdy said he had come to thank President Truman for all he had done in the past for Jewry and for the State of Israel. Browdy then informed the President that the American Zionist movement wished to establish a village in Israel to be named the Harry S. Truman Village. Before any step is taken by the American Zionists, they would like to have Mr. Truman's consent. The President was deeply touched by this gesture, and he readily gave his consent, but remarked that he does not deserve such honor; he had not done much, and the little that he had done was not for the sake of honor but because it was the right thing to do.

Browdy then outlined to him the project, where the village is to be located, who will be settled there, how it will be financed, etc. President Truman listened very attentively and was seemingly pleased with the plan. The hope was expressed that some day, in the not too distant future, he would be able to pay a visit to Israel and see a thriving village which bears his name.

DISCUSS NEAR EAST

The conversation then lapsed into a general discussion of the Near East situation and the problems affecting Israel. Browdy complimented the President for the three-power agreement on Middle East arms, which President Truman had announced the week before. He voiced the hope that the agreement would be implemented and that it would bring permanent peace to the Middle East, thereby enabling Israel to establish itself on a solid political and economic basis.

While details on Mr. Truman's reply cannot be revealed, Mr. Browdy told this correspondent that the President was most reassuring on the question of implementation of the arms agreement and the outlook for peace in the Middle East. Again and again, the ZOA president told me later, as we left the White House, how pleased and impressed he was to discover that President Truman is thoroughly acquainted with the problems concerning Israel and that "the Jewish people have a great friend in him."

The meeting was started by the introduction by Congressman MULTER who said: "Mr. President, here is the leader of one of the great Jewish organizations in this country who came to thank you for what you have done for the Jews and for Israel." That broke the ice and thereafter the three men sat and chatted in the most friendly manner.

Aside from the political and moral significance of the meeting, it is also noteworthy to record that, as far as this reporter can remember, the Truman-Browdy meeting was the first official meeting between President Truman and a ZOA president. The last such meeting occurred in 1944, when President Roosevelt met with Dr. Abba Hillel Silver and Rabbi Stephen S. Wise.

DINNER FOR BROWDY

The evening before the visit to the White House, Congressman MULTER gave a dinner in honor of Mr. Browdy for a select group of friends, chiefly Members of Congress and officials of the Government. Mr. Browdy thanked the Members of Congress on behalf of the ZOA for their cooperation and help toward Israel now and in the past. "We know who our friends are and we shall always be thankful to them," he said.

Present at the dinner were Senator Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, Representatives John Carroll, of Colorado, Emanuel Celler, Eugene Keogh, Walter Lynch and Abraham J. Multer, of New York, Assistant Secretary of Labor Ralph Wright, Samuel Klaus, of the State Department, Herbert Cummings, of the Commerce Department, Samuel Flatow, of the Justice Department, Elihu D. Stone, honorary vice president of the ZOA, Dr. Samuel Margoshes, and this correspondent.

It was Mr. Browdy's first official visit to Washington, but it will long remain an unforgettable visit for those who were privileged to witness it at close range.

The Genocide Convention—What It Really Means to Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New Orleans States entitled "The Genocide Convention—What It Really Means to Americans."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION—WHAT IT REALLY MEANS TO AMERICANS

President Truman has asked the United States Senate to ratify as a treaty the Genocide Convention.

Ratification of the Convention is being pressed during this session of the Congress. A subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has recommended it. It may go to the floor of the Senate for action at any time.

If the Senate ratifies this Convention as a treaty, it will become the supreme law of the land, for article VI, section 2 of the United States Constitution provides that:

"This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

So that the people may know what the Senate is being asked to ratify and thus make the supreme law of the land, the New Orleans States prints the first nine articles (the balance are procedural only) of the Genocide Convention elsewhere on this page today.

And to discuss, expose, and explain its effects, this newspaper today begins the first of a series of editorials on the treaty.

Ernest A. Gross, State Department representative to the United Nations, speaking before the General Assembly on December 9, 1948, the day the Convention was voted, said:

"The denial of the right of existence of entire human groups is the subject matter with which this Convention deals."

No decent person can quarrel with the announced objectives of this treaty—the outlawing of mass murder of groups of people. The very words Buchenwald, Dachau, and Lidice will live forever as a measure of mankind's degradation.

But a careful study of the Genocide Convention over a period of many months—a study which included conferences in person and in writing with constitutional and international law experts—shows that this treaty goes far beyond its announced purposes.

It is the conclusion of these authorities and of this newspaper that the Genocide Convention, if ratified in toto by the Senate, would:

Create a new international crime for which any American might be placed on trial for the killing of one individual.

Approve the creation of a Criminal Chamber of the International Court of Justice to try Americans in overseas tribunals without any of the guaranties safeguarding accused persons in American courts.

Throw many phases of domestic law into the uncharted seas of international law.

And it fails in its primary purpose: The outlawing of mass extermination of peoples by government.

It will not apply to genocide as practiced by Stalin in Russia or in the countries he has captured and is persecuting.

And it may obligate us to open warfare to control genocide committed in other lands in peacetime.

Each and every one of the above statements we will document in subsequent editorials.

The Genocide Convention was conceived in righteous anger, emotion, and good will. It must now be examined in the light of its effect upon our Constitution, our laws, and our citizens before it becomes an instrument for the destruction of our Bill of Rights.

Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Carle Whitehead, a distinguished lawyer of Denver, and an active leader in the Socialist Party of Colorado. The statement is entitled "An Assault on American Fundamentals." Twice in my campaigns for the Senate he has run against me. I do not agree with his position on the Mundt-Nixon bill, but I join him in urging everyone to read the great speech of former Senator Albert J. Beveridge, a Republican and a patriot.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

AN ASSAULT ON AMERICAN FUNDAMENTALS

I borrowed the above title from that great constitutional lawyer, historian, Republican, United States Senator Albert J. Beveridge.

In 1920, when this Nation was in the throes of a postwar hysteria like unto the present; when State after State (including Colorado) was passing laws requiring loyalty oaths, prohibiting the display of Red flags and about every conceivable kind of repressive measures, in an effort to squelch the Communists; when the Federal Government, through the Department of Justice, the Postmaster General, and the courts, was taking similar repressive action, and when these measures were sought to be excused by the plea that they were "necessary in order to save our country," the conservative Beveridge went before the American Bar Association (never noted for radicalism) and denounced the whole program as an assault on American fundamentals (37-page address, Reports of American Bar Association, 1920).

The alien and sedition laws of 1798, passed ostensibly to save us in a great national emergency, though mild in penalties and limited to 2 years in duration, threatened to cause a rebellion. Except for these mild and short-lived laws no such legislation had been passed in this country (even when our very existence was threatened by civil war) until the First World War, when the Espionage Act, the red-flag laws and all sorts of suppressive enactments were put on our statute books (National and State) with fines and prison penalties which, by comparison, dwarfed those of the alien and sedition laws. Moreover, all this legislation was enacted not simply for the period of emergency—not with any time limit—but as permanent legislation, thus establishing the practice of using an emergent condition as an excuse for passing repressive legislation which would be permanent and violate our constitutional freedoms in peacetime as well as during emergency. Thus, as Beveridge points out, did we make the first great assault on American fundamentals.

All of the suppressive legislation enacted during the World War I hysteria is still on the statute books and much more of the same kind, but of still wider scope and with increasingly severe penalties, has been added during the hysteria accompanying and following World War II.

The Mundt-Nixon bill is but one step in this general assault on American fundamentals. Compared to legislation of the World War I hysteria period and to the governmental practices and court-made law established under that legislation, the Mundt-Nixon bill may not appear to be a very great step on the road to the police state, but when viewed in the light of our freedoms, as they had existed during all of our periods of emergency during our 130 years of national life prior to World War I, the Mundt-Nixon bill stands out glaringly as a police-state measure.

The Espionage Act is now a part of our permanent legislation. We have come to accept it as matter of course but note the words of Beveridge regarding it: "During our Civil War no espionage or sedition law was thought necessary; but had such laws as our present (1920) statutes, as recently construed and enforced, to say nothing of those that are still urged, been in existence during the Civil War, there would not have been enough officers to arrest, courts to try, and prisons to hold the offenders. Grave as the danger to the Nation's life during the dreadful years of our civil conflict, our lawmakers were careful not to put on the statute books legislation which might possibly violate our national Bill of Rights."

As has ever been the case, the plea is made that such legislation is necessary in order to save the Nation. That plea was made to the United States Supreme Court in the famous case of Ex parte Milligan following the Civil War, and to that plea that Court replied: "A country preserved at the sacrifice of all the cardinal principles of liberty is not worth the cost of preservation."

If our Senators and Representatives in Congress would read and ponder that classic address of a great constitutional lawyer, conservative, Republican Senator Albert J. Beveridge, they would throw the Mundt-Nixon bill out of the window and put an end to this hysterical assault on American fundamentals.

Campaign for Cheap Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely and forthright address by the Governor of Colorado, the Honorable Walter W. Johnson, over Denver radio station KOA, June 17, 1950, on the infamous campaign for cheap silver currently being waged by the silverware manufacturers.

We are not unaware in the Senate of the activities of this selfish pressure group so this address should be of great interest here. Employing the well-known Hitler technique, the silver processors impugn Americans who resist their vicious campaign against sound money with operating a "legalized national hold-up." I hope every Member of Congress will read the governor's splendid address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, citizens of Colorado: The American Magazine contains an article entitled "High Silver," by Jerome Beatty. This article is headed by the statement, "For every silver article you purchase, from a roll of film to a loving cup, you pay tribute to six Western States in the silver bloc. Here is a report on a legalized national hold-up that hits the pocket of every taxpayer and consumer." As this heading indicates, the article is propaganda in behalf of eastern silverware manufacturers who want cheaper silver at the expense of the western metal miner.

Last month, Harper's Magazine contained a similar article by Dr. Morris E. Garnsey, an economist at our own University of Colorado. Both articles assume the United States is paying the silver miner more than his product is actually worth. Both articles imply the United States should dump its silver reserves on the market, and cease buying silver. Neither article informs the readers that this has been common practice throughout the world whenever selfish interests were desirous of artificially breaking the price of silver. Imagine what would happen to the price of wheat, dried eggs, or butter, which the Government now has in storage, if the Government were suddenly to offer all of that wheat or eggs or butter for sale.

Only last summer, the price of silver in India rose to $1.55 an ounce; whereupon, 15,000,000 ounces of the silver reserve of the government of Hyderabad were dumped on the market to break the price of silver to 95 cents an ounce.

I could devote an entire evening in answer to Dr. Garnsey and Mr. Beatty, but silver is only a part of the picture. It is high time the desperate condition of the American mining industry was squarely placed before the people of our Western States. In the last 10 years, 933 or 80 percent of all the producing metal mines in Colorado have closed down. Only about 2,000 of the 8,200 metal mines which were operating in the 11 Western States in 1940 remain open. Many of these will soon be compelled to close.

The 1950 convention of the Colorado Mining Association truly called the condition of the industry a national disaster. It pointed out that metal mining would soon be finished in this country. In the future, in times of peace, we will be compelled to pay high prices for foreign copper, lead, zinc, and other base metals, without which our present standard of living cannot be maintained. Since there will be little or no competition from domestic metal mining, and since there is no world-wide antitrust law, foreign dictatorships, cartels, and trusts will demand high prices for the metals required for making automobiles, radios, and the host of other gadgets and appliances we now use and enjoy. Outside of the United States, it is common practice to stifle competition, parcel out markets, create artificial shortages, and charge the highest possible prices. Until the birth of our synthetic rubber and chemical industries, we had no means of competition with foreign rubber and chemical cartels, which controlled the production and marketing of these commodities and exacted a tribute on every auto tire or chemical we purchased.

We all realize how vital an ample supply of lead, zinc, copper, and other base metals is in time of war. We all remember the huge shipping losses of the last war and the dangers in transporting supplies from overseas. Yet, even now, we are destroying our domestic metal-mining industry. We are putting our dependence both in war and in peace, solely upon foreign sources of supply. The American metal miner is the victim of world politics, sectional politics, and economic politics. These politics transcend party lines.

The American magazine article presents a current example of sectional or economic politics by which eastern silverware manufacturers are attempting to have Congress repeal the Silver Purchase Act so they may buy silver more cheaply. In this they are supported by Republican and Democratic Congressmen from Eastern States, while most western Congressmen, both Democrats and Republicans, oppose them. Obviously, a decrease in the price of silver would bring further hardships to an already crippled mining industry, since most ore bodies contain silver along with other metals. As an example of adverse world politics, we see the huge shipments of mining machinery, loans, and grants our Nation has made to foreign countries in recent years. It is true these loans and shipments were made to bolster the economies of foreign countries, but they aided in wrecking our own mining industry.

The brand of world politics which has caused the most damage to our metal mines is the system of managed currency, or paper money, which has been adopted by many nations, including our own. Managed currency deprives the people of gold or silver, or both; it forces them to use paper or token money, which has no value of itself. Managed currency can be, and frequently is, manipulated by the nation which prints it. When this country places a tariff on foreign metals to protect our domestic mining, foreign nations which produce these metals can and have devalued their paper money so as to nullify the effects of that tariff. As a

result, American metal miners have been forced to compete with cheap foreign mines all over the world. Most American miners earn as much in a day as a foreign miner does in a week. Cheap mining costs and devalued paper money enable the foreign mine owner to undersell his American competitor right here in the United States. To make matters still worse, our National Government has deliberately kept down the price of metals—often below their cost of production—and, at the same time, has increased the cost of metal mining.

Most metallic veins contain gold and silver. Formerly the price the miner received for this gold and silver helped to pay the cost of mining and treating the lead, zinc, copper, and other metals in his ore. Since 1935, Federal and State Governments have greatly increased taxes, new forms of taxation have been imposed, and wages and supplies have increased. The costs of metal mining have doubled in the last 15 years. At the same time, silver has been increased only 20 or 30 cents an ounce, while the National Government has forbidden any increase in the price of gold.

The American metal miner is confronted with ruinous competition from foreign producers of lead, zinc, copper, and other base metals. He is compelled to sell gold to the United States Mint at a price fixed by the mint 15 years ago. He is faced with an uncertain future for the price of silver because of the selfish demands of silverware manufacturers and silver-price manipulations by foreign governments. One after another of our Colorado metal mines has been forced to close down. The price these mines received for metals was far below their cost of production. Prosperous towns have become ghost towns; millions of invested capital have been lost. Mine employees have moved away; their know-how and practical experience have been dissipated. There are roughly 50,000 people in Colorado directly interested in or dependent upon metal mining. At least 20,000 individuals in this State own metal-mining properties. A great industry is lost, but the loss to the Nation is even greater.

You cannot open a new mine or reopen an old mine in a day. It requires months, and even years, to install equipment, open up ore and train employees.

In the event of a sudden emergency, such as war, demanding huge tonnages of lead, copper, and other metals for bullets, shells, planes, and tanks, we would not have the metals to win that war. We would not have the time to reopen closed mines, or search for new ones. We would be dependent upon foreign supplies and ships. We would be sunk along with those ships. No words can adequately describe our present stupidity or foolishness. It is of the utmost importance that we remedy this condition, and pray we be given the time in which to do it. Let us have no illusions about the task ahead of us. We in Colorado can do very little here. The solution lies in Washington but no one of us can longer remain silent. This is not a party political matter. All of us, not only in Colorado, but throughout the West, must join in the demand that the Federal Government stop the discrimination against domestic-metal mining and take the positive actions so necessary for its restoration. Superficial measures will not be sufficient. Subsidies will give temporary relief but they will not provide a lasting remedy. Subsidies mean increased taxation and Government regulations. No minor wants a subsidy as a permanent cure.

Increased tariffs are useless. They simply invite more foreign currency devaluation. The solution lies in a secure domestic economy and a stable world trade and commerce based upon a uniform and objective standard of value over which no nation has absolute control.

I have referred to our policy of managed paper money. I now say that, in my opinion, it is the cause of much of the turmoil and unrest that afflicts the world.

Whether it be the money of France, England, Germany, China, or the United States, paper money provides no stability nor security. Show me one single nation which has adopted managed paper currency and has successfully maintained the value of that money. I remember when the French franc and the Italian lira were each worth around 20 cents. Today they are worth only a fraction of 1 cent. The British pound is now worth about one-half of what it was only 20 years ago. In the twenties, Germany adopted a paper currency. This was followed by wild inflation and Nazi domination. In the thirties, China abolished its silver money, which was followed by a terrible inflation and Communist conquest. Even our own dollar is now a 60-cent dollar.

Today millions of Americans invest in bonds, social security and insurance to sustain them in times of need or old age. Paper money can render these investments worthless. The dollar you invest today buys about ten loaves of bread. Tomorrow, that paper dollar may not buy ven a slice of bread. We cannot expect labor to stop striking for higher wages and more security in the face of mounting costs of living. No government can balance its budget or reduce taxes; no business can plan a stable future in the face of constantly increasing costs of operation. Prices never stop rising in an economy based on printing press money. Our Federal constitution grants Congress the power to coin money and regulate its value. It forbids the States to make anything but gold and silver coin a legal tender. I am not a lawyer, but I leave it to you whether we are obeying the plain provisions of the Constitution of the United States. We must return to the American people their natural and constitutional right to buy, own and sell gold.

We must find the true price of gold in relation to other commodities. We should remonetize gold at that price and return to the gold standard. I know the gold standard has not been perfect, but it is far superior to paper money. It provides a relatively stable and permanent measure of value. Under the gold standard, our money will keep its value, just as the gold coins of ancient Rome and Greece have kept their value. With the gold standard, the money we use to buy bonds, social security and insurance will buy as much when we cash those bonds or need that security or insurance.

Finally, we must insist the other nations of the world also return to the gold or silver standard, or both. We must end the fiction of pegged exchanges whereby the paper moneys of the world are given an artificial value in relation to each other. Surely we can insist upon this as part of our foreign aid program.

It is only through these means that American metal miners can receive an equitable price for their gold and silver. When world currencies are stabilized and valued in terms of gold or silver, then American producers of lead, zinc copper and other base metals can be given the tariff protection necessary to preserve their operations and the high standards of living in this country.

We citizens of Colorado have a huge stake in metal mining. On my last trip east, a prominent official of a nationally known mining company told me Colorado was sitting on top of the biggest mining boom in the history of the State. We must use every means to remove the unfavorable conditions which now prevent the realization of that boom.

In conclusion, I wish to again thank Mr. Lloyd Yoder, manage of statio KOA, for making this time available. It has been a pleasure to report to you on the activity of your State government. So, from the people of Colorado to the people of Colorado—may I wish you all good luck, good health, good government.

Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stassen's Warning," appearing in the Evening News on June 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STASSEN'S WARNING

No American with an open mind is likely to quarrel with President Stassen, of the University of Pennsylvania, in his statement at the dedication of the P. P. & L. power plant at Shamokin Dam yesterday, that the readiness of the people "to let the Government do it" can easily lead to servitude.

With no reflection on the one-time Republican candidate for President, his statement is but a repetition of the same truth as revealed in the nursery, the sports field, the swimming pool, a thousand other places where self-reliance and a refusal to accept aid from others builds character and preserves freedom.

The most humiliating pages in American history are those which deal with examples of men who prefer relief to wages, who run to Washington instead of away from it in solving problems within their capacity, of yielding local authority to centralized government for the sake of money, of tainting education and risking the tyranny of dictatorship for the sake of a dormitory or a boost in faculty salaries.

Thomas Jefferson kept preaching that the best government is that which governs least. That means that the people, in his opinion, should go it alone just as far as they could, to manage their own affairs, to ward off the hand of government in the thousands of places government now sticks its fingers.

The great tragedy of recent years is that almost unconsciously the people have been surrendering their liberties. Freedom, under such circumstances, is not lost over night. That loss is much like a gradual and imperceptible growing paralysis. And it is the tragic end of such a process against which President Stassen warned in his Shamokin Dam speech.

Standard Operating VA Hospital Beds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like very much to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tabulation of standard

operating hospital beds by State, type, and number as of June 30, 1946, 1947, January 31, 1949, and April 30, 1950, with gains and losses April 30, 1950, against June 30, 1946.

This statistical information, so valuable and pertinent at this time, was prepared by Mr. Quintus E. Camp, of the national headquarters, Disabled American Veterans. It represents a tremendous amount of research work and enables us here in Congress to evaluate the hospital situation in our respective localities. It is most worthy of careful study. It follows:

Standard operating Veterans' Administration hospital beds, by State, type, and number, June 30, 1946 and 1947, Jan. 31, 1949, and Apr. 30, 1950, with gains and losses, Apr. 30, 1950, against June 30, 1946

	Type	Beds						Remarks
		1946	1947	1949	1950	Gain	Loss	
Alabama (total)					3,399			
Tuscaloosa	Neuropsychiatric	782	892	1,010	909	127		
Tuskegee	do	2,256	2,256	2,004	2,205		51	
Montgomery	General medical and surgical	329	300	268	285		44	
Arizona (total)					937			
Tucson	Tuberculosis	428	428	414	408		20	
Whipple	do	527	391	385	385		142	
Phoenix	General medical and surgical	158	144	144	144		14	POW hospital.
Arkansas (total)					2,380			
North Little Rock	Neuropsychiatric	1,782	1,760	2,095	2,080	298		
Fayetteville	General medical and surgical	305	305	255	300		5	
California (total)					8,645			
Livermore	Tuberculosis	458	452	458	445		13	
San Fernando	do	394	389	379	367		27	
Palo Alto	Neuropsychiatric	1,417	1,473	1,161	1,464	47		
Los Angeles	General medical and surgical	3,316	3,594	3,119	3,519	203		
Fresno	do				115	115		250 beds new.
*Oakland	do	USN	800	800	712	712		Navy.
San Francisco	do	438	357	396	414		24	
Van Nuys [1]	do	1,500	1,500	1,489	1,609	109		Army, Birmingham.
Colorado (total)					1,365			
Fort Lyon	Neuropsychiatric	1,026	918	781	887		139	
Fort Logan	General medical and surgical	USA	300	326	326	326		Station hospital.
Grand Junction	do				152	152		New May 16, 1949.
Connecticut: Newington	do	402	387	289	352		50	
Delaware: Wilmington	do	AAF	AAF 150	AAF 150	280	280		New, 300 beds.
District of Columbia: Washington	do	327	327	335	335	8		
Florida (total)					1,223			
Bay Pines	do	600	440	440	395		205	
*Coral Gables	do	USA		450	450	450		Army, Pratt.
Lake City	do	419	378	378	378		41	
Georgia (total)					2,543			
Atlanta	Tuberculosis	415	345	225	225		190	
Augusta	Neuropsychiatric	1,417	1,376	1,206	1,327		90	
Chamblee [2]	General medical and surgical	USA	750	750	631	631		Army, Lawson.
*Dublin	do	USN	USN	249	360	360		Navy.
Idaho: Boise	do	203	263	238	250	47		
Illinois (total)					7,965			
Danville	Neuropsychiatric	2,298	2,050	2,025	1,721		577	
Downey	do	2,050	2,929	2,947	2,587	537		Including 2 Navy hospitals.
Dwight	General medical and surgical	196	286	286	228	32		
Hines	do	1,993	3,474	3,109	3,253	1,260		Including Army, Vaughn.
Marion	do	214	202	176	176		38	
Indiana (total)					2,647			
Marion	Neuropsychiatric	2,086	1,952	1,650	1,750		336	
Fort Harrison	General medical and surgical	USA	500	500	500	500		Army, Billings.
Indianapolis	do	405	345	349	347		58	
Iowa (total)					2,081			
Knoxville	Neuropsychiatric	1,940	1,940	1,631	1,631		309	
Des Moines	General medical and surgical	545	452	393	450		95	
Kansas (total)					2,688			
Topeka	Neuropsychiatric	600	1,400	1,400	1,350	750		Army, Winter.
Wadsworth	General medical and surgical	2,062	1,017	1,082	1,082		980	
Wichita	do	256	256	256	256			
Kentucky (total)					2,945			
Outwood	Tuberculosis	378	376	376	320		58	
Lexington	Neuropsychiatric	859	1,230	1,230	1,230	371		
*Fort Thomas	General medical and surgical	USA	USA	308	395	395		Station hospital.
Louisville	do	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000			Army, Nichols.
Louisiana (total)					1,194			
Alexandria	General medical and surgical	722	662	662	543		179	
New Orleans	do	USN	1,000	670	651	651		Navy.
Maine: Togus	Neuropsychiatric	1,102	924	864	869		233	

[1] 1,609 beds in Van Nuys, Calif. (Birmingham General Hospital), to be closed and 1,500 beds, Long Beach, Calif., Naval Hospital, to be opened. (This will result in a net loss of 109 beds in California.)

[2] 631 beds to be closed in the near future and 500 beds in Augusta, Ga., Oliver General Hospital, to be opened. (This will result in a net loss of 131 beds to Georgia.)

*Star indicates permanent installation taken over from service department. Other entries indicating service hospitals are of temporary or semipermanent construction.

Standard operating Veterans' Administration hospital beds, by State, type, and number, June 30, 1946 and 1947, Jan. 31, 1949, and Apr. 30, 1950, with gains and losses, Apr. 30, 1950, against June 30, 1946—Continued

	Type	Beds						Remarks
		1946	1947	1949	1950	Gain	Loss	
Maryland (total)					2,301			
Perry Point	Neuropsychiatric	1,798	1,930	1,830	1,910	112		
Fort Howard	General medical and surgical	443	443	389	491	48		
Massachusetts (total)					4,976			
Bedford	Neuropsychiatric	1,913	1,875	1,642	1,871		60	
Northampton	do	1,106	1,137	925	1,105		1	
Rutland Heights	Tuberculosis	497	496	619	618	121		
Framingham	General medical and surgical	USA	1,000	1,100	1,000	1,000		Army, Cushing.
West Roxbury	do	382	382	316	382			
Michigan (total)					3,185			
Fort Custer	Neuropsychiatric	2,044	2,150	2,048	2,087	43		
Dearborn	General medical and surgical	460	455	1,117	1,007	547		
Iron Mountain	do				91	91		250 beds new.
Minnesota (total)					2,332			
St. Cloud	Neuropsychiatric	1,532	1,532	1,382	1,382		150	
Minneapolis	General medical and surgical	808	1,044	762	950	142		Including Army, Fort Snelling.
Mississippi (total)					1,930			
Gulfport	Neuropsychiatric	972	1,098	939	1,098	126		
Biloxi	General medical and surgical	244	238	202	238		6	
Jackson	do	250	650	750	594	344		Army, Foster.
Missouri (total)					1,382			
Excelsior Springs	Tuberculosis	271	253	251	251		20	
Springfield	do	USA	500	600	493	493		Army, O'Reilly.
Jefferson Barracks	General medical and surgical	734	724	561	638		96	
Montana: Fort Harrison	do	294	294	238	264		30	
Nebraska: Lincoln	do	379	340	280	300		79	
Nevada: Reno	do	31	33	166	125	94		
New Hampshire					0	0	0	150 beds soon ready.
New Jersey: Lyons	Neuropsychiatric	2,595	2,557	2,234	2,522		73	
New Mexico (total)					512			
Fort Bayard	Tuberculosis	377	285	223	223		154	
Albuquerque	General medical and surgical	306	305	254	289		17	
New York (total)					8,890			
Castle Point	Tuberculosis	619	619	613	605		14	
Sunmount	do	583	573	564	374		209	
Canandaigua	Neuropsychiatric	1,947	1,745	1,713	1,700		227	
Northport	do	2,806	2,794	2,312	2,702		104	
Batavia	General medical and surgical	294	294	294	84		210	
Bath	do	428	414	414	458	30		
Bronx	do	2,059	1,665	1,509	1,611		448	
Brooklyn	do	PHS	PHS	PHS	460			1,000 beds, new.
			400	400				
Buffalo	do				594	594		1,005 beds new.
Saratoga Springs	do	50	Closed	50	50			Reopened.
Staten Island	do	Army Halloran	1,500	1,500	720	720		
North Carolina (total)					1,828			
Oteen	Tuberculosis	1,182	1,996	1,996	1,500	318		Including Army, Moore.
Fayetteville	General medical and surgical	335	321	416	328		7	
North Dakota: Fargo	do	159	197	400	336	177		
Ohio (total)					4,623			
Brecksville	Tuberculosis	404	260	260	264		140	
Chillicothe	Neuropsychiatric	2,262	2,262	2,116	2,155		107	
Cleveland	General medical and surgical	144	964	1,000	1,000	856		Army, Crile.
Dayton	do	1,052	1,004	1,004	1,204	142		
Oklahoma (total)					579			
Muskogee	General medical and surgical	418	386	386	359		59	
Oklahoma City	do	USA	220	220	220	220		Army, Will Rogers.
Oregon (total)					1,178			
Roseburg	Neuropsychiatric	670	670	557	668		2	
Portland	General medical and surgical	526	515	412	510		16	
Pennsylvania (total)					4,230			
Coatesville	Neuropsychiatric	2,211	2,119	1,893	1,914		297	
Lebanon	do			501	501	501		New.
Aspinwal	General medical and surgical	1,020	941	714	935		85	
Butler	do	USA	1,000	1,000	880	880		Army, Deshon.
Rhode Island: Providence	do			399	354	354		New.
South Carolina: Columbia	do	703	703	606	700		3	
South Dakota (total)					1,228			
*Fort Meade	Neuropsychiatric	720	720	720	720			Station hospital.
Hot Springs	General medical and surgical	276	270	270	270		6	
Sioux Falls	do				238	238		New.

Standard operating Veterans' Administration hospital beds, by State, type, and number, June 30, 1946 and 1947, Jan. 31, 1949, and Apr. 30, 1950, with gains and losses, Apr. 30, 1950, against June 30, 1946—Continued

	Type	Beds						Remarks
		1946	1947	1949	1950	Gain	Loss	
Tennessee (total)					3,995			
Memphis	Tuberculosis	560	300	300	300		260	
Murphreesboro	Neuropsychiatric	1,006	1,258	1,307	1,105	99		
Memphis (Kennedy)	General medical and surgical	USA	1,750	1,750	1,426	1,426		Army, Kennedy.
Mountain Home	do	611	611	605	564		47	
Nashville	do	300	500	700	600	300		Army, Thayer.
Texas (total)					5,124			
Kerrville	Tuberculosis	408	400	695	419	11		
Waco	Neuropsychiatric	2,214	2,214	1,942	2,040		174	
Amarillo	General medical and surgical	187	187	156	187			
Dallas	do	349	366	270	354	5		
*Houston	do	USN			744	744		Navy.
McKinney	do	100	1,000	1,000	619	519		Army, Ashburn.
Temple	do	500	1,000	1,000	761	261		Army, McCloskey.
Utah: Salt Lake City	do	204	194	150	204			
Vermont: White River Junction	do	239	239	188	250	11		
Virginia (total)					3,634			
Roanoke	Neuropsychiatric	2,353	2,000	2,000	2,000		353	
Kecoughtan	General medical and surgical	335	604	604	564	229		
*Richmond	do	1,000	1,000	1,100	1,070	70		Army, McGuire.
Washington (total)					1,858			
Walla Walla	Tuberculosis	421	421	421	421			
American Lake	Neuropsychiatric	825	1,028	904	903	78		
Vancouver	General medical and surgical	USA	600	575	534	534		Army, Barnes.
West Virginia (total)					1,170			
Huntington	General medical and surgical	266	290	290	270	4		
Martinsburg	do	USA	1,000	1,000	900	900		Army, Baker.
Wisconsin (total)					2,454			
Waukesha	Tuberculosis	232	232	256	256	24		
Tomah	Neuropsychiatric		757	1,172	1,085	1,085		New.
Wood	General medical and surgical	1,417	1,473	1,409	1,113		304	
Wyoming (total)					978			
Sheridan	Neuropsychiatric	900	900	777	777		123	
Cheyenne	General medical and surgical	201	201	151	201			
Puerto Rico: San Juan	do	USN	200	200	200	200		Navy.

* Star indicates permanent installation taken over from service department. Other entries indicating service hospitals are of temporary or semipermanent construction.

Army and Navy hospitals operated by Veterans' Administration and later abandoned: Fort Washington, Md., 68 beds; Mendota, Wis., 257 beds; Miami Beach, Fla., 300 beds; New Orleans, La., 315 beds; Sampson, N. Y. (?) (abandoned before June 30, 1946).

The above chart includes 8,030 beds in semipermanent hospitals scheduled for closing without replacements. This chart does not include any domiciliary beds.

ADDITIONAL HOSPITALS IN VARIOUS STAGES OF CONSTRUCTION, PLANNING, ETC., FROM JULY 31, 1949, REPORT UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED

Alabama: Birmingham, 500-bed general medical and surgical; opening not scheduled. Tuskegee, 100-bed general medical and surgical addition; opening not scheduled.

Arizona: Pheonix, 200-bed general medical and surgical; opening scheduled February 1951.

Arkansas: Little Rock, 500-bed general medical and surgical; scheduled April 1950, dedication date November 26, 1950.

California: Livermore, 119-bed tuberculosis addition; accepted October 26, 1949, original plant being rehabilitated. San Fernando, 130-bed tuberculosis addition. Accepted October 18, 1949, original plant being rehabilitated. Van Nuys, 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric. Not contracted, to be built on site of Birmingham Hospital. San Francisco, 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric. Not scheduled.

Connecticut: West Haven, 400 tuberculosis, 500 general medical and surgical. Not scheduled.

District of Columbia: Washington, 500-bed general medical and surgical. Not contracted, reduced from 750, January 10, 1949.

Illinois: Chicago, 500-bed general medical and surgical, Medical Center District, not scheduled. Reduced from 1,000, January 10, 1949. Chicago, 500-bed general medical and surgical, Northwestern University. Not scheduled. (Tumor clinic.)

Indiana: Ft. Wayne, 200-bed general medical and surgical. Scheduled for February 1950. Indianapolis, 500-bed general medical and surgical. Scheduled for March 1951.

Iowa: Iowa City, 500-bed general medical and surgical. Not scheduled.

Kansas: Topeka, 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric. Not scheduled.

Kentucky: Louisville, 500-bed general medical and surgical. Not scheduled, reduced from 750, January 10, 1949.

Louisiana: Alexandria, 250-bed tuberculosis addition. Scheduled June 1950. Shreveport, 450-bed general medical and surgical. Scheduled March 1950, not shown April 30, 1950 report. New Orleans, 500-bed general medical and surgical. Not scheduled.

Maryland: Baltimore, 300-bed tuberculosis. Not scheduled.

Massachusetts: Boston, 1,000-bed general medical and surgical. Not scheduled. Brockton, 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric. Not scheduled.

Michigan: Ann Arbor, 500-bed general medical and surgical; not scheduled. Saginaw, 200-bed general medical and surgical; scheduled April 1950; will be available September 1950.

Minnesota: Minneapolis, 350-bed general medical and surgical addition; not scheduled.

Missouri: Jefferson Barracks, 500-bed neuropsychiatric addition; not scheduled. Kansas City, 500-bed general medical and surgical; not scheduled; 250-bed cut-back January 10, 1949. Poplar Bluff, 200-bed general medical and surgical; scheduled March 1950; available September 1950. St. Louis, 500-bed general medical and surgical; not scheduled, reduced from 1,000, January 10, 1949.

Montana: Miles City, 100-bed general medical and surgical; scheduled December 1950.

Nebraska: Grand Island, 200-bed general medical and surgical; scheduled April 1950; dedication date July 30, 1950. Omaha, 500-bed general medical and surgical; scheduled July 1950.

New Hampshire: Manchester, 150-bed general medical and surgical; scheduled April 1950; dedication date July 2, 1950.

New Mexico: Albuquerque, 250-bed tuberculosis addition; not scheduled.

New York: Albany, 1,005-bed general medical and surgical; scheduled June 1950, to be converted to tuberculosis hospital; 80 percent complete. New York City, 1,250-bed general medical and surgical; not scheduled, increased from 1,000 beds, January 10, 1949. Peekskill, 1,965-bed neuropsychiatric; scheduled January 1950 (Franklin Delano Roosevelt Hospital); dedicated May 21, 1950. Syracuse, 500-bed general medical and surgical; not scheduled; reduced from 1,000 beds, January 10, 1949.

North Carolina: Durham, 500-bed general medical and surgical; not scheduled. Salisbury, 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric; not scheduled; previously to be in North Carolina area; 921 beds originally set up for Salisbury canceled January 10, 1949, but restored at 1,000 beds; other project eliminated.

North Dakota: Minot, 162-bed general medical and surgical; scheduled December 1949, dedicated June 11, 1950 (John Moses Veterans Memorial Hospital).

Ohio: Brecksville, 140-bed tuberculosis addition; scheduled April 1950; 99 percent completed June 1950. Cincinnati, 500-bed gen-

eral medical and surgical; not scheduled; reduced from 750 beds, January 10, 1949. Cleveland, 500-bed general medical and surgical; not scheduled; reduced from 1,000 beds, January 10, 1949. Cleveland, 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric; not scheduled; reduced from 1,250 beds, January 10, 1949.

Oklahoma: Oklahoma City, 500-bed general medical and surgical; not scheduled; reduced from 1,000 beds, January 10, 1949.

Oregon: Portland, 155-bed tuberculosis addition; scheduled July 1950.

Pennsylvania: Altoona, 200-bed general medical and surgical; scheduled November 1949, available November 1950. Erie, 200-bed general medical and surgical; scheduled March 1950. Lebanon, 545-bed neuropsychiatric addition; scheduled March 1950, 97 percent complete June 1950. Philadelphia, 500-bed general medical and surgical; not scheduled, reduced from 1,000 beds January 10, 1949. Pittsburgh, 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric; not scheduled, reduced from 1,250 beds, January 10, 1949. Pittsburgh, 750-bed general medical and surgical; not scheduled, reduced from 1,200 beds, January 10, 1949. Wilkes-Barre, 475-bed general medical and surgical; scheduled August 1950.

Texas: Big Spring, 250-bed general medical and surgical; scheduled November 1949, dedication date September 10, 1950. Bonham, 50-bed general medical and surgical (300 domiciliary); scheduled November 1950. Dalias, 500-bed general medical and surgical addition; not scheduled. Marlin, 200-bed general medical and surgical; scheduled May 1950, 99 percent complete June 1950.

Washington: Seattle, 300-bed general medical and surgical; scheduled November 1950.

Spokane, 200-bed general medical and surgical; scheduled June 1950, 99 percent complete June 1950.

West Virginia: Beckley, 200-bed general medical and surgical; scheduled August 1950. Clarksburg, 200-bed general medical and surgical; scheduled September 1950.

Wisconsin: Madison, 500-bed tuberculosis; scheduled June 1951.

ELIMINATED JANUARY 10, 1949

New York City, R/B, 1,000 beds.

Harrisburg, Pa., general medical and surgical, 200 beds.

Charlotte, N. C., general medical and surgical, 500 beds.

Salisbury, N. C.,[1] neuropsychiatric, 921 beds.

Americus, Ga., tuberculosis, 250 beds.

Chattanooga, Tenn., general medical and surgical, 500 beds.

Gainesville, Fla., neuropsychiatric, 1,000 beds.

Greenville, S. C., general medical and surgical, 200 beds.

Memphis, Tenn., neuropsychiatric, 1,000 beds.

Tallahassee, Fla., general medical and surgical, 100 beds.

Thomasville, Ga., general medical and surgical, 100 beds.

Toledo, Ohio, neuropsychiatric, 1,000 beds.

Decatur, Ill., general medical and surgical, 250 beds.

Duluth, Minn., general medical and surgical, 200 beds.

Norman, Okla., neuropsychiatric, 750 beds.

Houston, Tex.,[2] neuropsychiatric, 1,000 beds.

Mound Bayou, Miss., general medical and surgical, 200 beds.

Tupelo, Miss., general medical and surgical, 200 beds.

Klamath Falls, Oreg., general medical and surgical, 200 beds.

San Diego, Calif., general medical and surgical, 200 beds.

Columbia, S. C., general medical and surgical addition, 200 beds.

Detroit, Mich., tuberculosis, 500 beds.

[1] See North Carolina above.

[2] Replaced by United States Navy hospital.

"During Good Behavior"—The National Judiciary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "'During Good Behavior'—The National Judiciary," delivered on June 22, 1950, by Walace Hawkins, of the Dallas Bar Association and the State Bar of Texas, to the Mississippi Bar Association meeting at Biloxi, Miss.

I am advised by the Government Printing Office that printing Mr. Hawkins' address will take one-half a page more than the two printed pages allowed under the rule without a statement of cost, and that the estimated cost is $205.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"DURING GOOD BEHAVIOR"—THE NATIONAL JUDICIARY

Impeachment is a constitutional and judicial procedure specially designed by the founding fathers to remedy many of our present-day governmental complaints. We must resurrect, reactivate, streamline, and make it a powerful and effective institution of our National Government. It is not a bungling, impractical scarecrow if used for the purposes for which it was intended. The removal from power and office of national officers, unfaithful to the Nation and guilty of political offenses against its institution, is the sole and only relief which the high court of impeachment can grant. The impeachment process was carefully implanted in the Constitution with the purpose and intent of having at hand a practical and workable remedy for the protection and defense of our Government and constitutional institutions against those who exercise a public trust. It was designed as a means of inquiring into the acts and conduct of our national officials. Moreover, the highest court known to us was established with jurisdiction to adjudicate the guilt or innocence at a public trial of national officials accused of offenses against the Nation described as high crimes and misdemeanors. These political offenses against our constitutional system and governmental institutions are made justiciable at the will of the people's elected representatives.

If we are to improve the administration of justice, and indeed if we are to defend and maintain our form of government, we must activate our national grand jury and require it to perform those duties assigned to it by the Constitution. Our national prosecutor—the House of Representatives—must assume and perform its constitutional duties. The high court of impeachment must convene and, at regular sessions and in the manner and according to the habits and customs of a judicial tribunal, dispose of the cases which may be presented.

I. HIGH CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS OF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

My remarks are principally concerned with the impeachment of Federal judges who, unlike officers of the executive branch of the Government, hold their offices during good behavior. It must be observed, however, that our people as well as national statesmen are involved and concerned at this time with executive officers who hold office only during the pleasure of the President, or the appointing power.

During the last 15 years, our people have witnessed the flowering of so-called administrators—executive officers who hold office at the pleasure of the Executive and who at one and the same time are legislator, prosecutor, judge, jury, and sheriff. Indeed the life of our people is ordered now by a vast horde of officers who are appointed by the Persident and the executive branch of our Government. The behavior of such officials is a matter of the greatest concern. It is inevitable, even in the natural course of events, that among such a large mass of rulers, thrice removed from responsibility to the electorate, men unworthy of the political privilege of holding office will creep in. The number of the unfaithful will necessarily increase in proportion to the number of such officers. Sheer weight of numbers weakens the effectiveness of the ordinary removal power.

At the moment our people are innocent bystanders to a heated and violent investigation and hearing relating to the alleged communistic attachments and activities of a few executive officers. This class of unfaithful officeholder is not, of course, among the common run. A Communist officeholder is not an accident. He acquires his office by stealth and infiltrates according to a plan formulated by enemies of our American institutions.

Our concern for the defense of the Nation against avowed political enemies is illustrated by the general positive law which makes the advocacy of the overthrow of our Government by force or violence an indictable offense The danger to our Government resulting from the conduct of privates in the fifth column alone, excluding the top brass who may also influence Government power, has been sufficiently clear and present to support recent mass convictions.

We may be sure that the general law against communistic activity applies to officers in the executive branch of our Government. Lawyers concede that the law applies with peculiar force to the legal profession.

In addition to the general criminal code, our people have also the protection arising from the power and duty of the Chief Executive to remove such officers without indictment, trial, or conviction in our courts. No one has any complaint of the intramural activities of the executive department itself and its loyalty boards designed to remove from office the unfaithful executive officers.

The founding fathers, however, did not entrust the safety and defense of our Government and its institutions to mere indictment and conviction under general law and executive removal from office. In addition to these remedies, the Constitution provided a special legislative process called impeachment. The doctrine of separation of powers, by which each of the three great branches of the Government—the legislative, executive, and judicial—is made independent of the control of the others, was sacrificed in the creation of the impeachment procedure. Impeachment cuts across judicial and executive powers and reserves to the Congress, closest to the people, the special power and jurisdiction to remove officials of the other departments of the Government for specified acts and conduct. The power of the Congress to remove from office executive officials is a remedy over and above, and in addition to, the power and duty of the President and executive appointing officers. To be sure, this extra power and jurisdiction of the Congress to remove is limited to high crimes and misdemeanors.

The charges being currently made against executive officials are of the very kind and character included by the founding fathers in the express and positive jurisdiction of

the high court of impeachment. If the facts supporting even a small part of the charges exist against executive officers which appear in our newspapers, the docket of our high court of impeachment ought to be crowded. Our daily newspapers should by now be full of the details of the trial and testimony in the case of the United States against communistic officeholders. Lawyers may be sure that the impeachment process is adequate and can well accommodate itself to mass trials. In such a supposed judicial proceeding with potential jurisdiction now resting in the United States Senate, most any lawyer in America would be compelled to observe that at least a few members of the court have already disqualified themselves as impeachment judges.

II. MISBEHAVIOR OF FEDERAL JUDGES

The removal by impeachment of Federal judges for high crimes and misdemeanors is familiar to all. Should the Congress empower the judicial branch of the Government, by special tribunals, to remove judges for misbehavior? It does seem that other methods for the removal of judges for misbehavior should exist. Certainly other methods existed in England for the removal of judges at the time our Constitution was written. Is impeachment the only possible remedy to remove from office a judge who is guilty of misbehavior? Did the framers of our Constitution intend that the special legislative method of removal by impeachment, restricted and limited as it is to high crimes and misdemeanors, should be the sole and exclusive method for deposing a Federal judge? Can it be soundly maintained that treason, bribery, and other high crimes and misdemeanors constitute a complete and exclusive recital of the causes for the removal of a Federal judge? If congressional impeachment by trial in the nature of a criminal proceeding is the only method, and if high crimes and misdemeanors are the sole causes for the removal of a Federal judge, I would then ask what you will do with another, separate, and different mandate of the Constitution which declares that a judge may exercise judicial power only during good behavior. The judicial commission of a judge says that it is good and endures only as long as he shall behave himself well. This tenure is expressed in the very language of the statute fixing the tenure of English judges. Nevertheless the English courts were open and continued to remain so for the removal of a judge whose misbehavior constituted a forfeiture of his office.

Undoubtedly the Constitution makers intended that judges should hold office during good behavior, and, in addition to removal by impeachment, they contemplated that our courts could remove judges whose conduct amounted to misbehavior. The platitude of our generation, however, is that a Federal judge holds office for life and can be removed only by impeachment. It seems fairly clear that this impression is a historical inheritance derived from the battlecry of those who resisted the attempted subjugation of our National Supreme Court by President Jefferson and his political party.

Certainly the framers of our Constitution did not intend that a judge guilty of misbehavior, misconduct in office, neglect of duty, corruption, or personal criminal conduct, should not forfeit his office. Misbehavior, by reason of conduct and acts not amounting to high crimes and misdemeanors, marks the end of a judge's tenure of office. If the constitutional tenure of office is to be enforced and maintained, there must be some method or process to determine and adjudicate a judge's forfeiture of his tenure. We all know that in the United States there has been no such machinery or procedure for the removal of judges who have forfeited their offices because of misbehavior. Since the President making the appointment has no power to remove and the judiciary has not been empowered to declare a forfeiture and remove a Federal judge, the sole available remedy at this time is congressional impeachment for misbehavior of such general magnitude as may constitute high crimes and misdemeanors.

Those who have come in our day to advocate the removal of Federal judges by court action have advanced urgent, convincing, and plausible arguments. They insist that Congress authorizes a judicial tribunal with specific jurisdiction to try judges accused of misconduct in office and to enter judgments suspending and removing judges found guilty of specified misbehavior. It is pointed out that impeachment, the heavy artillery of the Congress, is too ponderous, too slow, too expensive, bunglesome, and inexact. Certainly impeachment is not designed to remove judges who are merely unfit, disabled, or who are guilty of conduct and acts not amounting to high crimes and misdemeanors. It is affirmatively argued that removal by the bench of its own unfit and unfaithful members would neither endanger nor destroy judicial independence, but rather it would fortify and defend this great citadel of our freedom. Removal of misbehaving judges by judicial action is particularly adapted to personal and official misconduct, disability, and inefficiency. In many instances, such judicial machinery and process would avoid trials calculated to bring discredit on the judicial system. Removal by judicial action would be the crowning arch in the program designed to supply business administration of the courts, now becoming popular and which our Chief Justice so forcibly advocates. Moreover, it would give the judicial branch of our Government the same mechanism and procedure for the removal of judges as has been traditionally exercised by the executive and legislative branches of the Government in respect to executive and legislative officers.

The absence of any intramural procedure or process within the judicial branch of the Government for cleaning house has produced and will continue to produce bad consequences. In the first place, there have been attempts to use the impeachment process for purposes for which it was not designed. Impeachment efforts as to a single judge have endured for as long as ten years while the business of the court suffered. One lawyer stated that an impeachment in a particular case was "like employing an elephant to remove an atom too minute for the grasp of an insect." Perhaps the attempt to employ impeachment for purposes and in cases where it was not designed to be used is responsible for our present-day failure to understand its scope and purpose. To illustrate, I would point out that Congress has defined nonresidence in the district and the practice of law as high crimes and misdemeanors. I submit that none of us here could agree that residence outside the district and practicing law are of themselves immoral or criminal, not to mention high crimes and misdemeanors. The consequence is that most of us in despair simply class impeachment as inadequate and impractical. Then, too, there is the criticism we often hear that judges are not only independent but inviolable as a class and beyond the law. The genius of our system is that no officer, not even a judge, is above the law. It must be stated to the everlasting credit of the bench that outbursts of a people without a practical remedy have been few during our national history.

In our day Federal judges have increased in number beyond the wildest imagination. The appointing power for judges has, as we know, no power of discipline or removal. In addition, the business of the national courts and judges, once confined to national law, has now embraced the most minute affairs of the humblest citizen. There is an ever increasing need that our Federal judiciary keep its own house in order. We shall all regret a cry in our land of a wrong without a remedy. It does seem that for the usual cases of misconduct we should implement the judicial branch of the Government itself with a practical and workable judicial mechanism and procedure for maintaining "good behavior" among the judges.

III. HIGH CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS OF FEDERAL JUDGES

Let us consider now impeachment of Federal judges. Is it an effective remedy? Is it practical? Should it be revived and made to work? No American lawyer will question on constitutional grounds the right and power of the Congress to impeach a Federal judge, including members of the Supreme Court of the United States. Impeachment by the House, acting as a grand jury, and trial by the Senate, acting as a high court of impeachment, constitute our ancient and constitutional process for the removal of a judge. A judgment of conviction by the highest court known to our Government simply deprives a judge of a political privilege. It deprives him of the right to exercise judicial power. There is no other punishment, either by fine or imprisonment. The judgment is remedial and in the public interest; it is final, unappealable, and unpardonable. Impeachment is a political action and is prosecuted by the direct representatives of the people. The trial is by a political court and results in a political judgment imposing a political remedy to suppress political wrongdoing.

During the last 170 years, we have come a long way in understanding the scope and purpose of impeachment and how and when it should be used. We have learned that the causes of impeachment are not unlimited. Grounds or causes for justifying impeachment are not simply those deemed sufficient by a dominant political party. We have learned that the constitutional grounds for impeachment are not simply those which may be supported by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. These are the lessons which we learned the hard way in the impeachments of Judge Pickering and Associate Justice Chase. You will recall that the impeachments of these two judges were test cases in President Jefferson's fight to remove John Marshall and his associates. Jefferson's Republicans impeached the Federalists on the bench. We all know that unpacking the Supreme Court by congressional impeachment without constitutional cause is as extra-legal and reprehensible as packing it by the Executive. A judge is not to be deposed simply because the Congress disapproves of his judicial opinion or merely because of a legal error or mistake which is subject to judicial review. Perhaps our last lesson in the matter of what constitutes an impeachable offense is that impeachable acts and conduct need not be indictable acts and conduct under existing criminal laws. Undoubtedly high crimes and misdemeanors comprehend offenses not described by our criminal code. In truth, impeachable conduct and acts falling within the definition of high crimes and misdemeanors may be conduct which is neither immoral nor criminal. This we learned in the Judge Archbald 1912 impeachment case.

Last but not least, we have learned from the attempted impeachments of Judge Peck, of Missouri, and Judge Watrous, of Texas, that impeachment is too slow and ponderous for offenses of mere misbehavior not amounting to high crimes and misdemeanors. It furnishes no adequate and effective remedy for the removal of a judge based on a catalog of petty accusations and isolated and nonrecurring behavior of either personal or

official character. Mere dereliction in judicial duty, inefficiency, inability, physical and mental disability, and abdication, such as engaging in incompatible private affairs or becoming a partisan witness or defender in litigation, could better be remedied by the judicial removal process. Impeachment for such derelictions is simply too expensive and consumes too much time of a busy Congress. These cases, however, do not demonstrate or prove that impeachment is inadequate or ineffective for the purpose for which it was intended. Rather these experiences and efforts prove that in the absence of an available, appropriate remedy, the process of impeachment for high crimes and misdemeanors has been misapplied and tortured in attempts to accomplish purposes for which it was not adapted.

We understand better the scope and purpose of impeachment as well as the definition of high crimes and misdemeanors when we remember that the people reserved to their directly elected representatives the power to impeach judges. Impeachment is and was intended as an effective and practical legislative check on the executive and judicial branches of the Government. It is a special legislative mechanism intended for limited purposes. The target of any impeachment is necessarily a large one, and the evil must concern the stability and welfare of our governmental institutions. It was never intended that high crimes and misdemeanors would be defined with the precision of a criminal or penal code. Mortals could not catalog for the future the misconduct which unfaithful officers would employ against our constitutional institutions. Impeachment was intended as the last line of defense of the people against treason, bribery, and similar conduct tending to endanger, destroy, or subvert the Government. The case of Judge Humphries, a Federal judge of Tennessee who joined the Confederacy, is positive proof that impeachment is a proper and effective remedy against a judge who makes political war against national institutions. Impeachment, up to this time, has been an effective deterrent and preventative of coups d'état, palace revolutions, dictators, and rebellion by public officials. Impeachment is an effective remedy against usurpation and usurpers of power. The impeachment process alone will save our people from dictators, if anything can. It is specially designed as a remedy in behalf of the people against public officials who would subvert or reform our Government and its institutions in other and different modes than those requiring the consent of the people. It is a practical and effective remedy to maintain the stability and integrity of our form of government and political institutions.

There is abundant evidence all over our land that lawyers, without regard to party or creed, are seriously concerned about the chaos in our Supreme Court. Anxiety is focused on the gradual erosion and almost complete abandonment of the usual tools, methods, and techniques of the judicial process. Precedent and stare decisis, technique common to Anglo-Saxons for hundreds of years, are ruthlessly abandoned. The formality of this decisional device is maintained for the benefit of the innocent by the industry of law clerks. Instead law is declared and cases are decided according to legislative technique and methods, and after the fashion of legislators. What ought to be the law seems to be the concern of some of the judges. A desired social or economic result controls. This technique, long familiar to and used by Senators and Representatives, is the current mechanism employed by some judges in the adjudicating process. There is little wonder, then, that we have a judge willing to change his opinion of what the law is from hour to hour or from term to term. It is no wonder that law is pronounced by the judiciary although the Congress has refused to enact such legislation. Nor is it strange that our Congress spends a large portion of its time repudiating the pronunciamentos of the judiciary. Only judges concerned with general policy making as distinguished from mere interpretation of statutes choose and select cases for review on the basis of opportunity to advocate a reform or document a program.

Some of our judges are competing with Congress in legislative matters and are engaged in ex post facto lawmaking. Congress is admonished to delay until the Court legislates. Political considerations masquerade as flexible logic, a term devised to hide intellectual egotism. There is widespread complaint that the Supreme Court is "gradually invading the legislative domain." Recently an associate justice exclaimed that the "high tide in judicial usurpation" is upon us. Senator BRICKER declares judicial legislation a threat to our constitutional government and lists six positive dangers. Rather than executive subjugation of the judiciary, we have cooperative combination in personnel and program displacing an ever-weakening Congress. So-called judicial orders are displacing our statutes. Whole systems of economic regulation punishable by contempt take the place and supersede laws passed by the Congress. It is no wonder that Government loses no program case in a Government court. The danger seems clear and present.

That decisions of our Supreme Court are legislation or forbidden policymaking has been stated countless times by the Justices of our Supreme Court. The tally sheet for the last few years is as follows:

Black	28
Burton	9
Byrnes	2
Douglas	25
Frankfurter	39
Hughes	4
Jackson	13
McReynolds	1
Murphy	19
Reed	20
Roberts	17
Rutledge	14
Stone	15
Vinson	3

Continued acts of legislation or lawmaking by a judge vested with judicial power only is, in the United States, a high crime and misdemeanor. Judicial approval and authorizations to executive officers to make laws are in the same category. The judge who participates in an act of legislation violates his oath of office and that clause in his oath whereby, in conscience, he binds himself to perform his duty as judge "agreeably to the Constitution." Judicial power alone has been delegated to judges. A judge administers justice; he is not a lawmaker.

The constitutional remedy is impeachment. It is the American way. It engenders mutual respect and therefore maintains the stability and insures the integrity of our institutions. It is in the public interest. In the language of our Declaration of Independence, no Member of Congress should countenance the evil by "giving his assent to these acts of pretended legislation." Adequate power and procedures, designed to defend against internal enemies, whether of good or bad intentions, inhabit the framework of our Government. While we are engaged in making democracy work, we should not forget the great impeachment institution and process. We should employ it for the protection of our people. We should dehydrate impeachment and remove its attendant emotionalism. We should put it to work as any other judicial tribunal so that the wrongs which we complain of may be adjudicated, the necessary relief granted, and justice done.

The Genocide Convention—Does It Obligate Us to War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New Orleans States entitled "The Genocide Convention—Does It Obligate Us to War?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION—DOES IT OBLIGATE US TO WAR?

There are many serious questions arising in the Genocide Convention of which the American people should become fully aware and which the United States Senate should fully explore before this treaty is even considered for ratification.

The preamble says:

"The contracting parties * * * being convinced that, in order to liberate mankind from such an odious scourge, international cooperation is required, hereby agree as hereinafter provided:

"Article I. The contracting parties confirm that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and to punish."

Each signatory undertakes the duty—

To prevent genocide, and

To punish genocide.

Where does this obligation begin, and where does it end?

Does it obligate us to prevent and to punish genocide only in our own country, or throughout the world?

Its proponents and endorsers say our obligation ends at our borders.

But Carl B. Rix, of Milwaukee, former chairman and presently a member of the Special Committee on Peace and Law Through the United Nations of the American Bar Association, former president of the American Bar, and a student of this convention since its inception, has written of this obligation:

"The prevention is anywhere in the world—the punishment of offenders is in the country of capture or apprehension until an international tribunal is set up for the purpose of consolidation of trials."

And Mr. Rix wrote: "Clearly a minority in any signatory country may demand help from all contracting nations—the method of deliverance is optional with each country—persuasion, diplomacy, intervention, war if necessary."

Article VII of the convention provides that, "Any contracting party may call upon the competent organs of the United Nations to take such action under the Charter of the United Nations as they consider appropriate for the prevention and suppression of acts of genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in article III."

The State Department's letter of transmittal to the President, endorsed by him in his request to the Senate to ratify this treaty, contains the following:

Thus the heart of the convention is its recognition of the principle that the prevention and punishment of genocide requires international cooperation. However, the

convention does not substitute international responsibility for state responsibility. It leaves to states themselves the basic obligation to protect entire human groups in their right to live. On the other hand, it is designed to insure international liability where state responsibility has not been properly discharged.

The question the bar association's committee on peace and law wants answered is whether or not the affected groups, or their states, shall have the right to demand prevention and suppression of genocide because of the international responsibility of the contracting states.

"We assert," the committee declared in its studied report to the bar association at St. Louis last September, "that if an obligation of the convention is to prevent and suppress geocide wherever it appears in the world in civil and religious wars, in racial and ideological struggles, and in domestic life of the nations, it should be clearly stated. The United States may have to assume such an unknown obligation but, if so, let the country know it. The situation cannot be denied or glossed over any longer."

The ratification of this convention as a treaty by the United States Senate, thus may commit us, as a signatory nation, to perpetual interference in the internal affairs of other nations, and might obligate us, in the case of countries able to defend themselves such as Russia, to warfare if necessary.

Prevention of genocide in other nations calls for force in the final analysis. Punishment of genocide calls first for the apprehension of the accused.

In any case, if the convention is ratified as presented to the Senate, the decision where the obligation to prevent and to punish genocide begins and ends will not be in the hands of our Government, courts, or Congress. For under article IX interpretation of the convention lies with the International Court of Justice, wherever it may be sitting.

The Genocide Convention—How It Invades Domestic Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New Orleans States entitled "The Genocide Convention—How It Invades Domestic Law."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION—HOW IT INVADES DOMESTIC LAW

Article II of the Genocide Convention invades domestic law, nullifies statutes of many of the American States and departing the rule of law boldly enters the misty realm of psychiatry, persecution complexes, and psychological fixations.

Article II says: "In the present convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group, as such:

"(a) Killing members of the group;

"(b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;

"(c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;

"(d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;

"(e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group."

How many are included in "in whole or in part?" One man, one family, one hundred, one thousand?

The State Department says the killing of one person may constitute genocide.

In his letter of transmittal to President Truman, James E. Webb, Acting Secretary of State, quoted the United States representative on the UN Legal Committee as agreeing that:

"If an individual is murdered by another individual, or by a group, whether composed of private citizens or government officials, as part of a plan or with the intent to destroy one of the groups enumerated in article II, the international legal crime of genocide is committed as well as the municipal-law crime of homicide."

What does intent to destroy mean? Was it absent from the race riots in Detroit and Harlem? In lynchings in Georgia? Was it absent in the civil war in China? In border conflicts between India and Pakistan? Are we to be committed to stop genocide wherever it occurs in the world?

George A. Finch, of Washington, member of the Committee on Peace and Law Through the United Nations of the American Bar Association and editor-in-chief of the American Journal of International Law, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee in January on "intent to destroy" and "mental harm" as follows:

"Can it be successfully denied that segregation laws are susceptible of being denounced as causing mental harm to all members of the group against which such laws discriminate? Minority groups in this country are vigorously seeking to have such discrimination abolished by Federal legislation. Can there be any reasonable doubt that if Congress fails to enact the civil-rights laws now being urged upon it and if this convention is ratified as submitted, members of the affected groups will be in a position to seek legal relief on the ground that this so-called genocide convention has superseded all obnoxious State legislation?"

Finally, when is serious mental harm serious, when is it harmful, and when is it only mental? No American judge or jury will be the last arbiter of that question. It will be answered finally by the International Court of Justice if the Senate ratifies this convention as a treaty. Thus, the International Court of Justice is in a position to determine American law, a prerogative up till now reserved exclusively to our own Congress and our own courts.

Frank Graham's Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, this morning's edition of the New York Times printed an editorial concerning the recent defeat of our colleague the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] for the Democratic nomination in North Carolina. This editorial constitutes a fine tribute to the Senator from North Carolina and expresses the wish that his services should not be lost to the American public. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANK GRAHAM'S DEFEAT

It looked for a while as though the majority of the voters of North Carolina were willing to forgive FRANK P. GRAHAM for being a congenital reformer and send him back to the United States Senate, where he has been holding a seat under temporary appointment. He had led a field of four candidates in the primaries on May 28, and had fallen just 13,000 votes short of an absolute majority, but in the run-off election on Saturday he lost by a majority of about 20,000 to his conservative rival, Willis Smith.

Mr. Smith's general position is perhaps suggested by the fact that his success was warmly welcomed by the chairman of the Republican National Committee, Guy George Gabrielson. Mr. Gabrielson said that the Smith victory "is a severe rebuff to President Truman." Reports from North Carolina suggest that this was not all that was involved. A great many North Carolina voters, perhaps enough to have turned the tide, had been led to believe that Senator GRAHAM supported a Federal Fair Employment Practice Act. As a matter of fact, he did not. He believes in doing everything possible to improve relations between the races, but he does not believe in hastening this process by Federal mandate.

Despite this defeat, the fact that more than a quarter of a million North Carolina voters wanted to send Dr. GRAHAM back to the Senate indicates a growing liberalism in that State. As a professor for 15 years, president for 19 years, of the University of North Carolina, he has been an advocate of civil liberties, of the rights of labor, and of more high-minded policies than could be enumerated in a column of type. One journalist who wrote about him last year reported that at one time or another he had been on more than 200 committees for various reforms and improvements. Once in a while he burned his fingers when he inadvertently found Communists on the same committees, but he is as far from being a Communist as Mr. Smith, or Mr. Gabrielson. One hopes that this defeat does not mean the end of his public life.

The Federal Payroll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, a great deal of discussion was had on the Senate floor recently on the subject of the number of people who are receiving a regular check from the Government. It was first brought to the attention of the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I think the facts presented in the article have been very carefully developed, and I believe it to be a matter which should be called to the attention of Senators. I ask unanimous consent that the article

be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star of June 25, 1950]

ONE IN EVERY FIVE AMERICANS GETTING GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS

(By Martin S. Hayden)

One out of every five will live in whole or in part this year off a Government check.

This is the report of Federal statisticians assigned to determine how many people currently receive pay, pensions, insurance, or relief payments from Federal, State, and local Governments.

Added together, the report shows that 27,404,858 people are currently receiving Government checks.

The total includes only those actually receiving payments—not dependents who may be supported by them—and it does not include such indirect support as that given farmers through crop-support payments or bounties for not growing what they could have grown.

The 27,404,858 figure includes present and retired Federal and local civil servants and military personnel, veterans receiving pension or disability payments, veteran dependents receiving Government pensions, recipients of temporary unemployment compensation insurance, social-security beneficiaries, those on local relief rolls and recipients of such Federal aids as old-age assistance, aid to dependent children and aid to the blind.

FIGURES BROKEN DOWN

Gathered from the Federal Security Agency, the Civil Service Commission, the National Defense Establishment and the Department of Labor, the totals follow:

Civilian employees of Federal Government as of April 1950	2,111,000
Employees, State and local governments (year 1949)	3,911,000
Employees, District of Columbia	20,000
Military personel on Federal rolls	1,496,000
Veterans' Administration pension retirement, compensation recipients	2,358,541
Veterans' Administration dependency payment recipients	655,073
Retired Federal civil servants	173,000
Retired Army personel	32,278
Retired Navy personnel	52,201
Federal old-age assistance	2,768,715
Federal aid to dependent children	1,628,882
Federal aid to blind	94,453
Social security old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries	2,888,715
General assistance from State and local governments (605,000 families, estimated three to family)	1,815,000
Unemployment insurance (1949 recipients)	7,400,000
Total	27,404,858

From the taxpayer point of view the most expensive item on the list is the Federal and State payroll.

Total dollars for State payrolls are not available in Washington but figures here show that the cost of the Federal civilian employees in January and February this year averaged approximately $525,000,000 a month.

NINE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-NINE THOUSAND IN 1939

In 1939, the last prewar year when Republicans complained of New Deal payroll extravagance, the total of Federal civilian employees was 969,000. That jumped to 3,569,000 in 1945, dropped to a low of 2,066,000 in 1948 and was back up to the reported 2,111,000 figure as of last April.

Total State payrolls of 3,900,000 in 1939 dropped to a 3,116,000 low in 1944 and began a steady postwar climb to the 3,911,000 monthly average for 1949.

The 2,358,541 Veterans' Administration check recipients break down as follows: 15 Civil War veterans, 542 Indian War, 93,484 Spanish War, 511,679 World War I, 1,699,701 disabled men of World War II, and 53,120 Regular Army personnel retired because of war-incurred disability.

SEVEN MILLION FOUR HUNDRED THOUSAND PAID AS JOBLESS

Biggest single category on the tabulation is the total of those benefiting from unemployment compensation insurance. The 7,400,000 figure is the total of those who received unemployment checks during 1949 and, the Labor Department reports, it is conservative as a 1950 estimate. With 1,558,000 actually receiving checks during April, the totals are running ahead of 1949 and the 7,400,000 will undoubtedly be topped, the program administrators say. The average unemployment compensation recipient can receive a maximum of 20 weeks of such pay.

The 1,815,000 total of local relief recipients is again an estimate by the Federal Security Agency. Local governments report their welfare loads on a family basis and the April report showed 605,000 families. The larger figure is based on an assumption of three individuals per relief family.

Federal officials checked said that the figures given were "definite minimums."

They do not include the number of pensioned local and State employees, a figure not tabulated in Washington. Also left out are employees of street railway, water, and other utilities owned by local governments. Similarly omitted are those permanently hospitalized in Federal and local hospitals, sanitariums and asylums and those in prisons.

Federal Water Resources and Power Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I publish in the RECORD a carefully thought out and constructive statement on Federal water resources and power development made by G. A. Peters, president of the Southwest Washington Public Utility Commissioners Association, to the Federal Water Resources and Power Policies Committee which was appointed by the President.

Also accompanying the statement by Mr. Peters is a statement of policies adopted by the Washington State Public Utility Commissioners Association at its semiannual meeting held in Mount Vernon, Wash., on June 10, 1950:

STATEMENT RELATIVE TO FEDERAL WATER RESOURCES AND POWER POLICIES

The Southwest Washington Public Utility Commissioners Association recommends to the President's Water Resources Policy Commission the enclosed statement of the Washington State Public Utility Commissioners Association as adopted June 10, 1950, at Mount Vernon, Wash.

In addition it is hoped that the Commission may give consideration to the following items:

1. Electric power is one of the most important factors in promoting a higher standard of living and in increasing national productivity and income. From its status as a luxury service for ornamental lighting in 1880, the furnishing of electricity has become the most essential of all types of public-utility service, being second only to the furnishing of domestic water supplies.

2. The founding forefathers were unable to foresee the coming of electricity; and, therefore, they were not able to write into the Constitution of the United States the basic authority for Federal generation and transmission of electricity. The Federal Government has constructed generation and transmission facilities only as an incident to navigation, flood control, irrigation, and national importance of electric-utility service, defense. Because of the general welfare it is considered that the Federal Government has and should have the authority to generate electricity whether by steam plants, hydro or any other means and to transmit energy under the general welfare clause of the Constitution.

3. Electricity should be sold at the lowest possible cost. Electricity should not be burdened by additional subsidy requirements.

4. The free flow of electricity from hydroelectric generating plants to the load centers should not be restricted by monopolization of the available transmission lines. In order that transmission lines may be used in the best public interest and in order that there shall not be monopolization of power sources merely through control or ownership of high-voltage lines, the Federal Government should declare all high-voltage transmission lines to be common carriers as is done in the case of railroads.

5. In order that the installation of additional generation facilities may be encouraged, it is considered that the Federal Government should facilitate the planning and construction of generation facilities by public bodies and cooperative agencies. The Federal Government should implement this policy through lending of money, by making information available, and by providing grants-in-aid to the extent that local projects provide flood control, navigational and other nonreimbursable benefits which would be allocated as nonreimbursable if constructed by the Federal Government.

6. The Pacific Northwest is lacking in oil, natural gas and coal supplies such as exist in other areas. In this region the basic source of energy is hydroelectric power. The development of this nondepletable hydro power is essential as a means of conserving other forms of power for other areas. By the same token it is essential that each region be considered to have an inherent equity in its supply of hydroelectric power. This equity in hydro power should be considered to be similar to and to be a part of the concept of regional water rights.

7. The full and ultimate development of the hydroelectric power potentialities of the Columbia River and its tributaries is dependent on the construction of headwater storage reservoirs in Canada. Canadian cooperation is necessary to fuller flood control on the Columbia River and to maximum power development for use either in war or peace. The Federal Government should at once open conversations with Canada looking toward the preparation of a suitable treaty to accomplish those objectives.

8. Alaska is the last great frontier of the United States and will require many years for development. It is likewise one of the most important bulwarks of the national

defense. Alaska has at least 8,500,000 kilowatts of power potential. The Federal Government should institute an orderly program of Alaskan power development both for the encouragement of the Alaskan economy and as a measure of national defense.

Respectfully submitted.

GUS PETERS,
President, Southwest Washington Public Utility Commissioners Association.

The Washington State Public Utility Commissioners Association at its semiannual meeting at Mount Vernon, Wash., June 10, 1950, reaffirms its indorsement of certain policies in regard to power and other natural resources development.

The association urges the President's Water Resources Committee to submit recommendations in furtherance of the following policies:

NATURAL RESOURCES

1. Natural resources belong to the people and should be developed for the public welfare.

2. When such development is financed in whole or in part with the public funds, the benefits should be passed on to the public on a nonprofit basis.

3. Natural resources should be developed by river basins in an orderly manner on a comprehensive and balanced basis by means of multipurpose projects which should be coordinated and integrated with each other with due regard for the peculiar needs of each area and the particular stage of development of each area.

4. The Federal Government should prepare comprehensive plans for developing each river basin and should install facilities necessary for obtaining hydrological data, and make such other studies as may be necessary for adequate planning. Advances in the science of fish propagation, development of fish ladders and protective devices have greatly reduced the mortality of anadromous fish caused by the erection of multipurpose dams.

Further studies should be made, and experiments carried out, in order that this mortality may be further reduced to a point where a well planned and coordinated control of stream flows will actually be beneficial to the fishing industry in the propagation of anadromous fish.

FEDERAL POWER POLICY

5. The existing Federal power policy should be reaffirmed particularly as stated in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 with emphasis on the following four cardinal principles:

Power from Federal projects shall be marketed so as—

I. To encourage the most widespread use of electricity;

II. At the lowest possible rates;

III. Consistent with sound business principles; and

IV. With preference and priority to public and cooperative agencies.

6. The wholesale marketing of Federal power with preference and priority to public and cooperative agencies is essential to insure the most widespread use of electricity in rural as well as urban areas; to insure that the benefits from public developments accrue on a non-profit basis to consumers; to protect the public from monopolization of its sources of power; to insure the resale of electricity at the lowest possible rates; and to insure that publicly generated power may result in a higher standard of living and in fuller regional development. Restricting the sale of power at the bus bar is not in the public interest.

7. Although preference and priority clauses have been included in Federal power laws since 1902, this provision has not always been implemented in actual practice. In order to carry out the preference and priority provisions of Federal law it is essential that Federal agencies construct facilities to deliver power to the load centers of each individual public and cooperative agency regardless of size or location.

8. Where the Federal Government generates a substantial portion of the electric energy requirements of a river basin or region, the Federal Government shall be considered to have a definite responsibility as a public utility to insure that the supply of electric energy shall exceed the demand and that safe operating reserves are maintained.

9. Furthermore, since a substantial portion of the power supply of many regions is dependent on hydroelectric projects and since dams require about 10 years to plan and construct, it is necessary for the Federal Government to look ahead. Advance load studies in these regions must be made on a continuing basis covering future loads for at least a 10-year period in order to permit proper scheduling of dams. Experience has shown that the failure to exercise this foresight and the tendency toward overly conservative load studies had tended to make the Federal construction program lag behind actual needs. Any lag in the power supply of a region impairs the entire national economy and endangers the national defense.

The Public Also Has Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the Switchmen's Union of North America has gone on strike to secure a wage increase of 31 cents an hour. This dispute came before an emergency board appointed by the President. This board recommended a wage increase of 18 cents an hour concurrently with the establishment of a 40-hour week. All railroads accepted this recommendation. The switchmen's union has ignored these recommendations and are now on strike.

Daily we read of strikes. When some small plant is shut down, no one gives it any attention because it is entirely local in character.

The merchants, grainmen, and farmers in my district and State are now confronted with a strike that is seriously threatening their means of livelihood because they cannot sell their products. This particular strike affects everyone in the wheat-producing area of the Middle West.

The farmers are accustomed to many hazards in making a living. He must assume many risks. Many of these risks he knows are inherent in his field of endeavor. He must have moisture; he knows all about dust storms; he knows all about green bugs, mosaic disease, chinch bugs, grasshoppers, rust, hail, and windstorm—any of which can wipe him out economically, but he does not look to Washington to save him from these plagues. He tries to beat them through his own efforts, with his own know-how and ability.

Mr. Speaker, he does look to Washington for one thing, the Government to which he pays his taxes, that it will give him some protection from devastating strikes. He expects his Government to protect him. He knows that the idea back of all government is the protection of the individuals' lives and the rights to property.

He spends a year raising a crop—he can see his efforts all gone by a crippling strike just at harvest time.

Mr. Speaker, he cannot always understand legislation that guarantees a 75 cent hourly wage; a 40-hour week; the right to bargain collectively for men in the plants throughout the country; workmen's compensation insurance; old-age pensions, and many other advantages—all these things guaranteed to other citizens and he has to sit down and see his crops spoil on the ground for lack of box cars to haul them to market. He believes, Mr. Speaker, that his own Government should guarantee him some protection from the terrible effects of some labor bosses sitting down and saying, "We strike. We will not move a wheel until our demands are met."

He knows very well and would not advocate that any man cannot quit his job whenever he so desires, but in our complicated society he believes that no man has a right to join in a concerted effort to stop the movement of trains that so vitally affect our whole economy.

Mr. Speaker, he believes that when a man accepts a job with a public utility in which the general public has a vital interest, such as railroads, power companies, light companies, gas companies, telephone companies, water companies, streetcar and bus companies, and so forth, that that individual must of necessity because of the nature of his employment give up his right to go on strike. In these kinds of cases, the individual rights are secondary to that of the general public. He may quit his job, but he cannot deny others the right to continue on working, or by force, violence or picketing keep another man from taking the job that he left.

Mr. Speaker, I believe most firmly that the general public has the right to demand from his government, full, speedy and effective justice from these crippling public-utility strikes.

It has been the boast of American democracy that all the might and majesty of our Government exists solely for one purpose: To secure the rights of the individual.

Can it now be said that in America a group of willful labor bosses can stop the railroads from hauling wheat that all America needs? Shall this wheat be piled on the ground to be spoiled by the rain and wind?

The people back home in my district still believe and fondly hope that this country still belongs to all the people, all of the time—not to pressure groups most of the time. They want their fundamental ancestral public rights returned to the public, and I am sure they expect the Government in Washington to protect them from these all-powerful labor bosses.

These same people demand of their Congress that it pass the necessary legislation to make it a crime for any public utility to rehire or pay an increase in

wages, for a period of 2 years to any employee who goes out on strike on the railroads after a Presidential emergency board had made a finding of fact as to merits or demerits of a labor controversy.

In view of the strike of the Switchmen's Union of North America against the Rock Island and nine other western railroads, I have today introduced a bill, an amendment to the Railroad Labor Act to prohibit any railroad to reemploy any employee who goes out on strike after a Presidential fact-finding has made its decision. The employer would be liable to a fine of $1,000 if he rehires any employee who goes on strike. The period in which the employer could not rehire any striking employee would be for 2 years.

Recreational Facilities in the Nation's Capital Must Be Available for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress sworn to support the Constitution of the United States of America, I find that I must vote against H. R. 5968, a bill to vest in the Commissioners of the District of Columbia control over all public swimming pools in the District of Columbia.

On the surface, the bill appears to be a step in the right direction, a small step toward home rule for the District of Columbia, a measure which I fully support. The bill would vest in the Commissioners the control over the swimming pools, which are now controlled by the Interior Department. Control over the pools thus would be closer to the citizens of Washington, D. C.

But for some time it has been quite clear to me that no bill is necessary to effect such a transfer of control of pools. I have read in the daily papers that the Interior Department is and has been ready to transfer control of the pools; in fact, the Department has already transferred control of the golf courses, numerous playgrounds, day camps, and other recreation areas and facilities. I see no evidence that Interior is trying to hold on to control of these areas. I am familiar with the Interior Department-Recreation Board agreement of August 29, 1949, which granted the latter agency the right to conduct public recreation activities and programs in many park areas previously controlled by Interior.

What is the joker then? Why is it necessary to introduce a bill, and introduce incidentally a controversy taking up the time of Congress, to do what Interior has already agreed to do?

Obviously, the answer is that it is not necessary to transfer these park areas through congressional legislation except that by this method Interior will be unable to stipulate that the park areas, including swimming pools, shall be operated on the basis of being open to use by all people irrespective of their race, creed, color or national origin. Interior will be unable to require that all American citizens be allowed to use American park areas as it did on the agreement of August 29, 1949.

If this bill is passed, what will be the racial policy for the swimming pools? The Recreation Board, which is required by law to operate recreational facilities for the District of Columbia, has already declared that it will operate the pools on a segregated basis. This then is the crux of H. R. 5968, a bill aimed not to get the pools in the Commissioners' hands, primarily, but having as its purpose to allow the establishment of segregation in the swimming pools of the District. I am opposed to such a bill. I am opposed to segregation or discrimination in any form or guise.

I am confident, on the other hand, that the plans of the Interior Department to avert any possible disturbance, similar to that of last summer, are well thought out. Interior Department officials have trained Park Police to handle any disturbance, bringing in the noted sociologist, Dr. Joseph Lohman of the University of Chicago, to do this job. Interior is training its swimming pool staff to handle its job competently.

Although Metropolitan Police Department has not been reported to be training its force in sound intercultural relations, I am confident that if needed these department officials will be of service.

I say again that H. R. 5968, a cloak for segregation in the Nation's Capital, must not be passed. I say that every effort must be made to help our Interior Department carry out a policy of nonsegregation and afford opportunity for all Americans to enjoy public park facilities.

Resolution of Lithuanian-Americans of Waterbury, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution unanimously adopted by the Lithuanian-Americans of the city of Waterbury and the State of Connecticut at the commemoration of Lithuanian Genocide Day, held under the auspices of the Lithuanian-American Council of Waterbury at St. Joseph's Hall on the 17th of June 1950:

Whereas the 15th of June, 1950, has marked the tenth anniversary since the Soviet Union, in violation of a series of treaties concluded between Soviet Russia and the Baltic States, invaded Lithuania and her northern neighbors with armed forces, annexed them to the Soviet Union, established the Bolshevist totalitarian regime and a year later, June 14–16, 1941, started to destroy the enslaved nations by mass deportations to Siberian hard-labor camps;

Whereas before the end of World War II the Soviet armies moved again into Lithuania, reestablished the police state regime, and resumed the same Communist policy of terror, murder, deportations, and other criminal practices which up to this time have cost Lithuania about one-fourth of her population and threaten to annihilate the entire Lithuanian Nation: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Lithuanian-American Council of Waterbury, representing the majority of Lithuanian-Americans living in Waterbury, voice an emphatic protest against the terroristic activities of the Soviets in Lithuanian and other similarly situated countries, especially against the genocide crime being perpetrated by the Soviet Government; and be it further

Resolved, That the Lithuanian-American Council of Waterbury appeals to the President, the Government of the United States, and the United Nations with the request to take necessary steps to protect Lithuania from terror and prosecution by the Soviets and assist her in regaining her freedom and independence.

LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL OF WATERBURY,
ALEXANDER J. ALEKSIS, *Chairman*.
Miss MARCELLA ANDRIKIS, *Secretary*.

Exchange by Commodity Credit Corporation of American Cotton for Manchurian Soybeans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 7, 1950.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: This is in reply to your inquiry for information involving the exchange by the Commodity Credit Corporation of a quantity of approximately 45,000 bales of cotton for a quantity of 60,000 tons of Manchurian yellow soybeans which exchange was announced in United States Department of Agriculture Press Release No. 1187–50 (May 11, 1950), copy enclosed.

This transaction is covered in an agreement executed as of May 10, 1950, by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the World Commerce Corp., 25 Broad Street, New York City, as the other principal. It was negotiated by a representative of the law firm of Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft, of 14 Wall Street, New York City, as legal counsel for and along with an executive of the World Commerce Corp. A list of names of the board of directors as of May 22, 1950, is enclosed.

In the beginning, it would seem desirable to mention that since June 1949, the Commodity Credit Corporation has supplied roughly 146,000 tons of soybeans to the Department of the Army for shipment to Japan. However, due to the high soybean market prior to and since CCC entered into this agreement, all but roughly 15,000 bushels of CCC-owned stocks have been utilized and the remainder is in small lots scattered over

various parts of the United States. Based on present high prices it seems unlikely that CCC will acquire any of the 1949 crop under the price-support program unless in negligible amounts.

In late April prior to entering into this transaction, the Department of the Army informed us that it required more soybeans to fulfill its responsibility for food needs in Japan but was unable to obtain its soybean requirements in the United States with the funds available for such purposes. At such time (and even today) the high price of soybeans in the United States would not permit domestic mills to process them into end products and ship them to Japan at a cost for which the Army could pay and could obtain foreign-produced soybeans laid down and processed in Japan to meet its requirements.

The cost of freight, both inland and ocean, should also be added to the United States domestic price of soybeans, in making any attempted comparison with foreign-produced soybeans delivered in Japan. In this particular transaction the current United States prices, plus delivery cost to Japan, were unfavorable to the extent that, with the funds available for its soybean requirements, the Department of the Army would not have purchased any soybeans at all in the United States at that time or now.

We should also like to mention that entering the current United States market to purchase this quantity of soybeans for the Army would only serve to increase further the price on an already inflated market. Only recently, prices on the New York and Chicago exchanges reacted strongly to a rumor that CCC was canceling the transaction and would purchase the Army requirements in the United States.

The soybeans are to be delivered in Japan during the next several months and upon such delivery in Japan, the Department of the Army will take over the soybeans and make payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The World Commerce Corp. is obtaining the soybeans from Manchuria, from which area Japan normally has imported its soybean requirements to meet food needs for many years and has been importing some in recent months. These Manchurian soybeans are not from an area in which they are locally needed to meet the present extreme food shortages existing in parts of China today and, since Manchurian soybeans are being exported to other areas of the world, it would seem unlikely that these famine areas would have gotten them anyway.

In regard to cotton and other price support commodities, the Commodity Credit Corporation has been making every effort to dispose of them in a manner which will not impair the price support program. A cotton carryover of four or five million bales would probably be regarded as normal. We can expect a carry-over this summer of around 7,000,000 bales. This points to the desirability of some downward adjustment in the cotton reserve for which this exchange of approximately 45,000 bales provided one more opportunity, while at the same time being exported to an area which recently has not been a normal outlet.

The amount the Commodity Credit Corporation will receive for the cotton will be substantially what it would receive on a sale for cash for export. The transaction is expected, when finally completed, to involve approximately $7,000,000 being returned to the United States Government. At this time it is impossible to give an exact figure, since that is dependent on the final outturn weights of the soybeans after acceptance in Japan based on the results of their analysis to meet certain detailed specifications such as oil content, foreign matter, splits, etc. The cotton side depends on grade, staple length, quantities, and full investment costs, including carrying charges, for each particular lot from various storage locations in the Gulf area.

Provision has also been made that the transferee will take such precautions as may be necessary to preclude the reentry of the cotton or soybeans into the United States. No export subsidy payment will be made on the cotton. Provision has also been made that at the discretion of the Commodity Credit Corporation, other price-support commodities may be substituted for cotton in exchange for the soybeans. However, it is anticipated that the exchange will be based principally on disposal of cotton under the transaction.

In view of the above considerations, it appeared highly desirable to make an exchange of United States cotton for soybeans needed in Japan on a basis which would meet the food requirements of the Department of the Army for soybeans and at the same time which would reduce the cotton carryover in the United States.

We appreciate your interest and trust that this will give you the information that you desire.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH S. TRIGG,
Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that as of May 22, 1950, Frank T. Ryan was president of the World Commerce Corp. and its board of directors consisted of the following persons: E. W. Bickle, James F. Cavagnaro, W. W. Cumberland, Gen. W. J. Donovan, Alfred V. du Pont, J. Russell Forgan, Roger Gilbert, Jocelyn Kambro, James D. Mooney, John A. R. Pepper, Robert L. Raclin, John J. Ryan, Jr., Frank T. Ryan, and Sir William Stephenson.

Postal Curtailment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES V. BUCKLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in New York City, it was my pleasure to attend and address approximately 3,000 postal employees. Represented at the meeting were letter carriers, post-office clerks, men who operate the railway mail cars; in fact, just about every postal group took part in the meeting.

The meeting was called to protest the cuts in postal service that have been ordered by the Postmaster General.

Mr. William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, made the principal address. His remarks clearly pointed out the many defects and ill effects of the postal cutbacks, as well as the losses that businessmen are suffering from poor mail service.

There is one other portion of Mr. Doherty's remarks which I want to call to the attention of every Member. All of us have been receiving a great amount of mail in connection with the curtailment of postal service. Very frequently, these letters try to blame the Congress for the reduction in deliveries and other delays that have resulted since the program went into effect. Mr. Doherty very effectively points out that Congress was not consulted by the Post Office Department prior to the issuance of the curtailment program.

In order to provide an opportunity for other Members to get the true picture of these postal cut-backs, as far as the Congress is involved, I ask unanimous consent to include Mr. Doherty's address as part of my remarks:

I greatly appreciate the honor of attending this grand demonstration as a representative of the National Association of Letter Carriers.

The affiliated postal groups of the metropolitan area of New York deserve high commendation for arranging this meeting. I would ask the chairman of the committee, Brother Charles H. Dillon, to accept my thanks for the invitation to participate in this meeting; further, I would ask him to convey those sentiments of appreciation to the other members of his fine committee.

This is a timely meeting. Never has there been a greater need than now to present the true picture of the postal curtailment order. The American public is entitled to know the truth. The postal employee is entitled to the truth.

Since April 18, 1950, the date Postmaster General Donaldson published his hasty, ill-advised, and unnecessary curtailment order, mail users and postal employees have been confused about the meaning of the order. Both have been subjected to an almost endless barrage of misinformation emanating from the Post Office Department. There has been an equally large amount of misleading and deceptive information about the effects of the order, both real and potential.

This misinformation has been encouraged by certain postmasters, who are obviously acting under orders from the Department. It follows one of three distinct patterns:

No. 1. Mail users are being told by the Department that no cuts have been made in essential services.

No. 2. As a corollary to No. 1, the Department is attempting to define essential postal services.

No. 3. As a self-serving device, the Department is going out of its way to place the blame for the present postal crisis on the Congress, business, the press, and a certain, nameless, grossly insubordinate postal organization.

Who is to determine essential postal services?

Is Jesse M. Donaldson, as the Postmaster General, qualified to say to businessmen: Now look here, Mr. Jones, you don't know what postal services are good for you or for your business. The correspondence you have been carrying on with your mill, your factory, your salesmen, and your customers—come now, Mr. Jones, none of it is really essential?

Is the Postmaster General to decide for 150,000,000 Americans what services and functions of the post office are essential, necessary, and even indispensable to the orderly and peaceful conduct of their lives?

I think not.

Thank God, it is still a good, old-fashioned American tradition for the citizens of this country to do their own thinking—particularly so when it involves their private affairs—and I venture to say that even the Postmaster General is beginning to realize that.

We have never been a nation or a people that allowed ourselves to be led around by the nose, simply to satisfy someone's whim. We have never been one to stand idly by while someone tried to decide for us what is good or bad for our lives, and, pray God, we never shall.

And so it will be, my friends, in the present attempt of the Postmaster General to foist his ill-advised whim on the American people. There hasn't been anything in recent memory that has irritated the American people one-half as much as the postal-curtailment program. It is irritable to citizens

in every walk of life. People are convinced that postal cut-backs are unnecessary, unwise, and ill-advised. Poor mail service is costing mail users financial losses, great inconvenience, and other hardships that no Postmaster General has a right to inflict on the American taxpayers. It is my considered opinion that, before very long, the American people will lower the boom on the present postal policy of inferior mail service. The present Postmaster General is going to find himself in the unenviable position of being a leader of the disinherited.

The organization I have the honor to represent maintains that swift, certain, frequent, and dependable mail deliveries are essential.

We maintain that parcel post deposited and paid for is essential, both to the sender and the addressee.

We maintain that convenient and adequate window service in our post offices is essential.

We maintain that frequent and scheduled mail collections from the corner mail boxes is essential.

We maintain that directory service for misaddressed mail would make it possible to effect final delivery of a great amount of essential mail.

We maintain all these things, because we firmly believe that the prime responsibility of the Post Office Department is service—service to the taxpayers and citizens of our country—the opinion of the Postmaster General to the contrary notwithstanding.

If the National Association of Letter Carriers, in protesting the abdication of that prime responsibility is grossly insubordinate, then I say: Let the chips fall where they may.

But over and beyond these considerations in the public interest, the leaders of the letter carriers are also concerned with the health and morale of its members. We maintain those two items are likewise essential.

Insofar as we can determine, neither the health nor the morale of postal employees have been given one iota of consideration. The late, great Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Mr. Brandeis, once remarked: "Efficiency depends upon consent." It can be reasonably adduced from that observation that a totally disturbed and utterly distracted personnel is not capable of efficient performance. Believe me, when I tell you, postal people at every level are disturbed and distracted. They have no feeling of security. They wonder: what next? And I wonder what one-time letter carrier, Jesse M. Donaldson, is thinking these days. I wonder if he thinks letter carriers are going to consent to eating their lunch on curbstones. Man's first demand upon society is that he be treated as a human being, not as a machine. No employer, not even the Post Office Department, can ignore the vital needs and noble aims of man's nature. His inner dignity must be respected. Forcing a man to eat his lunch on the curbstone in the rain, the snow, and the scorching heat is bad psychology and bad ethics. To deny a man the common, ordinary decencies that are innate in his manhood is reprehensible. It is scarcely the way to encourage his maximum efficiency.

There was a time—and it dates back to the establishment of the postal service—when the American public had unbounded confidence in the efficiency and dependability of the postal service. Unfortunately, that is no longer the case. On the contrary, business firms are placing paid advertisements in the newspapers advising their customers: "Do not depend on the mail service." A wholesale grocer in Philadelphia so advised his 2,100 accounts. A Boston firm found it necessary to tell its customers: "Due to the recent curtailment of postal deliveries, we cannot be sure that your orders would reach you in time." So that company was obliged to discontinue certain services to its patrons.

Indeed, one firm in Dallas, Tex., has filed suit against the local postmaster demanding that its mail be given the same delivery service as its competitors. Apparently, the owner is one businessman who considers his mail essential, even though the Postmaster General has decreed otherwise.

In many respects, these curtailment orders represent no more than the culmination of a carefully fabricated story on the part of the Postmaster General. Actually, the order of April 18 is no more than the execution of a threat that has been held dangling over the heads of the Congress and mail users for many months past.

I would suggest that you take the time, as I have, to go back over the PMG's speeches. Look over his press statements. Study the transcripts of his appearances before congressional committees and elsewhere. In all these you will detect a very definite pattern.

Invariably, the threat was something like this: Certainly, I would dislike the idea of curtailing deliveries, but it looks as if it will have to be done.

Other times the routine would sound something like this: I do not want to eliminate certain postal functions, but I guess I'll have to do just that.

Again, it would be something like this: Now, of course, I do not want to reduce rural deliveries to three or possibly two trips a week, but it is coming to that.

All of these threatened eliminations and reductions were constantly held over the heads of the Congress and mail users. At times the threat was used to bolster an argument for higher postage rates; other times it was convenient to use as a blackjack to secure bigger appropriations. Regardless of the occasion, it was always the same sound and fury.

The cuts were going to be made, come hell, high water, or no mail service.

Well, finally, just about everything that was threatened happened. The bluff was called. Today there is a new scare line. Now we are told that if the Thomas-Taber and Jensen amendments remain in the appropriation bill, further cuts will have to be made. It will be impossible to move the mails, we are being told. Are the mails really moving, since April 18?

I want to tell you, my friends, the National Association of Letter Carriers is unalterably opposed to the Thomas-Taber and Jensen amendments. But we are not using a scare line to point up our opposition. We felt that we could show conclusively that the amendments are not a scientific approach to the problem of controlled Federal spending, consistent with the needs of our expanding Nation, and consistent with the needs of our ever-growing postal establishment. We have apprised the Congress of our reasons along the lines I have just pointed out.

The post office building at Twelfth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, in the Nation's Capital, is today a mausoleum of dead ideas. It is little wonder there is an annual uproar when post-office appropriations are being considered. The Congress, the Hoover Commission, or some authority, owes it to the country to streamline and revitalize the place, and clear away the cobwebs.

This business of constantly threatening the Congress and mail users reminds me of a story.

It seems there was a fellow who got into the bad habit of becoming intoxicated every Saturday night. He became obsessed with the idea. Eventually, he very calmly announced that the following Saturday evening he was going to get intoxicated, even if it killed him. He did, and probably it did.

Now there are two more thoughts I have about this postal curtailment; some comment should be made about both.

The Postmaster General and his staff allegedly have made public statements that the National Association of Letter Carriers has attempted to discredit the Postmaster General and his administrative staff.

It is further alleged that we have exaggerated the effects of the April 18 order.

I want to scotch both of those allegations here and now. Neither has any foundation in fact.

The National Association of Letter Carriers has at no time and in no manner allowed its opposition to the postal cut-backs to be reduced to personalities. Moreover, we do not propose to engage in personalities in our continued opposition.

The order was published in the Postal Bulletin, under date of April 18, 1950. The Bulletin is the official "information and guidance" organ of the Department. Postmaster General Donaldson, as head of the Post Office Department, certainly must assume responsibility for everything that is released by the Department for the "information and guidance" of postmasters and employees, and that includes the curtailment order.

Thus, when we oppose a policy of the Post Office Department, we are not attacking any individual or group of individuals in the Department. It is begging the question to infer otherwise.

Permit me to digress for a moment to say that we are perfectly within our rights when we oppose a policy of the Post Office Department. As far back as 1912 and as recent as 1948, the Congress of the United States enacted legislation guaranteeing us that right. Civil-service employees have a legal right to petition Congress in matters affecting the economic interest of Federal employees. Some overzealous postmasters are attempting to gag opposition to the curtailment order when postal employees are concerned. I would refer those postmasters to the Lloyd-La Follette Antigag Act of 1912, and Public Law 623 of the Eightieth Congress of 1948.

Suppose we petition the Congress in behalf of our economic interest. Let's say that in so doing we oppose an official policy of the Post Office Department. Who is the responsible head of the Postal Establishment? Should we name the Secretary of State? The Secretary of the Interior? The Secretary of Agriculture? Perhaps Kilroy was there.

I want to reiterate, the NALC is opposed to the postal curtailment program, period. Moreover, we will never be reconciled to the order as published.

We have no quarrel with the PMG's public relations section when they describe him as a "quiet and kindly" man. We are not concerned with his personality and winning ways. We are, however, vitally concerned with his snail mail policy, resulting from the April 18 order.

Now, then, have we exaggerated the effects of his snail mail policy?

As the late and beloved Al Smith said on so many occasions to audiences here in New York City, "Let's look at the record."

We have said that the cutback order was hasty, which is to say that neither the Senate nor the House were consulted before the order was published, nor were mail users consulted, nor were postmasters or employees consulted.

If the Postmaster General persists in his excuse that a lack of funds caused the issuance of the curtailment why, in heaven's name, didn't he first try to work out his problem with the Congress? The Members of the Congress are the only people in Washington who could possibly furnish sufficient funds.

The following is to be found in the report of the House Appropriations Committee:

"This amount should suffice to render adequate service without requiring the Department to come in later for deficiency requests."

There is nothing in that language apparent to my eye that even faintly suggests the elimination of certain postal services, and the curtailment of others. It does

not even intimate that the door was closed definitely and finally against a review of the situation.

There was a discussion of the subject on the floor of the House of Representatives on April 24—just a week after the cutback order was issued. In response to a direct question, this is what Congressman GORDON CANFIELD of New Jersey told his colleagues:

"I want to emphasize that the Postmaster General was invited by the very fair and able chairman of our subcommittee and the members thereof to come down and discuss his difficulties before issuing the order. He did not avail himself of a long-time invitation to come before us. Heretofore our relationships have been most happy and we are very much surprised at this order."

Let me add, Mr. CANFIELD is a distinguished member of the subcommittee in the House that handled the Post Office appropriation. Congressman J. VAUGHAN GARY, of Virginia, is the chairman of the subcommittee referred to in Mr. CANFIELD'S remarks.

So it would appear that the Postmaster General was hasty, insofar as the House of Representatives is concerned.

Let's now look at the record on the Senate side. Let's see if the Postmaster General consulted the Senate or if he ran off willy-nilly on his own.

On April 25 the Postmaster General was testifying before the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The following is extracted from the official transcript of the hearings:

"Senator NEELY. General, do you not think that you should have given this committee and the Congress some notice in advance of issuing this order if you had determined that this action should have been taken?

"Senator MCKELLAR. May I interrupt a moment? I want to say that so far as the Appropriations Committee of the Senate is concerned, it had no information or knowledge of the Postmaster General's intention concerning this order.

"Mr. DONALDSON. That is right, Senator MCKELLAR."

Is further proof needed to show that the Postmaster General failed to seek advice and possible assistance from the Congress?

And here is the amazing thing, after figuratively giving the back of his hand to the House Appropriations Subcommittee, and after bypassing completely the Senate committee, the Postmaster General is now pointing the finger at the Congress. Are the people of this country expected to believe that it is the fault of the Congress that mail is being delayed, curtailed, and even lost? I, for one, do not believe that the taxpayers and voters of this country are gullible. In fact, I am positive they are not.

Perhaps we can find something in the record to show where postmasters were consulted before the order was issued. Certainly, they should have been advised. However, there is nothing in the record. Can you imagine a responsible head of one of our large private corporations failing to consult beforehand with his branch managers, on a question of a radical change in policy? Can you conceive of that same corporation head completely ignoring the people in the firm that would have to make the policy click? It is a bald farce for the Department now to be asking for cooperation from postal employees at any level. Cooperation is a two-way proposition.

There was ample opportunity for consultation with postmasters and employee representatives. As a matter of fact, just a few weeks before the order was issued, 50 postmasters were called into Washington for a conference. These 50 postmasters head the 50 largest post offices in the service; presumably, the Postmaster General ordered these men into Washington to discuss postal affairs. I am quite sure certain aspects of the postal service were discussed; in fact, one postmaster told me that several hours of the conference were consumed in a red-hot argument as to whether letter carriers should be permitted to smoke on their routes. I presume other matters of equally cosmic importance were discussed.

A half dozen postmasters in attendance at that conference cannot now recall one, single, solitary word being uttered that would even intimate that a curtailment program was imminent. That is typical of the Department's approach to a labor-management program—meet problems after they arise.

Now let's see if the American public thinks the effects of the order are exaggerated. Let's see what mail users of the country think about delayed mail, and the inferior postal services they are now receiving—at the same old price.

At this point, I want to say that I am merely going to quote extracts from letters taken at random from files in our office. Anyone interested to do so, is perfectly welcome to visit our Washington office and examine these letters and others in their entirety.

Here is what business firms tell us:

A steel works in Saginaw, Mich.: "We now get our mail anywhere from 1:30 p. m. to 5 p. m. Our plant operations close at 3:30 p. m. It has caused us to lose business, caused the cost of operations to rise greatly, and has been a serious handicap on our business operations. We wrote the Postmaster General. We might just as well saved our time."

A business-form company in Orlando, Fla.: "We mailed a package to a firm here in Orlando on May 24. This firm called on Friday, May 26. They had not received the shipment although they are only five blocks from the post office.

"We mailed another shipment on May 8 to Albany, Ga., which was delivered on May 29. In the meanwhile we had duplicated the shipment."

A bed-manufacturing firm in Louisville, Ky.: "By the time we get our p. m. mail, open it, it is 4:30 p. m. and everybody has left for the day."

A sausage manufacturer in Chicago, Ill.: "The new regulations are already causing financial damage to our business and will surely affect our ability to give full employment to the hundred-odd men who depend upon our company for their livelihood."

A furniture store in Fall River, Mass.: "The enclosed letter was sent to us from Boston, 50 miles away, postmarked May 25; and received by us June 8. In other words, it took 12 days for us to receive this from Boston."

A petroleum products company in Muskegon, Mich.: "Just recently there was an increase in price of gasoline to us and notice of same did not reach our office until 2 or 3 p. m., instead of the usual 9:30 or 10 a. m. As this price increase was effective at 7 a. m. on that particular day, it cost us money plus the inconvenience."

A firm in Buffalo, N. Y.: "The delivery of mail today is slower than it was in 1896."

An iron works in Akron, Ohio: "We have been adjusting ourselves to the will and wishes and commands of the Post Office Department for so many years that we are doing just about everything but distributing the mail at the local post office."

A wholesale and retail paint distributor in Tulsa, Okla.: "We are a small business compared to the big company one block away who receives three mail deliveries a day compared to our one. Orders and checks are the life blood of our business, and we have lost several accounts to competitors who are located in the three or more daily delivery locations."

A greenhouse in Memphis, Tenn.: "I ordered a nozzle from Philadelphia. It was mailed May 29. I received it June 6. My father was in Italy last year and stayed in a small country town. They had two mail deliveries a day. If poor starved European countries can manage this, certainly the richest country in the world can do better."

A newspaper in Wisconsin: "The postal service smells."

A medical laboratory in Philadelphia, Pa.: "Curtailment of mail service has delayed specimens sent here which have arrived unfit for testing. Also, delayed our reports to the physicians which arrived in many cases too late to be of value."

A refrigeration company in Stamford, Conn.: "We certainly think this new arrangement is a step backward instead of forward."

A lumber company in Evansville, Ind: "Net result is that on the present slow up we are at least helping out the telephone company in placing long-distance calls for information normally handled by mail."

A realtor in Sacramento, Calif.: "We are receiving important mail 2 days later than previously."

A bank and trust company in New York City: "Several checks bounced because mail deposits to cover hadn't been received by us."

A diocesan chancery in Minnesota: "Since mailing rates have not been reduced in the least by the recent curtailment order, we do not see why we should be obliged to assume additional costs of service that we are already paying for."

A wholesale tea firm in Salt Lake City, Utah: "Since this new system has gone into effect our service is 'lousy'."

An electrical supply house in Norfolk, Va.: "The Post Office is the only branch of the Government from whom we receive any direct service and considering the very substantial annual taxes that we pay, we can only bitterly resent this curtailment, particularly in view of its motivation."

A refrigeration company in Long Island City: "A bid for an important installation was to be submitted by our firm by 10 a. m., May 7. The specifications were mailed to us from Brooklyn on May 5, and were delivered to our office at 10:45 a. m., May 7, which automatically removed us from competition on this bid. Consequently, we are considering the sole use of express agencies despite their higher rate. We are unable to rely on the post office any longer for prompt delivery."

A general contractor in Lowell, Mass.: "We feel that as time goes on we will suffer more than right now; before we knew at about what time to expect delivery, now we can only expect it when it arrives."

A building construction firm in Springfield, Ill.: "Late mail deliveries have rendered useless bids mailed us by material suppliers and subcontractors on Government and other projects. It means the difference between getting or losing a job merely by the lapse of time through delay in delivery."

A correspondence school in Battle Creek, Mich.: "Just yesterday I waited until 2 p. m. for my mail and then left without it. I made a trip to Sparta, about 70 miles from here, much of it over mean gravel roads. When I got home in the evening there was a communication there in the mail for me which makes it imperative I go right back to Sparta. See what I mean when I say I'm disgusted."

All of these complaints—and there are thousands of others just like them in our Washington office—come mostly from small-business men.

The lifeblood of these small-sized companies is the regular and frequent collection and delivery of their mail—a bid missed—an order not quickly serviced—perishable shipments delayed—all these cost the small shipper money. They simply cannot afford poor mail service in the highly competitive economy we have here in America.

These hardships to small-business men are pointed up all the more when we read last week's report of the Joint Congressional Economic Committee. Here is what the report had to say about small-business profits:

"In the last few years the rate of profits has declined the most for the small-sized companies. * * *

"In the postwar boom, when most goods were scarce, there was an unlimited market for everyone's goods. For the time being, the small businesses of this country did well. Their profit rates rose to levels as high or higher than those of the business giants. When this exceptional period of scarcity came to an end, big business was scarcely affected. The earning rates of the little concerns started downhill."

Mark Sullivan, the noted columnist, pointed out in a recent article that the slight savings that might come from the Postmaster General's order would be more than offset by the loss to American business. Elsewhere in that same item, he made the prediction that mail users would express their resentment against the order at the polls next fall. Both of these opinions as expressed by Mr. Sullivan contain a great amount of healthy common sense.

I am reasonably certain that both major political parties have men and women whose knowledge of political trends is more empirical than intuitive. I am sure they are thinking through this postal crisis and not playing hunches, as many others in high office seemingly are doing.

Thus, for the time being, I have come to the end of my story—and this does not half begin to tell the whole story.

Since April 18, the National Association of Letter Carriers has issued a great many facts and figures to show that curtailment of postal services is harmful to this country and its citizens. We have been encouraged by the support and cooperation received from every segment of American life.

The Congress has a bill before each House at this moment to rescind this damnable order.

The press and radio of the Nation have reported the situation objectively and impartially.

Business firms—giants, middle sized, and the small merchant in your neighborhood have registered complaints.

Religious, civic, and fraternal organizations have demanded a return of good mail service.

Individual mail users have voiced strong opposition.

Our organization—103,000 strong—is against the order to a man.

But over and beyond all the wonderful support we are receiving from so many different sources, we are particularly gratified at the solidarity of the various postal groups. It is the type of spontaneous demonstration that we are witnessing here this afternoon that is most heart warming. Post office clerks are here. I see a good representation from the postal transport group, mail handlers are here, special delivery messengers and the boys in the motor vehicle service are with us in this fight, and I dare say an overwhelming majority of individual postmasters and supervisors are against the cutback in postal services.

This is a postal employee fight—all postal employees.

It is a time when the stakes are all blue chips.

It is a time to stand up and be counted.

The Post Office Department would like to gag its employees. It would like to snuff out employee opposition to the curtailment order. But thank God, we are still in front of the iron curtain. We still enjoy the precious freedoms of speech and assembly. We still have a free press. This is still the America we want, where we worship according to the dictates of our own conscience.

The April 18 curtailment order is the most damaging thing that has happened to the postal service in its entire history. With everyone in the United States against postal curtailment—except a few diehards within the Department itself—we cannot lose. And in winning, the American people will win.

The postal service belongs to the American people. It must be restored to them in all its pristine glory. To that end, let us all rededicate ourselves.

Now I want to conclude by suggesting this short motto:

I am only one,
But, I am one;
I cannot do everything,
But I can do something.
What I can do,
I ought to do,
And what I ought to do,
By the grace of God,
I will do.

Effect of Imports on Employment in the Pottery Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the testimony of Mr. James M. Duffy, president, National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, American Federation of Labor, before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor holding hearings on the effect of imports on employment.

Mr. Duffy's testimony bears out what I had to say about this situation when I voted against the reciprocal trade agreements more than a year ago. The situation is rapidly becoming worse, and unless something is done in the near future, it will mean thousands more unemployed, not only in the pottery industry, but in other industries as well.

BRIEF OF JAMES M. DUFFY, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF OPERATIVE POTTERS, PRESENTED BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, STEED SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMPORTS AND EMPLOYMENT, JUNE 26, 1950

Mr. Chairman, I am president of the International Brotherhood of Operative Potters, an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor, and speak for the great majority of the workers employed in the pottery industry. This is an old, established union that has an excellent record of peaceful relations with the employers; and we are proud of this fact.

At the outset I want to express my appreciation and that of our membership for this opportunity of telling our story to this House Labor Committee. We perhaps appreciate more than others how much the import problem is a problem of employment and wages. For us the tariff question has no other meaning. If the level of our import duties had nothing to do with our employment, wage levels, and working conditions, we would have no direct interest in the tariff issue.

The connection, however, is both direct and vital. It is, therefore, most encouraging to have the Labor Committee look into this question. In fact, it was about time that the import problem was considered from its bearing on labor standards and employment. We know of no other economic effects of dutiable imports that are more important than their impact upon the workers.

We know, because pottery imports have been very heavy over a period of years. Even before the war imports accounted for 20 to 30 percent of total consumption. During and after the war the domestic industry expanded considerably, not only because imports were largely cut off except from the United Kingdom, Mexico, and a few other countries, but also because the demand for pottery increased in keeping with the enlarged purchasing power of the public. Employment increased somewhat in proportion.

In the past 3 years imports have, however, climbed to the point where today they are above the 1937–39 average. Japan, Germany, and Italy are the leading sources besides the United Kingdom.

Now it is proposed to reduce the tariff still further as a means of stimulating imports. In 1949 slightly more than $20,000,000 of pottery wares were imported, and this represents foreign invoice value, before payment of duty. Even today the imports from Japan are limited because they have not reached prewar levels of production in that country. Yet pottery items are listed for additional duty reductions for next September in the forthcoming tariff negotiations. Obviously the policy is to give yet more of our jobs to labor in other countries. There can be no doubt about this.

They say that this is necessary in order to place more dollars into the hands of the dollar-short countries so that we can reduce our dollar aid. But what will happen if by doing so our workers are forced out of jobs? This will cost money, too. Where will that come from? Out of the taxpayer's pocket, the same as foreign aid. Had we not also better think of what situation we will be left with after the dollar-gap has disappeared?

Wages in the pottery industry compare favorably with wages in other industries, even though there is still a large amount of hand work. The average hourly wage is $1.45. Thus the industry cannot be described as inefficient or uneconomic and therefore a fit subject for liquidation.

There is no direct measure of man-hour production in pottery because so many different varieties, sizes, qualities, and patterns are produced. For example, plates, cups, and saucers differ among themselves so greatly that the nearest approach to productivity can be attained by measuring general output by the dozens and making comparisons on that basis.

In this way we can reach a fairly reliable estimate of the number of employees that would be required to produce the pottery that is imported. The best statistics we have relate to vitrified china tableware, in the production of which 4,000 or 5,000 workers are engaged. Imports are roughly as heavy as domestic production. In other words, imports have taken 4,000 or 5,000 jobs that would be filled by our own workers if we made the products in this country.

The imports of vitrified china represent a little less than half of total pottery imports. We can, therefore, conclude quite safely that 10,000 to 12,000 additional workers would be required to produce in this country all the pottery that is consumed here.

However, we want to point out that we do not object to a share of the market going to imports. We appreciate the need of importing if we are to export. What we do object to is the level of the competition and its capture of a constantly growing share of the market. If imports took our market from us because foreign producers are more efficient, have a better and more attractive product and therefore beat us technologically, or if their workers outbid us in point of skill, industriousness, and artisanship—that would be one thing.

When, however, the foreign advantage lies almost wholly if not completely in the fact

that workers in other countries are paid less, work longer hours, and operate under less favorable working conditions, an entirely different set of circumstances is faced. Competition that gets its advantage from such sources is unfair and the Labor Committee of the House is very right in setting out to inquire into this phase of foreign competition.

Minimum-wage legislation in this country was recognized as necessary to assure minimum standards of living. It was clear that the employers who paid fair wages could not long continue to do so if his products had to compete in the market place with goods produced by competitors who paid lower wages and so gained a price advantage.

What difference does it make whether competition comes from within the same city or from abroad, so far as its pressure on wages is concerned? In the case of domestic producers there was always the possibility that a union organization might bring the offending wage chiselers into line. In the case of foreign producers this possibility is so small that it offers no remedy. To date the International Labor Organization has done little to close the wage gap; and even in our own country national minimum wage legislation came to the support of collective bargaining to overcome unfair wage competition. Unfair foreign competition is more difficult to reach; in fact, for all practical purposes it is beyond our direct reach.

What instrument can then be used to prevent unfair foreign competition? As of now we have at our disposal the tariff, but our State Department insists on throwing this defensive instrument away. That Department wants to say what industries are to be ground to pieces, dislodging the workers from their accustomed and, in many cases, life-long occupations.

They want, in effect, to say to workers in particular industries, "Your future in this industry is doomed. You just go somewhere else, to some other industry somewhere, and look for a place to work. Perhaps we will try to help you find something and we may in the end have to retrain you. First, however, we want to make sure that you lose your job. Don't come to us before that happens."

At the same time that the State Department pursues its policy of reducing the tariff, it condemns other protective devices. Yet it is very clear that in order to bring imports from a country such as Japan onto a fair competitive level with our own products in the domestic market would require a very high tariff rate. Wage rates of 10 or 12 cents per hour cannot be offset by moderate rates of duty. Our own workers are not so much more productive than the Japanese that we can have wages 12 or 15 times as high as those prevailing in Japan and expect to compete. The difference is entirely too great. As I have said, we don't outproduce the Japanese by any such margin.

Yet if we set a tariff of several hundred percent on Japanese pottery, such a rate would appear extremely high and in fact would be excessive against other countries from which we import and where wage and labor standards are considerably higher than in Japan.

Under such circumstances, import quotas would offer a better method of regulating competitive imports than the tariff. But our State Department has made strong pronouncements against quotas on the ground that they represent the worst form of trade barriers. They have condemned all quotas because quotas in some forms may be greatly restrictive of trade. The fact is, however, that quotas need not be restrictive at all. Their use could permit a fair share of the domestic market to go to imports. It might be possible then to maintain a low tariff.

In this way the destructive effects of foreign low-wage competition on our employment could be contained. The potential disruption of the price structure would be limited by the fact that it would be known in advance that the quantity of imports could not go beyond a certain portion of our market.

Factory owners could then, so far as foreign competition is concerned, plan production ahead and give steady employment, freed from the fears of a flood of cheap imports. These fears are often exaggerated but so long as they exist they inflict their damage on employment and wages, whether they materialize or not. So long as the gate is wide open the threat of increased low-priced imports to an unknown amount is ever present. This acts as a depressor of manufacturing activity and therefore of employment. This threat could be removed by setting a ceiling on total imports that could be brought in in any one year and in any quarter year; and this amount need not be less than had been imported over a representative period of time and should be a stated share of the market.

Unless a limit is placed on the amount of imports, the pottery industry in this country will be depressed even more than it is now for the simple reason that it is not known how much pottery will be offered by Japan this year, or next year, or at any time in the future, for sale in this country. What is known is that imports from Japan have always been at very low prices.

Such a combination is hard to face. The quantity is unknown but what is known is the fact of low-priced competition. What is true of Japanese imports is true in a lesser degree of imports from Germany, England, and Italy. Taken altogether this combination does not add up to an attractive outlook for our workers or for the industry.

Who knows, some of the fears of a flood of low-priced imports may be unfounded. That is the theme-song of Mr. Paul Hoffman, ECA Administrator; but that is not the point. No one can say beforehand how large imports will be. In a buyers' market this is the crucial question. It is the uncertainty that does the damage. This is what depresses production and employment. Then if imports do actually increase the fears are magnified and the damage is doubled. A finer road toward a general depression could hardly be imagined.

It is not possible to eliminate the fear of low-priced competition by merely minimizing it so long as the door is wide open. There is no assurance that can be given unless knowledge of foreign production and supplies is complete, and this is seldom the case. Therefore public statements that imports will not hurt domestic production are not only useless but misleading. So long as the potential of competition is not known, the effects will be the same as if the worst were actually going to happen.

The service that would be performed by import quotas thus becomes obvious. I dare say that most domestic producers would gladly allow more imports to come in than have come in in the past if they could be assured that they would not pass a given amount or limit. This would give an opportunity actually to liberalize trade rather than to restrict it.

Let me repeat what I have said before, to give it all the emphasis I can—it is very encouraging to know that this committee has opened up a channel of inquiry that should have been opened long before this. The tariff is not simply a tax-raising device. The employment aspects of the import question are of the greatest economic importance. Wage and job competition from overseas or from across the border can and do greatly influence the trend of wages and employment in this country.

Where the tariff itself does not meet the protective requirements, there should be no hesitation to consider other measures, such as the import quota. Doing so does not conflict with the objective of liberalized trade. In fact the quota system could be used quite effectively to increase the market for foreign goods in this country while drawing the sting from low-priced imports. I hope that this committee will give full consideration to this suggestion.

Thank you for this opportunity to appear and give testimony.

City of Independence and American Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James M. Myles, vice president Operative Plasterers and Cement Finishers International Association, from the American Federationist for April 1950:

CITY OF INDEPENDENCE AND AMERICAN LABOR

(By James M. Myles, vice president, Operative Plasterers and Cement Finishers International Association)

Philadelphia, the City of Independence, will witness next month a gathering of representatives of organized labor and statesmen from all sections of our Nation.

More than 1,600 delegates of the Pennsylvania State Federation of Labor will assemble in convention. The fifth great American Federation of Labor Union Industries Show will be held at Convention Hall (where the last two Presidents of the United States were selected). President William Green will convene the A. F. of L. executive council. The executive boards of A. F. of L. departments and of many international unions will also be in session in Philadelphia.

The leaders and representatives of American labor will be assembled within the shadows of that famous shrine of liberty, Independence Hall. There it was that our sacred documents, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, were drafted.

Long before our independence was achieved, the Pennsylvania State House (now Independence Hall) started construction of this magnificient building. Construction began in 1732 and the building was completed in 1741.

Twenty-four years after the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, the capital of the United States was moved to the District of Columbia. Having no further use for the building, the State of Pennsylvania in 1816 sold Independence Hall, its structures and adjacent land to the city of Philadelphia, and for 133 years the taxpayers of Philadelphia (of whom I am one) have maintained and preserved these famous historical shrines for all our people.

The city of Philadelphia and the Historical Society of Pennsylvania pleaded for many years to enlist Federal participation; finally, on January 11, 1943, the Department of Interior, National Park System, recognized the shrine of independence as a historical site, and on April 10, 1943, made it part of the National Park System—although owned, maintained and administered to this day by the city of Philadelphia.

There were citizens in Philadelphia, including members of the American Federation of Labor, who realized that the recognition of our national shrines in no way afforded protection to our historical buildings against

old dilapidated, firetrap structures. Determined to eliminate these dangers and secure further Federal participation, former Congressman Michael J. Bradley, of Philadelphia, introduced into the Seventy-ninth Congress a bill providing for the appointment of a commission to survey an area that should be covered by a proposed National Historical Park and to make recommendations to Congress. A companion Senate bill was sponsored by Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, of Pennsylvania.

Congressman Bradley at that time appealed to President Green of the American Federation of Labor for support of this legislation. President Green, in appointing the present writer, said:

"Congressman Bradley needs our help. His bill is of vital concern to the membership of the American Federation of Labor. Our ancestors in the American labor movement made possible these fine early American buildings and edifices for our forefathers of this great Nation to assemble in convention and proclaim liberty throughout our land.

"Without this system of democracy the people of America could neither be safe nor happy. It therefore became the patriotic duty of this federation to assist in the recognition of our historical shrines and places for their preservation for all posterity.

"You were born in Philadelphia. You know its history. You will represent the A. F. of L. and put forth every effort in supporting legislation to preserve our cornerstone of democracy, and you will have all the help at my command."

The Bradley-Myers bill was approved by the Seventy-ninth Congress and signed by President Truman. The President appointed the Commission. And there it ended until the legislation was reintroduced in the Eightieth Congress on a bipartisan basis. All of the bills provided for the establishment of a Philadelphia National Historical Park and authorized an appropriation of $4,435,000 to carry out the purposes of the measures. From the date of introduction, January 20, 1948, the legislation remained in camphor in both Houses until the House Committee on Public Lands and Buildings decided to hold hearings from March 1 to 3 and again on April 5 and 21, 1948, to consider the bills. The National Historical Park Commission then reported, and at the conclusion the Chairman said:

"In the past I have visited Versailles, where surrounding grounds and fountain displays are beyond description. I visited the tomb of Napoleon. I also visited Westminster Abbey.

"When I returned a few weeks ago to America's shrine, having visited it 40 years before and in the meantime having observed what France, Britain, and other nations have done by architecture and landscaping to commemorate their history, I felt ashamed. I returned to Washington more convinced than ever that Congress should carry out the recommendations of this splendid Philadelphia National Park Shrine Commission by removing eyesores surrounding the real cradle of liberty."

On June 8, 1948, we succeeded in getting H. R. 5053 on the House Calendar. It was removed by uninterested Members of Congress, but we had it back on the calendar again on June 15. Just before the House and Senate adjourned for the national party conventions at Philadelphia, they approved the National Historical Park bill, but without making any appropriations. President Truman signed the bill on June 28, 1948 (I was presented with one of the pens he used to sign it), and the measure is now Public Law 795, Eightieth Congress.

Well, here we had an act of Congress after 148 years for the Philadelphia Independence National Historical Park, but no funds to carry out its provisions. Our hopes were raised when the first session of the Eighty-first Congress received H. R. 3838, making appropriations for the Department of Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950. Section 162 of this bill provided for $500,000 for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Public Law 795 establishing a National Historical Park at Philadelphia.

This appropriation bill passed the House and went to the Senate. We were then confronted with the problem of securing the full appropriation. Senator MYERS took the initiative, submitting his brief on June 7, 1949, before the Senate Committee on Appropriations and appealing for the full authorization of $4,435,000. On June 16, before the same committee, the writer submitted a brief for the A. F. of L. calling for the full appropriation and covered with that statement every member of the committee. The Senate Appropriations Committee recommended:

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the act of June 28, 1948 (Public Law 795) for establishing a national historical park in Philadelphia, Pa., including printing and binding and expenditures authorized in section 6 of said act, $500,000 to remain available until expended and, in addition, the Secretary is authorized to incur obligations and enter into contracts, not exceeding a total of $3,935,000, for the acquisition of lands for purposes of the Independence National Historical Park."

This amendment covered the full authorized appropriation of $4,435,000 originally authorized in Public Law 795. It was approved by the Senate and sent to the House. On September 22, 1949, I prepared in behalf of the A. F. of L. another brief and covered all the members of the House Appropriations Committee. The whole House concurred on October 6, and the Senate again approved on October 7. President Truman approved on October 12, 1949. The Secretary of the Interior subsequently appointed the 11 members of the Advisory Commission as provided for in the act.

Public Law 795 will make it necessary, in order to establish the Independence National Historical Park in Philadelphia, to demolish about 1 square mile of obsolete, unsightly structures, namely:

"Bounded on the south by Walnut Street, to Manning Street, west side of Second Street, to the east side of Fifth Street, the site of the residence of Benjamin Franklin, and related grounds, comprising approximately a 100-foot-wide strip extending southward from Market Street, 200 feet between Third and Fourth Streets, and certain land and buildings immediately adjacent to Christ Church.

"The Secretary of the Interior, following consummation of agreements with the city of Philadelphia and Carpenters' Hall Company, as prescribed in the act, is authorized to acquire by donation or with donated funds or to acquire by purchase any property, real or personal, within the described area of such park, when, in his opinion, title to sufficient of the lands and interests in lands within the areas shall be vested in the United States, etc."

There have been many laws passed by our Congress that carried a bag of tricks. In Public Law 795 it is the delaying clause for establishment of the Independence National Historical Park. It reads this way:

"Provided, That the park shall not be established until title to the First United States Bank property, the Merchant's Exchange property, the Bishop White House, the Dilworth-Todd-Moylan House, and the site of the Franklin House, together with two-thirds of the remaining lands and interests in lands within the described areas, shall be vested in the United States."

The greater part of the Independence National Historical Park area has been condemned as a slum area. If we of the American Federation of Labor fail to take steps to eliminate from Public Law 795 the above frustrating provision during this Eighty-first Congress, it may be decades before the park gets under way.

We of the American Federation of Labor, while visiting the shrine of independence and other historical places in Philadelphia, may well be proud of the part we have taken in the enactment of this legislation which makes possible through our Federal Government this Independence National Historical Park. Indeed, it is a great honor for labor to prove its devotion and interest in establishing, for all posterity, this legislation for our Nation's birthplace.

Carpenter's Hall is included in the Historical Park. Before the birth of our Nation master carpenters in Philadelphia formed an organization known as the Carpenters' Company of the City and County of Philadelphia. They invited to membership all masters of subdivisions in building, in order to increase their stock of knowledge of building architecture, to search upon all manner of materials touching and concerning all work and workmen in building, so that the said work might be just, true, and lawful, without any deceit or fraud whatsoever, in building, and to assist families of sick or deceased members. The Carpenters' Company built and occupied Carpenters' Hall in 1771. It became a historic place when the First Continental Congress met there in 1774. It was there that Patrick Henry arose on September 5, 1774, and said:

"The distinctions between Virginians, Pennsylvanians, New Yorkers and New Englanders are no more. I am not a Virginian but an American."

The building craftsmen at that time also formed associations. They, too, adopted rules to govern their members in the use of materials and workmanship, establishing fines for bad work. They provided laws to assist their members and families in sickness and death. They created a bond of fraternity and fidelity among the building craftsmen of America. They left their mark of craftsmanship on our early American homes, edifices, and historical shrines.

Many of our modern unions of building craftsmen still maintain the original laws in respect to penalties for poor workmanship and assistance to the families of members in sickness and death, while at the same time they adhere to the principles of unity which can elevate the conditions and render easy the accomplishment of good works, which are so much required in creating confidence, generating esteem and respect and for promoting harmony and good fellowship among men.

It was through these principles that the greatest labor organization in the world, the American Federation of Labor, was created.

Visitors to Philadelphia have the opportunity to observe the parking lot and the hot-dog stand at Seventh and Market Streets. This is the site of the house where Thomas Jefferson lived and wrote the Declaration of Independence. The Eightieth Congress had no concern for that historic site. The area between Fifth and Sixth Streets, south side of Walnut Street, directly in rear of Independence Hall, was also eliminated from the legislation, property owners objecting to the removal of their buildings. Nor were provisions made in the act to govern the height, architecture or design of buildings in the area or the nature of materials or workmanship, so that all work might be just, true, and lawful, without any deceit or fraud whatsoever, on buildings in the National Historical Park area.

We of the American Federation of Labor are not finished with legislation for the Independence National Historical Park. We see in the future the Thirteen Original States whose representatives signed the Declaration of Independence taking steps to honor the

memory of their statesmen by erecting suitable structures in the park area. We must see to it that the Thomas Jefferson site is included. Any attempt to retard the creation of the park must be defeated.

We take this opportunity to commend Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, of Pennsylvania, a staunch friend of labor, for his courageous determination in prevailing upon Congress to approve Public Law 795 and the full appropriation.

We commend another true friend of labor, Congressman FRANCIS WALTER, of Pennsylvania, and all other true friends of labor in Congress who participated in the enactment of this important legislation.

President William Green was most helpful in his untiring determination to win this victory in establishing Independence National Historical Park. His efforts cannot be measured in words. We are grateful to all members of the national legislative council of the American Federation of Labor for their constant participation.

We shall be ever grateful to the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, for making the act possible. He is the first President in 149 years to make possible a law for the preservation of the Independence Hall area. This law, we hope, will create in the near future a beauty and splendor worthy of the only shrine of independence left in the world.

The Genocide Convention—It Will Not Stop Dictators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New Orleans States entitled "The Genocide Convention—It Will Not Stop Dictators."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION—IT WILL NOT STOP DICTATORS

The tragic part of the genocide convention is that it will not outlaw mass extermination of peoples by governments.

Historically, genocide has always occurred with the approval of governments. Genocide, properly defined, cannot occur without government acquiescence. That has always been the case in the great mass exterminations of history; those by Attila the Hun, Genghis Khan, and Hitler.

The first paragragh of article II of the genocide convention reads:

"In the present convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such."

There is no bar here to mass extermination of political groups.

Articles IV and VI limit application of the genocide convention to "persons."

And the United States itself has stated it will not agree that our Government can be held responsible or liable for injuries inflicted by it on its own nationals.

James E. Webb, Acting Secretary of State, inserted and President Truman accepted the following reservation concerning responsibility of this Government: "that (the convention) shall not be understood as meaning that a state can be held liable in damages for injuries inflicted on its own nationals."

The genocide convention would fail to be effective behind iron-curtain countries because governments cannot be held responsible for injuries to their own nationals and because "political groups are not covered."

The genocide convention will not stop the present major cases coming under the proper meaning of genocide, George A. Finch, of Washington, editor in chief of the American Journal of International Law, testified for the American Bar Association before the Senate subcommittee. He said that Russia has deported 400,000 Jews from the Ukraine and White Russia because they were considered too prodemocratic to be left on the Soviet borders in case of war (from a letter from the American Jewish League Against Communism, September 1949, to the Secretary General of the United Nations). They were removed as a political group and as possible enemies of the state. Our State Department, according to the New York Times of October 18, 1949, received confirming reports that Russia carried out mass deportation of Greeks and other non-Russians from the Caucasus. The Associated Press reported from Berlin on January 21 of this year that about 24,000 persons have died in Buchenwald concentration camp since the Soviet took it over for political prisoners.

As Mr. Finch testified before the Senate subcommittee last January:

"The genocide convention is an outstanding example of an international agreement upon which the public has been and is being misinformed. As genocide is defined in the convention, it does not apply to the mass killings and destruction of peoples by totalitarian government, but appeases such governments by making it possible for them to continue, as they are doing today behind the iron curtain, the monstrous treatment of thousands of human beings whom those governments regard as enemies of the Communist states. * * * There is not a word in the convention which denounces as genocide the mass killing and destruction of peoples by governments."

Dictators can sign this genocide convention with complete impunity. All they have to do is classify any group as enemies of the state.

Encouragement of Self-Rehabilitation Among the Disabled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, early this year I introduced legislation—H. R. 7448—extending to the physically disabled the same $600 additional income-tax exemption now granted to the blind. By alleviating some of the Federal income-tax burden on these disabled persons who, in spite of their infirmities, have overcome great physical obstacles and have become productive citizens contributing to the welfare of their communities, we will lift some of them out of the border-line area of becoming public charges and will encourage others to greater efforts toward becoming self-sustaining. The initial loss of actual revenue to the Federal Government as a result of this bill would be very small. There are about 101,000 disabled in this country today who would be eligible under the bill and many of these do not have sufficient disability to be included.

There is appended a resolution of the Westchester, N. Y., Society of Accountants endorsing this legislation:

Resolved:

Whereas there is now pending in the House of Representatives a bill for an additional $600 allowance for income-tax purposes, for disabled veterans; and

Whereas it is the desire and intention of the Westchester Society of Accountants to approve and endorse said bill; and

Whereas at a regular meeting of the Westchester Society of Accountants it was duly

Resolved, That the Westchester Society of Accountants go on record as being in favor and endorsing said proposed bill introduced by Congressman J. K. JAVITS.

WESTCHESTER SOCIETY OF ACCOUNTANTS,
JACK KAGAN,
President.
ALBERT ACKERMAN,
Vice President.
LOUIS G. MANGANO,
Secretary.
ANTHONY P. SONSONE,
Financial Secretary.
RALPH J. SPINA,
Membership.

Our Country's Safety Comes First

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, from the President's message one draws the conclusion that we are virtually at war with a foreign power in the most inconvenient place on earth, so far as this country is concerned. It is an alarming situation.

Theodore Roosevelt said one thing with which I thoroughly agree; he said the United States had only two friends, the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans.

If we get into war with a foreign power, we are going to have to fight it ourselves. It will probably result in the loss of millions of our American boys, and could result in the destruction of our country.

All this floundering around and ostensibly depending upon a gang of foreigners, who do not have sense enough to run their own countries, to tell the American people what to do, is merely leading us toward disaster.

What we need is the strongest air force on earth. I supported the 70-group air force from the beginning. I am for keeping the atomic bomb, and having a supply ready at all times to take care of any international emergency. We cannot afford to take any chance on being caught unprepared, which might mean our destruction.

I have been shocked at the administration's refusal to send in a budget recommendation for funds to complete the missing link in our national-defense program—that short stretch of waterway known as the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway, which would cut the water distance from the Gulf at Mobile

to our atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge by more than 800 miles and cut the cost of transportation between those points from 50 to 75 percent.

That missing link should have been constructed long ago; and today, when our country is threatened, and when our great cities are likely to be destroyed, we need to rush that development with all possible haste. Yet the Bureau of the Budget refuses to send in a supplemental estimate for it, on the theory that this is a new project. When, as a matter of fact, it is an extension of our defense plant at Oak Ridge, and will complete the missing link in our national defense program.

Failure to supply the funds to construct this missing link in our national defense program as rapidly as possible, is more stupid, in my opinion, than Nero's fiddling while Rome burned. Rome was only one city, but this danger to which we are subjected, and which is intensified by this delay in constructing this missing link, involves the safety of the entire Nation.

As long as this floundering around with the Air Force, with the atomic bomb, and with our national defense program continues, the safety of this Nation is going to be imperiled.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

What's Going on in Germany?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the resolution on the breakdown of the denazification policy of the American Government in Germany adopted by 5,000 persons at a mass meeting in New York on May 8 held under the auspices of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, Department of New York.

Mr. Speaker, there is some danger that this whole critical problem may be dismissed as peculiar to minority groups because Jewish organizations, for obvious reasons, have taken the lead in protesting the sinister developments in occupied Germany.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

The restoration of known and virulent Nazis to power is a threat to world peace. It is a threat to the security of every American home.

The wholesale persecution and murder of Jews in Nazi Germany was a symptom of a moral illness in Germany; it was not the cause, except as this brutal degradation of human values further degraded and brutalized the German national character.

I endorse this resolution and hope it will be heeded.

The resolution follows:

With profound concern the American people have received uncontradicted evidence of the breakdown of American occupation policy and the restoration in western Germany of an aggressive nationalism in the hands of a reactionary coalition.

With bitter disappointment we have noted the tragic failure of American occupation authorities to eliminate racism, militarism, and ruthless national ambition as major factors in internal German politics. We deplore the existence within western Germany not of a new political atmosphere but a disturbing continuation of the old.

With apprehension we have seen our occupation policies proven incapable of democratizing the German economy and curbing the concentration of economic power in cartels and trusts; incapable of preventing the reemergence of extreme nationalist political groups and the return of many former active Nazis to important administrative and economic positions, incapable of developing a program which will instill in the German people an understanding and appreciation of democratic institutions and a devotion to democratic practices.

We, 5,000 New Yorkers, here assembled at Madison Square Park in New York City on this fifth anniversary of the military defeat of Hitlerism, therefore declare—

That there must be instituted immediately by the Government a full, exhaustive and complete review of American policy in Germany;

That to conduct this investigation, an Investigation Commission must be appointed by the President of the United States to include Members of Congress as well as distinguished members of the community;

That this Commission must fearlessly appraise the accomplishments and failures of our occupation program thus far; and

That on the basis of its findings, this Commission must be directed to delineate those methods to be employed henceforth which will deter the growth of renascent German nazism and encourage those forward-looking elements in Germany in whom alone resides her potential as a peaceful and productive state: Therefore be it hereby

Resolved, That we, collectively and individually, petition Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States to enact speedily the resolution introduced on April 17, 1950, by Senators GILLETTE, LEHMAN, IVES, PEPPER, KILGORE, CHAVEZ, and DOUGLAS, and the corresponding resolution introduced in the House by Congressman CELLER et al., and call upon the President of the United States to give this measure his wholehearted support and endorsement as the most effective method of stimulating the growth of democracy in Germany, aiding the stabilization of world peace, and assuring the American people that their sons did not die in vain.

The Genocide Convention—A Threat to Freedom of Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New Orleans States entitled "The Genocide Convention—A Threat to Freedom of Speech."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION—A THREAT TO FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Article III of the Genocide Convention, now in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for study, sets forth that the following acts shall be punishable:

"(a) Genocide;

"(b) Conspiracy to commit genocide;

"(c) Direct and public incitement to genocide;

"(d) Attempt to commit genocide;

"(e) Complicity in genocide."

The officers and members of any organization which bans groups because of color, race, or creed are guilty of conspiracy to commit and complicity in genocide if our courts or the International Court of Justice decide that such rules and regulations of organizations cause "mental harm to members of the (barred) group."

In its study of the effect of the provision that "direct and public incitement to commit genocide" shall be a crime, the American Bar Association's Committee on Peace and Law through the United Nations makes this observation:

"This was adopted in spite of repeated objections of the United States representative that it was a plain infringement of freedom of speech and freedom of the press. Who shall judge if political speeches are incitement to genocide, the civil authorities?

"Who shall judge as to freedom of the press? As prevention of genocide, shall censors be provided by the state? Representatives of many countries insisted that as between genocide and freedom of speech and freedom of the press, the latter must give way. The position of our representative seemed to be incomprehensible to many of them. The representative of the United States boldly said that genocide should stop where freedom of speech begins. He warned the other nations more than once that inclusion of incitement to genocide would present an obstacle to ratification of the convention by his country.

"If the effort to promote human rights in the world is to mean anything, it would seem to be essential that freedom of speech and freedom of the press be preserved and that no treaty, no matter what its purpose, which seeks to deny those rights should be considered by the Senate of the United States."

We in this country do have freedom of speech and of the press.

Are we ready to swap those freedoms for the dubious advantage of allowing ourselves to be accused of genocide for a public utterance on the grounds that it has caused mental harm to others?

A Time To Keep Our Heads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Time To Keep Our Heads," which appeared in the Wilmington Morning News of Monday, June 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

A TIME TO KEEP OUR HEADS

The war that began in Korea on Saturday is a civil war in the sense that only the

forces of the two Korean Governments are directly engaged in it. And it may be carried to a conclusive victory for one side or the other without involving any other nation in war—though other nations may take a hand, at least indirectly, in the shooting. Yet, actually Korea is only a battleground; its hot war is one phase of the so-called cold war between greater adversaries.

That should be quite obvious and yet it needs to be stated. For it is essential to put this Korean civil war in its proper frame if we are to understand its implications without exaggerating them. It has created a very grave situation. When the President of the United States cuts short a week-end holiday in order to hurry back to Washington, the fighting along the thirty-eighth parallel is no small matter. But, as the President indicated, it may not be dangerous—it does not necessarily threaten to spread.

This attack by northern Korea on southern Korea is a matter of grave concern because the aggressor government is a Russian puppet—a Communist "people's republic" on the familiar pattern, equipped with a Russian-trained army, and evidently acting on orders from Moscow. The intended victim is a government brought into being by the efforts of the United States with the blessing and active support of the United Nations. In the circumstances, the invasion represents a challenge to this country and a flagrant defiance of the world organization.

We must face that fact. We must realize that the Soviet Government has revealed itself once more as a little group of men determined to stop at nothing in pursuing their ends. It is nothing new for them to use war as an instrument of Russian imperialism or to advance the cause of world communism. But they have not used it as openly as this since the defeat of Japan.

Still, the problem confronting the United States is not greatly different this morning from what it was last Friday. It is clearer in its broad outlines. This particular part of it has become more acute. We may be subjected to a damaging defeat in Korea unless we take resolute action—and such action might start a third world war.

For the moment we must wait to see whether the preparations we have made will prove sufficient. We can rally the public opinion of the world against Russia, with the help of the United Nations, and we can see that southern Korea has physical as well as moral support. We can steel ourselves for the worst, if it should come. But this is a time to keep our heads—not lose them.

Development of Resources of Oklahoma—$1,000,000 Program Sought for Bartlesville

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the last of a series of six articles relating to the development of Oklahoma. The article, which was written by Malvina Stephenson and published in a recent issue of the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune, is entitled "$1,000,000 Program Sought for Bartlesville."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OKLAHOMA LOOKS AHEAD—$1,000,000 PROGRAM SOUGHT FOR BARTLESVILLE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the last of six articles based primarily on a recent Oklahoma report prepared by the Department of the Interior. This report, covering the present and future activities of the eight member agencies in Oklahoma, points to a bright new prosperity through the development of the State's vast natural resources.)

(By Malvina Stephenson)

WASHINGTON, June 21.—A $1,000,000 building program at the petroleum experiment station in Bartlesville is being sought by the United States Bureau of Mines.

The construction schedule would run over a period of several years. The first new unit probably would be devoted to engineering and physical science research, which had been planned with the original building in 1937 but was dropped due to rising construction costs.

"In the elapsed 12 years, the need for a building of this type, as well as other facilities, has become far more acute," the Bureau of Mines reports today.

Two special projects are recommended by the Bureau. One study would deal with the radioisotopes as tracers for the movement of subsurface waters. Any tracer that can be added to water at injection wells and positively identified at producing wells would be a boon to reservoir engineering and recovery methods.

The second proposal calls for the establishment of an experimental oil mine, probably in Oklahoma. On-the-spot studies within an actual oil reservoir would provide much new valuable information on production problems impossible to learn in a laboratory or on fluid studies from the surface.

This research would be an important part of the Bureau's general program to conserve and develop the mineral resources of the Nation. Operating in Oklahoma for nearly 4 decades, the Bureau has given much aid to the advancement of the oil, gas, and coal industries.

The major objective of the oil and gas program in Oklahoma is to improve methods of recovery and increase the use of these natural resources and their products. These activities are centered at the experiment station at Bartlesville.

The early conservation activities of the Bureau attracted favorable attention. Officials assisted with the drafting of legislation in 1915 which brought to Oklahoma the first oil and gas conservation act placed in the statutes of any State.

Conservative estimates indicate that no more than one-half of the oil contained in Oklahoma petroleum reservoirs can be recovered economically by known methods of production. Research into secondary recovery methods is therefore of primary concern to the State. With this in mind, Bureau engineers are now making numerous studies on how to bring up stripper wells to new production totals.

The Bureau operates a practical research program in Oklahoma compiling comprehensive data on crude oil and its products. Over 1,000 analyses of crude oils produced in Oklahoma alone have been published. Experiments are also being made on the requirements for diesel and jet fuels. The quality of gasoline on the market is recorded and published.

Covering all important minerals, the Bureau has concentrated on coal resources, looking to better utilization and conservation. Investigation of new deposits of zinc and lead.

The relationships between mineral and water resources will be stressed in the upcoming surveys. Efforts will be made to prevent the flooding of valuable mineral deposits from the big dams. The need for power and water supplies will be estimated on the basis of potential mineral developments. No longer are there any isolated programs.

Soil and water and minerals—Oklahoma's great natural resources—will be studied and mapped in one big plan sponsored by all the State and local agencies involved. This is the new scientific "one-package" approach instead of the piece-meal hit-and-miss operation which has unfolded in the past.

The so-called "one-package" program will be wrapped up by the interagency committee in the forthcoming comprehensive survey of the Arkansas and Red Rivers. Congress will carry the ball from there, filling in the additional needed projects, and the Oklahoma development program will grow into a first class boom, opening the way for permanent business and industrial prosperity.

Enthusiastic sponsors estimate that we will begin to get the big job done in another 10 years. Otherwise, it might have been 50, or maybe never.

The Genocide Convention—It Won't Be Stopped in Peacetime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New Orleans States entitled "It Won't Be Stopped in Peacetime."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION—IT WON'T BE STOPPED IN PEACETIME

Supporters of the Genocide Convention point to article 1 to bolster their argument that this treaty is necessary to prevent and to punish Genocide whether committed in time of peace or in time of war.

There is already precedent for punishment of Genocide in time of war or aggression. At the Moscow conference in 1943, a declaration on German atrocities was jointly issued on October 30 by the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union.

The statement declared that "German officers and men and members of the Nazi Party, who have been responsible for, or have taken a consenting part in atrocities, massacres, and executions" in the countries overrun by German forces "will be sent back to the countries in which their abominable deeds were done in order that they may be judged and punished according to the laws of these liberated countries and of the free governments which will be created therein."

Pursuant to the Moscow agreement, the three governments were joined by France in signing the London agreement on August 8, 1945. This agreement established an International Military Tribunal for the trial of war criminals whose offenses had no particular geographical location. Subsequently, Greece, Denmark, Yugoslavia, the Netherlands, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Belgium, Ethiopia, Australia, Honduras, Norway, Panama, Luxemburg, Haiti, New Zealand, India, Venezuela, Uruguay, and Paraguay adhered to this agreement as members of the United Nations.

This set the stage for the now-famed Nuremberg trials.

On April 12, 1949, the Associated Press carried a dispatch from Nuremberg as follows:

"A United States war crimes court announced Tuesday the conviction of 14 former Nazi government officials of crimes against humanity in the murder of 6,000,000 Jews.

"All the 14, the court held, helped Hitler carry out history's most systematic program of race extermination."

No further authority for trying persons for genocide during wartime or aggression need be instituted.

It goes without saying, however, that in order to try those Nazis for genocide they must first have had to lose the war, and they must next have had to be captured.

In cases of genocide in peacetime, there is no precedent for trials, nor is any method provided in the suggested Genocide Convention, until a criminal chamber of the International Court of Justice is set up.

The only method of trial at present is trial in courts of the nationals accused.

Does anyone think that Hitler's courts would have tried any of Hitler's underlings for Hitler's program of genocide practiced in Germany in peacetime against Germans?

The question answers itself.

How else is genocide to be prevented, or punished, in peacetime, then, except by aggresive force which, if resisted, means war in the ultimate analysis?

As a matter of historic record, Hitler himself enslaved Czechoslovakia on a pretext of "genocide"; he claimed the Sudeten German minority was being persecuted by the Czechs. That claim of genocide was the basis for his first aggression which finally flamed into World War II.

There is no basis whatsoever for the assumption that the proposed Genocide Convention will ever prevent genocide in peacetime, and to punish peacetime genocide means war.

Development of Resources of Oklahoma—Water Precious as Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the fifth of a series of six articles relating to the development of the State of Oklahoma. The article, which is entitled "Water Precious as Oil to State Development," was written by Malvina Stephenson and published in a recent issue of the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OKLAHOMA LOOKS AHEAD—WATER PRECIOUS AS OIL TO STATE DEVELOPMENT

(By Malvina Stephenson)

WASHINGTON, June 20.—Water has come to be as precious as gold and oil, according to those who are planning an Oklahoma future keyed to business and industrial prosperity.

Virtually every major project involved in the Oklahoma development program has some connection with water. Irrigation, power generation, navigation, municipal systems—all depend on the control of water.

Long ago, the planners and the builders learned that water is not something to be used up on a hit-or-miss basis, whenever and wherever it can be found. For many years in Oklahoma, studies of supply and demand have been extended and coordinated, until today, the Federal Government is launching on a basin-wide survey of the entire Arkansas and Red Rivers.

In 1945, the Oklahoma planning and resources board, under the chairmanship of Don McBride, took the lead in compiling all the available water data in one booklet entitled "Oklahoma Water." That represented a good start on the long-range mammoth job, and, currently, another important joint project again has been initiated by the board. This also combines the efforts of the various State and Federal agencies which have valuable information on Oklahoma's water resources.

Such information ultimately can form the basis for the development of a State-sponsored "water use" plan advocated by the Department of Interior report. This type of plan would recognize the needs of all areas and interests concerned and provide for assignment of stream flows to satisfy those needs.

With the plan established, then a general agreement would be sought to put into operation the prescribed division of the waters.

This would call for joint action by the State of Oklahoma and neighboring States and the various Federal bureaus such as soil conservation service, corps of engineers, Southwest Power Administration, and the Bureau of Reclamation. The organized activity growing out of the recently authorized comprehensive survey of the Arkansas and Red Rivers probably will bring this result.

The most important fact-finding Federal agency collecting and distributing information on water resources is the United States Geological Survey. It has worked closely in Oklahoma with the State geological survey and other agencies who have water information available. The water resources division of the United States survey operates through its surface water, ground water, and quality of water branches.

Surface waters, of course, have varied uses in Oklahoma, but, a currently critical demand comes from the municipal systems which must depend on this source almost entirely. There are now 105 stream gaging stations to measure surface waters. The $86,000 annual budget is considered fairly adequate for the major streams, but at least 25 new stations are said to be "urgently needed" for the smaller streams.

Adequate ground-water records also are essential. Practically all of the rural population and small towns depend on groundwater supplies. An increasing number of irrigation projects draw on water before the surface, and Oklahoma industry is a heavy user of this source.

According to the Interior report, the program of ground water investigations in Oklahoma should be continued and expanded to include comprehensive studies of all the more important ground water reservoirs in the State. A program to meet the "minimum needs" of the immediate future would require an annual budget of about $75,000 or an increase of 150 percent over the present program.

A record of the "quality of water" is equally important. Many Oklahoma waters are highly mineralized due to natural conditions, and many of the waters have been polluted by oil field brines, sewage disposal and mining and industrial wastes.

A future program for investigating the chemical quality of waters should provide for continuous daily sampling at 20 or more stations on major streams in the State. Each river basin in Oklahoma could be worked thoroughly for a few years, until all are covered and recorded. The county-by-county inventory should be continued until it is complete, according to the Interior recommendation.

Topographic mapping portraying the natural and man-made features upon the land surface is another function of the geological survey. Only about 10 percent of the total land area of the State is covered by adequate maps, and for another 7 percent, maps are in progress.

Plans for 1950 fiscal year call for the initiation of work on 300,000 acres in the Binger-Fort Cobb area, and another 300,000 acres in the vicinity of Ninnekah and Marlow. A 440,000-acre project is set in the area along the Red River from the Arkansas border west to Hugo.

The far-reaching inventory of water resources obviously is a long expensive job. The planning to divide up the waters means endless efforts, and the ultimate agreement will require more time and patience. It is in reality a never-ending job, but it is essential to Oklahoma's future. Apparently, we are on the way.

The Late Honorable Francis D. McGarey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial that appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle—a tribute to our late Surrogate Francis D. McGarey. His death is a great loss to his family, his friends, and to the community, but we accept the will of God and pray that He will send His blessings to his widow and to his children to carry on:

DEATH OF SURROGATE MCGAREY A GREAT LOSS TO BOROUGH

Brooklyn loses one of its outstanding citizens through the death of Surrogate Francis D. McGarey after a protracted illness.

Few men achieve leadership in so many fields. Perhaps he has been thought of first in his official capacity as surrogate of Kings County in the so-called widows and orphans court where the handling of contested wills was one of his principal duties. Since 1942 he had served there and prior to that for 3 years on the supreme court bench. He was a fine judge, respected by all who had any contact with him.

It was the social problems of his fellow Brooklynites that were closest to his heart. Many of the cases in surrogate's court gave him the opportunity to take practical steps in matters of that kind. But he made this general subject his chief outside interest. For a long period he was one of the most active workers in the work of the Brooklyn Council of Social Planning, serving as its president for 3 years. During that period he was active in a significant experiment in mobilizing community resources to deal with the problems of juvenile delinquency. This was conducted in an area covering parts of Brownsville, Ocean Hill, and East New York.

This sort of interest naturally led him into the field of raising funds for charitable and social-service purposes. He was chairman of several Red Cross drives in Brooklyn. He was president in 1925 of the Emerald Association which raises funds for Catholic orphanages. These activities were followed by his choice as general chairman of the bishop's lay committee for charity in the Catholic diocese of Brooklyn.

This, of course, was especially close to his heart, for Surrogate McGarey was one of the most devoted Catholic laymen in the borough. Many distinctions came to him through his church activities, most notable being his appointment by Pope Pius XII as a member of the Knights of Malta and later of the Equestrian Order of the Holy Sepulchre which was especially in recognition of his work in the charitable field.

In a life so full only the highlights can be mentioned here, among which was his service in the Army in World War I from which he emerged with the rank of lieutenant. From the time he began to practice law he took an interest in politics and served in many less important posts in his earlier years. A native of Williamsburg he was an old friend of the late Frank V. Kelly and during the latter's leadership of the Democratic Party in Brooklyn was one of his principal advisers, a relationship which continued under the leadership of Borough President John Cashmore, who was also an old personal friend.

Surrogate McGarey was a man of unusual capacity and complete integrity. He was faithful to every trust. One of his outstanding characteristics was his deep sense of civic responsibility. It is indeed tragic that he has been cut down in the prime of life when he could have continued for many years his varied services to the community he loved.

The Genocide Convention—Shall We Face Foreign Judges?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New Orleans States entitled "The Genocide Convention—Shall We Face Foreign Judges?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION—SHALL WE FACE FOREIGN JUDGES?

The Genocide Convention which President Truman has sent to the Senate with a request that it be ratified as a treaty is the first step in a plan to give a criminal chamber of the International Court of Justice jurisdiction over every American from the President on down.

The end result of the plan will be transportation overseas of Americans for trials before foreign judges, prosecuted by foreign prosecutors.

Article IV reads: "Persons committing genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in article III shall be punished, whether they are constitutionally responsible rulers, public officials or private individuals."

Article V obligates each country which signs the treaty to enact legislation to make the treaty effective, and provide punishment for violations. This puts teeth into the treaty until the criminal chamber is set up to take over all genocide cases.

Article VI lays the ground work for the criminal chamber. It states:

"Persons charged with genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in article III shall be tried by a competent tribunal of the state in the territory of which the act was committed, or by such international penal tribunal as may have jurisdiction with respect to those contracting parties which shall have accepted its jurisdiction."

Article VII provides for extradition of the accused. It reads:

"Genocide and the other acts enumerated in article III shall not be considered as political crimes for the purpose of extradition. The contracting parties pledge themselves in such cases to grant extradition in accordance with their laws and treaties in force."

If the Senate ratifies this treaty, it means that it will have agreed to set up machinery for extradition of Americans accused of genocide committed abroad. If we accede to jurisdiction of the criminal chamber, our Senate will have agreed to ship Americans overseas for acts committed possibly in their own homes.

The genocide convention which was voted favorably by our United Nations representatives on December 9, 1948, contains three parts. Annex A, the subject of these editorials, defines genocide and prescribes procedure. Annex C recommends extension of its provisions to dependent territories, such as Hawaii and Alaska.

Annex B is as follows:

"The General Assembly, considering that the discussion of the convention on the prevention and punishment of genocide, has raised the question of the desirability and possibility of having persons charged with genocide tried by a competent international tribunal.

"Considering that, in the course of development of the international community, there will be an increasing need of an international judicial organ for the trial of certain crimes under international law.

"Invites the International Law Commission to study the desirability and possibility of establishing an international judicial organ for the trial of persons charged with genocide or other crimes over which jurisdiction will be conferred upon that organ by international conventions,

"Requests the International Law Commission in carrying out this task to pay attention to the possibility of establishing a criminal chamber of the International Court of Justice."

The Genocide Convention as sent to the Senate by President Truman does not include this plan for a criminal chamber to try Americans accused of genocide. As far as examination of the document the Senate has been asked to ratify is concerned, Annex B doesn't yet exist. Only those who have gone, or who will go thoroughly into this question can know what is planned.

But the State Department knows about it, and is on record as favoring it. At the sixth committee meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations held at Paris on October 14, 1948, the United States representative said:

"The United States delegation intended, at a later stage, to show the need for the establishment of an appropriate international tribunal."

This statement is in the records of the third session of the General Assembly, part 1, page 103.

No wonder Carl B. Rix, of Milwaukee, member of the bar association's committee studying these questions so vital to the American judicial system and our Bill of Rights could ask, in an address before the American Society of International Law:

"The paucity of discussion of these constitutional features is difficult to understand. Is it possible that discussion would not comport with propaganda?"

And no wonder Alfred J. Schweppe, of Seattle, chairman of the committee, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee that—

"The ultimate objective of proponents of the Genocide Convention is to submit American citizens to trial by an international court on account of having, for example, inflicted 'mental harm' on a 'national, ethnical, racial, or religious group.'"

Korea: Victim of Yalta Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including a review of events relating to Korea and prepared by a staff writer of the Christian Science Monitor, appearing in the June 26 issue.

Mr. Speaker, the present crisis in Korea had its inception in that conspiracy between Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt at Yalta in February of 1945. And that nefarious agreement has never been approved by the people of this country officially. While we professed great interest in a free Korea our acts belied our work and we sold her down the river by the establishment of a dividing line at the thirty-eighth parallel. Any official or officer, civil or military, who had a part in this sell-out, should be impeached or fired at once. The American people and the Koreans have been at the mercy of these incompetents for 5 years and we have had enough.

THE HERMIT KINGDOM

Korea, storied hermit kingdom of the Far East, with a recorded history dating back to the twelfth century B. C., long has been a prize sought through warfare.

Two Russo-Japanese wars in modern times (1894–1895 and 1904–1905) have been fought for Korea. Japan, victorious, annexed the peninsula on August 22, 1910, thus securing control of what it called, and is still considered, a strategic dagger pointed at her (Japan's) heart.

On December 1, 1943, the United States, Great Britain, and China declared at the Cairo conference that one of their World War II aims was Korean independence. Russia subscribed to this pledge at Potsdam in July 1945.

Meanwhile at Yalta, in February 1945, secret military plans are now understood to have been made for Russia to capture North Korea (when the Soviet Union entered the war) and the United States the south portion, each stopping at the thirty-eighth parallel of latitude.

After Japan's surrender, American and Russian troops occupied their halves, disarmed the Japanese army there, and sought to establish an all-Korean government under military supervision.

But as in Germany and Austria, this proved easier to proclaim as an objective than to establish in fact.

The arbitrary division along the thirty-eighth parallel has hurt both halves of the country since it built an unsurmountable wall between the predominantly agricultural south and the industrial north. Two-thirds of the population have been living in the formerly United States occupied part, one-third in the northern part.

It looked to the West as if Russia were attempting to obtain Communist control. Negotiations led to a deadlock which the

United States referred to the United Nations General Assembly in September 1947.

The UN sent a commission to Korea. Barred from the northern half, it conducted elections in the south on May 10, 1948, for a National Assembly, which proclaimed itself the government of all Korea on August 15, 1948. It was so recognized by the United Nations and most of the non-Russian world.

The Russian half of Korea set up a People's Democratic Republic at Pyongyang, also claiming authority over all the country's 85,000 square miles and 30,000,000 people.

Moscow announced it had withdrawn its troops in December 1948, but the West said Russia left a well-armed, Russian-trained army of Koreans. The United States withdrew its forces in January 1949, except for a military advisory group. New civilian elections under UN observation were held May 30, 1950.

At 4 a. m. June 25, Korean time (3 p. m. June 24, e. d. t.), according to the South Korean Government, North Korean troops attacked across the thirty-eighth parallel. The North Koreans charged that the first move was in the other direction.

The UN Security Council, in emergency session at Lake Success, adjudged the North Koreans the aggressors and ordered a cease fire at 5:30 p. m. June 25 (e. d. t.).

The Genocide Convention—Comments by Various Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD comments of various leaders of the United States regarding the genocide convention.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT LEADERS HAVE SAID ABOUT THIS STATES EDITORIAL SERIES

Hon. Joseph C. Hutcheson, Jr., senior judge, fifth circuit court of appeals:

"I read the proposed editorials, not casually, but with most critical eye. I have no suggestion for change. I find them altogether commendable. Clearly, fairly, and forcefully written, I think they carry their cause with them to the mind and heart of any unprejudiced person who will really read them."

Hon. Orie L. Phillips, senior judge, tenth circuit court of appeals:

"I have read with great interest your proposed editorials on the genocide convention. I believe they are accurate in every particular. I am glad you are going to send the editorials to Members of the Senate. They need to hear from those of us who believe that in our desire to help other peoples we should not sacrifice either our national or State sovereignties or destroy the safeguards with which under our constitutional system we have surrounded our citizens. You are rendering a great public service and I commend you.

Mr. Arthur G. Powell, Atlanta, member of the American Bar Association committee on peace and law through the United Nations:

"You are proposing a valuable piece of work in acquainting the American people with what is really involved in the attempts of the State Department to commit this country to this pact and others of a similar nature."

Mr. Alfred J. Schweppe, Seattle, Wash., chairman of the Committee on Peace and Law through the United Nations, American Bar Association:

"May I say, at the outset, that you have done a splendid job in these proposed editorials. You have done a magnificent job and deserve the gratitude not only of the United States Senate but of the country."

Frank E. Holman, Seattle, Wash., former president of the American Bar Association:

"I have examined your series of proposed editorials discussing the genocide convention. First of all, let me say that you are again rendering a distinct public service in presenting the dangers involved in the ratification of this convention."

Mr. George A. Finch, Washington, D. C., editor in chief, American Journal of International Law:

"I have read your series of editorials and congratulate you upon your grasp of the real significance of the so-called genocide convention. It seems to me that you have well covered the main points involved."

Carl B. Rix, Milwaukee, Wis., former president of the American Bar Association:

"You are doing a splendid job and your help is invaluable. I hope that we may be able to spur the editorial writers of the country to a realization of the situation which confronts us."

Competitive Position of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, General Services Administrator Larson recently testified before the Senate Small Business Committee that it is now firmly settled administration policy to foster and favor the competitive position of small-business units in every industry. The experience of a small-business firm in my area substantiates Mr. Larson's testimony. The Utility Electronics Co., of Newark, has conclusively proved that small business can do business with the Government and come out with a very handy profit. Mr. Harry Hirsch, 38-year-old president of Utility Electronics Corp., has built a business doing a $3,000,000 annual volume, dealing exclusively with Government contracts. I believe that Mr. Hirsch's experience will be of interest to small manufacturers everywhere, and I am therefore inserting below an article on him from the New York Herald Tribune for Sunday, May 14, 1950:

HIS LOW BIDS WIN

Long before the New York Herald Tribune's Jack Steele broke his prize-winning story about Five Percenters it was supposed that a small manufacturer couldn't do business with the Government and make money—if he could even land a contract. Last summer when comparatively small Utility Electronics Corp., of Newark, got a big contract for Signal Corps equipment after submitting the low bid, a national business magazine predicted dourly that the outfit would positively lose its shirt working at such prices. Last week, with 350 men working on rush orders, President Harry Hirsch was ready to reveal how he had defied the predictions of the pessimistic experts.

Utility Electronics was reorganized in 1948 solely to work on Government contracts. Such work shouldn't be a sideline of another production job, Hirsch believed, for then overhead charges creep into bid prices. In 1947 the firm had an annual business of $50,000. The next year it was $200,000. Last year it was $1,700,000 and this year will be well over $3,000,000. Net worth has increased from $16,000 in May 1948 to a neat $101,000 as of last December with a $45,000 tax reserve. Personnel has jumped from 10 to 350.

Never has an agent been used in negotiating contracts. Observers are stationed at the Signal Force purchasing office in Philadelphia, the Bureau of Ships in Washington, and the Air Force purchasing office in Dayton. They watch "invitations to bid" and notify their boss. Uncle Sam takes to the plan—having saved as much as $200 on a single item of equipment through Mr. Hirsch's low bids.

Nothing to it, shrugged the 38-year-old Mr. Hirsch. "Anybody can set up the same way—and just watch for the Government's invitations to bid."

Planning for a $300,000,000,000 Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 20, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to bring to the attention of the Members of the House a full and careful analysis of the administration's plan for an expanding economy by one of the plan's principal architects, Leon Keyserling. It is an excellent exposition of the role of Government in protecting and extending our prosperity. The article, titled "Planning for a $300,000,000,000 Economy," appeared in the New York Times Sunday magazine, June 18.

PLANNING FOR A $300,000,000,000 ECONOMY—A STEADILY RISING PROSPERITY IS WITHIN THE NATION'S REACH, MR. KEYSERLING SAYS

(By Leon H. Keyserling)

WASHINGTON.—Toward the war's end, many people worried about 8,000,000 unemployed by 1946. Then, for 2 years, they worried about inflation. Last year, they worried that the recession would deepen into depression. Now, in 1950, they are worrying again about inflation. It is high time that, as a Nation, we start worrying less and thinking more.

In domestic affairs no less than international, a perpetual state of jitters could shake us down to the size of possible enemies. We have our share of problems. But if we take confidence in our strength, reinforce the points of weakness, and achieve anything near our potential, we can become invulnerable to shock from within or without.

Most other economies now suffer from one or more of these grave liabilities: decimation by war; excessive population in relation to resources; generations or centuries of lag in industrialization; revolutionary changes in their world trade; systems which reduce inventiveness by stifling freedom of inquiry and expression. Yet many of these countries have made remarkable strides in production, the basis of economic strength. With none

of these terrific handicaps, our task is far easier. It is to avoid serious economic instability, and thus to enjoy fairly continuously the rising standards of living which our tremendous technology and resources permit.

We should approach this job in the high spirit that the record warrants. Even during the postwar inflation and the sequential recession, this writer maintained that any short-run interruption of the upward trend of economic activity would be brief and moderate. The minority who originally shared this view has been converted into a majority by events. For the second quarter of 1950, the annual rate of our total national output is estimated at nearly $269,000,000,000, an all-time postwar peak contrasted with about 262,000,000,000 in the highest quarter of 1948, and about 160,000,000,000 in 1939 (all measured in 1949 prices to make the comparisons realistic). Unemployment has dropped by about half a million in each of the last 3 months, and stood at about 3,000,000 in May. Employment is now more than a million higher than a year ago. While some prices are rising, repetition of the inflationary spiral which produced the downturn of 1949 seems highly unlikely. Prosperity appears to be on a more stable footing.

It will soon be a decade since we entered the war and 5 years since it ended. Drawing upon this varied experience, what can our economy accomplish over the next 5 or 10 years? What obstacles exist? Can we remove these or at least reduce them to manageable proportions?

First of all, what is our potential for economic growth? All of the new or better things to which we may aspire can be attained only if we produce more. We must bear always in mind that we cannot have our cake and eat it too. But we should also appreciate how large a cake we can bake before we go on a starvation diet and weaken ourselves by defeatism.

1. Output per man-hour (measured in constant dollars) increased about 22 percent from 1929 to 1939. By 1945, it was 19 percent above 1939, and tentative estimates indicate that it is now running about 13 percent above the 1945 level. Thus the gain during the recent postwar years has been about 2½ percent per year (compounded), compared with about 2.1 percent in the prewar decade. And we are just beginning to benefit by vast postwar improvements in plant and equipment. It is conservatively estimated that output per man-hour can further increase about 13 percent by 1955, and about 28 percent by 1960—an average increase of about 2½ percent per year during the next decade.

2. At reasonably full employment, the growth in the labor force should lift total employment to about 64,500,000 in 1955, and to about 67,500,000 in 1960.

These two developments (even if the work week, allowing for longer vacations, declined gradually from 40 hours to about 38) would raise total national output from the current annual rate of about 269,000,000,000 dollars to about 310 to 320 billion by 1955 and about 360 to 370 billion by 1960 (all in 1949 prices). This would be roughly equivalent to an average increase of about nine to ten billion dollars in output from year to year, with annual output in 5 years forty to fifty billion higher and in 10 years ninety to one hundred billion higher than in 1950.

There is no one pattern of how this progress might affect various segments of the population. In a free and flexible economy, there are divergent roads along which healthy growth can move. Those selected depend upon the voluntary choices of business and consumers. They depend also upon national policies, which might be called the priorities of need set up by a free people. But it may be helpful to outline, if only for discussion, some results within the range of the practical which could flow from an expanding economy.

In 1948, almost one-quarter of our 46,000,000 family units had incomes below $2,000 a year; about two-fifths had incomes of less than $3,000; and almost three-fifths had incomes of less than $4,000. Better education, health services and job opportunities, and further industrialization of the underdeveloped areas in which a majority of these families live could gradually increase their productivity and consequently their incomes to an average of about $4,000 a year by 1960. This progress for three-fifths of a nation would absorb just over half of the ninety to one hundred billion dollars by which our annual output a decade hence can exceed the current level. This would leave the other half of the gain for advances among higher-income brackets, for more stimuli to business initiative, for larger capital improvements, and for other national purposes.

These other national purposes would necessarily include public services, although the costs of certain services would be materially lowered by the reduction of poverty and by greater stability of employment. Merely by way of illustration, let us assume that there were now enacted the long-range proposals before the Congress in the following fields: (1) Comprehensive insurance against old age, unemployment and ill health, plus aid to the needy; (2) resource development programs for atomic energy, land, water, forests, and other purposes; and (3) Federal aid to education, augmented by additional outlays of Federal, State, and local governments sufficient to provide satisfactory minimum levels of primary and secondary education for every American child. These three undertakings would involve, by 1960, annual outlays only about $16,000,000,000 higher than in 1950. This increase would be only about one-sixth of a total annual output higher by ninety to one hundred billion dollars. And most of the cost of social security improvement would be borne by contributions rather than by the Government.

* * * * *

With the gains in living standards which would flow from these efforts, per capita meat consumption might increase by about 10 percent, food consumption by more than 12 percent, the demand for clothing by about 50 percent, and outlays for personal care and recreation by about 65 percent. The personal use of automobiles could rise from about 33,000,000 to around 45,000,000. The enlarged and more stable mass market for goods and services would help to absorb the products of a fully employed agriculture and industry. The per capita income of persons on farms could increase from about $725 in 1950 to more than $1,200 in 1960. This gain, requiring national programs, would be somewhat more rapid than for the population as a whole because our rural areas still lag. Business would also expand. Profits in the aggregate could average about $40,000,000,000 a year over the next decade, contrasted with the current annual rate of $33,000,000,000.

All of these estimates allow for population increase. They have not made allowance, however, for change in the total costs of defense and international programs together. Obviously, these costs should be reduced whenever the international situation permits. But in an economy with a conservatively estimated growth potential of about nine or ten billion dollars a year, the outlays for these purposes could be considerably increased if necessary for our security without strapping other objectives of national growth and progress. And if necessary, these expenditures could be stepped up even more by decelerating but not abandoning advances on other fronts. Even that would not be too high a price to pay for the freedom of the world.

* * * * *

Briefly stated, prices and wages should seek that balance between business incomes and consumer incomes which stimulates maximum production and sufficient purchasing power to sustain it. These factors seem in better balance now than in 1948, due to the moderate price decline in early 1949, after which reasonable price stability was maintained through early 1950. Since then the consumer price index has commenced to creep upward, and wholesale prices have risen somewhat more rapidly.

Major advances have been scored for building materials, steel scrap, and some other hard goods. Yet the robust consumer buying of durables even at these prices is tending to hold the demand for soft goods below levels consistent with maximum output. Further, a high and rising level of consumer credit is taking the place of some needed price-income adjustments. The situation on the whole, however, is assuring, and gradual adjustments can and should be made in time.

Where prices are set too high by specific business decisions, it is partly because business managers may assume that lean years are going to follow the fat years and that they must fill the storehouse to tide them over. But there is increasing realization that price policies geared to the "business cycle" will accentuate it, while price policies geared to the practicality of expanding sales in an expanding economy make a vital contribution to stable growth.

The same principles apply to wage negotiation. For if both parties release themselves from the paralyzing fear of the "business cycle," wages in times of prosperity are less likely to be too high because labor wants to make hay while the sun shines, or too low because business believes that prosperity is transitory. And with greater stability of employment, some restrictive practices by labor as well as by management will be easier to eradicate.

Some other policies of our enterprise system should also be geared to the needs of an expanding economy. The steel industry has increased its basic capacity from about 71,000,000 tons in 1929 to about 99,000,000 in 1950; nonetheless, the industry last month was operating in excess of capacity, although further economic expansion is needed.

For a growing economy, at least a 10-percent increase of steel capacity is required by 1955 and at least 25 percent by 1960. The output of electric utilities, in kilowatt-hours, needs to increase by about one-third within 5 years and by more than two-thirds within 10 years. The lumber industry, and other elements in housing supply, are very short of the needs of an expanding economy. The way to prevent price increases in these cases is not to shrink the economy but instead to stimulate private expansion of capacity in these highly strategic fields.

Is it too much to hope that management and labor will voluntarily respond to this enormous challenge to their foresight and ingenuity? Those committed by doctrine to progressively enlarged governmental intervention will say no. But there are two compelling citations on the opposite side.

First, the reaction of our business system—including management and labor—to the recession of 1949 set a unique mark of economic intelligence, contrasted with reactions to comparable threats a generation ago. The handling of inventories was better. Necessary price adjustments did not produce similar fears. Investment plans were contracted, but heavy allowance was made for a bright outlook in the longer run. Lay-offs occurred, but efforts were made to minimize these, and wage reductions were wisely avoided because of their cumulative influence upon a downturn. Labor behaved with restraint and moderation. There were some excesses on both sides, but they were the exception rather than the rule.

All in all, 1949 might have been another 1920. But it was not. Without these vastly improved policies in the private sector, the stabilizing effect of public policies alone would not have kept the recession within such narrow limits.

The second evidence of improved policy within our voluntary system is the recent General Motors contract. The significance of an agreement to raise wages by 4 cents an hour each year for 5 years—representing an assumed annual productivity gain of about 2.4 percent—is not that the industry and the union forecast 5 years of continuous prosperity. The significance is rather that they undertook to follow prosperity policies. The implications of the contract reject the idea that a long-run decline in the output of the industry is inevitable. The industry is committing itself instead to the proposition that prices can be so geared to the market that output will be well maintained and ultimately expanded; that efficiency can result in stable prices even with rising wages; that purchasing power must grow if production is to grow; that more industrial cooperation and not the class struggle is in the offing.

* * * * *

In the kind of economy we want to preserve, the increasing focus of private policy upon stable growth can hold the Government's important role to manageable proportions. In Business and Government, the fourth annual report of the Council of Economic Advisers (December 1949), the Council set forth its awareness that there is always room for improvement in public action. We stressed the need for more stability in Government policy; for testing programs by their effect upon the productivity and output of the economy as a whole; for emphasizing those programs which stimulate private expansion; and for adjusting such programs as old-age insurance to what an economy with rising productivity can afford instead of overplaying the idea that the payment of income to those who are no longer working can take the place of productive effort or pay for itself.

Equally urgent is further clarification in general public thinking about government. These few propositions are advanced in the hope of achieving broader agreement:

1. While some programs need modification in the light of experience, the enlarged scope of public operations during the last generation has introduced powerful stabilizing factors into the economy. Even the most intransigent critics tend to concede this point. Few want to abandon—though they hope to improve—farm-price supports, unemployment insurance, or other measures which automatically expand or contract inversely to the expansion or contraction of private investment. Last year's recession tested these policies, and the net result was good.

2. Many public programs are essential even to promote private industrial expansion. The lifting of depressed families and areas to the level of productivity where they can earn more in private enterprise will require enlarged educational opportunity and improved health services. Public investment in fundamental resource development throughout our history has been the underpinning for new types of private industry and the expansion of existing types. While we should rely mainly upon private adjustments for further improvement in the income structure, wage floors imposed by public authority have proved their worth. Efforts to prevent monopoly should continue, and some affirmative stimuli to small and new businesses are needed, although these should not be distorted into the proposition that business is bad just because it is big. We need good business both large and small.

3. The budget of the Federal Government, both on the tax side and on the expenditure side, must and will remain large, although we must strive for, and when international conditions permit should achieve, a budget of diminishing size relative to the size of an expanding economy. To point out that the budget has been balanced in only 2 or 3 years of the last 20 is an irrelevancy; because those years have included 10 years of depression and incomplete recovery, and about 5 years of a shooting war—apart from unsettlement since. If the next 20 years should produce another record-breaking depression or a third world war, our problems would be so catastrophic that talk about budget balance would be trivia.

Efforts to achieve true efficiency and economy in Government should be constant and not intermittent. But the surest route to a balanced budget is to follow those policies which maximize our security against aggression and our prospects for economic growth. The budget deficit which emerged last year resulted partly from excessive tax reductions and partly from the recession; but a strong case can be made that the shift in the financial position of the Government from plus to minus did more good in limiting the recession than any harm the deficit may have done on other grounds. In any event, it has become apparent in recent days that the deficit should be much smaller for next year as a whole than anticipated a few months ago, because of the rapid pace of business recovery.

If economic expansion continues and the international situation does not deteriorate, another year or two (depending upon whether one looks at the cash or the conventional budget) should achieve the surplus which ought to be the rule in prosperous times. Raising taxes or slashing expenditures enough to achieve a paper balance immediately would be unsettling; and certainly business conditions are now too good to rush ahead precipitately with large net tax reductions.

Looking further ahead by way of illustration, if our total annual output should increase by ninety to one hundred billion dollars within a decade, the tax receipts of Federal, State, and local governments even at current tax rates would be around eighteen billion dollars higher than the application of these same tax rates would yield in 1950. Progress in this direction would, long before a decade hence, permit large reduction of the national debt, finance the governmental share of all of the programs to which reference has been made, and leave room for very substantial lightening of the tax burden.

A balanced budget is desirable; but it is even more vital to achieve balance rather than hysteria in our thinking about the budget. For by the application of balanced thinking and mutual accommodation to all the looming problems which all Americans face together, we can make even more vivid in the eyes of the whole world the current strength and limitless prospects of our way of life.

The Genocide Convention—We Should Reject It as Submitted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New Orleans States entitled "The Genocide Convention—We Should Reject It as Submitted."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION—WE SHOULD REJECT IT AS SUBMITTED

The United States Senate should overwhelmingly defeat any proposal to ratify as a treaty the genocide convention.

In the series of editorials we have presented here on this very important subject, we have shown that the genocide convention fails in its major objective: The outlawing of race killing by governments, the only method by which true genocide has ever been committed from the time of Adam to Hitler.

We have shown that the convention would impose upon domestic law a vast new segment of international law.

We have shown that whereas one person or more might be tried for genocide for the killing of a single individual, mass slaughter of political groups, or the uprooting of them from their homes is not prohibited.

We have shown that it contemplates, and that our State Department contemplates, the establishment of an international tribunal for trial of Americans overseas, in violation of the sixth amendment of the United States Constitution, which provides for "a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed," and makes no provision for trial by jury, a right enjoyed by all Americans accused of crimes.

We have shown that not even its most ardent proponents can say whether or not it commits us to open warfare to suppress genocide in other countries, and we have shown that no American judge or court or Congress will decide that question.

We have shown that the convention provides for interference in State, county, and parish and municipal laws, and because it is in treaty form it will effectively nullify all conflicting laws.

The House of Delegates of the American Bar Association on September 8, 1949, resolved "that the convention on genocide now before the United States Senate be not approved as submitted." This newspaper is of the same opinion.

Historically, our laws are written by elected Representatives and Senators. Use of the treaty-making power of the President and the United States Senate to write or rewrite domestic legislation is an abuse of that power. It bypasses the House of Representatives entirely.

As Chief Justice Hughes said in 1929 before the American Society of International Law:

"So I come back to the suggestion I made at the start, that this is a sovereign nation * * * if we attempted to use the treaty-making power to deal with matters which did not pertain to our external relations but to control matters which normally and appropriately were within the jurisdiction of the States, then I again say there might be ground for implying a limitation upon the treaty-making power that it is intended for the purpose of having treaties made relating to foreign affairs and not to make laws for the people of the United States in their internal concerns through the exercise of the asserted treaty-making power."

Genocide should be outlawed. But genocide should be properly defined to include government approval, for then and then only is it genocide; it should include political groups as well as national, ethnical, racial, or religious groups, and it should not be used as a vehicle for domestic legislation.

But as presently written, the Genocide Convention is a tragic mockery of itself, dangerous in the extreme to our constitutional freedoms and should be rejected summarily by the United States Senate, for, as Chief Justice Hughes said, "This is a sovereign nation" and it should remain so.

American Zionist Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter that I have received from Mr. Elihu D. Stone, of the Washington bureau of the American Zionist Council:

JUNE 22, 1950.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: The joint declaration by the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, relative to the Near East, which was made public by the President on May 25, is a significant document which may lead to the establishment of peaceful relationship between Israel and its Arab neighbors if honestly carried out.

Your kind and effective cooperation in urging our State Department to take action for the purpose of promoting peace and tranquillity in the Near East is deeply appreciated.

The said declaration, as I analyze it, contains the following points:

1. For the first time in modern history the Big Three—the United States of America, England, and France—agreed on concerted and coordinated action in that sensitive region of the world—the Near East. It is a wholesome substitute for the pursuit of the hitherto policy of unilateral action resulting very often in conflicting action. It imposes collective responsibility.

2. The calling for a pledge on the Arab countries and Israel to refrain from any and every aggressive warlike action against one another as a condition precedent to the future delivery of arms should serve to discourage the Arab warmongers.

3. The pledge of the Big Three to place Isreal in a condition of equality and parity with the Arab states with reference to delivery of arms, and the establishment of a balance of arms between them, if honestly carried out, should serve as an encouragement toward establishment of permanent peace between the Arab states and Israel.

4. The unequivocal declaration by the Big Three of their "opposition to the development of an arms race between the Arab states and Israel" implies a policy of vigilant watchfulness obligating the Big Three to stop the shipment of arms whenever the threat of such an arms race manifests itself.

5. The Big Three pledged themselves to take immediate and joint action whenever and wherever a threat to peace in that section of the world may appear. They agreed to take such joint action "within and outside the United Nations." The term "outside" is most decisive. It implies speedy and prompt action by the Big Three to prevent a threat of aggression from being converted into actual aggression.

Like any other similar document this declaration will not execute itself. It is as strong as the reliability of its authors, and no more.

We assume, and we must assume, that the Big Three—the United States, England, and France—acted and will continue to act in good faith.

However, in the light of past sad experiences and disappointments, we must rely upon the vigilance of the friends of Israel like your good self to see to it that the Department of State carries out honestly the terms of the said Big Three declaration.

As you well know, the past record of the Near East Division of our Department of State is one of unfriendliness to Israel. The Bevin line dominated.

Your noble services to the cause of Israel will always be remembered. The Jewish people are a grateful people; they never forget their friends.

You, dear Congressman, have proven yourself to be a true and tested friend.

With kindest regards and best wishes,

Sincerely,

ELIHU D. STONE.

Address by John T. Koehler, Assistant Secretary of the Navy and Acting Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, at the Graduation Day Exercises, United States Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, Long Island, N. Y., June 21, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address by Hon. John T. Koehler, Assistant Secretary of the Navy and Acting Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, at the graduation day exercises, United States Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, Long Island, N. Y., on Wednesday, June 21, 1950.

This address is perhaps more significant since it represents the first public statement of Mr. Koehler since his assumption of the duties of Acting Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board:

Admiral McLintock, distinguished guests, the corps of cadet midshipmen, and members of the graduating class, I appear before you as an Assistant Secretary of the Navy who has been given temporary additional duty as Acting Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board and as Acting Administrator of the Maritime Administration. In this triple capacity, and in fulfilling the role of a speaker at graduation day exercises, I am, I suppose, expected to give you words of wisdom and advice which will better enable you to chart the course of your particular future. I must confess, at the outset, that I am a little reluctant to add my quota to the awesome flood of wisdom and advice with which graduation speakers, the country over, have been inundating audiences such as this. Consequently, what I have to say to you will be brief and, I hope, to the point.

The United States Merchant Marine Academy, by conferring degrees upon you, certifies that you are fully qualified to embark upon a career in the merchant marine. This means that the academy has given you the specialized knowledge and training which you must have and has done its best to foster within you those attributes of courage, loyalty, and integrity without which no man can fulfill his responsibilities in life. I assume that each of you possesses a full measure of courage, loyalty, and integrity, and I know, from personal contacts, in uniform and out, with many of your predecessors, that such an assumption is fully warranted.

Since you have been trained for a career in our merchant marine, in peace or in war, you are entitled to know what such a career offers you. Although it would be presumptuous of me to attempt to give you a definitive answer, I believe I can give you a more accurate "fix" on the future than would have been possible before the recent reorganization of the Maritime Commission.

First of all, I want to make it clear that I and my fellow board members are firm believers in an American merchant marine. Just as the Nation must have a strong Navy in its team for defense, it must have a strong merchant marine as a part of that team during a national emergency. We cannot have a merchant marine, ready for use in an emergency, unless in nonemergency periods we embark upon a constructive and integrated program which will permit this Nation to maintain its place as a leader in the maritime world.

The basic law governing the American merchant marine is the Merchant Marine Act, 1936.

That act not only laid down certain long-term objectives of maritime policy, but made possible the launching of a pre-war construction program designed to reach those objectives. While this long-range program was interrupted by our huge wartime construction effort, I think we should bear in mind that our present merchant marine is larger, faster, and has much greater carrying capacity than the prewar fleet.

The experiences of the American merchant marine for the past five postwar years must be evaluated in the light of the extraordinary conditions and circumstances with which they were attended, and as a result of which American-flag shipping was engaged to the fullest possible extent. Although this full employment unquestionably benefited the industry materially, it would be a serious mistake to fail to recognize the impermanence or the nonrecurring character of the conditions which brought such activity about. As a matter of fact, the contraction has set in with greatly increased competition in the foreign trades so that the industry is already confronted with the full impact and consequences of altered conditions and competition.

Thus, the disadvantages under which American-flag ships operate in the field of international commerce continue to require Government assistance if an American merchant marine is to survive. And survive it must, in the broad national interest.

Our future maritime policy should, in my opinion, adhere to the fundamental concept of parity expressed in construction and operating differential subsidies for American-flag vessels engaged in foreign commerce. The problem, and I may say parenthetically that it is a very difficult problem, is to determine the precise form which this subsidy pattern should take in the world of tomorrow.

The recent abolition of the Maritime Commission has been the subject of considerable discussion. Under the new plan, Reorganization Plan No. 21 of 1950, the old five-man commission has been replaced by a dual organization consisting of a three-man board, which is responsible for regulatory functions, and a Maritime Administrator who handles procedural, administrative, and organizational matters. The Chairman of the new Maritime Board is ex officio the Maritime Administrator and is thereby enabled to coordinate the work of both organizations.

The Board, as a regulatory body, is properly independent but the Administrator, as an executive official, is properly subject to the general policy direction of the Secretary of Commerce. Thus, and I consider this fact to be of great importance, the maritime affairs of the country are now represented by an official of Cabinet rank. I may say that Secretary Sawyer has already taken a very active interest in the work that the other members of the Board and myself are engaged in, and I am certain that the policy guidance he will give us will not only be sound and constructive but will be dictated by the same belief in the merchant marine I have already expressed to you.

This is hardly the time or the place for me to involve you in a discussion of the manner in which we are carrying out our task of reorganization. Suffice it to say that our objectives are those expressed in section 101 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, namely, (1) that this country shall have a merchant marine sufficient to carry its domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of its water-borne export and import foreign commerce; (2) that our merchant marine shall be capable of serving as a national military and naval auxiliary in time of war or national emergency; (3) that insofar as practicable, the American merchant marine shall be owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States; and (4) that the merchant marine shall be composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States, and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel. These objectives are as sound today as they were when they were adopted. Regardless of our efforts to effect a sound reorganization in Washington, these objectives cannot possibly be achieved without the fullest cooperation among Government, management, and labor.

Secretary Sawyer and the present Board members have already received much encouragement and many sound suggestions from all segments of our maritime industry, its owners, and its operators, its seagoing personnel, its building and repair-yard owners and operators, and the craftsmen who build and repair its ships. In an industry as complex as ships and shipping, all of us must coordinate our efforts and work together if we are to hold our proper place in the maritime world. Without mutual respect and understanding and without coordinated effort, we can never attain the objectives specified in the act no matter what laws are passed or what reorganization plans are put into effect.

In order that we may understand the scope of the problem before us, let me review for you various aspects of our existing merchant marine. Under the ship sales policy laid down by Congress and carried out by the Maritime Commission, the cream of our war-built cargo vessels and tankers was made available to private shipowners and operators. More than 700 of these ships were added to our active merchant fleet and, by comparison with 1939, the over-all picture looks very favorable.

However, a closer scrutiny of our present fleet is somewhat less reassuring. For one thing, we are still seriously short of passenger vessels and we need speedier tankers. Fleet Admiral Nimitz stressed this fact when he said, on National Maritime Day, that as far as the Navy was concerned, the greatest need of the American merchant marine was fast tankers and fast passenger ships capable of conversion into transports. In the field of passenger vessels we have made a good beginning with a construction program which calls for six new passenger and combination passenger-cargo vessels. While this limited program does not fully meet the demands of a well-balanced merchant fleet, it is a long step in the right direction.

Perhaps the least reassuring aspect of our existing merchant marine is presented by our domestic fleet, once the backbone of our maritime industry. In 1939, we had about 775 vessels in our active oceangoing domestic fleet. Today, fewer than 500 ships are engaged in these trades and close to 300 of these are tankers. This picture is all the more serious when we recall that twice in the last 30-odd years it was this home fleet primarily engaged in our coastal and intercoastal trades that linked us with our allies across the seas. In 1917 and again in 1941, when the fate of civilization hung in the balance, our domestic fleet was diverted to the vital needs of national defense. Many obstacles have appeared in the path of the rehabilitation or re-creation of our domestic water services. Some of the problems are technical ones. The Board, sensing the great importance of the restoration of our domestic water transportation, shall be obliged to give its fullest attention and efforts toward the attainment of this objective.

I promised to make this a short speech and perhaps I am failing to live up to that promise.

Consequently, I will take but a brief moment to dwell upon the many related problems which have a direct bearing on the future of our merchant marine. I speak of the widespread and costly lag in the development of port and terminal facilities, and the need for further progress in developing design standards for general cargo terminals. In this connection, the time may well have arrived in which we should build not only prototype ships designed to meet the present needs of our coastal and intercoastal shipping but protoype piers as well.

All cadet-midshipmen have a stake in the matters I have discussed and many of you will no doubt play a direct part in working out some of these problems. This graduating class is stepping out upon a much broader stage than some of you may fully realize. You will be called upon to play a dual role in behalf of world trade and world freedom and, as licensed officers of the American merchant marine, you will be expected to display the competence that your fine training has bestowed upon you. In addition, and as American citizens, you will have a very special responsibility to serve as good will ambassadors of democracy to freedom-loving peoples the world over.

I believe that we stand on the threshold of a more fruitful era in world trade relations. I do not discount the many disturbed conditions throughout the world, but we should not fail to see other and more hopeful signs as well. Among these signs are the point-4 program of President Truman and the enlarged pattern of European cooperation, both of which hold great promise for the future. These reasons, in addition to those I have developed during this talk, make me feel sure that the commerce and security of the world tomorrow must have the contribution which our merchant marine can make.

That contribution is the real measure of the career that lies before cadet-midshipmen. I am particularly pleased that Kings Point is now fully accredited and that this year's graduates will receive bachelors' degrees. I am also glad that 14 members of this graduating classe are men who have come "up through the hawse pipe," as the old saying goes. It is also interesting to know that about 100 members of the present Cadet Corps have seen previous service as seamen. To them, and to all other undergraduates, I extend my heartiest good wishes.

To the members of the graduating class, I offer congratulations on a task well done and best wishes for a long and successful career.

China—A Shameful Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, much is being said about China and our Government is being criticized for withdrawing support from military operations of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese financial manipulators with whom he is associated.

Many people fail to understand the fact that Chiang Kai-shek is closely linked to and works in cooperation with the famous Soong family, the 'Rothschilds of China," having married a Soong, a family that has been largely responsible for the debauching of the Chinese currency and the loss of the Chinese Government's money metal reserves of silver.

These critics of our Chinese policy seem to overlook the fact that in an effort to help China our Government recalled from retirement the Nation's top military man, Gen. George Marshall, and sent him overseas and kept him almost a year in China, doing everything he could to advise and assist Chiang Kai-shek to weld and equip a Chinese Army and establish a Chinese Government, only to be met with failure and the necessity of withdrawing General Marshall, due to the lack of unity and the selfish manipulations of the Chinese Government's officials.

What General Marshall had to contend with is described in the August 26, 1949, issue of the United States News and World Report, from which I quote:

The effort to find out what really happened to $4,530,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money given to China since 1941 is leading investigators to great personal fortunes amassed by a few Chinese.

Reports of graft and corruption thread through the State Department's White Paper on China. But the White Paper gives few details. It says that the United States Government does not know what became of much United States aid sent to China and that the Chinese Government, if it knows, will not tell.

Story behind the White Paper is that a few Chinese highly placed in Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's Government have built up fortunes running into hundreds of millions of dollars. They are fortunes comparable to those made by Americans in the period of this country's industrial growth. But Americans, owing to United States law, no longer can acquire wealth in the amounts amassed by top Chinese who profited from United States aid to China.

These fortunes now are hidden away outside China. Some of the wealth is in Switzerland and some in South America. Much has come back to the United States in securities and in cash. Chinese owners of wealth in the United States are paying taxes on their incomes, but neither the United States Treasury nor the Chinese Government can get at the capital which was sucked out of United States aid to China into individual pockets.

First bonanza for Chinese came in the form of a $500,000,000 grant which was approved

by the United States Congress early in 1942. The United States Ambassador to China, Clarence E. Gauss, and other United States officials urged that the Chinese Government be required to "inform and consult" with the Treasury Department on the use of the money. But the top leaders of Nationalist China objected. President Roosevelt, anxious to keep China in the war, waived the controls. The Chinese were allowed to use the money as they saw fit. Thus the "squeeze" began.

On the receiving end of this aid was a one-party Government dominated by Chiang Kai-shek and small cliques of his relatives and friends. Chief among them were the Soongs, the Kungs, and the Chens. The Soongs included Madame Chiang, her three brothers and a sister. T. V. Soong reorganized the country's finances and served for a while as Premier. T. L. Soong ran the Government's export and import office. T. A. Soong directed the salt-tax bureau, which produced $34,000,000 for the Government in 1947 alone. A sister, Ai-ling Soong, married H. H. Kung, an industrialist and banker of great wealth who was China's Finance Minister for 11 years. The Chen brothers, Li-fu and Kuo-fu, lifelong friends of the Generalissimo, managed the Kuomintang, China's state party. Today all the Soongs and the Kungs mentioned are in the United States. The Chens are in Formosa.

Down the line from the Government and the party leadership was the main body of 18,000,000 Chinese, including soldiers, who were employed by the Government. Civil-service salaries are low in China; posts similar to those paying $8,000 a year in the United States give Chinese only $960 a year. Many officials count on making their jobs pay by taking every advantage of their powers and responsibilities. To these officials, United States aid to China meant an opportunity for profit.

United States gold worth $220,000,000 at the United States price of $35 per ounce was sent to China under the 1942 agreement. The Chinese Government announced that the gold would be sold to the public to check inflation. On the basis of information given to United States officials, what happened was this:

When the gold went on sale at a date and for a price "secretly" decided upon by high officials, the "insiders" and their agents were first in line. They carried suitcases full of inflated Chinese currency. They bought most of the gold, keeping it in the hands of a few while gold prices soared.

How much the "insiders" made out of this gold is a matter of guesswork. United States Treasury officials in China were told that about $100,000,000 worth of gold was sold "to the public" up to June 30, 1945, but they do not know what was sold after that date. In any event, the gold buyers did not take their gold out of the country immediately. Most of them used it as security for loans of cash which they used to speculate in rice and other foodstuffs, thus increasing inflation, defeating the very purpose for which the gold was intended. Gold prices in China recently reached $75 an ounce while Chinese currency used to buy the gold vanished in runaway inflation. By the time the "insiders" realized their profits and left the country, the money they had made based on the original gold purchases ran into hundreds of millions of United States dollars.

United States dollars, actual currency totaling $200,000,000, were another source of private profit. The money was delivered to the Chinese Government as a fund for the eventual redemption in United States dollars of savings certificates and 10-year bonds issued by the Chinese Government. These were to be sold to the public.

American officials watching these securities found that they attracted few purchasers at first, though they sold at one fifth the price of United States dollars on the free market. Apparently Chinese doubted that the securities would really be honored in United States currency when they matured. In addition, these securities drew only 4 percent interest while Chinese money lenders got as much as 40 percent.

Suddenly, however, the Government announced that the savings certificates, $100,000,000 worth of them redeemable within 3 years in United States dollars, had been "oversubscribed." Informers told American officials that "insiders" had taken over the issue. As the "insiders" had known, these certificates were in fact redeemed in United States currency, while the provision for United States dollar redemption of the 10-year bonds was revoked in 1946.

Again, wealthy Chinese with connections in the Government had profited. "Insiders" who held bonds unloaded them before 1946. And, again, most of the profits in United States dollars remained inside the country, working against the Government's effort to stabilize China's currency.

United States lend-lease to China started in 1941, but little of it reached the country until after the attack on Pearl Harbor. Cost to the United States taxpayer of all military aid to China, including lend-lease, before and after V-J Day, was nearly $2,000,000,000. Most of the material bought with this money now is in Communist hands. Some was captured by Communists. But American officials learned that some was sold to Communists by high officers of the Nationalist Army. And some of the military aid never reached the fighting fronts, but was sold on the black markets of Shanghai and other cities.

Automobile and truck parts, radios and electrical equipment, blankets and GI rations, even blood plasma, which were sent from the United States to the Chinese Army were sold by and to civilians. Wealthy Chinese whose connections inside the Nationalist Government enabled them to divert these supplies from military channels reaped handsome profits. Some of the material was actually purchased by Communist agents and smuggled out to Communist ports in ships "borrowed" for the purpose from the Chinese Navy.

United States relief supplies and economic aid to China cost American taxpayers more than $2,000,000,000. But much went to profiteers. Information reaching United States officials showed that rice supplied by the United States for famine relief was resold by rich Chinese. American officials on relief agencies, required to work through parallel Chinese agencies, found that "insiders" were padding pay rolls and diverting supplies. United States textile machinery sent to factories owned by the Chinese Government ended up in privately owned factories. All along the line minor officials worked the "squeeze," but the biggest profits went to swell the fortunes of a few top insiders.

Once, in 1947, the control committee of the Chinese Government's treasury published a report charging corporations dominated by top officials in the Government with obtaining more than their quotas of foreign exchange. Army officers and civilian officials were denounced for speculating with public funds. Premier T. V. Soong, held responsible for the scandal, resigned. But the sums involved totaled only a few million dollars. Greater profits were not mentioned.

Taking out the profits made from United States aid to China was an operation that began about 1946 and still continues. Hundreds of millions of dollars in gold and foreign currency were smuggled out through British Hong Kong and Portuguese Macao. More was carried out by Chinese with diplomatic passports carrying Chinese Government pouches. Huge fortunes were assembled in Zurich, Buenos Aires, New York, San Francisco, and other cities out of reach of the Chinese people whom the United States sought to help. Most owners of these fortunes have fled China, too.

China's millionaires are prepared to defend their activities. They deny that they did anything illegal under Chinese law. Officials who profited see nothing wrong in it. An $80-a-month bank examiner employed by the Chinese Government once personally gave a United States diplomat a $5,000 check for the United States Red Cross, explaining that he liked to see part of his "squeeze" going to an organization that was trying to help China. The wife of a Chinese top official once chided an American diplomat for sending an adverse report on her husband's honesty back to Washington. "Of course we made money," she said. "What's the good of being on the inside if you make nothing out of it?"

Billion-dollar lesson learned in China is leading United States officials charged with policing aid to other countries to keep a close watch on expenditures. But wealthy Chinese, now out of their country, are holding on to profits made at the expense of the United States taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, after this disastrous experience in trying to help the wily Chinese, it is hard to understand how any American statesman could advise our Government to make further contributions of our precious gold reserves to the Chinese racketeers and grafters; but the November 21, 1948, issue of the New York Times had this to say:

This was the policy suggested by D. Worth Clark, a former Democratic Senator, from Idaho, who went to China on a special mission for the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Clark went to China last month with Russell Smith, executive vice president of the Bank of America, whose task was that of an economic adviser.

Senator BRIDGES, to whom the report was made, is one of the leaders of the pro-China bloc in Congress.

Mr. Clark recalled that in his first conference with President and Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, "China's desperate plight was outlined simply."

President Chiang Kai-shek, the former Senator said, "must either have help or fall.

"He (President Chiang) asked for immediate delivery of military aid already authorized by the United States. The word 'immediate' was emphasized and reemphasized.

"He requested additional direct and liberal military aid. In addition, he said, a loan must be provided to stabilize Chinese currency.

"If the two aids requested—immediate, all-out military aid, and a loan for currency stabilization—were accorded by the United States, President Chiang Kai-shek said China might survive."

Mr. Clark declared that "a minimum" of $200,000,000, in the form of a 5-year renewable loan in gold from the United States, would be necessary to create a stable reserve in China.

Later there appeared in the April 13, 1950, issue of the Washington Post a statement by a prominent newspaper columnist and news commentator from which the following is taken:

THE KUOMINTANG LOBBY

It has millions to spend, once hired Defense Secretary Louis Johnson, includes the powerful brothers-in-law of Chiang Kai-

shek, Dr. H. W. Kung and T. V. Soong. More about this lobby later.

Working in friendly cooperation with the Kuomintang lobby in this country have been former Ambassador William C. Bullitt; Gen. Claire Chennault; former Senator Worth Clark, of Idaho; Alfred Kohlberg; and Senators Bridges of New Hampshire, and Knowland, of California.

One of this lobby's neat byplays was sending former Senator Clark to China in 1948 to make a supposedly impartial survey and then recommend more United States money for Chiang.

Here are significant facts behind the byplay: Kohlberg gave a $1,000 campaign contribution to popular Senator STYLES BRIDGES, then chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. BRIDGES appointed Clark to go to China and make an impartial survey.

IMPARTIAL SURVEY

Clark, however, was by no means impartial. He had been associated with Tom Corcoran, chief representative of Chiang's brother-in-law, T. V. Soong, and who was paid a fortune by the Kuomintang crowd. Clark took with him to China Eddie Lockett, formerly with Time magazine, now a publicity man. Part of their expenses was paid by the Chinese Nationalists, despite the fact that they were supposed to be working for the United States Senate and American taxpayers.

Clark and Lockett came back, vigorously recommended more money for Chiang.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to understand the motives behind the criticism of the administration's Chinese policy or lack of policy when our Government has made such valiant and costly efforts to rescue China from its mercenary and fraudulent leaders.

Surely our Government can help China and the rest of the world better by keeping our precious gold reserves at home as security for the value and integrity of our United States dollars and the upbuilding and strengthening of our national defenses at home and abroad.

Flag Day Address of Gen. John P. McConnell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 14, this Nation celebrated Flag Day. Old Glory was properly honored in the city of Grand Rapids, Mich., at Houseman Field, by ceremonies under the joint auspices of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks Lodge, No. 48, and the American Legion Council, of Grand Rapids. The guest of honor and principal speaker on this occasion was Brig. Gen. John P. McConnell, Deputy Special Assistant to Chief of Staff for Reserve Forces. The remarks of General McConnell are an excellent example of clear thinking and sound logic. Citizens of this Nation should be rightfully proud of military leaders of the caliber of General McConnell. It is a privilege to include in my remarks the address of General McConnell on this occasion:

FLAG DAY ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. JOHN P. MCCONNELL

When the opportunity was offered me to appear before you tonight by your chairman, Congressman GERRY FORD, I wasted no time in saying, "I would." Grand Rapid's fame for hospitality has spread far into many corners of the world. I know that I am among friends.

This is not the first time I have visited the State of Michigan or your city. I know of Michigan's widely publicized products—of the mining, metals, aircraft and automobile industries. From Grand Rapids, we in the Air Force obtain such aircraft components as auto-pilots, ram-jet controls, and instruments like the gyro horizon. These are the products of your industry—both labor and business.

The Nation is grateful to your native sons for substantial contributions in domestic affairs and in the field of international relations. This is probably best exemplified by the affection and esteem felt by American citizens for Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG as a result of this statesman's impressive service to his country.

On this Flag Day, Americans are gathering all over our Nation as we are gathered here this evening, to pay homage to a symbol and an ideal. That symbol is the American flag and the ideal is that of freedom—the foundation of our democracy. That is why you are here, and that is why I am in your fine city tonight.

On the one hundred and seventy-third anniversary of its creation, we look upon our flag as the expression of national faith. It represents the legacy of America—the thought, labor, and sacrifices of the people of a great country—but most of all, it represents the idea and ideals of freemen as expressed in American citizenship.

Men who would rule by enslavement always have hated any form of human society based on the principle of freedom of the individual. Such hatred and fear of a free society caused Benito Mussolini a few years ago to refer to us as the "stinking corpse of democracy." Today the same fear of freedom causes other dictators to inspire hatred of democratic principles and institutions which threaten their power over enslaved peoples. The iron curtain with its censorship is an unconscious tribute to vitality of the idea of human freedom in our concept of American citizenship. For today human liberty remains a challenge to dictators, and an obstacle in their path.

When danger threatens, it is natural to consider means for warding off that danger. So we are forging a strong shield against the danger—a shield beyond which the free world may live in peace.

For our own national security we are building our strength—our political, economic, moral, and military strengths—and the strength of all the other peaceful nations of the world into a force for the discouragement of aggression. Granted this is the only relative security, but there is no such thing as absolute security in the world today. For so long as there is danger of aggression only an economically unacceptable amount of military power can guarantee freedom from it.

We could, if we wished to curtail many of our basic inherent freedoms, become an armed camp fully mobilized. However, we realize that even this would not be total security.

We could, if we so desired, build the greatest military might the world has seen. We have already shown that there is no limit to the miracles which this country can perform. It is a fact, however, that no nation can support great military forces without sacrifice. So we have evolved the concept of relative military security. In this country we have determined that we will not sacrifice our political freedoms, our economic advantages, or our moral character. We will not give these up for they are the broad supports behind our military forces which enable our Government to provide stability for its people and to act in concert with other nations for world peace.

Relative military security involves a calculated risk, and our present preparedness program takes this into consideration. The risk is not taken lightly nor blindly. We must always be alert to the intentions and capabilities of a possible foe.

One way to evaluate calculated military risks is by comparison. And a very convenient comparison lies in the strength of men and numbers of planes, guns, tanks, submarines, and other implements of military usage possessed by a potential enemy. Qualitative and quantitative comparisons of these factors give us some indication of the opponents' intentions. They are the principal measure of a nation's ability to wage war successfully. There are other factors to be considered—the relative capabilities of mass production, of industrial know-how, of national morale, and of potential allies and their capabilities.

We are convinced that both the individual and the Nation profit and progress most in peace. It is our fervent hope that conflicting ideologies and even conflicting economic and other interests may be harmonized so that future wars will not arise. Realization of that hope may sometime be fulfilled.

Meantime our job today is to so discourage any potential aggressor by our timely preparation that he will not accept the risk of an attack. The price of peace in the world of today is continual preparedness. It took a terrible war to teach us this. And to teach us that our most powerful weapon was and is our moral fiber as a people.

One thing we learned during the last war was that as a people we had been taking our ancient virtues for granted. Each of us expected our neighbors to have a deep knowledge of our freedoms, an almost instinctive awareness of dangers that threatened those freedoms and a broad factual foundation of understanding, assuring a realistic approach to problems that threatened us. If we had not exerted our thoughts, minds, and actions to these problems personally, we were confident that our good neighbors had assumed that responsibility. We were confident that as a people we were unbeatable. That all was well and must by nature remain so.

Our complacence received a rude awakening when in 1941 just prior to Pearl Harbor we discovered that great numbers of the men in our new Army were substantially ignorant of the calamitous events of the world. The citizen soldiers saw no danger and saw no compelling reason why the Congress had decided to retain them in the service. In common with other citizens they were perplexed and confused. It required Pearl Harbor to unite us as we had never been united before.

Even then there followed a national speculation of what we were fighting for—and a drive for slogans to keep us alert.

However honest these attempts were to describe the outward manifestations of our reasons for fighting, they failed to assess the basic truth that we were fighting because we had to fight—that the simple dignity of man was being threatened—that the principle of a Government owned and controlled by its people was in danger—that American democracy as we knew it was on the way to a rendezvous with lost civilization.

It seems to me that today we have a more awakened citizenry; that more people are personally and actively interested in the affairs of their community, State, and Nation, and in general world conditions.

A democratic government such as ours cannot function unless each and every citizen is well informed about, and takes an active part in, the affairs of the Nation

and in the relations of the Nation to other countries.

It is essential, also, that all of us keep abreast of developments in all fields of endeavor for, in modern, total war, every element of activity is involved. And developments today come too rapidly and affect our thinking and our planning just as rapidly and radically.

I can think of no better illustration of how events in the field of science affect our lives—in both peace and war—than the changes wrought by the advent of aviation. It was not very long ago—in fact, within the memory of us here today—that man was earthbound. No longer ago than the First World War, we thought of war in terms of engagements on the ground, or on the seas.

World War I came, was fought and ended before more than a handful of people realized the capabilities of air power, and before aviation itself had progressed to such an extent as to bring it into its own. Aviation tottered along, so to speak, until Lindbergh electrified the world in 1927 by making the first solo crossing of the Atlantic. At approximately the same time Maitland and Hagenberger were blazing the trail of pioneer air routes to the West and McReady and Kelly were completing the first nonstop dawn-to-dusk flight across the continent. The exploitation of air commerce which sprung from these pioneer flights and the slowly growing realization on the part of the enlightened people, as to the capabilities of the air, served to give us a small nucleus of an aviation industry but only an infinitesimal appreciation of the role of the airplane in any future conflicts.

By the time of World War II, which, as I have said, found us totally unprepared, we did, however, possess two important assets: We had the greatest commercial aviation industry in the world, small though it was, and we had American ingenuity and resourcefulness. These rendered us capable of turning, in times of extreme emergency, to the only weapon we could use until we could grapple with the enemy in closed combat. Hitler taught us our first lesson in air power when his Stukas spread terror over Poland, Holland, Belgium, and France. England taught us our second lesson when the RAF saved that nation from probable obliteration. Finally accepting the inevitable, we turned to the air for the defense of freedom. It was nearly 2 years before any major land or sea offensive was launched against the enemy. Meanwhile our Army and Navy and Marine Air Forces battled tenaciously until we had gained, first, air superiority and finally air supremacy. It there is one thing which we should have learned from the last war, it is that in the foreseeable future "there will never be a war lost with air supremacy and there will never be a war won without it."

We developed air power further than most men had ever imagined to be possible. At the commencement of World War II the American aviation industry ranked forty-fourth amongst the industries of the Nation. The dollar value of manufactured aviation products amounted to only $280,000,000, or approximately 7 percent of the value of automotive equipment produced. Within 5 years aviation was catapulted to the rank of the greatest industry in the history of the world. The value of aviation products expanded to over $20,000,000,000, more than five times that of the automotive industry during its maximum peacetime production. We hurled aerial armadas of thousands of planes across every land mass and every ocean in the world, striking the enemy at the focal point of his resources and depriving him not only of the power but also of the will to wage war. We established an air transport system that penetrated into every corner of the earth, carrying American goods, American men, and American material. We not only moved armies by air but we supplied them by air. We developed aids to navigation which were 15 years ahead of their normal time; and when the war ended, we had the greatest air power this or any other nation had ever known.

Today we have only a fraction of that power but we do have an Air Force developing a retaliatory potential to discourage any aggressor from attacking this country. In the event of such attack we must possess the means for effective counter blows, to slow down his attack, and eventually to destroy his offensive operation at its source.

It is true that we have been relatively safe in the past; we have been able to operate as the arsenal of our allies; our enemies either did not possess the weapons for an attack on us, or considered the cost too great for the success such a venture might have achieved. But with the example of the last war before him, any aggressor would be lacking in foresight if he did not realize the necessity of neutralizing America and her industrial potential. Today there are in existence weapons capable of reaching our industrial heartland. It is a matter of about 12 hours flying time over the North Pole to where we are tonight.

It is my conviction that with sufficient retaliatory potential, we can discourage aggressors for a sufficient time to allow for the peaceful settlement of differences in this world. To believe and act otherwise would be to invite aggression.

But air power is not great armadas of all-weather fighting planes alone. Air power is the capacity of American industry; it is the art and skill of American scientists, mechanics, and artisans; it is the exploitation of American resources for improved fuels, metals, and power plants; it is the training of American youth in an unnatural element—the air; it is the far-flung air-transport system of the world, flown with American equipment and manned by American crews. Air power is also the consciousness of the American people, developed by education and experience into a state of air mindedness—where we accept without question the capacity of aviation for commerce and for security.

The capability of aviation in transporting passengers economically has been well demonstrated and is now generally accepted. But I should like to mention briefly its potential for commerce—or air freight. Much progress has been made in this field, there remain problems, but there is also great promise for the future.

Transport aircraft were first designed primarily for the fast movement of people. During the war, we used them for the rapid transit of high priority machinery and material, but because of aircraft design we frequently had to dismantle the equipment for loading. We have since secured aircraft designed primarily for the transport of equipment, which accommodate reasonably large pieces—trucks, 105 mm. howitzer, light tanks—without dismantling. They can be loaded directly from truck bed height or by the use of small ramps. However, since these aircraft require up to 80 percent turn-around time for loading some types of freight as against 20 percent flying time, economy is not all that could be desired. This is an important factor in the fast commercial transportation of freight. It is important to the Armed Forces, too. And we have under consideration aircraft which are capable of physically detaching their entire cargo sections in the form of pods with about the same ease the present truck trailer is unhooked from its tractor. This will enable cargo ships to discharge one cargo pod in its entirety, pick up another loaded pod, and be airborne again in a matter of minutes. Conceivably, in commercial practice, such a pod could be loaded by qualified personnel at the factory shipping platform, tractored to the airport, and flown any place in the world—there to be tractored to the customer's door. This is single package handling, over oceans, mountains, continents, without benefit of connecting roads or rails.

Today we tailor aircraft for a specific job; such new developments as tractor-landing treads for heavier loads, reversible-pitch propellers, and special assists to permit landings and take-offs from shorter runways, will contribute substantially to the early arrival of great air-cargo systems.

One is not required to be a prophet to predict that in the near future a city need not be located on bays, oceans, railheads, or navigable rivers leading to the sea to become a great commercial port. Location of our new shipping centers will depend on their distance, in terms of time, from industry and from market outlets.

I understand that in this city you are spending $1,000,000 for new airport facilities, designed to keep Grand Rapids abreast of the latest in commercial-aviation developments.

Because of its location, Grand Rapids has not become the focal point of transcontinental rail lines; this geographic situation, however, does not hinder but actually enhances your city's growth into one of America's No. 1 air terminals. It seems to me that Grand Rapids is particularly adaptable to air commerce.

"I pledge allegiance to the flag"—these words express the idea that we are all standard bearers—that we all support this flag of ours, farmer, housewife, laborer, and businessman. It can be nothing but what we make it from generation to generation. It reflects the America of yesterday, today, tomorrow, and forever. It stands for the freedom and self-determination of peoples everywhere in the world. For we recognize that these freedoms must be guaranteed if we are to maintain our own.

The sun does not set on the American flag or upon our responsibility. We did not seek this world responsibility. Rather, it has been thrust upon us by the complexities of this age. We must recognize it as the opportunity it is—opportunity to better the lot of man everywhere.

It is up to us as a Nation to make many of the major decisions affecting other people in the world. If we fail, or if we refuse to accept our new responsibilities, much of what has been so assiduously gained may be lost for all time. Through indecision or weakness we could sacrifice all that we hold dear. Never were the stakes so high. Never was there so much to gain, so much to lose. Our course of action is clear. We have reached the point of no return. We must face now and solve those problems which heretofore seem to have eluded our grasp. Through the practice of American citizenship we must maintain a society wherein mankind can find the environment for peaceful evolution, economic betterment, progress, and development. As citizens, we must do this or witness the collapse of our civilization.

I firmly believe that good citizenship will provide an answer to many of our problems today. I would urge you to think about what kind of citizen you are, and are going to be—because it is a tough job being an American citizen. It is not enough to be ready and willing to serve when the call comes. Citizenship is a full-time job. You don't fight for it today and forget about it tomorrow. It is more than reverence on Memorial Day, taking the kids down to see fireworks on the Fourth of July, or saluting the flag as we do tonight. These are tokens of citizenship. They are a few of the moments which we have set aside for paying tribute to that which, I am convinced, is the greatest phenomenon in our lives—the opportunity of being an American. But the pages of history are quick to point out the tragic pitfalls that beset man on his path

of progress, and therein lies the real importance and the meaning of our opportunity.

Our founding fathers were aware of these pitfalls and fully realized the enormous responsibility citizenship entails. "We, the people"—the first three words of the preamble to the Constitution—with these words, the delegates to the Constitutional Convention gave highest priority to the concept that it was the duty of all the people to establish their country's fundamental law and that government was to be responsible to the people, not the people to the government.

We enjoy a unique status peculiar to our representative democracy. It ties us to the state as the embodiment of an experience which we, as individuals, share to our mutual benefit. We commonly hold that the highest benefit to be derived from this experience is also the final end of the state which we have created—to make and to keep men free. Under this system we have seen our country develop (in a few short years, as the life span of nations is measured) from a small, struggling group of Colonies into a Nation.

In these responsible days of American democracy we are challenged in our decisions to display courage and determination equal to that of our predecessors when they wrote, "We mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." Our own history has demonstrated repeatedly that we cannot avoid issues. We became involved in two long, frightful wars largely through a misinterpretation on the part of other nations as to what role America might or might not play in such a conflict. We were misunderstood, largely, through a failure on our part to stand up and be counted when we might have been a deciding factor in the cause of peace.

There is today a gigantic task facing all mankind in rebuilding the moral, spiritual, and economic devastation which has been the result of two recent wars. The task may be said to be largely an American task. More truly, it may be said to be a great American opportunity. Our training, our heritage, our ideals, our determination, our courage, our tolerance are sorely needed in the struggle to evolve a lasting peace from the vacuum developed by recent world catastrophes.

America needs the best that is in you; needs the most discerning thought you are capable of; needs all that is represented when one speaks of an American citizen, and persistent willingness publicly displayed by us as a people to dig in and work—in or out of uniform—for the extension of principles of freedom, the self-determination of peoples, and the preservation of the American way of life.

The program was as follows:

PROGRAM—FLAG DAY CEREMONY, JUNE 14, 1950

(Sponsored by BPO Elks, No. 48, Edwin A. Steinmann, chairman; American Legion Council, James E. Baker, chairman)

Master of ceremonies: Col. Lester C. Doerr.

1. Flag raising: By color guard, One Hundred and Twenty-sixth Infantry Michigan National Guard, Col. C. Schnippke, commanding.
2. Invocation.
3. Great Lakes Chorus: Francis Hodgboom, director, chapter 4 SPEBSQSA.
4. Etiquette to the flag: One Hundred and Twenty-sixth Infantry Michigan National Guard, Col. C. Schnippke, commanding.
5. Band number: Twenty-first Armored Division Band, Capt. Donald McLean, commanding.
6. Elks ceremonial: John Elferdink, exalted ruler, BPOE.
7. Address: Brig. Gen. John Paul McConnell.
8. Drill team and band: DeMolay Commandery No. 5 (Capt. Gen. E. V. Berggren and Carl Kuhlman), William J. LaBarge, commander.
9. Drum crops drill: Championship VFW Old Kent Post 830, Mart Pauwee, commanding.
10. Benediction.
11. Retreat.

Participating bands: DeMolay Commandery, No. 5, Twenty-first Armored Division Band, VFW Old Kent Post, 830, Band.

Honored guests: Hon. Gerald R. Ford, Jr., Hon. John B. Martin, Jr., Mayor Paul G. Goebel, Perry W. Greene, Edward A. Borgman, Andrew Rolf.

Development of Resources of Oklahoma—Land, Wood, and Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD one of a series of six articles relative to the development of the resources of the State of Oklahoma. The article, which is entitled "Land, Wood, and Water Development Theme," was written by Malvina Stephenson, and published in the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of recent date.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OKLAHOMA LOOKS AHEAD—LAND, WOOD, AND WATER DEVELOPMENT THEME

(By Malvina Stephenson)

WASHINGTON, June 14.—A two-way improvement program, linking an expanded industrial economy in the eastern part of the State with a western agricultural market, is forecast for Oklahoma.

The key to this bright new future lies in the development of its natural resources, according to Secretary of the Interior Chapman. Such a balanced prosperity which would reverse the declining population figures is vividly projected in a comprehensive 140-page booklet describing the present and planned activities of the eight department agencies operating in Oklahoma.

Uncle Sam, in cooperation with State agencies and the Oklahoma congressional delegation, is operating on the practical basis that an improvement program will multiply the dollars and thus lure people back to their home State and attract new residents. The per capita income must at least be brought up to par, if the State can hope to hold on to its population and grow with the rest of the Nation.

The power and water program is the nucleus of the whole plan. Soil conservation and irrigation will increase production in the rich farm lands of western Oklahoma. The control of excess waters poses the major problem for eastern Oklahoma agriculture, but the great potentialities of this section point to a new industrial future made possible by ample power and water, combined with a ready supply of labor and raw materials.

This over-all picture of Oklahoma's improvement program was requested from the Department of the Interior by Senator ROBERT S. KERR in Washington. Dramatized by the slogan of "land, wood, and water," Senator KERR'S own legislative program is keynoted to this same development of Oklahoma's natural resources. The forthcoming comprehensive survey of the Arkansas-White, and Red Rivers, sponsored by Senator KERR, is aimed at coordinating all the various State and Federal Government activities in this field.

Senator KERR is most enthusiastic over the Department of the Interior booklet. It is the only up-to-date review of the general program, and one of the few ever prepared. It fortunately comes as the new basin-wide development in the Southwest is about to get under way.

In order to spread this message, especially to the younger generation who will carry it on, Senator KERR is distributing copies of the booklet to the school libraries of Oklahoma, to the colleges and universities and the public schools.

He believes that a knowledge of this program will aid the students to select their own courses more wisely and will guide them later as citizens in contributing to the welfare of the State. As a matter of fact, many adults today probably are not fully aware of the relationship of the State's natural resources and what is being done to shape a unified development.

"If Oklahoma is to be developed, it will be by Oklahomans and others who learn of its resources and opportunities," Senator KERR points out.

"If Oklahomans are to have a finer prosperity, it will be through the conservation and utilization of Oklahoma resources. This is one of the newest and most comprehensive portrayals of those resources and the ways in which they can be of greater value."

The eight agencies represented in this review are Southwestern Power Administration, headed by Douglas Wright and located at Tulsa; Bureau of Reclamation, which operates the W. C. Austin irrigation project in the southwest corner of the State; Geological Survey, operated through offices in Tulsa, Oklahoma City, Drumright, Holdenville, McAlester, and Miami; Bureau of Mines, highlighted in Oklahoma by the petroleum experiment station at Bartlesville; the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including the Five Civilized Tribes Agency at Muskogee and the Osage Agency at Pawhuska; Fish and Wildlife Service, operating a fish-cultural station near Tishomingo, and three wildlife refuges known as the Salt Plains, the Wichita Mountains, and the Tishomingo National Refuges; the National Park Service, operating Platt National Park; and Bureau of Land Management.

To Avert Another War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mr. David Lawrence has made another valuable contribution to the thinking on the subject of another world war. His suggestions may not appear popular today in the face of the Korean situation but it offers the only solution that must ultimately prevail if civilization is to survive. I shall include the article that appeared in United States News and World Report on May 26, 1950:

TO AVERT WORLD WAR III

(By David Lawrence)

We are basing our whole concept of future security on the theory that war can be prevented by the armies, navies, and air forces

of the 12 nations massed together on our side. This is the military approach. It is well reasoned technically, and, because of our victories in past wars, the American people complacently feel no fear about the outcome of another conflict of arms.

But this very reliance on military force can prove our undoing.

Despite a military triumph eventually, our real defeat will date from the moment we enter the next war. Our economic strength will be sapped as our cities are destroyed. Our debt structure will pyramid to fantastic heights. The purchasing power of the dollar will shrink. We will move toward a disciplined economy and a virtual dictatorship that could last for generations. Individual liberties will be throttled in a desperate struggle for economic survival after an atomic war.

The philosophy that we should prepare for war and go to war ultimately because there is no alternative is a species of defeatism. It takes for granted that, while man possesses mechanical genius and inventiveness, he does not have brains enough or ingenuity enough to control the human passion that leads to conflict.

Such an assumption degrades the capacity of man. It says in effect that, because man is selfish and proud and ready to use his fists, he is unable to use his head—to substitute patience and reason or to find a way to convert his enemy into a friend.

It assumes that conversion of human beings and rehabilitation of criminals are exceptional occurrences. It assumes that nations are helpless aggregations of citizens who, being exploited or controlled by criminals, can never be saved from their dictators.

Our Government and the Russian Government engage in a cold war and prepare for military conflict—each placing the entire blame on the other. Our people are everyday taught to believe that there is no hope—no way out except threat and counter-threat—and that war can be prevented only by scaring the Russians into believing they will be beaten in war.

This is a thin reed on which to lean. No one has better expressed the opposite idea than John Foster Dulles in a speech delivered in the First Presbyterian Church in Watertown, N. Y., last year. He said:

"Today our Nation is relying greatly on material and military might. That is dangerous. A nation that possesses a great military establishment is apt to be influenced by the counsel of persons who believe in the inevitability of war or who believe that good ends can be gained by violent means. Our present course skirts, dangerously, the road to war. Our leaders take that risk because they feel that there is no adequate alternative. Policy makers work with the tools that, it seems, can be made available. Economic and military power can be developed under the spur of laws and appropriations. But moral power does not derive from any act of Congress. It depends on the relations of a people to their God."

Whatever may be our differences among sects and creeds as to theology, we are agreed that the Judeo-Christian concept of human behavior is miraculously effective in the life of individuals. Why can't we apply it also to international relations? Why must the philosophy which Jesus taught be brushed aside as impractical and idealistic in international policy?

Let's not become confused by demands for an explicit formula or for a blueprint of success before we start.

The first step, of course, is honest mediation. It is amazing how few attempts to mediate the dispute between America and Russia have actually been made. Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations, engaged in such an effort at Moscow last week. His brief comments afterward raised little hope because America already is convinced that his efforts will be of no avail. We act as if we believe that war is the only way out. We do not care, for the most part, to examine alternative methods. Confident of the rightness of our own position, we see mediation as futile unless the other side surrenders abjectly.

Have we ever examined ourselves to determine whether we are ready to make the sacrifices for peace that must be made—sacrifices of pride and even material wealth? Is Christianity merely something to which we pay lip service in our churches but which we refuse to accept as a code of behavior in dealing with a so-called enemy? Have we no regard for the challenge that a whole people might be reached by a display of Christian humility and forbearance? Do we dare to try a truly Christian approach to the Russian people? And if we try it, can we pay the price that it requires in order to achieve the greater objective?

It is worth trying. Physical force means a war that nobody wins. Moral force requires not a formula, but a spirit. It must be a bold and venturesome spirit. It must be a spirit that has faith in the limitless power of God to perform miracles through God-inspired men.

The Inadequacy of Our Present Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made before the Empire State Chapter of the Federal Bar Association luncheon:

THE INADEQUACY OF OUR PRESENT ANTITRUST LAWS

As chairman of the Subcommittee on the Study of Monopoly Power, I have listened to a year of testimony relating to the structure of our antitrust laws.

One conclusion has emerged clearly, and that is in relation to our antitrust laws to stand still is to move back. I am frankly puzzled by so much display of opposition to a clear look at our antitrust laws. It appears to me that in every other phase of our national development, there is little hesitancy in admitting times have changed. Certainly times have changed; they have changed dramatically and radically. To me it appears childish to point out the self-evident differences of our economic life between 1890, when the Sherman Act was enacted, and 1950—and to point out the differences between the world of 1914, the world of the Clayton Act, and the world today. Yet it is the self-evident fact that we find it necessary to repeat and repeat again when the sacrosanct attitude obtrudes itself before an honest attempt to examine our antitrust laws. When the Sherman Act was passed the Ford model T was not in existence, the Wright brothers had not yet launched their plane from Kitty Hawk. Science, medicine, art, industry, war, are geared to present conditions. But laws governing our economy are of the horse and buggy days. Must we not reexamine the legal fabric and change it according to current realities?

It is not a question of letting well enough alone. It is the basic, the very basic, question of the maintaining and strengthening of a free and competitive society, a concept which faces the most crucial test in the world today. With nation after nation blinding their development through rigid government controls, no greater responsibility lies before us than that of reaffirming the principle of a free and competitive society. It seems that every attempt at a reevaluation of our antitrust laws is met with a cry of "socialism," when, as a matter of fact, such reevaluation is the one road open away from socialism.

The Temporary National Economic Committee found that if an individual product is picked at random, there is a 1 to 1 chance that the four largest producers of that product will account for 75 percent or more of its output.

Such concentration is developed through mergers, acquisitions, and consolidations. Thus, in the case of the steel industry, mergers and acquisitions of other companies accounted for one-third of the long-term growth (1915–45) of the Bethlehem Steel Corp., and two-thirds of the growth of Republic Steel. And in the case of the industry's largest firm, the original formation of the United States Steel Corp. represented the greatest consolidation in history, with more than 170 formerly independent concerns having been brought together at one fell swoop. Much the same concentration is true of the copper industry, in which no less than 70 percent of the long-term growth (1915–45) of the three largest companies, Anaconda, Kennecott, Phelps-Dodge, has been due to external expansion through acquisitions and mergers. Obviously, then, there is an inadequacy in our antitrust laws.

The prohibition in the Clayton Act against the acquisition of capital stock of a competitor where the effect may be to substantially lessen competition was not and is not enough as the tables of concentration so glaringly reveal. Hence, the passage of the Celler Act, H. R. 2734, would prohibit the acquisition of assets as well as stock of a competing corporation and would plug the dangerous hole in our antitrust laws. It passed the House overwhelmingly and is now awaiting action in the Senate with favorable recommendation from the Senate Judiciary Committee. Certainly, it is a source of gratification that final enactment of H. R. 2734 should be forthcoming soon, but in the face of these economic truths it is shocking that it took well-nigh 25 years of effort to get the bill to the point where it is now.

Our committee is not interested in windjamming. We are interested in sending bills to the floor of the House for approval.

Let's look at another provision of our antitrust laws—that which concerns itself with the criminal penalties. At the present time, no matter how flagrant were the violations of the antitrust laws, the maximum monetary fine which can be levied upon each defendant may not exceed $5,000 for each transgression. The Department of Justice recently reported that: "In some respects the penalties are so low that violation is regarded by businessmen as a good business risk." Again this inadequacy is so patent that I find it shocking that not until this Congress did the possibility exist for increasing these fines to $50,000. Again our Judiciary Committee has taken the initiative. The bill passed the House and is now likewise awaiting action in the Senate.

The Webb-Pomerene Act is an exemption in our antitrust law. It permits export associations to fix prices for sales abroad but it has become a facade to hide fixing prices for domestic sale. Four typewriter companies (Underwood, Royal, Smith, and Remington), all members of the Typewriter Export Association fixed prices exactly to the fourth decimal point on Government contracts. This so-called export association never exported a single typewriter. The loopholes in the Webb-Pomerene Act must be plugged.

I cannot do more in this address but to touch sketchily here and there upon the problems which confront us. For example, let me illustrate the problem of monopoly power, which the Monopoly Subcommittee is presently examining. The evidence before the subcommittee revealed the United States Steel Corp. owns at least 51 percent of the high grade ore in the Mesabi region from which most of the iron ore for steel has been coming. If the United States Steel Corp. were to stop selling iron ore to its competitors, there would be a catastrophic situation in the steel industry. Some plants would have to be closed down and men would be thrown out of work. The steel corporation testified before my subcommittee that its policy was to continue selling iron ore to its competitors, but it also admitted that this policy, like all company policies, was subject to change. I do not say that this power will be abused, but the power is certainly there. One of the consequences of this power, as revealed before my subcommittee, is that the steel corporation has been able to give itself a thirty cents a ton discount on the ore which it sells itself—a discount so far only given to one of its competitors.

The United States Steel Corp. owns the principal railroad which must be used to transport the iron ore. The railroad is a bottleneck which must be used by the competitors of the steel corporation. This railroad makes more money than any comparable railroad suggested for comparison during the course of our hearings. In fact in some recent years, the steel corporation has made more money from its iron ore and railroad operations than it has from all the rest of its steel-making facilities. In other words, the profit is greatest where the monopoly power is greatest, and where there is strategic control over competitors.

Monopoly power can be seen at later stages in the steel industry. Some of the big steel companies, not content to make steel, have integrated forward into the manufacture of finished- and fabricated-steel products. The result is that many small manufacturers now find that they must buy their steel from steel companies who are directly competing with them. These steel companies hold the power of life or death over the small fabricators. By raising the price of steel and holding down the price of the manufactured product, the steel companies can catch the small fabricator in a price squeeze and put him out of business. Companies of substantial size have been caught in this way.

Monopoly power is, of course, a kind of governmental power. It is a power to fix prices. It is a power to put firms out of business or to permit them to continue when competition might force them into other fields. The important question about monopoly power is not whether it is used wisely but whether it is necessary at all. Private monopoly power is planned economy—no different from the bitterly opposed governmental planned economy.

For most industries monopoly power is not inevitable. Where it exists it is—in effect—the result of bringing separate units together under one holding company, sometimes with practically the whole continent between the plants. Usually it would be difficult to point to any additional efficiency resulting from the combination, and frequently marked inefficiency results. The backward integration of such a combination into the sources of raw materials, either through outright ownership or exclusive arrangements or connections with the sources for private capital, may make it impossible for any newcomer to enter the field. These, then, become the areas of industrial concentration. These are the areas where the monopoly partners or oligopolies control. Here it is that three or four companies will control over 50 percent of the industry. The present antitrust laws appear inadequate to combat this situation. This is the area where legislative revision may be required. I do not believe that any automatic legislative test can be devised. Nor do I think that Government regulation through a supervisory or price-regulatory agency is called for. To take that road is to back away from the ideal of free and competitive enterprise. But certainly some formula can be devised which will not impose Government regulation, will give due allowance to the requirements of efficiency, and yet will call into question combinations which are attempts to secure monopoly power. This is the central problem in the revision of the antitrust laws.

Another weakness in the structure of our anitrust laws lies in the danger of international cartels. This aspect was touched upon in our steel hearings, and we find once again as we examine the whole problem of newsprint that the ugly head of cartel is raised. Newsprint is as basic a commodity as steel, and yet we find evidence of secret agreements for restrictive pricing, division, and allocation of markets entered into between Americans and citizens of other countries without any of such agreements made of public record.

The newsprint shortage is acute. On the supply of newsprint hangs the life of free press. The lack of newsprint means the shaping of an iron curtain of the mind. Perhaps the answer would lie in the enactment of a law compelling each domestic company and each foreign company doing business in the United States to register with the Attorney General a copy of any foreign contract which contains any or all the elements of a cartel.

We find, too, in our investigations into newsprint evidence of a prevailing practice which permits American companies to move their principal places of business into Canada and thus keep them free from judicial process so as to permit them to move their records across the border and indulge freely in violations of the antitrust laws. Certainly such a circumvention should not have legal sanction. For example, to give you some idea of how far monopoly can go, newsprint companies were brash enough to cause the Legislature of the Province of Ontario, Canada, to pass a law making it an offense punishable by 1 year in jail for anyone to produce records of, or in effect testify, concerning operations in Canada of American or Canadian companies before any judicial or legislative tribunal.

Through this statute and by spiriting these records across the border, American and Canadian newsprint companies operating in one or both countries seek to make themselves impervious to our antitrust laws.

It is my sincere hope that these hearings now being conducted by the Monopoly Subcommittee will stimulate a healthy discussion and will emphasize the need for an honest reevaluation of our antitrust laws. Bit by bit the House Judiciary Committee is making its recommendations. The help we get depends upon an informed and alert public opinion.

Only recently we recommended yet another bill which is awaiting action in the House and that is an amendment to the triple damages provision of the antitrust laws. The amendments recommended by the full Judiciary Committee would permit the Government to recover actual damages, which judicial remedy had never been opened to the Government before despite its purchases in the billions of dollars from private companies.

Another amendment establishes a uniform 6-year Federal statute of limitation for the bringing of these suits.

I believe that the paralysis which attacked Congress heretofore in antitrust legislation is relinquishing its hold. Much of what will ultimately be accomplished depends on you—upon a cooperative, enlightened and alert bar and bench.

What Price Governmental Economy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of Congress to a very fine radio program which was broadcast over the NBC network from 1 to 1:30 eastern standard time on Sunday, June 11, 1950. It was also published in pamphlet form entitled "America United" which is a radio forum conducted by the American Federation of Labor.

To the participants in the forum discussion entitled "What Price Governmental Economy," namely, Representative ROBERT J. CORBETT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, and Langdon P. Marvin, Jr., of the citizens committee for the Hoover report, and the moderator, David Brinkley, an NBC Washington commentator should go the unstinted praise of all readers. In my opinion this was an outstanding discussion, in fact one of the best which I believe I have ever heard over any broadcast. Our colleague, Representative CORBETT, handled his subject in an outstanding way and other Members of Congress as well as his constituents can indeed be proud of him for his fine efforts.

The complete broadcast is as follows:

The ANNOUNCER. What about the cut in Post Office service and the other means being tried in Washington to reduce Government costs? What price governmental economy—that is the question.

This is America United, the informal round-table program heard on the NBC network each week at this time by transcription. The host today is the American Federation of Labor represented here by William C. Doherty of the National Association of Letter Carriers. Our other guests are Representative ROBERT J. CORBETT, Republican of Pennsylvania, and Langdon P. Marvin, Jr., of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. Our moderator is David Brinkley, NBC Washington commentator.

Mr. Brinkley.

Moderator BRINKLEY. In Washington of late, as almost everywhere else, there has been a great deal of talk about the Federal deficit, about the fact the Government is spending more money than it is taking in. Various remedies are suggested, some of which we are going to discuss here on America United today.

One of these remedies, one of these attempts to cut Government costs is a piece of legislation called the Taber-Thomas amendment. It would force a flat, straight across-the-board 10 percent cut in all Government personnel expenditures. Another is called the Jensen amendment. That one would reduce the Government payroll but would do it gradually; and it would direct that when vacancies occur in Government agencies because of firings or deaths or resignations, only 10 percent of them could be filled. Still another economy move, one more familiar to most people, is the recent cut in service by the Post Office Department in the name of economy.

So, on America United today, we will discuss the question on What Price Governmental Economy. First of all, we will have a short statement from each of our three

guests of his own opinion about these and other economy measures. I will call first on Representative CORBETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. CORBETT?

Mr. CORBETT. I believe, at the outset, that we ought to emphasize one item regarding governmental economy, and that is the point of view that governments at any level, whether local, State, or national, in effect, serve as collective purchasing agencies for the people. They collect the money from citizens and buy for them certain goods and services.

Now, obviously, the Government can purchase many things for the people better than they can buy them individually. Such things obviously come to mind as schools, sidewalks, fire and police protection, battleships, bombers, tanks, and guns.

Now, then, so long as the governments are buying what the people want and at a proper price, the public is generally willing to pay for it. The trouble comes when the Government buys many things the people do not care to have, when they pay excessive costs for them, or when they load the payrolls with more people than are necessary to carry on certain functions.

Now, in this present drive for economy, the feeling his grown in many circles that too much money is being collected by the Government to purchase things which are not necessary or desirable, and that there has been a great deal of waste and extravagance. Consequently, the economy issue has become prominent in our public life.

Moderator BRINKLEY. Thank you, Mr. Corbett. Now we will hear from Mr. Marvin of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. Mr. Marvin.

Mr. MARVIN. Mr. Brinkley, our slogan is: "Better government at a better price." I am particularly interested in what you spoke about at the beginning, this recent cut in postal delivery services to the public.

We find, in rereading the reports of the Hoover Commission, that there is no call to reduce the services to the public. The general aim was to give the public better service at a better price by putting in a number of reforms.

We have, for example, this cut in deliveries from twice to once a day in this country, which contrasts very badly, I think, with what Congressman MCGUIRE tells me is the schedule of residential deliveries abroad. I think he says there are two or three a day in London, three in Paris, and four in Brussels, Belgium. It seems to me that in this country we could do something to keep our standards of service.

Moderator BRINKLEY. We will hear now from Mr. Doherty, of the National Association of Letter Carriers.

Mr. DOHERTY. Congressman CORBETT and Commander Marvin and myself most certainly do agree on one premise—that we all favor economy. And I am quite certain that all three of us could likewise agree that we are against false economy.

For the record, I would like to say that the organization I represent is unalterably opposed to the Thomas-Taber amendment and the Jensen amendment to the appropriations bill, which we look upon as being false economy. We are also unalterably opposed to the order contained in the postal order of April 18, which was issued by the Postmaster General which cuts the residential deliveries from two to one a day and which cuts out business deliveries in those outlying sections of the city where there will be but one delivery where previously there were two. It is bad for Government, it is bad for business, and it is bad for employee morale; and something must be done to correct the situation and to save our United States postal service for the American people.

Now, I agree with Commander Marvin that in practically all of the countries on the Continent the mail service today is maintained at high standards. Practically all of those countries are still receiving three, four, and five deliveries a day. I might say, in passing, that many of those countries are able to maintain their postal system through our ECA and ERP programs.

Moderator BRINKLEY. Thank you, Mr. Doherty.

Mr. CORBETT. I just want to emphasize that what the people really want and what their representatives in the Congress or their executive officials should do is to give the people their money's worth.

Now, when it comes to this—and we can use it as a good example—curtailment order of the Postmaster General, none of us felt any call from the public to cut postal services. I think that it will be pointed out as we go along here that there are many places in the Post Office Department where economies could be effected that would improve efficiency and would improve services rather than curtail them.

I don't want to take the time here, but the curtailment orders were based on a deficit that doesn't exist in nearly the degree that has been emphasized. No attempt was made to apply scientific management principles to the Post Office, and there was no consideration given to whether or not the people were willing to pay for the services rendered.

Moderator BRINKLEY. At that point, I would like to ask Commander Marvin this question: Did the Hoover Commission report at any time suggest that the postal services be curtailed or that the people of America receive an inferior postal service from the Post Office Department?

Mr. MARVIN. No. I have read the Hoover Commission Post Office report several times, and none of the nine recommendations call for a cut in service. I will give you an example of the kind of things they do call for.

We are, for instance, making the Post Office Department pay $1 for approximately 60 cents' worth of air-mail transportation service. We are making them pay an extra 40 cents for subsidy.

Now, the House Post Office Committee, of which Congressman CORBETT is a senior member, 2 years ago recommended that the subsidy should be separated from the Air Mail Act. Senator JOHNSON of Colorado and Representative KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, have introduced legislation to this end. It would take out of the postal deficit anywhere from thirty to sixty million dollars a year. The legislation is, unfortunately, still in the Congress and has not been acted upon.

Mr. CORBETT. I think that is a good observation. We might, at the same time, in dealing with the deficit, say that the Post Office Department is charged with approximately $104,000,000 for penalty mail and franked mail and other free services rendered to governmental agencies.

I interrupted you there.

Moderator BRINKLEY. I wanted to ask Mr. Doherty if he could tell us a little more about this Post Office Department deficit, just how accurate the figures are, and how much of a deficit it really has.

Mr. DOHERTY. I know so much about those figures that I dream about them. The present postal deficit is somewhere in the neighborhood of $550,000,000, as alleged by the Postmaster General. The expenditures of the Post Office Department in round figures—and figures are always monotonous—are approximately $2,200,000,000 each year. The receipts of the Post Office Department are approximately $1,650,000,000 each year. Now, that difference between the income and the outgo is the alleged deficit. If you will divide that figure, you will find that it costs the people of America—every man, woman, and child—less than one penny a day to operate the most effective and most efficient branch of all the Government departments and agencies.

In my humble opinion, cutting postal services in the midst of a cold war was the wrong thing to do, was utterly ridiculous, was unnecessary and unwarranted, and, generally speaking, the orders of April 18 curtailing services were absolutely obnoxious.

Moderator BRINKLEY. What would you think the actual deficit to be?

Mr. DOHERTY. As best I can figure it out, I wouldn't estimate it to be over $250,000,000 because of the charges made against the Post Office for subsidies and penalty mail and free services. They total almost 50 percent of the alleged deficit. Without trying to confuse the situation, let's put it this way: Back in 1930, Clyde Kelly, the late Congressman from Pittsburgh, had written on the statute books an act known as the Kelly postal policy law, the act of June 9, 1930. That is still a law of the land, and it provides that the Postmaster General may take credit for penalty mail.

Moderator BRINKLEY. What is penalty mail?

Mr. DOHERTY. That is exactly what I am going to explain. Penalty mail is the carloads and tons of mail that goes out of Washington and other cities with a penalty stamp on it meaning that it is absolutely Government mail and handled by the Government. No credit is taken by the Post Office Department for, for instance, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, and the others who use the mail as penalty mail.

Then there is the franking privilege. We are not against penalty mail any more than we are against the franking privilege which the Congressmen are able to use.

Then there is the rail subsidy, the empty boxcars which the Post Office Department pays for. For instance, on a carload of mail leaving New York and going to Los Angeles, under the Railway Mail Act of 1916, the Post Office must pay for that carload of mail on a round-trip basis. In other words, the carload of mail goes from New York City to Los Angeles, and if there is no mail to come back the Post Office Department must guarantee the railroad the cost of that car as if it were loaded with mail. It is the only agency in or out of Government that operates on such a basis, despite the understanding through law that the railroads have; and it definitely militates against the Post Office Department and adds to this tremendous deficit. That, too, is a subsidy.

Then, of course, we have the air mail subsidy to which Commander Marvin referred a moment or two ago. All of these things go to make up what is called the postal deficit.

Now, if the Postmaster General had taken full credit under the Kelly Postal Policy Act for the past 20-year period, 1930 to 1949, inclusive, the actual cost of operating Uncle Sam's postal service, a great, efficient service prior to April 18, would have been $25,000,000 each year to the American people. Those are the actual figures taken from the Postmaster General's cost ascertainment reports and his annual reports. It would have been about $25,000,000, in round figures, each year.

Compare that with the other departments and agencies of the Government, or, if you please, compare it with any institution in outside industry, man for man and hour for hour. There is no comparison.

Moderator BRINKLEY. There is one further question about the Post Office which I would like to put to somebody here. The Post Office is, of course, a Government agency. No Government agency I know of, except the Post Office is expected to have anything but a deficit. Why is that? Why is the Post Office Department deficit thought to be bad when we have deficits in the Commerce Department and Agriculture and other departments?

Mr. DOHERTY. That is the strangest thing—and I don't want to take time away from the other panel members—it is the strangest thing in the world, if I might add just brief-

ly by saying that the Commerce Department, as one illustration, spent $667,000,000 last year and no one hears the Secretary of Commerce running around the country talking about a Commerce Department deficit. The Department of Labor, the Department of Agriculture, and all the other departments spend similar amounts of money, but only the Postmaster General seems to point up this so-called postal deficit.

Moderator BRINKLEY. Mr. CORBETT, do you want to add anything to that?

Mr. CORBETT. Yes. You have put your finger on one of the queerest notions that has gotten abroad in Government: That because an agency produces the bulk of the money it itself spends, they talk about it having a deficit, while as to an agency that spends every cent that is appropriated to it they say nothing about the deficit. Of course, the obvious example right now is that with all the money that is being expended for sustaining food price supports, they don't talk about that as a deficit, nor do they talk about the deficit of the military or the Treasury or anywhere else. It is only in this department that we ever hear about a deficit.

Moderator BRINKLEY. Mr. Marvin, can you enlighten us on that point?

Mr. MARVIN. I think certainly the first job of the Post Office Department is to provide service for everybody in the country. On the other hand. I think we do want to make as much effort as we can, and the Postmaster General has been trying to bring about a number of improvements. As a matter of fact, he has put into effect as many of the Hoover Commission recommendations as he can without legislation. I think we ought to all bend our efforts to trying to bring the books of the Post Office Department into better balance. Maybe they never will balance exactly, but they ought to balance an awful lot closer than that $500,000,000 deficit.

Now, there are two proposals that are up in the Congress now. After all, the responsibility is on Congress. I don't want the full burden to fall on Congressman CORBETT because there are how many more?

Mr. CORBETT. Four hundred thirty-five in the House when there are no vacancies.

Mr. MARVIN. Well, there are 434 other fellows who share the responsibility with you. There are these two bills that are up there now which we think will bring about some improvement.

One is the bill I have already spoken about, H. R. 2908, to take between $30,000,000 and $60,000,000 of airline subsidies out of the Post Office Department and hang them on the CAB. The other bill is S. 2212 to bring about a better accounting system in the Post Office.

Mr. Elmendorf, who was on the task force which did that part of the Hoover Commission report, tells me that that, plus the other improvements that they have recommended, might mean a net saving of $80,000,000 a year, a lot of money.

Mr. DOHERTY. Without a cut in service.

Mr. MARVIN. Without a cut in service; that is right. In other words, there are other ways to do it without cutting the service.

Mr. CORBETT. We might say that our investigating committees, working with the House Post Office Committee, could certainly advance ways and means to save many millions of dollars otherwise without cutting essential services.

Mr. DOHERTY. In my humble opinion, if I may, the Postmaster General's curtailment orders of April 18, constitute the greatest boomerang in all history so far as postal service is concerned. As the order was issued, it meant that postal personnel would be reduced from approximately 517,000 to 504,000. In other words, 13,000 job opportunities would go out the window during the fiscal year.

Then along came the Thomas, Taber, and Jensen amendments; and if they prevail, if the Senate does not knock them off the appropriations bill, some 57,000 other jobs are going out the window, to make a total of 70,000 jobs that will go out the window during the coming fiscal year.

Now, I am not speaking of jobs alone. If you take away 70,000 postal employees, you can imagine what the postal service will be like after July 1. It is bad enough now with the curtailment orders being put into effect with our present personnel.

Mr. CORBETT. May I interrupt you right there, Mr. Doherty? Here is the queer thing: Let's say, regardless of what the Senate may do with the Taber and the Jensen amendments, when you come to the post office, the only agency that produces much in the way of revenue, they are having imposed on them the additional cut resulting from the Postmaster General's orders. Nowhere else in the Government agencies, outside of the military, has there been a cut in addition to the proposals of the House.

Mr. DOHERTY. The Postmaster General's cut came first.

Mr. CORBETT. That is correct.

Mr. DOHERTY. There is no question about that, Congressman CORBETT. It came first, and so the Thomas, Taber, and Jensen amendments are adding, you might say, are actually adding insult to injury because they are taking 57,000 more jobs away and still further deteriorating the United States Postal Service.

Our motto has been down through the years that "neither rain nor snow nor heat nor gloom of night can stay these couriers in the swift completion of their appointed rounds." Some wag has said that only the Postmaster General can stay these couriers.

Mr. CORBETT. I recall that. However, doesn't it follow that in the Post Office service there is more reason now for a rescinding of Donaldson's orders than ever before because, if there is going to be a cut applied across-the-board by the Congress, certainly there shouldn't be an additional slice taken out of the Post Office Department.

Mr. DOHERTY. I am in total agreement. You are a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Congressman CORBETT; and just this past week you did report out the Morrison bill which would compel the Postmaster General to rescind his orders of April 18.

Furthermore, the Senate committee, a few weeks ago, by a unanimous action, a vote of 10 to 0, took action to rescind the Postmaster General's curtailment orders so that, in a sense, both the committees in the Senate and the House are actually the boards of directors of the Post Office Department. I think the order has been completely repudiated by both committees, the Senate and the House Post Office and Civil Service Committees. If the Senate and the House will now take action on the bills that are reported out by the respective committees, perhaps the Congress will take the bull by the horns, so to speak, and do something to restore the United States postal service.

Moderator BRINKLEY. What about these projected 10 percent cuts as they would apply to some of the other Government agencies outside of the Post Office Is the 10 percent cut called for in other agencies and other departments?

Mr. CORBETT. According to the Taber-Thomas amendment, the 10 percent cut would apply to all agencies of Government, except those specifically excepted, such as the Military, hospitals, and——

Moderator BRINKLEY. Instead of "called for," I should have said "advisable." Do you think it would be a good idea to cut 10 percent in the other agencies?

Mr. CORBETT. Very definitely the Taber formula is a type of meat-axe economy. It would have been so much better had there been a study, agency by agency, with those which could stand a cut being given maybe more than 10 percent and with those that couldn't stand 10 percent being given less. I believe the Post Office is one of those that shouldn't have been cut that much.

Mr. DOHERTY. Basically, the 10 percent is an across-the-board, horizontal cut on the one-package appropriation bill, so it is equally obnoxious to all the departments and agencies of Government. It is equally savage to them except that the Postmaster General saw fit to cut first. Isn't that about the way it sizes up?

Mr. CORBETT. Yes, except that I think we can agree that in his matter of economy there are agencies with too much personnel. There are agencies which have been spending wastefully. Now, had they gone back into those one by one, we would have probably done a job which would have stood up; but doing it this way we have thrown the burden on the Senate to either make those cuts selectively or there is going to be some very bad economy as the result.

Moderator BRINKLEY. Mr. Marvin, do you think this 10-percent cut is a good idea?

Mr. MARVIN. I don't know too much about those Taber-Thomas amendments. I have just this thought, briefly, on the postal situation. I think the Congress is in the process of rolling back the Postmaster General's order reducing the mail services to the public, and I think that is fine. But then the Congress, it seems to me, has to do more than that. Congress can't sort of be like King Canute telling the tide to go back. They have to take some more constructive measures to cut some of the expenses that are imposed upon the Post Office like these airmail subsides and streamline the Post Office in other respects like in the accounting system and really carry out some constructive measures.

Mr. DOHERTY. Don't forget the empty boxcars.

Mr. MARVIN. And the empty boxcars. Yes, I agree. These are all things that must be done to reduce the expenses that are imposed on the Post Office.

After all, there are two ways of balancing the books. You can increase the revenues which, in this case, will give you more of the taxpayers' money, and you can, on the other hand, cut the amount of money that they have to spend for services.

Moderator BRINKLEY. Mr. Doherty, from the free or near free services the Post Office gives, would you eliminate any of them, such as those special rates given to magazines and newspapers?

Mr. DOHERTY. I will be very happy to answer that.

I look upon the postal service as the basic line of communication in the United States or, for that matter, the postal service of any country is its basic line of communication. Let me say this: That in all of the countries behind the iron curtain the first steps taken by Stalin and his cohorts was to immobilize civilian populations through freezing transportation and communication. Once the transportation and communication systems were completely immobilized and the civilian populations stymied, then it was an easy matter for the Communists to take over. Now, unwittingly, the Postmaster General has apparently fallen in line with the plan that has been in use behind the iron curtain. I sincerely hope that he will not only restore the two deliveries, but that he will find ways and means of giving to the American people even more deliveries.

Now, as to the element of cost, it isn't generally known that we handle newspapers free within the county of publication. I am not against that. I think it is necessary as our basic line of communication. Some magazines are making money at the expense of the Post Office Department because of the ridiculously low rates. If the rates are wrong, then it is up to the Congress to correct that situation. But definitely this is no time to

raise postage rates for an inferior brand of postal service.

Mr. CORBETT. At the same time, if those rates are too low—the gentleman's first question was whether these free services should be cut out. Regardless of what services are given free, regardless of what rates are charged, the postal service should not be charged with having a deficit therefor.

It has been the policy of the Congress and the people to say: Look, we want these educational matters to be handled rather cheaply. We want news to be transmitted at a low cost. But the Post Office Department shouldn't be blamed for the resulting difference between income and outgo.

Mr. DOHERTY. You wouldn't have had an effective Air Corps in World War I or II if it had not been for the postal service air-mail subsidy.

Mr. CORBETT. Correct.

Mr. DOHERTY. By having the planes in the air delivering the mails and subsidizing them, we were able to put into the air, during wartime, the greatest Air Corps that man has ever conceived, the brain of man has ever conceived; and I hope that we won't discontinue those subsides just because of this great postal deficit bugaboo. There is no postal deficit.

Moderator BRINKLEY. Mr. Marvin, we just have a few seconds.

Mr. MARVIN. Let me just make our position clear. We aren't against the subsidies, and we certainly know how valuable the airlines are. We are just against there being hung on the Post Office an amount which adds to this deficit and becomes sort of an excuse for cutting the service. It should be taken out of the service.

Mr. DOHERTY. That is correct.

Moderator BRINKLEY. Well, Mr. Marvin, Congressman CORBETT, and Mr. Doherty, that is about all the time we have.

The only thing we need in a way of a summary today is a brief one. All three of our guests seem to agree pretty well that Government economy is a fine thing. We are all for it, but we agree that cutting the post office services, as they have been cut, is not the way to do it. Our thanks to all three of you. Now, here is your announcer.

The ANNOUNCER. Printed copies of today's America United discussion may be had without cost by writing the American Federation of Labor, Washington 6, D. C.

Speaking today were Representatives ROBERT J. CORBETT, Republican of Pennsylvania; Langdon P. Marvin, Jr., of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report; and William C. Doherty, of the National Association of Letter Carriers, A. F. of L.

Our moderator ws David Brinkley, NBC Washington commentator.

The States Discover That Federal Money Isn't Magic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial entitled "The States Discover That Federal Money Isn't Magic," which appeared on pages 10 and 12 of the Saturday Evening Post of June 3, 1950:

A bill before Congress, S. 3147, sponsored by 42 Senators of both parties, proposes to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. This body would be directed to study and report by January 1, 1952, upon the proper division of powers and functions among Federal, State, and local governments, with special attention to their fiscal relations. In other words, it would make an effort to clear up the present intolerable situation in the tax field. The same taxpayer supports, directly or indirectly, all three levels of government, but Washington has a first lien on his pocketbook. The Federal cut is so heavy that the subordinate ones get only slim pickings.

A recent survey by the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin showed that 12 major American cities all faced the same basic problems: congested traffic, housing, transit, water supply, and sewage disposal. Every one of them needed large amounts of money to meet these emergencies. As for the States, nothing is more common these days than an appeal to Congress to make grants-in-aid to the States, so that they can cope with a crisis in education or health or some other area traditionally regarded as a matter to be handled at home.

Addressing the last annual meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General, Miss M. Vashti Burr, deputy attorney general of Pennsylvania, said: "Since the only limit to the revenue raising potential of the Federal Government is the economic capacity of the Nation, there are those who advocate that the administration of virtually all taxes be taken over by the Federal Government, which would, in turn, share the proceeds with the States and their political subdivisions."

Needless to say, she opposed this notion. Her speech supported the propcsed national commission on intergorvernmental relations, with a view to reserving certain tax sources and obtaining an agreement that Washington would leave them alone in the future. Among these would be taxes on real-estate; taxes on public utilities, places of amusement; retail sales and use taxes; and taxes on the smaller incomes and estates.

The committee on Federal grants-in-aid of the Council of States Governments recommended this allocation of taxes in its recent report. The National Association of State Budget Officers endorsed it. So must every citizen who wants to check the growth of a system under which governors and mayors have to apply, hat in hand, for a return of part of the tax money collected in their own jurisdictions. Nowadays candidates even appeal to the voters on the ground that they have better Washington connections than their opponents.

The trouble with the Federal grant-in-aid set-up is that Congress cannot, and should not, hand out money without exercising some control over how it is spent.

An equally telling objection lies in the fact that the grant-in-aid method is cumbersome and expensive. Superficially, the idea of one agency, the Federal Government, collecting and disbursing all taxes, looks like a streamlined simplification. Actually, it is wasteful. Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey, has pointed out that in one year $525,000,000 was authorized and appropriated for grants-in-aid, but only $314,000,000 reached the State treasuries. That means that the local tax dollar shrinks to 60 cents as it travels to Washington and back to be processed into that wonder currency, Federal money.

Centralized financing can only wind up in centralized control, notoriously spendthrift and inefficient. The effort to reverse this dangerous trend deserves immediate action by Congress. It isn't altogether an accident that the Communist Party and the fellow-traveling Progressive Party are the most enthusiastic supporters of extending the grant-in-aid system on all fronts.

Going Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a commencement address delivered by my son, Paul G. Rogers, at Palm Beach High School on June 9, 1950. Paul served 4 years in Field Artillery during World War II, having been promoted to the rank of major. He received his law degree at the University of Florida and is now engaged in the practice of law at West Palm Beach, Fla.

GOING FORWARD

Tonight, as the strains of the traditional Pomp and Circumstance filled the air with its power and majesty—all eyes were upon you as you marched down the aisles to take your places. I could not help but recall a similar ceremony—12 years ago—for it was then that I graduated—the year that you began your schooling. And I am sure that my feelings on that night were those same feelings that are yours tonight.

This audience sensed, as I did, the excitement of this night as they watched you come forward in your caps and gowns, signifying accomplishment and ability, as they watched you taking sure and firm steps, with the assurance of youth, as they watched you holding your heads high, eyes fixed ahead toward the future. We all sensed your satisfaction and pride in attaining your position tonight, your confidence in your ability to meet the future, unknowing as yet what may come forth. We sensed your spirit of gratitude and appreciation to all who have contributed to your success tonight, your mothers, fathers, teachers, and friends. And I am sure we all sensed your feeling of humbleness and thankfulness toward your God.

For to you for tonight all is well with the world.

A great number of you are wearing on your finger, your class ring. I noticed some of you touched that ring with your thumb, as you came down the aisle, perhaps because of the excitement within you, and I wondered if you were aware, as you touched your ring that the crest of your school is on that ring, upon which are inscribed the following words: "Going forward."

Tonight, I know of no better motto or slogan to have constantly with you—bound around your finger as a persistent reminder—that no matter what heights of success you may attain—and certainly tonight is one—no matter what disappointments life has in store for you—each must keep "going forward." During the past 12 years, you have been "going forward" year to year—guided and directed in your learning by devoted teachers and parents. You directed your time and energies to the task at hand—obtaining knowledge. From the classroom in Palm Beach high school you have become familiar with the world in which we live. You know its geography—the thoughts of its peoples—its development by civilizations and national groups—its varying forms of governments and economic systems. You know of the advances made through science and you are cognizant of the differing faiths of the world.

You know of the mistakes, failures, and tragedies of mankind as well as the successes and triumphs.

But more—you have studied the formation and development of our own America. You have witnessed democracy in action—by the example of your parents and their neighbors. You have practiced democracy in your school activities.

Yours has been a life of untold and unmeasured opportunities—and you have applied yourselves well—your being here tonight evidences this.

You have been advancing with a firm step forward year by year.

Now that you have laid your foundation by preparing yourselves during the past 12 years, you are ready to commence the next step in life. Some of you will continue your education by attending various colleges of your individual choice. Some of you will prefer to step into and become a part of our community by starting your life's work. In both instances the opportunity will be yours of "going forward" toward whatever goal you may have set, toward whatever dreams may fill your heart.

The trend of your later life will be determined during the next few years. This is the period when you will truly begin to mold your character—your personality—your habits—your aspirations and your deeds—whether by education or actual experiences.

This is the period when you will be confronted as never before—with atheistic philosphies—with foreign isms, subtle and deceitful. You will be called upon to make decisions. Your principles of honesty, integrity, fairness, and truthfulness will be tested.

And it will be during these next few years that the full responsibilities of citizenship fall upon your shoulders.

Into your hands—American democracy will be entrusted for you to guard and preserve with all the vitality and devotion within the power of your being.

To assure individual achievement and progress—to insure the individual's right, to go forward—we must preserve American democracy.

The cumulative effort to spur democracy forward is the direct result of active individual citizenship.

The responsibility to uphold our way of life with its freedoms—rests upon each of you in equal shares.

It is axiomatic that one must either go backward or forward—one cannot remain the same for long—only those—strong in purpose and in will—go forward. As individuals then our task also becomes that of keeping America going forward.

You see then—that we are not concerned with your ability to meet life's obstacles as they come—you have already, in these few years, shown your ability to do this—but we are greatly concerned that each of you resolve tonight—that you will never set foot into the pitfall of indifference toward America and indifference toward your responsibilities as an American citizen.

Today—the greatest threat to America's going forward—even its continued existence—even more than foreign isms is the failure of our citizens to exercise their democratic duties.

This indifference toward government—toward our way of life comes about largely—because too many individuals say:

"But what can one person do?"

I can answer—that the American Revolution needed its Patrick Henry. It needed Thomas Jefferson. It needed George Washington. And each of these men stood up on his feet and spoke.

He was just one man—one voice. But what each said inspired other men, and one by one they became an army.

Great things can be accomplished by a few—if they believe and have faith in their principles.

Less than 12 disciples with the greatest Teacher of all times changed the course of civilization and history. They have influenced the destiny of man for almost 2,000 years.

Less than 100 people were responsible for the Renaissance and Reformation of Europe.

It is said that less than 10 men were responsible for the formation of the Federal Union.

Think of the unlimited possibilities that this body—260 strong—possesses. Think how much stronger America can be because of your active participation in the problems that face the governments of your city, your State, your Nation.

Think of the opportunity that is yours to contribute—to help build America and keep it "going forward."

Think of the future—of "going forward" to build your lives as you have dreamed, blessed with freedom—lives builded upon the principles that have been embedded in your hearts and minds these past 12 years.

Think of these things as you sing your alma mater tonight—think of these things as you sing that second verse:

"Into the world we soon will travel
After school is done
Still will stand our alma mater
Proudly looking on;"

For truly your alma mater will be proudly looking on as you keep "going forward." We will all be proudly looking on—as you keep "going forward."

And I know that the Creator of all good things, your God, will be proudly looking down as you keep "going forward."

Judge Frederic N. Chandler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include my address at the dedication of a memorial portrait of the late Frederic N. Chandler, district court, Lawrence, Mass., on Saturday, June 24, 1950:

It is a pleasure to pause in our labors and give testimony to the worth of a man's character.

To affirm rather than defend, attack, or punish.

Day in and day out, in the routine of this court, we see the sorry parade of those who err and who must make accounting for their misdeeds. Too much of this might make an observer cynical, but for those rare and precious occasions such as the present when we meet to honor the virtues of one we knew.

Frederic N. Chandler was a good judge, because he was a good human being.

In upholding the laws which protect the individual, and the society of which each individual is a member, the late presiding officer dispensed justice that was tempered with mercy.

He was not influenced by subtle pressure or prestige to yield special advantage to any man who came before his bench, whether that man came as plaintiff, defendant, prosecuting officer, or lawyer.

Neither did he regard people as mere numbers on a docket or as being all alike.

With an honest dignity he considered the man himself, in relation to the facts and the law.

How many he helped to save rather than condemn is the real and lasting measure of the service that he contributed to the orderly progress of our community's life.

The Honorable Frederic N. Chandler was a name that always came to mind when we were asked to describe Lawrence to strangers.

His father fought with the Union Army in the Civil War and with such bravery that he was awarded the Nation's highest decoration, the Congressional Medal of Honor.

With that precept to guide him, young Frederic grew up with a profound love for his home town and its people, which, to him, was our Nation in miniature.

Early in life he sensed that the worth of a man's life is not measured solely in terms of personal success. The only true satisfaction comes from paying back opportunity with service to others.

Fred Chandler graduated from Lawrence High School in 1889, when that fact alone was a privilege enjoyed by a few. Dartmouth College granted him a bachelor of letters degree in 1893. Four years later he completed his training for the profession of law at Boston University.

Like most of us, he found that the first client took a long time in showing up. In the meantime, Fred Chandler earned his way by teaching at Lawrence High. I think it so typical of the man that, in spite of his own difficulties, he had the generous heart that takes on the burden of others. As he taught the few whose parents could give them an education beyond grammar school, he thought of the many other young people who were forced to work in the mills at an early age to help their families. That was the seed of an idea which he cultivated with his mind, his energy, and his spirit. Due to his efforts, the Lawrence Evening High School was established, giving working youngsters a chance to continue their studies at night. In recognition of this contribution to the life of the community, Fred Chandler was elected to become its first principal and continued in this post of leadership for 8 years.

His talent and his character soon brought him to the forefront in his chosen profession. In 1899 he joined Attorney Fred H. Eaton in a law partnership that lasted a lifetime and won high esteem for its ability and integrity.

But Fred Chandler had more to give to his city.

He served as trustee of the Essex Savings Bank and as president of the Lawrence Cooperative Bank. Progressively, he became city solicitor of Lawrence, president of the old Lawrence Board of Trade which he reorganized into the modern chamber of commerce, and president of the Lawrence Rotary Club.

When World War II approached and the Nation set up the machinery of selective service as the just method to call up men for the Armed Forces, Fred Chandler was appointed to the draft board in the Andover-North Andover district, of Greater Lawrence.

He did not realize that the final summons was at hand. On the Saturday preceding the end, he presided over a session of this district court. His faithful practice of justice both on the bench and as a private citizen assure us of the award he has earned before that supreme court to which he has gone.

In devotion to the principles of law, Judge Chandler did not rule out the saving grace of charity. He recognized that there are many cases where a judge has no other choice but to impose severe penalties. But this did not blind him to those borderline situations where a defendant may be encouraged to overcome his weaknesses for the salvation of himself and the good of society. Fred Chandler believed from the bottom of his heart in the constructive application of justice.

This warmth of understanding touched all who ever lingered in this court room and explains why we remember him so clearly and with such fond regard, even though 10 years have passed since he was called to his reward.

The generation that has come of age in the meantime, is dimly aware that Fred Chandler was one of the most public-spirited citizens of Greater Lawrence. Perhaps their fathers have spoken of the many honors that he received and the many responsibilities that he shouldered. Perhaps they mention the fact that he was the prime mover in the establishment of the Lawrence Evening High School, inspired by his profound belief in providing greater opportunity for all our people. Maybe they refer to his energetic leadership in reorganizing the old Lawrence Board of Trade into the present chamber of commerce.

Out of these many contacts and this wealth of experience, he brought to his duties as judge of the Lawrence District Court, a vast, practical knowledge of men and circumstances. As a result, his decisions reflected a wisdom that did much to build confidence in our judicial system on the local level where faith in our institutions must take root.

I shall not dwell on the patience with which he listened to arguments, or to the courtesy he extended to counsel at bench conferences, or to the eminent fairness with which he rendered decisions. Nor shall I speak of the technical details that are appreciated by lawyers but not by the public at large. I would be doing Fred Chandler an injustice if I limited my recollection of him to these specialized matters.

He knew that others were watching and listening from the back benches, typical Americans from all walks of life. And he knew that an "open court," where the process of justice is clearly understood is one of the foundations of our democratic society.

Fred Chandler kept close to the common man and his common sense.

The key to his ability is not to be found solely in his academic training and his later experience. Even the variety of his public activities, does not spell out the whole story.

It is to be found in his home life and his hobbies.

It is gratifying to all of us that his widow is able to be with us at this dedication. Mrs. Chandler was the close companion of his earthly days. In the pride which she deservedly feels at this memorial, she also shares the tribute for him.

The late justice had a most happy home life.

Around that home was a beautiful flower garden which he tended with loving care.

Here was nourished his great faith in all life in its ability to grow and develop.

The weeds had to be eliminated. But the delicate flowers had to be helped over the critical period so that they might bloom in the fulfillment that was intended for them. And this fact was the more important of the two.

From this background blessed with awareness of the creative factors in life, Fred Chandler brought constructive influences to bear in his duties as justice of this court. Of these, none was greater than his fine integrity, not rigid, but human, and unashamed to be compassionate, whenever the circumstances called for understanding.

The members of the Lawrence Bar Association should be commended for their thoughtfulness in arranging for this memorial to their late distinguished colleague.

Mr. Harry Sutton, of North Andover, has painted a faithful likeness of Judge Chandler, whose image will honor this courtroom to which he devoted the best years of his life.

It is our hope and belief that it will inspire others to emulate the precedent of splendid service which he set before us.

And so, we dedicate this painting in memory of a dear, departed friend, the Honorable Frederic N. Chandler, teacher, lawyer, public-spirited citizen, and judge of the Lawrence district court from 1927 until 1940.

May it please the court: On behalf of my committee—the members of our legal fraternity—and the generous donors—I hereby unveil the portrait of the late Judge Frederic N. Chandler.

We present it to the Lawrence Bar Association, through its president, Attorney Robert V. O'Sullivan, secure in the knowledge that it will be cared for and honored for generations to come.

House Cleaning Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has ordered the Navy and the Air Force to protect southern Korea and the island of Formosa from Communist aggression. This may not be a shooting war in the ancient and traditional sense. A formal declaration of war has not been made. But to all intents and purposes it is war—undeclared war—started by the President, without the knowledge or consent of the Congress.

Perhaps it is necessary. Perhaps the President's action is warranted by the facts. It is too early now to reach a conclusion on that point. But reputedly it is true that the State Department was warned nearly 2 weeks ago that the attack by North Korean Communists on southern Korea was imminent. The entire American public has known for months that Gen. Douglas MacArthur has been urging steps to protect Formosa.

Then why is it that Congress has not been consulted? Why is it that both the President and the Secretary of State were absent from their posts when the blow fell? Why is it that since that hour hurried and secret conferences between the President and the chiefs of State and Defense have reached a belated conclusion of such tremendous import? There was time in which to consult Congress.

The President of South Korea now says that assistance sent by MacArthur from Japan was too little and too late? Why is this so? If the State Department was forewarned, as seems to be the case, why was General MacArthur not instructed to have the assistance ready at a moment's notice, instead of many hours later? If, indeed, the policy of the administration was to defend South Korea, why were no preparations made long in advance? Aviators from the South Korean Army, sent to Japan to fly back American warplanes, it now appears, never were trained to fly them in battle.

So far as concerns the decision to help Chiang Kai-shek defend Formosa, I believe the President and his advisers acted rightly. In itself this was no overt act of war. It was, instead, a continuation of the cold war. It was right, because Formosa is necessary to the maintenance of our position in Japan, as General MacArthur repeatedly has pointed out.

But the decision to defend South Korea: that is a different matter. If China was not worth defending, why get excited now about South Korea? Would a refusal now to involve this country directly in the armed conflict now going on in South Korea constitute a betrayal of an ally? If so, then that betrayal took place a long time ago. It became a fact when the administration now in control of the State Department and the Defense Department failed to take proper measures in advance for the defense of South Korea.

That betrayal, if such it might be called, took place when the administration decided, without reference to Congress, that China should not receive the war matériel and the money which would have enabled Chiang Kai-shek to prevail against the Chinese Communists. It took place before the end of World War II, when Franklin D. Roosevelt went to Yalta, and there turned over Manchuria and Korea to the Communists. It was one of the worst, perhaps the most disastrous, of his secret wartime deals negotiated with the heads of other states, without the consent, or even the knowledge, of the Congress.

In this connection, let me quote for you a couple of paragraphs from a speech I made on this floor on June 22, 1945. I said then that the text of the secret deal at Yalta revealed how China and Korea had been flung into the Soviet orbit. I said that this action was taken through secret deals, deceit and double-dealing. Alger Hiss was Roosevelt's adviser at Yalta.

Continuing, I said that—

> While the State Department is beating its breast daily in denials of Communists or Communist influence in the Department, nation after nation falls into the Soviet orbit in accord with Stalin's plans.
>
> If the Department's policies have not been activated by Red spies and fellow travelers, then it is being directed by a prize package of dupes and incompetents, and should be thoroughly house-cleaned.

So I said then. I say to you now that the things I believed 5 years ago I have more reason to believe today. I think you will agree with me, in view of the conviction of Alger Hiss, of Judy Coplon, the revelations in the Amerasia case, in spite of the administration's best efforts to hush the whole thing up.

As a representative of the people in Congress; as a member of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, whereby I have gained some real knowledge of the situation, I call now upon the President to do the house cleaning that so obviously was necessary 5 years ago. I call upon him to do so before it is too late; before we become involved in a shooting war under the diplomatic leadership of men unfitted for such leadership by reason of their false and misguided ideologies.

Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 21, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to say a few words in support of the President's action in giving aid to the Republic of South Korea.

The Republic of South Korea was established by democratic processes and free elections under the supervision of the United Nations.

The Republic of South Korea has been invaded by the army of North Korea.

The United Nations has called upon all member nations of the UN to come to the aid of the Republic of South Korea.

President Truman in responding to that request is only carrying out the obligations our country assumed when we became a member of the UN and accepted and signed the Charter.

Until an international police force can be set up under the Charter, the present action requested by the United Nations is the only way the Charter can be implemented and this act of aggression stopped and the integrity of the Republic of South Korea maintained.

The President has taken only that action required by the United Nations Charter.

European Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, Mr. Paul G. Hoffman is now in the hospital recovering from a serious and dangerous operation which may well have been precipitated by his tireless efforts in the public interest. The boundless energy and devotion he has brought to his great task have amazed all observers, except those of us who knew him well, and who knew, from the day he took office as ECA Administrator, that he would become not only a great national leader, but one of the most distinguished figures on the international scene.

Mr. President, one of Paul Hoffman's great achievements has been his leadership with the business and labor groups of the country, to whom he has brought great understanding of the complex economic issues with which the country is faced. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Hoffman's address before the United States Textile Workers of America, on June 22 last, just before he was taken to the hospital, which was broadcast over the facilities of the Columbia Broadcasting System. This candid statement not only met with the approval of this great labor union, but the United Textile Workers showed a statesmanship which many in the business community can do well to emulate.

I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix the resolution adopted by their eleventh biennial convention, in New York City, on June 22, by unanimous vote. The resolution is entitled "Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program." I congratulate the leadership of the union on this noteworthy statement, which courageously cuts through the miasma of prejudicial propaganda, and comes to grips with the economic facts of our times, upon the understanding of which our future prosperity depends.

There being no objection, the address and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

I am very happy to be here this afternoon since it gives me an opportunity to thank the United Textile Workers of America for their understanding support of the job ECA is trying to do in western Europe.

The support given the European recovery program by American labor generally has been a great source of strength. Its impact is clearly visible in the decline of Communist influence in the European trade-union. It is hard for a European worker to accept the Communist line that ERP is a wicked, imperialistic plot when he hears, for example, that President Valente is working with the Anglo-American Council on Productivity. Or that three of your vice presidents, Joseph Krause, Frank Sgambato, and Dorsey Mosley, have been assisting in the arrangements for the plant visits of the teams of European workers ECA has been bringing to this country to study how we, in America, do things.

The welcome given these visitors by members of your union, and others, has warmed their hearts.

The group leader of a spinners' team, in Washington, after a tour of American mills, told me that he and his team mates had been wishing that their families could be with them. He reported that their fellow workers here in America had treated them like brothers.

These same sentiments have been expressed to me time and again by the hundreds of visiting team members to whom I have talked. These visitors have been deeply impressed also by your attitude of helpfulness. They have told me that everywhere they have gone they have been met with "What can we give you?" rather than "What do we get out of this?"

I firmly believe that these contacts are laying the foundation of a new and closer relationship between the European workers and the workers of this country. These visitors go home and talk. They write reports. They spread the gospel of friendliness between the free people.

The free world needs that friendliness today. The bonds between the free people must be increasingly strengthened. Our unity is essential to the world of peace and prosperity we are trying to build. It is essential to victory in the present titanic struggle between the free world and the slave world of the Kremlin.

The realities of this struggle are, I think, well understood by your group. Unhappily that is not too true of far too many other Americans. And yet we must understand. General Marshall has said that this struggle is as important as any military campaign in history. It could well be the most important. For make no mistake about it, the goal of the Kremlin is world domination—the enslavement of all mankind. The stake is western civilization itself. The challenge is to the basic principle of that civilization—its faith in man as an individual.

Twice in my lifetime and once, at least, in that of all of us here this afternoon, this country has gone to war in defense of that principle. We would do it again if we had to fight or submit to tyranny and oppression. But there is another choice. If we win this present struggle I sincerely believe there will not be a hot war.

Few of us can doubt that world war III—a hot war—would bring death and devastation unequaled in history. The instruments of destruction have been developed to a point where civilization—as we know it—is now in a position to commit suicide. Recently, a distinguished scientist put it rather grimly when he was asked to name the weapons which, in his opinion, would be employed in world war III. He replied: "I can't say, but I do know that the weapons of world war IV would be bows and arrows."

The great goal of the free people of the world today is to prevent world war III. Through mutual aid programs, military and economic, we are seeking to build a peace so strong and enduring that no aggressor of today—or tomorrow—will dare to violate it.

Such a peace is possible.

But only under certain conditions.

America, today, is strong. That strength must be preserved.

The free peoples of western Europe, with our help, today are growing stronger. We must continue to help them gain in strength.

The free peoples today are developing a unity previously undreamed of except in war. That unity must be maintained and expanded. We must continue to stand together and work together.

Under the Marshall plan, working together has paid off substantially. Let me prove it to you.

During the 2 years of the Marshall plan, industrial production in western Europe has been lifted, not merely to prewar levels, but 24 percent higher. Farm harvests this year will be almost on a par with 1938. Transportation has been restored. Currencies are stabilized.

In human terms, the people of western Europe are eating. They are working and working hard. Let no one tell you they are not. The accomplishments of the past 2 years have been described as "almost a miracle" by General Marshall. That miracle has been brought about by men and women—270,000,000 of them—who, with our aid, have made the most courageous comeback in history.

The truth is that, with our help, western Europe has come alive. The stumbling, bewildered, sickly Europe that 3 years ago cringed at every Communist frown is gone. In its place is a Europe that feels blood in its veins again. The people are full of hope and confidence. They get angry instead of frightened when the Communists try to smash their efforts to rebuild. They are fighting back.

Politically—well, here we have accepted the fact that the western Europeans are politically mature and that the western tradition, for all its lapses, has been faithful to the basic concepts of freedom. We have not interfered. Our confidence has been justified by the sharp swing away from communism in western Europe since the Marshall plan went into action.

In the latest British election, for example, 100 Communists were entered. These 100 Communists were completely snowed under. In the recent important German state election the Communists took a sound whacking. The 14 percent of the vote they got in

1947 was reduced to a small 5 percent on Sunday, June 19, 1950, and Communist leader, Max Reimann, running from what was once a Communist stronghold, not only failed to get elected but ran fourth.

On the political front the Communists have been stopped cold in western Europe since American aid began more than 2 years ago.

These are satisfying achievements. They will be jeopardized, however, unless the Marshall plan countries, by the time ECA aid ends, are able to raise substantially the standard of living of their peoples. That standard varies from country to country, but it is generally too low for the democratic concept that all men are entitled to an opportunity to live in decency and dignity.

If these people—the free people—are to be completely immunized against communism, or any other kind of ism—they must have tangible proof that democracy is the better way of life. It is fruitless to talk of freedom to a man whose children are hungry and cold.

It is generally conceded that the high productivity of American industry and agriculture is the basis of our own comparatively high standard of living. As that productivity has risen our standard of living has risen also. Admittedly, we have still some way to go before all our people share fully in the benefits of our achievements, but we are definitely on the road.

With our aid, the Marshall-plan nations are making a heroic effort to increase their own productivity. These visitors you have entertained are here to study the know-how we have acquired over the years. They are seeking to translate that know-how into their own production figures.

But even with increased production, the western Europeans must continue to look to us for many of their vital necessities. Their cotton mills cannot operate unless they receive raw materials from us. Modernization programs cannot be carried out without essential machine tools procurable only from us. Agriculture cannot develop to its full potential without the necessary modern implements obtainable only here. The people cannot enjoy a sustaining diet without the products of our farms and fields.

This is not a new situation. Over the years the dependence of Europe—as well as the rest of the world—upon American goods and services has been steadily increasing. For some thirty-odd years, need for our products has outstripped the ability of these other people to pay.

This difference between need and ability to pay is the dollar gap. In one way or another, over the years that gap has been filled largely through gifts and loans made by the United States Government. These gifts and loans have enabled the other nations to secure the American goods they so desperately needed. They have, of course, sustained our own export market. They have meant employment to millions of our own people.

Over the past 2 years, the American people have supplied these dollars through the Marshall plan. The focal point of our aid has been western Europe.

The American people, I know, have put up these dollars willingly. We are a generous people. Moreover, we have come to realize increasingly how deeply our own security and prosperity is involved in the security and prosperity of the rest of the world—particularly that of the free world.

The situation, however, is not a healthy one. If the relationship of the free people is to be on a sound basis it must be on a business basis. As long as we are giving aid and others are receiving aid there will be annoyances and tensions. These annoyances and tensions will automatically evaporate if we can put our relationship on a cash-on-the-barrel-head basis with Europe paying us for what she needs.

In other words, Europe must earn the dollars to buy here. She must, also, save her dollars by building up economic sources of supply within her own territory.

At ECA, we estimate that the closing of the dollar gap with western Europe requires that Europe, between now and 1953, must increase her dollar earnings by something less than $1,000,000,000 and reduce her dollar expenditure by something more than $1,000,000,000.

She must, to put it tersely, earn a billion more and buy a billion less.

Of the $1,000,000,000 in increased earnings required by Europe, not over $400,000,000 would come from additional exports. Fear has been expressed in various quarters that such imports would seriously jeopardize prosperity in the United States and create unemployment.

I have never been able to look upon unemployment merely in terms of statistics. No businessman can. An unemployed worker, without income, is not only in a tragic situation for himself and his family but he is not a good customer for the products of industry. Working people need incomes to be good customers and businessmen need customers in order to employ workers.

High employment and prosperity are inseparable. American high employment and prosperity are inseparable from the goal the free world is seeking.

But $400,000,000—well, in 1949 the wholesale value of the goods produced in this country was $140,000,000,000. Four hundred million is less than three-tenths of 1 percent of that figure. Frankly, I cannot see it in the Frankenstein proportions it has attained in some minds.

I am aware, of course, that the textile industry is one of those where these proposed increased imports present, at first glance, a threat.

Let me discuss that threat frankly.

Our economists estimate that the European nations may be able to increase their exports to the United States of all kinds of yarns, textiles, and textile manufactures from $110,000,000 in 1949 to $150,000,000 to $160,000,000 in 1953. How much of this additional forty to fifty million dollars represents goods directly competitive I do not know. Part of it, probably, represents sales which otherwise would not be made by anyone. It is for you—not me—to say whether this increase of forty to fifty million, when measured against our total textile production of approximately twelve billion, is going to create a serious problem.

As far as I am concerned, I do not think we can meet the problem of unemployment in the textile industry of the United States by stopping this comparatively modest volume of imports from western Europe.

The way to solve unemployment in the textile industry—or any industry—is not to stop something but rather to start something. The aim should be to increase domestic consumption. The California stylist who introduced sport shirts for men contributed substantially to employment in the cotton textile industry. The pioneers who popularized cotton slacks, also put men to work. It is measures such as these, stemming from the resourcefulness and imagination typical of a free economy, upon which we should depend.

It is perfectly clear that if we cut off imports in any industry we are going to have to cut down exports. And that would really create unemployment in this country. Not just in one industry but in many. Unemployment in any one industry always sets up a chain reaction. It spreads.

I do not wish to give the impression that all of the problems of Western Europe will be solved when the dollar gap is closed. Such is not the case. Fundamentally there must be a closer union of the free nations of Europe, both politically and economically. They can remain free and become strong only if they draw together and work together.

But even that will not be enough. I see no chance of an enduring peace unless all the free nations throw all their resources—material, intellectual and spiritual—into the fight.

That means that we—the free people of America—must work with the free people of western Europe and stay with them. Our destinies are inevitably joined. They need us but we also need them. It was the poet, John Donne, who said that no man is an island, entire unto himself. That can be said with equal verity of nations. Today America is strong, prosperous, blessed above every nation on earth. But she is not an island, entire unto herself.

I think, too, that America, in helping the free peoples of the world to remain fre and gain in strength, is living up to its best traditions and will, itself, gain in strength by so doing.

From our very beginning, Americans have had a sense of mission about America. Our forefathers believed, and we have believed, that this free and good society we are building is not merely for our own good but for the good of all mankind.

I am convinced that we are today doing the work the founding fathers deeply believed we could—and would—do.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

Relatively full employment and high-wage standards are dependent, fundamentally, on a high level of general industrial activity in the Nation because this means more and better customers among American workers for American products, including American textile products. For the full development of such a high level of industrial activity and employment, it is essential that two-way international commerce be expanded.

The reciprocal trade program is contributing to such trade expansion by reducing or removing unnecessary and artificial tariff and other trade barriers, both foreign and American. This is important because the United States economy needs imports: (1) to supply necessary raw materials for United States industries as well as goods for United States consumers; and (2) because foreign customers for United States products, including United States textiles, can get American dollars with which to pay for those United States products only by selling their own goods and services in the United States market. The reciprocal trade agreements program makes these sales easier.

The reciprocal trade program is part of our general national policy of political and economic cooperation with the democratic forces of the world to combat all forms of totalitarianiasm and all menaces to the peace and political and economic stability of our democratic allies. The Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Pact, the point 4 program, the military aid program and the reciprocal trade agreements program are all part of this American foreign policy counterattack against Soviet Communist imperialism and its menace to peace and freedom.

During the 1920's, protective tariffs, which were at their highest point in the history of this Nation, failed to provide regular employment or high wages for American textile workers. Similarly, these high barriers did not make jobs or maintain wages for our textile workers back in the depression days of the 1930's. It has been American efficiency and know-how which have enabled American producers to compete in the world market against goods from foreign countries, when people in the world market can get the dollars to pay for American goods. On the other hand, high tariffs have raised the living costs of American consumers. This tends to reduce the ability of American workers to buy American goods, including American textiles.

Tariff reductions under the reciprocal trade agreements program are made with care and moderation and only after exhaustive study by trade experts and after opportunity for interested persons to state their views. In the 16 years, during which this program has been carried on, it has not brought about any flood of imports of any commodities. In 1949, notwithstanding the various tariff reductions in different types of textiles, under trade agreements since 1934, total United States imports of textiles were ridiculously insignificant by comparison with the vast size of our domestic production. In fact, since the development of the program, the American textile industry has grown very prosperous, jobs have been more steady and wages for textile workers have reached their highest levels in our history.

Therefore, the eleventh biennial convention of the United Textile Workers of America gives its support to our Government's reciprocal trade agreements program and urges that it be pushed with vigor, unimpeded by partisan political obstacles and the sordid pressure of special interests.

Economic Development of the Southwest Region

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JUNE 27, 1950.

To reach the goals of economic growth which are within our power will require local, State, and regional action, both private and public, as well as national policies and programs of action designed to facilitate such development and growth. It will also require careful attention to basic resources development and potential in the various regions of the country.

We are a nation of many areas and regions, each with its own particular combination of economic advantages, yet each dependent on the others. In the past, our regions have moved forward at different rates of growth, with the wave of expansion sweeping generally from the east coast westward. In the future also, we may expect differential growth rates among the major regions, with each making its own unique contribution to national economic progress.

We have been inclined, however, to concentrate a large portion of our effort upon problem areas and regions growing relatively slowly. This concern is important and necessary. But we should give equal attention to analyzing and making the most of the economic possibilities in places of more rapid growth. The southwest region, which on the whole has been growing rapidly in recent years, is an area of considerable economic potential and promise for the years ahead because of its endowment of natural resources and its growing and enterprising population. This region is made up of Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Arkansas, that portion of New Mexico east of the Continental Divide, southeastern Colorado, the southern half of Kansas, and the southern part of Missouri. It includes the basins of the Rio Grande, the Red, and the Arkansas-White Rivers, and the Gulf coastal streams of Texas and Louisiana. A realization of the region's potential will depend in large measure upon the adoption of the proper policies and programs by private groups and individuals and by Federal, State, and local governments, with respect to economic development generally and resources development in particular.

With about 21 percent of the land area of continental United States, about 11 percent of the population, a varied climate, and a variety of agricultural, mineral, forest, and industrial resources, the southwest region is moving from an extractive, raw material exporting economy toward a more balanced economy with an expanding industrial component. Information already available indicates that the southwest region has the material resources and the vigorous, growing population to support continued expansion of appropriate industries and related services, and thereby to promote national economic growth.

These very opportunities constitute a challenge which may be summarized under two headings:

1. To maintain and increase employment, production, and living standards for the benefit of the people now residing in the Southwest or who may reside there in the future and for the benefit of the whole country.

2. To point out in specific terms improved ways of utilizing the natural and capital resources, as well as the labor force, available to the Southwest to provide a basis for a continuing growth of the regional and national economies. Since much of the recent regional expansion has come through industrialization, it means determining what measures will insure adequate financing, transport facilities, electric power, and other elements essential to industry. It means, also, measures to insure a sustained yield of benefits at high levels from agricultural, forest, water, and other resources, plus a proper conservation of mineral resources. Finally, it means steady increase in labor productivity through such means as better education and more efficient plant and capital equipment.

Recognizing, therefore, that national economic growth depends upon growth and adjustment in the various regions of the country, the Council of Economic Advisers has a direct interest in the economic and resources development of the Southwest, in terms of both its own potential and the part which it should play in national economic development. The Department of the Interior, because of its primary interest in natural resources development and related industrial development, nationally and in the various regions, is concerned with the potentialities of the Southwest which have a direct bearing upon the magnitude and nature of the Department's resources programs, and is cooperating, therefore, with the Council in the present undertaking. The Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, as well as other Federal departments and agencies, which have similar interests in economic development of the southwest region, will also be consulted.

Because it places such a high value upon the analysis and recommendations of persons who live in a region and have studied its problems closely for many years, the Council of Economic Advisers is pleased that you have consented to serve on a Committee on the Southwest Economy. This committee, which will include a number of leading southwest economists in addition to yourself, is to prepare a report having the following objectives:

1. To identify specifically the major opportunities for economic development in industry, agriculture, mining, and trades and services.

2. To identify the major problems and obstacles to economic development in the various fields.

3. To analyze longer-term economic potentialities of natural resources and related industrial and service activities for the Southwest region as a guide in determining the resources-conservation and economic-development measures, public and private, which will be required.

4. To recommend policies, programs, or other actions—private and public, including Federal, State, and local—designed to facilitate the realization of the region's opportunities and the overcoming of its problems.

The following persons have been named to the Committee on the Southwest Economy: Clarence E. Ayres, professor of economics, University of Texas; W. Paul Brann, associate director, Bureau of Business and Economic Research, University of Arkansas; Robert W. French, dean, College of Commerce and Business Administration, Tulane University; Morris E. Garnsey, professor of economics, University of Colorado; Watrous H. Irons, vice president, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas; Raymond D. Thomas, dean, School of Commerce, Oklahoma A. and M. College; Nathaniel Wollman, professor of economics, University of New Mexico.

The committee will work closely with the Council of Economic Advisers and its staff as the work progresses. The recommendations, however, will be those of the committee and as such will be of greatest value to the Council and the Interior Department. As the work proceeds other persons familiar with the Southwest economy may be added to the committee.

The committee will hold its initial meeting in the Southwest region in the near future to begin upon the task it has undertaken.

Very sincerely yours,

LEON H. KEYSERLING,
Chairman.

Paul Leach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, whenever I have occasion to refer to the occupants of the Press Gallery, a certain stanza of verse invariably comes to mind, the author of which I do not presently recall:

Some day I'll pass by the Great Gates of Gold,
And see a man pass through unquestioned and bold.
"A Saint?" I'll ask, and old Peter'll reply:
"No, he carries a pass—he's a newspaper guy."

Paul Leach, who is celebrating this month his fortieth year with the Chicago Daily News, is one of the ablest, finest, and best "newspaper guys" it has been my privilege to know. Knowing him as I do, he does not need a pass to get him anywhere. I have never known him to take an unfair advantage of anyone or any situation. As a newspaper correspondent, Paul has always reported the news accurately and objectively.

In the fullest sense, Paul Leach has upheld the highest traditions of the fourth estate. The mere fact that he began with the Chicago Daily News 40 years ago as a sports reporter and has continued with that same great newspaper to be today its chief correspondent speaks more eloquently than any words of mine the merit of the man.

In his newspaper career, Paul has filed copy from every State in the Union.

Since 1920 he has covered every national election as correspondent for the Chicago Daily News.

With this broad experience and inexhaustible knowledge of governmental affairs, Paul writes a weekly news analysis column for the four Knight newspapers—the Detroit Free Press, the Chicago Daily News, the Akron Beacon Journal, and the Miami Herald.

And I think Paul has another accomplishment that ought to be mentioned. Shortly after he began his newspaper career he acquired a helpmate, who has been a constant source of inspiration to him. Their son and daughter have brought four grandchildren to the family circle. The boy served with distinction as an infantry captain in the Pacific during the last war, and the daughter's husband was a Navy officer in the submarine service.

In more ways than one, the Paul Leach family has made a real contribution to this great country of ours. I pay my respects to all of them. I congratulate the Chicago Daily News. To Paul, I would say, as Emerson at one time said: "The reward of a thing well done, is to have done it." And Paul has accomplished what is accomplished by few men. I am proud to claim him as a personal friend.

Myron C. Taylor Asks Work for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from a recent issue of the Boston Pilot, Boston, Mass.:

MYRON TAYLOR ASKS MEN TO RECOGNIZE COMMON TIES AND WORK FOR PEACE

Myron C. Taylor who served as personal representative to the Vatican for the late President Roosevelt and his successor, President Truman, was honored last Saturday, June 17, at the thirty-sixth annual conference of the Newman Club Federation in Cleveland, Ohio. Mr. Taylor received the initial award given by the John Henry Newman Honor Society. His remarks on this occasion follow:

"To gather one's thoughts on this occasion is not an easy task. I am deeply moved by the honor you confer upon me as the first recipient of the award of the John Henry Newman Honor Society. I feel sure that if this honor were awarded to me in a personal sense only, I would be overwhelmed with a sense of humility; rare, indeed, are the individuals personally worthy to receive this award bearing the name of so noble a spirit and so good a man. Rather I can accept it—and gladly I do—as an honor bestowed in encouragement of the great cause to which I have increasingly devoted such abilities as were mine, especially during the last 10 and more years as the challenge of the powers inimical to God and human liberty has become unmistakable, and decisive.

"Newman's life spanned all but the last decade of the nineteenth century. His influence and significance reach far beyond, as in his own lifetime his words and activities on the British Isles were pondered in lands far away.

"Reading in his earnest writings and in various books about him, I, as a young man, found that Newman was searching for a way of life; above all, of belief; he was struggling within himself for a clear certainty of religious philosophy and doctrine. In so doing, Newman confronted squarely the problems facing every person seeking understanding of his life and his relation to the Supreme Being and His purpose; problems to which each human being must find an answer, and can do so only through similar spiritual quest for the satisfying truth."

NEWMAN'S CONTRIBUTIONS

"Yet, while his thought records the deep travail of spirit common to multitudes of men and women today, and every generation, his life encourages all with the realization that this human struggle will lead to the tranquil destination of contentment of soul. Though I am of Protestant belief, I profoundly respect the answer he made when he entered the Catholic church, and I as deeply appreciate the contributions that he thereafter, as priest and cardinal, added to those which the mother church has made to the elevation and advancement of mankind during all the centuries of the Christian era. Christendom as a whole is indebted to the services for which this wholly Christian man used his great gifts of heart and mind.

"It was the appealing call and vision of a poem by him—a song I have often sung in church—that first attracted me to him: Lead, Kindly Light. Written at 31, while on board ship, becalmed in heavy fog for a week in the Straits of Bonifacio, and bound from Sicily for Marseilles on the way to England, to which his companions had preceded sometime before, this poem illuminates the whole life of Newman. Here, in the opening lines of the song—first published under the title "Faith"—is a true reflection of his solitude, his genius of originality, his spiritual depth. Through them shines the Christian radiance one finds in all the pages of the tracts, the Apologia, the idea of a university, and the lectures of this thoughtful, striving, patient, and courageous man.

"'Lead, kindly Light, amid the encircling gloom,
Lead Thou me on!
The night is dark, and I am far from home,
Lead Thou me on!
Keep Thou my feet; I do not ask to see
The distant scene—one step enough for me.'

"To Newman, knowledge and reason were sure ministers to faith, but without religion, they might create only a socially useless or harmful person. He had to argue, almost exactly one century ago, that religion is needed in universities to steady them in their performance of intellectual education. In his opinion, liberal education in the sciences and in literature (which as you know encompassed for him most of the disciplines of knowledge taught in present-day institutions of higher learning) made not the Christian, but the gentleman: 'a cultivated intellect, a delicate taste, a candid, equitable, dispassionate mind, a noble and courteous bearing in the conduct of life.' It did not necessarily make a moral man."

INTELLECTUAL EXCELLENCE NOT ENOUGH

"We today have been made sharply aware by the events of our era that the intellectual excellence which Newman saw as the object of the university is indeed not enough by itself alone. Without moral courage and vision, without the depth and sustaining impulse of faith, the educated men and women from whom mankind expects and receives so much of leadership must of necessity be limited in helping the free world to pass safely through the enveloping crisis of these hazardous times. For at bottom this is a period in which the moral values inseparable from religion—the values that are the heart of freedom—are at stake. This is another epoch, but greater than any before, where the moral forces upon which freedom ultimately depends for its safety and survival are not as yet unified for the struggle being waged for God and human liberty.

"If the moral ties among men of good will lead them to combine their resources of will and purpose, no jeopardy, however threatening, can prevail against them singly or as a whole. It is only in the dire event that men of good will would disregard the common moral interests and values which exist among them despite differences of outlook and of practices, whether of religious, economic, political, or other character, and would fail to join their efforts for their common well-being, that present dangers can prove overwhelming.

"The recognition of commonness of moral values is the foundation of the strength of all nations where the dynamic principles of freedom are respected. It is upon the unity and cooperative action of the moral forces, concerting their strivings for the objectives common to them all, that the entire cause of freedom and a true peace decisively depends. Moral values themselves are the first object of the totalitarian attacks witnessed today."

MEN MUST REALIZE MORAL DUTIES

"It will avail free men and women nothing to have vast material resources and military power if there is among them little conviction that the issues calling now for their utmost endeavors are moral issues. It will avail the cause of freedom nothing if the efforts of the moral forces of the world lack the unity of expression which should of right arise from their kindred vital interests in religious freedom and the achievement of a better world built on moral foundations.

"To bring to fruitful realization a concerting of the moral strength of men and women of good will is to make a fundamental advance through mankind's present crisis. To encourage thought in this direction, and to stimulate action by all upon whom public duty exercises a claim, whether through the performance of religious, educational, governmental, or other responsibilities affecting activities of free peoples, is the path by which further advance will be possible.

"It has been my heartfelt privilege to have worked in recent years directly with leaders of many religious faiths in various parts of the globe, and with leaders in official quarters, where the tasks of moral leadership come into daily concern. My own conception of these urgent and decisive tasks has been enriched by these associations. It has been an inspiring experience for me to observe the steadfast vision and courage with which Pope Pius XII and the President of the United States have sought to advance the world conditions necessary for the creation of true peace in the world, each exerting his utmost efforts in his own sphere of responsibility, and each striving to safeguard the interests that are common to all who worship God and cherish freedom. It has been encouraging to know likewise of the earnest efforts undertaken by leaders alike of the Protestant and Catholic faiths in our country and in other lands, toward exercising the great duties and privileges of moral leadership.

"It is with this outlook that I have welcomed the opportunity to make these few remarks to you today. To me, and I believe to you, John Henry Newman was the embodiment not only of the sense of religious duty, but of the realization of moral duty. Without these, no life is whole. Only where they exist in the life of the people of any nation are its freedom, well-being, and strength dependably assured."

Progress of Work of United Nations Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to make the following statement:

One of the surest ways we in the Congress can strengthen the United Nations and our participation in it is to pass House Joint Resolution 334. This joint resolution, if enacted, will enable the United States to pay in full its financial obligation to three of the largest specialized agencies in the United Nations system—the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and the International Labor Organization. This legislation will enable these organizations to move forward with their planned programs and will make more positive than ever before the desire of the United States to support wholeheartedly the economic and social aspects of the work of the United Nations.

The specialized agencies of the United Nations have been making steady headway toward their goals of economic and social betterment of the peoples of the world. Their programs are not visionary but concrete. They operate on modest budgets, stimulating further work by member governments, regional organizations, and nongovernmental organizations. Most of the members of the United Nations attach as much importance to the work of these agencies as they do to the more dramatic political decisions of the United Nations itself. The patterns of cooperation we have developed in these fields have made the goal of a peaceful world more realizable despite the serious political split in the United Nations itself.

Other governments are watching closely the conduct of the United States in these organizations. The United States has taken the lead in their establishment and has made clear that it, alone of the two dominant powers in the world today, is supporting international programs wherein all nations will help each other in economic and social development. The Soviet Union has boycotted the largest specialized agencies of the United Nations. Let us remember this: The International Labor Organization has been particularly bitterly attacked by the Soviet Union, which has never joined. Similarly, the U. S. S. R. has disdained to accept the obligations of membership in the Food and Agriculture Organization. Of the satellites, Hungary alone remains a member of the organization. Poland and Czechoslovakia have withdrawn from membership within the past year. The Soviet Union joined the World Health Organization, but has arbitrarily announced its withdrawal while in debt to the organization to the extent of its financial obligations of membership from the very first day.

With the exception of Poland, all the satellite countries have followed its example. At such a time, it is of great importance to the United States position in the United Nations and in the world community that it support these agencies in their continuing efforts to attack the problems of international labor, agriculture, and health with vigor and intelligence.

The World Health Organization has a regular budget to be supported by member contributions of about $7,000,000 for the calendar year 1950. This is something considerably less than one-half the annual budget of the Department of Health of the City of New York. The organization is devoting its modest resources in a manner calculated to make the greatest and most permanent impact on the health programs of member governments. The World Health Organization has devoted itself to promoting as widely as possible an awareness of what modern health techniques can do for plague-ridden populations and, by instruction and demonstration, to encourage the governments to better equip themselves to do the job required. It provides a great many services, such as epidemiological reporting, which are of incalculable service to the advancement of countries such as the United States as well as to the less developed countries. To this budget the United States is expected to contribute approximately $2,520,000 or 36 percent of the total. The World Health Assembly, recently concluded in Geneva, voted that the United States assessment should be further reduced to 35 percent in 1951. The organization is on record that in normal times a ceiling of 33⅓ percent should be set on the largest assessment, and it is anticipated that the United States' share will be reduced to that figure. The new ceiling of $3,000,000 and the working capital fund advance of $560,000 proposed by this legislation will permit the United States to meet its obligations for the calendar year 1950 and will provide some room for necessary expansion in future years.

The Food and Agriculture Organization has had a budget of $5,000,000 every year since its establishment. This would be considered patently inadequate to finance a State agricultural institute of any of the large agricultural States of this Nation. The budget is less than, for example, the amount appropriated annually to finance the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture. The Food and Agriculture Organization will continue its work toward the greatest possible extension of better farming systems internationally and in the development of more adequate international information as a basis for improved agricultural planning on the part of all countries. To this budget the United States is expected to pay $1,355,000 or 27.10 percent. The proposed new limitation of $2,000,000 will provide room for more growth in the future.

The International Labor Organization on a comparable budget of approximately $6,000,000 for 1951 will continue in its attempts to bring the labor standards of the member governments up to the level of those which have long prevailed in this and other advanced countries and to serve as a forum for the advancement of free labor and management objectives throughout the world. This organization always has had not only the strong support of the United States Government but also the support of all branches of organized labor in this country and of the representatives of organized management. Every delegation to an International Labor Organization meeting consists of representatives of government, labor, and management. To the modest budget of the ILO the United States is expected to contribute 22 percent in 1950 or approximately $1,270,000. This is an amount considerably less than a large and responsible American corporation would expect to pay for the maintenance of good labor relations in any one year. The proposed new limitation in House Joint Resolution 334 of $1,750,000 will provide for the future growth of this vitally important organization.

These three organizations, along with the other large specialized agencies of the United Nations, have been chosen as the vehicles to carry out a sizable portion of the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance which was first conceived as point 4 of the President's inaugural address and proposed in the United Nations by the United States. This Congress has enacted the Act for International Development, title IV of Public Law 535, to give effect to the President's original proposal. The raising of the limitations on the United States contributions to these organizations involves in no way a duplication of the point 4 program. The contributions to which the present limitation in this joint resolution relates are the contributions of the United States to the regular budgets of the organizations—for example, those providing for the central headquarters of the organization and for expenses which continue from day to day and year to year under the regular programs of the organizations, irrespective of the special program for technical assistance. Technical assistance available to member governments from the regular budgets is, for the most part, of a general planning nature. These regular budget do not presume to provide for the intensive technical assistance work which must be done on a large scale and in a concerted manner in many countries if expectations of the United States are to be met. The regular budgets are the firm platforms from which the special technical assistance efforts to be financed by voluntary contributions are to be launched.

The two other organizations which are covered by House Joint Resolution 334 are not formally a part of the United Nations system, but are closely allied to it. They are of considerable importance to the United States. One of the organizations is the South Pacific Commission, in which the United States participates as a consequence of its responsibilities under the United Nations Charter for non-self-governing territories.

In 1948 this Government joined with the Governments of Australia, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom to establish this Commission for the purpose of furthering the economic and social well-being of the inhabitants of the territories of the South Pacific for which each of the six nations has a trusteeship or related responsibility. The United States bears only 12½ percent of the annual cost of the operations of this Commission, as compared with 30 percent for Australia, 15 percent for the United Kingdom, New Zealand, and the Netherlands, and 12½ percent for France. Inasmuch as the Commission works as much as possible through the exchange of experience between the various governments and through the stimulation of self-help activities on the part of the native populations, the budget of the organization is quite small. The proposed ceiling of $75,000 in House Joint Resolution 334 should allow the United States enough flexibility to meet its obligations for the present and in future years. The original ceiling of $20,000 was set at that figure because it was the amount of the United States share of a small working capital fund set up to finance the organization until it could establish a budget. It has proved quite inadequate.

The remaining organization, the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood, is quite small and has a total budget of only $36,000. It serves as a research center for the collection and collation of information on child health and welfare in the American Republics and for the dissemination of information on measures for the reduction of infant mortality. Because of the legislative ceiling limiting the United States contribution to $2,000, we have been able to pay only a fraction of our assessment since 1946. Because it is a well-established organization, the Institute is now performing a service for the children of the American Republics which no other organization can perform, despite its small size. The Institute has made a significant contribution through its efforts to bring to Latin America a recognition of the need for compulsory notification of rheumatic fever. In this connection, the Institute serves as a corresponding agency of the American Heart Association.

The amount of the expense to the United States taxpayer resulting from the passage of the legislation will be very small, especially when viewed in the perspective of our total foreign commitments. It will enable us to pay a little less than $1,000,000 more this year than present ceilings allow and will allow a flexibility for future years of approximately $2,500,000 more than present ceilings allow. It will enable the United States to fulfill its obligations under the charters of the organizations. And, finally, it will reaffirm to other members the strong desire of the United States to bring a better way of life to peoples in all parts of the world through support of the United Nations program of economic and social betterment. House Joint Resolution 334 is legislation we cannot afford not to pass.

A Blow for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, no right-thinking American wants war. No one can consider it a warlike act for us to carry out our obligations as a member of the United Nations to protect our weaker sister nations from brutal, unprovoked aggression.

No one in our time has done more than President Harry S. Truman to bring about permanent peace in every part of the world. He has exerted his utmost effort to prevent hostilities and to bring existing hostilities to an end. His efforts in that regard in every part of the world have made history. His action with reference to Korea and the Far East is further proof of his determination to maintain peace. Our country and all the peace-loving peoples of the world will be ever grateful to him for his patience until action could no longer be withheld, and for the speed and forthrightness with which he ordered our Armed Forces to the defense of democracy when no other alternative was possible.

Immediately upon receipt of word of his action I forwarded to him a telegram commending him therefor and telling him that in my opinion the country and the freedom-loving world was united behind him.

The Congress was practically unanimous in spontaneously advising him to the same effect. Practically the entire American press has voiced similar approval. Typical of such approval are the following editorials, the one entitled "A Blow for Peace," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 28, and the other entitled "Democracy Takes Its Stand" which appeared in the New York Times of the same day:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 28, 1950]

A BLOW FOR PEACE

The President has acted—and spoken—with a magnificent courage and terse decision. This newspaper is convinced that the American people, bewildered and baffled by so many retreats, so many arguments, so many fine-spun fears and suspicions, will respond with a sense of quiet relief, verging on enthusiasm.

This newspaper is also convinced, as it said yesterday, that in the present context of affairs the boldest policy is the safest policy; that the result of the President's crisp orders to the American air and naval forces in the Far East will not be another major war, but a major contribution toward a reasonably stable international system, resting firmly upon the realities of the international world.

It was time to draw a line—somewhere, somehow. The mechanism of totalitarian infiltration, led by lying propaganda, backed by gunmen with their unanswerable arguments and consolidated by a secret police under the control of the victorious minority political machine represents the deadliest weapon ever brought against freedom. But it is also one of the easiest to defeat, when it is properly understood. A thousand writers have commented on the mistake of the French, who were paralyzed when Hitler sent his army into the Rhineland in 1936 but under orders (as the French did not know) to withdraw if there was opposition. There have been dozens of instances since, from the Manchurian border to the Mediterranean, to Iran or Greece or Berlin, where the attempted totalitarian push into a "soft spot" has been withdrawn when it has met with resistance inspired by courage and self-confidence.

Courage and self-confidence speak from the President's brief message. Acting under a mandate from the United Nations to suppress a flagrant use of armed aggression, United States air and naval forces will be deployed in defense of Korea; the United States Seventh Fleet will prevent any invasion of Formosa; military aid to the Philippines and Indochina will be stepped up and the processes of lawful order will be restored along the great Asiatic fringe of Communist subversion and conquest.

This position had to be taken. The jubilation in the Soviet satellite press over the first successes of the Korean invasion, the dispirited reaction from all people who have looked to United States support in their battle for freedom, is sufficient indication of what would have been bound to follow if the United States had supinely accepted this as one more victory for Communist armed infiltration. The President has refused so to accept it; his is an act of statesmanship and this newspaper believes that it is a basic contribution toward genuine peace in our disturbed and distracted world.

[From the New York Times of June 28, 1950]

DEMOCRACY TAKES ITS STAND

In a momentous and courageous act which for the first time since the end of the war engages American military formations in the defense of freedom, President Truman yesterday ordered United States air and sea forces to give cover and support to the embattled South Korean armies now waging a life-and-death struggle against invading Communist and Soviet-sponsored armies from the north. At the same time he ordered part of the American fleet to Formosa to protect that island remnant of Nationalist China from a Communist invasion. He further directed an immediate speed-up in military assistance to the Philippines and to the French and associated forces battling against a Communist revolt in Indochina.

In taking these steps, the President acted first of all under a mandate from the Security Council of the United Nations, which indicted the North Korean attack as a flagrant breach of the peace. Its cease-fire order having been disregarded, the Security Council is moving to invoke, for the first time since its creation, the Charter provisions for the use of force to give effect to its decisions. In so doing, it calls upon all United Nations members to furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the assault and to restore peace and security in that area. Under the circumstances, this assistance must be supplied primarily by the United States, but all member nations are now obligated to enlist in this effort, and negotiations for their participation are already under way.

But President Truman also acted under the provision of the Charter which specifically recognizes the inherent and inalienable right to individual and collective self-defense against lawless and unprovoked ag-

gression which, as Mr. Truman says, has now demonstrated beyond all doubt that in the conquest of independent nations communism has passed beyond the stage of subversion and infiltration and resorts to armed invasion and open war. This inalienable right of self-defense applies especially in the case of Korea, whose government is the special responsibility of the United Nations. But it applies with equal force to Formosa, whose occupation by the Chinese Communists, in Mr. Truman's words, would be a direct threat both to the security of the Pacific area and to the American forces performing lawful and necessary functions there. This is also true of the Philippines and Indochina.

Thus, both the United Nations and the United States have now decided to face up to the Russo-Communist challenge—the United Nations by invoking the strongest possible sanctions, beyond anything ever attempted by the League of Nations; the United States by revising the Far Eastern policy that helped to lead to the loss of China and by standing firm on the present lines. Neither Korea nor any other Pacific area that is still free is going to be sacrificed to a Far Eastern Munich. We have learned the lesson that appeasement does not serve peace; that in the face of naked aggression the forces of peace must make a stand sooner or later, and that the sooner they do so the better will be their position. The present action comes late, but there is hope that it still comes soon enough to restore the morale of the Korean armies and to avert a bandwagon psychosis among other Asiatic nations that might have begun to despair of western aid.

There can be no blinking of the fate-fraught nature of the new policies. Having committed themselves, neither the United Nations nor the United States can now contemplate a retreat. But it will be noted that thus far at least the actions of both the UN and the United States of America are of a limited character, designed solely to drive the aggressors back to the line from which they started and to restore the status before the attack began, in order to pave the way for a peaceful settlement. Whether action must go beyond that aim will depend on the further course of events. But the determination of that course, and the responsibility for it, now rests on one power and one power alone—Soviet Russia, which prepared and instigated this attack, and which alone is in a position to call off the war at any time it gives the word.

An appeal to Russia to follow this course is implied in the United Nations resolution. That appeal has been reinforced by a special note sent by the United States. Thus far Moscow has contented itself with challenging the legality of any Security Council decision made in its absence, though the validity of such action has repeatedly been acknowledged by the Soviets themselves.

The rest of the world can be neither silent nor inactive. It can only close ranks and marshal its immense moral and material resources to cope with this threat of brutal aggression, this breach of the peace, this challenge to human freedom.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am attaching two articles from the June 5 and 6 issues of the Chicago Journal of Commerce. Written by columnist Austin Kiplinger, they are an important statement of the approaching climax in the 50-year-old fight for the St. Lawrence seaway. Mr. Kiplinger recognizes that the long stalemate is apparently approaching its end as more and more groups recognize the need for and desirability of the seaway project:

[From the Chicago Journal of Commerce of June 5, 1950]

THE ROUND TABLE

(By Austin Kiplinger)

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PICKING UP SUPPORT IN BUSINESS AND LABOR

After nearly 50 years of controversy, the St. Lawrence seaway issue is coming to a head.

The perennial subject of debate, which first appeared in Congress in 1907, has been pigeonholed this year, but chances of its passage next year are stronger than they have ever been.

The plan would provide for building canals, locks, and dams around the unnavigable sections of the St. Lawrence River, resulting in a 27-foot ship channel all the way from the Atlantic Ocean to the ports of the Great Lakes. The cost is estimated at $803,000,000, with the United States paying $573,000,000 of the total.

Current momentum for the project comes from powerful new supporters in business and labor groups that were formerly cold to the idea. Some of them are now hitting the sawdust trail in its favor, including officials of Republic Steel, Armco Steel, the M. A. Hanna Co., of Cleveland, and the legislative spokesman for the CIO.

The United Mine Workers are opposed, but midwestern members of the AFL have asked the national union not to speak against it, and individual midwestern unions are among the strong proponents.

With this kind of backing, the St. Lawrence seaway is far beyond the stage of sectional enthusiasm or dreamy utopian planning. In fact, its advocates point out, a St. Lawrence seaway already exists, so the basic issue is not its creation but its improvement.

Small oceangoing vessels now steam into the Great Lakes by way of the so-called French canals and the Welland Canal in Canada. Four lines operate 25 ships from Europe to the Middle West, carrying cargo ranging from tulip bulbs to aluminum ingots and heavy machinery, and taking away grain and manufactured goods on the return trips.

Whether the mammoth project will make the grade next year will depend partly on the power question, for the dams would generate millions of kilowatts of electricity along the upper border of New York State.

Though private-power companies are opposed to this public competition, the outlook for more power has gained seaway support from Democratic Senator LEHMAN and Republican Governor Dewey, of New York.

Without a doubt, the St. Lawrence project would put competitive pressure on eastern railroads, power companies, and Atlantic and Gulf ports, but proponents of the plan argue that the stimulus of new business among 60,000,000 people in the central American region would offset any temporary loss.

In this atmosphere, the final decision will be made—surrounded by a complex pattern of issues involving railroads, power, shipping, ports, and national defense. But on one thing, disputants on both sides of the fence agree: If the seaway does go through, it will bring changes to nearly every part of the country.

[From the Chicago Journal of Commerce of June 6, 1950]

THE ROUND TABLE

(By Austin Kiplinger)

ST. LAWRENCE BATTLE HINGES ON ORE, POWER, COMPETITION, DEFENSE

Friends and foes of the St. Lawrence seaway draw such radically different pictures of the project that you would hardly recognize one from the other.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson envisions "a great highway of commerce stretching for 2,400 miles from Newfoundland into the industrial and agricultural heart of the United States and Canada."

Milwaukee Port Director Harry Brockel says the seaway will help America to obtain "greater production, full employment, expanded foreign trade, and an enlarged merchant marine."

Opponents argue that lake shipping is held up by ice during 5 months of the year, and that seaway traffic during the other 7 months would merely draw business away from established railroads, ports, and lake freighters.

Yet, sentiment has been drifting toward the project, partly because of the principle of self-support written into the latest bill, and partly because of the discovery of iron ore in Labrador.

The iron-ore question has been the most spectacular issue, because the newly located high-grade ores could be brought by water directly to the steel mills of Cleveland and Chicago.

Yet steel executives are not unanimous in their reactions. Officials of the United States Steel Corp., who have an interest in South American ores and who operate plants in the East and Middle West, have kept mum on the issue.

Republic Steel and Armco, both in Ohio, now favor the seaway. Inland Steel in Chicago, whose ore comes from the Mesabi Range, has remained neutral, though its top officials say they are not unalterably opposed if it can be demonstrated that the project would pay for itself.

Over the years, Chicago reaction has ranged through a wide gamut of approval, apathy, and condemnation. Before 1932 the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry was on record in support. Then it reversed itself, although it has recently shown signs of reexamining the proposition with an open mind.

Adding to former Chicago doubts was a provision to regulate the flow of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois River. This alienated some Chicago support, but in the current bill the water-flow provision has been eliminated.

Three years ago Chicago's Mayor Kelly testified in behalf of the project. His successor, Mayor Kennelly, has remained silent on his own position, but recently forwarded a report on the issue to the city council.

In the East private power companies have balked on the project, because it would involve the production of millions of kilowatts of public power in competition with their own output.

Where does national defense fit in?

With our coasts vulnerable to air attack, most military experts now favor the idea of an inland waterway connecting the Atlantic Ocean with the Great Lakes region, where a large part of American armaments are produced.

The only dissenting thought, from the military point of view, is the fear that the seaway might be damaged by bombing, and that some deep-water ships would thereby be bottled up in the Lakes.

But with more groups moving into the middle position of open-minded interest, next year's vote in Congress is sure to be close. And since the proposition now takes only a majority, instead of the previous two-thirds vote, the seaway has a better political chance than at any time in its history.

Massachusetts Polish-American Veterans State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the remarks of State Representative William X. Wall, Seventh Essex District, at the State convention banquet of the Polish-American Veterans held in Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday, June 11, 1950:

Your Excellency, Gov. Paul A. Dever, Attorney General Kelley, Congressman LANE, Your Reverences Father Szymanski, Father Haczynski, my colleagues in the great and general court, Governor's Councilor Twomey, members of the Lawrence City Council, distinguished and invited guests, Mr. toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen, to be permitted to address this organization is a singular privilege and a distinct honor. Allow me to convey to your committee my sincere appreciation for that privilege and that honor. Admitted thus to your company, one feels an atmosphere of faith, of loyalty, and of sublime courage. Helpfulness is here and cherlished comradeship. One sees the pride of race. Inspiration is here and achievement. But above all, one knows that here is Americanism—thorough, sincere, and beyond doubt.

By your name you have chosen to be marked both as Poles and as veterans. How eloquent it is that you should signify, at once, a heritage and a service. How typical of the Pole.

There are those who may accuse you of promoting hyphenated Americanism. I can decry as do they any destructive manifestations of this doctrine. I, too, can look with disfavor on its terminology of Irish-American, French-American, Polish-American, and Italian-American, as instruments of division and discrimination. But, I can, and do, embrace it as a reminder that the greatness of this Nation is a result not of one, but of many nationalistic groups.

From the great "melting-pot" that is these United States has come one people. From the common efforts and common sacrifices has come on allegiance. American genius, American success and, indeed, American love of liberty are of different racial sources and of varied linguistic roots. In no unimportant way are they Polish.

Your heritage is a fierce love of liberty, a respect for the dignity of man, the aspiration to intellectual stature, and a recognition of true culture. Your people have demonstrated that all of these are purchased at the price of suffering and struggle and are preserved by recurrent sacrifice. You have taught, too, that all of them are not selfish possessions, but gifts to be shared by men everywhere. The world acclaims the musical genius of your Chopin and your Paderewski. It extols the written artistry of your Conrad. It bows in eternal gratitude to your Curies. This Nation acknowledges a distinict debt to your Pulaski, and your Kosciusko. All civilization is inspired by the terrible sacrifices of Warsaw, Gdynia, and Lidice. These United States admit freely that thousands of its Polish-American residents have faithfully discharged the obligations of citizenship in all the wars of its history.

The members of your organization have been discharged as veterans of the most recent of these conflicts. In your civilian capacity, with your glorious heritage clearly in mind, you have assumed the associated responsibility in connection with this heritage to perpetuate, to insist that it be acknowledged, to exemplify and to propagate. That you should do so is both right and proper.

Massachusetts has watched the progress marked by the multiplication of the agencies through which you carry on your work. It felicitates you on the splendid bodies that now represent you in this State. Its citizens have learned from your people the lessons of courage, resignation and humility that are taught by suffering and prosecution. You have reminded us that here is no sanctuary to bigotry. You have recalled to mind the great truths of democracy: That when we lose the right to be different we lose the right to be free; that a state influences the mind through education, not legislation; and that freedom of thought, of belief, and of action lie at the base of all human decency. You have the admiration of the people of this State on the success of this convention. You are to be praised for a hope fulfilled and a task well done. Your associated activities have been progressive and beneficial. We congratulate you as Poles, as veterans, as Americans.

From time to time, we of the great and general court have been asked to implement the work of your organization by passing certain items of legislation. Last year you requested a bill to extend to Polish Americans the same rights in connection with their deceased veterans as already existed for other service groups. This year we were petitioned to allow cities and towns to provide headquarters for your local posts. In the forefront of the fight to pass these measures was the influence of His Excellency, Gov. Paul A. Dever. He it was, also, who enthusiastically signed them into law, becoming the first chief executive in the history of the Commonwealth to grant such rights to Polish-American veterans. In the house of representatives you had the active support and votes of Representatives Bresnahan, Conley, Batal, Giles, Longworth, and Collins, of Greater Lawrence; Wondolowski, of Worcester, Skladzien, of Webster; and Diniz, of New Bedford.

In the house you also had the support of Speaker of the House Thomas P. O'Neil, Jr., of Cambridge; Representatives Twomey, of Cambridge, and Lucey, of Brockton; Quigley, of Chelsea; Skerry, of Medford; Bissette, of New Bedford; Desmond and O'Day from Lowell; Kiernan, of Lowell; DeRoy, of Chicopee; Curley, of Springfield; Bresnahan, of Springfield; Brox, of Dracut; Cuffe and Hutchinson, of Lynn; Walsh, of Lynn; Sheehan, of Brockton; Pothier, of Haverhill; Pessolano, of Springfield; O'Connor, of Worcester; Nagle, of Fall River; Markely, of Springfield.

In the senate, you had the effective advocacy and vote of Senator Michael A. Flanagan. I had the honor to sponsor both of these matters. These privileges were well-merited and well-deserved.

With the same solicitous, sympathetic affection with which we have followed your progress to date, we shall watch the zeal with which you continue to discharge your self-assumed obligation. How well will you bring the message of Poland to us? Will you strengthen the fellowship of your brothers in arms? Will your organization continue to be a vehicle of mutual helpfulness and guidance? To all of these your future will give answer. Yours is the opportunity to demonstrate once again that this Nation is refreshed by its immigrants, even to the second and third generations. Yours is the present and immediate chance to impress on the world that only by resistance—never appeasement—is the evil that would enslave us all defeated. The warning, "Pray God will the the fervor of our hearts that this blessed land of ours shall remain the land of right and justice and freedom, free from the intrigues of designing men, who, even now, within the confines of our own country, are trying to undermine the memory of Washington, and Jefferson, and Lincoln, and who would throw aside our divinely inspired Constitution and make America the cat's paw of a foreign, crazy world," is as true today as when given. You can constantly impress on the scoffer the fact that serenity and happiness in life among peoples of different racial strains flows abundantly from the observance of the Master's admonition "Love thy neighbor."

Will you embrace these opportunities? As a Pole, I am sure you will.

The program was as follows:

PROGRAM

Posting of colors.....Color Guard
National anthems.....Miss Nellie Dzioba
Star-Spangled Banner.
Jeszcze Polska Nie Zginela.
Welcoming address.....Joseph A. Kudla, General Chairman and Commander Julian Stopyra Post
Master of ceremonies.....Edward J. Nantoski, Assistant Attorney General
Invocation.....Rev. Fr. Method Szymanski, Pastor, Holy Trinity Church

DINNER

(Music by the Ampolians)

Remarks.....James P. Meehan, Mayor, City of Lawrence
Thomas J. Lane, Congressman, Seventh District
William X. Wall, Representative, Lawrence
Mitchell Janiak, State Commander
Rev. Fr. Stanley Haczynski, Pastor, Polish National Church
Address.....Col. Donald N. Wackwitz, United States Air Force, Washington, D. C.

INSTALLATION OF OFFICERS

Installing officer.....Hon. Francis E. Kelley, Attorney General of Massachusetts
Principal address.....Hon. Paul A. Dever, Governor, Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Closing prayer.....Rev. Ladislaus Radzik, State Chaplain

The Navy Under Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, the thirteenth annual convention of the Navy Clubs of the United States was held at Elmira, N. Y., on June 22–24 this year and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address given by me at the banquet meeting in the Mark Twain Hotel on June 24:

In mathematics, we know of certainty that things equal to the same thing are equal to each other. In social relationships, we have reason to believe that persons interested in the same thing are interested in each other. That is the reason, no doubt, why I was invited to address this national gathering of Navy Clubs of the United States. That is the reason, I assure you, why I readily accepted the invitation. Because of our mutual interest, this is more like a family gath-

ering than a formal convention or conference.

Like everyone present, I have an abiding love of our great Navy, a profound respect for her mighty accomplishments of the past and her mighty role in the future, a sense of near reverence for her rich traditions and lore, her keen efficiency, her clean-cut, clear-eyed, sharp-thinking and far-sighted personnel, and her sound counsels to the Nation in peace and war.

Yes, and I am proud of the Navy's tradition of minding her own business—and of doing that business incomparably better than any similar organization of our Government today. I take still more pride in the Navy's tradition of accurate representation of her capabilities—with no exaggeration, no intentional distortion of fact for ulterior purposes, no ballyhoo and drum-beating and appeal to emotional factors which, to my way of thinking, cannot be said of all elements of our Government today.

These are historic times in the developments of our Nation's naval policies. More than that, they are perilous times in Navy matters—perilous not only because of the troubled and uncertain state of the world today, but also because, for the first time in our history, our American Navy is wedded into a new military framework which superimposes upon our naval policies pressures, problems, attitudes, and concepts heretofore disassociated from naval concern. So our Navy is confronted with perils from without and perils from within. The manner in which both of these perils are resolved has enormous significance to each of us today—and, to an even greater extent, in the future.

As to the perils from abroad and their relation to our Navy, I confess to some overconfidence. With the assumption that the perils of unification are satisfactorily overcome—and there my confidence is not excessive—I have little doubt that the American Navy can, in the future, as in the past, surmount strictly naval problems and carry out its mission of applying American naval power throughout the world wherever and whenever necessary.

But, with respect to the other peril, I am not so sure of success. I am not sure the Navy can survive the application, through unification, of military dogmas completely alien to the historic naval responsibilities, policies, and procedures. The subject of unification has taken on far too much of an aura of mother love, of dislike of sin, of faith, hope, and charity—and other manifestations of pious emotionality which has led to a sort of blind support of everything done in its name, whether sound or not.

I am going to talk bluntly about unification. Not, let's get the truisms out of the way first.

Let's all agree, first, that we favor economy in national defense. I do. You do. We all do. And to the extent that economy can be produced without impairment of our fighting efficiency, I have in the past supported it and will support it in the future.

There is one truism out of the way. We have to take it into account because there are so many who mistakenly believe that economy is synonymous with unification.

Let's dispose of another truism. Do you favor harmony among the armed forces? I do. You do. We all do. I favor it, that is, if its meaning is not distorted into a mailed fist imposition of a party line idea, so that all dissenting views are hidden from the public. I favor it, and I am sure you do, if it means that the four armed services shall amicably seek resolution of their differences and shall not publicly revile and abuse one another. We all want that. To say it differently, we would like the relations between the services to be as harmonious today as they were prior to unification. Now, we have that truism accepted.

So, we all want economy and harmony.

There is another one: teamwork. Now, there's a unification slogan with a powerful impact on all Americans. From childhood into maturity, all Americans applaud teamwork. We have it in our great sports, in our assembly-line manufacturing systems, in our associations, in our chambers of commerce. It is hailed from the pulpit, the political platform, from the President's office as he looks to the Congress, and from the Congress as it looks to the President. It is an office slogan, a church slogan, a sports slogan, a political slogan, a family slogan. It is a motif of the American scene.

And now we have it in military matters too, as a powerful slogan. It has been the main punch line of unification. The idea of teamwork, like mother love, has the support of all Americans.

Yes, I support the need for teamwork. I know you do. I know the Navy does, along with all other American institutions and societies and homes and individuals.

Here we have the shibboleths of unification: Economy, harmony, and teamwork.

But is that unification? Is that the meaning of this gigantic creature we have concocted in our Government known as the Department of Defense? Hardly, I would say. The time is long overdue, for those who truly desire a sound defense program, to lay aside these powerful slogans and look into the realities of our defense program—look critically, analytically, look with open eyes and unfettered mind, into the perils of unification. Only as this is done by all thinking Americans can we be sure of a stable and sound national defense.

Unification is not necessarily economy, nor harmony, nor teamwork. Unification is a mechanism through which the Nation hopes to obtain a sound, highly efficient, and effective national defense. Economy, harmony, teamwork are byproducts. They are not the goal. National defense is the goal.

The sooner our people, as a nation, brush aside the generalisms of unification, the slogans, the truisms, and look critically at the institution itself and the manner by which it should arrive at its goal, the sooner we will truly have a well-balanced, sound defense program.

What kind of national defense should we have? This takes us directly into the throes of unification. Let me survey for you just how serious this proposition is and how it relates to the Navy. To do this I must first summarize quickly how our defense program is formulated under the new unification framework.

Three years ago, we established, in the unification act, a new Government activity known as the National Security Council. It is a high-flown outfit. It is chairmanned, according to law, but not very often in practice, by the President himself. Its members are the Vice President, who was added at a member a year ago for continuity purposes should he succeed to the presidency; the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, who last year took the place of the Secretaries of Army, Navy, and Air Force; and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

Its military advisers are the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This consists of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and the military heads of the Army, Navy and Air Force. The Council is charged with the activities of the General Intelligence Agency which, like the National Security Resources Board, was a creature of the unification act even though it is not as widely known as the Department of Defense.

Now, this National Security Council, which advises the President, is supposed to be the keystone of our national defense system. It is supposed to make the $64 decisions on our foreign policies and military policies and domestic mobilization readiness problems. From those decisions are supposed to flow actions governing the size and composition of our Armed Forces and their disposition and readiness.

The idea behind that Council is excellent. It is supposed to balance our foreign policies and our military policies. It is supposed to keep us from adopting a foreign policy that our military strength cannot support, and to keep our military policies from subverting our foreign policies. It is supposed to be a focal point for formulating the master policy of our Nation. With all of these objectives I agree, and I know you do too.

But now, let's examine this institution a bit more critically. Let's lay aside the academics and get practical. You will remember the time-honored axiom of our Government—that we have a government of law and not of men. That, again, is a slogan which bears analysis. Some of you may remember, as I do, a recent occasion in which one man, high in our Government, approved the construction of a mighty new aircraft carrier for the American Navy. He made the decision under the authority of the Unification Act. Yet, operating under the same law, another man, the successor of the first, revoked the proposed construction.

So, in that instance at least, we had a Government of men and not of law. Let's see how that situation looks in the National Security Council.

The Chairman, as I indicated, is the President of the United States. His association with military matters was as a captain in the Army field artillery in the First World War and, as a Reserve officer in the Army.

The Vice President is not a factor in the problem because, unlike the other members of the Council, he has no direct operating responsibilities.

The next member is the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, a Navy ensign in World War I. As Vice Chairman of the Hoover Commission, he favored the creation of a single Chief of Staff over all the Armed Forces and the granting to the Secretary of Defense of unlimited authority over all elements of the military services—a position wholly foreign to persons with Navy experience and training and to the philosophy of the Unification Act.

The next member is the Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson. He was an Army Reserve colonel and former Assistant Secretary of War. His background is conditioned altogether toward Army concepts and organizational practices.

The next and last, but not least, member is the new chairman of the National Security Resources Board, Stuart Symington. He is former Secretary of the Air Force. I suspect that every person present is familiar with the concepts of Mr. Symington and their relationship to the Navy and naval and Marine Corps aviation, so I will not take the time to remind you of them now.

Then, we have the military advisers of the Council, the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Gen. Omar Bradley is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He is the former Chief of Staff of the Army. Then there are two other generals, Generals Collins and Vandenberg, the military heads of the Army and Air Force. Finally, and here is a departure, for I am about to name a Navy man—we have Admiral Sherman, the head of the professional Navy.

So, of the significant persons in this Council, the keystone of our defense program, there is but one Navy representative, Admiral Sherman. But even that is theory. The truth is that the Secretary of Defense is accompanied only by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at these meetings, and there General Bradley is supposed to speak for the other three members as well as for himself.

When the National Security Council establishes the basic defense framework, according to the theory of the Unification Act—that framework presumably containing a

sound interrelation of our foreign and military policies—the framework goes to the Department of Defense for implementation. There the skeleton is vitalized. There the over-all plans are translated into the machines, trained military and naval manpower, military and naval aircraft, ships, tanks, guns, and so on, necessary to carry out the master plan established by the Security Council.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff is the main instrumentality for laying out the program. The military Departments of Army, Navy, and Air Force and the Joint Staff under the Joint Chiefs of Staff contribute their studies and conclusions, but the Joint Chiefs of Staff are the group in which the major problems are resolved.

Their decisions govern the sums of money allocated to each Service. Their decisions determine how many aircraft will be operated and procured by the Air Force and the Navy—how many aircraft carriers will continue to operate in the fleet—and how many will be put in mothballs—how many divisions will be maintained by the Army—how many battalions will be kept in the Marine Corps.

Of course, their decisions are all subject to the whimsy of the Secretary of Defense and the President; but, as a practical matter, once the budget ceiling over the Armed Forces has been fixed by the Bureau of the Budget, the Joint Chiefs of Staff are the main arbiters in the distribution of those funds.

Now, that system sounds acceptable—and, given unification, it is, so far as I know, just about the only system that could be devised; for, with the Armed Forces lumped together, with one over-all military budget rather than separate budgets for each Service, each considered on its own merits, it becomes the primary responsibility of the Defense Department itself instead of the Budget Bureau and the Congress to allocate the funds.

I remind you that the keystone of this structure is the Joint Chiefs of Staff, composed of two Army generals, an Air Force general, and an admiral of the Navy. They lay out our strategy. They approve the funds allocations to the Army, Navy, and Air Force to implement that strategy. All of this must be within the master framework determined by the National Security Council and within the over-all budget ceiling.

Just how is this relevant to our discussion tonight? Here are some subjects affecting the Navy but which will be determined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff instead of the Navy.

What role will naval power play in any future war?

What is the effect, the feasibility, the cost, the advisability of aerial mass bombardments on cities, and what effect does such a method of warfare have on lasting peace following war?

What plans should be made for amphibious warfare in the future now that we and a potential enemy have atom bombs?

What should be our No. 1 weapons system to be maintained in time of peace—strategic bombers—naval task forces—tactical aviation—Army divisions—amphibious landing teams—or a balanced combination of them all?

Should the United States plan to unleash atom warfare in the event of war whether or not an enemy uses it, and if so, where and how should it be initiated?

What should be the role of the Marine Corps in any future war?

Should strategic bombardment be emphasized at the expense of the other Armed Forces?

What is the best defense against submarines—seeking them out and destroying them in the open seas or by bombardment of submarine pens—and what types of naval ships should be provided for this type of warfare?

Should the Navy develop a modern aircraft carrier of sufficient size to carry larger, modern aircraft of longer range capabilities, or should the Navy be restricted to aircraft carriers of World War II performance and design?

I could go on and on—and I am sure you have in your minds other questions of this sort which underlie our defense planning. But that's enough to show the problem. The answers made to such questions determine the role of each of the Armed Forces in a future war. They determine the character of our peacetime preparations for peace and war. They determine the soundness of our plans for deterring war—for if we attempt to deter aggression through a strategy which is fundamentally unsound, then an enemy could be encouraged to wage war instead of being deterred from it.

Now, the people who are deciding these matters are two Army generals, an Air Force general, and a Navy admiral, plus various civilians mainly imbued with an Army or Air Force type of outlook and background.

I think it must be acutely evident that insofar as we possibly can insure it, we must have the correct decisions on these problems. Our national existence may depend on it some day in the future.

How, then, can we best be sure that we do get the correct decisions?

The only way I know—and this reflects the unanimous conclusion of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives—to insure that national defense decisions are sound and balanced, is to insure that the Joint Chiefs of Staff organization provides adequate consideration for the views of all our expert military leaders. What we have to be certain of under unification is that we do not get an Army strategy, a Navy strategy, and Air Force strategy, or a Marine Corps strategy.

We must have an integrated strategy—a strategy which represents an amalgam of the views of all the services—a balanced plan and program which will adequately provide for the expert know-how of each service.

Every person present will remember the hearings of last October before the House Armed Services Committee. Those were the hearings which were wrongfully publicized as a Navy revolt, when the fact of the matter was that the committee itself initiated the hearings, established the agenda, and demanded that the Navy present its honest views.

Be that as it may, there was a very important issue developed in those hearings. It is an issue that cannot be resolved by any amount of national insistence on harmony or teamwork. It is a readily understandable issue, when you pause long enough to think about it.

That issue—and we still have it today—is the product of this basic fact: The Navy, the Army, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps have violently disagreeing concepts of the art of war. Their basic strategic and tactical concepts are markedly different. In many instances they seek different short-range purposes in warfare. These differences are as honest and as genuine as they are basic. They stem from the different kind of warfare that must be fought on oceans than on land, warfare that is different again in the air and in varying aspects of aerial warfare itself, such as tactical air warfare versus strategic bombardment.

The point is that none of these military leaders, who disagree fundamentally on the art of warfare, know with certainty whether or not they are right. In truth, only war itself can prove or disprove the naval, the Army, or the Air Force strategy or tactics. There is but one certainty, and that is that we must have a defense institution which is so established in fact as to prevent undue emphasis on any one of these concepts. Otherwise, in case of national emergency, we may well find that we have put too many of our eggs in one basket and a national calamity could well be the result.

So to insure that well-balanced defense program, we must be certain of a well-established Joint Chiefs of Staff organization.

I say that it is not well balanced now, and that, too, was a unanimous finding of the Armed Services Committee as a result of the hearings of last October. There is no doubt that the existing defense system gives undue emphasis to concepts and systems of warfare unsympathetic to and unfamiliar with naval power. There are two ways to remedy this; one is to require that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff be rotated among the armed services; the other is to add an additional naval-trained professional man to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Legislation to accomplish these two necessary improvements in the Joint Chiefs of Staff organization has been introduced in the Congress, but I am frank to say that, lacking the active support of persons with appreciation of the importance of such legislation, it will surely fail of enactment and may well fail even of perfunctory consideration by the Armed Services Committee.

You may ask what difference does it really make. The fact is, it may make the difference between victory and defeat in war, it may make the difference between prevention of war or inciting war, it may make the difference between a true victory in war or a pyrrhic victory which would be nearly as costly as defeat itself.

I want to offer a series of specific suggestions which, in my opinion, should be followed if we are to be assured of a sound national defense.

I suggest, first, that navy-minded people in the country, and all others interested in a balanced defense program, seek prompt and favorable action on legislation now pending in Congress to strengthen the organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Moreover, the Nation must watch with extreme care the strong tendency in the Defense Department to demand uniformity and common standards in each of the armed services; for, the end result of this practice is sure to be ultimate dilution of expertness in the Army, Navy, and Air Force to such an extent as to render each of them less efficient. A lifetime spent in the Army is not enough to learn all that must be known about land warfare. The same is true of the Navy and Air Force and Marine Corps. Yet, we are heavily embarked on a program designed to teach the Army about ships, the Navy about tanks, the Air Force about submarines. To the extent that the attention of our military leaders is taken away from their own fields to concentrate in the highly intricate and complex fields of the sister services, to that extent we will be denied, as a nation, the expertness we must have in each of the services.

My next suggestion is that the country resist the powerful tendencies to develop and foster the growth of a national general staff despite the specific prohibitions against this in the Unification Act. The Joint Staff under the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the various boards and agencies of the Defense Department are, today functioning almost percisely as a general staff would; and the end product of that system is certain to be the virtual exclusion of Navy concepts from the basic defense decisions, as developed for the same reasons in Germany before the last war. This leads to the next suggestion which concerns a single Chief of Staff.

Despite statutory provisions limiting the power of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, a situation is developing rapidly in the Defense Department directly contrary to the desires of the Congress and injurious to our national defense. This has nothing to do with the capabilities and integrity of General Bradley. He is a splendid soldier and gentleman for whom I have the utmost regard and affection and respect. It is not his doing, he is merely caught in the web of events which he himself cannot control.

The fact is, however, that it is General Bradley who mainly counsels the Secretary of Defense on military matters, that it is General Bradley who accompanies the Secretary of Defense to Europe to plan for European defense, that it is General Bradley who accompanies the Secretary of Defense to the meetings of the National Security Council where the basic defense decisions are made, that it is General Bradley who has just gone with the Secretary of Defense to the Pacific—to Japan and Formosa—a naval area fundamentally, to determine what plans must be made there to resist the advancing tide of communism in that part of the world.

It is no wonder that the Secretary of Defense now refers to General Bradley consistently as the quarterback of the team—a quarterback being the person who calls the signals—for that is what is occurring in the Defense Department. Neither is it surprising, under these circumstances, that the Defense Department has advocated that General Bradley now be given five-star rank—a rank reserved heretofore for wartime—thereby making him outrank his three fellow members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

There is legislation pending that requires the rotation of the position of chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staffs among the Armed Forces after a 2-year term of office. This should be pushed vigorously by the American people and this organization.

Finally, I urge all persons present to keep an active eye on all elements of the administration of unification. There is absolutely no doubt that the hearings of the House Armed Services Committee of last October were mainly responsible for relative improvement in the position of the Navy in defense councils in the past 6 months. These hearings produced more aircraft and an additional aircraft carrier for the Navy; they produced more aircraft and additional battalions for the Marine Corps; they reversed a deliberate policy of assault on all elements of Navy power. Yet, those hearings are now over 6 months old. Their impact cannot linger on indefinitely. The public, by insisting on revision of the Joint Chiefs of Staff structure, by carrying out the recommendations I have made in these remarks, can see to it that the Nation does not prevent proper consideration of naval skills and outlooks and concepts and training in the development of defense programs for America—a Nation, let me remind you, that has been a maritime Nation since her birth 161 years ago. I say to you that to the extent we diminish the role of our naval power in America's defense program, to that extent we jeopardize our Nation's security. To the extent we let proceed without continuing analysis the present and potential administration of unification as regards the Navy, to that extent we are making irreparable errors which could cost our freedoms. The United States Navy is the bulwark of our defense system.

It is up to you, to your friends, to your communities, to your representatives in the Congress, to see that naval power is not neglected by our leaders in Government.

Selling Russian Communism to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the happenings of recent months it is well for us to think back upon the efforts made by high-ranking New Dealers and Fair Dealers to sell the United States on the idea that Russia was all right.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks by including an article that appeared in Life magazine in 1943 which is a question and answer interview by Joseph E. Davies, former American Ambassador to Russia. The article is as follows:

THE SOVIETS AND THE POSTWAR—A FORMER AMBASSADOR TO MOSCOW ANSWERS SOME PERPLEXING PROBLEMS

(By Joseph E. Davies)

(The replies to these questions submitted by the editors do not reflect any current official opinion of either the Soviet Union or of the United States, so far as I know. Nor are the answers intended to be dogmatic. They are simply my own opinions, for such value as they may have. They are based upon published sources of information, and upon facts within my own knowledge, and represent my considered judgment.)

"1. Can we assume that the rulers of Russia are men of good will toward other nations and that they desire a peaceful, stable world?"

Yes. Their public statements of policy and their deeds in the past decade both establish that. Ambassador Litvinov, when he was Foreign Minister, both within and without the League of Nations, was the outstanding advocate of collective action by the nonaggressor nations, in order to insure "a peaceful and stable world." War anywhere, he constantly urged, would engulf all the rest of us for "peace was indivisible." Abyssinia, Spain, China, the attitude of the Soviets in agreeing to stand by Czechoslovakia with France against attack by Germany—all attest to their sincerity as "men of good will." It is, also, to their practical best interests to have peace with, and in, the world.

"2. Will Russia pursue a lone-wolf policy after the war or will she seek to cooperate with the other great powers in creating a stable world?"

That will depend upon what kind of world they will then face, or upon what kind of a world they think they are facing. If they believe in, and trust the proposals of Great Britain, China, and ourselves, and the United Nations, they will, in my opinion, go as far as any of these in a high-minded and altruistic effort to cooperate in creating a stable and decent world.

If, on the other hand, they believe they are not getting a square deal on a reciprocal and high-minded basis, they will not hesitate to go it alone. They will not be "taken for a ride." Nor will they be used to pull anyone's chestnuts out of the fire. They will do exactly what we would do, if in their shoes.

"3. Will Russia seek to create some kind of world federation, embodying some transfer of sovereignty from the member states to the central government? Or will she favor voluntary cooperation by the great powers to maintain a stable world?"

The Soviets vigorously supported the League of Nations and constantly advocated a stronger and more effective League. They are, however, essentially practical and realistic in the application of their ideals. "First things first" is the motto of the Soviets. They, I feel sure, would be willing to give up so much of their sovereignty as would assure a strong federation to outlaw war, aggression and conquest and to establish an international police force to keep the peace for the world community of nations. What other and further relinquishments of sovereignty they would agree to would depend upon how practical and unselfish the proposals were, and upon their confidence in the good faith of the other large nations.

"4. Will Russia be willing to undertake any international commitments which involve revealing military information to other nations?"

Yes, if it is upon a fair and reciprocal basis, and for the honest purpose of protecting the peace of the world community against gangsters, outlaws, or terrorists.

"5. Winston Churchill once described Russian foreign policy as 'a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma.' Can you make sense of it? What are its fundamental aims?"

In my opinion, the best approach to the solution of the riddle is to forget the epigram and set to one side the idea of either an enigma, or a mystery. The riddle, if riddle there be, from my experience can be best solved by the simple approach of assuming that what they say, they mean; that they are honest in their beliefs, speak the truth and keep their promises. If one were to assume, also, that they were strong, able, courageous and willing to treat others honestly, if they believe they are treated honestly themselves, the riddle can be answered with reasonable certainty.

As a matter of fact, in my opinion the foreign policy of the Soviet Government is quite clear. Its first concern is to insure the territorial security of the Soviet Union. They built up a great military and industrial system for that purpose. The Soviet Government is not a predatory power like Germany or Japan. It was only after Hitler came into power that the great industrial development projected by Stalin was speeded up for war purposes. Once that security is established, the Soviet policy is to develop the U. S. S. R. internally. That can best be done in a peaceful world. The Soviet foreign policy therefore has been consistently addressed to the prevention of war. When they lost faith in both the will and the capacity of the western democracies to join them realistically to stop Hitler, they still tried to maintain their security and their peace by entering into a nonaggression pact with Hitler in 1939. That was not a pact for a mutual offensive against Germany's enemies. In that particular, it provided only that neither would attack the other. They gained precious time which they feverishly employed to protect their security against the inevitable Nazi attack.

After this war there will be still greater need for peace to promote their plans for the internal development of their country.

There is no riddle or mystery if the statements of the Soviet Government, or its leaders, are read in the light of these policies. They are straightforward and direct.

"6. Is there religious freedom in Russia?"

The Constitution of the Soviet Union (art. 124) provides that, "Freedom of religious worship and freedom of antireligious propaganda is recognized for citizens."

By this same article the church is separated from the state and the school "to ensure citizens freedom of conscience."

Article 135 of the constitution provides that religion shall be no bar to the right of the citizen either to vote or hold office.

Prior to the enactment of article 135, which is attributed directly by some to the attitude of the President in his recognition of the U. S. S. R. in 1933, several nations including the United States were guaranteed that their citizens in the Soviet Union should have (1) full liberty of conscience and religious worship, free from persecution; (2) the right to hold religious services in churches or buildings selected for that purpose, free from molestation; and (3) the right to impart religious instruction to their children. That, however, did not include the right to proselyte outside those restrictions.

In 1937 there were about 100,000 ministers of religion in the Soviet Union, according to

the chairman of the Atheist League of the U. S. S. R.

The Russian Orthodox Church of the Soviet Union is militantly supporting the Government in this war. The highest prelate, Acting Metropolitan Sergei of Moscow, has appealed for the tolerance of religious people outside Russia and has urged that such people be not misled by "Fascist propaganda" or believe "their lies" as to persecution of the church in recent years. A book devoted to The Truth About Religion in Russia was recently published in Moscow by the Orthodox heirarchy, addressed to providing accurate information on religion in the Soviet Union.

There is no question, however, that despite these constitutional guaranties there is much hostility toward religion in the party membership. I was reliably informed when in Moscow that the objections raised to the adoption of these constitutional provisions were overcome by Premier Stalin's personal advocacy of their passage.

"7. Is Russia determined to pursue the cause of world revolution?"

In my opinion, no. The Stalin 5-year policy clearly set aside the Trotsky idea of world revolution. It was one of the alleged betrayals of the Revolution charged by the Trotskyites.

"8. If Russia has given up her ambition to turn the world Communist, may she nevertheless still fear capitalistic encirclement and attack?"

That depends upon whether they think that they have reason for such fear. Much will therefore depend upon how the rest of the world approaches the problem of postwar reconstruction, and the attitude of the other nations toward the United Soviet Socialist Republics. If there are evidences of hostility on the part of the outside world, they will certainly detect it and protect themselves.

Before Russia entered the war, Russian distrust of the western powers was very real. On the morning following Hitler's night attack, June 22, 1941, there were highly informed persons in Moscow who believed that Britain would launch a simultaneous naval attack through the Baltic Sea in conjunction with, and pursuant to, an agreement with the Nazis. That fear was only relieved when Prime Minister Churchill's broadcast came over the air, pledging all-out aid to Russia.

The developments in the conduct of the war, I believe, through contacts and better understanding, have definitely contributed to dissipating the classic fear of capitalistic encirclement and attack.

"9. Even if Russia is not interested in promoting world revolution for its own sake, will she still use revolutionary activity as an instrument of Russian nationalism? May she, for instance, promote Communist revolutions in Europe? In Asia?"

This idea is again being vigorously and assiduously preached by Goebbels and other Nazi propagandists, both in and out of Germany. The express oral assurance of Premier Stalin, the commitments contained in the Joint Declaration by the United Nations, and the treaty made with England have definitely killed that Hitler bugaboo which he has tried desperately, and without success, to sell to Europe these many years. The Soviet Union has an enviable record as a nation for keeping its obligations. Except as an instrument of military necessity, the Soviet Union will not promote dissension in the internal affairs of other nations.

"10. What do you think is the probable extent of Russia's territorial demands?"

It would be natural for them to demand what any other people would, under similar circumstances. First, they would naturally want that back which had previously been taken away from them by force after the last war. After that, it would be natural for them to require any such territory as that which they considered to be vital to their security in the event of possible future European attack.

The probable extent of Russia's territorial demands will therefore depend, in my opinion, upon what conditions are when peace comes and upon what kind of a world they think is going to come out of the peace. It should be remembered that the Baltic States were all carved out of, and taken away from Russia, after the last war. It is also the fact that the very Germany, which they are now fighting, in 1917 and 1918 took away from Russia nearly all of the territory gained westward since the accession of Peter the Great, including the Ukraine and White Russia. It would be only natural that they should want to get it back from a defeated Germany. Five million Ukrainians were arbitrarily converted into Polish citizens after the last war. Bessarabia, which was taken from Russia at about this time by Rumania, had been Russian for 100 years. The United States refused to recognize Bessarabia officially as a part of Rumanian territory. It could be contended with much force that Soviet claims to all of this territory would not be "territorial aggrandizement" and would not be inconsistent with pledges made by the Soviet Government either in the treaty with Britain last June, or with the covenants contained in the Joint Declaration of the United Nations made in January 1942, in Washington. It could be contended that the acquisition of such territories did not constitute aggression, but simply the restoration to the Soviets of that which has been taken from them by force and the rectifying of previous wrongs.

Further, if the Soviet Government believes that it is confronted with the same type of world which existed before this war, they will undoubtedly require that which self-preservation demanded in this war, namely, a sufficient extension of territory on its western frontier to make itself secure against possible European attack. That would mean a part of Finland and, possibly, a part of Poland up to the Curzon line. That, it will be remembered, was the line determined by the Curzon Commission under the Versailles Treaty as the line of racial demarcation of the Polish and Russian nationalities.

Last year, when the Soviet-British Treaty was signed, providing for a mutual-assistance pact in the event of an attack upon either for a period of 20 years, both Britain and the Soviet Union were satisfied to leave the solution of controversial questions to be settled after the fighting was over by the application of certain broad equitable principles. That was wise. It is no time to fight among ourselves until Hitler and the Nazis are thoroughly beaten.

At that time the question of the Polish border was raised, according to the press. It was reported that General Sikorski and the Polish Government were agreeable to that disposition of the problem in the interest of unity in the war effort. After the British-Soviet Treaty, which from press accounts seemed to have been approved by General Sikorski, great numbers of Polish prisoners held by Russia were freed, and some 100,000 Polish soldiers were released, armed by Great Britain and the United States, and organized as a fighting force against Hitler. They are now in the Middle East.

I am very sympathetic with the Polish people, but it could scarcely be expected that the Soviets would remain mute when these controversial frontier matters were recently brought up in London; particularly in the face of what appeared to the Soviets to an implied consent to the postponement of the determination of the issue until after victory. The Soviets obviously, could not permit these claims to be asserted without contradiction, without themselves being estopped at some future time from asserting their viewpoint, upon which naturally they would wish to be heard. It is significant that it is not the Soviets who are now pressing, so far as the United States is concerned, for decisions upon these controversial matters.

After victory has been won, conditions may be entirely different from those existing now. Many things may happen in the interim. The science of war is being completely revolutionized by airpower. Frontiers such as rivers and mountains, providing bases for fortifications, have lost much of their importance. The war has already shown that thousands of paratroopers may be transported to strike at vital centers in the interior, by simply passing over the frontier land fortifications. Boundaries may not be of such vital importance in a reconstructed and peaceful world.

Moreover, the terms of the peace may, and probably will, provide for mutual-defense agreements for collective security, which will reduce the necessity for military defenses and armaments. It is unthinkable that such little, at least, would not be the result of the war.

Under such conditions, it is not beyond possibility that the Soviets might consider, in the interest of a peaceful world, that the matter of the extension of its frontiers was not a matter of vital protection against a possible recurrence of German attack.

Certainly, the comradeship and understanding developed by mutual fighting against Hitler and aggression will provide solvents for these knotty questions.

"11. What does Russia regard as her proper spheres of influence?"

That would again depend upon the character of the world which the Soviet Government would confront at the conclusion of the war. If the postwar world can be assured of the enforcement of one principle, to wit: that military power cannot be used by any nation to enforce its will, then these questions of vital interest can be determined on the basis of equity and decency. The Soviets, I believe, would go as far as any nation to bring that about.

To answer the question flatly, however, there is no doubt that there are certain matters in which Russia has a vital interest. There is the matter of access to the sea and warm-water ports. That, particularly, affects the Pacific and the Mediterranean. Russia has always been concerned with the ports of Port Arthur and Dairen on the Pacific side, of which she was deprived in 1905. Again the use by her and other nations of the highway which the Dardanelles affords for shipping and an outlet from the Black Sea, and through the Mediterranean to the oceans, would naturally and rightly be a matter of concern. Also, realistically, in a hostile or an anarchic world, self-preservation might demand the thrusting forth of their defenses against a possible repetition of German attack through the territory of smaller states adjacent to Russia, which are not strong enough themselves to prevent a strong Germany, or other aggressor, from making a highway of these smaller countries to attack the Soviet Union. To illustrate: The great sea base of Kronstadt, and the city of Leningrad, are only 25 miles from the Finnish border and within easy reach of German long-range guns. The Soviet Union made a very strong effort to come to an agreement with the Finnish Government, whereby the Soviets could compensate them for concessions of territories which were vital to Soviet defense against German attack. These the Finnish Government, in fear of Germany, was unable to concede because, obviously, they were under the German gun, and, unfortunately, still are.

Presumably, all of these vital interests and others, such as fair access to raw materials, the common use of the seas and the air as highways for all of the nations in the world community, and similar matters, must ultimately be adjusted on a basis of reciprocity

and a fair balancing of the interests of the various states, if there is to be a stable peace. Their determination must be governed under rules of decency and equity as between neighbors who desire peace for mutual advantage, even though they be friendly economic competitors. I believe that the Soviet Union would cooperate wholeheartedly and would contribute positively to that end, once convinced of the good faith and reliability of her associates.

The attitude of the Soviets, no less than that of other nations, upon these vital matters will therefore depend entirely upon the kind of peace that is to be established to secure a decent, desirable, and stable world to live in.

"12. Will Russia be prepared to back up her demands with arms if we oppose them?"

If the Soviets face an anarchic world, where not peace but war confronts them, they can and will back up their security by force of arms if that is the only alternative. That, I am sure, would be far from their desire.

"13. If other states go Communist and voluntarily apply for admission to the U. S. S. R., will Russia admit them? Can we safely permit this?"

If states adjacent to the Soviet Union should voluntarily apply for admission to the U. S. S. R., I have no doubt that they would be admitted. If that were done, both countries being willing, it would be my opinion that it was none of our business; nor would our safety be necessarily imperiled thereby. If any such states were not contiguous to the borders of the Soviet Union, such application might possibly be embarrassing to the Soviets, but I doubt it. In any event, in my opinion, they would resolve such problems in a practical and realistic way in cooperation with those nations that were associated with them in the common enterprise of keeping the peace of the world community.

In this connection there has been much agitation directed from Berlin to the possibility that the success of the Soviet armies might result in communizing Europe. It is the same old red herring drawn across the trail. Anyone who knows Europe knows full well that neither the Scandinavian countries (Norway, Sweden, Finland) nor Poland nor Rumania nor Hungary nor Greece nor Czechoslovakia would ever voluntarily accept communism or the Soviet system. And it will be a long time before the Soviets will ever call either Frenchmen or Germans Tovarisch after this war.

"14. What will be Russia's policy toward the defeated nations?"

There is no doubt but that, like the rest of us, they would wish to see even-handed and exact justice done, under law and without passion. This would require that those in the defeated nations who were responsible for crime would be duly tried by a judicial body and, if after due process, they were found to be guilty; then punishment suitable to the crime would be administered.

Undoubtedly the Soviets would also require that all necessary safeguards would be established to prevent defeated nations from again breaking the peace and indulging in mass murder. Apart from these, the policy of the Soviets would, I think, be dictated solely by humanitarian considerations. Premier Stalin's published utterances abundantly support that conclusion.

"15. What would be Russia's attitude toward a European federation (not including herself and Great Britain)?"

It would clearly depend upon the character of such federation. If it were to contain the seed of either actual or potential aggression, the Soviets would oppose it, just as we all would. Assuming that it was part of a general plan to secure world peace through collective action, and that it was so set up as to prevent domination by any potentially strong aggressor unit in it, I do not think that the Soviets would oppose it.

"16. On what basis can a stable settlement in Asia be made between Russia and China?"

Both Russia and China, in my opinion, have leaderships which are sincere in their desire to secure a peaceful world. Both of these leaderships are practical and wise. Both recognize that there can be no peace if force is to be used by either as an instrument of national policy to enforce the will of either over the other. Both, I believe, to secure a peaceful world, will actively try to establish an effective international police. That accomplished, there is within these two countries sufficient capacity for fairness and tolerance to settle all matters of difference if any such exist, through reciprocal arrangements on a fair and equitable basis as between themselves; and if not, each, I am sure, governed by a decent respect for the opinion of mankind, would submit their differences to other members of the community of nations in order to preserve the peace of that community.

As far back as 1938, I was reliably informed in Moscow that the Soviet Union was most helpful to the government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, in that it exercised its influence on behalf of the Chinese Government to prevent communistic activities which would impair the common defense against Japan. That is indicative of the kind of decent cooperation which, in my opinion, can be expected from the Soviet Government in the interests of a peaceful world.

"17. Does Russia fear an Anglo-American entente with an anti-Russian basis?"

I do not know. It is, of course, possible, if we should so conduct ourselves as to justify that fear. It is of vital importance that this should not happen. We should accept the good faith of Britain and the Soviet Union, just as they should accept the professions which we make.

"18. What if the Russian economic system proves to be more efficient than ours?"

I do not accept the premise that their economic system will prove to be more efficient than ours.

From what I have seen of both systems, I am firmly of the opinion that we need not fear their competition. Our system of free enterprise, under rules of fair competition protected by government, contains springs of initiative and enterprise that will, under fair conditions, surpass anything that a bureaucracy, under government administration, can produce. A pure governmental socialism, even with the great vigor and energy which the Soviet leadership provides, cannot compete with the efficiency of our type of private enterprise. A completely socialistic state, in my judgment, will inevitably, as human nature presently is and will continue to be for a long time, breed inefficiencies in contrast to an industrial, economic, and social system such as ours which, in addition to the joy in the working, provides greater individual reward for extra effort and exceptional ability, coupled with police protection against unfair competition, monopolies, or other special class privilege.

The fact that the Soviets have constantly extended the system of individual profit in order to make their industries more productive during recent years, in my opinion, supports that point of view.

"19. What can America do to assure Russia of the security she needs and to assure mutual cooperation between our two nations?"

The Soviet Government, so far as the future is concerned, recognizes that any arrangement with the United States, to be of any real value, must be by treaty and that that treaty must be confirmed by the Senate of the United States. They know very well what happened in the last war when the Senate refused to ratify the League of Nations Treaty. That fact contains the answer to the question.

The surest answer is to be found in a better mutual understanding and confidence as between our peoples.

"20. How would you deal with Russia?"

Exactly as I would want to be dealt with if conditions were reversed. Their word I would accept with the same confidence that I would ask them to accept ours, until faith had been broken. Just as I would insist that their government would not interfere in our internal affairs or in our governmental matters, so I would scrupulously stay out of theirs. Their government is their business. What they tell their people, or do not tell their people, is not our concern. They have their own problems. They have handled them in a manner which demonstrates their effectiveness and also their purpose to serve peace, order, and law in the world.

Generally speaking, we should deal with the Soviet Union as she is entitled to be dealt with. The U. S. S. R. is a great nation. It covers one-sixth of the world's land surface and has approximately one-tenth of the total population of the world. The country is blessed with enormous natural wealth—mineral, agricultural, fisheries, forestry—and a great, vigorous, strong people. The potentialities of the Soviet Union are commensurate with the achievements which she has demonstrated. She is destined to be one of the very great powers of the earth.

In the interest of our country and the world at large, she must be accorded the recognition and treatment that such a situation requires. Without Russia, our common victory would have been seriously jeopardized. Without the cooperation of the Soviet Union, there can be no permanent and durable peace projected. Both of these are self-evident. If we cooperate with the Soviet Union on a basis of fairness to her, to ourselves, and to the rest of the world, the Soviet Union can be an inestimable power and a great influence in the establishment of permanent peace and the elimination of war, for the common benefit of all of us. To think of the Soviet Union in any other way and to deal with her in any other manner or on any other plane is to expose the world and ourselves to many avoidable dangers and catastrophes.

This was in effect the policy I recommended to my Government at the end of my service as Ambassador to the Soviet Union. To the Department of State I find that I wrote the following:

"Such a policy does not involve approving in any manner the ideological concepts of this Government. It does, however, recognize the right of self-determination. It is interpretative of the high-minded and Christianlike declarations of the foreign policy of the United States as expressed by the President of the United States and the Secretary of State in connection with foreign affairs. It is a good-neighbor policy, and one consistent with the best traditions of our diplomatic history."

"21. Should we start negotiations with Russia (and the other great powers) now to lay the basis for postwar cooperation?"

Yes, provided such negotiations were confined to matters upon which there is substantial agreement, the discussion of which would not impair the unity necessary to win the war.

If, for instance, the great powers could now negotiate a treaty providing for collective security, the outlawry of war as an instrument of aggression or conquest, and providing the means for enforcing order so that the peace of the world community would not be broken, it would be highly desirable. Upon such simple negotiations there could be little room for disagreement. It is obviously in the interest of all and detrimental to none.

With that done, a long step forward would be taken in the winning of the peace. Under

such a condition all other matters in difference would have to be settled by conference and mutual concessions, fairly and equitably, for force would be outlawed. Time would be afforded for the settlement of the inevitable graver problems of frontiers, access to raw materials and other economic and political problems.

Such a simple agreement would in itself constitute a great contribution to civilization. It might make haste more slowly, but in my opinion it would be more surely. Tropical growth flowers rapidly, but it wilts easily and is not hardy. Hardwood forests are slow in growth, but they withstand storms and last long.

Address of Dr. R. L. Hershey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions in recent years, Members of Congress from Texas have invited attention to the tremendous industrial development now being experienced on the Gulf coast.

On last Saturday, I attended a membership meeting of the Chamber of Commerce in the city of Victoria, Tex. The purpose was twofold: partly to observe the formal opening of a great aluminum plant located at Port Lavaca, some 20 miles away; and partly to celebrate the beginning of another great industrial plant in the immediate vicinity of Victoria. The latter is being constructed by the du Pont Co., and the principal speaker of the occasion was Dr. R. L. Hershey of that organization.

Doctor Hershey's speech so impressed me that I asked him for a copy of it. The text follows below, and I commend it to your thoughtful consideration:

My associates and I are very happy to be with the members of the Chamber of Commerce and their guests this evening at this annual banquet. For me personally it was an honor to be invited to speak to you and a pleasure to accept the invitation. I am especially grateful that it gives those of us from Wilmington a better opportunity to learn to know you and to give expression in a small way to our appreciation for the fine reception you have given our du Pont people since they have come among you.

This is my third or fourth visit to Victoria, the most recent previous visit having been made last summer when the industrial committee of your chamber very graciously honored several of my associates and myself by entertaining us at an informal dinner, which was a most enjoyable affair. That was my initial introduction to several of your leading citizens. I am happy to have this privilege of renewing my acquaintanceship and to meet other members of your community and to meet your invited guests. On each of my visits I have driven around Victoria and seen your fine schools and churches and much evidence of the civic pride that exists here.

In talking to you tonight, I am going to discuss a subject which I hope will have some interest for all of you and a subject in which my associates and I have a vital and profound interest. That subject deals with the establishment here of our plant now under construction. I shall try to make it a case history, illustrative of the developments which lead a company such as ours to build a new plant in a community such as yours. The Aluminum Co. of America or any one of the other companies who have located plants in this general area would make equally good illustrations, but I can perhaps be pardoned for discussing my own company's venture because of my familiarity with it.

How did it come about that the du Pont Co. is now building and will soon be operating a highly complex chemical plant in the community of Victoria?

To find a good starting point we have to go back a good many years—to 1927, in fact. At that time the policy makers of the du Pont Co. said to each other something like this: (I wasn't there, so I can't guarantee their exact words.) "There are a good many important things in nature that we don't understand. Some of them are chemical things and as we are a chemical company it might be well to see if we can find a way to get some understanding of a few of these mysteries. For example, we don't understand how a silkworm makes silk, a cotton plant makes cotton, and a sheep makes wool. And, further, what is it in these natural materials, all so tremendously important to man, that gives them their usefulness? If we try we can perhaps find answers to some of these questions and something useful to us as a chemical company may come out of the effort. Let's do something about it." They agreed to do something about it and in more formal language. du Pont deliberately undertook a program of strictly fundamental research.

We should note that in the beginning it was not certain that any answers would be found to the questions asked, nor that any that were found would have practical usefulness, nor least of all, that the du Pont Co. would make a penny of profit out of the effort. What was absolutely certain was that the program would cost money: to employ scientists and their assistants and to furnish them with laboratories and equipment, books and scientific periodicals and, in short, the best and most modern tools for discovering new facts about the chemical world. When this research began, then, the du Pont Co. knew that it had to lay a large sum of money on the line to buy it knew not what.

All industrial research, even when it has more precisely defined objectives than this program had, is a risk. It is sure to cost money. Many failures are certain; many more failures than successes will be met. But when the research is directed with imagination and perception, the successes will pay for the many failures and justify the whole effort. Faith in sound research is fundamental in du Pont policy. My remark that research must be directed with imagination and perception, implies that research, like every other human activity requires competent human beings for success. It was not enough for du Pont to decide to go ahead on a long-range fundamental scientific study, nor even to be willing to spend large sums of money on it. Something more was needed, a competent group of men to do the work. Such a group was assembled and put to work under the direction of a brilliant young scientist, Dr. Wallace Carothers.

We can hurry over the early years of their work. Much was learned and some practically useful discoveries were made, but they are not pertinent to our story tonight. In passing I might also say that it is still true today that the world has much to learn about the secrets of the silkworm, the cotton plant, and the sheep. But this group, despite many disappointments, did begin to get an understanding of some fundamental facts about the natural materials which are found in useful fibers; and in the middle thirties, 7 years after they had started, there began to appear the practical possibility that new useful fibers, utterly unlike anything seen in the world before, could be manufactured at costs that would permit their profitable sale.

But before any profits could be banked, or dividends paid, much more needed to be done. These new fibers were made from pure chemicals which were then only scientific curiosities; no one manufactured them in anything like the quantities that would be needed and worse, no one knew how. These chemicals next had to be brought together to make the raw material of the fiber, the so-called polymer; this had to be spun out into the threads and these in turn had to be twisted and otherwise prepared for the knitters and weavers, who themselves would have to learn some new tricks in using this new material.

No one knew how to do any of these things except in the crudest way and another 4 years went by until, in 1938, the du Pont Co. announced nylon and a year later made the first small sales. Real commercial production of nylon stockings did not arrive until 1940, about 13 years and $27,000,000 later than the decision which started it all.

In those years from 1934 to 1940, a vast team of chemists; chemical, mechanical, and design engineers; physicists; metallurgists; construction, production, and sales experts; market analysts; and textile technologists were busy in developing the manufacturing processes, designing the plants, training the operators, testing the product made experimentally in pilot plants; in short, learning how to do all the many things necessary to be done when the whole venture would be in operation, starting with simple commercial raw materials and ending with the new fiber adding service and glamour to the American scene.

To our department fell the responsibility of producing the new chemicals I have already mentioned. We were especially well suited to this work because, as it turned out, many of the operations required were similar to those we had developed in our plant at Belle, W. Va., where in 1926 we had begun the manufacture of ammonia and where we had over the years become highly expert in high pressure and other newer chemical operations. The chemicals we make are converted into yarn by another department of the company and sold by them as yarn to the textile trade. At the yarn stage the du Pont Co. signs off.

You all know that nylon has been a success. But let me emphasize that it has been a success because you, and millions of other Americans, the ultimate customers, have found something of value in nylon. If after those 13 years and that first $27,000,000, you had failed to buy our nylon and to keep on buying, for reasons you alone found satisfactory, nobody would remember nylon now, except perhaps, some du Pont people—sadly—we wouldn't be building this Victoria plant; and you'd have another speaker here tonight.

Nylon's success has already led to the construction of plants at Belle, W. Va.; Orange, Tex.; and Niagara Falls, N. Y., where nylon chemicals are made and to yarn plants at Seaford, Del.; Martinsville, Va.; and Chattanooga, Tenn., where the chemicals are converted into yarn. Even with these plants, we were and still are unable to supply the demands of our customers, the many smaller businesses which process the yarn into consumer products. So here we are in Victoria building another plant to increase our supply of nylon chemicals.

But how did we happen to choose a site in this community? Needless to say, we did not make this choice carelessly. The careful methods we used are not unusual in American industry and I quote our practice only as an example.

When it became apparent that we should need still another plant site, we studied three general areas against our specific requirements—the Ohio River Valley, the Mississippi Valley, and the Gulf coast. The Gulf coast area was economically preferred because of ready access to our needed raw materials, both natural and manufactured, and further because of the great natural potential for future growth.

We had then to consider and get information on many questions relative to specific communities and possible sites in those communities. In assembling this information, railroads, public utilities, and many local agencies are helpful. In our own case the assistance given us by the Central Power & Light Co. of Texas, the Victoria Chamber of Commerce, the Victoria banks, the Missouri Pacific Railroad, and agencies of city, county, and State governments were most important to our study.

Obviously, we had to find a plot of land, adequate in size, suitable in contour, and with good transportation facilities. Then we had to consider such questions as the quality and adequacy of the supply of water, possibility of waste disposal, flood conditions, if located on a river, and so forth.

Given one or more suitable sites, what about the community itself? What of the potential labor supply? This is extremely important and was examined very carefully. Is the available supply adequate for present needs and prospective growth? Is it of a type from whom reasonable efficiency can be expected? We take a critical look at the community and try to determine whether it is one in which our employees are likely to be happy and contented. Is it progressive? Does it have good schools, churches, hospitals, recreational and housing facilities? And, in the final analysis, we must know about the people who make up the community we are investigating. Because, in the final analysis, that is what industry is. It is not merely an assembly of buildings, machinery, and equipment. It is an assembly of people drawn from and living in the community in which they are located and they can be no better than their composite character. For this reason, enlightened industry—and that is most of the industry today—prefers to select a community in which the quality of people is of the best. It measures not only the quality of people who are likely to be its employees—it assesses the whole community and applies the measurement of character to all citizens who make up the community.

We must also take a look at the State in which we contemplate locating. What of the tax situation, its general attitude toward industry, and the cooperation it extends to new industries locating within its borders? Is its government constructive and stable?

It was after such a critical examination as I have outlined that we came to the conclusion that the site on the Guadalupe River, near the community of Victoria and in the State of Texas, fully measured up to our requirements.

Now that the plant is under construction, how do we feel about the development at this point. We are very well satisfied. Results have met expectations. We have a plant that is well designed and is being well constructed. The site on which it is located meets all requirements.

In building our local organization it will be, as I think you will all appreciate, necessary to bring a limited number of trained people from plants and offices which we operate in other localities. There will follow the problem of getting homes for them, difficult indeed in practically all locations at the present time, and, of course, difficult here. We have succeeded in housing those few of our people who have already arrived under reasonably satisfactory conditions. At present it may be that our coming in may bring some temporary hardships because of the housing shortage, but, based upon our experience in other localities, I am sure it will be only temporary. We have found in new locations that local people soon find attractive investments in real estate in a growing community. I might add that we are not in the real-estate business, and if you or your friends are interested you do not have to fear competition from us. I am certain that industry attracts industry, and our coming here will serve as a strong attraction for others which will add to the economic growth of Victoria.

In view of the critical way in which we look you over and the many questions we asked about your city and your people before locating here, you would be fully justified in asking us what our objectives are, aside from manufacturing certain products at a profit to the du Pont Co.

What can you expect of us? You can expect us to have amicable, friendly, and equitable relations with the hundreds of men and women who will join our organization and on whom we shall rely chiefly to make a success of our local plant operations. Representatives of other industrial plants will, I think, agree with me that we are often handicapped in our old plants in doing all we would like for the physical comfort and safety of our employees. When a new plant is built, as is the case here, management has an exceptional opportunity to plan for the physical well-being of the employees. They should, and we have, put as much thought and planning into making it a pleasant, healthy, and safe place to work as in designing it for efficient operation. Humans are more important than buildings and equipment. I believe the construction and design of our buildings, together with our medical staff, will provide a plant in which the physical welfare of our employees will be looked after according to the highest standards.

You can expect us to cooperate in advancing the general civic interest in the community and to discharge our obligations in keeping this a place in which people aspire to live. As a means of doing this, it has long been the policy of our company to give local management the maximum of authority in representing the company in a community such as this—this authority subject only to certain broad regulations which must be observed by a large company operating in many localities. Local management, who live and work here and whose interests are centered here, is much more familiar with and sensitive to the needs and objectives of the community than is nonresident management. We vest the maximum of authority in local management so that they may cooperate promptly and effectively.

We believe that the men and women who have recently moved into your city from other company locations and those to arrive in the near future will make fine, upstanding, and useful citizens, interested in and supporting educational, philanthropical, recreational, and religious programs which contribute so importantly to the high standing of your community.

We expect that our presence will add to the economic strength of Victoria and its environment. Large amounts of money will be circulated here through the medium of wages and salaries paid, of purchases and taxes, thus adding substantially to local purchasing power and financial strength. As you add new industries such as ours you widen the horizon of opportunity for most of your local business enterprises.

These are some of the contributions we hope to make. We shall try very hard to make the hope a reality.

Not that I have been told by any of you, but somehow, in my travels to Texas and association with Texans I have gained the impression that Texans like things big. If this is correct I am sure that our admiration for each other will be mutual. The du Pont Co. falls very definitely into the category of big business and is proud of it.

It should be obvious that big businesses are essential in the complex economy in which we live today. If we want low-priced automobiles, low-priced high-grade gasoline, low-priced radios, and low-priced television sets, we must have a large team of people to work and venture so that the benefits of mass production can be applied to those products. Big business has its own peculiar responsibility—that is to devote itself to those tasks that require its full resources of manpower, finance, and talent. In our case we have endeavored over the years to tackle the difficult projects that make full use of the resources we enjoy. I think this nylon story I have told you is a typical example of this. It also serves to illustrate the relationship between big business and little business.

Once the nylon yarn has been made it goes to hundreds of manufacturers, some large and some small, who make it into hosiery, or textile fabric, tires, or some other product. These in turn put it into the hands of thousands of merchandisers, a comparatively few of them large organizations, but the great majority of them falling squarely into the category known as small business. I believe it is true to say that literally thousands of small businesses have benefited from the development of nylon. It is certainly true that the distribution and sales work done by the small businesses has been indispensable to the success of nylon. There are numerous other examples—all adding up to the fact that there is nothing incompatible or antagonistic between big and little business. The mutuality of their interests is fundamental to the American competitive system. We have done well under that system and we like it.

I do not want to leave the impression that business, whether large or small, nor the du Pont Co., has never made mistakes. A business is a group of people subject to the same human frailties as people in any sphere of activity. But we are confident from the reception given us we have made no mistake in coming to Victoria. We want to be good neighbors and citizens worthy of your fine reception.

Pro and Con

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an interview with Mr. Frank Burgholtzer, commentator on the program Pro and Con, heard on NBC, on Friday, June 23, 1950, from 10:45 to 11:

PRO AND CON

Mr. BURGHOLTZER. What started this lobby investigation, Congressman, and how did you get into it?

Congressman BUCHANAN. During the 1948 Presidential campaign, charges were made by President Truman that the Eightieth Congress was lobby ridden—some said there

was a third House—the lobbyists. That charge was true. I am a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee and we were flooded with telegrams, letters, and postcards—between nine and ten thousand of them—on rent control alone. I began at that time to think very seriously about the specifics of lobbying in influencing legislation.

Mr. BURGHOLTZER. And what did you do about it?

Congressman BUCHANAN. In March 1949, I introduced two resolutions—one called for a joint House-Senate Committee investigation, and the other called for a House Committee investigation.

Mr. BURGHOLTZER. As the author of the original resolution you became chairman of the Lobby Investigating Commitee?

Congressman BUCHANAN. That is right, sir.

Mr. BURGHOLTZER. How long have you actually been investigating lobbying activities, Mr. Congressman?

Congressman BUCHANAN. During the month of November we began a series of preliminary surveys and studies, and quietly went about with our field investigations. This activity continued through December and the first few months of this year.

Mr. BURGHOLTZER. Why did it take you so long to get started on the actual hearings?

Congressman BUCHANAN. We set out to do an objective job. My committee and staff felt that we had a very important task to do and that we had to prepare ourselves with all the pertinent material and information that we could collect. We wanted to be fair and impartial. We were not out to be sensational. We wanted to arm ourselves with facts—documented facts. What is more, we decided to work both sides of the street, so to speak. If we investigated business groups, we should also investigate labor groups. We believe that we have acted temperately and have investigated as thoroughly and as impartially as possible.

Mr. BURGHOLTZER. Well, you mentioned that you want all the facts. Are you interested in ideas and opinions? Are you probing ideologies?

Congressman BUCHANAN. Definitely not. We are not a thought-control instrument of a police state. We are only interested in the techniques of lobbying. We want to know who puts up money for what. We are also not interested in heresay evidence. We wanted documentary proof and we obtained it. In my opinion that is the method that should be used in all congressional investigations. The smear technique, in my book, is an un-American activity.

Mr. BURGHOLTZER. Why do you have to investigate these lobbies? Don't lobbyists have to file now under the Lobby Registration Act?

Congressman BUCHANAN. Well, Frank, we first compiled a complete index of all registrations and we found that many organizations were not registered or were not giving complete information as the act calls for. It is my judgment, based upon what we have learned thus far, that only about a fifth of the organizations engaged in lobbying are actually registered. But I want to point out that this does not mean that these individuals and organizations are in violation of the law as it is written, because there are some loopholes and conflicts in the present act. Many are unable to determine whether they should register.

When our committee winds up its work after a study and analysis of all the information we have gathered, we expect to make proper recommendations to the Congress to clarify the present Lobby Registration Act.

Mr. BURGHOLTZER. How much do you estimate is spent each year in the United States on lobbying?

Congressman BUCHANAN. The reports filed for 1949 show that approximately $10,000,000 has been spent * * * but that is but a small part of the entire panoramic picture. Lobbying is a multimillion-dollar industry. In fact, I think our investigation will show it is pretty close to a billion-dollar industry.

Mr. BURGHOLTZER. That is a lot of money, Congressman. How do you arrive at that estimate?

Congressman BUCHANAN. Consider the money spent not only on direct lobbying of the Congress, but the lobbying of the 48 State legislatures, the county and city governments, as well. Add to that the millions spent by certain groups on advertising designed to promote or retard legislation or legislative proposals. I often wonder how much the insurance companies have spent since Franklin D. Roosevelt took office trying to unsell social-security legislation in letters to policyholders. Think of the postage cost alone—telephone and telegraph—that is just on one subject.

Mr. BURGHOLTZER. Well, Congressman, do you object to a citizen spending as much of his own money as he pleases to try to get over his ideas on legislation to his Congressman?

Congressman BUCHANAN. Certainly not. All we want is an accounting of how much is spent, the purposes for which it is spent, and who contributes the money. When the Congress is lobbied for or against certain legislation, the public is entitled to know who is paying for that message.

Mr. BURGHOLTZER. Chairman BUCHANAN, Life magazine says this week in an editorial that you are out to get business for advertising its point of view on public issues; that you are forgetting the right of petition which is guaranteed in the first amendment to the Constitution.

Congressman BUCHANAN. Nonsense. We are not out to "get" business—we are out to get the facts. The editor conveniently forgets that our committee has worked both sides of the street. We have investigated * * * as this editor well knows, but has failed to report * * * Government agencies, large labor organizations, as well as big-business lobby groups.

As for the charge that I seem to forget the right of petition contained in the first amendment * * * again the editor conveniently forgets that I have stated over and over again that the committee is not investigating opinions or views. * * * We want the facts, the methods, the techniques, who puts up the money, for both direct and indirect lobbying activities.

For the benefit of the public which is, perhaps, confused by some political editors reporting the work of our committee, I would like to point out that my entire record in Congress, and before I was first elected to Congress, is one of conformity with the first amendment to the Constitution which guarantees freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of worship, the right of petition, as well as all those other rights and freedoms which the American people have so long cherished. And finally, I believe that the people have the right to know all the facts and who is paying for the presentation of these facts, or alleged facts.

Mr. BURGHOLTZER. Have you discovered, Mr. Chairman, any new lobbying techniques?

Congressman BUCHANAN. Yes; there is definitely a new approach in lobbying—an indirect technique. The old practice of buttonholing Congressmen and Senators is still done, but this new approach, the indirect technique, is more subtle. Highly skilled professional lobbyists use it * * * and their aim is directed toward influencing legislation indirectly. This indirect approach or technique gets into the very controversial question as to whether or not you are "influencing public opinion" or actually influencing legislative action and national policy.

Mr. BURGHOLTZER. At your hearings you have gotten into a lot of controversy on this point, have you not, Congressman?

Congressman BUCHANAN. That is true. For one thing, this is a political year and the congressional elections of 1950 are at stake, and we get a clouding of the issues. I have tried to maintain an even-tempered, objective approach to this problem. I shall continue to maintain such an attitude.

Mr. BURGHOLTZER. Well, some people claim you are snooping and investigating and making inquiries into a lot of things you have no business to get into.

Congressman BUCHANAN. Perhaps we are reaching important pay dirt. We have uncovered some very unusual tie-ups.

Mr. BURGHOLTZER. What about your letter to the 166 corporations that created such a hullabaloo?

Congressman BUCHANAN. The hullabaloo was created in the press. The largest corporation in the world, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., sent in the requested information within the allotted time without any complaint. American Telephone & Telegraph was most cooperative.

It is interesting to note that some of the corporations were registered as lobbyists, or through their agents. We felt that the information shown on their registration forms was not as complete as it should have been. The balance showed up as contributors to foundations or leagues and other organizations or committees for this or that who either themselves were registered as lobbyists, or were enjoying a tax deductible status as an educational institution or a nonprofit corporation.

Mr. BURGHOLTZER. Did you send the questionnaire to any labor or farm groups?

Congressman BUCHANAN. Yes; and I should like to read in part an answer received this morning from the CIO: "Unlike some large corporations as well as business-supported propaganda agencies, the CIO has no wish to obstruct or hamper the work of the committee. * * * We do not understand how any organization whose activities in this field are aboveboard and legitimate can possibly object to your reasonable request for information."

Mr. BURGHOLTZER. In the course of the hearing the other day, Congressman, you mentioned the possibility of calling two of the du Pont family to testify before your committee? Are they lobbying?

Congressman BUCHANAN. Frankly, in the course of hearings on the National Economic Council the names of several members of the du Pont family, as well as other prominent industrialists and business corporations were revealed not only as big contributors, but as having made these large payments under a scheme which allowed them to claim deduction on their income tax as charitable contributions to colleges and churches. I shall discuss with the full committee whether we shall request testimony from the du Ponts or any of the other big contributors. I certainly do not want to single out any individual, but I believe that a complete disclosure of the contributors to these lobbying groups and of the techniques used in getting the money is essential to the public welfare.

Mr. BURGHOLTZER. How long will the hearings continue, Congressman?

Congressman BUCHANAN. We expect to run through the end of the present Congress. Before we can get a well-rounded story our list of hearings will include the Americans for Democratic Action, the Civil Rights Congress and other groups, as well as reports from some governmental agencies that were reputed to be lobbying.

Mr. BURGHOLTZER. Just one final question, Congressman, What do you think of lobbying in general?

Congressman BUCHANAN. I might say in conclusion and summary that lobbying in itself is not necessarily an evil, but there are evils in lobbying.

Postal Recommendations of the Hoover Commission Task Force Relative to the Operation of the Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementing the article which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday, June 27, 1950, entitled "What Price Governmental Economy," which article is to be found on pages A4747 to A4750 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the following very pertinent information which was furnished by Robert L. L. McCormick, the research director of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, on June 26, 1950, to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

This information is well worth while considering carefully, and studying assiduously, in an endeavor to put the Post Office service on a better paying basis and also to improve the efficiency of its general operations.

The article is as follows:

My name is Robert L. L. McCormick. I am research director of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover report. Dr. Robert L. Johnson, chairman of the Citizens Committee, has asked me to represent him in expressing the views of the Citizens Committee on H. R. 8923.

The Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report has assigned first priority in its program to an overhauling of the postal establishment. The postal deficit for the next fiscal year is estimated at more than $500,000,000. The Nation simply cannot afford to let its largest public business operate at such a loss.

A large part of this deficit is due to management factors for which neither the Postmaster General nor his staff can be held accountable under present law. We recognize, however, that other portions of this deficit are due to matters of public policy which cannot be remedied by administrative improvements.

We have suggested consistently that all postal recommendations of the Hoover Commission and of its task force be enacted. In our view the present deficit might be reduced eventually by as much as one-half through enactment of all of the Commission's proposals.

We would like to point out, however, that the enactment of any recommendation does not automatically save money. There must be a follow-through of two types:

1. The most modern management practices must be installed; and

2. Those administering the postal establishment must have a strong will to take every possible action required to save money.

Certainly, we cannot expect substantial management improvement unless those responsible are given full congressional authorization to institute reforms.

DEFICIENCIES OF THE POST OFFICE

The stockholders of a modern private corporation could not possibly expect its management to operate successfully under the outmoded methods and procedures which are forced upon the post office under present laws, some of them over a hundred years old. The deficiencies in the present postal setup were identified by the Commission and its task force as follows:

1. The administrative structure is obsolete and overcentralized.

2. A maze of outmoded laws, regulations, and traditions freezes progress and stifles proper administration.

3. Although the post office is a business-type establishment, it lacks the freedom and flexibility essential to good business operation.

4. Rates have not kept pace with wages and other costs and rate-making machinery is inadequate.

5. The service is used to hide subsidies.

6. Political appointment of first-, second-, and third-class postmasters and certain other officials produces inefficiency and militates against the incentives of promotion.

7. Accounts are kept by the General Accounting Office outside the Department and are available to the post office for management purposes only after months of delay. Methods of budgeting and appropriation are entirely unsuited to a business of the size and character of the post office. The pressure of these forces in a rapidly growing business accumulates to make impossible the most economical and efficient conduct of the service.

The bipartisan Hoover Commission was unanimous in its statement of these deficiencies.

BROAD AGREEMENT ON ACCOUNTING NEEDS

For many years there has been broad agreement among authorities on the need for a modernized postal accounting system. Much groundwork was done for Postmaster General Walker some years ago by Mr. Heiss, former comptroller of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. The findings of the Hoover Commission and of its task force again laid great emphasis upon the need for modernized accounting.

President Truman, in his postal message of June 24, 1949, gave a strong call for action in this field. Postmaster General Donaldson again and again has called for modernized accounting. Year by year, the concern of Congress in this matter has been expressed, almost with monotony, in the appropriations hearings.

DISCUSSION OF H. R. 8923

You and your committee, Mr. Chairman, have plainly shown your grasp of the essential importance of this reform. The bill before us includes many of the improvements required in this area. As you well recognize, it does not include in their entirety the Commission's postal accounting recommendations but in our view you are here taking a "man-sized bite" of it.

The bill would accomplish the following major reforms:

1. The actual accounting of the Post Office Department which has mainly been performed by another agency of Government in Asheville, N. C., would be transferred to the Post Office Department. It is a fundamental principle of good administration, private or public, that accounting operations should be performed under the supervision of the management.

2. By so transferring the accounting to the Post Office Department, the present grievous delay between the postal transactions and the accountings therefor could readily be eliminated. The delay in accounting has for many years hampered the postal management in its calculations. Frequently, the results of accounting have not been known definitely for perhaps a year.

3. The necessity of maintaining a duplicate set of books within the postal establishment itself should thus be eliminated.

4. For the first time, the postal establishment will be given a basis in law for installation of a business-type accounting system with the flexibility permitted thereby.

5. The proposed Post Office Department fund, a new revolving fund, should make it possible to eliminate the strict and unnecessary segregation of minor accounts in each of more than 42,000 post offices throughout the land. This should expedite all financial transactions.

6. The warrant system, installed by Alexander Hamilton and long since outmoded by the modern volume of transactions it covers, can, under this bill, be eliminated.

7. Site audits would be permitted without violation, witting or otherwise, of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, and it would also be possible to expedite auditing by the use of the "spot check" or "sampling" technique universally used in business today. The absurd practice of shipping truck-loads of vouchers to the Post Office Department and thence to Asheville, N. C., would thus be eliminated.

8. Congress would have a fair and impartial audit performed by its own agent, and that agent would no longer have dual responsibility, a practice long held to be unsound, for auditing the accounting maintained by its own employees. This would strengthen Congress' hand in that it would insure objectivity in consideration of the postal accounts.

9. By the use of the accounting and auditing techniques contemplated by this measure, Congress would have more and better information about what the post office is doing.

Each of these steps follows in principle the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. If prosecuted as the Hoover Commission and as I am sure your committee wishes, they can lead to vast improvements in the fiscal system of the Postal Establishment.

We must recognize, however, that implicit in the bill is a division of responsibility between the Post Office Department and the General Accounting Office. This is not, in some particulars, consistent with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in its reports on the Post Office Department and Federal business enterprises. Unless there is fair and wise teamwork between the two agencies concerned, these inconsistencies can conceivably cause the entire reform to fail.

DISALLOWANCES

One major difference exists between the present bill and the provisions customary for Federal business enterprises. Under this bill the Comptroller General retains the power of disallowance. In this respect the proposed measure fails to meet the criteria set forth for business-type enterprises (of which the post office is listed as one) by the Hoover Commission in its report on Federal business enterprises. Appendix A hereto discusses this point in more detail.

SUMMARY

H. R. 8923 is in conformance with the principles of the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government for modernization of the accounting procedures of the post office, except that the division of authority noted above has certain important implications. The bill does not, however, fully cover the Commission's proposals in this area. On the other hand, it does not run counter to the Commission's basic plan.

In our opinion, this bill would bring the post office more than halfway down the road to a modern, business-type fiscal system, without which the objectives of the bipartisan Hoover Commission, the President, the Postmaster General, and the Congress cannot be attained.

APPENDIX A—POST OFFICE ACCOUNTING UNDER THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION

H. R. 8923 fails to place the Post Office Department under the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945, although the bill takes most of the actions covered in that measure.

The Hoover Commission's report on the Post Office Department makes recommendations referring both to powers of the Comptroller General and to operation under the Government Corporation Control Act. It was recommended that the Post Office Department keep its own accounts and make its own disbursements, subject to audit by the Comptroller General and in accordance with procedures determined by a new Accountant General, these procedures to be approved by the Comptroller General.

It was further recommended that the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act in respect to business management, budgeting, accounting, and audit be applied to the Post Office Department. This recommendation meant, as indicated in the separate report on Federal business enterprises, that the Post Office Department should be on the same accounting basis as the Government corporations.

The report on Federal business enterprises referred to the Post Office Department as among Government business enterprises which should have the form of operations established under the Government Corporation Control Act. Recommendation No. 4 in that report was that these agencies should be given the same flexibility of business practice, a business form of budget, accounting and audit systems, which are now usually reserved for Government corporations.

Senate Report No. 1158, Eighty-first Congress, first session, issued by the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on "Progress on Hoover Commission Recommendations," took note of some ambiguity in recommendations at to accounting in the Post Office Department. After citing Recommendation No. 4 in the Report on Federal Business Enterprises and other pertinent recommendations, the Senate Expenditures Committee report came to this conclusion: "In view of these various recommendations it is reasonable to assume that the Commission intended that the Post Office Department should be granted approximately the same type of 'housekeeping' powers as are customarily granted in Government corporation charters."

Government corporations are granted in their charters, approved by Congress, certain exemption from laws applicable to ordinary governmental activities. These exemptions assure freedom from certain controls of the General Accounting Office beyond those provided in the Government Corporation Control Act. Primarily exempted are the authorities for advance rulings regarding availability of appropriations and the authority to disallow payments made.

Thus, the charter of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation provides that the Board of Directors shall determine the necessity for and the character and amount of its obligations and expenditures under this chapter and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, paid, and accounted for, without regard to the provisions of any other laws governing the expenditure of public funds and such determination shall be final and conclusive upon all other officers of the Government.

The charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation provides that the Corporation shall have authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers.

These provisions common to virtually all corporations have the effect of exempting the corporations from the provision of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 that "all claims and demands whatever by the Government of the United States or against it, and all accounts whatever in which the Government of the United States is concerned, either as debtor or creditor, shall be settled and adjusted in the General Accounting Office."

The Government Corporation Control Act provides that the financial transactions of the agencies subject to its full provisions shall be audited independently by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General. A report of each such audit for each fiscal year shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress not later than January 15 following the close of the fiscal year covered by the audit.

The Post Office Department, under H. R. 8923, would be subject to audits by the General Accounting Office of the same type as provided for Government corporations under the Government Corporation Control Act.

H. R. 8923, unlike S. 2112 and H. R. 5775, does not provide that the Postmaster General, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, may "determine the character and necessity for the obligations and expenditures of the Department and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to the laws applicable specifically to Government corporations."

The Comptroller General would, therefore, be able to control administrative practices of the Department through advance rulings and disallowances.

Postmaster General Donaldson in a letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Expenditures, said that S. 2212 (companion bill H. R. 5775) "has been drafted with the objective of carrying out many of the major recommendations of the Hoover Commission."

Mr. Donaldson said: "By assuming the character of a Government corporation, the Post Office Department would have a business-type budget, it would establish its own system of accounts, subject to the authority of the Comptroller General to examine and report upon the adequacy of the system; and the Comptroller General would make an annual audit of the Department in accordance with principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions. At the present time the Post Office Department operates under even more restrictive procedures than those established under the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 as the Comptroller General in effect performs the administrative preaudit and maintains the accounts for the Department."

SUMMARY

In closing it should be noted that H. R. 8923 is deficient, because it fails to eliminate advance rulings and disallowances, as is done for other Federal business enterprises.

Small Business Must Be Encouraged—This Revenue Bill Is a Most Meritorious Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, the tax bill which is before the House would reduce excise taxes and would provide offsetting revenues by closing loopholes, introducing withholding on dividends, and by increasing taxes of large corporations. In addition, it would increase collections of the Federal Government by about $800,000,000 in each of the next 5 years by a gradual acceleration of corporate income tax payments.

I believe my colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means should be congratulated. As the President requested in his message of January 23, 1950, the bill makes important revisions in our tax system, reduces inequities, stimulates business activity, and provides additional revenue. It is the first installment, and a good one, on the revision of our tax laws which the people of this country have been waiting for since the end of the war.

The bill has been criticized because a share of the revenue loss resulting from excise-tax reduction will come from large corporations. This criticism is unwarranted and I should like to present to the Members of the House the facts which prove it is unwarranted.

The bill would redistribute part of the corporation income tax from small and intermediate size corporations to large corporations and would, in addition, raise the tax of the large corporations. It would decrease the tax on corporations with income between $5,000 and $167,000 and would increase the tax on corporations with incomes above $167,000.

This shift of part of the corporate income tax from small and intermediate sized corporations to large corporations is justified because of the tremendous prosperity of large corporations. We are running a deficit despite the fact that the economy is operating practically at record levels. In this situation, it is essential that the budget deficit be reduced to the greatest possible extent. The corporate sector of the economy, especially the large corporations, has enjoyed in the last few years a period of record earnings. By any test, it is clear that large corporations have benefited more than any other group from the high level of economic activity since the end of the war. It is appropriate that these corporations should be required to contribute the additional amounts proposed under this bill to help reduce the deficit and to permit the reductions in excise taxes proposed under the bill.

As the Secretary of the Treasury stated in his appearance before the House Ways and Means Committee, the large bulk of corporation incomes is concentrated among the very large corporations. Only 13 percent of all corporations are expected to receive profits above $50,000 in 1950. Yet these 13 percent will account for 90 percent of the total taxable income of all corporations.

In the 3-year period 1947–49 corporate profits have averaged over $31,000,000,000 before taxes, more than three times as much as in 1929. Corporate profits after tax were more than double the 1929 figure. These levels of profits were sufficient to permit corporations to pay dividends at a record rate and to retain more than four times as much in undistributed profits as in 1929. Since large corporations account for 90 percent of all corporate profits, it is clear that the

record profits have accrued largely to the large corporations.

The great strength of the large corporations is also demonstrated by the trend in working capital, which is shown by recent figure of the Securities and Exchange Commission. The net working capital of all nonfinancial corporations amounted to $68,000,000,000 at the end of 1949. Ten years earlier, corporations had working capital of less than $25,000,000,000. This increase in working capital resulted to a substantial degree from an increase in liquidity. At the end of 1949 corporations held more than $40,000,000,000 in cash and United States Government securities. Again, it is clear that a large part of these large holdings of liquid assets are owned by the large corporations.

The recent report by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report presents some very interesting figures on the profitability of large and small corporations during the past few years. It states that the trend of profits for smallest corporations not only went steadily downward but went down most. From an average profit rate of over 14 percent in 1947 their profits declined by more than two-thirds to less than 5 percent in 1949. A similar though less drastic fall is indicated by the rate of profits for corporations with assets between $250,000 and $1,000,000. The rate for these corporations went down from 17 percent in 1947 to about 8 percent in 1949.

The largest corporations on the other hand showed a rate of profit of 13.5 percent in 1949 as compared with 13.3 percent in 1947. Thus, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report goes on to say, "the biggest corporations have the largest rate of profit, the smallest corporations have the smallest rate of profit." What is more, the largest corporations succeeded in maintaining their earnings at a very high level since 1947, while the small corporations saw their profits cut by more than half.

The increase in tax on large corporations is moderate. Let us look at the facts. According to the Secretary of the Treasury, corporations with incomes above $50,000, account for 90 percent of the total profits of all corporations. Those with incomes above $167,000, who would be subject to higher taxes, probably account for nine-tenths of the profits above $50,000, or about 80 percent of the profits of all corporations. The Council of Economic Advisers estimates that in the first quarter of this year corporate profits amounted to about $30,000,000,000 at an annual rate. This means that corporations with profits of $167,000 or more will probably earn a total of about $24,000,000,000. Their taxes will be increased by this bill by less than 3 percent, or about $700,000,000.

Opponents of this measure argue that this tax increase will be harmful to business and will reduce incentives. The facts prove otherwise. Undistributed profits of the large corporations probably amount to eight or nine billion dollars a year. The $700,000,000 increase in their taxes will still give them a very large margin of profit after taxes and will still preserve for them undistributed profits in amounts which were unheard of in the prewar years. Consumer demand is very high and promises to remain high for a long period of time. Under these circumstances, it is evident that the small tax increase under this bill will not make anything more than a small, insignificant dent in the financial position and outlook of large corporations.

In view of the unmistakable trends which show that large corporations are profiting more than any other group, the moderate increases in tax rates under this tax bill for these corporations cannot be regarded as oppressive. To the contrary, the figures show that the shift in tax burden from small to large corporations is justified. Small business must be encouraged and the tax deterrents to their expansion must be eliminated. The small increase in taxes for large corporations will not affect their operations to any important degree since their financial position is strong and their undistributed profits remain large.

Extension of Selective Service Act of 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that my absence from yesterday's session of the House prevented the recording of my position on the question of extension of the Selective Service Act of 1948 which the House passed by a vote of 315 to 4. As a member of the Merchant Marine Committee with a vital interest in maritime affairs I was present, with other Members of the House, at the launching of the steamship *President Jackson*, a passenger-cargo ship to be used in service in the Pacific. The launching took place in Camden, N. J., and our party was already on the scene there when yesterday's historic action by the President was announced. While I feel that my presence at the launching as a Representative of San Francisco, a highly important port, was in performance of my obligations to my constituents, I do wish to announce that had I been here I would have cast my vote unhesitatingly in favor of the extension of the Selective Service Act in the face of the late developments in the Korean theater.

Address of Hon. Walter A. Lynch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by the Honorable WALTER A. LYNCH at the annual dinner of the Bronx Democratic County Committee, May 25, 1950. Mr. LYNCH is one of our most beloved Members of the House, who is admired for his intellectual ability and his integrity. His comments are as follows:

State and county chairmen, ladies and gentlemen, I am greatly honored in having the privilege of addressing you here tonight, not only as a member of the Bronx Democratic organization, of which we in the Bronx are so proud, but also as a Member of the Congress of the United States.

On an occasion of this kind when Americans and Democrats, such as we are here tonight, are gathered together I do not think it amiss to sound a serious note and speak perhaps a solemn word. For some time past the people of our country and of the democratic countries of the world have been disturbed and troubled by the uneasiness of the peace. In our country that disquietude has been further fomented by some for political purposes and by others as undoubted agents of a foreign power, provacateurs of a war of nerves.

Looking back to those days when I first went to Congress, 11 years ago, I see the same pattern of confusion and doubt that today seems to hold the mind of the American people. You will recall the bitter jibes at President Roosevelt as he strove to awaken the people to the dangers that confronted them; you will recall the sneers at the Congress as the slow moving and ponderous legislative machine swung into the business of preparing for the defense of the country. Then we had a shooting war. Pearl Harbor galvanized the American people into action, united them into the irresistible force that beat Germany's nazism and Japan's militarism to the ground.

Similar jibes are cast today at President Truman as he seeks to weld the peoples of western Europe together in a common defense by supplying them with food to sustain themselves and by giving them the scientific and technical aid for operation bootstrap as they drag themselves from the rubble of their devastated homes and factories. Similar sneers are flung at the Eighty-first Congress as it carefully and thoughtfully provides the legislation necessary to implement point 4 of the President's program.

There are no heroics in this cold war. Thank God, there is no bloodshed. There is no Pearl Harbor; no Salerno, nor Normandy beach, but the stakes are the same: To secure for the world the four freedoms. The task of mobilizing the democratic forces, however, is more difficult today because we do not see the cold war; we only feel it and fear it. This is the time for courage and determination on the part of the American people, for just as surely as under the leadership of President Roosevelt the United States won the shooting war, so too under the courageous captain of artillery will the United States win the cold war.

There are some who today criticize our foreign policy in China and in other parts of the world. There were some who criticized our policy in World War II with respect to the Philippines. We had our Corregidor and Bataan in those days, but they were followed by the days of Leyte and Iwo Jima. We will have our reverses today in the Far East, but ultimately our efforts will be crowned with the same success that crowned our efforts during the shooting war in the Far East.

The recent trip of President Truman throughout the West has given to the people a new courage to meet the issues abroad while we vigorously tackle our own domestic problems. In connection with these domestic problems the Democratic administration has had marked success.

Anchored to our foreign economic policy and yet of vital importance to our prosperity at home is the reciprocal trade program, which was subjected to such crippling

amendments by the Republican Eightieth Congress and which was one of President Truman's key points for the development of world trade and world peace. Within 60 days after the Eighty-first Congress convened, the House of Representatives had passed a bill to remove those crippling amendments and revived and restored the reciprocal trade program to its former might and vigor. The reciprocal trade program is more than an ideal to the people of the great State of New York—when the greatest port in the world is busy, when its shipping is at its greatest, it means that the factories in our city and in up-State New York are humming with industry and that our working people have employment.

To show the prosperity that the country is enjoying under the present Democratic administration, one need only point to the fact that we have 60,000,000 people employed in this country—the highest number in our history. We are annually assimilating some 500,000 to 600,000 new entrants into the labor market and these are being absorbed without reducing the standard of wages.

The 1948 Democratic platform pledged an increase in the minimum-wage law from 40 cents to at least 75 cents an hour. I am proud to say a 75-cent minimum wage is now the law of the land. To the people of New York State this means not only the complete abolition of sweat-shop labor conditions, but it means that other sections of the country will not be able to profit through substandard wage scales by attracting unscrupulous employers. Through the encouragement given by the Democratic administration, collective bargaining has brought great benefits to the workers of the State of New York and these benefits, obtained under collective bargaining, would have been lost if industry were tempted to flee New York to other areas where the wage level was lower. The minimum-wage law enacted by the Eighty-first Congress has prevented that flight of industry by insisting that the standard of wages in the United States should be at a minimum of 75 cents an hour. This is Democratic progress under President Truman.

Our Democratic administration has not only provided job opportunities for the people of our country but it has taken forward steps also to see that they have adequate homes at reasonable rentals. To ensure to our people the full fruits of freedom and democratic progress, the Democratic Eighty-first Congress has authorized the most comprehensive urban and rural housing program in the Nation's history. I am sure you will recall the frantic efforts of the Republican leaders at their Philadelphia convention in 1948 to get the Eightieth Congress to pass a bill for low-cost public housing and slum clearance before the adjournment of Congress. They wanted to show the voters that Republicans could—at the eleventh hour—do something constructive. But the real-estate lobby was successful in blocking any action by the Republican Eightieth Congress. In contrast, we now have on the books—thanks to a Democratic Eighty-first Congress—a program calling for construction of nearly a million low-cost dwelling units over the next 6 years, with loans and grants to States and local governments to help rid our metropolitan centers of slums.

Probably the most important single piece of domestic legislation, which will be enacted during the present Democratic administration, is the new social security bill. Here we have in sharpest contrast the record of the Republican Eightieth Congress which actually turned back the clock on social security, and the record of the Democratic Eighty-first Congress which is extending the social security program. Many people still may not know that despite repeated Republican campaign promises and platform pledges to improve social security, the only social security bills passed by the Republican Eightieth Congress removed nearly 1,000,000 workers and their families from the social security rolls.

The House Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, spent nearly 6 months during the last session in careful study of social-security revision. This bill, H. R. 6000, now pending before the Senate Finance Committee, would double old-age and survivors insurance benefits, provide a program of permanent and total disability insurance, and increase the Federal grants in aid to States, for aid to the needy, the old folks, the blind, and to dependent children. For the first time—and this in particularly important to many residents of our own Bronx County—the citizens of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, American citizens such as you and I, would be entitled to social security benefits. Every one is interested in social security and from the Democratic Eighty-first Congress the people are getting performance—not promises.

It is this selfsame social-security program, initiated during the term of office of President Roosevelt and advanced during the term of office of President Truman that is presently providing the impetus for the establishment of pension plans in private industry. And for these pension plans, the people who are now engaged in private industry should thank the Democratic administration.

You have heard those who are opposed to the progressive leadership of our party, gleefully state that the Congress is not cooperating with the President. In the difficult task of legislation under our democratic process, where conflicting views must be brought into harmony, where the tugs and pulls of varying interests must be harnessed toward the one direction, it is natural that there should be temporary set-backs in some instances. When, therefore, those who by every tradition of the party of Abraham Lincoln should, by their presence on the floor of the Senate and by their votes on the roll call, unanimously support equal opportunity in our American way of life, regardless of color or creed—when those people point with delight to the failure of the Congress to pass an FEPC bill, then I say, "When the whale founders, the sardines exult with glee."

We Democrats from New York have no apologies to make. We have fought the good fight; we have stood shoulder to shoulder with our President in his program for civil rights and we will continue to do so until the final objective is gained. With such men as Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN and the replacement of a few Republicans by northern Democrats we cannot fail.

May I at this point turn to one feature of your State administration which to my mind merits the condemnation of every right-thinking decent citizen. The pittances that were paid as aid to dependent children and to the needy aged were wholly unrealistic during the period of high living costs. The Federal administration recognized the inadequacy of these payments, and under H. R. 6000, to which I have previously referred, the grants of money made to the States by the Federal Government for public assistance would be substantially raised. As I have previously stated, this bill passed the House last October and will probably be debated on the floor of the Senate next week. Under the bill the Federal grant to the State of New York for aid to the aged would be increased approximately $2,000,000 and aid to dependent children would be increased to $13,000,000. I ask you to remember those figures. Your State administration was well aware of these facts. Your State administration was also well aware that any increase in grants in aid to the State by the Federal Government was made for the benefit of the aged and of the dependent children—and not for the benefit of the budget of the State of New York. In view of the anticipated increased Federal grants, your State administration, instead of providing for increased payments and better care for the aged and for dependent children, reduced its own tax burden by slashing $6,739,000 from the State contribution for aid to dependent children and $1,069,000 from the State contribution for aid to the aged. That is an example of the financial wizardry of your State administration that enables the State of New York to have a balanced State budget at the expense of dependent children and of the needy aged.

In conclusion let me say that the Democratic Party is the party of progress. Under the able leadership of such men as State Chairman Paul Fitzpatrick and our own county chairman, Edward J. Flynn, we shall continue to be the party of progress.

March of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on June 25, 1950, the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Post, No. 105, the American Legion, Department of Maryland, held a dedication ceremony at its clubhouse grounds, Montrose, Md., and marked the dedication of a monument upon which it erected a bronze plaque, bearing a poem entitled "March of Freedom," composed by James Patrick McGovern, a long-time member of the District of Columbia bar, and a captain in American forces in World War I. Upon this occasion former Senator Henry Fountain Ashurst delivered the following address:

Mr. Commander, officers and members, you have honored me much by inviting me to participate in these exercises.

The space of 52 years is only a second—a tick of the mighty clock of time but it is quite an appreciable space in the life of a man. For more than 52 years I have known and admired Capt. James Patrick McGovern: patriot, poet, soldier, scholar, lawyer. About 3 years before the close of the nineteenth century, he came to Arizona where I first met him.

At that time he was in poor health, was about 18 years of age but was already an expert typist and shorthand writer and a most promising student of the law. Arizona soothed the throbbing nerves of pain, and painted roses upon the invalid's pale cheeks. He soon established in Arizona a reputation for courage and the ability to write and speak forcefully, and then he practiced law for many years with noted success in Washington, New York, and other prominent cities.

He served in our Armed Forces in World War I, and at the outbreak of World War II he immediately made application for military service in our Armed forces but—alas—was informed that age limit denied him that privilege. It was then that the poetic genius of Captain McGovern shone forth and, if ever the divine afflatus of poesy inspired any man of our generation Captain McGovern is that man. When many of our peoples and the peoples of our gallant allies were worn from heaped-up weariness, his poems rang out like some prophet of olden times cheering forward the fainting legions.

His poetry is expressed in words of beauty, grace, and felicity of expression and carry

with them a sound philosophy of human freedom, upon which every race of men and the statesmen of every nation may depend with confidence and trust.

It would not be possible to identify a man of letters who has more truly enriched the literary annals of our day than has Captain McGovern by his shining and splendid poetry. It is a happy circumstance that this plaque is dedicated and that these tokens and symbols of our appreciation of his genius and of his crystal-clear character should thus be made manifest while he is vitally among us and may partake of the fragrance of the honors offered to him by this dedication. That sonnet, written in 1945, reads as follows:

"MARCH OF FREEDOM

"Our valor now makes live each yesterday
Of bitter struggle wreathed with heroes' deeds,
Since first our fathers blazed their dauntless way
Through virgin tracts and sowed their hearths' new seeds.

"Our homes then grew in beauty, love, and peace
Within the fortress of our fruitful land,
Which promised that our state would never cease
As long as justice ruled the heart and hand.

"But freedom is an ever restless sea;
It must be always wooed and won again.
To change is life, to strive is destiny;
The rust was never deep for sword and pen.
Our future thus must give our past its due
Of victory again, of peace more true."

It is my opinion that one of the sources of the strength of his poetry is that he never took counsel of fear but took counsel of courage.

Historians of the future will refer to this midcentury period as the era of fear. To some persons it seems to be an era of dying traditions, blighted hopes, and shattered ambitions. Certainly it is an era of fanatical ideologies and prostrating fear, and fear is the most destructive of the human emotions. It is even more destructive than hate and jealousy. Men of medical science are of the opinion that fear may cause serious mental and physical illness.

There is, however, no cause for America to fall into the apathy of fear and dull despair. Poignant fear and doubt as to man's survival descended upon mankind at various periods of mankind's occupancy of this planet and will probably continue to do so until the end of the human film.

Fear and doubt as to man's survival came to mankind at regular intervals, not only in modern but in medieval and in antique times. From the dawn of history every invention has been susceptible of two uses—good and bad—but mankind happily possesses the reason, the conscience, and the moral governance which enable him to direct to what use—good or bad—an invention shall be put.

Opulent with irony as are all human affairs, no irony is sharper than the fact that our own inventive genius has brought forth explosive forces and weapons of war, which, when imitated by unsocial nations, are terribly dangerous to the nation making the discovery.

I take no stock in the gloomy jeremiads so constantly chanted that the human race will destroy itself. I do not subscribe to the defeatist attitude that human beings are but the helpless zanies of witless fate and thoughtless chance which will overthrow the wisdom of the wise, the valor of the brave, and the trophies of the truth. I reject such doctrine and assert that mankind is endowed with reason, conscience, and an ample power of self-direction. The midwives of nuclear science and nuclear physics have recently delivered some lusty infants: atom bomb and hydrogen bomb and these infants could conceivably become troublesome creatures since, by them, man presumes to take into his own hand the fire and force of Old Sol himself. The birth of these infants reminds one of the speech addressed by the Duchess of York to her unscrupulous son, King Richard the Third: "A grievous burthen was thy birth to me and tetchy and wayward was thy infancy." Fortunately these same explosive forces which have lately brought such spectre of dreadful terror to so many persons, will be the self-same forces that shall heat and illuminate man's habitation, transport him and his commerce and heal and cure his physical ills and agonies.

Of this, at least, we may be certain: Pride, arrogance, and injustice lead to the downfall of the individual man and the Nation as well. There is in this world a law of compensation, called by some persons the law of natural justice, which soon or late does its perfect work. This law may not be repealed—not even amended. Under the sure workings of this law the thief robs himself, the tyrant-oppressor inflicts upon himself a deeper wound than that which kills his victim and with every tyrant-oppressor there walks a spirit with uplifted blade—the unerring sword of retributive justice. We Americans may find much comfort in the assurance that our opulent and powerful country, while she has never chosen the violet—emblem of modesty and self-effacement as her national flower—she has never stood in stiff, prim Lucifer Pride; she has walked becomingly before the world, has given bounteously to the world and in these troublous times, she has been the world's constant, sure, and faithful nurse. Efficient in war, she has been clement and generous in victory.

In the fullness of time the nations will, after patient negotiation, reach a legal basis for the solution of national problems, meanwhile let us remember that disarmament is not a one-way street and it is impermissible for one first-rate world power to disarm unless disarmament is general and reciprocal.

A river of wisdom is ever slowly but surely carrying mankind to the great ocean of beneficent achievement; mankind will ultimately conquer all the arts and sciences and will subject them to the good—not to the distress and destruction of his species.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House realize how futile it is to attempt to obtain an over-all reduction of our taxes.

Long after the fighting of World War II has ceased, while we are in the most prosperous years of our existence, this wasteful administration, hoping to attract votes, is each year spending more than it receives—going ever deeper and deeper into debt.

The efforts of the Republicans and those on the other side who believe that the only way to prevent inflation, bankruptcy, and a grievous depression is to reduce needless spending, rather than to increase taxation, find themselves faced with a situation which makes it impossible for the Congress, if needful Government activities are to continue, to put through a tax bill which would reduce the total take obtained by taxation.

President Truman, who was never conspicuous, so far as we know, as an individual who achieved financial success or who engaged in any activities other than governmental which returned him a livelihood through his own efforts, has issued a decree that any tax bill which does not net his administration spending money approximately equal in amount to that which he is now wasting will be vetoed.

Unfortunately for the citizen, for the good of the Republic, he forces us into a situation where, if the Government is to continue to operate at all, in order to get a reduction in excise taxes we must vote for additional taxes on corporations. His argument is easily understandable.

It is that there are more people who pay excise taxes than there are who realize that they contribute to the payment of taxes levied upon corporations, hence, it is politically expedient to reduce excise taxes but increase corporate taxes, for, says the President—at least, by his action—the poor dumb citizen will think he is getting a reduction in the tax he pays on many an article he purchases over the counter but will not realize that the taxes on corporations are, by the corporations, passed on to him.

My vote shall be cast for the motion to recommit the bill and, if that fails, I will then be forced by the President's action to vote, under protest, for the bill itself.

It is my hope—yes, and it is my prayer—that before it is too late we will get for President an American who has sound economic ideas, who believes in America first, and that his first duty is to the taxpayer and the citizen of this country, rather than to a political machine.

Reasons Why AMA Opposes Reorganization Plan 27

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent approved by the House, I am enclosing herewith a statement from the American Medical Association giving reasons why the association is opposed to Reorganization Plan 27, now pending before the House of Representatives:

Plan 27 would—

1. Be in direct conflict with the Hoover Commission, which recommends an independent health agency.

2. Make difficult or impossible the creation of a Department of Health at any future time.

3. Ignore the fact that health, a direct concern of everyone, is entitled to equal governmental status with labor, commerce and similar activities which directly concern

only a portion of the population yet have separate Cabinet departments.

4. Not promote economy.

5. Create a triple holding company, a conglomerate Department of Health, Education and Security, most of whose work is not related.

6. Not be a reorganization of administration, but a renaming of an agency admittedly faulty in set-up.

7. Open the way for an ambitious secretary, entrusted with great power, to take over control of VA's medical department.

8. Make possible Federal control of medical education through granting and withholding scholarships, etc.

9. Point toward eventual Federal domination of our voluntary hospital system.

10. Create a master organization ready and anxious to take over administration of a national compulsory health-insurance program.

11. Place administration of the Nation's health activities in the hands of a politically-appointed secretary with no professional qualifications.

12. Place the direct operation of medical programs in the hands of a surgeon general who need not even be a doctor of medicine.

13. Not, in the slightest degree, promise to improve the health and welfare of the American people.

The Supreme Court Decision in the Tidelands Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM CONNALLY
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial having to do with the decision of the Supreme Court in the tidelands case, published in the Houston Post of June 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUNDAMENTAL ERROR

The fabled Smoky Mountain justice of the peace who brushed aside a lawyer's citation of a Supreme Court ruling with the dictum, "The Supreme Court yerred," may have had something. It has now been established as a fact that the high tribunal can make a mistake. Attorney General Price Daniel, in his Tuesday night broadcast, showed conclusively that the Court based its recent ruling against Texas in the Tidelands case on a "grievous error of fact and history."

Justice Douglas, who wrote the Court's opinion, made the alleged error in the statement that Texas entered the Union under an agreement placing her on an equal footing with the other States, nullifying her claim to her tidelands.

Assuming the correctness of Mr. Daniel's indirect quotation from the opinion, Justice Douglas has no logical escape from admitting his fundamental error and reversing his vote which was thereby determined, making it at least 4–3 in favor of Texas ownership, or granting a motion for rehearing. The motion is now being prepared, Mr. Daniel said.

Mr. Douglas could have avoided the apparent colossal blunder by allowing the evidence to be presented before writing an opinion, or even by merely reading J. H. Smith's book, The Annexation of Texas, the completely documented standard work on the subject.

In order to satisfy opponents of the Texas annexation resolution, Congress adopted an amendment which became section 3 of the measure. It gave the President the choice of two alternatives: (1) He could submit to the Republic of Texas for acceptance the specific annexation resolution adopted by Congress, in which Texas retained its public lands; or (2) if the President deemed it more advisable, he could withhold the resolution and open negotiations with Texas for its admission on an equal footing with existing States.

President Tyler, who signed the annexation resolution a few days before his term of office expired, chose the plan already enacted, which said nothing of equal footing. He submitted this to Texas, and Texas adopted it. Thus he discarded the alternative scheme of negotiations and an equal-footing clause. James K. Polk, succeeding Tyler as President, approved and carried out Tyler's decision.

So, as Mr. Daniel pointed out, the alternative plan was never submitted to nor accepted by the Republic of Texas. But Justice Douglas apparently misunderstood the facts when writing his opinion. He made his error and laid the false premise on which the court's tidelands decision rests, by quoting the abandonment alternative plan as a controlling provision of the annexation resolution, in support of his reasoning that Texas could not have entered on an equal footing and at the same time retained her tidelands.

Confronted with the documentary proof of this basic error, as he will be confronted when Mr. Daniel submits his motion for rehearing, will the distinguished Justice Douglas admit it and reverse his position on the tidelands question? And will the august Supreme Court thereupon reverse itself and hold that Texas owns her submerged lands—or at least grant a rehearing or order a trial of the case on its merits? What do you think?

Now the Clarification Cat Is Out of the Basing-Point Bag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the magazine Steel, the mouthpiece for the big steel companies, has at last let the cat out of the bag on the basing-point bill.

It was contended all along during the 2-year fight against restoring Pittsburgh-plus that the steel and cement companies only wanted the law clarified, that they did not expect to be allowed the privilege of conspiring with their competitors to fix prices. This was not correct.

In the magazine Steel, for June 26, 1950, in a discussion of the basing-point bill, S. 1008, under the title "Confusion Continues," this statement appears:

They will remember that the Supreme Court ruled that the mere fact cement prices were uniform on a delivered basis was in itself a sign of collusion. Certainly the point as to what constitutes collusion should be clarified.

In other words, the steel and cement companies want a law passed that will require more proof of collusion than the fixing of identical prices. The fact is there can be no better proof than identical pricing of collusion.

The inference in this statement is irresistible that what steel and cement companies want is a law that will not permit evidence of identical pricing to be sufficient to prove collusion.

The House Committee on Small Business is getting reports daily from every section of the United States on identical prices. The committee has been doing this for months. It is not unusual for exactly the same price down to the fifth decimal point to be asked on competitive bids by a dozen or more companies situated from 50 to 1,500 miles from the place of delivery.

Until the Cement decision, April 24, 1948, on cement and steel, prices were exactly the same. Since that decision there has been competitive bidding. If S. 1008 had become a law the cement and steel companies would have gone back to identical pricing again and there would have been no way on earth to have proven that they were in collusion.

Considering the huge amount of money that will be spent the next year and subsequent years for cement on road construction it would certainly be against the public interest to have any law passed that would permit cement companies to fix prices and have no competition. The Supreme Court decision does not need clarification. It is very clear that if competitors get together and fix prices which are identical, disclosing no competition whatsoever, it is a violation of the law, as such conduct is evidence of collusion. What the steel and cement companies want is confusion so that the Supreme Court decision will not be clear on this point.

Communist-Fighting Is Serious Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from a radio broadcast I made recently:

Communism is a serious threat to the safety of the United States. It isn't an internal political threat, however—it's a security threat. The Communists could not possibly take over the Government now or in the foreseeable future, but they can do a lot of damage through espionage and sabotage. It takes only one Communist, for example, to blow up a building. That is what we have to fight.

We should quit fighting the imaginary perils of communism and concentrate our efforts on the grimly real perils.

Some people amuse themselves by pretending the Communists have gained so many supporters that they are ready to take over Congress any year now. Others try to pretend that the Communists are in league with the executive branch of the Government and are really running things behind the scenes. These people embark on great, splendidly and spectacularly staged crusades against the imaginary foe, insisting on making public the methods and progress of our efforts to combat Communist espionage. In order to appear patriotic they insist on detailed reports and investigations on the loyalty of every Government employee, whether he has access to confidential material or not, and thus make it impossible to concentrate our security efforts in the areas where Communist spies can do great harm to our Nation.

While these howling red-hunters are leading the chase down the wrong avenues, the Communist spies work on—quietly, secretly, hoping the sensationalists will throw the hunters off the track and force into the open information that will aid them in their work.

And I ask: Is that true patriotism? Is that true wisdom?

Our struggle against communism—foreign and domestic—is too vital, too grim, to allow any foolishness. We must keep our heads, and we must constantly keep in mind our objective—not publicity, but security. Then we must use the best methods at our disposal to reach our objective—the removal of all disloyal Americans from positions where they can undermine the strength of our Nation.

That objective should be above any personal or political motives. It can best be achieved by a trained organization like the FBI.

Legislation Can Restore Great Lakes Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include an article by my colleague, the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, of Minnesota, entitled "Legislation Can Restore Great Lakes Shipping," which appeared in the April 1950 issue of State D. F. L. News, the official publication of the Democratic Farm-Labor Party of Minnesota:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN REPORTS LEGISLATION CAN RESTORE GREAT LAKES SHIPPING

(By JOHN A. BLATNIK, Member of Congress, Eighth District Representative)

It has long been my conviction that the key to the future economic prosperity of Minnesota, and especially northern Minnesota, lies in the development of those natural resources that are found in such abundance in the area, and the restoration of activities basic to the region. Federal pump-priming projects offer only a temporary solution to the problems of unemployment and business stagnation, and intelligent long-term and full resource development alone will provide permanent prosperity.

Minnesota is rich in natural resources which await development. On the Iron Range are found enormous deposits of taconite, which will in the words of the United States Bureau of Mines, "supply America's steel needs for a thousand years if its utilization can be made commercially feasible." Over half of the peat reserves in the United States are found in Minnesota. A program of reforestation would make productive again our vast acres of cut-over and burned-over timberlands. Such a program of resource-use would result in new industries, more jobs and bigger payrolls, more commerce and trade and a greater consumer market for the products of farm and factory.

TRANSPORTATION IMPORTANT

Such a program also involves the question of new transportation facilities, and with this in mind, I recently introduced legislation (H. R. 7505) to restore package freight and passenger service on the Great Lakes. Cooperating with me are more than 30 of my colleagues in the House, and similar legislation has been introduced in the Senate by Minnesota's HUBERT HUMPHREY and several of his colleagues.

What are the benefits of legislation to restore Great Lakes package freight and passenger shipping?

In the first place, passage of this legislation is necessary to promote commerce between Minnesota and eastern States. Package freight service (the carriage by water of all kinds of cargo in carload or less than carload lots) was a vital link in the Northwest-Great Lakes-east coast transportation system prior to World War II. Dairy products, flour, canned goods, packinghouse products and many others flowed eastward, while manufactured goods of all kinds were carried westward and north to vast consumer areas. The Duluth Harbor alone handled 730,000 tons of this type of cargo back in 1941.

SHIPPING WAS WAR CASUALTY

World War II destroyed this beneficial package freight service on the Great Lakes—the 24 vessels used for this purpose were requisitioned for war service back in 1942. Replacements have not been forthcoming, and this legislation is designed to remedy this.

Package freight communication resulted in enormous savings to both businessmen and consumers. In the prewar period, butter, eggs, and dressed poultry from Minnesota were moved to New York at a savings in transportation costs of 22 cents per hundredweight—average savings on all types of cargo amounted to about 15 cents per hundredweight. These savings were of course translated into lower prices for Minnesota consumers as well as lower costs to local businessmen.

PASSENGER SERVICE NEEDED

Finally, Great Lakes shipping has its recreational angles, too. The proposed legislation, which would provide for the use of ships now declared surplus to the Federal Government on the Great Lakes, calls for a combination package-freight and passenger service on the Lakes. Perhaps several of the vessels would be used strictly for tourists.

As everyone knows, the Lakes are the common man's vacation grounds. The average worker or businessman cannot afford ocean voyages to Bermuda, Habana, or the Mediterranean, nor can he run over to Europe each summer. Along the shore of the Great Lakes is some of the most beautiful tourist country in the world, and a few days' cruise can be a very pleasant vacation. A few vessels from our surplus fleet would tend to encourage and revive this recreational service.

Thus there is no question but that passenger and freight service on the Great Lakes should be restored as soon as possible. Passage of my bill will help to develop Minnesota commerce and trade, bring lower prices to our citizens and increase recreational opportunities. Such legislation will benefit all classes of society, and it is hoped that Congress will take favorable action this session.

Undeclared War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, history will record that President Truman bypassed the Congress yesterday when he declared war against North Korea. Now for a third time in less than 35 years a Democratic administration is about to take this country into another world war.

As part of my remarks, I am including an editorial that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald today:

UNDECLARED WAR

Mr. Truman's statement on Korea is an illegal declaration of war.

Nothing that the council of the United Nations has done or may do by way of pronouncing the invasion of South Korea by the Russian puppets an act of aggression can warrant either the United Nations or the President in throwing American armed forces into the struggle.

Only Congress may do that.

It is beside the point to say that Congress may or will back Mr. Truman. The fact is that Congress has not been consulted.

So much for the legalities. How about the wisdom of the course charted by Mr. Truman, his New Dealers, and his bipartisan Republicans?

Those of us who have been saying that the essence of the Truman policy is to give Russia free hand in choosing when war will come and where, have nothing to retract. The policy of defending against every threat of Communist aggression anywhere could have no other consequence.

Now the aggression has come in Korea which General MacArthur thought so indefensible that he counseled withdrawing our troops from the peninsula to avoid an impossible military situation. The troops were withdrawn and it is in this unfavorable theater that the war has been launched.

TRUMAN'S PROBLEM

Mr. Truman is himself fearful of the outcome. He has ordered the Navy to defend Formosa and the Philippines which is not beyond the capacity of the nation controlling the sea, but as to Korea he employs weasel words.

"I have ordered United States air and sea forces to give the Korean Government troops cover and support," his declaration reads. He hopes that this will be enough to turn the scale but he obviously isn't sure of it.

What does he intend to do if the air cover and support prove inadequate? He doesn't say. If any of our airmen is killed in these operations, will he send the infantry to avenge them?

If not, why risk the airmen's lives in a venture that may result in humiliation? If he intends to accept the Russian challenge to war in Korea, why doesn't he turn to Congress at once for a declaration?

The answer to these questions is not obscure. Mr. Truman's political fortunes are in a bad way. He can use a war, just as Mr. Roosevelt needed one in the midst of the Roosevelt depression of the late thirties.

Mr. Roosevelt hoped that the Germans would start the shooting against our convoy vessels in the Atlantic but was disappointed and finally had to squeeze the Japanese into their attack on Pearl Harbor. Mr.

Truman's problem is simpler. He can expect American airmen to be lost over Korea and he can count upon American indignation to do the rest.

CONGRESS IS ONLY HOPE

There is no limit to the folly of the Truman diplomacy. It is worth recalling that the same Truman who would not lift a finger to support the Chinese Nationalists in China is now risking every American young man's life to support the Korean Nationalists in Korea and, to cap the absurdity, the Chinese Nationalist remnant in Formosa.

The same Truman who took the advice of his man, Lattimore, to abandon the Korean Republic to its fate has now committed his administration to the defense of the Korean Republic in all its weakness.

The initiative today lies with Russia. We shall have a full-scale war if Russia wants it. If it comes, with or without atom bombs, its cost will be stupendous.

Even if we win it, we can expect to be sunk in debt and socialism as a consequence, and we shall have to devote billions of dollars and all the years of our lives to attempting to rule what we have conquered. The appalling record of the occupation of Germany provides a clew to the prospects of a good peace after another war, even if it is a victorious one.

The only hope for the country today rests with Congress. It is vastly disquieting to note that there seems to be little more forethought there than in the executive offices.

How Tariff Cutting Affects the Passaic Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News of June 23, 1950:

HOW TARIFF CUTTING AFFECTS THE PASSAIC AREA

When the McKinley Tariff Act was passed during the Presidency of Benjamin Harrison, in 1889, it was the purpose of the Republican Congress to encourage domestic industry and protect American wage standards by imposing high customs duties on foreign goods produced by poorly paid labor.

In that year manufacturers of woolen and worsted goods in Germany decided to crawl under the McKinley tariff wall, since they couldn't climb over it. Three spinning, weaving, and dyeing firms in Leipzig pooled their resources and sent Oscar Dressler to America. He had instructions to pick a site for a great mill, to be operated as an American company, with American labor, financed by German capital.

Mr. Dressler chose Passaic because of its good river water, so suitable for textile manufacturing; its proximity to New York, and its adequate labor supply. That's how Botany Worsted Mills happened to locate in Passaic.

Botany was the forerunner of others. Christian Bahnsen and his associates set up the Gera Mills in Passaic, named for the German city whence the founders came, and New Jersey Worsted Spinning in Garfield. Julius Forstmann built next to Botany the mills which bear his name, bringing with him the skills and the tradition of fine workmanship that came from many generations of Forstmanns in Werden.

There has been other wool and shoddy mills in Passaic and Garfield, all small, and all but one of which shut down during the low-tariff era. Samuel Hird reorganized the run-down Robertsford Mill in Garfield and—aided by tariff protection—created the area's fourth large manufactory, which his sons and grandsons manage today.

Hearings being held in Washington this month by the Committee for Reciprocity Information reveal a new threat to the continued prosperity of Passaic's woolen industry. It is a threat to the steady employment of the men and women who work in these mills.

Ray Tucker's recent article told how the thriving city of Gloversville, N. Y., is being hard hit by unemployment, caused by the import of cheaply-made European gloves. The lowering of the tariff and the devaluation of foreign currencies put approximately 6,000 of the city's labor force of 13,260 out of work. Family savings are being exhausted, taxes aren't being paid, homes are being foreclosed.

What is happening in Gloversville has happened in Waltham, Mass., where Swiss watch imports closed down the town's big industry.

What happened in Gloversville and Waltham can happen here. It can happen anywhere in America where fair wages are being paid to produce goods that can be turned out in England or on the Continent at one-fifth to one-third of our labor costs.

Since 1947 there has been a decrease of 57 percent in the yardage of men's wear fabrics produced by one mill in this area. That loss represents the labor of 635 men, working 40 hours a week for 1 year.

What does organized labor think of the impact of tariff cuts on American industry? Emil Rieve, president of the Textile Workers' Union of America, was asked the question, "Are imports bothering you much?", when the head of the union to which Passaic textile workers belong was a witness before the Senate's Finance Committee on February 27.

"They are beginning to. Yes, very much," was Mr. Rieve's answer.

His union, the TWUA-CIO, has protested to the Committee for Reciprocity Information, which is conducting the Washington tariff hearings, that "the American textile industry and its workers must be protected from unfair competition by countries which have deliberately depressed their labor standards in order to undersell American goods."

By importing fabrics, America exports jobs. Yet the top-level advisers of the Truman administration, including Paul Hoffman, ECA Administrator, seem to think that the American textile industry is "expendable" and that American workmen, thrown out of jobs by tariff-cutting, can and must find work in "more efficient" enterprises.

Lewis Hird, testifying before the Washington committee as executive committee chairman of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, asserted that the wool textile industry in the United States is as efficient as any in the world. "Our 'inefficiency' consists," said Mr. Hird, "in the fact that we pay fair wages."

While the United States is spending billions of American tax dollars to rehabilitate European industry, the President's advisers say it may be necessary for American workmen, who help pay these taxes, to hunt for other jobs so that the work now done by these Americans can be done by Europeans. Does this make sense? Yet that is what our State Department and Mr. Truman's "experts" propose.

Silver and the Revival of World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, there recently came to my desk a very enlightening article on silver and the influence of silver money on the revival of world trade, written by Mr. Archibald N. Jordan, of New York City, which is submitted for the information and consideration of my colleagues:

SILVER AN AID TO REVIVAL OF WORLD TRADE

(By Archibald N. Jordan)

The shortage of the supplies of silver and gold today in circulation has forced the world to resort to conducting trade with many foreign nations by barter instead of by payment in silver or gold.

The present hoarding of gold and silver resulting from governments throughout the world forbidding the private ownership of gold and silver and their free use by the people has caused a decrease in world trade and the devaluation of the currencies of many nations.

Governments are the greatest hoarders of these precious metals today. It is done chiefly through government-owned central banks. This is true in any hoarding movement as bankers, public or private, are the first to sense a scarcity that will come by a general demand for currency, paper, or coins, for fear of a shortage among the people for lack of the means of legal tender payments, and these bankers are the first to prepare to guard against the necessity of currency which will be caused by this shortage in supplies to fill the demands of carrying on commerce and industry.

Gold and silver coins, or bullion, in the East are treated as merchandise and valued according to their weight and purity, not according to the legal tender value of the coins placed upon the coins by the government that mints the coins.

The situation of western nations being forced to conduct their trading with India and other eastern nations by barter is not a new situation. It existed during the period immediately preceding A. D. 1545, when the Italian merchants of Genoa and Venice were forced to conduct their trade with the east through Egyptian merchants on the barter system because the supplies of silver from the European mines were too small to provide Europe with sufficient means to make payment in silver.

The discovery of the Potosi silver mines in Peru in 1545 A. D. and of the Sacotecas silver mines in Mexico shortly after soon furnished the European nations, through Spain, with the needed increase in silver supplies to carry on the trade with India and the East generally by payment instead of by barter. The newly mined silver from the Americas removed the necessity of carrying on that trade by barter and soon the world trade generally revived as the result of the increase in the supplies of silver coming from the west.

Today, because of the greatly intensified fear of the people due to world war, monetary hoarding in India, China, and other Asiatic countries has vastly increased. It has caused a shortage in the means of world payments. It is reducing world trade to barter in those and other sections of the

world. The Western World is losing its markets. Especially is hoarding increased in India, for the hot and humid tropical climate there rots and destroys paper money. The natives will not use silver certificates secured by silver, or any other form of paper money. They prefer to hoard their wealth in the form of silver. Their daily wages are low and being under a dollar per day, gold coins are too small to gain general circulation among the people of India.

Today, an increase in the production of silver in the mines of our Western States will not only benefit our mining industry in those States, but it will also result in the increase of our manufactures at home that we use to trade with among those Asiatic countries. This will benefit the rest of our own States as well, for the increase of silver in our western mines can again revive world trade.

The purchase by our Government of domestic mined silver from our Western States will increase the production of silver. The proposal to reduce the price of 90½ cents per ounce now paid for our newly mined domestic silver, to 73½ cents per ounce, the world price of foreign silver today, is not justified by the argument that the amount over 73½ cents is the payment of a subsidy to silver mine owners. It is not just a subsidy. It is a national benefit and for the general welfare of all our States, for the ultimate result will be an increase in our foreign trade and an increase in our own manufactures. Hence an increase in our own employment in our own factories and shops through exports from their products, demanded by the increase in our foreign trade.

India was a highly civilized nation over 5,000 years ago. The struggle for control of its trade by eastern Mediterranean Asiatic nations was active 200 B. C., when the Phoenicians had secured control of its overland trade, they being the more efficient merchants and navigators than the Jews or the Egyptians. The control of the commerce from India passed to the Italian merchants of Genoa and Venice just prior to the discovery of America by Columbus. The commerce had been lost to the Phoenicians when Carthage was captured by Rome at the time of the Ceasars. The Italian merchants lost the control of the Indian commerce to Spain, Portugal, France, England, and the Netherlands when the newly mined silver from the Americas arrived in Europe. This trade of the East was lost to the peoples of India and of the other eastern countries by the present world war.

NO INHERENT EVIL IN THE USE OF SILVER

There is no inherent evil in the use of silver or gold, either as merchandise, or legal tender coins, for foreign countries treat foreign coins as merchandise in calculating the values in payment of accounts or when received in exchange for goods. Free coinage of the countries who mint these coins may or may not be permitted so the bullion may not be returned and reminted.

AN INHERENT EVIL IN USE OF CREDIT

There is, however, an inherent evil in the use of credit, or any of its tools. It is an axiom, that at some time, often without the slightest warning, it may collapse through overexpansion that speculation has brought about. It expands until it bursts when not checked by a rise in interest rates sufficient to check, in time, such overexpansion. The collapse is long and painful, as is the period for recovery. This is so, and always will be so, in any credit system for monetary payments, as long as man is man.

The use of gold and silver, on the other hand, strengthens credit by broadening its base. The overissue of credit can only be guarded against in any system, for speculators, who are making 20 percent on paper, will not heed warnings.

The truth of the above axiom is supported by the facts shown by an examination of the results of the banking systems of the world, for no matter how good the resolutions of the founders of those systems are, sooner or later, these resolutions of the founders are abandoned, and the overissues of credit are indulged in.

The imperial patent of the Bank of Austria, June 1, 1816, granted after a disastrous experience with paper money, states: "From this time forth be there never again a creation of new paper currency having obligatory or compulsory circulation; nor any augmentation of the present issue." But in 1848 the war and revolution brought on a sudden panic and distrust of credit.

When Japan entered into relations with foreign nations she established a banking and currency system, based on the best of the systems of other commercial nations. But in 1905 she changed her currency from one secured by government bonds to an issue of currency unsecured except by the general credit of the bank. Shortly after Japan experienced a commercial panic, and was the first nation in which that commercial bank took place before it spread and became world-wide.

An international legal-tender paper currency cannot be successful such as is advocated by the advocates of irredeemable world currency. It would result in further devaluations of currency among the nations.

An international legal tender currency is possible through the use of subsidiary silver coins. In countries where the daily wages are under a dollar, subsidiary silver coins are successfully used, because gold coins are too small to circulate among the people in trade for daily wages. In countries where daily wages are over a dollar per day, the cost of storage and transportation of the silver-dollar coins limits the use of silver coins of that denomination. Gold is cheaper to store and transport. The market value of gold is more stable due to the small variation in its net annual increase. The net annual increase in the world supply of mined gold is absorbed by the net annual increase in the world's population, and therefore does not change the purchase price of gold so is more in demand as a stable measure of value. Its use is preferred in long-time contracts.

Today there is much more demand for silver on account of increase of hoarding and use in the industries. The world price for silver should remain steadier than it has, and be so for a long period. It will not circulate throughout the East in the form of silver certificates for storage on account of the holder of the certificate, and payable to him on his demand. Fear of war and confiscation of property, and repudiation of payment to the holder are too strong to permit the circulation except as bullion or coin, outside the country of origin.

The silver price of 90 cents should be continued to our domestic mines for the above reasons.

Opposition to S. 2113 and H. R. 5967 by American Trucking Associations, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated June 21, 1950, from the American Trucking Associations, Inc., with respect to the associations' opposition to S. 2113 and H. R. 5967:

AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSOCIATIONS, INC.,
Washington, D. C., June 21, 1950.

Hon. L. GARY CLEMENTE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Re Associations' opposition to S. 2113 and H. R. 5967, freight forwarders.

MY DEAR MR. CLEMENTE: For more than 15 years, freight forwarders have been able to obtain the services of motor common carriers at unpublished charges considerably less than their rates published and filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, despite the fact that since Federal regulation of motor carriers, both the Commission and the courts, have uniformly held such joint rates illegal.

Following enactment of part 2, Interstate Commerce Act, regulating motor carriers, in 1935 freight forwarders filed these so-called joint rates with the Interstate Commerce Commission. In 1939 the Interstate Commerce Commission ordered these rates expunged from their files as being unlawful. The Commission was upheld by the Supreme Court in this action in 1940.

Part 4 of the act, regulating freight forwarders was signed on May 16, 1942. An interim period of 18 months was allowed for the publication of lawful tariffs, during which time these joint rates would remain in effect. This grace period was extended twice by Congress, first, for 3 years and then for 9 months.

After years of effort to solve the problem of forwarder-motor carrier relations, the Congress in 1946, at the urging of both parties, delegated to the Interstate Commerce Commission the task of determining, once and for all, the basis on which motor carriers should handle forwarder traffic. The Commission held a great many hearings, compiled a voluminous record, and ultimately decided in Docket 29493 that the forwarders should be given rate discounts on more than 90 percent (revenuewise) of the forwarder traffic handled by the carriers. However, as to this traffic, the Commission did conclude that even though the forwarders were entitled to a discount, they would be required to pay rates which were at least compensatory.

The forwarders reject even this elementary safeguard by the agency which for more than 60 years has been the guardian of the public interest in the administration of congressional transportation legislation. One of the prime purposes of the companion bills S. 2113 and H. R. 5967 is to make certain that the Commission will be deprived of the jurisdiction absolutely necessary if it is to function as the protector of the public in transportation matters. Under these bills, the Commission would be powerless to protect the public and the rest of the transportation agencies from the granting of concessions to forwarders by carriers who were unable to resist the temptation to quote noncompensatory rates because of the larger forwarder tonnage offered.

In other words, these pending bills are preferential to forwarders and prejudicial to other shippers. The Commission is denied suspension power over these so-called "agreement rates." Competing carriers and shippers are denied the right of complaint.

With regard to the forwarders using their great bargaining power to obtain concessions from motor carriers, the following appears in the examiner's proposed report in Docket No. 29493:

"The evidence justifies the conclusion that the forwarder, particularly the large forwarder, has great bargaining power because of the traffic whose movement it can influence, and because of the regularity of the movement;

that in many instances, different carriers can handle the traffic; and that the forwarder can and does use its bargaining power to obtain a basis of compensation on a relatively low level. This conclusion is substantiated by the fact that generally the smaller forwarders are not able to get the motor carriers to agree to as low a basis of compensation as the larger forwarders. The evidence shows that generally the compensation received by the motor carriers from the smaller forwarders is on a higher basis. The record does not afford a basis for determining the relation between average compensation under the flat rates and the local rates, but it does warrant the conclusion that the compensation is far below the level of charges paid on motor carrier traffic generally, and in some instances it is at least as low as 40 percent of the motor carrier first-class rates."

We urge strongly that you oppose these two companion bills, H. R. 5967 and S. 2113, so that by statute the freight forwarders will not be permitted forever after to exercise without hindrance their great economic power. We attach a resolution containing the position of our association adopted in Boston, in October 1949.

Respectfully yours,

AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSOCIATION, INC.,
JOHN V. LAWRENCE,
Managing Director.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSOCIATIONS, SIXTEENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION, BOSTON, MASS., OCTOBER 25, 1949

Resolved, That the ATA staff be directed to continue opposition to any change in present laws affecting regulation of freight forwarders, and to continue support of the Interstate Commerce Commission decision requiring forwarders to pay tariff charges for terminal-to-terminal service by motor carriers.

I, Clarence I. King, assistant secretary of American Trucking Associations, Inc., do hereby certify that the above is a true and exact copy of the resolution adopted by the executive committee at its meeting of October 25, 1949.

CLARENCE I. KING,
Assistant Secretary of the American Trucking Associations, Inc.

Subscribed and sworn to (affirmed) before me this 21st day of June A. D. 1950.

AGNES M. GORDON,
Notary Public.

Further Comments on a Voyage to Three Continents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, on May 27, 1950, Col. Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher of the Chicago Tribune, delivered a second address over radio stations WGN, WGNB, and the Mutual Broadcasting System. The address was captioned, Further Comment on a Voyage to Three Continents.

The address made specific references and comparisons to the constitutions adopted in some of the far eastern countries, and, in addition thereto, contained recitals of great historic, educational, and economic value. The candid and enlightening discussion set forth in Colonel McCormick's radio address unquestionably was of great interest and benefit to his large radio audience.

It is my considered judgment that additional opportunities should be afforded the American people to gain the benefit of this splendid talk. The timely application that the address has to the disturbing elements prevalent in the world today, and which confront the Members of Congress at this hour, prompts me to call attention to this eventful address. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein the historic and significant radio address delivered by Col. Robert R. McCormick on May 27, 1950, over the broadcasting network hereinbefore noted.

You will remember that in my talks on A Voyage to Three Continents, I expressed surprise that a book on Egypt said its constitution was excellent, and, reading it, I found it was a villainous document which I will refer to later.

This aroused my interest and I looked into the constitutions of the successor states to India and Ceylon, and reexamined the constitutions of the British white commonwealths. I spoke about these last week.

Talking this over with Frank Hughes, who is carrying on my studies of freedom of the press in great detail, we perceived what seems never to have been written before, that there are three types of constitutions: those modeled on the former constitution of Great Britain; those modeled on the constitutions of continental Europe; and those modeled on the Constitution of the United States of America. Of the first, Madison said: "All the ramparts for protecting the rights of the people, such as their Magna Carta, their Bill of Rights, etc., are not reared against the parliament, but against the royal prerogative." In another place Madison said, concerning the tyranny of legislative assemblies: "They seem never to have recollected the danger from legislative usurpations which, by assembling all power in the same hands, must lead to the same tyranny as is threatened by executive usurpations."

Sir Cecil Carr, King's counsel and counsel to the Speaker of the House of Commons, in the very first paragraph of the United Kingdom's article in the Yearbook on Human Rights said:

"Human rights in Britain are not based on any fundamental laws which are, like the Constitution of the United States of America, specifically entrenched against the normal processes of repeal and amendment. The legislature at Westminster has sovereign authority; it could modify an enactment of constitutional significance by just the same process as it would use in modifying an enactment about road traffic or housing. The important constitutional statute which prescribes that parliaments are not to last longer than 5 years was suspended annually from 1940 to 1944 by acts which took only a few days to pass into law."

There are other variants between the governments founded on the British form and ours. In all of them, titles of nobility, orders of knighthood, and a variety of decorations are available to the government to bribe the citizens. In Ceylon, polyandry is permitted. In India, alcohol is prohibited. In India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon, polygamy is legal. Women are given in marriage by their parents. They have to bring a dowry to the husband which becomes his. Men have the right to divorce women at will. Women have no right to divorce. A man must marry a girl one-third his age, so that a man of 30 marries a girl of 10 and a man of 24 a girl of 8. In Saudi Arabia the hands of thieves are chopped off by the executioner. Let it be said in passing that in China, girls are sold into concubinage by their parents.

The countries in question will not be willing to give up their laws in any world state, so a world government would make these part of our law.

The continental type of constitution was undoubtedly inspired by our own, the oldest and only successful written Constitution in history, but our principles were set aside to follow European precedents.

As in the English Constitution, the royalist elements asserted themselves, as we can see by the continuation of the kings in Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, with some real and much social power, and titles of nobility in all but Norway, making upper and lower classes.

For their principles of government they turned to the declarations of rights of man of the French Revolution, which assert that "the nation is essentially the source of all sovereignty."

The French Republic thereby adopted the principle of Louis XIV that the Government has complete control over its subjects, their property, their freedom, and their lives. The continental type of constitution has taken over this doctrine, so antagonistic to ours, that "governments receive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The third doctrine in the continental constitutions is from the Second International, called the doctrine of the "right to work," which is the entering wedge of socialism, as Prof. F. J. C. Hearnshaw, of the University of London, a noted historian and scholar of socialism, said:

"The so-called right to work which the mob proclaimed meant then as it always means in practice the right to receive pay without doing anything for it. The prospect of getting a franc and a half a day gratis acted like a magnet and drew to Paris the riffraff of the whole country, including 20,000 deserters from the army and 12,000 foreigners. The provisional government soon found itself with 120,000 paupers on its hands—a mob of wild revolutionaries, without capacity or desire for work, resolute only to increase the amount of the daily dole—an army combined with a debating society."

In these constitutions a pretense that rights exist is set up, but they can be set aside by legislative enactment. The constitutions furnish no protection against the legislature.

In this type of constitution, as in the British form of constitution, the citizens have no rights. Neither of them admit that all men are born with the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, or that governments obtain their just powers from the consent of the governed, nor do they admit that the national government has only those rights conferred upon it and that all others are retained by individual states or the people.

The constitutions of France and Italy are combinations of the English and continental types. The Governments of Spain and Portugal are dictatorships. Soviet Russia has a document purporting to confer rights, including freedom of religion, of speech, or of the press, but they are all disregarded. Citizens are interned, tortured, and slaughtered without trial. The Soviet is in the United Nations.

Is it within the bounds of possibility that these countries—some of which still accept monarchy, some of which are already socialist, some of which are dictatorships, several of which are behind the iron curtain, all of which accept the all-powerful state, none of whom is even familiar with the rights of men as we understand them—will form a govern-

ment on our model? We know that the opposite is true.

You may remember that I told you from Egypt that I found a particularly bad constitution. It is the one chosen as a model for the constitution of the United Nations.

We all know that Alger Hiss was the dominating American member at the San Francisco Conference. As far as American views were incorporated, they were the views of the man who gave away American secrets to the Soviet Republic and then perjured himself. The other American members either went along with his philosophy or conformed from motives of political expediency. Thus we see that all American principles were thrown overboard and Soviet ambitions formed the background of the United Nations.

Hiss caused the appointment of Harvard Professor Chaffee—who says he does not know whether communism is right or wrong—to the Human Rights Commission, where he has consistently upheld the Soviet members. To this Commission, Mrs. Roosevelt submitted a resolution substituting duties for freedom of the press. This view was also upheld by Secretary of State Stettinius, chairman of the United States delegation to the United Nations Conference in San Francisco. Secretary of State Acheson has recently said that he will allow no criticism of the European political and economic allies.

Professor Hocking, of Harvard, has asserted: "British experience * * * finds that public planning (socialism) puts a new light on the right to criticize; no long-time plan can succeed if you go chipping away at it every 5 minutes."

All of this is so plain that anyone who speaks up for the United Nations is obviously either a Communist or utterly uninformed.

Of the committee to form these so-called human rights the Australian member is a Socialist and a general; the English member is a Socialist; the American member is Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, of whose activities you have just heard. Of the other 15 members of the Commission on Human Rights, 3 of them come from countries with continental-type constitutions, 3 from countries with British type of constitutions, 3 from Soviet countries, and 4 from countries with American-type constitutions. The members from Lebanon and China can know nothing of the subject. The American representative, as we know, does not believe in the American way of life, and the three Latin-American members have been unable to read American political philosophy in their languages and do not understand it. So American ideas are out the window, and the deliberation must be between continental, British, and Soviet ideas.

There is a Department of State brochure entitled "The International Bill of Human Rights." This does not admit the private ownership of property, does permit prosecution of ex post facto laws, and makes every excuse to destroy the other rights known to Americans. In connection with this, we must realize that Secretary of State Acheson is inextricably mixed up with Alger Hiss and former Secretary Byrnes is not clear of that connection. The State Department is so full of Communists that it is fighting with the Communist technique of abuse to prevent exposure.

The methods adopted by the United Nations in order to deceive the American people are twofold. One is to stress duties as opposed to rights. The other is to use such vague terms that after we have been taken in, a tribunal, superior to all of ours, can decide what they mean.

Fortunately, the conspirators have exposed their hand to those who will take the trouble to look at it. We have a work composed of a group of Reddish professors, headed by Chancelor Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, and Professor Chaffee, of Harvard, called A Free and Responsible Press, the purpose of which is to abolish all freedom and substitute responsibility to the Government. Professor Chaffee proposes to put this control in the international government. The other is an organization composed largely of the same people who have written a document called The World Constitution, which is proposed to take the place of the United States Constitution and deprive us of all the liberties we enjoy under our own instrument.

A recent decision of the California Court of Appeals says the United Nations Charter is the supreme law of the land. While this is a decision of California crackpots and will not be upheld by the Federal courts, it shows how near we are to losing our liberties. The United Nations has perfected a document to bring this about.

Stand Up and Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Frank Chodorov entitled "Stand Up and Fight":

The fellows who shout for free enterprise should have learned an important lesson from a recent headline story in the New York Times.

The special committee of the House of Representatives investigating lobbying activities issued subpenas designed to force three organizations to disclose the names of their financial backers. The subpenas were directed at the executive officers. Two of them had already been cited for contempt by the committee, for failure to produce lists of the contributors, and one has been convicted and sentenced to serve 4 months for his obstinacy.

The three organizations are: Committee for Constitutional Government, National Economic Council, Constitutional Education League. Their business is pamphleteering; it is not even asserted by the investigating committee that they are engaged in any other activities, according to the news story of May 27.

The literature put out by them is openly and unequivocally critical of the policies of the present administration. They urge less Government spending, less taxation, less political intervention in private affairs; in fact, less Government. Many of their pamphlets end up with the usual plea to "write your Congressman." Thus, they frankly admit the purpose of influencing legislation, as charged by the Democratic chairman of the committee. They hope to do so by marshaling public opinion behind the legislation they advocate.

Regardless of the merits or demerits of these organizations' work—and this comment is not written in commendation or criticism—such activity has not yet become illegal in this country. It is not yet subversive to oppose the party in power. The crime of lese majesty has not yet been written into the democratic code.

But, the pin-pricking of critical literature is decidedly annoying to the "ins," and they are seeking relief in the lobby law, the purport of which is to expose to public view the interests plugging for legislation from which they hope to profit. In the present instance, there is not even the suggestion that the organizations are after some special privilege for their membership.

In fact, the chairman of the committee that issued the subpenas denies any intention of looking into the activities of the organizations. Perhaps he is afraid the organizations might grab the opportunity to get their propaganda into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if questioned about it. However, according to the chairman, all the committee wants is the lists of contributors and the amounts contributed. The question is, Why do the "ins" want the information and why is it withheld?

The answer is all too obvious: The bureaucracy has at its disposal numerous legal and departmental means of annoying its annoyers, so as to silence them, and the supporters of these organizations are fearful of such reprisal measures. Business is sufficiently beset with the snooping bureaucratic agents these days, and Government lawyers—to justify their jobs—are quick to fix up nuisance-value cases. Then, too, business is entirely too dependent on tax money to thumb its nose at Government; dividends and Government spending are too closely related.

Taking everything into consideration, those who are spending money in the hope of directing public opinion against the political trend deem it wise to do so incognito.

II

The bureaucrat, however, is not to be warded off by pulling down the blinds; he has fangs and claws and, beast of prey that he is, he puts these to his use without inhibition.

That is the lesson that the forces opposed to the socialization of American life seem incapable of learning. They do not see, or will not admit, even to themselves, that the relations between society and the state are no longer in equilibrium, that the state is in the ascendancy and intends to become top boss. If the state is to be stopped, it will be only by recognizing it as an enemy, and one with which you cannot do business without expecting to be destroyed.

Unless this fact is admitted, and met with courage, the institution of private property in this country will go the way it went in Russia or England, or in Hitler's Germany. The only possibility of saving the institution is by way of an all-out, knock-down fight with the forces of centralization. That kind of fight calls for leadership that is not afraid of a bloody nose; certainly not the kind that hides behind an executive secretary.

Socialism made headway only because its proponents never counted consequences. They not only chipped in all their pennies, but they stood up and proudly proclaimed their faith. They suffered derision for their doctrine; they went to jail for it. They got what they wanted because they fought for it.

Capitalism, on the other hand, has been strangely apologetic and timid. A few of its votaries, hidden in ivory towers, point out that private property is the necessary condition of production, that production and progress are synonymous, and that the abolition of private property is always followed by a decline in human values. The practitioners of capitalism, on the other hand, ignorant of their own philosophy, are ready to resort to compromise and appeasement whenever their position is attacked. They have even admitted, in one way or another, the charge of thievery made against capitalism by doctrinaire Socialists.

Pusillanimity is probably the inevitable consequence of easy living. Having found a comfortable adjustment in life, one loses the will to fight, and is quick to make concessions that do not too seriously threaten that adjustment. Coolies and slaves are like

that, and the capitalist is made of the same stuff.

But, it should be evident that further compromise now means something more than sharing profits with the bureaucrat. Every concession hastens the ultimate extinction of capitalism and the ultimate is only a generation away. The drive of the power-crazed bureaucrat toward the abolition of private property is in full momentum—there is no question about that—and with the next emergency he will have achieved his purpose. Now is the time to fight, not conciliate.

III

The arrogance and impudence of the bureaucrat ought to convince the forces of private property that an understanding with him, based on any known principle, is impossible. In the news item above referred to, the staff report of the investigating committee is quoted as follows:

"The Committee of Constitutional Government is one of the heaviest-spending lobbies on record. Its filings under section 305 of the Lobby Act set out expenditures of $1,571,240.72 for the 38 months that the act has been in effect. This is an average of $40,000 a month."

Peanuts and fiddlesticks. Every hour of the day the agencies of the Government spend more than that monthly average to influence legislation, and the legislation they plug for is to lengthen their tenure, increase their appropriations, better their emoluments, strengthen their hold on the public purse. According to Postmaster General Donaldson, who wants more money to improve the position of his department, last year's taxpayer was milked of $149,000,000 to cover cost of mailing Government propaganda. What was the cost of printing it? Or clerk-hire?

The biggest, most pernicious, most unscrupulous and entirely selfish lobby in Washington is the Government. It is at work all the time; it has nothing else to do. Its list of contributors includes every man, woman, and child in the country. And yet it has the effrontery to point the finger of scorn at an organization that digs up a piddling $40,000 a month for the printing and distribution of literature; mostly, in the opinion of this commentator, rather innocuous literature.

You can hardly blame the bureaucrat for his arrogance. His opposite number, the prudent, parsimonious capitalist, hiding comfortably behind an organizational smoke screen, does not arouse much admiration. Who was it who said that nice people deserve to lose?

IV

If the institution of private property is to be saved, it needs bold, uncompromising, and intelligent championship. It needs leaders who put principle above profits, ideals above convenience. It needs men who, like the signers of the Declaration of Independence, are willing to risk their necks for what they know to be right.

Above all things, capitalism needs an intelligent and forthright press. It is interesting to note that long before socialism got hold of the country's tax fund, its lean and hungry advocates maintained vigorous, well-edited dailies, weeklies, and monthlies. They were widely read; that they had influence is evidenced by the current of legislation this past 20 years.

Capitalism is too poor to support anything with pretensions to character and influence. It has virtually no press.

While capitalism snoozed in comfort, socialism got its foot into the door of our educational system, edged its body in, and now has taken over the entire establishment. For nearly three decades the disciplines taught in our schools of higher learning have taken on a collectivistic hue, so that the graduates are completely unaware of the philosophy of individualism underlying the capitalistic economy. They simply know nothing about it, can't recognize its phrases when they hear them. Our schools need a complete overhauling if capitalism is not to become a lost art and a dead language.

The job is entirely too big for the few organizations that must confine their efforts, for lack of funds, to the inadequate job of issuing pamphlets. The best brains obtainable, including those now concentrating on the making of money, must be put to the fight. Above all, there must be an awareness that capitalists have nothing to lose but the chains that are tightening about them.

Special Plane Planned for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be of interest to the great majority of the Members of the House of Representatives to learn of the progress being made in the experimental agricultural airplane which is being designed at the A. and M. College of Texas, College Station, Tex.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by John W. Ball, which appeared in the Washington Post on June 22, 1950, concerning this cooperative project sponsored by the National Flying Farmers, the Department of Agriculture, Texas A. and M., and the Civil Aeronautics Administration:

SPECIAL PLANE PLANNED FOR AGRICULTURE

(By John W. Ball)

The Civil Aeronautics Administration yesterday listed the airplane as a farm implement, along with plows, tractors, combines, and hoes.

The announcement revealed that CAA has contracted with the Texas Agriculture and Mechanical College system to design and build a special agricultural plane. Jointly sponsoring the project are the National Flying Farmers, the Department of Agriculture, Texas A. and M., and CAA. Thereafter, the plans will be furnished at cost to anyone wanting an airplane for his farm.

CAA said a recent survey disclosed there are 75 different civilian uses for aircraft besides carrying passengers and cargo, all but a dozen in agriculture. Agricultural uses include:

1. Shooting coyotes on western range lands.
2. Seeding lakes with fish.
3. Farm mapping.

'COPTERS HELP CHERRY CROPS

4. The use of helicopters to blow moisture off cherries at a certain stage when the combination of the moisture and hot sun would crack the cherry skin.

5. Dusting fields with 2,4-D to kill weeds. (2,4-D, the report by CAA reveals, was developed in Maritime by the Army Chemical Service to destroy enemy crops, "especially the rice crop in Japan. Fortunately," CAA continues, "2,4-D will kill broad-leaved plants like most weeds, but will not harm grasses such as rice, the common grains, sugarcane, etc.")

6. Dusting with a chemical that defoliates plants. This is a great aid in cotton picking by machinery. The leaves fall off, which simplifies the work for the picker. It helps the hand picker, too.

7. Last year hundreds of thousands of acres of corn in Illinois and Iowa were treated by air to control the corn borer. "This particular pest offers quite a challenge," CAA said. "He gets himself born and starts eating very fast. He stays outdoors a very short time. After that, he is safely inside a juicy cornstalk where no spray can reach him. He has to be hit at exactly the right time. The airplane is the most effective tool for this job."

SPOTTING SCHOOLS OF FISH

The list of agricultural uses goes on and on. The list of industrial uses is shorter, and not as important. It includes spotting schools of fish for commercial fishermen, sky-writing and other aerial advertising, patrolling pipelines and power lines, etc.

Some citrus-fruit growers in Florida, Arizona, and California use airplane propellers to blow frost off their trees on cold nights. The Forest Service, another agricultural agency, uses airplanes for fire spotting. The Soil Conservation Service goes to air for farm planning. Reclamation uses them for flood control.

The airplane has been used in agriculture since 1920, says CAA. It was first used to dust cotton to kill the boll weevil.

CAA has issued a safety manual for flying farmers, entitled Protection of Pilots Against the Potential Hazard of Poisoning by Agricultural Chemicals. It is sponsoring meetings in farm areas to discuss the dangers involved. It is preparing a Duster Handbook for use by pilots who specialize in dusting crops. It is preparing a booklet on how to convert an ordinary airplane to farm use, how best to fly in the various occupations. It also has written a code of ethics of farm pilots.

Resolution of National Broadcasters Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting of the National Broadcasters Association, held in Washington, D. C., on June 23, the following resolution was adopted and released to the press:

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission has commenced certain proceedings involving the licenses of three important broadcast stations in the United States (KMPC, Los Angeles; WGAR, Cleveland; and WJR, Detroit); and

Whereas such action constitutes undue interference with licensees' responsibilities to the public; and

Whereas it appears that both in these proceedings and others instituted in recent years the Commission is attempting (1) to exercise censorship over radio programs and to interfere with the right of free speech in violation of the first amendment to the Constitution and of section 326 of the Communications Act; and (2) to violate fundamental precepts of due process of law and the procedures required by Congress in prosecuting licensees with whom it disagrees.

Now, therefore, it is the sense of the board of directors of the National Association of

Broadcasters that (1) such proceedings as those above-mentioned are of vital concern to the public and to the broadcasting industry; (2) broadcasters should take all necessary and proper steps to inform themselves of the issues involved and defend themselves against such usurpations of power by the Commission by all appropriate methods, including bringing the same to the attention of the Congress and of the people; and (3) the NAB management should watch proceedings of this nature closely and be prepared to take such steps as may be appropriate to prevent any derogation of broadcasters' rights; and (4) the matter should be retained on the board's agenda for further consideration to determine whether and to what extent the National Association of Broadcasters should move actively to participate in this and similar proceedings.

Statement of Spokane Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a statement of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce, made to the President's Temporary Water Resources Policy Commission. The study being made by the President's Commission involves the great Columbia River. We are going to develop the Columbia in the national interest, and I think it is heartening to be able to have all sides participate in constructive discussions toward a workable solution for that development.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF SPOKANE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SUBMITTED TO PRESIDENT'S TEMPORARY WATER RESOURCES POLICY COMMISSION AT AREA CONFERENCE IN SPOKANE, WASH., JUNE 16–17, 1950

INTRODUCTION

The Spokane Chamber of Commerce in preparation of this statement has considered the questions listed by the Commission for discussion in its area conferences. Those questions were stated in the Commission's press release of May 8, 1950, as follows:

"To what extent should the Federal Government participate in major water resources programs and what should be the character of such participation?

"To what extent should industry's growing concern for adequate water supply be considered in formulating national policy?

"How can erosion be reduced?

"How can we get cleaner water in our streams?

"How can we assure adequate municipal water supplies?

"What basis should be established for decisions to authorize water-resources projects of various kinds?

"How can we assure adequate consideration of all purposes which water resources can serve, including recreation and fish and wildlife?

"To what extent does sound development of water resources become a factor in the event industrial dispersal becomes necessary in connection with national defense?"

In that May 8, 1950, press release, the Commission stated that not only the above listed questions but also many other important water-requirement problems would be open for discussion in the area conferences. Accordingly, this statement is not confined to the scope of the listed questions.

We have noted that in the last paragraph of the President's January 3, 1950, letter to Chairman Cooke, the President referred to the Hoover Commission's study of the organizational issues involved in the water resources field; stated that the proper allocation of functions among agencies and the merits of various alternatives for coordination of river basin development programs are under active consideration in the executive branch; and mentioned that he had already made certain recommendations to the Congress (one of which is the administration's CVA bill). And the President in concluding his letter to Chairman Cooke stated: "While problems of organization are closely related to the development of consistent policies in the field of water resources, I am requesting your Commission to confine its recommendations to the questions of policy set forth in the Executive order together with related legislation." Thus, it seems that the President requested the Commission not to make recommendations on problems of organization involved in the CVA bill.

But in his January 3, 1950, Executive order establishing the Commission, the President directed it to study and make recommendations with respect to—

(a) Federal responsibility for and participation in the development, utilization, and conservation of water resources, including related land uses and other public purposes to the extent and character of Federal Government participation in major water-resources programs;

(b) an appraisal of the priority of water-resources programs from the standpoint of economic and social need;

(c) criteria and standards for evaluating the feasibility of water-resources projects; and

(d) desirable legislation or changes in existing legislation relating to the development, utilization, and conservation of water resources.

And it is clear that the Commission's list of questions for discussion at these area conferences, and the items which the Executive order directs the Commission to study, definitely involve the water resources and other policies proposed in the CVA bill. That bill, as every informed person knows, involves much more than mere form of governmental organization. It proposes, for the Pacific Northwest, substantial changes in water resources and other policies of the Federal Government.

Furthermore, the CVA bill's proposals regarding organization of Federal activity in the field of water resources cannot realistically be separated from water resources policies. The President's letter to Chairman Cooke acknowledges that the two subjects are closely related. We submit that the form of organization, in which the Federal Government functions in the field of water resources, is itself a matter of basic policy which involves our form of representative government and our constitutional provisions for checks and balances.

At the outset of this statement, the Spokane Chamber of Commerce therefore makes a brief comment on what some may call the organizational issues involved in the CVA bill.

The CVA bill proposes that Congress delegate to an executive agency a large measure of the powers to legislate and appropriate which are vested in Congress by the Constitution, and which at present are exercised by Congress itself. We offer a few examples.

Whether, when, and on what terms, the Mountain Home project in south Idaho and some other dozen reclamation projects in the Pacific Northwest should be authorized for construction is a legislative matter before the Congress this session. We strongly favor authorization of Mountain Home and those other projects. The administration also favors their authorization. It happens that Congress declined to authorize them in the recent rivers and harbors bill and they may have tough sledding in separate legislation.

But much as we want those projects authorized, we believe they should have to stand the test of congressional consideration and that they should be authorized only by specific legislative act of Congress.

Under the CVA bill's blanket delegation of legislative authority, CVA itself could authorize, construct, and operate such new projects as CVA deemed necessary. No further congressional authorization would be required.

Also, the bill would authorize CVA to plan and carry out its reclamation activities so as "to assure the highest relative benefits from the land and water resources for the region as a whole." CVA would determine the relative standing of various benefits and would determine what was best for the region as a whole.

CVA would have: the power to decide between Oregon and Idaho as to whether Mountain Home should be built; the power to defer reclamation developments and push power developments; the power to tell Montana that reclamation developments in western Montana would have to wait indefinitely because Montana waters should be held back in the summer to firm up low winter flows at Grand Coulee, McNary, and Bonneville; the power to give priority to lower Columbia dams instead of holding them back to allow time to carry out measures for conservation of the fishing resource; the power to adopt opposite policies and to subordinate hydroelectric power development in utter disregard of the Pacific Northwest's shortage of power supply.

Such powers to determine the course of our water resources development we do not want vested in the Bureau of Reclamation, Army engineers, Bonneville, or any other old or new department or agency or authority of the executive branch.

The determinations as to the course of our water resources development involve the various aspirations of the people of several States, involve delicate matters of balance between various water uses, and involve equitable apportionment of water and power supplies developed in the Columbia River system.

And to the extent the Federal Government should participate in our water resource programs, we want those determinations made in the halls of Congress where each affected State can be heard through its elected Senators and Representatives.

Also, the CVA bill would authorize CVA, in large measure, to finance its projects and activities from its revenues and from its fund in the Treasury, without appropriations by the Congress. Revenues from these projects out here are and will be the product of taxpayers' investments made through the United States, the greatest tax collector and spender. We refer to a statement of Mr. Elmer B. Staatz, of the Bureau of the Budget. In speaking before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress on March 24, 1950, he pointed out the sobering fact that because of underlying national considerations, every decision on individual water resources programs must be a compromise—a compromise between what we would like to do and what we actually can do in the light of existing commitments and the insistent demands from other segments of our society.

Those compromises, we submit, should be made by Congress where each of the United States can be heard through its elected Senators and Representatives. Those compromises should not be made by a CVA or any other old or new department or agency or authority of the executive branch.

To be sure, congressional action on those compromises, and the determinations of the course of water resources developments, involves some debate, some delay, and perhaps some inefficiency—when congressional procedures are compared to the functioning of a streamlined executive agency vested with great delegations of legislative power. But we submit that the controlling consideration should be our constitutional separation of powers. As Mr. Justice Brandeis said in his dissenting opinion in *Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52, 291, 295):

"Checks and balances were established in order that this should be 'a government of laws and not of men.'

"The doctrine of the separation of powers was adopted by the Convention of 1787, not to promote efficiency but to preclude the exercise of arbitrary power. The purpose was, not to avoid friction, but, by means of the inevitable friction incident to the distribution of the governmental powers among three departments, to save the people from autocracy."

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

One of the questions listed by the Commission for discussion in the area conferences is: "To what extent does sound development of water resources become a factor in the event industrial dispersal becomes necessary in connection with national defense?"

The Spokane Chamber of Commerce does not pretend that it can answer that question. But we do call the Commission's attention to some pertinent facts and some sound points of view expressed by others who have inside information regarding modern arms.

There is less cropped acreage per capita in the Western States, and particularly in the Pacific Coast States, than the national average. The West is having to import from other parts of the country increasing percentages of the foodstuffs required by its increasing population. And the requirement of transportation facilities for importation of foodstuffs into the Pacific Coast States complicates military transportation problems in times of national emergency.

There is a national defense value in further and rapid expansion of irrigation agriculture in the West, especially in areas inland from the coast. The current irrigation development of the Columbia Basin project in eastern Washington has such a value. The proposed Mountain Home irrigation project in Idaho, because of its location further inland, would have a still greater national defense value. Development of both agricultural and industrial potentials in the upstream reaches of the Columbia River system would reduce the defense risks involved in concentrations at tide-water cities.

Of even greater value—in the event national defense requires industrial dispersal and increased local self-reliance—would be comprehensive development of water resources, with ever increasing responsibility and control assumed by State and local governments and by locally managed private enterprise.

Just last week David Lilienthal criticized the Government monopoly of work in the atomic energy field, and he urged that private industry be given a chance to pioneer in the field of atomic energy. He stated:

"As to the new era of the atom, we have not only turned our back on the essentials of the industrial system that has given us our military security, we have done it in the name of military security. In the midst of a desperate competition with the Russian system, we have adopted a method that more nearly resembles the Russian system than it does our own."

A pertinent point of view has been stated in Modest Arms and Free Men, by Vannevar Bush, executive head of American scientists' wartime work in developing modern arms. His book expresses faith—belief in freedom and the dignity of man—the philosophical essence of democracy. Bush states that the way to prepare for any future total war is by building a strong democracy in every respect. And he recognizes competitive, free, and private enterprise as an essential part of strong democracy.

Lilienthal's and Bush's point of view, applied to development of water resources, suggest that the present trend toward Federal Government monopoly of that development should be reversed. And we submit that the trend in development of water resources should be toward greater responsibility, control, and participation by State and local governments and private enterprise.

We submit further that changing from the present trend to what we recommend cannot and should not be left to Congress alone. The States, particularly the Pacific Northwest States, and private enterprise must move forward and prepare to assume greater responsibility, control, and participation.

If we do that (in development of natural resources and in other matters), then individuals, private enterprises, and local and State governments will be better prepared with resourcefulness and self-reliance to meet the problem of dispersal and any other problems that may arise in connection with national defense.

WATER RESOURCES PROGRAMS, INTERSTATE COMPACTS AND COMMISSIONS, AND EXTENT OF FEDERAL PARTICIPATION

The Colorado River Basin States and the Eastern States in the Delaware River basin have interstate compacts and interstate commissions dealing with water resources. And we believe that those interstate compacts and commissions provide general patterns which the States in the Columbia River basin—and other basin areas—should follow.

The water supplies and power supplies developed in the Columbia River system should be equitably apportioned among the Pacific Northwest States by interstate compact, with the consent of Congress. And an interstate commission, operating pursuant to interstate compact and with appropriate Federal participation, should carry into effective operation the interstate agreements.

Of course, the great engineering services of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation should be utilized in investigation, design, and supervision of construction of major water projects. Reorganization possibly will change the names and departmental location of those two organizations; but their competent and specialized services cannot be dispensed with. Moreover, it would be foolish and uneconomical to attempt to supplant them with 48 (or 49) separate engineering organizations qualified to investigate, design, and supervise the construction of major water projects.

The Federal Government perhaps will have to continue, for a short time at least, the financing of construction of most major water projects. And if present subsidies, which provide substantially free navigation and flood control works and interest-free reclamation construction funds, are to be continued—the financial burden of those subsidies probably will have to be borne by the United States Treasury. But the possibilities of private financing and State and local financing of water resources programs should be fully explored and utilized. We believe that to some extent private enterprise and State and local governments can and should assume the financing of water resources programs. For example, there is no good reason why private enterprise or an interstate commission should not undertake and finance the transmission and marketing of hydroelectric power generated at the Federal dams in the Columbia River system. Certainly, municipalities and industries should finance and bear the cost of municipal and industrial water supplies, regardless of whether the water supplies are provided in connection with single purpose or multiple-purpose water projects.

Of course, to whatever extent the Federal Government ventures Federal funds in water resources programs it should have assurance that the programs will be carried out per plans and that charges for water and power service will be sufficient to repay whatever part of the Federal funds are reimbursable under applicable laws and contracts.

But the United States should not use its powers to regulate commerce, to spend and to provide for national defense in such a manner as to dominate apportionment among the States of water and water power, nor in such a manner as to concentrate in the Federal Government, monopolize, and control the development and utilization of water and related land resources.

EQUITABLE AND NONDISCRIMINATORY APPORTIONMENT OF WATER AND WATER POWER

The Commission either is or soon will become familiar with the delicate problems of equitably apportioning, among States, the waters of interstate streams. Such problems already have confronted some of the Pacific Northwest States, regarding waters of the Columbia River system. But more urgent out here, generally speaking, are the related problems of apportioning among the States the hydroelectric power supplies developed in the Columbia River system at federally constructed projects.

The Columbia River system's power potential is great, but it is not without limit. Unless and until atomic energy or currently used fuels for steam power plants become available at lower than current costs, we must face the unpleasant fact that our power demand (at its rate of growth the past 20 years) will absorb the Columbia River system's practicable hydroelectric potential by about 1990, and perhaps sooner. It is an unpleasant fact because, while our hydroelectric power favors us, as regards steam-generated power, we are at a competitive disadvantage compared to other areas of the country. The Federal Government proposes to develop the Columbia River system's power as rapidly as the market will take the power. Consequently, each of the Pacific Northwest States has a substantial stake in having the comparatively cheap hydroelectric power of the Columbia River system equitably apportioned among those States. It should be apportioned by interstate compact, with the consent of Congress. It should not be apportioned by any old or new Federal department or agency or authority.

Furthermore, no State should be deprived of its fair share of Columbia River power because, as a matter of local option, the State's heavy power-load areas prefer to have power distributed by privately owned utilities which are subject to public regulation.

Here in the Pacific Northwest, as matters now stand, hydroelectric power from projects authorized for Federal construction will dominate and practically monopolize the supply of additional power for the next 30 to 50 years, even though power supply apparently will be short or tight throughout that period. The public preference clauses of existing laws, in the particular situation confronting the Pacific Northwest, could and might operate to deny a State its fair share of Columbia River power.

That situation should be corrected. There should be equitable and nondiscriminatory

apportionment of that power among and within the Pacific Northwest States. We submit that when Federal agencies dominate and, in effect, monopolize the market of power supply, they should be required to supply power on a nondiscriminatory basis.

WHAT BASIS SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED FOR DECISIONS TO AUTHORIZE WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS OF VARIOUS KINDS?

An attempt at a full answer to that question (listed by the Commission) would require many more pages than used in our entire statement. We limit our response to some general comments.

We believe that there cannot be established a practiable, single basis for decisions to authorize the various kinds of water resources projects. The variety is so great that a single basis, regardless of how many factors it might include, would be impracticable.

It should be noted that in addition to engineering feasibility, the main measurement of worth of a navigation, flood-control or reclamation project has been in dollars of estimated cost compared to dollars of estimated benefits.

But some benefits cannot be measured in dollars. Furthermore, some of such benefits are not predictable. The national defense worth of Grand Coulee Dam and power plant is a good example.

When the Columbia Basin project, with its Grand Coulee Dam and power plant, was authorized and undertaken in the thirties the usefulness of its power in wartime production of light metals and plutonium was not predictable. Moreover, even when we now view the situation by hindsight, the worth of that power to the Nation in World War II cannot be measured in dollars. Most of us will agree that it was invaluable. And when we think in terms of current production of fissionable materials in what Mr. Lilienthal calls a desperate competition with the Russian system we continue to feel grateful for the water resource developments in the Columbia and Tennessee river systems that service Hanford and Oak Ridge.

Similarly, we cannot predict precisely the worth to national defense of the reclamation and power developments included in the proposed Mountain Home and Central Arizona projects. In the event industrial and population dispersal becomes necessary in connection with national defense, those inland projects might be invaluable.

We submit that the national defense worth of proposed water resource developments should be considered in determining whether a proposed project should be authorized. However, there should be safeguards that prevent the proponents of projects from using national defense worth as a Santa Claus gift bag.

At present there is no uniformity of repayment requirements in connection with Federal water projects. The Nation's taxpayers build and operate Federal navigation and flood control projects practically without charge to the direct and indirect beneficiaries of those projects. On the other hand, water users on Federal reclamation projects pay operation and maintenance costs on a pay-as-you-go basis. And to the extent of their ability to pay under the terms of applicable reclamation law, they repay, without interest, the cost of reclamation construction. Thus, a river bottom farm in the midwest, without charge, is protected against too much water, while a semiarid farm in the West, within its ability to pay, is charged with the cost of providing it with irrigation water.

We hesitate to propose reimbursability requirements in connection with flood control and navigation projects. But we do make the point that fiscal deficits and national and international defense requirements are casting a financial cloud on the future of water-resources programs which involve great free benefits dependent upon Federal subsidies.

We definitely want to continue the reclamation policy and legal requirement that water users pay operation and maintenance costs on a pay-as-you-go basis, and that, within their ability to pay, they repay to the United States reclamation construction costs, without interest.

Also we believe that out West power revenues from Federal projects (whether Army or reclamation) should furnish financial assistance to reclamation. Comprehensive development of western water resources requires that.

Of course, the financial assistance rendered irrigation by power should not be without limit. A reasonable balance should be maintained.

We believe that here in the Pacific Northwest the States in an interstate compact probably would agree upon apportioning the Columbia River system's water and water power among the States, and upon marketing of the power, in a manner which with reasonable balance would accommodate the various aspirations of the various States and of the various areas within a single State. And if comprehensive development were provided for upon a sound financial basis and in a manner that encourages rather than discourages competitive free enterprise—the consent of Congress probably would be given to whatever the Pacific Northwest States worked out for their own particular situation. We feel certain that the Pacific Northwest States do not want the Federal Government, through a CVA or any other agency, to determine the course of our water resources developments in accordance with whatever a CVA or any other Federal agency might conclude would provide "the highest relative benefits from the water and land resources for the region as a whole."

We realize that the phrase "sound financial basis," as used above in this statement, is not specific on the controversial issue of whether the interest component of power revenues should be used to help irrigation. On that issue the position of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce is influenced somewhat by facts of record and, perhaps, by facts of nature.

It is our position that construction costs allocated to power, together with interest thereon, should in reality be repaid to the Government, and that power rates and therefore power revenues to the United States should include additionally whatever amount is necessary to return reimbursable irrigation construction costs in excess of the amount the water users are able to repay.

We feel that any other position would be a breach of good faith by us. Regardless of whether the controversial Solicitor's opinion be sound or unsound as a matter of law, the record shows that the Spokane Chamber of Commerce, other organizations and Charles Leavy, then Congressman from this district, sought and obtained appropriations for the Columbia Basin project upon the representation that commercial power and the water users together would in reality repay to the United States power costs together with interest and irrigation costs without interest.

Aside from our determination not to breach good faith, we believe that the long-range interest of comprehensive development of water resources in the Pacific Northwest, and in the entire reclamation west, requires that we maintain our good credit standing with Uncle Sam, our ability to justify appropriations. We believe that our credit standing, our ability to justify appropriations, soon will slip if we shift to a basis of repaying Uncle Sam irrigation construction costs without interest and commercial power construction costs with only such interest, if any, as is left after using the interest component of power revenues to provide financial assistance to irrigation.

We realize that, in view of the comparatively less favorable power potential and power costs in other areas of the West, or for other reasons, the Congress may see fit to authorize application of the interest component to financial assistance of irrigation. If it does so, that will be the decision and the legislative policy of Congress. But, for the reasons stated above, we do not recommend such legislative authorization.

THE PROPOSED COLUMBIA BASIN ACCOUNT

As we have stated before, the Spokane Chamber of Commerce favors the use of power revenues, from both reclamation and Army power projects in the Columbia River system, to provide financial assistance to reclamation projects in the Columbia River Basin.

Questions regarding the extent of the assistance to be provided for irrigation and regarding use of the interest component have been discussed above in this statement. Those questions were involved in the proposed legislation to establish a basin account, which Congress declined to include in the recent Rivers and Harbors Act. They are likewise involved in the separate bill now pending.

Also involved in the proposed legislation are provisions that power rates shall cover depreciation of depreciable power properties and amortization of nondepreciable power properties. Nondepreciable properties probably would be few. Depreciable properties probably would include at least the power plants and generating equipment, the transmission system, and the part of dam construction costs allocated to commercial power. Depreciation periods would be of whatever length the Secretary of the Interior deemed reasonable. For some of the properties—especially dams and power houses—the periods might be 100 to 200 years. And over the depreciation periods only replacement reserves would have to be collected. Apparently the proposed legislation would go a long way toward permitting a shift of power features of Army and reclamation projects from a self-liquidating basis to merely a self-sustaining basis.

Those provisions may be a stumbling block to progress of the proposed legislation. If a curious Congressman should inquire: "Is the Nation asked, in effect, to give the Pacific Northwest the power projects and require rates that will produce only enough to operate them and make replacements as the projects depreciate?" A forthright answer apparently would have to be "Yes." And then most Congressmen probably would vote "No."

The proposed legislation is overloaded with the above provisions and others involving major policy matters. Certainly, much of the cargo it seeks to carry into law needs further inspection by Congress and by the States affected.

INDUSTRIAL AND MUNICIPAL WATER SUPPLIES, SOIL EROSION, ABATEMENT OF STREAM POLLUTION, RECREATION, FISH AND WILDLIFE

The above matters are involved in five of the questions listed by the Commission for discussion at the area conferences. Many of them will be discussed at some length by others appearing at the Spokane conference. In this statement we merely make brief comments on soil conservation and on planning.

In the State of Washington, great progress has been made in local organization and performance of soil-conservation work. Statistics show that, in 1948, 65 percent of the farms in this State were included in 45 soil-conservation districts organized under State law. And now in 1950, there are 66 such

districts and they include about 95 percent of the farms. Memberships in the districts are entirely voluntary.

Those local soil-conservation districts, with assistance provided by the Soil Conservation Service and the Washington State College, are making substantial and economical progress in reducing erosion.

Those local soil conservation districts and their work furnish a practical demonstration of how conservation, development and utilization of land and water resources can be organized and carried on by the local people, the private enterprisers, immediately affected. Similarly, the local people affected, their local and State governments and their private enterprises can handle such problems of industrial and municipal water supplies, abatement of stream pollution, recreation, fish and wildlife as are involved in water resources programs—using interstate compacts and commissions where necessary.

With respect to planning of water resources programs, and in conclusion of this statement, we quote from the chapter on Planning in Vannevar Bush's book, Modern Arms and Free Men:

"We want nothing of detailed regimentation in this country; our exuberance in throwing off wartime controls shows this. But we most certainly do want sound planning for the future, and we expect our legislature to regulate our economy soundly in accordance therewith. We want our planning done by sound men in whom we have confidence, and not by faddists, advocates of a rigidly socialized state, or advocates of any ism. Moreover, we want the kind of planning that will release the energies of our people so that the competitive free-enterprise system can work still better."

Respectfully submitted.

J. KENNARD CHEADLE,
Chairman of Columbia Basin Committee and a Vice President of Spokane Chamber of Commerce.

Korean Crisis No Surprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article by Mr. George Sokolsky appearing in today's Washington Times-Herald:

THESE DAYS
(By George Sokolsky)

It is suggested that what has happened in Korea represents a tactical surprise. Nothing could be more false. The Korean situation is the inevitable result of a continuously incorrect policy in the east of Asia, particularly China.

Empires are built step by step, the new line of attack moving out as a bulwark of defense. Once Manchuria came into the possession of Soviet Russia, it was inevitable that Korea would be the next step and following that would be an attack on Japan.

Korea is a peninsula that lies between Manchuria and Japan. It cannot defend itself against an invader from either Manchuria or Japan.

Therefore, all the countries lying close to Korea—China, Russia, and Japan—have vied for control in the modern historical period.

By 1910, Japan was in a position to dominate Korea and to annex it to Japan. The Koreans took that annexation placidly; perhaps because in their own language the name of their country is Chosen—the land of the morning calm.

In fact, the Koreans have been a peaceful people not given to fighting except on rare occasions. They are Buddhists.

Although there was always a revolutionary movement among Koreans living outside of their own country, its influence within Korea was negligible. Among the anti-Japanese revolutionists was one group whose sympathies were western; that is, they tended to place their dependence upon the United States. Many of those who belonged to this group had been educated in American universities or in Christian mission schools in Korea.

There was, however, another group which, along with other Asiatics, turned toward Moscow after the Russian revolution. They were trained in the Sun Yat-sen institute and the Lenin institute in Moscow and fought in the armies of the Chinese Communists under Mao Tse-tung and Chu Teh.

Many of these Korean Communists have had as many as 30 years of training in the Communist movement. Many of them have been active in the civil wars of China since 1924. It is interesting to note that Communists, the world over, place their movement before their country and recognize Russia as holding a special relationship to other countries because it is the motherland of the revolution.

Russia comes into this situation as a result of the Yalta agreement. It must be recalled that when the Yalta agreement was signed, Soviet Russia was neutral in the far eastern war. It was in that war a total of less than a week.

Nevertheless, an agreement was entered into which so completely placed Soviet Russia in control of Manchuria that Korea's future was inevitably to serve as a battleground in the next war.

At the Moscow conference, meeting between December 16 and 26, 1945, Korea was divided between Soviet Russia and the United States.

This was done "with a view to the reestablishment of Korea as an independent state, the creation of conditions for developing the country on democratic principles and the earliest possible liquidation of the disastrous results of the protracted Japanese domination in Korea, there shall be set up a provincial Korean democratic government which shall take all the necessary steps for developing the industry, transport and agriculture of Korea and the national culture of the Korean people."

By this Moscow agreement signed by James F. Byrnes, Ernest Bevin, and V. Molotov on December 27, 1945, Korea was to be held by a joint commission. Actually, the country was divided into two parts on the thirty-eighth parallel, Soviet Russia occupying the northern sector; the United States, the southern sector.

Had no politics been played in the United States, the practical solution would have been to place Korea completely under the control of Gen. Douglas MacArthur as part of Japan.

However, there has been a running fight between the State Department and the Department of Defense over the American policy in China, Japan, and Korea. This quarrel has been reflected in a weakened American implementation of policy.

If the Russians can conquer Korea, our position in Japan is definitely imperiled. For Japan is next and if Japan is taken, Alaska will be untenable. Empire moves unless it is destroyed.

Congress Should Reassume Its Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Passaic, N. J., Herald-News of June 26, 1950:

CONGRESS SHOULD REASSUME ITS AUTHORITY

Until 1934 Congress wrote the tariff laws which protected American wage standards by putting customs duties on goods manufactured abroad under low-wage systems.

In that year Congress surrendered its constitutional right to fix tariff rates. It passed the first Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which gave to the State Department and the President authority to negotiate tariff reductions with other nations.

Cordell Hull was Secretary of State in 1934. Mr. Hull was a Tennessee Democrat, schooled in the free-trade tradition of the cotton-growing South. For generations the South's best customer had been England, which had to import raw materials and export finished products to exist, and which therefore believed in free trade.

The 1934 act gave President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull the right to reduce (or increase) the schedules of the 1930 tariff law by 50 percent. When the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was renewed by another Democratic Congress in 1945, President Truman and his state secretaries were given authority to negotiate reductions in tariff schedules by 50 percent beyond the original 50, or to one-fourth of the duties charged in the 1930 protective tariffs. Delegates of reciprocal trade countries, Americans included, will meet on September 28 at Torquay, an English watering place, and at that Torquay conference, Secretary Acheson may make agreements for further tariff cuts which can be put into effect if Mr. Truman gives his approval.

Like so many other dealings with other countries under the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, reciprocal trade agreements do not guarantee a 50–50 break for the United States. Under the most-favored-nation arrangement, if we give a tariff concession to one of the conference nations, all others get it, too. If as part of a deal with Canada we agree to lower the tariff on Canadian shipments of Scotch whisky into the States (which are never large), the same tariff reduction goes to England and Scotland (whence most of our Scotch comes). Moreover, other nations which are permitted to ship the products of their low-cost labor into the States, under reduced tariffs, can—and frequently do—keep our products out of their ports, or put them at a competitive disadvantage, by restrictive import quotas, license systems and currency manipulations. Any way you look at it, we get the worst of it.

Many of these countries which are causing unemployment in our industrial cities, by underselling American-made goods in the United States—due to wage rates which are only one-fifth to one-third of ours, and because of lowered customs duties which no longer protect—are being put on their feet by ECA's spending of billions of American dollars to rebuild European factories, erect power plants, and supply competitive nations with our most modern machinery.

Administrator Hoffman, who directed the Studebaker automobile business before he

took over ECA's management, blithely tells us now that he's for increasing European imports into the United States, even at the expense of our own domestic enterprises. Mr. Hoffman doesn't speak as an individual; he's President Truman's boss-man in the spending of billions of American tax dollars overseas. He says that inefficient American industries must fold up and their employees must migrate elsewhere and look for jobs in well-run industries. What chance has the Passaic loom fixer or the Garfield weaver of getting a job in a Detroit automobile plant? And, as Lewis Hird told the Committee for Reciprocal Information in Washington, the only inefficiency that can be charged against a competently managed wool-textile industry in the United States is that it pays an average wage of $1.32 an hour, four times what working people are paid in England for the same kind of work.

What's the answer to all this? Control of American tariff rates should be taken away from the State Department, whose international boondoggling has hurt so many American communities and threatens to put more industries out of business and more workmen out of jobs.

Congress, elected by and responsive to the people, should reassert its constitutional authority to levy customs duties to protect American interests when its delegation of authority expires June 30, 1951.

Otherwise the authority that the State Department possesses and misuses today may pass tomorrow to some global agency, as we shall show when we tell about the scope and purpose of the International Trade Organization in a subsequent editorial.

The House Reduces Some Taxes, Increases Others

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, the President sent word to Congress that he would veto any bill to reduce excise taxes not provided for by an increase in other taxes. So, this week, after fiddling all winter, the House Ways and Means Committee has offered to the Congress a bill which shifts taxes, but does not reduce the total tax burden by 1 penny. It lowers excise taxes part way on a few items such as fur coats and pearl necklaces, handbags, and baby oil, but at the same time it raises taxes on the intake of most corporations from 38 to 41 percent. That means raising the taxes by $700,000,000 on the necessities of life such as food, clothing, and houses. These corporations produce 70 percent of all the merchandise the wage-earner consumes so they will have to collect the increased taxes from the workers—the consumers who really pay all taxes.

In addition the corporations must now withhold from all their little stockholders 10 percent of all dividends paid them. The little stockholders may not be subject to any taxes at all but the corporations will have to hold back the taxes anyway. A hospital which collects $20,000 in dividends from endowment funds necessary for its very life, will have $2,000 a year withheld, although it is tax exempt by another provision in the tax law. They may all fill out forms for a refund but before that can happen the next year's taxes are being collected, and so on and so on.

My colleague, Congressman JOHN PHILLIPS, of California, put it well. Speaking of the House Ways and Means Committee he said, "The mountain has labored to bring forth not a mouse but a tax rat, to gnaw at the roots of our economy." We were promised relief; instead we get reductions on luxuries and increases on necessities.

The minority position is that the people need tax relief, and need it quickly. The average American family now pays $31 a week in direct and hidden taxes. The minority say the remedy for the tax gap is a drastic reduction in Federal expenditures.

The administration propagandists are always asking, "How can you reduce expenditures with the cold war?" The opposition answers, "The appalling fact facing the people of this country is that annual Federal expenditures have increased by $10,000,000,000 in the last 2 years. Six billion of this increased spending has no connection with past wars or with national defense, or cold wars." All the talk about our deficit being due to the cold war is phony. The deficit is due to the way the Fair Dealers bring in bill after bill for the expenditure of a "token sum" on some grand new project, which is not going to cost us billions for another year or two. That is what Oscar Ewing and the other "planners" are hired for. The public thinks the small sum will not do any harm. The new program is authorized. And in a few years the infant project has grown and grown until it takes billions a year to keep it fed. Within 4 or 5 years the cost of these noble experiments will have risen to $25,000,000,000 a year.

Just do a little figuring for yourself—a practice thoroughly disliked and denounced by the Fair Dealers. If we add $25,000,000,000 to our present budget the annual budget will be $65,000,000,000. But we cannot pay for this year's budget of $42,000,000,000. There will be a deficit of at least $5,000,000,000. We are broke now.

During the most critical time in our Nation's history—World War II—the greatest amount of revenue that could be raised by tapping every source of taxes was just under $45,000,000,000. Even if we were willing to surrender our private-enterprise system for a socialistic economy we could not possibly raise the $65,000,000,000 required to finance President Truman's program of promises.

To quote from the minority report:

If this Nation is to have real, and not a temporary paper prosperity leading only to economic catastrophe and a controlled economy, Federal expenditures must be immediately reduced.

The report concludes:

But President Truman and the Democratic majority refuse to place the next generation above the next election.

The tax and tax, then borrow and borrow so as to spend and spend, vote and vote goes right on and on.

President Praises Labor Unions—Explains Point 4 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach the address given by President Truman before the annual convention of the American Newspaper Guild in Washington, June 28. Current happenings are confirming the wisdom of our foreign-aid program. The President's speech clearly illustrates why the point 4 program is so necessary to the future well-being of underdeveloped areas—and to our own future as well:

[From the New York Times of June 29, 1950]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO NEWSPAPER GUILD ON POINT 4 PROGRAM

Mr. President it's a pleasure to be with you today and I was just explaining to your president out in the hall a conversation with our former Ambassador at Large (W. Averell Harriman). I had a conversation with him just a short time ago and he was telling me what a contribution Mr. Martin (Harry Martin, president of the Guild and Director of Labor Information for the Economic Cooperation Administration) had made to ECA. I appreciate it.

It is a pleasure to meet with a group which plays so vital a part in upholding the American tradition of a free and responsible press. The men and women whom you represent perform a great function in gathering and disseminating the news of the world. Never has this function been so important to the general welfare as it is today.

When the Newspaper Guild was organized 17 years ago, its main purpose was to establish better economic standards for the working force of the American press. Over the years the guild has established such improved standards. Its efforts have greatly benefited many members of the newspaper profession.

One of the most important activities of the guild and all our labor unions is to work with the free trade-union movement of other countries. The A. F. of L., the CIO, the railway brotherhoods and all our major unions have extended the hand of fellowship and friendly assistance to the free trade-unions of the world.

Nothing is more vital to the cause of free institutions everywhere than this work of our labor unions. In many countries, working men and women have been the object of intensive propaganda and infiltration by the Communist movement. Our free trade-unions better than anyone else can effectively demonstrate to these people that the Communists are not interested in their welfare, but only in using them to further the imperialistic designs of an aggressive foreign power.

Our unions can best show the workers of other lands that the democratic way, not the Communist way, is the road to real economic advancement. Out of our own experience

we know what can be done to improve the economic conditions of working people.

It is hard for us to realize just how bad economic conditions are for many peoples of the world. Famine, disease, and poverty are the scourge of vast areas of the globe. Hundreds of millions of people in Asia, for example, have a life expectancy of 30 years or less. That's what this country had when the people landed at Jamestown. Many of these people live on inadequate diets, unable to perform the tasks necessary to earn their daily bread. Animal plagues and plant pests carry away their crops and their livestock. Misuse of natural resources exposes their land to flood and drought.

THREAT TO SECURITY

Conditions such as these are the seedbed of political unrest and instability. They are a threat to the security and growth of free institutions everywhere. It is in areas where these conditions exist that communism makes its greatest inroads. The people of these areas are eagerly seeking better living conditions. The Communists are attempting to turn the honest dissatisfaction of these people with their present conditions into support for Communist efforts to dominate their nations.

In addition to these attempts at persuasion, the Communists in these countries use the weapon of fear. They constantly threaten internal violence and armed aggression.

The recent unprovoked invasion of the Republic of Korea by Communist armies is an example of the danger to which the underdeveloped areas particularly are exposed.

It is essential that we do everything we can to prevent such aggression and to enforce the principles of the United Nations Charter. We must and we shall give every possible assistance to people who are determined to maintain their independence. We must counteract the Communist weapon of fear.

But we must not be misled into thinking that our only task is to create defenses against aggression. Our whole purpose in creating a strong defense is to permit us to carry on the great constructive tasks of peace. Behind the shield of a strong defense we must continue to work to bring about better living conditions in the free nations.

Particularly in the underdeveloped areas of the world we must work cooperatively with local governments which are seeking to improve the welfare of their pepole. We must help them to help themselves. We must aid them to make progress in agriculture, in industry, in health, and in the education of their children. Such progress will increase their strength and their independence.

The growing strength of these countries is important to the defense of all free nations against Communist aggression. It is important to the economic progress of the free world. And these things are good for us as well as good for them.

For these reasons I recommended in my inaugural address the program that has become known as point 4. The Congress authorized technical assistance to underprivileged areas under this program. This new law marked congressional endorsement of a practical and sensible course of action that can have tremendous benefits for the future of the world.

HE GIVES EXAMPLES

It is possible to make tremendous improvements in underdeveloped areas by very simple and inexpensive means. Simple measures, such as the improvement of seed and animal stocks, the control of insects, the dissemination of health information, can make great changes almost overnight. This does not require vast expenditures. It requires only expert assistance offered to the people on a genuinely cooperative basis. We have already seen, on a relatively small scale, what can be accomplished.

I am going to give you a factual—in fact a reporter's—account of a few technical assistance projects which have raised living standards in the countries where they were carried out. These are a preview of what a full-scale point 4 program can mean in the future.

In northern India there is a very rich farming area known as the Terai district. In recent years the malaria mosquito forced people to leave this land. One hundred and four villages were abandoned. Even in the face of India's tragic food shortage, no crops were planted in this rich soil.

India called on the World Health Organization for help, and that organization sent a malaria control team which arrived in northern India in April 1949. In the face of great difficulties, this international group sprayed the area with DDT.

Today, a year later, no infected mosquito is to be found in any village in the Terai district. Local workers have been trained to continue the spraying. Families who were refugees from malaria only a year ago are back in their homes, and their fields are green again.

This demonstrates how a simple program can make tremendous improvements in a short time.

Let me give you another example of what point 4 can mean; this one in Iran. This story concerns not an international organization, but one of our American voluntary groups, the Near East Foundation.

Four years ago, the Government of Iran asked the foundation to set up a demonstration project in a group of 35 villages not far from the capital, Tehran. The foundation brought village leaders to a series of training courses. It won their confidence, and through these leaders it began to carry out agricultural and health improvements.

The foundation met a water shortage by drilling deep wells. It overcame water-borne diseases with an inexpensive water filter. It sprayed homes with DDT. It sprayed crops with insecticides. It helped to organize schools in each of the 35 villages.

GRAIN YIELD TRIPLED

Today, only 4 years later, the village people are at work in new carpentry shops, vegetable gardens and orchards. And, most startling of all, the yield of grain in this area has tripled.

The effects of the Near East Foundation's work are spreading throughout Iran. This story will be matched many times over, under the point 4 program.

My next illustration is in the Republic of Liberia on the west coast of Africa. Here a United States Government economic mission has been working since 1944—headed, incidentally, by a former agricultural extension agent from Missouri, one of the Missouri gang you hear so much about.

This mission in Liberia has laid out roads, and mapped the timber supply, and helped to open up an iron deposit. Agricultural technicians have helped to expand rice production for the local market, and the production of palm oil and cocoa for export.

The effect of these steps has been remarkable. In one village near Monrovia, the cash income of the people, derived from selling rice, cocoa, and palm oil, has increased from $5 per person a year to $35 since the arrival of our economic mission.

Our mission—which has only five Americans in it—has worked in close cooperation with the Liberian Government. That Government already has built three new agricultural experiment stations. This is remarkable progress but it is only the beginning of the economic development which Liberia needs to become a prosperous member of the family of nations.

These achievements I have cited are samples of the kind of work that needs so badly to be done in underdeveloped areas all over the world.

Under the expanded point 4 program, we can greatly enlarge the scope of these activities. There are tremendous opportunities to improve living standards for wide areas of the globe. It may prove altogether possible, for example, through the activities of the Food and Agriculture Organization, to wipe out the scourge of rinderpest, the fatal animal disease that is responsible for much of the rural poverty in the Far East.

The development of hybrid rice seed, which the Food and Agriculture Organization is now working on, could conceivably increase rice production by 10 percent, and improve the health and living conditions in the Orient immeasurably. As an example of what hybrid seed can do, our corn hybrids, where they have been used in Italy, have increased corn production by over 25 percent.

Aside from these basic improvements in agriculture and health, it is equally important, in many areas, to build modern communication and transportation systems, and to establish local industries. Without these, the underdeveloped areas cannot put their natural resources to use for their own benefit and in profitable trade with the rest of the world.

CHARGES SHORT-SIGHTEDNESS

Building roads and railroads and factories will require considerable amounts of public and private capital. To aid the flow of American capital abroad, I have recommended that the Congress provide for limited guaranties to encourage greater investments overseas. I am hopeful that this legislation will be enacted soon.

Point 4 is not new—and should not become a matter for partisan differences of opinion. However, some critics have attempted to ridicule point 4 as a do-good measure; others have said it is a waste of money. This is the most foolish kind of short-sightedness. If we fail to carry out a vigorous point 4 program we run the risk of losing to communism, by default, hundreds of millions of people who now look to us for help in their struggle against hunger and despair.

And what we want to do is to teach these people how to help themselves.

Point 4 is a successor to the old colonialism idea, the exploiting idea of the middle seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. We want to have a prosperous world that will be interested in buying the immense amount of surplus things that we are going to have to sell. And now to do that they have got to have something to give back to us in order that they can buy our goods. I want to keep this factory organization of ours going at full tilt.

In order to do that we must help these people to help themselves.

Point 4 is an investment in a peaceful and prosperous world. It is a program which will bring increasing results over the years. It will bring about a chain reaction in economic development. It will serve to create economic health where poverty existed, and to equip the people of underdeveloped areas to carry forward their economic gains and preserve their independence.

A major share of this world campaign to improve the livelihood of peoples will be carried out under the United Nations.

In the United Nations Charter, each government pledged that it would promote solutions of international, economic, social, health, and related problems.

IDEA OFFERS NEW HOPE

At the last session the General Assembly voted unanimously to support a technical assistance program for raising the standards of living in underdeveloped areas.

Two weeks ago the United Nations conducted a technical assistance conference to make plans to raise funds for this new program. Fifty-four nations attended and fifty of them offered contributions.

By the end of the conference more than $20,000,000 had been pledged. The United States pledged $12,000,000 subject, of course, to appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress. This was the largest single contribution, but in relation to their resources a number of other nations contributed more.

The outstanding characteristic of this technical assistance conference is the fact that it demonstrates clearly the common desire of the peoples of the world to work together for human advancement. In a world dark with apprehension, the point 4 idea offers new hope.

All our citizens must play a part in making the point 4 program a success. Our missionary groups, our philanthropic, and charitable agencies, must continue the efforts they have been making over the years for the improvement of conditions in foreign lands.

Our young people can find careers in the pioneering work of bringing technical assistance to these countries. Our unions and our business organizations should enlarge their foreign contracts and bring the benefits of their experience to less developed countries. You newspaper men and women can help point 4 to achieve its aims by telling its story to the American people and to the people of the world.

Our point 4 program and the work of the United Nations are constructive ways to build the kind of world where all nations can live in peaceful prosperity, dedicated to the purpose of creating better lives for their people. We support this program because we seek a peaceful world, and a free world, where all men can live as good neighbors.

Snakes in the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, at a time of violent communistic aggression in much of Asia, and at a time of attempted communistic infiltration at home, the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer editorial of June 28, 1950, is of compelling interest. The editorial follows:

SNAKES IN THE FLAG

Let everyone who fears that we look too sternly upon sympathizers with radical dogma remember the words spoken recently by a wise, old man, Bernard M. Baruch, at Washington University.

"Communism in America," he said, "is not a political philosophy. It is not a political organization. It is not an expression of free thought. In America it is a criminal conspiracy, inspired and ruled by the Kremlin. Let us not quibble about this. It is not a matter of red baiting, or red herrings. It is a question of survival."

Courageously, the elder statesman approached another problem to be found on every college and university campus; a problem posed in part by honest men who believe that their opinion is right.

"You will find among us," said Baruch, "those who talk—who prate—of academic freedom, including, they say, absolute freedom to think and to teach. That is a dangerous romanticism, quite opposed to the naked reality.

"In the discussion of academic freedom, I beg you to remember that those who accept the Communist doctrine must accept the Communist discipline. They may not deviate from the line.

"In democracy we object to the slightest interference with the freedom of opposition; with the right of investigation; with researches into truth; or with conclusions freely arrived at.

"But we, as a country, reserve the right to prohibit teaching that is subversive, that is destructive to our form and spirit of government.

"We hold there is no academic freedom for those who are compelled to take orders from non-American sources, hostile to the spirit of our very existence. We refuse to surrender the right of self-preservation."

Pointing out that the educated man is a protector of his own and his fellows' freedom, Baruch added: "They are his enemies who lessen and destroy that freedom. And nowhere can this evil effort be begun as easily as in the schoolroom and in the community centers. It is there we must watch for the snakes in the flag."

It were well that we recall Baruch's formula for a national point of view, as follows: Establishment and maintenance of world peace; setting up of a peace waging commission; proper national armament; stoppage of unnecessary expenditures at this time; avoidance of further inflation; continuance of international aid; continuance of membership in the United Nations; continuance of the search for treason.

Past experience has shown that the elder statesman usually knows what he is talking about.

One final point should be remembered next election day.

"The 1948 Presidential election brought out scarcely one-half of all who were entitled to the great gift of suffrage, the final expression of our citizenship," Baruch declared. "Only 60 percent of the graduates of American colleges and universities voted."

Voting Is a Privilege

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the South Lyon Herald, South Lyon, Mich., of June 22, 1950.

This editorial indicates the extent to which people are losing interest in their privilege to vote. What is true in South Lyon was true throughout the Nation in the last national election when 51 percent of the registered voters of the country failed to exercise their right of suffrage.

If we fail to use the ballot, some day we may lose the ballot.

The editorial follows:

DOWN MAIN—AND UP THE ALLEY

(By Herb)

The failure of millions of Americans to exercise their right to vote is a national disgrace. In the last Presidential election, for instance, less than half of the eligible voters troubled to go to the polls. In many elections in which the Presidency is not involved, less than a third of the voters cast ballots. What we have, as a result, is government by minority. Right here in our community last week there was a school election in which only 36 voters bothered to cast their votes out of a potential of 1,500 voters. Luckily those elected in that election have the welfare of the community at heart and have proven themselves as able custodians of the trust placed in them. It makes one shudder though when we stop to think that 40 disgruntled citizens could have banded together and placed anyone of their liking in the offices in question. Free elections are at the root of all our freedoms. But free elections mean little if the people are too lazy or too indifferent to participate. A person who does not vote has no moral right to criticize the acts and policies of officeholders. When you vote you are building on the foundation of the best system of government ever devised. And that is as true of local elections as national elections. The primary elections will be held in Michigan within a few months. The candidates of the parties will be chosen and start their campaigns for election in November. If you want your party to nominate the candidate you believe best fitted, go to the polls. If you value your freedom—if you have any interest at all in defending and maintaining a free Nation—vote. Vote in every election, whether it involves a president or local officials. Every time you fail to vote, you fail to discharge the most basic American duty.

Iowa's Place in the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by me at Rake, Winnebago County, Iowa, on June 24, 1950, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of founding of the town:

IOWA'S PLACE IN THE NATION

As we gather here in Rake in the fiftieth year of its existence as a town, we have nothing but pride to register as we look at the history and enthusiasm for the future. For wherever Americans unite to form a town, we hope for their success; and as you people have proved, when the Americans are Iowans, too, success is assured.

A contemporary author has said, "Buildings and bridges do not make a town." How true that is. One single man of wealth could erect many fine buildings, paved streets, and beautiful parks, but without the support of cooperation of other men, it would never be a town. It takes understanding and sympathetic cooperation on the part of many to make a community thrive. Such qualities have built the hundreds of towns throughout our State. For it has been our people of Iowa who have worked to make our Hawkeye State the greatest in the Nation, the same stock that came into this prairie and built Rake and the farms of Winnebago County.

Less than 100 years ago this land of north central Iowa was completely unsettled—the prairie sod had not been broken, the trees had not been cut, and none of the marshes had been drained. The only explorers of the

area now known as Winnebago County were hunters and trappers who came to avail themselves of the natural wealth in the form of game and fur animals. When they told others about the country to the northwest, however, a few settlers became interested in the place where good prairie lands, abundant water, and much timber were so near at hand.

It was in 1855 that the first few families of settlers came to Winnebago County, most of them settling in the eastern part of the county and establishing farms. From that time on, there was a fairly steady stream of people from the east moving into the county and making their homes there. The settlement at first corresponded rather closely with the wooded areas, the pioneers being practical people with an eye to ease in providing shelter. The first houses were of the log-cabin type, and usually were built through the combined efforts of friends and neighbors at "house-raisings." Although they were rather crude structures, they sufficed as shelter against the Iowa winters and were used until better homes could be provided.

The early Iowans lived a self-sufficient life, through necessity. The nearest postoffice was in Cedar Falls, around 100 miles away, and the only mail service was received through the good will of neighbors who were making the trip to Cedar Falls to have flour milled and who brought back mail for all the settlers. No telephones or good roads were at hand to make life enjoyable for farmers; supplies were bought for long periods of time whenever the head of the family made the long trip to a store. Even clothing was made at home—the farmers kept sheep, and every woman and girl knew how to card, spin, and weave wool with the old-fashioned spinning wheels and hand looms. What a far cry from the modern stores found in every Iowa town of today, plus the service of shopping by mail through the efficiency of the United States postal service.

A postoffice, established in Forest City in 1857, brought the outside world much closer to the residents of Winnebago County, but still they were faced with the problems of carrying their grain long distances to be milled, and they also had difficulty in getting their products to market. Often a group of settlers would choose a market day and make the trip of 140 to 170 miles to McGregor or Dubuque together so that the hazards and monotony of the journey were somewhat lessened. In the early days, market prices were so low that the trip sometimes seemed hardly worth while—their wheat brought 40 cents a bushel, and dressed pork sold for 2 or 3 cents a pound.

The State of Iowa was less than 10 years old when this section was settled. After a small population was established, the county and local governments were soon organized. In 1857 Winnebago was chartered as a separate county, having been included with various other counties before that time. Elected officers took charge of the government in the same year, and the newly laid out town of Forest City was designated as the county seat. The first courthouse was built in 1863, but was replaced later by a more appropriate, larger structure.

By the turn of the century Winnebago County was thriving as a farming area, and three railroads had built lines to serve the population. In 1900, the town of Rake was established on the Rock Island line, and soon afterward a bank was incorporated here. In the 50 years since that time, Rake has served this farming community as a shopping center and shipping point for the northwest part of Winnebago County.

As we gather to celebrate Rake's fiftieth anniversary, it is appropriate that we review the reasons for the outstanding position held by our great State today. Situated in the heart of the continent, Iowa has a fortunate position between two great rivers—the Mississippi and the Missouri. The tall corn for which our State is famed is a result of a combination of the rich soil which our forefathers chose as the basis for settlement and the farming skills which they brought with them and developed through years of experience. The present high level of living which our farm families enjoy—Iowa is one of the top-level States in that respect—is a product of that same combination of soil and skill.

Of course, we have been aware of the superiority of Iowa farm land all our lives, since every farm child in our State soon comes to know that the tall corn of Iowa is unlike the crops by the same name in other States. But there are certain facts which prove these statements even to the citizens of those other States. For instance, within the boundaries of the Hawkeye State lies 25 percent of all the grade A land in the United States; one-fourth of the top-grade land is located in a State that ranks twenty-fourth in size when total area is compared. This is a gift for which we are truly thankful. But the credit for maintaining this land and making it produce goes to the people of Iowa—hard-working farmers, descended from pioneers like the ones who paved the way here in Winnebago County. These people have put 97 percent of the total area of the State under cultivation; this is an almost unheard-of proportion. Certainly we have little wasted space to account for.

On this land we produce a great variety of crops, with corn as the king of them all. We lead all the other States as well as any foreign country in the production of this crop, and it was in our State the hybrid seed was developed that revolutionized the entire industry—we have shared our wealth and our skill with our neighbors.

This golden grain goes to market itself, but it also provides for the livestock feeding which is an important part of our State economy. A total of 3,750,000,000 pounds of pork were produced on Iowa farms in 1949, and cattle are sent each year from the western ranges to be fattened for market in our State. One-eighth of the total value of production of livestock and livestock products in the United States comes from Iowa. In 1949 Iowa received almost $2,000,000,000 from the sale of livestock and livestock products. This is a sizable total in itself; but it is even more astonishing when we consider that the nearest any other State came to our level was Illinois with around one billion as a total.

In other agricultural crops and products, we have set similar records. The Hawkeye State is the leader in the production of oats, also, and we take our place as the world center for the production of popcorn and timothy seed.

In addition to the natural wealth provided by our soils, our mineral resources have proved themselves vital to the United States. Most important among them are the coal, stone, gypsum, cement, and clay products. The coal especially has added an important industry to our State and our Nation.

But to turn from an appraisal of our natural wealth, let us look at the result of this combination of wealth and skill—what exactly have these gifts of God meant to us during the history of our State? Has the extraordinary situation which produces record crops made an impact in any other way? To this question we can answer an emphatic "yes." Iowa leads all other States in per capita wealth, indicating that our people may enjoy more of the pleasures of life because they live here. This unusual level of living is illustrated in other ways; because we are primarily farming people we are interested in the way our farming population lives. We find that more than 86 percent of Iowa farm houses have electricity to serve them. This is a much greater percentage than any of our neighboring States, and it rates us among the top States in the entire country. Well over 90 percent of our farms are equipped with radios—certainly the families of today are not cut off from the world as the pioneers were when they broke the sod.

In farm machinery Iowans have also shown their desire for better farming methods and equipment. The total value of farm machinery is greater in the Hawkeye State than in any other—this, too, in a State that ranks twenty-fourth in size. More Iowa farm people travel by automobile than in the rest of the country; more than 90 percent of the farms are equipped with cars, and the State provides the highways for them to drive over. We have a surfaced-road system of 52,524 miles, which makes our average of surfaced roads per square mile of area greater than in any other State. About 80 percent of our farms are within a mile of all-weather roads, so the trip to market or to shipping points becomes an easy task rather than a journey of several days which often did not pay the farmer.

Iowa is equally proud of the sustained interest in education and cultural pursuits which has kept our State close to the top in literacy since 1870. She now holds first place. The first public-school law was passed in Iowa in 1839—7 years before the State entered the Union. Within the year after we became a State, the State University of Iowa was organized. Today more than 50 buildings are scattered on the 385-acre campus which is cut in two by the Iowa River and dominated by the old stone capitol so dear to all Iowa hearts. Over 10,000 students are enrolled in courses including the liberal arts, medicine, law, dentistry, pharmacy, engineering, education, commerce, journalism, religion, and the fine arts. In a very real sense, the university reflects the rich cultural tradition, the fine family environment, and the splendid education facilities throughout the State. Walter Damrosch first called Nationwide attention to Iowa's love of music when he noted that he received more letters from here than from any other State. The annual musical festival and the fine concert and symphony programs at the university draw a State-wide audience. Iowa's graduate school of art, which was inspired by a group of Iowa artists, is the largest in the country. The list of famous Iowa writers includes many well-known names. Since its first newspaper, the Dubuque Visitor, appeared in 1836, the press in Iowa has grown to produce prize-winning country weeklies as well as the famous newspapers and widely read magazines.

The Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts at Ames, established in 1858, not only serves as the home of Iowa agriculture but has become internationally famous in its field. Radio broadcasts, home-demonstration agents, and printed matter spread the knowledge gained in laboratory and experimental farms operated by the college to all of our farmers and to their sons and daughters.

The enrollment at the Ames campus averages about 8,000 students, divided among the many departments in agriculture, engineering, home economics, and other technical fields. Research is carried on by the college in many locations throughout the State and also in Guatemala, where a center has been established to further the development of hybrid corn. Other forward-looking projects under way at the State college include the construction of a large new building to be used for continuing research in atomic energy. This is a direct outgrowth of the work carried on at Ames during the war, when the scientists aided in research on the atomic bomb. Recently another first for the State was scored by Iowa State College when it

was the first land-grant college to put on a regular educational program by television for the rural communities of central Iowa.

It is a privilege for me to bring you a part of the story of Iowa—of its history, its people, its industries, and its farms. As our Iowa farmer and laborer work today, they know that our State is important not only to the Nation but to the world. It is endowed by nature and by its citizens with the capacity to respond to the world's plea for food. It is geographically situated to distribute that food to the Nation's markets and the Nation's ports. And with its paved roads, its extensive railroad mileage, and its broad rivers, it has the transportation facilities to get the food moving to the consumer.

Today the young men and women of Iowa are seeing visions just as their grandfathers dreamed dreams as they sat on the hard seats of covered wagons. As farm markets have become a part of the great complexity of world trade and world politics—and as they themselves have participated in a war which took them to so many parts of the globe—they have gained at once a new perspective and a new appreciation for our home State. Our radios and newspapers bring the football games, the fashions, and the symphonies of the world into our homes; our automobiles and our airplanes make the whole country more accessible. They have seen the bitter fruits of concentrated living. And they believe that only as our country fuses the vigor and might of the cities with the peace and security of our farms will we achieve a new beauty and harmony and completeness which will be our own.

Woolen Goods

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at the present time a United States citizen visiting Canada and other countries can bring back merchandise in the amount of $200 duty free if he had been in Canada or another foreign country for 2 days. If he had been in Canada or another foreign country for 12 days, he can bring back merchandise in the amount of $500 duty free, if he has not had a previous allowance in the preceding 6 months.

Mr. Speaker, the woolen industry, especially in New England, is having a very difficult time for its existence. The mills have been closed; they do not have the necessary number of orders due to foreign competition. Now, on top of that the administration is not being fair, through reciprocal trade agreements in the amount of woolen goods that are allowed to come into the United States. They are permitting persons returning to the United States from foreign countries to bring $500 duty free worth of woolen cloth every 6 months. You can imagine what is going to happen further to hurt the woolen industry and to put hundreds out of work. With Americans going to Canada and many are going to the Oberammergau Passion Play in Europe and this summer there are great church conventions in Europe with thousands of Americans going to Europe and bringing back quantities of woolen cloth. It is fine to help foreign countries to survive economically, but it should not be done at the great expense of our own. Friends of mine who are traveling abroad this summer tell me that they are besieged with requests to bring back woolens when they return to the United States.

Editorial Comment on the Road Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of the Members of this House to what the Louisville Courier-Journal recently termed a "glaring example of journalism at less than its best."

In an editorial dealing with deficiencies in two monthly periodicals, the Courier-Journal concerns itself principally with the handling given a condensation of John T. Flynn's The Road Ahead in the Reader's Digest. The editorial is a revelation of how far the proponents of Mr. Flynn's pernicious flummery are willing to go in their attempt to sell the American people disreputable and discredited propaganda. Here are excerpts from the editorial:

The graver of these two adventures in misformation is the Reader's Digest condensation of a grossly biased and misleading work by John T. Flynn. This man's career as writer and pamphleteer is based primarily upon a hysteric Roosevelt phobia. The extraordinary malice and distortion of his every reference to Roosevelt qualify him as a member in high standing of the Pegler-McCormick club, but not as a reasonable critic of the contemporary scene.

You may remember that on June 5 I outlined the singular career of Mr. Flynn as a propagandist imbued with Roosevelt hatred.

But to continue the editorial:

Mr. Flynn's last book, The Road Ahead, purports to show that this country is traveling a similar concealed road to socialism and statism as was traveled by Britain in the earlier years of this century. His digest of the history of the British Labor Party is wholly distorted and inaccurate. But upon it he builds a shaky and elaborate parallel of our headlong progression toward socialism. The book is unworthy of serious attention, as all of Mr. Flynn's efforts are. Any magazine publisher or newspaper editor who took seriously his duty toward his readers would in choosing any Flynn work for publication feel bound to point out the facts of the author's known bias and suggest that his readers take it into account when weighing his arguments.

But the Reader's Digest, which has built up an incredible circulation of 9,000,000 by picking other magazines' brains, largely of innocuous items, has delivered Mr. Flynn without warning into the homes of all these earnest citizens. It did more. It headlined and advertised this condensation, placed it in the front of its February issue, and pressed it with seven quoted paragraphs of resounding praise. Of these encomiums, however, two are editorials, one from the McCormick-inspired New York Daily News, the other from the Hearst-owned New York Journal-American. Both of these newspapers repeat the Flynn arguments daily in their editorial columns. * * *

Of the three others, one is a sentence from the New York Herald Tribune's review, one a comment by Benjamin Stolberg, a veteran New Deal critic, and the third is by Karl Schriftgiesser, a reviewer for the New York Times. In his selection of The Road Ahead for reprint the editor of Reader's Digest may have been guilty of no more than enthusiastic agreement with a biased viewpoint. In his choice of all the reviews but this last one, he may have meant no more than to buttress his choice with the views of like-minded persons. But the quotation from Mr. Schriftgiesser's review must be described as deliberate dishonesty.

Here is how the Digest quotes the Times reviewer:

One of the two "most important books about the contemporary scene that we will have this year."

Here is what the Times review really said about the Flynn book:

One of the two "most important books about the contemporary American scene that we will have this year" * * * because "they are the latest and most extreme manifestations of an endemic hysteria presently affecting a considerable segment of our population."

Elsewhere Mr. Schriftgiesser has described this books as "brazen nonsense" and "pernicious flummery." But Digest readers have not been told this.

Such is the curious respect in which the Digest is held by its innumerable subscribers that Mr. Flynn's wildly inaccurate warning has become a sort of Bible to segments of the worried middle class of this country. It has been reviewed at women's clubs, discussed by high-school debaters, read with bewilderment by thousands of good people who had innocently supposed until now that we were doing pretty well. Not many newspapers, outside of those which endorsed this book, would be guilty of passing off so flagrant an expression of editorial opinion as a feature of their news columns. * * *

The Digest flirtation with John T. Flynn may be something else again. This is not the first time the Digest has imposed upon its vast circulation some point of conservative dogma that is dubious in derivation and shaky in fact. It probably will not be the last. But it is depressing that a publication so noted for unction and a treacly piety has so little understanding that its power for mass dissemination of ideas carries a corresponding obligation of intellectual honesty. The Digest is undeniably powerful. Even its best friends, however, cannot defend its right to sell Mr. Flynn under false pretenses.

To the editorial I might add that even Mr. Flynn's best friends, those who direct and support financially the Committee for Constitutional Government and the other hate organizations which help to circulate Flynn's paean to primitivism, should not be in a position to deny the American public the right to know who is behind this antisocial nonsense.

When they deny the House Lobbying Committee knowledge of their contributions they are committing as grave an offense against the American public as the offense of the Reader's Digest cited by the Louisville Courier-Journal.

I suspect, however, that Mr. Flynn's best friends are the Reader's Digest's best

friends. In neither capacity are they interested in the welfare of the American people or the dissemination of honest information.

Extension of Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the 27th, I was unavoidably detained in my district in the interests of my constituents and so I did not vote on the bill to extend the Selective Service Act which was considered on that day, and I take this opportunity of putting myself on record as being very much in favor of its extension and stating that if I had been present I would have voted in the affirmative.

I also want to take this opportunity to express my entire satisfaction and approval of the President's statement in regard to the Korean situation and the measures which he has instituted for the promotion of peace in the world and the protection of liberty. His action was prompt and courageous and I feel sure it has the universal support not only of the people of this Nation but of liberty-loving people throughout the world.

Show-Down With Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very pertinent and pointed editoral, analyzing the latest Soviet outrage in Korea, which appeared in the June 27 issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette. The article follows:

KOREA ANOTHER COMMUNIST OUTPOST?

If the show-down with communism is not to be in Korea, where is it to be? In the Philippines? In the East Indies? Or in those islands which, one by one, were made historic by American tenacity, American heroism, and American blood, as all branches of our forces fought their desperate way to reestablish the American flag as a symbol of victory and freedom? Was the only mistake the Japanese aggressive tyranny made that of attacking us at Pearl Harbor? If they had not done that would we have remained inactive while they conquered the Philippines, the Netherlands East Indies, Borneo, New Guinea, Australia, and New Zealand?

But they did attack Pearl Harbor, and we summoned all our resources to throw them back, not only from Hawaii, Wake, and Guam, but from the Philippines, which we had rescued from Spain, administered, and set up as a free nation. And from there we pressed on against both Japan and Germany. We were in the war. We did not say it was merely a war to repel an attack. We said it was a war to establish freedom. And we won it. In the Pacific we won it practically alone. Five days before our complete victory, Russia, which had held aloof, came in almost without firing a shot in anger, and so far she has been rewarded by the bringing into her orbit, with only perfunctory protest, most of Asia. She intends to get all of it.

We occupied Korea below the thirty-eighth parallel and, having rid it of the enemy and organized it toward a democratic orientation, we, under the aegis of the United Nations, set up a free democratic government there. As much as any such thing could be, this was our baby. It carried our prestige, and our assertions of the blessings of democracy and individual freedom. The Russians scorned it. They supported in northern Korea the formation of a government nearer to their hearts' desire. Neither they nor the puppet government they established ever for a moment tried to conceal the fact that they were not content to be just another government of another section of Korea, but intended, either by peaceful or violent methods, to take over the whole country.

And now they have struck. It would be silly to suppose that the northern Koreans have created the equipment for this blow from their own resources. They have been supplied by Russia. No doubt the plan and the timetable are Russian, also. The resistance—or lack of it—they are meeting, indicates a much more thorough job of organization by those who have fostered the attack than by those who have fostered the spirit or organization of defense.

As in the case of China, every disquietude and discontent has been manipulated for the advantage of the attackers. This is the same process in miniature as was followed in China. The methods are the same. If our attitude is the same the result will be the same.

Russia uses the armies created by discontent and by the ambitions of leaders opposed to existing governments; as her mercenaries. But the conquests are hers, nevertheless. And through some sense of delicacy lest we come in conflict with her before she comes in conflict against us, or through some sort of intellectual confusion caused by a dubious weighing of too many speculations, we find ourselves helpless.

Somewhere, on the threshold of history, there is a grim and perhaps tragic reality. We had better forget the intellectual processes and find out what it is, very quickly. Korea is a pistol pointed at Japan and covering Sumatra, the Philippines, and the East Indies, and this is a calculated defiance of the United States and the United Nations.

Queens Man in the Street Agrees With Truman on Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I ask that there be printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Queens Man in the Street Agrees With Truman on Korea," that appeared on the front page of the Long Island Daily Press, June 28, 1950:

RED AGGRESSION MUST BE STOPPED—QUEENS MAN IN THE STREET AGREES WITH TRUMAN ON KOREA

As American armed might moved into South Korea, the Queens Man in the Street made it clear:

He's backing President Truman.

Reporters buttonholed the Man in the Street—men and women at the One Hundred and Sixty-ninth Street IND Subway station in Jamaica—as news of the President's military aid spread through Queens.

Most of those questioned agreed with the decision to defend South Korea. Here are the typical answers:

John Boechel, 50, a bank clerk of 89-10 Two Hundred and Second Street, Hollis, veteran of 2 wars: "The sooner you stop aggression, the better. I can't understand why we've waited so long to stop the Reds. We've let the satellite countries get away with a lot. Now's the time to show them the United States won't stand for aggression."

Joseph Dwyer, 39, of 211-06 Ninetieth Avenue, Bellaire, a supervisor: "By nipping this war in the bud, we may prevent a larger, more serious conflict. If we let the Communists trample over free territory in Korea, what's to stop them from trying it anywhere else? It's too soon after World War II to forget how hungry a dictatorship can get."

Eugene Cunningham, 30, ex-sergeant in the Air Forces: "I had 4 years service in the last war. I think we should have moved a long time ago. I can't see us getting kicked around. It's a good move, even if it is late."

Arlene Carry, 22, a secretary of 93-14 Two Hundred and Forty-second Street, Bellerose: "I wouldn't like to see my fiancé off to another war, but communism should be stopped. This may start another world war. But if we can stop war from endangering the whole world by helping South Korea, I'm for it."

Theodore Collock, 22, clothes cleaner of 210-16 Hillside avenue, Hollis: "It's a case of better late than never. It's about time the United States drew the line on the Communists. An offensive like this must be stopped. If American arms can help, I'm for it. We should have been firmer with the Reds long ago."

Irene O'Connor, 19, a clerk of 161-10 Grand Central Parkway, Jamaica Estates: "President Truman's action is timely. We'd have to make this move later, so I think it's better to act now, before it's too late. Sure, war is horrible and costly. But we must show we are willing to fight for peace."

Another Wolf in Sheep's Clothing

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times, it is possible to overlook important problems here at home while our eyes are focused on dramatic and crucial happenings abroad. Let us always keep in mind that our freedom could be lost by lack of vigilance on the home front as well as by unpre-

paredness for attacks from abroad. When there are threats and danger from without it becomes even more important that we put our own house in order and strengthen the home front in every way possible.

One important means of adding to our internal strength and protecting our system of free enterprise is to reduce waste, duplication, and bureaucracy within our Federal Government. Vigilance in that field is indeed essential in these days of high taxes and unbalanced budget.

Creeping socialism, unchecked, ultimately could cost us our liberties as definitely and finally as galloping aggression from without. For this reason, we should support and put into effect the basic recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Their aim is sound and has the overwhelming backing of most thoughtful Americans.

But even in this worthy, and I might say necessary, field we must be vigilant. We must not allow our enthusiasm for economy and efficiency to blind us to the schemes of the socialistic planners who strive to hide their starry-eyed or sinister schemes behind a respected label. The State planners do not hesitate to sugar-coat their bitterest pills by such tactics. To date, of 28 reorganization plans submitted, only 6 have been rejected by the Congress for what the other body thought sound reasons.

The very first of these, plan No. 1, was opposed and turned down on the grounds that the new Department of Welfare it proposed had a political objective rather than a goal of promoting governmental efficiency. It was realized that it would serve readily as a framework for the recklessly expensive and regimenting Fair Deal concept of a security program, including compulsory medical insurance. It was believed that it would also serve as a vehicle to lift Mr. Oscar R. Ewing to Cabinet rank. Many medical men viewed with alarm any further enhancement of personal power for this tireless promoter of socialized medicine. So did those who oppose expenditure of public money for propaganda and political purposes, a form of bureaucratic activity for which the Federal Security Administrator has a marked talent. A place in the Cabinet would undoubtedly strengthen his efforts to force the passage of the 163-page Thomas bill that the New York Times described as "the most radical reform yet to be broached by the Truman administration."

Although plan No. 1 was rejected last session, it has appeared again in another form as plan No. 27. It is still a socialistic wolf in sheep's clothing. Robert L. McCormick, research director of the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report, says his organization is opposed to this proposal and that it is at variance with the Hoover Commission recommendations. Mr. Speaker, let us be vigilant at home as well as abroad. We should pass House Resolution 647 and halt this renewed effort to slip through a program that would carry us another step down the sloping road to socialism.

Speech of Hon. Katharine St. George Commemorating Anniversary of the Battle of Monmouth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am very glad to include herewith a speech made by our colleague, the Honorable KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, of New York, on the occasion of the anniversary of the Battle of Monmouth.

This annual ceremony is held under the auspices of the American Legion each year and it is most impressive. The old Tennant Church, which was used during this battle as a hospital, is still standing and each year on the anniversary of this momentous occasion of the Revolutionary War people come from all around the country to rededicate themselves to the cause of liberty.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE'S remarks are particularly apropos at this time and I commend them most sincerely to my colleagues:

Mr. Chairman, members of the American Legion, ladies of the auxiliary, ladies, and gentlemen, you have spoken of my distinguished colleague, Mr. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS as a great Legionnaire, but to me he is, and always will be, a great representative of the American people.

JIM AUCHINCLOSS represents his district faithfully and well 24 hours a day. And what is more he represents all the people of his district without partisanship, thus he is a true patriot and the kind of Representative this district can well be proud of, regardless of party politics.

June 28, 172 years ago, in heat that caused more casualties than the engines of war, the Battle of Monmouth, whose anniversary we celebrate today, took place on this very spot.

According to Parson Weems, who is my favorite chronicler of the period, many of the casualties were caused because so many of the men drank water in the great heat, and the reverend parson quotes from St. Paul's epistle to Timothy, in which the saint enjoins his disciple to drink wine for the good of his health. It is, however, also recorded that the men were often withdrawn into the shade of the trees where they were refreshed with rum so that the water may not have been entirely to blame for their great casualties from the heat.

As we read the history of the battle, which is long and involved, one thing emerges vividly: the greatness of General Washington.

After we have read the history of the American Revolution, as it used to be taught when I was young, where the Americans won every battle and all our soldiers and their generals were heroes—or when you read the modern or debunked history where the Americans lost every battle but the last and that was only won because Cornwallis was even more inept than his opponents—we still are faced with the great question, How did these people who fought for 4 years, with little skill, and through terrible discouragements, succeed in winning against trained professionals who knew the art of war as well as any troops of that time?

There are, it seems to me, two reasons why our forefathers won their fight for freedom. First, because with all their ignorance and lack of discipline, they believed in what they were fighting for—and, more important still, they had in Washington a leader who believed in freedom and had sacrificed everything to that belief.

The Battle of Monmouth typifies all of this, first we see General Lee retreating in great confusion, when Washington counted on his advancing. We hear the contradictory orders, the accusations back and forth. We see General Hamilton, young, handsome, enthusiastic, believing in his exuberance and ardor, that the cause had been betrayed, getting off his horse and rushing to General Washington to say that America and the cause are lost and that now is the time to stand together and die. And General Washington, whose favorite Hamilton is, quietly suggests that he take back his horse before the animal gets away.

This incident is so true a picture of Washington, always in complete control—first of himself, and then of others.

But at the Battle of Monmouth it has been reported that the father of our country swore like an angel. He was a man of very temperate language but when he saw Lee's troops retreating in confusion, and for no apparent reason, he swore, and I am sure no one there, or now, will blame him. In fact, it gave such great pleasure to General Scott who was a most profane man, and doubtless an expert in such matters, that he told Custis that "never have I enjoyed such swearing before, or since—he swore like an angel from heaven."

Also at the Battle of Monmouth a woman, Molly Pitcher, became a true heroine in the fight.

She also is typical of American womanhood. She went into battle first as a water-carrier to the troops, as many women did at that time. Molly Pitcher was the wife of a cannoneer and when he was killed, she took his place at the gun—loading and firing it with such energy and vengeful fury that the next day General Green led her, still covered with blood and grime, to General Washington who gave her the rank of lieutenant and half pay for life. Thus she became the first woman ever to become a member of the Armed Forces of our country. Yes, the women of America, then as now, when they are at their best and true to their traditions, stand by their men as helpmates, comrades, friends, and equals, realizing that in this equality they do not ask or get privileges but that they share in service, in patriotism, and in responsibility.

So, from this battle we see at this one place, on this one day, all that made our Republic and kept her safe.

We see in Washington the heart and soul of the American Revolution and we see why this Revolution was different from any that followed in the Old World.

This was not a revolt of downtrodden, starving peasants demanding food and the good things of life that had been denied them by a proud aristocracy.

No, this was a revolution of men who believed in freedom and in the dignity of the individual. Men who believed truly that man is created in the likeness of God.

George Washington was a man of wealth and culture who lived in all the luxury that the times and country could afford. But he was willing to give up and leave all this for his belief in freedom.

Yes, he lost some of his nearest and dearest friends, who looked upon him as a traitor—notably his nearest neighbors, the Fairfaxes of Virginia, who left the country at the time

of the Revolution and broke their lifelong friendship with Washington at that time.

These men and women did not fight for security—they fought for liberty and justice.

And today, when I hear people comparing the revolutionists of Europe to George Washington, my gorge rises. It is sacrilege. It is like comparing a paid social worker to Christ the Lord.

The more we learn of Washington the greater he becomes in stature and here on this very spot we see much of his greatness. We see his freedom from passion and his sense of fair play when he asked General Lee if he wished to resume his command or should he, Washington, take over. We see his bigness again when he accords to General Monckton all the honors of war and a military funeral. That is a far cry to the sordidness of modern war.

As we stand here today we must compare our present with this historic moment 172 years ago. Then as now the fate of freedom hung in the balance.

But then men believed in liberty with an ardor and a singleness of purpose that we have lost today. These men and women were willing to sacrifice wealth, freedom, yes, and above all security for freedom. They realized something that we are prone to forget: That the responsibilities and duties of free men are many and that the sacrifices that have to be made continually to maintain and keep liberty require courage, honesty, and faith.

Courage, honesty, and faith are what won our freedom. Courage, honesty, and faith were part and parcel of Washington's character.

Honesty in our time is regarded lightly and we smile and laugh off the story of Washington and the cherry tree. I hope the day never comes when the children of America do not hear and repeat that story: "Father, I cannot tell a lie; I did it with my little hatchet." It takes courage in a child or in a man to face up to the truth even when the truth means admitting our own faults and errors.

Today we are not sure of what we believe. We have become soft. We love security and have sacrified freedom to it in too many ways. The people who fought here 172 years ago were prepared to die for freedom and were willing to sacrifice their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to that cause.

People often ask, What is the strength of the hold that communism has on its adherents? It is this: it demands unquestioning, blind and complete devotion to communism and loyalty to it alone, placing that loyalty and devotion over all else in life and being willing to die for it if called upon to do so.

This single loyalty we have lost. It would be well if we would write for ourselves a creed and then subscribe to it completely. These are some things we must be positive about: We must restore Government to the people and take it away from the bureaucrats.

In order to do this we must be positive in our philosophy and our thinking.

We stand for an honest and efficient government that will serve the people and not be their master.

We stand, at the present time in the world's history, for a strong military establishment and especially for a highly trained scientific establishment, as we know our foes will have the advantage of numbers if war should come.

We know that there are two roads ahead. One, the road to national socialism where so many free nations have met their doom since the First World War.

The other road will lead us to the perfecting of freedom which is a government of the people, for the people and this object can only be accomplished by the people themselves.

Washington and the men he led were positive in their beliefs and had but two loyalties and if we, as a nation are to survive, we too must have but two loyalties and casting all else aside, we must cleave to them only.

We must be loyal to our God and to the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands.

Thus and thus only, will we, their descendants, go one step further in achieving the ideal for which Washington and his men fought here at Monmouth.

The Security of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, at this moment it is impossible to predict the outcome of events in Korea.

Despite the gravity of the situation, however, the American people are more united and more determined than at any time since the cessation of hostilities in World War II. We have acted and we have acted with determination. The uncertainty of the cold war is over. It is my humble belief that we have acted to prevent world war III. It is reminiscent of what was not done when the Japanese marched into Manchuria, when Mussolini marched into Ethiopia, and when Hitler marched into the Rhineland. Had similar determined action been taken then World War II may not have occurred.

We all remember the madman, Adolf Hitler, who stood screeching before rapt throngs and sent his Nazi hordes across Europe; we all remember the poker-faced Jap warlords who directed their armies about a great orbit in the Pacific; we all remember the theatric Mussolini bawling from his balcony like a ham actor, and now we have the dour Joe Stalin attempting the reenactment of the same scenes. But the setting has shifted and this time this Nation has announced that it will use all of the resources at its command to prevent further Communist aggression. The position taken by our country is history-making. It puts into action in a crucial region of the world a clear course.

To have let South Korea go would have meant the collapse of all that had been done in the past 3 years. Other nations, large and small, would have concluded that they could not count on the United States when the chips were down. All organized resistance to Communist aggression, which we have built with so much effort and so much cost, would have simply collapsed. Our only alternative was to go to the assistance of South Korea. Plainly enough this involves a risk of war with the Soviet Union. It may be said at this time that the odds are against this. But in any event the right decision was made. Interestingly enough the decision has been attacked as usual by the combination of isolationists and Communists. The Daily Worker and the Chicago Tribune have used almost the identical line. The editorials in both papers condemn our action in Korea as illegal. But the American people are well nigh unanimous in their support of what has been done.

As the aggressors from North Korea are driven out, as they will be, the world conquest schemers in the Kremlin will be set back perhaps for years to come. It is they, not us, who will suffer loss of face throughout the world, and most important of all, the nations which have been wavering should be infused with new enthusiasm. They now know that the United States is prepared to throw everything into the fight for a free and decent world. Now we have a determined policy in the Far East.

The great majority of the people in this country, anxious as they have been for peace, have had enough of the Kremlin peace-wrecking tactics. They are ready to assume the risk of stopping another war before it gets under way, and in that determination they have the support of the Congress of the United States.

This brings me, Mr. Speaker, to a review generally of the security provisions which we have taken for the protection of our great country.

I think it essential to reiterate the fact that the Russian leaders have proclaimed ever since the Red Revolution the inevitability of conflict between communism and the free democratic nations of the world. It is under these conditions that we struggle for peace. Despite this, some of our people still fail to recognize this struggle. Only the other day I had a letter from a very intelligent lady in my congressional district complaining very bitterly because of the international situation, and asserting and believing that it could all be worked out by a meeting between Stalin and the leaders of the democracies.

I fervently wish, Mr. Speaker, that our problem lent itself to such an easy solution. Unfortunately it does not. And those who think that it does, simply do not understand the basic conflict of Communist philosophy and democracy. The only solution is a strong prepared America with strong prepared allies capable of defending itself both at home and abroad.

I believe that this conclusion can be buttressed even by a casual study of the recent history of the Soviet Union which indicates the unwillingness of the leaders of that nation to risk a war—despite their beliefs in the inevitability of conflict—unless they feel that victory is assured. An examination of the documents seized by this Government after the collapse of the Hitler regime in Germany proved conclusively that Stalin did everything conceivably possible to avoid a war with Hitler and that even after Hitler marched across the Soviet frontier, it was several days before the Russians counterattacked in the vain hope that war with Germany could still be forestalled. In Berlin, a year or so ago, when the Soviets clamped on a blockade of that German city, that blockade ended when the western allies showed their

determination to stay. In that ruined city only recently all of the bombast heralding the Communist display on May 28 came to naught when the Soviets recognized that we meant business in suppressing any march into the western sector of Berlin.

The evidence thus indicates that we must rely upon preparedness if we are to prevent a third world war. A weak America will assure war. The wishful thinkers who believe that by executing a new treaty or by holding another conference the cold war will end, just do not understand and know the Russian threat.

If the Politburo desired peace all that it would have to do would be to live up to the treaties which it has already executed and broken time and time and time again. If we have not learned this lesson then we have learned nothing and we are ripe indeed for Soviet plucking.

I am convinced, however, Mr. Speaker, that the vast majority of the Members of this body recognize that we are in for a long struggle. I believe, too, that they recognize that the American people must continue to make sacrifices if we are to preserve our country and its great institutions guaranteeing freedom of religion, of press, assembly, and of free enterprise.

It might be well, therefore, to review for a moment some of the steps which we have taken both at home and abroad to build up the strength of our country and its allies. As everyone knows we are faced with tremendous Federal expenditures these days, but a breakdown of those expenditures shows that over 70 cents of every dollar is going to pay for past wars, to prevent another war, or to be prepared in the event one should occur. Outlays for defense and related items total about $31,000,000,000 per annum. These outlays are broken down approximately as follows:

Department of Defense	$14,000,000,000
Economic Cooperation Administration, military assistance program and other international programs	5,000,000,000
Atomic energy program	900,000,000
Veterans' Administration	6,000,000,000
Interest on the public debt	5,500,000,000
Merchant marine, U. S. Coast Guard, airports and aviation	500,000,000

Despite these colossal sums in our defense program we are not seeking to match the Russians man for man or gun for gun, but we are seeking to stay well ahead of the Russians in superiority of weapons, training of manpower, and production potentials. Thus we are attempting to build a modern, powerful air force, a Navy equipped with the latest submarines and other sea and aircraft necessary to maintain our lines of communciation, and an Army capable of rapid movement with the latest weapons. We are building a defense team. In this connection we have made funds available for erecting a radar network to protect our country from attack from the air; and recently the free world has been heartened by the announcement of the perfection of a smaller atomic weapon as well as many other new devices for warfare on land, sea, and air.

Despite the tremendous expenditures by our people for armaments, these expenditures are much less than the sums being spent by the Russians for similar purposes. As a matter of fact were we to spend the equivalent of our national income as that now being spent by the Soviet Union, our total would be about $60,000,000,000 per annum. That, of course, is why our industrial and production potential is so vital and so important because that potential is our secondary defense. That, too, is why we must remain qualitatively superior.

Mr. Speaker, I have invariably, since coming to the Congress 10 years ago, supported all measures to maintain the strength of our armed services. I remember some of the early struggles over lend lease. I vividly recall the night when my one vote extended the draft. But our defense must include the other free peoples of the world. We have, therefore, sought to weld together the free peoples of the world in a common coalition against the Communist aggressors. In this coalition are the seeds of peace without war.

The beginning of this joint undertaking was the enactment by the Congress in 1947 of the Greek-Turkish program. This, however, was a piecemeal program with no chance of success if applied in a similar fashion to each country being threatened by Communist techniques in western Europe. It was at this point that Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and I introduced a resolution for a free and united Europe. Without being immodest, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the public discussion which accomplished this resolution had much to do with the eventual enactment of the Marshall plan. Everyone is familiar with the operation of that plan which has certainly saved western Europe from communism and which is now forging a strong alliance of the free peoples of that continent.

I will not trace all the steps leading to a united Europe but one of the outstanding developments of our times was the announcement recently of the so-called Schuman plan which calls for the pooling of the resources of western Europe and despite the Socialist Party pressure to the contrary, the British Government must go along. The Marshall plan itself has been followed by the Atlantic Pact and the military assistance program. This cooperation on the part of the free peoples of the world is every bit as important as our defense and arms programs. The Communists use as principal weapons fear, confusion, tension and threats. By these methods they have subjected eastern Europe. But the 270,000,000 skilled people of western Europe have within themselves, if they act together, all the economic and military resources required to prevent further Communist aggression. And by this integration western Europe becomes self-sufficient without further burden to the American taxpayer.

Of equal importance is the new program of using the great facilities of private enterprise in this country for the development of the backward areas of the world. This is known as the point 4 program. It has tremendous possibilities and it is similar in its operations to the good neighbor plan which has been in effect in the Western Hemisphere for 10 years or more. It contemplates using American genius in industry, agriculture, medicine, and commerce. Hand in hand with this program moves the furtherance of the reciprocal trade treaties making it possible for the democracies to carry on commerce with one another without the stifling barriers of high tariffs. The people whom I have the honor of representing, Mr. Speaker, recognize the great importance of these measures to the port of New Orleans.

I have supported these programs not because of humanitarian reasons, as commanding as they are, but because I am convinced that they are necessary for the security of our own beloved country. I wish that I did not have to do these things. I realize that they call for the expenditure of large sums of money, but our country today is the strongest, the most powerful, the wealthiest Nation on the face of the globe. With strength and power go responsibility. We tried isolationism for most of the first half of this century and that policy resulted in two frightful world wars. In my judgment a return to isolationism will assure a third world war without the strength of allies elsewhere in the world. If ever a policy is bankrupt, isolationism is.

Mr. Speaker, without transgressing the bounds of modesty I feel that my support of these programs has been justified. I am particularly pleased with the response which I have had to some of my efforts. I recall that on February 13, 1949, in the House of Representatives, in supporting the resolution which we passed condemning the Hungarian trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, I said among other things:

> The trial of Cardinal Mindszenty has shocked the entire free world. The Communist Government of Hungary before and during the trial employed the usual totalitarian technique of legal form and procedure, plus brutal maltreatment, suppression, and violence to destroy the rights of a great church leader and to violate the dignity of a human being.

I am quite proud of a letter which was addressed to me a few days later from the archbishop of my church, His Excellency Joseph Francis Rummel, of New Orleans, when he said:

> May I compliment and thank you for the excellent statement which you made before Congress on the iniquitous trial of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of Hungary. It is also inconceivable that a government should proceed upon so gross a violation of individual human rights as has actually been evidenced by the piecemeal reports that have come out to us from behind the courtroom curtain. Equally inconceivable is the deafness, blindness, and hardness of heart that would justify the communistic government in Hungary in carrying out the cruel sentence pronounced against the cardinal in the face of the universal indignation that has been expressed by so many leaders of men and of human opinion. It will always redound to your credit and honor to

have arrayed yourself among the latter in the statement before Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has also conducted a war against domestic Communists. The Committee on Un-American Activities has had my full and active support. I was pleased several days ago to receive a letter from the chairman of that committee, the Honorable JOHN S. WOOD, in which he said:

Your consistent support of the Committee on Un-American Activities in its efforts to expose and eradicate subversive influences in America and thus help to uphold the committee, has been a source of personal gratification to me, as I am sure it has to your constituents and all liberty-loving people in the Nation.

In recent years we have voted in the Congress to cite Communists who were in contempt in the Un-American Activities Committee. Recently a group of Hollywood writers were sent to the penitentiary as a result of this action by the House of Representatives. Earlier, the secretary of the Communist Party was also sentenced as was Gerhardt Eisler. At the same time it was through the work of this committee that the Hiss case was broken. The FBI has done an amazing job in connection with subversive activities. Only this week, in the light of this work, we have provided in the Congress for 400 additional FBI agents. The Coplon trial, the Bridges trial, the sentencing of the 11 Communist leaders in New York, are the direct result of the work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This great organization has always had my full support.

Recently I was pleased to receive the following letter from FBI Director Hoover:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
Washington, D. C., June 26, 1950.

Hon. HALE BOGGS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I did want to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for your thoughtful remarks concerning this Bureau which were printed in the June 22, 1950, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Your constant support of this Bureau is indeed a source of encouragement to my associates and to me personally.

Sincerely yours,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

In this connection I am the sponsor of two bills which I consider very important. On March 9, 1949, I introduced H. R. 3358, a bill to combat un-American activities by requiring the registration of Communist-front organizations. I believe that you will be interested in the preamble to this legislation which is now pending before the House:

SEC. 2. As a result of evidence adduced before the various committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, Congress hereby finds that—

(1) The system of government known as totalitarian dictatorship is characterized by the existence of a single political party, organized on a dictatorial rather than a democratic basis, and by an identity between such party and its policies and the government and governmental policies of the country in which it exists, such identity being so close that the party and the government itself are for all practical purposes indistinguishable.

(2) The establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in any country results in the destruction of free democratic institutions, the ruthless suppression of all opposition to the party in power, the complete subordination of the rights of individuals to the state, the denial of fundamental rights and liberties which are characteristic of a democratic or representative form of government, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of religious worship, and results in the maintenance of control over the people through fear, terrorism, and brutality.

(3) There exists a world Communist movement which, in its origins, its development, and its present practice, is a world-wide revolutionary political movement whose purpose it is, by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups, governmental and otherwise, espionage, sabotage, terrorism, and any other means deemed necessary, to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in all the countries of the world through the medium of a single world-wide Communist political organization.

(4) The recent successes of Communist methods in other countries and the nature and control of the world Communist movement itself present a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions and make it necessary that Congress enact appropriate legislation recognizing the existence of such world-wide conspiracy and designed to prevent it from accomplishing its purpose in the United States.

In addition to this, Mr. Speaker, I am the sponsor of legislation, which has already passed the House of Representatives, prohibiting the picketing of our Federal courts. I quote from the official report by the Committee on the Judiciary in connection with this legislation, which is now pending in the Senate, and which I am hopeful will be passed within the next several weeks:

The picketing of courts is a practice which has been recently developed and has appeared in various cities throughout the United States. It appears from the information made available to the committee that the technique of mass picketing has been employed solely in connection with the proceedings involving alleged Communist Party members or sympathizers. Specific examples disclosed that the number of pickets has ranged from 300 to 750 in such cities as San Francisco, Los Angeles, and New York. In these instances the committee is informed that the participants carried picket signs, distributed literature, and overcrowded the corridors and courtrooms of the building.

Another technique employed in this picketing of the courts is the loud chanting of slogans by members of the picket line. On one occasion in San Francisco a sound truck was employed outside the building which was being picketed, and it created so much noise that it seriously hampered those inside the courtroom in hearing the testimony.

The continuance of such conditions would inexorably lead to the undermining of the dignity necessary in our judicial proceedings. More important than the detraction of the dignity befitting a judicial proceeding is the possibility that should such a practice continue unchecked, it cannot help but bring about a disrespect for law and constitutional government under law. The essence of the Federal judiciary has been the impartially and independence under which it functions in the orderly administration of justice. However, the nefarious practice of picketing courts can but lead to the destruction of those two fundamental qualities.

It is the opinion of your committee that such practices must not only be condemned but must be stopped immediately; and, therefore, this bill is designed to make such a practice a crime where it impedes, obstructs, or interferes with the court.

Recently the New Orleans States commented on this legislation in part as follows:

The picketing of the courts was the most flagrant example of a flaunting of American court procedure. Such action has no place in fair trials; it imputes judicial integrity; it might intimidate officers of the court or witnesses. It is an alien thing, and the sooner it is no longer allowed, the better off our courts will be.

Judge Medina sentenced two or three defendants to contempt of court for their behavior in the precincts of his courtroom, but he never took issue with those who derided his court, the jury system or the trial procedure on the outside.

There are many judges and lawyers who believe as he apparently did: That his powers of contempt did not include actions outside his immediate ken. But there can be no doubt that his court was condemned time after time, day after day, all in keeping with orders transmitted through the Communist network from Moscow.

So shocking was the action of the Reds in their picketing that bills were offered in the Congress—bills which originated through a local member of the bar, Mr. Cuthbert Baldwin—by two Louisiana Congressmen: Senator ELLENDER and Representative BOGGS. The Boggs bill was passed by the House, but the Ellender measure was held up in the Senate by the objection of one man: Senator LANGER of North Dakota, when Senator ELLENDER asked that his bill be taken up by consent.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I trust that you will pardon the references which I have made to my own role as a Member of this great body in preventing the spread of this modern, atheistic, godless slavery. In fighting communism we must not be overwhelmed with fear, nor must we fall for the Communist trick of denouncing and smearing honest and patriotic people. Most of all, it seems to me that we must recognize that this great land of ours, working with the free peoples of the world, has within itself the means to prevent a third world war and to stop Russian aggression. In the psychological warfare which is part of the cold war nothing can be more beneficial to the Soviets than the general belief in America that we must have a war.

Our country today, if we continue to face the issues of the times with courage and vision, if we continue to attack the social and economic problems of the twentieth century, if we insist on maintaining a good climate for competitive enterprise in America, if we continue to encourage the expansion of free enterprise in order to provide employment and a higher standard of living, will overcome this menace.

In short, if we keep our economy strong, keep open the door of opportunity in America, the security programs under way at home and abroad will assure the survival of our great democracy.

The Korean Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Sokolsky:

THESE DAYS
(By George Sokolsky)

It is suggested that what has happened in Korea represents a tactical surprise. Nothing could be more false. The Korean situation is the inevitable result of a continuously incorrect policy in the east of Asia, particularly China.

Empires are built step by step, the new line of attack moving out as a bulwark of defense. Once Manchuria came into the possession of Soviet Russia, it was inevitable that Korea would be the next step and following that would be an attack on Japan.

Korea is a peninsula that lies between Manchuria and Japan. It cannot defend itself against an invader from either Manchuria or Japan.

Therefore, all the countries lying close to Korea—China, Russia, and Japan—have vied for control in the modern historical period.

By 1910, Japan was in a position to dominate Korea and to annex it to Japan. The Koreans took that annexation placidly; perhaps because in their own language the name of their country is Chosen—the land of the morning calm.

In fact, the Koreans have been a peaceful people not given to fighting except on rare occasions. They are Buddhists.

Although there was always a revolutionary movement among Koreans living outside of their own country, its influence within Korea was negligible. Among the anti-Japanese revolutionists was one group whose sympathies were western; that is, they tended to place their dependence upon the United States. Many of those who belonged to this group had been educated in American universities or in Christian mission schools in Korea.

There was, however, another group which, along with other Asiatics, turned toward Moscow after the Russian Revolution. They were trained in the Sun Yat-sen Institute and the Lenin Institute in Moscow and fought in the armies of the Chinese Communists under Mao Tse-tung and Chu Teh.

Many of these Korean Communists have had as many as 30 years of training in the Communist movement. Many of them have been active in the civil wars of China since 1924. It is interesting to note that Communists, the world over, place their movement before their country and recognize Russia as holding a special relationship to other countries because it is the motherland of the revolution.

Russia comes into this situation as a result of the Yalta agreement. It must be recalled that when the Yalta agreement was signed, Soviet Russia was neutral in the far eastern war. It was in that war a total of less than a week.

Nevertheless, an agreement was entered into which so completely placed Soviet Russia in control of Manchuria that Korea's future was inevitably to serve as a battleground in the next war.

At the Moscow conference, meeting between December 16 and 26, 1945, Korea was divided between Soviet Russia and the United States.

This was done "with a view to the reestablishment of Korea as an independent state, the creation of conditions for developing the country on democratic principles and the earliest possible liquidation of the disastrous results of the protracted Japanese domination in Korea, there shall be set up a provisional Korean democratic government which shall take all the necessary steps for developing the industry, transport, and agriculture of Korea and the national culture of the Korean people."

By this Moscow agreement, signed by James F. Byrnes, Ernest Bevin, and V. Molotov on December 27, 1945, Korea was to be held by a joint commission. Actually, the country was divided into two parts on the thirty-eighth parallel, Soviet Russia occupying the northern sector; the United States, the southern sector.

Had no politics been played in the United States, the practical solution would have been to place Korea completely under the control of Gen. Douglas MacArthur as part of Japan.

However, there has been a running fight between the State Department and the Department of Defense over the American policy in China, Japan, and Korea. This quarrel has been reflected in a weakened American implementation of policy.

If the Russians can conquer Korea, our position in Japan is definitely imperiled. For Japan is next and if Japan is taken, Alaska will be untenable. Empire moves unless it is destroyed.

The World's Best Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Post of June 28, 1950:

THE WORLD'S BEST HOPE

In 1931 the Japanese invaded Manchuria and, although few men perceived it at the time, the pattern of aggression for a decade was set. In each successive crisis the story was always the same; in Ethiopia and in the Rhineland, in Spain and Czechoslovakia tyranny advanced triumphantly while the free world wept and wavered. The League of Nations died in the hands of men who lacked the capacity or the will to act; with its death went the hope of peace.

All that is worth recalling now in the light of yesterday's dramatic events. To recognize risk in the course proclaimed by President Truman is to concede the obvious. The world is a dangerous place and there are no easy highways to security. The question is not whether action involves risk; it is whether the ultimate peril would be smaller if South Korea fell to the Communist armies while we hopelessly turned our eyes away.

In our judgment there is only one answer. We could not buy peace by appeasement in the Nazi era and we cannot buy it by surrender now. Communist aggression in Korea was a test of democratic nerve. It was also a life-and-death challenge to the United Nations. It could not be evaded without inviting new aggression—whether in Yugoslavia or some other explosive spot. In the hours preceding the President's announcement Communists in western Europe had prematurely begun to cite South Korea's defeat as a warning to others who try to combat the Kremlin wave of the future. If there is any hope of achieving world order in our century, resistance in South Korea may prove as crucial now as resistance in Manchuria would have been 20 years ago.

No human being can avoid a sense of anxiety and dread at the news that American bombers are in the air over Korea, manned by American pilots. We are tragically reminded of our failure to achieve peace through two world wars; men may gloomily wonder again whether they will ever live to see real peace on earth. Yet the historic fact is that our planes fly now as emissaries of the United Nations, translating into reality the dream of collective security which has stirred our generation. Some may dismiss as empty formality the proceedings at Lake Success yesterday; the decision, it will be pointed out, ratified an accomplished fact, whether because of an ill-timed "leak" from MacArthur's headquarters or a belief that hours were vital on the Korean fighting front. Yet those who miss the moral symbolism miss the one great hope. We did seek and obtain the sanction of mankind's tribunal—the UN. We are acting as members of a community of nations. We are contributing our resources to carry out a solemn declaration of the United Nations in that agency's most desperate hour. All that is something new under the sun.

These are the things the United States must say clearly now. The Voice of America is as important as the Air Force at this moment. Moscow will use our act to camouflage the aggression that provoked this crisis. We urge the President to give the world our answer in terms that can be understood everywhere. Bombs alone should not speak for America.

The confusionists are busy. On the pro-Communist left here is the usual loss of contact with reality; the world turns upside down and the aggressors overnight become "the liberators." The isolationist Chicago Tribune and the Daily Worker join hands again as they have done so often; both declare war on Mr. Truman. We believe most Americans will support him, with heavy heart but high hope. For if aggression can be halted in Korea, if the UN's words can become international law, if the despots are finally convinced that free men will not wait and wonder as they did in Hitler's heydey, there is hope that we may yet glimpse peace in our age.

As War Looms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press of June 27, 1950:

ALL THEY PLAY IS POLITICS—AS WAR LOOMS

The invasion of South Korea by armed forces from North Korea is military action directed by Russia against the United States.

That's war.

Whether it can be limited in scope to a reconnaissance in force remains to be seen.

The fighting so far has been between two Korean factions, American-trained in the south and Soviet-trained in the north.

The North Korean Reds can depend for support upon the victory-flushed Chinese Communists. Their territories are contiguous.

According to reports, American arms and equipment are being airlifted from Japan to our allies in South Korea.

Will the Koreans themselves, if Russia and the United States furnish the tools, finish the job or will their protagonists have to take a direct hand in it?

The inevitability of just such a clash as has taken place stemmed from the Communist victory in China, which the lack of an intelligent and honest Chinese policy in Washington promoted.

The Red Koreans, if they are really in earnest, aren't likely to be deterred by the UN Security Council's telling them to cease and desist.

Apparently, too, they were not impressed by John Foster Dulles' assurance of our support given last week to the South Korean regime.

Will they be deterred by the spectacle of President Truman flying back from his precinct work in Missouri to confer with the very officials who have gotten the United States into this new mess in the Orient?

All the American people have heard from the Administration about Korea is that this tiny peninsula jutting off the Asiatic mainland toward Japan was being held as an outpost of democracy in the Far East.

We have sunk upwards of a billion dollars in holding it since VJ-day.

With no warning from Washington the Red-sponsored regime in North Korea now attempts to push our outpost into the Japan Sea.

The public in this country was taken by surprise.

That is, if anything that happens in Washington these days can take anybody by surprise.

The United States emerged from two World Wars the richest and potentially the most powerful country in history.

Yet, it is totally unequipped for world leadership—and is in no respect more handicapped than in its ability to raise to high office men above precinct caliber.

The British built up and sustained, for centuries, a mighty empire because they trained men in the arts of government and world affairs.

As Rudyard Kipling wrote: "What should they know of England who only England know?"

With none of that experience in world affairs we were suddenly projected into the role of world leader.

What but disaster could be expected from entrusting our fate to men who haven't faith even in our own democratic system?

What should they know of America who only Kansas City know?

The Korean incident may or may not be the beginning of real trouble with Russia and China.

But no serious student of history will stake his reputation for prophecy upon the assumption that the conflict between western civilization and world communism will be resolved without bloodshed.

Yet in face of the dire probabilities ahead, the fate of the American people is in the hands of the heirs to the Yalta agreements, who won't turn their backs on Alger Hiss, who advised a dying President to sign on Stalin's dotted line.

The determination of the administration to cover up for Communist influences, as in the Amerasia case, further weakens public confidence in it.

The desperate lengths to which President Truman went in trying to make his pool-playing crony, Mon C. Wallgren, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board—most vital cog in any war mobilization—is evidence of an appalling lack of responsibility at the highest level.

We are facing what may be the beginning of the third world war, with an administration that prevents prosecutions of vote frauds, bank robberies and even murder in Kansas City.

Efforts are being made to hide the truth of the Communist infiltration into our Government and all who seek to save America from the very menace of world war III in the Orient are denounced as purveyors of "red herrings."

A big grin and a wisecrack will not whitewash away the evil of our body politic. There is no health in us.

"For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?"

Columbus Town Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. WALSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 14, 1950, I was privileged to appear on the Columbus Town Meeting program in Columbus, Ohio.

It is my sincere view that this battle for the democratic way of life is not confined to legislative halls and cold-war fronts.

Public-spirited citizens are fighting it, too, in all corners of the United States of America.

A typical effort is that of Columbus Town Meeting, a weekly discussion forum broadcast and telecast each Sunday afternoon to thousands of listeners and viewers in central Ohio.

Town Meeting is a nonprofit, public organization—open to everyone regardless of race, color, or creed—and dedicated to the cause of freedom of discussion.

Just how important that freedom of discussion is considered today is shown in a recent report by the Committee For Economic Development of New York City.

The CED decided that the most effective instrument in the current cold-war episode is widespread discussion. That is what Town Meeting assures.

It tackles any subject, trying to keep it timely and purposeful. It is an hour-long program, offering studied comment from leaders in the field of government, business, labor, and all walks of life.

The public, too, participates, by telephone questions for consideration of the panel of experts who appear each Sunday.

Columbus Town Meeting is one of the oldest and most successful programs of its type. Patterned after the national network show, Town Meeting of the Air, Columbus Town Meeting has been airing controversial issues for the public's enlightment for the past 11 years.

The program's executive director, Mrs. Grace Hare Frye, says she understands from radio experts that Columbus Town Meeting has had a longer, uninterrupted run than any other localized show of its kind.

Mrs. Frye, incidentally, is the personality who makes Town Meeting tick, and as such deserves a vote of appreciation from the entire democratic-thinking world.

Several efforts were made to put a forum-type show on the air back in the late thirties in Columbus, but none succeeded until Mrs. Frye became interested in the move.

An active member of the board of directors of the League of Woman Voters in Ohio, Mrs. Frye saw the opportunity of promoting democracy through such a show. So she got busy and has been busy ever since, lining up programs, persuading United States Senators and Representatives, Cabinet members, vice presidential candidates, college presidents, and others, to take time out of their busy lives to discuss questions of the day for the edification of Town Meeting's listeners.

More than 1,000 experts have paraded before Columbus Town Meeting's microphones, discussing everything from the cold war to how to make it easier for newspaper carrier boys to collect money from dead-beat customers.

Although it is a comparatively unheralded effort in behalf of democracy, Columbus Town Meeting's work has not gone completely unnoticed.

The program has won several important radio awards. For example, it recently was ranked first in the public service classification by Ohio State University's annual institute for education by radio, an institute encompassing the biggest and best minds in radio and video circles.

The institute cited Town Meeting for a forthright presentation of opinions on subjects of immediate public interest.

And that seems to be the secret behind the program's success.

The statement of policy by Town Meeting's board of trustees explains the goal even better. It says:

> Town Meeting is committed to fair and free discussion of controversial questions. Democracy demands that information be available to all the people and that intelligent judgment be formed through the medium of free discussion.
>
> Town Meeting is committed to no partisan position, whether economic, social, religious, racial or political, and the speakers are not censored.
>
> Do not expect our discussions to settle questions or provide all the answers.

And although few conclusions are drawn on the weekly forum, it has in the past stirred discussions and actions which have altered the laws of both the city and the State.

Columbus Town Meeting, under the guidance of Mrs. Frye, is conducted by citizens of Columbus with funds contributed by this same citizenry.

The men who make up the board of directors and the program committee are editors and reporters from local newspapers, bankers, merchants, college professors, city councilmen, State legislators, and so forth.

In other words, it is a truly democratic effort, being waged by people like you and me, and as long as such things endure, the hope for freedom and righteousness in the world will never be blacked out.

Mr. Hart Tells His Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach an article from the Christian Science Monitor of June 28. The article, written by Richard L. Strout, expresses the same amazement that hundreds of thousands of corporation stockholders across the country must have felt when they read of their corporations' contributions to the National Economic Council of Merwin K. Hart, a man tagged as a native Fascist by such groups as the Americanism committee of the Illinois Department of the American Legion:

MR. HART TELLS HIS STORY—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON
(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.

Merwin K. Hart, head of the National Economic Council which has taken as its life work the "stemming of the tide of communism and socialism" in this country, was a classmate of Franklin D. Roosevelt, but he refers to the circumstance only with a grim smile. Most of today's troubles, Mr. Hart believes, stem from 1932.

Rejecting a proposal to subscribe to some of Mr. Hart's printed material, the minister of the Church of Christ, Northampton, Mass., declared that it represented a "reactionary type of thought tending to a native American fascism." This is not the view of many of Mr. Hart's loyal supporters, including not merely individuals but corporations who contributed about $136,000 in 1948.

On the witness stand before the House Lobby Committee Mr. Hart spoke with a real zeal that appeared to arise from deep conviction. A gray-haired, respectable, business-executive-type figure in a Palm Beach suit, he was eager to tell his story and to lay bare the forces he sees operating against free enterprise.

A good deal of Mr. Hart's energy goes to combating democracy. To Mr. Hart this word has sinister connotations, America has a republican, not democratic, form of government, he argues, and heaven help us if this should ever change. Most of the trouble with Britain, Mr. Hart feels, is that it is a democracy. It is a little hard for listeners to follow this reasoning. The word "democracy" didn't have much use, Mr. Hart asserts, till "Woodrow Wilson came along." Then it dropped out again until 1932—and that classmate of Mr. Hart's.

Mr. Hart wrote in his circular letter No. 166 that if you find any organization that uses the word "democracy" you will probably find that "they are either left-wing or Communist."

To Mr. Hart, danger is not theoretical but real and imminent. "Your family and your home are in danger. Even your life may be in danger," he wrote. In Council Letter No. 183 he urged positive action—something every man could do—"Let him possess himself of one or more guns and a reasonable supply of ammunition."

Mr. Hart is no pussyfooter. He thinks the present Supreme Court should be removed—constitutionally, of course—because its members are all dedicated to socialism. Thereafter, he feels, all present Justices should be barred from judicial office.

Mr. Hart's council is against so many things that it is hard to name them all. It fought the Marshall plan and other forms of international cooperation. It is isolationist. Its ardent support for private enterprise rules out such matters as the Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal aid to education, the Atomic Energy Act, and social-security legislation like that which the Senate approved last week, 81 to 2. On the radio, for a while, the council sponsored Upton Close, an American figure who has been likened to Britain's Oswald Mosley.

I went to the Hart hearing here rather casually curious as to who supported him. My mood changed when I discovered that in a small way I was supporting him myself. A list of contributing corporations was put into the record. Some of these corporations which had aided the council and its circulars were big and respectable. After a good many years in Washington I still have the capacity for astonishment. I hold a modest stock or two in some of these corporations. Through the management of my companies, and without consulting me, they had contributed to Mr. Hart and his dogmas.

Mr. Hart, of course, has a right to any belief he wants, but that corporate management should enlist either for him or against him, any more than that it should make contributions to the Republican or Democratic Party, is astonishing. In a letter to Lammot du Pont, February 17, 1949, to take one example, Mr. Hart explained that "the Beech Aircraft Corp. of Wichita, Kans. (gave us), a subscription of one penny for each of the nearly 600,000 shares of stock outstanding."

Money contributed to send NEC circulars to schools, libraries, and churches "is deductible under the income-tax law," Mr. Hart explained repeatedly to clients.

A number of corporation executives may have difficulty explaining matters at their next stockholders' meeting.

The President's Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of June 29, 1950:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—THE PRESIDENT'S DECISION
(By Walter Lippmann)

The Government of the United States has worked impressively well in the Korean crisis. The President has met his great responsibility, which was to decide whether to commit American forces. He has met it without flinching and without fumbling.

There has been no pressure from Congress or from the public to force his hand. There has been no movement to oppose his decision. There has been a lot of partisan and factional nonsense in Washington during the past months. But confronted with a really great decision, everyone has realized that not only did the President have to make the decision but that only he had access to the information essential to making the judgments which preceded the decision.

It was necessary to know or at least to make a fair guess as to whether the South Korean Government was or was not undermined; whether its troops would stand and whether its civilian officials would remain loyal, assuming assistance could be given to deprive the northern forces of their armor, their airplanes, and their amphibious landing craft. Only the Government has sufficient information to make any kind of guess. There was not sufficient journalistic news from Korea on which the Congress or the press could have formed a responsible opinion. It was necessary to know also just what American sea and air forces could be brought to bear, and how soon. That information is obviously secret.

In making his decision, the President did not, however, need to be sure that the American intervention would be a certain success. He needed only to be sure that if the Americans went into Korea, there would be no doubt in anyone's mind that they had been in Korea. Assuming that the necessary forces are available to do an effective work, we were bound to act. Our commitments to the Seoul government, reaffirmed most solemnly by Mr. Dulles less than a week before the attack, demanded that we do something more than send in arms and take out the Americans.

Moreover, the attack is a naked act of aggression, unequivocally and unambiguously a defiance of the United Nations. To accept this aggression passively would have been fatal to its authority and its influence. If a wretched little satellite government in northern Korea can thumb its nose at the United Nations, then all hope would be lost that through that universal society the nations of Asia and the nations of Europe and the Americas can find a way to work together.

The Korean aggression is a reason, and not merely a good pretext, for interposing the United States Navy in order to isolate Formosa from Communist China. We can always be glad that we were not the first to use armed intervention in the Far East. But now that force is being used to upset the existing balance of power, force must be used to right it again. Though neither Korea nor Formosa is of overriding strategic importance, Formosa is more important than Korea.

By keeping the Communists from attacking Formosa and by keeping Chiang from attacking the Chinese mainland, we kill two birds with one stone—we withhold Formosa from Communist control and we impose what amounts to a truce in the Chinese civil war.

Report on United States Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. WALSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Labor, Maurice J. Tobin, recently addressed the International Labor Conference in Geneva, Switzerland.

This speech should be carefully noted by each Member of the Congress:

REPORT ON UNITED STATES PROGRESS

(By Maurice J. Tobin)

I have always been especially interested in the International Labor Organization. When I became Secretary of Labor of the United States I came to appreciate even more its great work. Needless to say, before Mr. David A. Morse left his post as Under Secretary of Labor in Washington to take up his duties in the International Labor Organization we discussed at length the problems and prospects of the ILO. At that time I assured him that at the earliest opportunity I would consider it a privilege to attend a session of this Conference.

I have a deep personal affection for Mr. Morse and consider him a credit to the United States. We are heartened that his fine talents have been made available to further the work of this great international organization.

We in the United States have especial ties with peoples in other countries. The United States is, as you know, a Nation of immigrants. We came from your country, whatever your country is. Our population is an admixture of every race and every creed and every nationality. Perhaps it is that universal origin of our people that makes us feel such a kinship toward those who live in other lands.

Our strong ties with the people of other lands also result from the nature of our political and economic institutions. They lend themselves particularly to this type of neighborliness. For democracy emphasizes human values and the dignity and importance of the individual. Our free enterprise economy also is peculiarly adapted to the stimulation of individual initiative and individual action.

Another factor which has had an important bearing on our attitude toward other people has been our emphasis on religion. As a people we attach great importance to spiritual values. This has given us a deep affection for our fellow man. No person who truly believes in God can be insensitive to the rights and needs of others.

I need hardly remind you that my country is a peaceful Nation. We do not seek war. On the contrary, we are devoting all possible energy and resources to the avoidance of war. In our efforts to obtain a just and lasting peace, we are acting through the international agencies which have been set up to achieve this goal. Among those agencies is the ILO. As our President, Harry S. Truman, told the governing body of this organization on June 13, 1948, "I think maybe this organization can make—and is making—a greater contribution to peace in the world than nearly any other organization of its kind in the world."

Nearly all people in nearly all nations want peace. Most people recognize that they must make sacrifices for peace or else suffer privations for war. That the American people are willing to sacrifice for peace has been made abundantly clear. Programs such as the Marshall plan and point 4 dramatically demonstrate my country's interest in the preservation of freedom and peace throughout the world.

We in the United States have been blessed by God and nature with great natural resources, a temperate climate, and other natural advantages. To these we have added a democratic form of government, a free-enterprise economy, ingenuity, industry, and intelligence. From these ingredients we have obtained prosperity and a high standard of living. With our blessings go a deep sense of humility and a keen appreciation of our responsibilities.

For the sake of our fellow man and ourselves, we have undertaken a large-scale program of economic and technological assistance to other nations. I am proud of the sense of responsibility which has impelled my country to take these steps. We know that these programs have value to the United States as well as the other participating countries. I am sure that you will recognize, however, that they also involve the spirit of brotherhood.

The aims and purposes of the ILO are consistent with those of the United States and other freedom-loving countries. As is stated in the ILO constitution, "universal peace * * * can be established only if it is based upon social justice." This demonstrates why the ILO's aims are so important to the world. In this organization you lead the way toward the better life for all people. This you do by agreement and cooperation. By voluntary action the member nations of the ILO are marching together toward a better and brighter future.

Just as my country is interested in the economic situation in your countries, so I know you are interested in the economic situation of the United States. The economies of all our countries are interdependent. As is well stated in the ILO's declaration of Philadelphia: "Poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere."

The United States was gravely concerned, as other countries were, with the downward movement in the level of economic activity early in 1949. Our country had experienced three full years of prosperity following the war. In the past, wars had been followed after a brief flurry of postwar prosperity by severe economic recession, as in 1921–22 in the United States. These were usually occasioned by, or connected with, a collapse in war-inflated prices.

Since people tend to expect history to repeat itself, it was imagined by many that sooner or later the United States would again experience a serious depression.

This did not happen in 1949. I do not believe we will ever again experience a major depression such as we had in the early thirties.

We are confident of our ability to avoid a major depression because of the great advances we have made in our social and economic legislation since 1933. The supports we put under our economy in these years stood us in good stead in 1949. They will be equally helpful in protecting our economy against serious recession in the years ahead. They are both a deterrent to depression and concrete evidence of the determination of the American people that we shall not have a repetition of that tragic era.

Among the bulwarks of our economy are a system of old-age and survivors insurance, free public employment services, and unemployment insurance system, insurance of bank deposits, and minimum wage and hours legislation. Agricultural price support programs removed one of the serious instabilities in the economy and sustained the purchasing power of an important group of our people. Resource development such as the TVA and rural electrification contributed to the economic development of large areas of our country.

We are moving steadily forward to strengthen our economy still further. At this session of the Congress we have raised the minimum wage to 75 cents per hour, or $30 for a 40-hour week. We are now in the process of broadening the coverage and increasing the benefits of our social-security system. Legislation accomplishing this objective will soon be on the President's desk for signature. The President has also requested action to expand the coverage and increase the benefits of our unemployment-insurance system.

America has proved the great strength of the free-enterprise system buttressed by sound social and economic programs. The combination of a free-enterprise economy and liberal social and economic legislation has permitted us to maintain a high level of economic activity during the postwar period. We have avoided a collapse of prices, credit contraction, bank failures, any large number of business bankruptcies, or lack of confidence on the part of business and the consuming public.

The significant fact about the decline in economic activity and the rise in unemployment in 1949 is this: it did not spiral in cumulative fashion throughout the whole economy. The cause of the decline was a cautious liquidation of business inventories. The effects were almost completely limited to the manufacturing industries directly affected by curtailment of purchases by business for inventory purposes.

It is important to note that the very fact which led to the decline in business activity in 1949—a rational and nonspeculative attitude with respect to inventory practices and policies by businessmen—is one of the factors making for confidence in the general stability of the American economy now and in the future. One of the significant institutional developments in the United States in the past 20 years is the introduction of scientific methods, under the direction of purchasing agents, who now play an important role in American corporations, in the management of corporate inventory policies. For this reason alone, it is hardly possible that the type of economic recession the United States experienced in 1921–22, which was largely the result of commodity speculation, could now occur in the United States. This is only one of the important institutional reforms in the United States in the last 20 years, but it is one which is too little appreciated.

As it turned out, the cautious policy of business with respect to inventories was carried too far. Inventory accumulation was not only stopped; inventory liquidation actually took place on a large-scale. As a result, employment and incomes declined. However, this did not result in general economic contraction.

Consumers maintained expenditures throughout 1949 in about the same volume as in the preceding postwar years. Dollar volumes were slightly lower, but so were consumer prices.

Businessmen maintained their plant and equipment expansion programs as planned. Investment for this purpose declined only moderately in 1949, as had been expected. Profits remained very good during 1949, and business generally saw no reason to cut back their capital investment programs.

Likewise government—Federal, State, and local—did not retrench. Necessary public activities were carried forward to meet the social needs of the American people.

As a result, the decline in gross national product was equivalent only to the net reduction in business purchases for inventories; and by midsummer 1949, there were indications of a rise in employment and production. The rise in unemployment was checked. In contrast to an average volume of less than 2,250,000 in the preceding 3 years of full employment, unemployment averaged 3,200,000 in the first half of 1949 and 3,600,000 in the second half of the year. As of the present time, unemployment is at a level of about 3,000,000, or less than 5 percent of the labor force. Moreover, these 3,000,000 unemployed are not a hard core of unemployment; many are between jobs or only temporarily out of work. Allowing for seasonal variation, the outlook is for a lower level of unemployment later this year.

Total production is now approaching the peak postwar level of the final quarter of 1948.

Steel operations are at capacity. In May 8,500,000 tons of ingots were produced.

Automobile output in May was at a rate of about 165,000 cars and trucks weekly. There will be over 7,000,000 produced in 1950.

New houses started in May reached a record figure of 140,000 units. In the first 5 months of 1950 there were 538,000 houses started, and more than a million new houses will be completed in 1950.

Total consumption of goods and services by American families in the first half of 1950 has been greater than in any previous period.

Weekly factory earnings in April 1950 averaged $56.89. This was $3.09 above the level of April 1948 when consumer prices were somewhat higher. The real earnings and the standard of living of American workers are now higher than ever before, and about 40 percent above prewar levels.

We can now look back and assess the meaning of the experience of 1949. It was the first significant test of the stability of the postwar American economy. In a free economy, largely dominated by private enterprise and subject to the forces of the market, there are necessarily some tendencies toward instability. The question which had not been answered was whether the American economy—transformed in many ways by the economic reforms of the past 20 years and by changed governmental policy with respect to stabilization of the economy—was now such as to assure economic stability in substantial degree.

I believe that history will show that the answer is in the affirmative.

One test alone is not conclusive. But it is significant that, despite large-scale inventory liquidation, consumers showed no lack of confidence, nor did businessmen in terms of their long-range plant expansion plans.

The Federal Government did not resort to emergency type of action to deal with the economic or unemployment situation in 1949 or early 1950. This does not mean that the Government assumed merely a passive attitude. The situation was followed very closely by the executive branch of Government and by the Congress. Under the Employment Act of 1946, the American people are committed to undertake all appropriate measures to maintain maximum production, employment, and purchasing power.

The general approach of the United States Government to full employment policy is to adapt current governmental activities and programs to the needs of the national economy. The emphasis is upon progressive growth and balance of the economy rather than simply antirecession policies of an emergency character. The test is whether Government fiscal policies and other programs contribute to the stability and growth of the whole economy. The President's recommendations in his economic reports in July 1949 and January 1950 were based on this approach to economic policy.

The United States Government is confident that depression and large-scale unemployment will be avoided.

We regard this as a major objective of Government.

As stated by the President of the United States on June 6:

"A prosperous and expanding economy in the United States is necessary not only to provide an adequate standard of living for our growing population; it is also necessary to our paramount objective of peace and freedom in the world. That is an objective to which—above all else—we must dedicate our efforts and our resources."

The United States is fully committed to a strong, high-level, ever-expanding economy. I am confident of our ability to meet any economic problems that beset us. We shall continue to fulfill our international commitments.

Any persons or nations who make their plans on the basis of an expected economic collapse in the United States are doomed to disappointment. We are determined to remain strong and free. We have the resources, both physical and human, the strength, and the will necessary to achieve this goal. My country is fully aware of its position in the world, understands its responsibilities, and is living up to them. We have joined with other countries in a common effort to maintain world prosperity and freedom. We are prepared to cooperate with all peace-loving nations. As President Truman said to this organization in 1948: "We want peace in the world. We want every country in the world to have the necessities of life, to be able to live with its neighbors on the basis of doing as you would be done by."

With cooperation, good will, and good faith, these high goals can be achieved. We face the future confident that international cooperation will pave the way to a better life for all.

Soybeans, Cotton, and Russia

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to again call the attention of the Congress to the infamous barter deal of cotton valued at $7,301,250, for soybeans valued in our domestic markets at $5,800,000, or at $4,600,000 in Manchuria, recently concluded with the Communists. There has been no official explanation or denial. A spokesman for the Department of Agriculture is reported as stating that my figures as to the profit received by the brokers was exaggerated, and that I had not made proper allowance for the difference in freight charges.

In a newspaper column titled "Washington Memo," appearing in the Des Moines Register on June 19, 1950, appeared the following story:

Soybeans: Inside story of the cotton for soybeans deal with Manchuria that Representative FRED L. CRAWFORD attacked is a great deal different than the Crawford version.

General Douglas MacArthur's headquarters (SCAP) bought the beans and had them stored in Japan before the Commodity Credit Corp. was told anything. SCAP then told Commodity Credit Corp. it had agreed to sell the Manchurian cotton in return for the beans.

Much as the Commodity Credit Corp. disliked doing business with the Russians who control Manchuria, it had to ship the cotton or start a brawl with SCAP.

Brokers who handled the cotton shipments got nominal fees.

I have no argument with the reporter or his story. It is clearly the only answer that the Department of Agriculture officials could find at the moment. What are the facts? Why does not Secretary of Agriculture Brannan officially answer my charges and give the American people the facts? What did the Army pay the Commodity Credit Corporation for the cotton? What did the Army pay for the Russian soybeans? Why was it necessary to have a broker on the deal? It could not have been to buy the cotton when the Commodity Credit Corporation owned on April 30, 1950, exclusive of loans, over three and a half million bales. On the same date they also owned over six and three quarter million bales of linters.

I wish to note that if the story given to the newspapermen is correct, then it appears to me the official announcement issued by the Department of Agriculture on May 11, 1950, was completely misleading and intentionally designed to cover up and deceive. What are the facts?

Again, I call the attention of the Congress to the resolution that I offered on June 19, 1950, calling for a special committee to enforce the acts of Congress. It could well serve in this particular matter and ferret out the truth.

The export of cotton, a commodity with a definite war use potential, at this time to the Communists smells strangely like the scrap iron deals with the Japs before Pearl Harbor. Until the facts are made known officially by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Defense, I can only conclude that there is somewhere a particularly foul-smelling carcass that they are trying to hide.

Show-Down in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's brave and forthright program regarding Asia is in the best tradition of our great national leaders. Friends of democracy everywhere will be heartened by his thrilling words. We must be eternally grateful that President Truman did not waver or defer when this terrible moment of Communist aggression rose. In the troubled days ahead we must close ranks behind our courageous leader.

I should like to put into the RECORD an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of Wednesday, June 28, 1950, concerning the showdown in Korea:

SHOW-DOWN IN KOREA

President Truman has boldly judged that the United Nations and especially the United States cannot compromise with the challenge hurled by the Red puppet forces of North Korea in their invasion of the South Korean Republic. His decision to intervene with American air and sea power to help the beleaguered Republic, and to cover other far-flung Pacific bastions as well, should have the support of free men everywhere.

For the UN, which sired the Republic of Korea and was responsible for the withdrawal of American troops there, a successful invasion by North Korea could be curtains. For the United States, godfather of the Republic, it would mean an incalculable loss of face, at least in Asia, where the remaining non-Communist forces would likely decide that the Red offensive was invincible.

On Sunday, the UN Security Council, with Russia boycotting, declared a threat to the world's peace existed in Korea, ordered a cease-fire and retirement by the North Korean Army to its own borders. The Communists have insolently ignored this directive. And so, the United States,

acting in the spirit of the UN request that member nations render every aid in the execution of the cease-fire order, has applied military sanctions in the form of air and sea power.

The American people should calmly and realistically face the issues involved here. Behind the North Korean invasion lies the directing hand of the Kremlin, probing, as it has done in Berlin before, for soft spots in the western political wall. We have not permitted that wall to fall in Europe. We are herewith attempting to save it, or what is left of it, in Asia.

Most of us regret that South Korea should have become the testing ground for this first cold war Soviet adventure in direct attack. The strategic situation on that peninsula has long been weighted against us. The republican government is weak and dominated by men who have seemed out of touch with the people.

Nevertheless, this country has poured vast amounts of economic aid into the Republic, has trained and equipped her army, and in all has morally committed itself by word and deed to her independence. Now that that army appears to have rallied after the first invasion shock, the President and his advisers have concluded that the United States cannot welch on its commitment without appeasing, which would mean ignoring the costly lessons of the last war.

There is every reason to believe that the Korean incident can be kept localized and brought to peaceful UN mediation by this vigorous American action—provided, of course, the Soviet Union does not want a general war now. We do not believe the Russians want such a war, and note particularly that so far they have kept publicly noncommittal on the Korean conflict.

However, the Kremlin's ultimate intentions are now irrelevant. This country's duty is to keep cool and push ahead with its resolve to uphold the UN and prove to friend and foe alike that America's word is her bond.

Quit Coddling Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, it is time to quit whitewashing investigations, coddling and covering up the Communists in our country who seek to overthrow it. It should never have happened.

In dealing with this Communist menace, the Government should have followed the policy of Washington who, in the darkest days of the Revolutionary struggle, when ordering his subordinates to put out the sentry lines, said: "Let no one be on guard tonight but Americans."

We have failed to follow that policy, even when the deadly secrets of the atomic bomb were at stake. Certainly the time has arrived when every Communist should be dealt with as an enemy of our country.

Mr. Speaker, if the American people knew the great damage the Communists have been permitted to do to our country they would rise up in righteous indignation with a determination to drive out of power every Government official in Washington who failed in his duty to fight and expose the Godless Communist spies who seek to overthrow our Government.

These spies for years, in great numbers have been allowed to run at will in this country. They have stolen our top military secrets with the connivance of traitorous employees in the Federal service. When those of the administration were warned that Government employees were suspected of being Communists or Communist sympathizers little or nothing was done to investigate such charges.

Fortunately, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, by investigating and exposing the Communist influence in Government has brought this dangerous situation to the attention of the American people and forced the issue.

One may well shudder to think of the much greater progress the Communist movement would have made in this country had not the members of the House of Representatives continued through legislation each year the House Committee on Un-American Activities to carry on this work.

This committee and the FBI have exposed the crimes these Communists have committed against our Government to the point where the American people have become alarmed.

They were shocked with the news that Communist spies during and after the war had stolen the secrets of the atomic bomb, and the secrets for the construction of the hydrogen bomb. That these spies had delivered to the Russian Government secrets that cost years of work and billions of dollars in research and construction of the atomic bomb.

These Communist spies made it possible for Russia to produce the atomic bomb possibly 3 years ahead of schedule. These traitors with easy access to Government departments have placed in the hands of the Russian Government, instruments of death that may in the future be turned against our Government killing millions of our people.

Never before in the history of the United States have so comparatively few men done such great damage to our Government and to the world. I say the world, because the influence of the Communists, the left-wingers, the fellow travelers, helped to formulate the policies of our Government, which caused us to lose the peace of the world at the Yalta Conference, and influenced the adoption of policies favorable to the Communist alinement in China that with the aid of Russia has taken over into Communist enslavement over 400,000,000 people.

Many students of government in the Congress and outside of it know this is what happened.

You will remember that Alger Hiss, later charged with being a Communist when he was convicted of perjury, was a high-ranking member of the State Department who accompanied the American delegation to the Yalta Conference as one of its chief advisers.

At this conference with Hiss as an adviser, Russia was placed in the driver's seat in Europe, and was given control of a large part of Manchuria, control of the Manchurian railroads, port cities and harbors, the Kurile Islands, and one-half of Korea, which may start world war III. This, in violation of a former promise and agreement with Chiang Kai-shek, our ally, who had fought with us for years in helping us to gain the victory over Japan.

The Communists, through their fanatical zeal to destroy this country and promote the domination of the world with their godless ideology, have damaged, and endangered the future of this country to a degree thousands of times greater than one could expect or imagine considering their numbers.

You will remember that when the Un-American Activities Committee was making its drive against the Communists in Hollywood, in New York, and in various places, and when it was making its drive to connect Alger Hiss, a former high-ranking member of the State Department, with Communist activities, they were charged with red-baiting and only uncovering red herrings.

They were smeared by the Communist press, by the so-called liberals and left-wingers, and left-wing radio commentators in the hope of arousing the public against the activities of this committee.

Had it not been for the work of this committee Alger Hiss would likely never have been prosecuted and convicted; Gerhart Eisler regarded as the top Communist of the United States would not have been convicted, and may I point out that after Gerhart Eisler was convicted he was released on the relatively small bond of $25,000 and then permitted to lecture throughout the Nation, until he decided to get aboard a Polish vessel, jump his bond and sail to Germany where today he is one of the top directors of the Communist movement in east Germany. He is leading the cold war against us in Germany.

And when the script writers in Hollywood who sought through the picture shows of the Nation to warp the minds of millions of children and other citizens favorable to the Communist ideology were investigated by the Committee on Un-American Activities and brought to Washington to testify before this committee, the same hue and cry went out to the American people in opposition to the activity of that committee in an attempt to array public sentiment against its actions.

Of the 10 movie writers brought before the committee who refused to testify two were committed to jail a few days ago, namely, John Howard Lawson and Dalton Trumbo. Seven others are awaiting trial.

Dr. Edward K. Barsky, chairman of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee of New York with others of that organization called before the committee, along with 10 other members of that committee were convicted and are now serving jail sentences.

And the head of the Communist Party, Eugene Dennis was convicted and committed to jail because he defied this congressional committee and is now serving his sentence.

Several weeks ago the Amerasia case which has been covered up and whitewashed since 1945, brought to the forefront recently by Senator McCARTHY is

now being reinvestigated. You have doubtless read much of the strange way this case is being handled at the present time by the committee which is supposed at long last to give the American people the facts. It seems doubtful they will be given all the facts, unless it is decided to turn the investigation over to the Un-American Activities Committee.

In 1944 and 1945, the Amerasia magazine in New York, the purpose of which was to undermine the government of China under Chiang Kai-shek, and influence, if possible, the State Department to favor the Communist leaders, was raided by the FBI where they found 1,700 secret documents which had been stolen or given to them through connivance of men in the employ of the Federal Government.

Many of the documents from the State Department found in their possession were important top secrets.

Some of these documents gave the location of our armed forces which were about to close in on Japan, and also the location of 20 of our submarines in Japanese waters.

Had this information got into the hands of the Japanese a terrible loss of life to our soldiers would have resulted.

Very little publicity was given to this case which indicated an effort to hush it up. After months of delay the case was finally tried in a quiet manner before a judge on a Saturday morning here in Washington with apparently no members of the press present. None of the stolen evidence seized by the FBI was offered in evidence. After 3 months of hard investigation by that splendid organization, no member of the FBI was called to testify.

The attorney representing the Department of Justice when asked by the judge how long it would take him to present the case, answered "about 5 minutes."

The result was that Philip Jaffe, owner of the magazine was let off with a fine of $2,500 and Emmanuel Larsen, the State Department expert on Chinese affairs was fined $500 which Jaffe paid.

The charges against Lieutenant Roth, a liaison employee of the Government between the Navy and the State Department was dropped and John Service who had been arrested with others named and who is still a member of the State Department was exonerated.

Had one of our soldiers fighting to defend our country tried to pass military secrets to the enemy, he would have been court-martialed and probably shot.

Despite the assurance of the President that his Loyalty Board has cleaned out the Communists and properly protected the security of the Government, the facts prove that it has not. Our agency loyalty boards passed Alger Hiss as a good security risk. Also Judith Coplon, Julian Wadleigh, George Shaw Wheeler, Carl A. Marzani, Russell Nixon, Nathan G. Silvermaster, and many others. Some of them have since been convicted in the courts including Alger Hiss, Judith Coplon, and Carl Marzani, and all of them including many others were fired or left the service because of their bad records.

This shows the danger to our country of the work of the Communists as it unfolds daily. The Nation was shocked with the arrest of Klaus Fuchs, the English scientist who worked on the atomic bomb in this country, gained all the knowledge as to its development and the hydrogen bomb, later passing this information on to Russia.

Very recently Nathan Gold and Greenwalt have been arrested and confessed that they were passing secrets with reference to the atomic bomb into Russian hands. The FBI will doubtless continue to make further arrests.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for those high in Government and every one in a responsible position to join in this fight to drive every person out of Government about whom there is any question as to his loyalty.

It is time that the President open the files to the committees of Congress who are investigating the charges made by Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY who has made such a courageous fight to drive Communists out of every Department of Government. The people are entitled to know what evidence if any which would tend to uncover Communist activities is hidden in the files of their Government.

It is time that Senator MCCARTHY has the cooperation of the executive department of the Government in an effort to stamp out the menace of communism.

It is time that all records in any department of Government which would tend to convict or uncover Communists in Government should be made available to any committee of Congress charged with an investigation to this end.

It is time, and past time that the hundreds, or thousands of perverts now employed in Government, all of whom are a security risk, should be fired.

It is time to clean up the mess and raise the moral standard of Government here in Washington.

Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Washington News Bulletin of June 23, 1950:

QUOTATIONS BY FAMOUS AMERICANS ON LIBERTY

They that give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety. (Benjamin Franklin, 1775.)

Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? As for me, give me liberty or give me death. (Patrick Henry, March 23, 1775.)

God grants liberty only to those who love it and are always willing to guard and defend it. (Daniel Webster, June 3, 1834.)

Liberty has never come from the government. The history of liberty is the history of the limitations of governmental power, not the increase of it. (Woodrow Wilson, September 1912.)

Political power, if surrendered, will surely be used to close the door of advancement and to fix new disabilities and burdens until all of liberty shall be lost. (Abraham Lincoln, 1861.)

Liberty and union, one and inseparable, now and forever. (Daniel Webster.)

True liberty consists only in the power of doing what we ought to will, and in not being constrained to do what we ought not to will. (Jonathan Edwards, 1774.)

The cornerstone of America's greatness is the principle of maximum liberty and freedom for the individual, consistent with the rights of his fellow man to the same liberty and freedom of choice. (Senator KENNETH S. WHERRY, June 1950.)

Montesquieu said: "A nation may lose its liberties in a day and not miss them in a century."

Edmund Burke said: "The people never give up their liberties but under some delusion."

Soviet Occupation of the Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the United American Latvian Council of New York to commemorate the extreme sufferings and cruel oppression of the Latvian Nation under the illegal and predatory invasion and occupation, perpetrated by Soviet Russia in June 1940:

Whereas Latvia has been brutally and illegally occupied, on June 17, 1940, by superior Soviet forces, in consequence of the infamous Hitler-Stalin conspiracy of war and conquest, and in flagrant violation of international law and treaties; and

Whereas the Baltic States, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, have been subsequently incorporated into the Soviet Union by unlawful devious processes and unlimited application of terror and force; and

Whereas the President and Government of the United States, having unequivocally denounced and condemned this Soviet aggression and occupation of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, and, having refused to recognize the purported annexation of the Baltic Republics by Soviet Russia, continue to recognize and to uphold the legal existence of the Republics of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia; and

Whereas the peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia are still subject to continuous inhuman treatment, unbearable sufferings, unspeakable privations, incessant fear of arbitrary arrests, torture, deportations, and death under the Soviet system of total oppression of all liberties, of freedom of thought and belief, and of human rights; and

Whereas the Soviet occupation authorities and political police continue, unabatedly and unpunished, their barbarian policy of extermination of the Baltic nations by deliberate perpetration of the crime of genocide, having deported by now an approximate 600,000 inhabitants from the Republic of Latvia alone to slow but sure death in remote Soviet slave labor and concentration camps, separating families by mercilessly

tearing men, women, and children from each other: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, loyal citizens and residents of the United States, of Latvian descent, gathered this day, June 17, 1950, to commemorate and to mourn the tragic fate of the Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian Nations, and to raise up prayers to God Almighty for the deliverance of these innocent victims of ruthless Soviet aggression and enslavement, appeal to the President and Government of the United States to intervene with the Government of the Soviet Union, and to intercede with the United Nations, in order to effect the removal of the Soviet armed forces, political police, and all other agents of the Soviet occupation authorities from the territories of the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia; and be it further

Resolved, That due to the continued resistance of the Latvian people to foreign oppression, we appeal to the President and Government of the United States to give the people of Latvia, as virtual allies of the United States and the Atlantic alliance encouragement through the Voice of America, and other aid and assistance in their unceasing struggle for the restoration of a free and independent democratic government in the Republic at Latvia; and be it further

Resolved, To petition the President and the Senate of the United States to ratify and proclaim the Genocide Convention, to enable the United States to expose, through the forum of the United Nations, before world opinion the criminal acts of genocide, now being perpetrated by Soviet Russia in the Baltic Republics; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be submitted to the President of the United States, the Secretaries of State and Defense, Members of both Houses of Congress, the Governor of the State of New York, the resident representatives of the United Nations, the diplomatic and consular representatives of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia in the United States, and the press.

HARRY W. LIELNORS,
President.
JOHN LENOW,
CHARLES STANKEWITZ,
Vice Presidents.

Defense Against A-Bomb Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. O'TOOLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 28, 1950.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The founding fathers while they built well were neither prophets, nor the sons of prophets. As a result, it was impossible for them at that time to foresee total warfare with its planes, A-bombs and H-bombs.

In providing for the Congress of the United States, they considered it a mobile unit that could always move from place to place in the event of an emergency. Today, due to advancing times and modern inventions, warfare is not a matter of the field of battle, but is an all-embracing conflagration that sears for thousands of miles in all directions. We have been warned of the terrible potentialities of the A-bomb. We have heard of secret weapons whose range and power are known only to the military, and we have not heard of the developments that have been made in the field of explosives and armament by those who do not care for the democratic way of life.

It is not beyond the realm of possibility that the House and Senate, or both, could be nearly or totally incapacitated by some act of present-day warfare. A study of the Constitution on my part fails to show any legal substitute for the Congress if such an event should occur. This failure to so provide could lead to a complete stoppage of the orderly process of Government with a resultant chaos that might lead to a speedy defeat and the destruction of our Nation.

The law of the land fails to make any provision for a means of taxing or providing for the common defense in the event that Congress is unable to act. With this in mind, I have today dropped into the hopper a resolution calling for the appointment by yourself of a committee of 25 Members to study the problem and to report back their findings and suggestions to the House as soon as possible. This committee should endeavor to work out ways and means whereby orderly process of government could continue during the period following any such catastrophe as I previously mentioned.

Very sincerely,

DONALD L. O'TOOLE,
Member of Congress.

Address of Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at the opening dinner of the drive for the St. Bonaventure Building Fund, Mark Twain Hotel, Elmira, N. Y., June 18, 1950:

Perhaps it is somewhat venturesome for a man of my background to speak on education before such eminent educators as Father Thomas Plassmann and Father Juvenal Lalor. All of you probably know that I was actively engaged in politics for over 35 years. Fewer know that I was engaged in business through those years, except during the 7½ years I served in the Cabinet. Most people associate me with business only for the past 9 years. No one associates me with education. As a matter of fact, I didn't associate myself with it too long. All in all I had 13 years of school, including high school, and 9 months of business college. Most of my education was received in the school of life. Because my rating in that school has not been entirely without honors, I feel qualified to speak about education in the world of change.

It may be trite to say we are living in a world of change, yet the ebb and flow of events is such that the truths, concepts, and theories of the law of God and the law of man are under calculated attack from men of sinister minds, who grasp power by spreading the disaster-laden doctrine of secularism. A confused and uniformed public opinion makes a nation the ready prey of desperate demagogs. A confused and misinformed mind endangers the soul.

Education, based on our heritage of freedom and justice, is the foundation of any permanent peace for the world. Education rooted in the laws of God makes for happiness and salvation. My training in the three R's was in the Grassy Point Grammar School and the Stony Point High School which were a small part in the excellent school system of New York State, and my training in the all-important fourth R—religion—came at my mother's knee and at the hands of gentle young women who drilled classes in catechism.

There are those who profess to see danger in education in the hands of the church. Actually these persons, except for the misguided fellow wanderers, fear the truth which makes men free. There can be no despotism and no men of vast power where there is freedom—freedom of worship, freedom of speech and of the press, freedom of criticism, freedom of assembly, freedom against unreasonable search and seizure, freedom of work, freedom to own property, and freedom to act as free men.

Our heritage is one of freedom under law. This freedom can be and is taught well in most schools. I believe most sincerely that there are few scoundrels in the teaching profession. There is, however, not a little confusion within our academic halls. Some would have freedom under the law; license under the law. They forget the laws of God.

The Governor of New York State, in a recent letter to Father Juvenal Lalor, the president of St. Bonaventure College, referred to the decision of this college to expand its resources as a very farsighted and courageous measure. Mr. Dewey's words express my feelings very exactly. The thing that St. Bonaventure is doing stirs my imagination and arouses my admiration. I have the deepest respect for people who recognize a worthy responsibility and have the courage to grapple with it. That, gentlemen, is precisely why I am associated with you in this matter.

I repeat there are and have been many who professed to see danger in education handled by the church. There are and have been, however, other men in the history of our country; men who foresaw the need of education far in the future and men who realized that secularism was a cancerous doctrine on our body politic. These men were and are the backbone of our present system of higher education.

An outstanding example of this type of person was Nicholas Devereux, a man whom you honor highly at St. Bonaventure. Devereux, a well-to-do businessman and landholder in western New York, saw the need for education and determined to do something about it. His farsighted plans included the building of a dream city on the Allegany River, a city patterned after the university towns of Europe. The city as he planned it never became reality, but the reason for the city and the main purpose of it became and is a fact. That reality is St. Bonaventure College. It may very well be that the best part of his dream did come true.

Through the years since that day back in 1856 when St. Bonaventure opened its doors, the college stood as a bulwark against the confused and sometimes misdirected education that has crept into our midst. It has maintained a standard of education that has advanced and changed and modernized itself in every way except in the principles of life, which do not change. Physical aspects of life have changed and should with the rapid advances made in the various fields of business and industry. But the moral aspect should remain the same. In too many schools this is not so. At St. Bonaventure it is.

I am happy to be here tonight and honored that you have chosen me as general chairman for this drive for the $4,000,000 necessary to the building program at St. Bona-

venture. Some of you might ask why I, who am not an alumnus of the college, should serve as chairman.

Actually, although I am not an alumnus, I have been in close contact with the progress of St. Bonaventure and have been kept in that state through our mutual friend and benefactor, Father Thomas Plassmann. I know that this present expansion program is a vital necessity and not just a frivolous whim. If the college is to continue its excellent work on the same level, let alone advance, this program must be a success. St. Bonaventure College has a commendable record. The research being done in the field of oil, radio, and the like is recognized by large corporations. The college is expanding academically. It must in addition expand physically.

Let me tell you, gentlemen, that there need be no element of shame in your approach when you seek contributions for St. Bonaventure. You may not be aware of it, but there is hardly a college in the country that is not seeking additional funds. You are in company with the alumni of the most respected institutions who are desperately seeking funds of this sort.

My admiration goes out to the administration of St. Bonaventure for the wise budgeting and business management that have forestalled the seeking of gift money until this late date. Only with the most watchful care on the part of college authorities could this have been accomplished.

As a businessman intimately concerned with balance sheets, I know that the men who handle the money at St. Bonaventure are continually called upon to make decisions concerning, "Can this be afforded? Can we spend money for that?" I know that they must occasionally make decisions which the alumni cannot understand because they affect long-standing traditions. Yet such decisions must be made.

It is a sign of advance and growth and wisdom that with the acceptance of new things, some old things must go.

There is a common feeling that religious orders are rich. Yes, they are rich. They are rich in honor and respect and devotion. If they are rich in terms of wealth, it is something that has escaped my observation. It is my impression that the religious orders like the Franciscans accomplish a great deal with their resources. It may be that large sums of money are handled, but it is also true that this money must be spread out very thinly in order to carry out the vast programs of service to humanity that are performed. Their skill in making a dollar do its full job is envied by the world of business.

As general chairman, and on behalf of the authorities at St. Bonaventure College, I want to take this opportunity of thanking you for the efforts and sacrifices you have made and have yet to make. For believe me, only through these efforts and sacrifices, genuinely made, will St. Bonaventure rise to her rightful place on a level with the best colleges and universities in the country. It's up to you, gentlemen. Good luck.

Address of Mr. Samuel F. Pryor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address before Association of the Junior Leagues of America, Inc., at Sun Valley, Idaho, by Samuel F. Pryor, vice president, Pan American World Airways, May 9, 1950. The address follows:

Members of the junior league: Here on this day in May on the side of this beautiful valley, I should like to bring you good news from Europe and the Caribbean from where I have just returned.

If I could not do that, I should like to bring you good news of the rest of the world. Or at least good news of the United States of America, which after all, is the hope of the world. But I cannot do it. It would not be the truth.

As John Foster Dulles has just written in his book, War or Peace: "We live in dread of mass destruction. We should not be concerned only about the mass destruction of bodies. We should be equally concerned about the mass destruction of minds and spirits."

This is not a pretty picture. It is not the kind of picture I would like to place before an audience which is in itself so pretty—and so young.

Time and again we men have been reminded that we should, "Never underestimate the power of a woman." That is a fundamental truth. May I, therefore, address myself not to your beauty, nor to your youth, but to your power—your political power which, I believe, you underestimate and your creative power which can turn stalemate in this cold war into victory for freedom.

I can bring you no good news as I have said. But I think I can present a few thoughts on how to win this cold war if everybody who has a vote will pitch in and work—work for democracy at the community level; the same level where the junior league has already made so many valuable contributions.

Ours is not just a problem of political parties, Republican versus Democrat. Ours is a question of survival—as a Nation, as a Government and as individual men and women.

First we must face the facts. If some of you go on to run a business—or even an airline—you will quickly discover that difficult problems can be put aside but can never be dismissed. We can try, and try again, to solve them without facing the unpleasant facts and we will fail every time. Facts must be faced and, so often, the unpleasant facts lie close to home. They can be swept under the bed and out of sight, but they will still be there.

John Foster Dulles says, "something has gone wrong with our Nation, or we would not be in our present plight and mood. It is not like us to be on the defensive and to be fearful. That is new in our history."

It is indeed new. It is not "The Spirit of '76." It is not like us in 1918 under Pershing. It is not like 1945 under Nimitz and MacArthur in the Pacific and under Eisenhower in Europe. It is un-American in the profoundest sense because it lacks optimism—it lacks faith in the future. And if a state of mind can be photographed—

Here I present a recent full-page photograph from Life magazine—a man in a 10-gallon hat sitting under a bed quilt for a month preparing to enter politics. Is this the way a warrior should look who is fighting a cold war? Is this, by any chance, a true picture of democracy in action?

Well, let us be thankful that it is not the whole picture of democracy in action but facts force me to state that this picture does show one phase of why we are on the defensive. It does portray the kind of inaction into which our democracy has been forced. By whom? By Russia? The answer is no.

The blame lies largely in the political laziness and the political ignorance of the American people themselves (15,000,000 bona fide voters did not vote in the last election). So it is clear that the main cause of our present plight lies right here at home. And in that fact we can take great hope because, I believe, any fault which is our own fault can be corrected.

Do you know the only reason why we are not in a shooting war today? The Kremlin has the atom bomb. The Kremlin has souped up B-29's, poised and ready to destroy at least 20 United States cities. The Russian bombers are waiting only 9½ hours from Sun Valley. But our capacity to produce is greater than Russia's and the Kremlin knows it.

Never were the words of Wendell Willkie truer than they are tonight—only the productive can be strong and only the strong can be free.

You women here tonight are free. What are you going to do to stay free?

What makes our stupendous productive capacity possible? Britain doesn't have it. No country in Europe has it. What makes it possible is our free-enterprise system and our form of government—a republic. And the only instrumentality to preserve our form of government is the two-party system plus practical politics. If you make politics right, you make the Government right.

A few years ago, I made a test in my home town. I made up a list of 15 questions such as:

Are you a registered voter?, who represents you in your party in your town?, who is chairman of your town committee?, who is your State committeeman representative?, who is your State committeewoman representative?, who is chairman of your State committee?, who is vice chairwoman of your State committee?, who is your national committeeman?, who is your national committee woman?, who represents you in your State legislature?, who represents you in the United States Houses of Congress?

I asked these questions of those to whom we look for leadership—the principals of the two public schools, the headmasters of the two private schools, the presidents of the two banks in town, the presidents of the two country clubs. Then I turned to those who look to them for leadership—the small merchants, the bartender, the gardener on the estate, the bootblack, and those on relief.

Do you know what happened? The bootblack group could answer 86 percent of the questions. The teacher group could answer only 2 percent.

Now let me ask you something.

How can we make democracy work if the leaders of a community know less about local government than the persons who look to them for guidance?

The answer is that we cannot.

Listen, not to me, but to the voice of wise old Ben Franklin on the sidewalks of Philadelphia over a century and a half ago. A group of young men averaging less than 30 years of age, the most remarkable group of practical politicians ever assembled, were framing the Constitution of the United States of America—the greatest document ever written in the whole history of political science.

Out from Independence Hall came Franklin, tired and weary after a long session, and a man who knew him stopped him on the street.

"Ben," he asked, "what kind of a government are you giving us?"

And Ben said, "We are giving you the greatest form of government on earth, a Republic, if you can keep it."

"If you can keep it."

Never was there a time in history when this form of government was in so much danger—or so important to the salvation of mankind.

Think a minute of our Constitution, not as it was in Ben Franklin's time but as it was in this same month of May in 1920. In that month of May 1920 no woman anywhere in the United States could vote. The nineteenth amendment was under consideration by the 48 States but the men in the

required three-fourths of the States had not voted in favor of it.

Then, in August 1920, the State Department proclaimed the amendment ratified. There, where anyone who can read can see it, it now says: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

Too, in some families three generations of women voters have come into being in the intervening 30 years. Can you state that we are any closer to keeping our Republic and extending its world influence for good than we were two generations ago?

Please don't misunderstand me. I am not going to answer this question with "No, we're not." Nor, if I did make such answer would I blame women voters any more than men for the state we're in. I am only asking you to ask yourselves if you have made full use of the unabridged right you have now held for 30 years. I have said that I believe in that modern commandment, "Never underestimate the power of a woman." I want to ask you again, have you taken full advantage of or underestimated that power? Do you realize that it is a great responsibility as well as a privilege?

Let us assume for a minute something which I can assure you is entirely practical. Let us assume that I divide you up into group of 60 or so, find out where each group wants to go, and in less than 36 hours from this minute put you in whatever part of the world you want to see.

Some of you I would like to take to the Near East—and we could be there tomorrow. Some of you I would like to take to Europe, others to China and still others to Africa.

What could we find before sundown tomorrow?

In the Near East we could find women penned up by their owners as livestock is penned up here in Idaho for the winter. The corral, in this case, is the harem, romantic only in fiction and useful, like most corrals, not to animals but to the owner. The animals, if they could get enough to eat, would prefer freedom.

What would we find in Europe? In some countries a woman is still her husband's chattel. In other countries, the people's collective mind—men as well as women—is so broken that both voice and vote have lost all meaning.

Taking Europe as a whole, inside or outside of the iron curtain, I don't think you would like the position of women.

Let us push on.

Let us land in China with its 400,000,000 people. What do we find?

We find an old Chinese custom still in operation—a custom that comes close to breaking our hearts. Women and girl children are sold in the same manner as unwanted female puppies are taken from their mothers' litters here in America.

This is an unpleasant fact, and is officially on record before the United Nations.

So, finally, let us push on to Africa, with its 180,000,000 people. Here we can see at first hand a specific case, also on record before the United Nations, which is funny, perhaps, if you were not one of the women concerned, but which would be tragic, I imagine, if you were.

A chief here in Africa was accused of having 180 wives as his personal possession. When such charge was presented before the United Nations he was righteously indignant.

The charge, he said, was not true.

He did not have 180 wives; he had only a hundred.

I'm glad—and I'm sure you're glad—that we're here in Idaho.

But do you realize that on a four-continent trip such as we have just taken, what we have been able to prove to ourselves what Ben Franklin said at Philadelphia? That we have "The greatest form of government on earth, a Republic—if you can keep it."

And this time I mean you women. This time I want to tell you specifically what you have not done, what you can do, and what you must do if all of us, American men and women alike, are not to sink back into the paralyzed state in which we can lose this cold war.

To begin with, we must hit, and hit hard, the absolutely unwarranted assumption that, first, "politics is a dirty mess," and second, that you therefore—man or woman—"ought to stay out of it."

Nothing, let me repeat, nothing could be more false than that.

What is politics?

In this country, politics is the business of governing ourselves.

Now what, in the name of heaven, is dirty about that? Could the false belief that politics is dirty—something to be shunned by all good men and women—could that be the reason why a man has to sit under a bed quilt for a month to get into politics? Could that be one reason why we are on the defensive in this cold war—when being defensive is against the American character.

I think it is.

I think, through laziness, we have let politics—the science of government—sink to a new and unjustifiable low.

Well, is this where we say "Thanks, Mr. Franklin. It was a good government, but we couldn't keep it"?

I don't think so, certainly not if women like you adopt the lifelong philosophy of a woman like Mary Lyon, the founder of Mount Holyoke College.

"Believe in God," she used to tell her students over and over again. "Believe in God and do something."

I salute Mary Lyon.

But I cannot let you go home with something so sound without also something more tangible than "Believe in God and do something."

"Something"—I have found in the period of my life which I devoted entirely to practical politics, is too often inclined to be nothing. The man or woman who is a social leader in the community frequently wants to jump into politics as a general. Not a private learning the ropes, but a general.

As a model for you all, look at MARGARET CHASE SMITH. Now a Senator, she started at the bottom and worked her way up.

We need more women citizens like Senator SMITH. There is your example—and there is your challenge.

I have just returned from Europe and Latin America. Just a few days ago I had the privilege of being in the presence of His Holiness in the solemn dignity of the Vatican. A few days later I stood beside a blue-overalled Portuguese dock worker along Lisbon's water front. Last week, I visited the sunlit islands of the Caribbean. My business takes me into 67 countries of the world.

You all want to know if there is going to be a war. My humble answer to you is that we are at war. It is a war in which neither side has yet issued the order to open fire.

You will want to know if shooting is going to start. No man can answer that with certainty. I can tell you that we are very close to a shooting war—much closer than you realize. We shall be close to it all this spring. If we get through summer without shooting, we shall be safe, in my opinion, for another 12 months. But at all times, the stronger our defenses the less chance there is of shooting. The Kremlin, the cruelest enemy ever faced in our history, recognizes only one argument—strength.

If there is a shooting war, you will ask, who will win it? We will—after much effort and sacrifice on the part of each and every one of us. Our productive and creative power will win it.

Now how about the cold war? We shall never win it fully until Europe is on her feet economically. There will be a crisis when the Marshall plan ends in 1952. Let us be realistic about this. Let us face the fact that Europe will continue to require and deserve our aid. Our great problem is to keep our strength while building theirs. We must strengthen and keep our free-enterprise system and our republican form of government at home while using its resources and unparalleled production capacity to win the cold war abroad.

There is an old saying that he who would reform the world must first reform himself. If we do our job right at home in our own community we can do it abroad.

And keep in front of you this fact: Potentially the American idea is dynamic. It is exportable because people all over the world are reaching for it. Take home this idea and tell it to your neighbors. If the American idea were not dynamic: If people everywhere were not reaching for it: Stalin would never have had to erect the iron curtain to keep it out.

The mere existence of the iron curtain is the greatest proof that the American idea is wanted and that it works. Your job, my job, the Junior League's job is above all else to keep our form of government and to make our American idea of freedom, under written law, even more dynamic, even with God's help, the salvation of the world. You can do it. You will.

Excerpts From Address by the Honorable Douglas Abbott, Canadian Minister of Finance, Before the Bond Club of New York, November 22, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from an address by the Honorable Douglas Abbott, Canadian Minister of Finance:

It always gives me great pleasure to be asked to speak about Canada to an American audience and to express the Canadian viewpoint on matters that concern both of us. Your invitation was especially welcome because I knew that I would be speaking to a group of Americans to whom Canada is by no means an unknown country.

It seemed to me that when you asked me to speak you probably want me to say something about the kind of policies we have been following in Canada and the results that have been achieved. This is an assignment which I willingly undertake. I believe that the record is one in which Canadians can justifiably take some pride.

Let me begin by referring to a matter that is always close to the heart of a minister of finance. I refer to budgetary policy—the spending and taxing activities of the Government. The modern governmental budget is, and must be, the balance wheel of the economy. Its very size is such that if it were permitted to fluctuate up and down with the rest of the economy, instead of counter to the swings of economic activity, it would so exaggerate booms and depressions as to be disastrous.

Since the end of the war the budget of the Canadian Government has been deliberately used to promote stability of employment and income. I would not suggest for a moment that the remarkable record of uninterrupted growth and expansion in Canada is entirely attributable to a sound fiscal approach. I am confident, however, that the line we followed did help to keep the economy moving ahead steadily on an even keel.

In the three fiscal periods between April 1, 1946, and March 31, 1949, we budgeted for a surplus and in every year the actual surplus exceeded expectations. In those three fiscal years, revenues exceeded expenditures by $374,000,000, $676,000,000 and $595,000,000, respectively. The aggregate surplus for those 3 years, about $1,645,000,000, is a little less than the Canadian Government spends in a full year and represents a 13-percent reduction in the net national debt. If these figures do not sound large to you, perhaps I should remind you that we are a small country and that to convert them into your terms you should multiply by 11, the ratio of our relative populations, or by 18, the ratio of our relative national incomes.

Broadly speaking, then, until the end of the last fiscal year, our policy had a definite anti-inflationary bias. Do not think for a moment that we did not reduce taxes during that period. Quite the contrary. The Canadian Government recognized quite frankly that the Canadian people were not ready to support taxes on wartime levels. We were equally sure that wartime taxes would have constituted a serious impediment to a full working effort and a brake upon the drive and initiative of men and women in all groups and classes. Taxes were brought down in careful stages over a period of 4 years.

It was not until this year, however, that we felt the time had come to plan for a balanced budget—or more accurately a modest surplus—rather than for a substantial surplus. It was our view that the increasing flow of goods available for sale to consumers made tax reductions economically feasible and desirable. Barring catastrophe, the postwar inflation seemed to have about spent itself. Having reached that conclusion we acted boldly, concentrating our tax reductions on the individual income tax in order to encourage consumer spending, but also taking off a large number of so-called nuisance taxes on commodities carried over from wartime and making a first attack on the problem of double taxation of corporate earnings.

In the individual income tax we restored exemptions to prewar levels, thus relieving about three-quarters of a million taxpayers of all income tax liability, which is a very large number in Canadian terms. We simplified the tax structure in such a way that three out of four of the remaining taxpayers became subject to a rate of 15 percent of their net taxable income—no more, no less. Altogether these changes meant a one-third reduction in revenue from the personal income tax.

You may also be interested in the start we have made on the reform of the corporate tax structure. As in the United States, it has been our practice to tax corporate profits and then to tax dividends when distributed, as part of personal income. For several years it has been the declared intention of the Canadian Government to introduce a measure of reform into this system of double taxation. During the war and the inflationary period following the war little could be done. This year, however, when substantial tax relief could be given without fear of feeding inflation, the opportunity arose of making a start.

First, we reduced the rate of tax on the first $10,000 of corporate profits to 10 percent. This reduction was specifically designed to help the small family type of business. On profits in excess of $10,000 the rate was raised from its former level of 30 percent to 33 percent.

At the same time individual shareholders, resident in Canada, were allowed a credit against their personal income tax equal to 10 percent of the dividends they received on shares of Canadian tax-paying corporations. Thus double taxation on the dividends received by an individual shareholder of a small corporation earning up to $10,000 is, to all intents and purposes, removed. Shareholders of larger corporations receive significant, though less, relief.

On March 22 of this year, 1949, when I brought down the Budget, there was some disposition to doubt the economic wisdom of such a bold program of tax relief. Events have, I submit, justified that boldness. It gave a stimulus to the economy at a crucial time. I am not suggesting that this was the only factor involved, but it is interesting, nonetheless, that even when you in the United States were worried by rising unemployment figures, there was no appreciable change in the employment situation in Canada. According to the survey taken in March of this year, the unemployed numbered fewer than 200,000 and only 2 percent of the civilian working population. In September, which is the latest date for which figures are available, our unemployed numbered fewer than 100,000. Furthermore, in spite of the unfavorable developments in the world's markets to which we sell our exports, our total national production has continued to rise. Every month this year the index of industrial production for Canada has been higher than in the corresponding month a year ago. As someone pointed out the other day, "For the moment we enjoy in Canada the only undiminished boom left in the world."

Lest anyone should think that these tax reductions must have put the Canadian Government into the red, let me hasten to add that, strange as it may appear to financial men like yourselves, every month since the beginning of this fiscal year I have been required to explain why revenues still exceed expenditures by more than had been predicted. Our latest estimates for the fiscal year as a whole indicate a surplus of around $90,000,000.

It is not only in the soundness of the Government's finances and the continued high levels of employment and income that I find support for the view that the foundations of the Canadian economy are more secure than ever before.

Into 4 or 5 years of the war period, Canada concentrated an expansion in industrial plant and equipment that would normally have required more than a decade to achieve. We diversified our productive mechanism. We found that we could make the most complicated types of equipment efficiently and, at least in many cases, as economically as any other country. There was a time when we feared that the end of the war would result in a huge area of vacant factory space and a large amount of idle equipment. But that is not at all what happened. On the contrary, our businessmen found it possible quickly to convert wartime industrial capacity to peacetime uses, and found it necessary to increase enormously their investment in new plant and equipment. In fact, the total capital investment in Canada—in industrial plant and equipment, public utilities, housing, public projects and so forth—has been proceeding at an unprecedented pace—a pace even more rapid than in the United States.

From what I have told you today about Canada and the Canadian point of view, I hope you will agree that we are making an effort to keep our own house in order and that we are ready to work with other nations reaching a satisfactory solution of problems that are common to all of us.

As far as the relations between Canada and the United States are concerned, I am confident of the outcome. Our partnership in great enterprises is a tried and tested one. We have differences from time to time as friends and partners invariably do. But Canadians and Americans know and trust each other. They have pretty much the same aims and aspirations. Given conditions such as these, we never have too much trouble in seeing eye to eye on the things that matter.

Admissions to House and Senate Press Galleries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today submitted a resolution to bar admittance to House and Senate Press Galleries, all departmental press conferences, and White House press conferences, to representatives of the New York Daily Worker, Tass Telegraph Agency of the U. S. S. R., Federated Press, and New York Daily Compass.

The freedom of dissemination of information is one of America's most cherished liberties. Our tolerance of expressions of opinion even by those who advocate the overthrow of our Government by force proves the strength of our democracy. However, in a time of tension, such as this, we must resort to restrictive measures which may temporarily curtail individuals but serve as a guaranty to the safety of our country as a whole.

So-called newspapermen representing Russian-controlled news sources have been given courteous treatment by officials of this Government in contrast to the manner in which our press representatives are received in Moscow. But the time has come when we must limit the activities of these Russian agents.

Why should we permit these undercover operators of the Kremlin, who daily report to Moscow, to ask officials of our Government questions regarding atom weapons, national defense, dispersion of troops, material, and other subjects vital to our national security and world peace?

The information received by these spies is always "on the record" and will be used against the security of the United States whenever possible.

The presence of these Kremlin parasites, especially in Washington, is a hindrance to representatives of our free press and the press of all free nations. It hampers Government officials who would like to speak honestly with an honest press, in their dealings with representatives of the free press of the world.

When and if Moscow allows the American press the accessibility to legitimate news that Russian-subsidized news organs have enjoyed in this country, we may remove restrictions. Until then, I believe easy access to official American news sources by avowed Communists must be stopped immediately.

The Will of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from today's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, without a doubt everyone in the Congress has approved of the President's declaration of military aid to South Korea. For days to come we will hear many severe criticisms of both the President and State Department for not having had a firm foreign policy in the Far East long before this outrageous attack of invasion took place. After visiting the Pacific area last fall, the members of our committee learned from almost every authority in that area that we should immediately adopt a firm policy and give notice to the Communists that they should go no further. This report was brushed aside and within a few days the Department of State said they would take no steps to militarily defend Formosa. The administration's failure to make definite moves to halt the Communists and withdrawing our troops from Korea really invited this attack by the North Koreans. Since we are familiar with the aggressive attitude of Soviet Russia, it would seem that the administration and the State Department could have taken the needed firm policy long ago. Of course, this is water over the dam and I hope this move will end our bungling foreign policy and stop for all time further communistic aggression:

THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE

The President's declaration on military aid to South Korea and other areas of the Far East has been greeted by the public with a reassuring and impressive degree of support. Leaders of both parties have taken their stand unequivocally behind the commitments involved. Where the Congress has been in a position to take action of its own, moreover, it has moved forward with decisive speed. Draft legislation had, for example, been caught up in a mixture of apathy and of mistrust of Presidential power; but the implications of the Far Eastern crisis swept all this away at a stroke. The House extended the draft law, without quibbling about the President's authority to invoke it at his discretion; the Senate brought the measure to the top of its legislative list, and passed it unanimously. This action was of vital importance in itself; it is also significant as an indication of the firm and united spirit which has gripped a body only recently divided and perplexed.

Accompanying this solidarity there is, to be sure, a subdued strain of questioning, a tendency to ask how the crisis arose in its present form and whether it might have been averted. For many months the passions aroused by our Far Eastern policy have been intense; the feeling with respect to responsible individuals have flamed heatedly. It would perhaps have been outside the realm of possibilities that these feelings should now be entirely forgotten. The question whether Mr. Acheson has reversed himself, whether certain of his Republican critics have been right all along and have now been proven so by events, is one that will in due time have to be answered; for the moment, it can have little practical relevance. What had to be done was done with dispatch and resolution and has received universal acceptance. In the light of that transcendent fact, other considerations fall to a subsidiary level.

A second strain of doubt concerns the degree to which the President has acted on his own in these matters, making commitments without prior approval of the Congress. Senator TAFT, for example argued yesterday that the decision to implement the United Nations resolution by use to the armed forces should have been referred to the national legislature. But the crisis, by its nature, was one which demanded and justified Presidential initiative. The test was not whether Mr. Truman should act on his own, but whether he could act in such a way as to attain the whole-hearted support of the people and their elected Representatives. That he has met this test is evident. Within his own circle of advisers he found a unity of opinion obliterating former differences; and the decisions based on these consultations expressed, in turn, the will and purpose of the Congress. In this accord, backed by the wider harmony of an aroused public opinion, we have an example of democracy rising successfully to meet a grave challenge.

Withholding Tax on Farm Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a comprehensive statement by Mr. A. D. Sappington, chief counsel of the Missouri Farmers Association, on the proposed 10-percent withholding tax on patronage refunds paid by farm cooperatives as carried in the pending tax bill:

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED 10 PERCENT WITHHOLDING TAX ON PATRONAGE REFUNDS PAID BY FARM COOPERATIVES

(By A. D. Sappington)

1. It would be difficult to determine on what amounts the withholding tax should be applied.

There is still some question so far as exempt cooperatives are concerned, as to whether patronage refunds merely credited to a patron constitute taxable income in the hands of the patron. In each case, whether exempt or nonexempt, whether the patronage refund credited and not paid in cash is taxable income to the patron depends upon the marketing agreement, the articles of incorporation, and the bylaws. That is, the obligation to pay the refund and whether it is merely a reserve fund or whether it constitutes a payment out and a reinvestment by the patron.

Regardless of the release issued by the Treasury Department, there is still a good deal to be settled with reference to this point. For this reason, the withholding tax would create many administrative problems.

The further question arises as to those cooperatives which operate on a revolving-fund basis. Must they withhold on the amount which they are paying out for a previous year, as well as on the amount credited to the patron's account in the revolving fund?

2. Under the sixteenth constitutional amendment it is contemplated that only fixed or determinable gains or income are to be taxable.

A patronage refund is not in any sense a fixed or determinable amount of gain or income. It is simply a portion of the selling price of farm products or a reduction in the cost of farm supplies. In the case of farm supplies, it might be called a repayment of an overcharge. This is recognized by the Commissioner in his instructions to farmers in preparing their tax returns. He advises them that the so-called patronage refund may be stated on the return as a reduction of farm expenses or as an increase in the original advance or selling price of farm products. For example, the farmer markets approximately a thousand dollars worth of milk. His cooperative will advance him $950. Then at the close of the year, if the cooperative has been successful, it may make him a second advance of $50, and it is on this $50 that the new bill proposes to withhold the tax. There is no more reason in withholding tax from the $50 second advance than there would be to withhold it on the $950 first advance. Neither the first nor the second advance constitute a fixed or determinable gain or income to the farmer but are the selling price of an article which has cost value. This $1,000 worth of milk may cost the farmer $1,100 so that when he receives his $950 and $50 advances he may still be losing $100 on the transaction. It would not seem reasonable to arbitrarily place a withholding tax on such an item.

Take the case of a purchasing cooperative. A farmer needs approximately $1,000 worth of feed. The cooperative charges him $1,000 for the feed and at the end of the year found that they have made a slight savings over their overhead. Therefore, they are able at the end of the year to refund him $20 of what he paid for his feed, making his feed cost him a net of $980. Under what basis of reasoning can the reduction of the farmer's cost of feed be treated as a fixed or determinable gain in which a withholding tax could properly be applied? The feed is fed to his livestock and his gain or loss arises from the sale of his livestock and it is difficult to conceive on what basis a withholding tax could be applied to an adjustment in the cost of the farmer's feed. In some cases a part of the farmer's so-called patronage dividends may be on groceries. He is never permitted to deduct the cost of his groceries on his income-tax return, why should he pay withholding tax on a reduction in the cost of his groceries refunded to him at the end of the year?

Or, the farmer's refund may arise from purchase of machinery. The machinery is a capital cost, not deductible on his income-tax return. However, if he receives a patronage refund at the end of the year, reducing his capital cost, the proposed plan would withhold a tax on this reduction of cost. We should not apply withholding tax to the reduction of the cost of farm machinery.

3. The withholding tax should be limited in its application to refunds paid to persons, firms, or corporations which are taxable under the law.

In the case of farm cooperatives, there are refunds either paid or credited by wholesale cooperatives to local cooperatives who are its patrons. In such cases, the local cooperative to whom the refund is paid or credited may not be a taxpayer, but is exempt under section 101 (12). If the withholding tax were applicable in such cases, every such cooperative would have to file a claim for refund, as it does not owe any income tax. This would create much administration work and effort, which is entirely unnecessary and uncalled for, on the part of both the local associations and the Treasury Department. The refund of the tax withheld would, of course, have to be paid because the person

from whom it was withheld is not taxable. But if no such refund of the tax were provided for, then it would certainly be erroneous, because it would be taxing an association which is exempt from taxation and would also constitute a double withholding on the refund, as the local association would then withhold on the amount of patronage dividend paid or credited to its patrons.

4. The withholding tax, if assessed against cooperative agricultural associations at all, should be limited to refunds of not less than $100, or some such figure.

Unless the proposed withholding tax is limited to sizable patronage refunds paid, the administrative costs to the local cooperative association will be tremendous. Furthermore, the administrative costs and expense to the Treasury Department, in processing the withholding tax, will be unreasonable and out of all proportion to the revenue derived. Many local cooperative associations have 1,000 to 1,500 patrons to whom refunds are paid. Many of these refunds are as little as a dollar or less. Many are less than $10.

In an actual tabulation of patronage refunds amounting to 14,918 refunds, the following shows the results as to size:

Range in amounts	Number of patronage refunds	Percent of total
1 cent to 99 cents	9,374	63
$1 to $4.99	3,871	26
$5 to $9.99	771	5
$10 to over	902	6
Total	14,918	100

5. The problems encountered as to a withholding tax on patronage refunds are much greater than as to a withholding tax on corporate dividends.

In any event, if the withholding tax on patronage refunds is to be applied, it should be limited, as we have set forth above. The problems with reference to a withholding tax on patronage refunds are much greater than are those with reference to a withholding tax on corporate dividends. In the case of corporate dividends, the stockholders of most corporations are rather limited in number, but even in the smallest cooperative association, in most cases, there are hundreds of patrons and in some cases over 1,000. In many cases the actual cost of computing, figuring, and filling out the necessary forms for the withholding tax on patronage refunds would be more than the tax remitted to the Government. Corporations already submit informational reports on dividend payments to the Government, and it has been proved that it is not unduly burdensome on the corporations. But the same reasoning does not apply in the case of patronage refunds, due to the multitude of patrons of cooperative associations.

Furthermore, many patronage refunds do not constitute taxable income. If the refund is for a consumer item, then the refund does not constitute income to the patron. The refund constitutes taxable income to the patron only if it is an additional payment for the farm products marketed or a refund on farm supplies purchased, which is the category of an expense of operation of the farm or business. In the case of refunds on marketing operations, there seems no more justifiable reason for withholding on the final payment, which the refund constitutes, for the product, than for applying it to the first payment, or the initial advance.

6. A withholding tax on either patronage refunds or corporate dividends is materially different from withholding tax on wages and salaries.

The withholding tax on wages and salaries was put in operation for the purpose of getting the income taxes paid on a pay-as-we-go-basis. It was not put in operation simply because it was considered that the American people are on the whole tax dodgers or evaders, and, therefore, the tax should be collected in that manner, but it was put in operation so that the tax would be paid as the income is earned rather than having the tax become in arrears and the amount of the tax having to be paid a year after the money had been earned. The withholding tax on wages and salaries takes into consideration the exemptions, dependents, and other items. The withholding tax on refunds or dividends could not take into consideration such factors, and it is entirely possible that such refunds or dividends would be paid to people who were not required to file any tax return. Certainly the withholding tax on refunds and dividends should not be applied just because it is thought that many people may not be paying the tax they owe on such income. This is placing the recipient of corporate dividends and patronage refunds as tax dodgers or evaders. There is nothing to indicate that any such action is necessary on the part of Congress to collect the taxes owed the Government. There are ample provisions and penalties now effective to insure the collection of taxes.

Furthermore, the proposed withholding tax on corporate dividends and patronage refunds would not produce one penny of new revenue for the Government as has been insisted upon by the President to replace cuts in excise taxes.

Mrs. Lois M. Fugler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an article from the Austin (Tex.) Sunday American-Statesman of June 25, 1950, which tells the story of one of Texas' most distinguished citizens.

This is a story of courage, determination, and success. For, during the 23 years that Mrs. Lois M. Fugler has been working in the veterans' service office of Travis County, she has overcome personal loss and sacrifice to extend a helping hand and an understanding heart to thousands of veterans and their families.

All of us who know her take pride in the fine work she does, and all wish for her the rich reward of personal satisfaction and happiness which comes only in helping others.

TEXANS IN ACTION—LOIS FUGLER: SHE'S FIGHTER FOR WAR VETERAN'S RIGHTS

(By Mary L. Kennedy)

The hopes of mankind cannot be kept alive merely by words. They must be translated into the life of a country by the love and sacrifice of brave men and women.

To Lois M. Fugler, assistant veterans' service officer for Travis County, patriotism is more than a business. It is a creed, a devotion, a near-religion.

For 23 years she has concerned herself with veterans and their problems. Her interest is not purely academic. In her own life she has known and overcome many of the sorrows they face. She lost a brother in World War I, her oldest son in World War II. Her husband died early in their married life, leaving her with three small children to support.

In spite of sorrow she has managed to live gracefully, valiantly, and usefully. As Goldsmith says: "You can preach a better sermon with your life than with your lips," and her own personal courage has put heart into many a veteran and his family.

Born in Marshall, the daughter of R. C. and Anna Jo Childs, Lois comes from a family of soldiers. Both of her grandfathers fought in the Civil War. Two of her brothers were in World War I; her two sons in the last war. She herself was a war bride.

Her husband, Virgil Dewey Fugler, enlisted in 1916 and was commissioned before he was 21 years old. He served as a member of the thirty-seventh and thirty-eighth legislatures from Harrison County. He became secretary to the State highway commission and founded the Texas Highway Bulletin.

After his death the highway department created a place for Lois. She rose from file clerk to secretarial work. Then she ran for and won the place as calendar clerk for the thirty-ninth and fortieth legislatures. When the veterans' service office was created in 1928 she was made its first secretary.

She progressed steadily to her present position and now handles every phase of veterans' benefits—vocational rehabilitation, disability compensation, pensions and retirement benefits.

Her work sphere radiates to the thousands of out-of-county veterans who attend the University of Texas and other training schools in Austin and vicinity.

Mrs. Fugler is the only woman in Texas who is an accredited representative of the Veterans' Administration with the authority to appear in behalf of veterans before rating boards. Her specialty is taking a case which has been kicked from pillar to post and securing to the veteran the benefit requested.

She has been cited twice in resolutions by the legislature for her unselfish devotion to the service of veterans and their problems which has made her known and loved by more disabled veterans and their families than any other lady in Texas.

It was largely through her work and inspiration that the statue commemorating the war dead of Travis County was erected near the Capitol grounds. Mrs. Fugler says she knows that every Gold Star mother who helped make this memorial a reality looks on it as a tribute to a son she lost in the war.

To her, the bronze young soldier is her oldest son, Virgil Dewey Fugler, Jr. He and his whole bomber crew lost their lives over New Guinea. A fine, handsome boy, he held every promise for a brilliant life. When word of his death came the light went out of her life. She became embittered and despondent. His honors—the Presidential citation, Air Medal, Silver Star, five bronze stars—were cold comfort.

Then her mother, 72, who "looks like an old-fashioned bouquet but is staved with iron," helped pull Lois out of her slough of despair. She showed her she still had much to live for—another fine son, a beautiful daughter, the whole world around her.

Lois began reading the old family Bible. She read and read. When she finished, she began all over again. Gradually strength and consolation flowed back into her life. She found, she said, that God is indeed "our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble."

At work she doesn't carry her sorrow on her sleeve. But there is always a vase of flowers before her son's picture.

She takes unto herself the troubles of all who come to her. And, like the little boy who was asked what the burden he carried was, she says: "That's no burden; it's my brother."

American Cancer Society Award to George E. Stringfellow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George E. Stringfellow has long been regarded as one of the most useful and philanthropic citizens of New Jersey. His accomplishments in the field of civics and also of humanitarianism are legion. Mr. Stringfellow is a former member and former vice chairman of the American Cancer Society's National Executive Committee. He was the first president of the New Jersey division of this society, which he took the lead in organizing.

He is the recipient of the 1950 medal of the American Cancer Society, Inc., which was recently presented to him by Gen. William J. Donovan. Other speakers at the presentation ceremonies were: Hon. J. Wesley Goldthorp, president, American Cancer Society, New Jersey Division, Inc.; Hon. Elmer H. Bobst, vice chairman of the board of directors, American Cancer Society; and Mr. George E. Sokolsky, the noted columnist and author.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I append herewith the addresses delivered by the gentlemen mentioned and the acceptance address of Mr. Stringfellow at the ceremonies:

Hon. J. WESLEY GOLDTHORP (president, American Cancer Society, New Jersey Division, Inc). I present Gen. William J. Donovan, distinguished member of the New York bar and founder of one of America's greatest law firms. He has rendered most distinguished military and diplomatic service to our Nation in both World Wars and in many fields of diplomacy.

As chairman of our 1950 Cancer Crusade, he is in command of a civilian army of volunteers fighting cancer, and never has his genius and resourcefulness found a task of greater challenge.

I present to you soldier, lawyer, statesman, and humanitarian, Gen. William J. Donovan.

Gen. WILLIAM J. DONOVAN. We have joined in this fight, some of us, because of our own experience with cancer or the experience of relatives or friends, or we are prompted to join because of a realization that we must destroy this No. 2 killer of mankind.

Certainly we cannot say it is the other fellow's job, and I know from looking at the records that the New Jersey Division has never passed the buck. It has always done its job and more. Your figures are eloquent testimony of that.

In the past 5 years you have raised $3,200,000 with which to fight cancer, $400,000 more than you were asked to raise during that period.

We are joined together here to make the fight for ourselves and for all who are in danger and we here are the selected leaders. The determining factors in this fight will be our example and our effort, our judgment and our skill, our humaneness and our patience, tied in with a sense of responsibility, comradeship, skills, and tenacity and an effort of similar groups throughout the Nation.

We should remind ourselves of the kind of enemy we deal with. Cancer is one of the oldest diseases in the animal and plant kingdom. It is found in primitive people as well as in modern people, in animals, tame and wild, in mice, cats, sheep, goats, fish, and birds.

It appears in humans most often after the age of 40, but no age is immune and, in fact, 3,000 children a year, between the ages of 2 and 14 years, are killed in this country by cancer.

Cancer is cured every day. On the other hand, about 200,000 people died in the United States of cancer last year. The number will probably increase this year and for the next several years unless means are found to deal successfully with a certain type of cancer in advanced stages, or to develop better detection to uncover the disease in its early stages.

We have built and put into operation the American Cancer Society, the only voluntary health agency in the United States seeking to control cancer through a comprehensive program of education of laymen and physicians, of long-term research, and of service to cancer patients. We have inspired and stimulated the development of a large research program for the conquest of cancer, a program financed by the National Cancer Institute, the Atomic Energy Commission, and private philanthropic organizations as well as by the American Cancer Society.

We have created public awareness of cancer and demonstrated the soundness of this approach. As a result, more cancer patients are seeing their doctors in early curable stages. The evidence shows we are saving lives now—today.

More specifically, we have contributed more than $13,000,000 to the society's national research program and increased annual public support of the American Cancer Society from $85,000 in 1944 to $13,000,000 in 1949.

The aim of the American Cancer Society is to bring to every person in the country sufficient knowledge about cancer so that he will not lose his life needlessly as approximately half of present cancer patients do.

While much has been done and is being done in this respect, the ultimate cure is still hidden in the test tubes and in the mouse cages of the laboratories of research scientists.

The key to the success of the Society's program is the intelligent, informed volunteer. This organization believes in its volunteers as the expression of the democratic tradition that each individual has a responsibility for his neighbor and for his community.

Now I come back to that theme with which I started and that is that in this fight we have to all work not only for ourselves but for all those who are in danger, and it is that spirit that must animate the whole society.

I have the privilege of speaking now concerning a man of your organization who has epitomized in a marked degree that spirit and that is Mr. George E. Stringfellow. He was the first president and leader in organizing the New Jersey Division. He served until October of last year when he voluntarily retired after expressing the opinion that the president of the division should not serve over an extended period of time.

Mr. Stringfellow is a former member of the American Cancer Society's national executive committee and former vice-chairman of that committee.

The great progress made in cancer control program of New Jersey has been due in a large measure to his remarkable leadership ability, and to the agreement as to responsibilities between the laymen and the medical profession.

He has for years been a leader in many national and State-wide civic activities and the contribution that he has made to the cancer program, not only in his own State, but in the Nation, has brought him recognition as one of the outstanding leaders in our movement.

Mr. Stringfellow is vice president of Thomas A. Edison Industries and the head of the company's largest manufacturing division. He was a daily business associate of the late Thomas Alva Edison during some of the wizard's most productive years. Mr. Stringfellow has been cited on many occasions for his constructive civic activities and is well known as a public speaker on topics of democracy, citizenship, and brotherhood.

His selection to receive the 1950 American Cancer Society's award was unanimous.

It is my pleasure, Mr. Stringfellow, to present you with this award.

Mr. GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW. Mr. President, Gen. Donovan, George Sokolsky, Elmer Bobst, other distinguished guests and friends, the progress made here in New Jersey in reducing suffering and death from cancer has been the result of close cooperation between the press, the radio, the laymen, and the medical men, who are intensely loyal to a great cause. I, therefore, accept this award in the name of the New Jersey Division of the American Cancer Society and shall continue to devote my best efforts in this great cause until "the roll is called up yonder."

Hon. J. WESLEY GOLDTHORP. Thank you, General Donovan, for this very splendid discourse and for those fine words of encouragement which you have brought to us.

I know I speak for everyone present that right in the very depths of our hearts we rejoice in George Stringfellow's receiving this award. Nothing was ever more merited.

I should like now to introduce another distinguished citizen of New Jersey and of the United States who has toiled long and hard in the cause of cancer and who has given of himself and of his substance to reduce suffering and death from cancer. He is the vice chairman of the board of directors of the American Cancer Society, Hon. Elmer H. Bobst.

Hon. ELMER H. BOBST. Fellow workers in this great cause, I have been looking at a beautiful bouquet. Spring will soon be with us. These flowers that you see will be growing in your gardens. Trees will be bursting their buds and leaves. Birds will be singing, and we hope that you and I will enjoy all the beauty of spring.

I was thinking as I was looking at that bouquet: "There is a dear friend of mine who, just 8 weeks ago, was strong, hale, and hearty. He will not be here to see the first signs of summer. He doesn't know it. I know it, and I grieve. He has cancer in both of his lungs. He's going to die in a few weeks. A man of achievement, a man of integrity, a man who has done much for civilization."

That is why I have given of my time and effort to this great cause. Just because of the fact friends of mine are dying of cancer, because of the fact that my mother and my father died of cancer, I want to fight it as long as I live, and I know you do, too.

'Tis said that great trees grow from little acorns. It seems only a few weeks ago that a group of 35 people met with me and we organized the fight on cancer in New Jersey.

While I have given time and substance, however, I think my greatest contribution to this cause has been in getting men and women to join in our battle against this terrible curse, and of those contributions I don't know of any greater one than George E. Stringfellow, whom we tonight honor.

When I invited Mr. Stringfellow to work with us I felt in my bones, "Here is the man for New Jersey. This is the man who can take over and make a success of it." And he did it.

You are here tonight because of him, because of the efforts that he has made during these five years.

What has been the result? Just think of the many lives that have been saved. Just think of how this battle is going on. In 1943 and 1944, those 2 years together, the American Cancer Society collected $1,300,000. That was all in 2 years. In 5 years—$54,000,000 has been collected with which to fight cancer. Prior to 1945 we were fighting cancer literally with bows and arrows. Now, as General Donovan told you, we are giving it the works, putting science with its searchlight to looking for truth, pitting it against this devil.

Hon. J. WESLEY GOLDTHORP. The next speaker needs no introduction to this or any other audience in America. He is George E. Sokolsky, a noted columnist, carried by 300 newspapers in North America and read daily by millions of our people. He is a noted radio commentator, lecturer, economist, and public speaker. He is an author of note, having written a number of well-known books, including The American Way of Life. It is my privilege to present George Sokolsky.

Mr. GEORGE E. SOKOLSKY. Mr. President, General Donovan, and Mr. Stringfellow. I came here tonight not to speak on cancer nor about the American Cancer Society, but to see George Stringfellow get something. In all the years I have known him I have never seen him get anything, not even a square meal at a dinner that he managed.

It is quite a change to see George sitting down quietly and taking something. It feels very good, as George Stringfellow deserves a great deal, much more than he gets, and he gets less than he deserves because George Stringfellow does not know how to speak pleasantly when he should not.

Dwindling Cotton Shipments to Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I submit to the House a copy of a report and resolution of the American Cotton Shippers Association adopted at the twenty-sixth annual convention of the association at New Orleans, La., May 20, 1950, on the subject of the loss of the Spanish outlet for United States cotton. This resolution forcibly calls to the attention of the country the deplorable state of our national relations with Spain. Our present policy in regard to Spain is doing injury to both Spain and our own country.

Whereas the traditional Spanish outlet for United States cotton has become virtually lost to other cottons, by reason of noncooperative politico-economic relations between the United States and Spain, in contrast with more cooperative relations between other nations and Spain: Be it

Resolved, That the American Cotton Shippers Association urge that the competent, financial agencies of Government, notably the Export-Import Bank, adopt a cooperative policy toward the financing of cotton supplies for the Spanish textile industry; and be it further

Resolved, That it recommends that Congress enact such legislation as may be appropriate for the purpose, if legislation be required.

The Menace of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, while the United States is not formally engaged in a shooting war with North Korea, an actual state of war does exist, and by sending material and men to South Korea we have, in a sense, committed ourselves to war.

I was one of the first Members of this body to openly declare that there was no other course for us to follow but to come to the aid of South Korea and supply her with all the material and manpower she needs to drive the invading forces of North Korea back to the thirty-eighth parallel.

I believe an overwhelming majority of Congress and the American public have voiced their approval of yesterday's statement by President Truman and will stand in united support of all-out aid to South Korea. In times of critical crises the American people have always been known to resolve their differences quickly, fall in behind their leader and unite their efforts for the cause of freedom, liberty, and the good of all mankind.

It is indeed good that we stand united for this cause. However, I would just like to remind this body of several stark realities.

In spite of all the warnings from various sources, it took an actual state of war to make the President and the State Department realize that the menace of the Communist conspiracy in the Far East presents a definite threat to our way of life.

Intelligence reports tell us that this situation in Korea did not spring up overnight—that it had been fermenting for some time, long enough for us to have been better prepared than we were to meet it had the warning signs been heeded by the President and the Department of State.

This brings to mind the ease with which the military can be blamed for blunders of this kind. It has been done before. Admiral Kimmel and General Short had to "take the rap" for the Pearl Harbor disaster. Had they been better informed as to what was going on in the White House and State Department, the story might have been told differently.

The United States has always frowned on vesting too much power in the hand of the military, but in these times when we are expected to protect the outposts of freedom over the face of the entire globe, our State Department must coordinate and implement its actions, to a certain degree, with our military protectors or we cannot expect anything more than what we have experienced on several bitter occasions.

With attention now focused on Korea we are likely to forget the growing menace of communism right here at home. There still are, today, operating in this country, more dangerous Communist agents than those needed to instigate and run the invasion of South Korea. We have sent billions of dollars to Europe to contain communism, and, until yesterday, we had our backs turned on Asia. With substantial evidence to prosecute and convict any number of Communist agents in this country, our Justice Department keeps playing a stalling game.

Gentlemen, it is unfortunate that an actual state of war was necessary to arouse some people out of their lethargic state. While I am in full accord with anything we can do to contain communism within an area as far from our shores as possible, we should not lose sight of the fact that we also have a serious problem at home. This calls for a consistent foreign policy by our State Department and vigorous prosecution by the Justice Department of pending cases against known Communist conspirators, sympathizers, and fellow travelers in our midst.

Now, in order that we may all be better informed as to the background and implications of the greatest criminal conspiracy of all time, I should like to extend my remarks in more pointed detail.

Sometimes during the past 10 years, those of us who have been so close to the problem have had cause to wonder whether the American people are even interested in what is happening to this country.

Unquestionably much of this public apathy and "do-nothingness" is the result of the blind and selfish leadership that we have had during this critical period of history. During this period when some other of our war allies have at least made some token resistance to Communist espionage agents in their midst, we in this country have been subjected to the cries of "red herrings," "false alarmists," or "publicity seekers" when any loyal American citizen attempts to direct the attention of fellow citizens to the conspiracy in our midst.

Many during the past weeks have had cause to view with alarm the arrest of leading atomic scientists for furnishing secret information to Russia. Leading politicians have come forward with breast-beating statements that our country is "in danger" and that our security must be tightened. The irony of the matter is that some of the most verbose of these statements came from politicians who have known since 1946 that there was a vast espionage network operating in this country to steal the secrets of the atom bomb and they have sealed their lips and maintained a "discreet" silence. What was the reason for their discreet silence? Was it because this foreign power did not continue to be a threat? In the four short years that have ensued we have seen the forces of a despotic government imprison almost one-half of the population of the world without firing a shot in the status of a "hot war."

We have seen these forces occupy countries without resistance because the virility of their government had been destroyed by fifth columnists and traitors within those countries. Those in the

know in our Federal Government certainly are aware, and the American people have been told time and time again, that there has been a great influx of foreign espionage agents into the United States since the cessation of hostilities. I can tell you now without any fear of contradiction, that there was a great influx of espionage agents into this country before, and during, the last war. Many of us had the dubious pleasure of playing tag with these espionage agents during that period. I say "dubious," because the pleasure has curdled. Every counterespionage agent that I knew during those war years worked like a man possessed of the devil in gathering evidence against not only the foreign subversive but against that most contemptible person in the human race, the domestic traitor.

The average person has no conception today of the gratitude that they owe the House Un-American Activities Committee. Working with a staff so small that they cannot even process much of the vital information that is furnished them, they have ripped out and exposed some of the smug, suave, lying traitors that have betrayed their heritage. In 1946, this committee began hearings to expose some of these traitors. In deference to the wishes of the executive branch of the Government these hearings were postponed as the committee had been informed that a Federal grand jury was being convened in New York City to hear evidence against the principals involved in espionage against this country. The grand jury was convened and heard evidence spasmodically for 18 months and not one indictment was returned for espionage activity. In the meantime, the statute of limitations on the crimes had run and the administration, as a cover-up, came out with its "red herring" charges.

The 1935 Communist chart shows that the Reds are organized in this country for such purposes as penetrating youth organizations, peace and unemployment agitation, and trade-union infiltrations. Fifty percent of the Communist Party members in the United States are in the trade-union movement. They are organized for infiltrations of defense, food, transportation, and propaganda fields where Communists could aid the foreign and military policies of the Kremlin. Their own chart reveals that they organize front groups for women, writers, farmers, veterans, artists, left-wing theaters, and for publications and propaganda. They have always used as a basis groups for racial agitation, for support of the Soviet Union and defense of American Reds who become involved in legal cases, as well as machinery for always attacking and smearing any well-informed and active foes of communism.

In order that you may realize the extent of espionage operations against the United States, I can tell you that by the end of 1941 there were 13,800 espionage investigations being conducted by an intelligence service of this Government. This does not mean that there were that many espionage agents active at that time but it does mean that that many people were suspected as espionage agents, for an investigation was not started unless there was a complaint or the subject's name had been involved in another espionage case. Similarly, these figures do not mean that there were not more than 13,800 principals and contacts in espionage cases in this country, for later developments have uncovered many hundreds of principals who were involved in espionage during that period who were not known at the time the figures were compiled.

It is at least common knowledge to anyone who cares that the Russian Government operated several hundred espionage agents in this country during and since the last war. We should consider, therefore, all possible procedures of this group in their subversive activities. It is a fact that the Communist movement is an international conspiracy designed to rule the world. They will attempt with every resource at their command to capture this country through infiltration and control of Government policies. If this method fails, and the free choice is still in the will of the American people, only a miracle will prevent a war with Russia. It is a choice between freedom and slavery; between a despotic government and a republican government.

Most of the American people, I feel certain, share my opinion that our State Department's foreign policy and the protection of domestic traitors are responsible for our precarious position in our international affairs today.

Most of you are familiar with the traitorous conduct of such former Government employees as Alger Hiss, Julian Wadleigh, and Judith Coplon.

I should like to give you some concrete examples of instances in which the State Department has been responsible for the protection of Russian espionage agents in this country.

Most of the Soviet espionage directed against the United States during the last war was directed through diplomatic personnel and trade and economic missions. Some of the Soviet agents, however, entered the country via fraudulent passports.

One of the most dangerous Russian agents entering this country under the latter clasification was Arthur Alexandrovich Adams. Adams was the head of one espionage group that was attempting to steal the secrets of the atom bomb long before the bomb was ever perfected. My recollection of the Arthur Adams' espionage activities and others that I shall name are as follows:

Arthur Adams was in the United States prior to 1921 when he went back to Russia with the Ludwig Martens party. He returned to the United States in the twenties and thirties as a representative of Amtorg, the Soviet purchasing agency located in New York City. As a cover for his espionage activities he entered the United States at Buffalo, N. Y., in 1938, on a fraudulent Canadian birth certificate obtained through M. S. Milestone, of Toronto, Canada, who was later identified in Canadian spy trials as a Canadian Red.

In 1938, Adams established technical laboratories with James Broches Aronoff, a New York attorney of Russian birth. Later Adams furnished a California Communist with about $2,000 in cash, with instructions that a weekly check should be sent to Adams as a cover for employment. Later still, Adams used the offices of the Electronics Corp. of America, whose president was Sam Novick, and a subsidiary of this company, the Keynote Recording Co., whose president was Eric Bernay. In 1943 Adams was seen making contact with one Clarence Hiskey, a scientist employed on the Manhattan project at the University of Chicago. Soon thereafter classified information was found in the possession of Arthur Adams.

In order to get Hiskey away from his highly secret work, the Army called Hiskey to service on a Reserve commission which he held in the Army. According to the public testimony of another Manhattan-project scientist, John H. Chapin, Hiskey contacted Chapin when Hiskey was called to the service and requested Chapin to meet Arthur Adams, a Russian agent, and furnish Adams whatever information he desired in the future. Chapin agreed to carry out Clarence Hiskey's request and subsequently had meetings with Arthur Adams. Chapin has testified that he got cold feet and did not furnish Adams any atom-bomb data.

Eric Bernay, previously referred to, attempted to help Adams escape his surveillance in New York City in January or February 1945. By subterfuge, Adams temporarily escaped surveillance, was met by Bernay within a matter of minutes and left New York City, but both were identified in the railroad station at Chicago when they alighted from their train. Adams continued to Portland, Oreg., where he attempted to board a Russian ship, but was surrounded by FBI agents before he reached the gangplank.

Steve Nelson, a member of the national committee of the Communist Party, was Adams' contact on the west coast. In his operations in the United States he has used many aliases. Nelson was born in Yugoslavia in 1903 and arrived in the United States June 14, 1920, an illegal entry under the name of Joseph Fleischinger, later legalized by order of the Immigration Service, November 21, 1922. He became an American citizen by naturalization in Detroit on November 26, 1928. Nelson attended the Lenin School in Moscow in the 1930's and in August 1931, asked for a United States passport, claiming Rankin, Pa., as his place of birth.

Two of Nelson's contacts from the atom-bomb laboratories of the University of California were Profs. Joseph W. Weinberg and David Bohm. Nelson was observed contacting Weinberg, at which time parcels were delievered to Nelson and in turn delivered to a representative of the Russian consulate in San Francisco.

And so the paths of Adams, Nelson, and other Russian agents crisscross in the United States, free to contact whom they will, and free from prosecution.

Within the past 2 years, the House Un-American Activities Committee has

questioned Dr. Joseph W. Weinberg about his contact with Nelson. Weinberg denied that he even knew Steve Nelson. The committee stated that Weinberg lied; that they had witnesses to prove he lied, and by a unanimous vote turned the case over to the Department of Justice with the recommendation that Weinberg be prosecuted for perjury. The Department of Justice has taken no action whatever. James L. Morrill, president of the University of Minnesota, where Weinberg now teaches, has been quoted as saying that no action would be taken against Weinberg by the University of Minnesota unless he is indicted by regular legal procedure. At the time that Weinberg was questioned by the House Committee, the Atomic Energy Commission admitted that Weinberg was a supervisor on an AEC Committee, passing on the eligibility and loyalty of students given fellowships to study atomic energy.

David Bohm is now a chemistry professor at Princeton University and 2 years ago was named on the Committee on Loyalty Problems by the Federation of American Scientists. David Bohm's superior at Princeton University is Dr. Henry Smyth, chairman of the physics department and author of the Smyth report on atomic energy issued shortly after the last war. David Lilienthal has been quoted as saying that the Smyth report was the biggest breach of security since the beginning of the atom-bomb project.

Clarence Hiskey, the University of Chicago scientist, who was commissioned into the Army to get him away from the Russian agent, was later honorably discharged from the Army with the rank of captain. He is now a professor in the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, N. Y. Hiskey has been questioned by the House Un-American Activities Committee and refuses to answer all pertinent questions on the ground of self-incrimination.

Another Russian espionage agent operating in this country during the last war was Andrei V. Schevchenko. This Russian agent entered the United States in 1942, representing the aviation department, Soviet Purchasing Commission. For a time he was assigned as a liaison man with the Bell Aircraft Co., Buffalo, from the Soviet Purchasing Commission. Schevchenko approached loyal American citizens and requested classified data on a new type of airplane which the Bell Aircraft Co. was developing. These loyal Americans, Leona Vivian Franey, Joseph John Franey, and Loren G. Hass, at considerable risk to their personal safety and under the supervision of the FBI, built up a strong espionage case against Andrei V. Schevchenko. Again the State Department would not permit an arrest, and Schevchenko left the United States in January 1946.

Let us address ourselves to the question of responsibility. Who are these untouchables in the State Department that hell nor high water cannot flush? Their tenacity in clinging to their positions of influence in face of their dismal failures make them security risks, whether willful or not. The destiny of 150,000,000 Americans and the civilized world, as we know it, hangs in the balance. What manner of thinking does our Secretary of State engage in when he announces a policy of total diplomacy against Russia and on the same day sends an urgent request to a Federal judge in New York City not to sentence to prison the only Russian espionage agent that this country has convicted.

How long will Congress permit the Owen Lattimores of the State Department to thumb their noses at Congress when any Member thereof dares to point out the reason for our loss of China. Let this man who was so quick to demand that a Senator resign his elected office place his record side by side with the Senator's and take his case before the American voter in order that he might learn, unequivocally, the wishes of the American people.

We come to the question of what remedies we can institute to contain and suppress this Red menace in our country.

First of all, I believe we must have a thorough airing and not another whitewash of the State Department. The public has a right to know how many Soviet agents, Communists, and their sympathizers have been employed in the State Department since the Communist spy rings began to operate and how many are still on the payroll? Who was responsible for their employment and whose influence kept them in positions of trust for years after substantial evidence had been discovered by Government investigators reflecting on their loyalty? What present employees in the State Department, and particularly in the far eastern division, were employed or promoted on the recommendation of Alger Hiss or Julian Wadleigh? What official in the State Department was responsible for white-washing the Amerasia espionage ring in 1945? Who was responsible for the hiring of 91 homosexuals in the State Department? These are vital questions bearing on whether or not the architects of our foreign policy are qualified to do their job.

I believe that our Congress should take measures to outlaw the Communist Party in this country. J. Peters, who for many years was the head of a Russian espionage ring in this country, once stated that the Communist Party is like a submerged submarine; the part that you see above water is the periscope, but the part underneath is the real Communist organization; that is the conspiratorial apparatus. The Communist Party then, by its representative's own admission, is conspiratorial. The part above ground is for no other purpose than recruiting members and espionage agents. Such former Russian agents as Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley state that they entered their espionage activities for the Russian Government through the Communist Party memberships which they held.

Some well-informed people have recommended against the outlawing of the Communist Party in this country. They argue that as long as we can see them operate, we know what they are doing and can take protective measures against them. What protective measures have we taken against them? They and their followers are 1,000,000 strong. They have penetrated every field of human endeavor in our country. If they were a bona fide political party, there would be reason enough that they should not be outlawed, for our Constitution provides that we are a free people, where the majority opinion will rule. The Communist Party is an international conspiracy and is not entitled to the status of a political party. It has never gained control of a country by receiving a majority of votes in that country.

The Communist movement almost died in this country in the 1920's. During that period the Federal Government was taking forceful action in deporting Communist aliens, and many States were prosecuting Communists under their criminal syndicalism laws. The party membership dropped from around 75,000 in 1920 to less than 13,000 in 1922. Some party leaders of those days tell us that this terrific loss in following was due to the many prosecutions of that period and the loss of the "sugar daddies," the wealthy fellow travelers of that day. The party's financial position became so acute that they had to borrow millions of dollars from New York racketeers with a guaranty from Amtorg, the Russian Government corporation in New York City. These facts were given in testimony before a congressional committee in 1939, and it was the first link we had between the two groups of racketeers.

Yes; the sinister plot of the Communist conspiracy to rule the world looms ominously on the horizon as the greatest threat to the freedom-loving peoples of the earth today. The Communist pattern in Korea is running true to well-established form. In this critical time we must give strength to the outposts of freedom such as South Korea, and, moreover, we must take militant action at home to combat the enemy within our gates.

In the words of Senator HARRY F. BYRD:

> Let us always remember that freedom is not a gift to man. It is an achievement by man, and as it was gained by vigilance and struggle, so it may be lost by indifference and supineness.

Message of Greeting From the President to Sixth Annual Dinner Meeting of the Liberal Party of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on June 14 the Liberal Party of New York had its sixth annual dinner. On that occasion a message of greeting was read from President Truman. I ask unanimous consent to insert President Truman's message to the Liberal Party in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., May 25, 1950.

DEAR MR. BERLE: It is a pleasure to send my greetings and good wishes to the members of the Liberal Party on the occasion of their sixth annual dinner. It affords me an occasion to thank you for the support you have given in the past to progressive legislation and to liberal public officials and it also affords me the oportunity to urge that you continue the good fight for liberalism and against reaction.

Sometimes our program moves slowly, for we fight powerful enemies, but I am confident that we will win our fight because the people are on our side and because ideas and ideals are more powerful than negatives and blind opposition to change.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Know Your Waterways: The Pork-Barrel Myth—A Widespread Misconception

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under previous authority to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include additional articles under the series Know Your Waterways published by the Marine News, of New York, as follows:

THE PORK-BARREL MYTH

It is astounding that the derisive term "pork barrel" when used in connection with waterway legislation is so widely believed. Such legislation has been free of "pork" for a generation. Projects are almost always initiated by local interests, not by Army engineers or politicians. To warrant approval they must be certified economically sound after hearings and long study; first, by the district officer of the Army engineers; second, by the division engineer; then, the findings are reviewed by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and, finally, by the Chief of Engineers. If they pass these tests and are approved in the House and Senate Public Works Committees, they are incorporated in an authorization bill, which, if passed, makes the projects eligible for allotment of funds when made available by Congress. Over one-half of the projects investigated are rejected by the Army engineers because "the benefits to be anticipated * * * are insufficient to warrant the expenditure of Federal funds." No other Federal expenditure is subjected to closer scrutiny. Labeling such legislation "pork barrel" is either deliberate misrepresentation or plain ignorance; it impugns the integrity of the Corps of Engineers and its Chief, committee members, and all other Members of both Houses of Congress.

A WIDESPREAD MISCONCEPTION

Year after year the Civil Functions Appropriation Act is widely referred to in the press and elsewhere as the river and harbor bill, and often as the "pork barrel" bill. The first designation is grossly incorrect; the second is either ignorant or malicious misrepresentation. Waterway projects are initiated by local interests which believe that their communities will benefit from them: Local benefits add up to national benefits.

For the 10 fiscal years ending on June 30, 1950, the civil functions appropriation acts total $3,209,636,115; $1,798,156,850, or approximately 56 percent, is for the prevention of flood damage; $929,211,290, or approximately 29 percent, is for rivers and harbors. This 29 percent provides not only for new and maintenance work but also for planning; operation and care of existing facilities; examinations, surveys and contingencies; prevention of deposits in New York Harbor; salaries of the Office of the Chief of Engineers; River and Harbor Board expense; Beach Erosion Board expense; and some smaller miscellaneous items. The remaining 15 percent provides for the Quartermaster Corps; Federal water mains; United States Soldiers' Home; maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, sanitation and civil government there, and the Panama Railroad Company; and other smaller items.

No other Federal appropriation is more misrepresented or less understood than that for channel and harbor improvements; no other adds more to the welfare of the Nation.

Case History of Uncle Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take pleasure in including the following very splendid address by Dr. R. Stanley Kneeshaw, of San Jose, Calif.:

[From the California Medicine of May 1950]

CASE HISTORY OF UNCLE SAM

(By Dr. R. Stanley Kneeshaw)

Uncle Sam, symbol of the United States, was born in the eastern part of North America in 1776. His parents were a liberty-loving people who wanted to be independent. He was not named until 1812 when he had his first quarrel, and it was with an old chap named John Bull. He emerged victor and set up quite a reputation for himself, as he was the first to stand up against this fellow John Bull, and he gained the respect of others quickly. He grew and grew but finally he had an internal illness in 1861. Although he took a long time to recover, he emerged from this illness quite a strong fellow.

At this period in the life of Uncle Sam, man was rewarded for his individual efforts. The ability of a person to do anything and the ultimate achievement of it, was not dependent upon his coming from any given stratum of society, but was dependent upon his own individual efforts and upon interesting others to help him attain his goal. Nor was it necessary for such an individual to come from this country of ours. Foreign people who had the burning urge to be free and to create were given equal opportunity to work out their plans provided they did not interfere with the rights and liberties of others.

In 1918 and again in 1941, Uncle Sam was engaged with other nations in suppressing an aggressor who threatened to take away from him that freedom that we in America are so proud of. These two wars showed the world that Uncle Sam still was a power to be treated with respect. These wars also showed other nations that the so-called capitalistic Uncle Sam was able to get things done; that he was not a softy; that he still had red blood flowing in his veins and that he still could be aroused to fight. Here he was, the only one of all these outstanding figures of the world who had maintained all of his faculties, had lost no appendage. John Bull had lost many of his digits, or partially lost them. John Bull had become weakened by an infection; a virus, I believe, called socialism and communism. Little by little, this virus had weakened him until, were it not now for the transfusion of American dollars, one wonders if he would be able to survive.

Now a similar infection seems to have befallen Uncle Sam. It seems that although for many years he has had to digest some of the products of the Socialists and the Communists, not until recently has he been very greatly affected. It has been noticed of late that the respect in which he had been formerly held by foreign countries has waned. Now citizens of the United States are held in ridicule in some countries abroad, are arrested, are murdered and nothing is done about it, for little do the foreign countries where such things happen seem to fear the great ideal, who for 174 years has taught them to respect his power and his ability. And he stands idly by and does nothing about it.

What has come about that has made this great change of feeling? Are the other nations so strong that they no longer fear and respect Uncle Sam, or has Uncle Sam become a doddering old man who has to submit to such humiliations? It is not the former, because these other nations are not stronger. Then it must be that Uncle Sam is getting softer. What ailment then has so affected him? What is it that has infiltrated his system to make him so susceptible to new, untried schemes? Here is where consultation on the part of the doctors is necessary, so consultation we will have.

We must go carefully into the background that has made Uncle Sam what he once was. We must go into the causes of this great debilitating disease that has so affected other similar characters and has rendered them so impotent that they are useless and dependent on their parent, the Government.

The background of Uncle Sam's early life shows that the individual was the beginning unit of efficiency. The city and county governments were the units of government comparable to the individual. The State government was dependent on the workings of the individual family groups, and the central government in the Nation's Capital was dependent upon the workings of the individual States in a cooperative liaison. Now, this system, the capitalistic system, had made this country the most envied of all countries. People from all over the world wanted to come into our country and through the years of its existence, the quota of people permitted to come each year has been completely filled and many people have to wait for years to get in. Yes; people even pay to get smuggled into this country, the country where all people are free and equal, with the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, dependent on their own efforts. They wanted to come here, for it was here that they could live where they chose to live, were free to speak their own minds, free from arrest and search without the warrant of law, free to own property, free to choose their own forms of occupation, free to spend their incomes as they thought best, free to worship the God of their choice. True, in exercising these freedoms, they were limited by the freedoms and the rights of others, but they had the right to make the wrong decisions in the exercise of each of them. The pursuit of happiness consisted of using their lives as they thought best so long as they did not infringe upon the same rights of others, to work a great deal or only a little, while seeking their happiness in whatever profitable or unprofitable avocation they chose. It included the right to use their incomes wisely or foolishly as they wished.

Their pursuit of happiness was of their own choosing. This was the environment in which Uncle Sam grew up. This was the freedom which made him strong, virile, and much sought after.

Now, as to the virus disease that has so gradually disintegrated such individuals as Johnny Bull, once the ruler of the seas, who once boasted, and rightfully so, that his borders were so far reaching that the sun never set on them. This disease was characterized by gradual onset. So insidious was it that it usually had invaded the hosts without any knowledge that a change was taking place. But, gradually it was noted that certain predominating characteristics of the person were changed. Certain remedies were advocated. Certain changes in mode of life were suggested to bring about health again. The welfare state was advocated as the panacea; this to be given in teaspoonful doses so that too abrupt reactions would not take place. Thus, little by little did Johnny Bull get his welfare state, and little by little did Johnny Bull get weaker. It took 9 years of this daily spoonful dose of socialism before the effects of the medication showed up: A representative of that type of medication became a British cabinet officer. In five more years, Ramsay MacDonald, one of the medicators, was Prime Minister of England.

In 1949 these practitioners were in control of the medication of John Bull. The history of these changes that took place in England are well known to you all, but I mention them again because all of these changes which have gradually reduced this outstanding figure, John Bull, to a limping cripple unable to stand on his own feet without help, which have reduced the once ruler of the seas to the rank of midshipman, have come about because of this medication. The country he once represented so proudly now cannot exist without help. England's position as a front-line nation is threatened. Yes; England, under the regime of the Socialists as it is today, will be able to hold on and exist as a figurehead only so long as it can get free billions of dollars as an aid from capitalistic America, the land of free enterprise, not a welfare state.

You may ask what has this to do with the case of Uncle Sam. The answer is: The same formula that was used in reducing our friend Johnny Bull to a second-rater is being used on Uncle Sam. He is gradually being inoculated by these social planners with such medicine as the planned economy system doles out. He was told that his system was run down and nothing would be so good for his welfare as this planned economy treatment, to be given to him by a group of men well qualified to spend other people's money. Uncle Sam, having just gone through a depressing illness in 1933, was really in a receptive mood for any advice or treatment that would revive him. So, he was ready to lend an ear to the suggestion that he take the cure. So, called into Washington by our President were the doctors of planning, a conglomerate group. The old system of free enterprise was pushed aside to allow the Government to enter into the picture in a more important light. In other words, it meant that the economic life of America must cease to be a free-enterprise system, and the state, which heretofore was not to compete with or interfere with private industry, was now to be the master of industry, telling it what to do and how and when to do it. Twenty years ago, little did we think that we could be told for what price we could sell one of our products. We could set our prices and if someone wanted our products, they could buy. But no more. Now, these social planners have entered into our homes, and from Washington comes the order of the planned economists. The plight of the lowly spud is a case at hand. Old heads of the Department of Agriculture warned long ago that writing into farm policy price supports on perishables would end in the mess it is now. But they were not heeded by these new planners, and that is one more chapter in the growth of farm planning. Similar crackpot advice on other controls has resulted in similar failures. Costly to the taxpayers? Yes; indeed.

So, for 16 years or more, Uncle Sam has been under the influence of the do-gooders. It has made an impression on him. He has become jittery. For 16 years he has heard nothing but the same jargon from the New Dealers. He has lost his ambition or has been so inoculated by these methods that he has become weakened and has come to believe that the Government should do his thinking or planning for him, and he need not do any individual thinking or planning for himself.

These planners have strange philosophies that they would foist upon us. These philosophies would destroy all sense of personal responsibility. They would, if accepted, debase man and take from him his only initiative to reach a higher station. It would mean the loss of all initiative, of all individual responsibility. It would take from him everything that America has stood for. So, we must fight to preserve these principles that have made America what it is today.

As Edgar Ansel Mowrer, noted foreign correspondent, said, "Our leaders in Washington are not bad men, but they just do not know what to do." What a predicament. Why then should they advise us to follow the pattern of a nation or of nations that cannot compare with us on any basis? Why then should they try to change a mode of life here in the United States when nothing better can be offered? What is it they have to offer? Let us take England, for example, for from there comes most of the impetus to change. It is England that has made the most abrupt change of all. First, according to authentic reports, only 250 persons in Great Britain have incomes of $14,000 or more after taxes are collected. Before World War II and the change to socialism, 11,000 persons were over the $14,000 income bracket. For this change, the Socialists are claiming an outstanding achievement. Second, a person in Britain formerly could jolly well choose where he would work. He could enjoy doing with his life what he chose, seeking his happiness and welfare where it might best be found. But what happened? A law was enacted, the notorious Control of Engagement Act, which states in effect that no man between the ages of 18 and 50, or woman between the ages of 18 and 40, can change occupation at will. The Minister of Labor has the power to direct such workers to the employment he considers best for the national interest. Third, the Briton's home was his kingdom. Now 100,000 officials in Great Britain have the power to enter private homes for inspection without search warrant. All this when war does not exist, when the nation is at peace.

Fourth, as to the status of medicine, we as medical men all are well aware of the catastrophe that has befallen England. But listen to a layman, Mr. Harold Stassen, in a recent article in Reader's Digest reported the following: During the first year of socialized medicine, the death rate in Britain went up rather sharply, industrial absenteeism because of illness was higher than in preceding years, there was a serious breakdown of hospital and medical care for elderly people. "The abrupt deterioration in the treatment of the sick is serious enough," said Stassen, "but the effect of the national health program on preventive medicine is tragic. Public-health work, measures for the prevention of diseases, either in existence or planned, have been retarded and even abandoned."

These reasons—and many more could be added—are reason enough why we must not allow Uncle Sam to get any more treatment from the economic planners.

The proponents of this planned economy have seen fit to advise Uncle Sam that to make him a healthier chap, he should adopt the scheme of socialized medicine as used in England, and thereby provide himself and all his children with every medical and hospital care necessary. They spout the false propaganda that then everyone would immediately get all of the medical care he had not been able to provide for himself, and free—at Government expense. These propagandists tell us that the American people are not provident enough, nor intelligent enough to provide this care for themselves, as it is too costly. They made much of a statement that $5,000,000,000 was spent in 1 year for medical care. However, they do not tell the people that eight billion was spent for liquor in 1 year, and $4,000,000,000 for cosmetics. Neither do they tell us that our national income is equal to the combined national incomes of the next six nations (both before and since the last war). Nor do they tell us that our workers can buy with their wages two times as much food, clothing, housing, travel, entertainment, education for their children as can workers at similar jobs in England, Sweden, or Switzerland; and five times as much as in Russia. They do not tell us that we were the only Nation that was able to arm itself adequately to meet the Axis powers; that we were the only Nation that was able and is still able to lend liberally to our allies in that war; or that we are the only Nation now able to lend its help to its neighbors.

No, they do not tell us all this when they try to propagandize the people about the cost of medical care. They have misused figures about the health of our Nation. They have used the number of draft rejections as a basis for their theory that if we had compulsory health insurance, all of our young men would be physicaly fit for the draft. They did not reason very well, for the figures showed that only a small number had defects that were remedial. There was no recognition by them that the medical profession by no means was liable for the loss of arms, eyes, legs, hands, or for the mental deficiencies and illiteracy that caused a large percentage of rejections.

The medical profession wants to be able to give good medical care. We want the people in the United States to get all the medical care necessary. We want them to continue to get the good care they have been getting and even to improve that care, if possible. We want hospital care available to people when necessary. We want the high standard of medical school training continued. We want the continuation of the inspiring medical research that is going on. The question is, how best can this be accomplished? What are the barriers, if any, that hinder people from getting necessary medical and hospital treatment? Can these barriers be removed by a program of compulsion without breaking down the present good system? Can the present system be improved by one of compulsion, or should we stand on our record of achievement that has given the people of the United States as good medical care as can be given in any country of the world, and by a free enterprise system?

It is the opinion of organized medicine, well based on facts, that no critical condition exists in America which calls for such a revolutionary change in the mode of practice as is suggested by our President. It is the opinion of organized medicine, now shared by many other groups, that the type of medical care that could be given by compulsory payment, controlled by the Government, would be inferior medical care, and that it would gradually deteriorate the quality of the system. It was the conclusion of the Brookings report that no crisis existed in the health conditions of our Nation that would call for such change in the American way of living. The report is summed up with the statement, "The United States is among the most healthful nations in the world."

Let us look at the health record of the United States.

First, the average life span has almost doubled since Uncle Sam was born. The life expectancy, based on insurance actuarial studies, is now 67 years against a former 38.

Second, there has been a 40-percent reduction in the average death rate since 1900, which means a saving of almost a quarter million lives a year, due to our progress in 50 years.

Third, infant mortality rate has been reduced one-half in the last 25 years.

Fourth, over half of the more than 4,000,000 babies born in 1948 will be alive at the age of 72, according to actuarial studies, whereas 50 years ago only one-half would be alive at the age of 58.

Fifth, maternal death rate has been reduced four-fifths in the last 25 years.

Sixth, the following diseases that once ravaged the American people, have been virtually wiped out, or the mortality from them is negligible: smallpox, scarlet fever, typhoid fever, malaria, whooping cough, infant diarrhea.

Seventh, effective treatment is available for diseases such as diabetes, pneumonia, pernicious anemia.

Eighth, the operative mortality in many cases has been reduced by better trained medical personnel and better hospitalization. The new operative treatments for many conditions that formerly were almost always fatal are now reassuring.

Ninth, the elevation of the standards of hospitals is one outstanding achievement. Their inspection and accrediting assures the public of safe care.

Tenth, the eradication of substandard medical schools and the elevation of standards of existing medical schools has made for better prepared medical graduates.

Eleventh, the war against quacks in medicine, and against the dangerous nostrums (now controlled by the Food and Drug Act) is to the credit of organized medicine.

A survey of these facts should be most reassuring. The story is one of progress on all fronts, and it is really most remarkable. We admit that there are problems of medical care that do exist in certain parts of the United States, but they are not of such character as to justify a radical change in the policy of carrying on our system of medical and health care that has such a record to its credit as I have just recited. No, there is no health crisis!

There is another side to the problem of medical care in addition to the medical aspect, and that is a very important phase of the whole problem. That is the financial one. There is no doubt that the average American has had reason to fear the financial burden of unpredictable, extensive medical and hospital care, especially hospital and surgical costs. There are two factors involved if the wage earner is the one afflicted. His earnings are stopped and his surplus is spent, if he is not protected by some form of insurance. Consciousness of the desirability of some protection against such inroads on the family budget has grown and is now widespread. Because of this consciousness, we now have the hospital care insurance programs which have resulted in the Blue Cross organization. Now over 32,000,000 persons are protected from the catastrophic costs of sudden illness.

The insurance companies followed the lead of the Blue Cross organization and started group hospitalization plans, and in addition in the last few years many people have been covered by consumer-sponsored organizations and by labor unions. The number of people now covered is estimated to be over 61,000,000.

At about the same time the Blue Cross hospitalization plans developed, group insurance to meet medical and surgical costs was instituted. The Michigan Plan, Kings County, Washington, Oregon plans, California Physicians' Service, and many others are examples. To date over 35,000,000 people have been insured by all types of organizations in this field. In 1948, the gain in this type of coverage was nearly 8,000,000.

Many experimental types of policies have been tried by the companies that handle this type of coverage, in an attempt to properly cover the individual. We recognize, of course, that there is plenty of room for growth and development in both the hospitalization and medical and surgical care programs, in the scope of their coverage and in their inclusions. Certain basic principles must be applied to all of these plans:

1. The patient must get adequate medical and hospital coverage.

2. There must be free choice of physician.

3. There must be protection against abuse of the plan by both the patient and the doctor.

4. The plan must be basically sound financially.

5. It must be a voluntary plan, not a Government-administered plan.

As yet, no plan has been evolved that can include everyone. There are some people who will budget everything but the cost of sickness. Some cannot yet afford it. Others will not protect themselves if they can afford it. But, because no all-inclusive plan has been developed since such plans have been inaugurated is no reason why the Government should take over and spoil all the plans that have been effected. Oscar Ewing admitted that if the Government health plan were enacted the Blue Cross and other plans would be forced out of business as a result.

Private enterprise has to keep these plans on a sound financial basis; it cannot compete with a ready-spending Government bureau. Many hastily promoted pension plans and health plans will sink under their own weight, or some of the services will have to be curtailed. Let us not be in too great haste to adopt some of the numerous plans that are being offered by some of our legislators. A certain hysteria has developed in Washington because of the impending threat of the bureaucratic schemes, but let us not be stampeded into accepting some plan which will finally result in the American public's getting poorer medical care.

I appeal to the medical profession to stand firm on the gradual, careful planning by the parties that are interested in giving protection to the people. There should be conferences of the Blue Cross, Blue Shield groups, of the insurance groups, and of the financial experts to the end that more people will finally be included in the plans, with perhaps longer coverage, and perhaps some deductible plan in which the patient would share in the initial expense. All these variations are being tried, but so much pressure is being applied to them that the groups are becoming panicky and unable to think clearly. We should not permit destruction of what has been accomplished in these last 20 years.

We know that Uncle Sam is sick. No one can deny that. Under the administration of a free-spending group of economic planners, we have been saddled with a national debt that our offspring will have a hard time paying off. Our foreign relations are in bad condition. Instead of being respected, we are held in ridicule. The bureaus in Washington are becoming too numerous and overlapping. We have too many people on Government payrolls. What, then, should we do?

We should alert ourselves to the fact that we have other responsibilities than that of caring for the sick. We should accept our duties as citizens as well. We should interest ourselves in civic affairs and pay more attention to some of the jobs we have delegated to others. We should be voters.

We should sweep Washington clean of these elected officials who are planning to abolish our free-enterprise system. We should see that the disloyal civil-service employees in Government service are discharged. We should replace these people with Americans who believe individual effort should be rewarded. We should stop unnecessary spending that is making the Nation financially unsound. We men of medicine should be permitted to go on and develop better methods of caring for the sick, and, with competent help and consultation, be permitted to work out a voluntary prepaid health service so that every person who wishes to do so will be able to share in it.

Yes; let us give Uncle Sam an injection of some of the spirit of 1776, to the end that his drooping shoulders will be straightened, his head will be again held high, his back straight, and once again with Liberty on his arm, he will march forward.

Ireland and North Atlantic Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

IRELAND AND NORTH ATLANTIC DEFENSE

(By Senator Denis Ireland)

"If instead of the expedition of Egypt, I had made that of Ireland, what would England have been today, and the Continent, and the political world?" (From the reported conversation of Napoleon at St. Helena.)

Sentiment rather than strict analysis of the situation governs the ideas of the British and American man in the street on the subject of Ireland and her relations with the North Atlantic Powers. Faced by its complexities, the man in the street usually exclaims "Thank God for Ulster!" dismisses the implications of a divided island on Britain's ocean flank in a phrase, and cheerfully prepares to forget all about Ireland—at least until the possibility of a third world war forces it violently back into his consciousness in the form of an anti-Irish barrage by press and radio.

It is then too late for clear thinking where Ireland is concerned. Yet even insofar as they applied to the last war, the conclusions of the ordinary British and American citizen can be shown as unsound in the light of hard strategic facts. Insofar as they apply to the possibility of another world conflict, they might conceivably be catastrophic. It seems, therefore, high time that the inhabitants of Britain and North America were supplied with at least the materials for reflection on this whole business of a divided Ireland, including a reminder of its geographic situation across a narrow sea from Britain and within easy flying time from the coasts of western Europe.

The best way to begin is with a swift incision into the comfortable idea that the partition of Ireland contributed to the security of Britain and America during World War II. That may be an isolated fact but it is not the whole truth. The uncomfortable truth is that it did so contribute only because, thanks to the mercy of Providence, and, as I hope to show, the stupidity of Adolf Hitler, Ireland remained uninvaded. If Ireland had been invaded, then partition could easily have contributed to the

downfall of Britain and a corresponding blackening of the outlook for the nations round the North Atlantic.

The gist of the matter is, did Hitler seriously intend to invade Ireland? Did it ever occur to this self-styled military genius to exploit the fact of Irish division, to sow political chaos in an island next door to Britain? Part of the answer was uncovered in the summer of 1944 in a cellar on the outskirts of Brussels, where British and American troops found vast quantities of documents and maps, many of them stamped "geheimg" (secret). Amongst these strategic papers were maps and textbooks prepared by German agents for the invasion of Ireland. There were three elaborately prepared maps for three special invasion areas, and a collection of aerial photographs of Irish ports, docks (with lengths written in in meters), airfields, etc., all taken from reconnaissance planes of the Luftwaffe. As proof of the Teutonic thoroughness with which information had been collected, there was a list of the natural resources of each Irish region, together with, in the event that invading troops might find themselves in Gaelic-speaking areas, a list of Gaelic words, with their equivalent in German.

THE LESSONS OF HITLER

Obviously, then, Hitler had not forgotten Ireland. What prevented him invading Ireland was probably part of the same complex of miscalculation that prevented him invading Britain. We know now from other captured German documents that, once the French coast of the English channel was in his grasp, he assumed that Britain would automatically surrender. From that initial false assumption he never recovered; in fact, from then onward he was pushed into one hasty improvisation after another, ending with the greatest and most disastrous of all, the invasion of Russia.

But at one time he had all the cards in his hands. That was when Germany held almost the entire coastline of western Europe, bending, at least in its more southerly portion, in an enormous curve from near Bergen in Norway to Finisterre in Brittany. Within the concavity of the more southerly curve lay (and still lie) the islands of Great Britain and Ireland. Now suppose that Hitler—always assuming, of course, that he had been deliberately leading up to just that particular opportunity for invasion, and had amassed the necessary material—had launched simultaneous paratroop attacks on Scotland from Norway and southern Ireland from the tip of northwestern France, coupled with a direct invasion of England by sea across the English Channel.

Suppose, in fact, that he had been able to see clearly in advance what Napoleon saw clearly only in retrospect from St. Helena—that Ireland was the key to the subjection of Europe, and that eastern adventures were a snare and a delusion. What would have happened if he had acted on that clear perception, and had included it as part of a larger plan for the subjection of Britain? As an Irishman it is not my business to enlarge upon what might have happened in Britain. In the first place, the British possess a political solidarity that makes them a dangerous people to attack. But Ireland—not through any particular vice of the Irish, but due largely to the fact that Britain would not leave Ireland alone—is still only painfully groping toward political solidarity. And some such lightning thrust from Europe as I have suggested could easily have induced complete political chaos in Ireland—chaos which, to put it mildly, would have dangerously complicated the problems of foreign defense forces concentrated in the six counties.

If that analysis of the potential dangers of the Irish situation during World War II is so far correct, the next step is to imagine the great curving coastline of western Europe from Bergen to the western tip of Brittany as once more in the grip of a continental (possibly a two-continental) power—a power this time possessed of, amongst other weapons, supersonic planes, and a highly developed technique for the aerial transport of infantry and artillery. In the light of that strategic nightmare (which we all hope will never be translated to reality, but which is by no means inherently impossible) what is the theory of Irish defense still, apparently, acceptable to the military thinkers and staff colleges of Britain and America? As far as I can make out from a study of the British and American press (and I hope I am mistaken), that theory begins with the belief that the division of Ireland contributes in some way to the security of Britain and the North Atlantic. It seems a curious assumption, especially when exactly the same set of strategists will tell you that during the last war the division of France led to the downfall, not only of France, but of Europe.

BRITAIN AND IRISH DEFENSE

But if the basic assumption underlying British and American ideas about the right way to defend Ireland is, to say the least of it, curious, its practical implications in the use of Irish manpower are like something out of Alice in Wonderland. In Britain, and to a lesser extent in America, it is apparently a kind of military axiom that the right way to defend Ireland is to send Irishmen to fight in the armies of other countries and at the same time to bring in foreign soldiers to defend Ireland—foreign soldiers whose presence in Ireland helps to bedevil the Irish political situation.

I am not here concerned with the question of whether the presence of foreign soldiers ought to complicate the political situation in Ireland. I am concerned merely with the fact that it does—which seems the more practical end of the problem in view of a possible world emergency. Nor, as an Ulster Protestant who lives in Belfast and is at the same time a member of the Irish Senate, am I directly concerned at the moment with the political, or even the economic, implications of partition. As an Irish ex-soldier of the First World War, I am primarily interested in the ideal means of defense for what has become almost simultaneously the home of an independent nation and a strategically valuable island on the edge both of the Atlantic and of Europe.

In view of Ireland's altered status and the North Atlantic Pact, the whole question of Irish defense should now be thought out anew. To go on thinking of it as at any rate the British appear to be thinking at the moment, in terms of a far-flung Empire around the edges of which the exiled Irish soldier will form a gallant portion of the "thin red line" is simply to sentimentalize a la Kipling and to ignore the facts of the real world situation—including, as a minor but still significant portion of the whole, the facts of the real situation in Ireland. After all, the Congress of Vienna took place quite a number of years ago, not to mention the fact that the European balance of power which that congress called into being disappeared, possibly forever, with the advance of Soviet armies into eastern Germany and the seizure of Czechoslovakia.

IRELAND'S VITAL POSITION

In order to get a clear mental picture of Ireland's strategic position in the new era of supersonic air speeds and the aerial transport of troops, it is, therefore, essential to bear two cardinal facts in mind—first, that Britain's age-long strategy of maneuvering for a balance of power in Europe is now a back number, and, second, that Ireland is no longer "an island beyond an island" but the home of an independent nation whose country happens to occupy an important position on the aerial atlas of the Western Hemisphere. In the light of those facts partition reveals itself as a source of danger to the military security of both Ireland and Britain in exact proportion to, and at the same rate as, man's increasing conquest of space. Indeed, in the light of that conquest and the new twentieth-century map of Europe, the old British conception of a divided Ireland that serves as a recruiting ground for foreign wars is sheer lunacy.

Why does Britain allow this lunacy to continue? Partly on the old Churchillian grounds that control of a strip of six-county coastline and the port of Derry kept open the "lifeline" for the importation of foodstuffs and munitions into Britain through the north channel of the Irish Sea. Now apart from the fact that it continues the age-old British fallacy of preparing for the next war in terms of the last, this form of argument (which consists fundamentally in declaring that the right way to get Irish cooperation is to assist in the division of Ireland!) ignores two important factors. First, that Britain can always control the north channel of the Irish Sea from the Scottish side without bolstering up and subsidizing a dangerous political, and therefore, in the last analysis, strategic division of the Irish nation. Second (and this reason includes and over-rides the first), that if partition had been ended before World War II broke out, there would have been an entirely new situation, and even greater strategic advantages than the possession of the six counties would almost inevitably have been accorded to both Britain and America. All that Britain achieved by accepting and bolstering up the partition of Ireland was that she made the worst of two Irish worlds, insofar as she had neither the use of the Treaty ports, nor had she a contented and militarily-united nation at her side. In this folly Americans concurred, presumably on the grounds that, because she was closer to it, Britain knew more about Ireland than they did. That was a false assumption. Not so much the British as the English have up till now always shown what amounted to a positive genius for mismanaging their relations with Ireland, as 700 years of Anglo-Irish history are there to prove.

BORDER COMPLEXITIES

In this analysis of the new, twentieth-century significance of Ireland's position in the eastern Atlantic I have avoided the word with which Englishmen and Americans love to mystify themselves about Irish affairs—the fatal word "Eire" used to describe (and, still worse, to delimit) 26 counties of Ireland. Likewise I have avoided the term "British Isles." I avoid them because, in their popular usage, they are inaccurate, politically and therefore strategically. "Eire" (see article 4 of the Constitution of Ireland) is simply the Gaelic name for the whole of Ireland, and to use it, as not only British and American journals, but even members of the British and United States legislatures, habitually do, to mean 26 counties cut off from the rest of Ireland by an imaginary line that meanders through the middle of cowbyres and farmyards, is simply to befog the whole issue from the start. If you are assured from the start that a certain figure is a square, and you insist on assuming it to be a circle, you are not very likely to arrive at an accurate result in a problem relating to the original square.

Yet that is exactly what Englishmen and Americans do when they attempt to estimate Irish reactions in a crisis on the basis of two entirely foreign nations, one labeled "Eire" and the other "Ulster," occupying one small island in the Atlantic. The point is that the complex of national sentiment which Englishmen and Americans insist on labeling "Eire" extends into "Ulster" as well—to the extent of between 35 and 40 percent of the inhabitants of the area inaccurately labeled "Ulster"—a fact that explains two Irish

phenomena during the last war, (a) the recruiting of a large percentage of able-bodied "Ulstermen" into armed police forces, not to fight Germans, but to watch their fellow provincials, and (b) the fact that the elementary mechanics of statesmanship in a partitioned country left 26 Irish counties no alternative but a kind of benevolent if uneasy neutrality. We were, in brief, as much hamstrung during the last war as the American Republic would have been if the New England States had been still partly populated by "loyalists" and Britain, in consequence, had garrisoned the northeastern corner of American territory with British troops.

And we are still hamstrung by the fact of partition when it comes to the question of participating in the North Atlantic Pact. In explanation of that fact, here is part of a statement issued by the Irish High Commissioner in London:

"As long as Ireland is partitioned the first essential of Irish participation is denied. For only a united Ireland would be secure against internal disruption in the event of world conflict, and only a united Ireland could be defended with full military efficiency.

"The noncooperation of the Government of Ireland in the North Atlantic Pact is not due to lack of sympathy with the aims of that agreement. The Irish Government and people are anxious to see the defense of the Atlantic countries against war or, in the event of war, foreign occupation perfected. They welcome American leadership on account of their traditional friendship with America, and would like their country to be a strong link in the chain of democratic states."

At the moment, then, the position of Ireland in relation to Atlantic defense is one of deadlock and uncertainty, all the more so in the light of election results in the six counties, not to mention one extremely debatable piece of legislation recently enacted at Westminster. Election results, based on fears, real and imaginary, of religious domination do nothing to settle the Irish problem for Englishmen; in fact, they exacerbate it. As an Ulster Protestant who has spent most of his life working with Catholic Irishmen, in business, in a former Irish regiment of the British Army, and now in an Irish Government, I do not share my fellow provincials' fears. But I understand them; and, still more to the point, I know only too well how unscrupulous politicians can make use of them for ends that have nothing to do with religion. I believe the Protestants of northeast Ulster, of whom I happen to be a literally Protestant member, must be offered adequate safeguards. And in fact they have already been offered safeguards by the Government in Dublin, including federal government for the special area of the six counties.

But though I am proud of many facets of Ulster Protestant life, character, and tradition, I do not admire my fellow-Protestants of the six northeastern counties when they combine to split the strategic defense of their country at an historical moment like the present. I think that there they do poor service to the cause of Christendom in face of an enemy who will make no distinction between Catholic and Protestant. At the beginning of the century George Bernard Shaw wrote in the preface to John Bull's Other Island:

"When the Orangeman sacrifices his nationality to his hatred of the priest and fights against his own country for its conqueror he is doing something for which, no matter how bravely he fights, history and humanity will never forgive him; English history and humanity, to their credit be it said, least of all."

It is possible to disagree with Mr. Shaw about many things, but there, written as an Irishman, and a Protestant Irishman at that, he said what we call in Ireland the "hard word." If through artificially created religious dissension, the conquerors of this strategically-valuable island should be in the twentieth century, not Englishmen but the forces of godless totalitarianism, how would the remnants of what had once been English history and humanity regard those who persisted in dissension? And, to modernize the words of Napoleon as he looked backward over his career from the island prison of St. Helena, what would then be the state of England, of Europe, and of the political world? The essence of the situation in the year 1950 is that the present conception of Ulster unionism must be widened to include the real twentieth-century unionism of the United Nations, Western Union, and the North Atlantic Pact, to the end that Ireland, as at least a military unit, may be able to take her place in the ranks of the western nations.

June Is Being Observed Nationally by the Dairy Farmers and Handlers of Milk as Dairy Month

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, because the county of Los Angeles in California—in which is located the Eighteenth Congressional District which I have had the honor to represent for two terms—is the leader of the Nation in milk production, I call to your attention that fact, together with the fact that the majority of the dairies which makes it true that Los Angeles County leads the Nation in milk production are located in the Eighteenth Congressional District.

And this, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that a considerable number of these important dairies which have for many years been located in the Eighteenth District have naturally been crowded out of that busy and rapidly growing geographical area by home builders and home buyers. For instance, in one subdivision only, 17,000 separate homes are being constructed where dairies were previously located. As the value of this dairyland has rapidly and sharply increased on account of the onrush and need of home occupancy in the Eighteenth District, these dairies have sold their land at a very substantial profit and have moved eastward and there purchased more land for less money.

In order that I might give to you accurate, down-to-date information on this important subject, I asked my good friend, Ned M. Clinton, manager of the Protected Milk Producers Association at Paramount, Calif., to supply me with the same and which information I herewith convey to you with pleasure. In a letter transmitting the data to me, he said, among other things:

The dairymen of this section are very progressive. As you know nearly all milk is now being cooled in stainless steel farm tanks and transported in stainless steel road tankers to distribution plants. Thus doing away with milk cans and furnishing the public with a better bottle of milk.

I consider it appropriate, therefore, that you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Congress, have the further following facts before you:

James N. Fulmor, chairman of the dairy department of the California Farm Bureau Federation, recently wrote a message on June Dairy Month, as follows:

Do you remember the family cow your parents, or your grandparents, owned? Well, you have a family cow right now. Of course, you have never seen her, but somewhere in California, not far from where you live, she is working for you with all her might like the cow in the children's verse; for the University of California tells us that it takes just about the total output of one cow to provide the milk and butter and cheese and ice cream for an average family.

When populations were scattered, most families owned a cow. But as more and more persons congregated in cities and towns the cows had to stay in the country. So that is where your cow is right now, tended by a farm family so that the city family may have plenty of milk for health and strength. And now trucks roll swiftly over the byways and highways bringing from country into town the milk supply, fresh and sweet.

California's greatest agricultural industry has grown up around the cow. One million dairy cows are grazing in California pastures. Thirty thousand farm families tend these cows. The cow works every day, and so must the dairy family—and that means Sundays and holidays as well as weekdays.

In California, every dairy farmer has needed to invest $1,000 for each cow in his herd. This includes the value of the cow herself and the costs of the farm lands which provide the hay and grain for her maintenance, the barns and milk house and equipment. When that sum is multiplied by the number of cows in California you realize how great a structure is needed in order that all persons in the State may have milk and milk products when and as they need them.

Dairying is the leading division of California's agriculture and, excepting only petroleum, is largest among all of the State's industries; and it is all based on your family cow.

Milk is nature's most nearly perfect food: One quart of milk, or its equivalent in other dairy products, will provide these daily nutritional needs for an individual: 100 percent of the calcium, 82 percent of the riboflavin (vitamin G), 67 percent of the phosphorus, 49 percent of the protein, 30 percent of the vitamin A, 22 percent of the thiamin (vitamin B_1), 22 percent of the calories, 19 percent of the vitamin C, 6 percent of the niacin, 3 percent of the iron.

Half of your daily nutritional needs for only 20 cents.

And my friend, Ned Clinton, hands me a pamphlet by the California dairy products group which says:

The story of milk starts on the farm—the dairy farm. And California dairy farmers have many records of which every Californian can well be proud. They pay their farm workers—the men who care for and milk the cows—far more than the national average.

After being produced under the most scientific and sanitary conditions, the milk is immediately rushed to the processing and bottling room where it is subjected to strict inspection and testing. It is scientifically refrigerated. Every drop of market milk sold in California is handled under highest standards of purity and sanitation. All by employees paid more than the average national wage scale.

The prices that California dairymen pay for land are, also, far above the national average. To these costs must be added the yearly charges for water for irrigation—a vital and expensive necessity on most of California's farm land, plus feed prices which in some instances are still 250 percent to 275 percent of prewar prices.

Now the milk is ready for delivery to stores, homes, and restaurants, hospitals, and institutions—wherever it is needed, whenever it is needed—fresh, cold, and clean—at a profit of less than one-fourth of a cent a quart—and at prices considerably less than the national averages.

To safeguard the purity and quality of the milk you buy, cows must undergo regular examinations, and all barns and equipment must come up to the rigid specifications for sanitation set by the California Department of Agriculture.

Milk is man's most nearly perfect food. Milk contains the vital food elements that everyone—young and old—needs for growth, health, and vigor. Proper foods add years to your life and life to your years. Even at twice the price, milk would still be your best food buy. But Californians are particularly fortunate—they get the finest milk for less than other Americans have to pay.

How is it that California dairymen and distributors can buy higher-priced land, pay higher wages, purchase the finest machinery and equipment, maintain unexcelled standards of health, sanitation and purity—and still sell the finest quality of milk for less than the rest of the country? Here are several reasons:

1. California dairymen, working with the scientists of the College of Agriculture of the University of California, have developed herds of cows that produce milk of highest qaulity—and more of it. The average yearly production per cow in California is 3,326 quarts, the highest in the Nation. That exceeds the United States average by 1,099 quarts per cow.

2. Because of our year-round growing season, California alfalfa land produces from four to eight cuttings a year, as against two crops for most parts of the country. Alfalfa is the chief raw material that a cow needs to manufacture milk.

3. California, on the average, has larger herds than other dairy areas, and this results in aditional efficiencies and economies.

4. Because of our fine highways, dairymen have been able to deliver milk with clocklike regularity, the basis for smooth-running efficiency and service.

5. Last, but far from least, the entire industry has presented a united front in holding milk prices at the minimums set by the California Department of Agriculture.

Pound for pound, penny for penny, milk is your best food buy.

Use more delicious milk for balanced diet and balanced budget.

A quart of milk is the biggest two pounds of food value you can buy. Just for your own food budget money-saving information, compare the cost and extra food value of milk with other foods.

No other food gives you so much for so little.

There is the most valuable and constructive cooperation between the State University of California, division of dairy industry, located at Davis, Calif., through the offices of E. L. Jack, who writes, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF AN ABUNDANT MILK SUPPLY

(By E. L. Jack, chairman, division of dairy industry, University of California, Davis, Calif.)

An abundant supply of wholesome nutritious milk is one of the greatest blessings that any group of people can have. Milk is nature's most nearly perfect food, providing unequaled proteins, the finest mineral balance, and important energy and vitamin constituents for human need. Young people thrive when milk constitutes a large part of their diet, building straight bones and strong bodies. Adults maintain a continuing state of well-being when they continue to use substantial quantities of dairy products.

Dairy products are not only held in the highest esteem because of their nutritional properties, but are in the top rank of palatability as well. They are well liked by people of all ages; children show particular fondness for milk, butter, and ice cream, while adults include cheese as well. It has also been shown that the addition of milk to many other foods improves their palatability. An outstanding example is the addition of milk to bread; milk improves the appearance, keeping quality, and flavor of bread.

Even with all of these recognized advantages of liberal amounts of milk in the diet, namely, high palatability and unequaled nutritional value, the peoples of the world generally have not been able to have much milk in their diet. We in the United States are the only large segment of the world's population that has milk in liberal amounts. Undoubtedly milk can be given a major share of the credit for our high nutritional status, in the same way that it has been shown to produce physically superior people among certain small groups, elsewhere in the world, who have had milk available. The development of the dairy industry to its present high standard has been and will continue to be an important stone in the foundation of our economy.

Wherein, then, lies the paradox that an abundant milk supply is a challenge. It would seem that an abundant milk supply is a condition to be highly desired, and indeed, it is, considering the nutritional needs of the people. The challenge arises because distribution is not able to make available to all the people that need it all of the milk that they need. Thus, in periods of an abundant supply, milk products tend to accumulate in warehouses and storage places until the cry of surplus is heard. Surplus is the specter that stalks the dairy industry continually, and yet examining the dietary need for dairy products the idea of a surplus at our level of production seems absurd. Let us examine in the light of actual figures where the basis for surplus originates.

The dairy farms of the United States are stocked to produce about 116,000,000,000 pounds of milk a year which furnishes about 800 pounds of milk for each person to use as beverage, ice cream, cheese, butter and other products. We use about 57,000,000,000 pounds of fluid milk and cream in the cities and on the farms for direct consumption which gives each person, if equally divided, almost exactly 1 pint a day. If each person drank only 1 four-ounce glass additional each day there would be no surplus. It would require 11,000,000,000 pounds of milk to supply this increase or nearly 10 percent of our whole production. Butter production is equal to about 10 pounds per person per year, and yet the people of the United States with far less available money with which to buy food consumed 16 pounds 10 years ago. The Government would not be in the butter business today if consumption were to increase only 1 pound per person. Like examples can be shown for many other dairy products.

The case for non-fat dry milk solids is slightly different because of the great increase in the volume of this commodity, production having doubled in 10 years. This should be a desirable situation because the components of this product are valuable nutritionally and should find their way into human food channels rather than to be fed to livestock. The use of this product in bread, where it is especially valuable, constitutes the largest outlet, and the inclusion of at least 6 percent based on the weight of the flour is recommended. If all bread contained this amount of non-fat dry milk solids, it would go a long way toward using up the increased production. And if the public is made aware of breads containing this amount of milk, it has been shown that their consumption of this commodity increases. "Bread and milk" has been known as a good food for generations.

Where, then, does the challenge of an abundant milk supply lie? It lies in the necessity to get this abundant supply to the people who need it—the milk is here, the need is here. The problem is to get them together. Taken in the aggregate the idea of millions and billions of pounds seems staggering, but broken down to a personal basis it comes within the scope of our comprehension and seems capable of accomplishment. It will not be easy, however. It will require the best concerted effort of everyone in all branches of the industry; it will require the same kind of ingenuity, perseverence and courage that the dairy industry has shown in attaining its present eminent position. That the dairy industry will successfully meet this challenge there is not the slightest doubt. And the goal is very worth while.

And another example of cooperation between the California dairy industry and the University of California's Dairy Extension Department is a splendid article by G. E. Gordon, who writes, as follows:

CALIFORNIA'S DAIRY FUTURE

(By G. E. Gordon, extension specialist in dairying, University of California)

June dairy month is probably a good time to try to visualize what might happen to California's dairy industry in the future. We have gone through a period of rapidly expanding dairy production and the use of dairy products in California. This past decade has shown a remarkable growth in the dairy industry which was brought on in considerable measure by the demand for milk and milk products during the war period when California's population increased at a rapid rate. The demand for milk was so great during this period that there arose some question as to whether or not California would be able in future years to produce an adequate supply of fresh milk for human consumption.

Since the war, the demand for milk has eased off somewhat, together with a continuing increase in the volume of market-milk produced—caused by the impetus given market-milk during the war period—so that for the past couple of years there has developed some surplus which has become burdensome. This is one reason why great emphasis should be placed at this time on the value of using milk and milk products in large quantity. They are not only relatively low in price, compared to other food products, but have exceptionally high nutritional value.

CAN CALIFORNIA PRODUCE?

As we look into the future, however, there are indications that California's population will continue to increase at a rapid rate. Several studies indicate an increase from our present estimated population of about 10,500,000 to over 14,000,000 during the next 10 years, which is an increase of approximately 35 percent. It is further estimated that our population will increase to over 17,000,000 by 1975, which would be an increase of around 65 percent. These people will need milk and undoubtedly will insist on having it. Can California produce it? There are several ways in which it can be done.

While our present surpluses will take care of the earlier increased demands for fluid milk, it will be desirable over the years to increase the percentage of our total volume that goes into fluid milk. This would mean

changing over some manufacturing milk to market milk, which could readily be done. Another way which will undoubtedly occur over the years is to increase the number of cows in production in California. Some of the crops demanded during the war period are no longer in such high demand, and the land formerly in those crops is being changed over to forage crops which would be valuable for dairy cattle. As our water resources increase, still additional land will be available for the production of feed crops. Perhaps one of the most important methods would be to maintain and improve our present level of production in the State as a whole, which would make it possible to produce more high quality market milk as the demand for it increased, and such a program would also be better for the dairyman from an economic standpoint as it would be possible for him to operate on a more efficient basis.

FURTHERANCE PROGRAM NECESSARY

The present situation has been somewhat discouraging to dairymen because of lower prices for manufacturing milk and because of the surpluses of market milk. These factors point out clearly the importance of carrying on research, education and advertising to increase the use of milk and other dairy products. Such a program is not only helpful in easing off the present situation and helping to reduce the present surpluses, but it is also helpful on a long-time basis in developing habits in the use of milk and milk products among our consuming public.

With the anticipated increase in our population, it is evident that we will have a ready demand in this State for increasing quantities of fluid milk and other dairy products. We will have to supply our own market milk because we cannot get it from the West or the South, and not conveniently from the East or the North. Our population will demand milk, and we must produce it for them. Such increased demand will undoubtedly cause our dairy to grow to even greater size than at present. These factors will help our industry to occupy an even more favorable position among other States and among the agriculture of our own State. Our dairy industry now supplies one-eighth of the total agricultural income of the State, and in the future may grow even greater.

While the problem for dairy producers has been somewhat more difficult this year than in the past, we must look at our industry from a long-time viewpoint—and such consideration indicates a growing market which will be available for those who can produce a high-quality product on an efficient basis.

To reveal to you the methods used by the State of California, Department of Agriculture and the California dairy industry cooperatively, I am pleased to present the quarterly report of the Education Committee for May 18, 1950, by the dairy industry advisory board from the State capital, Sacramento, issued by Richard J. Werner, manager:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, DAIRY INDUSTRY ADVISORY BOARD, SACRAMENTO, QUARTERLY REPORT OF THE EDUCATION COMMITTEE, MAY 18, 1950

READY FOR JUNE DAIRY MONTH

June 1950, dairy month, should be outstanding for a number of reasons. Most important, perhaps, and a factor which may in great measure be responsible for California's best dairy month observance, is participation of producers under the leadership of James N. Fulmor, chairman of the dairy department, California Farm Bureau Federation. Response has been appreciable to date, so the program carried largely by distributors in former years, is being shared enthusiastically this year by producers.

It is noteworthy that plans for the 1950 campaign were in the making last fall; materials were printed months in advance, the State chairman accepted appointment early enough to organize his county committees in March, and there was complete advance preparation of suggestions for county committeemen on organizing local programs.

News releases, advertising tie-ins, covercuts for trade journals, outlines for service club talks, television shorts, radio scripts, and spot announcements were completed in April, and ready for distribution the first of May. Most of the promotion material is now in the hands of producers and distributors, and speaking dates are being scheduled before consumer groups.

A special leaflet entitled, "A Bow to the Cow," carries a message from State chairman, James N. Fulmor. This will be mailed with statements to customers, used as place cards at luncheons and dinners and in a variety of ways. The initial run of 500,000 copies was oversubscribed, and another 200,000 printed. Special bumper strips were created. Other promotion materials include recipe booklets, car cards featuring milk and ice cream, butter and cottage cheese posters, and all other CDIAB materials.

A 24-sheet poster, featuring the ice follies twins and milk for health, is on billboards throughout the State. Reproductions in car-card size are available. In the bay area, tie-in with the 1950 ice follies feature act, "Dairyville," is being made through distribution of leaflets and soda fountain tent cards featuring a "Dairyville" sundae.

Chain stores, particularly food chains, have volunteered cooperation through their association. Among special events planned for June dairy month are a rally luncheon in Los Angeles, a dinner dance at a country club in southern California, and a school project tie-in in San Francisco.

TEST COURSES PROVE SUCCESS

Labor, industry, and the schools agree that the dairy employee pilot courses in three large metropolitan areas were successful. Oakland completed its 6-week school March 30; San Francisco presented 232 certificates of completion at the close of a 12-week course on April 25; Los Angeles will complete its 12 weeks with certificate awards on May 23.

Format of a short, intensive course in salesmanship is ready to be submitted in the Los Angeles and bay area as follow-up for the introductory course in fundamental. Questionnaires and discussion reveal that greatest interest of employees is in sales and merchandising. Courses in fundamentals are being considered for Sacramento, Fresno, San Jose, San Mateo, the north bay area, Long Beach, Riverside, and Santa Barbara.

LENT OVER—BUT COTTAGE CHEESE LINGERS ON

The Cottage Cheese booklet which was featured during Lent by distributors and food-page editors in newspapers and magazines continues in popularity. Requests are received daily by all offices. The recipes offer something really new in ways of serving cheese, and women have responded enthusiastically. One newspaper offer brought more than 2,500 requests. Written requests from customers of several dairy firms ran close to this figure.

CDIAB BOOKLETS CONTINUE POPULAR

"Outdoor Meals That Fit the Spot," is a perennial, and this is the season. "Food and Fun for Everyone" booklet, introduced just before the holidays last year, still is in demand. A number of men and women have called at CDIAB offices for these booklets—for their wives, for girls in their offices, and for themselves. They bring newspaper clippings and leaflets or cards distributed by their milkman—large and small dairies are offering the booklets. The San Francisco News received 982 requests for another popular piece, the chart showing commonly used cheeses.

THE RECORD SHOWS

Members of the staff spoke at 42 meetings to audiences totaling 4,160 persons. In addition, mobile-unit demonstrations were made before 34 school audiences totaling 19,387 pupils and teachers during March and April. Conferences were held with 1,190 key persons in education, health, general consumer groups, and the dairy industry, to plan and work out programs which featured dairy products in various ways.

Exhibits of CDIAB materials were set up at a four-county visual-aid conference, at county and Catholic school workshops for teachers, at the model milking barn for the junior show at the Cow Palace, a meeting of the California division, American School Health Association, a Brownie festival, and a dairy-employee course. Film showings totaled 290 before school, public health, and consumer groups, among them a number of service clubs. Two radio talks were made on public-service programs, and clippings for 93 free stories, totaling 11,313 lines were recorded.

Since January 1, more than 2,000,000 pieces of material have been distributed. This number includes the 481,819 pieces distributed in March and April, but only the preliminary mailings of June Dairy month materials, most of which were sample copies.

NEW MOBILE UNITS

New mobile units are being planned by the Los Angeles Board of Education, which has made them an integral part of the educational system in Los Angeles. CDIAB, accepted as an authority on such units, set the pattern and is being consulted by the board of education.

COUNTY-WIDE WORKSHOP

CDIAB was invited by the office of the school superintendent for Santa Barbara County to participate in two workshops for teachers, nurses, cafeteria workers, school officials, and parents. Both sessions, at which use of DIAB materials were demonstrated, were well attended and drew from all parts of the county.

STUDENT TEACHERS MAKE OFFICE CALLS

Teacher trainees at universities, State colleges, church, and other small colleges called in significant numbers at CDIAB offices. When a program director offered to demonstrate the materials in the classroom the reply was, "It is a good thing for these people to get used to calling at your office for materials."

COVERS THE FIELD

San Diego office reported conferences on program planning with dental hygienists, the audio visual department of the city school system, the city's social welfare department, PTA, Campfire leaders, an instructor of student nurses in a hospital, and home economist for the local gas and electric company.

PACIFIC TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO. CONSULTS

Nutrition is one of the major projects for employees in the Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Co. Its only woman vice president, who is making plans for an extensive program of classes in nutrition, conferred with CDIAB in Los Angeles regarding materials for instruction.

WIDE CONTACTS—HAPPY RELATIONS

Harr Wagner, San Francisco publishers of California textbooks, asked CDIAB to furnish photographs of champion cows of three dairy breeds for a fifth-grade text entitled, "Our California." Pleased with the pictures, the publisher came back with requests for photographs of 4–H winners with their prize animals, champions in the poultry world, and a

purebred sow with a litter. It is another example of channels into which good public relations can reach to make friends for the industry.

NEWS RELEASES

March issue of the California Farm Bureau Monthly carried a two-column special article on CDIAB activities, using a boxed item and photograph. Releases on the dairy-employee courses, nutrition findings, and CDIAB activities, have appeared in California trade journals, and newspapers, and some eastern publications.

RICHARD J. WERNER,
Manager, Dairy Industry Advisory Board.

And, having stated aforesaid, I know you will expect me to state the further fact in connection with dairying and agriculture, to wit: That California leads all other States with respect to cash farm income. While its leading position in the value of its alfalfa, apricots, artichokes, asparagus, barley, cantaloups, corn, lettuce, oats, potatoes, sugar beets, and tomatoes are nationally noteworthy. Furthermore, California also ranks first among all the States in the production of almonds, apricots, avocadoes, dates, figs, grapes, lemons, olives, oranges, peaches, pears, prunes, and walnuts.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with a just pride at being 4 years a Representative in Congress from the great Eighteenth Congressional District of California, on account of its dairy products, as well as for its other noteworthy and Nation-wide achievements, I desire to again congratulate all the producers of milk and dairy products in the Eighteenth Congressional District and in Los Angeles County and in my native State of California.

"Buzz-Saw Bill" Benton, Idea Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article, containing a brief sketch of the career of my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], entitled "'Buzz-Saw BILL' BENTON, Idea Man," which appeared in the Waterbury (Conn.) Sunday Republican on June 25, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"BUZZ-SAW" BILL BENTON, IDEA MAN—DEMOCRATIC UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT, ADVERTISING DYNAMO, REAL LIFE HORATIO ALGER—FOUGHT FOR HOOVER REORGANIZATION PLAN, FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE BILL, SPONSORED VOICE OF AMERICA

Widowed Elma Benton often mused how nice it would be if only her son BILL were respectable. She wanted him to be a teacher or preacher like all Bentons were as far back as she could remember. She herself taught school.

"If you won't go into a respectable profession," Mrs. Benton wrote her son, fresh out of Yale '21, "at least you could be a lawyer." Hopefully she enrolled him at Harvard Law. BILL meant to go but stopped off at New York where he found an advertising job at $25 a week. Later he wrote his mother he was writing snappy copy to advertise food, oranges, and a special brand of toilet soap. This was too much for Elma Benton. "I'm sorry to learn that you have gone into a business that says such-and-such soap is good soap," she wrote testily.

BILL did all right. But for years Mrs. Benton carried a silent burden until one day she read in the papers, "Says he'll make million by thirty-five and quit: Does it." BILL denies this but the legend persists. She couldn't wait to confide to a neighbor, "I hope this means he'll get a respectable job." If she were alive today—she died in 1942—she'd be right proud of her son WILLIAM "BILL" BENTON, Democratic United States Senator from Connecticut.

SENATOR SIX MONTHS

Conceivably she'd be equally proud of his record as a 6 months young Senator. For BENTON sparked the Senate fight for 21 Hoover Commission plans to reorganize and streamline Federal Government. (Former GOP President Herbert Hoover estimates the Government will save four billion annually if all his reorganization plans are adopted.) Sixteen of twenty-one plans submitted this year passed Congress. A national magazine described BENTON'S Senate fight a "BILL BENTON blitz, a minor miracle." It said BENTON spoke out. "He proceeded to raise hell with his own leadership, the minority leadership, the Senate in general, and a good part of the President's Cabinet. To his astonishment, it paid off."

BENTON also pressed for passage of the fair-employment-practice bill. He warned Russia is using our failure to pass FEPC as a propaganda lever to pry loose from American friendship colored and Asiatic peoples of the world. He called for a Marshall-plan-of-ideas offensive against Russia in the cold war. We fail to recognize the nature of the democratic world's struggle against communism. We don't need guns, tanks, and armies to win the cold war, though, he adds, it's a comfort to have them on our side. The cold war is a global struggle for the minds and loyalties of mankind. Words are the weapons, and ideas. Let's preach democracy to the world. We've got to sell it to peoples everywhere in every way possible. Radio, books, literature, newspapers, films, every media of communication must be used. If democracy is worth dying for, it's worth fighting for. War didn't end with the last shot. It will end when democracy is recognized in the world as the lay brother of Christianity, the best and only way of life in which the dignity of man can grow without fear or restraint. To this end we must have a free press and freedom of information throughout the world.

BATTLED FOR SMALL BUSINESS

BENTON tackled the Senate from yet another angle. He battled for better breaks for small independent businessmen. What he thinks about business appeared 6 years ago in Fortune magazine under Economics of a Free Society, or A Declaration of American Business Policy.

"The more skillfully we handle the role of Government in economy," he wrote, "the less the role that Government may have to play. We must rid the economy of injurious or unnecessary governmental regulations, as well as administration that's hostile and harmful * * * the American people must insist their Government pursue constructive, fiscal, monetary, and other policies that provide a climate where a private-enterprise system can flourish. Failure to insist on this may lead to some form of dictatorship or fascism." Again he wrote in Reader's Digest, "The man who has the best right to be proud is the man who works for himself. The farmer is the man with pride. The village blacksmith had more than arms like iron bands; he had pride. Don't worry because your chosen calling hapens to be humble. The flunky in a great corporation can't possibly take the pride in his business that the corner grocer takes in the business he built for himself." Six years after this was written BILL BENTON became Senator. What happened to his basic thinking on American business? He got himself appointed to a special Senate Committee on Small Business and hasn't wavered 1 second in his fierce insistence on free enterprise in American economy. Talks in Connecticut constantly affirmed this. BENTON further fought for three concrete plans to aid small business. He's urged legislation to give small independent businessmen "security insurance." There are presently 4,500,000 self-employed small-business men not covered by social security laws. He supported two other steps:

1. Allow small business a greater tax exemption on earnings in the $25,000 to $50,000 class.

2. Give small business a carry-forward provision in tax laws to charge up initial business losses against taxes over a 5-year period instead of the current two.

As an economy advocate BENTON led a three-man bloc in the Senate in a futile but determined effort to halt the administration's multi-billion-dollar price-support program. Other Senators were PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and HERBERT LEHMAN, of New York. All three voted against a hotly contested farm bill critics claim will cost taxpayers an extra $100,000,000 in price supports for peanuts, potatoes, and cotton.

A HUMAN DYNAMO

But what kind of a man is BENTON? Friends say he's "Buzz-Saw BILL, an idea man on the run, the nearest thing to a human dynamo in existence." He's an educator, radio impresario, film producer, economist, art lover, publisher, statesman, and a lousy golfer. He's BILL BENTON, a man of feverish activity who regrets he has to sleep, wolfs his food, and has worn out many a man 25 years under his 50. They say if you want to talk to BILL catch him on the run. The ediphone must have been invented for his sole use. It's a mechanical box that eats up what you say into it then lays a record of dictation. Many businessmen use them, few with such rugged insistence. He thinks nothing of turning out 30 to 50 letters a day. He keeps one machine in his car, one in his office, and others scattered through his Southport home. Several secretaries do nothing all day long but transcribe letters. He reads half a dozen books a week, runs three businesses, innumerable conferences, and still finds time to attend world-wide meetings as a representative of the United States.

"It's his glands," said Swedish-born friend Anton Carlson, famous physiologist, at a war-research conference shortly after Pearl Harbor. "If we could find oudt vat makes BENTON go, and inject a liddle in efferybody, ve could vin the vawr in a week."

OF CONNECTICUT ANCESTRY

BENTON is a real-life Horatio Alger. He was born 50 years ago in Minnesota where his father, a former Connecticut minister, taught at the University of Minnesota. His father Charles Benton was born in Tolland, Conn., in 1850. BILL'S grandfather, after whom he was named, also was born in Tolland in 1828. The first Benton settled in Connecticut in 1638 living in Hartford and Guilford. BENTON'S father died when he was 13. His mother promptly filed a claim on some free Montana land, homesteaded there with her two sons to prove their claim. It was wilderness and a pine board cabin they built together (Mrs. Benton sold the original house for $200 to a farmer in 1930. He

hauled it off with a team of horses.) Bill grew up the hard way. At this time his mother was earning $40 a month as a school teacher with 13 pupils. As a youngster he worked on the Duluth, Mesabe & Northern Railroad on the iron range of Minnesota, worked the land with his bare hands and a wooden plow, and later sold everything from plumbing fixtures to books and cash registers. He also worked in a bank for $80 a month.

FROM YALE TO ADVERTISING

His first job out of Yale paid $25 a week. His early years weren't all strawberry ice cream and cake, though in 1928 he was making $12,500 a year, had become a junior partner in an advertising firm. One day its president decided BENTON had stepped on his toes and fired him. He returned to his old advertising firm as assistant manager of the Chicago office. Six months later at 28 he was earning $25,000 a year. BENTON now determined to go into business for himself. He knew a young man, Chet Bowles, whom he had once hired as an assistant. He called him in, proposed a partnership, and they started the firm of Benton & Bowles in 1929. BENTON had refused a $50,000 a year job offer. He figured if he was worth that much to a firm he must be worth more on his own. Benton & Bowles started with $18,000 in capital assets. Three months later the stock market crashed, with it many established firms. BENTON gritted his teeth, said now was the time to prove advertising paid its way. He flatly refused to handle small accounts. This took a lot of gall but BENTON proved his point. Business picked up. When he quit in 1936 it was doing an annual business of $18,000,000 gross billings. BENTON was drawing a fat $250,000 a year. They cornered big accounts by developing a practice standard today—consumer research. The partners got the go-ahead sign from General Foods by ringing doorbells asking housewives what kind of jelly they liked best. BENTON brags today he's an expert on doors, he's had so many slammed in his face. All this, of course, was part of a larger research project on Mr. and Mrs. America's eating habits.

BECAME COLLEGE VICE PRESIDENT

Suddenly in early 1936 Benton shocked his friends. He up and quit. "What's the use of making money for money's sake? I don't want yachts or high living. I want to be of some use to people," he said. He seriously considered doing missionary work, didn't think the change-over unusual. Bentons had been teachers and preachers for generations. But a college classmate, Robert Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago, persuaded him to become the school's vice president.

BENTON went in as a 6-months-a-year vice president. The other six he spent at Southport with his family. First thing he did was to dictate a whole book—that's right—of suggested changes. He also reportedly wanted to meet Al Capone in addition to all faculty members. BENTON soon heard of a professor doing research work on sleep to cut 2 hours out of a normal night's rest. He rushed to him, said he was now getting along on 5 or 6 hours. "Imagine what I could do with two extra hours," he said. He consulted another specialist to speed up reading. Told he read with normal rapidity, he asked if that could be stepped up. The specialist said maybe 5 percent, so the vice president of the University of Chicago promptly started taking lessons with the humblest freshman.

BRITANNICA BOARD CHAIRMAN

During this time he became board chairman of the Encyclopedia Britannica. It was losing money. BENTON asked university trustees to put up $100,000 to boost promotion. They were afraid to take the risk, so BENTON invested his own $100,000 in the project. Encyclopedia Britannica now averages $300,000 annually in royalties to the university. BENTON next bought Muzak for $132,000. He's been offered $1,500,000 for it. Muzak is a firm that pipes music into restaurants, hotels, hospitals, factories, busses, and planes. BENTON'S investment luck is phenomenal. Years ago a friend asked him to back a shoe firm. He invested $5,000 against the advice of friends. The Joyce Shoe Co., of Los Angeles, made so much money BENTON sold his shares for $125,000. He acquired $7,500 in stock as a consultant for the New York newspaper PM when Ralph Ingersoll founded it. He later disagreed with its policies, got a $7,825 check for his shares. This he invested in the Chicago Times, later sold out for $55,000.

SPONSORED VOICE OF AMERICA

BENTON was appointed Assistant Secretary of State in 1945, a job more popular with State Department critics than friends. His job was to liquidate the wartime Office of War Information and of Inter-American Affairs. He found economy-minded Congressmen didn't care what happened to the offices so long as they were dropped. He ran into his biggest obstacle when he forced Congress to approve funds for the State Department's Voice of America. He told a congressional committee its purpose is to beam American broadcasts to iron-curtain countries to tell the truth of what's going on. The agency would also listen in on Russian propaganda broadcasts to other countries and in Russia itself.

A shocked southern Senator cried, "Why, that's eavesdropping, like peeking through a keyhole." The Voice today is recognized as one of America's most potent weapons in the cold war. He left the Department in 1947. His severest critics admitted BENTON raised America's Voice above a whisper. There's a screen in his living room given him by his subordinates in the State Department. It's plastered with letters in 18 different languages praising the Voice. A simple inscription says, "To BILL BENTON, without whose valiant fight there would have been no Voice of America."

Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the outstanding record of Philip B. Perlman, Solicitor General of the United States, before the Supreme Court has been the subject of remarks by Attorney General McGrath and of newspaper comment.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Attorney General, together with an article on the same subject which appeared in the Baltimore Sun of Monday, June 26, 1950, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Attorney General J. Howard McGrath said today that he had received a letter from President Truman commenting on the record made by Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman during the last term of the Supreme Court, when the Solicitor General was successful in every case he argued. The President said:

"Mr. Perlman's work brings great credit to himself, the Justice Department, and the United States Government. I honor him for it and want you to tell him so."

The President's letter was in reply to one written by Attorney General McGrath, just after the close of the term. Mr. McGrath's letter was as follows:

JUNE 6, 1950.

The PRESIDENT,

The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Because of the effort made in the Eightieth Congress to delay and defeat your nomination of Philip B. Perlman, of Maryland, to be Solicitor General of the United States, I am taking the liberty of calling your attention to the record he has made during the three terms of the Supreme Court since his confirmation.

During the present term of Court, Mr. Perlman appeared before the Supreme Court 12 times, arguing on behalf of the Government in some of the most important cases in this generation. I am happy to be able to report to you that he was successful in every instance, making a record never before equaled by any Solicitor General in history.

Among the cases which Mr. Perlman argued successfully were the Henderson case, in which I appeared before the Supreme Court with him, and which resulted in the nullification of regulations enforcing segregation between the races in railroad dining cars. He also filed a brief in support of the petitions in the Sweatt and McLaurin cases, involving segregation at the University of Texas and the University of Oklahoma. He argued the Louisiana and the Texas cases, establishing the paramount rights of the United States to the oil and other mineral deposits in the ocean off the shores of those States.

Mr. Perlman argued the two cases which established the validity of the anti-Communist oath required of officers of labor unions, as it was written into the Taft-Hartley Act. He also argued successfully the contempt-of-Congress convictions against Eugene Dennis, secretary of the Communist Party, and against Helen R. Bryan and Ernestina G. Fleishman, officials of the joint anti-Fascist refugee committee. The Dennis, Bryan, and Fleishman decisions were followed by denials of rehearings to other previously convicted officials of the same organization.

Although not counted as an argument, Mr. Perlman's motion for dismissal of the writ granted to Gerhart Eisler resulted in the conviction and sentence in that case becoming final. Mr. Perlman had argued the case in a previous term before Eisler fled the country.

Mr. Perlman obtained a reversal by the Supreme Court of a decision against the Government in the Seeley Tube and Box Co. tax case. Although the amount involved in the case was comparatively small, it was estimated that the principles approved in the case resulted in the collection by the end of 1949 of approximately $40,000,000.

Mr. Perlman also obtained a reversal of a Court of Appeals decision that alien enemies, convicted by American military courts abroad, could have the legality of their trials reviewed on writs of habeas corpus issued by the district courts of the District of Columbia. On Monday of this week the Supreme Court ruled in favor of the Government's contention that alien enemies, who were tried and imprisoned abroad for crimes committed abroad, have no rights in the courts here.

One of the important cases argued by Mr. Perlman during the present term was the one establishing the validity of the rent control law. Another was the case which reversed the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and established the right of Government agents to make searches and seizures incident to valid arrests. This case overruled a recent case in which important evidence was excluded on the theory

that the law enforcement officers were barred from obtaining and using evidence in the absence of a search warrant, even though the arrest which preceded the search was valid.

During the preceding term of the Supreme Court, Mr. Perlman also appeared personally 12 times, being successful in 11 of the appearances, involving a total of 15 cases, and losing but 1. It was during that term that Mr. Perlman argued in 3 separate cases in 1 day, and it was during that term that he argued successfully against the effort to induce the Supreme Court to take jurisdiction in the habeas corpus cases involving the Japanese war criminals. During the 1947–1948 term Mr. Perlman appeared 12 times, involving a total of 15 cases. One of these was not decided and 3 were lost. Among the important victories were the racial restrictive covenant cases, in which the Government for the first time intervened in the Supreme Court to urge the Supreme Court to enforce civil rights. The cases resulted in a decision that nullified all previous State decisions giving effect to racial restrictive covenants on real property. The case terminated all governmental sanctions of restrictive covenants based on race, creed or color. During the same term Mr. Perlman argued the cases that established the validity of the acts and regulations for the renegotiation of war contracts involving sums in excess of $10,000,000,000.

During the three terms Mr. Perlman has been Solicitor General he has appeared in the Supreme Court 36 times to argue in litigation that controlled the immediate disposition of at least 44 cases. He was unsuccessful in but 4 cases, and the principles in 2 of the 4—cases involving search and seizure—were modified or overruled in the case on the same subject decided this year. It is, I believe, accurate to say that no Solicitor General who argued such a large number of crucial cases has ever gone through an entire term with a perfect score, such as he made this term, and no Solicitor General has ever compiled such a successful record over a 3-year period.

Perhaps it should be mentioned that, in addition to the cases argued personally, the Solicitor General is in charge of all Government litigation in the Supreme Court, and, with the exception of a few cases handled by the Interstate Commerce Commission, is responsible for all briefs and the assignment of all arguments. The decision as to whether to seek reviews of cases lost in the lower courts, and the task of opposing efforts to obtain reversals of cases won in the lower courts requires much constant work. The results of all Government litigation in the highest court equal, if they do not surpass, the record of any previous administration, and this is a source of satisfaction and pride to me as the head of the Justice Department, and I am sure it will be to you by reason of your having originally selected and appointed Mr. Perlman.

Yesterday the Supreme Court concluded its term and I have undertaken today to make an analysis of our results. This analysis took me back over the period of Mr. Perlman's term of office. Having been honored by you with the office of Solicitor General, I have a tremendous appreciation of its importance and how much it means to the Government. I have, therefore, undertaken to write you this detailed report so that I may eventually hand a copy of it to Mr. Perlman as a token of my esteem and appreciation.

Respectfully yours,

J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
Attorney General.

[From the Baltimore Sun of June 26, 1950]

PERLMAN'S RECORD IS LAUDED BY ATTORNEY GENERAL, PRESIDENT

(By Robert W. Ruth)

WASHINGTON, June 25.—Philip B. Perlman, United States Solicitor General, won all the cases he argued personally before the Supreme Court during the recent term, thus establishing a record never before equalled by any Solicitor General, J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General, announced today.

The Baltimorean's achievement, involving 12 appearances before the court, was acknowledged in a letter from President Truman to McGrath. It stated:

"Mr. Perlman's work brings great credit to himself, the Justice Department, and the United States Government. I honor him for it and want you to tell him so."

STATEMENT IS QUALIFIED

On June 6, the Attorney General called Mr. Truman's attention to the unprecedented record "because of the effort made in the Eightieth Congress to delay and defeat your nomination of Philip B. Perlman, of Maryland, to be Solicitor General."

Senator FERGUSON (Republican, Michigan), chairman of a judiciary subcommittee studying the Perlman nomination in the summer of 1947, was almost solely responsible for the long delay in the Baltimorean's confirmation. Perlman was barely approved by the Senate in the last-minute rush of business before Congress adjourned. The Michigan Republican fought the nomination up to the last minute.

Asked for comment on the Perlman record, FERGUSON said he didn't know about the specific cases. He added: "Everything depends on the issues. Winning a case is a victory for the Government, but also there is a question of whether the Government should have won."

The Senator said he had not heard any criticism of Perlman as Solicitor General.

SET A NEW MARK

"I have known prosecutors," he remarked, "who won all their cases, but I could not comment on the justice done. District attorneys in Michigan have claimed to have won all their cases, but there are two sides to that, you know."

McGrath said the Solicitor General had appeared during the last term "in some of the most important cases in this generation." The Perlman record not only set a new mark but is also believed far and away a better victory record than ever established by any of his predecessors.

CASES ARE LISTED

The following are major cases Perlman argued:

1. The Henderson case: It resulted in nullification of regulations enforcing racial segregation in railroad dining cars. Perlman also filed a brief fighting segregation at the Universities of Texas and Oklahoma in the Sweatt and McLaurin cases.

2. The Louisiana and Texas tideland oil cases: Perlman argued the paramount rights of the Federal Government to the oil and mineral deposits under the ocean off the shores of the two States.

3. Two anti-Communist oath cases: These established the validity of the oath required of officers of labor unions under the Taft-Hartley law.

4. Contempt-of-Congress cases: Perlman argued convictions against Eugene Dennis, secretary of the Communist Party, and against Helen R. Bryan and Ernestine G. Fleishman, officials of the joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

5. Seeley Tube & Box Co. tax case: The Solicitor General won a reversal of a decision against the Government. Although the amount involved in the case was comparatively small, it is estimated the principles approved resulted in the collection by the end of 1949 of approximately $40,000,000.

6. Alien enemy trials: An appeals court ruled that alien enemies, convicted by American military courts abroad, could have the legality of their trials reviewed on writs of habeas corpus issued by the district courts here. However, the Supreme Court agreed with the Government that alien enemies, who were tried and imprisoned abroad for crimes committed abroad, have no rights in the courts here.

7. Rent control: Perlman won the case establishing validity of the rent-control law.

8. Rabinowitz case: The Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit was reversed. The case established the right of Government agents to make searches and seizures incident to valid arrests. This case overruled a recent case in which important evidence was excluded on the theory that the law-enforcement officers were barred from obtaining and using evidence in the absence of a search warrant, even though the arrest which preceded the search was valid.

THIRTY TIMES IN 33 CASES

Perhaps the most far-reaching in their consequences were the segregation and tideland cases. The Supreme Court decision on alien enemy trials prevented the imposition of a tremendous burden on the District courts here.

The closest squeeze Perlman had came in the anti-Communist oath cases. Part of the act could have been held invalid—that part involving an oath that one does not believe in the overthrow of the Government and does not belong to an organization which so believes. The Government contention was affirmed by a tie vote on this provision.

Perlman and his staff argued 30 times in 33 cases. Perlman's appearance 12 times is considered a high percentage.

During the preceding term, the Solicitor General appeared personally also 12 times. He was successful in 11 of the appearances, involving a total of 15 cases. He lost one case.

GOING TO ENGLAND

In the 1947–48 term he appeared 12 times, involving 15 cases. One of these was not decided and three were lost. The principals in two of the cases he lost—involving search and seizure—were modified or overruled in the case on the same subject this year.

During the three term he argued in litigation bearing on at least 44 cases.

Perlman, who is the highest ranking Marylander in the executive branch, is sailing on the *Queen Mary* July 8 to attend the International Bar Association meeting in London. He will talk on the Genocide Convention.

He has also been invited to address the Academy of International Law at The Hague. He is scheduled to return on the *Queen Mary* in August.

An Appeal for Action on the St. Lawrence Seaway Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me on the subject of the current international crises and the implications insofar as the St. Lawrence seaway is concerned. I also ask that statements of and communications from a number of farm organizations on the same subject be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. WILEY's statement and the other matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREAN SITUATION EMPHASIZES NEED FOR ADDITIONAL TRANSPORTATION ARTERY

(Statement by Senator WILEY)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the current crisis in Korea emphasizes anew that America could use another vital transportation artery to meet her overseas commitments.

I am referring to the need for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway which becomes indispensable in a critical situation such as we now face. If we had the St. Lawrence seaway, we would be that much more able to transport goods to Europe. We would thus relieve the congestion of east coast ports and east coast railroads. Of course the immediate crisis is in the Far East, but obviously there is danger of a Russian push in Europe, and we must strengthen our military defenses there, too, by shipping vital supplies.

WE NEED CANADIAN ORE FOR DEFENSE PRODUCTION

Moreover, if we had the St. Lawrence seaway, we would be in a position to import Labrador ore for our steel mills. It has been stated that the Mesabi Iron Range has served its last war in the sense that if all-out war came, and God forbid that dread eventuality, there simply is not enough high-grade ore in Mesabi to feed the hungry mouths of American industrial mills. We desperately need Labrador ore, therefore, brought in through the protected Great Lakes.

Obviously, if we had to import iron ore from South America, the ships would be "duck soup" for the torpedoes of Russian snorkel submarines. This, Mr. President, is not farfetched. This is based upon the grim record of World War II when German submarines smashed our shipping.

WE HAVE AMPLE TIME TO BUILD THIS PROJECT

To the unthinking observer it may appear that the Korean crisis indicates that instead of the pro-St. Lawrence seaway case being strengthened, it is allegedly weakened. Actually, the case is indeed strengthened. The unthinking, superficial individual might say: "Oh, well, let's not build any more major projects like the seaway in this present crisis." I say, on the other hand, that if we had defeated the selfish antiseaway lobbyists years ago and had this project been underway, we could have accelerated the project and completed it in short order. Moreover, we pray that this present Korean crisis does not mean war. There is ample time to start the project now, so that if another major emergency should come later on, we would not be complaining as we are today about the complete lack of a 27-foot seaway. There is ample time, I repeat, to act right now. We may be in a perpetual emergency. The excuse of emergency preventing action is a phony excuse.

Obviously, too, America is going to have tremendous military expenses in the present crisis. However, the modest costs of the seaway will be but a drop in the bucket compared to these military expenses. In addition, more electricity will be absolutely essential for defense plants, and Northeast industry is already starved for electric juice. Seaway power could help provide that electricity. The individuals who deny us this power are performing an act whose net effect is as grave as if they were Communists blowing up an electric plant. I am not calling them Communists; I am referring to the consequences of their selfish deeds—their selfish opposition to the seaway.

SUPERFICIAL OBSERVER'S OTHER PHONY EXCUSES

The unthinking superficial observer might say: "Oh, well, a few bombs could put the seaway out of commission." Well, Mr. President, the answer to that one is that a few bombs could put practically any great engineering project out of commission. They could put the Soo locks out of commission, the TVA or Boulder Dam or almost any one of our other vital installations. These excuses against action on the seaway simply do not hold water. We need the seaway now more than ever before. Let the opposition quit trying to kid us with trumped-up alibis and excuses to delay, delay, delay.

I repeat, if the Korean crisis should eventuate into still a worse crisis, we will need the shipbuilding facilities of the Great Lakes, we will need the navigation artery to supplement the crowded railroads, and so forth.

FARM NEED FOR SEAWAY IS GREAT

Now, Mr. President, throughout all of the discussion on the seaway there has been emphasis on the need of the industrial structure of our country for this great project. Because of that emphasis on the industrial structure's need, some folks may have gained the misleading impression that the farmers' need was not as great. Actually, the reverse is the case. The need of American agriculture for the seaway is as clear and as vivid as the need of American industry.

I am glad to say that there is more unanimity among farm organizations on this seaway matter than there is among any group in our economy. I have in my hands statements from certain outstanding farm leaders and farm organizations. I refer, for example, to a letter from my good friend, Charles Holman, to the chairman of the House Public Works Committee. Charles is the secretary of the National Milk Producers Federation. I refer to a letter from Roger Fleming, secretary-treasurer of the great American Farm Bureau Federation, to Chairman Whittington.

I refer to a statement by the National Farmers' Union to the House Public Works Committee. Lastly, I refer to the wonderful organization, the National Grange, as represented by Mr. J. T. Sanders, its legislative counsel, in direct testimony before that committee.

NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1950.

Hon. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON,
Chairman, House Committee on Public Works,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITTINGTON: In connection with the committee's consideration of approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin, we wish to register our support of House Joint Resolution 271.

The National Milk Producers Federation is a national organization of dairy farmers and their cooperatives. The Federation consists of 86 direct member associations and over 600 submember associations, all owned and controlled by almost one-half million dairy farmers throughout the United States. For many years, the members of the Federation have been vitally interested in the development of the St. Lawrence seaway, and their views have been embodied in formal resolutions adopted at annual meetings of our organization. As in the past, the voting delegates, at the thirty-third annual convention in November 1949, reiterated support for the St. Lawrence seaway. The resolution adopted at that time reads as follows:

"The inadequacy and ever-increasing cost of our overland transportation system and widespread shortages of electric power again focus attention on the St. Lawrence seaway. We favor the completion of the project for navigation and power purposes."

The regularity of the adoption of resolutions concerning this subject indicates our continuing interest in the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. In accordance with these resolutions in previous Congresses we have urged the approval of the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin.

Briefly, our support of House Joint Resolution 271 is predicated on our belief that the opening of a seaway to the Great Lakes would assist materially in the development of industry and agriculture of the Midwest. At the same time, the electrical energy made available in the Northeast would result in further industrial development in that region. Completion of the project would not only benefit these sections of our country but would add to the general wealth and strength of the Nation. Accordingly, we most respectfully urge the House Committee on Public Works to take prompt favorable action on House Joint Resolution 271.

Will you kindly incorporate this communication in the record of the hearings on the joint resolution?

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. HOLMAN,
Secretary.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1950.

Hon. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON,
Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WHITTINGTON: On numerous occasions since 1920 the American Farm Bureau Federation has adopted resolutions calling for development of the St. Lawrence seaway project. In reiterating our support, we have further said:

"We believe that to the greatest extent practicable, the project should be on a self-liquidating basis. Reasonable tolls should be collected for the use of the waterway. In our support we should strive, however, to have the authorizing legislation include maximum ceilings for various classes of cargo."

House Joint Resolution 271, now before the House, provides for agreement on "the principle of making the new deep-water navigation works on the St. Lawrence River herein authorized self-liquidating by charging reasonable tolls, this principle to be implemented through the conclusion of arrangements satisfactory to both governments pursuant to section 3 of this joint resolution."

We feel that the bill should contain adequate rate protection for the bulk commodities by providing for maximum charges according to classes of cargo. This is of special importance to farmers since those agricultural products which are likely to constitute a considerable proportion of the total tonnage moving over the seaway are relatively bulky.

The development of the St. Lawrence seaway is desirable for the well-being of agriculture, industry, and labor, especially in the Northeast and Midwest. Furthermore, there are good reasons to believe that it is highly desirable from the standpoint of national security.

In the event appropriations for completion of the program are not immediately forthcoming, authority to negotiate with Canada and otherwise launch the project should be granted now. In determining the time when actual construction is to be made, due consideration should be given to the matter of available labor and materials. Proper account must be taken of construction costs in order to assure achievement of the potential advantages sought.

The American Farm Bureau Federation supports favorable action on House Joint Resolution 271.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER FLEMING,
Secretary-Treasurer.

STATEMENT OF BENTON J. STONG, FOR THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, ON THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT, PREPARED FOR THE HOUSE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE, MAY 3, 1950

The National Farmers Union has supported the proposed St. Lawrence seaway power and navigation project since it was first proposed. The delegates to our biennial convention, held in Denver, Colo., only 2 months ago, unanimously adopted a statement on regional development which said, "We favor the St. Lawrence seaway project."

Past convention resolutions have more thoroughly explained the interest of the members of the Farmers Union in the project. Our organization's membership is heavy in Wisconsin, Minnesota, the Dakotas, and Montana. A great deal of wheat moves out of this area to the Lakes. A considerable volume of dairy products also moves out of the area eastward. Obviously the primary interest of the more than 100,000 farm families who are Farmers Union members in the area to be served by the seaway is in potential savings on freight costs which the seaway would bring.

The need for whatever savings can be effected for people in agriculture is becoming increasingly acute. In 1947, when Mr. Russell Smith testified in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he argued that "one of the most important reasons for construction of the seaway lies * * * in the deflationary price trends in prospect for agriculture which make prospective savings (from the seaway) of very great importance."

"It has become something of an axiom," Smith told that committee, "that farm prices fall first and hardest, and that they are the last to recover, when deflation sets in. This was true in 1921–22 and in 1929–33. At the same time rock-bottom farm prices are a terrific drag on the whole economy.

"It thus becomes of very great importance that the St. Lawrence seaway be available to help absorb this deflation in farm prices. Each dollar that can be saved in transportation will help just that much to maintain farm purchasing power at a time when its maintenance will be sorely needed."

In the 2 years and 11 months which have elapsed since Mr. Smith testified, his prediction of a decline in farm income has come about. Cash receipts from farm marketings in 1948 were $30,545,000,000. Last year they had dropped to $27,518,000,000. This year agricultural economists have predicted a further 10 to 15 percent decline, which means gross farm receipts of less than $25,000,000,000.

The enormous losses in farm purchasing power obviously are going to affect our whole economy, and whatever costs can be eliminated between the farmers and the consumers, in freight or other distribution costs, will help to ameliorate the effects of the present downtrend, which is already of quite serious proportions.

Our people regret that the St. Lawrence project was not put under way long ago. Time has increased the need and the urgency of early construction.

Farmers Union members are not solely interested in the St. Lawrence seaway for the reason I have mentioned, nor from a sectional or regional standpoint. Our organization is strongly in favor of regional developments across the Nation and in abundant supplies of low-cost energy in all areas, so there may be a high level of employment in all areas and, consequently, a good market for agricultural commodities. We are strongly in favor of the electric power aspects of the project, to provide New York and New England with abundant low-cost power. Parenthetically, I might add that we do not feel that the power should be turned over to a single State for marketing, but that it should be added to the total supply of the whole area. We feel that a source of low-cost energy will help to meet the economic problems of both New York and New England areas, now plagued with higher-than-average unemployment, and that such a step would be in the interest of the whole Nation.

We feel that gains in one region reflect in the prosperity of the Nation as a whole, for it creates more markets, more income, and more economic activity for all of us.

In 1947 the question of seaway tolls was raised and we waived our objections to toll charges in the hope of getting the project under way, with the understanding that if such charges proved too burdensome, and a case could be made to that effect, then the Congress would have the right, in concert with Canada, to modify the legislation, just as it now has the right to modify the proposals now before it for the construction of the seaway.

We continue that position, although it is our feeling that toll charges to liquidate waterway development costs should be applied across the board, or not at all. There are merits to arguments on both sides of the toll question. Those who would make all projects self-liquidating are unquestionably sincere, and not without sound arguments. On the other hand, transportation of all kinds has been subsidized by the Nation throughout its history and the imposition of tolls on the St. Lawrence waterway alone would seem to us discriminatory both as to waterway service for different areas of the Nation, and as to forms of transportation. It seems to us that the matter of tolls versus subsidies for transportation facilities should be considered in basic, over-all terms, and not in regard to a single project.

In our opinion, Mr. Chairman, the St. Lawrence seaway, like the Tennessee Valley Authority, will return its cost to this Nation many times over through benefits to farmers, city dwellers and the stimulation of trade and economic activity. It has been shown that the proportion of income taxes collected from the Tennessee Valley area has nearly doubled since the inception of TVA and that, in terms of increased income tax collections alone from the area, the Tennessee Valley Authority has more than returned its cost to the Federal Treasury already. Beyond that, there have been many times this benefit to the people of the region and all the people of America who supply that region with manufactured goods, feed, and food.

We hope that your committee will approve the St. Lawrence project as a dual-purpose, regional development.

STATEMENT BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 271, ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT, BY J. T. SANDERS, LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL, THE NATIONAL GRANGE, MAY 3, 1950

1. The National Grange has passed strong favorable resolutions for the earliest possible development of the St. Lawrence power project and seaway every year for almost 2 decades. Our present official stand on this highly important project is as follows: "We have for several years endorsed the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as a self-liquidating undertaking. And we request that there be no further delay in appropriating Federal funds to begin construction of this important strategical joint Canadian-United States project."

2. I doubt that the Grange has had any more consistent policy on any one item than that of support of this great national and international improvement since it was first proposed.

3. We are especially glad to again lend our wholehearted support to this project since it is now proposed as a self-liquidating project. The Grange, in general, supports essential public works that are not feasible as private undertakings and especially do we favor those with self-liquidating features. We believe that early completion of the St. Lawrence project is of great importance also as a part of our national defense. And since we have so frequently endorsed the project in the past without the self-liquidating provisions, we can give it all the more hearty endorsement when set up as a self-liquidating project, as is now proposed.

4. On the self-liquidating aspects and the importance of this project in national defense, the best possible presentation of the views of our membership, I believe, is expressed in two paragraphs from the annual address of Albert S. Goss, National Master of the Grange, at our Portland session in November 1946, as follows:

"An example of the wise use of funds for public works might be found in the development of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project which the Grange has advocated for years. It is apparent that only the Governments of Canada and the United States will ever build it. When built, it will pay interest on the money expended and retire the debt.

"It will open up a vast area for deep-sea transportation at annual savings of millions of dollars. It will make available a vast block of electric power which will save our exhaustible coal resources to the extent of possibly 5,000,000 tons a year, and make badly needed labor and transportation facilities available for other work. Whether or not it will have an effect upon the power rates in the area served is beside the point.

"The main issue is that it will be a vast creator of wealth instead of a consumer of exhaustible resources. Had this power development been completed before the war, it would have saved us hundreds of millions of dollars and materially speeded up many war materials."

5. Over and over again expert witnesses that have testified in past hearings on this project on the probable agricultural tonnage that would be carried by seagoing vessels over this great project have presented data that indicated that tolls for shipment of agricultural products would be one of the most important sources of revenues from the project. This improvement would bring oceangoing vessels right into the heart of the greatest grain-producing section of the world—an area that has in the past supplied, and probably will continue to supply, well over half of all bread grains entering international trade. Besides export grain, the grain consumed in the Atlantic seaboard States could be shipped at a great saving to the Nation. On grain alone, including bread grains for export and domestic consumption, and feed grains for export and domestic consumption, this great seaway will probably handle from a quarter to a half billion bushels of grain annually, paying from 1 to 1½ cents toll per bushel (much under competing freight costs) and saving the Nation's consumers and farmers an equal additional amount. Even at the lower and very conservative estimate, annual tolls to the extent of $2,500,000 could be paid and yield an equal saving to consumers and farmers under present shipping costs. This estimate does not include Canadian grains. These great savings would accrue to American grain producers and consumers and to many grain-needy peoples throughout the world.

6. Although it is impossible to foresee and tell accurately the full results of the adequate development of both transportation and power from the St. Lawrence project, we believe that this development will be very great—much greater than present indications. What proportions of the total present tonnage of east-west freight in the

Lake States and Canada that would move over the seagoing St. Lawrence route, it is probably not possible to predict. Certainly I have not made a study that justifies me in making definite estimates. The Brookings Institution study, which was adversely critical of the project, estimated the total tonnage that would move over the route would be 10,500,000 tons annually. This undoubtedly is much lower than can justifiably be anticipated, but even this very low estimate of tonnage at $1 per ton toll would yield $10,000,000 annual revenue. This is the total annual maintenance cost estimated by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army for these traffic costs of the project alone. As evidence that this 10,500,000 tonnage is probably very low, I call your attention to the fact that Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan testified in 1946 on behalf of the St. Lawrence project and called attention to the fact that export waterborne tonnage originating on lake ports averaged, from 1923–32, 9,000,000 tons annually and that 5,000,000 tons of imports arrived at these lake ports. Unquestionably it is reasonable to expect a far greater tonnage than this to develop after the seaway is established and commercial channels are opened.

7. We understand that there is a currently vocal suggestion that only the power portion of the project be built. From the farmer's viewpoint, this is an absurd proposal. As mentioned above, if the St. Lawrence can be made a deep seaway it will reach into the heart of the greatest agricultural area of the world. It will lend real advantage to every single farmer in this agricultural heartland. The only possible reason that we can see for a lopsided (power only) development of the St. Lawrence of one of the world's greatest natural resources is that it would maintain the present status of the railroads and some of the eastern port interests in the handling of freight. This is a purely selfish reason and is not in the interest of the national welfare. If we had allowed such artificial barriers to retard every cost-reducing development or improvement during the last century, this Nation would still be a third- or fourth-class power in the international field. Providing cheaper transportation for such a tremendous area will effect savings which will redound to the benefit of the whole Nation, and no selfish interests should be allowed to stand in the way.

8. Our nation will be strong and superior only insofar as we are vigilant to resist the obstructions of vested interest when these interests clearly stand in the way of national progress. Undoubtedly the opposition of railroads, of Atlantic and Gulf ports, and other interests is based on selfish and not on national interests. This opposition must not be allowed to stand in the way of national interests and progress. We want it to be known by all that the National Grange stands where it has stood over and over again—in favor of the national interest, for an early full development of the St. Lawrence project.

9. We firmly believe that even the railroads and these seaboard ports would not in the end lose by a full development of the St. Lawrence in a well-rounded coordinated manner. The expanded development of industry and agriculture that would be facilitated by the project would bring increased volumes of freight and traffic for these roads and ports. Even the railroads paralleling the seaway to the east and the ports served by these roads would likewise, we believe, receive added volume, and especially of the faster moving freight. We cannot in the least see the validity or the long-time soundness of this opposition by railroads and eastern ports.

10. As to the views of our organization on the lopsided development of the St. Lawrence, we passed strong resolutions in our recent Sacramento, Calif., session opposing scattered or piecemeal and especially incomplete and uncoordinated development of major watershed areas. Nothing less than a well-rounded development of both the power and the navigation resources of this great inland waterway will satisfy the policies and programs of the National Grange.

11. The National Grange has long advocated the development of the St. Lawrence seaway, not only because of the millions of dollars which would be saved annually in transportation costs by making it possible for seagoing vessels to load and unload almost in the heart of the Nation, but also because of the saving in vast quantities of exhaustible natural resources made possible through development of one of the largest hydroelectric plants in the world. Let's look briefly at the need for this additional power in the area around the St. Lawrence.

12. The Sixteenth Annual Report of the Power Authority of the State of New York furnished some most interesting data which amply support the stand of the National Grange. A few interesting comparisons have been developed from these data.

The following tables show the increase in generating plants from 1930 to 1945:

Area	Hydro-electric plants	Total generating plants
	Percent	*Percent*
New York	8.1	22.5
United States, as a whole	73.7	54.7

13. During this same period New York State's total production of electric energy increased 75.5 percent as compared with 144.2 percent for the Nation as a whole, while its hydroelectric energy production increased 52.3 percent as compared with 156.4 percent for the Nation as a whole.

14. In other words, with the St. Lawrence development, one of the greatest potential power sources in the world in its own front yard, the New York situation is characterized by three outstanding features. First, its increase in the development of electrical energy is about half that of the Nation as a whole. Second, its increase in the development of hydroelectric energy is about one-third that of the Nation as a whole. Third, most of its increase is from steam and internal combustion engine sources which have used dwindling supplies of exhaustible natural resources.

15. In such circumstances it is not surprising to find that New York State rates are high. The following table compares them with the rest of the United States and with the Pacific coast, where the potential waterpowers have been more freely developed. The purpose of this last comparison is to show what New York State could do if it had available the increased power which could be developed on the St. Lawrence. The table shows the average cost in cents per kilowatt hour for the three clases of customers:

Area	Average cost per kilowatt of electricity					
	Residential or domestic		Small commercial and industrial		Large commercial and industrial	
	Cents per kilowatt	Percent of New York rate	Cents per kilowatt	Percent of New York rate	Cents per kilowatt	Percent of New York rate
New York	4.24	100	3.31	100	0.78	100
United States as a whole	3.41	80	2.79	84	.93	119
Pacific Coast area	2.37	56	1.74	53	.61	78

16. After reviewing these figures one need not be surprised to find that in 1930, with nearly 11 percent of the population, New York consumed 13.8 percent of the Nation's electrical energy (because New York is one of the Nation's leading industrial States), while in 1945, still with nearly 11 percent of the population, New York was consuming but 9.8 percent of the electrical energy.

17. From the standpoint of the average consumer, the results are also interesting. The following table shows the residential or domestic consumption of electrical energy per consumer:

Area	Kilowatt-hours	Percent of New York usage	Rate	Percent of New York rate	Average annual cost
New York	965	100	4.24	100	$40.92
United States as a whole	1,216	126	3.41	80	41.46
Pacific coast area	1,665	173	2.37	56	39.46

18. Had the St. Lawrence seaway and electrical development been completed before the war we would have saved untold millions in freight, other millions of tons of coal, other millions of barrels of oil, millions upon millions of working days when manpower was so short, and we would have speeded up production tremendously and brought the war to a quicker termination. The project can be completed and financed on a basis such that every dollar invested will be repaid with interest and still furnish much cheaper power than the present cost of electricity to the citizens and the industries of New York and other States that will be served by the project.

19. The whole Nation is in the midst of an accelerating shortage of electric energy. Our international prospects, in the present and foreseeable near future, are too uncertain for us not to proceed with utmost practical speed on this great national and hemispherical defense project.

20. Because of the international character of the enterprise, we believe the project should be developed by the Federal Government, and that all the adjacent areas should share equitably in the benefits flowing from the generation of so large a block of needed power. Also the use of this power is of concern to Canada and its international considerations would be seriously complicated if administration of our share of the power were placed in the hand of any one State. Furthermore, the generation of power cannot be separated entirely from considerations of navigation. From the viewpoint of the interest of New York State, New England, the Nation, Canada, the international relations between the two nations and the coordinated management of navigation and power facilities, we feel that it would be a grave mistake to turn the management of the generated power over to any single State.

21. This is the type of development which has caused the National Grange to advocate a Federal statute providing a practical means under which two or more States could join in the development and operation of projects in which they have a mutual interest. Since as yet we have no such statute we believe the Federal Government should be the agency for development of the St. Lawrence project and the distribution of the power generated thereunder.

22. From any angle, we view this great proposed national and international benefaction—from its economic soundness, its value as a great national defense measure, its services to the Nation and the world—we cannot find any reason why its construction should be longer delayed.

United We Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "United We Stand," appearing in last night's Washington Daily News. I hope all Senators will read the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED WE STAND

President Truman has given the world's peace machinery real meaning by throwing the full weight of American military power behind the United Nations efforts to restore law and order in the Far East.

His courageous action may have averted a third world war.

The attack upon Korea made it plain beyond all doubt, as the President said, that communism has passed beyond the use of subversion to conquer independent nations and now is using armed invasion and war.

That challenge had to be met by force, if it was to be met at all. For nothing less would serve. The UN's appeal for a cease-fire order, issued Sunday, was not accorded even the courtesy of a reply by the Red invaders. The growing crisis demanded decisive action, and Mr. Truman's momentous decision answered that requirement without equivocation.

The President has done more than intervene in Korea to enforce the UN's peace demands. He has thrown a protecting arm around Formosa, the Philippines, Indochina, and the Republic of Indonesia, as well, thus drawing a line in Asia which Russian expansionism cannot cross unchallenged. That is a realistic recognition that the challenge of communism must be met on a world-wide basis.

Mr. Truman's policy involves a calculated risk. He is taking police action against an armed mob. The mob may fight back. If it does, there may be casualties.

It is possible, though much less likely, that Russia, the real culprit, will come out in the open and throw its armed strength behind its Korean puppets. But an eventual show-down with Russia was not to be avoided. It is better to know now than later what we must expect from that quarter.

A do-nothing policy in the face of this expanding menace would have left the weaker nations, exposed to the Communist techniques of infiltration and civil war, to be gobbled up one at a time.

We faced the ultimate alternative of challenging Red aggression or surrendering to it.

If civilization is to survive, peace must be restored and maintained in all parts of the world. But peace and its attendant blessings of freedom and security cannot be achieved by wishful thinking and good intentions. Such aspirations can be realized only through collective action, supported by forces superior to the forces of evil and destruction.

Both world wars might have been avoided by such action as President Truman is taking now. But, the great powers temporized with both situations until they got out of hand, and the United States, by its aloofness from the world community, was a major delinquent on both occasions. This time we have taken the initiative for peace, and we look to other free nations of the world for support.

We expect that support, and not merely in the form of lip service. Britain, the other nations of the British Commonwealth, and France, in particular, should join actively in this undertaking.

But first and foremost, the American people must close ranks behind the President and demonstrate to the world that he speaks for a united Nation.

This thing is for keeps. We have matched a fight we do not dare to lose.

We must give everything it takes to win.

Russia may or may not be bluffing. But we must prove that we mean business. Once the Kremlin is convinced of that, perhaps we can relax—but not until then.

Midwest Dairy Squeeze

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of June 27, 1950, an article written by Alfred D. Stedman which is very thought-provoking. It gives information and casts light on the problems of the dairy producer in the Midwest. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES REPORT CONFIRMS MIDWEST DAIRY SQUEEZE—FIGURES BARE PRICE EDGE GIVEN EAST

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

Federal orders played into the hands of eastern dairy price manipulations so as to beat Midwest dairymen out of seaboard markets, it was officially confirmed in a United States Government report Monday. The charges were made earlier by the Pioneer Press.

Exactly how it is being done was disclosed by the fluid milk and cream report of the United States Department of Agriculture for June, not in so many words but in the facts cited. The system is being worked in these two steps:

First, eastern prices of fluid milk for drinking are being set high above midwestern prices, as detailed by this newspaper earlier.

Second, with this margin to spare on fluid milk, eastern dairymen are being enabled to undersell Midwest dairymen on cream. The Government's own report showed instance after instance of eastern cream selling at less than midwestern prices of cream.

TWO-WAY SQUEEZE

Effects on midwestern dairying are regarded here as devastating. Immediate result is a sweeping loss by Midwest dairies of their eastern cream sales as they are priced out of the eastern markets.

A secondary result that ultimately may prove still more damaging is due to the combination of the cream-price disparity with the effects of the Government's flat-price system of butter-price supports. This latter by making buyers of eastern butter a virtual present of freight costs is handing the Midwest's eastern commercial butter outlets over to eastern butter makers.

The eastern cream that goes into butter is, through its cheap price, getting a double advantage over the Midwest in the butter market. After July 1, Midwest butter is to be hit another blow through the beginning of direct competition in 33 States with tax-free colored oleo. Already Midwest dairying is manufacturing heavily for the Government.

Here is the way the Federal Government's June milk report showed that eastern dairymen, by getting preferred prices on milk, are underselling the Midwest on cream and grabbing off the Midwest's cream markets:

In Boston, the fluid-milk price of $4.92 a hundredweight is $1.42 above the price here, but the cream price of $2.95 undersells us by 65 cents per hundredweight of milk equivalent.

In New York, the fluid milk price is $1.50 a hundredweight above ours while the cream price is about the same, thus underselling us by the freight cost.

In Providence, the milk price is $1.96 a hundredweight over ours, but the cream price undersells us by $1.09 a hundredweight of milk equivalent.

In Hartford, under State control, fluid milk prices are $1.98 a hundredweight over ours, but cream prices are $1 under ours.

In Rochester and Buffalo under State control, the fluid milk price is $1.50 a hundredweight over ours, but the cream price is about the same, thus underselling us by the freight charge.

This manipulation under eastern Federal and State orders of milk prices upward and cream prices downward explains why one Midwest dairy after another has reported to the Pioneer Press the loss of its once large eastern markets for cream.

"If we hadn't built up our strength through many years," the leader of one big Midwest cooperative told the Pioneer Press, "this system would have driven us under before now."

This is followed up by the effects of the Government's flat price-support system on butter, which gives eastern butter manufacturers an added bidding advantage over Midwest manufacturers to the extent of the freight cost. It cuts the ground right from under the Midwest terminal manufacturers, whether cooperative or private, by paying outlying creameries more than the terminal manufacturers can pay for butter.

Conservation Agencies Cooperate in Mills County, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and able soil conservation technician of Mills County, Iowa, sent me the following article and application for layout which surely deserves space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that other ACA and PMA agencies all over our Nation might have the benefit of copying the cooperative plan which is working so well for the folks in Mills County.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article, as follows:

CONSERVATION AGENCIES COOPERATE—ALL TECHNICAL WORK BY SCS—FEDERAL GROUPS AVOID DUPLICATION

(By Max Coffey)

Conservation officials in counties where the Department of Agriculture's conservation

agencies don't cooperate with each other might inspect the set-up in Mills County, Iowa.

There the Soil Conservation Service and the Production and Marketing Administration work hand in hand with a resulting impetus to conservation work and probably a saving to the taxpayers.

In Mills County, when a farmer makes application to the PMA for certain soil conservation practices that require engineering advice and that are eligible for Government payment, he fills out an application blank which is then forwarded to the Mills County Soil Conservation District.

MUST BE O. K.'D BY SCS

These practices include terraces, diversion terraces, drainage, and sod waterways.

Technicians of the Soil Conservation Service then make the engineering lay-outs for the practices the farmer desires. When the terraces, drainage ditches, or waterways are completed a Soil Conservation Service technician inspects them to see whether they are built to specifications. When he approves the work he signs the application blank and it is returned to the PMA office. There it is approved for payment.

No conservation practice that requires technical engineering lay-out is approved by the Mills County PMA office for payment until it is approved by the Soil Conservation Service technician.

SOME DON'T WORK THIS WAY

In contrast to this system is the existence in many counties of duplicating, overlapping staffs of technicians that serve each agency.

Some soil conservation districts that have suggested that PMA permit the SCS technicians to make the final approval of conservation construction that is required before payments to farmers can be made have been rebuffed. Some PMA county committees insist that a PMA staff man inspect all completed conservation work even though an SCS man saw the job completed and approved it.

B. F. Buffington, of Malvern, acting chairman of the Mills County PMA committee, said the system of cooperation has worked well.

"Both agencies," he said, "are parts of the Department of Agriculture. We (PMA) are a disbursing agency, so far as conservation is concerned. We make payments to farmers for certain prescribed conservation practices.

THEY WORK TOGETHER

"The Soil Conservation Service is a technical agency. Their farm planners and lay-out men are skilled in that line of work. We are happy to be relieved of that work.

"What we really should have is a single soil conservation agency. But in this county the PMA, SCS, and Extension Service all work together without stepping on each other's toes to get as much conservation on the farms as we can."

Ray Jones, work unit conservationist for the Mills County Soil Conservation District, thumbed through a sheaf of booklets containing 554 applications for conservation work in 1950.

He had the booklets cataloged by townships, so that any application could be found quickly and easily.

QUALITY OF WORK IMPROVES

"This system," he said, "has saved our office a lot of work in running back and forth to the PMA office. It enables us to plan our work in a more orderly manner. And we think we are building more uniformly good terraces as a result of our cooperative effort.

"Every terrace in this county has to be built according to our specifications or the PMA will turn down the application for payment on it. The PMA has backed us up in every instance."

Some credit for the situation in Mills County may be due the fact that J. F. Wearin, Sr., is chairman of the County PMA Committee and his son, J. F. Wearin, Jr., is chairman of the Soil Conservation District Board of Commissioners.

But there is nothing to indicate that the cooperative situation would be different in this county under different regimes.

APPLICATION FOR LAY-OUT AND CERTIFICATION OF TECHNICAL CONSERVATION PRACTICES

Application is here made to Mills County Production and Marketing Administration Committee and to Mills County Soil Conservation District for the technical lay-out of the below-listed practices:

Practice	Spring 1950 amounts	Fall 1950 amounts	Amount completed	Date
Terraces, linear feet (estimate 5,000 feet for each 10 acres to be terraced)				
Diversion terraces, cubic yards (0.8 cubic yard per linear foot)				
Drainage, cubic yards (estimate 1,000 cubic yards for each 10 acres to be drained)				
Sod waterways, square feet (average 50 square feet per linear foot)				

Farm is located:
Sec——— Township———

(Owner)

(Address)

(Operator)

Certified that practices are complete as listed.

(Technician)

Employment in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., Tuesday, June 27, 1950:

INDUSTRIAL PICTURE BRIGHTER

You know, no matter how pollyannish it sounds in these days of sighing gloom and melancholy defeatism, we still aren't convinced that Massachusetts is going on the rocks. We have been studying some comparative statistics on employment and unemployment gathered by the Congressional Quarterly, as reliable a garnerer of statistics as a man could wish for. While there is evidence that things are not at their best, there is also room for the optimistic belief that Massachusetts has a long way to go before the roof caves in and it becomes an unproductive rubble heap. The foundation for this belief is the fact that, although there is considerable unemployment in the State (too much, we admit), there is still a great deal of employment to balance the picture. Bureau of Labor Statistics figures show that Massachusetts still ranks eighth in employment in manufacturing in the country, which is no mean rank. The leaders, in this order, are New York, with 1,775,000 employed in manufacturing in March of 1950 and 1,773,600 in February 1950; Pennsylvania, 1,339,900 in March and 1,343,800 in February; Illinois, 1,171,100 employed in March 1949, no figures for 1950; Ohio, 1,104,600 in March 1950, and 1,096,300 in February 1950; Michigan, 1,007,700 in March 1949, no figures for 1950; New Jersey, 699,100 for March 1950, and 695,200 for February 1950; California, 696,800 for March 1950, and 684,000 for February 1950. Massachusetts comes next with 642,400 for March and 639,800 for February. It is true that these figures represent a decline, as is the case with all the other leaders except California, from the March 1949 totals (675,800 in Massachusetts), but it is also true that there are still a lot of people on the industrial payroll in this State, which is something we are inclined to overlook when we take inventory of our competitive situation.

Another optimistic index as far as Massachusetts is concerned is the fact that the average number of workers who received unemployment benefits in Massachusetts in March 1950 (77,987) was 18 percent less than for the corresponding period in March 1949 (95,098). According to the Bureau of Employment Security, only 12 States in the entire Nation could point to such a falling off in jobless claims. Although some of the decline may have been due to the fact that workers exhausted their benefits, it is safe to say that a good percentage of it can be attributed to economic improvement. Running through the figures for the whole country, we note that jobless claims in the two periods rose 101.6 percent in North Dakota, 105.8 percent in Nebraska, and 99.3 percent in Wyoming. Massachusetts is quite obviously not the only State with an unemployment problem.

Regarding the country as a whole, there are definite signs that things are looking up. According to Bureau of Employment Security records of jobless claims, the trend is downward. Continuing claims totaled 2,112,141 at the end of March 1950, which was 8.9 percent above March 1949. But the March 1950 figure was better than the February 1950 total, which was 2,331,100. During the last week of April, continuing claims totaled 1,885,870; in the week ending May 20, they had dropped to 1,768,700. On the basis of these figures, the Bureau of Employment Security believes it is possible that we may hit the 60,000,000 job level of 1947. It points out, however, in view of augmented labor force (set at 62,788,000 by the Census Bureau in May 1950) that "60,000,000 jobs are no longer adequate to meet the needs of the country."

While a definite improvement has been noted in Massachusetts and in Lawrence, it is nevertheless true that things could be better. The Bureau of Employment Security rates communities on the basis of its records of unemployment claims. The ratings are A, tight or balanced labor supply; B, slight labor surplus; C, moderate labor surplus; D, substantial labor surplus; E, very substantial labor surplus (ratio of unemployment to the labor force over 12 percent). At the end of March, 1950, the Bureau of Employment Security had surveyed 159 major labor market areas and smaller or economic areas in 40 States and had rated 39 communities in 19 States as E areas. Lawrence was among them, as was Lowell, New Bedford, and Worcester. Boston, Brockton, Fall River, Fitchburg, Lynn-Salem, Pittsfield, and Springfield received D ratings, which means that the ratio of unemployment to the labor force is between 7 and 11.9 percent. It is significant, for purposes of comparison, that only four communities in the country—Jacksonville, Fla., Rockford, Ill., South Bend, Ind., and Flint, Mich.—were given A rat-

ings, indicative of less than 3 percent unemployment.

And, of course, a factor which complicates the employment problem, not only for us but for every State, is the current crop of graduates from colleges and secondary schools. In Massachusetts alone, there were an estimated 22,500 college graduates this year, including B. A.'s, M. A.'s, and Ph. D.'s, 33,832 public high school graduates, and 8,096 nonpublic secondary school graduates. All of these will not immediately become competitive elements of the labor market, but enough of them will to add to the problem.

However, it seems to us that is enough on the good side of the ledger to support our argument that things in general could be far worse and that Massachusetts, while it must stay on the ball, is not so close to economic oblivion that it need despair.

American Veterans of World War II—AMVETS—Urges Effective Military Assistance to the Korean Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the President's message during the afternoon of June 27 telling of his orders to the Armed Forces to give air and sea support to the Korean Government troops was strongly supported by a vast majority of Congress and I am sure by all freedom loving people in the world. National Commander Harold Russell of AMVETS expressed the desires of that World War II veterans organization in a wire to the President during the morning of June 27.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following press release of AMVETS concerning the necessity of providing effective military assistance to the Korean Republic:

WASHINGTON, June 27.—Harold Russell, national commander of AMVETS, only congressionally chartered veterans organization of World War II vets, this morning at 11 a. m. sent the following wire to President Truman:

"AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II) respectfully urge a recommendation by the United States to the United Nations that proportionate military elements of member nations be immediately requisitioned—in lieu of a world police force—for the effective support of the Armed Forces of the lawful South Korean Republic for the purpose of restoring the status quo in that country by force of arms if necessary.

"As veterans of World War II we are painfully aware of the implications of such action. But as veterans we are equally convinced that no other course can now preserve the influence of the United Nations as an effective instrument for peaceful settlement of the world's ills. The time has come, if it has not already passed, for a firm stand against the creeping gains of international gangsterism in which is all too evident the old and evil pattern of piecemeal conquest which, if unchecked now, must lead inevitably to world conflagration on a scale too terrible to contemplate.

"The lawless and defiant invasion of Southern Korea is a calculated affront to the peace-loving nations—the first major test of our strength and our will. AMVETS will support the commitment of American military elements in proportionate conjunction with those of other member nations in the conviction that the calculated risk of action now is the lesser of the dangers facing the world."

John Boyle O'Reilly, Irish-American Poet-Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the one hundred and sixth anniversary of the birth of the memorable John Boyle O'Reilly, Irish poet and patriot, who died a great American citizen, a credit to his beloved adopted country.

Under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following splendid editorial written by Harry H. Schlacht and published in yesterday's New York Journal-American as well as in every Hearst newspaper from coast to coast:

JOHN BOYLE O'REILLY: IRISH-AMERICAN POET-PATRIOT

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

The best monument to a good and great man is the works by which his hand and head have enriched the world.

Today we commemorate the one hundred and sixth anniversary of the birth of John Boyle O'Reilly, the Irish poet and patriot.

We lay a wreath of admiration for his genius. We lay a wreath of affection for the man.

John Boyle O'Reilly was born on the banks of the beautiful and historic River Boyne in Ireland.

In boyhood, his imagination feasted on the songs and legends of the Celt. In youth, his heart agonized over the wrongs and woes of the motherland. In manhood, he dared to wish her free and found himself an exile.

He was numbered, marked, and branded. He was called rebel, traitor, and felon.

He came to America penniless and unknown. He came to America, stranded in a strange land.

Today the country of his adoption vies, with the land of his birth, to salute the gentleness of his character, the nobleness of his soul.

He was strong and tender. He was a true and a knightly soul.

O'Reilly speaks of his adopted country as a land where "here alone nor caste, nor kings, nor privileges are known."

He was Irish and American. He loved Ireland as his mother. He loved America as his godmother.

O'Reilly was the soul of freedom. His soul was a harp of the truest tones which felt the touch of the ideal everywhere. His soul breathed a responsive music, joyous and mournful, vehement and soft.

He is loved by all people who are free. He is loved by all people who seek to be free.

O'Reilly was devoted to two thoughts, religion and patriotism. Religion bound him to God. Patriotism made him idolize his country.

He drank deep at the fountain of faith and its draughts strengthened his soul in its aspirations for the highest ideals of liberty. He fought for liberty because he believed it to be the gift of God to man. Liberty was his life's ideal, God its source, humanity its application.

He was a foe to tyranny. He was a friend to humanity.

The world was his country; mankind, his kin.

Let us all take the lesson of his life to our hearts. He held neither office nor title. He was larger than any office and no title could ennoble him.

He was born without an atom of prejudice. He lived, wrought, and died without an evil thought.

All he had he gave to mankind, and he asked no return.

O, liberty, he has honored thy name. Add him to the roll of thy children whose names and deeds bid the world to demand justice and freedom.

Place him where the honor is richest. Place him where the poets will chant his praise.

The world is brighter because he lived. Mankind is enriched by his treasury of pure and noble thoughts which is his legacy to posterity.

A Reward for Housewives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the tax free margarine bill goes into effect this week. The Democratic Party has championed the consumers cause on three occasions in a short time: to wit, the Kerr bill veto, the basing-point bill veto, and the enactment of the antitax margarine legislation.

The following editorial by H. B. Snyder of Gary, Ind., Post Tribune recalls the opposition to this bill:

A REWARD FOR HOUSEWIVES

When the general public—particularly the feminine section—makes its demands known, it can get action out of Congress. Proof of that will show up Saturday in groceries and markets of 33 States when colored margarine will go on sale minus the long-imposed Federal tax of 10 cents a pound.

Repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws was the outgrowth of a demand on the part of millions of consumers. It had other support, of course, but other groups had urged repeal without success in previous years. This time the housewives spoke out, individually and through women's groups, and the repeal bill went through Congress.

Few lobbies have been successful so long as that of the butter interests which pushed discriminatory legislation through Congress for the first time back in 1886. Promargarine bills were sidetracked with monotonous regularity. Indeed, the first serious hearing on a margarine bill was not to be had until 1942.

During the war butter was scarce and many consumers turned to margarine which did not require red points. Their experience probably accounts in great part for the subsequent consumer demand for repeal of the Federal tax.

A repeal bill finally was forced out of the House Agriculture Committee in 1948, via a discharge petition, and was passed by a three-to-one vote. Dairy-State Senators talked it to death in the upper Chamber, however.

A year ago the House acted again, and the Senate agreed to take up the bill for

action in January 1950. Meanwhile a Statewide vote in Ohio repealed that State's ban on yellow margarine, and the effect of that action was felt in the Senate. The bill was passed on January 18 and was signed by the President on March 16.

Fifteen States still prohibit the sale of colored margarine, so the Federal tax repeal will actually be effective only in the other 33 States, of which Indiana is one. The law removes the quarter-cent-a-pound tax on uncolored margarine and the 10-cent tax on the colored product, and eliminates Federal licensing provisions.

Unrestricted sale of colored margarine actually may prove of little harm to the butter industry. Because of its more favorable price, margarine likely will win increased favor among low-and moderate-income families. The table-fat intake of these families thus may move more nearly in line with what it should be according to accepted dietary standards.

A Stand Against Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of June 28, 1950:

A STAND AGAINST AGGRESSION

The adventures in the Kremlin have their answer.

America stands.

The fate of South Korea is not to be that of Manchuria in 1931, Ethiopia in 1936, Spain in 1937, and Czechoslovakia in 1939 and 1948.

World opinion as well as American has learned a lesson from the series of aggressions with which it has been faced by totalitarianism in two decades.

The answer which President Truman, with bipartisan backing, has given to the military invasion of South Korea is the right and proper answer to Bolshevist aggression. Use of United States air and sea forces to support the Korean Government troops now has the further sanction of the United Nations Security Council.

This action speaks the language best understood by Communist imperialism, the language most reassuring to peoples who rely on American aid to guard their freedom, and the language out of which must grow a reign of international law against aggression, terrorism, and rapine.

Under Russian hammering America has found a much-needed policy in the Far East. It has developed not merely overnight at Blair House, however crucial that conference, but out of months of events, study, and earnest consultations.

The decision to draw a firm line which includes not only the 38th parallel but also the Straits of Formosa gives cohesion to the American position with respect to Asia. There is a line beyond which Soviet manipulations will not be tolerated. Presumably it includes Indochina and Malaya as well.

Some who lay great store on international machinery may ask, "But why did not the United States wait to obtain a specific mandate from the United Nations Security Council?"

The explanation is that, even with the benefit of Russian absence from the Council over the Nationalist China issue, it would have been a slow and hazy business to proceed under Article 43 of the UN Charter, which provides for such emergencies.

Had article 43 ever been implemented, as the San Francisco conference intended, by the establishment of a Military Staff Committee and an international police force, it would be made to order for this situation.

Trygve Lie, UN Secretary-General, said as much in a radio interview. But because of Russian obstructionism no staff committee or police force was ever set up. To place military units at the UN disposal would require legislation by Congress.

Under circumstances of unprovoked surprise attack, the only effective reply is immediate action. The United States moved justifiably under the initial Security Council resolution which called upon UN members to render every assistance in bringing about withdrawal of North Korean forces to the 38th parallel. The Council's second resolution authorizes UN member nations to act individually to halt the aggression.

Now that the die is cast and forces joined, the great consideration in practically all minds is to keep this fire from spreading to a world conflagration. Fortunately the very methods the Russians have chosen may contribute to that end; for they have operated through the North Korean army as a cat's-paw, rather than committing the Red Army or the Soviet Government.

Hence, if the paw gets stepped on, it may be withdrawn; and though the Kremlin will know and feel what has happened it will not be obligated to resort to fangs.

The United States has had to face up to the possibility of full-scale war—which would have been invited sooner or later by any hesitation.

This firmness will have a steadying effect all around the Soviet perimeter from Japan and Iran to Berlin. By acting promptly, resolutely, and vigorously, the probabilities have been improved of snuffing out the Korean war on the peninsula where it started.

Attack on Korea

REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, ever since VJ-day we have ducked and dodged the problem presented to us by Communist aggression in China and other parts of Asia. With the attack upon Korea we can evade it no longer.

We can hesitate and delay and watch the rest of Asia go down like a house of cards; or if, when the Security Council meets this afternoon, the Communist armies are still ignoring its call 48 hours ago to return to the thirty-eighth parallel, we can urge the United Nations to adopt the strongest possible stand against such naked aggression and flagrant violation of the Charter, and assure it that if requested by the UN, and to the limit of our capabilities in the Far East, the United States will make its full strength available for carrying out the UN's decisions and urge other nations to do the same.

Such action has some chance of proving effective in stopping this and further aggression in the relentless march of the Kremlin to conquer the world.

Indecision or half-hearted measures, which have been the curse of our policies in Asia in the past, are neither worthy nor sensible. They can lead only to continued disasters.

There are risks either way. But one course presents risks with some hope of success; the other presents equally great risks and the certainty of failure.

Can there be any question as to which is the course of duty, of intelligent concern for our own security, of preserving a useful United Nations, and of offering hope for a world of freedom and peace?

Wartime Excise Taxes Should Be Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before the House brings a reduction in war excise taxes to the amount of $1,010,000,000. While it does provide some relief from the burden that our people have carried for nine long years, five of them since the war was over, yet it does not bring about the full repeal of wartime taxes that the people had a right to expect.

It is disappointing to me that the bill presented to us by the administration falls so far short of what it should have been. I would gladly have voted for a bill that would have repealed all wartime excise taxes, but the bill was brought before the House under a rule for its consideration that did not permit a single amendment of any kind or character to be made to it. It was a case of take it or leave it. Of course, everyone, including myself, who desires reduction or repeal or wartime excise taxes will take it as the best we can get, and consequently will vote for it.

The reason that prevented the administration from offering a more satisfactory bill was its need for revenue to carry on its extravagant and wasteful spending program. For example, in 1939 there were, exclusive of the Military Establishment, 925,000 civilian employees of the Federal Government. Their payroll cost was $1,800,000,000 a year. In 1949 we have close to 2,500,000 civilian jobholders, aside from the Military Establishment, at a payroll cost of more than $7,000,000,000. This is an increase in size in 10 years of 250 percent and in cost of 400 percent. For months new jobholders have been going on the payroll at the rate of 500 a day. The present peacetime peak is well above the wartime

peak. The current $7,000,000,000 payroll is three times as much as the entire cost of Government 30 years ago, including the Military Establishment, Agricultural Department, Post Office, and everything else.

To further illustrate how extravagant the present administration really is, I wish to give a table of figures that appeared recently in the Reader's Digest.

The following is the amount spent by each of our 32 Presidents from George Washington to the end of Franklin Roosevelt's second administration:

Washington	$34,088,486
Adams	34,262,668
Jefferson	72,424,289
Madison	176,473,964
Monroe	147,237,899
Adams	65,427,017
Jackson	152,969,968
Van Buren	122,325,242
Harrison and Tyler	108,904,678
Polk	173,477,220
Taylor and Fillmore	179,631,529
Pierce	255,154,244
Buchanan	272,933,490
Lincoln	3,252,380,410
Johnson	1,578,557,645
Grant	2,253,386,743
Hayes	1,032,268,037
Garfield and Arthur	1,027,742,757
Cleveland	1,077,629,089
Harrison	1,412,315,899
Cleveland	1,441,674,174
McKinley	2,093,918,514
T. Roosevelt	4,655,450,505
Taft	2,799,211,854
Wilson	46,938,260,143
Harding	6,667,235,429
Coolidge	18,585,549,115
Hoover	15,490,476,636
Roosevelt (8 years)	67,518,746,001
Total	179,620,113,645
Spent by President Truman from fiscal year 1946 to Sept. 30, 1949: Truman	191,081,394,191

Think this over:

Thirty-two Presidents in 156 years spent $179,620,113,645.

One President in less than 5 years has spent $191,081,394,191.

(The extraordinary expenditures of the war years from 1941 to 1945 have been excluded.)

Not one American in a hundred realizes that the total tax collections now exceed the wartime peak. And not one in a thousand knows that hidden taxes—included in the price of everything he buys—will exceed $700 per family this year.

In 1945, when the United States was fighting a world war with 11,000,000 men under arms, Federal, State, and local governments collected $52,500,000,000 in taxes. This year they are collecting $55,000,000,000. This is 25 percent of the national income, and more than the entire national income in 1932, 1933, or 1934.

In 1929 the total United States budget was about $3,000,000,000. At that time we had fewer than 600,000 civilian employees. Today the number approaches as I have already said, 2,500,000, and a proposed budget of more than $42,000,000,000.

These are the conditions that prevent more substantial cuts in excise taxes than appears in the present bill. It is entirely due to a policy of spend, spend, spend, and tax, tax, and tax. There must come a change in this policy or our country will reap results that no one wishes to contemplate.

Shall It Be Another Roman Holiday for New Deal Spending?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of June 27, 1950, headed "Warning from Korea," as follows:

WARNING FROM KOREA

Korea is just one more piece of proof that the United States fought a great war for the greater glory of the Communist tyranny.

What this newspaper has said in reference to Communist-conquered China, what we have said of the unhappy state of the satellite countries of eastern Europe, we now repeat as to the newest Rusisan-inspired aggression. It is this:

When vacuums were created next to the borders of Russia, it was inevitable that the Russian rulers, being what they are, should rush in to fill them. And the men who led this country persistently refused to recognize that fact and to attempt to deal with it.

Well, what is done is done, and perhaps it makes little difference that we still continue to erect monuments to men who could be guilty of that stupid folly. But what makes a great deal of difference is that we continue to follow the social and political philosophy of those men.

Until this country squarely faces its errors in foreign and domestic policy, until it abandons the "spend and elect" theories of welfare-statism—so long as its citizens run to Washington for hand-outs, so long as a political party brazenly campaigns on the slogan of "what's in it for you," just so long will we tremble before the threats of a people backward in production and culture and just so long will the tyrant ruling those people believe that he can disregard us. And just so long will the prestige of America sink as it is now sinking in the face of the Korean affair.

And how far are we from the mood for reclaiming our national self-respect? Probably little further than we were last Saturday afternoon before the Korean war broke out. For, unless there is a vast reversal in Washington's mood, this armed outbreak will be the occasion for further huge expenditures, further demands for power, further controls—more of all the same trappings that have accompanied this country to its present position.

It will now take a courageous man to stand up in Congress and vote to curtail the purse strings when the spending comes under the guise of preventing a shooting war from spreading. True, the shooting is in a remote corner of the world where wars are not directly involved militarily. But even so, the cold war has turned hot enough to be frightening, and when people are frightened they are not apt to be reasonable or even to be patient with reason.

Speedier spending for national defense will become the charging cry in Washington. More money will be demanded not only for our own forces, but for the Atlantic Pact armaments, for anti-Communist aid anywhere in the world. And on top of this, if the past be any measure, there will be bigger money requests for a host of other things from housing to stockpiling that can with the least excuse bear the label "national defense."

No wise man will question many of these expenditures. The peace that was so costly won has been thrown away by blunders and stupidities—in any event, it is gone. And with it gone we must, however, sadly, prepare to defend ourselves against the possibility of new onslaughts.

But the wise man who believes that deficits and inflation are no way to build strength will find it hard to stop the outpouring on other matters. We do not anticipate that the present administration will curtail its spending appreciably on nondefense matters. It has shown no love for a balanced budget under any circumstances, and now it has a rallying cry that will make the very word "economy" unpopular.

Nor will the uses of the Korean affair end with spending. National defense, in the lexicon of Washington, means more Government regulation, more Government control over the economy and over the people.

Any man who now speaks up for economy or for freedom from controls can have a shooting war thrown up at him. He can be castigated as a threat to a unified national defense effort, as a pinch-penny reactionary who would leave his country ill-prepared and ill-organized to defend itself against the barbarians from the east. It will indeed take a courageous man to stand up against the administration now.

Yet as never before we are in need of such courageous men.

If we do not have them there will be no limit to the spending and its consequent inflation, no limit to the powers the Government will grab—all in the name of saving us.

As never before, we need men who will say that the Government has spent billions trying to bulwark the whole world and yet has failed miserably. Men who will say that this shooting in a remote corner of the world threatens to get us in another world war because our Government has by its planning embroiled us in commitments all over the world, commitments that are more likely to get us into rather than out of a war.

We also need to be reminded that since we are indeed threatened with the possibility of another war, our task is first and foremost to keep ourselves strong enough to meet it if it comes. And that we will not build strength for future trials by wrecking our fiscal affairs and strait-jacketing ourselves with more imprisoning controls.

Not since 1939 has the United States faced as explosive a situation. And not since then have we been as needful of men who will try to keep us from weakening our real defenses and destroying the economic system and the way of life we are seeking to defend.

Fifty Years Before Your Eyes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL CHUDOFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of this House a new motion picture entitled "Fifty Years Before Your Eyes," produced by Warner Bros. Fifty Years Before

Your Eyes is one of the finest contributions to Americanism that has even been seen on the screen. It tells the story of how our Nation, in the past half century, has become the leader of the world. It recalls the glorious events and great men of this country and it inspires a profound respect for the principles of freedom and equal opportunity on which our democracy is based.

In congratulating Harry, Jack, and Albert Warner, the heads of the company which produced Fifty Years Before Your Eyes, I should like also to congratulate every person who had any connection with the picture. I want to congratulate them for making a stirring, entertaining, and inspiring movie that is going to live forever.

It is my hope that every American—man, woman, and child—will have an opportunity to see this Warner Bros. picture, Fifty Years Before Your Eyes, and thereby to have a better understanding of the kind of people who made this country great.

Concerning the Bill Which I Introduced To Choke Off Certain Pernicious Activities of Lobbying and Propaganda Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as heretofore stated by me today in a 1-minute talk before the House of Representatives, I have introduced the following bill which I believe to be one of great and timely importance:

A bill to prohibit Members of both branches of the Congress of the United States and employees and relatives of Members, during their tenure of office or employment, and for 2 years after their offices or positions terminate, from accepting more than actual traveling and hotel expenses for delivering personally or through another, or by transcription, any of their speeches or other writings; from directly or indirectly accepting campaign aid from lobbying and propaganda agencies; prohibiting other persons, firms, or corporations from violating or conspiring to violate or aid, abet or assist in the violation of this act; from permitting the franking privileges of Members of Congress to be used gratuitously or for pay for lobbyists and lobby and propaganda agencies; defining lobbying for the purposes of this act; and providing for penalties for the violation thereof

Be it enacted, etc.—

1. That it is hereby declared to be unlawful, for any Member of the United States House of Representatives or the United States Senate, during his or her term of office, and for a period of 2 years after he or she shall have ceased to be a Member of Congress, or for any employee, agent or servant, or any member of the immediate family of such Member of Congress, during the afore-mentioned like period of time, (a) to accept, either directly or indirectly any compensation, present, or gratuity of any kind whatsoever, for the writing or delivery of any speeches, news releases, magazine, or other articles, or any other spoken, written or transcribed material of any kind on any subject whatsoever, (b) or for any such Member of Congress either directly or indirectly, to knowingly and intentionally accept during the period of time afore-mentioned, any entertainment of any kind, or any campaign advertising or literature or other campaign contributions either personally or through any of his agents, servants or employees, or relatives, or through his campaign committee, from any person, firm or corporation engaged directly or indirectly in any lobbying or propaganda activities whatsoever, (c) or for such Members of Congress to directly or indirectly permit the use of his or her franking privileges by any person, firm or corporation engaged directly or indirectly in any kind of lobbying activities or other propaganda efforts.

2. That it is also declared to be unlawful for any other person in addition to those heretofore enumerated, or his employees, agents, and servants, or the employees, agents, or servants of any firm or corporation to conspire with any Member of Congress or other person to violate any of the provisions of this act, or to aid, abet, or assist, or attempt to aid, abet or assist, any Member of Congress or his said employees or relatives to violate any of the provisions of this act.

3. That, nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit any person covered by provision (a) of this act from accepting actual traveling and hotel expenses from any person, firm or other organization before whom any such persons makes a talk or a speech or delivers comments of any kind personally.

4. The provisions of the bill referring to lobbying shall apply to any person (except a political committee as defined by law and duly organized State or local committees of a political party) who by himself, or through any agent or employee or other persons in any manner whatsoever, directly or indirectly, solicits, collects, or receives money or any other thing of value to be used principally to aid, or the principal purpose of which person is to aid, in the accomplishment of any of the following purposes:

(a) The introducing or the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States, or any other legislative body.

(b) To influence, directly or indirectly the introducing or the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States or any other legislative body.

5. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of $10,000 and 10 years imprisonment, and shall also forthwith forfeit his right to his office or position, if he still retains same at the time of his conviction.

When this bill, after due hearings and careful consideration before the Committee on the Judiciary, is perfected and becomes a law, I feel sure that it will prevent the continuation of some very improper and scandalous doings on the part of lobbyists and propoganda agencies and will help to free the members of both branches of the Congress from great public criticism and eventual disgrace.

It will help to remove from the legislative picture in Washington many of the monetary temptations presented by lobbyists to the legislative branch of the Government.

During my experiences as an active lawyer since 1910, and as an observer of the doings of legislative bodies which were harried by lobbyists, I have seen lobby avenues of approach and lobby techniques come and go.

There was a time in this country when almost every person of consequence in any State, such as the judges, legislators, State, county, and city officials, and other important persons gratuitously rode the railroad trains on free passes provided as special favors by railroad companies who were interested sometimes in very detrimental legislation, to the people generally, and other pernicious character-destroying activities. All of this resulted in the outlawing of free passes not only at the State level but also at the national level as well.

One of the next approaches of the lobbyist was to furnish sumptuous free meals without number, and great quantities of assorted intoxicating liquors to legislators and other worth-while persons, and many good men were not only debauched completely during their legislative session—but were rendered worthless also for any future service to their communities and to their States and to their Nation.

Many of these unfortunates who started out their public service with so much promise, due to the corrupting influence of lobbyists, filled drunkards graves, brought devastation to their private fortunes and shame and disgrace to their families as well.

The lobbyists and their sponsors began to see finally that this was not a very good way to influence people and to a large extent have abandoned such a devilish course of procedure.

Another rather common practice resorted to by the lobbyist to influence legislators, jurists, and leading people of the community was to organize a private poker game and let the persons to be influenced actually win large sums of money. I understand that this mode of procedure has likewise been abandoned by the lobby fraternity because many men did not seem to understand that their winnings were not on the square and afterward proceeded to do as they pleased and earned the names of double-crossers.

Another common way in which lobbyists were wont to influence legislators and others was to debase them morally by procuring for their entertainment lascivious women who were on the payroll of the lobbyist and who were willing to run the whole gamut, so to speak, of immorality.

I understand that this practice of having legislators and others embraced in the toils of the harlots is still in vogue at the seat of many State governments but has been practically abandoned in Washington, D. C., since the Supreme Court decision in the case of United States versus Carmen Beach.

This decision held that it was white slavery within the meaning of the United States criminal code for a procurer to proceed to solicit lewd women and pay their cab fare or other charges in order to transport them from one place in the District of Columbia to another place in the District of Columbia for certain denounced immoral purposes.

I have often thought that if the FBI was alert enough in reference to this matter, that almost any lobbyist could

be tucked away safely behind some prison bars for indulging in the practice of employing lewd women to entertain their legislative and other guests in hotels and elsewhere hereabouts. Perhaps many other people who are committed to the practices of paying cab fares and fees to transport immoral women from one place to another in the District of Columbia or convey them in their own automobiles for immoral purposes could also be brought to book under the white slave law of the United States, as announced in the case of United States versus Carmen Beach.

Another lobby technique was to hire some near and dear relative of the legislator to influence his voting.

Another technique was to steer the investment course of the legislator in the stock market and thus cause him to make large sums of money on stocks which he was influenced into purchasing.

Another method was to help the legislators to make other very profitable investments.

Another plan was to force a legislator to vote their way by the old-fashioned blackmail tactics after they secured something disgraceful on him.

I have observed of late, however, that lobbyists have made tremendous efforts recently to have people who do their bidding receive their pay-off so to speak for services well rendered by writing articles, making speeches, and indulging in comments so that they could be paid handsomely for their unnecessary services, in lieu of making an attempt to bribe the individuals directly.

Many of the speeches and articles and comments which legislators have made in truth and in fact were not worth a red cent as far as a literary effort was concerned. They were just poor old "hogwash" to my way of thinking. Others, however, have been top-flight productions.

If this bill is passed by the Congress, I think it will prevent lobbyists from thus fooling gullible legislators and others in a position of authority into thinking that they are about to blossom forth in a new field of lucrative endeavor, to wit, the literary field. It will also have the effect of causing many such persons to do a better legislative job than they have done heretofore as far as the people are concerned.

I do not know how other people feel about this subject but I do know that if one is employed for a handsome fee to do a talking or a writing job, it is very difficult for me to see how that person, who has been paid handsomely, could avoid being influenced by the thoughts and opinions of the person so employing him. It is just human nature, after all, for a person to lean favorably in the legislative direction and feel kindly toward the notions and the causes of a generous employer.

Other people besides legislators have lost all sense of moral balance when brought face to face with such an employment situation.

I believe that the payment of money to legislators for poorly doing a speaking and writing job is a most baneful influence upon correct and proper legislation.

During the first session of this Congress, I found it difficult on several occasions to work my way through the halls of the New House Office Building basement from my office to the cafeteria. It was just simply packed full of truckloads and stack of speeches and pamphlets which were being sent out at the behest of the Committee for Constitutional Government and other vicious lobbying organizations.

I remember reading in Drew Pearson's column an article which has not been denied, that one Congressman sent out under his legislative frank for this misnamed Committee for Constitutional Government, 2,500,000 separate pieces of literature. I also recall that when the halls leading to the cafeteria were jammed with this and other material that certain Washington newspapers gave it a great deal of publicity. No wonder that the Post Office Department faces deficits when lobby organizations are permitted to send out their propaganda dope free on a Congressman's franking privilege.

I realize fully that there is nothing in the present law that prohibits this practice and that is why I am making this endeavor to close these tax-sickening loopholes in the present law, and making the penalty stiff enough to cause lobbyists and others to stop, look, and listen before they perpetrate such outrages longer upon a long-suffering Post Office Department and a patient and all too generous people.

I am sure that there is not a man in either branch of the Congress who will have the temerity to defend the baneful practices which are condemned by this bill, and if there are such people in the Congress, I am sure that their constituents will take proper care of them when election day rolls around again.

If lobbying institutions want to send out propaganda they can hire the best writers in the country, instead of engaging legislators to scab upon the writers who are following the free enterprise plan—working competitively at their own specific line of endeavor. If these lobbying organizations and those walking hand in glove with them were one-half as interested in free enterprise as they claim they are, they would never employ a person who was unskilled and untrained in writing to carry out their purposes and pay them a salary for doing so far beyond the real worth of the services rendered.

You see, they know that whenever they can get a prominent Congressman to take up the cudgel, so to speak, for them that they have a better chance of influencing people who hold that particular Congressman in high regard than they would have in employing the best and finest writer which their money could secure, but who does not know the voters of a given district or is not known himself favorably by these voters.

In conclusion I want to say in the language of the poet Lowell that I feel sure that—

The time is ripe and rotten ripe for change. Then let it come. I have no fear for that which is called for by the instincts of true manhood.

In fact the present time is so rotten hungry for this type of legislation that one who has even the faintest sense of smell left, can perceive instantly the odor of rank corruption.

Danger! United States Government Overweight!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the address I delivered as the principal speaker on the cracker-barrel caravan sponsored by the Massachusetts Committee for the Hoover Report held at Lawrence, Mass., on Monday, June 26, 1950:

I want to hit this point straight, and right off the bat.

The Veterans' Administration will not be cut because it is an essential service. No other government on earth has ever pledged such help to the veterans as the Government of the United States. And we will go on providing the disability compensation, education benefits, medical care, and the many other services that we owe to all qualified veterans.

That is my stand, and that of many Members in the Congress.

On March 29 of this year, in a speech before the Congress, I spoke up for all veteran services under the control of the VA and to save the VA from breaking up.

As I said in that speech and I quote: "In view of the present potential case load, the accent must be on the maintenance if not increase in VA facilities. It does not seem wise to me that we should curtail or reroute these services less than 5 years after the end of the war in which so many were disabled or weakened by their strenuous service in defense of the Nation."

However, there are other activities of the Government where deadwood, in the form of outmoded methods and overlapping functions, have gathered through the years.

The tiding-up process will apply to such agencies as the Department of Agriculture, for example.

This is the opening of the biggest drive that you and I have ever been called upon to support.

Its purpose is to waken everyone to the need for improving the Government of the United States.

It is not a crusade that will be satisfied with the contribution of a dime or a quarter. It is not one day in the year devoted to better public administration which can then be forgotten until its anniversary rolls around next year.

This is the beginning of a citizen movement to save our Federal union from the waste and extravagance that bites so deeply into our pockets.

We call it the cracker-barrel caravan because it is bringing home to the people the problems that once were settled around the cracker barrels of country stores and city stores in the truly democratic forums of another generation. Here public opinion was molded by the good common sense of the average American, and his composite voice was law at Washington.

That was before our Nation stepped out on the world stage as a leading character and immediately got a swelled head and an extravagant taste.

Like Topsy, our Government just grew and grew in size and influence until it grew out of control.

If we wish to keep the United States household together, we must make this housekeeper live within our means.

In a little more than 40 years this Nation has had to face up to World War I boom, depression, World War II, and now the uneasy period of an armed truce. To meet these successive problems, new Federal agencies were created, right and left. There was no time to figure how each might fit into the over-all structure.

Only through experience are we learning that many of these agencies step on one another's toes. With several trying to do a single job, there is bound to be trouble.

Our first task is to unravel this costly traffic jam.

If some of the newer agencies or procedures are in collision, or burn up too much of our money, that does not excuse some of the older ones. The way they mope along is also a danger to orderly progress.

Did you know that many of the Federal personnel policies were nursed in 1883 and have never been weaned since?

Or that many of the accounting methods used in Washington are so moss-backed that they were antiques before this community of Lawrence was born?

No private business could survive if it clung to such practices.

Neither can the United States vehicle keep going unless it is overhauled and made to run without stalling and without wasting precious dollar gas.

For bear in mind that the Communists hope and expect that we will ruin ourselves by our own failures.

A number of wide-awake Americans are aware of this danger, and they are determined to overcome it.

They are known as the Citizens' Committee for the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government. In other words, the housekeeping branch. And they have a subcommittee working in every one of the 48 States. But they cannot succeed in their patriotic endeavor without your help.

From this day onward, we ask you to take the same vigorous and responsible interest in the affairs of your Government that your forefathers did around the cracker barrel.

Last year it was my privilege to speak over the radio in support of some of the Commission's recommendations for reorganization of the Federal Government. But the President, the Congress, and the agencies will not approve, adopt, and put these corrective measures into operation, fully and completely, until the groundswell of American public opinion demands better government and at a lower price.

Here at this rally you can put your shoulder to the wheel by coming forward and signing the honor roll of those who believe in getting things done the right way.

Now what is this Hoover report to which we refer?

In 1947, and by a unanimous act, the Congress created a Commission to make a thorough study of the program. Six Democrats and six Republicans were chosen to serve on this Commission. And a distinguished public servant, former President Hoover, was asked by President Truman to give of his time, his energy, and his talents to the leadership of this Commission. Under his direction, 300 experts went to work. After many, many months of tireless investigation, they came up with a 2,000,000-word report that was an eye opener. It revealed how the central authority in Washington had outgrown itself, piling bureau upon bureau until the structure looked like a monstrous and top-heavy mushroom that was in danger of toppling from its own weight.

The Commission, by its own example of hard work and thrift, should become a model for all other Federal agencies.

It cut through the dense jungle of red tape and blazed new trails that show how government can get on with its job without being bogged down in a tangle of duplication and deficiency appropriations.

Like a competent doctor, it not only diagnosed the disease and its complications, but prescribed the remedies.

No wonder Uncle Sam is worried these days. For his wife is putting on too much weight. She just can't control her appetite for luxuries. But the doctor says that she will have to go on a diet, giving up three to five billion dollars of "fat" spending before she ruins her own health and eats her family out of house and home.

For her own pride and self-respect, we had hoped that she would take the necessary steps to streamline her "figure." But knowing her self-indulgence in the past, we could not depend upon her to do this voluntarily. Through the medium of this cracker-barrel caravan, we are contacting as many members of the American family as we can possibly reach. The doctor, after consultation, has told us what must be done. The rest is up to us. After the doctor has gone we'll have to keep our eyes on Uncle Sam's wife to make sure that she takes the medicine and the exercise.

I have not the time here to go into all the details of the doctor's report. But any one of us can see that the patient is so short-winded that she can hardly move at times and is unable to do the ordinary work around the House.

You see, the "fat" gets in the way of alert thinking and the follow-through of alert performance.

This is regrettable and inexcusable.

As an example of the layer upon layer of fat that bloats administration and gets in everybody's way, let us look at one small county in the State of Georgia. The 1,500 farmers who live and work in that county have all they can do to fight off Nature's pests, without having to contend with human ones. But yet they are bothered by 47 employees attached to 7 different field services of the United States Department of Agriculture until the poor farmers don't know whether they are coming or going.

Incentives are necessary to spur people to extra effort and accomplishment, but in the Federal set-up we find the incentive principle taking us backward instead of forward. Supervisors are rated and paid according to the number of workers under them. They are thus inspired to build up their work forces recklessly. In other words, they are paid a premium for adding excess tissue to the overloaded figure of Government.

The rank and file of Federal employees are conscientious. But even they are often discouraged by the sea of red tape and regulations through which they are trying to swim. It is not good for the morale of any worker if he is required to go through a lot of waste motion that leads to no constructive results.

We often find that in the rush of things, several gear shifts have been installed in the machinery of an agency, with the consequence that it is trying to go forward under several clashing speeds operating in conflict with one another.

I have known of cases where a field representative has gone out with one set of instructions only to find that a contradictory set has arrived at his destination before him. This makes him look foolish until he learns to hold back from making decisions.

This lack of clear-cut and consistent directives puts a brake on initiative, delays action, and multiplies costs.

We do not ask that Government be pared to the bone, but we are determined to untangle it from the contortions in which it has become involved, so that it can do its work in a straight-away fashion.

What we need is a systematic reorganization so that it will not stumble all over itself and us.

It is impossible for any person to wash his hands of this responsibility and say that he can't be bothered with the problem.

It is imperative, for your personal welfare, to take a vital interest in your national investment.

You can't see it?

Well, just consider that new hat you just bought, and the 150 hidden taxes that boosted the price you paid for it. And when you look at the loaf of bread on the supper table, see for the first time the 150 hidden taxes on it that you paid for but cannot eat.

The high cost of living, for which Government agencies in part are responsible, is everybody's business if we are to save this Nation from defeating itself by waste and extravagance.

This business must begin not in Washington or Boston.

The foundation for it reaches down through every community, street, and house to the individual, and the question of what action you are going to take.

For this is your organization, and it will only be as good as the constructive influence you bring to bear upon it through the medium of alert and informed "cracker barrel" democracy.

I don't relish the point I am about to mention because it pains me as it will pain you, but the facts have to be faced.

Due to the cost of wars, and the weedy growth of Government, a United States mortgage of $6,000 now hangs over the head of every American family.

That's the debt. But how about the money that is being taken from us this year (and it isn't quite enough) to meet current costs?

Those of us who have worked steadily from January 1 up to this day have had the idea that we kept most of our earnings in spite of the fact that some was siphoned off to meet our local, State, and Federal obligations.

Let's not kid ourselves.

The record shows that we worked the first 120 days of this year, or almost up to May the 1st, not for ourselves but for the Government. Because 120 days' pay is the tribute we will pay to Uncle Sam's tax collectors before the year is up. And we might as well discount it as gone in advance, so that we can start to figure on what's left for us.

Does anyone still believe that he can afford to ignore the ways of Government?

Only at his peril.

So enlist now in this national reorganization crusade.

It is nonpartisan and all-citizen.

Its rallying cry is waste not, want not.

Through the cooperation of President Truman and the Congress, a number of the Hoover recommendations have ben approved in whole or in part. The rest will meet with stiff opposition.

That is why we are calling upon you for help.

Speak up for better government at lower cost.

I wish to emphasize, and strongly, that this is a campaign to streamline our Federal Government, and without sacrificing any of its essential functions.

It is supported by both parties.

It is an American job, and not one that is political in the narrow meaning of that term.

The only question before us is that of continuing the good work that is being done.

The renovations designed to bring our Government up to date must be completed and not left half-finished.

It is a job for Democrats, Republicans, Independents, all.

Let us streamline its structure and its functions so that they will become modern and efficient. And then let us be ever-vigilant to keep it under control, as our servant and not our master.

The payoff for wide-awake citizenship means that more of our earnings will remain in our hands to use for our own independence.

For that is the goal that is truly American.

"I Am Convinced That We Will Have No War If We Continue Our Way of Strengthening Our Military Forces, Maintaining the Stability of Our Economy and Remaining True to Our Fundamental Principles and Ideals"—Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the victory which fell to American arms in World War I left this country with a general feeling of complacency about the manner in which we won the war. There was a general inclination on the part of our people to accept the victory as merely one more evidence of the superiority of American political, social, and industrial institutions over those of what we were wont to think of as the less-enlightened people of western Europe.

As the soldiers returned to their homes, however, the lack of virtually all types of equipment; the poor quality of much of what was available, of the general bungling and the inefficiencies that characterized the entire process of supply was soon learned by all throughout the Nation.

It was entirely natural that a large portion of the weight of the criticism was made with respect to the material supply side of the war. Returning soldiers found a naturally sympathetic audience—and the facts of our industrial shortcomings were more available to the seekers-for-truth than almost any other aspect of our conduct of the war.

The impressive, although inaccurate, remarks of Field Marshal von Hindenburg in this matter were soon forgotten and supplanted by the more realistic statement of Mr. David Lloyd George who said:

> There were no braver or more fearless men in any Army * * * but the organization at home and behind the lines was not worthy of the reputation which American businessmen have deservedly won for smartness, promptitude, and efficiency.

Once the outcry was started it was easy to associate to the criticism other strong support for the belief that our supply effort had been something far less than inspired.

In answer to the widespread demand for action Congress started a general investigation into the conduct of the war. By far not the least of the great benefits that came out of that investigation and subsequent to congressional action, was the establishment of the Industrial College of the Army, now known as the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, which only last year celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary.

It can in truth be said that there is probably no phase of educational work carried on in the field of logistics or supplies by any other student body of which can even equal those prescribed by the Industrial College of the Armed Forces as constituted today.

In general, the instructional pattern of problem studies provides for committee and subcommitee work, the preparation of reports, and lectures. The availability of scores of officers and civilians who had been responsible for the operation of the American war program during World War II made it possible to present a remarkably valuable lecture program, and the students were able to find out at first-hand the answers to their questions on virtually every phase of war production and economic mobilization. Student problems are supported by the active efforts of research specialists of the college staff. Today for the first time, the students are able to benefit by direct instruction in the technical aspects of industrial production, material supply, economic potential—both foreign and domestic—and Federal administrative organization.

Intense interest on the part of the Navy Department has characterized the activities of the Industrial College from its very beginning. Navy officers have long participated in the work of the college, both as students and instructors, from its earliest courses.

Colonel Whitehead of the Marine Corps was one who had served with distinction as Commandant immediately prior to the wartime closing of the college.

In the postwar period there was intense conviction that the practical joint-service operation of the college should have official expression. Therefore, on April 11, 1946, the Under Secretary of War and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy entered into an agreement regarding joint departmental participation in the activities of the college. Public evidence of the agreement was made by an order of April 26, 1946, redesignating the college as the Industrial College of the Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces which is located in Washington is now primarily concerned with providing instruction to insure the most efficient mobilization and demobilization of our industrial resources and to study the industrial capabilities of other nations for war. The scope of instruction includes over-all consideration of matters relating to production and procurement of all materials of war; industrial organization and management; industrial manpower; availability and use of raw materials, facilities, and utilities; and economic warfare.

The Honorable Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, on Tuesday of this week, addressed the college.

In view of the present situation in the Far East I would recommend the reading of this splendid address to every Member of this House.

In this talk, Louis Johnson tells frankly, honestly, and candidly of his more than personal association to military life for more than a third of a century.

His narration of the contradictions, yes, and even of the successes with which he met makes it well worth the study of every Member of this Congress.

The talk was as follows:

I am happy to return to the old college after 10 years and to address another class of its graduates in the environment of a new setting. Today, it is the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. In 1940, it was the Army Industrial College but then as now its graduates represented all of our Armed Forces.

Today, for the first time, the class includes civilians from Federal Government agencies. Their presence is a symbol of our times, of unity among all of our people, of unification among all the services, and of full cooperation among all Federal agencies. I am glad to see you here although perforce I shall direct most of my remarks to the military members of the class.

When I spoke at the graduation exercises 10 years ago, Hitler's mechanized hordes had poured through France and the Low Countries. Force was on a rampage. Nations were crumbling. Marshal Petain was suing for peace. In all of Europe, Britain alone effectively still held out against the aggressors; and in the Orient, it was a similar story with Japan piling up victories and imposing its new order upon vanquished peoples.

Before long we, too, would be in the fray, and the officers I was addressing would be in battle themselves. Four of them would make the supreme sacrifice—Maj. Maurice Rose, as a major general commanding an armored division in Germany; Capt. Theodore Kalakuka as a colonel in a Japanese prison camp in Luzon; Capt. E. F. Shepherd as a colonel on a special mission to Australia; and Commander H. G. Sickel as a captain on a flight over a lonely atoll in the Pacific on his way to become the chief of staff of a group in an amphibious force.

That was a remarkable class, that class of 1940 with its 53 graduates. At the time of graduation its senior officer was a lieutenant colonel. Three years later he was a lieutenant general. Another member of the class reached the same rank. All in all there were 23 men in the class of 53 who later wore stars. I am confident that there is equal quality among you and that in due time you, too, will find yourselves ranked in the highest brackets of your respective services. I hope and pray, however, that there will be no war that will accelerate your promotion.

Moreover, I am convinced that we will have no war if we continue our way of strengthening our military forces, maintaining the stability of our economy, and remaining true to our fundamental principles and ideals.

Your education at this graduate school has prepared you for a useful role in the promotion of every one of these three vital objectives. Let us consider your possible contribution to each of them.

In the field of national defense your contribution will be an emphasis upon logistics and production. When I was the Assistant Secretary of War between 1937 and 1940 I found a deplorable lack of appreciation, especially among some line officers, of the problems of procurement and of the vital role of supply in battle.

Like many other impatient Americans of the pre-World War II era, they felt that if they had money or the credit and the desire to buy, all that was necessary was to place

the order and delivery would become a matter of days, or weeks, and certainly months at the most. They did not fully appreciate the time factor in procurement of weapons. They were often impatient with those who tried to explain that planes, and tanks, and ships are not items on the shelves of a cash-and-carry grocery store.

It took the cruel months between Pearl Harbor in 1941 and the taking up of large scale offensive in 1943 to convince some of our military men that it takes time to get weapons, even when an industrial Nation like ours is mobilized for war; that it takes even more time to put the weapons in the hands of our fighting men, and still more time to train them to be able to get the most out of the capabilities of each weapon issued them.

I need hardly tell any of you of the vital role that logistics and procurement played in World War II. Since my return to Washington as Secretary of Defense I have noted with great pleasure and satisfaction that the prewar attitude toward supply has been largely eliminated though I am not yet ready to say that it no longer lingers in any quarters. I am certain, however, that in the future the factor of supply will loom even more important than it did in World War II, and that no one who neglects the strategy and tactics of supply will be able to reach top level positions of responsibility among our armed forces.

In emphasizing supply, I in no sense minimize the significance of the man for whose strength and protection all supplies are mobilized. There still is no substitute for man himself. And the ability to lead him, and the duty to equip him, train him, transport him, and take care of his body and his spirit remain the fundamental charge of our military establishment. Because you have had the privilege of gaining greater insight into the supply phase of our military program you will be better able to lead and better equipped to service the sterling American fighting man, who has no equal anywhere in the happy combination of ingenuity, intelligence, and courage.

The primary role of supply is to develop, produce, and place in the hands of our fighting man, weapons of such quality and in such quantity as to prove superior to anything a potential foe can pit against him. In this quest for superior weapons those entrusted with our scientific research and development program are doing an outstanding job. I would like to spell out their achievements in full detail, for the benefit of our own people and of our partners and our friends overseas who may be the first called upon to resist aggression. I prefer not to do so, however, because at the same time I would be giving our potential enemies information that might help them anticipate and counteract any superiority in weapons or techniques that we may have thus developed.

In our calculations we must accept as a fact the assumption that our potential enemies are pushing their research and their development as hard as we are, and that they, too, may be coming up with the right answers. Years ago, when I was a member of the wrestling team of the University of Virginia, our beloved coach, "Pop" Lannigan, kept hammering away during every practice the accepted precept of the mat—that there is no wrestling hold that a good wrestler cannot break. Or, as "Pop" Jenkins, the West Point coach, used to put it to many of you in his own inimitable style, "There ain't no holt that can't be broke." I have a suspicion that this maxim in some form or other has found its way into the language of other countries, including our potential enemy's where its military significance is fully appreciated.

I take that maxim to mean in military terms that there is no offense for which a defense cannot be built, no weapon developed whose effect cannot be reduced by some counter weapon. So we must go on developing machines and techniques that can raise havoc among enemies and at the same time concentrate on countermeasures to lessen or destroy their effect upon us if an enemy happens to possess similar weapons. It is nip and tuck between ourselves and our possible enemies in this vital race for supremacy in the scientific research and development of superior weapons.

We have some information about the scientific progress behind the iron curtain, but I am hardly prepared to say we have all of it. And in the absence of full information, I still try to follow the principles of the Field Service Regulations, which I studied at Fort Benjamin Harrison in 1917 as a candidate for a commission. One of these regulations reads as follows: "When reliable information of the enemy cannot be obtained, it is assumed that he will act with good judgment." That means that he will pursue the same objectives that we do and in due time can come up with answers similar to our own. That means that we dare not be complacent, that we dare not become self-satisfied over any superiority that we believe we may have at any moment. All we can do and must do and are doing every day is to persist in our efforts to stay ahead of the pack; and to guard especially against any undue optimism merely because we have succeeded in a particular experiment, or have produced a pilot model. There is a great gap in time and effort familiar to all of you who have taken this course between the construction of a single prototype of a weapon and its production in sufficient quantity for the forces in being, and for their manufacture in mass for use under the conditions of a wartime mobilization.

There is a period of gestation from conception to birth among weapons as there is among living things. Between the drawing board concept of a weapon and its ultimate distribution for use, there are a number of operations that cannot be avoided. There is research, development, the production of a pilot model, the proving-ground test for that model, a remodeling to eliminate faults that have developed during the test, the service test, modification resulting from faults developed during the service test, production engineering, standardization, contracting for production, mass production, and finally distribution to the troops. Each of these steps takes time. Each of these steps costs money, and appropriations must be obtained to cover the expenses; and that, too, takes time. From the drawing board to final distribution, depending on the complexity of the item, months and even years may pass. In the case of an ultra-modern plane, it may take 5 years. And, in some cases, even 7 years.

These and similar principles of procurement and industrial mobilization will guide you in your own work. You will have to interpret these principles to industry and to labor whose combined efforts are responsible for the great arsenal of democracy that is America. You will have to explain the lessons you have learned here to all of the American people who, in the last instance, are the actual buyers of those weapons and whose sons may have to use them for their own protection, and for the security of our people, our country, and our institutions.

Among our institutions none is more important than our free economy, and the maintenance of its stability is the second of the three great objectives for which your training here at the industrial college has especially equipped you.

To understand the full implications of industrial mobilization you have made a thorough study of our flexible American economic system and the means whereby it was able to shift from peace to war production on little notice, and then go back into reverse without slipping a cog.

Our production performance in World War II astounded our enemies and encouraged our allies. Once we got under way, our men on land, and sea, and in the air were able to get what they wanted, where they wanted it, on time, in the quantity desired, and of a quality superior to what our enemies were able to pit against them. Then, when victory was assured, our American industry shifted gear, went back into production for peace, and now our wheels are spinning, turning out necessities and luxuries to satisfy all of our needs and to take care of many vital requirements of peoples everywhere.

The shifts from peace to war and back to peace may not have pleased all of our people all of the time, but the fact remains that we are more prosperous than ever, that our economy is sound, that our standard of living has reached its highest peak, and that in a world of great distress America still stands out as the promised land of freedom and opportunity.

The strong industrial potential of ours continues to serve us as a dominant military asset. Our enemies of 10 years ago, who always respected and always feared it, had counted on our suffering long delays in the process of conversion from peace to war. They miscalculated. Our potential enemies of today are students of World War II. They know what we accomplished before. They fear what we may be capable of doing in another emergency. Our industrial system, therefore, becomes a logical target—not only a physical target to bomb and destroy in case of hostilities but a spiritual target to undermine at any time.

Your work in procurement and industrial mobilization will put you in a position where you will influence the stability of our economic system. You will deal with management and with labor. I am confident, you will never lose sight of the fact that a profit for the investor and an adequate wage for the worker are both part of our system and that both are attainable under our democratic processes. Nor will you forget that business to be successful must be solvent and that this principle applies to Government as well as to industry. I know you will join me and the civilian and military heads of all of your departments in a determined effort to improve the efficiency of all of our operations, to eliminate waste and duplication, and to get a maximum of defense out of every dollar made available to us by the American people.

I come finally to the principles and ideals of our country which were basic to your studies and discussions at the college. I am confident your faith in them has been strengthened by your experiences here and that you not only will be guided by them yourself in your own duties but that you will foster them in all of your official relations with others.

You are commissioned officers of a great democracy. Your discipline as a member of our Armed Forces, the American people properly are accustomed to take for granted. The kind of discipline, they expect, however, is more than mere formal obedience to orders. They expect the enthusiastic and exemplary support of orders—exemplary to those who have a right and a duty to look to your leadership—even though the directives may appear on the surface to conflict with the seeming interests of your own special outlook. You have a duty to make your views known to your superior to whose staff you are assigned. You have a responsibility when called before a congressional committee to give not only the official views of the agency you represent but your own honest convictions. But once a decision has been made, discipline demands that you act upon the decision, energetically and wholeheartedly,

as if it were the result of your own personal recommendation.

I know that wherever you go you will be given a most cordial welcome. The great prestige that those who have preceded you had built up will be enhanced by your performance. We are getting eight of you in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. It is my regret that we are not getting any more. When I was the Assistant Secretary of War, responsible for current procurement and industrial mobilization, I leaned very heavily on Army Industrial College graduates of our Armed Forces. Some of its alumni are on my staff now, and they are of inestimable help to me. From those who join the Office of the Secretary of Defense tomorrow I shall expect a similar high quality of performance.

Those of you who are returning to civilian agencies carry with you, I am confident, a better appreciation of our problems of national defense and particularly those pertaining to procurement and industrial mobilization. Your education in our Industrial College will help you serve your own agency more efficiently and to cooperate with us more effectively.

Whatever any of you are called upon to do, I know that as graduates of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces you will serve faithfully and reflect the sound teachings of this higher school of military learning.

I congratulate you upon your achievement. My best wishes go to each and every one of you, wherever destiny may take you.

Independence Day, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, next Tuesday we will celebrate another Independence Day. The real meaning and true significance of this anniversary largely have been lost in recent years.

It is most timely and extremely necessary that the minds of the American people be alerted to the genuine importance of this day of freedom.

No man ever I have met or known is better qualified to speak on the true meaning and real significance of this anniversary than our able colleague from Maine, the Honorable FRANK FELLOWS, a skillful and astute lawyer, a resourceful and courageous statesman, a wise counsellor, a loyal friend, an unselfish, patriotic American, a warm, sympathetic, understanding, helpful human being, whose address this year on this memorable occasion, I submit. It is worthy of the careful reading and prayerful consideration of all red-blooded Americans.

God help us to do something about it.

The address follows:

This week we celebrate the Fourth of July—formerly referred to as Independence Day—for it commemorates the adoption of the Declaration of Independence in 1776. I don't know whether any significance attaches to the fact that we speak nowadays of the holiday as the Fourth of July, instead of Independence Day—but it well may be.

Mr. Webster, in his dictionary, defines "independence" as "exemption from reliance on or control by others; self-subsistence or maintenance; direction of one's own affairs without interference." Such things were considered of the greatest importance in the early days of this country. So it was that, in general Congress, those Representatives of the United States, after first seeking divine guidance, mutually pledged each to the other his life, his fortune, and his sacred honor in support of the Declaration. They stated that prudence would dictate that long-established government should not be changed for any light or transient cause. The record shows that they long forebore action, exercised patience, and exhausted every argument before taking the final step which meant separation from Britain.

Let us now be equally cautious before making any change in our Government.

We are constantly reminded by youthful zealots and political schemers that times have changed—as indeed they seem to have done. The urge to be independent is disappearing. If means are forthcoming, few care what the source is, or what strings are attached. We want to work as little as possible, and to be saved the necessity for planning our own future. Let the deductions from our pay envelopes insure a maximum of compensation when we become unemployed and a minimum of effort on our part. Let the Government take its cut from our wages to defray a part of its running expenses, and still another cut to save for our old age. But don't bother us with all that. Just take another percentage to pay the doctor and the hospital if we get ill—and for Heaven's sake don't let's think about it. After all, the Government gets enough of a cut so it ought to do our thinking for us. And it is so willing.

Deputy Prime Minister Herbert Morrison, speaking last November in Preston, England, said, and I quote: "President Truman's declaration of his 10 points is in line with the policy of the British Labor government, and in spite of the cock-and-bull stories that the British Government is pursuing a policy in violent conflict with the United States Government, it is clear that Mr. Truman's state of mind is very much the same as that of our own Government." So spoke the Deputy Prime Minister of the British Labor government.

It was July 4, 1776, that we made public announcement of our conviction that we knew a better way than Britain's. But that was 174 years ago. The Deputy Prime Minister of Britain recognizes that we have gotten around to her way of thinking now—to socialism.

The New York Times of October 11, 1938, quoted John Strachey, British Cabinet officer, as saying—and I quote: "Like all Socialists, I believe that the Socialist society evolves, in time, into the Communist society."

The question at this point then, as we prepare to celebrate the Declaration of Independence, and as we stand on the threshold of possible all-out conflict in the Pacific, should be this: Assuming that Britain's Herbert Morrison is correct in his recognition that our President's 10 points are in line with Socialist policy, and assuming Britain's Strachey is correct in his belief that a Socialist society evolves into a Communist society, are we headed in the direction we want to go? Do we want socialism? Are we getting socialism? Who is responsible? And what can we do about it?

On June 15 the Federal Grand Jury for the Southern District of New York reported with reference to its investigations into espionage, in part, as follows: "The safety of this Nation and its institutions is being jeopardized because (a) the underground activities of Communists in this country, organized in a continuing conspiracy and using effective techniques to extend their influence beyond their ranks, have greatly increased during the last 5 years; and because (b) the Nation, confronted with an an entirely new situation in its history—a situation in which for the first time the loyalty of certain of its own citizens has been diverted to a foreign ideology—has not as yet devised adequate means to combat this menace; and because (c) there has been and is now a concerted attempt on the part of many, both Communists and disloyal Americans, aided by fellow travelers, to conceal the truth from the American people."

The conviction, they state, was arrived at by the grand jury after an experience in which it came face to face with the evil that is communism. Its substitution of the false for the true as the standard of judgment has introduced into human affairs a new attack on man's integrity.

The American cannot afford to tolerate evil of this character, particularly in their Government, nor, on the other hand, can they deny their fellow citizens the civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution. But among such civil rights is not the right to be employed by the Government, and the people are correct in demanding that all entrusted with the welfare and safety of the country be above suspicion.

Under favor, and with deference to the opinion of those who publicly discuss such things, as one who actively practiced the profession of law for 30 years, it is my opinion that if you hire a man to work for you and thereafter your valuables disappear, to be found in his pocketbook or at the pawnship where he has deposited them, the Constitution does not guarantee him a jury trial before he can be fired. In such a case, trial by accusation is sufficient.

As intelligent American citizens, we should demand loyalty—unquestionable loyalty—to this country and its system—of our public servants. We should require as well that degree of intelligence and care which will not through imprudence divulge secret information to our enemies. There is no substitute for brains, and no security with stupidity.

A glaring example of this is our Department of State, which either could not read or failed to heed the storm warnings in the Pacific.

Fifty years ago, like every other boy of my acquaintance, I lay sleepless the night of July 3, savoring in anticipation the pleasures of the morrow. A few bunches of firecrackers and a couple of sticks of punk could be fingered and smelled, and plans which included the use of one of mother's discarded dishpans beneath which to explode the firecrackers didn't allow much time for sleep. One merchant in our town is forever embalmed in the memory of every Bucksport child of that time, because to each of us who presented himself at his store he gave one ten-cent bunch of firecrackers. On the Fourth our fathers and mothers kept weather eyes out from the back plaza, and even Penobscot River salmon and new potatoes and peas had slight drawing power when lined up against a good torpedo at dinner time. Mother was frequently called upon to use soda or tea leaves on burned hands. Father promised dire punishment if we exploded crackers under our neighbors' sheds. Both had in mind that adoption of the Declaration of Independence stood for something worth taking a little chance for even in celebration. Dad never failed to vote on election day—rain or shine. Times have changed. In many towns and cities last election day, only one in 4 cast his ballot. One in four. But they saw to it that their children were protected from danger of burning their clothes, singing their eyebrows or causing property damage by outlawing use of fireworks. Were those other 3 out of every 4 worried about socialism, communism, or fiscal and foreign policies that might lead to another war? Not enough to bother to go to the polls.

On the eve of another Independence Day, as we hold in ours the hot little paws of

our children and grandchildren, shouldn't we pause to consider what is and what is not important so far as the future of the younger generation is concerned?

Those brave souls who broke with Britain to build a new nation dedicated to freedom and equal justice under law erected safeguards for your independence and mine. They appreciated that whether it was malicious mischief or common garden variety stupidity that caused a child to burn his home down, the result was equally disastrous. Blunderings of honest men are no less harmful than schemes of the wicked. Voters and lawmakers have been hopelessly stupid or criminally negligent if we are far on the road to socialism, and if that course has at its dead end communism. The criminally negligent are those who either fail to vote, or give too little thought to how or for whom they vote. We should choose officeholders as we do our surgeons—on performance. Not on appearance or promises. A handsome physician with a soothing bedside manner may serve if nothing serious is wrong, but in case of brain tumor a knock-kneed specialist with buck teeth who has had adequate preparation and experience should be the choice. And a brain tumor is no more serious than the health of our Republic—as any European would be the first to tell us.

The fruits of liberty will be neither sweet nor plentiful if we become blindly indifferent to the system that nurtures the tree. The situation in the Pacific is the natural product of the seed sowed at Yalta, and it was design, not accident, that kept China and our own people from knowing what commitments were made there and thereafter in our name. Confusion and chaos are the products of corruption and stupidity.

On this Independence Day let us keep ever before us the knowledge that the ideal requires resistance to inertia—resistance to indifference regarding the two-party system's strength—resistance to unthinking acceptance of propaganda and promises. To have our independence wrested from us would be sad enough, but to exchange it for a promissory note, or have it snatched from us while we sleep would be shameful indeed. Self-discipline, self-control, and self-maintenance are independence. If a majority of Americans through stupidity in the choice of candidates or disinterest in exercising their ballots put in power those who squander our freedom or exchange it for a Socialist society, they will have cheated their children of an inheritance beyond price. Our course of action now may determine whether the future calls for the use of crepe or bunting on anniversaries of the Declaration of Independence.

Letter to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter that I am sending some of my constituents:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 3, 1950.*

MY DEAR FRIEND: I am writing this letter to ask for your vote and support in my reelection. Election day, as you know, is July 25, and your support will be deeply appreciated by me. I will also be deeply grateful if you can contact your friends, neighbors, and relatives and urge their support of my candidacy for reelection.

It has been my privilege and honor to be your Congressman for the past 8 years or four consecutive terms. I am extremely appreciative of the confidence that you have placed in me and also of the fact that you have elected me by a larger vote each time that I have come up for reelection.

I have certainly tried in every way to justify your confidence by trying to assist each and every person who called on me regardless of their walk in life or past political alinement. No problem has been too small nor none too large to receive my urgent attention. Even those who have opposed me politically in the past readily admit that I have tried to be one of the best Congressmen that ever served the Sixth District.

I do not want to appear boastful as to my efforts but I do feel that by writing you this letter that it will enable me to let you know how deeply grateful I am to serve as your Congressman.

Your Congress has faced a multitude of difficult issues and problems during the past years. I have consistently voted for all measures that would aid the farmers, the veterans and for the various bills that improve our security and standards of living.

I pledge to do everything within my power to continue to help you to remedy the troubles that beset you at this time and to improve your working and living conditions. You may, therefore, rest assured that I shall continue to put forth my best efforts in your interest.

I trust that my legislative experience for the past 8 years and my record as your Congressman in these 8 years will warrant your continued consideration for your vote for my reelection July 25.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

P. S.—As I have said in the past, I want you to feel that at any time I can ever serve you in my capacity as Congressman, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Jersey Boys' State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, it has been said many times that the future of democracy rests with its youth. I believe one of the most important tasks confronting us today is to instill in our youth a love for their American heritage, respect for the ideals and purposes of the democratic way of life, and an understanding of the machinery of government. In my State of New Jersey the American Legion has taken the lead in developing a program for the accomplishment of these aims, particularly the last one of giving our young people an insight into the workings of their State government, by sponsoring Jersey Boys' State. A fine editorial describing in detail the American Legion's investment in better citizenship in sponsoring these annual sessions appeared in the June 22 issue of the Burlington Press. Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include that editorial, which follows:

JERSEY BOYS' STATE

Probably every school boy knows that Congress once met in Trenton, November 1, 1784, and that it was chosen to be New Jersey's capital November 25, 1790. But the average schoolboy's knowledge of what goes on in Trenton today probably is as limited as, say, that of the average adult who boasts that he knows nothing of politics and doesn't want to.

In general this lack of working knowledge of State government and its operations is a deficiency that can be charged to the educational system. It is also a deficiency that the American Legion, in one of its better contributions to youth and government, is trying to overcome. This the Legion is doing by sponsoring Jersey Boys' State, which is in its annual session this week at Rutgers University.

Approximately 400 boys attend these meetings. Individual delegates, from 16 to 18 years, are selected by fellow students from panels nominated by school principals and teachers. Every county is represented, and various Legion posts underwrite the boys' expenses. For 8 days at New Brunswick they hear lectures on government and its functions by busy men who are, however, not too busy to put time and thought into this praiseworthy enterprise. Primary elections, political conventions and general elections are held, and the boys run model municipal, county, and State governments.

Boys' State is an investment in better citizenship that is not local to New Jersey. Such assemblies are held in all States under Legion auspices. The purpose is to impress the youth of the land with the privileges and obligations of citizenship, a field which obviously needs cultivation. For proof skeptics are invited to contemplate the civic default by the millions who are eligible to vote annually and don't.

The Legion hopes that out of these meetings the boys will learn of the day-by-day operations of State and home government, and that they will spread this knowledge among their schoolmates and thus encourage participation in future "states." And if in the process some youthful vigor and enthusiasm for better government is transmitted to parents, New Jersey and its municipalities will be the gainers.

Unbalanced Fuel Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the increased tenseness in the international situation during the past few days has brought a new urgency to many matters now being considered by Congress.

Each of us fervently hopes that the President's decisive action on Tuesday of this week will block the Reds' aggressive action and avert an eventual war. But all of us realize at the same time that we must consider as well the possibilities which may flow from this most

recent brash and unwarranted Communist threat to peace.

We may—though I pray it will not come to pass—be forced to place America on a full war footing. We must reckon with this possibility, and we must face squarely the giant demands which a third world war would make upon our fuel resources.

On March 15 of this year, I introduced Senate Resolution 239, calling for a full study by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of our Nation's energy needs during peace and war, and furthermore, a companion study of our fuel resources upon which we will be forced to call in order to meet our energy needs.

The existing international situation, as I view it, makes it more imperative than ever that we hasten to the task of surveying fully our energy needs and supplies.

I therefore ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the statement which I made in submitting Senate Resolution 239 be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD at this time and that there be printed with it an article from the Christian Science Monitor of June 23, 1950, entitled "Unbalanced Fuel Economy".

While I would disagree with several of the inferences made by Mr. Trott in writing the Monitor article, I believe he has presented an excellent general review of the need for a comprehensive congressional study of our fuel resources at this time, and believe his article should be brought to the attention of Congress and the Nation.

There being no objection, the statement by Mr. MYERS and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, ON INTRODUCING SENATE RESOLUTION 239

Mr. President, I am submitting at this time a resolution to authorize a full and complete investigation and study of the available fuel reserves of the United States, with the aim of formulating an over-all domestic fuel policy.

In submitting this resolution, I am fully aware that in relatively recent time two somewhat related proposals have been submitted to the Senate. I am referring here to Senate Joint Resolution 157, introduced on March 1, by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for himself and Senators MORSE, of Oregon, and DOUGLAS, of Illinois. Secondly, I have in mind S. 3215, introduced March 8, by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Both Senate Joint Resolution 157 and S. 3215 propose to establish commissions dealing with the coal industry and its related products. I would like to say, Mr. President, in connection with each of these that both proposals direct their attention at an issue of primary importance to the United States and the world.

It will be recalled that in President Truman's message to the Congress of March 3, 1950, at which time he requested the Congress for special emergency legislation to provide for Government operation of the coal mines until agreement between the operators and the union had been reached, the President stated that the coal industry had been sick for a long time, and he stated further that in his opinion, the recurrent labor-management strife over coal contracts was merely a symptom of the crisis condition in which that industry finds itself today.

The resolution I am proposing at this time, Mr. President, recognizes this critical coal situation which is now before us. If, however, my resolution went no further than this, I would certainly have no purpose in wishing to introduce it.

My resolution is broader. It is my personal belief that we cannot consider coal as an isolated energy source. At the same time, I am fully aware that neither Senate Joint Resolution nor S. 3215 contemplated a study of coal independent of its relation to other available fuels.

I do feel, however, that if we are to arrive at a national fuel policy, a policy I believe we are long overdue in arriving at, I think we must direct the same kind of attention to every known or conceivable fuel source. My resolution contemplates such an investigation with one important exception: it does not, for I think obvious reasons, include within its scope an exhaustive inquiry into the field of atomic energy. International considerations for the moment require that we consider the atom all by itself.

Otherwise, Mr. President, my resolution proposes that the Senate conduct a study into our existing and foreseeable fuel resources. This would necessarily mean that we would have to examine not only our coal reserves, but our reserves of oil, natural gas, and our potential development of hydroelectric power. Such a study also means that we should examine such research matters as are now being conducted in the field of oil shales, and the availability of synthetic petroleum from coal. Such a study would also consider the availability of foreign imports and our opportunities for stockpiling against some national emergency.

My resolution visualizes an investigation that will have to be conducted along a broad front if that investigation can ultimately become the basis for recommending a national fuel policy. That fuel policy cannot, under present world conditions, confine itself exclusively to our peacetime domestic needs of the future. It would have to weight heavily factors affecting the national security in time of war. Thus, it would be necessary to consider not only what our wartime needs might be, but as well, a careful look would have to be made at the extent to which we are at present dependent upon imports which might, in time of war, be cut off either for a relatively short time or perhaps for some considerable period. An excellent illustration of this kind of problem, for example, is the still well-remembered rubber difficulty which confronted us early in 1942 when the Japanese attack spread across the southwest Pacific and cut off our supply of the natural product that we had previously obtained in that area. It is against such contingencies as these that a national fuel policy could protect us.

So, in summary, Mr. President, my resolution is a two-step affair. It proposes first, that we assess our present fuel reserves, not just of coal, but of all the fuels which today and in the future will operate this vast economy of ours. This investigative stage will not confine itself to our present technological developments, but an examination must be made as well of the technological progress we may expect through additional research into every phase of our fuel program. This investigation should also determine our energy needs for both peace and war.

When the facts are all in, Mr. President, we will then have a sound basis on which it should be possible to draw up an over-all fuel policy which will place in their proper perspective coal, oil, natural gas, and water power. It is to determine a domestic policy which would provide us with the highest possible standard of living in peacetime and the greatest possible security in the event some national or international emergency might arise.

In drawing up my resolution, I had an opportunity to discuss this question with the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, Mr. O'MAHONEY. With the introduction of my own resolution, that committee will have before it Senate Joint Resolution 157, S. 3215, and my resolution. I know that the committee will give these three proposals the careful consideration which matters of such primary importance to our national well-being deserve.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of June 23, 1950]

UNBALANCED FUEL ECONOMY

(By Harlan Trott)

WASHINGTON.—Where do we stand and where are we going in this important question of national fuel supplies? The outlook for oil and gas never was better. Interior Department officials tell us there are enough known oil reserves in the Western Hemisphere to fuel the national economy even on a war footing—a jet-propelling one at that.

Natural gas is inching its way across the Nation. Texas gas will soon be boiling water in Bangor. At the same time, the bottom is about to fall out of the Nation's coal hod. This does not look serious on the surface. Self-started fueling is altogether in keeping with the modern trend of things.

The catch is that over 95 percent of the Nation's known fuel resources are locked up in our 2,000-year store of coal. Can we afford to leave the oil tap open at the presently accelerated rate? And be sure it would keep running should there be another 5-year war emergency?

The world recognizes that our easy and superior standard of living, industrial power, and military potential rest upon our abundant resources and high per capita use of energy fuels. But today, by this unbalance of our fuel economy, this heavy-handedness on the throttle, we have been brought almost unknowingly to the brink of the most insecure position in our history.

What we are saying here is not a layman's appraisal. It reflects the careful opinion of Government fuel economists who are helping to shape the Nation's defense program. They firmly dispute the Interior Department's casual business-as-usual approach to our jet-powered strategy.

At the peak of the war effort, the coal industry provided 54 percent of our national fuel energy requirements. By 1949, this effort had shrunk about one-third, and almost every prospect points to further deterioration of the industry. Anthracite production already has dwindled to its 1902 level. Is the bituminous business, the fuel which in terms of B. t. u. values represents 95 percent of the Nation's known fuel resources, riding the same toboggan?

About 22 pieces of proposed coal legislation lie before Congress today. Each measure is so confused within itself that Congress also is confused. Why all this confusion?

The reason, these national fuel strategists assert, stems, from an inordinate growth of our fuel supply industries, unnatural competition, financial pressure, unsound labor-management arrangements, and a pathetic

backwardness on the part of what one official recently described as too many push-button tycoons.

One bill before Congress purposes to put a price floor under coal; another would subsidize production of anthracite for military stockpiling; another would impose a $1 a barrel impost on oil imports. And so it goes—in all directions, all at once.

"Practically all our fuel supply industries have assumed an air of smug self-sufficiency," a key Government fuel expert commented privately the other day. He complained that none apparently sensed the need for a coordinated understanding of the national fuel economy. He was particularly critical of what he termed the lack of industrial unanimity of purpose and national service among the coal industry's top leadership.

He mentioned the regrettable misuse of data relating to national fuel resources. "Too often," he said, "it has developed a complacency in the minds of coal operators, lulling them into a feeling that soon the profits of the whole national fuel economy will pass from oil and natural gas industry into their hands."

One infers that the coal industry is waiting for the Nation to run out of oil and gas on the assumption that coal then will come into its own again as the prime source of fuel. What is it doing to keep railroad coal haulers running in the meanwhile? What is it doing independently of the Government's present experimental program to transform coal to take the place of oil and gas in any future push-button, pipeline fuel economy?

Impartial fuel economists here would like to see congressional proposals for a coal industry investigation broadened to encompass a study of all the Nation's fuel resources. What is most needed, they assert, is a coordinated fuel policy to insure that the country makes the best use of its uneven fuel resources in any future emergency.

The Hiss Herring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Hiss Herring," recently published in the Daily Plainsman of Huron, S. Dak.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HISS HERRING

Today's fourteenth and final installment of the story of Alger Hiss and Whittaker Chambers concludes the thoroughly documented, well written, and easily read story by authors De Toledano and Lasky, Seeds of Treason.

It is a story which the two hard-working journalists told with coherent completeness which the ordinary reader may have missed when the Hiss-Chambers trial was actually underway.

There is no point in reviewing the book here again, as most readers of the Daily Plainsman must have read the fascinating installments. But these salient points ought to remain burned in the reader's memory:

1. Alger Hiss, a brilliant young American who had every advantage, did become a Communist.

2. Other Communists helped get him placed in high Government circles and finally as a top State Department adviser who was the key man in formulating policy at Yalta.

3. Hiss betrayed the United States by turning secret documents over to Russia, documents so secret that even now the United States will not disclose what their contents were.

4. Hiss was "vouched" for completely by Acheson, Frankfurter, Reed, and others, even during his trial and after his conviction. President Truman called his case a "red herring." The Department of Justice did not prosecute the case but even dropped it. It took the House Un-American Affairs Committee to produce the evidence and force the trial, at which a jury of 12 Americans considered the evidence and found Hiss guilty.

Those facts underline the significance of the Hiss case and emphasize why it is now incumbent upon the Truman administration to prove to the public that it has cleaned all other Hisses out of Government office. At the present writing the Truman administration is not doing that but instead obstructing a thorough survey and giving credence to charges of "whitewash" by the Tydings committee.

As Senator KARL MUNDT said in the Senate in a thorough and convincing summary of the case January 25, 1950:

"It is impossible to estimate or perhaps overemphasize the complete sum total of the disservice tendered by Hiss to the cause of freedom and his assistance to the Communists who now threaten our interests and freedoms at every point around the globe. Mr. President, history may never show and our citizens may never completely understand the full significance of the part played by Alger Hiss and those brought into Government as friends of his, or his classmates, or his associates, in the determination of daily decisions in foreign policy which, added together, formed the matrix of developments beginning at Yalta and stemming out to boundaries which are yet untouched and undefinable."

A Tribute to a Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there has been called to my attention in a release of June 25, 1950, an article which touched me very deeply. Mr. Frank Tripp, one of the outstanding writers of this country, has paid a beautiful tribute to a man for whom I shall always entertain a deep affection.

The article is headed "Coincidence—Or God?" Mr. Tripp refers to Judge Thomas F. Fennell, who was a roommate of mine at Cornell University. We both played on the Cornell football team, and from that time on Thomas F. Fennell enriched and ennobled the world with his high ideals and humanitarianism which he practiced every day until his death.

The incident related by Mr. Tripp is only one of hundreds typical of the love and sympathy which Judge Thomas F. Fennell, affectionately called Tom, rendered to his fellow men. The influence of this great and good man on thousands of boys will bear rich fruit for generations to come.

I am happy, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, to include this tribute to my friend, who sacrificed his life to hard and unselfish work in his chosen profession, the law:

COINCIDENCE—OR GOD?

(By Frank Tripp)

Judge Thomas F. Fennell was one of the grandest men I ever knew; one of the humanest and kindest. He was a Cornell football, track, and crew star in the late nineties. He died all too soon for the good of this troubled world and the countless little people who were being made happier because he lived. Everybody called him Tom—or Tommy.

One time when he was holding court in New York he called me at my hotel room late at night. "I ran into a friend of yours today," he said. "That is, I did or I got a good hooking—which wouldn't matter much." This was Tom's story:

He was passing along Forty-second Street, near Grand Central Station. His big athletic hulk bumped into a man who was milling among the horde of hurried subway moles en route to the Manhattan pigeonholes that they call home.

The man was dazed by the impact, staggered backward as if to fall. Tom caught him by the shoulders and held him up. He was well-dressed and sober, but his eyes were wild and bloodshot. "Let me go, I'm all right," he said to Tom; but Tom saw that he wasn't, and clung to him.

Judge Fennell, tired from a long day on the bench, took the bewildered stranger into the Commodore and induced him to stay for dinner. "That's where you come in," Tommy said to me; "I guess between us we saved a man's life, if his story is true. Do you know him?"

I did know him. That very afternoon he had come to me in distraction and I had pleaded with him. He was a pretty-well-known newspaper-supply salesman, had called on me for years, in days when all was well with him. He had a good job then and earned good money. Everybody liked him; was glad to have him come around.

Then he met a girl, when he was around 35—and she wasn't the right girl, but he worshipped her. The home and family he wanted never came about. She was out too much nights with other men for that.

He began to drown his troubles, first now and then, finally too much. His work slipped. He got to be a pest. The friends who'd welcomed him came to avoid him. His sales contacts dwindled. He lost his job and could not get another.

When he came to me he borrowed $2 and wanted no more. Tommy told me why. He wanted to repay a loan he'd had from a fellow to whom $2 was a lot. Then he was going to kill himself.

When Tommy bumped into him he had just decided it should be the river, rather than the subway tracks he'd first selected. Tommy spent the evening with the man. An evening with Tom Fennell was good for any man, but it meant life and hope to this one.

In the man's confession to Tom he told of that afternoon's visit to me and he could answer questions which proved our acquaintanceship. Then Tommy went to work on him in earnest. Tom won. The man reclaimed his wrecked life.

I wonder how often many of us bump into a stranger as did Tom; just say, "I'm sorry," and go on our way. Perhaps a dere-

lict who needs the kindness by which Tommy saved a life and made a man out of a human wreck.

And I wonder if it was just coincidence that in the great, heartless city of New York, this man who never had heard of Tom Fennell, nor Tom of him, went straight from me into the arms of this grand fellow with whom I grew up, back in the country, hundreds of miles from there.

I can't think it was just coincidence. I think God had something to do with it.

Seventeenth Century Day, Ipswich, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, August 12, is the date chosen this year for Seventeenth Century Day in Ipswich, and, just as 2 years ago when the old town played host to several thousands of visitors from near and far, it will again this year draw thousands more to her hospitable firesides and old houses, there to bask in the warm glow of New England hospitality Ipswich is, and well may be, proud of her history for, settled in 1633, she is one of the oldest towns in the Bay State. The first houses were nothing more than huts or wigwams but it was not long after the first settlers began their life in the New World that they also began the fine old houses that are the pride and joy of their owners today.

John Winthrop, Jr., son of the governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, may be called the first settler for it was he who led a band of "men of good ranke and quality" from the Salem and Boston settlements to the new territory beyond the Salem boundaries. The object was pretty much to provide an outpost against Indian attacks and also to be able to warn the other settlements of possible trouble from the French. But along with Winthrop in his settlement came Sir Richard Saltonstall, ancestor of the present United States Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Richard Bellingham and Samuel Symonds. These four in turn governed the Bay Colony as magistrates. Rev. William Hubbard was also one of the Bay Colony's first and best historians and the first poetess in America, Anne Dudley Bradstreet, The Tenth Muse, lived in the town. We also should mention Rev. John Wise, who protested against "taxation without representation" almost a century before Patrick Henry.

Sponsored by the Ipswich Historical Society and the Ipswich Garden Club, of which Mrs. R. Elbert Titcomb and Daniel B. Lunt are serving as cochairmen, several of the old houses will be opened to the public with a staff of hostesses in charge. Among these houses will be the old Whipple homestead, the headquarters of the historical society, and the ancestral home of many of the Whipples of America. Proceeds will be devoted to maintaining and improving the historic features of Ipswich.

Our Anti-Anti-Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Our Anti-Anti-Communists," written by William Henry Chamberlin and published recently in the Wall Street Journal. I think this is especially pertinent to be placed in the RECORD today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR ANTI-ANTI-COMMUNISTS
(By William Henry Chamberlin)

In leftist thinking, as in Paris gowns, styles are subject to change. Membership in blatantly open Communist-front organizations is no longer as smart and popular as it was in the thirties, and during the war years, when it was encouraged in the very highest official circles. It is now a comparatively small and narrow circle of individuals who run marathon races with each other in joining pro-Soviet and anti-American leagues, committees, councils, societies, and whatnot.

But a new species has appeared on the political horizon. It may be called the anti-anti-Communist. Some European refugees from nazism are charter members of this informal club. They naturally feel keenly the evil from which they fled. And they lack the intellectual discernment or the emotional sympathy which would have led them to recognize that their lot as free and independent thinkers would have been just as hard in Stalin's Russia as in Hitler's Germany—and that it might have been harder to escape from the former.

The ranks of the "anti-antis" are swelled by many former fellow-travelers who find it prudent or expedient to beat a strategic retreat, yet still cherish a nostalgic yearning for their old intellectual pastures. The anti-anti-Communist first disarms suspicion by disclaiming any sympathy with communism. He then commits himself to the following propositions which may be regarded as his identification tags:

1. Any attempt to safeguard strategic Government agencies against Communist infiltration or to expose such infiltration, when it has occurred in the past, is indignantly brushed aside as "witch hunting," "hysteria," "redbaiting," etc.

2. America should make some spectacular peace gesture, as if it were the guilty party in the cold war. Truman should make overtures for a meeting with Stalin or, better yet, there should be some scheme which would bring the Soviet Union and its satellites within the range of America's global spending.

3. If there is any difference of opinion, as in the blockade of Berlin or in the Soviet boycott of the United Nations, America should always give way. Of course, your anti-anti-Communist emphasizes the point that he is opposed to appeasement.

4. If anyone is known to be strongly opposed to communism a more or less subtle campaign of depreciation is set in motion against him. There is an attempt to discredit him as prejudiced and lacking in objectivity, as a little hysterical and perhaps not altogether free from the taint of fascism.

5. There is a constant attempt to suggest that the true danger to peace lies in Germany, not in the Soviet Union. One wartime illusion, that the Soviet Union is a peace-loving, cooperative democracy, has been shattered beyond repair. But the anti-anti-Communist school of thought tries to keep alive the maximum hatred and suspicion of Germany—with a view to preventing the European unity which would be one of the strongest barriers to Soviet expansion.

6. The anti-anti-Communist makes a habit of ringing wrong numbers, of addressing appeals to wrong addresses. He is always asking the United States to make some sacrifice in the supposed interest of peace, but seldom thinks of asking any corresponding sacrifice from the Kremlin.

7. The crimes of Soviet communism, the killing of millions of people by starvation, the enslavement of millions more, the universal espionage, are attributed not to the nature of communism, with its unchecked concentration of power in the hands of the state, but to Russian historical inheritance. Communism is represented as a good idea gone wrong, as something with a good many wave-of-the-future characteristics.

8. There is a determined effort to look on the bright side as regards Soviet satellite regimes in eastern Europe and in China. Their subservience to Moscow is denied; their obvious oppressive features are overlooked or softened; their hostility to the United States is played down. There is a revival, on a smaller scale, in regard to Tito's regime in Yugoslavia of the sentimentality that prevailed regarding Stalin's dictatorship during the war.

9. There is a determined effort to pin the fascist label on foreign individuals, groups and governments which are consistently opposed to communism. There is a persistent attempt to put over the suggestion that the only effective way to resist communism is to adopt measures which would go half or three-quarters of the way toward communism.

The straight Communist partyliner does not enjoy a very wide audience in the United States today. But the anti-anti-Communist (whose program curiously coincides in many points with what the Kremlin might be expected to want) is an influence to be reckoned with. His viewpoint is strongly entrenched in some very respectable places.

The nine points which have been listed above could be illustrated with many citations from speeches and articles of more or less prominent publicists and professors, churchmen and scientists. The mixture of fallacy and half-truth that enters into the anti-anti-Communist psychology deserves careful analysis and attention. It is more influential than is generally realized.

Federal Grants to States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 24, 1950, I inserted in the RECORD what the States pay out in revenue and what they receive in return. I now wish, under unanimous consent, to furnish tables prepared by Colin F. Stam, chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, together with his letter and other documents, relating to expenditures made by

the Federal Government as direct payments to New York State and all States under cooperative arrangements and expenditures within New York and all States which provided relief and other aid, fiscal year 1949. I believe that these tables will be highly informative to the membership of the House:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON
INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION,
Washington, May 15, 1950.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REED: This is with reference to the figures on Federal expenditures by States which were furnished you on April 18.

The above table gave the most comprehensive information by States available for the past 10 years. Only the totals of expenditures for grants and aid were given in this table. You later inquired about the various programs included in these totals especially with regard to flood control. The attached table I shows the available detail on these expenditures for the fiscal year 1949. Less than $1,000,000 in that year was for flood control since practically all of these expenditures are direct rather than in the form of Federal grants to States. The major expenditures shown in the attached table I can be summarized as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	New York	All States
A. Grants to States and local units:		
Old-age assistance	37	718
Other Social Security Administration grants	40	373
Highway construction	16	410
Agricultural programs	8	165
All other	15	189
Total grants	116	1,855
B. Federal aid payment to individuals, etc.:		
Veterans' Administration, readjustment benefits and vocational rehabilitation	286	3,297
Agricultural conservation program	5	202
National Guard	9	115
All other	1	25
Total aid payments	301	3,639
Grand total, grants and aid payments	417	5,494

The Bureau of the Budget recently made available to us a compilation showing Federal grants to States and expenditures for direct public works for the fiscal year 1949. These figures are summarized in the attached table II.

The figures shown under Federal grants are roughly comparable to the figures shown on the first page on attached table I except that some of the smaller programs are not included in the budget compilation. The expenditures for direct public works is a new compilation. You will note that expenditures for flood control appear under the caption of "Natural resources."

The Bureau of the Budget also made available a table showing estimated expenditures from major Federal trust accounts, by States, for the fiscal year 1949. These expenditures are not inclued in regular budget expenditures or in the budget deficit. If you are interested in these figures, we shall be glad to prepare a table for you.

Yours sincerely,

COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff.

TABLE I.—*Expenditures made by the Government as direct payments to New York State and all States under cooperative arrangements and expenditures within New York and all States which provided relief and other aid, fiscal year 1949*

[In thousands of dollars]

	New York	Total, all States
A. GRANTS TO STATES AND LOCAL UNITS		
1. Department of Agriculture:		
(a) Agricultural experiment stations, regular grants	200	7,355
(b) Research and Marketing Act of 1946, regular grants	123	3,135
(c) Cooperative agricultural extension work, regular grants	751	29,961
(d) National school-lunch program, regular grants	4,181	73,502
(e) National forests fund, shared revenues	-------	6,040
(f) Sub-marginal land program, payment to counties, shared revenues	1	249
(g) Forest fire cooperation, etc	244	[1] 9,276
(h) Supply and distribution of farm labor, emergency grants	−4	−45
(i) Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities	2,684	35,552
2. Department of Commerce:		
(a) Civil Aeronautics Administration, Federal airport program, regular grants	3,882	30,391
3. Department of the Interior:		
(a) Federal aid, wildlife restoration, Fish and Wildlife Service, regular grants	255	4,988
(b) Payments from receipts under Mineral Leasing Act, shared revenues	-------	9,535
(c) Payments from receipts under Migration Bird Conservation Act and Alaska game law, shared revenues	1	155
(d) Payments under certain special funds, shared revenues	-------	3,075
4. Department of the Army:		
(a) Lease of flood-control lands, shared revenues	4	237
5. Federal Security Agency:		
(a) American Printing House for the Blind, regular grants	10	125
(b) Office of Education:		
(1) Colleges for agriculture and mechanic arts, regular grants	224	5,030
(2) Cooperative vocational education, regular grants	1,851	26,146
(c) Public Health Service:		
(1) Venereal disease control, regular grants	496	13,138
(2) Tuberculosis control, regular grants	416	6,786
(3) General health assistance, regular grants	793	11,213
(4) Mental health activities, regular grants	260	2,924
(5) Hospital survey and planning, regular grants	113	10,762
(d) Social Security Administration:		
(1) Maternal and child-health services, regular grants	511	11,240
(2) Services for crippled children, regular grants	182	8,162
(3) Child welfare services, regular grants	77	3,669
(4) Emergency maternity and infant care, emergency grants	19	60
(5) Old-age assistance, regular grants	36,976	718,012
(6) Aid to dependent children, regular grants	19,578	189,415
(7) Aid to the blind, regular grants	1,347	20,470
(8) Unemployment compensation and Employment Service administration, regular grants	18,625	140,314
(e) Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, regular grants	1,217	18,765
6. Federal Works Agency:		
(a) Bureau of Community Facilities:		
(1) Public works advance planning, emergency grants	421	6,451
(2) Veterans' educational facilities, emergency grants	340	2,076
(3) Community facilities, emergency grants	-------	1,534
(4) Maintenance and operation of schools, emergency grants	9	5,494
(b) Public Roads Administration: Highway construction:		
(1) Regular grants	16,240	[2] 397,744
(2) Emergency grants	230	12,653
(c) Liquidation of Public Works Administration, emergency grants	-------	5,739
7. Housing and Home Finance Agency, Public Housing Administration:		
(a) Federal annual contributions, regular grants	935	3,288
(b) Veterans' reuse housing program, emergency grants	356	−8,558
8. Federal Power Commission:		
(a) Payments to States under Federal Power Act—shared revenues	-------	23
9. U. S. Maritime Commission:		
(a) State marine schools, regular grants	42	155
10. Veterans' Administration:		
(a) State and Territorial homes for disabled soldiers and sailors—regular grants	6	2,907
(b) Supervision of on-the-job training—regular grants	-------	4,771
(c) Administration of unemployment and self-employment allowances—regular grants	2,624	20,824
Total grant payments	116,217	1,854,790
B. FEDERAL AID PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUALS, ETC., WITHIN THE STATES OTHER THAN GRANTS AND LOANS		
1. Department of Agriculture:		
(a) Agricultural conservation program	4,711	202,163
2. Department of the Army:		
(a) Reimbursement for education of dependents of construction personnel; river and harbor and flood control	-------	501
(b) National Guard	9,316	115,149
3. Federal Security Agency:		
(a) Reconversion unemployment benefits for seamen	694	1,900
(b) Public Health Service, cancer control	215	2,361
4. Federal Works Agency:		
(a) Forest highways	-------	10,779
(b) Public Buildings Administration	-------	102
(c) Bureau of Community Facilities:		
(1) Disaster and emergency relief	5	2,480
5. Veterans' Administration:		
(a) Automobiles, etc., for disabled veterans	655	6,620
(b) Readjustment benefits and vocational rehabilitation	285,509	3,296,863
Total payments within States	301,105	3,638,921
Grand total	417,323	5,493,711

[1] Includes $13,613 for flood control.
[2] Includes $64,268 for flood control.

Source: Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1949, table 98.

TABLE II.—*Federal grants to States and local governments, and expenditures for direct Federal public works, fiscal year 1949*

[In thousands of dollars]

	New York	All States
I. Data from compilation by Bureau of the Budget:		
(1) Federal grants to States and local governments:		
Veterans' services and benefits	2,970	29,488
Social welfare, health, and security	66,361	1,090,422
Housing and community development	1,144	9,431
Education and general research	2,084	36,669
Labor	18,165	138,137
Agriculture and agricultural resources	3,758	76,011
Natural resources not primarily agricultural	455	14,701
Transportation and communication	20,353	440,792
Total	115,290	1,835,651
(2) Expenditures for direct public works: [1]		
Civil public works:		
Veterans' services and benefits	41,490	141,672
Social welfare, health, and security	----------	6,427
Housing and community development	----------	1,040
Education and general research	----------	445
Agriculture and agricultural resources	----------	275
Natural resources:		
Corps of Engineers, flood control	14,744	374,049
Tennessee Valley Authority	----------	47,132
Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, and Bonneville and Southwestern power systems	----------	236,358
All other	35,280	347,711
Transportation and communication:		
Corps of Engineers, river and harbor work	2,542	74,153
All other	52	75,201
General government	127	3,386
National defense public works	4,608	176,678
Total	98,843	1,484,527
Total Federal grants and expenditures for direct public works	214,133	3,320,178
II. Expenditures shown in table I as aid payments to individuals, etc. other than grants and loans [2]	300,890	3,636,560
Total, all budget expenditures which are distributed by States	515,023	6,956,738

[1] Expenditures for a particular State include amounts spent for materials and equipment purchased in other States. Thus, the table shows expenditures on projects in the State, rather than actual disbursements in the State.
[2] Adjusted to exclude expenditures for cancer control which the Bureau of the Budget includes under Federal grants.

Address by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, at Meeting of Pennsylvania State Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me at the meeting of the Pennsylvania State Committee at the Penn Harris Hotel, Harrisburg, Pa., on June 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I'm delighted to be here tonight, discussing campaign plans and campaign issues with the board of directors of the Democratic Party of Pennsylvania.

As a Democrat, I'm always glad to be here for these annual meetings. But as a candidate for reelection to the Senate on the Democratic ticket I'm doubly delighted to be here today, and I'll tell you why:

The enthusiasm I see here is good campaign insurance. It indicates pretty clearly that we're going to win.

You men and women who constitute the State committee are pretty good barometers of popular sentiment. I've noticed that, operating at the grass-roots level of politics, you know when people are sore, when they're steamed up, and why. And when you're enthusiastic about our prospects, that's good news.

It shows you know something, something good.

Some of the sorriest affairs I've ever attended have been State committee meetings in years when it turned out later we hadn't had a chance. The speakers would get up and exhort and maybe bluster a little, and predict victory till they were blue in the face.

But you people were just blue. You knew. Or you sensed.

Down in Washington we never feel absolutely sure we know just what people are thinking, what's bothering them, what's eating them, or whether anything is. The crank letters come in—we all get some—and some of the more timid Democrats go all to pieces, worrying about the trend that they think these things reflect; while a lot of the Republicans—manic-depressives that some of them are politically—get all excited and decide that the trend is suddenly all for them again, and so let's kill the Marshall plan and repeal the 75-cent minimum wage.

Well, these trends are always being talked about down there—they made Dewey President for about 4 months back in 1948—and are often taken seriously one way or the other, making, as I said, manic-depressives out of a lot of politicians, when actually few of them have any reliable idea at all about what the public is thinking. Perhaps, as a result, there are more licensed, practicing fortune tellers in Washington, D. C., than anywhere else in the country.

You men and women, the county chairmen and county officers and workers and the State committee, don't need fortune tellers or ouija boards or even the Gallup poll. You always seem to know what the people are thinking—because you talk to them and find out. I always find your reports reliable and your advice helpful on public issues, and today I find your enthusiasm doggoned gratifying.

Well, I'm enthusiastic, too. I'm enthusiastic about our party's program and our party's candidates—all of them—Richardson Dilworth for Governor, Judge Musmano for Lieutenant Governor, Rev. Frank Ruth for secretary of internal affairs, Judge Michael Egan for supreme court, and Judge Roy Carson for superior judge.

And I might add, if I didn't think my record would stand up to a campaign microscope without uncovering a lot of germs for everyone to see, then you could be sure I wouldn't be a candidate. The salary they pay a Senator isn't worth risking a ruined reputation or disgrace for one's family. I'm proud of my reputation, and I love my family, so when running for reelection, I'm running on a record which I believe needs no apologies.

And one that I believe you don't have to apologize for either.

Although there are few subjects more interesting to a candidate than his own candidacy, there are some other things to discuss here today—more important things.

First, however, I want to express my deep appreciation for the wholehearted way in which Democrats throughout the State accepted my bid for renomination. To be nominated without opposition is a high compliment. The solid support which you men and women, the county chairman, and you of the State committee, and the workers in the ranks, gave me from the start was most encouraging. You have my deepest gratitude for your confidence and your friendship.

In coming here tonight as your nominee for reelection to the Senate of the United States, I cannot help thinking back to the last time I was here as a candidate—in 1944—and of the campaign of that year.

Of all the campaigns I have participated in—and I have been actively engaged in all of them in Philadelphia and in the State and Nation for a good many years now—I remember that one most vividly. The personal factor would enter into that, of course, but, as you know, I was elected to Congress three times before I ran for the Senate, and being a candidate was not new to me in 1944.

One of the things I remember vividly about 1944 was the pattern of that campaign.

We were deep in the war; the troops were on the European mainland but far from victory; the big offensive against the Japanese was still very far off. That was the set-up which dominated everyone's thinking in those days.

Both the Democratic and Republican Parties were campaigning, of course, on win-the-war platforms.

The Democrats went a lot further than that, though. We were talking about plans for winning the peace after the war, for establishing real and effective international cooperation against totalitarian aggression, for getting the GI's back home to good jobs, good education, decent housing, and an expanding, prosperous, full-employment, full-production, free economy. These were the problems, as well as the war issues, which made up the Democratic campaign issues.

And what were the Republicans talking about?

Pearl Harbor.

The Pearl Harbor issue was low and dirty and false. As they told it, Franklin Roosevelt had conspired to get Japan to attack Pearl Harbor. He had further made sure that the Japanese would cause maximum death and destruction there. He had caused

Pearl Harbor. That was the cock-robin campaign of 1944.

Not very many people will remember that today, because it all sounds so completely irresponsible as to be incredible. I remember it, though. I remember it because in my first campaign for the Senate it was an "issue" being used against me and against our party. Another one, you remember was the little dog Fala.

Now why do I mention all this today? What bearing does it have on this election? I'll tell you why.

There's a whole lot more to a political campaign than the candidates, important as they are—and, of course, as a candidate, I surely consider them important. Issues are important, terribly important, and parties are important. Party responsibility is important—more important than most citizens seem to believe. Party unity and party attitude are as important as the candidates, because no candidate for Governor or Lieutenant Governor, for the appellate courts, for the Senate or the House, or for any other major office can achieve much by himself, on his own. With all the faults of a party system—and there are many—it is the only effective system we have had in America during practically our entire history as a republic for achieving political progress. Well-intentioned men with farsighted programs could achieve nothing if they did not have effective political parties organized to promote their programs and push them through, and then to see that they function efficiently.

So it is not enough to know what a candidate is for; you must also know what his party is for—not just in generalities or platitudes, but in fact, on the record, and in the hearts of the leading representatives of that party.

Since 1932—some say long before that—the Republican Party, as a party in the United States, has had no program and no policy, except the program and policy of opposition. I am not now speaking of all individual Republican officeholders or of most Republican voters. I am speaking of the majority of their representatives in the Congress, and that's where party policy is really made. That's where records that are meaningful are built.

Dewey, both in 1944 and 1948, and Willkie in 1940—let's leave poor old Landon out of this—went over the country promising progressive Republican programs. The Republicans in the United States Congress, however, as a party group, made mockeries of those promises by their voting records.

The seniority system in Congress had enthroned the most reactionary Republicans—from the most rock-ribbed Republican districts of the country—as the Republican leadership of the Congress. The leadership held the reins and planned the policy, and the policy was always made from the same dead tissue as their own political thinking.

They were the "agins," and their policy has always been the policy of pure opposition.

I am concerned at what I see—concerned as an American, not merely as a Democrat.

I am concerned because incumbent Republican irresponsibles in Congress are being renominated throughout the country. As long as they continue to go back to Congress, term after term, to wield the leadership reins, to call the shots, to dictate party policy, and to blackmail their more progressive Republican colleagues into following that policy as a matter of party loyalty—blackmail them with purge threats of well-financed opposition—there is little hope for real cooperation and real unity among Republicans and Democrats in Congress on grave national and international issues.

The Eightieth Congress showed that. The irresponsibles were in command. The Vandenbergs were a sorry minority of their own party on international issues. And the Morses were voices in the wilderness, protesting, complaining, sometimes opposing on votes, but powerless to sway the party leadership or swing the result.

I was there and I saw it happen. Take the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act as just one example. Many Republicans in Congress believe in that program. The party leadership does not. When the act expired in 1948, the leadership decided to extend it—not for the customary 3 years but for 1 year * * * until the 1948 election was safely over * * * and then let it die. The 1-year extension act of 1948 was a mercy-death bill, designed to cripple the program so dreadfully that when it died a year later its demise would be considered merciful. That was the intention. A lot of Republicans in Congress were privately very distressed about this and hoped that Dewey, if elected, would be powerful enough in the Congress to resurrect the dying program.

I said they were privately distressed. I know that because they told me so when I was helping in the Democratic attempt to save the program from destruction.

Yet when Vice President BARKLEY, who was the minority leader, offered the amendment in the Senate in 1948 to continue the act without change for 3 years, just one solitary Republican Senator voted with us.

The Republicans had been told: This is party policy. You must follow. And follow they did. It was an order they dared not defy.

The result, as you know, was that the crippled, 1-year act never worked: Not a single agreement was ever made under it. When the Eighty-first Congress convened, we repealed the Republican act and reinstituted the old program. The Democrats had the votes to pass it, and pass it we did, so the so-called progressive Republicans were allowed to vote with us without fear of blackmail from their party leaders. The "must" orders go out only when they will insure a leadership policy's success. And at that time definance is unpardonable.

I could name similar instances—the 75-cent minimum wage bill, which never even got out of committee in the Eightieth Congress, but which is now law in the Eighty-first with some Republicans allowed to vote for it; the public housing bill killed in the Eightieth, now law in the Eighty-first; the appropriations for the Marshall plan; the DP Act from which we finally removed the bigotry of the Eightieth Congress.

Incidentally, go through our 1948 platform some day, and you'll be amazed at the extent of our success in making good on it so far; then go through the 1948 Republican platform and compare it with the record votes of the Republican Members of Congress.

And you'll really be amazed at that.

This all brings me back to the 1944 campaign when the Republican Party was campaigning against the Pearl Harbor attack and the little dog, Fala, while we were trying to look ahead to a decent world in which our GI's could find a future in keeping with the sacrifices they had made to protect our Nation and our freedom. The GOP leadership was too busy looking backward to look ahead.

In 1940, when Roosevelt was trying to alert the Nation to danger, Republican leaders and campaigners were yearning for isolationism, because that had been a safe course a century before.

In 1936, when our party was seeking to bring us out of the chaos of depression looking forward to the social gains which dramatically changed all America and made it stronger and better and healthier and our economy secure, the GOP was attacking WPA.

Now don't misunderstand, an opposition party in the United States is vital to our democracy. We need a critical opposition party. It keeps the majority on its toes, by watching for, and dramatizing, mistakes, and fraud, wherever it can find them. But it should also have an affirmative program of its own and the Republican Party does not.

I submit that in this modern-day complex world, with our multitude of complex economic and social and political problems, an opposition which can only criticize, which yearns for yesterday and yestercentury, presents a hopeless outlook, a completely depressing picture of tomorrow, and is altogether out of keeping with the dynamic, informed, alert, and ever-hopeful character of the American people.

We as a people have the problems of the whole world in our lap, not just our own domestic problems which are sometimes vexing enough. We must service and improve the free-enterprise machinery for maintaining America's economy, one able to continue shouldering for sometime some of the massive demands of the rest of the free world for help in defending freedom as a way of life against the Red inheritors of the Hitler mantle of aggression and of conquest. We must keep our free enterprise economic machinery from breakdown and collapse, as a major force for defense of our freedom, and also because the American people are entitled to, and must continue to, share the benefits of our mass-production genius.

Right now, our labor force is expanding, while technology spurts dramatically ahead in replacing men with machines. One possible solution has always been to try to restrict technology.

A far better solution is to widen producing facilities and thus provide more and more job opportunities. But they must be at good wages, sufficient to keep the American worker as the best customer of the goods and services he produces. That's our program.

These things are easy enough to talk about but terribly complex to achieve. They aren't made to happen by the waving of a wand or the recitation of some mysterious slogan such as our Republican friends are accustomed to create for campaign purposes.

The problems, I repeat, are complex, and their solution mighty tough. No individual public official by himself can work the miracle of solution. Party imagination joined with party responsibility and unity can help to work these miracles of political and economic progress. A political party can promise these things freely, but its performance is the only reliable guide the voter can follow in judging the future competence and sincerity.

Now we in the Democratic Party are always inclined, in these political campaigns, to talk about the depression of 1929 and what the Democratic administration did about ending it. The implication to the voter is: You should be grateful for that, and vote for us.

But a whole generation has grown to voting age since the depression was cured. To them, you are talking ancient history. And their elders are no longer impressed, either.

We frequently remind the farmer how bad his situation was—and it was horrible, all right—under Republican administrations * * * even during the boom of the twenties—and how good it has been in more recent years. And our implication there, too, is: Be grateful and vote for us.

Well, this appeal is getting to be kind of shop-worn, this plea for votes out of gratitude. These people are Americans. They helped to bring about these changes with their votes and their support. They are worried about the problems of 1950, not those of 1930. No amount of gratitude for what a party did in 1935 or 1940 or 1945 should or could compensate for lack of vision in 1950, lack of imagination, lack of competence, lack of sincerity. Don't misunderstand me.

We are proud of these accomplishments and they are eloquent proof of our ability, as a party, to lead our country forward to greater prosperity for all our people, to greater security—to a way of life that is truly American and really free.

Let's not make the mistake the Republicans have been making these many generations. They still seek the Negro vote today as their due for the fact that a Republican President named Lincoln, nearly 90 years ago, wrote the Emancipation Proclamation and set their forefathers free from slavery.

If the Republicans in the United States Senate had joined with us in devising an effective cloture process for shutting off filibusters on civil-rights legislation last year, their party today might really have some appeal to Negroes. But they didn't, and it doesn't.

Just as Lincoln can no longer win votes for the Republicans of 1950, Roosevelt can't win them for the Democrats.

What we did under Roosevelt is significant today only insofar as we still believe in those same things under Truman—and we do. Our record shows we do, and as long as it does, we can talk about the ancient history of the Roosevelt years, but only as a guide to future action, which is a much better policy than pleading for gratitude for past favors.

The administration has stood for certain definite things in the Eighty-first Congress—and we Democrats have enacted into law, or are about to enact into law, much of that program—both on the home front and in the field of foreign relations.

The Republican record has been made on these programs by the votes of their representatives in Congress during the last 18 months. It will be my purpose to expose that record to the bright sunlight of publicity during this campaign—and it will be my purpose to read the record of Republican inaction, reaction, and isolationism at every crossroad and in every hamlet and town and city I can possibly visit.

And I shall expect the Republican candidates in Pennsylvania to state frankly and sincerely where they would have stood and where they will stand on these specific issues.

We Democrats will not be satisfied, nor will the voters be satisfied, with Republican slogans, generalities, and platitudes.

Let me give you a couple of recent illustrations of votes in the Senate—votes which no amount of platitudes, generalities, or what have you, can explain away.

In our all-important efforts to stop world communism and promote peace, here is a sample—the final Senate vote on the Marshall plan several weeks ago. There were 7 Republican votes for the bill—and 23 votes against it. The Democrats on the other hand, had 40 votes for the bill and only 4 opposed to it. There it is: the Republicans voted more than 3 to 1 against the Marshall plan bill—and the Democrats voted for it 10 to 1.

Just yesterday, the Senate voted to extend rent controls. Now all of you know how much rent control means to so many families in Pennsylvania—and all of you know, too, that there has been not one single piece of stand-by State legislation enacted in Pennsylvania to extend rent controls in the event the Federal rent-control law expired. Other States have recognized that Congress might not have continued rent controls this year—but not Pennsylvania.

Well, the Pennsylvania families can thank the Democrats for continuing rent control in the Senate—and here's why: Six Republicans voted for continuation of rent control on a local option basis, and 23 opposed it. Thirty Democrats voted for the local option bill, and only five opposed it. So there you are again: the Republicans opposed rent-control extension almost 4 to 1 in the Senate—and the Democrats backed the bill 6 to 1.

It's on such issues as these that I want the Republican candidates in Pennsylvania to get down to brass tacks, and make their positions clear.

The voters of Pennsylvania don't want platitudes—and believe me, they won't get them from the Democratic candidates. Our Pennsylvania Democratic slate this year is a slate of honorable people—people who know where they stand—people who want the voters to know where they stand, chapter and verse.

So, with a detailed program to take to the voters of Pennsylvania, and with a crackerjack ticket of Democratic candidates, we've got all the essential ingredients for success in November—save one: hard work.

And you know—and I know—that the hard work will be taken care of between now and election time. You'll do it. I'll do it. All the candidates will do it—and the Democratic organization you represent, and are a part of, will do it.

There it is. With the candidates, with the program, and with the hard work, we'll be successful in selling the product we have to sell—and the voters of Pennsylvania—who know a good product when they see it—will vote us to victory in November.

Ocean View Lodge, No. 903, Improved Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the World, Holds Significant Oratorical Contest on the Subject of the United States Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 4, 1950, in the auditorium of Polytechnic High School, in my home city of Long Beach, Calif., I had the pleasure of hearing two significant and inspiring orations by two young ladies who are in attendance at the public schools there.

Following my brief remarks will appear the text of these orations, both of which were delivered with utmost dignity, interpretation, and forceful emphasis. The large audience was not only receptive, it was truly inspired to have the privilege of hearing these contestants. The occasion was the annual oratorical contest on the Constitution of the United States sponsored and supervised by Ocean View Lodge, No. 903, of the Improved Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the World, the grand exalted ruler of which is J. Finley Wilson, of Washington, D. C., and the grand esquire of which is A. E. Bradley, of Long Beach, Calif.

It was Mr. Bradley who invited me to be guest on this happy occasion, which included the privilege of presenting the award to the winner. I was there informed that this local contest on June 4 was the preliminary for the State-wide contest under the same splendid auspices. And so Mary Catherine Just, of Long Beach, Calif., will shortly have the honor and responsibility of participating in a State-wide contest in which will participate young ladies and young men residents of California who have been similarly selected from appropriate geographical areas in order to compete for the State-wide honors. I was further there informed that a condition of being qualified to win the award and the privilege of representing a local community in this important oratorical contest is that the participant must not have yet graduated from the high school grades.

The two orations follow:

THE CONSTITUTION—OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE

(By Mary Catherine Just)

In September 1787 the Constitution of the United States was laid upon the table for the signatures of the men who had labored for many months to bring it into being. It was a dramatic moment. For some minutes nothing was said; then Benjamin Franklin, holding a paper in his hand, arose as if preparing to speak. But the words would not come. He was an old man, about to close the last national service of his life, and his voice and body were far too weak for him to speak. He handed the paper to another man, who read it. The message was an appeal from the old statesman, asking that the members of the Constitutional Convention sign the document which they had produced.

George Washington was the first to sign. The others followed. This great covenant, however, is not an idol to be worshiped, but a constitutional document in which our personal liberties are protected. This decreed that every individual must have certain inalienable rights. To secure these each must respect the rights of others. No restrictions are to be placed upon any people because of race, color, religion, or social position to which he is born. Americans drawn from all races of mankind provide the challenge to our democracy.

The theme of this Constitution, our heritage, stresses the importance of the individual. Our forefathers believed that every person has an essential dignity and integrity that must be respected and safeguarded. They believed, as we do today, that the final goal of group life is the welfare of the individual. We must build social institutions that will guarantee equality of opportunity to all, for without this equality freedom becomes an illusion.

Freedom, to me, has come to mean the privilege that a man possesses in managing his own affairs. In America there is no essential conflict between freedom and government, for the Declaration of Independence states that 'Man is endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights. Among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. To secure these rights, governments are instituted among men."

The Constitution gives us four basic rights that to me are very essential. Our right to safety and security is assured. Freedom can exist only where the citizen is safe from bondage and lawless violence. Freedom from slavery in all its forms is necessary if all men are to have equal opportunity to use their talents and to lead worth-while lives.

Consider for a moment what the right to citizenship and its privileges means to us in this country. To deny qualified citizens the right to vote while others exercise it is to violate the very principle of freedom and equality. For an individual to attain his rights, he must enjoy full citizenship and have an equal voice in his Government.

In addition we are granted the right to freedom of conscience and expression. In a free society there is faith in the ability of the people to make their own decisions. The

achievements of each person are limited only by the skills and efforts used in opportunities given to all. Our forefathers fought bloody wars and suffered torture and death for the right to worship God according to their own conscience. It is the Constitution that has given us this unquestioned personal freedom.

The most important of all, however, is the right to equality of opportunity. The privilege given individuals to obtain useful employment and to achieve success must be provided with disregard of race, color, creed, and national origin. Without equality of opportunity the individual is deprived of the chance to share the profits of success. Here in America men are equal but free to be different. It is from varied differences that comes the great human and national strength of America.

Our Constitution gives us prestige among nations of the world and a strong feeling of national pride. Pride, however, is no substitute for performance. Our record shows that at various times since our Constitution was written the gulf between ideals and practice has been wide. We have had human slavery. We have had religious persecution. We have had mob rule. Even yet, pride and prejudice still exist against some people.

This great document, the Constitution of this United States, has lasted for more than a century. It has been a stormy century, littered with the wrecks of governments and nations, dynasties and constitutions; yet it remains practically unchanged. The future of the Constitution rests upon the American people, their character, their vision and their high ideals and principles. Our world is fast changing. In that one word lies the key to our future. The amendatory provision of our Constitution is an unbarred door which may be opened at any time, but he who tries to destroy our Constitution finds the American people to reckon with.

We have everything for which to fight—America, our beloved country, founded for freedom and grown great for freedom. Our people are the most fortunate on earth, not because we are wealthy but because we are free. We have within ourselves the tools with which to maintain that freedom and to create the kind of life we Americans should have, and we can do what we will because we are Americans.

THE CONSTITUTION AND CITIZENSHIP

(By Doris Louise Walker)

More than 60 years ago Edward Bellamy wrote these words in his book, Equality. "It is the democratic idea that all human beings are peers in rights and dignity and that the sole just excuse and end of human government is, therefore, the maintenance and furtherance of the common welfare on equal terms."[1]

He was prompted to utter them by his vision of the fulfillment of the principles laid down for the peoples of this Nation by those seers of the past who framed our Constitution. No other government instituted by man has ever given such assurances to its peoples as that which is contained in our Constitution. There will never be any other government that can make a more profound declaration. All the essentials for a contented people enjoying to the fullest extent equality, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are contained in the Constitution not as mere postulates, but as attainable goals.

From time to time we the people have added amendmends to undergird and preserve these principles and we further implement our belief when we pledge allegiance to the flag and repeat, "one nation indivisible with liberty and justice for all."

Yet in our daily walks of life we have inequalities, divisions, and discriminatory practices that obstruct and negate the very essence of those vows we make. When we salute the American flag we do not differentiate between the red, white, and blue nor do we salute an individual star that represents the State in which we live. The stars and stripes, the red, the white, and the blue, are component parts of an emblem of beauty which represents "one nation indivisible."[1]

There are still serious trends along social and racial lines; we classify Americans into majority and minority groups, with limitations as to their enjoyment of equal rights. I first speak of myself as an American citizen before I say I am a member of a minority group. The things I say about myself are meant to apply to all groups whether they be classified as majority or minority. Let us again take the American flag as a symbol of the component races that make up our citizenry. The composite structure of our democracy includes minority groups of almost every race and nationality. If each integral part of this structure is given full constitutional protection, unhampered by race hatred, segregation, and discrimination, then we could show the world that Democracy does work. When a thing becomes an integral part of a whole, it ceases to be an individual thing and is made part of the whole. It may retain its individual characteristics just as the lumber, the hardware, the plaster or the paint on a house, but they all combine to make one house.

So it is then with the individuals who make up our Nation, they are all Americans be they Mexicans, Negroes, Jews, Chinese or any other group. Each group brings its contributions to make up our one great "nation indivisible."[1]

Now this brings us to the question, "What are the rights of the minorities?"[1] The simplest answer to this question is for each individual to enumerate the rights that he or she desires as a citizen. If one were to write them down they would include life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness on absolute equality with other Americans. I am sure this list would include the right to work at any job for which you feel you are qualified; the right to live wherever you want to; to raise your family in an environment that is conducive to good Americanism, close to good schools, churches, recreation; the right to pay taxes and to take part equally in the benefits accruing from taxation. One would include the right to serve his country in times of peace and when our national security is threatened, to bear arms either as a leader or in the ranks; to take to the air at the head of the squadron or fly over enemy territory as one of the formation. Of such is the right to mingle your lifeblood with those who die to preserve the great principles of our democracy. As you have heard these rights you have heard the answer to "What are the rights of the minorities?" These are the things for which the minorities are striving. Let me again quote from Bellamy's Equality: "Are the aspirations after liberty, equality, and happiness implanted in the very core of our hearts for nothing?"[1]

The classification of American citizens into racial and minority groups would imply inferiority of these groups, notwithstanding that they have the same aspirations for liberty and equality as the majority. You cannot make a man feel inferior when he knows within his heart and soul that he is not inferior. You may convince him that he is an unfortunate person by circumstances but, not that he is an inferior being. No provisions are made in our Constitution for second-class citizenship and the minorities, whether they are Negroes, Jews, Mexicans, Japanese, or Chinese, will accept nothing short of first-class citizenship.

"Race prejudice is not only idiotic but it is too costly an indulgence for this land of ours. Sooner or later America must uproot that hideous tree that bears such bitter fruit; world opinions demand it and the unerring law of biology over which we have no control points toward its advent. The time has come when equality of opportunity must also mean opportunity for equality."[1]

Mr. Speaker, when I was called upon to present the award and make a few remarks, I considered it a privilege to be present and to vigorously compliment and congratulate the Ocean View Lodge No. 903, Improved Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the World, upon their appropriate and timely emphasis on the subject of the United States Constitution.

[1] Man of Color, J. Alexander Summerville, D. D. S. (Negro civic leader).

No. 29 in Biweekly Series Broadcast by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, to People of Pennsylvania

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the transcription by me over Pennsylvania radio stations on June 25, 1950, which is No. 29 in the biweekly series of such addresses delivered by me.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One of the earliest—and toughest—lessons a Senator learns is that the Congressional issues will be few and far between when his vote on any particular bit of legislation will not seem unjust to many decent, deserving people.

And the recent legislation extending Federal rent controls for another year when the present law expires June 30 is most certainly no exception.

I have heard from close, loyal friends bitterly protesting any further rent control action by Congress. I have received letters from individual landlords who have set forth figures which certainly seem to indicate the present controls are indeed working a real hardship on them. And my office has been virtually flooded with anti-rent control material from various real estate groups.

Despite this bombardment, however, and despite the fact that I had hoped last year's rent bill would finish the job, I strongly supported the rent control extension bill. I consider that its passage was a "must," unless we wanted to run the risk of further inflationary trends which could have seriously disrupted the country's economy.

I do not intend to defend every action of the Office of Housing Expediter. I do not intend to deny that there exists instances of some unfairness in treatment of individual

landlords. I do not claim that the present set-up, with some units under controls and other units decontrolled, has not caused some confusion, though I would like to say, on this point, that if Congress had not been in such a hurry to remove controls on certain types of construction, this last problem would not exist.

But by and large, we are now getting an administration of rent controls which gives the landlord a fair return on his investment without permitting him to capitalize on the helpless position in which most tenants find themselves. And the present decontrolling machinery does in fact permit the gradual lifting of all rental ceilings where the need for controls no longer exists while at the same time maintaining some brake on sudden, unjustified jumps in rent.

We all heard, during the recent debates in Congress, a great deal of talk about the great unfairness of the rent control law. Some, opposing controls, attempted to create the impression that a tight law—a law like the one in effect during the war years—still exists today.

But this simply is not true. Today—and under the new bill—new construction is not under controls. Today converted structures are not under controls. And today many situations represent valid grounds for obtaining rent increases from the Housing Expediter.

Here are a few examples. If a tenant rents out part of a dwelling, his landlord can get an increase for additional expenses and extra wear and tear on his property. If a landlord's coal bill, or oil, or gas bill goes up, he can get an increase in rent to make up for his higher operating costs—whether the higher costs are due to fuel, or taxes, or utilities, or even repairs.

And what about the landlord who wants to make some improvements in the kitchen? Does he get any break? He most certainly does. He's entitled to an increase amounting to the rental value of any major improvements, plus an extra allowance for increased costs. And furthermore, before he starts, he can find out exactly how much of an increase he will get.

Don't think for a minute, either, that the landlords have not taken advantage of these liberal provisions for rental increases—though I am not saying this in any critical sense—they certainly are justified in getting the maximum possible return under the law.

Altogether increases in the past year were granted for almost a half-million units. The Housing Expediter—by his action in approving 76 percent of requests for increases, with the increases averaging 17.8 percent—certainly gave clear proof that he was not adopting any strictly anti-landlord policy.

The important thing to emphasize, in any discussion of the need for rent controls, is that the housing shortage in most sectors of the country is still critical. With a few major exceptions, there are very few localities in this country where a tenant—particularly a tenant paying less than $50 to $60 a month—can find a vacancy if he's forced to move.

Our country has seen a tremendous housing boom since the end of the war. All over we see complete new communities—homes, places of business, schools, everything. And the low-rent Public Housing Act passed by Congress last year will go at least part of the way in relieving the housing problems of many cities. Thirty-five Pennsylvania communities have, under this Housing Act, been allocated nearly 25,000 low-rent units.

But the fact remains that despite all the private construction, and despite the efforts now being made under public housing acts, the housing shortage is still acute and is most certainly not just a propaganda scheme dreamed up by rent-control advocates. Those depression years of the thirties, when there was little building; and those war years of the forties, when there was even less; and the tremendous increase in the number of family units in this country due to wartime marriages—all these factors, and others, have created such a terrific backlog in the Nation's housing supply that the shortage simply cannot be licked in a few busy years. Experts estimate that the increase in the number of nonfarm households during the 1940's exceeded the number of new dwelling units started by one and one-half million.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics did an extremely valuable study a few months ago on over-all vacancy rates and habitable vacancy rates in many of the most important cities in the United States. The study revealed that the average habitable vacancy rate in these cities was less than 1 percent. Pittsburgh, for example, had an 0.4 percent vacancy rate; Chicago, the same vacancy rate; Jacksonville, 0.7 percent; Minneapolis, 0.1 percent.

Though it is generally assumed that rent control is needed only in the larger cities, the fact is that rent-control boards in over 500 communities under 25,000 population recently advised the Housing Expediter that housing shortages still existed in their communities and urge him not to decontrol their areas. More than 90 percent of the communities where boards wanted controls to continue had less than 10,000 population and nearly 80 percent had less than 5,000 population. And 154 of the communities urging that controls be continued had a population of 500 or less.

Most of those who opposed any further extension of rent controls point to the high increases in prices of commodities the landlord must purchase. And they argue that landlords receive only 10 to 15 percent more in rents from tenants than they received before the war. But there is little validity in the claim that landlords alone are the only ones who aren't allowed to charge, under our system of free enterprise, whatever the traffic will bear. For an essential of free enterprise is free bargaining and free bargaining can exist only when each party has a real choice of accepting or rejecting the other's proposal. Tenants have no such choice in today's tight rental market.

Furthermore, the fact of the matter is that a slight increase in rent can result in a very large increase in net return to the landlord. Landlords in rent-controlled areas have practically no vacancies and the services provided have been greatly reduced or are no longer available.

Now, some explanation of the provisions of the new rent-control bill. As you probably know, the act now in effect gives a great deal of power to both State and local authorities to determine just what controls—if any—the State should have. Four different methods are provided for decontrol, three of them based on local determination. First, the governing body of any incorporated city, town or village can remove rent control if it finds that the housing shortage has eased to the extent that control is no longer necessary and transmits a resolution requesting decontrol—after approval of the State Governor—to the Housing Expediter. Second, any State can terminate rent control throughout the State—or any part of it—if controls are no longer necessary. In the third place, any local rent advisory board can secure the removal of rent control upon the submission of its recommendation and substantiating evidence that the demand for rental housing has been reasonably met. And finally, the Housing Expediter is directed to decontrol any area where the demand for housing appears to have been met.

Fearing that Congress would be reluctant to pass another rent-control bill this year, some State governments went into action and passed their own rent-control laws, or at least, stand-by legislation for if and when the Federal Government withdrew from the picture. For the States to take over at this point represented a difficult, expensive proposition since they had neither the trained personnel, nor the organizational set-up needed to administer an effective rent-control law.

But at least these State governments recognized that the critical conditions made some action—some protective measures—imperative. Unfortunately, Pennsylvania's legislature—despite the fact that the State has many areas of concentrated population and despite the fact that practically no communities in the State had felt conditions had eased enough to exercise their local option right to decontrol—despite these facts—Pennsylvania's legislature did not bother to exert itself even to the extent of passing some stand-by legislation.

This year's act further extended that local option provision. The bill provides that Federal rent control shall continue after December 31, 1950, only where there has been affirmative action by local governing bodies on or before that date. Specifically, Federal rent control will cease on that date except in any incorporated city, town, or village which has made a prior declaration that a shortage of rental housing accommodations exists which requires the continuation of rent control. This declaration can, under the law, be made either by resolution of the governing body adopted for that purpose or by a popular referendum in accordance with local law. And in cases where this declaration has been made, rent control can be continued until June 30, 1951.

I am not too happy with this provision requiring that local communities take affirmative action if they want controls to continue after the end of the year. Such a provision places an extremely difficult burden on those who want Federal controls to extend over those last 6 months. And I would have preferred that Congress had passed a simple year's extension of the present act.

But, speaking frankly, we just didn't stand a chance in getting through Congress that year's extension, without adding some provision such as this one requiring affirmative action from local communities. And though the final bill is far from perfect, at least we have won a real victory in enacting a bill which will protect, for at least 6 months, some 8,000,000 tenants from completely unreasonable rental increases.

Perhaps the next year will see the end for need of any rent controls. I certainly hope so. I am convinced that there will be no more Federal rent controls after next June. I would say to those in communities which will still face a critical housing shortage next year, that you should begin work now, at a community level, to get the local authorities to request rent controls after December 31. And you should also make it clear to those in the State legislature that you favor the prompt passage of stand-by rent-control legislation.

I most certainly do not like rent controls merely for the sake of controls. But I feel sure some Federal control is still necessary. And I am indeed thankful that Congress has decided to provide for one more year of rent controls.

United States Spuds Go to Eastern Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following news article is

from the Marshfield News-Herald. Does this bring to mind the Japanese scrap-iron purchases? Maybe since the administration has now changed its foreign policy we will not be sending food to Communist-dominated countries at prices less than the same food can be purchased by the consumers of America. The article is as follows:

UNITED STATES SPUDS GO TO EAST GERMANY—REDS PAY CENT PER POUND FOR SURPLUS

FRANKFURT, GERMANY.—East Germany was caught holding the bag today—and the bag was filled with American potatoes.

Two weeks ago east German Communist authorities complained in loud and aggrieved tones that the United States was scattering potato bugs from airplanes to destroy the east German potato crop. American officials just shook their heads in amazement.

SECRET DEAL

Today it came out that east Germany has concluded a secret deal for the purchase of 50,000 tons of surplus American potatoes for a million dollars. That's a good price: A penny a pound. Housewives in New York pay between 5 and 6 cents a pound.

(In Washington officials of the Agriculture Department confirmed that a sale of 1,000,000 bags of surplus potatoes, of 100 pounds each, has been made through a New York exporter for delivery in Germany.

(However, these officials said that so far as their connection with the deal is concerned, delivery in Hamburg ends the matter. Any shipment to eastern Germany, they said, is a State Department and occupation administration matter.

(The Agriculture officials said that Department approval was obtained for the sale.)

STANDING OFFER

(The price was 1 cent a bag under a standing offer to sell surplus potatoes at that price to any commercial exporter who can find an approved outlet abroad.)

The potato purchase appeared to be a delicate matter with the east German Trade Ministry in Berlin. They would not deny that the deal had been made, but there was no one around there who would say he knew anything about it. But Arthur Stroh, trade expert in the American high commissioner's Berlin office, announced that it had been made and that delivery already has begun.

Relationship of the Slum-Clearance and Low-Rent Housing Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, a statement was issued by Raymond M. Foley, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency; John Taylor Egan, Commissioner, Public Housing Administration; and Nathaniel S. Keith, Director, Division of Slum Clearance, on the relationship of the slum-clearance and low-rent housing programs.

I commend the statement to the consideration to all those interested in slum clearance and low-rent housing, since it clarifies many of the problems which have existed in the programs.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT ON THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE SLUM-CLEARANCE AND LOW-RENT HOUSING PROGRAMS

(By Raymond M. Foley, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency; John Taylor Egan, Commissioner, Public Housing Administration; and Nathaniel S. Keith, Director, Division of Slum Clearance)

The Housing Act of 1949 provides two programs which are specifically directed toward the removal of slums and the improvement of housing conditions for families now living in slum areas.

One is the new slum-clearance and community-redevelopment program authorized in title I, under which Federal loans and capital grants are made available to communities to finance the acquisition, clearance, and disposition of slum and blighted areas so that the land may be available at fair value for suitable private or public redevelopment, with maximum opportunity to private enterprise.

The other is the expanded low-rent housing program authorized in title III, under which Federal loans and annual subsidies are made available to communities for the provision of decent housing for low-income families living in slums and other bad housing.

The Housing Act of 1949 clearly recognizes that the clearance of slums involves grave difficulties and responsibilities in the present period of housing shortages. Under title I, Congress required that before a contract is made for financial aid there must be not only a feasible method for the temporary relocation of families to be displaced by any slum clearance, but also that there are or are being provided decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings equal in number to the number of families to be displaced and available to such families at rents and prices within their means. Moreover, under the title I program, slums may not be cleared before July 1, 1951, if the local governing body determines that such demolition would cause undue housing hardship. Under the low-rent program of title III, Congress allowed a period of 5 years after completion of a public housing project in which to accomplish the equivalent elimination of substandard dwellings, which is required wherever nonslum sites are used, and the elimination was to be still further deferred if a housing shortage persists.

In view of the grave difficulties in finding homes for the families displaced by clearing slums during a period of acute housing shortages, it is of urgent importance that a supply of new housing available to such families be provided. Congress itself recognized this necessity by including in title I authority for financial assistance in the assembly of open and predominantly open land for new residential development.

It is doubly important that, wherever possible, vacant sites be used for low-rent housing projects, at least in the initial stages of a local public housing program. Such projects can care for a very substantial proportion of the families displaced by any program of slum clearance, and under the new legislation specific preference is accorded to such eligible families in order to facilitate community redevelopment projects or low-rent projects which involve slum clearance. This essential function of low-rent housing in caring for displaced families who are eligible for admission can be fully effective only if vacant sites are used.

If, on the other hand, slum sites are used in the early stages of a local low-rent housing program, the dwellings in these projects will not be available for relocating eligible families at the time they are displaced. The fact that eligible families will be permitted to come back to such a project upon its completion gives them no help during the period while it is being built. Families who are ineligible for low-rent housing, either because their incomes exceed maximum limits or because no dwellings for single persons and only a limited number of dwellings for two-person families are provided in public housing, will be subject to even greater hardships if low-rent housing is built exclusively on slum sites under present conditions. The families and persons displaced by such projects will frequently be forced into other slum dwellings often more crowded and more inadequate than those from which they are displaced. The hardship on such families is particularly severe in the case of Negroes and other minorities who in very many cities are gravely restricted as to the neighborhoods in which they can find dwellings of any kind.

Proposals submitted by local housing authorities for low-rent projects on slum sites which involve substantial displacement will of necessity be subject to very careful review by the PHA. This will be particularly true of projects where Negro or other minority groups would be displaced. In some cases, a partial solution may be found through building projects in stages if the slum site includes sufficient vacant land on which to make a start. But in certain cases, the problems of relocating displaced persons may be so grave that without the use of some vacant sites no feasible relocation plan can be presented, thus incurring an insurmountable barrier in developing the proposed public-housing programs.

We wish to point out that the use of vacant sites for low-rent housing projects is also extremely advantageous in that it conserves funds for the development of the maximum number of low-rent dwellings. Slum sites are ordinarily much more expensive than vacant sites even after the added costs of site improvements are taken into account. In large metropolitan centers, the costs of slum sites, if developed at any reasonable density, run to very high amounts per dwelling unit. Capital grants under the title I program will be available only to a limited extent for the write-down of expensive slum sites for public housing use, because of the statutory provision which requires that maximum opportunity be given to private enterprise in the redevelopment of cleared sites. It is thus apparent that if expensive slum sites are used for public housing, the subsidies involved will have to be met primarily out of low-rent housing funds, thus decreasing the number of units which could otherwise be provided for slum families.

In order to conserve low-rent housing funds for their primary use and to avoid their excessive diversion into slum-clearance costs or other expensive site costs, it has been necessary to limit the amount which may be spent for land acquisition plus site improvements to 20 percent of the total cost of a project. For the first-year program of a local housing authority, however, a somewhat higher ratio of land costs is permitted because of the fact that even the limited aid for public housing which might come from the title I program is not yet available. In specific cases for such first year programs, PHA will approve costs of land plus site improvements running up to 25 percent of total development cost. This will be done, however, only where suitable vacant sites are not available in a locality or where the local authority is publicly committed to a balanced program of vacant and slum sites, and only if the excess site costs are not being incurred in order to avoid increasing the land areas in the community which are available for occupancy by Negroes or other minority groups.

We would urge upon local housing authorities one further advantage in the use

of vacant sites. Because of the much lower land costs it is, in general, possible to develop vacant sites at much lower densities than cleared slum sites. There is no gainsaying the fact that housing at low densities is more conducive to good living conditions than the congested housing at high densities which all too often proves necessary on expensive slum sites.

In connection with the relocation of families displaced by slum clearance who are not eligible for low-rent housing, local redevelopment agencies should carefully examine the possibilities of assisting private developers in the use of open or predominantly open sites for housing development. The use of assistance under title I in connection with open or predominantly open sites is of special importance in localities where private developers have found it impossible to assemble substantial tracts of such land. New private housing built on such sites made available by local redevelopment agencies would increase the supply of housing and thus help in relocating families displaced by public housing on slum sites, or by slum-clearance and redevelopment projects.

But whatever types of sites are used in either program, it is imperative that operations under both public housing and title I be carefully coordinated in order to achieve the maximum usefulness of the two programs. On the Washington level, this coordination is being achieved through joint staff work of the Public Housing Administration and the Division of Slum Clearance and Urban Redevelopment.

A similar coordination is necessary in localities if these programs are to achieve their maximum effectiveness. Since the housing built on redevelopment sites by private enterprise will not generally be available to families in the lowest income groups, it is extremely important that the first low-rent projects be timed so as to be available for rehousing eligible families who are displaced by such clearance projects. With this objective in view, local housing authorities should locate their public housing on vacant sites wherever possible, and have them available in time to rehouse eligible families displaced by subsequent slum-clearance. At a later stage low-rent housing projects can, if necessary, be located on slum sites making use of low-rent subsidies for the necessary write-downs if land costs are reasonable, or in appropriate cases making use of capital grants from tile I funds if the locality determines that public housing is the most suitable use for all or part of a cleared site.

Washington News Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my Washington News Letter, a personal report to the people of Pennsylvania, under date of June 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the news letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

JUNE 22, 1950.

Six years ago this week Congress passed the GI bill of rights. This measure, which I was proud to support, represented no hand-out to our returning veterans. We were only making certain the Federal Government did its part in helping millions of young people—who had spent some of their most productive years in the armed services—acquire the equipment needed to do a good job in civilian life.

Over half of the Nation's 15,300,000 World War II veterans have participated in at least one of the three major programs set up under the law. And the same holds for Pennsylvania's 1.2 million veterans. These programs provided for education and on-the-job training; Government guaranteed and insured loans for farms, homes, and businesses; readjustment allowance program to help veterans unable to find work or making less than $100 a month in their own businesses.

This readjustment allowance program ended for most veterans almost a year ago. Final VA figures—showing that the average ex-GI collected benefits for only 6 weeks even though he was eligible for 52 weeks—prove our veterans are much more interested in finding work than in collecting easy money.

And the success of the loan programs is further proof that Congress' faith in our vets was justified. Less than 1 percent of the loans were defaulted to the extent that VA had to make good the insured and guaranteed portions. The batting average of Pennsylvania veterans on these loan programs—for homes, businesses, and farms—is even better than the national.

Over 150,000 GI home loans, totaling $814,000,000, have gone to Pennsylvania veterans. And only 343 of these loans had to be taken over by Uncle Sam.

Almost 7,000 ex-GI's in Pennsylvania went into business for themselves—businesses ranging from diaper services to gas stations—with the help of $23,000,000 in loan guaranties from the VA. Less than 500 of the vets failed to make the grade, forcing a 1.7-percent loss.

About 2,200 farm loans, for farms and for farming equipment, have been made in Pennsylvania under the GI bill. Of the $54,000,000 guaranteed by the VA, only 54 loans, amounting to only 0.1 percent of the total, could not be paid by the GI himself and had to be made good by the VA.

These loan programs, incidentally, still have another 7 years to go.

The education and on-the-job training benefits have meant additional schooling for over a half million Pennsylvanians. For some, it meant continuing an education interrupted by the war—for others, it meant getting an education they would never have been able to get otherwise—and for many, too, the in-job training provisions did a lot to help them on their way to better jobs through new skills they were able to acquire.

Pennsylvanians who headed for the Nation's colleges after leaving the service total about 125,000. Over twice as many went into schools below college level. Although only 10,000 ex-GI's in Pennsylvania are working in training programs on farms, they are, unlike the collegians, continuing to increase in number. The on-the-job training group, which has dropped considerably in the past year or so, still adds up to over 116,000 vets. There's a July 25, 1951, deadline for veterans starting an education or training course under the GI bill—but those still in training at that time have until 1956 to complete their training.

Handling disability claims and hospital treatment of vets, together with administering the GI bill, head VA's assignments. Many World War II veterans in Pennsylvania—over 120,000—received awards under either disability or pension claims. And nearly 100,000 ex-GI's have been treated and discharged from one of the VA hospitals in our State.

The war's been over nearly 5 years now. And millions of young men and women have found jobs, homes, security, because of that first push they received under the GI bill—a push they richly deserved.

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

Stalin or God?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, June 7), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine statement by a great industrial statesman of America, a vice president of the Thomas A. Edison Industries, Mr. George E. Stringfellow, who is also a great Christian. His address was on the subject Stalin or God.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STALIN OR GOD?

Since membership in masonry is a prerequisite for membership in the Shrine of North America, I would like to make a few remarks about masonry before I touch briefly on the Shrine.

The basic foundation of masonry, as you know, is faith in the existence of the Supreme Being. It was that belief, I think, that motivated our Masonic forefathers in laying the foundations of America. It was divine guidance that gave them the courage to push forward the frontiers of world commerce. One cannot read the Declaration of Independence; one cannot read the Constitution of the United States; one cannot read the debates from which these great documents grew without realizing that these courageous pioneers placed their faith in God instead of trickery, as the Communists do today.

Belief in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man is the essence of freemasonry. This thought animates Masons throughout the world, 3,500,000 of whom are in the United States.

There is a spiritual thread running throughout craft which holds it together and makes our efforts a constructive force in advancing civilization. This spiritual thread gives us faith, hope, and courage to work for a brighter and better world.

There is today an atheistic movement called communism spreading throughout the world like a prairie fire. If this atheistic movement is to exist, it must substitute belief in a figurehead, currently Joe Stalin, for belief in God. This movement is embraced by citizens of our country who brazenly tell us that in time of war, if that war were with Red Russia, they will follow the Red flag instead of Old Glory. That, I submit, is an admission of treason in advance of the act. These communistic termites, in a number of instances, have infiltrated Masonic lodges in the southern part of our country. They

are working like Trojans to bring about discontent in our fraternity and thus divide our craft. They realize that masonry is a bulwark that supports our way of life. That's why they would destroy it.

We are frequently asked, "Is communism a threat to our fraternity"? The answer is a very definite affirmative, but is far more than that. Communism is a threat to the liberty and dignity of man. Communism is a threat to our way of life. Communism is a threat to our form of government, which was largely conceived by our Masonic forefathers—more than half of those who signed the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were Master Masons.

"Christianity," said Stalin, "must be destroyed everywhere before communism is safe anywhere." Christianity is, as you of course know, the foundation of our fraternity. Communism is, therefore, a threat to the very existence of freemasonry and the Shrine of North America.

Substitute belief in Stalin for belief in God, which the Communists advocate, and our happiness and our liberties would vanish overnight.

When the peoples of the world recognize God as the great architect of the universe, as we Freemasons do; when they practice brotherly love, advocated by our fraternity, the world will then withstand the winds of adversity. Dissent and strife will melt into a harmonious chord and the peoples will become one happly family. That is the objective and that is the ideal of Masons throughout the world.

The Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine is 76 years old. It is composed of 160 temples and about 625,000 members. It advocates and, through the conduct of its members, exemplifies good citizenship. It is often referred to as the playground of masonry, but we Shriners are ever conscious of the fact, even when we play, that we are Masons and conduct ourselves as such.

The Shrine of North America is one of the greatest philanthropic organizations known to man. It operates 16 hospitals exclusively for crippled children who cannot obtain help from any other source. We Shriners are not interested in the religion, belief, or the color of a crippled child's skin. We are interested in helping those who cannot be aided elsewhere. Over 200,000 crippled children have passed through these temples of mercy during the last quarter of a century and have been either completely cured or greatly helped. It may be truthfully said that the Shriners' hospitals for crippled children have given a soul to the Shrine of North America.

I am extremely grateful to Illustrious William B. Wilkinson, distinguished, alert, and affable potentate of Kalurah Temple, for naming this class in my honor. You may rest assured that your naming this class, Illustrious Sir, in my name, is a compliment and an honor which I shall always cherish.

Warrant Officers—The Forgotten Men of the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT SUTTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, while at this session of Congress it is obvious that certain solemn promises that have been made cannot now be fulfilled, I feel it is incumbent on someone to remind all of us that we are still charged by all the rules of moral obligation not to forget those seemingly forgotten men of the armed services—the warrant and commissioned warrant officers.

These men alone, of all who were provided with benefits by the Career Compensation Act of 1949, have been penalized by the failure of Congress to require that the pay grades provided for warrant officers of the armed services be utilized through a required and prescribed distribution of officers into the pay grades.

During the last session of this Congress, I desperately tried to secure an amendment which would insure a fair distribution of these officers into the pay grades provided for them by the Career Compensation Act. In the Senate, Senator MYERS fought staunchly to secure the same amendment. We both failed. But we failed because respected and honorable men in the House and in the Senate promised definitely that if the amendment sought was not included in the Career Compensation Act that the warrant officers would be properly cared for during the current session of Congress. We know now that this cannot be done. We know now that these promises cannot be fulfilled. But we should not forget our obligation in this respect, and I now give notice that, if I am here during the next Congress, or if the chance occurs before the end of this Congress, I shall introduce legislation which will make those promises good.

What we sought to do in the last Congress was to specify as a matter of law the pay grades into which warrant officers would be placed. The act as it was reported from the committees of the House and Senate, and as it was passed, permitted the secretary of the department concerned to assign as he saw fit, and without limit of his discretion, the warrant officers under his jurisdiction to the four pay grades provided by law—W–4, W–3, W–2, and W–1. We now realize through experience that what Senator MYERS and I predicted might happen, months ago, is a reality. We pointed out more than a year ago, before the passage of the Career Compensation Act, that unlimited power vested in the secretary of the department concerned to distribute warrant officers as he sees fit can mean the negation of congressional enactment. He can legally put 1 warrant officer into each of the three highest pay grades and 14,000 in the lowest pay grade.

When the Navy Department worked out a fair formula for the distribution of warrant officers, which met with the approbation both of the administrative authorities and the officers affected, in a fair approach to what Congress intended, we find even that fine job jeopardized by a higher official, the Secretary of Defense, who in the interest of economy clamped percentage limits upon each pay grade provided for warrant officers, despite the fact that the Congress relying upon the assurance of administrative fair play had placed no such limit upon the grades.

Thus we find reported in the May 27, 1950, issued of Armed Force, a magazine published weekly by the Army and Navy Bulletin, Inc., in Washington, under the headline "Johnson restricts warrant-officer promotions authorized by the Career Compensation Act," the following:

> Defense Secretary Louis Johnson has ordered the services to stop promoting warrant officers to the two higher pay grades authorized by the Career Compensation Act except to the extent that funds can be made available within current ceilings.

The editorial comment of the same publication in the same issue comprised a strong and vehement protest against the unfairness of the treatment of the warrant officers under the caption "Unwarranted." Among other things, the editorial said:

> Gradually emerging from the dim cloisters of the Pentagon is a situation which exemplifies public administration at its worst. It is the kind of thing which causes people to sneer or snicker, depending on their mood, when the epithet "bureaucrat" is loosely applied. It is so illogical that most observers inclined toward generosity would be prone to say that such misfeasance couldn't happen in a Government manned by rational human beings, yet the bald facts comprise their own indictment.
>
> Last October, after months of deliberation and debate, prefaced on a 2-year study by the eminent and highly qualified Hook Commission, the Congress passed and put into effect the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351). This was hailed as the first progressive step forward with reference to service pay scales in more than 40 years. It was received enthusiastically and gratefully by service personnel. While it failed to heed some of the pertinent and pointed warnings of the Hook Commission, it did constitute an approach to a basic concept of a unified, integrated, equitable cross-service pay table. Moreover, it did rectify or modify many long-standing injustices and inequities.
>
> One of the provisions of that law sought to rearrange the grades and pay of the warrant officers on a realistic basis, so as to make these commensurate with what a civilian with like talents and responsibilities might reasonably expect. Nothing ambiguous, nothing vague can be found in the language of sec. 201 (c) of title II, which said: "For basic pay purposes, warrant officers (including warrant officers heretofore retired) shall be distributed by the Secretary concerned in the various pay grades prescribed for warrant officers in subsection (a) of this section."
>
> It might be thus assumed by the uninitiated that nothing remained to comply with the new law of the land other than the reallocation, by each Departmental Secretary, of warrant officers into the four pay grades thus created. The act, of course, created two new grades, and it meant the determination of criteria of service and ability for elevation to these topmost two grades.
>
> Because the following points take on added pertinence as the situation develops, it might be reemphasized at this juncture that nothing was said, or even implied, that this should be deferred until May or August or October of 1950, or that it should be conditioned on budgetary limitations, or that it should be based on percentage tables. Moreover, it should be noted that the language of the statute was specific in designating the "Secretary concerned" as the agent who would decide the basis of distribution of warrant officers, and the criteria for promotion, within his own service.
>
> Last winter the Navy Department, heeding the directive of the statute and noting no qualifying or modifying language which would justify any further delay, proceeded with setting up the mechanism which would redistribute warrant officer personnel within

the new grades. The Marine Corps board finished its allocations in December; the Navy warrant reallocations were concluded in January. It was a massive job, involving a study of the personnel jackets and records of about 4,600 warrant officers in the two services, and requiring a determination as to qualifications for advancement to the two newly created grades of W–4 and W–3. The changes subsequently were put into effect, and the warrant officers were confirmed in their new grades.

It is noteworthy in passing that, as of now, 6 months after the act was passed, the Army and the Air Force had not completed their studies and reallocations of warrant officers, although the machinery to achieve this was slowly and belatedly being set into motion. In fairness, these services, with about 6,400 warrant officers, were confronted with a much larger physical task.

About 2 weeks ago, May 15 to be exact, a letter went out to the Departments, over the signature of Defense Secretary Louis Johnson—despite the prior rejection by the Department of a draft embodying its identical aims—which ensnarled the entire warrant officer situation in a hopeless tangle. This directive, ignoring the fait accompli in the Navy Department by referring to its already completed reallocation as preliminary plans and contrary to the letter of intent of the statute, ordered the operating Departments to make no allocations of warrant officers for the 1951 budget in excess of those contemplated in the 1950 budget. It would limit promotions in the new W–4 and W–3 grades to 3 percent and 7 percent, respectively, of the estimated warrant officer strength as of June 30, and it stipulated that Army and Air Force warrants in the three highest grades could not exceed 40 percent of their total warrant strength.

It is hard to believe that Secretary Johnson could have been aware of the import and impact of this letter when he signed it. It smacks more of his misplaced confidence in the gobbledegook of some personnel technician who belatedly—6 months belatedly, to be exact—discovered that what Congress had ordered did not fit into his neatly preconceived book theory of personnel structure and administration. This genus of misunderstood intellectual often is likely to be a constant attendant at fraternity meetings of fellow personnel experts, where the ultimate goal is the reduction of the lives, hopes, careers, and ambitions of human beings to an exact, inflexible formula, regardless of the effect on those being so deftly juggled.

In this case, the order is, first of all a reprehensible breach of faith with those Navy and Marine warrants whose promotions already have been placed in effect. Whether reversions in their status could now be effected without new legislation, or an amendment to the Career Compensation Act, is a moot question.

In a still broader sense, the Defense Secretary's order negates the Army and Air Force career plans by creating an artificial stoppage in the warrant-officer grades. By sawing off the top rungs of the so-called career ladder, the Defense Department automatically creates an artificial log jam which backs up clear down to recruits. In effect, it serves notice on the noncoms that you can't get there from here. Moreover, the question of what will happen if numerous officers now serving in commissioned grades are forced to revert to their permanent warrant status is completely ignored.

Finally, the order contraverts the specific intent of Congress that each departmental secretary should determine the distribution of the warrant-officer personnel in his own service within the newly created grades. Those who followed the Career Compensation Act hearings and debates will recall that an attempt to set up arbitrary percentages for each of the grades was rejected on the grounds that the individual arms should not be inhibited in determining these criteria.

The order is incongruous, illogical, and unsound. It should be modified or revoked. In the process, the morale of the services might be immeasurably bolstered if an investigation were launched into why it takes 6 months or longer for the Personnel Policy Board, and other responsible officials, to promulgate directives putting into effect the statutes, and intent, of Congress. If the machinery of administration has become that cumbersome, an overhaul is indicated.

I have quoted this at length because the skilled editorial writer, looking at the matter more objectively than I can—since I feel very strongly about and confess to my bias in favor of the warrant officer—has stated the facts and the conclusions more effectively and strikingly than I can. I agree entirely with this point of view.

But, in the event that other authority is sought along the same line, let us here quote what the proud old Army and Navy Journal—established in 1863, and now known as the Army, Navy, and Air Force Journal, recently bequeathed to the Gridiron Club an exclusive organization of top-flight Washington correspondents—has to say:

Lack of funds to permit the distribution of warrant officers in the various pay grades provided by the Career Compensation Act discriminates unfairly against many of these officers in the matter of pay increases to which they would otherwise be entitled. Section 201 of the new Pay Act fixes the compensation for each of the pay grades established by the law. It also provides that for basic pay purposes warrant officers shall be distributed by the Secretary concerned in the various pay grades prescribed for such officers. Several months prior to the passage of the act the Personnel Policy Board, at the direction of the Secretary of Defense began a comprehensive study of personnel legislation, including the development of an overall policy on the career program for warrant officers. This study has not been completed. In the meantime, the Department individually developed, and in some cases put into effect, preliminary plans for promotion of warrant officers to the higher pay grades authorized by the new law. However, no budgetary provison for the increased cost was made in either the 1950 or 1951 estimates, because the Personnel Policy Board had not determined on uniform procedures. This situation has caused the Department of Defense to announce an interim policy drastically limiting the extent of warrant officer promotions, in order to keep the cost within available funds. This has the effect of penalizing many warrant officers. Thus, these officers, highly important in the efficient administration of the Military Establishment, are denied the pay increases the Congress had approved for them. The Personnel Policy Board should immediately act to unblock the promotions and the Defense Department should request the Congress to provide sufficient funds to cover the pay raises.

All this stems from the fact that we, as legislators, have not embraced and discharged our responsibility for assigning these warrant officers to pay grades by law.

I am not speaking without due deliberation and consideration. I consulted three of the top officials of the only warrant officers' organization I know before completing this protest against inequity and plea for fairness. They were Paul J. Schonwald, president; Gerald A. Hearn, national chairman; and George R. Pearce, chairman of the legislative committee, of the Chief Warrant and Warrant Officers Association of the United States Coast Guard and they all agreed with me.

I have mentioned promises that have been made and not fulfilled. I am not referring to generalities but to solemn and particular promises which have been made, and which now seem to have been forgotten. It must be noted that when Senator MYERS and I were fighting for fairness for these warrant officers during the first session of this Congress, the opposition at no time was based upon the merits of our cause. Not a word was said about any unsound or any undesirable feature of the amendment which would fix by law the distribution into pay grades for warrant officers in the same manner in which Congress fixes the distribution into pay grades for physicists and charwomen, generals and first lieutenants, admirals and janitors. Oh, no. The basis of the opposition was that to put the amendments into effect in the Career Compensation Act would freeze the situation so that Congress would not be later—at this session—able to do all it wanted to do for warrant officers.

Let us look at the record—the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in fact, for the 26th day of September, 1949—beginning on page 13255, in column 3, and continuing therein for the report of the debate on the Career Compensation Act.

Here is the debate between Senator MYERS and Senator SALTONSTALL, who was acting as floor manager of the Career Compensation Act on the Senate floor, in the absence of Chairman TYDINGS:

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would the Senator's position on this amendment be affected if he had reason to believe or understood that the status of warrant officers was going to be the subject of legislation next year with relation to providing the same degree of opportunity with reference to warrant officers as now obtains with reference to commissioned officers? I am informed by one of the experts of the House Armed Services Committee that one of the reasons it was left as it was, and the Senator's amendment was rejected in the House committee was that it froze a situation that would make it impossible to give opportunities for warrant officers in further legislation. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 26, 1949, p. 13255, col. 3.)

To this question Senator MYERS' reply was:

Mr. MYERS. I am not altogether sure that I would agree with the statement that it would deprive warrant officers of those opportunities. This subject was also discussed by Representative SUTTON before the Armed Services Committee, and he said this—and I must agree with his statement; I think he answered the question very well at that time: "I realize that the drafters of this bill maintain that they are working on a measure to take care of the warrant officers later. Why later? Are we going to enact this bill, and then, in the next breath, ignore certain provisions contained therein and do a lot of wrangling over a warrant officers' bill? Why not treat all branches of the service alike and include everybody in this one bill?"

I agree with him when he said: "Personally, I can see no reason for all of this procrastination over the provisions pertaining to warrant officers."

The committee had the matter before it for some time, and I certainly think the

Department could have come before the committee with its recommendations as to warrant officers, and incorporated this entire matter in one paper.

During his concluding remarks, Senator SALTONSTALL summarized his position—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 13258—as follows:

The amendment offered by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] applies to the grade of warrant officer. With regard to that amendment I may simply say it is my understanding that at the present time the two top grades of warrant officer are new to the Army and the Air Force. They have very few men in those grades. They are getting more men into them. They are working out systems and qualifications for the grades. I am informed it is expected to bring in a bill on this subject at the next session of Congress, only 3 months hence. If we agree to the amendment, we shall thereby freeze the law regarding warrant officers, and we shall put warrant officers back, as I understand, on levels which will be computed on length of service alone. It eliminates the whole theory of efficiency and merit in our armed services. Mr. President, I hope that amendment will also be rejected. I trust therefore that the bill, which is extremely technical, and which has been very carefully worked out, will be passed without amendment.

These are the promises I am talking of. These are the things that must not be forgotten. These are the things I pledge to bring to the attention of the first session of the next Congress at my first opportunity.

I am confident that we on Capitol Hill have not lost all sense of right and fairness; and we do respect solemn promises which have been relied upon by fellow legislators acting on a bill; and I am certain that when I present the amendment next January to fulfill the promises made and the pledges given, Congress will welcome the opportunity speedily to enact the same and provide the same protection by law to warrant officers that others similarly circumstanced have always received.

A Memorial to Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, during the forty-fourth annual convention of the Texas Chamber of Commerce Managers Association held in Amarillo, Tex., June 5, and 6, 1950, a resolution expressing the feelings of those in attendance toward the recent events affecting the title of the people of Texas to their tidelands was unanimously adopted.

This resolution was prepared and offered by Walter E. Long, of Austin, Tex., former manager of the Austin Chamber of Commerce, and a veteran chamber executive. I believe that it expresses quite well the sentiment of the majority of Texans on the tidelands question. I respectfully call the attention of the Members of this House to the resolution for your information and deliberation:

A MEMORIAL TO HONOR

"Ill fares the land to wandering ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay."

One hundred and seventy-four years ago a new Nation was born. To its life men pledged their sacred honor.

They declared certain inalienable rights and wrote them into a Constitution of the United States. This document was the first in history to give full stability to contractual responsibility, thereby making possible America's great industrial growth by credit expansion.

One hundred and fourteen years ago another new Nation was born through sweat and blood. It too adopted a Constitution which men again pledged their honor to defend.

For 9 years this Nation of Texas fought off from her borders those who would invade her homes, while over her tidelands her Navy battled those who would take over her seacoast.

In 1845 the Republic of Texas accepted the invitation of the Congress of the Republic of the United States to become a State in that Union. These acts were performed with honorable motives by honorable men.

In surrendering her sovereignty as a Republic the free and independent Nation of Texas made certain terms regarding her public domain, which were accepted by the Congress of the United States. These terms and agreements became a part of the sacred contract between honorable Representatives of two honorable Governments. Has that contract become a scrap of paper?

We can understand why nations of different peoples disagree with one another and go to war over less provocation, but in a civilized and Christian Nation of kindred bloods it is difficult to reconcile or condone dishonor among brothers.

If this sacred agreement stood among honorable American for 100 years, why is it now circumvented?

It is not strange that in a disturbed world we ourselves cannot keep contracts with one another? How can we face skeptical nations with stained hands and expect them to keep their agreements with us?

Has the lure of wealth, opulence, power so saturated our beings that even as nations we seduce all that is honorable? Has wealth so accumulated that men decay?

How much further can we go until confidence is destroyed in the oath men take on the Bible as with upraised hand they swear to defend all that is sacred in our dealings with one another—in the Constitution of our Nation?

Gentlemen, if that time has come, then we bring these words as flowers to the dead dreams of a once great people and lay their fading sprays over the remnants of a broken pledge and a shredded contract between a nation that once had honor and the Republic of Texas. If these conditions exist, then we, as ordinary citizens, offer these thoughts as our memorial to the honor that once was.

Tariff Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following communications that I have received from the Peabody City Council, Peabody, Mass.:

CITY COUNCIL,
Peabody, Mass., June 26, 1950.

Congressman THOMAS J. LANE,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: At the most recent meeting of our local city council held on Thursday evening, June 22, 1950, it was unanimously voted to forward the enclosed copy of a letter relative to tariff rates on leather to the Congressman and Senators of this district.

In compliance with the request of the members of the Peabody City Council, I am forwarding said copy for any action you might deem necessary.

Very truly yours,
JEREMIAH F. O'MEARA,
City Clerk.

PEABODY CITY COUNCIL,
Peabody, Mass., June 22, 1950.

HONORABLE SIR: We, as city councilors of the city of Peabody, which is considered as being one of the largest leather-producing centers in the world, are personally interested in what our Government proposes to do with regard to the tariff on leather.

Our principal industry has reached a low level inasmuch as it is meeting with serious competition from substitutes and as a result volume is dropping, with many plants already having closed their doors. A further drop in leather tariffs might be the death blow to what we consider to be a very vital and all-essential industry to the citizenry of our community.

We will appreciate your protests against any reduction in the present tariff rates. In this way you can help protect the livelihood of the majority of the citizens of this city and thereby assure the security of their immediate families.

Respectfully yours,
MEMBERS OF THE PEABODY CITY COUNCIL.
By direction:
JEREMIAH F. O'MEARA, *City Clerk.*

Hawaii Offers Finest Opportunities For Volcanological Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to present an editorial which appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Honolulu, T. H., on June 7, commenting on the recent eruption of the great volcano, Mauna Loa. The editorial follows:

THE STRUGGLE OF SCIENCE WITH MAUNA LOA

Nowhere in the world can volcanoes be studied with greater effectiveness than in Hawaii.

The big island presents with frequency the picture of creation—a process that has been going on through the ages and that will continue to exist far past the life span of those of us who are here today.

The current southwest rift eruption of mighty Mauna Loa is an excellent example of the workings of Mother Nature.

Her enormous outpourings of sun stuff from within our globe contain never-ending lessons for our scientists—the men who keep the watch at craters and on the slopes of volcanoes.

Their objectives are many and varied but one of their most important goals is the

development of methods that will permit them to determine, well in advance, the exact spot and the exact time at which an outburst of lava will appear. This already has been done to some extent.

When it becomes infallibly possible, and research toward that end never ceases, a warning may be sounded in ample time to permit residents of a threatened area to remove themselves and their belongings to a place of safety.

The immense value to humanity everywhere of such prediction is all too obvious.

Certain men in Congress are charged each year with the responsibility of preparing a budget covering the activities of the Federal Government.

In the past these men have shown little or no interest in the development of the science of volcanology and particularly little or no interest in the existence of the Hawaiian Volcano Observatory, now a part of the United States Geological Survey.

To continue to operate the observatory must have funds for its staff of specialists, its physical expenses such as electric current, telephones, motor transportation, machine equipment; for experimentation, for looking into the future.

Such funds must not be niggardly—and they have been.

They must cover honest requirements. They must permit expansion rather than force slow strangulation.

Without friendly understanding and reasonable generosity progress will cease.

Were it possible for key members of the National Senate and House Appropriations Committees to have watched Mauna Loa's performance during the last few days they most assuredly would have gone home with a depressing sense of the monster's primitive, ruthless, crushing power.

They would have seen blazing, fuming lava fronts 40 feet high and a half mile wide tumble across the single belt highway around the island of Hawaii in three places, to plunge on headlong into the sea.

They would have seen Kona residents, upon whom the flows were descending as rapidly as 6 miles an hour, forced from their dwellings, saving their lives but losing all their belongings.

They would have seen homes and buildings and telephone lines destroyed, the loss of livestock and farming equipment; the general dislocation of normal, useful life.

They would have seen people, caught between two lava flows and finally rescued by boats from the sea after harrowing experiences.

They would have seen the utter helplessness of mankind face to face with the primal.

A Mauna Loa flow that enters inhabited areas invariably brings tragedy in its wake. The current eruption is by no means the last that will be spawned by the colossus of the Pacific. Mortals cannot stop them.

The need for vision, for protective planning for what is to come was never greater.

A few thousand dollars anually certainly is not too great a price for a rich America to contribute from the taxes paid by its citizens to enhance that vision to its utmost limits.

We Must Stop This!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, every father and mother, not only in this country but in every other civilized nation in the world, must join hands and do their utmost to maintain peace and outlaw war with its destruction of the world's youth, the impoverishment of its people and the ruin of civilization.

This is the third time that many of us have seen the dark pall of war settle down over our country and humanity, with no power and no hands which could be raised anywhere to stay wars with its terrible ruin and destruction.

People everywhere must thrust aside the control of profiteers and warmongers and the domination of servile politicians and self-seeking militarists; and unite in all countries to provide the means of protection of the human family in its peaceful pursuits, just as our forefathers did when they met, labored, and brought forth our Constitution dedicated to the proposition that—

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

We must stop wars and all the anguish and distress that attend wars.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 227

(81st Cong., 2d sess., in the House of Representatives, June 28, 1950; Mr. WHITE of Idaho submitted the following concurrent resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be the fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations in order to maintain peace and prevent war by joining with governments composing the United Nations in adopting an International Charter. The nations subscribing to the Charter will create no supergovernment and will insure the retention of the sovereignty of every nation.

The nations subscribing to the Charter will establish a World Court composed of proportionate representatives of the signatory nations, and will establish an International Commission subordinate to the World Court implemented with an international army and navy, each signatory nation to have proportionate representation on the Commission, and supply a proportionate quota of the policing force.

The personnel composing the international army or policing force not to be permanently stationed in or permitted to serve in the country of which they are nationals;

The Commission to maintain universal disarmament and freedom of the air and freedom of the seas; the Commission to have sole control and command of the international police force and to maintain peace and order as between nations in all parts of the world;

No nation to be permitted to maintain a navy or maintain an armed force in excess of its domestic policing requirements;

All international disputes or disagreements to be settled by the Commission under the rules of judicial procedure with right of appeal to the World Court, whose decision shall be final and enforced by the International Commission.

The subscribing nations will establish an International Monetary System in which the monetary units of the several governments shall be made interchangeable and standard by weight and fineness to the metals gold and silver at a ratio of relative value between the two monetary metals to be fixed by international agreement.

Since introducing House Concurrent Resolution 227, submitted above, we are reminded of the effects of wars and war scares in an enlightening article published in this morning's paper, the Washington Post of June 30, which follows:

A professional psychologist, wanting to see the human mind work under stress, should study the ebb and flow of stock prices when a dramatic surprise—a disaster—takes place.

Consider Monday. At breakfast, the idea penetrated that a different day in foreign affairs had dawned. South Korea had been invaded. First reaction: My God, this means war. War shoots terrible fears into the stomach pit. It means death, destruction. There's something immoral, indecent about men killing one another, about destroying property.

Men, sitting in stock brokers' boardrooms before the market opened, could see the nervous, questioning faces of other men. If it had been 1929, these boardroom sitters would be wondering: What will they do?

They, in those days, was the mysterious great of Wall Street. They ran the pools, pulled the strings, had all kinds of inside information.

Today there is no they in the old sense. There are professional traders, investment trusts, institutional holders of common stocks, like banks, and investment counsel, who handle funds of clients. And then there are you and me—people who are interested in stocks as investments, but not as a business.

In short, they is the market, its ups and downs, its judgments and reversal of judgments. They is the hopes and fears of thousands of men and women recorded by what these men and women do or don't do with their dollars, with their common stocks. They is the great unknown, mass reaction to events and ideas.

On Monday they were the big boys and little boys rushing, not walking, to the nearest exit at the cry of fire. Not till noon, after the Korean news, did the market steady. By then, they had a second thought: The United States won't get in this. Korea's not our fight. It's too far away.

No sooner had that thought sunk in than a new idea struck. If we don't do anything, it's a major defeat for the United States in the cold war. It's the end of the United Nations, which we created. And anyway, we'll have to fight sooner or later. Whereupon a furious wave of selling carried stocks down to the lows of the day. Wall Street closed breathless. Bargain hunters got busy. They reasoned: Dividends are still attractive. Profits are high. Maybe there will be Government controls and regulations. Maybe there'll be an excess-profits tax. Even so, stocks are still reasonable, especially after declines of 5 and 10 points. Besides war makes for big orders. It's assurance against an industrial depression.

So, Tuesday opened with a rally. Word flashed that an important announcement was due around noon. The rally slowed. Then came the announcement: President Truman was going to send American bomber planes and warships to the defense of South Korea.

Selling orders poured into the market. This was war. We were in. The ticker tape fell 27 minutes behind. But by 2 o'clock the excitement died down. The market showed rallying tendencies. Wall Street, the collective mind, was agog with a new thought: Now its Russia's turn to back down. Truman has told 'em. Joe Stalin had better save a little face while he still can. When the day ended, stocks were up well above their lows.

Wall Street had run through the three major waves of selling, one major wave of buying. And the buying wave persisted into

Wednesday morning. Then still another thought: Why should Stalin pull out now? The Kremlin would wait to see whether we were able to repel the North Korean invasion. If we couldn't even stop the Korean Commies, well * * * that would be a fine how-do-you-do. And if we did finish the fight quick, well, Stalin could always wash his hands of the whole affair.

So vacillated the Wall Street mind. War. Peace. War again. And always with one thought piling on top of the other. Surely we'd not go into this unless we had the power to lick the North Koreans. But then, hasn't the rally corrected for that? And wasn't a big decline overdue after a year-long rise? Maybe this thing's got further to go.

On the other hand, if the boom in housing and autos faded, we now have a back stop—bigger defense business. Still, war means controls and limits on profits. That's bad. However, Truman has acted. That's what the country has needed, action. Good thing.

True, but Joe probably has a countermove in mind. Maybe Korea's a feint? If Stalin really mean's business, he'll move into Berlin, into western Germany. Well, at least we'll know what's what. No more uncertainty. That's something.

They, Wall Street—the human mind—is a wonderful mechanism. Under stress, it renders a "bloodless verdict"—with a confused mind and a heavy heart.

Since the above was written, this morning's paper brings us more distressing news, taken from the Washington Post of June 30:

JITTERY TRADERS UNLOAD—STOCKS PLUNGE FOR THIRD TIME IN WEEK; LOSSES RANGE TO $10

NEW YORK, June 29.—Stock prices tumbled under a new blast of selling today.

Jittery traders dumped stocks on the market in a series of three crippling attacks.

Key shares plunged an extreme of $10.50 a share. Nearly 200 issues sold at new lows for 1950.

On average, the market dropped to the lowest level since late January.

It was the third time this week that the market has staggered under savage selling. The loss was one of the largest since the roaring markets of 1929 and the early 1930's.

Selling was influenced mainly by two factors: A plain case of nerves among traders who have been watching Korean developments and a desire to protect what profits there were left after a 1-year rise that started in June a year ago.

Rumors contributed their share to keeping investors and speculators in a state of confusion—rumors of what Russia has done about Korea, or might do about Korea, rumors of United States troop movements to Korea. The choice was wide.

Three times selling welled up in great waves, in the morning, in early afternoon, and again just before the market closed. When the final bell sounded the market was headed downward at top speed.

During each burst of liquidation offerings of stock came in so fast that the high-speed ticker tape fell behind in reporting transactions on the trading floor. The tape was late when the market closed.

Sales totaled 3,040,000 shares. This compared with 2,600,000 Wednesday, 4,860,000 Tuesday, and 3,910,000 Monday.

The Associated Press average of 60 stocks cracked 2.8 points to 72.6, lowest figure touched since January 26.

In 4 days, in other words, the slowly accumulated profits of 5 months were wiped out.

Blue-chip stocks, the market's favorites for a long time, again took the worst mauling. The list of most active issues included such investment-rated stocks as United States Steel, General Motors, Chrysler, Westinghouse Electric, Socony-Vacuum, and du Pont.

Today's decline was the latest twist in a dizzy price trail followed by the market all week. On Monday and Tuesday morning the market took one of the steepest dives in 20 years.

Tuesday afternoon a rally got rolling which carried through Wednesday. Today the market started off on a note of indecision which in a matter of minutes changed to a trumpet call of retreat.

Allied Chemical lost $10.50; Chrysler $3.36; General Motors $4.12; Radio Corp. $1.50; Westinghouse Electric $3; du Pont $3.50; Texas Co. $2.50; Dow Chemical $5.50; Electric Autolite $3; Firestone $3.50; Goodrich $5.62; Coca Cola $5.50; Johns-Mansville $3.50; American Telephone & Telegraph $3; American Viscose $6.

Corporate bonds slid downhill with stocks. Long-term United States Governments, recently under pressure, improved a bit in over-the-counter dealings.

I am sure that every right-thinking American will agree that we must stop this.

California Indians Support Restoration of Funds for Indian Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter signed by the Indians of California, an organization representing a portion of the Indians of California, in regard to the deletion of funds for the Indian Bureau in California. The letter follows:

APRIL 29, 1950.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: As delegates representing Indians of California by a written authority of more than 10,000 Indians, we are authorized by them in part as follows: "To represent them in any and all matters which require consideration by the Committee of Indian Affairs, the Secretary of the Interior, the Congress of the United States, the Indian Claims Commission or the Courts of the United States."

The executive representative of the Indians of California, Inc., has been constantly active since 1910. His authority to represent Indians of California stems from the organization which is sponsored by Indians.

We are presently vitally concerned for and on behalf of the Indians of California with the several items included in the budget and appropriations for the year ending June 30, 1951. We have examined those items and have reached the conclusion that they should be included in the bill H. R. 7786. We hasten to observe that these proposed appropriations are for but 1 year ending June 30, 1951, during which the Office of Indian Affairs should continue.

A delegation of Indians from Southern California appeared before the House Committee on Appropriations and made representation for the deletion of certain funds, which the Committee accepted, according to the report of that committee. Under present circumstances the restoration of these funds is vitally needed for the benefit of the Indians throughout the State of California.

It has been the policy of the Department of the Interior, beginning with its declaration to the Senate Committee on Civil Service February 8, 1947, to free the Indians of California within a few years, from all supervision of the Office of Indian Affairs, thereby cutting down the necessity for many of the appropriation items which have been recurring over a period of many years—nearly a century.

The lands and other restricted resources of the Indians of California represent a total of many millions of dollars.

The liquidation of Indian Affairs in California by the Federal Government should be done in accordance with a well-defined, definite program, and that program should be made known to Congress and to the Indians of California. We are aware of the fact that for a reasonable length of time, it will be necessary for the Office of Indian Affairs to have a suitable number of workers and an adequate appropriation for the liquidation of its affairs among the Indians of California.

The main justification advanced for the continued appropriations for health, education, and welfare is based on the fact that the Indians of California reside on restricted lands which are exempted from taxation. There are approximately 687,000 acres of tax-exempt Indian lands in the State of California. In order to remove this justification for special Federal appropriations, we advocate that Congress provide for a sum to be paid to the State of California, equal to the tax that normally would be levied on taxable land. The Indians under State and Federal laws pay all other taxes on the same basis as other residents of California.

We wish to reiterate, we are favorable to the several items that constitute the $2,647,871 included in this total sum, for the year ending June 30, 1951, and that the Office of Indian Affairs take steps to drastically limit the necessity for such appropriations thereafter and to speedily put the Indians of California on the same basis as other residents of that State.

There are certain items recommended by the Budget Bureau to which we call special attention. Eight hundred thousand dollars was authorized by an act of Congress and is recommended by the Budget Bureau for the reconstruction of school buildings at Hoopa, Humboldt County, Calif. The need and justification for this item grows out of the fact that the present school buildings are old and not suitable for school purposes. They are located on restricted lands which are held in trust for the Indians of Hoopa Valley by the United States. The only method under existing laws in California for the construction of school buildings is by the levy of a special tax within the district. A large portion of the lands within the Hoopa school district are nontaxable because the title of those lands are in the United States; for these and other reasons this item of $800,000 should be appropriated.

The $560,000 under the heading of education is for Sherman Institute, which is a nonreservation boarding school maintained exclusively for needy non-English speaking Navajo and Papago Indians of New Mexico and Arizona. We are informed that the Sherman Institute buildings and ground were acquired in the name of the United States and that the Indians of California have no vested interest in them and that they have no reason or justification for opposition to the purpose to which these properties are being used or as to the appropriation for the maintenance of Sherman Institute. Perhaps a misleading impression may have been created by the fact that this item of $560,000 is included with items for the California Indians. Perhaps this impression could be corrected if it appeared among the items in the State of New Mexico or Arizona for the education of Navajo and Papago Indians.

The item of $322,000 is for the purpose of paying a subsidy to the State of California toward the education of Indian children attending the public schools. The

necessity therefor results from the fact that many of these Indians reside on nontaxable land, the title of which is held by the United States. It should be understood and borne in mind that there are many residents of California other than Indians, who do not pay taxes. Their children are admitted freely to the public schools without any special subsidy.

There was in the appropriation bill an item under the caption "Tribal funds," on page 229, as reported to the House by its Committee on Appropriations, which reads as follows:

"*Provided,* That $100,000 of the amount appropriated herein shall be available from the judgment fund appropriated for the Indians of California by section 203 of the act of April 25, 1945 (59 Stat. 77), to be advanced for compensation and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed by any tribe, band, or other identifiable group of Indians of California under contracts approved by the Secretary, each such advance creating a charge on any judgment or settlement won by such tribe, band, or group, reimbursable out of such judgment or settlement, with interest at 4 percent per annum, to the judgment fund of the Indians of California."

This provision was stricken from the bill on the floor of the House.

Funds from which this item was intended to be derived is the result of a judgment fund in favor of all of the Indians of California. The total sum, including interest, is about $6,100,000. The Senate on April 19 passed a House bill whereby the individual Indians of California are recognized to have a per capita interest in that total sum. The bill authorizes the payment to each enrolled Indian on a per capita basis. It is therefore established by Congress that each individual Indian of California has a recognized interest in that total sum.

The Jurisdiction Act of May 28, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), providing for settlement of amount due the Indians of California, section 6, expressly provides in part as follows:

"The amount of any judgment shall be placed in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California."

That act also created a roll of the Indians of California and provided:

"That for the purpose of this act the Indians of California shall be defined to be all Indians who were residing in the State of California on June 1, 1852, and their descendants now living in said State."

The funds involved belong to all of the Indians of California and not to any tribe or band or group thereof. The individual members of such bands or groups have an interest in the trust fund that the bands themselves as such do not. If the fund is used to pay litigation expenses, such payment should depend on contracts approved by the Secretary of the Interior, in accordance with existing law. In the case of the Mission Indians, for example, no suit of any kind has been instituted before the Indian Claims Commission, and no one can possibly weigh the chances of any recovery as to unknown claims. There is no basis, therefore, for a provision for recoupment of funds used to defray expenses of litigation. If an approved contract calls for payment of expenses, the Department can determine the allowance of any claim thereunder. If the contract does not call for such payment, a claim therefor under such contract could not be allowed.

TRIBAL FUNDS

On page 229 the appropriation bill as passed by the House provided for $2,430,965. We would suggest that this amount be increased by $15,000, to be from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California, to defray expenses and to pay compensation of attorneys in connection with litigation now pending before the Indian Claims Commission for and on behalf of the Indians of California, as provided in contracts approved by the Secretary of the Interior for them and not otherwise. Such an appropriation is authorized by section 6 of the act of May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602) and this amount would be in addition to the $10,000 appropriated for the same purposes by the act of July 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 348, 361), and such funds should be made immediately available for suits brought under such contracts.

It is worthy of special note that the item proposed does not come out of the public funds in the Treasury of the United States, but is a part of the funds belonging to the Indians of California.

We believe the proposed amendment is reasonable and proper to care for pending litigation where expenditures are required to be made in accordance with attorney's contracts approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Payment of expenses of witnesses, travel expenses, court and printing costs, payment of appraisers and such items, among others, require funds to be available for such purposes.

With appreciation for the privilege of presenting this statement, we are,

Respectfully,

CLYDE F. THOMPSON,
ROBERT CROMWELL,
Delegates Representing Indians of California.
F. G. COLLETT,
Executive Representative, Indians of California, Inc.

The Tax Bill: A Delusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, after the vital question as to whether, out of Korea, will come the third world war; after the query as to whether, in the executive departments in Washington, there are still individuals like Hiss, Wadleigh, Coplon, and others whose sympathies lie with communism and Russia, comes the issue as to whether the taxpayer's burden is to be decreased or whether the Government is to continue, day after day and year after year, borrowing money, running ever deeper into debt, to meet current expenses.

Excise taxes are a special, burdensome tax. They should long ago have been repealed and our daily governmental expenses brought within our income.

As Franklin Delano Roosevelt so truly said, excessive expenditures mean national bankruptcy, disaster to our Nation.

But President Truman has the Congress buffaloed. He told us that he would veto any tax bill repealing excise taxes which did not give him approximately the same amount of spending money.

There is no question about the President's right to veto a bill. Neither is there any question but that it is the duty, as well as the right, of the Congress to write a tax bill.

But, buffaloed by the President, the House Ways and Means Committee sent in a bill—and it came to the House under what is known as a closed rule, which prohibits any changes—a bill which, instead of repealing the excise taxes and lessening your tax burden, was designed to yield approximately the same amount of money as previous legislation. This it did by imposing new and other taxes, in addition to those already imposed upon us.

With others, I have long sought, and promised, to repeal the excise taxes. They were, and they are, burdensome taxes. They were wholly unnecessary taxes.

But the bill, while it reduced those taxes somewhat, did not repeal them, and it added new taxes which those who purchase any manufactured article must pay.

It being impossible to amend the bill on the floor, I voted, although unsuccessfully, to send the bill back to committee so that excise taxes might be repealed, the total tax take reduced.

Expenditures are excessive. Apparently, there is but one sure way to reduce them, and that way is to cut off unnecessary—that is, excise—taxes, reduce others, and then refuse to give the President authority to borrow more money.

It is apparent that the spending agencies of the Government have not the slightest intention of lessening the taxpayer's burden.

Congress Thursday should have repealed excise taxes, refused to pass any bill increasing any tax, and then let the President, if he desired, veto the bill and assume the responsibility. By following that course, the Congress would have given the taxpayer real, substantial relief, to which he is entitled.

In my humble opinion, it is unfair and unjust to lead the people to believe that, by reducing some taxes, while at the same time increasing others—which ultimately they must pay—they are getting a reduction in taxation.

Lessening the load on one shoulder while slapping it down on the other does not give relief from excessive taxation.

The excise taxes should be repealed and there should be no new or additional taxes unless they come out of those who have heretofore unjustly escaped all taxation.

If the taxpayer's burden is lessened, he can, and he will, be more independent, ask less of the Federal Government.

Present Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following self-explanatory letter:

LYNN, MASS., *June 27, 1950.*

DEAR SIR: You know, some of these modern washing machines made a few mistakes. They left a woman with time to waste as she waits for spinners to finish spinning.

Prompted by the happy but hard responsibility of raising a good average bunch of

little Americans, I want to say that it's about time somebody in a position—a tricky one—had the guts to shoot hell out of the cartels and war artists and let the pieces fall where they could.

It's time that this wonderful country—and you bet your best boots I am a flag waver—lived up to its own estimation and received its due respect instead of being prestige-shorn and pushed around corners like an unwanted relative.

You in Washington as a representative of the common vote are in a position to help. As a mother in contact with other mothers and as an individual—marvelous word—I can see so many people who want no war just to satisfy obligations incurred by a lot of people who will never mean anything or do anything for us.

We want no war with our men gone, children hectic, probably are own homes gone, and an upside-down world. Give all you can do to get this start in Korea a quick finish. Let them get big stuff in there and finish it off fast before it becomes boundless and boundaryless. Let's show the world this is a mighty country and its people are mighty efficient. Let's find our horror in something less than a dying baby or heartless, heart-lost people.

Well, you are one of the men who can help a little. I sure would like to have your chance.

It's up to Washington. Will we women have new war jobs or new families next year? It's up to you to let us know.

Sincerely,

LUCIANNE KIRK.

The Copper Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Waterbury Republican of June 28, 1950:

THE COPPER TARIFF

The House voted yesterday to continue suspension of the import tax on copper for 60 days. But if the Senate doesn't act before Saturday, the import tax will go into effect again. This would endanger jobs here in the Naugatuck Valley. It would imperil America's supply of a vitally-strategic defense material. This import tax should remain suspended.

The owners of the American copper mining industry would naturally like to see the restoration of the 2-cents-a-pound import duty on copper. It would mean a 2-cent jump in the price of their product. That would be a juicy profit increase.

More enthusiasts for copper tariff restoration are to be found in the ranks of the speculators who play the copper market. If the tax goes on again, quotations will take an automatic jump of 2 cents a pound. This is 2 cents a pound in the pocket of every commodities gambler who played a bullish hunch in copper.

The copper interests and the speculators have had strong support in Congress. They've had such champions as Senator ED JOHNSON of Colorado, a vociferous Democrat. They've had the aid of Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, the ranking Republican on the Senate Finance Committee.

The copper bloc had the services of lobbyists paid for by such interests as Phelps-Dodge, the giant domestic producer. They've had the advantage of widespread congressional ignorance of the copper situation and the unconscious aid of the economic illiterates who believe that American living standards are always protected when tariffs are raised.

The combination has managed to bottle up several bills for continuing the tax suspension. It has framed a bill for the restoration of the import tax and hitched it as an amendment to another bill dealing with scrap metal that is given good chances for passage. The copper tariff group has, furthermore, arranged for delay by making consideration of the copper tariff, part of the general tax bill, which may be many weeks from passage and which may never pass at all.

There's no need, probably, to emphasize for our own readers that restoration of this tax would mean hikes in the cost of producing everything in the brass and copper industries and that these industries are hurt every time they have to put their prices up.

Brass and copper compete for customers with a large number of industries using other materials. Jobs in the brass and copper industry are dependent on the ability of manufacturers to keep up with the competition. Keeping up gets harder every time the price of copper takes another jump.

It's not just a local issue, either. Chile's economy is extremely dependent on exports of copper. And the stability of Chile's economy is extremely important in that country's resistance to the strong efforts to overthrow the Chilean Government. South American communism is aimed most threateningly at Chile.

Finally, the United States uses more copper than its own mines can produce. We have to import copper or go without the products that are made from it. In addition, copper is such a vital defense material that the Government has been stock piling it so that we would have supplies to use in an emergency.

One of the worst things Congress could possibly do at this time would be to make imports more difficult. But if the people who realize the importance of tariff-free copper imports don't get their legislation through before the end of the week, the tax goes on again and the whole Nation will suffer.

The Soldier Has Discharged His Duty—Has the Citizen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following addres delivered by the new department commander of the Spanish American War Veterans of Iowa, Hon. Lloyd Thurston, who served many years in the House:

THE SOLDIER HAS DISCHARGED HIS DUTY; HAS THE CITIZEN?

More than a half of a century has intervened since the Nation-wide cry: "Remember the Maine" swept from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and a crusade to stamp out tyranny against the people of an island near our shores began. Volunteers by the thousands responded to the call of the Government. The Navy under Dewey at Manila, and under the command of Sampson and Schley at Santiago, annihilated the enemy fleets. The land victories of our troops in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and in the Philippines were won with such expedition, and the collapse of Spanish power was so sudden and complete, the world was shocked beyond expression. The American volunteer promptly closed his books on this conflict with a well done from a grateful Nation.

The Spanish-War veteran salutes the service men and women who served their country in World Wars I and II. Words cannot add to the glorious victories they won throughout the world. On every continent and on countless islands many of their comrades lie interred as mute evidence of their sacrifice. History does not record more bitter conflicts or greater victories. They fought for a free world.

What about the American citizen? Has he been adroitly lulled into focusing his attention on foreign propaganda, and thereby failed to witness the undermining of his government? Is he content to listen to the lullabies of the intellectuals who are more concerned about the rights of traitors than the preservation of our freedom loving land? How long can Red votes be traded for high posts in our Government?

The American soldier and sailor, whether on the land, in the air, or on the sea, has always done his job; now is the time for the American citizen to volunteer for public service. The official who connives with and accepts support from the subsidized termites is a greater traitor than the weak-minded person who subsists on such treachery. Mr. Citizen: It is now your turn to serve * * *.

The Spanish-American War in 1898, was the beginning of the first major movement of our Government to promote justice and freedom in world affairs, and as a result new and free governments were set up in Cuba and in the Philippine Islands. It was rather difficult for other governments, especially those with colonial holdings, to understand that political control of governments could change through voluntary, peaceful action, rather than through military conflicts.

The fine sounding platitudes: Freedom, justice, equality, conciliation, arbitration, had long been the favorite expressions of so-called statesmen throughout the centuries, but history coldly recites that nothing was done about bringing these rules of humanity into being, until the United States paved the way.

While man has always suffered from physical discomforts and probably always will, national boundaries, profit-making resources, such as fertile land, metals, coal, were the dominant thought of nations seeking advancement, rather than to examine into the wants and well being of individuals, so again, the Spanish-American War generated action to alleviate human beings from age-old scourges, malaria, yellow fever, dysentery, which counted their victims by the hundreds of thousands each year. Untold millions were given new birth through sanitation and hygiene promoted by our Government.

The Spanish-American volunteer can take pride in the knowledge that his service, in his time, hastened these benefits to the tropical climes.

The destruction of millions of homes, and the decimation of thousands of human beings, has not and never will be the true measure of the results of a war. Social and physical betterment of the survivors, foundations for human progress alone will survive.

On Memorial Day, just passed, thousands of communities in the United States, and in many foreign lands, earned tribute was paid to the American soldier and the American sailor. He had the courage to remain with Washington at Valley Forge; made rapid marches with Jackson to reach New Orleans in time; crossed the parched plains of Mexico; bivouacked with Grant and Sherman on

a hundred battlefields; sailed with Dewey to a glorious victory at Manila, and in our time, crossed the Atlantic to serve with our forces under Pershing; lastly, fought unnumbered land and air conflicts in Europe and Africa, and then hopped from island to island in the Pacific until the most inhuman enemy of all, the Japanese, were blasted from their island fortress.

No wonder, the American citizen is proud of this unbroken chain of victories, all based upon the premise that freedom is the most precious heritage of men.

The American serviceman comes from all walks of our life; he is a composite person, who not only believes in free institutions, but if need be, will fight to preserve the principles of representative government.

This beautiful, bountiful America of ours is the finest heritage ever handed down to a people. America's position in the world did not just happen; it was attained through the toil and privation, the talent and the genius, yes, the sweat and blood of thousands of men and women who were determined to prove that human agencies, through divine guidance, could create and maintain a form of government which would provide free institutions for a Nation with the highest concepts known to man. It would seem that the wisdom and results of their efforts would be patent to all.

And as we in our mind view this endless panorama of the ages as they pass by, and witness the fruits of the labor of the nations from antiquity to date, the contributions of our people have brought more happiness, more necessities of life, not to mention luxuries, than the combined efforts of others for all time. Why should we abandon or turn over these countless values to pagans who would enslave the world?

Having in mind these unprecedented privileges and benefits which have flown from the wisdom of our founding fathers, who first gave fixed principles as rules for free men, it is almost unbelievable, that in our midst, traitors, some in public office, would destroy this Government which you and I love. Why? Because of vanity in shallow minds, or in exchange for votes from groups who know that direct attacks on our institutions would fail, but termites boring from within, could accomplish what foreign enemies could not win from without.

These traitors would have you exchange freedom for slavery; happiness for misery. The question is: What are you going to do about it?

The pages of history disclose that there has been through the ages a conflict between two dominant philosophies of life: Those who strive for freedom; those who are willing to be slaves. The man or group who would usurp the limitations placed upon the abuse of power, in effect, says to you: You are incapable of self-government; that your lowly mental stature justifies controls from above. Whether these ideas of supermen come from abroad or are fostered in our midst, sane minds will join to scourge these false concepts. Political pygmies, better known as immature minds, consistently strive to increase their power so as to cover their mental deficiencies. Nobility and modesty mark the truly great: Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln.

Is the American citizen so lazy or so dumb that he will carelessly sit and watch his home, his farm, his family sold into slavery without a protest? If he will stir his thoughts he cannot help knowing that unspeakable changes have recently come to other lands. He buys insurance against loss by fires and floods, but fails to heed a much greater destructive force which threatens not only his property but life itself. In our country the subversive groups have changed from the old-time, long-whiskered bolshevik, to the pink intellectual or weak-minded Government employee.

All boast about our tolerance. Most people can compromise differences as to religion, politics, and almost exery phase of life, except: we cannot agree with the diseased minds which would destroy this, the greatest concept of the ages, our land.

What we badly need is more level heads, with horse sense in them.

Innumerable problems, both civil and military, are constantly arising in a Government so far flung in its interests as ours, so citizens and public officials must be concerned with the decisions to be made. May we not be perplexed with the proposals to rearm Germany and Japan? When we just slightly sketch the story of German atrocities in one prison, Dachau, only 5 years ago, can one conclude that because German arms were defeated that their people or ruling class have been reformed in so short a time? The horrible atrocities committed against noncombatants as well as our troops by the Japanese command only a few months ago, for instance; the march through Bataan, which ended in their defeat, can it be logically contended that it is safe to rearm a race without the slightest instinct of humanity?

It is doubtful if a race indoctrinated with the military supremacy philosophy can be changed in the same generation. The subject just mentioned concerns not only America but the future of the world.

While we face grave problems in international affairs, much publicity has been given to this phase of our liabilities, but our security has another major threat to our existence—a Federal debt of $300,000,000,000, a sum so gigantic that human processes cannot evaluate the weight of this burden. Made on a high-wage and commodity basis, a sharp recession could, in effect, double this monster. The rule may be stated—a solvent nation is a strong nation; an insolvent nation is weak both from without and within. At this point we might stop, look, listen.

In retrospect, may we not direct our thoughts to the unknown soldier, this mythical veteran of all of our wars? What a flood of thoughts come to each of us when this challenge is to be considered? How should we describe this phantom veteran? As a sailor, we could picture him as standing erect, alert, on the bow of a destroyer, cutting through the foam of the sea, with shells splashing on either side of his ship; or, a pilot, in formation with his wing, diving in an attack through a hail of missiles from hidden land batteries; then there would be the doughboy, wading ashore, burdened with a heavy load of ammunition, trench tools, and field rations, expecting to dig in and hold a salient point. Encountering more dangers and risks in a few hours than a civilian would experience in a lifetime.

Try to think of the change brought into the life of this young American. Called to the service of his country, abandoning his way of life, his family, his business. If this unknown soldier could speak, he might ask: "What of the future? Will those for whom I have served appreciate my sacrifice? If my services contribute to the winning of the war, will the country I am fighting to preserve retain its free institutions? Or will those who are poisoned with unsound or unknown principles gain control? Will the gangsters in the cities combine with the pinks and dreamers to destroy that which they could not build? Will real Americans rise up and strike down those who would destroy my Government, your Government, the best Government the world has ever known?

"I am the unknown soldier; I cannot speak aloud; I am interred in many lands and under the sea far from my home, but you too, have a duty to perform." So spake the unknown soldier.

Today we salute the valor of the unknown soldier and sailor, and millions of their comrades in their efforts, to perpetuate the principles they fought to hold. They shared the glorious victories of right and freedom, the highest aspiration of man. They would replace might with humility; wrongs with justice; war with peace.

As an animated, living symbol of their sacrifices, these veterans would have you unfurl and hold high the flag that is the greatest inspiration of freemen—the flag of the United States of America.

Resolution of Lithuanian Americans of Hartford, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Resolution adopted at a mass meeting of Lithuanian Americans, held under the auspices of the local branch of the Luthuanian American Council, in Hartford, Conn., on the 18th of June, 1950, in connection with the tenth anniversary of the occupation of Lithuania by Soviet troops.

At the beginning of the Second World War, Lithuania became a victim of Soviet Russia. On June 15, 1940, Soviet troops occupied Lithuania without the slightest legal justification, breaking the nonaggression pact and other treaties of 1920, 1926, and 1929, as well as the promise to respect Lithuania's sovereignty and integrity.

During the Soviet occupation Lithuania suffered, and continues to suffer, an immense manpower loss. During the nights of June 12–14, 1941, 40,000 innocent inhabitants were deported to Siberia. The second Soviet occupation brought Lithuania innumerable new losses. New mass deportations, carried out parallel with individual arrests, have been recently reported from occupied Lithuania. Three new waves of mass deportations ravaged the country on May 22, 1948, on March 24–27, 1949, and in June 1949. In summarizing the available figures it may be stated that the crime of genocide, perpetrated by Soviet Russia in Lithuania, has resulted in the extermination of 800,000 people.

The Soviets, hating all nations fond of liberty, are determined to destroy the Baltic States and to fill their places with a Russian and Asiatic population. In an age when liberty is guaranteed to all peoples, human rights are proclaimed and genocide is condemned, the bestial regime of the East, striving to spread its doctrine over the world, aims to destroy and extirpate the Lithuanian nation with such methods of cruelty as have been hitherto unknown in the history of mankind.

The American Lithuanians, who through immigration to the United States of America, have been saved from a similar fate through the mercy of God, together with all the Lithuanians dispersed throughout the world, this day remember the tragedy of their homeland and appeal to the conscience of the world, demanding that the criminal cruelties of the eastern oppressors be stopped.

We have not yet given up our belief in human justice and are hoping that with the help of the world all those millions of precious lives, sacrificed for the cause of liberty, will be expiated. Therefore, we resolved to urge our Government to use its power to help Lithuania and the other Baltic States regain their freedom and sovereign rights in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the

United Nations, and not to make any peace settlement with Soviet Russia until this has been achieved, and be it finally resolved that this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and copies thereof sent to the Secretary of State, the Senators and Representatives of the State of Connecticut, and to the press.

JOSEPH LEONAITIS,
Chairman.
STANLEY ILLINEIKA.
JONAS I. AUGUSTRIAORCUS.

The Republicans Now Accept Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach an editorial from the June 28 issue of the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times. Titled "The Republicans Now Accept Social Security," it properly notes the parallel between the GOP's original denunciation of the social-security program back in 1934 and 1935 and its present anguished screams about such similar programs as national health insurance:

THE REPUBLICANS NOW ACCEPT SOCIAL SECURITY

When the present United States social-security program was first proposed back in 1934 and 1935, the Republicans of this country took the stump and denounced it as rank socialism. Otherwise responsible Republicans, in and out of public office, were publicly charging that if the program was enacted the American people would lose their identification and be thereafter referred to by numbers which they would wear around their necks on dog tags.

It is interesting to recall these arguments now in light of the vote in the United States Senate the other day to expand social-security coverage and increase its benefits. The bill was passed by a vote of 81 to 2. Many of those Republicans who voted for expansion of the program were among those who joined in the dire predictions of 1934 and 1935.

The vote on the social security amendments illustrates again how the die-hards must finally yield to socially constructive measures. The history of organized government is full of similar incidents. What the reactionaries denounce as socialism today they will clasp to their breasts tomorrow, once it has become the law and has proved itself popular and politically expedient. Only the most stupid try to turn the clock back.

They denounced the income tax, women's suffrage, workmen's compensation, public education, and other advances as socialism in years past. In the immediate past they attacked bank deposit insurance, rural electrification, farm price supports, minimum wage legislation, home mortgage relief, and other New Deal measures as socialism but they now accept them.

Today they denounce the socialism of national health insurance, the Brannan plan, and other Fair Deal proposals. Assuming that this Nation remains free and men have a right to speak and think as they please, these programs will eventually be adopted because they are needed. When they have been, the men who are today denouncing them will embrace them.

This has been the lesson of history. Progress has always started with a small minority favoring a reform. The minority is always abused and vilified, but little by little the majority comes to accept its program. It is then that the die-hard politicians surrender.

This has been the enduring virtue of the democratic way of life which guarantees to the minority the right to speak and organize to attain its ends. Despite the dogma of the Fascists of the right and the Communists of the left, it is the only way that lasting progress can be made.

Howard E. Zink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Howard E. Zink is one of the leading citizens of my district and is a typical example of opportunity under the American way of life. I want to include a news story from the Fremont News-Messenger of Fremont, Ohio:

HOWARD ZINK STORY RESEMBLES ALGER TALE; SEAT-COVER FIRM DEVELOPS FROM TWO-MAN INDUSTRY TO ONE EMPLOYING 900 PERSONS

The story of Howard E. Zink, Fremont, Ohio, industrialist and civic leader, might have provided a wealth of material around which Horatio Alger could have woven one of his most interesting novels.

It is a story that would be possible only in America and under our American system of free enterprise.

Because from a $2-a-month school janitor as a boy, Mr. Zink has developed an automobile seat-cover industry which is recognized as the largest in its field in the Nation. His enterprises in all four corners of the Nation employ between 800 and 900 persons, and are continuing to expand.

But Mr. Zink hardly regards the development of his business as of Horatio Alger caliber. Instead he believes that anyone—anywhere in the Nation—could do the same thing as he has done.

OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL

"In our land," Mr. Zink said, "everyone has an equal opportunity. Everyone has a right to improve his position in life, to develop his business, and to help others get ahead, but success can come only after hard work and careful planning and leadership."

The Fremont industrialist often recalls his humble start in life. He walked three-fourths of a mile to school each day in all kinds of weather to start the fire in the country schoolhouse in the rural area near Fremont. He earned $2 each month for his chore, and was glad to get it.

Back in 1917, after he had completed his education in the Fremont district's common schools, he joined with the late A. K. Hodes in the automobile-accessory business.

And even then money was scarce.

Both Mr. Zink and Mr. Hodes borrowed money to set up an establishment in which they made storm fronts for buggies.

"We had very little money," Mr. Zink recalled, "and we did all of our own work. We cut materials by hand, using a long-handled knife with a short blade. We did our own janitor work, our own selling, repaired our own sewing machines, did our own bookkeeping."

BUSINESS IN INFANCY

The accessory business was in its embryonic stage at that time, Mr. Zinz declares. "Automobile makers were too busy putting out their vehicles to think about all the gadgets and comforts that could be provided, so we found an excellent field for various items."

"Since all cars made at that time were open ones," the manufacturer recalled, "we found that there was an opening between the top and the windshield where drafts always prevailed, so we made an item that closed that space."

Mr. Zink traced the development of the so-called gadget business from storm fronts to coil protectors to keep water off spark plugs to repairs and refinishing for automobile tops.

The top-repair business became a major one, and this developed into manufacture of side curtains, then tire covers which were made in quantity by the Hodes-Zink plant, and finally to seat covers, the principal product of the corporation now.

All during this time the company kept expanding, adding employees, some of whom are still with the firm in important roles.

In 1923 the company was incorporated and in 1936 its initial outside-of-Fremont expansion was launched.

A plant was started in Passaic, N. J., this being the beginning of a program of expansion which has taken Howard Zink products into Long Beach, Calif., and Charleston, Miss.

Each part of the Nation is served now by Howard Zink Corp., each expansion, according to Mr. Zink, intending to move the source of the firm's products closer to an available market.

In 1937 Mr. Hodes died, and late in 1938 Mr. Zink bought his interest in the business from his estate.

Mr. Zink vividly recalls the difficulties of the 1938 period when business was at an extremely low ebb and every industry was faced with a fight for survival.

But the firm, despite rugged problems, survived.

In 1940 Mr. Zink changed the name of Hodes-Zink to the Howard Zink Corp., and took several of his key employees, persons who had grown up in the industry, into the company as directors.

There are now 15 directors, all actively associated with the organization, and each has had more than 15 years of service with the company.

LOOKS TO THE WEST

Continuing to expand the company's industry in Fremont and enjoying good business at the Passaic plant, Mr. Zink next looked to the West for a location and in a few years opened a modern plant at Long Beach, Calif. During the last year an auto-seat-cover plant was acquired in Charleston, Miss., and it is now an integral part of the Zink industry.

Here in Fremont the Zink Corp. has two huge seat-cover plants, just now completing an addition to one of its production units.

In addition to the manufacture of seat covers and associated products the company owns the Consolite Corp., also in Fremont, which manufactures and distributes highway advertising signs over many parts of the Nation.

The Zink Corp. advertises in Saturday Evening Post, Holiday, and in all trade publications.

To understand Mr. Zink's success in business it is necessary to know something of the philosophy with which he operates his vast industrial holding.

"Our corporation operates as one happy family," he pointed out today.

"Every employee," he continued, "knows that the door of my office is open at all times. Every one knows that he can bring his problems to me; his financial difficulties, if any, his domestic ups and down, and any problem that he might have.

"All of us are very close to one another," this reporter was told. "Our relations are excellent and always have been."

Definite proof of this statement is shown in the fact that there has never been any labor difficulty at a Zink Corp. plant. None is organized by any union.

MUCH IN BONUSES

Mr. Zink pointed out that in 1949 the company paid out more money in bonuses to employees than went out in dividends.

"One factor that helps our employer-employee relations," Mr. Zink declared, "is the policy we have of promoting from the ranks. We do not go out and employ executives for top positions in the Zink Corp.; instead all of our officials are men who have been trained in our company, many of them starting when very young men and progressing as the business advanced."

Heads of the Passaic and Long Beach branches are Fremont men, who started their careers in the automobile seat-cover business in Fremont, learned the business here and then showed sufficient ability to head important divisions of the company. The Charleston plant, only recently acquired, is operated on a little different system, some of its former executives retaining their positions, although Mr. Zink's son, Jack, is that plant's manager.

The Zink Corp. has 50 seat-cover salesmen on the road in various parts of the Nation.

Mr. Zink said today that business in 1950 is 15 percent ahead of 1949, that being the banner year in the history of the corporation. As for the future, the industrialist expects continued good business, anticipating increased volume with a lower percentage of profit.

The man for whom the industry is named plays a vital part in much of Fremont's life. He is president of the National Bank of Fremont, a past president of Rotary, and first president of the Sandusky County Chamber of Commerce organized only a few years ago.

His family includes Mrs. Zink, the son, Jack, and two grandchildren. His brother, Warren, is secretary of the corporation and one of its capable directors.

ONE OF THE GANG

The corporation maintains elaborate clubrooms for its men's and women's clubs, and anyone doubting the democratic manner in which the firm operates should go to one of the meetings of the various employee organizations when Mr. Zink is present. He's just one of the "gang," subject to heckling and the butt of jokes, just as any other individual in the organization might be.

Many persons have thought that some day Mr. Zink would become interested in making his home in some other part of the country, possibly in Long Beach, Calif., where he has one of his plants, or in some other location. But that idea has been pushed aside once and for all.

"I started life in Fremont," Mr. Zink said, "and I'll stay here. This is the finest city in the whole Nation and it will always be my home."

And the industrialist, without any doubt Fremont's No. 1 citizen, still says he has done nothing that any other person cannot do by enterprise, hard work, and by a God-given belief in his fellowman.

If War Comes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying: "In time of peace, prepare for war." That advice is sound. The nation which does not follow that advice is asking for defeat.

In childhood, we read from the Good Book the parable of the 10 virgins who awaited the coming of the bridegroom—five had oil in their lamps—five did not, and while they were seeking oil, the bridegroom came. The five virgins who had oil in their lamps went to the wedding and the wedding feast. The five who were not prepared were on the outside—not even looking in. What the individual or the nation should learn from that parable is to anticipate and prepare for a coming event.

The President on the 29th, last, told reporters that although orders were given the Air Force and the Navy to meet the drive of North Korea, even though Americans have already died in that attempt and the fighting is on, we are not at war. The situation is so akin to war, so fraught with danger, that foolish indeed would we be if we did not prepare for war.

No one wants war. It is indeed strange that the United States of America, after furnishing the munitions of war and the fighting men whose courage, determination, and endurance made us victorious, should now be threatened with, if we are not now actually involved in, war.

There is something wrong, radically wrong, with the foreign policy of a nation which has twice, through its productive ability and its military might, been the deciding factor in a World War, being forced against the will of its people to engage in another war in order to maintain peace throughout the world. Continuous warfare does not spell peace.

The grievous mistake of stopping Patton's victorious army short of Berlin, of dividing that city and giving the Russians jurisdiction over a part of it, and over eastern Germany, cannot be recalled.

The repeated appeasement of Russia, the furnishing to her after the war was over of munitions of war—arms, ships, and planes—was vigorously protested by some of us. Our protests went unheeded. The mistake then made cannot now be corrected. The foolish—the utterly foolish—gift of China and 400,000,000 of her people to Russia cannot now be recalled.

If we are to follow a policy of forever becoming involved in every conflict in every part of the world, wherever disgruntled or ambitious world politicians may choose to create trouble, then we should at least use common sense, prepare for the inevitable war which will follow such a course, and trust only those whom we know to be loyal Americans, those who have ever first in their hearts and minds the interests of this country.

What I am trying to say is that, if the internationalists must have their way and American youth must ever stand ready to fight anywhere and everywhere that quarrelsome, disgruntled individuals who happen at the moment to be in authority in this country or that, then we should, for at least once in our history, know why we are fighting, for whom we are fighting, and the ultimate purpose of the fighting. More important yet, we should fight only under the direction of those who are free—completely free—from the domination of any foreign nation or group.

When an individual, a group within a political party, or a political party has demonstrated its lack of ability, its incompetency, as have those who have formulated our so-called foreign policy, that group, those individuals, should not be trusted in time of war.

It is an established fact that our present situation is the result, to be charitable, of the incompetency of those who have headed our State Department. Dean Acheson, the present head of that Department, has let his pro-British sympathies and feelings involve us in a situation where we may be forced into war.

In view of the present situation which now exists in Korea, in view of the fact that American lives are being sacrificed, and to again put a charitable construction upon the situation, where we are engaged in putting down, as the President said, an attack upon a peaceful nation by a bandit, Dean Acheson and all who follow the same line of thought, whether they be in the State Department or in the Armed Forces, should be kicked out, be replaced by those who have but one objective—that of the welfare of America.

Because Russia was placed in a position where she now threatens the peace of the world, we find ourselves in a situation where it may become necessary to fight another war.

Common sense, sound judgment, demands that those who involved us in this perilous situation should not be relied upon to get us out of it.

We should prepare for war. But arms, ships, planes, munitions of war, cannot protect us if those who guide our destiny are either incompetent or have not a fixed purpose of thinking and acting first for our country.

Dean Acheson and all those who sympathize with communism or any form thereof, or who have any thought of advancing the interests of Great Britain or any other nation, or who are not wholeheartedly and solely devoted to the security and future of America, should be removed from all places of responsibility.

President's Korean Stand Approved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a very pertinent editorial comment on the President's action with respect to the Korean incident, which appeared in the June 28 issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram. The article follows:

PRESIDENT ACTS

President Truman acted promptly and vigorously yesterday in the Korean crisis,

and there is every reason to believe that the American people will approve of the steps which he took. In ordering American planes and warships to go to the aid of South Korean forces, he was not committing the United States to needless meddling in a remote civil war. Instead, he was laying down a policy of American firmness against further Russian aggression in the Far East. In directing the Navy to be prepared to prevent a Communist attack on Formosa, he made it clear that he had given up hope that the Russians would refrain from actual armed aggression. "The attack upon Korea," he truthfully declared, "makes it plain beyond all doubt that communism has passed beyond the use of subversion to conquer independent nations and will now use armed invasion and war."

Americans may not be deeply interested in the kind of government which the majority of the people in Korea want or do not want. But the point is that Korea has become the critical center in the Far East, and the implications of what Russia has done there are world-wide. We cannot let Russia have her way without abandoning our whole policy of keeping Soviet Russia within bounds, without giving up our whole idea of protecting all nations against aggression.

The United States is not playing a lone hand in this emergency. It is taking practical steps to back up the United Nations. It would be reassuring if a powerful international force could be sent to the aid of the South Koreans. But that cannot be. There is not even such a force in existence, mainly because Russia prevented its creation.

The United States is the only Nation which can do something at the moment to halt the Russian march of aggression. That's all that the United States wants. It has no ideas of expansion or conquest for itself.

This show-down is not of our seeking. We have been openly defied by the Communists. If our intervention—a wholly justified intervention—in Korea should lead to a general war, the guilt will be Russia's alone; and we learned 10 years ago that when a dictator wants war, no amount of appeasement will deter him.

American Intervention in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the reaction of the non-Communist world to American intervention in Korea is that the United States has stood up to be counted among the men. For this we all salute our President, who once again has demonstrated his qualities of leadership.

Now the less strong and less courageous may take heart and pace forward confidently.

It is significant, too, that with this step the global line of containment which President Truman first drew along the northern borders of Greece and Turkey now extends completely around the world.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the June 29 issue of the Newark Star-Ledger:

STRAIGHTENING OURSELVES OUT

The United States at last has an Asiatic policy with whalebone in it.

In brief it is this: We will not tolerate aggression and we will back up our conviction with military might. Korea has been the Rubicon and we have crossed it with heartening solidarity at home.

Up to this point, our policy, if it can be called that, was to support non-Communist governments with money and armaments. That policy might have been effective enough had it not been sabotaged by Communist sympathizers at home.

FIRE MUST BE FOUGHT WITH FIRE

We have learned, particularly in China, that this type of secondary support for beleaguered nations is not enough. We have learned that moral indignation has little effect on unmoral aggressors. We have learned also that we must fight fire with fire. We have put our lessons into execution in Korea.

What we have done, in effect, is to assume fully our role as a world leader. We have met our responsibility unflinchingly in the area of our control by backing up the desires of the United Nations with planes and tanks. The pace has been set. It is for the other nations with strength to follow.

The UN is no longer a mere academy of debate. We have made it into a citadel for the right. This citadel will be only as strong as the individual members want to make it.

It would be rash indeed to say that, as a result of our bold action, communism has been stopped. If we succeed, with the promised help of British warships, to curb the Reds in Korea, they will undoubtedly feel us out somewhere else. Areas of responsibility must be set up by the democracies throughout the world to meet these tests.

Russia, like ourselves, does not want war. But she has a tremendous appetite for power which she will try to assuage without conflict at every opportunity. The democracies appear prepared now to sprinkle her diet with highly unpalatable substances.

The Honorable Edith Nourse Rogers, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has accepted and hung upon the walls of its committee room, a portrait in oils of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

It must have been 20 years ago when I first met Mrs. ROGERS. It was on an occasion where she was performing an act so characteristic of her—she was visiting the patients at a Veterans' Administration hospital in Hot Springs, S. Dak.

That was several years before I came to Congress. She stamped the impress of a vivid, gracious personality on my memory then. Fourteen years of association as a colleague here have only intensified my appreciation of her tireless efforts in behalf of the comfort and care of "those who have borne the brunt of battle."

Others may grow calloused or weary or they may forget. But the gracious gentlewoman from Massachusetts has never been too busy or too tired or too forgetful to be concerned with the needs of the veteran.

Mr. Speaker, we do some things in life which are routine, and some things which do us little credit, but we act with honor when we pause in the press of congressional life to hang portraits in committee halls to commemorate the services of such chairmen as the gentlewoman from Massachusetts—EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

North Carolina's No. 1 Citizen Wasn't Enough of a Demagog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Lowell Mellett in the Washington Evening Star:

NORTH CAROLINA'S NO. 1 CITIZEN WASN'T ENOUGH OF A DEMAGOG

(By Lowell Mellett)

"May our America be a place where democracy is achieved without vulgarity, where differences exist without hate, where the majority is without tyranny and the minority without fear, where the least of our brethren have the freedom to struggle for freedom, where respect for the past is not reaction and hope for the future is not revolution."

The man capable of thus expressing his creed as an American and, who is much more capable of carrying it out during a long, active and extraordinarily useful career, has just had his seat in the United States Senate jerked out from under him. Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM, after serving little more than a year by appointment, has been repudiated by the forces dominant in his State of North Carolina and told to retire to private life.

SELFLESS SERVICE NEEDED

That he probably won't do or be allowed to do. His State, his beloved South, his country will be calling on him, as in the past, for selfless service, and in the light of his successful mission to Indonesia, it can be expected that the United Nations will continue to seek his assistance.

This gentle, brave, and eminently able man has long been regarded as the No. 1 citizen of North Carolina—some say, of the South—and the question naturally arises as to why he doesn't make his State an acceptable Senator. The answer appears to be that he is not enough of a politician. What he can do for his State, his region, or his country, he cannot do for himself. He has demonstrated a genius for adjusting differences where they "exist without hate," a genius even for eliminating hate at times, but where the hate is turned on himself he appears to be helpless, incapable of returning it effectively, even unwilling to do so.

ALL PRETENSE DROPPED

It was a hate campaign that defeated him, a campaign that could not be met by turning the other cheek. The forces seeking this Senate seat for their own uses succeeded in making Dr. GRAHAM a personal devil on the race issue. In the first primary much of the emphasis was placed on his alleged radicalism and communistic sympathies, but he came through with a vote almost equal to the combined vote of his opponents. There-

fore in the runoff primary all pretense of decency and fair play was dropped and the race quesiton was pressed in a manner not seen in North Carolina in a half century.

Dr. GRAHAM could not be persuaded to drop to the same demagogic level, although all the necessary materials were ready to his hand. He couldn't, or didn't, reveal to the people of the State the real basis of the battle against himself, which had little or nothing to do with the race issue, but which had to do with how he as a Senator voted or would vote on such things as taxes, labor legislation, education, health, and social security. He couldn't, or didn't, make clear that the fight against him is the same fight that is being made this year against every liberal in Congress, whether from the North or the South, and that, so far as he was concerned, the race issue had been raised merely because he could not be beaten on the real issues. He couldn't, or didn't, make the issue one of North Carolina against the outside influences that, having done a job in Florida, had moved for a time into North Carolina on their way north and west, bringing their money and their propaganda organization with them.

The eminently respectable lawyer, in whose name this job was done, but who endeavored to dissociate himself from some aspects of it, may be comfortable in the seat he is taking, but that isn't too easy to believe.

Resolution of the American Flint Glass Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I wish to include herein copy of a resolution in support of the American Flint Glass Workers' Union Buy American campaign, which was sent to me by Dexter Clark, secretary of the Marquette Central Labor Union, in my district.

It is time that Congress began to give some attention to import taxes which will protect the American workingman against slave-labor competition from abroad.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the American labor movement has, on innumerable occasions, demonstrated its devotion to the cause of international peace; and

Whereas the American Federation of Labor, realizing that world peace could not be insured when hunger, want, and unemployment existed in postwar Europe, gave full support to the Marshall plan for aiding European recovery; and

Whereas Europe, during the past several years, aided by billions of dollars of American taxpayers, has made a remarkable recovery and is now producing large stocks of industrial materials and merchandise; and

Whereas European production, which has been accomplished at a cost greatly below that of similar production in the United States, now is threatening the glass and certain other American industries; and

Whereas trade agreements and tariff walls have failed to stem the tide of cheaply produced European hand-made glassware and other European industrial products; and

Whereas neither the administration nor Congress has given timely or decisive action to safeguard and protect the glass industry and its workers who have been forced to wage, almost single-handed, a struggle for existence against great odds: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Marquette Central Labor Union, aware of the plight of our fellow workers in the American Flint Glass Workers' Union of North America, pledge our support and cooperation in aiding the union's Buy American campaign; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all local retail merchants for the purpose of informing them of our action in supporting the American Flint Glass Workers' Union in its fight to preserve the hand-made glass industry from destruction; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all the local unions affiliated with the Marquette Central Labor Union with a request that they take similar favorable action on this matter; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the American Flint Glass Workers' Union of North America, 204 Huron Street, Toledo, Ohio; to the daily newspapers, and to our Representatives and Senators in Washington, D. C.

Approved June 21, 1950.

DEXTER D. CLARK,
Secretary, Marquette Central Labor Union.

Korea and John S. Service—Reaping as We Have Sown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Acheson, Lattimore, Service, Hiss, and Jaffee policies in China are now paying off in Korea and the whole Far East. President Truman's switch to a new approach to communism there is a frank admission of the failure of Acheson's policy in spite of denials from the White House. The Secretary of State has clearly demonstrated his inability to handle the office and he should resign forthwith.

Mr. Speaker, I am including two editorials that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of yesterday:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of June 29, 1950]

KOREA

The invasion of Korea should warn Congress against giving Mr. Truman the authority he is asking to call conscripts to camp whenever he feels like doing so. That power should never be yielded by Congress to any Executive, because it is all but equivalent to the power to declare war itself. To yield the power to this Executive would be to invite catastrophe.

The great majority of Americans have only the friendliest feelings toward the Korean Republic, but not one American in a thousand believes that the defense of Korea is worth the life of a husband, a son, or a brother. The Members of Congress know this and will not vote for war without weighing the risks. Nobody can say what Mr. Truman may do, if unchecked by Congress.

NEW DEAL POLICY ONE OF CONFUSION

Nobody can say because the record of New Deal policy flies in opposite directions. On the one hand, Mr. Roosevelt got the United States into World War II by telling the Japanese they would have to clear out of China for good. He would not compromise. He would not grant them even a face-saving formula.

Then, when the war was all but won, Mr. Roosevelt turned around and gave Stalin all the rights in China that he wouldn't give the Japanese invader. The Communists got Manchuria, the Kurile Islands, and the better half of Korea. Mr. Truman, at Potsdam, approved the deal. He sent General Marshall to China with a proposal which could only strengthen the Communists. To make the outcome certain, Mr. Truman discouraged the Chinese Nationalists. The outcome, of course, was the conquest of all of China by the Communists.

One of Mr. Truman's policies is to contain the Communists everywhere around the globe. Another of Mr. Truman's policies is that China, a nation of 400,000,000, wasn't worth the war that Mr. Roosevelt said it was. Which policy does he mean to follow now? If Stalin is to be checked wherever he seeks to expand, Mr. Truman must fight for Korea. If China wasn't worth a war, the aggression against little Korea surely isn't worth a war.

Mr. Truman's thinking, if that is the word for it, is further confused by his own political troubles. A month ago, his man, Senator PEPPER, was licked in Florida and on Saturday his man, Senator GRAHAM, was licked in North Carolina. The Democratic Governor of Ohio said only a few days ago that he was half inclined to vote for Mr. Truman's leading Republican opponent, Senator TAFT. Mr. Truman's political fortunes are ebbing. He could use a war.

In face of Mr. Truman's chronic confusion of mind, augmented now by his worries over his own political fate, only a Congress of madmen would give him authority to rush this country toward war without consulting anybody.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of June 29, 1950]

JUST A SERVICE, SAYS MR. SERVICE

John Stewart Service, one of those State Department "far eastern experts," had a chance to explain to a Senate investigating committee just how he happened to get mixed up with the pro-Soviet outfit which ran the magazine Amerasia, during the war. Mr. Service got so thoroughly mixed up with this crowd that he finally found himself under arrest in 1945 with five others in the group on charges of conspiracy to commit espionage.

As is well known, the Justice Department went into the tank when called upon to prosecute. Mr. Service and two of his leftist pals weren't even indicted. Philip Jaffe, the editor, got off with a $2,500 fine, and Emmanuel S. Larsen, another State Department official, with a fine of $500. Andrew Roth, a lieutenant in naval intelligence, was indicted, but the Justice Department let him off without producing any evidence against him.

HAS ADVANTAGE WITH SENATOR TYDINGS

Mr. Service, who has been quizzed four times by the President's loyalty review board, and is back in Washington for a fifth whirl, had the advantage of explaining his peculiar connections to a sympathetic New Deal majority headed by Senator TYDINGS. He blurted out so many damaging admissions, however, that TYDINGS adjourned the public hearing, muttering that the public might be getting a mistaken impression, and continued the inquiry behind closed doors.

Mr. Service's story, briefly, was this: He had transmitted secret Government documents to Jaffe and to Mark Gayn, a member of the board of Amerasia and, at the time of his arrest, a foreign correspondent for the now defunct Chicago Sun. Although these documents had been classified as secret,

Mr. Service asserted that he had the authority, on his own motion, to decide whether they could be declassified and made available as background information for newspaper writers.

The Tydings committee did not endeavor to find out from any of Mr. Service's superiors whether he had any such power. But, even granting that Service had such a right, two questions remain. The first: Why did he go out of his way to accommodate a magazine with known Soviet sympathies, with a negligible circulation of 1,700 copies at top, especially when it opposed at every turn the officially proclaimed Government policy for Asia then prevailing? And why didn't Mr. Service submit a list of other newspapers and magazines to which he had extended favors like those he gave the Amerasia crowd?

Any Washington correspondent will tell you that the State Department occasionally briefed the regular correspondents in Washington, but that Service's solicitude for Amerasia was wholly without precedent. There is no record of an official like Service carrying brief cases filled with secret papers to a rendezvous with an accredited correspondent. Jaffe was not even accredited.

Because of the presence of a very large photo-copying department in Jaffe's office there is the added suspicion that he was serving an espionage ring which was copying and transmitting secret Government documents to a foreign power, in violation of the Espionage Act.

These are very grave matters, which the Senate cannot permit to be hidden from the public eye under Senator TYDINGS' bushel basket.

The Defense Situation in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a very timely editorial which appeared in the June 28 edition of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette, directing attention to the vital necessity, in view of the Korean outbreak, of a current reexamination of our European defenses. Let us learn from the example of Korea. The article follows:

FOR A NEW SCRUTINY OF EUROPE'S DEFENSE

Event of the past few days in the Far East will compel the United States to a severe reexamination of the defense situation in Europe. For the problem is not solely that of the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea. It is, so to speak, also that of the eighth to twelfth meridians, inclusive, between the channel and the curtain.

We had a program of arms aid to South Korea. It obviously was not enough; what aid we did provide was of a token nature.

We have a program of arms aid to the Atlantic Pact nations of Europe. It is larger than anything given Korea. Moreover, it moves as part of a treaty commitment. If an Atlantic Pact nation—Norway, for example—were attacked by Russia, we would immediately enter war.

But the Korean experience has shown the acute danger of "token assistance." We have therefore to ask immediately whether the Atlantic Pact aid program is enough. The answer may be that it is; but the question certainly must be asked, and bluntly.

We and our allies in Europe face also the difficult question of defending Germany. The picture in Germany is not precisely that of Korea. We still have troops occupying both Germany and Austria, and Soviet invasion of western zones of either country would bring instant war.

Do we, however, have enough power in Europe to make a stand against a Russian drive in Germany, Austria, or elsewhere?

A token defense is only enough for a token stand.

Letter From Mr. George W. Spayth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter, a copy of which I have received from Mr. George W. Spayth, editor of the Spayth weeklies in New Jersey:

THE SPAYTH WEEKLIES,
Dunellen, N. J., June 26, 1950.

Mr. EDWARD A. RUMELY,
Committee for Constitutional Government,
New York City.

DEAR MR. RUMELY: Replying to your solicitation for a contribution from me the best that I can do is to point out that you might save some money by taking my newspapers off your mailing list, which will save some money, and this might be helpful.

I have read and studied your statement to the Committee on Lobbying Activities of the Congress and I fail to be convinced that your right to print and distribute books or any kind of propaganda is being threatened. I am forced to the conclusion that you must have something to hide.

If I receive a book through the mail I have a right to know who paid for it. Not just the name of the donor's agent, which might be meaningless. I listen to the highly flavored alleged news of the radio commentator sponsored by the AFL, and, knowing his sponsors, I absolve the broadcasting company of all blame.

As an editor I naturally have an aversion to the anonymous letter, but I have never yet refused to permit anybody to use my columns for the expression of their opinion, drawing the line only at decent language and insisting that libel be confined to myself or newspapers—from whom I have no fear of a libel suit—but, I do, in many cases, insist that the writer publish his real name. He could, presumably, insist that I am abridging his right of free speech by refusing to permit him to use initials of a nom de plume.

I am opposed to rent control, and have been ever since the shooting stopped, and am in favor of the Taft-Hartley law, and can point to nothing in the propaganda you distribute with which I could take issue, but, I insist, I have a right to know who pays for it. Your refusal to state leaves me suspicious. Don't ask me of what, because I do not know, but cannot see any possible reason for objecting and your plea of constitutional right being invaded is not convincing.

I am opposed to governmental health insurance, just as I am to any governmental activity that can be handled just as efficiently, and usually more efficiently, by private enterprise. But I believe that congressional investigations are beneficial because they throw light in dark places. There are cases, of course, where privacy is invaded in violation of the Constitution, but, if yours is one of these cases, I feel sure the courts will protect you.

If your right to print and distribute literature is ever questioned, get in touch with me and I will help you all I can. But, frankly, I would like to know who your sponsors are. I am sure the American Bible Society, who are doing even a better job than the fine one you are doing, would not object to naming their contributors, and, for the life of me, I can't figure out why you yell so loudly.

Yours in all sincerity,
GEORGE W. SPAYTH,
Editor.

Veterans of Foreign Wars Oppose World Federalists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on last February 20, Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, director of national legislative service, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs and testified against world government resolutions pending before that committee. His statement should be preserved for the RECORD as it is a very valuable contribution to current discussions on the subject of federal world government. As a part of my remarks, I am including Mr. Ketchum's statement in full:

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am grateful for the opportunity and privilege of appearing before your subcommittee as legislative spokesman for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, an organization composed of approximately 1,250,000 men who have served in the armed forces of the United States on foreign soil or in hostile waters during some war, campaign, or expedition in which our Nation has been involved. My appearance today is to present the viewpoint of the Veterans of Foreign Wars with respect to Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, Senate Concurrent Resolution 57, Senate Resolution 133, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 66, relating to world government, federation, or union under consideration by this subcommittee.

Since 1943 the Veterans of Foreign Wars has opposed the entrance of our Nation into any form of world government, federation, or union which would require any substantial yielding of our national sovereignty. This opposition was first expressed in the forty-fourth national convention held in New York City in September of 1943. Continued opposition to a philosophy of world statism was vigorously renewed and reemphasized at our national convention held in Miami, Fla., August 21–26, 1949. The resolved clause of the 1949 national convention resolution reads as follows:

"Resolved by the Fiftieth Annual National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, we hereby declare that we are unalterably opposed to any program which would entail the surrender of any part of the sovereignty of the United States of America in favor of a world government; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That our legislative representatives on both the State and National level be directed to vigorously oppose any effort to place the United States of America in a position which would entail the surrender of our national sovereignty in any form whatsoever."

On the basis of the foregoing resolution the Veterans of Foreign Wars is, therefore, opposed to all of those resolutions now pending in either the Senate or the House of Representatives which declare, imply, or infer that the United States should enter into any form of world government, federation, or union in which our national sovereignty would be diminished or subordinated.

We recognize there is some confusion and misunderstanding with respect to the intention of those Members of Congress who have sponsored the varying resolutions, but it is our considered judgment that all of the resolutions which refer to world government, federation, or union pose a threat to our national sovereignty. We find it exceedingly difficult to correlate the written and oral statements of objectives by advocates who are supporting these resolutions, in relation to the expressed intention of some of the Members of Congress who have sponsored the resolutions.

We are, therefore, compelled to interpret these resolutions in the light of printed statements and definitions distributed by such supporting groups as the United World Federalists, Inc., and the Atlantic Union, as well as in the light of what would be required to effect a world government, federation, or union which could go beyond the present authority and jurisdiction of the United Nations. Proponents of some of these resolutions frankly admit that world government, with all the sovereign powers required, is the definite objective, while other proponents deny they are seeking more than to strengthen the United Nations to the point where aggression and war may be prevented and peace maintained. It appears to our organization that there has been much shifting and sidestepping among the proponents of these resolutions when specific points of opposition are encountered.

Out of the morass of confusion, charges, and countercharges, there remains the clear and unmistakable fact that no world government, federation, or union can be effected without granting it certain sovereign powers over all the participating nations. To participate in either a complete or partial structure of world government, federation, or union the United States would have to surrender a substantial part of its present national sovereignty, and it would mean the end of the United Nations organization as we know it.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has been a stanch supporter of the United Nations since its inception. Our organization was represented by three official observers in San Francisco when the Charter of the UN was adopted. We believe in an association of sovereign nations dedicated to the principle of adjudicating international disputes, discouraging aggression, and preserving the peace. We believe, in spite of its critics, the United Nations has been very effective, and, if given the opportunity, will do as much as any world agency that could be formed to settle international disputes and maintain peace.

Members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars understand from personal experience the horrors of war and no group of American citizens is more desirous of peace than our organization. However, we want peace with honor and not peace at any price. We recognize the tremendous appeal of the promise of peace which is being advanced by the proponents of world government, federation, or union, but we also believe that to enter into any one of such proposals would require surrender of national sovereignty and would constitute peace at any price.

If peace at any price, through some form of world federation, is the answer, why did this Nation expend its wealth and manpower in fighting imperial Germany in 1917–18? Kaiser Wilhelm would have been pleased to bring us in under a world government which he and his military leaders had in mind. The same question could be asked with respect to our all-out opposition to Adolf Hitler and his Nazi cohorts in 1941–45. Herr Hitler would have been delighted to have accepted us—on his terms—into his dream of world government. We are equally certain that Joe Stalin and his satellites would welcome the United States into his plan for world government.

Members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, having risked their lives in three foreign wars and several campaigns to preserve the independence and sovereignty of the United States, take a very dim view of this "peace at any price" program which is now being advanced. We believe now, as we believed in time of national peril, that it is better to die on our feet than to live on our knees.

Any plan of world government, federation, or union which could go beyond the authority and jurisdiction of the United Nations would require the following sovereign authority:

(a) A superlegislature to enact superlaw governing the participating nations. It is inconceivable that representation in such a legislature could be established other than on a population basis.

(b) A supercourt to interpret the law and to sit in judgment on officials and citizens under said law.

(c) A superpolice force or armed services to enforce law and to prevent civil war between participating nations. This would mean that the United States would have to disband its armed forces, surrender its heavy weapons and its military secrets to this supergovernment, and maintain only an internal policing force.

(d) Grant to this supergovernment the authority to impose and collect taxes, above national taxation, and to enforce the collection of said taxes.

(e) The free movement of all citizens between the participating nations. This would mean that the supergovernment would control the policy of immigration and the United States would no longer have anything to say concerning immigration. This alone would pose the greatest problem ever to confront our labor and the economy of the United States.

The foregoing points have been directly or indirectly admitted in writings and speeches by responsible spokesmen for groups supporting one or another of these resolutions which are under consideration by this subcommittee. In addition, common sense tells us that any world or supergovernment must have certain over-all powers, such as the Federal Government of the United States, if it is to go beyond the present powers of the United Nations. This would clearly require the United States, if a participant, to surrender substantial national sovereignty.

We were delighted to note that the present Federal administration, through the State Department, has pointedly advised this subcommittee that it wants no part of any scheme for world federation or union and that the administration is satisfied to depend upon an association of sovereign nations—the United Nations—to effectively solve international problems without the necessity of surrendering our national sovereignty. We sincerely hope this subcommittee will be guided by the position of the Federal administration, along with the millions of people who are in opposition to these schemes, and bury these resolutions in pigeonholes where they will catch only dust. We have faith that if mutual understanding and peace between nations can be accomplished, it can best be accomplished through the United Nations. If one or more nations are determined to impose their will and vengeance upon their neighbors it is not likely that any world government, federation, or union could prevent them from trying.

In conclusion, may I urge, on behalf of our organization, that after these hearings are concluded the subject matter be dropped and forgotten.

These Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Sokolsky from the Washington Times-Herald for June 30, 1950:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Thinking over some of the curiosities of congressional committees, which seek publicity often in the doldrums of summer news, I went back to a document: Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack; Minority Views.

Although Pearl Harbor occurred on December 7, 1941, and there have been several investigations into the subject, there is no clarification of the facts even to this day. As with the Amerasia case, the Fuchs thefts, and other matters of a similar nature, such as the escape of Arthur Adams and the self-deportation of J. Peters, the facts are hidden under a mountain of apologia.

Much that the minority wrote in 1946 applies also to current investigations. For instance, "when all the testimony, papers, documents, exhibits, and other evidence duly laid before the committee are reviewed, it becomes apparent that the record is far from complete. The committee did not have an opportunity to cross-examine any of the high civil executive principals in the Pearl Harbor affair."

They also said:

"It is extremely unfortunate that the Roberts commission report was so hasty, inconclusive, and incomplete. Some witnesses were examined under oath; other were not. Much testimony was not even recorded."

The commission knew that Japanese messages had been intercepted and were available, prior to the attack, to the high command in Washington. The commission did not inquire about what information these intercepts contained, who received them, or what was done about them, although the failure of Washington to inform the commanders in Hawaii of this vital intelligence bears directly on the question of whether those commanders performed their full duties. Mr. Justice Roberts testified before this committee:

"I would not have bothered to read it (the intercepted Japanese traffic) if it had been shown to us."

One major difficulty is that investigations occur so long after the acts that memory becomes dimmed and records disappear. Why records disappear from Government files is not quite understandable, but they do.

It was in relationship with the Pearl Harbor investigation that President Truman closed Government files. It was also on this committee that the majority members (the Democrats) rejected the right of the minority members (the Republicans) to do any investigating.

On this subject, the minority had this to say:

"The plain fact that an investigation could not be an investigation if committee members remained mere spectators, persuaded some members that restraints on their freedom were not justified. The flimsiness of the argument for restrictions became even more evident when permission to search files and other records was denied by majority vote to the individual members even when accompanied by committee counsel. Rightly or wrongly it was inferred from this that there was a deliberate design to block the search for the truth."

Of course, had such a course been followed by Calvin Coolidge, there would have been no successful Teapot Dome investigation, a fact to which Senator Burton K. Wheeler fully testified. Senator Wheeler commented:

"I know of my own personal knowledge that he (Senator Walsh) got from the Department, and from officials in the Department, information which he afterward used, and if he had not been permitted to do that, and if I had not been permitted to do it, I am sure there would have been a complete failure of the investigation of the Department of Justice."

President Truman did not conduct the Truman committee, which brought him fame and the Presidency, as he would have the Tydings committee and the Buchanan committee conducted. He was altogether a different man in those days.

Red Penetration of Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson from the Washington Evening Star of June 30, 1950:

RED PENETRATION OF LATIN AMERICA DECLARED CENTERED IN GUATEMALA

(By Dorothy Thompson)

In a series of articles in the New York Times, Will Lissner confirms reports of Soviet penetration in Central America, previously revealed in the June issue of Intelligence Digest.

Soviet global strategy, directed primarily against the United States, touches every country however small. Its aim is to frustrate American foreign policy from the most remote regions to our own doorsteps; to confuse the world's peoples by propaganda about peace; to exhaust our economy by the necessity of heavy external expenditures; and to effect the collapse of our society, without war if necessary, with war only if circumstances seem certain to assure victory.

Though Soviets do not command popular sympathy, they do command the most remarkable organization in history, combining subversive and military tactics. Communist ideology is entirely subservient to Russian power politics and Communists make alliances with any elements who can be used to further them.

GUATEMALA IS KEY POINT

Guatemala is a key point in the Americas, because of its bearing on the security of the Panama Canal. And the Communist Party, though officially suppressed in Guatemala, has extended its power over the government since Gen. Jorge Ubico was overthrown in 1944.

He was succeeded by a triumvirate of Jorge Toriello, Jacobo Arbenz, and Col. Francisco J. Arana. Arana was the one nonpolitical man in the group. Arbenz is ruthless, amoral, and of extreme leftist views. Against Arana, he and Toriello sponsored the candidacy of the present president, Juan Jose Arevalo, one of the most consistent fellow travelers in South America. Arbenz and Arevalo first got rid of Toriello, whereupon a systematic penetration of Communist sympathizers into the government began. Arana, still commander of the army, moved to frustrate this.

When his troops seized a big cache of arms held by the so-called Carribbean Legion, at Lake Amatitlan, Arana went in person to investigate and was murdered. The murderers have not been arrested.

The Caribbean Legion is the Soviet-controlled military organization that fought in the Spanish Civil War as the international brigade.

According to Intelligence Digest the murder was ordered by Moscow through another of its agencies, the so-called technical services in Mexico City.

REDS ON POLICE FORCE

Colonel Arbenz is now a candidate for the presidential elections in December. He has the support of all Communist-front organizations. But since popular reactions are growing, it is anticipated that the elections may not be held, and Moscow's Caribbean Legion may back a putsch being engineered by Alberto Arguello, a Guatemalan, and Edelberto Torrez, a Nicaraguan. Both are wanted in Mexico for arms smuggling into Guatemala, but although numerous correspondents have seen them, the authorities "cannot find them."

Spanish Republican Communists are strong in the police force, some having been trained in the Red police that prosecuted Nationalists and anti-Communists loyalists in the Spanish Civil War. Arana's loyalist soldiers are being replaced by Arbenz', so that large parts of the army are under Communist control.

The influence of the United States is waning. Left-wing influences in the State Department are believed to have contributed.

The American Ambassador, Richard C. Patterson, Jr., has been subjected to constant insults and veiled threats. The Guatemalan consul in Mexico wrote an article accusing him of plotting the murder of President Arevalo. Mr. Patterson properly protested and demanded—in vain—the withdrawal of the offending consul to Mexico. Then a press and radio campaign was launched against him, and Washington was asked to withdraw him. The State Department recalled him late in March and has not yet replaced him or made a final decision.

Guatemala is the perfect example of how Communist power can be won through leftist so-called reformers. Card-bearing Communists are few, if any. In internal politics Communists and fellow travelers are careful to maintain the camouflage—protected by a law similar to our own, which makes the charge of communism libel per se.

Under this camouflage, Guatemala is being made into the directing center for all Communist activities in Latin America.

It is extremely serious for the United States of America.

Marine Firemen's Union Pledges Cooperation in Present World Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I know the Members of Congress will be interested in a spontaneous affirmation of loyalty to the United States of America in the present world crisis from a prominent maritime union. I have received the following telegram:

JUNE 26, 1950.

Hon. FRANCK R. HAVENNER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In the current Korean crisis you will be interested to learn that the Marine Firemen's Union in a special meeting today at headquarters passed the following resolutions:

First. If the crisis develops to a shooting stage involving the United States the Marine Firemen's Union pledges its all-out support for victory.

Second. If the United States Government in the interim takes any Communists or Communist sympathizers off the ships the Marine Firemen's Union will not indulge in support or condone any phony demonstrations, tie-ups, etc., but on the contrary will allow these traitors to perform their sailing up in Tule Lake.

Third. We urge the immediate reconditioning and return to service of the *Monterey* and *Mariposa* and pledge that we will man all ships carrying war equipment for Japan, Korea and western Pacific area.

V. J. MALONE,
President, Marine Firemen's Union.

Bungled Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted me by the House, I am enclosing a timely editorial written by J. L. Napier, managing editor of the Evening Kansan-Republican, of Newton, Kans.

Mr. Napier is one of the outstanding editorial writers in the State of Kansas. His views with respect to the manner in which one of the big agencies of our Government is being managed are worth your reading. It follows:

BUNGLED PLANNING

Permitting a governmental bureau, wrapped up in the traditional political preference blanket of pernicious patronage usage, and then bound around in a maze of red tape, frustration, inadequate know-how, not to say downright lack of consideration, is no way to operate anybody's private business nor industry.

That's what is happening in the United States Agriculture Department to a large extent. Planning acreages to be planted, monkeying with subsidies, bonuses, loans, and other regimentation measures, which serve to almost force compliance with regulations that farmers do not want. This program resulted in much new storage being provided during the last year or two in the grain belts. That storage was filled with Government contract wheat and corn, or that on which the Government holds mortage liens. It looked 6 weeks ago that the wheat crop was going to be short. Anyway, the Department failed to clear out its wheat. After the harvest began, somebody awoke, and started to yell for elevator space, storage, boxcars to ship grain to market or elevator terminals. It is either that or pile that fine wheat on the ground to result in heavy loss.

No Central Government has ever yet been successful in trying to take over and dictate to private industry or business, and certainly the conglomerate mess now trying it is making a dismal failure of the effort.

Having become the owner of vast supplies of wheat, without doing agriculture any appreciable good, a well-managed program would have provided in advance for taking care of the current crop in storage designed for such use, and also railroad cars for moving such wheat as farmers wished to place on the markets.

Rent Control and Housing Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently supported rent control in the United States because I thought it was necessary, especially in the cities and the metropolitan areas adjacent thereto. During the last year the rate of housing construction has increased as the joint housing committee, of which I had the honor to be chairman, predicted, to the extent that the number of housing units in 1949 broke the all-time record and in 1950 it is apparent, will break the 1949 record. The records of new housing starts will break the record for the United States in 1950 and for the world.

The rate of new buildings for rent and for sale will and is rapidly breaking the back of the so-called housing shortage. When and as that happens—and it has been broken in many communities—rent control will automatically be broken also. The law of supply and demand will take over as it already has in many communities in the United States outside of the large metropolitan areas.

I am mindful that the housing shortage in certain large metropolitan areas still exists and that rent control in those areas should continue.

Some States having no housing shortage have decontrolled in toto. Some States have passed stand-by decontrol laws.

The State of New York has met the situation head-on, and it has taken over completely the problem of rent control and it is out from under the Federal rent-control law. New York State has further appropriated the sum of $2,500,000 to cover the cost of administering the New York rent-control law. If Federal rent control is extended for another year the State of New York will be called upon and required to pay again its disproportionate share of the Federal rent-control expense. The amount appropriated for rent control for the year 1950 by the Congress was $22,100,000. The share of New York State is roughly 20 percent of that amount, or $4,420,000, or a total expense to the State of New York of $6,920,000 for the administration of the Federal and the State rent-control laws.

Chicago, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and many other cities in the United States still have rent controls under Federal law. The States could have and should have been honest and forthright enough to have come forward and taken over their share of the burden. Of course, if these States had made this decision their Representatives would have voted to discontinue Federal rent control and eliminated their proportionate share of the cost. Why should the citizens of New York State pay in addition to the cost of administering rent control in New York State, their proportionate share of rent control in Chicago, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and many other cities? Personally, I don't know and I am, for this reason among others, voting against continuing the rent-control law.

Pearl Harbor All Over Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of June 30, 1950:

PEARL HARBOR ALL OVER AGAIN

Admiral Roscoe Hillenkoetter, director of the Central Intelligence Agency, was summoned before the Senate Appropriations Committee for questioning concerning statements that his outfit of sleuths and spies had been caught by surprise by the North Korean invasion.

The admiral said it wasn't so. He contended that CIA had known for a year that North Korea was strong enough to invade, but said that the agency could not predict a timetable.

HOW IT HAPPENS

The report of the director could have been more reassuring, for it developed that Izvestia, the official newspaper of the Soviet Government, and the Communist Party of North Korea had given 15 days' advance notice of their intentions.

On June 10 Izvestia outlined the plans of the North Korean Communists to hold general elections throughout North and South Korea between August 5 and 8 in order to put all of Korea under a single parliament by August 15, the fifth anniversary of the country's liberation from Japan.

When this was written, the Communists were in control only of North Korea and it was obvious that they could not put such plans into effect without taking South Korea by force in the interim. Here was the tip-off on the invasion, offered to anyone who bothered to read Stalin's official newspaper.

But even more disconcerting was Admiral Hillenkoetter's statement to the Senators that, while the CIA is charged with gathering information, it is not the function of the agency to evaluate the information or to make predictions about intentions. It may be asked what use intelligence is if no one undertakes to appraise the information gathered and seeks to determine coming hostile actions.

This is almost precisely the situation that prevailed when Pearl Harbor was attacked and the Roosevelt administration, with a wealth of information at its disposal reflecting Japanese intentions, professed to have been taken by surprise.

We had broken the Japanese secret code months before the attack and were reading, so to speak, over the shoulders of the leaders of the Japanese Government; yet when the question was later asked why the information had not been put to better use, the man who then was chief of Army intelligence said that evaluation was not considered as important as the concealment of a military secret of incalculable value.

Thus the code-breaking advantage was not employed to put American forces on the alert against indicated hostile dispositions and moves. The leading idea of all concerned was to hide from the Japanese the knowledge that we had cracked their code.

Almost 9 years later, American intelligence operations are found to be as disorganized as when Pearl Harbor was caught with its planes down. If it isn't the duty of Hillenkoetter's outfit to evaluate intelligence information, whose duty is it? Without evaluation, intelligence is precisely as useful as a man without a head.

The Egg Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES P. NELSON
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, the poultry industry is a very important industry in our country. The total income from poultry in the United States in 1948 was $3,076,000,000 and in 1950 it is estimated to be $2,500,000,000.

Under the Hope Act which was in effect in 1948 and 1949 eggs had a support of 35 cents per dozen or 90 percent of parity. Under the present Anderson-Cooley bill, which went into effect January 1, 1950, the support is only 25 cents per dozen. This is only 50 percent of parity and the Secretary has had the authority and power and could have kept the 35-cents-per-dozen support if he so desired.

Before the war there were from 35,000,000,000 to 38,000,000,000 eggs produced and since 1943 there have been from 54,000,000,000 to 56,000,000,000 eggs produced each year. The production of eggs for the first 5 months of 1950 is 1,852,000,000 eggs more than the first 5 months of 1949. This indicates that the lower support price might be causing a larger production than a lower production as many producers may be keeping more hens to maintain their incomes.

Under the Anderson-Cooley bill the price of feed is maintained and supported at 90 percent of parity and the eggs, as I stated before, are supported at only 50 percent of parity. The parity price of eggs is 50.6 cents per dozen and the support price is what the Secretary of Agriculture makes it or the 25 cents per dozen the 50 percent of parity.

New England egg producers are feeling the squeeze because the feed they buy is secured on a 90-percent-parity-price basis, and the eggs produced by the feed they buy are supported only on the 50-percent-of-parity basis. This same situation exists in relation to other livestock products as well. The feed has a

mandatory higher support while the meat and milk have a lower support. In fact, some livestock products do not have any support whatsoever. Hogs are an example.

If the feed could be purchased on the same basis as the resulting products are sold, the situation would not be so critical. The above is only one of many examples of the unfairness of the price relationship between feeds and the resulting products.

Difficulties of American Businessmen in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to discuss the experience of some acquaintances of mine in attempting to establish an independent business in the Republic of Cuba. At various times I have discussed this with officials of appropriate agencies; but the United States seems powerless to intervene in the affairs of a sovereign neighbor to protect these enterprises, except through arousing public opinion. Indeed, I would have it no other way; but I can see no impropriety in laying the facts before this House in an effort to let the people of the United States know that the American who goes into Cuba to invest his money should do so only if he can afford to be the victim of such collusion as is seldom encountered.

I am personally acquainted with Jack Gutfreund, who was, during World War II, employed by the United States Government and stationed in Cuba as a purchaser of various food items; I am personally acquainted with the American attorney of record; and I know by reputation another of the partners, Stanley Hollander, who is a veteran of World War II.

In October 1947, Hollander and Gutfreund entered into an agreement with a citizen of Cuba, Frederick Lindner, for the establishment and conduct of a business of freezing frog legs and lobster tails in Cuba, which were to be disposed of in the profitable existing markets of the Caribbean and the United States.

The two Americans invested a total of about $60,000 in the venture, chiefly for plant. Lindner invested nothing; his contribution was to be his knowledge of the industry and of the country. Lindner was made president of the firm.

In violation of his authority as an officer of the company and without knowledge or consent of the other officers, and without necessity, Lindner, with the cooperation and possible knowing collusion of the Agricola Bank of Cuba, borrowed funds from the bank and executed a note payable to the bank in the sum of some $9,000. The note was assigned to another citizen of Cuba, one Cabrera, who thereupon attached the physical plant which had been erected in Cuba and as a result of the proceeding was designated trustee of the company.

Shortly after this occurrence proceedings were instituted by the American citizen partners to remove Lindner as president of the corporation, in accordance with the terms of a voting trust agreement in existence between the partners.

When Lindner's financial duplicity became known, a certified check, sufficient to pay for the note, and drawn on the National City Bank, was deposited in the Superior Court of the Republic of Cuba. The face of the check was sufficient to have satisfied the receiver, for he was entitled only to the principal and accumulated interest, and the check covered that liability.

However, things are done differently in Cuba; or at least these American investors have good reasons for believing so.

After one judge had indicated that Cabrera was to file a report of his activities as the receiver and to accept the payment of the $9,000 in full satisfaction of the note, another judge decided that the plant should continue to be operated by Cabrera and Lindner, with the result that for a period of 2 years this matter has been in the Cuban courts, Lindner and Cabrera having been permitted to run the plant into a deficit of some hundred thousand dollars.

The machinations that have been going on in this case are directed against the citizens of the United States with the aid and comfort of those powers in control of the Government of Cuba. There have been all sorts of charges of bribery. Seven judges have already heard this case. The decisions have been deliberately held up, every effort having been made to coerce the attorneys for the American citizens into withdrawing from the case. Although Lindner and Cabrera have since been indicted and compelled to post a bond in the sum of $100,000, the plant is lying fallow and is not in operation. It is likely that these American citizens will not only have lost their entire investment but will be charged with additional expenses for which they have not been in any way responsible.

Extreme pressures are still being brought against the attorney for the American citizens to stall this case. Responsible individuals in government, including representatives and attorneys close to the government, have made offers and overtures to the attorney for the American citizens in an effort to obtain the plant for the individuals who are now under indictment.

These American citizens charge the Agricola Bank with working in conjunction with Cabrera and Lindner in an attempt to steal this plant from these American citizens.

It takes 5 years for a criminal indictment to be finally determined in Cuba. During that time, the plant is in the hands of the court and rent and other expenses keep mounting. Whether this is all a part of a preconceived plan to extort the plant from these American citizens is a matter worthy of investigation.

American citizens are not given the equal justice under the law as is practiced in the courts of the United States. If this condition is permitted to continue, especially with regards to the actions now pending in the Cuban courts, it is feared that these Americans will have lost their entire investment due to no reason known to them. They have placed their faith in the Cuban laws and in the Cuban Government. All of their efforts to obtain this equal justice have been thwarted.

The attention of the American public should be directed to these conditions as a warning to them in the event that they should have any ideas of entering into a business venture in Cuba.

The ILGWU Resolves To Win the Cold War and Preserve the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, and the introduction to the declaration adopted by the twenty-seventh—fiftieth anniversary—convention at Atlantic City, which speak eloquently for themselves:

INTERNATIONAL LADIES' GARMENT WORKERS' UNION
New York, N. Y., June 23, 1950.

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Our recent jubilee convention, held at Atlantic City, May 23–June 1, gave considerable attention to the critical international situation. We were particularly concerned with the role our country and trade-union movement should play in assuring the maintenance of peace, the protection and promotion of democracy, and the advancement of social justice.

As a result of these deliberations our convention adopted a resolution dealing with the present world-wide crisis. In conformity with the decision of the convention that a copy be sent to you, I enclose herewith this document. I hope that you will spare a few moments of your precious time to peruse it.

Thank you most heartily for your kind interest.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID DUBINSKY.

WIN THE COLD WAR—PRESERVE THE PEACE

(Declaration adopted by the twenty-seventh (fiftieth anniversary) convention of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, Atlantic City, N. J., May 23–June 1, 1950)

FOREWORD

The growing interest and participation of American labor in foreign affairs is one of the most significant developments of our times. Today, the activities of the American Federa-

tion of Labor in the international labor movement and in the all-important struggle between human freedom and totalitarian tyranny are world-wide and increasingly decisive in their impact on the foreign policy of our Nation and on the international working class movement.

Our organization, the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, has for years been a pioneer in this significant growth of labor's ideals, vision, and social responsibility. In 1947, our twenty-sixth convention adopted a declaration "For a Democratic Foreign Policy" which was a vital step marking the expansion of American labor's interest and activities in the realm of international affairs. Our jubilee convention, held at Atlantic City May 23 to June 1, 1950, came forward with another timely policy statement on foreign affairs appearing in English, French, German, and Italian. We hope it will have a beneficial effect on the pivotal role of American and world labor in the fight for freedom, social justice, and lasting peace.

We herewith present to the democratic labor and progressive movements of all countries our jubilee convention basis declaration on foreign policy—"Win the Cold War—Preserve the Peace." We fervently hope that our call to action will help inspire free labor to ever-greater services in the cause of democracy and peace. Our most cherished hope and aim is to speed the day when the workers of every race, religion, and nation on both sides of the iron curtain will lose all their economic and political chains and be truly free men in one free world.

DAVID DUBINSKY,
President, General Secretary, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, A. F. of L.

OPENING ADDRESS TO ILGWU CONVENTION BY PRESIDENT DAVID DUBINSKY

Some people have only recently discovered the cold war. We of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union have known it for over 30 years. We have been fighting that long against the Communist attempts to grab American labor unions and to use them for forcing on the American people a Moscow type of dictatorship.

Let me say that America and the other democratic and free nations must make up their minds that they must win the cold war. No price is too high to be paid for this victory. If we win the cold war, there will be no hot war. But if we lose the cold war, there will be a hot war and we may lose that one too.

In order to win the cold war, it is no longer possible to defeat the Russian war lords by beating them in any one particular place, let us say only in Europe. What has happened in China shows how dangerously wrong any other policy is. America and the other free nations must realize that the cold war is global, world-wide and indivisible.

This means that we must drop our piecemeal strategy. We cannot get a good garment to fit a peaceful world if we limit ourselves to section work. Also, the garment will never fit if some of the sections are botched. Our diplomats and statesmen ought to learn that from our trade. We cannot expect to win the cold war if we win in Berlin and then lose in China. We must win in both. Europe is not our only problem. Asia is not our only problem. Communism is the deadly enemy of freedom, peace, and progress in every country and on every continent.

Those short-sighted politicians and confused intellectuals who are playing with the notion that their country can or should be neutral in the face of the increasing Soviet aggression are living in a fool's paradise. Foolish notions do not make for free nations. In the struggle against Communist tyranny there can be no neutrals. The Communists themselves recognize no neutrals. Those who are not of them, for them, and with them, they are against, treat them as enemies and send them to the concentration camps or the liquidation chambers.

We have reached the stage where there are no longer the old convenient divisions of pro-Communist, anti-Communist, and non-Communist. The cold war has already become so intense that, in reality, there can be today only anti-Communists or pro-Communists.

But anticommunism alone is not enough to win the cold war and save the freedom and peace of the world. Our anticommunism must spell out freedom from poverty, colonial oppression, and the fear of political terror. Our answer to iron-curtain tyranny cannot be only military might to deter the Communist aggressors from military adventures. We must use the world's natural resources and great technical knowledge not for the privileges and the profits of the few, but for the benefit of the many, for the improvement of the living and working conditions of all peoples—regardless of the color of their skin, the language they speak, or the God they worship.

Right here is where the democratic organized-labor movement and its experience come into the picture. Unless the free labor movement is in the forefront of the fight, the cold war can never be won by the democracies. In the United States organized labor—particularly the American Federation of Labor and our own union—have always realized the acute menace of communism and all other brands of totalitarianism. We only wish that a lot of people who get red in the face shouting that they are liberals would have been as wide awake to this great threat to our liberties. Then, their faces would not be so red so often these days—after it has been shown what innocents and dupes they were to have allowed themselves to be used by the Communists as transmission belts and in their united-front organizations. Thereby they have given the Communists a label of respectability and prestige. Some liberals and labor men have recently had the courage to recognize the errors of their way. Some others are having a tough time getting out of the dirt into which they got themselves.

I cannot warn too strongly against any superficial approach to the Communist menace of today. I cannot stress too forcefully that the best way to keep Communists out of influence and power is first of all not to let them in. When will some people learn that all one has to do to foul up the tent is to let the camel stick his nose into it?

There are no American Communists. There are no American Nazis or Fascists. There are only Communists, Nazis, and Fascists in America. In all cases, these totalitarians are the fifth columnists and Quislings of a foreign imperialist power dedicated to the destruction of our freedom, the rights of labor, and world peace. The Communists in our country—whether they be native or foreign-born—are not American citizens with just different political ideas. They are only foreign guerrillas; they are Russian paratroopers of the cold war, operating as the enemy within for the enemy without.

True liberals, genuine progressives, should be the ones to be in the forefront of the fight against Communists and their infiltration of our Government and other institutions in our democratic society. Had the liberals and the progressives themselves led in this fight, reactionary and isolationist forces could never have picked up the Communist issue and exploited it in such a manner as even to play into the hands of the Communists and their fellow-travelers. Had this been so, the question of cleaning out Communists and their influence would not have become the political football, the partisan plaything, it is today.

Before a convention like ours, it is unnecessary for us to go into details as to the vital role of American labor in the present grave world crisis. Nor is it necessary for me to explain to you the great significance of the formation of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. The A. F. of L. and your own organization have played a most prominent and constructive role in the establishment of this mighty force for freedom, social justice, and peace.

As a result of continued insistence by the A. F. of L., our Government has recently recognized the need of appointing labor attachés in various countries. Today, realizing the great importance of world labor and American organized labor in the tense international situation, I suggest that:

1. There should be selected an Assistant Secretary of State to deal with labor affairs on a world scale. A competent authoritative trade unionist shall be chosen to direct this work.

2. A leading trade-union spokesman shall be designated as a permanent and full member of the American delegation to the United Nations.

We are not making these proposals to our Government because we want political favors. We are firmly convinced that without such active and direct representation and participation by American labor, our Government cannot pursue an effective and consistent democratic foreign policy. For instance, we do not want any deal with Franco to save American or world democracy. Labor participation would be the best guaranty against doing business with the Spanish dictatorship.

Moreover, our country is more and more going to have close relations and cooperation with nations that are labor-minded. Under these circumstances, our Government needs representatives who know first-hand the aims and aspirations of free labor, who understand, without benefit of special experts, the language free labor speaks throughout the world.

We should continue to render energetic and generous support to the A. F. of L. in the furtherance of its vigorous and fruitful international labor activities and sound foreign policies.

An Interesting Device for Avoiding Income Taxes on Contributions for Lobbying Purposes

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in connection with the legislation to repeal, adjust, or reduce certain of the wartime excise taxes, to raise certain corporate tax rates, and to close certain loopholes now present in the revenue laws, I would like to call to the attention of the House and to the committees of Congress concerned with tax legislation a very interesting device in connection with income taxes

which we have uncovered in our lobying investigation.

The House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, of which I am honored to serve as chairman, has been delving into both direct lobbying activities and techniques and into the indirect techniques based primarily on the influencing of the people back home at the grass roots.

We are, of course, not investigating public opinion or private opinions, free speech, or anything of the kind. We are interested only in knowing how organizations engaged primarily in the effort to influence Congress go about influencing the public so that the people at home will get after their Congressman to support or oppose legislation. We are interested also in all of the fund-raising techniques involved.

In that connection, we recently conducted hearings into the operations of the National Economic Council, Inc., located in the Empire State Building in New York City, an organization with very definite—and in some cases, I would say, rather extreme—views on national legislative issues.

Mr. Merwin K. Hart, president of NEC, testified before us at some length on the operations of his organization. He pointed out that although they do engage in a certain amount of direct lobbying activities in Washington, and are occasionally represented before congressional committees, their effort is devoted largely to the preparation and distribution of a newsletter, action reports, and similar propaganda material designed to influence both Members of Congress and other readers with the views therein expressed. The organization receives and spends in the neighborhood of about $140,000 a year on its work to influence national policy, and does report regularly on these expenditures in its regular financial statements filed under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act.

TAX DEDUCTIBILITY PLAN

Mr. Hart was quite frank and cooperative in his testimony, and described for us in some detail a plan which NEC has developed and put into operation for obtaining sizable contributions toward their work from some executives of large corporations and from others interested in helping to spread the National Economic Council's viewpoint.

The details of this plan are pretty well set forth in an exchange of correspondence between Mr. Hart or other officials of the NEC, on the one hand, and Mr. Irenee du Pont and Mr. Lammot du Pont, on the other. Mr. Hart filled in some of the details for us.

The plan in brief is this:

Although cash contributions to the National Economic Council are not deductible under the terms of the income-tax laws, because the organization does not have tax-deductibility status, a friend who desires to subsidize the distribution of NEC literature where it might do the most good—among college students and in libraries, for instance—can send in a check for $5,000 for 500 sets of free subscriptions to NEC publications at the rate of $10 a year each and claim a "charitable contribution" for each subscription—thus the entire $5,000 is tax deductible.

The following letter from Mr. Hart to Mr. Lammot du Pont explains that.

MARCH 7, 1947.

Mr. LAMMOT DU PONT,
Wilmington, Del.

DEAR MR. DU PONT: We have devised a plan that should greatly widen the list of readers of our council publications and strengthen us financially.

We have had legal opinion (I enclose copy) to the effect that a purchase by anybody of subscriptions to council publications to be sent to educational and religious corporations is a gift that is deductible before taxes. Furthermore, as such a gift, it may be for any amount—not limited by the $3,000 gift tax.

We are already receiving subscriptions along these lines. We have compiled a list of colleges and universities, public libraries and Protestant churches in many sections of the country, and we are going to press this in the hope we can eventually place these publications of ours in the hands of all of these organizations throughout the country. That would be of inestimable help.

We have already covered the States of Michigan, Ohio, and Indiana, and most of Illinois, so far as libraries and colleges are concerned, as well as certain other sections.

I write to ask if you would be willing to subscribe for 500 sets of these publications at $10 each on the above lines.

The enclosed copies of letters from a college president and a librarian indicate that the gifts are being well received.

The publications in each case are sent to the institution, attention of either the college president, or the librarian, or the rector or pastor of a church.

I am enclosing an order form for your consideration.

Incidentally, the legal counsel of at least two other parties, one of whom has made a substantial purchase of these subscriptions and the other intends to do so, have likewise given as their opinion that without question such an expenditure is a deductible item.

I shall be glad to hear from you at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

MERWIN K. HART,
President.

Mr. du Pont replied that this seemed a little complex, and asked: "Is the game worth the candle?" Here is that answer:

LAMMOT DU PONT,
Wilmington, Del., March 19, 1947.

Mr. MERWIN K. HART,
President, National Economic Council,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HART: You asked me by telephone whether I had received your letter in regard to the sending of council publications to educational and religious organizations, and suggested I might subscribe funds for that purpose. I had not read your letter at the time, but have done so since.

If in the council publications to be sent are included the council letters, I have some misgivings. As you know, I think your language is frequently too violent and positions taken are too positive, and perhaps based on too little information to make an entirely satisfactory impression on the public. Many people who are "on the fence" would be pushed off on the wrong side by this kind of publication.

In spite of the above, I have not definitely decided to decline your proposal, but would like some further information.

In Mr. Bigelow's letter, he gives a very logical reason why a subscription for this purpose would not be taxable, but he says in the taxpayer's return he will have to claim as a charitable deduction the value of each donation. In your suggestion, that would mean that I would have to list in my tax report 500 donees. Are you prepared to send me such a list, and is the game worth the candle? Perhaps Mr. Bigelow did not mean his statement literally.

May I hear from you on this question?

Yours sincerely,

LAMMOT DU PONT.

These letters, of course, Mr. Speaker, are taken from the files of the National Eonomic Council, with its permission, without a subpena. They are, I am sure, correct copies of the originals, which Mr. Hart identified as having been received or sent by him.

In answer to Mr. Lammot du Pont's series of questions about this proposal, Mr. Hart replied as follows:

MARCH 20, 1947.

Mr. LAMMOT DU PONT,
Wilmington, Del.

DEAR MR. DU PONT: Thank you for your letter of March 19.

I suppose the language of our letters is occasionally fairly strong. Yet quite a number of libraries, including some of the best, subscribe to our publications and themselves pay the usual rate. Many more libraries have asked us to send them. I have an impression that a well-run library is glad to have different points of view presented. Certainly the language in our publications is not nearly as strong as that in many leftist, and even middle-of-the-road publications. Frequently libraries will write us if they have missed so little as a single number, and request us to send duplicate copies.

You raise the question as to whether, in event you went into the matter, you would have to claim as a charitable deduction the value of each donation. We meet this situation by furnishing the person who makes such a contribution with duplicate lists of the corporations, with, of course, addresses, and with the names of the particular individual to whose attention our publications are directed. Any contributor can, therefore, append one of these to his income-tax return, or can hold it in his office and show it to the internal revenue examiner if it is subsequently requested. In short, we attend to all this detail ourselves.

I hope the above is satisfactory comment on the two points you raise.

Looking forward to seeing you next Tuesday evening.

Sincerely yours,

MERWIN K. HART, *President.*

The next letter in this group was addressed to Mr. Irénée du Pont by Mr. Hart, outlining for his information the same plan he had previously suggested to Mr. Lammot du Pont. This letter is as follows:

JUNE 3, 1947.

Mr. IRÉNÉE DU PONT,
Wilmington, Del.

DEAR MR. DU PONT: For some time past certain of the libraries and educational institutions of the country have taken our Economic Council publications. We have been studying methods of extending the distribution of this material to all such institutions throughout the country.

Sometime ago we received an order from a friend of ours in the Middle West for 300 sets of our publications at $10 per set, to be sent to 300 public libraries, colleges, and universities in three or four certain Middle Western States. With the order came the assurance that he had obtained from his legal counsel an opinion to the effect that a contribution of printed matter (or anything else, for that matter) given by him to such institutions could be deducted before taxes. He specified that the material should each time go addressed to, say, the "Public Library of Ann Arbor, Mich., attention John Doe, Librarian."

We have had the matter up with our legal counsel, Mr. Mason H. Bigelow, of Gould & Wilkie, 1 Wall Street, New York, who unhesitatingly confirmed this opinion, following it up with a written opinion of which the enclosed is a photostatic copy.

This opens up a new and substantial field for the Council, for in the United States there are about a thousand colleges and universities, some seven or eight thousand libraries, and perhaps sixty or seventy thousand Protestant churches. We hope to organize in such a way that these publications will, within a fairly short time, be going to every one of these educational and religious corporations. For the deductibility privilege applies whether the material goes to an educational or a religious organization.

Incidentally, as examples of the satisfaction of various of the libraries and colleges now receiving this matter under the order of our midwestern friend, I am enclosing copies of two recent letters.

We are having lists prepared of all of the colleges, universities, and public libraries, and the Protestant churches in the United States. Suiting the wishes of any donor, we can arrange for the material which he may order to go to whatever section of the country he may specify. We could, of course, be prepared to submit lists of names for his consideration, and copy of such list—with whatever additionas or subtractions the donor cares to make—can be sent us with the order.

I write hoping that this matter will commend itself to you, and that you will feel you can personally send us an order for a quantity of our publications to be sent to certain libraries, colleges, and religious corporations.

I am enclosing form of letter we are sending to each beneficiary of those who are subscribing to our publications for some of these educational and religious corporations.

Check should be made payable to National Economic Council, Inc.

Sincerely yours,

MERWIN K. HART,
President.

Apparently the plan was not immediately accepted, for a few months later we again find Mr. Hart addressing a plea to Mr. Irénée du Pont to go along with the proposal and help build up NEC's effectiveness. That letter is very interesting and I include it here in full:

JANUARY 2, 1948.

Mr. IRÉNÉE DU PONT,
Wilmington, Del.

DEAR MR. DU PONT: When in Wilmington Wednesday, I phoned your office from Mr. Lammot du Pont's office, hoping I might possibly see you. Owing to the shortness of the notice, I was not surprised that it was not convenient.

A letter was mailed you from our office here that same day. I did not know that your name was on the list of certain of our January expirations to receive this particular letter.

What I wanted most to tell you, however, was not contained in that letter. This is that the work of the council has become more and more widely recognized and that fortunately, new and additional friends are coming to our assistance all the time.

One such friend told me last week that he would himself put in $5,000 and would secure at least four other persons to give $5,000 if five of the present friends of the council would themselves contribute $5,000 each for the coming year.

Mr. Lammot du Pont is today sending his check for $5,000, and I am writing to ask if you would be willing to send us $5,000 also. Your subscription in each of the last few years has been $3,000. Let me point out to you that it will be possible for $2,000 of the $5,000 that we would like you to give to be deducted before taxes. This could be accomplished by your purchasing 200 sets of our publications, each set to be sent to some educational or religious corporation, that is to say, any public library, college, university, or Protestant Church.

Our legal counsel and that of quite a number of persons who have purchased our publications to be given in the way stated, to educational and religious corporations, have given their opinions that such subscription is deductible under that provision of the income-tax law that allows deduction of 15 percent of anybody's income to charitable, educational, and religious corporations.

We have definite evidence in a number of instances that our work with respect to measures before Congress has been decisive in the disposition of these measures. All we need, in order to be of a conclusive influence on a substantial number of measures, is the funds to get additional personnel and to meet other necessary costs. It is this opportunity for more extended usefulness that has prompted our new friends to make the offer referred to above.

The steps that we propose to take to effectuate this objective are the following:

1. We desire to engage a competent man whose business will be to form in each of a number of centers a small committee of five men, each impressed by the need for real educational work in the community and willing to give an amount of time, with a view to watching for and overcoming left-wing tendencies in educational institutions, in churches, and in any fields in their community. We have discussed such a committee with two prominent men of one certain upstate city in New York and they are willing to serve.

These committees will work quietly; will aim to see that opinion-formers, like members of boards of trustees, vestries, school boards, etc., etc., receive certain brief literature that will better enable them to counteract the left-wing tendencies. Each committee will serve as a nucleus around which perhaps a score or two of men can presently be gathered to fight for things that are American.

2. We shall issue a weekly sheet containing a 500- or 600-word article of current interest and importance which will be sent to as many of the country's newspapers as possible. Very possibly we could put such an article in mat form. I got this idea in England a few months ago from the British Society of Individualists which has been carrying on work of this kind for 2 or 3 years and finds many of the country's rural newspapers anxious to receive the series.

Incidentally, this thought was stimulated in our minds by Frank C. Rand, Jr., who owns a string of newspapers in New Mexico, when he wrote us recently that he thought our stuff was so good that his papers and, he believed other papers, would like it. Properly handled, this method can achieve excellent results.

We shall need a competent, additional man to handle this work.

3. Another idea that I got in England and which is being used there with a high degree of success by one or two organizations like ours, is to furnish assistance to people in all parts of the country who desire to write letters to the newspapers on public subjects. Most anywhere in the country we find leftists letters appearing in newspapers. These we are advised are largely the work of organized effort by our communistic friends. So far as we know, there is no agency in the country that furnishes similar help to people who think as we do. There is a field here for great usefulness.

4. We are building up a speaker's bureau. We can get many speaking engagements, a number of which will pay nothing, not even expenses, though many of which will yield a modest fee. And we already have several competent speakers and can get many more, some of whom will work for nothing in their vicinities, and others will require a modest fee. We will need to have some person to take charge of this speaker's bureau if it is to be adequately developed, and the speakers properly coached and directed.

5. We desire to appear more often in Washington through proper representatives before committees of Congress on widely important matters. We think our experience will enable us to do this job on a scale several times larger than in the past—if we have the means to accomplish it.

Hence, I hope very much that you will look favorably on subscribing $5,000 to this work, which $5,000 will be one of several that we are asking some of our present friends to give and which will be matched by the subscriptions of others of the new friends of whom I speak.

With kindest regards and best wishes for the New Year.

Very sincerely yours,

MERWIN K. HART,
President.

SUBSCRIPTIONS UNSOLICITED, SENT ANONYMOUSLY

In the meantime, Mr. Lammot du Pont has been making sizable contributions to the NEC for free subscriptions to colleges and libraries and also to churches. Under the NEC plan, he is to claim these as charitable contributions to the individual institutions, even though they were unsolicited and, according to Mr. Hart, were sent anonymously. The following letter from Mr. Lammot du Pont indicates that Mr. du Pont has received the list of institutions to which he sent the subscriptions and can have this list for income-tax purposes:

LAMMOT DU PONT,
Wilmington. Del., January 16, 1948.

Mr. MERWIN K. HART,
National Economic Council,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HART: Referring to your letter of January 15, there is returned herewith one copy of the list of libraries of colleges and churches, which I have approved.

Yours sincerely,

LAMMOT DU PONT.

The following two letters show Mr. Irénée du Pont is going along with the same gift-subscription plan:

DECEMBER 6, 1948.

Mr. MERWIN K. HART,
President, National Economic Council, Inc., New York City, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HART: I have approved and am returning herewith one copy of the list of institutions to which your publications are to be sent.

Yours very truly,

IRÉNÉE DU PONT.

DECEMBER 17, 1948.

Mr. MERWIN K. HART,
President, National Economic Council, Inc., New York City, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HART: This will acknowledge your letter of yesterday and return to you the list of those institutions to which the books have been sent as gifts from me.

It was my intention to make contributions for books from time to time and I am so designating all three of the contributions for that purpose solicited by you. I hope that is quite all right with you.

Yours very truly,

IRÉNÉE DU PONT.

NOT ENOUGH BENEFICIARIES

In January 1949, Mr. Irénée du Pont inquires in the following letter why he

had not received sufficient names of institutional benefactors of his gift subscriptions to NEC publications for account in full at $10 each for the funds he had sent in:

IRÉNÉE DU PONT,
Wilmington, Del., January 7, 1949.

Mr. MERWIN K. HART,
President, National Economic Council, Inc., New York City, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Referring to your letter of January 3, according to my record (see your letter of November 12), the $3,000 gift of stock mentioned in the second paragraph of your letter was for the purpose of sending books to various educational institutions. Now I find that I have received from you only 800 names of recipients of the educational books and that none have been received for the $3,000 of last January. To keep my record, for tax purposes, I should have these names available when my accounts are audited by the Government. Would be obliged to you if you will send the names in question.

Yours very truly,

IRÉNÉE DU PONT.

We now find an interoffice memo in the National Economic Council from Mr. Hart to one of his assistants, calling attention to a mix-up here:

MEMORANDUM TO MRS. DALL FROM MR. HART

JANUARY 10, 1949.

Please note attached copy of letter of January 7 from Mr. Irénée du Pont.

Mr. du Pont sent us four separate checks in 1948. In January he sent one check for $2,000 and another (this was not a check, it was 50 shares of petroleum stock) for about $3,000. The stock sold for between $2,900 and $3,000.

Then in July, he sent us $3,000 and in late November he sent us $3,000.

We understood that his $2,000 check of January was for the purchase of 200 subscriptions but that the 50 shares of petroleum stock was a gift—a regular contribution. We assumed also that the $3,000 he sent us in July was a contribution—just like the $2,000 he sent us in January.

When he sent his $3,000 in late November, he made clear that this was for the purchase of 300 subscriptions. Just prior to sending this late November check, he notified us that it was his intent to make the $3,000 in July a payment for 300 subscriptions to our publications. We corrected our records to conform with this statement of his intention.

By his letter of January 7 (copy attached), he indicates that when he gave us the stock certificate in January of 1948, he intended that also to be for the purchase of 300 subscriptions.

In other words, he wants the whole $11,000 which he sent us in 1948 to be for the purchase of 1,100 subscriptions.

We must be governed by what Mr. du Pont tells us was his intent—even though in sending the 50 shares of petroleum stock last January, he erroneously stated, as I think he did, that it was a contribution.

Mr. du Pont is an extremely busy man and might easily have become confused on such a matter. Therefore, it becomes our duty to find 300 subscriptions to charitable, educational and religious corporations, which subscriptions have been in force since January of last year and allocate them to Mr. Irénée du Pont.

Mr. du Pont brings this matter up in response to my letter requesting him to give us $5,000 in January 1949.

If we can't find 300 of these subscriptions, then we will have to find as large a proportion as we can. My impression is that there are 150 subscriptions which Mr. Earhart did not renew last year and which started about the same time or a little later. If that is true, we can begin with those.

Mr. du Pont is accustomed to leave a little later in January for Cuba, to be gone for 3 or 4 months, and hence it is important to get him this list as soon as possible.

MERWIN K. HART.

But a few days later, Mr. Hart has thought of a solution and so informs Mrs. Dall in the following interoffice memo:

MEMORANDUM TO MRS. DALL FROM MR. HART

JANUARY 12, 1949.

I have thought of a way to handle the matter of those 300 subscriptions which Mr. Irénée du Pont thought that he was purchasing a year ago by giving us 50 shares of Phillips Petroleum stock.

You showed me the other day complimentary subscriptions totaling about 150 of various public libraries, colleges, and churches, and we will consider that they were paid for by Mr. du Pont's stock certificate.

This leaves 150 subscriptions unprovided for and to meet this situation, please have Miss Schilling make up an additional list and send out publications to them for a year commencing January 1, 1949.

When this list is made up, please let me have it and I will send it in a further communication to Mr. du Pont.

In the meantime, notice attached copy of letter to Mr. du Pont.

MERWIN K. HART.

On the same day, he writes to Mr. Irénée du Pont to explain the solution, as follows:

JANUARY 12, 1949.

Mr. IRÉNÉE DU PONT,
Wilmington, Del.

DEAR MR. DU PONT: I called you on the telephone this morning to discuss the contents of your recent letter in which you told us that both contributions which you made to the National Economic Council in January 1948 were intended to purchase subscriptions.

We got an erroneous impression of your desire in the matter because you, apparently inadvertently, in your letter of January 7, 1948, mentioned the 50 shares of Phillips Petroleum stock as "a contribution to the work of the Council."

Accordingly, we have altered our records to conform to what we now know was your desire, namely, that the proceeds of the Phillips Petroleum stock, as well as the $2,000 for which you sent your check, were intended to purchase subscriptions.

We have about 150 subscriptions which we have been considering of a complimentary nature, and which have been going to colleges, public libraries, and churches for something more than a year. It will be entirely proper to consider that these were actually paid for by your subscription.

This would leave about 150 subscriptions which we cannot properly credit to your subscription. Hence, if you so desire, we will immediately allot 150 fresh institutions of the three kinds indicated to your account and will consider that they were paid for by the other half of the proceeds of the 50 shares of Phillips Petroleum stock which you gave us a year ago. If we do not hear from you to the contrary, we will send you this additional list within a few days.

Sincerely yours,

MERWIN K. HART, *President.*

The next letter is to Mr. Lammot du Pont again. This member of the du Pont family had sent out a plea to business executives for funds to help NEC. Mr. Hart reports on progress and offers Mr. du Pont the post of finance chairman:

JANUARY 17, 1949.

Mr. LAMMOT DU PONT,
Wilmington, Del.

DEAR MR. DU PONT: We continue almost daily to get additional checks from those to whom your letter of December 10 went. We will make you a report a little later as to those persons who gave since our last report to you.

The January letter will go out this week, and will be addressed to about 4,000 names. Scrupulous care has been taken to avoid duplication.

In this connection, several of us in the economic council have been talking, and we think it would be an excellent thing if you would be willing to join our board of directors and become chairman of our finance committee.

Membership on the board would not be very burdensome, for the board, as such, meets only once or twice a year.

The work of the chairman of the finance committee would likewise, I think, not be very burdensome. Requests for money going out over your name as such officer would have great weight with many thousands of people in all parts of the country. When letters go out over my name as president, many of the recipients probably think that I am getting a very juicy slice of what comes in. As a matter of fact, my salary, which is supposed to be $10,00 a year (much less than half of what I formerly earned in other work), is always in arrears. I do not think there has been a single year when I have drawn the full amount.

But letters going out over your name would inspire people with confidence, for they would know that you had no financial interest in it.

It would greatly hearten us if you would give consideration to this suggestion.

Sincerely yours,

MERWIN K. HART,
President.

Mr. Lammot du Pont declines the offer, as the following shows:

LAMMOT DU PONT,
Wilmington, Del., January 20, 1949.

Mr. MERWIN K. HART,
President, National Economic Council, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HART: Your letter of January 17, inviting me to become a member of the board of directors of the Council, was duly received.

Since my retirement from executive work I have endeavored to reduce my responsibilities and commitments, so am very loath to take on additional responsibilities. Further, I believe that I can do the Council more good by not being a member of the board than by being a member. You certainly have my interest, and I believe you will continue to have my support.

Yours sincerely,

LAMMOT DU PONT.

The following letter refers to a mix-up over the mailing of some envelopes which Mr. du Pont had sent to NEC to be addressed. Apparently many had been sent out empty:

JANUARY 24, 1949.

Mr. LAMMOT DU PONT,
Wilmington, Del.

DEAR MR. DU PONT: As you may imagine, I am chagrined at the error in the mailing of a considerable number of your envelopes from this office, stamped and addressed, but with no contents.

We have not been able to ascertain just how it happened. But we have taken steps that will prevent such a thing happening again. I greatly regret the inconvenience and annoyance to yourself.

We received on Saturday the envelopes you sent us that had been received by you, and immediately we mailed freshly addressed envelopes with the proper contents to all of those names. We shall follow this course in the case of any further envelopes that may be received from you, and we shall be obliged to you if you will forward to me promptly any that come.

Probably no explanation to the recipients will be needed, for the receipt of a letter with contents within 2 or 3 days after receiving the empty envelope will probably clear up the matter in the minds of the addressees. I regret, too, the inconvenience it has caused them.

Sincerely yours,

MERWIN K. HART,
President.

ONE CENT FOR EVERY SHARE OF STOCK

Apparently as a result of Mr. du Pont's appeal for funds to help NEC, the Beech Aircraft Corp. is now shown to have subscribed a penny for every outstanding share of stock. Mr. Hart so informs Mr. du Pont in the following letter:

JANUARY 27, 1949.

Mr. LAMMOT DU PONT,
Wilmington, Del.

DEAR MR. DU PONT: Confirming telephone conversation today, we are especially pleased to receive a check this morning from the Beech Aircraft Corp., of Wichita, Kans., for $5,998.65. The accompanying letter tells us that this represents one penny per share for each share of issued and outstanding stock.

On the face of the check are the words: "Payment for work in opposing socialism and communism in America, and for the maintenance and strengthening of American private enterprise, private property and individual initiative."

It would be a splendid thing if we could enlist other organizations to pay us for our work on this same basis.

Sincerely yours,

MERWIN K. HART,
President.

Now it is Mr. Lammot du Pont's turn to keep Mr. Hart posted. He has come to the defense of the NEC in a letter to Mr. C. O. Hodges, vice president of the American Cast Iron Pipe Co. at Birmingham:

FEBRUARY 7, 1949.

Mr. C. O. HODGES,
Vice President,
American Cast Iron Pipe Co.,
Birmingham, Ala.

DEAR MR. HODGES: Many thanks for your interesting letter of February 4, regarding the National Economic Council and matters relating thereto.

My thinking seems to be parallel, but, as usual, there are slight divergencies. While, as you say, there is nothing that the National Economic Council can do at this stage to stem the tide, it does seem to me that the council's clients or readers are encouraged or inspired to do something that they, as individuals, can do from time to time.

There would seem to be no doubt that our troubles are mainly due to the thoughtlessness of the people. That very thoughtlessness prevents them from reading sound literature or listening to sound addresses or broadcasts. They just are not interested. Therefore, to do anything in the way of public education, the sound views have to be put in a form that the public will read more or less inadvertently. According to my thinking, that is one of the reasons why a multiplicity of organizations, such as Spiritual Mobilization, the Foundation for Economic Education, and the National Council of Profit-sharing Industries is effective, rather than wasteful. Each one appeals to a certain area, but no one appeals to all of them. I think the National Economic Council has a certain audience, but, as stated above, it acts as a catalyst on the other organizations and people.

Yours sincerely,

LAMMOT DU PONT.

Mr. Hart, encouraged by the response of the first du Pont appeal to business executives for funds for NEC, now suggests that a similar appeal be sent to business corporations, citing the Beech Aircraft check as an example of the fertile field for new funds, as follows:

FEBRUARY 17, 1949.

Mr. LAMMOT DU PONT,
Wilmington, Del.

DEAR MR. DU PONT: Our work continues to increase. In January of this year I think we had twice as many subscriptions and purchases of publications as in any previous month of our history.

One man in Kansas City has purchased from 11,000 to 12,000 of each of our last two or three council letters and of our last book review, for circulation to his customers. Increasing attention seems to be paid to our publications by men in Congress. The morning mail brings in a reprint of one of our recent council letters published in South Africa.

You were impressed, I think, as I was with the subscription that came to us from the Beech Aircraft Corp. of Wichita, Kans., which was a subscription of 1 penny for each of the nearly 600,000 shares of stock outstanding. This subscription was in response to your January letter.

It has occurred to me to wonder if you would consider addressing a letter to perhaps 100 or 200 carefully selected corporations, mentioning our work and stating that one moderate-size corporation has subscribed in that manner (1 cent for each share of stock), and asking them to consider making a subscription on the same basis. If we got only a few subscriptions out of such a letter, it would be well worth while.

If you think well of this, would you be willing to draft such a letter which might contain, for instance, council letter 207, copy of which I enclose, or if you prefer, I would be glad to submit a suggested draft of such a letter.

Yesterday I received a letter from Lt. Gen. P. A. del Valle, retired, now vice president of the International Telephone & Telegraph, in which he said he considered letter 207 the most important document that had been published in America in the last two decades. That is going pretty strong, but the letter was very well received.

Cecil Palmer, our English lecturer, is making a great hit and we are being flooded with applications for him to speak. He made a profound impression at a dinner Senator Hawkes gave in Washington on February 9, at which 32 Senators (about one-third of the Senate) and about 25 Representatives were present. We will be able to arrange good dates for him in all parts of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

MERWIN K. HART,
President.

Mr. Lammot du Pont decides against that, as follows:

LAMMOT DU PONT,
Wilmington, Del., February 21, 1949.

Mr. MERWIN K. HART,
President, National Economic Council,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HART: Your letter of February 17 was duly received.

I cannot consent to your suggestion that a letter of mine be sent to 100 or 200 selected corporations, mentioning the work of the council and suggesting subscriptions.

There are two reasons which compel my taking this position:

First, you have just recently been following a similar effort, addressed to individuals. It is too early to repeat the performance, even to a different mailing list.

Second, and most important, I cannot individually solicit contributions from corporations when I well know that the company with which I have spent most of my working life; namely, the du Pont Co., would in all probability not comply. The reasons why I think the du Pont Co. would not comply require considerable explanation, and I do not believe need be given.

Yours sincerely,

LAMMOT DU PONT.

And now, Mr. Speaker, we have Mr. Lammot du Pont referring back to his previous inquiry about the missing names of the beneficiaries of one of his free subscription gift checks, as follows:

LAMMOT DU PONT,
Wilmington, Del., March 3, 1949.

Mr. MERWIN K. HART,
President, National Economic Council,
New York City, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HART: Your letter of March 2, with list of 300 names to whom Council publications will be sent, was duly received.

You are correct that it was my intention to subscribe to $5,000 of subscriptions for 1949, and in January of this year I sent a check for $5,000 to cover.

The list you have sent me covers only 300 names. A copy of it is returned herewith, bearing my approval. Could you not send me an additional list covering 200 names to complete the 500?

In your letter of January 7, 1949, when you acknowledged receipt of my check for $5,000, you indicated that the list you were going to send would include the 200 to which gift subscriptions were sent last year. Does this mean that you are going to consider the list of last year as being renewed and the 300 on the current list added? If so, should I not have a list to the 200 names of last year?

Yours sincerely,

LAMMOT DU PONT.

The following letter, with its attachment, is in answer:

MARCH 9, 1949.

Mr. LAMMOT DU PONT,
Wilmington, Del.

DEAR MR. DU PONT: Mr. Hart has requested me to send you a list of 200 institutions whose subscriptions you are renewing for 1949. This list is enclosed herewith. Please sign and return one copy.

You may note there are some changes in personnel which brings the list up to date.

You will be interested in the enclosed copy of a letter received from a librarian whose library is on one of your gift lists.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) C. G. DALL,
Assistant to the President.

UNIVERSITY CITY PUBLIC LIBRARY,
University City, Mo., March 7, 1949.

Mr. MERWIN K. HART,
President, National Economic Council,
Inc., New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HART: Thank you for your letter of February 24, 1949, telling us that we are to receive a gift subscription to the publications of the National Economic Council. I liked the Power to Destroy, and the March Review of Books, which were sent to us. May I say that I am heartily in accord with your article, the Power to Destroy? The complacency with which too many of our everyday citizens look upon the increasing trend toward socialism in our country is indeed distressing. We are glad to display your publications on our magazine table. Thank you very much.

Yours sincerely,

CONSTANCE GRIER,
Librarian.

The following letter is dated April 14, 1949, but apparently is misdated and

should be in March for, after that, comes a later letter dated April 4, 1949, on the same matter:

APRIL 14, 1949.

Mr. MERWIN K. HART,
President, National Economic Council, Inc., New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HART: This will acknowledge Mrs. Dall's letter of March 9, enclosing list of 200 institutions whose subscriptions have been renewed for 1949.

Mr. du Pont is in Florida at the present time and will not return until April 4. Shortly thereafter he will return one copy to you, signed.

Yours sincerely,

MARY A. DOUGHERTY,
Secretary to Mr. du Pont.

APRIL 4, 1949.

Mr. MERWIN K. HART,
President, National Economic Council, Inc., New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HART: Further in reply to your letter of March 9, I am returning herewith list of subscriptions which have been renewed for 1949 and which I have signed, as requested.

Yours sincerely,

LAMMOT DU PONT.

THE DONEE LISTS USED FOR TAX DEDUCTIONS

These above, refer to this matter of keeping track of the names of the institutions—colleges, libraries, and churches—to which NEC subscriptions have been sent anonymously, but at Mr. du Pont's expense. The purpose of keeping the lists is, I understand, to claim these as charitable contributions to the particular institutions in the donor's income tax return.

Some months thereafter, on November 25, 1949, Mr. Lammot du Pont addresses another letter to businessmen to urge for the NEC. This letter follows:

LAMMOT DU PONT,
Wilmington, Del., November 25, 1949.

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: Last December, believing the National Economic Council was doing outstanding work toward stemming the tide of communism and socialism in this country, I wrote to many Americans, urging them to contribute to the Council.

Now, I have just read Council Letter No. 226, "There Is no Peace," calling attention to the import of the trial of the 11 Communists before Judge Medina, and pointing out clearly and forcefully the work that still must be done to save our country from communism and socialism, or any other form of tyranny.

Will you not read the letter, think about it, and form your own opinion of its worth and truth? True, it is only one sample of the Council's work, but in my opinion, after reading many of the Council's Letters, it is a fair sample.

I feel sure that you will conclude that the Council is doing a good job. We all have many calls upon us, but in my opinion the National Economic Council should stand among those at the top or near the top of any businessman's list.

Will you not stretch a point and make a contribution, or make a larger contribution, and promptly?

Checks should be mailed to National Economic Council, Empire State Building, New York 1, N. Y.

Yours sincerely,

LAMMOT DU PONT.

After a reasonable interval, Mr. Hart follows up with a letter to the same list of potential donors, as follows:

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, INC.,
New York, N. Y., January 9, 1950.

DEAR SIR: Mr. Lammot du Pont tells us that last November he brought to your attention the work of the National Economic Council, which for the past 20 years has been combating Communist-Socialist influences in the United States.

Mr. du Pont sent you Economic Council letter 226 as an example of one of the activities of the council, and he asked you to read this letter and give your financial support to further council activities.

We are taking the liberty today of enclosing a subsequent council letter No. 227, entitled "Socialism and Bankruptcy."

Any contribution that you or your company makes will be welcome and will be used in the continuing fight to prevent America from becoming a hand-out state.

We shall be happy to hear from you.

Very sincerely yours,

MERWIN K. HART,
President.

Following is a reference in NEC files to some of the turn-downs from this appeal:

TURN-DOWNS TO DU PONT LETTER FOR CONTRIBUTIONS

JANUARY 22, 1950.

A. E. Berlin, president of the Hearst Corp., comments:

"We have been combating communism as a public service to our readers and to our fellow countrymen. Your pamphlet, Socialism and Bankruptcy, is splendid. Too much of this sort of thing cannot be circulated among the people of America."

Turn-downs to NEC from:

Koppers Co.

Collier Keyworth Co.

Canadian Foreign Investment Co.

Federal Mills, Inc.

United Light & Railways.

Cerro de Pasco.

Atlas Steel Castings.

State Street Trust. All on Forbes says that he is working with two other similar enterprises and does not want to do more.

Hardy & Rankin Co.: J. K. Rankin, president, thinks all similar committees to NEC should join together and pool their activities. His outfit is distributing a quantity of the Road Ahead.

Esso Standard: G. M. Buckingham wrote, "This company through its public and advertising devotes considerable time and expense to preserving the American way of life—and must decline doing more."

IF LEGAL, IS IT MORAL?

Now, Mr. Speaker, it will be seen from these exhibits above that the National Economic Council has an excellent scheme for having contributions to it—which are not tax deductible—made tax deductible by the simple means of regarding them as gifts, not to the lobbying organization, but to the particular church or college or library receiving the material.

I do not know whether this is permitted under present law, but evidently Mr. Hart had good legal counsel on the matter, as shown by an early letter. I do not think it is moral, however, for anyone to claim a charitable contribution to a lot of churches, libraries, and colleges of $10 each for subsidizing the anonymous mailing to these institutions of very extreme political and economic propaganda. I am sure any church would rather have $10 toward the mortgage than a free subscription to the NEC news letter. I think any college or library would prefer the $10 in cash to use as it sees fit.

Whether legal or moral or neither of those things, I think, Mr. Speaker, that it might be a matter the tax committees of the Congress would be interested in exploring.

My committee, the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities is interested in this scheme only as it reflects a successful money-raising technique for a lobbying organization.

IS IT A REVENUE LOOPHOLE?

But I am sure other committes will be interested in exploring this matter from the tax-loophole angle. It seems to me the Government could lose a lot of revenue, and lobbying organizations would benefit financially accordingly, if they could get extensive funds from wealthy donors which would be tax deductible because of a technicality. All any lobbying group would have to do would be to establish a paid-subscription news letter to go to charitable or educational institutions and let the contributions be earmarked for free gift subscriptions.

The ramifications of this are tremendous.

British Reciprocity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, those who have been hopeful of the Marshall plan, of European cooperation, and of reciprocity between nations generally have been astounded and disheartened by the recent attitude of the Labor government of Great Britain. An exceedingly well-expressed editorial on the subject entitled "How the British Give Thanks" has recently appeared in the Vineland Times-Journal, and is herewith appended:

HOW THE BRITISH GIVE THANKS

There is a trait inherent in some children which causes them to say, "I won't play if I can't be the leader." And when children reach adulthood, they sometimes acquire another trait, that of biting the hand that fed them.

Great Britain's Labor government this week seems to have evidenced both traits in its announcement that it will have nothing to do with the Schuman plan to pool French and German industrial resources.

British labor's foreign policy statement said, in effect, that His Majesty's Government could not take part in any industrial union in Europe because the other nations involved are not socialistic—public utilities and other large industry are not government owned. Of course, if all the other western nations would model their governments after the British, then His Majesty's Government will be glad to cooperate, as long as His Majesty's Government is not overruled on any important subjects.

What the United States has poured into England in materials and money since the end of World War II, during the Labor

Party term of office, has been of too recent memory to be dimmed. We don't recall Uncle Sam telling His Majesty's Government that it would receive no American aid toward recovery unless it ditched its Labor Party leadership. We can't remember President Truman or Secretary of State Acheson telling the British to remove the coal industry from nationalization or risk losing Marshall-plan funds. We recall only that the United States said to Great Britain and the other western European nations: we will help you on the road to recovery, and with no strings attached.

Perhaps it is time for the United States to stop mollycoddling His Majesty's Government. Perhaps it is time for Uncle Sam to tell the British administration that if it can do without European unity against possible Communist aggression, then perhaps it can also do without any further American economic and military aid. We believe that time has come.

Among many people, there is more than a sneaking suspicion—more like a definite conviction, that Great Britain through the years has continued one policy: England first and the rest of the world be damned. The policy statement by the Labor government this week has cemented that conviction.

Terror by Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am impressed with the patriotic fervor, courage, and determination of George N. Craig, national commander of the American Legion, in pressing the fight against Communists. The American Legion can perform as great a service now for our country in defeating the subversive enemies within our Nation as they did in fighting a foreign foe in the late wars.

The article entitled "Terror by Law" by National Commander George N. Craig in the American Legion magazine should alert every legionnaire and every other patriotic citizen to help clear our institutions, organizations, schools, colleges, and Government from the vicious un-American Communist enemy endeavoring to weaken and destroy our form of government.

I am inserting as a part of my remarks the article by National Commander George N. Craig, to which I have referred:

TERROR BY LAW

(By George N. Craig, national commander, the American Legion)

Terror was the watchword for anyone who dared talk out against the Communists 20 years ago.

The reds had goon squads, gangs equipped with blackjacks and knives, and they used them to beat into a blood pulp the men—and the women, too—who opposed their plot to take over America.

In the mine fields of West Virginia, in the steel mills of Pennsylvania, in the automobile plants of Michigan and the garment factories of New York, it was a rare day that someone was not found in a crumpled, bleeding heap. And that someone was always a person who had stood up against the Communists.

Concentrating as the Stalinists were then on organizing the foreign-born, their terroristic tactics were designed to spread fear among the susceptible, panicky people they were working on. They were devised to create the legend, "It doesn't pay to fight Communists." That such tactics were effective can be seen from the success the Reds had in gaining so much control in the American labor movement.

Today, the Reds have changed their strategy.

The Communist Party knows that the average American of the year 1950 cannot easily be frightened by threats of bodily harm. Instead of using physical assaults, the party, therefore, is now resorting to something even more sinister—legal beatings up—as a means of intimidating anti-Communists.

No word of this has yet hit the headlines, but I can reveal that a well-organized machine of Communist legal goons are now operating in every section of the United States. Like the old gangs of strong-arm men, the machine has just one objective—to scare off opposition to the Reds' plans.

This Communist legal juggernaut swung into action recently in a little community on the outskirts of New York City. Its victim was a plain, ordinary American whose sole crime was that he objected to domination of his town's government by a group led by Communists.

What happened was this:

A long-time resident of this New York suburb suddenly awakened to the fact that a clique of alleged liberals, led by a small but efficient core of Communists, had taken control of the town's affairs. By shrewd politicking, these people had placed their men in office as city manager, as police commissioner, and, even more insidious, as head of the local school board.

The old-timer didn't like it.

He got up at a town meeting and declared, "This town is under the thumb of a gang of pinks and reds, and it's time that the real Americans here did something about it."

Minutes later this old-timer was approached by two men of the Communist-led faction whom he knew to be lawyers. One of them shoved his fist in his face.

"You've just committed a vicious slander," he said, "and unless you retract it publicly, we're going to sue."

"Go ahead and sue," he replied. "What I said is true, and you know it."

"Maybe so," the lawyer said, "but you'll still have to hire lawyers to defend you, and before we're through with you, it'll cost you every cent you have."

Like any citizen confronted with the threat of a lawsuit, the old-timer was alarmed. He felt sure he could substantiate his charges, but he knew he couldn't afford the big fee a lawyer might ask to defend him. Such a trial, he knew, mght drag on for months or years. And supposing the Commies won.

At the next meeting he rose and withdrew his statement.

The significance of this retreat was not lost on others at the meeting, and a budding rebellion against the Reds collapsed. Today that New York town of 10,000 people is still under the sway of the Red-led clique.

The two lawyers who threatened the old-timer were, of course, part of the Communists' legal steamroller and their blackmailing approach was typical of the technique it employs.

This Red legal machine is used throughout the country, in big cities and small towns, to intimidate individuals, organizations, and even newspapers who oppose the Stalinists.

But that is not all it is used for.

It is used to aid Communist spies and conspirators escape punishment for their admitted crimes.

It is used to discredit the courts and the democratic code of justice.

It is used to plant Communist lawyers in high Government posts so that they can commit espionage in behalf of Soviet Russia.

The activities of this machine are so widespread and so menacing that immediate steps to offset them are imperative.

What is desperately needed, in my opinion, is a remedial program consisting of two equally important points. One provides for the legal profession itself to clean house. The other calls for the rallying of all lawyers within the ranks of the American Legion to help in the fight against communism. Under its terms lawyers' committees would be established in every post to protect good Americans from legal persecution by the Communists.

That something must be done, and soon, is certain.

Here are some actual case histories of how the red legal juggernaut has been functioning.

In a small town near Chicago a veteran demanded the ouster of a confessed Communist from the city council.

The next day this veteran, who was earning less than $75 a week as a bank teller, was sued for $50,000.

In filing their suit, the Communists deliberately saw to it that it received wide newspaper attention. Just as they expected, the bank for which the veteran worked, didn't like this publicity and discharged him.

Out in the Midwest, a young businessman started a campaign to oust a known Communist from his position as the city welfare administrator. This businessman knew that the Communist in question was utilizing his post not only to aid other Reds but also to discriminate against non-Communists in real need of relief.

Within 10 days after he had launched the drive, this businessman, who was the head of a small, struggling factory, received a letter from a left-wing lawyer. It was a threat to bring suit against his company for alleged infringement of patents.

Before he even had a chance to reply to the letter, the businessman got a telephone call. It was from the left-wing lawyer.

"If you'll drop your campaign," he said, "we'll drop our suit. If you won't, we'll take your business away from you."

The businessman told him, "Go to hell." As a result, his concern is now tied up in the courts.

Nor is it solely laymen who have suffered.

When the police of a southern city tried to halt an illegal Communist-sponsored parade, the Commie stooges intentionally created such a row that they had to be arrested.

Less than a week afterward, a half-dozen policemen had been served with papers in a false-arrest suit.

Right now, Paul Robeson and some of his fellow left-wingers have a $2,000,000 damage suit pending against the law-enforcement authorities of Westchester County, N. Y. That, you will recall, is where the Commies provoked two shocking riots.

The extent to which the Communist legal machine will go was illustrated even more vividly in Connecticut a few weeks ago.

The editor of a small newspaper there who had been vigorously crusading against certain Communist organizations was visited by a delegation of three lawyers from nearby Hartford.

"We've come to ask you to halt these attacks on our organization," they said.

"You're wasting your time," the editor told them.

"Then we'll sue you for $1,000,000 damages."

"Go ahead and sue," the editor said.

"You're forgetting something," the trio of attorneys stated. "Under Connecticut law, we can attach all the property and funds of your newspaper in a case like this. And

we can freeze them until the outcome of the trial. That means you won't be able to use your bank account or anything else for months and maybe years."

Although this editor has continued his fight on communism, he has been having some sleepless, worrying nights lately.

The Red's lawyers have moved in on anti-Communist writers and publishers, too.

When Eugene Lyons, the noted author, wrote a book exposing the subversive methods of the Communists, Reds all over the Nation bombarded the publisher with threats of suit.

One fellow traveler actually filed suit, and, despite Lyons' objections, the publisher backed down before the threats of the fellow-traveler's lawyers and agreed to make revisions in the text of the book.

The fellow traveler did not stop there.

He went so far as to try to prevent book wholesalers from distributing the book.

"We'll sue you, too," his lawyers told the book wholesalers, "unless you stop handling this book."

They brought so much pressure that several wholesalers became frightened, too, and ceased distributing the book.

Harassing tactics of this sort are, however, only one use the Communists make of their legal machine.

They constantly utilize it to protect party followers from paying the penalty for their subversive acts.

To do this, they maintain a regular pool of high-priced lawyers, each of them skilled at taking advantage of all loopholes in American law. These lawyers are always on call for the defense of Reds who get into trouble. So strict is party discipline that they will drop any other client they may be representing, no matter how high the fee, to defend anyone the party designates.

Time and again, these machine lawyers have succeeded in getting Communists out of blatant jams.

Scores of alien Communists have been saved from deportation by their tricks.

Hundreds of Communists have successfully avoided answering the questions of congressional probers because of their legal stratagems.

The Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities was so outraged by the testimony of one of the Reds' lawyers, Maurice L. Braverman, of Washington, D. C., that former Congressman John McDowell, Pennsylvania, exclaimed bitterly:

"It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that an attorney, too, is a traitor to his country."

Nothing is too extreme for some of these lawyers to do. Character assassination is, for instance, one of their specialties.

Mervyn Rathborne, a reformed Communist who used to be president of the CIO American Communications Association, found that out when he was called to testify at the recent trial of Harry Bridges for perjury. The defense counsel went to such lengths to discredit Rathborne's statement that Bridges, the left-wing stevedore leader, had lied when he said he had never been a Communist, the prosecuting attorney had to protest.

The defense, he complained to the court, had badgered and threatened Rathborne and referred to him as "a burglar, a drunkard, a gambler, a thief, a liar."

The Reds' lawyers do more, though, than just put up a defense for accused commies. They also are ultra-skilled at making every trial serve as a vehicle for Stalinist propaganda.

The trial of the 11 top leaders of the American Communist Party on charges of conspiracy to overthrow the United States Government is a graphic example of this.

Knowing that the evidence was preponderantly against the defendants, their attorneys set out to milk the trial dry for propaganda purposes. They turned the case into an "agit-prop" device—a means for creating agitation and propaganda. They used the trial to cast reflections on the American jury system and the fairness of American judges.

As part of this plot the Reds' lawyers made their grandstand charges that Negroes and Jews were excluded from Federal jury rolls—an accusation that was completely disproven but which made for 2 months of headlines.

As part of this plot, the Reds' lawyers adopted heckling, obstructionistic tactics which threatened to convert the trial into a circus. They did everything in their power to exasperate Judge Harold R. Medina and make him declare a mistrial. Their efforts were so flagrant that they resulted in jail sentences for several of the lawyers for contempt of court.

It is significant, incidentally, that Vincent Hallinan, chief defense counsel for Harry Bridges, was also held in contempt by a Federal judge for employing the same type of courtroom conduct.

In both cases, the object of the attorneys appeared plain—to break down public confidence in democratic judicial processes.

The most sinister of all uses made by the Communists for their legal machine is the infiltration of the Government for subversive purposes.

Congressional investigators have discovered how this plot has operated.

The Communist Party laid the groundwork for it back in the thirties by getting jobs for party lawyers in such Federal agencies as the PWA, the WPA, the AAA, and the old NRA. The lawyers they planted there saw to it that other Communist attorneys were hired, and they helped each other get placed in "sensitive spots" throughout the Government.

That was how Alger Hiss obtained his high-ranking post in the State Department and was able, according to the sworn testimony of Whittaker Chambers, to act as a spy for the Soviets.

The Communist underground in Washington was full of these lawyers. In it, according to Chambers' sworn testimony, were left-wing attorneys like Nathan Witt, Lee Pressman, and John Abt. When these three and the others were asked whether they were members of the Communist Party, they refused to reply.

To answer this simple question, they said, might incriminate them.

The injury that men like these have done, and still may be doing, to the security of the United States is enormous.

There is yet another major use which the Reds make of their legal machine. It is one of their chief instruments for subverting labor unions.

In every union in which the Communists have any influence, they always seek to get one of their lawyers appointed as the organization counsel.

"Communist lawyers," states an official congressional report, "serve as the direct channel between the Communist Party and the union. Although not elected by the membership and not responsible to it, they often exercise monopoly control of collective bargaining and union policy.

"They are responsible for all kinds of legal tricks to perpetuate the control of Communist officials and stifle all opposiiton."

How does the Red legal juggernaut function?

At the top, in total control, is the party's politburo. Next in command are the party heads in the various States and cities. Under policies laid down by the Politburo, these local Communist chieftains decide what cases they want their lawyers to handle, what individuals or groups they want them to assail.

How does the Red legal machine recruit its forces?

The party makes it a special point to enroll lawyers in preference to any other group.

It maintains a regular lawyers' faction inside the organization. Today, insiders say that more than 5,000 of the party's 55,000 dues-paying members are lawyers. Typical of them is Harry Sacher, who has been identified as a party member by Louis Budenz.

The force of 5,000 attorneys, moreover, represent only a part of the party's legal strength. In addition to it, the party can also count on the help of thousands of fellow-traveling lawyers.

The principal mechanism utilized by the Red legal machine is the front organization.

More than 20 separate legal fronts have been established by the party precisely for this purpose. These range all the way from the All-California Conference for Defense of Civil Rights and Aid to Labor's Prisoners to the Oklahoma Federation for Constitutional Rights and the Committee for Citizenship Rights.

Typical of them is the Committee for the Defense of Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. It has been described by the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities as "drummed up by the Communist Party and its fellow-travelers to defend known Communists from charges of perjury, contempt of Congress and the courts, immigration and passport fraud, illegal registration, and other violations of law."

Also typical is the International Juridical Association. The New York City Council has said that it is "devoted to the defense of the Communist Party, Communists, and radical agitators * * * not limited merely to legal research but to sharp criticism of existing governmental agencies and defense of subversive groups."

The two worst of these Communist legal fronts, unquestionably, are the Civil Rights Congress and the National Lawyers Guild.

The Civil Rights Congress is an outgrowth of the International Labor Defense, or organization officially branded "The American section * * * of the Red International Aid." Formed in Detroit on April 28, 1946, this Civil Rights Congress, it has been found, is "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party."

The National Lawyers Guild is even more dangerous because it has been able to camouflage its Communist connections.

Formed as an organization of lawyers ostensibly interested in raising the standards of the bar, the Guild succeeded in enrolling thousands of nonsuspecting lawyers, men of the calibre of Judge Ferdinand Pecora, Joseph D. McGoldrick, and Nathan Margolf, the Solicitor to the United States Department of the Interior.

Although all three of these men, and many others, have since quit in disgust over the organization's adherence to the Communist line, the Guild still maintains its facade of respectability.

Just how much this outfit has been able to dupe the public came glaringly to the surface only a couple of months ago.

The exposé occurred when an enterprising Washington correspondent asked the Senate Judiciary Committee how it determined the qualifications of persons nominated for Federal judgeships by President Truman.

"We get the advice of outside organizations," committee officials declared.

"What sort of organizations?" the correspondent inquired.

"The National Lawyers Guild," the committee said.

Incredible as it may sound, the all-important Judiciary Committee of the United

States Senate was consulting with an organization named by Earl Browder himself as "a Communist transmission belt" as to who should sit on the Federal bench.

So far, all endeavors to fight the Communist legal machine have failed. When a move was made in the California Legislature to compel lawyers to take loyalty oaths, the machine licked it.

It is with this in mind that I am calling for the adoption of the two-plank remedial program which I outlined earlier in this article. The need for it is urgent.

Under this program, the legal profession itself would crack down on Communist lawyers who make a mockery out of the canons of the professional ethics of the bar.

The grievance committees in the various local bar associations must move to disbar any lawyers who deliberately try to sabotage the American system of justice.

Grievance committees in most bar associations have this right, and it is up to them to use it.

Such a move would not deprive Communists, or anyone else, of the legal protection to which they are entitled under the American Constitution. It would simply prevent Communist lawyers from sabotaging the Constitution.

At this very moment, the legal profession is—and knows it is—under fire for its disregard of the public. There is, in the words of Glenn R. Winters, editor of the Journal of the American Judicature Society, "an estrangement between attorneys and the public."

The bar can do much to ease this estrangement by acting against the type of lawyers who most discredit it.

As a lawyer, I call on the bar to act now. But even that will not be enough.

What also is needed is legal protection for the average American who believes in his patriotic duty to stand up against the Commies.

That is why I, as national commander of the American Legion, am calling on lawyer-members of the Legion to join the battle against the Reds.

I urge that each Legion Post organize a committee of lawyers from among its own membership who would be prepared to give advice to any Legionnaire tangling with the Red legal machine. They would tell what is safe, and what is legally unsafe, for him to say and do. They would tell him how seriously to take the threats of the Red lawyers and how much attention he need pay to their blackjacking methods.

If a Legionnaire learns that a public official in his town is a Communist and wants to make it known, he could discuss the matter first with his Post's legal committee. He could find out how solid is the evidence he has, and whether he has the right to air it. This will safeguard him by keeping him from making charges he can't make stick.

Equally important, the legal committee would be ready to defend any Legionnaire unjustly attacked by the Communists.

What if there are no lawyers in a Legion Post?

Then the Post should enlist the aid of prominent anti-Communist lawyers in town. The Post should explain the threat of the Communist legal machine and ask these other attorneys to serve on a voluntary basis. I am certain that they will be glad to help.

Both these steps—the clean-up of the bar and the establishment of Legion legal committees—are essential if the Red legal juggernaut is to be stopped from continuing to trample on the civil liberties of America and genuine Americans.

Effect of State and Federal Regulation Upon the Insured

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, March 29), 1950

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address recently delivered to the American Management Association, at New York City, by Mr. Roger Kenney, insurance editor of the United States Investor. Mr. Kenney has discussed, in a pertinent and lucid manner, the problem of insurance regulation. He deals particularly with the question as to whether or not the States have been making progress toward the establishment of a free competitive system in the insurance industry.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the United States Investor of May 27, 1950]

EFFECT OF STATE AND FEDERAL REGULATION UPON THE INSURED

(Address by Roger Kennedy before the insurance conference of the American Management Association at New York City, May 23)

Far be it from me to set myself up as an oracle who can tell you exactly down to the most minute detail what you can expect either in the form of future regulation or its effect upon the policy buyers. But I can point out the underlying conditions which have brought into sharp focus the question whether State regulation is to survive in whole or in part, and then let you judge for yourselves what the future holds forth. * * * Why is it that you raise this question of the future regulation of the insurance business? I can tell you in a few short words. You are dissatisfied with the present order of things in the fire and casualty business—particularly fire—and somehow or other you have come to the conclusion that any situation would be better than the present—even Federal regulation.

Harsh words, you say. Not if I have been interpreting correctly some of the speeches made by members of your own group in recent months. Indeed, it was only a few months ago that the insurance buyer of a large retail organization pointed his criticism at the fire-insurance companies and charged them with "hiding behind laws they helped to put on the statute books, through their All-Industry Committee, as a defense against doing anything other than within the confined limits dictated by their rating bureaus."

On still another occasion, the insurance buyer of a large manufacturing and distributing organization made a similar charge. "Vital competition in price between insurance companies," said he, "is stifled by State regulatory laws which require collaboration in rate making—and buyers of insurance and the public in general must adjust their perspective and incidentally their pocketbooks, too, to this socialization of the insurance business." And from there, he went on to say that "State regulation of insurance was put on trial with the enactment of Public Law 15. If it proves to be cumbersome and detrimental to the ability of the insurance industry to meet the insurance requirements of our expanding economy, then Public Law 15 will be modified and regulation transferred to Federal authorities."

FED UP ON STATE REGULATION

Now, if these words reflect a cross-section of the thinking among your membership, then I am certainly within my rights in assuming that you are a bit fed up on State regulation as it is being administered under Public Law 15—and you are wondering whether it would not be a good thing for the insurance buyer to end this period of trial and error of State regulation once and for all. Frankly, I have had the same thoughts at times! But I have stopped short of going the full way toward Federal regulation. And this, for two reasons. In the first place, I am still firmly of the belief that because of the personal nature of insurance, its regulation should be held close to the people. In the second place, what guaranty has anyone—in or out of the insurance business—that the period of trial and error will be shortened under Federal regulation—or, even if it should be shortened, the final effect upon rates and forms will be any more to your liking than they are today, particularly as to competition and flexibility?

PROPHECY COMES TRUE

* * * as far back as March 1947, in an address in St. Louis, I made this very definite prophecy:

"The very situation which the SEUA decision outlawed now crops up in legality. Under the rating laws so far devised by the all-industry committee, rates will be uniform, adequate, reasonable, fair and nondiscriminatory, perhaps. But to all intents and purposes, the public will pay the rates fixed by the States. Competition in the insurance business will be dulled. There will be little or no incentive among companies to do a better job at a lower price—if for no other reason than the practical difficulties attendant upon securing approval of deviation."

* * * Hasn't that very condition come to pass, and isn't it the underlying cause of all your dissatisfaction with State regulation as it is being administered under these rigid laws recently passed.

Truth of the matter is that the great majority of the fire and casualty fraternity have come to realize that certain great legal minds sold them a bill of goods on these rigid rating laws, and they are now looking for a way out—a way to meet competition not only from within their own ranks but also from certain privileged, unlicensed and unregulated underwriters from abroad.

There's no need of speaking in generalities on this score. Let me take you behind the scenes in that august organization of the stock fire insurance companies—the FIA. The story starts with a confidential call for a special meeting of the members of the FIA in the New York board room on February 2 last. And a very important meeting it was—as is evident from the fact that a record number of top executives attended.

POOL VERSUS INDIVIDUAL ACTION

What went on at this eventful meeting? Well, you'll find it difficult to believe, but a program was unfolded by the president of the FIA, which would, in reality, substitute group or pool underwriting of certain large risks now subject to competition within as well as without the stock insurance ranks and having little or nothing in common, one to the other. In other words, even though it was carefully set forth in the call for the

meeting that action should be taken to meet this situation, "possibly within the framework of the FIA, possibly without," there wasn't any doubt as the meeting proceeded that President Pierce of the FIA had some rather definite ideas as to how the underwriting could be accomplished within the framework of that organization.

And that's where the "fun" began—many executives in attendance soon recognizing that the whole scheme was diametrically opposed to the philosophy which prompted the passage of Public Law 15 and of the State rating laws enacted to carry out that philosophy. In short, very early in the meeting it became apparent that all this talk we have been hearing from Senator O'MAHONEY and others in Washington to the effect that "Public Law 15 was an invitation to the insurance industry and to the States to set up a formula of State regulation which will preserve a free economy in insurance" had been forgotten under the stress of competition by the executive staff of the FIA.

THE SPIRIT OF INDEPENDENCE

You'll ask me now: "What became of this very ambitious program of collective action sponsored by the management of the FIA? I'll tell you. It was torn apart by the general membership and finally assigned to committee for further study—which means a peaceful and unannounced death.

Mark you well, my friends—this recent episode behind closed doors of the stock fire insurance business has great significance so far as the future of State regulation and the general competitive situation in the fire insurance business is concerned. It means—among other things—that at long last, the thinking in the higher reaches of that branch of the business has now definitely turned in the direction of more individual action and less collective action. It means that the top executives in the fire insurance business will have no part of a program based upon the bold theory that collective action is always more intelligent than individual action. It means that the spirit of independence has gripped even the so-called organization companies in the stock fire insurance business—all with the result that from now on, you are going to see a very distinct trend toward the elimination of those moss-grown bureaus, associations and committees which have tended to choke off private enterprise and to substitute committee thinking for individual thinking and initiative in the fire insurance business.

Still another off-the-record meeting of top fire insurance executives was held recently at the Hotel Pierre here in New York City. With the top officers of the National Board of Fire Underwriters acting as unofficial hosts, invitations were hurriedly sent out all over the country for this secret and important meeting. It was truly a gathering of the top brass in the industry, and all for the purpose, apparently, of making answers to the charge that there was no leadership in the business worthy of the name. And what happened? Why the very thing that you, as buyers, would want to happen. The assembled guests were presented with a list of no less than 148 organizations in which membership is necessary to write multiple line business in 48 States and asked to suggest ways and means of streamlining the business.

In the wake of that meeting has now come a public pronouncement from one of the far-sighted leaders in the business, none other than Harold V. Smith, president of the Home Insurance Co., that "there are too many committees in the business that don't do anything", that what the industry needs is a national board of insurance to represent both the first and casualty companies. Yes, and it also needs a man in Washington who knows his way around and can speak with authority for the industry.

AN ANSWER TO YOUR CHARGE

There, my friends of the American Management Association, you have your answer to the charge made from within your own ranks that the fire insurance business set up these strict rating laws as a legal blind to cover up a lack of desire to meet the challenge and invitation contained in Public Law 15 which is that the States shall set up a formula of regulation that will preserve a free economy in insurance. I beg of you, therefore, to exercise a little patience before you lend your support to an ill-timed and ill-conceived movement for Federal regulation of the insurance business which will add one more unit to the already topheavy Federal bureaucracy without any guaranty that private enterprise in the insurance business will be given a new and life-giving transfusion of blood. Indeed, there is reason to believe that quite the contrary will result.

* * * * *

If your memory will take you back 3 or 4 years, to the time when feelings ran high on the question whether Public Law 15 required that the States enact rigid rating laws, you will recall that I had a good deal to say about the possibility of what I chose to term a State-blessed monopoly emerging from the enactment of such laws. This, because there was altogether too much disposition among certain regulatory authorities, as well as certain segments of the insurance business, to interpret the word regulate as used in Public Law 15 to mean absolute control of rates by the commissioners, even to the extent of having only one rate for given classifications or types of risks.

Well, that fear hasn't proved to be entirely without foundation in certain States with regard to so-called schedule-rating plans in general liability, automobile liability, and other casualty lines. The plain fact is that not so many months ago, there was a movement under way in zones 2 and 3 (comprised of the Virginias, Carolinas, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Maryland, Delaware, Tennessee, and other Southern States), to disapprove these plans on the theory that they constitute discrimination—a situation which would have the tendency to make for but one rate to a classification and thereby upset the entire casualty business, wipe out the experience and knowledge of underwriters and agents and, in effect, create the very type of monopoly which the rating laws were designed to prevent—a monopoly in the hands of a few large companies.

A SHOW-DOWN ON SCHEDULE RATING

To be sure that you understand the full import of the problem, let me define "schedule rating" as it is used in the casualty business. Stated simply, it is the rating man's approach to the scientific and not unfairly discriminatory rate. Or to put it another way, the term "schedule rating," as used in this controversy, was an attempt to evaluate accurately the intangibles and imponderables.

So, you see, there's nothing mysterious about schedule rating in the casualty business. It is a refinement of the classification system with a view to establishing a not unfairly discriminatory rate for the individual risk within the classification.

But that's where the rub came so far as certain commissioners were concerned. Following the enactment of the new regulatory laws in the various States a year or two back, the companies felt that it was necessary to treat these rating practices as a rating plan and accordingly various versions were filed with the insurance departments. At the outset, comparatively few States had either the time or the facilities to make any comprehensive study of the problem, but the time came when certain commissioners decided that the rule or plan as filed did not meet the requirements of the law—particularly that part which says that "rates shall not be excessive, inadequate, or unfairly discriminatory."

One commissioner went so far as to call a hearing on the subject, stating that "it appears that the application of such underwriting is purely on a judgment basis and therefore discriminatory. The plans lend themselves too well to competitive-rate reduction when difficulty arises in procuring the business." That was the signal for trouble—the kind of trouble that would truly warm your hearts as discerning buyers of casualty coverage. Almost to a man, both the companies and the agents rose up to remark: "What of it"? Then they proceeded to remind the commissioner that the rating laws were designed to promote competition and not monopoly—that it is the commissioner's job to regulate for solvency, that is, to see that competition does not get out of hand. Yes, and the commissioner was also reminded that most State rating laws provide that uniformity of rates is neither prohibited nor required, and thus for a single classification, a variety of different rates can apply.

There you are. The record of this case—and others I might cite if time allowed—ought to be enough to convince you that there is no disposition in the casualty industry to use the rating laws recently passed as a legal screen for inflexibility of rates and forms. You'll have no doubt on that score when I remind you that the companies and the agents were so militant in their stand against any interpretation of the rating laws which would make for a State-blessed monopoly that the commissioners who had been insisting upon one rate per classification have retreated behind a further study of the problem.

NO WHOLESALE AMENDMENT OF RATING LAWS

Now, of course, the fact that both the fire and casualty industry have taken a new view of the rating laws since the memorable days of the All-Industry Committee when many of us were shouting ourselves hoarse warning against the possible development of a State-blessed monopoly, doesn't mean that we are in for a period of wholesale amendment of these State laws. What the industry can do—and is trying desperately hard to do—is to make the commissioners understand that they earnestly desire competition to remain in the insurance business—that whether State regulation continues or not is dependent quite as much upon the administration of these rating laws as upon the content of the laws themselves.

You will now ask me what are the chances of success in the industry's new approach to this whole rating question, and I'll be quick to answer "good." But the sad part of it all is that even if the acme of success is attained in this endeavor to impress upon the commissioners the need of fostering competition in the business and the removal of any undue barriers to the free flow of insurance between the States, there is still no guaranty that State supervision will survive. And this, for two reasons: In the first place, you must always remember that State supervision—no matter how efficient it is from the standpoint of the buyer or that of the industry—exist only by the will of Congress under Public Law 15. With Congress rests the final decision as to whether State supervision will remain. What Congress gave, it can take away in this sphere of regulating a business now deemed interstate commerce by the highest court in the land. In the second place, you and I would be less than realists if we did not recognize that even though the States went very far—perhaps too far—in enacting rigid rating laws, there are still some holes in the armor of State regulation which lay it wide open to poaching by the Federal Government.

THE REAL THREAT FROM FTC

In this connection, you hear a great deal today about intrusion by the FTC into the mail-order field where it has promulgated certain rules which have definitely cast a blanket of Federal authority over this particular branch of the business. But I warn you that while this has been the most publicized of the activities of the Federal Trade Commission, it is by no means the most important. For there is good reason for believing that the Federal Trade Commission's investigation into the ocean marine and auto-finance fields—and yes, into the broad field of State insurance laws themselves—may be nothing more than the precursor of an even more lively interest in phases of the business which directly concern you as buyers of fire and casualty coverage for large organizations. I mean the entire rate-making structure, with all its ramifications—even including agents' commissions.

* * * * *

TWO IMPORTANT QUESTIONS

But leaving aside all the legal questions bearing upon the future of State regulation, there still remain to be answered these—the greatest of all questions:

1. Are the various segments of the industry ready and truly willing to sacrifice their selfish interests for the preservation of State regulation?

2. Are you, as discriminating buyers of fire and casualty coverage, willing to exercise patience and not rush headlong into the camp of the advocates of Federal regulation? Or are you to be beguiled into that camp by all this talk to the effect that Federal regulation will be simpler, less expensive, and therefore better for the policyholder than 48 State laws?

On the first question, you will remember that I have already said that a goodly portion of the industry is trying desperately to preserve competition. And for that, our friends in the industry are to be commended. But the difficulty has been that competition has stopped short of accepting many large industrial risks in this country. And therein rests one of the greatest single threats to the continuance of State regulation.

It's as simple as this. Have you noted the sudden rash of so-called American trust funds which have been set up in this country by foreign insurance organizations in the past month or two? Do you know that these foreign insurers are taking a leaf from the notebook of Lloyd's and are setting up trust funds almost identical with the Lloyd's fund in New York—funds which are primarily a banking operation and therefore free from insurance regulation?

How long do you think that State regulation can exist under such conditions? And whose fault is it—the foreigners? Not entirely. True, they have found the door which leads around rigid State rating laws. But they would not have searched for that door with the zeal they have if there was not an increasing number of large risks in this country which our domestic companies refuse to write at what the buyers consider a reasonable rate. It's because of this latter situation that you witness the enactment of more and more surplus line laws in the States these days. The enactment of these laws is not only an admission by the State legislature that there is an area in which State regulation will not apply, but also open testimony to the fact that private enterprise in the insurance business of this country will go so far—and only so far—in the writing of certain lines, leaving the remainder to unlicensed foreigners, or perhaps to the Federal Government itself.

A TRAVESTY ON STATE REGULATION

Just let me emphasize that the more surplus line laws enacted in this country, the more testimony you have of the inadequacy of State regulation, and the less likely it is that you will ever witness the regulation of foreign unlicensed interlopers on the American insurance scene. For, not only are these laws an open proclamation to the world that we here in the United States cannot or are not willing to take care of our own insurance needs, but there is the added fact that they are discriminatory in nature and a travesty on State regulation in that the commissioner is placed in the untenable position of giving his sanction to insurance in an organization over which he has no control—and about whose financial position he knows little or nothing. If State regulation is to survive, it must spread its authority over the entire insurance business—not merely a part of the business.

Mr. Truman, as Chief of State and as Commander in Chief, Has Measured Up in Admirable Fashion to His Enormous Responsibilities—He Has Taken His Stand, so Have We, Come What May

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, President Truman took the oath of office on Thursday, April 12, 1945. I recall that on the following Sunday morning, I was cloistered in my office with several visitors from my district who had come to discuss a matter having to do with some of the involved farm problems of that year. Of course, there was discussion as to the untimely death of President Roosevelt and of the succession of the Vice President to the Presidency of these United States.

Mr. Speaker, Harry Truman has long since proven himself to be a great President.

His pronouncement of 48 hours ago can easily constitute one of the greatest statements ever made in the history of civilization.

Who knows but what out of Harry Truman's courage will come the end of war among men, and as Harry Truman has stated on more than one occasion, he "would rather see world peace assured than to be the President of this Nation."

What President Truman did 48 hours ago was bold and courageous; it was an act of a great humanitarian which may determine for all time whether humanity is going to live by the law of the jungle, or be slaughtered by the impact of an atomic bomb if the day ever dawns when the great structures reared by this civilization are to be pulverized through man's inhumanity to man.

What a momentous time it was for Harry Truman to breathe the breath of life into the United Nations—to find all civilized and peace-loving peoples of the world who are members of the league joining together to stop at the very onset the actions of those who would again precipitate this Nation and all nations into world war III.

There is no doubt but that procrastination on the part of those who were signatory to the League of Nations, of which the United States was not a member, failed to halt the Hitler-Mussolini aggression which eventually brought on World War II.

The President of these United States having now taken his stand, the people are behind him to a man, come what may.

Mr. Speaker, last evening's Washington Star carried two editorials having to do with the action that was just taken with respect to stopping aggression in the little country of Korea. One is entitled "The Commander in Chief"; the other is headed "To uphold the rule of law." These are two wonderfully clear expositions of the problem that confronted our President and, under unanimous consent of this House, I insert them in the RECORD so that the clear, concise, factual reporting and opinions expressed in those two articles can be spread through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD throughout the length and breadth of these United States:

THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF

Once again the President has shown that capacity for bold action which has characterized his management of foreign policy and which has done so much to stem the Red aggression. Americans may—and do—differ with him on domestic matters. But there will be few to deny that Mr. Truman, as Chief of State and as Commander in Chief, has measured up in admirable fashion to his enormous responsibilities.

Back in early 1947, when it looked as though Greece and perhaps Turkey were marked for conquest, the President rose to the occasion. With the British pulling out of Greece, he laid before Congress the Greco-Turkish aid program and secured the funds to see it through. He acecpted the risks involved without wavering, and today both Greece and Turkey still can be counted among the free nations. Then came the Marshall plan for the revival of the ecoomies of western Europe. This was followed by the Atlantic Pact and the Military Assistance Pact. All of these were bold ventures—undertakings which called for wisdom and courage on the part of the President. If they had failed he would have had to accept the political consequences. And since they have not failed, but instead have been conspicuously successful, he is entitled to the fullest measure of credit.

This whole structure of a reviving free world was threatened, however, when the North Korean puppets of Moscow sent their tanks and troops crashing into South Korea. Here, at last, was naked aggression, posing for us the greatest risk of all.

The choice was both clear and hard. To have let South Korea go would have meant the collapse of all that had been done in the past 3 years. Other nations, large and small, would have concluded that they could not count on the United States when the chips were down. And the structure of organized resistance to Communist aggression, which we had built with so much effort and at so much cost, would simply have come apart.

The only alternative was to go to the assistance of the South Koreans. And that, plainly enough, involved a risk of war with the Soviet Union. It may be said that the odds were against that. But the fact remains that this Government had no sure means of knowing whether the Russians would pull back or whether they had settled upon Korea for a showdown. The President, faced with this choice, did not hesitate. A timid man, in an election year, would have tried to play it safe. But Mr. Truman met the issue head-on.

In this newspaper's opinion, there is no doubt that the right decision was made. If

the aggressors from Northern Korea are driven out, as they probably will be, the world-conquest schemers in the Kremlin will be set back, perhaps for years to come. It is they, not us, who will suffer loss of face throughout the world. And, most important of all, the nations which have been wavering should be infused with new enthusiasm. They know now that the United States is prepared to throw more than words and dollars into the fight for a free and decent world.

It is highly gratifying that the President, in taking the bold course, obviously has the overwhelming support of the American people. The dissenting voices have been few and unimpressive. The great majority of the people in this country, anxious as they have been for peace, have had enough of the Kremlin's peace-wrecking tactics. They are ready to assume the risks of stopping another world war before it gets under way. What they need is some one who will take the lead in meeting force with force, and in Mr. Truman they have their man.

"TO UPHOLD THE RULE OF LAW"

The miiltary orders announced yesterday by President Truman add up, in effect, to a fateful warning to the Kremlin that a line—a kind of quarantine—has been drawn against it in Asia and that if it moves aggressively against that line, either directly or through its puppets, it will meet head-on physical resistance backed by the power of the United States.

This is a history-making and much-needed declaration of American policy that puts into force a concrete program of action in a crucial region of the world where for many months past our Nation has seemed to be more or less like a drifting ship bound no one knew where. But all that is changed now. Now the course is set clearly enough to remove doubts from everybody's mind, particularly from the minds of the Russians and their satellites.

Thus, acting in his constitutional capacity as Commander in Chief, the President has made clear just what this country proposes to do in the area of immediate crisis. Without any if's, but's, or maybe's, he has ordered—and the order has already been put into effect—our air and sea forces to give "cover and support" to the Southern Korean troops now engaged in defending their country against the criminal invasion of the Kremlin's puppet regime in the north.

This action has been taken by the President "to preserve international peace and security" against a Kremlin-directed aggressor force that has defied the order of the United Nations Security Council to cease fire and withdraw to the thirty-eighth parallel—a Communist aggressor bent on destroying an independent democratic country brought into existence under the sponsorship of America and the UN as a whole. For its own part the Soviet-boycotted Council, in a 7-to-1 decision, with Yugoslavia dissenting and India and Egypt not voting, has for the first time in its history asked all of the UN's members to apply military sanctions by joining the United States in helping to repel the Korean invasion.

But the President, rightly viewing the situation as plain evidence of communism's readiness to resort to war to attain its ends elsewhere in Asia, has done much more than take bold action to save Southern Korea. In a timely and highly significant reversal of past policy. he has ordered the Seventh Fleet to prevent a Chinese Red attack on Formosa, the last stronghold of the Nationalist regime of Chiang Kai-shek and an island of great importance to our own security. In addition, he has directed that our forces be strengthened in the Philippines, that we step up our armaments aid to the government there, and that similar measures—including the dispatch of a military mission—be taken to back up France and the associated states in Indochina, the gateway to southeast Asia.

In a long-range sense, as action designed to forestall further Communist advances in Asia and the Far Pacific, the President's orders on Formosa, the Philippines and Indochina have an importance that can hardly be exaggerated. But in a current sense, in the sense that it has all the makings of an immediate showdown with the Kremlin, his decision to throw American sea and air forces into the struggle for Southern Korea is overshadowingly momentous. For it can result in either of two eventualities—either a speedy collapse of the northern invaders or Russian reaction of a kind that could lead, over a period of days or weeks, to another world war.

Here, obviously, is a great gamble. Accompanied by an American request to the Russians to tell their Korean puppets to obey the Security Council, it is a gamble that has been taken, in the President's words, "to uphold the rule of law." The risk of not taking it would have been much graver than the risk of taking it. For had it not been taken, then the Red totalitarians would have had a green light for aggression everywhere. The halt must be called now—as Mr. Truman has courageously called it—before it is too late.

People Are Wonderful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised when certain of our colleagues during the course of the 1950 census publicly referred to the enumerators as "snoopers." I believe the enumerators, and all the others who participated in the census, performed a truly useful public service and are entitled to our gratitude.

The data included in the census is important to all of us, not merely because it will determine the number of Representatives who will serve in this body, but also because the detailed information resulting from the census will be used to further the welfare of all the people in the country. Public and private agencies are becoming increasingly dependent on this information to help them solve the complex economic and social problems resulting from our Nation's growth; and all of us know how valuable the census data is in our study and discussion of various national issues.

The American people responded wonderfully when they were asked to give information. By and large they answered the questions fully and honestly. Warmly and humanely they welcomed the enumerators to their homes. Most Americans, I feel sure, were glad to be living in a country which "counts them in" instead of "counts them out" when the enumerator's rap on the door was heard.

I should like to include as a part of my remarks a letter from one census enumerator, Mr. Howard R. Clark, and an item appearing in the Chicago Daily News of May 3, 1950, describing his experiences. I feel that equally interesting experiences were shared by thousands of enumerators.

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 28, 1950.*

Hon. SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you very much for your letter of June 19 and your expression of appreciation for the work we did on the 1950 census. I would like to direct your attention to the article that appeared in the Chicago Tribune about May 28, 1950, by Congressman BROWN of Ohio, in which he questioned the legality of certain census information, and referred to the enumerators as snoopers. You can therefore understand our appreciation of your commendation. We are fully vindicated of the charges publicized by Congressman BROWN and are again citizens of the United States.

Seriously though, we did like the work and to give you concrete evidence of this, I am enclosing tear sheet from the Chicago Daily News containng an article headed "People Are Wonderful." This was written from the human interest standpoint. I knew if I wrote a factual account it would not be published. However, I note from your letter that you are interested in the mechanics of the census and that is what I think should be brought to the public's attention. I found in taking the census that practically no one realized the necessity of the information requested.

Several magazine articles could be written about the assembling of information, the making up of the IBM cards, how they are sorted, and the variety of information that is gleaned from the cards, and how this information is for general public service. Such articles would be helpful to small manufacturers and distributors who are unaware of the service available to them. It would be the means of stepping up our production immeasurably. If you are interested in this subject I would be glad to see you whenever you are in Chicago.

Very truly yours,

HOWARD R. CLARK.

[From the Chicago Daily News of May 3, 1950]

PEOPLE ARE WONDERFUL, REPORTS CENSUS TAKER IN CHICAGO DISTRICT

I wish to express my thanks to the people in Census District 103-3733, lying between Montrose and Eastwood and between Mozart and the Chicago River, comprising eight blocks.

There was not a respondent who refused to answer the questions and only two or three that referred to it as a "Red inquisition." One woman remarked, "I suppose I'll have to be nice to you." I replied that she was very disarming, and let it go at that.

Of course, I realize I had one of the best districts in Chicago. However, it was a good cross-section of the country, as there are at least a dozen different nationalities represented, and on the whole they were very friendly and hospitable.

Among some of the most interesting were invalids and aged shut-ins. They have a real message for those that take perfect health for granted. I noticed they were mellowed by their afflictions and conversing with them was on a different plane than with able-bodied, active persons.

And don't forget the pets. I had parakeets fly over and light on my shoulder, cats in my lap, youngster jumping up and down on the davenport where I was trying to write, big dogs that would lick my ears and little mutts with rubber dolls in their mouths that would squeak when they bit them.

Altogether it was a wonderful experience and I have a much greater appreciation of the people in the world with us. They're wonderful.

HOWARD R. CLARK.

CHICAGO.

Straight Talk for High School Students Not Going to College on Graduation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on June 7, 1950, I visited the United States Army and United States Air Force recruiting station at Long Beach, Calif. I had previously heard from several sources of the very energetic, capable job of recruiting being executed in my home city of Long Beach and had previously had the pleasure of meeting with and listening to Sgt. James Bowen, in charge of the recruiting station, and I am pleased to say it is a vigilant, cooperative Armed Forces manpower commission and actively cooperates with the recruiting personnel in that vicinity.

I was much pleased with everything I saw at the recruiting office on my visit. I was very much pleased also with the resourceful and businesslike manner in which these recruiting officers in my home city carried out and planned their important assignments. Sergeant Bowen, above-mentioned, handed me a neatly worked-out mimeographed announcement, the text of which follows, when I asked him where they got it he said, "Oh, we worked it out."

Because this deals with high-school students not going to college upon graduation from high school, I know you, Mr. Speaker, will realize its special significance. I learned much on my visit to this important armed services office, and I have learned much of value to me as Congressman each time I have had the benefit of listening to Sergeant Bowen and his distinguished associates. I strongly recommend that you, my colleagues, get in touch with this important agency of government in your own congressional districts. See for yourselves and learn fully if possible what they are doing. It affects the youth of our Nation. It affects the home life of our Nation. It affects the security of our Nation. It affects every segment of our national existence and our national welfare at the point in the direction of which our youth is now traveling.

Here is the story as given to each high-school student who is considering enlistment. Here is what Sergeant Bowen and his associates deliver to the high-school students at Long Beach, Calif.:

STRAIGHT TALK FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS NOT GOING TO COLLEGE ON GRADUATION

Unless you have a guaranteed future, you are probably thinking about your first full-time job. Your family is concerned too, because your first job will be so important in shaping your success in the business world.

It will pay you to give a lot of time now to a serious evaluation of your possibilities. The earlier you discover those possibilities, the faster you will get ahead. This is a competitive country and many fine young men have lost wonderful chances simply because they did not plan, but preferred to wander from job to job.

Here are some questions you must ask yourself:

1. What have I learned in high school?
2. What do I want to do seriously, so that I can become a successful adult member of my community?
3. Am I equipped to take a job with a future in the field of work I prefer?
4. If I am not equipped for that job, how much more training do I need and how do I go about getting it?
5. How much will this cost in time and money?
6. How can family expenses be adjusted to take care of that time and money?
7. What Federal, State, city and school agencies and family friends in business can help me find the answers to these questions?

When you obtain information from agencies and successful businessmen, remember that you are getting advice from people who have already made their way in the world, so it will pay you to consider every job carefully. Each job might hold for you just the right chance you need to begin your career properly.

Among these agencies you find the local offices of the United States Army and United States Air Force Recruiting Service. We are here to help you, especially at this time, to evaluate your future and it would be unwise for you to ignore our advice, just as it would be unwise for you to ignore the advisers on your high-school faculty.

Jobs in the Army and Air Force are very much like jobs anywhere else. You may want them, or you may not. You may be good at them, or you might not. You may be eligible to train for a commission, or you might not even be eligible to enlist as a recruit. But at least you owe it to yourself to find out what the recruiting service has to offer you.

Above all, be careful when you go into this business of finding the right job. Talk to as many people as possible about it. Be practical in your outlook and eliminate the pitfalls caused by wishful thinking and daydreaming. Then, when you have made up your mind, you will have the satisfaction of knowing you did everything you could to arrive at the best possible choice.

A Popular War so Far

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald for June 30, 1950:

A POPULAR WAR SO FAR

We are inclined to think that Mr. Truman's undeclared war over Korea is popular and that, as matters stand today, he has strengthened himself politically. Recent primaries in several States showed a marked anti-Truman trend. Maybe he has succeeded in turning the tide in his favor.

TRUMAN POLITICS

The evidence on the point is still too scanty to warrant a firm conclusion, but the overwhelming vote in the House and Senate in favor of extension of the draft, with added powers to the President, is significant. There have been no spontaneous parades and no great flood of volunteers is storming the recruiting offices, but there have been no protest meetings and much the greater part of the comment in the newspapers and on the radio has been favorable.

All this is easily enough explained. Mr. Truman promises a cheap war in which the Air Force alone will send the Communists scurrying back over the thirty-eighth parallel, while Formosa and the Philippines will be safeguarded by the Navy and its planes, and the French in Indochina will be enabled to down their opponents with the help of a few million dollars' worth of munitions over and above what had previously been promised.

Cheap wars are nice if you can find them. Mr. Truman is betting that this one will not get out of hand. Similar threats of American action persuaded Stalin to back away from Iran, Turkey, and Greece, and broke the blockade of Berlin.

These were all essentially taxpayers' as distinguished from soldiers' wars. The losses, so far as the United States was concerned, were confined largely, though not entirely, to money.

Maybe this experience will be repeated in Korea. All of us hope so, but those who are feeling a sense of relief, now that Mr. Truman has challenged Russia to war, are likely to be disappointed in the long run, even if the Russians crawl this time. The fact is that the pledge to defend southern Korea is merely another evidence that the President believes it is the duty of the United States to oppose the spread of Russian communism anywhere, at any time.

The commitment extends around the globe. Russia can start the real war where and when she pleases. If she doesn't choose to fight for Korea now, a cold war, scarcely distinguishable from the last one, will begin, just as happened after Russia's refusal to fight for control of Iran, Greece, Turkey, and Berlin.

Mr. Truman's new Korean policy can win him political support only if the voters forget that at the Potsdam Conference Mr. Truman put Russia in a position to conquer China and thus menace Korea, Indochina, Formosa, and the rest.

The Case of the Missing Property Owner's Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, it was the common experience of most Members of Congress to have received a great many letters on the issue of the extension of rent controls when that legislation was recently before the House.

Among the many communications which I received on this subject there were two which caused me a great deal of consternation, and the puzzle has not been solved yet.

On June 12 I received the following telegram from none other than Mr. Gus Scholle, president of the Michigan CIO

Council, who, I am sure, speaks with the authority of the members of the CIO in Michigan on topics of interest to that organization:

Urge very strongly that you vote in favor of full extension of rent control for at least 1 year. CIO feels that this issue is of vital importance to the 15,000,000 workers in organized labor.

AUGUST SCHOLLE,
CIO Regional Director.

On that same day I received the following telegram from one John Krausman who describes himself as the secretary of the Property Owner's Committee of the CIO. The telegram, which had no return address, is as follows:

We property owners committee of the CIO urge you to completely discontinue rent control now. Over 54 percent of the CIO members are property owners and disagree with the radical leaders on this issue of extending rent controls.

JOHN KRAUSMAN,
Secretary.

In a letter dated June 12, I answered Mr. Scholle on the subject and inquired of him the identity of the mysterious John Krausman whose address my staff was unable to locate in the Detroit Directory. My letter is as follows:

DEAR MR. SCHOLLE: This is to acknowledge your recent communication relative to rent control.

On May 19 the House Committee on Banking and Currency reported out H. R. 8276, which would continue existing Federal rent controls to December 31, 1950, and permit an extra 6 months' extension to June 30, 1951, under a local option plan. In other words, the passage of this bill would mean a 6 months' extension of rent control on the part of the Federal Government, giving people due notice that rent control is coming to a close. I am frank to tell you that in checking here on the Hill, it looks as though the vote for the continuation of rent control, even on a 6 months' period will be by a close margin.

When this legislation is brought to the floor of the House for action, you may be assured that I will be governed by the debate as presented by the members of the Banking and Currency Committee, who have made a thorough study of this legislation, and also by the many communications I have been receiving from my constituents on this subject.

Thanking you for writing me and assuring you of my ambition to be of service, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
Member of Congress.

P. S.—The bill is on the floor today, June 13, and it looks as though it will pass. Now, this is my hope. Who is John Krausman, secretary of the property owner's committee of the CIO, who writes me "over 54 percent of the CIO members are property owners and disagree with the radical leaders on this issue of extending rent controls"?

Needless to say, I was surprised to receive the reply sent to me by Mr. Scholle, which is as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I was as surprised as you could have possibly been when I received the information that a John Krausman, secretary of the property owner's committee of the CIO, wrote the letter which you referred to in your letter of June 12. I have been completely unable to find anyone who has ever heard of the fellow before and I can only advise you that I think he is an out and out faker because the CIO has no such organization as the property owner's committee. I think, under the circumstances, it would probably be well for some Congressman to expose this fact and have it recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

AUGUST SCHOLLE,
President.

Most Members will agree that this correspondence points up the reason why we frequently have a great deal of trouble answering our mail on important and controversial matters, but the reply which I have received from Mr. Scholle gives rise to a consideration of more far-reaching importance.

If this John Krausman does not exist, and it would seem in the opinion of a responsible member of the organization which he purports to represent, that he does not, then this telegram represents a deliberate attempt to deceive and misinform a representative of the people on a matter of very vital interest to the whole nation. It immediately casts a dark cloud of suspicion on the validity and truthfulness of all the correspondence which we receive, no matter what side it favors on any issue. How can we expect to get a true picture of our constituents opinions when people such as the author of this mysterious telegram will stoop to the unfair device of perpetrating a deliberate fraud upon one whose oath it is to represent fairly the views of the people who have elected him to office? Are there no limits to which these unscrupulous characters will go in their attempts to block the workings of the democratic legislative process? The unethical conduct of the author of this telegram would seem to indicate that there are none, and I, for one, would like to solve the mystery surrounding the identity of John Krausman and the missing "Property Owner's Committee."

Win the Cold War, Preserve World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the declaration, in the form of a resolution, adopted by the twenty-seventh convention of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, the fiftieth-anniversary convention of this great and forward-looking organization of workers, at Atlantic City, May 23–June 1, 1950:

I. PREAMBLE

Mankind is in the throes of a most profound and painful crisis. In the span of one generation, it has been rocked to its foundations by two world wars and a shattering international economic breakdown.

Today, humanity is being subjected to an intense cold war waged fanatically against the free peoples by the totalitarian Soviet Union, its satellites, and its Cominform and World Federation of Trade Unions.

Even in the countries enslaved by them, the Communists wage this cold war. They have completely shut off their oppressed peoples from all free contact with the outside world. They are exterminating all groups and individuals who might question or challenge their tyrannical regime.

The struggle in the world today is not over markets or between competitors seeking areas to dominate or peoples to exploit. The decisive struggle confronting mankind today is between democracy and totalitarian tyranny. The overriding issue facing humanity today is between human decency and Communist despotism. In relation to this conflict, all other domestic and foreign issues come second. Questions or issues over property forms or forms of property ownership are very important. But alongside of the central, the pivotal, problem, these issues are secondary. If democracy triumphs, then the form of property ownership and kindred questions can be settled through the democratic process, in a peaceful civilized manner. But if totalitarian communism triumphs, then we will all be slaves and intellectual robots of a ruthless dictatorship which is synonymous with a monolithic militarized party which has a complete monopoly of every means of livelihood and every avenue of life. And even this party is only the tool of a small clique of power-mad dictators dressed up as field marshals, generalissimos, and MVD generals.

In this cold war, America has been the main target of Kremlin and Communist abuse and hostility. This special bitterness against America is due solely to the fact that as the strongest democratic power, the United States is the principal obstacle to the Soviet drive for world domination. Except for the United States there is not today a single nation or association of nations that could successfully resist a combination of Soviet Russian aggression from without and Communist subversion from within, that could maintain its freedom and national independence in the face of such a combined assault. Today, it is America which stands between imperialist Soviet Russia and its conquest and totalitarian subjection of all Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Only to the extent that America is militarily strong and is able, through democratic and progressive policies, to rally, unite, and aid the forces of freedom to resist effectively Soviet Russian expansion and Communist subversion, can there today be a foot of free soil on the continent of Europe or elsewhere.

II. WHY THE CRISIS

The world crisis has not been brought about by a clash between American and Russian interests over some particular issue. Nor is it a conflict between two giant powers each of whom seeks world domination. It is only the Soviet Union which has seized vast areas and brought under its yoke many scores of millions of people in Europe and Asia. America does not seek an inch of territory or a cent of tribute or loot from any nation on earth—regardless of its economic or political system. On the contrary, America has generously aided both its friends and foes of the last war. Unlike Soviet Russia, America has organized no fifth columns and resorted to no subversion on a national or world scale. Unlike Soviet Russia, our country has done nothing to impose its economic or political system on any nation—little, poor, or big.

The paramount cause of the present crisis is the unrelenting drive by Soviet imperialism and not by America or any other power for world conquest and domination. The appetite for this imperialist drive has been whetted by the actions of the democratic powers at Teheran and Yalta and during the immediate postwar years. Then America and Britain relied on appeasement of

Soviet Russia in order to assure her continued full participation in the war and in the maintenance of the subsequent peace. In the face of this Communist totalitarian onslaught, America, Canada, France, Britain, and the other democratic powers have been on the defensive. The democracies have repeatedly sought to reach an understanding and live in full peace with the Soviet Government. These efforts have proved fruitless and futile.

That this Soviet offensive is hypocritically masked by so-called socialist phrases and pseudo-internationalism only aggravates its sinister character.

III. NEUTRALITY: A FATAL ILLUSION

A serious obstacle to the democracies winning the cold war is the spirit of defeatism calling itself neutrality. This dangerous illusion, evidenced in some circles in western Europe and Asia narrows and weakens the front of resistance to Soviet imperialism. The victims and propagandists of this neutrality illusion play into the hands of the Kremlin clique and greatly encourage Soviet aggression. These victims fail to realize that neither Russia nor its Cominform respects any neutrality or recognizes neutrals, Those who are not pliant and willing tools of the Kremlin face only annihilation in a world conquered and ruled by totalitarian Communism. Besides, mankind is not confronted today with a choice between two totalitarian despotisms and between two imperialist aggressors. It is entirely untrue that Europe or Asia is endangered by American as well as Russian plans for world conquest.

It is rather significant that among the latest and loudest advocates of this theory of so-called neutrality are reactionary German and French Big Business interests which hope to reap fabulous profits by selling heavy industrial products and strategic war materials to expansionist Soviet Russia and its Chinese puppet. In their madness for piling up profits, these merchants of misery and death who brought the Nazis into power, financed the Hitler war-machine and betrayed France are now slandering America. They are accusing the United States of undermining the independence of Europe. Despite the billions of dollars America has been giving away to speed economic reconstruction through the Marshall plan, these neutrals are now charging the United States with putting too little emphasis on economic efforts in behalf of the continent. The democratic forces of Europe will not fall for such vilification of the American people. They know that in order to help assure the independence, freedom, and well-being of Europe, America has participated in World Wars I and II. In these wars, the American people have suffered higher casualties and spent far more of their money and natural resources than they did in the two wars—Revolutionary and Civil—to win their own national independence, preserve their own national unity, and wipe out slavery in the United States.

IV. FOR FREEDOM AND PEACE

In evaluating the present world crisis and in evolving a program for defeating totalitarianism in the cold war and saving the peace of the world, we must always keep in mind that any government which for years denies its own people all rights and suppresses them at home becomes psychologically and politically conditioned and anxious to extend such suppression and aggression against other peoples abroad. No government which pursues a policy of reaction and war against its own people can be relied upon to be progressive and peaceful toward other peoples. This is the lesson that Hitler and Mussolini have taught us. This is the lesson that Stalin is teaching us today. This lesson we must not forget. Only to the extent that the governments of the free nations are genuinely democratic and pursue a truly progressive course at home can they serve effectively as forces for democracy, social justice, and peace abroad.

Grave as the present world crisis is, the situation would be infinitely worse were totalitarian Russia to dominate the world. Soviet imperialism as distinct from the old type of imperialism seeks to dominate not only the material and economic but also the intellectual, spiritual, and moral resources of its satellites and overrun lands. Nothing could be more dreadful and degrading for humanity than the human race spiritually and intellectually enslaved, politically crushed, and economically exploited by an octopus Communist state. Peace under such conditions could only be the peace of the potters' field for free and progressive humanity.

The main task confronting the free peoples of the earth is to preserve and invigorate their freedom and assure world peace. In the present grave international situation, this means first of all that America and the other democratic countries must win the cold war. Unless the democratic nations win the cold war, they will be unable to prevent a hot war and may even lose that, too. Such a conflagration would throw the human race back socially, culturally, and politically many centuries. Such a catastrophe might, in view of the development of the atomic and hydrogen bombs, even lead to irreparable destruction and total chaos for the human race.

But if we set about in earnest to win the cold war there is no real ground for despair. Potentially, and in many ways actually, the democracies are today stronger than they think and far stronger than the totalitarian orbit. The free world still commands more than four times the resources of the Communist empire. Through the proper harnessing of their manpower and material resources and their decisive technical and productive superiority, the democracies can enjoy tremendous defensive and offensive advantages. In recognition thereof, we propose that free labor and the peoples of America, Canada, and throughout the world should rally to the following program:

V. PROGRAM FOR VICTORY AND PEACE

1. Work for an increasingly close association and closer and more confident relations—not only in a military but in a political, economic, and cultural sense—among the peoples and races of the earth not under the iron heel of Communist imperialism. The cold war and the world crisis are global and indivisible. To win the cold war and to prevent a hot war, the free nations must drop all piecemeal strategy, cast aside all chauvinist and narrow nationalist prejudices and interests, and develop a unified world approach, program, and appeal.

In this regard, we welcome the recent declaration of the executive council of the A. F. of L. emphasizing that "the first prerequisite for mobilizing fully the moral and material resources and rallying successfully the fighting forces of world democracy against Soviet aggression and the expansion of totalitarian Communist influence" is for the western nations to "approach the free peoples of Asia with a comprehensive program for the speedy and systematic elimination of the last vestiges of colonialism in Asia,"

2. In every country, the productive efforts and the defense efforts must be coordinated into a common program for social as well as national security. Not military power alone, not prosperity alone is required to win the cold war. What we need is prosperity plus power, full employment plus national security. The two go very well together. They naturally supplement each other and can be realized by governments pursuing genuinely progressive programs at home and abroad. In this light, President Dubinsky has very correctly stressed in his opening address that: "Our anticommunism must spell out freedom from poverty, colonial oppression and the fear of political terror. Our answer to Iron Curtain tyranny cannot be only military might to deter the Communist aggressors from military adventures. We must use the world's natural resources and great technical knowledge not for the privileges and the profits of the few, but for the benefit of the many, for the improvement of the living and working conditions of all peoples—regardless of the color of their skin, the language they speak, or the God they worship."

3. America wants no satellites. We are against any policy of seeking dependent nations as our allies. We want no nation to be dependent on us for economic or military aid. We want to see all nations self-reliant, free, democratic, independent, and cooperating for universal peace and well-being. In this spirit, America should redouble its efforts to encourage especially west European initiative and action in efforts to build their economies, raise their living standards, and help win the cold war.

4. In this connection, we are for the Schuman proposal to join up the coal and steel industries of France and Germany—provided it meets certain requirements. It must not serve as a French-German cartel of the Ruhr and French industrialists—under the hegemony of the shady, reactionary, de Wendel interests or the notorious Ruhr coal and steel barons. It must not serve—as advocated by the reactionary West German Chancellor Adenauer and certain antilabor groups in France—as a cover for a cartel of big business interests. Under the pretext of helping Europe to "liberate" itself from American influence, these big-business interests are maneuvering to disrupt the projected North Atlantic community.

The merging of the French and German steel and coal resources must serve as a force for the beginning of an all west European economic and political integration and of effective collective defense. It must likewise serve as a force for developing German democracy and attaining a democratic rapprochement between France and Germany and, thereby, resolving the French-German antagonism which serves only Soviet imperialism. What is more, organized labor and the consumers should have independent representation of their own choosing on all such boards of international authority, so as to assure the protection of their interests.

5. We reiterate our wholehearted support of the European recovery program.

6. We call for speedy application and extensive implementation of President Truman's point 4 in line with the A. F. of L. program for carrying out this urgent and progressive proposal.

7. In view of the Soviet Union cutting off from the free world market the raw materials and the many millions of people under its yoke in Europe and Asia, it is imperative that immediate practical steps be taken to make available more raw materials for western Europe and more of west European manufactured goods for the people of Latin America, Asia, and Africa. Toward this end, we propose that our Government should designate a competent authoritative commission in which organized labor shall participate, through representatives of its own choice, in preparing a program for worldwide economic cooperation in line with point 4 and the experience of the Marshall plan. This new charter of economic cooperation and mutual aid for the free world should go into

effect at the close of the European recovery program.

8. Through its systematic abuse of the veto, the Russian Government has undermined the competency, authority, and effectiveness of the United Nations and has kept out of UN membership such vital forces as democratic Italy. The UN should be improved and strengthened through the elimination of the veto power.

9. In its consideration of the Chinese problem, the UN should first investigate and act upon the serious charges of Russian intervention placed before it by the Nationalist Government of China.

10. We commend United States High Commissioner McCloy in Germany for his recent veto of Chancelor Adenauer's reactionary civil-service and tax laws and for lifting the suspension of the codetermination laws in Hesse and Wuerttemberg-Baden. We must at the same time emphasize that, to enable Germany to function effectively as a member of the west European community of free and democratic nations, our Government should break with every policy of tolerating former Nazis and favoring the German industrial and financial magnates who brought Hitler to power and built the Nazi war machine. These monopolistis are anti-Semitic, antidemocratic, and antilabor. Merely because they pretend to be for free enterprise, does not entitle them to American aid and comfort. We propose that the American, British, and French Governments should, instead, place their trust in the free trade-unions, the Social Democratic Party and the progressive elements in the Catholic party as the bearers of democracy capable of promoting the democratization of the German people.

11. In line with such an active and consistent democratic policy, our Government should display vigorous leadership in rejecting every move to give financial credits, economic aid, or diplomatic recognition to the Falangist dictatorship of Franco imposed on the Spanish people by the Hitler-Mussolini gang. We should encourage and assist the broadest unity of Spanish antitotalitarian parties and forces so as to speed the day when the Spanish people will regain their political liberties and enjoy the blessings of democracy.

12. We strongly urge our Government to have the UN, through its appropriate channels, develop an international program to deal effectively with the problem of surplus population, particularly as it affects countries like Italy.

13. An end must be put to the intolerable and crippling paradox of the present cold war in which the Kremlin and its satellites and agencies have full right to spread dissension, disruption, and subversion in the camp of democracy while the democratic powers are completely shut off from and denied the right to reach the oppressed peoples in the totalitarian prison house. We should assist every free country to work out its own democratic methods suited to its own specific conditions to put an end to the menace of the fifth column and to the tremendous advantage enjoyed by Moscow and its cominform-WFTU apparatus in the cold war today. Unless the democratic powers remove this terrible advantage now enjoyed by totalitarian Russia, they cannot hope to end or win the cold war.

We cannot emphasize too strongly in this connection that the Communist Parties are not political parties in the peaceful, democratic sense of the word. The Communists are not interested in eliminating the evils of our social system but only in exploiting them in such a manner as to tear up our social fabric and divide and cripple our Nation so that it may be all the more easily conquered by the totalitarian Soviet dictatorship to which alone they owe their loyalty. The Communist Parties with all their front organizations and fellow-traveler outfits are really servants and tools of the most dynamic totalitarian regime now seeking to destroy the democratic world. The Communist movement should be considered as a criminal conspiracy of espionage, sabotage, and subversion—working for and serving the interests of a foreign power which seeks to rob us of our liberties and conquer and enslave us as a Nation.

We recognize that there are enormous difficulties in the way of breaking through the iron curtain with the message of democracy and truth to the peoples in the Soviet orbit with whom we have no quarrel and for whom we have only friendship. They are not responsible for the dictatorships which oppress them. Through modern science and technology the necessary practical steps can be found to convey to the peoples of Russia and its satellites the truth about life and labor in the democratic countries and to exploit, in the interest of peace and democracy, the economic, political, social, national, and religious contradictions with which these lands reek—despite the savage terror that grips them.

14. We indorse the proposals of President Dubinsky for fostering adequate labor representation in the molding and execution of our Nation's democratic foreign policy through the appointment of a prominent trade-unionist as Assistant Secretary of State for world labor affairs and a leading labor spokesman as a full member of the United States delegation to the UN.

15. We pledge continued and generous support to the American Federation of Labor in its endeavors to help build the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions into a most powerful force for a free, prosperous, and peaceful world, for world labor solidarity and unity, for social justice and social security, for a world free from the horrors of war, the evils of colonialism and imperialism, the terrors of every brand of totalitarian dictatorship, and the fear and misery of poverty.

Communists and Fellow Travelers in Our Government

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in this critical hour we cannot afford to take chances of having disloyal individuals in key positions in this Government. The time has come to clean house and fumigate every governmental department.

A few days ago a man who, in my opinion, is one of the most dangerous men on the Federal payroll, Edward U. Condon, head of the Bureau of Standards, made a speech attacking the Committee on Un-American Activities—a committee that has done more to expose the enemies within our gates than any other agency of this Government.

The FBI made an investigation of this man Condon a few years ago and wrote a three-page letter condemning him.

We were only able to get a portion of that letter, but I want to tell you now that when you read this report of the subcommittee, which I am inserting in the RECORD, you will see that he is probably one of the most dangerous men on the payroll of this Government and should be removed at once.

The report referred to follows:

REPORT TO THE FULL COMMITTEE OF THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

When the Committee on Un-American Activities was reorganized in January 1947 it adopted an eight-point program of investigation. The fourth point of that program stated:

"Those groups and movements who are trying to dissipate our atomic-bomb know-how for the benefit of a foreign power will have the undivided attention of our committee agents, as well as those who are seeking to weaken other aspects of our national security."

While your subcommittee is fully aware that it is not our responsibility to detect and counter the espionage activities of foreign countries in the United States, nevertheless in our continuing investigation of the extent and character of communism here, we necessarily have to check on the activities of Soviet agents, because of the integration and tie-up between so-called domestic Communist activities and that of the official Soviet Government.

That the Soviet Union and her satellite nations have been desperately attempting to not only secure our complete atomic know-how, but also to weaken or destroy our hold of this important knowledge, is plainly evident to this subcommittee. As the full committee is aware, for over a year now, agents of the committee have been assigned to special investigations in this field, and while their investigation is not yet completed, the subcommittee feels that it should submit a preliminary report, particularly on one aspect of this matter which is of such importance that it demands immediate attention. It has to do with Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards. From the evidence at hand, it appears that Dr. Condon is one of the weakest links in our atomic security. In substantiation of this statement, the subcommittee respectfully submits the following information:

PERSONAL HISTORY AND EDUCATION OF DR. EDWARD U. CONDON

Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, was born at Alamogordo, N. Mex., on March 2, 1902. On November 9, 1922, he married Emilie Honzik, an American-born woman of Czechoslovakian descent. Dr. Condon is a graduate of the University of California, having received a bachelor of arts degree from that institution in 1924, and a doctor of philosophy degree in 1926. During the years 1926 and 1927, Condon studied at the Universities of Munich and Gottingen in Germany. In 1928, Dr. Condon was a lecturer on physics at Columbia University in New York City. In 1929, Condon was a professor of physics at Princeton University and during the years 1930 to 1937, he was associate director of the physics department at the institution. From September 1937, through November 4, 1945, Dr. Condon was employed by the Westinghouse Laboratories at Pittsburgh, Pa. While with the Westinghouse Laboratories, where he was employed as associate director, Condon was a consultant on war-research projects, being performed at the radiation laboratories of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., and at the University of California, at Berkeley, Calif. Condon is principally regarded as a theoretical physicist which involves radar, nuclear physics, radioactive tracers, mass spectroscopy, and the elastic properties of metals. On Novem-

ber 5, 1945, Dr. Edward U. Condon was appointed Director of the National Bureau of Standards. Dr. Condon was recommended by Henry A. Wallace, who was then Secretary of Commerce. The Bureau of Standards is a Bureau in the Department of Commerce.

In addition to the employment mentioned above, it should be noted that during the year 1940, Condon was a member of the National Defense Research Committee and that during the year 1941, he was a member of the Roosevelt Committee on Uranium Research. During the Seventy-ninth Congress, Dr. Condon was scientific adviser to the Special Committee on Atomic Energy. In July 1946 Dr. Condon was a member of the President's Evaluation Committee which was formed for the purpose of observing the effects of the atom-bomb test made at Bikini Atoll. Condon has also served as an adviser to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

INFORMATION REGARDING THE NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

The National Bureau of Standards is the principal agency of the Federal Government for research in physics, mathematics, chemicals, and engineering. It acts as custodian of the Nation's basic scientific standards and serves Government and industry in an advisory capacity on any scientific and technical matters in the physical sciences. The Bureau's direct appropriations for the fiscal year totaled approximately $6,800,000, which was supplemented by approximately $10,800,000 in funds transferred by the Army, Navy, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the Office of the Secretary of Commerce, the Bureau of the Census, and other Federal agencies.

The bulk of the Bureau's work is conducted at its laboratories in Washington, D. C. However, it has several field-testing stations located at various points within the United States and its territorial possessions. Included in the research work presently being conducted by the Bureau of Standards is the field of radio propagation, which relates to guided missiles. In conducting its radio propagation activities, the Bureau of Standards maintains field stations at Sterling, Va.; Adak, Alaska; Punnene, Maui, T. H.; Palmyra Island; Guam Island; Trinidad, British West Indies; and Las Cruces, White Sands Proving Ground, N. Mex. Research projects engaged in by the Bureau of Standards at the present time concern atomic energy, radar proximity fuzes, instrument-landing systems, and radisonde. During the year 1947, the Bureau of Standards conducted research work on classified projects for the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

With reference to the work performed under the auspices of the Atomic Energy Commission, it should be noted that the background for this activity extends to the early years of the twentieth century, for in the atomic energy field, the National Bureau of Standards has had the responsibility for conducting basic research associated with the scientific standards, the physical constances, and properties of substances, and methods of measurement and instrumentation. The atomic-bomb project itself originated in the Bureau in 1939.

Other national defense work carried on by the Bureau of Standards during the year 1947, particularly for the Army and Navy, consisted of basic studies of the properties of electromagnetic radiation in connection with communication and radar activities, the development of related instrumentation, and radio propagation research. The Bureau also conducted special research regarding jet fuels, the design and construction of new types of optical range finders and methods of retarding gun erosion.

The Bureau of Standards is one of the most important national defense research organizations in the United States. Because of this, it has become the target of espionage agents of numerous foreign powers.

The subcommittee has in its possession a list of employees of the National Bureau of Standards who have been cleared by the Atomic Energy Commission to perform work on atomic projects. Because of the fact that this list contains restricted data, it is not being included in this report. However, it is to be noted that when this list was issued at the end of November 1947, the name of Dr. Edward U. Condon was carried in a pending status. This list contains the names of all of those persons who are qualified to work on atomic-energy projects from a loyalty standpoint. The fact that the name of the Director of the Bureau of Standards was carried in a pending status by the Atomic Energy Commission as late as November 1947, becomes a matter of serious concern to us when it is recalled that he had, as early as 1941, held several important positions in the United States Government which related to the development of atomic energy. For instance, in 1941, he was a member of the Roosevelt Committee on Uranium Research, and in July 1946 he was a member of the President's Evaluation Committee which, as stated previously in this report, was found for the purpose of observing the effects of the atom bomb test made at Bikini Atoll.

It is of interest to note, that in May 1947, Dr. Condon reorganized the Bureau of Standards and set up 14 separate divisions. Despite the fact that he had not been cleared to perform work on atomic-energy projects for the Atomic Energy Commission, he appointed himself head of the Atomic Physics Division, one of the Divisions involved in the reorganization.

That the Atomic Energy Commission had reason to doubt the loyalty of Dr. Condon is evidenced by a letter, the original of which the subcommittee has in its possession, which letter was dated July 11, 1946, and is addressed to a Member of Congress, who at that time was a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Congress. This letter was written by a person who held a high post in the security division of the Manhattan project, and who is now a ranking official of the Atomic Energy Commission. The first paragraph of this letter is quoted in part as follows:

"Attached is a very hurried attempt which may be of some help. Unfortunately, the ——— group has loaded me down in preparation for Friday's meeting. May I suggest that you demand Dr. Condon's record of the FBI. It would be enlightening."

The associations of Dr. Condon and his wife have been cause for great concern to the agencies charged with the security of the United States. Dr. Condon, knowingly or unknowingly, entertained and associated with persons who are alleged Soviet espionage agents, and persons now reported to be under investigation by a Federal grand jury. So serious have Dr. Condon's associations been, that on May 15, 1947, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, sent a confidential letter to W. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce. The letter is quoted in part as follows:

"The files of the Bureau reflect that Dr. Edward U. Condon has been in contact as late as 1947 with an individual alleged, by a self-confessed Soviet espionage agent, to have engaged in espionage activities with the Russians in Washington, D. C., from 1941 to 1944.

"Mr. and Mrs. Condon associated with several individuals connected with the Polish Embassy in Washington, D. C. Among those are Mrs. Joseph Winiewize, wife of the Polish Ambassador, Virginia Woerk, a clerk employee of the Polish Embassy, Helen M. Harris, secretary of the Polish Embassy, and Ignace Zlotowski, former counselor of the Polish Embassy and presently a Polish delegate to the United Nations.

"Helen Harris is identified as a former secretary to the American Soviet Science Society during the time it was known as science committee of the National American Soviet Friendship Society. She went to work for the Polish Embassy in the fall of 1946.

"Zlotowski is identified as a nuclear scientist who studied under Joliet Curie, known member of the Communist Party. He was ex-secretary of the American Soviet Society. It is known that in February 1947, Zlotowski purchased 270 books on atomic energy which had been published by the Department of Commerce.

"It is also known that Mr. and Mrs. Condon were in contact with several other persons closely associated with this alleged Soviet espionage agent. It is also reliably reported that in March 1947, Zlotowski offered the use of the Polish diplomatic pouch to scientific groups as a means of transmitting scientific material outside the United States, dissemination of which had to be restricted because of security reasons by military authorities.

"Zlotowski was in contact with Anatole Cromov, first secretary of the Soviet Embassy who has since returned to Russia. Mrs. Emily Condon applied for passports for European travel in 1926, and passport for travel to Russia in 1945. Passports were withdrawn. Condon issued passport 276319 on October 11, 1946, to travel and study in Germany, France, Holland, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Great Britain, Denmark, and Switzerland. He applied for passport June 4, 1946, to Russia which was issued but was later canceled by the Army."

There are other instances in which Dr. Condon and his wife have been guests at the home of persons who are attached to the Embassies of Soviet satellite nations. Also present were the representatives of official Soviet agencies.

We have previously stated herein that the Bureau of Standards, because of its importance to the national defense, has became a focal point for espionage agents attached to foreign governments. For a great many years, the Bureau of Standards has been visited by representatives of many foreign governments.

In order to accommodate foreign visitors, shortly after his own appointment as Director of the Bureau of Standards, Dr. Condon appointed Demetry I. Vinogradoff, a Russian-born scientist, as the liaison representative of the Bureau. Vinogradoff, prior to his affiliation with the Bureau of Standards was employed by the Westinghouse Laboratories at Pittsburgh, Pa. During the wartime years, he was in charge of liaison between the Westinghouse Electric Co. and the representatives of the Soviet Purchasing Commission.

During the period July 1946 through March 31, 1947, a total of 238 visitors and 64 delegates from foreign nations, including Russia and Poland, visited the National Bureau of Standards. During this period, a total of 39 Russians and 3 Polish nationals visited the Bureau. Among these visitors, were the naval attaché and the assistant naval attaché of the Russian Embassy, and three representatives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Since March 1947, a total of 666 persons representing foreign governments have visited the Bureau. Very few Russians or Russian satellite nation representatives are included in this number. The reason for the decline in the number of Russian visitors to the Bureau of Standards is unknown to this subcommittee. However,

it should be noted that during the month of December 1946, Demetry I. Vinogradoff, liaison officer of the Bureau of Standards, made arrangements with F. T. Orekahov, the first secretary of the Russian Embassy in Washington, D. C., to discuss the problem of exchanging books, pamphlets, and other written material. The arrangements for the discussion were made by Vinogradoff at the request of Dr. Condon, and it was agreed that the discussion between Orekahov and Vinogradoff would be informal because, otherwise, it would be necessary to obtain a clearance from the State Department.

It is also known that Vinogradoff has been in close touch with Capt. A. F. Belikov, Assistant Naval Attaché of the Russian Embassy.

Your subcommittee would like to point out to the full committee that the exchange of scientific material with the Soviet Union is a one-way street, and that our Government is pursuing a dangerous and foolish policy of making scientific data available to the Soviet Union, since they will not permit us to inspect any of their bureaus, nor will they exchange any information with us. Early last year, the chairman of the committee, Mr. THOMAS, disclosed that the Soviet Union, acting through its fronts, had secured hundreds of thousands of patents from our Patent Office, and our present investigation along these lines reveals that even today they are continuing to order thousands of patents. We are convinced from the information we have that what the Soviet Union is actually doing is setting up her own patent bureau by obtaining all of ours, at the rate of 10 and 25 cents each. We should like to point out that the Russian Government has refused to give the United States a single patent since 1928.

Your subcommittee, by a very diligent investigation, has determined that Dr. Condon has in the past 5 years been in personal contact and communication with a number of individuals who are American citizens; but who are members of the Communist Party. There is no evidence in our possession that Dr. Condon is a member of the Communist Party, however, but as a member of the executive committee of the American-Soviet Science Society, which is affiliated with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., and which was recently cited as a subversive organization by Attorney General Clark, he has lent his name and influence to one of the principal Communist endeavors in the United States.

The extent to which he has aided and abetted this Communist front is illustrated by the following letter, dated March 7, 1946, addressed to certain employees of the National Bureau of Standards, by Samuel Gelfan, for the membership committee of the American-Soviet Science Society:

AMERICAN-SOVIET SCIENCE SOCIETY

Affiliated with National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., 114 East Thirty-second Street, New York 16, N. Y.

MARCH 7, 1946.

———— ————,

National Bureau of Standards, United States Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ————: It has been suggested by Dr. Condon, who is a member of our executive committee, that you might be interested in the activities of our society and membership in same.

We are, therefore, enclosing a brief statement concerning the objectives and activity of our organization, and under separate cover are also mailing you a copy of our last bulletin.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL GELFAN,
For the Membership Committee.

In response to this letter, 10 scientists of the Bureau of Standards joined this subversive organization. The subcommittee is cognizant, however, of the implied pressure which Dr. Condon, as Director of the Bureau, applied to his subordinates, and therefore it should not necessarily reflect upon these 10 employees. It does, however, indicate the dangerous extremes to which Dr. Condon has gone in an effort to cooperate with Communist forces in the United States.

Speaking before the fifth annual scientific institute, March 5, 1946, Dr. Condon stated, in speaking of Russia:

"We must welcome their scientists to our laboratories, as they have welcomed ours to theirs, and extend the base of scientific cooperation with this great people. Of course, we must behave this way toward the scientists of all nations. I only mention Russia because she is right now the target of attack by those irresponsibles who think she would be a suitable adversary in the next world war."

This subcommittee is in possession of no evidence or information which indicates that the Soviet Government has in the past or will in the future permit the scientists of the United States in their laboratories or to make available to them any information of any scientific importance. Any Government official who is not aware that the Soviet Union is bent upon the Stalinization of the world, is not qualified to hold a strategic position which affects the security of the United States.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In considering the case of Dr. Condon, we wish to emphasize that what is involved is not a question of freedom of speech or research. The ruthless rush of Stalin through Europe, in the opinion of this subcommittee necessitates a revision of the policy and thinking of this Government and the people of the United States, regarding communism. We should bear in mind, that the Government is charged not only with the administration of public affairs, but it is also charged with the security of the people and the institutions of the United States. Whether we like it or not, we are engaged in a great epochal struggle; not a struggle with guns, because the Communists don't fight that way. They didn't take over Czechoslovakia with guns, they merely employed the strategy of getting a few men in the government and then a few more, and then they took over the entire government without firing a single shot or calling out a single regiment of soldiers.

They are conducting exactly the same kind of campaign in other countries. In this country they haven't gotten as far as they have in Czechoslovakia, but they got pretty far, because they got a man as Vice President of the United States, and he is now their candidate for President, and he is the same man who recommended Dr. Condon as Director of the Bureau of Standards.

It is the unanimous opinion of this subcommittee that Dr. Condon should either be removed or a statement should be forthcoming from the Secretary of Commerce, setting forth the reasons why he has retained Dr. Condon, in view of the derogatory information which he has had before him.

We further recommend that the full committee address a communication to the President of the United States, calling to his attention, the fact that the situation as regards Dr. Condon is not an isolated one, but that there are other Government officials in strategic positions who are playing Stalin's game to the detriment of the United States. It should also be pointed out to the President that the evidence before our subcommittee and the evidence which we are sure should be available to him, indicates very strongly that there is in operation at the present time in the United States an extensive Soviet espionage ring, and to permit this ring to continue, in view of the high atomic prizes which they are seeking, is folly, and can only lead to ultimate disaster.

We recommend that all of the evidence in the committee's possession be forwarded to the President for his consideration.

The Terrible Consequences of Inflation in France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the history of the French assignat and inflation in France, during the eighteenth century, is a record of financial and political disaster. Everyone should inform themselves on what happened to France when the Government abandoned a redeemable currency and based the issuance of its money on the land and the wealth—credit—of the country.

With the issuance of an abundance of easy money, the French became prosperous for a time and Government leaders flouted the use of silver and gold as money.

We are told Prudhomme's newspaper poured contempt over gold as security and Royer, a French leader, predicted the time would come when gold would lose all its value.

But inflation and the French assignat proved to be the undoing of the French economy; and many of the French leaders lost their heads on the guillotine during the ensuing revolution as revealed in the history of the French assignat by the former President White, of Cornell University, prepared with many citations from authentic documents, made with painstaking care, which I have taken the liberty to condense and present herewith for the information of my colleagues:

Early in the year 1789 the French Nation found itself in deep financial embarrassment; there was a heavy debt and a serious deficit.

There was a general search for some short road to prosperity; ere long the idea was set afloat that the great want of the country was more of the circulating medium; and this was speedily followed by calls for an issue of paper money. During the last months of 1789 and the first months of 1790 came discussions in the National Assembly looking to issues of notes based upon the landed property of the church—which was to be confiscated for that purpose.

The National Assembly had determined to confiscate the vast real property of the French church—the pious accumulations of 1,500 years. There were princely estates in the country, bishop's palaces and conventual buildings in the towns; these formed between one-fourth and one-third of the entire real property of France, and amounted in value to at least 2,000,000,000 livres (normal value 19.1 cents). By a few sweeping strokes all this became the property of the nation. Never, apparently, did a government secure

a more solid basis for a great financial future.

It was urged, then, that the issue of four hundred millions of paper (not in the shape of interest-bearing bonds, as had at first been proposed, but in notes small as well as large), would give the treasury something to pay out immediately, and relieve the national necessities.

In April 1790, came the final decree to issue 400,000,000 livres in paper money, based upon confiscated property of the church for its security.

This sum—four hundred millions, so vast in those days—was issued in assignats, which were notes secured by a pledge of productive real estate and bearing interest to the holder at 3 percent. No irredeemable currency has ever claimed a more scientific and practical guaranty for its goodness and for its proper action on public finances.

The first result of this issue was apparently all that the most sanguine could desire; the treasury was at once greatly relieved; a portion of the public debt was paid; creditors were encouraged, credit revived; ordinary expenses were met, and, a considerable part of this paper money having thus been passed from the Government into the hands of the people, trade increased and all difficulties seemed to vanish. But soon there came another result; times grew less easy; by the end of September, within 5 months after the issue of the four hundred millions in assignats, the Government had spent them and was again in distress. Throughout the country began a cry for another issue of paper.

The question was brought up by Montesquieu's report on the 27th of August, 1790. This report favored, with evident reluctance, an additional issue of paper. It went on to declare that the original issue of four hundred millions, though opposed at the beginning, had proved successful; that assignats were economical. Chabroud said that the issue of assignats would relieve the distress of the people and he presented very neatly the new theory of paper money and its basis in the following words: "The earth is the source of value; you cannot distribute the earth in a circulating value, but this paper becomes representative of that value and it is evident that the creditors of the nation will not be injured by taking it." Boutidoux, resorting to phrasemaking, called the assignats "un papier terre," or "land converted into paper."

Royer said to the National Assembly "If it is necessary to create five thousand millions, and more, of the paper, decree such a creation gladly." He, too, predicted, as many others had done, a time when gold was to lose all its value, since all exchanges would be made with this admirable, guaranteed paper, and therefore that coin would come out from the places where it was hoarded. He foretold prosperous times to France in case these great issues of paper were continued and declared these "the only means to insure happiness, glory, and liberty to the French nation."

Prudhomme's newspaper poured contempt over gold as security for the currency, extolled real estate as the only true basis, and was fervent in praise of the convertibility and self-adjusting features of the proposed scheme. On the 29th of September 1790, by a vote of 508 to 423, the deed was done; a bill was passed authorizing the issue of 800,000,000 of new assignats, but solemnly declaring that in no case should the entire amount put in circulation exceed twelve hundred millions. To make assurance doubly sure, it also provided that as fast as the assignats were paid into the treasury for land they should be burned, and thus a healthful contraction be constantly maintained. Unlike the first issue, these new notes were to bear no interest.

Within a short time there had been received into the treasury for lands 160,000,000 livres in paper. By the terms of the previous acts this amount of paper ought to have been retired. Instead of this, under the plea of necessity, the greater part of it was reissued in the form of small notes.

There was, indeed, much excuse for new issues of small notes, for, under the theory that an issue of smaller notes would drive silver out of circulation, the smallest authorized assignat was for 50 livres. To supply silver and copper and hold it in circulation everything was tried. Citizens had been spurred on by law to send their silverware and jewels to the mint. Even the King sent his silver and gold plate, and the churches and convents were required by law to send to the government melting pot all silver and gold vessels not absolutely necessary for public worship. For copper money the church bells were melted down. But silver and even copper continued to become more and more scarce. In the midst of all this, various juggleries were tried, and in November 1790 the Assembly decreed a single standard of coinage, the chosen metal being silver, and the ratio between the two precious metals was changed from 15½ to 1, to 14½ to 1—but all in vain. It was found necessary to issue the dreaded small paper, and a beginning was made by issuing one hundred millions in notes of 5 francs, and, ere long, obedient to the universal clamor, there were issued parchment notes for various small amounts down to a single sou.

A troublesome fact began now to appear. Though paper money had increased in amount prosperity had steadily diminished. In spite of all paper issues, commercial activity grew more and more spasmodic. Enterprise was chilled and business became more and more stagnant. At one town, Lodeve, 5,000 workmen were discharged from the cloth manufactories. Every cause except the right one was assigned for this. Heavy duties were put upon foreign goods; everything that tariffs and customhouses could do was done. Still the great manufactories of Normandy were closed, those of the rest of the kingdom speedily followed, and vast numbers of workmen in all parts of the country were thrown out of employment. Nor was this the case with the home demand alone. The foreign demand which at first had been stimulated, soon fell off.

All this breaking down of the manufactures and commerce of the nation made fearful inroads on the greater fortunes; but upon the lesser, and upon the little properties of the masses of the nation who relied upon their labor, it pressed with intense severity. The capitalist could put his surplus paper money into the Government lands and await results; but the men who needed their money from day to day suffered the worst of the misery. Still another difficulty appeared. There had come a complete uncertainty as to the future. Long before the close of 1791 no one knew whether a piece of paper money representing a hundred livres would, a month later, have a purchasing power of 90 or 80 or 60 livres. The result was that capitalists feared to embark their means in business. Enterprise received a mortal blow. Demand for labor was still further diminished; and here came a new cause of calamity; for this uncertainty withered all far-reaching undertakings. The business of France dwindled into a mere living from hand to mouth. This state of things, too, while it bore heavily upon the moneyed classes, was still more ruinous to those in moderate and, most of all, to those in straitened circumstances. With the masses of the people, the purchase of every article of supply became a speculation.

In the leading French cities now arose a luxury and license which was a greater evil even than the plundering which ministered to it. In the country the gambling spirit spread more and more. The artful plundering of the people at large was bad enough, but worse still was this growing corruption in official and legislative circles. Out of the speculating and gambling of the inflation period grew luxury, and, out of this, corruption. It grew as naturally as a fungus on a muck heap. It was first felt in business operations, but soon began to be seen in the legislative body and in journalism. Bribery of legislators followed as a matter of course, Delaunay, Jullien, and Chabot accepted a bribe of 500,000 livres for aiding legislation calculated to promote the purposes of certain stockjobbers. It is some comfort to know that nearly all concerned were guillotined for it.

On December 17, 1791, a new issue was ordered, making in all twenty-one hundred millions authorized. Coupled with this was the declaration that the total amount in actual circulation should never reach more than sixteen hundred millions. Before this issue the value of the 100 livres note had fallen at Paris to about 80 livres; immediately afterward it fell to about 68 livres. The most curious thing evolved out of all this chaos was a new system of political economy. In speeches, newspapers, and pamphlets about this time, we began to find it declared that, after all, a depreciated currency is a blessing; that gold and silver form an unsatisfactory standard for measuring values; that it is a good thing to have a currency that will not go out of the kingdom and which separates France from other nations; that thus shall manufacturers be encouraged; that commerce with other nations may be a curse, and hindrance thereto may be a blessing; that the laws of political economy however applicable in other times, are not applicable to this particular period, and, however, operative in other nations, are not now so in France; that the ordinary rules of political economy are perhaps suited to the minions of despotism but not to the free and enlightened inhabitants of France at the close of the eighteenth century; that the whole state of present things, so far from being an evil is a blessing.

On April 30, 1792, came the fifth great issue of paper money, amounting to three hundred millions; at about the same time Cambon sneered ominously at public creditors as "rich people, old financiers and bankers." Soon payment was suspended on dues to public creditors for all amounts exceeding 10,000 francs. This was hailed by many as a measure in the interests of the poorer classes of people, but the result was that it injured them most of all. Henceforward, until the end of this history capital was quietly taken from labor and locked up in all the ways that financial ingenuity could devise. All that saved thousands of laborers in France from starvation was that they were drafted off into the army and sent to be killed on foreign battlefields.

On the last day of July 1792, came another brilliant report from Fouquet, showing that the total amount of currency already issued was about twenty-four hundred millions, but claiming that the national lands were worth a little more than this sum. A decree was now passed issuing three hundred millions more. By this the prices of everything were again enhanced save one thing, and that one thing was labor. Strange as it may at first appear, while the depreciation of the currency had raised all products enormously in price, the stoppage of so many manufactories and the withdrawal of capital caused wages in the summer of 1792, after all inflation, to be as small as they had been 4 years before—viz, 15 sous per day. No more striking example can be seen of the truth uttered by Daniel Webster, that "of all contrivances for cheating the laboring classes of mankind, none has been more effective than

that which deludes them with paper money." Issue after issue followed at intervals of a few months, until on December 14, 1792, we have an official statement to the effect that thirty-five hundred millions had been put forth, of which six hundred millions had been burned, leaving in circulation twenty-eight hundred millions. The consequences of these overissues now began to be more painfully evident to the people at large. Articles of common consumption became enormously dear and prices were constantly rising. The washerwomen of Paris, finding soap so dear that they could hardly purchase it, insisted that all the merchants who were endeavoring to save something of their little property by refusing to sell their goods for the wretched currency with which France was flooded, should be punished with death; the women of the markets and the hangers-on of the Jacobin Club called loudly for a law to equalize the value of paper money and silver coin. It was also demanded that a tax be laid especially on the rich, to the amount of 400,000,000 francs, to buy bread. The result was that on the 28th of February 1793, at 8 o'clock in the evening, a mob of men and women in disguise began plundering the stores and shops of Paris. At first they demanded only bread; soon they insisted on coffee and rice and sugar; at last they seized everything on which they could lay their hands—cloth, clothing, groceries, and luxuries of every kind. Two hundred such places were plundered. This was endured for 6 hours and finally order was restored only by a grant of 7,000,000 francs to buy off the mob. The new political economy was beginning to bear its fruits luxuriantly. A gaudy growth of it appeared at the city hall of Paris when, in response to the complaints of the plundered merchants, Roux declared, in the midst of great applause, that "shopkeepers were only giving back to the people what they had hitherto robbed them of."

On June 22, 1793, the convention determined that there should be a forced loan, secured on the confiscated lands of the emigrants and levied upon all married men with incomes of 10,000 francs, and upon all unmarried men with incomes of 6,000 francs. It was calculated that these would bring into the treasury a thousand millions of francs. But a difficulty was found. So many of the rich had fled or had concealed their wealth that only a fifth of the sum required could be raised, and therefore a law was soon passed which levied forced loans upon incomes as low as 1,000 francs—or, say, $200 of American money. This tax was made progressive. On the smaller proprietors it was fixed at one-tenth and on the larger, that is, on all incomes above 9,000 francs, it was made one-half of the entire income. Little if any provision was made for the repayment of this loan, but the certificates might be used for the purchasing the confiscated real estate of the church and of the nobility.

The third outgrowth of the vast issue of fiat money culminated on September 29, 1793, in the Law of the Maximum. Committees of experts were appointed to study the whole subject of prices, and at last there were adopted the great four rules which seemed to statesmen of that time a masterly solution of the whole difficulty.

First, the price of each article of necessity was to be fixed at one and one-third its price in 1790. Secondly, all transportation was to be added at a fixed rate per league. Thirdly, 5 percent was to be added for the profit of the wholesaler. Fourthly, 10 percent was to be added for the profit of the retailer. Nothing could look more reasonable.

The first result of the maximum was that every means was taken to evade the fixed price imposed, and the farmers brought in as little produce as they possibly could. This increased the scarcity, and the people of the large cities were put on an allowance. Tickets were issued authorizing the bearer to obtain at the official prices a certain amount of bread or sugar or soap or wood or coal to cover immediate necessities. But it was found that the maximum, with its divinely revealed four rules, could not be made to work well—even by the shrewdest devices. In the greater part of France it could not be enforced. As to merchandise of foreign origin or merchandise into which any foreign product entered, the war had raised it far above the price allowed under the first rule, namely, the price of 1790, with an addition of one-third. Shopkeepers therefore could not sell such goods the maximum laws. Manufactures were very many went out of business, and the remainder forced buyers to pay enormous charges under the very natural excuse that the seller risked his life in trading at all. That this excuse was valid is easily seen by the daily lists of those condemned to the guillotine, in which not infrequently figure the names of men charged with violating the maximum laws. Manufactures were very generally crippled and generally destroyed, and agriculture was fearfully depressed. To detect goods concealed by farmers and shopkeepers, a spy system was established with a reward to the informer of one-third of the value of the goods discovered. To spread terror, the criminal tribunal at Stransburg was ordered to destroy the dwelling of anyone found guilty of selling goods above the price set by law. The farmer often found that he could not raise his products at anything like the price required by the new law, and when he tried to hold back his crops or cattle, alleging that he could not afford to sell them at the prices fixed by law, they were frequently taken from him by force and he was fortunate if paid even in the depreciated fiat money—fortunate indeed, if he finally escaped with his life.

Involved in all these perplexities, the convention tried to cut the Gordian knot. It decreed that any person selling gold or silver coin, or making any difference on any transaction between paper and specie, should be imprisoned in irons for 6 years—that any one who refused to accept payment in assignats, or accepted assignats at a discount, should pay a fine of 3,000 francs; and that any one committing this crime a second time should pay a fine of 6,000 francs and suffer imprisonment 20 years in irons. Later on the 8th of September, 1793, the penalty for such offenses was made death, with confiscation of the criminal's property, and a reward was offered to any person informing the authorities regarding any such criminal transaction. To reach the climax of ferocity, the convention decreed, in May 1794, that the death penalty should be inflicted on any person convicted of "having asked, before a bargain was concluded, in what money payment was to be made." Nor was this all. The great Finance Minister Cambon soon saw that the worst enemies of his policy were gold and silver. Therefore it was that, under his lead, the convention closed the exchange and finally, on November 13, 1793, under terrifying penalties, suppressed all commerce in the precious metals. About a year later came the abolition of the maximum itself.

It is easily seen that these maximum laws were perfectly logical. Whenever any nation intrusts to its legislators the issue of a currency not based on the idea of redemption in standard coin recognized in the commerce of civilized nations, it intrusts to them the power to raise or depress the value of every article in the possession of every citizen. Louis XIV had claimed that all property in France was his own, and that what private persons held was as much his as if it were in his coffers. But even this assumption is exceeded by the confiscating power exercised in a country where, instead of leaving values to be measured by a standard common to the whole world, they are left to be depressed or raised at the whim, caprice or interest of a body of legislators. When this power is given the power of fixing prices is inevitably included in it.

It may be said that these measures were made necessary by the war then going on. Nothing could be more baseless than such an objection. In this war the French soon became generally successful. It was quickly pushed mainly upon foreign soil. Numerous contributions were levied upon the subjugated countries to support the French armies. The war was one of those in which the loss, falling apparently on future generations, first stimulates, in a sad way, trade and production. The main cause of these evils was tampering with the circulating medium of an active nation; keeping all values in fluctuation; discouraging enterprise; paralyzing energy; undermining sobriety; obliterating thrift; promoting extravagance and exciting riot by the issue of an irredeemable currency.

And now was seen, taking possession of the nation, that idea which developed so easily out of the fiat money system—the idea that the ordinary needs of government may be legitimately met wholly by the means of paper currency—that taxes may be dispensed with. As a result it was found that the assignat printing press was the one resource left to the government, and the increase in the volume of paper money became every day more appalling. The national convention, which succeeded the legislative assembly, issued in 1793 over three thousand millions of assignats, and, of these, over twelve hundred millions were poured into the circulation. Everything was tried. By various degrees of persuasion or force—the guillotine looming up in the background—holders of assignats were urged to convert them into evidence of national debt, bearing interest at 5 percent, with the understanding that if more paper were afterward needed more would be issued. All in vain. The official table of depreciation shows that the assignats continued to fall. A forced loan, calling in a billion of these checked this fall, but only for a moment. The interconvertibility scheme between currency and bonds failed as dismally as the interconvertibility scheme between currency and land had failed.

Cambon, especially, ranked then and ranks now as among the most expert in any period. The disastrous results of all his courage and ability in the attempt to stand against the deluge of paper-money show how powerless are the most skillful masters of finance to stem the tide of fiat money calamity when once it is fairly under headway; and how useless are all enactments which they can devise against the underlying laws of nature. In obedience to those who believed with the market women of Paris, as stated in their famous petition that "laws should be passed making paper money as good as gold," Couthon, in August 1793, had proposed and carried a law punishing any person who should sell assignats at less than their normal value with imprisonment for 20 years in chains, and later carried a law making investments in foreign countries by Frenchmen punishable by death. But to the surprise of the great majority of the French people, the value of the assignats was found, after the momentary spasm of fear had passed, not to have been permanently increased by these measures; on the contrary, this fiat paper persisted in obeying the natural laws of finance and, as new issues increased, their value decreased.

The question will naturally be asked, On whom did this vast depreciation mainly fall at last? When this currency had sunk to about one three-hundredth part of its nominal value, and, after that, to nothing, in

whose hands was the bulk of it? The answer is simple. I shall give it in the exact words of that thoughtful historian from whom I have already quoted: "Before the end of the year 1795 paper money was almost exclusively in the hands of the working classes, employees and men of small means, whose property was not large enough to invest in stores of goods or national lands. Financiers and men of large means were shrewd enough to put as much of their property as possible into objects of permanent value. The working classes had no such foresight or skill or means. On them finally came the great crushing weight of the loss. After the first collapse came up the cries of the starving. Roads and bridges were neglected; many manufacturers were given up in utter helplessness." To continue in the words of the historian already cited; "None felt any confidence in the future in any respect; few dared to make a business investment for any length of time and it was accounted a folly to curtail the pleasures of the moment—to accumulate or save for so uncertain a future."

This system in finance was accompanied by a system in politics no less startling, and each system tended to aggravate the other. The wild radicals, having sent to the guillotine first all the Royalists and next all the leading Republicans they could entrap, the various factions began sending each other to the same destination—Hebertists, Dantonists, with various other factions and groups, and, finally, the Robespierrists, followed each other in rapid succession. After these declaimers and phrase-mongers had thus disappeared there came to power, in October 1795, a new government—mainly a survival of the more scoundrelly—the Directory. It found the country utterly impoverished.

The first new expedient of the Directory was to secure a forced loan of 600,000,000 francs from the wealthier classes, but this was found fruitless. Ominous it was when persons compelled to take this loan found that for an assignat of 100 francs only 1 franc was allowed. Next a national bank was proposed, but capitalists were loath to embark in banking while the howls of the mob against all who had anything especially to do with money resounded in every city. At last the Directory bethought themselves of another expedient. Pursuant to this decision it was decreed that a new paper money fully secured and as good as gold be issued under the name of "mandats." In order that these new notes should be fully secured, choice public real estate was set apart to an amount fully equal to the nominal value of the issue, and anyone offering any amount of the mandats could at once take possession of government lands; the price of the lands to be determined by two experts, one named by the government and one by the buyer, and without the formalities and delays previously established in regard to the purchase of lands with assignats.

Perhaps the most whimsical thing in the whole situation was the fact that the government, pressed as it was by demands of all sorts, continued to issue the old assignats at the same time that it was discrediting them by issuing the new mandats. And yet in order to make the mandats as good as gold it was planned by forced loans and other means to reduce the quantity of assignats in circulation, so that the value of each assignat should be raised to one-thirtieth of the value of gold, then to make mandats legal tender and to substitute them for assignats at the rate of 1 for 30. Never were great expectations more cruelly disappointed. Even before the mandats could be issued from the press they fell to 35 percent of their nominal value, from this they speedily fell to 15, and soon after to 5 percent, and finally, in August 1796, 6 months from their first issue, to 3 percent. The plan failed.

From time to time various new financial juggles were tried, some of them ingenious, most of them drastic. It was decreed that all assignats above the value of 100 francs should cease to circulate after the beginning of June 1796. But this only served to destroy the last vestige of confidence in government notes of any kind. Another expedient was seen in the decree that paper money should be made to accord with a natural and immutable standard of value and that 1 franc in paper should thenceforth be worth 10 pounds of wheat. This also failed. On July 16 another decree seemed to show that the authorities despaired of regulating the existing currency and it was decreed that all paper, whether mandats or assignats, should be taken at its real value, and that bargains might be made in whatever currency people chose. The real value of the mandats speedily sank to about 2 percent of their nominal value and the only effect of this legislation seemed to be that both assignats and mandats went still lower. Then from February 4 to February 14, 1797, came decrees and orders that the engraving apparatus for the mandat should be destroyed as that for the assignats had been, that neither assignats nor mandats should longer be a legal tender and that old debts to the state might be paid for a time with government paper at the rate of 1 percent of their face value. Then, less than 3 months later, it was decreed that the 21,000,000,000 of assignats still in circulation should be annulled. Finally, on September 30, 1797, as the culmination of these and various other experiments and expedients, came an order of the Directory that the national debts should be paid two-thirds in bonds which might be used in purchasing confiscated real estate, and the remaining "consolidated third," as it was called, was to be placed on the great book of the national debt to be paid thenceforth as the government should think best.

As to the bonds which the creditors of the nation were thus forced to take, they sank rapidly, as the assignats and mandats had done, even to 3 percent of their value. As to the "consolidated third," that was largely paid, until the coming of Bonaparte, in paper money which sank gradually to about 6 percent of its face value. Since May 1797, both assignats and mandats had been virtually worth nothing. So ended the reign of paper money in France. The twenty-five hundred millions of mandats went into the common heap of refuse with the previous forty-five thousand millions of assignats. The nation in general, rich and poor alike, was plunged into financial ruin from one end to the other.

After the assignat and French inflation had run its course, the subsequent history of French finances and French money is extremely interesting. The French Government established the bimetallic system of money on a ratio of 15½ to 1 between the money metals, silver and gold, with the franc as the unit of value. This money system worked so well that later the French Government, to stabilize international exchange between several European countries, joined other nations in establishing international bimetallic system of money. We are told that on the 23d day of December 1865 (70 years after the passing of the assignat), France, Belgium, Italy, and Switzerland united in a monetary treaty to regulate the weight, title, form, and circulation of their gold and silver coins whereby they agreed to coin gold only the pieces of 100, 50, 20, 10, and 5 francs in weight, standard, tolerance, and diameter, and of silver only the 5-franc pieces of the standard weight and fineness with unlimited coinage and legal tender for such coins, and further agreed to coin in amounts as herein prescribed for each state, silver coins of 1 and 2 francs, 50 and 20 centimes of reduced fineness and limited in legal tender to 50 francs, and that any nation could join the convention by adopting its monetary system in regard to gold and silver coins. On January 4, 1867, Mr. Berthemy, envoy of France to the United States, submitted to Secretary Seward a copy of the monetary convention of December 23, 1865, and invited the United States to become a party to it. Senator Cockrell in his illuminating speech said that was the only time the United States was ever offered an opportunity to become a member of an international bimetallic union.

Here was a bimetallic system upon the ratio of 15½ to 1 maintained by France since October 30, 1785, and all our Government had to do was simply subscribe to it—there was no international complication connected with it—nothing to do but simply subscribe to it and agree that we could coin certain coins. In order to come to that we only had to strike out about 12½ grains of our standard silver dollars—reduce it to 400 grains—to bring it down to the ratio of 15½ to 1. This was an opportunity, an invitation to the United States to join an international bimetallic union of Europe and we are told that the distinguished Senator from Ohio, Mr. Sherman, and Mr. Ruggles, United States Commissioner to the international monetary convention of 1867, prevented it.

Following this, silver was demonetized in this country in 1873 and the long struggle to remonetize silver and the effort to secure the adoption of a stable international monetary system ensued with the result that Congress passed a resolution embodying a declaration of policy as to international bimetallism. And while little or no effort has been made by succeeding administrations to carry out the provision of the declaration, the law still stands on our statute book which is inserted here for the information of my colleagues:

SEC. 311. Policy of United States as to bimetallism: It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals, and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts. And it is hereby further declared that the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetalism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States, in the markets and in the payment of debts.

This declaration of our monetary policy was never repealed.

Who can calculate today the loss that might have been saved to people of the

world if France and the United States had been successful in establishing a sound, adequate, workable money system by securing the adoption of international bimetallism throughout the world?

Address by Secretary of Defense Johnson Before Reserve Officers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 5 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, last week, at a time when our young men were being committed to action for the first time since World War II, there assembled in Washington in national convention the Reserve Officers' Association.

In the enlisted and officer Reserves and in the National Guard we have vital elements of our national defense. These, Mr. President, are the civilians who give over a part of their time to keeping themselves in readiness for the defense of their country.

Under the Honorable Louis Johnson's direction as Secretary of National Defense, programs have been developed for the benefit of the reservists. As a Reserve member, Secretary Johnson has understood and sympathized with the problems of the reservists.

One of the speakers before the association meeting here was Secretary Johnson, and I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow members of the Reserve Officers' Association, the most distinguished and the most respected member of our organization has just paid us the very high compliment of a personal visit to our convention. I am greatly honored to follow him, the President of the United States, on this program.

Membership in the Reserve Officers' Association has meant a great deal to me over the years, as I know it has to every one of you. Above all, it has meant intimate association with the leaders of our country, with such men as President Truman, who, as Colonel Truman of the Reserve Corps, always manifested a keen interest and took an active part in the formulation of the policies of our organization. Through the meetings, publications, and comradeship of this association, I, as a Reserve officer, have been able, over the years while in private and civilian life, to keep abreast not only of the Reserve matters but of the whole subject of national defense, in its many facets. Based on its present activities and its recognized strength and influence, I am confident that the Reserve Officers Association will continue to serve well the officers of the civilian components of all our Armed Forces, and to attract them in increasing numbers to its membership. And as Secretary of Defense, I shall continue to look to the association for counsel, suggestion, and for constructive criticism, too, in Reserve matters.

When I became Secretary of Defense a little more than a year ago, I brought with me my whole adult life's experience as a Reserve officer. There were happy memories of active service and of definite contributions to the promotion of national defense by Reserve officers but there were, also, recollections of disappointment and frustrations in the face of official inertia. I felt that the new office of Secretary of Defense offered an excellent opportunity to strengthen the Reserve, to do away with the interservice rivalries among the civilian components as well as among the Regulars, and to set up the nucleus of an efficient, all-service combat team for national defense, in keeping with our policy of unification.

As a first step we set up in the Office of the Secretary of Civilian Defense a Civilian Components Policy Board. The idea of having one over-all group to study the entire field of the National Guard and the Reserves of all of our Armed Forces in their relation to each other and to the over-all needs of national defense strongly appealed to the President. It won the hearty approval of the Congress and the wholesome support of the Reserves themselves, including this Reserve Officers Association. To the membership of the Board we attracted outstanding leaders among our civilian components and in October 1949 its deliberations began with its first meeting.

In the short period of its existence the Board could hardly have been expected to iron out all of the differences among the services—many of whose roots were planted long before the First World War—and come up with solutions to all of the problems that beset our civilian components. Nevertheless sufficient progress has already been made to convince even the most skeptical that we certainly are on the right track.

The process of unification is a complex one. It calls for the analysis of a problem and the presentation of a solution meeting with the satisfaction of the services themselves, the submission for approval of that solution by the Secretary of Defense, and where funds are involved further submission for its support by the President and the Congress. Under our democratic procedures, time for discussion and deliberation must be allowed and a give and take spirit must be developed by the participants. Everyone of us must realize that we cannot have satisfied all of our demands without the need for a budget far in excess of what the President and the Congress feel that our country can afford at this time. In planning for reserve forces as in all other matters pertaining to national defense we must never lose sight of the fact that the financial structure of our Government must always be kept strong, and that there is a limit to defense spending beyond which it is most imprudent to go. Moreover, we must also appreciate the fact that there are priorities of needs within the Department of Defense, and that all of them cannot be met in the early stages of an overall national defense program.

I recall these facts to your attention to give you a clear perspective of what confronts the Board in its efforts to develop comprehensive and constructive policies and to have them translated into effective laws and regulations. I ask you to judge its accomplishments accordingly. Based on what it has done since October and what I know of its plans and activities for the immediate future, I assure you that a year from now when we meet again your "faith and patience" will "inherit the promises."

Let me review for you some of the achievements of the Civilian Components Policy Board since it began to operate 8 months ago.

It established a joint advisory panel for the coordination of the ROTC programs of the three services. We of the Department of Defense have been striving to effect parity between the services in the procurement and training of junior officers for the civilian components and the regular establishments. We hope to extend the rights and privileges now available in the Navy to the Army and Air Force as well and to provide equality of opportunity among all three services. I therefore strongly favor this project, and shall support it in every way.

The Board initiated a policy, now in effect, for the assignment of Regular officers to duty with civilian components at some appropriate time in their careers. This policy, I believe, will result in a more thorough understanding of the citizen soldier by the professional military man, and in a high quality of skilled guidance and supervision for the civilian components, which only professional military men can supply.

The Board has taken the initiative in securing widespread joint utilization of existing facilities by the civilian components. It found many good outfits—hundreds of them—without suitable meeting places and arranged means whereby they could double up with the regular services and with other governmental agencies. Right now the Board is exploring every possibility for additional joint utilization of the existing plant of the Department of Defense.

The Board, with the help of 52 local boards, operating in each State, Territory, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, has drawn a tentative long-range plan for providing additional facilities which will be needed to take care of outfits and activities which are now unable to utilize existing facilities. This plan will be kept in constant readiness for the day when authority and funds may become available to implement a complete program.

We recognize that the most limiting factor in the entire civilian components program is the lack of sufficient and adequate training facilities, and we are therefore supporting the national defense reserve facilities bill which has passed the Senate and has been favorably reported in the House by the Armed Services Committee. Its enactment should break the facilities bottleneck that has been holding up the development and training of civilian components.

The Board, in cooperation with the Army, Navy, and Air Force, is working on a number of measures, all of them of great importance to a well-balanced program for the civilian components. There are, at least, 20 such projects which I shall not take the time to discuss in detail. The Board receives splendid cooperation from Members of Congress. The President has taken an intimate interest in its activities. The Department of Defense is solidly behind it. For the first time in our history, civilian components, through their own Board, reporting directly to the civilian head of the Department of Defense, are participating actively on the highest policy-making level in the Military Establishment of the Nation in decisions affecting all reserve elements of all the services.

This, then, is a brief résumé of what we have been doing in the Department of Defense since October to strengthen and improve the civilian components and their position on the over-all national defense team.

Now let me give you a few suggestions as to what you as loyal citizens, commissioned officers, and members of this association can do for national defense in the coming months.

First, I urge you to continue your wholehearted interest in every phase of our national defense program. The support of the Reserve Officers Association as an organization and of its members as individuals not only for unification but for the whole program of national defense, has contributed appreciably to our progress of the past year. As an example of this invaluable cooperation, I refer to the changing of Security Week from February to May, with its ending to coincide with Armed Forces Day. This change served immeasurably in the mobilization of public opinion for the celebration of Armed Forces Day, and I am highly pleased

at this time to extend to the association the appreciation of the Department of Defense for making the change and then coming through so wholeheartedly with all of its resources to make our first Armed Forces Day a great national success.

The Reserve Officers Association set the pattern for unification by bringing together under one roof the Reserve officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Coast Guard, too, at a time when the concept of unification among Regulars was just barely beginning to gain acceptance. And speaking of the Coast Guard, the Department of Defense on the recommendation of the Civilian Components Policy Board, strongly supported the Secretary of the Treasury in his request for an appropriation of funds for the reactivation of the Coast Guard Reserve as an integral part of the over-all defense team.

My second suggestion is that you do what you can to keep alive the spirit of service among all of our young men—veterans and those who are becoming of age now, and encourage them to become active participants in our national defense program. There are vacancies in the regular services. We have ever-growing needs for the capable enlisted men who make the planes fly, the ships sail, and the guns roll. The ranks of our Reserves, too, are not full. With the exception of the National Guard of the Army and Air Force which are up to strength, there are places in the Reserves for thousands of young men in the Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force. There are opportunities for young men attending colleges and universities who have this opportunity are taking advantage of the training facilities available to them. Then many of those who graduate with commissions allow their status to lapse after several years. Encourage such men to train for the Reserve and to keep up with the Reserve after they graduate from college.

Then there is West Point and Annapolis. Young men of military promise should be encouraged to attend the service academies. Where Members of Congress fill their vacancies by competitive examinations, the best talent of our communities should be urged to compete. Our Armed Forces, Regular and Reserve, still depend basically, as it always will, on men, men of high caliber for whom no machine can ever serve as a substitute. You would serve your country well in this critical hour, if each of you became a voluntary recruiting officer not only for your own service, but for all of the Armed Forces.

National defense is stronger today than ever before in our peacetime history. We are spending more. We are getting more than ever before. Next year we will get even more by way of preparedness out of every dollar appropriated, than we are getting now.

The seeds for a more satisfactory and a more efficient Reserve have now been planted. Some of the plants have already begun to sprout. It is still the early spring of our efforts in the Reserve fields. The coming months will be fruitful. With your continued help we will harvest a rich crop in terms of adequate defense. We shall achieve our goal of peace through strength.

The Heart of the Amerasia Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 1, 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Heart of the Amerasia Case," written by George Sokolsky, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of June 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

THE HEART OF THE AMERASIA CASE

The excitement over the Amerasia case is at long last reaching into all segments of the American people. And there has been no advantage—political or personal—in the various attempts to suppress it.

The Amerasia case involves espionage in time of war and our people are not so supine as to condone that.

May I, with due humility, say that for 5 years now, with calendar regularity, I have sought in this column to keep this issue alive. During March and April of this year, I wrote more than 20 articles on the subject, until some of my editors thought that I was playing a broken record—and wrote me so. Then Frederick Woltman, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, and Bert Andrews, of the New York Herald Tribune, did magnificent journalistic jobs, fighting against prejudice and distortion. And on the air, Fulton Lewis, Jr., displayed great courage and ingenuity comparing favorably with the mouthpieces of falsehood and suppression.

And it would be unjust not to mention the risky role played by Senator JOE MCCARTHY, who put himself way out, until one of his senatorial colleagues described him as a mad dog.

Well, JOE is not a mad dog. He is a fighting Irish marine.

When he started, he did not have the facts. He could not have had them. They were hidden in the archives of Government. He risked telling half the story, so that the whole of it would be forced out. His was the task of saying to the people that while he could point out the goal, he was not sure of the steps leading toward it.

It is curious that most of us have forgotten that, just as it has been forgotten that he refused at the start to mention names until the files were opened.

It was Senators LUCAS and TYDINGS who forced him to produce sample cases to justify his charges. And once they were produced, the same Senators smeared JOE MCCARTHY for doing what they demanded he should do. Maybe that is why they demanded names.

All the shenanigans of the administration, and the State Department, all the byways they followed, all their promises to investigate and their failures to investigate, their attempt to throw the blame on J. Edgar Hoover and James Forrestal—all this mattered little, for the people have wanted the whole story. And no matter what is done about it, the people will never be satisfied until the whole story is told.

And the story did not begin or end with the Amerasia case. It goes back to 1934, at least. It can be taken back to 1848, if we had the time, but 1934 is a good date to start, and if the American people really want the whole truth, they must take their investigation back to 1934, 1 year after Franklin D. Roosevelt recognized Soviet Russia.

The American-Soviet agreement of 1933 was immediately broken and the proof is in several places, but the easiest to get at is the organization of the Harold Ware cell in Washington, which came into existence only 1 year after Roosevelt and Litvinoff reached an agreement.

Alger Hiss was a member of that cell. So was Harry Dexter White. So were many others who attained to high positions in our Government.

If an investigation were to start there, the whole picture could be uncovered, showing an activity from, at least, 1934 to 1950—an activity of espionage, of infiltration in Government, of the corruption of our policies.

This can be proved and it is to the benefit of our people that it should be proved conclusively, letting the chips fall where they may. Many may get hurt who were only foolish, but individuals must not count. It is the Nation that needs saving.

It is too late for anyone to attempt to cover up. Even if each one who now shouts for the truth were smeared or sued for libel, or imprisoned, the truth will come out. For others will arise to demand it. The politicians may save time but they will not save themselves.

Therefore, why not forget politics and remember America?

Address by Hon. James E. Murray, of Montana, and Proclamation by Harold Turk, Mayor of Miami Beach, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 1, 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech which I delivered at the Roosevelt memorial service held at Flamingo Park, Miami Beach, Fla., on Wednesday, April 12, 1950.

I also ask that there be printed in the RECORD following the address a proclamation issued by the mayor of the city of Miami Beach, Hon. Harold Turk, decreeing April 12, 1950, as Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Day.

There being no objection the address and proclamation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES E. MURRAY, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MONTANA, AT THE ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL SERVICE, FLAMINGO PARK, MIAMI, FLA., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 12, 1950

No greater honor could be paid me than your invitation to join in this memorial service.

We are gathered here today to pay homage to the memory of one of the greatest Americans of all times—Franklin Delano Roosevelt—a man whose memory is revered in every nation in the world.

When Prime Minister Winston Churchill heard of the death of our great President, he paid him a eulogy in the House of Commons which warmed the hearts of all Americans. To Mr. Churchill, Franklin Roosevelt was—and I use Mr. Churchill's own words—the "greatest American friend" England has ever known and the "greatest champion of freedom who has ever brought help and comfort from the New World to the Old." "I felt," continued Mr. Churchill, "the utmost confidence in his upright, inspiring character and outlook, and a deep personal regard and affection beyond my power to express today."

Unlike some of the great men of the past, Franklin D. Roosevelt does not need to await the judgment of history. His greatness was apparent to most of us during the closing years of his life, and his untimely death made it doubly apparent to all.

I venture to say that if the people of the world during his lifetime were to vote for the living person whose name meant the most to humanity, Franklin D. Roosevelt's name would have been their choice.

He gave us the essential philosophy, the courage, and the tenacity of purpose to preserve democracy in the world. Without his leadership we might have been subjugated to the dictators and totalitarian ideology of triumphant fascism. He was a human being whose depth of understanding encompassed the needs and aspirations of his fellow men throughout the length and breadth of the earth.

He was a great friend to the people of the South and gave special thought to their problems. In speaking of the South as the Nation's No. 1 problem he was never moved by a spirit of criticism or condescension. He had an earnest desire to improve the economic conditions and provide for the welfare of the people of this part of the country. He had the same attitude toward the West and the supported programs for its development.

But it would be futile to speak of the greatness of our late leader in terms of sectional interests. He belonged to the Nation and to the world, and it is in relation to issues of at least national importance that we most remember him.

One of the things that was very near to his heart because it is basic in building a better life, was the problem of raising the health standards of the American people.

Certain interests have recently tried to exploit the fact that President Roosevelt was opposed to—and I quote—"socialized medicine."

I do not for one minute doubt that Roosevelt was opposed to socialized medicine just as all of us who now propose national health insurance, are opposed to it.

But I also know that like all honest liberals of both Houses of Congress, President Roosevelt favored and supported a national health program for all the people. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Labor Committee, I had many conferences with him on this subject.

In December 1944, President Roosevelt was ready to propose a comprehensive national health program, including national health insurance, and a Presidential message was to have been prepared to this effect. In fact, Harry Hopkins, in 1944, had called in one of the outstanding health experts to help prepare this message. Mr. Roosevelt's untimely death prevented the delivery of that message to the Congress but his position in favor of national health insurance and in opposition to socialized medicine was clear and definite.

Because President Roosevelt was deeply interested in bringing better health care to all Americans, it is appropriate to discuss the plan which those of us who were inspired by and followed him in life are now proposing for the American people.

This brings to mind the words of President Truman, in a special health message to Congress on November 19, 1945, in which he said, "What I am recommending is not socialized medicine. Socialized medicine means that all doctors work as employees of the Government. The American people want no such system. No such system is here proposed."

Probably the greatest difficulty in dealing with the national health insurance proposal is to understand what it really is. It has been so misrepresented—and by the greatest masters of ingenuity in misrepresentation the world has ever seen—that many men, ordinarily well-informed, are in doubt concerning it. They have been confused by the constant repetition of the falsehood that it is a socialistic or communistic proposal. Of course, it is nothing of the kind. It is as purely American as our system of old-age pensions or unemployment compensation or Federal deposit insurance which protects the savings of the masses. We propose simply to use the magic of insurance to guarantee medical care and protect the health of the American people.

On the other hand, the opponents of the President's health program seek to evade rather than to provide adequate medical care for the people.

Some years ago a special subcommittee in the Senate made a study of this problem. These studies disclosed that 10 percent of the families (those with the greatest amount of illness) spent 41 percent of all money expended for medical care. We found that the people receiving the lowest incomes had more sickness but less medical care than those with higher incomes. We found that charity does not begin to take care of the health requirements of the aged, the blind and dependent mothers and children. We found that commercial insurance, the Blue Cross hospital plan and other medical voluntary insurance plans covered but a small proportion of our population. In fact, only about 5 percent of our population have protection against illness under these plans. Our committee concluded that the voluntary plans simply do not bring the needed hospital, medical, dental, and nursing care within the reach of most of our people. We, therefore, believe as President Roosevelt did, that the only way every American citizen can get the health care he requires is for the Congress to adopt a national health program, including health insurance under which he would be able to provide in advance for hospital, medical, dental, and nursing bills and get the full care and attention he should have.

What we propose is medical care that every citizen can afford. The President's program calls for—

1. Government aid to medical schools to help them train more doctors, dentists, nurses, and other health workers, and scholarships so that qualified young people can afford to take this expensive training.

2. More Federal aid for specific medical research (such as we are now sponsoring), in the care of cancer, heart, dental, mental illnesses. Last year, chiefly through the efforts of the members of our committee, in making personal appearances before the Senate Appropriations Committee and by stirring debates on the Senate floor, we were able to provide $18,900,000 for cancer research, $10,725,000 for heart research, $1,780,000 for dental research, and $11,612,000 for research into the causes of mental illnesses. While these matters are national in scope, you people of Florida should be especially interested. We know that 2,969 Floridians died of cancer in 1948 and that one-third to one-half of these deaths could have been prevented if there had been a sufficient number of local cancer clinics in Florida. As a result of our efforts in the Senate and in the Congress, there are already 13 clinics in Florida, including one right here in Dade County.

Your Senators in Washington are now trying to get $17,895,000 for research, on heart disease, the leading killer in the Nation and in Florida. Over 6,800 Floridians died of heart disease in 1948, and there is not a single research project now being conducted in this State. I understand the University of Florida and several other institutions of higher learning have requested funds to build heart-research facilities and the new Federal appropriation that we have requested should enable them to obtain these funds.

We are trying to get $9,180,000 for mental-health-research activities. Florida needs at least 25 local mental-health clinics. Fortunately, Dade County is one of the five counties in Florida with a mental health clinic which has been granted Federal funds.

The third section of our program also calls for—

3. More Federal aid to the States for training public-health workers and establishing full-time local public-health units in every country, and for extending pollution control, water and milk sanitation, and all the other services which make a community a healthy place in which to live.

Last year the Senate passed a bill to provide increased aid for these local public-health units. We also secured in the Senate last year $16,600,000 to be used as Federal grants for these local units. This year we are trying to get as much as $27,400,000 in order that all of our communities will have adequately staffed local health departments.

4. Federal grants to help States and communities build more hospitals, set up medical and dental clinics and organize traveling clinics. Since the beginning of this program in 1948 Florida, with Federal help, has been able to start construction on 21 hospital projects, covering 1,653 beds, 3 health centers, and 2 out-patient departments. Florida has witnessed a remarkable decrease in maternity death rates because of the increased hospital space available. In 1935 there were 8.7 natural deaths for every 1,000 live births, and in 1948, 1.9 deaths per 1,000. Infant death rates in the same period declined from 61.9 per thousand live births to 35.3 per thousand. Florida's hospital needs are still very great, for Florida lacks an estimated 14,000 beds on the basis of its present population.

5. Increasing present Government grants to provide better facilities for the care of crippled children.

All of this will go a long way toward strengthening our national health-care system but medical care will not be apportioned fairly while medical costs remain high and the average person cannot afford to buy them.

As I said before, the President proposes a common-sense plan by having everyone pay his share of the cost of high-quality medical care through small, regular payments. This is not a new idea, it is exactly like social security, through which a worker provides old-age benefits for himself and protection for his wife and children if he should die before reaching age 65.

Health insurance would be paid for like social security. Under the plan those who receive wages and salaries would pay a small premium, based upon their wages—1½ cents per dollar earned up to $4,800 a year. Employers would match these premiums equally. We estimate that a person who employs himself or herself, such as a merchant, lawyer, or farmer, would probably pay about 3 percent of his income up to $4,800 per year. With this kind of insurance you wouldn't have to meet medical bills when sickness strikes and when you are least able to pay. You would pay your premiums into a national health insurance trust fund in the United States Treasury. From this fund moneys would be transferred to the State and local community for administration. Your State and not the Federal Government would operate and administer its own plan, and in your own community, local townspeople, including doctors and hospital experts, would keep the arrangements for medical care in their own hands.

Every insured person would have complete freedom of choice as to his doctor or hospital. The doctor would accept or reject his own patients exactly as he does now but when he accepts a patient he wouldn't have to worry about geting payment for the bills due him. Your insurance would take care of that.

Health insurance is only part of the general health program which we are trying to enact.

When you realize that nearly everyone in the United States believes that we need more medical education, more doctors, more medical research, more hospitals and health centers, more local public health work, better health protection for our mothers and children, and a better method of paying for good medical care, I know you will agree that the only way it can be done is through the integrated over-all program which is being sponsored by the President.

If a better way could be found, let us have it, but under present conditions we see great numbers of our people die before their time, we see people who are ill and can't get the care they should have, who suffer when their suffering can be prevented or lightened. That is why we liberals are fighting to do everything possible to preserve human life and to protect human happiness through our national health program in the best democratic way we know.

That is why Franklin Delano Roosevelt in his lifetime advocated a national health program which would bring health, happiness, and security to the American people—a program which would bring the best modern medical care within the reach of all our citizens, regardless of their means.

Perhaps on this day of commemoration we should pause and reflect on the tremendous impact that this most revered of all Presidents has had on the lives of all of us. Most of us can remember the economic chaos that existed when this great humanitarian gave the people of America new courage by those memorable words in his first inaugural address that "the only thing we had to fear was fear itself."

In the 17 years that have elapsed since that first inaugural address, we, the people of America, by and through the leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, have embarked upon a bold new program—a program designed to promote the general welfare of all of the people of our great democracy. We the people know that the path has not always been an easy one. We know that at every turn, the program of President Roosevelt was fought bitterly and viciously by the organized lobbyists of the special interests.

You remember that back in 1933 when the banks of the Nation were closed, President Roosevelt proposed and carried through reforms in our banking system which put our currency on a sound basis and made our bank deposits safe.

But we are inclined to forget that these simple reforms met with bitter name-calling attacks. When the great body of legislation designed to raise the living standards of the American people, including the Wagner Act, Social Security Act, minimum-wage law, and public housing law, was proposed, the same masters of misrepresentation attacked them. Weren't we told that the great TVA program would destroy private enterprise? History has proved, however, that instead of destroying it, private enterprise in the entire area has flourished. These prophets of gloom called each part of Franklin Roosevelt's program socialistic or communistic. But we the people were not duped by these assaults. We the people fought along with our President and we are the beneficiaries of the more abundant economy that has resulted. Under those reforms America has become the greatest and richest industrial power in the world.

I believe that President Roosevelt did more to save the free enterprise system of this country and to contribute to the prosperity of business than any President we have ever had in the history of our country. His conviction that justice to all of the people of this country is best for the rich and the poor, is easily proven. When labor gets better wages, farmers get better prices and larger markets. Therefore the interests of the farmer are identified with the well-being of the industrial worker. Bank deposits, business profits, and wholesale and retail sales are in direct ratio to the well-being of the working man and woman of America and to the degree of employment of the working people of the land.

Conversely, when industrial employment declines, when wages go down, when we have unemployment, the farmer, the banker, the businessman, the professional man, yes, every segment of our society suffers.

So when we advocate decent wages and dependable jobs and reasonably favorable conditions for labor, we are talking about something that is in the best interests of all people.

We can best honor the memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt by rededicating ourselves to his principles, because the program that he launched is unfinished. In determining the wisdom of any new step, let us judge it on the merits. Let us not be misled by false labels smeared on by the gloom painters. We must continue to work to make our democracy more effective. We must not be diverted by hysterical name calling. Mr. Justice William O. Douglas, of the United States Supreme Court, in a speech at your own University of Florida, clearly expressed this idea when he said: "We must put an end to the shameful practice of branding everyone a Communist who espouses a liberal reform or promotes a program for the underprivileged. * * * The political antidote of communism is effective democratic government."

And so we honor the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt here today as a great humanitarian. We hail him as America's greatest champion of freedom and human rights.

He was a man moved by deep human feelings. He was a friend of the forgotten man. He sought to make health and a happy life the birthright of every American. In every field of human activity he entered, he made justice his guiding star—justice to the workingman, justice to all, regardless of race or creed or color. His majestic figure looms ever grander and more sublime as it recedes into the past, and the final verdict of history will fix his place first among the preservers of American democracy. The judgment of posterity will hold his influence on human progress to be the highest and most beneficent of any man who ever served the Nation.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt by an overwhelming mandate of the people was elected to serve as President of these United States of America through four successive terms; and

Whereas in true American tradition of daring and imagination, he threw off the shackles of passivity and, welcoming change in an ever-changing world, revitalized the democratic concept of government; and

Whereas in this high office he brought renewed hope and confidence in the American way of life to all his fellow countrymen, encouraging them to free themselves of doubts and fears during the dark days of economic distress; and

Whereas acting as Commander in Chief, he led his country through a tragic world-wide conflict to victory; and

Whereas he symbolized to the entire world the hope of freedom from the evil forces of tyranny and oppression and the ultimate attainment of a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt, on April 12, 1945, 5 years ago today, mourned by men, women, and children all over the civilized world, passed away, as surely a martyr to mankind's fight for liberty as any soldier on the battlefield; and

Whereas it is vitally urgent that the passage of time should not tarnish the bright vision of a better world which he inspired and equally urgent that our determination to achieve his goals be strengthened and our faith in the democratic processes which he cherished be intensified; and

Whereas it is fitting that at this time every American rededicate himself to the ideals for which Franklin Delano Roosevelt fought and died and to a reaffirmation of his philosophy that we have nothing to fear but fear itself:

I do, therefore, as mayor of the city of Miami Beach, decree and proclaim this day, April 12, 1950, as Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Day in honor of that great American statesman, humanitarian, and hero, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in whose memory we solemnly dedicate ourselves with the sacred pledge that he and his ideals shall live forever in the hearts of his countrymen.

HAROLD TURK,
Mayor, City of Miami Beach.

The Railroad Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 1, 1950

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Could Be Simple" published in the Pretty Prairie Times, of Pretty Prairie, Kans.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COULD BE SIMPLE

Again a labor union has decided to throw its weight around like an enraged bull—or a spoiled child who flops on the floor, kicks and bawls until his parents let him have his way to keep peace in the family. The railroad strike now in progress has been inaugurated by the switchmen's union, a group representing only about 5 percent of the Nation's switchmen, but supported heartily by the trainmen and conductors' unions which make up about 95 percent of the switchmen. Result: Effective hampering of shipment of grain at a time when every minute counts.

Not all the fault, perhaps, lies with the union. They get that way for several reasons—first the public tolerates the bad boys of our economic family, leaving the matter up to the Government to do something. The executive branch of the Government has the obligation to act only so far as the laws are set up by Congress—but the President ignores the Taft-Hartley law and provides a fact-finding board. The board recommends a solution which is ignored by the unions. And there, dear readers, you have a vicious circle from which no one gains while the public is distressed.

One might think at first glance that Congress performed its duty when it enacted the Taft-Hartley law. We wonder how many people, in and out of Government, really understand the law. This writer confesses, he doesn't. But then what could the public do if everyone did understand the law? The President still refuses to use it.

Add to the confusion of Government meddling, if you will, and consider the fact that the Government doesn't care where the wheat is stored—perhaps not even if it's stored. Long-time storage costs money, but the money is supplied by taxpayers and incomes will even be higher in the year 2000, we are

told. But when storage space in the Wheat Belt is allowed to pile up, the taxpaying wheat growers must provide their own storage and foot the bill.

The Government could see that railroads had cars ready to haul the wheat—harvest starts about the same time each year—but the Government waits until the emergency arrives. This should be the responsibility of railroad management but they use a swivel chair as a place from which to shout: "We're being robbed." Cars remain hard to get every harvest.

May we pause here to remind the President, Congress, railroad management, and the union: Another harvest will be here early in June next year and please, gentlemen, let's see if there is such a thing as national cooperation to put the wheat into storage in record time—just for once.

The program of wheat deliveries could be a simple one—and one that would work well in all disputes between capital and labor, capital, and the Government, labor and the Government—and—the President and Congress. First there should be public support back of a simpler method of cooperation. The Taft-Hartley law was a Republican triumph over a Democratic President—politics exemplified. It doesn't work when the President doesn't use it.

Congress might admit that the Taft-Hartley Act is a failure since it does not produce cooperation. The President has witnessed a failure of his fact-finding board in the present railroad strike—and others. The railroads and unions, jockeying for the upper hand, have nothing to offer but more strikes. After the switchmen get their demands, the trainmen and conductors will want their slice of pie. We'll hear from the engineers, firemen, brakemen, water-monkeys, and what have you. After that there will be the other lines such as the auto workers, tinsmiths, paper workers, dock hands, and ditch diggers. Still no cooperation.

Suppose the next strike was settled—not by Congress, nor by the President's fact-finding board—but by a civil court and the FBI, if necessary, see that the decision was carried out. Any time there was a lack of cooperation, either side should have the privilege of going to court for a definite settlement. If at any time public health or safety was endangered the responsible organization should bear full responsibility. The theme should be to simplify our affairs rather than complicate them with political confusion.

Our system of Government fails to be a democracy when laws made by Congress are flaunted by the Chief Executive; when unions demand objectives from capital; or when any of our resources are laid waste by the stubbornness of any group within our borders. We are not in need of more laws—simplicity is recognized by the public as an honest effort which will result in national cooperation.

Watch 'em Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 3, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say that the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch is one of America's great newspapers. It truly covers central Ohio like a blanket.

The following is an editorial from this fine paper which discusses the conditions in the State Department and especially the Lattimore case. Something should be done to clean out this Department.

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch of July 2, 1950]

WATCH 'EM CHANGE

Last August Owen Lattimore, at the request of Dean Acheson, wrote a report on the Far East as a guide to United States policy for State Department people. This, among other things, is what he said:

Owen Lattimore criticized United States policy in helping Chiang Kai-shek.

Owen Lattimore recommended that the United States recognize Communist China or Outer Mongolia.

Owen Lattimore said Japan could not become a good ally of the United States.

Owen Lattimore called South Korea "more of a liability than an asset." He urged that "the United States should disembarrass itself as quickly as possible of its entanglements in South Korea."

Owen Lattimore said a great deal more along the same line. Later he actually proposed that the United States support a nationalist regime in China "even if it is Communist nationalism."

That's what Owen Lattimore was thinking, writing and advising in our State Department—only a few months ago.

Come, now, and let us look at the new Lattimore, the Lattimore after the heat has been on for a while, thanks to such Americans as Senator MCCARTHY; after the trend of world events moved so fast that Owen Lattimore found himself on the spot.

The "new" Lattimore addressed a public gathering in Baltimore the other day. He warmly approved President Truman's action in bolstering the very same South Koreans of whom he wanted us "disembarrassed" those short months ago. He said our policy in South Korea was "both morally and politically justified." This is the same South Korea, by the way, that was more a liability than an asset a few months ago.

He said it was a mistake to have divided Korea, because the Koreans are homogeneous and division cannot solve their problems.

No! Five years after Yalta and Moscow, Owen Lattimore finally decides that it was a mistake for us to have yielded to the Soviet Union on this abortive division. Owen Lattimore had no such criticism last August when he was advising Dean Acheson in his famous pro-Soviet-line report.

Owen Lattimore was shocked by the march across the thirty-eighth parallel into South Korea by the Soviet-puppet, North Koreans. He said such an act demands and justifies emergency measures.

There was no such demand and justification statement from Owen Lattimore concerning any other of the Soviet or Soviet-puppet usurpations of territory elsewhere in the world. Is this new light which Mr. Lattimore sees caused by an opportunistic appreciation that events in the United States have passed him by and made his pro-Communist position untenable?

Dean Acheson was an appeaser. Now he's the big action man.

Owen Lattimore was another. Now he's putting his stamp of approval (whatever that means) on events which have left him far behind.

Owen Lattimore is apparently trying to disembarrass himself from his pro-Communist position before just deserts overtake him.

The American people will probably react against this weaseling into the current position. They will probably view scornfully the shameful, unabashed opportunism by which such men as Acheson and Lattimore jump from one camp to the other, whichever seems most profitable at the time.

The American people may well be disgusted and angered at the incredible conceit of such men as Dean Acheson who appear to believe that they have a permanent claim to top Government posts no matter how many mistakes they make; no matter how much the cost and anguish of their errors to the people.

Dean Acheson has long been identified with the soft-toward-Russia element in the United States Government.

Owen Lattimore has long been an apologist for Soviet aggression and has shown a peculiar affinity for Communist policy. What right have such men to claim public office or public notice? They made their beds, but they won't lie in them. They want the new model bed now, the tough-toward-Russia sort. Why should they be allowed to get away with such deceit, cowardice, and crass opportunism?

Alaska and Hawaii Statehood Bills Should Be Considered Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 3, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported the Alaska and Hawaii statehood bills to the Senate last week, and among many newspapers which took note of this historic event was the New York Times. That notation took the form of an editorial published in the June 30 issue urging that the two bills be considered by the upper House before this session ends, an appeal heartily endorsed by all statehood advocates. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I commend the Times' editorial to the attention of Congress:

THE STATEHOOD BILLS

Alaska since 1907 and Hawaii since 1920 have been trying to become active instead of passive members of that exclusive club known as the United States of America. On Tuesday, when a Senate committee approved, with some modifications, statehood proposals already passed by the House, the goal seemed in sight. There are a number of reasons why this Congress should act favorably, one good reason being that members of both parties are committed by their party platforms to do so.

The other reasons have been recited many times: it is inconsistent with democratic practice to deny citizens the right of self-government; at least 6 States have smaller populations than Hawaii; Alaska, with a population recently estimated as high as 120,000, is not far behind our least-populous State, Nevada; Hawaii and Alaska each has a strategic importance which increases with every passing year—and just now one might say each passing day. It is objected, in the case of Alaska, that the inhabitants could not easily bear the additional cost of State administration and that most of the land

would continue to be owned and operated by the Federal Government. But the fact that the majority of the voters have asked for statehood ought to be conclusive on these points.

The Senate is busy these days, but it ought not to be too busy to perform a just and reasonable act such as this would be. A vote of confidence in the integrity of our pioneer citizens on the western frontiers would be singularly appropriate just now.

Letters From Chicago Bankers on S. 2822, to Amend the FDIC Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 3, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is expected that S. 2822, to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, now under consideration in the Banking and Currency Committee, may shortly reach the floor of the House.

As the only member of the committee from the city of Chicago it has been my practice when proposed legislation affecting banking operation was before us to request from the bankers of Chicago such expression of opinion as would reflect the banking judgment of that large and important community. I trust that the extensions of my remarks which I have made from time to time to include letters from the Chicago bankers on pending legislation of direct interest to them in the operation of the financial institutions of the second city of the United States, and the first in the great inland of America, have been of some value to my colleagues in the deliberations upon the floor of the House. Hence, I am now presenting the letters which I have received on S. 2822, which follow:

JUNE 21, 1950.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I am writing to you in connection with Senate bill 2822. As the first Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and as an active banker since that time, I have naturally followed the affairs of the Corporation rather closely and with much interest, and I am familiar with this bill. It is, I believe, a constructive piece of legislation and will have a salutary effect not only on banking but on public confidence in banks throughout the country. I trust that you will support this bill. With assurance of my esteem and with cordial personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WALTER J. CUMMINGS,
Chairman of the Board, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago.

CHICAGO CITY BANK & TRUST CO.,
Chicago, Ill., June 22, 1950.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May we bespeak your support of Senate bill 2822 to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act?

In asking your consideration of this legislation we should like to talk with you particularly about the position of the smaller banks, of which we are one, in relation to Federal deposit insurance. As you are undoubtedly aware, the smaller community banks of the Nation, who do not have the high ratio of demand or commercial deposits to time or savings deposits found in the large commercial banks, are faced with the important problem in these days of low interest rates on Government securities, to earn sufficient income on deposit totals to permit the payment of reasonable interest rates against savings deposits. In our case, as in many other smaller banks, our savings deposits represent a ratio of $3 of savings to $2 of commercial deposits. This means that the cost of our total deposits, in terms of interest payments to our customers, is necessarily much higher than that of the large commercial bank which may hold $4 or more of commercial deposits against $1 of savings deposits.

Coupled with interest costs, FDIC insurance premiums on a substantial volume of savings deposits in the smaller community bank add greatly to the operating cost in maintaining such deposits.

The opportunity for profitable commercial lending in the smaller community bank is also limited to the demand by its commercial customers in the bank's trading area. Therefore, in order to meet present costs on savings deposits there seems to be a regrettable tendency in the smaller banks to overemphasize the amount of lending in which a bank should engage in the real-estate mortgage field and in the consumer-installment-loan activity.

A continuance of the trend of seeking higher rates on investments in order to meet interest and insurance premium costs, it seems to us, must eventually reach a point where the soundness of the banking structure as represented by the many thousands of small community banks throughout the Nation will be materially affected as these institutions are obliged to liquidate their sound Government bond portfolios in order to engage in other lending activities to provide the higher income necessary to meet expenditures. This certainly is not to the best interests of the FDIC reserve fund, and we feel that S. 2822 which provides some measure of relief from premium costs for FDIC coverage so long as actual losses, operating costs, and expenses of the Corporation are provided for, will in the end have the effect of strengthening the loan and investment policies of the smaller banks of the Nation. In view of the present size of the reserve fund of the Corporation it appears to us that relief might be granted the banks without in any way endangering the soundness of the insurance fund.

Yours very truly,

FRANK C. RATHJE,
President, Chicago City Bank & Trust Co.

SCAREBOROUGH & CO.,
Chicago, June 21, 1950.

The Honorable BARRATT O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SENATE BILL 2822

DEAR SIR: I regret my inability to appear before the Committee on Banking and Currency to testify at the meetings on Senate bill 2822, but I do request you to be my exponent and vote for this bill, without amendment, as it is an important piece of legislation for the banking fraternity of this country. We know, for we handle the insurance for over 1,200 banks and recognize the value of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation examiners in dealing with embezzlement for it has been our privilege, if it can be called such, to pay out over $10,000,000 in embezzlement losses to the bankers of the country over the last quarter of a century.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is an institution created by bankers' premiums and while a Government instrumentality it is in essence a bankers' company, and the bankers are in accord with the request and right of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to aid them in their operations by the examiners visiting the insured banks. And as I have written you before, it is a requisite of any insurance company to inspect its risk.

I shall be glad to hear of your views and positive vote for Senate bill 2822.

Sincerely,

HENRY SCARBOROUGH,
Of Scarborough & Co., Insurance Counselors to Banks.

THE SOUTH SHORE NATIONAL
BANK OF CHICAGO,
June 23, 1950.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Thanks for your letter about S. 2822. We do not believe that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation should be granted power to examine member banks of the Federal Reserve System without first obtaining permission in writing from the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. We believe that the blanket power to examine member banks should not be granted to the Deposit Corporation.

Senate 2822, in our opinion, should be enacted into law without further delay. It is sound as it is and needs no amendment, particularly the one proposed by Representative MULTER requiring the Deposit Corporation to abide by any agreements between bankers and depositors. The Corporation has honored all bona fide agreements where the record is clear, but it should not be bound for agreements where there is no record of their terms.

The writer has a firm conviction that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation should be an insurance corporation only and should have no examination powers. Examinations of national banks should be conducted by the Comptroller of the Currency as they are now and examinations of State banks that are members of the Deposit Corporation should be conducted by the Federal Reserve System, be the banks members of the System or not.

I may speak without authority on this particular matter; however, having been an officer of State banks and National banks, a national bank examiner, a Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation supervising examiner, and a bank management consultant for a decade, I do not speak without experience.

Cordially yours,

M. R. BATY, *President.*

SOUTH SIDE BANK & TRUST CO.,
Chicago, Ill., June 24, 1950.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I have your letter of June 20 enclosing copy of Senate bill 2822, an act to amend the FDIC Act.

In reply to your question as to the difference of opinion between FDIC and Federal Reserve System, as to the examining feature, it is my humble opinion that the present examining body do a thorough job of examining the banks and I believe the present arrangement should not be disturbed. Another examining body would appear to be a duplication of effort and would not help the situation too much but it would be burdensome to the banks.

Other features of the bill appear to be satisfactory and beneficial to the welfare of the community as a whole.

Respectfully yours,

CARL L. JERNBERG.

CHICAGO NATIONAL BANK,
Chicago, Ill., June 21, 1950.

The Honorable BARRATT O'HARA,
Congressman from Illinois,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I am advised that Senate bill 2822, having to do with the revision of the law governing the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, is being considered by the House Committee on Banking and Currency, of which you are a member. I wish to advise you of my favorable opinion of this bill and to solicit your support of it.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, to my personal knowledge, has been very capably administered since its inception and is ably directed by its present board. I am intimately acquainted with Chairman Maple T. Harl, and members, Preston Delano and Earl Cook. The fact that these men, who are closest to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, approve Senate bill 2822 gives me complete confidence in it.

From personal analysis, it would appear that the present capital of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, plus protected provisions in the bill, are ample for the purposes for which the Corporation was created.

From the standpoint of individual member banks, I feel a reduction in Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation assessment will enable the banks to increase their capital funds which, in many instances, is so greatly needed. Actually, under the very conservative dividend policy, now followed by the banks, increase in the banks' capital represents indirect support for the liabilities of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

I repeat my statement of approval of Senate bill 2822 and my request for your support of it.

Respectfully yours,
R. D. MATHIAS,
President, Chicago National Bank.

THE MID-CITY NATIONAL
BANK OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., June 21, 1950.

Congressman BARRATT O'HARA,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We are vitally interested in Senate bill 2822 which is up for consideration in the House, and we address this communication to you in order that you may be apprised of our feelings in the matter.

We believe that banks in general are entitled to the consideration which the bill offers in that there will be a reduction in the premium and an increase of insurance coverage on deposits.

We feel that banks are especially entitled to this consideration inasmuch as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Treasury Department believed that the capital reserves of the Corporation were ample to take care of any contingency and approved the return to the Treasury of the capital which was supplied by the United States Treasury to the Corporation bank in 1933.

If both the Treasury Department and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation considered the corporation to be in sufficiently good condition to permit this, we feel that there should be some adjustment in the amount of premium being paid by the banks to insure their deposits. Then, too, during the 16 years of operation the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has built up almost $1,250,000,000 in capital reserves, which we believe to be adequate.

We look to you for assistance in seeing to the successful passage of this bill.

With highest regards,
Yours very truly,
F. A. GROENWALD,
President, the Mid-City National Bank.

SOUTH CHICAGO SAVINGS BANK,
Chicago, June 24, 1950.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: In reference to your letter of June 20 relative to the matter of according the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation the power to examine Federal Reserve member banks without first obtaining the approval of the Federal Reserve System we submit the following as an expression of our viewpoint.

In our opinion the FDIC should not be given that power. We speak as a State bank which is a member of the Federal Reserve System.

We now have two supervising authorities, the Federal Reserve and the State. Assuming they are informed as to safe banking requirements and practices, and are competent, thorough, and conscientious in their supervision, and our experience indicates that they are very much so, we fail to see how a third authority and examination will add to the safety of the bank and its depositors.

On the other hand, the addition of such third authority will impose additional burden on the banks. Considerable time and effort on the part of the bank and its staff must necessarily be devoted to the examiners during examinations and in studying and replying to their findings later. Direct supervision and examination by a third authority will add to that burden. It will also contribute to confusion in that the bank will have three supervisors instead of the present two. It is analogous to the situation resulting from a man trying to serve too many masters. If such third supervision served a purpose the bank could not rightly object but, again assuming the competency of the present supervision, we fail to see any such purpose.

Federal Reserve and State authorities are more local and consequently in better position to supervise. We have at times noticed how rule-of-thumb rules and regulations emanating from a national regulatory body, while possibly pertinent in many situations, can create unnecessary hardship in others.

Supervision by the Federal Reserve, the authority which by its nature is entirely familiar with banks and banking and which practically is our banking system, to say nothing of the State supervision which should not be discounted, is adequate without complicating matters by imposing still another direct supervising body to no purpose.

Very truly yours,
GUY A. NELSON, *President.*

ILLINOIS BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, June 19, 1950.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: It has been reported that the House Banking and Currency Committee will start hearings on S. 2822 on June 20. This bill passed the Senate to provide increased coverage by the FDIC on insured deposits with a reduction of assessment and a number of other provisions.

This association is not opposed, but on the contrary favorable, to the three most important features of this bill; namely, increasing the coverage, reducing the assessment, and simplifying the method by which the assessment base is arrived.

However, we are definitely in opposition to the provisions in subsection C of section 18 which is as follows: "No insured state nonmember bank without prior written consent shall reduce the amount or retire any part of its capital notices or debentures," and subsection D of section 18 which requires a nonmember State bank to get prior written consent to change its location. These are matters provided in State banking laws and subject to supervision of State bank supervisory agencies. These provisions are a reflection of the quality of State bank supervision and an invasion of State rights; a repudiation of our banking laws. These conditions are not imposed upon national banks nor upon State member banks, and is unfair discrimination against State nonmember banks.

May we suggest that H. R. 7647 be considered as a substitute for S. 2822 in that it does not contain any of the controversial provisions and without any question is a fairer approach to the main provisions than anything that has yet been introduced or discussed. Then the House Banking and Currency Committee could postpone action on the other provisions of S. 2822 until an opportunity has been given it to thoroughly study those which are in controversy.

Your consideration of these matters will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,
HARRY C. HAUSMAN,
Secretary.

THE COSMOPOLITAN NATIONAL
BANK OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, June ??, 1950.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I am happy to respond to your letter of June 20 on the subject of our views relative to bill S. 2822.

In my opinion, this is a matter of getting back to fundamentals. We are not opposed to examinations as such, but we are opposed to multiplicity thereof by Federal agencies having to do with banking. For this reason I am of the opinion that governmental agencies having a statutory responsibility in the condition of banks, should rely upon the comprehensive and thorough examination which is currently being made by the Comptroller of the Currency. In my judgment, there is no undue hardship imposed upon the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to require that it first obtain the approval of the Federal Reserve System before making an examination of the specific bank. Both instrumentalities can and should work in harmony with each other and with the full cooperation of the Comptroller of the Currency.

Very truly yours,
PETER I. BUKOWSKI,
President.

CHESTERFIELD FEDERAL SAVINGS &
LOAN ASSOCIATION OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, June 27, 1950.

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been following with much interest the hearings before the House Banking and Currency Committee on S. 2822, especially the remarks by George L. Bliss, chairman of the legislative committee of the United States Savings and Loan League.

I concur in his conclusions, namely, that in the public interest, the method of liquidation of a defaulted insured institution by either the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation should be similar.

To this end the amendments proposed by the league would seem to me to be in order.

If you agree, I hope you will exert your influence on the committee accordingly.

Best regards.

Yours very truly,
CHESTERFIELD FEDERAL SAVINGS
& LOAN ASSOCIATION,
ABEL D. HAAN, *President.*

Korea Is Showdown for United States and United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I gave on the Town Meeting of the Air broadcast from New York City on Tuesday night, June 27, 1950:

WHAT IS THE MEANING OF THE KOREAN INVASION FOR THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED NATIONS?

The lawless attack upon the Republic of Korea by Communist armies brings both the United States and the United Nations to the hour of showdown—at least in our thinking with respect to the nature, the objectives, and the methods of the Communist movement in Asia. We have ducked and dodged this problem ever since VJ-day. We can evade it no longer. It must now be clear to all that Communist forces in Korea, China, Indochina, the Philippines, and other parts of Asia are just what they are everywhere else—part of the Kremlin's conspiracy to conquer the world, country by country.

What can we do to prevent its success? First, with respect to Korea. We had only two choices. We could hesitate and delay as we have done heretofore in Asia, and watch the rest of the continent go down like a house of cards.

Or, we could do what I yesterday urged our Government to do—the course which, in substance the President announced this noon as our policy from now on, and which I fervently hope the Security Council will adopt at its meeting taking place at this hour—namely, support the strongest possible stand by the United Nations against such naked aggression and flagrant violation of its Charter, with firm assurance by the United States that if requested by the UN, and to the limit of our capabilities in the Far East, we will make our full strength available for carrying out its decisions and urge all other nations to do the same.

Such a stand is honorable and has some chance of proving effective in stopping this and further Communist aggressions in Asia. Indecision or half-hearted measures, which have been the curse of our policies there in the past, would be neither worthy nor sensible. They could lead only to continued disaster.

There are risks either way. But one course presents risks with some hope of success; the other presents equally great risks and the certainty of failure.

All over the world, the Soviets and forces controlled by them spend their time pushing on doors. Wherever they have found a door strongly held, usually by ourselves or by forces backed by us, they have not pushed to actual involvement in war. Witness Iran, Greece, Berlin, Trieste, Italy, France.

Wherever they have found a door not firmly held or supported by us, they have walked in. Witness China and now Korea.

If action of the United Nations, backed to the hilt by the United States, convinces the Russians that at last we mean business in the Far East just as we did in Berlin and in Greece, there is a possibility, perhaps a probability, that the Soviet Union will decide not to push down the Korean door and may even announce that it will use its influence with those impetuous North Koreans to get them to withdraw to the thirty-eighth parallel, in line with Russia's well-known and ardent desire for peace.

If, despite today's decisions, Russia insists on going ahead in Korea, the situation will be no worse than if we did nothing. In fact, it will have enormously better effect upon the rest of Asia for the UN and ourselves to do our best, even if, tragically, it should be too late to save Korea, than to do nothing at all except deplore, condemn, send sympathy to the victims—and then seat the aggressors in the United Nations.

That is, firm action cannot make things worse; and might, I think, make them better.

For the stakes are far greater than just Korea, important as that is. The larger issues are: First, whether any of the free peoples of Asia are to have any confidence that the United States will stand behind them in the clutch—as we have stood behind the free nations of Europe; and second whether anyone anywhere can place any confidence whatsoever in the United Nations.

That brings me to the question originally announced for tonight, Should Communist China be admitted to the United Nations? It seems to me a little like Alice in Wonderland to support in one breath, as my opponent does, the drastic action our Government has just announced in opposition to Communist aggression in Korea, and in the next breath to advocate giving the greatest possible assistance to Communist aggression in China and all over Asia by seating Communist China in the UN. There is nothing to gain and everything to lose by such a course.

First, there are no legal reasons why Communist China should be admitted. It does not meet any of the customary qualifications:

(a) It does not have clear possession of the state with the consent of a majority of the people. No election has been held, not even a regular Communist-rigged election, and Mao Tse-tung officially admitted only last month that over 400,000 guerrillas are fighting his regime, more than are involved in the fighting in Korea on both sides.

(b) It does not have the capacity to carry out ordinary international obligations, because it is not independent; it is an acknowledged puppet of the Kremlin.

(c) It has demonstrated that it does not desire and is not willing to enter into normal international relations or carry out normal international obligations, even with those who hastened to recognize it months ago.

Second, there are no moral reasons. Aggression over a period of 3 years is no less aggression than that carried out in 3 days.

Third, there are no self-interest reasons. It cannot be in our national interest needlessly to present such a boost to Communist strength as admission to the UN would give; and such a blow to the morale of those in Asia who are resisting it.

Fourth, the survival of the UN as an instrument of justice and peace in the world is at stake. At Yalta we sacrificed our principles and other people's rights and territories to get Russia to come into the United Nations. If now we yield again to blackmail in order to get her to attend meetings, then every time she cannot get her way by normal methods she will stage a new boycott and get it that way. It would almost be simpler to amend the UN Charter to state that the Security Council is obliged to do whatever the Soviet government wants.

If Russia can browbeat the Security Council into accepting the Red regime in China, what is there to prevent her obtaining easy entry for all Communist stooge governments, no matter what their illegitimacy? How could it deny a demand that it seat Ho Chi-Min and his Communist rebellion in Indochina to represent Viet Nam?

The UN will not be wrecked if Red China is not in it, anymore than it is wrecked by the Soviet refusal to let Switzerland join. If Russia is willing to wreck the United Nations over this issue, then it is willing to wreck it over any one of a dozen other issues which it can cook up whenever its will is crossed or whenever it believes it will be to its advantage to stage another walk-out.

It is a delusion to imagine that admitting Communist China will end the cold war. Only the Soviets who started the cold war can end it—unless we propose to surrender to them, and I doubt that anyone here suggests that. As long as they insist on trying to enslave us, and we insist on remaining free, there is no way to end the cold war except to win it.

To yield to Soviet coercion under the mistaken belief that we are saving the United Nations is, in my judgment, to sign its death warrant.

Just as Munich did not prevent war but made it inevitable, so action now to scuttle the Republic of China, a loyal ally, in favor of the Communists, an avowed enemy, will not prevent war but, I fear, make it inevitable.

So I must urge nonadmission of Communist China for the same reason I urge support of South Korea. We must not continue further appeasement of communism anywhere. It can lead only either to surrender or to war. Somewhere Communist expansion by aggression has got to be stopped. It should have been done much earlier when it would have been much easier. But it will be still harder later when the Soviets have a stockpile of atomic bombs.

To allow Soviet Russia or one of her satellite fifth columns to take over an independent country, whether China or Korea, and then admit the new puppet regime into the United Nations and give it full standing, recognition and rights, is not only morally wrong, it is suicidal.

If Communist aggression throughout the world is not a threat to ourselves and to peace, then why do we spend billions to arm ourselves and others against it? If it is, then how can anyone suggest that we build it up against ourselves? It does not make sense.

Vocational Rehabilitation and Educational Benefits Available to World War II Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, since the passage of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and of the GI bill of rights by the Seventy-eighth Congress, this Nation has been engaged in the biggest program of vocational rehabilitation, education, and training of its veterans of World War II that any country has ever undertaken.

Nearly 10,000,000 veterans have participated in this program, and the results of the undertaking are apparent all about us. Disabled veterans have been rehabilitated, and some of the handicaps of their disabilities have been overcome as a result of this great program.

In addition, several million veterans have received educational opportunity that they would not otherwise have had, but for this program.

The results of this program will be far-reaching and will be more and more apparent during the next 50 years. The vocational rehabilitation and educational program now being carried out have and will continue to open the doors of opportunity and advancement to unnumbered thousands of veterans of World War II.

This program is an expensive one, but its influence on a growing America will be worth much more than its cost.

This Government committed itself to this program in 1944, and we must carry it to the conclusion provided by the laws under which it was set up.

We must not forget that the laws providing for rehabilitation, education, and training, of our veterans were passed at a time when this Nation was engaged in the world's most devastating war.

The men and women soldiers of this country were fighting in 1944 that this Nation might live. We must carry out the obligations to them, which these laws expressed.

I hope that every veteran of World War II will take advantage of every opportunity which these laws may afford him.

Most veterans must begin their education or training by July 25, 1951. Since that date is little more than a year away, I am including as a part of my remarks a statement prepared for me which outlines the educational, training, and rehabilitation benefits of these laws:

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AND EDUCATION BENEFITS AVAILABLE TO WORLD WAR II VETERANS UNDER LAWS ADMINISTERED BY THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Under certain conditions, qualified veterans of World War II are entitled to receive vocational training and educational benefits at Government expense. Included in these benefits are subsistence allowances, tuition payments, and necessary training supplies. These benefits are administered by the Veterans' Administration pursuant to authority contained in the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (Public Law 16, 78th Cong.), as amended, and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong.), as amended.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION (PUBLIC LAW 16, 78TH CONG.)

Eligible disabled veterans may receive education or training at Government expense with tuition, supplies, and subsistence allowance, provided by the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (Public Law 16, 78th Cong.). As of February 28, 1950, 169,970 World War II veterans had been rehabilitated, 168,836 were then in training, and such training had been approved for 728,520 veterans. Of those in training as of that date, there were: In institutions of higher learning, 47,709; in schools below college lever, 30,748; institutional-on-farm training, 42,858; and job training, 47,521.

Eligibility: To be eligible the veteran must—

(a) Have active service since September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of World War II (July 25, 1947).

(b) Be discharged from military or naval service under conditions other than dishonorable.

(c) Have a disability incurred in or aggravated by such service for which compensation is payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration (or would be but for receipt of retirement pay).

(d) Be found in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of a disability such as described.

All four requirements must be met.

Length of training: Eligible veterans may receive training for as long as necessary to restore their ability to work up to a total of 4 years (longer period allowable in certain cases). Veterans may apply for vocational rehabilitation at any time after their discharge but in time to complete their training by July 25, 1956.

Type of training: Eligible veterans may be (1) enrolled in schools or colleges; (2) placed in apprenticeships or other training on-the-job; or (3) entered in institutional on-farm training programs or other programs which combine school and on-the-job training.

Before disabled veterans begin training they will be interviewed by Veterans' Administration counselors. If necessary, they will be given a series of tests to determine their aptitudes and interests. This, together with a review of the veterans' past experiences, will enable the Veterans' Administration counselor and training officers to help the veterans decide upon the type of training that they should receive.

Subsistence allowances: Basic monthly subsistence allowance payments of $65 are paid to disabled veterans without dependents and $90 per month to veterans with dependents. (In the cases of disabled veterans pursuing courses of full-time institutional training the subsistence rates are: $75 without dependents; $105 with one dependent; and $120 with more than one dependent.) The law provides further that the minimum payment of such allowance plus disability compensation or other benefit shall not be less than $105 per month for a person without a dependent or $115 per month for a person with a dependent where the service-connected disability is rated at less than 30 percent; and where the service-connected disability is rated 30 percent or more, not less than $115 per month for a person without a dependent, and $135 per month for a person with a dependent. The minimum combined amount of such allowance is increased according to the number and type of dependents which the veteran has established in his claim. The Veterans' Administration determines the exact amount of subsistence allowance to be paid to each veteran. Such allowances are subject to the restriction outlined in the succeeding paragraph.

The law requires that the employer of an on-the-job trainee pursuing training under Public Law 16 submit a monthly statement of the wages, compensation, or other income paid by him to the trainee. Based upon such statements, the Veterans' Administration is authorized to reduce the subsistence allowance of the trainee to an amount considered equitable and just. Veterans' Administration regulations provide that the total of wages and subsistence allowance in such cases may not exceed the wage of an experienced worker in the job for which the veteran is being trained. Veterans are provided also with such tools, equipment, and supplies as are commonly required to be personally owned by other trainees not under Veterans' Administration jurisdiction who are pursuing the same training in the particular establishment.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING (SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT, PUBLIC LAW 346, 78TH CONG.)

Eligible veterans may receive education or training at Government expense with tuition, supplies, and, in many cases, subsistence allowances, provided by the so-called GI Bill of Rights (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., as amended). As of February 28, 1950, 2,176,456 World War II veterans were receiving training under this program. Of the number then in training there were: In institutions of higher learning, 765,804; in schools below college level, 866,464; institutional-on-farm training, 303,559; and in job training, 240,629. The total number of cases approved for training up to February 28, 1950, was 9,013,693.

Eligibility: To be eligible the veteran must—

(a) Have active service since September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of World War II, July 25, 1947. The exception in the case of enlistees under the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945 (Public Law 190, 79th Cong.) will be discussed in the next section.

(b) Be discharged from military or naval service under conditions other than dishonorable.

(c) Have at least 90 days' active service or be discharged by reason of actual service-incurred injury or disability.

All three requirements must be met.

Length of training: Eligible veterans may take a course of training not to exceed 1 year plus a period equal to the time served in the armed forces between September 16, 1940, and July 25, 1947. As to any person who voluntarily enlisted or reenlisted between October 6, 1945, and October 5, 1946, under the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945, the entire period of such enlistment or reenlistment may be counted as war service for this purpose regardless of the date the war was declared officially ended. In no event shall the total period of education or training exceed 48 calendar months.

Training must be commenced by July 25, 1951, or 4 years from the date of the veteran's discharge, whichever is later, and except as to those persons who voluntarily enlisted between October 6, 1945, and October 5, 1946, must be completed by July 25, 1956. In this connection, the Veterans' Administration issued a regulation on April 1, 1950, concerning the pursuit on or after July 25, 1951, of courses of education or training, in order that all eligible veterans may be made fully aware of the importance of the date and of its effect upon the education and training program. In essence, the regulation requires that a veteran otherwise eligible must have commenced and actually be pursuing his course of education or training on July 25, 1951, or at a date 4 years after discharge, whichever is later, except where his attendance is interrupted because of the normal interruptions for summer vacations or other reasons beyond his control, and he must pursue his course of education or training continuously until completion except for conditions which normally would cause interruption by any student.

Type of training: Eligible veterans may choose their own course of training in any school or establishment approved by the appropriate State agency. Generally the school must have been in operation, however, for at least 1 year prior to the date of the veteran's enrollment. Veterans may (1) enroll in schools or colleges, (2) take apprenticeships or other training on the job, (3) enroll in institutional on-farm training or other programs which combine school and on-the-job training, or (4) select correspondence-school courses.

The law does not permit the veteran to take a course for avocational or recreational purposes. If the course is one which is frequently pursued for avocational or recreational purposes the veteran must submit to the Veterans' Administration complete justification that the course he wants is in connection with his present or contemplated business or occupation. With respect to certain aviation courses an affidavit procedure is applicable in establishing the vocational objective.

Standards for on-the-job training programs: It is worth noting that certain minimum standards for on-the-job training programs have been especially prescribed

by an amendment to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. The standards to be used by State agencies in approving on-the-job training establishments include requirements that—

(a) The training is adequate.

(b) There is a reasonable certainty that the job will be available to the veterans at the end of his training period.

(c) The job is one in which progression and appointment to the next higher classification are based upon the skills learned through organized training on the job and not on such factors as length of service and normal turn-over.

(d) Wages are not less than those customary in the establishment and the area to a nonveteran learner in the same job and conform to State and Federal laws and applicable collective agreements.

(e) The job customarily requires a full-time training period of at least 3 months and no more than 2 years (except apprenticeships).

(f) The length of the training period is no longer than customarily required in the establishment and the area.

(g) Related instruction is provided where needed.

(h) Adequate facilities, supervision, and record keeping are provided.

(i) Adequate records are kept to show progress of the veteran in training and the periodic report of conduct and progress is furnished the Veterans' Administration.

(j) Credit is given for previous job experience and appropriate wage adjustments are made accordingly. A course will be considered bona fide if given to a veteran who has already qualified for the job.

(k) Copies of the individual training program are provided to the veteran and to the Veterans' Administration.

(l) A veteran is awarded a certificate upon completion of his training.

Subsistence allowances: Veterans entering any type of training (except correspondence-school instruction) may be eligible to receive subsistence allowances. The maximum monthly allowances for veterans studying full time in schools and colleges are $75 without dependents, $105 with one dependent, and $120 with more than one dependent. Maximum rates for on-the-job trainees are $65 without dependents and $90 with one or more dependents. The rates for veterans enrolled in combination types of training may be somewhat higher than the on-the-job training rates, depending upon the amount of institutional training involved.

The maximum amounts as shown in the preceding paragraph are proportionately less for part-time courses, and in any event the rates may be affected by the extent of the veteran's earnings. The law provides that when the veteran's income from productive labor exceeds $210 per month for a veteran without dependents, $270 for a veteran with one dependent, or $290 for a veteran with two or more dependents no subsistence allowance may be paid. Where the combined amount of the veteran's income from productive labor and the subsistence allowance paid by the Veterans' Administration exceed these amounts the subsistence allowance is reduced in the amount of the excess. In addition, in the case of on-the-job trainees the rate of subsistence allowance payable is never greater than the difference between the monthly wages received by the trainee and the minimum entrance wage paid the trained worker at the end of the course of training. Veterans may be provided also with such tools, equipment, and supplies as are commonly required to be personally owned by other trainees not under Veterans' Administration jurisdiction who are pursuing the same training in the particular establishment.

Tuition rates: The Servicemen's Readjustment Act authorizes the payment to the educational or training institution in which the veteran is pursuing his course of the "customary cost of tuition," and such laboratory, library, health, infirmary, and other similar fees and expenses for books, supplies, and equipment as are customarily charged. However, such payments in an individual case may not exceed the rate of $500 for an ordinary school year unless the veteran elects to have the customary charges paid in excess of $500. If he makes such an election there is charged against his period of eligibility the proportion of an ordinary school year which such excess bears to $500 and his period of eligibility is reduced accordingly. For this purpose the regulations define an ordinary school year in the case of instruction given on a semester or quarterly basis as a period of two semesters or three quarters—not less than 30 nor more than 38 weeks in total length. An ordinary school year for instruction not customarily given on a semester or quarterly basis is defined as 34 weeks. The law prohibits the payment of tuition for on-the-job training. Special provisions for the payment of a fair and reasonable rate of tuition are made with respect to short intensive courses of less than 30 weeks, except that the date of tuition for any such a course may not exceed $500. Fair and reasonable rates of tuition may also be paid for correspondence courses, but not more than $500 will be paid for a correspondence course or courses furnished to any veteran. Under existing law where an institution does not have an established customary charge as determined by the Veterans' Administration, that agency is authorized to determine a fair and reasonable rate of tuition, which determination is subject to an appeal to the Veterans' Tuition Appeals Board. In general, this applies only to institutions established since June 22, 1944, or which have increased their rates more than 25 percent since that date.

Provisions of H. R. 8920, Relating to Social, Civic, Fraternal, and Veterans' Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1950

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, several questions have been raised as to how the provisions in H. R. 8920 will affect social, civic, fraternal, and veterans' clubs and organizations such as the Lions, Rotary, Elks, Kiwanis, Masons, American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, and similar organizations.

In answer to these questions I am furnishing the following information:

Dues: H. R. 8920 makes no changes in the present 20-percent tax levied on any amount paid as dues or membership fees under section 1710 and section 1650 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Admissions: The admissions tax is reduced from 20 percent to 10 percent in H. R. 8920.

The bill also exempts from the tax admissions when all the proceeds inure to nonprofit religious, educational, and charitable institutions; community-supported symphony orchestras; nonprofit cooperative or community center motion-picture theaters; National Guard organizations, Reserve officers' organizations, and veterans' organizations; and police or fire departments, and funds set up for the benefit of their members and their dependents. However, the bill does not exempt admissions to wrestling and boxing matches; carnivals, rodeos, or circuses where professionals participate for compensation irrespective of whether the proceeds go to a charitable organization, or to athletic contests unless the proceeds inure exclusively to the benefit of elementary or secondary schools. The bill also exempts admissions to nonprofit agricultural fairs and to concerts conducted by nonprofit civic associations.

If, for example, the Rotary Club or the Elks sponsored some activity and charged admission, the profits of which went to their own organization, a tax would be payable, but if all the profits went to a charitable organization, no tax would be levied unless the event consisted of a wrestling or boxing match, carnival, rodeo, or circus where professionals participated for compensation, or an athletic contest unless the proceeds went to the benefit of an elementary or secondary school. Admissions to events sponsored by veterans' organizations will not be taxable irrespective of whether the proceeds are retained by the organization or go to charity unless the event consists of an athletic contest, wrestling and boxing matches, or a carnival, rodeo, or circus where professionals participate for profit.

Unrelated business income: H. R. 8920 imposes the regular corporate income tax on certain tax-exempt organizations which are in the nature of corporations and the individual income tax on tax-exempt trusts with respect to so much of their income as arises from active business enterprises which are unrelated to the exempt purposes of the organizations. The tax applies to the unrelated business income of the labor, agricultural, and horticultural organizations exempt under section 101 (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; the literary, scientific, religious—other than churches—educational, and charitable organizations, including hospitals and foundations, exempt under section 101 (6); and the business and trade associations exempt under section 101 (7).

The various social, civic, fraternal, and veterans' organizations will not, however, be affected by this new provision because they are for the most part exempt under section 101 (3), (8) and (9) of the code. However, section 301 (b) of the bill provides that no organization operated primarily for the purpose of carrying on a trade or business—other than the rental of real estate—for profit shall be exempted under section 101 merely on the grounds that all of its profits are payable to one or more organizations exempt from tax. If, for example, a tax-exempt organization should operate a separately incorporated business, the profits from the business would be taxed even though the profits are payable to a tax-exempt organization such as the Disabled American Veterans, the American Legion, the Lions Club, or any other tax-exempt organization. On the other hand, if a

tax-exempt organization—other than one exempt under section 101 (1), (6), or (7)—owns and operates the business as a part of its own activities and not as a separate corporation, then no new tax is imposed under this bill. For example, the profits made by a veterans' organization or a fraternal society from selling food or refreshments will not be taxable, but if the veterans' organization or fraternal society should operate a restaurant as a separately incorporated business the profits from such business would be taxable under H. R. 8920.

New Era for UN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 3, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune of June 29, 1950:

NEW ERA FOR UN

The free world at last has the collective security organization for which it has been yearning since the closing days of World War II. It is the United Nations, launched with such high hopes 5 years ago but fast falling into disrespect because of its ineffectuality.

Russia, whose participation in UN from the outset has been solely for the purpose of preventing it from becoming an effective instrument for collective security, is unwittingly responsible for UN's finally becoming what it was created to be.

Had Russia remained active in the UN, instead of boycotting it in order to supplant Nationalist Chinese with Communist Chinese delegates, UN might have followed the League of Nations into disuse. Had Russia not encouraged its North Korean puppets to breach the peace and flout UN's order to cease fire, the peace-craving democracies might never have provided UN with means of enforcing its decisions.

The Korean crisis thus bids fair to prove the savior of the UN in contrast to the Manchurian and Ethiopian crises which were the doom of the League of Nations.

That, of course, is the last thing Russia intended or desires. It hoped to sabotage UN into complete impotence while steadily building up its own security system—an ever-widening Soviet power.

The democracies went away beyond the second mile in their efforts to convince Russia and its satellites that their security would best be safeguarded by loyal collaboration in a universal collective security organization. They might have continued this conciliatoriness until UN had fallen into complete disrespect if the Communists had not gotten too menacing.

President Truman's use of American air and sea forces to carry out the decisions of the UN Security Council marks a historic turning point in that organization and in the quest for collective security. It should lead to the permanent ascendancy in UN of those who really want collective security and the end of sabotage by those hostile to collective security. Henceforth UN should be the vehicle of those who believe in it.

Russia's first reaction to this unexpected outcome of its boycott and fostering of a breach of the peace is characteristic. It terms collective action against aggression in Korea "gross trampling on the UN Charter, acting as though the UN organization did not exist at all."

Coming from such a flagrant disregard of the UN this Pravda utterance hardly deserves a retort, but the Attorney General of Great Britain, an eminent international lawyer, told Parliament yesterday: "The British Government entirely dissents from the view that the action of the United States Government is not both within the UN Charter and its legal powers under international law." Britain accordingly has, in the words of Prime Minister Attlee, put its naval forces in Japanese waters at the disposal of the United States authorities to operate on behalf of the Security Council and in support of South Korea.

Other members of the UN are joining in the collective effort to localize the fighting in Korea and to uphold the rule of law.

A new era has begun in international relations and Russia has had no small part in it. When the Minnesota poll takes another poll on the UN's performance in building world peace a larger number of Minnesotans are likely to say it is doing a good job than did when the previous poll was taken. In a poll published June 18 only 26 percent of the State's voters rated UN's performance as good. Sixty-three percent thought it was doing just a fair job or a poor job. That poll was taken before UN's members got fed up with being pushed around by Russia and decided to make breaches of the peace unprofitable.

The Bill for 10 Years of Madness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 3, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of Monday, July 3, 1950:

THE BILL FOR 10 YEARS OF MADNESS

American ground troops have been committed to the war in Korea, joining air and sea forces already thrown into battle. The casualty lists are beginning to come in again.

Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Truman, and the other men who put us in World War II promised to lead us toward clearly seen objectives. War was never to happen again. What were called the "peace loving nations" were to emerge united, and, under the banners of a global organization dedicated to international morality, were to lead the world into a lasting peace where the four freedoms governed everywhere.

We have seen this vision dissipated steadily, until now, not 5 years after the end of hostilities, America's sons are braving the fire of enemies on a distant front once more.

KOREAN CRISIS PART OF PATTERN

To anyone gifted with a modicum of historical insight, it is obvious that this turn of events was all but inevitable from the very beginnings of the New Deal leadership's flirtation with war a decade ago. The Korean excursion is not an unrelated development; it is an integral part of the pattern which was set when Mr. Roosevelt first resolved to plunge into World War II without reckoning the costs and consequences, and without a sane and profitable political end in view.

This newspaper has devoted a great deal of space to the origins of American intervention in World War II. We have devoted equal study for the benefit of our readers to the war-time diplomacy that was supposed to direct the world into the ways of a peace based on justice, charity, and universal tolerance. We have been constantly preoccupied with the information and ostensible purposes of postwar American foreign policy. We have reviewed at length the signs of Communist influence within the administration and especially in shaping foreign policy.

Some of our readers thought we devoted too much space to these matters. We felt justified in going to these lengths because the subjects, we knew, were fateful in their bearing upon the future of the Nation.

We were compelled, reluctantly, upon the basis of the unmistakable evidence, to conclude that the leadership which Americans had followed had been fallible at all times, and fraudulent most of the time. It had resorted to hypocrisy, deceit, and concealment. For political advantage and glory, it had brought death to 300,000 of our young men and the dissipation of $300,000,000,000 of the country's wealth and material resources—all this to gain the uncertainties of a future as unstable to the domestic economy and social order as it was to the peace of the world and the safety of all mankind.

The altruistic propaganda which was put forward in justification of these sacrifices and hazards—the Atlantic Charter, the four freedoms, the United Nations, and the thousand and one reassuring pronouncements and speeches—were falsified almost as quickly as they could be given currency.

Mr. Truman and the legatees of the Roosevelt policy now talk bitterly of the insatiable ambitions and the manifold betrayals of the Russian Communist enemy they once trusted as an ally and heralded as a great democracy. Mumble and mutter as they may, the beast is the same as it always was. It has not changed character.

The error—and it was enormous—of the Americans who trusted this military empire was in refusing to accept at face value the declared tenets of the Marxian creed. These were that communism is irretrievably hostile to capitalism, that there can be no compromise between these two worlds, and that one or the other must fall.

Yet Mr. Roosevelt plunged into war, with no questions asked, gladly assigning himself the role of Stalin's partner, for the utterly idiotic purpose of crushing the only two military powers—Germany and Japan—which stood as a check, east and west, upon Soviet expansion. In war he made vast concessions in international conference at the expense both of allies and of enemies, so that the vacuum created by the defeat of the major enemy states would be extended to the heart of Europe and to the shores of the Pacific and beyond.

By turning Russia into China as the price for Russian military intervention against Japan for a total of 6 days out of a war that Americans carried unsupported for 1,341 days, Mr. Roosevelt made certain the Communist conquest of China; and Mr. Truman, in agreeing to the theaters of operations, allowed Soviet occupation of North Korea, thus causing the power imbalance which Mr. Truman himself now seeks to redress.

REDS SABOTAGED UNITED STATES INTERESTS

The contribution of Communists and fellow travelers within the administration, playing Stalin's game throughout the war, assisting the realization of Soviet ambitions in Yalta, undermining China, readying the Chinese Nationalists for the knock-out after the war was over, consistently misrepresenting Asiatic Communist armed parties as dedicated to agrarian reform and simple nationalism, was far from negligible.

Not until very lately, with the Hiss affair, the McCarthy charges, the Amerasia scandal, and dozens of similar developments, has the American public learned of this Communist sabotage of American interests within the administration, and, particularly, within the State Department.

The readers of these columns cannot be unfamiliar with the whole record, patiently and explicitly set forth year by year and almost day by day. This labor was motivated by concern for the welfare of America's husbands and sons, now called to the battle line again.

If experience is any monitor, the history of these last 10 years should demonstrate to the Republic the folly of following leaders who do not know where they are going, and who, even when belatedly they learn, misrepresent the course. Madness begets madness. We have had 10 years of it, and more of it is in the making.

GOP Group Forms Progressive Bloc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 3, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in the language of Gabriel Heatter there is good news—very good news—today. The stubborn old reactionaries of the Republican Party suffered a telling body blow, I hope, in Philadelphia, Pa., on July 1 last. For many years now in many States of the Nation, and in some instances nationally, Republicanism was grounded upon a violation of the seventh commandment, to wit, "Thou shalt not steal." It may be a little hard for reactionary Republicans and some other readers to satisfy themselves that such has been the case, and if you are in doubt about it, I suggest that you consult your religious adviser and learn from him the startling truth that when any person elected by the people fails, neglects, or refuses to serve the people while he holds public office that conduct amounts to a theft. At least "that is the way I heeared it, Johnny." A political party which induces or inspires an officeholder to do such a wrong is guilty also. The first article dealing with the subject of this extension of remarks was in the New York Times of Sunday, July 2, 1950, and is as follows:

GOP GROUP FORMS PROGRESSIVE BLOC—LEADERS FORMULATE DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES URGING UNITED STATES TO FORM PACIFIC COUNCIL

PHILADELPHIA, July 1.—A group of Republican leaders from more than a dozen States today formed an organization called Republican Advance and issued a declaration of principles designed to help revitalize the party.

The declaration included a call for establishment of a Pacific council to show the people of Asia that the United States has no domineering intentions in meeting Soviet aggression in the Far East.

The group acted at the close of a 2-day informal meeting here under the leadership of Henry Varnum Poor, a New York attorney, and former president of the Young Republicans Clubs there.

OBJECTIVES DEFINED

Among those attending the meeting were Russell Davenport, writer, editor, and adviser to the late Wendell Willkie in the 1940 Presidential campaign; Arthur Goldsmith, retired New York businessman; and leaders from Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Missouri, Oregon, Washington State, Michigan, Kentucky, Colorado, and Connecticut.

Mr. Poor described the primary objective of Republican Advance, which will have a temporary national headquarters at 303 Lexington Avenue, New York, as "to organize in support of a positive Republican program and to appeal to independent voters everywhere."

The declaration of principles adopted by the meeting, Mr. Poor said, is intended to provide a basi of discussion for "those interested in helping revitalize the Republican Party whose point of view heretofore has not had adequate expression."

Some of those at the meeting said they expected to enlist next week the support of 21 Congressmen who agree with the group's aims.

In the declaration of principles, the group demanded that the GOP meet the demands of the times in terms of its own progressivism.

On the subject of the Far East, the statement said that the situation there "now has deteriorated to such a point that it can he repaired only on a long-range basis."

"The Republican Party," the document added, "should develop a positive Far Eastern policy, which should include two long-range objectives:

"1. Assurance to the people of Asia that the United States does not intend to intrude into their affairs in a dominating or possessive manner.

"2. Equal assurance that we are prepared to help them defend their freedom.

"To this end," the declaration said, "a constructive move might be to set up a Pacific council into which we could invite the Philippines, Southern Korea, Indonesia, Thailand, Indochina, Australia, New Zealand, India, Pakistan, Burma, and eventually Japan.

"All questions in foreign affairs now are overshadowed by the potential conflict, terrifying in its implications, between the United States and Russia."

IVES, FLANDERS BACK GROUP

WASHINGTON, July 1.—Senators IRVING M. IVES, Republican of New York, and RALPH E. FLANDERS, Republican of Vermont, today endorsed the declaration of principles laid down before the Republican advance meeting at Philadelphia today.

"It fills the vacuum in present-day political thinking and provides chart and compass by which the American people can extricate themselves from the fallacies and follies of the New Deal-Fair Deal dynasty," Senator IVES said.

Senator FLANDERS said the Philadelphia declaration could "mark the turning point of our years of defeat."

The next article on the subject appeared in the Washington Star, edition of Sunday, July 2, 1950, and is as follows:

GROUP OF REPUBLICANS START PROGRAM TO LIBERALIZE PARTY AIMS

PHILADELPHIA, July 1.—Republicans from 10 States across the Nation today issued a declaration of principles, urging the party to become the champion of social-welfare legislation while guarding private liberties against "slavery to the state."

Identities of about 50 members of the group—all described by a spokesman as "party rank-and-fliers"—were not disclosed. They were reported by local political sources to be men and women of wealth and party influence who are convinced the party can win national control only through liberalizing its policies.

Henry V. Poor, former president of the New York Young Republicans, acting as spokesman, declared the group wants to "help our party by encouragement of progressive thinking, by gaining new members from independent voters, and by helping * * * to make a genuine appeal to young men and women whose lives and interests lie ahead."

Mr. Poor said the meeting was an attempt to organize in support of a positive Republican program.

WILL ORGANIZE IN STATES

A national committee is being formed in New York City, Mr. Poor said, and plans are already under way in many States for organization of State groups.

Mr. Poor said the name "Republican Advance" had been adopted as a general description of the group's activities. Members were here, Mr. Poor said, from Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Illinois, Minnesota, Colorado, and Oregon.

Identies of the members of the group were withheld, Mr. Poor said, because it didn't want to bring personalities into the group. Mr. Poor called the session here but he left the city before he could be asked how the meeting happened to be held or when it was planned.

The declaration of principles, Mr. Poor added, was drafted as a basis of discussion for those interested in helping to revitalize the Republican Party.

Another member of the group, which met yesterday and today in a Philadelphia hotel, was Russell Davenport, New York writer and editor who was a backer of the late Wendell L. Willkie. About 20 Republican Congressmen were reported to be ready to announce their backing of the movement.

The group invited Pennsylvania Governor James H. Duff, outspoken foe of Republican old guardism to speak to it, but Mr. Poor denied that Governor Duff was a member. He said, however, that Governor Duff "thinks the declaration of principles is a good idea."

Governor Duff warned the group the GOP must "shed its cloak of reactionarism."

Asked about reports from Washington that the movement was aimed at defeating the aspirations of Senator TAFT, of Ohio, for the Republican Presidential nomination in 1952, a representative of Mr. Poor said:

"This is no move for any candidate anywhere or against any candidate * * * the declaration may not be acceptable to some of the old guard, but we have enough reaction from enough States to know that it is acceptable to the rank-and-file. It is an effort to sell an idea."

The group's declaration carefully avoided mention of the Taft-Harley Labor Act.

In Washington, two Republican Senators, IVES, of New York, and FLANDERS, of Vermont, issued statements supporting the declaration.

Senator IVES called it creative, dynamic inspiring, adding:

"It fills the vacuum in present-day thinking and provides chart and compass by which the American people can extricate themselves from the fallacies and follies of the New Deal-Fair Deal dynasty."

Senator FLANDERS said the Republican Party has been hovering between two extremes—those who want to out-promise the Democrats and those who "subscribe to reactionary principles which would not deserve and could not by any chance get enough popular support to bring the party back into power in a national election."

He said the new statement of principles represents a group of Republicans who don't subscribe to either view.

"If the principles on which the statement is built are followed by the Republican Party," he said, "this declaration can mark the turning point of our years of defeat and the beginning of a period of active, responsible service to our Nation."

THIRTEEN-PAGE DECLARATION

The 13-page declaration of principles said that "necessary reforms" had been brought about in the past two decades, during 17 years of which the Democrats had the Presidency. But, it continued, "the inevitable end" of methods adopted by the Democrats to meet social problems "is a new form of slavery—slavery to the state."

The Republican Party, the declaration stated, must not hesitate to embrace "social goals * * * so necessary to the health of our society," but social welfare legislation should "be devised defining the responsibilities of private parties and * * * providing incentives for their fulfillment."

Throughout, the document emphasized shifting of controls and administrative powers from Government to private hands. It declared the GOP's battle must be not with reforms but with concentration of power in the Government.

GOALS WANTED BY THE PEOPLE

The declaration called the following "goals deeply desired by the people and * * * essential to the preservation of freedom in an industrial society":

"Reasonable security for old age, adequate medical care available for all, insurance against unemployment, year-round work, better education, better housing, protection of the rights of labor, and aid to agriculture."

The declaration hit out at the charge of "me-tooism" as a "lack of clear thinking that seems almost fantastic." Also, it said, "too often the party has been maneuvered into a position of purely negative opposition; the appearance has been created that the party is not merely antisocialistic but antisocial."

I do hope that the sinful old Republican Party of more than a decade—no, it is longer than that; it has really rounded out about 40 years of political sinning—will at last reform and give everyone "a legitimate break" instead of the greedy, favored few who have endeavored to gain control of the Government via the Republican Party.

Communism Increasing in the Philippines Because of the Defeat of Laurel in 1949 Election

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, on June 27, 1947, my remarks appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and for the most part, dealt with conditions in the Philippines. On November 8, 1949, the voters in the Philippines retained President Quirino in power.

In my remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 21, 1949, I quoted from an article written by W. R. Mathews of the North American Newspaper Alliance, with a date line Manila, July 22, 1949, from which I again quote the following:

The Government is barely able to cope with the wave of lawlessness. Manila newspapers almost every day print stories of holdups in broad daylight. Employment of private guards for homes has become a necessity for those who can afford it. The Communist-led guerrilla Huks are merely one aspect of the widespread breakdown of law and order. Lawlessness prevails in public life. A top Philippine politician was able to get a bill through the Philippine Congress giving him tax exemption, despite the fact that the bill or law deprived the Government of 2,000,000 pesos ($1,000,000) annually, to this man's benefit. * * * The days of good government in the Philippines are over.

Shortly before the November 1949 election, Hon. Jose P. Laurel issued the following statement:

This is a year of decision for our people. More than 3 years after the present administration assumed the trusteeship of public affairs, the Republic is confronted today with a government paralyzed by factional squabbles while grave problems are clamoring for vigorous and urgent solution. Never in the last half century has our country been cursed with an administration as corrupt, as full of self-seekers, as cynically indifferent to the people's welfare as the one we are tolerating now. Instead of a stable Government and a happy and progressive community life, the spectacle presented to us is the tragic comedy of one group of high Government officials of the Liberal Party trying to prove before the world that the rival group in the Liberal Party is more corrupt, the more venal, and the more licentious in the exercise of power. Public moneys are squandered recklessly consttiutional provisions are flagrantly ignored, and civil liberties are crushed by naked force while our industries lie unrehabilitated. The ranks of the jobless are swelling every day while the cost of living is rising steadily. Our reserves are dwindling fast and thousands of children who should be in school find no accommodations. We are almost on the brink of disaster and bankruptcy. The people will not tolerate this state of things much longer. There can be compromise with evil and evildoers or further incompetence and mismanagement of the people's affairs.

I have always been interested in the Philippines. As a Member of Congress I have tried to be helpful to the Philippines during their struggles as a commonwealth, also during Japanese occupation and later as a Republic.

I had hoped that Hon. José P. Laurel would be elected President of the Philippines in November 1949. Some of my friends felt that I should not have gone to the length of expressing my opinion about Dr. Laurel on the floor of the House of Representatives.

In the light of recent events in the Philippines, particularly since the November 1949 election I feel that my personal choice of Dr. Laurel for President has been completely vindicated.

I was even more certain of it when I read the following editorial of the Washington Post for June 29, 1950:

QUIRINO'S REACTION

President Quirino of the Philippine Republic appears to have been aroused out of his lethergy by the invasion of Korea. In a statement calling upon all Filipinos to pull together and present a united front to the dangers both inside and outside, he has acknowledged that he is concerned over the Philippines' internal situation. No doubt he was thinking more about the Communist-led Huk movement in the islands than about the corruption in his own regime. But at least he has recognized the need for a stronger internal policy in the face of active Communist aggression in the Far East.

President Truman announced yesterday that he has ordered strengthening of the United States forces in the Philippines and acceleration of military aid to the Manila government. The real danger is that the Philippine Republic will be rebuttressed at all points except its weakest one. We have frequently pointed out that the greatest peril in the Philippines comes from the corruption within the Quirino regime, which is sapping the confidence of the people. No amount of external danger is likely to restore the faith of the people in their government unless there is a genuine house-cleaning that will drive the exploiters, including the president's relatives, from their positions of power.

Mr. Blake Clark wrote an article entitled "Are the Philippines Going the Way of China?" for June 1950 issue of Reader's Digest, from which I quote the following:

The Philippines today are a China in embryo. The downfall of the Chinese Nationalists started with a corrupt government. Many high officials of President Quirino's Philippine administration are not only astonishingly dishonest, they even admit it. Luis Taruc's efficiently trained, Communist-led, Filipino Huks, are even now holding their own against the Philippine constabulary.

Many unprincipled officials fatten off the impoverished people of the Far East, but none do so with such grace and good humor as the Filipino politician. "We are not angels" confesses former Senate President Jose Avelino with engaging frankness, "what are we in power for?" Before assuming his seat in the senate in 1946, Avelino had a bank account of $3,000. By April 1948 he had deposited $500,000. (He gained a portion of this from the sale of U. S. Army surplus, ignoring the prohibition against a member of the government participating in such deals. Suspended from the senate for this act, Avelino brazenly ran for President of the Republic (in November 1949 election). Rejected overwhelmingly by the people, Avelino was forgiven by President Quirino in a deal for political support and after the November 1949 election he again became president of the Philippine Senate.

Exclaimed a politician when the United States turned over the surplus property to the Philippine Government: "Let's rehabilitate the country, but let's first rehabilitate ourselves." Philippine officials allowed friends to negotiate contracts at low figures instead of competing with other bidders. They declared caterpillars, bulldozers and other valuable heavy equipment scrap and knocked it down to favorites by the ton. Warehouse superintendents, inspectors, and other employees pilfered stockpiles. * * * Peso millionaires sprouted everywhere. These same warehouse superintendents and inspectors bought movie theaters; half-million-dollar apartment houses were built. Mothers-in-law of government officials acquired some of the finest office buildings in Manila. For the many corrupt politicians the new immigration quota offered a golden chance. The Philippine Government had limited the number of Chinese streaming into the Islands to 500 per year. Speaker of the House Eugenio Perez secretly distributed the lion's share of the entrance permits among the other representatives in the House. Senate President Avelino supervised the allocation in the Senate, after keeping 40 entrance permits for himself. Wealthy Chinese, desperate to escape from Communist China, paid handsome sums to get their names on the entrance-permit lists. The usual price for a permit was $1,500, and some

came higher. When Senator Tanada exposed this racket, he declared that of the nation's 24 Senators, only 7 were not accepting their share of the spoils.

Francisco Martinez, treasurer of President Quirino's Liberal Party, also treasurer of the Province in which he lives. * * * During 2 years he bought from two favored Manila firms more than $1,387,500 worth of school supplies at exorbitant prices. He acquired enough carbon paper to last the Province 152 years at 54 cents per sheet instead of 4 cents per sheet. He laid in a 57-year supply of stencils at $7.35 a quire when he could have bought them for $1.75 per quire. He paid $13.50 each instead of 65 cents each for 10,000 small mattocks for school gardening. Office supplies and school supplies overflowed the Leyte capitol's storerooms. The auditor general investigated and recommended the dismissal of Francisco Martinez. Criminal prosecution was scheduled to follow. Martinez was not dismissed. He is still treasurer of the Province (and is head of Quirino's Liberal Party in Leyte) * * * The newspaper reporter who first uncovered these facts found that the same type of buying is going on in a number of other provinces.

A systematized network of collusion and graft among revenue collectors is costing the Government 75 percent of all collectible taxes. According to Secretary of Finance Pio Pedrosa, appraisers, secret-service operatives, harbor police, customs agents, and treasury agents work hand-in-glove with tax evaders and smugglers. They pool and divide their cut in set proportions.

If bribery and corruption were stamped out, the Government could balance its budget. As it is now, Secretary Pedrosa expects a deficit of more than $45,000,000 this coming fiscal year. Some believe the deficit will double that figure. The Philippine Government cannot pay its employees a living wage. It is almost too much to expect a customs official or tax collector receiving $75 a month to turn down a $250 bribe. * * * And there has been plenty of cash. Since July 4, 1946, the United States Government has poured a billion and half dollars into the islands.

Five hundred thousand firearms are loose in the islands today—almost all of them in irresponsible hands. Even college boys, legislators, bankers, and churchgoers tote .45's and .38's like professional killers. Signs in the hotels in Manila, in night clubs, and in the halls of congress invite guests to "check firearms." * * * In Manila 1 man in every 10 carries a gun. You take your life in your hands when you travel along many public roads. Women are not allowed to traverse the 45 miles alone from Clark Field to Manila. * * * Jeeps travel in threes, the first one armed. The brutal murder of Mrs. Quezon and her daughter and members of her party on a public highway, the slaying of two young Americans on their own farm, and the slaying of two professors hiking in a region only 40 miles from the summer capital of Baguio were headlined in America. Manila newspapers give details of similar murders virtually every week. Many law-abiding citizens are more terrified of the Philippine constabulary and civilian guards than of the outlaws.

The notorious Filipino Stevedore Workers' Union is laying the entire water front wide open to Communist control. Unloading gangs are paid for as if they comprised 13 men but actually contain only 10. * * * The shippers and eventually the buyers pay the wages to the union men who were not there.

Tired of corruption and starvation wages, many Filipinos eagerly anticipated the 1949 elections as a peaceful means of getting honest government. * * * But on Negros Island, for instance, when friends attempted to campaign for a candidate noted for distinctive public service, special police assaulted and clubbed the campaign workers, driving them away with smashed faces and broken heads.

Campaign money for the Quirino Liberal Party poured in like cane-sugar sirup. When a businessman, from whom the Quirino campaign workers solicited a $5,000 contribution, protested that he did not have such a sum, he was told to borrow the money from the Philippine National Bank. When the businessman said he could never repay the loan, he was told: "You don't have to. The bank will cancel it as a bad debt." * * * Some $3,500,000 of Government money was thus chuted into the party coffers of the Quirino Liberal Party. Every device known to fraudulent elections was used on November 8, 1949. Filipinos remarked that even the birds and the bees voted (for Quirino) in some precincts. In other precincts ballots were counted (and reported to Manila) on the night before the election. The returns from some of the municipalities far exceeded the 1948 population. Many citizens in Batangas (located not far from Manila) went to the polls to learn that during the night the mayor of Batangas had transferred their names to the voting lists of distant precincts far away.

With the deterioration of Quirino's administration, some people are already turning to the Huks (Communist-led Huks), the Red army of the Philippines. Today the Huks call themselves the People's Army of Liberation. It is estimated that they have 10,000 trained men under arms, with large potential reserves. Many are experts with Browning automatics, Thompson submachine guns, and automatic carbines. The Huks buy new machine guns complete with tripods for $15, taken from Clark Field and the Philippine Army barracks. In each Province where the Huks are organized, the Huks have indoctrination schools complete with books and supplies where tenant farmers learn to read and write. Experts instruct special groups of young men in politics, economics, and tactics of guerrilla warfare.

Whether the Philippine Republic will stand or fall rests primarily with President Quirino.

What I have quoted in the foregoing was written by a special writer sent to Manila by the Reader's Digest, a reliable and respected American publication. The article was printed in June 1950 issue. I respectfully commend the article to my colleagues in the House for careful reading. I am sure they will find it interesting as well as enlightening.

The New York Times of June 12, 1950, carried an article by Mr. Tillman Durdin, special writer for New York Times sent to Manila to get the facts first hand. I quote the following from Mr. Durdin's article:

President Quirino's Liberal Party engineered election frauds here (in the Philippines) that cost the Nationalists success.

The Washington Star of June 4, 1950, carried an article by Mr. Creston B. Mullins, from which I quote the following:

PHILIPPINES SHOW UP AS A WEAK LINK IN PACIFIC DEFENSE—CORRUPT REGIME AND UNSTABLE ECONOMY IMMEDIATE DANGERS—COMMUNIST-LED HUKS POSE REAL THREAT WHILE QUIRINO RULE FAILS TO COPE WITH GRAVE SITUATION

The United States has an Achilles heel in its Pacific defenses, the Philippine Islands. The republic, which will be 4 years old next month, is perhaps the weakest link in our defensive structures in the western Pacific and southeast Asia. The very real danger that the islands can and possibly will fall to communism, unless the Philippines halt their downward slide, is scarcely appreciated by the Americans. Philippine political leadership is so shot through with corruption and ineptitude, its economy is so near collapse, and the danger of the Communist-led Huks overthrowing the government is so real that we are confronted with the necessity of recognizing the situation and doing something about it, if we can. Mr. Quirino ran for election in November 1949 and won. The character of the voting has been widely challenged, even in quarters normally neutral in internal affairs.

The Washington Post of June 12, 1950, carried an article by Harold R. Isaacs, with date line Manila, June 11, 1950, from which I quote the following:

PHILIPPINES REPORTED NEAR POLITICAL, ECONOMIC COLLAPSE

During the last few weeks many reports and articles critical of the government of the Philippines have appeared in the American press. These articles and reports have suggested a growing crisis in Filipino affairs. These writings have drawn an ominous parallel between the present situation in the 5-year-old Republic of the Philippines and the state of affairs in Chiang Kai-shek's China just before it fell to the Communists. The independent press in Manila reported that President Quirino was trying to blame his critics for the evils that lie at the door of his own administration. The press in Manila has demanded that President Quirino carry out his promises to clean up the mess instead of trying to blame the whole thing on a conspiracy against him.

From another article in Washington Post of June 15, 1950, by Harold R. Isaacs, with Manila date line June 14, 1950, I quote the following:

If only 10 percent of what is alleged about corruption in government in the Philippines were true, the place would still be a political cesspool. It is almost impossible to stand on a Manila street corner without being hit by some of the flying charges. A bewildering array of investigations is constantly going on, and other investigations are threatened. Some of the more celebrated current charges have to do with an overpayment of 1,500,000 pesos on a land-purchase deal; another charge is the regular sale of immigration quotas; another charge has to do with the disposal of American Army surplus, the original value of which was $1,000,000,000, the write-off value was $100,000,000, and the estimated final receipt $40,000,000.

A year ago when President Quirino and Jose Avelino, Senate president boss, had their spectacular falling out. Quirino spread some of Avelino's defalcations on the record and had him kicked out of the Senate, of which he was the president and head. Avelino, in the presidential campaign in 1949, turned up expenditures of some fancy items by Quirino, the purchases being made out of presidential funds. One item was a famous $2,500 bed. Avelino ran against Quirino for president after being dismissed from the Senate. After Quirino was declared the victor in the November 1949 election, President Quirino put Avelino back in his old position as president of the senate. He also sent Avelino to the United States after the election as a good-will ambassador.

A characteristic remark made to me in Manila was: "Avelino is no good, but at least he made his money by bringing in Chinese. Quirino is taking it from us."

In Washington Post, June 16, 1950, I read an interesting article about the Philippines, from which I quote the following:

At least in Manila the resentment and dissatisfaction over the state of affairs in the Philippines has focused to an extraordinary degree on one man, President Elpidio Quirino. Quirino's weakness, stubborness, slowness, incompetence, and his inadequacy are blamed for everything. Filipinos are used to having a strong man on top. They yearn for

the toughness of the late Manuel Quezon, who was the all-powerful boss of Filipino politics for a generation. Quirino is a minor political figure, brought to power by accident, commands little respect. He is a flaccid, sick man who seems to have a penchant for being tenacious about the wrong things. He has not been forgiven by many Filipinos for the way he won the election in November 1949. Last November's election was a lulu. It was a three-cornered fight between Quirino, Jose Avelino, and Jose P. Laurel. Jose Laurel's followers say the election was stolen from Laurel. Even Quirino's friends admit that local party bosses "did go a little far." In the first session of congress after the election, Quirino lost control of his own senate. Some of his most scathing critics today are members of his own party majority. Vice President Lopez, a rich sugar man from Iloilo, has made no secret of his disaffection and criticism of Quirino.

I have quoted from New York Times; Washington Post; Washington Star; Reader's Digest; Mr. Tillman Durdin, special writer sent to the Philippines by New York Times; Mr. Creston B. Mullins, in his article sent from Manila to Washington Star; Mr. Harold R. Isaacs, writing in Manila for Washington Post and other papers. My opinion about Dr. Jose P. Laurel and conditions in the Philippines, as expressed in my remarks June 27, 1947, and September 21, 1949, is in great measure backed up by recent articles appearing in America from which I have quoted. My opinion of Dr. Jose P. Laurel today remains the same as I expressed in my remarks which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in 1947 and again in 1949.

Dr. Laurel has served his people in every crisis. He fought for his people before the Commonwealth of the Philippines was established. He wrote the constitution under which the Filipinos now live, because the same constitution which governed the Commonwealth was adopted practically without change for the present Republic of the Philippines. He fought for Philippine independence. He fed, he clothed, and he protected the Filipinos during the long period of occupation by the Japanese. In his eventful life he has faced one crisis after another. He has never failed to show the true steel in his make-up. In all the hardest times which have been visited upon the Filipino people he has not hesitated when called upon to do so. He has never failed his people—and, in my opinion—he never will.

Today Dr. Laurel is using his energy and resourceful mind to oppose the onrushing tide of communism which, according to reports, is rapidly engulfing his country. Before the war and during Japanese occupation and since the last war ended the name of Laurel was a living symbol of national assertiveness, of dignity, and of patriotic ardor which enrich the mainsprings of a noble heritage. The war did not change the genuine metal of his greatness. Today he has more friends throughout the Philippines than he ever had at any time before. Laurel has used his great talents to advance the cause of justice. He has given his all to the cause of righteousness. His only concern is the triumph of justice. He has used his wisdom, his great talents, his energy, and what material means he had to fight every form of oppression and discrimination and to assist and guide his people throughout all of their struggles. He is the champion of the common man in the Philippines today. He represents the ideals which Rizal fought to preserve. By his devotion to principle, his austerity, his refusal to compromise or make deals, and his love of country he has won millions of followers to his banner. The one impelling force which has guided this great man throughout his life has been his desire to help his people.

When Laurel's time has come to an end historians of the future will present the true size and stature of this great patriot. They will rank him with Rizal, Bonificio, General Luna, Mabini, and Quezon. It will be said that his understanding mind, his profound sympathy, his human kindness, his moral courage, his iron will, his rugged fearlessness will serve as an inspiration for unborn generations to come. Justice cannot fail this man whose sacrificial service now shines in the fullness of its grandeur within the contemplation of a grateful people. Such a man of steel will always remain in the hearts of his people. In the light of chaos, confusion, corruption, and unrest in the Philippines since the November 1949 election, my conviction remains that the wrong which was done in the 1949 election will be corrected in the next election and Jose P. Laurel will be called into service by his people to serve as the next President of the Republic of the Philippines.

Savings and Loan Associations Gain Financially Under Square Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 3, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that there appeared in the New York Times, on Sunday July 2, 1950, a very informative article, which recited the financial benefits which have enured to savings and loan associations by reason of signing last week by President Truman, of the savings and loan bill.

I feel that this article is of wide interest not only to savings and loan associations but to persons having their money deposited in same. The article is as follows:

SAVINGS-LOAN GAIN IS BASED ON NEW LAW CUTTING INSURANCE PREMIUM AND UNITED STATES SHARE

(By George A. Mooney)

Savings and loan associations have moved into the strongest competitive position in their entire history. Based on President Truman's signing of the savings and loan bill last week, the advance is being hailed by industry leaders as the most significant in two decades.

Reduction of the premium rate paid by insured associations, as provided under the new law, permits an annual saving in operation costs estimated at $4,300,000 of which more than $625,000 will be in this district. This feature will allow the individual association an opportunity to offset rising expenses in its overhead, while at the same time offering wider latitude in its competitive activities.

Because of the steady increase in the volume of lower-return mortgages, no general increase is expected in the rate paid on savings accounts. Any pressure on such rates, however, has been eased by the insurance reduction, and perhaps significantly, one association in this city has already announced an increase in its rate from 2 to 2¼ percent.

The insurance premium reduction brings the previous rate of one-eighth of 1 percent down to one-twelfth of 1 percent of the insured accounts and creditor obligations of each association. The new level now matches that prevailing for insured banks and is retroactive to June 30, 1949. Aside from the saving in money, the savings and loan men are especially gratified that they have received this official recognition of their standing through a rate similar to that of the banks.

AMENDING OF LOAN ACT

The insurance feature of the new law, however, is only one of a series of changes in savings and loan status which association leaders assert strengthens their position and indicates that the industry has come of age. Most important in the long view, they explain, is the fact that the law largely eliminates Government participation in their business.

Thus, the statute amends the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of 1932, which authorized the creation of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, and the National Housing Act of 1934, under which the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation was set up. It provides means to effect the retirement of $100,000,000 of United States Treasury funds invested in the capital of the Insurance Corporation and to speed the pay-off of the remaining $75,000,000 of Government money in the capital stock of the district Federal home loan banks.

The Insurance Corporation is directed to retire annually an amount of its capital stock equal to 50 percent of its net income for the year. It is estimated that repayment of the Treasury money can be completed in about 12 years.

The Corporation will also pay to the Treasury the approximate cost of the money in past years—a sum which now amounts to about $29,000,000. Dividends in the future will be paid to the Treasury by the Corporation at a rate taking into account the current average rate of interest paid on Treasury securities. On May 31 the Insurance Corporation held nearly $120,000,000 in reserves in addition to its Treasury capital of $100,000,000.

SPEEDING OF REPAYMENT

To accelerate repayment of Government funds in the capital of the district Federal home loan banks, the law now requires that within 1 year each member institution acquire stock in its respective bank equal to at least 2 percent of its outstanding home mortgage loans, instead of the previous minimum of 1 percent. Each district bank will then be required to retire Government-owned stock equal to the amount by which the stock held by members exceeds the amount required under previous law.

Remaining Government capital in the system is expected to be paid back in full within 3 years. Much progress has already been made in retiring the Government stock, which has been cut from $125,000,000 to $75,200,000, as of May 31, the Home Loan Bank Board has reported. Stock owned by member institutions has been increased from $9,000,000 to $151,000,000, and three of the district Federal home loan banks have retired all of their Government stock.

The law, however, authorizes the Treasury to back-stop the Federal Home Loan Bank System in any extreme emergency by purchasing the securities of the district banks up to a maximum of $1,000,000,000. Thus, the system is supplied with potential supports somewhat similar to those already existing for commercial banks and for the Nation's system of farm finance.

H. T.'s Bypassing of Congress in Korean Action Stirs Fears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 3, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Sears Henning from the Washington Times-Herald of Monday, July 3, 1950:

H. T.'S BYPASSING OF CONGRESS IN KOREAN ACTION STIRS FEARS—USE OF UN TO CIRCUMVENT CONSTITUTION VIEWED AS PAVING WAY TO DICTATORSHIP

(By Arthur Sears Henning)

One of the most sensational aspects of American intervention in the Korean War is President Truman's demonstration of the use of the United Nations to bypass the United States Congress as the sole repository under the Constitution of the prerogative to declare war.

While the undertaking to defend South Korea from invasion by the Russian puppet republic of North Korea has received almost unanimous support in Congress, Mr. Truman's procedure for calling American armed power into action is being widely questioned as to its legality and also as to the implications of the precedent in the future.

There are misgivings and apprehensions that the United Nations will come in time to supersede Congress not only in the matter of declaring war but in the matter of legislation generally.

SHOWS WAY FOR DICTATOR

Mr. Truman in invoking the authority of the United Nations instead of the authority of Congress to make war, has shown how a dictator could operate to flout Congress and carry into effect a Socialist program, such as the welfare state or police state, or even impose on the country a completely totalitarian form of government. All he would need would be the approval of the United Nations, which the United States is bound by treaty to carry out.

In the Korean venture, Mr. Truman wanted to make it a United Nations war, not a United States war, for the wider international support that might be obtained. There was ground for UN action, for the South Korean Republic was set up by the UN and justifiably could claim UN protection.

In addition, Mr. Truman wanted to avoid asking Congress for a declaration of war or any other authority for employing American Armed Forces in Korea. Such a request, he thought, would only provoke division and result in at least several days' delay before an enabling resolution could be adopted.

SO HE IGNORED CONGRESS

So Mr. Truman decided to ignore Congress. The news of the Reds' attack on South Korea reached Mr. Truman the night of June 24. He decided that the United States should enter the war. At 3 a. m. June 25, Mr. Truman, through an American UN delegate, asked Secretary General Lie to convene a special meeting of the UN Security Council that day. That was done. By 6 p. m. Sunday, June 25, the Council had adopted an American resolution declaring the Korean aggression a breach of the peace, calling for immediate cessation of hostilities and asking all member nations to render every assistance to execute this mandate.

Acting under the color of that authority, though it was not in accord with the act of Congress requiring congressional approval of the use of American forces by the UN, Mr. Truman ordered United States air and naval units to Korea. The next day, June 26, the President warned those responsible for the act of aggression that the United States takes a very serious view of the invasion.

On June 27 Mr. Truman emphasized his by-passing of Congress by calling members of its Foreign Affairs and Armed Services Committees to the White House and reading to them his announcement that military forces were being sent to Korea and Formosa and military aid would be furnished to the Philippines and Indochina. He asked no advice. He merely stated an accomplished fact under the aegis, not of Congress, but of the United Nations.

THEORY PUTS UN SUPREME

The theory that the authority of the UN under which Mr. Truman acted overrides the authority of Congress is based on the contention that in adhering to the Charter of the United Nations the United States bound itself to support UN acts, whether approved or disapproved by Congress. The UN Charter is a treaty and under our Constitution a treaty, no less than the Constitution and the laws, is the supreme law of the land.

What Has Happened to You?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 1, 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "What Has Happened to You?" written by John T. Flynn and published in a recent issue of the Readers' Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO YOU?

(By John T. Flynn)

The vast majority of people in the United States are the victims of a condition which may be illustrated by two or three concrete examples.

Let us take the case of a particular group, the public school teachers. In 1939 a young teacher starting out in New York City got $1,608 a year. Now she would get $2,500 a year. It looks as if she would now begin her career $892 better off. But does she? Let's look a little closer. In 1939 the teacher paid $20 in Federal taxes, but in 1949 she paid $275. The local authorities gave her a raise of $892, but the Federal Government took just about one-third of it in taxes.

Let us go further and compare her position in 1939 and 1949. After taxes in 1939 she had $1,588. After taxes in 1949 she had $2,225. It looks like a good deal more. But that is because we keep talking about dollars. What counts is not dollars but purchasing power. How much will a dollar buy? Because of inflated prices, dollars now are worth only 60 cents compared with 1939 dollars. Therefore, this teacher who got 1,588 units of purchasing power in 1939 is now getting only 1,335 units of purchasing power.

What will happen to her when she reaches the highest grade salary? In 1939 the top pay was $3,883. Now it is $5,125. In this case the Government takes almost one-half of the increase. So let us compare her salary after taxes in 1939 and after taxes in 1949. It was $3,783 then. It is $4,455 now. But what about purchasing power? It was $3,783 then; it is $2,674 now. She is much worse off, though she has more dollars.

I have examined the salary schedules of teachers in many cities, large and small, in the United States. In a few cases there have been increases in pay which actually bring the teachers about even with their 1939 purchasing power. In most the increases have been about as in New York. In some the situation is a crying outrage. For instance, in cities between 100,000 and 500,000 population, the pay of an average high-school principal was $5,674 in 1939. It is now $6,396. Take out deductions for a wife and child and the Federal taxes would be $95 in 1939 and $655 in 1949. The increase in pay was $722, but the Federal Government took $560 of it. This principal's purchasing power in 1939, after paying Federal taxes, was $5,579. Now, after paying taxes, his purchasing power in our inflated dollars is only $3,444. He is actually $2,100 a year worse off than in 1939.

What is true of teachers is true of all sorts of civil servants. Consider a New York policeman. In 1939 the rookie got $2,000. Now a rookie gets $3,150. After taxes his take-home pay is only $2,875. But they are 60-cent dollars. Translated into purchasing power they are worth only $1,725. It is much the same in other cities.

A fireman's plight is no different. For example, a young fireman who started in 1939 got $2,000. Ten years have brought him promotions. He now gets $4,150. He has a wife, and with that deduction pays $416 in Federal taxes. This leaves him $3,734 take-home pay. But these dollars are worth only what they will buy—$2,240 worth compared with his 1939 dollars. Practically all his 10-year promotion increases have been swept away by inflation and Federal taxes.

Education has always been a concern of the local authorities and the States. Then why is it that the cities and States cannot raise enough money by taxes to increase the purchasing power of teachers and civil servants? The answer to this is the answer to one of the gravest problems in our social life.

We have three governments—Federal, State, and local—with their hands in our pockets. Obviously there is a limit to the amount they can take out. When taxes become too oppressive the people have a way of calling a halt—and meaning it. And that is where we are now.

To understand this we must look at some very simple figures. In 1939 tax collectors dipped into our pockets for the following sums:

Federal	$4,900,000,000
State	3,387,000,000
Local	5,309,000,000

In 1948 they split the taxes as follows:

Federal	$41,550,000,000
State	7,791,000,000
Local	6,600,000,000

In 1939 the Federal Government took one-third of the tax dollars. Now it takes three-fourths of them. The States and cities can't get any more tax dollars.

I estimate that Ohio spent $160,000,000 on her teachers' salaries last year. But the people of Ohio had to pay more than 2⅓ billion dollars in Federal taxes. In a State

like Nebraska teachers' salaries cost $35,000,000, and Federal taxes from the State were $355,000,000. This is the reason that many States have been unable to find enough money for teachers.

Our public education was the greatest in the world because our people were able to spend freely on schools. Our cities were able to collect taxes for schools. But now the Federal Government has taken bite after bite out of the tax dollar. It has been estimated that new schemes before Congress would take another $15,000,000,000 in taxes annually.

The teacher may think that, despite all this, she should strive for some share of this Federal money. But on this point there is no chance for her. There just is no more Federal money. There will be no additional taxes. The end has been reached. From every quarter of the Nation comes the protest against further taxes. Washington dare not impose any more. The Government is currently deeply in the red.

This—a return to deficit spending—is just about the worst thing that could happen to all those groups whose incomes remains low. It is the high prices that have cut the buying power of the teacher's dollar. And this inflation has been caused largely by Government borrowing. The surest way to cut the teacher's buying power is to create more inflation by more borrowing.

There is one way, and only one way, to better her condition. And that is to put a stop to further Federal spending commitments and then roll back the Federal budget to within rational limits. Then our cities and States may impose taxes on their own people for their own needs.

Everybody is the victim of this condition—all save that minority which collects the money taken from all. The teachers, the firemen, the policemen are not alone. I have used them merely to illustrate a plight which has overtaken the millions who are on the paying and not the collecting end of all this spending. All civil servants of city, State, and even the Federal Government are the victims of this.

But there are others far more numerous.

It would be difficult to find white-collar workers whose salaries have risen enough to offset the inflation and the taxes. There is also the great army of industrious people who, after long lives of hard work, are now retired on pensions, only to see their buying power cut in half by the inflation. There are the millions who own life-insurance policies payable in dollars now worth only 60 cents. There are the millions who have tried to provide their own security through savings in our banks and in our public and corporate bonds—who put aside dollars worth 100 cents and now must live on dollars worth only 60 cents. The security of every thrifty citizen is threatened.

All of us have a deep personal stake in checking the Federal spending of both taxes and borrowed funds.

To Limit or Not To Limit the Franking Privileges of Congressmen—That Is the Question

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 3, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, many of the newspapers of this country who are eager to say something derogatory about President Truman, the State Department, agencies of the Government, the Fair Deal, and the Democratic Party, as a "bull rushing to enjoyment," have been serenely silent about the necessity of legislation being passed by Congress to prevent abuses in the use of the franking privileges by Congressmen.

This is to be expected because so many newspapers today are walking hand in glove with the Committee for Constitutional Government and other big lobbying organizations masquerading about under exalted and high-sounding names, just like every "Commie" organization does to conceal its true identity.

Having had a first-hand opportunity to know something about what is going on as far as the wholesale franking of documents by Congressmen is concerned, I caused to be introduced, in the House of Representatives, H. R. 9001, which was a bill designed to make it difficult for lobbyists to use Members of Congress to carry out their vicious purposes. This bill seeks to prevent Members of the Congress, or their relatives, or the employees of Congressmen, from charging anything above actual traveling expenses, for making speeches, delivering lectures, or making comments upon any subject. It also seeks to outlaw the hitherto legal practice of permitting lobbying agencies or organizations from borrowing, or, taking over and using, the franking privileges of Members of Congress, in order to gain circulation for their propaganda.

In view of the fact that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has national circulation, I have determined to insert in same two articles appearing in responsible daily papers, which will give the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a general idea of how freely the franking privileges of Congressmen have been abused. It must be understood, however, that in permitting their franking privileges to be used, in the way indicated in these articles, no violation of law was committed by any of these Congressmen. I call attention to these specific instances, related in the daily press, merely to emphasize the fact that this practice should be outlawed.

The first article appeared in an editorial in the Christian Science Monitor, published in Boston, Mass., on June 30, 1950, and was as follows:

FRANKING UNLIMITED

Just a few days ago, in his regular circular letter to his constituents, Representative RALPH W. GWINN, of New York, was urging that the Post Office Deparment be turned over to private enterprise. Then, said he, the bureaucrats in Government departments would have to pay postage.

Now it develops that the Committee on Constitutional Government had several of Mr. GWINN's speeches printed and mailed out during 1949, 2,450,000 copies of them, at Government expense under the Congressman's franking privilege. Mr. GWINN told reporters he had no apologies.

All of this has an obvious bearing on the postal deficit and the remedy proposed. But the CCG mailing figures bear also on another and more serious question—whether some Congressmen (Mr. GWINN wasn't the only one) have carried their franking privilege much beyond the purpose for which it was intended. Dr. Edward A. Rumely, head of the CCG, told the House Committee on Lobbying that during the last 4 years his organization had mailed out somewhere near 10,000,000 pieces of literature under Congressmen's frank.

The merits of the literature thus mailed is not the question. (We have agreed with some of the CCG's stated objectives and disagreed with others.) Nor is excessive use of the frank by administrative agencies a justification. But that number of communications mailed free by a lobbying organization by courtesy of Members of the very body the organization exists to influence certainly stretches the proprieties to the breaking point.

The next article appeared in one of the finest newspapers published in the United States, the New York Times, of Thursday, June 29, 1950. It will be recalled by many that this is a newspaper which advertises that it furnishes to the reading public of the Nation "all the news that's fit to print." And, by the way, the statement is true. This news article, printed in the New York Times, is as follows:

10,000,000 LETTERS FRANKED BY LOBBY—DR. E. A. RUMELY SAYS HIS GROUP HAD AID OF CONGRESSMEN BUT NOT IN TOTALS CHARGED

(By Clayton Knowles)

WASHINGTON, June 28.—Dr. Edward A. Rumely declared today that 8,000,000 to 10,000,000 pieces of literature—not 40,000,000 or 50,000,000—were mailed by the Committee for Constitutional Government under congressional frank in less than 4 years.

Benedict F. FitzGerald, Jr., counsel to the House Committee Investigating Lobbying Activities, sought to shake Mr. Rumely on this estimate, but the latter stuck to it when asked if the correct number of mailings might not be 40,000,000 or 50,000,000.

The committee counsel put into the record a breakdown by years showing 5,236,000 mailings during the period. This breakdown, he said, did not include 4,000,000 mailings under frank by the organization made in 1947 in connection with the Taft-Hartley Act debate in Congress.

Both Mr. FitzGerald and Mr. Rumely, executive secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government, agreed the organization had paid for the printing of the literature but said that the mailing by frank had not cost it anything.

All franked mail goes first class so that the organization, by Mr. Rumely's own figures, saved $240,000 to $300,000.

The committee breakdown showed 692,000 mailings in 1947, 1,216,000 in 1948, 2,853,000 in 1949 and 475,000 in the first 4 months of 1950. Of the 1949 total, 2,450,000 mailings were under the frank of Representative RALPH W. GWINN, Republican of Westchester, N. Y., it was said.

A breakdown by individuals for the first 4 months of 1950 revealed that there were 70,000 mailings under the frank of Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, 40,000 under the frank of Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat of Mississippi; 100,000 under the frank of Representative WINT SMITH, Republican of Kansas, and two lots of 100,000 and 165,000 under the frank of Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Republican of Michigan.

The Committee for Constitutional Government, which has its principal offices in New York City, has fought much of New Deal and Fair Deal domestic policy through the years. It has been regulated as a lobbying agency under a law passed in 1946. It registered, however, under protest.

Mr. Fitzgerald read into the record several letters from Members of Congress to the Rumely organization declining to have letters sent out by frank under their name. One said that it was an "inappropriate use of the frank." Another said it was an "imposition." To this, Dr. Rumely replied that the House investigators were going through his files for letters that were not typical.

Questioning of Dr. Rumely revealed that his organization had two direct affiliates, Fighters for Freedom and Features for America. He denied that the first was a political arm, asserting that all who contributed enrolled in it.

He said 50,000 persons had been enrolled who paid about $5 or $6 a year.

"We hope to get 250,000 enrolled, each paying $10,555," he said. "When we do, we'll be heard."

OVERLAPPING IN DIRECTORATES

The witness denied that America's Future, an organization founded by Frank E. Gannett, the publisher, was the radio arm of the Committee for Constitutional Government, also founded by Mr. Gannett. He said that this was a separate organization, as was, he added, the Constitution and Free Enterprise Foundation. All occupy offices in the same building at 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City.

Dr. Rumely conceded, however, that there was some overlapping in directorates among these organizations.

On one occasion, while questioning revolved about the Committee for Constitutional Government's mailing lists, the witness took exception to the publicity given by the House committee to a millionaires' list containing 10,171 names. Mr. Rumely said that this was only one mailing list used by his group and probably was the least productive.

Later in the day the House investigating group recalled Merwin K. Hart, president of the National Economic Council, to explain why his organization in its lobbying reports to Congress allegedly failed to list, among contributions, 49 sums, each over $500 and some as high as $5,000.

Mr. Hart replied that upon advice of counsel, his organization had merely lumped these among general receipts, because each was for a bulk subscription to council literature. He conceded that the donor seldom designated to whom the literature should be sent.

Toward the end of the day, wrangling started among House committee members with Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN, Republican, of Ohio, contending that investigators were not devoting enough attention to lobbying within Government to influence legislation.

Representative FRANK BUCHANAN, of Pennsylvania, the committee chairman, retorted that the committee report, when completed, would be in proper balance. He disclosed that the committee now was sifting three cases with the help of the General Accounting Office.

He said these involved the charge that Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan spoke last spring before a bought audience at St. Paul, Minn.; that Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, took a trip abroad last winter to help lobby for compulsory health insurance, and that the State Department was seeking to influence legislation through entertainment of Members of Congress at Prospect House, a Government guest house.

Speech by Ambassador J. M. Elizalde Before Midcontinent World Trade Council Convention

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 1, 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech delivered by Ambassador J. M. Elizalde, of the Philippine Islands, before the Midcontinent World Trade Council Convention at Omaha, Nebr.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is difficult to say which of the problems facing the world today is the most important one. One could, of course, think of the European problem; another, that of the Middle East; but there is no question that on the solution of the problems of Asia rest largely the stability of the world from the economic, political, and social standpoints.

The whole picture of Asia and its component countries has totally changed in the last 10 years and, although there was evidence of such a change even before that, one could well say that it became real and certainly more important after Pearl Harbor.

In the political field, the change followed with the grant of independence to many countries in that area, among the largest and most populated in the world such as India, Pakistan, and Indonesia—and before all of them, the Philippines. Then, Japan, by its defeat, also has assumed a different role which cannot be overlooked in the study and appraisal of the situation in general. With things as they are today, it is difficult to talk of trade—that is, international trade, without considering world politics and it is equally impossible to talk about world politics without regard to armaments, defense, and the possibility of war, distasteful as war is to all the peoples in Asia who were involved in the last struggle against Japan. From war, we all know, nothing but destruction can come, and yet that is what we are facing today unless cool minds prevail and a strong united effort is made to avoid it. For that reason, we are proud that the President of the Philippines, Elpidio Quirino, has succeeded in bringing together seven of the important countries of Asia and the Pacific to meet in conference to discuss mutual needs but, better still, to acquaint each other with their common problems and, in a friendly way, attempt to find formulas for their solution.

World peace and understanding are absolutely essential for the settlement of all the world problems of today. Nothing can be solved except in such a climate. This is the case in any country—this is the case in my own country, where we are carrying a burden to keep world communism away from our shores, a burden completely out of proportion with our means and I could well say our strength.

I did come here to talk of trade and economic expansion and enterprise and therefore with the optimistic expectation that one of these days we may all be able to trade freely and to develop together for the benefit of all the world, I will limit myself now to a discussion of possible trade in the Pacific area and more particularly with the Philippines, that is between the United States and my country.

From the beginning of this century, the bulk of our trade has been with the United States—both imports and exports. Before the Philippines came under American sovereignty, the United States supplied only $350,000 of a total import trade of the Philippines of approximately $11,000,000, or only 3 percent. From that small figure, it increased during the American regime by leaps and bounds, so that at about the outbreak of the Second World War, you were exporting to us about $81,000,000 worth of American goods. We had become your sixth best customer and we were the largest buyer in the world of American cotton goods, wheat flour, canned milk and cigarettes. Since our liberation from Japan in 1945, this import trade has increased more than five times. On the other hand, our main exports before the war came to this country, as we exported all of our sugar; practically all of our copra and coconut oil; a great part of our leaf tobacco and a big percentage of our cigars and our manufactured rope; and we supplied over 95 percent of the needs of this country of Manila hemp. We also sent to the United States timber and lumber, base metals such as chrome and mangancse and all of the gold produced in our mines. Our territory was the second largest producer of gold under the American flag, I think only second to California. A substantial part of our imports and exports were transported in American vessels; and American insurance companies—life, fire and marine—controlled most of the business including reinsurance. Such was the trade between the two countries which at the time more or less balanced itself, permitting in that manner the maintenance of a stable currency without fear of deficit or problems of balance of payments which are so prevalent today. I am sure that you are well aware by experience that the most dislocating factor in international trade now is the instability of currencies. It is disturbing not only to the maintenance of export trade, but equally as disturbing if not worse, from the point of view of investments in foreign countries.

The war was the end of all of our normal trade. During several years of Japanese occupation we could only do business with Japan and thus many of our industries which were not essential for the war effort of the enemy had to be closed and where machinery was involved, in many cases these were dismantled either for scrap or for the utilization of part of the machinery such as motors and equipment in Japan itself. Of course, as many of you already know, we not only lost heavily in merchant marine, port facilities, bridges, etc., when the Japs came in in 1941, but the worst was yet to come with the retaking of the islands by the American forces. The battle for the retaking of the Philippines was so bitter and so strategic in nature that what the Japanese did not destroy in their retreat and for their own reasons, the incoming American forces and Philippine guerrillas had to destroy in their day-to-day advance. The air force took care of all big buildings, especially those resembling warehouses or storage facilities. In other words, all industrial facilities and equipment were destroyed in one way or another or for one reason or another. In our industrial set-up, we lost two-thirds of our sugar mills, all of our mining industry—buildings and equipment—our coconut-oil factories.

One of our main losses and which has been the cause for the delay of our agricultural rehabilitation was the loss of our work animals. We lost about 4,000,000 carabaos in the war and consequently our post-war rice production has yielded less than what is needed for our increased population, thereby giving rise to an enormous increase in the cost of living of the average family. This situation has brought about social discontent and a chaotic dislocation of our normal daily life with corresponding political repercussions which the enemies of democracy are taking very definite advantage of. It was humanly impossible to start production of our main exports immediately, because equipment was not there. Furthermore, immediately after the war, it was not a matter of ordering equipment or even having the money to pay for it, because as you also know there was no way of getting it due to the shortages here. On account of that, we lost or were forced to lose very valuable time in our reconstruction. During this period, our unemployment increased, and this made matters worse for us. All of these, and many of which happened through no fault of anybody but mostly as a result of the disorganization caused by the war, were upsetting to all plans made for our early recovery.

Foreseeing the huge and widespread destruction which would be the lot of the Philippines as an aftermath of the war and acknowledging that it was the moral, if not the legal, responsibility of the United States to repair this damage after the liberation of the Filipinos from their Japanese oppressors, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in a radio broadcast on August 13, 1943, made the solemn pledge to the Filipino people that they will be assisted in the full repair of the ravages caused by the war. He followed this broadcast with a message to the Congress of the United States on October 6, 1943, recommending that "the Congress make provision for the physical and economic rehabilitation of the Philippines made necessary by the ravages of war which the invaders have inflicted upon them."

On May 5, 1945, President Harry S. Truman, in a press statement said the following: "The Filipino people, whose heroic and loyal stand in the war has won the affection and admiration of the American people, will be fully assisted by the United States in the great problems of rehabilitation and reconstruction which lie ahead."

The United States Government has been most generous in assisting our country in its huge task of rehabilitation and reconstruction. Apparently in fulfillment of the solemn pledges made during the war and immediately after our liberation, as above stated, your Congress enacted the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 under which $400,000,000 have been authorized to be appropriated to cover civilian losses as a result of the war, and $120,000,000 for the repair of roads, bridges, port work and public buildings. Upon signing the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, President Truman reiterated the previous pledges made for the rehabilitation of the Philippines when he said that the act "climaxed promises made to the people of the Philippines that not only would their land be liberated from the tyranny of the enemy, but that they would be given their full independence and would be rehabilitated from the ravages of war."

The amount of $400,000,000 to cover civilian losses and $120,000,000 to cover public claims, generous as they are, cannot by any means cover the replacement value of the properties lost. We have been receiving from the United States war-damage payments in accordance with the above authorization in increasing tempo. The War Damage Commission has done an excellent job in a most difficult and intricate undertaking. There has been no public or private criticism in the Philippines against it; on the contrary, it has received not only commendation from the United States Government but also from the Philippine Government and the Filipino people. Nevertheless, the funds authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of paying private claims and which it was thought in the beginning would pay 75 percent of the approved claims, actually pays only 30 percent of the said claims as the prewar cost of the properties damaged or destroyed and probably only 10 percent of their replacement cost. Only half of the destruction caused to public properties can be paid from the funds authorized.

Our veterans, that is the Filipino veterans who fought in the United States Army, have not been adequately compensated or provided for. Only last year, the Congress of the United States passed a hospitalization bill for veterans and now is considering another measure to provide for burial privileges to our former soldiers. No provision has been made up to now and none is in prospect to give to our veterans the educational benefits which are now being enjoyed by their American brethren-in-arms. When one considers the delay in the passage of measures which in simple justice are due to the men who fought in the same battlefields and under the same circumstances as your own boys, you can well understand the feeling of discontent, if not despair, among our Filipino veterans.

The Philippine Government, in spite of its lack of funds due to the serious dislocation of its economy as a result of the war, has not failed to discharge its part in the huge enterprise and difficult responsibility of rehabilitating our country ravaged by the last holocaust.

After our liberation from the Japanese, the Philippine National Bank, a prewar Government institution, and the Rehabilitation Finance Corporation, a new Government organization, became the public instrumentalities in charge of the financing or rehabilitation and economic development plans being carried out or which were proposed to be carried out by Government agencies and private entities. Bold and aggressive loan policies have been prosecuted by these two agencies with a view to the attainment at the earliest time possible, and at the fastest pace, of the twin objectives of rehabilitation and economic development. In industrial loans the amount of around $54,000,000 were granted by the Philippine National Bank from 1946 to June of 1949. It also extended about $50,000,000 in agricultural loans to expand the production of various crops and commodities such as sugar, rice, coconut, corn, abacá, tobacco, and fish.

Between January 1, 1947, and June 30, 1949, the Rehabilitation Finance Corporation granted loans with a total value of $116,416,000 for both agriculture and industry.

The Government itself spent $61,700,000 for the construction of public roads, bridges, port and harbor facilities, and irrigation projects, and $26,600,000 for the construction of school buildings. These amounts are over and above those made by the United States through the War Damage Commission and the United States Public Roads Administration. The Government advanced $15,700,000 to Government corporations for their operation and has contributed $27,200,000 to the capital of the Rehabilitation Finance Corporation. It provided approximately $5,000,000 for the rehabilitation of private banks and $1,800,000 for domestic insurance companies. In other words, contrary to some comments, we in the Philippines have not adopted a let-Uncle-do-it attitude.

A lot has been written about the sale of so-called war surplus properties and about alleged anomalies in the sale or disposal of materials sent to the Philippines during and after the war. There are, as always, two sides to a story and in order not to unduly tax your patience, I will dismiss this matter by saying that inventory values were many, many times higher than prices obtainable for battered equipment. For this reason, when sales were made of war-surplus materials, great discrepancies were found between what some thought should have been obtained and what was actually obtained from their sales. There has been a little graft, committed by both American and Filipino opportunists, and I certainly cannot condone that; but I do think that there is considerable exaggeration in the reports about the whole picture. Some individual and flagrant cases do not make the real picture. True enough that in the confusion resulting from the war, crooks and embezzlers found an easy and fertile ground in which to operate. The Government has conducted investigations into alleged wrongdoings connected with the disposal of surplus properties and where evidence existed warranting prosecution of the persons responsible, they have been prosecuted. However, I must strongly dissent from the general impression created by correspondents going for short visits to Manila, that the cause of most of the postwar evils in the Philippines can be attributed to war-surplus property scandals.

Of interest to persons engaged in promoting trade between the United States and the Philippines is the problem connected with peace and order. You must have heard about the existence in the Philippines of an organization which has been referred to as the Hukbalahaps. This organization, during the war with the Japanese, was a patriotic organization engaged in fighting guerrilla warfare against the Japanese. Soon after the Japanese surrender, the members of the Hukbalahaps were required to return the arms given them, but they refused, and instead fled to the mountains. In time, especially after independence, groups of these dissidents engaged in skirmishes with the law-enforcement agents of the government. The administration, appreciative of their services to the government during the war, parleyed with their sympathizers and asked them what ends they sought to achieve. Agrarian reforms, they replied. So the late President Manuel Roxas personally discussed with their representatives the terms of a bill to regulate the conditions of tenancy on rice lands, which was their main grievance at the time. A bill was agreed upon and passed to meet their demands. Implementing the social-justice measure of our constitution and the special provision therein regarding the acquisition of big landed estates for resale to the tenants at cost, the government embarked moreover upon a program of purchase of large farms to be subdivided among the tenants in possession. Nevertheless, the dissidents remained in hiding and continued in their challenge against constituted government. When the government was finally convinced that what the leaders of the Huks desired was not agrarian reforms, but eventual control of the government by force, as evidenced by the fact that communistic papers were found in their hiding places; that they were conducting schools for the indoctrination of their followers in Communist ideas, and that plans for the mass murder of their so-called capitalist and reactionary enemies had been mapped out, the Government declared the organization illegal and outlawed the same. The government has succeeded in isolating them in the mountains and if sporadic attacks have been made against populous towns and villages, this has been in pursuance of a campaign for which they have been trained during the war, that is, guerrilla campaign; and after each attack, they return to their hideouts in the mountains and flee in the face of the pursuit of government forces. Their movement is not widespread. The support they receive from the people is unwilling and at the point of the gun. Do not expect these enemies of democracy in the Philippines to be routed in a short time.

Engaging as they do in guerilla warfare, their eventual extension must follow after a campaign of attrition against them and such a campaign, from its very nature, will take some time to carry out to find successful termination.

The Communists found the situation in the Philippines after the war a propitious one for their own purposes. The Communist movement thrives in misery and in chaos. The Philippines, because of the dislocation of her economy as a result of the war, became a fertile ground for foreign Communist propaganda. World events, especially in Asia, have some repercussion in the peace and order problem of the Philippines. Already, we see the infiltration into the Philippines of Communists from nearby Communist China; and this could be a powerful fifth column in the event of a world conflagration. Therefore, the solution of the peace and order problem in the Philippines must follow the solution of the Communist threat emanating from Russia and spreading its vicious contamination not only over Europe but also over Asia and the Far East. If anyone believes that the Philippines can single-handed stop communism, I can well dissuade him. The avalanche of communism forcing its way all over Asia and the Far East as a result primarily of the defeat of the Na-

tionalist government of China is too much for us to cope with and we, as all the other Asiatic countries without exception, are in the gravest of dangers. One has to admit that today there is as yet no integrated plan to stop communism in the Orient. The economic situation of the people in that area is such that they, in their desperation, are engaged in the arduous task of looking for the next bowl of rice and certainly cannot enter into serious discussions as to the advantages of the democratic system over the totalitarian communistic system. I must admit that as the disturbance of peace and order in the Philippines is due to a Communist inspired and directed movement, we must need assistance from the democracies. The Communist movement in the Philippines is merely a part of the larger world problem. Our problem, therefore, should be the concern not only of the Philippine Government and the Filipino people, but also of the whole world, especially the United States of America which must assume the leadership in coordinating and helping protect present democratic countries of the world from the scourge of totalitarian communism.

I have attempted to picture, in broad outlines, the problems of the Philippines which could be of some interest to you as they affect our trade, and the measures we have taken and the assistance we need to solve those problems. From time to time, we see in newspapers and periodicals reports of conditions in my country which seek to portray only the alleged evils from which we are suffering, casting entirely to one side the many good things we have done on our own or jointly with the United States Government. This situation can serve no useful purpose; but yes, it could antagonize patriotic citizens in the Philippines, alienate their good will as well as the good will of our American friends; and on top of this all, feed with useful grist material the propaganda mills of our enemies, who are also your enemies. They could point with derision to the failure of the American experiment in the Far East and thus advance their unholy crusade against the American democracy. I therefore plead for more tolerance after a thorough comprehension of the problems involved and a more cooperative appraisal of the situation in the light of what we face in the Philippines as a result of the war and as a result of the developing situation in the Far East not of our own making. The loyalty of the Filipino people during the dark days of Pearl Harbor and in the battles of Bataan and Corregidor cannot be overlooked; and certainly in this day, a determined and faithful ally should not be discounted or discarded. My impression of much of what now is being written on the Philippines is that in the long run it can only be damaging and handicapping to those who are now trying to revive the spirit of 1941. We may yet have reason to be grateful some day for having the people of the Philippines fighting with the democracies for the preservation of all the spiritual and material values that this system had engendered.

Special Prayer on Behalf of the People of Korea, United States Missionaries, and Gallant Servicemen of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 3, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 30, 1950, there appeared on the first page of the Catholic Review, published at Baltimore, Md., the following message from His Excellency Patrick A. O'Boyle, archbishop of Washington, D. C.

In my opinion it is an article which everyone should read, and which approaches the Korean situation in a fitting and proper way. The article is as follows:

ARCHDIOCESE OF WASHINGTON,
CHANCERY OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., June 30, 1950.

DEARLY BELOVED IN CHRIST: The grave developments of the past few days affect every American. They prompt me to ask you to offer this special prayer on behalf of the unfortunate people of Korea, and on behalf of our missionaries and our gallant servicemen.

"Almighty God, in whose name the independence of this Nation was declared, graciously continue to pour forth Thy grace on our land in this hour of peril to peace and to Christian civilization.

"Inspire with Thy divine wisdom the President and Congress in their decisions for safeguarding the welfare of this Nation and the many peoples dependent upon us. Grant courage, fortitude, enlightenment, and perseverance to all our people in these critical days.

"Extend Thy boundless mercy and consolation upon those who have suffered from this frightful aggression so that their trial will bring them close to Thee. And as we commemorate the anniversary of our national independence, we implore Thee to grant eternal rest to those who nobly laid down their lives for our country and to inspire in the living an unyielding devotion that will match the courage of the dead in upholding the divine ideals for which they so willingly died. Amen."

May I ask you to observe the anniversary of our independence by attending Holy Mass and imploring Christ, the victim for our redemption, to grant America the graces it needs in this hour.

Praying God's blessing upon you, I am,
Faithfully yours,
PATRICK A. O'BOYLE,
Archbishop of Washington.

Address by Hon. Brien McMahon, of Connecticut, at Graduation Exercises of FBI National Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 5 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on last Friday I had the privilege of hearing a very impressive address by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] before the graduation exercises of the FBI National Academy. I ask unanimous consent that his address, together with introductory remarks by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and introductory remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. J. EDGAR HOOVER. Our next speaker this morning is fulfilling a return engagement. His address on the occasion of an earlier graduation exercise was so impressive that we invited him to be with us again. He is a very busy man, particularly in these days of national stress, and it is a great sacrifice we know for him to take time from his legislative duties to join us this morning.

He is a native of Connecticut, a lawyer, and served as a judge in his home town of Norwich, Conn., before coming to Washington. He entered the Department of Justice in 1933 as a special assistant to the Attorney General. In 1935 he was named as Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division. You will recall that during the period when kidnapping was a real menace in this country it was his responsibility to prosecute many of the infamous criminals in that period. In many instances he personally appeared in court and took charge of the prosecution of some of the most dangerous criminals. He was elected to the United States Senate from Connecticut in 1944 and has served on many important committees, but I think he is best known for his service and contribution to the development of the Atomic Energy Commission. He is chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in the Senate and House of Representatives and has been closely associated with this great program. It is my great pleasure to present to you this morning my personal friend and yours, the Honorable BRIEN MCMAHON, United States Senator from Connecticut. [Applause.]

Senator MCMAHON. This day—a day of leave-taking for you who are receiving diplomas—is a day of homecoming for me. From 1933 to 1936 I was a member of the Department of Justice team. During those years I had a chance to observe at close hand the work of the FBI under the leadership of J. Edgar Hoover—the foremost law enforcement officer of the world.

It's good to be back—especially on such an occasion as this one. It was in 1935 that the FBI National Academy was established. I observed the early courses with intense interest and satisfaction; I have followed with no less satisfaction the growth of the Academy during these last 15 years. I know that you graduates have profited greatly from these 12 weeks; and I know that your instructors have profited no less from this chance to see how police problems look from the vantage point of our State and local communities.

I am not sure what makes people want to be law-enforcement officers. For some of you, the ambition perhaps goes far back to early youth, when—with an instinct that was very sound—you rightly imagined there could be no job more honorable or important than defending the law against its transgressors.

As you achieved maturity, I suppose you were relieved of certain misapprehensions. You saw that the Philo Vances and Perry Masons were found only in detective stories. You came to realize that your craft had less use for the brilliant intuitive hunch than for the cautious scientific hypothesis. You learned that for every hour of excitement, there were 100 hours of painstaking methodical work. And you came to know—perhaps most of all—that your work had rewards of a singular nature. You found that bringing law breakers to justice was not the most joyous of tasks. But you also realized it was a job that very much needed doing, and you found your satisfaction in upholding the dignity and majesty of the law .

In a sense, your intellectual evolution could be compared to that of our Nation's soldiers. As children, they may have imagined that war is a thing of blaring trumpets and heroic charges and glorious victories in which somehow only the enemy is killed. But on reaching adulthood, they came to know war for the grim business it is. They came to realize that it is an abomination—and that only one thing is worse—living as slaves. It is entirely appropriate that it took

a soldier—General Sherman—to describe war most accurately; it is completely fitting that our military men long for the day when the world will have no need of their profession. But until that day arrives, the men of our Armed Forces give their skills—and will give their lives if necessary—to protecting the society that has nurtured them.

I think it is the same with those who enforce our Nation's laws. They also would like nothing more than a world in which men adhered without exception to those immutable and transcendent principles of justice from which a free society derives its strength. They would prefer—far prefer—that all men learned through reflection rather than bitter experience that the way of the transgressor is hard. But they know that exhortations of righteousness are, by themselves, no answer to a loaded revolver; they realize that if our society is to survive, wrong-doing must meet its proper deserts.

Whether you patrol our highways or work in the quiet of detection laboratories, those of you honored at this convocation are also soldiers—soldiers in the noble cause of defending our society against those who would violate its God-given precepts of justice and its democratically written laws. No task exceeds this in importance. From Aristotle onward, our philosophers and statesmen have told us that anarchy is freedom's mortal enemy. Freedom and order are not in conflict; on the contrary, the delicate equipoise of an open society needs restraints and rules that men may violate only at their peril.

Never has this free society of ours been in greater need of defenders. If we required proof of this, we have found it in Korea. The tragic happenings in that embattled land bring into sharp focus the struggle that tyranny and freedom wage throughout the globe.

That we Americans should be so imperiled is nothing very new. Indeed, our whole history is one of overcoming adversities to which a less hearty people would have succumbed. We did it in 1776 and 1917 and 1941—and I know we can do it again. If some are inclined to think that we lack the hardihood and tenacity of our illustrious fathers, they must revise their notions after these last few days, when Americans have closed ranks to defend southern Korea's freedom.

When I joined the Department of Justice in 1933, the world was only learning to know the name of Hitler, and the fifth column was yet unheard of. The headline makers of those days were the John Dillingers, and the Pretty Boy Floyds, and the Bruno Hauptmanns. Thanks to our local and State police forces, thanks also to the FBI, these names quickly disappeared from the news, as their owners disappeared behind bars, or else suffered some more conclusive separation from society. A grateful Nation saluted J. Edgar Hoover and the brilliant staff that worked under him.

But with these threats to law and order held in check, our police officers were confronted with adversaries yet more formidable—this time, from the direction of Hitler's Nazi Germany. The men of our police forces were better than the perverted best of the Nazi sabotage schools. During the entire war, in fact, our Nation suffered not a single successful case of sabotage. Thinking back to those days, I have cause to regret that the FBI was not made responsible for investigating the members of our atomic energy project until the Atomic Energy Commission took charge in 1947. It is significant that the atomic traitors—the infamous Klaus Fuchs and his helpers—have been detected or apprehended on information furnished by the FBI. It is no less significant that their transgressions occurred while the Manhattan Engineer District did its own security investigating. Had this job been entrusted to the FBI—where it properly belonged—I feel very sure that the Fuchs case would never have happened.

Today, our law-enforcement officers have a new public enemy No. 1—the gentlemen who have their lair in the Kremlin. Instead of shaking down terrorized individuals, these men have shaken down and now hold in terrorized subjection entire nations. Instead of being armed with sawed-off shotguns, they flaunt tanks and jet planes and atomic bombs. Instead of violating merely state and national laws, they violate international law and the conscience of all mankind. Behind their iron curtain they have made one-third of the world their secret hideout.

The men of Moscow are the Nazi's original tutors. They employ, with even greater skill, the techniques of subversion and infiltration their pupils copied so diligently. And as if this were not enough, their arsenals contain an ever-growing stockpile of atomic bombs, and they may come to possess hydrogen bombs as well. These weapons are ideally suited to a totalitarian—or, better, brutalitarian—state. They are Pearl Harbor weapons; they are the natural weapons of the sneak attack delivered before a democratic victim is aware that hostilities have begun.

At a time when the techniques of war—both declared and undeclared—are being revolutionized our law enforcement officers face enormous new challenges. Take, for instance, the whole problem of civil defense. With atomic weapons in existence, the traditional distinction between civilians and soldiers is at an end. We have no right to assume that an aggressor will ignore our cities. Therefore, as part of our agenda for survival, our Government is now actively mapping out a realistic civil-defense program.

These plans assign vital duties to our police forces and it is easy to see why. Suppose that a single atomic bomb were to be released over one of our cities. Thousands of lives would be lost or saved depending on the skill with which our police forces were able to bring order out of confusion, to direct evacuation in a planned and orderly fashion, to reroute traffic in a situation where arterial streets might be impassable, to prevent the sabotage that might well accompany an attack.

What makes such problems doubly difficult is the fact that we are concerned not only with saving our lives; we are concerned even more with maintaining those liberties that make life worth living.

Let me give you an illustration, again from the field of civil defense. If we tried to secure complete and total security against the ravages of atomic or hydrogen weapons, we might end by destroying our free society in the process. Suppose, for example, that we undertook a compulsory dispersion program that would seek to decentralize and relocate the 200 cities with populations of more than 50,000. It has been suggested that the financial costs of such a program would be $300,000,000,000 or more. Measured in terms of the loss of our precious freedoms, the costs might be incalculably greater. In seeking to guard ourselves against the possible attack of a garrison state, we might ourselves end up by becoming a garrison state.

This harsh dilemma—reconciling freedom and security—is one we cannot escape so long as the arms race continues. Nor can I, in honesty, predict, so long as the arms race is unabated, that the dilemma will become less cruel. To the contrary, I fear that the minimum demands of survival may pressure us toward more and more abridgements of our democratic heritage. It is not a few shortsighted Americans who will bring this about; it is the relentless logic of a world of uncontrolled weapons.

Our Nation is therefore compelled toward tight-rope walking of the most precarious sort. If we lean a bit too much in one direction, if in the name of freedom we do not tend fully to our security, we may become a tempting target for an aggressor. If, on the other hand, we lean overly much in the opposite direction, if for the sake of security we encroach too much on our freedoms, we may lose our democracy without a shot being fired.

No group is more aware of this dilemma than our law-enforcement officers. They know that—so long as it is kept within the rules of the democratic game—freedom of dissent is not a privilege but a right; it is not a luxury but a necessity if our democracy is to be maintained. They know that their police manuals are no more required reading than is the Bill of Rights. They know that due process is the most sacred precept of our jurisprudence. As a result, our police officers need no urging in accepting restraints that would bewilder those who run totalitarian states.

And yet, paradoxical as it would seem to the men of the Kremlin, it is these very restraints that help make for the efficiency of our police. The ground rules that surround them stimulate their efforts and in the end, produce a better and more thorough job—a wider collecting of facts and a keener analysis of evidence.

No American shudders when he passes a policeman in the street. Although he may grumble when caught passing a red light, it is the grousing that occurs within a close-knit family. The American people know that the police are on their side and that they exist not to restrict but to enlarge and defend our democratic rights.

And so I say to you that you are members of a great profession. Your are being entrusted with the heaviest of responsibilities. It is not even too much to say that on your conscientiousness and devotion may hinge the destiny of the Nation. May you acquit yourselves ably and well.

Independence Day Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 5 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, yesterday at Fredericksburg, Pa., a very interesting Fourth of July celebration was held, connecting the great State of California and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The speakers were the Governor of Pennsylvania and the distinguished and able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I ask unanimous consent to have the address delivered on that occasion by the Senator from California printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chairman Worrilow, Governor Duff, and fellow Americans, on this anniversary of our Nation's independence I bring you a hand-across-the-continent greeting from the people of California to those of Pennsylvania.

The westward movement of pioneer Americans who came to the Pacific coast and contributed so much to the building of our Western States contained many Pennsylvanians. Among those pioneers who repre-

sented the spirit that has made America great was James Lick who was born in this community in 1796 and arrived in California in 1848, 2 years prior the State's admission to the Union. James Lick through his initiative and hard work accumulated a substantial estate at the same time he accumulated a high sense of public responsibility. He became a public benefactor who added much to the educational, culture, and charitable institutions of the San Francisco Bay area.

This imaginative Pennsylvania Dutch farm boy sought new horizons and found them in distant places—South America, Europe, and California. James Lick's life represents a typical American story of the boy with intelligence, ambition, and a willingness to work hard, who achieved fame and fortune. To be sure he did not have the handicap of Government regulations and taxes that a later generation faces. But with the James Lick spirit even these burdens can be carried.

On June 30 the following wire was received by me:

"Upon this important historic occasion of the rededication of the James Lick family monument at Fredericksburg on July 4, 1950, the city of San Jose in the Santa Clara Valley, where James Lick spent the major portion of his life while in California and where Lick Observatory, among his many bequests, is an institution and attraction of extreme importance, welcomes this opportunity to send our greetings and best wishes.

"FRED WATSON,
"Mayor, City of San Jose, Calif."

The spirit of freedom and the initiative to undergo the necessary hardships to achieve it brought colonists from the Old World to the New. Here in the Western Hemisphere men and women from every part of Europe found an opportunity to gain the religious, political, and economic freedom which could not be found in the Old World.

The war for the independence we celebrate today was but a natural outgrowth of a public reaction against growing restrictions being placed upon the colonists by a Government in England which at that time little understood the hopes and aspirations of the people here.

From those days until now our people have been faced with many challenges and have passed through dark periods. Yet the spirit that sustained the Continental Army at Valley Forge has been present to overcome reverses which have occurred since that time and to achieve ultimate victories.

There are too many at home and abroad declaring what's wrong with America. We need to underscore what's right with America. There are no economic or political problems that prayer, hard work, thrift, and a sense of civic responsibility cannot solve.

We need not permit this solvent, going concern, the free-enterprise system, to be liquidated by the strong-armed methods of communism nor the voluntary bankruptcy of state socialism.

It has been the hope of the people of the United States along with the other law-abiding nations of the world that a system of international law and order could be established that would preserve the peace for this and future generations.

Once again this concept has been challenged, this time by international communism.

In utter disregard of international law and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations the North Korean Communist regime, with encouragement from the Kremlin, made a full-scale overt invasion against the free Republic of Korea.

Had this attack gone unchallenged as had the earlier invasions of Manchuria by the Japanese war lords, Ethiopia by Mussolini's forces, and both Austria and Czechoslovakia by Nazi Germany, the United Nations would have died as did the League of Nations before it Every small nation in the world would have been left at the mercy of international communism.

Keeping in mind that Denmark had been overrun by Nazi Germany in 2 days and Holland in 5, it was obvious that if the United Nations was to function as more than a mere debating society its resolution had to be promptly implemented, for resolutions alone will not stop aggressive communism. The response of the whole free world has been overwhelmingly in support of the action taken to date.

Munich certainly should have taught us that appeasement of aggression, then as now, is but surrender on the installment plan. Mr. Chamberlain, Prime Minister of Great Britain 10 years ago, may have sincerely thought that he was gaining "peace in our time" by consenting to the destruction of a free and independent Czechoslovakia by Nazi Germany. We know now that paying such international blackmail only increased later demands that made World War II inevitable.

The men in the Kremlin are as power hungry as the Nazis, and their system is as destructive of human liberty as was Hitlerism, with which they were bedfellows while Poland was being dismembered in 1939. They have, however, learned some new techniques.

Communism is destructive of human liberty everywhere in the world. It is no less destructive in China or Korea than it is in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Hungary, Rumania, or Bulgaria. The pattern may differ slightly. In Poland the opposition leader, Mikolajczyk, was forced to flee; in Bulgaria Petkov was hanged; in Rumania the king was given a 2-hour ultimatum to change the government regardless of the constitution; in Czechoslovakia Masaryk's life was forfeited when it became apparent that coalition with communism would not work. In China and in Korea the Communist satellite regimes have resorted to force of arms when they found they could not take those governments by an internal coup d'état.

The early morning hours of Sunday, June 25, in Korea was a momentous time for that nation and the entire free world. In a well-timed and well-executed attack the North Korean Communists with the aid of armored equipment supplied by the Soviet Union launched a powerful thrust by which they hoped to overrun the entire nation before the free world could recover from the shock.

They had a twofold purpose in mind. One was to destroy the last vestige of freedom on the continent of north Asia and next to demonstrate to the remaining free countries on the perimeter of the Soviet Union and its satellites that neither the United States nor the United Nations could function in time to prevent their destruction.

In the situation which existed, time was a priceless ingredient. The decision would be measured in hours and days rather than in weeks or months. The delay by the United Nations or the United States by so much as a single day might have resulted in the collapse of any further effective resistance in South Korea, in which case assistance from the free world to Korea might have found it necessary to land their forces by an amphibious assault upon a hostile shore rather than through port facilities in friendly hands. This, of course, would have been a far more costly operation and one that would have prolonged the action by months if not by years.

Yet I would not have you believe that the task we have undertaken is an easy one. Freedom is not a commodity which once having been won is secure. To the contrary as many people have already found out it can be lost very quickly and once lost is most difficult to regain.

Our secret weapon against any potential totalitarian aggressor is not the plutonium or the hydrogen bomb. These secrets can be stolen from us by a Dr. Fuchs. Our real strength is that which communism dares not steal to take to the Soviet Union or its European or Asiatic satellites. I refer to liberty and the determination of a self-reliant people to be informed, make their own judgments, choose their own leaders and rally overnight if their free institutions are threatened from within or without.

In his time and in facing the challenges then confronting our Nation Abraham Lincoln said: "Fellow citizens we cannot escape history, the fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. * * *

"We, even we here have the power and bear the responsibility. In giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. We shall nobly save or meanly lose this last best hope of earth."

Now almost a century later living as we do in the age of airplanes and atomic weapons must we not face up to the fact that this world in which we live cannot for long remain "half slave and half free."

I am convinced that if we show the same courage and common sense that motivated the men who sat at Philadelphia and drafted our Constitution and the early pioneers who crossed the plains to win the West there is no domestic problem we cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need fear.

Broadcasting and Law Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 5 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Broadcasting and Law Enforcement," by the Honorable Niles Trammell, chairman of the board of the National Broadcasting Co.; and in connection with the printing of the address, I ask consent that the introductory remarks by J. Edgar Hoover also be printed.

There being no objection, the address and introductory remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. J. EDGAR HOOVER. We have with us this morning as our first speaker a native of Georgia. He served in the first World War, and in 1923 entered the field of radio where he has had a fabulous rise. He joined the National Broadcasting Co. in 1928, rose through the ranks of that organization and is responsible for many of the great programs which are on the air today. He is the man who is responsible for developing the programs of Fibber McGee and Molly, Ma Perkins, Al Jolson, Eddie Cantor, and Wayne King and many others and for placing them on the air. In 1939 he became the executive vice president of the National Broadcasting Co. and in 1944 was elected president of that great organization. In 1949 he became chairman of the board of the National Broadcasting Co., and in that capacity he has done much to mold public opinion along the lines of the American way. It is my

great pleasure to present to you this morning, our friend, Mr. Niles Trammell, chairman of the board of the National Broadcasting Co. [Applause.]

Mr. TRAMMELL. When Mr. J. Edgar Hoover invited me to be with you this morning, I was delighted at the opportunity to participate in these ceremonies, and to pay my respects to the great work he has done in the service of the Nation.

Under his leadership, the FBI has become an institution revered by every decent citizen, and feared only by the lawbreaker and the enemy within our gates. More than any other man, he has made the detection of crime a science, and the enforcement of law a respected profession.

Today, the FBI is carrying an enormous new burden. It has the task of guarding our internal securities against a secret army of termites—the agents of police states in eastern Europe and Asia. And in this task it is holding fast to its traditional role as a servant of the people. It is protecting America without sacrificing these basic civil rights which our system of government is designed to secure.

In the lands ruled by the Kremlin, the agencies of investigation are sinister ones. They strike terror into the hearts of the people with mass purges, the torture chamber, the faked trial, the slave labor camp. In the United States, the G-man and his associates in the police forces are respected members of the community and the popular heroes of old and young alike.

THE FBI AND THE POLICE

This National Academy, whose graduating class we are gathered to honor, is a monument to Mr. Hoover's faith that law enforcement in a democracy must itself be organized on the broadest democratic base. With courage and conviction he has resisted the idea of a centrally controlled national police force. He has insisted that law enforcement in our cities and towns can best be administered by local police, who are part of the community they are serving and are intimately familiar with its life.

This was a sound starting point, but a problem remained. Many local communities did not regard their police forces as responsible professional citizens doing an important job. Police pay was low and funds were not made available for adequate training or facilities. Under these circumstances, police forces were naturally handicapped in their work. And so in 1935 the FBI National Academy was established. From small beginnings it has become the outstanding educational institution for law enforcement in this country and a central point for cordial working relations between Federal, State, and local officials. Its influence is international in scope. It has attracted high police officials from many foreign countries, who have come to the Academy to study American techniques of investigation and law enforcement.

You gentlemen of the graduating class know better than anyone else how rigorous a course of training you have just completed. You were eager to undertake this difficult assignment because you wanted to increase your effectiveness in your work. And you were selected from a long waiting list on the basis of merit alone and on a record showing that your qualifications were outstanding. All of you—chiefs and captains, lieutenants and sergeants—have received equal and identical treatment while you have been at the Academy.

Now you are going back to your homes as leaders in your field, equipped to pass on your training to others in your community. In doing so, you are carrying forward a great tradition. Since 1935, the 2,100 graduates of the Academy have in turn set up centers which have trainned over 100,000 police officers in every State of the Union. As a result, the entire level of police efficiency in the country has been raised.

The people have come to realize that law enforcement calls for men with intelligence, education, and experience, and they are beginning to realize that these men are entitled to salaries commensurate with their responsibilities. In all of these ways, Mr. Hoover's conviction that law enforcement is basically a community undertaking has been made effective.

THE INFLUENCE OF BROADCASTING

And now I would like to talk to you about a great community service which is part and parcel of the life of your cities and towns and can provide you with invaluable support—the service of broadcasting by radio and television.

All of you are familiar with the use of radio in your departmental work. In the past 20 years, police radio has revolutionized the techniques of law enforcement. County is linked to county and State to State in a growing police network. There is almost no place in the country where the criminal can escape beyond the reach of police radio.

By this application of science and the coordination of police activities it affords, the efficiency of law enforcement has been tremendously enlarged. But radio—and the new art of television—can perform even more important services for you. Before we examine what they are doing in this particular field, let us look for a moment at their overall scope and capacity, for we are dealing here with giant social and educational forces.

Radio in the United States is the most massive and comprehensive medium of communications the world has ever known. It reaches virtually everybody, and reaches them hour after hour, day after day, week after week. Over 40,000,000 families in the United States have radio sets in their homes, 95 percent of the total population. They listen in fabulous numbers and they keep listening wherever they go—in public places, in automobiles, at work, and at play—through 20,000,000 sets installed outside the home and additional millions of portable sets. Listening to the radio is the favorite recreation of Americans by a wide margin. It claims more than twice as much of their time as magazine and newspaper reading combined.

Everybody listens to the radio—in the cities, in the towns, and on the farms. As law-enforcement officers you are particularly concerned with the attitudes and activities of our young people. You will be interested to know that 64 percent of the teen-agers have sets of their own and 60 percent listen to them daily. Many young people spend as much time listening to the radio as they spend in school.

Added to this massiveness of radio is its impact and appeal. We know that listening is easier than reading, that the spoken word makes a more lasting impression than the printed word. Radio has this quality, and with it all the warmth and persuasiveness of the human voice. Its message is heard in a setting of drama and gripping entertainment. It is a living thing, brought into the homes of America. No wonder it is so pervasive a medium for reaching the minds of men, and no wonder it exerts so compelling an influence on the way we think and act.

For all of its scope and massiveness, this powerful medium has its roots in the local communities throughout the country. Its operations are manifold and diverse. There are over 2,100 standard broadcast stations in the United States, each of them managed by people who are active in the life of their community and are responsive to its wants and needs.

Radio broadcasting was a mature and developed service when television went into commercial operation 3½ years ago. Since then television's growth has been one of the miracles of our time. At the beginning of 1947 it was based on 6 stations in operation and 16,000 television homes. Today, there are 104 operating stations serving over 5,000,000 television-owning families and additional millions of nontelevision owners. Within 3 years, television has become a billion dollar industry, stirring the imagination and interest of the people like no other medium in history.

As citizens, and more importantly, as officers of the law, you have a stake in these two broadcast services, with their vast powers to shape the attitudes of young and old. I urge you to get to know the broadcasters in your home towns and to work closely with them. You will find that they are on your side, and that they are public-spirited citizens eager to help you advance the cause of law and order.

BROADCASTING AND POLICE ACTIVITIES

What can radio and television do for you? For one thing, they can rally support for your work where it counts most—right within your own communities. No matter how well-equipped and well-staffed your department may be, you need the understanding and the backing of the public. The people back home must be made aware of the seriousness of crime in terms which are meaningful to them. They must be shown how it affects their daily lives and their pocketbooks. They must know how criminals operate, and they must become familiar with the work of their own police department. With this knowledge, the problem of crime becomes their problem as well as yours. As participants with you, they will give you the cooperation you need in your work. Better than any other media, the broadcast services of radio and television can develop this public participation.

But they do more. They educate against crime and delinquency. By drama and example, they reveal the criminal in all his ugliness and futility. Without seeming to read a lesson, they impress upon millions of young Americans that crime is not glamorous and that the relentless process of the law puts the criminal where he belongs—behind bars or in the electric chair.

I know there are some who feel that young people should be shielded from the facts of crime—that the mystery program should be taken off the air and crime news should be eliminated from the press. But we do not attack a great social problem by closing our eyes to it. We do not educate our youth against evil by hiding it from them. As Mr. Hoover himself has so wisely said: "A youngster old enough to commit a crime is old enough to listen to an anticrime program which plainly and convincingly teaches him that the criminal, an enemy of society, is playing a losing game."

This is the lesson hammered home in program after program on radio and television, and it is the more effective because it is developed in a form as exciting as the detection and pursuit of crime itself. One of the outstanding examples of these factual and realistic crime programs is This Is Your FBI, which presents actual cases handled by this great organization and shows an audience of millions how to guard against racketeers and law breakers. And there are many other programs serving the same purpose—shows like Dragnet, based on the files of the Los Angeles Police Department, and written, directed, and produced by men who have sat in on line-ups, patrolled in prowl cars, attended lectures in police academies, and studied scientific methods in crime laboratories; programs like Wanted, which will help track

down fugitives by broadcasting the evidence on unsolved crimes through tape-recorded statements from all of the people connected with it; and programs like Mr. District Attorney which has exposed rackets, inspired new legislation, and won the acclaim of so many civic organizations.

In all of these ways—by developing community support for your work, educating against crime, and deterring law breakers—broadcasting makes its contribution to the cause of law enforcement. A catalog of all the different forms in which these contributions are made would be too long for the telling here, but I think you will be interested in a few specifics.

Here is some of the material we have presented this year, and every other network and station in the country is performing similar services. We have had appearances by exconvicts bringing home to the audience how it feels to be hunted for crime and to serve a prison sentence, campaigns in support of boys' clubs established by the police, documentaries on juvenile delinquency, with a vivid account by the reformed leader of a kid's gang who warned young gangsters "to get wise fast," clues to missing persons, descriptions of fugitives with offers of rewards, talks by businessmen who hire parolees, and interviews with police officials discussing their work and problems.

Radio and television are also impressing the public with the importance of safe driving through broadcasts from traffic courts, dramatizations and discussions of safety issues, interviews with victims of accidents, and campaigns against recklessness on the highways. For their outstanding work in this field, the National Safety Council last year presented special awards to 78 radio stations, 6 television stations and 2 radio networks, stating that these public information activities "revealed a tremendous voluntary contribution to safety which undoubtedly has played a major part in bringing the accident death rate to the lowest point in history."

I know that with your ingenuity and the willing assistance of the broadcasters in your town, you can develop many more uses of radio and television, tailored to your particular needs and problems. Through such cooperation, your departments can work more effectively; radio and television stations can enlarge their opportunities for service; and your communities will become better places in which to live.

BROADCASTING AND THE NATIONAL SECURITY

Until now I have been dwelling on the part radio and television play in supporting domestic law and order in our communities. Today the country is facing another menace perhaps even greater than crime—the menace to our internal securities. Here, too, broadcasting has a great role to play, as was proved so well when our national life was threatened by the war machine of the Nazis, the Fascists and the Japanese militarists.

On December 7, 1941, radio in the United States shouldered arms, and together with the American people and American industry, geared itself for total war. Thoughout the long years until victory was won, it carried the responsibility of broadcasting for the United States Government. The story of its contribution is too large ever to be recorded in its entirety. Every wartime effort found its support in radio. Bond drives made compulsory savings unnecessary. Armies of workers were recruited to war production without legislation. Radio campaigns resulted in topping quotas for enlistment of nurses, and the idea of a nurses' draft was dropped. In every other area of the war effort—civil-defense training, rationing, conservation, psychological warfare, and the entertainment of troops from the Aleutians to the South Seas—American radio proved itself a mighty weapon in the Nation's service.

And above all, it brought about a great national consciousness of the fact of war, without parallel in the history of the world. It showed our people the face of the enemy and why we were fighting. It renewed our devotion to cherished institutions which the enemy would destroy, and drove home a realization of what would be lost by defeat. With this realization, the total support of the Nation was rallied. And it is this total national support—in fields and factories, in homes and battlefields—that wins wars.

We won the shooting war, and on the heels of victory came a new threat to the liberties of free men: the expansion of Communist power wherever national weakness permitted—by open aggression, by exported revolution, by propaganda which confuses and conquers, by espionage, and by infiltration. America, guarded for 150 years by two oceans, is not safe from this threat today. The consequences of defeat in the cold war can be quite as fatal to us as defeat in a shooting war.

In these critical times, the security of our Nation lies in its economic strength and in its moral strength. The broadcast services are helping to build both.

As basic advertising media they stimulate business enterprise, which is the driving force behind our expanding economy. We know that a sound economy, a rising standard of living, and continued prosperity are the best vindications of our economic and social structure. They give the lie to the Kremlin's wishful prediction that the American system is facing collapse. And they support the techniques of mass production and the industrial might that victory in modern war is made of.

As the most powerful media of public expression, these same broadcast services mobilize our moral forces. They can forge a consciousness in the minds of our citizens of the meaning and value of our democracy. Our forefathers created this way of life by believing in it, fighting for it, and making it work. If we are to keep it, we must believe in it just as deeply, practice it just as constanly, work for it daily, and fight for it if need be. As in wartime, radio is again showing Americans what they can lose by defeat in the cold war and is awakening them to all that is at stake. And in bringing this message to the people, television is adding the gift of vision to radio's voice.

But in everything it does, broadcasting must not infringe upon the civil liberties which are the very fabric of democracy. By Federal regulation and by practice, its doors must be kept open for the airing of all sides of public issues in controversy, so that it can truly serve as a forum for public discussion.

In administering this function, the responsibilities of broadcasting are grave and its task is difficult. We know, for example, that several years ago, Communists in the United States were directed to infiltrate the various media of public expression—the press, broadcasting, and the movies—with the aim of slanting them to serve the propaganda purposes of the international Communist movement; and they were especially interested in broadcasting because of its great influence on the way we think and act. I assure you that we do not intend to let them succeed in this treacherous work. We are alert to the danger and we welcome the assistance of the authorized agencies of investigation and enforcement in helping us keep broadcasting a vital force in the service of the American nation.

The United States has assumed leadership of the free world, and its strength and wisdom will determine the future of that world. In the task which faces us, no one agency of government and no single institution can do the job alone, but each can assist in the common purpose. The FBI and the police are doing their work well in guarding our securities against attack from within, and maintaining law and order in our communities. The forces which mold our attitudes and opinions can serve by bringing to every citizen an understanding of the momentous problems of our times, and by building unity of purpose in facing the issues. All of them—newspapers and magazines, the school and the home—can make real contributions to this cause.

As one of these basic agencies of public information, broadcasting has opportunities which are great and challenging. You may be sure it will not fail in its trust. Operating under the standard of public interest, its message will continue to advance the ideals of the American system, on which so much today depends.

Hawaii Needs Its Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 5 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the commencement-day address entitled "Hawaii Needs Its Youth," delivered by my former House colleague and former Delegate from Hawaii, the Honorable Samuel Wilder King, at the University of Hawaii, Honolulu, on June 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAWAII NEEDS ITS YOUTH

Mr. President, members of the faculty and of the student body of the University of Hawaii, fellow guests, and members of the graduating class of 1950, to whom I am particularly addressing myself, it is an honor and a privilege to have been asked to address you on this occasion, the fiftieth anniversary of our organization as a Territory, our Jubilee Admission Day. Great changes have taken place in our community in these past 50 years, and not the least of them has been the establishment of this institution. I, together with all of the people of Hawaii, have watched the steady growth of the University of Hawaii with a great deal of pride and satisfaction. We have welcomed the successive graduating classes, as they have completed their training here, into the ranks of our citizenry; and observed how they added to our body politic a viewpoint that was both forward-looking and yet imbued with our local, our native traditions and attitudes.

The establishment of this seat of learning is the culmination of the long and honorable record this community has in the field of education. When the American missionaries came to Hawaii about 130 years ago, they brought not only Christianity but the art of reading and writing, and the conviction that education should be available to all the people.

This revolutionary idea was only then, in the early 1800's, gaining ground in the New England from which these missionaries came. Remember it was not until 1837, under the leadership of Dr. Horace Mann, that

Massachusetts provided a system of public education for its youth, the first State to do so.

In Hawaii, soon after the missionaries arrived, the entire Nation, old and young, went to school to learn to read and write. As fast as a person was qualified, he was sent out as a teacher and became another center for the dissemination of the new learning.

In no time the entire Nation was literate and could read the Bible and other publications in the Hawaiian language. In 1840 the Kingdom of Hawaii organized a free, compulsory, public-school system, long before many States of the United States had followed the example of Massachusetts.

From that day to this, education, the training of its youth, and of its adults also, has been accepted as a public responsibility.

When immigration to Hawaii became an important factor in our development, to fill the void left by the rapid decrease of the Hawaiian people, the newcomers found an organized school system ready to welcome their children.

Eight years before annexation, in 1890, the language of the public schools was changed from Hawaiian to English, in order that our children should be better prepared for a future that might not find the Hawaiian language helpful.

As simple as these first schools were, even primitive in some instances, they nevertheless compared favorably with the education offered the children of similar communities of the United States.

And the point to note and remember is that, as standards became higher and more exacting, Hawaii kept pace with the progress in American thought and practice.

I am a product of our public-school system, attending the old Honolulu High School, when it was the only public high school in Hawaii, with a total enrollment of less than 200 in all four classes.

I leave you to draw the comparison between my school days and yours.

Shortly after annexation this institution was born, as a land-grant college, to complete the system of public education available to our youth.

As the logical development of our conception of public responsibility for the education of our citizens, the community has supported this institution. Its expansion from the early small beginnings is the natural outcome of this policy.

The expense involved is considered not only as an obligation, as the duty of a father to provide for his children, but as an investment that will pay dividends in good citizenship.

Today you are graduating, to take your places in the world, or to continue your training in other institutions. You have had here the opportunity and the facilities to fit yourselves for your future careers.

In this commencement address it may be that I am supposed to admonish you to beware the pitfalls of the world; to inspire you to live by the high principles taught in these academic halls; or to advise you how best to achieve success in the market place.

However, I confess I am at a loss as to how to admonish, inspire, or advise.

Each of you, as you leave this rainbow guarded sanctuary of learning, has a personal problem, which only you yourself can solve, with help and advice, perhaps, from those close to you through bonds of relationship and friendship.

Undoubtedly your training here, and in the schools you attended before coming here, will help you find a solution to that problem. Your special training should better fit you for some skilled vocation. Your general education should provide you with a better attitude toward life and its vicissitudes.

Your first problem is to find a foundation for your future, which means a job, preferably employment in some activity that you like. In a reasonable time, that foundation must include a mate; to establish the family unit which is the foundation of our civilization.

Here again it is a personal problem, different for each of you in some degree, while in principle the same for all of you.

One way and another, each of you will work out that problem, with varying degrees of success. I anticipate that within a few years you will be taking out college tuition insurance for the next generation; and struggling with the installments on a home.

How you are to achieve that result is a personal matter.

The old axioms of hard work, thrift and diligence, seem still to earn rewards, in recognition and in dollars and cents. Shrewdness seems still to be a characteristic that pays dividends in material things, at least. Some vocations call for a selfless devotion to your task, expecting only the satisfaction of a job well done.

In any case, you will soon find your particular vocation, by choice or through necessity, and apply to that occupation the talents you have inherited and have developed here.

My only suggestion to you is be a good citizen. We are fortunate to be citizens of the United States. We are doubly fortunate to be citizens of Hawaii. In recognition of that good fortune, in appreciation of the opportunities placed at our disposal by our Nation and our community, it is the duty and obligation of every one of us to take our share of the community burden.

Whether it be in politics, in community associations, or other civic groups, join with your fellows of similar interests and purposes, and add your quota to the sum total of civic accomplishments.

Success is a relative matter. There is no one so important that he is not overshadowed by someone of greater importance. Happiness does not depend upon material things, and those in high places are often the least happy. "Uneasy the head that wears a crown" figuratively applies to more than royal rulers.

In my circle, I have many friends whose character, good judgment and sane outlook on life I esteem very highly. Yet by the usual criteria of position and wealth they would not be considered successful.

The world today is facing great changes. The era of colonialism has ended. We see the birth of democracy in former subject countries, the repudiation of the theory of racial supremacy, the demand of all peoples to choose their own governments.

The principles by which America has lived for 175 years; that all men are created equal; that they all have certain "unalienable" rights; and that governments derive their just powers only from the consent of the governed—this philosophy of government has spread steadily over the world. This belief in the personal dignity of the individual and of his responsibility to participate in public affairs is the soul of democracy.

But, in conflict with democracy, there has been a revival of despotism, the philosophy of government by force. This totalitarian principle is not new. Whether exercised by the divine right of kings; by right of conquest; by dictators infiltrating the machinery of government, and maintaining themselves by purges, the assassination of the opposition; or by a Politburo ruling through fear; the principle is the same, a denial of individual rights, a self-perpetuation in power by force.

Under the cloak of a championship of the people's rights the proponents of this ideology sneak into strategic positions in a democracy, then proceed to wreck the government, and betray the people they proposed to serve. Capitalizing on the faults and failures of the present, they kill democracy to cure its ills.

Against this attack, which has even crept into America, democracy's best defense is, first, a complete exposure of the agencies and their methods that promote this fifth column in our midst; and, more important, an enlightened citizenry, loyal to the ideals of democracy, and determined to perfect its institutions, without abandoning its principles.

In Hawaii an aroused consciousness of our responsibilities, as well as of our rights as citizens, has intensified the claim to statehood, emphasized the demand that this semicolonial territorial status be ended, and our full rights within the Union be granted us.

We have pending in the United States Senate enabling legislation to this end. We are engaged in drafting a constitution for the State of Hawaii in anticipation of the passage of that legislation. In any case the constitution we draft will be presented to the National Government, and upon approval will become our fundamental law as a sovereign State of the Union.

My personal conviction is that the course we are pursuing should procure our admission as a State within a year. You may well be the last class to graduate from this institution while we are a Territory.

What future does Hawaii offer you on the eve of statehood? Again, I must reiterate, your future is in your own hands. No avenue of endeavor is closed to you. No measure of success is denied you, if you will pay the price in work and persistence.

As you seek a place in the community, and perhaps find it difficult at first to find one that meets your expectations, you may feel that you have trained yourself in vain. On the contrary, Hawaii has provided these facilities because the community needs trained youth for an ever-expanding future.

We need your idealism and optimism, your strength and courage, your special abilities, and your approach to the future based on a mind trained in the principles of our democracy.

Right at the moment Hawaii is going through a trying period of readjustment. The problem of unemployment is acute. Our economy is not in good balance. A recent study shows that we are spending more than our income. A community, no more than an individual, can long stay solvent on that basis.

We need to produce more of our own requirements and buy less, increase the income from existing industries, and develop new sources of income. Most of these measures take time, and we may need to adopt temporary measures to provide immediate employment to those seeking work.

But as I look back over the annals of Hawaii's story, and note the obstacles overcome, the crises solved, the steady growth in population and wealth, the improvement in our physical plant, of which this great institution is a splendid example, I cannot be a pessimist with regard to Hawaii's future, which is your future.

Freed from the shackles of a Territorial form of government, with its limitation on our powers of self-government, I am sure Hawaii can, when it becomes a State, direct its future with even a greater degree of success than it has done in the past. As a sovereign State, the responsibility will again be more upon ourselves to channel that future into a program that will achieve the greater good to the larger number.

With the same devotion to the public welfare this community has always shown, from the days of Kamehameha, with your active help as workers and citizens, we will work out our problems and build a finer community for the next generation to inherit.

In this task we will need professional men, technical men, educators and public servants, farmers and livestock raisers, skilled workers and just plain workers, and even politicians.

Our status as an island community has its disadvantages. But it also has many great advantages. Our natural resources, while limited, are yet ample for a much larger population than we now have. These resources have yet to be fully developed. As I go about these islands, I have seen thousands of acres of unused land, waiting for some yet to be determined crop. Water is within reach, by modern engineering methods, to make these lands fruitful.

As a great port we serve the ships and planes of trans-Pacific commerce. As a land blessed by nature with scenery and climate unexcelled in the world, we offer a friendly vacation land to our fellow-citizens of the mainland, and to the people of other countries.

My faith in the future of Hawaii is founded on the record of the past and on my confidence in the people of Hawaii; on you, who take your places in the ranks of our citizenry after this graduation; on those who preceded you, and those who will follow you from this institution.

With unity of purpose and homogeneity of outlook, regardless of racial origin, we can, and we will make Hawaii even a better place than it has been in which to live and raise a family; a place in which each of you will find your niche according to your merit, a place that will assure all of you the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I congratulate you upon the completion of your studies here; and I congratulate the proud parents and relatives whose self-sacrifice perhaps made these studies possible. Go forth in confidence, not that the world is your oyster, but that Hawaii has need of you, that the community and your relatives ask only that you go forth determined to take part in building Hawaii's future as a good citizen.

I envy you your opportunity to be a part of this future, in this second half of the twentieth century, and wish I could find the fountain of eternal youth, so that I might join you today, with my diploma in hand, to meet the challenge of that future.

The best of luck to you all.

Mahalo me ke aloha a nui loa.

"None But Americans"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 5 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent for the insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD of an editorial entitled "None But Americans," published in the evening edition of the Omaha World-Herald of Omaha, Nebr., on Monday, July 3.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"NONE BUT AMERICANS"

President Truman has been widely complimented, and deservedly, for adopting a strong and firm American policy in the Far East.

But as the power of the North Korean offensive is revealed, it becomes plain that policy will not be enough. Substantial military strength will be needed—strength which General MacArthur does not have immediately available. If Russia should decide to make this a "second Spain," as has been hinted, the campaign may be long and costly.

Thus the mistakes of the do-nothing, fellow-traveler days are coming home.

Last July, less than 1 year ago, Prof. Owen Lattimore wrote in the Compass: "The thing to do, therefore, is to let Korea fall but not let it look as though we pushed it."

Mr. Lattimore is Secretary Acheson's friend and adviser on far eastern affairs—one of those on whom the Secretary will not turn his back. The Lattimore line, until last Tuesday, was the State Department's line. The sentence quoted above suggests one reason why the Communists had the audacity to invade South Korea, and why the South Koreans and Americans were so ill prepared.

If the campaign drags on, as now seems possible, other administration mistakes will come home to the people.

Fighting costs money. The greater a nation's unpreparedness the greater the cost. In recent years the Government in Washington hasn't put aside a cent for a rainy day. On the contrary, it has been running into debt almost $5,000,000,000 a year to support a bumbling political program.

As a result, the forces of inflation already are at work. The cost of the far eastern war will intensify the pressure. Currently there is talk of shortages and gray markets in certain lines. If military spending increases as some people anticipate, the demand will quickly come for controls, allocations, rationing, and all the rest, and another generation of Leon Hendersons and Chester Bowleses will descend on Washington.

A strong economy, prudently governed, could support an unbalanced budget through a brief crisis without much strain.

But an economy which has been overburdened with crackpot do-goodism and give-away programs can't carry an extra load. As the drain on the over-drawn Treasury increases, totalitarianism controls will be required.

The combination of a do-nothing diplomatic policy and a do-everything domestic policy has left the country poorly prepared to carry out the President's new strong policy in the Far East.

Surveying that situation last week, Senator TAFT called for the immediate resignation of Secretary Acheson.

There are clear grounds for that demand. The Secretary and his Lattimores and Jessups steered the country into a Russian booby trap. Had it not been for their Communist-coddling policies and utterances, this particular test might never have come.

But it is fair to point out that the responsibility is not theirs alone. Secretary Brannan, Oscar Ewing, and the whole passel of give-away politicians are equally to blame. And at the top of the chain of culpability stands Harry Truman himself, the man who for many years accepted and followed mush-headed counsel from men who are soft toward almost every "ism" except traditional Americanism.

At a critical moment in the Revolutionary War, George Washington is said to have issued this order:

"Put none but Americans on guard tonight."

As Frank C. Hanighen observes in the current issue of Human Events, "The words have immediacy."

Mr. Truman made a start in the right direction when he put Douglas MacArthur on guard in the Far East. If it is his desire to safeguard the future of the Republic in a hostile world, he should put men of equally good sense and high patriotism on guard at home.

The Surprise Attack on Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 5 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Samuel Shaffer, whom all of us know, which presents some very interesting and perhaps startling background material in connection with the development of the Korean crisis. The article appears in the current issue of the magazine Newsweek.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DATA FOR A PEARL HARBOR ECHO: DID WE MUFF IT IN KOREA?

Did the United States have any idea the Communists were preparing to invade the Republic of Korea?

Was it prepared for the attack?

If not, why not?

In 2 days of supersecret hearings, the Senate Appropriations Committee made a stab last week at finding out the answers. It didn't discover all of them, but what it did learn was enough to make the startled Senators seal the highly explosive testimony in a Manila envelope and lock it away in a safe—perhaps forever, perhaps only until the shooting in Korea is over. Said a top Republican significantly: "There may someday be another 'Pearl Harbor' investigation."

The hearings started quietly enough, for they had been called to deal with a routine matter—to hear Secretary of State Dean Acheson and Defense Secretary Louis Johnson read prepared statements on the military assistance program. Then Republican Senator STYLES BRIDGES dropped a blockbuster. Turning on Acheson, he charged that American intelligence had bungled in Korea, failing to warn the Pentagon that a Communist attack was imminent. American intelligence, he said, "fell down on the job."

Suavely, Acheson answered that he didn't think BRIDGES had fairly characterized the situation. He said the United States Government had been fully aware that North Korean forces were gathering along the thirty-eighth parallel. Republican Senator HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, bore in. Did the Government know they were preparing an offensive? Acheson hesitated. No, he finally said.

At this, Johnson cut in. "It was a surprise attack," he admitted.

Then the Defense Secretary volunteered that he long had been completely dissatisfied with the intelligence reports he was receiving from his military attachés abroad. The time had arrived when military attachés should stop acting as social secretaries to ambassadors and do a little intelligence work, he said. He added that he already had started replacing the cookie-pushers-in-uniform.

Was the United States military attaché in Korea "a social secretary"? Johnson was asked. He didn't know, the Defense Secretary confessed. Had the attaché sent him any information on the attack? The answer was no.

Had Johnson heard anything while he was in Japan recently to indicate that an attack was imminent? Democratic Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, wanted to know. Again the answer was a flat, stunning "No."

That afternoon Rear Adm. Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, took some of the curse off Johnson's admissions by showing the Senators copies of the CIA reports on Korea for June 9, 13, and 20. The June 20 report he read aloud. It told of the massing of Red troops and tanks along the thirty-eighth parallel, describing them in detail; it reported the construction of new highways for the movement of heavy artillery and similar matériel and the evacuation of villages along the border.

The Senators agreed that on the basis of the June 20 report the conclusion that a Communist attack might soon take place was inescapable. Then why had the offensive caught the United States by surprise, as Johnson had testified? Why hadn't the Government made any preparations to meet it?

Answers: On Tuesday the committee called Maj. Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, director of the office of foreign military assistance, and John H. Ohly, acting director of mutual defense assistance, for the answers. When they had finished testifying, the Senators didn't know whether to shiver with fright, howl with rage, or simply bang their heads against the wall in sheer frustration.

FERGUSON demanded to know how much of the $10,230,000 provided for Korea in the MAP authorization of July 1949 and the appropriation of the following October had been spent, and how much matériel had been delivered. Looking as though he'd rather be facing a Russian tank with a can opener, Lemnitzer answered that only a small amount of signal equipment had actually been sent. "How much," prodded FERGUSON. "Very little," Lemnitzer replied. "How much?" FERGUSON insisted. "Well, not more than several hundred dollars' worth," Lemnitzer said. FERGUSON insisted, and Lemnitzer finally put the sum at $200.

FERGUSON was shocked. "Several hundred dollars' worth of signal equipment out of ten million," he asked. Lemnitzer started to answer, but Republican Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California, cut him short. He said he knew the Korean Republic had asked time and time again for planes. He pointed out that our own military mission had recommended giving them some. "Wasn't it true," he asked, "that not a single fighter had been given to Korea?"

"Yes," said Lemnitzer.

Hadn't the Koreans told Washington they "desperately needed some fighter protection because without them, in the event of war, Seoul will be a sitting duck?" KNOWLAND asked, his face flushed.

"Yes," said Lemnitzer.

The Senators turned on Ohly. Democratic Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, wanted to know whether it was accurate to state that our policy toward Korea had been to give the republic just enough arms to maintain internal security but not enough to cope with the army trained and equipped by the Russians in the north.

That was substantially an accurate statement, Ohly replied. The policy had been laid down in March 1949 by the National Security Council.

Republican Senator GUY CORDON, of Oregon, couldn't believe his ears, thought he was hearing things. "You mean," he asked incredulously, "that you had a force that was incapable of defense, but you thought it might scare somebody?"

The purpose of the force was primarily internal security, Ohly answered calmly.

"Did you at any time prepare any plans for the order, the procurement, and the shipment to Korea of any arms and ammunition to resist agression from northern Korea?" Democratic Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, asked.

Ohly replied: "I think the answer to that is no."

Why? O'MAHONEY demanded.

Ohly answered in circles. The equipment furnished was useful in resisting an invasion, but it was not furnished primarily for that purpose but to maintain internal security in South Korea, he said.

The double-talk infuriated O'MAHONEY. Exploding, he accused Ohly of trying to alibi. He asked: "Was it ever contemplated at any time to furnish equipment to South Korea for the express purpose of resisting invasion?"

The answer was no, Ohly replied.

Republican Senator KENNETH WHERRY, of Nebraska, asked Lemnitzer whether South Korea hadn't been given a fairly low priority among the nations receiving arms from the United States. The general admitted that it had.

In an aside, KNOWLAND, a bitter critic of foreign policy, remarked: "It was practically low man on the totem pole."

Significance: The minute the shooting war stops in Korea, a bitter political war is likely to break out in the United States over the failure to arm the republic to defend itself against the Reds.

As Ohly admitted in his secret testimony, that was a premeditated policy. But, as neither Ohly nor anyone else confided to Congress, the National Security Council had what it considered good reasons for adopting it.

In military terms, South Korea isn't worth defending; the United States Army, moreover, has always considered it "a potential Bataan." Yet the United States, by the very act of establishing the Korean Republic, made a moral and political commitment to defend it.

When the National Security Council was drawing up a policy for Korea in March 1949, defense officials recognized the impossibility of reneging on this commitment. They agreed that, if the Reds attacked, the United States would have to come to South Korea's aid no matter what the risks involved. At the same time, they made it clear they weren't looking for trouble: They didn't want to give South Korea planes and tanks and all the other weapons necessary to defend itself because they were afraid the South Koreans might then feel strong enough to start a war themselves.

The National Security Council resolved this delimma in the following manner: It (1) gave South Korea only enough arms for internal security, not enough for either aggression or defense; (2) drew up plans that could be put into effect instantly and automatically for sending in additional arms if and when the Reds invaded; (3) drew up plans also for the putting the case before the UN; but (4) deferred the question of sending in the armed forces until the necessity arose.

This was the policy that was followed.

But Congress, uninformed of the policy, provided funds for Korean defense.

Soil Fertility and the Nation's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 5 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD an essay entitled "Soil Fertility and the Nation's Future," which was composed by Mr. Albert B. Harvey, of Hockessin, Del., and which won a prize in the Nation-wide essay contest sponsored by the American Plant Food Council, Inc.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOIL FERTILITY AND THE NATION'S FUTURE—SIXTH PLACE ESSAY

(By Albert B. Harvey, Hockessin, Del.)

"I just can't see how I can afford to turn under the clover this year; I need the money from the hay."

Echoing from the four corners of our land comes this threat to our Nation's prosperity. In the midst of plenty, we abuse the source of our wealth, expecting a heaven-sent Utopia.

Nature does not work that way. We are disrupting her delicate balance of growth and decay, the balance created by wave after wave of vegetation of the past for today's plants. We are turning living soil into dead earth. Soil, like the best cow, cannot be milked indefinitely without food, and, from constant sucking of its fertility, it becomes sick.

With a sick soil, we suffer a whole series of far-reaching consequences. Each droplet of water, instead of diffusing into the soil, is shed as from a tin roof, each carrying particles of its would-be host. Imagine billions of similar droplets cascading to the sea in a grand free-for-all of destruction, and you picture erosion. Our whole land is changing from a sponge to a funnel, pouring 3,000,000,000 tons yearly of our lifeblood into overworked rivers. We note with apprehension the increasing frequence of flood and drought, and wonder.

All the soil in the harbor doesn't grow corn for John Doe, and what is left on the land cannot possibly meet increasing demands, for it is sick too. Sick soil bears sick plants, and sick plants make sick men. Thus cattle eat protein-deficient grass; man eats protein-deficient beef, and falls ill. Man may relish his home-grown flourine-deficient vegetables, but he will soon discover his teeth decaying.

This, then, is the stark reality we must face: our total productivity is diminishing; bankrupt farmers are starting a wave of nomadism and social disintegration; our waters are becoming ever more unruly; and man, poor victim, finds his health merely a toy of agriculture.

To a conscientious thinker, these facts can give rise to only one question: Are we building our civilization on sand? Have we plunged so far into the intricacies of industrialism that we have irreparably lost contact with our Mother Earth? The answer: To the pessimist, yes; to the optimist, no. Considering that little of value is ever accomplished by the former attitude, let us see how we can cooperate with nature to restore that contact.

First, we must revamp our whole agricultural policy; change its theme from one of extensive factory production to one of intensive conservation practices. Conservation demands a well-integrated plan of natural plus mechanical soil building.

Naturally, we must employ sounder methods of healing our diseased soil. To strengthen its structure; revitalize its internal processes, thus creating a lasting fertility, only organic matter can be used. It is the only "balanced fertilizer"; artificial fertilizer at best is merely a supplement; if used in excess it is like a drug to the soil, making it toxic to plants. Organic matter can be supplied by any farmer either in the form of barnyard manure, or by the plowing under of a grass or legume crop, such as vetch. Legumes have the added ability to fix nitrogen from the air; the roots of both legumes and grass penetrate a compact soil, forming tiny channels which in-

crease aeration, activity of bacteria and earthworms, and form natural outlets for surface water. Thus we build up by building down, and, with the use of natural methods, we find many diverse problems falling into line.

Nevertheless, all our efforts are wasted unless we discover some mechanical method of holding our recuperating soil in place. There are no hard and fast rules to follow; since each acre must be treated individually, and the prescription must embrace the many variances of soil type, climate, slope, and kinds of erosion. If the farmer, however, will faithfully follow these general practices, with the guidance of an expert, erosion can be halted: Rotation cropping, including a sod, to prevent the exhaustion of continuous cultivation; contour and strip farming, with alternate sod and cultivated crops, to impede runoff of water; reseeded pastures and limited grazing to prevent devegetation; permanent sodding of steeper slopes to hold soil; and vegetated channels for the safe evacuation of water.

These practices mean more work, but we are pioneers of a new age and pioneers must always work. Carried to a national scale through competent social direction and cooperation, they would provide a true abundance of life-giving food. Today we see millions of hungry, war-starved people all over the world turn to us, as a child would beseech his father; begging, pleading only to be given a chance to help themselves. Can any man with a soul deny them that?

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 5 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement by Elmer W. Cart, member of the North Dakota Public Service Commission, Bismarck, N. Dak., before the House Committee on Public Works, Eighty-first Congress, in support of House Joint Resolution 271, relating to the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF ELMER W. CART, MEMBER OF THE NORTH DAKOTA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION, BISMARCK, N. DAK., BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 271

My name is Elmer W. Cart, residence Bismarck, N. Dak. I am a member of the North Dakota Public Service Commission a State regulatory body which is charged with the duties of representing the State of North Dakota before the Congress of the United States, the Interstate Commerce Commission and other Federal agencies dealing with transportation and related matters in which the State of North Dakota is interested.

For the past 15 years I have been closely associated with transportation problems as a public service commissioner, as an employee of the Office of Defense Transportation during World War II and as director of traffic for the North Dakota Farmers Union for a priod of 4 years. I am a class B registered practitioner before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

North Dakota is vitally interested in the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and has consistently supported legislation introduced in Congress for the purpose of bringing this much-needed development into being.

On February 20, 1946, I testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee which held hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 104.

While our principal interest will be in water transportation, we are also much interested in the power development of that portion of the St. Lawrence River which forms the international boundary between the State of New York and the Dominion of Canada, because of the large amount of power that will be available to the industrial northeastern part of the United States.

The harnessing of the water power which is presently being wasted, will add to our national wealth and create cheap energy for industrial and domestic use in the Northeastern States. This will stimulate both the manufacture and consumption of consumers goods and will aid in furnishing employment and create better living conditions to a large number of people in this section of our country.

Those of us who live in the north central part of the Nation will benefit from having available goods manufactured with cheap power and customers for the products we produce, who can only be good customers when they are employed and have a stable income.

North Dakota is one of the great grain-producing States of the Nation. According to data released by the United States Department of Agriculture, North Dakota produced over 1,248,000,000 bushels of wheat during the period 1941 to 1949, inclusive, an average of slightly over 142,000,000 bushels per year. In addition to the production of wheat, North Dakota also produces a large amount of oats, barley, and flax.

North Dakota being a surplus-grain-producing State, must find a market for a large portion of its production in the eastern part of the United States and in foreign countries.

By the development of deep-water transportation from Duluth, Minn; Milwaukee, Wis.; Chicago, Ill.; and other cities on the Great Lakes, the land-locked territory of the north-central part of the Nation, Rugby, N. Dak., being the geographical center of the North American Continent, will be greatly benefited by having deep-water ports operating 7 to 8 months of the year. Using the formula of 3.6 water-miles to 1 rail-mile for rate-making purposes, places the State of North Dakota much closer to deep-water transportation than it is today, as the following illustration shows: Bismarck, N. Dak., is 1,608 railroad-miles from New York City and 446 railroad-miles from Duluth, Minn.

The distance by water from New York to Liverpool, England, is approximately 3,400 miles and the rail-miles of 1,608, Bismarck to New York, equated to water-miles is 5,792, making a total of 9,192 water-miles on the route all-rail to New York and water beyond. The distance by water from Duluth to Liverpool, England, over the Great Lakes-St. Lawdence seaway and Atlantic Ocean, is approximately 4,600 miles, and the rail miles of 446 equated to water-miles is 1,605, making a total of 6,205 or a savings of 2,987 water miles or 829 railroad-miles over the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, compared with the present rail and water route by New York City.

This illustration could be used with other domestic and foreign points of origin and destination and substantially the same results would be obtained. The benefits of the seaway would extend west and south from Lake Superior and Lake Michigan ports to approximately one-half of the distance to the Pacific Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico.

With the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway where ocean-going vessels drawing 25 feet of water could operate from ports on the Great Lakes, the present expenses of transferring shipments originating at Great Lakes ports to rail or barge for movement beyond the eastern lake ports and then again transferring to ocean-going steamers at a deep water port, would be eliminated as well as the loss and damage which increases with each transfer from one type of carrier to another.

During the Great Lakes shipping season for the year 1949, the average cost of moving wheat in bulk from Duluth, Minn., to Buffalo, N. Y., was approximately 11½ cents per 100 pounds. Assuming that we had the seaway in use at that time, it is my opinion that wheat could have moved from Duluth to Montreal at 14 cents per 100 pounds, excluding the toll charge for use of the seaway facilities. Further assuming, that the toll charge on bulk commodities like wheat, to be 60 cents per ton, which is approximately one-half of the maximum fixed in House Joint Resolution 271, would bring a total cost of 17 cents per hundredweight in moving grain from Duluth to Montreal and when the ship arrived at that port there would be no need for transfer to an oceangoing ship.

I do not have information available as to the cost of transferring grain which moves in bulk cargo on the Lakes as it moves to Buffalo, N. Y., by bulk cargo and then is transferred to either barge or rail for movement to New York or Montreal for reshipment on the ocean. However, I wish to point out that the export rail rate on grain from Duluth to Montreal is 56 cents per 100 pounds, which would be 39 cents per 100 pounds greater than the illustration just given. If the grain moved all rail from Duluth to New York City, the export rate is 48 cents per 100 pounds, making a difference of 31 cents per hundred pounds. The domestic rail rate on grain for this same movement is 61½ cents per 100 pounds to New York and 71 cents to Montreal. These illustrations are cited to show that substantial benefits can be obtained by agriculture in seeking foreign markets, the transportation charges being borne by the farmer.

The foregoing illustrations show the benefits that would accrue to North Dakota and the other grain-producing States in the northern Great Plains region and would materially assist our farmers in the moving of that portion of their crop which must be sold in foreign markets. Unless a portion of the foreign market can be made available to the grain producers in the Great Plains region, further drastic cuts in production, no doubt, will be imposed with the result that the farmers income will be further curtailed with the additional result that the manufacturer of consumer and industrial goods will have a smaller home market in which to dispose of their products.

I also wish to point out that the high grade iron ore in northern Minnesota, which supplies most of our iron and steel requirements, is rapidly being depleted. The period of time when high grade Minnesota iron ore would be available should be extended to meet any further emergency by conserving this natural resource by extending our transportation facilities to other presently existing supplies. With the construction of the seaway, the industrial plants located in the Great Lakes region will be able to continue their operation by bringing in ore from Labrador and other foreign locations. This will add to our national security and keep the iron and steel plants on the Great Lakes operating in their present location. Unless this is done, millions of people will be forced to seek new locations. I respectfully urge the passage of House Joint Resolution 271.

Ten Commandments of Good Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 5 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Ten Commandments of Good Citizenship, written by the Honorable Milton F. Napier, of St. Louis, Mo., a member of the Missouri State Senate.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I

Be informed; think.

II

Vote in every (primary and general) election. Support democracy, the free-enterprise system. Respect authority. Serve gladly as an election official.

III

Dare to do right. Be courageous. Be respectful. Respect the rights of others. Serve gladly as a juror.

IV

Do not be bigoted. Only God decides our race or color; you might have been the "other fellow." Be tolerant. Be yourself.

V

Be just and kind; impartial; forgiving. Be purposeful. Do not hate anyone. Be merciful.

VI

Be alert. Take a part in civic and school affairs. Do not neglect your church. Keep faith. Live for eternity.

VII

Obey the laws of God and man. Do not knowingly or wilfully violate any law. Hold your oath sacred and bear false witness against no one. Serve gladly as a witness.

VIII

Be thrifty; charitable; ambitious. Support your government and pay your just share of its cost. Be responsible.

IX

Be loyal. Be patriotic; be prepared. Defend your country from its enemies at home and abroad.

X

Fulfill your obligations. Enjoy your rights and privileges. Be interested in home, family, community, political, and governmental matters and functions.

Aid to Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 5 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon, expressing the opposition of many small-business men to President Truman's five-point program to aid small business, based on a recent survey made through questionnaires sent to the members of the National Small Business Men's Association.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS IS AGAINST AID PROGRAM, SURVEY SHOWS

CHICAGO, ILL., June 27.—The great majority of small-business men in this country do not want any part of President Truman's 5-point program to aid small business, stated DeWitt Emery, president of the National Small Businessmen's Association.

Emery said his statement is based on a recent survey made through questionnaires sent to the association's membership. Replies were received from 2,641 businessmen scattered throughout the 48 States. The majority vote was against all five points of the proposed program with the heaviest opposition shown to federally chartered and promoted investment firms, and the least opposition to a Department of Commerce clearinghouse for information of interest to small business.

"Here's the way our association's members voted on each of the five points," Emery stated:

	Percent
1. Government insured bank loans to small business—up to $25,000, payable within 5 years:	
For	11
Against	89
2. Federally chartered and promoted investment companies:	
For	3
Against	97
3. Broadened lending powers to small business by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation:	
For	13
Against	87
4. Establishing in the Department of Commerce a clearinghouse for scientific, engineering, and managerial information of interest to small business:	
For	28
Against	72
5. Centered responsibility in the Secretary of Commerce for entire program, except that the proposed national investment companies would be under Federal Reserve:	
For	14
Against	86

"This vote represents a true cross section of small business," said Emery, citing the fact that 78 percent of the questionnaires were returned by businessmen with fewer than 100 employees—which is the classification into which the great bulk of business establishments in this country fall—and only 2 percent were from businessmen with over 500 employees. He gave the following breakdown of returns, according to number of employees:

Number of employees:	Percent returned
1 to 25	37
25 to 50	18
50 to 100	18
100 to 250	15
250 to 500	5
Over 500	2

Asked for his opinion as to whether the President's small business program would be passed by Congress, Emery said he considered it altogether unlikely.

"It doesn't take much imagination to predict what would happen if this program did pass," said the president of the National Small Business Men's Association. "Loans would be granted with great abandon to everyone with the 'right' connections without regard to the likelihood of the money being paid back and the taxpayer would have to make up the losses.

"Small business certainly does need access to a steady flow of venture capital, but the remedy is not easy money from the taxpayers' pockets. The remedy is lower taxes.

"Present excessively high taxes take away from small business the money which should be plowed back into the business. High taxes also prevent individual savings which would be invested in private business.

"What the small-business men of this country want is a drastic cut in Federal spending and a corresponding reduction in taxes. Then small business will finance itself without any handouts from the Federal Government."

The Post Office Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY CORDON
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 5 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, recently I received a letter from Mr. Spencer W. Yates, of Roseburg, Oreg., on the subject of the deficit in the Post Office Department, and commenting on the reasons therefor. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD; and I hope it will receive the attention of all Members of the Senate, and particularly those who are also members of the Appropriations Committee.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YATES, MURPHY & CARLSON,
Roseburg, Oreg., June 26, 1950.

Hon. GUY CORDON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CORDON: I noticed in the Roseburg News Review a news item to the effect that a bill is now before Congress to rescind the recent Post Office Department cuts. The article indicates that a $545,000,000 loss was sustained by the Post Office Department last year, and that Congress cannot figure out how to cure this loss.

It seems to me that the answer is simple. The volume of second-, third-, and fourth-class unwanted mail reaching my desk each morning exceeds the volume of first-class mail. With the deficit indicated, the per capita loss we are paying for post office subsidy of second-, third-, and fourth-class mail is about $3. With my family of four that would be $12 a year and I imagine that I pay about treble the average income tax which means that I am paying out approximately $36 a year to be annoyed by direct mail advertising I do not want to receive.

I do not think that the rates on newspapers and magazines should be increased very substantially but doubling the rate on direct mail advertising would be highly appropriate.

I would sincerely appreciate having my views put before the appropriate committee.

Very truly yours,

SPENCER W. YATES.

The Genocide Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 5 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in the New York Times of July 2, there is a letter to the editor from Mr. Adolf A. Berle, a former Assistant Secretary of State, and a distinguished authority on international questions. His letter deals with the Genocide Convention, and replies to objections which have been raised by certain members of the legal profession. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTLAWING GENOCIDE—OBJECTIONS TO TREATY REVIEWED IN ADVOCATING RATIFICATION

(The writer of the following letter, chairman of the Committee on International Law of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, was Assistant Secretary of State from 1938 to 1944.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Ratification of the United Nations convention against genocide will presently come before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and should come up for ratification by the Senate this session. This treaty outlaws acts intended to exterminate or extinguish racial or religious groups, like Hitler's campaign to exterminate Jews in Europe. It should be ratified.

Arthur Krock in his New York Times column some days ago gave attention to certain constitutional objections to this treaty raised by a few lawyers whose opposition had aroused little echo until then.

A special committee of the American Bar Association on Peace and Law Through United Nations appeared before the Senate subcommittee, and contended that the treaty was dangerous because it might be "self-executing"—might outlaw genocide without further act of Congress. Also, that it invaded States' rights by enlarging legislative power of the Federal Congress. Mr. Krock wondered whether the provisions of the treaty against genocide might have the effect of constitutional amendments. The Senate subcommittee drafted certain understandings or interpretations, and has recommended ratification. Mr. Krock seems to want further delay.

OBJECTIONS STUDIED

Actually the section on international law of the American Bar Association, which is composed of experts on international law and treaty analysis, had already examined all of these contentions and decided that there was nothing in them. But it is worth giving the answers here. They have been concurred in by many very able lawyers, including former Secretary of War Patterson, former president of the New York Bar Association Harrison Tweed, Dean Wesley Sturges, of Yale, Professor Manley Hudson, of Harvard, and a host of others whose competence is unquestioned.

The genocide treaty calls for legislation outlawing the following actions: Committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group such as (a) killing members of the group; (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm * * *; (c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

But it does not by itself make them criminal. Instead, by article 5, it obliges the parties to the treaty to enact necessary legislation providing effective penalties for genocide. The treaty does not make law; it binds the signatory parties to make their own laws.

EXISTING STATUTES

To some of us it might not be an unmixed evil if the genocide treaty did of itself make these acts illegal. Actually, by its terms, it does not. And, if it did, each of the acts specified is already a crime under the criminal code of every State. If anyone may commit murder, mayhem, mass appression calculated to destroy, forcible birth control or child kidnapping, without breaking present American law, it would be bad news. These actions will be no less criminal if they are committed with intent to destroy a national or racial group. Even a self-executing treaty would not change our substantial law. Certainly it would not change any constitutional law: deprivation of life, liberty, and property, or of equal protection of the law, acquiesced in by authority, is already forbidden by the fifth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments.

The genocide treaty raises none of the issues suggested by the recent California decision which held that ratification of the United Nations Charter automatically nullified the alien-land law of California. The United Nations Charter is, and is expressed to be, self-executing. The genocide treaty is not. The California decision (which merely reaffirms the classic American doctrine that a treaty is a form of legislation binding on the States if the subject matter has to do with international relations) undoubtedly did underline the fact that treaty making is a serious business and that international law can be real as well as academic. But all that was known to the genocide-treaty craftsmen, and was carefully covered in the text.

INTERNATIONAL CRIME

A second contention of the "Peace" Committee, noted by Arthur Krock, is that the treaty extends the power of Congress and thereby invades States' rights. There is little to this point either. The Constitution of the United States (art. I, sec. 8) specifically gives the Congress power "to define and punish offenses against the law of the nations." By treaty legislation the Congress has defined a number of such offenses: slave trading, international narcotics peddling, piracy, and so forth. Certainly genocide is more clearly an international crime than any of these and is a "proper subject of negotiation between our Government and other nations," to use the language of the Supreme Court.

A minor technical point was raised by the "Peace" Committee. Fear was expressed that one accused of genocide might be haled before an international, instead of an American, court. The genocide treaty (art. 6) did say that if an international criminal court was organized, and if a signatory nation had accepted the jurisdiction of the court, the crime of genocide might be tried before such a court. No such court has been organized, the United States has not accepted its jurisdiction, and is not bound to accept it in any case. Objection on that score, one would think, had best be postponed and dealt with if, as, and when such a court is created. The United States is only obligated to accept jurisdiction of the existing World Court in case diplomats disagree over interpretation.

In blunt fact, these opponents of the genocide treaty are arguing that the United States and the several States should reserve to themselves the power to legalize genocide if they feel like it, without being answerable to international law. The position is untenable—just as it would be untenable to argue that the United States should reserve to itself the right to engage in the slave trade, international narcotics peddling, counterfeiting, or piracy, for fear of constitutional complications. Genocide should be an international crime. The present treaty, fully clarified by the understandings carefully drafted by Senator MCMAHON, should be ratified.

A. A. BERLE, Jr.

NEW YORK, *June 28, 1950.*

On This I Stand or Fall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 5, 1950

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the Republicans who recently signed a declaration of Republican principles. One newspaper columnist in putting his interpretation on the statement said that those who subscribed to it were apparently attempting to "blast and unseat such Republican leaders as Senator TAFT and JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., etc." I assure you that no interpretation by any stretch of the imagination could be further from the truth so far as my own motive in signing it is concerned. My only thought was that perhaps I might be instrumental in helping to revitalize and reawaken the vast army of Republicans to a realization of the greatness of the Republican Party and the part which they as individuals might play in helping rejuvenate and revive their party. If I could help in accomplishing this objective there would be no cause for worry regarding those whom they might choose as their leaders.

In the balance of this article I am setting forth my honest convictions and the principles to which I subscribed. I cordially invite anyone to read it and then honestly say that those who agree with my sentiments are attempting to "blast or unseat our leaders."

I believe that the Republican Party was founded to meet the greatest social issue of modern times—human slavery. Under its leadership that issue was decided on the battlefield and the decision written into the Constitution.

But slavery may take many forms. The rise of industrial mass production, opening up for the first time in history the hope of economic sufficiency, also created the danger of economic slavery—slavery to the machine. The era following the War Between the States thus immediately created a new challenge for the Republican Party.

The party proceeded to meet this challenge through a series of farsighted progressive policies, designed both to encourage the growth of industry and to protect the freedom of the individual amid the rise of industrial giants. It sponsored the American policy of high

wages. It became the workingman's party with the slogan of the full dinner pail. It developed the Sherman Act which guards the American people and their enterprises from the threat of monopoly. It fostered aid to agriculture. Through farsighted subsidies it encouraged the rapid growth of industry and the multiplication of jobs and opportunities everywhere in the land. And in order to give the people a direct voice in government, it campaigned for the initiative, the referendum, and the primary. As a result of these and many other measures, the Republican Party became the world's greatest progressive force for productivity and freedom.

In the foreign affairs the Republican Party was equally progressive. One of its Presidents, William McKinley, was one of the first to understand that modern technology would make the world smaller and raise entirely new problems for American statesmen. Mr. McKinley and his immediate successors advocated a reciprocal tariff policy looking toward equality of trade. The Republican Party was the first to sense America's international destiny, at a time when others were preaching a flabby isolationism. It challenged the nations with the open-door policy in China, lifting from the Chinese the burden of imperialistic domination. And yet another of its Presidents—William Howard Taft—after leaving the White House, led that great internationalist movement, the League To Enforce Peace, which was later molded into the League of Nations.

All of these measures were part of the Republican Party's mighty drive for the emancipation of man from economic or any other form of slavery.

The new challenges of our time are dominantly social in nature. They have given rise to certain goals that are deeply desired by the people and that are in fact essential to the preservation of freedom in an industrial society. Such goals include a reasonable security for old age, adequate voluntary medical care available for all, insurance against unemployment, year-round work, better education, better housing, protection of the rights of labor, aid to agriculture—to mention only the most conspicuous. The implementation of such goals has become necessary to that basic security without which a free society cannot long endure.

For 17 years the New or Fair Deal Party has been faced with these challenges; yet it has proposed only one solution to them; namely, the unlimited extension of governmental control of the people. The Republican Party, on its side, has always stood for a strong Federal Government, and many of its leaders will agree that the application of this principle during the past two decades has brought about many necessary reforms. Yet to try to solve all issues by one single remedy is a form of political bankruptcy. I believe that the American people are aware of the dangers lurking in the infinite extension of Government responsibility and power. The inevitable end of that road is a new form of slavery—slavery to the state.

The rank and file of the Republican Party has opposed this bankrupt kind of thinking. And they will continue to do so. Nevertheless, alternative solutions have been too slowly evolved and too often the party has been permitted to be maneuvered into a position of purely negative opposition. Too often the appearance has been created that the party is opposed to certain social goals, such as security for old age, adequate voluntary medical care available to all, better education, better housing, protection of the rights of labor, and aid to agriculture. These goals are deeply desired by the people, and are in fact essential to the preservation of freedom in our time. In appearing to oppose them, therefore, certain members have given the impression that the party is working against the people and against the development of freedom.

The situation is made worse by the fact that many Republicans who have frankly espoused these goals have been accused by members of their own party of being "me too." This accusation displays a lack of clear thinking that seems almost fantastic. In the first place, if the goals are right and just, then, as a responsible political party, we must accept them. In the second place the accusation of "me too" completely misses the real issue.

The real issue against the Fair Deal does not lie with the goals. The truth is that all of these goals are wholly consonant with traditional Republican aims; they are typical of the kind of goals that the party has always worked to establish in its long battle to free the common man. They are of the essence of true Republicanism. And they are wholly achievable under our free economic system. The real issue with the opposition lies with the means of achieving these goals. It is not Republican policy, for example, to prevent the benefits of modern medicine from spreading to the people. I believe that this goal must be achieved. But I insist that it must and can be achieved without enslaving the American medical profession to the state, as proposed in the Fair Deal bill, and without confiding the people's medical needs to the hands of Federal bureaucrats.

Thus the Republican task today is twofold. Firstly the party should not merely accept, it should provide enthusiastic leadership for the social goals that have become so necessary to the health of our society. But secondly, it should develop new means of achieving these goals without enslaving the people. In the case of the medical goal, a group of Republicans have already made a proposal that demonstrates how this can be done. Instead of vesting total responsibility in government, this proposal gives strong government encouragement to mutual efforts on the part of the people themselves toward the goal of adequate medical care. The party must now set to work to frame legislation of this kind, placing the prime, though not the sole, burden of social advance upon the people rather than upon the state.

The acceptance by the Republican Party of this challenge would open up a whole new vista of freedom: The vista of a society based upon the mutual, voluntary efforts of free individuals, encouraged and assisted by their Government, to pursue those social goals that have become necessary to the maintenance of the American way of life. Such a policy would revive in this country the true spirit of freedom—the spirit that formerly animated our party and made it one of the world's most enlightened political institutions. We believe that in this spirit, but only in this spirit, Republicans can reassume the political and moral leadership of the United States, and hence, of the Western World.

Whether the Republican Party is able to seize this magnificent opportunity for leadership depends, in large measure, on its willingness and ability to develop specific legislative measures. This treatise does not purport to provide detailed solutions. Its aims are essentially the declaration of certain principles and the definition of a certain attitude. It makes no specific legislative recommendations but contains the implicit demand that the actual work of implementing these principles and this attitude start now.

Pending such work, and as a foundation for the approach here suggested, I appeal to certain concepts that have animated American political thinking from the very beginning. These concepts are set forth in the Declaration of Independence as the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I take these words seriously. I believe that the task of a modern republic is to learn how to apply them to the end that the people may find an escape from regimentation, just as our ancestors escaped from monarchical tyranny. Among the many desirable applications the following appear to me to be self-evidently necessary.

The least well understood of the three general rights is the right to the pursuit of happiness. Yet in the preservation of freedom this right is in a certain sense the most important. When a totalitarian state is set up, the right to pursue happiness in one's own way is the first to go. Men and women are constrained to serve this state, whether this service fits their own definition of the pursuit of happiness, or not.

Properly interpreted, this right is the right to be an individual. It is the right to fulfill oneself according to one's own lights. And so long as one's self-fulfillment does not harm others in a social way, the Government has almost nothing to say about it. The American people jealously guard this right. They ask Government to help them build and maintain educational institutions, for example, but they themselves keep control over the conduct of these institutions—what should be taught, who should teach, and so forth. These matters, coming under the head of academic freedom, are left to school boards, to the institutions themselves and to responble leaders. So, too, the Government is excluded from control over cultural and spiritual matters, both vital to the development of the individual.

The position of the present administration, that the Government can fix everything, bypasses this concept of the individual, and replaces it with the con-

cept of mass anonymity. On the other hand, the approach here proposed consists essentially in appealing to millions of people as individuals for the proper implementation of their citizenship responsibilities. Cynics may object that this approach overrates the stature of the American people. Yet if this objection is valid, the hope of maintaining a free republic is vain. The truth is, that the appeal has never been made in modern terms, because the Republican Party has been slow to modernize its own doctrine.

In what follows it will be found that the individual is called upon to play a much more responsible role in the development of society and the maintenance of freedom than has been the case for many decades. This is not mere idealism. It is, frankly, in the belief that the individual American is capable of shouldering such responsibility and that the Republican Party must take this role if it is to hope for any victory at all. I am not willing to agree that the American people are too dumb to govern themselves.

The failure of the Fair Deal Party to recognize Americans as individuals is illustrated by the disgraceful record of that party with regard to civil rights. These rights stem from the fundamental right to liberty, through which every individual, irrespective of race, color, or creed, is entitled to equal political rights and equal protections under the law. Civil rights constitute the core of such rights and protections, guarding every individual against the encroachment of other individuals, and also against the encroachment of his own Government, whether Federal or State.

The Republican Party was founded to proclaim and enforce these rights, and it is now the duty of the party to proceed uncompromisingly to complete this task. The minimum action necessary is an effective anti-lynching law and an effective anti-poll-tax law. Political alliances with those who would withhold the civil rights from certain groups are essentially anti-Republican. The Republican Party should immediately frame a comprehensive program of action for the universal application of civil rights. No compromise with expediency, no alliance for supposed political advantage, can be permitted to divert the party from the fulfillment of this program.

However, freedom in our time cannot be maintained by civil rights alone. The right to life is as fundamental to freedom as the right to liberty; and in an industrial society, in which men and women are dependent for their livelihood upon economic factors wholly beyond their control, the implementation of the right to life becomes largely an economic matter. It gives rise to certain rights, here called social rights, which can be implemented only by providing protection from economic hazards against which the individual cannot hope adequately to insure himself. These hazards include unemployment, old age, accident, ill health, disabilities, and so forth.

Most modern societies recognize these social rights. But they can find no way to implement them except by giving the government monopolistic powers over the people's lives. It is the pressing task of the Republican Party to develop means by which the primary responsibility for the implementing of these rights can be carried by the citizens themselves, for by no other means can the free economic way of life be maintained.

This does not mean that the Government should play no part in making these social rights real. On the contrary, it is Government's role to provide substantial assistance. This it can do, chiefly, in four ways: First, by wise legislation defining the responsibilities of private parties; second, by the encouragement of education for the better understanding of citizenship responsibilities; third, by direct grants; and fourth, by offering economic incentives, such as tax benefits, to encourage private individuals and organizations to implement the rights for themselves.

If social rights and responsibilities are thus defined by adequate legislation, if their recognition is encouraged, and if their violation is punished by the due processes of law, the citizens of this country will rapidly build the social insurances they need. Such insurances, retained in the hands of the people, would be roughly commensurate with the economy's ability to pay—a great advantage over the present political handout system. The threat of State monopoly, which now hangs over our society like a dark cloud, would be dispelled. And American politics would be freed from the psychological tyranny now exercised by the Fair Deal Party, which persists in exploiting the people's economic fears for partisan political purposes.

The level at which such social insurances can be maintained, however, depends ultimately upon national productivity. The Republican Party should adopt, as the keystone of its economic policy, the constant expansion of American productivity on a competitive basis.

Such expansion can best be achieved by, first, the exercise of maximum efficiency and economy in Government, as recommended by the Hoover Commission; second, the utilization of the taxing power to provide maximum industrial incentives for owners, managers, and workers; third, vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws to curb monopoly capital; fourth, intelligent conservation of our national resources; and fifth, long-range subsidies through public works and projects designed to stimulate new economic opportunities.

None of these measures will avail, however, if the present inflationary tactics of this Administration continue. These tactics have placed more dollars in people's hands—but the dollars are worth far less. This soft money policy constitutes in effect a cruel tax on savings and life insurance. In addition, swollen expenditures by the Federal Government, resulting in deficits even in prosperous times, have piled on every citizen an enormous burden of taxation, much of it concealed.

The Republican Party has always stood for a sound dollar and should now reiterate this stand. It is the obligation of the Republican Party to show that profligate fiscal policies, while temporarily gratifying, in the end inhibit growth and fool the people.

The Fair Dealers claim that we are faced with the choice of damaging our system through excessive taxation or borrowing against the future by unbalancing the budget to provide the funds necessary for defense and aid to other countries to meet the threat of Communist aggression. I emphatically hold that to meet this problem, and at the same time to give the people the services to which they are entitled, it is imperative that there be instituted administrative economies, including the recommendations called for by the Hoover Commission, to balance the budget.

Deficit spending may be useful for the purpose of counterbalancing the economic cycle, and to this end the party should begin to plan for public works that could profitably be undertaken if the cycle were to turn downward.

It has long been the policy of this administration to maintain itself in power by granting concessions to special groups of citizens. The Fair Deal has thus become a loosely knit alliance between such groups, each fighting for its own interest at public expense. It is sometimes said that in order to win office Republicans should try to outbid the Fair Deal. Aside from the fact that such a course would be politically futile, it is repugnant to the ideals and principles of good republicanism.

The real hope of the party with regard to this issue lies in an entirely different course. As already indicated, it must stand or fall on the proposition that the majority of Americans are individuals capable of responding to the challenge of modern citizenship. The Republican Party must dedicate itself wholeheartedly to the doctrine that the national interest is paramount to self-interest. It should constantly point out that special concessions by Government to one group have to be paid for by all other groups. Consideration of justice or of economic growth may well lead to special concessions, but in this event all groups should have a voice in the decision. The welfare of the whole must be the dominant consideration.

Organized labor is one of the groups in our society that raises a problem under this heading. This problem centers around the fact that the right of collective bargaining is an elementary social right. Like other rights, it is subject to abuse—and has in fact been abused. Yet the abuses cannot be corrected merely by devising punishments or exercising the police power, both of which, under certain circumstances, may constitute threats to the very existence of the right. A punitive attitude will never solve the labor problem.

The problem raised by collective bargaining is essentially a problem of responsibility, and the Republican Party can solve it only by thinking of it in those terms. The primary responsibility for industrial peace, in other words, should be placed squarely upon owners, managers, and workers; and legislation should be framed defining the responsi-

bilities of each with due regard for the right of the community to protect itself.

It is naturally necessary to provide due punishment where those in power fail to live up to their responsibilities; yet in a free republic the assumption must be made that responsibilities, once clearly defined, will be accepted by the overwhelming majority, who will thus protect the essential rights involved. This principle, indeed, has been applied for years in the enforcement of the antitrust laws, where the primary responsibility for avoiding practices in restraint of trade has been placed upon private ownership. The concept of responsibility, as applied by those laws to industrial corporations, is also applicable to trade unions. The Republican Party must guard labor's rights, as it did in the Republican-sponsored Norris-La Guardia Act, but it must at the same time insist upon the fulfillment of their public responsibilities by all the bargaining parties—labor, management, and ownership. In addition, the party should proceed to devise a system of incentives that will encourage peaceful bargaining and the profitable participation of labor in the fruits of increased productivity.

The farmers are another group that needs special attention. They offer both a problem and an opportunity. The problem arises from the fact that the farmer cannot suddenly adjust his production to meet the requirements of supply and demand, the way other types of producers can. The opportunity arises from the fact that the farmers, when prosperous, provide the best per capita market for the products of our industrial plants. A steep drop in farm purchasing power will be felt to an aggravated degree by the entire national economy. By the same token, prosperous farmers mean a prosperous country.

The profligate agricultural policy of the Fair Deal is now resulting in diminishing returns for the farmer. In their eagerness to buy farm votes, regardless of the ultimate effect upon the national economy, or on the farmer himself, the Fair Dealers have brought millions of farmers to the point of controlled production and lower income. The damage has already been done. There is no completely painless way to undo it.

Farm supports cannot be dropped now. Any attempt to abandon them suddenly would be disastrous. On the other hand, the present humiliating policy of forcing the farmer to be dependent upon Government hand-outs for his income cannot go on indefinitely. There is dire need, therefore, for the creation of a new long-range policy that will undertake to maintain the prosperity of the American farmer through positive measures that will have a constructive, rather than a destructive, effect upon the economy.

Such a policy would begin with the installation of income-producing programs—such as, for example, programs for broadening consumption, cooperative endeavors, better financing, constructive soil conservation, new industrial uses for farm products, more intelligent marketing and distribution, and so forth. All such programs should be formulated, insofar as possible, by the farmer himself, who, like other Americans, should be encouraged to exercise responsibility for his own welfare in relation to the welfare of the whole. Insofar as these positive measures are unable to meet the requirements of the farmer, price supports should be used to supplement them. But a realistic program of positive measures will enable us to reduce price supports to a minimum.

In the meantime, as a means of working out of a dilemma into which the present administration has plunged the farmer, the price-support program should be so directed as to encourage the production of commodities for which a demand exists and discourage the production of commodities now in heavy surplus. This means a flexible-support program, with a minimum floor below which prices will not be permitted to fall. Farm problems will not be solved by supporting high prices for uneconomic production, but only by assisting the production of those commodities that will strengthen farm income and the national economy.

The Fair Deal solution to the farmers' problems has been to give more power to government. The Republican solution must be: "Prosperity based upon freedom for the farmer and a minimum of control."

During the last decade of the nineteenth century the Republican Party developed a strong internationalist policy which laid the foundation for the world leadership that this country has now at length achieved.

The Republican Party must now carry on its own internationalist tradition by a full acceptance of the responsibility of the United States as the leading nation of free men. It must insist on world-wide policies to meet world-wide dangers. It should emphasize that, if our foreign policy is to succeed in preserving both peace and freedom, then its prime objective must be to support and strengthen the United Nations.

The active participation of the party in a bipartisan foreign policy during recent years is an achievement in which it can take great pride. I endorse the continuance of such a policy. This does not mean, however, that Republicans must passively accept without argument everything proposed by this administration. It means simply, first, that Republicans should pledge themselves to consider matters of foreign policy from a standpoint of patriotism, not partisanship; and second, that certain Republican leaders who have knowledge of international matters should be given a voice in the formation of all policies to be applied beyond our shores.

The Republican Party should apply abroad the same principle of self-help that it applies to domestic issues. From its great store of knowledge regarding industry and business it should devise practical programs that will enable other nations to help themselves—to the greatest possible benefit to all. And the great humanitarian traditions of the party should be continued through a policy of hospitality to the exiled and oppressed.

The nature of United States responsibilities in the Pacific was first grasped, around the turn of the century, by the Republican Party. In recent years the party has witnessed the disintegration under the present administration of wise and long-established policies toward China, with the result that this traditional friend of the American people has been abandoned to communism. The situation in the Far East has now deteriorated to such a point that it can only be repaired on a long-range basis. The Republican Party should develop a new and positive far-eastern policy. We should give assurance to the people of Asia that the United States has no intention of intruding into their affairs in a dominating or possessive manner. Another constructive move might be to set up a Pacific council, into which we could invite the Philippines, southern Korea, Indonesia, Thailand, Indochina, Australia, New Zealand, India, Pakistan, and, eventually, Japan. Such a council would show the people of Asia that we do not intend to act unilaterally in that area, but would at the same time assure them of our assistance in the maintenance and development of their freedom.

All nations in foreign affairs are now overshadowed by the potential conflict, terrifying in its implications, between the United States and Russia. It is not my intention to attempt to set forth a detailed policy on this matter. Two general principles, however, must provide the base for whatever policy is developed. We should first remember that American policy will not be respected unless we are adequately armed; and therefore, while we shall want to hold our military strength at a minimum, it is necessary to assure ourselves that this minimum is adequate and is being effectively implemented by the Secretary of Defense.

On the other hand, however, since Communist aggression is primarily political in character, we cannot defend ourselves against it by purely military means. Further defense must be found in the power of ideas. This requires that we ourselves must be loyal to the ideas and ideals of our Republic. We must never forget that in international matters principles are at stake, and that these principles eventually shape the destiny of the world, for war or peace, for slavery or freedom. Every time the United States acts out of mere expediency we lose ground and war is brought closer to us. The real power of the United States is moral power. We must, therefore, define our principles with complete clarity and then stand firmly upon them. And we must eventually implement them economically. Through liberal trade policies, the encouragement of the flow of private capital, and the building of hope everywhere, we should make democracy work so well that political aggression against it will become impossible.

As already stated, this declaration has not attempted to propose specific legislation. That is a task—and a great one—that still lies ahead of a revitalized Republican Party. My aim has been, rather, to set forth a fundamental point

of view, which has its roots in historical Republican policies, and which I believe to be capable of inspiring the American people to new achievements, both social and economic.

Yet the essence of this point of view is neither economic nor social, but moral. It is my belief that the American people, as individuals, are able and willing to make moral judgments regarding their affairs. It is my belief that in such judgments, in the last analysis, lies the real power of America, and the real hope of freedom everywhere. My opposition to those, who would supplant the individual by an all-powerful government, lies precisely here. Moral decisions originate with individuals, not with Government bureaus. The concept that government is responsible for everything, whether social or economic, deprives the common man of the opportunity, and hence eventually, of the ability to make moral judgments for himself. It will therefore, in the long run, corrode the fibers of American society. This, rather than any particular legislative enactment, is what opens the way to statism.

I take my ultimate stand on the willingness and ability of the overwhelming majority of Americans to make moral judgments. It is the task of the Republican Party to explain and implement these Republican principles, founding upon them a new political era.

Bill Introduced To Simplify Governmental Accounting and Auditing Methods and Procedures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 5, 1950

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the budget and accounting procedures bill of 1950 to authorize the President to determine the form of the national budget and of departmental estimates, to modernize and simplify governmental accounting and auditing methods and procedures.

The Hoover Commission in its report last year advocated a general overhaul of Federal fiscal procedures. The present accounting and auditing methods which are now controlled by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 are obsolete. They do not provide the Government nor the taxpayer with accurate and complete information as to revenue received and expenditures made by the Government in connection with its operations.

This bill provides a complete framework for bringing the budgeting, accounting, and auditing procedures of the Government up to date. It will set up an accounting system patterned after sound commercial practices and will provide better controls over all Federal funds.

Title I on budgeting and accounting contains two parts. The first, on budgeting, clarifies the Budget and Accounting Act to emphasize authority for the preparation of a performance budget with financial information in terms of functions and activities of the Government, and a segregation of operating and of capital and investment programs. Technical amendments to the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act are made in aid of the objective to develop budgetary information in the manner best suited to present the financial program of the Government. Increased emphasis is placed by the bill on the development by the President through the Bureau of the Budget of plans for the organization, coordination, and management of the executive branch with a view to efficient and economical service, and improvements in the gathering, compiling, analysis, and publication of statistical information by the executive branch. The authority thus granted would supplement existing authority relating to these matters.

Part 2 of title I comprises a complete Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950. This legislation embodies the principles and objectives of the cooperative program which is being conducted under the leadership of the Comptroller General of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to improve the Government's accounting, financial reporting, and auditing. The provisions of this part will also facilitate the attainment of the budgetary improvements provided for elsewhere in the bill. This part spells out clear-cut responsibilities and duties while at the same time providing for their exercise in proper relationship and cooperation toward the common goal of making accounting, financial reporting, budgeting, and auditing of the greatest value.

The careful allocation of responsibilities is designed to produce an integrated accounting system for the Government as a whole. Emphasis is placed on the development and use of agency accounting systems as the foundation for financial control and the production of necessary financial information. Provision is made for progressive improvement and simplification of the present accounting of the Government and a specific basis is laid for more comprehensive and selective performance of the independent audit by the General Accounting Office to the fullest extent practicable at the site of operations. This legislation will provide flexibility that is urgently needed for putting into effect more economical and efficient accounting and auditing procedures in order to obtain maximum benefits from work now going forward under the joint accounting program and lays a solid foundation for carrying out the policies and objectives of the program.

Title II provides for certain transfers between appropriations within a 5 percent limit in departments in order to promote economy and efficiency, and requires prior approval of department heads before the submission to the Bureau of the Budget, the President, or the Congress by departments of requests for legislation authorizing subsequent appropriations. It also includes provisions authorizing the President to set up reserves from appropriations for the executive branch when he determines the purposes intended by the Congress will be accomplished by lesser expenditures. Further authority is provided for transfer of balances of appropriations incident to reorganizations in the executive branch.

Title III repeals over a hundred acts or parts of acts relating mainly to the compilation of the estimates and the furnishing of certain financial data, most of which have been superseded or rendered outmoded by other existing provisions of law, particularly the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921.

I strongly commend this legislation to the attention of every Member and wish to express the hope that early action will be taken on the measure in order that the budgeting, accounting, and auditing of the Government can be simplified, modernized, and made effective to the maximum extent possible to provide the Congress and the President the information and the means of control they need for management of our gigantic Federal fiscal structure, as well as giving the taxpayers the information they are entitled to as to where their money goes.

Flash Flood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 5, 1950

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, so many people have contacted me and so many statements have been made regarding the disastrous flood which struck Muskingum, Morgan, and Perry Counties a couple of weeks ago, that it seems fitting and proper that a full detailed report be submitted regarding this particular disaster as well as to set forth the procedure which is followed in times like this.

When a disaster of this kind strikes the first relief agency on the scene is the American Red Cross and occasionally the Salvation Army.

Next the Army engineers appear on the scene. They have an emergency fund which may be used in situations of this kind. However, they do not have any money for direct grants or gifts to the victims of the disaster.

The next agencies usually appearing are the Soil Conservation and the Forestry Service, which deals with the problems not dealt with by either the Red Cross or the Army engineers, but is confined mostly to erosion, and so forth.

The American Red Cross notifies the RFC that a real disaster area exists and the RFC as it has been doing since it instituted its program of disaster loans in 1937, sends its representatives into the area to receive applications for rehabilitation loans. Here again no direct grant or gift is made to the people. In this case

the RFC, following the recommendations of the Red Cross, declared Muskingum, Morgan and Perry Counties to be a disaster area.

The Farmers Home Loan will also make disaster loans but only to farmers who may have suffered loss. A good many years ago they also had a fund from which they could make direct gifts or grants to farmers for direct relief. However, this fund no longer exists, so that they now fulfill only the same function as the RFC, except that they make loans only to the farmers, while RFC covers all classes.

Therefore after seeing that the Red Cross, the Army Engineers, the Forestry and Soil Conservation Service, the RFC and the Farmers Home Loan all had representatives on the scene and were doing everything within their power to relieve distress and suffering, the only remaining step which could be taken in an effort to render direct financial benefit to the victims of the disaster, was for me to introduce a resolution stating that it was the sense of the Congress that President Truman make available immediately $25,000 from his emergency fund to the city council of Crooksville for them to use as they saw fit. This emergency fund of the President is the only Federal fund available from which direct gifts of this kind may be made. This fund was set up by Congress during the war in order that the President might have money available for just such an occasion as this.

The Bureau of the Budget informed me that this fund still contained $60,000, and it was from this amount that I hoped the President would make available the $25,000 called for in my resolution. The new appropriation bill continues the emergency act and also replenishes it with $1,000,000 in cash.

Following the introduction of this resolution I directed a letter to President Truman calling upon him to make this money available to the city council. Knowing that the President would wait to receive a recommendation from the General Services Administration before taking any action, I also contacted this agency setting forth the facts and requesting them to make an on-the-spot inspection. I am now in receipt of a letter from the General Services Administration, signed by Mr. Russell Forbes, Acting Administrator, in which he states, in part:

> We have detailed one of our field engineers to look into the situation at Crooksville and, accordingly, will be familiar with conditions should we be asked for a recommendation on extending financial assistance to this unfortunate community.

I can now only hope that President Truman will call upon the General Services Administration for their report, and that based on their favorable recommendation he will make this $25,000 available at once.

Aside from direct relief, the other step which could be taken was for me to introduce a resolution calling upon the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives to grant authority to the Army engineers to make a resurvey of this area and to include Crooksville in this new survey and submit their recommendations back to the committee. I took this action immediately following the flood.

A comprehensive survey and report on this area was previously made by the Army engineers, but it did not include Crooksville. Colonel Hiatt, of the Army engineers, informs me that this report was in 1943 or 1944 and was based on the highest flood up to that time. The flood in this area on the 16th of last month was higher by 2 feet than any ever experienced in this area.

Therefore, since the immediate relief has been dealt with, and since President Truman has been requested to make immediately available money from the only fund for this type of service, and since the Army engineers have been instructed to make a complete survey and report their recommendations to prevent a future disaster of this kind, it would seem that everything which can be done at this time has already been achieved.

Naturally I intend to continue working with Senators TAFT and BRICKER, as well as Congressman SECREST, in an effort to guarantee passage of legislation looking toward the construction of the flood wall in the Roseville area already recommended, and also for the inclusion of any and all other construction which the Army engineers may recommend to protect Crooksville and the contingent areas from a reoccurrence of another devastating catastrophe.

A Fairy Tale—Or Is It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 3, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, today I received a letter from the Honorable Frank Crowther, a former longtime and distinguished Member of this House from the great State of New York. He served here for 24 years, each of which was a notable one. Since his retirement he has lived in Pueblo, Colo. In his letter he enclosed an article entitled "A Fairy Tale—Or Is It?" by Dr. H. E. Coakley, of Pueblo.

I offer this splendid article for the RECORD and commend it to the thoughtful consideration of the Members:

A FAIRY TALE—OR IS IT?

Once upon a time there was a house. It was a very lovely house, and, having been constructed over a period of many, many years by craftsmen who knew their business, it was a very well built house indeed and stood sturdy and stanch against the elements.

Its timbers were sound and substantial; its walls were built solidly and true, and an honestly constructed roof kept out the rain, the sleet and the snow. Proudly upholding the entire edifice was a massive foundation of well-laid brick.

Each solid integral part did its share and it seemed that the structure must endure forever.

Then came an organizer. Outwardly his appearance was kindly and benign and his voice was suave and persuasive. He spoke softly to the little bricks who stood shoulder to shoulder in the immovable foundation.

"My friends, why are you satisfied to occupy so lowly a position in this magnificent structure?"

And the answer came, "We are doing that for which we were intended and which we best know how to do."

And the suave persuasive voice said, "But you are being imposed upon most grievously. Here are you, supporting upon your shoulders the crushing weight of these idlers above you. Look at the roof! It lies basking in the sun, enjoying the fruits of your labor which makes its existence possible. You are equally entitled to the life of ease it enjoys at your expense."

To this, one guillible little brick replied, "You are right; why should we who do all the work be imposed upon? I, too, would like to be a part of the roof."

When the organizer extracted the little brick from the foundation and tossed it upon the roof. There it lay, freed from its burden and revelling in the sunshine, forgetting that its place in the sun threw an added burden upon its brethren.

Soon it called loudly to its fellows, "You are fools to continue supporting the weight of this structure. Let our good friend toss you too up where life is easy and toil and sweat are no more."

So more and more bricks from the foundation joined their brother on the roof and very soon it became a joyous gathering of those emancipated from the bondage of labor.

Ere long, timbers began to creak, cracks appeared in the heretofore impregnable walls and ever so gently the roof began to sag. Did this deter the remaining remnants of the foundation from their rapid ascent to the roof? Not in the least.

Finally a vagrant breeze gently nudged the undermined, top-heavy building and, with a great crashing and rending of timbers and masonry, the once beautiful and useful dwelling crumbled into dust.

H. E. COAKLEY, M. D.
PUEBLO, COLO., *November 22, 1949.*

The Good Old U. S. A.: The Best Country With the Best Government on Earth—Let's Keep It That Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, if our country is to continue to enjoy the blessings of good government, the voters should not neglect their privilege to vote in the primaries.

ADVICE TO VOTERS EVERYWHERE

Do your part to give our country good government.

Be sure and vote in primaries. Go to the polls and pick out the men and women you want to serve you in public office.

It has taken a long time and much effort to get the privilege to select the candidates in either party you want to have the right to vote for in the general election.

Now that you have that right, do not sacrifice it by neglect.

Do your part to give our country good government.

UAW-CIO Backs National Health Insurance—Calls Voluntary Plans Inadequate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 5, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach a significant address given by Harry Becker, director of the UAW-CIO social security department, before the conference of presidents and officers of the American Medical Association in San Francisco June 25. Titled "The Problem of Prepaid Medical Care," it is a logical and well-stated declaration of the reasons labor generally, and the UAW-CIO specifically, support national health insurance and the rest of the President's national health program. Becker, an experienced expert in the analysis of the inadequacies of voluntary health insurance systems, rejects voluntary health schemes as a satisfactory solution to union health problems. He likewise warns the doctors that their association with organizations like the Committee for Constitutional Government tends to make large segments of our population mistrust the motives of organized medicine.

THE PROBLEM OF PREPAID MEDICAL CARE

Prepaid medical care is one of the major public policy questions before the American people today. Since it has become an issue of public policy, it has become a political issue—as it properly should. For in our democratic society the right to make political decisions on matters that concern all of us distinguishes our form of government from the kinds of government that exist today in many other parts of the world. There are now 10 different bills dealing with health insurance before the Congress. Members from both sides of the aisle have signed these bills—some of which have bipartisan sponsorship. At least one out of every five Senators has signed his name to one or more of these pending health-insurance measures.

It is no cause for alarm that prepaid medical care has become a political issue.

In resolving this issue application of the democratic process is as fundamental as the decision that is reached. The physicians of America as well as the general public have a common stake in the free and honest application of our democratic process in solving this issue of prepaid medical care.

We are spending billions of dollars to protect our form of government and to demonstrate its meaning to other peoples of the world. It is futile to appropriate enormous sums of money for these purposes if we cannot resolve satisfactorily at home, within the social and political framework of our society, such questions as how to meet the people's need for medical care. Our answer to communism is democracy—not just the idea of democracy, but a demonstration of how it works to meet the needs of people. In this, organized labor and the physicians have a common interest and a common determination.

ECONOMIC BARRIER TO HEALTH

The demand for prepaid medical care grows out of recognition that the average family cannot pay for costly illness unless an insurance method for spreading the costs is developed. The workingman knows that recommended treatment for himself and family often cannot be obtained because he cannot pay for it. Prepayment is the basic approach to removing this economic barrier.

A few decades ago the highest quality of medical care represented a very different standard from that available today in some of our modern medical institutions—as different as the model-T Ford is from the car of today.

Improved medical-care standards are a part of the larger movement for higher standards of living. Higher standards are inevitable; they are part of the fight for human progress and a better life for all men. Higher standards of medical care for all people result from more knowledge and improved methods of distribution. The medical advances of the past 10 years alone have changed patterns of practice and changed, likewise, our concepts of satisfactory standards of care. But these developments mean higher costs to the consumer.

The physicians of America have agreed that today's higher medical costs can best be met by some form of prepayment. The need for prepayment is not at issue; the issue, rather, is whether prepayment shall be accomplished through a system of public insurance or through a system of voluntary insurance augmented with governmental action.

AMA SPENDS MILLIONS

Millions of dollars have been spent in the past several years by the American Medical Association and groups associated with it in the fight against national health insurance. The effect of this widespread and intensive program has been to promote public awareness of the insurance idea and the advantages of prepayment. The American Medical Association, therefore, deserves not-often-expressed credit for helping to sell health insurance to the American people and for making our Congress aware that certain national health problems do exist and that they exist as public issues. This awareness has been further stimulated by the Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans and the commercial insurance companies in connection with their sales programs.

Organized labor and many physicians agree that the common objective is to bring the highest quality of medical care within reach of all people—that economic barriers to needed medical care must be lifted by a system of prepayment. From that point on, we have an area of controversy which will be resolved by Congress within the next few years.

It is to be expected that organized labor—that international unions such as UAW-CIO—would have a position on this major issue. Likewise, we should expect the physicians' organization—the American Medical Association—to have a point of view on the issue. When the mechanism for financing goods and services which the people need becomes a public issue, we can expect that the consumers and the providers of services may have somewhat different positions. Since workers are consumers of medical services and physicians are suppliers, it is not surprising that organized labor and the organized medical professions differ on the method of providing prepaid medical care.

FOR NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

Organized labor feels that the demand for health insurance should be met by a comprehensive national health program, including national health insurance developed within the framework of our national health and social-security policy. Such a national health program would represent a coordinated program for the following purposes: Furthering medical research; building programs of preventive medicine; strengthening facilities for training professional personnel; aiding the establishment of hospital and clinic facilities in areas of special need; and establishing methods of prepaying personal medical care to assure adequate financing of the care needed by all members of our society.

Labor's reasons for this position have been stated before. The methods of making medical care available and of paying for it have not kept pace with our technical know-how. There is a gap between the best that medical science and practice has to offer and that which is generally received by the people. We have not fully developed the vast potential for well-being and more healthful lives that is within our grasp. It is the desire to fill the gap between where we are and where we could be in bringing the best in medical care to the people that motivates labor to push for and support a comprehensive national health program.

A problem as complex as health insurance requires a synthesis of ideas from several different fields of thought and experience if we are to understand all of the factors involved. No one of us has within ourselves the resources to do this effectively and easily. Most of us expose ourselves to those journals and other mediums of communication peculiar to our own professions—neglecting the vital cross-fertilization that results from pulling together ideas from several schools of thought.

So it requires bringing together people who can add to our own fund of knowledge their experience and points of view. We will not always agree with these points of view; but only in this way can we have the opportunity to sift the truth from the untruth, the reasonable from the unreasonable and intelligently analyze the problem.

NEED INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS

A physician makes an independent analysis before accepting the diagnosis of a colleague. To diagnose the problems of prepaid medical care also requires tests and checks before independent judgment can be formed. Certainly a diagnosis of the economics of prepaid medical care should be checked and rechecked before being accepted. Too often diagnosis of this problem has been accepted without careful and analytical challenge.

In view of this, we urge every physician in America to reanalyze the problem of prepaid medical care in the same objective and scientific manner that he would diagnose a new patient's medical problem.

Let us at this point prepare our prepaid medical care problem patient for surgery. Let us proceed with our surgery with the same care that we would exercise for a patient with an obscure disease that requires exploratory examination and subsequent treatment. If we are true medical scientists we will not be afraid to examine our patient thoroughly nor to take the necessary steps to accomplish the desired course of treatment.

The American Medical Association in its diagnosis says that governmental prepaid medical care is "socialistic"; is inefficient;

will lower the quality of medical care; and is too costly. To avoid these effects, the American Medical Association recommends that voluntary and nongovernmental agencies be the vehicle for provision of prepaid medical care.

UAW-CIO EXPERIENCE

The UAW-CIO and other unions currently negotiating for partial or fully employer-paid hospital and medical protection for their members and their families are having an opportunity to learn the extent that voluntary agencies are unable to provide prepaid medical care. Through collective bargaining, UAW-CIO has won this year employer contributions toward the cost of prepaid medical care for over half a million families. This number will soon reach a million in our union; and the total number of workers in America for whom such gains are won in collective bargaining will soon reach five to eight million.

Let us examine labor's nation-wide experience in its efforts to provide under collective bargaining agreements prepaid medical care through existing voluntary agencies.

The choices available to labor today for programs developed under collective bargaining are:

1. To utilize the commercial insurance company plans with their cash indemnity approach.

2. To participate in Blue Shield plans sponsored by the State medical societies.

3. To establish union-operated clinics and hospitals.

4. To promote and use such organizations as the health insurance plan of Greater New York, the Group Health Association of Washington, D. C.; or to make agreements directly with physicians in group medical practice or with hospitals with salaried physicians.

The American Medical Association Council on Medical Services has not taken a position in support of the medical society-sponsored plans as the preferred agency. The council gives equal weight to the commercial insurance company and the Blue Shield plan approach. We do not understand why nonprofit prepayment plans sponsored by the State medical societies are not favored by the Council on Medical Services. Neither do we understand why the council does not recommend the consumer-sponsored group medical practice type of plan in preference to the insurance company plans.

COMMERCIAL INSURANCE PLANS HIT

The commercial insurance company prepaid medical plans fail to meet the standards for prepaid medical care implied by the American Medical Association in its criticism of national health insurance proposals. The insurance companies at best provide only cash benefits with payments depending on the surgical procedure or other service performed. These cash benefits bear no direct relation to the cost to the worker of his medical care. Nor do they bear a proper relation to the kind of care for which his physician or physicians should be reimbursed. Thus, they meet neither the workers' nor the physicians' needs for prepaid medical care.

Insurance companies provide an expensive method of prepaid medical care because of high operating expenses. For group insurance the operating cost is measured by the amount of premium dollar allocated for selling, profit, administration and taxes. On the average this is about 20 cents of each premium dollar. Often it is as much as 40 cents.

Benefits under commercial insurance company plans are inadequate when measured by the degeee of protection afforded to the worker and his family. Experience with the cash allowance approach to prepaid medical care indicates that in many instances the existence of the insurance is interpreted by the physician as increasing the worker's abiility to pay for care. Therefore, his fee is larger than it might have been had the benefit not been available—and the worker must pay the extra amount.

NOT FLEXIBLE ENOUGH

Another point that should be made with respect to this approach to prepaid medical care is that within this framework there can be no recognition of quality of care nor does it promise flexibility for development of comprehensive services. In fact, the question might be asked whether or not cash allowances for surgical procedures do not sometimes encourage unnecessary surgery.

We cannot recommend to our members the commercial insurance company approach as a satisfactory method of providing prepaid medical care under collective bargaining contracts. Since the insurance company plans do not satisfy the American Medical Association's own criticism of many prepaid medical plans we sometimes wonder if the support by the American Medical Association of this approach does not indicate that approval is being given to the insurance company plans in exchange for their opposition to national health insurance rather than on the merit of their programs.

BLUE SHIELD PLANS INADEQUATE

Organized labor, in setting up programs under collective bargaining, has found that the Blue Shield plans—like the commercial insurance company plans—fall far short of meeting requirements for prepaid medical care programs when measured by the yardstick used by the American Medical Association in evaluating national health insurance proposals.

We must realize, when we evaluate the Blue Shield plans, that they are relatively new and have not had time to mature. At the same time we must realize that, if they are to be utilized as a method of prepayment for medical care under labor-management contracts they have a job to do that has not been done. The present Blue Shield plans are not satisfactory to labor groups which are making health insurance an issue in negotiations with employers, nor are they satisfactory to many management officials with whom labor negotiates for health insurance.

Specifically our experience with Blue Shield plans has demonstrated the following inadequacies:

1. They do not provide real security to the worker against the economic consequences of illness. The reasons are twofold: First, the Blue Shield plans are limited in scope and generally subscribers have only protection against the cost of surgery; second, the worker has no assurance when he or members of his family are ill that the Blue Shield allowances will meet the full cost of surgical or other types of care; and further, the cash indemnity benefits bear little relationship to the charges made by physicians or to the amount of services rendered.

Blue Shield cannot be the prepayment plan of choice for programs set up under collective bargaining unless the worker can be assured that when he obtains Blue Shield coverage he is given adequate health insurance protection against the costs of medical care. The worker wants security against the cost of illness in the same manner that he wants security against the time when he will be too old to work and too young to die.

HOW TO IMPROVE PLANS

The Blue Shield plans can meet the objection that benefits provided are not full payment for physicians' services rendered by removing the income ceilings entirely, or at least raising them to a level which will assure workers that when illness strikes the full cost of care will be met through the prepayment plan. This would require a family income ceiling of at least $5,000 rather than the present prevailing ceilings of from $2,500 to $3,000. And this income ceiling should be raised without increasing fees and rates to a level that is prohibitive. In most instances any increase in fees should be minor in character to permit selective adjustment of specific fees and not across-the-board increases.

2. In general Blue Shield plans are too expensive for the protection provided because operating costs are still too high In 1948 the average Blue Shield plan spent somewhat less than 15 percent of total income for operating expenses. Some Blue Shield plans have an operating expense more favorable than the national average. Others have operating expense records of one-fourth and more of income. This is too high for a successful prepaid medical care plan.

Also Blue Shield plans, to be successful in competing cost-wise with other types of prepaid medical programs, must experiment with methods of paying physicians, including methods of paying for group medical practice and out-patient clinic services.

3. We feel that medical-insurance plans should maintain and promote incentives for improving the quality of medical care. One of the major American Medical Association criticisms of national health insurance is that it believes the quality of care would be lowered. But the voluntary Blue Shield plans have done practically nothing to improve the general level of medical care, even though much can be done. In fact, some Blue Shield plans are specifically prohibited from being concerned with any aspect of the quality of care.

If medical review and study were given to various aspects of the Blue Shield program, such as studies of doctors' bills and the procedures performed, a necessary public service could be rendered. Group medical practice can be encouraged by the Blue Shield plans as a measure for improvement of quality of care. There are innumerable examples of how an organized prepaid medical program sponsored by the medical profession could take positive action within the framework of acceptable medical ethics to raise the general level of medical care.

4. Organized labor and most, if not all, management groups want a health-insurance plan that is concerned with building a program which removes the economic hazard of nonsurgical as well as surgical illnesses and chronic disease, and which also builds toward prepayment for integrated preventive and treatment programs. However, with but one or two exceptions, the Blue Shield plans have done nothing about such major problems as heart disease, cancer, rheumatic fever, diabetes, tuberculosis, burns, osteomyelitis, severe fractures, and other types of chronic or prolonged illnesses that can be more costly to the worker and his family than a hospital admission for a surgical procedure. These types of chronic illnesses are even greater economic burdens to the worker than the type of medical care now covered by many Blue Shield plans.

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY NEEDED

The Blue Shield plans have failed completely to build toward programs of comprehensive medical and surgical coverage for the full range of medical services, including preventive services, for which prepaid medical care is needed. Where integrated and coordinated community services for adequate care of certain types of illness are lacking the Blue Shield plans have not taken initiative in working with the medical and hospital groups for the providing of programs that the plan administrators and boards of trustees know to be desirable. The Blue Shield plans have not done as good a job of health education as some of the insurance companies. The Blue Shield plans have not accepted their social responsibility to join forces with others in the medical community in building improved city-wide and State-wide medical-care services.

Success of voluntary prepaid medical-care plans should not be measured alone by the number of subscribers. It is impressive to

show the growth of these plans in terms of the number of subscribers. It is significant that 14,000,000 Americans have Blue Shield coverage—but the gap between the type of program that is provided and what is needed is even more significant. We must keep an eye on how rapidly and how adequately we are meeting the real needs of the people.

Generally speaking the Blue Shield plans are not giving the public much more than the insurance companies, and in some cases not as much. This is a serious charge.

The medical profession has a great responsibility in this matter if the voluntary plans are going to meet the objectives of health-insurance programs set up under collective bargaining agreements. The medical profession should be mindful, too, of the fact that in many States, under State law, the medical-society plan has been given a virtual monopoly as the only nonprofit prepaid medical-care plan. The kind of monopoly that Blue Shield enjoys requires a high degree of social and community responsibility.

UNION ACTION

UAW-CIO, for example, feels money obtained through collective bargaining for hospital care should be utilized to strengthen the hospital facilities and services for the entire community and not just for one segment in the community. Hospital and medical programs made possible under collective bargaining contracts should be developed in a manner that will strengthen the total community prepaid hospital and medical care programs as well as facilities for care. In those cities where most workers are assured prepaid medical protection under collective bargaining programs the money available because of these programs will result in higher standards of hospital care and a greater number of hospital beds. Removal, for the patient and the physician, of the economic barriers to the kind and amount of medical care required will mean higher standards of care for the workers and for all members of the community.

To the extent that existing prepaid medical plans do not provide the kind of protection and types of programs that are necessary for a health-insurance plan, unions will have to make agreements directly with hospitals and groups of physicians. In large cities, if presently available prepaid medical care plans are not prepared to move into the broader aspects of the voluntary prepaid medical care job in connection with collective bargaining programs, the New York health insurance plan pattern may be an answer. In smaller cities the group medical practice prepayment plans built around one or two local hospitals may be a solution for the collective bargaining programs.

In sharing with you our criticisms of the existing voluntary prepaid medical care plans which result from our experience with collective-bargaining programs, we realize that many representatives of the medical profession will not agree with all our objections. We believe, however, that our experience is a valid test of what is available today in relation to the desires of our union and many other unions. Even though we recognize that prepaid medical care programs set up under collective bargaining agreements cannot substitute for a health-insurance program covering the entire population, some of the gaps in our collective bargaining programs can be filled by cooperative planning between the unions and the plan administrators. We should fill some of these gaps.

MISTRUST EXISTS

We cannot talk about collective-bargaining programs that require joint planning between ourselves and representatives of the medical profession if they are to be fully effective in meeting their objectives without pointing out that there are serious barriers in the way. The practicing physician must wonder why there exists a feeling of mistrust and misunderstanding between the physicians and such consumer groups as organized labor. It is unfortunate that this situation exists because it impedes progress. But it does exist and something should be said and done about it.

An example of the medical professions' lack of real support of voluntary prepaid health programs is the great difficulties experienced by Blue Cross in establishing national standards of hospital protection to assure full-payment for hospitalized illness. A few months ago one State medical society adopted a resolution in opposition to Blue Cross efforts to establish a standard in that State which would enable Blue Cross to say to its subscribers that its contract would pay the full amount of the hospital bill. Further, when this resolution was passed there was no other recommendation as to how this desirable objective should be accomplished by Blue Cross. How does this medical society expect voluntary plans to provide comprehensive medical care if it will not cooperate with Blue Cross in an attempt to provide a comprehensive prepaid hospital plan? Another example of the medical societies' unwillingness to provide effective prepaid medical plans is their recent refusal in a number of States to increase the income ceilings.

CRITICAL OF AMA PUBLICITY

Another reason for labor's mistrust of the motives of the American Medical Association is the type of publicity it has engaged in. Millions of dollars have been spent to advance the reasons why national health insurance, in the judgment of the American Medical Association, is not a desired method for meeting the existing prepaid medical care problem. The American Medical Association in a recent folder entitled "The American Way Is the Voluntary Way" states that the only question is: "How will you have your health insurance: On a voluntary basis—with sound medical direction? Or on a compulsory basis—with politicians at the controls?" Then the folder proceeds to set forth 50 questions and answers. In many cases the answers are factually incorrect and, for the most part, the language used is intended, not to give an understanding of the problem, but to frighten doctors and others into political action in support of the official American Medical Association position.

For example, the statement is made that Lenin said: "Socialized medicine is the keystone to the arch of the Socialist state." The Library of Congress has been unable to find any evidence that Lenin ever made such a statement. The leaflet follows this unsubstantiated statement with the accusation that those who support national health insurance are supporting Lenin's concept of a Socialist state. This is, of course, untrue, as is made obvious by labor's fight against communism.

Labor is aware that hundreds of thousands of such folders are being distributed while at the same time there is no evidence that organized medicine is making any comparable efforts to meet and solve the problems which are forcing the people to reject the voluntary plans as a substitute for a national health insurance program.

TIE-IN WITH FLYNN BOOK

Labor is also concerned because the American Medical Association has expended much effort and money in the past few months to distribute a book of half-truths and scare words that is as dangerous a threat to our form of society as any piece of literature or activity of the Communist Party. This reactionary, undemocratic book, The Road Ahead, by John T. Flynn, was reviewed in the New York Times as "The latest manifestation of an endemic hysteria presently affecting a considerable segment of our society."

Even if the doctors of America were unaware of the judgment of responsible reviews of this book they should be alarmed at being associated with the kinds of groups that are asking the American Medical Association to finance its distribution. For example, the Committee for Constitutional Government, which circularized the doctors of America urging them to buy it in quantity for their friends and patients, stands for much that would make most physicians cringe with embarrassment. It was reported in the Washington Post a few days ago that a million and a half copies of this book have been bought and distributed by the medical profession. This statement may or may not be precisely correct. The exact number of copies distributed is relatively unimportant. What is striking is that organized medicine would distribute such a book and expect to have our confidence.

It is fair, certainly, to ask what would have been the effect had the energy and money which went into distribution of this book gone into constructive effort to improve prepaid medical care plans.

There are other reasons why organized labor questions the social responsibility of the American Medical Association and why there is misunderstanding between these two groups. One is the American Medical Association opposition to the inclusion in the Federal social-security program of cash income payments for persons who are unable to work because of permanent and total disability. Labor is concerned about the need for retirement security for disabled persons as much as it is for the aged.

Employers have almost without exception recognized the need for incapacity retirement as well as age retirement, and both types of pensions have been provided for in collective bargaining agreements negotiated this past year.

The House of Representatives recognized this need when it passed H. R. 6000—the bill amending the Federal Social Security Act—with a provision for retirement benefits for insured workers who are unable to work because of permanent and total disability. Labor began to feel that at last there was general acceptance of the obvious need of disabled workers. But when hearings were held in the Senate early this year the American Medical Association and the insurance companies led the opposition to disability benefits.

Reasons for the opposition of the insurance companies were obvious—a public disability insurance program would, they feared reduce the volume of sales for disability insurance. Reasons for the American Medical Association opposition to this type of income maintenance protection are not so clear.

AMA OPPOSES DISABILITY CLAUSE

We made a direct appeal to the American Medical Association to support this provision for the disabled or at least to withhold opposition. Labor had reason to feel that organized medicine would not fight this type of social security because in the October 11, 1947, issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association it was stated editorially that "Social-security measures to maintain income such as disability insurance, old-age insurance and public assistance are likewise of vital importance." This editorial comment followed earlier action of the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association favoring disability insurance.

But we were disappointed.

In testimony before the Senate committee on February 28, 1950, the official spokesman for the American Medical Association said his organization was opposed to the permanent and total disability benefit because it might lead to congressional consideration at some future time of health insurance or some form of government medicine for this category of

individuals. He suggested that the permanently disabled should look to local poor relief authorities for any assistance they might need. Local poor relief was regarded as adequate security for these persons; however, the average poor relief payment per family unit for the month in which this statement was made was only $48.71.

Labor will not soon forget that the entire resources of the American Medical Association were thrown into the fight to oppose giving the permanently and totally disabled the same kind of protection that is now given the unemployed and the aged.

It would seem obvious that if voluntary health insurance approach is so vulnerable that an extension of cash income benefits to the permanently and totally disabled is a serious threat, the voluntary plans must not be as valid an alternative to national health insurance as many believe.

When we look at prepaid medical care there are two main problems that come to mind: (1) How can we give all people prepaid comprehensive medical protection, and (2) what can we do to make higher standards of care generally available? Neither of these tasks is simple and neither can be accomplished quickly. But we are going to have to solve them.

PREPAID CARE REQUIRES TEAMWORK

Progress toward these objectives will not be made on a constructive basis until there is the kind of understanding which permits the workers in the shops and on the farms and the physicians of America to work together. For the successful planning and administration of prepaid medical care programs requires the teamwork of the physicians who provide the care and the people who pay the costs. This is a reason why voluntary prepaid medical plans should have more public representatives selected from among the subscribers on the boards of trustees.

Sometime and somehow—but soon—we will find a way to work together to lift the economic barriers so that the highest quality of medical care will be available to all people regardless of their race, where they live, or their economic status.

Labor will continue to press for a comprehensive national health program, including national health insurance, within which program collective-bargaining agreements and voluntary health-insurance plans meeting proper standards can also operate.

Labor will continue to press for legislation necessary to this end while at the same time carrying forward immediately useful nonlegislative programs and seeking at all times the cooperation of physicians and their organizations in behalf of our common goal of better health for Americans.

Harnessing the Cumberland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 5, 1950

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks I desire to include an address delivered by Mr. Harry S. Dyer, of Nashville, before the fourth annual meeting of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association.

In this address Mr. Dyer points out what to me seem logical reasons for the development of the Cumberland River by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The address follows:

HARNESSING THE CUMBERLAND RIVER

(An address by Harry B. Dyer, president, Nashville Bridge Co., before the fourth annual meeting of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Nashville, Tenn., April 21, 1950)

When Mr. Finley and Mr. Sisk invited me to appear on your program to discuss the development of the Cumberland River, I felt somewhat fearful that someone might be overestimating my knowledge of electrical-power development. However, when it was explained to me that what the convention wanted was a more or less factual discussion of the general over-all development and its possibilities, I was glad to accept and bring to you a general idea of the plans and possibilities as I understand them.

Quite naturally, I have some knowledge of and am interested in the Cumberland and its development. I was practically born on the river, and my office, in which I have spent my business life, overlooks the river at Shelby Avenue here. My interest and knowledge, however, has largely been centered upon navigation, as the Nashville Bridge Co. has been a builder of boats and barges since 1917.

Navigation, however, is only one phase of the development and control of the river. Flood control has been one of the most important factors in the development of the Cumberland River, and now the growing importance of electric-power development is becoming more and more recognized, and even recreational facilities made possible by the development of our rivers are adding greatly to the industrial wealth of our State.

I understand the subject of my talk is harnessing the Cumberland River. To me, the word "harnessing" in this case means being able to obtain and control the potential usefulness of which something is capable.

The over-all length of the Cumberland River is almost 700 miles, with a fall of more than 800 feet from its source to its mouth. You will note, from the large map here on the wall, that the upper part of the Cumberland Basin above Burnside, Ky., lies in the Cumberland plateau, and the river and its tributaries flow in deep, narrow valleys bordered by mountainous country. I have followed the upper Cumberland River as best I could by automobile from Burnside almost to its source, which carried me past the beautiful Cumberland Falls, then to Williamsburg, Barbourville, Pineville, Harlan, and to the little city of Cumberland, where I could almost step across in the dry season. From Burnside to Nashville, the river forms a succession of sharp, oxbow bends, and this section of the river used to be navigated in high water seasons by the old, sternwheel packet boats, which in those days were practically the only means of transportation to Burnside and the upper Cumberland Valley. Below Nashville, the alinement is characterized by wider meanders, with fewer sharp bends. I hope you will examine this map more closely at your convenience.

There are nine major tributaries feeding into the Cumberland. Beginning at the source, there are the Laurel, then the Rock Castle, and the South Fork comes at Burnside. Below that, the Obie River comes in near Celina, and then the Caney Fork joins the Cumberland a short distance above Carthage. Stones River flows into the Cumberland about 18 miles above Nashville, and Harpeth River joins up about 35 miles below Nashville; then the Red and Little Rivers come in below Clarksville.

When it is realized that the drainage area of the Cumberland totals almost 18,000 square miles, or nearly half the drainage area of the Tennessee River, one can easily understand some of the problems and potentialities of this great river.

Flood control is one of the important considerations in connection with the harnessing a river, and I shall take up in more detail this important problem. As far back as we can remember, our valuable lands along the river have from time to time been inundated by floodwaters. These floods on the Cumberland are usually confined to the period between the middle of December and the middle of April, and they are caused by storms which generally follow paths from southwest to northeast, more or less parallel to the Tennessee, upper Cumberland, and Ohio River valleys. I have seen the effects of these floods in the Cumberland Valley as far up the river as the little city of Pineville, where there is a mark high on the wall of the lobby of the principal hotel as a reminder of where the floodwaters had been; and, down as far as Paducah, I have seen the floodwater mark as high as my shoulders on the wall in the lobby of the Irvin Cobb Hotel. Right here in Nashville, I have ridden in a boat through our entire plant, where the water was 8 to 10 feet deep, and I have crossed Shelby Avenue at Second Street in a boat. The Red Cross has been called upon to evacuate families in distress along the river-front areas, and the social problem of homeless families, sewers backed up, the spread of disease—any one of these should cause serious concern. It is difficult to estimate the amount of the loss to individuals in connection with the social displacements and sufferings listed above, but it is more practical to estimate some of the industrial losses.

Many industrial sites are rendered untenable by the probability of inundation. Would you buy land and establish an industrial plant to manufacture a product if you knew it might be literally flooded out of business? Control of the river to an ascertainable stage would reclaim for industrial use many sites which are now valueless. Zoning laws have so restricted the areas in which industry can locate, that presently flooded areas are, in some cases, the last resort. We need industry in this area for a balanced economy, and we must take every possible step to protect present industry from damaging floods and to provide new areas free from flood damage.

Fortunately, something has been done about the flood problem. The Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, which is the only agency authorized to do flood-control work on the Cumberland River, undertook a study of the situation some years ago and presented a plan to Congress, which was approved; and funds have been appropriated for partially carrying this plan out. Four large, flood control dams were planned to give flood protection to Nashville. The first of these to be undetraken was the Dale Hollow Dam on the Obie River. This dam has been completed and has been helping to reduce the flood heights here in Nashville. The next flood-control dam to be completed was the Center Hill Dam, which is located a short distance above the mouth of the Caney Fork River. This dam went into operation during the past year and contributed its share in reducing the height of the flood here in Nashville during the past winter. The largest flood-control dam projected for the Cumberland River is the Wolf Creek Dam, which is located on the main stem of the Cumberland River near Jamestown, Ky.

This dam is not yet complete, but it is believed that it will be closed during the coming summer, so that it will lend its aid in controlling the floodwaters of next winter and spring. The fourth flood-control dam which is necessary to complete the flood protection of Nashville is to be located on Stones River and will be known as the Stewarts Ferry Dam. No progress has been made toward the construction of this dam because

Congress has not authorized any funds with which to begin its construction. It will be the missing link in the flood protection of Nashville, and I consider its construction equally urgent with the development of the lower Cumberland.

I am, of course, an industrialist, and I believe in the maximum industrial development from the raw material stage to the finished product. I believe that the South and the Cumberland area should take advantage of all her potentialities in industrial development; and, therefore, we should take all possible advantage of the potentialities for electric power development along the Cumberland River. There has been a surprising increase in the demands for electrical energy in this area, far in excess of anything we had anticipated 10 or 15 years ago. Even now, I do not think we realize the possibilities for increased power consumption in this area in the near future, and I think we should be far-sighted enough to make provision for all possible power development from the Cumberland River. Our recent experience with the coal strike and the continual increase in the cost of coal makes hydroelectric power more and more an important factor which we must consider.

Fortunately, hydroelectric power goes hand in hand with flood control, and the three large flood control dams which I mentioned a few minutes ago are provided with turbines for producing electric power. This brings me to my opening remark that I am not an expert on hydroelectric power production. I have not taken the time to sit down and compute how many acre-feet of water it takes per 100 feet of head to produce so many kilowatt hours of electrical energy, but it is easy to see that the impounded flood waters can be converted into useful electrical energy as they are released; and, although this electric power may be considered as a by-product of flood control, our rapid industrial expansion and development may soon get to the point where power facilities may be the key to further expansion; and then, it will be necessary to construct additional dams designed primarily for power production.

In our own plant, without ample power we could not have manufactured the numerous submarine chasers, mine sweepers, personnel lighters, and various other craft in anything like the time required for the Navy during the war. Motor power, welding, and hundreds of electrical uses all add up to increase industry's demands for more power. The importance of electric power in American industry cannot be exaggerated. The whole question of national defense depends in large measure on our industry, and our industry depends upon whether we take advantage of our opportunity to develop our natural resources, one of which in this area is electric power.

From a report of the President of the United States, dated March 2, 1945, I take this extract: "The power system proposed by the Corps of Engineers for the Cumberland Basin contemplates an ultimate annual output somewhat in excess of 3,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy annually, of which about two-thirds would be continuous or primary energy."

The term primary energy means "electrical energy all the year around." This is the type of electricity every resident and most businesses and industries need and require. You, of course, understand this term even better than I do. To me, it means it's there and available so that you can have it whenever you want it.

I have been informed by the Nashville Electric Service that the requirements of the city of Nashville and Davidson County, the area they serve, is at present more than 900,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually, and is expected shortly to be in excess of 1,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of primary electrical energy annually. That is for every day—not intermittent—use. This means that Nashville alone can absorb about one-third of all the power production now contemplated for the Cumberland River. I am told that the new testing laboratory to be constructed by the Air Force at Tullahoma may eventually require as much electrical power as the entire city of Nashville. So, with new establishments of this kind, coupled with the industrial expansion that is taking place in this area and the probable rapid trend toward electrical residential heating, we will require tremendous quantities of electric power; and, for this reason, I cannot subscribe to less than full and complete development of the Cumberland River with respect to its power potentialities.

In regard to navigation, I have a natural interest; not as to my own business alone, but an interest in the benefits that it can bring to the citizens of this area as a whole. Few people realize how much river navigation means to Nashville and the surrounding area.

By far, the majority of our gasoline and oil is brought into this area by river barge, and if navigation were suddenly to be stopped, we would have a much worse gasoline shortage here than at any time during the war. With the recent increases in general freight rates, barge movements of all types of cargo have increased on the Cumberland River by leaps and bounds, even in spite of the inadequate channel and small, obsolete locks and dams. Our locks are so small that only one of the average-size cargo barges in use can be put through the locks at a locking, and it is therefore necessary to have separate lockings for each barge and for the towboat. There are some barges in operation today which are too large to even get in the locks at all, and among these, are the new integrated barges of the Federal Barge Line, which are too wide to come into the Cumberland River locks. When two fleets of five or six barges each arrive at a lock at approximately the same time, the congestion becomes so great that there have been delays of 14 hours or more in getting through a single lock, and there are seven of these obsolete locks between Nashville and the mouth of the river. The dams are of the old, wood and rock crib type, and some of them are set on gravel or dirt foundations. There is always the danger that these obsolete dams on insecure foundations may be undermined and washed out; such a thing would be a catastrophe for the people of Nashville. Already some shifting in the abutment of one of the present dams has been detected. They must be replaced before we lose one.

Not only are the obsolete locks and dams inadequate and in an uncertain condition, but the channel during the low-water season is not sufficient to permit full loading of the larger size barges. This means that only a partial load can be brought up the Cumberland, which further increases the cost of transportation to us here in this area. Estimates made by the Corps of Engineers covering modern navigation facilities in the Cumberland River below Nashville indicate that the ratio of benefits to cost would exceed 3 to 1, and this is the highest ratio of benefits to cost of any river project in the United States. From the businessman's standpoint, it is an excellent investment for the people. So, there is an urgent need for the completion of the entire river development below Nashville, and we must recognize this urgency and do everything possible to have the present dams replaced before some catastrophe overtakes them.

Fortunately, navigation goes hand in hand with electric power development and flood control; and it is possible to combine all three for the fullest development and utilization of the Cumberland River below Nashville. Already, one modern dam has been started below Nashville, but it is only the first link in the chain; and, as you all know, one good link in a poor chain is not much help. It takes all good links to make a chain carry its proper load.

Since the full development of the Lower Cumberland River below Nashville could accomplish a three-fold purpose: the urgently needed increase in electrical power, the urgently needed modern and safe navigation facilities, and an added measure of flood protection on the rivers below the Cumberland, consequently, the full development of the Cumberland River below Nashville should receive top priority in the plans for over-all development of the Cumberland.

As I have already said, this Cumberland and Tennessee Valley area has made great strides in the development of both agriculture and industry, but one great new industry has sprung up more or less as a by-product of harnessing the Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers. The great strides made in recreational facilities and industries incidental thereto have been remarkable. Recreation has become a great industry in Tennessee, and each year brings millions of dollars to our State. The large flood-control and power reservoirs along both the Cumberland and the Tennessee Rivers are providing untold recreational opportunities. These beautiful, artificial lakes throughout our State, and some of our adjoining States, are becoming the subject of conversation of sportsmen and beauty lovers throughout the Nation as a whole. A vacation paradise is what Tennessee is called, and it has all sprung more or less as a byproduct of the full development of our rivers.

The Cumberland River rises in the Appalachian Mountains very close to where the Tennessee River rises. At Harlan, Ky., the Cumberland is only 35 miles from the Tennessee, and it is only 10 miles from the Clinch River, one of the Tennessee's major tributaries. Following more or less parallel courses, they both flow in a southwesterly direction down through Tennessee, then westward, and finally they both turn and flow more or less northward into the Ohio. At their mouths, near Paducah, Ky., these two rivers are only 12 miles apart; and at one point they are less than 3 miles apart, divided only by a low ridge. They are both an integral part of Tennessee; and, in great measure, the problems of both are the same. The seasons, the soils, the annual rainfall, the climate are all similar in nature. Even the shape and the contours of the basins follow the same general pattern; and so it is only natural that they should be considered together in the over-all development of our expansion in Tennessee and the South.

As a businessman, I can appreciate the advantages of operating the various departments of a business under a single management head. Not only is the over-all cost of management reduced, but there is better coordination between departments; and the over-all efficiency can be increased by coordinated, unified planning. I have favored the consolidating and streamlining of Government agencies, as recommended in the Hoover report. I have favored the unification of the Armed Forces under a single head; and, likewise, I can see the advantages of consolidating and unifying the development of these two great rivers of Tennessee. The Tennessee Valley Authority already has the responsibility for the transmission of all the electric power developed both on the Tennessee River and on the Cumberland River, and it also has the responsibility of

always providing adequate electric power wherever it may be called for in this entire area. It would, therefore, seem logical that, if this agency is charged with the responsibility of delivering the right amount of power at the right place at the right time either now or at any time in the future, then it should also have the responsibility for the unified planning and development of the sources from which this power is to be derived.

I have great admiration and respect for the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army; and I think they have done an excellent job of the development of the Cumberland River, as far as they have been able to go with the financing allotted them and with the opposition they have had. I think they should be commended for their courageous efforts in the face of serious obstacles. But I feel that we have struck a stumbling block in the further development of the Cumberland unless we have unified control and unified financing for both of our two great rivers of Tennessee. I, therefore, favor the immediate inclusion of the Cumberland River under the complete jurisdiction of the Tennessee Valley Authority. It would not only consolidate the over-all scheme of planning for the fullest development of both rivers, but it would consolidate the financing of the over-all development in such a manner that the most urgently needed links in the over-all chain of development could be allotted adequate funds so as to carry them through to completion at the most economical rate of construction.

At the present time, the plans for the complete development of the lower Cumberland seem to be somewhat uncertain, and the financing of this urgently needed development seems to be even more uncertain; and I feel sure that the unification of the over-all development and the over-all financing under the one agency will result in the much earlier accomplishment of the full measure of all the advantage possible from this beautiful and powerful stream.

What Is Going on in Germany?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jewish Forum, a respectable and conservative monthly journal of Jewish life and comment published in New York, as it appeared in the July issue. The editorial accurately reflects without hysteria the increasing concern all decent Americans feel over the failure of American denazification policy in Germany.

THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE AND OUR STATE DEPARTMENT

The Anti-Defamation League and its president, Justice Meier Steinbrink, are to be congratulated on their action in refusing to give High Commissioner General McCloy's assistant, Benjamin J. Buttenweiser, an opportunity to propagandize the cause of the Nazis. The Anti-Defamation League reported that the United States "has failed in its denazification and democratization program for western Germany * * *. The same old ruling clique—Prussian militarists, Nazi gangsters, and industrial war lords—is slipping back into power." Yet, Mr. Buttenweiser makes the statement that "nazism in Germany * * * has been destroyed, never to rise again." As Mr. Frank Goldman, national president of B'nai B'rith stated, Mr. Buttenweiser's report was a "calculated insult" to the Jewish people. Or, to say the least, it was an effort on the part of the State Department to get the Jewish people to take American policy with respect to the Nazis as a matter of course. General McCloy's handling of the situation, we feel, has not inspired faith in his promise to deal "swiftly and firmly" with any resurgence of German fascism.

Mr. Buttenweiser himself, after defending American action as occupying power, found it necessary to rebuke the leaders of Germany for their inordinate demands that America "forgive and forget" their past crimes.

In view of the contradictions between word and deed, with regard to the claims of democratizing Germany, we wonder whether the emissary was not used by the State Department as a cat's-paw to cover up its failures.

Who does not know that the American avowed intention when occupying defeated Germany was to transform the Nazi ideology of Hitler's gangsters into one in harmony with American democracy? This, however, turned out to be a complete farce—a travesty on the cause of democracy. Who does not know that, in order to circumscribe the expansiveness of Soviet Russia, the American State Department places great weight on the assistance it expects to get from Hitler's gangsters? It ignores their opportunistic and grasping character and their undying goal of becoming the ruling race of the world—"Deutschland ueber alles?"

It has been proven time and time again that superior physical power cannot, in the long run, win against the superior moral spirit that overcomes all obstacles. In his Memorial Day address, Gen. George C. Marshall, too, stated that "the most important thing for the world today is a spiritual regeneration which would restore a feeling of good faith and good will among men generally. * * * Our sincerity should not be open to question." What sincerity can we attribute to our Government if its influence in Germany fails to discourage the Nazi ideology?

Since a majority of those in the German Government, national as well as local, are known to be former Nazis, as was reported in an official survey by the state denazification ministry, 8,450 former Nazis out of 11,000 officials in the 5 major ministries, it is obvious that the people of Germany, who elected them, carry the same leopard spots of hatred and bestiality that they wore in Hitler's service. That they possess the same savage spirit as during war days may be seen from their brutal attacks on Jewish DP's and from the fact that over 200 Jewish cemeteries in Germany out of a total of 500 have been desecrated since the war, as reported by United States Commissioner for Hesse, James R. Newman. Apparently, they are anxious to wipe out all traces of their murderous deeds. That is why they want us to forgive and forget. But that they have not changed an iota from their savage character may be observed from the report brought back to America after 2 years' experience in Germany by Dr. S. S. Schwarzschild, Rabbi since 1948 of the Liberal Congregation in Berlin. In his Shavuoth sermon, he swore not to set foot on German soil again, since the German people as a whole had failed to show the feeling of remorse and shame that might have been expected at Nazi crimes against the Jews. What has grown, he said, is nationalism, from which their anti-Semitism is inseparable. And even the chairman of the Parliamentary Commission for Restitution in Berlin is not averse to making derogatory references to the victims of fascism who now claim restitution. "Germans," he stated, "both east and west, were taking advantage of the cold war to foster their own unchanged aims of nationalism and expansionism."

Why does the United States court of appeals in Germany practically nullify almost insignificant sentences for damages Nazis keep inflicting on synagogues? Why does the United States Government not use its influence with the British Government not to permit in its zone of occupation the performance of the furiously hate-inciting Passion Play at Oberramergau? Justice is so democratically administered in Germany that Jews are evicted by court order so as to admit in their homes Hitler's SS men—Himmler's elite guard—we presume in preparation for the collapse of the so-called present parliamentary system. The SS, as testified by a member of the prosecution staff at the Nuremburg war crimes trials, Hon. Frederic S. Burin II, in a letter to the New York Times, January 23, 1950, was "the most formidable terror and murder organization known in history. The magnitude of its crimes all but defies human comprehension—about 15,000,000 defenseless civilians and prisoners of war succumbed to its genocidal fury." And he refers to American policy in Germany today as inexpedient as it is immoral to fight the devil with one hand and to comfort Beelzebub with the other, and suggests that this policy would drive our natural allies, the oppressed people of the satellite countries, into the arms of the Soviets through fear of a Germany dominated by the SS.

Why are 75 percent of the officials of the West German state for Wuerttemberg-Baden in the United States zone former Nazis? Why has the United States State Department, as charged by Stanley S. Jacobs, director of the Antidefamation League for the State of Washington, sponsored a tour of Seattle, at the cost of $5,000 in public funds, for two young Germans who spread anti-Semitic propaganda in that State? Why have almost a hundred newspapers that played a decisive part in the spread of anti-Semitism before and during the war been permitted to resume publication in American-occupied Germany?

And what do we find imported from Germany into the United States? Libels just as in the heyday of Nazi incitements that paved the way for mass murders. If the United States Government would not maintain its present attitude toward the restoration of nazidom, would a Chicago Tribune have the arrogance to publish such concoctions as were charged against the Jews in Germany and elsewhere, and as it did recently, to the effect that Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., and Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN form a secret government in the United States, dictating foreign policy? Would a G. A. Richards keep poisoning the air on three radio stations he controls by spreading hatred against the Jew? Would freedom-loving Americans generally find it necessary to be apprehensive of a probable reign of terror should legislation like that of the Mundt bill be passed? Would Hitler's top financial adviser, Hermann Abs, as stated by Senator GUY M. GILLETTE, be welcomed here by various Government agencies in his mission to raise a substantial loan for the giant German cartel, the United Steel Works? Would "former" Nazis be welcomed in large numbers to this country as they are being today? As Senator GILLETTE puts it, "We and the French and the British and the Russians all share the frightful responsibility for recreating the German menace." And he adds, "All Germany's neighbors again are trembling for their safety. They tremble all the more since they know that the menace this time may very well mean subjugation not merely

by German force, but by an alliance of a renazified Germany with the Soviet Union."

By refusing to let the representative of the State Department use the Antidefamation League conference as a medium for helping to congeal our Government's policy vis-à-vis the revival of nazism, the Antidefamation League rendered the important service of calling public attention to the failure of our State Department to be consistent with its declared aim of establishing democracy in naziland. For thus manifesting its alertness and self-respect as a Jewish body, the Antidefamation League of the B'nai B'rith has earned the gratitude not only of Jewry everywhere, but also of all truly democratic Americans.

I am including also the acidulous comment of the American Jewish Congress on both the Buttenweiser incident and a more recent pronouncement from a Brooklyn student:

YOUTH CALLS WEST GERMANS ANTI-NAZI, ANTI-RED

Harvey Leyton Schwartz, a 20-year-old junior at Brooklyn College, returned to New York from a 5-day visit to Berlin with an eyewitness report of the Whitsuntide Communist youth demonstrations and gave an interview to the press on his trip. It was paid for by Common Cause, Inc., and in Berlin he was the guest of the State Department and the allied military government. While there he interviewed and spoke to German students, both western and eastern. "West German students," the New York Herald Tribune reported, Mr. Schwartz said, "know no racial or religious prejudice." The young man said that the west Germans are anti-Nazi and anti-Red. His interviews were made in the company of a representative of the State Department and an interpreter, since Mr. Schwartz speaks no German.

A naive, inexperienced youngster, who appropriately enough is also Jewish, like Buttenweiser, and therefore a good counter to the criticisms by his coreligionists, is given a lovely junket under government auspices for 5 days with all expenses paid, and gets his name into the papers with a pontifical obiter dicta on critical world events. The whole thing is a very exciting and youthfully exuberant, and resembles nothing so much as the guided tours entranced fellow travelers used to take in Russia in the early thirties for up to 6 weeks, after which they would write rapturous books as experts on the Soviet Union. The amount of worthwhile, true information that can be picked up in an occupied capital by a person who doesn't speak the language, has never been in the country before and doesn't know the people guided by a vested interest adviser is dangerously misleading, and certainly cannot be made a generalization for the whole of western Germany. Mr. Schwartz could have gotten the same information in Washington and need not have gone to Berlin.

The fact is that now, as after World War I, German expert Kurt Grossman, formerly head of the German League for Human Rights until the advent of Hitler, points out that only some 10–12 percent of German youth are at all interested in politics, and the danger is that when and if the great leader comes, the other 90 percent will shift to him, and the politically literate and liberal will go to jail or the concentration camp, unless we can help move Germany and Germans sufficiently along the road to democracy to prevent such a result. People who join their parliamentary head in singing Deutschland Ueber Alles are not people who are anti-Nazi or anti-Red; they are pronationalist Germans. Mr. Schwartz' statement on racial and religious prejudice runs counter to all our information from seasoned, reliable observers and correspondents who speak the language, have been in Germany a great deal longer than 5 days, and are not accompanied by official advisers in their news expeditions.

Will the Boom Last?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 5, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD an article that appeared recently in the New Republic by Dr. Dewey Anderson, director of the Public Affairs Institute, entitled "Will the Boom Last?"

This article makes one single fact clear: There is no alternative to an expanding economy for America.

This can best be realized when you consider that industrial production is up to peaks very near the 1948 highs, and yet unemployment remains at nearly 5 percent of the labor force. That means we are in the midst of a boom, and yet we have still not reached full employment.

The reason is simple: Over a million persons are added to the labor force each year. It must be realized that while these persons are job seekers, they are also potential purchasers, and given employment and a source of income, they will add to the purchasing power and to the demand for increased production that will give us full employment.

I commend this article to my colleagues.

WILL THE BOOM LAST?
(By Dewey Anderson)

In recent weeks, the daily press has been filled with optimistic statements about the condition of the national economy. Most of the business prognosticators are saying that the level will be high for at least 6 months or a year. Although the stock market fluctuates wildly, its general course during May and the first half of June was upward; some stocks reached the highest point since the great bull market of the twenties. The employment upturn in April caused optimistic statements to be put out by various Government bureaus, which had apparently stopped worrying about the problem of unemployment.

Was this optimism justified? What are the facts about the employment situation?

The increase in total industrial activity of the late spring has been due to five factors: first, restoration of the depleted inventories of 1949; second, record-breaking construction of houses; third, expanded automobile output; fourth, the influence of greatly enlarged individual borrowing; and fifth, veterans' spending of their $2,800,000,000 insurance dividend.

Offsetting these expansionary factors, there have been other developments which are far from justifying optimism. First of these is our apparent inability to restore full employment as we had in 1948, despite the sharp rise in industrial output. This increase has amounted to 8 percent in the 5 months ending with May, yet the demand for labor has failed to expand appreciably, if you allow for seasonal factors. Nonagricultural employment, on the census basis, had risen only 1 percent by May above the average for the fourth quarter of 1949, when major strikes affected employment. The current level of 3,100,000 unemployed, or 4.9 percent of the civilian labor force, is only slightly lower than the rate of a year ago—5 percent—and 70 percent higher than 2 years ago.

A sharp increase has been experienced in long-term unemployment during the past 2 years. While in the period February to May of this year the number of unemployed decreased by more than 1,500,000, the number unemployed 15 weeks or longer was hardly reduced at all. In May they totaled 1,000,000, including 500,000 who had been out of work 6 months or longer.

The available evidence indicates that the rise in employment and drop in unemployment this spring has almost all been seasonal, reflecting increases in agriculture and construction. An increase in unemployment may be expected to begin about now, when 500,000 college graduates enter a labor market where vacancies are almost nonexistent in many fields. It should continue to rise in the fall after inventories have been built up.

The fact is that we have not been able to expand consumption, and therefore employment, fast enough to keep up with the 1,000,000 people who annually enter the labor market. We are also failing to provide new jobs for those displaced by technological advance. For the economy as a whole, productivity has been increasing lately at about 3 percent per annum, but in certain manufacturing industries, notably durable goods, gains have been as high as 8 to 12 percent. In April 1950, average weekly man-hours of production workers in manufacturing were down 8 percent from 2 years ago, but industry was able to expand output 1.5 percent. Obviously, to reach and keep a maximum level of jobs, we must increase effective demand at least enough to keep pace with these gains in productivity. But gains in real wage income are not keeping abreast of industrial productivity.

Recent increases in output per man are not being adequately reflected either in lowered prices to the consumer or in more money income to labor. Too many of the gains achieved through increased productivity in the past 2 years have gone into undistributed corporate profits and higher dividends. Some consumer prices, notably rents and essential utilities, have risen sharply and are still rising. Others, like food and clothing, which might be expected to go down, fell only moderately.

The existence of "sticky" prices is dramatically evident if we exclude food and fibers from the wholesale price index. There was a noticeable drop in total demand in 1948–49, yet this decline was not in any way reflected in a majority of the industrial commodities included in the index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. More than half of these commodities held their peak postwar prices, while some, such as metals and building materials, rose.

How profits and dividends run away from wages is shown by figures compiled by the New York Federal Reserve Bank and the Council of Economic Advisers. Between January 1949 and April 1950, the bank's index of average hourly earnings in manufactures went up less than 1 percent. On the other hand, the Council of Economic Advisers estimates that corporate profits have risen 16 percent between the second quarter of 1949 and the first quarter of 1950. Cash payments of dividends are up by the same proportion. So it is not surprising that a relatively small increase in industrial activity has created such large increases in corporate profits and that Wall Street is booming.

Yet permanent prosperity will not be sustained if we do not increase consumer demand. This condition is being prevented by

the unbalanced price, wage, and profit relationships described above. If we don't do something about it, recurring unemployment crises are inevitable. It is clear from recent experience, moreover, that moral exhortations to employers to keep prices down and increase wages commensurately with productivity gains have been largely ignored.

This situation has resulted—while adjustments were still capable of being made—in shifts from one occupational group to another. Although total civilian employment in April 1950 was back to about the level of April 1948, there have been sharp drops in two important groups. Skilled workers, craftsmen, foremen, etc., have declined by 600,000, and semiskilled workers, such as machine operatives, have declined by 300,000. Offsetting this drop, the number employed in distribution, including selling, has increased by about a million. These jobs on the whole pay less than the others just mentioned and are taken only when workers are unable to get higher-paid skilled employment. The increase in distribution jobs also demonstrates the return of a buyers' market.

By the beginning of this year, manufacturing was providing about one-third of all nonfarm jobs, as it did before the war. Trade, finance and the service industries were furnishing another third. Transportation is down, public utilities are up, mining is level. Government employment is up. Building is high, with about 5 percent of all nonagricultural jobs. However, the recent cost increases in new houses, the determination of Congress to let the middle-income groups sink or swim by their own efforts, and the absence of plans to develop a replacement market, suggest that the present level of housing construction may not be maintained beyond 1950.

With a return to prewar conditions in the composition of employment, it will be increasingly difficult to find jobs for the technologically unemployed, and newcomers to the labor market. The drift toward the distributive and service trades may continue for a time, but even this could come to a halt.

It is imperative that Government policy should be directed toward solving the problems arising from the unbalanced conditions in the economy described above. This is a primary responsibility of those charged with the implementation of the Employment Act. If it were not for the distribution of the veterans' bonus, the easing of consumer credit and the curtailment of supply temporarily through the steel and coal strikes, the seriousness of the situation would be far more apparent than it is.

Increasing the arms budget is not the way to full employment that most Americans want to travel. That way means high profits for a few. Propping the economy that way means freezing the inequities and enlarging the imbalances in the distribution of income.

The full employment we want is one that rests on high consumption of a variety of goods and rising living standards for the many. This is the kind of full employment the Fair Deal is meant to provide. To get it, Government policy must implement those adjustments in prices, wages, and profits which are necessary.

Soil Fertility and the Nation's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 5 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the National Grange and the American Plant Food Council, Inc., sponsored a Nationwide essay contest for the farm boys and girls of America. This year the essay dealt with the subject Soil Fertility and the Nation's Future. The first prize was won by George F. Dunbar, of East Craftsbury, Vt. The second prize was won by Dennis Barber, of Hub, Miss. The third prize was won by Kenneth L. Allen, of Latta, S. C. The fourth prize was won by Bill McCaw, of Lowden, Wash. The fifth prize was won by Lucille Hahn, of Havana, Ill. The sixth prize was won by Albert B. Harvey, of Hockessin, Del.

I am naturally very proud that the first prize essay was won by George Dunbar, of East Craftsbury, Vt., and I ask unanimous consent that this first prize essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOIL FERTILITY AND THE NATION'S FUTURE—FIRST PLACE ESSAY

(By George F. Dunbar, East Craftsbury, Vt.)

"Since God placed man on the earth, agriculture has existed. There is no occupation that precedes it. * * * Before literature existed, before governments were known, agriculture was the calling of man. And all the fruits of social progress since then grew from the brown soil."

A striking example of the part agriculture plays in the destiny of a nation is set forth in the history of China. This nation was once the center of civilization, but today its barren soils stand as a constant reminder of what the loss of fertility and productiveness will do to a nation's well-being. The land of Canaan once "flowed with milk and honey," but today its people eke out their existence on unproductive soil. And so it has been since time began that each nation has prospered only so long as its agriculture prospered. Let us consider America and its future:

When our forefathers first landed on our shores, they stood on virgin soil. Because this soil was rich it produced bounteous crops; our country expanded and prospered, and our people remained free and independent. In the space of less than 300 years it grew from a tiny settlement into the mightiest Nation on earth. If we are to retain this high position of world leadership and prestige our agriculture must prosper. The happiness and welfare of our people and their continued freedom and independence depend upon the productiveness of our soil. Therefore good land management is a necessity. This means the complete utilization of all lands for continued maximum production. To attain this we must control erosion, conserve water, and return to the soil the needed plant foods and minerals.

Controlling erosion is a very effective way of preserving the fertility of the soil. In the beginning nature covered the land with vegetation for protection against wind and rain. Man destroyed this protection when he began cultivating the land. In 1935 the Soil Conservation Service was established to aid farmers in effecting means to control erosion. This can be done by coutour plowing and strip cropping, erecting wind breaks, and by keeping in sod land that is too steep for cultivation. By terracing and contour cropping water can be better controlled, lessening the danger of gullying and the washing away of valuable topsoil. Stubble mulching and the leaving of crop residue on the surface also is effective in controlling erosion and water run-off.

Cropping, as well as erosion, depletes the plant food in the soil. Plants like all growing things need food for growth and development. The soil, climate, and crops to be raised determine the kinds of plant food needed. Each individual farmer must find out what nutrients are needed for his farm and crops, and apply them accordingly. It takes about as much time and labor to plant and harvest a poor crop as it does a good one, so, if a farmer is to remain prosperous, his per acre yield must be high.

High yields per acre can be obtained by the use of sufficient quantities of plant foods and fertilizers, which include crop residue, green manure crops, barnyard manure, commercial fertilizers and lime. By plowing under crop residue, green manure crops and barnyard manure, valuable organic matter is restored to the soil. This not only adds fertility but also makes better soil structure or tilth. Commercial fertilizers add ntirogen, phosphates, potash, and other minerals. A good farmer does not overlook the fact that crop rotation also adds to the fertility of the soil, especially if the rotation includes a well innoculated legume. The Extension Service, county agents and Soil Conservation Service stand by ready to help each individual farmer with his own specific soil problem.

This idea of a prosperous agriculture is not entirely new, but it is more important today than ever before. Our population is constantly increasing, and we are faced with the problem of feeding this expanding population on the same number of acres as formerly. Also many millions elsewhere will continue to look to America for food and fiber. With good land management our soil will produce abundantly for the health and happiness of our own people, and we will still be able to share our produce with others. If we conserve and use wisely our oldest and most valuable resource—our land—we can assure for ourselves and our posterity a continued high standard of living, freedom, and independence.

Butter Versus Oleomargarine and Silver Versus Banknote Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, despite the opposition of the banks and the financiers of the country, our Government has made a lot of money—profits—in buying silver and converting it into money under the provisions of the Silver Purchase Act.

Our Government could make a lot more money if our national administration had not given the bulk of the surplus silver, accumulated under the silver-purchase program, to the governments of foreign countries.

Many of these governments have coined and put our gift silver in circulation in their country at a higher coinage value than the silver in our United States dollars.

Mr. Speaker, the way the Secretary of the Treasury carries out the provisions of the Silver Purchase Act may be compared with the way a Washington dairyman could run his butter and milk business.

Suppose this dairyman had a support market for all the butter he could churn at a dollar a pound and under his buying program he obtained the milk

around Washington, which he used to make a pound of butter, for 50 cents; and, at the same time, he could procure Indiana and Ohio—foreign—milk that was used to make a pound of butter for 35 cents; and later the supply of Washington milk that made a pound of butter was raised to 70 cents. Look at the money this dairyman could make.

But because this dairyman had a gentleman's agreement with the big companies making the butter substitute, oleomargarine, he limited the sales of the butter he produced so as to come out even with the money he took in and with the money he paid out for all the milk he bought, while he continued to pile up his unsold and unused surplus butter until he accumulated over a billion pounds of perfectly good butter, butter that was in demand in every part of the country; while the oleo people continued to reap in profits by supplying the butter trade with their cheap butter substitutes.

What kind of a businessman would you think that dairyman was especially when you realized he was handling your business?

That is exactly the way the Secretary of the Treasury has been and is operating the silver-purchase program. The record discloses that the Silver Purchase Act, Public Law No. 438, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 19, 1934, provides:

SEC. 3. * * * the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase silver, at home or abroad, for present or future delivery with any direct obligations, coin, or currency of the United States, authorized by law, or with any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, at such rates, at such times, and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem reasonable and most advantageous to the public interest. * * *

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to issue silver certificates in such denominations as he may from time to time prescribe in a face amount not less than the cost of all silver purchased under the authority of section 3, and such certificates shall be placed in actual circulation. There shall be maintained in the Treasury as security for all silver certificates heretofore or hereafter issued and at the time outstanding an amount of silver in bullion and standard silver dollars of a monetary value equal to the face amount of such silver certificates.

In considering the silver purchases authorized under this law, it is interesting to note that it is mandatory for the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase silver, and that he is directed to issue and put in circulation, silver certificates in an amount not less than the cost of all the silver purchased. While it was not mandatory, the Secretary of the Treasury had the authority to use all the silver purchased under the provisions of the act for money by revaluing the silver and putting it in circulation in the form of silver certificates; but if he had used all the silver procured under the purchase program, he would have reduced the demand for Federal Reserve notes by that much and thereby reduced the interest income of the banks on the bonds or the interest-bearing eligible paper—commercial obligations—deposited with banks to support the issuance of Federal notes which the silver certificates would have displaced.

So we find, from the Treasury statement, that instead of putting all silver bought by the Treasury to work as money, the Secretary continued to sterilize and pile up unused silver. The record discloses that by May 6, 1942, the Secretary had bought almost 3,000,000,000 ounces of silver—2,895,667,983 ounces to be exact—which cost the Government on the average of 50 cents per ounce. This silver had a money value of $3,743,893,955 when converted into silver certificates, but the Secretary of the Treasury by following his plan of only converting enough silver into silver certificates to comply with the mandatory provisions of the law, the Secretary limited the issue of silver certificates to $1,964,301,066, leaving 1,365,468,438.5 ounces of silver, with a dollar value of $1,765,454,142 sterilized and lying idle in the United States Treasury.

While this silver was lying idly and unused, the Government continued to borrow and pay interest on money in the form of Federal Reserve notes by issuing bonds. If we calculate the interest on this $1,750,000,000 in the form of this sterilized silver at 2½ percent, we find the Treasury could have saved the taxpayers $44,136,353.55 in interest every year since that date by converting this sterilized silver into money in the form of silver certificates.

But that is not all, the Treasury continued to buy and sterilize silver after reaching the peak of its silver accumulation on May 6, 1942; and from that time on our Government commenced to reduce its accumulation of silver by giving its reserves away to foreign governments faster than it accumulated the silver by its purchase program. Many of these governments proceeded to mint our gift silver and put it into circulation in their country with a money value higher than our silver dollar.

We find from the records of the Treasury the following countries were given silver from the Treasury reserves under a lease-lend arrangement, and none of this silver has been returned except that given back by Belgium. Following is the list of the countries that received our silver free and converted it into money:

Country:	*Fine ounces*
Australia	11,773,093
Belgium	261,333
Ethiopia	5,425,000
Fiji Islands	196,364
Great Britain	88,073,878
India	225,999,904
Netherlands	56,737,241
Saudi Arabia	22,347,431
Grand total	410,814,344

The seigniorage table printed on page 49 of the Treasury Bulletin for April 1950 reveals a total silver seigniorage—profits—on the silver actually converted into money as of April 30, 1950 to be $1,099,600,000; and in addition to the seigniorage on the silver actually converted into money, there was an extra potential seigniorage shown in this table of $1,048,200,000, had all our silver accumulation been converted into money as of 1942. As our sterilized silver accumulation has been dissipated by the Treasury since 1942, the potential seigniorage, as shown by the table in the Treasury Bulletin, has declined since that date.

Now with the whole world clamoring for good old United States of America dollars, and value and redeemability of our paper money stabilized by over two billion in silver dollars and bullion in our monetary metal reserve; and the value of paper money shaky in every other country, it would be a rash economist indeed that will attempt to dispute these figures and decry the use of silver in our currency system, or advocate the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act.

Long Beach (Calif.) Newspaper Says It Is No Time for Political Partisanship and Great Need of Courage and Determination in Trying Days Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 3, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the Long Beach Independent, published daily in my home city, Long Beach, Calif., did, on Friday, June 30, 1950, print and distribute as an editorial, the text hereinafter appearing.

Since said newspaper is generally reputed in that community as Republican, this said editorial is further evidence of the fact that, regardless of political party registration, the prompt and patriotic action of the President of the United States in connection with Korea, including his refusal to consider either demanding or accepting a resignation by Secretary of State Acheson, is also recognized in the most rapidly growing portion of the United States as sound policy and in the best interest of the security of our Nation.

NO TIME FOR POLITICS

Senator TAFT demanded Secretary Acheson resign because Acheson's attitude concerning Formosa had been reversed by the President. The Senator announced his complete support of the President's actions but continued the Republican attack on Acheson because aid had not before been given the Chinese Nationalists under Chiang Kai-shek.

If Secretary Acheson is to be condemned for this attitude a large part of the Republican Party will be equally condemned. If all the errors of judgment over the past 30 years were totaled up they would be about equally divided between Republicans and Democrats. One could start back in 1919 when Woodrow Wilson pleaded for our going into the League of Nations. It was the Republicans' Hiram Johnson and Borah who had most to do with stopping us. Had we been a part of the League there might not have been a World War II.

Then we should recall how we scrapped our battleships under the Republican President Harding. Japan and Germany kept on building and getting stronger and defying the parity agreement. Then it was under Herbert Hoover's term in office in 1931 that Japan first moved into Manchuria.

From that time on the decisions were those of Democrats. It was they who appeased Mussolini and Hitler. It was they who sold out China at the Yalta meeting between Stalin and Roosevelt. It was at Potsdam after Germany's surrender that

President Truman agreed to the division of Korea although Russia was in war against Japan less than a week.

Maybe we made a mistake, but China had a weak, corrupt government we could not help because it would not help itself. The decision to protect Formosa is not a complete reversal of the policy of the State Department. It comes about in the over-all policy set up by the President to stop the further spread of communism wherever it moves.

There is nothing to be gained now by demanding the resignation of Acheson because policies have changed. There is no point in trying to place the blame on President Truman for the mess we are in. Both parties have their share of blame. Most of us have been more interested in making dollars than we have been in world events. Most of us have changed ideas as events have developed.

We are going to need a lot of courage and determination in the trying days ahead. Care must be taken that we do not allow political prejudices to mislead us on important issues. No one but the Russians know if there is to be a world war III. But there is no question about the tenseness under which we will live for some time to come. It is no time for political partisanship. It is time for us to put politics aside on issues involving all foreign affairs and the fighting of the war in which we find ourselves.—L. A. C.

Mismanaging a "Managed" Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 5, 1950

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House, I am very pleased to include in the extension of my remarks an article appearing in the Guaranty Survey, published by the Guaranty Trust Co., of New York, entitled "Mismanaging a 'Managed' Economy."

This is a thoughtful article which is very much to the point, and I hope my colleagues will read it with care. It shows the bewilderment of many citizens at the befuddled and mixed-up operations of those who are planning our economy. As the writer of this article points out, we should heed the advice of Bernard M. Baruch in stopping unnecessary expenditures because we must concentrate what we have left of our resources in arming ourselves against one common enemy—Russia.

This certainly is not a partisan matter, but a matter which all loyal Americans who have the best interests of their country at heart should ponder and support.

MISMANAGING A "MANAGED" ECONOMY

Deficit financing by the United States Government has now continued so long that the warnings of those who see future disaster in deficits as a way of life seem reduced almost to triteness. Yet the continuance of unbalanced budgets into the postwar boom period involves a paradox or contradiction of policy that is relatively new.

In only 2 of the last 20 years has the Federal Government lived within its income. The first part of that period was a time of depression, when deficits were defended as a means of overcoming a shortage of purchasing power, or priming the pump—although it is widely doubted whether they actually had that effect. The second part of the period was a time of war, when Government spending was on such an immense scale that a balanced budget was not a practical possibility. We are now in a third period, in which deficits are not only indefensible on the grounds just mentioned but run directly counter to the compensatory theory that originally prompted them, besides gravely threatening the successful prosecution of the cold war and the social security that is a major objective of Federal policy.

This is peacetime, however precarious, and a period of virtually full employment, high national and personal income, and an unusual level of prosperity in general. Here is a Nation of 150,000,000 people, among whom a near-record total of 59,000,000 are gainfully employed. It is a land blessed with a wealth of natural resources, a range of soil and climate, and a level of industrial efficiency that are the envy of the world. The ordinary American citizen buys more of the necessities and comforts of life than does any other national anywhere. The taxable resources of the Nation are preeminent.

Even for this Nation, the present is a time of exceptional abundance. Industrial activity is running high. Steel production, automobile production, and construction are at record levels. Personal incomes in general have never been so large. Liquid assets of individuals are estimated at more than $200,000,000,000. There are, as always, some weak spots in the over-all picture; yet the general panorama is one of prosperity and virtual full employment. Tax collections are extraordinarily large.

In the face of all these favorable conditions, the Government continues, in good times as in bad, to flout the plain man's common-sense rule that living beyond one's means brings trouble. Inherent in the situation is a serious question of fiscal integrity. If this wealthiest of all nations does not live within its income in a year of unusual prosperity and full employment, such as 1950, when will it?

DEFICITS AND THE MANAGED ECONOMY

But the real irony, or corollary paradox, is discernible under the heading of economic planning and the managed economy that recall the political doctrines and shibboleths of the depression of the 1930's. If the attainment of full employment is the basic aim of social policy, then that condition is here now for all practical purposes, since unemployment is not far above the recognized minimum. In the troublous period of the 1930's the advocates of the managed or compensated economy argued that deficit financing was justifiable in times of widespread unemployment. Heavy Government spending, it was believed, would create jobs, swell purchasing power, prime the pump of recovery. The assumption of social responsibility for leveling out, or at least minimizing, the undulating boom-and-bust cycle in business and employment became an avowed policy. Spending heavily during bad times, the managed economy would provide budgetary surpluses during good times for reducing the national debt. So it was thought.

Then came the greatest of all wars, in which enormous spending and deficit financing were imperative. Its financial aftermath is a huge public debt, which multiplies manyfold the need for a prudent fiscal policy—the need for putting into practice the compensatory principle of making good times pay for the deficit financing of bad times.

These are good times in 1950; so what of the managed or compensated economy as it affects the debt burden? In the concept of a managed economy, what is happening to the managing? Or if ours be a planned economy, then what has become of the plan for debt reduction during good times? The compensated economy is not running on schedule. Instead of showing a budgetary surplus and reducing its debt, the Government keeps borrowing to fulfill its promises and commitments—aside from supporting its essential functions.

DEFICITS AND THE COLD WAR

Necessary spending for defense should be matched by retrenchment elsewhere, not only for the purposes of the compensated economy but for those of the cold war itself. On this point the Nation would do well to heed the sage advice of that elder statesman, Bernard M. Baruch, in his address before the June commencement at Washington University in St. Louis.

"We must, whether we like it or not, be fully armed," declared Mr. Baruch. "We are arming against one foe—Russia.

"We must stop unnecessary expenditures at this time, expenditures which can await greater need or greater financial capacity. We must avoid further inflation which, unless checked, will bring about the ruin which Russia is hopeful will befall us. That is her primary objective of the cold war."

Lenin gave the same warning many years ago when he said that the surest way to destroy capitalism was to debauch the currency. By making the cold war the excuse or the occasion for a loose fiscal policy, we are defeating our own purposes.

THE WEAKNESS OF THE COMPENSATED ECONOMY

Whether in peace or war, the theory of the compensated economy is a doctrinaire principle that suffers from the weaknesses of its kind. The doctrinaire, whatever his philosophy, necessarily formulates his social equation in terms of too few and too simple variables; and reality, which involves many bewilderingly complex variables, naturally intervenes to confound the formula-thinking. Among the imponderables, aside from war or a possibility of war, are the fallibility of human judgments, the self-interests inherent in human nature, both individual and collective, and the changing and unpredictable climate of public opinion. Human society, and more especially democratic society, is not and cannot be made into a laboratory for experimentation under controlled conditions.

If there were no cold war today, there would still be the organized efforts of minority pressure-groups to participate in governmental largess. There would still be the struggle of officeholders against any elimination or curtailment of their functions. There would still be the proverbial tendency of legislators to be swayed by the political popularity of appropriations and the unpopularity of taxes. There would still be the paralyzing fear of even a moderate business recession overhanging a Government that has had the temerity to assume the responsibility for continuing full employment. In a word, there would still be the complex of factors that combine to disprove the doctrinaire assumptions of the planners and the compensators.

The refusal of reality to conform to the doctrine has now led to the alteration of the doctrine. No longer is it deemed necessary to balance the budget over the term of a business cycle. It is not the cyclical swing but secular growth that is now relied upon to equalize receipts and expenditures over the long term. If the Government spends enough now, it is supposed, the economy will expand so greatly that at some future time the budget will balance itself without any painful necessity for a reduction of expenditures

or an increase in tax rates. The compensated economy, in other words, has been shifted from a short-term to a long-term basis.

THE PRESENT OUTLOOK

This novel approach to the fiscal problem has been accepted with surprising complacency, not only in official circles but apparently by large sections of the general public as well. And a political atmosphere of complacency does not encourage a determination to bring Government expenses under prudent control.

As matters look now, there is no prospect of a balanced Federal budget within the foreseeable future. The present need for a balance is not officially admitted. The only recognized necessity is for a long-term balance—a balance in the tomorrow of procrastination. It does not seem to occur to the planners that a growth of population and an expansion of the economy will bring new demands for Government spending at least as fast as they bring new receipts to the Treasury.

Whether governmental deficits are financed by the simple device of printing money or by the more elaborate process of selling Treasury obligations to the banks, as was done on such a huge scale during the last war, the effect is the same—to increase the amount of currency in circulation. When this is done at a time of substantially full employment, the increase in demand cannot be matched by a corresponding increase in supply; so commodities and services become "scarce," and prices rise. The advance of prices may be interrupted or accelerated in a variety of ways, but the broad principle that more dollars mean cheaper dollars invariably holds good in the long run. This is a danger the country faces today.

DEFICITS AND SOCIAL SECURITY

Cheapening the dollar by attrition jeopardizes the whole Federal policy of social security for the masses of citizens. In fact, social security can become social insecurity if and when the dollars paid in old-age pensions, life insurance, and other fixed obligations are dollars of declining purchasing power. In 1940 a pension of $100 a month provided as much in necessities and comforts as one of $168 does now. The $25 received by a citizen today for a maturing United States savings bond has 21 percent less purchasing power than the $18.75 paid for the bond 10 years ago. A hundred dollars deposited in a savings bank in 1940 would, with compound interest, now total about $120, the exact amount depending mainly on the location of the bank; but the purchasing power of the money, instead of increasing approximately 20 percent during the 10 years, would have shrunk nearly 29 percent because of the cheapening of the dollar.

These comparisons, of course, cover the war period, when inflationary governmental financing was inevitable. But they also cover 5 years of the postwar period, during which the habit of deficit financing has been carried over into boom times. Can the Government in good conscience continue to urge its citizens to practice thrift to provide future security for themselves and their families, while at the same time pursuing a fiscal policy that discounts such security?

The thinking American does not desire public parsimony at the sacrifice of good government or adequate military preparedness, but he has the right to expect his Government to exercise enough fiscal prudence to live within its income in a time of full employment and general prosperity. This is a social responsibility that is as binding on the self-styled liberals as on anyone else—especially those who have dogmatically preached the virtues of compensatory governmental spending and held out the prospect of financial security and paternalistic benefits from the public treasury.

Republican Advance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the organization of Republican Advance and its support by 21 House Members should not be considered as creating a bloc in the Republican Party in Congress. It is a serious effort by those of us who see the future of the Republican Party to be in realizing the full benefit of the Nation's productive resources and moral power to state their common principles and guides for individual action.

Millions of Americans have been waiting for just this development in progressive thinking in the Republican Party. They realize that it is essential to the preservation of the two-party system. In addition, it is most important, particularly for the young men and women who want a society with vastly enlarged opportunities. This progressive statement of principles is the basis for a vast expansion of American opportunity domestically and abroad. I am wholeheartedly for it.

Appended is an editorial from today's New York Times on this subject:

REPUBLICAN YEAST

Twenty-one Republican Members of the House of Representatives have endorsed a statement of principles drafted over the week-end by a group of rank-and-filers who call themselves the Republican advance. The statement favors a strongly international foreign policy and a progressive program of domestic legislation.

We welcome the statement and this first reaction to it, for it seems to us that the thinking of the Republican Party has become a little musty. Certainly this comment, taken from the statement, comes close to the mark in explaining Republican adversities in recent years: "Too often the party has been permitted to be maneuvered into a position of purely negative opposition. Too often the appearance has been created that the party is not merely anti-Socialist but antisocial. The situation is made worse by the fact that many Republicans who have frankly espoused some of the important social goals have been accused by members of their own party of being 'me, too.' This accusation displays a lack of clear thinking that seems almost fantastic." The history of the Republican attitude toward social security could be cited as a case in point. First, the sharp denunciation of this whole idea as something utterly alien to the spirit of the American people. All the excited talk about dog tags, etc. Later, a gradual acceptance of the proposal as essential to the needs of a new day. Now, willing support of it and cordial efforts to cooperate in making it work better.

The United States needs two strong political parties. It runs the risk of having only one strong political party if the Republicans lag too far behind the times. That is why we agree with the authors of this statement that many of the social objectives on which the Democrats now seem to have a monopoly are wholly consonant with traditional Republican aims, and that the party's real issue with the Democrats lies with the means of achieving these goals.

Game Seldom Worth Candle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, Henry Vance, Birmingham News columnist, widely read in and a former resident of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, has recently written a column on politics entitled "Game Seldom Worth Candle," which I believe every Member of the House of Representatives will enjoy reading. I include the article:

GAME SELDOM WORTH CANDLE
(By Henry Vance)

Politics will run you through the wringer. Then after you're all washed up and out, they'll ultimately hang you on the line to dry. There you'll flap in the wind with frazzled knees and elbows, a Liberty bell crack in your heart, a truly grotesque spectacle for passersby, be they enemies who helped bring about your downfall, or friends who went down the line for you when your cause was so lost that no want ad could ever help matters any.

Politics: The greatest and most heartless vixen that ever spun a web to entrap and enslave some naive victim foolish enough to think that lady luck is a constant dame with a yen to march to the altar, swear the vows, be a homemaker and ultimately celebrate the golden wedding. No politician has ever yet lived in enough peace and tranquillity with the huzzy, politics, to celebrate a golden wedding.

Going into politics is sorter like acquiring the dope habit, except that it's a whole lot worse.

I used to know Bill. Bill's dead now. Literally. But that boy was a caution in his better days. Before Bill got into his fifties he was a man who was known by all and sundry to have something on the ball. In the halcyon days I have seen Bill sitting on top of the world and just sorter dangling his feet for the sheer joy of it. When Bill was in deep cotton he was really a human dynamo. Why, if he had been an octopus equipped with a dozen or so arms in those days he would have had a phone receiver in each hand. But, on second thought, there still wouldn't have been enough ears to go round. Bill had an Alexander Graham Bell complex, and couldn't go anywhere without being constantly called to the phone.

God made Bill, just as sure as He made little apples. But he made each on a temporary basis. Somewhere along the line, however, Bill got the idea that he was indestructible physically and politically.

Bill's wife, though she saw him little, was also of the opinion that nobody could ever dish it out as fast as Bill could take it. He wore out more bicarbonate of soda after endless dinners than any man in the State. On rare evenings at home, he was an "I'll-get-it boy" as the phone just about rang its neck off.

Then, all of a sudden, word went out one day by the slow but sure grapevine method: "Bill's slowing up. We've got to shake him off the vine."

The first shake wasn't successful. Bill squeezed through. But his wife confided to her best friend: "Bill can't take it like he used to. Formerly everything was in stride. Why, he was nervous enough to pass any heebie jeebies test last night when the returns started coming in."

The little homemaker didn't seem to realize that Bill had been building himself into

a nervous breakdown for years. When Bill just did make it across the tape in that election the dinner engagements slowed down a bit. His evenings at home grew in number. But Bill was a restless somebody, and when the phone calls dwindled he'd nervously grab the phone and talk to somebody about nothing in particular.

Bill was on his way out two ways, but no warning seemed to come. The die was cast when they finally unseated him. Lots of folks Bill considered as the warmest of friends made trades and stabbed him in the back. You know how it is. "This job Bill's running for is not too terribly important. Hate to do this to old Bill. But if we can swap Bill out on his race, well, that will help put Whoozis in for the big job. Whoozis is a newcomer with plenty on the ball, so we've got to get him fixed up. After all, Bill's sorter shot. Saw him at dinner today and his coffee cup was actually shimmying in his hand. Don't know what has come over the guy."

They might as well have buried Bill the night he got kicked out of his job. He went on a fishing trip with some loyal friends after it was all over. He drank a lot, but so did the friends. Yet each one said to the other: "Bill's drinking pretty hard. Doesn't look like he can take it any longer."

He was nervouser than ever on his nights at home now. He was coming to know that the little woman was a pretty good sort of guy. They played double-sol, canasta, the Victrola, and got quite a kick out of some television shows. And the food was 10 to 1 better than he had ever been served at any been bitten by the political bug even Alcoholics Anonymous couldn't do anything for you. Some of the old guard, encouraged by Bill himself, finally twisted his arm and induced him to run for something else.

He came in like a selling plater on that one. They usually do.
political dinner or rally. But when you've

Bill limped home from an awful licking, and his frau bathed his wounds. She was just about the most sympathetic soul in the world. She went out of her way to think up little parties where his friends would come in. Still his nerves were frazzled, and where he used to speak imperatively he now spoke imploringly. One day he keeled over in the flower garden he had ultimately come to love and died.

Everybody, including the widow, remarked that he finally got so he couldn't take it. Nobody seemed to realize that all the work, the hecticity, the phone calls, the elections, the dinners, the planned coups—all these had worn his nerves to a frazzle, had deshredded them of any cushions they possessed in the beginning.

No way to tell, of course, but Bill might have lived to be 96 if he hadn't got into politics.

Senator Connally, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 6 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, no State is more proud of a Senator than is Texas of TOM CONNALLY.

For more than three decades, Senator CONNALLY has ably represented Texas in the national forum of Congress. Through many of those years, especially during the last 10 decisive years, TOM CONNALLY has represented America to the freedom-loving people of the world.

TOM CONNALLY has been a champion of freedom and courage in the period of our greatest national emergency. He has brought to the conference tables of the world a refreshing candor, bold common sense, and consistent sound judgment. As the people of the world have hoped for peace and freedom, they have come to recognize TOM CONNALLY as one of their great champions, fearless in his advocacy of justice, effective in his role as a champion of international harmony.

Recently Beverly Smith, Washington editor of the Saturday Evening Post, had published in the Saturday Evening Post a fine characterization of Senator CONNALLY and his invaluable service as the helmsman of our ship of state in these stormy times. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article, The Senator Loves a Fight.

I have been informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make three and a third pages in the RECORD, at a cost of $273.40.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATOR LOVES A FIGHT

(By Beverly Smith)

(He looks like an old-time medicine man. One indignant woman called him "a foolish old Texas bumpkin." But Senator CONNALLY can make or break our foreign policy—and history may prove him our shrewdest wielder of power in the cold war.)

The big Senate caucus room was jammed to overflowing one morning last year for the Foreign Relations Committee hearings on the North Atlantic Treaty. Klieg lights glittered and cameras buzzed. The press tables were crowded. Foreign diplomats and observers were there in force, for the question of the day was of world importance: Should America join with the nations of western Europe to repel possible attack from Russia on the principle that "an armed attack against one * * * shall be considered an attack against all"?

Advocates of the treaty had already been heard. Now, leading off as the first witness for the opposition, came Henry A. Wallace, once Vice President of the United States under Roosevelt, more lately a Presidential candidate on the left-wing Progressive ticket. The treaty, Wallace argued, was not a defensive pact for peace, but an aggressive military alliance leading on toward war. He had prepared his case carefully. As he warmed to the subject his messianic fervor, his air of shaggy-haired sincerity, began to have some effect on the audience. This treaty, he declared, would so frighten and madden the Russian leaders as to provoke them into war. Then Wallace swept on into this ominous, climactic sentence: "It will make Russia into a wild and desperate cornered beast."

The statement had a certain fearsome impact.

At the words "cornered beast" Senator TOM CONNALLY, veteran chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, peered up over his horn-rimmed spectacles in apparent perplexity.

"Corned beef?" he murmured testily. "What's corned beef got to do with it?" It was a murmur, but the CONNALLY murmur has the carrying power of a stage whisper. The microphones picked it up neatly.

The startling incongruity of the remark tickled the crowd. There was a volley of laughter. Wallace himself giggled uneasily. CONNALLY looked about with seemingly innocent surprise. The hearing proceeded, but Wallace could not get up full steam again. The drama of his presentation had been punctured beyond repair.

At another point Wallace was questioning whether Russia was really responsible for the Communist seizure of Czechoslovakia. Rather, he suggested, the coup may have been a spontaneous outgrowth of inner Czech conflicts. What then, demanded CONNALLY, was Russia's Vishinsky doing in Czechoslovakia at just that time?

Wallace said, "I think he was taking the cure at some baths."

"Yeah," drawled CONNALLY. "Vishinsky took the cure * * * and he gave it to the Czechs."

Afterward, as the crowd filed out, an earnest lady spectator was muttering indignantly to her companions, "The idea. Imagine having a man like CONNALLY as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Hardly listening to the testimony * * * making crude wisecracks. Why, he's just a foolish old Texas bumpkin."

A Texas reporter who heard this was amused. "Foolish like a fox," he said. "TOM is just up to his old tricks. He knows Wallace is immune to ordinary argument, so he slipped in the little slice of corned beef for Henry to trip over. As for the ad-lib crack about Vishinsky, that's CONNALLY'S knack for taking a complex international situation and giving it a slant that people understand and remember."

These two views—that of the lady and that of the reporter—are typical of the extraordinary divergences of opinion about Senator TOM CONNALLY. There is no unanimity on TOM, no consensus, not even in his own party or among his own colleagues. For 33 years he has been on full public view on Capitol Hill, first as Congressman, then as Senator, always picturesque, witty, belligerent, a leader in rough-and-tumble debate. For seven of the last nine critical years he has been chairman of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in a strategic position to make, mar or muddle the foreign policy of the United States. His views are recorded in literally thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Surely there should be some agreement on such a man. Yet you can talk to a hundred of the best-informed people in Washington, and get a hundred differing appraisals of the senior Senator from Texas.

The extreme opinions run something like this:

Favorable: CONNALLY is a shrewd and wily elder statesman, a chief architect of the bipartisan foreign policy who, along with Republican Senator VANDENBERG, has served as an indispensable link between the President and the Senate, thus enabling America to preserve a unified front in a dangerous world. His sharp wit deflates diplomatic pomposities; his homely common sense holds policy within bounds which the public will support.

Unfavorable: CONNALLY is an old-time politician who, by the accidents of seniority and the committee system, has been carried to a position of international importance beyond his depth. He is not sufficiently dignified, or studious, or intellectual. His knowledge of the world is shallow. He pays lip service to bipartisanism, but his own ingrained partisanship frequently endangers it. Admittedly he is quick and clever, and when he wants to he can charm the birds off the trees; but he is also irascible, indiscreet and unpredictable. His sarcasm, his irrepressible witticisms, might sometime upset the international applecart.

The contrast between these extreme views is almost comic, but it has its serious aspect. Prejudice about an individual can

muddy the waters as much as prejudice about an issue. Senator CONNALLY is in a position where his actions bear upon the welfare of America and the world. For years he and Senator VANDENBERG, in jealous but effective alliance, have worked to prevent the kind of split which paralyzed American foreign policy after World War I. In recent months Senator VANDENBERG has been seriously ill, and no other Republican has come forward to fill his massive role. The pressure upon CONNALLY's aging shoulders has increased accordingly. It may be well, then, to look more closely at the man himself, to try to disentangle the conflicts and find some fair balance between the extreme estimates. Besides, he is worth meeting. He is a rare bird. You will go far before finding another person so engaging and exasperating, so compounded of honey and vinegar, talent and mischief, statesmanship and buffoonery.

His appearance is the joy of photographers and cartoonists. He is the classical image of the old-school Senator, with his big head, his flowing silvery locks—thinning on top now, but long and bushy in the back—his wide-brimmed black hat, his long cigar, his black bow tie, his boiled shirt with gold studs and cuff links, his clothes of fine material but old-fashioned cut. At 72 his complexion is as pink as a baby's. He is over 6 feet tall, with a plump body and long, thin arms and legs. His feet in their neat, pointed black shoes seem almost too small to sustain his big frame as he toddles with short little steps upon his senatorial rounds.

It has been said that his costume is worn for political effect. But a photograph taken of him when he was a skinny student at the University of Texas in 1897 shows him wearing the same style of togs—black hat, bow tie, boiled shirt and all. It suited him then; it suits him now. From this it could be argued either that TOM was already a politician at 20 or that he is too much of an individualist to change with every passing whim of fashion. There is some truth in both.

CONNALLY is not ashamed of the name of politician. "When a successful politician is dead," he says, "they call him a statesman. That's fine. But so long as he remains alive, he'd better not forget his politics." He is not, however, a machine politician. He has never bothered to build a political organization in Texas, State, city, or county. He doesn't need one. Since he first announced for the legislature at 22—that was in 1900—he has never lost an election. When campaign time comes he simply ambles about the vast reaches of his native heath, renewing innumerable friendships, cracking jokes with the populace and making the famous CONNALLY speeches.

One fine day long ago, they say, CONNALLY arrived unannounced in a small Texas town and was surprised to find the streets almost deserted. He did not know that a political enemy of his, a politico noted for his silver tongue and itchy fingers, had come to make a speech at the fairgrounds; and that the whole town had shut up shop to attend the show. CONNALLY hailed a lonely traffic cop.

"Why are all the stores locked up?" he asked.

"Governor Blank is in town," said the cop.

"You mean," inquired CONNALLY wonderingly, "that he robs folks right in broad daylight?"

Nor is CONNALLY a subservient or hack politician. During his career he has defied the Ku Klux Klan, the big corporate interests—on taxes—and the labor unions—with the Smith-Connally bill to check strikes in wartime. When Franklin Roosevelt was at the height of his power, CONNALLY broke with him on the NRA, the Court plan and the reorganization bill. Truman he has supported loyally, even in the dark 1948 days when so many others ran for cover or flirted with the Dixiecrats. But he disapproved of Truman's haste in abolishing the excess-profits tax when the war was over. CONNALLY wanted to reduce it gradually. Today many economists agree that a slower reduction would have retarded postwar inflation and left the Treasury in healthier shape than it is now. Liberals who label CONNALLY as a moss-backed reactionary should examine his record on taxes from 1916 to date.

Just as he keeps to the old style in clothes, so does CONNALLY cling to old friendships. Such friends, in turn, are his stoutest enthusiasts. Texans who remember him as Talking Tom, the Boy Orator of Baylor, or as a gawky young sergeant in the Spanish-American War, or as the youthful crusader for the first Texas antitrust law—these leathery old lads don't just admire TOM, they love him. They actually choke up with emotion as they talk about him. When they try to tell one of his southern stories, they get to laughing so they have to stop, and mop their eyes, and gasp, "I can't do it. You got to get TOM to tell it himself. Make him tell you about Old Blue, the coon dog who solved the big murder case. And about the sinner at revival meeting with the stolen ham under his shirt bosom. And how an old colored woman, the defendant, made a laughing-stock of TOM when he was prosecuting attorney."

These old pals regard even TOM's faults, if any, with affectionate indulgence. "TOM talks too quick. He's not one of your cold-blooded, close-jawed fellows. He's honest, impulsive. He blurts out what's on his mind. He makes a lot ' boners that way. But then he just chews away on his cigar and thinks things over, and by the time the show-down comes, why, he has the right answers. Never knew a man to make so many little-bitty mistakes and so few big mistakes. You just look at the record."

Or: "TOM does play kind of rough in debate. But he doesn't mean a speck of harm by it. He comes by that whiplash talk naturally—inherited it from his pa, Jones Connally, who had the sharpest tongue in McLennan County. TOM has been whetting up his sass on the opposition for 50-odd years now, until—well, he just don't realize how deep his words can cut."

There are Members of the Senate who will hardly agree with this picture of CONNALLY as a playful old kitten unaware of the sharpness of his own claws. At one time or another, most of the Republicans and some of the Democrats have been slashed by his repartee. Usually the wounds heal quickly under the sunny balm of TOM's private personality. Sometimes the ridicule festers and lingers. There are Senators who, being human, are tempted to oppose a measure merely because CONNALLY advocates it. Someday, on a close vote, this might derange national policy or damage the public welfare. CONNALLY may realize this partially—lately he has apparently tried hard to hold himself in check—but not fully. Some time ago, after a bitter exchange in which CONNALLY goaded an opponent almost into apoplexy, a reporter went to ask him about details of the battle.

"Well," said CONNALLY, lighting a fresh cigar and beaming rosily—he always looks younger after a hot fight—"we had a bit of persiflage."

The "persiflage" may run all the way from light to heavy, from frolicsome to wicked. Well remembered is CONNALLY's appeal to Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, to approach his subject with an open mind instead of an open mouth. Last fall during the arms-for-Europe debate, Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, after harassing CONNALLY with a long series of questions, said with mock politeness, "I hope my questions are not embarrassing the Senator."

Snapped CONNALLY, "The only way the Senator can possibly embarrass me is by agreeing with me."

In the course of a heated debate with CONNALLY, the Republican floor leader, Senator WHERRY, of Nebraska, waved his arms energetically, banged the desk, and roared impressively.

"I feel," rejoined CONNALLY, "like an old lawyer I know in Texas. His opponent shouted and foamed at the mouth in addressing the jury. When the old lawyer's turn came, he said, 'If your honor please, bow-wow-wow-wow. Now that I have answered my opponent, I shall discuss the issues of this case.' "

WHERRY barked right back, but CONNALLY, who can mimic man or beast, outbarked him. It was a happy day for visiting school children in the Senate galleries.

CONNALLY seldom makes long speeches himself, and is a picture of pained boredom when others drone on. Sometimes he protests against "all these cubic feet of oratory." Once he said, "Draco wrote his laws in blood. The Senate writes its laws in wind." And again: "Concentration in government has affected everything but senatorial speeches." His courtesy can be utterly disarming, but also deceptive. One day an opponent had made a grandiloquent speech.

CONNALLY rose and said blandly, "The distinguished Senator is justly called one of the shock troops of the Republican forces." (The unsuspecting victim bowed complacently.) CONNALLY's voice sharpened, "His speech shocks the credulity of everyone who knows the facts."

Under stress CONNALLY occasionally throws away the rapier and wields a downright ugly bludgeon. He has called an opponent's speech "this slimy exudation" and "liverystable talk, fit only for the back room of some low house." In one feverish night session he said of an adversary, suspected of presidential ambitions, "The Senator has covered this whole subject with the vomit of his prejudice and rancor and hatred and ambition. Oh, ambition is a fatuous thing. * * * When a Senator gets the ambition to run for President, no longer is he worth a damn as a Senator."

In all the above examples the printed words give only a dim impression of their effect as uttered by CONNALLY. He could have made a fortune as an actor, with an easy mastery of tragic, character, and comedy roles. Not only is his face immensely mobile and expressive; his whole being gets into the act. The shrug or sag of his shoulders, the wide gestures of the sinuous arms, the angle of each finger, the jut of the cigar, the droop of his knees, the stance or prance of the little feet—each contributes its part to drama or ridicule. He can, by mere tone and inflection, make ordinary words absurd or reverse their obvious meaning. For example:

During the hearings on the Atlantic Treaty one of the witnesses was an eminent professor and doctor of divinity. A long statement of his college degrees, his academic and churchly honors, was put into the record. The professor proceeded to attack the treaty with pious zeal and some ingenuity. All this was most distasteful to Chairman CONNALLY. He squirmed uneasily, but said little until the professor had finished.

Then he leaned forward, waved his cigar in a tolerant sweep of dismissal, and said, "We have greatly enjoyed having you here, doctor. We know you are a man of culture, of education, of refinement, and of high ideals. You are excused."

In form, the words were faultlessly courteous. Why then the rising titter which rippled through the audience? It came from that faint but unmistakable overtone of derision in CONNALLY's voice. It was gently done. One reporter said, "I don't think the professor even knows he's been stabbed."

CONNALLY's inflection has become a sort of instrument or index of international policy. When Tito was still a buddy of Stalin's, and was backing the Communist guerrillas in Greece, it was wonderful to hear CONNALLY pronounce the word "Yugoslavia." He would throw back his head, wrinkle up his nose, and drag out the third syllable in a scornful, bleating whinny, "Yugosla-a-a-a-a-av-ya." It was primitive comedy of sound, but a sure-fire laugh with venerable Senators as well as with gallery youngsters who did not even know what the word meant. Nowadays, with Yugoslavia on the outs with Russia and making friendly overtures to Greece, CONNALLY pronounces the name in an ordinary voice.

At one international conference CONNALLY persisted in calling the Saudi-Arabians "the pseudo-Arabians." The diplomats tut-tutted and the protocol boys almost had a fit. Why did TOM do it? Was it ignorance or willfulness or mischief? Or was it annoyance that the oil of these dratted pseudo-Arabians might compete with the wells of his beloved Texas? This brings us into a fertile realm of controversy. How much does the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee really know about international affairs?

The anti-TOM faction, headed by some of our most earnest diplomats and deepest global thinkers, contends that he is deplorably ignorant on world problems. They say he has hardly even thumbed the thousands of pages of pregnant data underlying the Marshall plan, and that he is bewildered by European economics. They are annoyed by his reference to the "dollar gap." I've had the dollar gap all my life. It can't be filled. They tell of the time when he was in Paris in 1946, as negotiations got under way on the Italian peace treaty. The crux of the matter was Trieste. When asked about this, he said, "Where is Trieste?"

Another story is that when Tom was attending a session of the United Nations, he was approached by a member of UNESCO—United Nations Economic, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

"Senator," he said, "I'm from UNESCO."

"Ah," said CONNNALLY cordially, "I'm always happy to meet anyone from your fine little country."

Probably that one is apocryphal. But even if it is true, there is no way of telling—that's the trouble with old TOM—whether he was slipping a cog or slyly kidding the ever-mushrooming alphabetical agencies. The pro-Tom faction argues that CONNALLY knows all that he wants or needs to know in order to form sensible judgments on the main issues; and that he sometimes plays dumb for reasons of strategy or just plain fun.

CONNALLY's indifference to diplomatic amenities is the recurrent despair of Ambassadors and the State Department. During the China debate last autumn he said Chiang Kai-shek had absconded with several hundred million dollars in gold. Further aid to China, he declared, would be pouring money down a rathole, at the bottom of which hole you'll find old Chiang, the generalissimo who never generalissimos. This spring W. John Kenney, Chief of the ECA mission in England, testifying before CONNALLY's committee, began again the long, familiar story of England's postwar economic difficulties.

CONNALLY waved his cigar impatiently, "We know she's all crippled up," he said; "got one eye half gouged out and one ear bit off. But just what are we doing about it?"

Last summer, at a luncheon for Foreign Minister Bevin, CONNALLY remarked genially, "Whenever the British come over here we feel a little elevated, a little lifted up, a little lighter."

"Every so often," says one diplomat, "our ambassadors have to run around to the foreign chancelleries and try to explain just what kind of a man Chairman CONNALLY is—one of the most puzzling tasks in the history of diplomacy." One statesman who needs no briefing on CONNALLY is Winston Churchill. On his visits to Washington he used to make it a point to see CONNALLY. The two would retire to an inner office, from which, for some time after, would come only the fragrance of rich Havana smoke and the sound of deep-throated laughter. When Churchill was accused of fighting against America in the Spanish-American War, CONNALLY quickly got the true facts from his friend and refuted the story in a fiery Senate speech. He has Churchill's letter of appreciation framed on the wall of his office.

Some younger critics seem to think of CONNALLY as an unschooled old yokel with no international background who somehow blundered upon the world scene during the 1940's. This is wide of the mark. CONNALLY has been responsibly concerned with American foreign policy since 1917, when, an ardent young Wilsonian, he was appointed to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. He was an advocate of the League of Nations from the beginning, and later of the World Court. As early as the 1920's he was pleading for a bipartisan approach to foreign policy. He opposed our intervention in Nicaragua, and was a strong and early proponent of friendlier relations with Latin America—long before the "good neighbor" phrase was coined. Since 1924 he has been a delegate to numerous conferences of the Interparliamentary Union in Geneva, London, Constantinople and Rome. In 1917 he cast his first vote in Congress for the declaration of war against Germany—"That's one I really had to pray over"—and in 1941 he penned the draft of the war declarations against Japan, Germany, and Italy.

He is neither a novice nor an unschooled rustic. His father, Jones Connally, after fighting as a Confederate officer with Parson's Brigade, went back to Texas, broke, and built up one of the most prosperous farms in his county. Young TOM was reared with more than the usual advantages. He was the only boy among a family of adoring sisters, who spoiled him then as affectionate friends have spoiled him since. He was exceptionally bright and quick, and something of a prodigy at mental arithmetic. At Baylor University he took the classical course with heavy emphasis on Greek, Latin, and history, graduating at 18, the youngest man in his class. At 20 he had his LL.B. from the University of Texas law school, cum laude. Later, two terms as the boy wonder of the legislature, two terms as the popular young county attorney, then a prosperous law practice, and then election to Congress before he was 40.

No, "dumb" is not the word for CONNALLY. "Too smart" would be closer to it. His mind is so quick, his intuitions so sharp, his tongue so clever, that he has had little incentive for deep study or closely reasoned thought. Things have come too easily to him. Over the years he has neglected the mental disciplines of concentration and application. Sometimes he grows careless, stumbling into blunders and misunderstandings which are remembered to his hurt. But whatever the defects in the profundity or details of his scholarship he has never to my knowledge neglected the main lines of American policy, or the supreme importance of winning unified backing for them on Capitol Hill.

In his early days in Washington, Congressman CONNALLY was a fascinated observer of the League of Nations struggle. He saw his idol, Woodrow Wilson, an intellectual, a scholar, a learned student of government and history, fail tragically for lack of simple political acumen and common sense. He saw Henry Cabot Lodge—the elder—another most scholarly man, put on a stubborn fight which shoved America back into isolationism for a generation. Possibly the sight soured CONNALLY on the supreme value of intellectuality in international affairs.

Some people think TOM has swung too far in the other direction. Can't he at least, they ask, genteelize those crossroads colloquialisms of his? Even here CONNALLY would disagree. As far back as 1927 he was in rebellion against the language of diplomacy, protesting, "The pronouncements of the State Department lack pointedness. They pulsate with the cryptic language of diplomacy rather than with the clear-cut meaning our people prefer. The veneer obscures the substance. Let's have the real homespun talk the people can understand."

Even in the 1920's he advocated a nonpartisan approach to foreign problems, and on May 7, 1924, he made—with a typical CONNALLY slant—this acute prophecy on international organization:

"I even have hopes of our friends, the Republicans, embracing some doctrine of that kind. When the wild elephant is first captured in the jungle he is not able to stand on upturned tubs and do all the marvelous tricks of the ring. When they try out the surcingle, when they adjust the crupper, he cavorts and snorts and raises all manner of sand [business of CONNALLY snorting and cavorting like a wild elephant]. But finally he becomes accustomed to it. And after a while we who attend the circus see the old elephant putting on all kinds of fancy performances, to the delectation of the audience.

"When this Republican elephant finds a league of nations with the name of Woodrow Wilson erased from it, and sees that instead of being called a league it is called an association of nations, and gets used to that—he may trumpet a few times and switch his tail, but finally he will probably encircle it with his rusty old trunk and say: 'This thing, after all, is just what I've been looking for.' "

Pretty good prognosticating for 1924.

The so-called bipartisan policy—CONNALLY calls it nonpartisan, VANDENBERG unpartisan—actually began sometime during the late war. It is impossible to assign an exact date for its birth or precise credit for its invention. The idea was in the air; many men were tinkering with it. Certainly the Connally resolution of 1943 was one of the landmarks. And early in 1944, at the invitation of Secretary Hull, Chairman CONNALLY appointed a subcommittee to work with Hull on "a basic postwar security program." In a departure from custom, CONNALLY named to his subcommittee an equal number of Democrats and Republicans—four of each—and stated, "In foreign relations it is of the highest importance that our country present a united front." Later that year John Foster Dulles, as Governor Dewey's envoy, helped in the arrangements to keep foreign policy out of the 1944 Presidential campaign. In early 1945 VANDENBERG made his dramatic renunciation of isolationism, and emerged as the forceful leader of bipartisanism on the Republican side. Thereafter bipartisan delegations were sent to the San Francisco Conference, to the United Nations and to all major international meetings. CONNALLY and VANDENBERG labored together to make the Foreign Relations Committee a closer liaison unit between the President and the Senate. The bipartisan policy grew in coherence and strength.

Since then there have been many Democratic-Republican squabbles on foreign policy or State Department matters—including the recent bitter storm over the MCCARTHY charges. But the remarkable fact is this: Every really major measure of foreign policy since the war has received the support of both parties in Congress. Even when the Republicans captured Congress during 1947–48, there was no upset or break in continuity.

Bipartisanism is personified in the public mind by Senator VANDENBERG. He has played a major part in it ever since he came into the limelight with his famous "conversion"

speech of 1945, and played it superbly well. He was fitted for it in temperament and personality. His suave dignity is impressive. As a writer and editor he was master of the right phrase—striking or portentous—to fit the occasion. What other man could have filled the role so well? He has deserved immense credit, and received it.

CONNALLY, on the other hand, has received perhaps less credit than his due—and for this there are reasons. His personality is not naturally fitted to the role. By temperament TOM CONNALLY is about as nonpartisan as a fighting rooster. The fact that he has held his combative emotions in check as well as he has—with only minor explosions—represents an extraordinary triumph of mind over instinct. Actually he is devoted to the nonpartisan policy, he is proud of it, he has put into it the major labor of his later years. It is a pity that those little outbursts have to splotch the picture—yet without the temper and the tongue it would not quite be old TOM. A tamer TOM might go down further in history, but it would make for a duller present.

The personal relationship between CONNALLY and VANDENBERG has been an interesting one. These two strong characters both came to the Senate at the end of the 1920's. Both sprang quickly into prominence there. Both have a dramatic quality and a touch of the prima donna—there was a certain natural rivalry between them. As the two rose to be the leaders of their respective parties on the powerful Foreign Relations Committee there was plenty of occasion for friction and jealousy between them.

Much has been made of this jealousy. Some observers contend that after the Republicans won control of the Senate in the 1946 elections, and CONNALLY had to yield his cherished chairmanship to Van, he was almost ill with envy. Maybe so. Envy is a pervasive human emotion. Macaulay, I believe, spoke of "envy, that vile ingredient which fouls our dispositions." It has lost battles and wrecked governments. If there was this alleged jealousy between CONNALLY and VANDENBERG, it is vastly to their credit that they did not let it get out of hand, but continued to work faithfully together on issues of delicate balance and world importance. And if there was envy, there were also mutual affection and respect.

CONNALLY's irascibility has also been much commented upon. Not only does he play rough in debate; he also, less forgivably, is brutally sarcastic at times with witnesses who appear before his committee—persons who, out of respect for the chairman's position, can hardly talk back on equal terms. Partly this is a legacy of his days as a prosecuting attorney—anybody who takes the witness stand is fair game. Last year, when a witness referred to "heckling," CONNALLY said, "We do not heckle here. Anybody coming here comes at his own peril." This is a questionable doctrine for persons appearing before the Foreign Relations Committee as a matter of public spirit or governmental duty. Even witnesses favorable to CONNALLY's own views may find themselves the hapless targets of his exasperation.

Sometimes his irritation can jar an empire. This spring Britain's effort of save dollars by shifting her purchases from American oil to Middle-Eastern oil was under discussion. CONNALLY broke in angrily to say that if Britain persisted in such practices, "then I'm not in favor of giving her another dollar." Later CONNALLY, as his friends say, "chewed away on his cigar," then fought successfully for the ECA extension bill giving Britain her share of aid as usual. But his remark, when made, hit the headlines, stirred the jubilation of the McCormick press and sent a shudder down England's spine.

This irritation has been especially noticed in the last couple of years. What is not generally known is that during that time Senator CONNALLY has suffered from an unusually prolonged and nerve-racking case of shingles—also called herpes zoster, or St. Anthony's fire. It is one of the most painful of the nonfatal diseases. It is accompanied by intense sensitiveness of the surface nerves and agonizing neuralgic twinges. During the entire ordeal CONNALLY has continued doggedly at work, carrying a heavy burden of responsibility, but the pains haven't helped his disposition. In some of those irascible outbursts, it is fair to guess that it wasn't Tom, but the shingles speaking. A future aspiring Ph. D. might well explore this subject further with a thesis: Influence of Senator CONNALLY's Herpes Zoster on the Climate of the Cold War in the Mid-twentieth Century. Recently the doctors have been trying one of the new drugs on CONNALLY's ailment and he has been feeling much better.

In private converse CONNALLY is generally a model of gentle charm, old-fashioned courtesy, and paternal benevolence. The people who work for him idolize him—not a bad sign. His position carries with it, ex officio, all the best dinner invitations, and the Senator and the attractive Mrs. Connally are extremely popular in their own right. As an old bridge fan, Tom is fighting a stubborn rear-guard action against canasta. He has an engaging fund and gaiety. Some years ago, at a big party, with the orchestra playing, a friend found the Senator off in a secluded corner, executing a neat pas seul. "I'd go out there in the middle of the floor and do a clog," he said, "except they'd say I was a fool."

It has been complained that CONNALLY has never originated any important legislation in the international field. He would agree. He does not claim to be an originator. He tries rather to get the bugs out of the bill and put it in such common-sense shape that he can shepherd it through the Senate and win public support. It is said that CONNALLY's first reaction to any new idea is an angry "What the hell for?" When he accepts the idea it is said, "He's been prodded into it." When it passes the Senate it is said, "Well, the Senate was for it, anyway." The fact remains that on the record CONNALLY has an amazingly high batting average.

It is true that he is going on 73—August 19—and not getting any younger. Every now and then this leads to an amusing little drama. When word gets around that old Tom is not feeling so pert, certain Texas Representatives drift over to the Senate Chamber—not that they want to inherit his seat, of course—just want to see him in action. CONNALLY, who has an uncanny knowledge of everything which happens on Capitol Hill, is always quite aware of this. He dodders to his desk with a show of infirmity. He fumbles feebly with his documents. Then, seizing a favorable opening, he jumps to his feet and puts on a masterly exhibition of eloquence, vigor, and wit. The Texans from the lower House tiptoe out, looking a mite discouraged.

Keynote Speech by Hon. William E. Jenner, of Indiana, Before Indiana Republican State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 6 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the complete text of the stirring keynote address delivered by my able colleague, the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] at the biennial Indiana Republican State Convention in Indianapolis on June 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, delegates to the Republican State Convention, distinguished guests, fellow Hoosiers, you have honored me once more by giving me the privilege of keynoting this Indiana Republican State Convention.

Indiana is one State where we are still proud of our great American heritage.

Our motto is still "In God we trust." And He who helped our forefathers make this the greatest Nation on earth will not desert us now in our struggle to preserve it.

Today we know that if we are going to be able to continue as Hoosiers, Americans, and Republicans we are in the fight of our lives.

So great are the stakes, we have resolved the differences and mistakes of yesterday must remain buried in the dead past. We must move toward November united in a common determination born of our deep love for constitutional liberty and freedom.

Of course, our modern breed of self-appointed saviours insists there is really no need for us to be concerned for the future—there is no need for this convention—there certainly is no need for the Republican Party—indeed, there is no longer any real need for us even to try to keep our traditional American principles alive.

Why?

Because, if we are to believe what we hear, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and their contemporaries were political ignoramuses. They never were able to sit at the feet of Karl Marx and Lenin and never palled around with "Good Old Joe."

Because they say the Fair Deal shows up these founding fathers as nothing but backwoods politicians, who were just lucky enough to have lived in a nation that finally produced Harry-Super-Truman.

Folks, just whom does Harry really think he is kidding?

Can you conceive of a more rattle-brained theory than Harry's that the Fair Deal is alone responsible for our every blessing?

He claims it is the Fair Deal which slowly but surely is building new foundations for enduring progress, prosperity, and peace.

If there is anything wrong with the Fair Deal, he says, it is only because we just have not given him enough power, enough controls, enough money with which to work his modern miracles.

And here is the real snapper—this wonderful political discovery of Harry's is based on such a simple formula for success that the American people just cannot afford to reject it.

Just promise everybody something for nothing.

Incredible as it may seem, Mr. Truman insists that on the international scene during the past 5 years this formula has already brought us closer to enduring peace than ever before.

Now we have all become grimly aware of what has happened to the President's promise of peace.

With rightful suddenness they have exploded into a war in Korea.

For the third time in one generation we American GI's have been ordered into action by a Democratic administration. Why? Surely something must be terribly wrong with politicians, policies, and personnel who can only solve America's problems by a cycle of recurring wars.

Of course, we shall not shrink from our patriotic duty as loyal Americans to see this crisis through, and we know the fearful risks

and the further terrible sacrifices that are involved.

But we also know that it would be a criminal disservice to America for us to line up in blind support of a repetition in the future on a larger scale of criminal blunders of the past.

The President's action in Korea completely discredits the global Truman doctrine we have been following. It is a shocking proof that this administration's pro-Soviet propagandists, for the past 18 years, have been leading the American people from one lie to another; from one sell-out to another; from one catastrophe to another; behind false slogans, false panaceas, false programs, and false promises.

The President's action also is the most complete repudiation of a Secretary of State in our history.

In the face of these frightening facts, the time has come to clear the decks for action.

The Secretary of State ought to have enough moral decency left to resign, and if not, he ought to be forced out of office.

To make sure our own hands are clean, we must repudiate every single one of the treasonable agreements of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam which have paved the way for Russian conquest of Europe and Asia.

Then we must clean out the Fair Deal fanatics who want to remake America from within and the miserable scheming, conniving State Department personnel who have helped to force this crisis upon us.

We dare not entrust the future to those who have betrayed the past.

And Mr. Truman insists at home that this formula will usher in the promised land of plenty for nothing; that in the year 2000 every family will have an income of $12,000 a year. Folks, the way that guy is throwing our money around the world, we just can't wait that long.

The tragedy is that Mr. Truman actually enjoys living in this fool's paradise.

And the modern miracle is that America still stands, not because of the New Deal and the Fair Deal, but in spite of them.

Our forefathers builded better than they knew.

If we are to preserve to the future an America worthy of the past, we sure have a job cut out for us.

We dare not wait for Mr. Truman's Fair Deal to collapse of its own folly.

We dare not permit the Fair Deal's power-drunk propaganda peddlers to continue poisoning American public opinion.

The time has come to shock the American people to their senses.

I know how tough a job it is to lick temporary prosperity. I know how impossible it is to convince many of the staggering extent of the Fair Deal fakery and fraud in which we are caught. But I know there are enough real Americans in both the Republican and Democratic Parties who, when they finally get the facts, will join hands with us to carry out the most complete national house cleaning in our history.

This Fair Deal is nothing but the same old game of power politics played on the domestic and international scene with the same stacked pack for the same fake stakes that have impoverished and enslaved every other people who have tried it.

Folks, this year we're going to change deals, and we're going to change dealers.

We're going to have an American deal for Americans in the American way. I'm tired, and I know you are, of having American freedom as the stake in an international poker game.

We are not going to stand idly by while our President gambles away America's future will all the odds of history stacked against us.

It would be fatal now to underrate the strength and the deliberate intention of Mr. Truman's Fair Deal horde of assorted varieties of panhandling 5 percenters, gangsters, racketeers, political hacks, and collectivist crackpots.

The insolence, the arrogance, the hypocrisy, and the corruption of the political powers that be have now become an insult to every God-fearing, law-abiding, and freedom-loving American.

Today, America is at the mercy of a man who holds in his hands more power than any other man in history ever dreamed of. His sole claim to success is that he succeeded in shifting the center of the unholy Pendergast alliance between politicians and racketeers; namely, the Kansas City Kitty, to the Federal Treasury and turned this Nation and the whole world into an unhappy political hunting ground.

And now the take has become so enormous that the Fair Deal master minds are playing for keeps.

Well, we accept the challenge. We'll call their hand.

Out here in Indiana when anyone gets drunk with power, the people sober him up. When anyone becomes an indispensable man, we cut him down to size. When anyone becomes infallible, we make him eat crow. When anyone seeks to play off one group against the other for his own selfish interest, in the name of the public good, we call his bluff. And when anyone resorts to bribery and deceit to cover up his betrayal of a public trust, we smoke him out.

These are traditional Hoosier reactions to sham, fakery, fraud, and betrayal of the public interest whether on the local, the State, the National or the international level.

And we do not now propose to abandon them.

The truth is that never have the American people been so betrayed as during the past 18 years. With hope and faith the American people took up the New Deal. With misgivings and notable patience they stood by the Fair Deal. Today, the grim truth emerges from the mists of propaganda. We can now see those two frauds in their true perspective—the twin evils of a monstrous double-talking double deal.

We now know that for the past 18 years a well-devised and cleverly carried-out conspiracy to destroy our form of government has been operating under our very noses.

This conspiracy began with a small group placed in strategic governmental positions. Their plans began to take shape with the advent of the New Deal. And piece by piece their schemes were carried to Congress where under the guise of humanitarianism they found their way into law.

The shocking facts prove that our highest policymakers and members of their families consorted with and sponsored traitors. Such men as the jailbird, Browder, had open access to the White House years before we learned that this conspiracy had spawned the Judith Coplons, the Elizabeth Bentleys, the Remingtons, the Wadleighs, the Lattimores, and the Alger Hisses; and all the time they were tearing pages out of the "Book of America" and substituting Marx's Manifesto.

Their influence spread to Yalta where Alger Hiss, the convicted liar and traitor, whispered the words into the receptive ears of a declining President that brought the rape of Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and China. It spread to our highly secret atom bomb plants and into the secret files of the State Department where the lavender lads of easy virtue were ready prey to the cunning agents of Harry's "Good Old Joe."

Only last week I was one of four Republican members of the Senate Judiciary Committee who tried to save our own Senator CAPEHART'S effort to bring the sordid story of the Amerasia case into the open.

Yet the influence of this conspiracy has mushroomed into the halls of Congress. "Whitewash, Inc.," set up by presidential decree, with Senator TYDINGS wielding the brush, is determined to continue covering up this outrageous story of corruption, perversion, espionage, and treason. Why, even the Department of Justice has been reduced to a political flunky to silence the rattle of communistic skeletons in the administration closet.

They try every scheme and every device which their cunning minds can invent to cover up the filthy story. Like shadowy ghouls they have even desecrated the grave of the late James Forrestal by pinning on a dead man the blame for trying to hush-hush the Amerasia case.

And this outrageous Presidential whitewash continues in the face of J. Edgar Hoover's warnings that Communists are more numerous, more active, more tricky, and more dangerous than ever.

Vicious as this Communist conspiracy has become it is not the only danger we confront. Equally as dangerous are the Fair Deal fanactics with their pie-in-the-sky panaceas. For they all lead to the same ultimate end.

Mr. Truman has whistle-stopped his way across the country demanding a fair deal, rubber stamp, Congress. And Mr. Truman and Mr. Dulles have ordered a purge of those who dare disagree with them. That would be the end of constitutional representative government in this country. Yet, Mr. Truman labels his opponents as obstructionists. If this is obstructionism, count me in and send HOMER CAPEHART, CHARLIE HALLECK, EARL WILSON, RALPH HARVEY, CECIL HARDEN, and the entire Republican congressional ticket to Washington. They will help to halt the Fair Deal on its mad march to bankruptcy and slavery.

Have the American people forgotten how Mr. Stalin, Mr. Hitler, and Mussolini came to power? They corrupted the minds and the morals of their people with a promise of something for nothing.

All of us Hoosiers have learned the hard way you just don't get something for nothing. That's why your farmers oppose the Brannan plan.

You don't intend to become the ward of an arm-chair farmer who doesn't know a furrow from a farrow.

You who have given your lives to education know the dangers of Government thought-control.

We Hoosiers intend to keep on educating our kids without it.

This administration is not content to defraud just the farmer with the Brannan plan—it's taken on the old folks with a social-security program by which people are taxed every payday and promised a prescribed amount at their retirement. But long before they reach that retirement they are given another world war and inflation to make the promised benefits worthless.

The worker who invested his dollars in social security in 1939 is now collecting 59-cent dollars in terms of purchasing power. You'll never get even that way.

And what about our old folks? They're being forced to live on a miserable pittance that wouldn't feed a dog.

The Fair Deal pitchmen are peddling another fraud. Dr. Truman's precinct medicine men are trying to sell Oscar Ewing's peculiar brand of pills. They are sugar-coated but beneath the sugar lies a bitter experience.

We're not going to permit any invasion of the confidential relationship between doctor and patient under the guise of socialized medicine.

The sham and deceit of the Fair Deal run through their shabby treatment of minority groups. Year after year the Democratic Party has pledged itself to adoption of civil-rights legislation. Year after year their promises have been maneuvered into the political ash heap.

On every roll call taken in the United States Senate, the majority of votes against the civil-rights legislation has been cast by

Democratic Senators; yet the administration continues to dangle this vote bait before the eyes of a still bewildered race. Colored people of Indiana, haven't they used you long enough?

Another vast group of hard-working, loyal American citizens who are being defrauded today by Fair Deal squanderers is the postal workers of America.

Thousands of these loyal workers are being discharged because the Post Office Department has squandered its funds to a point where even mail deliveries have been curtailed.

Yet we send our hard-earned American dollars to provide three mail deliveries daily in Socialist England and the American people are getting but one delivery a day.

Despite the Democratic Congress given Mr. Truman to carry out his demand for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, his own Eighty-first Congress has refused to emasculate this law.

While the Fair Deal protests its loving interest in the welfare of the working men and women, at the same time, it is insisting on legislation which would deprive them of their jobs.

With more than 4,000,000 American workers unemployed today, the administration is insisting upon opening American markets to foreign-made products in competition with American-made goods. Glassworkers, watchmakers, textile workers, shoemakers, pottery workers, oil workers, coal miners, railroad workers, and others are being forced into idleness as a result of the reciprocal trade agreements.

And next September at an international conference to be held in England, it is proposed to remove 2,500 additional items from the American duty list.

All of these Fair Deal schemes, and I've only mentioned a few, are designed to extend the Fair Deal from the national to the international level. They are designed to make America a mere cog in an international political and economic machine. They are all designed to fasten on each of us a superbureaucratic leash from the cradle to the grave.

Then we would cease to be Hoosiers, cease to be Americans. We would become paupers and puppets in the hands of striped-panted internationalists, who would turn our pockets and our pocketbooks, our earnings and our savings into an international grab-bag to provide everybody else's needs and to underwrite everybody else's interests but our own. This is a one-way road to national bankruptcy and suicide.

We need not leave Indiana to view the litter of broken pledges, spiraling debts, and political scandals of a party carried into power by rash promises and glib appeals. We can stay here in our own backyard and look upon the costly wreckage of a Democrat administration.

Henry-the-Hat is no slouch as he pushes Indiana down the road behind Harry-the-Haberdasher.

The little Fair Deal's boss-ridden convention of last Tuesday revealed the "Hat" in its true light. Boss McHale can report now to headquarters in Washington "Operation Schricker Completed."

No longer can there be any doubt about Henry's boasted independence. The self-styled Independent Henry is now a boon buddy of Harry from Independence.

McHale has delivered him body and soul all tied up in a pink ribbon, and now the White Hat can be put away in the political deep freeze.

Just give 'em time, folks.

Recall 2 years ago when Indiana stood high in the sisterhood of going States? Her public schools, among the best of the Nation, were staffed with well-paid teachers, and a sizable cut in gross income taxes appeared certain. Her highway system, proudly proclaimed as second to none, was being enlarged and improved through common-sense management and expert engineering.

While other States grappled with strikes and industrial paralysis, Indiana put into effect a utility arbitration law and through the fair-minded diligence of a Republican labor commission, kept the wheels of business and industry spinning.

Just 2 years ago, Indiana had met the increased cost of Fair Deal inflation without raising property taxes or neglecting penal and benevolent institutions. She did not find it imperative to rent more space for payrollers, nor did she suggest to her people they should consider junking their constitution. Despite the dislocation of a postwar period, Indiana moved higher in the Nation's esteem by pioneering the cause of humane treatment for the mentally ill, interstate planning for flood control, and steady improvement of natural resources—soil fertility, wildlife conservation, reforestation, and our famous State parks.

What is the picture today?

Our sons and daughters of World War II, voted a bonus by the same grateful citizens who volunteered to discharge the obligation, must wait indefinitely for payment. The tax the people voted was side-tracked for one dictated by Henry-the-Hat.

Now, nickels and dimes, the administration assures our veterans, are trickling into their special fund, while millions of tax dollars, including their own, are poured out of Indiana's general fund to meet the bills of a political machine that has mired down.

New taxes have been imposed; others are in prospect. A governor who campaigned on a platform that was written, sealed and delivered by his party men soon disavowed that covenant.

He went to his party's convention 2 years ago after a considerable period of playing hard-to-get and accepted his nomination, holding on to the white hat with one hand while someone jammed the party platform into the other. He held on to both until after he was elected when he decided to keep his white hat but dropped the platform plank by plank.

You and I properly rejoice that under the constitution of this State a governor cannot succeed himself. We had not realized before the advent of "The Hat" that a chief executive of limited abilities cannot succeed by himself. Through his first administration he sat alone, while elected Republicans, occupying all other State offices, went about the job of serving the people. Through his more recent official life, he managed to survive the misadventures of a Democrat house because a Republican senate squelched their more elaborate raids on the State treasury. After the 1949 assembly ended its deliberations, noted for the follies failed rather than the laws enacted, affairs at the statehouse went to pot. Ranking State officials, expected to cooperate, declined to speak to each other and the Governor couldn't mend the breach because he had quit speaking to several of them. Departmental business finally reached such a state of waste and confusion that only a press agent could dream up an alibi. He admitted the time lag was embarrassing, but maybe the public could be convincingly told the current mess wasn't current at all—it was inherited from the Republicans.

They seek to blame the Republicans for their mess, but we know "The Hat" and his boys are responsible in 1950 for the way they conducted State affairs in 1949.

While our highways are crumbling and Chuckhole Feeney's streets look like a waffle iron, Indiana is the only State where you can apply for a driving permit, pay for a driver's permit, and then run your car for 60 days on an official apology from the commissioner of motor vehicles.

What Indiana needs now, this administration says, is a new statehouse. What Indiana needs more is some new faces, some new economy, and some new courage to send back to the statehouse we have.

Folks, these Fair Deal fanatics have been in power now far too long. We can trace the same suicidal pattern of their follies across the State, National, and international scenes. Their siren songs are leading us further down the trail of no returning. For the pot of fool's gold at the end of the Fair Deal rainbow can never buy back our precious heritage.

There are those who ridicule our fears with the snide remark, "You can't eat the Constitution." Yet we are still sane enough to know that if we don't return to the Constitution we may not eat at all.

The American people will have no one else but themselves to blame, now, if they fail to read the handwriting on the wall.

Mr. Truman may be proud of our present prosperity and the plight of the world, but we are ashamed and disgraced by the spectacle. He boasts of a prosperity that was built on a $300,000,000,000 war, that was bought with blood money at the horrible sacrifice of American boys, that now rests on a $254,000,000,000 debt which is sustained by robbing the American people of their earnings and their savings.

The Federal Government is already spending 25 percent of our national income to keep its bureaucratic monster breathing. Already we are working 1 day out of every 4 to pay for this experiment in national suicide. Every time the second hand ticks out 1 minute, the Government goes deeper into debt by spending $10,400 more than it takes in. How long can we stand that?

Already Harry Truman has spent more than all the other American Presidents in our history, put together, up to the time of Pearl Harbor. The total, if you please, is the staggering sum of $181,000,000,000.

Already, since the end of the war, he has squandered $35,000,000,000 abroad through 27 international Fair Deal hand-out schemes.

And now under the guise of the point-4 program and the North Atlantic Pact, he is committing us to a permanent global Marshall plan, and the rearmament of the rest of the world. And yet, General Bradley, Secretary Matthews, and even Mr. Dulles and Mr. Stassen admit we are losing the cold war and preparing the table for Stalin.

On the domestic scene, in the same period, Mr. Truman has spent $50,000,000,000 for national defense. Yet General Bradley admits that today we are unable to keep the peace, win a war or even defend ourselves.

In addition, Mr. Truman himself now admits he cannot possibly keep this pump-priming prosperity alive on the present take of the Federal Government. So he is trying to force through Congress 15 additional Fair Deal programs which will ultimately raise our national budget from forty-two to sixty-seven billion dollars a year. This could not be financed without at least a 60-percent increase in taxes which would force us to spend half our time working for the Federal Government.

There is little wonder then this reckless squandering is forcing States into a 73-percent increase in State-Government debts and forcing the people in the grass roots to turn more and more to Federal hand-outs in every field to pay for the increasing cost of the vicious spiral of deficit spending and inflation.

Today, Indiana's $206,604,414 biennial budget is the largest in history. Indiana's share of this year's $42,490,000,000 Federal budget which Mr. Truman asked for, amounts to $971,853,000. This is almost five times the total of all Indiana State taxes. It equals the total annual value of Indiana's farm income.

This riotous squandering might make some sense if it really were strengthening the economic security of the American people by

meeting their genuine needs. But here's the picture.

Billions of our tax dollars are pouring into the ratholes of Europe and Asia and the pouring has only started. At home swarms of bureaucrats are stumbling all over themselves in a mad rush to turn our tax dollars into votes. Meanwhile, our enormous debt, deficit spending and inflation are eating away the earnings, the savings, the insurance and the pensions of Mr. and Mrs. America.

With an estimated population increase to 155,000,000 by 1955, here is a list of our own needs which must be met just to keep our standard of living where it is.

To get rid of our shameful slums and give us an average minimum standard of housing equal to the level of 1940 we need an estimated $77,500,000,000; we need $12,000,000,000 to bring our schools up to date.

We need $9,000,000,000 for hospitals.

We need $41,000,000,000 for our Nation's highways.

This is how we are neglecting our own.

What do you think would happen if we added Mr. Truman's insistent demand for a 60 percent increase in this staggering tribute we are already paying the Fair Deal bureaucracy?

When men suffer such illusions of grandeur they have been in power for too long. And all one can say of Mr. Truman and his Fair Deal rabblerousers in their present state of mind, is that "those whom the Gods would destroy, they first make mad."

They say we don't know what we stand for; that we have no program, so we can't help straighten out this mess. Well, under the Republican Eightieth Congress, we showed the American people where we stand and what we can do. Under the Republican Eightieth Congress we achieved the highest national income in our history, highest farm income, high wages across the board, and our lowest peacetime unemployment level. The Republican Eightieth Congress met our tremendous obligations both at home and abroad and at the same time reduced taxes, balanced the Federal budget for the first time in 16 years, and left a huge surplus in the Federal Treasury.

We did it before and we can do it again.

As Republicans we have not been a party that has been fostering and advancing the cause of Communist infiltration in the Federal Government.

As Republicans we have not been conniving and scheming to subvert and bypass the Constitution.

As Republicans we have not lent our support to the criminal betrayals of America's vital interests either at home or abroad.

As Republicans we have not lined up as "yes" men and women, as goosesteppers in thought and practice to preserve our own selfish interests in perpetuating hand-outs of our share of political plums and patronage.

As Republicans our ranks are not infested with fanatical do-gooders and world-saviors whose mania is running other peoples' lives with other peoples' money.

As Republicans we refuse to accept complicity in, or responsibility for, the depths of degradation, criminal corruption, perversion and treasonable practices into which our Government has been dragged during the past 18 years.

As Republicans we have carried on a faithful fight to preserve the traditional principles of liberty and justice under law upon which our constitutional representative government was founded.

And as Republicans we stand alone today as the only political party in America that still holds high in its hand the flaming torch of freedom.

What else can the American people turn to halt this Fair Deal's mad march to destruction?

We ask Divine Providence for the wisdom, the courage and the strength to succeed in the task we have set for ourselves. And we ask for the understanding and the humility, born of a burning faith in America's future, that will win our fellow-Americans, from every walk of life, to the justice of our cause.

If America goes down, there goes the last best hope of earth.

Our job is to save America, and we dare not fail.

Significance of the Korean Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 6 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, last week, at the invitation of the Newark Star-Ledger, of Newark, N. J., I prepared a statement on the significance of the Korean crisis, which was printed in the Star-Ledger on Sunday, July 2. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MEANING OF THE KOREA CRISIS

(By United States Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH)

The Communist aggression against South Korea and the magnificent response of the United Nations and the United States to that aggression may well go down in history as the most momentous happening of the turbulent years since the end of World War II. It proves that the free nations of the world can, and will, act together, and act swiftly, to stop a ruthless and unprovoked military aggression against a free people.

In appraising the significance of the events of the past week, there are four points which seem to me especially important.

1. In the first place, the united American support of the President's action of last Tuesday is partly due to the fact that it follows closely the spirit, and in some respects even the details, of proposals made by leading Republicans as early as last December. There were a number of us who had been calling for a long time for a strong American stand against the Communist threat throughout Asia. In particular, former President Hoover, Senators Knowland, Taft, Ferguson, and myself, and Congressmen like Walter Judd and John D. Lodge had urged such a policy, and had called for American action to prevent the fall of Formosa to the Communists. Partly on the basis of what I had learned during my far eastern trip last fall, I suggested on January 9 that such an intervention should be made on condition that offensive operations from Formosa against the Chinese mainland be suspended, and that Formosa under our protection should be devoted to the achievement of political and economic reforms. General MacArthur shared such views at the time.

It is well known that the administration at that time took an entirely different view, and specifically considered Formosa strategically unimportant and the Chinese Nationalist regime apparently not worth defending. President Truman's statement of last Tuesday, of course, reverses this stand.

I definitely do not wish to indulge in party recriminations which could greatly weaken our unity at this critical time. On the contrary, I enthusiastically support the President's stand and I admire his courage in changing his policy to a positive one in the face of the new crisis. By his action, as Commander in Chief, he has earned the support of all Americans and of free people throughout the world.

2. My second point is that our action in Korea is definitely not a war. It is a police action, under international sanction, to stop an armed aggression against the Korean Republic by a puppet Communist regime in their own country.

Far from being a war, our action in my judgment, taken under definite instructions from the United Nations, is the best guaranty against world war III. If we and the United Nations had taken no effective action, the Kremlin would have taken this as a signal that aggression anywhere in the world would go unopposed. If Korea had fallen Formosa would have been next, Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines would have been gravely threatened, and soon we might have had to retreat from Guam and Hawaii to fight for our lives on the Pacific coast. Our position not only in the Far East but in Europe as well might have collapsed, and we would have been forced at last into a global conflict under disastrous conditions.

To dramatize this point we need only remember the aggressions of the 1930's. It is virtually undisputed today that if there had been effective action by the free world to stop the Japanese aggression in Manchuria in 1931, Mussolini's seizure of Ethiopia in 1935, and Hitler's bloodless occupation of the Rhineland in 1936, World War II would never have happened. Instead the free nations seemed paralyzed and demoralized by these brutal atacks. The result was further aggression against China, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Poland, and Greece, and the beginning of a world conflict.

I do not ignore the dangers involved in the course we have undertaken. It already seems clear that some hard fighting will be necessary in Korea. There is also the possibility, however slight, that the Russians will actively intervene there. But in my considered judgment the dangers in any other course of action, especially in doing nothing, would have been infinitely greater.

3. The third point I want to make is the tremendous importance for the United Nations of what has happened. For the first time in modern history, an international body has taken effective steps against an armed aggression. The result has been an immeasurable strengthening of the prestige and power of the United Nations, which is our best hope for peace.

Again the history of the 1930's dramatizes this point. Whoever remembers the futile debates in the League of Nations following the aggressions between 1931 and 1936 is filled with a sense of tragic frustration. The paralysis of the League in the face of these cynical acts led directly to its downfall. By 1938, when Hitler acted against Austria and Czechoslovakia, the League to all intents and purposes was already dead.

By contrast our American action with respect to Korea was backed by the powerful voice of the United Nations. Australia, Nationalist China, Great Britain, Canada, the Netherlands, and New Zealand have already promised the aid of their armed forces. Altogether at least 33 member nations have already announced their support of the United Nations action. One of these is the great Republic of India, which hitherto has remained entirely aloof from the East-West conflict. This is the greatest and most inspiring step the United Nations has ever taken in organizing peace. Proposals are already being made that General MacArthur be named commander of all United Nations forces in the Korean area.

Whatever develops in the future it is already clear that Russia blundered badly in permitting the open aggression in Korea.

Evidently she never expected the united response of the free world which has come forward in the past week in answer to the clarion call of the United Nations. By its own deeds the Communist world has demonstrated the complete hypocrisy of its blatant "peace" propaganda. At last the bluff has been called.

4. But finally I want to make a point which has in it a note of warning. In our relief over all these events it is supremely important that we remember our long-range objectives of peace. These objectives can never be attained simply by military might and armed conflict. They can be attained only by a dedicated effort, together with other free nations in the United Nations, to follow the purposes so eloquently set forth in he preamble to the United Nations Charter:

"We the peoples of the United Nations determined—

"To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind; and

"To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small; and

"To establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained; and

"To promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom * * * have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims."

These goals can be attained only in the presence of an American leadership which is imbued with moral courage and high idealism. The seeds of war lie in injustice, poverty, prejudice, and disease. It is our highest mission to attack those evils where they exist, both at home and abroad. We must not allow the alarms of battle to unsettle our judgment or to deter us from the steady pursuit of our great human objectives in the world.

Britain's Health Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 6 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Britain's Health Service Reviewed on Second Birthday," written by Howard Norton, and published in the Baltimore Sun of yesterday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN'S HEALTH SERVICE REVIEWED ON SECOND BIRTHDAY

(By Howard Norton)

LONDON, July 4.—Socialized medicine in Britain is 2 years old tomorrow.

But there appears to be no plans for any public celebration of the occasion.

The truth is, many Britons are dissatisfied with the results of the experiment so far.

The system is costing the British people three times more than they were told to expect.

It is costing, this year, $1,299,600,000.

THREATEN TO WITHDRAW

Yet, in spite of the already high cost of the system, the 20,000 family doctors working under it are threatening to withdraw en masse on the ground they are underpaid.

And dentists and druggists are also talking of quitting for the same reason.

The average family doctor in Britain now gets a net income of only $4,284 a year, according to the British Medical Association.

Less than 10 percent of the cost of medical care under the Government plan goes to the doctor in fees.

And the doctor's plight is made more difficult to take in view of official's admissions that the 10,000 dentists registered under the socialized plan get average net incomes of $6,440, despite a recent 4 percent cut in the fees.

LAYMEN DISGRUNTLED

On the other side of the picture, hundreds of thousands of laymen are disgruntled because, after paying an average of $25.96 for each member of their family for a year's health service, they find they cannot get it without long waits—sometimes as long as 3 and 4 months.

The only alternative is to offer to pay the doctor or dentist a fee over and above what the government pays him. Then you get immediate service.

If you have a toothache in Britain today there is almost no hope of having it attended to without private payment.

If your child's tonsils need to be removed, the surgeon's answer is:

"Sorry, we have a long waiting list (perhaps in 4 months) unless you would like to pay 35 guineas ($100)."

CHILDREN'S TEETH NEGLECTED

Under the national health set-up, the teeth of British children are being neglected more than ever before. School dental service has all but completely broken down, with dentists flocking into more lucrative practice.

Family doctors are paid a capitation fee of about 5 cents a week for each patient who signs up with them under the national health plan.

In order to boost his income, the doctor has to increase his list of registered patients.

This has led to intense competition among doctors to acquire long lists of patients, and has resulted in some of the more favored doctors' taking on far more patients than they can handle.

MORE SENT TO HOSPITAL

And this in turn has led to other evils.

As a result hospital waiting lists have tripled in the last 2 years, and it is now impossible to get a bed for any but the gravest cases.

More than 11,000 tuberculosis sufferers are now waiting to get into hospitals and sanitoriums. Some have waited more than a year, and about 400 of them are dying each week in their own home.

Meanwhile, hospital costs have skyrocketed. In fact they are one major reason why planners of socialized medical care were so far off in their estimate of what it would cost.

In 1947, the year before socialization, the average cost of maintaining a hospital bed for a week was $28.15.

Today it is $84.

BLAMED FOR INCREASE

The horde of nonmedical people who swept into Britain's hospitals with the national health service is responsible for much of this increase, according to hospital executives.

Their job is to cope with an avalanche of paper, regulations, committee meetings, and changes of methods of accountancy demanded by the national health service.

Hospital accounts have been placed under a blanket of secrecy by order of the health ministry. But Sir Harold Wernher, chairman of University College Hospital, disclosed recently that in 1938, when his hospital had 617 beds, it spent $452,051.

The present cost for 1,100 beds, he said, is $2,955,792.

Though the British system is called a national health service, one of the most frequent criticisms is that it places the emphasis on disease and not on health.

PREVENTIVE WORK HURT

Preventive work and the promotion of good health are getting almost no attention at all. Health centers that were to have been a key feature of the plan have never got beyond the drawing boards.

One of the most notable phenomena of British health service is the tremendous increase in medical and drug consumption.

The average cost per capita of drugs and medicines supplied to patients in 1948 was 96 cents. Last year it was $2.04.

Country doctors in Britain traditionally do their own pharmaceutica work. Under socialization they have found the old custom to be a handy way of earning extra money.

By prescribing harmless but expensive medicines for patients whose ailments are largely matters of imagination they have been able to collect more from the Government and at the same time give the patient the feeling he is getting help.

HOW THEY MAKE ENDS MEET

A lot of country doctors are reported to be making ends meet through this practice because they are unable to live on the 5-cents-a-head fee they get for patients in their sparsely populated areas.

Even its critics admit there are good features in Britain's national health scheme.

Without it thousands of old men and women would have gone on making the most of it with toothless gums and dime-store spectacles. And there would have been no hearing aids for the deaf of small means.

WHAT DOCTORS THINK

And without it sudden serious illness might well have been ruinous for today's average middle class family in Britain, which, statistics show, is finding it impossible to save or take on extra insurance.

But the British Medical Association thinks these same benefits could have been secured by less drastic methods. What the average British medical practitioner thinks of socialization on its second birthday appears to be summed up in a resolution to be presented to the British Medical Association at its convention next week.

How Profits Benefit the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 6 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Mr. John T. Kennedy, president of the Benjamin Franklin University, a school of accountancy and financial administration, Washington, D. C., delivered recently to a group of students. I feel certain that his address will be of interest to Senators and to others who may read the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW PROFITS BENEFIT THE PEOPLE

You are mainly concerned with the long range prospects of those entering upon an

accountancy career. During 1949 I discussed these with specific reference to accountancy. Tonight I wish to discuss them from the standpoint of the future of American business. Manifestly progress in accountancy will largely depend upon our general economic progress.

Here we find contradictory forecasts, some being optimistic and some pessimistic. One of the more optimistic is that of the Committee for Economic Development. The committee states that, subject to certain conditions, it is possible that real wages will double in the next 30 years. By this they mean that the employee will be able to buy twice as much with his wages as he is able to buy today.

Another optimistic forecast is that of Dr. Moulton of Brookings Institute. After a most careful investigation of our resources and technological progress he has written a book on our possible economic future. In this book he states that it is possible for our scale of living to rise to eight times what it is today within the next century. To be sure he warns us that he does not say this will happen but that it is possible from the standpoint of our national resources and technological development.

Those predictions which are pessimistic are usually based upon political and social trends. Quite often those writers present a list of our trends which are similar to the trends which led to the fall of Rome. This comparison may be reasonably correct. There are no doubt a number of evils which call for remedial action. But I have heard about our going the way of ancient Rome for more than 40 years and I may be pardoned if I turn the tables. So I shall devote the rest of this talk to the question: what have we which ancient Rome did not have?

Just before Rome fell the mineral resources of Italy had become exhausted. Likewise most of the farming land was unproductive. Not enough food was being raised to feed the population and food had to be imported from other places. Scientists tell us that our important mineral resources are ample for a century and some of them for several centuries to come. From these resources we get more heat, more light, and more power in proportion to population than Rome ever did. In addition we have a multitude of by-products. For the most part these represent resources, which, in bygone days, were wasted.

Likewise today we are producing more food than we need for ourselves. To preserve our soil an extensive program of soil conservation is under way. Still again, in connection with certain water-power projects recently constructed, thousands of square miles of what was once barren land have been opened up for cultivation. Indeed our aim is not merely to produce enough food for ourselves but also for other nations besides.

Consider now the human resources. About 60 percent of the population of Rome were slaves. Our labor is free. From your studies you are well aware of the higher efficiency of free labor. We have taught you that the highest degree of efficiency in a working organization is not obtained by arbitrary rules but by inducing voluntary self-discipline on the part of the workers. I need not repeat the many expedients used in American industry by way of workers' incentives.

Back in Rome the people served the wealthy. Here all of us, whether wealthy or not, serve each other. Most of the income of the wealthy Romans was spent on themselves for extravagant living. With us most of the income of the wealthy is plowed back into industry and benefits all of us.

You have probably read about the star ball player who is paid $125,000 a year. Those of us who have practiced Federal taxation know of men who are earning that amount of income and who live on about $25,000 per year. This means that 80 percent of their income goes back into public service either by way of taxes or by way of investment. If the $125,000 earned by that ball player was used to increase the pay of 125 ball players to the extent of $1,000 each nothing like 80 percent would go back into public service, nor would we have any star ball player. The probabilities are that Ted Williams works just as much for the public as he does for himself.

This is true not only of individual income but also of corporation income. From your studies you know that a considerable portion of corporation income is reinvested in the business. Since the end of the war more than one-half of the income of our more important corporations has not been distributed but has been retained and put into more plants and more improved machinery and equipment.

Consider what this means by way of creating jobs. Jobs do not just happen. Our economists estimate that it takes a capital investment of $10,000 to create a single new job. From this you will appreciate the part which this huge reinvestment of profits has played by way of increasing the number of jobs available during recent years.

Go one step further and consider what becomes of the yield from this reinvestment of profits. This yield does not consist of new profits alone but also of wages. From your studies of profit and loss accounts you are aware that wages are often three to four times as much as the amount paid out in profits. Thus under our economic system profits do not benefit proprietors alone but also benefit the people.

To understand the significance of our economy we need only compare Great Britain with ourselves. Obviously it would not be fair to make that comparison on the basis of conditions in Great Britain today. So what I say applies principally to the prewar years. The British did reinvest some of their profits but never in the proportion which we did. As a consequence the machinery in most British factories is 20 to 30 years behind the times so that the British worker cannot hope to produce as much as the American.

One of the most vivid contrasts between Great Britain and ourselves was made by John L. Lewis a few years ago. Mr. Lewis pointed out that the British coal miner produced about one-third as much coal as the American, received about one-third as much wages, and that the cost of a ton of coal was three times as much to the British consumer.

Probably you heard the recent broadcast of the Town Meeting of the Air in which some of the speakers attributed our economic welfare to technological progress. This was true as far as it went. What those speakers did not stress is the fact that this technological progress would have been impossible without the reinvestment of profits made by our people. The British did not fully enjoy that technological progress because they did not make the required reinvestment of profits. We did because we made that reinvestment. This comparison between the British and ourselves clearly shows that our practice of reinvesting substantial profits creates new jobs, provides increased wages, and contributes to that enlarged production which is the only source of national wealth. You will instantly recognize that this reinvestment of profits is simply an organized form of Benjamin Franklin thrift.

Back in ancient Rome the rich obtained their wealth at the expense of the people. Here the wealthy can preserve their wealth only by helping the people to prosper. If business proprietors are to profit from the enormous output of our factories they must sell that output. For them to sell, the people must be able to buy. Hence maintaining high wages is just as important to employers as to employees. We do have our disputes as to whether an hourly wage rate should be 10 or 20 cents more but usually the amount in dispute is only a fraction of the total high wages.

This mutuality of interest is also evident from the measures that our more progressive corporations take to promote health and contentment among the workers. Usually we think of these developments respecting our larger corporations so I shall give an example of a relatively small factory in Philadelphia which has about 1,200 employees.

There you will find the latest safety devices and the most modern lighting. They also have air conditioning, which by the way, was introduced into American factories long before it was used in living quarters. Throughout the day both in the office and shop of that concern there are frequent musical concerts. The employees have a full hour for lunch. To enable them to enjoy recreation during that period, there are dining and kitchen facilities, lounging rooms, pool and billiard tables, bowling alleys, table tennis, and most of the facilities of a first-class club. When it comes to the comfort, health, and recreation of employees the extremely few facilities provided by our Government departments are far behind those prevailing in a number of our factories.

Equally important are the studies now being made by progressive corporations to make the work itself more interesting to the workers. The Committee for Economic Development, consisting of business leaders, recommends this as one of the goals of industry in the immediate future.

A number of these constructive measures are in their infancy and much remains to be done. But we have the satisfaction of knowing that our system of free competition will ultimately force the laggards to get into the procession.

What a contrast between all of this and ancient Rome. They had reached a state of extreme scarcity, while we have a superabundance of resources and food. Sixty percent of their people were slaves, while we have the efficiency of free labor. Their rich spent most of their income on themselves; our rich reinvest most of their income and the people benefit from that reinvestment. The rich Romans garnered their wealth at the expense of the people. Here the wealthy must help the people to prosper in order to prosper themselves.

To the cynic this may be no more than replacing a selfishness based upon animal instincts with a selfishness based upon intelligent reasoning. Even if this be true, our economic history shows that we have profited in the degree to which we have followed the spiritual ideals of human brotherhood.

Today we are confronted with a philosophy which pretends to do away with profit making. In one way or another there is profit making in every large national economy. There are times when this profit making is disguised by another name but it is still profit making in the sense of providing premium incomes. Thus the political leaders of Russia not only collect large incomes but also get what they want for one-half the prices charged the people. One investigator reports that the gap between the very rich in Russia and the masses is greater than in many capitalistic countries.

Since there is some form of profit making in every large economy the only question is, who gets the profits? Under feudalism the feudal lords got the profits, under the military dictatorships of the past the military got them, under the theocracies of Egypt the clergy got them, and under modern communism those who possess political power get them.

In all of these economies the profits went to others than the ones who earned them. Our policy is to make business a game and to award the prizes to the winners in the

game. We use profit making to reward business service, to stimulate thrift, to arouse competitive effort, and to cultivate the courage to take the risks which progress requires. From our viewpoint there are two tests of the desirability of any economy. One of these is the extent to which profits are based on contributions to the general welfare. The other is the extent to which profits benefit not only proprietors but also the people.

All this does not mean that the conduct of a modern business is an easy proposition. All too often our youth are advised to get a bit of experience, collect some capital, and then start a business. You will recall how disastrous this advice proved when given to GI's after the war. Yet 2 weeks ago an editorial in Life magazine gave that kind of advice to liberal arts college graduates.

Every year our school enrolls hundreds of students who are employed in business establishments. This circumstance shows the difficulty of learning modern business from business experience alone. Most positions in business are so highly specialized that they do not afford a comprehensive knowledge of the entire business. Moreover most of the new businesses which fail do not have adequate accounting. To attempt to engage in modern business without either the knowledge of the techniques of finance, or an association with someone who has that knowledge, is hazardous. Those who do understand financial management may be encouraged by the fact that the number of new businesses in our country is constantly increasing. There are abundant business opportunities for those who know how to play the game.

Neither our economy, nor any other, should be judged by standards of absolute perfection. So long as mankind is imperfect our institutions cannot be perfect. Unquestionably there have been abuses of free enterprise on the part of certain selfish interests. In spite of these abuses our American economy comes closer to the ideals of human brotherhood than has any economy in history. Moreover we have a firm foundation for our faith that the expansion and growth of the past will continue in the years to come.

For these reasons I do not share the fear of those educators who view with alarm the number of college graduates entering the employment market during June. On the contrary that event should be encouraging. For it shows that millions of our youth are interested in their self-development. Your class is an outstanding example. Most of you are spare-time students who have given up leisurely recreation to pursue serious study. Instead of our inspiring you, it is you who inspire us. So I urge you to carry on. Continue to exercise the same zeal and enthusiasm and enterprise you have shown here and you may look forward to a glorious future for yourselves and for our country.

Formosa Under the Nationalists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 6 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Formosa Under the Nationalists," by Fitzhugh Turner, which appeared on the editorial page of the New York Herald Tribune for Saturday, July 1. This article presents a very well-balanced review of recent history and the present situation on the strategic island of Formosa.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORMOSA UNDER THE NATIONALISTS—CHIANG'S GOVERNMENT IS RELATIVELY EFFICIENT AND REASONABLY POPULAR

(By Fitzhugh Turner)

Formosa, last home of Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese Nationalists—now being defended by the United States Seventh Fleet—is a green and lovely place of high mountains, twisting rivers and fertile coastal lowlands. Its area is about that of Massachusetts and Connecticut combined, its cities are picturesque and clean after the Japanese fashion, and its economy, thanks to its former Japanese rulers, is better ordered than anywhere on the mainland 100 miles across the China Sea.

The island has electric power, telephones, hard-surfaced highways, deep-water ports, and a busy railroad (450 trains a day, mostly on time). It produces sugar and tea for export, camphor, and two big crops of rice a year. It has coal and other minerals, prospects of oil, some factories, and a much larger industrial potential than has been touched in its history.

The government imposed by the Nationalists is relatively efficient, and reasonably popular. The 7,000,000 people, who are of Chinese stock, work hard, live peaceably when they are able, and dislike communism. Fewer than 500, by Nationalist count, are Communists; these largely are mainlanders, some are in jail, and some few have been shot.

The situation of Formosa is important strategically to the United States. The island lies between Japan and the Philippines, thrusting in three directions toward areas of vital American interest. Okinawa, where the Air Force is reentrenching, is within 3 or 4 hours of Formosa's excellent airfields. Korea, Manila, and Tokyo all are within 5 to 7 hours by bomber. With its dependent islands, Formosa blocks the sea route from Communist-held north China to Communist-threatened southeast Asia.

Except for 160,000 recent headhunters in the mountains, the 7,000,000 native Formosans are Chinese in character, descendants of people who moved 2 or 3 centuries ago from Fukien and other mainland provinces across the strait. But as habitual islanders, they are inclinded to set themselves apart from mountaineers newly arrived from the mainland. Second-class citizens for 50 years under the Japanese, their frequent revolts firmly suppressed, they hoped for good treatment, and a measure of autonomy, when China regained Formosa after the war.

They were given neither. Although the island was promised to China at Cairo in 1943 and again at Yalta and Potsdam, the Chinese, when they arrived, found themselves poorly prepared to take over. Unable to separate good Formosans from collaborators, unwilling to trust individuals, they brought with them an eager swarm of half mountaineers—islanders who had fled to China before and during the war. The half mountaineers promptly grabbed the best jobs from the departing Japanese, in industry and business as well as government, and the true islanders found themselves out in the cold.

Nor did it help when their efforts to get a better deal resulted in a massacre. After some rioting and considerable palaver, General Chen Yi, the Nationalist Governor, allowed his troops to go beserk with their weapons on February 28, 1946. No one kept count, but the streets ran with blood, and estimates are that 3,000 to 20,000 Formosan men, women, and children perished. Chen Yi (no relation to the Communist general of the same name) was transferred for the exploit, but the local leadership had been wiped out and Formosan nationalism, for practical purposes, was smashed.

Nationalist reforms—together with the recent execution of Chen Yi as a Communist collaborator—have done much to win the islanders since then. They date to some months before the Nationalists fled the mainland and took refuge in Taipeh, Formosa's capital. Largely they have been the work of three men: C. K. Yen, the Finance Minister; General Chen Cheng, the slight, 52-year-old Chinese commander in Burma during World War II, and Governor K. C. Wu, who was educated at Princeton University, was wartime mayor of Chungking and postwar mayor of Shanghai.

Chen Cheng was governor of Formosa until March, when he became premier of the Nationalist Government. One of his first steps, last year, was to eliminate the island's unpopular tax on salt. He broke up the more dangerous of the black markets, and revamped, reduced, and tightened the messy provincial bureaucracy. Most important, he came down with a heavy hand on the landlords who controlled the island's agriculture. Chen Cheng's land reform program limits farm rents to 37.5 percent of the farmer's crop—it had been up to half—regulates exploitation of tenants, and forbids such old abuses as the iron rentals, which required a farmer to pay even if his crop failed.

Land reform, a fertilizer program for the rice fields, and a propaganda and improvement campaign enabled the farmers last year to produce enough to feed the island, except for Chiang Kai-shek's big army. Rice production was 1,200,000 tons, as compared with 650,000 in 1945. Given luck this year—and rice stalks are growing double, which means good luck in China—the harvest is expected to reach 1,400,000 tons.

Another important reform was accomplished in currency during Chen Cheng's governorship, so that Formosa has escaped the inflation which did much to wreck the Nationalists on the mainland. The Formosan dollar is backed by some $30,000,000 of Nationalist gold, and is relatively stable. It is worth about 20 cents (United States) at the official rate, half that in the black market, and has held its value nearly a year.

Dr. Wu, who succeeded Chen Cheng as governor, is the most western among top National officials, and one of the most astute. He has included 17 Formosans among the 23 members of the provincial commission (a few other islanders hold fairly high administrative jobs), has introduced a beginning of social security, and has made plans for elections this year for local magistrates and mayors.

Dr. Wu also has been easing half mountaineers out of their jobs so they can be replaced by islanders. He is not above covering the blunders of a newly appointed islander until the man has learned his duties. Loyalty of the Formosans and support for the Nationalist Government are his aims. It is evident that to a large degree he is attaining them.

A few miles north of Taipeh, the capital, and elsewhere on Formosa's beaches, barbed wire fences block the surf, pillboxes dot the shore, and mines have been laid in the sand. Troops are in evidence everywhere, some armed, some maneuvering without weapons. Around barracks you see basketball or soccer games in spirited progress, and often, on the roads you meet platoons or companies engaged in tough cross-country marches.

The soldiers seem happy and confident. Intelligence reports vary, morale seems to rise or fall with such events as the evacuation of Hainan and the Chushan Islands. You can have a fruitless—pending the test of battle—argument about whether the Formosa troops are well fed or underfed, content with the island or homesick for the

mainland, anxious to fight or willing to defect to the Communists.

Economically the United States has spent something over $20,000,000 in Formosa and still is spending at the rate of $2,200,000 a month. Much of the money has gone for rural health, seed improvement, pest control, and all-important fertilizer for the rice fields, but some has gone for industrial purposes, and a $3,000,000 program for industrial maintenance is getting under way. It includes a new power station for a Chinese-built fertilizer plant, transmission lines, crossties and rails, spare parts for trucks and busses, and materials to mend the island's 3,000 railroad and highway bridges.

In the opinion both of Chinese and American officials, the Economic Cooperation Administration program is helping but has not made a substantial dent in what ought to be done to give Formosa the full economy it can support. To do an effective job, Americans say, the program should be tripled or more.

The Chinese have made specific proposals. What they would like, they say, is $10,000,000 a month in economic aid, plus an American contribution of $30,000,000 to back the Formosan currency. This would free $30,000,000 from the Nationalist treasury for other purposes.

Single Catalog System in the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 6 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written to President Truman by Lt. Col. Vernon J. Nelson, of Wallace, Idaho, on the subject of a single catalog system in the Government.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALLACE, IDAHO, *May 15, 1950.*

Mr. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TRUMAN: I am sending this appeal to you in hopes that you will take a personal interest in a matter of vital importance to the Nation.

First, I would like to state that the opinions in this letter are my own, although I know that practically all the members of our local chamber of commerce, of which I am president, and many other people of the community are in accord. But we are becoming alarmed at the increasing size of our national budget and also afraid for our national security. We are thinking that there must be some way of cutting expenditures, and at the same time keep our country strong. For this reason we have taken such things as parts of the Hoover Commission for study and made reports to the chamber members. The part I felt most qualified to report on was that of supplies and particularly property identification of materials. Apparently the latter still is in a very sad state of affairs. Not only does the report bear this out but as an example, in a March 14, 1950, United Press news release, we read where the General Services Administration had found one Government agency with a 93-year supply of light bulbs, a 247-year supply of loose-leaf binders, etc. The GSA evidently is attempting to find excess supplies and spread them out to avoid big inventories and save huge expenses. Now our local people cannot understand how such huge excessive inventories, etc., could accumulate; but, as for myself, having spent 4½ years in the last war, that is perfectly understandable. And the whole trouble stems from inadequately identified material.

I feel particularly well qualified to speak on the question of inadequately-described material for during the last war I came in contact with the problem from the factory through to the front lines. In explanation of this I might say that as a Reserve officer I entered the Signal Corps School at Fort Monmouth in October of 1941. At that time, and later, I had several contacts with the laboratories and testing grounds. My next assignment was to general headquarters at the War College. When that headquarters was reorganized I was transferred for a year's duty in the office of the Chief Signal Officer and assigned to the Installation and Maintenance Division.

Work there included making maintenance parts lists, visiting repair shops over the United States of America, etc. The radar depot at Lexington, Ky., soon got into a great deal of trouble due to most materials being shipped in without stock numbers, etc. I was assigned there for a year as OIC of the technical division. Our principal duty was to properly stock number all unidentified materials—it took a staff of nearly 70 technicians to accomplish and keep up with that work at that one depot.

One soon learns in such a large establishment that nothing moves out of the depot unless it is properly identified. Without a stock number, the personnel in the field don't know how to properly order it. While at that depot I also taught in the supply school, a class in identification and cataloging. By that time the Signal Corps Stock Numbering Agency had bogged down with an almost unsurmountable backlog of work. I was then assigned to that agency as chief of the planning staff. After a great deal of hard work under wartime pressures, but under the capable leadership of Col. W. A. Kelley, progress was made and the agency was put on a current basis. Work at that agency put us in close contact with Procurement, Storage and Issue, factories, depots, the development laboratories, Standards Agency, the Marine Corps, Air Corps, Navy, the British, and other branches of the service. It was my firm conviction, on leaving that agency, that come peacetime, a great deal of effort must be put in to set up new stock numbers and arrive at a single catalog system for all the Armed Forces. My next assignment was to the Command and General Staff School with training in the services of supply. I was then assigned to the Army Services Forces Headquarters in Washington for a special school and practical training. I was then assigned to the southwest Pacific in the planning division of Gen. Douglas MacArthur's headquarters, with duty in New Guinea and the Philippines. It might be well to point out here that the planning division was made up of representatives from the Navy, Air Corps, Marine Corps, Australian Army, and various technical services of our Army—when it came to speaking of detailed items of supply it was practically the same as though each spoke a different language.

The above service history has been given to show that I have come in contact with the problem and have found that supplies must be correctly identified in order to be effectively handled through our supply chain. And also when you have joint operations, or greater unification as we are striving for, it becomes even more important that we all use the same language by using the same stock numbers and catalog information.

During my tour of duty I was witness to many cases of duplication, of errors made, of no stock numbers, and saw much confusion and correspondence on the matter. I recall a good example of duplication which occurred in Panama during the early part of the war when an SCR 268 set could not be kept operating due to failure of a particular resistor. In spite of the dire need of the set it could not be immediately put back in service because their supply depot was out of that stock numbered item.

However, one of our traveling inspectors found a great quantity of the required identical resistors under 13 other stock numbers. This meant that precious cargo space, critical materials, storage space, personnel for handling, etc., had been wasted in sending many times the needed stock of a single item, besides the delays in carrying on the war effort. Such duplications, errors, etc., were numerous in each of the technical branches and the waste of money must have and still must run into millions of dollars.

In the theater of war, and even in our depots in this country, I saw much material that could not be used because it was not properly identified or marked with stock numbers. I've also seen numerous requisitions for badly needed supplies returned because the items could not be identified. Had there been available at the beginning of the war a catalog system used by all the armed services, we could have maintained single stocks of supply. Articles both at home and in the foreign theaters, to be used by all services instead of forcing each to vie in procuring, storing, transporting, and issuing unnecessary and duplicate items. Such duplicating procedures not only cost additional huge sums of money but also quite often did not secure equitable distribution of critical and short supply items.

During my confinement in the Army hospitals, prior to being discharged, I talked with a number of supply offieers and found that they all had the same problem in all theaters, and I read with interest an article by Lt. Col. Glenn E. Rathbun, of Palo Alto, Calif., of the difficulties in the Normandy campaign and his plea for reforms in our supply system. It is understood that this same article of his won an award given by the National Association of Purchasing Agents. He also had his Congressman, Mr. JACK ANDERSON, introduce a bill last year that was thought would get some action but it apparently hasn't.

We know that you are interested in the proper identification and handling of materials and supplies, because it is understood you wrote a letter saying you wanted something done about it. But so did several Presidents before you try to do something. What was the result? Nothing. It is believed the same thing is happening to you. You might say that directives have been written, organizations set up, consultants hired, and money spent. Mr. President, the same thing has been happening for years; it happened after the First World War.

Bureaucrats are not going to permit the installation of a single catalog in which all articles used by the Government will have one name and one number. That will cut their budgets by reducing storage space, by reducing transportation costs, and reducing drastically the number of personnel. And bureaucrats in the armed services will not like a project that forces them into greater unification.

Mr. President, you may not see this letter and it may fall into the hands of someone who will give us the brush-off. Knowing that this is very probable, I am taking the liberty of having it published in the hope that some one may bring it to your attention.

Mr. President, we know that you are filling a very difficult job and can't possibly be an expert in all operations of the Government. However, we urge you to take from your staff, someone that you can trust, and have them get the real information on what is going on. You might ask just two questions:

1. For how many years has the project for a single government catalog been under way? (Our answer: Since the First World War.)

2. Where is the catalog today? (Our answer: There isn't one.)

And further, Mr. President, if you will read the records over the years you will find that the same statements have been made to your predecessors in the White House and to Congress to the effect that excellent progress is being made in the development of a single catalog—always progress, never completion.

It is believed that if a single catalog is adopted in which all items used by the Government is included with a single name and identifying number, you will have been able to perform a task that has baffled former Presidents, but one that is essential for the future safety of this Nation; and, incidentally, something that should reduce the tax load on our people.

During the war I was much concerned with the problems occasioned by improperly identified items, and I'm afraid, from the information I am able to uncover, that the matter is not solved but merely being kicked around. As an American citizen, a businessman, father of two sons, and a lieutenant colonel in the Organized Reserves, I am very much concerned with our national budget and future national security.

Won't you please make an investigation of this cataloging matter which is fundamental to efficient and economical supply?

Sincerely yours,

VERNON J. NELSON,
Lieutenant Colonel, Signal Corps Reserve, [redacted]

Nazism Rises While World Watches Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 3, 1950

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, preoccupied as we are with our efforts to halt the spread of communism, we have given too little attention to another dangerous condition—the rebirth of nazism in Germany. Commander in Chief Clyde A. Lewis, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, deals with the situation ably and factually in an address delivered over a Nation-wide radio network on Independence Day. This outstanding young veteran's presentation of a most serious question should be read and heeded by every thoughtful American.

NAZISM RISES WHILE WORLD WATCHES COMMUNISM

One of the major, and most formidable, tasks in the international field of politics and diplomacy is the material and political recovery of western Germany, a Germany that is the residuum of the autocracy of Bismarck, the militarism of Kaiser Wilhelm, the ineffective republic of Weimar, and the savage nationalism of Hitler.

Thoughtful Americans will, in general, agree that to solve intelligently a major part of the many problems confronting us in Germany will require the best leadership and intelligence that the United States can produce in a specialized field, that of dealing with foreign peoples.

The international problem of assisting to create a new Germany is unique in history because our country—a victor—is spending a vast amount of money and time to help a conquered nation toward political and economic recovery. In short, this means finding markets for German goods, helping to rebuild German cities, and most important, an attempt on our part to discourage in the foreseeable future German plans of world conquest or aggression. This latter can only be accomplished by eradicating superman philosophy, master-race propaganda, and the theory that might is right.

Hypernationalism and militarism must, insofar as humanly possible, be eliminated. The German people must be shown that the Hitler government, based on hypernationalism and militarism, brought their rich land into the most tragic and destructive wars of all times. That will be the verdict of history.

Only by sympathy, patience, and properly directed firmness of purpose on our part will the ghost of German militarism be laid.

We have no positive assurance that German officialdom appreciates the substantial assistance of the United States. But it is believed that the people, the plain people, of Germany—they who have been so tragically exploited and deceived—will in time see the light—but only if denazification of the official and military classes is expeditiously and efficiently accomplished.

In a recent speech at Stuttgart, our high commissioner in Germany, Mr. John J. McCloy, said this:

"Our main purpose is to help Germany achieve political recovery."

How well we are achieving that laudable objective is a matter of grave concern, not alone to us here in the United States, but to the entire world. It may well mean the difference between winning and losing the cold war.

There are those who challenge our right to mix into the political problems confronting Germany. To these, I say: How can we hope to reap the full fruits of our victory in World War II if we fail to stamp out once and for all the evil forces that led Hitler's Reich afield in quest of world domination?

I submit that the problem of Germany is a political one, and must be dealt with as such. Politics brought Hitler to power, and his national-socialist political organization implemented his ill-starred dream of world conquest.

Recently, a world-wide news agency revealed that there are some 19 new and active political parties in Germany. Leaders of most of these new groups are spreading the virus of Hitlerism. As members of the present Bonn parliament, they have a voice in the drafting of legislation, and, more significantly, in the shaping of public opinion.

We are disturbed by what we hear about Germany today. In spite of what some of our leaders tell us, we know that nazism is boldly renascent.

Encouraged by the Soviet masters of eastern Germany, and heartened by the reluctance of our leaders to crack down in the west, nationalism is flourishing—the selfsame brand of fierce and articulate nationalism that spawned the Bismarcks, the Kaiser Wilhelms, and that archdemon of them all, Adolf Hitler.

Recent statistics tell a revealing—and alarming—story. Figures published by our own military government officials and advisors disclose the sordid fact that in Bavaria alone, as of last November, there were approximately 35,000 persons employed in Bavarian ministries and their administration, and of this number, more than 15,000—almost one-half—were former Nazis. Highest percentages of these former Hitlerites in responsible positions were in the Ministry of Finance, with 60 percent former party members; food, agriculture and forestry with 70 percent, and the department of justice with 81 percent. This latter figure includes only the judges and prosecutors, and not administrative personnel.

Germany has been likened to a vast arena where the forces of totalitarianism on one side are arrayed against the forces of democracy on the other. And while these gladiators engage in a struggle to the death, sitting by as spectators are the millions of free men and women throughout the remainder of the world. They are more than spectators; they are the prize which each side in the death struggle seeks to win to its cause.

The forces of democracy must win this titanic struggle if the world is to remain free. The denazification of Germany is a must if there is to be lasting peace. And denazification must be on our terms—not Germany's.

We cannot, and we must not, tolerate a Germany in which youths swagger through the streets singing Hitler songs; a Germany in which 90 percent of the newspapers are operated by the same crowd which operated them under Hitler; a Germany in which members of a pro-Nazi parliament brazenly proclaim racial hatreds and antidemocratic sentiments.

Recently, a leading member of the German party, now a member of the Bonn coalition government, was applauded frantically by German audiences when he declared: "Germany is least responsible for the Second World War. It is the anti-Nazis who have brought about the present misery. Germany did not break down from exhaustion, but only on account of the treason and sabotage committed by the anti-Nazis."

Another member of the Bonn parliament, Dr. Richter, told a recent meeting that Germany lost the war because of the treachery of the democrats. One of Hitler's former henchmen, ex-storm trooper Ernst Remer, is leader of another noisy political party which has a name reminiscent of Hitler's organization. Remer recently declared that we will be the masters of Germany in 2 years.

With the aid of Dr. Schacht, the old Deutsch-Nationale Volkspartei, which was instrumental in raising Hitler to power, has been reestablished. Another dictator in 5 years is the bold prediction of August Haussleitner, leader of a new rightwing party, Deutsche Union.

Meanwhile, there are reports of several secret Nazi organizations. One of these groups has brazenly declared that the principles of national-socialism were and are true; they evinced a tremendous success. The goal of the group is to educate the elite of the coming Germany.

Not infrequently in Austria, where the upsurge of nazism is even more conspicuous than in Germany, mass meetings are held where participants appear in SS uniforms and sing Hitler songs. Secret SS and youth organizations are spreading terror throughout the country.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States believes the American people are entitled to know what we are doing to block the resurgence of nazism. We are building strongholds of democracy here and abroad, and are taking every measure to thwart communism in its ruthless march toward world domination. The potential threat of nazism is equally as ominous, yet we blink our eyes and do little or nothing.

What happened to our campaign of education that was to teach German youth the blessings of democracy? Why do we permit indifference and inertia to let German nationalism grow and flourish under the selfsame slogan that brought Hitler to power—the conviction that Germany is the predestined master of the world?

A New York Times survey last December brought the conclusion that the resurgence of reactionary radical nationalism with Nazi overtones is the most dangerous long-range

problem facing the western powers in Germany.

Drew Middleton, New York Times correspondent in Germany, reminded us on January 28 of the past affinity between German and Soviet militarism. He stated that each step which the United States takes leading to a strengthening of the extreme right increases the future danger of a new Russo-German alliance.

One high United States occupation official in Germany blandly tells us that nazism has been destroyed in Germany, but in the same breath proposes that Germany be handed back to the same crowd that made a god of Adolf Hitler and brought upon the world the most horrible blood bath in its history. Fanatical German nationalism and nazism are from the same cloth. Both must be destroyed if democracy is to survive.

We must make the Germans understand that the world is fed up with superracism, that no one nation, no one ideology, whether it be nazism, fascism, communism, or by whatever name it may be called, is going to rule the world.

Nazis, like Communists, understand but one language—the language of force. Only through a show of force—moral as well as military—can we hope to stave off another and far more horrible world conflict.

We are prone to forget Dachau and Buchenwald. We realize with indifference that scoundrels like Schacht and Von Papen are free; that Ilse Koch, the wretched beast of Buchenwald, has been released; that characters like Fritz Thyssen, who started Hitler on his rise to power, have been dismissed as "minor Nazis." Do facts such as these lend credence to High Commissioner McCoy's declaration at Stuttgart when he said: "One of the primary purposes of the occupation has been and is to eradicate Nazi influence and leadership from German political, economic, and cultural life"?

Today, in this great free land of ours we are observing the one hundred and seventy-fourth anniversary of our Declaration of Independence. Since that day in 1776 when our forefathers courageously proclaimed our freedom from oppression, this Nation has been the leading champion of free democratic government throughout the world.

We are working to safeguard democracy in the cold war. Only recently, we joined with 11 other North Atlantic countries to strengthen alliance of the free countries of the west to meet any challenge from Russia. We have implemented our bid for strength of the democracies through the Marshall plan. We have, through orderly legislative processes, made material military aid available to these friendly nations.

Twice within a generation, we have thrown our total resources into world struggles to stem the tide of totalitarianism. Now, 5 years after the conclusion of World War II, we are at bloodless war with an arrogant aggressor nation which has avowed its determination to rule the world regardless of cost.

Germany is the battleground in this cold war. Likewise, Germany is the real key to world peace, and upon the outcome of the titanic struggle between the western forces standing for freedom and democracy, and the totalitarian forces in the east, may well depend the fate of our civilization.

There must be a declaration of independence for Germany if civilization is to survive. Our apathy, our indifference have retarded progress toward that goal. Only a few months ago, High Commissioner McCloy stated that, in his judgment, "there is still too much totalitarianism and authoritarianism in German life. * * * There is still resistance to reforms long overdue, and too many German people are apathetic or negative in their approach to political responsibility."

Not long ago, while visiting in Munich, a distinguished American educator was shown a textbook then used in the elementary schools of that city. One page of this book contained instructions for the formation of capital letters, and opposite each letter was an example of its use. Here are a few of the letters—and the examples presented:

A—as in Adolf.

D—as in dolch (a dolch is a small dagger worn by Nazi soldiers).

F—as in Fuehrer.

K—as in krieg (krieg means "war").

P—as in panzer (the Nazi tank troops).

S—as in sieg, meaning victory (remember the Nazi song Sieg Heil! Sieg Heil!).

U—as in uniform.

V—as in vaterland.

W—as in Wehrmacht—the German Army and, I have kept for last—

H—as in Hitler!

Does this indicate that nazism is dead in Germany?

Let us listen for a moment to Gen. Telford Taylor, who was chief of counsel for the war crimes trials in Nuremberg. Less than 6 months ago, General Taylor declared:

"If the Germans failed to measure up to what one might have hoped for in denazification, our own neglect of the reeducation program has been even more disastrous. Indeed, each failure contributed to the other. * * * The Germans speedily concluded that reeducation was not a seriously intended program and that most of our talk of democratization was nothing but window dressing."

Of this, from Emelyn Williams, of the Christian Science Monitor, one of the Nation's great and most respected newspapers, who said:

"All over Germany great sympathy is being shown toward people tried and sentenced as war criminals or as Nazis. Fugitive war criminals are never betrayed to the Allied authorities or to the German authorities by the population itself. There are thousands who at times opposed the Nazis, who today join the Nazis in opposing democracy."

There is further evidence from reputable American correspondents in Germany that our efforts to organize German youth against communism have failed completely.

A glaring example of our failure in this respect is the program to bring baseball to Germany. The Army spent many thousands of dollars to provide gloves, bats, masks, and other baseball paraphernalia. One American writer said he saw literally mountains of this equipment rotting in German Youth Association clubs.

The fact is that German youths have never played baseball. They don't understand it, and they don't want to. They consider it "sissy," just as they regard the free cokes and the Mickey Mouse movies sent to Germany at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Stalin has played a smarter game. To him, German kids are German kids. In eastern Germany, he has reorganized the very successful Hitler youth group, the jugend, and has renamed the Freie Deutsch Jugend. A lad joining the FDJ is given a badge and a natty blue uniform and, as in the Hitler days, he and his fellows parade through the streets goose-stepping to the tune of a military band.

To the young German of today that is real fun. It reminds him of the days when his father, Hermann, and his uncle, Otto, strutted so proudly in their SS uniforms.

One high American youth official put it this way:

"The little youth work we are doing is based on the occupation directive to make German kids forget the regimentation of the Hitler regime and to think, pray, and live like American kids.

"We are forbidden to discuss current politics, and open mention of the Soviet Union would be against State Department policy. Our program is similar to the Boy Scouts or the YMCA."

We may dislike Soviet Russia's methods, and we may abhor their willingness to embrace the rudiments of Hitlerism in dealing with German youth. But the fact remains that they are outstripping us in their dealings with the young people of Germany. We must admit that Sovietism is far more acceptable to German youth than the brand of democracy we are attempting to sell them.

We must not forget that it was Hitler, the god of the Nazis, the so-called defender of Europe against communism, who made a deal with Soviet Russia. His followers, if encouraged, will build a renazified Germany that might well make a similar deal with Russia—the more so because the Soviet Union can offer Germany the markets and the raw materials which the west cannot promise her.

What can we do?

We can insist that our Government take appropriate and decisive action leading toward denazification of Germany in fact. We must take effective action to strengthen every democratic force in Germany. We must see to the removal of all supporters of nazism from key positions in the administrative, political, and educational life of Germany.

We must halt the concentration of power in the hands of a few German industrialists.

We must assure for Germany an adequate standard of living, but at the same time, we must provide impregnable barriers against Germany ever again becoming an aggressor.

In the words of President Truman, we must prove by "hard work and practical demonstration, that free men can create for themselves a good society, in which they can live together at peace and advance their common welfare."

America's veterans cannot forget what they saw as our victorious troops moved into the heart of the Reich. They can never forget the terrible price we paid in the crusade to crush Hitlerism.

Today, 5 years after, veterans insist that there must be no renascence of nazism. They demand a realistic and effective acceleration of our program of national security, of military preparedness, and of democratic education and progress.

We must assist western Germany by material aid and spiritual support to gain a government wherein its citizens have the fundamental freedoms. But, meanwhile, we must, by a show of force beforehand, serve notice of our intention to brook no arrogant dreams of world conquest by any "ism."

There must be no third world war. Above all, there must be no more Dachaus or Buchenwalds.

And in conclusion on this the Fourth of July, it is appropriate to refer to an eternal verity of foreign policy as enunciated by the great George Washington:

"Observe good faith and justice toward all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it?"

It is a policy of truth and value of an infinite worth that time cannot wither or custom stale.

The Mundt Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 6 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mundt Bill," appearing in this morning's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUNDT BILL

The eruption in Korea has been used by some Republicans as a pretext for reviving the Mundt anti-Communist bill. They want action on the issue before the Eighty-first Congress adjourns and goes off for its vacation. We hope that the heat in Washington will induce the legislators to forego this overheated idea and put the matter over for calmer consideration, if necessary next winter.

While disclaiming any intention to outlaw the Communist Party, the Mundt bill would require all Communist political organizations and all Communist-front organizations to register with the Attorney General and maintain accurate lists of their members; it would deny use of the mails or radio broadcast facilities to any of these groups unless its message was plainly designated as coming from a Communist source; it would forbid members to hold Government jobs or obtain passports. The indubitable effect of this would be to outlaw not only the Communist Party but every voluntary association that might be officially designated subversive and to put under a cloud those innocents who have ever belonged to one.

In addition, the Mundt bill would create a new crime—knowingly to conspire or agree with any other person to perform any act which would substantially contribute to the establishment within the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship. This could mean anything at all, including a campaign contribution to the Republican or Democratic Parties which have been variously called Fascist and Communist in intent by their opponents.

To be sure, the laws need strengthening to meet the challenge coming from conspiratorial communism, but, as we have reiterated, the way we would start would be by insisting upon a public accounting of funds collected by organizations asking for financial support. Disclosure of this sort is consonant with democratic processes; punishment for lawful associations is not. The latter would endanger all our institutions.

The "Ifs" of Pearl Harbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 6 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and myself, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The 'Ifs' of Pearl Harbor," written by Rear Adm. Logan Ramsey, United States Navy, retired.

I have been informed by the Public Printer that the article will exceed by two-thirds of a page the ordinary two-page limitation, and that it is estimated that the printing of the article will cost $218.68. Notwithstanding the fact that the article slightly exceeds the limit of two printed pages, I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, because I think it is of value to the Congress and to the people of the Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE "IFS" OF PEARL HARBOR

(By Rear Adm. Logan Ramsey, U. S. Navy, retired)

Even a superficial study of the vast verbiage dealing with the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor indicates that the far greater portion of its volume is devoted to a search for American sins of omission and consequent responsibility for the disaster. The errors of commission are obviously few and unimportant. There is a constant reiteration, principally by more or less tacit implication, that if certain steps had been taken, the defeat might have been greatly minimized or entirely averted. This paper proposes to discuss four of the most plausible "ifs," with a view to expounding what could have been the results had these might-have-beens actually affected the Pearl Harbor campaign. It will attempt to do so while avoiding, as far as humanly possible, the initiation of any controversy. Space limitations, alone, will prevent any discussion of events on the high political level, and of diplomacy or grand strategy.

To avoid enmeshment in a profitless squirrel cage of speculation and whirling from minor hypothesis to consequent minor conjecture, it is necessary to assume that definite decisions were made at specific times that an attack on Pearl Harbor was probable as well as possible. Exactly how such decisions could have been reached, or by whom, is immaterial to the purpose of this paper.

Our first "if" assumes that the Military Establishment of the United States began to act on November 27, 1941, on the premise that the Japanese might attack Pearl Harbor in the near future. Under these circumstances the initial moves of our forces would have been the recall of the *Saratoga* from the west coast and the dispatch of patrol plane squadrons to Midway, Johnston, and Palmyra Islands. On the basis of then existing estimates such as the Bellinger-Martin one, and the over-all patrol plane availability, long-range scouting to 700 miles from Midway on the sector north to northeast and station patrols on the Midway-Johnston-Palmyra line would have been the optimum that could have been expected from these outlying units, other than an occasional scout toward the mandated islands. Naturally, in view of the actual route taken by the Japanese attack force, this effort would have been wasted except insofar as the negative information so obtained would have enhanced the freedom of movement permitted the United States Fleet. The remaining patrol planes with possible reinforcements from San Diego would have supplemented this long-range reconnaissance by similar patrols from Oahu to the northwestward or in advance of our fleet. Their available numbers, even with the maximum possible reinforcements from the west coast, would not have permitted an optimum coverage of even the most dangerous sectors. The actual daily search plan would have required some very nice decisions involving such factors as holidays in the coverage obtained the previous day of the Midway sector, aircraft availability, and anticipated movements of the fleet.

Assuming that decision and preparation of plans occupied all of November 27, subsidiary planning and preparations for the patrol plane movements to the outlying bases would have consumed the twenty-eighth. The patrol plane movements could have been effected the following day and the initial scouting from the chosen bases on the last day of November would have permitted a United States Fleet sortie on December 1 under the most favorable practical circumstances on the basis of information then available. Actual movements of the fleet would have been somewhat dependent upon our hypothetically advanced return of the *Saratoga* to Hawaiian waters. Therefore it appears logical to assume that the fleet would have operated generally to the north and eastward of the Japanese objective, as did the forces of Admirals Spruance and Fletcher under somewhat similar conditions just prior to the battle of Midway. Even had the *Saratoga* been available on the sortie day, the risk of getting too far from Oahu for interception, had the Japanese taken a route via the Mandated Islands, would have been too great to have permitted much of a venture to the northwest of Oahu.

Of course, a station generally along the Pearl Harbor-Midway line might have facilitated interception regardless of whether the Japanese chose the northern or the southern route. However, such a fleet position would have been disadvantageous in that tactical contact would have probably been made after, instead of before, any attack on Pearl Harbor itself. It must be remembered that in 1941 the fuel storage at Pearl Harbor was relatively vulnerable to aerial attack, and that fleet oilers were far too few in number to have rendered the prospect of loss of the Oahu fuel other than calamitous in a situation where the entire fleet was at sea with depleted bunkers.

Even after the *Saratoga* had joined the fleet—after refueling at Pearl Harbor—the officer in command would have been well advised to have remained inside the radius of his Oahu-based patrol planes if only because the Japanese planes of that date materially outranged those with which the *Saratoga, Lexington,* and *Enterprise* were then equipped. Of course, we were then not fully aware of that important fact, and this ignorance alone might have resulted in a disaster far greater than the actual Pearl Harbor had our fleet accepted an engagement under the given conditions in an area beyond range of our patrol planes. But under our present assumptions, and discounting any possible and fortuitous earlier sighting of the Japanese force by one of our submarines, it does not seem likely that the enemy would have been sighted before the afternoon of December 6, even if he had continued on the track actually taken.

And here we must consider the possible effect that the fleet sortie might have had upon the Japanese plans. Our basic decision might have included steps to stop all flow of information from Oahu to the Japanese. However, such action, even if fully effective, might have been interpreted by the Japanese as a mere reflection of increasingly strained relations. The Japanese plan, as reported after the war, contained provisos as follows: if discovered prior to X–2 day (December 5), return to Japan; if discovered prior to X–1 day, action optional; if discovered on X–1 or X days (December 6 or 7), continue and deliver the attack; if interception should be attempted by the American fleet, counter-attack; and if, on arrival in Hawaiian waters, the American fleet was at sea and not in Pearl Harbor, scout on a 300-mile radius around Oahu and attack if contact results, but otherwise withdraw.

With these stipulations in mind it seems plausible under our present hypothesis to assume further that by December 3 Admiral Nagumo would have had, at best, positive information of the fleet sortie, or, at worst, an absence of all data from Oahu, indicating strongly that a complete surprise could not be confidently anticipated. As the refueling of his force at sea actually took place on that date it might have been possible, prior to the completion of that critical evolution, for the entire plan to have been cancelled without "loss of face" to those originally advocating the Pearl Harbor attack.

On the other hand, as indicated before, effective counter-espionage on Oahu might have been discounted, and the United States fleet sortie—if known at this time—might have been attributed to a mere military reflection of the diplomatic uneasiness. If we can assume that, in Japanese semantics, the "discovered" in the provisos to the Jap plan of attack means "sighted and reported," then the last stipulation would have governed. An attempted 300-mile circuit of Oahu could hardly have failed to produce a naval battle. Our first "if" therefore boils down to the probability that if we had decided definitely on November 27 that the Japanese would probably attack Pearl Harbor in the near future, then a naval engagement would have been fought to the northward of Oahu, probably on December 7.

While the writer makes no pretense to any insight into Japanese psychology, it appears plausible that once the attack force had sailed from Hitokappu Bay, it would have been quite difficult for it to have been recalled by any Japanese volition in the absence of any "discovery" prior to X–2 day or of an American diplomatic surrender. Instead, the inertia affected other forces already set in motion; the inexorable march of events, the Japanese spirit of fatalism, and their subsequently manifested tendency to persist in plans once started—all these would have conspired to produce a game of "buck passing" on the grand scale—Nagano to Yamamoto to Nagumo, or whatever were the effective Jap "channels" at this time. And if the decision had been left to Admiral Nagumo, the fear of "loss of face" alone might have made him decide to continue to Hawaiian waters in the absence of any definite recall by higher authority. If we then conclude that an engagement would have resulted, it is difficult to assume that the American officer in tactical command would have lightly discarded the advantages of remaining within range of his Oahu-based patrol planes.

Assuming Nagumo had kept to his actual track, no contact could have been reasonably expected before the afternoon of December 6. However, if the Japanese admiral had been aware of the absence of the United States Fleet from Pearl Harbor, he might have altered course to the eastward at sunrise on the 6th to remain beyond patrol plane range while attempting to locate our fleet by aerial scouting during that day. With our 17-knot battleships hampering the mobility of our fleet, Admiral Nagumo's fleet speed of 26 knots would have given him an immense advantage had he been successful in so making contact. In fact, nearly every factor would have favored the Japanese. First of all, they would have had a nearly 2-to-1 advantage in air striking power. In addition, if we except the numerically impotent Hawaiian-based Army B–17's, this aerial force materially outranged ours. Also we must remember that never again during the entire war did a Japanese admiral have under his command as superbly trained, fresh, and efficient an aerial striking force as the one which raided Pearl Harbor. By contrast, our carrier pilots had not yet achieved the efficiency they reached at Midway and later engagements. Finally, our tactical thinking was then still inclined to consider carrier duels as merely the overture to the engagement of the battle lines.

All in all, if we merely consider what happened at Midway, where many of the initial Japanese advantages had disappeared, and apply the old thumb rule of damage inflicted varying inversely as the squares of the fire power engaged, it would be difficult to assume an American victory. (Parenthetically, this rule worked out at Midway, if we disregard nonessentials. The Japanese had four carriers; we had three, plus the equivalent of about one carrier in our shore-based air. But with the enemy devoting one-half of his air striking power to the tactically nonessential attack on Midway Island itself, he was left with only the equivalent of two carrier air groups at the scene of the vital part of the engagement—at sea—to oppose our four. Hence the theoretical loss should have been 16 to 4, or four Jap carriers sunk to one of ours which, of course, was the actual result.) Consequently, disregarding chance which might have favored the enemy rather than ourselves, our hypothetical battle might well have resulted in losses based on the results obtained by six carrier air groups opposed to three, or 36 to 9 in favor of the Japanese. On this basis, we might have expected to lose all three of our carriers to one for the Japanese. Had such a disaster taken place, follow-up attacks on our then comparatively defenseless battleships would have undoubtedly produced a defeat far more devastating than did the real Pearl Harbor.

Naturally, in arguing on this basis we are discounting certain moral factors which might have produced quite different results. Knowing our fleet was at sea, Admiral Nagumo might have exercised considerable caution, particularly if his early losses had been as much as the two carriers the Japanese had expected would be lost in the attack on Pearl Harbor. However, the relative weakness of our fleet at this moment in what later proved to be the really effective naval striking power—the air groups of our carriers—would have made the chance of an American victory almost beyond the realm of possibility. And a defeat under such circumstances would have been far worse to morale than was Pearl Harbor. It is bad enough to be defeated by a treacherous surprise attack; it is even worse to be licked when presumably ready to fight. We came up from Pearl Harbor fighting mad; a defeat in this "if" battle might have resulted in a far less favorable reaction.

The second of our "ifs" is concerned with the stoppage of radio intelligence tending to locate the Japanese carriers during the first week of December 1941. To quote from Admiral King's comments on the naval court of inquiry, "up to December 2, no reliable estimate could be made of the whereabouts of four of Japan's 10 carriers, and * * * there was no information as to any of the carriers thereafter."[1] If, on the basis of this negative information or of any other data, an estimate had been made on December 3 that an attack on Pearl Harbor was probable in the very near future, the actual disposition of our forces on that date must be considered. The *Saratoga* was on the west coast and would be out of the picture entirely. On the morning of the 4th Admiral Halsey was off Wake Island, launching a squadron of Marine fighters from the *Enterprise*. Admiral Brown with the *Lexington* and Task Force 3 (less battleships) was at sea to the south of the Oahu-Midway line. One patrol squadron was at Midway, a second was to depart from Wake for Pearl after extensive scouting while based on Wake to cover the advance and retirement of Task Force 8. Under these conditions a long-range patrol plane reconnaissance as outlined in our November 27 "if" would be indicated, with modifications to give the task forces at sea greater coverage in advance of their movements. In view of the fuel situation in Admiral Halsey's task force, a rendezvous with Admiral Brown to the eastward of Midway would have been indicated. The battleships were in Pearl Harbor, principally because of a shortage of destroyers to provide them with adequate antisubmarine screens. Consequently it might have been considered advisable to keep them in port on short notice pending more definite indications, although an immediate sortie on the morning of the 4th would have permitted their joining Admirals Halsey and Brown on the Pearl-Wake line early on the morning of December 6. The difference in this situation and our earlier "if" would be that our fleet—this time with only two carriers—would be some 700 miles west of Pearl Harbor. If Pearl Harbor had been reported as empty to Admiral Nagumo, he would probably have started the 300-mile circuit of Oahu. In view of the patrol plane availability which would have precluded our covering of all sectors, if contact had not been made with his force on December 6, he might well have avoided detection until December 8. By this time he would have been south of the Hawaiian chain, assuming that he had not in the meantime decided to attack the fuel storage and other permanent installations at Pearl Harbor with at least a portion of his air striking power.

Naturally had the Japanese submarines around Oahu been able to give him any clue as to the direction in which our fleet had departed from Pearl Harbor before X-day, his movement would have been to the westward; but, failing such information, he might well have decided to deliver an attack on Oahu itself, if only to knock out our shore-based air and thus give greater security to his movements while in Hawaiian waters. His fuel situation would have been causing him considerable anxiety in his planning for future operations. In fact, had no contact been made with his forces on December 6 by our patrol planes, he might well have decided to deliver a late afternoon attack on the permanent installations of Pearl Harbor on December 7. Assuming such a strike had been delivered from about the same location as the actual attack, he could have expected to recover his aircraft about sunset and steamed during the ensuing night on the western semicircle of 300 miles from Pearl. Presumably he would have been more than willing to have a night action between at least his cruisers and destroyers and our fleet, while avoiding action with his carriers and possibly his battleships. The afternoon attack on Pearl Harbor could have hardly failed to locate his force to the northward of Pearl, and our forces might have headed to the northward on the assumption that it was a hit and run raid. Under these conditions a night action might have taken place during darkness of December 7–8, or the two forces might have missed contact entirely. On the whole, the possibilities in this general situation (with our battleships at sea) might have been as follows: (1) an afternoon air attack on Pearl Harbor December 7 with a night action following; (2) the same attack on Pearl with no contact thereafter; (3) or a daylight engagement on December 7 or 8 to the northward and westward of Oahu. The probable results of any of these might well have altered the actual course of the Pacific war to our detriment.

Certainly, in view of his orders, Admiral Nagumo would hardly have attacked an empty Pearl Harbor unless he was convinced he had not been detected, and consequently it is quite possible the first indication of such an attack to our forces would have been either by radar or patrol plane sighting. In view of the communication facilities available at this time, a sighting of the Jap surface force or radar contact 1 hour before the attack would have permitted only about one half hour for preparatory action. With such short warning, while considerably more air opposition to the attack would have been presented, the antiaircraft fire (with the battleships at sea) would have been considerably less; and while the over-all Japanese air losses may have been somewhat greater, this would have been counterbalanced by the damage done to the fuel storage, dry docks, and other permanent installations. Had a night action taken place, our losses would have undoubtedly been greater than those of the enemy, as the Japanese were at this time considerably better prepared for night combat than our fleet. As for a day action, we had only two carriers to oppose six.

[1] As published in the United States News of September 1945.

All in all, the best we could have hoped for under the conditions of this December 4 "if" would have been for a patrol plane sighting of Nagumo's force on December 6 and a subsequent failure of the two fleets to make contact which, while a possibility, would have been a remote one. At worst, in a day engagement, we might have lost the major portion of our fleet, including two of the three carriers then in the Pacific. Had our two carrier task forces been permitted to operate without the handicap of having their movements restricted by the old battleships, they might have accomplished something.

The third "if" to be discussed here will treat with the possible alteration of events had a long-range patrol plane search to 700 miles been operating during the first week in December. The actual Japanese track, patrol plane cruising speeds, and the time of sunrise combine to indicate that, had the sector north to northwest from Oahu been covered on December 6, two planes might have sighted Nagumo's force between 1330 and 1430 on December 6. Assuming a median 1330 for the contact, development of the contact, formulation, coding, and transmission of the dispatch, etc., the information would probably have reached Pacific Fleet headquarters at Pearl Harbor about 1415. Sunset at this season came earlier than any other time in the year, so that even with the greatest possible celerity of decision and action, the harbor could not have been cleared and a formation effected that evening without acceptance of a grave potential risk from Japanese submarines. In fact, a partial sortie of those large ships in the highest degree of readiness and all available destroyers might have been the logical solution. The Japanese submarines in Hawaiian waters would have undoubtedly reported whatever sortie was effected, and Admiral Nagumo's air plan would have been modified in consequence. Japanese interrogations after the war have given the information that the Pearl Harbor attack planes had sufficient fuel to attack the fleet as far as 150 miles south of Pearl Harbor, so that unless the battleships at sea had been ordered to "run away from the fight" they might have still afforded a target for the Japanese air attack.

Actually with Admiral Halsey and the *Enterprise* about 300 miles to the west, a rendezvous with him would probably have been the order. Assuming that all except one or two large ships had sortied on the sixth, the reconnaissance float-type Zeros from Nagumo's heavy cruisers would have reported that the birds had flown, and the Japanese air strike might have been held clear of Oahu pending further information. Our morning patrol plane search from Oahu would have located the Japanese force but, in view of the vulnerability of the Catalinas and the number of Zeros in the air, such contacts might well have been manifested by the absence of any reports from our planes in those sectors rather than by any positive information.

Of course, had Oahu-based fighters intercepted and shot down the four Zero float planes, the originally planned attack on Pearl Harbor might have been carried out. While it would have met with considerably more air opposition from Oahu fighters, the Zeros which actually expended their efforts in strafing targets on the ground would have been diverted to air combat. In addition, the antiaircraft fire from Pearl Harbor, the far greater portion of which actually came from surface vessels, would have been so materially reduced in volume as to more than compensate for any hypothetical increase in accuracy due to the absence of surprise.

Hence the Japanese bombers and torpedo planes might well have been able to deliver an attack nearly as efficient in both volume and accuracy as that recorded by history. With a paucity of ship targets, the oil tank storage and other permanent installations would have formed most inviting targets of opportunity. On the return of this air strike Admiral Nagumo undoubtedly would have attempted to bring on an engagement. Our commander undoubtedly would have realized by this time how badly he was outmatched in air strength and most probably would have delayed seeking action until reinforced by Admiral Newton with the *Lexington*. The end result might well have been an engagement a la Midway somewhere between that island and Oahu, but this time with no shore objective to divert Japanese air strength. Assuming even as high as the equivalent of one carrier air group as the combat and operational losses suffered by the Japs in the Pearl Harbor strike, Admiral Nagumo would have still outmatched our air strength in the ratio of 5 to 2 and our losses might have been expected to be as high as six times those of the Japs, or even higher in case the attack on Pearl had been canceled.

Our final "if" deals with the possible effect of an eleventh hour warning, either through the medium of timely transmission of late "magic" from Washington, a more efficient and rapid interpretation of radar indications, or a more timely transmission and evaluation of the early morning submarine contacts off the entrance to Pearl Harbor. These items so captured the public imagination when these "failures" were first published that an inordinate amount of inquiry and explanation have been devoted to these minutiae. Broadly speaking, none of these data could have been placed in the hands of the men with authority to evaluate and translate decision into action more than 1 hour before the first bomb actually dropped. Practically speaking, this would have permitted only a few more fighting planes to have taken the air, more antiaircraft guns to have been manned, and a few water-tight doors to have been closed. A few more Jap planes might have been shot down, but not enough more to have affected materially the damage inflicted by the enemy. In addition, many individuals and groups that day took correct action under the compulsion of indoctrination without specific orders. Who can say whether the omission of many ordinarily required musters, tests, reports, etc., materially hindered or possibly even aided defense efforts in the pitifully few minutes that would have been available?

In summation of the possible alteration in the effects of Pearl Harbor had our four "ifs" governed, we have:

(A) If it had been decided clearly and definitely on November 27 that Pearl Harbor would probably be attacked in the near future, we might have had—

(1) A remote possibility that the scheduled attack on Pearl Harbor might have been canceled;

(2) A more probable naval engagement north of the Hawaiian chain with probable losses to our forces of four times those of the Japanese, and including all our carriers then in the Pacific.

(B) If it had been decided clearly and definitely on December 3 that Pearl Harbor would probably be attacked in the very near future, we might have had:

(3) A possible attack on an empty Pearl Harbor with the fuel storage and permanent installations as targets;

(4) Either in place of or in addition to (3), above, a naval engagement to the west of Oahu with our probable losses 6 to 9 times those of the Japanese, and including 2 of the 3 carriers then in the Pacific.

(C) If long-range air reconnaissance had been conducted during the first week in December, we might have had a contact with the Japanese attack force on the afternoon of December 6 followed by:

(5) A possible attack on a nearly empty Pearl Harbor with one or two heavy ships, the fuel storage, and permanent installations as targets;

(6) A naval engagement, possible between French Frigate Shoals and Midway, with our losses 6 times those of the Japanese, and including 2 carriers.

(D) If a late warning by any means had afforded Admiral Kimmel and General Short about 1 hour for action, we might have had:

(7) A slightly smaller amount of damage to our forces and a somewhat larger loss of Japanese aircraft.

Five of these seven hypothetical results probably would have been more disastrous than the real Pearl Harbor; the seventh would have had no really material effect on history. It is here impracticable to comment adequately on the remaining possibility—the remote chance that the attack might have been canceled by the Japanese had our entire fleet sortied on December 3. Possibly Professor Morison's comment provides a sufficiently broad basis for further consideration when he says, "On the strategic level, it [the attack on Pearl Harbor] was idiotic. On the high political level it was disastrous." [2]

If we grant the force of this quotation, then we have an explanation of why, before December 7, almost no one believed that Pearl Harbor would be attacked. It was possible, yes, to forecast how such an attack could best be delivered, as witness the Bellinger-Martin estimate. But even that prophetic document does not comment on the possibilities of such an attack being undertaken, and it begins with assumption that if risk of such an attempt is determined to exist, then such and so should be done. Of all the many members of the armed services and civilians with whom the present writer conversed during 1941 prior to December 7, only one man (then a senior commander in the Navy) expressed a definite conviction that the Japanese would attack at Pearl Harbor and without warning.

Why was the conviction that an attack on Pearl Harbor, while possible, was rather unlikely, so nearly universal among Americans? Was it because we felt instinctively that it would be bad strategy and worse high politics? Or was it just because we thought so differently from the Japanese? Semanticists are beginning to claim the type of actions of a man, or a nation, can be predicted fairly accurately under given conditions if we can properly evaluate the stage of civilization to which he belongs. They claim a peasant will act and feel as a primitive, while a feudal nation will react as did the medieval man. Note that Japan is less than a century away from full-blown feudalism. Further note the statement of Capt. Y. Watanabe, gunnery officer on Admiral Yamamoto's staff, when asked the objective of the attack on Pearl Harbor. "In Japanese tactics we are told when we have two enemies, one in front and one in back, first we must cut in front by sword. Only cut and not kill, but make it hard. Then we attack the back enemy and kill him. This time we took that tactic, having no aim to capture Pearl Harbor but just to cripple it. We might have returned to capture later." Possibly a semantic approach to the psychological study of a potential enemy can so reinforce conventional intelligence methods as to reduce the risk, when and if world war III occurs, of hostilities opening with a Pearl Harbor II.

---

[2] The Rising Sun in the Pacific, p. 132, vol. III, of History of United States Naval Operations in World War II, by Samuel Eliot Morison.

Illinois Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs Establishes an Annual $2,000 Fellowship To Train Mature Illinois Women for Careers in Government Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 6 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding the establishment of an annual $2,000 fellowship by the Illinois Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the convention of the Illinois Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, in Springfield, on April 17, 1948, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas there is a grave need of trained and capable men and women in the field of government and diplomacy; and

"Whereas, we are particularly interested in the training and placement of qualified women in such fields; be it

"*Resolved*, That a State scholarship fund be established by the Illinois Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; that said fund when of sufficient amount be used to provide education and training for a mature Illinois woman to fit a Government, State Department, or diplomatic position; that local business and professional women's clubs be urged to contribute to this fund from their local educational and scholarship fund, and that individual members make contributions in an endeavor to accumulate a State scholarship fund sufficient to provide full tuition and expenses, exclusive of room and board, covering a period of study and training in an accredited school or college, estimated at this time to amount to approximately the sum of $1,000 annually; that a State scholarship committee be appointed by the State executive board, which committee shall formulate the general rules under which the scholarship shall be awarded, including educational and personal qualifications, aptitudes of applicants seeking the scholarship, determining how and when the money shall be made available, the college or school where the money may be used, and a guaranty by the prospective student, even though she marries, that she will be willing to serve for a reasonable period in the Government or diplomatic position which is open to her upon the completion of her educational and training period, as well as all other details connected with the administration of this scholarship fund."

Upon the adoption of this resolution the scholarship, later changed to a fellowship, was named the Celia M. Howard Fellowship because Celia M. Howard best typified the type of woman the Illinois Federation of Business and Professional Women wished to see in diplomatic service.

Born in Elgin, Ill., her early experience in a law office led her to study at the John Marshall Law School. The only woman in her graduating class, she ranked highest and was voted the class valedictorian.

Upon the basis of this record she received a scholarship to Harvard University Law School, which she could not use because she was a woman, and which still reposes in her safety deposit vault. But even without the scholarship she continued in the legal field and completed 40 years of service with Judges George A. Carpenter and Phillip L. Sullivan in the United States District Court of Chicago.

Miss Howard's professional career is distinguished. Respected throughout the legal profession for her judicial mind, her power of concise analysis, and her integrity, she was admitted to practice before the Illinois Supreme Court, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and the Supreme Court of the United States.

Her devotion to humanitarian and civic work is exemplified by her public service record of 15 months in France during the First World War with the American Red Cross as a member of the Women's Overseas Service League. She was in charge of service work for war veterans at the hospital for mental cases in Elgin and for 10 years chairman of the Elgin chapter of the Red Cross. She served as woman member of the NRA advisory counsel representing the consumer, and was for 5 years a member of the Mayor's Committee on Housing and Feeding the Unemployed, both in Elgin.

She was an early member of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs. According to my information no member of this federation has given more freely and unselfishly of her talent, time, and energy to furthering the high purpose of the federation than has Miss Howard. Her service began with the birth of the national federation in St. Louis in 1919 and her charter membership in the Elgin club in the same year. She was president of the Elgin club for 2 years; chairman of the eleventh district for 2 years; treasurer of the Illinois federation for 1 year; president of the Illinois federation for 2 years; official hostess to the 1933 biennial convention of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs in Chicago during the World's Fair; recording secretary and second vice-president of the National Federation for 2 years, respectively. She has been a member of the Alliance of Business and Professional Women of Chicago since 1943, serving as its president in 1947-48. She represented the National Federation at hearings of the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate on the equal-rights amendment, and compiled a statement of the changes that would be required in the statutes of Illinois in case of ratification of this amendment. Throughout the years she has served as parliamentarian for the State federation, district, region, and local clubs.

The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, of Medford, Mass., was chosen by the Celia M. Howard Fellowship Committee as the school which could best furnish the training the Illinois Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs wished to provide for the recipient of its fellowship, and the announcement was made to all universities in the United States.

On January 4, 1950, Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, recognizing the importance of the fellowship, sent the following letter to the chairman of the Celia M. Howard Fellowship Committee:

"JANUARY 4, 1950.

"Miss CLARA LAWRENCE,
Evanston, Ill.

"MY DEAR MISS LAWRENCE: It has recently come to my attention, through my friend Dean Stewart of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy of Tufts College, that you are chairman of a committee created by the Illinois Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, for the awarding of a fellowship available to Illinois women in the field of international affairs.

"This intelligence is very gratifying to me, inasmuch as I believe that women generally are destined to play an increasingly vital role in international organization; and I am especially glad that provision is being made for the training of our own women of Illinois for this purpose.

"I should like to congratulate your committee for devoting itself to this objective, and to send my very best wishes for the success of this activity.

Sincerely,

ADLAI E. STEVENSON,
Governor."

At the twenty-ninth annual convention of the Illinois Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs meeting in Springfield, April 15, 1950, the first fellowship was awarded to Miss Mary Louise Winbigler of Monmouth, Ill., a graduate of Monmouth College, with cum laude honors, and with three and one-half years' service with the American Red Cross in Germany and in France during World War II. She was also on the staff of the wartime Naval School at Monmouth College. Miss Winbigler was selected from a total of 30 applicants, five of whom were interviewed in the final selection. She flew to Springfield from Los Angeles, Calif., for the interview.

The fellowship carries with it the following obligations on the part of the recipient:

1. That she must enter some form of diplomatic service in the United States or a foreign country at the completion of her study and to continue in such service as a career unless there is some condition beyond her control.

2. She must satisfy the Celia M. Howard fellowship committee as to her loyalty to the constitutional principles of the United States of America.

3. That marriage shall not interfere with the fulfillment of this career.

God in his infinite wisdom saw fit to take from this earth on May 22, 1950, Celia M. Howard, to her final reward. Her task was done, to other hands is now entrusted the course she has set.

It is therefore appropriate that the establishment of this fellowship instituted by the Illinois Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, should be written into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that the following tribute to Miss Howard should be recorded here:

"Celia M. Howard, gentlewoman, possessor of twinkling good humor; resourceful, courageous, with a profound understanding of the law and keen ability in its application; endeared to many persons because of her loving, honest, and straightforward simplicity; aware of the perils and rewards of constancy to friendships, has through her achievement and service brought honor not only to herself but also to all women and to the Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

"A recipient of the Celia M. Howard fellowship is 'a woman with a lighted lamp in her hand', whose flame is fed from the oil of inspiration, integrity of purpose, and self-emulation. She will carry that lamp into unchartered places and through her diplomacy contribute toward hastening the time when the hands of nations will be joined, encircling the world with understanding friendship.

"Committee for the Celia M. Howard Fellowship of the Illinois Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.: Miss Helen M. Cirese, Oak Park, Ill.; Mrs. Marjorie B. Leinauer, Sycamore, Ill.; Mrs. Hazel R. Ferguson, Evanston, Ill.; Miss Mildred Shambo, Aurora, Ill.; Dr. Grace M. Sproull, Macomb, Ill.; Miss A. Zola Groves, Chicago, Ill., secretary; Miss Clara E. Lawrence, Evanston, Ill., chairman.

"Dated at Chicago, Ill., April 23, 1949."

We Must Stand Up to the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 6 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Must Stand Up to the Facts," published in the Wall Street Journal of July 3, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST STAND UP TO THE FACTS

Last Tuesday President Truman issued orders for air and naval units of the United States to go to the support of the South Koreans who had been attacked by the Communist-dominated Koreans to the north. That order and subsequent Washington comment emphasized that ground troops of this country were not to be used and there was to be no military action north of the thirty-eighth parallel which divides the two parts of Korea.

On Friday Mr. Truman issued another order sending ground troops into action and lifting the ban on American air attacks on northern Korean soil.

When the first order came on Tuesday this newspaper said in these columns that the situation had been brought about by a foreign policy which was foggy; which implied commitments which had not been thought through.

Reluctantly, because the circumstances are as they are, we feel that comment should now be repeated.

There is one of two conclusions: When Mr. Truman issued his original order he and his advisers did not have an accurate appraisal of the situation in Korea and how far the United States might have to go. Either that is the case, or Mr. Truman was deceiving the American people by withholding from them some of the necessary information. We believe that the former and not the latter was the case.

Mr. Truman's first order on Tuesday was a shock to the American people; the fact that they took it in their stride does not change the fact that it was a shock for which foreign policy pronouncements had illy prepared them. The order of Friday was as great, and perhaps a greater, shock. It was that because it leaves the public wondering how far this whole situation may have been misjudged.

We think it is time that the Government officials themselves faced up to all the facts in this Far Eastern undertaking and that they frankly and fully inform the public of the facts.

We completely realize that what has been written above will cause many to criticize on the ground that one who says those things is disturbing the unity that the country needs at this moment.

Any doubts of the general reaction should be dispelled by the reception accorded the statement of Senator TAFT who commented very much along the lines on which this newspaper has commented. It is said of Senator TAFT that many of the points he made have validity but that he should not voice them at this time. We should like to know why not.

If your chauffeur drives carelessly, goes around curves on the left side of the road, and finally puts the car in which you and your family ride with two wheels in the ditch, you surely do not say something like this:

"You really did shake us up, but on the whole it was a brilliant bit of driving. I am right here behind you and don't let things get on your nerves. Above all, we must not let the neighbors and the bystanders suspect there is anything unusual."

Well, perhaps some people do that, but personally we would say something like this:

"See here, they put those white lines in the road so that you would stay to the right of them. Those signs beside the road are not just decorative; they were put there for a warning. Let us go on with that in mind."

There is in this country an apparently dominant idea that one ought not to criticize in the matter of foreign affairs and particularly when foreign affairs are in a critical state. We can think of no idea which has done greater damage.

If there had been a check when Mr. Roosevelt and his advisers were dealing with the Russians in setting up postwar settlements; if there had been some discussions of Yalta, for instance, if the minority had been allowed even to know what was taking place, there might today have been no Korea.

It is not a matter of calling attention to past errors for what political effect it may have.

What we wish to say is that if the atmosphere which allowed those errors to occur is perpetuated, there will be more errors.

More TVA's?—The Issues Weighed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 6 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "More TVA's?—The Issues Weighed," written by Willard R. Espy, and published in the New York Times magazine of May 7, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE TVA'S?—THE ISSUES WEIGHED—NUMEROUS PROJECTS NOW BEFORE THE CONGRESS APPRAISED FOR THEIR REAL WORTH TO THE COUNTRY

(By Willard R. Espy)

The Senate recently passed a measure adding half a billion dollars' worth of navigation and flood-control projects to the billion-dollar rivers and harbors bill approved by the House. Both branches of Congress ignored alternative bills for TVA-like authorities which, their backers contend, would save the taxpayer hundreds of millions of dollars that are now going to waste through political log-rolling and would provide controlled development of our great river valleys.

Not that these ignored projects would be cheap. Over the next half century they would cost in the neighborhood of $42,000,000,000. But valley authority proponents assert that the record of the present Congress, like that of most earlier Congresses, proves that $42,000,000,000 will be only the start if valley development remains a pork-barrel item. The true question is what we get for our money.

The proposed authorities—many of them do not go by that name—would directly affect almost every corner of the country: a fourth of the Nation's farmland in the Missouri Valley; 10 percent of our land area in the Pacific Northwest; a seventh of our population in the Ohio Valley; the entire heartland of the United States that would be served by the proposed St. Lawrence waterway.

These projects are as important as they are expensive because of what they can do for the country. If we spend the $42,000,000,000, says a recent Twentieth Century Fund survey, the United States would be enriched by hydroelectric plants with a combined generating capacity of 54,000,000 kilowatts—nearly the equivalent of our capacity from all sources at the end of the war. We would be freed forever from the danger of floods of the kind that turned a Columbia River city of 40,000 people into kindling wood in a half hour's time in 1948, or killed 137 persons and destroyed $400,000,000 worth of property along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers in 1937.

The amount of western land under irrigation—21,000,000 acres now—would be doubled. Erosion would be halted on 300,000,000 acres of crop and range land, while 100,000,000 acres more would be made cultivable by drainage and clearing. Cutting and replacement would be brought into balance on nearly half a billion acres of forest land.

If we do not adopt a program of control and development projects, the retarded areas of the United States must slide even farther backward. In great sections of the most advanced country in the world today, poverty, filth, ignorance, and sickness are the order of the day. Topsoil is peeling off our earth like a rind off an orange, decreasing our wealth at a rate which has been estimated at $4,000,000,000 annually. Every year our flood losses alone run to more than $100,000,000. Stream pollution has turned the loveliest rivers known to man into currents of diluted sewage.

It is because of the growing realization of these conditions and the necessity of correcting them that demands, both in and out of Congress, for additional river-valley developments are increasing.

Allowing for regional differences and special problems, the proposals seek to apply in other areas the experience and techniques of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the American project which set the minds of men in every retarded region of the world afire with the dream of bettering their lot through grand-scale river-valley developments.

In the light of the expanding demand for development projects, why has Congress not passed legislation authorizing them? The answer is that it has been unable to agree on the answers to two fundamental questions: Can we afford, at a time of unparalleled commitments, with a deficit running at $5,000,000,000 and more a year, to spend still more money for large-scale TVA's? Does Government creation of additional power represent unfair competition with private enterprise?

Fortunately, both questions can be answered objectively out of our own experience and without regard to any special interests. But before presenting the answers it might be well to review briefly the need for and present status of our development projects. There are three reasons for this:

First, all intelligent discussion of river-vally developments must start with need, and the need for additional projects has been studied and well tabulated.

Second, the plans have been drawn up. Although Congress has yet to pass the necessary over-all enabling legislation, all projects have been worked out in detail, at least on paper.

Third, much more has already been done than many of us realize. While the Congress has debated, engineers have gone ahead

and changed the face of America. On the Tennessee, the Missouri, the Columbia, the Snake, the Colorado—on all those rivers, and others, there has risen monuments so huge as to be visible from the moon. Sums so tremendous as to dwarf our national income of a generation ago are being expended each year on dams, levees, power plants, irrigation ditches. The argument as to whether or not we should encourage more TVA's is to some extent academic because most of the proposed developments are, in one way or another, already in work.

Here is a résumé of the major projects:

The Ohio Valley is increasingly menaced by floods and pollution. The valley drains waste from a population of 4,000,000 directly into the Ohio River; in some places, a quarter of all the river flow has passed through a sewage system. Proposed projects would not only stabilize and cleanse the Ohio but also provide a badly needed fresh-water connection between Lake Erie and tributaries of the upper Ohio, facilitating traffic in iron and coal. They would cost about $2,000,000,000.

The Arkansas Valley suffers from underemployment of 60 percent of its farmers. It has been proposed to retire 8,000,000 marginal acres from cultivation, putting the displaced farmers into new industries powered by abundant hydroelectricity. Cost of soil conservation, flood and pollution control, power, irrigation and water-supply projects is estimated at $2,000,000,000.

The lower Mississippi has been the scene since 1927 of $500,000,000 worth of work on levees, reservoirs, spillways, and floodways. Another $500,000,000 remains to be expended on projects to provide for flood abatement and malaria control, and to support a larger and healthier population.

In the Savannah Valley, an authority proposed jointly by the two Senators from Georgia would cost between $250,000,000 and $300,000,000. Besides navigation and flood control it would include dams with an installed generating capacity of 761,200 kilowatts.

In the Connecticut and Merrimack River Basins of New England, the enactment of proposals for flood control, pollution abatement, and hydroelectric projects would cost $100,000,000, produce a billion kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. An effort is now being made to integrate the entire river-valley development of New England.

The Colorado Valley, third largest drainage basin in the United States, is being developed not through a single regional authority but through an interstate compact. An international flavor is added to the undertaking by the involvement of Mexico in the lower river. In addition to Boulder Dam and the All-American Canal, projects are planned to control silting, establish an electrical generating capacity of 4,000,000 kilowatts, and irrigate 2,000,000 more acres. They will cost $2,500,000,000.

The Central Valley of California has 200,000 acres of land returning to desert. The State water plan will restore this land and bring an additional 7,000,000 acres under cultivation through water from 38 major dams. The cost has been estimated at between $1,000,000,000 and $2,000,000,000.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway is the only project that still remains entirely on paper. Canadians and Americans for more than 50 years have agitated for a canal which would enable deep-draft ocean vessels to steam from the Atlantic to the Great Lakes. At a cost of $500,000,000 the 27-foot-deep ditch would create an electric generating capacity of 1,640,000 kilowatts.

All the above proposals have aroused bitter controversy. The banks of the Colorado have provided a setting for disputes among Western States which for a while took on characteristics of civil war. But the developments which are bringing about the greatest exchange of name-calling today are those which are already under way for the Missouri Valley and the Pacific Northwest. They are also the two best known and the two largest.

The Missouri. The Missouri River, twisting 2,640 miles and serving 29 percent of the total area of the United States, represents an economic and social problem of tremendous complexity. In its lower reaches—eastern Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, and Mississippi—the crying need is for flood control. Farther toward the source, in the great plains, a parched countryside waits for irrigation.

The Army engineers, one of the two great Government bureaus at work on the Missouri, started from the assumption that the valley needed flood control and increased navigation. They began building dams for a few tremendous reservoirs.

The Bureau of Reclamation, on the other hand, decided that irrigation was the primary need and, accordingly, began building a large number of small reservoirs.

Both parties worked with a will—throwing up dams and levees, hydro-electric power plants, flood walls; boring tunnels, digging ditches, deepening canals.

Into this turmoil there was flung in 1944 a proposal for a unified Missouri Valley Authority. As fighting cats will forget their quarrel long enough to drive off an invading dog, the Army and the Bureau of Reclamation at once joined hands in a compromise, known as the Pick-Sloan plan.

The Hoover Commission, which looked over Pick-Sloan, reported in consternation: "The compromise consisted for the most part in a division of projects, each agency agreeing to forego the privilege of criticizing projects assigned by the agreement to the other. The result is in no sense an integrated development plan for the basin, and there is serious reason to question whether agreement between the two agencies is not more costly than disagreement."

The proposed Missouri Valley Authority differs from Pick-Sloan in being a unified project, which would be preceded by a careful study of the entire valley area. According to its backers, it would raise the Pick-Sloan sights on power production from 1,000,000 to 3,000,000 kilowatts—more than the entire capacity of the U. S. S. R. as recently as 1930.

The Columbia: In some ways similar, in others vastly different from the story of the Missouri, is that of the Columbia and Snake Valleys. Where the Missouri population is dwindling, that of the Northwest between 1940 and 1949 rose 36 percent. Where the Missouri lacks major industrial development, the Columbia is going through one of the great industrial bursts of American history. The economy of the Missouri is on dead center; that of the Columbia is hurtling forward.

The Columbia River is 1,214 miles long. Its hydroelectric potential is 30,000,000 kilowatts—more than a third the potential of all the United States, and more than our entire electric consumption in 1929.

Federal agencies working to develop the Columbia Valley are handicapped, as on the Missouri, by lack of over-all direction. In early 1949 President Truman had to give a public spanking to those same old Kilkenny cats, the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, for squabbling over who was to build what. A few weeks later, his administration's proposal for a Columbia Valley Administration reached Congress. It called also for an additional immediate outlay of $100,000,000 for hydroelectric and reclamation projects.

These, then, are our Nation's most urgent development needs, and what has been planned and is being done to meet them. There remain the two great policy questions: Can we afford to go all-out for valley developments at the present time? And are the projects compatible with the American tradition of free, private enterprise?

Answers to these questions can be found in the record of the one great valley development project that has had a chance to show its effectiveness—the TVA.

Today TVA produces 15,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy a year. It watches 3,400,000 acres of test-demonstration farms. It is checking erosion and building soil on 7,000,000 acres. It is cooperating in developments of new mineral deposits and control of pollution.

In 1933, only 15,000 farms in the Tennessee Valley power-distribution area had electricity; today there are 300,000. During the first half of 1949 residents of the valley purchased $100,000,000 worth of electric appliances. Tennessee Valley farms in the same period used 20 times as much electricity as they had used in 1933, while the United States as a whole was using just 3 times as much. Within a decade the valley has developed 400 new industries, employing 100,000 workers.

In 1930 an acre in the Missouri Valley was worth $39.17—15 cents more than in the Tennessee. Fourteen years later an acre in the Tennessee Valley was worth $46.30, while in the Missouri Valley it was down to $25.82. Despite its scantiness of resources, the Tennessee Valley today supports 65 persons per square mile. If the Missouri Valley reached the same figure, its population would be up by more than 20,000,000.

It would be unrealistic to maintain that the faster gain in the Tennessee Valley was entirely due to TVA. Other parts of the south have also shown a more rapid improvement than the national average. Nonetheless, if the income of the Tennessee Valley had risen only in the same proportion as that of the rest of the country, its annual income—and the Nation's—would total $1,240,000,000 less than it is today. This yearly difference is far more than the entire $762,000,000 cost of the Authority. Similarly rapid growth is likely in other valley authority areas. As the Twentieth Century Fund has remarked in analyzing the Arkansas Valley proposal, "The limit to such expansion cannot be estimated. But it would certainly be many times the initial outlay." The conclusion seems inescapable that we not only can afford such projects but also that we cannot afford to forego them.

Flood control, hydroelectric production, irrigation and reclamation have long constituted a pork barrel in which almost any Congressman could find a little money for his own constituency. The pork barrel in President Truman's latest budget amounts to $1,200,000,000, much of it for projects already under way. It is hardly to be expected that a vote-hungry Congress, however loud it cries for economy, will appreciably cut that figure.

But there is no pork for a hungry Congressman in a TVA. Valley authorities in such areas as the Missouri and Columbia Basins—set up either by Congress or by interstate agreement—are the only means on the horizon by which the waste, overlapping and log-rolling now taking place there are likely to be eliminated. On future undertakings of comparable magnitude valley authorities will be equally necessary—and for the same reason.

The principle of responsibility to Congress has been invoked against TVA's by some sincere and disinterested men. It has been invoked by some also, however, to cover an equally ardent interest in the principle of the pork barrel.

Valley authorities need not be a way to spend money. They can be, on the contrary, a way to get far more value for the money we are spending now.

Our experience in the Tennessee Valley also appears to answer the second major

question negatively. Many critics contend that the regional development projects contradict the spirit of private business. On the basis of experience so far, however, it seems to me fair to say not only that valley authorities can act as a stimulus to free enterprise but that it is free enterprise alone which makes their full achievement possible.

In the Tennessee Valley the Government did not shut off a segment of the country from private investment; it opened a segment to private investment. It performed in twentieth-century terms the same function that it had performed a hundred and more years ago, when, by turning over tens of millions of acres of public land to homesteaders and railroads, it made possible the settlement of a continent nearly in the twinkling of an eye.

Today the Tennessee Valley is dotted with profit-making businesses—private businesses—which could not have existed there 20 years ago.

Conversely, the gigantic achievements of the Tennessee Valley Authority were possible only because private capital was available to turn the newly available power into machines, to hire for industry the men and women who were no longer tied to their farms, to create the goods and services which could make for a richer and fuller life. Without that capital and that grassroots incentive the network of dams could have produced but a fraction of its actual benefits.

There should be no stampede into new development projects. In each case the need should be clearly established, the remedy clearly effective. The timing and details will differ. Some projects are urgent; others can await the Nation's convenience. As each is launched, it will be the duty of every citizen to seek firm safeguards against Federal encroachment, to insist on a maximum of local control and a rate of expenditure which is not in excess of a reasonable public investment capacity. But that is far different from blind opposition. Now, as in the past, those who seek to oppose something with nothing are likely to find themselves wringing their hands in the ruck of history. For integrated river-development projects, properly administered, can enrich America and strengthen American democracy. The projects are feasible, they are desirable, and therefore they are inevitable.

State Legislatures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 6 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Members of the Senate will recall that in the course of the debate on S. 1728 I made reference to the fact that State legislatures were in the main not as democratic nor as representative of the people as other legislative bodies in America. In that connection I was interested in an article appearing in the July 1, 1950, issue of the United States Municipal News published by the United States Conference of Mayors. It reprints an editorial from the Akron Beacon Journal and goes on to refer to another editorial appearing in the Milwaukee Journal on the same subject.

I ask unanimous consent to have these excerpts from page 51 of the publication printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the United States Municipal News]

TYRANNY IN OHIO

The United States Conference of Mayors met in New York City last month and adopted a number of resolutions, one of which read as follows:

"*Resolved*, That since equality of representation is the most vital and fundamental principle of democracy and inequality of representation is a tyranny to which no people worthy of freedom will lightly submit; and in order that cities be accorded the fair and equal representation in the various State legislatures to which they are entitled as a matter of justice and right, the 1950 Annual Conference of the United States Conference of Mayors urge upon the States where fair and equal representation does not exist to correct this condition which is utterly repugnant to the basic concept of democratic processes of government by initiating action leading to reapportionment at the conclusion of the 1950 population census, or, in those States not having constitutional or statutory provision for reapportionment on the basis of population, to sponsor the constitutional or statutory amendments necessary to make such reapportionment possible."

Are Ohioans unworthy of freedom? The "tyranny" of unequal representation has existed here ever since 1903 when the Ohio Constitution was amended to give every county, no matter how small, one State Representative. For 100 years prior to 1903 Ohio had enjoyed representative government.

Representation became unequal as soon as the 1903 amendment went into effect and the inequality has been growing more pronounced ever since. In the 1951–52 legislature, Vinton County's lone representative will speak for some 11,000 citizens, while each of Summit County's four will represent 100,000.

It is conservative to say that two-thirds of the Ohio House represent only one-third of the people.

We doubt that any other State in the Union is guiltier than Ohio of tolerating the tyranny which the Conference of Mayors deplores.

Here, a constitutional amendment is necessary to restore representative government. This could be done, though with some difficulty, by circulating petitions and initiating an amendment for the voters' consideration—perhaps as early as 1951.

There is another and perhaps a better way. The people are scheduled to get a chance to vote in 1952 on whether they favor the calling of a constitutional convention—the first, by the way, since 1912 and the third since the present Constitution was adopted in 1851. If the people's answer is yes, legislative reapportionment doubtless will be one of the main subjects taken up by the convention. Reapportionment arrived at in this way might be sounder than reform accomplished by means of an initiated amendment.

Of course, there is no certainty that a vote for holding a constitutional convention will be followed by approval of the convention's proposals. The work of the 1873–74 convention was rejected by the people. And there is no certainty, even, that a majority will favor the holding of a convention. The last time the question came up, in 1932, the decision was against a convention.

Still, it seems to us that the cities, having endured inequality of representation for almost 50 years, can afford to wait until 1952 to find out whether they must push for amendment of the Constitution by petition and referendum. In the meantime, city officials should begin to consult with political-science experts with a view to having a satisfactory plan ready to present either to a convention or to the people.

In our view there is no question that the Ohio system, wherein a population minority controls the legislature, is undemocratic. The penalty which this system has imposed is the necessity of compromising principle. Too many times bills which would benefit the majority have been blocked until rewards were forthcoming for the overrepresented minority. Ohio's fantastically complicated and illogical tax system can be blamed in large part on the logrolling which goes on, necessarily, in a lopsided legislature.

The tyranny of unequal representation is too solidly entrenched to be overthrown at a single stroke. But if we consider ourselves worthy of freedom, we should begin to organize our rebellion now.—Akron Beacon Journal.

On the same subject the Milwaukee Journal recently editorialized as follows: "Every large city in the Nation * * * has been battling for years against rurally dominated State legislatures which are openly reluctant to give metropolitan areas the full authority they need to cope with city problems. It's a carry-over from the rural fear of cities that is as old as the Nation. * * * To get home rule, cities like Milwaukee will have to break down those fears. They will have to do it by educating rural legislators to metropolitan problems and by proving to them that the end of rural domination will not mean the beginning of urban domination."

Statement of C. H. Purcell, Director of Public Works, Before the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, Berkeley, Calif., June 23, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a statement of Charles H. Purcell, director of public works of the State of California, to the President's Water Resources Policy Commission.

These views are the considered views of Governor Warren. The Governor, during his entire adult life, has been exposed to and studied the water problems of California. The statement is a masterful declaration of policies that should be pursued in the handling of water and incidental problems of California and the West. This statement could well serve as a textbook for those having the responsibility of developing and building water projects of all kinds.

Water is our perpetual resource. It comes every year. Its conservation and full utilization is what California needs to properly build its economic destiny. I think I may appropriately say that during the past 30 years I have been exposed to and studied the water problems of California. That is why I so heartily approve of everything that is contained

in this statement. It again illustrates what a great governor and statesman we have as our chief executive officer of California.

I hope every one of my colleagues will read this statement:

STATEMENT OF C. H. PURCELL, DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS, BEFORE THE PRESIDENT'S WATER RESOURCES POLICY COMMISSION, BERKELEY, CALIF., JUNE 23, 1950

Chairman Cooke and members of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to appear here today at your invitation as the representative of our Gov. Earl Warren. On behalf of Governor Warren I want to welcome you to California and assure you that were it not for the governor's conference being held in White Sulphur Springs this week, Governor Warren would have been on hand to greet you personally. I can tell you that sincerely, for Governor Warren is vitally concerned with the many complex problems which beset this State in regard to development of its latent water resources.

We have come a long way in the development of our water resources during the past century and we still have a long way to go. We can point with considerable pride to our achievements in this field of activity, but I believe that everyone here, and you gentlemen on the President's Commission are only too well aware of the tremendous task that lies ahead of us, in common with other semiarid States of the West.

The State of California, with an area of 100,000,000 acres and a presently estimated population of 11,000,000 has vital interest and concern in the formulation, operation, and interpretation of Federal policies relating to water and land use. California's future economic and social welfare hinges to a great degree on the manner and method of development, utilization, and management of its water and land resources.

During its 100 years of statehood, California, through necessity, has formulated and adopted definite policies relating to the use and control of its waters. These policies have been formulated through adoption of provisions of the State constitution, acts of the legislature, court decisions, administrative practices, and legislatively approved reports.

These policies relate to and are based upon conditions existing in California, a semiarid State where practically all precipitation occurs in a 6-month period from November to April, and none during the remaining months of the year. Furthermore, the precipitation and resulting run-off are unequally distributed as related to the need. Forty-one percent of the water supply in the State occurs in the north coastal area representing 12 percent of the total area of the State, and needing only 2 percent of the State's ultimate water requirements, while only 2 percent of the water supply occurs in the south coastal area, representing 7 percent of the area of the State and where 12 percent of the State's ultimate water requirements will be utilized.

During 15 of the past 20 years, California's cash farm income has been higher than that of any other State in the Nation, and during the past 4 years has exceeded $2,000,000,000 annually. This great national asset is largely attributable to and dependent upon irrigation. Irrigated land in California totals nearly 6,000,000 acres, or about one-quarter of the total acreage under irrigation in the entire United States.

The total use of water for domestic, industrial, and irrigation purposes in California aggregates 20,000,000 acre-feet, or 6,500,000,000 gallons, annually, substantially greater than the use in any other State in the Union, and approximating the domestic use in the entire United States. Approximately one-half of the water used in California comes from surface streams and reservoirs, and one-half from ground-water basins, which contributes to and generates problems—legal, engineering, and administrative.

In addition to water utilization, California has had broad and extensive experience with respect to other water resources problems. These include flood control, navigation, salinity, and pollution control, production of hydroelectric power, and preservation of fish and wildlife.

It should be noted that by far the greater part of California's tremendous irrigation plant, and all of its many outstanding works for municipal water supply, as well as many of its other water developments, have been initiated, financed, and developed by local public agencies within the State, under State water resources policy.

With the experience gained over the years in the development, control, and utilization of its water resources to the extent and magnitude herein briefly outlined, it is believed that California is particularly well qualified to make recommendations with respect to national policies concerning water development and utilization.

The statement I am submitting on behalf of the State of California has been prepared with the objective of assisting the President's Water Resources Policy Commission in establishing sound and logical Federal water policies, applicable not only to conditions in California but also to the Nation at large.

You will find, upon examination of the text of the statement, that the State of California desires uniformity in Federal water resources policies, and uniformity in administration of those policies on the part of Federal agencies. In our experience with, and analysis of Federal policies and procedures we have noted a regrettable lack of unity in purpose, and want of common standards. This involves all phases of Federal projects, from their inception to completion and management. Uniform objectives and practices by all Federal agencies dealing with water resources are highly desirable, and should be given primary consideration in setting up a national water-resources policy.

In the formulation of sound policies for the development and utilization of water and land in the Nation as a whole, thorough and complete consideration should be given, and a searching analysis should be made of all basic elements involved, including the following:

(a) An engineering plan.
(b) Economic justification.
(c) Financial feasibility.
(d) Financing and management.
(e) Relationship to national economy.
(f) Relationship to national security.

Following are the views of the State of California with respect to the foregoing basic elements of a national water-resources policy.

The engineering plan should be comprehensive and designed with the objective of developing and utilizing to the fullest practicable extent and in a coordinate manner the waters of a river basin to meet present and future requirements for all beneficial purposes. The following general principles should be observed in connection with present and future projects and, insofar as applicable and praticable, with existing works:

1. There should be a demonstrated need for the project.

2. There should be demonstrated desire for the project upon the part of a majority of the direct beneficiaries thereof. Local developed areas should not be integrated into a comprehensive plan, except upon expressed majority consent.

3. The plan should provide for present and future needs of the river basin in which the water originates before water is exported to satisfy requirements outside of the basin.

4. The water requirements of all interests should be given consideration.

5. The plan should contain full consideration of relative priority of the several beneficial water uses. In this connection, domestic use should be accorded the highest priority and irrigation the next in order. Use of water for navigation or for the preservation and protection of fish and wildlife should not be permitted to interfere with requirements for higher uses.

6. The plan should provide for the fullest practicable utilization of both local and imported waters, particularly in areas of deficient water supply.

7. The plan should be designed as a progressive development with units constructed only when determined to be economically feasible, and as necessity demands. Units for initial construction should be planned so as to permit enlargement and extension at minimum expense when economic feasibility justifies such expansion toward the ultimate plan of development.

8. The plan should be coordinated with established State rights and interests and interstate compacts, so that there will be the least possible interference with existing developments and their operations.

9. The plan should be so designed as to make the fullest practicable use of the available water at minimum cost.

10. Interested local and State public agencies should be given full opportunity to participate in all phases of engineering investigation and project planning. Likewise, when a lapse of time occurs between authorization of a project and approval of funds for its construction sufficient to necessitate reanalysis of economic feasibility, State and local interests should be given opportunity to participate in such reanalysis.

11. The plan and project should be subject to approval and authorization by the Congress, which functions should not be delegated.

With reference to a specific project or development, the following requirements should be met or established:

1. The physical works should be determined to be feasible of construction, structurally safe, and adequate in design to fulfill the required or specified service.

2. The water supply should be determined to be sufficient in amount to meet the specified requirements and to be of suitable quality for the purposes of use. All possible available information should be obtained relating to the water supply for the purpose of analysis and study.

3. Rights to the use of water at the places, times, and in the amounts required should be established in accord with law.

4. The estimates of cost of the physical works and the project as a whole should be definitely determined as adequate in amount. The costs should include all possible items—physical works, rights-of-way, fees, legal and engineering services, investigations, administration, interest components, and contingencies. For any specific project, full and complete information should be obtained for the purpose of preparing an adequate estimate of cost. No project should go to financing and construction until there is definite assurance that it can be built within the estimated cost.

The principal emphasis for approval of water resources development projects should be placed on economic justification, but financial feasibility should be the final criterion in determining economic justification. A project can be economically justified if the benefits accruing therefrom should substantially exceed the costs thereof, both benefits and costs usually being expressed in annual values. In other words, the benefit-cost ratio should be substantially greater than unity. If the engineering plan is comprehensive in scope and comprises a number of units susceptible of progressive develop-

ment as the need may arise over a long period of years, each unit should be analyzed as to its economic justification at the time of need for construction.

The benefits should be determined or estimated in accord with the following general principles:

The present conventional methods of evaluating benefits for improvement of navigation comprising savings in transportation costs over alternate means, while not entirely satisfactory should be generally followed. In evaluating these benefits consideration should be given to any detriments to existing facilities which may be incurred through the construction of the navigation project.

Benefits assigned to flood control should be limited to those directly attributable to reduction in flood damage and to increase in net income resultant from improvement in land use.

Benefits attributable to irrigation should be limited to increase in net income to water users.

Benefits from hydroelectric power should be revenues derived from sale of the electric power.

Benefits assigned to use of water for domestic, municipal, and industrial purposes should be revenues from sale of water at a price based on its vendibility.

Benefits to fish and wildlife should be assigned on the basis of their net effect on local business and recreational values.

Benefits assigned to silt control should be equivalent to those minimum costs of alternative methods and means of control of the silt.

Benefits assigned to control of salinity should be limited to net value of the damages prevented and to increase in net income resultant from improvement in land use.

As used herein, "financial feasibility" means that over a period of years the costs of a project will be met by the income therefrom, and is to be distinguished from "economic justification." A project may have a favorable benefit-cost ratio when all benefits are considered, as compared to the costs and may be economically justified. However, it may be that the beneficiaries cannot or will not pay their proportionate or proper share of the benefits as estimated or there are no methods or means or legal or statutory authority for collection thereof. Such factors as suitability of lands to be irrigated, ability of farmers to repay costs of irrigation works, willingness of local interests to assume required costs and responsibilities for flood-control works, and availability of markets for power and water, should enter into determination of financial feasibility.

The capital cost of a project should be divided among its several components such as irrigation, flood control, navigation, electric power, etc., and the cost of the several components be divided in whole or in part among the different entities benefited. For example, the cost of the flood control component may be divided among local interests and State and Federal Governments.

The first step in making an analysis with respect to financial feasibility of a particular project should be to allocate the capital cost thereof among the various components. The second step should be to divide the costs among the benefited agencies or entities. The third step should be to determine the methods and means of payment of the allocated costs.

In the allocation of the cost of a single purpose project obviously the entire capital cost should be allocated to that particular purpose.

In the case of multiple-purpose projects the capital cost of that part of a project directly attributable to a particular component should be charged to and allocated to that component. The remaining or joint costs of the project should be divided proportionately among the several components—navigation, flood control, irrigation, etc.—on the basis of the net annual benefit—gross value less annual maintenance, operation, and replacement charges—of each component capitalized on a sinking-fund basis.

With respect to the division of costs of a project, it should be recognized that there is local, State, and Federal interest in all features of most water-resources projects. It would appear logical and equitable to divide the cost in proportion to benefits accruing to each affected entity. However, it is believed to be impracticable to precisely evaluate the relative local, State, and Federal benefits. Therefore, apportionment of costs to the respective interests must necessarily be somewhat arbitrary, based insofar as possible upon consideration of benefits.

The Federal Government should assume the cost of the physical works of the navigation component of a project. Local or State interests should furnish required lands, easements, and rights-of-way and facilities appurtenant to the navigation works.

The Federal Government should assume the cost of the physical works of the flood-control component of a project. Local or State interests should furnish required lands, easements, and rights-of-way.

Local or State interests should assume the capital cost of the irrigation component of a project, and the Federal Government should assume the interest on the capital cost of that component.

The hydroelectric power component of a project should be self-liquidating, and net power revenue should be utilized to reduce costs of the project.

Components of a project assigned to domestic, municipal, or industrial water should be self-liquidating, and net revenues therefrom should be utilized to reduce costs of the project.

Costs of a project assigned to fish, wildlife, and recreation components should be borne by the concerned State or proportionately by affected State, And net revenues from fish, wildlife. and recreation components should be utilized to reduce costs of the project.

Costs of physical works for silt control should be considered joint project costs and prorated proportionately to the benefits accruing to the remaining components. Costs of soil-conservation practices resulting in incidental silt control should be borne by benefited landowners.

Costs of the salinity control component of a project should be considered joint costs of those other components involving consumptive use of the water, such as irrigation, domestic, municipal, and industrial uses, and should be assigned proportionately to benefits accruing to those components.

Repayment to the Federal Government of capital costs, without interest, for the irrigation component of a project, should be limited to a period not to exceed 40 years. If the payers elect to repay their obligation over a period in excess of 40 years, interest should be paid on the principal not retired during the 40-year period. In no case should the repayment period exceed 60 years. The payers upon execution of a contract should be given opportunity to pay their obligation in advance in a lump sum, to be calculated as the present worth of the deferred payments with interest at the cost of money to the Government.

Interest payable to the Federal Government should be at a rate adequate to recover the cost of money advanced, and computed on the unpaid balance of the capital account from date of commencement of service. The interest should be accounted for and paid as compensation for use of funds advanced, and should not be assigned or otherwise applied to repayment of capital or other costs.

If local or State or interstate agencies elect to finance, construct, and operate a water resources project, the Federal Government should make contributions to the project proportionate to navigation and flood-control components.

Local or State public agencies should be given opportunity to assume management and ownership of water resources projects, including those for navigation, flood control, irrigation, and hydroelectric power, subject to such supervision and regulation by Federal agencies as may be required to secure the interests and investments of the United States in the projects. Regional authorities, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, are not considered desirable for the development and management of water resources. However, organization of interstate agencies, with appropriate representation of each concerned State and the United States, to assist in investigation, planning, and construction, and to assume repayment responsibilities, management, and operation of interstate water resources projects, under the terms of interstate compacts, should be encouraged and authorized.

Preservation of the integrity of State laws concerning the control, use and distribution of water is of paramount importance to all Western States. In constructing and operating Federal projects within States or portions of States lying west of the ninety-eighth meridian, Federal agencies in charge of interstate projects should administer the same in conformity with the laws of the States wherein such projects are located to the maximum feasible extent. With respect to projects lying wholly within the boundaries of a single State and having no direct effect upon another State or States, they can and should be administered strictly in conformity with State law.

Water-resources development is inextricably involved with national fiscal, agricultural, and economic policies and conditions. No major water-resources project or development should be initiated or constructed without due consideration to its impact on the national economy.

Value to the national security should be determined for each major water-resources project or development. Priority in construction should be given those projects or developments with substantial values to the national security.

It is recommended that the foregoing views of the State of California, with respect to elements of a national water-resources policy, be incorporated in Federal policy for the development, control, and utilization of the water resources of the United States, to be applied uniformly therein. It is further recommended that such new legislation be enacted as may be required for this purpose.

In closing, Mr. Cooke and gentlemen of the Commission, I again want to express my appreciation, and that of Governor Warren, for the invitation you extended to the chief executive of the State to present California's views on the elements of a national water-resources policy. When Governor Warren first received your invitation to present the views of the State of California, he immediately called upon all State agencies dealing with water resources to present their views. These comments were channeled through the department of public works and were given due consideration in the preparation of this report. Other public agencies also voluntarily submitted their comments for review and consideration by the State. These likewise were given careful consideration.

I am accompanied here today by the responsible officers of several of these State agencies. With the Commission's permission, I should like to present them so that they may briefly state their views in person.

United Nations Grows in Stature During Crisis in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, all of us who have watched with intense interest the growth and development of the United Nations can be proud of the prompt and resolute action taken by the international organization during the Korean crisis. One of the best statements I have read on the United Nations activity appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of July 5, written by William R. Frye, United Nations correspondent of that newspaper, and under permission to revise and extend my remarks I include this dispatch in the Appendix:

LAKE SUCCESS.—The United Nations has achieved 10 years' growth in 10 days as the result of prompt and realistic action in the Korean emergency.

In the short time since Communist armies swarmed across the thirty-eighth parallel, the UN has been transformed from an organization hamstrung by the Soviet boycott, struggling for its very existence, into a major factor in international affairs.

The question being asked here—and elsewhere in circles interested in progress toward world government—is this:

Is the transformation a passing phenomenon, or can it be rendered permanent? What chance is there for the UN to retain its police power?

The UN recognizes that decisions made far from Lake Success—notably in Washington—have had much to do with the boost in its potency and prestige. But the fact that it has taken a new lease on life can hardly be disputed.

NO LONGER A DEBATING SOCIETY

The United Nations is no longer a debating society. It has the nucleus of an army, navy, and air force. It has rallied some 40 nations behind a joint military police action against an aggressor.

Where the League of Nations fell down over Manchuria and Ethiopia—the UN has acted on Korea. For the moment, at least, its voice is the voice of authority.

The uncertain fact just over the horizon is that at any moment, Russia could decide to return to its seat and bring with it the old, familiar routine of haggling, bickering, and obstructionism. And the UN would be right back where it started.

Or would it?

Certainly one thing could not be eradicated. Whether or not the UN and the non-Russian world win their momentous gamble in Korea—and most especially if they do win it—the value of a world organization with power to act decisively will have been made clear in dramatic and unmistakable fashion.

Up to that point, such a proposition would have been convincing theory; then, it would be demonstrated fact.

Under such circumstances pressure to eject the Russians or somehow to loosen the shackles of the big-power veto might become irresistible.

COMPARISON TO MOUSE

Some delegates are comparing the UN to that quasi-legendary mouse which is said to have eaten from a bowl of breakfast cereal, reared up on its hind legs, thumped its paws on its breast, and cried, "Now bring on your cats."

In this instance perhaps it would be more appropriate for the legend to conclude, "Now bring on your bears." At least the bear that stalks as an invading army in Korea has discovered that the mouse has considerable power of resistance.

Once having demonstrated to itself and to the world what it can do without the veto power to tie its hands, the United Nations is not likely to submit weakly to a return of impotence, it is felt here.

At the same time, modifying the veto is much easier said than done. Russia has a veto on all amendments to the Charter. And just in the proportion that events of the past 10 days may have convinced the west the veto should be changed, they must have confirmed Russia's conviction it should be kept intact.

POLICE FORCE PROPOSAL

However, when public opinion is sufficiently aroused, things which have seemed impossible often have taken place. For example, there are ways to strengthen the General Assembly without directly amending the Charter, which might accomplish approximately the same purpose as discarding the veto in the Security Council.

One proposal already made would have the non-Russian world set up a police force which they would pledge themselves to use, in case of aggression, to carry out the decisions of the General Assembly. There is no veto power in the Assembly.

It is suggested that the Atlantic Pact easily could become the nucleus of such a force. All that would be necessary would be for the Atlantic powers to place it at the disposal of the Assembly.

This would be a revolutionary step, doubtless requiring a treaty and ratification by the United States Senate.

But if the peoples of the world really wanted a powerful United Nations badly enough, it is felt here that it would be possible.

Indeed, the threat of such an agreement might be sufficient to persuade Russia to compromise on modification of the veto power. The United States undoubtedly would not wish to discard the veto completely.

OTHER ALTERNATIVE

The other alternative—ejecting the Russians from the UN—is not considered desirable here.

Most persons connected with the UN still hope it will grow in stature and effectiveness until it eventually becomes something approximating a world government, embracing all nations on the face of the globe.

To eject the Russians would mean that at least for many years, during formative stages of the still youthful organization, it could not even hope for universality.

Not a Lobbyist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, when the appropriation bill was recently before us, the astounding disclosure was made that more than a third of a billion dollars was included for various Government departments for traveling expenses. Admittedly much of this is legitimate. There is equally no question, however, that a substantial part of it is spent for purely political purposes to plug this, that, or the other administration program at the expense of the taxpayers.

One of the most flagrant instances of this kind was the meeting held in St. Paul to hear the Secretary of Agriculture hold forth on his fantastic utopian scheme known as the Brannan plan.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent editorial on this subject from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle:

NOT A LOBBYIST

Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan is not engaged in lobbying for his Brannan plan for agriculture. We have this on word of the Democratic chairman of a House of Representatives lobby investigating committee.

Republican Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, thinks differently. He and other Members of Congress 2 months ago accused the Secretary of "hiring" an audience with Government money to hear him expound his Brannan plan.

It happened this way: In each local farm community there are committeemen for the Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture. In Minnesota the chairman of the State committee wrote to 5,000 local committeemen urging them to come to St. Paul and hear the Secretary. He assured them they would receive $8 per day pay plus travel expense.

The Secretary went there and discussed his plan. Cost of the meeting to the Government was estimated at more than $50,000. Senator AIKEN charged that the Secretary discarded his prepared speech which had been released to the press in advance and delivered a 100-percent political oration.

Whether this was lobbying or just plain politics, or, as the Secretary says, a routine matter, it cost the taxpayers a lot of money. Anyway the investigators have decided that the whole affair was entirely proper. Expensive, we would say, and indicative of the manner in which Secretary Brannan never loses a chance to plug his Brannan plan.

Save Formosa by Legal Action, Not Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article by Mr. Vicente Villamin which appeared in the New York Times. Mr. Villamin suggests that Formosa can be saved without using force. I am sure this article will be of great interest to all Members:

With the occupation of China's mainland, the reduction of the island of Formosa is the only major job left for the Chinese Communists to do. They will soon attack it in force. Its capture is conceded to be only a matter of time.

Formosa is a formidable bastion in the western Pacific. Under the Communists, it is a menace to the countries in south and southeast Asia, the islands in the Pacific, Australia, and New Zealand, and the United States.

America is not substantially aiding the Chinese Nationalists to hold Formosa, not because she lacks appreciation of its strategic importance, but she realizes the futility of defending it from capture in this late date.

Is there any hope for Formosa? Is it possible to save it from the Communists without the use of force? If it is, then the doctrine of the last clear chance should be tried.

There are at least three nonforcible methods of saving Formosa from the Communists. They are: (1) Let it revert to Japan and be under the jurisdiction of General MacArthur and its final status determined at the peace conference, (2) grant it sovereign independence, (3) turn it over to the United Nations for temporary administration as a trust territory.

The purpose of each of the three methods is to remove Formosa from the area of fighting between the Chinese Nationalists and Communists. By so doing, that island will be legally detached as a part of China's national domain and thereby deprive the Communists of the belligerent right to take it as enemy territory.

Only Gen. Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalist Government can properly detach Formosa from China by adopting either one of the three methods. He will have to act as a world statesman and not as a Chinese military leader bent on a last-ditch resistance to have Formosa by nonmilitary action. It is obvious that by fighting for it with his inferior force and losing it to the enemy, he is turning it over to the Communists.

By stopping the Communists on Asia's shore line, the millions of people in the Philippines, Indonesia and all around south and southeast Asia will hail him as a great moral leader. The American people would be grateful to him and feel compensated for whatever aid they gave his nation in happier and more hopeful days. He will gain stature and not lose face. Like Napoleon, who wanted to be remembered in history with the code of laws in his hand, Chiang will take his place in history as a military leader who lost his last battle but won on the field of law.

Formosa would have remained with Japan and its future status defined at the peace conference, when one is held, if not for an agreement reached during the war in Cairo, Egypt on December 1, 1943, between President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Generalissimo Chiang. This agreement was confirmed in paragraph 8 of the Potsdam declaration of July 26, 1945, in which the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and China laid down the terms for Japan's unconditional surrender. Russia did not endorse this declaration until she declared war against Japan on August 8, 1945, effective August 9, 1 day before Japan took the first formal step to accept the surrender terms.

That paragraph 8 removed Formosa, Manchuria, and the Pescadores Islands from under Japanese sovereignty. The Cairo declaration, like paragraph 8, was a reassurance to China that she would get those areas after the war.

The Cairo declaration was lived up to in respect to Formosa and the Pescadores, but Russia gained special rights in Manchuria—rights which later were expanded in their effects by subsequent treaty with the Chinese Communists after the Nationalists had been forcibly displaced.

The Nationalist government still has effective control of Formosa and could legally dispose of it. It could propose the revocation of the Cairo declaration as, in effect, it is already revoked as to Manchuria. It would not be proper either for the United States or Great Britain to even suggest its revocation, but it is reasonable and rational to expect that the two countries would agree to a proposal to that end by Nationalist China.

As to Japan under the Potsdam declaration, it would be a matter of vital interest to her that Formosa does not fall in the hands of the Communists, and she could be expected to assent to the suspension of paragraph 8 of that declaration.

If the Chinese Nationalists do not propose the rescission of the Cairo declaration, it could grant independence to Formosa as Formosan leaders have been asking for.

The conversion of Formosa into a trust territory should be the last resort, for it might bring on some abtuse legal complications.

If Generalissimo Chiang should take either one of these three actions, he will have to leave Formosa and demilitarize it insofar as his Government is concerned, for his presence there as a belligerent would expose that island to continued attack by the Communists.

One question arises at this juncture: Would the Chinese Communists respect the legal moves here suggested to remove Formosa from the area of belligerency before they capture it? And would Russia? The skeptic and the cynic would answer in the negative. But if any of the three moves is accomplished properly, there would at least be a basis for world opinion to condemn Communist China for annexing Formosa and to question her title to it. Russia's basis for opposition is nominal. She was not a party to the Potsdam declaration and her endorsement of it is but an incidental formal act and not a legal inducement to her war declaration against Japan effective one day before Japan sued for surrender.

Formosa is 20,700 square miles in area. It is about 100 miles from the China coast. It has a population of 6,500,000, whose backbone are Chinese settlers from south China. It was taken away from China by Japan after a war between them in 1895. The island is rich in natural resources. It is more developed and has a higher standard of living than China's mainland. Before the war it had an oversea trade of over $225,000,000 a year, which was higher per capita than the trade of Japan proper itself or any other country in the Far East.

Immediately after World War II Formosa was detached from Japan and reverted to China under the Cairo and Potsdam declarations. The new Chinese sovereignty was hailed by the Formosans for sentimental and nationalistic reasons. But soon a regime of corruption, oppression, and inefficiency became manifest and the Formosan leaders started to renew their agitation for independence. But with the establishment of the refugee government by Chiang Kai-shek conditions improved and the people to a certain extent made common cause with it against the Communists. The island is now in a state of siege, expecting any day a major attack by the Communists.

India-Israel Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the editor of the Hindustan Times:

JUNE 28, 1950.

Mr. DEVADAS GANDHI,
Editor, Hindustan Times,
New Delhi, India.

DEAR MR. GANDHI: I would appreciate your presenting to your readers and, through them, to the good people of the great Indian Republic a question that is disturbing me personally and which concerns a large segment of the American people.

From remarks made by your Prime Minister, Pandit Nehru, both in public and in private, during his visit to the United States, I and others believed that diplomatic relations between India and Israel would be established in the then near future. Many months have passed since. There is still no recognition of Israel.

The case for the recognition of Israel by India seems to me to be most potent. If, as an American, one talks to Indians or Israelis, or if, as an observer, one listens to their official pronouncements, or if one watches the Indian and the Israel delegations at the United Nations, one is most forcibly struck by the similarities in their outlook—their social and political attitudes. I, at least, know of no other cases where national renaissance and the regaining of independence have been integrated as closely with social ideals as in the cases of India and Israel.

I am told that the works of your own father were translated into Hebrew at a time when very few translations were published in that reborn ancient language. During my visit to Israel I saw at an exhibition the Hebrew translation of Prime Minister Nehru's memoirs published in Hebrew almost immediately after their publication in English. That interest displayed by the Hebrew public was not accidental. I believe it is the expression of an affinity that exists between yours, one of the largest states in Asia, and Israel, one of the smallest. Both believe statehood is not an end in itself.

It is a means to social and individual liberty. Their beliefs, I would venture to say, is Asia's great inheritance. It is the message that the continent of Asia will have to teach in a divided and harassed world. I, at least, know of no other nations which in their aims, as well as in their historic struggle for independence, have lived up to these tenets than have India and Israel.

Thus, both on moral and political grounds there is so much in common between these two Asiatic nations, it seems strange to the friends of both that they have not yet entered into full political, diplomatic, and economic relations. But are striving, as far as I understand it, to preserve, to develop, to recreate their natural culture and inheritance, and at the same time to employ western technology in their industrial advancement. If I understand them right, they are trying to put technology to social use without losing their souls. That, it seems to me, may yet be Asia's great contribution to the development of humanity in this age. Small as Israel is in numbers and area, she seems to me next to India the foremost exponent of this tremendous endeavor. More than any other Asiatic country, the rule of feudalism has been broken by India and by Israel. They are the most progressive countries in Asia (and I say that without any detrimental implication toward any other country).

Why, then, is it that the great Indian nation has not yet seen fit to extend a brotherly hand to the people of Israel? The friends of both were delighted a few years ago, when even before the State of Israel was established, representatives of the Hebrew University and of people of the Israel were invited to the Asiatic conference in Delhi.

I am told that recognition is being withheld because of so-called practical politicis. I am given to understand that your government does not wish to offend Moslem feelings. Far be it from me to express any opinion on any tensions existing between India and Pakistan. I wish both of them well, and I wish that such tensions may soon be resolved, but I think I ought to ask whether your government really believes that the recognition of Israel would in any wise add to the present difficulties with Pakistan.

There is no genuine Moslem interest clashing with the interests of Israel. There is no serious political reason for India's failure to recognize that nation in Asia which, more

than any other, has successfully embarked on a course so similar to that to which the great leaders of India have dedicated themselves. I put it to you that Israel in the Near East is doing on a small scale what India does in all of Asia in the grand manner. The interests of India and of Asia, and finally, of peace, would be served by an even closer relationship and cooperation between India and Israel. I thought you should know that the friends of India in this country would see in India's hand being extended to Israel, the hand of peace across the Asiatic Continent.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Too Much Cotton, Too Little Common Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the constant homage paid to King Cotton becomes ridiculous. In the first place, this war commodity should not be sent to potential war enemies, and in the second place, millions of dollars should not be continually wasted on this one crop that does not represent 5 percent of the national farm income so far as domestic needs are concerned. Are we to forever continue to pour millions and billions in the growing and disposal of this one crop?

Correspondence about this situation is as follows:

MAY 17, 1950.

RALPH S. TRIGG,
Administrator, Production and Marketing Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Would you be kind enough to give me the answers to the following questions:

1. Number of bushels of soybeans in storage in the United States at the present time.
2. Number of bushels and the value of soybeans owned by the CCC or for which they have made contracts to purchase.
3. The name of the broker in New York City that negotiated the exchange of the 45,000 bales of cotton for the 60,000 tons of Manchuria yellow soybeans.
4. The name of the president of this New York firm and also the names of the directors of the company.

An early reply to this inquiry will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING DIVISION,
Washington, D. C., May 29, 1950.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of May 17, requesting answers to the following questions to which we have stated the answer immediately following each question:

1. Number of bushels of soya beans in storage in the United States at the present time is 119,663,000 bushels as of April 1, 1950.

2. Number of bushels and the value of soya beans owned by the CCC or for which they have made contracts to purchase are estimated to be 15,000 bushels of CCC-owned stocks, as of this date, scattered over various parts of the United States with a total estimated value of $43,500. There are no contracts to purchase as of this date.

3. The name of the broker in New York City that negotiated the exchange of the 45,000 bales of cotton for the 60,000 tons of Manchurian yellow soya beans. This transaction was negotiated by a representative of the law firm of Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft, of New York City, on behalf of the World Commerce Corp., 25 Broad Street, New York City, with whom CCC executed the agreement.

4. The name of the president of this New York firm and also the names of the directors of the company are as follows:

Frank T. Ryan, president.

Board of directors: E. W. Bickle, James F. Cavagnaro, W. W. Cumberland, Gen. W. J. Donovan, Alfred V. DuPont, J. Russell Forgan, Roger Gilbert, Jocelyn Hambro, James D. Mooney, John A. R. Pepper, Robert L. Raclin, John J. Ryan, Jr., Frank T. Ryan, Sir William Stephenson.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH S. TRIGG,
Administrator.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 5, 1950.

Mr. RALPH S. TRIGG,
Administrator, United States Department of Agriculture, Production and Marketing Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TRIGG: Thank you for your letter of May 29 in regard to the cotton-soy bean exchange between our country and Manchuria. With the thousands of Chinese reported to be starving, it did not appear to be a desirable transaction from a humanitarian viewpoint and it appeared to be a rather high price to pay to dispose of a few bales of cotton.

Just exactly what position will the CCC now take in connection with the disposal of so-called surplus agricultural commodities since the reversal of policy as a result of the Korean situation? While potatoes have been sent to Communist dominated countries and whereas the commodities under 416 of the Anderson-Cooley bill have not been very effectively distributed to United States agencies, the question arises as to how much of these foods are to be distributed to Communist countries. The 45,000 bales of cotton to Manchurian Red portion of China, and with China itself confiscating thousands of bales of ECA cotton, and with shipments of $740,000 worth of cotton sent to China last week, according to ECA press release of July 3, 1950, it would appear that the time has come for a change of operation. While the CCC may not determine this unwise policy, it is at least in a position of calling the attention of the State Department to the fallacy of the program.

The ECA has, as you well know, been the means of disposing of $1,067,314,000 worth of cotton and over $289,000,000 worth of tobacco to feed the starving people of Europe. The CCC has been kept in the "black" insofar as cotton and tobacco are concerned because so much of the funds have been used to give these commodities away at the same time that manufactured dairy products have been allowed to accumulate because the funds were used for cotton and tobacco. The ECA July press release states: "Cotton purchase authorizations totaled $25,312,000 or nearly 30 percent of the dollar value of last week's total figure of $87,267,000. The bulk of the cotton approvals went to the United Kingdom which received $23,000,000 to buy this commodity."

The dried skim milk disposed of through the ECA at 3 cents per pound with the support at 12 cents per pound left a loss to be assessed against the dairy business. I am given to understand that the ECA is waiting for Congress to adjourn when another dried skim-milk deal is to be in order at 3 cents per pound.

The points I wish to bring to your attention are (1) It is high time that someone quits sending a war commodity like cotton, to Manchuria and other potential enemies. The press states that 200,000 Manchurians are on the border of Korea getting ready to fight America. Are these Manchurians clothed with American cotton? It isn't exercising the best judgment to send a war commodity like cotton to Red-dominated countries, and it doesn't make sense to produce 50 to 100 percent more cotton than we need in the United States when its market is largely a give-away one. It doesn't appear very desirable to be so anxious to dispose of cotton that you O. K. a deal to acquire Manchurian soybeans, when according to your letter we had 119,663,000 bushels on hand in the United States and $43,500,000 of them owned by the CCC. (2) It is also the time to distribute the foods and commodities somewhere near in proportion to their importance and not spend so much of the effort and funds to dispose of commodities that only represent less than 10 percent of American farm income.

Please accept this letter in the spirit meant.

I am, sincerely,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

Effect of Imports on Employment in the Pottery Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the testimony of Mr. L. P. Reese, president, Scio-Ohio Pottery Co., Scio, Ohio, before the Subcommittee To Investigate the Effect of Foreign Imports on Employment of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Reese's excellent statement is further evidence of the way in which the reciprocal trade program is operating to the serious detriment of the domestic pottery industry. This situation, unless corrected, is going to result in the loss of thousands more jobs of American workingmen in this and other industries.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF MR. L. P. REESE, PRESIDENT, SCIO-OHIO POTTERY CO., SCIO, OHIO, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE EFFECT OF FOREIGN IMPORTS ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MONDAY, JUNE 26, 1950

I am happy to have the opportunity to appear before your committee to bring some facts to you about the Scio-Ohio Pottery Co. and its 957 employees, who are also my friends, which in my opinion clearly demonstrates that freedom of the American people is the best thing in the world.

The loyalty of this group, whom I believe to be outstanding Americans, has never been

questioned but has been proven in several different instances.

I am going to refrain from details such as difference in wage rates and different living conditions in the United States and other countries concerned, as this information is well known to your committee.

We are manufacturers of a general line of dinnerware and the only industry in the town of Scio. We have built a business from practically nothing, when started in 1932, to one that is worth approximately $3,000,000 today.

In 1947 we had over a $1,000,000 fire not covered by insurance. Our employees' loyalty and determination made it possible for them to set a world's record on erecting steel buildings.

The world's record was formerly held by Texas City, Tex. After the disaster at Texas City, they erected 930 square feet of building per day; our employees erected 3,000 square feet per day.

This accomplishment was recognized by our State Department and on January 16, 1948, the story was used on the Voice of America broadcast.

Following is a telegram from Secretary Morgenthau on their work during the third war loan drive:

"I am glad to learn that you have invested in extra war bonds during the third war loan an average of considerably over 30 percent of your gross pay. This is a very good achievement. I congratulate your company, all its workers and all the organizations or associations that have helped to achieve this fine record.

"HENRY MORGENTHAU, Jr.,
"Secretary of Treasury."

These people were far above the average in every bond drive and very few of them have cashed their bonds. Many bought them to be used in their old age.

One hundred and seventy-five of our employees served in World War II on all fronts. They are practically all back on their jobs. There were very few who did not come back.

We have just had an audit of our books by the accounting firm of Ernst & Ernst, which brings the question of protection in our industry so forcibly to my mind. Here are the figures computed on percentage of sales:

	Percent
1940	15.48
1941	11.34
1942	5.97
1943	5.69
1944	6.05
1945	6.09

In 1946 the percentage was down to 4.08 due to a large bonus which was given to our employees.

In 1947, the year of our disastrous fire which wiped out all our surplus, our profit was 2.95 percent.

In 1948 our profit was 8.06 percent. Up to January 1, 1949, we did not have an inventory, as during the war years we shipped merchandise out as fast as we could make it.

In January 1949, we started to stock our warehouse, and it was necessary to borrow $125,000 for working capital. We ended the year with a profit of 2.46 percent.

I would like to mention that the cut in profits in 1949 was not due to an addition of high-salaried executive or administrative personnel.

You can very plainly see by these figures that if this condition gets worse, these brave people are faced with a wage cut or unemployment.

Putting it in very simple language, I would like to leave this thought with your committee: Is it right that our boys should leave their homes and travel 8,000 to 10,000 miles to conquer Japan, then in a few years have the conquered take their jobs?

Please understand that I am not looking at this from a personal angle. I am interested first in my employees and the town of Scio; second, the thousands of workers in the pottery industry who are unemployed at this time and whose jobs depend on the action of our Government.

If Japan and other countries, with their low wage rate and low standard of living, are allowed to sell their merchandise on the American market at a lower price than the American manufacturer can produce, the standard of living of the American potter must be lowered. If that is a good thing for Japan and the world in general, it is only fair that it be explained thoroughly to the American people and especially the workers who earn their living in the pottery industry.

May I respectfully ask you gentlemen for the sake of the American worker and humanity in general, to think this over seriously before making a recommendation.

Do not wreck the pottery industry, as we have entirely too much unemployment in the United States now.

Do not deny the American potter the right to follow his chosen occupation.

I can assure you it has been an honor and a pleasure to appear before your committee and I want to thank you for this opportunity.

The Jobs of American Workers and Our National Security Are Imperiled by Unsound Foreign Import Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the jobs of American workers and, in many instances, our national security are imperiled by stubborn adherence to a demonstrably unsound policy relating to foreign imports. An increasing number of vital American industries are being endangered by the steadily increasing flow of these imports into this country. Many of these industries are vital to our national defense and security and should be protected in order that we may not become totally dependent upon other countries for our national defense requirements. It would be disastrous if we were to find that we had built up industries abroad at the expense of our domestic production and then in time of emergency were unable to obtain critical imports in sufficient supply to meet our increased needs.

One vital line of manufactures whose existence is threatened by these foreign imports is the optical industry of America, which makes cameras, lenses, binoculars, the Norden bombsight, and other basic war needs.

When the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was before the House for a 2-year extension in February of 1949, I supported it because no country can export as heavily as we do and not import a great many foreign goods. The chief way consuming countries get the dollars to pay us is by selling their goods to us. In addition, this reciprocity was necessary to enable the tottering economy of Europe to regain its feet and become more nearly self-sufficient. This was only common sense since, to prevent collapse, we were the ones who had to supply the goods and food which they could not produce themselves.

This Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, however, should have had a peril-point provision in it. That becomes increasingly apparent. The peril-point amendment which unfortunately was defeated, would have afforded a measure of protection to American workers and industry. It provided that the Tariff Commission should advise the President from time to time of any increases in duties or import restrictions which appeared necessary to prevent serious injury to a domestic industry. While the President would not be required to act in such instances, he would at least be in possession of all the facts and alerted to the threat facing the particular industry.

The bill was passed, however, without this protective provision, which was opposed by the administration forces, and American labor is now beginning in many areas to feel the full impact of competition with cheap foreign labor. The bill was passed at a time of prosperity in this country when there was no lack of work, but now the situation has changed appreciably. Unemployment has become a source of concern for men and women in those industries which are being so drastically affected by unfair foreign competition.

The optical manufacturing industry affords a specific example of the effects of this competition. For instance, skilled laborers, working on precision instruments, such as microscopes and binoculars, receive on an average $1.80 an hour, while persons doing similar work in Japan receive 12 cents an hour, in Germany, 30 cents an hour, and in England, 70 cents an hour. Despite the improved manufacturing methods in this country, it is simply impossible to meet such competition. Since labor represents about 70 percent of the retail price of these instruments, it can be easily seen that an American laborer at $1.80 an hour could afford to spend only 3 hours on a pair of binoculars to compete in price with an instrument which the Japanese worker at 12 cents an hour spent 45 hours making.

Obviously, American producers and workers cannot compete on any such extreme basis. Soon these manufacturers may not be able to keep even the skeleton force which is necessary if the plant is to be maintained in such working condition that it could be reactivated quickly and efficiently in time of war. Such a result would be a catastrophe.

We cannot afford to allow this situation to continue, from the standpoint of either our domestic economy or our national defense. The situation calls for immediate and drastic treatment. An initial step which should be taken without delay should be to face up to past mistakes and quickly amend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to insert the peril-point provision.

Not only do our own workers require this absolute minimum of protection, but in many lines of industry, it is dictated with even greater urgency by considerations of national security.

Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Two Bills To Call Up Promptly," which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on Wednesday, July 5, 1950:

TWO BILLS TO CALL UP PROMPTLY

If the Senate wants to strike a mighty psychological blow against Communist aggression, it can do so by passing two bills which have been approved by its own committee after approval in the House. These are the bills to admit the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood.

Alaska reaches to within some 50 miles of Siberia. Hawaii stands far out in the Pacific. Admission of these two Territories to the Federal Union, with all which this act implies, would be notice to the world, including the Kremlin, that the United States is permanently committed to protecting the cause of peace in the Pacific.

Truman administration leaders should schedule these bills for prompt passage. Since both party platforms in 1948, along with President Truman, favored statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, the vote in the Senate should be overwhelming. We predict a tremendous moral reaction to their adoption.

Schedule them for a vote.

Fetish of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Very Reverend Hunter Guthrie, S. J., president, Georgetown University of Washington, on the occasion of the one hundred and fifty-first commencement exercises, made a most interesting address to the graduating class and those who were present. He has touched on a phase of our national life which has been given too little consideration in the past decade. I am including at this point the remarks by Father Guthrie, together with a letter written by him to the Washington Post. I commend his remarks and the letter to all Members of the House:

ADDRESS BY THE VERY REVEREND HUNTER GUTHRIE, S. J., PRESIDENT, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D. C., GIVEN AT THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIRST COMMENCEMENT EXERCISE, JUNE 12, 1950

One of the most fruitful theories which the early Ionians contributed to western culture is the concept of limitations. This notion through more than 26 centuries has enabled men to see form, shape and size, kind, species and definition in what would otherwise be a formless, shapeless, and very confusing universe. Where man outside this tradition has taken refuge in the unstable putty of mysticism, western man found in this concept a tape measure which would assist him in plotting the size of material things and delineating the character of spiritual reality. The essentials of this theory lie in the dual principles of form and matter. Each is complementary to the other and each exercises a limiting control which contributes to the individuality of the objectively finished product or the subjectively understood thing.

To illustrate by a pedestrian example: On the one hand, a block of marble, which for our purposes may be considered as the principle of matter, will limit by its size and shape the eventual form which the sculptor's intention, which again for our purposes may be called the form, will, in turn, determine whether this block of marble becomes a statue of Ulysses S. Grant or Robert E. Lee—a trenchant difference which the southerners in our audience will appreciate. Hence, every individual thing that exists contains somewhere in its make-up the delineating polarity of matter and form, and, as a corollary, it should be added that nothing exists nor can be understood in created nature without the assistance of these patterning principles.

In the educational world today, we are witnessing the foolhardy attempt either to bring into being or to understand a thing which has neither form nor matter, is subject to no standard or norm, has neither limitation nor definition. The sacred fetish of academic freedom. This is the soft under belly of our American way of life, and the sooner it is armor-plated by some sensible limitation the sooner will the future of this Nation be secured from fatal consequences. Two test questions, which imply limitation, come to mind at once when the matter of academic freedom is discussed. The first: is the matter being taught true or false? and the second: if it is false, and presented as such, may one prudently suppose that a good and not an evil end will eventuate from its exposition? The true and the good, then, are the natural limitations of freedom. This is not an area for opinion because opinion does not delineate, for by its very nature it packages the false with the true. Nor is this a matter for experimentation because the prudent man does not experiment with suicide.

These reflections should be of vital concern to the audience present. The majority here are not professional educators. Nevertheless, education controls your way of life not only as to what you shall think, but how you will be taxed. The formidable blind spot in big industry down to the average business and professional man is the failure to recognize the potent control which education exercises over the national life. For the past few years columnists and comedians have been poking fun at the college professors in Government. Despite this harmless barb, these professors and college-trained men, the products of a disastrous and ill-defined academic freedom, have taken over the State Department, the Judiciary, the Budget, the myriad agencies of the Government, and have transformed our ways of thinking and living and acting beyond recognition to what they were several decades ago. Instead of reexamining the system of education which produced these men otherwise responsible citizens have futilely hurled criticism against the men themselves, and in some notable instances have continued handsomely to support the schools which produced them. Business and professional men alike have failed to understand that without a knowledge and love of God, man cannot understand the American Constitution or the Bill of Rights; without a knowledge of and belief in the principles of morality, he cannot administer justice or fashion an honorable treaty with a foreign nation, or even draw up a budget with any semblance of fair play to the economic interests of the various categories of our citizens.

If the United States is to continue in the western tradition which made it great, it behooves those of our citizens interested in the present and future of this Nation to search out and support the educational institutions which are still striving to maintain that tradition; a tradition which was grounded on freedom limited by a belief in God, by faith in the omnipotence of truth and the beneficence of justice. In a word, a tradition that freedom springs from truth, but that truth is rarely freedom's offspring.

Georgetown University today, more consciously than ever before, stands for these principles. It welcomes those who still believe in them to rally to her support.

[From the Washington Post of June 17, 1950]

FETISH OF FREEDOM

As a result of your June 14 editorial several people have written me requesting a clarification of the excerpts you printed from my remarks at our one hundred and fifty-first commencement.

Freedom, as I see it, is our human choice to say what we think is true rather than false; to do what we hold to be good rather than evil. Intelligence decides the former, conscience the latter. The educator's task is to sharpen a student's intelligence and assist him in setting up moral standards for his conscience. In America, one of these standards has traditionally been considered basic to our way of life. That is the existence of God. From this accepted fact flow our human rights, which we claim are God-given, not state-given. Remove God and the structure of our American system collapses.

As an American educator, therefore—my religious beliefs quite apart—I feel duty-bound to maintain the existence of God as an important intellectual, moral, and political factor and so to teach or see that it is taught in my school. Since the current interpretation of academic freedom permits a professor to teach that God does not exist, I, as an American, raised my voice in protest.

I called this interpretation of academic freedom a fetish because I think it is used as a sacred protection by an alarming number of professors who, consciously or unconsciously, are undermining our American way of life. I felt that was sufficient justification to request a limitation of academic freedom; a limitation, please note, not based on the dogma of any religious faith but on a reasonable American tradition.

It would be instructive for your editorial writer to thumb through a good history and find out why Galileo was condemned. The modern heliocentric system was discovered by Copernicus, a Roman Catholic priest, who, incidentally, was not condemned.

HUNTER GUTHRIE, S. J.,
President, Georgetown University.
WASHINGTON.

Aid to Divorcees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the enlarged scope of governmental activities is amusingly covered in an editorial from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and

Chronicle, which follows, under leave to extend my remarks.

The humor could be better appreciated were the reader not faced with the painful realization that his own hard-earned dollars are involved in such curious ventures as are illustrated by the loan to the Nevada gambling casino.

AID TO DIVORCEES

A new chapter has been written in the Federal Government's weird financial philosophy. A Senate committee has been told that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation lent just under a million dollars to a Reno hotel, which houses a top-floor gambling casino.

The RFC explained that the public interest requires adequate accommodations for persons going to Reno for divorces. This is an awe-inspiring concept of the public interest.

If Uncle Sam—in the garb of the Washington administrators—is officially accepting divorce and gambling as a necessary part of our way of life, the average man has a right to be a teeny bit stunned and staggered. How to explain to Sis, in her malleable teens, that husbands aren't to be tried out like hair dos until one suits her, when the Government underwrites a hotel for divorcees? Or how to convince Junior of the stupidity of risking his allowance on the flip of a card, when Uncle Sam virtually owns title to a swank gambling casino?

Even a pair of Democrat stalwarts couldn't quite stomach this.

Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, the committee chairman, and Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, objected. DOUGLAS protested that "it was extending the concept of the welfare state too far." That should rate Mr. DOUGLAS as a sorry conservative in some Federal circles.

The welfare state, on this newest evidence, is but a babe and the Kansas caves full of dried eggs represent only its toddling steps. If housing for a divorcee can be guaranteed, why not her expenses? And if Junior cuts a trey when he needs a face card—but enough, we are being carried away, the whole proposition is so intriguing.

But it is a disgusting footnote on the domestic life of a nation otherwise facing up to a world crisis.

FBI Academy Making Tremendous Contribution to Law and Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to attend the graduation exercises of the FBI National Academy class graduating on June 30, 1950.

It happened that Richard E. McHugh, chief of police of my home city of Stockton, Calif., was a member of the class and was thoughtful enough to invite me to the exercises.

The class was composed of 44 law-enforcement officers from all parts of the Union. California had the largest group, the following being members of the class: Police Sgt. N. L. Harris, Chula Vista; Chief of Police William A. Hydie, Merced; Deputy Sheriff Harold C. Marlowe, Los Angeles County; Captain of Police Arthur Carl Nielsen, Mountain View; Highway Patrol Sgt. Charles H. Paynor, Sacramento; Chief of Police Ralph Earl Parker, Pomona; Chief of Police Raymond Pruitt, Dinuba; Inspector of Police Howard Sorrello, Oakland; Captain of Police Lawrence S. Trimble, Sacramento; Chief of Police Richard E. McHugh, Stockton.

Several interesting addresses were made to the graduates stressing the importance of efficient peace officers in both our national and local security.

The FBI Academy was organized in 1934 and this was the forty-fourth class to be graduated. Its graduates have exerted a powerful influence on law enforcement. Scientific detection of crime and the latest in good administration of police systems are taught.

However, as a lawyer, I think the most important contribution this Academy makes to law enforcement is in teaching peace officers how to gather legal evidence. By this I mean evidence which conforms to the rules of evidence applied in criminal courts. Any person who has had any experience in the prosecution of crime realizes that frequently these officers do not understand the difference between gossip or hearsay and evidence which will be received by a court. This is one thing that officers learn at the FBI Academy. Evidence is what convicts criminals.

Nothing hurts the underworld more than convictions of its members. A criminal does not worry about publicity, criticism, or even a trial, if he is acquitted. But a conviction really cramps his style. It has a great deterrent effect on others who may be committing crime or contemplating doing so. It is a sad commentary, which every informed person knows, that there is a defined underworld in the enlightened and self-governing United States of America. That morbid and subversive group of people are working to destroy everything that we hold dear. Civilized society means law and order. Without it we have anarchy and our security and safety is gone. The underworld works every day in the year to defy the law, to circumvent it and thus to defy organized society and bring it into disrepute. Big money is made by the practice of crime. Many of the big crimes are germinated in places where the smaller crimes flourished.

With a group of alert, trained, and skillful peace officers on the job, in every county and city, life and property is more safe. If they are trained as they have been at the FBI Academy they know how to outwit the criminal and how to get convictions where he crosses the line and commits a crime. This constitutes a great deterrent to crime.

That type of officer dispersed throughout the United States is the result of the training given by 44 classes who have graduated from the FBI Academy. Director J. Edgar Hoover is the man who developed this idea. His idea is reaping big profits in law observance. We are getting spread all through the Nation officers who can cope with criminals and who know how to successfully bring them to the bar of justice. That is a tremendous contribution to our safety and our peace of mind. Because of this crime is getting dangerous. The very basis of popular government is that people will observe the law. This means that they have the character and the will power to respect the law, even though they do not like it. Also, popular government, to be successful, must be able to cope with those who are trying to destroy law and order. That is where our peace officers come in. That is where this FBI training comes in. They do learn how to cope with lawlessness successfully. This constitutes a great contribution to the future stability of our Nation.

To date I remember four men from our county who have attended this academy: Sheriff Carlos Sousa, Chief Richard E. McHugh, Officer Tom Monarch, and Deputy Sheriff Nick Canliss. There may be others, but these four I have visited with in Washington during their school-days at the academy. Everyone has told me that he has learned invaluable things pertaining to his job at the academy. I hope we may have more come here and take this course. It is a fine investment for any community to send their peace officers here for this training.

No More Depressions?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith a penetrating editorial by David Lawrence which appeared on the final page of the June 30, 1950, issue of the United States News and World Reports. I commend its reading to my colleagues:

NO MORE DEPRESSIONS?

(By David Lawrence)

How naive the Soviet rulers would be if they accepted the prediction made last week by the United States Secretary of Labor, Maurice Tobin, before the International Labor Organization at Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. Tobin said:

"I do not believe we will ever again experience a major depression such as we had in the early thirties."

He spoke of the great advances in social and economic legislation made by America since 1933 as a deterrent against depression. Then he added in an obvious reference to Russian expectations:

"Any persons or nations who make plans on the basis of an expected economic collapse in the United States are doomed to disappointment."

But the Russians have able economists. Their periodicals, which are translated and read in the United States, reveal a good grasp of the factual data about business conditions here. The Russians don't need to come to America to find out the strain under which our economic system is laboring—all they have to do is to read the American newspapers. The Russian thesis that in the next few years America faces a serious depression, if not economic collapse, is undoubtedly based on these premises:

First, the people of the United States have become totally indifferent to the size of the national debt. It was $251,600,000,000 at the low point of the postwar period. It's now more than 257 billions.

Second, the Congress of the United States, comprising both political parties, is not interested in reducing the national debt, but is increasing it. The official figures for our current fiscal year ending this month will show a deficit of more than $3,500,000,000. There is, furthermore, coming an estimated deficit of almost as many billions for the next fiscal year. What kind of an economic mind does one need in order to discover that, if you pay out each year more than you take in, you are headed for collapse?

Third, the American Government—as evidenced not only by the speech of the Secretary of Labor but by the political addresses of the administration—believes that wages can keep on going up and up as less and less hours are worked and less and less production is obtained and that this will not affect prices or ultimately bring about a serious devaluation in the purchasing power of the dollar. If that's the way to strengthen capitalism, the Russians probably are saying, "Let's have more of it."

It would be wise not to underestimate the intelligence of the Russian economists. They know, better than do some of our own wishful thinkers, the American habit of thought under the dictatorship of a political clique.

How long will the American people sit by and let the debt go up year after year without a sign of paying off the war bonds the people have bought? These Government securities, to be sure, will never be repudiated—certainly not as long as the Bureau of Printing and Engraving keeps on printing renewal bonds to take the place of those that mature—and so long as the people keep on buying the replacements.

But how long will public confidence last in the paper dollar and the paper bond? Only until such time as the people suddenly conclude that the public debt isn't going to be paid off. Will the American people see this dilemma coming and have the gumption to turn out of power the spendthrifts and stop the inflationary trend which today is so patent but which the administration describes on the stump as real "prosperity"?

If you think the American people will come to their senses at the polls and repudiate the spenders in both parties, restore thrift, and make a start toward paying off the public debt, then you can assume we will have a temporary readjustment or deflation, and it will avert a serious depression. There will have to be, of course, some days of reckoning to pay for unsound measures of the past.

If, however, you are convinced that the people will never kill Santa Claus until Santa Claus kills them, then you can put it down now that there will be a major depression and that the crash will be much more severe than anything America has ever experienced.

The Russian rulers are already convinced of the lack of courage or moral fiber of the political leaders in the United States. The Soviets may decide that, if we are going to have an economic collapse, curtailing aid to Europe, there will be no need of a shooting war to grab Europe—they may be able to win it by infiltration as they did China. Think of it—Asia and Europe without a shot. Will America help them do it?

If the administration is right, the sky is the limit—there need be no restraint on prices nor on wages. Everything presumably will come out O. K. without balanced budgets or enough tax collections to pay for past extravagances or for the never-ending benefits in the future promised to special groups of voters.

If that kind of political economics fools the Russians, they are easily fooled. But, what is more important, will it fool the American people?

Reorganization Plan No. 27

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, many reasons have been advanced both for and against the adoption of plan No. 27. However, it seems to me that those advanced by the American Medical Association in opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 27 are worth inserting into the RECORD. They are as follows:

Plan No. 27 would—

1. Be in direct conflict with the Hoover Commission, which recommends an independent health agency.
2. Make difficult or impossible the creation of a department of health at any future time.
3. Ignore the fact that health, a direct concern of everyone, is entitled to equal governmental status with labor, commerce, and similar activities which directly concern only a portion of the population, yet have separate Cabinet departments.
4. Not promote economy.
5. Create a triple holding company, a conglomerate department of health, education, and security, most of whose work is not related.
6. Not be a reorganization of administration, but a renaming of an agency admittedly faulty in set-up.
7. Open the way for an ambitious secretary, entrusted with great power, to take over control of VA's medical department.
8. Make possible Federal control of medical education through granting and withholding scholarships, etc.
9. Point toward eventual Federal domination of our voluntary hospital system.
10. Create a master organization ready and anxious to take over administration of a national compulsory health-insurance program.
11. Place administration of the Nation's health activities in the hands of a politically appointed secretary with no professional qualifications.
12. Place the direct operation of medical programs in the hands of a Surgeon General who need not even be a doctor of medicine.
13. Not, in the slightest degree, promise to improve the health and welfare of the American people.

Investigation of Homosexuals in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of Mr. Eric Sevareid's analysis of the news, broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Friday, June 16, 1950. His discussion of the investigation of homosexuals in Government is one of the most clarifying and intelligent commentaries on this question that has come to my attention.

The Senate subcommittee headed by HOEY, of North Carolina, has now been assigned the task of investigating homosexuality among employees of the Federal Government. Congress has probably never before undertaken a task of such delicacy, nor one surrounded by as much primitive fear and general ignorance. For those reasons, this is a subject that no commentator very willingly assigns himself to discuss; but it has seemed to us that because this is now a matter at public issue, and because there is so much misunderstanding, it is useful, indeed, necessary to explain a few of the basic facts. What I say here is the summation of what I am told by doctors, lawyers, and administrators in Washington.

From their information it would seem reasonable to state that (1) homosexuality is a universal problem, everywhere, and in all times; (2) it is primarily a psychological problem, quite nonpartisan, has nothing to do with loyalty or disloyalty; (3) it does not involve Government security, save in a marginal manner; and (4) it is no more prevalent among administrative employees than it is in any similar group of human beings, whether they be in a college, or a private business concern, or, in the Congress.

When the Senate groups question phychiatrists as they will, they will discover, that there is no specific, clinical test, psychological or biological, for identifying a homosexual person. They will find themselves in an endless twilight area of fact, with overt, aggressively practicing homosexuals at one end of the scale, and happily married persons at the other, who are latent homosexuals and don't know it themselves. They will find innumerable gradations in between.

The Senators will find that the only statistics available are those of Dr. Kinsey—which not all statisticians accept as final, by the way. Those figures show that 37 percent of all American males, at some time or other in their lives, have had some homosexual experience. They show that 8 percent of American males are active homosexuals for at least 3 years of their lives; that an indeterminate number are the same for a lesser period, and that 4 percent remain such all through their active lives.

The Senators will find no statistics on women homosexuals, which they also intend to consider, but they will be told that the ratios are probably about the same as they are for men.

There is an idea that sexually maladjusted persons are more prevalent in Washington than elsewhere. But local psychiatrists conclude that the rate is no different among Federal workers than among office workers elsewhere. Indeed, according to Dr. Kinsey, the rate of abnormality is highest among laborers, in rural regions, and lowest among professional people.

MCCARTHY and some others make much of the fact that 91 homosexuals were found in the State Department; they do not mention that those people were weeded out over a period of 3½ years, that it was handled, not by security officers, but by personnel officials, in a routine manner in the interests of office morale and efficient administration. Security was involved, only in two or three cases of persons having access to secret documents and who, it was feared, might be subject to blackmail by foreign agents, because of their abnormality.

But there again, qualifications arise. A frank and open homosexual may be far more blackmailproof than, for example, a normal person engaged in extramarital affairs. So the problems are endless, extremely subtle. And so perhaps it is fortunate that Committee Chairman HOEY is not given to sensationalism and that a highminded woman, Senator MARGARET SMITH, is on the committee, reducing the chance that the information will be brutalized, but given the basic

facts, it seems probable the committee will conclude, in the end, that this is purely an administrative matter for each agency, will have to be so handled, as it always has been.

The Electoral College as a Political Graveyard for Minority Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I include in my remarks a statement by Hon. Clarence F. Lea, a former able and distinguished Member of the House. I hope every Member will read Mr. Lea's statement. He began to study the subject of the election of President and Vice President many years ago. In 1928 he introduced a bill to amend the method of the election of these officials, substantially as the Lodge-Gossett proposal, now pending in the House, provides. In 1933 the Elections Committee of the House unanimously recommended the Lea proposal, but it never reached the floor of the House, as the Rules Committee bottled it up. What could happen in the event an election was thrown into the House of Representatives, where each State has only one vote, is terrible to contemplate. In that event States representing less than 10 percent of the population of the United States could elect the President. That would be an awful distortion of representative government.

Following is the statement of Hon. Clarence F. Lea:

THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE WITH ITS UNIT VOTE IS A GRAVEYARD IN WHICH IS BURIED EVERY VOTE FOR A MINORITY CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT, IN EVERY STATE IN THE UNION AT EVERY ELECTION—THIS INJUSTICE IS FURTHER AGGRAVATED BY THE FACT THAT SUCH DISFRANCHISED VOTES AFTER BURIAL ARE STILL COUNTED AS IF CAST FOR THE PLURALITY CANDIDATE IN EACH STATE REGARDLESS OF WHETHER SUCH CANDIDATE HAS EVEN HALF OF THE STATE VOTE

THE DISFRANCHISEMENT OF MINORITY VOTERS

The outstanding and indefensible evil of our system of electing the President is its ruthless disfranchisement of all minority voters of all parties in every State in each presidential election.

The method of computing votes under the electoral-college system is a conglomeration of false equations.

In 1948, 48 percent, or over 23,000,000 of all voters were disfranchised and their votes credited in the electoral college as if they had been cast for their political opponents against whom they were voted.

Though the number of disfranchised voters greatly varies as between different elections, on the average for many years over 44 percent of the votes cast by the American people have been credited in the electoral college contrary to the way they were cast.

This is a vicious injustice to the millions who are thus disfranchised and denied the right to have their votes counted as cast in the final determination of the election.

Let us suppose that an amendment were presented to Congress that boldly provided that no vote for the candidate of a minority party shall be credited to any minority party in any presidential election; that all such votes, contrary to the way voted, should be credited to the plurality candidate in each State. No Member of Congress could be found who would be willing to be recognized as the supporter of such an absurd proposal.

However, that is exactly what we now do under the unit-voting system.

The minority voter is denied credit for his vote, but that is only half the injustice. His vote is credited in the electoral college as if cast for the opponent against whom he voted.

To allow one candidate credit for the votes cast for another without sanction of law is a crime in every State. To allow such a credit with the sanction of the law is legally right but morally wrong and a political monstrosity.

MUTILATING OUR NATIONAL PARTIES

Our present method of computing votes utterly ignores the practical nature of our political system. Within the first four decades of our Government we developed what is called a party system of government. Under our system of popular government a political party, even a minority party, is almost as important as the legal structure of our Government itself. A political party furnishes the only practical means by which citizens of generally similar convictions and purposes can combine and cooperate together within the State and between the different States in a Nation-wide common purpose to support men and measures that they believe to be for the best interests of the Nation. The best interests of the Nation require that those who desire to so cooperate in the affairs of the country be enccuraged or at least be treated fairly in making such effort that all citizens who so participate in party government, in public affairs, be allowed to do so under fair rules of the game.

Under the present system each national party has 48 areas of operation and cooperation. Each party has 48 segments as determined by State lines. Now all credit in each State is denied to all minority parties which have less than a plurality vote. Whether the minority party be the Democratic, or Republican, or a third party it rereceives no credit from any State vote less than a plurality of its whole vote. In one small State the minority party may be denied 300,000 votes; in another large State it may be denied credit for 3,000,000 votes.

Thus in the election of 1948 the Democratic Party received credit in the electoral college for its segments in 28 States and also received credit in the electoral count for the votes of all the Republican and members of other parties in those 28 States. At the same time the Democratic Party received no credit in the electoral count for the 9,500,000 votes in its favor in the 20 other segments or States of its operation.

The Republican Party was the minority party in 32 States. It received 22,000,000 votes in the 48 States or segments of its party, but received no credit in the electoral college for the votes of its 12,100,000 supporters in 32 States it failed to carry. Thus a great party, after 94 years of its existence, was slashed to pieces and left with only 16 of its segments functioning in 16 States or only one-third of the States of the Nation.

The votes in 32 States, or two-thirds of all its segments, were counted as if cast for its opponents and their policies.

Thus this false system of computing votes mutilates our great national parties. It denies every political party the cooperation of its supporters in every State where it receives less than a plurality of a State vote.

Expressed in short but accurate terms, we elect a President by disenfranchising every minority voter in 48 States.

EACH CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT RUNS AGAINST HIMSELF

In 1948 the Democratic Party was a plurality party in the 28 States it carried. It was the minority party in the 20 States it lost. In those 28 States Mr. Truman received 14,600,000 votes and his opponents 13,000,000. So Mr. Truman in those States was credited with 27,600,000 votes in the electoral college, which was 3,500,000 more than his total vote in the Nation.

In the Democratic minority States Mr. Truman received 9,500,000 votes for which he received no credit in the electoral college. These voters were disenfranchised and counted as if they had voted for his opponents.

The Republican Party was a plurality party in 16 States. It was a minority party in 32 States.

Mr. Dewey, in his 16 plurality States, received 9,900,000 votes which were credited in his favor as cast. In the 32 States in which he was the candidate of the minority party he received 13,000,000 votes, which were counted against him and as if cast for his opponents. Thus 12,100,000 voted for Dewey as a minority candidate against the 9,900,000 who voted for him as a plurality candidate. Dewey as a minority candidate defeated Dewey as the plurality candidate by a majority of 2,200,000.

To summarize the situation: The votes of each candidate in his minority States are counted against him the same as are his opponent's votes. This means each candidate for President is running for himself in his plurality States and against himself in his minority States. Mr. Truman as a plurality candidate running against himself as a minority candidate received a majority as plurality candidate of 5,100,000.

Mr. Dewey, running as a plurality candidate in the States he carried against Dewey as a minority candidate was defeated by 2,200,000 majority.

Thus it is apparent that a candidate for President, through the counting of his own votes against him, may defeat himself for President.

It is hard to conjure up any more unjust and absurd way of crediting votes than that exemplified in the election of 1948, which is typical of our electoral system.

FALSE EQUATIONS

In 1948, 6 States, with a total of 179 electoral votes, had over 90 electoral votes counted contrary to the way they were cast. Sixteen of our States, or one-third of the Nation, have a total electoral vote of only 73. Thus the vote disfranchised in 6 States more than equaled the total vote of 16 States of the Nation.

In 1948, in the 8 largest States with 27,000,000 voters, over 13,600,000 voters were disfranchised and their votes counted contrary to the way cast. This means that over 13,000,000 votes in 8 States were taken from the candidates to which they belonged and credited to their opponents.

Under the present system it is fairly certain that in an average election for President the plurality candidate for each State will receive credit in the electoral college in varying numbers from 140 to 210 votes for each 100 cast for him in the State he carries.

The smaller the plurality of the candidate the greater will be the false credit he receives. For instance, one candidate carries the State by a plurality of 45 percent of the vote. He will get credit for 55 votes in addition to each 45 cast in his favor. A candidate who receives 60 percent of the vote will get a false credit of only 40 votes out of each 100.

In 1948 the 10 large States had over 60 percent of the votes of the Nation. About 48 percent of their votes were credited contrary to the way they were cast.

The unit rule, all or nothing, in each State makes no distinction between a plurality of 1,000 and 1,000,000, or between a plurality of 40 percent or 60 percent. Any candidate who has a plurality carries 100 percent of the State vote.

Neither is there any distinction as to the number of electoral votes carried by a plurality. A plurality of 1 percent carries the 47 electoral votes of New York the same as the 3 electoral votes of Nevada.

In 1948 a very high percentage of the electoral votes of the Nation were carried by pluralities of less than 5 percent, important ones by less than 2 percent. The electoral vote of 13 of the 48 States was carried by pluralities of less than half of the State votes. These slim pluralities show the hazard, the injustice of the unit vote. One of these small pluralities can control the total vote of the largest or any other State in the Union. A plurality candidate with only a minority or a vote practically equal with his opponent, takes 100 percent of the electoral vote of each State.

In three large States with over 10,000,000 voting, 78 electoral votes, the whole number was controlled by a plurality of less than 60,000 votes.

These false equations result in practically unlimited distortions of the popular votes.

THE MINORITY GRAVEYARD

Under the Constitution, the people cannot vote directly for President. The only method afforded the people to vote for a favorite candidate is to vote for Presidential electors who are pledged, if elected, to vote for a certain party candidate. If those candidates for Presidential electors are not elected they can never deliver the vote given them by the voters for that purpose.

Thus the unit voting system is the graveyard for the burial of all minority votes less than the plurality.

These presidential electors are only an intermediate agency between the people and the presidency. The people, though denied the right to vote directly for President, can only indirectly do so by voting for a presidential elector who they hope will be elected. The electors, in effect, hold a proxy for the voters who elect them to vote for their candidate. They hold only a party proxy. They do not cast their proxy, their vote, except as a party representative and not as a representative of the people who voted against the candidates to whom they are pledged. This leaves all minority voters unrepresented in an intermediate count, before the final count which determines the election is made.

The injustice of the unit vote, its senseless method of denying credit for minority votes, is still more completely discredited by counting the buried votes as if they had been cast for the plurality candidate in each State.

OUR GENERAL METHODS OF ELECTION

Under our American scheme of government we have developed a method of electing local, State officials, and Representatives and Senators for the Federal Government, by practices which are just, fair, and practical and in their operation. Under this system the voting and first count are at the local precinct. There the votes are counted and each candidate is given credit for his own votes—no more and no less. The precinct results are certified to the county authorities where the total votes of all candidates within the county are tabulated and again credit is given to each candidate for his own votes—no more and no less.

The totals for each county within the State are transmitted to the State authorities where the totals for each candidate in the State are tabulated. There again credit is given to each candidate for his total vote—no more and no less.

Then, under this general practice, in the final count which determines the election, the plurality candidate for all State, county, and local offices are given certificates of election for the offices for which they received the plurality vote, regardless of how large or small their plurality may have been or what percentage of the people voted.

This general plan of election, after the State count, is broken up so far as the election of the President is concerned. The popular vote of the State must be translated into electoral votes. Under the present method any fair translation through the Presidential elector is impossible. What the Lodge-Gossett resolution does is to mathematically translate the popular votes of each State into electoral votes in exact proportion to the popular vote of each State. In this way there is no circumvention of the will of the people of the State. The voters of the State thus register their vote in the final count on an equal basis with each other voter in the State. This is a just method of voting in the State. Where each State vote is recorded faithfully we have an election that faithfully represents the voters of all States.

THE ELECTORAL VOTE

The authors of the Constitution recognized that a State-wide vote of the Nation regardless of State lines would not result in an equitable distribution of the rights of the State to take part in the Federal Government. It was also recognized the many variable conditions which affect the number who may vote in any given State at any particular time prohibited the practicability of basing State representation on the number of votes cast.

Therefore, the authors of the Constitution determined to give the States representation in the affairs of the Federal Government on a basis of population in each State, regardless of the number who might vote in any one State. Electoral votes were assigned to each State in proportion to its population as determining the extent of its right to representation in Congress and also to participate in the election of a President. This basis of allotment gave each State the same relative power to participate in the election of a President as it has in its representation in Congress.

The State popular vote is representative of the whole people of the State, regardless of the number who vote within the State. This plan, with a fair degree of success, accomplishes equality of representation between the States.

THE TWO-VOTE ALLOTMENT

However, the Constitution makes one departure from the general principle of State representation in proportion to population. Each State, regardless of population, is given two votes in the Senate and two electoral votes regardless of population. This was a compromise concession to the smaller States and also serves as one of the checks and balances to our representative republic.

This gives 96 electoral votes to the plurality candidates regardless of population. The Lodge-Gossett resolution does not propose to deprive the States of this two-vote allotment. It does, however, provide that the two votes in each States shall be divided between the respective candidates in proportion to their total vote instead of all going to one candidate.

The effect of this proposed change is important. It eliminates the gratuitous character of this vote except as to the plurality between any two candidates. Thus, if one candidate receives a plurality of 5 percent of the State vote, he would be credited with 1.2 electoral votes, while the minority candidate would receive credit for .8 of one vote. So the gift to the plurality candidate would be .4 of one vote instead of 2 votes.

In the election of 1948 Mr. Truman carried 28 States, which gave him 56 electoral votes on account of the two-vote allotment. Mr. Dewey carried 16 States with 32 votes. Thus Mr. Truman, from this source, had a gratuitous credit of 24 electoral votes. Under the Lodge-Gossett plan each candidate would have received credit in proportion to their popular votes, which would have substantially increased the vote of the minority candidate and decreased the vote of the plurality candidate.

In 1936 Roosevelt carried 46 States and Landon 2. Thus Roosevelt received 92 of the 96 votes and Landon 4. Under the Lodge-Gossett resolution Roosevelt would have received a plurality of about 24 electoral votes instead of 88.

Thus the Lodge-Gossett resolution very greatly minimizes any objection that now exists to the two-vote allotement on account of this gratuitous character.

NO SATISFACTORY SOLUTION WITHOUT DIVISION OF STATE VOTES

The Constitution properly provided electoral votes, allotted primarily on a basis of population, as the measure of the right of each State to participate in the election of the President. It failed to anticipate the time when the people of the country would, on their own account, want to select the President.

The insuperable barrier of the Constitution to the selection of the President by any fair system of crediting votes is its failure to provide for the division of the State votes so as to accurately reflect the will of the people of the State.

In view of the great variety of conditions that prevail in our widely separated 48 States, it is utterly impractical, if not nonsensical, to attempt to devise any satisfactory plan of election that does not provide for a division of the State votes. Then, too, that division must give equal recognition to every vote lawfully cast so that it will be given its proper credit in the final count that determines the election.

This requires the elimination of the presidential elector. No difference how selected, he never has been, and never will be, able to cast a vote for President that will accurately reflect the divided will of the people of the State for which he was selected.

The presidential elector is an obvious obstruction to any proper system of election and must be eliminated.

The Lodge-Gossett resolution provides the best remedy ever proposed to meet this defect. Under its provisions every vote for President in every State will be counted and credited as cast. There will be no disfranchisement of voters and no votes credited contrary to the way they were cast. If adopted it would make an important change in our method of counting votes. It would not take a single vote from a candidate or party to which it belonged. It would injure none. It would greatly improve our political life, just by giving each candidate the credit due him, no more, no less.

SHALL THE HOUSE ACT?

In 1933 the Elections Committee of the House, after holding hearings in two Congresses, by unanimous vote of its Democratic and Republican members alike, favorably reported a resolution to the House similar to House Joint Resolution 2. In the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, by a large majority, the Judiciary Committee of the House favorably reported the Gossett resolution.

The Senate, in January of this year, by 64 to 27, voted to submit such a resolution to the States. Can the House afford to do less?

Is Congress going to give the American people an opportunity to free themselves from this system of false equations and establish a method for the election of a President by a fair and just count?

Protection of American Glassware Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION—PROTECT AMERICAN GLASSWARE INDUSTRY AND JOBS OF AMERICAN GLASSWORKERS

Whereas lower wages than those prevailing in the United States account for the principal competitive advantage enjoyed by foreign countries when they ship dutiable merchandise into our domestic market;

Whereas these lower wage scales permit dutiable goods to be sold at lower prices than our own producers can meet without reducing wages or curtailing employment;

Whereas competitive imported goods that derive their sales advantage from lower wages are as destructive of our own labor standards as were sweatshop operators in this country before the adoption of a nation minimum wage;

Whereas our labor organizations have no means of organizing the workers overseas in an effort to raise their standards and our minimum-wage laws do not extend beyond our own country;

Whereas it is no more necessary that foreign exporters have a competitive advantage derived from low wages in order to sell in this market than it is for sweatshop operators to make a regular practice of grossly underselling fair employers in order to compete with them;

Whereas a healthy import trade can be created upon a basis of fair competition and can, in fact, thus be expanded, just as the elimination of sweatshops in the domestic economy contributes to healthy economic expansion;

Whereas limitations on imports need not be restrictive in order to create competitive parity and, by creating the basis of fair competition, would contribute to the growth of trade in the international field no less than fair competition does in the domestic;

Whereas over 60 percent of the imports into this country are now and have long been free of duty because they represent goods in the production of which other countries enjoy a natural advantage of climate, soil, or resources and which are complementary to, rather than competitive with, the output of our own factories;

Whereas the remaining 40 percent of competitive imports, if unimpeded in any way, would leave our workers at the mercy of low-wage rivalry—a process that could have only one ultimate effect, namely, the impoverishment of our labor force;

Whereas we, the members of the American Flint Glass Workers' Union, know from direct and bitter experience the disastrous consequences of low-wage foreign competition which has not been properly offset by a rate of duty or other protective measure to insure its fairness: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Flint Glass Workers' Union in its annual convention severly condemn imports that find their competitive advantage in low-wage payments, if this unfair advantage is not sufficiently offset by a protective tariff or other safeguard; and extend this condemnation to governmental policies that condone such import conditions; be it further

Resolved, That the inadequacy of the tariff as a protective device in those cases where competition in one product comes from countries of widely differing competitive levels makes it imperative that flexible import quotas, related to domestic consumption over a representative period, be utilized by our Government; and, finally, be it

Resolved, (1) That the distressful future faced by the hand production branch of the American Glassware Industry under present tariff policies demand relief far beyond the remedies now sanctioned by our Department of State; (2) that our views be communicated to the President of the United States and the Members of Congress.

Address of M. W. Clement, Chairman, Pennsylvania Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. M. W. Clement, chairman, Pennsylvania Railroad, at Girard College commencement, June 22, 1950:

Dr. Odgers, gentlemen of Girard College, ladies and gentlemen, greetings.

Graduation is a time of interesting contrasts. Valedictorians and commencement orators—youth and experience; a significant crossroad of the past and the future.

That crossroad is a place for hopes and not for fears. A new generation is impatient to be on with its world. It is willing to hear from us of an older day, but all that we can do is to offer perspectives to those who will take over where we leave off.

Girard College is a peculiarly appropriate place for such a perspective. In the will of your great benefactor there is expressed, in simple words, a complete text for a veteran of life like myself to address to younger friends like you who are starting on your way. I quote from article 21, section 7:

"I would have them taught facts and things, rather than words or signs * * * that by every proper means a pure attachment to our republican institutions, and to the sacred rights of conscience, as guaranteed by our happy constitutions, shall be formed and fostered in the minds of the scholars."

It would be well if all educational institutions stuck to that simple faith. Only by sticking to it in the face of the confusion of our times can we look forward to a better and happier world.

"Facts and things," not "words or signs," "constitutional guaranties," "a pure attachment to our republican institutions"—in these few words Stephen Girard spelled out the essential basis of the America which has become great and made its people great; American enterprise, American economy, American Government, American patriotism that should be every American's inspiration.

Those words are lodestars which you should keep before you if you wish to make the most of yourselves and of your country and of the world that your children will inherit from you. Using those words as a standard you can test the world about you today, and we of the older generation cannot complain if, tested by that standard, you find some fault in what you see about you. Meanwhile, if you have patience to listen to one of the older generation, like myself, we may be able to help you a little way toward understanding the gap between the ideal and the reality.

As one looks over the years from the vantage point that is mine, four or five significant periods stand out in the life of boy and man.

The first of these periods you are scarcely mindful of now. It is the age of imaginative childhood, the time just before starting school and just upon entering it. In those happy years you have none of the responsibilities of life to circumscribe you.

Another is the age you are in today—one of the two most important periods of your life—the time you spend in school getting ready to enter business activity. This period, and the years in which you are getting yourselves established in your own particular field, are the two periods that I should like you to have in mind today. They largely determine the character and substance of the individual contribution that you make to human society and the responsibilities you assume or reject.

In between these two periods we can assume that many of you will have gotten married and will have begun to develop your own family life, with young children to bring up and guide and watch and enjoy as they grow and develop.

Each of these periods has its own pleasures, its own joys, its own hopes, and some realizations; but it is your days here at Girard that abound in these things to the fullest. It is here, and the first few years beyond, that you begin to have an understanding of yourself, of your desires, your capacities, your hopes, and your ambitions. Everything lies ahead of you; great visions and enthusiasms inspire you. You have confidence in yourself as you move forward, knowing that some day responsibility will be yours and that you are equipping yourself to take it on.

In this happy school time you are generally pleasantly unconcerned; you feel comfort in the thought that most of your current responsibilities rest with school and home. Yet all the time you are advancing from the discipline imposed by school regulation into a period where discipline becomes largely self-imposed, whether it be at the beginning of your business career or as you receive further education if you continue beyond these halls. You may not realize it, but actually you are going through one of the most significant formative periods of your life as you move from where you live under imposed discipline to where you impose discipline upon yourself.

During your school days you are laying the foundation upon which much of your future thinking will develop.

In our schools of higher education today, the age-old struggle between student and teacher, the one seeking to avoid as much of the work of getting an education as possible, the other seeking to impart all the knowledge he can—is not so great. It is no longer even a dubious sort of honor to be at the foot of the class. Youth generally sees no inevitable inconsistency between enjoying school and college life and learning self-discipline; no contradiction between the pleasures that rightfully go with school years and getting an education.

It is not for me to tell you how to study or what to study. But let me say that nothing excites my admiration for Stephen Girard more than the fact that over 100 years ago, when the country was young and education was hard to obtain, he indicated a curriculum that has stood the test of time; one that is as effective today as it was then.

That was foresight. Foresight and courage made this great institution of yours possible. Most people have hindsight; most of the world's leaders today shine in hindsight. If

we all had foresight we would not as a Nation be confronted with some of today's economic and social and political problems. It was the foresight of a few that made America great. And it was the foresight of Stephen Girard that made this institution of yours what it is.

In Girard's day practically all study of science was covered by the general term: "Natural Philosophy" and he prescribed that it be taught here. In my own life, I have found that a knowledge of things under the earth—geology; a knowledge of things on the earth—biology; a knowledge of things beyond the earth—astronomy; and a knowledge of things metaphysical and spiritual—philosophy, have done much not only to make life pleasurable to me but to give me understanding and, above all, a sense of proportions. Perhaps the study of astronomy did more than any other to give me a sense of values, and to inspire in me a faith and confidence in my Maker.

Stephen Girard directed attention also to mathematics, and today no education can be considered complete unless it makes the student acquainted with at least the elements of theoretical mathematics. The physical basis of our civilization rests on mathematical principles. Every structure we build, every machine we operate, every trade we study, every facility of transportation we use, all our modern methods of heating and lighting—all are designed and planned upon mathematical calculations. Scientific thought in all fields is becoming more and more mathematical both in its method and in its expression. Mathematics is perhaps the only universal language that the world has.

Those of you who have taken up physics and chemistry realize that it helps one's power of reasoning and understanding to know something about the natural things that surround us everywhere—on land, under water, and in the air. Your whole curriculum as I see it is designed to give you a wholesome intelligent interest in the problems of living and thinking—and of why we are here.

I have left history to the last. All of you have given a lot of time to history. Those of you who will continue your studies will be wise to give more time to it, for after you think you are through with the study of history and move on into life, you will find yourself studying it again. It is then you will learn that a better understanding of what is happening today comes through knowing about the same kind of things that happened thousands of years ago and have kept on happening down through the centuries. A curious pattern of recurrences is woven in the history of mankind, and no function of history is more important than that of telling us about it—even though current events may indicate that little attention is being given to the warnings of history.

This is no new discovery. Some 2,200 years ago the unknown but gifted author of Ecclesiastes wrote a famous observation, which has come down to us in these classical words from the King James version (Ecclesiastes 1: 9):

"The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done; and there is no new thing under the sun."

The truth of that will grow upon you as the years pass, and often you will be reminded that your thoughts are thoughts that were thought of thousands of years ago.

The closer your thoughts take in the realities of life, the more you can measure your adequacy. Here you have developed character—the greatest of all assets. Here you have developed ability—a necessary talent if one is to succeed. Dangerous as it is to place power in the hands of a man that lacks ability, how much worse it is to place power in the hands of a man without character.

And that leads me to a simple idea that is most important to the present and next succeeding phase of your lives. It is between you and yourself. It is apart from the educational process pursued for knowledge and the ability to find and how to use it. It runs parallel with and is part of your development of character. That is discipline—self-discipline.

As you come here to school you leave home discipline behind. As you leave here you leave behind you the discipline of Girard College regulation. Then it is that you find it necessary to discipline yourselves. Self-discipline is one of the foundations of wisdom. It is the safeguard of liberty. When self-restraint, self-discipline, fails, external restraint must be applied. The safety of the people depends upon self-restraint.

It is after you have passed out of school education into the education you get from life itself that you should begin to pick up wisdom, and with it the responsibility of success that should come with middle age.

Speaking not only from my own life, but from the lives of many others who have been associated with me in the same business as well as in many other kinds of business and the professions, I believe these two qualities—self-discipline and a sense of individual responsibility—are the primary essentials that bring men to real success in this complex country we call America.

What is the true nature and meaning of success? Success in any station in life means the ability and willingness to carry responsibilities. It means being known by your neighbors and by the community as one who is able to carry responsibility and willing to do so. It means doing a job which is important in the sense that the welfare of others depends upon that job being well done. The man who is a success is the man who holds that kind of job and does it well.

I have watched thousands of high-school boys and college boys with education, with training, and with self-discipline, move into positions of leadership by assuming responsibilities overlooked or neglected by the many equally well equipped that they have left behind. There is no doubt whatever in my mind that as compared with the generations that have preceded you there is equal, if not greater, opportunity open to you to move forward and take your places of leadership. The path to opportunity is always open.

As you move into positions of responsibility, you will look back from a new vantage point on many of the things that you learned at school, that take on a new meaning for you in the light of your experiences of life. You will have a perspective that will enable you to recognize the great surges of humanity and human thinking that have occurred over the centuries and you will perceive how frequently in the history of the world those surges have moved from east to west and from west to east.

No one can review the things that are happening in our time in the light of what has happened in past history without recognizing that there are two outstanding philosophies of life which are in basic conflict with each other. What is going on in the world today is a phase of that conflict. It is a war of ideas, and principally of ideas about the relations between governments and the governed. This is the real war behind the cold war that we read about in the newspapers.

There is the philosophy of the east, where discipline comes from the top—the chief of the tribe, the chief of the state, the chief of the party; one man with a few satellites, directing all the endeavors of all other men. This philosophy that has come out of the east these many thousand years has now penetrated far into the west, even to the upper reaches of the Danube. Opposed to it is the other philosophy, our philosophy, that of the west, which we have accepted so much as a matter of course, as a part of the order of nature, as to make it hard for us to believe that it can be threatened.

The struggle between these two philosophies is the struggle that is going on in the world now. It is a struggle in which the east has for some years been extending its domains. It is a struggle that you, a product of the philosophy of the west, may be called upon to reckon with perhaps more seriously than any generation that has gone before you.

How do you, a product of the philosophy of the west, evaluate this struggle? What is the essential difference between our way of thinking and that of the east? In the philosophy of the east, man lives for the state. In ours, man lives in his own dignity and for the higher things for which we were put on earth. The state is our creature, the government our servant, not our master. Ours is a philosophy in which the individual, conscious of his own worth and dignity as a member of mankind, is conscious, too, of his individual responsibilities to himself and to his fellow men, and to his Maker.

These few simple things are the essentials of our western philosophy. In school, in everyday life, in business, in the professions, they mean the assumption of responsibility by the individual. They mean self-discipline. They mean for you the training of yourselves to the leadership that awaits you and the trusteeship which that leadership imposes on you. They mean making sure, on your part, that those who come after you shall have no less opportunities than the generations that have gone before.

You, no doubt, are thinking, What of the future if this struggle shall continue? There is no need to be appalled or dismayed by the outlook the world presents to you. Read your history. This is not the first, nor is it likely to be the last, crisis in human affairs. It is unthinkable that we should lose this struggle with the east, and I do not even entertain the thought. Suffice it to say that I assume, without any question, that we of the west will continue to go forward in our own philosophy and in the ways of life that we know and love.

This is the great challenge to the youth of today, and my firm belief is that you are more than equal to it. That is why I repeat to you there is just as much opportunity ahead in your day and generation as there was in my day and generation. There is just as much opportunity, for example, for young men to come into my business—the transportation business—and to get ahead in it as there was in the days when I entered it nearly a half century ago.

The great technological progress in this and other essential industries; the great improvement that is taking place in the working conditions and in the lives of the men who serve industry; the great advances that have been made in the instrumentalities which serve the public—all these and many other factors today increase the need and the opportunity for trained young men. And what is more, under self-discipline and the exercise of individual responsibility, there is greater opportunity than ever before to make of life an interlude of pleasant and gratifying accomplishment.

That is America, and America is yours. It belongs to you, the youth of today. And, as Stephen Girard said to you, "guaranteed by our happy constitutions." Good luck.

Wisconsin a Leader in Milk Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it has been an obvious fact that for many years Wisconsin was one of the leaders in the production of milk and its allied product, cheese. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a statement prepared by the Milk Industry Foundation which points out that Wisconsin has more than 2,000,000 milk cows which are valued in excess of $500,000,000. These cows produced the amazing total of more than 7,000,000,000 quarts of milk in 1949, with an average production per cow of 3,144 quarts. The importance of this great industry to Wisconsin cannot be measured. Credit goes to the great farm population in that great State.

WISCONSIN A LEADER IN MILK INDUSTRY

Wisconsin's milk industry is a tremendous factor in the health and economic progress of the State, according to new figures developed by the Milk Industry Foundation.

The industry's importance to the State is graphically illustrated by Wisconsin's 2,303,000 milk cows which were valued at $520,448,000 in 1949. These cows produced 7,241,000,000 quarts of milk during the year and production per cow averaged 3,144 quarts, a new record.

Wisconsin dairy farmers received a total of $452,989,000 in cash income from milk in 1949. Cheese production of 430,130,000 pounds, and butter 169,415,000 pounds, and ice cream 15,755,000 gallons plus other dairy products swell the tremendous total which the milk industry adds to the State's wealth.

Few industries have shown more progress in the last quarter century than milk. Milk consumption is on a higher level and people drink more milk. From the long process of raising better calves and growing improved feeds to the use of mechanical milking, more rapid transport to the plant, new testing methods, pasteurizing and bottling, outstanding advances have been made.

Stalin in Strategic Spot in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including a speech given recently by Mr. Harry W. Colmery, former national commander of the American Legion before the Topeka Kiwanis Club. The address appeared in the Topeka Daily Capital of July 3 and the statement by Mr. Colmery is an important contribution to the present situation in Korea. Mr. Colmery is an outstanding American. I include his remarks at this point:

STALIN IN STRATEGIC SPOT IN KOREA DUE TO YALTA FUMBLE, COLMERY SAYS

(By George Mack)

Stalin is in a good position in the Korean situation, Harry W. Colmery told Topeka Kiwanians Monday.

"He can ignore the challenge—neither back down nor openly fight," the candidate for Republican nomination for United States Senator said. "He can disclaim responsibility and rest while we expend our energy. And, with Slavic patience, bide his time."

IN KOREA RECENTLY

With this in mind, Colmery asserted that leaders of the United States "must abandon and avoid some of the illusions" indulged in in the past. The former national commander of the American Legion, who was in Korea recently and has been special assistant of the High Commissioner of the Philippines, listed these illusions as:

1. "That a powerful Soviet Russia, in a weakened and impoverished Europe and Asia, would be a force for international cooperation and peace. It will not be."

2. "That personal snake-charming ways and appeasement could or would melt away the ambition and design for conquest and domination which are deeply rooted in Russian history and Communist philosophy."

Speaking before an intent crowd of club members and nearly three dozen guests, Colmery traced Korean history and geography. This included warfare back to 1,200 years before Christ and the more recent Russo-Japanese wars in 1894–95 and 1904–5, in which Japan was victorious.

KOREA LONG BEEN SPLIT

He pointed out that Korea long had been split between those favoring the western or United States way of life and those trained in communistic doctrine.

In the Yalta agreement, Korea's future was mapped.

"Under the Yalta agreement," Colmery pointed out, "Russia got control of Manchuria. This made it inevitable that in due time Russia would seek to take over Korea."

The speaker said it was merely a technicality to say that the United States is not now at war.

HIDING BEHIND FORMALITIES

"The President says that we are not at war, that we are only doing a police job to carry out a mandate of the United Nations," Colmery said. "True, Congress has not declared war against anyone. In fact, the President did not consult the Congress. But to say that the United States is not at war is hiding behind formalities and in this instance a constitutional formality."

WILL DRAW NO DISTINCTION

"Certainly northern Korea or Russia—or whoever we are 'shooting at,' will not draw any distinction between bullets fired by United States troops on the basis of whether the President or the Congress ordered them to be fired. Nor will the devastating effect of those shot back at our boys be any the less."

As for the future:

"Only Joe Stalin can answer that one," Colmery said.

The text of Colmery's speech on the Korean situation as it has developed during World War II and since, follows:

"Independence for Korea was one of the World War II aims of the allied countries. The United States, Great Britain, and China made that declaration, at the Cario conference, on December 1, 1943. Russia subscribed to that pledge at Potsdam in July 1945.

"However, in the meantime, in February 1945, the allied countries signed an agreement at Yalta. At that time, Russia was neutral as to Japan, in the far eastern war. Under the Yalta agreement, Soviet Russia got control of Manchuria. That made it inevitable that, in due time, Russia would seek to take over Korea."

DIVISION OF KOREA

"Later, at the Moscow Conference, in December 1945 Korea was divided between the United States and Soviet Russia. This agreement, was signed on December 27, 1945, by James F. Byrnes, Ernest Bevin, and V. Molotov. Its stated purpose was to reestablish Korea as an independent State, and to create conditions for the development of Korea on democratic principles, to liquidate Japanese control, and to set up a Korean democratic government which would take the necessary steps to develop the industry, transport, and agriculture of Korea, and the national culture of the Korean people.

"To accomplish these purposes, Korea was to be held by a joint commission.

"But what actually happened was this: Korea was divided into two parts on the thirty-eighth parallel. After Japan's surrender, Soviet Russian troops occupied the northern sector and United States troops occupied the southern sector. This arbitrary division created an impossible situation. The northern sector is predominantly industrial; the southern sector agricultural.

"Later on, it appeared to the United States as though Russia was attempting to gain control. Negotiations between the countries led to a deadlock, which was referred to the United Nations Assembly in September 1947. The United Nations sent a commission to Korea. Its purpose was to try to reunite the country. The Russians would not let them in the northern half."

TWO GOVERNMENTS

"This commission conducted an election in the southern half, for a National Assembly, which proclaimed itself to be the Government of Korea on August 15, 1948. That Government was so recognized by the United Nations and most of the non-Russian world.

"The Russian half of Korea set up its own government and claimed authority over all the area and the 30,000,000 Korean people. Moscow announced that it had withdrawn its troops, in December 1948. But it appears that it may have left the nucleus of a well-armed, Russian-trained army of Koreans. The United States withdrew her troops in January 1949, except for a military advisory group.

"On June 25, 1950, the northern Korean troops attacked across the thirty-eighth parallel. The United Nations issued a cease-fire order. This was disregarded. Whereupon, it called upon its members to furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea, as is necessary to repel the assault and restore peace and security."

WHAT IT ALL MEANS

"In response thereto, President Truman has now committed United States military forces to the task.

"Where are we? What does it all mean?

"The President says that we are not at war—that we are only doing a police job to carry out a mandate of the United Nations. True—Congress has not declared war against anyone. In fact, the President did not consult the Congress. But to say that the United States is not at war is hiding behind * * * formalities. War is a contest carried on by force and with arms, to obtain and establish the superiority or dominion of one of the belligerents over

the other. When we send our young manhood into that kind of a conflict, in which several have already lost their lives—then for all practical purposes, the United States it at war. I do not see any real distinction between the United States, Great Britain, and Australia, banded together as allies in military combat against Russia, and the same countries, doing the same thing against Russia, but acting at the instigation of the entity called the United Nations."

BULLETS NO DIFFERENT

"It isn't of any great moment, except, that so much has been concealed from our people in connection with our dealings with other countries, that I do not like any attempt to mislead or deceive them from what is obvious. The people are entitled to know what is going on—and to prepare themselves for the best or the worst—as they see it.

"Certainly, northern Korea, or Russia—or whoever we are shooting at, will not draw any distinction between bullets fired by United States troops—on the basis of whether the President, or the Congress, ordered them to be fired. Nor will the devastating effect of those shot back at our boys be any the less."

STALIN KNOWS ANSWER

"What will it amount to?

"Only Joe Stalin can answer that one. He can either leave northern Korea to its fate or he can move in with a full scope offensive and the big war will be on. Thus far the action of the United Nations and the United States are of a limited character—designed to drive the aggressors back to the line of the thirty-eighth parallel from which they started and to restore the status before the attack began, and pave the way for a peaceful settlement. Whether the action goes beyond that and ripens into a full scale conflict rests on one power and one power alone—Soviet Russia.

"Clearly—Soviet Russia being the aggressor she is—we have taken the risk of an open war with Russia. We would assume that the President would not have taken that risk, except on the basis of intelligence reports that Russia was not ready for war—and with confidence that the situation could be cleaned up quickly. Personally, bearing in mind the quickness with which the decision was made, I doubt that much calculation was made as to the risks involved—in the event Russia moved into an open war with the United States. How much blood and tears Korea was worth? Do we risk another Bataan?"

UN PROBLEM

"Frankly, not having information as to urgency of the situation at the moment, I am not in a position to say that the President should have consulted the Congress. Did circumstances permit, with safety to the United States, he should have.

"Waiving that, the United Nations was confronted with the alternative of proceeding to enforce its action or confessing its impotence. Failure to act would have destroyed confidence—world-wide—in the United Nations as an instrumentality through which to preserve the peace.

"Likewise the United States had a great stake. This is the most flagrant, direct aggression that has occurred since the end of the war. For it was an attempted overthrow by external armed force of a regime which has been recognized and extensively aided by the United States."

UNITED STATES HAD FORCE

"The United States was the only United Nations country which had substantial forces in the Far East. Russia knew that. Had we failed to protect southern Korea, their confidence in us would have been destroyed; the confidence of the disarmed Japanese in America's will or ability to protect them against Communist aggression would be severely shaken; and American prestige in the Orient would have suffered a serious blow.

"Certainly it would encourage the Communists in southeast Asia and spread doubt and gloom among those who try to hold the line against communism.

"If Mr. Stalin gets away with this smash-and-grab tactic in Korea, we could expect him to try it in other vulnerable spots in Europe and Asia."

STALIN IN GOOD SPOT

"It may well be that he was trying to test the reaction of the United States, to encourage the Chinese Communists to launch an assault on Formosa and to weaken both our military and political position in Japan.

"Stalin, of course, is in a good position. He can ignore the challenge, neither back down nor openly fight. He can disclaim responsibility and rest while we expend energy, etc. And with Slavic patience bide his time.

"Concerned as we are and should be, there are some lessons to be learned from this situation."

RUSSIA NOT NEEDED

"We did not need Russia in the war against Japan in 1945. We already had Japan hanging on the ropes. She had made several overtures for peace before the Yalta Conference. Yet, we begged Stalin to intervene and to declare war on Japan. For that we sold out China, by agreeing to give Russia control over Manchuria, and this paved the way for the Communists to establish a base on northern Korea. And we also broke faith with Korea, to whose independence we had become openly committed.

"Our sole objective was to crush Japan. We had no objective beyond that. We should have had as our purpose a program to keep any aggressor nation from dominating Asia, particularly Russia, whose avowed plan and purpose to destroy our American free system was already known to us. Had our leaders had that vision, they would not have made the Yalta deal with Russia. They would have made peace with Japan on reasonable and satisfactory terms. They could have preserved the economic links between Japan and Korea, which were mutually beneficial; likewise Manchuria, and protected China. That could have been done before the Soviet Union was able to transfer larger military forces from Europe to the Far East, and would have kept Russia out of Manchuria and Korea."

MANCHURIA THE KEY

"Again, empires are built, step by step, by ambitious men. Once Manchuria came into the hands of Soviet Russia, it was inevitable that Korea would be next. Then will follow the attack on Japan. If Japan is taken, Alaska is in peril.

"At every turn we are confronted with Russia—with an estimated armed force of 14,000,000 men, modern submarines, and swarms of airplanes—and thanks to numerous despicable persons who betrayed us in Washington, D. C.—the atom bomb secret—a fist full of military might.

"And with it a determination to destroy our American capitalistic system. They would impose on us an unholy system of tyranny, which does not recognize justice and mercy, the cornerstones of our Christian faith.

ILLUSIONS MUST GO

"This situation demands a change in our thinking on foreign policy and national security. For our Christian civilization faces a clash with the pagan, in the form of a ruthless, aggressive and relentless Communist Russia.

"We must abandon and avoid some of the illusions in which we have indulged in the past—such as:

"(1) That a powerful Soviet Russia, in a weakened and impoverished Europe and Asia, would be a force for international cooperation and peace. It will not be.

"(2) That personal snake-charming ways, and appeasement could or would melt away the ambition and design for conquest and domination which are deeply rooted in Russian history and Communist philosophy.

"It is high time that we recognize these illusions and scrap the policies of our Government which grew out of them.

ONE WAY TO GET ALONG

"There is only one way which gives us a chance to get along with a vast totalitarian empire, such as the Soviet Union. That is, to maintain the United States stronger—militarily, economically, politically and morally.

"And then it would be wholesome to have a higher sense of moral responsibility in our public servants, so that, with unswerving fidelity, they would place the Nation's welfare above friendship, sentiment, greed, or personal preferment.

"The news that hundreds of homosexuals were employed in our State Department was shocking. The so-what attitude showed a callous disregard for our country's welfare. For it is an admitted fact that agents of foreign countries diligently prey upon these unfortunates. They should not be employed where our most precious national and military secrets must be guarded and our international integrity protected. Perverts must be removed from such positions of trust and decency, integrity, and moral consciousness reinstated."

LAWS NEED STRENGTH

"And we must quit pondering as to the ultra-intellectuals who consider that their individual freedom is subject to no restraint—not even for the security of our country. The laws must be strengthened, and adequate punishment meted cut to Communists and others who seek to destroy our country by unlawful means, steal our valuable secrets."

Power Supply in New England and Its Effect on Rural Rates and Service

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 5, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in the battle which I have waged for the last 20 years for cheap electricity for the American people, and especially for the farmers of the Nation, I have tried to present the picture as it affected every section of the country.

One of the best statements I have seen on the situation as it exists in the Northeast was made in a speech by Mr. George H. Duncan, president of the New Hampshire Electric Cooperative, Inc., at Pittsfield, Mass., on December 15, 1949.

When one realizes that that section of the country has no coal, no oil, and no natural gas, he can understand the necessity for developing the water power of that area, and seeing that it is distributed to the people at the lowest possible rates.

Mr. Duncan lives at Jaffrey, N. H. By profession he is a retail druggist; but he has taken an active interest in public affairs. He has served for more than 20 years in the New Hampshire legis-

lature. As a member of that body in 1939, he cooperated with the late William J. Neal in securing passage of a bill allowing the organization of electric cooperatives in New Hampshire, and was one of the incorporators of the New Hampshire Electric Cooperative, serving as its first secretary. On the appointment of Mr. Neal as Deputy Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration here in Washington in 1943, Mr. Duncan was elected president of the New Hampshire Electric Cooperative in his stead.

Mr. Duncan's speech follows:

The future of electric service in rural New England and New York falls naturally into three aspects:

I. Future necessities.

II. Prospective supply.

III. Present and prospective rates.

Most available data are not so segregated as to apply solely to our rural areas. However, rates and service are reasonably characteristic here of those in urban centers both in New York and New England.

As of August 1949 the Federal Power Commission released a Power Market Survey of the five New England States, excluding Maine where conditions were regarded as so variant as not to be considered in the same study. However, this survey does give certain data regarding Maine and New York which will give some idea as to the general situation. Beginning with 1934, a curve was plotted up to 1947 and thence projected to 1970 to determine prospective needs.

For the 5-State area in 1947, farm and nonfarm residential use was 2,577,000,000 kilowatt-hours, the average annual use being 1,171 kilowatt-hours. It is estimated that by 1970 the average use in this class will reach 3,060 kilowatt-hours annually, requiring a supply of 8,674,000,000 kilowatt-hours or 23 percent of 1947 supply. Total production of electric energy, about 12,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1947, must be increased by 1970 to 26,600,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, or 213 percent of 1947 supply. Noncoincident area peak demand of 2,639,000 kilowatts in 1947, is expected to increase by 1970 to 5,390,000 kilowatts, or 207 percent. This indicates the scope of future demands on generating facilities; and, of course, rural people are equally concerned with every other user of electricity as to where the supply is coming from. Even in 1948 wide areas of this region were troubled by shortage of power indicated by low voltage.

As of December 31, 1948, Power Market Survey shows that 99.4 percent of Connecticut farms were receiving electric service; 98.9 percent of those in Vermont; 96.3 percent of those in New Hampshire; 94.8 percent of those in Massachusetts and 94.4 percent of those in Rhode Island—this comparing with a national average of 74.9 percent. Although this indicates that here we are approaching saturation, by no means does it prove that we are nearing the limit in use of electricity. While, as before stated, the estimated average use by all farm and nonfarm residents is 3,060 kilowatt-hours by 1970, for farms alone the estimate is 7,160 kilowatt-hours. Every rural resident, with few exceptions, knows of some use to which he or his wife can put labor-saving electric power on the farm or in the home.

Late in 1948 a committee of the New England Council, headed by Hon. Edgar H. Hunter, chairman of New Hampshire Public Service Commission, submitted a valuable study entitled "Power in New England." This shows, among other important material to which later reference will be made, that from 1939 to 1947 residential and farm sales increased 78 percent in the six New England States; and this period, of course includes the war years when extensions were almost suspended. Power in New England projects demand only to 1957; but the curve being almost identical with that in Power Market Survey, it appears that the latter's 1970 estimate is reasonable.

As for possible supply, Power Market Survey has this to say: "No specific suggestions have been made as to sources from which additional dependable capacity of the future may come, as this will be covered in future studies"; and certainly we shall await the report of those studies with interest.

Power in New England likewise is reticent on this point, limiting itself to pointing out that the total dependable capacity for New England in 1957 should be about 4,566,000 kilowatts—380,000 kilowatts in Maine and 4,186,000 kilowatts in the other New England States. But where the extra capacity is coming from, beyond the additional 630,000 kilowatts now under construction or on order to be in operation by 1951, and amounting to 1,264,000 kilowatts is left to conjecture.

According to studies by the Federal Power Commission, there is potential undeveloped water power in five States of 1,312,000 kilowatts and something over 1,807,000 kilowatts in Maine. But power in New England finds only 157,000 kilowatts in the five States and 263,000 kilowatts in Maine. Granting the essential honesty of both investigations, it is strange to find such vast discrepancy. I believe the difference arises from two entirely different approaches, resting on two grounds—physical and financial.

If we envision a power site as available only for generation of power, the feasibility is vastly less than if we view it as an integral part of a coordinated undertaking. The sound approach from the point of public interest is to regard an interstate river valley, such as the Merrimack or Connecticut, as an entity, having regard for such other benefits as flood control, soil conservation, reduction of pollution and in the lower reaches improvement of navigation. In such a development with reasonable allocation of costs to these other benefits, the proportion of cost to be assigned to power projects is reduced to a point where development is feasible.

But to undertake such a coordinated project is beyond the scope of private enterprise in most cases. Even in the case of Maine, the Androscoggin, Saco, and Ossipee Rivers have their source and much available storage area in New Hampshire. Thus a broad project lies outside even the authority of the State. Further, since development of a single site brings some advantage to downstream locations and private enterprise has no power to compel contribution from owners of such locations, this type of development faces obstacles of initial costs heavier than can be supported.

Thus it is obvious that the only practical approach is through the agency of a State, a combination of States, or the Federal Government. New Hampshire took an important and enlightened step in this direction by the passage in 1935 of the so-called Water Resources Act, under which the Board was authorized to construct storage reservoirs provided contracts with downstream users of stored water were made whereby such users would pay sufficient to amortize the cost of the reservoir. The act further provided that no one should use stored water without payment.

It will be recognized at once that the latter provision introduced a new principle apparently in conflict with the historical rights of riparian owners; yet to make such a project fair and sound the right to charge for stored water is inherent. The legislature authorized the issuance of State-guaranteed bonds in the amount of $900,000. The reasonable approach would have been to undertake some project where contracts could be made of sufficient amount to amortize the cost within the amount of the State guaranty and then to proceed by friendly suit or otherwise against some recalcitrant riparian owner to determine the constitutionality of the impost.

However, the water resources board decided to embark on a project at the headwaters of the Connecticut, now known as Murphy Dam, impounding Lake Francis at a cost of some $3,000,000. Where to get the additional $2,100,000 then became a problem. At this point three utilities—Connecticut River Power Co., Bellows Falls Hydro, and Public Service Co. of New Hampshire came forward with a generous (?) offer. They would contract to make annual payments for the use of stored water in an amount sufficient to amortize the cost in 40 years, thus in effect guaranteeing the whole issue. But for their generosity they exacted the full pound of flesh. If any other revenue is derived from the use of the stored water during the amortization period, the additional revenue inures not to State but to reduce the contribution of the original contractors. Thus there is no incentive for the State to determine the constitutional right since, if successful, not even the cost of litigation could be recouped. Worse yet, the precedent having been set, there is no probability that a similar project could be financed on a different basis.

In this connection it is interesting to note that the cost of stored water is computed to be about 3 mills per kwh to the utilities concerned; also, that the so-called Wilder project, now under construction, being owned by one of the original contractors, in effect will receive the benefit of stored water without cost.

Thus the State of New Hampshire, having sacrificed the opportunity to do a big, self-liquidating project on storage reservoirs, the only remaining approach here appears to be through the authority of the Federal Government, either directly or through some agency similar to TVA. And judging by the fate of the bill to create a Vermont Power Authority last winter and the abortive attempt to establish a New England development authority, the outlook for the State activity in New England looks dim.

But even though our rivers were used to the fullest extent, it appears that the area still will be short of power. The St. Lawrence project offers some possibilities but still not enough. Our New York friends have put in a claim for all the 800,000 kw to be generated there; but even though they were forced to relinquish part through interstate comity, the 200,000 kw which may be allotted to New England still would be insufficient. In any event hydro power must be balanced by steampower to overcome the vagaries of nature, albeit full regulation of rivers would go far to meet that necessity.

On the financial side the utility approach affects the feasibility of development not only of hydro but of steam power. This is shown more clearly in figure V–1 (p. 31) of "Power in New England, a pie-chart showing the distribution of the cost dollar as follows:

	Cents
Operation and maintenance	17.4
General administration	12.8
Fuel	16.0
Taxes	20.6
Depreciation	9.1
Return on investment	24.1
	100.0

Under any type of financing the first four items: Operation and maintenance; general administration; fuel and taxes, amounting to 66.8 cents would be relatively fixed charges. In hydro plant, although there is no cost of fuel, it well may be that higher development and transmission installation costs would entail a burden comparable to fuel. And so long as we have our present system of taxation fairness calls for taxes or "in lieu" payments on approximately the same basis.

But the other two items, depreciation and return on investment, amounting to 33.2

cents, presuppose no amortization of investment thus constituting continuing charges. If it were planned to amortize initial cost during the life of the plant, no depreciation reserve is required beyond a modest figure to cover errors in estimating that life. Thus the major part of costs allocated to those items would be allocated to the amortization and interest.

Experience in the Province of Ontario, Canada; in the cities of Seattle and Tacoma, Wash., and elsewhere proves that the revenue under such circumstances far exceeds interest and amortization charges, making possible drastic reductions in rates. The 1946 report of Ontario Hydro shows 304 municipalities, served from a provincially-owned transmission system of 9,894 miles, practically out of debt for their own distribution system with the result that the average domestic service rate is about 1 cent per kilowatt-hour, all this accomplished since 1910 without tax contribution.

As for electric rates in rural New York and New England, we are met with the same situation as in power use—no data exists showing just what they are. However, since it is found that in general urban rate schedules apply in rural areas, plus capital contributions in some cases, we are justified in using urban rates for comparison.

All studies indicate that rates in our area are among the highest in the Nation while average power use is among the lowest. Following are a few comparative figures as of January 1, 1948:

City	Average residential use, 1947 (kilowatt-hours)	Typical residential bill	
		100 kilowatt-hours	250 kilowatt-hours
Manchester, N. H. (private)	1,022	$4.16	$7.16
Springfield, Mass. (private)	1,243	3.59	7.34
Rutland, Vt. (private)	----------	4.38	7.58
Portland, Maine (private)	1,241	4.25	7.25
Albany, N. Y. (private)	1,140	3.55	6.80
Chattanooga, Tenn. (TVA)	3,537	2.50	5.00
Spokane, Wash. (private)	4,411	2.76	4.38
Seattle, Wash. (municipal)	4,511	2.72	5.10
Portland, Oreg. (private)	3,610	2.85	5.12

It will be recalled that it was stated that the average annual farm and nonfarm residential use in the New England area, 1,171 kilowatt-hours in 1947 was estimated to reach 3,060 kilowatt-hours by 1970. How conservative is that estimate will be seen by comparison with present use in some of the areas cited.

While cooperatives are interested primarily in serving farmers and other rural homes, we do supply some small commercial enterprises; so it may be interesting to note some comparative rates in that class.

City	Typical monthly commercial bill		
	375 kilowatt-hours	750 kilowatt hours	1,500 kilowatt-hours
Manchester, N. H	$14.70	$28.20	$55.20
Springfield, Mass	17.63	30.75	57.00
Rutland, Vt	----------	----------	47.75
Portland, Maine	14.25	28.50	57.00
Albany, N. Y	13.49	23.49	42.24
Chattanooga, Tenn	10.00	17.50	27.50
Spokane, Wash	9.99	15.49	28.24
Seattle, Wash	10.35	20.70	41.40
Portland, Oreg	9.45	14.70	24.57
Tacoma, Wash	5.03	10.05	20.10

For the year ending June 30, 1948, REA cooperatives purchased from utilities 61.3 percent of all power purchased, paying an average of 9.6 mills. All New England and New York cooperatives are included in this category except a small amount purchased by Vermont Cooperative.

Following are the prices paid and source of supply of these cooperatives:

Cooperatives	Mills per kilowatt-hour	Source
Maine:		
Kingman	12.0	Bangor Hydro.
Farm-Home	12.6	Maine Public Service.
Dennys River	12.5	Bangor Hydro.
Union River	12.4	Do.
New Hampshire: New Hampshire Electric Co-op.	13.9	Public Service Co.
Vermont:		
Vermont Electric	9.6	Public Electric Light Co.
Washington Electric.	11.0	Green Mountain Power Co.
Halifax Electric	16.6	Central Vermont Public Service.
New York:		
Otsego	13.1	New York State Electric & Gas Co.
Delaware County	13.3	Do.
Steuben	13.5	Do.
Chautauqua	13.7	Do.
Oneida-Madison	13.3	Do.

After hearing these figures doesn't it make your mouth water to hear of wholesale rates like these:

	Mills
Oregon State average	4.6
Tennessee State average	5.1
Texas State average	6.7
Washington State average	3.6

While in our area it is improbable that we reach these favorable figures for a long time, owing to lack of extensive water power, except in Maine, and distance from fuel supplies, our rates are higher than in States such as Kansas, Illinois and Ohio, not especially favored in this respect.

Some figures derived from the 1948 annual report of the Public Service Company of New Hampshire to the Public Service Commission may shed light on the situation. During that year the company bought from Connecticut River Power Association at Hudson, N. H., 17,278,700 kilowatt-hours, at an average rate of 15.2 mills. At the same point there was sold to the same company 13,447,300 kilowatt-hours at an average rate of 4.8 mills. At Lunenburg, Vt., there was paid $25,000, apparently for the privilege of connection, for at that point there was sold to Connecticut River Power Association 6,352,700 kilowatt-hours at a rate of 5.7 mills though none was bought.

At Townsend, Mass., 13,588,781 kilowatt-hours was bought from Northeast Power Association at 15.4 mills, while none was sold. At Portsmouth, N. H., 7,852,600 kilowatt-hours was bought from New Hampshire Gas & Electric Co. at 19.2 mills, while at the same point there was sold to the same company 2,736,900 kilowatt-hours at 6.1 mills. In all, the company bought at wholesale 43,945,714 kilowatt-hours at an average rate of 16 mills and sold at wholesale 93,800,027 kilowatt-hours at an average price of 10 mills.

If the company had paid no greater rate for all wholesale power bought than the rate received for all wholesale power sold, the saving for the year would have been $263,694. The average paid to the named suppliers was 5.2 mills. If this rate had been paid to these named suppliers for all power bought from them, the saving would have been $430,668.

It is unfortunate that the Corps of Army Engineers fails to take a broad view of possibilities in this area. An experience with which I am familiar will illustrate. I conduct a store near the bank of the Contoocook River, a tributary of the Merrimack and near its source. In the floods of 1936 and 1938 I suffered minor damage, while severe losses were incurred all the way down both rivers to the ocean.

In 1938 the Army engineers developed a project for a flood-control dam at Riverhill, about 40 miles down the Contoocook and 3 miles from its confluence with the Merrimack. This project not only failed to afford protection for Contoocook Valley residents upstream, but would have flooded out valuable farming land as well as the village of Contoocook of about 1,000 inhabitants. Valley residents objected strenuously while suggesting several available sites upstream, one on Mountain Brook in Jaffrey, small, but near the headwaters and uncontrolled. Owing to these objections the project was dropped.

Going upstream about 10 miles, the engineers then proposed Hopkinton-Everett, a site where all Contoocook water could not be contained, necessitating a canal to divert surplus flow into another river valley, the Piscataquog. Opposition to this arising, they adopted three other suggestions: Blackwater and West Peterboro, now built, and Mountain Brook in Jaffrey. After extensive studies at the latter site bids for construction were advertised. At his juncture certain manufacturers using power sites on the river discovered that the dam was to be open with no provision for gates. These men came forward with the proposal that, if the project were dropped, they would build a conservation dam at the site. After hearing before the governor and council, State approval was revoked. Thereafter the Jaffrey Reservoir Co. was organized and built the dam at a cost of about $75,000, while the bid on the engineers' specifications was about 10 times that. The dam now built, while not giving protection for 100-year frequency floods, as was planned by the engineers, apparently will give it for about 50-year frequency volume, while conserving water for all downstream users.

In the meantime the Federal Power Commission has been studying the area, and in reply to a request of Senator SALTONSTALL (Massachusetts) reported to him under date of February 28, 1949, in effect, as follows, regarding the Contoocook. Including Blackwater and West Peterboro, apparently intended to be converted to flood-control-conservation reservoirs; power development at Blackwater; a flood-control-conservation reservoir at Bennington; a flood-control-conservation-power development at Hillsboro and a diversion dam at Riverhill with power site at the confluence of the Contoocook with the Merrimack, complete flood control of the Contoocook would be accomplished while power generation would be nearly 100,000 kilowatts. An added advantage of this plan is that little disturbance of local economy would be involved beyond that already created by the flood-control reservoirs now built. And not one of these sites was deemed feasible for power in Power in New England.

Vermont people in particular will recall the battle of West River recently where, as I understood it, the engineers proposed to build a giant dam near the mouth, flooding out one or more villages and much valuable farming land. That battle was won by the objectors, but neither flood control nor power has followed. I had occasion not long ago to drive up the West River Valley, and it occurred to me, without too much engineering knowledge, that there were numerous sites where smaller dams could be constructed without serious damage to give adequate flood control and much power.

Too much criticism, however, should not be laid at the door of the engineers, instructed by law as they are to recommend sites where the ratio of benefits to costs shall be greatest. In the case of Riverhill and, I assume, of West River, the figures warranted the projects, looking only at the narrow flood-control view. But my sugges-

tion is that, taking a broad view and including all conceivable advantages and disadvantages, a combination of small projects might well be proved feasible. And it irks my Scotch soul to see flood-control dams, costing millions of dollars of public money and admirably conceived in themselves, lying idle when without material interference with the major purpose they might be put to additional beneficial use.

While the instances related refer mainly to New Hampshire with which I am most familiar, I doubt not that elsewhere in the area similar instances may be found where ulterior motives or lack of vision have resulted in failure to make the most advantageous use of our natural resources.

In this connection, I should like to propound a couple of theories, or perhaps I should call them hunches, for, so far as I can see, they are incapable of direct proof. Still, by deduction from known facts, they must be true. (1) A small conservation reservoir will retain more water, proportionally, than a large one; (2) a conservation reservoir confers more intangible benefits than ever can be derived from a strictly flood-control reservoir.

1. It is evident that with a conservation reservoir each foot of the perimeter will control a certain amount of ground water in the banks, dependent, of course, on the character of the banks. For easy understanding envision a reservoir 100 feet square. The perimeter will be 400 feet, each foot retaining ground water in the banks. Where the bank is porous the amount so retained will be great; where nonporous, small. Now cut the 100-foot square reservoir into four reservoirs, each 50 feet square. While the surface area will remain the same, the perimeter will be doubled to 800 feet. And there is the added advantage that the retained ground water will not be subject to evaporation as will be that of the body itself.

2. A strictly flood-control reservoir never will retain any appreciable amount of ground water. A conservation reservoir always will retain such amount of ground water as its basin and banks permit. But when the reservoir is drained, all such ground water will not return to the parent body but, by subterranean course, may find its way underground for considerable distances, finally perhaps appearing on the distant side of a hill to revivify a spring or brook. Further, these underground courses by constant use will tend to enlarge so that in time of flood much surplus flow may be diverted from the principal channel to others where danger may be far less. On the other hand, with a dry reservoir these underground channels will tend to clog during disuse, with the result that at flood time all discharge is through the principal channel.

During recent years the intensity of floods in the area has shown a marked increase; and I am convinced that one important cause has been the gradual disappearance of innumerable small millponds which in earlier years dotted every stream. So, while the initial cost of a number of smaller reservoirs may be greater than that of a few giants, the damage to local economy will be less and the intangible benefits greater. The whole theory of control of our rivers requires a broader vision than as yet has been applied.

To sum up, then. It seems that we in the Northeast must look forward to shortage of power and high rates for service until such time as there arises a force of public opinion as will bring those in authority in Congress, in our legislatures, and in utilities to take a broader view of the possibilities in both physical and financial aspects as here outlined.

However, it is encouraging to note recent interest among those representing the area in Congress. Mention should be made of the introduction by Senator SMITH, of Maine, of a bill looking toward development of Passamaquoddy power; of Senator AIKEN, of Vermont; and Senator TOBEY, of New Hampshire, in support of the St. Lawrence seaway; of Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, who has introduced a bill for a comprehensive survey of power possibilities in New England; and of Congresswoman WOODHOUSE, of Connecticut, and Congressman LANE, of Massachusetts, who have introduced bills creating a Connecticut Valley Authority and a Merrimack Valley Authority, respectively. We of the cooperatives should use every means at our disposal in support of these projects.

Stupidity or Treason?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article by Mr. William Henry Chamberlin that appeared in the June 28 issue of Human Events, as follows:

It was a few months before the fall of the Czarist regime in Russia. Prof. Paul Milyukov, leader of the opposition Constitutional Democratic Party, was delivering an indictment of the Government before the Duma or Parliament. (It is perhaps worth remembering that in Czarist Russia, in striking contrast to the Soviet Union, there were real opposition parties and there were parliamentary speeches critical of the Government.)

Milyukov asserted that pro-German influences were at work in the Russian administrative apparatus. Backing up this general charge with specific allegations, he repeated over and over again the accusing question, "Is this stupidity or treason?"

A good many Americans may well have repeated Milyukov's question as the bizarre, disturbing, and still fragmentary story of Communist espionage, infiltration, and pervasive influence in Government agencies continued to unfold. It is America's misfortune that no one in the position of Igor Gouzenko, Soviet cipher clerk who decisively cracked the Canadian spy ring, had "chosen freedom" in this country.

Because of the character of his work Gouzenko had names and facts about the Canadian spy ring, organized by the Soviet military attaché in Ottawa, at his fingertips. He was able to deliver to the amazed and unsuspecting Canadian authorities a neatly packaged, coherent case.

Revelations of Communist underground activity in this country, on the other hand, have come out in confusing, piecemeal fashion. Soviet intelligence work inherits two very efficient and experienced traditions. Espionage was one of the best developed services in Czarist Russia. And in those days Russian revolutionaries developed extraordinary ingenuity in dodging the police.

One of the first principles of every efficient espionage organization, and one that is very faithfully practiced by Soviet foreign intelligence agencies, is not to let any individual know too much about the organization as a whole. The three individuals who have contributed most to uncovering the Communist underground in the United States, Louis Budenz, Whittaker Chambers, and Elizabeth Bentley, frankly admit that they were only cogs in a very big machine during their periods of Communist service. Many aspects of Soviet espionage were outside the sphere of their activity and knowledge.

Yet the verified record up to the present time is sufficient to confound the innocent and not-so-innocent individuals who try to brush off the fact that there is a disloyalty problem of serious proportions with stereotyped cries of "hysteria," "witch hunt," "red herring," etc.

The Canadian spy ring was not the figment of some diseased imagination. When the German refugee, Dr. Klaus Fuchs, confessed that, with a still undisclosed number of American accomplices, he conveyed important atomic secrets to Soviet agents there was unfortunately no reason to suspect the truth of what he said. There was sufficient evidence to convince juries that Alger Hiss and Judith Coplon were guilty as charged.

Unless the Departmen of Justice was flagrantly lying, some highly top-secret Government material was found in the office of the pro-Communist magazine Amerasia. Between the cases where there is a strong presumption of downright disloyalty, exploited by a foreign power, and the sheer stupidity that caused respectable magazines to go overboard for Soviet propaganda during the war, and Hollywood to dabble in idyllic pro-Soviet films, there is a large and very disquieting area in which emotional bias prompted decisions which were in Soviet, rather than in American interest.

II

One cannot understand the still incomplete and unfinished story of Communist infiltration without recalling that emotional pro-Soviet bias was the occupational disease of a considerable part of the American intelligentsia during the thirties. The Soviet regime is perhaps the only tyranny in history that has maintained over so long a period the uncritical sympathies of individuals who liked to regard themselves as friends of all good causes.

Educated Americans, almost without exception, repudiated and denounced the violations of the rights of man represented by the regimes of Hitler and Mussolini. But many of them flunked the moral test presented by the Soviet regime in Russia.

Intellectuals bowed before the shrine of a regime that stripped the intellectual in Russia of his last shred of self-respect and independence. Individuals who quivered with indignation over occasional violations of civil liberties in the United States sang the praises of a regime which recognized no civil liberties whatever. Certain artists, playwrights, writers, and musicians whose knowledge of the facts involved was sketchy and limited, to say the least, developed the habit of tossing off blanket endorsements of the wholesale death sentences that followed Soviet political trials.

In this widespread and quite unprecedented emotional commitment to a foreign government one can find the seeds of treason in some cases; the clue to the success of Communist infiltration tactics.

III

International espionage is a very old game indeed. But in the United States as elsewhere, something new has been added by the growing up of a Soviet fifth column, composed of individuals who, for conviction rather than for money, are prepared to betray their own country for the sake of the Kremlin. There was no serious or effective German or Japanese espionage in this country during the war.

But the status of the Soviet Union as an ally whose motives and intentions could not be safely questioned offered a golden opportunity for many Communist infiltration methods. In his book, Defeat in Victory, the Polish Ambassador to the United States at that time, the Honorable Jan Ciechanowski, reports:

"Some of the new war agencies actively conducted what could only be termed pro-Soviet propaganda.

"So-called American propaganda broadcasts to occupied Poland were outstanding proofs of this tendency. Notorious pro-Soviet propagandists and obscure foreign Communists and fellow travelers were entrusted with these broadcasts."

Three prominent employees of the Polish branch of the OWI after the war appeared in the service of Communist-dominated Poland where one of them now edits a pro-Communist paper. Not only the OWI but other wartime agencies opened their doors of employment wide to Communist sympathizers, while they pursued a policy of excluding individuals of proved democratic sympathies who were known as strong anti-Communists. It can easily be imagined how much warping of American policy was the result.

The detailed, substantiated testimony of Whittaker Chambers, backed by the most eloquent inarticulate witness, the Hiss typewriter on which the incriminating documents were copied, convinced a jury that Alger Hiss was guilty of perjury. This raises the still unanswered question whether and how far Hiss used his influence for pro-Soviet purposes, as one of the few civilian advisers at the Yalta Conference and as chief director of preparations for the San Francisco Conference which launched the United Nations.

Probably more important, although less publicized than the case of Alger Hiss, are the implications of the alleged Communist sympathies of the late Harry Dexter White. White was mentioned both by Whittaker Chambers and by Elizabeth Bentley as a source of information for Communist spy rings. Neither Chambers nor Bentley, despite the abuse hurled at them by the people whom Arthur Koestler calls anti-anti-Communists, has been proved inaccurate on any major piece of testimony.

White was the right-hand man of Henry Morgenthau, and the chief architect of the Morgenthau plan for the deliberate economic ruin and destruction of Germany. A point that has been generally overlooked is that the Morgenthau plan called for the policing of Germany exclusively by the troops of Germany's continental neighbors, excluding American and British armed forces.

Is not this exactly what Stalin would have desired? A searching investigation of the origins of the Morgenthau plan is long overdue.

IV

Out of the blasts and counterblasts set off by Senator McCARTHY's charges there emerges a considerable core of hard indisputable fact. Agents of the OSS and the FBI discovered large quantities of stolen Government documents in the office of the magazine Amerasia, a publication edited by Philip Jaffe, a man of long Communist-front associations. Many of these documents were top secret and were of high political and military importance.

In the opinion of the FBI, communicated to Under Secretary of State Joseph C. Grew and to the State Department security officer, Julius Holmes, there was an airtight case for the prosecution of six persons who were arrested in connection with the case. But, for reasons which have never been satisfactorily explained, the prosecution was allowed to peter out, being dropped in some cases and most ineffectively pressed in others.

The Institute of Pacific Relations, which supplied many supposed experts for service in the Far East during the war, included in its staff some persons later revealed as Communists and many whose writings would stamp them as fellow travelers.

What has been going on, what must often inspire the question "Stupidity or treason?" is a guerrilla war for the mind of America. It may be doubted whether guerrilla tactics are ever countered without some excesses. But the man who sees a Communist under every bed is no more absurd and is probably less dangerous than the complacent individual who doesn't recognize Communist agents and sympathizers who are right in bed with him.

Why Is Anyone Shocked at Red Invasion of Korea?—United States Invited It When We Foolishly Wrote Off Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Star of June 27, 1950:

UNIVERSAL SURPRISE OVER KOREA INVASION CALLED MYSTIFYING—UNITED STATES WROTE OFF ASIA LONG AGO TO CONCENTRATE ON EUROPE

(By David Lawrence)

* * * * *

Just why anyone should be surprised that the Communists in Moscow took advantage of America's policy of drifting is a mystery. The whole world acts surprised—as if the doom of Korea wasn't foreseen for a long time as a part of the Washington administration's policy of concentrating on the cold war in Europe and taking a chance on what might happen in Asia.

Senator CONNALLY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, summed up with admirable candor the policy of the United States toward Korea in an interview in the magazine United States News and World Report, in its May 5 issue:

"Do you think," he was asked, "the suggestion that we abandon South Korea is going to be seriously considered?"

NOT PART OF DEFENSE STRATEGY

"I am afraid," he replied, "it is going to be seriously considered because I'm afraid it's going to happen, whether we want it or not. I'm for Korea. We're trying to help her—we're appropriating money now to help her. But South Korea is cut right across by this line—north of it are the Communists, with access to the mainland—and Russia is over there on the mainland. So that whenever she takes a notion, she can just overrun Korea, just like she probably will overrun Formosa when she gets ready to do it. I hope not, of course."

"But isn't Korea an essential part of the defense strategy?" he was asked.

"No. Of course, any position like that is of some strategic importance. But I don't think it is very greatly important. It has been testified before us that Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines make the chain of defense which is absolutely necessary. And, of course, any additional territory along in that area would be that much more, but it's not absolutely essential."

Senator CONNALLY doesn't make American foreign policy, but is well informed on the trends. This policy has been in the making for some time. Thus Owen Lattimore, called by Senator McCARTHY the "architect of America's far eastern policy," urged long ago the scuttling of Korea. In his memorandum of August 1949 for the State Department's advisory committee, which was made public April 3 in the midst of the McCarthy-Lattimore controversy, Mr. Lattimore wrote with reference to Korea:

CALLED A LIABILITY

"South Korea is more of a liability than an asset to the interests and policy of the United States. It is doubtful how long the present regime in South Korea can be kept alive, and mere effort to keep it alive is a bad advertisement, which continually draws attention to a band of little and inferior Chiang Kai-sheks who are the scorn of the Communists and have lost the respect of democratic and would-be democratic groups and movements throughout Asia.

"The United States should disembarrass itself as quickly as possible of its entanglements in South Korea."

So the Moscow Government has committed another act of aggression. Only last week the State Department was talking of eventual negotiations with such a government. It ought to be plain now that any further reliance on the Kremlin would be useless.

The Soviets have kept up a program of harassment all over the world. Meanwhile the United States has done hardly anything to harass the Communists in the satellite states or inside Russia, ignoring the many opportunities for psychological penetration and also allowing the Voice of America—a most important instrumentality—to be utilized as a routine news service instead of a crusade of ideas designed to separate the Russian people from their Communist overlords.

Perhaps the Korean episode will sharpen American policy and change it from a passive affair to an active policy of carrying the cold war into the areas behind the iron curtain.

Public Complains About Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, according to many newspaper articles of columnists and letters sent to the editor of many of the daily newspapers throughout the country, the public is complaining concerning the curtailment of mail service. They are also complaining that the service is not as efficient or satisfactory as it was some months ago.

One of the postal employee organization's friends, with headquarters here in Washington, submitted to me two articles which he read recently in the New York Post. They were written by the columnist Sylvia F. Porter.

I am sure the article would be of interest to readers of the RECORD so I have added it to my remarks herewith. The article appeared in the New York Post on June 21 under the column headed "Delaye . letters."

It follows:

DELAYED LETTERS

(By Sylvia F. Porter)

The postcard read "one-day private sale, Monday, June 19. Drastic reductions on all goods in stock, we're clearing our shelves before going on vacation until July 4. Come early! Wonderful bargains!" That card arrived at my home yesterday afternoon, the 20th—almost a full day after the sale ended.

"So this is how the Post Office's economy drive is working out," I mumbled as I studied the ad and the postmark. "Here's one little-business man I'm going to interview."

When I walked into the shop (it's in my neighborhood), the owner was behind the counter, sorting boxes. No one else was in

the store. I showed him the card, told him why I had come.

"I know, I know," he moaned, "you're not the only one who has called me today to say they'd just received their notices. And I mailed them early last week! I've told everyone who has called that I'm extending the sale and to please come in. I've postponed my vacation and I'll stay open in the hope they'll come in."

"How did the sale go?" I asked.

"Fair," he said. "It wasn't much better than an ordinary day. And people around here, like you, always respond to my sales, don't you?" I nodded, he moaned again. "I don't know who got my cards, who didn't. I don't know how many customers I've lost, what the business might have been. Can't you do something? Can't you?"

Yes, we can do something—if we raise our voices to complain to Congress, tell our representatives how we feel about this slowdown. For both, the House and Senate Post Office Committees have passed bills ordering the Post Office to restore mail service.

These bills are waiting in Congress right now, can be passed overnight if you tell your legislators to do so.

If you just continue complaining to your family and neighbors, nothing will be done. And as of July 1, the cuts in service will be extended to every community in the country.

But if you protest, Congress will act. It's up to you.

The whole idea of slowing down the mails after two centuries of speed-up is repugnant. The very suggestion of this backward step in an era of the hydrogen bomb and at a moment of record prosperity is full of sardonic irony.

Postmaster General Donaldson has to save $70,000,000. His expenses for next year are set at $2,277,000,000, his appropriation is now $2,207,500,000. So what does he do?

Under his economy schedule, home mail deliveries are down to one a day and collections have been ended after 7 p. m. in most areas. Much of the night work in the post office that used to expedite the mails is out; windows are closed; services are curtailed.

Of course, delays in social mail—family letters, invitations, congratulations, etc.—aren't serious. But they're annoying, upsetting. And they can turn out expensive for the individual family. I know several people who are now relying on special delivery, telegrams, and long-distance phone calls for family important news—instead of the customary 6-cent or 3-cent stamp.

And much more important is the impact on the innocent businessman, the smaller firm that happens to be located in a residential area or a district outside the busiest. He may lose customers, as my local merchant did, through no fault of his own. He may be placed at a distinct disadvantage in competing with more centrally located firms for orders.

There are much more intelligent, much more efficient ways to raise $70,000,000 than this—regardless of Donaldson's affection for "shock treatment." This is senseless, painful "economy"—and the quicker it becomes an embarrassing memory, the better.

Motto: Liberty, Intelligence, Our Nation's Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, more and more every day, we hear opinions expressed from the general public concerning our Government, and the people behind it. The great majority of these opinions are of a critical nature. We all know that our Government and the men behind it are not perfect, no more than the people who are criticizing it are perfect; but it is the best Government in the world today, and in view of the world situation, it is about time that our citizens do a little more praising of our Government instead of criticizing.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of a resolution passed by the Downtown Lions Club, of Fort Worth, Tex., and forwarded to me by H. E. (Buck) Cunningham, which includes a statement of fact taken from the World Almanac of 1949 and the Statistical Abstract of the United States that only 55 percent of the potential voters have exercised their privilege of the free vote:

RESOLUTION BY DOWNTOWN LIONS CLUB, FORTH WORTH, TEX.

(Motto: Liberty, intelligence, our Nation's safety)

Whereas our forefathers founded this country on the premise of personal liberty and justice for all, with special privileges to none, with government of the people, by the people, and for the people; and

Whereas the standard of living and personal liberties of the citizens of the United States have reached the highest plane in the history of mankind; and

Whereas all agree that our country, and democracy itself, are passing through the supreme crisis of their existence, and that never before has there been such a need for leaders of intelligence, integrity, industry, and vision; and

Whereas pressure groups and subversive elements are now active in movements, which, if not checked at once, will break down our economy, jeopardize personal liberties and endanger our Nation's safety; and

Whereas from statistics taken from the World Almanac of 1949 and Statistical Abstract of the United States only 55 percent of the potential voters of the United States exercised their constitutional privilege and 45 percent neglected their duties as citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the undersigned members, in keeping with our motto, and carrying out our inherent patriotic responsibilities, pledge ourselves to unite with others in demanding that all men in public office, regardless of party affiliations, whether in city, county, State or Federal Government, must now and in the future work for the good of America and her economic and moral security; and be it further

Resolved, That we demand that all men in public office, now and in the future, vigorously strive to protect American interest, both foreign and domestic, in keeping with the intent and purpose of our Constitution; and be it further

Resolved, That we strive to promote and maintain within the various ramifications of our Government a strong moral, social, and economic fiber; one that we may view with pride as it is passed on to coming generations; and be it further

Resolved, That we demonstrate our love of country by familiarizing ourselves with all public issues and using the rights and privileges vested under our democratic form of Government; that we do hereby pledge ourselves to vote upon all occasions and take it upon ourselves to urge others to do likewise.

Submitted by the citizenship and patriotism committee to the membership of the Downtown Lions Club, May 30, 1950, A. D., at its regularly scheduled weekly meeting.

CITIZENSHIP AND PATRIOTISM COMMITTEE,
HAL CHERRY, *Chairman.*
ROBERT M. DUKE, *Cochairman.*
JOE NADOLAKI,
KENNETH JONES,
FLETCHER WARD,
A. B. SAMMONS, *Members.*

The above resolution presented and adopted by membership May 30, 1950.

ROY M. NAUGLE,
President, Downtown Lions Club, Fort Worth, Tex.

Attest: E. S. WEIDRUFF,
Secretary, Downtown Lions Club, Fort Worth, Tex.

To Seat Communist China in the United Nations Would Give It a Veto Over Action Against Aggression and Thereby Frustrate the Wishes of Genuinely Peaceful Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington News of July 5, 1950:

NO PLACE FOR NEUTRALS

It is beyond understanding how governments supporting the United Nations in the fight for Korean independence can at the same time urge election of Communist China to a seat on the UN Security Council.

All the world knows that the Korean invasion was Moscow-inspired.

The Red invaders were trained by Russian officers, and are supported by Russian-built tanks and fighter planes.

Many veterans of the Chinese civil war are fighting now on the Korean front against the forces of the UN. There can be no doubt that they have the wholehearted support of the Moscow and Peiping regimes, for both capitals loudly proclaim that fact.

What do would-be appeasers of the Soviet Union hope to gain by ousting Nationalist China from the UN and assigning its membership to the Reds, who at this very moment are openly defying the organization's Korean decisions?

If Russia had not been boycotting the UN on the China issue, the Soviet delegate would have attended the Security Council meeting which voted military sanctions against the North Korean aggressors, and almost certainly would have vetoed that action. This would have tied the organization's hands and all of Korea probably would be under Red rule today. Only since Russia's self-imposed absence from UN meetings has the organization been permitted to function as its Charter contemplated. Why then sacrifice honor and integrity to bring the Russians back into the organization where they can do more harm?

This fight is for keeps, and the war in Korea is only its initial skirmish. Similar Communist adventures are plotted wherever Moscow has a well-organized fifth column. Presumably, the weaker spots will be exploited first, but no free nation is immune to attack. There can be no neutrals in such a situation, and Moscow recognizes none.

Weak and vacillating governments which are too blind to see this must not be permitted to wreck the UN, which has become the world's best hope.

Strengthen the United States Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the present difficulty in which this country finds itself points up to the need for a full-fledged United States Marine Corps.

The barriers placed in the way of the corps are well known to the Members of this body. The real danger to the marines is not in any legislative proposal but rather in the matter of appropriations. In this respect it may be well to point out that the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Armed Forces is aware of this and has done all that it could to give the Marine Corps a fair deal. It is my hope that the Senate Appropriations Committee will consider the funds allocated to the corps for 1951 and raise the amount sufficiently to allow for two fully manned and equipped divisions and a 22-squadron air force.

The budget recommendations for 1951 would reduce the Marine Corps by 5,000 enlisted personnel. This in itself certainly would seem to be a great mistake at the present moment when it is obvious that we need to build up the ready forces we have available to use for this and any other emergency that may occur.

Should the present bill as passed by the House be approved by the Senate and go into effect it will mean, in addition to a reduction of 5,000 enlisted personnel, a reduction from 22 air squadrons to 12 squadrons. This is a clear indication of how the Marine Corps can be weakened through control of expenditures within the executive departments to an even greater degree than that exercised by the Congress when it grants the appropriations.

As has been brought out on the floor of the House many times, air power in itself is not enough to win a war. It is necessary, in view of the present difficulties which we face, that we have a coordinated air-ground team capable of rendering the close air support of ground troops similar to that developed by the Marine Corps during World War II. This deficiency will be met in part by the small number of available marine squadrons now being rushed to the scene of action.

It is my hope that the Senate Appropriations Committee which will consider the omnibus appropriation bill very shortly will take these views into consideration and appropriate the funds necessary to strengthen the Marine Corps so that it can operate with the maximum amount of efficiency, speed, and coordination.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

LEATHERNECKS "SADDLE UP"

(By Harlan Trott)

WASHINGTON.—Word that a combat division of marines has been alerted for the trip to Korea has had a good effect on the morale of the Nation's famous amphibious fighters.

The marine top brass has been noticeably close-mouthed about the rather dismal communiqués from MacArthur's headquarters. But underneath the surface, officers and men were beginning to sound off about being kept stateside 10 days after the shooting had begun.

The order to "saddle up" is bound to have a heartening effect on Americans everywhere mindful of the battle-tried efficiency the marines have displayed in scores of headlong assaults out of waist-deep water from Guadalcanal to Iwo Jima.

The fact that General Erskine's outfit is embarking from San Diego will help to counteract gloomy first impressions of the speed with which the heavily armed and mechanized Communist forces have overrun the defenses.

The increasing opinion about the invasion of Korea is that a long campaign will be necessary for the United States and its UN allies to drive the Communist-backed northerners back over their side of the line—6 months at least.

The invaders have driven their motorized armor so deep into South Korea that it is expected to take weeks before ground troops and supporting heavy equipment such as tanks and artillery will be available to mount a powerful enough counterattack.

If and when that time comes, military observers think then would be an ideal moment for the marines to spring a surprise. The building up of such an offensive could be greatly helped, too, they believe, if one marine division were used to create a powerful diversion that would help to relieve the pressure on the main front.

They are wondering if an amphibious landing on the Yellow Sea by a full division of marines in the vicinity of Seoul, for example, would not be an ideal place for what would in effect be a second front.

The farther the Communists advance away from their home bases, the thinner and tauter becomes their line of communications.

The assumption here is that one division of marines fully supported by sufficient heavy tanks and guns and air cover from Navy carriers would compel the invaders to withdraw their forces which already are well south of the Korean capital. It might even split the invading army and trap the advanced forces in a pocket.

All this would involve considerable risk; it would tie up a sizable sea force, including carriers which would be operating within range of enemy land-based aircraft. There would even be the chance that hostile submarines might be encountered.

Nevertheless, it is encouraging to realize that bold, attack-conscious thinking figures in current military appraisals. Some Navy carriers, incidentally, have air squadrons aboard manned entirely by marine aviators, men schooled in close tactical air operations, carrier landings and take-offs, and sea-air combat intelligence procedure.

Before many weeks have passed reports from the Korean war front may thrill us with the news that the marines have landed and the situation is everything that tradition says you could reasonably expect when the leathernecks take over a fighting assignment.

Keep It Clear: The Cold War Was Not Our Choice; the Kremlin Forced It on Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson from the Washington Star. The fact that this article appeared just before the Communist attack on Korea only underscores its wisdom:

HANDING OF COLD WAR BACK TO REDS WHO STARTED IT IS PROPOSED

(By Dorothy Thompson)

It seems to me that the free nations are inept at presenting their case, and are neglectful of both psychology and semantics. We have allowed the Russians to run away with peace while we have gotten ourselves put on a limb with the term "cold war," which phrase has been put into the reverse of its initial meaning.

The term "cold war" was invented to describe the Soviet strategy of pursuing war by every means but the ultimate one against all non-Stalinist states. The cold war was Russian—not American. It started in the spring of 1945, when, as the war neared its end, international communism openly deserted the policy of Allied cooperation and reverted to its basic aim of world conquest via revolution and civil war.

Actually, the Russians revealed their hand much earlier, when they broke diplomatic relations with General Sikorski in 1943, aiming at the creation of an all-Communist Polish government. In Germany they broke with four power control, still loyally upheld by the Western Allies, the winter following the war, suppressing the German Socialists in their zone as a step toward full Sovietization. Their aim was visible at Yalta and Potsdam, though not, apparently, to Presidents Roosevelt or Truman.

UNABLE TO BUY OFF RUSSIA

America demobilized its vast armies in such haste that there was even a problem of finding a garrison force for Germany. The center of American policy throughout the war and as late as 1946 was to seek agreement with Russia at almost any price and at the cost of our other Allies. It was the frankest kind of appeasement, which resulted—as a sideline, but inevitably and logically—in pro-Communist personalities and actual Communists exercising undue influence in our own Government, which heritage is the cause of the present distrust and fear.

The United States realized with excruciating slowness that Russia was not to be bought off by regional spheres of influence, but that Stalin (like Hitler) was thinking, "Today, east Europe: tomorrow, the world." Then came the belated beginning of western resistance to Stalin's cold war.

Resistance is an excellent word. But instead of using it to describe what we are doing, we have aided the Russians to turn the tables on us. Our leaders began talking of waging and winning this cold war. So that from one end of the world to another the Soviets are confusing the peoples into believing that America started the cold war while

the Soviets are upholding the resistance—a complete reversal of the truth.

One recalls the condition described by Lincoln in the second inaugural address:

"One-eighth of the population were colored slaves * * * localized in the southern part. These slaves constituted a peculiar * * * interest * * * to strengthen perpetuate, and extend this interest was the object for which the insurgents would rend the Union even by war: while the Government claimed no right to do more than to restrict the territorial enlargement of it."

RESISTANCE THROUGH UNITY

That describes our situation with the Soviets. At no time has there been thought of waging hot or cold war on the territory or population of the Soviet Union, or of liberating its slaves, or interfering in its internal affairs. All that we have belatedly determined is to restrict the territorial enlargement of that regime and state by defense resistance.

Lincoln also said:

"While (the Government) was devoted to saving the Union without war, insurgent agents were seeking to destroy it without war * * * and divide effects by negotiation. Both parties deprecated war but one of them would make war rather than let the Nation survive, and the other would accept war rather than let it perish."

The west has decided, in strengthened unity, that it will accept war rather than perish. Every measure we have taken has been to warn the Soviets that we will accept war, if they make it. Western leaders are convinced that this is the only deterrent that can pave the way for eventual negotiation and settlement.

We are working for peace. And we should hand the cold war back to its initiators, never use the phrase again, and describe our struggle correctly, as defensive resistance, through unity and strength.

Dr. Jessup Must Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker as part of my remarks, I am including an editorial that appeared in today's Washington Times-Herald. This editorial gives a fair résumé of Dr. Jessup's activities as they affected our far eastern policy and which have now resulted in the Korean war.

The editorial follows:

DR. JESSUP AND MR. HYDE

It is reported that the New Deal majority of the committee under Senator TYDINGS which was charged with investigating Senator MCCARTHY's charges of Communist influence in the State Department has voted to clear Ambassador at Large Philip C. Jessup of allegations that he was a Communist sympathizer. The whitewash was expected.

Mr. MCCARTHY had said that it was up to the American people and Congress to determine whether Dr. Jessup was a Communist dupe or a knave who knew what he was doing. "But, dupe or knave," said the Senator, "certainly he is not the type of person we want shaping our foreign policy."

REDS GRAVITATED TO INSTITUTE

Dr. Jessup has an extremely curious history. He was for many years a professor of international law at Columbia University. He was successively chairman of the American council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, chairman of the Pacific council of the IPR and vice chairman of the American council and concurrently chairman of the research advisory committee of the American council.

The remarkable thing about the Institute of Pacific Relations was the number of Communists and Communist sympathizers who gravitated to it.

In his various capacities Dr. Jessup was associated with Prof. Owen Lattimore, named by Senator MCCARTHY as the principal architect of America's disastrous policy in China and Asia, and a number of persons cited as Communist or pro-Communist by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and other governmental bodies.

SECRET DOCUMENTS STOLEN FROM UNITED STATES

Far Eastern Survey, a publication of the American council, for a considerable period occupied offices adjoining those of the pro-Soviet magazine Amerasia. Six persons, two of them State Department officials, one a lieutenant of naval intelligence, and three editors or writers on the Amerasia staff, were arrested in 1945 for wartime espionage involving the theft of 1,700 secret documents from the State Department and other Government offices. The magazine also maintained a large photocopying department which could copy such material.

During the period from 1934 to 1941, Lattimore edited another IPR publication, the Quarterly Pacific Affairs. He was a member of the editorial board of Amerasia along with Philip Jaffe, its editor, and Mark Gayn, one time correspondent for the defunct Chicago Sun, both of whom were seized in the 1945 roundup of document thieves.

Under Dr. Jessup's direction, Far Eastern Survey, on July 14, 1943 attacked our ally, the Chinese Nationalist Government of Chiang Kai-shek, in an article by Bisson. Bisson called Nationalist China feudal China, while Communist China was democratic China. Bisson turned up for a time in the State Department.

JESSUP JOINED MANY RED FRONTS

Within weeks after the Jessup-Bisson blast, Communists from Moscow to New York had adopted the new line that Chinese Communists were democratic and agrarian reformers.

Senator MCCARTHY asserts that Frederick Vanderbilt Field, a millionaire partyliner, rewarded the American council for its support of the Communists with two checks totaling $3,500.

The records of the House Committee on Un-American Activities help to round out the Jessup portrait. He was a member of numerous Communist fronts, among them the American Law Students Association, of which he was a sponsor.

In 1939 Jessup was a sponsor and one of those issuing the call for the National Emergency Conference in Washington, which opposed registration and fingerprinting of aliens, and also protested the deportation of aliens who advocated changing the American form of government. Other party fronts joined by the professor were the National Emergency Conference for Domestic Rights and the Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo (on arms to Spain).

CLOSELY ALLIED WITH ALGER HISS

When charges of Communist infiltration were made against the Institute of Pacific Relations in 1947, Jessup denied the charges. On February 16, 1946, he was one of 12 signers of a letter to the New York Times urging that "the United States at once stop the production of (atomic) bombs," and that any fissionable materal on hand be dumped in the sea. After Russia first exploded an atomic bomb last year, it boasted it had been producing them since 1947. Dr. Jessup would have disarmed America of atomic weapons while the Soviets were arming themselves with them.

As deputy to Alger Hiss at the San Francisco United Nations Charter Conference in 1945, at which Hiss served as Secretary General, Jessup became a friend and admirer of the State Department official later convicted of perjury in denying past Soviet espionage activities. Hiss and Jessup were fellow trustees both of the IPR and of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, of which Hiss was president at the time of his indictment. Jessup was a character witness for Hiss at both of his trials and, upon Hiss' conviction, stated that he saw no reason to change his previously expressed opinion that Hiss' reputation for integrity, loyalty, and veracity was good.

THIS IS THE MAN TYDINGS DEFENDS

Among Jessup's other contributions was to direct the preparation of the State Department white paper commissioned by Secretary Acheson when China was lost to the Communists, offered as an apologia for the dismal course of American policy which sold out the friendly Nationalist Government. The surviving remnants of the Nationalists, in whose behalf Acheson later said America would not lift a finger, are now under protection of the American Seventh Fleet at Formosa by order of Mr. Truman, who reversed himself and overruled Acheson, Jessup, et al., after getting into a war with the Korean Communists.

After this assignment, Jessup was dispatched to the Far East to try to dream up a new American policy for the Orient. He chose Bangkok for a conference with American diplomats in the area, although informed observers knew that city as a hotbed of Soviet espionage, and knew, further, that the principal hotel in the city was owned by the Russian Government.

This is the man who, in the view of Senator TYDINGS and the New Dealers, is not subject to challenge concerning loyalty and good sense. He is a man regarded by his protectors as adequate to fill a position as a one-man State Department brain trust on a roving commission to the world. If he is the best we can get, heaven help the country, for its days are numbered.

American Diplomats in Formosa Still Seeking To Destroy Rather Than To Assist the Chinese Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Richard L. Stokes from the Tidings, of June 2, 1950. Mr. Stokes had just returned from a personal visit to Formosa. Is it any wonder we get into messes like that in Korea when we still have third-string

men in charge of crucial areas like Formosa. It is intolerable to have American representatives abroad undermining friendly governments and thereby giving decisive assistance to our country's enemies, the Communists. We need in Formosa as able and experienced and wise diplomatic troubleshooters as we have.

UNITED STATES EMBASSY ON FORMOSA STILL PARROTS RED LINE

(By Richard L. Stokes)

Let us suppose a party of correspondents, representing Pravda, Izvestia, Trud Novoje Vremija, the Vehitelskaya Gazette, and Krokodil had traveled from Moscow to investigate conditions in Hungary.

Imagine further that staff members of the Soviet Embassy in Budapest led them into corners by the buttonhole and whispered the following into their ears:

"We have to admit that the situation in Hungary is better than could be expected. But the regime will never be a true people's democracy until non-Marxist parties are admitted into the government on equal terms with Communists.

"Hungary can be saved, but only if it rids itself of Comrade Rakosi, falsely known as 'the Magyar Stalin.' As his successor, an admirable choice would be Cardinal Mindszenty."

HEROIC NATION'S LAST STAND

Readers will murmur: "How utterly mad." But the fantasy is only slightly more incredible than the atmosphere which shocked recent American visitors to the United States Embassy in Taipeh, capital of Formosa.

The spectacle of a gay and valiant people, fighting a battle of life and death with their backs to the last wall, commonly wins respect even from their enemies.

When the heroic nation, in addition, embodies the most ardent pro-American shrine on earth, and is waging America's war singlehanded against communism, the least to be expected would be sympathy or, at worst, neutrality.

American correspondents were horrified to discover that the American Embassy in Taipeh is engaged in mercilessly driving the final nail into the bier of his country's only staunch ally in the Far East.

At the head of the American Embassy in Taipeh they found not an Ambassador but a Chargé d'Affaires, in the person of Robert Campbell Strong, a plump and supercilious career man from Wisconsin, 34 years old, who formerly had been a mere consul at Tsingtao.

OFFICE BOY ON THE JOB

"The State Department," muttered one correspondent, "has put an office boy on the job at one of the hottest diplomatic spots in the world. What Taipoh needs is a full Ambassador of the highest caliber."

In the opinion of his compatriots on Formosa, Strong is a rabid Stilwellite—that is, a devoted adherent to the party line as redrawn for China by Joseph Stalin in 1943, following the victory at Stalingrad.

Strong defined himself as a loyal servant of the State Department.

The fundamentals of the new Soviet policy drafted 7 years ago were that Chiang Kai-shek must be eliminated, and that the Chinese Reds should gain admission to the government with the purpose of becoming its political and military masters.

According to responsible informants, Strong's policy, directed by the State Department, has been as follows:

Until the effort was shown to be futile some months ago, Strong constantly urged upon Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek that the Formosa government would never be recognized by Secretary Acheson as a true democracy until Communists were accepted in the regime on equal terms with the Kuomintang, Social Democratic and China Youth Parties. These are the three components of the Legislative Yuan.

The Embassy at present is striving to bring about the downfall of Chiang Kai-shek, though he has stood for 20 years as the Orient's great pillar of flame against communism.

An endeavor is also being made to force a wedge between the Generalissimo and his armed forces by cultivating dissension with his brilliant commander in chief of ground troops, Lt. Gen. Sun Li-jen.

General Sun is a graduate of the Virginia Military Institute. In his compound are two elephants which he brought to Formosa from Burma as souvenirs of the victory in which the Chinese armies, under his command, smashed for the first time the legend of Japan's military invincibility.

CRIMINAL INSANITY

The spiritual climate of Formosa is patriotic, idealistic, and intensely pro-American. The contrast upon entering the United States Embassy was that of setting foot on alien and enemy soil, which was not only anti-Chinese but anti-American and pro-Soviet.

One experienced, as never before, a sense of the criminal insanity of the State Department's betrayal of free and loyal China.

Immediately after our arrival, Strong held a press conference. His condescending air of sophistication and evasion of major questions led the spokesman of the newspaper group to suggest, to Strong's face, that we should walk out of the room. The proposal was rejected, and we heard members of the Embassy staff make some important admissions.

The Nationalist regime, we were told, is "indubitably superior" to any previous one in American experience in China. It was acknowledged to be honest and efficient.

The point was stressed that the currency has remained suprisingly stable, thanks to wise fiscal measures, in spite of enormous pressure placed on the island's economy by a flood of refugees from the mainland, and by the government's administrative and military costs. The expected runaway inflation did not occur.

Peasants had been relieved by a reduction of rents from 55 to 37½ percent of their produce. Labor on Formosa, what with wages and bonuses, was the best paid in the Orient. Exports of sugar, coal and other commodities averaged $200,000,000 a year. Some 90,000 Formosans were benefiting from unemployment and disability insurance.

Nevertheless, more than half of the correspondents boycotted a reception given for them by the Embassy just before their departure. The purpose proved to be that of undermining any favorable impressions we might have gathered on the trip.

It could no longer be charged that the Nationalist regime was corrupt and inefficient. There were no war lords on the island, no grafters and squeezers. Denial was not attempted of the fact that in all the Far East there was no government so politically stable as that of Formosa.

We had met the Nationalist chieftains of army, navy, and air force, and found them without exception to be not only tough and hard-bitten but dedicated men.

"CHIANG MUST GO"—BUT WHY?

We had seen in the making a soldiery distinguished for morale and physical stamina. We had watched trainees running 3-mile races in a noonday heat of 120° or doing field exercise under the fire of live bullets and grenades.

But a member of the embassy staff took me by the arm, led me apart to a sofa in a corner, and spoke softly, as follows:

"This is the best government we have ever known in China. In fact, we could still save Formosa, if we could just get rid of Chiang Kai-shek. The trouble is that the Generalissimo thinks himself a great strategist. Well, he isn't. He is widely jealous of General Sun and hampers him in every possible way."

It happened that some weeks earlier Chiang Kai-shek had issued an edict giving complete freedom of action to General Sun. One recalled the Generalissimo's brilliant campaigns against the war lords, the Chinese Communist armies, and then the Japanese.

"If we could just get rid of Chiang Kai-shek." It was depressing, to put it mildly, to hear a State Department career man on Formosa in May 1950, still parroting the ukase uttered by Stalin in 1943 at Moscow: "Chiang Kai-shek must go."

Dangers of Communism in America

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, J. Edgar Hoover tells us of the dangers of the Communists within our gates. He says there are 54,174 members of the Communist Party in the United States at the present time. That does not include their sympathizers, stooges, and fellow travelers—many of whom are more dangerous, if anything, than the Communists themselves. Mr. Hoover says that—

Mankind, at the opening of the twentieth century, stood at a pinnacle of achievement. The previous 100 years had witnessed countless salutary developments: the expansion of democracy over large areas of the world; incredible scientific and technical discoveries; the adaptation of science to the needs of the ordinary citizen; the spread of education. Man seemed destined to conquer still greater worlds.

Unfortunately, the first 50 years of the present century have betrayed many of these hopes. History, in large areas of the world, has been rolled back. Fanaticism has replaced reason; terror, compromise; hate, friendship. Science, education, and philosophy, the vehicles of progress to western man, have been perverted, distorted and retooled into weapons against civilization. The dictator states, Fascist and Communist, during the past generation, have renounced—deliberately and scornfully—the values of western society: religion, morality, democracy, the dignity of the individual. They have tried—with the Communists still in action—to create a totalitarian man, a man whose fawning servility would be matched only by his intellectual imbecility.

Communist strength is based on duplicity, hypocrisy, and sham. The Communists are masters of mirage, painters of brilliant Utopias. Their success, strange as it may sound, has been achieved, to a large extent, by making calumny respectable, deceit a virtue, and downright falsehoods the unimpeachable truth. Their false gods, clad in the shining armor of truth, justice, and mercy, are today masquerading, with a surprising degree of success, as the legitimate deals of democracy—a democracy, they say, which has failed miserably to nourish the spirit of man.

The acceptance of communism as liberalism, as freedom, can mean but one thing: the utter destruction of the spirit of free inquiry, and thereby the motive power for the growth of democracy. The soul of America would be entombed; her body disemboweled. Communism is tyranny, naked, brutal, and terrifying. The Communist myth stripped of its beguiling and ersatz clothes,

is a wicked, foul, hateful story. The individual, in Communist society, is a pawn, subject to the whims of the ruling elite. Civil rights are nonexistent; concentration camps the symbol of justice; terror the order of the day. Communism is cynically immoral, an abject disillusionment—all the more so because it professes to be the savior of mankind, the architect of an alluring paradise where injustice, misery and war will be abolished.

The years ahead, without question, will be years of critical decision, deep strain, and serious thought. At times the going will be rough, the destination dimly lighted, the motive power weak. But to surrender, to compromise in the least iota with an alien philosophy, is to forfeit the past and to betray the future. America's best, and only, hope lies in an intelligent and well-informed public opinion: conscious of the evils of communism and dedicated to the validity and sanctity of the democratic tradition. Democracy, like life itself, must be conquered anew each day.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to clean house and fumigate every department and every agency of this Government.

Then we should proceed to clean out the Communists and their fellow travelers who are here plotting the overthrow of this Government or trying to get rid of the United States and subordinate us to the domination of foreign powers.

Potsdam Congressman Brought Great Jurist Into Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article from the Currier-Freeman, Potsdam, N. Y., about how Bertrand H. Snell, former chairman of the Rules Committee, and minority leader, persuaded Harlan F. Stone to enter Government service during the time of Calvin Coolidge.

I think the general public will be interested in knowing how one of the country's great public servants, Hon. Bertrand H. Snell, of Potsdam, N. Y., induced another great man to serve in our Government.

I am sure Bert Snell's old friends in the House will be interested and I know you, Mr. Speaker, knowing Bert as you do, will be especially interested.

The article follows:

POTSDAM CONGRESSMAN BROUGHT GREAT JURIST INTO GOVERNMENT

Here's the way Harlan Fiske Stone, one of the great Chief Justices of our time, was recruited for governmental service by a distinguished citizen of Potsdam.

The story came out yesterday in Bertrand Snell's office at 59 Market Street.

Bert's sharp eyes sparkled. Alertly, infectiously, he smiled at his visitor across the well-ordered desk. Then his eyes roved nostalgicly to a particular photograph among many on his wall.

At 80, Bertrand Hollis Snell, for 24 years a Representative in Congress from this district, has the strong knit body of a football tackle and the gentle whimsy of a public figure who has taken part in history.

Yesterday, for Mr. Snell and his visitor, a majestic yet tender pageant came trooping down the years. It happened this way:

Roscie Ellard, a writer from Editor and Publisher magazine and a member of the graduate faculty of Columbia University in New York, asked Bert to reminisce. To reminisce about his part in bringing Stone from a $100,000 a year law practice to the Government of the United States as Attorney General—at $15,000.

Attorney Generalships don't pay much. Nor Chief Justiceships—in terms of big men. Just prestige and the chance to serve, if one has it in him. Four Amherst collegemates did—Cal Coolidge '95, "Doc" Stone '94, Dwight Morrow '95, and Bert Snell '94.

Mr. Snell was born at Colton when General Grant was President. At 15, Bert came to live in Potsdam. Later he was graduated from Potsdam Normal School, now the Potsdam State Teachers College. After Amherst—and the oil, cheese, and lumber business—he became chairman of the Rules Committee in Congress, and finally minority leader. Doubtless he would have been Speaker of the House had he not retired in 1939.

"And now," asked his visitor, "how about the little reunion of Amherst friends that destiny arranged for history, with some adroit help from you?"

"Well," Mr. Snell chuckled, "I used to talk with President Coolidge nearly every morning, and he needed a new Attorney General. Harry M. Daugherty was resigning. That was in 1924."

An election year.

"Appointing an Attorney General," Bert Snell continued, his eyes twinkling back to the picture of Stone, "is always a ticklish business.' The names of excellent men had been in the President's mind. He needed one whose record was above suspicion and who was not connected chiefly with business. The President was worried about it and talked with me quite confidentially.

"I began working my own mind and decided no one was better fitted for that position than Harlan F. Stone. His background, character, ability, and experience admirably fitted him for the post. His private life and law practice were beyond reproach."

Stone had been a teacher and dean of the Columbia University law school for 13 years. He had practiced law in New York while he was teaching and for a year had been a member of the law firm of Sullivan & Cromwell. He was said to be earning more than $100,000 a year.

"How about our old Amherst friend, Harlan Stone?, I suggested," Bert Snell recalled. "And every morning when I was with the President I talked about 'Doc' Stone. Coolidge listened patiently and showed interest, but he never gave me an inkling of how he felt. At last one morning, he asked suddenly, 'How do you know Stone would take it?'

"'I don't. I've had no authority to ask him.'

"'You better find out,' the President directed.

"I went to New York that night and met Stone in his office the next morning. He was much surprised when I reported my talks with President Coolidge and told him why I was there. We argued the situation, point by point, for 2 or 3 hours.

"'I've recently made a most favorable connection with Sullivan & Cromwell, one of the leading and most successful law firms in New York City,' Stone observed. 'Perhaps it is my duty to use my ability as a lawyer to make some money for my family and provide for the future.' He seemed to be thinking out loud.

"'There will be plenty of time for that after you have been Attorney General of the United States,' I argued.

"Stone certainly would gain prestige after making good as Attorney General, and I was confident that he would. It was a hard decision for him to make—to give up the certainty of earning better than $100,000 a year for an appointive position at $15,000.

"'It is a great honor and a great service,' I kept urging. 'The country needs the very best man in that position.'

"Finally Doc stood up and walked to the window. He looked out, and nothing was said for several minutes. I waited.

"Then he turned and smiled the old smile I remembered from our college friendship. And he said:

"'I've always believed that when any good citizen is called upon to render public service, he should accept the challenge.'

"That was the way it started.

"'Of course I can't make any promises, Doc,' I explained. 'I am merely doing what the President asked.'

"Doc" understood.

And Bert Snell of Amherst '94 journeyed back from "Doc" Stone, his classmate, with a "yes" to Cal Coolidge of Amherst '95. The President made the appointment.

Stone's sturdy open-mindedness, his scrupulous fairness and genuine humanity soon blossomed in his work for the public. So did his vigor and skill as an attorney. Quickly he became a respected and popular public official.

Within a year, a vacancy occurred in the Supreme Court, and Coolidge appointed Stone as Associate Justice. Then, 16 years later—June 1941—President Franklin Roosevelt, the Democrat, elevated Stone, the New England Republican, to Chief Justice, the top juridical post in the United States.

And today, Bert Snell, who had studied with "Doc" and "Cal" at Amherst, and had first proposed his classmate for governmental service, twinkled his charming smile, recollecting another characteristic of Cal the Taciturn.

Did President Coolidge tell Congressman Snell, his college mate at Amherst, "Bert, I've appointed Doc, as you suggested."

He did not.

"Know how I first learned that Harlan had been really appointed Attorney General?" he grinned. This time Bert's merry eyes turned to another photograph on his office wall—a picture of Cal and Bert together at Lake Placid.

"Well, sir," Bert chuckled, "Cal Coolidge was Cal Coolidge all right. It was Bascom Slemp, the President's secretary, who called me saying, 'Bert, you've made an Attorney General.' Then he asked me to tell the newspaper correspondents about it. I knew the correspondents so well—and I certainly knew more than anyone else about the new Attorney General.

"Next day when I stopped at the President's office, I asked:

"'Why didn't you tell me you had appointed Doc Stone as Attorney General?'

"The President grinned. 'I thought you would find out,' he said.

"That was Cal Coolidge—and his little joke on me."

We Need the Marine Corps, Don't Scuttle It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the Boston Daily Record of July 10, 1950:

WE NEED THE MARINE CORPS, DON'T SCUTTLE IT

At the outbreak of Korean hostilities, this country's armed services were deployed in many parts of the world.

General MacArthur commanded 160,000 troops in Japan.

We maintained small occupation armies in Germany, in Austria, and on the Adriatic.

The Air Force had bombers in Great Britain, fighter planes at Wiesbaden on the Rhine, and a base in North Africa.

The Navy had Asiatic and Mediterranean fleets.

Never before, in a period of technical world peace, did we have so many land garrisons and sea and air detachments stationed abroad in a posture for war—stationed in danger areas where alert attention was essential and warlike moves impended.

But a familiar element was lacking.

Even a cursory survey of our foreign placements invited the question: Where are the United States marines?

The answer was, on June 25, 1950, the Marines were here at home—all 71,000 of them, except a few on temporary naval assignments.

Consequently, in the Korean emergency, Marines had to be transported across the Pacific to support General MacArthur.

And the fact that marines were ready to go to Asia proved anew the indispensability of the corps in our national defense.

The Marines were not being confined to drill yards because the Marines wanted it so.

They were detained, and their ranks had been much reduced, because military policy, under the National Defense Act, apparently sought to abolish the Marine Corps.

Not only were there no marines on shore duty overseas, but the commandant of the Marine Corps had been debarred from the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Thus the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force no longer had the expert consultation, as they no longer had the field collaboration, of the most versatile section of our defense establishment.

Yet the Marine Corps unquestionably belongs in our organization, both afloat and ashore.

Marine training, as well as marine tradition, admirably equips marine regiments for occupation tasks at such outposts as Trieste.

In large-scale hostilities, marine companies are best adapted to lead amphibious actions, as the marines proved in the Pacific war.

And when it comes to plans and operations, only the marines can provide seasoned officers who combine both Army and Navy education and experience with their own specialty.

For the purpose of improving our military councils, and preserving a martial institution that has brought luster to our annals for 175 years, Representative VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, has introduced a bill (H. R. 7580) to amend the National Defense Act.

This bill deserves immediate and sympathetic attention.

There are many sound reasons, growing out of its origin, for retaining and not impairing the Marine Corps.

By a somewhat common error, the marines are often regarded as merely a part of the Navy.

But the marines were never that.

The Marine Corps was separately created by Congress in 1798 and made subject to the President's orders.

Subsequently, in the departmentization of government, the marines became part of the Naval Establishment under the Secretary of the Navy and the President.

Marines on ship duty are under naval discipline; but the Marine Corps is not commanded by the Navy.

The Marine Corps has its own commandant, whose rank and title are equivalent to those of an Army general.

And, subject to Presidential directions, marines are assigned to shore duties in which the Navy does not partake.

As a separate service, a specialized service, and a select service, the Marine Corps should have a place in our defense organization.

Equally, the Marine Corps, while executing its nonmilitary duties, should have a voice in our defense planning.

Representative VINSON'S bill will assure these desirable things.

The Marine Corps has always been one of the most popular branches of the armed services with the people of New England.

Many of our sons have served with honor and distinction in the Corps in the two World Wars and in the period separating these conflicts.

James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Watertown Daily Times of July 6 and the Syracuse Herald-Journal of July 5:

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times of July 6, 1950]

JAMES A. FARLEY'S VISIT

James A. Farley, the former Postmaster General and the former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, paid a visit to Watertown on Wednesday. He addressed the service clubs at a luncheon, and he was honored by the Elks Lodge in the evening. During the afternoon he found time to get over to the Thousand Islands, stopping both in Clayton and in Alexandria Bay.

Mr. Farley is always welcome in northern New York and we have reason to believe that he was impressed with what he saw. Everywhere he went he was given the friendliest kind of reception, and he responded with the affability for which he is famous.

We confess that we do not know what Jim Farley's political intentions are. We do not know that he could win the Democratic nomination for governor or, having won it, that he could be elected.

We do know, however, that here is a man of strength and character who has devoted much of his life to the public service and all of his life to the winning of friends. And by visiting Watertown and the river communities he strengthened the ties he already had and, in addition, won some new friends. Coca-Cola never had a better salesman than Jim Farley.

We hope Mr. Farley enjoyed his day in Jefferson County and that he will come back soon and often.

[From the Syracuse (N. Y.) Herald-Journal of July 5, 1950]

JIM FARLEY IN WATERTOWN

There has been a lot of talk recently of the possibility of the Democrats nominating Jim Farley for governor. Hence the former Postmaster General's appearance in Watertown today inevitably will be discussed in connection with the gubernatorial campaign.

But what many observers would like to know is whether Jim Farley actually would be interested in the governorship at this time.

It may well be that if the delegates to the Democratic convention unanimously called on him to head the State ticket this year, he would respond.

But there is nothing at present to indicate that he has any desire to become involved in a knock-down and drag-out fight for the Democratic nomination.

Today Jim Farley is the chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp. Under these circumstances he would undoubtedly want to do a good deal of heavy thinking before he agreed to get back into active politics. Who wouldn't?

But it is apparent that some of his admirers are going to fight to get him to be a candidate, as they foresee his election if nominated.

Reserve Officers Association Annual Banquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor to have been a guest at the annual banquet of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States held in Washington on June 30, 1950. The banquet was merely the culmination of several days of intensive work during which the ROA delegates from all over the United States considered their program and made their plans for the coming year.

Our host was Col. Augustus Dunaway, the executive secretary of the ROA in California. California is fortunate to have members on the committees who have jurisdiction of matters involving the Reserves in the Armed Forces. On the Armed Services Committee of the House are Congressmen ANDERSON, JOHNSON, HAVENNER, and DOYLE. On the Appropriations Committee is Congressman HARRY R. SHEPPARD. It is fortunate for the ROA of California that so many of us are on the committees which must consider the Reserve problems.

It is particularly fortunate that on the Subcommittee on Armed Services Appropriations we have the Chairman HARRY R. SHEPPARD. He is in a strategic position to help the reserve program as he is the head of the committee that provides the money to make the program effective. Furthermore, Mr. SHEPPARD is particularly interested in the Reserve program. The California ROA is lucky to have a man in the key spot occupied by Mr. SHEPPARD. His influence combined with his interest in the ROA program is a valuable asset of the association. We of the Congress have always found Mr. SHEPPARD receptive to any suggestions made by us to develop the Reserve program and thus enhance the security of the United States. Without strong Reserves no emergency could be properly handled. Without money to inaugurate a vigorous training program the trained Reserves which we need in a crisis would not be developed.

The High Cost of Federal Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the following editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Staunton News-Leader, a newspaper published in the city of Staunton, Va.:

Virginia PIC News, publication of the Virginia Petroleum Industries Committee, states that the Federal Government is collecting almost $1,200,000,000 of excise taxes from motorists annually, but is returning only $443,000,000 to the States for highway construction. Thus, declares the News, Uncle Sam "is guilty of the greatest diversion of motor and gasoline taxes."

To Virginians, who have successfully resisted every effort to divert State gasoline taxes from highway funds, even for advertising which would develop more tourist business and therefore more highway funds, this statement will strike a responsive chord. It should be remembered, however, that the Federal excise tax on motor vehicles was not imposed for highway construction but for general revenue, and that Congress never committeed the Government to use of any but the Federal gasoline tax for State aid for highways.

Should the Federal Government stop the practice of collecting taxes and returning what's left of them to the States after deducting the high cost of administration? So far as highway construction is concerned, Mr. E. L. Schmidt, chief of engineers of the Pennsylvania Department of Highways thinks so. He declares:

"It is time for the States to battle for sufficient funds at the State level and to quit fooling their people and themselves by pretending that Federal funds are secured in some mysterious manner by the National Government. Federal funds can only be secured by taxing the workers who produce our national income.

"The Federal Government is operating at heavy annual deficit. Any additional appropriations to the States come from higher taxes or continued borrowing with its growing interest rate. There are also the additional costs of collecting and distributing the money as well as a 3¾ percent annual overhead charge by the Bureau of Public Roads on every dollar appropriated for Federal aid highway construction.

"We believe the highway problem can best be solved at the local and State levels with minimum assistance and regulation from the Federal Government.

"The withdrawal of the Federal Government from the fields of gasoline taxation and motor excise taxes, with these funds accruing to the State would do more to improve the highway situation than any possible increases in Federal aid appropriations or increases in the Federal share for highway construction with resultant increases of Federal control.

If we persist in further demands on the Federal Government, the States may just as well quit the field and let the Federal Government do the entire job. This would be fatal but it is definitely the direction in which we are traveling."

It would be best for the Nation if the Federal Government would get out of the business of aid to the States generally, returning responsibility and taxing power to the States and the localities and halting the centralization of authority which is destroying self-government.

Demands for Federal action in various fields grew out of the failure of many States and localities to act effectively, but the high cost of administering Federal aid, the tremendous burden on the taxpayers, the gradual loss of liberty through bureaucratic Federal regulation, have created a greater appreciation of local self-government which should assure better and less expensive discharge of responsibilities were Federal aid to be discontinued.

That there will be any such reversal of policy is improbable. Instead, the States and localities are turning more and more to the big tax gatherer, the Federal Government. Their needs for public services and facilities are beyond their revenues, and will remain so as long as Washington collects the billions, the States a few millions, and the localities a few hundred thousands.

State Merit-System Program of the Federal Security Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to the Honorable Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, under date of June 20, 1950, by Mr. James R. Watson, executive director of the National Civil Service League of New York City, on the tenth anniversary of the State merit-system program of the Federal Security Agency:

NATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE LEAGUE,
New York, N. Y., June 20, 1950.

The Honorable OSCAR R. EWING,
Federal Security Administrator,
Federal Security Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. EWING: On this tenth anniversary of the State merit-system program of the Federal Security Agency, I wish to congratulate you and your staff for doing a splendid job. You have made great progress in eliminating spoils politics from those essential programs for child welfare and health, public assistance, and public health. Those of us who have watched your activity realize the many obstacles that have been thrown in your path to hinder the development of merit systems by the States in these services. It has been a pioneering effort in Federal-State relationships.

At this 10-year mark, it can be seen that your leadership, the tact and ability of your staff, and cooperation from the States have made the program successful. We are pleased to review the details of this program in our current issue of Good Government (May-June 1950) in an article by the director of State merit-system services, Mr. Albert H. Aronson.

Your program and the success in educating the States toward the values of the merit system is a fundamental contribution to better democracy. The acceptance of political debasement of the civil service is but a surface manifestation of deeper corruptions in our democratic system. The debasement is more pronounced when corrupting such programs as children's services and public health.

From our point of view we are in a position to note publicly that your program has helped educate many administrators, political leaders, and public groups throughout the Nation in the advantages of good personnel administration.

We are glad to have the opportunity at this time to recognize this unusual contribution to better public administration.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES R. WATSON,
Executive Director.

Reorganization Plan No. 27

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, The proposal to create a Department of Health, Education, and Security will serve, in no small way, to encourage the beneficial work performed by the professional men and women engaged in these various fields of activities. Many medical people would, of course, like to see a separate Department of Health. Many professional educators would like to see a separate Department of Education. There is still a deep-seated feeling on the part of some against having a single department which embraces all these activities. But the majority, I think, of all progressive-minded professional people recognize the very real and immediate advantages that will accrue under this plan.

For one thing, unlike the plan of last year to establish a Department of Welfare, the name of the new Department indicates clearly the coequal status of all these activities—health, education, and security. There will be a Secretary serving directly the interests of health, of education, and of social and economic security. Furthermore, the coequal standing of departmental status with all other major departments will place the programs in these various fields on a par with other important operations of our Government. The Public Health officers will feel that their work is as important in the eyes of the Nation as the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture; the education specialists will see that their functions are as important as those who are developing our great waterways.

Through the Secretary, each unit of the Department will be able to present its problems for consideration at the very top level of Government. As a Cabinet officer, the Secretary will be able to participate in the decisions of over-all policies of the Government while they are still in the formative stage, and make certain that vital matters of health, education, and social and economic security are given proper weight in any decisions that are taken.

Each unit of the department, however, will have at its head a trained

professional person with appropriate authority in all substantive or professional matters. One of the most serious objections to the proposal to create a Department of Welfare was that it gave the Secretary total authority over the department. At some time, it was feared, he might unwisely use his authority to make decisions which—to put it bluntly—were none of his business. The present plan meets this unwarranted objection. Professional matters will continue to be decided by professional people. Broad problems of administration will be settled by administrative people. Matters of public policy, as they concern the broad problems of the general welfare of the Nation, will be developed by all top officials of the Department—professional and nonprofessional—working together as a team.

Specifically, the plan provides for three commissioners—a Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, a Commissioner of Education, and a Commissioner of Social Security—with appropriate professional qualifications, who will head the three principal units. These men will be appointed by the President with Senate confirmation. Under present law there are no requirements regarding professional qualifications, except that the Surgeon General must be chosen from the regular commissioned corps. Moreover, the Commissioner for Social Security is not a Presidential appointee.

The Commissioners are to report directly to the Secretary. The Under Secretary, Assistant Secretary, and Administrative Assistant Secretary provided for in the plan will have no authority over the Commissioners.

The present statutory functions of the Surgeon General and the Commissioner of Education are unchanged. The Public Health Service and the Office of Education, which are now statutory entities, are also unchanged, and the Social Security Administration is given statutory recognition which it does not now have.

The plan limits the working functions that can be assigned to any of the three Commissioners; they must concern the appropriate professional field, and they must be required by or pursuant to law.

The plan authorizes the establishment of central administrative services but expressly protects the professional or substantive functions of the Commissioners from transfer or removal.

A Department of Health, Education, and Security as now proposed, with the professional interests of the constituent units definitely safeguarded, will go a long way toward strengthening all Government programs in these related fields of activity. The professional people who administer these programs will have the necessary and desirable professional latitude. With departmental status, they will feel that they are working at, and with, the top level of Government administration and that their efforts are officially recognized as a major contribution to the well-being of the Nation.

Reorganization Plan No. 27

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, as one who is opposing Reorganization Plan No. 27 because it does not conform to the Hoover recommendation and is merely a subterfuge to regiment our schools and our medical profession, I think this letter from Dr. Wayland adds another reason for opposing this plan. It is especially important since Dr. Wayland is considered a liberal in the medical profession:

SANTA BARBARA CITY SCHOOLS,
Santa Barbara, Calif., July 6, 1950.

Mr. NORRIS POULSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POULSON: May I respectfully present to you the following views of the Committee on School Health Administration of the American School Health Asscciation, California division, as well as the feeling of the entire division as has been expressed in overwhelming majority votes through the last few years.

1. We are opposed to the President's Reorganization Plan No. 27.

2. We are opposed for the following reasons: First and foremost we believe that it is contrary to the best interests of the Nation's most important public institutions, the public schools. There is nothing that we think is any more important to the preservation and enlargement of democracy in this country than to maintain the freedom and autonomy of its public schools. One of the weak links in the freedom and autonomy of these schools has been the fact that on a Federal level we have not had an autonomous United States Office of Education under a national board of education. We are opposed, therefore, to the present Federal organization in its relation to the United States Office of Education, and would be for the same reasons and others opposed to its inclusion in a department of health, education, and welfare. Because we do not have an autonomous Federal United States Office of Education responsible to a national board of education, the foes of public education in the United States, including the Catholic hierarchy, have been able on a Federal level to grievously weaken our public schools.

Some thinkers on the subject have said that the United States Office of Education represents 28,000,000 people, and that health affects and has to do with all the people. We would object to that thinking as being incorrect in that, while health does affect all the people, so does education in all of its ramifications, be they children or adults, and in no way can we limit the total effect of education as represented on a Federal level by the United States Office of Education any more than we can limit the effect of a Federal health department on all the people.

3. We advise a separate department of health with a secretary of Cabinet status because we believe this is best administratively and in all other respects for a proper serving on a Federal level of the health interests of the American people.

4. We are also opposed to the Reorganization Plan No. 27 because it does not conform to the Hoover plan. We, for the most part, are highly in favor of most of the Hoover plan. We do not recommend, however, as it does, the setting up of a Department of Education and Security. As I have mentioned above, we believe that these two should be separate.

Very truly yours,
L. C. N. WAYLAND, M. D.,
Chairman, Committee on School Health Administration, California Division, American School Health Association.

P. S.—As one of the relatively few liberals in medicine, I can say that the objections quoted above have nothing to do with the problem of socialized medicine.

The Deadliest Sin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, faced with one of the gravest crises ever to confront our Nation, the American people and their leaders have risen to the challenge. They have acted with courage and determination because they have faith in democracy and its ultimate triumph over communism. They have avoided what Henry Stimson calls the deadly sin of cynicism. A timely article on this question has just been written by Mr. Averell Harriman, and has been republished in leading newspapers throughout the country as a public service advertisement by the International Latex Corp., of Dover, Del. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this advertisement, as it appeared in the New York Times for July 6, 1950, be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The advertisement reads as follows:

THE DEADLIEST SIN

(By W. Averell Harriman)

"The only deadly sin I know is cynicism."—Henry L. Stimson.

These are the closing words of Secretary Stimson's book, On Active Service, ending a vigorous statement of his faith in mankind and in human progress. To me, there is nothing more vitally needed in the world today than this faith.

We Americans believe in the freedom of men to think for themselves. We believe in governments by majority will. We want to live at peace, with freedom and justice for everybody.

But today a powerful and aggressive force is loose in the world, determined to extinguish both freedom and justice.

I have had long and intimate contact with the Kremlin. From my observations it is apparent that the basic difference between its viewpoint and the democratic viewpoint comes down to this: the Soviet leaders do not trust people; we do.

Cynical of men's worth, they hold that the few should be allowed to dictate to the many. Having faith in mankind, we say, let the majority rule. Men at liberty to decide for themselves, Americans believe, will ultimately choose what is right.

The difference in viewpoints shows up in our contrasting attitudes toward other nations. The Soviets trust only satellite governments taking orders from Moscow. We believe that wherever the will of the people governs we have friends.

In the struggle ahead, remember that history is on our side. The Kremlin proclaims "the inevitability of the dictatorship of the proletariat." But history does not teach the inevitability of tyranny. It teaches just the opposite.

The whole stream of human development has been a successful struggle of mankind for ever-growing freedom. Dictatorships have been overthrown by the strongest of all human forces—man's passionate desire for liberty.

Mr. Stimson was aware of these things when he wrote of the generations succeeding his:

"Let them have hope, and virtue, and let them believe in mankind and its future, for there is good as well as evil, and the man who tries to work for the good, believing in its eventual victory, while he may suffer setback and even disaster, will never know defeat."

Leaders With Soft Spots Dangerous—Nationalists Versus Isolationists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as isolationists or nationalists for the past 20 years have been charged with being narrow-minded because they thought first of the interests of their country, bitterly opposed the surrender of our sovereignty, now that we are in a third world war, because we followed the advice of the internationalists, our contention is that, if we are to win that war, those who failed to keep us out of it should not now be accepted as advisers or directors of our foreign policies.

The internationalists have always argued, have contended that the way to peace was through a world organization, through concession to, appeasement of, the Communists and every other group which wanted to involve us in world affairs.

All the internationalists have ever succeeded in doing was to give us World War I, World War II, and now world war III, national bankruptcy, and the loss of much of our individual liberty and freedom.

Having failed to win any measure of peace or anything of value for the United States of America, they should not now assume to be our advisers or leaders.

No matter how sincere, how honest, they may have been, events have shown that they were wrong and they should now get out.

A news story by Walter Trohan, of the Washington Times-Herald, this morning calls attention to two of these gentlemen, one of whom might well serve his country by resigning; the other, Lie, might better contribute to world peace, to the winning of the war, by keeping his nose out of our business.

The news story reads as follows:

ACHESON'S, DULLES' ABOUT-FACE ON SOVIET HIT IN CATHOLIC PAPER—ACCUSED OF SHIFT TO SAVE THEMSELVES; LIE OF UN LABELED RED SYMPATHIZER

(By Walter Trohan)

Secretary of State Acheson and "his friends and associates" are described in the current issue of the Catholic Review, official newspaper for the Archdioceses of Baltimore and Washington, as "right-about face savers" in their swing toward "a position in keeping with the interests of America."

TRYGVE LIE CALLED PINKO

The publication noted that Acheson has apparently abandoned appeasement of Russia. It also marked some shift in the attitudes of Owen Lattimore, foreign-policy adviser attacked by Senator MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, as pro-Soviet, and John Foster Dulles, former foreign-policy adviser to Governor Dewey, of New York, and now adviser to Acheson.

Lattimore was identified as responsible for setting off the Korean war. Trygve Lie, Secretary-General of the UN, and an Acheson friend, is labeled as a Soviet sympathizer by the newspaper.

LIE'S STAND DENOUNCED

"Latest and foremost in the element of surprise is the opinion of Mr. Lattimore, whose advice on foreign policy in China and the Far East set the scene for the current conflict," the Review said in an editorial.

Lattimore is a resident of Baltimore and a professor of Johns Hopkins University. He is not a Catholic.

"He now appears to feel that North Korea should be punished for its aggression southward," the publication continued. "He has not yet arrived at the point of blaming Russia for pushing her henchmen.

"Mr. Lie, of the United Nations, thinks the incident emphasizes the need for greater understanding between Russia and United States. This is a reecho of his great theme song and indicates no detectable alteration in his Socialist and pro-Soviet sympathies. He seems to imply that we do not understand the beneficent purpose of those who are determined to replace democracy with dictatorship. It was this theme that made Norway an easy push-over for Hitler.

"Mr. Dulles feels that the Korean affair has blasted our hopes of peaceful settlement of international questions. Both Lie and Dulles have given birth to what sounds like world-shaking pronouncements of high-school-graduation addresses.

"It is not difficult to ask ourselves if they really mean these things. Or is it just a convenient and temporary cover-up necessitated by the administration's reapproachment to traditional Americanism? Will they abandon their fatuous faith in the happy grandpa myth of Stalin's statism or will they effect a return to the policy of unceasing appeacement that has brought up the present debacle in Korea and a situation that could launch us upon a third and catastrophic war?

UNITED STATES AT WAR, WRITER AVERS

In an editorial-page column in the publication the Reverend James M. Gillis, retired editor of the Catholic World, leading Catholic magazine, concludes that President Truman has declared war.

"The Nation is actually at war now in Korea and potentially at war anywhere in the world from now on," he said.

"What is to be said of the President's action on grounds of constitutionality? Putting aside all quibbling, the fact is Mr. Truman declared war. It may be a short war. It may be for a while strictly localized on and around the thirty-eighth parallel of latitude some 30 miles north of Seoul. But it may develop into a war which will range in all latitudes and longitudes. One thing is certain; it is war.

"Also, except for those who like to play with verbal distinctions rather than face hard facts, the President declared war on his own authority. How do the citizens like it? Apparently they don't dislike it. But how about the Constitution? The country seems to say, 'What's the Constitution in a crisis?' Constitution or no Constitution we have our answer to the question, 'What is the foreign policy of the United States in regard to war?' If anyone cares to know, I don't like the answer—the full answer with all its implications."

Power Trust Captures Irrigation Districts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL F. WHITE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, the water power of our great Nation is one of our most valuable resources. In the last half century, electricity has become almost as important in our daily life as air, food, and water. A large portion of our food supply is now constantly protected by electric refrigeration.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, electricity should be used for heating our homes and for firing the boilers of our industrial plants throughout the Nation. This would go a long way toward remedying the almost unbearable condition of air pollution in our major cities. Particularly would it benefit the great city of Los Angeles in my home State of California, in its battle against the so-called smog, a combination of smoke and fog, which stings the human eye, is detrimental to human health, and hides the beauty of nature.

Some day, Mr. Speaker, our coal, oil, and gas supplies, for fuel, are going to run out. Then where are we? Electric power is ideal for fuel and its supply is as inexhaustible as the rains that fall from the heavens and as constant as Tennyson's Brook, which flows on forever. There is no reason, Mr. Speaker, why the billions of kilowatt hours of undeveloped electricity which our Nation's streams could provide should not be developed forthwith.

The Government could issue bonds for this power development and they would sell like hot cakes. The whole development should not cost the American taxpayer 1 cent. The private power companies sell bonds to develop and exploit the people's resources and they can keep reissuing these bonds as they fall due almost in perpetuity. Why cannot the Government follow this same program? The water power of the Nation belongs to all the people and not to the power trust. Great confusion exists today, Mr. Speaker, in the development of our water resources. There are two Government

agencies competing for the building of dams in our Nation; the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, and I have introduced a bill to consolidate them in accordance with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

The President of the United States has established a Commission to make recommendations for the proper development of the Nation's water resources. The Commission is known as the National Water Resources Policy Commission.

This Commission has been holding hearings throughout the Nation on this important subject. I spoke before the Commission at its meeting in Berkeley, Calif., on June 24 and I ask unanimous consent to place a copy of my statement in the RECORD at this point:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, as I sat here yesterday listening to the testimony before this Commission, a feeling of sadness came over me and I said to myself "Are these people who are testifying here Westerners who want more irrigation water at the cheapest price possible? Or are they men from States which do not engage in irrigation and who would try to raise the cost of irrigation?"

PSEUDO IRRIGATIONISTS ACTUALLY FIGHT IRRIGATION

One man gave testimony in which he opposed the efforts of the Commissioner of Reclamation to extend the repayment period for the irrigation features of Federal reclamation projects. Obviously, the longer the period of repayment, the cheaper the annual payments for irrigation water. Does it not seem peculiar that a man purporting to represent irrigationists should object to the cost of irrigation being reduced?

It would appear more logical that these gentlemen should be here before you, pleading as I now do, that you recommend that the cost of irrigation features of Federal projects be made nonreimbursable, that is, free of charge, just as flood control is. I don't see how anyone can call himself a devoted citizen of California, or any other Western State which must rely upon irrigation, and be opposed to a reduction in the cost of irrigation.

IRRIGATION BENEFITS NATION MORE THAN FLOOD CONTROL

Let us take a look for a moment at the water situation on a Nation-wide basis. Floods are the great menace and the scourge of the East and the Mississippi Valley. The cost of Federal flood control is nonreimbursable. Drought is the great menace and the scourge of the West. Drought control should also be nonreimbursable. By "drought control," of course, I mean the storage of water for irrigation. A dam may be built for flood control and many years may pass before a flood recurs to make use of that dam. Therefore, flood control benefits are spasmodic and benefit only a comparatively small number of people. On the other hand, irrigation benefits (the answer of the dust-bowl problem, if you please) recur year after year in perpetuity. Irrigation benefits help to make farmers financially strong, and when a Nation's farmers are strong that Nation is usually strong. It has been said that food is an important factor in winning a war and the peace. Surely the food supply to feed our armed forces and our allies is more certain if we do not have to depend upon timely rains to produce it. Therefore, a Nation with an abundant and dependable supply of irrigation water is a strong Nation indeed. There is hardly ever a water-storage project which will not produce an abundance of hydroelectric power. There, gentlemen, is the key to reimbursement for the American taxpayer: The hydroelectric power should pay for all of these reclamation projects by stretching out, yes, even doubling, the period of repayment.

I was amazed at the statement of one gentleman yesterday when he suggested that the Secretary of the Interior be stripped of his power to pronounce irrigation projects as feasible. It reminded me of the words of the late Congressman Richard Welch, of California, when he said "Is the West against itself?" Can you imagine people representing a State like California where irrigation is the very lifeblood of our economy, saying to the Commission: "Gentlemen, please try to make the attainment of irrigation projects more difficult and more expensive?" We all remember the old saying "truth is stranger than fiction." After witnessing these hearings, I am ready to agree that that statement is quite true.

HAND OF POWER TRUST SHOWS

What is the reason for the strange behavior of these gentlemen who call themselves irrigationists but who oppose cheaper irrigation and would make irrigation projects more difficult to build? I say to you, gentlemen, that it is the desire on the part of these people to acquire the hydroelectric power rights on our California streams which causes their seemingly incomprehensible attitude. In some cases the effort on the part of an established irrigation district to acquire the hydroelectric power rights is justified. In other cases it is not. It depends upon the circumstances in each case. The same is true with reference to integration of local projects into the Central Valley project. Each case should be judged separately on its individual circumstances. For instance, if a project involves considerable flood control, and if flood waters are withheld from certain lands to make those lands have some value as agricultural land in the first place, such as the case of Tulare Lake lands in the Kings River watershed, the flood waters which are withheld at government expense should be available for distribution to irrigationists under the Federal reclamation laws. To take the opposite view would be like asking the Federal Government to remove earthquake debris from your property and store it away for your future use and deliver it back to you at the time and in the amounts you request, free of all restrictions which other citizens are bound by law to endure. To be specific, may I respectfully recommend that the waters of the streams from which are taken the water supplies of all irrigation districts between and including the Oakdale and Merced irrigation districts shall not be integrated into the central valley project.

I say this for several reasons. One is in line with the slogan mentioned here yesterday when one gentleman said, "If you need water 10 years from now, you need it now." In other words, I believe the population of those areas I have just mentioned will eventually expand to use all the water of their streams. Flood control is not a serious matter in those areas but irrigation is. They have built or will build dams with their own money.

FEDERAL MONEY MEANS FEDERAL LAW MUST APPLY

On the other hand, the Kings River situation is different. I say the Kings River should be integrated into the Central Valley project and I have introduced a bill in Congress to accomplish this integration. The Kings River people asked for Federal money, and in accepting that Federal money, they must abide by Federal laws, including the so-called 160-acre law.

In my humble opinion, the fight against the 160-acre law is a fight against all Federal irrigation and public-power projects. The opponents of the 160-acre law must surely know that if we repeal the 160-acre law the eastern Congressman and Senators are not going to appropriate any more money for California irrigation and power projects. That is just exactly what the private-power people are trying to accomplish. If they are not able to stop this public-power development by repealing the 160-acre law, they have two other strings to their bow. One is State development of the Central Valley project. They know the State cannot do the job and the fat plum of hydroelectric power development would fall into their hands. Or even if the State did do the job, they undoubtedly feel they would have a better chance of acquiring the power under State control.

WOULD SAVE LARGE PART OF SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY FROM DUST BOWL FATE

The other string to their bow is the propaganda slogan "complete the irrigation features of the Central Valley project first and the power features later." This is impossible and they know it. It is just another way of stopping the Central Valley project dead in its tracks. The water must be pumped 200 feet up the hill into San Joaquin Valley and it takes cheap Government power to do it and still make the water cheap enough for the farmers to use. If the Government power is not used the pumping cost would be increased through the use of P. G. & E. power to the point where the project would be nonfeasible. So the power and the water must be developed together if we are to have full development of the Central Valley project and prevent a large portion of San Joaquin Valley which depends upon a fast-disappearing supply of underground water, from turning into a dust bowl.

A Fighting Chance for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, Russia made her biggest blunder in her campaign to enslave the freedom-loving peoples of the world when she boycotted the Security Council of the UN in the Korean crisis.

Withdrawal from the Council by the Reds made possible the unprecedented, swift sanction of military action which was necessary to stop the Kremlin-planned aggression in South Korea. The usual veto would have rendered the UN helpless again in its most crucial hour.

As a result, two-thirds of the members of the UN have actively rallied behind America's leadership in a united effort to stop the Russian-inspired battles in Korea from spreading into a disastrous world war and to hold high the hand of the UN. Direct action by America outside the framework of the UN and without its active cooperation might have sounded the death knell of that peace-seeking organization.

Neither the United States nor any one nation alone can afford the men and the money necessary to police the entire world indefinitely. Yet, we could not stand by and see Russia pick off one country at a time in the Far East like

she did in Europe until she is ready to attack the United States.

A Communist victory over the friendly little democratic country of South Korea, that was established by the UN with full backing of the United States, would make world war III almost certain. Now we have a fighting chance for peace. Other nations in the Far East and in Europe would bow to Stalin's superior forces which could overrun any of her neighbor countries unless America helped to stop them.

Freedom-loving people the world over should press the advantage of our combined peace offense. When this fight is won—as it will be—let us not stop short of reorganizing the UN to make it capable of preventing war under any conditions.

World peace must not depend upon a wrong move or blunder by Russia or by any other greedy nation. Hitler proved that the waiting, appeasement process is too costly and deadly. World peace must be won and preserved by the right moves of America, the UN, and the freedom-loving countries everywhere. We must be ready and prepared to stop war before it starts. Plenty of danger signals have warned us that an aggressor nation was on the move in every instance long before the attack came. That is the time to call their hand. We might not be able to survive a sneak hydrogen bomb attack.

America has taken the lead to stop Russia and save the UN. When the shooting is over—and I pray that may be soon—we should take the lead in rebuilding the UN into an organization capable of preventing war. The price of peace is eternal vigilance and sacrifice of nations as well as individuals. The price of war is destruction and slavery. The choice is ours. Therefore it is with a deep conviction that I ask your most serious consideration of House Concurrent Resolution No. 15 which I have introduced along with several other Members of Congress, as the first step in this reorganization.

As a matter of information, I am placing before you a copy of this resolution and a timely editorial entitled "No Place for Neutrals" by one of the leading newspapers in my district, the Birmingham Post-Herald:

House Concurrent Resolution 15

Whereas all the world deeply desires durable peace; and

Whereas the United Nations was created as an instrument to preserve the peace of the world; and

Whereas experience increasingly indicates that the United Nations in its present structure is not fully adequate for this task; and

Whereas the United Nations Charter in its article 109 provides a procedure whereby the Charter of the United Nations may be revised and amended: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should immediately take the initiative in calling a General Conference of the United Nations pursuant to article 109 for the purpose of making the United Nations capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law to prevent war.

[From the Birmingham Post-Herald of July 6, 1950]

NO PLACE FOR NEUTRALS

It is beyond understanding how governments supporting the United Nations in the fight for Korean independence can at the same time urge election of Communist China to a seat on the UN Security Council.

All the world knows that the Korean invasion was Moscow-inspired.

The Red invaders were trained by Russian officers, and are supported by Russian-built tanks and fighter planes.

Many veterans of the Chinese civil war are fighting now on the Korean front against the forces of the United Nations. There can be no doubt that they have the wholehearted support of the Moscow and Peiping regimes, for both capitals loudly proclaim that fact.

What do would-be appeasers of the Soviet Union hope to gain by ousting Nationalist China from the UN and assigning its membership to the Reds, who at this very moment are openly defying the Organization's Korean decisions?

If Russia had not been boycotting the UN on the China issue, the Soviet delegate would have attended the Security Council meeting which voted military sanctions against the North Korean aggressors, and almost certainly would have vetoed that action. This would have tied the organization's hands and all of Korea probably would be under Red rule today. Only since Russia's self-imposed absence from UN meetings has the organization been permitted to function as its charter contemplated. Why then sacrifice honor and integrity to bring the Russians back into the organization where they can do more harm?

This fight is for keeps, and the war in Korea is only its initial skirmish. Similar Communist adventures are plotted whereover Moscow has a well-organized fifth column. Presumably, the weaker spots will be exploited first, but no free nation is immune to attack. There can be no neutrals in such a situation, and Moscow recognizes none. Weak and vacillating governments which are too blind to see this must not be permitted to wreck the United Nations, which has become the world's best hope.

Hoover Warns Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Malden (Mass.) Evening News:

HOOVER WARNS AGAIN

If there is virtue in repetition, Herbert Hoover may eventually bring the American people to a realization of the need of economy in Government before the threat of national bankruptcy becomes more pronounced. His proposals for Government reorganization in behalf of economy have so far been ignored by Congress, while the administration continues its policy of deficit spending. Explaining the relation of Government expenditures, deficits, and taxes to jobs and national life, Mr. Hoover says it all adds up to one thing—inflation. Government expenditures can be reduced, Mr. Hoover insists, and without endangering the Nation's military security. Expenditures for nonmilitary functions of the Government have been increased 400 percent in 17 years and 50 percent in the last 3 years of peace. Mr. Hoover warns that the American people cannot stand more taxes without danger to the entire economic structure. The alarming thing about the whole matter is the complacency of the American people while their Government is being plunged deeper into debt at the rate of nearly half a billion a month.

Puerto Rico—An Advance in Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Globe of July 5, 1950:

AN ADVANCE IN FREEDOM

Congress has exemplified this Nation's finest ideals in passing the bill, which President Truman signed into law this week, granting Puerto Rico an opportunity to take another long stride forward in self-government. Under this law, our fellow citizens on that island territory are authorized, if they so desire, to set up a constitutional regime of their own within our Federal system.

While this does not alter Puerto Rico's present Territorial status, it will enable her people to institute a political structure closely resembling that of our State governments. By decision of President Munoz Marin, or on the initiative of the Puerto Rican Legislature, a plebiscite may now be ordered to determine whether a majority of Puerto Ricans want constitutional rule of their own. If a majority so votes, elections will be called to select delegates to a constitutional convention, whose handiwork will then be submitted for ratification to the Puerto Rican electorate and to the Congress at Washington.

Puerto Rico's progress since the end of the recent Great War, and the earlier aftermath of economic dislocations it produced, has been truly remarkable. Thanks to a leadership built firmly upon the foundations of new ideas, progressive social policies, economic far-sightedness, and a keen appreciation of the opportunities opened by association with the United States of America, the Territory has been moving into a new day. At the same time, the island's position in the Caribbean, where Great Britain is on her way toward creation of a new colonial federation, has grown in importance.

President Munoz Marin is one of the most capable statesmen in the Americas, despite the relatively small scene of his labors. He, whose forbears fought more than half a century ago for freedom from old Spanish rule, rallied Puerto Rico from its miseries after World War II. His task was one of appalling difficulty. Not only did he and his energetic young associates have to battle against the island's ancient heritage of poverty, disease, overpopulation, and a lack of economic viability caused by a one-crop economy. His struggle had to be directed simultaneously against public apathy, fostered by powerful absentee ownership of the island's sugar plantations and by the unenlightened control exercised by its agents over the Territory's legislative machinery.

Against such odds he prevailed by direct appeals to the people and by espousing their primary needs as his program for revitalizing democracy on the island and its economic

hopes. When, by act of the Eightieth Congress, Puerto Rico was granted the right to choose its first native-born President, Dr. Muñoz-Marín and his Popular Democratic party captured almost every city, town, and village in the territory. The new regime, in complete control of the executive and the legislature, proceeded to expand the economic and social program by which the energetic chief executive and his associates hope to build broader, firmer foundations under Puerto Rico's economy, and to enhance its role in the Caribbean.

In the 18 months since Dr. Muñoz-Marín became President, the building up of Puerto Rican industries has gone on steadily and diversification of the island's agriculture is being pushed. The Territory's educational progress has made her an objective of interest for all countries around the Caribbean. Students from adjacent islands and from the states on the isthmus compete to study at San Juan's expanding university. It is a tribute to the practical value of the education offered there that these guest students are mostly financed by their home governments.

With the way opened for constitutional government of her own, Puerto Rico thus reaches another milestone on her journey. At an hour in history when the motives and policies of the United States are maligned by foes of human freedom and distorted to serve the propaganda uses of regimes that deny human rights and individual values. Puerto Rico presents a shining proof of the falsehoods of the former and the hypocrisy of the latter.

In the new law Congress asks that the new Puerto Rican Constitution provide a republican form of government and that it include a bill of rights to protect the individual citizen from oppression by the state. Here is a story which the Voice of America should trumpet throughout Asia.

Unemployment Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me on an unemployment resolution before the resolutions committee of the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, while acting as United States alternate delegate this year at the thirty-third annual session of the conference, and also acting as the United States member of the Resolutions Committee.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. It is with genuine satisfaction that I am able to record my Government's general support of the principles enunciated in Mr. Roberts' resolution. There is no subject to which we attach greater importance. This will be borne out, I think, by an examination of our record.

The policy of the United States Government is clearly expressed in the Employment Act enacted in 1946 which, in part, reads as follows:

"That it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free, competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions upon which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

This act further requires the President to include in his economic reports statements of "the level of employment, production, and purchasing power needed to carry out the policies declared in section 2," quoted above. The expression "full employment" has not been used in this legislation but for all practical purposes there is no difference between "maximum" employment as we use the term and "full" employment as it is intended in this resolution. This is confirmed by the President's economic reports where allowable unemployment is defined in quantitive terms as the minimum necessary to provide sufficient fluidity in our free labor force to meet the requirements of our expanding American economy and to enable workers to move freely from job to job.

We could, of course, abolish unemployment. Any country could, if it chose to, use dictatorial powers which would deprive the workers of freedom of choice, and which would prevent the development of a free, highly productive, and dynamic economy. But we feel that a highly productive economy which provides freedom of choice to the individual worker can be achieved only if it is, at the same time, a free and a dynamic one.

This does not mean that we are not sensitive to the dangers of large-scale unemployment. We are, and as our record indicates, we have taken active steps to deal with the problem—many steps, in fact, which are contained in Mr. Roberts' resolution. Our system of employment offices, unemployment insurance, old-age pensions, and other social-security benefits are examples. Our regular and very carefully prepared employment and economic information services, our minimum-wage and maximum-hour legislation, our farm-price supports, a tax system which works in the direction of better income distribution, and the work of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, are other examples, to mention only a few of the things we are doing.

I cannot, however, refrain from saying that while we recognize its importance, we cannot foresee in the United States any substantial unemployment—certainly we do not foresee any repetition of the 1930's. We did have, as you all know, postwar unemployment which resulted from the reconversion of our economy back to a peacetime basis. But this adjustment has taken place, and I am happy to report that during the past year employment has shown marked and continued improvement. Our Bureau of Census report for May indicated 59,731,000 persons in civilian jobs—the largest since last summer.

The success of the measures we have taken to deal with unemployment is indicated by the fact that consumer expenditures were maintained at high levels throughout the recession in employment and reached an all-time high during the first quarter of this year. One of the major explanations lies in the confidence of wage earners that their wages would not be cut. Collective-bargaining contracts and minimum-wage laws served as effective safeguards.

As I remarked at the outset, my Government agrees in general with Mr. Roberts' resolution. I should like, however, to acquaint you with a few principles to which my Government is committed in this connection—principles from which will flow our specific suggestions for amendment of certain sections of the resolution under discussion.

In the first place we strongly believe that domestic measures are necessarily the principal means of maintaining high levels of employment, and that the chief contribution of international organizations in this connection is to facilitate the adoption and consistent application of such domestic policies.

Second, we feel that the achievement of full employment involves more than the formulation of a series of new specific employment policies; it is rather the adoption and management of a country's ordinary and continuing programs to which we must look for economic stability and full employment. We would maintain, for example, that a sound and well-administered progressive tax system is an integral and indispensable part of a full-employment program. We believe, in other words, that more reliance should be placed upon ordinary Government measures in the time of relative prosperity to maintain it, than upon measures, necessary as they are, to relieve unemployment after it occurs.

In the third place, our Government stands committed to the principle that full employment is not a responsibility of the Federal Government alone, but is also the responsibility of management and labor groups. As a matter of fact, in our free competitive system, we place major emphasis upon the role which must be played by these nongovernmental groups to assure continuously expanding employment opportunities. We place principal reliance, for example, upon private financial markets for expanded international investment. Likewise we look to the bargaining strength of labor organizations, rather than to Government action, to keep wages and purchasing power at a level which will assure continuing consumer demand.

In our Federal system, moreover, no full employment program can be assured without the full cooperation of State and local governments.

Finally, my Government is firmly committed to the principle of the interdependence of nations. We wholeheartedly believe that economic stability and full employment can be assured only if there is full and free consultation and exchange of ideas between governments directly and through international organizations. We hope that we may be able to share our own experience. We are eager to learn from the experience of others.

As I indicated before, these are the guiding principles upon which we may make specific suggestions as the discussion gets under way. Within these limits you may be sure that our delegation will do its very best to forward the high aims of this resolution.

The Hoover Commission Recommendations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 10 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast by my colleague, the junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], on July 9, 1950, regarding the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and other matters before Congress.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the battle of the appropriations that is now going on in the Senate, the Federal agencies have brought up some big threats in an attempt to counter the appropriation cuts that were made in the House. One of these countermoves is the plan to adopt a new "pay-for-services-rendered" policy. Some agencies already charge fees for such services rendered to the public. They now threaten to hike those fees. Other agencies threaten to collect fees from business for services which are now free.

For instance, the Department of Agriculture would charge for the meat packing and other food-examining programs it now renders free of charge to the meat and food processors. The Bureau of Mines would charge mine owners for the Federal safety inspections that are made. The Federal Communications Commission would charge radio and television stations for the licenses that it grants to them. The Mediation and Conciliation Service would charge fees for the services of its arbitrators in wage disputes. The Interstate Commerce Commission would charge the railroads and other carriers for the hearings that it holds in their interests—especially the rate increase hearings. In like manner the Civil Aeronautics Administration would charge fees to the airlines.

Congress is girded for this move in the definite feeling that the Federal agencies don't have the authority to put such a fee system in effect. Congress will oppose it. Yet it does have some aspects of a pay-as-you-go plan which seems to appeal to economy advocates today. Such a plan has been proposed for the social-security system.

I have had quite a few letters complaining that Congress has not adopted all of the Hoover Commission recommendations by this time. These letters show an impatience which is not justified. Already more than one-third of all of the Hoover Commission recommendations are now in effect. That is pretty impressive when you realize that everyone is for reorganization except in the case that reorganization touches them. The typical letter that I get on the Hoover Commission recommendations and legislation based on those recommendations states that the writer is opposed to a certain reorganization plan and wants me to vote against it because it affects him and in the very next sentence writes that he is for everything else on reorganization.

Now if we operate in Congress on the basis that nothing should be enacted except that to which there was no opposition, we would pass very little legislation and accomplish very little for the people. We would be stymied just as the United Nations has too often been stymied by Russia's exercise of her veto power.

The record of Congress this year merits commendation from the Hoover Commission supporters. Of the 21 reorganization plans President Truman submitted last March, 16 have become law. Only 5 plans were defeated and 1 of those plans had no relation whatsoever to the Hoover Commission recommendations. In other words, in this particular series the Hoover Commission advocates can well give Congress a mark of 80 percent on recommended reorganization. That's enough to win the pennant in any league.

There is mounting opposition to the reciprocal trade program in Washington and that opposition is reported to have caused some concern to President Truman. Recently when he entertained the Democratic Governors in Washington they told him in no uncertain terms that the reciprocal-trade program to encourage foreign trade had become a political issue loaded with dynamite.

Foreign competition under this program is beginning to produce unemployment. Here in Maine we have felt that result in some of our industries, especially the textile industry. The effect is spreading westward across the country to coal, glass, and pottery industries.

Sensing that it is a good campaign issue, the Republicans have seized upon it as the basis for a "full dinner pail—save the workingman's job" campaign this year. The problem for President Truman and the Democratic Governors is how are they to meet this political hot potato.

There are three principal proposals now before the President. One is to make loans to allow industries affected to go through a transition of changing over to lines that are not so affected by foreign competition. Some observers would, with justification, call that economic appeasement. Another proposal is the oft-repeated subsidy—this time restricted to strategic industries. That is a dodge at best. The third proposal is special unemployment benefits for workers made jobless by foreign competition. This seems to have the best chance of the three of adoption.

Representative ROBERT HALE can well be proud of his record on advocating greater aid and attention to Korea. He went to the President many months ago and warned him about the vulnerability of Korea. BOB HALE'S predictions have been borne out by recent events. It is an example of the manner in which he thinks ahead.

BOB HALE talks very little about what he does. This modesty keeps many of you people in Maine from knowing about the conscientious and effective service that he is giving you in Congress. Because he is so sound in his judgment—because his colleagues have found him to be so reliable—he has gained a stature in the House of Representatives that is widely acknowledged in Washington. The people in Maine should know more about it, and I want to take this opportunity to mention it.

Recently the Washington Times-Herald gave me a very high compliment, by coupling me with Bob Hale and stated in effect that our political records and thinking were very similar.

As you may know, I have been advocating a Passamaquoddy tidal power project for some time now. I introduced a bill in the Eightieth Congress for an authorization of such a project. I reintroduced that bill in the Eighty-first Congress. The introduction of those bills, at the request of the Washington County Chamber of Commerce, together with the vigorous and imaginative efforts of the Washington County Chamber of Commerce and the efforts of the entire Maine congressional delegation led to action by the International Joint Commission on this matter. Because the Commission initiated a study of the Quoddy proposal following the introduction of my bill, I did not push for the immediate passage of my bill. The preliminary study has been completed and we are now awaiting the final report and recommendation of the Commission on whether the big over-all study should be made.

Now there are some disturbing rumors that have been going the rounds in Washington to the effect that one of the American members of the International Joint Commission will recommend against Quoddy. There is no question in my mind but that Chairman A. O. Stanley of the Commission, and former Senator from Kentucky, will vote for the big over-all study and for Quoddy. At present he is our best hope for the Commission's approval of Quoddy.

There was an incident last fall that I immediately thought of when I heard this disturbing rumor about Quoddy. A Maine representative of one of the labor organizations, while reporting into his Washington headquarters, called my office and stated that his group had been authorized by the Democratic National Committee to say that if either of the Maine Senators voted against the confirmation of Leland Olds to be a member of the Federal Power Commission the Democratic administration would kill the Passamaquoddy tidal power project through one of the international joint commissioners whom he named. The caller went on to say that if MARGARET CHASE SMITH voted against Mr. Olds the caller's labor organization would expose MARGARET CHASE SMITH from one end of the State to the other as being completely insincere about Quoddy.

Subsequently I called the caller's boss and told him that I would not take such threats and that I would defy the threat and vote against the confirmation of Mr. Olds. I could not believe that the threat was based on facts. My assistant called the international joint commissioner mentioned by the caller and reported the conversation. The international joint commissioner denied that as far as he was concerned there was any truth in the threat. With this I dismissed the threat as being without any basis.

But this recent disturbing rumor of opposition, together with the editorial attacks of a paper outside of Maine, but which has circulation throughout the State, on me questioning my sincerity on Quoddy—the rumor and the editorial attacks strikingly bear out the labor organization's threat of last fall.

I have talked with President Truman several times about Quoddy and each time he has assured me he was for Quoddy. This past Wednesday I again talked to President Truman personally about the rumor that Quoddy would be killed by the negative vote of one American member of the International Joint Commission and told him of last fall's threat against me and of how developments were shaping up to indicate that that threat was being carried out. The President again assured me that he was a strong supporter of Quoddy and that he would continue to support the Quoddy proposal and expressed his belief that the threat of last fall was without foundation. I told him that I thought that last fall and until recently when developments began to shape up indicating that the threat was being carried out. I sincerely hope that my talk with the President will result in favorable action for Quoddy.

However, if it doesn't, I shall renew my fight for Quoddy in the Eighty-second Congress. It will be more difficult to get favorable action on Quoddy in Congress without the support of the Democratic administration simply because the Democrats control the Congress as well as the White House. That is why I have been willing to proceed thus far the International Joint Commission route rather than the route in Congress. But if Quoddy is killed by the Democratic administration in accordance with the threat that I received last fall, I shall renew my fight for Quoddy in the Senate at the beginning of the new Eighty-second Congress next year.

Investigation of Organized Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 10 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to offer for insertion in the RECORD a splendid radio broadcast by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. In his speech, which is widely circulated throughout the State of Pennsylvania, is a very forceful discussion of the newly organized

Senate Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce. The thought-provoking presentation of this pressing problem by the Senator from Pennsylvania is certainly worthy of being called to the attention of all conscientious and law-abiding Americans.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

My fellow Pennsylvanians, this is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's capital, and bringing you another discussion of Happenings in Washington.

One of the most important developments in this session of Congress was the decision to investigate organized crime in the United States.

The investigation is now under way. It is being conducted by a special committee of the Senate headed by Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee.

Of course the average citizen has no direct contact with the criminal element which is engaged in various types of law breaking.

He may be aware that in his community there is a certain amount of horse race betting, that the numbers lotteries are operating and that slot machines can be found in some clubs and other places.

But in most cases he is not too much disturbed about that situation. It seems small and does not appear to be seriously harmful to law and order.

But the senatorial investigation has already revealed that those who control the gambling activities in our cities and towns are part of a highly organized Nation-wide system which is big business, really big business.

It is looking into many shocking outbreaks of lawlessness, including murder, which clearly point to an unholy alliance between the gangster kings and unprincipled politicians.

If the average American were asked to name the largest private business in the United States, he would probably suggest some corporation such as United States Steel, General Motors, or American Telephone & Telegraph.

Yet figures now being brought to light disclose that the take of organized crime comprises the biggest private gross receipts in the Nation.

It has become second in size only to the annual tax receipts of the Federal Government. It is greater than the Federal revenues were as recently as the prewar years.

In other words, organized crime has become a terribly menacing problem which calls for the attention of all our people.

Let me give you another example of the size of this still growing menace.

In the year 1949, the 48 State governments spent more money than ever before in their history. Including bonus payments to World War II veterans, public assistance and debt retirement, the 48 States spent a total of about $11,800,000,000. That was an all-time high.

It was a record breaking figure.

But recently on the floor of the United States Senate, some figures were quoted to show how much big time gambling alone takes out of the pockets of our citizens each year. The various estimates—from authoritative crime investigation sources—ran from a low of $11,000,000,000 to a high of $21,000,000,000 a year.

Think of that, my fellow Pennsylvanians. In a single year more money goes into illegal, corrupt rackets than the 48 States of the Union spent for Government in the record-breaking year of 1949. And the highest estimate placed the figure at nearly twice what the States spent.

I am confident that when the Senate investigating committee has completed its task, the people of our country will know a lot more about this monstrous thing which has been flourishing like an evil parasite, weakening the moral stamina of our people and corrupting many public officials, sworn to support and enforce the law.

But it isn't necessary for good, decent Americans to wait until the committee reports to Congress next February. All should begin giving this matter attention now, and helping to combat it.

You will notice that the investigation is to cover all organized crime, not merely gambling alone, although the figures I quoted cover only gambling.

For example, organized crime in this country includes such things as narcotics, illegal loan shark rackets, the white slave traffic, swindling schemes, organized murder, the extortion rackets which prey upon legitimate business and legitimate labor unions, and other criminal activities which reach across State lines.

In order to understand the magnitude of organized crime in the United States, it would be necessary to add the income from these other activities I have just mentioned to the receipts of illegal gambling.

So you can begin to get some idea of this vicious thing that is growing like a cancer upon the body of the American Nation.

Organized crime is directed and operated by interstate syndicates who have their rackets under tight control. Like sovereign nations they divide up the country into exclusive territories. They are careful not to overstep their district bounds for fear of setting off a bloody gang war.

The syndicates are largely controlled by the former bootleggers of the prohibition days, who find this far more profitable.

Because the racket syndicates operate on a Nation-wide scale the situation has become a national problem. But essentially it is a local problem. It reaches into every city and every town and into many rural sections.

It is as plain as black and white that organized crime cannot operate without the connivance of many local law-enforcement officers and other local officials.

For example, consider slot machines. The estimates are that the racketeers of organized crime gross as much as $3,000,00,000 a year from slot machines.

Now, you can't hide a slot machine under a postage stamp. It does its operators no good unless it is placed where many people have access to it, so that they will feed their coins into it.

So, undoubtedly, in every State, in every county, and in every town, there are plenty of otherwise law-abiding citizens who know where the slot machines are located. And the local enforcement officers must know, too.

What is more, owners of gaming machines must pay a license tax to the Federal Bureau of Internal Revenue on each machine. So there is a record of who owns them and how many he has, and where they are. Yet, thousands upon thousands of them are in illegal operation in this Nation, drawing up to $3,000,000,000 a year into the pockets of the crime syndicates and their political allies.

Local governments can stamp out these rackets if they wish.

In many case corrupt officials don't wish to halt the rackets. In other instances, there are officials who fear to do so.

They are afraid of the growing political power of the organized crime syndicates. In some places they have built up such powerful political strength that they are virtual dictators in city halls and courthouses.

Just a few months ago, the executive director of the American Municipal Association, an organization of city governments, wrote to the Attorney General of the United States seeking Federal assistance against the growing political power of organized crime.

In his letter, he wrote—and I quote:

"From the experience of several mayors of our member cities there has recently emerged the necessity of dealing with organized crime on a national scale.

"The matter is important because it appears that crime syndicates are making an effort to control local politics in those municipalities where the public officials are most opposed to organized crime in all its aspects.

"In some cases the mayors are threatened with recall, and in other cases it appears there is active political pressure prior to election.

"In any case the matter is too great to be handled by local officials alone, since the organized criminal element operates on a national scale across State boundaries."

There, my fellow Pennsylvanians, is a terrible, vicious situation that is threatening the American form of government.

Just think of it.

Organized crime, with its annual income somewhere between twelve and twenty-two billion dollars a year, is pouring some of these billions into the corruption of local police officials and even entire local governments.

Organized crime is pouring its billions into municipal elections.

It is buying up votes and politicians, electing mayors and town councils.

It is strong enough to defy mayors who dare to do their honest duty of stamping out the criminal rackets.

These are cold, stark, ugly facts, reflecting conditions which must be exposed to public view so that the dangers can be clearly understood.

The statement by the mayors of American cities is a warning of what is happening and a forecast of much worse that can happen if we do not rally now in the cause of decent government.

Public opinion must be aroused to the importance of the fight.

Largely our people have lived sheltered lives, away from criminal elements and without being aware of the viciousness of organized crime and racketeering.

An aroused public can smash the syndicates which are moving in on some of our local governments, corrupting and controlling them.

We have come a long way since the days of 20 years ago when there was public glorification of criminals, when the movies glamorized the bootlegger and the racketeer.

Today most of that is gone. But today, unfortunately, there is so much indifference on the part of the public.

Unless the moral forces of our communities arouse themselves to crush the rackets wherever they exist there can be no hope of honest, decent government.

We cannot have good government unless we elect to public office courageous men of outstanding ability, upright character, and unquestioned integrity, who are devoted to civic betterment and the public welfare.

Victory over the racketeers can be won only if every right-thinking, law-abiding citizen takes an interest in government. And that means taking an active part in political affairs.

Looking back to the election of 1948, when we were electing a President of the United States, a new House of Representatives, and one-third of the United States Senate, the record shows that 49 percent of the eligible voters in the Nation did not go to the polls.

One sample analysis showed that among the list of delinquent citizens were 33 percent of all clergymen, 37 percent of the automobile dealers, 37 percent of the independent grocers, 20 percent of the doctors, 27 percent of the independent druggists, and 25 percent of the members of the chambers of commerce.

Only through the ballot box can we rebuild confidence in our form of government and erect a structure of morality that will bar the racketeer and the chiseler.

The people must go to the polls in full number to elect fearless and honest local officials. And they must back up such officials to the limit.

On the other hand, the police and other public officials must make the citizens understand that they must be part of any move for clean, racket-free, conditions in the community.

I think there is no doubt that no community can ever secure effective law enforcement unless the community really demands such enforcement. And only in a community where the elected officials and the public are working hand-in-hand can such a demand be made and carried out successfully.

Finally today's situation demands full support from the moral leaders of communities, the clergy, the businessmen, the professional groups, organized labor. All must be active leaders in the battle against organized crime and in support of honest, graft-free government.

This is ED MARTIN speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

More Voice From United Nations Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, Raymond McConnell, Jr., editor of the Nebraska State Journal, is the winner of the Pulitzer Prize. His editorials on international affairs have attracted much attention. His recent one regarding the United Nations and the real objectives of UNESCO is of vital importance now that we are leading the fight for the United Nations countries in Korea. I include it in my remarks for the information of the membership of Congress and the country generally:

Men were talking last week in Washington of strengthening the Voice of America. They were talking of organizing a vast American "truth campaign" to offset the Russian propaganda drive by which, with imponderable success yet with determination and skill, the Communists were hitting hard, wherever they could be heard, on the theme of "imperialist United States aggression" victimizing peace-loving North Korea.

There had been revived in Congress a long-dormant resolution by Senator BENTON and 16 other Senators, calling for an expansion, in every field, of American information abroad, in support of this country's action in Korea and of its democratic purposes everywhere.

A TRUTH OFFENSIVE

The testimony was impressive and unanimous. John Foster Dulles asserted that upon the effectiveness of our propaganda against that of the Russians may hang the question of war or peace in the next few months. General Marshall called for a more dynamic program to meet the Russian assault on men's minds. Secretary Acheson, pointing out that just as totalitarian states by their nature are equipped to suppress the truth, so the free nations are equipped by their nature to discover and disseminate it, said that these great resources implicit in democratic life must be utilized to the fullest.

"The truth can almost be classified as our T-bomb in this war," said General Eisenhower, who proposed that some great American be called on to head up a new nonpartisan United States department charged with carrying on an ideological warfare on the broadest possible world front.

These gentlemen were merely applying to the present situation what Jesus had said long ago, "And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

But they were overlooking, every one of them, the greatest opportunity of all for applying that great principle. They were overlooking, at a time when daring and imagination are called for, the daring and imaginative way to strengthen the cause of freedom and peace.

There was nothing the statesmen were urging upon the United States that could not be undertaken better, more convincingly to the peoples of the world, and on a broader world front, by the United Nations itself.

There is a branch of the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) whose constitution declares:

"That since wars begin in the minds of men it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed.

"That ignorance of each other's ways and lives has been a common cause, throughout the history of mankind, of that suspicion and mistrust between the peoples of the world through which their differences have all too often broken into war.

"That the great and terrible war which has now ended was a war made possible by the denial of the democratic principles of the dignity, equality, and mutual respect of men and by the propagation in their place, through ignorance and prejudice, of the doctrine of the inequality of men and races.

"That the wide diffusion of culture and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace are indispensable to the dignity of man and constitute a sacred duty which all the nations must fulfill in a spirit of mutual assistance and concern.

"That a peace based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of governments would not be a peace which could secure the unanimous, lasting, and sincere support of the peoples of the world, and that the peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind."

For these reasons, the nations, in UNESCO, dedicated themselves to the "unrestricted pursuit of objective truth and the free exchange of ideas and knowledge." They set up, in UNESCO, a mass communications section, charged with bringing to the peoples of the world, through mass media of press, radio, and films, and in as dramatic a fashion as possible, the message of peace and cooperation.

There never has been a Communist veto power in UNESCO. Despite this, its activities so far have been timid, looking to the long dim future. The resources at its disposal have been limited to the extreme. Its exponents have cut out for it an unrealistic, academic role, laying undue stress on the idea that wars begin in the minds of man and forgetting that it is not in the minds of people generally that wars begin, but in the minds of a ruthless, ambitious, unscrupulous, tyrannical, powerful few. Misjudging thus the facts of aggression, UNESCO has neglected largely its role of constructing the defenses of peace, which can only mean the defenses against totalitarian aggression in the minds of men.

Now is the time for UNESCO to be recast in its rightful role.

Now is the time for a voice, not of America alone, but of the United Nations.

The strength of President Truman's action ordering American forces to the defense of South Korea was that it was undertaken in the name of the United Nations and in its behalf. This fact, more than any other, accounts for the quick and universally approving response it won from Americans and the world's free peoples. In line with it, the Security Council's action authorizing MacArthur as the UN commander of international forces under the blue and white flag, symbolizes the true, underlying nature of the conflict and flings the lie at Russia's propaganda.

Can we afford, on the ideological front, to fit our strategy to a narrower mold than that by which troops were ordered into battle?

Must we not, rather, meet Russia's propaganda on a level higher than that of mere national counterpropaganda which, by its very nature and origin, would tend to confirm the Communist lie that this is America's battle alone?

Let us be as bold and imaginative in the cause of truth as in lesser things. The UN Security Council, at our request, met in emergency session to issue its military orders. Let us ask for an emergency session, under UN auspices, of the free world's best brains, to outline an all-out UN truth offensive aimed at counteracting the ignorance and prejudice that makes possible, in the words of UNESCO's Charter, "the denial of the democratic principles of the dignity, equality, and mutual respect of men." Let Congress pledge all possible United States resources in support of such an offensive, putting the T-bomb in a supervehicle that can deliver it most effectively.

Only when we have done that can we truthfully say that we have utilized to the fullest, as Secretary Acheson, backed by Marshall, Eisenhower and Dulles urged, the great resources of the free nations.

RAYMOND A. MCCONNELL, Jr.

Earl C. Michener

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, EARL C. MICHENER will, at the end of this Congress, have served in the House of Representatives for 15 terms.

Curiously, the first man that I met when I came to Congress was EARL MICHENER. I met him in the House restaurant by introducing myself to him. We had a long conversation and Mr. MICHENER told me a great many interesting and useful things about the House of Representatives. From that day to this, we have been friends and to say that I hate to see him leave the House of Representatives is putting it mildly.

The length of Mr. MICHENER's service is not the main indication of his usefulness. From many contacts and numerous discussions with him I have come to know that he is a very statesman-like Representative. He has the knowledge, the judgment and the balance to be a wonderful Member of Congress, which his record has amply displayed.

While Mr. MICHENER is a good party man, he looks at each measure—not only from the party viewpoint—but from the broader viewpoint of the effect of the proposed bill on the public welfare. In other words, he is statesman in his conduct as a Representative in Congress. His keen and penetrating mind can ferret

out the flaws or the hidden effects of any proposal. He is a wonderful man to be able to go and talk to about controversial public issues on which we are frequently called to pass judgment. He does not try to give any dogmatic answers to inquiries regarding any particular proposal, but he analyzes it carefully and tries to help one understand the true effect of any proposed bill and whether or not it will really accomplish what the authors and the rabid partisans claim for it.

Many times I have had the privilege of talking to Mr. MICHENER, and one need not give him any notice but simply walk into his office to discuss such matters with him. From a selfish standpoint I am sorry Mr. MICHENER is leaving as it will terminate the opportunity I have had for 8 years to talk to him frankly and freely on any matter whether public or personal and get frank and helpful information and answers to my questions.

EARL MICHENER takes a great delight in helping new Members of Congress. He is friendly, he is thoughtful, he is generous and he wants all of us to succeed so far as it may be in his power to do so. In the larger sense it is unfortunate that a man with his vast experience and his good judgment should find it necessary to terminate his service in the House. I have never heard anyone say an unkind word about Mr. MICHENER. I know from personal contacts that he is universally admired by the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle. However, each man must solve his own personal problems and since he feels that he must leave for family reasons, one has no right to complain.

I wish we had many more MICHENERS in Congress. They are the kind that develop sound public policies that are for the public interest and that truly reflect the aspirations and ambitions of the Members of the House of Representatives.

We wish for him happiness and good health for a long time. I personally hope that he will find something of interest to occupy his time. He has worked hard and faithfully during his entire career and without some serious work to do he might be lost. As long as I live I will have very pleasant memories of EARL C. MICHENER.

Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, there is everywhere evidence of a gathering storm. There is evidence in the Korean action of a pending global explosion. The action in Korea may be but a preliminary one, but it is an alarm bell giving us warning that this is no time to drag our feet.

It is time for unity. Many people in the country feel the President has declared a war without the consent of Congress. He calls it a police action; but certainly when men get killed and we prepare for full-scale war, then it can hardly fall into a category of a mere police action. The Constitution provides that the Congress must declare war. In my opinion, the President, even though he may have acted hastily, has the support of the great majority of the American people. In that support we should clear the decks and get ready for action. The Congress should know about our military production and preparedness. We should revalue and reexamine the needs for a 70-group Air Force with more production of submarines, A-bombs, and other technical instruments of war. Me must be ready to meet any avalanche of force which may be turned upon us by Russia. The President should no longer deny Congress their desire for a 70-group Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, we must deal in cold, hard facts and quit dreaming about what we hope might happen. We cannot continue to do business as usual with the world on fire. There are many difficult and grave questions confronting the Nation. It is high time that Congress and the people have full access to information needed for a sound understanding of the problems the people we represent must face. The trend of events everywhere indicates that we are not moving fast enough. It is time we get into high gear. It is possible that this gathering storm may break into atomic fury at any time. The handwriting seems to be on the wall. The events in Korea bring it into a sharper focus. Our reversals in Korea indicate that we are up against trained military men who are well equipped.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to know that General MacArthur will have full command under the United Nations command in the Far East area. This should have been done long before. He must be supplied with everything he needs. The job in Korea is to unite it, not at the thirty-eighth parallel, but all of it under the Free Republic of Korea. The secret arrangements of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman with Russia cannot be recognized as a legal act. It will be necessary to retrace our steps and undo the damage which was done at Yalta and Potsdam, and in other secret agreements.

I have no doubt but what we, in the end, will win. The events are shaping up rapidly. This Korean thrust may be the first of a number of aggressions around the world; and if so, world war III has arrived. The free world will continue to live in an increasingly hostile and perilous time. We must be prepared to mobilize all our resources to meet the impending danger.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we ought to halt at once all of the socialistic programs. We ought to halt socialized housing, slum clearance, the socialistic point 4 program and all aid under the Marshall plan except those who have proven to be friends which will be of a military nature. We should stop efforts to adopt socialized medicine and the controversial Brannan farm plan. We should reexamine every item of Federal spending which is not channeled into the military sphere. If the third war develops, we ought to stop all aid to the States, abolish the 40-hour week, freeze profits, wages, and materials of every nature. A total mobilization plan will be needed for all manpower. I know this is the method of a dictator. I dislike it very much; but when war comes, such steps are necessary. If we clear the decks for action, there should no longer be strikes and stoppages of works and bickering over wages. The next war will be one of survival of the human race. We cannot afford to drag our feet at this time and not be prepared for the worst.

Mr. Speaker, as we look back on "why" the Korean crisis and war, we must weigh the reasons. Those individuals in the State Department who have been responsible for the far eastern policy should be removed from office at once. It has been their policy in the past that has caused this disunity and war. Mr. Acheson and his coherents split the unity at the top. There has been gross incompetency on the part of Mr. Acheson and his advisers. Their conduct of foreign policy in peacetime reveals their liability in wartime. They never did comprehend the nature of communism nor the implication of the Kremlin policy. Mr. Acheson and his group have been reversed by the President and the military forces. Mr. Acheson in his right-about-face in the crisis of the Far East gives it as his idea in the beginning. This, of course, is not true and should offend the intelligence of every Member of Congress as well as the American people. The Secretary of State's record of failures in foreign policy should disbar him from service in this national emergency.

It would seem, also, Mr. Speaker, that all of our trade relations with the countries behind the iron curtain should be carefully reexamined. Why should this country be sending huge amounts of oil, minerals, and other war materials to countries who may soon be our enemies?

Mr. Speaker, the use of a large number of foreign agents in our diplomatic offices of the world should be reexamined. It is my understanding that some 12,000 foreigners now serve our embassy throughout the world. Some of them are known Communists. Surely we have enough loyal, red-blooded Americans to fill these positions of trust without resorting to the use of individuals whose loyalty can be questioned. Security regulations should be tightened in this country. The FBI tells us there are about 54,000 known Communists in America. Their aim is to overthrow our form of Government. There is an additional 4,000 who have been cited for deportation. Yet these people are permitted to roam our country at will and spew their venom of hate for all to see and hear. It is time these individuals were rounded up, placed in jail, or deported to the country of their origin.

In my opinion it is also time for every large city and industrial area in the United States to develop a civilian defense authority which will be able to handle any emergency which may develop. We must set and gear our thinking to the tempo and seriousness of the times.

Crop Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 10 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very interesting editorial entitled "The Wrong Way To Apply Crop Controls," which appeared in the July issue of Country Gentleman, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is well worth reading and preserving for future reference.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WRONG WAY TO APPLY CROP CONTROLS

The present method of allotting corn acreage under the crop-control program has too many things wrong with it and will have to be changed.

Widespread complaint has been aroused in the Corn Belt by the way the allotments were made this year. The dissastifaction centers around several issues. As farmers see them, these are:

The present crop-history method of determining allotments, with all farmers taking the same flat percentage cut across the board, is both unfair and unsound. It penalizes the farmers who have been following good rotation and soil-conservation practices and favors those who have been "corning" their land hard.

It directly conflicts with other farm programs, such as those sponsored by the Soil Conservation and Extension Services.

As now administered, it is not a farmer-directed program at all but one imposed by Washington and carried out by the State PMA officials.

The feeling toward these phases of the crop-control program is strongly evidenced in Piatt County, Ill., where some 275 farmers appealed their corn allotments. They were not opposing the control program itself, but the way the allotments were apportioned. And they had something definite on which to base their protests. Taking the exhortations for a grass-roots program seriously, Piatt County farmers some time back had worked out such a program with the help of University of Illinois agricultural specialists. Their idea stressed good land use and confined benefits to those farmers who were following a definite plan along that line. It also called for considerable local responsibility.

A well-formulated program, stressing such features, was presented by Piatt County farmers and those of six other counties comprising the east central Illinois Land Use Council to PMA and other Government officials last fall. They were encouraged to believe some of these proposals would be adopted. The next thing they heard was that the 1950 farm program was already set, and it was too late to do anything about it.

The program, as it was put into effect, virtually ignored the matter of good land use. It fell hardest, in fact, on those farmers who had been giving their land the best care. The J. P. Kratz farm holding in Piatt County is an example. It consists of 1,547 acres, but it is no newly accumulated big-farm operation. The forebears of the elder Mr. Kratz, now 71, set up the original farm of 1,347 acres way back in 1847, and the remaining 200 acres were added in 1890. It is managed by a son, a veteran of the South Pacific, and there would be more sharers in it but two other sons have died, one a war casualty.

Ever since the local soil-conservation district was organized in 1942, the Kratz land has been included in it and operated in compliance with an SCS plan. Out of the 1,547 acres 1,535 are tillable. Under the soil-conservation plan only 20 to 25 percent of the tillable land was in corn, and the Kratzes would have liked to continue on that moderate basis. They received an allotment of 230 acres, which they finally got raised to 273 acres. That amounts to about 17 percent of their tillable land. The average for the county is 31 percent.

Other Piatt County farmers who have been following soil-conserving practices suffered the same penalties. They took a percentage cut, based on their past 3-year corn-growing history, regardless of the fact that they had not been the ones contributing to the corn surplus.

It is their contention that the crop-history method of determining allotments is illegal under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which is still the basic law. The 1938 AAA statute says: "The acreage allotment to the county for corn shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the local committees, among the farms within the county on the basis of tillable acreage, crop-rotation practices, type of soil and history."

When Piatt County farmers tried to get allotments apportioned on something like this basis, they were told by the State PMA that it was "impractical, won't work and besides you can't get compliance."

An apparent reason why the crop-history percentage method is favored by Washington was revealed in a letter by a top PMA official, which contains the remarkable statement: "It should be noted that with such an approach (The PMA's allocation of a fixed percentage of the cropland on each farm) farm allotments can be determined very quickly at the State or Washington level by the use of an IBM or similar type of calculating machine. County and community committee determinations would be eliminated."

If that statement means what it says, bureaucratic convenience comes ahead of the needs and conditions on the individual farm. And with the elimination of county and community committee determinations, just about the last wisp of local farmer influence would be gone.

This influence doesn't amount to much now. As one Piatt County farmer said: "When we had our county committee in, it was the fieldman from the State office who did all the talking—told us what we could and what we couldn't do."

What has happened in Piatt County stands out only because more farmers there have made protests and carried them further. The county is the scene of one of the Lincoln-Douglas debates. Some of the spirit which entered into the declaration that "a nation half free and half slave cannot stand" finds an echo in the present controversy.

The dissatisfaction there is typical, though, and can be found in virtually every corn belt county. It raises questions that will have to be settled right if acreage controls are to work satisfactorily, whether under the present program or any other plan.

One of the most glaring defects is the conflict with other farm programs that is created by the crop-history allotment method. It works against the efforts of the Soil Conservation Service and the teachings of the Agricultural Extension Services. Moreover, the PMA is in conflict with itself, its own ACP program being intended to encourage conservation practices.

Any farm program that can be justified should promote good farming and be in the public interest. The biggest interest the public has in a farm program is the insurance of its future food supply through the conservation of our basic soil resources. The PMA should get back to the principles of the 1938 act and put a premium on good land use. It will then have a means of getting at those who are really causing the surpluses.

The pretense that this is a program conducted by farmer-elected committeemen is a joke. A way must be found to make it actually a program of farmers, by farmers, and for farmers. This means a large shift of authority and responsibility to local people in determining how the program is to be applied. They know what is sound and right for their locality a lot better than Washington.

When they have that sort of program, there will be more farmer interest and a bigger vote at the local PMA committee elections. The prevailing vote of 10 percent or less in many areas reflects the farmers' feeling of "what's the use?" It has resulted in a perpetuation of the same PMA committeemen and officials until the job has become a career with many of them. With more local responsibility there would probably be fewer appeals from acreage allotments and certainly more faith in the justice of the appeal procedure.

It is distinctly up to Secretary Brannan to bring the various farm policies—PMA, Soil Conservation, and Extension—into order so that they will mean the same thing. The present situation was aptly described by a Piatt County farmer, who said, "This whole thing is so crazily wired together we don't know where to begin."

If, as farmers have been told by PMA officials, "Congress intended this for a control and not a good land-use program," then Congress has a job to do in revising the 1949 act so that it makes sense.

A price-support program probably needs crop controls. But they ought to conform to American principles of maximum local responsibility and the long-time interests of agriculture and the Nation.

Hysteria Is No Excuse for Mundt-Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 10 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hysteria Is No Excuse for Mundt-Nixon," which appeared in the Denver Post of July 2.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HYSTERIA IS NO EXCUSE FOR MUNDT-NIXON

The very real feeling that further Soviet aggression and possible war may be just around the corner must cause our Nation to be doubly watchful in all our actions from now on. We must exercise the greatest of care to preserve the peace and to preserve our Nation.

In exercising that care, however, we must no threaten those things which stand at the very core of our Nation and of our people. We must not threaten our personal liberty, and our justice and our freedom.

Not long ago, in the pages of the Cosmopolitan section of the Post, Seth W. Richardson, Chairman of the President's Loyalty

Board in Washington, wrote of the dangers to our civil liberties in case of an atomic war.

Those dangers, he said, are very real. The first reaction of many would be to curtail liberty in the interests of security. They would try to take away our freedom and substitute autocratic rule for our democracy.

Unfortunately, in any war many of our normal freedoms are curtailed anyhow. They are curtailed, too, in a period of national emergency. Our freedoms have not been quite the same since 1941, when the Japanese attacked us at Pearl Harbor, for since that day there has been no real peace for us.

Because this is true, because we believe the best we can hope for in the next few months and years is an uneasy peace, we must not only prepare for war but we must safeguard our liberties at the same time.

One "safeguard" that has been proposed is the Mundt-Nixon bill to control Communist activities in America. We believe that is no safeguard whatsoever. It is a destroyer of liberty, and as such should be defeated by Congress.

There is reason to believe that a superhysterical segment of the Republican party will try to bulldoze this bill through in the aftermath of the first shock of the Korean invasion.

If they do so, other Members of Congress should remember that the Mundt-Nixon bill threatens the liberty of free Americans, not the liberty of Communists. Particularly in a state of emergency, the Communists will go underground. They will have to be rooted out one by one. But under the Mundt-Nixon bill, hysterical men could persecute many Americans who are not subversive and who are not dangerous. The bill is a bad bill and should be defeated no matter what the circumstances.

If the Federal Government does not have adequate power to track down and punish subversives in our country—let it ask for more power, and let the Congress consider what it asks.

Let us not endanger our liberty because of the hysteria of a very few.

Appropriations for the Point 4 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 10 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles—one from the Christian Science Monitor, under date of July 7; and one from the New York Herald Tribune of Saturday, July 8—both dealing with the so-called point 4 program appropriations, which I hope will be increased by the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of July 7, 1950]

MAKING IT POINTLESS

We hope it is only a rumor. It is one of those things that certainly ought not to be so.

But there is a report that the Senate Appropriations Committee has voted to reduce the initial appropriation for the point 4 program from the $35,000,000 Congress authorized to a miserly $10,000,000.

This, for a worldwide program of technical assistance to economically backward countries, would make point 4 practically pointless.

To scuttle one of the few affirmative contributions America can make toward a betterment of world living standards would be the height of crass stupidity and political pettifogging.

The United States is spending nearly $14,500,000,000 a year on its own military budget, plus additional costs for the fighting in Korea and a possible 70-group air force.

It authorized last year more than $1,000,000,000 of arms aid to western Europe. It spent $345,000,000 to help win a civil war in Greece, and since has furnished $375,000,000 worth of arms to that country and Turkey.

How much is the United States willing to spend to help improve the opportunities of world neighbors whose economic level is pathetically and irritatingly lower than its own?

Is it true, as its enemies say, that all America cares about is armed might and exploitation?

No, it is not, and $35,000,000 under present circumstances is small earnest to give of a deeper and more benevolent interest.

The $35,000,000 which both houses of Congress have authorized for this purpose is less than the cost tag on 4 hours of World War II.

That is a small enough effort toward kindling hope in the world.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 8, 1950]

A REVERSIBLE BLUNDER

It is hard to imagine a more damaging blunder than the Senate Appropriations Committee is reported to have made in its treatment of the appropriation for the point 4 program. The committee is said to have slashed $25,000,000 from the previously authorized amount of $35,000,000 earmarked for technical aid to undeveloped countries. If the cut were retained by the committee and approved by Senate and House, this country would not only be reneging on the offer of support made last month to the United Nations program for technical aid; it would be announcing to the world that the American people, although they can weigh properly the actuality of armed aggression, are incapable of developing a constructive program to secure the economic basis of a peaceful world.

Fortunately, the blunder is reversible. The committee may correct its own mistake before reporting to the Senate next week. If it should not, the Senate can reverse the committee by amendment. If the Senate should let the boner slip through, the House could still restore perspective to our foreign policy by refusing to accept the cut.

Assuming that the cut will be canceled, it may still be asked by what reasoning the Senate committee could have allowed it to be entertained in the first place. Perhaps the committee members, impressed by the likelihood of a rise in military expenditures, cast about to save money in an item superficially less important. If this explanation is correct, the blunder is a profound one. Granting, as we must, that a military victory will be won in Korea, the political and economic problems will remain. The social and economic instability in that tortured land is duplicated in equal or lesser degree in undeveloped countries the world over. So long as such conditions endure, world peace will be precarious, world prosperity unattainable, and American security uncertain. American self-interest and humanity combine to dictate a positive policy for the elevation of friendly and neutral states.

The task is a long one. Unless we dedicate ourselves to it, we shall be limited to counting as our allies only those over whom we raise an armed umbrella. They will be dubious allies. Equally important with winning the military victory in Korea is seizing the occasion to serve notice that the United States stands for democratic progress as well as military self-reliance.

The Mundt-Nixon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 10 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Totalitarian Bill," which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 25.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TOTALITARIAN BILL

A little recognized danger of the McCARTHY excitement is that it might induce Congress to pass the Mundt-Nixon bill. That would be a harmful consequence second not even to the damage the Wisconsin Senator's unsupported charges have done to the State Department.

The Mundt-Nixon bill is ostensibly for the registration and supervision of Communists in the United States. But it also provides for the registration of members of organizations blacklisted as subversive by the Attorney General. It contains sections which require no proof of overt act or evil intent. It would set up a Subversive Activities Control Board with indefinite standards for passing judgment on the loyalty of citizens. It would make each day of failure to register a separate offense punishable by a fine up to $5,000 and 5 years in jail.

It is not farfetched to say that this bill, if it became a law, could be used to harass and even to prosecute any nonconforming individual or group. When the bill was ill-advisedly approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator KILGORE, of West Virginia, said:

"It is fundamentally a sedition bill, and in the hands of a prejudiced prosecutor or national administration, can be used against organized labor and in fact against other organizations, whether churches, farm, business, or any of the multitude of legitimate American organizations against which a hostile prosecutor or administration might want to use it."

At the same time, Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, said he questioned the constitutionality of the measure. And Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, declared without qualification of any kind: "This bill seeks to regiment the thinking of the American people and to impair and prevent the free exercise of constitutionally guaranteed freedom of speech and association."

Similar criticisms of the bill are also before the House. In a notable statement prepared for the benefit of the Un-American Activities Committee, Harvard's distinguished legal authority on free speech, Prof. Zechariah Chafee, Jr., said that detestation of dictatorships should keep us from copying the methods of totalitarian rule.

Yet the Mundt-Nixon bill bears committee endorsement and in an unguarded moment

might slip through the Senate. The nomination of the House sponsor, RICHARD M. NIXON, for Republican Senator from California, has revived interest in the lower Chamber.

There is no question as to the menace of communism. There can be no doubt that it is a fifth column, that many Communists will lie and steal and betray.

But what good against spies and saboteurs would be a law which requires Communists to register and to submit to supervision? None at all. The liars will go on lying and the stealers of secrets will go on stealing secrets if we are foolish enough to permit Communists to get their hands on secret documents and plans.

It would be different if we had no laws at all to protect us. But we have a whole series of such statutes. The 1861 conspiracy law punishes conspiracy "to overthrow, put down, or to destroy by force the Government of the United States or to oppose by force the authority thereof, or by force to prevent, hinder or delay the execution of any law of the United States."

As Professor Chafee says, this and other laws were ample protection without the passage of the Smith Sedition Act of 1940. There is cause enough to regard that repressive statute as unconstitutional. If Congress wants to do anything about sedition laws, it had much better be restricting, if not repealing, the dangerous Smith Act rather than passing the still more dangerous Mundt-Nixon bill.

The test is simple. Imagine the Mundt-Nixon bill a law. Then imagine JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY in the White House and conducting a national purge of so-called fellow travelers. How many citizens could count themselves safe from defamation or even destruction?

Campaign of Truth Throughout the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 10 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I have often observed that our labor-union leaders, who have had a long tough fight against Communist infiltration, understand its danger and the threats of totalitarianism to a free society far better than do other groups in our economy. Striking evidence of this war provided by Mr. Stanley H. Ruttenberg, director of research and education, CIO, in his testimony on Friday before the Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, of which the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is chairman, which last week examined my Senate Resolution 243 calling for a campaign of truth throughout the world. I ask unanamous consent that his statement be inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have known Mr. Ruttenberg as a distinguished and highly valued member of the Executive Committee of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, and as a member of United States delegations at UNESCO General Conferences. I am sure no one will contradict me when I say that his clear and incisive testimony made a deep impression on the subcommittee, as did his responses to the constructive questions of the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

In particular I call the attention of the Senate to his important observation: "The Communists gain the support and loyalty of many peoples because they espouse the legitimate aims and aspirations of people." This aspect of Communist propaganda—while at the same time, as Mr. Ruttenberg states, the Communists "camouflage their strict ties to a foreign power"—this aspect is not sufficiently understood by those in our country who have not had the intimate contact with the problems of our leaders of union labor.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

TESTIMONY OF STANLEY H. RUTTENBERG, DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH AND EDUCATION, CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, ON SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 243, BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE.

We appear here today to urge support for the general concept of Senate Resolution No. 243 introduced by Senator BENTON on behalf of himself and a group of other Senators.

We believe that democratic ideals must, can and will win out in this chaotic world of ours. For the third time in less than half a century we stand on the brink of war. Every effort possible must be made to avert another catastrophe. We in CIO have supported the foreign policies of our Government. We have urged strong support for the Marshall plan. We have endorsed the North Atlantic and Military Assistance Pacts. We have recognized the need for the extension of economic aid into the point 4 program. We must not weaken our Military Establishment.

Mr. Philip Murray, in writing to Senator BENTON on April 12 of this year about the Senator's introduction of Senate Resolution No. 243, said: "We cannot weaken our military power or our diplomatic influence but both could be significantly implemented by the suggestions which you (Senator BENTON) make. In a world such as ours we cannot underestimate the necessity for strength. But unfortunately, we have been strengthening only our military power when we should be also strengthening the desire and demand for peace in the minds and loyalties of men."

In those brief few sentences the position of our organization and of the millions of workers and workers' families which we represent is clearly set forth. Mr. Murray stated, "We must strengthen the desire and the demand for peace in the minds and loyalties of men." This we must do.

The totalitarian propaganda of the Communist forces must be counteracted by bringing to peoples the concepts, principles, and development of democracies, the principles of life in the democratic world, the desire of people in the democratic world for peace and security, and their desire to avoid wars and catastrophes.

We know from hard experience in our own organization that the propaganda of the Communists must be counteracted—the Communist infiltration destroyed. They work their way into organizations like weasels. They stop at nothing in presenting their point of view and their ideas to the country. As a most recent example, in the Korean situation, the Communists told the people throughout the world that the South Korean forces, supported by the American imperialists, were responsible for the conflict now in Korea by making unprovoked attacks upon the North Korean forces. This we all know to be sheer propaganda. But do the peoples throughout the world know that that Russian statement is sheer propaganda? I am afraid that we must say that our efforts to tell the world otherwise fail of their ultimate goal. They fail because we are not engaged in a sufficiently extensive program of telling the people the facts in the situation. It is for this reason that we so strongly support the resolution introduced by Senator BENTON. We know how important it is to fight Communist propaganda—propaganda that always spouts, "It is the other fellow's fault and the only way to obtain agreement is to accept our point of view."

I might briefly recite the experience of our organization, the CIO. We have just recently expelled from our ranks some six or eight international unions that have been dominated or controlled by the Communist Party. Prior to the expulsion of these unions we tried for a long time to work with them. We found that when the Communist Party's policies permitted, they were in wholehearted support of democratic trade-unionism. But the moment the party line changed, they were all out with their invidious propaganda. They used their brief periods of agreement in policy to consolidate and strengthen their position to gain followers for the party line. This could not be tolerated. We found it impossible to work with them. The only way to work with the Communists was to accept their point of view. This we never did in CIO. We took steps to expel from our organization these unions that followed the policies of the Communist Party.

We didn't stop there. We realized that the democratic forces had to fight back, had to gain the loyalties of the workers. This realization is too frequently ignored. Many think it is sufficient to avoid dealing or trading with the Communists or sufficient to preclude any type of contact. But this is not so. Once you recognize that the goal of the Communists is to propagandize and to infiltrate, you must take action, not only to remove them from your organization, but to carry the democratic fight in a forceful way to the people. In our organization we have found that by taking the fight to the rank and file trade-unionists in a forceful and provocative manner, making the fight with ideas, programs, and democratic concepts, that we were able to overcome the influence and the hold the Communists had on many people.

We recently expelled from our organization a union with over 350,000 members. Simultaneously, however, we established another union to organize the workers in this same field. It involved the expenditure of large sums of money. It required a large staff of field people, the use of the printed word and of radio programs. This effort has proved successful. We have since acquired bargaining rights for over 250,000 of these workers who formerly were affiliated with the Communist-controlled union we expelled. We drove back the propaganda of the Communist Party by spreading the ideals and principles of democratic trade-unionism in a sound, concrete, and specific way. I can cite many other examples, but I think it unnecessary. The analogy to the Benton resolution is clear.

We must get to the minds and loyalties of men. We need to make the Voice of America really the voice and not, as Senator BENTON says, "the whisper of America." We must be prepared to develop a world-wide, long and short wave radio network that will reach people throughout the world. We must be prepared to develop an extensive exchange-of-persons program that involves not only students, scholars, and professional people, but also workers.

There is a United Nations specialized agency devoted to promoting peace and security which must receive the wholehearted support, financially and otherwise, of the

people of the United States and the Congress. This is the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. UNESCO must be encouraged because it is engaged in promoting peace and security through international understanding and international cooperation. It has done extensive work in the field of exchange of persons and of freedom of information, the latter along with the Sub-Commission on Freedom of Information of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

From our experience in the labor movement we think the spreading of the concept of democratic ideas and programs to the peoples of the world is as important, if not more important, than the maintenance of a strong military force.

One final word. We must fight communism through the extension of democratic ideals and not through totalitarian methods. That means we must extend the principles of democracies by improving democratic institutions. This must be forever in the forefront of our minds as we engage in counteracting the propaganda and infiltration of the communist philosophy.

We must recognize that Communists gain the support and loyalty of many peoples. They do so because they espouse the legitimate aims and aspirations of people while they camouflage their strict ties to a foreign power. The Communists are destructive in aim, suppressive of liberty, and agents of a foreign power, yet they gain and hold the support of great masses of people. Their technique frequently discourages us from espousing the goals and aims of the peoples of the world. But we must not let Communist support for legitimate aims prevent us from further developing and extending legitimate aims and aspirations of democratic people.

We sincerely believe that an extensive program such as that proposed in Senator BENTON'S resolution and supported by sufficient appropriations would go a long way in precluding the eventual use of military power by democratic governments of the world.

Operation Coonskin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. H. HEDRICK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two recent editorials from the Charlestbn Gazette, Charleston, W. Va., concerning a recreational park in Charleston, Kanawha County, W. Va., created without cost to any department of Government:

OPERATION COONSKIN

A startling demonstration of the fact that free enterprise is carrying on with the utmost freedom in this country was demonstrated by our Operation Coonskin when citizens of all stations of life joined with the utmost enthusiasm in building an immense park in 2 days.

No department of Government sponsored this event and no tax money was asked. The whole operation was a spontaneous movement by private and personal interests and the park stands today and will stand for years as a gift of the people to the people.

We think this highly successful effort has importance beyond our community. It was an example of spontaneous action of a free people. It was something that any city or county in the country could do provided realistic leadership appeared and good citizenship took over. It was something the whole of communistic Russia could not possibly have accomplished.

The project demonstrated the fact that the American people will act in unison and with full effort to bring to successful conclusion any movement that is unselfishly advanced in the interests of the people. It was the same spirit one sees in all-out war and the wonder of it was that it operated just as efficiently as a peacetime movement.

This 2-day job represented the expenditure of more than a million dollars of value in labor, machines, materials, and superintendence. It was not handicapped in any way by bureaucratic control. It could not possibly have been done so expeditiously through the agency of any department of government. The people did this themselves, under their own direction, and they did it with a display of utmost enthusiasm.

Here we had the highest type executives, the ablest engineers; a great body of technicians, the military and police, mechanics and common laborers working together under highly efficient direction and it didn't cost the taxpayers 1 red cent. Visitors came in a spirit of curiosity, absorbed the enthusiasm and many plunged in unasked to help in any capacity possible. Among these was seen a prominent businessman who deals in thousands of dollars of contracts, out in the mud directing traffic. A carpenter, past 80, sawed boards and drove nails. The Governor of the State came and was embued with the same quality of enthusiasm. The mayor of the city stayed all day, plunged from one center of operation to another and remained until the ceremonies were over. Young women took hold unasked and helped serve meals to the workers. Musicians and entertainers gave their services freely and willingly. Leading businessmen donned aprons and caps and prepared the food. Yet there was no confusion, so well had operation coonskin been planned over a period of 2 months.

For years to come many citizens in every walk of life will visit the park and say pridefully, "I helped do this." The park will stand for many years as a monument to public spirit operating under the most efficient direction, yet with the fullest freedom—free enterprise without restriction of government in any form.

Of course the work is far from finished. From month to month and from year to year there will be extensions and improvements. The possibilities are unlimited. Organized groups will sponsor more and more related projects and hundreds of other citizens will come forward from time to time to give their services.

We should like to see some sort of monument in the park with a plaque inscribed something like this: "A gift of the people to the people; an example of what a free people can accomplish on their own unrestrained initiative."

Let us never fear that freedom will ever languish in this country or that the spirit that made America great and continues to make it greater will ever diminish. Operation Coonskin gives us a new confidence in our form of government and in our people.

OPERATION COONSKIN

Thousands of citizens piled off the B. & O. shuttle train and busses at Coonskin Park yesterday and watched, wide-eyed and fascinated, as ponderous earth-moving machines excavated for two large artificial lakes and built an access road into the 825-acre park and workers rushed buildings to completion. It was operation Coonskin which in 2 days is transforming an old farm into what will be one of the most beautiful parks in this section of the country.

Shelters, out-door ovens, comfort stations, were springing up everywhere. Hundreds of laborers, engineers, superintendents of construction worked at top speed, yet there was no confusion, the project having been so well planned in advance. On the faces of all, workers and spectators alike, there were smiles of satisfaction as they tried to visualize what the park will be like when completed and what it will mean to Charleston and the Kanawha Valley.

It is impossible to do justice here to this great undertaking. To have built a fine park in 2 days would have been considered by most as an impossibility. But by dark tonight, there it will stand, a perpetual monument to high cooperative spirit of a progressive community.

To our mind the biggest part of operation Coonskin is the example it sets other communities. We maintain that everywhere there is the same quality of public spirit that makes this project a reality. All it requires to activate it is leadership. When that is unselfishly presented, full unselfish cooperation is bound to follow.

Charleston and the Kanawha Valley will be proud of operation Coonskin, even prouder than we are of the other great projects that have been accomplished the past few years. It is not possible to express this fine community service in monetary terms, but we would consider the 2-day job to represent in machinery, materials and labor at least $1,000,000, all freely given.

Coonskin Park is truly a gift of the people to the people. Every strata of society, many lines of human endeavor, are represented in this fine service. One realizes this when he sees top business executives working side by side with common laborers and all with a smile.

Too many have given of their time, talent, money, and effort to Coonskin Park to name them here, and many who have done so will go on unsung. But in the hearts of all there must be a great feeling of great self-satisfaction.

The Truth Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 10 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Truth Bomb," written by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, and pastor of Foundry Methodist Church. The article was printed in the Washington Sunday Star, in the column Spires of the Spirit.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—THE TRUTH BOMB

(By Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., LL. D.)

The first lesson in the primer of victory is "T is for truth." More powerful than any other bomb is that which General Eisenhower has recently designated as the T-bomb. The most devastatingly explosive thing in the world is truth. History proves, again and again, that there is no force equal to the pulverizing impact of facts.

There are certain theories which have no support in the nature of things and which, therefore, at last must be discredited. There

are other valid conceptions for which the very stars in their courses fight. To live, or die, for them is to be on the side of the angels. This is not to claim that all those who accept the democratic doctrine are angels, and those who deny it are devils. Let us sadly confess that the denials of democracy by some who march under its banners are many and grievous. But that is not the point. The fundamental fact in the present global struggle is that the slave system which stems from the Kremlin conspiracy is based upon palpable economic and ethical falsehoods, and that the free system, based, for instance, on the truth of that immortal phrase about all men being endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, rests upon eternal truth.

A distinguished group of men, statesmen, clergymen, educators, met to draft in positive terms what western democracy means by the truth. They agreed on this conclusion: "All men should be free to think, to speak, to write and create, to approve and criticize, to assemble and organize, to choose an occupation, to improve their condition, to worship their own God, to follow their own conscience, and to pursue their own goals. Freedom is the ancient, eternal, and implacable foe of the totalitarianism and every form of tyranny over the bodies and minds of men."

Opposed to all that is implied in that ringing credo is the sinister system which exalts atheism, puts supreme confidence in the twisted conceptions of Marxian materialism and, proclaiming its gospel with a militant zeal, marches forth to conquer the world. The free and united nations are obligated to repudiate and to refute this false doctrine and to condemn the cruelties, injustices, and lying propaganda which are inherent in it.

The clever conspirators of the Kremlin have known from the first that no such diabolical scheme involving torture and slavery could succeed unless the victims were isolated from the decent opinion of mankind. "Men love darkness better than light because their deeds are evil," said Jesus whose teachings are ridiculed and caricatured by the instigators of this godless system. As they fear nothing so much as the truth, the iron curtain was dropped. Behind the iron curtain, with no rebuttal allowed from the free world, the duped and cowed hosts are trained to chant that white is black and black is white. Back of that iron fence, through which and over which is allowed to pass no sound from the free realm beyond, they drill their regimented minions to shout senseless slogans. Here they build their prison of the mind and soul with no spires of the spirit pointing from the earth to the sky. At a given signal they project their armed automatons against the defenders of the free life and then broadcast to an outraged world, which they would hoodwink, "a devilishly clever farrago of falsity and nonsense concocted with a purpose that has nothing to do with historic truth." At immense cost, broadcasts from the outside which would take the blinkers from blinded eyes are jammed whenever possible.

To the multitudes of Europe and Asia, exploited across the centuries, yearning for more abundant life and demanding it, they pour out their inverted vocabularies, labeling enslavement liberation and peacemakers warmongers.

In the face of all this, with no spirit of vainglory, we proclaim that we have the truth that makes men free. To be sure, we have this treasure in earthen vessels. But we have this treasure. That truth bomb is the most potent instrumentality in our armor of freedom. At whatever cost to the free world, the grotesque system which vainly promises to build an alleged utopia on unspeakable concentration camps and millions of dead men's bones must be brought under the glorious light of freedom and revealed as the heinous blasphemy it is. If it takes billions of dollars to turn on the light and to shatter the night, then billions must be spent, for the safeguarding of our future and the future of those now coerced and threatened by these fanatical social brigands. Into the areas they now control a way must be found, somehow, to project radiant words of hope as God's truth goes marching on.

There is no doubt that when the battering rams of truth open up avenues along which liberating ideas can march into walled areas shackled multitudes will cry out, "We choose freedom."

The one thing falsification, distortion, suppression, and deception cannot stand is the truth. We must convince the Russian people and their fellow slaves in satellite countries that there can be no freedom under the tyranny of Moscow. We must reach them and win them through the truth which makes men free. And the truth which brings emancipation will write on the walls of the most obscene thralldom the world has ever known the ancient prophecy of doom: "Your covenant with death shall be annulled. Your agreement with hell shall not stand. Your refuge of lies shall be swept away. When the overflowing scourge shall pass through ye shall be trodden down by it. The mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

This is the victory which will make all mankind brothers.

The War for Your Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 10 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a sermon delivered by the Reverend Edgar N. Jackson of the Newfield Methodist Church, of Bridgeport, Conn. Mr. Jackson has set forth in an excellent manner the great importance of the struggle for men's minds and the need for a campaign of truth. This is particularly timely in view of the hearings of the last week before the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on my resolution—Senate Resolution 243—calling for a world-wide campaign of truth. I urge my colleagues to read this important sermon.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAR FOR YOUR MIND

Text: Second Corinthians 4: 4. "In their case the god of this world has blinded the minds of the unbelievers, to keep them from seeing the light of the gospel."

Your mind is a priceless possession. We speak of "losing one's mind" as a tragedy of magnitude. What about the tragedy of selling one's mind cheaply to those who would use it for purposes that violate your own best nature? Christianity recognizes the absolute value of every individual mind and soul. Democracy protects the rights of each individual person. We believe that within the framework of Christian Democracy the best interests of every human can most advantageously be protected and served.

Let us look at your mind for a moment. We believe it is the most distinctive fact of all creation. It is the instrument that can reason, sense moral judgments, think, recall and remember. It has the capacity for unconscious organization of impulses as well as the conscious ordering of thought. Within the space of a few cubic inches and a weight of but a couple of pounds, the brain furnishes the sensitively organized nerve tissue that is capable of evaluating and storing an infinite number of facts, impressions and experiences. All that happens to you consciously or unconsciously becomes a permanent part of you through the miraculous powers of your mind. And this priceless possession comes as standard equipment with every human being. It is yours to use, to value and to protect.

Your mind is valuable to you because it determines the quality of your person and the direction of your action. It is also valuable to others for the simple reason that they can use you when and if they can condition your thinking to the place where you will do their bidding, and seek their goals. In our modern world the war for the minds of men has become a major campaign. Some call it a cold war. Others call it propaganda. Whatever you call it, it amounts to the same thing. Two great contending paganisms challenge each other in our world. There is the paganism of practical materialism which acts as if things are more important than people. There is also the paganism of dialectical materialism that acts as if the state is more important than the human souls who constitute it.

The Christian believer in democracy can give assent to neither of these paganisms. His loyalty is to a higher ideal. Because he tries to stand above the level of the judgment of the contending paganisms, and because his loyalty is to an ideal higher than either contending party would accept, the believer in Christian democracy is often misinterpreted and misunderstood. He values his own mind so that he does not want it to become a pawn in the war of ideas. He values the minds of other men so that he resents any abuse of their right to know the truth that can make them free.

This war of ideas has been recognized by our Senator from Connecticut, the Honorable WILLIAM BENTON, in a resolution recently presented to the United States Senate. He wants to take action to protect the minds of men from abuse, in our land and throughout the world. After recognizing the nature of the forces that struggle for men's minds Mr. BENTON says: "In such a struggle force and the threat of force do not change men's minds or win their loyalties * * * and we have learned that such Communist methods cannot be beaten back by arms and dollars alone but require world-wide offensive in behalf of the ideas which express our democratic principles and aspirations."

In the light of that recognition our Senator proposes a program to increase the free exchange of information, the strengthening of UNESCO until it may be able to function as an international university for mutual understanding, and an expanded program for our own State Department to make available to other peoples objective information about the ideals of democracy. I commend the study of this program to you as a feasible and important next step in a program of building good will and international understanding. Certainly such objectives merit our support, both as Christians and also as believers in the democratic ideal of the rights of all men to the information that can guarantee the integrity of their minds.

We know too well what can happen when the minds of men become inflamed by falsehood and stimulated by undisciplined action and emotion. Marion Starkey has done a real service to us by bringing to mind the emotions and attitudes that plagued the life of Salem, Mass., 258 years ago. In her book, The Devil in Massachusetts, she gives the

psychological background of the cramped life of adolescent girls under Puritanism, and the personality dynamics that bubbled over in a weird interest in voodooism as interpreted by a West Indian slave. Before long the warped minds of these girls started an orgy of abuse and incrimination that cost the lives of 20 innocent persons and sent hundreds to prison as witches. The charges were false, but the charges were repeated so often, and were so nebulous in nature that no one could prove or disprove them on the basis of their idea of acceptable evidence.

Those charged as witches could do one of two things. They could confess, and implicate others, and in the process gain the mercy of the court. Or they could deny their guilt, and just as definitely throw themselves on the wrath of the court. We can be thankful that such a blot on our history was of but a few months' duration. But we can be equally thankful that the dangers of such rampant emotion and unfounded charges have been brought to our minds by Miss Starkey's book. For we can again develop the state of mind that will believe the most unreasonable charges. We have seen the witch hunts of Germany and other countries where some modern equivalent of the name witch could be applied with similar results in the suffering of the innocent. Similarly, we have seen the Salem technique again at work with those who confess throwing themselves upon the mercy of the courts and implicating others on flimsy evidence. It is inevitable that with such attitudes, the innocent shall suffer and the guilty be able to continue their work of poisoning our minds. It is important for us to guard our minds against the methods of insidious penetration that worked at Salem and can work again here if we are not on guard.

We are acquainted with the methods of conditioning our responses. We see it each day in advertising. There it is innocent enough and we can evaluate it. You may have seen a magazine advertisement showing a young woman being served breakfast in bed in a luxurious stateroom. The copy informs you that but a short time before she led a humdrum existence as a salesgirl in a 5- and 10-cent store. Then, some very good friend whispered a word in her ear, and from that moment life was changed, and she is now wed to a wealthy gentleman who takes her on a tropical cruise for a honeymoon. It is so simple. What is the word that worked the magic? Yes, you guessed it, halitosis. That word becomes a symbol of tragedy and frustration. And just as truly another word becomes a symbol of salvation, freedom from boredom, and a new life of privilege. Yes, and you have guessed that word, too, mouthwash. You smile at such an advertisement, and it is innocent enough. But it must work, or its expense would not be warranted. The conditioned response to frustration and personal boredom may make some persons look for salvation in a mouthwash.

But suppose the same method is used for less innocent purposes. In Germany the halitosis word was "Jew," and the salvation word was "Hitler." In Italy the halitosis word was "communism," and the salvation word was "Mussolini." We can see the shallowness of those historical experiments in conditioned response, but we can also see the tremendous cost in life and property that came about before those false ideas were brought to light. In our day the efforts to make one or another form of paganism or materialism a symbol of tragedy or a symbol of salvation calls for careful analysis by all believers in Christianity and democracy. For we can be maneuvered into a position of supporting short-term purposes that may destroy our long-term goals.

There is no better way of freeing ourselves from the dangers of false ideas than to have the truth made available to ourselves and to others. You may feel there is no danger to your mind. But the conditioned response is always at work, as has been well illustrated in recent months. A writer who had sought admission into the ministry of our church, and was judged unacceptable, wrote in a popular magazine an article in which he pointed the witch's finger and placed the label "pink." Almost immediately the conditioned response to that word went to work, and thousands of normally intelligent persons accepted the judgment from one questionable source rather than the record of many years of creditable service and judgment on the part of thousands of their church's leaders. Yes, the force is already at work and we need to be on guard against it. St. Paul warned against the blinding of minds that keeps one from seeing the light of the Gospel. It is at just such danger points that your mind may be most subtly assailed.

The solution of the problems of society will come not by bringing our minds to the low level of a common battlefield. Rather, the best promise of the future comes through protecting the capacity of our minds to see clearly the weaknesses of conflicting ideas so that we may point the way to larger truth. Perhaps one of the reasons there is current sniping at liberal Christianity is because it keeps at the task of passing judgment on ideas, not in terms of contending paganisms, but in terms of the light of the Gospel, which raises the focus from the point of men's resentments and fears to the level of their common objectives and their faith in a better future through devotion to higher ideals than have been generally acceptable in the past.

The mind of Christ that St. Paul commended to us could not be blinded because it moved on the basis of a greater need than resentments or fears. Its primary need is to know God's will for ourselves and other persons. It is not easily blown about by every wind of doctrine because it has a higher loyalty. That higher loyalty is to a concept of the value of all men and their minds in the sight of God. Such a need and such a loyalty make it possible to develop a calm objectivity. Truly, such calmness in our thinking is a much needed quality for our day. However, let it be a calmness that preceeds deliberate and reasonable action, not the calmness that moves on to complete detachment and inactivity.

Your mind is a priceless possession. It can be an instrument in the hands of God to pass wise judgment, and stimulate intelligent action. Or it can be a tool in the hands of those who regard neither God nor man. You owe it to yourself and to your God to guard well the approaches to the citadel of your spirit, for surely, out of it ultimately come the issues of life itself.

Broadcast by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 10 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio broadcast delivered by me on the week end of July 7–9, 1950.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I want to attempt, on this broadcast, to develop in general terms, a bit of American history. I'm sure that most of us, at one time or another, have studied the things I'm about to discuss, but it seems quite fitting to me that this particularly critical moment in history we should refresh our memories on the subject of the origins and development of American foreign policy.

I don't intend an elaborate review of our hundreds of international commitments which we have made since the founding of our Republic. Rather, I hope to show in outline at least, the respective roles played by Congress and the President in the evolution of our democracy—in other words, to illustrate with a few landmarks the parts played by the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government in making and carrying out our foreign policies.

The Constitution itself is a good place to start. When our founding fathers sat down to plan the Government of the United States, they drew heavily on the example of the English Government. This was perfectly understandable because the colonies themselves having been under the English crown for more than a century and a half had patterned their local governments after English models. Thus, though we did rely primarily upon English experience in guiding us, the founding fathers, nonetheless, had many sweeping changes to make.

In England, the power to make war and to conduct foreign policies generally was vested exclusively in the crown. Neither the House of Lords nor the Commons had any say in the foreign policy field. Those who drafted the Constitution of the United States insisted that the power to declare war should not be left to the President alone. They felt that such power should be delegated to the Congress, since that body more truly represented the wishes of the people. So, article I of the Constitution, in listing the powers of Congress expressly states that Congress should have the power to declare war.

Elsewhere, the Constitution delegates to the President the power to make treaties with the advice and consent of the Senate, with the further provision that two-thirds of the Senators voting must agree to the treaty before it can become binding. The Constitution also states that the President shall be the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia of the several States when called into actual service of the United States.

Apart from these three major provisions, the Constitution has little else to say concerning Federal powers in the field of foreign affairs. I think you can readily see that the Constitution left unsaid a great many things that might have been said in spelling out more completely the duties of Congress and the President with regard to our dealings with other nations.

From the earliest days of our Republic, men have debated the question of where the power of the President stopped and that of the Congress began in conducting our foreign relations. That debate still rages, but in the course of the past 160 years, a long series of precedents has emerged which, over the course of time, has defined, partially at least, the roles of the President and Congress in the foreign policy field. The first, and perhaps among the most important of these precedents, took place during George Washington's administration. In 1793, just 4 years after Washington took office, war broke out between England and France. The struggling young American Republic had

enough troubles of its own without getting entangled in a European war, and President Washington issued his so-called Proclamation of Neutrality which declared that the United States intended to pursue a course friendly and impartial to both belligerent powers. President Washington was brought under almost immediate attack from French sympathizers in this country who contended that the President had exceeded his constitutional authority in issuing such a declaration in the name of the United States Government. The verbal fireworks subsided shortly, however, after Alexander Hamilton and James Madison exchanged a series of letters in which Hamilton defended Washington and Madison charged that the President had sought to annex to himself the powers of the British crown. The result of President Washington's neutrality proclamation was to establish a precedent which has been followed with few exceptions since that day.

In the following year, 1794, Congress had its inning, and the first American neutrality act was put on the books. This action by Congress established the fact that it was within its legislative power to determine American neutrality. Thus, in 2 years' time there was developed a pair of precedents which recognized the power of both the President and the Congress to assert American policy with respect to warfare between other nations. In short, a compromise emerged from the two precedents.

Despite the clear constitutional mandate that the Congress, and not the President, shall have the power to declare war, there have been so-called incidents throughout our national history, in which the President has brought about armed intervention in foreign areas, without calling upon Congress to declare war. We find examples of this where Americans, living and doing business abroad have suffered injury to their property or to their persons as a result of facts of unfriendly nations. A familiar early example of this occurred when American forces were used nearly 150 years ago to put down acts of piracy against American vessels at sea. From such beginnings as these, our later Presidents have expanded the scope of this protection of public and private American interests abroad. President McKinley, without stopping to consult Congress, sent 5,000 men into Peking during the Boxer Rebellion in order that American business interests there might be protected. President Wilson, again without consulting Congress, sent Black Jack Pershing and the American Army into Mexico shortly before World War I.

During the 1920's American forces were sent into several Central American countries where civil disorder had broken out. These efforts culminated in 1927 when the Coolidge administration had more than 5,000 troops in Nicaragua, conducting what President Coolidge's critics called a private war. Peace was finally restored in Nicaragua as a result of the efforts made by Col. Henry Stimson, who was later to serve as our Secretary of War during World War II.

While it would appear from these actions that various Presidents have taken upon themselves an apparent power to make war without calling upon Congress formally to declare it, the Congress has by no means taken a back seat in the conduct of our foreign affairs. It is true that from time to time both the Senate and the House have passed resolutions expressing their intent that American foreign policy should be one thing or another, and these very resolutions have been disregarded by the President then in office. Needless to say, the Presidents who have rejected such resolutions as these have come under considerable fire from congressional majorities and from the public at large. More often, however, we find the Congress inclined to work in close cooperation with the President in establishing affirmative foreign policies. This close cooperation between Congress and the President has been particularly marked in periods of national crises.

What Congress has frequently done under these circumstances is to delegate broad and comprehensive powers to the President, recognizing that the executive arm of the Government is frequently called upon to act quickly under emergency conditions, and cannot always wait for Congress to be convened and special legislation enacted. In recent years the Lend-Lease Act of 1941 is perhaps the best illustration of the way in which Congress delegated broad powers to the President for use in an emergency. The Lend-Lease Act gave to the President the power to furnish munitions of war and other supplies to those governments which had banded together in the fight against Hitler. Under the terms of lend-lease, passed 9 months before Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt was able to furnish billions of dollars' worth of equipment which flowed into the fight against Hitler prior to our entry into the war.

Despite the broad powers which lend-lease gave the President, Congress nonetheless retained for itself the ultimate control over that program. Lend-lease required funds for its operation, and Congress, through its annual appropriations of money, controlled the purse strings, thus giving to Congress the final powers of review over the President's actions.

The modern-day requirements of total war—total war in the sense that every person is, in one way or another, an active participant in the war effort—have given rise to an expanded use of powers delegated by Congress to the President once the Nation is engaged in war. We saw many illustrations of such emergency powers during World War II. The President was authorized by Congress to establish priorities on critical materials. He was authorized to establish price ceilings on all sorts of essential commodities, and where necessary, to ration them. But these illustrations are familiar to most of us, and I simply mention them to point out what we have found it necessary to do in order to wage total war successfully.

The net result of these broad delegations of power by Congress to the President in emergency periods is that we have had to establish, as a matter of necessity, a temporary supremacy of the executive branch over the Congress. Whenever this has occurred, we hear the familiar cry raised that the President has turned the Congress into a rubber stamp, and that the Congress itself has stripped away its powers in favor of the Chief Executive. Such criticisms as these, while they are possessed of some substance, neglect many important considerations.

During the Civil War, for example, President Lincoln took on extraordinary powers. He regarded the entire Nation as part of the field of military operations, and President Lincoln held, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, the powers to commandeer property, and otherwise to undertake actions which would never have been condoned under peacetime conditions. Comparable powers were placed in the hands of Presidents Wilson and Roosevelt during the two World Wars. Those who argue that such delegations of power make Congress a rubber stamp overlook the need for giving to the executive branch an authority flexible enough to meet any unexpected demand which might arise to threaten the national security. They also overlook the fact that, following every war, the extraordinary powers vested in the President during the war period are quickly repealed and revert once more to the Congress and the people.

The true greatness of our Constitution emerges when we direct our attention to a study of the way it has served us over the course of our national history. Our founding fathers wisely recognized that they could not spell out in minute detail a blueprint in the 1780's which would remain serviceable throughout the undreamed-of ages to follow. In drafting the Constitution they deliberately staked out boundaries marked by such guideposts as the demand that Congress should have the exclusive power to declare war. They also designated the President as the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, and gave him the power, concurrently with the Senate, to make treaties with other nations. Elsewhere, the Constitution specifies the express duties of the Congress and the President and of the judicial branch of Government as they are to operate in normal peacetime conditions. Wisely, however, the founding fathers did not seek to freeze into an inflexible pattern the respective duties of the judiciary, the executive, and the legislative branches in the conduct of foreign affairs. While the founding fathers did not foresee the coming of the air age, the development of atomic energy, and the fact of total war, they did have the great foresight to realize that the Constitution had to endure for all time, and in order for it to endure, it needed to possess a sufficient flexibility to permit speedy action to meet circumstances which could not possibly be foreseen in the 1700's.

That America exists today as the strongest democracy in the world is a splendid tribute to the wisdom of those who created the Constitution.

The Hour of Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include therein a speech made by Hon. Fred O. Dickinson, Jr., at the graduation exercises of Jupiter High School on June 9, 1950, at Jupiter, Fla. Mr. Dickinson is a practicing attorney in West Palm Beach, Fla., being a member of the firm of Fisher & Dickinson. He served gallantly during World War II. I felt this was such a fine message to a young graduate that I wanted to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Dickinson's speech follows:

THE HOUR OF CHALLENGE

The peak of a speaker's challenge is to be invited to address his remarks to young American citizens who have through diligence, hard work, and faith emerged victoriously from their first truly great educational test. It is with this thought in mind that I express to members of this class a deep and sincere thanks for the honor and the responsibility that is mine this evening. I deem it timely and proper to caption this address "The hour of challenge."

From the days of prehistoric civilization, when sign-language images were indented upon the uncultivated earth to express their desire for food and shelter, to this miraculous era of the atomic age, man has tirelessly sought to better himself and his associates. This ever-appearing characteristic in the make-up of mortal man is perhaps one of the simple but conclusive differences between man and all other living creatures.

Learning early in recorded history—and I do not use the word "learning" loosely—the value of collective effort and force, man has

organized into political societies for the ultimate purpose of drawing upon the abilities one of another to promote better living. To accomplish this pattern our early historical societies became governments, different in basic concept, operation, and adventure, but all for the purpose of enjoying collective advantages. Through the invincible fate of our ever-loving Creator, we in America were born into a society of democratic-thinking peoples. Of even more importance, we were born in the United States, which has more nearly attained the utmost from political unity to inspire each boy and girl, regardless of race, color, or creed, to develop, grow, and expand, if you please, into useful citizens who offer their new, fresh, versatile ability and individualism for the betterment of life on this earth. The ultimate, then, in American citizenship is to live an honorable life, dedicated through democratic belief, to the mental, moral, physical, and spiritual betterment of ourselves and our fellow citizens.

With the church, the American public school—for which, incidentally, the State of Florida expends more than one-half of its revenue—has played the master role in building good citizens. In order that this graduation may become a proud historical event in the lives of these graduates and in the history of this high school, these young citizens and all others of their stage and age in life, must be more than the hope of tomorrow, for it is the educated American youth of today who are the trustees of the hour and the future of this Nation and our way of life. It is from their ideals, their character, their learning, their wisdom, and work that the hands of time will inscribe the measure of good that this institution has played in our great democratic processes.

The teachers, parents, advisers and friends have all in some measure assisted these fine graduates to this hour of victory and challenge in their lives. As parents, teachers and advisers we must continue to show our interest in and offer our needed assistance and desired help to, these graduates as they travel along the road of life. Of far more importance than the ultimate benefits of our coaching is the goal in life which you graduates select and pursue. You have reached the age of reason—your appreciation and understanding of art, literature, mathematics, science, history, government, athletics, logic, mental and physical hygiene, is not insignificant. But above all, your understanding of right from wrong and your appreciation of real character is of priceless importance. From this beginning, from this foundation, from this commencement, you must individually choose whether you wish to graduate into real productive citizens or aline yourselves to defy the directive of God by stepping into useless obscurity. The basic tools of education and character have been offered to you and you have used these tools well, as evidenced by your presence here this evening as graduates of this fine high school.

You have attained the first great milestone in your life. It is only fair to assume, and it is gratifying to predict, that you will continue to command the respect of all those about you by developing your already obvious abilities into fields of greater accomplishment, as each succeeding year burdens you with the complexities of an ever advancing world. It is my firm belief and prayer, based upon your fine records which are passing in review here tonight, that each of you will accept the challenge handed to you upon this occasion.

It matters not what financial station in society fills your ambition, because you live in America, where we have no goose-stepping, regimented populace taking orders from a war-lorded government or a caste-conscious society. You live in a nation where everyone is the peer of his fellow men. But of immeasurable importance to you and your future is the means you choose to climb and advance in life with the majesty of experience and maturity. After deciding upon the career which is to clothe your ambition and draw from your energy and ability, make one thing certain—whatever you decide to do, do it well.

If you will hold sacred and forever uppermost in your hearts your faith in God; if you will dedicate your life to the nobility of honorable work; if you will accept your advancement with thankful but proud humility; if you will be positive in your knowledge that your education shall never cease; if you will continue to recognize the fact that education opens the door which leads into the hall of wisdom; if you will practice or diligently strive to practice the teaching of the Ten Commandments and keep alive and unfaltering your faith in these United States of America, you will always be prepared for the hour of challenge. To meet the hardships and tests of life—and there are many—you must exert your individual abilities to the maximum of your capacity, and thereby earn for yourself the satisfaction of a job well done, you will earn for yourself the realization that our way of life shall be preserved unto all posterity; and last, but not least, you will have carried out the greatest purpose committed to man—that of attaining for yourself and, helping others find, a heavenly place in the palace of our Eternal God.

United States Fuel Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 10 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address on the subject of United States fuel reserves, delivered by me on July 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Those of you who are old enough to remember what America was like a quarter, or even a half century ago, probably reminisce now and then over the vast changes which have taken place in American life during your own lifetime.

Many of you can recall when the automobile was a curiosity, when the airplane was a madman's toy, and when, if you were lucky, the combination of a crystal set and an old telephone receiver would bring in a static-laden broadcast from Pittsburgh.

But in thinking of the earlier days, we don't usually give much thought to what these amazing developments of the twentieth century have done in terms of the amount of power needed to drive our present-day industries, to run our transportation systems, to operate our vast mechanized world.

Just to illustrate what I mean, here are some examples: since the time of World War I, we have just about doubled the amount of energy required to operate our economy. In the past 10 years alone, the number of telephones in use has jumped from two families in five to almost 70 percent of all families. The increase alone in the use of electricity since the end of World War II is greater than our total use of electricity was in 1925.

But in addition to our vastly greater needs for energy today, there have been sweeping changes which have taken place in the sources from which we draw our power.

At the time of World War I, more than 80 percent of all our energy was supplied by coal. Today, coal supplies less than 40 percent of our total energy needs.

Part of the reason for the change in the importance of coal in our present fuel picture unquestionably comes from the development of so many new markets for liquid and gaseous fuels. In the past 30 years, we have seen the liquid fuels find greater and greater use each year for our cars, for airplanes, for Diesel locomotives, for the network of huge motor trucks that today spans the face of the continent.

Many who formerly heated their homes with coal, or with wood, today rely on natural gas or fuel oil. Even the big electric utilities are, in some sections of the country, beginning to use more fuel oil and gas in place of the coal they formerly used.

The implications of these changes in our fuel tastes are many indeed. We find, for example, that our coal mines, which operated at peak capacity throughout World War II, are today working but a few days a week, and in some instances, are being shut down altogether because they can't find enough business to keep going.

Shut-downs and short workweeks mean losses of income and buying power for those whose livelihoods have previously depended upon coal. And, of course, where the buying power of any group of people drops off, this has an effect on the amount of goods which our industries can produce and sell.

Another important implication arises from the fact that our energy demands are still on the increase, and we must give some thought to the future in terms of where we will look for the fuels we will need in the generations to come. It is pretty generally agreed that coal provides 95 percent of all our fuel reserves—or in other words, in terms of our known stored natural resources, oil and gas make up only 5 percent or so of the whole.

We can find comfort, of course, in the short-run picture, by noting the fact that we continue to make discoveries of new oil and gas fields, and that according to some opinion, our known petroleum reserves today are larger than they have ever been in the past. The petroleum reserves are, however, still very small by comparison with those of coal.

Now, curiously, in the growth of our great industrial economy, we have never really sat down to figure out just where we are going in terms of our energy needs for the future. We haven't up to now taken any comprehensive inventory of our present supplies, nor tried realistically to gage our future use of these supplies in terms of what we will need.

I firmly believe that the time has come to make a thoroughgoing study of the trends in fuel usage that we have witnessed over the years, in order that we can map out, for the near future at least, what our total energy needs will be for an expanding peacetime economy, and also to determine, as a matter of national security, what we would need in the event of another total war, an event I pray will not take place.

In connection with a study of what our energy needs will be, I believe we've got to take a careful look at what fuels we have on hand to meet them. We've got to determine, in short, a national fuel policy.

I have introduced a resolution in the Senate, calling for such a study of our fuel needs and resources, with an eye to formulating an over-all national fuel policy when all the facts are brought together. It will not be an easy job to gather the needed information and to weigh each fact in its proper relation to the whole picture. But I believe such a study is now due, and I am most hopeful that the Senate will turn to an early consideration of this problem. It is of vital significance if America is to continue its growth in the future. And this, I am sure, is something we all wish for.

Tribute to Senator Wiley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 10 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I was delighted to read in the July 1950 issue of the magazine National Republic, published here in Washington, a splendid article on the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. This article points up the many reasons why I firmly believe the people of Wisconsin will give an overwhelming vote of confidence to our Wisconsin colleague this coming November.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this richly deserved tribute to the senior Senator from the Badger State be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATESMAN FROM WISCONSIN

(By Paul R. Bish)

On November 7, the people of Wisconsin, like their fellow citizens in other States of the Union, will go to the polls to elect officials who will represent them in the trying years ahead. One of the surest bets in Wisconsin politics is that voters of the Badger State will reelect their senior United States Senator, ALEXANDER WILEY, for another well-deserved term of office. (This is assuming, of course, that overconfidence does not weaken Republican strength as it did in 1948.)

Impartial political observers have always regarded the friendly, down-to-earth Wisconsin Senator as one of the ablest, strongest campaigners in Badger political history. They recall his 17,000-mile auto circuit during the 1944 campaign, when accompanied by his wife (now deceased), he spoke in friendly terms to the citizens at grass roots corners in practically every town and village of the 71 counties of America's dairyland.

The relative certainty of the reelection of Senator WILEY is based on a number of factors in addition to his energetic campaigning. Wisconsin voters recognize the vital importance of retaining in high office a man who is practically at the top of the Republican list in seniority. In fact, Senator WILEY is among the third highest ranking Republicans in the Senate. He is the highest ranking Republican on the key Senate Judiciary Committee and the second highest ranking Republican on the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which is so vital in determining the future peace of America and the globe.

Moreover, Wisconsin citizens are satisfied with WILEY'S 12 years of hard work in their behalf. They know that the lights burn late practically every night in suite 427, in the Senate Office Building. WILEY'S reputation for being on the job 6 days a week, 52 weeks a year, often on Sundays and holidays, answering his bundles of mail promptly, seeing practically every visitor who comes from the State, returning to Wisconsin as often as possible, is the sort of reputation that's hard to beat.

With regard to the issues of this campaign, Wiley's position has, as always, been frank and clean-cut.

Senator WILEY has described the major issue of the campaign as follows:

"Are we to continue constitutional government in America or is such Government to be destroyed by giving the President dictatorial powers over jobs, health, pricing, supplies, credit, housing? Are we to maintain three separate and independent branches of Government—legislative, executive, and judicial, or are we to have a single all powerful Executive with—

"(a) A rubber stamp Congress, giving blanket approval to his demands,

"(b) A subservient Supreme Court approving all of their unconstitutional acts,

"(c) A tremendous bureaucratic army of over 2,000,000 employees interfering in the lives of the citizens and pressuring the electorate into the support of the administration?"

Senator WILEY continues:

"We can take either of these choices, the one road—already taken by Great Britain, into Socialist chaos, dictatorship, and yes, possibly eventually to war because the Chief Executive becomes an absolute dictator of foreign policy. Or we can take (as I believe we will) the other road—the American road leading to peace, prosperity, and freedom.

"Every single vote cast in November 1950, will help determine which road we take. It will determine whether there will be enough Senators to battle against the socialistic trend of our times or whether the Senate—the last barrier against socialism and depression—shall become a rubber stamp to a corrupt spend-crazy administration.

"This issue is bigger than partisan politics. I am grateful for the support of many independent Democrats in Wisconsin who have indicated their agreement with my fight against the present administration and its collectivist approach."

The people of Wisconsin recognize that a major effort will be made by the Democratic administration to try to purge Senator WILEY along with other independent-minded Senators as TAFT of Ohio, HICKENLOOPER of Iowa, CAPEHART of Indiana, DONNELL of Missouri. However, Wisconsin recalls that an attempted Presidential purge is old stuff insofar as Senator WILEY is concerned. In 1944 the Democrats threw all their big guns into Wisconsin in an attempt to dictate to the voters whom they should choose. Harry Truman came into Wisconsin to defeat WILEY. So did Henry Wallace, Claude Wickard, Harold Ickes. The CIO Political Action Committee distributed hundreds of thousands of pieces of literature. Union men were recruited wholesale to influence the workers.

But the purge flopped. The people of Wisconsin showed that they refused to be dictated to by outsiders and slapped down all the intruders who attempted to purge their Senator.

Now the pattern of outside interference is shaping up again. Vast sums of money will be poured in from the Democratic Party treasury, from the CIO and A. F. of L. big shots in trying to purge Senator WILEY.

The Senator, however, is confident that the people of Wisconsin will give the same verdict that they did last time to the would-be purgers.

However, Senator WILEY has emphasized to his supporters that it will be necessary to fight fire with fire, to conduct a street-by-street campaign in all of Wisconsin's 3,157 voting precincts in order to defeat the attempted purge of himself and other Wisconsin Republicans.

His supporters back up what the Senator has said so already the machinery is under way for formation of Independent Citizens Committees for the Reelection of Senator WILEY throughout the Badger State. Wisconsin's men and women of the highest integrity and character representing the broad background of their respective communities are banding together in order to make sure that every single area of Wisconsin has a pro-WILEY club and that there will be efficient campaign machinery to assure Senator WILEY'S continuation in public office.

One of WILEY'S friends states the November problem in this way: "In Wisconsin, as well as in Ohio and elsewhere, the New Dealers, Fair Dealers, and what-have-you, are building up a tremendous organization so as to take over the Senate. They are setting up campaign units all over the country. We, therefore, who believe in Senators WILEY and TAFT and men like them must be willing to pitch in and fight—with our dollars, our time, our energy.

"This means we've got to have folks who are willing to write favorable letters on behalf of these Senators to members of their type of business or profession. It means there will have to be folks who will be willing to call up by phone their friends to acquaint them with the issues in the campaign. It means that there will have to be thousands of folks who will put up posters in their windows on behalf of Senator WILEY and other free-enterprise candidates, who will put candidates' picture labels on their cars to keep our way of life intact. It means that there will have to be banners on buildings all over the State, urging voters to support worthy candidates. It means that there will have to be literature delivered in every mail box and placed under every door.

"Moreover, we can't simply talk among ourselves; that is, talk to folks who are already devoted to the free-enterprise system. We've got to go out and convert those folks in the ranks of labor and elsewhere who may not so strongly believe in our way of life, or who have been infected by the Socialist virus."

As indicated above, WILEY'S position in the Republican Party of Wisconsin has reached its strongest peak since he first came into the limelight.

Proof of Wisconsin's esteem of its senior Senator can be found in abundant measure in the letters of endorsement which have poured into his office. Here are a few such grass-roots expressions:

From Neenah, Wis.: "You have always voted in favor of the little fellow and I believe you will vote with us again. * * * I'm a Democrat by birth; but your record has earned my vote."

From Kiel, Wis.: "Your soundness and Americanism gives us a feeling of confidence at least in some members of our National Government. * * * We appreciate your past work and your loyalty to the American system of government and we assure you of our aggressive support."

From Wausau: "I certainly want to congratulate you on the stand you have taken in the past against this reckless expenditure, increased Government payrolls, and bureaucratic pork-barrel rolling. While it may seem to you a thankless job to combat this sort of a movement, please rest assured that we folks back home who foot the bills are glad that we have representation in Washington which sees clearly on these issues."

From Green Bay: "I am glad you have 'intestinal fortitude' to stand on your two feet and say what you think is right. I thought the old-fashioned patriot was a thing of the past, but I know, Mr. WILEY, that it isn't, because I believe you are a patriot."

Here is what a businessman in Ashland, Wis., wrote about the proposed Presidential purge: "We note with interest that President Truman is going to try the purge stunt on you. * * * I have heard a lot of favorable comment for you on this because Wisconsin people generally don't want someone in Washington telling them how to vote. We are still independent enough to decide these matters for ourselves. * * * Just keep up the good work that you have been doing and the voters will take care of you. A man that hasn't any ideas or that won't scrap and fight for anything is of no value to the people. You have done a good job

this past session and we personally want to thank you for it. If we didn't have Senators with courage we wouldn't have a country."

The great State of Wisconsin has scored a number of notable "firsts" in the Nation by virtue of a long series of pioneering achievements in social legislation and in other fields. But, as we have seen, it has still more "firsts" to its credit—firsts for farming, for business, for labor—thanks to the large number of legislative "beats" scored for it and for all America by its senior Senator, the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY—a worthy candidate for reelection in November 1950.

World War II Veterans' On-Farm Training Program in Alabama in 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, Alabama veterans of World War II enrolled in the on-farm-training program, under Public Laws 16 and 346, made great progress in 1949.

NUMBER OF ALABAMA VETERANS TAKING ON-FARM TRAINING

Twenty thousand veterans were enrolled in the program. They had 65,000 dependents.

Nine thousand five hundred of these veterans own their farms. One thousand four hundred purchased farms in 1949. Twice as many made their plans to purchase farms in 1950.

EXPANDED CREDIT NEEDED SO VETERAN-FARMERS MAY PURCHASE HOMES

The Congress should expand the tenant-farm-purchase program and the rural-housing program so as to provide an opportunity for a much larger number of these veterans to buy farms and build farm homes for themselves.

It is my judgment that such a program would not cost the Federal Government 1 cent over the years. Such a program would provide credit for thousands of these veteran-farmers, at a time when they need it most, and at a time when credit opportunities in the rural areas are limited, and at a time when their interest in farming is greatest. The programs which the Congress has set up are good as far as they go. The need is for expansion of these programs.

Approximately one-half of these veterans are either share croppers or cash tenants.

These 20,000 veteran farmers in 1949:

First. Constructed 19,500,000 feet of terraces.

Second. Planted upward of a million forest trees.

Third. Turned under 134,000 acres of cover crops.

Fourth. Planted 21,000 acres of lespedeza, 4,000 acres of alfalfa, 2,000 acres of kudzu, 154,000 acres of legumes.

CROPS PLANTED BY ON-FARM TRAINEES

These veterans planted commercially 2,500 acres of Irish potatoes, 2,000 acres of sweetpotatoes, 300 acres of strawberries, 9,000 acres of truck crops, 2,500 acres of orchards, 46,000 acres of peanuts, which produced 20,000 tons of peanuts.

They planted 283,000 acres of corn, an average of 14 acres per person, from which they harvested 5,600,000 bushels of corn, an average of 20 bushels per acre, and, in addition, 36,000 acres of the corn was hogged.

RECORD OF HOGS, CATTLE, AND CHICKENS

These gentlemen in 1949 owned 802,000 laying hens that produced 4,000,000 dozens of eggs. One and three-fourth millions of broilers were produced.

They butchered 8,500,000 hogs for home use, and sold 113,000 hogs, an average of more than 5 hogs per trainee.

They owned 2,500 purebred dairy cows, 49,000 grade dairy cows and heifers, 2,500 purebred beef cattle, and 35,000 grade beef cattle. Nineteen thousand beef cattle were sold during the year.

More than 8,000 trainees—40 percent—were selling milk during the year.

RURAL TELEPHONES

Twelve hundred on-farm trainee veterans—slightly more than 5 percent—had telephones in their homes. Fifteen thousand five hundred, or 77 percent, stated that they would like to have telephones in their homes.

I am proud that this Congress passed a rural telephone bill, which I believe will have the effect of bringing the telephone within the reach of millions of farmers in this country.

ALABAMA FARM VETERANS MAKING PROGRESS UNDER PUBLIC LAWS 16 AND 346

Mr. Speaker, if the evidence outlined above is not sufficient proof of the progress being made by the on-farm veterans in Alabama, I am sure that the following facts will be conclusive:

First. These veterans own 6,000 tractors.

Second. They stored over half a million pounds of food in quick-freeze lockers during the year; they dried 2,500,000 pounds of food, and canned over 5,000,000 quarts.

Third. Forty-five hundred of them landscaped their homes; 5,500 painted their homes; 9,000 wired their homes; 10,000 screened their homes.

Fourth. Twenty-seven hundred installed running water in their homes; 1,200 installed bathrooms; 8,000 constructed sanitary toilets.

All this adds up to a fine record of achievement. The figures cited show much diversification and planning. As a matter of fact, these 20,000 veteran trainees only planted 167,000 acres of cotton in 1949, an average of less than 9 acres per trainee.

CONCLUSION

There are many people who criticize the on-farm training program for veterans. But, Mr. Speaker, this country, through its Congress, promised these veterans this program in 1944 when they were engaged in the greatest war of all history. The Congress must see the program through. It is giving the veteran of World War II an opportunity to become a trained farmer. The figures I have used here today show that he is taking advantage of this opportunity. The program is paying off in opportunity for the individual veteran and this opportunity is being translated into efficient production and good citizenship.

As a part of my remarks, I include a letter from J. C. Cannon, supervisor, agricultural education for the State of Alabama, together with a summary of his annual report:

STATE OF ALABAMA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Montgomery, Ala., June 1, 1950.

Hon. CARL ELLIOTT,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ELLIOTT: I am enclosing copy of the summary of annual report for institutional on-farm training program in Alabama for the calendar year 1949. You will note that this report includes a total of 96 different items and that this is summarized in terms of total units for Public Law 346 and Public Law 16 trainees. In the right-hand column is given the number of trainees participating in each of the activities or items listed at the left of the page. We feel that the program of institutional on-farm training for veterans in vocational agriculture has made excellent progress in the last 2 years.

I trust that you will have time to examine this summary in detail.

Very truly yours,

J. C. CANNON,
Supervisor, Agricultural Education.

SUMMARY OF ANNUAL REPORT FOR INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING PROGRAM IN ALABAMA

Period covered by this report Jan. 1, 1949, through Dec. 31, 1949

	Total units, Public Law 346 and Public Law 16	Total number Public Law 346 and Public Law 16 trainees participating
1. Number married	17,197	17,197
2. Number of dependents	65,351	18,652
3. Number completed fifth grade	5,616	5,616
4. Number completed seventh grade	5,141	5,141
5. Number completed ninth grade	·,529	4,529
6. Number completed twelfth grade	2,970	2,970
7. Number of college graduates other than agriculture	57	57
8. Number of white trainees	16,381	16,381
9. Number of colored trainees	3,814	3,814
10. Number of farm owners	9,462	9,462
11. Number of cash renters	4,865	4,865
12. Number of sharecroppers	5,868	5,868
13. Number purchased farms this year	1,371	1,371
14. Number planning to purchase farms next year	2,906	2,906
15. Number of feet of terraces constructed	19,511,688	4,221
16. Number of forest trees planted	851,249	378
17. Number of acres of cover crops turned under	134,637	13,682
18. Number of acres of sericea (lespedeza) planted	21,499	5,691
19. Number of acres of alfalfa planted	4,026	2,166
20. Number of acres of kudzu planted	2,424	860
21. Number of acres of legumes planted	154,090	12,278
22. Number SCS plan on farm	5,500	5,500
23. Number of acres reseeding clover	27,592	5,871
24. Number of acres of temporary pasture	122,653	14,506
25. Number of acres of improved permanent pasture	109,936	10,520

SUMMARY OF ANNUAL REPORT FOR INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING PROGRAM IN ALABAMA—Continued

Period covered by this report Jan. 1, 1949, through Dec. 31, 1949—Continued

	Total units, Public Law 346 and Public Law 16	Total number Public Law 346 and Public Law 16 trainees participating
26. Number of acres of Irish potatoes planted commercially	2,557	1,276
27. Number of acres of sweetpotatoes planted commercially	1,950	1,142
28. Number of acres of strawberries planted commercially	300	247
29. Number of acres truck crops planted commercially	9,144	2,491
30. Number of acres of commercial orchard	2,417	569
31. Number of acres of peanuts produced commercially	46,018	3,945
32. Number of tons of peanuts produced commercially	20,416	3,784
33. Number of acres of peanuts hogged	12,623	2,429
34. Number of acres of corn planted	283,863	19,226
35. Number of bushels of corn produced	5,626,369	19,236
36. Number of acres of corn hogged	36,502	3,284
37. Number of acres of hybrid corn planted	75,971	9,261
38. Number of acres of cotton planted	167,113	17,254
39. Number of pounds of clover seed harvested	685,327	762
40. Number of laving hens	802,740	19,352
41. Number of broilers produced this year	1,776,543	13,823
42. Dozens of eggs produced	3,918,051	19,284
43. Number of purebred boars owned	2,223	2,045
44. Number of purebred gilts and sows owned for breeding purposes	6,716	4,103
45. Number of grade gilts and sows owned for breeding purposes	30,684	14,804
46. Number of grade boars owned	3,064	2,453
47. Number of pounds of hogs butchered for home use	8,569,156	18,589
48. Number of hogs sold during the year	113,124	12,448
49. Number of purebred dairy bulls owned	740	649
50. Number of purebred dairy cows and heifers owned	2,596	1,121
51. Number of grade dairy bulls owned	2,459	1,837
52. Number of grade dairy cows and heifers owned	49,074	18,907
53. Number of cows bred to purebred bulls during the year	14,265	6,203
54. Number selling grade A milk	4,972	216
55. Number selling grade B milk	3,715	1,070
56. Number of cows artificially bred	1,075	508
57. Number of cows and heifers tested for Bang's	9,773	2,960
58. Number of calves vaccinated for Bang's	4,967	1,427
59. Number of purebred beef cattle owned	2,494	967
60. Number of grade beef cattle owned	35,390	6,086
61. Number of cows bred to purebred sire	16,528	1,893
62. Number of beef cattle sold during year	19,476	5,017
63. Number of cows tested for Bang's	5,004	916
64. Number of work stock owned	27,660	16,418
65. Number of colts raised	408	334
66. Number of homes landscaped	4,494	4,494
67. Number of homes painted	5,541	5,541
68. Number of homes wired	8,933	8,933
69. Number of homes with running water installed	2,729	2,729
70. Number of homes screened	10,318	10,318
71. Number of bathrooms installed in home	1,231	1,231
72. Number of sanitary toilets constructed	8,169	8,169

SUMMARY OF ANNUAL REPORT FOR INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING PROGRAM IN ALABAMA—Continued

Period covered by this report Jan. 1, 1949, through Dec. 31, 1949—Continued

	Total units, Public Law 346 and Public Law 16	Total number Public Law 346 and Public Law 16 trainees participating
73. Number of homes built during year	1,234	1,234
74. Number of major farm buildings constructed during year (barn, poultry house, etc.)	7,590	5,778
75. Number of fruit trees planted during the year	113,421	7,225
76. Number of pecan trees planted	13,270	2,682
77. Number of quarts of food canned	5,034,354	19,630
78. Number of pounds of foods dried	2,531,093	10,385
79. Number of pounds of meat cured	5,758,457	17,317
80. Number of pounds of food stored in quick-freeze locker	576,542	2,306
81. Number of tractors owned	6,079	5,880
82. Number of combines owned	428	423
83. Number of mowers owned	4,600	4,547
84. Number of plan A trainees	35	35
85. Number of plan B trainees	20,160	20,160
86. Number of general farming objectives	19,463	19,463
87. Number of poultry farming objectives	153	153
88. Number of dairy farming objectives	168	168
89. Number of truck farming objectives	82	82
90. Number of swine production objectives	79	79
91. Number of beef cattle objectives	221	221
92. Number of labor incomes of $1,000 or more during year	1,482	1,482
93. Number of veterans interested in further training in vocational agriculture after their institutional on-farm training has ended	16,209	16,209
94. Number of veterans who have telephones in their homes	1,168	1,168
95. Number of veterans who would like to have telephones in their homes	15,620	15,620
96. Other farming objectives	29	29

Report to the People of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 10 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Washington News Letter of July 6, 1950, being a personal report by me to the people of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the News Letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington News Letter of July 6, 1950]

President Truman's dramatic response to the Red invasion of South Korea—apart from its significance in rejecting aggression as a means of conducting world affairs—galvanized the free nations by its conclusive demonstration that America will back her pledges with action.

Postwar American foreign policy has consistently affirmed our deep belief that the modern world cannot tolerate aggression. This policy, which has enjoyed the overwhelming support of our people, underlies every program we have initiated to promote world peace. Look, for example, at—

The Charter of the United Nations, to which the United States has given its firm pledge and full support;

Military aid to Greece, Turkey, and Iran, which permitted the Greeks to stamp out Communist-led rebellion, and enabled Turkey and Iran to withstand Red pressure;

The Marshall plan, established to promote economic recovery in the free nations for strengthening themselves against aggressive Communist tactics from within;

The Berlin airlift, which blocked Communist efforts to control all of Germany;

The North Atlantic Pact, which pledged the Atlantic democracies to united action against any aggressor who attacked them;

The military-aid program, which, beginning last year, has furnished modern military equipment and funds for strengthening defenses of free nations from Europe through the Middle East and around to the Philippines, Indochina, and Korea;

The point 4 program, just enacted by Congress to bring needed technical know-how to poverty-ridden nations that they may expand their industry and food production. Communist propaganda has always operated with greatest effectiveness where hunger and misery are the worst, and point 4 is the surest answer to the Communists.

These programs to halt communism and promote a stable world in the future have been under attack—as might be expected—from the Communists themselves, and from a handful of noisy isolationists here at home. Significantly, however, the isolationists' clamor subsided rapidly after the Korean invasion. The military assistance program, bitterly attacked in Senate debate before the invasion, was passed unanimously by the Senate a few days later.

These international programs—and our strong national defense system—made the President's action possible. As a member of the United Nations, acting in support of the Security Council's order, our aid to South Korea had international legal sanction. Moreover, the Republic of Korea would have fallen overnight had it not been for the millions it has already received in American assistance for training its forces and rebuilding its economy.

Our modern, unified defense system brought effective aid at a moment's notice. General MacArthur, when he assumed command, had land, naval, and air units at his disposal. He also had the equipment developed by our extensive postwar research program:

Ten-mile-a-minute jet fighters, unknown to combat in World War II;

Fast heavy bombers, fitted out with the new developments in radar control;

Our fastest, best-equipped fleet units, decked out with antisubmarine and anti-aircraft gear that would have saved hundreds of vessels in World War II;

And the best-trained Armed Forces in the world.

Peace is at stake—as it has been throughout the postwar period—because of Soviet bad faith, and plans to dominate the world. In the past 5 years, the Government has invested billions in national defense and in programs to aid the free nations. But steep as these costs have been, they are minor by comparison with the costs of another war. The costs of peace, however, have made any reduction of our national debt impossible at present.

Free man may thank God that the United States is strong and healthy enough to bear the heavy burdens of halting the spread of totalitarian oppression and despair. The critical events which have brought us to the present situation abundantly demonstrate the wisdom of our firm policies against communism. And the American people, confident that right is on their side, have accepted the role of world leadership resolutely, bringing with them to the task the moral support and physical wherewithal to see the job through.

Foreign Investment Guaranties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith insert a statement prepared by the Export-Import Bank of Washington in regard to H. R. 8083, foreign investment guaranties:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CONCERNING H. R. 8063, FOREIGN INVESTMENT GUARANTIES

Question. Why have a guaranty program at all? Why not let American investors take their own chances abroad or keep their money at home?

Answer. We have a better chance of a peaceful world and victory of freedom-loving democracy over slave-driving communism if the underdeveloped countries can secure technical help and private capital for development from the free world. There must be developed, therefore, some self-supporting plan for encouraging the flow of private capital. Soft currency or nonconvertibility risk and the risk of expropriation are among the more important deterrents to American private capital venturing into less-developed areas where profit returns are usually greater. These are risks which, because of their nature, private capital cannot be expected to assume. They are particularly appropriate for assumption by the Government.

Question. What has been the average rate of United States private capital investment abroad in recent years?

Answer. Since the end of the war United States private investment abroad has amounted to almost $1,000,000,000 each year. At the end of 1948 it was estimated that the grand total United States direct investment abroad was approximately $11,000,000,000. Foreign investment could be at several times this rate and still make but a small dent in the opportunities ahead.

Investment abroad in the past 2 years, however, has been sharply limited in a number of ways. It has been concentrated to a very high degree in a few industries, notably the petroleum industry, and in a few areas, notably Canada, Venezuela, and the oil producing countries of the Middle East. Furthermore, a major part of the investment has been made by a very small number of large companies.

It seems desirable that a large number of United States investors be encouraged to make and be facilitated in making foreign investments. It seems desirable also that United States private capital flow into the many fields of economic activity which offer opportunity for the investment of funds and the application of enterprise, initiative, knowledge, and skills.

Question. What is the relationship of the technical assistance program incorporated in the Act for International Development (Public Law 535, 81st Cong., 2d sess.) and the guaranty program of H. R. 8083?

Answer. The Act for International Development provides that the United States Government shall furnish technical assistance to underdeveloped areas. The knowledge, experience, personnel, and training to be furnished by the United States Government under this program will largely be used to lay the groundwork for broad development programs on a national scale rather than to carry out projects on the industrial, individual business level.

The guaranty program incorporated in H. R. 8083 is intended to encourage the flow of United States private capital to these underdeveloped areas. Such capital is necessary because technical knowledge must be embodied in machinery, tools, and other equipment if it is to be translated into greater productivity and national income. With this capital will also flow the "know-how" and technical skills of American industry and agriculture for use in the development of specific projects and individual business enterprises.

The two bills are thus complementary, each program helpful to the other, but each intended to accomplish different purposes. Together, they form two of the necessary ingredients to point 4.

Question. Why is the Export-Import Bank named in the bill to administer the guaranty program?

Answer. The bank is the ideal medium for administering the guaranties since it has already had 16 years' experience in the field of foreign investment and specifically in participation with private American capital in such investment. Furthermore, the bank has demonstrated its ability to conduct a self-supporting program. Losses on credit authorizations of over $4,000,000,000 have not exceeded $300,000 and net profits after all administrative expenses, losses, and the interest cost of all Government funds used by the bank exceed $100,000,000.

Question. Many people seem to think that the guaranty program will be just another handout. Is this true?

Answer. No. It is intended to be a self-supporting, businesslike banking program. The bank is required by its enabling statute to use its powers only when there is a reasonable assurance of repayment consistent with its purposes. Fees will be charged the American investor for the guaranties. The bank will have claims against the foreign governments for dollars for the local currency which the bank acquires from making good on guaranties to American investors.

Question. Do you believe that the guaranty program authorized under H. R. 8083 will actually result in an increased flow of United States investment capital abroad?

Answer. It is not possible to predict the precise effectiveness of the guaranty program, for there are many deterrents to private foreign investment and this bill attempts to deal wtih only two of them. This bill does not, for example, attempt to deal with the fact that there is an abundance of opportunities for profitable investment in the United States, or the lack of knowledge on the part of potential United States investors of investment opportunities abroad. The removal of the important deterrents covered by the bill, however, may well result in a significant increase in foreign investment by United States private capital over a period of time.

Question. What is intended in the bill by the phrase "encouraging productive investment"?

Answer. The bill limits guaranties to productive investments in order to stress the importance of those types of investment projects which promise to increase the foreign country's productive capacity and to increase its ability to provide dollar exchange for the service of such investments. This is a sound banking policy and sound economics because it makes possible a continuing self-supporting program and enhances the value of existing investments.

Furthermore, productive enterprises contribute generally to the sound economic development of the countries concerned.

Question. What countries would be included in "economically underdeveloped areas" referred to in the bill?

Answer. The term is a relative one and might be taken relative to the United States. For practical purposes, there would be substantial agreement that Latin America, the Far East, the Near East, and Africa are underdeveloped relative to the United States. However, the term is used in a broader concept to include countries whose agriculture or industry fail to meet modern standards of technical progress by a sufficient margin that the introduction of more modern techniques and capital can bring about substantial increases in production, higher income, and higher standards of living. Such changes can be expected to provide the basis for greater social, economic, and political stability to form the base for a higher level of a sound balanced foreign trade, and thus to promote the welfare of both the United States and the underdeveloped areas. Thus western Europe, or regions other than those named above, might be included in the broader concept in instances of specific projects fully meeting such tests.

Question. Will the guaranty bill eliminate all risks inherent in private foreign investment by transferring the risks to the United States Government?

Answer. No. The bill, specifically limits the risks against which guaranties may be issued to two contingencies, inconvertibility and expropriation. The bank is thus prohibited from insuring an investor by authority of H. R. 8083 against any other risks.

Consequently, the private investor must take all other risks, such as all ordinary business risks, fluctuations in exchange rates, risks related to the locale of the investment such as excessive taxation, forced labor requirements, damages from civil riot, war, acts of God, etc.

What the proposed bill does, briefly, is to enable the guaranteed investor to proceed in appraising his own risks and potential returns without worrying about "soft currency" or expropriation of his property, both of which obstacles loom large and which he can do nothing about. It is appropriate that the bank should assume these risks with a self-supporting program to which all guaranteed investors will contribute proportionately through their fees paid for the guaranty.

Question. What percentage of American capital invested in a specific foreign project might be guaranteed?

Answer. At least up to 100 percent of the original capital invested and a reasonable profit thereon.

Question. How will an "appropriate fee" be determined.

Answer. The bank will charge a fee large enough to cover estimated administrative costs and the cost of a risk factor determined in the light of the bank's experience with international credits. It should be remembered that the bank will not necessarily suffer a loss when it makes good on guaranties to an American investor. By agreement with the country concerned, the bank will have a dollar claim against the local currency it acquires from the American investor. Accordingly, in fixing the fee, the bank will take into consideration and appraise its risk of being unable to collect dollars due it by the foreign government. It is intended that the whole guaranty program will be self-supporting and constitute no drain on United States Government revenues.

Question. What will the bank do with the local currency or other property acquired by it pursuant to guaranty operations?

Answer. Apart from and in addition to the general investment treaties which may be entered into by the United States Government and foreign governments, it will be necessary for the bank to negotiate specific agreements with those countries in which investments are to be guaranteed, such agreements to set forth in detail the treatment to be accorded the local currency and other property which the bank may acquire as a result of the guaranty operations.

As a minimum these agreements will constitute a recognition by the foreign government that any local currency held by the bank will be converted into dollars. The bank plans not to request any priority of dollar payment due it on foreign currency taken over from guaranteed investors, in order that there may be no discrimination against existing investment. The bank will either use the foreign currency for local expenditures of the United States in that country or will hold the currency waiting its proper turn to be converted into dollars.

In the case of expropriation, the agreement would provide for a fair settlement of any claims held by the bank on the basis of prearranged standards of valuation or prearranged mechanics of arbitration.

Question. Will applications for guaranties be issued by the bank more or less automatically in all cases qualified in terms of the bill, or will the bank exercise discretion within the limits of the bill?

Answer. The bill confers the power of guaranty on the bank but does not direct the bank to guarantee all qualified investments. It is intended that the bank will use discretion, taking into account all factors, such as safety of investment, soundness of the project, earning potentials, relative value of the project to the area concerned both for increasing production and as a means of earning dollar exchange, conditions in the area and in fact most of the factors which the bank now considers in making a loan. Prospect of profit and safety of investment are by no means the only criteria.

Question. Would guaranties be extended to service enterprises such as retail merchandising or primarily to the development of natural resources, transportation, power, manufacturing plants, etc.?

Answer. The bank would not rule out the possibility of guaranties of investments in the field of distribution; retail merchandising for example. Improvement in the efficiency and reduction in the cost of distribution can make an important contribution to economic development. On the other hand, there are other sectors of economic life which are perhaps more important in the development of an underdeveloped area. Furthermore, the problem is in part one of balance. Dollar investments require dollar servicing and it would be hopeless to expect increased dollar service from a country in which all investments were concentrated in activities which did not enhance the net dollar earnings of the country.

Question. Will the bank require, as a condition to issuing a guaranty, that the investor secure the approval or consent from the country in which the investment is proposed to be made?

Answer. It will be the policy of the bank not to guarantee any investments in foreign countries which are not in favor of such action. The whole guaranty program must be founded upon a willing cooperation between the foreign country involved and the bank.

Question. Will general investment treaties be prerequisites to the issuance of guaranties?

Answer. As indicated in the committee report on H. R. 8083, the guaranty program provided for in the bill will be accompanied by the negotiation of investment treaties with foreign countries. Such treaties will have as their purpose the creation of a more congenial climate for the investment of United States capital abroad. The intent of the executive branch to undertake such treaties or agreements is an integral part of the point 4 program. Before guaranties are issued the foreign countries involved must have demonstrated their interest in creating a favorable climate for foreign investment by indicating their willingness to negotiate investment treaties or agreements or to make other arrangements to protect investors from unwarranted treatment under the laws of such countries.

Question. How will the bank determine the amount of guaranties that will be issued in any particular country?

Answer. The amount cannot be arbitrarily determined in advance. Governing circumstances will include: opportunities for profitable and productive investment; the budget, exchange and monetary conditions of the country and the demonstrated willingness of its government to establish conditions favorable to investment and to the transfer of earnings. These circumstances may vary from time to time so that guaranties may be granted for a time and later withheld; or the reverse. If the guaranty program is wisely administered it will not result in the creation of dollar obligations that the underdeveloped countries cannot reasonably be expected to meet, but should actually increase the power of those countries to meet their dollar obligations.

Question. Does the bank propose to guarantee existing investments?

Answer. No. Although the bill provides for the guaranty of "capital invested in productive enterprises abroad" with no limitation as to whether the investment must be made prior or subsequent to the date of enactment of the bill, the bank does not now propose, at least at the outset, to extend guaranties to existing investments. Existing investments are, after all, well established on the basis of arrangements already worked out. They were entered into voluntarily by the investor without any expectation of guaranties. The basic purpose of the guaranty program is to encourage new investment, to stimulate the flow of additional and new capital abroad. It is the opinion of the bank and of many responsible representatives of the business community that the extension of guaranties to new investments would in no way prejudice the position of any existing investment, for productive new investments will definitely enhance the value of existing investments by improving the dollar earning capacity of the foreign country. It should be noted, however, that the bank plans not to request any priority of dollar payment due it on foreign currency taken over from guaranteed investors, in order that there may be no discrimination against existing investment.

Question. Would H. R. 8083 permit the bank to guarantee investments of other than equity capital, such as commercial bank loans?

Answer. The proposed legislation would permit the bank to guarantee investments made in other than equity forms. The bank proposes to guarantee investments in such other forms. In the opinion of the bank the significant distinction is not that between equity and loan or other forms of investment. Loans made by United States companies or by United States individuals or financial institutions to foreign companies may not differ from purchases of stocks or other evidences of ownership in any significant respect. The important question is whether the funds supplied are used for a productive purpose which will contribute to the economic development of the country in which the investment is made and thus redound to the benefit of the United States.

The bank however, makes this qualification: That it sees no object in issuing a guaranty to a lender who takes no risk other than the risks covered by the guaranty. The funds invested by such a lender would be private in name only. An example might be a loan by a financial institution or by private individuals to a foreign government. In the case of such a loan the only risk is the transfer risk, since any foreign government possessed of the power to tax and the ordinary monetary powers can provide its own currency in unlimited amounts. On the other hand, a loan to a private foreign enterprise engaged in a business actually involves for the lender business risks in addition to the nonbusiness risks against which guaranties would be issued by the bank. Thus the investment is genuinely a private investment and would be considered to be eligible for guaranty.

Question. Would the bank guarantee the investment of foreign currencies owned by United States citizens?

Answer. Although the bill would permit this, provided the capital is American owned, it is not intended that the guaranties provided by the bill shall be used in cases where the investment is merely a means or subterfuge for the conversion of American funds now held in the form of blocked foreign currencies. On the other hand, it may prove to be the case that permanent foreign investment of those blocked funds could serve usefully in foreign development to the advantage of the underdeveloped areas and to the United States, in some circumstances. The bank recognizes that serious problems are involved and that the subject needs further consideration and study.

Question. Will guaranties be issued to enterprises which compete with United States industry?

Answer. In authorizing the bank to issue guaranties only with respect to investments in productive enterprises the bill would prevent the bank from issuing guaranties which would result in uneconomic duplication and expansion of production and productive facilities already existing in the United States and other countries.

Question. What steps does the bank propose to take to assure that small business will receive an equitable proportion of the guaranties issued?

Answer. The bank does not believe that only large business ventures can be sound and productive, and, in fact, is inclined to believe that small business enterprises are peculiarly appropriate and peculiarly valuable in the development of underdeveloped countries. Such businesses have the great merit of introducing individual initiative and competition into a situation in which there is typically a great absence of both of these qualities. Furthermore, small businesses have the advantage particularly desirable in a changing economic situation of flexibility and adaptability which is frequently lacking in the case of massive enterprises.

Question. Does the bank believe that a program of guaranteeing private investments would be an effective substitute for intergovernmental lending?

Answer. Not completely. Intergovernmental lending will continue to be desirable for undertakings that do not lend themselves to private investment, such as irrigation, highway construction and maintenance, public works and for other undertakings for which private capital is not available.

Question. Why would it not be simpler and more economical in the long run for the United States Government to just lend money to the underdeveloped countries than get involved in an investment guaranty program?

Answer. There are definite advantages in having investments necessary to the economic development of foreign countries made

by United States private citizens (even with limited Government guaranties) rather than by way of loans on a government to government basis. It seems clear, for one thing, that the investment of private United States capital abroad may well be accompanied by the initiative, the organizing ability, the knowledge, and the skills which are so essential to efficient production whether at home or abroad. In addition, the investment of private United States capital abroad is more likely to create conditions in the future which will make further guaranties unnecessary, i. e., a new international economy established on a sound and enduring basis. Furthermore, private capital is the only adequate source of continuing investment from a creditor country in the democratic world.

Question. Will the guaranty program provided by the bill necessitate the bank materially to increase its staff and administrative expenses?

Answer. Some small increase in the staff of the bank will be necessary. But the increase is likely to be gradual and not substantial for the limited program provided by the bill. In any event, guaranty fees are to be charged sufficient to cover administrative expenses as well as losses.

At present the bank operates with a total of 125 employees. Total administrative expenses of the bank are less than $1,000,000 per year. Administrative costs total approximately four-one hundredths of 1 percent of average total loans outstanding. The bank feels at present that the cost of administering guaranties should not differ materially from the cost of administering loans. Much will depend upon the number and average size of guaranties the bank will be called upon to make. A large number of small guaranties will cost much more than one guaranty of the same aggregate amount.

The Korean Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House an article which appeared in the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot for Sunday, July 9, 1950. It discusses some of the mistakes made by our Military Government in Korea.

The author of this article, Mr. Harold Sugg, in 1946 served with the American Military Government as public information officer for the North Kyongsang Province, at Taegu. His writing in the January 1947 issue of Harpers magazine foresaw the Korean situation as it is today. The article which I quote is based on his personal experiences. It gives us much cause for thought.

Mr. Sugg's observations undoubtedly account for the fact that in the current situation American forces are not always greeted with 100 percent enthusiasm and cooperation on the part of South Koreans. He says we could do better. To my way of thinking, we must do better.

In addition to the mistakes which we have made on the diplomatic scene, it seems obvious that we have also made many errors in connection with our Military Establishment. This whole situation seems to point out an overaccentuation on strategic warfare, on heavy bombers and fast jet fighters.

These are vital in our total defense program, but they alone are not sufficient. We still need ground troops and the weapons to provide our soldiers with tactical support. We must utilize fully the capabilities of our Navy and naval aviation.

The peril of the present situation points up an urgency for a reevaluation of the emphasis which we have placed upon various weapons and various components of our Armed Forces together with their capabilities for providing the defense which our Nation must have. The time is late, but as we consider possible eventualities, we must now be sure that we make no mistakes and that we provide the forces and weapons which we may need in every category to meet this threat of a possible world war III.

It would serve no purpose to seek to place the blame for the current situation on one or more individuals. The simple fact is that mistakes both military and politically must be corrected.

Mr. Sugg's article follows:

NEXT MILITARY GOVERNMENT FOR KOREA COULD DO BETTER—REVOLUTIONARY HAVE-NOTS MUST NOT AGAIN BE IGNORED—OUR FORMULA FOR DEMOCRACY FAILED TO FIT ASIA'S PATTERN

(By Harold Sugg)

"Two weeks after we leave, this whole thing will fall to pieces and the Communists will take over."

That gloomy idea was frequently in the minds of American military government officers in Korea 4 years ago.

The South Korean Government structure did not fall to pieces with the end of AMG. The Republic of South Korea, which took its place after a UN-supervised election, managed to do enough good and put enough people in jail to prevent it from being overthrown by internal revolution.

That is to the credit side. But the disasters following the first hard North Korean punch—even considering the disparity in armament and the advantage of surprise—suggest that there were basic weaknesses in the American program for South Korea.

Eventually there will have to be another military government of South Korea, even if it functions behind the facade of a restored republic.

Experience suggests urgently that a program for South Korea be devised that will avoid the mistakes of the first makeshift program and both entice and compel the support of the "revolutionary" Korean people—the young, ambitious, and the have-nots who are in the majority.

Such a program, when devised, would brush upon ideas useful for other countries in Asia. For although each Asian country has distinct national differences, reports from the others show similarity in problems.

SIMPLE AND UNTUTORED

In Korea about 80 percent of the people are simple peasants, living on intensively worked farms averaging about 3 acres. Ten percent are the land-owning and governing class and the remaining 10 percent are workers with no more stake in the economy than the landless peasant and, in case of famine, in a more vulnerable position.

These figures are subject to adjustment a few points each way; accurate statistics are hard to come by. But the general outline is undebatable. When the occupations began, it was estimated that 80 percent of the people were illiterate. Since then, illiteracy has been reported reduced to 20 percent. The great majority, while barely literate, are uneducated.

When the Americans came, the Koreans were overjoyed, happy with their independence and anxious to improve themselves. The Americans found a native "government" already operating—the Korean underground which had received power from the Japanese on the day of surrender. It had committees operating at the national level, at provincial capitals and in the villages. When one considers that a whole governing class, the Japanese, had been overthrown, the situation was remarkably orderly.

What did the Americans do? We ignored this native outfit that pretended to be a government. We hired and relied upon only those who had a clean shirt, who held remotely responsible jobs under the Japanese and who had the aspects of well-being which, in America, indicated an ability to carry responsibility. (Unfortunately, the rule in America wouldn't apply in Korea.)

The Americans brought in Syngman Rhee, a Korean patriot who was named president of the Korean Provisional Government after a western-style independence movement in 1919. Dr. Rhee had spent his life trying to keep the name of Korea alive in western capitals. As a real patriot, he doesn't deserve all of the criticism he now gets.

WOULD NOT COMPROMISE

But the unfortunate fact was that he had not been in Korea for 25 years and would not compromise with other Koreans who had been in and out of Japanese jails for political reasons and who in August, 1945, had fervent political followings. With Dr. Rhee as political adviser, the AMG made a hard and fast alliance with the conservative landlord class. This, unfortunately, included some of the Koreans who not only cooperated with the Japanese (all Koreans had to do that) but did so enthusiastically.

There was a reason for AMG to be very suspicious of the native "government" which went through various transformations and wound up as the "People's Party." It contained Communists.

To understand why there were so many Communists, or people who thought they were Communists, it is first necessary to realize that the principal goal of the patriotic Korean was to break the Japanese domination. Since the failure of the 1919 revolution, it was made plain that Washington, London, Paris, and other western capitals had forgotten all about an independent Korea. The only hope for assistance lay in Moscow, or so it seemed. The western world had its chance—but muffed it. The Korean "Communists" became leaders in the independence movement, such as it was in a hopeless situation.

The AMG, at the top level, unable or unwilling to sift out the patriots from the varying degrees of Communists in the short-lived native government, simply blacklisted them all. In this AMG was encouraged by conservative Korean politicians who learned that the way to a good job and power was simply to advise the Americans that the opponents were Communists.

The blanket exclusion of the native "government," while well-intentioned and having a partial basis, had one unfortunate result: It drove some of the best brains towards the Communists and against the government. This was particularly true among the young people and in the provinces.

What did the Russians do? They dealt only with people who did not have a clean shirt. They tossed out the rich Koreans who cooperated most avidly with the Japanese, started a land redistribution program, took over the ownership of industries and put "workers committees" theoretically in charge. And they started the perpetual magic show

which the Communists employ to make people think a revolution is working for them.

THE RUSSIAN ANGLE

On a strict analysis, the Russians did not do anything for Korea. They didn't put the money into Korea that we did. Their land distribution program didn't give the peasant private ownership; it merely took the land from private ownership and placed it in the hands of a party-controlled village committee.

The anti-Japanese program looked like a fraud. Every Korean had cooperated to some degree with the Japanese in order to live. When the Russians found an uncooperative Christian or pro-American Korean, it was an easy matter to cook up and prove a pro-Japanese charge, send him to prison or hard labor—or across the border as a refugee burden for the AMG.

The point is, however, that the Russians based their politics on the young men, on the side of change.

The question is: Why can't the Americans go into Korea with a program that enlists the vigor of the young men, harness the desires of the have-nots majority and put the United States on the side of the revolution and not against it?

It can be done if enough Americans will remember that the United States came to being through a revolution. But it can't be done unless Americans are willing to support a State Department program for a western-style revolution in Korea.

The point 4 program, TVA's, Federal aid to education and to health, British-style ownership of basic industries, government action to put the farmland into the hands of the peasants who till it—these are the ideas that Koreans under 50 years will respond to.

IRONICAL SITUATION

The irony of the problem is that the conservative wing of the Republican Party which has been so bitter about American failures in Asia is the same group most opposed to the ideas that would put the United States on the side of the revolution in Asia rather than against it. For 20 years, we had sold the idea that free enterprise equals democracy.

Free enterprise has a vital relationship to democracy in America. But the rule does not apply to Korea. For a program to attract Koreans, it is necessary to separate democracy (a political term) and economics. We can sell them on democracy easily if we won't try to enforce our particular brand of economics. For the Koreans, free enterprise means simply that the few haves and the many have-nots will remain the same. And they are willing to fight about it.

Here are some examples of how free enterprise did not work in Korea. When the Americans arrived, the whole Korean economy was disrupted because of the defeat of the Japanese who had held every position of importance. There was a severe shortage of consumer goods due to the war. If there ever was a time or place where price controls were necessary, Korea in the fall of 1945 was it.

What did AMG do? The top command, good military men and conservatives all, declared the end of price controls and the institution of a new era of free economy. The price of rice sky-rocketed. There were not many durable goods on the market to attract the farmer. By the following February, AMG was using Korean police to go out and make the farmers sell rice to AMG at a Government-fixed price.

When the Americans arrived, almost all the industries in South Korea were without owners and managers, for the Japanese had been the owners and managers. What did AMG do? It farmed the plants out temporarily to Koreans. The prime prerequisite for getting a license was to be a member of the so-called Korean Democratic Party (the landlord class evidently had heard the Democratic Party was in power in Washington).

This system opened up the old-style Oriental custom of getting hold of a business or Government office and then filling it with relatives. It turned the workers against the AMG.

Some painful scenes followed. In many cases, the workers themselves had started running the ownerless plants. And then one day some Korean they never saw before walked in, showing an AMG permit. Sometimes there were fights and strikes. Sometimes the new manager made bargains with the workers. The result made no friends for Americans among those able and willing to fight.

When the Americans arrived, all parties were clamoring for a program to put the land in the hands of the peasants who tilled it. But that, of course, sounded like communism. Not until June 1 of this year—3 weeks before the invasion—did the Republic of South Korea, which grew from what AMG left, get around to a land-distribution program. This was to have distributed all land in excess of 7-acre farms to about 1,000,000 landless peasants. The landlords, in return, received government bonds with which they could, with priority, buy the former Japanese industries.

Whether the transfer was completed before the invasion is not known here. But if AMG had distributed the land 4 years ago there would be 1,000,000 peasants now with very good reasons to fight the North Koreans. Had our good conservatives in AMG been less afraid of what they imagined to to be communism then, we might be less concerned about actual Russian-trained Communists now.

Putting it in familiar terms, an attractive program for Koreans (one they will fight for) will be, at least, New Dealism or Fair Dealism (unpopular phrases over here), and, at the most, socialism. The only thing we have to insist upon are fair and regular elections and our Bill of Rights. No Korean government will be unfavorable to us if it has the last two elements.

If the above idea is hard for you to swallow, then you have to make up your mind: either you want the United States to be on the winning side of the Asian revolution or you don't.

If the United States is to fulfill its task as a world leader, Americans have to realize that the world is a mighty big place, with all sorts of patterns. Koreans have much to learn from us. They don't have to be exactly like us—and they won't be.

On these points Koreans are interchangeable with Chinese, Filipinos, Indochinese, Indonesians, and Nehru's Indians.

THEY WERE "GOOKS"

Another point on which the Korean is interchangeable with other orientals involves what we delight in calling "southern democracy." Many of the American troops in Korea looked upon the Koreans about like the Negroes were considered in Mississippi 20 years ago.

Some examples of this are not fit for a Sunday morning paper. Here's a mild story:

A bright young Korean student came proudly to the public-relations office of AMG in Taegu and announced that the Koreans had formed a baseball team. In the interest of Korean-American relations, the team wished to play an AMG team.

The public-relations officer went to the commander of the military government company with the invitation. The commander told him: "My boys don't want to play ball with any g—— d—— gooks."

There is a better side to the picture. Many other Americans did a fine job in making friends for this country. Some of them have dug into their own pockets to help bring their Korean friends over here to study. The good outweighs the bad—by a moderate margin. But there was an appalling amount of American rudeness in southern Korea.

The hardest job AMG public-relations men had was to explain racial incidents in America which the Moscow radio picked up, enlarged upon, and rebroadcast to Korea and elsewhere in Asia. We were asked by Korean newspaper reporters, for instance, why the Daughters of the American Revolution would not let Marian Anderson sing in Constitution Hall in the Nation's Capital.

How would you explain that to the Korean reporters, whose complexions were about that of a light-skin mulatto? Progress in racial relations must be continued in America and racial prejudice must be left at home altogether, if we are to have fighting friends in Korea and elsewhere among the colored peoples of the world.

If these ideas also disturb you, then you just have to make up your mind. Either you want the United States to be the influential power in Asia or you don't. It makes a lot of difference right now to the American soldier fighting in South Korea whether he passes a village where Americans made friends or one where AMG didn't make friends.

UNITED STATES MILITARY POWER

There must be a lot of "do-goodism" (awful word over here nowadays) in the next military Government. But that's just one-half of the prescription. The other half is American military power. The uneasy and unstable American policy in Asia, the fear of the "inevitable" Communist triumph which Russian propaganda spreads, played a large part in weakening South Korea.

The present line-up in Asia as it affects Korea is insane by all past standards. By all the laws of national interest, Communist China ought to be helping drive Russian influence out of Korea. One reason she is not is that the Russians have displayed the power and captured the dynamic ideas—while the United States demobilized its power and presented no dynamic program to hold the people's interest. This situation must be reversed.

When South Korea once more is cleared up to the thirty-eighth parallel, we will be back where we started. The problem will remain extremely difficult, for Korea, essentially an economically balanced peninsula, will be divided between an industrial North and an agricultural South. But at least we can do a better job until the day comes—probably many years from now—when a general settlement puts Korea together again.

It is important to remember that Koreans, North and South, can unite on one thing: They want independence and unity. They would never have produced this tragic situation; they are victims of cold war. If the Koreans could ever have their own choice, with confidence and freedom, the North could be de-Russianized.

RUSSIAN ROBBERY

All the rudeness of a minority of the American troops, put together and multiplied, would not equal what the first Russian troops, a sorry outfit, did in plunder and rape in North Korea. All the confusion and mistakes of the Americans put together and doubled would not equal the stream of lies put on Pyongyang radio by the Russians. All the people put in jail or executed at the behest of Dr. Rhee's government would not exceed the political persecution that has gone on in the North Korean Government.

And nothing the United States did in Korea even approached the gross cruelty of the Soviet Union in establishing the thirty-eighth parallel as an arbitrary border, dividing one people and one balanced economy.

It will be tempting, if the Korean war can be finished without becoming part of world

war II, to urge that United Nations forces repair the error of Yalta and Potsdam by pushing on beyond the thirty-eighth parallel and complete the independence and unity of Korea. That is a grave question that must await developments. But it may be accepted as a fact that Korea will continue to be a powder keg until it is all one, united, democratic (political-style) country.

The point is that the Americans did so little with the opportunity that was present, and now are having to win the opportunity back at great cost. Next time, why can't we be the revolutionaries?

But It Is Serious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of July 8, 1950:

BUT IT IS SERIOUS

Optimism is a virtue in military and national leaders; but it is most valuable when the civil population soberly recognizes the grimness of the struggle. That grimness is contained for many in news that the draft will be used if necessary to fill increased manpower quotas of the armed services.

General MacArthur may be right in a narrow sense when he says the situation of the American ground forces in Korea is not serious. But the over-all situation is serious.

It is well also for President Truman to speak hopefully about Korea.

But the meeting of the Communist attack already is bitterly costly to men on the firing line and to the families of those in the casualty lists. The over-all situation is certainly not one for lightheartedness or for business, politics, strikes, and pleasure as usual on the home front.

Not a few "dogfaces" will remember that there were days of sanguinary fighting and heavy destruction after General MacArthur had hopefully announced the liberation of Manila. That came not at the beginning of a campaign but toward the end of a long march back from defeats that began on a peninsula named Bataan.

To be sure, the hostilities in Korea represent a localized conflict. But into that theater have been poured somewhere upward of 100 Russian tanks, with great reserves of Communist Asian manpower available. The struggle there can make immense demands on America and its companion members of the United Nations.

It is none too soon to recognize that the struggle is serious and will require long, hard, unrelenting effort.

Governor Dewey struck this note in a statement from Albany urging the administration to institute an all-out program "to match and outstrip Soviet production of arms."

Free men do not enter with any delight into an arms race. We would greatly prefer that the Soviet challenge were to produce better housing, broader education, more adequate diet, or more soap and running water for earth's millions.

But the challenge is in arms. And it must be met with the moral willingness to do what is necessary to help protect mankind from the ravages of an aggressor.

Rearmament, Mr. Dewey points out, will call for allocations of materials, elimination of nonessential production, and redirection of Federal spending. "No one should doubt," he says, "that the American people would prefer to sacrifice their luxuries, their comforts, even essentials, to save the blood of their sons."

Reports from the Korean front indicate that American and other United Nations troops will need weapons of the highest quality and caliber to meet the thrust of Russian-built armor.

The Senate Armed Services Committee has taken a logical reaction to the news by calling upon military leaders for full information about the distribution of defense equipment.

This, rather than petulance or criticism at reverses, is the way to meet heavy going and to pull through.

Let's know what the need is and take steps to supply it. But make no mistake about it: the situation is serious.

Korea and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including from the European supplement to Human Events for July 5, part of Mr. Frank C. Hanighen's remarks entitled "Not Merely Gossip." His comments on politics and Korea and Mr. Acheson are very interesting at this time:

POLITICS AND KOREA

The really big political show in the capital in the past week has been the administration's attempt to conceal the bankruptcy of its foreign policy. This is in deadly earnest and has inspired the violent attacks on TAFT by lickspittles in press and radio. These attacks were concentrated on TAFT's invocation of the constitutional role of Congress in declarations of war. But the administration emphasis was purely tactical, being aimed at creating the usual confusion in the public mind when matters constitutional come up. Actually, the maneuver was to conceal TAFT's brilliant review of the State Department's record of complete bankruptcy. The administration's trickery succeeded, for there was very little reporting of the Ohioan's unanswerable arraignment (of State Department blundering) on the floor of the Senate (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 28).

The hullabaloo over "unity" is the keystone of the administration's defense strategy. The harebrained response by public leaders (to the appeal for "unity") is one of the most discouraging aspects of the present situation. The same cry of "stand by the President" smothered at the outset necessary criticism of such policies as the Morgenthau plan, the unconditional surrender policy, the first outlines of the project for UN, etc.—when vigorous criticism might have prevented these fatal mistakes.

It is agreed among honest observers that a real foreign policy can only be rebuilt after a complete clean-out of th old State Department gang, who originated the above fatal policies and brought us to the present pass. Indeed it is arguable that such a house cleaning is the best way to restore our prestige among our allies—not by protecting vested State Department interests, not by the cry of "unity."

ACHESON

Open funk, openly arrived at, has ceased to be admired since guns began to roar in Korea; and so the myth of Acheson, the great statesman, is fading rapidly. It was never more than a product of the tea-cozy camarillas (composed of Washington press and politicos) with whom the Secretary's synthetic English accent and oh-so-cute ventures in humorous understatement went over great guns.

Acheson, since assuming his post, has obviously been of the firm opinion that the best thing to happen would be for history to just stop—while he presided over delicious little international conferences. But history has insisted on going on in a most disagreeable manner. It is believed that the Acheson policy was blown to vapors by a sudden explosion of the President's old Battery D spirit. On the other hand, there are those here who think that Acheson and his crowd are still punching. It is reliably reported, as an instance, that this crowd is today strenuously urging, behind the scenes, the resignation of Chiang Kai-shek.

Additionally, it should be said that Acheson still has powerful personalities behind him. The "big brother" of course is Justice Felix Frankfurter who can when necessary mount quite a publicity offensive in his friend's behalf. Recently, from sources close to former Secretary of War Stimson, we heard of one such Frankfurter maneuver, several months ago when Acheson's via dolorosa was haunted by the ghost of Alger Hiss. These sources claim to have been present when a call to Stimson came from the Supreme Court Building, "Felix speaking." The call was to urge the old Secretary of War to make public a letter backing "Dean" which the latter did. It can be imagined that this was not the only call made by "Felix."

Yet most observers here think Acheson's goose is cooked. It is noted how some in the press are "building up" the President as a great statesman, obviously in order to "build down" Acheson. (Those who take this line—no friends of Truman—are doubtless proceeding on the theory that there is no danger of completely succeeding in the task of making the man from Missouri a superfigure.) Likewise, it is noted that certain press courtiers at the Acheson court are already—but privately—talking with confidence of how well they know "Averell." For the capital is duly expecting Harriman to succeed Acheson. And, on one matter the capital is in agreement—that Averell Harriman is very weak. All this leads one to the conclusion that there is little hope in sight for a State Department house cleaning and a new vigorous foreign policy.

German Youth Recounts Its Fate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including an article by Marion Donhoff which appeared in the supplement to Human Events of July 1950, in which she states her reactions to the young people in Germany. I am inserting it in the RECORD at this point:

This week the Hamburg firm of Christian Wegner published a bock which bears the title "Jugend untern Schicksal." It is an exciting and stirring bock. It is a collection

of the life histories of German boys and girls who in the years 1946 and 1949 went to school again, and who recorded their life histories when registering for their matriculation.

When 15 or 16 years old all of them had been uprooted by the chaos of the last 2 years of Hitler's regime. They had left school and been enrolled as antiaircraft helpers, in the labor corps or for military service. Young people who could hardly remember a time when there was no report of the Supreme Command—as one of them writes—picture their fate in the bombing, in the final struggle for Berlin, in the dreary trek of the refugees, and in Russian prisoner of war camps. They do it in a short and crisp, and sometimes a touching and gripping manner.

Nearly all of them refer to the fact that in 1945 their whole world collapsed. Even before then many had already begun to doubt the sense of the whole train of events, to doubt the integrity of the Führer and the moral authority of his demands. But most of them had unconsciously again and again stifled their doubts.

They all belonged to the Hitler Youth (HJ) or to the League of German Girls (BDM). They had grown up in that atmosphere of extreme credibility, of fake idealism, and they were suddenly faced with bankruptcy. Without exception they have all realized this bankruptcy to the full and faced up to it, often in prolonged and desperate mental struggle, and in the end they have mastered their fate. Not an easy fate: to realize at the age of 18 that those whom one had adored as gods and heroes had betrayed one; to see their pride and dreams annihilated. Many stand alone in the world and do not know what has become of their parents. Many have lost their homes and all support.

Among the many thousands who have sent in reports—of which only a selection of 70 have been compiled in this book—there is only one who has not found his way back to a sane life in this world and whom destiny has broken. All the others display an astounding vitality, and have firmly decided not to give up but to strive for a better world.

For those who are not content with hearsay on the attitude of German youth, these reports, in which the very young themselves take the stage and give an answer to thousands of questions, are of extraordinary interest. The book constitutes one of the most informative documents which has been published in Germany since 1945.

Lobbying Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I can understand, although I cannot sympathize with, the desire of some Members of Congress to disparage and discredit the work of the House Select Committee on Lobbying. But what I cannot understand is the fact that in their efforts to discredit the committee, some Members of this House will resort to the use of the product of a notorious hate-monger who has already gone to jail for contempt of Congress in 1944, and is now again in contempt of this Congress.

I refer specifically to the statement of Joseph P. Kamp, which was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 8, page 8341, by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. Inserting that statement in the RECORD was, it seems to me, an affront to the authority of the committee appointed by this House, since Mr. Kamp had openly defied the committee by refusing to produce records which he had been directed to furnish by subpena.

Who is Joe Kamp? On October 6, 1949, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report entitled "Subversive Activities of Hate Groups" of the Americanism Commission of the American Legion, Department of Illinois. That report listed many of the organizations whose purposes and techniques are contrary to the basic precepts of Americanism. These organizations are there described as being "inimical to the best interests of American democracy" and "anti-American since they pit class against class, race against race, and creed against creed, and make appeals with varying degrees of emphasis—all with the purposes of creating chaos and disunity among our people."

Included in that list was Joseph P. Kamp and his Constitutional Educational League. The activities of Mr. Kamp and the Constitutional Educational League were described in the following terms:

> The Constitutional Educational League's main activity is pamphleteering. Pamphlets issued by the group try to create religious hostility. In its accusations of Communist infiltration it makes malicious and irresponsible charges against responsible and respected groups and individuals who are working to strengthen and improve our democracy. The league is a personal vehicle of Kamp's which sells its pamphlets at profiteering prices in order to insure a good living for him.

Also listed in that report was the National Economic Council and Merwin K. Hart, whose lobbying activities have been the concern of the select committee, and who was called before the committee the same day as Mr. Kamp. The report had the following to say of Mr. Hart:

> Merwin K. Hart operates his National Economic Council with an aura of respectability. Recently Hart abandoned his subtle innuendoes and showed his true character by resorting to anti-Semitic items in his publications and speeches. The official publication of this group is the Economic Council Letter.

Is it not reaching mighty low to impugn the integrity of a duly appointed House committee with the irresponsible and bigoted statement of a character such as Joe Kamp? That statement tarnishes the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Surely the gentleman from Michigan does not condone the contempt of Congress perpetrated by his friend, Joe Kamp. Does not the inserting of Kamp's scurrilous slanders in the RECORD have that effect?

The persons and agencies attacked by a person like Kamp need no defense. The source of the attack enables decent-minded Americans automatically to disregard it.

The gentleman from Michigan on June 21, page 9031 of the RECORD, mentioned a number of organizations and implied they were on the Attorney General's subversive list. Let us keep the record straight. Not one of those organizations is on the list.

Hats Off to the Keogh Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the current situation in Korea and the threat it entails for our national security, the report of the House Small Business Oil Subcommittee, headed by our colleague Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH, of New York, is very timely and important. This subcommittee undertook some months ago a comprehensive study of the effects of oil imports from abroad on our domestic oil producers and our domestic production.

In the report recently concluded by the subcommittee proper consideration was also given to its effects on our domestic economy and national security. As such, the subcommittee's efforts are a distinct and timely contribution for which the chairman and the members of that subcommittee deserve our appreciation and high commendation.

The petroleum editor of the New York Journal of Commerce lauded the subcommittee's report as a "careful and comprehensive study." I believe that all Members of this House will be interested in reading W. M. Jablonski's article in the New York Journal of Commerce of July 6, 1950, which is as follows:

PETROLEUM COMMENTS

(By W. M. Jablonski)

CAREFUL AND COMPREHENSIVE STUDY

It seems a little ironical for a Government committee to find it necessary to warn an industry of the pitfalls of inviting Government control.

This in effect is what the House Small Business Oil Subcommittee, headed by EUGENE KEOGH (Democrat, New York), did in its report on a comprehensive 14-month investigation into the effects of oil imports on domestic producers.

Commenting on proposed legislation for a 5 percent oil import quota, sponsored by some independent oil producers, the Keogh report observed:

"It appears rather unusual for an industry, or rather a segment thereof, to request Federal control of any feature of the industry's business when this industry, and particularly this segment, has fought for so many years to avoid Federal control."

The report went on to point out that establishment of any quantitative quota requires establishment of some Federal agency to administer the quota, and that such an agency inevitably would have to become involved not only in questions of allocations but also in the conservation practices of the domestic industry.

"What would happen," asked the Keogh subcommittee, "when the Federal agency administering the quota system determines at any given time that domestic production is exceeding the maximum efficient rates? Would it not mean that this same agency would be required to take steps which might be tantamount to an interference with the rights of the respective States to control their production?

"This question has been presented to several witnesses. The usual answer has been to the effect that the respective States could tell the Federal administering agency the amount of their maximum efficient rate of production. The subcommittee's next question has always been, and no satisfactory answer has been received to date: What will happen in the State of California, which has no conservation program? Would it not be foolish to give a Federal agency the responsibility of administering a quota system in keeping with good conservation practices for domestic production, and then take from that agency the authority to properly administer?"

The report found not much more good to say for the proposed alternative legislation to hike import tariffs to $1.05 per barrel.

Diligent investigation, it declared, failed to reveal any showing of whether a $1.05 tax would limit the import of any quantity of oil, a certain quantity of oil, or all oil imports. Nor has it been able to ascertain that anyone has established a sliding scale of tariffs which might be necessary to cope with the eventualities of domestic price fluctuations, the committee noted, and concluded:

"It would be rather disastrous to blindly impose a tax or a tariff that could possibly curtail all imports and thus leave the consumers and users of specialty crude and residual fuel oils without an economically feasible source of supply."

The Keogh report—adopted unanimously by the whole House Small Business Committee (headed by WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas)—is probably the most thorough and most objective study of this controversial question undertaken by any congressional group.

Its recommendation against congressional restrictions and in favor of voluntary industry import cuts was made only after extensive hearings in different parts of the country, evaluation of the interests of consumers and marketers as well as of producers, and analysis of the specific import plans of individual companies.

Its open-minded approach and refusal to jump to either extreme is clear throughout. For instance, while finding that independent producers are correct in claiming that some imports are excessive, the report observes that this has not affected United States drilling activities to date and that its actual effect on the independent producer has been a diminution of income from the 1948 level. And only a portion of that diminution can be attributed to imports, it adds, because the domestic oil supplanted by imports is still in the ground and will ultimately be produced at a price.

The objectivity of the committee's study has drawn praise even from Russell Brown, of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, who has spearheaded the demand for legislative curbs. While expressing disappointment that the report did not offer a remedy that would give immediate relief, Mr. Brown described the study as thorough and factual and credited the committee with a distinct and most commendable service in developing the record.

Last fall, Chairman KEOGH promised that his committee's final report would not consider the domestic producer or importer alone, but would give consideration to the whole industry, the domestic economy, and our national security. It is clear that he has lived up to that promise.

Israel Supports the United States on Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I record with much satisfaction and pride the fact that at a time when the United States is faced with a serious emergency in Korea because of a shameless act of aggression on the part of communism the little State of Israel has taken a fearless and courageous stand alongside of our country. On July 2, 1950, the Government of Israel officially condemned that aggression and agreed to support the United Nations Security Council in its efforts to end the hostilities in Korea and to restore peace in the world.

It is also noteworthy that while Israel quickly jumped to the support of the United States views and efforts in the United Nations, Egypt, which is a member of the Security Council, has refused to do so. Nor have, thus far, any of the other Arab states taken a stand in the United Nations in support of the United States position. And this despite the fact that Britain—and to some extent our own country—has been supplying them with arms during the past year.

Only a short time ago those who should have known better were saying that Israel would prove to be a hotbed of communism and a threat to American interests in the Middle East. Now we find that the State of Israel, itself only 2 years old and beset with enormous problems of immigration and economic problems, has nevertheless unhesitatingly joined forces with the United States in the fight for world peace.

Korea is becoming an acid test for many problems in the crucible of world affairs. For one thing, it has shown us who is our friend and ally in the Middle East, and upon whom we can depend least and trust even less.

The following official statement of the Government of Israel regarding its stand on the Korean issue was adopted by its Knesseth at a special session attended by its President:

The Government of Israel opposes and condemns aggression wherever it may occur and from whatever quarter it may emanate. In fulfillment of her clear obligation under the Charter, Israel supports the Security Council in its efforts to put an end to the breach of peace in Korea and restore peace in that area. The Government of Israel hopes that the United Nations will continue its endeavors to aline all the great powers in the common effort for safeguarding the peace of the world.

The following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of July 6, 1950, is indeed appropos:

EGYPT STANDS ASIDE

The Egyptian refusal to join the free world in its condemnation of the North Korean aggression has been a blow. Egypt is a member of the Security Council, and while it turned out that her adhesion to the resolution calling for armed intervention was not necessary, the moral effect of her opposition has been damaging throughout the Middle East.

The reasons for this action are complicated and a little obscure. Internal politics are at present in a heated condition, with the ruling Wafd party applying some arbitrary and highly undemocratic procedures against the opposition, 29 of whose Senators were dismissed from Parliament a few weeks ago. It has long been a virtual necessity for Egyptian political parties to assume a fervent nationalistic role against Britain because of the Suez Canal and treaty negotiations, and against the United States because of Palestine. There was doubtless some degree of pique involved. There must also have been an unwillingness to admit that a critical world situation has arisen which would make the defense of the Suez Canal a more vital United Nations issue than it has been.

Considering the situation coolly, as one must, the attitude of Egypt is not too hard to understand, but that does not alter the fact that we and the other democracies who are supporting the Korean action deplore the stand that Egypt has taken. It is hard to believe the stories out of Cairo that our State Department, acting through Ambassador Caffery, is bringing strong pressure to bear on Egypt to change her mind. Egypt is a sovereign country, the greatest of the Arab nations, and she certainly cannot be forced to do anything of this sort against her will. However, there have been indications that many influential Egyptians do not approve of the Government's action. Those of us sitting on the outside cannot help feeling that a great mistake was made, one as damaging to Egypt's prestige and place in the Mediterranean and world situation as it was unhappy for the United Nations.

This is no time to bury one's head in the sands of the Sahara Desert and ignore the fact that the world it at a crossroads. After her initial abstention, India recognized that she must go down our road, the road of freedom and democracy. It seems as if Egypt must reconsider and make the same fateful and satisfying decision.

Our Merchant Fleet and War-Risk Shipping Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the Korean situation with its implications calls for immediate consideration by Congress of two extremely important proposals. The first deals with the need for repair of certain ships in our laid-up merchant fleet. The other has to do with reactivating Federal war-risk shipping insurance.

Most authorities are of the opinion that our merchant marine is wholly inadequate to meet defense needs. A definite shortage of passenger liners exists—passenger liners readily convertible for use as troop transports. Many vessels, deemed essential in the event of an emergency, lie dormant in the lay-up fleets on our three coasts. The Maritime Commission has twice recommended that

military-type vessels in these fleets be repaired and put in readiness for emergencies. The Joint Chiefs of Staff recommend similar action, with specific designations as to the type and the number of vessels to be repaired. The Shipbuilders Council likewise support this program.

Because of lack of shipbuilding and ship-repair work, shipyards of the Nation are being dismantled and closed. The skilled shipbuilding personnel are seeking employment in other fields. In the event of a sudden war, these yards and these workmen would not be immediately available to reactivate the yards. Repair work on vessels in the lay-up fleet would keep the yards in operation and the skilled workmen available. Appropriations for such purpose are necessary without delay.

Mr. Speaker, we should at once enact stand-by legislation to provide Government war-risk insurance similar to that in existence during World War II to insure continued operation of our merchant fleet. These vessels now carry private insurance which is subject to cancellation upon 48 hours' notice in the event of a major outbreak. One can readily see what the effect would be upon a most important phase of our national defense, namely, shipping, if there were no war-risk insurance immediately available upon cancellation of private insurance. In event of an emergency, our ships must be kept in continuous operation. There must be no delays. Stand-by legislation must be ready to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to put the legislation into effect upon notification by the President that private war-risk insurance was no longer available.

The Challenge to Free Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. KRUSE, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. KRUSE. Mr. Speaker, the momentous events of this hour are such as to cause grave concern to all free peoples throughout the world. America's position of leadership places serious and grave responsibility upon its leaders. I would consider it a most tragic mistake if Congress were to adjourn at a time when Americans are engaged in mortal conflict on far-flung battlefields. The Congress must stay in session. The challenge must be met and we must give our overwhelming and united support to those whose sacrifice far exceeds that of we here at home. I cannot at this time conceive of politics and business as usual. I can well conceive and understand the attitude toward us by those who are carrying the heaviest burdens at this time if we do not decisively demonstrate our determination and unity in all respects.

Mr. Speaker, the conflict in Korea is not a police action. The unprovoked, illegal, and wanton act of aggression by the Soviet-sponsored North Korean Communist forces simply foreshadows the possibility of other grave events. To construe the implications of the Korean war as less is sheer folly. I sincerely trust and hope that all responsible authorities keep the American people as fully advised as possible. To do less would be an insult to the courage and character of all Americans, and those who prefer liberty to slavery. It would be sheer blindness and ignorance to underestimate the implications of the present situation. The Korean situation is but a part of the whole, and I therefore plead that, within the bounds of security, the American people be fully advised, and that all responsible authorities including the Congress of the United States take all steps that are necessary so that we may be prepared for any eventuality. All of continental Europe was lost to totalitarian forces prior to our entry into World War II. Time was on our side then; time may be fast running out now.

I am a combat veteran of the last war and I can well understand the tragedy befalling those who must hold the line in the early stages of battle. Idle talk and complacency at such times can ultimately prove very expensive in both resources and, more important, lives. Were it not for those who down through the ages have been willing to fight and die for their fellow man, we would not have a Nation wherein we could worry about business, economy, and politics as usual. I sincerely believe that most Americans are not guilty of shortsightedness and complacency, and I have every confidence that the American public is ready in all respects to meet this greatest of all challenges to the existence of liberty and justice on this earth.

False Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article by Judge Adrian Bonnelly of the municipal court in Philadelphia. This article points up very vividly the situation in which our judiciary throughout the country finds itself as a result of the high cost of living. Our judges are still trying to live on a prewar scale of salaries. Judge Bonnelly has bravely offered his case as an example in order to emphasize the threat to our judiciary and our judicial system.

Several bills have been introduced in the present Congress to raise the salaries of our judges and thus make it possible for them to concentrate wholeheartedly on their judicial activities, instead of worrying about financial problems and thinking of leaving the bench for more lucrative positions to support their families. These bills are now before the House Judiciary Committee awaiting clearance. Early and favorable action by the Judiciary Committee is imperative.

Judge Bonnelly's article was published in the magazine This Week, July 9, 1950, and is as follows:

MUST HONEST JUDGES GO BROKE?—IN MANY PARTS OF THE COUNTRY, JUDGES ARE GETTING 1938 WAGES TO MEET 1950 COSTS—NO WONDER GOOD MEN REFUSE TO SERVE—A VETERAN JURIST SPEAKS OUT ABOUT A DANGEROUS SITUATION

(By Judge Adrian Bonnelly, as told to Ray Josephs)

I don't know if you have ever been in my court. Watching me as I sit in judgment, handing down decisions that can take away your children, cost you your savings, or even put you behind bars, you probably think of me as an impressive, even awe-inspiring figure. In my black robes, surrounded by my bailiffs, aides, and the walnut paneling of my spacious courtroom, I personify the prestige and security of the law. I myself, however, no longer feel secure.

For though I am a judge who cherishes the honor, standing, and tradition of the law, I'm also a man. I'm the head of a family, a father with three daughters. I have carpenters' bills to pay, my wife needs a new coat, and the rainspout leaks.

Prestige and honor don't help me make ends meet. And the position I'm in—shared by thousands of judges—is creating a situation endangering your rights.

Except in a few States, judges' salaries in common pleas, municipal, circuit, district, and in some instances State superior courts are inadequate. Judges in these courts, which among them handle almost every aspect of your civil and equity rights, your domestic relations, juvenile, and many criminal cases—are still getting the same, or virtually the same, take-home pay as they did before the war, while their expenses, like everyone else's have risen 100 to 200 percent.

SILENCE SHOULD BE BROKEN

The result: Unless they are rich men who've previously earned, inherited, or married fortunes, most judges have had to scrape to the bottom of their resources. Some—especially among the younger men—have resigned to return to private practice. And in a few cases—happily still very few—judges have surrendered to the venal temptations freely offered them.

It is because of this last development, threatening the integrity of the whole judicial system, that I feel the self-imposed silence of the thousands of underpaid and overworked judges should be broken.

Let me tell you about my own case. Perhaps at first glance, my salary of $12,000 looks pretty good. But during the last 11 years I've been getting poorer and poorer. When I gave up a lucrative law practice to take a judgeship in Philadelphia, I knew the financial sacrifices the lessened income entailed. I felt that by drawing on fixed income from investments and with a little careful budgeting, I'd have no trouble.

PRIVATE INTERESTS INTERFERE

Because members of my family have been in the law for the past 400 years, the opportunity to be of service appealed to me as it does to almost every lawyer worth his salt. I wanted to be a good, thorough, conscientious judge, a judge who would never allow other affairs or private interests to interfere with the prompt and proper performance of my duty. But as living costs rose I began realizing how heavy my expenses would be.

The little cottage we'd bought in Florida for retirement someday was first to go. We had a seashore place down in Atlantic City.

My wife and I decided we didn't really need that either. Cars? Well, you can only drive one anyway. And though some people think judges travel only in chauffeur-driven limousines, my wife does very well at the wheel.

The pinch really began when household costs soared. Once we had three in help; today Mrs. Bonnelly does the housework, though not even most of our neighbors know it. If the stores sell me one new suit a year, they're lucky. My wife sews and remakes many of her own things. My eldest daughter, a lawyer, is married; the two others work, not just because they want to be career girls—though it happens that they do. It's just that of necessity they must contribute to their own support.

In 1947, all Pennsylvania judges, myself among them, were given a 20-percent raise. This made my salary $12,000. Yet actually I have a good deal less than the $10,000 I received in 1938. I was wryly reminded of that fact as I heard a domestic-relations case last week.

The man was a plumber. Ten years ago I ordered him to pay his wife $10 support from his $25 weekly ($1,300 annual) income. Recently she sought a readjustment. I granted her $40 weekly. For his earnings had gone up four-fold—to $125, or $6,500 a year. Steelworkers, miners, clerks, streetcar conductors all have had one, two, three, and four rounds to keep pace with rising living costs.

PROFESSIONAL EXPENSES, TOO

Where food once cost me $30 a week, it now takes $60 (or $3,120 yearly) to run the table and pay for household incidentals, plus $240 a year, or $20 a month, for lunches. Household repairs and upkeep require at least $200 a year; the electrician and his meter get another $150. Medical bills run to $250, clothing, shoes, hats for my wife and myself—$750. The mortgage on my house runs to $1,200 a year. Heating takes another $500.

And then there are many professional expenses that the average person doesn't have. Membership in the various organizations to which a judge must belong costs $500 yearly. Necessary books, journals, and papers run another $500. My charity contributions—judges are expected to be generous during every drive—take about $1,000. The pension fund, that will pay me $3,000 a year after retirement, removes another $1,000 from my take-home pay. City tax is $150 a year. Biggest item of all is the Federal income tax, which costs me nearly $2,000. The ironic thing about that item is that back in 1938, before my raise, judges weren't subject to the income tax. Thus the tax just about balances the raise.

The result is that my expenses last year were actually $2,560 greater than income. That's been true for the past several years.

What about outside work to augment income? The custom of judges practicing law on the side has been steadily curtailed, for sensible reasons. No judge can be strictly impartial about a lawyer against whom, a few hours previously, he has argued as a fellow attorney. New Jersey's new constitution, for instance, correctly abolished this practice.

Besides, what with the meetings, conferences, board sessions, and the terrifically overcrowded calendar in most courts, a judge has no time for outside work. Last year our court heard over 20,000 domestic-relations cases plus an equal number of juvenile cases. For every hour on the bench there were two in chambers, or with a bulging brief case at home. Writing decisions, keeping up with new decrees in law journals, council, legislature, and Congress, take time and energy.

Like other judges in the same situation, I have trimmed expenses in every way I can think of, and finally dipped into savings. I've cashed in all my war bonds, substituted neighborhood movies for Broadway shows, cut out many other pleasures. My wife, fortunately for me, is uninterested in Cadillacs or yearly minks. Together, I know, we'll solve our problems, and neither of us is complaining.

The thing that worries me is what I've seen happen to other men. Every judge and most lawyers know of judges squeezed by hospital bills or other emergencies who've had to go into debt—of others who've speculated in the market. And everyone connected with our courts knows how the self-seeking, the unscrupulous and the downright corrupt have applied a score of persuasive temptations to these economically insecure judges.

IT'S DANGEROUS

I don't attempt to justify what's happened in some cases. Or to say that weak men who prove dishonest—directly or indirectly—wouldn't have strayed if they had all the world's money. I feel a sense of pride in the overwhelming majority of our judges, who, despite the sacrifices involved in salaries far smaller than what they could earn as practicing lawyers, have stood highest in honesty, decency, and judicial capacity.

What I do say is that a dangerous situation exists. And that judges—like anyone else—put into a position where they find it extremely difficult to make ends meet, are certainly going to be easier prey to temptation than men who are financially independent. Two other things are also likely to happen. Men with the background, training, and ability to be good judges but lacking private wealth will no longer be interested in taking office. Our judgeships will go only to rich men, or to men with wealthy fathers or fathers-in-law willing to subsidize them.

It will also mean that our judges will be older men, past their prime and lacking the freshness of approach the law needs. Instead of the best men, the bench may well come to be occupied by incompetents, second-raters or political henchmen expecting to "get theirs."

IT'S YOUR PROBLEM

Where am I and others like me to turn? I think it is to you, the American public. Maybe you've never been in court. But some day when the things you hold dearest are at stake, you may be. You'll benefit if our courts and judges are good.

Perhaps we can't afford to pay a brilliant lawyer who might make an excellent judge what he might earn in private practice. But can we afford not to see to it that the best men can earn enough as judges to induce them to serve? Can we permit our judges to be put in a position where they are subject to temptation?

If we Americans think these things cannot be permitted, what can be done about it? Some judges urge tax-free salaries, explaining: "Switching funds from one governmental pocket to another wouldn't raise the budget." I don't agree. Let one group of Government servants go tax-free and the door is open to all. Furthermore, I want to pay my fair share of taxes.

But steps can be taken. As a start, here is a program favored by many judges to whom I've talked:

1. Congress should have its judiciary or other appropriate committee make a complete study of the situation, both as it applies to our 197 Federal district court judges and our thousands of State judges.

2. These committees should work in cooperation with the appropriate bodies of the State legislatures, the bar associations, and citizens' committees to develop new salary standards.

This is particularly necessary in the States of Ohio, Texas, California, Kentucky, New York, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Michigan, and Georgia, representing over 50 percent of the national population. In that order, according to a recent study of the Texas Committee on Judicial Salaries, they pay the lowest salaries per 1,000 of population. The 10 jurisdictions paying the highest on the same basis are, in order: Delaware, Nevada, Wyoming, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Vermont, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Montana, and New Mexico. These figures were compiled last year, and some changes have occurred since then, but basically the picture remains unchanged.

3. Insofar as possible, these standards should reflect not only the current cost of living in the various areas of the United States but local assessed real-estate valuations producing the taxes from which judges' salaries must come.

UNAWARE PUBLIC

In the last few years many States have considered moves for judicial salary increases. Bills have been passed in several places—in Colorado, Idaho, Indiana, Michigan, Montana, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Wisconsin, Wyoming, and the District of Columbia among others. But in many other places, bills have been defeated because the public was not aware of the facts. That's why I have offered my own case in evidence. If the steps necessary to correct these conditions are taken, we will be able to insure that our judges will be above temptation. If we fail, then the loss will be yours—and that of every other American.

Who Opened the Door to These Nazis?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a press release from my office of July 7; certain correspondence with public officials regarding a Slovakian Nazi named Karol Sidor; and the newspaper column of Walter Winchell as published in the Washington Post of July 7.

Mr. Speaker, the first information I had about this man Sidor came to me a year ago in a letter from Andrew Valuchek, editor of New Yorkski Dennik, a daily newspaper printed in New York in Slovakian, with an editorial policy agreeing generally with the present administration on most issues. His letter follows:

NEW YORKSKY DENNIK,
New York, July 19, 1949.

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have just heard from very reliable sources that Karol Sidor, the former "Minister of the Slovak State to Vatican," is trying to enter United States, or the American Zone of Germany.

Karol Sidor was the founder and the leader of the notorious Hlinka Guards, a Nazi organization, which during the Hitler days terrorized Slovakia, carried on pogroms, and hunted down American airmen who were forced down in Czechoslovakia. These they turned over to the Germans.

Sidor tried several times to enter USA but the State Department would not permit it.

I hope that he will not succeed again and thus I ask for your help and your intervention in the name of decency and democracy, the cause which you so ardently espouse.

I thank you again for your help in this matter and remain,

Very truly yours,

ANDREW VALUCHEK.

I transmitted this information to the Departments of State, Justice, and National Defense.

All replied. I was informed verbally by the Immigration and Naturalization Service that a look-out would be posted against his possible entry into the United States.

The State Department gave full information in these two letters:

AUGUST 18, 1949.

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. KLEIN: I refer to your letter dated July 22, 1949, concerning your interest in the case of Mr. Karol Sidor, who desires to come to the United States from Italy.

The records of the Department show that the American consulate general at Naples refused a visa to Mr. Sidor in 1947, under the authority of title 22, section 53.33, of the Code of Federal Regulations, as a person whose entry would be prejudicial to the interests of the United States. Authority to issue or refuse a visa is vested by law in American consuls abroad and the Department has recently been informed that interested persons have requested reconsideration of this case by the consulate general. Assurance is given that any new evidence will be thoroughly investigated and considered carefully by the examining consular officer. The decision reached will be in the light of the laws and regulations governing the entry of aliens into the United States, including those designed to protect this country from the admission of aliens whose entry would endanger the public safety or would be prejudicial to the interests of the United States.

The Department is forwarding a copy of your letter, together with a copy of this reply, to the American consulate general at Naples in order that the consular officer concerned may be advised of your interest in the matter and that you may be informed of the final decision reached in the case.

Sincerely yours.

H. J. L'HEUREUX,
Chief, Visa Division
(For the Secretary of State).

AMERICAN CONSULATE GENERAL,
Naples, Italy, September 13, 1949.

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I refer to your letter of July 22, 1949, to the Department of State in Washington and the Department's reply thereto of August 17, 1949, regarding Mr. Karol Sidor, who desires to enter the United States for permanent residence.

As you were informed by the Department of State, Mr. Sidor was refused an immigration visa at this consulate general during 1947 under the authority of title 22, section 53.33 of the Code of Federal Regulations as a person whose entry would be prejudicial to the interests of the United States.

The information contained in your letter under reference has been made of record at the consulate general and its contents will be taken into consideration at such time as Mr. Sidor's application may be reviewed. This office will inform you of the final decision reached in this case.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE L. BRANDT,
American Consul General.

You can imagine my consternation, therefore, when I learned that Karol Sidor had been admitted to Canada for permanent residence and had then been issued a 3-month visitor's visa to enter the United States for the purpose of speaking at Cleveland before a convention of the Slovak League of America and subsequently to make a lecture tour for pay, which presumably would be a violation of his condition of entry.

The following release explains my recent protests, by telephone, together with a telegram dated today.

I have just dispatched the following telegram to the Secretary of State:

"Urgently request explanation of admission on visitor's visa of Karol Sidor, a Slovakian quisling of notorious reputation.

"Please refer to my correspondence with Department in July and August 1949 when I was informed application for visa was refused Sidor in Naples on grounds he was person prejudicial to interests of United States.

"I especially request explanation of fact that Sidor was given 3 months' visa in Montreal when advisory instructions authorized only 2 weeks' visit. Formal letter of protest follows."

On July 22, 1949, I informed the Departments of State, Justice, and National Defense that Karol Sidor, a notorious Slovakian quisling who, as head of the Hlinka guards during the war, had a personal responsibility for the trapping of American airmen forced down in Czechoslovakia, was attempting to enter the United States or the American zone of Germany.

I was informed by the Secretary of National Defense that appropriate measures would be taken to keep him out of Germany.

I was informed by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, verbally, that a look-out would be posted at immigration stations against his entry.

I was informed by the Department of State, in detail, that Sidor had applied for a visa at the American consulate in Naples in 1947 and had been refused a visa by the American consul general, George L. Brandt, under the authority of title 22, section 53.33, "as a person whose entry would be prejudicial to the interest of the United States."

A month ago I was shocked to learn that the American consul at Montreal had issued a 3 months' visitor's visa to Sidor; that the Immigration and Naturalization Service lookout had not extended to inland stations, so that the central office did not even know where Sidor had entered; that Sidor himself had contracted to make a lecture tour in violation of the terms of entry; and that Canada has permitted him to enter as a permanent resident.

I was further shocked when I learned that, under congressional pressure, the visa division had given advisory instructions to the consul that Sidor might enter for 2 weeks, while the consul had apparently taken it on himself to issue a 3 months' visa.

It has been impossible to obtain authentic information about Sidor from official sources; on the basis of private information I am writing a formal and lengthy letter of protest to the Secretary of State.

In this morning's Washington Post, Mr. Walter Winchell discussed this case. I do not know where he received all his information. I am inserting that column in the RECORD; but I do not quite share the strong language applied to the State Department.

I am obviously critical and I feel it was a terrible error to allow this man to enter; but I am more critical toward our own colleagues whose names are unknown to me, who put sufficient pressure on the Department of State to force the issuance of Sidor's visa. Particularly, I have a high regard for the integrity of Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and even when I am forced to disagree with him on specific issues, I am certain that he is an honorable man discharging great responsibilities with a grave sense of the importance of every official act. I am certain he had no immediate and personal responsibility for the entry of Karol Sidor:

[From the Washington Post of July 7, 1950]

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE

(By Walter Winchell)

This column has repeatedly warned the State and Justice Departments and the people that large numbers of Nazis and other Hitlerats have been creeping into this country. So far as Government security agencies are concerned most of our warnings have fallen on deaf ears. Here are a few instances in which we succeeded:

Last year we documented a case against Walter Gieseking, the pianist collaborator who played Nazi tunes for Hitler. Rather than face Department of Justice investigation Herr Gieseking scurried back to Europe. We proved that Ferenc Vajta, the Hungarianazi, was a leader in the Hungarian Arrow Cross (Fascist) Party. The Department of Justice then nailed him. A few months ago Vajta left the United States voluntarily for South America. We stripped Edward Sittler, the Nazi radio official who tried to stay in this country after he completed his testimony as a witness in several treason trials. Sittler squealed that he wanted to become an American citizen again. The heel was born here. He is now awaiting deportation hearings. Our most recent target was Lajos Marschalko, another Hungarian who, during the war, poison-penned newspaper articles which urged the shooting of captured American aviators. Marschalko is now at Ellis Island awaiting Uncle Sam's boot by deportation order.

But the Nazi parade into the United States continues. On May 23 of this year Karol Sidor sneaked across the border from Canada as a visitor. This democracy hater was given a visa by an American consul in Montreal, despite the fact that his name was on a United States State Department blacklist. There was good reason for blacklisting Karol Sidor. Look at his record:

After the Munich-Hitler rape in September 1938, Czechoslovakia was divided into 3 states. Karol Sidor was National Vice Premier. Joseph Tiso was Premier of one of the states—Slovakia—until March 10, 1939. Two days later Sidor became Premier of Slovakia. Two days after that the Nazis walked into Czechoslovakia. Tiso immediately became the Hitler-puppet Premier of the Slovak Government and Karol Sidor his Minister of Interior.

Tiso's record as a Nazi tool: First Premier, later President of Slovakia, he forced his country into the Nazi economy and war apparatus. For his crimes Tiso was arrested after the war and tried as a Nazi. He was convicted and hanged in April 1947 by the Czechs before Russia seized their little democracy. Note that date—April 1947—because Carol Sidor and others like him now claim that Tiso was a victim of Communist persecution. A convenient excuse behind which Nazis like to hide.

During this same Tiso-Nazi regime (from July 1939 to 1945) Karol Sidor was a diplomat in the Slovakian foreign service. His government declared war on the United States (by Hitler's order) and in his 6 years as an Ambassador for Slovakia, Sidor was an important cog in the machinery of Axis diplomacy.

After Munich, Karol Sidor and Joseph Tiso transformed the Hlinka (until then a minority political group) into a totalitarian party. They suppressed or annihiliated all opposing parties, using a strong-arm gang of storm troopers, the infamous Hlinka Guard. Sidor was the organizer and first leader of the Hlinka Guard. The terrors and outrages committed by Hitler's storm troopers in Nazi Germany were duplicated by the Hlinka Guard in Slovakia.

Like his boss Tiso, Karol Sidor was accused (after the war's end) of collaboration with the Nazis. Unlike Tiso, who was nabbed in Czechoslovakia, Sidor stayed on in Italy where he had a diplomatic post and thus avoided punishment. In October 1947 he was tried in absentia by the Czech National Court—convicted of collaboration—and sentenced to prison for 20 years. Note that the commies had not yet seized Czechoslovakia, which was still a democracy under President Eduard Benes.

Today Herr Sidor roams freely in the United States thumping his chest and posing as a good anti-Communist—conveniently forgetting his pro-Nazi record. He has duped many good citizens of Scranton, Pa. (where his daughter lives), into helping him. He has even made passes at a United States Congressman to introduce a bill in the House of Representatives, which would allow him to remain in the United States, as a permanent resident. Of course, Sidor didn't tell this Congressman that in February 1939 he sent a delegation to Berlin for discussions with Gen. Hermann Goering. And we'll bet the Congressman doesn't know that on January 25, 1945 (when the United States was at war with Hitler) Sidor was responsible for a statement to the effect that the Slovak people were the friends of Germany.

The State Department approved Sidor's visa in May after he asked permission to deliver one speech before a Slovak group in Cleveland. That speech has come and gone—but not Sidor, who has a half-dozen public speaking engagements scheduled between now and August 6 in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Here's the proof of State Department stupidity in this case: Nine months ago Herve J. L'Heureux, Chief of the State Department's Visa Division in Washington, D. C., wrote as follows: "The records of the State Department show that the American Consulate General at Naples, Italy, refused a visa to Mr. Sidor under the authority of title 22, section 53.33 of the Code of Federal Regulations as a person whose entry would be prejudicial to the interests of the United States." One month later George L. Brandt, American Consul General in Naples, wrote a letter stating that his office had refused an immigration visa to Karol Sidor on the ground that Sidor's admission would be harmful to the interests of the United States.

If Karol Sidor was no good in the eyes of the United States State Department in September 1949, what made him a desirable visitor in May 1950? Why didn't the American Consul in Montreal (who okayed Sidor's visa application) know as much about the man's rotten record as the American Consul in Naples, Italy? Or did he?

In short, this is just one more instance of blundering red tape. Or perhaps it's part of an idiotic plan on the part of some State Department officials to give American shelter to the killers of American soldiers. Either way, Secretary of State Acheson, you try explaining it to Gold Star Mothers and crippled GI's in veterans' hospitals. We can't.

Liquidate the RFC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, many of the constituents whom I have the honor to represent in Congress are becoming much concerned about the manner in which the RFC has been lending the people's money. The press has carried many articles about the unsoundness of these loans. The fact that the people are interested enough to protest to their Representatives in Congress is indicative of the feeling on the home front.

My attention has been called to an editorial appearing in the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram, which expresses what I conceive to be the general opinion of the people in my congressional district. Pursuant to the permission granted to me, I am including that editorial which is self-explanatory. It reads as follows:

LIQUIDATE THE RFC

The more the Senate Banking Subcommittee turns up about the lending policies of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the more the public will agree with Jesse H. Jones, former RFC Chairman, who demands that the RFC be liquidated, lock, stock and barrel. For the record shows the RFC not only has made dubious loans and lost millions thereby, but it is lending public funds for enterprises that public opinion cannot sanction. The latest disclosure shows the RFC lent $975,000 to a Reno hotel whose notorious gambling concession is its biggest source of revenue.

Repayment of the loan depends upon the profits of the gambling done in the hotel. The hotel exists to furnish plus quarters for a gambling casino. The casino is run by Lou Wertheimer, former big-time Michigan gambler. A neighboring hotel is moving in with a flashier and gaudier gambling casino run by Lou's brother, Mert Wertheimer.

The revelation about gambling being the real security for an RFC loan was not the only thing brought to light. The loan application was disapproved by the RFC's San Francisco office and by the Washington committee which reviews loan applications. Nevertheless the RFC made the loan.

RFC Director Harvey Gunderson defended the loan before the Senate committee. Gambling is legal in Reno, he said. Indeed it is. The city's existence depends upon gambling—that and the furnishing of temporary quarters for those seeking divorce under Nevada's easy divorce laws. Director Gunderson said it was no more wrong to lend money to a hotel housing a gambling casino than to a hotel housing a bar.

The same Federal Government that lent the money to the hotel with the plush gambling casino is engaged with governors of the States and officials of principal cities in a campaign to stamp out gambling and Nation-wide gambling syndicates. Yet the loan by the RFC, a Federal agency, gives comfort and housing to the very public enemy which the Government and its Administration professes to be warring against.

The fact that the RFC approved the loan after being advised against it by its San Francisco regional office and by its own loan committee in Washington is illuminating. Exactly the same thing happened in Florida not long ago.

A company that wanted to market a duplicating machine, employing a new technique, asked for a loan. The regional RFC office at Jacksonville recommended that the company not be given a single dollar. The loan review committee in Washington suggested that the company be given no loan of more than $125,000. But the RFC advanced $400,000.

In less than 2 weeks the company went bankrupt. It already had received $300,000 from the RFC. The Senate committee learned that the RFC office in Washington was told that an officer of the company was "a very close friend" of President Truman.

Then there's the case of the Lustron Corp., formed at the close of the war to build prefabricated houses of enameled steel. It had practically no capital, just an idea. It was going to mass-produce houses, turn them out as fast as automobiles come from the assembly line. It found backing for its idea in Washington. Pressure was put on the RFC for a loan.

In the circumstances it was not a loan at all, but a case of the Government furnishing funds to start a new business. And it was a risk, a $37,000,000 risk, which the RFC lost. The corporation produced very few houses and found no market for them. It went broke, leaving the RFC holding the bag.

The RFC has lost millions on other poor loans, though it has got its money back on many. Meanwhile the evidence accumulates that it undertakes risks that it was never intended to take, and that it uses public funds for purposes not countenanced by our laws or economic system. It was intended that the RFC would be used as an emergency lending agency in the depression period, to keep businesses going and supply employment. No longer is the RFC an emergency agency. The emergency it was designed to meet has long passed. Instead of an emergency we have a boom. Business is very prosperous and production immense. Yet the RFC still exists, a permanent Government agency competing with banks and other lending institutions—and making loans so bad that no private lender would make them.

The RFC holds an important place in President Truman's Fair Deal program. He wants its lending powers broadened. It would be the central agency of an expanded program of Government lending to private business. It is part of his ideas of pouring out billions more into pump priming. And the program he advocates would put Government deeper into business and the control of business. It would clearly be a step toward socialism.

As a starter he would transfer the RFC to the Commerce Department. That is the President's Reorganization Plan No. 24. The Hoover Commission recommended that RFC be put under the Treasury Department. But one Hoover Commission task force recommended that the RFC be abolished entirely as a loan agency, since the emergency it was created to deal with no longer exists.

That also is the recommendation of Jesse H. Jones, former RFC Chairman. His 14 years as Chairman certainly puts him in a position to speak authoritatively. Meanwhile the hearings of the Senate committee back him up.

The evidence mounts that the RFC disregards what few restrictions the law places over it. There also is clear evidence that it ignores the recommendations of its own local advisory committee, as well as its loan review board in Washington. Finally the evidence increases that considerations other than the public interest decide its loan policies. The RFC has become a law unto itself. In short, the case for liquidating the RFC becomes stronger hour by hour.

Armed Forces Day Address by Maj. Gen. Earl S. Hoag, Special Assistant to Chief of Staff of Reserve Forces, United States Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, on Armed Services Day, 1950, the city of

Camden, N. J., was fortunate in having as its guest speaker, Maj. Gen. Earl S. Hoag, special assistant to Chief of Staff of Reserve Forces, United States Air Force. General Hoag delivered an address that was comprehensive, instructive, and illuminating as well as interesting. He described in detail the objectives of our military forces from the standpoint of our national defense and the part to be taken by the different services in the unified whole. Because of the inspirational as well as informative value of his address, I have, in accordance with the unanimous consent granted, included the address as a part of these remarks:

Mr. Chairman, some 5 years after the end of hostilities in Europe, we are celebrating a new day in the history of military strength of this Nation—Armed Forces Day. It stands as a symbol of unification, the merging without loss of identity of the three services, Army, Navy, and Air Force—and it calls attention to our combined military strength.

We ask for this attention for it is our opportunity to present, in a single dramatic package, what might be called our Armed Forces annual report to the people. Today is the first such unified report day.

A report, however, which deals exclusively with the status of our Armed Forces, would present an incomplete picture of our real strength as a Nation, for those in uniform represent but one of several elements in the total national security.

National security consists of four elements within America and one beyond our borders. Each is very important. All are interdependent in the common goal of maintaining a state of peace.

The most obvious of the elements is our armed might—our three military services, well trained, well equipped, appropriately located and alert to respond quickly and strongly to any attack or threat of attack.

The second element in the national security is our political strength—or, as some call it—our civic strength. This is something we have always taken for granted—based as it is upon our faith in the democratic form of government, our Bill of Rights and our constitutional guaranties of liberty and freedom. But what if this faith of ours should be undermined by the infiltration of strange doctrines, likely to be alluring? What if these influences should knife our belief in democracy, interfere with our liberties, destroy our unity, and spread distrust among our people? Loss of our political strength by this or any other means, would destroy our ability to defend ourselves as surely as an overwhelming attack by armed might.

The last war, and we would like to see it remain the last, gave ample proof that, all other things being equal, a country's industrial capacity is one of the determining factors in military victories. In this consideration we find our third potent element of national security—economic strength.

Our political and economic strength are no more a concrete part of our total defense than our moral strength. And moral strength, our fourth element, is just as real as it is impossible to adequately describe and evaluate. The moral strength of a nation, it seems to me, is reflected in the character of its citizens; the attitudes of the individuals toward those things we hold dear and deem important in a decent society and in a free world.

Happily this is a commodity of which this country has an abundance. From the earliest calls to colors down to our day, Americans have always entered into conflict fortified not only by a feeling of patriotism sprung from the spiritual fountains of our life, but by the innate desire to see evil dispersed and righteousness upheld.

We defend to the death that which we hold sacred; for any lesser emotion, we will present but a token resistance and possibly not even that. No one will sacrifice himself for a principle he does not hold valid. Nations without the will to national existence have always been vulnerable to tyrants and invaders.

The moral fiber of a people is the clue to what may be expected of them when danger threatens. I believe that we are blessed with a vigorous potential in this respect; that in this essential element America is mightily endowed.

I have mentioned one other element in the several considerations of our national security—a factor outside our continental limits. The peaceful intentions of other countries were what I had in mind in this connection. It is hoped that through the several foreign assistance plans and information programs of our Government, and through the courageous and worthwhile efforts of the United Nations Organization, and of individual peace-loving nations in various sectors of the globe, we may approach a condition of world peace.

That, however, is truly in the realm of long-range planning, for there are peoples who have ambitions inimical to this cause. They have—as Charles Dickens expressed it—"affection beaming in one eye and calculation shining out of the other."

So long as this condition exists, our security is imperiled, and we must maintain a constant guard against its poison. As the President's Air Policy Commission proclaimed nearly a year and a half ago, world security and the security of the United States are the same thing.

Our military strength must complement, without impairing, our political, economic, and moral strengths, and yet it must be tailored to fit existing world conditions. We rely upon teamwork to maintain peace without crushing us beneath the unbearable burden of a too-costly military machine.

We speak of military security. Factually, however, we should speak of relative military security. There is no such thing as absolute military security in our democratic way of life. So that we, as Americans, may enjoy a continuation of our democratic processes, we have evolved this concept of relative military security. It entails a present military budget which represents the maximum beyond which we are not willing to go in straining our economic strength. Yet, at the same time, we strive to maintain an efficient and effective military force under this budget. In our efforts to maintain this force we are continually studying and improving upon the structure and missions of the force in being and of the Reserve. Our planning looks to both the present and the future.

We could, if we wished to curtail many of our basic inherent concepts, become an armed camp fully mobilized. However, we realize that for Americans this would not be total security.

We could, if we so desired, build the greatest military might the world has seen—if that were the only thing we wanted. We have already shown that there is no limit to the miracles which this country can perform. It is a fact, however, that no nation can support great military forces without sacrifice. In this country we have determined that we will not sacrifice our political freedoms, our economic advantages, nor our moral character. We will not give these up for they are the broad supports behind our military forces which enable our Government to provide stability for its people and to act in concert with other nations for world peace.

Relative military security involves a calculated risk, and our present preparedness program takes this into consideration. It is not taken lightly nor blindly. We must always be alert to the intentions and capabilities of a possible foe.

One way to evaluate calculated military risks is by comparison. And a very convenient comparison lies in the strength of men and numbers of planes, guns, tanks, submarines, and other implements of military might possessed by a potential enemy. Qualitative and quantitative comparisons of these factors give us some indication of the opponent's intention. They are the principal measure of a nation's ability to wage war successfully. There are other factors to be considered—the relative capabilities of mass production, of industrial know-how, of national morale, and of potential allies and their capabilities.

We in the Armed Forces have a strong conviction that both the individual and the Nation profit and progress most in peace. It is our fervent hope that conflicting ideologies may be harmonized so that future wars will not arise.

In proclaiming this newest day of national observance, the President stressed that the "Armed Forces as a unified team, are currently performing, at home and across the seas, tasks vital to the security of the Nation and to the establishment of a durable peace." This concept—the collaboration of service in a single operating team system, was born of wartime necessity. We have extended and made many improvements in this system, in the knowledge that mankind has emerged into a new age, an age which has seen the development of tremendous new powers for good or evil. Unification is one of our most important devices for maintaining a military force in this new age at a price we can afford to pay. It should enable us to add to the total strength of the three services through joint planning, and at the same time reduce the over-all cost.

Never before in peacetime has the American public been so concerned about the components which constitute our national defense. It is quite possible that no vital national subject has been more misunderstood than the National Security Act. It is frequently overlooked that this act created not only the Department of Defense, but two organizations outside that Department. These are the National Security Council, wherein national, foreign, and military policy may be coordinated, and the National Security Resources Board, which is charged with the over-all planning of total emergency mobilization. Within the Department of Defense we have two important boards created by this same act: the Munitions Board which plans the military phases of industrial mobilization, and the Research and Development Board which guides the work of devising superior military equipment upon which to base our strategy.

Therefore, unification might be described as an arrangement whereby we balance our military requirements with those of our national economy and apply as a national unit our diplomacy, our military policy, our scientific knowledge and our industrial capacity to keep the Nation secure.

Our first President and Army Commander, George Washington, said that "Experience is the surest standard by which to test." World War II taught us that modern conflict cannot be waged without unified planning, unified reasearch, unified procurement and the advance assignment of definite missions to a force created, trained, and equipped to carry them out. Neither can it be waged successfully without the intelligent support and resolute conviction of a free democratic people.

No matter what other points may be disputed, there is common agreement that we will never again be permitted the luxury of months, not to mention years to organize for a war after it has started. Our job today is to so discourage any potential aggressor by our timely preparation that he will not

attempt the risk of an attack. The price of peace in the world of today is continual preparedness.

In our efforts to attain a state of preparedness, we have accomplished a number of things, and all these in the spirit of unification.

We have formed the Military Air Transport Service, combining the former Naval Air Transport Service and the Air Transport Command of the Air Force. All sea transport has been consolidated into the Military Sea Transportation Service under the operational control of the Navy. All common use land transport has been assigned to the Army. You business men will be interested to know that the Munitions Board assigns to one service the responsibility of buying one particular commodity, not only for itself, but for the two other services. For instance, the Air Force buys all photographic equipment. The Navy buys all hand tools, and the Army buys all basic foods and all automotive equipment. In some fields, such as petroleum, a central purchasing agency has been set up to do all the buying. The desult has been increased procurement efficiency, an absolute necessity if we have to begin asking industry for its products in time of emergency.

Prior to unification, thousands of laws were enacted which were equally applicable to the Army and the Navy, but differing in many respects. This increased the administrative burden in the two Departments immeasurably. A unified legislative program has changed this for the better.

We have also established a weapons systems evaluation group to provide topside coordinated analysis of the capabilities of different weapon systems.

A personnel policy board has been appointed to insure uniform, adequate, and fair actions affecting both military and civilian personnel and in line with our changed concepts of personal and human dignity, we have drafted a new code of military justice for all concerned.

The civilian components policy board, a staff agency in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, was set up 1 year ago today to establish over-all policies for the civilian components of all three military departments and to coordinate the separate plans, policies, and programs of the departments in this field.

The work of that board is of considerable interest to me and my staff, for it is our responsibility to administer the programs of the civilian components of the Air Force. These components, by the way, consist of the Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard, and the Air Force ROTC.

When Mr. William T. Faricy, the board's first chairman, relinquished that position a few days ago and was succeeded by Mr. Edwin H. Burgess, a report on the agency's program was made to Secretary Johnson. That report contained several heartening comments, so far as our preparedness program is concerned, and because they relate to our citizen-soldiers—the men and women of your community and mine—I want to call them to your attention.

Mr. Faricy reported as follows: "The civilian components of the Armed Forces are at their greatest peacetime strength in the history of our country. There are more than 2,500,000 reservists on the rolls. Of these, 710,000 are in a drill-pay status, and tens of thousands more are receiving systematic training of one type or another without pay.

"While great numbers of those who signed up after VJ-day have been completely inactive and will ultimately be dropped from the rolls, there has been a steady, wholesome growth in the number of reservists who are actively participating in the program in one form or another.

"In addition, 218,000 high-school and college students are participating in the junior and senior ROTC programs of the three military departments and will provide 16,000 new junior officers for the civilian components and the regular forces during the current year, and increasing numbers in future years."

The reserve programs of the several services constitute one of the most vital and important aspects in our military planning. In modern warfare the airplane has telescoped space into time—and time is of the essence. It takes time to train men for the highly skilled tasks which must be performed in the uniformed forces of today.

Our military strength—that No. 1 element in our national security—is a two-pronged spear consisting of the Regular Establishment and the Reserve. From the standpoint of numbers of men, our most potent force is the trained mass of citizen-soldiers. And these must not be the type of citizen-soldier who spring to action carrying obsolete muskets, but men who, through consistent part-time training with modern equipment and progressive instruction, have prepared themselves for the vicissitudes of modern warfare.

To keep adequately prepared we must have on call a large pool of reservists in a high state of readiness for duty.

Following the passage of the National Security Act and the establishment of a new mobilization plan for the Air Force, we revised our program for the civilian components. The recent Faricy report announced that our revised program is now, for the first time since the war, working toward objectives which appear to be in accordance both with strategic requirements and with budgetary and other capabilities.

Here, in capsule form, is what we now have in our Air Force Reserve Forces:

1. The Air National Guard, 45,000 strong, consisting of 24 fighter groups and 3 light bomb groups.

2. The Air Force ROTC, active in 127 colleges and universities throughout the country, with a membership of 45,000 cadets.

3. The Air Force Reserve, a body of some 400,000 officers and airmen. The vast majority of these men and women (we have hundreds of WAF reservists) are veterans of the recent war; some have valuable experience dating back to service in the First World War.

This Reserve is offered five different brands of training, and participation in any one type is, to a large extent, a matter of individual selection based on the amount of interest displayed by the reservist and the convenience with which he can attend drills. A great many reservists, as you can appreciate, do not live within commuting distances of the sites where we offer the type of training they would most like to have. Those people have to take another brand of training, for we cannot establish nearly as many facilities as the market demands. Approximately 100,000 reservists actively participate in the current program for the Air Force Reserve.

The recent war taught us many things. One thing we learned was that as a people we had been taking our ancient virtues for granted. Each of us expected our neighbors to have a deep knowledge of our freedoms, an almost instinctive awareness of dangers that threatened those freedoms, and a broad factual foundation of understanding assuring a realistic approach to problems that threatened us. If we had not exerted our thoughts, minds, and actions to these problems personally, we were confident that as a people we were unbeatable, that all was well and must by nature remain so. This was a situation well calculated to lead to national stupidity.

Our complacence received a rude awakening when, in 1941 just prior to Pearl Harbor, we discovered that great numbers of the men in our new Army were substantially ignorant of the calamitous events of the world. The citizen-soldiers saw no danger and saw no compelling reason why the Congress had decided to retain them in the service. In common with other citizens they were perplexed and confused. It required Pearl Harbor to unite us as we had never been united before.

Even then, there followed a national speculation of what we were fighting for—and a drive for slogans to keep us alert. Among some advertising agencies it amounted almost to a national contest, and we were treated with such incongruity as a full-page ad in a national magazine explaining that the man overseas was fighting for the safety of the corner drug store, or its contents, or fighting for such a homely item as Queenie's new pups.

However honest these attempts were to describe the outward manifestations of our reasons for fighting, they amount almost to a slander on our character. Perhaps they really gave a more honest indication of the shallowness of our thoughts than we cared to admit. They failed to assess the basic truth that we were fighting because we had to fight, that the simple dignity of man was being threatened, that the principle of a government owned and controlled by its people was in danger, that American democracy as we had known it was on the way to a rendezvous with lost civilization.

It seems to me that today we have a more awakened citizenry; that more people are personally and actively interested in the affairs of their community, State, and Nation, and in general world conditions.

That is good; it is a healthy condition which we should all strive to develop further.

And in this growing interest in national projects and problems, I hope that there will be a greater appreciation on the part of each citizen in the security program as a whole, and in the activities of the Regular and Reserve forces of these United States.

History has repeatedly shown that we can issue moral ultimatums designed to preserve the freedoms of mankind only when such ultimatums are backed up by persistent willingness publicly displayed by us as a people to dig in and work—in or out of uniform—for the extension of principles of freedom, the self-determination of peoples, and peace throughout the world.

Liberty Is a Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, a fine tribute having reference to our observance of Independence Day is exemplified in the following editorial entitled "Liberty Is a Way," which appeared in the Delta Sunday Independent, Delta, Colo., on July 2, 1950. This editorial reads as follows:

LIBERTY IS A WAY

It has taken mankind long and painful aeons of time to learn certain immutable truths, whose use dignifies those segments of the race, who accept them must be held at all costs. Out of the dim weariness of centuries of the binding influences of feudal life and devastating and selfish governance by despotic men, the American Nation was born because men of a frontier possessed a philosophy of liberty.

There was nothing new in thought when they affixed their names to the Declaration of Independence and staked their fortunes and their very lives in that brave gamble. Theirs was a sunburst of the yearnings of men through all of those dark and brutal ages before them.

They drew their inspirations from the teachings of Christ and the dialogics of the thinkers of ancient Greece. They recalled the action of those stout Englishmen, who forced a despotic king to accept the Magna Carta at historic Runnymede, an effort which challenged the divine right of tyranny and began the leavening process from which democracy emerged.

They knew out of bitter experience that behind all of the pomp and circumstance of kings and princes despotic whim produces degrading influences. And, they knew that men pay in blood and liberty to gratify these whims. They made America because they wanted to live in freedom's light and they wanted their descendants to exist that the dream might be drawn to the fulfillment which they never could achieve.

We have experienced the illumining nature of that dream. But we have not achieved it. It remains for us as we approach the observance of our Independence Day to dedicate our concepts and our action that this dream may not be broken, but that we may strengthen our way of life so that others, who come after us may enlarge it, and profiting by our mistakes, may keep it and extend its blessings.

Reexamination of German Policies

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, what is happening in Korea today convinces me an immediate, thorough, and comprehensive reexamination of our policies and programs be undertaken with respect to Germany. This is not a partisan or personal issue, but an immediate and urgent requirement, on behalf of our entire Nation.

Early in World War II the decision was made to devote our major military effort to the earliest possible defeat of Germany and the destruction of the Nazi war machine then in control of Europe, from the Pyrenees to the Caucasus, and from the Atlantic Ocean to the Balkans. From the initial landing in North Africa, in November 1942, through the tremendous effort in France in 1944, until the final collapse of the Nazi machine, in May 1945, our main effort was directed to this one aim. Whether it might have been wiser to have followed other courses of action, such as an advance through the Balkans, I shall not discuss at this time. Suffice it to say that in the spring of 1945, as a result of the massive ground and air efforts on the western front, and the continuing Russian pressure on the eastern front, the Allies met in the middle of Germany. Our policy of unconditional surrender, which was accepted eagerly by the Russians, and with some reluctance by the British, meant that there was, at that time, no organized government in Germany.

Our plans, however, contemplated the restoration of a German administrative organization, with operating agencies throughout that country. The functions of the occupying forces in the several zones were conceived to be the destruction of any remaining Nazi organizations and war matériel, the reduction of industrial capacity, so that Germany could not again menace Europe, and, of course, the maintenance of order in the occupied areas until stable conditions could be reestablished. Our program, in short, was "denazification, demilitarization, and deindustrialization." This was, as has since been demonstrated, a more or less negative approach. However, it was considered to be a short-range program, to permit the establishment of a reconstituted government, which would take its place among the nations of Europe.

Our expectations and plans with regard to Germany, which formed the basis for the Potsdam Conference, during the summer of 1945, have not, as you know, been realized. It may, though, be noted that our Army and Air Force speedily accomplished the collection and destruction of the remaining war material in Germany. This phase of the program was, for all practical purposes, concluded in our zone, by the end of 1945.

In the denazification program, we made two basic mistakes. The first was in attempting far too ambitious a program, without regard to the conditions prevailing in Germany, or our own capabilities. The second error was in failing to follow through and finish what we had started. The inevitable result was that our program bogged down; and we were forced, by want of personnel and facilities, to dismiss charges against large groups and categories of people, who should probably never have been listed in the first place. Further, we turned the remaining phases of the program over to the Germans, from whom the results have been spotty at best. As a consequence, some fairly prominent Nazis have regained positions of influence; and in other instances, the recovery of our zone has been handicapped by denying qualified technicians opportunity for employment. Whether, on the whole, this program has increased our standing, or been productive of any lasting results, is certainly open to question.

The program of reducing the industrial capacity of Germany to a level from which it could not again menace neighboring countries operated satisfactorily with respect to the destruction of munitions plants and similar war facilities. Difficulties, though, naturally arose in the cases of those plants and facilities which were not essentially military in nature, but could be partially or wholly converted to military purposes in time of war. Furthermore, the unfortunate agreement for the mass transfer of the German populations from Czechoslovakia, East Prussia, and what is now Poland, resulted in a flood of refugees into the Western Zones, entirely beyond the capacity of those areas, with respect to employment, shelter, or even subsistence.

Finally, our plans and expectations with regard to a unified administrative organization for Germany were grievously disappointed. The Russians, at the Potsdam Conference, clearly indicated their future attitude in this regard, by limiting the fields in which they would permit or support unified administrative agencies, from 13 departments in the prewar German Government, to only 5 ministries, principally in such technical fields as the post office and Government-owned railroads. It speedily became apparent that their purpose for making such an agreement was to obtain possession of any serviceable rolling stock which was dispatched from our zone; and the complete debasement of the occupation currency, with resulting chaos throughout the country. It took an unreasonably long time for our supposedly qualified advisers and experts to reach the very obvious conclusions that if we were to have a sound currency the uncontrolled issue of paper money had to be stopped; and that if we were to have any railroad operations, we must either have a return flow of cars from the Russian zone or stop the dispatch of rolling stock to that zone. However, these mistakes have been belatedly rectified; and it is not my purpose today to dwell upon them, other than to show some of the background of our present situation in Germany.

It has become increasingly evident, over the past 4 years, that western Germany is largely cut off from the foodstuffs and raw materials of eastern Europe, which formerly met a major portion of its requirements. And, with some 12,000,000 refugees imposed upon the previously concentrated population, western Germany can exist only by industrialization. Consequently, efforts have been made by our military government to find markets overseas for manufactured products; and in some fields these efforts have been successful. However, there have been many handicaps and obstacles, such as the lack of diplomatic or consular representation, the destruction of German manufacturing and transport facilities, loss of the German merchant marine, prejudice against a former enemy nation, and changes in markets. It is my conclusion that while overseas exports will assist German recovery, a solution must be sought in Europe.

The best approach to this problem appears to be the economic integration of western Germany—the British, French, and United States zones—into the economy of western Europe. While that area, all of which is relatively close to German production centers, has relatively little surplus food, there are significant amounts of certain commodities, such as dairy products from Holland and Denmark, wheat from France, and fruit from Italy available for export. On the other hand, the countries of western Europe can use sizable quantities of German manufactured goods. It is only by such exchange of goods and the integration of German production and economy that western Europe can be strengthened and expect to survive. We cannot continue indefinitely the

heavy drain on our economy of supplying Germany essential materials, with no return or reimbursement; and it is unrealistic to expect to develop, in the United States, a large scale mass market for German industrial and manufactured products. Germany is an essential part of western Europe, and its economy must be integrated within that region. While I commend the efforts thus far made to stimulate exports to overseas areas, I also want our policies reexamined with a view to coordinating the economy of this vital area with those of the surrounding countries at the earliest practicable date. During the time Marshall plan aid is available it can provide a valuable means of adjusting the dislocations and easing the strains that such integration will produce. If, however, we fail to press forward vigorously at this time, and fail to achieve early results, the unfortunate consequences will be visited upon us.

One basic essential in any such program of integration is a western Germany currency freely convertible into other monetary units; and I call upon the State Department to accomplish this without further delay. Unless the manufacturers and traders of the United States and British zones can exchange currencies received from sales in France, Belgium, or Italy, at open and stable rates, they cannot long continue sales to other countries. This was brought forcibly to my attention in the case of the Bavarian Motor Works, which has two large plants in the vicinity of Munich. Before the war this company was a leading producer of motorcycles, and is now preparing to undertake the manufacture of earth-moving and road building machinery such as carry-alls, scrapers, and graders. There is a substantial need for this machinery, not only in Germany but throughout western Europe. However, unless the funds received in payment for such products can be exchanged into marks, this company cannot make sales in other countries.

There is one additional factor in the economic recovery of Germany which I wish to mention at this time. That is the question of confidence by the people in the future security and business conditions of Germany. This factor is hard to analyze and impossible to evaluate accurately. It is, however, of the utmost importance. While the dismantling of German industrial capacity has weakened the economy of that country and is threatening to drive workers in some areas into the arms of the Communists, there is still, I believe, sufficient industrial capacity, even now, to meet all essential needs at least for the time being. In Germany, as in the United States, continuing large-scale capital investment in productive facilities is necessary for a healthy expanding economy, with a rising standard of living, and full employment. Such investments will only be made if there is reasonable assurance of political security and economic stability. In other words, individuals and corporations will not invest money in German factories, warehouses, and plants if they feel that the country may be overrun at any time by the Russian Army. Some regions of Germany and some lines of activity have shown a remarkable degree of recovery from the depths of 1945 and 1946. However, much of the rebuilding is improvised structures for retail stores and small-scale investments in housing. There has been relatively little investment in manufacturing or heavy industry, because there is little assurance that the present western German Government can continue; and it requires a substantial period of time to amortize the major investments required in those lines. I shall refer in a moment to the military situation as I see it, but I wish to invite attention at this point to the fact that a well-organized and adequate defense establishment is essential for economic recovery, as well as other purposes.

I am aware that the integration of western German economy is a part of the larger picture of western European economy but it is the keystone of any program in this field. It is also the area in which, through our high commissioner and military government, we possess the greatest authority and responsibility.

Similar reexamination and reevaluation of our current policies is required in the military field. Our objective is no longer simply to prevent the revival of nazism. We are faced with a much more immediate threat; namely, stopping Communist expansion by armed force. It is not communism as a social philosophy, or an economic theory developed by Marx, Engels, and Lenin which we fear, but the Russian military tyranny, controlled and directed by Stalin. In the Atlantic Pact and Mutual Defense Assistance program we have undertaken a major commitment and solemn obligation. We have agreed, within the framework of that pact and the supporting regional alliances and agreements, to assist the countries of western Europe in preparation for and, if necessary, resistance against Russian military aggression. While the pact is couched in diplomatic language and expressed in general terms, there is no mistaking its plan, purpose and intent—either by ourselves or the Russians. We are seeking, by mutual agreement and with proper staff planning, to furnish material aid in the form of arms and equipment for a defensive military organization in western Europe, capable of deterring or repelling Russian external aggression. At the same time, we hope that by strengthening the economic position of these countries, we can diminish if not eliminate the danger of internal, Communist-inspired revolutions. So far as the military picture is concerned, there may well be, in my opinion, a serious question as to whether we have not created such a cumbersome, complicated, and top-heavy staff set-up that we would be unable, in the event of a sudden emergency, to function promptly.

Disregarding that for the moment, however, let us examine the capabilities for mobilizing an army in western Europe. First, we must not lose sight of the fact that while the atom bomb and the United States Air Force (which I should like to see both stronger and better equipped) may be able to inflict terrible retribution on the Russians, only an adequate ground force properly organized and equipped with the best available weapons can hope to stop the Red army, short of the Atlantic Ocean.

In order to construct an organized and effective defensive force, we must first undertake to determine, approximately at least, the probably size and strength of the forces which the Soviet Union could put in the field in that theater. I have heard various estimates presented to the committees of the House and the Senate, and have read numerous articles in newspapers and popular magazines. Most qualified observers, though, agree that the Soviet Union could, within the first month or 6 weeks following the beginning of a war, place between 100 and 125 fully armed, well-trained and equipped divisions on the western front, between Stettin and Trieste. Within 6 months to a year they could increase this by at least another 100 divisions. So far as tactical air support for ground units is concerned, that is, in close support of land armies, the disparity in forces is so great that I should hesitate to venture an evaluation. At this point, there may be heard the remark that the Russian armies would outrun their supplies and thereby immobilize themselves. This is not the case. As long as there were no major contending armies in western Europe, to oppose the Russian advance, there could be no large battles. Major battles and sustained conflict are the principal causes of the consumption of war matériel, such as artillery ammunition, aircraft, and fuel. The Soviet armies are accustomed to living off the land, and their requirements for the individual soldier are comparatively simple. Assuming that they would assemble large reserves of food and gasoline before launching a major offensive, I do not believe that in the absence of a strong opposing force the Red army will halt short of the English Channel, the Pyrenees, and the Po Valley. In short, they will not stop, but must be stopped.

In order to be in a position to oppose major Russian offensives against western Europe, the nations with which we are allied and to whose defenses we are pledged should be able to interpose an effective force equal to not less than 50 percent, and preferably 70 percent, of the initial Soviet striking force. In estimating these requirements, I disregard such intangible political factors as Communist disaffection in the western European countries, with the attendant possibilities of sabotage, riots, and so forth. In short the Atlantic Pact countries, including Great Britain and the United States, would need, within the first 6 weeks or 2 months after the outbreak of war, a force of some 60–70 divisions. At the present time, including the United States forces in Europe, we would have available only

some 25–30 divisions at most. For example, the French Army, which in 1939 mobilized over 100 divisions, could today put from 8–12 divisions in the field, even disregarding the struggle now raging in Indo China. Holland and Belgium, whose armies formerly consisted of 8–10 divisions each, now could only account for 5 or 6. Contributions of the other Atlantic Pact countries are likewise small, and would require considerable time to mobilize.

I have examined this problem for a considerable period of time, and have sought the best information available. As I have stated previously, I had an interview with General DeLattre, former chief of the French Army, and now commander of the ground forces of the Atlantic Pact nations, in December of this past year. This experienced soldier and determined leader told me that he was glad to have the assistance of the Italian Army, and would likewise welcome the Spanish infantry. Even assuming, though, that Italy, handicapped as it is by the limitations of the peace treaty, could organize, equip, and train a force of 6 to 10 divisions, and that Spain could furnish the equivalent of 5 to 7 more, we are still woefully short. Unless we propose to launch our counteroffensives on the beaches of Normandy, and the southern slopes of the Alps, we must have more troops. As a simple matter of arithmetic, whichever way strategists sum up the military conditions, and regardless of detailed estimates, concerning which I shall not quarrel with anyone, we must have the equivalent of at least 25 German divisions, if we are to defend western Europe. It is only by this means that the overwhelming preponderance of the Russian armed forces can be balanced. I regret as much as anyone that the high hopes of 1944 and 1945 concerning world disarmament and the United Nations have not been realized. At the same time, we cannot disregard the continuing build-up of Russian strength, and allow the weakness of our own forces and those of our potential allies to continue. Nor do I welcome a resurgence of German military might, which has twice within this generation required the sacrifice of American manhood on the battlefields in Europe. But we cannot meet the present danger by concerning ourselves with past problems.

In my opinion, this military situation calls for a fresh, constructive, and coordinated program which will permit western Europe, without restoring German militarism, to utilize the capabilities, resources, and determination of the 45,000,000 people in western Germany in the organization and defense against Russian aggression. I am confident that if we give this matter our attention, results can be obtained. One method, which may not necessarily be the best, was suggested last fall by the London Economist, namely, the organization of German infantry units as parts of the over-all Allied land army. Whatever means are adopted, we must face the realities of the situation; and the sooner we organize the available—and indispensable—military resources of western Germany, the better we shall be prepared. Whether we like it or not, the division of Germany is complete. And, it is necessary to treat the Germans in our sector as European citizens, with equal rights, and with equal obligations for the defense of their homeland.

Along with the integration of Germany into the economy of western Europe, and the organization of an effective military establishment incorporating and utilizing the capabilities of the German people, we must reexamine the strength and purpose of our occupation forces in Europe. Our small contingent there was organized to deal with problems of military government, in the immediate postwar period, and to provide a force capable of meeting any insurrection. Surely, no one believes today that the mission of our forces in Germany is to prevent uprisings in Frankfurt or Munich. Our forces in Europe should be reorganized and strengthened, for the mission of providing a striking force capable of rapid mobilization. They should be organized and equipped to assist also the components of the western European countries, including those to be raised and trained in Germany. This will require, in my opinion, substantially larger forces than we now have in Germany, particularly with respect to the Air Forces, and the mechanized elements of our Ground Forces.

To sum up, we have undertaken, during the postwar period, the organization and defense of western Europe. We have invested very substantial sums for this purpose; but such expenditures cannot be continued indefinitely without threatening our own economy. It is generally recognized that one major deterrent to the economic recovery of western Europe is the dread of Russian invasion. By incorporating western Germany into the economy of Europe, and by mobilizing the military potential of Germany, we can achieve a twofold purpose. We shall reduce the drain upon American resources and the burden of the American taxpayer. We shall provide the underlying conditions for political stability and confidence, which are so essential if Germany is to achieve self-support and attract the capital investment required to provide employment for the present population. At the same time, we can restore the hope and confidence of the German people in their ability to defend their homeland.

Such a program calls for a new examination and a fresh start on our part. It will also call for some assistance, both economic and military. However, the most valuable form of assistance, whether to an individual or to a nation, is that which encourages further effort, and does not constitute a continuing dole. Almost 5 years have passed since the end of hostilities in Europe, and time is running out for us. Let us embark now on a program which will merit the support of the American people, encourage the efforts of those Germans west of the iron curtain, in helping Europe rebuild its economy, and prepare its defenses.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of July 9, 1950]

WEAPONS UNITED STATES DESTROYED WOULD BE VALUABLE NOW—ENOUGH EQUIPMENT WAS THROWN AWAY TO OUTFIT ARMIES OF THOSE NATIONS WHICH SIDE WITH US IN CRITICAL PERIOD

(By Constantine Brown)

World war III is around the corner and only some unforeseen circumstances can avoid it. To think anything else would be to hide our heads in the sand, as we have done repeatedly for the past 4 years.

While most public figures—officials and private persons in high standing—were singing hosannahs for the millennium which was created by establishment of the United Nations, this column has long harped "monotonously" on the unreliability of Moscow's friendship, its Asiatic lust for power—far more ruthless, dangerous and cruel than that of any western dictator—and particularly on the increase of the Soviet armed forces, far beyond its normal needs.

Since the end of the war we and the rest of the Western nations, relying on the untested magic powers of the United Nations, have reduced our armed forces to little more than a constabulary. Under political pressure we pulverized our ground, air and naval forces quickly after VJ-day.

Our political leaders, and many of our military men, refused to realize that we had created a Frankenstein from the shambles of the Nazi-Fascist dictatorship. They did not believe in the proof of Kremlin trickery and assumed that our earnest attempts to establish some order in a devastated world would—of necessity—be endorsed by the 11 men who dictate to hundreds of millions.

QUICKLY DEMOBILIZED

While we were spending our substance helping our Allies, neutrals, and even former enemies rehabilitate themselves, on the sound theory that satisfied peoples will not seek wars, Russia was sulking, demanding more territory and taking it by ruse while building up her obsolete military forces.

The United States, the only remaining western nation with a good war potential, was busy beating its swords into plowshares. After the war we actually threw away and destroyed enough war material to equip all the manpower of the nations which stand with us in these trying hours.

We put into mothballs ships which, at this time, could give real assistance to the nations which either already are under attack by the Kremlin imperialists' puppet or are on the point of being invaded.

The development of the atom bomb gave us a feeling of false security. Our advances in modern aviation led many politicians to believe that ground and naval forces were as obsolete as medieval archers. Even if suspicions that Russia wanted to unleash another war were well-founded, it was believed, our planes could break the backbone of Russia's power in a few weeks of intense air raids.

A bitter battle against this illusion took place in Washington, with the rest of the American people sitting on the sidelines and taking sides with the advocates of air power alone, because it appeared far more convenient to build planes than to maintain obsolete armies and navies. But we did not even follow this mistaken doctrine. When the airmen demanded 70 air groups as a minimum for national security and their request was approved by Congress, the executive branch decided it was too much and on its own authority cut the appropriation to permit the creation of only 48 groups.

Our top political leaders, believing firmly in peace even if Russia rendered it somewhat precarious, were loath to spend more billions

than in their opinion were absolutely necessary. There was money to pay for subsidies on eggs, potatoes, and other agricultural products. But since we were operating on a deficit basis, the money had to be saved somewhere.

RUSSIA POWERFUL

Cuts in the armed services have always been popular with the voters, who always like to believe that wars are never in the offing. And we cut deeply into our military strength. This is not said in a spirit of hostile criticism of our present leaders. They, too, believed—and some now still believe—that Russia was bluffing and would never have the potential to wage war on us, no matter how great an effort she might make.

At this critical time the situation is as follows:

Russian ground-force strength is conservatively estimated at 174 divisions (about 15,000 men to each division). According to a survey presented by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to Congress last spring, Moscow would mobilize within a relatively short time—not more than 6 months—another 100 divisions. In addition to this national force, there are between 900,000 and 1,200,000 Chinese Reds adequately equipped to fight in Asia. Besides these, there were some 700,000 troops—indifferent in quality and of questionable loyalty—in the countries behind the iron curtain in Europe, some 200,000 Koreans, and hundreds of thousands of fifth columnists, subversives, and other kinds of Red followers throughout Europe, Asia, South America, and even the United States.

While we were playing marbles and coddling traitors, subversives, and fifth columnists in our midst, the Russians were getting ready to play for keeps.

In addition to these ground forces—and fifth columnists can be even more dangerous than actual divisions—Moscow was building up her aviation much faster than were the western nations led by America.

We are relying on our industrial potential and on the conviction that we can get ready, as we did in previous wars, after hostilities break out. The Russians, aware of their industrial shortcomings and their slow production, have worked day and night on planes, guided missiles, and probably atomic power from the very moment that the cease fire was sounded in Europe and Asia in 1945.

UNITED STATES HAS SKELETON FORCE

At the present time the military picture is as follows:

Our ground combat forces at this moment are 10 divisions strong, strewn from Japan to Germany, Austria, and Trieste. Our 48 air groups, the best in the world, are distributed to the four corners of the world, from Okinawa to Alaska, from continental America to America, Britain, Germany, and Austria.

The Navy, which at this moment could render immense services to our defense if it had in commission the major part of the 99 carriers it had at the end of the war, is doing yeoman's duty with less than half a dozen such ships. The rest are in mothballs and it will take several months before they can be placed in commission again.

The marines, who at one time last year were threatened with extinction, today comprise only 40,000 men. This force is called officially the Fleet Marine Force. Popularly, they are known as the "fighting marines," with a tradition as hard fighters about as old as the country itself.

We, too, have allies, and the numerical strength of the western nations compares favorably, on paper, at least, with that of the U. S. S. R. But, unfortunately, the wartime allies have had no time to prepare themselves for an emergency such as we are faced with today.

France can no longer be counted as the chief military power of western Europe. The bulk of its combat armies is engaged in Indochina and its chances of disentangling itself are extremely slim. Ho Chi Minh, the Communist guerrilla leader, has been able single-handed to check the 150,000 French troops for more than 4 years.

Now with the Chinese Communist troops on the Indochinese borders estimated at 250,000 men the prospects of defeating him have become even slimmer. The available metropolitan forces are not more than six divisions.

The military-aid program, which is rushing equipment from the United States to Europe, has not been able to increase the efficiency of the French armies yet. Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, and Luxemburg cannot be counted on as military assets. Norway will do well if it holds back a Soviet onslaught from the Finnish-Soviet border for a few weeks. Britain's greatly reduced navy, and its small but first-class air force, can be reckoned only as a temporary help to us while we are girding ourselves for battle.

TURKS NO PUSH-OVER

In the Middle East the several hundred million dollars spent on preparing Turkey for an emergency have paid ample dividends. That republic today is about the only country which has a military and air force capable of meeting successfully—if only for a limited time—a Russian attack from the Caucasus. It is even conceivable that the Turkish armies under certain circumstances could penetrate Soviet territory and threaten seriously Russia's main oil supplies at Baku, Azerbaijan.

Appeasement of certain ideological elements in this country, suspicion and prejudice have prevented us from arming the two best possible fighting forces in Europe—Germany and Spain.

The Russians have rejected all such considerations and in the last 2 years have created a first-class German military force estimated by our intelligence at between 50,000 and 150,000 men. Many of them have served in Hitler's armies and are veterans of the last war. Others are new to warfare, but are anxious to restore the glory of the Fatherland.

There is much discussion about their loyalty to Russia. According to the best advices from western Germany they would—in all probability—cross the lines to join our side, if the people of that portion of the Reich under western allied control had a similar organization and appeared capable of defending themselves against another Russian invasion.

MILITARY LEADERS IGNORED

There have been few cases in the history of Germany since the Napoleonic wars in which Germans fought Germans. Under present conditions, with Germany completely disarmed and protected only by a flimsy western garrison of not more than six American, British, and French divisions, the chances are that it will be the western Germans who will go over reluctantly to the other side.

Picayunish prejudices have prevented us from supplying a Spanish army of between 500,000 and 1,000,000 men. The latter figure includes the trained reserves.

It was at the Potsdam Conference that we and the British, in order to appease Stalin, agreed to apply sanctions against the Spanish totalitarian regime.

The United States not only withdrew its ambassador but also adopted what amounts today to an unofficial economic boycott.

Defense Secretary Johnson, General Bradley, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; General Vandenberg, chief of staff of the Air Force; and General Collins, Army chief of staff, have urged that we start rebuilding Spain's military strength while there is still time. They have been joined by their opposite numbers in Britain and France.

The Korean situation is far from encouraging. At best it will be a long affair. It has been proved that the Air Force alone cannot do the job. And to defeat the Russian-trained North Korean armies and their Chinese helpers who are being rushed to Manchuria for any eventuality it will take more than the contingents we now have in South Korea.

At worst the Korean affair, carefully planned in Moscow, might be the signal for world war III. There is no doubt that we won't be second best in that tragic eventuality. The American people are not warlike, but are the best warriors in the world when they are subjected to aggression.

We have all the elements for final victory. Under the pressure of circumstances, there is no question that a wave of realism will spread among those who bear the responsibility of conducting these operations. Politics of all kinds will be buried and the administration soon will recognize that since we are now playing for keeps, and our national existence is threatened by an oriental foe, we must apply ourselves with every means available to win this last struggle for our own sake and for the sake of living in a decent world.

Free Mailing Privileges for Combat Forces in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the Senate has approved a measure which will grant free mailing privileges to the military forces now in combat in Korea. I am today introducing a bill in the House which would effect the same result.

The free mailing privilege granted in World War II, and since rescinded, should in all fairness be reenacted at this time. From personal experience, I can relate the morale-building effect of this statute. Normal mailing procedures were nonexistent in combat areas, and the service personnel would have been severely restricted in their communication with their families and loved ones without the free mailing privilege.

Those fighting in Korea are as much entitled to this privilege as were the forces of World War II. The same conditions exist, and this Congress should do all possible to facilitate the flow of information between the GI's and their families. It is only through the sending and receiving of mail that the spirits of those fighting and those at home can be maintained at a high level.

The committee having jurisdiction over this measure should immediately report favorably on it so that free mailing will be made available at the earliest possible moment.

National Security of the United States

REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House of Representatives will consider the bill H. R. 7439, a bill to provide for protecting the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment of civilian officers and employees of certain departments and agencies of the Government. The rule making this in order was previously adopted. I intend to propose certain amendments to this bill. The effect of this will be to provide an appeal to the Civil Service Commission from any adverse decision by the head of the department or agency. The amendment will also provide that if the Civil Service Commission recommends the reinstatement of the appellant and the head of the department or agency, as the case may be, determines after consideration of the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission that such a reinstatement would not be against the public interest, he shall reinstate the appellant and allow him compensation for all or any part of the period of his suspension as is now provided by statute.

We all agree that there is no place in Government service for the disloyal employee. He should be removed from Government service at the earliest possible moment. However, a person may be a security risk and not be disloyal. The Under Secretary of the Navy appearing on behalf of the Department of Defense said, "A Defense Department employee, even though loyal to the United States, may be a serious security risk due to his associations, affiliations, habits, or indiscreetness." As it now stands, if this bill become law, the agency concerned will act as prosecutor, judge, and jury. It opens the door for a group of martinets to become all powerful with no restraint upon their actions.

All these amendments of mine do is to provide an appeal to the Civil Service Commission which makes its findings and reports back to the head of the agency. If the head of the agency, upon reviewing the case, still decides that the appellant is a security risk, he need not reinstate him. The only safeguard that my amendment, in effect, gives the appellant is to insure that his case is brought before the head of his own agency. Surely, in our American system of checks and balances, this is not too much to ask.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my amendments be printed in the RECORD that those interested may study them before this bill reaches the floor tomorrow.

AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 7439, PROPOSED BY CONGRESSMAN MILLER

On page 1, line 3, after "That", insert "(a)."

On page 2, line 25, after "shall", insert a comma and the following: "except as provided in subsection (b)."

On page 4, after line 12, insert the following:

"(b) (1) Any person whose employment is terminated under authority of subsection (a) shall have the right to appeal to the Civil Service Commission from the adverse decision of the agency head concerned. Such appeal shall be made in writing within a reasonable time after such termination of employment and may be accompanied by such affidavits as the appellant may desire to submit. The appellant shall be given the opportunity to appear before the Commission, either in person or through a designated representative, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Commission. After investigation and consideration of the evidence submitted, the Commission shall (A) submit its findings and recommendations to the agency head concerned, and (B) send copies of such findings and recommendations to the appellant or to his designated representative. If the Commission recommends that the appellant be reinstated and such agency head determines, after consideration of such recommendation, that such reinstatement would be fair and reasonable and not against the public interest, he shall reinstate the appellant and allow him compensation as provided in subsection (a) for all or any part of the period of his suspension and separation from the service.

"(2) The Civil Service Commission shall submit to the President and to the Congress an annual report with respect to the activities of the Commission under this act, and shall include in such report a statement indicating the extent to which the several agency heads have complied with the recommendations of the Commission, submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, for the reinstatement of dismissed officers and employees."

Operation Loot in the Sales of Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, today our boys are dying in Korea. We are amazed at the lack of equipment available to them, especially aircraft. We are told that notwithstanding the great number of planes at the end of the last World War there are not a sufficient number now to meet even the transportation required at this time to convey personnel and supplies to Korea. As a result we are chartering private commercial planes to do what is necessary in this respect.

In view of the above it is interesting to note the facts and figures appearing in Informational Bulletin No. 136, issued Monday, July 10, 1950, by Paul O. Peters, Washington, D. C., as editor of News Bulletin. The information contained in this bulletin is so important in showing the result of a mistaken policy in disposing of our aircraft following World War II that I am including it as a part of my remarks in accordance with the unanimous consent granted by the House:

OPERATION LOOT IN THE SALES OF AIRCRAFT

(By Paul O. Peters)

At the conclusion of the actual fighting in World War II, the Congress was confronted with two difficult problems. The first was to as rapidly as possible rescind appropriations that had not already been encumbered for the procurement of military equipment and supplies, and the second was the setting up of legislative authority for the orderly disposal of approximately $35,000,000,000 in surplus properties of all kinds.

On May 28, 1945, in a report to Congress, the Surplus Property Board which had been created under the Surplus Property Act of October 3, 1941, said in part:

AIRCRAFT AND EQUIPMENT

"Government expenditures for aircraft so far in this war have amounted to over $40,000,000,000. Since July 1940, this country has produced more than 270,000 planes and immense quantities of components and spare parts. On March 31, 1945, the reported original cost of all surplus aircraft and equipment in inventory was about $1,000,000,000."

At the time this report was submitted to Congress, several large aircraft manufacturers were still making both transport and combat planes under their contracts with the Government. As rapidly as these planes were completed and test flown, they were ferried, fully equipped, to fields in Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico.

Thus, it came to pass that by the fall of 1946 planes declared surplus to the needs of the military services was assembled at fields, as follows:

	Planes
Albuquerque, N. Mex	1,551
Clinton, Okla	7,547
Kingman, Ariz	5,443
Honolulu, Hawaii	2,265
Walnut Ridge, Ark	4,822
Total	21,638

Another group of 1,340 planes were assembled at various fields in California making the total planes declared surplus at that time 22,968. Previously 33,567 surplus aircraft with an original declared cost of $1,134,851,000 had been placed in inventory and 10,193 had been sold for $15,841,000.

To give our readers a brief summary of just how the aircraft in surplus toward the end of 1946 were disposed of, we present the following tabulation of the so-called On the Hoof Sales:

Purchaser	Number of aircraft	Declared cost	Sold for—
Compressed Steel Co., 600 West Bayard St., Denver, Colo.	1,551	$259,620,394	$411,275
Sherman Machine & Iron Works, 18-36 East Main St., Oklahoma City, Okla.	7,547	702,322,783	1,168,550
Universal Airplane Salvage Corp., South Bend, Ind.	2,265	304,554,754	629,000
Martin Wunderlich, 219 East High St., Jefferson City, Mo.	5,443	1,237,638,134	2,780,000
Sharp & Fellows, 533 Central Bldg., Los Angeles, Calif.	1,391	222,338,598	408,843
Texas Railway & Equipment Co., 4300 Calhoun Rd., Houston, Tex.	4,822	1,042,201,384	1,817,738
Total	23,019	3,768,676,047	7,215,406

Texas Railway & Equipment also secured 87 other aircraft for which we were unable in 1946 to get the purchase price.

Also White Metal Rolling & Stamping Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., had a contract to receive surplus planes to be dismantled for the purpose of recovering 32,000,000 pounds of scrap aluminum. This contract it appears was

later transferred to a syndicate of eight other firms.

During the investigation of surplus property disposal, only one of the sales, that being to Martin Wunderlich, of Jefferson City, Mo., came under partial investigation, and that because of the fact that approximately $600,000 worth of high octane gasoline and gallons of lubricating oils were overlooked in determining the sales price, and this windfall was claimed by Wunderlich since he bought the airplanes on an "as is, where is" basis.

Many of the planes sold to Wunderlich had been flown direct from the factories to the field at Kingman, Ariz., and were loaded with supplies, equipment, and spare parts. Thus in one fell swoop, our disposal experts succeeded in getting rid of what might well be airplanes we could be using in the Korean incident.

This is just one small incident in "operation loot."

Eagle Scout Saves Woman From Drowning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, with the closing of the National Boy Scout Jamboree at Valley Forge, where some 47,000 Scouts have been assembled with their leaders, I wish to point out an example of the fine training this organization gives to our American youth. A young lad in my district recently used his Scout training in the successful rescue of a young woman who was almost drowned in the Dolores River. The following article, taken from the Dolores Star at Dolores, Colo., gives the details of the heroic act of this Eagle Scout:

EAGLE SCOUT SAVES WOMAN FROM DROWNING IN DOLORES RIVER—LYN DENBY SNATCHED HATTIE BLAKE BACK FROM DEATH SUNDAY

Sunday, Lyn Denby, son of Mr. and Mrs. George Denby, of Dolores, through quick thinking, and Boy Scout training, saved Miss Hattie Blake, daughter of Mrs. Mary Blake and niece of Dr. Hoffman, of Cortez, from drowning in the Dolores River.

The accident occurred about noon at the old Oranger place, 10 miles above Dolores.

Diana Dawson, of McElmo Canyon, was the closest person to Miss Blake when the accident occurred. She stated that Miss Blake was walking a short distance behind her, on a path running along the river bank. She heard a splash and looked around and the woman had vanished. A row of bubbles were rising from the deep water a short distance from shore. She immediately screamed for help. Denby, who was some distance away heard her screams and went to investigate. When he arrived at the spot where the girl was, Miss Blake was floating face down, about 20 feet from the shore.

After removing his shoes he dived in and swam out to the woman; she did not struggle, was apparently unconscious, and not breathing. On reaching the shore he began administering artificial respiration; Mrs. Nellie Sparks, of Portales, N. Mex., assisted him. After several quarts of water were forced from the woman's lungs, she began to breathe and show signs of life.

A motorist drove 4 miles down the river to Dr. Rasor's summer cabin for medical aid, but before going to the scene the doctor came to Dolores and enlisted the help of two Dolores firemen, Willis Thomas and Cy Robinson, and the department's resuscitator.

After being revived sufficiently, although never becoming fully conscious, Miss Blake was taken to the Cortez Hospital where at present she is making satisfactory recovery.

Sojourners Blast World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an address given by Mr. W. Floyd Jackson, national chairman of the National Sojourners, before the Dupont chapter, which is an important contribution to the discussion as to whether or not this Congress should endorse the idea of a federal world government:

The plans of United World Federalists, Inc., and other agencies which have devised similar plans to subjugate our Government are best described by one word—overwhelm. This means to destroy or to crush utterly. It is a plan for the concentration of power with authority to enslave the world. Our Government recognizes the danger of such great concentration of power in industry as is evidenced by its fight against monopolies.

In the beliefs, purposes, and policies adopted October 29, 1949, by the Third General Assembly of United World Federalists, Inc., under "Principles: No. 2, membership," participation in world federal government should be open at all times to all nations without right of secession. This is no experiment in government monopoly—it is final and fatal.

In the same beliefs, purposes, and policies, under membership, United World Federalists recognize that world government must bring together under a rule of law peoples of various ideologies throughout the world. However, as a United States organization, United World Federalists will not knowingly admit or continue as members persons who seek to overthrow the government of, or in the interest of a foreign power, seek to weaken the United States, or change its form of government by other than constitutional means. This seems to be rather an ambiguous statement because the end results are the same when the government has been changed overwhelmingly. It has been stated that fellow travelers and sympathizers are more dangerous to America than outright Communists, because often they lend an air of respectability to organizations and movements, to influence the support and finance these organizations whose whole purpose is to so weaken us as a nation that we become impotent. We experienced this before World War II through the efforts of more than 1,500 organizations, many of which have since been found to be subversive and un-American. Many of these organizations had as supporters and sponsors persons whose names are now found on the list of officers, national advisory board and national executive council of the United World Federalists.

As the president of this group, we find Alan Cranston, former Chief of the Foreign Language Division of the Office of War Information. In July 1943 Representative Richard B. WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts, charged that there were 417 aliens hired by OWI with incomplete checks as to character and loyalty. Associated in the OWI Division under the control of Alan Cranston was an alleged Italian Communist, Carlo Emanuele a Prata, who had been expelled from Switzerland as a Soviet agent, entered the United States on a Czech passport issued to a Milan Janota. Also employed by Cranston's division was Alfredo Segre, a script writer married to Hazel Florence Burston, an employee of the Daily Worker, the official organ of the Communist Party. Also David Karr, alias David Katz.

Washington Times-Herald Columnist John O'Donnell, July 7, 1943, writing up Miss Ruth Mitchell's charges against OWI declared that Alan Cranston obtained draft deferment through pressure for three editors of the Croatian Communist newspaper, Slobonda Rech. Mr. Cranston is mentioned on page 9253, November 4, 1943 issue, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, by the then-Congressman, Fred E. Busbey, of the Third Congressional District of Illinois as follows: "Here is a situation in which you should be interested. Alan Cranston, Chief of the Foreign Language Division of OWI, according to Common Ground, which is the official organ of the Common Council for American Unity, edited by Louis Adamic, is a member of the staff of the Common Council for American Unity. Let us look at the record of Louis Adamic for a minute, because he is a rather important individual in this picture. He attacks General Mahailovich who has the support of the United Nations. He is associated with many Communist-controlled front organizations, and many of his writings condemn the Government of the United States while he eulogizes the Government of the Soviet Union."

"Alan Cranston, the Chief of the Foreign Language Division of OWI, had an article in Common Ground the summer of 1941 opposing the alien registration bill, which in the minds of many was a very necessary war measure. He came out in support of the Communist, Harry Bridges. His article in many respects, parallels the program of the Communist Party."

"I hold in my hand a letter on the stationery of the Common Council for American Unity. The members of the Committee on Appropriations may be interested in this one paragraph written by Read Lewis, executive director, soliciting funds for the Common Council for American Unity: 'When Mr. Elmer Davis appeared before Congress to appeal for continuing funds for the OWI, he displayed a photographic montage of one of his releases that had appeared in newspapers published in 27 different languages. Ninety percent of those clippings were directly traceable to our organization which had translated and sent out the original story to each foreign-language press'."

For the May-June 1940 issue of the Jewish Record he wrote on Congress and the Alien, in which the representatives of the people were severely castigated.

In 1943, when the OWI Foreign Language Division broadcast, labeling King Victor Emmanuel as a moron and Premier Badoglio as a Fascist, it was immediately repudiated by both President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull.

As an active vice president of UWF, Inc., we find the name of Raymond Swing, who has been associated with the publication, Soviet Russia Today. This publication has been cited as a Communist publication by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. Mr. Swing was a sponsor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friend-

ship, which also has been cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General, and the Committee on Un-American Activities.

In the Communist publication, the Daily Worker, September 26, 1947, page 12, Raymond Swing intervened in behalf of Hans Eisler, a Communist who was being held for deportation at that time.

From December 26, 1949, Newsweek, page 40, Red Anthem, Hans Eisler, composer—brother of bail-jumping Communist Gerhart Eisler—was deported from the United States in 1948, despite the protests of many fellow travelers and artists. Like his brother Gerhart, Eisler ended up in the Soviet zone of Germany. Among other activities, Hans composed the music for a new east German national anthem, and last week Communists in both the east and the west German zones were busy learning it in preparation for the Stalin birthday celebration. Sponsor, American-Soviet Friendship Celebration. Why do you suppose the vice president of UWF wanted to keep Hans Eisler in the United States?

Continuing Swing, sponsor, World Federalist U. S. A., Inc., 1947; vice chairman, executive council, United World Federalists of District of Columbia, 1947. Advisory committee, International League for Rights of Man, 1947, International Editorial Board World Government News, 1948. Sponsor, Committee of 1,000 To Abolish House Committee on Un-American Activities, 1948. Note carefully: National Committee, American Civil Liberties Union, 1948, "The American Civil Liberties Union is closely affiliated with the Communist movement in the United States, and fully 90 percent of its efforts are on behalf of Communists who have come into conflict with the law. It claims to stand for free speech, free press, and free assembly, but it is quite apparent that the main function of the American Civil Liberties Union is to attempt to protect the Communists in their advocacy of force and violence to overthrow the Government." This from the congressional committee to investigate communism—Fish Committee. "Is a supporter of all subversive movements, its propaganda is detrimental to the state. It attempts not only to protect crime but to encourage attacks upon our institutions in every form." This is from the New York State Joint Legislative Committee, investigating seditious activities, the Lusk Committee.

"The American Civil Liberties Union may be definitely cited as a Communist-front organization or 'transmission belt' organization." This from the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

Another vice president, Carl Van Doren, has been associated with many Communist-front organizations and publications officially cited as such by official Federal, State, or municipal agencies, viz, John Reed Club, sponsor, Medical Bureau To Aid Spanish Democracy, opposed New York State Legislature bill barring Communists from office; sponsor, American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born; American Relief for Greek Democracy; sponsor, New Masses, dinner, New York City 1946, etc.

The 1949 program vice president of United World Federalists, Vernon Nash, in 1939 was on the executive committee, the Fellowship of Reconciliation reported to be a radical-pacifist group using Christian terms to spread Communist propaganda, which played an important role in bringing about the recognition of Russia in 1933. It is a section of the War Resisters International, which believes changes can be accomplished by revolutionary uprisings.

Cass Canfield, another vice president, signer of letter in 1940 to this committee, auspices American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom—this committee was cited as Communist-front organization by the California Tenney Legislative Committee, also by the House Un-American Activities Committee, and the New York City Council Committee Investigating Municipal Civil Service. It is further reported that in 1945 he was associated with the American Committee for Yugoslav Relief, which has also been cited by the California Tenney Legislative Committee and the Attorney General of the United States Subversive List No. 2 as Communist fronts.

Chairman executive committee, U. W. F., Inc., Cord Meyer, Jr., issued report Militarization of America, circulated by National Council Against Conscription. Coauthor report circulated by National Council Against Conscription, 1948. This committee was cited by the California Tenney Legislative Committee.

National Advisory Board, United World Federalists, Inc.—From October 1949 list:

Dr. Rufus Clement, president, Atlanta University, Ga., a sponsor for many years of "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" (Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities), the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. This committee was also cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Tom Clark. Dr. Clement was also a signer of statement circulated by National Federation for Constitutional Liberties supporting Army order rendering Communists and sympathizers eligible for commission, 1945. Sponsor, Congress on Civil Rights, 1946—which was cited as subversive and Communist by Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities, also by Attorney General Tom Clark, "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it."

Dr. Albert Guerard, another sponsor of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born; in addition Dr. Guerard was the signer of a petition, 1941, to President Roosevelt to free Earl Browder; in 1942 he was signer on an open letter to the President in behalf of Harry Bridges, which was sponsored by National Federation of Constitutional Liberties. This organization has been cited by the Attorney General, Un-American Activities Committee and the New York City Council Committee, "is one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party," "one of the most important Communist-front organizations."

Lewis Mumford, listed as a contributor to the publication, New Masses. Sponsor, American Friends of Spanish Democracy, 1936, and a member in 1937 of the North American Committee to aid Spanish Democracy, and on the board of directors in 1937. American Society for Technical Aid to Spanish Democracy. American Friends of Spanish Democracy, organized by the Communist Party for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, cited by the Congressional Committee and California Committee on Un-American Activities.

James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union, also a signer of the statement circulated by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties supporting Army order rendering Communists and sympathizers eligible for commissions, 1945. Initiating committee, Congress on Civil Rights, 1946 (see remarks under Dr. Clements on Congress on Civil Rights); coauthor report circulated by national council against conscription, 1948. National Committee, American Civil Liberties Union, 1948 (refer to remarks on Raymond Swing. Note this same year Raymond Swing served on national committee of American Civil Liberties Union); joined in CIO, CP drive for return of GI's from Pacific, 1946; signer statement released by Civil Rights Congress assailing Red-baiting, 1947.

Dr. Ralph Sockman, signer of "Conscientious Objector," statement, 1931; sponsor World Tomorrow Dinner, 1931; sponsor, National Peace Enrollment Emergency Peace Campaign, 1937; sponsoring committee, World Youth Congress, 1938, cited by House Un-American Activities Committee. Emergency Peace Mobilization, a "Communist-front which came forth after Stalin signed his pact with Hitler, to oppose the National Defense Program"—Congressional Committee Un-American Activities. "Among the more conspicuous Communist fronts that have defied brazenly the interests of the United States and other freedom-loving nations whenever they have been in conflict with the interests of Soviet Russia and world communism." California Committee on Un-American Activities. Fellowship of Reconciliation (see remarks under Carl Van Doren); also a signer of "World of Tomorrow" poll, which voted in favor of socialism, a drastic increase in inheritance and income taxes, a "cooperative commonwealth" instead of capitalism.

Dr. Albert Einstein, sponsor, Abraham Lincoln Brigade; national sponsor, Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign; patron, Congress of American-Soviet Friendship; signer, petition to Congress to abolish Dies committee; sponsor, American-Soviet friendship celebration; sponsor, Committee of 1,000 to abolish House Committee on Un-American Activities; coauthor report circulated by National Council Against Conscription; issued report "Militarization of America," circulated by National Council Against Conscription; National Advisory Board, United World Federalists, Inc., 1947–49, etc.

There are others with similar connections and associations interspersed among the National Advisory Board and the National Executive Council of U. W. F.

Alger Hiss, former State Department employee, and president of Carnegie Peace Foundation, was reported in the press to have secured permission from the courts of New York to leave their jurisdiction; it was reported that he made several speeches for United World Federalists. (Note this was between the trials.)

In the beliefs, purposes, and policies of United World Federalists under membership, it is stated that they are a United States organization—we seem to have some difficulty in reconciling this with the "World Federalists progress around the globe," on page 6 of the January 1950 issue of their World Government News magazine in which a chart is made showing China, New Zealand, Australia, Philippines, Japan, India, Pakistan, Israel, Lebanon, Austria, Egypt, South Africa, Turkey, Greece, Argentina, United States, Finland, Sweden, Norway, Great Britain, Germany, Denmark, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, France, Switzerland, Canada, and Italy. They state under World Federalists progress, "the United States organization, United World Federalists, probably leads its sister groups throughout the world. In political accomplishment at the grass roots, it probably has the edge, too."

This probably would indicate that it was a foreign-born scheme to enmesh the United States of America into a world-dominated government. It has been reported originally under the name of Federal Union, which was established simultaneously in London, England, and New York City with

a nationally organized committee to bring in nearly 200 American cities with headquarters in Washington, D. C., under the title "Union Press," with offices in the National Press Building. These were the promoters of Union Now, which was apparently the organization to do the cultivating and groundwork in preparation for the return of Robert Lee Humber to his native State of North Carolina. A Rhodes scholar, he had spent many years in Europe, where he had apparently been well trained to carry out certain duties on his return to America, all under the guise of world peace.

After becoming affiliated with a local post of the American Legion in the State of North Carolina, plan No. 2 went into effect and the Humber resolution was presented to the legislature of the State, purporting to be an instrument to establish world peace. The timing for such a scheme was perfect; men were dying on the battlefields of the world.

The New York Herald Tribune, December 20, 1942: "If Mr. Humber has moral powers only in mind, he needs only to go back to the time when the United States gave the League full support in its effort to halt Japan's depradations on the Asiatic mainland to realize that he is being fatuous; if he has military powers in mind, he must contemplate the endowment of his world federation with absolute control over such a big and effective police force that no nation, or coalition of nations, could defy its mandates; and also that no nation that disapproved them could withdraw its contribution to that police power. This would mean that if a coterie of such nations as Germany, Italy, and Japan were to organize a conspiracy to abolish this country's form of government and to put an appointed dictator over us, because of some faked-up charge against us, we should have to take it and like it."

Mr. Humber was supposed to have been an international lawyer and business executive in Paris, France, for 16 years prior to the collapse of France's resistance. This 16 years of practice as a lawyer and business executive fades into oblivion in the force of his great desire to disarm America through world federation.

Information in the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities regarding Mr. Humber reveals that he has been associated in international groups since the year 1933. It was reported in the press in Wilmington, Del., that Mr. Humber was a member of the first post of the American Legion formed in Paris, France, in 1918. National headquarters of the American Legion report that he was not a member: "Robert Lee Humber not listed on charter application for Paris Post, No. 1, nor did he attend Paris caucus of legion."

It is our opinion that the Un-American Activities Committee of the Congress should investigate the United World Federalists, Inc., and other allied organizations, to definitely determine their ultimate aims and purposes, before further hearings are continued by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House or Senate of the United States.

The UWF have followed the established Communist party line in establishing university and lower school federalists groups, regional meetings have been held with selected high-school students, they enlist the support of educators as sponsors of their meetings. This is done to influence the parents through the student.

From the American Legion Magazine, December 1949, page 63: "A strange fallacy is abroad in our land. It is a fallacy that communism is simply a very radical social doctrine. It is nonsense to look upon the present world struggle as one of ideology versus ideology. The communism with which we are concerned in 1949 is not primarily an ideology but the embodiment of brute force seeking world conquest. The Communist Party of the United States is a Soviet-originated conspiracy to advance this conquest. Its professional members are a peculiarly contemptible kind of conspirator and, as conspirators against their own country, they have no academic rights which could possibly be infringed."

World government is world conquest through dictatorship.

South Korean Manpower Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 11 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Mr. Henry G. Mazlen, of Greenbelt, Md., a demographer at National University, has prepared a paper on the manpower resources of North and South Korea. In view of the very vital interest the American people have in Korea today I should like to make this study available as widely as possible. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have this paper by Mr. Mazlen printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH KOREAN MANPOWER RESOURCES

(By Henry G. Mazlen)

PRELIMINARY DATA

In order that our people may be more realistically aware of our assets and liabilities in the Korean theater of war, I have prepared a critical analysis of the human resources of the divided Korean forces as of January 1, 1950. The ebb and flow of battle, with conquest and loss of territory which will change hands more than once before we have consolidated our Armed Forces on Korean soil for the final push, will not be considered in this analysis although the transfer of populations resident in towns and cities is implied by such territorial changes in battle.

When the thirty-eighth parallel was made the dividing line between North Korea under Soviet domination and South Korea under American military governmer t, the latter encompassed about 36,500 square miles of the total of 84,738 square miles for the entire peninsula. Also, about 67 percent of the entire population was concentrated south of the thirty-eighth parallel. It would be expected that the largest population centers would be found in South Korea too and this is borne out by the fact that four of the five largest cities are so located.

POPULATION STATUS OF SOUTH KOREA AS OF JANUARY 1, 1950

The attached tables provide estimates on a current basis of the major population characteristics of South Korea as of January 1, 1950. The analysis is presented by age, sex, and possible utilization of both sexes for military or industrial service. Also, the tables provide estimates of the Red Korean armed forces along similar lines.

Of the estimated total South Korean population of 17,582,362, males numbered 8,764,632 and females numbered 8,817,730. Of these, the total of both sexes under age 75 was 7,593,788; the total between ages 15 and 49 was 3,815,420 males and 4,028,292 females whereas the population over 50, both sexes numbered 2,260,564.

It is extremely doubtful whether Soviet indoctrination has overcome the influence of the Japanese sovereignty to an appreciable degree in altering the status of women in either North or South Korea. Insofar as the utilization of women for industrial and military purposes is concerned, there is equal likelihood that women will continue to be employed in North Korean industrial enterprises and in South Korean agricultural pursuits.

The geographical features of the Korean peninsula has made the North Korean area the industrial and manufacturing center whereas South Korea is the "bread basket" of the entire area. The Japanese had succeeded in introducing many advanced ideas in sanitation and industrialization of Korea. As mentioned, the Japanese factories had been located north of the thirty-eighth parallel for the most part because of access to hydroelectric power, and mineral resources. Nevertheless, for the most part, the Koreans have not emancipated their women along Soviet lines. The level of such accomplishment probably lies along the Japanese plane. Soviet indoctrination may have prepared North Korean women for saboteur, guerrilla, and spying roles, but it is not believed that the numbers so engaged are significant.

It is important, however, to consider the fact that Japanese sanitary engineering had raised the general level of health of Koreans considerably above that of the Chinese. Accordingly, we may expect a larger proportion to be eligible for combat service in either the North or South Korean forces. It is here estimated that 20 percent of all males between the ages of 15 and 49, inclusive, will not be available for any form of active general military service due to physical or mental disability or because of essential nonmilitary assignments. This leaves available for military service a total of approximately 3,000,000 South Korean males, assuming a total commitment.

HUMAN RESOURCES OF NORTH KOREA

The total population of North Korea is here estimated to be 8,791,181 as of January 1, 1950. Of this total 4,382,316 were males and 4,408,865 were females. For both sexes, children under 15 years of age totaled 3,796,999 whereas those over 50 totaled 1,130,282. Available males, over 15 and under 50, allowing for rejections and deferments as outlined for South Koreans, numbered 1,526,168.

CONCLUSION

Despite the advantages of attack to the aggressor and the fact that industrial advantages also accrue to the North Koreans by virtue of the industrialization of their territory by the Japanese and by themselves under Soviet guidance, the fact remains that South Korea is the source of food supply for all Korea and the available males for military service in South Korea is double that of North Korea. It would appear from the examination of these conditions that the adequate supply of military equipment and military leadership to the South Koreans, assuming nonintervention and support of the North Korean armed forces by external elements, particularly by trained units of the Red China armed forces, would ultimately lead to the extermination of the North Korean fighting forces, the complete disruption of their lines of supply, the destruction or capture of their territorial sources of supply and restoration of the status quo prior to North Korean aggression.

(Principal data source: Demographic Year Book, United Nations, 1948 (Korea).)

Manpower resources of North and South Korea[1]

NORTH KOREA

(Jan. 1, 1950)

Classification	All ages	0 to 14	15 to 49	50 and over
Both sexes (total)	8,791,181	3,796,999	3,863,900	1,130,282
Males	4,382,316	1,931,856	1,907,710	542,750
Available for general military service	1,526,168		1,526,168	
Females	4,408,865	1,865,038	2,014,146	529,681

SOUTH KOREA

Both sexes (total)	17,582,362	7,593,998	7,727,800	2,260,564
Males	8,764,632	3,863,712	3,815,420	1,085,500
Available for general military service	3,052,336		3,052,336	
Females	8,817,730	3,730,076	4,028,292	1,059,362

[1] Calculations are based on population extrapolations and estimated distributions. Original population data obtained from the Demographic Yearbook, United Nations (1948).

Wisconsin Democratic Party Absorbed by Labor Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article by Mr. John Wyngaard which appeared in the Janesville Gazette, Janesville, Wis., and which is pertinent to the political situation in Wisconsin:

STATE DEMOCRATIC PARTY IS LABOR PARTY, TO ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES, CREDO SHOWS

(By John Wyngaard)

MADISON.—To all intents and purposes, the Democratic Party of Wisconsin today is the labor party.

When the new Democratic organizing committee platform was published recently, the Wisconsin CIO newspaper promptly advised its readers that the Democratic program for the State is virtually the CIO's own program. Logically enough, the CIO high command got out a statement urging CIO members to support the Democratic Party organization. A perusal of the Democrats' platform on matters of concern to organized labor shows what was meant.

The State DOC platform denounces the Taft-Hartley Act, which has not yet been repealed by the Democratic-controlled Eighty-first Congress, in terms identical to those employed by the CIO and other opposition forces. It proposes a return to the Wagner Act, which Taft-Hartley replaced, as the basis for a future national labor law.

STATE ISSUES

The similarity between the Democratic Party's objectives and union leaders' demands is even more pronounced in the platform chapters dealing with State affairs and the proposals for State legislation.

It is largely a negative document, proposing the forthright and complete abandonment and repeal of the labor statutes put on the Wisconsin books during the last 12 years by succeeding Republican State administrations.

The basic State labor code is the Wisconsin Employment Peace Act, enacted by the Republican legislature at the instance of a Republican administration in 1939. That labor law of the commonwealth, say the Democrats in their official credo, as written, interpreted and applied, has resulted in the destruction of the essential basic rights of working men and their unions. We favor the enactment of a "little Wagner Act," says the platform in an undisguised appeal to those labor spokesmen who opposed that law bitterly when it was enacted, and have denounced it ceaselessly since.

The Democrats also promise to repeal the law which substitutes compulsory arbitration for strikes in public utilities, and was fought unsuccessfully in the last two sessions. The platform is vague on whether the Democrats would allow strikes in essential public services. The document says "in its stand we favor the enactment of legislation which will encourage the settlement of disputes in this field without requiring compulsory arbitration or permanently prohibiting the right of strike to public-utility employees."

BENEFITS

The benefits under the State workmen's compensation law and the unemployment compensation law have been gradually increased by recent legislatures, which have without reluctance followed the recommendations of joint committees representing unions, management, and the public. The Democrats propose even further increases, without going into detail, as well as elimination of certain undesirable practices of workmen's compensation carriers that are not elaborated.

They would prefer a State compensation fund to cover risks of time loss in industry, rather than the assumption of such risks by private carriers under premium payments by employers. The Democrats also want a bigger school for workers at the university. Such a department should have more moral as well as financial support, however that can be achieved.

The platform asks for a minimum wage law for all employed persons (the present minimum wage law covers only women and minors) with time and one half pay for more than eight hours a day and 40 hours weekly, but it is silent on the essential question of what the minimum wage rate would be. It also demands repeal of the two year statute of limitations on the collection of wage claims.

All in all, the new Democratic platform probably complies as closely with the political aims of organized labor in Wisconsin as any political platform ever put together here, barring possibly the Socialist Party of earlier years. It is not wholly irrelevant in that connection that some of the politicians who were once wedded loyally to the Socialist Party are now practicing Democrats.

Origin of FEPC Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 11 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, certain arguments were made during our previous debate on FEPC legislation regarding the ideological origin of this legislation. I have at hand some interesting evidence concerning the actual origin of this legislation and have prepared a statement concerning it. I ask unanimous consent to print in the Appendix of the RECORD this statement and a copy of a program of action adopted by the NAACP in 1919.

There being no objection, the statement and program were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

During the recent debate on FEPC legislation we heard repeated reference to the supposed Communist origin of this program. I should like to say at the outset that I have evidence at hand indicating that this allegation is without factual basis.

It has always seemed to me rather pointless to condemn or to attack an idea or a proposal because that idea or proposal was suggested or advocated, in an entirely different framework, years before, by some group or individual with whose broad views we differ or disagree. This seems to me to be extending the doctrine of guilt by association to ideas as well as to persons.

I think that if you will look back in our history, you will find that many laws now on the statute books, such as the Sherman Antitrust Act, the Food and Drug Act, and a great deal of other now commonly accepted legislation, were originally advocated by extreme and radical groups who themselves never achieved any influence or power in the United States.

In any event, however, I am advised by persons who have done research on this matter that fair employment legislation is not in fact of Communist origin at all. It has been urged by Negro organizations for the past 30 years.

I have at hand a photostat of a report of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People dated January 1919. That report sets forth a 9-point program for the future for the NAACP. Some of these points have already been made part of the law of the land. The eighth point, however, has not. The eighth point urges as a goal for Negroes, "An equal chance for a livelihood in public and private employment." That is precisely the principle underlying FEPC legislation.

THE TASK FOR THE FUTURE—A PROGRAM FOR 1919

First and foremost among the objectives for 1919 must be the strengthening of the association's organization and resources. Its general program must be adapted to specific ends. Its chief aims have many times been stated:

1. A vote for every Negro man and woman on the same terms as for white men and women.

2. An equal chance to acquire the kind of an education that will enable the Negro everywhere wisely to use this vote.

3. A fair trial in the courts for all crimes of which he is accused, by judges in whose election he has participated without discrimination because of race.

4. A right to sit upon the jury which passes judgment upon him.

5. Defense against lynching and burning at the hands of mobs.

6. Equal service on railroad and other public carriers. This to mean sleeping-car service, dining-car service, Pullman service, at the same cost and upon the same terms as other passengers.

7. Equal right to the use of public parks, libraries, and other community services for which he is taxed.

8. An equal chance for a livelihood in public and private employment.

9. The abolition of color-hyphenation and the substitution of straight Americanism.

Mr. LEHMAN. I submit that this document proves conclusively that FEPC legislation antedated even the birth of the Communist Party in America.

The fact that the Communists later supported and made political capital of their advocacy of this kind of legislation should be no more held against the FEPC bill today than the fact that Communists today are pretending to support peace should impel us to condemn peace as a Communist idea.

Launching of Liner "President Jackson," of the American President Lines, at New York Shipbuilding Co., Camden, N. J., June 27, 1950, Should Be Only the Beginning of a New and Larger United States Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the unanimous consent granted to me by the House, I wish to include an editorial of the Courier-Post, Camden, N. J., of the issue of June 29, 1950. On Thursday, June 27, 1950, 2 days following the commencement of Korean hostilities, the liner *President Jackson*, of the American President Lines, was launched at the New York Shipbuilding Co. at Camden, N. J. It was an eventful day. Addresses were made by Vice President Alben W. Barkley, George Killian, president of the American President Line, and T. H. Bossert, president of the New York Shipbuilding Corp. Each of these addresses emphasized the importance of maintaining an adequate merchant marine and the necessity to continue a working force of skilled workers. The editorial I herewith include as part of my remarks clearly and emphatically sets forth the importance of the views expressed on that occasion:

"JACKSON'S" LAUNCHING SHOULD BE ONLY THE BEGINNING

The Korean crisis made Tuesday's launching of the liner *President Jackson* at the New York Shipyard an unexpectedly grave occasion.

Every spectator, every man who had worked to build this modern, sleek new ship designed for round-the-world passenger service, realized poignantly that she and her two sister vessels now on the ways might first face grimmer duties. All were aware that their maiden voyages might be as the naval auxiliaries and troop transports to which they can quickly be converted.

With this in mind, Vice President BARKLEY'S speech regarding our maritime weaknesses could not have been more appropriate.

Actually, it did not need Korea to substantiate the warning that there is "serious deficiency in the American merchant marine," that our dependence on foreign shipping at present is "humiliating to the American people."

As BARKLEY said, it is vital that we provide ourselves with enough troop ships to meet any national emergency," and we do not have them now. As he said, "We need a capacity of twice what we now have or what we will have after completion of the six liners" now being constructed under Federal subsidy.

As he said, instead of only six such ships the armed services have estimated that we need 50, ranging in capacity from 2,000 to 10,000 men. As he said, it is vital to our defense to keep the Nation's shipbuilding plant intact and ready for emergencies, to maintain shipbuilding and repair employment. Yet our present working force in the Nation's shipyards, both private and naval, totals only 35,000 men whereas the President's Advisory Commission on the Merchant Marine has warned that it should never drop below 60,000.

As BARKLEY noted, American shipyards are building only 28 out of the 882 vessels now under construction throughout the world, which is a pitiful proportion indeed, due to our lack of foresight and in fact to our lack of hindsight, our woeful failure to profit by mistakes of the past.

President Bossert, of the New York Shipbuilding Corp., spoke not merely from solicitude for the future of his company and its workers when he warned that, "Without new work, by this time next year all ways in this yard will be empty and employment at an all-time low. In effect, the entire industry is being permitted to slowly die on the vine."

The situation is the same throughout the Nation's shipyards as it is in Canada. It is incredible that, in the face of the mounting emergencies confronting us, the Government can continue to permit this essential industry to wither away.

Tuesday's launching, we hope, will turn out to be a historic occasion—the first of many to follow, under a new and expanded governmental shipbuilding program that will revitalize a critical industry and enable us, in peace or war, in Vice President BARKLEY'S words, to "carry our strength, our products, and our leadership throughout the world"—

And supremely important now:

"We must have more ships immediately so that troops can be carried to any part of the world to protect the democratic way of living."

On the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 11 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "On the Home Front," which appeared recently in the Oil City Courier.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE HOME FRONT

Cost of another conflict as large as the last one would be at least $540,000,000,000. It would take 90 percent of the Nation's industrial capacity and 72,000,000 workers.

There would be rigid price, wage and export controls, rationing, higher taxes and compulsory war savings.

Plans for total mobilization are ready, but Congress must act before they go into effect. The administration would ask for powers to—

1. Control the labor market, eliminate nonessential jobs.
2. Cut civilian production 25 to 30 percent.
3. Virtually eliminate civilian construction.
4. Impose strict rationing.
5. Freeze prices, wages, rents.
6. Eliminate duplication of products and near-duplication of retail outlets.

Taxes might soar 50 percent, and Government purchases would go above the $125,000,000,000 mark. National Security Resources Board already has placed phantom orders for $800,000,000 worth of machine and cutting tools. Stuart Symington has told the Red Cross that civil defense will require 12 or 14,000,000 volunteers, thousands of them on full time.

Emergency legislation prepared but not yet introduced would give the President of the United States power to create new Government corporations, build defense plants, set up priorities and allocations, bypass antitrust laws, requisition anything the war requires, establish export-import controls and establish censorship.

These measures are not even being discussed yet. They have been ready for some time.

A for Attendance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, so many brickbats fall a Congressman's way, it is a pleasure to note that critics occasionally let a kind word slip in. In the present instance, I am referring to an editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, a newspaper which usually takes the Republican partisan line.

Yet on a recent occasion it saw fit to bestow a verbal bouquet upon two Democratic Congressmen from Buffalo, Mr. TAURIELLO and Mr. GORSKI, whose election this newspaper went to strenuous efforts to oppose. Undoubtedly when an election rolls around again this fall, the paper will again sharpen up its politically prejudiced knives. But in the meantime, let us be thankful for even a temporary willingness to recognize good work on the other side of the political fence.

It is a pleasure to call attention to the fine attendance records of these two men who, like myself, are freshman Congressmen.

Every week end they go home to fulfill a busy schedule of meetings, interviews, and so forth, in order to keep in touch with the people at home and to know how they feel about the important issues

pending before the Congress as well as other Federal matters. During each week, they have faithfully attended their committee meetings and the sessions of the House, representing their districts as they feel the people want them to. While they may not always agree with the Buffalo Evening News regarding various legislative matters, the fact remains that they have been right on the job and have achieved a splendid record for themselves. It is a pleasure for me to join in commending my two colleagues from Buffalo.

Following is the editorial to which I refer which appeared in the Buffalo (N. Y.) News on Saturday, July 8, 1950:

A FOR ATTENDANCE

The News has been highly critical of Buffalo's two Democratic Congressmen on many counts, but when it comes to attendance, we are pleased to note that they both rate straight-A. Since the present session began, the House has had 84 record votes; Representative ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO has responded to 82 of the roll calls, and CHESTER C. GORSKI has been on hand for 80. These are among the best attendance records in the House. In comparison, Republican Congressman WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER gets a low mark for attendance; he has answered only 37 of the 84 roll calls. To do him credit, however, he recognized frankly that he couldn't carry a full load in Congress while he was also serving as chairman of the State Republican committee, and that was why he announced he would not seek reelection to the House.

Sensible Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of July 11, 1950:

SENSIBLE PREPAREDNESS

The House has before it a bill creating a Civil Defense Agency for the District.

DEFENSE NEEDED

The bill introduced by Senator MCMILLAN (Democrat), of South Carolina, chairman of the House District Committee, authorizes the selection of a civil-defense director for Washington who will work under the District Commissioners. He will prepare a program to meet civilian needs in the event the city is attacked.

He will also be charged with training volunteers, recruiting medical facilities, and arranging with Maryland and Virginia for mutual aid in any emergency.

Certainly such a program is long overdue for the District. It has been openly asserted for some time by military experts at home and abroad that should another shooting war develop Washington would probably be the No. 1 target for a bombing attack.

As recently as last week it was reported that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have marked out several "critical areas" in the country which they believe need protection from bomb attacks.

This list included Washington, Detroit, New York, San Francisco, and Seattle.

There can be no doubt that Washington needs to prepare its civilians to aid the military in the defense plans. A similar bill to the one on the House Calendar is pending before the Senate District Committee. The language is identical.

We urge the House and Senate to take the bill up immediately and enact it so the program can be started as promptly as possible. Too much time has been wasted already.

Mr. Country Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the country editor, and there are several thousand men and women in the United States who come under that distinguished category, has the distinction of being the balance wheel that maintains and holds secure our American ideals and form of government. He is invariably a sound American who is able to keep his feet on the ground and truly reflects the solid opinions of Main Street.

The country editor is the stalwart individual among his fellow citizens around whom they rally in time of disaster or when there is occasion for rejoicing. When any movement for civic improvement or community welfare is inaugurated, it is the country editor who carries the ball. He is seldom affluent because if he had a highly developed acquisitive instinct, he just would not be a good country editor. You will never find a lazy one, because the margin of profit is so slim that if he does not keep hustling he soon goes broke.

I could say a great deal about country editors, but, today, I want to call your particular attention to one distinguished country editor who has received special recognition from his fellow country editors of the First Congressional District of Minnesota. He is Mr. Herman Roe, of Northfield, Minn., the publisher and editor of the Northfield News.

Mr. Herman Roe, a past president of the National Editorial Association, was designated by his fellow newspaper editors as doctor of rural journalism, with the honorary title of "Mr. Country Editor." He merits this recognition, and I am pleased to include in these remarks the following tribute which was paid to him by the editors of the First Congressional District of Minnesota, which I have the honor of representing in the House of Representatives:

CITATION

June 9, 1950, was just another beautiful June day to most of us but it was a memorable occasion in the history of journalism and of the State of Minnesota. It was the sixty-fourth birthday of one of our most distinguished members—Herman Roe, editor and publisher of the Northfield News.

It is a pleasure, indeed, for me to read this citation in connection with the presentation to Editor Roe of one of the honorary degrees of the First District Editorial Association of Minnesota.

Herman Roe, without a doubt, has attended more editorial conventions—district, State, and National—than any other country editor in all of our 48 States. There's such a thing as attending a convention and missing all the business sessions but that isn't the way Herman does it. He has sat on more hard convention chairs and listened with more flattering attention to more speeches, resolutions, reports, papers, discussions, seminars, and clinics than any other mortal ever absorbed.

Yes, indeed, if anyone typifies, embodies, and symbolizes Mr. Country Editor, it's Herman Roe.

When you stop to think of the great variety of Causes—and I spell Causes with a capital "C"—he has espoused since he became editor of the Northfield News in 1910, you are profoundly amazed.

Here are but a few:
Jefferson Highway, from Pines to Palms.
Rice County Fair.
Minnesota State Fair.
The Republican Party.
St. Olaf College.
The Lutheran Church.
Music.
Northfield.
Norway.
The University of Minnesota School of Journalism.
Editorial associations—county, distict, State, and National.
Agriculture.
The F. G. Leslie Paper Co.
National Newspaper Association Managers.
Graphic Arts.
Yes, even the Rotary Club.

Those of us who have benefited from his 40 years as an editor marvel at:

His enthusiasm, energy, endurance. He is a pacemaker who has shown no signs of wearing out.

His satisfaction in seeing others get along; his quick readiness to help them. His generosity. His all-around helpfulness—be it to family or friend or casual acquaintance.

His loyalty to country newspaper people. His loyalty to his family—parents, brothers, and sisters, his own household, grandchildren, in-laws, and distant cousins.

His knack for keeping in touch with people—across many years and many miles, in many and varied walks of life. His filing cases of memorabilia.

Oh, there is so much worthy of remembrance to this friendly person. But he's such a sentimental cuss, I dare not go on further.

Suffice to say, Herman Roe has cleared some of life's high hurdles. But—he is still good for the dash and distance races and we are proud of him, indeed.

Herman Roe was born at Porters Mills, Eau Claire County, Wis., June 9, 1886, the son of Louis I. Roe and Ellen Krangnes. He was graduated from St. Olaf College at Northfield in 1908. He entered the newspaper profession in June 1910, and became editor and publisher of the Northfield News in July 1910.

He was a coauthor of the National Survey of Weekly Newspaper Publishing Industry of the United States—1930, 1931, 1932.

He was vice president of the F. G. Leslie Paper Co., of St. Paul, in 1936, 1937, and 1938.

He was a trustee of St. Olaf College for 12 years, 1936–48.

He was secretary of the Minnesota Editorial Association 4 years.

He was president of the Minnesota State Agricultural Society in 1925 and 1926.

He was secretary-treasurer of the National Newspaper Association Managers in 1931.

He has been executive secretary of the Graphic Arts Association of St. Paul and of the Northwest Graphic Arts Association.

He was president of the National Editorial Association in 1927, its field director for 4 years and as chairman of its advertising committee wrote the annual reports of 1923, 1924, and 1925.

He belongs to the National Press Club in Washington, D. C.

He is a member of the St. Paul Athletic Club and of Sigma Delta Chi.

But why go on? This could keep up all night.

You all know, too, I'm sure, that 9 surely is his number. He was born June 9, his name contains 9 letters, he was graduated from college June 9, his wife's birthday was May 9, his only son was born April 9, his youngest daughter was born May 9, and for years his automobile license number has been 99-999.

But did you know that he introduced the saxophone to Norway? And particularly to Norway's Queen? Years ago when he was at St. Olaf, the college band made a concert tour to Norway. The band serenaded the King and Queen in the park surrounding the palace. The royal family was delighted—and the Queen couldn't take her eyes off the queer instrument Herman was playing. Later, she asked a lot of questions about it.

Twenty years ago a group of American newspapermen went to Norway. They had an audience with King Haakon and Herman Roe was the spokesman. In fact Herman is almost as well known in Norway as he is in the United States. During the trip over the country in the King's private car, by auto or on the old Stavangerfjord, there were delegations at every stop asking for Herman Roe.

In Florida last winter, where he went to lecture on rural journalism at Florida State University in Tallahassee, Herman managed to meet an average of one St. Olaf graduate in every community he visited.

The hour is getting late but one more story and I'm through.

Herman, as we all know, also has a great sense of humor.

He is America's foremost expert on Northfield bank robbery lore. He knew Cole Younger intimately. He provided Homer Croy, author of Jesse James Was My Neighbor with much of the data. When the book came out Herman received an autographed copy.

He immediately wrote a review in which he kidded the book unmercifully, calling it one of the worst ever written. He insisted the author was drunk all the time he was in Northfield. Then he printed a press run of one copy, containing the review, and sent it on to Croy. Croy of course had no idea he was reading the only copy of the review and he went straight up in the air.

As a matter of fact, the book was an excellent one and Herman so said in the reviews published for public consumption.

But the incident just goes to show that despite his 64 years and his 40 years as an editor, there's still a bright twinkle in the eyes of Herman Roe.

Now, on behalf of the members of the First District Editorial Association of Minnesota, it is a great honor and rare privilege to confer upon Herman Roe the honorary degree of doctor of rural journalism with the title of "Mr. Country Editor."

No man ever deserved it more.

An Excellent Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 11 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, yesterday President Truman sent to the Senate the nomination of Mr. Edward Weinfeld as United States judge of the southern district of New York. I was happy to endorse Mr. Weinfeld and thus was very pleased to see in this morning's New York Times a very fine editorial concerning Mr. Weinfeld's qualifications for the post to which he has been named. I ask unanimous consent to insert this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN EXCELLENT APPOINTMENT

Edward Weinfeld will make an able and just United States judge in the southern district of New York, and we congratulate President Truman on the nomination. He has practiced law in New York City for more than 25 years. His career is a New York success story. Edward Weinfeld was born in a lower East Side tenement house, attended the public schools and the New York University law school. Married and the father of two children, he lives now a few blocks from where he was born.

He served his political apprenticeship in the old sixth assembly district and was elected a delegate to the State constitutional convention of 1938. He now had his first chance to do something for housing reform. He played a major part in passage of the slum-clearance amendment, which the people approved. He became, by Governor Lehman's appointment, the first State housing commissioner, serving from 1939 through 1942. As president of the National Public Housing Conference in 1948–50 he was influential in the long fight that finally won passage of the Wagner-Taft-Ellender housing bill. He has worked tirelessly in innumerable civic causes in New York City. A man of warm sympathies, of fairness and high personal integrity, he will, we are confident, be a respected judge.

José Artigas: Uruguay's Hero of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the invocation given at the Washington ceremonies, June 19, 1950, to start the program at the unveiling of the statue in honor of José Artigas, champion of Uruguayan freedom. This prayer was given by my friend, Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs, one of the United States workers for the good-neighbor policy here and in the other American republics. Others who took part in the ceremonies honoring the father of Uruguayan independence were Secretary of State Dean Acheson; Dr. Alberto Lleras Camargo, secretary general of the Organization of American States; Ambassador Alberto Domínguez Cámpora, of Uruguay; and Rev. Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate. The whole event helped to cement the ties of friendship in the Americas at this critical period in history.

INVOCATION

Heavenly Father, author of light and of love, look down with favor upon these representatives of the people of the American republics;

Grant us the divine graces necessary to salvation, in time and eternity;

Enlighten our souls with generous principles of goodness, freedom, and progress;

Strengthen our wills that we may embrace the sacrifices required to make good neighborliness a golden reality rather than a form of words;

Guide us, dear Savior, in the path of truth, fairness, and true affection.

This we ask in the name of our Redeemer, "the Christ of the Andes." Amen.

Radio Desert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the record I enclose an article from a recent issue of the Pathfinder magazine entitled "Radio Desert." This relates to the value of clear channel broadcasting service with particular reference to the remoter rural areas. In the State of Texas, these areas are now served by three clear channel stations: WBAP, Fort Worth; WFAA, Dallas; and WOAI, San Antonio, which operating in clear channels are able to get weather reports, market, and other news to areas which could not otherwise have the benefit of such service:

RADIO DESERT

Most United States radio listeners assume that all United States citizens have access to radio programs. They are wrong. Some 20,000,000 Americans, mainly in rural areas and small towns, either do not hear regularly and clearly any radio station at all or, at best, can get only one station.

Farm organizations have been up in arms about it for years. Letters of protest pile up on the desks of Members of Congress. But nothing happens.

Last week Senator TOM CONNALLY (Democrat, Texas), goaded by the National Wool Growers Association and the Texas Goat and Sheep Raisers Association, was fighting to keep rural radio coverage at least as good as it is now. None knew better than CONNALLY, however, that this would be only part of the job.

NO CHOICE

One way to end the skimpy radio service to farmers would be to boost the power of the few clear channel stations in the United States. There are only 26 of them. They are called clear channel stations because no other station shares the same wave length. Currently they are limited in power to 50,000 watts. To people who live in 75 percent of the area of continental United States, 1 of these 26 stations is all the radio they can hear.

Result: farm listeners in this vast region have to depend on these stations for weather reports, market news, frost warnings, as well as entertainment.

Typical of the 50,000-watt clear-channel stations is KFI, Los Angeles, reaching out to a multimillion dollar agricultural industry in 70 counties in 6 States. Another in WHO, Des Moines, penetrating remote areas in 5

States, and WLS, Chicago, covering the Midwest.

Owners of existing clear-channel stations maintain they do not have enough power to do a good job. They point to stations in Mexico operating on 500,000 watts. That means, for example, that Mexico City can be heard more clearly in remote parts of Utah than KSL, Salt Lake City.

INTERFERENCE

What chiefly riles the farmers is a bill in the Senate, sponsored by Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON (Democrat, Colorado), chairman of the powerful Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Johnson's bill would maintain the present "ceiling" on power at the present 50,000-watt level and reduce the number of clear-channel stations by calling on the Federal Communications Commission to permit these channels to be shared by other stations. This, say opponents, would create more interference—no matter where the stations were located—and add static to signals already too weak.

Chief supporters of Johnson's bill are station owners or would-be station owners who want to use the clear-channel frequencies for smaller local outlets. But thousands of letters from farmers ask (1) programs of better quality, which only the big 50,000-watt stations can afford to provide; and (2) more power—perhaps 750,000 watts—for these 26 stations.

Oddly enough, boosting the power of each 15 times would not radically increase the area covered. but it would increase the signal intensity, and this would mean almost perfect reception.

"And if," as one farmer wrote Senator CONNALLY, "we can hear only one station we do not want static to drown out that one."

Administration-Sponsored Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SANBORN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a radio broadcast I made in March 1950 on the administration-sponsored health program. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered over several Idaho radio stations on March 13, 1950, in order to reemphasize points I made at that time on the weaknesses of socialized medicine. It follows:

President Truman has repeatedly asked for compulsory health-insurance legislation. He requested it in his message to Congress in 1948, 1949, and again this year, even though there has been violent reaction against his proposal. In view of the all-out drive being made to propagandize the people in favor of the President's plan to socialize the medical profession and services of the Nation, I believe it imperative that we consider this proposal and understand what its adoption would entail.

In making the demand for socialized medicine attention has been called to the inadequacies of the present system of health insurance and medical services. I know, and I am sure you know, that there is no such thing as perfection in any single group. I am a farmer by trade and I know we have our weaknesses. The members of the medical profession likewise have their weaknesses and sins of omission and commission. The profession has been accused of selfish ends in some instances, and perhaps rightly so, and of inaction, in other instances. But the indisputable fact remains that the medical profession has raised the standards of medical care in this country to the highest levels the world has ever known.

We have more doctors, dentists, and nurses and hospital technicians per capita than any other Nation. We have more hospital beds per capita than any other Nation. The medical profession is first in medical research and unequaled in that field. Our hospital equipment and laboratory machinery is without equal.

Today there are approximately 60,000,000 Americans participating in various voluntary medical-care plans. In addition, there are industrial, fraternal, and labor-health plans and there are private group clinics in abundance.

Why, I ask you, does America need socialized medicine? Why must one of the most successful private endeavors in the world be turned over to the Socialist schemers in Washington?

The arguments advanced by Mr. Oscar Ewing, the Federal Security Administrator, and his fellow workers, are so feeble that it is a wonder that anybody can be convinced by them. They have declared that 325,000 persons die needlessly every year, and they imply that if medical care were only turned over to them the figure would mysteriously be reduced to zero.

They do not tell you the full story. They do not tell you that 40,000 of these deaths are caused by accident, which no form of health insurance could prevent. They do not tell you that 115,000 of these deaths were due to cancer and heart disease, both of which are principally afflictions of old age. They do not tell you that 120,000 of these deaths were the result of communicable diseases, nor do they explain that control of these diseases has been increased and the high rate of deaths from these diseases has been sharply reduced and in some cases almost eliminated.

This presentation of a false picture by the advocates of compulsory health insurance does not stop at this. They make much of the number of draft rejections during the war. They do not tell you that the reasons for these rejects ranged from color-blindness, amputations, and deafness to defective vision, mental deficiency, and illiteracy. The Brookings Institution exposed this fraudulent argument by making an impartial survey which showed that only 6 percent of all men examined had defects that might have been cured by medical treatment.

The advocates of compulsory health insurance have carefully avoided giving you the facts as to the connection between their plans and complete socialization of the country. The father of modern communism and the creator of the police state, Nikolai Lenin said: "Socialized medicine is the keystone of the arch of the socialistic state."

The sponsors of the compulsory health plan estimate that it will cost $5,500,000,000 a year. Others say it would go as high as $18,000,000,000 annually. This, they say, would be the cost for medical and hospital insurance, for nursing care, and dental services. A tax levy of from 3 to 10 percent would be made on every salary check up to $4,800, half to be paid by the wage earner and half by the employer. Farmers and other self-employed persons would have to pay the full amount. The bill before Congress fails to give adequate health protection to those who have no earning capacity. These people would certainly be at the mercy of a political machine.

Under the administration bill no one is exempt from these compulsory health insurance taxes whether he or she is a veteran and entitled to some medical services automatically, whether he or she is covered by a group or a voluntary medical plan.

The cost of administering a compulsory health plan would be enormous. It would mean the creation of another gigantic Government agency which would require regional administrators in every city, town, and village, to be appointed like postmasters. These local czars, appointed from far-away Washington, would function much like OPA directors did during the war. Thus it would be impossible to keep politics out of the medical-care system. Inevitably private information on a patient's health would become public records. In every modern nation which has tried socialized medicine the costs have far exceeded the taxes collected and the quality of medical care has declined. Socialized medicine has been tried in Germany, Russia, Austria, France, and England, and some smaller countries. In Germany we find that it took 1 clerk for every 100 persons insured.

In England, where socialized medicine has been in force for more than a year, many of their physicians are pulling out of the medical socialization program. They withdrew on the ground that they cannot find time to treat their patients properly after executing all the paper work necessary under the government red tape. In the first 9 months of last year the British plan went $200,000 into the red.

It seems ironic that the United States with its outstanding leadership in medical and health affairs should even consider adopting a European system unsuccessful from start to finish. In spite of all the assertions by the advocates of compulsory health that service would be given, there is little to support their contention that it would be guaranteed. The benefits, as set up in the legislation before Congress, are neither specified nor guaranteed. Certain services are evasively promised in typical language. We find such phrases as "insofar as possible" and "when facilities permit."

Another alarming and significant fact is that the program does not require that the head of the service be a physician.

Russia has had socialized medicine of one kind or another for more than 30 years. The Communist Party line in the United States demands socialized medicine for this country. At the sixteenth Communist Congress in Moscow, compulsory health insurance was advocated as a permanent part of the world-wide communism program. And on September 29, 1947, a special committee of the House of Representatives reported on the Communist propaganda drive for socialized medicine in the United States. Here is what that report said:

"Suffice it at this time to report our firm conclusion that American communism holds this program (socialized medicine) as a cardinal point of its objectives; and that, in some instances, known Communists and fellow travelers are at work diligently within the Federal agencies and with Federal funds in furtherance of the Moscow party line in this regard."

It is well to know just who is fighting to put over this compulsory health insurance. It is unfortunate the administration is linked with star-gazers, Communists, fellow travelers, pinks, and left-wingers in this undertaking. All are united to change the present system of the American way of life.

Let us look to those who oppose such a plan. The advocates would have you believe the opponents are the doctors and lobbyists of the American Medical Association. Here is the list I have found to be opposed to socialized medicine:

The General Federation of Women's Clubs, with 5,000,000 members, the American Legion, the American Farm Bureau, the American Bar Association, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Association of Small Businessmen, the National Grange, the DAR, the

American Legion Auxiliary, and nearly all the service clubs of the Nation. At least 40 of the present State governors and many church groups oppose this program.

America today enjoys better health than the people of any other country on the face of the globe. The average span of life in the United States has increased from 49 years in 1900 to 67 years in 1948. Our mortality rate established an all time low in 1948 with less than 10 percent for each 1,000 population. We are blessed with more resources for scientific research than any other nation. Up to date we have enjoyed a freedom which has kept the medical profession and scientific development unfettered by political machines and their handcuffs.

Many citizens have been told and honestly believe that the plan proposed by the administration is not socialized medicine. I believe that it is. It is because the Government proposed to collect the tax, control the money, determine the services, maintain the records, and lay down the regulations for the patient and the doctor to participate in the program. The Government would control not only the medical and dental professions but all the hospitals, clinics, and nursing and all allied professions.

There is need for improvement in our medical services. There are deficiencies in our present system but steady progress is being made. Sickness is an ugly thing—cruel, costly, without pity. It has scourged the earth since the first man was born. It is no respecter of age, sex, race, color, wealth or position. Everyone can agree on the above statement. And we can further all agree that we must continue the fight relentlessly against infection, disease, and weaknesses of the human flesh. The issue is not whether there should be a better program. The issue (and it is the only issue) is whether our crusade for better national health shall be based on a voluntary or a compulsory plan. And further, whether or not it shall be administered by the Federal Government.

I believe we can continue to improve our present medical system through the voluntary plan using the agencies of government to supply facts and information without implementation. There is a definite need for promotion and expansion of medical research. The voluntary plans for medical health insurance must be expanded to meet the needs of all groups. There is need for Federal assistance in the establishment of local public health units and services. The primary responsibility in the field of health and welfare should rest with the Government at local levels. The Constitution does not direct a grant of power to the Federal Government to deal with these questions. In the welfare state the Government undertakes to supply all the wants of the people. The Government becomes your master and not your servant as intended.

It is my firm conviction that socialized medicine would be harmful to America and would lead toward complete socialization and nationalization. I encourage you to join with me in the fight to protect our individual rights and maintain the freedom that is so dear to each of us.

For Better Sportsmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter by R. E. Nelson, of Crookston, Minn. This letter has been reprinted in several Minnesota newspapers. Mr. Nelson has also sent copies to many hunters and farmers in northwest Minnesota.

I feel that the efforts of Mr. Nelson to bring about a better understanding between farmers and hunters is of wide interest not only to Minnesota sportsmen, but to sportsmen throughout the country. The text of Mr. Nelson's letter follows:

GENTLEMEN: I have been reading so much about new ways for the farmer and hunter to get along better. I understand a certain group thinks that by passing laws requiring a hunter to have a permit signed by the farmer is the solution. Altho it is a nice thing to do, I do not believe it is going to help the situation. The largest share of farmers who do not hunt themselves, do not post their land, but in many cases they permit their friends to post it—or else some selfish sportsman by paying a sum of money leases it. I do not blame a farmer who does not hunt himself, if he can get a little money out of it, but I do think the one that posts his own land and also hunts on other land is being selfish. For instance, a pheasant country may not be a good place to hunt deer or ducks, and the farmers that have a good duck pass or place for deer, like to hunt pheasants in other parts, vice versa. If people would follow the Golden Rule, I think there would be plenty of chance for all of us. I am a farmer myself and have never had my land posted—nor do I intend to do so.

It is harder to find a good place to hunt ducks, that is not posted, than any other game, and surely there is less danger to property in duck hunting than deer hunting. I would like to see the Conservation Department lease enough public hunting grounds to take care of the average hunter. In return, I'm sure the average hunter would be glad to pay a larger license fee if he could get in on some good shooting.

Last fall a group of hunters, including Congressman HAROLD HAGEN and myself, had access to a duck pass that was very good, and not posted. After the season was over, we got together and bought the farmers each a gift to show that we appreciated their good sportsmanship. We also went out and gathered up any rubbish left by the hunters, and took it on ourselves to pay for any damage done by reckless hunters. I believe that by doing more of this, and by sharing some of the birds with the farmer, we may develop a more friendly attitude.

Among sportsmen there are many ways they can be selfish. For instance, when there are more than one hunting on a duck pond, rather than wait and let the birds come down to shooting range, some of them will take a 9-to-1 chance and shoot, fearing that the other party will get a shot at them first. Why not try and remedy this by getting together and agree to shoot a limited time and divide the birds. A good shot does not like to quit—if he gets four birds in a hurry, while a fellow that doesn't shoot as well—would appreciate a little help. Too, don't exceed your limit. I have seen instances where arguments over game came to blows. This could be avoided if the birds were divided. Further, many hunters in a group association do not wish other hunters to share their hunting grounds—and the result is that they lease the property for their own hunting property and post it.

Whereas, real sportsmanship can be worked out to the mutual advantage of all hunters, if only each individual would stop and think, and then cooperate with their fellow men.

R. E. NELSON.

Curtailment of Postal Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the Kearny committee of the town of Kearny, N. J., is a fine, outstanding representative group of businessmen and civic leaders who are alert to community needs. This body is fully cognizant of the consequences of the recent order of the Postmaster General curtailing postal services and has written me to protest such action.

I have already introduced my own bill, H. R. 8210, on April 25, 1950, which is intended to correct this situation. And, yesterday, July 10, 1950, I signed discharge petition No. 31 in order to more quickly bring corrective legislation before the House for consideration.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein letter addressed to me by the Kearny Civic Committee which contains a resolution adopted by that body indicating its disapproval of the Postmaster General's order:

KEARNY CIVIC COMMITTEE,
Kearny, N. J., July 10, 1950.

HON. PETER W. RODINO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At the last regular meeting of the Kearny Civic Committee, which is composed of businessmen and civic leaders of our town, and under the sponsorship of the mayor and the town council, the following resolution was made, seconded, and unanimously passed:

"Whereas Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson recently ordered a drastic curtailment of postal services by cutting city home deliveries from two to one each day, reducing Saturday business deliveries, reducing street box collections and limiting the hours of service in post offices; and

"Whereas the foregoing order, if put into effect, would result in the discharge of thousands of mail carriers and other postal employees at a time when unemployment is increasing, impose an almost impossible burden upon the remaining mail carriers who are presently overtaxed and seriously impair the efficiency of the postal service; and

"Whereas the people of the United States have become dependent upon the postal services for the transaction of their business and other activities, and any disruption of these services would lead to confusion and financial loss; and

"Whereas there is an unanimity of public opinion that the cost of maintaining the present postal services, in comparison to the importance these services are to the public welfare, is not excessive and that a curtailment, to save money would indeed be a false economy: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Kearny Civic Committee, of the town of Kearny, county of Hudson, and State of New Jersey, That this committee does hereby record its disapproval of the proposed curtailment of the postal services and respectfully requests Postmaster General Donaldson to reconsider his order of April 18, 1950, and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded immediately to his Excellency, President Harry S. Truman, Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson, United States Sen-

ators ALEXANDER SMITH and ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON and Congressman PETER W. RODINO.

"Respectfully yours,

"KEARNY CIVIC COMMITTEE,

"CHARLES J. ZETKUS,

"Secretary."

The Real Tragedy of Forrestal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an article from the Washington Post of last Sunday, July 9, 1950, by Joseph and Stewart Alsop.

It looks now very much like the Frankenstein that was born of the ineptness of our negotiators at Yalta, Potsdam, and elsewhere has been continuously fed until we really have something to deal with. Has it outgrown the capacity of our present administrators?

Here is another sad saga:

MATTER OF FACT—THE REAL TRAGEDY OF FORRESTAL

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

It is instructive to look back now, from the grim viewpoint of the Korean war, upon the moment when the final tragedy of James V. Forrestal was acted out upon the sordid Washington stage. Who now remembers how Forrestal's successor as Secretary of Defense used to explain that the first sign of "poor Jim's breakdown" was Forrestal's desire to spend so much upon defense? Who now recalls the charming hints that Forrestal was insanely fearful of the Soviets?

Yet the real tragedy of James Forrestal was not that his heart and strength broke at last, under the heavy burden of his work and the strain of perpetual calumny. The real tragedy of Forrestal was that he failed in his task itself, when he failed, in November 1948, to make the President grasp the need for a serious defense effort. This was the turning point, when we took the road that had led us, inexorably and inescapably, to Korea.

In any inquest upon this great error of American policy one must bear in mind the political atmosphere of the time, which is symbolized by conservative Republicans voting the straight Communist Party line on foreign and defense measures. But in any such inquest the primary blame must be placed upon the responsible leaders of the administration, who were too timid or too stupid to tell the country the truth, and then to challenge the Republican Party liners to do their worst.

BEGAN WITH PRAGUE

The moment when this country began to be deceived can be rather precisely dated. As early as 1947 Forrestal and Robert A. Lovett had seen the urgent need to back up our policy of firmness toward Soviet aggression with solid military strength. After the Czech coup d'etat an emergency build-up of American strength was initiated by Forrestal, with the President's approval. By the summer of 1948, when the Atlantic Pact was born in the minds of Lovett, Forrestal, and Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, plans were being made to continue this build-up of strength in an orderly, continuous manner.

Had those plans of Forrestal's been carried out, there can be no doubt whatever that the Kremlin would never have dared to launch the attack upon Korea. Had those plans been carried out, we should by now possess a powerful armament, instead of being terrifyingly weak and appallingly deficient in many of the most critical weapons. Had those plans been carried out, there would be no need to worry today about how to deter a repetition of the Korean attack somewhere else when all the poor power of this country has been committed in the rough Korean hills.

There was nothing unbearable, moreover, in the national effort that Forrestal proposed. For the 1949–50 budget he urged expenditure of $17,000,000,000, with rises thereafter to an annual level around $19,000,0000,000. This was the cost of real strength, sufficient to defend the Western World, before the problem got out of hand. It is nothing to what we shall have to spend now.

But Louis A. Johnson then wanted Forrestal's job. The great Gen. Harry Vaughan hated Forrestal's guts. Treasury Secretary John Snyder wanted no increase of taxes and a more nearly balanced budget. And President Truman was suffering from the peculiar cockiness induced by his victory at the polls.

By a combination of these causes, when the next year's budget was formally closed in November 1948 Forrestal's last plea for a serious defense effort was rejected by President Truman. A $14,000,0000,000 budget ceiling was enforced, which meant that we would buy all the permanent overhead of the armed services, with no possibility of increased strength. And a little later Secretary Johnson moved into Forrestal's office in his role as the great economizer.

GREAT GAPS SLASHED

What Johnson then proceeded to do increased tenfold the effects of the President's refusal to listen to Forrestal. In the name of economy, a still lower level of expenditure was suddenly commanded. Marine battalions were suppressed. Aircraft replacement rates were slashed to ribbons. Research and development were slowed down. Great gaps in our strength, such as our weaknesses in tanks and tactical aircraft for supporting ground forces, were blandly ignored. And the loss of vital strength was veiled in untruth.

The Kremlin saw all this; saw the idiotic administration response to the first warnings, such as the Soviet atomic bomb; saw the Atlantic Pact itself being transformed into a mockery. The whole process of weakening America, of refusing to build up the strength of the west, of trying to get by with transparent fakery, was an open invitation to Soviet aggression. That invitation was accepted 2 weeks ago.

There was no alternative to doing what President Truman then did, in answering force with force. But at this moment, it is well to remember who were the guilty men, if only because the drama of November 1948 is now obviously being repeated at the White House. But the issue now is whether all this Nation's resources are to be mobilized at once, to repair the defenses of the west in the time that is left to us.

Big Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by our former colleague, Hon. Bruce Barton:

BIG BUSINESS

(By Bruce Barton)

As a crude gawky kid in the Middle West, I used to try to imagine what New York must be like—that rich, cold, wicked city. All I could picture was a long, thin island of three streets: Broadway (dissipation), the Bowery (crime), and Wall Street (money and greed).

The muckrakers, as Theodore Roosevelt called them, had made us simple-minded westerners believe that Wall Street lived exclusively by the oppression and persecution of farmers, little storekeepers, and all honest, God-fearing, hard-working people in the provinces. Somewhere in the dark recesses of the J. P. Morgan office there was a secret room where Mr. Morgan, Mr. Rockefeller and George F. Baker met every morning and said to each other: "Whom shall we ruin today?"

When, one day, I myself arrived in New York to take a new job, my boyhood notions blew up in a thousand pieces.

To my amazement I discovered that the big men in the big company that employed me were quite ordinary fellows who let their wives boss them around, and worried about their weight, and seemed to have no master passion but the hope of lowering their golf scores. If they had any well-developed plan for sneaking money out of the pockets of the poor, I never could get on to it.

In the ensuing years I have sat in many confidential policy meetings with these heads of big industries. Again and again I have heard a president say to one of his associates: "I admit that the plan you propose would get us more business, but it would be a serious blow to many of our small competitors. We just can't do it."

Or: "That is a clever scheme, but I think it is against the law. Or, if it isn't against the law, it ought to be and some day it will be."

Business has its faults. But, by and large, it is true, as Dr. Johnson said: "There are few ways in which a man can be more innocently employed than in getting money."

For no man can get very much money very long unless he is honestly producing something that people need and want, and selling it at a price they can afford to pay.

The Mexican peons have a saying: "It is the little saints who annoy the Lord." In business it is likely to be some very little man who drops his hand onto the scales when he is weighing the meat, puts the big strawberries at the top of the basket and the little ones at the bottom, or fudges on his income tax.

The big-business man has too much at stake and knows he is too closely watched.

Our American Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including herein a radio address which I delivered over Station WJR, Detroit, Mich., on June 9, 1950, entitled "Our American Heritage":

I greatly appreciate the fine courtesy of Station WJR in affording me this time to present to the citizens of Michigan my thoughts on some of the problems confronting the Nation at large.

In view of the chaotic conditions prevailing in the world today, it is my desire to emphasize the constant necessity for our country to remain true to its constitutional heritage. No nation on earth has had such a phenomenal growth toward prosperity as has ours; and the principal reason is because it was founded upon the American Constitution. As Calvin Coolidge said in his foreword to Beck's American Constitution, "The Constitution of the United States is the final refuge of every right that is enjoyed by any American citizen. To live under the American Constitution is the greatest political privilege that was ever accorded the human race." And James Bryce, the great English statesman and author of the American Commonwealth said, "The American Constitution is the greatest political document ever penned by man."

For many years, our Government adhered closely to the principles of the Constitution, which resulted in the rapid growth of our country, our prosperity, and a general good will manifested toward the other nations of the world. In more recent years, however, there has developed a group who believe that the Constitution is no longer as important as it used to be; and for that reason, many attempts have been insidiously made to change the terms of the Constitution or to change its application to present problems.

You will recall that the Constitution itself affords the opportunity of amendment thereto; but, notwithstanding that fact, even the Congress, at certain times, has passed legislation the intent of which might be to encroach upon the Constitution or to subvert some of its principles. Washington and Jefferson, in public statements emphasizing the Constitution and its preservation, stated that no insidious attempts should be made to detract therefrom; but that if it became necessary, then changes of importance could be made through constitutional amendments by legislative process.

In more recent years, those who are not devotedly attached to the Constitution, have turned toward socialism as a remedy for all the ills that might confront our Nation. The history of socialistic nations should convince those people of the futility of such an effort. We have in our country now those who advocate socialized medicine. I am opposed to that. There are those who favor the socialization of agriculture. I am opposed to that. There are those who advocate the socialization of our educational system. I am likewise opposed to that.

Every citizen of Michigan can be justly proud of her educational system. Michigan is one of the foremost educational States in the Union. Our teachers are competent and efficient. Our citizens are interested in the education of their children. For those reasons, I want to see no socialization of our educational system, nor any attempt to socialize this country. America has become great under her Constitution, which allows private enterprise and individual initiative. In my judgment, those principles should be closely adhered to.

The present tendency of many citizens is to have the Federal Government encroach upon State, county, and community life. While the Federal Government should be the over-all government in matters affecting the public interest, yet the State is in a better position to solve those problems affecting State matters, and are the county and community on those local problems which confront them.

My thought is that the Federal Government should not become the dictator, and should not interfere in matters which local communities, because of their closer knowledge of the problem, can best solve.

Of course, some of the States and local communities are partly to blame for this tendency, because they have looked upon the Federal Government as the Santa Claus who will present to them without cost, all of the benefits requested by them. It is well to remember that there is no such thing as a gift from the Federal Government, for Uncle Sam has no money except that which is taken from the taxpayers of the various States. For every benefit which Michigan receives from the Federal Government, the taxpayers of Michigan pay more than the benefit would have cost had they administered it locally, because of the tremendous overhead incident to administering it in Washington.

Let me also call your attention to the fact that any attempt toward socializing any industry or profession will result in increased taxes to the people because of the greatly increased payroll necessary for the administration of such programs from Washington, and in increased inefficiency because long-distance administration of your business and mine can only result in greater inefficiency.

In the interest of the Government itself, in the interest of economy, our people back home must assume, insofar as possible, the handling of their own fiscal affairs. The Federal Government naturally must see that the Nation itself is fully protected; but the States and communities must see that their own funds are used for the best interests of their own people.

Every thinking citizen should know that no government can be automatic; that it depends upon the intelligence, the integrity, and the loyalty of its citizens. Therefore, no citizen can afford to neglect his duty as a citizen. One of the greatest difficulties in public life has been exemplified in the statement, Let George do it. Our Nation and our State is comprised of thoughtful and studious citizens of government; but the difficulty has been that so many citizens, interested in their own businesses and professions and private affairs, have neglected to devote the time and effort necessary to preserve it.

Let us make the matter practical. What should a citizen do to earn his right as a good citizen and help preserve our Government?

First, he should vote whenever the opportunity presents itself, after carefully considering the background of the candidates for office, to be sure that he is selecting the man best qualified for the position to which he aspires.

Second, he should write to the President, and to his Senators and Representatives, expressing to those public officials his opinions on pending public problems and principles of government. Our citizens should remember that these public officials need to know the wishes of the people, in order to enact laws and regulations which the people approve, thus preserving our heritage as a self-governing people.

It is well to remember that there are several basic principles underlying our Constitution:

First, it establishes a representative form of government in which the people themselves are the rulers.

Second, it establishes a dual form of government, under which each citizen is not only a citizen of his State, but of the Nation itself.

Third, it guarantees to its citizens individual liberty, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the right to own property, and the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

Fourth, it establishes an independent judiciary, and created the great Supreme Court, which has been well called the safeguard of the American Constitution and, in the past, has been pronounced by critics as the greatest intellectual forum in the world.

Fifth, it prevents the concentration of power in the hands of one man or group of men, by checks and balances, through the three departments of Government—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial—each department being independent, yet co-operating with each other toward the working of a harmonious government.

And, sixth, it places in the hands of the President and the Senate joint power in determining the foreign affairs of our Nation. This is an especially important clause today because of the fact that the United States is now a member of the United Nations organization, and under the wise leadership of Michigan's senior Senator, the Honorable ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, has taken an outstanding place among the nations of the world. It is Senator VANDENBERG's devoted wish, and ours as well, that, as the result of our foreign connections, a just and lasting peace may come, and that the era of war shall pass away.

In closing, may I say that the United States of America is not only the greatest Nation in the world today, but is the only nation self-supporting and adequate, that confers upon its citizens rights and privileges not known in the other countries of the world. To summarize: every American citizen can—

Go to any church he pleases.
Read, see, and hear what he chooses.
Express his opinions openly.
Receive his mail as sent—uncensored.
Enjoy the privacy of his telephone—untapped.
Join any political party he wishes.
Vote for what and whom he pleases.
Have the right to trial by jury.
Be protected against search and seizure.
Know that neither his life nor his property can be forfeited without due process of law.

There is only one nation on earth that gives to its citizens all of the rights and privileges which I have just spoken to you about, and that is our own United States.

Intelligence Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in the state of awareness which is the world today, intelligence information is a matter of life or death to our Nation. Every Member should give serious thought to the adequacy of our intelligence organization and its methods of operation. The element of surprise is even more important in today's wars than ever before. We dare not be caught napping as in Korea. The appended editorial from the Washington Star analyzes this subject carefully and fairly:

[From the Washington Star of June 28, 1950]

INTELLIGENCE RESPONSIBILITY

The Communists' surprise attack on southern Korea has raised some questions regarding our intelligence system that need to be answered. Although Rear Adm. Hillenkoetter, Chief of the Central Intelligence Agency, made a favorable impression on senatorial questioners, the failure of responsible authorities properly to evaluate the intelligence from Korea remains unexplained. More serious still is the apparent

confusion over whose responsibility it is to evaluate collected intelligence.

Admiral Hillenkoetter, according to senatorial sources, gave a good account of the CIA's operations in keeping tab on Red military movements in northern Korea. He produced CIA bulletins of 2 or 3 months ago reporting troop and tank concentrations just north of the thirty-eighth parallel. The latest of this series of warnings was submitted to defense and diplomatic officials on June 20. But the CIA chief was quoted as saying it is his job only to report the facts, not to attempt to draw any inferences from them. That, he reportedly implied, is the job of the Defense and State Departments. The admiral's testimony was somewhat in conflict with that of Secretaries Johnson and Acheson, who are said to have told the Senators that they were taken completely by surprise by the Korean invasion.

Congress had supposed that the question of responsibility for intelligence evaluation was settled by section 102 of the National Security Act of 1947. This section says it is the duty of CIA to "correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security." However, this conceivably could be taken to mean evaluation of the reliability of information sources, rather than of the significance of the facts reported. The Federal Bureau of Investigation reports facts, but limits its evaluation of them to an estimate of the reliability of the informants. But Admiral Hillenkoetter himself is on record in the Army Information Digest as defining the CIA task as one involving "the systematic and critical examination of intelligence information, the synthesis of that intelligence information with all available related material and the determination of the probable significance of evaluated intelligence."

It is pertinent to recall that the Eberstadt task force of the Hoover Commission found a number of disturbing inadequacies in our intelligence system. "The CIA," it said, "is sound in principle," but it criticized the agency's lack of a top-level evaluation board devoted solely to weighing and analyzing intelligence estimates. In the light of recent developments, a special congressional study of the Hoover group's report might prove well worth while.

Address of Hon. Maurice J. Tobin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the address of Hon. Maurice J. Tobin, the Secretary of Labor, before the thirty-third session of the International Labor Conference in Geneva, Switzerland:

This is a pleasure to which I have long looked forward. I have always been especially interested in the International Labor Organization. When I became Secretary of Labor of the United States, I came to appreciate even more its great work. Needless to say, before Mr. David A. Morse left his post as Under Secretary of Labor in Washington to take up his duties in the International Labor Office, we discussed at length the problems and prospects of the ILO. At that time I assured him that at the earliest opportunity I would consider it a privilege to attend a session of the conference.

I have a deep personal affection for Mr. Morse. We consider him a credit to the United States. We are happy that his talents have been made available to further the work of this great international organization.

We in the United States have special ties with the people in other countries. We are, as you know, a nation of immigrants. We came from your country, whatever your country happens to be. Our population is an admixture of every race, of every creed, and of every nationality. Perhaps the universal origin of our people makes us feel such kinship toward those who live in other lands.

Our political and economic institutions lend themselves particularly to this type of neighborliness. Our democracy emphasizes the value of human dignity and the importance of the individual. Our free and private enterprise economy is also peculiarly adapted to the stimulation of individual initiative and individual action.

Another factor which has had an important bearing on our attitude toward other people has been our emphasis upon religion. As a people, we attach great importance to spiritual values. This has given us a deep affection for our fellow man in all parts of the world. No person who truly believes in God can be insensitive to the rights and to the needs of others.

I need hardly remind you that my country is a peaceful Nation. We do not seek war. On the contrary, we are devoting all possible energy and resources to the avoidance of war. In our efforts to obtain a just and lasting peace, we are acting through the international agencies that have been set up for the purpose of achieving this goal. Among these agencies is the ILO. As our President, Mr. Truman, told the governing body of this Organization on June 13, 1948, "I think maybe this Organization can make—and is making—a greater contribution to peace in the world than almost any other organization of its kind."

Nearly all the people in all nations want peace. Most people recognize they must make sacrifices for peace or else suffer the privations of war. That the American people are willing to sacrifice for peace has been made very abundantly clear. Programs such as the Marshall plan and point 4 dramatically demonstrate my country's interest in the preservation of freedom and peace throughout the world.

We in the United States have been blessed by God and nature with great natural resources. We have been blessed with a temperate climate and other natural advantages. To these have been added a democratic form of government, a private enteprise economy, and a deep devotion to the rights of individuals. From these ingerdients we have obtained prosperity and a high standard of living. With our blessings go a deep sense of humility and a keen appreciation of our responsibilities. We are conscious of the fact that God has been extremely good to the United States of America.

As you know, we have undertaken a large-scale program of economic and technological assistance to other nations. I am proud of the sense of responsibility which has impelled my country to take these steps. We know these programs have a value to the United States as well as the other participating countries. I am sure you will recognize, however, that they are based upon a genuine spirit of brotherhood.

The aims and purposes of the ILO are consistent with those of the United States and other freedom-loving countries. As stated in the ILO's constitution, "universal and lasting peace can be established only if it is based upon social justice." This demonstrates why the ILO's aims are so important to the world. In this organization you lead the way toward a better life for all people. This you do by agreement and by cooperation. By voluntary action the states members of the ILO are marching together toward a better and a brighter future.

Just as my country is interested in the economic situation of your countries, so I know you are also interested in the economic situation of the United States. The economies of all our countries are interdependent. As is so well stated in the ILO's Declaration of Philadelphia poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere.

The United States was gravely concerned, as other countries were, with the downward movement in the level of economic activity early in 1949. Our country experienced three full years of prosperity following the last war. In the past, wars were followed, after a brief flurry of postwar prosperity, by a sericus economic depression, as in 1921 and 1922 in the United States. These depressions were usually occasioned by the collapse of war-inflated prices. Since people tend to expect history to repeat itself, it was predicted by many that sooner or later the United States would again experience a serious depression.

This did not happen in 1949. I do not believe we will ever again experience a major depression such as we had in the early 1930's. We are confident of our ability to avoid a major depression because of the great advances we have made in social and economic legislation since 1933. The supports we have put under our economy in the intervening years have stood us in good stead in the year 1949. These props will be equally helpful in protecting our economy against serious recession in the years that lie ahead. They are both a deterrent to depression and a concrete evidence of the determination of the American people that we shall not have a repetition of the great depression of the past.

Among the bulwarks of our economy are our free enterprise system, old-age and survivors' insurance, free public employment services, unemployment insurance system, minimum wage and hour legislation, public housing programs and a number of Government credit institutions which assisted in maintaining housing in a situation of stability. Our agricultural price support program has removed one of the serious instabilities in our economy and has sustained the purchasing power of an important group of our people. Resource development such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, with which all of you are familiar and which is known the world over, and rural electrification have contributed to the economic development of large areas of our country.

We are moving steadily forward to strengthen our economy still further. The Congress at this session has raised the minimum wage to 75 cents per hour and $30 for a 40-hour week. We are now in the process of broadening the coverage and increasing the benefits of our social-security system. Legislation accomplishing this objective will soon be upon the President's desk for signature. The President has also requested action to expand coverage and to increase the benefits of our unemployment-insurance system.

The United States has demonstrated the great strength of the private enterprise system buttressed by sound social economic programs. The combination of a free enterprise economy and liberal social and economic legislation has permitted us to maintain a high level of economic activity during the postwar period. We have avoided a collapse of prices, credit contraction, bank failures, any large number of business bankruptcies, or lack of confidence on the part of business and on the part of the consuming public. One of the major explanations lies in the confidence that wage earners have had that their wages would not be cut. Collective bargaining on minimum wage rates has

served as an effective safeguard. The significant fact about the decline in economic activity and the rise in unemployment in 1949 is this: It did not spiral in a cumulative fashion throughout the whole of the economy. The cause of the decline was a cautious liquidation of business inventories. The effects were almost completely limited to manufacturing industries directly affected by the curtailment of purchases by business for inventory purposes.

It is important to note that the very fact which led to the decline in business activity in 1949—a rational and nonspeculative attitude with respect to inventory practices and policies by businessmen—is one of the factors making for confidence in the general stability of the American economy now and in the future. One of the significant institutional developments in the United States in the past 20 years is the introduction of scientific methods into the management of American corporations. For this reason alone, it is hardly possible that the type of economic recession which the United States experienced in 1921–1922 could now occur in the United States. This is only one of the important institutional reforms in the United States of the last 20 years, but it is one that is too often too little appreciated.

The inventory policy in 1949 resulted in some fall in employment but did not result in a general economic contraction. Consumers maintained expenditures throughout 1949 at about the same volume as in the preceding post-war years. Dollar volumes were slightly lower, but so were consumer prices.

Businessmen maintained their plant and equipment expansion programs as planned. Investment for this purpose declined only moderately in 1949, as had been expected. Profits remained very good during the year, and business generally saw no reason to cut back their capital investment programs.

Likewise, Government—Federal, State, and local—did not retrench. Necessary public activities were carried forward to meet the social needs of the American people.

As a result, the decline in gross national product was equivalent only to the net reduction in business purchases for inventories——and by midsummer of 1949, there were indications of a rise in employment and production. The rise in unemployment was checked. In May of this year our unemployment was less than 5 percent of the total labor force. Moreover, most of those out of work are not a hard core of unemployment. Many are between jobs or only temporarily out of work. Allowing for seasonal variation, the outlook is for a lower level of unemployment during the course of the remainder of this year.

Total production is now approaching the peak postwar level of the final quarter of 1948.

Steel operations in the United States are at maximum absolute capacity. In May, 8,500,000 tons of ingots were produced, making the annual rate of production 102,000,000 tons.

Automobile output in May was at a rate of about 165,000 cars and trucks weekly. There will be over 7,000,000 cars and trucks produced in 1950.

More buildings were placed under construction in 1949 than even in the best years of the boom times of the 1920's, and so far this year the record is 50 percent above a year ago mainly as a result of the financial provisions of the Public Housing Act of 1949. New houses started in the month of May reached a record figure of 140,000 units. In the first 5 months of 1950 more than half a million houses were started.

The total consumption of goods and services by American families during the first half of 1950 has been greater than in any previous period. Weekly factory earnings in April of this year averaged $56.89. This was better than $3 above the level of April 1948 when consumer prices were somewhat higher than they are at the present time. Real earnings and the standards of living of American workers are now higher than ever before—about 40 percent above prewar levels. This has been achieved at a time when we were undertaking large responsibilities for reconstruction and development in other areas of the world.

We can now look back and assess the meaning of our experience in 1949. It was the first significant test of the stability of the postwar American economy. In a free, competitive enterprise economy there are necessarily some tendencies toward instability. The question which had not been answered was whether the American economy—transformed in many ways by economic reforms of the past 20 years and by changed governmental policy with respect to stabilization of the economy—was now such as to assure economic stability to a substantial degree. I believe history will show that the answer is positively in the affirmative.

One test alone is not necessarily conclusive. But it is significant that, despite large-scale inventory liquidation, consumers showed no lack of confidence, nor did businessmen in terms of their long-range plant expansion plans.

The Federal Government did not resort to emergency-type action to deal with the economic or unemployment situation in 1949 or early 1950. This does not mean that our Government assumed a merely passive attitude. The situation was followed very closely by the executive branch of the Government and by Congress. Under the Employment Act of 1946 the American people are committed to undertake all appropriate measures to maintain maximum production, maximum employment, and maximum purchasing power.

The general approach of the United States Government to a full employment policy is to adapt current governmental activities and programs to the changing needs of the national economy. The emphasis is placed upon progressive growth and balance in the economy rather than simply upon antirecession policies of an emergency character. The test is whether the Government's policies and regularly continuous programs contribute to the stability and growth of the whole economy. The President's recommendations in his economy reports of July 1949 and January 1950 are based on this approach to economic policy.

The United States Government is confident that depression and large-scale unemployment will continue to be avoided. We regard this as a major objective of government.

As stated by the President on June 6: "A prosperous, expanding economy in the United States is necessary not only to provide an adequate standard of living for our growing population. It is also necessary to our paramount objective of peace and freedom in the world. That is an objective to which—above all else—we must dedicate our efforts and our resources." I quote directly that great President of the United States, Harry S. Truman.

The United States is fully committed to a strong, high-level, ever-expanding economy. I am confident of our ability to meet the economic problems of the future. We shall continue to fulfill our international commitments.

Any persons or nations who make their plans on the basis of an expected economic collapse in the United States are doomed to disappointment. We are determined to remain strong and determined to remain free. We have resources, both the physical human strength and the will necessary to achieve this goal. My country is fully aware of its position in the world, it understands its responsibilities, and it proposes to live up to them. We have joined with other countries in a common effort to maintain world prosperity and world freedom. We are eager to cooperate with all peace-loving nations. As President Truman said to this organization in 1948: "We want peace in the world. We want every country in the world to have the necessities of life and to be able to live with its neighbors on a basis of doing as you would be done by."

With cooperation, good will, and good faith, these high goals can be achieved. We face the future confident that international cooperation will pave the way to a better life for all.

May God bless the ILO and its great work and may we be able here to contribute to a future peace in the world that will bless every last one of God's children in every part of the globe.

United States Errors in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hanson W. Baldwin, military expert of the New York Times, published in this paper on July 10, 1950:

UNITED STATES ERRORS IN KOREA—POLITICAL PACTS, MILITARY POLICY, ESTIMATES REGARDING TANK AND AIR POWER ARE CITED

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

A tragedy of errors—big and small—provides the somber background for the reverses and defeats suffered by the United States in the first 2 weeks of the Korean war.

These errors are both political and military; some date back to the war; some are recent. A few of them are listed here:

1. Conflicting political and military policies in the Far East. Wartime agreements committed the United States to a political guaranty of the postwar independence of Korea—a commitment almost impossible to back up militarily. This agreement was later greatly complicated by the Yalta Conference in which Russia was promised, in effect, strategic domination over Manchuria. We have been, in other words, committed to the independence of at least southern Korea, but we could not implement that commitment without the expenditure of a vast effort altogether disproportionate to the strategic, economic, and military value of the country.

2. Our Korean military policy. We created a South Korean Army, equipped and organized to prevent border raids and maintain internal security but not to stop a full-fledged invasion. In part, this policy was dictated by attempts to reconcile the irreconcilable requirements mentioned in the first error—to fulfill our political commitment but without too great military involvement.

FEARED SEIZURE BY FOES

In part, it was dictated by two fears: (a) That any heavy material given the South Koreans would in time, like our China aid, merely help to arm our enemies, the Communists; (b) that the power-loving South Korean Government and its volatile troops, if given heavy equipment, would commence an invasion of northern Korea. As a result we gave either too much or too little; we should either have given more or nothing at all.

3. Poor training and organization of South Korean forces. The usual complacent and

overconfident appraisal of our own handiwork blinded most of our leaders to the weaknesses of our own creation—the South Korean Army. This army, now in rout and dissolution, was described by the former United States commander of our Korea Military Advisory Group on June 25 as the best fighting force on the Asiatic continent. Yet it broke at the first few hammer blows.

Our political and military assessment of South Korean strength obviously was erroneous. Poor morale, Communist infiltration, bad leadership, unpopular political leaders, inefficient staff work added to the normal volatility of the Korean have produced, under the stress of war, military chaos. There is no use giving military assistance to any nation unless it is better applied, and administered and the results better assessed than this.

4. Underestimation of the enemy. One South Korean regiment, we were told, could lick a North Korean brigade (two regiments). That sounds dangerously like the old chestnut, so thoroughly disproved by World War II, that "one American can lick four Japs" (or Germans, or what not).

5. Improper intelligence and/or improper assessment of available intelligence. The North Korean Communists achieved a tactical, but not a strategic surprise. The Central Intelligence Agency and other agencies noted before the attack began a build-up on the thirty-eighth parallel capable of attack at any time. But although this information undoubtedly was also available in Seoul and Tokyo, it was not acted upon. The United States intelligence staff and command organizations in these countries took no actions to meet invasion threats, gave no warnings and were taken by surprise.

ROLE OF TANK UNDERESTIMATED

6. Underestimation of the role of armor in modern war. In Korea, the fighting has revolved around the tank—although Korea, our military mission had assured us, was bad tank country. Only a few weeks ago, the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Staff were beginning to count the tank out—with new weapons that were still in blueprint or factory.

7. Overestimation of the effectiveness of air power. Apparently, it was hoped initially that we could do the Korean job with air power and naval power alone, although a few of our soundest air officers, who see military force as indivisible and all elements of it as essential in modern war, stated from the first that ground power would be essential. But some of our leaders seem to have become bemused with the overstated doctrines of some of the proponents of air power, forgetting that it is always the man on the ground who dominates, occupies, and controls.

Weather and night always handicap air power. Overwhelming United States air superiority and constant pounding of the German supply lines in the Italian campaign never succeeded in interdicting those communications. Nor is it impossible to win victories without air superiority. Rommel won battles in the desert despite British air superiority; the North Koreans have won victories in recent weeks despite our air superiority.

8. Overconcentration on one kind of airpower, at the expense of others. This issue was one of the basic issues of the Navy-Air Force hearings last fall. The Korean fighting demonstrates, as most informed Army, nearly all Navy, and some Air Force people then believed, that the Navy was right. The big bomber school, the blitzkrieg school that believed in 24 hour victory by atomic pulverization of the enemy, has been in the ascendancy in the Air Force, particularly during the term of W. Stuart Symington, the former Secretary. As a result, and because of Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson's economy program, other elements of air power were too much neglected.

What was first needed in Korea and what will be first needed in virtually any war in which we may engage was tactical air power—fighters, fighter-bombers and light-bombers—based on land and sea bases. The aircraft carrier, marine aviation, which has specialized in the close support of ground troops and was severely cut this year in Mr. Johnson's program from 24 to 16 squadrons, and Air Force tactical planes were the first kinds of air power needed.

The B–36, it was said, could reach anywhere in the world; what was the use of the carrier? But the B–36, high-level bomber, is no good for the Korean war; nor is this little hot war a war for the A-bomb. The land-based tactical planes of the Air Force, based in Japan, could not reach important North Korean targets; carrier planes could and did. But tragically, again due in part to Mr. Johnson's economy program, there are not enough carriers.

A part of this mistake has been the overconcentration by the Air Force upon jet fighters, essentially short-range planes, for ground-support work. Despite the objection of some of its own experts, the propeller-driven, long-range F–51 was put out of commission in Japan, Alaska, and elsewhere and replaced by the F–80, which is essentially an interceptor. The fighting in Korea also has shown the need, urgent at the start of any war for airlift.

9. Reduction of Marine ground units and an underestimation of the importance of amphibious lift. This, too, was an issue in last fall's interservice hearings, and again the Navy and Marines have been proved correct. The First Marine Division, elements of which are now scheduled for the Korean fighting, was reduced by economy to one infantry regiment. The amphibious lift was dangerously low. Yet the Marines are the best police force the country has, and sea transportation is vital to any victory.

These and other errors, now so sharply revealed by the Korean reverses, should be carefully studied by Washington. For the Korean war may well be, like the Greek guerrilla fighting, another of a series of little hot wars, deliberately started by the Kremlin as part of its campaign to win the cold war. And these little hot wars cannot be won by an atomic blitz or by unmobilized military potential. The right kind of military force must be available quickly.

A complete reassessment of our somewhat dubious military policies of the recent past seems clearly in order.

Domestic Issue Should Not Be Clouded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD a penetrating editorial from the July 8 issue of the Wisconsin State Journal, of Madison, Wis.:

IF WAR LASTS 2 YEARS

It would be a tragic and horrible thing if the shooting war with world communism were to last as long as 2 years.

First and most important, of course, would be the sickening waste of human lives, the senseless destruction of homes and instruments of peace, and the stupid, wanton waste of men and material that could have been used to produce a more abundant life.

Second, there would be the inevitable feeling that wars can't be avoided, and that we might as well give up trying to avoid them. Our fumbling and clumsy attempts to build an organization that would help us avert wars would seem like wasted effort. There would be the danger that we might not try again, and not to try is worse than failure.

And third, it is obvious that continued world hostilities in 1952 would make it difficult, if not impossible for American citizens to settle some of their important domestic problems on their own merits. Overwhelming public concentration on the greater issue of war and victory would make discussion of these other problems a mere sideshow.

And that would be bad, very bad for the United States and its citizens. For this country has some domestic issues that must be settled and that cannot be settled in an atmosphere where the cry "Support the Commander in Chief" has irresistible patriotic appeal.

Americans have some serious thinking to do about their own future. That serious thinking can't be done when our boys are fighting on foreign fields, and when our wealth and our energies are directed at another task.

For many, many reasons it is important that the present hostilities be terminated quickly—and victoriously.

SOCIALISM: THE DOMESTIC ISSUE

One issue Americans must face—and it should be faced in a calm and dispassionate manner—is the unmistakable trend toward socialism in this country.

The Republicans have decided that the issue in this year's congressional elections and in the 1952 presidential voting is "liberty versus socialism."

This issue is something more than a slogan dreamed up by GOP reactionaries. This country's movement toward socialism, under the direction of President Truman and the Fair Deal, is a definite and planned migration guided by a combination of schemers who seek only continued political victories and theorists who are using the present blundering administration to destroy private capitalism.

President Truman said, not so long ago, that "it is an insult to the intelligence of the American people to say this country is on the road to socialism."

The President's comment drew an immediate comment from Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, a member of the President's own party but one who has revolted at the basic radicalism of the Fair Deal.

Said Senator BYRD:

"I submit it is an insult to our intelligence to assume we do not realize that adoption of the President's program will commit us irrevocably to a Socialist state from which there can be no retreat."

Senator BYRD then asked President Truman seven questions, and he argued that if the President is against socialism the people are entitled to answers to these questions.

Mr. Truman still has not answered.

Senator BYRD's questions were these:

1. If Mr. Truman is against socialism, why, in the absence of domestic emergencies, does he advocate unnecessary deficit spending on domestic civilian programs having no connection with veterans or other obligations resulting from past wars of defense, foreign affairs, or interest on the debt?

2. If he is against socialism why did he send Oscar Ewing to England at public expense to pick up propaganda material to be used in the advocacy of socialized medicine in the United States?

3. If he is against socialism why does he approve of the activity and outrageous use of public funds by the Secretary of Agriculture in the promotion of the Brannan

farm plan which inevitably means socialized agriculture?

4. If he is against socialism why does he continue to endorse extension of socialized housing which for years has been propagandized by Leon Keyserling now head of his council of economic advisers, and formerly a collaborator with Rexford Tugwell? Earlier in the New Deal, Fair Deal, welfare-state era Tugwell was a chief exponent of planned economy. In the end this means socialism, and it is significant that the President keeps a Tugwell associate on his staff.

5. If he is against socialism why does he sanction Government competition with free enterprise such as that which is illustrated by the tremendous loans to Lustron and Kaiser, and why does he advocate the Government subsidized competition inherent in the huge valley project proposals?

6. If he is against socialism why has he never retracted his request for peacetime authority to allocate commodities; why has he never retracted his request for peacetime control over prices and wages; and why has he never retracted his request for peacetime control over consumer credit and bank requirements?

7. If he is against socialism why has he continued to pressurize Congress for enactment of his civil rights program—spearheaded by the FEPC—which, in its entirety, would usurp State and local prerogatives, invade individual rights and disregard constitutional processes?

As we say, the President has not yet answered these questions.

THEY CAN'T WIN ALONE

The liberals who deny President Truman's fair deal program will lead America into socialism apparently base their case upon the fact that neither the President nor most of his followers are avowed members of the Socialist Party.

This is a political babe-in-the-woods attitude. It is like saying that it is physically impossible for a man to have smallpox unless a quarantine sign is first posted on his door.

At the International Socialist Conference at Copenhagen in early June, there was clear recognition of the fact that—as a New York Times reporter put it—"the time is past when Socialists can afford to be exclusive."

All across Europe—as well as here in America—Socialists have seen that they cannot win unless they can capture other elements of the voting population.

In the United States, despite years of determined and sincere effort, the Socialist Party itself can win only about 1 percent of the total vote. But Socialists have had a definite and direct influence on the Democratic Party, and, as a result, much of the Democratic Party's program today is pure socialism even if it bears the Fair Deal name.

Socialists all over the world seem to have adopted the policy—a wise one, from the strictly political point of view—that calls for infiltration of and cooperation with the parties whose names happen to be more attractive to voters.

That has happened in much of Europe, and it has happened in the United States, even if Mr. Truman chooses not to believe it.

We do not believe the American people want socialism, even though some of our recent New and Fair Deal Congresses have made it appear so.

At any rate, the distance the American people are willing to walk down the Socialist primrose path is an item that should be discussed realistically and completely.

We would like to see the Korean war ended victoriously for many reasons. Among those reasons is our belief that this Nation has a vital domestic decision to make, a decision that cannot be made while our hearts, energies, and minds are engaged elsewhere.

Reorganization Plan No. 27, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have given careful thought and study to plan No. 27. It is another one of many reorganization plans recently submitted by the President designed to streamline the Government and to consolidate and make compact, more efficient and more economical various Federal agencies.

The assertion has been rather freely made here today that this plan is socialistic and entails the ultimate adoption of socialized medicine. With due respect to those who have made such assertions, I find nothing whatever in the plan which could possibly be construed as leading to any form of socialized medicine. The plan merely creates a new executive department to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Security. To this new department is transferred all functions of the Federal Security Agency. There are no new powers granted to any agency under this plan. Cabinet status is conferred upon the new department which is charged with vital functions relating to the social welfare of the American people—health, education, and security. It has been my view that national health alone would warrant the establishment of a new department in the Government because that field has broadened and will continue to broaden as years pass in order to adapt and perfect present laws and to encompass the forward progress of American economy and democracy, particularly to promote better health in the Nation.

We already have a Department of Agriculture which deals with a great many essential functions including the health and development of certain animal life. This new department would give the same consideration to the maintenance of the human public health—research, hygiene, sanitation, and preventive as well as corrective measures designed to make a healthier America.

It is most unfortunate that this plan had to be considered by the House in the light of rumors and innuendoes regarding individuals and baseless assertions that it leads in the direction of socialized medicine.

I am not an advocate of socialized medicine. I am a strong believer in the American system and all that it implies—freedom of the individual in every way compatible with law, order, and public policy. I believe that this freedom upon which initiative and enterprise feed is the very foundation stone of our free way of life and our democracy.

It is my unalterable view that regimentation of business and the people is inconsistent with true democratic government. It stultifies the creative instincts of the individual. It breeds and nurtures dictatorial and bureaucratic measures. It promotes arbitrary control of the processes of government by a select clique. It is oligarchy and even autocracy, but it is in direct and gross violation of every democratic principle. Only in war or dire emergency can regimentation be justified. Yet the trend toward the regimented state is proceeding at such a rapid pace in our legislative action and in the social philosophy of so many of our people that it is beginning to shape up as an ominous threat to our most precisious freedoms.

Socialism as well as communism leads inevitably toward this result. Both are antagonistic to the very basic principles, techniques, and mechanisms by which our own democratic representative Government seeks to work out in equity and justice the multiplicity of problems, financial, industrial, social, and economic which have such profound and enduring influence upon the long-time welfare of our people.

One of the more immediate targets of this type of regimentation is the medical profession. It is proposed by some to convert, against their will, against their rights as free Americans, against the principles of this Government, against long established traditions, all the doctors of the Nation from the status of free professional men into the ranks of civil servants. It seeks thus a virtual system of indenture for doctors and at this time, for doctors alone, although we may be sure that this regimentation, once begun, will later embrace other fields of endeavor until it covers every business, profession, and occupation and person in the country. That is the known plan of many social reformers.

It is obvious to any observant and thoughtful person that reasonable and coordinated measures to conserve, safeguard, and improve the public health are urgently required. Our population has substantially grown and shifted; our doctors are often overburdened and need newly-trained recruits in increasing numbers; our medical schools must be strengthened; our hospital system must be expanded and modernized; preventive medicine encouraged and extended; research and development promoted; the public health improved.

Because of oppressive taxes private philanthropy, so generous and lavish and responsible for much of our health and hospital progress in the past, can no longer carry and finance ordinary local hospital projects, let alone support the huge national health program which will admittedly be necessary in the future.

Care and hospitalization of the sick can be provided and managed best by local communities rather than through socialized media of the Federal Government. If we take private initiative and community and neighborhood interest out of our medical and hospital program, out of the care of the sick, we will discard and disregard the valuable experience and splendid results which we have progressively achieved throughout the years and remove that intimate personal

interest and touch so helpful and beneficial in ministering to those who are afflicted.

The Federal Government can help, it can render financial assistance, research and guidance in encouraging and advancing national medical and health programs. But it must not assume the control and domination of these activities heretofore reserved to the States and local communities. And, of course, any such program should, from a financial standpoint, be carefully adapted to our national capacity and financial potential.

In any program, however, that involves the public health, we should be most scrupulous not to impose the servitude of regimentation on doctors, dentists, nurses, druggists, or any other class. We will provide best for the health of America if we continue to develop our techniques of medical care and treatment, hospitalization, and social welfare along the traditional lines of free activity by which we have established what is incontrovertibly the best system of medicine in the world. And let me stress that fact—there is no place in the world which has such high standards of medical skill, advanced modern scientific treatment and medical care so generally available to the people as a whole. I am not contending that this system is perfect. There is unquestionably room for improvement. But let us not destroy the central theme and spirit of this splendid system under which many thousands of American trained doctors, nurses, dentists, technicians, druggists, and other persons associated with them have given and are giving to the American people such outstanding attention and care.

Let me reiterate—this plan under consideration will broaden our horizons on matters of health and security without in any way affecting members of the medical profession and associates in their basic rights as American citizens to practice as they have in the past. It is simply not factual to say that this bill intends such a result. Unquestionably, the measure would effect substantial savings in the fields it covers. It will integrate current activities, improve the effectiveness of the service and result in increased efficiency.

There are strong arguments in favor of a separate Department of Health which I have not ignored but clearly we cannot have a department with Cabinet powers for every activity in the Federal Government. We must proceed to merge and consolidate Federal agencies in accordance with principles laid down by the Hoover Commission in order to centralize diffused functions and make the Federal Government more responsive to public needs as well as to insure economy.

Whatever comes to pass regarding this measure, I am convinced that the day will come when this Congress will have to tackle in earnest the critical problems of the public health and resolve them in the interest of all the people without setting up additional Government bureaucracy but rather by consolidating some agencies which exist as this legislation proposes to do and above all without placing the heavy hand of Government regimentation upon any class or group of American citizens.

In my opinion, there are presently pending before Congress several proposals which lead toward socialized medicine and which would threaten the system Congress has wisely provided for the care and hospitalization of our veterans and their dependents. These measures should give real concern to the medical profession and all believers in the American way of life.

A Bill Under Wraps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called, by one of the well-informed residents of Illinois, to an editorial in a recent edition of the Chicago Journal of Commerce, entitled "A Bill Under Wraps." My correspondent is Mr. L. Ratzesberger, Jr., president of the Illinois Canning Co., Hoopeston, Ill. His letter says:

A few days ago when the Korean situation started, newspapers carried an item about Mr. Symington, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, who told reporters upon leaving the White House that he had a control bill all set up ready for Congress to look at, the moment the President should declare a national emergency. This proposal, no doubt, would control such subjects as prices, wages, raw materials, etc.

In yesterday's Chicago Journal of Commerce there was an editorial on this subject which I am enclosing herewith, as I think it is very timely. The main point that appeals to me is, as the editorial suggests, submission of this bill should come before and not after an emergency so that the Board of Commerce, business, and the general public should have an opportunity to see what is proposed rather than wait until the emergency occurs and then have the bill jammed through Congress because of an emergency, when time can be taken to put the whole thing through in proper order.

It seems to me that it might be proper for Congress to ask that a draft of the bill be submitted to Congressmen and to the press so that during the coming adjournment of Congress, there will be ample time to consider the whole matter.

The matter is deserving of attention by the Congress, and for that reason I am including the editorial mentioned, under permission granted by the House. It follows:

[From the Chicago Journal of Commerce of June 30, 1950]

A BILL UNDER WRAPS

William Stuart Symington, chairman of the National Security Resources Board, has got a little list. It contains 20 titles dealing with controls over prices, wages, raw materials, and phantom orders for machinery and tools.

The NSRB list of controls is embodied in a bill. This bill, according to the Associated Press, will be handed to Congress whenever the President declares a national emergency. Mr. Symington says he has no deadline for submitting the bill for congressional discussion.

"But suppose the situation blew up tomorrow?' a newsman asked the former Air Secretary.

"What's going to blow up tomorrow?" Mr. Symington replied.

A flip retort to the NSRB chief might be: "Possibly the executive office building where your agency is housed."

More seriously it can be argued that this is no time for complacency or procrastination. The industrial mobilization bill should have been in Congress' hands long ago. As things stand, the chance for congressional action at the current session, even if the bill were submitted tomorrow, is negligible.

However, the measure should be available for congressional study during the months ahead. And it should be a high priority item on the agenda of the Eighty-second Congress next January.

Above all, submission of this bill should come before, not after, an emergency is declared.

The NSRB bill reportedly calls for near enslavement of the population by the Government. Undoubtedly it contains a good many provisos which businessmen would find obnoxious. Some of these provisos may ultimately be justified. But they should not be imposed before the persons they affect have an opportunity for complete hearings in an atmosphere of judicial calm.

The political climate during an emergency is far from calm. It is hysterical. It is surcharged with emotional appeals—with a sense of urgency and rush, rush, rush.

If the NSRB bill is to receive fair, dispassionate consideration, it should be submitted with minimum delay. Time marches on. And so does Russia.

United States Defense Weakness Revealed on Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, concern over the true state of our defense capacity has occupied the attention of the Congress throughout the troubled period of the post-World War II years, but the resumption of shooting war in Korea has served to provide an answer impossible previously.

In a week spent with residents of the congressional district I have the honor to represent, I found almost universal shock at our inability to mobilize sufficient force rapidly enough to meet the sudden challenge to American arms in Korea. On every hand were thoughtful citizens—veterans and fathers and mothers of future GI's—asking whether or not the pattern of national defense as outlined since 1946 has been placing too much emphasis on single weapons, and whether or not we have discarded the lessons learned at such frightful cost in World War II when this country developed the victorious teaming of land, sea, and air arms.

Reflecting this national concern is an article from the current press, written by Robert C. Ruark, nationally known

columnist, and an editorial from the Paris (Ill.) Daily Beacon-News, of which I am editor. Under permission granted by the House, I am including them in the Appendix to the RECORD. They follow:

HERE'S A WAR—WHERE ARE THE PUSH BUTTONS?

(By Robert C. Ruark)

NEW YORK, July 11.—This would be a costly way to preach a sermon, this trouble in Korea, but we are paying the price and we might as well absorb the lesson.

Remember all that who-struck-John about the next war, the push-button war, the war of air power, of guided missiles, of germ and infected cloud? The bold claims of the Air Forces and the test-tube commandos, the rocket boys, and the A-bomb babies?

O. K. So we got a war. Insofar as the record goes, this is world war III. No deadly dandruff yet has powdered the shoulders of Korea. No clouds have spilled their poison on Korean Reds. No atomic bomb has been set off. Very few buttons have been pushed.

The "useless" Navy has been fetched out in force to protect a flank and blockade Formosa from undue attention. The Marines have been called up. The first consignment of dogfaces has landed. Bayonets are still being worn. The friendly Injuns panic and blow up the wrong bridges too soon and kill some more friendly Injuns.

You would have thought, from the uproar of 4 years, that any after-dinner speaker, breathing into his half-demolished peas and chicken patties, could have knocked off the enemy with a rolled-up copy of his speech. Scrap the Navy, the airplane is here to stay. Junk the airplane, the guided missile is just around the corner. Destroy the guided missile—the scientists have perfected a radar-directed halitosis that can kill everybody with one whiff.

But here is your war: The Navy's out. The Marines are landing. The infantry has arrived. The airplanes are in business again. Supplies are on the way. General MacArthur, an old relic who has merely fought successfully in two centuries, again is the hour's man.

Now is a fine time for the people who have read the papers and listened to the radio addresses of the spellbinders to fix a simple fact in their minds:

Wars cannot be won by mechanical aid alone. Wars need people—soldiers, sailors, fliers, merchant mariners, Red Crossers, Wacs and Waves. Wars need gold bricks and rear echelons and moral inspirers. Wars consist of mud and mistakes and stupidities and courage and cowardice.

No machine will win one. No single branch of the service will win one. No selfish publicity campaign will win one. Wars are won by taxpayers.

When you get mixed up in a war you need everybody, not just some Buck Rogers with a chemistry set.

[From the Paris (Ill.) Daily Beacon-News]

UNITED STATES DEFENSE WEAKNESS REVEALED IN KOREA

The news from Korea has been far from heartening in the 2 short weeks since the outbreak of hostilities there. Significant has been the rapid transition in attitude on the magnitude of the task as reflected by changing American policy on conduct of the military assistance being given to the South Koreans.

In the first days it was President Truman's plan and hope that American air power would be sufficient to turn the tide. Then it was hoped that air power, supported by small scale naval units, might be sufficient. The quick trip of General MacArthur to the battlefront served to change all that, and the Nation was forced to accept the fact that nothing but full-scale operation of all branches of the armed forces would be sufficient, including ground troops. Although a decision to expand our forces was made quickly, the forces cannot come to bear on the enemy immediately, and the result has been a series of preliminary reverses for American arms and American prestige.

David Lawrence, Washington newspaper veteran and outstanding columnist, has raised some pertinent questions about American defense policy in the light of recent events. Writing this week, he has asked:

"Why was the western Pacific left without naval forces? Why have nearly all our aircraft carriers been put in 'mothballs'? Where is the personnel to man more aircraft carriers if they should be taken out of mothballs in 30 to 60 days, which time is required to man them?"

Mr. Lawrence says this Pacific job "is a job for substantial naval force with adequate aircraft and amphibious operations." Yet he points out that there was only one aircraft carrier and no Marine regiments in the Far East when the orders to aid Korea were given.

"All in all," Mr. Lawrence says, "the big question which the American people will want answered soon is why the United States Navy has been pushed aside and its aircraft carriers and Marines kept 8,000 miles or more away from a trouble area which for several months has been advertised as such in the newspapers. They were not even garrisoned at Guam.

"If a United States carrier task force had been patrolling Korean waters, the aggression by North Koreans might never have happened.

"The United States Air Force planes, flying back and forth to Korea from their base in Japan, take about 2 hours up to the front and back and can spend only a couple of hours or so over the combat area. Their fuel will not permit longer sojourns and their sorties cannot be as frequent as they would be for airplanes coming off the deck of a carrier stationed in waters close to the combat zone. The job in the Korean waters is one for the aircraft carriers of the Navy and its amphibious troops—the Marines—which carried on the 'island hopping' in the last war.

"But the psychology that there never would be another important amphibious landing and that everything can be done from the air has prevailed in allocating funds. The idea that ground troops would be needed, along with air support and tactical air cover from carriers, and that mobile rather than fixed bases would be required in different parts of the world has not been accepted by the Army and Air Force spokesmen. The Marine Corps has been cut down and nearly all the aircraft carriers of the Navy have been taken out of commission as an economy move while the bulk of the money is spent in other directions."

Mr. Lawrence is not alone in his analysis of the weak American defense position. George Fielding Eliot is another nationally known writer who has pointed up the same weakness in naval carrier strength to do what is essentially a naval job.

The expensive B–36 long-range superbomber theory is not working out very well. The little Korean operation is showing the value of naval-ground troops-Air Force coordination. No one service can do the job alone. The major claims of the superbombing theory were based on results in the Pacific in World War II, but these bombing victories would have been impossible without a strong Navy with adequate carrier-based aircraft to soften the enemy defense, protect the beachheads, and transport men and supplies step by step across the Pacific.

If the Korean experience convinces the military planners that they have been wrong and that they should begin at once to balance up our defenses with modern carriers and tactical air power, the country will be the stronger and peace will be more possible.

Unfortunately, it remains true that there is no simple way and no single way to win a war, just as there seems to be no simple way to maintain peace. In a world of force, the second best in national defense will not do. The tragic events in Korea have demonstrated the United States cannot build its defenses on a single weapon, atomic, or otherwise. It cannot confine the Defense Establishment to an Air Force alone. Only a balanced team combining the strength of the old and the new can prevail. If we learn that lesson from the first 2 weeks in Korea, there may yet be time to rebuild the closely integrated forces so successful in World War II. There may yet be time, in so doing, to prevent the spread of what still remains a localized conflict into the larger theater of global warfare. The alternative of possible defeat is unthinkable to a people determined to preserve the hope of ultimate peace—and freedom—in the world.

Arms and Peace in the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, many of us in this House took a deep interest in the matter of the Near East arms situation in the hope of establishing the security of the area and maintaining peace there. The arms pact signed by the United States, Britain, and France last May 25 was, to a great extent, due to the interest shown by the Members of this House. Here is a specific case where we were helpful in the interests of peace.

A very fine analysis of the three-power agreement regarding arms for the countries of the Near East has just appeared in the New York Times. It is written by Murray Frank, a Washington newspaperman, and was published in the issue of July 6, 1950. It is as follows:

NEAR EAST ARMS PACT—FACTORS INVOLVED IN THE TRIPARTITE DECLARATION ARE DISCUSSED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Now that the Arab States have formally accepted the three-power declaration of May 25 and have pledged themselves to maintain peace in the Near East, it is worth examining some of the factors and implications involved in that declaration.

On May 25, it will be recalled, the Big Three—the United States, Britain, and France—issued a joint declaration delineating their policy concerning arms for the Near East and the security of the area.

The tripartite agreement contains several factors which make it potentially important and which should be emphasized at this time. These are:

For the first time in modern history the Big Three have agreed to undertake concerted and coordinated action in the Near East, which has hitherto been one of the most troublesome and sensitive areas in the world. If this policy is successfully pursued, it will mean the end of the policy of unilateral action formerly practiced by each of three

powers in its own way, for its own selfish interests, often in conflict with the policies of the other powers, and most often contrary to the interest and wishes of the peoples of the Near East.

SIGNIFICANT PROMISE

The three powers have united on a policy whose specific task it is to curb aggression in the Near East. They promise to take immediate action whenever the peace of the area is threatened, in this way hoping to forestall a renewal of hostilities. The pledge is somewhat vaguely worded, there is no clear guaranty what means the powers would employ to stop aggression or how soon "immediate" action would occur if, for example, an Arab State is discovered preparing an attack on Israel. Nevertheless, in view of the report that assurances have been given to the three powers by all the Arab States and by Israel that they have no aggressive designs against their neighbors, the significance of the promise and the policy upon which it is based remain great.

No less important is the fact that Israel is placed on an equal footing with the Arab States in the matter of arms supplies, since the three powers undertake to establish a rough balance between the military strength of the Arab States and Israel.

Although the first two factors described above appear to be general and vague, while the latter point dealing with arms shipments is much more specific, the problem of arms supplies is unquestionably the most vulnerable point of the tripartite agreement. It contains a cryptic idea of some kind of coordinated control of arms shipments and a certain indefinite implication of an equal and impartial treatment of Israel vis-à-vis the Arab States in the matter of arms supplies.

It may be asked, Who will control the flow of arms from Britain to Egypt and Jordan? By what means will such control be exercised? Who will determine the military balance between Israel and the Arab countries when, in reality, the exact amount of arms shipments to the Near East countries has never been disclosed? How "rough" must this arms balance between Israel and the Arab States be?

UNCERTAINTY ON ARMS

Just how Israel will obtain her arms supplies and from whom is still an uncertainty. Thus far the State Department has failed to indicate the extent of arms Israel can expect from the United States or when such shipments may take place.

Despite these weaknesses and implications which lend themselves to various interpretations, the three-power agreement is a valuable document. If nothing else, it will serve as an instrument whereby the United States will be enabled to call Britain to account should the latter decide at some future time to renege or whittle down the agreement, as Britain has done so often in the past where it concerned Palestine.

From a more immediate and practical standpoint, however, the agreement should take some wind out of the Arab opposition to peace negotiations or perhaps bring about a noticeable dent in Arab stubbornness. At any rate, once the Arab States become convinced of the seriousness of the purpose behind this agreement, the cause of peace in the Near East will have been advanced considerably.

It is clear that the tripartite declaration, like other well-meaning declarations in the past, will not execute itself. Unless that is done by the three powers who have drawn it up, it will remain another unfulfilled promise, and genuine peace in the Near East may prove to be a false and distant hope.

MURRAY FRANK,
Washington Correspondent, Jewish Morning Journal.

WASHINGTON, *June 24, 1950.*

Veterans' Preference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 11 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have before me a copy of an important article written by the director of the national legislative service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Mr. Omar B. Ketchum. This article was published in the July 1950 issue of the VFW official publication, Foreign Service. The subject of the article is the deplorable actions by certain Government agencies in nullifying the intent of Congress and in violating the veterans' preference statute of our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, which is of crucial significance to every veteran employed in the civil service, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRICKING THE VETERAN OUT OF HIS JOB—MINOR CLAUSE IN LAW BEING USED TO OUST VETERANS HOLDING JOBS UNDER CIVIL SERVICE PREFERENCE ACT

(By Omar B. Ketchum, director, national legislative service)

To a tune reminiscent of Three Little Words, the Veterans Preference Act of 1944 is being waltzed, mostly dragged, around the Washington circuit, and many toes are being trampled—veterans preferred!

The old theme of Three Little Words—I love you—is reserved especially for politically favored nonveterans, but that new tune A Few Little Words is dedicated to veterans. Its theme is civil-service demotion with a capital D.

The "few little words" are in section 14, of the Veterans Preference Act of 1944, which is the authority for demotion. They are "for such cause as will promote the efficiency of the service." Government agencies representing the whole alphabetical scale, have pounced upon this clause as an excuse to demote veterans while keeping nonveterans on the payroll in high-ranking positions.

Federal agencies are violating the spirit and intent of the Veterans Preference Act which was especially designed to give the veteran a break in Federal employment and to assure him, in some measure, employment opportunities which were lost through wartime service.

Wielding the baton are various groups and organizations which are cutting in on veterans' preference rights that have been recognized by a grateful Nation for generations. Efforts by the Federal Career Employees Association, Government employee groups, and some unions, to discredit veterans' preference in Federal employment has rung the bell. That new tune, A Few Little Words, now ranks first on the demotion hit parade.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has been swamped with letters from veterans who have been demoted for the so-called good of the service. Yet when their cases are studied there is no pausible reason for the drop in status. They are demoted "for the good of the service."

The VFW is for efficiency in Government service. But the way section 14 is being used by various Government agencies, this phase of the law is nullifying the Veterans Preference Act, and has little relation to efficiency. In fact, demonstrations handed to veterans through the use of those "few little words" are making for less efficiency in Goverrntment service.

Such demotions affect the standard of living of men who gave many months, or years, of their lives in defense of our Nation. They also strike directly at their morale. Men who are trying to make up for those lost years in the military service should have protection against these "thin-excuse" demotions.

Recently the United States Court of Claims in Washington, D. C., had something to say about these thin excuses in respect to one of the Government agencies. The court took a rather dim view of a Government agency for failure to follow the "simple requirements of Congress" and for "slicing the ham too thin" in applying a demotion order under the Veterans Preference Act.

In a unanimous opinion written by Chief Judge Marvin Jones, the court ruled that the Government must pay one demoted veteran the difference between his top salary and his lower-status salary. The veteran was demoted in 1944, and it is expected that the repayment will total approximately $4,500. Although the court did not contest the agency's right to demote the veteran, the judge wrote, "It seems rather strange that department officials are sometimes reluctant to follow the simple requirements of an Act of Congress," The agency had granted the veteran 29 instead of the specified 30 days' notice.

Judge Jones wrote, "We have no doubt the offiical thought he was allowing exactly 30 days, but in his effort to give not an ounce more than was necessary, he sliced the ham too thin."

Not all veterans are as fortunate as the foregoing example.

When the Veterans Preference Act became law in 1944 no Congressman, or anyone who had anything to do with the framing of that law, intended that the few little words of section 14 would be used as a device to demote veterans and retain nonveterans in Government service. It is not conceivable that the Congress had any such intent in mind. It is not conceivable that the American public desired such an interpretation of that particular phrase.

The act was passed to give definite preference in examinations, appointments, retention in employment and retention in a specific job.

In a pamphlet on veterans' preference, released by the United States Civil Service Commission, the meaning of that law is clear. The Commission's answer on the question "Why are veterans given preference in Federal employment?" is: "The Congress, recognizing that an economic loss is suffered by persons who serve their country in the Armed Forces, has enacted the preference law as a means of preventing veterans who seek Federal employment from being penalized by the fact that the months or years they spent in the service of their country isolated them from the civilian world during that period."

Veterans' preference is almost as old as the Nation itself. George Washington recognized the special debt of gratitude which the Nation owed its fighting men. He saw to it that veterans of the Revolution received grants of land for homesteading. Abraham Lincoln declared it was the duty of the Government to "care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphans." The history of the United States runs parallel with the history of special preference for veterans, with the first such statute enacted in March 1865, and laws in subsequent years adding to and strengthening veterans' preference.

It is deplorable that veterans who sacrificed their youth, and their opportunities to

advance in civic life, should be demoted to make way for men who sat it out in the greatest war in history. Veterans' preference is an established basic policy of the United States. Why should it be reversed now because of a soft spot in the present law?

The devious ways to demotion cannot be cataloged. Various Government agencies cite one factor in a case as meritorious. In the next breath they use it as a club to knock a veteran down the ladder.

A recent case is cited as a perfect example. The case was before the Board of Appeals and Review in Washington, D. C., involving two demotions of veterans under section 14. The hearing on one veteran was held during the morning and the Government agency argued that the length of service of the nonveteran was the controlling factor in retaining him and demoting a veteran. The agency argued that this greater length of service of the nonveteran would promote the efficiency of the service.

During the hearing on the second veteran in the afternoon of the same day, the agency argued that the efficiency rating, rather than the length of service of the nonveteran, was the determining factor in retaining him over the veteran and that this also promoted the efficiency of the service. In this case the veteran had longer service than the nonveteran. Both veterans were employed in the same agency and in the same shop. The Civil Service Commission rendered decisions in both cases favorable to the nonveterans.

One veteran may be demoted by a Government agency because he has only a general knowledge of his work. The same agency then argues that another veteran is too specialized and demotes him for the efficiency of the service.

One of the below-the-belt techniques employed to demote veterans is to give them efficiency rating of unsatisfactory, demote them and then rehire them for a job that has a lower rating. This procedure is difficult to reverse if an argument develops, because the veteran is forced to prove that he didn't deserve an unsatisfactory rating in the first place.

Although the section 14 abuse has been worked overtime in most Government departments and agencies, the Post Office Department has recently taken the Veterans' Preference Act for a long ride with section 14 providing the fuel. Hundreds of veterans employed as mail carriers were demoted from a permanent to substitute status after the Postmaster General ordered once-a-day delivery. Instead of the customary reduction in force, with veteran preference being observed, the Post Office demoted veterans.

The VFW is trying to plug up that loop hole with a new bill (H. R. 4207), introduced in Congress on April 12:

"Be it enacted, etc., That section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 387), as amended, be further amended by deleting the words 'except for such cause as will promote the efficiency of the service' from the first sentence of said section, and substituting in lieu thereof the words 'except for inefficiency, delinquency, or misconduct'."

The Boy Scouts of North Essex Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following remarks I presented at the dedication of the Statue of Liberty replica to the city of Lawrence, Mass., by the North Essex Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, in tribute to the city's youth, on July 9, 1950:

Once upon a time, all of us grown-ups were as young as the Boy Scouts who are presenting this model of the Statue of Liberty to the people of Lawrence.

In their honest and eager faces, we see the dreams that passed us by.

But we can still remember the things we wanted to do at their age.

We wanted to be of service to our church and country and there was no finer way of serving the two together than the secret ambition we had to join the Boy Scouts of America.

Many of us, born in an earlier generation where other necessities took up all our time and energy, never realized this opportunity.

We are proud, however, that you young people have become the Scouts that we wanted to be. You are making good for yourselves and for us.

And as I look around this Common, with its monuments to the brave men and women who served us in the past to the last, full measure of their devotion, I wonder why we did not think of building here a replica of all our hopes and aspirations—the Statue of Liberty enlightening the world.

The Boy Scouts of North Essex Council are away ahead of us in this matter, and by their imagination, faith, and leadership, are proving that the future of our way of life is in good hands.

In contrast with the Scouts, older people sometimes say: "Everything is confusing, these days."

So much is happening that our attention is distracted by swiftly changing events, and the calm, clear belief of other days is lost.

There is danger in this situation, for unscrupulous men are using this confusion to breed despair and then rob helpless people of their freedoms.

There is need for the people of the United States to be on guard against subversive techniques, and the surest way to be vigilant is to know the sources of our faith and strength.

The Boy Scouts of America know the answer.

The Statue of Liberty speaks to the human heart with a message that no words could convey. The Scouts hope and believe that this representation of it, set up in the center of every American city, will remind us of the duty we owe to ourselves and others to keep the light of freedom glowing.

For nearly 20,000,000 immigrants, for millions of tourists and millions of returning soldiers, the first glimpse they had of home was the towering figure of Miss Liberty holding high the light of hope and opportunity and justice.

Hard-bitten veterans of grueling campaigns have wept unashamedly before this inspiring welcome back to the New World.

Our country is not merely new in the sense that it was discovered less than 500 years ago. Its youth is not to be judged solely by the modern look of its cities and farms and the bustling energy of its people.

The United States is the most progressive Nation in the world because it encourages the highest development of each and every individual, instead of keeping them in fearful obedience to a tyrannical father-state.

In this New World we want men and women who are trained to stand on their own two feet, knowing that they alone will be able to cooperate for group purposes with the collective wisdom of all.

The Boy Scouts build character and train for citizenship.

Dictators, fearful that their power might be undermined by civilizing influences, suppress such organizations as the Boy Scouts and thereby admit that they cannot prevail in a free and open contest with the creative elements in human experience.

During the past 2 weeks we have witnessed a profound and stirring demonstration of this fact.

Communism, playing every trick and deception to take advantage of weakness, had been making vast and disturbing gains.

Suddenly the free nations, under the leadership of the United States, shook off their fears and confusions. Confronted with a plain act of aggression, they did not falter and appease.

They made a decision, seized the initiative, and moved forward under the banner of the United Nations to enforce law and order.

There will be many anxious days—and maybe years—before the greater issue of which Korea is the tension point of the moment is finally solved in favor of humanity.

Peace is the goal, not the shadow of peace under which we have lived during the five uncertain years since 1945, but in the bright and confident sunlight of world-order, backed by universal law and sanctions to halt any breach of the peace whether that assault is direct or indirect.

No man in his right mind wants war.

But that does not mean that we must surrender piecemeal to the blackmail of communism.

President Truman has served notice that we will not tolerate aggression in any form.

From now on we stand wholeheartedly in positive support of the UN as the only agency that can win the peace.

The UN however, cannot succeed if one nation uses the veto power to kill all possibility of compromise and to insist that its minority viewpoint shall win out on every major issue.

If we in the Congress took a walk every time we found ourselves on the losing side of a legislative count, well, there just wouldn't be any Congress, for every Member sooner or later finds himself in such a position and accepts the will of the majority.

The men in the Kremlin rely on force and terror and treachery to maintain and extend their power.

When they outlaw the Boy Scouts, they confess their fear of an idea.

That idea is that boys and girls, given access to all information, given a chance to worship their Creator according to their conscience, and given an opportunity to serve others of their own free will, will grow up into men and women who are a credit to themselves and to others.

The Communists are afraid that the mature judgment of people when freely expressed everywhere will judge them to be wrong. And they cannot face this verdict.

We, in this Nation composed of a sovereign and independent people, alert ourselves to the danger of communism, for that is the first requirement of this hour. We must go beyond this, however, to affirm our belief in freedom.

Through this replica of the Statue of Liberty, the Boy Scouts of North Essex Council are helping to rekindle in us the vitality of that faith.

The Scout code gives boys a standard that appeals to the manliness in every boy. It emphasizes the true values in human experience, an active religious life, loyalty to country, personal honor, interest in other people.

All these fuse into the daily good turn—that habit of service to which all Scouts dedicate themselves.

We are proud that this is the first statue of its kind to be erected in New England, proud of the self-reliance and leadership of the Scouts in this area.

It is not enough to thank them and their counselors for the fine work they are doing and for this gift to our city.

We can only repay them by striving to become as good Americans as they are, working for that day when liberty will truly enlighten the world and all men may prosper in the security of universal peace.

Philippine Scouts Offer To Join Democratic Forces in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Philippine Ambassador to the United States, the Honorable J. M. Elizalde, has called my attention to an editorial, which appeared in the New York Times regarding the Philippine Scouts. This fighting force has demonstrated time and time again its effectiveness as well as its eagerness to defend democratic institutions.

The Philippine Scouts have offered to join the democratic forces in Korea but it is not known if the offer can be accepted. Nonetheless it conclusively shows the enthusiastic support that the defense of southern Korea is receiving from freedom-loving nations. If the Philippine Scouts can be spared from the armed forces in the defense of the Philippines, it is hoped that the defenders of southern Korea can be further supported by the Philippine Scouts.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial that appeared in the New York Times on July 8, 1950:

There is something peculiarly heartwarming, although not at all unexpected, in the offer of the Philippine Scouts to join the democratic forces in Korea. These soldiers, formerly a contingent in the United States Army, have a record for valor and devotion that stands high. The Scouts are the veterans of Damortis and Bataan and Corregidor, where they fought shoulder to shoulder with their American comrades.

It has been repeatedly suggested that the United Nations forces in Asia should have their units of Asiatics so that the international character of the resistance would be most clearly apparent. The Philippine Scouts, having formed a historic link between east and west in the past, might well be represented in such a military establishment.

Why Citizens Don't Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, on June 12 I introduced House Resolution 641 to appoint a select committee to investigate the adequacy of participation by citizens in public affairs through voting in elections for Federal offices. This resolution has touched off active discussion of this problem throughout the country. Public opinion in the United States, when interested, knows very well how to express itself. The seriousness of the issues before voters has fixed attention upon why the responsibility is not more generally shared. There are appended hereto a selection of editorials led off by the New York Herald Tribune and covering every section of the country commenting on this resolution:

[From the New York (N. Y.) Herald Tribune of June 14, 1950]

SPURRING THE NONVOTER

Representative JAVITS has never been one to resign himself to the shortcomings of democracy, and in a resolution introduced yesterday he addressed himself to one of the most puzzling and disturbing of these. Why do so many citizens with the right to vote remain away from the polling booth? How can a larger proportion of the electorate be brought to the polls? Every election such questions come prominently into view, and it is a foresighted move which asks for a select committee of the House to survey methods by which a broader participation of voters in national elections can be assured.

In the last national election only a little more than half of the potential voters cast their ballots. This compared with the slightly more than 86 percent who, at about the same time, were voting in the western sectors of Berlin, or with the 83 percent who in 1896 went to the polls to make their choice between McKinley and Bryan. The disconcertingly small number of recent United States voters may be in one sense a sign of strength: because men and women feel that the foundations of their social order are secure, that no shattering and fundamental issues are at stake, they indulge in the luxury of nonvoting. But in other respects that bare majority of the potential voters is an indication of apathy and ignorance, of failure to perform the duties which free government entails, and of barriers placed deliberately in the way of the franchise.

Mr. JAVITS' resolution sets up no dogmatic remedy; it asks, rather, for a survey of measures now undertaken, by States, municipalities and private organizations to increase the vote. Evidently there is much that can be accomplished by these means; in Portland, Maine, a survey and the ensuing remedial action resulted in an increase in voters from something over 5,000 to 7,660. Beyond these methods lies the possibility of some form of compulsory voting, with fines established for failure to exercise this right, as in Australia, Belgium, and Holland. Representative JAVITS seems to have sympathy with such schemes. Yet in governmental matters it is best to deal first with the human material rather than to succumb easily to procedural innovations. In our own country there remains a vast field where education and voluntary efforts can bring returns; there are barriers to voting that wait to be removed. If a congressional committee can concert and vitalize efforts along these lines it will have begun a highly useful work.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press of June 26, 1950]

IF YOU DON'T VOTE, YOU CAN'T CRITICIZE THE FOLKS ELECTED

Congressman JACOB K. JAVITS (Republican, New York) has asked Congress to create a committee to study the advisability of making voting compulsory by law or constitutional amendment.

Like many other thoughtful Americans, he is concerned because such large numbers of citizens neglect their duty as voters.

Almost half of those eligible didn't go to the polls in the presidential and congressional election of 1948, he points out. Almost two-thirds failed to vote in the 1946 congressional election.

Australia, Belgium, and the Netherlands have compulsory voting. JAVITS thinks it should be at least considered here. Greater participation in elections, he concedes, wouldn't necessarily mean more informed voting; but he believes it is an essential first step toward getting citizens to think about the issues and assume personal responsibility for deciding them.

It's a large question, however, whether people driven to the voting booths by fear of penalties could be counted on for constructive thought. Perhaps there is better prospect of good results in a second part of JAVITS' proposal: that the committee also find out what measures of education and encouragement cities, States, and private organizations are taking and might take to bring out a larger voluntary vote.

Labor's political action committees are increasingly busy in this field. Numerous other organizations appeal effectively to the special interests of various groups whose members they urge to register and vote.

But too little is done to convince all Americans that voting is not merely a right but a high privilege and a vital duty—that the little time it takes to cast a ballot is well spent. And far too many citizens continue to stay away from the polls on election day and then put in the rest of the year griping about the kind of officials the voters elected.

[From the Ogden (Utah) Standard-Examiner of June 13, 1950]

HOW ABOUT A LAW TO COMPEL US TO VOTE?

Do you think it would be a good thing to have a United States law requiring eligible citizens to vote, a law similar to those in Australia, the Netherlands, and Belgium compelling people to vote?

Liberal Republican Representative JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, wants Congress to study the question of compulsory voting. He believes the entire Nation should be concerned with the neglect of many citizens to take advantage of their voting privilege.

Mr. JAVITS doesn't deceive himself. Compelling citizens to vote will not immediately mean a more informed vote, but there is much in what he says to the effect that citizens, facing a law-enforced duty, will give more thought to what they are doing than if permitted to continue their present inactive citizenship.

One of the best arguments for compulsory voting is that it would help to thwart the plans of the political machines. To rig an election in a town where only half of the eligible citizens vote is much easier and simpler than in a place where close to a 100 percent turnout takes place.

[From the Duluth (Minn.) Herald of June 23, 1950]

VOTE STUDY

Portland, Maine, had such a poor vote in 1948 that a local research council called in a New York psychological consultant. He made a survey, drafting some recommendations which the city put into effect. The 1949 election, which might have been expected to show a poorer total vote than the one in 1948, showed an increase of about 50 percent.

Exactly what was done in Portland, and its applicability to other cities is not mentioned in some of the accounts of the experiment. The country may learn more about that, though. A New York Congressman, J. K. JAVITS, Republican-Liberal, wants the House

to investigate the possibilities of getting out a larger vote in elections for Federal offices. He would like to have a committee survey the ways States, municipalities, and private groups have used to make people see the importance of voting, and to induce them to vote.

Mr. JAVITS is not sure that compulsory voting is the answer, though he thinks the committee should examine the advisability of attempting such a requirement. He does not believe that an increase in the proportion of those voting would necessarily help either political party.

Practically everyone concedes that the figures on nonvoting in this country in recent years have been disturbing. This is much more than a question of voting, though. What kind of citizen, to give him a title he does not really deserve, is the person who never votes, or who votes very rarely? What kind of worker or employer, what kind of parent, what kind of taxpayer?

We are in the midst of the greatest struggle of ideas in history. Hundreds of men and women in the nations of the west are giving their time and their thoughts to this struggle. And all around them are men and women, millions of them, who don't care enough about anything beyond their personal business, to bother about voting occasionally.

Ignace Jan Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. George J. Olszewski, whom many Members will recall as an employee of the House a few years back, which eulogizes the late Jan Paderewski. Mr. Olszewski is now employed by the Department of the Air Force as a writer and researcher, and the talents of his job are reflected in this article; also reflected strongly is his admiration and veneration for the late great Paderewski as an artist, as a democratic leader, as a Pole, and as a man.

IGNACE JAN PADEREWSKI

(By George J. Olszewski)

Nine years ago, on June 29, 1941, the world learned with profound sorrow of the death of the internationally renowned Polish pianist, composer, patriot, and statesman, Ignace Jan Paderewski.

Despite his advanced years and poor state of health, Paderewski had returned to his "second country," the United States, less than a year before his death to continue his lifelong battle for the freedom and independence of his beloved Poland, once again overrun by her traditional aggressors in World War II.

PADEREWSKI THE PATRIOT

Living in retirement in Switzerland at the time of the invasion and subsequent partitioning of Poland between the Nazis and Soviets in September 1939, Paderewski instinctively knew that, for his country as well as for any nation cherishing its freedom, there could be neither peace, nor hope, nor justice in abject submission of the minds of free men to the dictatorial philosophies of Poland's aggressors. Paderewski knew that one-half of the world could not live in freedom and independence, while the other half lived in ideological enslavement.

Within the furthermost recesses of his creative mind, Paderewski heard the clanking chains of an enslaved Poland and the stirring challenge of the majestic call to battle of Chopin's Polonaise Militaire. And, idealist that he was, Paderewski answered the call to battle just as he had in the past, particularly during World War I in the midst of a brilliant artistic career.

Now aged and weary, but spiritually valiant, Paderewski undertook the strenuous voyage to return to the United States, arriving here on November 6, 1940, his eightieth birthday. Despite the advice of his physician, Paderewski toured extensively to encourage and invoke needed aid for his distressed homeland. But this heroic figure was not to know peace in this world. While attending a meeting of Polish veterans, to which he desired to give the great impetus of his genius and personality, Paderewski was brought down by an attack of pneumonia which took his life.

Paderewski died as nobly as he fought—girded for battle against oppression. To the last, he prayed and fought for the freedom and independence of his native land. On his deathbed, Paderewski's last words were the same battle cry uttered by other Polish sons throughout the long years of Poland's oppressive occupation: "Polska powstanie—Poland will rise again."

PADEREWSKI THE STATESMAN

The honors bestowed upon Paderewski as a statesman were innumerable: Honorary degrees, for his superior individual accomplishments, by universities of the United States and Europe; decorations and awards, for his services in the cause of world peace, by the Governments of Poland, Belgium, France, Great Britain, Italy, and the United States; and laurels and acclamations, for his superior artistic achievements, of the luminaries of the musical world, the theater, and the press.

To Paderewski, however, the most significant of all honors would have been the homage of the humble who, by the thousands, filed past his catafalque as he lay in state in St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City, the red and white flag of his homeland tenderly enfolding his last mortal remains while a guard of honor of Polish veterans proudly stood the lonely all-night vigil.

For the first time in 25 years, the Most Reverend Francis J. Spellman, Archbishop of New York, delivered the eulogy during the solemn pontifical requiem mass. Thousands of Paderewski's admirers from all walks of life—they knew no class distinction—lined the route of the military funeral cortege as it slowly wound its way through crowded New York streets to the celestial melodies and measured rhythm of Chopin's Funeral March. All paused in silent tribute to the passing of the immortal Pole.

In the Nation's capital, representatives of the diplomatic corps and of our own Government, and thousands of those who loved him, paid their final respects as the body of Paderewski lay in state at the Polish Embassy. The highest tribute of the United States was bestowed upon Paderewski by the late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who authorized Paderewski's burial in Arlington National Cemetery.

Now reposing in the quiet, green hills overlooking the capital of the Nation he loved so well, this heroic Pole slumbers in hallowed peace until such time as his body can be returned to the free and independent Poland of Paderewski's dreams.

THE IMMORTAL PADEREWSKI

Today, in the midst of this strife-torn world, when world peace is threatened once again by active Communist aggression in Korea, let us pause a few moments to recall the stirring tribute paid by the House of Representatives 9 years ago to the memory of the immortal Ignace Jan Paderewski.

On July 9, 1941, House Resolution 269 of the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, adopted by unanimous consent of the House, paid tribute to Paderewski in the following words:

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the United States of America has learned with profound sorrow of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski, chairman of the National Council of the Republic of Poland, former President of the Council of Ministers of Poland, and world renowned pianist; a foremost champion of freedom and democratic ideals, restorer of Polish independence, spiritua lleader and champion of the oppressed.

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives sympathizes with the millions of Poles throughout the world on the loss of this outstanding leader of Polish freedom and independence who effected superlative gains in his own patriotic endeavors, who pleaded for the afflicted of all nations, and who manifested the greatest humanitarianism to the point of self-deprivation."

This expression of sentiment was communicated to the Polish Ambassador at Washington by our Secretary of State. On the same day that the resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives, the following eulogy was delivered on the floor of the House:

"On June 29, the world learned with profound sorrow of the death of a foremost statesman, humanitarian, idealist, and artist, Ignace Jan Paderewski. He was a man who was idealistic in his beliefs of democratic principles of freedom and independence; a man loved by all liberty-loving men and women throughout the world. Paderewski sacrificed his life, his genius, and his wealth to aid the oppressed. Despite his fame as the world's first pianist, Paderewski was as simple and humble in his contacts with all men as any truly great man must be to win the love and affection of his compatriots.

"The American people join with the people of Poland in mourning the death of Paderewski. He will be remembered as a genius of the piano ranking with Liszt and Rubenstein, bringing joy and peace to the hearts of millions through his superb mastery of the piano and his interpretation of the music of his compatriot, Frédéric François Chopin. Long before the critics recognized his genius, Paderewski contended that his greatest success was here in the United States where the American people recognized his artistry and held him in high esteem."

POLAND RISES AGAIN

"At the outbreak of the first World War, Paderewski immediately set himself the task of laboring for the liberation of his native Poland. He did much to enlist world support for the restoration of Poland as a member of the community of nations.

"The simple words of Paderewski on the lecture platform endeared him to Americans everywhere. Through his dominating personality and the eloquence of his speeches, Paderewski coordinated the work of 4,000,000 Polish-Americans who formed the Central Committee of Assistance to aid the resurrecting Poland. As honorary president of the Polish National Department of Chicago, and as the friend of President Woodrow Wilson and his adviser, Colonel House, Paderewski exercised increasing influence in the political circles of Washington on behalf of Poland. It was largely through his efforts that the thirteenth of Wilson's fourteen points was devoted to the restoration of a free and independent Poland.

"Unofficial ambassador of a liberty-loving oppressed people, Paderewski received official recognition from our Department of State on many occasions. Paderewski represented the Polish people at Washington during 1917 and 1918; he assisted in organ-

izing the Polish Republic in 1918 and 1919. Paderewski was president of the Polish Delegation to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, and the first Polish delegate to the Council of Ambassadors to the League of Nations in 1920. In addition, Paderewski was at one time Minister of Foreign Affairs for Poland, president of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Poland and at the time of his death, chairman of the National Council of the Republic of Poland.

"Despite the worldly honors conferred upon him, Paderewski's greatest happiness came in contributing his time, his talents, and his resources to the needy of his own and other lands. To the American people, whom Paderewski held in high esteem, he stands as a symbol of liberty. Paderewski will take his place in history with Pulaski and Kosciuszko, other Polish heroes who aided the United States so nobly in its own fight for freedom and independence. Paderewski's faith and courage will long remain in the hearts of Poland's sons."

Let us, therefore, extend our heartfelt sympathy today, just as we did 9 years ago, to the millions of Polish-Americans here in the United States and the Poles throughout the world, but especially to those in Poland who are being persecuted for their belief in the dignity and freedom of mankind. May the great and undying genius of Paderewski, and his belief in the patriotism of future generations of Poles and Polish-Americans, serve to guide and inspire the people of Poland to continued resistance against the tyranny of aggression and occupation.

Let us recall the inspiring message of Paderewski in which he said, "The vision of a strong and independent Poland has always been the lodestar of my existence. Its realization is the greatest aim of my life." Finally, let us never forget the last words of this immortal Pole who gasped with his dying breath: "Polska powstanie—Poland will rise again."

Falcon Park Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the address I delivered at the dedication of Falcon Park, summer camp for children on Mill Street, Burlington, Mass., by the Polish Falcons of America, district X, eastern Massachusetts, on Sunday, July 2, 1950:

This is one of those week ends when prepared remarks are hopelessly outdated by the dramatic and far-reaching events that have been crowded into a few days.

Last Sunday we heard a news broadcast about a little trouble taking place in a small country half way around the globe. We weren't quite sure how to pronounce the name of the capital city of Korea, so little did we know of that peninsula as a whole, and its 30,000,000 people.

During the past week we have learned a great deal.

The mask has been ripped off the wolf that stalks in sheep's clothing, and Communism has been exposed in all its naked and cruel power.

You people knew that it happened before in Poland, but the rest of the free world did not know or did not choose to know.

It has happened in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere, but too late for anybody to do anything about it.

Meanwhile, in our own hearts, all of us have been disturbed by these happenings. Somehow, our Government, as the leader and the spokesman for the non-Communist world, seemed to be faltering and ineffective in dealing with this dangerous technique.

We were just drifting, while the Communists were taking over one country after another.

True, we were doing something in Europe but nothing in Asia.

Then the Communists grabbed China, and still we did nothing.

All the vast area of the Far East seemed ready to fall in Communist hands because of our helplessness.

However, we woke up last Sunday and not a minute too soon.

We woke up to the fact which was there all the time for us to see that communism was following the Nazi technique. In our desperate desire for peace we seemed willing to make concession after concession to the aggressor in the faint hope that somehow he would become satisfied and stop.

Our President made a bold and courageous decision.

He called the Communist bluff.

And I think that all of us experienced a sense of relief when he did so.

In spite of the serious consequences that might follow, it was heartening to see that we had stopped retreating, had drawn a line, and had taken a firm and clear stand in support of our position that aggression must be halted in its tracks.

An electric feeling of unity swept through the Nation, bringing together all parties at home and encouraging our friends abroad. Ex-President Hoover, Governor Dewey, General Eisenhower rallied behind President Truman, demonstrating all-American approval of his leadership in this emergency.

We have served notice on the Kremlin that we will not stand on the side lines and see the world taken over piece by piece until we stand alone and helpless.

And it was done in the name of the United Nations which is trying to bring law and order to the world community.

The Communists thought it was just a debating society that would talk itself to death. But we are proving that words, when translated into effective action, can build the UN into the successful instrument for peace that men hoped it would become.

No man can look far into the future, but of this one thing we can be certain: This is our finest hour that is winning the admiration of freemen everywhere.

The confusion of retreat is behind us.

We are venturing forth into the unknown, clear in our own minds at last, and determined to follow a positive policy that is based on morality and realism.

They call it a calculated risk, but we now have the faith and the sound judgment to face it.

This is a tremendous set-back for the Communists, no matter how they may try to twist its meaning.

When the complete story of this past week comes to light through the researches of history, it will reveal the confusion that beset Stalin and company when the United States moved swiftly in support of justice and genuine peace.

For this may well be the turning point of our times, marking as it does the first positive step in affirmation of those human values under God which most men cherish. This is the sign that most of us have been hoping for, and to which we can give our full energy and faith in the crusade to reconstruct a world in which fear will not dominate the lives of any people.

On an occasion such as the present it is customary to recall the glorious history of Poland. But you and I are living in such history-making times, that it is best for us to consider some of the things that we must do now and in the future to justify the responsible leadership that has been placed in our hands.

The Communists are trying to remake Poland in their image.

Outwardly they may do so for awhile.

Buildings, roads, factories, machines—they can build these, as other can, but they can never find a substitute for the human soul and its decent impulses, which only God can create.

This condemns them to the failure that is inevitable, once they have exhausted their deceits and treacheries.

They cannot build an iron wall that will reach to the sky and shut out the truth forever.

Even now I feel confident that a few people in Poland already know the truth of the past week and see in it the first ray of hope for themselves. It is up to you and I, in every way that we can manage, to communicate with them and tell them that it is only the beginning.

Democracy always loses the first battles but it wins the final verdict. And we have just begun to win.

I think it significant that President Truman could take time out from the heavy responsibilities that he measured up to so ably during the past week to speak of plans for helping other nations to raise their standard of living.

In other words our goal is to assist and not to enslave.

There is the heart and soul of our United States.

Even under the stress of danger we do not lose sight of the rights of individual human beings.

Just as the Polish Falcons on this eventful Sunday are dedicating a constructive project.

Here on these peaceful grounds, blessed with good sun and fresh air and in the hopeful company of nature, you are establishing a summer camp for children which is one of the best investments I can think of. Our Nation and the fine principles for which it stands, will never be in real danger as long as we give our children a happy and healthy childhood, and one that is not clouded by fear. A sound mind in a sound body is the best foundation for a happy life in a society composed of free and mature citizens.

Falcon Park is another contribution in the long line of voluntary efforts by the people themselves to make life better in every way.

This is the basis of our freedom, our faith, and our future.

It is also the hope of mankind.

In this showdown we are not acting as one nation seeking its own selfish ends as Russia is doing, but in the name of all nations.

And already our policy has been approved by nearly two-thirds of the 59 member governments of the UN.

This is the outstanding moral fact.

We are proceeding under the laws and regulations of the United Nations and we shall continue to do so, backing up words with actions that will strengthen that organization and establish a standard of law and order for this world.

Never before have we been so right.

At last we have the great propaganda weapon of truth.

We must drive it home to all the captive peoples of Russia and the satellite states so that they may rise up in hope and confidence to overthrow communism.

The schemers in the Kremlin have overreached themselves.

At last the initiative for peace is in our hands.

Let us build it with courage and realism.

Long Beach Editor Talks About Executive, Union, Individual Corporation Pensions and Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July, 3, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under authority heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to call to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives the text of an editorial appearing in the Long Beach Independent on Wednesday, June 14, 1950. This is one of the two daily papers printed in my home city and its pertinent comments and frank statements I commend to your careful reading:

PENSIONS PAY EXECUTIVES

Fantastic pensions are being provided top executives of industries, banks, utilities, and chain stores. The boards of directors of most of the organizations are given pensions even though their only activity for the enterprise is a monthly appearance at board meetings. Cost to stockholders of these pensions is mounting into tremendous sums. The cost is added on to cost of products or services.

Reason for this spread of pensions to high-paid executives is that income taxes take most of the salary. Before us is a list of executives of large concerns. Their salaries range from $150,000 to $600,000 a year. On the $600,000 salary, after income taxes, it is estimated the executive has only $200,000 left. On the $150,000 salary only $78,000 is left. Thus the top man receives four times or $450,000 more than the lower man but has only twice as much or $72,000 more after taxes. In other words, of the added $450,000 the Federal income tax takes $378,000.

In these changed economic conditions it would seem $150,000 a year, after taxes, should be enough for any man working for a salary. Very few of these executives have any investments or gamble in the enterprise they serve. It is true they have charge of savings of millions of small stockholders. We believe they should be highly paid, but how high is high?

In a scheme to pay the executives and themselves added nontaxable compensations, the boards of directors of the companies have set up pension plans. Stockholders (who rarely attend meetings but mail in proxies) have approved these plans. In so doing they have set up pensions of from $10,000 to $100,000 a year for the executives of their companies. The cost will be from $150,000 to $1,500,000 for each.

The Internal Revenue Department has ruled that payments into such funds may be charged as deductible business expenses. Therefore, the corporation's tax of 28 percent is saved. The only tax paid will be on payments the individual receives from the pension after retirement when his income is lower.

It is a case of government not letting its left hand know what the right is doing. High taxes on individual income discourages high salaries so the companies pay large sums into pension funds which the Government makes tax-free. It is delayed payment of large salaries by subterfuge approved and encouraged by government. It costs stockholders millions of dollars a year. It also adds to the cost of goods and services and adds to what small taxpayers must pay.

Executives with such pensions of their own can hardly argue with unions demanding ever-increased securities. The result can only end in a fantastic race between unions and executives for higher pensions at the expense of the majority of people who have none. It is the reason all future pensions, not paid for by the individual, should be outlawed. It is why a tax allowance should be allowed on up to 20 percent of an income when it is invested in an annuity and all such allowances by corporations be not allowed—L. A. C.

This Congress Knows Stuart Symington as a Man Who Makes Success Out of Failure, Profits Out of Losses, and Brings Order Out of Chaos—Every Job Stu Symington Has Ever Undertaken Has Been Done With Exactitude, Respect to Law, Precision, and Dispatch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, second only to the Secretary of Defense in securing the peace of this country are the powers reposed in the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. The function of that Board is to advise the President in general concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization.

Among its many other duties the Board is charged with the establishment of action programs looking to the effective use in time of war of the Nation's natural and industrial resources, both for military and civilian needs; the unification of all Federal departments and agencies concerned with production, procurement, distribution, and transportation; maintenance of relationships between potential supplies and requirements for manpower resources as well as productive facilities, the establishment of policies looking to the maintenance of adequate reserves of strategic and critical materials while in the performance of its functions.

This Congress can well be assured that in discharging these various duties—all-important to the Nation's security and defense—that Stuart Symington will utilize to the maximum extent the existent departments and agencies of the Government without unduly increasing payrolls and creating further drains on the taxpayers' dollars.

It was solely because of his enviable record as a business executive and administrator and as a tried, trusted, and proven public official, that President Truman nominated as chairman of the National Security Resources Board the trusted friend of every Member of this House, the Honorable W. Stuart Symington.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor to speak these words because of an article which I read in the Washington Post this morning headed "Avoid a stampede."

In commending that article to the reading of the Members of this House, I know that we all agree with the editor of the Washington Post when he said:

Mr. Symington now will have personal responsibility for seeing that the mobilization plan is up to date and ready for instant implementation by Congress. This will include responsibility for drafting proposed manpower legislation, industrial controls, priorities and the like, as well as responsibility for advising on current policies and supervising civil defense preparations.

The editorial is as follows:

AVOID A STAMPEDE

It would be a mistake to connect the expanded planning powers which W. Stuart Symington has been granted as chairman of the National Security Resources Board with the police action in Korea. Mr. Symington's job is assuredly one of the most important in the administration, but the new responsibilities he has assumed under Reorganization Plan 25 were proposed long before the Korean invasion broke. They were the result of the doldrums in which the NSRB had languished during its period of government by the Cabinet. Mr. Symington now will have personal responsibility for seeing that the mobilization plan is up to date and ready for instant implementation by Congress. This will include responsibility for drafting proposed manpower legislation, industrial controls, priorities and the like as well as responsibility for advising on current policies and supervising civil defense preparations.

It does not follow from this, however, that general mobilization is contemplated. Some persons have seen in Mr. Symington's scheduled meeting with labor leaders today, for example, an indication that manpower controls are on the way. The fact is that this is but one of a number of meetings Mr. Symington has held with groups such as the National Association of Manufacturers and the Committee for Economic Development. The views of such groups are important in sound mobilization planning; but today's meeting would have been held irrespective of the Korean crisis.

Americans are anxious to do everything necessary to support the Korean effort. But enthusiasm must be tempered with judgment and restraint. It is essential to avoid riding off in all directions at once. To call for general mobilization now would be to do just that. Some degree of mobilization may become necessary, of course, to support the Korean action if it is protracted or if eruptions break out in other hot spots. The labor market is tight in certain areas; it also may be essential to divert some production for munitions manufacture. But if and when such steps are necessary a great deal can be accomplished on a limited or voluntary basis short of all-out mobilization. If there is a danger in complacency, there also is a danger that precipitate mobilization would tie up the country and achieve one of the Russians' purposes. So long as it appears that a general war can be averted through the prompt police action in Korea, we must act accordingly.

Puerto Rican Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore obtained, I place in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial

which appeared this morning in the Washington Post, entitled "Puerto Rican Progress." I wholeheartedly agree with the sentiments expressed in this editorial which reads as follows:

PUERTO RICAN PROGRESS

The American example of responsible stewardship toward dependent territories was carried forward in noteworthy fashion recently when President Truman signed a bill authorizing Puerto Rico to write its own constitution. The island has moved with rapid strides in recent years toward complete self-government. It was given the right in 1947 to elect its own governor, choosing for that office Luis Muñoz-Marín who has led his people steadily toward economic as well as political emancipation. Now the members of its supreme court, the last remaining officials chosen by Washington, will be locally elected. And the people of Puerto Rico will decide by referendum whether they wish to adopt a constitution of their own in conformity with the stipulation of Congress that it shall guarantee a republican form of government and include a bill of rights.

Puerto Rico has been governed since 1917 under an organic act adopted by Congress. The projected constitution will make little or no change in the character of the island's government. But it will give Puerto Ricans a measure and symbol of independence which they desired and are entitled to as associates of the United States. The step constitutes, as Secretary of State Acheson observed, "proof of our Government's democratic practice of its democratic faith." A more effective riposte to Soviet yelpings about American imperialism could scarcely be presented to the world. And no doubt it will strengthen the ties that bind Puerto Rico in free devotion to the United States.

Our Transportation System—Good or Bad?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 10 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, on Saturday, June 24, Theodore Granik's American Forum of the Air, in cooperation with Reader's Digest, presented over the National Broadcasting Co. television and radio network a vital and interesting discussion, which has created tremendous interest throughout the transportation world, on our transportation system. The broadcast was based on an article entitled "All the Railroads Want Is a Fair Deal," in the July issue of Reader's Digest. The article was written by John L. Beckley, former Newsweek editor in charge of business reports. The speakers were: Admiral Emory S. Land, president, Air Transport Association of America; Col. Robert S. Henry, vice president, Association of American Railroads; Chester C. Thompson, president, the American Waterways Operators, Inc.; and Walter W. Belson, director of public relations, the American Trucking Associations, Inc.

The Reader's Digest and the National Broadcasting Co. should be highly commended for their great public service in having entered into a cooperative arrangement whereby the American Forum of the Air presents, each month, a program based on one of the magazine's articles. In advance of each broadcast, the Digest prints as part of the article an announcement telling its 50,000,000 readers to tune to their local NBC station, for a discussion of all sides of the issues raised by the article. I have recently appeared in a program based on an article I wrote for the Digest ,and have been immensely gratified by the excellent response to this arrangement. I should like to have the text of the particular broadcast of June 24 placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent to that effect.

I am informed by the Public Printer that this manuscript will make 3½ pages, at a cost of $273.34.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM—GOOD OR BAD?

ANNOUNCER. The National Broadcasting Co. presents The American Forum of the Air, founded 22 years ago by Theodore Granik, and dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues, coming to you from the NBC Theater in Washington, D. C.

Now, here is your moderator, Theodore Granik.

Chairman GRANIK. The current issue of Reader's Digest features an article which has the transportation world all excited. It is entitled "All the Railroads Want Is a Fair Deal," written by John L. Beckley, former Newsweek editor in charge of business reports. I quote from the article:

"What's the matter with the Nation's railroads? Why are they chronically ailing? Is it inefficiency or dry rot? Are they being regulated to death?"

"Contrary to popular belief," continues Mr. Beckley, "they are not dying of old age. They are being slugged insensible by competitors subsidized by the taxpayer. These competitors are skimming the cream off the transportation business,"

The American Forum of the Air in cooperation with Reader's Digest, has therefore invited all these competitors in the transportation business to a round-table discussion. We are pleased to present Admiral Emory S. Land, president, Air Transport Association of America; Robert S. Henry, vice president, Association of American Railroads; Chester C. Thompson, president, the American Waterways Operators, Inc.; and Walter W. Belson, director of public relations, the American Trucking Associations, Inc.

Gentlemen, the article quotes Martin Clement, chairman of the Pennsylvania Railroad, as follows:

"We subsidize the post office so the post office can subsidize the airlines so the airlines can cut their passenger fares and take away our business."

How do you feel about that, Admiral Land?

Admiral LAND. I suggest that Mr. Clement read a paragraph in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman WELCH called the "Great Train Robbery," where he might find out something about 48 or 50 millions dollars a year for the back hall of empty cars. I also suggest that the total air mail subsidy for 10 years equals the post car deficit for 1 year.

So far under the so-called air mail subsidy the users of air mail are the only ones subsidized. Eighty percent of domestic air mail is now carried on a service basis in no way subsidized. Airline subsidy is completely irrevelant with regard to railroad problems and their solution.

Chairman GRANIK. Colonel Henry?

Colonel HENRY. A far more important subsidy to the airlines is not that in the mail. It is in the comparatively free use of very expensive public airports. Here in the city of Washington, for example, there is an airport which cost the taxpayers $23,000,000 to build; it costs them $1,500,000 per year to operate, and they get much less than that, very much less, from all sources, only about $120,000 a year in landing fees from the airlines, who are very largely the principal users of the airport. By contrast you have a railroad station here which cost the taxpayers nothing to build, costs them nothing to maintain, but instead pays $450,000 a year in taxes net to the taxpayers.

Chairman GRANIK. Do you want to comment on that, Admiral Land, before we go on?

Admiral LAND. I have a very brief comment. As far as aircraft cost is concerned, it is pertinent to note that scheduled aircraft account for only 19.8 percent of the total use of airports.

Colonel HENRY. How do you count total use? Each aircraft landing and taking off?

Admiral LAND. Yes.

Colonel HENRY. A Piper Cub then counts just the same as a 42-passenger airliner.

Admiral LAND. That is the use of the airport. That is what it is for.

Colonel HENRY. A rat and a horse.

Mr. BELSON. I don't want to get into that airline thing.

Chairman GRANIK. We will come back to that in a little while.

Mr. BELSON. There is an expression Mr. Beckley used and you quoted with reference to competitors of the railroads skimming the cream off the traffic that I would like to comment on because that is a very catchy phrase. The difficult part of that is that like so many other catchy phrases, it won't stand analysis because one man's cream may be another man's sour milk. I would like to tell you what I mean.

Generally the railroads regard cream traffic as all high-rated traffic, and high-rated traffic is generally value traffic. Not very long ago, in fact last fall, one of Mr. Clement's own officers told the Philadelphia Bond Club that the Pennsylvania Railroad had handled $300,000,000 worth of that cream of traffic the year before and it had cost $350,000,000 to do it, pointing out that it cost them $1.17 for every dollar they took in on that cream of traffic. Here is what it means to the average person, because not everyone understands the economics of railroading. It is a very involved subject. Let's take coal from eastern Tennessee coal fields to Atlanta. The rate on that is $4 a ton approximately. The railroads can haul that coal, as much of the coal as they want to, and make a fortune hauling it. The trucks couldn't begin to haul it. So it is the railroad's cream and the truck's sour milk.

Chairman GRANIK. Let's get back to the railroads a minute. He might want to comment on that sour milk.

Colonel HENRY. Let him finish.

Mr. BELSON. I will round it out and Bob can take both ends. Let's take that millinery which the ladies are interested in, moving back from the Tennessee coal fields. That rate is $4 a hundred or $80 a ton. The trucks can make money on that and deliver it the next morning. It takes the railroads 14 days, but the railroads can't haul that without losing on it. They have always lost on that kind of traffic. So here again is truck's cream and the railroad's sour milk.

Colonel HENRY. There is no doubt that there is business which trucks can handle better than railroads. Our problem in the railroad business is this, though, that through the insistence and encouragement given to our various competitors by the Government they are enabled to hit us in various places where we live. For example, Mr. Thompson's friends on the Waterways take some of the bulky traffic that we could make money on, and we could also make a great deal of money on a great deal of the traffic which goes by trucks, because remember the

average revenues the trucks receive for hauling freight is about five times the average revenue that the railroads receive for hauling the average ton of freight by rail.

Mr. THOMPSON. As a matter of fact, Colonel Henry, what the railroads really want is a monopoly of transportation like they enjoyed in this country from 1890 on through the late 1920's. Isn't that the fact? Isn't that the theme of the entire Beckley article? It should have been headed or entitled "All the Railroads Want Is Another Monopoly," rather than a fair deal.

Colonel HENRY. Oh, that is easy to say, but actually the railroads are perfectly willing to take their full and fair chance in competition with any form of transportation so long as they all stand on their own feet and pay their own way.

Mr. THOMPSON. But, Colonel Henry, as a matter of fact, are the problems and the difficulties of the railroads traceable to competition? Isn't it a fact that the most difficult problems they have to face today revolve around featherbedding and labor union contracts and local taxation, none of which was brought on them by their competitors?

Colonel HENRY. Those are difficult problems, of course, but in meeting the problems we would be in a much better position to meet any problem if we were able to preserve the proper relationship between our costs and our traffic, and that revolves largely around the question of volume. If your competition is able to pick you off wherever there is profit to be made and leave to you the business on which there is no profit to be made—because they don't want that—they are perfectly willing to leave that to us.

Mr. BELSON. That is not strictly true at all. I am sure that I am not question your integrity, Bob, at all, as you know, but that is a very sharp difference of opinion. As far as volume is concerned you are doing now, today, certainly 75 percent more traffic, you are handling more ton-miles than you handled 10 years ago. In 1948 you handled 91 percent more, nearly double your 1939 ton-mile traffic.

Colonel HENRY. Yes. That is true.

Mr. BELSON. So you are not losing any volume to the trucks appreciably. You are again steadily gaining. All you are losing is your relative motion. I am inclined to go along with what my friend says here to the effect that what is disturbing the railroads is not the loss of business so much as the loss of monopoly which they once enjoyed. You have all the business you can handle.

Chairman GRANIK. You are bubbling with a question, Admiral.

Admiral LAND. Doesn't the subject of the complaint of rails have a hollow ring because the taxpayers are called upon to subsidize the rails in their passenger business which is run at a loss by increased rates on freight which is run at a profit?

Colonel HENRY. Why the taxpayers? What have they to do with it? The taxpayer don't give us a dime. They take it from us.

Admiral LAND. They pay all your revenue.

Colonel HENRY. The taxpayers?

Admiral LAND. They certainly do.

Mr. THOMPSON. But the shippers in communities in areas where there is no competition also pay a subsidy to the railroads because the railroad's policy traditionally has been to charge all the traffic will bear and still retain the traffic.

Colonel HENRY. Then what is the situation of the poor shipper in a situation where he is not able to take advantage of the so-called cheap water transportation? After all the water lines reach only about a certain percentage. I don't know just what——

Mr. THOMPSON. That is true, but the savings in transportation costs that are afforded by water transportation reflect themselves over the entire Nation, and everyone benefits by it. We are talking about—you mentioned something, Colonel Henry, about the cream of the crop or taking off the cream. That whole milk is mighty weak because inland water transportation can only handle an average of less than 4 percent of the total ton-miles of freight traffic in the United States from 1939 through 1948. That was pretty weak stuff that they started from.

Colonel HENRY. The inland water lines handled last year about 7½ percent as much traffic as the railroads. That doesn't sound like much, but remember that the inland waterways only have 10 percent of the mileage of the railroads. So that 7½ percent was concentrated in 10 percent of the mileage. To the particular railroads involved it was a very serious situation. It didn't mean much to some of the others.

Mr. THOMPSON. In using those figures do you consider the volume of freight that the railroads themselves handled by water transportation?

Colonel HENRY. I don't know. I am speaking now of the total handled. I don't know how much the railroads handled.

Mr. THOMPSON. On the Atlantic Coast alone in 1947, according to the official figures, the railroads handled better than 30 percent of the total water traffic.

Colonel HENRY. Inland?

Mr. THOMPSON. Harbors or inland, just as much as rivers or anything else.

Chairman GRANIK. Let's hear from the truckers a moment. Go ahead, sir.

Mr. BELSON. I would like to go back to that subsidy thing when I let Bob slide in there a few minutes ago without interruption, because it is one of those things that becomes another catch phrase. The trucks are subsidies? I don't know what his authority for it is. There has been only one definitive study of subsidy made in this country and that was by Joe Eastman, an unbiased study. Of course the railroads have made several studies since but they come in the classification of that unbiased viewpoint on the Civil War from the Southern standpoint arrangement. They made their own. Those aren't worth very much in our opinion. We have never made one because we don't think one under our own auspices is so good. But Joe Eastman made one and his study, the work of many years and an exhaustive analysis of the whole highway situation, and the railroad situation, too, discovered that the railroads have been subsidized but that highway transportation is not subsidized.

Colonel HENRY. Do you remember the basis on which he arrived at the conclusion that highway transportation was not subsidized?

Mr. BELSON. You mean the partial allocation of highway expenses?

Colonel HENRY. Yes. How many billion dollars did the study prepared for Mr. Eastman say had been spent on highways between 1921 and 1937, the period covered?

Mr. BELSON. I think roughly—I don't recall exactly, approximately 40.

Colonel HENRY. Forty and a half. How much of that had been paid by the motor vehicle users of the highways?

Mr. BELSON. Do you intend now to qualify as an expert to discuss Joe Eastman's study and want me to qualify in rebuttal?

Colonel HENRY. If it is going to be brought in I might as well discuss it.

Mr. BELSON. Do you want to discuss the findings? Do you dispute Mr. Eastman's findings?

Colonel HENRY. I am trying to help this audience see the line of reasoning by which the findings were arrived at.

Mr. BELSON. Let's not do that.

Colonel HENRY. Just answer my question. How much money was paid in by the motor vehicle users in that same 17 years? Twenty-five and a half billion was spent on the highways in that period according to the study. How much of that was paid by the motor vehicle users?

Mr. BELSON. Let me counter with the remark that until the advent of the motor vehicle 100 percent of everything spent on all roads was spent by nonvehicle owners.

Colonel HENRY. Yes, indeed, and a great many roads had been built.

Mr. BELSON. I don't want to go into the innards of Mr. Eastman's study.

Colonel HENRY. Let's don't bring it in unless we are willing to stand on it and discuss it. I didn't bring it in.

Admiral LAND. I would like to get in a blow below the belt there on this subsidy question. I want to quote for the benefit of the distinguished FFV from Virginia the statement on the President's Air Policy Board which said on this airways system at least 90 percent of it could be charged to national defense.

As long as I have the floor for a moment, it might be a pious idea for all forms of transportation to stop criticizing their competitors and improve their own service to passengers. This particularly, is true with regard to rails. People who liye in glass houses shouldn't throw stones and for God's sake pull down the blinds. [Applause.]

Colonel HENRY. I still want an answer to my question.

Chairman GRANIK. Mr. Belson.

Mr. BELSON. I still say, Colonel Henry, I have no qualifications——

Colonel HENRY. I will answer the question.

Mr. BELSON. If you don't mind my being impertinent and I don't mean to be, sir, I doubt very much that a study as comprehensive as Mr. Eastman's can be dissected by any of us here tonight.

Colonel HENRY. We are discussing a very large subject in a very short time. That is the reason I was hoping you will answer the question promptly. I will now answer it for you. Twenty-five billion five hundred million dollars was spent on the highways in that period of 17 years, of which ten and three-fourths billion dollars was paid by the motor vehicle users. The only way in which the study arrived at a conclusion that they were more than paying their way was that they assigned to motor vehicle users 40 and a fraction percent and said that the other 60 percent of the cost of improvements of highways, plus all the cost of right-of-way, plus all the cost of everything spent before 1921, should be assigned to the general taxpayers.

Mr. BELSON. Do you quarrel with that?

Colonel HENRY. Yes; I do.

Mr. BELSON. Why?

Colonel HENRY. I am a taxpayer.

Mr. BELSON. Aren't you a beneficiary of highways, whether or not you drive a car? Don't you get your mail delivered? As a matter of fact, Colonel, where do you live in town here?

Colonel HENRY. I live in Alexandria.

Mr. BELSON. Is your home served by railroad or any other form of transportation than highway?

Colonel HENRY. There are railroads all over Alexandria.

Mr. BELSON. But they don't bring you coal and food and move your household goods.

Colonel HENRY. Certainly not, but they put it within reach of the people who do bring it.

Mr. BELSON. Do they give you fire and police protection?

Colonel HENRY. But we pay for that by our tax system.

Mr. BELSON. Part of those taxes go for the highways which make that kind of protection possible. They do it for everybody else.

Chairman GRANIK. We will get back to the waterways. Go ahead, Mr. Thompson.

Mr. THOMPSON. I just want to stress that what the railroads want is a monopoly of transportation. Their entire propaganda has been fed to the public for the last fifteen or twenty years has been directed toward monopoly, and they advocate all kinds of synthetic restrictions on all of their competitors for the sole purpose of increasing the cost of

competitive transportation so there will be no competitors after that. That is the whole philosophy of the railroad campaign.

Mr. HENRY. What does water transportation cost, Mr. Thompson?

Mr. THOMPSON. You mean cost?

Colonel HENRY. Not the rate; the cost.

Mr. THOMPSON. The cost is much lower to the shipper and to the general public than rail transportation or any other, else it would not be so successful as it is; and it does not, Colonel Henry, in any manner adversely affect the railroads. In areas of this country where water transportation is of the heaviest density, the railroads likewise enjoy the heaviest freight traffic in the world.

Colonel HENRY. I am not speaking now of its effect upon the railroads. I am speaking of its effect upon that poor unwitting and sometimes unwilling goat, the American taxpayer. What does it cost the taxpayer to provide so-called cheap water transportation?

Mr. THOMPSON. It doesn't cost the taxpayer anything because the taxpayer benefits by low-cost water transportation, the same as the railroads benefit in the harbors and in the areas where they operate car ferries and other floating plants.

Colonel HENRY. If water transportation is so economical, why is it that the people in that business are so unwilling to pay for the cost of the facilities which are provided for them and maintained for them at public expense and at very heavy public expense?

Mr. THOMPSON. The facilities you are talking about are not provided exclusively for water transportation. Everyone in the Nation benefits by it. The national defense aspects, recreation, water supply for communities and for industry all benefit by it. You and the organization you so ably represent would saddle that entire cost upon your competitor, water transportation, and it is inequitable, it is unfair, and in my opinion the American people will never stand for it.

Colonel HENRY. Do you think the people of this country benefit by having railroads?

Mr. THOMPSON. Oh, certainly, and the Government of the United States provided a lot of property for them in the form of land grants many years ago.

Colonel HENRY. For which the railroads paid back the Government in reduced rates on Government freight and passengers over a period of many, many years about ten times the value of the land which the Government granted them.

Mr. BELSON. There are a few clinkers in that, Bob, that haven't been brought to popular attention.

Chairman GRANIK. Go ahead and bring out the clinkers.

Mr. BELSON. I was looking over a little law case up in the Northwest where the Government had made a complaint against a railroad, charging that in selling the land-grant property which they got free from the Government——

Colonel HENRY. Free? Don't say "free."

Mr. BELSON. I will take it your way—which they got from the Government free initially, in selling that land or in leasing that land, they have inserted what they call a traffic clause which is a neat little device that requires that just so long as that land is used for business or agriculture or any other purpose, every bit of property coming into that land or going out of that land goes over that named railroad. That is the charge. There is another little trick in connection with the selling of that land that is very interesting, and I would like you to answer this. Isn't it true that while the railroads may have sold some of this land-grant property for a named price which you used in your calculation to produce the 10 to 1, that they reserved mineral rights?

Colonel HENRY. They might have.

Mr. BELSON. They have, according to the Department of Justice.

Colonel HENRY. That is not the price that I mentioned. The price I mentioned was the price established in Mr. Eastman's study.

Mr. BELSON. It could not, of course, comprehend the value of undiscovered and undisclosed oil, because that land now is discovered to contain coal and lead and iron and oil and a great many other minerals.

Mr. THOMPSON. Worth possibly hundreds of millions of dollars.

Admiral LAND. I would like to get another potshot at this railroad friend of mine here.

Chairman GRANIK. You seem to be taking those potshots.

Colonel HENRY. This seems to be a battle royal.

Mr. THOMPSON. He is an able fellow. He can take it. Don't shed any tears over the Colonel. He is no green hand.

Admiral LAND. The railroads are static; the air is dynamic. In the last 10 years airline ton-mile costs have been reduced 17 percent; railroad passenger train mile costs have increased 63 percent. A thorough house-cleaning is therefore essential with regard to railroad contracts with labor, in which there is entirely too much featherbedding. We in the air transport industry do not want to get into bed with you on this type of contract in our industry.

Chairman GRANIK. Do you want to answer that potshot or make a statement about that?

Colonel HENRY. We will just let that one ride.

Mr. BELSON. Let's see if we can come at this from another angle. Colonel, I would like to ask you a question. Although it took the railroads a very long time to make joint rates and joint routes with each other, I guess until the early part of this century, although they had been going since 1830, more or less, why don't the railroads make joint rates with bus lines, with trucks, airlines, and waterways? Why don't you make joint rates and joint routes and joint accommodations with other forms of transport?

Colonel HENRY. It is my impression that we do make joint rates and routes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes; they make them. The Interstate Commerce Commission ordered them to make them, and they have taken the Interstate Commerce Commission and all water transport into the Supreme Court of the United States to keep from making them. That is how they are making them.

Colonel HENRY. It is my impression that we are required to make them, and our share is 20 percent less than it would be if we handled the business on our own account, but I am not a rate expert.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Belson, people who are attempting to establish a monopoly don't want to share their business with anybody.

Mr. BELSON. I think so. I would agree with that. But so that the people generally who are listening understand exactly what is meant by joint rates, you can take a shipment now on the New York Central, say, from New York, and it will be passed on to the lines of three or four other railroads if necessary, and the passenger can do the same thing. Eventually the shipment gets out to the coast on an original bill of lading on the New York Central, say, but all you have to see is the one railroad. But the trucks are not included in that scheme by the railroads, so you cannot send a package now from New York or any place else in the country which will be part way by rail and then part way by truck, except in those places where the rails do have a hired truck line. The only thing the rails will do, as I understand it, with possibly a slight exception here and there, Colonel, is maintain a master and servant relationship, which I think goes to the line of your thinking, Chet.

Mr. THOMPSON. Certainly. They want to keep it in the family, Walter.

Chairman GRANIK. Let the Colonel answer that.

Mr. BELSON. I am addressing that to the Colonel.

Colonel HENRY. I don't know any particular reason why any line of business should give up its business to any other line of business just for the pleasure of it.

Mr. BELSON. Couldn't you do a lot of your business cheaper? Look, you are losing money, and admittedly so, on a good deal of your branch-line business—passenger and freight. Suppose that you were to haul people to Chicago, let's say, from the main metropolitan area, and then if they have to go on a branch line, send that party out by a bus which is now serving that community, or send the package out by a truck line which is serving that community, and do it all at one time?

Admiral LAND. Or by airplane.

Mr. BELSON. Or send them by air, if you can.

Colonel HENRY. Of course a great deal of that sort of thing is done.

Mr. BELSON. Not under the relationship that I am mentioning, that I know of.

Colonel HENRY. There is no particular reason why it should be done on any particular sort of relationship. It is done as a business arrangement.

Mr. BELSON. You don't do it with truck lines like you do it with other railroads.

Colonel HENRY. Why should we?

Mr. BELSON. Because you do it for your own benefit. When two railroads make an interline arrangement, it is for the benefit of each, including the originating line.

Colonel HENRY. We use truck lines where it is to our benefit to do so.

Mr. BELSON. On a master-and-servant relation.

Colonel HENRY. That is just language, master and servant.

Mr. BELSON. I don't think it is just language.

Mr. THOMPSON. I would like to ask Colonel Henry how healthy the railroads were 25 or 30 years ago when they had no competition, when there was no modern transportation, when the airplane had not been adapted to commercial use, and when there were no busses and no trucks. Practically the entire railroad system was bankrupt then. There were receiverships. Several of the major railroads were in receivership. They were still crying that they weren't getting enough money, that they were having difficulties. Now they have competition, and all at once they swing it around and say, "Our competitors are causing all of our troubles."

Colonel HENRY. I at least never said and I don't know any responsible railroad man who does say that all our troubles are due to competitors. Every business has troubles, and it is part of the business of every business to meet those troubles. But the difficult point is that we are expected to be self-supporting, truly tax-paying, paying taxes which don't go to support railroad roadbeds but which go to support schools and fire departments and these other things you speak of. We are expected to be truly self-supporting, truly taxpaying, to pay our own way, to meet our own costs, terminal costs are well as road costs, and to compete with very important and very able and very fine transportation systems that are not subject to that same rigorous requirement.

Mr. BELSON. Then, Colonel, it amounts to this: It is not economic, but your feelings are hurt.

Colonel HENRY. My feelings are of no great consequence, but my point——

Mr. BELSON. Your corporate feelings.

Colonel HENRY. Nor our corporate feelings. They don't count. The point is that it is uneconomic to the American people that the

public is paying more for its transportation than it would have to pay, not in rates but in taxes. After all, the biggest item of expense of every family and every business in America these days is taxes. Things that increase taxes should be scrutinized carefully, and the relative savings and other things, if you could reduce taxes, would be a great deal more than in other fields.

Mr. THOMPSON. You might reduce taxes if the Nation adopted the program of the Association of American Railroads, but you wouldn't reduce freight rates. It doesn't make any difference to Mr. John Q. Public whether he spends his money for taxes or freight rates. He certainly would pay more in higher freight rates than he does pay in taxes if you fellows had the monopoly that you are seeking.

Chairman GRANIK. Admiral Land, do you want to get a word in there?

Admiral LAND. Fools step in where angels fear to tread. I want to make one suggestion, again to the FFV here. The real difficulty with the rails is not lack of business, because the more business you get, the more money you make. It is the lack of ability to translate business into profit.

Chairman GRANIK. Colonel, do you want to comment on that?

Colonel HENRY. Of course that isn't quite correct. We are not translating business into profits, I am sorry to say, not as much profit as we should. On the other hand, it is not true that the more business we get, the more money we lose. That is the very essence of the railroad business. The more tons you can put in a car, the more cars you can put on a train, the more trains you can put on a track, the more passengers you carry in a train, the more money you make.

Admiral LAND. Is that true of passengers over the last few years?

Colonel HENRY. Oh, yes.

Admiral LAND. That isn't according to my railroad statistics.

Mr. THOMPSON. That isn't the way the Interstate Commerce Commission says it.

Mr. BELSON. That isn't the way less-than-carload business shapes up, either. You have more less-than-carloads than you had 25 years ago.

Colonel HENRY. We have a great deal heavier operating expenses than we had 25 years ago.

Mr. BELSON. That is something else.

Colonel HENRY. But if we had less passenger business than we have, we would lose more money than we are not now losing, if you get what I mean.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is clear. I understand that.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

You have been listening to a discussion, Our Transportation System—Good or Bad? Our speakers have been Admiral Emory S. Land, president, Air Transport Association of America; Col. Robert S. Henry, vice-president, Association of American Railroads; Chester C. Thompson, president, the American Waterways Operators, Inc., and Walter W. Belson, director of public relations, the American Trucking Associations, Inc.

ANNOUNCER. For reprints of this discussion, send 10 cents to Ransdell, Inc., printers and publishers, Washington 18, D. C. That is 10 cents to R-a-n-s-d-e-l-l, Ransdell, Inc., Washington 18, D. C.

Join us again next week at this time for a discussion on the vital question, Is the Constitution a Modern Instrument of Government? Our speakers will be Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota.

The American Forum of the Air, founded and moderated by Theodore Granik, has been presented as a public service by the National Broadcasting Co. and has come to you from Washington, D. C.

This is John Batchelder speaking.

Addresses Made by Vice President Barkley; George Killion, President of the American President Lines; and T. H. Bossert, President of New York Shipbuilding Co., at Launching of the Steamship "President Jackson" of the American President Lines at New York Shipbuilding Co., Camden, N. J., Tuesday, June 27, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the addresses delivered at the exercises incident to the launching of the steamship *President Jackson*, of the American President Lines, at the New York Shipbuilding Co., Camden, N. J., on Tuesday, June 27, 1950, were of a character to emphasize the importance of constructing and maintaining an efficient and adequate merchant marine, and likewise the absolute necessity of continuing at all times that skilled force of workers, without which this Nation would be in a serious way in the event of war emergency. The addresses were delivered by Vice President Barkley; George T. Killion, president of the American President Lines; and Thomas H. Bossert, president of the New York Shipbuilding Co. I have included them as part of my remarks, in accordance with the unanimous consent granted to me:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE ALBEN W. BARKLEY AT THE LAUNCHING OF THE STEAMSHIP "PRESIDENT JACKSON," CAMDEN, N. J., ON JUNE 27, 1950

We are witnessing today the launching of the steamship *President Jackson*, one of six passenger vessels placed under construction under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which sets forth as our national maritime policy the development and maintenance of a merchant marine adequate for the needs of both trade and defense.

The 1936 act, as you know, provides for placing American owners and operators of merchant vessels on a par with their foreign competitors. It costs more to build ships in this country and operate them under the American flag. Therefore, the Government makes up the disparity in construction and operating costs to insure enough ships to carry a substantial portion of the waterborne export and import commerce of the United States and to serve as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency.

These new ships, therefore, will correct a serious deficiency in the American merchant marine—lack of passenger lift, and, more important, lack of troop lift in case of war.

Two other vessels like this are scheduled to go down the ways at Camden in the next 6 months. All three will join the round-the-world fleet of American President Lines.

At Quincy, Mass., two large passenger vessels are under construction for the Mediterranean service of American Export Lines. One of them was launched on June 3, and the other is scheduled to be launched in about 3 months.

At Newport News, Va., a great superliner, rated at 48,000 gross tons—the largest commercial vessel ever laid down in this country—is taking form on the ways. This ship, which will carry 2,000 passengers in the North Atlantic service of United States Lines, will equal the fastest trans-Atlantic schedules, making the crossing in about 4 days. She is expected to be launched next April, and will go into service a year later.

These six passenger liners are part of a postwar shipbuilding program inaugurated by the former United States Maritime Commission, now supplanted by the Maritime Administration and Federal Maritime Board in the Department of Commerce.

There are three reasons why we need more passenger ships under the American flag:

First, because we do not have enough ships to meet the demand for passenger service. In 1939 we had 127 passenger ships. Today we have only 49. Even with these six new ships in service, our fleet will have a passenger-carrying capacity of less than 50 percent of the capacity of the 1939 fleet.

Second, because we must provide ourselves with enough troopships to meet any national emergency. We must have more ships immediately so that troops can be carried to any part of the world to protect the democratic way of living. Our present lack of passenger vessels, and consequently of sufficient troop-lift potential, is due largely to the fact that no passenger ships were built during World War II. The six ships now under construction will help this situation, but they are by no means the complete answer. The armed services have estimated that we need about 50 new passenger ships in all, with troop-carrying capacity of 2,000 to 10,000 each, to overcome the present deficiency in the troop-lift capacity of our merchant ships and military transports combined.

Third, because we must keep up our shipbuilding plant and shipbuilding and ship-repair skills. To provide against a possible future national emergency, we must have the operating construction and repair yards and a good nucleus of trained and experienced personnel in them, from which to expand to a wartime level of production. The President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine stated its opinion in 1947 that it would be a matter of national concern if the number of men actually engaged in the construction of vessels in private and naval shipyards should drop below 60,000. Now there are less than 35,000 employed in commercial and naval yards on construction. We are faced with immediate prospect of further reduction of employment in commercial yards due to lack of new construction. This year there are under construction or on order throughout the world a total of 882 vessels, only 28 of which are being built in American shipyards. Included in that total of 882 are 134 passenger-carrying vessels of 1,211,624 gross tons. Only 6 of these, of 129,500 gross tons, are being built in American yards. All six will be completed by the spring of 1951, except for the superliner, which is scheduled for delivery in the spring of 1952.

We are far from parity in the passenger ship field compared to other nations. At the present time we have only one modern passenger vessel—the steamship *America*—in operation in the all-important North Atlantic service between here and channel ports in Europe. The present dependence on foreign shipping is humiliating to the American people. Foreign-flag ships—British, Dutch, French—are carrying the bulk of the trade. This pitiful situation of our merchant marine fleet is due to the foolish policy of indifference on the part of the American people to the expansion and development of our fleet in the time of peace. We well remember two times within our generation when we had to rush feverishly to get ready for emergencies cast upon us. If one

life can be saved by being prepared let us be prepared.

The steamship *President Jackson*, her sister ship on the ways at Camden, and the three other passenger vessels now under construction under the postwar shipbuilding program, are worthy additions to the American-flag fleet. All are of the most modern and advanced design, offering speed, comfort, and safety unsurpassed by the ships of any flag on the high seas. Modern developments in vessel design, engineering, and navigating features insure dependability and safety.

Important also are the special provisions which have been made for rapid conversion of these vessels to troop-transport status should the need arise. The reliability of special features of design and engineering so valuable for commercial operation will be doubly important to wartime operation of the ships.

With such vessels as the *President Jackson*, the American flag will regain its rightful place on the high seas. This vessel will carry our flag around the globe, taking it into ports where it will be greeted as a symbol of the power of democracy to bring peace and order to a troubled world.

RÉSUMÉ OF REMARKS BY GEORGE KILLION, PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN PRESIDENT LINES, AT THE LAUNCHING OF THE "PRESIDENT JACKSON" AT THE NEW YORK SHIPBUILDING CORP. YARD, CAMDEN, N. J., JUNE 27, 1950

At the outset Mr. Killion mentioned the names of the many honored guests who are attending today's launching. These included Alben W. Barkley, Vice-President of the United States; Mrs. Barkley, sponsor of the ship; Italian Ambassador Alberto Tarkiani; Ceylon Ambassador Corea; Indonesia Ambassador Sastromajojo; George G. Sharp, designer of the *President Jackson*; Under Secretary of the Navy Dan A. Kimball; Rear Adm. William Callaghan, Commander, Military Seas Transport Service; Rear Adm. C. D. Wheelock, Chief of the Bureau of Ships, United States Navy; Vice Adm. Merlin O'Neill, Commandant, United States Coast Guard; Rear Adm. Halert C. Shepheard, Chief of the Merchant Vessel Inspection Division, United States Coast Guard; Brig. Gen. Paul F. Yount, Commander of the New York Port of Embarkation; Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation; Rear Adm. Paul L. Mather, member of Federal Maritime Board; South Trimble, Jr., member of Federal Maritime Board; Capt. Lucius A. Chapel, aide to John Koehler, Acting Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board and Assistant Secretary of the Navy; Vice Adm. W. W. Smith, former Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission; Joseph K. Carson, former member of the United States Maritime Commission; David Coddaire, former member of the United States Maritime Commission; Leslie L. Biffle, Secretary of the United States Senate.

The following Members of Congress were also present: Representative HERBERT C. BONNER, North Carolina; Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN, Alabama; Representative JOHN F. SHELLEY, California; Representative JOHN J. ALLEN, JR., California; Representative EDGAR A. JONAS, Illinois; Representative CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, New Jersey; Representative CHARLES R. HOWELL, New Jersey.

Mr. Killion said:

"This magnificent new vessel we are to launch is to be named for President Andrew Jackson, whose courage and progressive philosophy have been a source of encouragement to the millions of Americans who have helped to build this great Nation.

"In that same progressive spirit we have now embarked on a program of building a modern merchant marine.

"We have resolved to engage in a new shipbuilding program with full knowledge that a vast fleet of new vessels are being constructed in other lands to operate under flags that forced most of our merchant vessels from the sea lanes soon after the termination of World War I.

"As all of you know, the result was detrimental to the interests of the Nation, to labor, and to industry.

"More than the economic welfare of the Nation is involved now, for all of us realize that the world leadership that has been thrust upon us, carries with it the responsibility of assuring that sea lanes are maintained to the ports of all free nations. A large part of that responsibility must be shouldered by the American merchant marine.

"In discharging that responsibility we must assure that the world's raw materials and manufactured products will be borne peacefully to and from other free countries, thus providing the most important single factor that will keep those nations free.

"In that undertaking we are backed by President Truman, the Congress, by labor, and by the many diversified interests that are essential to the well being of the Nation. We confidently expect the continuation of that support. The *President Jackson* constitutes the initial contribution of the American President Lines to that program.

"Two sister ships, the *President Adams* and the *President Hayes*, are being rushed to completion on adjoining ways and will join the *President Jackson* in the near future. They will be operated on the round-the-world route and will be followed by four others now in the planning stage.

"Although the *President Jackson* will carry cargo on a high-speed schedule, she is essentially a passenger vessel, affording every luxury the art of modern shipbuilding can devise. Thousands of men and women will be safely transported to 30 ports of 17 nations all over the world. I trust that this magnificent ship will bring them many days of comfort, relaxation, and joy.

"This ship is exceptionally well constructed to fulfill that wish, and is a great credit to the fine artisans and engineers who have created her and who maintain the enviable reputation of her builders, the New York Shipbuilding Corp.

"Upon completion the *President Jackson* will be manned by seamen who will carry on the fine traditions that have been handed down since the days of John Paul Jones. May it always be for them a happy ship. It should be a happy ship, for ship and crew will symbolize the renaissance of the American merchant marine.

"Although the *President Jackson* is intended for peace, her design is such that she may be quickly converted into a vessel of war. She will serve us well, whatever the future may have in store for the people of the United States.

"May God grant her a long and a useful life.

"It is altogether fitting that Vice President BARKLEY and his gracious lady should be with us today, for he clearly exemplifies the high ideals and progressive spirit of Andrew Jackson whose name this great new ship will carry throughout her long and illustrious life."

RÉSUMÉ OF REMARKS BY T. H. BOSSERT, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK SHIPBUILDING CORP., AT THE LAUNCHING OF THE "PRESIDENT JACKSON," CAMDEN, N. J., JUNE 27, 1950

Mr. Vice President, Mrs. Barkley, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, we welcome you to New York Ship for the christening of the steamship *President Jackson*, the first of the new round-the-world luxury liners for the American President Lines.

"Old Hickory" would be proud of this ship bearing his name. He was noted for his common touch and common sense. And it's certainly just plain common sense for this country to build ships that can serve us equally well in war and peace. The *President Jackson* is that kind of ship. We hope she spends her life in the peaceful pursuits of foreign trade. But if the occasion arises, with a minimum of conversion, she can carry our troops speedily and safely to any corner of the world.

We congratulate Mr. Killion, president of the American President Lines, for his courage in initiating this first postwar program under conditions incident to unfavorable construction and operational subsidies. It is essential the American people and the Congress realize that the building and operation of ships is as necessary and vital in peacetime as in war.

We are proud of this addition to our American merchant marine. However, as she slides down the way, shortly to be followed by her two sister ships, we have a feeling, may I say, of frustration, for, short of a national emergency, these ways from which ships have glided to fight in two world wars will never again be used to launch ships. Without new work, by this time next year all ways in this yard will be empty and employment at an all-time low. In effect, the entire industry is being permitted to slowly die on the vine. Why, you may ask? The answer is simple. Instead of taking advantage of the experiences gained through two world wars, we wait until we are in a jam, hoping to muddle through. The results are wasted—manpower, waste of the taxpayers' money. We are poor housekeepers, for we fail in our peacetime economy to provide for a modern merchant fleet.

In 1939 our passenger fleet, while some 126 vessels, only had a capacity of 40,000. Our present passenger fleet (including the 6 new ships now building) numbers only 59 vessels with a capacity of 20,000. Many are 25 years or older, relatively obsolete, inefficient, and with outmoded slow-speed propulsion. They are not capable of future requirements and would be prey to the modern submarine.

We should be independent of presumed allies for carrying our troops in case of war. Our past war bills paid to foreign lines for carrying our troops would stagger you. As an example, we paid about a million dollars per trip for the *Queens* alone. Today, ECA reports foreign yards have received from us $104,000,000, in indirect aid alone. If the present situation in the Far East would require the use of our troops, we would again have sold ourselves short. This is not preparedness. This is not economy.

A little over 50 years ago, the present site of this yard was a farm, a few pigs, chickens, one or two cows. Oh, yes, I am told there was also a strawberry patch. No doubt the owners at that time were glad to get rid of such a liability. Times have changed. Farms now are of a certain importance.

Do we want to see this vast plant with its modern facilities idle, its skilled and trained craftsmen who have given the best of their lives to the building of ships confronted with perennial unemployment? Do we want to return all this to the farm, the cows, and chickens? The answer is, "No."

Then it is up to all patriotic American citizens, the administration, and the Congress to see that this does not happen here or elsewhere. We must continue to build more *President Jacksons*, proud and fine ships to carry America and Americans to the rest of the world in peace. This is the only way we can accomplish all that is expected of us if there be war.

Thank you.

Did You Happen To Hear Representative Dewey Short?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald:

DID YOU HAPPEN TO HEAR REPRESENTATIVE DEWEY SHORT?

The buzzing in the House of Representatives stops when DEWEY SHORT stands up. He is one of the best orators on the Hill. He has a golden voice, a trigger-quick mind, an elephantine memory, a neat, a very neat, phrase-making ability, a nimble wit.

He can pour the small acid of sarcasm as deftly as a surgeon and he can roll out the big cannon of thunderous direct attack.

He can also be funny.

On June 15, 1948, Mr. Congressman Sirovich, of New York, was backing a bill to create a Bureau of Fine Arts—cost to the taxpayers, $40,000,000—at a time when there were 12,000,000 unemployed.

Up rose DEWEY SHORT.

He spoke of art.

Dreamily, he told of his love for the waltzes of Chopin, the operas of Wagner, the symphonies of Beethoven, until the House floor became a moonlit garden.

But, said he suddenly, "God knows I have never enjoyed even Puccini on an empty stomach." And, said he, who could be expected to appreciate Mendelssohn with the seat of his pants out?

And DEWEY SHORT proceeded to do a little toe dance.

What happened to the Sirovich bill? Well, we still haven't got a Bureau of Fine Arts.

DEWEY SHORT, only Republican Representative from Missouri, comes from the Ozarks, where, says he, "people are rugged individualists, Republicans, of course—not like the lowland Democrat farmers who used to be slaveholders."

He has worked hard all his life.

He has traveled far and studied much.

He was graduated from Baker University, he served in the Infantry in World War I, he took further degrees from Boston University and he studied at Harvard, Berlin, Heidelberg, and Oxford universities. He taught psychology and philosophy at Southwestern College—in 1 year he raised $1,500,000 for the college's endowment fund—and for one summer he was pastor of Grace Methodist Church in Springfield, Mo.

He was first elected to Congress in 1928.

When he starts waving his arms and o'rating he can out-Webster Dan'l himself, can our DEWEY. He can put the fear of God into the administration, whether quoting Edwin Markham: "I fear the vermin that shall undermine Senate and school and citadel and shrine," or telling his own version of the lessons of history: "Egypt, as you grew rich and powerful, you grew corrupt and tyrannical; Babylon, too, could not endure prosperity; Greece, rich and powerful, became weak and corrupt; Rome, mother of dead empires, broke on the rocks of materialism, selfishness and greed; will this great Republic of ours go the same road?" Oh, he rocks them, does our DEWEY.

But good Georgia Democrat CARL VINSON once called DEWEY SHORT "the most highly beloved man I have ever known."

Death, Hiding in the Cloak of Neglect, Fells Six More Maintenance Workmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the July 1950 issue of railway journal of the Brotherhood of Maintenance-of-Way Employees, regarding the tragedy which took the lives of six maintenance-of-way employees:

DEATH, HIDING IN THE CLOAK OF NEGLECT, FELLS SIX MORE MAINTENANCE WORKMEN

April 24, 1950, could properly be named Disaster Day on the Norfolk & Western Railroad. It will long be remembered by the citizens of Kimball, W. Va., who witnessed train No. 24, on that fateful morning, emerging from the tunnel with the mangled bodies of dead maintenance-of-way employees draping the front end of the locomotive. The accident which resulted in the death of five bridge and building employees, and serious injury to the sixth, occurred inside the tunnel when their track motorcar was struck by the eastbound train. The injured member of the crew died a short time later.

The disaster, described as one of the worst of its kind in the territory, occurred shortly after 7 a. m., while the crew was en route to the location where work was to be performed. Due to the fact that the eastbound track had been under repairs for several days, passenger trains were switched to the westbound track at Kimball; consequently, the train was running against the current of traffic when it struck the motorcar on a curve in the tunnel. It was reported that Foreman Houchins called the Eckman yard before he and the crew started on their ill-fated trip. According to informed sources, he was given a clear signal and told to proceed on the westbound track, but a few moments later the collision occurred.

Newspaper headlines screamed their gruesome stories, but sealed lips refused to admit the neglect that resulted in the wholesale massacre of this bridge and building crew. While no official statement was made at the time of these press releases, it is hoped that the guilty conscience of those responsible will eventually force a confession. Since it was definitely established that the foreman was instructed to proceed on the westward track, and the train was also given orders to use this track, it is evident that someone in authority is responsible for the accident.

It is our sincere hope that when an official investigation is conducted by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the findings and recommendations will not be the usual report—"failure to provide adequate protection for track motorcars"—but that definite evidence of neglect will be shown to the extent that those responsible will be required to answer.

Here is a case where an entire bridge and building crew, with the exception of one member, was compelled to meet death within the dark recess of the tunnel through no fault of their own. It cannot be said that there was a violation of the operating rules by the members of the crew. We hope that the dead men will not be compelled to shoulder the responsibility for their own death. The one member of the crew, C. E. Kitts, was saved only by a miracle—he did not report for work that morning, but suffered the agony of identifying his dead comrades. Graves now mark the resting place of Foreman Henry Houchins, J. B. Arthur, H. I. Rickman, L. G. Cochran, W. E. Lambert, and Thomas J. Bowles. The total number of maintenance of way employees killed by motorcar accidents during the past 6 years is now 59, but is this the end of human slaughter?

There will be no peace of mind for those responsibile for the deaths, for they deserve none. Unless they come forward and admit their guilt, they will be tortured by voices from the graves. No heart-rending cries, no agonizing sobs will be heard, only confess, confess, confess!

United States Survey Mission to the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Manila Bulletin and Manila Chronicle of Saturday, July 1, with reference to the United States Survey Mission to the Philippines. I am particularly pleased to include these editorials which speak so well of the record made by our distinguished Ambassador to the Philippines, Myron M. Cowen:

[From the Manila Bulletin]

THE SURVEY MISSION

Things are happening to the Philippines more important perhaps to the future of the nation than the war in Korea. President Truman's formal announcement about the economic survey mission is one of them. It could mean a grat deal to the Philippines—or it could mean another report that will gather dust in the files with nothing ever done about it. That depends to a large extent on the Philippine Government.

Ambassador Cowen in his talk at the Harvard Club last night gave the most detailed explanation we have had so far of what the mission will undertake to do. It will make a minute study of the economic structure and its relation to social problems here and will find out how the United States can best assist the Philippines. This country is under no compulsion to accept the report, or the assistance. It is offered in the spirit of neighborly aid and counsel, quite sincerely.

Heading the mission is a man who commands a great deal of respect in the United States, Daniel W. Bell, banker, economist and former Government official in the Treasury Department. His opinion carries weight in Congress and in the rest of the Government. It is evident that he accepted the job with some reluctance. He did not seek it out but had to be prevailed upon to take it. He is probably fully acquainted with the thankless nature of a broad task of that kind.

For there is a very definite psychological stumbling block in the whole procedure of sending a mission from one country to another to find out, essentially, what's wrong with the country of reception. There is a long history of such missions from the United States to the Philippines, and a great deal

of report material is gathering dust to this day because perhaps it was phrased in a way that caused resentment or antagonism or because it was politically unpalatable to those in authority here.

And then again there is a heavily retarding effect on progress of too many national plans and blueprints coming one after another. National progress cannot be accomplished merely by swallowing an undigestible set of documents and plans. It has to be done step by step, piecemeal, in ways that can be shared not merely by national executives but by the people, many people.

The idea for such a mission at this time was first suggested to President Truman by President Quirino when he was in Washington many months ago. Possibly Mr. Quirino himself on second thought had reservations about the political wisdom of such an undertaking from the Philippine viewpoint, for he did his best to make it a joint mission. He had appointed a group of men to represent the Philippines as a component part. They were carefully selected, able men of large knowledge, and they still can be of great assistance to the American mission if only to point out with frankness and candor some of the aforementioned difficulties.

[From the Manila Chronicle]

COWEN REDEFINES DEMOCRACY

The most timely and eloquent portion of Ambassador Cowen's speech before the Harvard Club of Manila the other night is that in which he said: "The American program of economic aid and development for underdeveloped countries must be pursued in an atmosphere of democratic freedom and justice * * * and must demonstrate the capacity of a free society to enhance and expand the well-being of its members without the sacrifice of individual rights, without submission to regimentation."

We shall take this, coming as it does from a high representative of the United States Government abroad, to be the gist of a new American policy. We shall use it to discourage any intention or attempt on the part of any man or group of men to interpret the grant of American aid and support as a visa for corrupt and tyrannical rule. We shall give Ambassador Cowen's statement the meaning that should a government become unworthy of the people and cease to represent public welfare and interest, American aid will automatically be stopped.

As we understand it, America is interested in spreading democracy to the so-called backward areas and strengthening it in those regions where it has taken root. We understand democracy to mean the preservation of individual liberties, both civil and political. We have always harbored the idea that democracy, in its very essence, means the right of the minority or of the individual to criticize and oppose policies which he thinks are inimical to the welfare of all. We have been brought up in the belief that the Government can only take action against a group the moment that group, in the words of the late Justice Cardozo, "merges thought into action."

Indeed, it would be a funny brand of democracy which, under the camouflage of high-sounding phrases, would stifle the right of the citizen to speak his mind and express his disapproval of his government's actuations.

Ambassador Cowen must deserve the praise of all Filipinos for clarifying the essence of democracy. He should be congratulated for reviving, at a time when freedom and truth are likely to be casualties, that classic Americanism enunciated by a great American—freedom not only for the thought we love but freedom for the thought we hate.

An Example of Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from Raymond J. Vince, of 3430 Fir Street, East Chicago, Ind., a World War II veteran, is indeed a remarkable expression of patriotism which should encourage every American during these critical times. Americans of the type of Raymond Vince have made this country the land of freedom, and their spirit will preserve freedom in our form of government for centuries to come.

EAST CHICAGO, IND., *July 9, 1950.*

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MADDEN: I write to you as an American who is interested in the affair now going in Korea, and probably will lead us into something more severe in the future.

In the present time and the future I should say, we Americans must not "kid" ourselves as to the welfare of our Nation and the world in general. Political emotions and selfish interests of our leaders must cease at once.

I fully realize and understand war. I spent over 3 years with an infantry division (Fortieth Division) throughout the Pacific area. I do not believe in war, when we must kill and destroy property to gain an objective it is for time we, who are supposed to be civilized, put an end to this uncalled for situation. Yet, at the same time, I, as all true Americans are fully aware that the Communists are trying to disrupt our great form of government. We must stop their senseless way of thinking and do it now, sooner the better, so the people of our country and the world can live in peace.

What can we do about it? We can, and I for one am ready at any time to resume my military career on the battlefield to put an end to this business of war once and for all.

However, Mr. MADDEN, my situation at present is, I am married, the father of two daughters and a stepson. I am 42 years old, in good condition, so you can see why I am interested in the future of our children. When I pass away I want the thought of peace in my mind and I dare not want to see my children or anyone else see the abuse of war, such as I have seen, particularly the Philippine Islands when we invaded Luzon in 1945.

As I read the papers concerning the present war in Korea it stirs me to a point where I would like to help, as I feel the troops we now have there are in the inexperienced group and must go to the front and learn it the hard way.

I am fully experienced as an infantryman, my business in particular is the 81 mm. mortar. I really love the weapon and I possess a keen interest in young men and have proven so as a squad leader throughout three campaigns in the Pacific, climaxed with the Philippine area. My qualifications can be had if necessary from my former commanders or the division headquarters in Los Angeles, Calif.

I have a fairly good job and my family responsibility doesn't quite make it possible for me to enlist as a Regular. If I was to go in with a rating and consideration I sure would be glad to consider the matter.

Naturally, my family comes first, however, making the world safe from war will enable my children to live in a world of peace and free from destruction.

I want to help finish this job. Russia is after us; we cannot deny it. The only regret I have is at the same time we cannot exterminate the Communists of our own country, but our legal departments are taking care of the matter in grand style.

Mr. MADDEN, I speak to you as one American to another. I am willing to help clean up this mess. I fear nothing. I have been under fire numerous times. I shall not quit. I am not a quitter. I am not a coward. I have the "guts" and determination and ambition to carry on the fight for everlasting peace. Last, but not the least, I am carrying God's will. I like to use His will. We must for His sake make this world one happy, loving family.

So, my dear friend, what more can I do? May I hear from you?

Best personal wishes to you and yours and continued success as part of our great Government.

As ever,

RAYMOND J. VINCE.

Federal Money in Up-State New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Federal Money in Up-State New York," which appeared in the Monthly Economic Letter of the Northeast Farm Foundation for July 1, 1950, published at Ithaca, N. Y., together with supplemental and explanatory tables:

FEDERAL MONEY IN UP-STATE NEW YORK

In the Country Gentleman magazine for March 1950, one of its editors, John Strohm, reported on a study which he had made of the extent of Federal money being spent on agricultural activities in De Kalb County, Ill. This is an important Corn Belt county.

Mr. Strohm reported "178 men and women working for the Federal Government in De Kalb County last year. * * * These put in part or full time and were paid from $8 a day up to $5,350 a year. * * * Uncle Sam spent $86,065 in tax money to bring their services to the county's 2,500 farmers."

The above article prompted Hon. W. STERLING COLE, Congressman from the Thirty-ninth New York District, to make inquiry of the amount of Federal funds being spent similarly in the five counties of his district: Chemung, Schuyler, Steuben, Tompkins, and Tioga.

While this tabulation does not include some fringe categories of outside persons who spend some time within these counties, nor clerical help hired at odd times, it appears that 274 men and women are working for the Federal Government, full or part time, in agricultural activities, in these five counties. Uncle Sam spent last year $131,000 on these people who, as Mr. Strohm put it, "tell farmers what they should do, what they can do, and, in some instances, what they

cannot do." In addition, there are 70 vocational teachers (including home economics) who received $34,477 of Federal money.

In Steuben County alone, 86 full- or part-time people were paid a total of $37,000 of Federal money last year. This included 63 county and community committeemen, who received $4,147 of Federal money. In addition this county has 29 agricultural and home economics teachers who received $12,500 of Federal money.

In Tompkins County 51 full- or part-time people were paid $34,000 of Federal money. This included 30 county and community committeemen who received $2,041 of Federal money for their services. And the county had 17 vocational and home economics teachers who received $9,204 of Federal money.

Tioga County's 48 full- or part-time employees received $25,000 of Federal money in 1949, including 33 county and community committeemen who were paid $4,731 from Federal funds. Also 12 vocational teachers who were paid more than $7,800.

In Chemung County Federal funds in the amount of $10,560 were paid to 51 employees including 36 county and community committeemen who received $1,885. In addition nine home economics and agricultural teachers received $3,798.

Last year Schuyler County had 39 full- or part-time people who were paid $25,075 of Federal money. Of these 24 were county and community committeemen who received $1,973. Also paid from Federal funds were three vocational teachers who received $1,150.80.

Obviously the amount of Federal money being spent on these agricultural activities in southern New York runs far less per county than it does in the heart of the Corn Belt. Some of it certainly represents well recognized and valuable educational work. But this whole growth of Federal activity here in the Northeast is such as to provoke some thoughtful appraisal of what it implies and where it could lead.

Congressman COLE also asked 25 representative farmers in each of his five counties their opinion of this situation. Their overwhelming sentiment in a tabulation of replies, was that there are too many people engaged in these activities within the counties, that far too much tax money is being spent on them, and that the value received is not worth the cost.

Incidentally, this inquiry brought the following response regarding price supports: 13 percent of those replying favored the Brannan plan, 87 percent opposed it. Eight percent favored the 90-percent-of-parity system, 92 percent opposed it. Forty-three percent favored some kind of price support for agriculture, 57 percent opposed all such systems.

Number and salaries (Federal funds) of employees administering programs at the county level, in selected counties in New York, fiscal year 1949 [1]

County and agency	Full-time employees		Part-time employees			All employees		Agricultural and home economics teachers	
	Number	Reimbursement	Number	Total man-days worked	Reimbursement	Number	Reimbursement	Number	Reimbursement
Tompkins:									
Production and Marketing Administration	2	$4,360	[2] 30	291.6	$2,041	32	$6,401	----------	----------
Soil Conservation Service	[3] 5	13,929	(4)	(4)	(4)	5	13,929	----------	----------
Farmers Home Administration	2	7,016	3	38.3	173	5	7,189	----------	----------
Extension Service	[5] 9.2	[5] 6,230	----------	----------	----------	2.9	6,230	----------	----------
Total	18.2	31,535	33	329.9	2,214	51.2	33,749	17	$9,203.91
Tioga:									
Production and Marketing Administration	3	6,216	[2] 33	675.9	4,731	36	10,947	----------	----------
Soil Conservation Service	3	8,479	(4)	(4)	(4)	3	8,479	----------	----------
Farmers Home Administration	(6)	(6)	3	24.5	111	3	111	----------	----------
Extension Service	[5] 6.1	[5] 4,952	----------	----------	----------	6.1	4,952	----------	----------
Total	12.1	19,647	36	700.4	4,842	48.1	24,489	12	7,826.30
Chemung:									
Production and Marketing Administration	2	4,800	[2] 36	239.1	1,885	38	6,685	----------	----------
Soil Conservation Service	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Farmers Home Administration	(7)	(7)	3	26.7	120	3	120	----------	----------
Extension Service	[5] 9.2	[5] 3,755	----------	----------	----------	9.2	3,755	----------	----------
Total	11.2	8,555	39	265.8	2,005	50.2	10,560	9	3,796.08
Schuyler:									
Production and Marketing Administration	2	5,120	[2] 24	292.2	1,973	26	7,093	----------	----------
Soil Conservation Service	[5] 2	5,897	(4)	(4)	(4)	2	5,897	----------	----------
Farmers Home Administration	2	7,052	3	35.1	158	5	7,210	----------	----------
Extension Service	[5] 6.1	[5] 4,875	----------	----------	----------	6.1	4,875	----------	----------
Total	12.1	22,944	27	327.3	2,131	39.1	25,075	3	1,150.80
Steuben:									
Production and Marketing Administration	4	10,000	[2] 63	598.8	4,147	67	14,147	----------	----------
Soil Conservation Service	[8] 6	17,945	(4)	(4)	(4)	6	17,945	----------	----------
Farmers Home Administration	(8)	(8)	3	34.0	153	3	153	----------	----------
Extension Service	[5] 9.5	[5] 4,935	----------	----------	----------	9.5	4,935	----------	----------
Total	19.5	32,880	66	632.8	4,300	85.5	37,180	29	12,500.39
Total, 5 counties	73.1	115,561	201	2,256.2	15,492	274.1	131,053	70	34,477.48

[1] Excludes employees (such as those in State offices or in research work) located in these counties but not engaged in administering at the county level.
[2] Represents the total of county and community committeemen. In addition, in all counties except Chemung, there was nominal employment of temporary clerical help, on a day-to-day basis, in rush seasons of work.
[3] In addition, some work was done in the county by 2 employees stationed outside the county.
[4] Temporary assistance employed on a day-to-day basis amounted to about 2.2 man-years of work in total for all of these counties.
[5] With respect to the number of extension workers, the fractional part of the figure for each county represents the time worked by 1 part-time employee. The salary payments shown represent only the portion of extension workers' salaries paid from Federal grants, since they are not Federal employees.
[6] This county served by the office at Ithaca in Tompkins County.
[7] This county served by the office at Watkins Glen in Schuyler County.
[8] This county served by the office at Wellsville in Allegany County.

Soil-Conservation Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DARLINGTON, WIS.,
June 21, 1950.

Hon. GARDNER R. WITHROW,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WITHROW: I have been planning for some time to send you a copy of the Republican Journal of Darlington, Wis., in which the editor, Bowden Curtiss, goes to some length to explain the virtues of soil-conservation practices.

Since the Soil Conservation Service was created by an act of Congress, and you are the Representative of southwestern Wisconsin, I, as a supervisor of the Lafayette County Soil Conservation District, felt that you would be interested in knowing of the cooperation the staff located at Darlington is receiving in furthering the progress of soil-conserving measures. It may be that consideration would be given to including certain selections in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as evidence of the accomplishments of a Federal agency activated to serve both present and future citizens.

While the work that has been done to date is proving effective and there are still thousands of acres of land being farmed with no efforts being put forth to control erosion, a good many farmers are changing their minds to the extent of trying soil-

conservation practices. I feel that from now on soil conservation will progress more rapidly on the farms of Lafayette County.

Sincerely yours,

DALE LANCASTER,
Chairman, Lafayette County Soil Conservation District Supervisors.

The important history and results of soil-conservation practices were set forth in a number of articles in last week's Darlington Republican-Journal. The material for the articles was provided by C. C. Bowers and Lawrence Mevis of the Lafayette County Soil Conservation Office.

I know that it is impossible to include all of the articles, however, I am merely inserting in the RECORD a short résumé containing statements of actual farmers who have adopted soil-conservation practices and who testified as to the benefits derived therefrom. The following testimonials, by men who are engaged in soil conservation at the grass roots, prove that soil conservation is being accepted by intelligent agriculturalists and that a spirit of cooperation exists that cannot help but make for success of this great Federal undertaking. It is my opinion that soil conservation, if properly applied, can contribute as much to the growth of this great Nation as any other Federal activity.

The following are voluntary statements made by actual farmers who are practicing soil conservation on their farms:

Erling Swiggum, Blanchardville, Wis.:

I am very well satisfied with my contour stripping. I have strips 80 to 100 feet wide. I think the 80-foot strips are the best. I would heartily recommend that every side hill be contour stripped.

Steve E. Jacobson, Blanchardville, Wis.:

I have had a big increase in crops with greatly improved soil fertility on my contour strip cropped fields during the past 8 years. I believe it is the only way to take care of our soil and say that every farmer in southwestern Wisconsin should contour strip crop.

Isaac Berg, Argyle, Wis.:

Contour strip cropping is a real benefit to any farm with hilly land. In addition to saving power while working your fields, there is much greater chance for your soil, water, and fertilizing elements to stay where they belong; also, after working a field laid out in contour strips, you are in better shape physically as you are not completely shaken up from crossing ditches, which occur more frequently in non-contour-stripped fields.

Alvin Beebe, Hazel Green, Wis.:

With contour strips, I find I have a great saving in topsoil as there is practically no washing. My crop yields have increased over 50 percent since I have discontinued the old method of farming.

Wayne Jenkins, Platteville, Wis.:

I am managing a farm of 300 acres. The yields have greatly increased after 2 years of contour strip farming. I have rented two other farms and stripped each one. The same profit has resulted each time. I find strip cropping saves time and gas, the soil is saved for yields of greater production, and it is much easier to manage.

Walter L. Dawson, Leadmine, Wis.:

Contouring on these slopes of ours in some cases has the disadvantages of smaller fields or strips in crop. However, I find that the advantages far outweigh the disadvantages in increased yields and conserving the precious topsoil. Most people who have contoured say, "Why didn't I do it sooner?"

H. V. Osterday, Darlington, Wis.:

This is how we have benefited from the Soil Conservation Service plan installed on this farm in 1942. We have increased the corn production from 50–55 and have hit the 116-bushel mark in '42 to 90–100 bushels three times so far. The corn on the Paulson farm has increased from 25-30 bushels last year, oats from 40-60 bushels to 90-97 bushels. Alfalfa grows on any acre. We have almost no loss of soil. We have begun the pasture improvement now and expect to raise the milking herd from 24 to 40 head. We have increased the hogs from about 60 to 110 head.

Woodsworth Bros., Shullsburg, Wis.:

We started strip cropping in 1947 and are well pleased with the profits. We find the water which ordinarily runs off making ditches is kept there, keeping the ground moist in dry weather and thus eliminating the ditches. The fertilizer is not washed away, either. Strip cropping does have a disadvantage. Small strips and corners of the field take more time for the amount of ground in them.

Edwin Stauffacher, Calamine, Wis.:

We started contouring in 1942 and have practiced it along with strip cropping ever since. Results have been most gratifying. Former gullies and ditches are now grassed and our crop yields have doubled. If ever anyone needs the "show me," you are welcome at our farm at any time, as seeing is believing.

C. L. Vickers, Jr., New Diggings, Wis.:

I am more than pleased to write you a few lines about what I think of soil conservation. I think it is one of the finest things that the Government has ever done. The big problem is to save the soil. This can be done on most farms by contour strip cropping and terracing. I have used both for some time and believe me, it pays big, not only for now but in later years to come. I am 100 percent for soil conversation.

Lester McQuillan, Woodford, Wis.:

We have only had contour strips for this past year but I think it is the only way to farm these side hills. We had a very good corn yield on the strips this past year. We plan to have more of our farm laid out for contour strip cropping in the future.

The Battle of Fort Stevens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday and today mark the eighty-sixth anniversary of the Battle of Fort Stevens, where, on July 11 and 12, 1864, the Confederate forces under Gen. Jubal Early were held back and repulsed and the Nation's Capital saved from invasion and possible capture during the most critical period of the Civil War.

Appropriate ceremonies commemorating that event were held last evening at the site of Fort Stevens, by the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic assisted by various patriotic societies of the District of Columbia, the conclusion of which was featured by an appropriate address by our colleague, Hon. CHAUNCEY W. REED, of Illinois. I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an extension of my remarks:

THE BATTLE OF FORT STEVENS

Eighty-six years have elapsed since Fort Stevens was the scene of an armed battle. Today, few of the citizens of our great Nation, and probably not many Washington residents realize that here, on July 11 and 12, 1864, the Nation's Capital was in the gravest danger it ever experienced since its invasion by the British in 1814. On Independence Day 1864, the citizens of Washington felt rather smug and complacent. At last the President had found a great warrior who had already made a name for himself in the campaigns in the West. He had captured Fort Donelson and then Vicksburg, and the Mississippi then flowed freely to the Gulf. In February, President Lincoln had commissioned him lieutenant general and placed him in command of all our Armies. Unlike many Union generals who had preceded him in campaigns against General Lee, this antagonist was aggressive, had the tenacity of a bulldog and having set his sights upon Lee's army and Richmond, determined "to fight it out" according to his plan, "if it took all summer."

The Wilderness, Spottsylvania, and Cold Harbor had been fought and now Grant was pressing Lee further and threatening the Confederate capital at Richmond. Of course, Washingtonians, feeling that victory was within their grasp had good reason to feel suave and self-satisfied as Independence Day approached. Certainly they were in no danger. Scores of forts surrounded Washington. Lee was in no position to bypass Grant and attack the Capital and there were no other Confederate armies in the vicinity. And, too, there were plenty of soldiers in Washington. One could see them every day, on the streets, in the stores, in and around Government buildings. What they didn't know however was that the forts surrounding Washington were meagerly manned and that few able-bodied soldiers with military experience remained in the Capital. What they didn't know; also, was that Lee's efficient Gen. Jubal Early, had been by his superior, sent on an important mission and that he had taken with him about 25,000 seasoned veterans of Lee's army. This detachment quickly routed the few Federal troops that opposed them at Harper's Ferry and proceeded northward to Hagerstown. After levying tribute on the citizens of that city, it turned southeast and repeated its successful tactics on the citizens of Frederick.

In the meantime official Washington was aroused from its lethargy and commenced to take an inventory of its defenses. An appeal was made to General Grant for troops but that gentleman, realizing the precarious situation, and knowing that Jubal Early was up to no good, had already dispatched one division of the Sixth Army Corps under General Ricketts to reenforce Gen. Lew Wallace who was in command of about 2,500 men at Baltimore. Without waiting for the reenforcements, General Wallace moved out on the Baltimore pike to a point where that road converged with the highway between Washington and Frederick. When General Ricketts arrived at Baltimore, he learned that Wallace had already left and he and his troops hurried after him. They arrived just in time.

Early, flushed with his successes turned his eyes toward the Capital. On July 9, he encountered the forces of General Wallace numbering then about 6,000 men, at the Monocacy River. After a sharp engagement,

Wallace, overwhelmed by numbers, was forced to fall back on the Baltimore road. Early did not tarry but marched south and that night was encamped near Rockville. Civilian Washington was now aroused to the danger that threatened them. Clerks in Government offices, convalescing soldiers from hospitals and officers and enlisted men from the Quartermaster Corps who knew nothing of defense technique were hurriedly furnished with arms and commenced drilling in the streets. In the meantime General Grant had sent two more divisions of the Sixth Corps under General Wright for the relief of Washington but these troops could not possibly reach the Capital until Monday, July 11.

On Sunday, July 10, General Early's tired, hungry and footsore force moved into Silver Spring. Here the Navy comes in for a share of credit. I was informed by a retired admiral, since deceased, that many months before these events, Admiral Foote, had in some way come into possession of two or three barrels of contraband bourbon whiskey. Not wishing to destroy it, he had induced a gentleman who resided in Silver Spring to permit him to store it temporarily in his basement, and it was still there when the Confederates marched into that city on Sunday, July 10. It was not long before this prize was discovered and it was likewise not long before a goodly proportion of Early's men had imbibed too freely of the tempting beverage. At any rate many precious hours were consumed with the precious liquid, during which time General Wright's troops were hastening toward Washington. Had General Early attacked this fort immediately as he contemplated doing, he most surely would have captured it and his progress to Capitol Hill, the Treasury, the Arsenal, and the Government storehouses would have been the next order of business.

Of course, he could not have expected to be able to hold it, but he would have inflicted considerable damage and the effect of his conquest on the morale of the people of the North would have been indeed disheartening. But such was not to be.

About noon on Monday, July 11, the two remaining divisions of the 6th Army Corps under General Wright arrived at the water front and without much delay these hardened veterans were soon marching briskly up Seventh Street. Later in the afternoon they arrived at Fort Stevens. When Jubal Early saw through his field glasses, what had taken place, he knew that his chance to plunder the Capital had passed him by.

The President and Mrs. Lincoln arrived at Fort Stevens soon after General Wright had taken command and came again on the following day. Having resolved upon an offensive General Wright mounted the parapet and shouted his orders to his men, most of whom were deployed around the fort. Standing at his side, at the very spot from which I am now speaking, was the President of the United States, seemingly unmindful of his perilous exposure to enemy fire. General Wright as diplomatically as possible urged him to step down but from time to time the President, in order to attain a better view would again mount the breastworks where he stood within range of the Confederate sharpshooters. Finally when a surgeon was shot down alongside of him, General Wright threw diplomacy to the winds and informed the President in respectful language that if he didn't come down behind the protection of the fort, he would be compelled to order his men to forcibly eject him. The President laughingly obeyed.

Early's skirmishers were driven back to Silver Spring and the next day his entire forces were in flight northward on the Rockville road. Thus ended the siege of Washington, and its citizens, as well as its officialdom, breathed easier.

Grant still retained his bulldog grip on Petersburg that was unrelinquished until it fell. The scene enacted here 86 years ago, reminds us that delay (which we are so prone to condemn) is sometimes the best military strategy. In the Revolution George Washington's continual delaying tactics and countless retreats enabled him finally to marshal his forces at Yorktown and end the struggle for independence. The delay occasioned by General Wallace's spirited resistance at Monocacy, plus the fortunate discovery of Admiral Foote's bourbon at Silver Spring were just enough to permit aid to arrive to our threatened Capital and save it from deep humiliation.

Even today, we are informed that although we may be losing a few miles to the invading Reds of North Korea, we are merely trading territory temporarily for time in which to launch an aggressive offensive.

At any rate, it reminds us that we should be ever watchful of our home defenses—keeping them strong and well manned by those whose judgment is sound and whose loyalty is unquestioned. We might take a page from the history of France. When Germany under Hitler was rearming and its armament works were turning out countless implements of war and its citizens were working 12, 14, and 18 hours a day, the French were taking life easy with 8-hour days, holidays, strikes, and work stoppages. They had no worries. Were they not protected by the great Maginot Line? No enemy could ever hope to invade their land again. It was not until their land was swarming with invading Germans that they realized the fallacy of their dream. Then in a frenzy, they attempted to recover their lost ground but it was too late. France was taken over in but a few days.

So until we in America are definitely assured that world peace is a reality; that danger from aggression is forever a thing of the past; that all nations of the world are at last committed to the proposition of remaining at permanent peace with each other, our motto should be, "Put our trust in God, and keep our powder dry."

Pacific Pact Just as Necessary as Atlantic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ludwell Denny from the Washington News of July 12, 1950. It is encouraging to note that more and more people are now, even though tragically late beginning to see the inescapable truth of what some have urged since Japan's aggression began in 1931 and especially with respect to Communist aggression in China, namely, that global defense is necessary if any defence is to be effective. MacArthur said it in a telegram to the Committee on Foreign Affairs March 3, 1948. "One major frontier is no less important than another, and a decisive breach of any will threaten to engulf all." The Far Eastern Division of the State Department would not listen then; will they now?:

FAR EAST PACT NEEDED

(By Ludwell Denny)

The Korean war highlights the need for a far-eastern defense alliance similar to the Atlantic Pact.

This is one of several major jobs the administration is not getting around to fast enough. Yesterday the House Foreign Affairs Committee, after approving the $1,250,000,000 foreign military aid program, called for such an Asiatic set-up. But the administration lags under this prodding.

Several alibis have been offered in the past for failure to move in that direction. On the diplomatic side it was said that the basic Asiatic problems were political and economic, rather than military.

Nationalist leaders were described as suspicious of American or foreign protection as a form of disguised imperialism. Economic aid was the real need, and that had to be either plain relief or limited technical assistance because of the same suspicion of alleged American imperialism.

On the military side it was pointed out that the Asiatic nations, mostly new, were not comparable to the long-established European nations. They were not capable of contributing to a military alliance like the Atlantic Pact.

But the real barriers were somewhat different. President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson had no far-eastern policy. They did not want one "until the dust settled." And the President's military advisers constantly reminded him that Europe rather than Asia was the major defense area, and that the United States lacked sufficient strength to police the entire world. That was why we withdrew our occupation Army from Korea and turned over responsibility to the United Nations.

Communist aggression in Korea, however, forced an abrupt end to the Truman do-nothing policy in the Far East. The President not only reacted swiftly for American and UN defense of Korea, he also proclaimed American protection of Formosa and the Philippines, and American military aid for French Indochina.

Red invasion of South Korea also ended the Pentagon's understandable but baseless hope that we could concentrate on Atlantic defenses. Now more and more American military strength is being concentrated in a distant secondary war in a small country of minor strategic importance. From a purely military standpoint this cannot be justified. Nevertheless it is imperative for political reasons—to save the UN, and to buttress morale in western Europe with a demonstration that we will not desert victims of Red aggression.

The net effect is that America is forced into a position where it has most of the disadvantages without any of the advantages of a far-eastern alliance. For neither the UN nor any individual European ally is committed with us to joint defense of Formosa, the Philippines, or the Pacific.

France is making no pledge in return for our Indochina aid. Britain is intent on guarding chiefly Hong Kong and Malaya.

The still unlearned lessons of Korea are that global defense is the only genuine defense, and that no single exposed point can be protected alone in the Far East any more than in Europe. An Atlantic Pact without a Pacific Pact will not stop Stalin.

My Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we all know that war is destructive. A policy which has given us

four wars in one man's lifetime, if followed, will destroy our Nation. Oblivion has been the fate of every nation which persistently sought either world domination or participated in continuous world-wide warfare.

An editorial which, in my opinion, expresses the thought and conviction of the average American, at least in the Middle West, written by Leo W. Hoffman, who left wife and children to serve in World War II, carried in the Allegan Gazette of July 6, published in my home town, reads as follows:

[From the Allegan Gazette of July 6, 1950]

REACTION ON KOREA

While the press and radio all over the country are bleating praise for Truman's action in ordering our military forces into action in Korea, like sheep following a leader, the Gazette is taking a critical, long-range view of the matter.

First we will say we approve of the use of military force in Korea under the circumstances but—

We do not approve of the use of our Army and Navy under the sponsorship of the United Nations.

Since before World War II, all action taken by our two left-wing Presidents and their left-wing State Department, has been contrary to our constitutional principles of democratic government.

Before the war, without the consent of the Congress, Roosevelt as President of the United States, attempted to entangle this country in the war.

Once in the war, Roosevelt, without the consent of Congress, made secret after secret treaty, obligating the people of this country to commitments all over the world.

During the closing stage of the war with Germany, Roosevelt misused his power and in meetings with Stalin, with the advice of Alger Hiss and other left-wing sympathizers gave away to Russia, all the advantage that this country had gained by the force of arms in World War II.

After Roosevelt's death, Truman continued the policy of appeasement of Russia, and without protest, on the advice of Communists and left wingers in our State Department, permitted Russia to gain control of China.

Now, at this late date, Truman acting apparently under the sponsorship of the United Nations, uses our military force, as a United Nations police force.

We will explain our position further. During the war and ever since there has been an effort on the part of some of our leaders to form a world government with this country as its sponsor and as a member nation. This movement gained considerable momentum immediately following the close of the war and legislatures of many States passed resolutions to that end. However, when people became better informed and learned that such a world government would result in the loss of our sovereignty; would place our Army and Navy at the disposal of the world government as a police force to be used all over the world; and actually put the economic and so political life of this country at the mercy of a combination of foreign powers; the legislatures of many of these States previously sponsoring the movement changed their minds and withdrew their resolutions.

When Truman used our military without consulting Congress, he played into the hands of those sponsoring world government. We don't know what his purpose is but perhaps like Roosevelt he dreams of becoming president of the United Nations of the world so that he can with greater authority divide the resources of this country among our more backward neighbors.

Whatever we do in international affairs let us do it as the United States.

If our men have to fight, let them fight upon the demand of people of this country, and not at the command of some stooge of foreign interests.

Let us have an end to that clique of futile appeasers who have built a solid foundation for world war III.

Let us throw out of office all those left wingers, do-gooders, Communist sympathizers, and abnormal people who think first of the welfare of the rest of the world, and if at all, lastly of the welfare of the United States, so that once more we can become a Nation instead of merely a tool of foreign politicians.

We have no objection to this country taking a strong position in international affairs, but let us do it as a strong nation ready to meet aggression with counter aggression for the benefit of this Nation, instead of with futile appeasement and bribes for the benefit of other nations.

In brief, let us become once more the United States of America.

Lord God of Hosts, Be With Us Yet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, in the July 6 issue of the Kingman Journal, a weekly newspaper published in Kingman, Kans., there appeared an editorial entitled "Lord God of Hosts, Be With Us Yet."

This editorial was written by my good friend Fred J. Cloud, and it seems to me that it strikes just the proper note in these critical and distressing times. I hope that every Member of Congress will read this excellent and timely editorial. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the same herewith:

LORD GOD OF HOSTS, BE WITH US YET

There was a decided contrast in the attitude of the people of these United States in the Fourth of July just passed and those days of other years. In the older days of the Republic it was customary for folks to gather on the Fourth of July and listen to smooth talkers—generally celebrities of some sort or often just aspiring politicians—feed them a lot of taffy about the greatness of this country; how it could lick the whey out of any other nation on God's footstool; how we were the smartest, richest, most progressive people the sun ever shone on.

And our fathers sat and soaked it up. Full well they knew that, although they had the finest government of free people on earth, dishonesty and corruption and carelessness was shot through public administration. These things make the seamy side of government by the people when the people go to sleep and are lulled into a false sense of security by smooth talk and promises of government aid and subsidies of every kind.

But things have changed. As it grew older it began to see that it had not yet got a corner on all the wisdom of the ages. It saw its wealth and its corruption grow side by side. It saw its cities dominated by racketeers and gamblers. It learned that not all the problems can be solved by giving men their liberty or making them their own bosses—any more than all the problems of childhood can be solved by allowing a child to be his own boss in all things. It realized that a people, or a child, to be beneficially self-governing, had to be invested with intelligence; that no ignorant man can possibly ever be free in any sense of the word; that no person who is prejudiced, unlettered, violent in opinion, distrustful of his fellows, ever is or can be anything but a slave of the lowest type. It took to education.

Today there is no such spread-eagleism as was known in this country 50 years ago. On this Fourth of July we were threatened with another war, a war which, if it does come, might well destroy all civilization, and the people of this Republic were in a solemn mood—as solemn as the mood of a man who, having been converted to Christianity, feels it his duty to go forth into the wilds of the world and spread it, fight for it if need be. We know that much has been given us in 150 years, and that much shall be required of us. The blessings that have come, the liberty that has been ours, are to be shared with others now.

Well may this Nation have been on its knees in prayer this Fourth of July, rather than rending the air with self-praise and shattering the quiet with orgies of meaningless noise. It may be that this country is going to be called upon to make the greatest sacrifice of all its days—all for humanity, to prove that a republic can be unselfish enough to fight for humanity and for peace.

This may have been the most momentous Fourth of July in our history.

F. J. C.

Banks Make Their Contribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by H. J. Stuhlmiller, president of the State Savings Bank, of Fontanelle, Iowa:

BANKS MAKE THEIR CONTRIBUTION

The high standard of living that we American people have attained is due principally to our marvelous system of private enterprise. To the success of this system, the banks of our Nation make an important contribution.

Our Nation is being served by 14,680 banks. Six hundred and sixty-five of them are located in Iowa—four in this county. While nearly all are chartered and supervised either by State or national departments, they are owned and controlled not by government, but mainly by private individuals.

With some exceptions, such as Government-sponsored loans, banks still remain relatively free from too many restrictive regulations and red tape. In serving their clients, no discrimination is made because of political or religious beliefs or even personal dislikes for an individual should any exist.

Capable bank management recognizes that the bank prospers only as its clients and its community prosper. So bankers are always anxious to help their customers succeed. Few bankers pretend to know as much about their client's business as he does himself. Yet, by keeping familiar with the practices of successful businessmen and farmers, bankers can often offer helpful suggestions.

Bank officers and employees are not political appointees. The success and survival of each bank rests mainly upon the quality of service it performs.

Looking back over the years that this writer has had the privilege of serving in our local bank, considerable improvement can be observed in bank operating methods,

resulting in better service to the public. During the past 10 years bank operating costs have gone up the same as in most other types of businesses. Yet, under our competititve-enterprise system there has been a constant incentive for banks to do things better and more efficiently. Very little increase in cost of bank services to the public has been the result. Interest rates remain low, and worthy borrowers find that their local bank is the best place to obtain needed funds.

American industries and agriculture have outstripped those of other nations during the past century. Certainly such progress could never have been attained without the helpful and stimulating services that only a system of independent, competitive, and privately owned banks such as exist here could provide.

The greatest menace to our economic system today is the watering of our money supply that takes place when the Federal Government spends beyond its income. That process is shrinking the real value of the people's savings, their bonds, their life insurance and all of their dollar investments. It reduces the ability of the people to earn, their incentitve to work to save for the future, and their self reliance. And under our present paper-money system it is so difficult to check this fatal deficit spending.

It is to the credit of bankers that more and more of them are recognizing these facts. By advocating that our Nation restore a sound money system, namely—the gold standard and the coinage of gold—they recognize their moral obligation of protecting the purchasing value of their depositor's money as well as their legal obligation of keeping it safe.

H. J. STUHLMILLER,
President.

Welfare Rejection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of July 12, 1950:

[From the Washington Post of Wednesday, July 12, 1950]

WELFARE REJECTION

The overwhelming House rejection of Reorganization Plan No. 27—to create a new Department of Health, Education, and Security—was scarcely a surprise. The President's proposal was vociferously opposed by spokesmen for the medical and dental professions. For quite different reasons, it incurred the disapproval of the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover report. And it fell foul of a certain regional animosity to Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing, who would presumably have been chosen by the President to head the projected department. Against such forces, the unorganized supporters of the reorganization plan, backed only by logic and considerations of orderly administration, proved of no avail.

It is rather difficult to see what the opponents of Reorganization Plan No. 27 gained by rejecting it. The Federal Security Agency remains in existence—an agency administering Federal activities in the fields of health, education, and security. Its jurisdiction is about the same as it would have been under the President's proposal; rejection of the proposal has simply denied it departmental status, and thus, to a certain extent, impaired its effectiveness. Mr. Ewing continues to be its Administrator. If the reorganization plan had been accepted, and if the President had named him to be secretary of the new department, the Senate could have declined to confirm him had it so desired. It cannot do so now.

This is not the first defeat for a unified welfare department. A similar reorganization proposal was beaten last year. The President tried conscientiously to meet the objections expressed then by changes in the plan submitted this year. His failure suggests that the opposition is more emotional than rational. He will have to try again—with, we trust, better luck next year. For an integrated Federal welfare program at the departmental level is now a vital national need.

The Airplane and the Turtle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of July 11, 1950:

THE AIRPLANE AND THE TURTLE

When Postmaster General Donaldson announced economy curtailments in the postal services last May many of us thought that the public would not be seriously inconvenienced. The National Association of Mail Carriers vehemently objected, but since perhaps 10,000 of the carriers were about to lose their jobs, and the remaining ones would have to tote heavier loads, this attitude was understandable. A little more serious is the statement made this week by the association's national secretary, Jerome J. Keating, that mail is piling up in post offices, that some first-class mail is scrambled up with stores of undelivered third-class mail, and that in general "the condition of the mail is the worst in the history of the country." Mr. Keating could be exaggerating. Still, it might be wise to look into the situation and find out if the $25,000,000 a year the Post Office Department is supposed to be saving is really saved and really an economy.

A postal deficit of $500,000,000 is admittedly too large, but we should remember that the Department has rarely made a profit; only 15 years during the past hundred has it taken in more than it put out. A slap dash reduction of service is not true economy. The country does not profit when letters that used to take 2 days to reach the recipient take 3 or 4. One might guess that the present slowdown costs businessmen and others many times the possible saving. It becomes supremely ridiculous when we fly mail at one-third the speed of sound and deliver it at the speed of an aging and discouraged turtle.

The Hoover Commission made recommendations which, it was estimated, might ultimately save $200,000,000 a year in the Post Office Department without cuts in services. Some of these recommendations have been acted on; others, including a plan to take 20,000 postmasterships out of politics, await action. Congress might do something here, instead of trying to enforce "economy" by lopping funds out of the appropriations.

Agricultural Reform—When?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 12 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Agricultural Reform—When?" appearing in the March–April 1950 issue of the magazine Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

This article deals with the failure of the German government to carry out the United States military government law which called for the breaking up of large land holdings for the benefit of the small farmer.

The Society for the Prevention of World War III, a nonprofit educational organization which was founded in October 1943, has received the warm commendation of many Americans, including top-ranking officials of the Government, for its outstanding work in disseminating factual information and publishing educational material.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURAL REFORM—WHEN?

Every now and then we are obliged to turn to the food situation in Germany because it is of fundamental importance in analyzing the real needs of the German economy. We have shown through facts and figures that the German food situation since the end of the war has been no worse than that which has obtained in the countries which were ravaged by the German armies. In spite of this fact, the Germans have received A–1 priority in food shipments from the United States which has been accompanied by an overwhelming propaganda campaign. We have declared time and again that this great concern over the German food situation has been often motivated by other than humanitarian principles.

The real reason for this agitation was to provide an excuse for the preserving of Germany's industrial war potential which, according to the Germany-firsters, would produce products in exchange for necessary foodstuffs. It was this spurious argument which helped to scrap a great many of our agreements, including those on reparations.

Naturally it has not been a pleasant task for us to expose this propaganda for it could be misinterpreted as a denial of the fact that hunger knows no boundaries. However, we have never for a moment advocated a policy which would deprive the Germans of necessary foodstuffs. All we have said is that the Germans, during the early postwar period, were eating much better than official statistics showed and that they could have a better diet if they were willing to

rationalize their agriculture. This also presupposed an Allied program which would have been realistic and effective. It did not work out that way because the Germans deliberately created one obstacle after another, and the Allied authorities tolerated this sabotage.

In assessing the potential resources of German agriculture, we asked the following question: How could one know just exactly what the Germans need in the way of foodstuffs when they have not exhausted all the possibilities of producing indigenous agricultural products? That question, which touches the core of the problem, was never answered. The other day, however, we got an answer from Mr. Charles Bingham, an American businessman, who was former chief of the Foreign Trade Division of the Joint Export Import Agency at Frankfurt. In early February, he spoke before the Commerce and Industry Association in New York where he discussed matters pertaining to German trade and economics.

Among other things, Mr. Bingham said, "the basic need of Germany and of all of Europe is to produce more food especially of the basic types which Europe lacks, namely, bread, grain, sugar, fats, and oils." In this connection, he said, "a program of land consolidation is necessary before any mechanization can be applied to German agriculture. Through consolidation of land and through improvement of animal husbandry, the food production in Germany can be increased from 10 to 25 percent." This pertinent information received scant attention and it needs to be aired even more now than ever before. Mr. Bingham implicitly reveals that the Germans, thanks to our paternalism, have refused to modernize and expand their agriculture.

This is confirmed by Mr. Robert Hanes, chief of the ECA in Germany. He recently wrote a sharp letter to Dr. Adenauer reminding him of the importance of increasing agricultural production in Germany. Mr. Hanes brought out the fact that 70 percent of total United States aid to Germany has gone for food. On the other hand, he disclosed that less than 10 percent of Germany's counterpart funds have been assigned to the development of agricultural resources. If Mr. Hanes is incensed about this situation, he should not only blame the German politicians and land owners, but those Allied officials who have tolerated this state of affairs.

In the United States zone alone, 1,235,000 acres owned by 700 individuals and organizations were to be subjected to land reform, but as of April 1949, only 71,000 acres were distributed. This in spite of the fact that the law for land reform was passed 3 years ago. The failure to reform German agriculture has provided the excuse for the Germans to ask for more hand-outs at the expense of the American taxpayers, who thus are not only subsidizing German exports, but also supporting feudal conditions on the land in Germany. In terms of social as well as economic significance, this state of affairs is definitely detrimental to the democratization of the German people.

But apparently the Germans are not at all concerned. The Bonn regime has finally done away with rationing with the exception of sugar. They have done so, not because they have earned the right but because our policy, in fact, guarantees that no matter how little they produce, Uncle Sam will make up the difference. In contrast to the plethora of foodstuffs in Germany today, our British Allies are still under rationing controls. As a further contrast, we point to the millions of people throughout the world who are living on a starvation diet and who have never attacked the United States.

The question of a self-sustaining Germany is directly related to the problem of agricultural reforms. Even Mr. Charles Bingham, who is all in favor of unlimited German industry, admits "there is literally no prospect that Germany within the foreseeable future can pay for American goods except through Marshall aid or through the increasing of German imports to America." The problem of importing to the United States, however, is not one which concerns the Germans alone. They are in for a rude awakening if they believe that they can recapture their old markets. Certainly with such poor prospects, there is no point in defending a program which emphasizes a huge industrial potential which will be able to produce the commodities which are supposed to be exchanged for foodstuffs.

If the Germans want to eat better and on a more stable basis and if the American taxpayers hope to be relieved of subsidizing German food imports, then agricultural reforms must be instituted and the sooner that is done, the better for all concerned.

Hoover Indicts the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wayne Township (N. J.) Record of July 6, 1950:

The American Communists, who have gone underground with a vengeance, are attempting to weaken the Nation through propaganda, and are training spies whose job is to bore inside the Government and to steal our top military secrets—particularly those concerning atomic weapons, jet planes, and plans for the national defense in event of war. That, in essence, is what FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover recently told a Senate committee.

Mr. Hoover is under no illusions as to Communist purposes. He said, "The Communist Party is not a bona fide political party. It is a highly organized, militant, and disciplined conspiratorial group following the whims and dictates of international communism. The party is a group dedicated to the overthrow of our Government."

Just how large is this party whose loyalty belongs to a foreign power? According to Mr. Hoover, there are 54,174 actual Communist Party members within the United States at the present time, most of whom are in the concentrated centers of population. New York State alone contains about half of them. It is likely that for every party member, there are 10 sympathizers who are ready, willing, and able to do the party's work. So he said: "There is a potential fifth column of 540,000 people dedicated to this philosophy."

Since the trial and conviction of all 11 members of the party's executive board, major organizational changes have been effected, Mr. Hoover continued. The trend has been toward decentralization. In order to eliminate the dangers that arise when large numbers congregate, the number of Communist Party clubs has been almost tripled. No membership cards were issued last year, and the maintenance of membership records has been discontinued. A courier system has been established to protect confidential communications. Secret printing plants have been set up. Leaders are being selected for the underground. A thorough and elaborate system has been devised for making certain that each member is loyal to communism and will remain so.

According to Hoover, the party has endeavored to exploit youths, veterans, civil rights, foreign nationality, the press, radio, television, the motion-picture industry, educational, political, women, and labor groups. Forty-eight percent of the membership of the Communist Party is in the basic industry of this country. Communist efforts toward infiltration have been intensified in basic industries vital to our security, such as steel, heavy machinery, mining, communications, transportation, the electrical industry, and the maritime industry. The Communists have developed one of the greatest propaganda machines that I think modern civilization has ever known."

It is clear that Mr. Hoover regards the Communists and fellow travelers as an exceedingly grave menace to our security. And no man is in a better position to know.

Capital Investment in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 12 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have received a copy of a speech delivered in Manila by Mr. Gerald Wilkinson, a British subject doing business in the Philippines. He discusses in this speech the question of capital investment in the Philippines as a means of economic rehabilitation and development of that country. Without passing judgment on the conclusions contained in this speech, I nevertheless consider it of sufficient interest, in the light of our current concern with Pacific affairs, to ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen: It is good of you to ask me here today, and I am particularly glad to speak on the subject you have chosen, the newly formed Philippine Association. For I believe that the Philippine Association is going to be an instrument of enlightened purpose and of real benefit to the Philippine Republic.

The Philippine Association is a nonprofit organization resulting from a series of luncheon-meetings attended by scores of men of various nationalities, at which Col. Andres Soriano played host, a host to whom is due much of our desire to work together.

The major purposes of the Philippine Association are twofold.

1. To take steps for the creation and maintenance in the Philippines of a climate attractive to capital investment in the Philippines, with reasonable protection therefor.

2. To initiate and maintain effective public relations on a high plane in the United States and elsewhere in order to preserve

enlightened interest in the Philippines, its welfare and its future.

The Association's President is none other than the Foreign Secretary, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, whose remarkable capacities are well known to all of us. On the principle that if one wants a job well done one should ask a busy man to do it, because a busy man has learnt the secret of arranging his time, General Romulo is unlikely to be surpassed. The association is indeed fortunate in leadership of such distinction. Moreover, as noted by Colonel Soriano, even the initials C. P. R. augur well for consolidated public relations.

Under General Romulo are the following directors of the association: Judge J. W. Haussermann, chairman; Gil Puyat, vice chairman; Col. Andres Soriano, vice president; Gerald Wilkinson, vice president; Felino Neri, executive vice president; A. M. Macleod; Ramon V. del Rosario; Peter Lim; Paul Wood; W. Hogue; Robert Trent; Aurelio Periquet; Ramon Araneta; Demetrio Santos. It is noteworthy how large a place is occupied in this board by Rotary.

The directors have appointed from among their number compact executive committees to operate here and in the United States, aided by a finance committee in the Philippines and advisory groups of experienced Philippine and American newspapermen in both countries. In due time, and without haste, the association will engage a high-grade public-relations organization in the United States which will work closely with the officers of the Philippine Association. The Philippine Association will simultaneously work to develop a frank and friendly liaison between the Philippine Government, on the one hand, and the members of the Philippine Association and the business community, on the other. I might add that the Philippine Government has given its expressed blessing to the association.

In no case does the association propose to usurp the functions of our able chambers of commerce, nor will it espouse any case whose benefits are limited to a single industry or group, unless the public interest is involved. The yardstick of the association's interest and espousal will be the extent to which any case submitted to it is beneficial or detrimental to Philippine public relations at home and abroad and on the highest level. Our directors do not expect concrete achievements to be rapidly achieved, but they are determined to make a start, and we are resolved to pool all differences of nationality and competition in this common effort.

Gentlemen, I have given you an outline of the organization and basic purposes of the Philippine Association. May I now speak to you, not in the name of the association but as an individual businessman who is a resident of the Philippines by choice and who has grown to love this country and to feel a deep sense of gratitude toward it? May I tell you why I have joined this association? It is because I feel that an element of fear and misunderstanding is drifting like a strange mist across, not the hearts but the vision of many of us in the Philippines today. In the war fear could be obviously defined, gnawing and specific, sometimes sharp and immediate. Today's fears are different. They are nebulous and intangible, but I think that all of us in this room know that they are there. What is this fear? I suggest that it is largely fear of the unknown; fear of the unknown intentions of each of us toward the other; fear in the minds of some legislators and some domestic interests that foreign capital may deprive, rather than enrich, the Filipino people; fear by our foreign businessmen that there is a rising intent to legislate them out of business and to expropriate by law a growing portion of their activities for transfer to others. In saying this I realize that I am now passing over that comfortable boundary that separates the things we talk about in public from the things we grouse about in private. And perhaps this boundary should be crossed, provided that we cross it with good will.

Can we therefore examine together the reasons for the fear of foreign capital that is suggested by recent legislation and that is indicated, to take a specific example, by the complicated and almost hostile licensing procedure under which foreign technicians and engineers and craftsmen are delayed or debarred from obtaining local certificates before they may apply their already proven skill to the Philippine industries that vitally need them? Are these restrictive fears well grounded? At first glance perhaps they are. The western nations have been far from perfect in their relationships of bygone years. As individual human beings many of us have sinned against the brotherhood of man, sinned by omission as well as commission. But do these failings of the past warrant fear today, narrow, confining restrictive fear? Surely not.

Let us look at the lessons of history. My own country, England, a small island bedded on coal (and not much else) and surrounded by fish, and sometimes by enemies, has traditionally provided refuge for other nationals in spite of her excessive population. And England has for centuries profited from the entry of skilled foreigners and from the equality of opportunity afforded to all residents, foreign and domestic, who trade within her shores. Since the last war alone, over a quarter of a million foreigners have been admitted to residence in the British Isles where they ply their trades on equal terms with British nationals. I am well qualified to report to you on this matter because one of my ancestors was a Frenchman whose first arrival for residence in England was unfortunately confined to the fact that he arrived there concealed in a barrel. Now, the natural resources of the Philippine Republic are far richer and more varied than the United Kingdom's, and the Philippine population is smaller, although growing more rapidly. Can these resources really be stolen and the Philippine population really impoverished if foreign capital and technicians enter on a substantial scale? Let us look at some figures. A small factory in one of several potential local industries that would require ₱1,000,000 of imported capital to develop a business of two to three million pesos of sales per annum might earn, if exceptional success was achieved, a net annual profit of 25 percent per annum on the capital. In other words, a profit of ₱250,000. Where does fear enter this picture? Presumably through fear that the foreign financiers of this factory might wish to repatriate their full annual profit, although in practice they would only wish to do so if freedom of convertibility of currency was threatened. What happens if they are permitted to repatriate their full annual profit? The Philippines loses ₱250,000 of foreign exchange against a first gain of ₱1,000,000 of foreign investment. But there is also the two to three million pesos of annual production. This, which is 8 to 12 times the repatriated profit, is pumped into local circulation enriching labor, raw-material production, subcontractors, and, last but by no means least, the tax collector and thus the coffers of the Philippine Government itself. What is there to be afraid of in all this?

Let us take another specific example, this time in an industry manufacturing for export. The Hawaiian-Philippine Co., of which I happen to be president, ended the war with a common-stock structure of ₱4,000,000 represented by a dramatic assortment of burnt-out ruins on the island of Negros. To restore it to production took 2 years of work and approximately ₱11,500,000, all of which was remitted into this country by foreign investment and loans. In other words, an immediate gain to the Philippine Republic of five and three-quarter million United States dollars from foreign financiers. Last year the company made a net profit of about ₱1,600,000. What happens if these foreign financiers want to remit overseas this full net profit to repay loans and service capital? The Philippine Republic will be returning merely US$800,000 against a recent import of five and three-quarter million United States dollars, and this is by no means the whole picture. For the value of the Hawaiian-Philippine Co.'s production last year exceeded ₱15,000,000, the bulk of which was in United States dollar exchange and all of which, less the profit referred to above, is a gain to the Philippine Republic, not to mention the fact that the major portion of this gross income was distributed, not to the company, but to hundreds of planters and thousands of laborers. What is there to be afraid of in this? I simply do not know.

But I do know that Mr. Daniel Aguinaldo spoke words of wisdom last week when he drew your attention to the experience of the United States, that giant of material progress and deep benevolence. For America has historically welcomed the entry of foreign capital, and not only in the earliest years when her population and her skills and domestic capital were insufficient to develop the natural resources beneath her soil. For decades, foreign money flooded into America and owned and financed its development and repatriated its profits. And the supreme beneficiaries have been the people of the United States and the local capitalists.

Money is essentially permeating, and the history of one country after another shows that no one is ultimately more enriched by the entry of foreign capital than the local capitalists in the country of entry. For industries feed and supply each other. They expand together as can be seen in any country where industry has progressed. America is no obsolete example. It is insufficiently remembered that until 1914 she was a debtor Nation and doing very well out of it. And Canada, a conspicuously successful member of the British Commonwealth, is still a debtor nation. Then why do the Philippines shrink and fear the examples of these successful peoples? Do we prefer to imitate failures? I do not know. But I have wondered if we sufficiently realize the human tendency to set one's sights below one's capacities, the tendency to nourish fear and to starve confidence. The current lack of confidence in the Philippines today is surely overplayed. To read the excerpts from the press that have been published in the United States, one would think that this country was finished; that its commerce was nonexistent, and that it was peopled mostly by outlaws. Gentlemen, you and I know that this is not true. Anyone who reports disorder in certain parts of Luzon should, in fairness to the Filipino people, add that peace and production prevail in the major regions of the Archipelago. When our rice production was low after the war, and heavy rice imports drained much-needed dollars, the fact was widely publicized. How much prominence is given today, both at home and abroad, to the real improvement in rice production and to the savings in dollars that have been achieved? The threat to the peso was widely publicized overseas when import and exchange controls were applied last December. How much overseas publicity has been accorded to the maintenance of the Republic's dollar reserve that has been achieved since December by

the Central Bank, an institution which, in my humble opinion, has conducted its unpopular task with far greater efficiency to-date than has yet been publicized? Let us hope that, as the ultimate yardstick of stature, all those who discharge the great responsibilities of directing these controls, will realize that the highest objective of controls must be their eventual abolition, if money and trade are to be restored to full fruition. For exchange controls are merely the lingering shackles of the war. They are not the property of peace. In many less fortunate countries who applied controls at an earlier date in their postwar economy, these shackles are now being struck off one by one, as industry and trade regain their equilibrium, and as money is restored to its function of movement.

The economic problems of the Philippines, as all of us must know, are infinitely easier of solution than most other countries. For however strenuously the Central Bank may husband the dollar reserves of the Philippine Republic, this country's greatest dollar reserves lie undeveloped in its soil—in its forests, in its mineral reserves, silently awaiting development by the skillful combination of additional capital, craftsmen and labor, and throughout the agricultural regions whose yields can be so greatly improved. Is it not time that we thought of these things with more confidence and less fear? And if the Philippine Association, whose basic purpose is public relations, can clarify the fears that now confine us, then the association is, to my mind, immeasurably worth supporting. For one cannot conduct public relations without an understanding of truth. And I cannot believe that most of today's fears can survive truth. Fear and misunderstanding must shrink before truth if truth is clad with good will just as the mists of night are dissolved by the majestic sun.

Gentlemen, I am proud to be with you today and to have had this opportunity of speaking to you about the Philippine Association and about some of the reasons that have caused me, as a plain businessman and a representative of both foreign and local capital, to have joined it. Won't you do likewise?

Decision Time for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 12 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a timely editorial entitled "Decision Time for America," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star yesterday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 11, 1950]

DECISION TIME FOR AMERICA

The trend of events in Korea and elsewhere throughout the world leaves no room for doubt that this Nation is now at a point where it must make hard decisions, one way or the other, for the sake of its own safety. Must we act at once to mobilize our strength on a prepare-for-the-worst basis or should we merely hope for the best and seek security in a program of half measures?

This is not a simple question. It involves two risks at opposite extremes, wholly apart from how Russia might react to our heavy rearmament. On the one hand, if the decision is for all-out mobilization, and if the world—over a period of months—takes a spectacular turn for the better, our national economy and society will have been subjected to a highly costly upheaval without such an upheaval really having been necessary. On the other hand, however, if we adhere to our current program of improvisation and keep on resorting to bits and pieces of action from hour to hour, we may find—with overnight suddenness—that total war is upon us and we are woefully unprepared. Stated with some oversimplification, the choice this presents is a choice between the danger of doing too much and the danger of doing too little.

The United States needs to set a course for itself right now. It must make up its mind as to how much it wants to do—whether it wants to go all the way or only part of the way—in terms of things that deeply affect its national existence. Regulation of the labor force; economic controls like rationing, priorities, and higher taxation; conversion of industry to mobilize it for a sharply increased output of tanks, guns, planes, naval vessels, etc.; the commandeering of shipping; the question of whether the present limited draft is sufficient or whether we ought not to call up our national guardsmen and reserves—these are some of the matters that must be decided upon. The chief decider, of course, by virtue of his office, must be Mr. Truman. Working in close consultation with key Federal departments and with such men as W. Stuart Symington, who has already begun to explore the situation as our mobilization director, it is the President who must take the lead in making up the country's mind.

Two weeks ago, just after the first shock of the Kremlin-supported Red invasion of southern Korea, the American people—though aware that this criminal act of aggression might lead to another world war—had at least a little reason to be optimistic about the possibility of localizing it and ending it without too much trouble. For at that time the President himself, describing our intervention as a police action, seemed fairly confident that the job could be done with a minimum of effort. But today the story is quite different. Now we have ground troops engaged in the struggle, and before we win—if we are going to win—we may have to send in as many as six divisions of them. Perhaps, considered by itself, this situation, despite the numerous grave risks and the serious supply problem involved, does not require anything more than our present bits-and-pieces program. The grim fact is, however, that it cannot be considered by itself. The grim fact is that what is happening in Korea may be duplicated at any moment in places like Iran, Yugoslavia, and western Europe.

For the pattern of Soviet-directed Communist aggression is world-wide in scope, and the Kremlin, either next week or next month or next spring, may strike a blow—possibly against us directly—that will lead immediately to a global war. That is the thing we must keep in mind now. That is the menace we must be wide awake to. We may hope that nothing will come of it. We may hope that the Russians will not set off an explosion. We may hope that somehow, some day, we will be able to settle our differences with them without an armed conflict. Meanwhile, though, as they lurk and maneuver furtively behind the iron curtain, we have every reason to suspect the worst of them, and events throughout the globe are like an alarm bell warning us to be prepared.

In such circumstances, our choice is not necessarily between doing too much and doing too little. There must be a middle course somewhere between the two extremes. But we must do more than we are doing now, and if we err it should be on the side of doing too much. For it is better to be ready for the worst, even if the worst never happens, than to hope for the best and take the risk of finding ourselves losing everything in a catastrophe against which we have armed ourselves chiefly with wishful thoughts and desperate prayers.

Wedemeyer Makes Another Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Wedemeyer report on China was long a secret which the people of the United States were not permitted to see. Some parts of that report have since been published in the China white paper, but on June 1, last, General Wedemeyer delivered a commencement address at Creighton University and he has expanded on the report which he previously made. Pertinent comments have been made by Frank C. Hanighen in his column, Not Merely Gossip, which appears as a supplement to Human Events for July 14. I am including his comments on General Wedemeyer's address:

A friend in Omaha sent us an interesting document the other day. It is a copy of a commencement address at Creighton University in Omaha, Nebr., given on June 1 by Lt. Gen. A C. Wedemeyer, an alumnus. Wedemeyer, it may be recalled, was commander of the China-Burma theater late in the war; and in the postwar period was sent on a Presidential mission to China. He rendered a famous report on China which was long kept secret by the administration. Last year the general was transferred from his position as chief planner of the Army and sent to command the Sixth Army area on the Pacific coast. Some in the Capital felt that Wedemeyer was shifted because of his supposed dissenting attitude toward administration war plans.

Absence from Washington with its internecine strife in the services has borne fruit in some valuable and detached observations in the general's address. We find it significant that he emphasized three points:

1. At a time when there is much to-do about "informing the American people" concerning recent conferences abroad, and when many believe that the State Department is not frank with Congress, Wedemeyer said: "First, we must avoid unnecessary secrecy. We must remember the noble demand of President Wilson for open covenants, openly arrived at. During the war, information concerning national and international commitments was withheld from everyone except the highest officials. As a result, the citizens of this Nation were unable to analyze and pass judgment on actions that influenced their future well-being and that of their country. There is no justification under existing conditions for stringent security measures involving denial or only partial dissemination of information of vital interest to the American people."

2. Next, General Wedemeyer laid unusual stress on what our contributor last week, General Bonner Fellers, called "psychological

warfare": "In order to cope successfully with these destructive forces of communism, we must understand that military force alone will not suffice. We must reach the hearts and minds of all peoples with an appeal to human reason and compassion. It is imperative that we develop and implement all possible informational means that will clarify American attitudes, policies, plans, and actions * * *. Paradoxically, today we are permitting the Communists to misinform the world of our motives, plans, and actions * * *. It is true we are trying to eradicate this curtain of deceit, but so far on a pitifully inadequate scale."

3. Finally, we note that the general devotes much space to the necessity of having a "global plan." He utters no criticism of current planning. But it is noteworthy that, as a military planner in the last war, he speaks as follows: "Events that have transpired since VE and VJ days would indicate that we never achieved effective agreement with our allies concerning the peacetime conditions to be initiated and maintained in the defeated nations, Germany, Italy, and Japan. A plan for rehabilitation, territorial adjustments, and the creation of self-determined political, economic, and cultural structures should have been evolved and agreed upon at the time of our entrance into the war or shortly thereafter when we were lend-leasing billions of dollars worth of supplies and when we possessed irresistible military power." It is known that the general in 1942 strongly urged political planning for the end of the war. But it is interesting that in the June 1 address in Omaha he seems to advocate that "he who pays the piper should call the tune." He says bluntly, "if we Americans are to answer successfully the challenge of communism or any other form of totalitarianism, we must have global direction for the use of our manpower and resources."

Foreign Letter Writing Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 12 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, an organization known as the Common Council for American Unity has been carrying on what I consider a very important campaign encouraging Americans to write letters to their relatives and friends abroad. These letters are designed to further the great campaign of truth which the United States must carry on in every part of the world.

I have here a press release from the Common Council for American Unity addressed to the American people urging them to new efforts in this letter-writing campaign. I think these letters can be more effective than anything which governments can say or write.

I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to insert this press release in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMON COUNCIL FOR AMERICAN UNITY,
New York, N. Y.

THE STRENGTH OF AMERICA

When people abroad think about America, they sometimes believe the strangest things. The same person may hold two entirely contradictory opinions—and both opinions may be false.

It is a fact, for example, that America is often said to be soft, as if its strength had been drained away by its high standard of living. And at the same time it is said to be warlike. It is pictured as a lazy country, and it is pictured as aggressive.

The hostile propagandist encourages both these extremes, knowing that two lies can be more confusing and dangerous than one. The citizen who is taking part in the "campaign of truth" must combat these lies in every way he can.

What is the truth about America's strength? How can that truth be fostered by letters written to friends and relatives abroad?

America's record in two World Wars is proof, of course, that it is not soft. Yet every fiber of the country's being cries out against further wars. America wants to be strong, but it also wants to be peaceful.

Everyday letters can convey something of this deep American sentiment. In telling about the life of his town or city, the writer gradually builds up a picture of a people devoted to peace, yet ready to defend at all costs the freedom under which it lives.

Of course it would be possible to talk of the trivial or unfortunate incidents that break out in every community—cases of boys getting into trouble of crime or divorce. But the wise letter-writer will avoid these things. He will give no chance for the unfriendly critic to whisper: "You see, I told you these Americans are weak and decadent." He will emphasize, instead, the schools, the labor organizations, the civic meetings from which spring a vital community life.

On the 30th of this month, Memorial Day is celebrated. In towns and cities across the land America will pay tribute to its war dead, and will reaffirm its desire to end wars and conquests forever. At the same time there will be parades and martial music.

In these lines of boys and young men, in these veterans of former wars putting on their old uniforms for a day, will be the symbol of America's eternal strength. Behind the gathering in each village square will be the unseen image of the great armies which can be called into being when our safety or freedom is threatened.

Let the citizen think about Memorial Day, and then write about it to his friends abroad. Let him tell what he sees and what he feels in his heart. That testimony will overcome falsehoods, and will portray the real strength of America.

Milestones Marking the Downfall of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address delivered by Col. Donald N. Wackwitz, USAF, at the second annual convention of the Polish-American Veterans of Massachusetts, Inc., on June 11, 1950, at Lawrence, Mass.:

MILESTONES MARKING THE DOWNFALL OF POLAND

Ladies and gentlemen, I consider it a great honor to speak to the Polish-American Veterans of Massachusetts on this occasion marking your second anniversary. As veterans, I know you represent all services and served in all theaters of war and, like almost everyone else, returned to civil life, thinking that the peace had been won.

This afternoon I have chosen to talk about Poland. Recent Polish history is significant, not only to Americans of Polish descent, but to all Americans. I wish to tell the story of the tragic fate of Poland and to describe the underlying reasons behind this tragedy, namely, the complete misunderstanding of Soviet aims and intentions on the part of the United States and Great Britain. Well intentioned and naive though the Western Powers might have been, the fact remains that their errors assisted materially in delivering Poland and other European countries into the barbaric yoke of Bolshevism—costly errors which we can ill afford to repeat. The fate not only of Poland and other captive areas, but also of the entire free world, lies to a substantial degree in our understanding of past errors. To act wisely in the future, we must face up to our mistakes.

When, back in 1942 and 1943, the Allies failed to discern the war aims of the Soviets, the fate of Poland was sealed. Postwar-resistance by Mikolajczyk and other patriots was doomed to failure even before it got under way. This statement will become clear as I develop the main characteristics of Soviet foreign policy.

First, let us examine the Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement of August 23, 1939. This event, coupled with documented statements made by high-level Soviets during the months preceding, reveals with clarity the actual intentions of the Soviets at that time. To befog this clarity, Soviet propaganda has made considerable efforts in explaining the 1939 agreement as a "defensive maneuver" designed to buy time in which to prepare for the German attack. This was not the case, although the Soviet explanation was accepted at face value. Even to this day, this defensive myth has largely persisted. We have not yet learned to identify the more subtle types of Soviet propaganda.

The weight of all available evidence supports the thesis that the Soviets regarded the 1939 agreement as an offensive strategic move designed to re-equate the world power balance, permitting the Soviets to emerge as the dominant Eurasian power.

The Soviet claim that their nonaggression pact with Germany was for the purpose of buying time is refuted by the very situation existing at the time in which the Soviets made their choice of alliances. During negotiations with Germany, the Western Powers were seeking a military alliance with the Soviet Union. Negotiations had advanced to the point where political agreement had been reached and initialed—a fact that is as yet little known in the United States. The only outstanding problem was for the Western Powers to reach accord with the Soviet Union on military matters. But before the technical military problems had been solved, the Soviets signed their agreement with Hitler. The Soviet deliberately procrastinated to avert agreement with the West. By conducting simultaneous negotiations with Germany, they were in a position to select whichever alliance suited their intentions best.

In 1939 the Western Powers were committed to come to the assistance of Poland in the event that Poland were attacked by Germany. The Soviet Union had encouraged western firmness to such an extent that, in August 1939, it was no longer possible for the Western Powers to withdraw and arrange for a compromise solution. The situation then existing made it extremely probable that German aggression against Poland would result in general war. The Soviet high command understood this clearly. However, a policy which led to a common German-

Soviet border, a strengthening of Germany in the east, and possibly to an isolated Russo-German war without concurrent neutralization of German military strength in the west was unacceptable from the Soviet viewpoint. On the other hand, if the Soviets were genuinely desirous of preventing the outbreak of general war, or, if they really feared German strength, their best policy by all odds would have been to come to a military agreement with the west. Such a policy offered the best chance of gaining the greatest amount of time, as well as the strongest military posture vis-a-vis the Nazis. As an ally of the west, the Soviets would have been able to purchase vast quantities of equipment, all to their added advantage.

Inasmuch as the Soviets turned their back on these more obvious advantages in negotiating a Western Alliance, it is evident that Soviet policy aimed at creating war, not at avoiding it. This deduction is supported by statements of Soviet leaders. (The most logical and best documented discussion of Soviet strategy leading to the pact with Hitler is contained in Strausz-Hupé and Possony, International Relations in the Age of the Conflict Between Democracy and Dictatorship, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1950, ch. XXV.)

In March 1939, Stalin, himself, summed up the possibilities inherent in the then existing situation:

"The bourgeois politicians know, of course, that the first imperialistic world war led to the victory of the revolution in one of the largest countries. They are afraid that the second imperialistic world war might also lead to the victory of the revolution in one or several countries."

In the same speech Stalin outlined Soviet policy in greater detail:

"The policy on nonintervention means conniving at aggression giving free reign to war, and consequently, transforming the war into a world war. The policy of nonintervention reveals an eagerness, a desire, not to hinder Japan, say, from embroiling herself in a war with China, or better still, with the Soviet Union; to allow all the belligerents to sink deeply into the mire of war, to encourage them surreptitiously in this, to allow them to weaken and exhaust one another; and then, when they have become weak enough, to appear on the scene with fresh strength and to dictate conditions to enfeeble belligerents. Cheap and easy."

Although this particular statement refers specifically to the Far East, the doctrine expressed therein is equally applicable to western Europe. As early as 1925, Stalin predicted the Second World War and said that Russia could not avoid being drawn into it, but should enter it last. Stalin's strategy was developed originally by Lenin in 1920 and can be summed up in the following terms: (1) To encourage non-Communist states to exhaust their resources in fighting wars, preferably with each other; (2) when they are weakened sufficiently, to appear on the scene and dictate conditions to the enfeebled belligerents; (3) this is the road to cheap and easy conquest.

Strausz-Hupé and Possony aptly called this maneuver "chestnut strategy": the Soviets contrived that other nations got the chestnuts out of the fire for them—the old device of the tertium gaudens.

Obviously the logic of the thesis that the Soviets provoked World War II depends on the assumption that the Soviet leaders estimated the defensive strength of the western powers to be adequate in a contest with Nazi Germany. Fortunately, on this point, the evidence is fairly conclusive. The Soviets, among other observers in 1939, greatly overestimated the strength of the western powers and underestimated the strength of Germany. Stalin, in his speech of March 10, 1939, stated that: "Combined, the nonaggressive democratic states are unquestionably stronger than the Fascist states, economically and militarily." On the following day, Manuilski spelled out the Soviet estimate of the situation in greater detail:

"The world reactionaries are deliberately creating the legend of the might of German fascism in order to weaken the peoples determination to resist. Fascist Germany is not prepared for a big and serious war—she has not enough war materials and food stuffs; her financial position is critical; her coasts are vulnerable to naval blockade; her army is inadequately officered; her rear is a dangerous one for fascism. The superiority of material force is undoubtedly on the side of the so-called democratic states."

It is evident that the Soviets confidently expected that Western strength would cause Germany so to exhaust herself that the Soviets would be able to emerge with unimpaired strength from battle and reap the fruits of an easy victory. While Stalin discounted the danger of a Nazi victory without concomitant exhaustion of Germany, he believed also that the Soviet Union was strong enough to withstand a full German attack. This estimate was reflected in Stalin's speech of March 10: "We are not afraid of the threats of aggressors, and are ready to deal two blows for every blow delivered by instigators of war, who attempt to violate Soviet borders."

Most convincing in this connection is the fact that the Soviet economy was not mobilized for large-scale armaments until after June 27, 1940, that is, after the fall of France. On that day the 8-hour working day was reintroduced, a 7-day week ordered, and workers were frozen in their jobs. It is evident, therefore, that the requirement for an emergency armament build-up was not felt in August 1939. Thus, it must be concluded that the Soviets believed in the accuracy of their estimate of the situation.

Additional support to the thesis that the Soviets deliberately provoked World War II comes from the Soviet emigrees who have escaped from the U. S. S. R. Lt. Col. Grigori A. Tokaev, formerly a member of Marshal Zhukov's staff, has been particularly articulate in his exposé of Soviet policy:

"The Politburo had no intention of entering the European war, at least before the issue had been decided. Its hope was that Germany would be an instrument for smashing the main European enemy of Bolshevism (Britain and her ally, the United States). Hence the Non-Aggression Pact of 1939 satisfied both Stalin's crude sense of opportunism and basic Marxist theory. The Soviet Union would arm Germany to bring down Britain and the United States. Then, when Western society was bleeding to death, Bolshevism would intervene and dominate the void.

"Hitler struck first, and his fierce lunge to the east ruined that monstrous ambush. Between 1941–43, the Soviet Union had to fight for its life, and the great dream of a Communist hegemony in Europe was temporarily shelved." (An Exposé of Soviet Russia Plans and Policies, by Lt. Col. Grigori A. Tokaev, in Intelligence Information Bulletin No. 35 (unclassified) of May 13, 1949, published by Headquarters Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala.)

Thus, the Soviet motive behind the Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement was one of sinister opportunism, consistent with Soviet grand strategy and enunciated doctrine. The true reasoning of the Soviet Government in 1939 was not only concealed successfully at the time, but also with equal facility during the war itself, when the United States and Great Britain continued to miscalculate Soviet intentions.

THE LATTER PHASE OF WORLD WAR II

Stalin's actions of 1939 proved extremely costly and risky to the Soviet Union. He made a grievous error in calculating the relative strength of the opponents. He greatly overestimated that of France and Britain and underestimated the strength of Germany. As a result, the Soviets themselves became involved in a struggle for survival. However, in spite of the damage sustained, the war damage to other European nations also was very high. Long before the end of the war, it became evident that the Soviets would emerge as the dominant power in Europe. The Politburo again began to plan for Communist hegemony in Europe.

During the latter part of the war, the Soviets devoted considerable effort in preparing for the post-hostilities period. After the battles of Stalingrad and El Alamein in 1942 and 1943, the Politburo realized that, for planning purposes, Germany already had been defeated. It simply was a matter of time before the final military victory could be consummated. From this time onward, two entirely different wars were being fought: (1) the United States-British war to defeat Nazi Germany during which the west continued to assume incorrectly that the Soviets were still their partners; and (2), the Soviet revolutionary war of maximum expansion at the expense of the west in Europe and in Asia. This parallelism of two wars resulted frequently in contradictory strategies which usually were resolved to the advantage of the Soviets.

For example, Soviet insistence on a western attack across the English Channel was due not to an ignorance of the complexities of amphibious warfare, as we had supposed, but rather was the result of the Soviet General Staff estimate that such an attack was virtually impossible. It was assumed that the western armies either would be thrown back or would be too weak to penetrate deeper into the continent. When it became known in Moscow that the British-American task force had landed successfully in France, the existing sentiment in higher circles, so aptly described by Lt. Col. Grigori A. Tokaev, is worthy of note:

"I was in Moscow when the Anglo-Americans landed in France. The news aroused in the ruling circles anything but the expression of relief one might have expected from a hard-pressed nation given reprieve through the gallant action of an ally. Rather were they afraid that, if the Allied landing succeeded, and a quick thrust to the east developed in consequence, the Soviet armies would be too late to occupy the whole of Germany. Although Stalin sent a message of congratulations to the Western Powers, the atmosphere in the Politbureau belied his expressions of joy."

The Soviets expected that the Allied invasion not only would fail in accomplishing its objectives, but also, and more important, would draw German strength from the east, and thereby facilitate Soviet occupation of all of Germany. In support of this concept, Soviet policy from 1944 onward was that Germany must be occupied by Soviet troops, whatever the cost might be, and under no circumstances, by any other western powers. The importance attached to the occupation of all of Germany transcended any of the United States-British objectives, geared to defeating Nazi imperialism. Again, Lieutenant Colonel Tokaev throws some interesting light on this subject:

"The success of the Normandy invasion took the Kremlin by surprise. The power and mobility revealed by the Anglo-American armies in the break-thrcughs at Caen and St. Lo gave rise to a near panic that they would be in Berlin before the 1944 winter. 'Hurry, hurry, hurry' became the slogan of the Soviet high command.

"Yet, though the Red army strained every nerve, the race seemed hopeless until the western advance was suddenly halted. It is common knowledge among the Soviet General Staff officers that the race for Berlin cost the Red army over 1,000,000 casualties."

The Soviet race for Germany and the tremendous amount of energy the Politbureau was willing to expend on this operation point up the importance in Soviet thinking for the necessity of conquering territories militarily. In other words, the Politbureau operated on the assumption that any territory overrun by the Red army would become Soviet territory and that territories would become communistic only if and when conquered by Soviet military force.

In reality, with only one exception—Czechoslovakia—all Soviet gains made in western Europe during the war were the result of the Soviet Army advance; the subsequent installation of Communist-type governments was purely an administrative device to assure perpetuation of Soviet control. Considering this, it is difficult to understand why many supposedly well-informed people have assessed the Soviet installation of Communist-type governments in the various satellite countries as representing an enormous gain accomplished through the use of nonmilitary means. Even in the case of Czechoslovakia, Soviet military forces were massed on the frontier, poised for action and holding out a threat. The success in Czechoslovakia can be attributed to the psychological use of military force.

We are now able to make some conclusions about Soviet prewar and war aims:

1. Basic Soviet aims and intentions prior to World War II were to expand world communism. To this end, Soviet strategy attempted to steer Germany and the western European powers into an exhaustive war, which they calculated would transfer the balance of power to the Soviet Union.

2. Once the Soviets were assured that their struggle for survival against Nazi Germany would succeed, their strategy from that moment on was not to assist the western powers, their allies, but to weaken them.

3. Soviet strategy recognized the importance of the advancing Red army and the part it played in subsequent Communist expansion.

SOVIET CONSOLIDATION OF POLAND

Even so-called competent observers realize but rarely the simplicity of the Soviet program for consolidation of Poland; nor do they realize the thoroughness of its execution. Few people understand that the Soviets initiated measures to assure themselves of control at a very early date, namely, in 1939.

In general, the pattern pursued was as follows:

1. The elimination of the opposition with the aid of secret police and the consent of the western allies;

2. The establishment of a Kremlin-trained puppet government, including sham elections to legalize the authority of the puppet government;

3. Purges of the Communists in power to maintain control and assure political reliability; and

4. Religious persecution.

Elimination of Polish leaders, potential and actual, dates from the time of the initial Soviet occupation of Poland in 1939. It is common knowledge that approximately one and a half million Poles were deported to the U. S. S. R. between the time of the Soviet occupation of Poland in 1939, and the German attack against Russia in 1941. These people were placed in concentration camps where starvation, work, and terror took their toll. According to Mikolajczyk, the professional Poles were assigned the most degrading tasks. (Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, The Rape of Poland (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1948), p. 24.)

As a second step in the elimination of potential opposition, the Soviets murdered some 15,000 Polish officers interned in three camps; so the evidence shows, which the Soviets, despite hard tries, were unable to disprove. Mass graves of about one-third of these officers were found by the Germans near Katyn on April 12, 1943. An exhumation of the graves revealed that all of the Poles, without exception, had been executed by a shot through the back of the head, which is a long-practiced method of Soviet execution. Diaries and papers on the corpses fixed the time of the murders as April and May 1940, when the Germans were not in the area.

The graves at Katyn explain the disappearance of approximately 5,000 of the 15,000 Polish officers interned, but the other 10,000 are still to be accounted for. Fairly reliable evidence indicates that these officers were removed from their camps, and disappeared in the vicinity of Vyazma and Kharkov. Probably they were executed at about the same time as those near Katyn. In any event, the Soviets failed to return these officers to the legal Polish government as promised, and the Polish officers have disappeared in Russia without leaving a trace. Not a single one of these hapless officers returned. Who can be made responsible for their disappearance but the Soviets?

Early in 1944, when the Red army began overrunnning Poland, the Soviet secret police again began eliminating Polish patriots. As early as 4 months before the Warsaw uprising, the Polish underground was reporting that its members were hesitant to show themselves to the Red army. This did not deter the Warsaw underground from rising, unfortunately. In spite of some misgivings, they responded to the Soviet signal and rose in full, open, armed rebellion. The Soviet betrayal gave proof that their fears were well founded. Instead of relieving the Poles, the Red army remained rooted on the west bank of the Vistula while the Germans annihilated the Poles during 63 days of fierce fighting.

Approximately a quarter of a million residents of Warsaw, including the bulk of the insurgents, were killed. Another 350,000 were forcibly evacuated. The only land effort the Red army made to relieve the Warsaw uprising was to send the Polish Kosciusko Division to its suicide. As the Polish division was pushing across the Vistula, the Soviets cut off its artillery support, thus assuring its annihilation. (Mikolajczyk, op. cit., p. 85.)

The elimination of patriots, of course, continued after the end of hostilities. The Polish satellite government rounded up some 40,000 officers and men of the underground army and deported them to Russia. In March 1945 the 16 top leaders of the underground movement were tricked, by a promise of safe conduct, to go to Russia for a meeting with the Soviet Government. They were arrested on the trumped-up charge of espionage and treason, and were never heard of again. (Ibid., pp. 111–112; also United States Ambassador H. B. Lane, How Russia Rules Poland, Life, July 14, 1947, vol. 23, pp. 98–100.) These unhappy men included Ehrlich and Alter, two world-famous socialists who had devoted their lives to the cause of labor and socialism. The backbone of the resistance movement against the Soviets was broken even before it had a chance to organize.

These, then, were the essential steps by which the Soviets secured control of Poland for their puppets. It was primarily a military as well as a police and terror operation. The parliamentary maneuverings, sham referendum, and elections which came later were mere window dressing to hide the consolidation of control. Even the Soviet military intervention was camouflaged in the guise of a defensive war. (Lane, op. cit. As Soviet troop strength was reduced in 1946 and Polish satellite troop strength was increased, it became a common joke that the new Polish Army was remarkably fluent in Russian.) Later, the virtual incorporation of the Polish armed forces into the Soviet military machine was camouflaged through the appointment of fake Poles to high positions, a technique which was applied most brazenly in the appointment of the sham Pole, Rokossovski, as commander of the Polish forces.

THE POLITICAL DEFEAT OF MIKOLAJCZYK

With the physical control of Poland assured, the Soviets set about fulfilling their program and established, step by step, the dictatorship of the proletariat. At the command of the Soviets, the Lublin Committee of National Liberation (a Soviet appointed body of Communists and pro-Communists) proclaimed itself the new government of Poland on December 31, 1944. On January 5, the U. S. S. R. formally recognized this provisional government. The United States and Great Britain refused to accept this Soviet fait accompli, and continued to recognize the London government. Under the terms of the Yalta agreement the Big Three, however, agreed that all Polish parties should take part in the provisional government. The Soviets sabotaged this agreement by insisting that the Lublin group have a majority in the new government. Without encountering too serious a western opposition, they managed to put Communists in all the levels of command. The participation of the London Poles in the government had no significance whatever, and was terminated soon.

From the moment of entering Warsaw the Lublin puppets set about preparing for the sham elections which would serve as the window dressing for removal of Mikolajczyk. By terror, the effectiveness of the Peasant Party was reduced to insignificant proportions. Peasant Party leaders were systematically murdered until organized opposition to the Communists was destroyed, and nothing was left but a few last-ditch resisters who had only feeble words against the machine guns of the police.

Mikolajczyk was beaten before he started to fight. The secret police tormented him, and arrested other leaders of his Peasant Party. His paper, the Gazeta Ludowa was severely censored. In parliamentary sessions he was impotent with his handful of supporters. In short, the Communists prevented Mikolajczyk from reaching the people.

Preparation for the "free and unfettered elections" took nearly 2 years. Eventually, however, the puppet police (under the training of the Soviet secret police) became very efficient. In January 1947 the puppet government felt confident enough to allow general elections to be held. The government bloc won by the majority specified by Stalin (about 87 percent) and the man selected by Stalin, the renegate Socialist, Josef Cyrankiewicz, became "prime minister." This was the death blow to the Peasant Party. Mikolajczyk was forced out of the government and fled in October 1947.

PURGES OF POLICE COMMUNISTS

It is an established practice for the Politburo to purge key officeholders periodically. By extensive elimination of these Communist Party members, the Soviets accomplish in a relatively short space of time one or more complete changes of leadership for a particular region or area. This method, while demoralizing, is effective in achieving its purpose, i. e., maintenance of control. Purges preclude the possibility of conspiracy and destroy the continuity of opposition.

The Soviets apparently began application of this policy to Poland (and other satellite countries) during 1949. On November 13, President Bierut reported that three members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party: Gomulka, Spychalski, and Kliszko, had been removed from their status as committeemen, and at the same time he announced plans for a thorough purge. To date the purge has not developed to major proportions. Osubka-Morawski, former prime minister, was removed and fell into obliv-

ion—the well deserved fate of most pro-Soviet dupes. While many of the original puppet cabinet are left, it is too early to make predictions for a long tenure of office.

PERSECUTION OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

Religious oppression appears to be one of the least fruitful of the Soviet social measures. Admittedly the Soviets have made major inroads on the strength of the Orthodox Church in the U. S. S. R., but even after 30 years of effort, the number of religious adherents is very considerable.

In Poland, the Communist government began fighting the Roman Catholic Church almost from the start of its existence, but not very intensively at first. In recent months, the puppet government has increased the severity and intensity of its measures against the Roman Catholic Church. But the Soviets recognize the strength of Christianity in Poland, and therefore they proceed slowly, using the method of gradual infiltration and disintegration rather than of direct assault.

Let us conclude: the present puppet regime was imposed upon the people of Poland against their will. The Poles were and are extremely patriotic, but they did not have a chance for heroic resistance against the imposition of communism. They were betrayed by their professed ally, the U. S. S. R., at the very time when they were fighting the common enemy, Germany. Unfortunately, the leadership and elite of the Polish nation have been greatly reduced and may soon be annihilated. The probability of strong Polish resistance in the future is therefore small.

Most important, the fate of Poland was the result of great power decisions over which the Poles had no control. The present tragic plight of Poland is partly attributable to the fact that the United States was completely misinformed about Soviet intentions and did not take effective counter-measures. Considering the present over-all military situation, it appears that Poland has no chance of escaping from the shackles of Soviet slavery until the democratic nations of the world are successful in breaking Bolshevik control. The fate of Poland should teach us that not only Poland, but the United States as well, is now engaged in a deadly struggle for survival.

Explanation of Federal Health Service Reinsurance Act (H. R. 8746), Introduced by Congressman Charles A. Wolverton, of New Jersey, Providing a Plan for National Health Service, Without Socializing the Practice of Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, we Americans have long held the view that it is the function of the Federal Government to undertake such projects as can only be done or better be done by the Federal Government. We have as a Nation prospered and become powerful by encouraging private, individual industry.

Today throughout the world—and in America—there are those who appear to be of the opinion that the Government can do almost everything better than the people. I do not share that conviction. And as we look out over the world to observe the examples of Government in business, there is little to recommend its encouragement.

As a progressive, humane, democratic people, all Americans are concerned about our national health. We all want to reduce the ravages, pains, and costs of illness and accident. We all want to improve the treatment of disease. We all want to see every American have available to him the best of medical and hospital care. No party or political philosophy can lay sole claim to that fervent hope. None of us can afford to leave it to idle hope—or to make health a political issue.

In discussing health and hospitalization and medicine, it is fair to start on the assumption that we all wish to provide the best possible progress in this most important field. Our differences arise over the question of how this can best be accomplished. There are those who believe it is the function, or even the duty, of the Government to provide a bureaucracy to diagnose and treat all the ills of all our people. Many pious but impractical suggestions have been made. The need for a practical plan remains. The measure I propose is, I believe, a sound base on which to develop a comprehensive, effective, health service. It can be improved by the thoughtful help of all who are interested in this vast problem. If I were convinced that by that method, we could best solve the pains and costs and heartaches of illness, I would be the first to support it. I do not oppose a socialized medical system because I fear the term or because I want to see anyone become rich at the expense of the misfortunes of others. I oppose such a system for two reasons:

First, because where it has been tried it has resulted in poorer quality medical service at a higher cost.

And, second, because my judgment tells me the same would happen here. Health is not an industry. Because hospitalization costs are, in many cases, out of reach for many people, we must deal with the problem on a community-wide basis. We cannot apply the strictest principles of competitive trade for the care of illness, but we can avoid the penalties—careless costs of bureaucratic control.

Nevertheless, those who, for one reason or another, appear to have lost confidence in the concept that built this Nation persist in their advocacy of the first step toward socialized medicine or, as they call it, national health insurance. Their investigations and their efforts seem to be largely directed toward the establishment of such a system. While they try to sell a socialized medical system, private health service plans have rapidly expanded—to the apparent surprise of those who believe only the Government can treat our ills.

Not long ago one of the pioneers in the Blue Cross program testified before Congress in regard to some of the health bills now being considered. At that time he made this very interesting observation:

> I attended a meeting in Washington when we had enrolled 1,000,000 subscribers. We were told by those with whom we conferred * * * that the million then enrolled was about the maximum we could expect. It was explained that this had been the usual experience in other countries—that no more would enroll on a voluntary basis; that we had done well; that, although we were serious and earnest people who deserved a pat on the back, we had shot our bolt. * * * Yet within 2 years enrollment had risen to 4,431,000. The same people then expressed surprise. * * * They added, however, that the absolute maximum for American voluntary plans had at last been attained.
>
> In 1941—1 year later—Blue Cross had an enrollment of 6,049,000 subscribers. This time we were assured that the only reason American voluntary insurance experience had varied from the experience of other nations was because our Nation was preparing for war, and that if shooting started the membership would diminish rapidly. Two years later, in 1943, after war had started, we had 10,500,000 subscribers. Again the explainers stepped forward. Now and again in 1945, when enrollment had reached 16,511,000, they said that enrollment had increased only because we were at war and that when war was over membership would at once melt away. At the end of 1946, when war was over, we had enrolled 19,959,000. By this time some were willing to admit that Blue Cross enrollment was a most unusual phenomenon. Nonetheless, the record was still regarded as a flash in the pan and that membership at some time would fall off.
>
> And so it goes. In 1947 we reported 25,876,000 subscribers, and as of December 31, 1948, 33,000,000, and this does not count 22,000,000 other Americans protected against hospital expense by labor unions and commercial insurance plans—55,000,000 in all. When does such an American record become significant?

With such an amazing record, certainly these private health service associations deserve consideration. Obviously, there are gaps in the service they can offer. For example, it is impossible for them to insure a subscriber against the disaster of a long, continuous, and costly illness.

To meet this and some of the other problems we now face, to encourage the wider distribution of better hospital and medical care, to preserve the free choice of the individual, and to keep Government bureaucracy from telling us when we can be sick, what medicine we should get, and who should treat us, I have introduced in the Congress H. R. 8746.

This proposal modeled after the successful plan of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation provides that the Federal Government shall, as it does in the case of bank accounts, guarantee and backstop the individual's investment in medical and hospital insurance programs. It provides a comforting assurance against the ruinous cost of long illness. It provides these and other encouragements to better health without Federal control of medical facilities and at a price those who most need such a service can pay.

I would like to make clear at the outset that some of the preliminary estimates of cost and contribution should be considered as bases from which to evolve a sound statistical structure. Study by our own Government departments and by private research organizations can develop precise limitations that should be prescribed.

This bill, which I believe is an entirely new approach to the problem, provides

a broad extension of medical and hospital services by prescribing that benefits offered by approved associations shall run for as long as 6 months out of a year; that even home calls by doctors—except for the first and up to a maximum of 12 per year—shall be paid for; that the associations will pay 95 percent of hospitalization costs; that extra charges, beyond those prescribed in the contract, shall not exceed 25 percent of the cost; that the Federal Health Reinsurance Corporation shall be liable for two-thirds of each individual claim in excess of $1,000; that Health Service Associations shall meet strict standards before approval. It is proposed also that a patient pay a small additional charge of 5 percent of his medical bill at the time he receives treatment. The premium charge for this reinsurance and expanded benefits shall be 2 percent of the gross payments, a sum to be matched by Federal appropriations. The bill proposes the formation of a $50,000,000 Federal Health Reinsurance Corporation to be directed by a 3-man board of directors serving for 6-year terms.

There are several obvious limitations in the bill—the first home call by a doctor is not paid for, those home calls are limited to 12 per year. Eligible associations must develop contracts guaranteeing a minimum of 75 percent of all charges. Patients are required to pay an additional fee—$1 per day or 5 percent of the bill—for hospital services. Those provisions are included—not because their elimination would add substantially to the cost of these services but rather to prevent the abuses of unlimited medical services we have observed particularly in Great Britain. Without some such restrictions a few would call a doctor every other day for minor or imagined illness; a few would loll for months in our hospitals and thereby so tie up our medical facilities for unnecessary purposes that legitimate and serious health problems could not be treated. Similarly some few doctors or hospitals may use the familiar "charge for extras" unconscionably unless a limit is set. It is useless to pretend these possibilities do not exist. The British Government has found that its health service is bogged down by those who take advantage of its theories. Our planners too would soon find themselves harassed by the same problem.

It has been reliably estimated that a plan embodying the features of this one would cost on the average $5 per month to the individual worker—and the benefits would cover his entire family.

However, because of the wide coverage envisioned; because of the Government guaranty and support; because of the many supplemental plans possible such as employer participation or community participation in needy cases; the cost of this reinsurance plan will be such that any American can participate.

Wider coverage can be assured through encouraging employer participation in these plans—such participation has already been developed by many companies as for example at Bethlehem Steel Co. which provides an excellent plan to its employees at a cost of $2.95 a month.

There are today almost 36,000,000 American people covered by various Blue Cross plans and millions of others included in union and cooperative health service plans. These private plans which are operated by nonprofit organizations have an administration cost of approximately 9 percent. Most of us know the services they offer. Can we suppose that either the cost or the service under a Government program would be comparable?

We are all well aware that this is not our only problem in the health field. We need more and better medical education and research. We need better and expanded hospital facilities particularly in the South and in rural areas. We need to expand such health-service plans to include dental and nursing care. We want to make sure that the size of a man's purse does not determine the state of his health or the care of his illness. We can do that by developing the proper Government function of reinsuring our private investments in health so that all Americans will have equally available at a price they can pay, the right to go to the doctor and hospital they choose and expect to receive the best care American medicine can offer.

I invite individuals and organizations directly concerned with this problem to help further develop this proposal.

This Federal Health Service Reinsurance Act proposes to have the Government act, as it does in the case of banks, as the auditor and supervisor of reinsurance payments. It proposes through private enterprise backed by Federal guaranties to have illness treated on a basis of need. It proposes to end the haunting worry of doctor and hospital bills. But it further proposes to keep bureaucracy where it belongs—out of the accident wards, out of the doctors' offices and out of our private business of choosing whom we want to treat our families when they are sick.

An analysis of H. R. 8746 follows:

ANALYSIS OF H. R. 8746 (THE WOLVERTON BILL)

The purpose of this bill is to expand health services by encouraging and guaranteeing private nonprofit voluntary associations. The general procedure is to use the mechanism employed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to back-stop private health plans in order to permit extended coverage and to allow protection against long, costly treatment. By such Government reinsurance, these local health services can be expanded both in membership and coverage; retain the free choice of the individual; and prevent costly, impractical, Federal control.

The precise figures used in this act are, in many cases, preliminary estimates to be used as starting points and be revised following further study by competent and interested organizations.

Section 1: Describes the purpose of the bill: To improve health by a wider distribution of private medical and health services through a Federal reinsurance program guaranteeing care even in cases of protracted illness.

Section 2: Guarantees a strictly limited Federal participation and guarantees a free choice of doctor and hospital.

Section 3: Defines the terms of the bill describing health service associations as voluntary nonprofit organizations operating under State laws.

Section 4: Establishes a Federal Health Reinsurance Corporation headed by a three-man board of directors holding office for 6 years and being paid $12,000 annually. It describes the powers of the board and capitalizes the Corporation at $50,000,000 to be appropriated from the Treasury. The Corporation is required to report to Congress annually.

Section 5: Provides that the Corporation shall approve health service associations which agree to pay reasonable cost for examination; permits the Corporation to have access to information regarding their operations; agree to pay a premium charge for reinsurance; agree to limit the proportion of their out-of-State subscribers to 25 percent; agree to accept any eligible subscribers; eligible associations will develop contracts with hospitals and doctors to guarantee at least 75 percent of the total bill for hospital care. This section also describes the provisions that must be included in a contract to make the association eligible. These include provisions that the contract shall be specific and written, and that benefits shall run for periods of at least 6 months in any year. This section further provides that, in order to prevent abuses or malingering, each subscriber to a hospital service contract shall pay an additional fee of $1 a day or 5 percent of the total cost; that the association will pay 75 percent of the cost of all doctor's home call charges (except for the first call and up to a maximum of 12 per year); that the association must pay 95 percent of the cost of all hospital medical care; that all licensed doctors and all hospitals in the area are eligible and that the subscriber has a free choice in his selection; and that the Corporation shall pay two-thirds of each claim in excess of $1,000 within any 12-month period.

Section 6: Provides that each association shall pay to the Corporation 2 percent of its total gross contract payments for the benefits of reinsurance. It also provides for reinsurance reserve of $25,000,000 to be established for hospital service and $25,000,000 for medical care. The Corporation is also authorized to borrow, from the Treasury, up to a maximum of $25,000,000. The Federal Government is required to match the premiums for reinsurance paid through the associations and to appropriate funds for administration. Penalties are prescribed for false claims.

Section 7: Covers technical matters concerned with termination of contracts, consolidations and assumptions of liabilities and revocation of approval.

Section 8: Details in regard to advertising regulations, contracts, suits and other similar technical matters. Health service associations are precluded from using the words "insurance," "casuality," or "surety" in their names.

Section 9: Provides for reviews of board decisions.

Section 10: Provides a short title of this act—Federal Health Service Reinsurance Act.

Section 11: Precludes any modification of Government statutes regarding medical care for veterans.

Edward Weinfeld, a Man of Integrity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, President Truman has used his usual good judgment in the selection of Edward Wein-

feld to succeed Judge Simon H. Rifkind as United States district judge in the southern district of New York. He has chosen a man of high integrity and ability. He will undoubtedly be a credit to the Federal bench in New York.

The unanimity of approval of the President's action is evidenced by a news item from the New York Herald Tribune and an editorial from the New York Times, both of July 11, 1950, which are as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 11, 1950]

WEINFELD GETS COURT VACANCY LEFT BY RIFKIND—TRUMAN NOMINATION PRAISED BY BAR OFFICIALS; LAWYER WAS ASSOCIATE OF LEHMAN

WASHINGTON, July 10.—President Truman today nominated Edward Weinfeld, of New York, to be a United States judge for the southern district of New York, succeeding Judge Simon H. Rifkind, resigned.

FRIEND OF LEHMAN

Mr. Weinfeld, 49, a friend and former political associate of United States Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, was State housing commissioner under the then Governor LEHMAN from 1939 to 1942. The vacancy was created when Judge Rifkind, in an unusual move, stepped down from the $15,000 a year Federal bench here May 24, saying he could not raise his family on that salary.

The appointment of Mr. Weinfeld, a former member of the judiciary committee of the association of the bar of the city of New York, by President Truman, was praised by Whitney North Seymour, president of the bar association, and John M. Harlan, chairman of the judiciary committee.

The bar leaders said that "Mr. Weinfeld is a lawyer of wide experience who has previously rendered notable service," adding that he was one of a group recommended to the Attorney General. The statement predicted that Mr. Weinfeld will make a "real contribution" to the court here.

A secondary vacancy remains on the Federal bench here, caused by the death of Judge Murray Hulbert. The post is slated for New York County for an attorney of Italian origin. Four persons are being considered, it is said, Justice James J. Lanzetta, of domestic relations court, and Justices Vincent A. Lupiano and Thomas C. Chimera, of municipal court, and City Court Justice Louis J. Capozzoli. The last named was recently designated as candidate for general sessions, but his name may be substituted if the Federal appointment comes through. So far no jurist of Italian origin has been named to the Federal bench here.

[From the New York Times of July 11, 1950]

AN EXCELLENT APPOINTMENT

Edward Weinfeld will make an able and just United States judge in the southern district of New York, and we congratulate President Truman on the nomination. He has practiced law in New York City for more than 25 years. His career is a New York success story. Edward Weinfeld was born in a lower East Side tenement house, attended the public schools and the New York University Law School. Married and the father of two children, he lives now a few blocks from where he was born.

He served his political apprenticeship in the old sixth assembly district and was elected a delegate to the State constitutional convention of 1938. He now had his first chance to do something for housing reform. He played a major part in passage of the slum-clearance amendment, which the people approved. He became, by Governor LEHMAN'S appointment, the first State housing commissioner, serving from 1939 through 1942. As president of the National Public Housing Conference in 1948–50 he was influential in the long fight that finally won passage of the Wagner-Taft-Ellender housing bill. He has worked tirelessly in innumerable civic causes in New York City. A man of warm sympathies, of fairness and high personal integrity, he will, we are confident, be a respected judge.

Address by Setrak Benjamin Minas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of an address delivered by Setrak Benjamin Minas at the Armenian Youth Federation banquet at the Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., on June 25, 1950.

The address follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED AT ARMENIAN YOUTH FEDERATION BANQUET OPENING THE SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION BY SETRAK BENJAMIN MINAS, REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE

Having served as national executive secretary of the Armenian Youth Federation for 3 years, I am well aware of the serious purpose of your organization and the magnitude of the problems you will discuss this week in your convention. The motivating philosophy of the Armenian Youth Federation is a strong belief in the concept of democracy. Your immediate basic objective is to help restore the independence of the Armenian state now under enslavement by Soviet Russia.

Today, it is becoming more apparent that piecemeal thinking and piecemeal planning characteristic of international conduct in the past has no potency. We have interpreted conflicts between peoples as manifestations of nationalistic ambitions whereas in truth they have been manifestations of a human urge far more basic—the inherent urge of man to secure economic and political dignity within his environment. In the past our minds have been fashioned to think in terms of a Greek cause, and Indonesian cause, or an Armenian cause. Because we have failed to recognize the fundamental cause of conflict between peoples, measures applied as solutions have turned out to be merely expediencies and as such have been impermanent. So, after countless centuries man's dream of peace remains illusive and beyond his grasp. It is only now becoming apparent that the world and civilization cannot long endure half slave and half free. Long ago in the history of the United States we recognized this fact within our own country and set our house in order. Now, we are beginning to comprehend this fact on an international scale. In the face of Soviet Russian power with its diametrically opposed concept of civilization, we in the west have been forced to readjust our thinking and our idea of international relations. The impact of Soviet Russian philosophy has unintentionally but vividly posed the real question confronting mankind. The fundamental issue posed to us as a challenge is whether our concept of the freedom and dignity of the individual confined to a limited area, shall or can prevail over the Russian philosophy now being pushed on a global scale, that the individual as such has no validity and is subordinate to the supremacy of the totalitarian state. As between these two opposing concepts of man's place in society, there is no doubt that democracy is the climate under which man can most nearly fulfill his destiny. The vulnerability of democracy today is that it has not been permitted to flourish. It has been guarded as a treasure not to be shared. With miserly jealousy we have made it unavailable to mankind everywhere. Instead of encouraging the greatest idea ever conceived by man's political thought to propagate itself to the four corners of the earth, we have restricted the reproduction of democracy by a form of birth control, and made it available to comparatively few areas of the world.

When the democratic Armenian Republic was permitted to fall the first victim to Soviet Russian expansion in 1921, it was not exclusively an Armenian loss. It was a vital blow at the idea of democracy and the capture of one of its outposts. The fact that some three to four million Armenians have been forced to live for the past 30 years under the enslavement policy of Soviet Russia means that democracy has lost three to four million disciples. Democracy cannot isolate itself and then in time of danger expect effective world support. People will not or cannot rally to defend the tree whose fruit they are not permitted to share.

The President and the Congress have recognized the economic value of aid to underdeveloped countries by adopting the so-called point 4 program. However, this program is doomed to fall short of its purpose unless implemented by an equally enlightened political plan for exploited and suppressed countries. We are exporting American wheat, American raw materials, agricultural and industrial machinery, and scientific and industrial know-how, yet we have placed an embargo upon the most valuable American product—the idea and practice of democracy. Exporting one without the other is sheer waste. The most vivid and tragic example of this paradoxical and myopic policy was the pushing of China into the Soviet orbit of influence. We exported everything to China except democracy and justice. By thus isolating the concept of democracy and failing to make it available to the suppressed peoples of the world, we have castrated democracy and deprived it of its natural virile and dynamic force.

Today, in the market place of ideas, we too often engage in a sales double-talk that no longer impresses the exploited peoples of the world. It is negative salesmanship to tell these suppressed people that the glittering Russian product is really shoddy. They are forced to try it because it is better than no product at all. Since they cannot get democracy from the West, they are compelled to accept the Russian product. Today, southern Korea stands on the brink, as the latest victim of Russian expansion. We hope that a halt will be called to Soviet imperialism in time to save these liberty-aspiring people. We hope to stop Russian expansion by threatening with terrible modern weapons which Russia also possesses or can possess, whereas, Russia really stands in fear of a weapon which she can never possess. It is the most potent weapon in our arsenal which Soviet Russia does not want to steal—and that is the idea of democracy. This weapon we permit to rust in idleness. Along with American economic aid abroad must go American democratic ideas ready for use. Democracy has hundreds of millions of allies from the Middle East to the far coast of Asia waiting for the opportunity to join the team. They are waiting for a dynamic leadership from the United States delivering them from the discredited status quo ante. This dynamic leadership is predicated on eliminating from our Government ranks those men who have lost faith in democracy, and have encouraged

Russian ambitions by hobbling a foreign policy that would serve the best interests of the United States and mankind.

We here tonight are speaking more specifically for the enslaved Republic of Armenia. The Armenian wants independence. He wants democracy as we define it. The Armenian stands as a potential ally in the Middle East. A people who had the virility to rise up after six centuries of enslavement and establish the democratic Republic of Armenia in 1918, today stands separated from us by the Russian iron curtain. We can penetrate that barrier by sending forth our ideas. The American Committee for the Independence of Armenia recommends an Armenian language program on the Voice of America. Let us send to them the voice of hope—the voice of democracy. Let us help them compare American democracy with Russian despotism. We are confident of their verdict, because we believe in the inherent goodness and strength of democracy. Let us force the repudiation of the false Russian philosophy to come from within Russia. The Armenian along with other liberty-loving peoples can be a vital force in that repudiation.

Worcester, Mass., Has Many Firsts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, being naturally quite proud of my home city of Worcester, Mass., I wish to include, for the edification of my colleagues, a very impressive article, by Mr. William Moiles, which appeared in the July 4 issue of the Worcester Telegram. Worcester is second to none in our list of her many firsts. The article follows:

CITY'S FIRSTS IMPRESSIVE LIST

(By Bill Moiles)

We were thinking that the 8,000 or so new residents who have turned up in Worcester since the 1940 census might be interested to know some of the fields in which this city and its people have pioneered.

If they don't already know it, that is.

If you grabbed us on a busy street, or even on a quiet one, and asked us to name five Worcester firsts quickly, about the only thing we would be able to think of was that Elm Park was this country's first municipal park—the first actually owned by a city.

After that, our mind would go blank.

We are indebted to Miss Dorothy M. Gleason of the Free Public Library staff for finding some of the other Worcester firsts for us in a useful reference work, Famous First Facts, compiled by Joseph Nathan Kane and published by the H. W. Wilson Co., of New York.

THEY MAKE AN IMPRESSIVE LIST

Some of these things we remember hearing of or reading about before. Some of them are new to us. Even if Mr. Kane has not succeeded in rounding up all of the things that happened here for the first time, what he has found makes an impressive list.

Our respect for old Isaiah Thomas, Worcester's printer of Revolutionary times, has increased since we learned that Mr. Thomas was mixed up in no fewer than five of these firsts—and it may well be that there are others, overlooked by Mr. Kane.

The first national historical society in the United States was founded here by Mr. Thomas on October 24, 1812. It was the American Antiquarian Society, which, of course, still flourishes. The first meeting of this group was held November 19, 1812, at the Exchange Coffee House in Boston. Mr. Thomas was the first president, and the first vice presidents were Aaron Bancroft and Timothy Bigelow.

Mr. Thomas put out the first dictionary to be published in the United States. That was in 1788. The book was titled, "The Royal Standard English Dictionary; the First American Dictionary, Carefully Revised and Corrected from the Fourth British Edition," by William Perry, lecturer in the academy at Edinburgh. This 596-page dictionary sold for 7 shillings. It was dedicated to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

THE FIRST ILLUSTRATED BIBLE

In 1791, Mr. Thomas published the first illustrated Bible in folio size to be published in the United States. It contained 1,012 pages and 50 plates.

In 1800, Mr. Thomas put out the first New Testament in Greek in the United States.

The first printing history to be published in this country also came from Mr. Thomas' busy press, in 1810. It was his own History of Printing in America, With a Biography of Printers and an Account of Newspapers.

Here are some of the other Worcester "firsts"—unless otherwise noted, first means first in the United States:

The first Esperanto course carrying college credit was offered by Clark University on September 16, 1908. Dr. Robert Mowry Bell taught the course, which offered a brief outline of the grammar and some practice in reading the new universal language.

CLARK GRADUATE SCHOOL OF GEOGRAPHY

The first graduate school of geography was opened at Clark University in the fall of 1921. The late Dr. Wallace W. Atwood was director.

The first envelope-folding machine that proved commercially practical was patented January 21, 1853, by Dr. Russell L. Hawes, of Worcester. Although it was not self-guming, the device enabled 3 girls to produce some 25,000 finished envelopes in 10 hours.

The first envelope-folding and gumming machine was patented February 8, 1898, by John Ames Sherman, of Worcester. It reduced the cost of gummed envelopes ready for market from 60 cents to 8 cents a thousand.

George Henry Coates, of Worcester, manufactured the first United States clipper for cutting hair in 1876. His product was so superior to those imported from England and France that he received an intial manufacturing order for 5,000 clippers.

AND WORCESTER'S CIRCUS FIRST

Worcester had a circus tinge even as far back as October 9, 1855, when Joshua C. Stoddard received a patent on his invention of the calliope. He formed the American Steam Music Co. in the same year.

The first intercollegiate regatta was held on Lake Quinsigamond July 26, 1856. Harvard defeated Yale and Brown over a 3-mile course.

Worcester was the scene of the first intercollegiate billiard match, July 25, 1860. Benjamin Thompson Frothingham and William Stackpole, both of Harvard, defeated George St. John Sheffield and Theodore C. Bacon, men of Yale, by a score of 800 to 720.

The first rebellion against the United States Government occurred in 1786, organized by Daniel Shay. They seized Worcester on December 5 of that year, but didn't get very far with it.

NATIONAL WOMAN'S RIGHTS CONVENTION

The first national convention of women advocating women's suffrage was the National Woman's Rights Convention at Worcester, October 23 and 24, 1850.

The first sewage disposal by chemical precipitation was undertaken by Worcester in 1890.

The first liquid-fuel-rocket patent was granted July 14, 1914, to Prof. Robert H. Goddard, of Clark University. It covered what was later termed a "rocket motor."

The first national psychological organization was the American Psychological Association, organized at Clark University, July 8, 1892. Dr. G. (Granville) Stanley Hall was first president.

The first Negro lawyer regularly admitted to the bar was Macon B. Allen, who passed his bar examination at Worcester and was admitted to practice May 3, 1845. He had previously practiced in Maine, where no license was required.

FIRSTS IN MACHINERY FIELD

The first paper-twine machinery was patented December 17, 1895, by George Loomis Brownell, of Worcester.

The first spring-winding machine, in which the size of the spring helix was determined solely by fixing the angle at which the wire was forced between guides—oh, yes; it was, too—was developed and built in 1892 by Clinton S. Marshall, of the Washburn & Moen Manufacturing Co.

The first piano wire was produced at the factory of Ichabod Washburn in Worcester in 1850.

The first wire gage for standardizing the sizes of drawn wire was developed in 1849, also by Ichabod Washburn, who lived—you know where.

The first column by Bill Moiles was—but why go on?

A. F. of L. Free Trade Union Committee Speaks on Korea and the UN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there is appended hereto a declaration by the free trade union committee, American Federation of Labor, which demonstrates that quality of statesmanship and clear sightedness in the labor movement which deserves the attention of every Member It contains a mature and adult appraisal of our relations with the United Nations and shows a determination to preserve and maintain this organization with a willingness to make any sacrifice it requires. Working men and women everywhere understand so very well the issue of freedom versus slavery and how deeply it affects their lives and their futures that they are willing to defend freedom as they would life itself:

DECLARATION BY FREE TRADE UNION COMMITTEE, A. F. OF L.

Mankind is on the threshold of irreparable disaster. Soviet imperialism is driving at a furious pace to conquer all of Asia as an integral phase of its drive for world domination. This is the real meaning of the war now being waged against the Republic of Korea by the puppets and hirelings of the Kremlin.

This brutal sneak attack is far more than an attempt by totalitarian darkest Russia to

destroy the national independence of another weak and small people. This barbarous assault is a callously calculated blow against the United Nations collectively and the United States particularly as forces for peace, freedom, and orderly social progress.

This savage aggression must be defeated and defeated decisively and promptly. It is above all the inescapable responsibility and the solemn duty of the United Nations and the United States to preserve and protect the national independence and sovereign integrity of the Korean people. The territory of democratic Korea must be freed from the bandits who have, upon orders from their masters in Moscow, invaded and defiled its soil. Otherwise, a horrible world war and a ghastly fate await all humanity. Only to the extent that the United Nations and the United States take immediate and adequate steps to assure the peace and security of democratic Korea, will the peace and security of the entire world be assured.

The Republic of Korea was created by the United Nations. In association with the other free nations, the United States welcomed the formation of this free and independent republic and its determination to shun the ways of totalitarianism and to take the democratic path. Despite a powerful fifth-column lavishly financed and skillfully directed by the Kremlin, this young republic, only recently held democratic elections and launched constructive social reforms. Enraged by these manifestations of democratic consolidation and progress in an area so close to their arsenal in Manchuria and their newly born still unsettled Chinese satellite, the Soviets unleashed their mad dogs of war.

To rely on promises, diplomatic protests, and loud lamentations as a means of halting this latest wanton Russian aggression is to insure the collapse of the remaining free and independent peoples in Asia and to invite the destruction of the freedom-loving independent nations throughout the world. We must not forget this costly lesson taught the civilized world by Hitler and his strategy of piecemeal conquest more than 10 years ago. What has happened to China yesterday, what is happening to Korea today, may take place in Germany tomorrow—unless the free nations unite to put an end to this world lawlessness. We dare not be unmindful of the terrible truth that Stalin, as the most apt and cynical pupil of Hitler, far exceeds his master and model in sinister recklessness, cunning, ruthlessness, and rank hypocrisy.

In this light, we greet the prompt and firm statement of the United Nations Security Council branding Moscow's North Korean puppet as guilty of breaking the peace and implying strong measures in the event of its refusal to withdraw its invading troops.

At this critical hour, America must lose no time in giving active and positive leadership to the cause of human decency and world peace. America's record and role in Korea entitle it to such world leadership. We have not sought to suppress and exploit but to encourage and support the Korean people. We have, under the supervision of the UN, voluntarily withdrawn from Korea our Army of liberation. This action on our part was in striking and refreshing contrast to the conduct of Russia which refused the UN Commission the right to supervise its withdrawal and denied the UN all entry into the northern portion of Korea seized by the Red army after America defeated imperial Japan. This has placed an additional responsibility upon the UN and its member nations.

Moreover, Korea is not merely a small and distant land. The tragic plight of the Korean people is a grave peril to all of us. The cynical rulers of expansionist Russia are striking through the Koreans at all free nations. We are confident that the American people, and especially organized labor in the United States, realize that it is easier to stop the Communist aggressors in Korea than in California. Hence, we welcome the timely declaration of President Truman that "willful disregard of the obligation to keep the peace cannot be tolerated by nations that support the United Nations Charter" and that "those responsible for this act of aggression must realize how seriously the Government of the United States views such threats to the peace of the world." We hail President Truman's decision to take practical measures to counteract and defeat the Russian-inspired war of aggression against the Korean people.

In this spirit do we urgently appeal to our Government and the United Nations to move jointly and separately to translate these forthright expressions into firm deeds. The crisis in Korea cannot be isolated from the general world crisis. The Russian-planned and directed assault on Korea must, therefore, be counteracted with a view of thwarting and defeating Moscow's central and guiding objective—the conquest of all Asia, Europe, and the rest of the free world and the subjection of all mankind to the savage yoke of Communist totalitarianism.

We, therefore, propose the following line of action:

1. We call upon the United Nations to urge strongly every member nation to act in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and to render full moral and material aid to the Republic of Korea now defending its national sovereignty and integrity against wanton aggression.

2. The United Nations should make a special appeal to the Soviet government to order its puppet North Korean regime to halt its invasion and withdraw forthwith its forces north of the thirty-eighth parallel.

3. Should both the invaders and their Soviet instigators fail to heed the solemn United Nations request and continue to flout its decision, the United Nations should then invoke complete economic and diplomatic sanctions against both puppet and master.

4. Our country should set the pace in providing through the channels of and in cooperation with the United Nations the providing of prompt and adequate military supplies and material as well as moral aid to the Republic of Korea so as to insure the defeat of the aggressors. The United States should, therefore, conclude a treaty of mutual aid with the Republic of Korea and undertake to mobilize and equip its citizenry to chase the Russian-led invaders across the frontier from which the Communist attack was launched.

5. Our Government should declare categorically that it is committed to the defense of Formosa and immediately begin to provide the military supplies, airpower, naval craft and technical personnel essential to the defeat of any Communist assault from whatever part of the Asiatic mainland it may come.

6. In view of the experiences in Czechoslovakia, Germany, China, and Korea with the Communist fifth column as an auxiliary of the Soviet Government in its policy of subversion and imperialist expansion against all free countries, the Departments of National Defense, State and Justice—together with a commission of private citizens representative of labor, management, the farmers and the public—should be charged with preparing an effective democratic program to uproot, paralyze and eliminate all such traitorous agents, agencies and activities from our country.

7. In order to impress upon the American people the gravity of the crisis and in order to help rally and unify the Nation to meet whatever crisis may arise from continued Soviet subversion and aggression, we urge the President to address a joint session of the House and Senate in support of the above measures and the aspirations, aims, and actions of the United States in the present world crisis.

A Heaven for Political Forecasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a very pertinent and informative article, entitled "Free Elections—Soviet Model," which appeared in the June 17, 1950 issue of the magazine America.

The author, Rev. Maurice F. Meyers, S. J., holds a Russian Institute certificate and a master of arts in Russian literature from Columbia University. Here he forthrightly reveals the supreme farce of so-called free Soviet elections. The article follows:

FREE ELECTIONS—SOVIET MODEL

(By Maurice F. Meyers)

Pollsters who would like absolute security in their job might consider taking up the prediction of Soviet election returns. Last March 12 Russia held an election for members of the Supreme Soviet. Long before the evening of that day I was ready with my fearless forecasts. I confidently asserted that Stalin and the Politburo members, and, in fact, every candidate on the government-sponsored single list (there were no other candidates) would be elected. I predicted that more than 99 percent of the eligible voters would go to the polls to do their civic duty, and that, of the votes cast, at least 99 percent would be in favor of the government-approved candidates. Stalin, I said, would head the slate without a dissenting vote; the other bigwigs would yield him some fraction of a percentage point in proportion to their current standing in the Soviet hierarchy.

Sure enough, on March 14 the Central Electoral Commission announced that 99.98 percent of the electorate had voted. In one House of the Supreme Soviet the official candidates had received 99.73 percent of the votes cast; in the other House, 99.72 percent. Stalin and the 11 other Politburo members had been elected unanimously. On this last point I had been slightly in error.

We smile when we hear that the Soviet people are told that this kind of election is the most democratic in the world. We can't imagine that they really believe this, and we may be legitimately curious to know just what they do think of their electoral system. I don't know where one could get a definitive answer to this important question, short of burrowing into the inner mind and consciousness of the people themselves. However, I happen to have the civics textbook for the secondary schools of the Soviet Union, called the Constitution of the U. S. S. R. and published in Moscow in 1948. Here we can see what is dinned into the heads of Soviet children during their formative years.

This is what the party and government want them to think of the laws and civil structure of the U. S. S. R., including the electoral system. In the complete absence of any contrary propaganda, this probably sets the general line of thought for the youth and the younger men and women of the Soviet Union on the subject.

Chapter VI, section 2 of this textbook deals with the electoral system. All citizens of 18 years and upward, it tells us, have the right to vote, irrespective of race, nationality, creed, education, term of residence, social origin, material condition, or former activity. According to the 1936 constitution, certain disabilities that previously obtained, such as descent from the old nobility, pristly state, etc., were abolished. Only people of unsound mind and criminals deprived of the right by a court of justice may not vote or be voted for.

The full equality and universal extent of the electoral law, so Soviet youths are taught, is characteristic of the Soviet system in contradistinction to bourgeois states. These, though they claim to give full equality, limit it by various means, especially in regard to the workers and the oppressed. The United States is brought in as an example, as certain States give voting privileges only to those who pay a poll tax or have a certain amount of property. This little story is quoted from an American critic of the system: "In a certain State a man had a mule worth the amount one had to own to vote, so he was included in the voting lists. But while he was on his way to the polls to vote, his mule died; and the man was consequently excluded from the vote. Which therefore really had the right to vote, the man or the mule?"

The moral is spelled out for the Russian children: "Such a question is absurd to a Soviet citizen, but in a country where the worth of a man is measured by his possessions, it is easily understood." In the United States a period of residence is necessary to vote, sometimes as much as 2 years. This, says the textbook, works especially to the disadvantage of the workingman, who is frequently obliged to go from place to place in search of work. In America millions of Negroes are disfranchised because they do not pass a test in English. Some other countries give university people a supplementary vote—another discrimination against the worker, since higher education is hardly possible to him in capitalistic countries. Above all, racial prejudice keeps 13,000,000 Negroes in the United States from using the voting rights they are supposed to have. The electoral districts, too, are so arranged that a large, predominantly worker population gets only the same representation as a much smaller group of propertied bourgeois. In bourgeois countries many other means are used to keep unwanted voters from the polls, in defiance of the law: votes are bought, especially from the unemployed, and terroristic methods are used, particularly in the United States and Greece.

After such an indictment, the superiority of the Soviet electoral system is supposed to be evident to the boys and girls in a civics class. This is emphasized by the fact that Soviet elections are now all direct, though in the beginning the needs of the time made it necessary to work through a hierarchy from the local Soviets to the district and finally to the all-union Soviet. Here, again, the capitalist states suffer by comparison. In the United States, for example, Presidential elections are indirect, and the electors, so the book says, are bound by the dictates of a party, not the will of the people.

The Soviet schoolboy and girl are told that the democratic nature of the Soviet system is shown also in the manner of nominating candidates. The right to nominate belongs to various civic organizations—the Communist Party, of course, and also trade-unions, cooperatives, youth organizations, cultural societies. Thus, those nearest to the people and the best workers are supposed to get the nominations. In contrast to this model "democratic" system, in other countries only political parties put up candidates—and not every party, but only those that the government has approved. As an example to Soviet eyes of how this opens the way to abuses, the case of Henry Wallace is cited, who was allowed to be a candidate for President only after most energetic struggles by millions of the people.

After the nominations in Soviet Russia, the candidates are all given a good airing in the public press and at various meetings, so that only worthy people will finally get on the ballot.

Then a little hitch comes in that is not explained to the students; nor is it made clear even by the most devoted apologists abroad. Thirty days before the elections the candidates must be registered with the electoral commission. This commission is supposed to put the duly registered candidates on the ballot, but in practice only one candidate for an office ever appears. The decision as to just which of the various nominees will be placed on the ballot is made by some authority, not defined. This little feat having been accomplished, the ballots are ready for the polling booth. The candidates, so the children are told, have been agreed upon by party and nonparty circles alike. There are no campaign battles, since there are no hostile classes. The whole people unanimously follows the lead of the party of Lenin and Stalin, which has proved in deed its devotion to the interests of the workers and won their love.

What a contrast is put before the Soviet youth in the bourgeois system of hostile parties. There is no place for the nonparty man; he has no chance at all. But in Soviet Russia the party asks the people to vote for nonparty candidates the same as for those of the party. (Never is a party man opposed to a nonparty man or vice versa.) Then how different are the electoral campaigns. In the U. S. S. R. the Government supports organized campaign work for the election of the official candidates, and supplies gratis what is needed in the way of meeting places, press notices, radio time. It meets all the expenses for campaign material, whether it be in the form of posters, pamphlets or photographs. But in bourgeois countries the candidate or his friends must pay all the expenses of the campaign, a circumstance that obviously works to the advantage of the wealthy. What is more, the police hamper the campaign of anyone not favorable to the ruling classes, and at times break up meetings of the workers and arrest their organizers and participants.

Election day in the Soviet Union falls on Sunday, and is a popular holiday. In order to vote, one proves his identity by showing his passport or kolhoz or trade-union card. After this check-up he is given the ballot and goes to a voting booth.

Since there is but one candidate named for any office on the ballot, the voter's choice is between approving of the candidate by depositing the ballot as it is, and disapproving of him by crossing his name out. The latter, it would appear, is done very rarely. The Soviet child is taught to see it as a great proof of democracy that the candidates are given rubber-stamp approval with hardly a dissenting voice. This is supposed to be a sign of the cooperation of all the people and of their moral and political unity. In 1937, 96.8 percent of those eligible voted and, of these, 98.6 percent approved the official slate. Every single candidate was elected, with an average of only 1 percent of the vote against him, whereas to fail to be elected his name would have had to be crossed out on more than half of the ballots. In the election of 1946 the batting average was even better, with 99.7 percent voting and 99.1 percent of these saying "Yes." This year's election set a new record.

What a contrast to the United States. There the poor lose faith in elections, in spite of high-pressure propaganda, so that, as the Soviet children are told, at times only 15 percent of the electorate, or even as low as 4 percent, take the trouble to vote. Even in the important election of 1946, only 37.5 percent voted, and of these voters—oh, horror!—a considerable part cast their ballot against those who were finally elected. After these dark evidences of difference of opinion, the glowing confidence of all Soviet people in their unanimously elected candidates is supposed to make a big impression on young minds. Stalin sums it all up for these future voters:

"There are general elections in some of the capitalistic, so-called democratic, states. But in what circumstances do they take place? In a setting of class strife and enmity, with pressure exerted by capitalists, landowners, bankers, and the other sharks of capitalism. Such elections, even if they were universal, secret, and direct, could not be called fully free and democratic. In the Soviet Union, on the other hand, elections take place in completely different circumstances. We have no capitalists and landowners, so naturally there is no such a thing as pressure of the haves on the have-nots. Here, all is in an atmosphere of cooperation between workers, peasants, and intelligentsia, of mutual confidence and friendship—for we have no exploiters—and thus there is no one to put pressure on the people to bend their wills. So you see why our elections are really the only free and democratic ones in the world."

Thus are Soviet children taught to consider their elections. We may be tempted to laugh when we hear such outrageous distortions of the truth. But these children have no means of checking or verifying what they are told. Repeated in season and out of season, by school teachers, newspapers, radio, and all the organs of propaganda, these distortions of the truth must finally make some impression. There is an iron curtain around the minds of the Soviet people no less than around their homeland.

A Democratic Constitution of Israel Grows by Evolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from the Israel Digest, an authorized English-language monthly of the Israel Government, in the hope that their inclusion here will aid in giving Members a clearer understanding of the miracle of the Israeli Republic, where a democratic government modeled closely on that of the United States, adapted to its own historical and geographic context, is being self-consciously molded by a free and courageous people:

PARLIAMENT—A BUSY MONTH

The Knesset, Israel's Parliament, had a busy month. It finished the debate on the budget, details of which were reported in the last issue of the Israel Digest. It voted

on the crucial question of a constitution. It dealt with the implementation of the compulsory education law. It endorsed by a large majority the Government's new proposals on the question of Jerusalem (also reported in the last issue of the Israel Digest). It abolished child marriage, which had been customary in some of the oriental communities from which immigrants are now arriving in Israel in considerable numbers, and it received the draft of a citizenship law according to which every Jew who so wishes will become a citizen of Israel on his arrival in the country.

CONSTITUTION

The Knesset voted 50 to 38 to adopt a constitution by evolution over an unspecified period. The text of the resolution is printed below. The debate was between those who favored the adoption of a written constitution now and those who wished it to grow out of the collective experience of the nation. The opposition parties which pressed for the immediate adoption of a constitution pointed out that the present Knesset had originally been elected as a constituent assembly and therefore was bound by the people's mandate to write a constitution. The Government parties insisted that the adoption of fundamental laws which at a later stage might be fused into a constitution was all that could reasonably be required of the constituent assembly of a State which has been in existence for only 2 years and which during that time has had to fight a war and absorb over one-third of its present population. Basically, the debate was an argument between the believers in organic growth and the method of trial and error, and those who hold that the development of the nation should proceed along lines to be laid down in writing now and to be adhered to by coming generations.

The profound belief of those who wanted to postpone the writing of a constitution and who won the debate by vote was once aptly expressed by one of the Knesset members when he said: "One does not write a constitution. Constitutions write themselves." He might well have pointed to the example of the United States where 11 years passed between the Declaration of Independence in 1776 and the adoption of the Constitution in 1787 and where, despite this long period of gestation, only 2 years later it was found necessary to add the first ten amendments to the original seven articles of the Constitution.

Apart from the basic belief in slow and organic growth, there were of course also other reasons which made the Government wish to postpone the writing of the Constitution. It was felt that the attempt to write a constitution now would not only jeopardize the unity within the present Government coalition, but would also create a rift within the population (e. g. on the religious issue) which Israel cannot afford now, but which in the course of years might become less pronounced. The forces of unity won, and the writing of a constitution was postponed by the votes of the Labor Party as well as by those of the orthodox bloc.

This, however, does not mean that there are no constitutional safeguards for a democratic government and for the freedom of the individual. The Proclamation of Independence itself contains such safeguards, and there is a body of laws known as the small constitution which deal with such basic matters. The small constitution consists of chapters dealing with the rights and duties of the Knesset, the President of the State, the Government, and with other administrative matters.

The intention of the resolution now adopted is to add such further fundamental laws as may be required until in good time of historic development they grow together into the constitution of a free and democratic state.

THE RESOLUTION

"The first Knesset delegates the Constitution, Legislation, and Juridical Committee to prepare a draft constitution for the State. The constitution shall be constructed article by article in such a manner that each of them shall in itself constitute fundamental law. Each article shall be brought before the Knesset as the committee completes its work and all articles together shall comprise the State constitution."

CITIZENS ON ARRIVAL

A law of return was circulated among Knesset members and will soon be introduced formally by the Minister of Justice. Its first section decrees in five Hebrew words that every Jew has the right to immigrate to Israel. Thus the ordnance issued immediately after the proclamation of independence which abolished the mandatory power's discrimination between legal and illegal immigration is finally and solemnly reaffirmed in this new law.

The law provides for the automatic acquisition of Israel citizenship by every Jewish immigrant who desires to become a citizen. If the law is being passed, all former Palestinian subjects who registered on or before November 30, 1948, and are residents of Israel when the new law comes into force are citizens as of that date. Likewise, all those who immigrated or were born after the establishment of the State become citizens from the date of arrival or birth.

This automatic acquisition of citizenship does not apply to persons of foreign nationality who declare within a given period that they do not wish to become citizens of Israel, but the draft law provides (as do similar laws in some other countries) for the possibility of dual nationality. That is, a foreigner may become a citizen of Israel and yet retain his original nationality if the law of his country of origin does not prevent him from doing so. Such persons who are both Israel and foreign nationals would be considered Israel citizens for the purpose of all laws applying to citizens of Israel.

In practice, the immediate granting of all rights of citizenship to new immigrants has been more or less in force for some time. In the elections for the present Parliament, for instance, in January 1949, everyone was entitled to vote who at that time had been in the country for a period of not less than 10 weeks. The draft of the citizenship law has been received by the Israel public with something akin to enthusiasm because it is to put on record one of the basic tenets of Israel: the right of every Jew to return and the denial of any difference between oldtimer and newcomer. There is no doubt that the law of return, once adopted, will be considered as one of those fundamental laws all of which together will one day form the constitution of Israel.

IMMIGRATION

Fifty-eight thousand one hundred and seventy-three immigrants, according to a preliminary statistical survey, arrived in Israel in the first 5 months of 1950, bringing the total of immigrants since the establishment of the State to 399,142. During the first 3 months of 1950, the immigrants were divided by their countries of origin as follows: 17.2 percent came from Poland, 15 percent from Yemen, 12.5 percent from Libya, 12.3 percent from Rumania, 10.4 percent from Iraq. The remainder came from practically all over the globe.

ISRAEL SUPPORTS UN DECISION ON KOREA

The Israel Government in special session and in the presence of the President of State decided on July 2, 1950, on Israel's stand on the Korea issue. The decision was cabled to Mr. Trygve Lie, Secretary-General of the United Nations. It reads as follows:

"The Government of Israel opposes and condemns aggression wherever it may occur and from whatever quarter it may emanate. In fulfillment of her clear obligations under the Charter, Israel supports the Security Council in its efforts to put an end to the breach of peace in Korea and restore peace in that area. The Government of Israel hopes that the United Nations will continue its endeavors to aline all the great powers in the common effort for safeguarding the peace of the world."

MONTH OF THE KORAN

Israel's 120,000 Moslems are celebrating the month of Ramadhan during which, according to Islamic tradition, the Koran was "sent down for the guidance of man." Observing Moslems keep a fast during daylight throughout the month while at night they rejoice and partake of festive meals.

Special rations of meat, rice, sugar, and coffee were issued by the Israel Government to the Moslem population. Special daily broadcasts are devoted to the holiday by Kol Israel, the official radio station. Sheikh Taher Tabari, the Kadi of Nazareth, broadcast on the eve of the holiday, and every Friday during the month services will be relayed from the mosques at Acre, Jaffa, and Haifa. The minister of religion sent special greetings to the Moslems of Israel on the occasion of the holiday. The old Turkish custom of firing a cannon at nightfall as a sign that the fast may be broken, was reintroduced (after being interrupted during the war in Israel).

The religious life of the Moslem community has been fully restored. There are now 150 Moslem religious officials active in Israel: four kadis (religious judges) in Nazareth, Haifa, and Acre, 67 imams (who lead prayers and deliver sermons), 24 muezzins (callers to prayer), 21 mazuns who register marriages and divorces. The salaries of all these officials are paid by the Israel Government, which in addition also maintains four sharia courts and 70 mosques throughout the country. A home for aged Moslems is maintained by the ministry of social welfare in Acre, and preparations are in hand for the establishment of Moslem orphanages in Jaffa and Haifa.

Export-Import Bank Guaranties of United States Private Capital Invested Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, why should our taxpayers and wage earners be asked to guarantee that a handful of big operators shall be able to get their foreign funds converted into dollars and be guaranteed against loss arising out of action taken by a foreign government? This is a bill to benefit the few at the expense of the many.

A number of my constituents who are American citizens have appealed to me for assistance in helping them to get their small savings or modest investments out of various foreign countries. They are unable to get their money out, hard as they try. Many of them need that money and need it badly. Yet without in any way attempting to alleviate that condition, we are asked to do for a few international bankers and financial

interests what we are not doing or even pretending to do for our other citizens.

There has been a lot of loose talk in this debate about the desirability of the so-called point 4 program and the endorsement of it by many organizations. Many who subscribe to the general objectives of a plan for the betterment of the world's underdeveloped areas, both for their own benefit and our eventual advantage, and who favor the creation of a climate there conducive to the encouragement of investments abroad, entertain serious doubt that the way to accomplish that desirable objective is through embarking on the entirely new and radical departure of providing indirect Government subsidy in the form of guaranties. It is a distortion of language to use their general endorsement as an indication of approval of this particular half-digested measure before us.

The easy way to entice American capital into foreign fields is through Government subsidy. The sound way to do so is by the negotiation of favorable treaty provisions which will serve as an incentive to those in this country with funds to invest, which they are not able to put to work advantageously here. Both currency convertibility and insurance against expropriation should be handled by satisfactory treaty assurances from the foreign country which is to benefit from the investment, rather than by filing a lien on every pay envelope in our country, which may ripen into an actual assessment.

Since we have been told in so many words that the other body will not act on this bill at this session and we have been presented with an amendment which I believe is meritorious but which completely changes the nature of the bill, the only responsible course is to recommit the measure for further study by the committee.

There is a further point of which we cannot lose sight just at this moment. If we have a quarter of a billion dollars that we feel justified in committing to assist foreign countries, it looks to me, as I read the tragic reports of our boys bleeding and dying because of inadequate equipment, as if we had better spend that money to provide our fighting men with what they need. Put another way, we must put first things first and certainly at the moment the guaranty of our businessmen against loss can wait. I feel sure they would be the first to agree to that proposition.

Cheese: Cornerstone of Wisconsin's Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 12 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on many occasions it has been my pleasure to take the floor of the Senate on the subject of the great Wisconsin cheese industry—its problems, its needs, its importance to Wisconsin and the Nation's dairy industry.

In last week's issue of the newspaper, the Glenwood City (Wis.) Tribune, there was a very fine and brief factual summary on this vital subject which means so much to us of Wisconsin, and to the nutrition and eating enjoyment of our country.

It seems just yesterday that it was my pleasure to address the fifty-eighth annual convention of the Wisconsin Cheesemakers Association in Milwaukee. Actually it was the end of last year, but the recommendations I then made on cheese problems and related issues, I feel have continued validity now.

To be sure, the Korean crisis has arisen in the interim, and other new issues have come up. However, I should like at this time to ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the Glenwood City Tribune article, followed by a list of the splendid officers of the Wisconsin Cheesemakers Association, including my dear friend, its distinguished president, Len Kopitzke, and that there follow the text of the talk that I made before the association at its last annual convention.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Glenwood City (Wis.) Tribune]

CHEESE IS THE CORNERSTONE OF WISCONSIN DAIRY INDUSTRY

Cheese is the cornerstone of Wisconsin's dairy industry. It is as much a symbol of Wisconsin as the badger or the dairy cow.

It was the first dairy product for which Wisconsin acquired a national and international reputation, following the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia in 1876. Wisconsin cheese is known and recognized throughout the Nation and is familiar to more American consumers than any other product of our 2,500 dairy plants.

From an economic standpoint, cheese is also the dairy farmer's most important product. And here is the reason: A larger proportion of our annual milk production is used for the manufacture of cheese than for any other dairy product.

Approximately 35 percent of all our milk is used in the manufacture of cheese. With an annual production of 15,000,000,000 pounds of milk a year, this means that five and one-fourth billion pounds are used for making cheese.

To realize further the tremendous importance of cheese to the dairy farmer, let us look at the part it plays in his annual income:

Last year (1949) the cash farm income in Wisconsin was $940,000,000. About one-half of this income is received for the sale of milk—or about $470,000,000. Since more than one-third of the milk produced on our farms is used for making cheese, our farmers received for milk sold to the cheese factories the significant sum of approximately $165,000,000. This is the largest single source of farm income in Wisconsin.

Now let us look at cheese production itself—the volume of cheese made by the Badger cheese factories. Figures used are for 1948 as detailed reports for last year are not, as yet, available.

In that year Wisconsin produced 502,104,000 pounds of cheese, almost one-half of the total national production of 1,094,425,000 pounds. This means that Wisconsin dominates the Nation's cheese production. No matter where Madame Consumer buys cheese—and that means natural cheese—at least one-half of her purchases are Wisconsin cheese.

As cheese dominates the Badger dairy industry, so American or cheddar cheese dominates the Wisconsin cheese industry. In 1948 we made 386,000,000 pounds of American cheese. That represents three-fourths of our entire cheese production. It is also 45 percent of all the American or cheddar cheese made in the Nation. About three-fourths of all the cheese made in the United States is American cheese.

In some of the other types of cheese our domination of the national cheese production picture is even more complete, although the volume is smaller. We made in 1943, for instance, nearly 8,000,000 pounds of Munster cheese—94 percent of the Nation's supply; nearly 8,000,000 pounds of brick cheese—86 percent of the United States production; 43,000,000 pounds of Swiss cheese—65 percent of the United States total; and 20,000,000 pounds of Italian cheese—40 percent of the entire United States production of Italian cheese.

That's the story of Wisconsin cheese industry. It shows why Americans think of Wisconsin every time they think of good natural cheese.

WISCONSIN CHEESE MAKERS' ASSOCIATION, INCORPORATED FEBRUARY 22, 1899

Officers: Leonard E. Kopitzke, president, Marion, Wis.; C. C. Brick, vice president, Brillion, Wis.; A. H. Graf, secretary, Zachow, Wis.; George E. Hernke, treasurer, Hilbert, Wis.; H. P. Mulloy, field manager, Sheboygan, Wis.; Paul H. Raihle, attorney, Chippewa Falls, Wis.; George L. Mooney, executive secretary, Plymouth, Wis.

Directors: John Fischer, Boaz, Wis.; Art Woldt, Reedsville, Wis.; E. W. Marten, Spencer, Wis.; Emil Hansen, Chippewa Falls, Wis.; E. W. Jung, Beaver Dam, Wis.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

AMERICA'S TAXES—CREATIVE OR DESTRUCTIVE

It is a real pleasure to be home again in Wisconsin, and home with your fine organization, your able officers and membership. Being with the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association brings to my mind, as perhaps it does to yours, many memories of yesteryear—some very pleasant regarding progress which we have made and some bitter sweet, recalling the hardships and tribulations of your great industry.

RECOLLECTION OF DEPRESSION DAYS

Ten years ago, in 1939, when I first came to Washington, I need not recall to you the terrific economic problems which faced Wisconsin cheese makers. America was still slowly climbing out of a depression. Cheese production and cheese consumption were down. Cheese prices were low—so low as to deny you a reasonable profit for your heavy investment in plant and labor. Our farmers were getting only around $1.25 per hundredweight of milk.

Then the war years came and with them came the price regulations of OPA. You and I know that there have been few more critical periods than those days of regimentation of the cheese industry from Washington, D. C., when cheese was priced below its cost of production, when numerous types of cheese were placed in such poor price relationship that they were literally priced off the market. I recall how your officers worked so diligently with the Wisconsin congressional delegation in those trying times.

And now at last we are enjoying some of the fruits of peace and prosperity. It is not my purpose, therefore, to take more than this brief backward look at the past. I did, however, want to recall these few facts at

the outset because it is our job—yours and mine—to learn certain lessons about our experience in the past and to profit from them.

OUR MAIN SUBJECT TODAY

My main theme on which I would like to submit a few thoughts to you today is the question of America's tax set-up. You need hardly be told, my friends, that the nature of the tax system here in our country, will in considerable measure determine whether you are going to make a profit in your cheese factory or are going to suffer a loss. Taxes, of course, will not be the exclusive factor.

YOU HAVE BECOME BOOKKEEPERS FOR UNCLE SAM

Other Government regulations will affect you. For example, the question of the way in which the Wage and Hour Administrator handles his interpretations of the Fair Labor Standards Act, whether he interprets the law carefully and conscientiously, or in a completely arbitrary way. Thus, the Department of Labor can have a crucial affect upon your operations. In the same way, the activities of the Federal Social Security Administration can help or hurt you, because it and the Congress will determine the nature of your payroll taxes, etc. As a matter of fact, my friends, you gentlemen have obviously become bookkeepers, accountants, clerks, in effect, for the Federal Government. You are forced to supply more and more information, fulfill more and more assignments for your Uncle Sam.

To some extent, this trend is inescapable. Government today in the atomic age is fulfilling a greatly expanded role, and in part necessarily so, because economic life is becoming more and more complicated and the people are looking to Washington for more direction.

However, there is a limit in just how much activity the Federal Government can indulge in without destroying our free enterprise system. Yes, without destroying the small cheese factories of America. You recognize that and I do, and I feel it is your job and mine to demonstrate that fact to our people in Wisconsin and in all America.

ONLY YOU CAN RUN YOUR OWN INDUSTRY

We cannot run to the Great White Father in Washington to solve all our problems. In fact, if there is one thing that the experience of the Wisconsin cheesemaking industry learned during the war it was this: No one man in Washington, no single group of men in Washington, knows one one-hundredth of what they would have to know to be intelligent enough to direct and govern the Wisconsin cheese industry (or for that matter any other industry).

The relationship between cheese, fluid milk, butter, and other dairy products is so complex, so sensitive, that no single expert or army of experts in dairying or any other field is wise enough to order you around or to direct your internal affairs. You, yourselves are the only ones who should determine how much Cheddar to produce, how much Bleu, and Limburger, and Swiss, and Munster, and Brick, and Italian, and Brie.

Not only is Federal regimentation, therefore, undesirable, because you alone can and should determine the policy of the industry, but it is undesirable because all Federal regulation inevitably involves an increase in the staggering tax load upon our people and a decline in American liberty. This, then, is my basic theme, my friends. As regulations increase, taxes increase, while liberty decreases.

WISCONSIN'S HEAVY SHARE OF TAXES

You and I know that last year, the people of Wisconsin paid some $800,000,000 in Federal taxes—hidden taxes and open taxes. Only a tiny fraction of that $800,000,000 tax load was returned to America's dairyland in specific services and grants. Now, let us note that in 1928, Uncle Sam took only 34 percent of the total of taxes. The States took 16 percent, the localities took 50 percent. In that year, 1928, the American people paid only $9,000,000,000 in taxes. Last year, however, the total tax pie (State and national) had swelled to $60,000,000,000. Who got that pie, my friends? The answer is simple. The Federal Government took a whopping 74 percent. The State and local portions had dwindled to a mere 13 percent each.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MUST CUT ITS TAXES

Now, just what does that mean in terms of small Wisconsin communities? It means that the Federal Government is taxing so many items to such a huge degree that a little community of 1,000 or 5,000 or 10,000 is left with almost nothing to tax. The Federal Government taxes gasoline, theater admissions, dues, stoves, food-processing machinery, furs, jewelry, cosmetics, and hundreds of other items.

If Uncle Sam were to cut down on his expenses, he could afford to give up some of these tax sources. In that way the localities could, if necessary, tax these items and thus would not have to squeeze property owners at an enormous rate on real estate. Moreover, the States would be in better financial shape if Uncle Sam were to cut down on Federal taxes. You know, my friends, that our State government at Madison which will spend $200,000,000 in the next 2 years is facing a critical $40,000,000 deficit. That poses quite a problem.

Realizing these facts, I personally have introduced legislation to cut the Federal wartime rate on literally hundreds of nuisance taxes. The administration is, however, opposed to this legislation and that is why we have not made much progress thus far in tax relief.

It is obvious, however, that more than tax reduction is necessary. We need comprehensive tax reform. Taxes should be lowered and used in a creative constructive way instead of a destructive, punitive way.

HOW TAX CHANGE CAN HELP CHEESE MEN MEET POLLUTION PROBLEM

Let me illustrate what I mean. I need not tell you that you gentlemen of the cheese industry have the problem of preventing pollution by coping with residues of cheese manufacture. This involves a staggering economic problem to you. Recognizing that fact, Congressman BYRNES in the House, and I in the Senate introduced legislation which would permit you to depreciate at an accelerated rate the cost of antipollution apparatus. In other words, we want to give you favorable tax treatment in order to cope with this problem. We want to help you meet this challenge in a constructive way. We want your tax load to be lightened rather than to be increased, when you undertake to make antipollution expenditures.

The same thing should be done in the housing field. Builders should be able to mark off the cost of new housing for tax purposes at an accelerated rate, thus encouraging the private enterprise system to build more houses.

EXCESSIVE TAXES CAN CHOKE INDUSTRY

Tax reduction and tax reform—these go hand in hand. I am hoping that the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, which will be opening in January, will achieve both of these objectives. It will, however, do so only if you let your legislator know that these objectives are your objectives.

The alternative can mean a gradual paralysis for the Wisconsin cheese-making and other industries. If you don't have the incentive to produce more and better cheese, then I say you will not go about expanding your factories, buying new machinery, increasing your sales and promotion budget. You have a right to the fruits of your labor. Your profits should not be confiscated by an all-powerful government in Washington which tosses around billions of dollars in wasteful activity.

If we are to ever achieve tax reduction, obviously Uncle Sam is going to have to cut down on his appropriations. Next year, we are faced by a four to eight billion dollar Federal deficit. The administration is talking of increasing taxes instead of decreasing taxes. How can industry possibly be encouraged, if your already crushing tax load is still further increased?

SOME CURRENT FACTS ON CHEESE INDUSTRY

Now, my friends, before I go any further I should like to comment a bit on your own problems—problems which I consider my problems because cheese and Wisconsin are synonymous in your heart and mine.

Across my desk each week in Washington comes the latest information from the United States Department of Agriculture and from State sources on cheese production, consumption, exports, and imports. I should like to dwell for just a few moments on some of these recent facts which have come to my attention.

I know that if I were to try to present an over-all picture of the cheese industry's problems to you, it would be like carrying "coals to New Castle" because you gentlemen are expert in your own field, and your fine officers and consultants do a splendid job of informing you. Nevertheless, let me report on a few facts. As you know, this year's output of cheese in the United States will hit around 1,200,000,000 pounds. Domestic consumption of cheese per person will exceed 7 pounds for the first time on record. This compares with pre-war average consumption of 5.5 pounds per person in 1935–39, and 6.8 pounds in 1948.

GOVERNMENT'S CHEESE SUPPORT PROGRAM

You are all familiar, of course, with the Government's price support program under which this year around 90,000,000 pounds of butter have been bought up by the Commodity Credit Corporation and around 335 million pounds of nonfat dry milk solids. Back in July, too, you will recall the Department of Agriculture announced that it would purchase Grade A American cheese throughout the rest of 1949 at 31¾ cents per pound at any point in the United States. Following that announcement, quotations of cheddar cheese on the Wisconsin Cheese Exchange advanced around 35 cents per pound. Still in the middle of last month, quotations on the exchange were 25 percent below the near record level of mid-September last year.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF CHEESE

In my work on the Foreign Relations Committee, I always try to analyze the net effect of our foreign policy on cheese imports and exports. We know that the modest exports of cheese this year will be about the same as last year. But exports of cheese in 1950 will be the smallest in the last decade. In fact, exports will probably only be slightly larger in total than United States imports of all varieties of cheese.

Of course, we are all familiar with the basic fact that by and large, United States milk products consumption is a domestic matter because around 97.8 percent of dairy products produced this year will be sold in our own country. Cheese production, we know, is rising abroad. Let me point out too that the recent devaluation of the pound in England and affiliated countries will mean that those countries are in a better position to sell their cheese, all other things being equal, in foreign lands—meaning in America.

You are all familiar with the administration's insistent program for tariff reduction. You know that the administration is constantly seeking to promote the export of dairy products—cheese, butter, etc., from other lands to America. This policy of the administration must be evaluated in terms

of its actual effects upon the Wisconsin cheesemaking industry. We must ever bear in mind that Congress' and the President's basic responsibility is to our own people, first and foremost, much as we want to encourage world trade.

HOW VARIED LEGISLATION AFFECTS CHEESEMAKING

Tariff legislation is, of course, but one of the many fronts on which Congress impacts your industry. Consider, too, the new postage rate increase bill now pending before the Senate. I previously have protested against the drastic rate increases which the administration had previously contemplated—increases in the costs of mailing farm magazines, weekly newspapers, business mail, advertising, etc. Now, my friends, quite a few factories ship cheese by mail, and this has become a significant part of Wisconsin cheese promotion and sales. If Congress is to arbitrarily increase rates, will the effect not be to cut down on cheese mail order shipments? You know the answer as well as I do. That is why I say that it is up to you to call your legislators to account for their actions. You ought to let them know that you are looking beneath the surface of legislation in order to determine just whom this legislation will help or hurt.

There is quite a bit of legislation pending in Congress that will do the free enterprise system no good, in fact, very definite harm, for example, the socialized medicine legislation which would mean huge 4 percent payroll taxes on everyone. I am sure you will agree that an alert citizen should scrutinize such legislation very closely.

Every time some politician gets up and proposes some huge government expenditure program, it is up to you to ask: "How must will it cost? Where will the money come from? Who is going to pay for it? Should Uncle Sam handle this matter at all or should it not be left to the States and localities?" No man in Washington should be allowed to get away with glib suggestions for more appropriations without being called to account—to explain just where the money is going to come from, as well as the answers to these other questions.

PROMOTING NEW MARKETS FOR CHEESE

Now, my friends, in the same way, I feel it is your right to call your legislators to account for their stewardship as regards the welfare of the cheese industry. In Washington, D. C., I have always felt it one of my primary obligations to boost Wisconsin cheese. And I will continue to do so by every legitimate means available. You know, of course, that it is up to the cheese industry itself to continue its fine work along this line—to improve cheese packaging, cheese advertising, cheese promotion, the way other industries are doing. I know that you have devoted a lot of time, thought, and finances to that purpose. Still more will be required, and I know that you will meet that challenge very well.

The only real assurance, of course, for the continued prosperity of the cheese industry is greater per capita sales and consumption of cheese—far higher than the present 7 pounds per person.

We must not allow this country to slump into a depression again, not only because we want to avoid the staggering loss in terms of manpower, production, the loss of pride to jobless breadwinners, etc., but because we know that the American people have a right to a constantly improved standard of living. We want our youngsters to drink more milk, to eat more cheese at home and in their school lunch boxes. We want nutritional standards to improve. We want production to be uninterrupted so that we avoid a slump.

CONCLUSION

If we continue to fight for an equitable tax system that will encourage industry rather than paralyze it, if we are successful in limiting the activity of the Federal Government to only those areas where a Federal interest actually exists and where the States, localities, and private industry cannot do a specific job—if we do this and more, my friends, then we will be assuring the continued prosperity of your great industry of which we in Wisconsin and in the entire Nation are rightly proud.

I was in California last year, and as I returned from a tour in San Francisco harbor, there was an old man who ran the elevator. As we came down I noted he had an accent, and I asked, "Where were you born?" He said, "Forty-four years ago I landed down there on that pier. I came from Italy, but this is my country." I wonder how many of us feel like he did. I wonder how many of us could put in juxtaposition what he had. He was a Roman Catholic, and he knew about the billion dollars we put into Italy so it would not go communistic. He knew that his children would never own their own home in Italy, that they would have no chance to get anywhere.

"This is my country." I just want to say that one of the biggest sins that you and I commit every day is the failure to pay our obligations to our State and Nation. This man preached this country. Oh yes, Marcus said there are some mistakes, but let's not be the fool that would burn the house down to get the rats. Let's get the rats and keep the house. This Italian said, "This is my country." I said to my secretary who was with me at the time that that was the greatest thing, which had happened on that trip. The way that man said it made me resolve that no matter what difficulties or troubles may come, I won't lose sight of the fact that this is my country. Our country could go to the bow-wows like other countries, if all of us get so tied up in our little business that we don't recognize that our business is the business of the Government of the United States; and if we don't see to it that men in public office perform their duties as trustees and servants. "This is my country."

So I tell you, one of the greatest sins is the failure to pay our obligations. And carrying on in that vein, your obligation is to keep America American. Don't be sabotaged by the term liberalism, the welfare state. What made your industry work? Thrift, know how. What made America? Look at the pictures on the walls here; see industry in action. Who made America? It wasn't the loose thinker, the guy who said, "Let George do it." It wasn't the fellow who thought he could depend on the state for support. That is not what brought your fathers and mine here. That is not what we had when we were kids. We had the thought that this was a great country, a land of opportunity, a land where we could build a life, and raise a family, and find wealth—not simply material wealth, but wealth of mind, body, and soul.

And now my friends, we are through in Washington for 1949, I hope. I plan to have a couple months to go around the State and visit. Nineteen fifty is coming up, and I want to know what people think. I want to hear from their own lips what they think of their Senator, and more than that, I want them to impress on me that they are awake and alert to this tremendous adventuresome age in which we are living—this tremendously exciting age, this tremendously dynamic age; and that they are aware that this Government has been precipitated to the top to provide light and guidance. When I hear that, I will know that no matter what the storm is, the old ship of state will make port, because each one of us will be like the Italian saying in our hearts—"this is my country." Thank you.

Fierce Is the Wrath of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the most powerful expressions which I have read since the development of hostilities in Korea is the supplement to the Whaley-Eaton Service published on July 1 which I commend to the thoughtful attention of every citizen of this Nation:

FIERCE IS THE WRATH OF FREEDOM

1. There is a sharp distinction between Americanism and its Government. Americanism is a genius for achievement. It is the will to work. It is the capitalization of opportunity. It is that freedom of the soul that generates dreams and makes those dreams come true. It is the materialization of those intangible assets that, before America was, tended to wither on the vine and were but slightly utilized. From such sources came the gadgets that decorate every kitchen and light every farm. You free the housewife, you liberate the pedestrian, you loosen the bonds of information and by sight and sound, airborne, you give even to the dumbest mind a new range and perspective. That is freedom. These things are its fruits.

2. The great problem in America, therefore, is not how to lift men's eyes higher and higher or to satisfy his ever-widening demands. That is already in process of solution. The supreme task is rather how to maintain a government that will not blockade the triumphal road. Government, after all, is primarily the machinery to assure orderliness. It has few positive virtues of its own. It is best when it least impedes. It can be a good servant, but it can never be a good master. Americanism is too precious—too obviously precious—ever to perish unless it is destroyed by its own implement, its Government.

3. Man must be free. "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." And the greatest of all freedoms is freedom from government encroachment. Given that, all difficulties can be surmounted.

4. This week, communism struck in Korea. It dropped the mask, already but a thin disguise, and pushed its battalions south against a free ward of the United Nations. Ordinarily the tramp of troops, while disconcerting, is chiefly a peril to dynasties and regimes. But armies may march for righteous and supreme causes. They may be the legions of freedom.

5. Now a common enemy appears. It is as if Lucifer, rising from the depths, were again challenging God. Communism, as an economic theory or order, is as old as civilization. It is recorded in the incunabula of the ancients. It is a system, never yet operated successfully, that opts for an idealistic distribution of the rewards of labor without regard to the contributions given. It lacks practicability, but it is not infamous.

6. The word Communism, however, has been stolen by a group of ambitious men, who have wrapped themselves in its idealistic objectives and seek, in that guise, dominion of the globe. They hate God. They are in rebellion against the humanities. They kill the body and they try to destroy the soul. One thing above all others is anathema to them and that is freedom. They cannot survive if Americanism lives. There is a great and impassable gulf between the two. One gropes in dark caverns and the other

yearns for the mountain tops. It is the beast against the man.

7. In the recent war there was revealed to humanity a mystery of the universe. Man learned how to split the atom and thus release infinite power. He saw, at long last, that all things material are immaterial, and that what we are is merely energy frozen into a particular form. Such knowledge frees the race. It introduces potentially a new dispensation, so advanced, so far beyond anything that men heretofore have ever dreamed of, that the future belonging of right to our children and our children's children, for uncountable generations ahead, surpasses the power of our imagination to envisage.

8. This incomparable asset of peace and progress has so far been used primarily for destruction. The knowledge of it, through treasonable practices, has come into the possession of the men of the Politboro. They could, by its useful employment, if of good will, saturate their own country with progress and happiness. They could, if they wished, within a relatively few years, produce so bounteously that every good thing they viciously promise through their masqueraded communism, could be achieved with joy.

9. But they want none of it. They have refused to join in a dedication of atomic power to peaceful purposes. Their every thought is negative and their hymns are a chorus of noes. They do not want a golden world. They lust for an enslaved earth, peopled by zombies. They plan to extirpate freedom from the face of the globe.

10. Never before within historic times has the peril been so great. Genghis Khan stamped and the world trembled. But he made obeisance to his kind of deities. He did not hate religion. Mahomet inspired his hordes with a religious mission. Even Tamerlane raised temples to Divinity and bowed his head within them. Only now does there burst forth from the gutters of the world a mass effort to destroy men's souls. Can freemen worship Lenin or bend their knees to Stalin?

11. Tuesday, the United States, acting for and through the established agency of the nations with souls, decided to meet the challenge head-on. President Truman, having no truck with vacillation, stated the case with absolute clarity: "The attack upon Korea makes it plain beyond doubt that communism has passed beyond the use of subversion to conquer independent nations and will now use armed invasion and war." He thereupon ordered the Armed Forces of the country, as an agent for the United Nations, into action.

12. There was no other course open to him and to the people of this country. "I stand at Armageddon and I battle for the Lord."

13. If war must come, and it seems ultimately inevitable unless the people of Russia break their own shackles, free men must be alert to prevent in their own countries a concentration and abuse of governmental power. Freedom is already in grave peril here at home. This follows from the financial operations of the Federal Government. It is bankrupting the individual States by conscripting the tax sources on which they must rely to carry on their proper functions. That is why there is a demand for Federal aid for education and numerous other activities which States could handle adequately themselves were their means not being drained by Federal encroachment. The Federal Government alone has the right to create money and, with abandonment of the traditional gold standard, there is no limit to its exercise of this privilege. It can print money endlessly. It does, in fact, do this when it issues bonds to finance deficits. Its prodigality feeds upon itself.

14. The very heart of the American governmental system is the idea of federation and the retention by each constituent member of its right to administer its own local affairs. That right is diminished and must finally be extinguished when the means to finance State operations is taken away.

15. Another war will seriously magnify the national debt. The interest alone on the present debt is greater than was the entire cost of the Federal Government when Hoover was President. The present Congress sincerely tried to hold the budget within reasonable limits. It failed conspicuously because, in part, the Government is already committed to vast undertakings. It, in fact, steals the opportunities belonging to posterity when it undertakes to do immediately a multitude of things that reasonably should be left for achievement over a period of years. The Utopia that Stalin sinfully promises to those he would enslave is what is likewise sought here at home by well-meaning men who would create a Frankenstein. Their good intentions overwhelm their judgment.

16. No economy can be looked for when waging a new war, with which we are now threatened. Victory is imperative no matter what it costs in blood or money. But triumph will be worthless and dictatorial government will spread of necessity over the whole earth unless a real peace, long enduring, is actually won. That peace must be built upon sound financial practices, which will call for sacrifices over a long period of years by the populations of all countries.

17. This can be assured only if, by constitutional amendment or otherwise, the power of the Federal Government to bankrupt the States and to confiscate the property of private persons, through taxation or/and deficit financing, is strictly limited. A suggestion is that in normal times the Federal Government should be prohibited from deficit financing (and taxation in excess of a given percentage of income) unless concurred in by, say, two-thirds of the States through their legislatures. Unless something of this sort is done, the States are doomed. They are becoming Federal dependents.

18. The budget is not alone out of control. The Government itself is in the same condition. The United States is involved throughout the globe. Its activities are countless in number. The Senate, no matter how hard it labors, is utterly unable to keep up with its responsibilities and to act intelligently. It may be doubted if a single living person has the time and the capacity to comprehend the official reports in their totality of even ECA. The Government has become a vast machine, beyond the intelligence of any individual to comprehend, and its legislative decisions, in consequence, must often be the result of more guesses by those who vote for or against them.

19. The Chief Executive, accordingly, already has been endowed with powers greater than those heretofore exercised by any authority in history. He can only press the buttons and must rely on a vast secretariat, the efficiency of which is somewhat questionable. No wonder Mr. Truman is so often absent from Washington and indulges in frequent vacations. He has learned, what other Presidents before him might have discovered to their own and the country's benefit, that he must rely on his subordinates to do the work and confine himself merely to decisions on those matters which are controversial within the Government's own establishment. He can be only the umpire.

20. A bill now being formulated would virtually commandeer everything and everybody, devoting all alike to the national service. Special powers exercised by the Executive in the recent war have not yet been revoked. Enthusiastic theorists are already maintaining that, to defeat stalinism, the methods of his politburo must be permanently adopted here. They talk of a progressive socialism and the nationalization of industries. They, too, perhaps in all good faith, contemplate a nation of robots, regimented, fed and housed in droves. "The individual is nothing; the State is everything." Let the Nation beware of such a destiny.

21. So far, the industrial technicians, the workers in the industrial plants and on the farms, have made the present enormous debt endurable. The politicians have not done it. With all the talk of the common man and the exaltation of proletarianism, the fact remains that one Edison is worth more to our economy, in financial and other terms, than millions of ordinary men. Civilization does not progress by mobs, but through the dedication by individuals of their talents and genius to the common welfare. Politicians have contributed little to the industrial economy. They merely write the rules whereby the benefits that an Edison's genius confers on humanity are utilized and distributed.

22. We seem destined to wage the approaching conflict in the destitute sections of the earth. We have to operate among those who for centuries have swarmed in hovels. These are the people who, probably because deprived of freedom, have never been able to capitalize and utilize those vast resources which, to the contrary, here in America particularly, freedom has permitted civilization to utilize. We have not only to beat back the forces of stalinism, which thrives amid the shambles, but we have somehow over the years to bring these stricken populations into a realization that the beautiful things of earth are obtainable and they need not live in squalor.

23. An economic system, under an organized world peace, operated by men of good will, can be evolved to bring such things about. The new revelation is that, through atomic power and technological advances, what were the dreams of yesterday can be the realities of tomorrow.

24. The course is clear. We must devote all that we have to the extirpation of this awful thing that Stalin and his associates have brought into being. But we must also be sure that, in the process, the basic principle that has made this country what it is shall not be sacrificed. That vital thing, of course, is freedom. It is the key to all progress.

25. At this critical moment in human affairs it is good that emotionalism and sound good sense unite in a common conclusion. It may be that President Truman should have asked Congress first to sanction his defensive use of force in the Orient, particularly as he would have been assured of almost instant approval. It is extremely satisfying, on the other hand, that this man and his advisers saw clearly the magnitude of the threat and determined to meet it without equivocation. It was no time to quibble.

26. This world is moved by spirit, by high motives, by grand conceptions and nobility of purpose. The genius of Churchill thus endowed the British people with unconquerable devotion in their hour of gravest danger. Today, as this and the other nations face the culminating struggle, the shouting facts themselves have an eloquence of their own. No man who has a soul can doubt the need to do what this Nation has undertaken.

WHALEY-EATON SERVICE.

Chinese Markets—A Big Stake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 12 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Chinese Markets—A Big Stake" appearing in the March-April 1950 issue of the magazine Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

This article reveals how the Germans, through the shortsightedness of Allied policy, are not only rebuilding their war potential but are preparing to strengthen the totalitarian forces in the East.

In my opinion, the Society for the Prevention of World War III is one of the few nonprofit educational organizations in the United States whose singleness of purpose and patriotic devotion to the security and best interests of the United States deserves the gratitude of all security-minded Americans.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHINESE MARKETS—A BIG STAKE

To check the growing expansion and influence of communism, our State Department launched the policy of containment. In the words of X, reputedly to be George Kennan, writing in Foreign Affairs (July 1947), the the policy of containment would "confront the Russians with unalterable counter forces at every point where they show signs of encroaching upon the interests of a peaceful and stable world." At the same time, however, that this doctrine was being put into practice, a new program for Germany was under way which, if carried to its logical conclusion, will burst asunder the chains of containment as envisaged by Mr. Kennan.

By the end of 1949, this self-defeating policy in Germany had made significant progress. The reparations program, designed to whittle down Germany's industrial war potential, was scrapped. There was a drastic revision in Germany's favor of the list of prohibited war industries. The programs for decartelization and denazification were emasculated. German heavy industry was given the green light to rebuild its terrible power.

The London Economist, in predicting the shape of things to come, declared recently: "Specifically, the Federal Government, which leans heavily on the support of the industrial and business circles, will seek to end the restriction of steel production to 11,100,000 tons, the restrictions on shipbuilding, the bans on civil aviation, and on the manufacture of synthetic oil and rubber, and the unilateral subordination of German heavy industry to the Ruhr."

Thus, the building up of such a Germany in the face of contracting world markets and increased competition among the nations of the world is virtually an act of setting the fuse to a powder keg. Containing communism while we revitalize German economic power is like trying to build a house during an earthquake.

The Germans, given excessive economic power and capacity, will eventually open the way for new Communist expansion throughout the world. In this connection it is well worth recalling that the rebuilding of German industry after World War I with the help of American dollars, not only gave Hitler the basis for an army, but after his defeat opened new fields for Communist expansion. This is how German heavy industry and its rulers have served the cause of democracy.

The prospect of German economic power breaking up the containment policy is not a fantastic dream. Indeed, there is much reality to it already, as can be seen from certain events in Communist China.

The spirit of Rapalloism, born in 1922 with the Russo-German Treaty of Rapallo, continues to spread in present-day Germany. One result of the Rapallo Treaty was that German officers and generals were dispatched to China after the First World War to organize and train the Chinese armies. The Weimar Republic constantly sold weapons and arms to China and did a boom business, in violation of the Versailles Treaty. In the late twenties, high-ranking members of the German general staff shuttled back and forth between Berlin and China.

It is interesting to note that the chief protagonists in this affair were those members of the German general staff with avowed Russophile inclinations. General Hans von Seeckt himself, who is responsible for the re-creation of the German Army after the First World War, went to China and stayed there for some time supervising the organization of the Chinese armies.

This chapter of history has not been forgotten by the Germans nor by the Russians—and today we are witnessing the same story all over again .

Reports from Europe disclose that a number of German agents and officers who were formerly members of the Free German Committee in Moscow, have recently left for Communist China with the intention of resuming where their predecessors left off 25 years ago. It has been reported that the Chinese Communists have purchased and received from the Russians German weapons from the last war. If this is true, the Chinese would find it very convenient to have German technicians and officers return to China to acquaint them with the use of these weapons.

Alongside of these reports, it is noted that the Russians are tempting the industrialists of western Germany to resume business with China on the grounds that this would afford a very profitable outlet for the products of German heavy industry.

According to the Swiss daily, Tages Anzeiger, of Zuerich, the first inducement of an order for China was recently extended by the Russians to the western German industrial magnates. The paper reported that a contract was offered to the Germans to deliver 100,000 tons of railway trucks to China. The British learned about it and intervened.

Vera Micheles Dean, writing in a recent issue of the Foreign Policy Bulletin (published by the Foreign Policy Association), openly states that "Russia might invite western Germany, already looking about for export outlets, to provide technicians and machinery for the industrialization of China." And she adds significantly that "such an invitation could not be lightly disregarded by any German government, whether controlled by industrialists hostile to communism, or by Communists."

Another keen observer of the political scene, Marquis Childs, recently wrote in one of his columns from Berlin: "(Leaders of the Free German Committee) are said to have gone to China where along with Russian observers they are attached to headquarters of Communist military leaders. According to one source, General Paulus himself is in Peiping. Back of all this speculation is the solid fact that the owners and managers of German industry want to find an outlet for their products and their skills in eastern Europe and Asia."

It is therefore not surprising that German industrialists as well as conservative and right-wing politicians see their great chance for the future in an alliance with Soviet Russia. A typical example is Herr Josef Mueller, vice president of the Christian Democratic Party. As reported by Drew Middleton in the New York Times, Mueller seeks the immediate expansion of trade with the eastern German Communist state and eastern Europe. The German industrialists know that a trade agreement with eastern Germany and with the countries behind the iron curtain would pave the way for gigantic markets in Communist China.

The possibility of closer ties between Germany and Soviet Russia through such arrangements would open up new areas for Germany's industrial power. The German industrialists are aware that Moscow needs and wants the industrialization of Communist China and who would be better equipped for carrying out such a gigantic task than the industrial war lords of the Ruhr. Needless to say, these industrialists are solely concerned with the profitability of such a venture as it would enhance their power, just as the German militarists would be happy to practice their art in China for reasons of their own. The Russians, on the other hand, believe that they can use these German ambitions for their own political aims in the Far East.

Thus every plant not dismantled and every concession granted to Germany which helps to rebuild her industrial war potential in the Ruhr, undermines our policy of containment. The Germans, however, will not only reach out to China, but their economic power will impel them to seek every means possible to extend their influence at the cost of our containment policy. More than that, it will be the American taxpayers who, through their billion-dollar subsidies to Germany, will be contributing to the breakdown of the containment policy.

Do our policy makers in Washington favor such a course of action? Do they agree that American policy in Germany should undermine the containment policy against communism? They act as if they would.

UN and United States Action on Korea May Help To Prevent Third World War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Star of June 28, 1950:

UNITED STATES ACTION ON KOREA MAY HELP TO PREVENT THIRD WORLD WAR—MOVE RECALLS FAILURE TO BLOCK HITLER MARCH INTO RHINELAND IN 1936

(By David Lawrence)

The world has just witnessed an episode that may help to prevent world war III. It is an episode reminiscent of something that was not done in November 1936. When Hitler marched into the Rhineland, the British and French Governments procrastinated and did nothing, and the League of Nations—without America as a member—failed to halt the aggression.

Today the United States, acting in behalf of the United Nations, takes its stand firmly, orders its military forces into action and is prepared to take the consequences in an effort to halt an aggressor in his tracks.

The United States, though regarding the outbreak as technically between two groups of Koreans, has sent a note to Moscow mak-

ing it unmistakably clear that America understands the motivation of the North Korean action to be Russian.

UNITY DEMONSTRATED

What all this may lead to in world affairs is too early to appraise, but there is such a sigh of relief throughout Washington today that it's like a breath of fresh air in a stuffy room. The Republicans and the Democrats are once again united on an unpartisan foreign policy. There is no more partisan politics now, as both parties get behind the President in a remarkable demonstration of unity before all the world.

The new policy in the Far East is, to be sure, a reversal. For months it had been decided to write off the Far East—Communist conquests in China were just too bad. Formosa couldn't be defended, Korea might have to be abandoned. But the recent trip of Secretary of Defense Johnson and General Bradley to confer with General MacArthur and the vist of John Foster Dulles to Korea all seemed to synchronize with American sentiment, namely, that a manifestation of weakness in the Far East would be a blow to America's prestige throughout Asia as well as in Europe. If America were indifferent to the fate of Korea, then no small nation could expect help from either the United States or the United Nations. A stand had to be taken in the Far East to show that America was ready to fight to defend freedom anywhere. It was an opportunity for a military demonstration—so often made as a means of preventing a big war.

Also the main defect in the Truman-Acheson policy which has led to such severe attacks from Senators KNOWLAND, of California, and ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey, and Representative JUDD, of Minnesota—all Republicans—has been corrected at last. It was this trio which wanted Formosa saved somehow, but to this the administration had cried out that they were flirting with war.

RUSSIANS BLUNDERED

Fortunately for everybody concerned, the Russians blundered in time. They suddenly gave the administration a way out of the whole dilemma. For President Truman promptly pointed to Communist aggression in Korea as a justification for protecting Formosa against Communist attack. True enough, the administration does not necessarily get behind Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalists now but keeps the Communists out of Formosa just the same. The Chinese people may interpret the action as they please—and the Communists in China will get small comfort out of it.

As for the shooting, it will be brief. The Russians are not likely to provoke a war, though their capacity for harassment should by no means be underestimated, as they might bring in Communist troops from China to help the North Koreans and start a chapter in history not unlike that which developed in the Spanish civil war as a prelude to World War II.

It could happen, of course, that the Russian people may grow restive and begin to ask if the Kremlin is involving them in war. It could happen that the Moscow government will backtrack and, while disavowing any responsibility for the behavior of the North Korean forces, nevertheless keep the latter from continuing their aggression.

Most important of all considerations in reversing American policy was the possible effect on the Japanese people of the reported abandonment of Korea and Formosa. If that had happened, Communist infiltration in Japan would have become bolder and more effective. The new policy, like the drawing of a line in Greece and Turkey, has awakened real support on every side as a logical development of America's global leadership.

Russia tried to test out America and found a firm, hard, unrelenting policy in Asia as in Europe. That is the biggest single development thus far of the postwar period and could conceivably prevent any attempts at aggression by the Communists in Europe or elswhere.

A New Policy in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, William Henry Chamberlain, in the 5th of July issue of Human Events, has an article entitled "A Line Is Drawn in Asia." In this article he points out the change in position which the administration has assumed as a result of the Korean crisis. As part of my remarks I am including the article.

Out of the turmoil and confusion of the Korean war two definite hard facts of considerable importance appear. The United States has drawn a line in Asia and is prepared to fight if this line is crossed by the forces of aggressive communism, and the Truman administration, doubtless hoping that no one will notice the fact amid the general uproar, has spectacularly reversed its far eastern policy.

This process of drawing a line which must not be crossed on pain of American military action has been progressing steadily in Europe since 1947. The first step was the so-called Truman doctrine—the assurance of military and economic aid to Greece and Turkey. There was no direct American military commitment in the Greek civil war. But American technical advice and American aid, military and civilian, helped to defeat the Communist rebellion.

The fall of Czechoslovakia to Communist indirect pressure speeded up self-defense moves in western Europe. As a participant in the North Atlantic Pact, signed in April 1949, the United States is strongly committed to take positive action in the event of a Soviet attack on any of the European signatories. The presence of American troops in Germany and Austria, in Berlin and Vienna, is an automatic assurance of United States involvement should there be a Soviet attempt to take Germany or Austria by force.

Meanwhile the countries behind the iron curtain have come under increasingly direct Soviet domination. So the demarcation line is plainly drawn on both sides, with only Tito's Yugoslavia as a kind of political and military "no man's land," cast out by Moscow but totalitarian in internal methods of rule, boycotted and harassed by the Communist states but unwilling to enter into full partnership with the west.

Until June 25 there was a marked reluctance in Washington to draw in Asia the kind of hard-and-fast line against aggression which has been marked out in Europe. Asia was in a far more fluid condition than Europe. Several countries were in a state of civil war. The tendency was to avoid binding commitments, apart from those involved in our occupation of Japan and our special relationship with the Philippines.

Then the Soviet Union forced Washington's hand by giving its North Korean satellite the green light for a surprise onslaught on South Korea—a state recognized by the United States and sanctioned by the United Nations. The move went beyond anything the Soviet Union had yet attempted in that it involved the open marching of an armed force across a frontier. Yet full Soviet involvement in the beginning was avoided. Soviet military units were not committed.

The foray of June 25 was a probing question, a test of American probable reaction if there should be a Chinese Communist invasion of Indochina or a Soviet move into Iran or Afghanistan. The answer was prompt and vigorous. The Soviet Union deliberately heated up the temperature of the cold war to lukewarm by unloosing a satellite invasion. The United States did not hesitate to raise the temperature a few more degrees by throwing its air and naval forces into the scales, backed by the authorization of the UN Security Council.

II

The administration has found it necessary to change its position completely on such important questions as the degree of American participation in resistance to communism in Asia and the disposal of the strategically important island of Formosa. We are now doing in the limited theater of South Korea precisely what Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer recommended that we do on the large stage of China in his prophetic, neglected, and long-suppressed report of September 1947. This report is published in full in United States Relations With China, the State Department so-called white paper, pages 764–814. Its salient conclusions, in Wedemeyer's own words, are as follows:

"In order to preclude defeat by Communinst forces it is necessary to give the National Government sufficient and prompt military assistance under the supervision of American advisers in specified military fields.

"American military aid to China, ground, sea, and air, would, if appropriately supervised, contribute to gradual development of stability in the Far East and lessen the possibility of a Communist-dominated China.

"It is recommended—

"That the United States provide as early as practicable moral, advisory, and material support to China in order to prevent Manchuria from being a Soviet satellite, to bolster opposition to Communist expansion, and to contribute to the gradual development of stability in China.

"That China, with the advice and support of the United States, develop and implement a sound program of equipment and improved logistical support.

"That arrangements be made whereby China can purchase military equipment and supplies (particularly motor maintenance parts) from the United States .

"That China be assisted in her effort to obtain ammunition immediately."

It is evident from the nature of some of these recommendations that the official State Department version of China supplied to excess with American munitions and supplies is not accurate. At the time when Wedemeyer submitted his report the Chiang government had large forces still under arms and was in control of all China south of the Yangtze River, of much of North China, with some footholds in Manchuria. Now the essential principle of the Wedemeyer report, active American advisory leadership, has been adopted when friendly territory on the mainland of Asia has been reduced to the little beachhead of South Korea.

III

Even more important has been the reversal of the administration's position in regard to Formosa. The issue of what was to become of this large rich island, with its valuable strategic and economic possibilities, became

acute toward the end of last year, when organized Chinese Nationalist resistance on the mainland ceased. Chiang Kai-shek established his last base of resistance on Formosa.

The consequences of letting Formosa pass into the hands of the Chinese Communists would obviously be disastrous, from the standpoint of American interests. Formosa was vigorously developed as a stationary aircraft carrier by Japan before the war. It was from Formosa that the Japanese forces took off for the invasion of the Philippines. From the southernmost promontory of Formosa one can see the northernmost islands of the Philippine archipelago.

Occupation of Formosa would give the Chinese Communists attractive opportunities for increased contact with the Communist-inspired Hukbalahap insurgent movement in the Philippines. It would mean a serious breach in the chain of islands, running from Japan to the Philippines, which represents an outer line of defense against Asiatic communism.

Formosa was formerly Japan's sugar bowl. There was a natural and mutually beneficial exchange of Japanese manufactured goods for such Formosan products as sugar, citrus fruits, and surplus rice. Formosa's tea and camphor were valuable items in Japan's balance of payments.

The disappearance of Formosa behind a Communist "bamboo curtain" would thus imperil American strategic security and make still more difficult the restoration of economic self-sufficiency in Japan. Yet up to the day of big decisions, June 27, Secretary Acheson was bent on having America stand aloof from the impending struggle for the island.

General MacArthur has long been conscious of the significance of Formosa. More than 6 months ago ex-President Hoover and Senator TAFT came out in favor of an American guaranty for the island, which could not be taken, in the face of such a guaranty, without a far greater muster of air and sea power than the Chinese Communists possess.

IV

But at that time Acheson, who carried the President with him on this issue, was adamant in his insistence that Formosa properly belonged to China, that America should disinterest itself in its fate. This was just what President Truman did in a very blunt statement last January. There was no trace of bipartisan foreign policy in the decision to abandon ship in Formosa. This was exclusively the responsibility of President Truman and Secretary Acheson.

Now, at the eleventh hour, when the danger of conflict may be greater because Chinese Communist prestige is geared to the projected invasion of the island, it has been decided to throw a protective screen around Formosa. Better late than never, perhaps; but the handling of the Formosan issue has been a suitable climax to the vacillating bungling that contributed so much to the loss of China.

Acheson has now come up with the conclusion that "the future of the status of Formosa can be settled only upon the restoration of peace and security in the Pacific, a peace settlement with Japan or consideration by the United Nations." This bears little, if any resemblance to what he was saying last December and January.

Is America at war as a result of the invasion of South Korea? The boundary between war and peace is much more elusive in modern times than it was in the days when hostilities were apt to be formally declared. The Soviet Union and Japan fought at least two big battles in disputed border areas in 1938 and 1939 without calling it war. There was extensive intervention in the Spanish civil war, by Russia on the one side, by Germany and Italy on the other, without formal international conflict.

At any rate a line for which America has been committed to fight has been drawn, in Asia as in Europe. This line is very clear amid the rice paddies near the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea, along the coast of semi-tropical Formosa. It is somewhat dimmer in the jungles of Indochina. How much fighting will be necessary to hold this line depends on the Kremlin.

Meanwhile the Roosevelt policy of giving Stalin the keys to the Far East at Yalta and the Acheson policy of waiting for something to turn up in China have been tried and found wanting.

False Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a Congressman welcomes constructive criticism, expects some not constructive, some misstatement of his views; hence, on occasion, must call attention to the record.

Esther Van Wagoner Tufty, a sister of former Michigan Governor and Highway Commissioner Pat Van Wagoner, Pat now being a Fair Deal protégé in Europe, is a New Deal-Fair Deal writer.

In the Three Rivers Commercial of June 28, under the caption, "Congressman HOFFMAN'S voice only one raised against Cabinet offices," after calling attention to the fact that a woman might be appointed to the President's Cabinet and stating that the President's Plan No. 27 "to give Cabinet status to a new Department of Health, Education, and Security was approved by the House Executive Expenditures Committee," she wrote:

> Only one voice was lifted against it. Michigan Republican CLARE HOFFMAN offered a resolution against the proposal. But he was voted down. Hoover Commission favored the idea.

That short paragraph contains two statements of fact, two untrue statements.

House Resolution 647, disapproving of the President's plan No. 27, was offered by me. It was voted down in committee.

It is also true that my voice was the loudest, the most continuous, and that, for a time, I stood alone in insisting that the House vote upon the plan, which was the opening wedge for socialized medicine.

It is not true that mine was the only voice against the plan, for every Republican member of the committee signed our minority report.

Nor is it true that the Hoover Commission favored the idea. Mr. McCormick, of the Citizens Committee, which backs the Hoover Commission's recommendations, appeared and testified as a witness against plan No. 27, in favor of my resolution.

Mrs. Tufty apparently seeks to create the impression that, had a new department with a Cabinet head been created, a woman would eventually have been appointed to that position, and that I had some objection to a woman holding a Cabinet position.

That inference is not true. Women furnish the men for war. They pay their share of the taxes. They do their full share of our everyday work. I know of no reason why they should not participate equally in Government activities.

Mrs. Tufty seeks to create the impression that I was opposing a Hoover Commission recommendation when I opposed this plan. That is not true. The Citizens Committee for the Hoover report opposed the plan. It was an indirect, back-door attempt by the President to give this country socialized medicine. From the time when socialized medicine for this country was first proposed, I have been against it, as even Mrs. Tufty must know.

Her inference that I stood alone is absurd. Republicans almost as a unit have opposed socialized medicine, as have many Democrats from the South. This deliberate misrepresentation of my views, this considered attempt to misrepresent me before the voters of the district, in this, an election year, is inexcusable.

Opposition from sincere individuals who differ from my political views I have no right to criticize, for, to a certain extent, this is still a country of free speech, a free press.

I introduced the resolution rejecting Mr. Truman's plan to give us socialized medicine. I insisted that the committee vote upon that resolution. Defeated in committee, I insisted that a record vote be taken in the House.

On Monday, July 10, the House voted upon my resolution. The result was that every Republican except one—Mr. JAVITS of New York—and many Democrats voted to adopt the resolution to reject the plan for socialized medicine. The record vote showed 249 voting in favor of the resolution, 71 against it.

The fact is that your humble servant, instead of standing alone as Mrs. Tufty would lead you to believe, had the company of all the Republicans—with one exception—present and voting and of 106 Democrats. For the present, socialized medicine, in the House at least, is as dead as the proverbial duck.

Israel Supports UN Decision on Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the whole world normally watches a new small state to see which path it will travel. In the case of Israel having suffered so much itself by aggression and containing a population largely composed of the remnants of the martyred Jewish people of Europe, and the persecuted Jews of the Near East, it is to be expected that reaction to the naked Com-

munist aggression in Korea would be decisive and complete. The appended Government report on Israel's position should prove interesting to the many members who are watching the development of Israel with deep and sympathetic interest:

The Israel Government in special session and in the presence of the President of State decided on July 2, 1950, on Israel's stand on the Korea issue. The decision was cabled to Mr. Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations. It reads as follows:

"The Government of Israel opposes and condemns aggression wherever it may occur and from whatever quarter it may emanate. In fulfillment of her clear obligations under the Charter, Israel supports the Security Council in its efforts to put an end to the breach of peace in Korea and restore peace in that area. The Government of Israel hopes that the United Nations will continue its endeavors to aline all the great powers in the common effort for safeguarding the peace of the world."

Socialized Medicine Plan Must Be Defeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the President has submitted Reorganization Plan No. 27 and he states that it is in accordance with the Hoover Commission's recommendations. I deny, Mr. Speaker, that plan No. 27 is in line with those recommendations. It is true the Hoover Commission suggested a Department of Welfare but not a political catch-all for politicians like Oscar Ewing.

Mr. Speaker, whenever we put all of the educational activities, all of the social-security activities, plus all of the health activities of the Nation under one man, you give him more political power than any individual in the country except the President. And, Mr. Speaker, it is political power that this administration wants more than anything else.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the plan that is before us and I shall vote for the pending resolution which aims to put the plan on ice—and I hope, forever.

The cost alone of this proposed scheme for the socialization of medicine, surgery, and dentistry will cost untold millions of dollars annually. Under it the cost in the health of our people might be appalling.

The effect of it would be a blow to individual incentive that makes men and women want to serve in the private practice of medicine and dentistry. These people do not want to be the servants of a super-state bureaucracy where they will be subject to the beck-and-call of the politician. This is not the spirit that has made for the highest standard of medicine in the world today.

Mr. Speaker, socialized medicine has failed miserably in Great Britain. If it were to be tried in this country it would prove a ghastly failure in this land of the free. I shall vote against the plan by voting for the resolution which will kill it.

Communism Constitutes a Menacing Danger to Our National Security—Testimony of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of H. R. 7439, now before the House. The underlying purpose of the bill is to protect our national security against subversive elements in Government departments. It enables the head of the several departments enumerated in the bill to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employees who are considered to be bad security risks.

The need for legislation of this kind has been demonstrated by recent revelations of communistic activity by infiltrating departments of Government with individuals sympathetically inclined toward communistic teachings. The determination of Soviet Russia and her Communist fifth columns in practically all countries seeking to gain control of the entire world is an open record. It is time America awoke to the menace within our own gates. It is encouraging to realize that there is a growing realization upon the part of our people of the existence of this danger.

Any doubt as to the existence of this danger in our own country will be quickly removed by a reading of the testimony given by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI before the Senate Appropriations Committee. In that testimony, which I am making a part of these remarks in accordance with the consent granted to me by the House, you will note that Mr. Hoover warns that there are more subversive activities in the United States today than at any period during the recent war. He also said that the Communists are trying to secure most vital atomic, military, and industrial secrets and they have a potential fifth column of 540,000 people.

In his testimony before the committee Mr. Hoover said:

There is a larger volume of subversive activities than existed at any period during the last World War. Communism today is at a greater height in the United States than either nazism or fascism was during the last World War, and I will show that by figures.

Since the cessation of hostilities, the work in the internal security field has increased tremendously. As a matter of fact, it exceeds those of the peak World War II years.

The orbit of Communist control has extended from one-seventh of the world's population in 1917 to one-third of the world's population at the present time. That is, of course, reflected in the Western Hemisphere.

The intensification of communism and underground activity in the United States has increased proportionately.

If we are to preserve our internal security in times of emergency, it is incumbent that the identities of those who work against the peace and security of America be established. Such investigations are of a continuing nature.

The experiences of World War II which brought about the downfall of entire nations through fifth-column activities did not occur overnight. Such activity develops over a long period of years. That is exactly what has taken place in this country.

We must not forget that the United States and our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere stand as the last bulwark against Communist domination.

Now, I would like to deal with certain activities of the Communist Party in this country.

That movement, as you gentlemen know, has changed its name many times, while its party line changes from day to day. There is, however, one fact that prevails and that is that the party line is based upon the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism.

They use the term "Marxism-Leninism" as their so-called doctrine and philosophy. That doctrine, as their own documents set forth, advocates the violent overthrow of capitalistic governments. They state that in their documents and in their speeches. That doctrine further advocates the establishment, in place of the capitalistic governments, of the dictatorship of the proletariat by the Communists. It further states that that cannot be obtained except by force and violence.

One of the great instruments and weapons used today by all Communists throughout the world is the resort to propaganda and the resort to the boring and termite tactics. That is an entirely new technique that came into being during the last world war, as I have indicated, in the fifth-column movement. That is the type of warfare they are resorting to today to take over countries without a direct attack of arms, but rather by penetrating into governmental functions, into schools, and into churches, where they will have access to public expression and opinion.

To go further into this matter, many Americans have been lulled into a sense of complacency by the claim that there are comparatively few members of the Communist Party of the United States of America. Personally, I would have no fear if the Communists could be brought out into the open, but so long as the party is a branch of a worldwide underground movement, inspired from abroad, they cannot be dismissed lightly.

According to our best information, there is a total of 54,174 members of the Communist Party in the United States at the present time.

Most of the members of the Communist Party in the United States are in the concentrated sections of population of the country. For example, New York State has 25,000 members; California, 6,977; Illinois, 3,361; Pennsylvania, 2,876; Ohio, 2,834; Michigan, 1,250; Massachusetts, 1,022; Nevada, 23; Wyoming, 10; Tennessee, 27; Alabama, 141; New Hampshire, 43; and so on.

Even though there are only 54,174 members of the party, the fact remains that the party leaders themselves boast that for every party member there are 10 others who follow the party line and who are ready, willing, and able to do the party's work.

In other words, there is a potential fifth column of 540,000 people dedicated to this philosophy.

* * * the Communist Party is not a bona fide political party. It is a highly organized, militant, and disciplined conspiratorial group following the whims and dictates of international communism. That

was proven in the New York case which recently concluded with the conviction of 11 members of the executive board of the Communist Party. The Communist Party of the United States constitutes a fifth column if there ever was one.

The trial of the 11 members of the executive board of the Communist Party in New York last year took the Bureau approximately 10 years to prepare. We prepared a 1,837-page brief, with a total of 1,033 exhibits.

The trial of the Communist leaders removes any doubt in the minds of right-thinking people as to where the loyalty of the Communist Party rests. It was brought out at the trial that the party is a group dedicated to the overthrow of our Government.

The Communist leaders have become increasingly security conscious and have developed certain security measures to protect their organization.

The trend has been toward the perfection of a highly developed underground apparatus and decentralization of Communist Party operations. This decentralization has almost tripled the number of Communist Party clubs, the purpose being to do away with their congregating in such large groups.

As a security measure, no Communist Party membership cards were issued in 1949. The maintenance of membership records has been discontinued. Members speak in a jargon of double talk, and use codes in correspondence. A courier system has been substituted to protect confidential party communications. Public meetings are maintained at an absolute minimum. Party records have been destroyed or removed to clandestine hiding places. Secret printing facilities and supplies have been secreted for future underground operations. Transfers of party members from one district to another are now controlled through the use of an elaborate identification system.

The party today is in the process of selecting individuals for secret leadership of its underground apparatus. To counteract the FBI's penetration of the Communist Party, its leaders have established a far-reaching and vigorous loyalty program of its own, calling for the establishment of investigating committees in each State and a thorough investigation of each member of the party as to personal history, activities, associations, contacts, and length of membership. Each member of the party is being gone over thoroughly by the various investigating committees. The executive committee, itself, which consists of 13 members, is being investigated by a subcommittee of 3 members to make certain that they are loyal. So they have a real loyalty program of their own in operation.

Now, I state these things because these steps tending toward security within the party have made more difficult the Bureau's maintenance of confidential informant coverage of the activities of the party. I do not mean to infer to the committee that we do not have good sources of information or that we do not have good representation in the party in varying positions of trust. But it is true that it is more difficult to penetrate the party today. Those in the party exercise greater caution. Investigation of party leaders requires more ingenuity. The additional budget request will materially aid us in maintaining the type of coverage necessary for the preservation of our internal security.

Question by Senator FERGUSON. Where are they getting their money?

Mr. HOOVER. Various benefits and fund-raising drives are held from which money is obtained. Then they also receive contributions from individuals who are either members or fellow travelers and who are individuals of wealth.

I would like now to take up the activities of certain of these front organizations. A new drive is being launched in the Communist Party circles to revive what is known as the united-front program which characterized the party's greatest growth in the middle thirties. One of the great dangers of communism is the ability of its espousers to infiltrate and corrupt various spheres of American life.

The way to evaluate the real effectiveness of the Communist Party is by observing its influence and its ability to infiltrate otherwise thoroughly American phases of life.

Combating the front organizations is more difficult today than ever before. To prove party affiliation is difficult; but their deeds and acts expose them for what they are. They cannot long survive in the spotlight of truth

At the present time scores of known or suspected Communist Party-front organizations are under investigation by the FBI. Many are organizations national in scope with chapters in various cities throughout the United States.

The Communist Party has, through its increased activities, endeavored to exploit youths, veterans, civil rights, foreign nationality, the press, radio, television, the motion-picture industry, educational, political, women, and labor groups. That statement can be corroborated by overwhelming facts which we have in our possession.

Now, in connection with the Communist-front organizations, the FBI is primarily concerned with Communist infiltration of such organizations and the manner in which Communists seek to subvert these organizations to further the Communist cause.

Experience has demonstrated that many fronts are used as a cover for espionage purposes and others as a propaganda media.

Now, I would like to refer briefly to the infiltration by the Communists into our basic industries. The Communists have long advocated working through trade-unions as a means of accomplishing their ends.

Forty-eight percent of the membership of the Communist Party is in the basic industry of this country. In this manner, they would be able to sabotage essential industry in vital defense areas in the event of a national emergency.

Our investigations disclose that Communist activities are most pronounced in such strategic industrial areas as New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, California, and Michigan.

Communist efforts toward infiltration have been intensified in basic industries vital to our security such as steel, heavy machinery, mining, communications, transportation, the electrical industry, and the maritime industry.

The Communists have developed one of the greatest propaganda machines that I think modern civilization has ever known. They capitalize upon ill-founded charges designed to enlist honest, progressive liberals to support left-wing causes.

Of the many professions, penetration of the legal profession is the most amazing. As officers of the courts, well trained and educated, lawyers have made some of the finest contributions to American life. It is regrettable, therefore, that any association of lawyers will permit itself to be used and parrot the Communist Party line.

Earl Browder, then the acting head of the Communist Party, on September 6, 1939, while testifying before a congressional committee, defined what he meant by the term "transmission belt."

He said, "Transmission belts refer entirely to the Communist approach to the problems of reaching the masses. Transmission belts mean having Communists work among the masses in the various organizations."

He later was asked about a group of organizations as to whether they were Communist transmission belts. When asked about the National Lawyers Guild he replied, "Yes; they are one of the organizations."

During the trial of the 11 Communist leaders in New York the bar was shocked by the actions of the defense attorneys. Some of those lawyers were members of the National Lawyers Guild.

Since 1940 the National Lawyers Guild has been most vociferous in its denunciation of the FBI. One member of the Lawyers Guild in 1940 made the statement at a meeting of that organization that—

"If we keep up the constant criticism of the FBI and of Hoover, and if this criticism is systematically kept up and followed all the time, particularly by organizations, it can and it will weaken the power of the FBI and hamper them very effectively."

The committee will recall that some years ago a group of reputable and prominent members resigned from the guild. Among them were Judge Pecora, of New York City, Justice Jackson, Mr. Morris Ernst, and Mr. Berle, former Assistant Secretary of State, who resigned because the guild had been infiltrated with Communist control at that time.

Now, I would like to mention Communist attempts to infiltrate the media of mass dissemination. Their objectives are most obvious.

For example, in the communications field, they have as their primary objective the control of communication facilities in the event of an emergency. In 1946, the cultural section of the Communist Party was given a special directive to penetrate the radio field.

Communist schools and Communist fronts have offered training courses in connection with radio writing, acting, and directing. Special Communist-front organizations having to do with radio have been organized. Many Communist fellow travelers and stooges have been able to secure positions enabling them to actually control personnel and production.

Communists, masters of pressure tactics, are always on the alert to chastise those who would oppose them. One front group boasts of having thousands of monitors in every section of the country, who will take up a letter-writing campaign against any commentator who disagrees with what they advocate.

As to the matter of civil rights, the American Communists, artists of concealment, for years have been seeking to gain public support through the issue of civil rights, a subject too sacred to be hindered by Communist propagandists.

The Civil Rights Congress, cited by the Attorney General as subversive, is a good illustration. Whenever the Communist Party wants to start a demonstration, the Civil Rights Congress is called into action. They have picketed Federal courthouses; they have marched on Washington; they have issued handbills; they have sought to inspire a barrage of telegrams and letters, as the Members of Congress know so well. Their protest meetings and campaigns are fervent and frequent.

* * * * *

During the past year, Bureau investigations have disclosed that the objectives of certain foreign espionage agents are: Information on atomic research, identities of atom scientists in the United States; radar; jet propulsion; topographical maps of the United States coastal areas, including airports and military landing fields; data on biological warfare; our industrial and military resources; and biographical data concerning leading personalities in the United States.

Experience has revealed that foreign espionage agents seek the protection of a legal cover. By that, I mean they seek admitttance into the United States on diplomatic passports. They seek assignments to some official foreign agency and thus conceal themselves under the diplomatic cloak of immunity. To further avert suspicion, a high ranking espionage agent may very well be employed as

a clerk in some minor capacity in a foreign establishment. However, when he speaks, those with higher-sounding titles follow his orders without question. Foreign espionage service maintain strict supervision over their activities in this country.

Hoover testified on Communists stirring up civil rights problems as follows:

Our civil rights and domestic violence work increased 45 percent during the past year. In that connection, I would like to point out that our problems have been extremely aggravated by Communists and by Communist-front organizations who go into these areas where civil-rights problems arise and endeavor to aggravate the situation rather than leaving it in the hands of the Federal and local authorities.

In some of the Southern States where there have been charges of the violation of civil rights, and where we have had to go in and make investigations, there appear one or two or three delegates or propagandists from Communist-front organizations who endeavor to aggravate the attitude of the communities. The local authorities, in many cases, want to properly handle the case. But these Communist-front organizations send in their propagandists who make all kinds of charges and criticism without any foundation in fact.

I believe that in these instances that are violations of Federal laws if investigation were left to the constituted Federal or local authorities as the case may be for handling, we could get better results than are obtained through the irritation of the local communities by these agitators.

No one will doubt the integrity of J. Edgar Hoover, nor, will anyone doubt his ability to speak authoritatively on this or any other subject that he has investigated. He is actuated by sincerity of purpose and a desire to protect the security of our Nation. His statements constitute a warning we cannot and must not treat lightly. It behooves each of us to be on our guard to make certain that the Democracy for which our boys have fought and died all over the world is not lost in our own country.

I shall vote for this bill, now before the House, because I believe it will be helpful in protecting our national security by giving power to remove from our Government service any who are found to constitute a menace to our national security.

The No. 1 Problem—Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 12 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The No. 1 Problem—Steel," appearing in the March-April 1950 issue of the magazine Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

This article presents the pertinent facts regarding the dangers of a resurgent German economic power to world security and economic stability.

The Society for the Prevention of World War III is a nonprofit educational organization. Since its founding in 1943, it has given full support to the basic policies of President Roosevelt and President Truman, and has worked tirelessly to enlighten the American people as to the dangers which would vitiate our Government's program for peace and security.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NO. 1 PROBLEM—STEEL

To understand the far-reaching economic and political repercussions which could result from policies that place overemphasis on the development of Germany's industrial power, it is necessary that we resort to some cold statistics. Admittedly, statistics can be boring and even frightening, but at times there is no other alternative but to take the gamble and hope that the reader will stay with us throughout.

The steel division of the ECE (Economic Commission for Europe), a United Nations agency, recently made public its report on the steel situation in Europe. The report indicated that European demands for steel in 1953 would be roughly 58,000,000 tons. It was also estimated that for the same year Europe might be expected to export about 4,100,000 tons of crude steel. On the other hand, the steel programs of various European countries surveyed by the steel division, amount to a total production of 70,000,000 tons. Thus, according to the steel division, 8,000,000 tons of steel may not be able to find a market in 1953.

The Economic Commission for Europe, as reported by the New York Times, January 1, 1950, found that in the year 1949 there were 6,000,000 tons of steel capacity idle in Europe, excluding Germany. When these two facts regarding the situation in steel production in Europe are considered alongside the report that American steel capacity has reached the enormous level of 99,000,000 tons per year, then the world is faced with a problem of the first magnitude.

The Germans are fully aware of these facts and yet their steel barons agitate day and night for the overthrowing of all limitations on steel production in Germany on the allegation that the export of German steel and steel products are necessary to fill in the gap between Germany's exports and imports. The Germans shy away from the crucial question of how they intend to sell more abroad, in the face of contracting markets throughout the world. They have good reason to avoid answering the question because there is no magic formula that could wish away these facts. But let it not be said that the Germans are bereft of ingenious plans. The London Economist, in trying to answer the German urge for all-out steel production, declared that the Ruhr industrialists envisaged the present organization of the Marshall-plan nations evolving into a new international cartel. Once the cartel is set up, then the Ruhr, a cheap producer, economically well situated can look forward to the collapse of plans for establishing steel industries for such countries as Italy and Norway. In other words, the Germans in their bid for economic resurgence hope to organize a new and more gigantic steel cartel that would dominate Europe.

The prospect of German steel dominating Europe frightens Germany's neighbors. Furthermore, some leaders in the American steel industry are aware of the implication of a revival of the German powerhouse. As a matter of fact, Eugene G. Grace, the chairman of the Bethlehem Steel Corp., told its stockholders recently that Bethlehem steel exports during the fourth quarter of 1949 dropped 4.1 percent of the company's total shipments. "That is how quickly our exports have nose-dived," he said. Touching on the program for enlarging Germany's steel capacity, which incidentally has not been mentioned officially by American authorities, Mr. Grace declared that this would result in Germany having 8,000,000 tons of steel available for foreign markets over and above her domestic needs. This too, Mr. Grace implied, could have a serious effect on the steel industry in the United States.

Some may say that there need be no fear of German competition, but the Germans do not compete according to normal business practices. On the contrary, the Germans have a history of resorting to every kind of shady practice backed up by the German State, to undercut competitors. Even today the Germans are preparing to employ huge subsidies for their steel industry. There are already signs that there will be a reorganization of the industries of the Ruhr whereby the coal mines would be owned by the steel trusts which, as in the past, would run them at a loss in order to dispose of the finished steel products at cut-rate prices. We know that the steel industry in Germany today receives a subsidy in the form of cheap coal, while the same coal sells higher for export.

The Associated Press reported that the German federal railways would introduce special freight rates for iron and steel exports via German seaports. The reduction of freight rates provided for is by one-third lower than that before the war. Other plans are afoot whereby German exports would be accelerated by a 10-percent foreign-exchange bonus. Together with these contemplated subsidies and the notorious cheap labor in Germany, we can discern the outline of the new German assault in the economic sphere.

We are told, however, that Germany would not be allowed to set up any cartel devices which would help carry out this grandiose plan. On the supposition that that is true, what about United States policy as regards the ultimate capacity of the German steel industry? If, on the one hand we solemnly pledge that Germany shall not be permitted to use her power in steel to undermine the economies of her neighbors, and on the other hand, wink at German agitation for the lifting of present limitations, we shall be creating a new Frankenstein monster.

It should be recalled that a good part of German heavy industry in the past was out of balance. It did not correspond to the genuine domestic needs of the German people and it was confronted at that time by shrinking world markets. Particularly after World War I, the real nature of the German economy became clear when the Germans initiated the cartel system in Europe. The establishment of these huge cartels was an implicit recognition of the fact that under normal competitive business conditions, Germany's productive capacity could not function at full blast.

The tremendous industrial war potential which Germany possessed prior to the war, including steel, is for the most part intact. As in 1930, these top heavy German industries are facing contracting markets abroad. It is clear that dangerous consequences flow from the present policy in Germany which permits an excessive industrial potential. After World War I the Germans "solved" this dilemma by the building up of the German war machine and preparing for aggressive war. Is it not clear that this double game of so-called decartelization, and at the same time recklessly building up the German steel industry, will produce the same urge on the part of the Germans to seek other outlets for the employment of this huge industrial war potential?

Yet Mr. John J. McCloy, American High Commissioner, has intimated that serious considerations have been given to the resumption of American investments in German industry. We do not know whether

this is part of the point 4 program which is supposed to develop backward countries, but we do know that there is tremendous pressure to permit new multi-million dollar investments in the German steel industry. For the German steel barons, such investments would serve as the opening wedge for unlimited steel capacity

But there is another angle which was neatly expressed by the astute German politician, Gustav Stresemann. In his memoirs, Stresemann talks about the Dawes plan of 1924 which was the precursor of enormous American investments in German industry. He said, "The Dawes loan will cause 300,000 Americans to make propaganda for Germany because they will be interested in her prosperity." Herr Stresemann knew whereof he spoke. Chancellor Adenauer too knows the score.

Prof. Ludwig Erhard, Minister of Economics for the Bonn Government, who has taken a hand in the propaganda drive of the German Steel Trust, admitted that whether the present limitation will be sufficient for Germany "was not an economic but a political question." In other words, from an economic point of view, the German demand has no sound economic basis. It is rather linked up with other considerations such as profitable investments and perhaps military strategy.

The military consideration was very succinctly expressed by Mr. Jackson Martindell, president of the American Institute for Management. After a recent on-the-spot survey of the European situation, he had this to say with regard to Germany:

"In part, this is a duplication of what happened to France after World War I. As part of her indemnities, France obtained from Germany old and obsolete rolling stock and other equipment which she put into use in France, leaving Germany stripped bare of many essentials. Germany then borrowed money from England and the United States and rebuilt with the most highly modern equipment, resulting in Germany—the defeated nation—being technologically far ahead of France, the neighboring victor."

Mr. Martindell said that the same thing seemed to be occurring again. He related the story of a British salesman who asked him "Why are you Americans letting Germany have all this wonderful machinery if your purpose is not to ruin both of us?" In commenting on this point Mr. Martindell said:

"This is no mere passing phase. The tendency is strong for the reestablishment of German industry, at least in the west. What has not been dismantled and shipped out of the country has been damaged by war and is now being replaced. Germany, defeated in two major wars, is likely to come out of the second one far superior in technology to any country in Europe or Asia. If the western powers then decide to arm western Germany so that she might be a buffer against Russia, we will have created an industrial war potential overshadowing our combined allied might."

Is it not clear from all this that one cannot permit the Germans to build up her steel capacity under present contracting market conditions without creating a situation which will induce the Germans to resort to rearmament again? Policy makers refuse to tackle this dilemma.

While our primary concern is the danger of the revival of Germany's industrial power which could be the basis for any future wehrmacht, the scrapping of present limits on her steel capacity would create havoc among the economies of Germany's neighbors. It would increase unemployment and create political unrest which would play into the hands of extremist elements. Nor would American industry or labor be immune. Here too there would be a falling off of steel production and employment which would have a chain reaction throughout the American economy.

Must American labor and management be sacrificed in the interest of 300,000 new potential investors? These are the considerations which deserve the careful study of American management and labor. In our opinion, a program which would limit Germany's industrial potential to genuine peacetime requirements as recommended by the United States Foreign Economic Administration, would not only avert this economic danger, but would at the same time strengthen American security and world peace.

Life Insurance and the American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of Alabama, delivered a very thought-filled and thought-provoking address on the subject entitled "Life Insurance and the American Economy" recently, to the State convention of the Alabama Association of Life Underwriters at Sylacauga, Ala.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Senator SPARKMAN'S address:

I was asked to talk to you on the subject "Life Insurance and the American Economy." As one of your customers, and as a strong believer that the life-insurance business makes an important contribution to the strength of the American economy, readily agreed to tackle the assignment.

Frankly, I did not realize just how great that contribution is until I began to review some facts that had escaped my memory, and to learn some new facts about your business. You will not mind, I hope, if I relate some points about life insurance which, no doubt, many or all of you already know. It is information which every American should have because of the prominent part which life insurance plays in our lives. In fact, there is no phase of life insurance that is not related to the Nation's economy, and which consequently is not of concern to all of us.

The life-insurance profession has had a varied and successful growth. The first insurance company formed in the United States was called A Corporation for the Relief of Poor and Distressed Presbyterian Ministers and the Poor and Distressed Widows and Children of Presbyterian Ministers. The corporation was set up by the Presbyterian Synods in New York and Philadelphia in 1759. We see, then, that man's desire for security for his family and for himself in later years gave birth to your profession. It is still a compelling motive to life-insurance purchasers.

Since the founding of the first company, the formation of new companies, the passage of State and national legislation concerning the insurance business, and the acceptance by the American public of the worth of insurance protection, have marked the steady progress of a flourishing and deserving profession.

Few people outside the profession realize the tremendous growth your business has undergone, particularly since the turn of the century. About eight times as many people own life insurance today as in 1900. The amount in force—over 200 billion dollars—is about thirty times the amount in force in 1900. It is significant to note that $50,000,000,000 or nearly one-fourth of the total has been put in force since the end of World War II.

Four out of every five American families have some life-insurance protection. Whereas in 1898 only one-ninth of the population was insured, 50 years later one-half of all our people were insured.

This rapid expansion of insurance in force means not only better protection for millions of families, but also employment for many thousands of American citizens. Approximately one-third of a million people are employed full time in the life-insurance business, a gain of 25 percent since 1945, and many other thousands owe their livelihood to the business.

Besides employment of tens of thousands, there are other contributions which the life-insurance business makes to the American economy. One of the greatest is the payment benefits. Annually hundreds of thousands of American families receive such payments which amounted in 1948 to nearly three and one-quarter billion dollars. The total volume of payments is increasing steadily, and, no doubt, the total is a good many more million today.

A large part of the payment benefits, nearly one-half, are death benefits. These payments actually prevent many thousands of survivors from suffering extreme hardships and from becoming members of the public-care list. This help is available when aid is most needed. It saves unfortunate families from deep embarrassment. It provides opportunities for those left behind to make necessary adjustments to life. The many values can only be realized by those who have lost loved ones, especially when those loved ones were depended upon for making the living.

The remainder of life insurance benefit payments likewise serve to lighten or to make unnecessary the care which the government or welfare agencies would otherwise have to supply. Such assistance as endowment benefits, policy dividends, annuity and disability payments help the economy in numerous ways, to say nothing of the pride and satisfaction that recipients enjoy from having made preparation for old age and less fortunate days.

Thus we see that life-insurance companies in paying hundreds of millions of dollars to policy owners and beneficiaries each year are thereby relieving local, State, and Federal Governments, and private welfare agencies of the responsibility of looking after many additional persons. All this means less burden on the taxpayer, happier people, and more prosperous times for us all.

It is not generally known, but the benefit payments made by life-insurance companies far exceed those made under the United States social security system. For example, in 1948 Social Security paid out $576,000,000, while life-insurance payments, as I have already stated, amounted to three and a quarter billion dollars. In other words, social security payments were less than 18 percent of that of life insurance. This contrast helps to point out the added magnitude of the job that would be imposed on both government and private welfare agencies for the welfare of millions of our people if there were no life-insurance benefits.

Through their assets, life-insurance companies have also played an essential role in the Nation's economic development.

Incidentally, it is important that the general public understand that these $60,000,000,000 in assets as shown on the annual financial statements are not owned by the companies themselves. The companies are trustees for the approximately 80,000,000 policyholders who own these assets. With the trusteeship goes a tremendous responsibility which, on the whole, has been well met.

One of the ways these assets have been used for the benefit of the entire Nation is in helping to meet the financing needs of the United States Government. Historically, in times of greatest Government financing need, the purchase by life-insurance companies of United States Government securities has been the heaviest.

Following the panic of 1893, life-insurance investments in Government securities rose and contributed greatly to economic recovery. Such investments then declined until World War I when the ratio of investment in Government securities to total investments rose to 11½ percent. By 1930 the ratio was down to 1.8 percent, but during the depression years of the 1930's the ratio rose again and by 1940 the investment of life-insurance funds in United States Government securities had reached 19 percent, or in terms of dollars $5,857,000,000.

These dollars played a valuable and essential role during depression years in relieving millions of needy families.

With World War II came the largest participation of insurance companies in helping to meet the country's financing requirements in history. Between 1940 and 1946 the life insurance dollar investment in United States Government securities increased from $5,750,000,000 to twenty-one and one-half billion. About 45 percent of all life-insurance funds were invested in the war effort. At times during the war, investment in Government securities ran as high as 70 percent of all new investments. This assistance helped immeasurably in bringing the war to a successful termination.

With the war's end, there was a sharp decline in the financing required for the Government's military needs. On the other hand, however, there was an increase in the demands of business and industry for capital funds.

Life-insurance companies responded to this demand, and so again participated in building for a prosperous Nation and a stable economy. Since the end of the war, life-insurance companies have about doubled their amount of business and industry securities. More than 35 percent of their total investments are now in such securities.

This confidence in America's future definitely aids the establishment of an expanding and safe economy. It creates and maintains jobs, increases purchasing power, and also, of course, produces more prospective policy owners.

There are other types of investments made by life-insurance companies which help to strengthen the whole fabric of our economy. Purchase of railroad bonds; stocks, the majority of which are preferred stock; real-estate mortgages, and ownership of large-scale, moderate-cost housing projects; and loans to policy owners, are among the helpful financial activities engaged in by life-insurance companies.

It seems to me that life-insurance funds have been invested with vision and foresight. Naturally they have had to be reasonably safe investments because of the primary consideration of protecting adequately the policyholders who are in reality the owners of the life-insurance funds. There is no doubt, however, that on the whole the funds have been wisely invested and wisely administered.

As such, the life insurance business has been a contributing factor in helping the Nation to recover from periods of financial slump, to wage successfully the wars we have been forced to fight to preserve our way of life, and to build an economically strong America. These are facts in which all of you may justifiably take pride.

Besides the marvelous growth of your profession, and the worth-while accomplishments made by life insurance companies, there are two or three other topics I want to mention briefly. They are things that have to do with our economy. They are things which affect all of us, and with which the life insurance business itself is closely interwoven.

They are serious problems which, in my opinion, are being discussed rather irrationally by some critics. There is not time here to discuss them in detail, but I do want to refer to them with the thought that before we pass final judgment we have all the facts, and insofar as possible we understand the import of our decisions regarding them.

First, there is the problem of an unbalanced budget. We all, or at least everyone that I know, want a balanced budget.

I, for one, and I think it is true of nearly all of us, was brought up to live within our incomes. My family as farmers had difficulty doing so, but at least when the crop was sold at the end of the year, there was hope and expectancy that all debts would be paid and that we would have lived within our income. With this kind of training, I am naturally concerned when the Government operates "in the red," as I know all of you are.

As we consider the imbalance between income and outgo, however, we must take into account for what the money is being spent before we can wisely determine whether or not we can balance the budget at the immediate time. When this is done there are several facts which enable us to understand the difficulty now of avoiding deficit financing.

In the first place, we find that so far as expenditures are concerned we are just as surely fighting a war today as we were before the "cease-fire" order was issued at the end of hostilities in World War II. We are not spending as much money, of course, as we did in 1943, 1944 and 1945, or even in 1946, but most of what we are spending goes to pay for war items connected with those years and for preparations against wars we hope to avoid. In fact, nearly three-fourths of all Federal expenditures have to do with expenses connected either with wars we have fought or with efforts to maintain peace.

The year 1939 is generally looked upon as a fairly normal year. At least it was a time that we hopefully thought we had overcome a frightening depression. There were still several million unemployed, but we could definitely see better times ahead.

Let us compare the expenditures of certain items—those that make up most of our expenditures today—of the 1939 budget with the same items of the 1950 budget. The four items today which take nearly three-fourths of the 1950 budget, or more than $32,000,000,000, required in 1939 only a little more than one-fourth of the budget, or $2,500,000,000. These items are: (1) National defense, (2) veterans' services and benefits, (3) international affairs and finance, and (4) interest on the public debt.

Of the first two, there is no question at all but what they are war expenses—either for wars fought or wars we hope we do not have to fight. When a fair examination is made of the other two, we have to come to the same conclusion.

It would take a separate speech to discuss with you the importance and meaning of our programs for international cooperation. They include the Marshall plan; aid to Greece, Turkey, and Korea; the Atlantic Pact; etc. While these programs cost money there is absolutely no doubt in my mind but that without them we would be spending far more for our defense forces. There is so much at stake if we fail to keep the Marshall plan countries from falling under the domination of Russia and if we cannot check communism elsewhere that realistically we have no choice except to make every effort to do just that.

Most of the more than $5,000,000,000 we pay out each year for interest on the national debt is a war expense. We did not nearly pay for the war while it was being fought. For example, during the years 1942–46, the budget receipts came to approximately $173,500,000,000. The budget expenditures during the same time amounted to approximately $370,000,000,000, resulting in a deficit of around $200,000,000,000. That is the reason the debt is so high today, and the fact that we are having to spend such a large part of our receipts to prevent and to prepare against another world-wide catastrophe accounts for the unbalanced budget which worries all of us today.

These facts show the major difficulty to be encountered in making a sizable reduction in the budget. It might very well endanger our national security to reduce by any sizable amount our defense efforts.

Another point to bear in mind is the adverse effect on business activity a sharp and sudden reduction of Government expenditures could produce. I want to make clear that I believe a reduction can be effected and I have supported several efforts to that end, but I think that we should try to make certain that we do not make unwise cuts that could bring a set-back to business growth.

This caution is of direct concern to the life insurance business. As the American economy is prosperous and grows, so does your business grow. There is direct relation between the increase in the gross national product and the increase in life insurance in force. Likewise, a study of your life insurance policy lapses and surrenders rate shows that they fluctuate from year to year with general business conditions. Counting the years 1935–39 as 100 percent, there were nearly twice as many policy lapses and surrenders from 1930 to 1935, which included the worst years of the depression, and only about as many as 50 percent in 1948, a good year for our economy. The lapse and surrender ratios in the year 1932 were about the highest in any year in the Nation's history since 1900.

Frankly, it is my belief that we cannot expect to balance the budget completely except by expanding the economy. We are flirting with our own existence if we try to do so by weakening our defenses, surrendering to communism, or reverting to isolationism.

A second complaint heard on every hand today is that the country is drifting to socialism. Some describe it by the term "welfare state." To me, this is another charge which must be dealt with calmly and with realistic thinking. Every Government official whom I know is opposed to socialism. I see no evidence on the part of Government officials at the national level to take over control of business activity or to abolish the free-enterprise system. Neither do I see any evidence that the Federal Government is attempting to provide complete security or a Utopia for its citizens.

The question of what part the Government should play is a highly controversial one. It seems to me that there are two or three elementary principles on which the Federal Government can legitimately operate. For instance, there are some activities, particularly such matters as national defense and international relations that have to be set up and administered almost entirely on the national level. Yet, there should always be as much State and local determination as is practically possible in any activity in which the Federal Government participates.

We Americans are almost unanimous in our effort to preserve private enterprise, but private enterprise must always recognize that it owes obligations to those it serves along with its being entitled to certain freedom of operation. Consequently, while we all oppose Government control over private enterprise, we all know that it is necessary for

the Government to exercise supervision in some fields.

There is definitely a place in our order of things for the National Government, and this place is not limited to just wars or foreign relations. It carries over into joint responsibility with State and local governments and with private enterprise. This responsibility is met through Government acts and agencies which provide or help to provide in an age of interdependence and mass production, services for people, which on the whole, they cannot provide for themselves.

In brief, it is not my belief that Government should attempt to provide all the needs of the people. Yet, it is my belief that it is the responsibility of Government to help make it possible for the people to fill their own needs. Freedom and equality of opportunity should be assured by the Government even though equality of achievements could never be given. Certainly any government worthy of support in a democracy will take steps to provide essential needs to the governed when such needs are not otherwise being met.

This concept is as old as the Government itself. It extends back to the governing bodies of most of the colonies. It is established in the preamble of the Constitution, and in article I, section VIII of that same great document.

These principles permeated the entire growth of the Nation and the increased prosperity which has come to our people over the years. The health services; the banking laws; the public-welfare assistance programs; the child labor laws; the many acts of Federal aids to education; the farm programs; the conservation of natural resources; and dozens of other examples are proofs of the necessity of the National Government stepping in to assist State and local governments and private enterprise in meeting the expanding needs of the American people.

How many of these would any of us today claim have taken away our liberties and freedoms? Would the three score and more cities in Alabama that have planned and are planning hospital programs under the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act claim that their people are being shackled and bound by socialistic practices in Washington?

Sylacauga and a good many other Alabama cities either have or are planning housing projects for low-income occupants. These cities, as you know, have not been forced into accepting this Federal aid. The decision has been made locally, and with local participation.

I dare say that the many thousands of farmers who lead an easier life because of the Rural Electrification program would not consider themselves to be Socialists.

In their entirety, these programs have meant more to Alabama and the South than to other sections of the Nation. For example, the per capita income of the South—including States of the Southeast and the Southwest—in 1930 was $303; in 1948, it was $1,004, a gain of 231 percent. For the entire Nation, the per capita income in 1930 was $596; in 1942, $1,410, or a gain of only 137 percent.

The part of the South which lies within the TVA region experienced even a more phenomenal increase. No other part of the country has equalled the South in per capital income growth during the last 20 years.

I am confident that such projects as TVA, REA, Soil Conservation and other farm programs; hospital construction aids, and other public health services, just to name several Government aids, have contributed to the South's outstripping the rest of the Nation in per capita income gains.

What does this mean to the life insurance business? This question is answered when the relationship between the per capita income and the amount of life insurance per capita is realized. With hardly an exception, the same states, Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, Arkansas, South Carolina, and so forth, that have a per capita income much less than the national average also have in force much less life insurance per capita than the national average. Most of these States are in the South.

Just as there is no Southern State that has a per capita income above or equal to the National average, so is there no Southern State in which the per capita life insurance exceeds or equals the National average. The import is unmistakably clear.

Likewise, the higher the family income, the greater the percentage of families which own life insurance. Less than half the families with incomes under $1000 own life insurance. Of course, the amount in such cases is a mere pittance. Sixty-seven percent of families with incomes of between one thousand and two thousand own life insurance; 84 percent between two thousand and three thousand, and so on until 93 percent of families between $5,000 and $7,500 own life insurance. Above $7,500, 91 percent own life insurance.

I know there is a limit to what the Government can do, and I know there is a degree beyond which the Government should not go in helping its citizens to lead a better and happier life. As long as there is as much participation and administration on the local level as is practical, and as long as Government aid is channeled through private enterprise, Government domestic programs of the kinds we now have will continue to contribute to a sounder economy than we would otherwise enjoy.

Just one more word on this point—it is my thought that every Government program that is in operation today has strengthened the private enterprise system. For example, I conceive that to be true of the Social Security system and its relation to private enterprise. Instead of being a bar or an impediment to the life insurance profession, Social Security goes hand in hand with it. The many who are afforded security which the Social Security law provides are taught the importance of protection and in their desire to want more of it, they buy life insurance. Thus, the Social Security laws are not inconsistent with private life insurance.

No doubt you know that full-time life-insurance salesmen would be covered under the proposed social-security legislation now before the Senate. They are already included in the bill as it passed the House of Representatives. This coverage is requested by the salesmen themselves, and I am told by staff members of the Senate committee handling the bill that only one or two life-insurance companies oppose the idea.

It is my observation that life-insurance salesmen are among the most independent of all people. Certainly none of them I know favor socialism, but some people consider social security to be socialistic.

The same relationship with regard to one complementing the other exists with respect to national life insurance that was sold to veterans during the recent war. I have had life-insurance salesmen tell me that the national life insurance program and the social-security program have helped your business. From the rapid expansion which you are enjoying, I do not see how they could have hurt it.

It has been said that the best way to prevent people from going communistic is to make each one a small capitalist. If our people can own a little property, can have decent clothing and shelter for themselves and their families, can give their children an opportunity for education and jobs, I have no fear of our succumbing to foreign isms. Thus far, in my opinion, Government programs actually initiated have helped to set up safeguards against socialism and communism.

A third complaint made by all of us has to do with the high taxes we have to pay. If you will recall the story of the Federal budget, you will understand why taxes are high. High taxes are due primarily to wars and preparations for peace. Contrary to what some would have you believe, they are not due primarily to Government domestic programs.

As a matter of fact, in 1939, this country spent about $1,500,000,000 more for social welfare, health and security than in 1950. There are items which when combined make the nonwar expense of 1950 greater than in 1939. However, the proportion of the national income devoted in 1950 to programs outside national defense, international affairs and finance, veterans' services and benefits, and interest on the public debt is actually less than in 1939. For example, nonwar related programs in 1950 came to around 5 percent of the national income as compared with about 9 percent of the national income for these programs in 1939.

I would not leave with you the thought that all is well with the Nation's affairs. However, there is more reason for hope and confidence than for despair. The outlook for your business is especially bright. Predictions are that by 1960 there will be 8,000,000 more families than now. Population growth is expected to be 9 percent. Nearly everyone—conservatives and liberals alike—predict a continuous and steady expansion of the American economy. Worker's purchasing power has improved 36 percent over the last 9 years, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Expectation for future increases is good. All these developments portend many more life-insurance prospects, and a much larger volume of business than you have ever had.

We would be unrealistic and derelict in our responsibilities if we refused to face the serious world and domestic problems which confront us. Yet I feel confident that we can solve these problems. We must do so. To face the future with optimism as illustrated by the successful convention which you are holding here is one means of building a sound American economy and thus helping to make it possible to preserve a strong nation of hope and success for us all.

Switchmen's Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include a letter which I have written to Mr. D. K. Hill, local chairman of Pratt Lodge, No. 734, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, at Pratt, Kans.:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 6, 1950.

Mr. D. K. HILL,
Local Chairman, Pratt Lodge, No. 734,
Brotherhood of Locomotive
Firemen and Enginemen,
Pratt, Kans.

DEAR MR. HILL: I am in receipt of your letter of recent date and am glad to hear from you.

You are correct in your understanding that I am receiving communications urging that legislation be passed which will ban strikes and provide for compulsory arbitration of labor disputes on our railroads.

These communications are from farmers, some of whom are piling their wheat on the ground because no transportation is available; from farmers who are unable to secure fuel oil and other harvest supplies; and from still other farmers who are situated in the drought area and whose livestock is suffering from a lack of feed because of the railroad strike. They are coming from businessmen who are unable to replace their stocks. They come from the owners and operators of grain elevators who have had to close their doors and go out of business temporarily because their elevators are full of wheat and no railroad transportation is available.

They come from people of various occupations who believe that something is wrong when the leaders of a small group of railroad employees can tie up a transportation system and utterly paralyze the business activities of great areas of this country. They come from people who recall the strike of just a few weeks ago on the Santa Fe and four other railroads, conducted by your organization, in which it was demanded that the railroads put a second fireman on Diesel engines. They come from people who have witnessed what John L. Lewis has done to the economy of this country by preventing the production of coal, which not only paralyzed the industry of great areas, but which resulted in distress and suffering on the part of many thousands of people because of lack of fuel.

I can understand why these people are demanding legislation which will protect the public from just such catastrophes as we now have as a result of this switchmen's strike. I think you can understand it too. And you can understand also, I think, that while the public is patient there is a limit to that patience.

The Diesel strike of a few weeks ago and the present one are clear indications that the statesmanship in railroad labor which was responsible for the enactment of the Railway Labor Act of 1926 is now sadly lacking. The Railway Labor Act has deservedly been considered a great piece of legislation. For many years through good times and bad it operated successfully. It is just as good today as it ever was. But it is not functioning for the simple reason that the leaders of railroad labor are not satisfied to let it function. They have taken the position in recent years that unless the decisions of the fact-finding boards are 100 percent for the unions they should not be accepted. Such an attitude will kill any law and especially one which depends for its success upon the good faith of those who operate under it.

I hold no brief for railroad management. I am neither commending nor criticizing railroad management at this time. Management is fully capable of presenting its own case and the railroad labor organizations are certainly capable of criticizing railroad management where it needs to be criticized. I am speaking only for the public which has a far greater concern than either management or labor in strikes which involve the public health, safety, and welfare as does every railroad strike.

In your letter you refer to free enterprise and say that a denial of the right to strike would be an infringement of the same. But I am sure that you would not contend that we have free enterprise when the leaders of a small group of 4,000 men can, by calling a strike, paralyze great transportation systems with the resulting financial loss and damage and danger to the health and well-being of the people. Such is the very antithesis of free enterprise. It is a dictatorship not by the Government but by private individuals who have set themselves above the Government and its people.

Power brings responsibility and the power which comes from leadership in labor unions imposes a responsibility not only to those who belong to the unions but to the public as well. If this public responsibility is to be ignored then the power will have to be taken away.

You deplore the passage of legislation which would prohibit strikes on the railroads. But if such legislation comes it will come for one reason and one reason only; namely, that the unwise and arrogant leadership shown by the heads of railroad labor organizations. They will bring it on themselves.

No group of people in this country has ever gotten anywhere by taking the attitude that the public be damned. Business and industry have found this out in the past and if labor organizations haven't found it out already they will in the near future.

I have a high regard for the railroad men of this country. They are a splendid group of citizens performing well the important work which it is theirs to do. I know hundreds of them. They are my friends. I consider you my friend. And I am writing this letter in the friendliest spirit possible. But I would not be a real friend to you and all the other fine railroad men whom I know if I did not speak frankly at this time.

Very sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD R. HOPE.

Strange Bedfellows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, certain of our super-patriotic and hyper-hysterical Americans find themselves in very strange company these days. The Chicago Tribune, in its unrelenting attacks upon President Truman and his administration, sounds very much like the Daily Worker.

Spreading venom in our midst has long been an art in which Colonel McCormick and his Chicago Tribune have excelled. They thrive on confusing the minds of our people, in wartime no less than in times of peace, in times of national emergency as in periods of tranquility. Hatred, bigotry, intolerance, prejudice, suspicion—these are the wares the Chicago Tribune is peddling day in and day out. All this has finally landed the "Colonel" and his mouthpiece in a blind alley in the respected company of another great spokesman for the American people—the Daily Worker. The extremes find that they have much in common—their hatred of American life and the American system of democratic government.

The following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post June 29, 1950, makes good reading:

COMPANY THEY KEEP

One of the more interesting corollaries of this Korean crisis has been a general exchange of bedfellows all over the place. To put it bluntly, the Communists have found themselves a brand-new set of fellow travelers.

The party line on President Truman's announcement of a new policy in the Far East has been set forth in an editorial in the Communist Party mouthpiece, Pravda. Pravda's main point is that the President in ordering American planes and warships to support the resistance in South Korea has usurped an authority he does not rightfully possess.

"Who authorized the American Government [i. e., Mr. Truman] to take this step? In putting its Armed Forces into action, did the United States Government reach an agreement with the United Nations on its policy about their loyalty, to which Truman and Acheson make such a display? * * * It was not the United Nations, nor any other international body, that authorized the Government of the United States to take these acions with regard to Korea and China that Truman announced yesterday."

Interestingly enough, this very same point of illegality has been raised by the Chicago Tribune and its Washington outlet. Where Pravda feels that Mr. Truman had no right to take any action about the Korean war without an explicit mandate from the Security Council (of which Russia, of course, is a member), the Tribune feels that only the Congress had the right to decide what should be done about Korea. Therefore, says the Tribune, the President's statement "is an illegal declaration of war. It is beside the point to say that Congress may or will back Mr. Truman. The fact is that Congress has not been consulted."

It almost seemed as if the Tribune's words were taken out of the mouth of Representative VITO MARCANTONIO, or vice versa. The President, asserted Mr. MARCANTONIO, has "usurped the powers of Congress by declaring war without its consent."

There is yet another point on which Colonel McCormick's boys in the Tribune Tower, Chicago, and Comrade Stalin's boys in the Daily Worker on East Thirteenth Street, New York, appear to agree. Both believe that Mr. Truman has been impelled by other motives than a benevolent interest in the well being of the world. The Tribune thinks Mr. Truman is rushing us into war in a desperate effort to ward off political defeat.

"Mr. Truman's thinking, if that is the word for it, is * * * confused by his own political troubles. A month ago his man, Senator PEPPER, was licked in Florida, and on Saturday his man, Senator GRAHAM, was licked in North Carolina. The Democratic Governor of Ohio said only a few days ago that he was half inclined to vote for Mr. Truman's leading Republican opponent, Senator TAFT. Mr. Truman's political fortunes are ebbing. He could use a war."

The official pronouncement by the National Secretariat of the Communist Party in America, has to be sure, a slightly different version of the President's motives. He is, say the comrades, simply obeying the will of his masters in Wall Street.

"These war moves of armed intervention are only in the interest of the powerful bankers who mint their profits from the lives of the plain people here and throughout the world."

But whether Mr. Truman's motive is political panic or economic cupidity, the Tribune and the Daily Worker draw precisely the same moral. "Not one American in a thousand says the Tribune, "believes that the defense of Korea is worth the life of a husband, a son, or a brother." "The interest, the will of the American people," says the Worker, "is for peace. * * * Our country, our sons, our daughters are in grave danger."

Oh, well, it all goes to prove that no matter what position you take, if you stay there long enough you'll suddenly find the comrades by your side. Nor is this the first time they have found themselves places on the bench beside the Tribune. There was also, you remember, the little interlude of the Hitler-Molotov pact. Yet it would be both sad and unjust if (applying the principle of guilt by association) people should now begin to refer to the Tribune as the prairie edition of Pravda.

Korean Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the current developments in the Far East, I desire to call to the attention of my colleagues the following letter which I addressed to the President of the United States on July 11, 1950. I am making similar appeals to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, July 11, 1950.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The blow has fallen. In the ugly reality of the naked Korean aggression, the true nature of international communism is revealed for all to see. It was in far-away Korea that this blow descended, but it might have been and it may still be repeated in Turkey, Iran, the Balkans, or even closer to home.

The Communists have already had their answer in unmistakable terms. Thanks to your courageous and unflinching leadership, Americans have rallied as one people to give that answer. And in this hour of trial, most of the free nations of the world have closed ranks behind us.

So great was the crisis confronting us and so great was your response to it that partisan differences have been stilled. The situation called for unity, and once again, as they always have in the past, the American people have risen to the challenge.

But in the exaltation of the moment we must not lose sight of the grim days that lie ahead. We face brutal and determined aggressors. In their mad drive to power, comparable to that of the Nazis and the Japanese militarists, they will stop at nothing. No one can foresee what new demands will be made on the forces of peace and freedom. Will the aggressors attack our Seventh Fleet which plows the waters between Formosa and the Chinese mainland? Will they spill their herded forces over the border into Indochina? Will they seek to subvert the Philippines Republic? Will they set in motion a new maelstrom in the Middle East? Will they plunge into western Europe and set the entire world aflame once again?

No one can yet foresee what consequences may arise from this incident in little-known Korea. We do know, however, that American planes and ships are already deeply engaged there. We do know that Americans once again are fighting and dying for peace and freedom. They must be given material and moral support without stint. Not a single American life must be lost for lack of proper equipment. And since the extent of the task ahead is still undetermined, we must marshal all practicable strength both military and civilian to meet any eventuality.

Certainly, we can ill afford to have idle those plants and the men with the skills to operate them which can repair, reequip, and produce the instruments for quelling aggression. Yet that is precisely what is happening at the New York Navy Yard, Mr. President. Many of its loyal, highly-skilled and long-experienced men have remained idle because of false economy. When the order was given last year which would have reduced the working force in this great plant from 12,225 to 3,385, I vigorously protested. I urged the Defense Secretary in a letter dated September 28, 1949, that in the interest of national security prompt action be taken to strengthen our defenses, and that the naval construction and repair program underway at the Brooklyn Navy Yard be carried out. I also wrote you under date of October 1, 1949, that "This is certainly no time to cut down on our national defense, even in the name of economy. To carry weight against Russia in international councils, to make war if war is thrust upon us, we shall need a defense organization of maximum efficiency in full being."

There should now be no question of the urgency for getting the New York Navy Yard and similar establishments back into high gear. I strongly urge that steps toward this end be taken at once. Our men on the firing line in Korea and wherever else international communism shows its aggressive face will need the equipment which these plants alone can produce.

Respectfully yours,
LOUIS B. HELLER,
Member of Congress.

National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the arguments advanced by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] and others in support of the amendment giving the Civil Service Commission certain review authority, where employees are deemed poor security risks. While I fully apppreciate the fine concern of the gentleman from California over the possibility of unjustly depriving an employee of his rights, it is my opinion that adequate safeguards will be available in the bill as reported.

The problem is primarily one of administrative procedure, rather than of basic civil rights. There are risks involved, whatever our decision on the Miller amendment, but I have a strong faith in the department heads' sense of responsibility to individuals charged with being poor security risks as well as to the national security interests. I shall therefore vote against the Miller amendment.

I am reluctant to help make more cumbersome the procedures by which services of employees in the so-called sensitive agencies may be terminated, where the national security requires such termination.

In recent years we have witnessed the development of precedents and traditions having greater force, sometimes, than statutory law, which make extremely difficult, and often impossible, the termination of services of undesirable employees; and this is not good for the public service. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the public interest will be better served by fixing more clearly the responsibility of the department heads. Since it is clear from the language of the bill and the report that it is the intention to give every reasonable protection to those unjustly accused, I shall oppose the Miller amendment.

The provision of the bill which gives an affected officer or employee the right to seek or accept employment in any other Government department is further evidence of our desire to protect the individual and to provide that proper balance which should exist between national and individual interests.

The Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 7, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to extend my remarks and include a news article from the Journal Herald of Dayton, Ohio. This article was written by Hon. Roy G. Fitzgerald, who was for 10 years a very able and influential Member of Congress. Mr. Fitzgerald is a prominent lawyer and while in Congress was chairman of the Committee on Revision of the Laws. The article follows:

THE WELFARE STATE

EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL HERALD:

Your reference to the phrase "welfare state" in your leading editorial of June 15, prompts me to relate the following fable, which may be apropos.

Two fleas decided to marry and settle down. The ceremony performed, they selected a big inactive dog and took up their abode.

Life was sweet and rosy. Food, shelter, and heat were provided from a central-control source. Freedom from want and fear became a reality. With a housing unit in every wrinkle, the fleas had little to do other than eat, sleep, and multiply.

The dog seldom scratched. He never in any other manner upset the tranquillity of his "citizens." Selfish, material rights were subordinated to the welfare of the fleas, who enjoyed this abundant sheltered life. They multiplied amazingly.

There came a time when the old dog grew weary and debilitated. Could be the fleas were too voracious in their appetites. Unable longer to support this hungry and nonproductive citizenry, the dog wandered into the wilderness and passed away.

Panic reigned among the fleas. They raced from tip of tail to nose, shouting "The economic system has let us down."

Many of the panic-stricken horde, disillusioned and without sustenance, and totally incapacitated to seek a new livelihood, died on the spot. Others trudged on to face a cold, unsympathetic world, dying as they tried to thumb a ride to the next dog.

With initiative, a will to do a fair day's work, a bit of discipline, plus self-reliance, the fleas would be living today, and so would the dog.

ROY G. FITZGERALD.

Private and Public Power Cannot Meet Demand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the July 3, 1950, issue of the Sacramento Bee makes it very clear that the combined efforts of public and private power production cannot meet the ever-increasing demand. It is not a question of whether or not public and private power can live together, but whether or not by their joint efforts in the production of power they can keep even reasonably close to the national requirements. The Sacramento Bee editorial, I think, will be of interest to those who have been led to believe that public power production is putting the private power companies out of business. The editorial follows:

PRIVATE UTILITIES SHOULD PUT AWAY CRYING TOWEL

The current issue of the United States News and World Report of Washington publishes the results of an extensive research into what has been doing in the field of electric power development in the United States in the past few years.

One thing it discovered is that the demand for power is expanding by leaps and bounds.

Another thing which becomes immediately apparent from its investigation is that the continued Cassandra wailings of the privately owned utilities about what public power is doing to them in particular and "free enterprise" in general are 100 percent hokum.

For instance, a striking chart published by this weekly shows privately owned utility generating capacity in 1951 will reach 61,000,000 kilowatts, 20,000,000 more than in 1945, a 50 percent increase in 6 years.

Is that a picture of a melon withering on the vine?

On the other hand, public power agencies in the same period will have added only 5,200,000 kilowatts to their production.

Their total output will remain, as in 1945, about 20 percent of the Nation's total.

The News goes on to say:

"Spending totals, for new plant and equipment, also point up the trends in power development. Spending figures show private companies' investment of about $8,050,000,000 in new generators, transmission lines, and other facilities in the 1945–50 period. Federal expenditures, by unofficial estimate, amount to about $1,597,000,000 in this same period. Cities, States, other power units invested around $1,500,000,000 during these years.

"In other words, privately owned electric power companies are building new plants and putting up lines about three times as fast as all the city, State, and Federal agencies combined. That is the national over-all picture."

And the over-all picture strikingly bears out the recent statement made in Secramento by Assistant Secretary of the Interior William E. Warne that it will take the combined efforts of both public and private power agencies "to expand power development fast enough to sustain our dynamic economy."

Is it not about time for the privately owned utilities to put away the crying towel?

They should in fact be grateful to public power.

It has provided the spur which has goaded them on to enjoy their greatest period of growth and prosperity.

Warning on Korean Situation 4 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, almost 4 years ago I took the floor of this House and urged positive action by our State Department in Korea. The speech I made that day—Tuesday, March 4, 1947—is, in my opinion, worth reading today. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include that speech, and in view of our present desperate situation in Korea, I commend it to Members of the present Congress and those of our executive and military departments who may be interested:

SPEECH BY HON. PAUL W. SHAFER, OF MICHIGAN, TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 1947, PAGE 1649, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. Speaker, one of the most dangerous boundary lines in the world today is in Korea.

It was created artificially with the sanction and approval of Franklin D. Roosevelt. It was done in secret and without either the knowledge or consent of the American people. It splits the Korean nation asunder.

Korea is back in the headlines today. These headlines are fraught with the gravest peril.

On one side of the line, and in control of 10,000,000 unhappy Koreans, is a huge military force of Soviet Russia. On the other side of the line, and in control of 20,000,000 unhappy Koreans, is a relatively small military force of the United States Army.

Soviet and American troops were reported the other day to have exchanged shots across this infamous and abominable boundary, the thirty-eighth parallel.

Our American commander, Lt. Gen. John R. Hodge, back in Washington to report on Korea, says the Russians are creating in their zone a slave army of nearly half a million Koreans. The reason for this is that the Korean people and their leaders in the south want their own representative government. But Russia tolerates no freedom near its doorstep. Accordingly, it has marked Korea as its next victim.

We are told that history repeats itself. Right now a repetition of the vilest sort is working itself out with results that may be disastrous for the United States.

We all know how Poland was sold down the river in a power-politics deal that benefited no country except Soviet Russia. Exactly the same thing is now happening on the other side of the world—in Korea.

Russia wanted control of Poland and she got it in a secret deal. Russia also wanted control of Korea, and she is in possession of the northern half of that country as the result of still another secret deal.

We all know that Korea is a friendly country. The Koreans fought valiantly against our common enemy—Japan—for 40 years. We all know that Koreans were promised their independence at the Cairo meeting attended by Roosevelt, Churchill, and Chiang Kai-shek. We know that this promise of independence was reaffirmed at Potsdam, with Russia sitting in.

We look at a map and we see Korea split in two, just as Poland. We see that the Red army of occupation is sitting in northern Korea, down to the thirty-eighth parallel. We know an American force is occupying southern Korea, waiting till the Russians agree to withdraw so the Americans can leave, too, and give the Koreans their independence. But there are no signs that the Russians have any intention of getting out. Instead, they are digging in.

The Russians poured into Korea during the last week of the war just as fast as they were able to get there. Although there was no fighting, the Russians went in with a force of a quarter of a million men. They pushed right up to the thirty-eighth parallel line and began to fortify it as though it were the permanent boundary of a hostile power. The only power on the other side of the line was a small force of Americans. The Americans haven't fortified their position. They didn't crowd up to the Russian line, but left a neutral no-man's land 2 or 3 miles deep between themselves and the Red army.

The Russians at once dropped an iron curtain down along the thirty-eighth parallel line. They refused to let newspapermen into their zone. They would not even let official representatives of the American Army go in. They stopped all trade and all travel back and forth across the line. They shut it up so tight that they won't even broadcast weather information from the northern zone to American weather stations in the south.

Inside their zone in Korea the Russians have appplied the same tactics they have used in Poland and elsewhere. They have clamped on a totalitarian dictatorship. They have prohibited freedom of speech, so the Koreans couldn't criticize what they are doing. They keep out all news from the outside world, so they can tell the Koreans just exactly what they want them to hear. They plaster all the towns with pictures of Lenin and Stalin, and they fill the newspapers and air waves with Communist propaganda. And they forbid any Korean to listen to any radio program from outside.

The Russians are hurrying just as fast as they can to make northern Korea a Communist state. They have brought back into their zone several hundred thousand Koreans who had fled to Siberia to escape the Japs, and who have been indoctrinated with communism. They have set up a puppet Communist administration which they claim allows "self-government" to the Koreans in their zone. And they are using three methods to make Communists of as many as they can of the 10,000,000 Koreans who are captive north of the 38th parallel.

These three methods are force, bribery, and exile. Let us examine them one at a time.

The first method has all the Communist totalitarian earmarks of sheer terrorism. For the first 2 months of their occupation, the Russians turned their army loose on the people to rape, loot, and brutalize just as they pleased. When a semblance of "order" was restored, it was the order of the prison house. Koreans were not allowed to travel outside their own villages without papers of identification—and they can only get those papers after they have convinced their Russian masters that they will be "good" collaborators with the Communist regime.

The Russians also announced that all Koreans who had collaborated with the Japs should be punished. They decided at the start that all Koreans who owned property were Japanese collaborators. So they seized their property and put the Koreans in jail. They took Cho Man Sik, the Korean patriot leader of the north, and tried to make him head of the Communist regime. When Cho Man Sik refused to cooperate with them, they threw him in jail. He has never been heard from since.

The Russians in Northern Korea have made it perfectly plain to the people there that the only way to be safe is to give up their national patriotism and support the Russian plans.

Their second method of imposing a Communist state is by bribery. They took over all Japanese-owned property, and all the landholdings of the rich Koreans as well. They then proceeded to redistribute the farm lands. They had some 2,000,000 acres of arable land in their possession, and here's what they did with it. They divided it up into communes. They then told the Korean peasants that in order to hold any land in a commune, they would have to work with the Communist Party. The choice was to play the Russian game, or to starve.

Actually, this land redistribution was a gigantic fake. The Russians told the Korean farmers that the old share-crop system of paying half their crop to the landlords as rent was a crime. That extortion, they said, was ended by the beneficent rule of the Communists. But, they explained, of course, the new government had to be supported by taxes. And for the time being at least, the taxes would be the same 50 percent of the crops.

The Korean peasants, naturally, were helpless to oppose the Red army's will. Whatever the terms offered, they had to accept. So they moved back onto the same old farms, and operated them in the same old way. But now title rests in the Communist Party, and they are subject to the will of the Communist state.

The third method the Russians have used is exile. There have been many Koreans who would not accept the new regime on the Russian terms, but at the same time were generally so well-behaved that there was no excuse for executing them or throwing them in jail. To these Koreans the Russians gave the opportunity to escape. They could leave all their property behind, and sneak down through the mountains to the American zone. Thousands of patriotic Koreans accepted that choice. They left their property, their friends, and their home communities behind to join their 20,000,000 fellows south of the thirty-eighth parallel.

This is only a part of the story in Korea today. It is a system based on agreements made in secret, and it operates in secret behind the iron curtain the Russians have dropped across the thirty-eighth parallel line. But it is far from being the whole story.

In northern Korea the Russians are trying to establish communism so firmly that they will always have a Communist regime there to help them dominate the future of the country. But they also are spreading communism through the American-occupied south by every means in their power.

In order to get money with which to do this they substituted a military currency for the 5,000,000,000 paper yen in circulation in their zone. The Americans have kept the paper yen in the south, so all the five billions the Russians have acquired have been available for their propaganda activities in the south.

The question is, What does the United States intend to do to block Russian plans to make Korea another Communist puppet state? We agreed with them at Moscow in December 1945, that Korea should be reunited and a Korean provisional government set up over the whole country. But this decision has never been put into effect. When the Russian-American Joint Commission met last spring to try to put it into effect, the Russians blocked any action by insisting that only Communists should be consulted or permitted to have any part in the provisional government.

That is the situation concerning Korea today. Eighteen months have passed since the Japanese surrender. The Cairo pledge of independence for Korea is further away today than ever before. The Russians are entrenching themselves solidly in northern Korea. The job of prying them loose from Korean control is growing more difficult with every day that passes.

Yet, so far, our only policy is to let the situation alone and wait. What I want to know is what are we waiting for? Why are we giving the Russians still more time? They said over a year ago that they were ready to get out. Why aren't we demanding that they keep their word?

The Moscow decision of 1945 has never been enforced. Unless we are willing to sell Korea down the river just as Poland was sold, we had better take some positive action now. The time has come for us to tell Russia that the promises she has made must be kept. If the United States is ever to have any position of respect and prestige in the Orient, the pledges we have made to the Korean people must be made good. We can never win friends by continuing to back down. Nor can we win friends by denying the Korean people self-government, maintaining a censorship, preventing them from trading with the rest of the world and treating them not as allies—which they were—but as enemies—which they were not.

Export-Import Bank Guaranties of United States Private Capital Invested Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 8083, before us seeks to establish a policy of this Government to insure loans against certain losses and big-business men and to encourage them to set up manufacturing plants to develop the backward countries of the world. In other words, the thrifty, hard-working, saving American citizens would have to bear an additional tax to insure these big-business concerns against certain possible losses in business they develop overseas.

Of course, this is a Wall Street move of millionaire capitalists, exporters, and importers who see a field of cheap labor in foreign countries which they can exploit, yet they want the taxpayers of the Nation to guarantee them against certain losses.

This is the world dream of the present Fair Deal known as point 4. There were only 5 days of hearings on this bill, and only five people testified, three of them from the bureaus that helped write the bill.

With world conditions as they are, it would seem this administration would have more judgment than to push this program which calls for an initial expenditure of $250,000,000 to encourage American capital to help develop the backward nations of the world. As Secretary Acheson said a few months ago in speaking of China, "I think we had better wait until the dust settles," so that if we do carry out this foolish idea we will know what countries we can go into where our capitalists can build plants without them being taken over before they are finished by some revolutionary gang.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say with all the emphasis and deep feeling at my command, that this administration, from the President down, which has so bungled our foreign policy that we are now in an undeclared war in Korea, ought to stop such propositions as this and try to win this war we are in that is causing the loss of lives of many of our soldiers this very day, and may cost the lives of countless thousands of them before we are through with it.

Is it not time that these dreamers should get down to the level of reality and try to do something to preserve our own country in its most difficult days in many years? We need to build up our own strength, fight off the war that is on us now and that threatens us from many other angles.

Mr. Speaker, I made the charge several times lately that the big labor leaders of the Nation are failing to protect the interest of the rank and file of labor in their political support of this Administration, right or wrong, regardless of the damage it will do to labor. They have endorsed for the past several years the policies of the Democratic Party here on Capitol Hill, and they have endorsed this bill and program now before us. This is another proof of the truth of my charges.

This bill seeks to help establish great manufacturing concerns in foreign countries where there is cheap labor at a time when there are almost 4,000,000 men out of work in this country who cannot get a job.

Worse than that, if it is carried through successfully, most of the goods they manufacture at labor from 20 cents to 60 cents an hour will be shipped back into this country under the present free-trade policies of this administration, and will drive more millions of men out of work.

This bill asks the taxpayers, including labor, to guarantee American capital against certain losses if they will go to these other countries where there is cheap labor and develop manufacturing organizations. Capital can migrate, build factories, and do business in the backward countries where there is cheap labor, but the millions of laboring men at home cannot follow these factories to the far corners of the earth and take their families with them.

This administration which has raised a smoke screen by crying out against the Taft-Hartley law and other legislation, is now tied up with Wall Street, as it has been all the way through with the international bankers and exporters while it has been backing the free-trade policies of reciprocal trade agreements. This is another step against the interest of labor and in combination with Wall Street to pull the rug out from under the laboring people of this country, while they use the Taft-Hartley law as a smoke screen.

If you want automobiles, electrical appliances, typewriters, and electric light

bulbs which before the war were shipped in here by the billions from Japan; if you want practically all articles made in foreign countries at labor from 20 to 60 cents a day and exported from those countries into this country, which will close down businesses here and throw millions of people out of work, then follow the policies of this administration and vote for this bill. Again I say, why are the labor leaders not opposing this bill?

They will be able to manufacture refrigerators, electrical appliances of every kind, and thousands of articles, and through the free-trade policy of this administration dump them all on our shores at about half what they could be made here under our high labor wage standards. And they can supply the other countries of the world, and ship them to all the ports at the same sort of price, whereas, if we can keep our industry at home to make jobs for our own people at the highest standard of wages in the history of the world, we can supply the world market, as we have in the past, to keep our own working people busy and happy.

Where are these vaunted big labor leaders that they have not come in and opposed this bill. The gentleman from New York, a member of this committee, points out with pride that the American Federation of Labor, the CIO, and all of the big labor leaders are supporting this legislation. Their reason is that they support the policies of this administration first, and protect the interests of the laboring men they are supposed to represent last.

They have supported the free-trade policies of this administration which has caused hundreds of thousands of men to be thrown out of work. If this thing goes through where we establish our manufacturers abroad and insure them against certain losses, it will wreck labor and the economy of this country.

This bill helps capital to migrate; to leave our shores and set up shop in foreign countries where they can hire labor from 20 cents to 60 cents an hour. The poor laboring man, with his family, cannot migrate and follow these capitalists who are guaranteed against losses by taxes extracted from labor, and all of us left here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill in every form. I hope the Members of the Congress will join with me and others to defeat it. If we can defeat it, we will be serving the best interest of labor, of business, and of all of our people.

Truman's Plan No. 27 Deserved Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include the following timely editorial from the Washington News:

HOOVER'S PRESCRIPTION

Congress has killed another of President Truman's Government reorganization proposals—Plan No. 27, which would have created a Cabinet Department of Health, Education, and Security.

This time the House dealt the death blow, 106 Democrats joining 143 Republicans to roll up a 240-to-71 majority against the plan, which also has been disapproved by a 6-to-3 vote in the Senate Expenditures Committee.

Plan No. 27 deserved defeat.

It was so far at variance with the Hoover Commission's recommendations that the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report refused to support it.

The Hoover Commission urged departmental status for the Government's social-security and educational activities, now under the Federal Security Agency, but not inclusion of health activities in that set-up.

The overwhelming House vote against No. 27 reflected belief among many Members of Congress that approval for the plan would have been a long step toward socialized medicine in the form of the administration's compulsory health-insurance program.

It also reflected strong congressional objection to giving more power, and possibly a Cabinet seat, to Oscar Ewing, present head of the Federal Security Agency and foremost advocate of compulsory health insurance.

It seems to end whatever hopes Mr. Ewing may have had of becoming the Nation's first Secretary of Health, Education, and Security. And it probably makes adoption of "socialized medicine" a very remote prospect.

But defeat of plan No. 27 will accomplish no positive good unless Congress considers and acts on what the Hoover Commission did recommend as to Federal health activities.

What the Commission did recommend was that the Public Health Service, now part of the Federal Security Agency, be merged with the medical and hospital functions of the armed forces and the Veterans' Administration under a United Medical Administration.

More than 24,000,000 persons in the United States are now eligible for Federal medical care. More than 40 different Government agencies attempt to provide it, at a cost of some $2,000,000,000 a year. These agencies operate under no central plan. They compete for appropriations and scarce medical manpower. They duplicate hospital and other facilities.

The Hoover Commission held that unified direction of the Government's medical activities is essential to eliminate waste, overlapping, and inefficiency.

It would, the Commission said, provide better care for the beneficiaries of Federal medical programs; improve training and service in the various agencies; reduce the drain of doctors from private practice; provide better organization for research; promote better medical preparedness for war.

This newspaper believes that the Hoover Commission's recommendation is sound and that Congress should speed legislation to put it into effect.

Memphis Fights Back for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 12 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in many areas of the world, civilization has been moving toward collectivism and politicians have been pushing people around increasingly because individual citizens and communities have failed to fight back for their rights until they have lost the right to fight back at all. Let it be said here for the record, Mr. President, that such is not the case today in Memphis, Tenn.

The following news story from the pages of that progressive and courageous southern newspaper, the Memphis Commercial Appeal, tells its own inspiring story. It is a recital of constructive activities by courageous citizens which should be emulated throughout America as this Republic continues to drift and drive toward national socialism or something worse parading under the deceptive disguise of a welfare state, a planned economy, or just plain big government run wild. It is a clear-cut, convincing demonstration of what any American community can do that has in it individual organizations with real leadership capacity—plus the desire to stay free.

This news story gives but a capsule treatment of the comprehensive program being undertaken by the Fighters for Freedom of Memphis, Tenn. A letter to Joe L. Lumpkin, executive secretary of the Memphis Fighters for Freedom, addressed to 1107 Union, Memphis, Tenn., will bring any community a documented account of what this grass-roots all-Memphis movement is doing to make the formula for freedom work and remain in the United States. Or you can write to Mr. C. E. Hutton, president of the Hutton Motor Co., of Memphis. By newspaper advertisements, by radio programs and pageants, by public forums and meetings; by booklets and printed leaflets; by sermons in the churches, lessons in the schools, by programs before the luncheon and womens' clubs; and by speeches made by a trained corps of determined Memphis citizens, the story of a free America and what we must do to keep it strong and free is being told to young and old alike in Memphis.

Just recently, this Memphis group carried a full-page advertisement in the local press reproducing the salient portions of a great speech by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] calling upon Americans to rally and organize themselves into effective units for the fight against socialism in America. The Senator from Virginia pointed out specific steps which must be taken if the forces of collectivism are to be defeated—or even slowed down, in this country. And this fighting, articulate, highly significant organization of the men of Memphis relayed BYRD's stirring message to every citizen of the community.

Among other activities, this Memphis group which is willing to struggle to survive, put 1,882 copies of John T. Flynn's great best-seller, The Road Ahead, into every school room in the city and teachers are using the book as a text to give their students an appreciation of what is right with America—and what is wrong with communism, socialism, nazism, fascism, and their kindred creeds of collectivistic, big government conception.

Starting with a group of less than 50 about 1 year ago, this Memphis committee now exceeds 2,000 of the leading citizens of the community. It is a great nonpartisan movement which is openly and effectively pro-American and pro-free enterprise. Believing with the sages that it is better to light a candle than to curse the darkness, Memphis, Tenn., is showing the United States of America what can be done and what must be done by business and professional men, by laborers and farmers, by women's clubs and patriotic organizations, if the give-away disciples of big government are to be stopped before they succeed in stopping individual initiative and free enterprise of America.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Memphis Commercial Appeal, to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIGHTERS FOR FREEDOM CARRY CAMPAIGN TO SAVE DEMOCRACY TO SCHOOLS' FUTURE CITIZENS—THEIR WEAPON IS POWERFUL BOOK, THE ROAD AHEAD, TO GO TO MEMPHIS AND SHELBY COUNTY TEACHERS—RESPONSE TO VITAL CRUSADE IS ENCOURAGING

Memphis Fighters for Freedom are carrying their battle to thwart America's creeping socialistic revolution into the schoolroom.

Their weapon of attack? Copies of The Road Ahead—John T. Flynn's best-selling book, which dramatically points up the threat existing today to the Nation's free enterprise, competitive system.

Some 1,882 copies of the book have been ordered for distribution to every school teacher in the city and county, Joe L. Lumpkin, executive secretary of the Memphis Committee for Constitutional Government, of which the Fighters for Freedom is a division, said yesterday.

"The response from the schools has been most encouraging," Mr. Lumpkin said. "We hope to have a copy of this thought-provoking book in the hands of every teacher in Memphis and Shelby County.

"We feel that every American—certainly the teachers—interested in keeping America the land of opportunity should study The Road Ahead carefully."

GROUP NOW EXCEEDS 2,000

Distribution of the book is the latest step by the fast-growing Memphis organization to acquaint the public of the need for action to preserve our cherished freedoms.

Officially organized here just 2 months ago, the Fighters for Freedom and Memphis Committee for Constitutional Government have mushroomed to where there are now more than 2,000 members in the organizations.

More than 150 persons attended the organizational luncheon meeting at the Peabody March 3 and heard Horace Hull and Dr. Doyle Smith explain the principal function of the freedom fighters:

To sound the warning, inform the people about how the socialists, under the guise of state welfare and paternalism in government, are dividing and conquering our people.

CIVIC LEADERS AT HELM

To accomplish this goal, the organization set up a large-scale publicity campaign and planned for wholesale distribution of the weekly Paul Revere newsletters and The Road Ahead.

A week after the first meeting, the board of directors held its initial session, and three business and civic leaders were named officers—C. E. (Chuck) Hutton, chairman; Nate A. Carter, Sr., treasurer; and Joe L. Lumpkin, executive secretary.

Meanwhile, the organization went ahead with its campaign to inform the people.

Full-page advertisements appeared in the daily newspapers and the Memphis Labor Review; round-table discussions were held over many of the radio stations in the tri-State area; WMCT, the Commercial Appeal television station, presented three telecasts of Fighters for Freedom objectives.

And the orders for the Paul Revere newsletter and The Road Ahead poured in.

The committee held its first mass meeting April 7 in the auditorium, with Senator KARL MUNDT (Republican, South Dakota), as the distinguished guest speaker.

MORE THAN 3,500 ATTENDED

More than 3,500 persons heard Senator MUNDT declare that state socialism, with which the United States is now menaced, is merely "an empty half-way house on the road to totalitarianism."

Senator MUNDT, coauthor of the Mundt-Nixon bill to outlaw communism, warned that "Communists work for the establishment of socialism as a necessary transition stage on the road to communism."

The April mass meeting was only the first of several planned by the freedom fighters. Another gathering is being set for June, at which it is hoped a speaker of the caliber of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower or Senator HARRY BYRD (Democrat, Virginia), will be obtained.

Another public meeting for Negroes also is planned.

The Memphis organization is just 1 of 26 already formed across the country. Typical of the work being carried on by other fighters for freedom is the job being done in Florida.

Before the recent Democratic senatorial primary there, more than 100,000 copies of The Road Ahead and other pieces of literature were distributed. Workers canvassed the State telling the citizens that a vote for GEORGE SMATHERS was a vote for constitutional government and freedom.

SMATHERS defeated Senator CLAUDE PEPPER in the primary, and is assured of election in predominantly Democratic Florida.

In Memphis, in Florida, and in each of the fighters-for-freedom organization, its primary function is to arouse the people to resist the rapid encroachment of socialism.

HAVE 10-POINT PROGRAM

But all fighters for freedom also stand on a more detailed, 10-point platform, which proclaims it the duty of every American, especially of officials and elected representatives to—

"1. Pitilessly expose communism; deport or imprison all conspirators striving to overthrow our Government, and to stop the march to fascism or socialism.

"2. Restore the American incentives to work, own, and save, and the old rewards to individuals for producing more and better services and material goods; defend their human rights to hold, use, and dispose of all property honestly acquired and protect the property and income of all citizens from seizure or confiscation.

"3. Protect every individual's right to work where he will, his right to bargain and contract as he wishes, his right to quit when he will, if not under contract, and his right to go to and from his home and place of business or occupation without interference by any individual, organization, or Government agency. Eliminate mass picketing, rioting, and terrorism. Restore and protect the right of every individual to enjoy freedom and the fruits of his own efforts.

"4. Safeguard our system of free, untrammeled, competitive markets, and apply antitrust laws fearlessly and equally to all monopolies, both of business and labor.

"5. Stop using taxpayers' money to compete against private enterprise.

"6. Build down Washington's bureaucratic big government; strengthen State and local governments and free them from Federal financial and administrative control. Reduce the Federal payroll by discharging needless jobholders. Stop the waste of public funds. Balance the budget."

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

"7. Protest against politicians buying votes by promising Federal aid for education, socialized medicine and public housing, which results eventually in Federal control.

"8. Stop inflation—the process which, by cheapening the dollar, defrauds all thrifty Americans who have insurance policies, social security cards, bank deposits or investments. Stop deflation—the process which throws millions out of work and bankrupts employers. Encourage, not penalize, thrift. Keep American citizens solvent.

"9. Abolish or reduce immediately those taxes which especially hinder saving and the capital accumulation. These are essential for expanding old enterprises and providing new and better tools, and for financing new inventions and new risk-taking, job-making enterprises which assure increased production and higher income for wage workers and others. Limit by constitutional amendment the peacetime taxing power of the Federal Government.

"10. Preserve the Constitution with its Bill of Rights, and oppose all attempts to violate it by legislation, usurpation or evasion."

Trustees of the Memphis Committee for Constitutional Government, who also will serve temporarily as directors, are:

Nate A. Carter, Sr., Dr. A. W. Dick, Albert R. Erskine, Hodges H. Honnoll, Blackburn Hughes, Horace H. Hull, C. E. (Chuck) Hutton, T. Walker Lewis, Fred W. Lucas, Poston Maury, Robert M. Metcalf, Jr., Charles F. Schadt, Dr. Doyle J. Smith, Howard Tayloe, R. A. Trippeer, J. Richard Walker, Rollin V. Wilson.

Col. Roane Waring, Charles King, Jr., Edward Barry, Bob Snowden, W. L. Acroyd, Neil Farrell, Oscar Seelbinder, F. A. Conkling, Herbert Hood, Jr., Mason Ezzell, E. F. Higginbotham, Frank Ahlgren, Abe Scharff, J. E. Hooks, Lt. Gen. Ben Lear (United States Army, retired), J. E. Shannon, L. T. McCourt, Everett Cook, Karl Pollard, and Joe Lumpkin.

Headquarters of the Memphis committee are at 1107 Union.

President Truman Gets Some Much-Deserved Credit for a Courageous Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, an editorial that appeared in the New Orleans Item on Sunday, July 9, gives credit where credit is long overdue. This editorial reviews the major elements of United States foreign policy since World War II, and gives credit to the man who is ultimately responsible for initiating that policy—the President of the United States. As the editorial points out, many of President Truman's most ardent critics, who are now applauding his courageous and decisive action in meeting the Korean crisis, seem

to consider this the exception rather than the rule. In my opinion, this factual review of the high spots of American foreign policy refutes this view.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert this editorial in the RECORD, and commend it to my colleagues:

WHERE COURAGE COUNTS—PRESIDENT TRUMAN AT HIS BEST

As a Nation we give credit where credit is due, except in politics. In the arts and sciences, even in business we readily recognize the achievements of an Einstein, a Toscanini, a Gershwin, a Ford, a Conant.

Not so in politics. In this respect Americans are often narrow, ungenerous, and shallow in their judgments. We are so personal and partisan in our politics that even the best Presidents, including Lincoln, have had to go to their graves before receiving a discriminating appraisal.

These thoughts are prompted by Mr. Truman's leadership in the Korea crisis.

In the minds of many Mr. Truman is—and always will be—the little man who once ran a haberdashery. Some cannot forget that he was merely a small-time judge and junior Senator before being catapulted into the White House. This impression was deepened by Mr. Truman's own modesty. He frequently reminded the public of his shortcomings in education and background.

All of this has tended to obscure two important facts. First, 5 years in the White House, with all of its terrible responsibilities and demands, would increase the stature of anyone. By any measurement, Truman is a bigger man than he was in 1945.

Second, and more important, events have revealed to a surprised public that Truman brought to the Presidency one supreme personal quality—courage. And there are times in a Nation's history when courage is needed above all else.

Only the future can be the final judge of some of Mr. Truman's domestic policies. But in foreign affairs, where our very natural life is at stake,, it is about time we acknowledge his gift for rising to emergencies and dealing with them wisely. Above all, with courage.

The President's actions in Korea are now being hailed on all sides. Even political opponents and unfriendly newspapers are commending his decisions. In some of these remarks, however, there seems to be a disposition to regard this as the exception rather than the rule.

Let's look at the record. For 5 years the United States has been engaged in a special kind of war with Russia. And the enemy, nearly always disguised, has challenged us from one end of the globe to the other.

Early in 1946, only a few months after VJ-day, Russia moved to take over Iran and its great oil deposits. We were then on friendly terms with Russia. But Truman promptly demanded that the Soviet withdraw its troops from Iran by March 2 of that year. On March 1, the Red army marched out.

In March of 1947 Russia inspired the Red attack in Greece. Britain was too depleted to meet the emergency. Overnight, the President enunciated the Truman doctrine for Greece and Turkey. It was so bold that even friendly advisers had misgivings. But it worked. Greece and Turkey were saved.

Later that year, when the Communists turned their attention to France and Italy, the President acted promptly to save all of western Europe. He not only adopted the Marshall plan, but personally used all of his influence to get this gigantic program through skeptical Congress.

Who would have believed the United States would support Europe to the tune of $20,000,000,000? Less than 2 years before, Truman had bowed to pressure and abruptly ended lend-lease. It was one of his few serious mistakes in foreign policy. He has since freely admitted it was a grave error. But he had the courage to reverse himself and shove through ECA.

Again it worked. The Communist tide in France and Italy was rolled back. Western Europe was saved from Russian domination.

In 1948 the Soviets sprang the Berlin blockade. Here, indeed, was a dangerous situation. To meet the challenge was to court a shooting war. Europe and the world held its breath. The President's daring answer was the Berlin airlift. In the end, Russia backed down.

In 1949 and 1950 the President gave the signal to organize the Atlantic community through the Atlantic Pact, to provide arms for Europe through the military assistance program, and to join our own forces with a new European Army.

In the Far East, America has also held its own, except for China, where we found our position untenable because of circumstances beyond our control.

Despite propaganda to the contrary, Truman did not give up easily in China. He sent arms of all kinds, hundreds of millions in cash, and his best advisers such as General Marshall and General Wedemeyer, in an effort to salvage the corrupt regime of Chiang Kai-shek.

America withdrew from China only after it was crystal clear that the people would not support Chiang, that his soldiers would not fight, that our military equipment was being sold to the Communists by Nationalist generals, and that the ruling clique was pocketing many of the millions we sent.

We had the choice of withdrawing or deposing Chiang and then sending in a huge expeditionary force to carry on the fight ourselves. Just how the United States could have committed most of its Armed Forces to an all-out war in China and still contain Russia elsewhere in the world, is something that not even Senator JOE MCCARTHY can explain.

So we come back to Korea. Although it is only a fraction of China's size, even this undertaking may seriously drain our military resources and leave us vulnerable elsewhere. It is a calculated risk. The President has taken it. He has been right in the past and we pray he is right again.

But right or wrong, let us all generously admit—no matter what our politics may be—that Mr. Truman has once more acted with the courage and decision of a real national leader.

Address Before Fifty-third Annual Convention of the Zionist Organization of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

A STATEMENT FROM CONGRESSMAN JOHN W. MCCORMACK, MAJORITY LEADER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, TO THE FIFTY-THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA

It is with pardonable satisfaction that I may point with pride to the fact that I am an old Zionist. More than 30 years ago, while a member of the Massachusetts Legislature, circumstances arose which caused me to concern myself with the tragic problem of Jewish national homelessness. It was then that I supported a resolution in the Massachusetts Legislature, calling for the "establishment of the Jewish Commonwealth" in Palestine.

As a son of a people who, themselves, were exposed to cruel oppression and persecution, and who are still struggling to achieve complete national self-fulfillment, I was able the better to appreciate the sad plight of a people like the Jewish people, fighting for the elementary rights of life, and for the freedom of opportunity to rebuild their ancient land.

During all these years I actively watched the development of the Jewish National Home and the achievements of the pioneers with deep sympathy and admiration. This evolutionary process reached its climax in the proclamation of Israel's Independence on May 14, 1948.

All men of good will, regardless of race or creed, welcomed the inclusion of Israel into the family of free, democratic, and sovereign nations.

It was no accident that our own beloved country—the United States of America—under the leadership of President Truman—a true friend of Israel—was the first country to grant de facto recognition to the State of Israel, at the very hour of its birth.

In the last analysis, Israel's stuggle was a continuation of the battle for liberty and human dignity which began at Lexington and Bunker Hill.

I am aware of the many problems which Israel is facing today—problems of tremendous magnitude. However, in the light of past accomplishments, one is inspired to believe that ways and means will be found for an amicable and satisfactory solution of all oustanding problems which may, at this moment, appear to be insurmountable.

A people which has been the custodian of the wisdom of the ages, a people that gave to the world saints and prophets, and the Judeo-Christian concepts of civilization, is bound to find the road to justice, freedom, happiness, and peace for the good of humanity and for the glory of God.

This is my hope;

This is my faith;

This is my salute to the fifty-third annual convention of the Zionist Organization of America.

Oil for Red Tanks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL T. WAGNER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cincinnati Post:

OIL FOR RED TANKS

American oil companies readily agreed to the United States Government's request that they stop selling oil and gasoline to Communist China, thus preventing such products from being passed on to the Red forces in Korea.

But Britain has rejected the request and no reply has been received from the Netherlands, the third major source of far eastern petroleum supplies.

Britain's excuse is that her oil and gas sales to Red China are too small to permit their diversion to war purposes.

The British Goverment, like our own, does curb export of certain other war potentials

to the Far East. But there was no consultation between the two Governments when the lists were made up, and as a result the two lists don't match.

This is not good teamwork by the two major powers in the peace camp. The Marshall plan nations have agreed not to ship potential war supplies to Soviet Russia and her European satellites, and the same restrictions should apply to the Communists in Asia.

An absolute embargo on oil and gasoline shipments to the Reds is an essential in stopping their tank and air operations. And no distinction should be made between Chinese and Korean Communists. They have a common frontier in Manchuria and both serve the same Moscow master.

Here is a place where our Government should not take the first no for an answer When Americans are fighting and dying on the battlefield under the banner of the United Nations, and in a common cause, they are entitled to the unreserved support of all Allied nations.

The oil embargo should be enforced without exceptions.

The Korean Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, indicative of the opinion united behind the Presidential action and in support of our heroic forces in Korea, I submit for the RECORD a letter from Thomas D. Leadbetter, city clerk, and the resolution passed unanimously by the Common Council of Detroit.

It is a document well worth preserving in the recorded doings of this body:

CITY OF DETROIT,
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
July 6, 1950.

Mr. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: The Common Council of the City of Detroit, at their regular formal session on July 5, 1950, has unanimously passed the attached resolution relative to the Korean situation. I am forwarding you copy of this resolution for your information and to urge your continued support in this situation.

Yours very truly,
THOMAS D. LEADBETTER,
City Clerk.

Resolution

Whereas Communist Russia has established beyond question the pattern of world conquest based upon terror and slavery; and

Whereas Communist Russia has established puppet states in various areas of the world to accomplish this indefensible program; and

Whereas the invasion of Southern Korea is but the last of a series of calculated steps taken by Communist Russia in its steady march to world domination; and

Whereas this latest aggression if left unchallenged, would threaten the peace and safety of the free countries of the world; and

Whereas the United Nations and our Government have finally been alerted to this danger and have taken initial steps to halt this unspeakable disregard of solemn treaty obligations by Communist Russia: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Detroit, speaking on behalf of its citizens, That we commend the United Nations and our Government in sending military aid to Korea; and be it further

Resolved, That it is our firm conviction that our Government should continue to work with other free peoples to drive out the Communist brigands from Korea and thereby demonstrate to the Kremlin mobsters that they can go no further in their effort to enslave others; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the hope of this Common Council that this timely and necessary action of the United Nations and our Government may give new hope to the threatened and conquered peoples everywhere, and that the day of their release has been brought nearer and that the common enemy of decency, freedom, and religion will someday soon be brought to final judgment before the bar of mankind; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to: Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; Trygve Lie, Secretary-General of the United Nations; Sygman Rhee, President of the Republic of Korea; to our Representatives and Senators in the United States Congress; Paul V. Betters, director of the United States Conference of Mayors; Carl H. Chatters, director of American Municipal Association; John H. Huss, director of the Michigan Municipal League.

Adopted as follows: Yeas—Councilmen Beck, Connor, Garlick, Kronk, Oakman, Rogell, Smith, and the president; eight. Nays—None.

Credit To Build Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, one of the oustanding institutions of north Alabama is the State National Bank. Under the direction of is distinguished president, Mr. T. J. Cottingham, this fine private enterprise has initiated a splendid program of assistance to the farmers of our section, and this program, which has been carried out so effectively by Mr. Cottingham and his associates, has opened new doors to better farming. It is a testimony to the foresight and wisdom with which Mr. Cottingham is meeting some of the problems facing an agricultural area. Therefore, it is most refreshing to have the following account of the activities of the State National Bank as told by the well-known editor of the Progressive Farmer, Mr. Alexander Nunn, in the July issue of his magazine:

CREDIT TO BUILD FARMS

(By Alexander Nunn)

This is not an easy story to tell. Space for a half dozen features this length would have made the writing far simpler.

It's a story of north Alabama farmers and a banking system and the amazing progress they're making together. It's a story, too, of a farm boy grown to bank president who never forgot country folks and the stuff they're made of.

The farm families you'll hear from live in Limestone County; we might easily have made a similar tour in any one of 9 or 10 other counties. There was an early morning stop with Mr. and Mrs. Sam Roberts. "We don't need any pensions now," said Mr. Roberts. "Chickens make us a good living. It's better than counting on a pension. When I used to depend on nothin' but cotton (younger members of the family grow it now), my smokehouse and my crib were away up North somewhere. I couldn't get nowhere. I had too many doors to go through."

The Roberts have financed their broilers and feed through Farm Industries, Inc. In Athens, one of the first things W. A. Orman, local manager, told us was, "There just couldn't have been a Farm Industries without the program of the State National Bank."

About 60 percent of the broiler production in the area is done on a credit basis. Growers make a note to Farm Industries for their chickens. Then the bank lends Farm Industries 75 percent of the value of any or all notes they wish to discount. Company payments to farmers for broilers run between $50,000 and $60,000 weekly. Payments for hatching eggs alone are $6,000 weekly.

"I hope you'll notice," commented C. T. "Doc" Bailey, bank farm agent, "how closely credit, markets, and solving of management problems go together. There's no lending without a market, whether it be broilers, or milk, or hogs. There's also a plan of close supervision, especially at first."

Manager Orman and "Doc" Bailey compared notes to see how broiler efficiency had increased. When broiler raising first got going, 4 years ago, they agreed it required up to 110 sacks of feed per 1,000 broilers; today it's running as low as 75 and 80. A mortality of 10 percent was normal; now, even with Newcastle disease, it is down to 5 and 6.

A. C. Dodd, another good broiler grower, was getting in alfalfa hay when we drove up. He gets his credit direct, and said very frankly, "We need an agricultural program like the bank has. It has been a great help to me." Mr. Dodd depends chiefly on cotton and four broods of broilers of 4,000 to 5,000 each for his income.

Out east of Athens, "Mack" Frierson is turning an old cotton farm into a diversified set-up. "The old front-porch days are over," he had decided. Terracing his valley land and stopping uphill-and-down farming was one of his first jobs. A college graduate and a war veteran who never as a boy heard farming spoken of as a success, he is using credit, research, and the bank farm agent's counsel to make rapid progress.

Away out in the steep hill country near the Tennessee line live the Ewell Hightowers with their twin sons, Boyd and Loyd. There'll be no row crops on their 67 acres after this year. Right now the farm is carrying 20 cows, 6 calves, 18 pigs, and 2 sows. Thirteen milking cows have been averaging 3 gallons apiece per day.

"Our farm has been in the family 100 years last February 21," Mr. Hightower told us with pride. Then he continued: "Eight years ago I owed on the farm and was in debt for running expenses. Four years ago I started milking cows. Now the farm is paid for, I've got $8,000 worth of cows, my milking barn is paid for, and I don't owe but $1,000. I told the boys I'd take them into full partnership as soon as everything is paid for. I give State National Bank full credit for what I've done."

Mason and Reuben Freeman are general farmers, growing wheat, cotton, oats, and crimson clover seed, also beef and eggs. Today they're also milking 35 to 40 cows and selling grade-A milk. Older brother Mason got interested in cows as a member of the bank's loan committee, seeing the income of other farmers financed by the bank. Then Reuben was back home out of service and "liked to fool with cows."

Like every other bank customer turning to dairying, the Freemans are pushing grazing. No customer is going to get financing for more animals than he has feed for.

Millard P. Glass is literally building a home and grubbing a farm out of the wilderness. A year and a half ago he found himself at rope's end financially. By accident, he had heard of what State National was doing to help farmers develop new enterprises. He took his case to them. By selling his car and buying a bicycle, he cleared up most of an old debt hanging over him. Bank officials checked with neighbors and friends who knew him, decided he was a good character-loan risk. They bought him three cows to begin selling grade B milk. In spite of a cotton failure in 1949, he paid all he owed (including note on cows) by fall and had milk income to live on last winter. This spring a loan for three more cows was approved. All he wants, says Mr. Glass, is a little time to prove to the bank that he can really get somewhere with the faith they have shown in him.

"The bank picked us up. We didn't have a dollar to go on," Claud Harrison told us. "Now we have our barn and our herd paid for." He and his son-in-law, Thomas McCurry, a veteran, had in their herd 13 cows milking, seven dry cows, nine heifers and a Holstein bull. There were 60 acres of good grazing.

Bank and bank farm agent are making a real contribution to a more stable agriculture by bringing good tenants and good landlords together. Mrs. Pryor Williams, owner, and E. E. Shirley, operator, are pleased over a cotton, seed, and hog set-up that began with the bank's recommendations of one to the other last fall.

Bank customers like Dr. B. S. Kennedy, who are not concerned about financing, turn to the bank's farm agent for help in their farm planning. He, in turn, can point them to other farm agencies and the specialized services they can give. Dr. Kennedy and John Knox are operating a very successful dairy and hog farm in partnership on steep and once badly galled land. Virtually all the farm will soon be in thick-growing legumes and grasses. "The land can't leave me now," Mr. Knox could boast. "Doc" has been their constant adviser.

Sitting in the office of President T. J. Cottingham in the parent bank in Decatur I came to realize why State National means so much to so many north Alabama farmers. Mr. Cottingham is a man who dislikes hand-outs and relief, so much that he is willing to meet people more than half way to help them to help themselves, so they'll never need to go on relief.

"We have two requirements for a loan," he told us, "character and willingness to work. We also expect a farm customer to take advantage of the work of his experiment station." With special pride he pointed out that of 3,400 farmer customers, not a one had defaulted. Some rearrangements had been made, he added, then continued, "There is no more dependable bank customer than the north Alabama farmer. The educated farmer today is as good a businessman as the shopkeeper or doctor or anyone else."

In an earlier visit with Fred Stewart, superintendent of the Belle Mina experiment substation, and in the farm visits, I had seen how largely the bank's program on each farm is based on research. Then Mr. Stewart had said, "We look on the bank simply as one of our good educational agencies. We work together all the time."

I asked Mr. Cottingham how he came to adopt present agricultural policies. His answer started all the way back in South Carolina with a farm boy who stayed on the farm until he went to college. In 1907 he entered the banking field, but never lost interest in farm folks or farm problems. Somehow, he felt, farm life must be made to pay better and be more satisfying. Older people, he felt, were too set in their ways to make changes rapidly. By working with the younger ones, he hoped to make farm life desirable enough for them to stay on the farm. The first farm agent was put on in Cullman County 10 years ago.

"I told our directors," he said, "that it was bread cast on the waters and that it would be 5 years before we could expect to get our money back. Somewhat to the surprise of us all, the program was paying for itself in 2 years. Since then, we've added agricultural agents until we have six at work with us. They're a fine group of men. Today, as you know, they're working with all ages of farm folks."

"Doc" Bailey makes Limestone County headquarters. Other bank farm agents are M. E. Wilson, Blount; George H. Lehnert, Cullman; Carlyle E. Cook, De Kalb; W. H. Buchanan, Lauderdale; W. J. Alverson, Marshall.

A check of bank statements shows how well such progressive policies have paid. Fifteen member banks had deposits of $2,000,000 in 1937 when Mr. Cottingham took over, with total resources of $2,300,000. A late April statement this year, with one less bank, showed deposits of $41,418,000; total resources of $43,693,000. Those figures are roughly 20 times those of 1937. Farm loans now are nearly $7,000,000 of which nearly $2,000,000 represent loans for new-type farm enterprises. Cotton and farm land loans take another $2,000,000. And none of these totals include such loans as poultry loans discounted for farm industries.

A Tribute to a Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the tragic death of Joseph G. Meglinske another and a glorious chapter of heroism and selfless service is added to the many pages of the Detroit Police Department. It is a book written in deeds not words; it is ineradicable and indelible; it will remain of record for all time and serve as an inspiration to all the men in blue, present and future; it makes amply clear that the security of the citizen is paramount and that the majesty of the law will prevail.

The heroism of Joseph G. Meglinske left an engraved mark upon the hearts of all loyal and law-abiding citizens of Detroit who will always stand behind the force in the faithful performance of their duties.

To the widow and surviving child society is everlastingly indebted, and the obligation must be discharged by more than mere words of condolence. They should be remembered above and beyond the formal obsequies and the customary period of mourning. Law and order depend upon our attitude and action.

The roster of the Detroit Police Department numbers among its personnel the finest men and women of the community. They are of a select pattern; of the highest ideal; all willing and subject to lay down their lives for the safety and security of the citizen. Barring the exception, they are all of hero mettle and ready one and all for the test when duty calls.

Even as death approached, the noble officer wrote a poem of thanksgiving to God "for my Ann whom You sent." He called it A Prayer For My Love.

Mr. Speaker, the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be enriched and its readers will be edified by the inclusion of the tribute paid to Ann, the beloved wife, by her departed husband even as his great heart faltered in its steadiness of beat, but never in the fullness of his love:

A PRAYER FOR MY LOVE

Heavenly Father up above
Please protect the girl I love;
Teach her to see that I love her
As she loves me.
Help us now, help us forever
To be loyal and always together.
Grant me this, I'll be content
And Thank You, dear Lord for my Ann
Whom you sent.

Ohio Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a speech which Mr. Edgar Morris delivered on July 9, 1950, in his capacity as chairman of the Reception Committee of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission.

Mr. Morris has for a number of years been one of the most active civic leaders of Washington. I have had occasion to observe him as he climbed up to be the president of the Washington Board of Trade. He filled that position most creditably and from there he has continued to advance not by accident or by pull and influence but by reason of his own ability and industry. He is now a director of the Washington Board of Trade and a director of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

When the Sesquicentennial Committees were set up, Mr. Morris was made chairman of the Reception Committee of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission. As such it was his duty to extend a welcome to those who were arranging a celebration in connection with the dedication of beautiful Ohio Drive. He performed that duty admirably. He assisted in making the arrangement for that celebration and at the dedication celebration he delivered an address of welcome to all who were present. His address was delivered with a warmth of cordiality that made all those present feel welcome. His address of welcome is as follows:

A WORD OF WELCOME
(By Edgar Morris)

Mr. Secretary, Governor Lausche, Members of Congress, and other distinguished guests

from Ohio, ladies and gentlemen; It is a real privilege for me to bid you welcome on this historic occasion in behalf of the reception committee of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission.

We have assembled in this picturesque spot to dedicate the speedway around East Potomac Park as Ohio Drive on the day set aside by the Governor of Ohio to honor the Nation's Capital during its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary.

We extend most cordial greetings to the Chief Executive of Ohio who has honored us with his presence and to the representatives of Ohio on Capitol Hill, especially Representative THOMAS A. JENKINS, Chairman of the Ohio Honor Day in Washington. We are very happy that members of the Ohio State Society and their president, Representative JOHN MCSWEENEY, are participating in this dedication program.

Where could one find a more beautiful thoroughfare in the spacious confines of the Nation's Capital than this well-remembered roadway to be associated henceforth with the name of Ohio? Extending for five miles between the pink double-blossom cherry trees and willows along the sea wall, it encompasses some 327 acres devoted to wholesome recreation for visitors to Washington and our own residents.

It was about 60 years ago that the United States Army engineers began to reclaim this swamp land by clearing the Potomac channel, forming a bulwark to protect our then newly created harbor and creating at the same time the impressive recreation center where we are gathered today.

From Ohio Drive our citizens in future years will enjoy this magnificent vista of the lower Potomac with the old city of Alexandria etched against the distant blue haze of the Virginia hills.

Likewise from Ohio Drive they will lift their eyes to the dome of the Capitol, and the monuments to Washington, Lincoln and Jefferson standing guard over our heritage as a people.

In such moments we shall all be grateful for the century and a half of our Nation's progress in which the great State of Ohio has played so conspicuous a part.

Again I welcome you all most cordially to the dedication of Ohio Drive.

Cost of Delivery of United States Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. WALSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks I have been fighting for a complete investigation of the cost of delivery of the United States mail. However, I have been unable to get the committee to act upon the resolution providing for an independent investigating committee to thoroughly go into the matter.

For the information of the House I am asking the membership to read the following newspaper article by James Daniel, Scripps-Howard staff writer, entitled "Moving Ghost Mail Is Costly":

The General Accounting Office (GAO) has prepared a report for the Senate Post Office Committee which charges that the Nation's railroads are receiving millions of dollars annually for carrying nonexistent mail.

Highlights of the report:

The Post Office Department pays the highest rates of any shipper, except on certain short hauls.

The Department makes no computation of its own as to how much space the railroads devote to mail, but takes the railroad's figures.

In addition to paying top rates, the Department is the only shipper that reimburses the railroads for empty space and for deadhead cars that return without mail cargo.

Railroads are permitted to substitute other cars for those actually used in carrying mail, and in effect charge the taxpayers for deadheading cars which they need to move about for their other shippers.

Deadhead mail cars sometimes are returned in freight trains, and the Post Office Department pays as though they returned in passenger trains.

Some complex arrangements between the Department and the railroads permit the carriers to bill the Government for deadheading cars in advance of the outbound movement of mail cars.

How much does the taxpayer lose by these practices? The Post Office Department says it paid the railroads $221,017,189 last fiscal year, but that it kept no record as to how much was for phantom mail.

The GAO checked some mail runs and found the Government was paying as much as 84 percent additional for unused space and deadhead cars. Over a large representative check, the GAO found that 22 percent of the money the railroads received was for providing no service.

Often, the GAO reported, it is more profitable to the railroads to return a mail car empty and bill the Government for it than to accept a pay load from another shipper.

What is the GAO's proposed remedy: According to the accountants, the Post Office Department should not pay for empty cars and unused space. The GAO contends that a certain amount of empty return movement is natural in railroading, and is an element in the rates the rails set for their other shippers.

Canada, cited by the GAO as a model, pays its railroads 32.7 cents per mile for a 60-foot storage car, and nothing extra for empty deadheaded cars. We pay 50.62 cents for the identical service, plus an equal sum if the car is returned empty.

The fact that almost any car in an emergency can be used for mail makes it easier for the railroads to bill the Government for their nonrevenue-producing movements. In 1 month, the GAO reported, the Post Office Department reimbursed the railroads for returning the following to Washington:

Two baggage and mail cars, 79 baggage cars, 132 baggage-express cars, 22 refrigerator cars, 58 express cars, 1 coach, 1 box car, 6 milk cars, 19 baggage and passenger cars, and 10 postal storage cars.

"It is not apparent," said the GAO, "that anyone really knows what the total space actually used in railway cars is per day, week, month, or year. It would appear probable that no one will ever know as long as these complex, recondite and unwieldly agreements, precedents, and practices exist."

New Revenue District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Long Island Daily Press of Queens County, New York City, concerning my efforts to provide for the counties of Queens, Nassau, and Suffolk, a separate internal revenue office.

NEW REVENUE DISTRICT

Congressman L. GARY CLEMENTE, of Ozone Park, has introduced a bill at Washington which would separate Queens, Nassau, and Suffolk from Brooklyn and Staten Island and give them an internal revenue office of their own.

The 5 counties are lumped together now as the eastern district, with offices in Brooklyn. A resident of Queens, who has business at those offices, faces a long trip by public transportation and one that is almost impossible by automobile because of parking difficulties in Brooklyn.

The rapid growth of Queens and Nassau is a strong argument for Congresman CLEMENTE's proposal. Those 2 counties and Suffolk have a total population of at least as large as Brooklyn's, but Brooklyn has all of the Federal offices serving the area.

To make it possible for the eastern district to be split up, Congresman CLEMENTE proposes that a new Federal building be erected in Jamaica. Not only would that be more accessible to all parts of Queens than the Brooklyn offices, but it would also be a more convenient location for Nassau and Suffolk.

It is likely there will be opposition to the rearrangement proposed, even though it is logical and in keeping with public needs. There is no good reason why Federal offices which serve all of Long Island, and particularly the income tax office, should be in a remote corner of Brooklyn where they cannot be reached easily and where traffic conditions are among the most difficult in the city.

Our Ordering an End to Chinese War Against Reds Endangers the Political and Security Objectives Which Our Far Eastern Effort Must Have

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

OUR ORDERING AN END TO CHINESE WAR AGAINST REDS ENDANGERS THE POLITICAL AND SECURITY OBJECTIVES WHICH OUR FAR EASTERN EFFORTS MUST HAVE

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

The crying need for pushing the North Korean aggressors back to their own frontier in the smallest possible time is evident. Nothing must be omitted that will contribute to it. Yet the very real military urgency should not induce the American administration to make the error F. D. R. made during World War II. That was of forgetting the political purposes for which that war was fought.

Every war is a political act. It makes sense only within the context of a foreign policy. For forgetting or misunderstanding or subordinating the need for not letting the Soviet Union become too strong while beating Japan, Americans are now paying dearly. We must not let our President forget that however important the need for

repelling aggression against the United Nations, giving a lesson to North Korea Communists will not solve the main problem in Asia.

That problem is the defense of Asia against Soviet imperialism. It is primarily political and will remain so short of an all-out war against the Soviet Union.

In his admirable announcement of June 27, President Truman contributed a good deal to the political solution. He undoubtedly saved some sort of a United Nations so that it can be used later. He overruled the reformers in the State Department and agreed to defend Formosa from attack by the Chinese Communists. He promised to the Philippines the military assistance that they have been so much in need of. He promised that greater military aid will be given to the forces of France and the associated states in Indochina.

CHIANG'S ENEMIES REJOICE

And so far so good—in fact, very good. But presuming that all these purposes were successfully accomplished, the problems of the two most important Asiatic states would still remain unsolved. I refer to China and Japan.

The President's decision to protect Formosa, while preventing the National Chinese on that island from attacking the Communist forces on the Asiatic mainland, looks like an effort to put not only Formosa but National China into deep freeze. It looks like an effort to end the Chinese civil war.

It is being hailed by those Americans who desire the destruction of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek at almost any cost as a triumph of statesmanship. It is said by correspondents at Lake Success to mean that the Chinese Nationalists will now be excluded from the United Nations even if the Chinese Communists are not immediately admitted in their place.

One can only hope that the President's statement meant nothing of this sort. For the liquidation of Nationalist resistance in China would be a far greater victory for the U. S. S. R. and for communism than the repulse of North Korean Communists will be for us.

NATIONALISTS "FROZEN"

The United States has no interest in seeing the Chinese civil war ended with the victory of the Communist aggressors. It has indeed every interest in seeing it prolonged at least until the Communist advance has been stopped everywhere in Asia. Instead of "deep freezing" the Chinese Nationalists, the United States should be encouraging them as never before. For as long as they can maintain their flag and their rule on Formosa, the Chinese Communists will think twice about getting into trouble outside their own country.

In my opinion, nothing is preventing the Chinese Communists from openly helping the North Korean Communists but the certainty that if they do, the United States will accept the help of those three Chinese Nationalist divisions which the generalissimo has offered to put at the disposal of the United Nations for the defense of Korea. It would be an act of perfidy to accept the military aid of Chinese Nationalists while planning to end the Chinese civil war to their detriment.

Therefore, instead of trying to end that war, the United States should use the threat of helping the Chinese Nationalists openly in order to keep the Chinese Communists out of the Korean conflict.

JAPANESE PROBLEM

We ought, it seems to me, to make a withdrawal of the diplomatic recognition of the Chinese Communists by the United Kingdom a condition of our willingness to help the British defend Hong Kong against a possible Chinese Communist attack. Now, in fact, is the time to show Communists everywhere that we shall not meekly repel their attack in North Korea and then extend the hand of friendship to them at the United Nations.

It is indeed questionable whether the question of Japan can ever be solved so long as the Communists are in control of China. Militarily, of course, we could probably build up a non-Communist Japan to the place where it could defend itself against possible assault even by the Soviet Union—with our help. That would cause a good deal of bad feeling in those Asiatic countries that Japan overran and mistreated during World War II. But it could probably be done.

Yet such a Japan could hold out economically only through permanent subsidies from the United States or through a resumption of trade with China. Communists in control of China could conceivably force Japan into disorder and communism by a refusal to trade, once American subsidies were withdrawn. Though it is too early to say, it may turn out that a Communist China is incompatible with any permanent stabilization of the Far East.

Here then is another reason why, for the present, and until we have stopped the advance of communism everywhere in Asia and made up our minds what to do with Japan, we should make no concession of any sort to the Chinese Communists.

This means supporting what is left of the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa—with or without the Generalissimo.

Panama Canal—Propaganda for Sea Level Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have closely followed the Panama Canal question with special attention to the problems of national defense and national security. I have observed that certain interests in this country—manufacturers of heavy earth-moving machinery, dredging, contracting, and certain civil engineers, both civilian and Army, associated with them—have engaged in a determined drive to secure authorization for constructing a so-called sea-level canal at Panama. The publication, on July 9, 1950, of an Associated Press news story of some length in the newspapers of the United States by Luis B. Noli, of Panama—some dated and others not—appears to be a part of an organized drive of engineering origin, and requires some explanation.

The present canal issues were squarely presented to the Congress in a report by the Governor of the Panama Canal under Public Law 280, Seventy-ninth Congress, significantly transmitted to Congress by President Truman without recommendation, on December 1, 1947. Since that time many illuminating articles on various aspects of the canal question have been published, and some republished in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A selected bibliography on the Isthmian Canal policy of the United States was placed in the RECORD on August 25, 1949, by Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, chairman of the Special Subcommittee Investigating the Panama Canal under House Resolution 44, Eighty-first Congress. An extremely able paper on this subject by Representative Willis W. Bradley, entitled "What of the Panama Canal?" in the RECORD of April 21, 1948, merits the closest study.

As pointed out by Representative Bradley, Public Law 280, Seventy-ninth Congress, originally drafted by those who later supervised its execution, was subjected to extreme interpretations in which only one factor of the law—that of "security"—was, by interpretation, made the paramount factor of inquiry and stressed by canal authorities in justifying the construction of a new canal of "sea-level" design.

In the course of these investigations the A-bomb was made to serve, by means of a sustained propaganda campaign originating within certain engineering groups at Panama, as a psychological lever to influence the people of this Nation and their elected Representatives to accept the views of the "sea-level" proponents.

The Associated Press story above mentioned conforms to the recognized line of propaganda that has consistently featured the investigation under Public Law 280, stressing the A-bomb threat in verbatim quotations from the Governor's report of that investigation, which was prepared in 1947.

Since then many independent engineering, atomic warfare, national defense and national security authorities of eminence have studied this subject and have challenged the basic assumptions upon which the Governor's report was formulated, as being fallacious, and its recommendations, as erroneous and extravagant of national resources. These authorities also challenge the cost estimates given in the report as misleading, the estimate for completing the authorized Third Locks project modified to the Terminal Lake plan, being grossly exaggerated, and that for a "sea-level" undertaking greatly minimized.

A grave defect in this report is its failure to give any consideration to the important question of a new treaty with Panama that would be required for the sea-level plan. What such a treaty would involve no once can state. Aside from its costs additional to construction costs in the form of a huge indemnity and greatly increased annuity, it is fraught with a high degree of diplomatic uncertainty that may affect our relations with other nations.

None of these important questions, which have been raised repeatedly in published writings since 1947, are answered in the indicated news story. Since the article was written and promulgated from Panama, it must be evident that it was inspired by Isthmian sources, and constitutes a part of the organized propaganda already mentioned. Why did the author of the article omit—as was done in the Governor's report—any reference to the all-important treaty question? The answer must be obvious. Such matters as these are certainly too important for Congress to ignore, as they have serious implications.

The project advocated in the news story would have to be covered by increased taxation, to be measurably reflected in shipping tolls, and would divert funds and resources from more urgent national defense needs and programs. Published at this time, as the Korean crisis grows, this story amounts to an attempt to take advantage of that crisis as an opportunity for launching a vast project of astronomical cost whose value as a defense measure has been challenged by independent authorities of outstanding ability and experience.

Just prior to World War II, the Third Locks project—originated by certain Army engineers—was started as a "defense measure"; but was suspended, in May 1942, 6 months after the United States entered the war. Later, it was shown to be navigationally unsound and inadequate, and was disavowed even by its proponents—but not until after some $75,000,000 of taxpayer's money was spent on what is now recognized as a great engineering error. If civilians had been responsible for all this they would have been crucified.

Now, that world war III seems to be shaping up, this is certainly no time to launch upon another costly engineering undertaking of doubtful value, that is likely to be similarly suspended after a vastly greater expenditure.

The foregoing, I submit, are adequate reasons for early action by the Congress on the reorganization legislation—H. R. 8677 and S. 3649—for the Panama Canal as contemplated in the report of Director of the Budget Frank Pace which was forwarded to the Congress by the President on January 31, 1950—House Document 460, Eighty-first Congress—and for the creation of an independent Interoceanic Canals Commission to make a thorough up-to-date inquiry into the whole subject of interoceanic canals and to submit its conclusions and recommendations in the premises. Let us have no more ex parte treatment of a problem so vital.

Though the news story under discussion supplies no new information, it is important that the Congress be alert to the drive it represents, for the time has come to stop fooling the people with the idea that an impregnable canal can be constructed. The defense of any canal at Panama, or elsewhere, as I have stated many times before, is an over-all governmental responsibility, and its defense like that of the ports, transportation system, and highways of the United States, depends upon the combined industrial, military, and naval power of the Nation and not upon inherent features of design.

The Tidelands Oil Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 13 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very interesting article concerning the so-called Tidelands Oil Case, appearing in the Lewistown (Mont.) Daily News of February 21, 1950.

The able editor of this Montana newspaper states the problem in simple terms so that every citizen can see just what Montana and other interior States would lose if the public interests are ignored in the solution of this vitally important problem.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT WOULD YOU THINK IF SOMEONE TRIED TO TAKE $268 FROM YOU—TIDELANDS OIL CASE WOULD COST US MONTANA'S SHARE OF $268,000,000,000

Suppose your family had $268.

How would you feel if two of your brothers and a sister gave away your share of this money, without even asking you how you felt about it?

Chances are you would be irate, and would have plenty to say.

Well, Montana is one of a big family—a family of States.

And some of our brothers and sisters, in the form of Senators and Representatives from other States, are trying to give away the family money.

But in this case it isn't just $268.

It is a whopping $268,000,000,000, and a substantial share of this huge sum belongs to the people of Montana.

"Tidelands" is the magic word in this family problem, which means the land for 3 miles out from the shores of California, Texas, Louisiana, and other States facing salt water. "Shores," in this case, means the low-tide line. Inland waters are not included, nor are lands above the low-tide line.

It is 800 miles from Lewistown, Mont., to the closest salt water, but under the present laws of the land the Treasure State owns a share of the minerals that are under this water.

And in this case it is oil—an estimated $268,000,000,000 worth of it.

When this oil is brought to the surface, under our present laws, Montana and all other reclamation States are entitled to a share of the revenue. This money, when secured by Montana, is used to finance reclamation, schools, and other projects for the public good, at a saving to the taxpayers.

The "battle of the tidelands" was fought all the way to the Supreme Court of the United States in 1947, and the highest tribunal in the Nation then ruled that the 3-mile strip of land under the water but fronting on the coastal States belonged to the United States rather than the individual States. This meant that returns from oil and other minerals also belonged to the Nation, and would be distributed to the reclamation States, including Montana.

Oil companies were not satisfied with this decision, and have tried to get it reversed through legislation by Congress.

To go back into history a bit, when Congress opened up western lands for homesteaders or sale, the proceeds went to the dry or reclamation States. They used it to develop irrigation projects, help finance their schools, and carry out other projects for the public good.

Then, when this income fell off, Montana and other reclamation States were cut off from this source of revenue.

But minerals, including oil, on Federal lands have closed the gap and provided money to replace that from sale of public lands.

Nobody paid much attention to the tidelands, which are included in the public lands, until the oil companies discovered that rich petroleum resources are under them.

They decided, then, that they wanted the States rather than the Federal Government to control these great riches. Apparently the theory was that they could get more out of the State governments of California, Louisiana, and Texas, for example, than they could out of Uncle Sam.

Hence the test case that went to the United States Supreme Court, and was decided in favor of Federal ownership in 1947.

But it didn't end there.

Proponents of State ownership then turned around and introduced a bill in Congress which would do what the Supreme Court refused to do—turn the tidelands over to the States and deprive Montana and other reclamation States of this revenue.

It wiggled through Congress, too, but President Truman vetoed it.

The matter doesn't rest there as another bill is before Congress to give the tidelands and their billions of dollars in resources, to the States. It seems certain that pressure for its passage will be great.

Why politicians from inland reclamation States can be for this measure is hard to realize, as they have nothing to gain for their States by such a measure, and they are sure to lose millions of dollars in revenue that must be made up, through taxes on the people.

But, oddly enough, there is such support among many reclamation State officials, even though they will be taking money out of their State coffers by so acting.

Oddly enough, the National Association of Attorney Generals, is lobbying for giving the tidelands to the States.

In 1948, when this organization of elected State officials was lobbying to take money away from their States, only three attorney generals actively opposed this measure. They were Montana's R. V. Bottomly, and the attorney generals from Arizona and Missouri. The latter is not even a reclamation State, but the battle was fought with the editorial leadership and help of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, one of the Nation's greatest newspapers.

The issue of protection of the people in this battle was made plain in an editorial in the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star on January 22, 1948, which said, in part:

"Now and then something new under the sun catches the eye.

"The emoluments which Nebraska's attorney general, Walter R. Johnson, receives as a lobbyist for the National Association of Attorneys General—$1,500 monthly, plus expenses—is not the most money in the world, but it still is a lot of dough. It would appear that if in addition to representing the National Association of Attorneys General in the national capital, Mr. Johnson continues until the end of his term to represent the people of Nebraska * * * will be doing quite all right by himself. It is up to someone besides the editor of this column to decide whether Mr. Johnson is doing all right by the people.

"Where is Nebraska's interest here? There may be oil beneath the waters of the Missouri, the Platte, the Dismal, or Alkali Lake, but the title to the oil underneath those waters is not the vital problem involved in the Tidelands Oil case.

"The undertaking upon which Mr. Johnson is engaged in an effort to get Congress to upset a ruling of the United States Supreme Court, through legislative action, returning title to the States of all oil beneath the waters offshore in the Pacific, the Gulf of Mexico, or wherever oil may be found offshore.

"California, for example, it was pointed out in this column by the attorney general of Montana, cuts in to the tune of 5 percent of the royalties of these fabulously wealthy oil reserves. Nebraska does not get a penny of those royalties now. If the title belongs to Uncle Sam, Nebraska will get its share

to be used for the development of highways or for the improvement of the public-school system. Nebraska's interest, it would appear, is directly contrary to the interest for which Nebraska's attorney general proposes to lobby * * *."

And what the Lincoln Star says of Nebraska's interests also applies to Montana and its people.

Latest newspaper of Nation-wide circulation to comment on the tidelands case is the Washington Post, which, on January 6 of this year, ran an editorial entitled "American Oil." It, and comments on the tidelands case by A. A. Carmichael, attorney general of Alabama, appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

Quoting the Alabaman, the Post editorial said:

"Mr. Carmichael has pointed out what most State attorneys general have apparently ignored—that by quitclaiming the marginal sea Congress would be making an outright gift not to all the States, but to a very few—California, Texas, and Louisiana, principally, with Alabama itself a possible beneficiary—of incalculably rich mineral resources, the income and use of which should rightfully benefit all citizens of this country. These resources should be conserved and managed in the national interest and as a bluwark of the national security. To give them away would be to give away fraudulently an inheritance of the American people."

Opposing plans to give the tidelands to the States as advocated by the National Association of Attorneys General, which is presented by Nebraska's Johnson in Washington, the Alabama attorney general takes issue with the body by saying:

"The cost of public education, public health, aid to Europe, national defense, social security, and other of the more extensive Government programs does not, in the aggregate, even approach the potential money which Mr. Johnson would so generously give to Texas, Louisiana, and California.

"It is apparent that Mr. Johnson's proposal represents an outright donation of immensely wealthy Federal resources to a few coastal States. Mr. Johnson's proposal completely ignores defense, welfare, and conservation considerations, if the Congress of the United States gives these tidelands to the few coastal States involved, the Congress of the United States will be perpetrating a fraud on the people of this country."

A fraud on the people of this country.

Yet the battle continues, as another bill is before Congress which would give these great tideland riches to a few States.

This gift would cost Montana and other reclamation States hundreds of millions of dollars in the years ahead.

If the money is lost, Montana taxpayers will have to dig deep to replace it, or go without the many benefits that will result.

It is hard to see how any public official in Montana or any reclamation State can favor giving this wealth away.

Deficit Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 13 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there appeared in the Washington Post of this morning an article entitled "Deficit Diplomacy," by Walter Lippmann. In my opinion the article is not only timely, but is very thought-provoking, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be print[ED] in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of July 13, 1950]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

DEFICIT DIPLOMACY

Unless a diplomatic solution can be worked out, the campaign in Korea to force the North Korean Army back to the thirty-eighth parallel cannot be counted on to take less than several months. A line will have to be established behind which the counter-offensive can be mounted. The rains must end and the ground must harden. If all goes well in the sense that the fighting remains localized in Korea, the military decision called for by the Security Council might be looked for in the autumn.

During this anxious and dangerous period we shall, in addition to the measures required for the Korean campaign itself, have to redress our over-all position in the world. For the Korean affair has demonstrated—fortunately in time to correct it—how President Truman has allowed our commitments to increase while our power to meet them has been allowed to decline. The Truman doctrine, interpreted as an American obligation to fight wherever there is aggression on the one hand, and the military cutbacks and the roaring civilian boom on the other hand, are the very negation of a sound national policy. In Korea we are suffering painful reverses; they are local and limited samples of what can happen when, to make it specific, Mr. Acheson has commitments which Mr. Johnson is not prepared to carry out.

The fact of the matter is that Mr. Johnson did not know, the Chiefs of Staff did not know, General MacArthur did not know, that the United States might have to fight a war in Korea. There was no decision taken in cold blood well in advance of the North Korean aggression and then supported by a plan of operations. Though it was known, perhaps once asserted it was felt, that we had a moral, and some kind of political commitment, to the South Koreans, the only planning done in advance seems to have been to turn at once, as we did within a few hours, to the United Nations. Little, if anything else, seems to have been planned, much less prepared in advance.

What happened, then, was that President Truman and Secretary Acheson, who make foreign policy, were committed in Korea. Yet they were not so clearly and definitely committed in Korea that they insisted on being prepared for a Korean campaign. And so President Truman as Commander-in-Chief allowed Secretary Johnson and the high command in Washington and in Tokoyo to "write off" Korea as not worth the military effort to defend it. The fact that Korea had been written off is probably the best explanation not only of why General MacArthur's intelligence service was totally surprised, but also why the troops he had to throw so hastily into the battle were so untrained and so badly armed. General MacArthur did not prepare for a Korean campaign because he did not believe and did not know that President Truman would ever decide to order a Korean campaign.

No one, I think, can condone the practice of the civilians taking positions where they may feel they have to order our troops to fight in places where the soldiers have not been told to be prepared to fight.

But something more needs to be said about Korea before we can begin to form a judgment about over-all policy. It is that on the whole Asiatic borderland of the Soviet Union until we reach Turkey, Korea was unique in that it was the only threatened country where the United States was in a position to intervene promptly and decisively. For Korea is within close reach of Japan where the United States has, as a force in being and in place, its largest concentration of air, sea, and ground power.

Nowhere else in the world were we able to exert so much power so quickly. Similar concentrations of American power—as great as those which are already at General MacArthur's command—cannot be built up and maintained near all the other places in Asia that are covered by the Truman doctrine.

That is to say we cannot build up and maintain local forces to contain all the satellites and to resist revolution and insurrection all over Asia if we are not to allow ourselves to be diverted from our own, and the free world's supreme and vital military interest—which is to be strong enough to deter the Soviet Union itself from precipitating a world war.

It is imperative that we reverse the tendency in Washington, which is to practice what might be called deficit diplomacy. We need to reduce our political commitments which the political orators are ever ready to expand; we will need to enlarge our military forces in being which the politicians hate to raise taxes to do.

In order to reduce our political liabilities we need particularly to have it precisely and clearly understood—from here on out—by the State Department and the Pentagon and the White House where American expeditionary forces may be landed. That there has been no such understanding—though this is the heart of high policy—the Korean experience with its snap judgments and its improvisations has sharply demonstrated.

To enlarge our active military forces our primary concern must continue to be with developing the power to deter the Soviet Union itself from engaging its own forces. Strategic air power was never designed, let us remember, for a little war against a tenth rate army.

But, secondarily, we will need also to organize—or to reactivate—mobile task forces that are not anchored to any fixed position which is not indisputably and securely American.

The purpose of the task forces should not be to fight wars inside Asia, not to become involved in grour d fighting with land armies and with guerrillas. Their purpose should be to help friendly governments, which cannot expect to support navies and air forces, that are helping themselves on their own good earth—and to support those actions which the United Nations call for.

Statehood for Defense?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 13 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Statehood for Defense?" published in the Daily Alaska Empire, of Juneau, Alaska, on July 3, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEHOOD FOR DEFENSE?

WARREN MAGNUSON has always been one of our favorite Senators but we cannot agree

with his plea for immediate statehood for Alaska because of the imminence of war with Russia.

That is all we need in Alaska to have us in a complete state of confusion.

Mix up the military, civilian defense, Territorial statehood committees, candidates for election as delegates to a constitutional convention—all with their separate but important projects—and what do you have?

Defense of Alaska has nothing to do with statehood and statehood has nothing to do with the defense of the Territory or the Nation.

At the statehood hearings in Washington 2 months ago Admiral Wood was bold enough to say just that.

From his testimony we quote:

"It has been stated that statehood for Alaska is now going to bolster somehow the national defense.

"In my opinion, it makes no difference whether Alaska is a State or a Territory as far as national defense is concerned. As a matter of fact, since the federation of the Original Thirteen Colonies the common defense has been just that.

"Our plans, purposes, policies, and practices in the common defense have been offered without regard to sectionalization.

"During the period of our frontier days, the Territories were, in a way, and because of necessity, better defended than the original States.

"In recent times, Alaska, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, and Hawaii received the utmost attention in our scheme of national defense. In other words the status as to State or non-State never entered defensive or offensive calculations.

"Were Alaska to become a State tomorrow, it would not alter, I am sure, the general over-all consideration of our defense problem.

"Be advised that I am not debating the merits of statehood. I am simply pointing out that the question of the national defense is not germane to the issue."

Admiral Wood had previously given credit to "My chief of staff * * * Sim MacKinnon, of Juneau * * * my operations chief * * * Captain John White, from Fairbanks" and Bob Ellis, in command of installations at Attu. "All of these people did very fine service and were typical of a great many others."

The admiral concluded his testimony thus:

"In conclusion, I would say that all persons responsible for the national defense—the President, the Congress, the Department of Defense, and others—will do their duty to the utmost irrespective of the political status of Alaska, State or Territory. Thank you for your courtesy."

And, we can thank Admiral Wood for his testimony on the question.

We think, in this instance, his judgment is better than that of Senator MAGNUSON.

Let Us Not Imitate Nero's Fiddling While Rome Burned

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are told that Nero fiddled while Rome burned; for which he has received the ridicule of the centuries.

Let us not imitate his horrible example.

This country is faced with the most dangerous situation ever known in all its history.

If this Korean affair should develop into a world conflict, it will not only involve the life of this Nation, but will involve the very life of civilization itself.

The burden of such a conflict will fall upon the people of this country. The chances are that it will wind up in a world conflict, fought with airplanes and atomic bombs. We not only need to build the strongest air force on earth, but we must do everything possible for the effective operation of our atomic-bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., which is not only our greatest defense plant, but it is the greatest defense plant the world has ever known. We need to throw around it every possible protection, and improve as rapidly as possible every facility for ingress and egress to and from it; for we are going to need them if the worst comes to the worst.

Therefore, I am again appealing to you, my colleagues in the House, as well as to the Members of the other body, for an amendment to the civil functions appropriations bill to provide ample funds for the speedy construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway--which is the missing link in our national-defense program.

It will shorten the water distance between the Gulf of Mexico and Oak Ridge by more than 800 miles, and cut the cost of transportation between those points to the irreducible minimum.

We cannot afford to delay this construction longer. It has already been approved by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President. Funds in the amount of $658,000 have been provided and spent for the planning of this project, and those plans are now ready for execution.

We cannot afford to delay this construction until our sleeping cities are awakened by the terrible music of the bursting bomb. This is an emergency, a dire emergency, and should be provided for at once.

Let me also call your attention to the fact that it will provide what will amount to a slack water route from the Gulf to the Great Lakes, and to all points on the Ohio, the upper Mississippi, the Missouri, the Illinois, and the Cumberland Rivers, and at the same time save the swift current of the Mississippi for the downstream traffic.

From that standpoint alone its construction is more than justified, and should not be delayed.

Besides, our iron-ore supply in this country is being rapidly exhausted. We are going to have to get our iron ore in the future from Venezuela. This project will greatly facilitate the transportation of that material to the places in the Middle West where it is to be used, such as Pittsburgh, Youngstown, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Cincinnati, St. Louis, and all the other cities in that great midwestern country.

Every Member of this House and every Member of the other body knows, and the President admits, that this project must be constructed sooner or later. The sooner the better. We need it now. It might not only contribute to saving the lives of untold thousands of American boys, but it might mean the very life of the Nation.

Let us proceed with its construction now.

The Korean Situation Helps Senator Lucas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 13 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Korean Situation Helps Senator LUCAS," written by Raymond P. Brandt, and published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 11, 1950]

WASHINGTON SIDELIGHTS—KOREAN SITUATION HELPS SENATOR LUCAS

(By Raymond P. Brandt)

Widespread popular support of President Truman's quick and forceful action in Korea and the adverse public reaction to the sniping criticisms by Republican Senators TAFT, WHERRY, JENNER, KEM, and MCCARTHY are expected to be reflected in the November elections.

Illinois, where Senate Majority Leader SCOTT LUCAS is opposed by Republican Everett Dirksen, former Representative, furnishes a dramatic example of how military operations in Asia are likely to influence voters in this country.

The changed picture in Illinois is now one of sharp contrasts because LUCAS is in on all the White House conferences with congressional leaders regarding the world situation and Dirksen has the backing of the Chicago Tribune, one of the few papers in the country that denounced Truman's Korean decisions.

The Chicago Tribune's editorials have so closely paralleled those of the Communist Daily Worker that the Washington Post has dubbed it the prairie edition of Pravda. Apparently this blow struck a sensitive spot. Last week the Chicago Tribune printed an editorial cartoon listing Stalin as champion scoundrel of all time. That's something the Daily Worker would never dare think of doing.

LUCAS promptly exploited the new front offered him. In his weekly broadcasts to the voters back home he has emphasized his frequent calls at the White House, the unanimous or near unanimous votes in the Senate on security measures, and finally Dirksen's amazing switch from one of the most effective supporters of international cooperation to Chicago Tribune isolationism after he decided to run for the Senate.

Speaking at a dinner in his honor at Quincy last week Senator LUCAS fired a barrage at Dirksen's roving positions. In his introductory remarks he reported to his constituents:

"Soon after the outbreak of fighting in Korea, the President called the leaders of Congress to the White House. I had the

privilege of being present at that historic meeting. In a stern, calm voice, the President informed us of his decision to send American military forces to aid the South Koreans * * *."

Later LUCAS said:

"My friends, it is my ambition to be reelected to the United States Senate for another term next November. To speak for Illinois in the Senate and the councils of the Nation is the fulfillment of my deepest desire. But I tell you this—and I am speaking straight from the shoulder—I have never used the foreign policy of America, which deals directly with the lives of American boys, as a subject of political maneuvering to catch votes. Anyone who knows my record or cares to examine it will find that I have been a consistent supporter of our strong foreign policy long before the infamous attack upon Pearl Harbor by the Japanese.

"My opponent has flip-flopped from one position to another and back again on foreign policy. I have stood firm from the beginning. * * *"

LUCAS recalled that Democratic Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, had debated with Dirksen at Quincy just a year ago on foreign policy.

"My opponent," he continued, "was fresh from consultations with the men who run the Chicago Tribune and he definitely said, in answer to a query by Senator DOUGLAS, that he had made a mistake when he voted for the Marshall plan while he was in Congress; that if he were elected to the Senate this November he would not vote for the continuation of Marshall plan funds for the year 1951.

"Whatever views my opponent has expressed or will express upon the President's policy in the Korean crisis, you can be sure of one thing. Whatever he says tomorrow will not have any meaning if his masters tell him to change his tune on the day after tomorrow. What he says next week will be subject to change without notice—whenever the pressures brought upon him are strong enough to make him sing a different song.

"He is noted for his golden voice. It is a voice that easily adapts itself to any melody he believes suitable for the passing moment. In his public life he has proved his astonishing ability to warble one tune after another while he swings back and forth on the flying trapeze."

Senator LUCAS then quoted some of Dirksen's statements when he was one of the ablest pleaders in the House for the bipartisan foreign policy and Marshall-plan aid.

This writer remembers meeting Dirksen in London in 1947, when he was a member of a congressional delegation studying economic conditions in Europe. The Illinois Representative was easily the best informed man in the group, and he came to Washington to help the successful fight for the Marshall-plan appropriations.

Two years later Dirksen switched to isolationism and made the cost of international cooperation one of his principal charges against LUCAS and the Truman administration.

Dirksen's present isolationist views have been a shock to his friends, who had been impressed by his forward-looking record in the House. As late as 1948, when he was one of Governor Dewey's top campaign advisers, he was a bipartisan foreign policy man. He now follows the Chicago Tribune, which has read Dewey out of the Republican Party several times. He gambled on the hunch that the Illinois voters want the Tribune brand of nationalism. The Korean situation unexpectedly changed the odds.

Meat Is the World's Diet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made before the sixty-first annual meeting of Nebraska Stock Growers' Association at Alliance, Nebr., June 10, 1950:

Friends, it is good to be back speaking before your association. This is the sixth time you have invited me to address your annual meeting. I am complimented that you feel I can make some contribution to your growing and forceful group.

The stockmen of the country have always been in the vanguard of that group of citizens who believe in free enterprise and want to be left alone by their Government. You have made a great contribution to the welfare of the Nation. You have supplied the meat and food needed by the fighting forces and by our growing population.

It was 5 years ago that I first gave some remarks on the value of meat in the human diet. Today, I will enlarge upon those remarks, adding a few items that research has brought to light. I would also like to comment briefly on some of the thoughts expressed by Harry B. Coffee and Congressman GOSSETT.

There is an old proverb which says: "Tell me what you eat, and I will tell you what you are." That is one reason I take as my subject, Meat in the World's Diet.

The American people have always been meat eaters. Meat has been the principal item of diet for some of the human race from the beginning of time. Primitive man found satisfaction in making a kill and eating the meat. As a physician, I can tell you that the human body is especially adapted to the consumption and digestion of meat and animal products. There is no food which nature has endowed so lavishly with the necessary proteins, vitamins, minerals, and fat. Indeed, meat is a masterpiece of nature's laboratory.

In the past several years, intensive research has been carried on with all foods. I desire to deal mainly with that which has been carried on with meat. It has been possible, through a micro-biological method, to carefully essay the 22 amino acids in food. We find that meat has these 22 amino acids and at least 12 of them are necessary for a carefully balanced diet. Meat also contains the essential minerals and vitamins needed by the human being.

I have had the opportunity in the past several years to see much of the world and compare the strong healthy boys and girls of Nebraska, where they eat plenty of meat and other foods, with the youngsters of India, China, Korea, Japan, and the Pacific Islands. There is a striking contrast, because in these countries, we find half-starved, spindle-legged, pot-bellied children who have not had a balanced diet. The children of Nebraska are rosy-cheeked, well-muscled, and full of vitality. On the farms of the Nation, the growing child is close to nature's supply of food. In some of our congested cities, the diet is not properly balanced. Here people must resort to vitamin pills and other artificial means to supply them the needed food requirements.

In India it is estimated that there are about 200,000,000 head of cattle, and a population of 470 people per square mile. These people have generally a rigid diet of cereals and vegetables. The people who do not have an ample diet of meat certainly are not physically a strong race. Some of the people in the Pacific islands and Asia would eat meat if it were available. It is also interesting to note that in these nonmeat countries, they have permitted the fertility of their soil to be depleted because they lacked the necessary livestock population which adds fertility to the soil.

Again let me speak to you as a physician. Until recent years, there was a false idea that hospital patients and youngsters should not eat meat. Scientists carrying on extensive experiments have found this to be a false idea. It is no longer necessary just to give the hospital patient fish and chicken. Recent experiments have shown that red meat is not harmful, but can contribute to the patient's recovery by supplying many of the vitamins, minerals, and acids so necessary to tissue repair and health.

I also deplore the fact that people have found it necessary to resort to so many vitamin pills to keep their diet in balance. Many of the advertised vitamin pills are worthless. I am also conscious of the fact that Government agencies are working overtime in an effort to find substitutes for meat. It is high time that the livestock industry made greater efforts and worked with men and women of research in an effort to discover new uses for meat and its by-products. There are many new fields and opportunities that are almost unlimited in pointing out the use of, and value of meat.

Well-cooked meat is appetizing and tastes good. It stimulates the flow of the digestive juices from the mouth to the stomach and aids digestion. The proteins and other essential acids found in meat make up a part of every cell tissue and organ in your body. The muscles, the glands, and the corpuscles of your body are constantly in need of the vitamins, proteins, and acids found in meat. That is, proteins provide the necessary repair parts which must be carried on continuously to keep the complex human machine working satisfactorily. When meat is cooked, it is 90 percent digestible.

The Government's nutritional program should become the core of agricultural planning for abundance. Scientists should continue to probe into the evidence of malnutrition in order to find its causes and learn how to eliminate it so this Nation may remain strong and self-sustaining. We must know more about the chemistry of food and the vitamins in food. In doing this, we eliminate the cause of malnutrition and deficiencies in diet which have plagued nations for centuries.

It has been the duty of the American stockmen and farmers to help supply the people of the world who do not have enough to eat. Starvation is rampant in many countries of the world today. Many children and older people never have their bellies full of food. I believe it is the duty of this country not to be wasting food, burning potatoes, or destroying food that can be used by other people in the world. The problem of feeding the world is a part of our responsibility. The one way to stop communism is to stop starvation. People will accept many types of promises when they are hungry. Someone has said that there are only nine meals between men and revolution. I believe this is being demonstrated in many parts of the world today. It will not be possible to have peace while great nations of people are grievously undernourished.

The world has been facing a crisis in the need of food. It will become more and more acute as the soil fertility is depleted and the population grows.

This country ought to always plan for abundance. Plans for distributing it to the needy people should be put into action.

In my opinion there never has been an overproduction, even though there were surpluses which hung over our food markets. These surpluses coincide with unemployment of labor and capital. During this time, people were hungry. Factories were closed. Tons of food could not be distributed. Capital reserves were frozen. Men could not find work. During periods of unemployment, people eat less and eat cheaper foods. It simply is an inability to buy the things they need and want.

Certainly food concerns more people directly than any other thing in the world today. A nation's strength depends on its people's strength, and the strength of the people depends to a large extent on the type of food that they eat. In the last war we found that food was a weapon which helped to win the war just as much as did the machine gun, the airplane, and the bomb. To control the people, control their food supply. Moral stamina, courage, and endurance depend to a large extent on good nutrition. An adequate food supply is as important a part of the modern warfare and the making of a people, as are diplomats, politicians, and the dollar.

The production of cattle has increased about 2,000,000 head in the last year. It is estimated that all types of cattle in 1949 totaled about 80,277,000 head. I would like to point out at this point, that the Fourth Congressional District, which I represent in Nebraska, has more cattle than any other District in the United States. Nebraska also has some 25,000,000 acres of high-quality grass. Properly pastured, it returns good dividends. The cattle on the ranges make a harvesting machine which seldom needs repair. Our grass has the necessary calcium, phosphorous, iodine, and other minerals which make excellent quality animals. Beef cattle number about 43,000,000 head. In 1945, when the OPA was in operation, we reached the all-time high of 85,573,000 head. The records from the Department of Agriculture show on January 1, 1920, that there were 70,400,000 head of cattle. Our population then was about 105,000,000 people. On that basis we should now have 100,000,000 head of cattle. The number of hogs on January 1, 1920, was 60,159,000; while on January 1, 1950, there were 60,424,000. This shows an increase of less than 300,000 head in 30 years' time. The records on sheep are interesting. On January 1, 1920, there were 40,743,000; and on January 1, 1950, there were only 27,064,000. In fact the sheep population is the lowest now that it has been in the last 50 years. It is also interesting to find in these statistics that on January 1, 1920, there were 20,901,000 horses in the country. Today we have only 5,310,000. The mules in 1920 numbered 5,651,000 against 2,153,000 today. The decrease in the number of sheep, horses, and mules means that there is this much more food now available for other animals. The Department of Agriculture estimates that, if an additional 2 percent of the cattle were fed grain, the present surplus would soon disappear. It also estimates that, if the bread we eat contained 5 percent more wheat, the surplus of wheat would disappear.

It should be remembered that the population of this country is increasing about 2,500,000 over the deaths each year. The amount of farm land in this country is limited. Irrigation projects bring new wealth and industry to a community. They provide a backlog of safety and security in those areas where the lack of water is a limiting factor in producing crops.

It should be noted that we do not produce enough meat in this country for our needs. Last week I checked with the Tariff Commission and find that in 1949 we imported as dressed meat equivalent 445,000,000 pounds of meat. It was broken down as follows: The dressed veal and beef, 83,300,000 pounds; canned beef equivalent, 206,900,000 pounds; dressed live cattle equivalent, 155,000,000 pounds. Most of this came from Argentina and Canada. During the same period we exported 135,000,000 pounds of meat. This does not take into consideration the meat procured by the Army from other sources than the United States. It is estimated that meat production in the United States in 1950 will be more than 23,000,000,000 pounds. I do not believe that we are near the saturation point in the consumption of meat and meat products. It is also interesting to note that last year we imported $1,600,000,000 worth of agricultural products. In the last 20 years, without exception of four wartime years, we have imported more agricultural products than are in competition with our own products than we have exported. In fact, today, we are bringing in more competitive agricultural products than we are able to give away. The administration has been anxious to close the gap on dollar trade with the world. This has been done on an agricultural basis for many years. If industry permitted more tractors, farm machinery, hats, and other materials to come to this country, they, too, would close this so-called dollar gap. The only fear that I have is that unemployment, if it comes, would reduce the ability of the individual to buy meat because, at the present time, it costs them more money than certain cereals he can buy. In fact, the Government agencies are working overtime trying to find substitutes for meat and animal products. Many of these substitutes lack the necessary acids, vitamins, and minerals contained in meat, milk, and butter. In my opinion, the vitamin business has grown because Government has been urging substitutes for natural foods.

I have tried to point out to you how important meat is in our diet. If these remarks stimulate your thinking and aid in your deliberation, then my efforts have not been in vain. Meat-eating nations have been strong nations because they have the vitality and the energy so necessary for progressive action. Now permit me to make a few comments on the remarks made by Harry B. Coffee and my colleague, Congressman GOSSETT, of Texas. You stockmen are in a position to exert a powerful influence upon Washington. You have always taken an active part in making a better society, a better community, and a stronger nation. You have performed a splendid mission in the production of meat. It is well that members of your organization take a lively and active interest in the direction your Government now goes. I know that you recognize a great threat in the fact that our country, without conscious choice on the part of its people, is rapidly and unmistakably drifting toward consummation of a false conception of a socialized state. The men who have preceded me on this program recognize the growing power and expansion of our wasteful Government, with its colossal debt and the heavy burden of taxation. They and you recognize that Government produces nothing and that the course that we are now on must lead to national bankruptcy. You realize that the future health, strength, and prosperity of our country depends upon the reestablishment and maintenance of a free and competitive enterprise.

You are opposed to those socialistic schemes in which the Government does the thinking and the planning and you as individuals lose your freedom. You are opposed to the Government squandering your hard-earned savings on socialistic schemes. You men have the spirit of those early pioneers who were not afraid to take a chance and did not lean upon government or expect government to give them a job and security. You know that if you are to have better health, better homes, more pleasures, more money in your pockets, that you must provide it yourself.

You do not go along with those starry-eyed planners who hold out the promises that the Government can provide everything and that the individual need not worry about tomorrow. You know that this Nation did not become the greatest nation on earth with the highest standards of living by constantly looking to Government to give them security from the cradle to the grave.

You want to enjoy the fruits of your labor, which consists of your home, your farm, your livestock, your job, your insurance, your investment, your right to acquire property and substance for yourself and your family. You know it is possible that government through taxation and bad fiscal policies can confiscate not only your profits but destroy those vital incentives which call on one to create and produce.

I know that you cattlemen, while you go about your job of producing meat for the Nation, will provide your own security. That is good sound Americanism. You realize that it can be done only by hard work. You realize that when you start looking to Washington to solve your problems you tread the path of socialism. Socialism means controls. Controls from Washington mean the loss of freedom. The loss of your freedom can be measured by the amount of help people ask from the Federal Government. With Federal money goes power. With power goes control and concentration of authority in government. The Government cannot give the people security. That thought is a snare and a delusion. Only the people themselves can provide security through production and thrift.

You can dedicate yourself to no greater or more important task than that of protecting and preserving the philosophy upon which our Government was founded. We need to repeat from time to time what freedom really means to us, to the people and to a nation. It is too easy to lose sight of fundamental principles and to take them for granted. Freedom can be lost. Freedom does not come easily or cheaply, nor can it be held easily. It cannot be traded off today and recovered tomorrow.

We are a great nation because we are, first, a Christian nation and, second, we have the know-how to use the tools of production. The early pioneers came to this country in order to escape religious persecutions in the Old World. Standing out like a bright, shining beacon is our Christian Nation. This Nation has more than 260,000 churches, cathedrals, synagogues, and temples with a membership of 77,000,000 people. I am convinced that if peace and security are to be found, that this intangible religious force should be brought under a total mobilization as a moral force with Christian men and women working for better human relations. The churches and the Christian people of America must not only vote, but must take an intelligent and militant part in government. Horace Greeley once said:

"No Bible-reading nation has been mentally or socially enslaved."

This Nation was founded on the basic rights of the individual. One of these was religious freedom. Going with this philosophy, the pioneers maintained that the government should be the servant of the people and not their master. Yes, our Nation became great not only because we are a Christian nation, but because freemen with free minds have invented the tools of production. This free-enterprise system has permitted individuals to think, act, create, and hold property. They were permitted to enjoy the fruits of their labor.

The people of other countries, where famine, pestilence, poverty, and fear stock their daily lives, work harder and longer

than we do in America and for a mere pittance. The intelligent use of our productive tools spells the difference between the abundance we enjoy and the scarcity that plagues the lives of other people of the world.

I often get mad and even sick at heart when I hear the radicals, the Socialists, and the do-gooders of Washington condemning our system of government, our way of life, and our free competitive enterprise system. These people want socialism. They want the Government to do the planning and the thinking for them and provide them the necessities and pleasures of life. I have asked many of them:

"Does socialism in England, or communism in Russia, or fascism under any dictator provide the people with as many good things as they enjoy in America?"

The answers are twisted and unusual. I tell you, my friends, these left-wing Socialists, when weighed on the scales of humanity, are wanting.

I have great faith in our country, its people, our Christian traditions, and our tremendous productive power. We are able to withstand many tough economic jolts and keep our balance. The members of the Nabraska Stock Growers' Association are rugged individualists. You will do your part in keeping our country economically and spiritually strong. Part of the pattern of remaining strong involves a good, well-balanced diet. With all of us working together, we can and will move on to new fields of higher living and better human relations. We can do this under our own power, without the Government doing our planning and thinking. It is a responsibility which all of us must accept so that we may pass on to our children a type of living and freedom which they will cherish and preserve.

The British Gold and Dollar Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 13 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement from the British Economic Record showing the improvement in the British gold and dollar position, which I think will be of great interest to Senators, particularly in connection with the appropriation for ECA.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPROVEMENT IN BRITAIN'S GOLD AND DOLLAR POSITION

The Chancelor of the Exchequer announced to the House of Commons on July 5 that Britain and the other sterling countries showed a surplus of $180,000,000 in their dollar accounts in the second quarter of 1950, in contrast to a deficit of $632,000,000 in the second quarter of 1949.

The dollar position has steadily improved since devaluation of the pound in September 1949. In the 9 months since September there has been a surplus of $189,000,000, compared with a deficit of $1,501,000,000 in the 9 months before.

The reserves have thus been steadily built up from their disastrously low level in September. With the aid of the surplus, and of $240,000,000 under ERP and $18,000,000 under the Canadian credit, the reserves rose by $438,000,000 in the second quarter of 1950, and now stand at $2,422,000,000.

Sterling area gold and dollar reserves held in London

[In millions of United States dollars]

Years and quarters	Net deficit or surplus	Financed by—					Reserves at end of period
		United States credit	Canadian credit	Other items [1]	E. R. P.	Drawings (−) on reserves	
1946 year	−908	600	523	----------	----------	+215	2,696
1947 year	−4,131	2,850	423	240	----------	−618	2,079
1948 year	−1,710	300	52	453	682	−223	1,856
1949:							
First quarter	−330	----------	30	32	325	+56	1,912
Second quarter	−632	----------	30	----------	340	−262	1,651
Third quarter	−539	----------	29	----------	284	−225	1,425
Fourth quarter	−31	----------	27	20	246	+263	1,688
1949 year	−1,531	----------	116	52	1,196	−167	1,688
1950:							
First quarter	+40	----------	27	----------	229	+296	1,984
Second quarter	+180	----------	18	----------	240	+438	2,422

[1] Purchases from International Monetary Fund; and gold loan from South Africa of $325,000,000 in 1948.

It is our "declared aim," said the Chancelor, "to stand on our own feet in 1952 without any extraordinary outside help." The great recovery in the dollar position since September is evidence that Britain is making good progress toward the achievement of this aim.

The following passages from the Chancelor's statement analyze various factors in the improved position, and draw attention to the policies of restraint which will still have to be applied in the difficult period which lies ahead.

REASONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT

"Last April, when I spoke about the first quarter's results, I explained that two main types of influence had been at work in bringing about the improvement in our affairs.

"First, there were those influences which were outside of our own control, such as the recovery in demand by dollar countries for the goods which are supplied by the sterling area.

"Secondly, there were the effects of our own policies and actions, such as the positive encouragement we have been giving to exports to the dollar area and the economies which all sterling area countries acting in unison have exercised in their expenditure on dollar imports.

"By making our own exports more competitive, compared with dollar goods, devaluation played its part in encouraging these economies. It also helped to limit expenditure on the so-called invisible items.

"We benefited too from the great change in sentiment about our position and prospects which took place after devaluation, and resulted in a considerable accretion of funds as debts outstanding were paid and new business entered into.

"The chief thing to say about the second quarter's results is that most of these influences have continued to be powerfully at work.

"Among them, it is probably true to say that the continued high level of demand in the United States, particularly for the raw materials produced by the rest of the sterling area, must take first place. The increase in our own exports to North America, especially Canada, is also a factor worthy of special mention.

"Our expenditure on dollar imports, and the expenditure of other Commonwealth countries, has continued to be kept within the limits which we imposed on ourselves a year or so ago.

"Our gold and dollar payments to the so-called hard currency countries outside the dollar area, which were so grievous a burden on us last year, have also been very moderate. To other OEEC countries we have made no gold or dollar payments at all in recent months."

DIFFICULTIES AHEAD

The chancellor said that though the picture was one "of growing strength," the less favorable features of the situation, and the uncertainties ahead, must be borne in mind:

1. The reserves have been built back to their earlier level with the help of Marshall aid, and the assistance available in 1950–51 will be substantially less than in 1949–50.

2. Dollar imports by Britain and other sterling countries "have been runing well below the limits we have set ourselves, and some increase over the present level may well occur."

3. "The exceptional accretion of funds following devaluation cannot continue indefinitely."

4. The rise in prices of raw materials which has so greatly benefited our dollar earnings cannot be expected to go on. Some reductions have already taken place and more are possible. This may be so even though the underlying conditions in the dollar area and elsewhere remain essentially favorable."

FLUCTUATIONS MUST BE ABSORBED

"Quite apart from the effects of any serious deterioration in international affairs, it would not be right, for the reasons which I have given, to count on a continuation of all the favorable factors which have governed our experience in the last 6 months.

"In the volatile world of international trade and finance, there are bound to be fluctuations both downwards and upwards. Moreover, our position as banker for the whole sterling area, and as the center of the world-wide trading system based on sterling, makes it necessary for us to carry the burden of downward fluctuations, as well as reap the benefit of the upward movements.

"Such fluctuations, when they occur, should not be interpreted as implying a basic weakening of our situation. We must expect such perfectly normal phenomena to continue. They need not alarm us so long as conditions at home are sound, our exports are fully competitive and our enterprise in selling our goods is unimpaired.

"But this in turn will only be so providing we can keep in check here the rise in personal incomes and the total level of monetary expenditure."

NEED FOR STRONGER RESERVES

"Moreover, it is essential that our reserves of gold and dollars should be adequate for their purpose.

"Although they have increased over the last 9 months, these reserves are still far below the level that is necessary to enable us to face with equanimity all the sudden

and substantial changes in external conditions which may take place. Their further strengthening is a matter of the highest importance to us.

"It is for this reason that we must firmly maintain those policies of restraint, in respect both to personal incomes and expenditure, especially on dollar imports, while at the same time providing the maximum encouragement to dollar earnings, which have contributed so much to our recovery during the past 9 months. It is along this road that we can reach our declared aim, namely, to stand on our own feet in 1952 without any extraordinary outside help."

UNITED KINGDOM DOLLAR EARNINGS FROM EXPORTS

The following table shows the progress of Britain's own exports to North America. The figures are drawn from the "Trade and Navigation Accounts of the United Kingdom":

United Kingdom exports to North America

[Monthly averages in pounds and millions of United States dollars]

	United States		Canada		Total, North America	
1948, average	£5.5	$22.3	£6.1	$22.6	£11.6	$46.9
1949:						
First quarter	5.3	21.2	6.6	26.7	11.9	47.9
Second quarter	3.3	13.4	6.6	26.5	9.9	39.9
Third quarter	3.7	15.1	6.2	25.2	9.9	40.3
Fourth quarter	6.7	18.7	7.2	20.0	13.9	38.7
1950:						
First quarter	6.7	18.8	8.5	23.9	15.3	42.7
April	5.6	15.6	8.9	25.0	14.5	40.6
May	8.2	23.0	12.4	34.7	20.6	57.7

TRADE OF THE UNITED STATES WITH STERLING COUNTRIES

The table which follows (based on figures published in Foreign Commerce Weekly, a publication of the United States Department of Commerce) shows United States exports to and imports from Britain and the other sterling countries of the British Commonwealth.

The United States import figures are f. o. b., but do not tally exactly with the figures given above, though they follow the same trend.

United States trade with sterling countries of British Commonwealth

[Monthly averages, in millions of dollars]

	Exports by United States		Imports by United States	
	To United Kingdom	To rest of British Commonwealth, except Canada	From United Kingdom	From rest of British Commonwealth, except Canada
1936-38 average	41.6	23.4	14.5	30.5
1947	92.0	138.9	17.1	82.8
1948	53.7	112.4	23.6	92.8
1949:				
First quarter	58.3	106.6	22.7	88.0
Second quarter	72.1	110.9	14.7	87.2
Third quarter	51.8	88.2	17.3	60.1
Fourth quarter	51.1	82.7	20.9	73.4
1950:				
First quarter	46.5	75.4	18.9	87.2
April	49.9	71.9	18.3	88.6

These figures yield the interesting fact, that in the 7 months after devaluation, the British sterling countries cut their trading deficit with the United States to an annual rate of $309,000,000, compared with an annual rate of $922,000,000 in the previous 6 months.

IMPROVEMENT DEPENDS ON HIGH UNITED KINGDOM EXPORTS TO OTHER COUNTRIES

The world's abnormal dollar shortage since the war is being steadily eased by the recovery of production in nondollar countries, creating nondollar sources of supply.

Britain's increased exports in the last few years are thus playing a direct part in restoring a healthy balance not only in her own dollar payments but in those of other nondollar countries.

The following table shows the remarkable increase in Britain's total exports:

United Kingdom exports since the war

	Exports of United Kingdom goods	Volume (1938=100)
1938	£471,000,000	100
1946	912,000,000	99
1947	1,138,000,000	109
1948	1,582,000,000	136
1949	1,784,000,000	151
1950:		
First quarter at annual rate	2,064,000,000	170
April, at annual rate	1,800,000,000	----------
May, at annual rate	2,196,000,000	----------

Surprise? Truman, State Department, and Armed Services Knew the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald for July 12, 1950:

THE BIG SURPRISE

Mr. Truman, the high command, and the State Department learned about the opening of the Korean war from the newspapers. When and if the big show with Russia materializes, it is devoutly to be hoped that the responsible military and civilian leaders won't be apprised of the fact only by the conk of the first atomic bomb. But if Korea is any indication, that's about what we can expect.

Rarely has there been such a ludicrous picture of surprise as that of our solemn nonentities in the days just before the blow-up along the thirty-eighth parallel.

John Foster Dulles, Republican consultant to Secretary of State Acheson, was in Korea 5 days before the shooting started. News photographs showed him with South Korean army officers on the border, peering out from under his fedora from a foxhole toward the Communist north, where the offensive was being prepared. Mr. Dulles detected nothing alarming.

Secretary of Defense Johnson and General Bradley, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, were in Tokyo at the same time. Nobody knows what General MacArthur told them, but they came home without ever a whisper that dirty work was afoot. Mr. Johnson's reactions when the North Korean attack came suggests that it was about the last thing that would have occurred to him. He rushed before Congress and urged passage of a bill appropriating about 1¼ billion dollars for gift arms to Europe. What that had to do with Korea is a mystery.

Mr. Truman, on the day of the attack, was in Baltimore dedicating an airport to the cause of peace. "We would not," he said, "build so elaborate a facility for our air commerce if we did not have faith in peaceful future." One day later he was pulling the Commander in Chief act, rushing planes and ships into action. Next he was shooting in the ground troops and bawling for a draft.

Admiral Roscoe Hillenkoetter, director of the Central Intelligence Agency, was not shouting from the housetops about a coming war. He was issuing reports from his spies and agents all over the world, but if they were silent about war on the Korean front, that the admiral explained, was because it was not the function of his organization to evaluate reports or make any prediction about intentions.

Perhaps the most comic character in the whole cast was Brig. Gen. William L. Roberts, until recently commander of the American military mission training South Korea's army of 95,000. Although this army was without tanks and air cover, General Roberts announced shortly before the opening of hostilities that the South Korean troops composed the best fighting force on the Asiatic continent.

THEY FORGOT TO TELL THE REDS

He said 95 percent of its officers were approved by the American military advisers and stated that its marksmanship was excellent. Tanks were not any great menace, the general said, because Korean terrain was not suited to them and demolition of bridges and mining of roads would stop them. (Tank spearheads accounted for every subsequent North Korean advance.)

One South Korean regiment, General Roberts wound up, was easily a match for any North Korean brigade, and all that was needed to complete the training of the South Korean forces was a full-scale attack. Subsequent developments indicate that the South Korean Army may have been in training for the Boston marathon, in which Koreans at the last running took the first 3 places.

Not since the late Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox announced on the morning of the Pearl Harbor attack that "the Navy is ready" has anybody achieved a score comparable to that of General Roberts for accuracy in reverse.

Yet no gift of prophecy was required to see what was coming. Countless predictions were on the record that Communist Korea could push over republican Korea at will. For example, Capt. Edgar C. Bundy of Wheaton, Ill., former air intelligence officer, testifying a year ago before a Senate committee, said: "The Soviets have armed a people's army in North Korea and trained them, about 300,000 troops. These can easily take over South Korea when the signal is given."

BUT THE REDS TOLD EVERYBODY

Even a reading of the encyclopedia would have told the same story. The 1948 edition of the American People's Encyclopedia noted

that the North Korea regime announced the formation of an army in February 1948 "with which it intended to occupy the whole peninsula and rule from Seoul."

Now all the dummies who had the hodful of bricks descend on their heads are acclaiming themselves as wise and far seeing statesmen and responding to compliments for having taken prompt and decisive action. If they were so bright, why did they yank out the American garrison of 19,000 trained troops in South Korea, only to face the painful job of transporting other troops back to the same battle theater now in an attempt to check the Red onslaught?

There Can Be Only One Foreign Policy as of Today—Back Up the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by former Gov. Alf M. Landon, of Kansas, at the Foreign Policy Conference at Colgate University on July 11, 1950:

THERE CAN BE ONLY ONE FOREIGN POLICY AS OF TODAY—BACK UP THE PRESIDENT

I speak today as a Republican who opposed step by step the stupidities and the duplicities in the management of our foreign affairs. I also have for years urged the building up of our national defense, including the intelligence service.

I was among the first to support the Turko-Grecian aid. I pointed out at the time that the same policies of containment must be applied to the Pacific.

I early supported the Marshall plan—though I have questioned our failure to use it more skillfully in the cause of all free peoples.

I am not going to review at this time, the terrible blunders that lost the peace. What we face now is facts—not history.

We have squared off. As always, all good Americans are united behind any effort that Nation puts forth.

By the same token, we have a right to know where we are headed and exactly what we are going to do when we get there.

I believe in due time there should be a statement of United States aims—for presentation to the world. It must be more than simply a statement that we are resisting aggression—if we are to reach the millions of the world now being deluded by Communist propaganda.

And it must be more than simply a statement of military policy in the Far East.

We have been singularly blind in our propaganda to the power of ideas in the world—particularly American ideals.

We know we fight for neither gold nor land—but there are many millions in the world who do not know that.

Many millions in the world see America only as attempting to maintain the status quo all over the world.

The President might well consider setting up a bipartisan policy advisory committee—with real Republican representation from the Congress—to draft a statement of our overall, long-range foreign policy. The trouble is that a large part of the world does not understand what we are trying to do—and that is equally true of American citizens.

I believe the American people have a right to demand that the President keep the people—and the Congress fully informed of what is going on. I think that is particularly important as far as the leaders of the Congress are concerned—Republicans as well as Democrats.

Cooperation for the sake of the Nation is a two-way street. As our national leader, the President should initiate it. In this critical world situation he should call the Republican leaders in for consultation—not after a policy is decided—but as a cogent factor in its decision.

In September 1939 President Roosevelt asked the leaders of both parties in the Congress—and Mr. Frank Knox and myself to meet with him in the White House.

But it soon became evident that we Republicans were not called in to participate in any of the decisions of policy—or even to be given any information on world conditions.

As JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Republican leader of the House, said to me, "This is a conference of the President's floor leaders to receive orders to carry out something already decided. We have no business here."

That is definitely not the way to get the unity so essential at this time.

I don't think it's too much to ask that the President keep the people fully informed of what is going on. That goes for the bad things as well as the good. The chips are down.

This is no small or trivial affair. This could be Gethsemane for our way of life—even if we win a major conflict. So the most honest and most intelligent course for the President and his assistants to follow is to let the people of the United States know what it's all about, all the time, and without pulling any punches.

Naturally, there are many things that can't be revealed. But the underlying, or over-all, situation can be communicated to the people honestly and frankly all the time.

The President made a personal decision to protect the southern Korean Republic.

It is a grim but electrifying stand. We must pull no punches. The President has reared back and said in effect—look—we have tried everything to get along with you people—now you are looking for trouble and we are going to act.

I applaud the raw courage of the President in making promptly his momentous decision. Though I believe it would have been better if the President had first brought into consultation—as in the way of preserving our democratic processes—the leaders of both parties in the Congress. They were no farther away than the same telephone that called Secretary of State Acheson—General Omar Bradley—and the rest of the executive branch who attended the conference.

There was no excuse for not calling into consultation and for participation in the decision, the leaders of the Congress—both Republicans and Democrats. After the decision had been made, the Democrat leaders were called in and were told of it. The Republican leaders read of this momentous decision in the papers, except for Senators WHERRY and BRIDGES who were called to the White House to read the press release an hour or so before it was released.

However, I realize time was of the essence because of the collapse of the forces of the Korean Republic and the necessity of attempting to hold the Han River for the purpose of reorganizing these forces behind that vital strategic line.

In order that the American citizen may understand that the emergency was no trumped up affair—and for the record for some future President who may be tempted to use Mr. Truman's obvious unconstitutional action as precedent—for when you send troops in—it's war no matter what you call it—let us review the military facts that must of necessity face our President when he crossed the Rubicon—as it were—at 2 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, June 27.

Much of Korea at this time of year is flooded rice fields. The rest can be described as mountainous and difficult for military operations. The only means of transportation are the roads through those rice fields and mountains.

Even foot soldiers—let alone trucks, motor cars or tanks—find it hard to go any place except on those roads.

Seoul—not only the capital of the Southern Korean Republic, but the center of communication for the whole country is only 40 miles from the border.

The Han River—almost as wide and difficult to cross as our own mighty Mississippi—is only another 20 miles farther away. It was the best strategic line on which to stop the Communist invaders.

The army of the southern Korean Republic was hard pressed. Successful landings either had been made or were to be anticipated as a certainty on both coasts of the peninsula. If they were consolidated and expanded, the forces of the Southern Korean Republic would have collapsed completely.

The military situation and the strategic factors demanded immediate decision and prompt action by the President—if the Communist satellite army was to be stopped.

It was a situation of now or never. It was the first real overt act on the part of a Communist satellite against a free people—who were under our special and particular protection. Heretofore the Soviet conquests had been made by our gifts and by fifth-column methods.

The political effect on the free peoples of the world would be tremendous whatever we did.

If we failed to face up to the direct challenge to our position, it would largely destroy what benefits have come from the ECA, and the Atlantic Pact and the Turko-Grecian policy.

We either had to stop the Communist aggression in Southern Korea or we might as well have retired to the Western Hemisphere—and let western Europe with its steel plants and the oil of the Near East fall into Communist hands.

There have been other momentous acts by American Presidents infringing on their constitutional authority.

Historians list Polk, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin D. Roosevelt as those Presidents who have coldly and deliberately transgressed their constitutional limitations and authority.

I do not recall of any American President confronted with a decision of such magnitude requiring both immediate decision and the reversal of his Secretary of State.

It is to the President's credit that he didn't side-step or hesitate in action.

There can be only one foreign policy as of today—that is for each and every American citizen to back up to the extent of his abilities the President of the United States of America.

That backing up means that each of us has an obligation to work and produce in civilian life as our Armed Forces are bending every effort on the field of battle.

We must be willing to sacrifice and to support whatever measures may be necessary to increase our military power to a safe point.

That safe point is something of a mystery—perhaps a needless mystery.

I do know that we are below the military strength repeatedly recommended by the Chiefs of Staff.

For example, we are short in tanks. We have not made a new tank since the end of the war. We do not have enough aircraft to support our ground forces.

In all three services we do not have enough trained fighting men. None of the services are even up to the paper strength they are

supposed to possess. But the Army is unbelievedly short of trained and ready forces, to meet not only Korea, but any further developments.

Korea dramatizes the error we have made in becoming infatuated with new machines and gadgets as a way to win wars, or that we can win with air and sea forces alone.

No matter how good our weapons, we must have stout-hearted men to use them.

We have concentrated on scientific developments. Now is the time to transform the new models into production.

What we have got to face is that Korea is probably going to take more forces than we can spare now in our Regular Army.

If additional incidents call for our military support, we will be like Mother Hubbard, who went to the cupboard and found her cupboard was bare.

I do not see how our situation can mean anything else than an immediate increase in our armed strength and the revision upward by the Congress of the appropriations for our armed services.

The whole world is watching us. Our ability to work together may well be the demonstration that is necessary to acquire peace.

The Kremlin has sneered at us as a decadent democracy—despite the fact that it was the fruits of our production that saved Russia in the last war.

It will be the fruits of our labor that save us from the next war or, if war comes, from the fate of a conquered people.

Let there be no thinking that the Korean campaign will be a short one or an easy one.

The job of reestablishing the Southern Korean Republic will be a matter of a much longer time than was anticipated. It is taking more than the Air and Sea Forces originally contemplated. But long or short, we have set our hands to the plow and we must finish the job.

That is the way of national survival. That is the situation now confronting the American people.

We must prepare for the long pull.

As a result of two world wars in one generation, our natural resources have been materially reduced and our national debt materially increased.

Therefore, I believe Government economy—as well as unity—must be the watchword.

We must economize everywhere except on national defense so that in the hour of victory we do not lose our democratic processes through national bankruptcy.

Hence, I believe the President should:

1. Call on the Congress to pass the pending bills providing for Government reorganization according to the Hoover Commission's study and recommendations.

That proposed sweeping elimination of Government duplication and red tape will not only save money—but manpower.

2. Call on the leaders of both parties in the Congress to pare nonmilitary appropriations drastically. This is certainly a time when the river and harbor bill, for instance, must be pared to the bone.

I believe the President should say to the Congress that because of the existing emergency he is laying aside his own program for more Government hand-outs for the more pressing matter of national survival.

3. Stop all Federal projects and ask governors, mayors, county commissioners to suspend all except the most necessary projects and to tighten up all along the line in State, municipal, county, and even township spending.

We have a special interest in Korea, having liberated that nation, guaranteed its independence, and sponsored it in the United Nations as a sovereign state.

Korea is not only important as a point of our national honor. The stand taken by the United States has sounded the clarion call for liberty-loving peoples in the world.

After all, we couldn't keep on making empty promises and equally empty policies and then sit idly by as other people tested at will our sincerity.

Korea is a symbol that we will fight for the things we believe in.

In Korea we have two interests. First we are honor-bound to stand by the South Koreans. Second—and this, Americans can more readily understand—we are in a military, political, economic, and psychological fight for the freedom of the individual and the dignity of man as exemplified by the political philosophy of the system of government of the United States, and ultimately the very existence of the United States.

The outcome of the Korean war is far reaching. I believe our reaction caught the Kremlin off-guard. It means that they must weigh very carefully their next moves. It means we are not willing to abandon the Asiatic world to Moscow.

Certainly it has given hope to the free world, as the American people have risen to the occasion.

But it also means that we, our friends and allies, must get our guard up.

Korea is not the only issue. Who knows where the next blow may fall? Iran? Scandinavia? Indonesia? Italy? The Philippines? Germany?

Whatever the outcome of the Korean fight—and we are faced with pitting quite a small United States armed force against almost limitless Communist forces, but whatever happens there, we are now in it up to our necks.

The struggle is global, and we must prepare to meet it with all our means.

We must prepare ourselves immediately for a possibly colossal task. More and more peoples may be drawn in. Consider the stabilizing effect in the world if we go forward in national unity toward the stark threat we face.

In any event, we must strip for action. I hope the Korean war may yet be a short one. But long or short, it must be a conclusive one. A complete triumph of freedom and liberty.

Racial Prejudices Unpatriotic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the McKees Rocks Gazette, of McKees Rocks, Pa., for May 18, 1950:

RACIAL PREJUDICES UNPATRIOTIC

Another victory for true Americanism was recorded this past week when the American Bowling Congress rescinded a rule restricting membership to white males. Hereafter, as it should be, membership in the ABC will be based on a person's interest in bowling and not on the color of his skin.

Actions such as this are in keeping with the American tradition of fair play and further serve to give the lie to the Communist charges that we are a Nation of first and second class citizenships.

In connection with this, we urge as recommended reading an article in the current Saturday Evening Post, entitled "The Story of Jackie Robinson." It tells in vivid detail the way in which prejudice against the admission of Negro baseball players was broken down in the big leagues and the heartbreaking incidents Robinson had to overcome before establishing himself as one of the finest stars of the game.

Any kind of race prejudice is silly and idiotic and unworthy of Americans. Unfortunately, incidents of this kind pop up every once in a while—even in our own town. When they do, they usually serve as good propaganda fodder for the Communists.

We have said before and we repeat again that the way to judge a man or woman is not by the color of his skin, hair or eyes—but by the way he lives and acts toward his fellow human beings.

There are plenty of instances in the history of this country to prove that no one race or nationality of people are better or worse than any other.

We are unequivocally opposed to any type of race discrimination. If and when we hear of any such instance, we shall oppose it to the best of our ability.

What Price the Philippines?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include as part of my remarks an article by Gen. Bonner Fellers which appears in the July 12 issue of Human Events. This is an invaluable contribution to the thinking on our Far East problems and I recommend it to all of the Members:

Human Events, on May 24, reported grave concern in official Washington circles over the disturbing situation in the Philippines. It pointed out that criticism of the Manila Government follows a line suspiciously similar to that taken by certain left wing publications about the Chinese Nationalists before their defeat by the Communists.

These attacks on the rule of President Quirino emphasize corruption, the need for agrarian reform and the gravity of the rebellion of the Communist-led Hukbalahaps, described as an "agrarian reform movement." Following this particular emphasis on the Philippine situation by various American publications, other sections of our press have offered a rather different picture of the plight of our former possession.

What is the truth about the Philippines today? I have spent 8 years of my military career in the islands; watched the liberation from Japanese domination in 1944–45; and have since kept closely in touch with Philippine conditions. It is my hope to present a factual report on the condition of a people who value our friendship, and whose fidelity to us we should prize.

America must never forget the complete loyalty of the Filipinos to our cause when the Japanese attacked the Philippines in 1941, nor the fierce resistance made against the Japanese occupation in subsequent years. I saw Manila liberated—and destroyed in the throes of that liberation. Yet I never heard a Filipino complain, nor express regret for the stand which the Philippines made with us against a savage enemy. Today war flames in Korea and the world situation is grave. The United States needs friends. In the Philippines we have them, but they need our help.

II

The Filipinos are endeavoring to rise from the prostration of war. The Japanese destroyed most of the enterprises, utilities, and communications. What little was left stand-

ing we, in our retreat to Bataan or during the liberation, unavoidably destroyed. Agriculture was paralyzed principally because 4,000,000 water buffalo—the power plant for the rice paddy—were slaughtered. Eighty percent of the cities were burned to the ground.

Following the liberation, new, American-backed Philippine pesos were pumped into the local economy by our Government. As there was little to buy with the new money, price skyrocketed. Lawlessness, banditry, and the abandon of people released from the ravages of war did the rest. Corruption set in.

During the occupation the Japanese tortured to death many of the capable Filipino leaders. There has always been a shortage of leadership because until recently the Philippines never ran its own affairs.

It takes time, leadership, and discipline for a disorganized population, which had been armed clandestinely and which had suffered the tortures of war, to return to normal, peaceful life. For nearly 4 years the American Government had smuggled arms to guerrillas by submarine. We had encouraged sniping; putting firearms to use was a patriotic service. Widespread unemployment, impoverishment, and a habit of being careless with firearms all contributed to continued lawlessness after liberation. Much of the present disorder—attributed to the Communist Hukbalahaps—is due to this background.

III

Many charges of corruption in and out of government are well-founded. Corruption, however, is not confined to the Philippine Government, nor to China, to which the Philippines are compared. It is prevalent in the Far East and indeed we have not escaped the taint of corruption in the United States. Today we have two Congressmen in jail; a number of administration politicians are under fire or investigation. Less self-righteousness on the part of Americans is in order.

President Quirino's recent letter to all department heads in which he directed them to cleanse their departments of graft within 30 days or be subject to the "risk of separation from the service and to the penalty which the law prescribes" should bring improvement.

The Hukbalahap movement is a real menace. But its magnitude has been exaggerated and its agrarian reform aspect has been misrepresented. It is not true, as has been asserted, that this revolt is one of agrarian reformers against a stand-pat reactionary government.

After his election as President, Manuel Roxas instituted a policy of attraction toward the Huks by guaranteeing the tenants 70 percent of the crop they raised. It developed immediately, however, that agrarian reform was not the primary aim of Huk Communist leaders; their objective was—and is—to create chaos and overthrow the Government. After the war the Philippine constabulary—hastily gathered together and trained for police work only—was ill-prepared to deal with these Communist-led, experienced Huk outlaws.

In April of this year President Quirino turned the Huk job over to the armed forces of the Philippines. Ten battalion combat teams were organized especially to unlock Huk guerrilla resistance. But the armed forces are doing much more. Public and troop information sections are being trained; modern psychological warfare methods are being studied and implemented. Leaflets, distributed in Huk areas, are scientifically prepared and compelling in their appeal. Not all Huks are Communist; some were drafted forcibly; others are temporary bandits who plied their trade against the Japanese and who may return to normal life; others are criminal outlaws who will never surrender. Obviously, it would be wrong to eradicate the entire Huk rank and file by force. As Secretary of Defense Kangleon, on June 4, 1950, explained, the army has adopted a policy of using "force where force is unavoidable, and by extending good will where it will beget us good will."

The policy of combining the mailed fist with one of "attraction" is succeeding. A number of Huks with quantities of firearms have surrendered. Local people in Huk-infested areas are being won over by the Government, and no guerrilla movement can long survive without support of the local population. There is a shortage of military equipment among the battalion combat teams which, if supplied, would enable them to solve the Huk problem within a reasonable time—substantially within the year as promised by the Secretary of National Defense.

Not long ago, Mr. Tillman Durdin, New York Times reporter, spent a week with a unit of the Filipino Army serving in the Hukbalahap-infested areas in Luzon. He wrote: "Given political and economic stability in the country, I see no reason why the Hukbalahap can't eventually be cleaned up. I feel the Government thoroughly dominates the situation. There is still small-scale Huk activity over an extensive area, but there is no grave or widespread disruption of normal activity anywhere I visited."

IV

Although the Philippines is the richest land under the sun and blessed with almost unlimited natural resources of great strategic value, the domestic economy is today badly dislocated. In 1941, the Philippines purchased $1,000,000 worth of American goods. They were able to balance nicely this import with exports. But the war destroyed the means to produce and exports have fallen far below normal. The cost of purchasing the means to reestablish production is almost prohibitive. In 1948 the Philippines spent $257,000,000 in the United States, principally to accelerate their lagging production. This unfavorable trade balance depressed their economy to a dangerous level.

In addition to the hundreds of millions of dollars pumped into the Philippines by the American Armed Forces, our Government has paid $520,000,000 in war damage claims—enough to replace about 10 percent of the losses. Also, the Philippine Government has made $258,000,000 available for rehabilitation. The Philippine economy is starting, very slowly, to move in the right direction.

A free Philippines, economically sound, is an essential element in the security of our position in the Pacific. The Aleutians, Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, and the Philippines form a vast counter-reconnaissance screen off the coast of Asia. Through this chain of islands, entrance to and egress from the continent may be controlled. Possession of this screen by Red forces would deny all access to Asia from the Pacific; it would permit Red air and naval forces to control the ocean approaches.

On the other hand, if we hold the screen, from bases which the United States has already built, our air and sea power can sweep Asiatic coasts from Indonesia to the far reaches of the Arctic. The Philippines are the southernmost bastion of this screen, key to Asia and the Far East. Here is a friendly base—the anchor position in the line holding the Reds out of the Pacific. It is especially essential that the Formosa link of the chain remain in friendly hands. In war, were the Red Air Force to base on Formosa, the Philippines would be within easy air striking range. Our shipping routes to the Philippines would also be endangered.

The people of the United States must keep in mind that the Philippines is largely a Christian country whose people are devout and willing to fight for the same ideology which we are determined to preserve. Their loyalty has been tried and proven in war.

Whatever local disturbances President Quirino faces, the United States, in its own best interest, should cooperate in resolving them. It is not a question of American troops. It is a need for weapons, for officer training, and mutually beneficial economic aid.

The Philippines must not go the way of China.

Last of the Least Minority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, in 1936 a group of people in my State of Washington organized and incorporated the Children's Benevolent League of Washington, now one of the oldest organizations of its kind in the Nation. Its aim—to bring to the community a sense of its real responsibility to the forgotten children, the mentally deficient children, to throw even a pencil light of truth upon the misconceptions and misunderstanding surround this desolating problem. That they have done their job well is affirmed by the fact that the league now numbers 13 chapters with 5,000 parents, friends, and professional people working effectively and without fanfare.

It gives me sincere gratification to tell of the part these people in my State have taken in pioneering a field where fear, shame, and anguished secrecy have too long kept ignorance alive. Through their efforts perhaps society will grow kinder.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues and all who read this RECORD the following article, On Locusts, by the distinguished Mr. Richard H. Hungerford, director of the bureau for children with retarded mental development, and Children Limited, a graphic description of the problem of the mentally deficient and what is being done about it in the State of Washington:

ON LOCUSTS

(By Richard H. Hungerford)

Everywhere about us we see evidences of difference. Some like Rembrandt; some, Picasso. Some like Bach; some, boogie-woogie. Some like the spring, when the earth is lush and man is planting, when the clouds of the morning entice the heart, if not the feet. Some like the fall, when the lights are lit and the leaves are burning, when the gray geese cry overhead in the darkness and the heart comes home to Harper's, popcorn, and wrestling on television. There is a report of difference in religion, as well as of sex.

In tenement and Waldorf a few Maccabees still take their stand, knowing they must wait a thousand years for understanding. But hundreds of little men far more lonely—of all kinds, in all places, with differing problems—exchange their souls for safety and find it dust. On the dead-end streets of Greenwich Village and Sutton Place they wait afraid, not having dared not to be. Their young and their old look outward with empty eyes.

Before one door there is a Packard, before another a wheel chair. One house is jubilant, welcoming an heir; the next is desolate, weeping for its dead. And the heart cries, "Why?" Why war? Why loneliness? Why death? Why feeblemindedness? "I have kept Thy commandments"; why did this come to me? Why did this happen to my son?

Yet no answer is heard that satisfies the heart. Not from Euripedes or Isaiah or Confucius. Not from Shakespeare or Freud or Einstein. Perhaps the mind may find a reason; but no man is wise enough to understand the why of difference. " 'Justice is mine,' saith the Lord." But difference is man's.

Everywhere, however, we hear talk of sameness. "All men are created equal" it is declared. And at the ballot box and the subway rush, in Hiroshima and Coney Island it almost seems that way. Moreover, coming back from Staten Island on the ferry, as you see an unkempt bootblack lift his head to gaze at the Manhattan skyline—you know that these words of Jefferson are not mere snares for votes and popularity. But standing on the same boat with the hand of your idiot son in one of yours—with mingled love and distaste placing a handkerchief against his drooling mouth—you know that Jefferson's words are not easy to understand.

There is a difference in sameness. Perhaps the days of our years are for the bootblack. But assuredly the nights are for our idiot son.

Some of this talk of sameness is the talk of charlatans. An easy way to solve a problem is to say that it does not exist; ignorance and ignoring have a moral as well as a semantic affinity. By charlatans the complex, the boring, the disturbing are made simple by fiat. To charlatans all men want the same, all men are the same. In international relations, in industrial relations there is only victory or defeat; there is no common gain. In social welfare imbeciles are released from institutions to go home to loneliness and dependence, and there is no problem of crowded institutions. In education all children are promoted on the basis of age; and there is no need to tell parents children differ in ability.

There is a subtle form of laissez-faire in the doctrine of sameness. There is freedom to await the deluge. There is freedom to grow up ignorant even of the little one can learn. There is freedom to be laughed at and ravaged on some back street.

With the doctrine of sameness no one has to say "No." The leadership of the fearful is safe. No one needs to take a stand for the unpopular, the condemned, the idiot—for they do not exist. No one of account gets hurt. No one gets hurt—except the man, the woman, the child who is different. The majority is safe; only minorities are endangered. The most verbal pupils—perhaps being unacquainted with life's subtleties—make the schools' curricula; the least verbal adults—having taken no unambivalent stands—make the policies of nations. By paying lip service to the doctrine of sameness the curriculum makers and the policy makers lead the most of us—with sureness if not with safety—to the hydrogen bomb. But there is an umbrella for every Chamberlain.

A touch of snobbery, thinly disguised, hides behind all talk of sameness. He who does not prefer my necktie has poor taste. There is here something of opportunism, something of frontier rawness, some unleashed eagerness to exploit, some adolescent dislike of recognizing the unpleasant, some desire for black-and-white simple answers, some immaturity. In the Orient men do not talk of good luck lest it disappear. In the Occident men do not talk of difference lest it must be accepted—and lived with—and ministered unto.

"I don't believe in I. Q.'s," one man says. "The word 'idiot' should never be used," says another. "They must be given the same schooling," says a third. "They are not different; they are slower learners, not slow learners." "My child really is normal, she just got a poor start." "I heard of someone in another state who was cured of mental deficiency; I'll let my son alone, and he'll snap out of it." "No one with any heart would let his son go to an institution."

All are statements deserving of discussion. As long as there are human beings, there will be mistakes, there will be differences. We all must take for ourselves moments of hope—excursions into fantasy, whether of gardening for one tomato or dosing our children. It is possible to distinguish between faith in a cosmic eventual justice and a mundane injustice. We must not let an awareness of difference keep us from trying with everything that we have to eliminate it or ameliorate its unpleasantness. But in our desire to rid ourselves of the frustration of such a staggering responsibility, we must not forget that some of the different differ—differ so much that they need protection. We are our brother's keeper. We are our son's keeper. The word "keeper" has fallen upon evil days; but it comes of proud lineage.

Only the brave dare look upon the gray—upon the things which cannot be explained easily, upon the things which often engender mistakes, upon the things whose cause cannot be understood, upon the things we must accept and live with. And therefore only the brave dare look upon difference without flinching.

It is so much easier to put your faith in those who will promise cures or organization, in those who say your child really is not different, in those who say he plays the piano wonderfully (without adding that it is a comparative statement). It is so much easier to put your child within four walls and say he is going to school and getting an education. It is so much easier to take your child out of an institution and say that he is capable of maintaining himself independently in society.

It is so hard to say your child may grow up to be a dish washer—to work with him day after day for only slight gain in order that he may learn by sweat and tears what others pick up casually or pass by with disdain. It is so hard neither to demand more of him than that which he can do nor less than that of which he is capable. It is so hard to be without rancor toward God or envy toward the more fortunate and yet train your son, who has been so sinned against, to guard in drudgery the health of those who have so much. It is so hard to accept for one's son the ministry of dish washer. We could accept it so much more easily if it came only to us.

Two years ago I visited the home of some friends who have an imbecile son. And in one corner of their living room there was a beautiful old chest holding several pieces of antique china, much of it broken. And the mother, her hands twitching, said to me: "He broke so many things, you know."

The retarded break so many things. They are quick to break the relationship between a family and its neighbors. Oftentimes they break the faith between husband and wife—as each seeks the blame, as each would shoulder the responsibility. They break something of our friendship with our other children, asking them to have a sympathy, a helpfulnes, which untouched adults so often lack. The retarded break our faith in any easy concept of democracy. Sometimes they even break our faith in God. They make us beat our hands in helplessness against the Cosmos. What will happen to these children when we die?

Nor can I see that it will be different in our lifetime. Perhaps just around the corner there is some cure, some easier way for the retarded to learn and live. Perhaps society will grow kinder. Perhaps, whatever the advances society makes, the retarded will not remain the least of the last minority so that any gain is only comparative.

There are many both within and without the field who will advise building a program solely around hope. But I cannot do so. We must work for every great gain of which we can think, but we likewise must keep on working in a tiresome way for the little gains alone possible at present. With respect to mental retardation there is no way to run; in our despair, however, let us not stop creeping.

"They who would bring back the riches of the Indies must take out the riches of the Indies." They who bring dignity to living find dignity in life.

My office window looks out on a near-tenement street. In the main there are curtains awry at the windows; there are rusted fire escapes with half-filled milk bottles precariously perched on them. The pavement is littered with papers listlessly moving in the March dusk. And at the end of the street there is Bellevue, a city hospital. In general it is not pleasant.

Two apartments, however, are different. The same kind of fire escape breaks the view; the same dirty pavement is beneath. But in these apartments the windows are clean, the curtains are starched and white, the Venetian blinds are evenly drawn. And a light has been lit. They have met a common problem and found dignity.

So I think it must be with each one of us. This is our street. We can be ruined by it, or we can bring meaning to it and so to ourselves.

And perhaps that is the sameness for which our hearts long. All streets have grayness, at one end of every street there is a Bellevue. All problems are difficult; it always is hard to work in the half-light, the partially understood, which encompasses so much of all living. We cannot run away from life. We cannot pick up all the empty milk bottles or isolate all the derelicts. We must not judge harshly man—or God. We must be kindly. We must work with everything that we have for the betterment of the street where we are placed. And we must keep our windows clean and turn on the lights against the common twilight.

No man can say: "I will restore to you the years which the locusts have eaten." Yet whenever men and women face life with dignity, courage, and kindness, there I am persuaded the beauty of maturity, the maturity of incompleteness, will come. "See all nor be afraid."

"Of him to whom much has been given, much will be demanded." But it also has been said: "Out of every faithfulness, I have caused thee to be troubled."

Children Limited

Untold hundreds of thousands of children innocently stumble over the countless barriers placed in the way of normal growth and development by nature. These exceptional children fall victim to various crippling diseases, infections, congenital deficiencies, and so-called birth injuries that leave them physically and/or mentally handicapped.

Of all the children affixed on the cross of imperfection the least known and understood is the one whose central nervous system has become involved. This child is known as the mental deficient.

These are not to be confused with the mentally ill whose once sound minds have deteriorated like a cracked wall. These are the mentally deficient whose minds will never fully develop, like a wall left unfinished.

This child is doomed to live in a world of shadow. His body may be weak and twisted, or it may be strong and supple, but mentally

he cannot understand, control, repress, and inhibit as the normal child. Intellectually he will never mature. Yet he feels more like other children than not; he sees, he feels, he loves, and he wants.

ONE OUT OF FIFTY

As a Nation we are appalled by the terrifically large number of deaths caused by automobile accidents, but few of us realize, each year this figure is exceeded by the number of mentally deficient children who are born.

It is generally conceded that 2 percent of the population is mentally deficient, ranging from the high grade and borderline deficient to the severely retarded.

NO FAMILY IS IMMUNE

Mental deficiency is no respecter of people. It is found in every race, in every environment, in the country as well as the city. Its blight falls upon the family of bankers and laborers, of professors and illiterates. The mentally deficient may stem from superior as well as poor stock.

It could happen in your family.

IT'S YOUR PROBLEM

If the mentally deficient are slow to learn of the world about them, it is certainly true the world has been slow to learn of the mentally handicapped.

Too often ignored and misunderstood by the community, the mentally deficient children become constant sources of anguish and trouble to themselves, their families, and the neighborhood.

Those able-bodied among them may find themselves in school and unable to keep pace. They become the victims of pranksters. Because of their inability to distinguish certain social values they are easily exploited and perhaps led into delinquent activities. Those unable to venture from the home become a particular emotional drain upon the family and contribute to its eventual disintegration. Financial burdens imposed by special care invariably takes part in the complete demoralization of the family group.

The effect of a mentally deficient child upon his normal brothers and sisters cannot be ignored. Their educational and emotional development is greatly endangered by the presence of the retarded child.

No family can for a sustained period of time maintain the physical and emotional stamina let alone the financial resources to rear a subnormal child without outside help.

IT'S A COMMUNITY PROBLEM

The majority of mentally deficient children can be provided for in the home if the community demonstrates intelligent and sympathetic understanding, giving assistance in the form of home-training programs, special school classes, and tolerance for the child and his family.

But there remain thousands of children for whom home care is an impossibility. For these the community demands institutional care.

WORLDS IN SLOW MOTION

The State of Washington maintains two schools for the mentally deficient. Lakeland Village, located in eastern Washington at Medical Lake, has been in existence since 1907. Rainier State School, located in the western part of the State at Buckley, was founded in 1939 for the children of western Washington.

The schools are worlds in slow motion, geared as best they can to provide the greatest amount of happiness and joy to those entrusted to their custody. In the schools the children are recognized for what they are and are not derided for what they are not. Psychological, educational, sociological, recreational, and medical departments are functioning. Every effort is made to see that the children are not allowed to dawdle in idleness; every child is given an opportunity to receive training to develop his abilities to a maximum.

For the more capable child there is a program of academic, industrial and farm training under special leadership that aids in the rehabilitation of as many as possible to useful citizenship. For the middle grade of defect who is incapable of adaptation to productive service there is a program of training and recreation to provide the child contentment, a good home, and opportunities in harmony with his stage of development. For the severely retarded, either physically, mentally, or socially, there is given humane and tender care.

Under effective administration the schools have become recognized as among the best of their kind. They are performing a magnificent task. But it is at heartbreaking odds.

TOO LITTLE AND TOO LATE

Residence halls are in danger of being overcrowded to indecent proportions. Lakeland Village is caring for 1,500 persons. The population of Rainier State School is 1,250, with a normal capacity of 1,040.

The supersaturation of the schools spotlights the lack of sufficient attendant personnel. Seventy percent of the children in the schools are entirely dependent upon others. This necessitates a high attendant patient ratio. Insufficient operating budgets have forced low pay standards with the attending evil of not being able to obtain enough trained and competent personnel.

Not only the adequate care of the children has become a problem under these conditions, but the reduction in operating budgets has also precluded the hiring of a highly trained technical staff, the type of staff required to meet the challenge of training these children to their highest level of performance.

THE CHILDREN'S BENEVOLENT LEAGUE

The Children's Benevolent League is not a group engulfed in their common misfortune, but an organization operating as an effective liaison between the schools for the mentally deficient, the Department of Public Institutions, the legislature, and the people. They are promoting the idea that the schools are a part of, not apart from, the community.

TOWARD PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING

Too often the public is interested in mental deficiency only if it is of a bizarre, socially dangerous, or pathological nature. It is seldom of a dramatic nature. The care and training of the deaf, the blind, and the crippled are taken for granted. The Children's Benevolent League seeks to break down the remaining suspicion and ignorance with which mental deficiency is held.

THE DARKEST CORNER

The State schools should be more than a home, a school, and a hospital. They should also be a laboratory devoted to the study of the causes, treatment, and prevention of mental deficiency. Psychological, educational, and medical research in this little explored field is urgent. Mental deficiency is the darkest corner of medicine today. No laboratory is too costly if it succeeds in making a single dent in the problem of prevention. Not only will it save thousands upon thousands in the taxpayers' money, but it will save millions in human tears.

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The immediate aims and objectives of the Children's Benevolent League are:

Provide for all the children requiring care now by expansion of the physical facilities at Rainier State School and Lakeland Village.

Work for standards of employment and training of school personnel, based on requirements set by the American Association on Mental Deficiency.

Educate the public through a speakers' bureau and educational films and publications.

Present a need for an independent mental health commission, and recommend a transfer of the schools from the Department of Public Institutions to the Departments of Health and Public Instruction.

Interest the University of Washington Medical School and Washington State College in instituting a research program into the causes, prevention, and alleviation of mental deficiency.

Organize a national federation of parents' groups with aims similar to the Children's Benevolent League.

THE CRY IN THE NIGHT

Every parent becomes attuned to the needs of their children. Their cry in the night initiates an immediate response of concern, protection, and love.

We, as a community, must attune ourselves to heed the cry of the thousands of mentally deficient children in Washington, for without your help this cry will go unanswered.

These are our children. We ask for your understanding and your support of our program, a program which will give Washington's mentally deficient children a chance to live the fullest lives of which they are capable.

Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the July 1950 edition of the International Teamster:

TRUTH ABOUT ANTILABOR LAWS—FOUR YEARS AGO, THE LATE SENATOR WALSH OF MASSACHUSETTS DELIVERED A SCORCHING BLOW AT CASE BILL; HIS LOGIC APPLIES TO T–H ACT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The late Senator David I. Walsh of Massachusetts was a great friend of organized labor. He fought for labor in the Senate as he had for the worker from the time he was a young man. One of his most moving speeches in behalf of labor was made in the Senate on May 23, 1946, in the debate on H. R. 4908, popularly known as the Case bill, to regulate labor disputes. The words of Senator Walsh on labor and labor's problems are as vital to labor today as they were 4 years ago. All members are urged to read Senator Walsh's speech.)

In May 1946 the United States Senate was engaged in debate on a labor-disputes measure. A bill had been reported out by the House of Representatives and a substitute brought forward by Congressman FRANCIS CASE of South Dakota.

The debate on the bill in the Senate brought out bitterness on the part of both antilabor and prolabor Senators. The bill was the forerunner of the Taft-Hartley measure which was enacted by the Eightieth Congress.

One of the outstanding speeches made in the debate on the bill in the Seventy-ninth Congress was delivered by the late Senator David I. Walsh (Democrat) of Massachusetts. His speech delivered after midnight on May 23, 1946, is an excellent statement of the progress made by labor and a tribute to organized labor for the advances made in the last 60 years.

Excerpts from Senator Walsh's speech are reprinted here as observations which are as timely today as they were 4 years ago when first made:

"Mr. President, at this late hour after midnight I hesitate to take the time of the Senate to make some observations that the unusual proceedings, the exciting and tense debate on this issue, have prompted. I had not intended to address the Senate at this time, but I cannot longer remain voiceless when the deep-seated convictions I entertain over what is transpiring here seek expression."

UNUSUAL EXPERIENCE

"Mr. President, the Senate has in recent days been passing through a most unusual experience. I have been here a long time, and I have never seen the proceedings in the Senate assume the extraordinary character they have during this debate and especially tonight. We have seen an antilabor coalition ride roughshod over a minority to the extent that even a motion to lay on the table has been made against amendments in the interests of, and proposed by friends of, the workers, without permitting even debate or a vote on their merits. It is clear that there is a solid bloc of Senators, including members of both parities, determined to vote for almost any amendment restrictive of the rights of the workers. Of course, they urge that their purpose is to correct the excesses of labor unions, but that does not change the fact that their opposition is against every man and woman who belongs to labor organizations or who may choose to join them in the future. The atmosphere of the Senate appears to be charged with a determination to pass legislation impetuously and primarily for punitive ends. Calm and wise judgment has disappeared. As the roll is called, the question seems to be not so much on the merits of individual amendments but on a determined intention to classify Senators into two categories—one, the representatives of the employers, and the other, the representatives of the workers. By innuendo, if you happen to be a Senator championing the cause of the workers, you are a strike sympathizer and should receive the condemnation and contempt that some people hold at the present time toward John L. Lewis."

HOSTILE AND DETRIMENTAL

"Instead of the ordinary procedure of discussing and analyzing the problems that affect labor and industry, of trying to prevent or remove the abuses that exist in both groups, the issue here is to seize the present opportunity to curb and restrict the rights now enjoyed by the workers. Senators who heretofore have boasted of their loyalty to the working class are gleefully rushing to vote for amendments that every man and woman in every labor organization in the country considers hostile and detrimental to the rights of the working class. Senators who were elected as friends of labor have succumbed to the hysterical emotions of the hour, and have joined the procession supporting the antilabor amendments. For the first time I have witnessed an attitude of indifference, if not real hostility, toward any expressions of sympathy with, or support of, the causes that Senators heretofore have been proud to advocate. There is a subtle attempt here to imply that those who speak against these repressive measures are either disloyal or wild-eyed labor agitators.

"It is to be noted that every amendment to place management and trade associations in the same status as labor organizations, in regard to management of their group funds or reports of their joint membership, has been rejected. It appears to be a determination to punish labor, and labor only.

"In contrast with the situation in this chamber in regard to the legislation at hand, I recall the long struggle of the workers for social justice, for the opportunity of obtaining a decent livelihood, for a fair and just share of the earnings resulting from their toil.

"I recall that in my own State it took 60 years of agitation to enact reasonable child-labor legislation. I can remember as a youth scenes in my own community where I saw young girls, 13 and 14 years of age, going out in the darkness of the early morning to work in the cotton mills for 10 and 12 hours, returning in the darkness of the evening. I have heard from their lips stories of how they ran every inch of the way from their homes to the mill gates because they were frightened. Who brought about the changes that have resulted in today's improved working conditions? Who has accomplished the shortening of work hours and the improvement of working conditions? It was done through the organization of the workers, through unions, and other associations that they set up for using their collective power to influence employers who were often of the absentee landlord class."

WORKERS GET CREDIT

"I recall, in the eighties, the enthusiasm with which the workers received the establishment of the organization known as the Knights of Labor, and their espousal, under difficulties and persecutions, of the cause for shorter working hours, better wages, and better living conditions. Much progress has been made, but the credit is due in large measure, if not in full measure, to the unions and labor organizations that the workers themselves set up.

"I recall witnessing—I can picture some of them now—many of them I knew by name—women 75 and 80 years of age—trudging the streets in summer and winter, year in and year out, from the mills to their homes, with bent backs and gnarled fingers due to ceaseless toil over the spindles, looms, and machines in the factories and workshops of New England. Who lifted their voices and used their efforts to help bring about better living conditions, shorter hours of work, and the securing of safety appliances? The workers' organizations."

FIGHT FOR SAFETY

"I remember as a young lawyer prosecuting cases in the courts for damages sustained by employees—one a young woman whose scalp was torn from her head because the hair become entangled in the machinery due to the lack of proper safeguards. I remember other cases seeking compensation for loss of arms, for loss of fingers, and other disabilities. In all of them I found raised in defense the doctrine of 'assumption of risk'—that the employees assume the risk involved in their work. These and other victims of industrial injuries were often obliged to turn to public charity or to members of their families for support. Sometimes when a father was seriously incapacitated the children were forced to leave school and go to work to support him.

"Who led the fight and brought about legislation that eliminated the doctrine of 'assumption of risk' and make it possible for these victims of industrial life to become other than a public charge? It was labor, organized labor, union labor.

"The long and at times discouraging struggle made by labor organizations, against what seemed insurmountable obstacles, to elevate the workers from almost a state of servitude to the improved position that they now hold through legislation requiring safety appliances, better working conditions, and shorter working hours, is an inspiring one. It is indeed a story of the glorious victory of human rights."

A GREAT DEBT

"Mr. President, have we forgotten the obligation, the great debt we owe to the workers of this country? All the vast wealth we have accumulated has come from the toil, sweat, and blood of the workers.

"Their strength, their vigor, their health, their labors, have opened up the vast wealth that the Almighty planted in the bowels of the earth for our benefit. They have tilled the fields so that we might have the rich harvests with which we are blessed. They have exhausted themselves in the workshops, factories, and industries of the country. How meager has been their share of the prosperity that has resulted from their toil and sacrifice."

NOT IMMUNE TO FAULT

"Have they no claim to our sympathy and assistance? Must we be heedless of their social advancement and welfare because some leader may have misjudged his obligation to them or his responsibility to the public? Labor leaders are not immune from the faults, failure, and mistakes or even the misuse of power which is observable in other phases of life.

"Even those in the public service, whom we sometimes call politicians, make serious mistakes and fail to promote the public welfare.

"I have witnessed the struggle of the workers for recognition of their rights up to this very hour, and I regret to see in this Chamber efforts to restrict the progress that has been made—efforts that indicate a lack of sympathy, a distrust of the workers' organizations, a hindrance to further progress—efforts to place limitations on their rights to organize and to engage in collective bargaining.

"Mr. President, I regret to see in this Chamber what seems to me to be a determination to turn back, an attempt to undo some of the helpful things that have been accomplished through years of effort. Indeed, I think I observe here a spirit of passion, a spirit of intense hostility, a desire to get even with someone. We are acting as if we were looking for blood. I fear, instead of helping to end strikes and bring about peaceful and harmonious conditions, we may be moving toward more turmoil, more strikes, and more hostility between capital and labor.

"Mr. President, not all employers are petitioning for this legislation. There are many, very many who deal fairly and justly with labor. Many of them have a sincere and deep sympathy for their workers. Many of them have often voluntarily expressed this in bonuses, pensions, and in various other benefits to the workers. Let us counsel with these representatives of the employers and we will find them cooperative. Not one of them will ask us to repeal collective bargaining or the right of the worker to strike.

"Hundreds, yes thousands, of disputes and differences between labor and industry have been peacefully and successfully adjusted. Because there have been a few failures and hardsnips have resulted and the public interest has been jeopardized does not, in my opinion, justify the putting of all labor in a straitjacket."

KEY TO HARMONY

"One would be led to believe, listening to the debate here, that there is no class consciousness on the side of management; that it is all on the side of labor. In my opinion, there is as much class consciousness on the one side as on the other, and in my opinion, some labor unions remain miltant because, forced to deal with a hostile employer, they believe that the labor union can survive in no other way.

"In the final analysis, it is my opinion that the sympathetic attitude of management toward unions is the key to sound industrial relations, and, if the employers wholeheart-

edly accept the philosophy of collective bargaining, our labor unions would rise to the responsibilities which they have and fulfill their rich promises.

"Mr. President, let us think of the workers other than John L. Lewis as we discuss this legislation. There are millions of them who are law abiding and who seek and desire industrial peace. Men are fallible and so are leaders, whether they are in the labor, the industrial, or in the political life. Rash and extreme measures that affect and injure the welfare of the people are taken even at times by men in public service.

"Let us remember there is another day coming when the present labor turmoil will have subsided. Industrial peace will come, and the workers, in my opinion, desire it and want it just as much as management."

A PLEA FOR CALMNESS

"Let it not be said of us when our record is scanned that in the heat of passion we attempted to undo the progress that labor has made through its long uphill hike for industrial freedom, that we have in a moment of excitement sought to abridge and reduce the rights of workers.

"Let us consider these measures calmly. I cannot emphasize too strongly the fact that no amendment proposed here by the coalition can in any manner affect or change the present strike situation. Nor could these coalition amendments, were they the law today, have prevented the present strikes. The amendments are proposed now in the belief that the present hysterical state of mind will give the support that the amendments would not get in normal times. In fact, some of the proponents of these amendments concede this.

"These proposals will result in arousing antagonism and resentment of all workers, who are innocent parties to present labor disturbances, when they know the motive behind these proposals and their true significance."

Stand Up and Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a highly informative article written by Frank Chodorov, and appearing in Human Events, on the work being done to smear certain organizations said to be indulging in lobbying activities critical of the present administration.

It would appear that the crime of lèse majesté is now a part of the Fair Deal code and that they are determined to punish it.

The article follows:

STAND UP AND FIGHT

(By Frank Chodorov)

The fellows who shout for free enterprise should have learned an important lesson from a recent headline story in the New York Times.

The special committee of the House of Representatives investigating lobbying activities issued subpenas designed to force three organizations to disclose the names of their financial backers. The subpenas were directed at the executive officers. Two of them had already been cited for contempt by the committee, for failure to produce lists of the contributors, and one has been convicted and sentenced to serve 4 months for his obstinacy.

The three organizations are: Committee for Constitutional Government, National Economic Council, Constitutional Education League. Their business is pamphleteering; it is not even asserted by the investigating committee that they are engaged in any other activities, according to the news story (of May 27).

The literature put out by them is openly and unequivocally critical of the policies of the present administration. They urge less Government spending, less taxation, less political intervention in private affairs; in fact, less government. Many of their pamphlets end up with the usual plea to "write your Congressman." Thus, they frankly admit the purpose of influencing legislation, as charged by the Democratic chairman of the committee. They hope to do so by marshaling public opinion behind the legislation they advocate.

Regardless of the merits or demerits of these organizations' work—and this comment is not written in commendation or criticism—such activity has not yet become illegal in this country. It is not yet subversive to oppose the party in power. The crime of lèse majesté has not yet been written into the Democratic code.

But, the pinpricking of critical literature is decidedly annoying to the "ins," and they are seeking relief in the lobby law, the purport of which is to expose to public view the interests plugging for legislation from which they hope to profit. In the present instance, there is not even the suggestion that the organizations are after some special privilege for their membership.

In fact, the chairman of the committee that issued the subpenas denies any intention of looking into the activities of the organizations. Perhaps he is afraid the organizations might grab the opportunity to get their propaganda into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if questioned about it. However, according to the chairman, all the committee wants is the lists of contributors and the amounts contributed. The question is, Why do the "ins" want the information and why is it withheld?

The answer is all too obvious: The bureaucracy has at its disposal numerous legal and departmental means of annoying its annoyers, so as to silence them, and the supporters of these organizations are fearful of such reprisal measures. Business is sufficiently beset with the snooping bureaucratic agents these days, and Government lawyers—to justify their jobs—are quick to fix up nuisance-value cases. Then, too, business is entirely too dependent on tax-money to thumb its nose at Government; dividends and Government spending are too closely related.

Taking everything into consideration, those who are spending money in the hope of directing public opinion against the political trend deem it wise to do so incognito.

II

The bureaucrat, however, is not to be warded off by pulling down the blinds; he has fangs and claws and, beast of prey that he is, he puts these to his use without inhibition.

That is the lesson that the forces opposed to the socialization of American life seem incapable of learning. They do not see, or will not admit, even to themselves, that the relations between society and the state are no longer in equilibrium, that the state is in the ascendancy and intends to become top boss. If the state is to be stopped, it will be only by recognizing it as an enemy, and one with which you cannot do business without expecting to be destroyed.

Unless this fact is admitted, and met with courage, the institution of private property in this country will go the way it went in Russia or England, or in Hitler's Germany. The only possibility of saving the institution is by way of an all-out, knock-down fight with the forces of centralization. That kind of fight calls for leadership that is not afraid of a bloody nose; certainly not the kind that hides behind an executive secretary.

Socialism made headway only because its proponents never counted consequences. They not only chipped in all their pennies, but they stood up and proudly proclaimed their faith. They suffered derision for their doctrine, they went to jail for it. They got what they wanted because they fought for it.

Capitalism, on the other hand, has been strangely apologetic and timid. A few of its votaries, hidden in ivory towers, point out that private property is the necessary condition of production, that production and progress are synonyms, and that abolition of private property is always followed by a decline in human values. The practitioners of capitalism, on the other hand, ignorant of their own philosophy, are ready to resort to compromise and appeasement whenever their position is attacked. They have even admitted, in one way or another, the charge of thievery made against capitalism by doctrinaire Socialists.

Pusillanimity is probably the inevitable consequence of easy living. Having found a comfortable adjustment in life, one loses the will to fight, and is quick to make concessions that do not too seriously threaten that adjustment. Coolies and slaves are like that, and the capitalist is made of the same stuff.

But it should be evident that further compromise now means something more than sharing profits with the bureaucrat. Every concesssion hastens the ultimate extinction of capitalism, and the ultimate is only a generation away. The drive of the power-crazed bureaucrat toward the abolition of private property is in full momentum—there is no question about that—and with the next "emergency" he will have achieved his purpose. Now is the time to fight, not conciliate.

III

The arrogance and impudence of the bureaucrat ought to convince the forces of private property that an understanding with him, based on any known principle, is impossible. In the news item above referred to the staff report of the investigating committee is quoted as follows:

"The Committee of Constitutional Government is one of the heaviest spending lobbies on record. Its filings under section 305 of the [Lobby] act set out expenditures of $1,571,240.72 for the 38 months that the act has been in effect. This is an average of $40,000 a month."

Peanuts and fiddlesticks. Every hour of the day the agencies of the Government spend more than that monthly average to influence legislation, and the legislation they plug for is to lengthen their tenure, increase their appropriations, better their emoluments, strengthen their hold on the public purse. According to Postmaster General Donaldson, who wants more money to improve the position of his Department, last year's taxpayer was milked of $19,000,000 to cover cost of mailing Government propaganda. What was the cost of printing it? Or clerk hire?

The biggest, most pernicious, most unscrupulous, and entirely selfish lobby in Washington is the Government. It is at work all the time; it has nothing else to do. Its list of contributors includes every man, woman, and child in the country. And yet it has the effrontery to point the finger of scorn at an organization that digs up a piddling $40,000 a month for the printing

and distribution of literature; mostly, in the opinion of this commentator, rather innocuous literature.

You can hardly blame the bureaucrat for his arrogance. His opposite number, the prudent, parsimonious capitalist, hiding comfortably behind an organizational smoke screen, does not arouse much admiration. Who was it who said that nice people deserve to lose?

IV

If the institution of private property is to be saved, it needs bold, uncompromising, and intelligent championship. It needs leaders who put principle above profits, ideals above convenience. It needs men who, like the signers of the Declaration of Independence, are willing to risk their necks for what they know to be right.

Above all things, capitalism needs an intelligent and forthright press. It is interesting to note that long before socialism got hold of the country's tax fund, its lean and hungry advocates maintained vigorous, well-edited dailies, weeklies, and monthlies. They were widely read; that they had influence is evidenced by the current of legislation this past 20 years.

Capitalism is too poor to support anything with pretensions to character and influence. It has virtually no press.

While capitalism snoozed in comfort, socialism got its foot into the door of our educational system, edged its body in, and now has taken over the entire establishment. For nearly three decades the disciplines taught in our schools of higher learning have taken on a collectivistic hue, so that the graduates are completely unaware of the philosophy of individualism underlying the capitalistic economy. They simply know nothing about it, can't recognize its phrases when they hear them. Our schools need a complete overhauling if capitalism is not to become a lost art and a dead language.

The job is entirely too big for the few organizations that must confine their efforts, for lack of funds, to the inadequate job of issuing pamphlets. The best brains obtainable, including those now concentrating on the making of money, must be put to the fight. Above all, there must be an awareness that capitalists have nothing to lose but the chains that are tightening about them.

Aluminum Workers Protest Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution, Aluminum Workers Protest Imports, recently adopted by the International Council of Aluminum Workers. The resolution follows:

Whereas it is the prime objective of all organized labor to protect and further the interests of all its members and especially so in its constant fight to maintain and increase full employment, higher wages, and better working conditions; and

Whereas to fulfill this initial obligation labor must continually remain alerted and ready to thwart any and all threats contrary to these principles in the interests of the general welfare of our membership; and

Whereas a very serious situation has evolved and matured within the aluminum industry without too much protest or publicity on the part of this International Council of Aluminum Workers or its affiliated unions, and if left unhampered in its present state it is certain to more drastically effect present and anticipated employment of our members and most assuredly has and will continue to retard wage standards and good working conditions; and

Whereas this unwholesome situation is direct result of tremendous imports of Canadian aluminum produced under inferior wage rates and substandard working conditions; and

Whereas this flood of Canadian-produced aluminum imports is a serious threat to the future welfare of our domestic producers and our membership and made possible only under the present very low tariff rates; and

Whereas there is a current influential movement afoot to cause these tariffs to be further reduced and if so, is destined to almost totally eliminate our identity in the American aluminum-production field; and

Whereas this source of Canadian competition was created and made possible during World War II emergency conditions, financed and paid for by the American taxpayers through loans made this Canadian monopoly and never was it anticipated or expected to favor or succor this project in peacetime to the entire detriment of our American aluminum producers and our American workers: So, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this International Council of Aluminum Workers, in convention assembled, in fulfillment of its objectives publicly go on record in voicing its opposition to the present importations of foreign aluminum production and further this International Council of Aluminum Workers be instructed to appeal to the appropriate legislative representatives or legislative bodies and a copy of this resolution be sent to the president of the American Federation of Labor, a copy to the President of the United States, a copy to the Subcommittee To Investigate the Effect of Foreign Imports on Unemployment of the Committee on Labor and Education, and a copy to O. R. Strackbein, Chairman of the National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy.

The Issue in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, last spring an American friend brought me the following copy of a speech he had heard given on February 7, 1950, by Dr. Chen Chih-mai, counselor of the Chinese Embassy in Washington, at the American University in Washington. The speech was delivered extemporaneously, but at the suggestion of members of the audience, it was put in written form. It is even more useful now than when given, because events in Korea have forced to American attention the situation in China in such a way that people now may be willing to look at the facts about communism there, instead of the distorted propaganda about it. It is too bad that it takes us until 1950 to learn what the Chinese have known and have been warning us about communism since 1927:

THE ISSUE IN CHINA

Mr. President and gentlemen, during my sojourn in the United States I have always been deeply impressed by the lively interest which the American people show toward China. We are now again in the midst of a great debate. If there is one idea common to all sides, it is that the Chinese situation is extremely complicated.

I submit that the Chinese question is basically very simple.

The present danger in China and the Far East is simply the manifestation of Soviet imperialistic aggression against China during the postwar period.

Beginning from September 1949, it was my good fortune to serve on the Chinese delegation to the fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. On November 25, 1949, China's chief delegate to the United Nations stated:

"Moscow has made, out of world communism and world imperialism, one new poisonous chemical compound. It may be called commu-imperialism or imp-communism. The poisonous strength of the new compound vastly exceeds the strength of either simple communism or simple world imperialism, taken separately. It is as revolutionary in the political sphere as atomic energy is in the physical sphere. If civilization is to be saved, a coordinated plan of world defense must be made."

In order fully to grasp the underlying significance of this new poisonous compound, allow me to begin by dispelling certain misconceptions about it.

To begin with, the Communist Party in China, created in 1921 by the Third International, is not native to the Chinese soil. It is a subversive apparatus imported from the U. S. S. R. This is made plain by hundreds and thousands of documents, of which the following quotation from Mao Tse-tung, the leader of the Communist Party in China, is at once the most categorical and authoritative:

"According to the constitution of the Chinese Communist Party, all who recognize the constitution and rules and program of the Communist International and the * * * Chinese Communist Party may become party members. * * * The Chinese Communist Party was born with the help of the Communist International; it grew up under the guidance of the Communist International, and the Chinese revolution developed under the guidance of the Communist International. The Chinese Communist Party and its central committee, with the exception of the two short periods, have been loyal to the guidance of the Communist International. * * * To carry out the international line and to be loyal to the executive committee of the Communist International is to guarantee the success of the Chinese revolution." (Mao Tse-tung, Chinese Communist handbook on party organization.)

Scholars of Communist movements and Soviet foreign policy, such as David Dallin and Martin Ebon, have proved in their painstaking research that the Communist Party in China has during the past 30 years followed every twist and turn of Comintern policies. Their conclusions are also fully supported by a special (Bolton) report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives issued in 1948. I quote the following passage from this report:

"For many years the most important single test of unqualified Communist discipline has been the following of zigzags in the world-wide party line. This has been the test that has distinguished heretics against world communism from its loyal followers. It is the test that has combed out the present tried and proven leaders. In 1935, when the Comintern adopted the popular-front line, the Chinese Communists followed it. From 1937 to 1939 Moscow supported the Chinese National Government against Japan, and the Chinese Communists loyally played their part in the united front. From 1939 to 1941

Moscow referred to the war in Europe as an imperialist war and adopted an isolationist position, while the Chinese Communists slackened their efforts against Japan and intensified their efforts to secure their own power. After June 22, 1941, the imperialist war became the war for freedom and democracy, both in Moscow and in Yenan. After Stalingrad the Chinese Communists resumed their independent drive for power in China. In 1945, when Moscow made a treaty of friendship with China, the Communists became quite docile for a few months, and in 1946 when it became clear that the United States would not, for the time being, underwrite the National Government, the Communists moved promptly into open civil war. No Communists in the world have better standing."

This policy of slavish obedience to Moscow was being continued in subsequent developments. The Chinese Communists have denounced the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall plan and the North Atlantic Pact, in practically identical words to those used by Moscow and its satellites. They have denounced Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia as a traitor when he broke with the Cominform. They have vigorously supported religious persecution in the countries behind the iron curtain. They have rushed to recognize Ho Chih-minh, the Communist insurgent in Indochina.

Above all, they have leveled invective at the United States, calling every American act of commission or omission regarding China, under whatever circumstances, as measures of "dollar diplomacy," diabolically contrived to enslave the Chinese people. General Wedemeyer and General Chennault, who helped us in our war against the Japanese, were branded as "American imperialists." So was Gen. George C. Marshall. And so was every other American in China. The Communists in China have been in the midst of a "Hate America" campaign ever since the war, just as the east Germans are now launching such a campaign. You need not be reminded of the indignities to which American consular officials in Shanghai, Mukden, and Peiping were subjected during recent months.

These facts all point to one conclusion: The Communist movement in China, far from being a native peasant revolt, as its apoligists sometimes picture it to be, has always been and remains an arm of Soviet imperialism. It is a cog of the gigantic world-wide subversive machine, with its nerve center in Moscow, serving but one purpose—the military, political, and economic expansion of the Soviet Union.

One of the most tragically erroneous notions is to the effect that this so-called cold war, this postwar contest between the U. S. S. R. and the free world, is a war of ideologies and not power and strength. This line is followed, for instance, by Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick, who is one of three experts to advise the State Department on far eastern policy. Mr. Fosdick says in an article recently published:

"What confronts us (in China) is a war not with armaments but with ideas * * *. Those who talk of arms and a display of power as the principal counters in the game misunderstand what the game is about. Arms undoubtedly have their place, but we are up against a set of ideas, and ideas cannot be stopped with bombs or battleships."

The idea behind this passage is just a variation of the often repeated dictum "You cannot shoot an idea with a bullet." It follows, therefore, that those who hold such views would advise the countries of the free world to fight the Communist ideology with the democratic ideology, to conduct some form of psychological warfare in order to win the people over from the Communists. The more radical of these advocates would say that the fight against communism, like charity, should begin at home, and that unless and until democracy in the free countries is made perfect, its appeal would be to that extent limited. They would equate victory over communism with reforms at home.

As an illustration of how fantastically astray this line of thought can lead you, I would like to quote certain passages from an article by Prof. Nathaniel Peffer, of Columbia University. Professor Peffer's views are particularly interesting to me because he is known as an expert in the Far East in general, and in China in particular. Professor Peffer believes that—

"As things go now, in the first instance the Communists can be expected to win in a large part of Europe and Asia. * * * The Communists are more likely to be successful, bringing with them, presumably the Russians."

What can be done to reverse this trend? "It can be reversed," Professor Peffer thinks, "only when we array against the only form of totalitarianism now functioning, which is Russian communism, a doctrine of democracy which has been revitalized and men who genuinely believe in that kind of democracy."

In more concrete terms, Professor Peffer thinks that America should encourage "the third force both in Europe and the Far East. But for that to come about, America must first divest itself of many of its present allies in Europe and the Far East, even at the risk of momentary advantage to the Russians."

And which are the allies which Professor Peffer proposes should be discarded? One would have thought that there are few. But no. "Everywhere in the world," Professor Peffer writes, "we appear to be giving aid and comfort to those who * * * desire only to return Europe to the status of the past, meaning the preservation of their own privileges."

These include "the financial and commercial oligarchy of Greece," "the industrial barony of Italy and France," as well as the "reaction" in many European, Latin American and Far Eastern nations.

The third force championed by Professor Peffer, Blum's followers in France, Nenni's in Italy, the Socialists in Austria, is unfortunately nowhere in power, and so France, Italy, Austria, China, Greece, Turkey, and many others must be thrown overboard even at the risk of momentary advantage to Russia. In fact his enthusiasm for the third force is so profound that he thinks "the Marshall plan * * * could be operated so as to encourage and fortify middle-of-the-road groups." That this constitutes direct intervention in the internal affairs of other countries, and is a violation of the United Nations Charter, does not seem to bother him at all. (These quotations from Professor Peffer are from his article "Democracy Losing by Default," Political Science Quarterly, September 1948.)

The upshot of all this, of course, is that America would be almost completely isolated, and many nations who are now fighting against Soviet aggression in one form or another would be deprived of American assistance, and left alone to be consumed by the masters of the Kremlin one by one. Any program of action more pleasing to Stalin and Molotov could not easily be conceived.

That this concept of ideological war is at variance with the actual situation is borne out by facts which are clearly demonstrable. One would have thought that, if this conflict between the Soviet Union and the free world is indeed an ideological war, the Communists would do their very best to make their ideology familiar to the people. But the fact is that, in the United States, as in all other free countries, the Communists are not reproducing mass quantities of Communist literature, such as the works of Marx and Engels, or Lenin and Stalin. They have not tried to indoctrinate the American people with their theories of "the materialistic interpretation of history" or "dialectic materialism." The Communist-dominated labor unions in America do not talk of the "labor theory of value." In fact, they do not denounce free enterprise and capitalism nearly as vigorously as the socialists or what is known as the middle-of-the-road groups.

No. They do not make any serious attempt to sell their ideology to the peoples of the free world. Rather, they choose to concentrate on espionage and sabotage, and on employing subversive agents like Gerhart Eisler and Whittaker Chambers, to steal State Department documents and atomic secrets. They are interested in the day-to-day business of the free countries, rather than the philosophical basis of capitalist society. The trial of the 12 top American Communists in New York showed more clearly than anything else that the Communist Party in the United States does not choose to compete fairly with other political parties for the assumption of political power. Their program is to employ subversive tactics to overthrow the American Government itself. The Chinese Communist leader, Mao Tse-tung, following the dictates of Stalin 23 years ago, is advising all Communist leaders of Asia to use the technique of the "armed revolt" which Mao so successfully employed in China.

In all these activities, the Communist parties in the countries of the free world are neither more nor less than agents of the Politburo in Moscow. If one were to fight such an apparatus with nothing more than ideological propaganda, if no security measures were taken to guard against their subversive activities, the Communists would in all probability have completed their program of world conquest.

There is, I submit, a basic reason for such Communist tactics.

The Communist, par excellence, is a realist. He knows very well that the doctrines of Marx were based on conditions in England during the early days of the industrial revolution. Such conditions do not exist in the capitalist countries today. Marx's prediction of the polarization of social classes, the extinction of the middle class, which is the very foundation of the theory of class war, fails completely to come true. Nor did the proletariat of the world rise in unison, to overthrow the capitalist society, as the Communist Manifesto says it will. As if to play a practical joke on Marx, the Communist revolution took place, not in England, France, or the United States, but in Russia, one of the least industrialized nations of modern Europe. Stalin was so embarrassed by such developments that he had to purge those who took Marx seriously, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Bukharin, Radek, and practically every member of Lenin's Politburo except Stalin himself.

To sell such a ridiculous theory to the world is an impossible task, and Stalin knows it.

It follows that no Communist Party has ever succeeded in winning power by fairly competing in a free election. No Communist Government existing today, not the Government of the Soviet Union, not the so-called Communist government in China, not the governments of all the eastern European satellites, achieved their present power through elections. On the contrary, when they took part in free elections, as they did in Hungary in 1945, in Italy in 1947, in France on many occasions, in Finland only recently, they have always failed miserably. In the free elections of China in 1947, the Chinese Communists, instead of testing their strength on the same level with the Nationalists before the polls, chose to boycott the whole affair, and then turned

around to denounce, and revolt against the government which the Chinese people elected.

Their recourse has always been espionage and sabotage in countries where their strength is relatively weak, as in the United States, or to armed insurrection and rebellion when they saw that the occasion was propitious, as in China. It is a safe bet that a similar process will be followed by the Communists in the Far Eastern countries, such as Indochina, Burma, Siam, and the Philippines.

The thought here is not that the Communists have forgotten their ideology. The process of indoctrination and thought control begins only when absolute power has already been achieved. The Communist Party in China has been in existence for 30 years. One American traveler in China noted with astonishment that there was no full translation of Das Kapital into the Chinese language some years ago. He will find many such translations in China today.

In Communist China today, the process of indoctrination is in full swing. The Russian language is a required subject in all high schools and colleges. The New York Times magazine illustrated the Fosdick article I mentioned with a woodcut by Koo Yuan, called Winter School. It shows Chinese peasants huddling in a North China courtyard on a warm winter day studying the Russian alphabet. An official education circular told the colleges that "all departments would be expected to conform with the Marxian spirit," and said that "it is advisable to establish departments of Russian language wherever possible." "Dialectical and Historical Materialism," written by Stalin, has been adopted by the Higher Education Commission in Peiping as the basic textbook for teaching the "new philosophy" in North China's colleges and universities. In another authoritative exposition of the new education in Communist China, teachers were advised to take great care in teaching the natural sciences. They were told they must point out to students that "scientists of capitalist society are liable to be backward and even reactionary in thought and understanding." I quote further from the report:

"Reactionary theories on heredity propounded by Mendel, Weismann, and Morgan have already been deleted from biology textbooks for the senior and middle schools but the progressive theory of Michurin should simultaneously be inserted to take place of the discarded ones.

"In dealing with the origin of human thought and knowledge it is necessary to set forth in detail the theories of Pavlov. In dealing with Darwin's theory of evolution, care should be taken to differentiate between its progressive and reactionary features.

"In dealing with Einstein's theory of relativity attention should be centered on those aspects in support of dialectical materialism while the backward aspects of the theory should be refuted. Special efforts should be made to eradicate the reactionary theories of Eddington and Heisenberg, which, as a product of Einstein's theory of relativity, have pervaded the scientific circles of the western world."

The rigorous process of indoctrination is being carried out behind a rapidly descending iron curtain. The most tightly controlled area is, of course, Manchuria, where foreign correspondents and travelers, excepting Russians, are barred. Since the departure of Angus Ward and his party from Mukden, there is not a single American in the whole area. News gathering is only permitted to the Chinese Communist official agency and the Soviet Tass Agency. All the Chinese newspapers today read like the Pravda and the Izvestia, with nothing but official pronouncements and strictly censored and often corrupted versions of so-called news.

To a Chinese who is educated in the western world, like myself, the thought control imposed by the Communists is one of the most colossal tragedies of modern times. Only a century ago, China was an isolated nation, with a rich and mellow culture of her own. During the last 100 years, the wall of isolation was gradually being pierced, and a process of cross-fertilization between the east and west ensued. My people were reevaluating their traditional concepts in the light of western culture, and promising developments were taking shape.

With the rise to power of the Chinese Communists, this historical process is being reversed. The Communists in China brought with them an ideology which at once eradicates Chinese culture from its roots and denounces modern science as decadent and backward. Confucius and Lao Tze are now being condemned in the same breath with Darwin and Einstein, all in favor of Stalin and Pavlov.

With the reorganization of society enforced by the Communists, in Comsomols and Stakhanoff brigades, the family system, so characteristic of Chinese society, is being destroyed.

In sum, the Communists in China, as elsewhere, do not employ their ideology as a means to achieve power. Their method has always been espionage and sabotage, armed revolts and insurrection, as the case may be. But once power is achieved, as in Russia and China, the process of indoctrination backed by the GPU and the instruments of the state, is as ruthless as it is thorough.

Viewed against this background, the basic meaning of our fight against Communist domination takes on more meaning. We have not been fighting the Communists because we are simply anti-Communist. Our fight is not one merely to preserve power. It is to preserve the freedom of the Chinese people from foreign domination, and more particularly, from Soviet domination. It is to enable the Chinese people to lead a full life, to enjoy the fruits of their ancient and beautiful culture, to be free to absorb the equally ancient and beautiful culture of the west. We are fighting for the very existence of the Chinese people as a self-respecting, independent, and free nation, holding the keys of the future in our own hands. We refused to be subjugated, to be reduced to the status of colonials of a sprawling empire centered at Moscow.

Chiang Kai-shek has said that the basic meaning of the war against the Communists is essentially the same as the war against the Japanese. He said it in 1931, and has repeated it often.

The Japanese tried to conquer and incorporate us into the east Asia coprosperity sphere, to be dominated by Tokyo. They put forth the slogan "Asia for the Asiatics," and violently denounced American imperialism. They even invented a new ideology for us, known as the "new people doctrine." They brought in stooges to rule us, Pu Yi in Manchuria, Wang Keh-min in Peiping, and Wang Ching-wei in Nanking. We fought them for 8 years. The flame of freedom, once kindled, carried us through the long night.

The Soviet Union also tried to conquer and incorporate us into the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, to be dominated by Moscow. It imported among us an ideology, "the new democracy" and a form of government "the people's republic," with the same cynical reference to the "people" as the Japanese used. It, too, led our people to denounce American imperialism. Just as the Japanese bombed the *Panay*, to subject American and European nationals to indignities, so the Russians are ordering the Communists in China to bomb the *Amethyst* and to insult and jail Americans in Shanghai, Peiping, and Mukden. The Soviet Union, like the Japanese, brought in stooges to rule us, in the person of Mao Tse-tung, Chou En-lai and Liu Shao-chi.

The patterns of Japanese and Soviet imperialism, I submit, are too familiar to be ignored by the outside world. They are patterns of aggression in all its nakedness—ruthless, cynical, and diabolical.

My people, in their long history, have gone through many trials and tribulations. Their nationality and culture have been subject to frequent severe tests. Their sterling qualities have always carried them through, so that China's is the only ancient culture which has survived through the ages.

There are many people today who think that we who are fighting for freedom in China have lost out. And if we still carry on here and there, we must be written off, discredited, and buried while we are still breathing. Some nations, like Britain, have rushed to extend their hands of friendship to the Soviet stooges in China.

Last fall, the Chinese Government brought China's case against the Soviet Union to the General Assembly of the United Nations. This also has a strange parallel in history.

When Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931, enacting act I of the drama of Fascist aggression, China took the case to the League of Nations. The Japanese delegate, Matsuoka, banged on the table; he walked out of the conference chambers. The great powers of those days were unable to bring pressure to bear on the Japanese warlords, and thus paved the way for Mussolini and Hitler and the Second World War. The smaller powers at Geneva were more far-sighted, but they were over-awed by the so-called statesmen of Britain and France.

Last November, when China brought her case against the U. S. S. R. to the sober judgment of the world community, Vyshinsky banged on the table; he led his stooges out of every conference chamber in Lake Success and Flushing Meadows. The great powers, including the United States, refused even to endorse our position of morally censoring the Soviet aggressors. They dared not go further than making a pious declaration in favor of the principles of the United Nations Charter. This was, as the delegate from Ecuador said, "serenading the moon." As was true in 1931, the smaller powers were more far-sighted. "The position of the great powers," Sr. Alfredo Martinez-Moreno, of El Salvador, stated, "makes us think of the lack of political responsibility, of historical foresight, of those nations which should be the guides and the guardians of international peace. It makes us think of the old policy of appeasement. Confronted by the approaching storm, we have only a Chamberlain-like umbrella to cover us. We see a dark and dreary Munich looming over us."

Is the course of future events going to repeat what took place during the tragic years before the Second World War?

The spectre of aggression and global conquest is again stalking in the world today. Are we going to have only Neville Chamberlains and Pierre Lavals in the chancelleries of the world? Is the United Nations going the way of the League? Is it going to capitulate to Vishinsky's walk-outs by submitting to his blackmail? Are we prepared to sacrifice every concept of international morality and every principle of international law just to give us more occasions to listen to more vituperations by Molotov, Vishinsky, Gromyko, and Malik?

I do not claim to be able to answer these momentous questions. As things stand now, it looks as though we have only a Chamberlain-like umbrella to cover us from the approaching storm.

All I know is that, as far as the fight for freedom in China is concerned, we are by no means licked. Whatever may be our

shortcomings, and there are many, our people are not defeatist. They have not given up hope. In fact, our people on Formosa and Hainan are showing promising signs of vitality and dedication, and these qualities, so clearly manifested in our fight from Chungking during the war, may yet carry us far.

The Chinese are by nature a philosophical people. Perhaps that is why they sometimes appear to be weak. But we like to stick to moral principles, and we are not given to yielding to so-called realities or expediences as some others are. Perhaps herein is our strength. For who could have imagined that we would be able to fight the Japanese all alone for 4 years, when the so-called realists were giving us only 3 months? The picture from Formosa looks dark today, but it is not one shade darker than in 1938 when the Japanese were on our necks, and when Britain, in the name of expediency, arbitrarily closed our only link with the outside world, the Burma Road?

Address by Bishop Bernard J. Sheil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, among the most distinguished leaders of the Catholic Church in this country is Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, of Chicago. He is also a leader in the study of moral and social sciences in the labor field. With permission to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I attach the eloquent address he delivered at the twenty-seventh annual convention of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union in Atlantic City:

Mr. Dubinsky and officers of this great union, just allow me to say in all humility that it is for me a very happy occasion to, at least, have a couple of hours to participate in this golden jubilee convention of a fine union, splendidly led and constantly proving its high quality and warm heart that is attuned to suffering everywhere. You have given a lot to the American scene and you are one of the great hopes for the future. [Applause.]

Might I be allowed just to pay a few words of tribute to the president of this international union, whom I consider one of the outstanding labor leaders of the day and of the age. [Applause.]

Unions long have signified their active support of FEPC. They have been and are among its most vigorous supporters. Can this be said of all groups and individuals who seek to limit, by legislation, the democratic functioning of unions with regard to civil rights and collective bargaining?

Certainly the restriction of clear and present danger should be the only major stricture advanced against the civil rights of union members—just as such an ideal should make temperate our loyalty considerations throughout the entire Nation.

When one glances at the scareheads in the daily newspapers or hears the sometimes frantic voice of a radio commentator describe the undercover pattern of Red subversion that is being revealed in Washington; when one observes the charges and countercharges, the smears, the allegations and character assassination now so typical of the Red hysteria that is spreading like a grass fire across our Nation, the serious question comes to the lips: "Is this America; is this the land of the four freedoms; is that the Nation where a man is innocent until he is proven guilty; is this the country that must be to the world the last, best hope of democratic freedom?"

It is not unreasonable to ask that our congressional hearings be conducted with the same dignity, fairness, and discretion so characteristic of the American court of law. We are trying to preserve, not destroy, American democracy, and the broken character of innocent victims sucked into the vortex of investigations is a sorry contribution to the preservation of a free America.

It is stunning to consider the vigor and deadliness with which the Mundt-Nixon bill is being sponsored in the Federal Congress. Here, we have another instance of hysteria acting as the means which can decidedly corrupt and defeat a good end; namely, the extirpation of political subversion.

I have had occasion to say this before, but it cannot be repeated too often: Police-state tactics will not destroy communism, but they may introduce into a democratic nation the very poison of statist thought control which such tactics are calculated to destroy.

If they have not already done so, it is quite conceivable that sponsors of repressive loyalty measures may retaliate with the allegation that FEPC is, in its way, repressive.

In its way, indeed.

Once and for all, let it be asserted that FEPC does not restrict humanity—as would the Mundt-Nixon bill. FEPC, we are happy to say, would only restrict humanity the same as laws against murder, theft, and arson do. For the latter are laws which would protect the human rights of our citizens. FEPC would protect constitutional rights also. Who in America can honestly assert that the right to work is not synonymous with the right to live?

In retrospect, the end of World War II seems to have been an ideal time for management and labor to cooperate in a statesmanlike manner. Industry was about to boom on the strength of endless postwar orders and labor itself, strong and confident because of its most worthy participation in the war effort, looked ahead to almost unprecedented years of full production.

What a setting for industrial democracy! What a cue for Government to play the role of a benevolent distant cousin!

Yet what happened—what did labor get? Quick on the heels of a smashing congressional victory by a major party, was enacted a lopsided repressive labor law which has done more to bring labor-management relations to a recurrent boiling point during the past several years than any other factor.

Let there be no mistaking the fact that the Taft-Hartley law is a strong contributing element in the current atmosphere of jeopardy in which we find many of our civil rights. This act, still the law of the Nation, is undeniably a punitive measure which endeavors speciously to achieve industrial peace by a systematic weakening of labor unions.

Thank God, the framers of this law have been neutralized because of their own ineptness. For astute prolabor legal minds seem to have been able to frustrate the act by the legal means of capitalizing on the loopholes and vagueness integral to the legislation.

Yet the damage done by the act to labor-management harmony cannot be minimized. The most devastating effect of the Taft-Hartley law is, one might suggest, the obstruction of the slow, yet steady progress which labor and management were making toward solving their own problems, with only minimum assistance from the arbitrational facilities of Government.

And what, presently, is the condition in which Taft-Hartley has placed organized labor? I would say that labor has been put on the defensive to such an extent that it finds statesmanlike experiments with management more than normally difficult.

A. F. of L. President William Green and Philip Murray of the CIO, in a recent exchange of letters, plead for "the organic unity of all labor." This call to union hegemony reflects a justified fear on the part of organized labor that growing unemployment—which both groups think may rise to 6,000,000 by 1951—and growing hostility to labor's rights may set up political forces which will seek to strengthen rather than abolish repressive labor laws.

Let us hope, however, that the recent signs of labor-management statesmanship in Detroit provide some barometric indication of liberal political weather for the congressional elections this coming fall.

Yet, come good or bad political weather, it would be a splendid thing for unions to amalgamate if—and this is a big if—such amalgamation would mean further efforts toward statesman-like agreements with management for the common good.

It would be the height of cynicism and against the best of spiritual traditions to assume that labor and management must continue to solve their problems coldly and exclusively on the basis of bargaining and compromise. The vastness and complexity of present day plants and labor unions makes the call for a sense of reverence among workers and employees all the more urgent.

On the other hand, no true vision of economic democracy could concede that the powerful, independent unity of management versus the powerful, independent unity of labor would be factors making for industrial peace and the abundant life. That way lies the police state and the end of civil rights for both labor and management.

Let us, rather, endeavor, without the repressive interference of government, to preserve and develop collective bargaining to its highest possible degree—to a degree that can be called cooperative bargaining—a more practical label for labor-management relations.

Cooperative bargaining, as I have already implied, is collective bargaining with the great big plus of charity. Cooperative bargaining is a practical, creative arbitration and settlement of labor-management difficulties based not on inordinate wage appetites and the leprosy of class hatred, nor on the unreasonable profit-lust of a group of irresponsible absentee owners. It is based, rather, on steadfast reference to basic Christian principles.

This, indeed, would be civil rights in action, hurling the challenge of freemen at hysteria and reaction, capturing the hearts of the people by the sheer exhilaration of successful self-government.

I fear for the freedom and integrity of labor if it should subscribe in while or in part to the deterministic theory of a future struggle to the death with management.

I have not the slightest hesitation in putting before you, the members of the great and benevolent Garment Workers' Union, my belief that labor-management statesmanship and the example of civil rights in action must spring out of a spiritual motivation. This is so, not only because of my religious persuasion but, additionally, because of the deep humanity which you and your distinguished leader, Dave Dubinsky, have manifested in time of social, political, and economic crisis.

What lover of freedom will ever forget the courageous role which the ILGWU played in the political victory of democratic forces in

Italy in 1948? And what fair-minded citizen was not touched by your donation of $100,000 to the CIO auto workers' fund during the recent Chrysler strike?

We have nothing to fear from fear when love of this kind abounds so selflessly and generously in one of the great labor unions of the world.

Let us continue to conform our Nation to the minds of its founders and reconstruct a world that God would recognize as his own.

A Grass-Roots Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to refer to a bill which I introduced yesterday, H. R. 9093, to control surplus farm commodities in the United States.

At the request of the Agriculture Committee of the Washington State Grange, I introduced this bill which that group has entitled "The Agricultural Commodity Surplus Control Act." Mr. Richard Hedges is chairman of this committee.

This bill was drawn up by a group of farmers, members of the Washington State Grange, who pooled among themselves their several ideas with regard to the handling and disposition of American agriculture surplus commodities. In this very real sense, I say it is a grass-roots farm bill.

This measure was submitted to me nearly a year ago in rough form and at my request the Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives translated those ideas into legal form. This transcript was then resubmitted to the Washington State Grange, approved by its agriculture committee, disseminated to several dozen local granges throughout the State for their comments and approval and finally at the State convention of the Grange held last month at Everett, Wash., was adopted unanimously by that organization as its proposal for a national farm policy.

Because of the manner in which this proposal originated and the great deal of thought and interest put into it by the hundreds of active farmers who participated in its writing, I feel that this bill and its approach to the farm problem is worthy of every consideration which we in Congress can give to it.

I know that our House Committee on Agriculture has spent many long months in hearings and consideration of a multitude of farm proposals and that the members of that committee are diligently and sincerely seeking to enact those measures which will prove to be in the best interests not only of farmers, but all Americans.

Therefore, I urge that the committee give its full consideration to this program which is drafted by farmers themselves and which I have introduced at their request.

Of particular significance in this proposal is the method of choosing and organizing the surplus commodity control boards at the county, State, and National level so that they are self-governing. Secondly, the farmers who drew up this measure feel that it can operate at little or no cost to the Federal Government. Under these circumstances I feel that this measure should receive the same sincere consideration by the Congress as it has by those who have drawn it up.

Under leave to extend the above remarks, I am also pleased to include an editorial from the current Country Gentleman which points up the same problem:

THE WRONG WAY TO APPLY CROP CONTROLS

The present method of allotting corn acreage under the crop-control program has too many things wrong with it and will have to be changed.

Widespread complaint has been aroused in the Corn Belt by the way the allotments were made this year. The dissatisfaction centers around several issues. As farmers see them, these are:

The present crop-history method of determining allotments, with all farmers taking the same flat percentage cut "across the board," is both unfair and unsound. It penalizes the farmers who have been following good rotation and soil-conservation practices and favors those who have been "corning" their land hard.

It directly conflicts with other farm programs, such as those sponsored by the Soil Conservation and Extension Services.

As now administered, it is not a farmer-directed program at all but one imposed by Washington and carried out by the State PMA officials.

The feeling toward these phases of the crop-control program is strongly evidenced in Piatt County, Ill., where some 275 farmers appealed their corn allotments. They were not opposing the control program itself, but the way the allotments were apportioned. And they had something definite on which to base their protests. Taking the exhortations for a grass-roots program seriously, Piatt County farmers some time back had worked out such a program with the help of University of Illinois agricultural specialists. Their idea stressed good land use and confined benefits to those farmers who were following a definite plan along that line. It also called for considerable local responsibility.

A well-formulated program, stressing such features, was presented by Piatt County farmers and those of six other counties comprising the East Central Illinois Land Use Council to PMA and other Government officials last fall. They were encouraged to believe some of these proposals would be adopted. The next thing they heard was that the 1950 farm program was already set, and it was too late to do anything about it.

The program, as it was put into effect, virtually ignored the matter of good land use. It fell hardest, in fact, on those farmers who had been giving their land the best care. The J. P. Kratz farm holding in Piatt County is an example. It consists of 1,547 acres, but it is no newly accumulated big farm operation. The forebears of the elder Mr. Kratz, now 71, set up the original farm of 1,347 acres way back in 1847, and the remaining 200 acres were added in 1890. It is managed by a son, a veteran of the South Pacific, and there would be more sharers in it but two other sons have died, one a war casualty.

Ever since the local soil-conservation district was organized in 1942, the Kratz land has been included in it and operated in compliance with an SCS plan. Out of the 1,547 acres 1,535 are tillable. Under the soil-conservation plan only 20 to 25 percent of the tillable land was in corn, and the Kratzes would have liked to continue on that moderate basis. They received an allotment of 230 acres, which they finally got raised to 273 acres. That amounts to about 17 percent of their tillable land. The average for the county is 31 percent.

Other Piatt County farmers who have been following soil-conserving practices suffered the same penalties. They took a percentage cut, based on their past 3-year corn-growing history, regardless of the fact that they had not been the ones contributing to the corn surplus.

It is their contention that the crop-history method of determining allotments is illegal under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which is still the basic law. The 1938 AAA statute says: "The acreage allotment to the county for corn shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the local committees, among the farms within the county on the basis of tillable acreage, crop-rotation practices, type of soil and history."

When Piatt County farmers tried to get allotments apportioned on something like this basis, they were told by the State PMA that it was "impractical, won't work, and besides you can't get compliance."

An apparent reason why the crop-history percentage method is favored by Washington was revealed in a letter by a top PMA official, which contains the remarkable statement: "It should be noted that with such an approach (the PMA's allocation of a fixed percentage of the cropland on each farm) farm allotments can be determined very quickly at the State or Washington level by the use of an IBM or similar type of calculating machine. County and community committee determinations would be eliminated."

If that statement means what it says, bureaucratic convenience comes ahead of the needs and conditions on the individual farm. And, with the elimination of county and community committee determinations, just about the last wisp of local farmer influence would be gone.

This influence doesn't amount to much now. As one Piatt County farmer said: "When we had our county committee in, it was the fieldman from the State office who did all the talking—told us what we could and what we couldn't do."

What has happened in Piatt County stands out only because more farmers there have made protests and carried them further. The county is the scene of one of the Lincoln-Douglas debates. Some of the spirit which entered into the declaration that "a nation half free and half slave cannot stand" finds an echo in the present controversy.

The dissatisfaction there is typical, though, and can be found in virtually every Corn Belt county. It raises questions that will have to be settled right if acreage controls are to work satisfactorily, whether under the present program or any other plan.

One of the most glaring defects is the conflict with other farm programs that is created by the crop-history allotment method. It works against the efforts of the Soil Conservation Service and the teachings of the Agricultural Extension Services. Moreover, the PMA is in conflict with itself, its own ACP program being intended to encourage conservation practices.

Any farm program that can be justified should promote good farming and be in the public interest. The biggest interest the public has in a farm program is the insurance of its future food supply through the conservation of our basic soil resources. The PMA should get back to the principles of

the 1938 act and put a premium on good land use. It will then have a means of getting at those who are really causing the surpluses.

The pretense that this is a program conducted by farmer-elected committeemen is a joke. A way must be found to make it actually a program of farmers, by farmers and for farmers. This means a large shift of authority and responsibility to local people in determining how the program is to be applied. They know what is sound and right for their locality a lot better than Washington.

When they have that sort of program, there will be more farmer interest and a bigger vote at the local PMA committee elections. The prevailing vote of 10 percent or less in many areas reflects the farmers' feeling of "what's the use?" It has resulted in a perpetuation of the same PMA committeemen and officials until the job has become a career with many of them. With more local responsibility there would probably be fewer appeals from acreage allotments and certainly more faith in the justice of the appeal procedure.

It is distinctly up to Secretary Brannan to bring the various farm policies—PMA, Soil Conservation and Extension—into order so that they will mean the same thing. The present situation was aptly described by a Piatt County farmer, who said, "This whole thing is so crazily wired together we don't know where to begin."

If, as farmers have been told by PMA officials, "Congress intended this for a control and not a good land use program," then Congress has a job to do in revising the 1949 Act so that it makes sense.

A price-support program probably needs crop controls. But they ought to conform to American principles of maximum local responsibility and the long-time interests of agriculture and the Nation.

Trygve Lie Assailed by Gromyko and the U. S. S. R

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, we should be perfectly clear as to the implications of the naked aggression by North against South Korea and as to the support of such aggression by the U. S. S. R. The Russians would have their people believe that this aggression was a consequence of a provocational attack by troops of the South Korean authorities on border regions of North Korea as the result of a preconceived plan. It is important for every Member to study this statement in great detail for it demonstrates the nature of the forces against which we contend and the urgent necessity for getting the facts over to the Russian people who certainly hear anything but the facts from their own Government.

This statement was published in all Soviet papers on July 4, 1950, and the text of it is available from the Department of State on transmittal from our Moscow Embassy.

I draw the particular attention of Members to the paragraph in this statement which is appended dealing with the United Nations Secretary-General, Trygve Lie. He has been submitted to some very caustic criticism on the floor of the House and has been assailed as too friendly to the Communists—and worse. An effort has been made to discredit the United Nations because of Mr. Lie's connection with it. The events in Korea have given Mr. Lie an opportunity to show by deeds not words his prodemocratic views and feelings which from his personal history it is clear have dominated his life. His aid in the decisive action of the Security Council in for the first time invoking military sanctions against Korean aggression is now historic. The current attacks on him from Moscow including the official attack by Mr. Gromyko which is appended, are further illuminating evidence on the same point. Certainly Mr. Lie's faithfulness to democratic principles must now be clear in the minds of all fair-minded people. There is also appended an editorial from the New York Times on this subject.

[Excerpt from statement by A. A. Gromyko]

The unseemly role of UN Secretary General, Mr. Trygve Lie, in all this affair, cannot but be noted. Obliged by virtue of his position to see to the precise compliance with the UN Charter, the Secretary General, in the discussion of the Korean question in the Security Council, not only did not discharge his direct obligations, but on the contrary obligingly assisted the gross violation of the Charter on the part of the Government of the United States and other members of the Security Council. Thereby the Secretary General showed that he is concerned not so much with strengthening the UN and strengthening peace, as with how to render assistance to the ruling circles of the United States of America in the implementation of their aggressive plans with regard to Korea.

[From the New York Times]

MR. LIE AND MOSCOW

Whatever it may portend for the future of the United Nations, the savage attack on Secretary General Trygve Lie that has just come out of Moscow is an excellent object lesson. It is a further demonstration, if any were needed, that there can be no such thing as honorable but independent friendliness toward Russian communism.

Mr. Lie, in his efforts to promote peace and to preserve the structure of the United Nations, has tried very hard to see the Soviet point of view and to persuade both the Soviet Union and others that some sort of compromise was possible and desirable. In so doing he has drawn criticism upon himself from some quarters for being too friendly toward the Russians. The suggestion that he himself might be a Communist, made at a press conference, was, of course, outrageous nonsense and richly merited the rebuke that was given.

When the Korean crisis arose Mr. Lie carried out the obligations of the United Nations Charter with promptness and rectitude. He demonstrated, beyond cavil, that he was above all a man of the greatest integrity. It is that fact that makes him intolerable and unforgivable to the Soviet Union.

Some additional Russian venom is doubtless inspired also by the fact that Mr. Lie is a liberal democratic Socialist. The Communists are even fiercer in their fury against those who are on the left in politics than against those who are admittedly rightist and capitalist. They have demonstrated this again and again in their assaults on groups such as the British Labor Party.

But Mr. Lie's real sin is the unwillingness to be subservient to Kremlin dictation. In the Communist book there is no such thing as agreement; there is only obedience. There is no tolerable course of action except that dictated by Moscow. The United Nations boycott is merely the outward manifestation of a determined and doctrinaire frame of mind.

Those who are now concerned with preserving a suppositious neutrality or those who seem convinced that the Korean problem can be solved by yielding to Russian dictation in the matter of United Nations membership may well take the case of the good Mr. Lie to heart. No one could have tried harder to be impartial and judicious. But when a point of conscience was reached he was obliged to obey that conscience. From then on he was marked for nothing but calumny by the Soviet Union. Soviet communism has no toleration for truth or independence, and in the face of such intolerance there can be no moral neutrality and no compromise.

Kings River Bill Would Benefit Small Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL F. WHITE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 8885, to provide irrigation water and cheap electric power for the farmers in the Kings River area of California. The Power Trust and some well-entrenched irrigation officials who are seeking the hydroelectric power rights for their own selfish ends are trying to block the bill.

On June 13, 1950, at Easton, Calif., before an overflow crowd at the high-school auditorium, I debated this issue with my chief adversary. Under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD a copy of my opening statement in that debate:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Moderator, and ladies and gentlemen, it is my firm conviction that my bill, H. R. 8885, to integrate the Kings River project into the Central Valley project, is in the best interest of the majority of the water users in the Kings River area.

I believe this mainly because the bill would retain behind Pine Flat Dam for the use of the small farmers in Fresno, northern Kings, and northern Tulare Counties about half of the water which would go to about two dozen big so-called corporation farmers in Tulare Lake, if my bill does not pass and the now pending Werdel bill becomes law. I say this because the Werdel bill would remove Pine Flat Dam water from the effect of the 160-acre limitation, while my bill would retain the 160-acre limitation.

FARMERS' WATER RIGHTS PROTECTED BY WHITE BILL

I say my bill is in the best interest of the small farmers for the further reason that it would permit the building of a canal from Mendota Pool to bring additional water from the Sacramento River to the lower reaches of the Kings River area to supply water where it is now needed, according to Mr. Kaupke's own testimony in Washington recently. My bill specifically prohibits the interference with any existing water right and, to prove this point, I quote directly from the bill itself,

section 6: "No provision of this act shall operate to take away, reduce, or impair any existing water right which is valid under the laws of the State of California."

SUPREME COURT DECISION GUARANTEES WATER RIGHTS

There was a Supreme Court decision last week which adds strength to the argument that my bill and the reclamation law provide full protection for water rights which are valid under State law. I refer to the Supreme Court decision in the Gerlach case, in which the water rights had already been bought from Miller & Lux and paid for by the Bureau of Reclamation in four instances, and the money had been held in escrow until it was determined by the courts whether or not the Miller & Lux reservations of the rights were valid. In these four instances the landowners won out, much to the delight of the Bureau of Reclamation. In the other four instances the landowners sued for $3,000,000 for the withholding of floodwaters—not for the loss of irrigation water but for the withholding of floodwater at Friant Dam—and the court awarded them only a few thousand dollars. I think the Bureau of Reclamation is to be congratulated on that Supreme Court decision, which further shows that water rights are never confiscated under reclamation law.

To show you how another Member of Congress feels about this important Supreme Court decision, let me quote you from a news article appearing in the Fresno Bee of yesterday, June 12: "Solons Hail CVP Ruling as Water Rights Charter. Washington, June 12. The recent United States Supreme Court decision as to water rights on the San Joaquin grasslands is being interpreted in congressional circles as firmly establishing all existing private water rights tied in with the Central Valley project.

"Calling the Court's decision 'a milestone in the progress of reclamation,' Representative CLAIR ENGLE said the case 'makes plain once and for all that the building of a Federal reclamation project does not limit or take away water rights of private landowners acquired under State law.' "

Congressman ENGLE, who made that statement is the chairman of the subcommittee on reclamation of the House of Representatives, which committee is scheduled to arrive in Fresno in the near future for hearings on the White bill which we are discussing here tonight.

To further bear out my statement that this Supreme Court decision continues to make safe the existing water rights which are valid under California law, I wish to quote an excerpt from the law which was quoted in the Supreme Court opinion on the Gerlach case which Congressman ENGLE referred to in the news item:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect, or to in any way interfere with the laws of any State or Territory relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation, or any vested right acquired thereunder."

PUBLIC MISLED ON FRIANT WATER CASES

Now don't let anybody scare you on these Friant water cases which have been in the newspapers recently. Please bear in mind that an amount of water sufficient at all times to take care of all remaining nonpurchased water rights has been flowing down the San Joaquin River ever since Friant Dam was built. So, nobody has ever suffered for water or will ever suffer for water. The only points which have not been settled are the amounts of money to be paid by the Government to the landowners for the lowering of the water table and for subirrigation benefits which are lost by the reduction in the flow of the river. It was amusing to me to see in the papers recently where Mr. Kaupke said these Friant water rights were lost while the Fresno Bee headline earlier had said that the farmers had won the water rights. Actually, the case had not even been tried. Judge Hall's decision merely denied the injunction sought by the landowners to stop Friant Reservoir water from being diverted, and the case of the amount of damages due the landowners is yet to be decided. But one thing you can be sure of is this—those landowners will still have water regardless of how the suit turns out, and they will have just compensation for the extra lift of their water and for having to apply surface water instead of subirrigation. Now does that sound like the Bureau of Reclamation has hurt anybody? If the Bureau had not handled matters in this way, there would be no Central Valley project. Please remember that in the Gerlach grasslands case only floodwater was withheld and no irrigation rights were involved and even then the landowners were paid, while in the Friant cases, every single farmer will continue to get water and receive a payment from the Government, too.

I hope Mr. Kaupke will refer to these cases in his statement and point out where I am wrong, if he thinks I am wrong in my statements on these water-right cases.

Furthermore, my bill would bring more water into the Kings River area—not take it out. The Kings River area is a water deficient area, according to Mr. Kaupke's own statement in Washington recently. Therefore, why would we want to take water out of the Kings River area? To bear out this point, I quote directly from the White bill. "A system of storage reservoirs and transfer canals to make possible the importation of water to the Kings River service area in order to meet the deficiencies which will remain in that area even after construction of the North Fork Kings River development." Now does that sound like anybody is going to lose any water rights?

WATER MASTER FIGHTS FOR TULARE LAKE

I think the big hue and cry about the possible loss of water rights comes from the two dozen or so big corporation farmers in the Tulare Lake area. Do you know what they want? Why, they want the Government, at the expense of the taxpayers, to hold the Kings River floodwater off of them, so their land will be worth something in the first place and then they want the Government to turn around and give them that water back, at a nominal cost, as irrigation water, at the time and in the amounts they demand, in complete disregard of the 160 acre limitation law. It is my firm conviction, and the stand of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Congress of the United States that the 160 acre limitation law applies to all of the waters of the Kings River except that portion of the normal daily flow of the river which has heretofore been acquired under California law as valid water rights. And certainly the floodwaters which reach Tulare Lake cannot be considered as a part of the normal daily flow of the river.

So, I say to you, that the Tulare Lake people should either have to conform to the reclamation law, or pump their water from the underground supply, and let the small farmers have those floodwaters which will be impounded by Pine Flat Reservoir. Many of the small farmers in the Kings River area are unable to get water from the Kings River over the full irrigation season, and this floodwater would be of great benefit to them. After all, the small farmers are scheduled to repay 82 percent of the repayment costs to the Government for irrigation, while the Tulare Lake group would pay only 18 percent. This means that the Tulare Lake group would get 95 percent of the flood-control benefits, about 50 percent of the hydroelectric power benefits of Pine Flat Dam, if the Werdel bill becomes law instead of the White bill, and the Tulare Lake group would pay only 5 percent of the total cost of the dam. I say this because the Tulare Lake people are scheduled to get approximately 50 percent of the water over and above 7,000 cubic feet per second flow at Piedra, and if the flow did not exceed 7,000 second feet, no dam would be needed.

In other words, if the flow of the river never exceeded 7,000 cubic feet per second at Piedra the water would all be used up for irrigation before it reached Tulare Lake and no dam would be necessary. So, it is only that portion of the river flow above 7,000 feet which makes the dam necessary and Tulare Lake, according to the latest schedule adopted by Mr. Kaupke and his group would get approximately half of the water over 7,000 feet to Tulare Lake.

WATER MASTER IGNORES COURT DECISION AGAINST TULARE LAKE

And, this, mind you, in spite of the fact that I have here on the table before me the photostatic copy of a court decision against the Tulare Lake people in favor of Miller & Lux which provides that the first 2,000 second-feet of water over and above the 1927 Kings River flow schedule shall go to Miller & Lux. That 2,000 second-feet of water now belongs to the Federal Government and to prove my statement I have here before me the contract under which the Government purchased that water from Miller & Lux. Under my bill, that water would all go to the small farmers of the Kings River area free of charge, but Mr. Kaupke and his group have given half of it to the two dozen big landowners in Tulare Lake under the revised schedule which they have recently adopted.

KINGS RIVER FARMERS TO PAY NOTHING ON OTHER CVP FEATURES

Now to further bear out my statement that I am going to see to it that the small farmers in the upper Kings River area are fully protected, I am going to quote to you a further amendment to my bill which is not really necessary, in my opinion, but I am putting it in because I want you to feel that your water rights are absolutely secure, and to keep the opposition from having their ditch tenders continue to tell you that I am trying to take away your water rights. The amendment reads as follows:

"Water users using or entitled to use the waters of the Kings River, Calif., pursuant to rights established under the laws of the State of California shall be given preference with respect to the waters of the Kings River which are impounded and stored by the Pine Flat Dam and Reservoir and which are in excess of the amount of water necessary to satisfy the rights acquired under the laws of the State of California for the use of waters of the Kings River.

"The sum to be repaid by the water users of the Kings River for the irrigation and conservation benefits of Pine Flat Dam and Reservoir shall not include the construction costs and other expenses, or any portion thereof, of any feature of the Central Valley project or any other project other than Pine Flat Dam."

Now that amendment means that the small farmers in the upper reaches of the Kings River area who now have water rights and who comply with the 160 acre limitation law would get first crack at the impounded floodwaters behind Pine Flat Dam.

CHEAP WATER UNDER WHITE BILL

It would mean that these small farmers could irrigate the year around instead of running out of water in the late summer months as they do now. And it means that all this talk about having to pay $3.50 an acre-foot for Central Valley project water if Kings River is integrated into the Central Valley project is just that—talk—and nothing else.

The repayment cost on the water at the Kings River diversion point would be roughly 30 cents an acre a year under my bill.

That is not 30 cents per acre-foot, but 30 cents per acre per year, based on approximately 1,000,000 acres in the Kings River area. That is less than 7 percent of the $3.50 an acre-foot which the opposition has been trying to get the farmers to believe would be the cost of the water. This repayment cost of roughly 30 cents an acre per year is definitely tied down under the new amendment to my bill which I just read to you a moment ago, but actually that was the intention of the Bureau of Reclamation all along to charge only 30 cents an acre a year, and the $3.50 an acre-foot is the usual scare story of the opposition.

POWER IS MAJOR BONE OF CONTENTION

Another purpose of my bill is to develop hydroelectric power on the Kings River. A large part of the power is needed to pump Central Valley project water. It is a sad commentary on human nature, indeed, to state that while accepting an electric power subsidy from power generated at Shasta Dam on the Central Valley project water which is pumped up on a hill 190 feet at Tracy and thence runs down to Mendota pool, a part of the Kings River group, the Tulare Lake group, who have already applied to the Bureau of Reclamation for some of this Central Valley project water, are at the same time unwilling to allow Kings River power to be used to pump Central Valley project water at the project rate. What it amounts to is that the Tulare Lake group are unwilling to have Kings River power used to pump water to themselves.

I have encountered selfish viewpoints before, but that one just about takes the cake.

Now, with regard to the hydroelectric power features of my bill, may I say that if the Kings River group had done as the Modesto, Turlock, and Merced irrigation districts have done—that is—built their own dam with their own money, I would not only sanction their action but I would commend it. However, the Kings River group for some unknown reason saw fit to wait around until the Government has authorized the expenditure of $50,000,000 of the taxpayers' money for Pine Flat Dam, which makes upstream power development possible, and now the Kings River group wants to come in and take over these power benefits after all the people of the area have paid their share on the costs. Besides the Kings River group could not provide firm power the year round and would have to make a deal with the P. G. & E.

If the power is developed by the Bureau of Reclamation it will extend the benefits of the Central Valley project, and could provide cheap power through the REA to the farmers who have to pump water for irrigation. The power could also be sold to municipalities who might have their own distribution systems. The farmers and the cities can buy the power at the same price the P. G. & E. would pay the Government for it.

WHITE BILL MEANS MORE WATER FOR SMALL FARMERS

I am asking the people to support my Kings River bill to keep the 160-acre limitation law and to protect the small farmer's water, as well as give him cheap power for any pumping he needs to do and for his domestic needs.

If the White bill becomes law it means the small farmers would have 50 percent more water over 7,000 second-feet flow in Kings River than would be the case under the Kaupke sponsored Werdel bill. Under the Werdel-Kaupke bill the big farmers in the Tulare Lake area would get this water and it would be free to them eventually, after applying the power revenue.

What good does it do the small farmers to have the price of water made a little cheaper through a power subsidy such as the Werdel-Kaupke bill provides when under that bill half of the small farmers' extra water created by the dam goes to the big farmers in Tulare Lake?

Finally, I say that if the philosophy of Mr. Kaupke and his group prevails it means the Central Valley project is stopped dead in its tracks and the large portion of this valley which pumps water from the underground supply will eventually turn into a dust bowl.

County Ranked at Top in United States Buying Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached article entitled "County Ranked at Top in United States Buying Power," taken from the Daily Times, published in Mamaroneck, N. Y., May 24, 1950:

[From the Mamaroneck (N. Y.) Daily Times of May 24, 1950]

COUNTY RANKED AT TOP IN UNITED STATES BUYING POWER—WESTCHESTER NOW RATED WEALTHIEST PER FAMILY IN ENTIRE NATION

Effective buying income makes Westchester the wealthiest per family of the more than 3,000 counties of the United States of America.

This is the conclusion drawn by Sales Management magazine today in its twenty-first annual survey of buying power, following an exhaustive survey of the Nation's 200 most populous counties, those in which the greatest buying power has accumulated. The magazine's findings substantiate a study made by this and affiliated Westchester newspapers last year based on a survey of New York State personal income tax payments.

Drastically revising its estimates of last year, when Westchester was ranked fourth in the Nation, Sales Management today shows Westchester far outstripping last year's leaders.

This year's survey lists income per family (after Federal income taxes) in Westchester at $9,942.

In second place is Nassau County on Long Island, generally considered the most comparable to Westchester, with $8,778. Westchester leads by more than $1,000 per family.

Third place is held by Essex County (Newark) N. J., at $6,644; fourth is Cook County (Chicago) Ill., with $6,282; and fifth is San Francisco County, Cal., with $6,269. New York City is ranked eighth in the Nation with $5,981 per family.

The Westchester family buying income, $9,942, is more than twice that of the national average of $4,474.

Westchester's total effective buying income—that is, the total income available for spending after local, State, and National taxes have been deducted—is listed by Sales Management at $1,725,859,000. This total is twelfth among the Nation's most populous counties. Last year Westchester's total was listed at $1,075,368,000, making it twenty-fifth in this category. The buying power per family is obtained by dividing total income by total number of families, and in this arithmetical treatment Westchester emerges at the No. 1 spot in the Nation.

When computed on an individual basis, Westchester also shows up at the top in effective per capita buying income, with $2,782 per person against the national average of $1,286.

MOUNT VERNON RANKS FIRST

Sales Management also ranks the per-family income for the 200 most populous cities, listing in the table cities of 67,000 population and over. In this category, Mount Vernon ranks first and Yonkers sixth among these larger cities.

Further, a study of more than a thousand of communities of 5,000 or more population listed by the magazine in the survey indicates that other Westchester communities rank nationally as follows in their per family effective income:

Scarsdale, first; Bronxville, second; Larchmont, third; New Rochelle, seventh; White Plains, tenth; Mamaroneck, twelfth; Mount Vernon, fifteenth; Mount Kisco, seventeenth; Tarrytown, twentieth; Port Chester-Rye, twentieth; Yonkers, fifty-eighth; and Ossining, seventy-ninth.

Greenwich, Conn., is estimated with per family income at $6,982 and ranks forty-eighth in the Nation.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the United States is in a difficult position to fight communism. The reason for this is that the Nation is itself deeply mired in this base creed. Communism, nazism, fascism, New and Fair Dealism, the welfare state, and so forth, are made of the same stuff. They vary only in degree, since each spells out in political control. This is the essence of these isms.

That there should be attachment of the believers in and advocates of communism, or of those who put their faith in political control, in this country, with the more advanced Communist states, such as Russia, France, and England, is but natural.

There is much confusion and misunderstanding as to what constitutes communism. This was forcibly illustrated in the Mundt-Nixon anti-Communist bill, which passed the House a few years ago. It contained a provision that any organization in the United States which advocated any of the things Marx and Lenin have advanced should be considered a Communist organization.

Marx and Lenin believed in and advocated progressive taxation. The Wilson administration adopted in 1913 the system of progressive taxation and the Republican Party has accepted it. According to the Mundt-Nixon bill, therefore, this would make both of the major political parties Communist organizations.

So that there is really no quarrel between the forces controlling the United States and those controlling Russia, as regards mode of government. The real

difference between the two countries relates to jurisdiction over lands and peoplies. Roosevelt and Truman sanctioned Russia's vast accrual of territory and population. All the subversive forces within and without our Government have built up Russia to its present size and strength.

We Must Act Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in today's issue of the Washington Daily News, there appears an editorial that should have the attention of every Member of the Congress. The majority party leadership should particularly take note of the subject matter and the suggestions contained therein. It is time for this Government to get down to business and face the facts of the crisis that may be upon us any day. We must act now:

NOT SAFE TO BE UNREADY

If the fighting is confined to Korea, this country may be able to surmount the present crisis without such economic controls as a major war would require.

But there is no assurance that the fighting will be confined to Korea.

Each day's news from Korea makes it surer that even the task to which America is committed there will demand far more than at first seemed likely in manpower, in more and much better weapons and in money.

And each day's news makes plainer the urgent need for better preparedness against acts of Communist aggression elsewhere.

Even a partial mobilization of industry would strain the national economy more seriously than it did 10 years ago, when America was becoming the arsenal of democracy.

In 1940, more than 8,000,000 workers were unemployed in this country. Plenty of hands were available to make munitions and to produce enough civilian goods for a still limited demand. The national debt was oly about $43,000,000,000. Prices had barely begun to rise.

In July 1950, only a little more than 3,000,000 members of the labor forces are jobless. Demand for civilian goods is at record levels. Already foolish hoarding is pushing high prices higher. Already the national debt is over $267,000,000,000 and its further growth will increase dangerous inflationary pressures.

We can understand the tendency to hope that the situation will not worsen and that stern necessity will not require mobilization of wealth, of industry, of industrial manpower, even though drafted men are being mobilized to fight.

But it is not safe to be unready if such hopes prove vain.

It is not safe to leave plans for total mobilization incomplete in the secret files of the National Security Resources Board.

It is not safe for President Truman to wait until some great and surely possible emergency forces him to send those plans to Congress with a plea for rubber-stamp approval.

They are not the sort of plans that should be rubber-stamped. They are the sort of plans that Congress should study carefully—and study now—not in the heat and confusion of a greater crisis than Korea has raised.

Any day may bring compelling need for the Government to control industrial production, materials, and manpower; to impose wartime taxes; to put ceilings on prices and wages; to restrict credit selling; to ration consumer goods.

These things were done in World War II. But they were done piecemeal, after much costly fumbling and countless blunders, and so they were far less effective than they should have been in speeding war production and curbing inflation.

If these things must be done again, they must be done better. A repetition of the mistakes made in World War II would be inexcusable and could be disastrous.

Mr. Truman should instruct the National Security Resources Board to perfect the latest draft of its total mobilization plans and give them to him for delivery to Congress.

Congress, remaining in session, should consider those plans with all the speed that thoroughness will permit. And Congress then should enact them into legislation which can be held ready to go into immediate effect if and when the House and Senate declare by concurrent resolution that an emergency requires the Government to use the powers conferred.

The Korean Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JULY 11, 1950.

DEAR JOHN: After talking with you on the telephone last night I cannot refrain from writing you further about the Korean situation. I can well understand how you, as a Reserve officer, are disturbed about it. So are we all. The fact is, we live in a very disturbed and troubled world.

First of all let me say again that I approved of what the President did in Korea, although I regret the necessity of doing it. The tension between Russia and our own country has been increasing for a long time; in fact since 1945. There has to be a stopping point somewhere. The issue has to be resolved as between communism on the one hand or self-government and liberty on the other.

Second, I want you to know how unalterably opposed I am to communism and I know you share this feeling. I believe in Iowa there are very few if any Communists. But that fact should not deceive us as to the situation elsewhere. A large part of the human race is now under the domination of the communistic government of Russia. There is an active and unscrupulous minority in the United States adhering to communistic doctrines which will destroy this country and its institutions if it were able to do so. The issue between communism and our form of government is pretty clear because (a) communism destroys the institution of private property which most Americans believe to be one of the rights guaranteed by our Constitution and form of government; (b) communism destroys individual liberty and self-government wherever it goes; (c) communism is based upon a materialistic philosophy which denies the existence of God and would destroy Christianity.

The events of World War II have thrust the United States of America into leadership of world affairs. Whether we like it or not, the force of events has pushed us into heavy responsibilities in world matters. As I see it there is no escape from these responsibilities because our very refusal to accept them would have important and perhaps disastrous results. As an illustration of this let me say that in my opinion the administration made a considerable number of grave errors in dealing with Russia since the war. It will not serve any useful purpose to enumerate them because unfortunately we cannot retrace those steps and start over again. We must accept the situation as it is regardless of any opinion that we may have that the situation could have been avoided by other and different courses of action in the past.

I do not believe that we should become panicky about it but should hold our heads and resolve that this time we shall bring about a situation so that our foreign policies would not be subject to the caprice of the Russian Kremlin.

At this writing it is of course impossible to tell what the outcome will be. We can at least hope that Russia will realize that this is the "stop signal" and will not cause trouble in some other area of the world.

It was good to talk to you and to exchange ideas with you on this matter which so gravely affects all of us.

With all good wishes,

Very truly yours,

JAMES I. DOLLIVER.

Mother Feels Son's Sacrifice May Be Used To Further Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to have appear in the RECORD a letter from a mother in my district in South Dakota. This lady requests that her name be withheld, because an older son has a civil-service position. She asks that I make her feelings known to Members of the Congress and to the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, because this letter contains such a great element of pathos and reflects the feeling of one American mother, I recommend it to the Members of this body.

To the Honorable HAROLD LOVRE:

My son who will be 18 years old on his next birthday wishes to enlist in the Army since the Korean disturbance. But I cannot, in conscience, allow him to do so since it seems from past experience that his sacrifice may be used in the interest of communism rather than to protect our own, or any country, from aggression.

Under our present and late administrations, we have recognized and aided all those governments under Communist domination as well as countries such as England and France who were certain to turn against us in the event of war with Russia. But we have steadfastly refused all help to those countries which have fought and are fighting communism. (Even poor China who

held our enemies at bay at such a sacrifice for so long a time.) And in our own land we have protected and abetted those who would betray our country into Russian hands. In other words, we have allowed Communists to have their way here and elsewhere. And now that they have achieved their objectives—conquering of China and most of Europe, infiltration of every country, and total preparedness for war—we are ordering our military to the other side of the world where issues can easily be obscured and victory almost impossible. To make war on a peaceful people, whose fault lies in their weakness, as seeming puppets, driven to war by their Soviet bosses.

I believe we could overcome any obstacle to win with God on our side. But how can we expect His help, having betrayed Him so shamelessly?

Are we American mothers to be regarded as Hitler did the mothers of German youth? Only as producers of cannon fodder? Or do we have the right to demand that the blood of our sons will be shed only in defense of Christian principles and that their moral integrity will be safeguarded as far as possible? During the war just fought, no effort was made to protect our soldiers from the carrion which feed on the death of their manhood. But in true Hitler-Stalin fashion they were taught how to sin without getting caught.

Our oldest son served 3 years in the European area of World War II. Seeing many of his buddies suffering and dying for the oft repeated slogan, "The freedom of all peoples and prevention of future wars." But also for their hopes and sacrifices. Even then, secret treaties and diabolic agreements were in the making. Exiling, enslaving, trading, and dividing many millions of helpless, innocent people, with less regard than if they were cattle, or at most, pawns on a checker board. Korea being one of the first of our inhuman traffic pawns to bring its burden of national injustice home to roost.

Have we not reason to distrust leaders who were party to such injustices, as, cry to Heaven for vengeance?

These leaders, or men in power, still defend these policies and voice their intention of continuing in the same path in the future. They also promoted the doctrine of total war, mass murder of unarmed and helpless people. We have every reason to believe that this Korean crisis is being used to bolster their warring powers and to distract attention from issues at home.

Hypocrisy in High Places

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached editorial entitled "Hypocrisy in High Places" taken from the Daily Times, published in Mamaroneck, N. Y., May 23, 1950:

HYPOCRISY IN HIGH PLACES

One of the 1948 campaign arguments upon which President Truman secured Democratic majorities in both the Senate and the House of Representatives was that he intended to create a Fair Employment Practice Commission, to set up and enforce provisions in employment against discrimination because of race, color, or creed.

The electorate gave Mr. Truman those majorities. And now see what has happened:

On the vote last week to adopt cloture, in order to bring the FEPC controversy to a vote in the Senate, the proponents of FEPC lost by 12 votes.

Let it be noted for the record that 33 Republicans voted for cloture and only 6 against. Let it also be placed on the record that only 19 Democrats voted for cloture while 26 voted against.

In other words, the Republicans voted by better than 5-to-1 to permit a vote on FEPC. The Democrats voted 4-to-3 against permitting a vote.

Where, then, is there any reasonable basis for Mr. Truman's attempt to make of this a partisan issue?

And where, it might be asked, were some of the administration stalwarts on this crucial test?

Absent.

Senator MURRAY of Montana, Democrat, had a legitimate excuse of a personal character.

But Senator CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, Democrat, was campaigning in his home State.

Senator FREAR, of Delaware, a Democrat, was on a committee assignment.

Senator DOWNEY, of California, Democrat, not seeking reelection, stayed at home.

Senator GRAHAM, of North Carolina, Democrat, reported sick.

Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, Democrat, said he was at the White House examining loyalty files.

And Senator PEPPER, of Florida, Democrat, that zealous New Deal advocate for the underprivileged, was resting after a campaign.

Is there any wonder a growing percentage of the American people doubt the real sincerity of the Truman administration in this matter? Isn't there cause to believe their actual purpose is to keep the issue alive for the fall campaign?

Our Tragic Foreign Policy in China and Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein a statement of our foreign policy in China and Korea. We are reaping the whirlwind today from the seeds that were sown at the conferences of Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam and the radical advice of some of those who represented our Government there whose loyalty, even to this day, is questioned.

No one can read this statement of the tragic events and the blundering policy of this country without feeling resentment toward the administration in power for the blood and lives now being sacrificed as a result.

The present administration has now has been in complete control of our foreign policy since 1933. In this 17 years the fate of millions of Americans has been left to the judgment of men whose mistakes have cost us and are costing us the lives of our boys. During that period we fought a great war. For 3 years our boys, enduring untold hardships, fought in the malaria-laden swamps of Guadalcanal, New Guinea, and hundreds of other islands in the Southwest Pacific. They fought with a single-minded purpose to make this world a better place to live in. They fought so that their sons would never have to fight again. Before the battle in the Pacific was half over, we were beginning to mortgage their future. A series of conferences at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, held between 1943 and 1945, made concessions to Russia on the flimsy excuse that without them Russia might make a separate peace. This showed poor judgment, for to make a separate peace, Russia, then occupied by Nazi troops, would have had to forfeit everything. Stalin never had the slightest intention of making a separate peace, but our statesmen believed that he might, and in believing so agreed to outrageous compromises with the very Atlantic Charter which had become the touchstone of liberty everywhere.

With Mr. Alger Hiss as his adviser, President Roosevelt agreed at Yalta to give Russia Southern Sagahlien, the Kuriles, and the Japanese holdings in Manchuria. He recognized Russia's theft of Outer Mongolia. He undertook to force Chiang Kai-shek to sign a treaty of friendship with Soviet Russia which was actually done on August 14, 1945, the day before Japan surrendered. And what was the price that Stalin paid for these concessions? Stalin agreed to fight Japan. And Stalin did fight Japan. For nine whole days, Stalin "fought" a Japanese army in Manchuria, an army who knew they were licked when the atom bomb, dropped on Hiroshima on the very day the Russian offensive began, spelled the beginning of the end. Then 800,000 Japanese in Manchuria surrendered to the Russians and were promptly transported to Siberia, where 375,000 of them still remain, or are dead. Their weapons were left at convenient places in Manchuria, which was then being overrun by Russia's puppets, the Chinese Communists, coming overland from northwest China.

Our troops after landing in Japan were sent to China to evacuate some 2,000,000 Japanese, both military and civilian, and return them to their homeland. Chiang Kai-shek moved his troops, with our LST's, across the Gulf of Pechili and into the cities along the South Manchurian Railroad. We reached an agreement with the Russian armies invading Korea which stopped them at the thirty-eighth parallel. At Cairo we had declared with China and Britain that Korean independence was our goal. Russia never adhered to this Cairo declaration, made by us in 1943.

Ever since General Stilwell, whose political adviser was one John S. Service, had been appointed adviser to Chiang Kai-shek in 1943, he had urged Chiang to take the Communists into the Government. But Chiang had been fighting the Communists since 1927. He steadfastly refused to take into his government an armed party, whose open backer was Soviet Russia. In asking him to do so, we were violating the Hay Doctrine, which in 1900 had declared our aim to be

to maintain the territorial integrity of China. How can any country's territorial integrity be maintained when the government is partly composed of paid satellites of a foreign power, such as would have been the case had Chiang agreed to take in the Chinese Communists? General Stilwell resigned and came home and with him John S. Service. It was only shortly after this that Service was arrested for turning over confidential documents to Amerasia magazine, which was run by a known Russian agent. Vice President Henry A. Wallace, accompanied by John Carter Vincent of the State Department, now was sent to China on a special mission. The objective, as brought out by the white paper on China, was still to convince Chiang Kai-shek that he should bring the Chinese Communists into his government. Owen Lattimore accompanied the party as the new adviser to Chiang Kai-shek. Despite this high-powered pressure group, who worked on him for several weeks, Chiang refused to have the Communists in his government, unless they disarmed.

After Japan surrendered, the group in the State Department, made one last effort to put the Chinese Communists into Chiang's government. They sent General Marshall to China and the general did his utmost to carry out their designs. He also failed, however, and proclaiming a "plague on both your houses," he, on July 1, 1946, withdrew all further support from Chiang Kai-shek in his battle against the Communists. While Russia, by leaving millions of tons of armament and equipment taken from the surrendered Japanese in Manchuria where the Chinese Communists could find them, was giving aid to the Communists, we were withdrawing all aid from Chiang Kai-shek. Chiang had the guns but nothing to shoot in them. When attacked his troops had to flee and abandon their armor. The result was inevitable, but just what the boys in the State Department had planned. Chiang was denounced, the white paper was published, leaving out most of the essential facts, in an effort to discredit Chiang, and the Communists finally took over.

In Korea the tale is, if anything, more tragic. At the Moscow Conference Russia and the United States agreed to carry out the Cairo declaration and set up an independent government in Korea. But when it came to implement this agreement, Russia balked and refused to allow any Korean political group to take part in a constituent assembly who had agreed to a trusteeship for Korea under the United Nations. This eliminated all but the Communists and Socialists who were already the pawns of Soviet Russia. We tried to mediate the matter, but being unsuccessful, finally turned it over to the United Nations. Under the aegis of that body a constituent assembly in South Korea drew up a democratic constitution in 1947 which placed Syngman Rhee as chairman and called for elections. These were held with 80 percent of electorate voting and Rhee was elected President. In North Korea the People's Government was constituted by the single-slate procedure common in Russia and proclaimed itself the only legitimate government of Korea, outlawing the southern Republic.

In December 1948 the United Nations requested both the United States and Soviet Russia to withdraw their armies from Korea. Russia complied in January 1949 and 6 months later we withdrew our forces. But in withdrawing her forces Russia left a strong army, well equipped with heavy tanks, and backed by a declaration that the southern republic was an outlaw. We left equipment for what was essentially a police force, lightly armed, with no tanks and no air support.

Ambassador Muccio and others began to warn the State Department that northern Korea was making ready to attack the south shortly after that, and kept it up for nearly a year. Finally he made a strong statement, 23 days before the attack, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in which he pointed out the plight of the south in case an attack came. Despite the appropriations from Congress earmarked for the purpose, not one cent was allowed to be spent by the State Department from these appropriations for the type of defensive material which the Ambassador had shown was needed. Adhering to Owen Lattimore's advice "that we had no business in Korea and should cease supporting little Chiang Kai-sheks," the "too little and too late" boys repeated their Chinese performance and left the South Koreans undefended.

Today every drop of American blood which has been spilled in Korea can be attributed to this policy advocated by Owen Lattimore. Sending a battalion of 500 men against 3 North Korean divisions of 18,000 men, in a pitiful attempt to stem the onrushing Red tide, we have made ourselves the mockery of the world. It is no wonder that our boys, bleeding and wounded and falling back, are cursing the fact that we have no heavy antitank guns and no tanks. Not since 1898, when our boys died like flies from malaria and bad beef at Chickamauga, has utter mismanagement in high places brought on such a debacle. Flying the flag of the United Nations our boys are forced to retreat before the Red horde. Can we afford to sit back and smugly say, "While we are not at war, any criticism of the State Department at this time is very ungentlemanly." For Dean Acheson, who has done a splendid flip-flop, the dust may now have settled. He may hope that all bets will be off, "for the duration," which many believe will continue long after the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November next; but I for one do not intend to let this administration forget or to let the American people forget that every drop of American blood now being shed in Korea could have been prevented had we been adequately prepared to meet the situation which we knew existed.

Mother Love

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, one of the most beloved citizens of Jersey City is Rev. August F. Bender. Dr. Bender was for many years the distinguished pastor of one of the city's most progressive Protestant churches. He is now pastor emeritus of the church and also chaplain of the Jersey City Police Department.

Dr. Bender is a scholar of note. He has been invalided for a long time and has borne his suffering with admirable Christian resignation and with a spiritual fortitude worthy of a saint.

He is noted for his engaging prose style, which has captivated countless audiences during his active career as a preacher and author, and still draws the attention of a multitude of people who enjoy reading his publication.

As an example of his excellence as a writer, and the lofty thoughts to which he frequently gives public expression, I append herewith a recent article which he contributed to the local press on the subject entitled "Mother Love":

MOTHER LOVE

Mother love is a powerful thing that few, if any, of us appreciate until it is too late. Mother love comes into the world with us. It exists in the mother's heart for us before our advent. It is instinctive. It is permanent.

Sometimes sons and daughters are ungrateful, are neglectful, are unresponsive. But in their heart of hearts the love of mother is lingering and waiting to be aroused.

In the mother's heart the love of her children never dies. The blackest sheep will find a fold if the mother can show the way. Mothers, since the day the world began, have been imposed upon by their children, and mothers have made sacrifice after sacrifice for them.

If men and women could just get back into their worldly hearts the sweet simplicity of that childish prayer: "Now I lay me down to sleep, I pray the Lord my soul to keep," that most of us repeated at our mother's knee, while she softly stroked our heads, and her heart throbbed, hopefully and helpfully, encouraging our baby prayer: if we could only understand and feel again, as we did in those innocent days of childhood—what a beautiful world this would be.

Children look into their mother's eyes, listen to her dear voice, notice the affection of even a single touch of her gentle hand, and feel a confidence that they can never feel in after years. It is wondrous power—this power of the mother love—so little understood, so sadly unappreciated.

"Mother" has no geography—she is in all lands. No particular locality—she is everywhere. The tenses—past, present, and future—have their superlative in the rich fullness of her heart. All temperaments, warm or cold, nervous or phlegmatic, trusting or suspicious, fearless or fearful, strong or weak, sensitive or hard, have harmonious companionship with her.

Every minute of life, every condition, has a haven of solace in the warmth of her arms.

Prisoner and prince, pauper, and rich man, defeated and victorious, sick and well, disgraced and honored—all equally share right of entry to this unfailing reservoir of consolation.

Her prayers are not often spoken. They are largely wordless prayers. The sunken eyes are prayers. The trembling lips are prayers. The drooping hands, and back all bent, to me are prayers most eloquent. Her repressed sighs are voiceless prayers—yes, and her smiles are benedictions.

Korea

REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I regret that my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has seen fit to make the comments he made on what happened in an executive session of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I have always been proud of the fact that regardless of the leaks that frequently emerged from committees of the other body, our committee in the past has always kept in strictest confidence secret information that has been given us, even though frequently I believed and said it was completely wrong to keep much of it from the press and the public.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to say today is to condemn in the strongest terms the incompetence and delay with which much of our military aid program has been conducted. Some of us on the committee have known this for some time. Persons high in the Pentagon have come to me months ago privately at night in civilian clothes to warn me that the administration of the program stinks—that was the word used—due in large part to inability to get prompt clear decisions and directives from the State Department. I have said this repeatedly in committee and once in open hearings, trying to get this situation corrected.

May I now read from a press release which I am including as part of my remarks. It was issued on May 21, 1950, more than a month before the attack on Korea, by the Korean-American Council here in Washington. It reported on a radio broadcast and news conference by President Syngman Rhee, of Korea. He was begging us to wake up to the facts of life while there still was time. Dr. Rhee said he was "aware antagonistic elements were arguing against arms for south Korea on the claim they might be used to march into the north." Those antagonistic elements in our own Government have been proved so wrong they should be removed.

Dr. Rhee's remarks continue:

The recent growth of the combat strength of the northern army, and its improvement in weapons even to the formation of a 195-plane air force, makes improvement in southern equipment necessary purely for the purpose of defense, and nothing else.

With no planes, with Communist artillery possessing greater range than ours, with the Chinese Communists contributing rifles to the northern Korea forces, we defend the parallel under severe handicap. And we live with a sense of something worse.

They have begged us for assistance, and someone would not send it, even though authority and funds were provided last October. Almost nothing had been sent. Somebody ought to be held responsible for the death of the American boys who are now fighting almost alone because we would not arm effectively the south Koreans. The responsibility for their death does not lie solely in the Soviet Union or in north Korea. It lies also in the failure of somebody here at home to prepare the south Koreans so that those whom we love would not have to be fighting with little aid from the Koreans whom we could not expect to defend themselves without suitable weapons.

[From the Korean-American Council, Washington, D. C., May 21, 1950]

WEAPONS FOR DEFENSE, NOT FOR AGGRESSION

SEOUL, May 20.—Any weapons given to the Korean Government by the United States would be used only for an increasingly necessary defense and not to upset the international status quo by an invasion of Communist-dominated northern Korea, President Syngman Rhee has declared emphatically.

He extended the assurance at a news conference.

In a radio broadcast to the people of northern Korea he gave further assurances by stating that commitments toward peace did not permit the democratic south to move by force for their liberation, but he urged their puppet officials to come to their senses and join the free government.

President Rhee said he was aware antagonistic elements were arguing against arms for south Korea on the claim they might be used for a march into the north to reclaim the half of the country occupied by Russia when the Japanese surrendered.

Before an ostensible withdrawal simultaneously with the American occupation forces in the south, the Russians established a northern Korea quisling government and an army which outnumbers that of the south. Dr. Rhee said:

"The recent growth of the combat strength of the northern army, and its improvement in weapons even to the formation of a 195-plane air force, makes improvement in southern equipment necessary purely for the purpose of defense, and nothing else.

"The northern force is exerting greater and greater pressure on the 38th parallel dividing the two areas of control. Behind their heavy garrisons already on the line, they are stacking up bigger units of combat power.

"Their guerrilla columns make frequent invasions. With no planes, with Communist artillery possessing greater range than ours, with the Chinese Communists contributing rifles to the northern Korea force, we defend the parallel under severe handicap. And we live with a sense of something worse.

"Anyone who knows us, anyone who realizes our sense of international responsibility in this tense world period, understands that we contemplate no invasion.

"Those who charge such an intent are forwarding Communist propaganda, the purpose of which, of course, is to so weaken us that we cannot hold out.

"We seek only the sense of security which a few planes and other weapons would give—not jet planes, merely some of the guns and some of the planes the United States is now discarding and junking.

"We ask defensive weapons, not the weapons of aggression."

THE RED PLANE MENACE

SEOUL, May 20.—Estimates by the Korean National Defense Ministry that the Soviet-created North Korea army has 195 war planes has forced new realism on free South Korea, where there are no combat planes or antiaircraft guns.

The south faces the fact that its complete lack of air defense might mean disaster to the capital city of Seoul and to the ports of Pusan and Inchon should the north, unceasingly aggressive along the thirty-eighth parallel, attempt an air operation.

Such an attack would be only a step farther in the north's persistent dispatch of guerrilla columns across the parallel into the south, and its steady rifle, machine gun, and artillery fire on national army trenches at the parallel.

Observance of the spirit as well as the letter of United Nations wishes keeps the southern forces from counteroffensive, although at places the Communists actually hold heights south of the border, with important tactical advantage.

Confirmation of reports that a strong air force is coming into being in the north, the planes made by Russia and the crews trained by Russians, was accompanied by other evidence recently that the Soviets are rapidly building up a puppet military force of invasion proportions.

Arms, uniforms, and other material needed no longer by the victorious Chinese Communists, including American rifles furnished to the Chinese army during the Japanese war, are now flowing into North Korea.

The military draft there has been extended to women, and a number of rifle-bearing girl guerrillas already have been captured by national troops south of the line dividing free South Korea from the Russian-ruled north.

In other indications lies evidence that the north is undergoing nearly total mobilization.

The matter of aircraft, however, dominates in the worry of the two-thirds of the 30,000,000 Korean population that now lives in the south, and was strong enough recently to compel the Korean Embassy at Washington to make formal request of the American Government for defense planes.

The recent desertion to the south of a North Korean fighter pilot with his Russian-made plane added to and confirmed information already gathered by the Korean Defense Ministry as to the formidable strength of the Communist air force.

The defecting plane, a three-place fighter, with a three-bladed propeller and a machine gun, was one of 70 Stormovik IL-10 planes in the North Korean air force, its pilot, Lt. Lee Kun-soon, reported after he landed near Pusan after escaping with the ship from the airstrip at Wonsan on North Korea's east coast.

A chart prepared by the Defense Ministry after Lee's report shows North Korea in possession of 55 Yak-92 fighter-pursuit planes, 22 advanced trainer planes, and other models, many suitable for bombing.

With snow largely gone from the mountains along the parallel, raiding guerrilla bands are now resorting frequently to the setting of forest fires to spread terror and destruction south of the line and to tie up manpower in fire-fighting.

The defeat of one invading column by National troops is followed almost immediately by the appearance of another working its way southward through rugged passes.

Official reports from the Eighth Korean Army Division in the extreme northeast part of South Korea, declare that on several occasions Russian officers brazenly wearing Russian Army uniforms, have been sighted with the invading bands.

The Truth About the Federal Council of Churches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 3, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House of Representatives Select Committee on Lobbying, acting under and by authority of House Resolution 298, "to conduct a study and investigation of all lobbying activities intended to influence, arrange, promote, or retard legislation," and so forth, I heard one Edward A. Rumely, the very able, active, and experienced executive director of all the extensive activities of the Committee for Constitutional Government, testify in public sessions of the select committee repeatedly about and in support of the recent book, the Road Ahead, by one John T. Flynn. In fact, I received a free copy of this book, along with several other books and pamphlets, via the United States mail, from the lobbying office headed by Mr. Rumely. In line with my duty and responsibility, I read every word of this book.

When I came to chapter 10, entitled the "Kingdom of God," when I had finished it I pondered. I wondered if Mr. Flynn had made a correct—a fair appraisal, if you please—of the subject matter. I wondered what the distinguished Americans who were commonly known as the leaders, the lay leaders, of the Federal Council of Churches in America had to say about Mr. Flynn's "attack and appraisal of their work." I immediately started to find out for myself what the real facts were. You see, having served on the Select Lobbying Committee for several months now, I frankly state that the American people need to look into the very heart and soul and truth of these publications and books that are printed and distributed by this committee or that committee. The advice my father used to give me as a growing boy is still sound advice. Yes, it is. He said to me, "Son, read all your eyes will stand. But, son, read it with open mind until you learn the truth."

And as I was asking what the real facts were, for I applied my dad's advice to my own case as to this chapter 10, for example, I received through the mail a page of the bulletin of the First Congregational Church at my home city of Long Beach, Calif., relating to this very subject of Mr. Flynn's attack on the Federal Council of Churches in his book, The Road Ahead which I heard Mr. Rumely, the expert lobbyist of the Committee for Constitutional Government, boast about before the Lobbying Committee so much.

For your information and guidance, I herewith offer the complete text of the printed page I received recently from Long Beach, Calif.

And, having read the Flynn book and having heard Mr. Rumely testify in public hearings about it, including the fact that he received 4 percent of all the cash received from its sales, I naturally wonder whether these 50 Christian lay leaders of this particular church organization are all wet or what?

You will note that amongst other statements these 50 laymen make, in answer to Mr. Flynn and Mr. Rumely, is—

> The Federal Council has formally and unanimously denounced Marxian communism as atheistic and as clearly opposed to Christianity. It has pointed out that on these differences Christians cannot compromise.

And then, their closing statement about the Federal Council of Churches in America, about which Mr. Flynn and they so sharply differ is as follows:

> We record our full confidence that the Federal Council functions with complete fidelity to Christian ideals. We pledge our continuing support of its work. We express our conviction that, by providing the churches with a means of unified expression and action, it is performing an indispensable task.
>
> The undersigned are well acquainted with the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America either through participation in its work or contact with its leadership over several years.

And what leaders of American business were among those who signed this statement, in direct contravention of Mr. Flynn's charge?

Just look at a few of the names. Are they Socialists? Are they creeping toward socialism? Are they the men whom Mr. Flynn says in his book are "using its machinery to promote the interest of a Socialist revolution in America." Flynn also says, "I do not believe that they realize what is being done by these leaders."

Well, certainly, if these distinguished laity leaders of the Federal Council of Churches, had been careless before about what their employed executives or leaders were preaching or publishing, certainly Mr. Flynn's specific charges of socialism and Socialist revolution and procommunism put these leaders in specific notice of backing and financing such Socialist revolution.

But, having seen Mr. Flynn's specific charges in his book, these leaders of Christian laity specifically reply to Mr. Flynn and say, publicly—his charges are baseless.

And, here are a few of these supporters of the Federal Council of Churches about whom Mr. Flynn writes: John Foster Dulles, Eric A. Johnston, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, Harper Sibley, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, William T. Gossett, vice president of Ford Motor Co., Charles P. Taft, lawyer, and brother of United States Senator Robert Taft and Chester I. Barnard, former president of New Jersey Bell Telephone Co. and president of Rockefeller Foundation.

So, Mr. Speaker, books and pamphlets are written and sold by the thousands. Money and commissions are made from them. Charges and countercharges are made: propaganda—appearing in perfectly respectable dress and garb—is furnished free to the American public; or, at special rates. The whole truth about anything is a real rarity. The withholding material facts from the public is destructive of democracy. Only an informed, an enlightened public opinion can exercise the voting franchise and participate in support of our American heritage with enduring and lasting vigor and vigilance.

The sound foundation for the solution of the ills of civilization is still: "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

[From the Federal Council Bulletin]

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Expressing their full confidence in the Federal Council of Churches as an instrument of Christian unity in America, 50 Protestant laymen, leaders in industry, Government and many other walks of life, have joined in refuting as baseless charges of socialism and pro-communism made in recent weeks by John T. Flynn, the Ku Klux Klan and the American Council of Christian Laymen of Madison, Wis.

Both the group of Protestant laymen and the 155 members and alternate members of the executive committee of the Federal Council declare there is no ground whatever for the charges that now appear to be part of a widespread campaign against the cooperating churches from strangely assorted sources. The statement as adopted by the 50 laymen follows:

The undersigned are well acquainted with the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America either through participation in its work or contact with its leadership over several years. We have noticed suggestions, some of which have been given considerable publicity, that the Federal Council may be under the influence of persons who believe in state socialism and who may be using the Federal Council to bring about political and social practices incompatible with a Christian view of the nature of man and his right to develop freely his God-given possibilities. It is implied that the Federal Council may unwittingly be lending itself to conduct which would facilitate Communist penetration of our society.

There is no basis whatever for any such conclusions.

The Federal Council is the agency through which 27 great denominations cooperate in matters of common concern. Its policies are determined at biennial meetings of delegates and, in the interval, by an executive committee made up of members designated by the constituent denominations. These delegates have always had varying political and social viewpoints within the pattern of our American democracy. But their concern in the Federal Council is primarily in vitalizing the Christian view of the relationship of inviduals to God and to fellowmen. There is deep concern for evangelization, for human freedom and for social justice with equal opportunity for all.

There are sometimes differences of opinion within the Federal Council as to precisely how these fundamental beliefs should be expressed in words and works. But, so far as we are aware, all application of these beliefs which have been sponsored or given favorable recognition by the Federal Council have

been of a nature to thwart totalitarianism, serfdom, regimentation or despotism in any form or guise. The Federal Council has formally and unanimously denounced Marxian communism as atheistic and as clearly opposed to Christianity. It has pointed out that, on these differences, Christians cannot compromise.

We record our full confidence that the Federal Council functions with complete fidelity to Christian ideals. We pledge our continuing support of its work. We express our conviction that, by providing the churches with a means of unified expression and action, it is performing an indispensable task.

Among the 50 laymen who signed are:

Barclay Acheson, director of international editions of Reader's Digest;

Chester I. Barnard, former president of New Jersey Bell Telephone Co., president of the Rockefeller Foundation;

Cleveland E. Dodge, vice president of Phelps-Dodge Corp.;

John Foster Dulles, former United States Senator from New York and former Representative of the United States in General Assembly of United Nations;

William T. Gossett, vice president of Ford Motor Co., Detroit, Mich.;

Eric A. Johnston, former president of United States Chamber of Commerce, president of Motion Picture Association of America;

Mrs. Thomas W. Lamont, New York;

Henry R. Luce, publisher of Time, Life, and Fortune;

Mrs. Dwight W. Morrow, Englewood, N. J.;

Leslie R. Rounds, first vice president of the Federal Reserve Bank, second district;

Harper Sibley, former president of United States Chamber of Commerce;

Charles P. Taft, lawyer of Cincinnati, Ohio, formerly director of Wartime Economic Affairs, United States Department of State.

In response to requests from churchmen in many communities for the facts, a 32-page pamphlet, the Truth About the Federal Council of Churches, was printed by the Federal Council.

Time To Get Alarmed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial entitled "Time To Get Alarmed," from the Daily Times published in Mamaroneck, N. Y., June 16, 1950:

TIME TO GET ALARMED

One of the points which agitate the American public these days is the bovine placidity with which officials of the Federal Government accept exposures of Communists and other enemies of our Government in strategic spots for espionage.

There are highly placed Government officials who still adhere to a belief in the loyalty of Alger Hiss, convicted of perjury and indirectly of treason. There are others who seek to obstruct public knowledge of the smelly Amerasia case. And now it is revealed by two inspecting members of the United States Senate that no less than 13,000 aliens are employed in our diplomatic missions overseas.

Many of these aliens have direct physical access to offices wherein top-secret documents are filed; many who were not thoroughly screened before employment are in positions where they are close to classified secret material.

Why are such things left for discovery by independent investigators? Why are they not found and eliminated by the heads of affected departments themselves?

We fear that the answer lies in partisan politics. Any exposure and there have been many—is immediately denied or minimized by the Government, as in the Amerasia case, but no substantiation of the denial follows. We are asked to take such denials on faith—and the American confidence is fast running out.

It is high time, we are convinced, that the American public demands full and fearless exposure of not only the Communists and aliens who infest our Government's offices, but also of the department heads who, either through ignorance or connivance, permitted this breach in the wall of our national security.

Our Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address of Mr. Basil Brewer, publisher, New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, before New Bedford Lodge 914, Loyal Order of Moose, on the thirty-eighth birthday anniversary of the lodge, May 24, 1950:

FREE AMERICA

In America, it is of little moment whether one's country is the country of his birth or the country of his adoption.

It matters little whether the town in which a citizen lives happens to be the town of his adoption or his birth.

In the minds and hearts of all true citizens of America it is enough to fully realize that the town in which one lives is his or her own town, and that our country is in truth and in fact our own—our very own—country.

Sitting with me on the Merchants Limited train from New York a week or two ago was a gentleman, writing a letter, as he waited for his dinner.

His was a fine face, probably, I decided, someone to whom we sometimes refer, perhaps thoughtlessly, as a "foreigner."

In a moment he dropped his letter writing and said with great feeling, "This wonderful country of yours, this beautiful shore line, these cities, your wonderful factories—I must talk to someone about them."

Then he had in his hand the picture of her to whom his letter was being addressed, his wife, a beautiful woman with definitely classic Greek face.

"I just was trying to describe to my wife something of what I see and feel," said my friend, who was just from Athens, here representing a newly established Greek commercial agency.

His errand was to try to find a market for Greek goods, to secure dollars, yes, but also to establish closer relations with the Nation which he said, almost with tears in his eyes, had "saved his country, not only from commercial ruin, but from a far worse death, Communist dictation.

"Could you Americans only know what your aid has done for us," he said, "you would never doubt the wisdom and mercy of what you have done.

"We have beaten the Communists on every front; we have won the war against communistic dictatorship, thanks to America," said my handsome and grateful companion.

My mind went back to my schoolboy days. I saw the ancient Greeks 2,500 years ago at the Pass of Thermopylae, a handful, defending with deathless valor the gateway to their country against the hordes of the Persians under Xerxes—the story every schoolboy knows.

I saw these same Greeks in our own time, outnumbered and ill-equipped, throwing back the hordes of Mussolini at Ionnina, on the Florina Road and at Larisa as this dictator tried to trample underfoot this ancient, pround, and valorous people.

I seemed to see in the handsome face of my friend, in his patriotism, loyalty, appreciation, a true descendant of the age of Pericles, of Homer, and of all the storied heroes of ancient Greece.

Here on their troubled peninsula, battleground of the centuries, undefeated by the fascism of Mussolini, the nazism of Hitler, and by the godless and soulless tyranny of the communism of Stalin, were a grateful people asking for our friendship, worthy of our faith and trust.

Call my chance friend of the evening a foreigner?

Might as well call foreigners LaFayette, or Kosciusko, or Pulaski, or Baron Steuben, or any of those kinsmen who risked, and in some instances, gave their lives for our freedom in the War of the Revolution.

Fellow citizens, fellow Americans, whoever fights the good fight for freedom, his own or another's, shall never be a foreigner to America or Americans.

He hath kinship with ourselves in the only thing that really worth while, without which nothing else matters—liberty.

My young friend then related some of the horrors of the communistic war, parents slain in front of children, and children in front of parents, not armed soldiers but innocent civilians, whose only crime was to be opposed to communism.

He told me there are today, still held captive in nearby Communist countries, more than 35,000 children of Greek families whom the Red Cross is trying to rehabilitate and repatriate.

"Russia never will attack this America," said my admiring and enthusiastic friend, "because you are too strong and she knows she could not win. Russia never attacks unless she is certain she can win."

I felt my pulse quicken, my pride and faith in my country strengthen. My resolve became stronger to continue to fight, not only for our freedom, with which all Americans agree, but also for the basic principles which have made my country, your country, our country, great.

Not greatest in military power necessarily, though we are very strong; not greatest in wealth and commerce necessarily, though that we well may be; not greatest in production of mills and factories, though there can be little doubt of that. But greatest in courage to fight for our ideals and principles, intelligent enough to comprehend the sources of our greatness—and willing to fight and, if necessary, die in defense of them from whatever direction they may be attacked.

Yes, let our America be great enough to reach out a mighty hand to broken and Communist-stricken Greece, asking nothing in return.

Let our America be great enough to reach out a hand even to former enemy countries of the late war, Italy, Germany, Hungary, and the rest, asking no foot of land and no dollar of payment in return.

Let no one of us mistake himself or herself that this aid is not understood and appreciated in these countries.

Aid to France, Italy, western Germany, Greece, Netherlands, Belgium, and England is appreciated, down to the very children on the streets who gaze almost in awe on visiting Americans.

This is the testimony of almost every American tourist with eyes to see and ears to hear the voice of the people of these countries.

They have been saved from starvation and, in many instances, from death by the greatness and conscience of America, your America, my America, our America.

Yes, as my Greek friend said, they have been saved from something worse than death—communism, which attacks not only the body but the soul of mankind.

American aid in the postwar period to Europe and Asia used and appropriated approximates $27,000,000,000. For this there is no precedent in the history of mankind.

And in return we ask nothing, though many of these grateful people would weave silken rugs for us to walk on could they do so and would we accept them as an expression of their gratitude.

Yes, America, our America, is great. But it is a greatness which only dictators need fear.

Our country is Christian America, with more Christian church members than any country in the world, all devoted to the principle of freedom of religion, of speech, and of the press.

Our country, America, wants only to live in peace with the peoples of every land—willing to sacrifice anything for the cause of peace—except liberty itself.

Our country, America, is great enough to face the decisions of today with courage and faith, whatever those decisions may be.

I said to my young Greek friend, "What tremendous battles you fought against Mussolini and the Italians, beating them at every turn in spite of their superior numbers and arms, defending your soil after the best traditions of Thermopylae."

For a moment he hardly could reply and then he said, "Never doubt when and if war with Russia comes, Mr. Brewer, Greece will not fail America. Of that you may be very certain."

I believe this to be absolutely true.

I say to you, fellow Americans, if it becomes necessary for us to fight Stalin, the most ingrate and conscienceless tyrant of history, and every sane person hopes it will not be, this war will be a Christian crusade.

In this war will join the Christians of every land, the lovers of liberty of every land, wherever they are able to strike a blow or say a prayer for freedom. Such a crusade cannot fail.

Eut, what we have done and are doing, and shall continue to do, cannot be done without cost. That's where you and I come in. That's where we have to share the load.

Every man, woman, and child in this broad America has a little less here and there and everywhere, because we have chosen to lend a hand to stricken Europe, friend and foe—to be our brother's keeper.

Yours and mine is the task and privilege of helping to maintain our America—not unchanged—but with the basic principles, which have produced our greatness, undisturbed and intact. And, friends, this is not easy and it will not be easy.

It requires not only work and sacrifice on the part of every one of us, but above all it requires vigilant, intelligent study of public affairs.

Neither communism nor its precursor, socialism, ever was adopted voluntarily and knowingly by any people in modern history. Not even in Russia could communism have been instituted by a free election of the Russian people.

Communism comes by two means only, either by military dictatorship, or by the creeping process of socialism, presented to the people as a form of democracy.

The Socialist route to communism takes a little longer, but accomplishes its purposes equally well. Socialism destroys private enterprise by destroying the possibility of gain, leaving only risk without reward.

The end result is complete government control, Communist, Fascist, or Nazi, among which there is but little difference so far as the people are concerned.

The so-called welfare state, with its promises of security for everyone, is but a delusion and a snare.

Only a dishonest government or a dishonest public official would suggest that jobs can be guaranteed any more than profits can be guaranteed.

Of course, we can cushion the shock of unemployment, and we must do so—up to the limit of our resources and economy.

But, friends and citizens, there is but one source of public money, city, county, State, and Nation—your and my and everybody's taxes.

Your Government can afford only what you can afford, for you are footing the bill.

Ladies and gentlemen, the system on which our America is founded is a system of individual enterprise, a capitalistic system if you please.

By our system the man or boy who owns a cow, a horse, a car, home, or a truck is—a capitalist. He has a stake, however small, in our capitalistic system.

Last Sunday we published in our magazine Parade the story of the Kid Bankers, who in Cleveland, Ohio, have their own bank with assets of over $2,000,000. Total deposits in the Kid Banks and Kid Bank accounts of a few large cities amount to $50,000,000.

The alternative to the capitalistic system, so-called, is not socialism, it is communism.

Hitler called nazism, national socialism, just as Stalin refers to Russia as a group of Socialist states.

Hitler, at least was more frank. As he rose to power he told the German youth, "You can have your liberty or you can have a job. You cannot have both your liberty and a job."

Inexperenced in popular government, unacquainted at first hand with the blessings of liberty, the German youth chose to forfeit liberty for the promised job—and for a war—which was not promised.

Of course, no true citizen in this America, if he is informed, wants either communism or socialism.

Our chief job is to see to it that socialism, the precursor of communism, is not foisted upon us without our realizing it.

Our responsibilities to our town are but a part and parcel of our responsibilities to our country. Our town problems are closer only in perspective.

With most of our local officials we are acquainted; some are neighbors of each of us. They are kind and personable, persuasive and plausible.

It's not easy to criticize them fairly and justly.

Yet, every town official needs the help, the advice, and the criticism of every one of us.

For the Government of our country is but a multiple of the government of our cities, towns, and counties, and States.

"Eternal vigilance," said John Philpot Curran, noted Irish statesman, "is the price of liberty"; vigilance in choosing not only honest but able men, vigilance in seeing through plausible but unsound measures, and plausible but unsound means which may be used to advance such measures.

Watch the public pocketbook of your town and your country as you would your own.

Beware of the office seeker, great or small, who solicits your vote by offering public favors which are in reality but bribes for your vote.

Your common sense tells you these must be paid by your own money as a taxpayer.

Once and for all, there can be no security in other than a solvent Nation, State, county, or town.

Once and for all, there can be no liberty, permanent liberty, except in a solvent Nation, State, county, or town.

The use of the words "capitalist system" as a stigma is in keeping with and of a piece with that other product of ignorance, the calling of people of different nationalities by degrading epithets.

Neither belong in our town or in our free America.

Ladies and gentlemen, I give you a toast, "Our town and our country, free, fair, progressive, solvent, now and forever."

Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce, Release of June 9, 1950, Indicates California Prosperity and Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by courtesy of the unanimous consent of Members of this House, I am pleased to present for your information and guidance the following brief release by the Bureau of the Census, under date of June 9, 1950, as relates to my native State of California. Being many times asked by Members of this Congress as to the extent to which sales, retail receipts, and so forth, have increased or decreased in California in the last several years, I am sure that the following from the recent report of the census will give every Member of the Congress and the others who read it the answers thereto.

CALIFORNIA

Retail, wholesale, and service establishments located in California showed a substantial expansion in dollar volume of trade from 1939 to 1948 according to preliminary figures from the 1948 census of business released today by the Bureau of the Census, United States Department of Commerce.

Retail sales in the State during 1948 aggregated $10,980,000,000, an increase of 244 percent over the $3,187,800,000 sales in 1939, when the preceding census of business was taken. Wholesale sales volume in the State showed a 243 percent rise over the same period, reaching a total of $13,165,300,000 in 1948 as compared with $3,840,100,000 in 1939. The service trades included in the census of business reported receipts totaling $839,400,000 in 1948 compared with $276,200,000 in 1939. Hotel receipts moved from $79,800,000 in 1939 to $191,900,000 in 1948. Amusement businesses in the State recorded receipts of $248,300,000 in 1948 compared with $100,800,000 in 1939.

Employment in the State also rose over the 9-year period between 1939 and 1948 for the trades covered by the census of business. Retail-trade establishments reported 533,-

559 paid employees for the workweek ended nearest November 15, 1948. Of these, 448,341 worked the full week, and the remainder part of the week. The comparable total and full workweek figures for 1939 were 341,295 and 273,196. Wholesale-trade establishments reported a total of 209,199 full- and part-week employees for the week of November 15, 1948, compared with 138,096 for the same week in 1939. For the selected service trades, November 15, 1948, paid employees numbered 108,596; the comparable figure for 1939, adjusted for change in scope between the two censuses, was 77,625.

These preliminary figures have been compiled from similar releases being made available for each county in California. Final figures, superseding the preliminary data for California, will be included in a State bulletin to be issued in several months. Similar data will be made available in preliminary and final form for each of the States.

A single copy of the preliminary release for the State of California as well as an order blank for other area releases may be obtained by writing to the Bureau of the Census, Washington 25, D. C.

Ready To Serve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am proud to include herewith a telegram which I received today from Battery B, Two Hundred and Ninth Field Artillery Battalion, Forty-fourth Infantry Division, Illinois National Guard, Belleville, Ill., expressing readiness for duty in the event of need in the present emergency:

BELLEVILLE, ILL., *July 12, 1950.*

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
Congressman from Illinois, Congress:

SIR: Battery B, Two Hundred and Ninth Field Artillery Battalion, Forty-fourth Infantry Division, Illinois National Guard, Belleville, Ill., ready for duty with 75 enlisted men and 4 officers.

CARL E. HIRTH,
Captain, Field Artillery, Commanding.

Smearing Is Evil, but Whitewashing of Reds Is Worse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under the above caption the Saturday Evening Post of July 15, 1950, carries an editorial which, with certain names deleted because of the rules of the House, reads as follows:

SMEARING IS EVIL, BUT WHITEWASHING OF REDS IS WORSE

Some people are still ecstatic about the performance of the seven restive Republican * * *, headed by * * *, who last month issued a declaration about the evils of "smear tactics" in the course of congressional investigations. The idea seemed to be that communism was evil, but that it was equally evil to embarrass innocent people by investigating it too ruthlessly. The implication was that * * *, who has been denouncing all sorts of people as spies, had libeled more innocent people than he had exposed guilty ones.

In the abstract all this is sound enough, and we agree that * * * made irresponsible accusations, and his colleagues did right to rebuke him. But if we are talking about congressional committees, who is damaged by being asked a few impolite questions? Was the late J. P. Morgan harmed beyond repair when some smart-aleck placed a circus midget on his knee in the course of a congressional inquiry? Did the late William G. McAdoo never recover from the rough treatment he received at the hands of the Teapot Dome probers? Or, to come down to the present hubbub, isn't it true that the Tydings subcommittee was rougher with witnesses who objected to Communists in the Government than with those whose record was questioned? Will there be equal solicitude for the businessmen shoved around by Representative BUCHANAN's lobbying committee?

The joy in the Truman coterie over the performance of the seven Republicans that repented should have been the tip-off to the * * * group—known in coarse circles as the soft underbelly of the Republican Party. The administration's approval suggested that it would be all right to kiss off as a smear the notion that there might be a Communist apparatus. If the record of the Roosevelt-Truman regime in tolerating Communists could be turned into a to-do-over "McCarthyism," what could be sweeter? Of course, * * * made this confusion inevitable, but we hate to see Republicans fooled by it.

If the seven sensitive Senators want something to get mad about, why not work on the Administration's refusal to produce the information which alone can make it possible to tell whether * * * is practicing "McCarthyism" or really has something? In the early stages of the Hiss case, the Department of Justice, when it had got its hands on the first installment of Whittaker Chambers' evidence, gave out a statement that it was about to drop the Hiss-Chambers case "for lack of evidence." If Mr. Chambers had not kept some additional exhibits in that memorable pumpkin, this effort to suppress the truth would have succeeded.

In the Amerasia case, the Department of Justice performed in almost the same way. First, its Mr. McInerney denied that there were any documents worth mentioning. Then, faced with the facts, he indulged in a lot of double-talk about how memorandums, reports and other items were not documents as he understood the meaning of the term. Senators would do well to be as disturbed over concealment of the truth as over possibly unfair "smears."

The real trouble is not so much that some people have been "smeared" as that others, who ought to be exposed, have been carefully protected by the Administration. Even the * * * subcommittee did its best to confine the "smearing" to those who made accusations against the Communists, and to ignore what they had to say. It got so bad that one FBI agent wrote to * * * to complain at the supercilious treatment he had received on acount of his efforts to tell the committe what he knew about Communists spying.

None of this seems to have concerned the seven soul-searching Senators very deeply. We do wish they had put first things a little closer to first.

Address Delivered by Former President Herbert Hoover at Emporia, Kans., on the Occasion of the Dedication of a Memorial in Honor of William Allen White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday evening, former President Herbert Hoover delivered a very splendid address at Emporia, Kans. The address was at the dedication of a memorial contributed by the people of the community in honor of their beloved friend, a distinguished Kansan, a great American, William Allen White.

I had the privilege of being present at the ceremonies attended by crowds of people who gathered from the community and various parts of the country to pay respect to the memory of Mr. White and to hear the address by Mr. Hoover. It is an honor to include Mr. Hoover's address in the RECORD. It follows:

WORLD PEACE AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Since your invitation to address you on this occasion in honor of William Allen White, a momentous and sad trial has come to our country. An attack has been made on the peace of the world. I have no doubt that every loyal American will support the President.

Tonight I wish to speak upon some of the problems of lasting peace, together with Mr. White's relations to them.

PART I

The character and service of Mr. White

But first let me say something of the life and character of Mr. White. All of his adult life he was the editor of a newspaper in this town. At the same time he was a powerful leader of American thought and of things of the spirit.

To refresh my memory, I have gone through the files of hundreds of communications between us over a third of a century. They revive again our comradeship in many common causes. They bring to life again the sparkle of his expression and his wit, the breadth of his outlook on our country, his keen insight into the forces moving in the world, and the depth of his devotion to America and to all mankind. They reflect his unflagging devotion to his friends which was so much a part of his character and spirit. They prove his rare ability to appraise forces and clarify confusions. And every page raises again the sense of personal loss at his passing and the loss to his country of his superlative mind and character.

William Allen White was an unvarnished nineteenth century liberal—something far different from those who would travel under that cloak today. His was a never-ceasing gospel of personal liberty. He was opposed to every governmental encroachment upon it. He opposed every domination of free men, whether by business, labor, farmers, or by group action anywhere, or at any time. For half a century his was the great voice of the Midwest which still clung to building progress through freedom of men's minds and spirits.

But above all, these files constantly reflect his efforts for peace for our country and for the world.

The Paris Peace Conference

We were together at the heart-breaking peacemaking at Versailles. We grieved over its political settlements. At that time also, we each in his own field, had to deal with the bloody rise of communism in the world. Its horrible philosophy and its portents to mankind were large in our minds even then.

The League of Nations

After Versailles, I joined with Mr. White in urging American entry into the League of Nations. He remained constant to that purpose long after America had relegated it to the Never-Never Land. He stuck to the ideal of international organization to preserve peace as a great moral and spiritual necessity if civilization were not to be destroyed. He hoped the League could be freed of its chains and in the end serve its great purpose.

Opposition to America joining in the Second World War

Again, when the Second World War cast its dread shadow over the earth, he and I, until Pearl Harbor, were opposed to America joining in that war. When war came we both gave undeviating support to our Government. Mr. White was no isolationist. He was not only devoted to world organization to preserve peace but he did much to secure aid in materials for Britain so that Hitler should not triumph.

We were stiffly challenged in that great prewar debate. But he never lost confidence that the judgment of future generations would be in our favor.

That debate had many facets, one of which has a direct bearing on today's problems. That occasion arose with the proposed strange alliance between the United States and Communist Russia at the time of Hitler's attack on Stalin in June 1941. Mr. White and I both protested against that alliance. We stated that the British were then relieved of danger of defeat because of the diversion of Hitler's armies. We said the result of our joining with Russia would be to expand communism and diminish liberty in the world. The record is clear that we both foresaw the only hope of peace to the free world was the mutual exhaustion of these two dreadful despotisms.

We agreed that when the day came that they were sufficiently exhausted to listen to the military, economic, and moral powers of the United States—at that moment, and at that moment only, could the United States promote a just and lasting peace.

Many other Americans held similar views. President Truman, then a Senator, on June 23, 1941, expressed somewhat these ideas.

Confirmation of the rightness of that position has already been the verdict of many masters of history. Seldom has advice in war been so quickly justified by the development of world events. With that wrong turning, the United States was to prove powerless to bring lasting peace.

PART II

The present crisis

The questions arise in every American's mind, "Can lasting peace come to this world?" Are we forever to be diverted, from the high purposes of civilization, to support huge armies and sacrifice our sons?

I pray hourly that we may not again be involved in another general war. There is some comfort in the fact that a general war must have an attainable end that can be strategically possible. There is no general military victory strategically possible for the Kremlin.

But the men in the Kremlin are not always sane men. At the moment, they are making a try-on to test the limits of appeasement and to test the solidarity of the non-Communist members of the United Nations. We must meet that test.

PART III

Some appraisals

It is vital to our future that, without petty criticism, we appraise objectively these forces and some lessons from the past.

Today, as I advance toward the end of my life span, after 35 years given to the problems of peace and war, I should fail in my duty did I not speak out on these questions.

The international purposes of communism

Today there is but one enemy of peace in the world. We should coldly examine this great malignant force. It is only about 30 years since Lenin, its leader, repeatedly and publicly confirmed its philosophy, its ideas and methods in international relations. On one occasion, Lenin said:

"As long as capitalism remains we cannot live in peace. In the end one or the other will triumph—a funeral requiem will be sung over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism."

Again he said:

"We have to use any ruse, dodges, tricks, cunning, unlawful method, concealment, and veiling of the truth."

And again:

"The basic rule is to exploit conflicting interests * * * to dodge and maneuver."

And again:

"Religion is the opiate of the people."

That does not sound like the Sermon on the Mount.

Lest anyone think Stalin and his Politburo are reformed men, I may remind you of the repeated oaths at Lenin's tomb to carry out every word of that gospel. And, indeed, you may find the expansion of these evil ideas in their writings and their resolutions down to this day.

Those who dismiss these statements as merely the heat of revolution or in blind hope they have been abandoned should review step-by-step the actions of these men over the last 11 years. The men of the Kremlin have in so short a time violated over 35 solemnly signed treaties. They have subjected a dozen nations and 600,000,000 human beings in those nations to slavery. Their persecution of all religious leaders has never ceased to this day. Except to the blind, there stands out the cunning dodges, tricks, unlawful methods, and veiling of the truth by which the allied leaders were fooled at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. And I could also remind you that today there are unending fifth columns in every nation. I could recite that at times they have even penetrated into the high ranks in our own Government. I could review the convictions of Hiss, Coplon, and Fuchs; Gold's confession; the Canadian spy case; the repeated jail sentences of American Communists for conspiracy against us. Today, Red Russia threatens the world with greater armies than all the rest of the world put together.

But what more confirmation do we need of Lenin and Stalin's philosophy and method than the events of the past 15 days?

This is the force with which we now have to deal.

Two wars

We should also coldly reexamine our experience from having fought two gigantic wars at fearful cost in resources and in lives. The valor of our men won great battles. But we have won no lasting peace. However, from these sacrifices we can deduce some vital truths.

I suggest to you a fundamental truism. War is justified only as an instrument for a specific consequence. That consequence for America was lasting peace. In four directions we strayed from that major objective.

First. Both wars proved that we cannot change ideas in the minds of men and races with machine guns or battleships. Our purposes were confused in both wars by crusades with glorious phrases about the personal freedom of man. Ideas in nations are rooted in their racial history, their very mores. Ideological wars are no more capable of settling anything than the thousand years of crusades and religious wars of the Middle Ages. Such wars have no ending and no victory. The way of life of a people must come from within; it cannot be compelled from without.

Whatever the present events may bring, I suggest we never again enter upon such crusades. If the Communist states like their slave ideology, we should engage in no loss of American lives to free them from it. Communism is a force of evil. It contains within itself the germs which will in time destroy it.

We should say, "Our concern is only that you keep your armed men within your own borders. As to your fifth columns, our jails are our peace device."

Second. Our second departure from our major purpose was concentration on winning military battles. Winning battles which do not drive to the major purpose of lasting peace are battles lost.

In support of these views, may I quote today's greatest of American military writers, Mr. Hanson Baldwin of the New York Times' staff, who in a recent book says,

"The United States has fought wars differently from other peoples. We have fought for the immediate victory, not for the ultimate peace * * * We have had no * * * well defined political objective to chart our military action.

"We fought to win—period. We did not remember that wars are merely an extension of politics by other means * * *."

The alliance with Stalin in 1941, to which I referred, is a profound example.

I will not elaborate but I recommend that you read Mr. Baldwin's little book.

If we should be forced—and I pray not—to engage in general war, our military strategy must be held to our single major purpose, which is lasting peace.

Third, in our political settlements after both wars, we departed from our true path and left many nations in such a plight as to become the prey of others. We yielded to the spirits of greedy imperialism in other nations and of vindictiveness and revenge.

We sowed the dragon's teeth of still another war.

Fourth. Truly, in both wars we realized that lasting peace could come only from suppression of aggression and from disarmament. The League of Nations and the United Nations were set up in that hope. The tragedy of the League was that it was turned into an instrument to protect imperial spoils of war. The tragedy of the United Nations was that it turned into an instrument to protect Red imperialism.

PART IV

The making of lasting peace

During 1942 and 1943, after America was in the Second World War, Mr. White, Hugh Gibson, and I joined in urging that when the shooting stopped the world must try again to build a new and effective organization to preserve peace. Perhaps vainly, we believed, we could distill from world experience some lessons on how it should be done.

From the experience of a hundred years, including the Congress of Vienna and Versailles, we said to obtain lasting peace that political peace with the enemy states must be made first; that a period of two or three years should elapse for emotions to cool and thought to ripen. We stated the principles for political settlements from which, when men's passions had abated, the dragon's teeth could not spring again. We asserted that the attitude of great nations, including

Communist Russia, must become clear before an adequate world organization could be built.

The United Nations

But the United Nations was handicapped by being launched into a morass where there was no peace to preserve.

Still more tragic is that for 5 years the United Nations has with the Kremlin's gospel been made an instrument to provoke fear and hate among and within the nations of the earth. The purpose of Soviet Russia is not to carry out the four times repeated pledge in the United Nations Charter to establish the independence of nations and peace on earth.

Forty-two times Soviet Russia has used its veto to thwart important efforts toward peace. The Kremlin representatives have denied membership in the United Nations to nine anti-Communist nations. Thirty-four times they have walked out of meetings in an effort to coerce the members into accepting Communist China into its very seat of power—the Security Council—which would further communize the organization and give another veto to Russia.

Yet, if we survey the world, we find that although one-third of the people on earth have been subdued to communism, there still remain 60 non-Communist nations, comprising two-thirds of the people on the earth, who yet cling to belief in God and the independence of nations.

PART V

The way out

Today our hopes of lasting peace lie in a new direction of national policies. The first of these is to reorganize the United Nations.

Two months ago, in an address to the newspaper publishers, I stated that our problem was to mobilize the economic, moral, and spiritual strength of these 60 non-Communist peoples for lasting peace. I suggested that the UN stop appeasement and Soviet domination. I proposed if that agency was to function in its task of lasting peace it must be reorganized without the Communists in it. I pointed out that the United States was steadily being saddled with the sole responsibility of defending the independence of nations. I stated that thus the United States would be part of a phalanx, and not become a single spear.

Two months ago it looked as though it might be a long time before the world would realize this inevitable necessity. At that time the officials of the UN and our State Department unanimously and loudly denounced my proposal. I will not, on this occasion, pursue that point.

Today, the mobilization of non-Communist nations free from Russian domination is slowly unfolding. The Security Council has called upon its members to join in repelling the aggression against Korea. Some 42 members have given that call their moral support. Three other nations have so far joined with us in the military measures of that task. We shall soon know how much the world is prepared to meet this issue.

The non-Communist world is now faced with three possible courses if it would have peace:

Shall it go to war to wipe communism from the face of the earth? I have stated that my answer is "No."

Should we return to the illusion that the Kremlin has changed its gospel and will work for world peace through the United Nations? That would seem futile.

Shall we try to build the United Nations so as to confine communism to the peoples already enslaved, estop military aggression and trust to time for this evil to abate? My answer is "Yes."

Alternatively we must crawl into isolation and defend the Western Hemisphere alone. That would be less than a secure peace.

The answers to these question, however, may not be in our hands.

While our purpose must be to isolate this malignant force, we might even say to the Kremlin:

"When you have proved that your purpose is peace and that you have abandoned the purpose of aggression and hate, we would be glad to have you stop your walk-out of the United Nations, but never again may you have power to thwart the march of peace."

Clarification of national policies

But beyond all immediate action, if we are to take part in bringing lasting peace to the world, we and the United Nations must have clarification of thinking and determination of purpose. We cannot successfully cope with present world problems or secure a lasting peace without consistent and clearly defined policies and objectives which we are prepared to support and defend. Military strength is no substitute for sound policy.

I give you an example. Over a century ago our country announced the Monroe Doctrine. We never flinched from its support. The world knew what we meant and few have ever tried to breach it. It has contributed to peace throughout all these years.

I will not pursue the subject further at this time. You might get an idea of what I mean by reading the second, third, and fourth verses of the first chapter of the Book of Genesis.

In the meantime, may I recall to you a sentence of mine which had wide distribution in a former time of trial.

"Pray hard, work hard, sleep hard, and play hard. Do it courageously and cheerfully. We have a cause to win."

I believe that, were William Allen White among us today, he would not speak very differently—but he would have said all this with a grace and skill and gentleness for those were the gifts that the good Lord gave to him at birth and which he always used to the advantage of his country.

Reorganization Plan No. 27

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to which were referred the Hoover Commission reports, for the purpose of bringing about greater efficiency and economy in the Executive Branch of our Government, and which is presenting Reorganization Plan No. 27 today for your consideration, may I preface my remarks this afternoon by stating that I am unalterably and unequivocally opposed to socialized medicine.

I make this statement because several of the speakers preceding me said their reason for opposing this reorganization plan is that it will result in the socialization of medicine. In giving this reason, I submit they have not offered one iota or scintilla of evidence to substantiate such a finding.

If they had attended the committee hearings on this plan, and listened to the testimony of the witnesses, the allegations made here on the floor could not be justified from the facts presented by the representative of the American Medical Association, the association most prominent in the fight against socialized medicine in this country. Their representative was Dr. Louis H. Bauer, chairman of the board of trustees of the American Medical Association. In his five-page statement, setting forth the reasons for the American Medical Association opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 27, he did not indicate, at any time, direct fear it would lead to socialized medicine. In fact, the phrase socialized medicine was hardly mentioned. He gave this reason for the opposition of the association and I quote:

> If this plan (meaning Reorganization Plan No. 27) becomes effective, I fear that the separation of health functions of the Government into a single agency or department will be postponed for a long time, if not permanently.

In other words, ladies and gentlemen, the American Medical Association's principal concern was that it might prevent the establishment of a Department of Health with cabinet status, for the director.

May I quote further from the record of the hearing, at that point, when Dr. Bauer was being questioned by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HARDY]:

> Mr. HARDY. Doctor, you have spoken of the d ngers of commingling all of these functions in one agency. Is it the feeling of the American Medical Association that this commingling of functions of health, education, and welfare, will have a tendency toward socialized medicine?
>
> Dr. BAUER. Well I do not think that is the principal objection.

If this plan is supposed to produce socialized medicine, then we have socialized medicine existing within the Federal Security Agency today, because in that agency we already have the divisions of health, education, and social security. Their functions will not be changed as the result of the adoption of this plan and cannot be changed without statutory authority.

In other words, Congress would have to pass laws to change their particular functions or responsibilities. Under this plan, their status in no way changes; it merely enlarges the importance of health, education, and social security by giving the director elevation to the cabinet. Thus enabling its director to be a member of the President's official family which would result in improving coordination of top-level governmental planning, direction, and control. By this method, the President would be able, in Cabinet meetings, to receive reports first hand on all major elements comprising our national economy, including health, education, and security. In addition, the new secretary would have the advantage of contact with other cabinet members for the receiving and dispensing of counsel and information for cooperative planning and policy.

This particular reorganization will redound to improve efficiency and service, unify direction and reduction of costs to Government by elimination of conflicts in programing.

Such procedure has been repeatedly recommended by various joint committees and commissions, and every President of the United States, since 1923. They have all agreed that the social-security agencies, which deal with health, education, and social security should have Cabinet status, because they are just as important to our economy as Labor, Agriculture, Treasury, Interior, Post Office Departments, and the others that now enjoy such rank.

Consistent with the Reorganization Plan Act itself, this proposal neither provides for any new program nor enlarges the existing program beyond the scope of the laws now on our statutory books.

From the evidence presented to our committee, and study I have made, I am convinced the adoption of this plan would result in greater efficiency and economy and, therefore, I urge you to support its passage.

Lower Nuisance Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 27, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I insert the attached article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD entitled "Lower Nuisance Taxes," an editorial appearing in the Daily Times, published at Mamaroneck, N. Y., June 24, 1950:

LOWER NUISANCE TAXES

It is now fairly well decided that emergency or wartime Federal excise taxes which have continued for 5 years after the shooting stopped will be minimized. Agreement has been reached at Washington whereby these taxes which affect individuals so intimately will be lowered or eliminated altogether, while this revenue loss will be offset by higher corporation taxes of which the general public is not so well aware.

There will be, in addition, an attempt to recoup some of the lost revenue through closing existing loopholes in the tax collection procedure.

So, the 20-percent tax on jewelry, furs, luggage, toilet articles will be cut in half; on handbags, wallets, key cases, kits and bags, lower-priced timepieces, baby oils, powders, lotions, barber and beauty shop supplies—the taxes on these will be dropped altogether.

The 20-percent tax on theater and movie admissions will be cut in half, while the same tax on cabarets will be reduced to 15 percent; taxes on telephone calls and telegraph messages will be reduced; and so will taxes on chewing tobacco, snuff, cigars, and medicinal whiskey; also eliminated will be taxes on baby-bottle warmers, heating pads, and hand irons, toasters, and kitchen devices.

It sounds good, doesn't it?

The slack will be taken up by heavier corporation taxation, which will be passed on, inevitably, to consumers. But these won't know about it since such taxes are hidden.

Altogether, it is about as good a tax bill as could be expected in an election year, especially from an administration which measures almost everything by the yardstick of votes.

Medical Care Furnished by Private Practice of Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 14 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons held a national essay contest on the subject, Why the Private Practice of Medicine Furnishes This Country With the Finest Medical Care. The first prize was won by Miss Thelma Sipe, of Oakland, Pa., and I ask unanimous consent that her essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE PRIVATE PRACTICE OF MEDICINE FURNISHES THIS COUNTRY WITH THE FINEST MEDICAL CARE

(By Miss Thelma Sipe, Oakland, Pa.)

Comparisons between the quality of medical care offered by private practice in America and that provided by the socialized systems of other countries, as well as the status of health among American people indicate that the private practice of medicine does furnish this country with the finest medical care. In spite of varying climates, mixed races, and a highly industrialized civilization, American people do enjoy health unequaled by any other people in the world today.

During the last half century alone, traditional medical practice and research have increased our life expectancy by 19 years. Unstified individual initiative has brought about control or prevention of diabetes, pernicious anemia, diphtheria, pneumonia, venereal diseases, tuberculosis, and meningitis. Compare these achievements with the contributions of the preceding 20 centuries. During that whole period the average life span was increased only 19 years. Since then, traditional medical practice has made great progress. But Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, asserts that "over 300,000 people die whom we have the knowledge and skills to save." This is not true. While many people do die needlessly, their own indifferent neglect is often the cause. The medical profession cannot be held responsible for the deaths of individuals who refuse to avail themselves of a doctor's care. Our American system may not be perfect, but it is certainly progressive. And unless hindered by Government controls, private practice will continue to lengthen life, to improve general health, and to eliminate preventable deaths.

This private practice of medicine safeguards the inalienable rights of American people. The right to choose any doctor he desires increases an individual's trust and confidence in his physician. And how often such trust has helped a patient toward better mental as well as physical health. That the family doctor has not disappeared millions of Americans in all income brackets will testify. Thus, private practice not only encourages friendship between a practitioner and his clients, but it also permits the doctor, in many cases, to be familiar with the medical history of his patient's family. Frequently, such knowledge is invaluable in preventing complications during an illness or operation. When an individual chooses his own doctor and pays his doctor bill from his own pocket or through voluntary prepayment plans, he will not accept inferior medical care. But if the state finances treatment, the quality of care becomes secondary to quantity. The best insurance against such degenerated medical treatment is the democratic right of free enterprise. Competition among private practitioners results in a higher quality of medical care for the patient. Since the doctor is not subservient to nonprofessional bureaucrats, who would burden him with time consuming paper work and infinite red tape, he may devote all his energy and ability to treating the sick. In accordance with the Hippocratic oath, private practice guarantees a client complete privacy: "And whatsoever I shall see or hear in the course of my profession in my intercourse with men, if it be what should not be published abroad, I will never divulge, holding such things to be holy secrets." Under private practice a third party does not review written records of the client's medical history, as Government-controlled plans advocate, for the doctor has always believed this privacy an inalienable right. But most important of all, private medical practice is the epitome of democracy. "Nationalized medicine will be followed by nationalized industry. * * * We must be constantly mindful with David Hume, that liberty of any kind is seldom lost all at once."

But opponents to private practice claim this type of care is too expensive for most people to finance. The difficulty does not seem to be the ability to pay, but the will to pay. Let us look at the annual expenses of the average American as computed in June 1944, by the United States Department of Commerce. The bill per capita for liquor was $39; for the upkeep of cars, $25; for tobacco, $18; and for medical care—$8. Nevertheless, for those who cannot afford to pay, voluntary prepayment plans are a solution. At present over 32,000,000 people are protected by 84 Blue Cross plans alone, and the number is constantly increasing. A highly satisfactory plan providing 70 days hospitalization covers 100,000 employees of Bethlehem Steel Co. and their dependents. Under a contract with Blue Cross, half the cost is paid by the company and the remaining $2.95 per month is paid by the employee. Insurance such as this can be extended to other groups of people.

To provide wider protection for a greater number of people, to maintain these high standards of private medical practice, and to protect these privileges of American citizens, the American Medical Association has taken an interest in legislation. For the first time in its 102-year history, the organization has levied dues of $25 a year on its members to finance a program that would preserve the characteristics of American medicine. Realizing our present system has much room for improvement, but that flawless medical care for all cannot be legislated and cannot be produced overnight, the association responded to the pleas of the "middle of the road" doctors who wanted their dues to be used to develop an adequate AMA plan for improvement medical care. The program of the American Medical Association for the Advancement of Medicine and Public Health was the result. Following are the provisions of this plan:

1. The establishment of an independent health department of Cabinet status with a physician in charge.

2. The establishment of a National Science Foundation to encourage medical research.

3. Extension of voluntary medical and hospital insurance.

4. Establishment of a medical care authority in each State to receive and spend funds according to the wishes of consumers and distributors of medical care.

5. Extension of hospital facilities.

6. More and better local public health units.

7. Establishment of mental health clinics and protection against charlatans.

8. Public health education to be offered by AMA State and county societies.

9. Support of the Commission of Chronic Illness for care of the chronically ill.

10. Protection of veterans' medical rights.

11. Cooperation with the National Safety Council and continuation of the Council of Industrial Health to reduce accidents.

12. Encouragement of local and private funds for medical education.

This program concludes by expressing opposition to any plan of federally controlled, compulsory medical care paid for by payroll taxation. Here the AMA has laid the groundwork for improving the medical care of the healthiest people in the world by keeping that system in practice which has made us so healthy; and preparing to increase quantity of services without cutting down quality.

In all countries where government-controlled medicine has been introduced, the resulting inferior quality of medical care proves another reason for preserving our own system of private practice. The extremely inferior grade of Sovietized medicines in Russia may be judged by an article appearing in the August 1949 issue of Sovetskaya Meditsina, a restricted magazine not intended for foreigners. Speaking of medicine for the masses, not for the party elite, it states: "According to data of the Mytishora Hospital, Moscow, during 1946, the percentage of mistakes in certain departments amounted to 50 to 75 percent * * *. The picture is similar in other cities." Do the Russian people benefit in any way? Vice Commissar Parrin says, "Where only 5 percent enjoyed good medicine before, 100 percent now get some kind of medicine. Our only requirement for a doctor is the desire." In Great Britain, while standards of medical practice have decidedly fallen, expenses have risen. The estimated cost of health and dental service for the first 9 months of socialized medicine was 150,000,000 pounds. The actual cost was 208,000,000 pounds. While 2,000,000 pounds were estimated for ophthalmic services, the cost was 12,900,000 pounds. The cost of pharmaceutical services exceeded the original estimate by 4,000,000 pounds. Patients choose their own doctor in Britain, and he gets 18 shillings ($3.60) a year for each patient on his list whether he sees that patient 20 times or not at all. To make a living the medical practitioner must accept 4,000 patients on his list. Can his medical attention be anything but poor? Samuel Gompers' statement in 1916 to "Look over all the world where you will and see those governments where the features of compulsory benevolence have been established, and you will find the initiative taken from the hearts of the people" is only too true in Britain. But since Mr. Attlee plans to socialize everything, he has only followed Lenin's advice that "Medicine is the keystone in the arch of the socialized society." If you give men their "bread and circus games," gradually you can rob them of all liberty.

Through the centuries democratic government and fine medical care have grown side by side. We cannot suffer both to be destroyed in a single step. Only the private practice of medicine upholds our inalienable rights and provides us with the finest medical care.

A Call To Revitalize the GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 14 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an editorial entitled "A Call To Revitalize the GOP," which appeared in the July 10 issue of the Buffalo Evening News, and which conveys most effectively the purpose of those who have been associated with the Republican advance as expressed in their declaration of Republican principles.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Buffalo Evening News of July 10, 1950]

A CALL TO REVITALIZE THE GOP

The Declaration of Republican Principles put forth last week by a progressive group calling itself the Republican Advance has gone over like a lead balloon, so far as the Old Guard is concerned. Doubtless the framers of this ringing call to the Republicans to rediscover and reaccent the positive forces in their tradition expected that reaction. But they have nevertheless produced a siginificant manifesto—one that conceivably could so excite the people as to lead to the founding of a new political era.

The declaration has the enthusiastic endorsement of a handful of progressive Republican Senators and some 30 Members of the House. We dare say it will win new adherents among the party rank and file every day, as more people become familiar with its contents.

It is a rather wordy document and doesn't purport to offer a specific party program. What it does do, with rare candor and persuasiveness, is proclaim that there is a modern alternative to the omnipotent state, that the people can attain their social goals without enslaving themselves to an ever-growing central government, and that Republicans, drawing on their own best traditions, have the makings of such a program and can provide the leadership to make it click.

The fundamental issue the Republican Advance draws with the Democrats concerns the means of achieving such common goals as a reasonable security for old age, adequate medical care available for all, insurance against unemployment, etc. The Democrats, this statement charges, have faced all these challenges for 17 years and have produced only one solution—the unlimited extension of governmental control of the people. Progressive Republicans, it declares, can and must develop new means of achieving these goals without enslaving the people. It then spells out a general approach to each of the many challenges confronting the Nation—an approach that would reverse the New Deal-Fair Deal trend to make the Government responsible for everything, and return the primary initiative and responsibility to the individual.

It is the individual, these Republicans insist, whom the New Deal attitude would submerge in an anonymous mass, and it is the Republican task to restore his place in a country that is dedicated to the individual right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. By accepting that challenge, they assert, a revitalized republicanism can open up a whole new vista of freedom: The vista of a society based upon the mutual, voluntary efforts of free individuals, encouraged and assisted by their Government, to pursue those social goals that have become necessary to the maintenance of the American way of life.

The declaration specifically declines to propose a detailed legislative program; its aim, rather, is to set forth a fundamental point of view, which has its roots in historical Republican policies, and which we believe to be capable of inspiring the American people to new achievements. Here and there, however, the statement gets remarkably specific. With reference to an over-all fiscal policy, for instance, it declares that the GOP should reiterate its historic stand for a sound dollar, flatly reject the Democratic resort to inflation, and insist upon a balanced budget in relatively prosperous times, even if that means foregoing expenditures that would otherwise be socially desirable.

Space does not permit detailed reference to its approach to a farm policy, a labor policy, a foreign policy, etc., but in each instance it takes fundamental issue with the New Deal and proposes a course of action that not only reaccents individual freedom and responsibility but is wholly in tune with the complexities of this modern era.

This is a statement that thoughtful Republicans should read and ponder—an approach that is not too far short of the adjectives Senator IVES used in describing it: "Creative, dynamic, inspiring." It represents the kind of thinking of which Republicans have had need if they would restore their position as the majority party in tomorrow's America.

Race Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 14 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. F. H. Mebane, of Washington, D. C., which appeared in the Letters to the Editor page of the Washington Evening Star of July 13, 1950, entitled "FEPC Danger." This article evinces so much better understanding of race relations than manifest by so many people who write on this subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEPC DANGER

(By F. H. Mebane)

This letter is written as the result of an article by Drew Pearson, Capturing the South, in your issue of July 10.

If the result of the primary election in North Carolina was due to FEPC or any other special legislation attempted for the Negro, it is to be regretted. I base this conclusion on the fact that North Carolina, my

home State, is one of the most liberal Southern States and gives its Negro citizens the opportunity to perform unhampered, any of the skills they are prepared to perform. During the more than 20 years I was employed there in the Negro schools, I never heard of any mass effort to prevent the race from rising to the highest level possible for it to reach. It was encouraged in this effort by leaders who realize that the strength of the commonwealth can be increased only by building up each separate part.

I may invite the criticism of my people by saying this, but I do not feel that outside legislation can aid or improve the condition of the Negro in North Carolina. I feel that it will tend to produce friction where there is now peace and satisfaction.

Alaska Fastest Growing United States Entity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 26, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, with open conflict in Korea, added attention has been directed to defense, economic, and political problems existing in the Territory of Alaska.

Fergus Hoffman, Seattle Post-Intelligencer staff writer, is recognized nationally as an authority on Alaska. He has traveled over much of this area which extends to within only 3 miles of the U. S. S. R. In an appearance before the Senate Committee on Appropriations he gave Congress the benefit of his first-hand observations. The following is the first of a series of articles which he is publishing in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer on what is happening in Alaska:

ALASKA FASTEST GROWING UNITED STATES ENTITY—ANCHORAGE GRABS FAVORED SPOT IN SUN

(What goes on in Alaska? Do we have our guard up in that vital first-line of defense? What do the people think there and what are they doing? With the Korea crisis and its threat of plunging the world into another global conflict these questions are being asked by many anxious Post-Intelligencer readers these days. To answer them, Fergus Hoffman, Post-Intelligencer staff writer who is intimately acquainted with our northern outpost, which juts to within 3 miles of the U. S. S. R., recently completed an extensive journey through Alaska. He tells you what he has learned in a series of interesting and informative articles of which this is the first.)

(By Fergus Hoffman)

(First of a series)

Alaska, suffering slightly from growing pains but fully ready for the adulthood of its own State government, today is the fastest growing political entity under the American sun.

And Anchorage, by far its largest city, apparently has grabbed the favored spot in the Alaskan sun. Slums which have drawn fire in the Halls of Congress and local politics which keep municipal affairs in constant turmoil don't tell the whole story of the Territory's biggest, boomingest town.

There is a bright side to Anchorage, key of the northland's military defenses. It is evidenced in the new, modern schools, mushroomed in the past 3 years. It shows in the high requirements for teachers—a master's degree is almost prerequisite for high-school teachers.

And although Anchorage children probably will have to attend classes next fall on a split-shift basis, due to continued crowding of the city, plans for more new schools are afoot.

A new apartment house is almost completed, financed through Federal support, and others are planned. One, if it reaches its contemplated 14 stories, will be Alaska's only skyscraper.

Anchorage is a planned city which outgrew its plans. Its first orderly plats were laid out in 1915 to provide a community for the new Alaskans arriving to staff the yards and shops of the then-building Alaska Railroad. The town boomed briefly during World War I, subsided to small but steady activity in the peace years, and burst at the seams when World War II struck home.

Nearby Fort Richardson and Elmendorf Air Force Base make Anchorage far more than a railroad town. Anchorage subsists chiefly on military money, but because of its critical location in the world of strategists, Anchorage probably will continue to grow for many years. It lies on the North Pacific air routes to Asia and is the heart of any projected air action to or from Alaska. Uncle Sam has decided to make Alaska's defense permanent, and this means permanent economic security for Anchorage.

The big problem for the military, and thus for civilians, is housing. Anchorage is probably the only place where a tourist agency would telephone the nearby fort and try to rent rooms in the basement of the general's house for vacationing visitors, but it happened the other day in Anchorage.

Lack of understanding in the distant District of Columbia is the principal reason that progress along the Alaskan housing front is so pitifully slow. Although there has been a constant traffic of delegations from Alaska and committees from Washington, D. C., the truth is that the Nation's defense mills are grinding perilously slow in the North. Housing is the handicap.

The military cannot provide enough housing for its unmarried enlisted men, let alone those with families, and overburdened Anchorage can't help much. Defense Secretary Louis Johnson has repeatedly described Alaska as one of the Nation's most strategic spots, but still the Territory suffers from slow motion in fast-moving times.

Now, with the Korean situation bringing the plight of Alaska sharply into focus, some way must be found to speed up housing construction there. Until the cold war warmed up, progress on the housing front was at least "hopeful."

Since October 1947, when Lt. Gen. Nathan Twining assumed charge of northern defense as commander in chief of Alaska, millions of dollars have been pumped into new construction. About $100,000,000 has been spent; contracts are now being let for $127,000,000 more, and Congress has authorized another $99,000,000 for the 1951 fiscal year.

The Civil-Rights Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 14 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD an article by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star of July 13, 1950, on the civil-rights problem.

This presents very clearly the reverse effect which results from the efforts of extremists to force compulsory legislation. We are making great progress throughout the whole country, including the South, in dealing with our race relations if only the impatient souls would permit these processes to continue which would eventuate in the proper solution of the whole race problem.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL-RIGHTS PROBLEM DEALT SEVERE BLOW BY EXTREMISTS' ACTS—SOUTH CAROLINA PRIMARY THIRD IN WHICH NEGRO ISSUE HAS BEEN RAISED

(By David Lawrence)

The extremists—so frequently the worst enemies of the very cause they are championing—have made a mess of the civil-rights problem.

Today the advance of the Negro toward a better deal in the economic life of America has been dealt a severe blow by those who insist on a Federal law to regulate hiring and employment practices.

The latest contest in the Democratic primaries—in which Senator JOHNSTON defeated Gov. Strom Thurmond for the United States Senate nomination in South Carolina—is the third in which the Negro issue has been raised in the South. Emphasis on this led to the defeat of Senators PEPPER, of Florida, and GRAHAM, of North Carolina, for renomination. Senator JOHNSTON'S victory was due to his claims on the stump that he was less inclined toward the Negro side of the argument than his rival. In fact, Mr. JOHNSTON pointed with scorn to the fact that Governor Thurmond, though a Dixiecrat, had appointed a Negro to a medical board.

This very week, also, in the Senate, the proponents of a Federal law with compulsion in it on the subject of hiring have tried without success to get the measure to a vote. The move toward cloture to cut off debate has now been defeated twice in this session.

LIBERAL EFFORTS RETARDED

Where does all this leave the Negro, particularly in the South? It is evident that the sincere effort of liberals in the South to advance the cause of the Negro have been retarded and restrained by extremists in the North. For years various Negro leaders in the South have felt they were being used as a political football. They have not been fooled by the talk of antipoll tax and antilynching laws. They have felt that the politicians were merely exploiting the issue and that any improvement or real change in conditions would have to be worked out with southern people and not by force if it were to be at all effective. The mere passage of a law, they have recognized, would not help toward nondiscrimination any more than the enactment of the prohibition law changed drinking habits of long standing.

The Republicans in the North have supported the civil-rights crusade, though many of them have conceded privately it was a phony issue and that it was done solely to offset the efforts of the Democrats to capture the Negro vote in the populous areas of the North.

The acid test of sincerity on civil rights comes when Democrats as well as Republicans in Congress turn their eyes away from Federal laws to punish mass picketing and the use of violence in labor disputes—the alibi being offered that this is a matter for State power. However, everyone knows the same political influences affect State authorities and local police chiefs and make

them wary about protecting the civil rights of nonunion workers or union employees who want to cross a picket line.

HARDENING OF LINES

In spite of the fact that the civil-rights issue, as manipulated by the politicians, has caused a hardening of lines, the climate of thought in the South on the problem is changing constantly toward more and more recognition of the economic rights and opportunities of the Negroes.

The biggest mistake was made by the Truman administration when it rejected the recent proposal of Representative BROOKS HAYS, Democrat, of Arkansas, and others who joined with him. This would have created a council or commission to help advise with employers and employees so as to help broaden job opportunities for Negroes. It would not have been compulsory but would have been educational and advisory. It would have carried the prestige of Federal policy and yet would not have required compliance except on a voluntary basis.

Many southern Members of Congress would have voted for the Hays plan as a simple way out of the deadlock on civil rights. With administration backing, it would have gone through Congress.

But the extremists among the Negro leaders vetoed the project. With them, as usual, it's all or nothing. The administration played ball with the extremists, believing they represented the largest number of votes in the North and turned down the proposal. Thus is progress retarded by the very friends of a cause which both parties perhaps like to keep alive because it means votes for them and a chance to exploit the voters.

The Flag of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by R. W. Frazier, professor of government and history of Southeastern College, of Durant, Okla., June 14, 1950:

The flag, a common Teutonic word in this sense—but apparently first recorded in English—a piece of bunting or similar material—admitting of various shapes and colors, and waved in the wind from a staff or cord for use in display as a standard, ensign, or signal.

Among the remains of the ancient peoples who left the earliest traces of civilization, the records of the forms of objects used as ensigns are to be found frequently from their carvings and paintings, supplemented by ancient writers. It appears that several companies of the Egyptian army had their own particular standards. These objects were associated in the minds of men with feelings of awe and devotion. Likewise, sacred animals, boats, emblems, or figures—a tablet bearing a king's name—fan and feathered—shaped symbols—were raised on a staff as standards, and the office of bearing them was looked upon as one of peculiar privilege and great honor. We find a custom of similarity among the sculptures unearthed at Nineveh, only two different designs of standards were observed—banners, standards, and ensigns are frequently mentioned in the Bible. "Every man of the children of Israel shall pitch by his own standard, with the ensign of their father's house" (Numbers ii: 2). "Who is she that looketh forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, terrible as an army with banners."

The Persians bore an eagle fixed to the end of a lance—and the sun—as their divinity—was also upon their standards which appear to have been formed of some textile, and were guarded by the bravest men of the army.

The Carion soldier who slew Cyrus, the brother of Artaxerxes, was allowed the honor of carrying a golden cock at the head of the army, it being the custom of Carions to wear that bird as a crest on their helmets.

The North American Indians carried poles fledged with feathers from the wings of eagles. The Greeks bore a piece of armor upon a spear. The Athenians, the olive and the owl, while Rome became the heir of Grecian culture and Grecian civilization in her evolution to power and dominate, she had many emblems; according to Pliny it was Marius who, in his second consulship, ordained that the Roman legions should only have the eagle for their standard emblem.

Thus have been the customs, both sacred and military, through the centuries that emblems and standards of identifications representing the minds of the peoples of all nations exemplifying the ideologies, emotions, exaltations, and devotions to superiority of rulership.

Now, as to the background of our national emblem and origin of its colors, we go to the national background of the English banner for centuries.

Those who founded this Nation of ours, through their aspirations, struggles, sacrifices, and achievements, made and handed down to us a great country with a great flag, symbolizing ideals and institutions which, in the short span of a century and a half, have made the United States the foremost nation in greatness and power, wealth and influence, of all the world.

In order to understand properly the history of the flag of the United States, its origin and evolution, it is necessary to know about the principal flags of other countries which have influenced its design. Especially should we be familiar with the development of the flag of Great Britain which, no doubt, had greater influence on the design of the United States national emblem than any other flag.

One of the earliest flags of Great Britain to have a possible influence on the flag of the United States was the Cross of St. Andrew. From about the middle of the eighth century the Cross of St. Andrew, Scotland's patron saint, had been the national standard of that country. It was a white diagonal cross on a blue field, thus containing two of the colors of our present flag. The Cross of St. Andrew was brought to America by the Scots during their early explorations and settlements in Nova Scotia at the time of the English settlements at Plymouth, Mass., and Jamestown, Va.

Another early flag of Great Britain of interest to us is the Cross of St. George, a red cross on a white field. It was in the latter part of the thirteenth century that Edward I of England became so interested in the story of St. George and the dragon that he adopted the Cross of St. George as the flag of England. This flag was first unfurled in North America in 1497, by John Cabot, who probably landed on the coast of Newfoundland.

In 1606, James VI of Scotland, who 3 years before had ascended the throne of England as James I, decreed that the crosses of St. George and St. Andrew be united on one field to typify the linking of the destinies of the two countries. The combination of these two crosses brought together the colors of red, white, and blue, which almost two centuries later became our national colors. In time the new flag of James I, became known as the Union Jack, the word "Jack" being derived from Jacques, the French word for James. The flag was also known as the Grand Union flag and the King's colors. It was the flag under which England colonized America and for a long time was used by the colonists. It flew from the mainmasts of the *Constant* which brought the English settlers to Jamestown in 1607, and of the *Mayflower* which brought the Pilgrims to Plymouth in 1620, while the Cross of St. George was displayed from the foremasts of these vessels.

In 1707 a flag consisting of a red field and the King's colors as a canton was adopted as the national standard of Great Britain, and as such was well known to early American colonists. This Meteor Flag of England, as it was sometimes called, was also known as the British Red Ensign and continued to be the national flag of Great Britain until 1801. It was the flag of Great Britain in America throughout the War of the Revolution and the banner under which Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown, October 19, 1781.

While there is reason to believe that the British flags had the greatest influence in determining the design and colors of the flag of the United States, it is probable that an influence was exerted also by the flags of the Dutch Republic, the United States of Netherlands, and the Dutch West India Co. For half a century before the English began colonizing the Middle Atlantic States, the Dutch had been settling and governing New Netherland, which consisted of the Dutch settlements in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. So the Dutch flags with their dominant stripes and colors of red, white, and blue had been familiar to American colonists for over a hundred years. Incidentally, it may be noted that the word "stripe," so essentially a part of our flag vocabulary, is from the Dutch, "a stripe, streak."

Before the Continental Congress adopted a flag for the United States, in 1777, various banners of different designs were used in a number of the Colonies. Those here mentioned were among the best known and most interesting.

In 1774, 2 years before the signing of the Declaration of Independence, the so-called Taunton flag was unfurled at Taunton, Mass. It was, in reality, the Meteor Flag of England, with the word "Liberty" across the lower part of the red field. The Bedford flag, which waved over the "embattled farmers" at Concord, April 19, 1775, when they fired "the shot heard round the world," is considered by many to exceed all other colonial flags both in interest and in historic value.

This famous standard is today carefully preserved in the public library of Bedford, Mass. A mailed arm extends from a cloud, the hand clasping a sword. A scroll bearing the motto, "conquer or die." To this flag belongs the honor of being the first flag of the American Revolution to receive a baptism of British fire. The three disks are supposed to represent cannon balls.

The Moultrie flag is said to have been the earliest displayed in the South, 1775. It was a blue flag with a white increscent in its upper left-hand corner. A year later the word "liberty" was emblazoned on it.

The story of the Moultrie flag's origin is interesting. When Col. William Moultrie occupied Fort Johnson, on James Island, in September 1775, his troops wore a blue uniform, with a silver increscent on the cap. Realizing that a flag was necesasry, he improvised one having a blue field, with a white increscent in the canton. This was the flag that Sergeant Jasper so gallantly rescued on June 28, 1776, when the British fleet attacked Fort Sullivan at Charleston, S. C. For his gallantry, the Governor presented him with his own sword and offered him a lieutenant's

commission, but he declined the promotion, saying, "Sir, I am not fit to keep the company of officers."

The Pine Tree flag of different designs was very popular in New England, the pine tree symbolizing the hardiness of the New Englanders. One form known as the Bunker Hill flag consisted of a blue flag with a white canton bearing the red cross of St. George and a green pine tree. Another form of the Pine Tree flag—the one adopted by Massachusetts in 1776—had a white field with a pine tree in the center, above which were the words, "An Appeal to Heaven."

Used especially in the South, the Rattlesnake flag, in a variety of forms, rivaled in popularity the Pine Tree flag. One form, known as the Gadsden flag, had a yellow field with a coiled rattlesnake in the center, under which appeared the words, "Don't Tread on Me."

Various reasons are given why the rattlesnake symbol should have been selected. Benjamin Franklin, is said to have defended the symbol on several grounds: that the rattlesnake is found only in North America and that among the ancients serpents were considered possessed of wisdom and vigilance; the rattlesnake does not attack without first giving warning; and that the number of rattles increases with age—hence the symbol was especially appropriate for the anticipated growth of the United States.

Because of the oft-repeated claim that the design of the union of the flag of the United States was suggested by the stars in the flag of Rhode Island, this flag is one of the most interesting of the colonial flags. It had the word "hope" in a white field and 13 white stars in a blue canton. The middle vertical and horizontal line of three stars form the cross of St. George, while the two diagonal lines of five stars form the cross of St. Andrew, but whether this occurred through coincidence or design isn't known.

The first flag of the United Colonies was designated as the Cambridge flag, the Grand Union flag, or the Great Union flag, the first flag of the United Colonies was flown over George Washington's headquarters at Cambridge, Mass., January 1, 1776. It had 13 horizontal red and white stripes, with the combined crosses of St. George and St. Andrew in a canton with a blue field. In fact, it was the Meteor Flag of England with the solid red field divided by white ribbons so as to make 13 red and white stripes, representing the 13 rebelling Colonies. This similarity may at first seem strange but it must be borne in mind that at the time the idea of independence from England was not seriously considered by the colonists so that the King's colors in this flag showed the allegiance which the Colonies felt they still owed to the mother country.

When Washington heard, for the first time, the Declaration of Independence in New York City, July 9, 1776, the Grand Union flag was flown for the occasion. While the Army used this flag over barracks, camps, and fortifications, it never, so far as is known, carried it in battle. In fact, it was short-lived, as it was naturally inappropriate and unpopular after the signing of the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776.

The adoption of the flag of the United States on June 14, 1777, the Continental Congress in Philadelphia adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the flag of the United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be 13 stars, white in a blue field representing a new constellation."

The significant part of this resolution is, the words "Thirteen stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation," for it is in them that we find the very soul and spirit of the American flag. These were the words which, like scintillating stars in the heavens, signaled to the world the birth of the first nation on earth dedicated to the personal and religious liberty of mankind.

It will be noted that the resolution of adoption did not prescribe how the stars were to be arranged. As a result, in the beginning they were arranged in various ways, including a circle. Some say the circle was to indicate the equality of the States, while others contend it was to symbolize the hope that the Union would be without end.

In 1791, the State of Vermont was admitted into the Union, and in 1792 Kentucky was admitted. Likewise, the representatives of these two States in Congress wanted their States recognized in the flag; so on January 13, 1794, Congress enacted a law to the effect that, beginning May 1, 1795, there should be 15 stars and 15 stripes in the flag.

In some flags the stars were staggered in five horizontal rows of three stars each, while in other flags they were arranged in three horizontal rows of five stars each, one directly above the other. The flag that flew over Fort McHenry when Francis Scott Key was inspired to write our national anthem, The Star-Spangled Banner, had its stars staggered in five rows.

In 1818, the number of States having increased to 20, Congress passed a law (1) giving representation in the flag to the 5 States—Tennessee (1796), Ohio (1802), Louisiana (1812), Indiana (1816), and Mississippi (1817)—that had been admitted into the Union after the last Flag Act had been adopted, thereby increasing the number of stars to 20, effective July 4, 1818; (2) returning the number of stripes to the original 13; and (3) decreeing that thereafter a star should be added to the blue field for each new State admitted into the Union, such addition to take effect on the Fourth of July following the date of admission into the Union—that is, the law provided in effect, "Every star a State; every State a star."

It is in the stars of the flag that we read the growth of the American Nation. As the Nation has grown in size, so have the stars in the flag increased in number.

From the time the stars increased to 20 in 1818, to the beginning of the Mexican War in 1846, Illinois (1818), Alabama (1819), Maine (1820), Missouri (1821), Arkansas (1836), Michigan (1837), Florida (1845), and Texas (1845) were admitted into the Union, the number of stars thus reaching 28.

From 1846 until the beginning of the War Between the States in 1861, 6 more States—Iowa (1846), Wisconsin (1848), California (1850), Minnesota (1858), Oregon (1859), and Kansas (1861) were admitted, and the number of stars increased to 34.

From the beginning of the War Between the States in 1861 to the commencement of the Spanish-American War in 1898, 11 more States were admitted—West Virginia (1863), Nevada (1864), Nebraska (1867), Colorado (1876), North Dakota (1889) South Dakota (1889), Montana (1889), Washington (1889), Idaho (1890), Wyoming (1890), and Utah (1896), making the number of stars 45.

In 1907 Oklahoma became a State and in 1912 the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona reached their statehood.

The stars in the flag then numbered 48, the number we have today. In addition to the 48 States of the Union, constituting the continental United States, foreign possessions of such expanse have come under the protection of the Stars and Stripes, today it may truly be said that the sun never sets on the American flag.

The distinction of having made the first American flag is often given to Betsy Ross, a Quakeress, of Philadelphia. According to the popular story, in June 1776, shortly before the Declaration of Independence was signed, George Washington, George Ross, and Robert Morris called on Betsy Ross and told her that they, as a committee of Congress, wanted her to make for them an American flag according to a sketch they had. She replied, "I don't know whether I can, but I'll try." After the flag was completed, the committee submitted it to Congress, and it was unanimously adopted, thereby giving to Betsy Ross the honor of having made the first American flag.

Almost without exception, however, historians assail the accuracy of the Betsy Ross flag story, which is based entirely on family hearsay and is not supported in any way whatsoever by contemporary evidence. To quote the late Admiral George H. Preble, United States Navy, universally acknowledged as America's greatest flag historian:

"It will probably never be known who designed our union of stars, the records of Congress being silent on the subject, and there being no mention or suggestion of it in any of the voluminous correspondence or diaries of the time, public or private, which have ever been published."

Like the George Washington cherry-tree legend, the Betsy Ross flag story is intriguing. It appeals to sentiment and satisfies the imagination. We all wish it could be proved to be true. But it is misleading to teach it to American youth as history. It should be taught them as a legend—a tradition. Historically, the question of who made the first American flag is still unanswered, authentically, as primary documental evidence.

What the flag means as stated by Charles Evans Hughes: "This flag means more than association and reward. It is the symbol of our national unity, our national endeavor, our national aspiration. It tells you of the struggle for independence, of Union preserved, of liberty and Union one and inseparable, of the sacrifices of brave men and women to whom the ideals and honor of this Nation have been dearer than life itself.

It means America first, my friends. It means an undivided allegiance. It means America united, strong and efficient, equal to the tasks. It means that you cannot be saved by the valor and devotion of your ancestors alone; that to each generation comes its patriotic duty; and upon your willingness to sacrifice and endure as those before you have sacrificed and endured, rests the national hope.

It speaks of equal rights; of the inspiration of free institutions, exemplified and vindicated; of liberty under law intelligently conceived and impartially administered.

There is not a thread in it but scorns self-indulgence, weakness, and rapacity. It is eloquent of our community interests, outweighing all divergencies of opinion and of our common destiny.

The flag of a people symbolizes their hopes and aspirations, their struggles and sacrifices, their joys and achievements. If these be fine and noble, their flag is great; but if their aspirations, conduct, and accomplishments be ignoble, then their flag means little or nothing. In other words, the flag of a country is what its people make it. It is nothing more, nothing less.

In conclusion, my friends, why should any school boy or girl—why should any other person beneath the protecting wings of our democratic government, enjoying the freedom of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, refuse to salute the emblem symbolic of our Bill of Rights in this land that answers the first call of distress for the needs of humanity throughout the world?

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands—one nation indivisible—with liberty and justice for all." The God of the universe being my helper, I promise so to do.

Preserving Our Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written by W. F. Twombly and printed in the Reading (Mass.) Chronicle of July 13, 1950:

PRESERVING OUR LIBERTIES

The events happening in Korea today have given this Nation, and many others, the greatest cause for anxiety since Pearl Harbor. The great question now is are we on the brink of world war III or is the fighting now taking place of local conflict. The answer lies with the Russians, and their rulers are the only ones that know the answer.

This effort to win Korea for the Communists may be only one of a number of attempts which will be made in the future to add to the present number of satellite nations. Obviously the ultimate objective is to add all Europe to the Kremlin power, and if and when that happens then we certainly will be involved in another world war.

It seems likely that the course of events in Korea will have great influence on what the future may bring forth. Up to the present there are several hopeful indications.

In the first place the United Nations, upon which organization many nations have based their hopes of preserving peace, has declared this action by North Korea as an act of aggression and the United States, as the only Nation capable at the present time, is supplying the power that is needed to enforce the action taken by this world organization. That this procedure has been approved by the most powerful nations of the earth should give pause to those who instigated this invasion of a peaceful country and give the answer to the question as to what will result if further attempts are made to subjugate peaceful peoples. If the weight of world-wide opinion is a factor in future decisions then the present situation should give the aggressors something to think about.

In the second place the fact that the action has thus far been confined to Korea gives hope that those responsible for the present situation are not, for the present at least, ready to risk an enlargement of the field of operations.

The one thing that the invasion of South Korea has done is to crystallize the course that must be pursued by the United States. We are now committed to the fact that we will assist any peace-loving nation to preserve its liberty. This means, we believe, that we intend to confine the Communist sphere to its present influence and will not tolerate any aggression that seeks to add to the present nations now under Communist rule and regulation. No longer will our State Department be without a policy and waver this way and that. Appeasement was ruled out as far as aggressor nations are concerned at Munich.

Reading the exchange of notes between the United States and Russia we are struck by the fact that as far as propaganda is concerned the Russians are so far ahead of us that it isn't even funny. How events can be so twisted, false motives implied, and technical points developed to suit their own convenience is an art in itself. The resulting propaganda is so plausible that a disinterested party looking for the facts and reading this distortion of the facts might readily believe that the United Nations and the United States were in the wrong. It is natural to think that no one will believe such hogwash but the fact is, many do and we risk the loss of world approval of our action if we sit idly by and take only futile steps to counteract with the truth the lies that are put out by the Russian propaganda machine.

The truth of the matter is we must take steps at once to build up the Voice of America so that it reaches every possible corner of our globe and tell our story truthfully and simply so that all may understand. This takes money and brains but we have both and cannot afford to lose all simply because we cannot get our story across.

Our job is clear. We must use our financial resources, brains and even lives, if necessary, to preserve for at least a part of this planet the liberties upon which this Nation was founded and which we have been able to preserve up to the present time. If it ever comes to the point where communism rules the earth then we stand to lose everything that has brought this Nation to its present position where it is the hope of all freedom-loving peoples.

Power Development in Europe Under ECA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY CORDON
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 17 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release entitled "French TVA," written by Gus Norwood, and released by the Northwest Public Power Association. The release deals with expenditures under ECA for power purposes.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRENCH TVA
(By Gus Norwood)

Millions of American ECA dollars are making possible the most spectacular power development in Europe. Over 16,000 Frenchmen are at work building 18 hydropower dams on the Rhone River between Lake Geneva and the Mediterranean. These 18 public power projects together with other dams on Rhone tributaries are lumped together as one job—the Rhone River Valley project.

During 1949 the United States donated 90 percent of the construction cost of this project. Congress has approved similar free grants for 1950 and 1951.

Meanwhile, Congress has been paring down on the availability of loan funds for self-liquidating, interest-paying dams for the power-shortage Pacific Northwest. And meanwhile, the States of Oregon and Washington are paying unemployment compensation to workers who can't find jobs because industries cannot build or expand factories in the Pacific Northwest because of the power shortage.

United States funds will also create a 354-mile-long inland navigation waterway plus provide irrigation water sufficient to increase French agricultural output 5 percent.

The June 26, 1950, issue of Life magazine carried 7 pages of dramatic photographs. The Life story contained this significant statement: "* * * the all-encompassing plan for the Rhone came only after the French began, in 1945, to probe the causes of defeat in 1940. They realized that prewar France had become a puffy industrial invalid, whose meager production of energy, particularly of hydroelectricity ('white coal'), mocked the enormous potential capacity of the nation."

Perhaps in years to come American tourists from the Pacific Northwest will admire the Rhone River Valley project which was merely copied from TVA. And perhaps at the same time they will get a letter from home saying that a new flood is raging down the Columbia River, and also that unemployment in the Pacific Northwest is expected to drop off 1¼ percent with the advent of the berry-picking season.

The French World War I debt to the United States, including unpaid interest as of July 1, 1948, was $4,837,772,854.40.

Speaking of credit standing, the Bonneville Power Administration in 12 years, after paying all operating and administration expenses, irrigation subsidy, interest and amortization, is now $50,000,000 ahead in cash payments to the United States Treasury.

Such is the statesmanship of high finance.

The Knowland Amendment to the Social-Security Bill—It Opens the Door to Encouraging Strikebreaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in the social-security bill recently passed by the Senate, there appears an amendment, now commonly referred to as the Knowland amendment, which was not in the bill as passed by the House, and which will, therefore, be a subject of conference.

I think it should be pointed out to the Members of the House that this amendment was considered by the Senate Finance Committee, and rejected by that committee. On the floor of the Senate, only 10 minutes of debate were allotted to this amendment—7½ of which went to its proponents and only 2½ minutes of which were allocated for an explanation of the reasons for opposing this rather technical and subtle amendment. Members will find the record of this brief debate on pages 8883 to 8887 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 20.

This amendment is represented merely as a device for delaying any action that may be taken by the Secretary of Labor to correct any State violations of standards which this Congress has very wisely written into our unemployment-compensation laws. Most of the wordage of the amendment is devoted to this purpose.

This ignores, however, the most important part of the amendment, which involves merely the changing of one word. Let me explain.

As I am sure most Members of this House are aware, there are certain labor standards and guaranties which the

States must agree to preserve if they are to participate in Federal unemployment-compensation programs. Many States have written these guaranties into their own laws, often using the same language contained in the Federal statutes.

Nevertheless, it is possible for a State to nullify these standards and guaranties not by actually amending the letter of the law itself through positive legislative action, but merely through interpretation. An actual example of this, which occurred recently in my own State of Washington will serve to show how this is possible.

In Spokane, there is a local of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America—Local 98—that has about 2,000 members. In the spring of 1949, at least 269 of these union members were out of work, because of a lack of jobs. Many of them were drawing unemployment compensation. About this time the members of Local 98 proposed new agreements to their various employers, as they had a right to do. Several employers signed these agreements immediately, but others refused to do so, and so about 500 carpenters went on strike. These 500 either did not apply for unemployment compensation, or were rightfully denied such compensation, because their unemployment was clearly due to the strike which they had initiated, and to which they were a party.

Naturally, the more than 200 carpenters who had been unemployed before the strike began did not want to become strikebreakers by filling the jobs vacated by the strikers. They had a right to do this and at the same time to continue to draw unemployment compensation. This right is guaranteed both in Federal statutes, and in the Washington State law itself, which provide that compensation shall not be denied to any individual who refuses to take a new job that is vacant as the direct result of a labor dispute. In this case it seems clear that the vacancies were directly caused by the labor dispute, since over 200 carpenters were unemployed before the strike began.

Yet the Washington State unemployment compensation agency cut off the benefits from the men who had been unemployed prior to the strike, and denied them benefits until the strike should be settled. This was done despite the fact that these men had not walked off the jobs that were vacant.

I think that any Member of this House will appreciate the pressure that is brought to bear on a man without a source of income to accept struck work, and thus become a strikebreaker.

The Secretary of Labor, feeling that this ruling of the State agency clearly nullified a guaranty of the Federal statutes, held a 3-day hearing, beginning December 12, 1949, in which the State was afforded an opportunity to explain and justify its position. When all the evidence had been heard, the Secretary ruled that the State of Washington had changed its law from the meaning given to the provision on strikebreaking when it was adopted. The State thereupon changed its interpretation, so that workers who were not unemployed because of a labor dispute or because of their involvement in it no longer faced the choice of becoming strikebreakers or having their unemployment compensation cut off.

It should be made clear that the Federal guaranty was nullified through interpretation, and not through any amendment of the State law through an action of the State legislature.

The Knowland amendment would render the Secretary of Labor powerless in such a case. Under existing law, without the Knowland amendment, the Secretary is authorized to take action if the State changes its law—and the word "changed" includes modifying the effect of the law through interpretation. The Knowland amendment specifies that the Secretary can take action only if the State amends its law—the word "amend" has been substituted for the word "changed"—through some positive action of the State legislature. Thus, under the Knowland amendment, the Secretary would have been powerless to act in the case of the carpenters.

Representatives from the west coast will be interested in knowing that there have been other similar cases on the west coast in which members of maritime unions have been denied unemployment compensaton, even though they were not directly involved in a strike, and thus pressure brought to bear upon them to become strikebreakers.

I bring these facts to the attention of the House, primarily because I feel that, owing to the short time allotted to debating this amendment in the Senate, there may be a great deal of misunderstanding about the real effect of the amendment.

I hope that all of the Members of this House—and particularly my colleagues on the west coast, will urge the House conferees to eliminate the Knowland amendment in conference.

New England Opposes Limitation of Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from F. D. Campbell, president of the New England Gas and Electric Association:

NEW ENGLAND GAS
AND ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION,
Cambridge, Mass., July 14, 1950.

Hon. ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GOODWIN: I am writing to record with you the concern which the officers of the New England Gas and Electric Association and its subsidiary utilities feel over current proposals in Congress for limiting imports of oil or by duties accomplishing the same result.

Since 1945 we, along with other utilities, have been waging a constant fight to avoid the necessity of raising our rates to our customers, a losing fight insofar as our gas companies are concerned, I am sorry to say, until, in the past year, we were able to take advantage of the dropping oil prices. By pooling our system requirements and arranging for transportation in leased tankers direct from the oil fields and conversion of boilers to use oil, we have made material savings in our fuel costs. It would be discouraging, to say the least, to lose this advantage were domestic oil prices to be increased as a result of an artificial restriction of the imports of foreign oil, and it would penalize the power users of New England.

We have converted enough boilers in our electric-generating plants so that at present our base load can all be carried on oil-fired boilers. One of our gas companies now produces gas made entirely from oil, a process which in itself is more economical apart from the lower cost of oil per B. t. u. Our other gas plants use large quantities of enriching oil for their gas as well as heavy oil to fire their boilers. As a result of this extensive use of oil we have been able to hold the line on electric rates and a few months ago reduced the rates of the company which is making oil-gas.

I am sure you can understand why the prospect of an increase in oil prices concerns us and, because it would unquestionably necessitate increasing our rates to our customers, you can appreciate its undesirability on that account. Gas and electric rates in New England have had enough adverse criticism in the past few years without the further increases which would be inevitable if oil prices were to again approach the 1948 highs.

New England residents, in common with those of the other States along our northern boundaries and to a much greater degree than the majority of the States of the country, need cheap fuel for the heating of homes and places of work. The Federal Reserve Bank of Boston in a recent study states that the petroleum imports have helped to bring down the price of oil in New England. It seems to us unfortunate if the cost of that fuel should be forced up unnecessarily. It is hard to believe that the potential revenue from increased duties is that essential.

It also seems to us that from a national defense viewpoint, with the uncertainty that exists concerning the future, it would be unwise to speed the exhaustion of our domestic oil supply by hampering the free flow of foreign oil to our refineries. We have seen no comment that it is necessary to restrict imports for the benefit of our domestic producers.

We hope that you will agree with us that limitation of oil imports is not in the best interests of New England and that you will actively oppose any such measures.

Very truly yours,

F. D. CAMPBELL,
President.

P. S.—Our subsidiaries are the Cambridge Electric Light Co., Cambridge Gas Light Co., Cambridge Steam Corp., Cape & Vineyard Electric Co., Dedham & Hyde Park Gas Co., Kitery Electric Light Co., Milford Gas Light Co., New Bedford Gas & Edison Light Co., New Hampshire Electric Co., Plymouth County Electric Co., Plymouth Gas Light Co., Provincetown Light & Power Co., and Worcester Gas Light Co., serving over 330,000 customers in 105 cities and towns of eastern New England.

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ivan H. Peterman appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer of Friday, July 14, 1950:

UNITED STATES PAYS WITH LIVES FOR STUPID POLICIES

By Ivan H. Peterman

WASHINGTON, July 13.—It's going to be blood, sweat, and tears for many days to hold on in Korea.

As in every surprise attack the United States has had to fend off—always through stupid lack of preparedness—this is becoming a straight exchange of GI lives and South Korean soil, for time. Vital time in which to do what blind, brainless policymakers on the Far East, refused to allow—despite warnings on all sides. We are buying time to bring up men and munitions.

This is the dismal prospect from the capital of our bewildered Nation, where in the famed Pentagon building, the military once more are attempting to solve what American statesmen have botched. If there is soldiers' bitterness in the mud of the Kum River, believe me, there is just as much in the hearts of hamstrung leaders of Army, Navy, and Air Force down here.

This is the bloody payoff for being nice to Russia. This is what comes of the Alger Hiss influence, the concessions at Yalta, the strict adherence to agreements, and the pursuit of appeasement on the advice of the Dr. Lattimores and the Far East "pink" persuasion, the daffiness boys who went lecturing about Communist continentals and Robin Hoods and the horrible Chiang Kai-shek with his anti-Communist record.

Although the Air Force, by terrific effort in a short time, has begun to pulverize North Korean supply lines, and the dearly sold distance retains a beachhead in Korea, Army spokesmen see no rainbows ahead. Here is why:

There is not much heavy ground stuff to send from Japan. In its occupation job, the Army of General MacArthur went heavy on administration, and light on shooting units. What we do have, cannot all be committed for fear of leaving Japan, the Philippines, Okinawa, etc., wide open.

There is just one poorly equipped Korean port in which to land reinforcements and material. It is 110 miles across the straits from Japan. It is 7,000 or more miles to Korea from the western United States coast.

"But what have we done with the $13,388,000,000 defense budgets?" citizens ask. That puzzles everyone.

Of the 1949–50 budget, the Army received $4,380,644,298, according to its press release. Air Force got $5,289,975,770. Navy's share was approximately four and one-fourth billions.

The Army was authorized to maintain 10 divisions, the Air Force 48 groups, and the Navy 652 vessels, of which 238 were for combat. For 1951 the figures are not much different, except Army's personnel is slightly reduced, Navy gets one more combat ship, the Air Force won a slight increase in planes and personnel. But most of this stuff isn't available until the year after it's O.K.'d in Congress, if in that time.

For example, the Air Force in the past year ordered 1,250 planes, but many are not yet under way. Some are understood to have cost $20,000,000 each.

"This isn't going to be just one sad story," said a disillusioned inhabitant of the Pentagon. "It will be a continued tragedy. How long can we hold on? When can we attack? Where? With how much?"

These are questions posed by the latest "sneak attack" from a supposedly "friendly" nation. This comes from setting up a weak Republic, then obeying to the letter an agreement with the worst treaty-breaker since Adolf Hitler. We removed United States military forces in Korea—while Stalin merely changed Communist casts, and piled his weapons over the thirty-eighth parallel.

Underlying the whole misconcept of far-eastern events was, of course, the quick deterioration of Soviet-Western relations, the rapid conquest of China by Mao Tse-tung's armies (releasing them to backstop the North Koreans), and the cynical shift of Communist plans from virulent propaganda and "cold war," to the hot variety served up by willing puppets.

The United States military estimated Soviet Russia would not be ready for 2 more years. Whatever prompted this estimate—unless the consistently sour intelligence we've been getting—overlooked the possibility of trial runs by non-Soviet outfits. The North Koreans, having nothing but a parallel to cross, were ideally suited for the test. Whatever their stature in civilization's handbook, they have made a remarkably good showing to date. As good as the Republic's was bad.

But none of such hindsight explains why a whole United States division had to be committed without adequate artillery, tanks, or other defensive weapons. Where were the mine fields? What happened at river crossings? Why, after all we learned in World War II about tank warfare, were we caught worse than in Tunisia—outgunned, outarmored, outmaneuvered, and outnumbered? Red tanks, which from pictures appear to be nothing more than reinforced German captures, or outmoded Russian models, have run through South Koreans and Americans alike. As they always will, if you don't have proper anti-tank weapons, air support, and a knowledge of how to fight them.

"We forget faster in America than in any other country," said one officer. "We put emphasis on all the trivia, but in times like these overlook our security and the defense of the most precious thing we have: freedom. When will we learn?"

ECA Blushes To Discover Itself in Roman Night Club Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of July 15, 1950:

ECA BLUSHES TO DISCOVER ITSELF IN ROMAN NIGHT CLUB BUSINESS

(By George Weller)

ROME, July 15.—A nest egg of $15,000 spent on a swank Roman night club with cultural touches is costing the Marshall-plan sponsors in Italy more blushes than the whole $1,057,000,000 program decorously expended in 2 years.

The United States spends more than $1,000 a minute helping Italy, but has suffered disproportionate headaches since the Open Gate Club opened in March with restricted membership.

ECA's $15,000 pays a year's rent for the club, which still lacks legal officers. After slamming the door on all but a select list of members approved by a steering committee of titled Italian clubwomen, the Open Gate Club and its ECA backers have discovered themselves with surprise in the hot-spot business instead of the pious pilgrim trade.

The $15,000 came out of a $2,900,000 ECA fund to promote facilities for pilgrims in Holy Year, approved by a board of nine Italians and one American.

The Open Gate Club occupies the four bottom stories in a modern building in the heart of Rome's neon jungle of tourism, with a doorman uniformed in green and gold, creamy furniture, and hunt-club decorations. It has a night club and restaurant, a luxurious public cinema with 224 deep seats, sumptuous lobbies, and six minor clubrooms. The clubrooms, little used as yet, are intended for afternoon bridge, reading, teas, travel guidance, and art exhibits on a moneyed level.

The manager is Countess Elena Valensano, a statuesque woman of Russian origin, formerly a friend of Marshal Badoglio, and now married to his nephew, Lt. Col. Count Giuseppe Valensano. She rents the four furnished stories from the owners, the Societa Generale Immobiliare, for $26,500 a year plus $8,000 upkeep.

SIX ROOMS SUBRENTED

Countess Valensano, a dignified Texas Guinan, runs an operating business called the Open Gate Co. The company subrents the six lesser rooms to the Open Gate Club, run by the ECA-subsidized Roman ladies. The American $15,000 entitles the members to a year's rent of the partial premises to preferred service in the restaurant, and good seats at movie openings. The movie, the Flammetta (little flame), features undubbed foreign pictures at top prices.

The clubrooms amount to about one-twelfth of the cubic area of the entire establishment, including the two-story movie house, and the night club, with kitchens. The ECA has been irked to find itself paying nearly half the rent and getting use of a dozenth part, or less, of the whole plant. The ECA itself has offices in an upper story.

HUNDREDS BELONG—ON PAPER

On paper the Open Gate Club has several hundred members, chiefly wealthy Italians and foreign diplomats. The club also has, on paper, a constitution providing for the election of a president, two vice presidents, foreign and Italian, and eight advisers.

But no election has ever been called, and ECA is still dealing uneasily with the aristocratic lady founders. The temporary chairman is Duchess Elena Della Rovere Rospigliosi. The incandescent spirit is Mrs. Carla Garabelli Orlando, daughter of a great Italian statesman and head of Italy's league of women voters.

Countess Valensano, the impresaria, is one of the governing five Italian ladies. The club's sponsors number 16 foreign Ambassadors including the American envoy, James C. Dunn. The key ladies are able, according to the charter, to pass on membership candidates without appeal, by secret ballot, and without being obliged to state reasons for nonadmission.

The club was scaled for maximums of 300 charter members at $85 each, 2,000 visiting members at $16.50 and 5,000 14-day members at $3.50. It was computed that the club

would clear as much even in falling under these figures, as the $15,000 subsidy from ECA.

But travelers generally have ignored the ornate clubrooms, and turned to commercial facilities for the same services. Few tourists and no pilgrims have been able to meet the caviar prices of the night club. The pious are too poor and the rich too scarce, except among diplomats and wealthy Italians. Diplomats, however, use the Open Gate for dinners, enjoying the refined dance teams and singers selected by the countess.

Mail Call

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I believe if anyone were to ask the GI stationed in a foreign country what he considered the most important period of the day, that he would state: "Mail call, when I look forward to hearing from the loved ones back home, is by far the most important time of day."

I also believe that if you were to ask his loved ones back home what they considered to be the most important time of day, that they also would say: "It is the hour at which the mailman is due to arrive and we look forward with hope and anticipation of receiving a letter from our loved ones overseas." I know that this sentiment prevailed during World Wars I and II, and I am convinced that the same sentiment now prevails even though we are not engaged in total war.

Mr. Speaker, my record in supporting economy measures is well known to all and I have no intention of deviating from my established purpose of striving for a balanced budget, especially in peacetime. However, in my opinion even though the actions of Postmaster General Donaldson in curtailing the number of city deliveries in a given period might have possessed much merit under normal conditions, yet now with so many of our boys serving outside the continental limits of the United States, and with so many loved ones waiting, hoping, and praying here at home to receive direct word by mail stating that their loved ones are still safe, I feel fully justified in signing Discharge Petition No. 31, in the hope that the legislation may be permitted to come before us having as its objective the reestablishing of the postal delivery service which was curtailed by the PMG's order.

A GI Thanks His Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I have received, as I assume other Members of the House have received, hundreds of letters criticizing the Government in connection with the GI bill of rights. It should not be forgotten, however, that as a rule we of the Congress only hear from those who have a gripe. It is true that they constitute only a very small percentage of the millions who have received or are receiving benefits under the GI bill. We know that the vast majority of the veterans are appreciative of the benefits they have received, but they seldom put their appreciation in writing.

I think, therefore, that the Members of the House will find it refreshing to read a letter addressed to me by one of the veterans in my district. I am proud not only of the writer of the letter, but also of the home and the school that taught him an appreciation of his country and his government.

Under unanimous consent granted, I am pleased to include this letter from my constituent, Daniel J. Barnwell:

JULY 4, 1950.

DEAR SIR: It finally happened. Just 1 month ago, I became a college graduate and a chemical engineer. But it probably would never have happened without the GI bill.

Since it is only right to express gratitude when given anything, let me say, "Thank you" to you, and through you, the United States Government for my education. I, for one, deeply appreciate everything that has been done.

Yours truly,

DANIEL J. BARNWELL.

BRONX, N. Y.

War or Peace, the Goal Remains the Same

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald for July 17, 1950:

WAR OR PEACE, THE GOAL REMAINS THE SAME

Predictions abound that the New Deal will use the Korean conflict as a pretext for invoking wartime controls of industry, prices, and manpower. The regimentation scheduled is more complete than anything Americans have ever seen.

CRISIS IS EXCUSE FOR SEIZING POWERS

In an hour of uncertainty and depression occasioned by our reverses in Korea, Congress and the public may not show the energy and spirit required to question the necessity and purpose of the administration's plan, and the Nation may slip into totalitarianism as a result.

The most cursory study of the political objectives of the administration will show that the latest emergency is merely an excuse for seizing powers that have long been coveted.

On September 6, 1945, after World War II had ended, the President presented a 21-point program to Congress which would have reserved to the administration in time of peace almost all of the sweeping powers with which it had vested itself in time of war. The retention of wartime controls was asked on the ground that they were needed "to hold the line against inflation." As will be recalled, rationing and price control held over until the shortages of 1946 so exasperated the voters that they returned a Republican majority in both Houses of Congress.

During the Republican Eightieth Congress, the New Dealers were slowed down, but they were not stopped. When the 1948 election consolidated Mr. Trumans' hold on office, he returned to the attack. He asked the new Democratic Congress for authority to control prices, allocate scarce materials, and build and operate production facilities he might decree to be necessary.

An elaborate bill to achieve these purposes was introduced by Representative SPENCE, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee. The description of this bill showed that its inspiration was derived from the administrations' full employment bill of 1945. It was declared that the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government were to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, and it was submitted as a finding of fact that shortages of materials and continued price increases endanger the realization of these objectives.

The powers proposed to be entrusted to the President under the Spence bill parallel those which he would be granted under existing plans for war mobilization and wartime controls. They were:

1. Power to designate materials or facilities in short supply whenever the President reports a shortage is affecting or threatens to affect adversely the "domestic economy, * * * the general welfare, the national security, or the carrying out of the foreign policy of the United States."

2. Power to contract without limit for research to develop substitutes for or improved utilization of short materials or facilities.

3. Power to purchase on whatever terms and conditions as the President should choose, with or without competitive bids, and at home or abroad, materials in short supply, and to refine, process, store, and resell them.

4. Power to loan up to 75 percent of amounts the President decides are needed for expansion of productive facilities, on whatever terms he decides.

5. Power to build additional productive facilities or rehabilitate existing facilities, including Government-owned war plants, and contract for the operation of such plants.

6. Power to approve any voluntary plan for allocation of materials judged to be in short supply.

7. Power, if deemed necessary, to impose mandatory priority and allocation controls over the distribution of materials.

8. Power to continue export controls.

9. Power to require sellers of any commodity significantly affecting the cost of living or costs of industrial and agricultural production to give 60 days' notice of any proposed price increase and to justify such increase at a public hearing.

10. Power to invoke price control and to regulate or prohibit labeling or packaging of goods which the President considered to result in prices inconsistent with the purposes of the bill.

DICTATORSHIP AT SINGLE STROKE

The New Deal never was able to put this program for the planned economy across, but, under the pretext of war emergency, the whole program is in process of being resubmitted in far more drastic form. At a single stroke the American people would have fastened on them a dictatorship or a Socialist state.

The Nation must retain a sense of perspective. So far we are in no earth-shaking crisis, but in what the President himself has

described only as "a police action" against "a bunch of bandits." By Mr. Truman's own terms, this is no excuse for asking the people to surrender their liberty.

Planners Flunk Test of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the United States News and World Reports:

PLANNERS FLUNK TEST OF WAR

(Reported from Pusan, Korea, and Washington)

(Fancy weapons and strategy have a different look after a few weeks of fighting in Korea. They don't work wonders, after all. B–36, key to defense planning, is on the side lines. Jets turn out to be of limited use, too. Tanks, once written off, are still a big weapon. As military men see Korea: infantry-tank teams, well supported, are what is needed. It can mean a basic change in United States planning.)

War is putting United States military ideas, new weapons, and strategy plans to the test of experience. On the basis of the record to date, the report card on first performances can be marked: "Flunked."

Taxpayers in five postwar years have provided the military services with $50,000,000,000 to spend on defense. The military sold the country on giving first priority to atom bombs, big bombers, guided missiles, new mystery weapons, fast jet planes. Defense was to center around quick retaliation with air power. Bombs and new weapons were to replace big armies and big navies. When the show-down came, North Korea—a supposedly primitive area, using old Russian weapons—failed to fold up under bombing, soon showed she could outgun and overwhelm inadequately armed American forces.

A post mortem of the first weeks of war already is being held. It is one in which top military officials try to find out how they could have guessed so wrong, made so many mistakes. Its outcome will determine, in large measure, how much present defense plans will be shifted, what direction will be taken by the remobilization effort just ahead.

A report on United States weapons that represent the big postwar investment, and how they have stood up in actual uses is given here to indicate what changes are to come.

B–36 BOMBERS

These are the big bombers designed to strike back quickly at Russia, if Soviet armies move, with blows that would either win quickly or sharply reduce the enemy's ability to wage war. The B–36's have gotten the largest single share of military-equipment money in recent years. Yet no B–36 was used in the critical opening weeks in Korea, in a type of war that may set the pattern for localized Communist attacks. In other words, strategic bombing, important in a big war, turns out to have only limited uses in this kind of fighting.

ATOM BOMBS

Billions also have been spent on building a large stockpile of atomic weapons. None has been used in Korea. Threat of retaliation with A-bombs, counted on against Russia, appears not to work against Russian satellites. The bomb as a "tactical" weapon for land warfare also has not panned out so far, remains in the planning stage.

TANKS

Played down by United States Army planners as an obsolescent weapon, impractical in mountainous country and of little value against infantry with antitank weapons, tanks are turning out to be the basic weapon in the Korean war. Moreover, present American tanks, all World War II models, are shown to be inferior to Russian tanks—in fire power, in armor, in size. The role of tanks in coming warfare and the type of tanks needed, thus, are being reassessed.

AIRCRAFT CARRIERS

These mobile air bases, cut far back under recent economy orders, have turned out to be highly valuable as a means of furnishing air support to troops and preventing amphibious landings. Of 103 carriers and escort carriers left over from the last war, only 14 are in service. Recall of more carriers from "moth-ball" status, as a result, is being started.

JET FIGHTERS

A heavy investment in these planes over the last 5 years is paying off in part. But, where jet fighters were counted on to give improved support for troops, they now have shown themselves, in practice, too fast to be as efficient as propeller-driven types in working with ground forces. Jet aircraft may be valuable to combat fast enemy jets, but far less reliance is to be placed on them for troop support. World War II types turn out to be better for this job.

ANTITANK WEAPONS

Recoilless artillery, improved bazooka, other antitank devices on hand also are failing to give United States troops the edge that was expected. None has proved really effective against Russian-made tanks.

PROXIMITY FUZE

This device, now available in improved form after much research is failing to provide the sure-fire defense against masses of enemy troops that was advertised. Idea was that shells equipped with these fuzes would break up any enemy attack by automatically bursting a few feet above ground and hurling shrapnel in all directions. Enemy attacks, instead, have kept coming.

TRANSPORT PLANES

Air transports, on which military buying economized in favor of big bombers, are found in the Korean war to be needed and lacking. There has been no means of quickly moving troops from Japan or the United States to Korea. Partial use of commercial transports, as the military planners see it now, still fails to provide an adequate airlift. From this lesson, Army officials are hoping to sell the idea of buying enough air transports to move at least two divisions and their equipment. Belief now is that, in time, all Army and marine troops must be air transportable.

TRANSPORT SHIPS

Supply of ships also is found to be too low for a Korean-type war. Cutbacks in number of Navy ships have been so drastic that badly needed marine forces were kept waiting for weeks in California. And whether other types of naval vessels are plentiful enough to patrol Korean waters while preventing enemy landings on Formosa and filling other commitments remains to be seen.

That, in brief, is the appraisal by competent military planners of how this country's costly defense equipment is proving out in actual warfare in Korea. It shows graphically the errors in emphasis that had been given most weapons, from the standpoint of this type of war.

Changes resulting from that appraisal, however, are to affect the organization as well as the type of weapons United States will mobilize in the period ahead.

Ground troops, well equipped and in large numbers, are to get first priority in remobilization. Lesson No. 1 in Korea has been that present expensive weapons cannot wholly substitute for infantry and its supporting arms. Mobile ground-combat teams were especially needed when the Korean attack began and were not available. Marine Corp battalions, trained and organized for that purpose, had been cut far back in size and all stationed in the United States. Not even one full division of marines is available now. Army airborne divisions lack equipment for quick use. And all Army ground troops total only 10 divisions.

Air power, at the same time, is in for a shift of emphasis from big bombers to ground-support planes. The theory that bombers alone can stop ground forces is dead. The demonstrated need is for support fighter bombers.

Use of armor, too, is to be stepped up. More armored divisions and more tanks for infantry divisions are likely to follow, altering the Army's present balance of forces and discounting its recent philosophy that tanks are a dying breed.

Sea power, finally, is due for a fairly rapid build-up. Korea is showing the need for more emphasis on carriers, transports, patrol vessels, as well as antisubmarine teams.

Lessons now being learned in Korea, thus, are pointing toward a basic change in this country's defense plans, its military equipment, the organization of its Armed Forces. How far these changes will go will depend on how altered war plans in Korea succeed in weeks ahead.

The Mess MacArthur Inherited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the American people have more faith, more confidence, and more trust in the ability, the knowledge, the integrity, and the judgment of General MacArthur than they have in Secretary of State Acheson, Secretary of Defense Johnson, and President Truman, all three combined. General MacArthur is responsible for the only bright spot in our entire foreign program. Where Acheson, Johnson, and Truman can only show failure after failure in their foreign-policy program General MacArthur can point with pride to his particular sector of our foreign-policy line, because it is the only bright spot in the entire line. For this reason the dastardly and unwarranted attack upon General MacArthur by former Secretary of the Interior, Harold Ickes, placing the blame upon General MacArthur for the present situation in Korea, cannot go unchallenged and must be answered.

The best answer to the Ickes attack is an editorial carried in the Washington Times-Herald of July 14, 1950. That editorial presents a clear picture of the situation MacArthur faces today, and also points out how it came about. It proves beyond any question who is to blame for the situation.

THE MESS MACARTHUR INHERITED

The Government has decided to negotiate a peace settlement with Japan as soon as possible. Long-term military rights for American forces in the Japanese home islands are to be asked.

The Korean war has indicated the advisability of these steps, which are said to have brought General MacArthur, as supreme commander in Japan, into reasonably close agreement with the State Department and the defense establishment for the first time in many months.

GREW IS LET OUT

When the Presidential decision was made to intervene in Korea, the whole job was wished upon MacArthur. The general is believed to have viewed the successive retreats before communism in Asia with grave misgivings, but he had nothing to do with them. He was not given any voice in higher policy until the State Department had made an egregious mess of everything in the Orient. Then, in effect, he was given a mop and told to clean up.

A little history on the relationship between General MacArthur and Secretary of State Dean Acheson is illuminating. In the summer of 1945 Acheson had been assistant Secretary of State for 4½ years. On June 7 of that year 6 persons, 2 of them State Department officials, were arrested for espionage in the theft of 1,700 secret Government documents for the pro-Soviet magazine Amerasia. By coincidence, the New York Communist newspaper, the Daily Worker, praised Acheson on that day as "forward looking."

Joseph C. Grew, Acheson's immediate superior as Under Secretary of State, was in favor of vigorous prosecution of the document thieves, but forces were at work to render the prosecution a dud. The Communists yelled for Grew's scalp. On August 14 James Byrnes succeeded Edward R. Stettinius as Secretary of State, and both Grew and Acheson tendered their resignations, as was customary.

Former Ambassador Joseph E. Davies, Russophile author of "Mission to Moscow," is said to have related that Acheson had made Grew's resignation a condition for staying on himself. On August 27 Acheson was appointed Under Secretary, and Grew was out. Philip Jaffe, central figure in the Amerasia case, confided to one of the other defendants, "Well, we've suffered a lot, but anyhow, we got Grew out."

On October 7, 1945, the leftist New York paper, PM, remarked editorially, "Now State Department policy has a better appreciation of what Soviet Russia wants." On November 14 Acheson appeared at Madison Square Garden on the same platform with such well-known Stalinists as Davies, Corliss Lamont, Paul Robeson, and Albert Fitzgerald, president of the Communist-dominated CIO United Electrical Workers, at a mass meeting in honor of Dr. Hewlett Johnson, the Red Dean of Canterbury.

ACHESON'S ABOUT FACE

Almost immediately upon his assumption of the post of Under Secretary, Acheson set about putting General MacArthur, the hero of the Pacific war, in his place. General MacArthur had stated that Japan was docile under American occupation and that 200,000 American troops were all that were needed. On September 19 Acheson, Acting Secretary of State in Byrnes' absence, snapped back in a statement the Associated Press called more pugnacious than diplomatic.

Among other things, he said that the United States Government, not the occupation force under General MacArthur, is determining American policy toward Japan, and that the policy laid down by the Government—i. e., the State Department—would not be changed and would be carried out regardless of cost.

Some Senators, among them WHERRY, of Nebraska, and Chandler, of Kentucky, said the Acheson statement was a deliberate insult to MacArthur. Whatever it was, it indicated that Acheson intended to call the signals on the far eastern policy, and that MacArthur's role was to be confined to doing as he was told.

With the exception of the year and a half between July 1, 1947, and January 8, 1949, when he was out of the Department, Acheson called the signals. In his tenure as Secretary, Nationalist China was conquered by the Communists.

America's trained forces were withdrawn from the Republic of South Korea. Acheson announced that surviving Nationalist Chinese forces in Formosa had been written off. In statements before closed senatorial committee meetings, he accepted Communist conquest of all of east Asia, even the Philippines, and ultimately, Japan. His open-ended policy envisioned only the containment of Soviet Russia in Europe.

Up to June 27, when the President abruptly reversed the whole policy and ordered American forces into Korea, MacArthur sat on the side lines while Acheson ran a losing show. Communists and the leftist press never ceased sniping at MacArthur's occupation policy in Japan, which was a brilliant success compared to every one of Acheson's successive nose dives.

Only when the hands of the clock stood at 1 minute to midnight, when the knell was about to sound on Acheson's policy in the Orient, did the Secretary of State step back while an all but hopeless job of retrieving what could be saved was thrust upon MacArthur with the equivalent of some such phrase as "It's all yours, general."

The American people should remember that it was Acheson who 5 years ago snapped that he, not General MacArthur, would make America's policy for the Far East. The words return to haunt him.

Montana Chrome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, chrome is one of the things we have to have to fight a war. Without chrome we cannot produce the steel that is required for guns, tanks, planes, warships or any of the myriad other machines which are a part of modern warfare.

Time and again during the past 5 years I have called attention to the fact that the United States is dependent upon far-away foreign sources for chrome and other strategic materials, and that we were making little or no effort to develop our own resources of such materials. Last week it was announced for the third month that Russia had refused further shipments of chrome.

During the last war we found that we have a domestic source of chrome and we had to have it in a hurry. The Government spent millions of dollars constructing modern mining plants to bring chrome ore out of the mountains of Montana, where 75 percent of our domestic resource of chrome is found. Before the war was even ended the executive departments began to destroy these plants, over my strenuous objections, and we returned to dependence upon foreign sources, including Russia.

During the past few years I have made repeated efforts to save for the people of America the few remaining essential structures at the Montana chrome mines which we will need again to bring out these ores. An intolerable situation exists at these mines. The big concentrator and 17 other buildings, built at a cost of $1,500,000 are on private land, and must be destroyed or moved unless the land is purchased by the Government. Other buildings, sold by War Assets to private people, are about to be dismantled and destroyed unless the Government repurchases them.

A year ago the House Appropriations Committee refused to authorize the expenditure of already appropriated funds with which the Bureau of Mines could have reacquired the buildings at far less than their original cost. This year the Budget Director of the Department of the Interior refused to support the Bureau's request for such authorization.

Now we are up against the gun. We have to have chrome. The chrome is in Montana. The time has come when we must acquire whatever mining property has been dismantled, lay plans to rebuild the other structures so foolishly and shortsightedly destroyed, and reopen these mines to their maximium production.

It is time for the administration to stop playing international politics with strategic materials, and begin the systematic and sensible development of our domestic supplies of critical materials.

Korea Product of Communist Conquest of China—Acheson, Hiss, Lattimore, Jessup, Service, Jaffe, Vincent, and Field Wrote the Policy for Conquest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Fulton Lewis, Jr., is a fearless radio commentator. He has many enemies among the New Deal set, but the overwhelming number of his listeners appreciate his frank reporting over the airways. A particularly significant broadcast was made by Mr. Lewis on July 11 and, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including it at this point:

The Korean war situation as of tonight frankly is not encouraging and there is little effort to disguise that fact in most sectors of official Washington.

News dispatches from the Tokyo headquarters of General MacArthur are somewhat ahead of the information that is given to the press and radio in the military, naval, and Air Force briefings here, and admittedly the defense headquarters here in Washington has no detailed information on which

to go. But Gen. Omar Bradley, head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, gave the Senate Armed Services Committee a fill-in on the military situation at a meeting this morning, and almost without exception, those who heard him, came away with a gloomy outlook. Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, chairman of the committee, told newsmen that General MacArthur is doing the best he can, and that the Korean operation is an extremely difficult one; that the picture is such that "it would be a disservice to treat the Korean events with any optimism." He said rather mysteriously that several other free nations of the world are going to contribute help in the Korean battle in the next few days, but would give no clue as to their identity.

Spokesmen for the Department of Defense said that new and far more effective antitank weapons are being rushed to General MacArthur, and are on their way, if they have not arrived already. Included in these new weapons are new 3½-inch bazookas, which, it is claimed, are capable of knocking out the heaviest tanks in existence. These same spokesmen, however, admitted that they are puzzled by dispatches from the front, telling of new 60-ton Russian tanks which reportedly were present in great numbers to lead the new attack by the North Korean Communists.

The largest thing we know about that the Russians have, according to this spokesman, is the Joseph Stalin Tank, at 50 tons, and our information is that there is no great number of these.

One thing is certain: General Bradley's testimony today dispelled any possible idea on the part of those who heard it, that the expedition in Korea is any comic opera warfare. Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, a member of the committee, said it is tragic that the high command here in Washington temporized with the far-eastern Communist situation as long as it did, and failed to heed the intelligence information which it has had at its command all the way along. He said the set-backs in Korea are no reflection whatever on the American soldiers who are there, doing their utmost to stop the Russo-Korean tide, but they are a reflection on those in control of our top national policy, who let China go by default to the Communists, and then sent a boy to do a man's job in Korea. He said that capable and intelligent leadership should have seen to it that men, supplies, and the very best available equipment, with plenty of all of them, were available and poised ready to strike with telling effect the moment the Korean tinderbox was touched off. He said:

"For a long time, many of us have been demanding a firm and positive foreign policy toward the Far East, but all we could get was an excuse that the foreign policy had to be made from day to day. The American blood that is being shed in the Korean hills at the present time, is the ink in which that day-by-day foreign and military policy is now being written."

Which seems very much to the point.

Stop and think back a little, ladies and gentlemen, in the light of the news dispatches that are coming through at the present time.

Our presence in Korea is the simple and direct outgrowth of the Communist conquest of China. And the pattern for that conquest of China was laid out at the Yalta Conference, at which Alger Hiss admittedly was the prime adviser to the desperately ill President Roosevelt. It had been promoted and pounded and propagandized and infused into State Department policy circles by a powerful team of influential advisers—Dean Acheson, then Undersecretary; Alger Hiss, Owen Lattimore, the magazine Amerasia, John Stewart Service, working on the scene in China under Gen. Patrick J. Hurley sent him back to the United States; John P. Davies, John Carter Vincent, the Institute of Pacific Relations, of which Philip Jessup and Frederick Vanderbilt Field were backers—(the same Philip Jessup who now and for some months past has been the great State Department expert on the Far East); Henry Wallace and Laughlin Currie, the latter being Far Eastern Adviser to Mr. Roosevelt and later to Mr. Truman.

And their story was that the Chinese and the Korean Communists were not Communists of the Soviet Russian type at all—nothing like it. It was just a noble agrarian reform, trying to free the poor Chinese and Korean people from the Nationalist Government of China, headed by Chiang Kai-shek.

There was a system, in all this. It was talked in the State Department constantly. The magazine Amerasia was subtly built up as the last word of expert information and thinking on the Far Eastern problem. From those on the scene, came back reports always on that line—an agrarian reform; a noble enterprise. They just called themselves Communists for lack of a better name. No connection with Moscow. Perish such a thought!

There was a determined campaign to undermine and get rid of General Hurley, Mr. Roosevelt's ambassador to China, because he was in the way. His reports were different. And he said at the time that he found his reports were getting to the Kremlin within a few hours after they got to Washington. General Marshall came in as Secretary of State, and all he had to go on was the information that came to him from his own underlings—this same crowd, these same sources. And it was from their information that he had to report to the White House.

There was a demand, still based on the same old line, that Chiang Kai-shek take the Communists into his government, as partners. The free government of Poland had been persuaded to do that. So had the free government of Czechoslovakia. And Hungary. And Latvia. And Lithuania. And Estonia. And Bulgaria. And Rumania. They took the Communists in, too, as partners. And the partnership became enslavement.

As late as last December, the line was still going on; the same old crowd was still in control. They had weathered the crisis of the Amerasia case, in which 6 people, one of them being John Stewart Service himself—were arrested. It had been hushed up. A little gesture toward prosecution, four of the six turned loose despite a case against them which the FBI said was airtight. It's a powerful spot to be in, if you can control those things.

As late as last December, we would have no part of the Nationalist Government against these poor agrarian reformists. And anyone who dared try to go into the sacrosanct clique that had dictated and maneuvered all these policies; anyone who dared question the accuracy of what had been said, or the Christian purity of the far-eastern Communist movement—anyone who dared say, "Wait a moment * * * we concede that plenty is wrong with the Chiang Kai-shek Government, but this looks like another mission by Moscow"—those persons were smeared and ridiculed, and called dupes of the Kremlin, unwittingly serving Joseph Stalin's secret purposes.

The Tydings committee undertook to give the movement the respectability of a congressional investigation. Those who asked these impertinent questions were irresponsible, dangerous, little short of traitors. The State Department put out daily diatribes of vicious personal attacks.

That is the background; the record; the history. Just an agrarian reform; we must let the poor struggling people of the Far East fight their war of revolution against the Nationalist Government of China.

But the news of today tells a different story.

The tanks, the planes, the artillery—they are all Communist Russian. The Chinese Communist armies are supporting the Korean Communists in the midst of the fight. Their young officers are so imbued with the Moscow brand of communism that they try to convert the American officers who capture them. American boys—perhaps the sons of some of you listening to this broadcast—are lined up by the roadside after they have surrendered, their hands and feet tied, and they are machine-gunned through the face. American wounded, lying on the field of battle after their fellow soldiers have been forced into withdrawal, are shot to death, there on the ground, as they lie helpless.

Agrarian reform, they said. Just a noble heroic revolution, by those simple and honest folk who live by the soil. And it was their importunings, along that line, that guided the unhappy destiny of our foreign policy into the slaughterous battlefields of the Korean hills and valleys.

And yet, even as of this moment, they say "forget the past * * * there must be no looking backward * * * it is of no help to try to find out who was responsible for what has happened." We must stop all questions.

I wonder if the parents of the six boys taken prisoner and shot to death in a ditch, are satisfied with that answer, or whether you will be. And I mean you, who are hearing this at this moment, if your son happens to be one of those to fall under the Russian hammer and sickle hidden behind the red star of Communist Korea. Was it just an agrarian reform? Do you feel that those responsible for leading us down this alley of appeasement should be protected, either by a Senate investigation or by a Government Loyalty Review Board?

Do you believe they should be permitted to continue, in their positions of influence and power, to guide us further in the precarious future? I rather doubt it.

Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, chief critic of the past policy on the Far East, tomorrow will drop a bombshell in the lap of Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, chairman of the Senate committee which tried to drop bombshells on Senator MCCARTHY.

He will release to the press documentary evidence that Senator TYDINGS did not speak the truth when he told the public that he had official information disproving MCCARTHY's charge that State Department files had been rifled. And the Senator has documentary proof and official records to prove his case.

I commend it to your attention.

Editorially Speaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Chillicothe (Ohio) Gazette and News Advertiser under date of July 11, 1950, is self-explanatory and I desire to congratulate the publisher of this paper, Mr. J. K. Hunter, for the vision and leadership which he has displayed by this editorial:

GOP STATEMENT

Under the label "Republican advance," a little group of men meeting in Philadelphia shaped a party document notable for its

honesty, clarity, and lack of political bombast.

It deserves to be viewed as a major contribution to the long overdue framing of a sound Republican philosophy of government, tailored to modern needs.

The statement of principles notes that in the domestic realm the chief challenges of our time are social. "They have given rise to certain goals that are deeply desired by the people and are in fact essential to the preservation of freedom in an industrial society."

These goals include old-age security, adequate medical care, insurance against unemployment, improved housing, protection of labor's rights, aid to farmers, better education.

The Republican group observes, however, that during its 17-year tenure in the National Government the Democratic Party has evolved but one approach to all these problems—the unlimited extension of governmental control of the people.

In other words, wherever faced with a prime social dilemma, the Democrats have almost automatically said, "Let Washington fix it."

It is no secret that the Republicans regard this philosophy as destructive of individual liberties. They have been saying so for a long time.

But as the Republican Advance points out, the GOP has been too slow to shape policies that are at once capable of safeguarding individual freedoms and answering the social needs of the times. In their glamorous instance on saving the individual, they have seemed to ignore his basic wants.

The Advance believes there is solid footing for a progressive Republican Party on new ground some distance away from the old.

It cites as an example a GOP-sponsored health bill which would place the primary burden on voluntary efforts by the people themselves, with the Government asked only to encourage and promote these mutual activities. It believes this plan opens a whole new vista for the solution of the Nation's social problems without submerging the individual in an anonymous mass.

Four Senators and 21 Congressmen among the GOP have hailed the new manifesto as a powerful declaration of party beliefs. It would be more accurate to say the "beliefs of one wing of the party," for the silence of many GOP leaders suggests their disapproval or at least their apathy.

But if this statement is not to serve as a foundation stone in the building of a constructive Republican policy, then it would seem incumbent in the silent party generals to come forward with something equally forthright and hopeful. Nothing they have produced so far meets that test.

Support of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. WHITAKER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor and privilege to represent in this House of Representatives of the United States the Second Congressional District of the great Commonwealth of Kentucky. Not a day passes that I do not have something to happen which causes me to be proud of my people and to love them for the faith they have in me. The trust they have placed in me causes me to humbly hope and pray that any statement I should make, act of mine, or vote that I may cast will ever cause them to regret this trust.

In order that my colleagues may know of the fine, high type, Christian, patriotic, loyal American citizens who reside in the second district of Kentucky, by unanimous consent, I respectfully include a copy of a resolution which I received this morning, and which was adopted on July 8, 1950, by the board of directors of the Stemming District Tobacco Association, at Henderson, Ky.:

"Be it resolved, That the directors of this association pledge themselves as individuals and as members of this association to support our Government to the fullest extent with whatever efforts are necessary to support our Government in the present and apparent coming crisis, and we further pledge ourselves to enter personally and wholeheartedly in any campaign that may be necessary for the purpose of securing and providing the necessary finances to the Government with which to defray the expenses for the present and any subsequent crisis growing out of present conditions, or to do anything that will be of help to our Nation in this hour of unrest; be it further

"Resolved, That the Tobacco Branch of the United States Department of Agriculture be notified of this action of the board and a copy of this resolution be furnished to our United States Senators and all Members of Congress from Kentucky."

Motion by W. J. Scherm, seconded by I. H. Nance, that the foregoing resolution be adopted and that the secretary be authorized to prepare and furnish the necessary copies provided for in said resolution and also furnish a copy to every newspaper published within the district of this association. The resolution was unanimously adopted.

The Responsibility of Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the following editorial appearing in the Green Bay Press-Gazette under date of Friday, July 14, 1950:

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF STATESMANSHIP

"We could not foresee that one of our partners in the war would become so selfish and so domineering," said Vice President BARKLEY recently.

The ordinary run of people may be forgiven for hoping against hope or adopting the attitude that those in power would not be inadequate for any occasion. But men like Mr. BARKLEY, however, benign and benevolent, requested from their fellow citizens the right and privilege to run the Nation, and not only implied but stated over and over again that they were fit for the position and that our great ship of state, freighted with so many millions, would be operated with sagacity and understanding. Mr. BARKLEY has no right to use the pronoun "we" in recounting the failure of our rulers to understand the Russian menace. There were certainly many prominent Democrats who understood Russia all too well. And a review of known and protruding facts will show rather conclusively that the lack of understanding of Kremlin purposes has no excuse to support it.

1. Our State Department has declared that every important provision in the Roosevelt-Litvinov pact of 1934 under the terms of which we recognized and invited Soviet diplomats hither had been broken by 1939.

2. In August 1939, we witnessed Molotov and von Ribbentrop signing what they called an historic treaty. They even sent to this country pictures of the ceremony. The treaty was part and parcel of the attack on Poland. When Britain and France tried to thwart this bloody outlawry Moscow denounced them as instituting a capitalistic war.

3. As soon as Poland was beaten to its knees by the Nazis, the Russians moved in and took their half, their share of the unholy bargain.

4. In December of 1939 the Kremlin sent an army against Finland. It announced at the time that the Finns, with little more than the population of Wisconsin, had attacked Russia. It wanted to get certain ports and certain mines away from Finland. It got them, too.

5. Next Russia moved against Estonia. In this case it sort of mixed its pitches. It did not accuse Estonia of attacking it but said it was moving in to protect the Estonians. Then it put the educated classes in Estonia on freight trains and sent them off to Siberia. It murdered right and left. Lenin once wrote that the only proper way to set up a new government was to have plenty of shooting and other forms of assassination.

6. Having finished off Estonia the Kremlin moved into Latvia. There it repeated its record in Estonia.

7. With Estonia and Latvia safely tucked away the Moscow government moved into Lithuania. There it once more went through the hideous form of its horrible conduct.

8. On all these occasions the Kremlin maintained a barrage of falsehood unexampled upon this earth.

9. Moscow assiduously helped Hitler with great quantities of food, oil, and other materials. It used its French fifth column to strike France down. It served the Nazis with everything it had.

10. To the knowledge of the FBI, and of most of official Washington of high degree, Moscow employed the Roosevelt-Litvinov pact to funnel over here a constant stream of spies and agents. Until it itself was attacked it violently sabotaged many efforts of America for preparedness. One of its principal weapons was the strike. The one at nearby Allis-Chalmers Co. has already been proven and sustained in the courts as directed by it for the purpose of creating confusion and chaos in this country.

11. The demands made by Moscow upon Mr. Roosevelt at Tehran and Yalta, and upon Mr. Truman at Potsdam, reveal the selfishness of a glutton and the stony heart of an aggressor. It wanted everything everywhere. And it certainly got a lot, including North Korea.

12. It took over Darien and Port Arthur on the Pacific. As a little lesson in what was coming it insulted Mr. Roosevelt, and so falsely and rudely that he, a man of quite a little patience, responded in bitter words to its accusations.

13. It made a burlesque of free elections, which it had promised, in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and elsewhere. In some of the states in its neighborhood on the west

it moved in in spite of the elections against it and took over by force and violence.

14. It has kept almost everyone of the ships that we have loaned it, altogether quite a navy. It still retains the $11,000,000,000 with which we furnished it. It has treated numerous of our citizens and our diplomats with vile accusations and sometimes with prison in the manner of a baron in the Middle Ages lashing out at a hostler.

15. It is provoking civil war in Burma, Malaya, and Indochina. It violated its promise to Mr. Roosevelt that it would support Chiang in China. It looted Manchuria. It gave surrendered Japanese arms to Chinese Reds. Consistently around the world it has treated kindness with trickery, candor with falsehood, and while it prepared for devastating wars like that in North Korea it has preached peace and accused us of attacking it everywhere.

If Mr. BARKLEY wants to admit that this constant and steady course of conduct did not put him wise, such is his privilege. He might admit with it that if all these blows and kicks could not awaken a man, a trusted sentinel upon our walls, to the peril in which the Nation was floundering, he could hardly call himself qualified to participate in ruling, preparing, and protecting that nation.

Closing Valley Forge Hospital—A Military and Economic Blunder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial which appeared in the Daily Republican, of Phoenixville, Pa., on June 30, 1950.

In my opinion this editorial, which takes the form of an open letter to the Honorable Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, constitutes a scathing indictment of a policy, or lack of policy, which resulted in the ill-advised closing of Valley Forge General Hospital.

Taken as a part of a series of errors of judgment, the closing of Valley Forge stands out as glaring example of what happens when untrained political appointees usurp the prerogatives and functions of medical and military professionals. I can only hope that the gravity of our military situation at the moment will persuade the authorities to correct the error by reopening without delay an institution which is vital to our national defense. The editorial follows:

AN OPEN LETTER

The Honorable LOUIS JOHNSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.:

A national news magazine recently carried a photograph of you in conference with Generals Bradley and MacArthur. It was a nice publicity shot, except for the fact that in it, you had both eyes closed tight.

Now, many of us are wondering if that scene is not symbolic of your general attitude. Have you had your eyes shut to the prelude to a situation in the Far East—Korea and China—which is now more than a mere incident?

Mr. Johnson, open your eyes.

Today, as the direct result of an order you issued on February 1—just 5 months ago—a modern, efficiently operated general hospital in Phoenixville has officially locked its doors. And what have been the consequences?

As a result of that order, you have crippled the Army's vast professional training program.

As a result of that order, you have blasted the morale of Army doctors who now must work in questionably substandard hospitals not worthy of the name.

As a result of that order, you have overloaded every other Army general hospital in the United States beyond its authorized bed capacity, and thereby without justice you have interfered with the health of Army patients.

As a result of that order, you have left the entire industrial East without a single strategically located Army medical facility. Remaining Armed Forces hospitals are in painfully obvious target areas.

As a result of that order, you have seriously retarded research in diseases that are themselves enemies of the Army.

Mr. Johnson, open your eyes.

Just as we were certain that sooner or later Communist clements would provoke an overt act against the United States, we were certain that when it came, we would not be operating an adequate military hospital system.

We are not alarmists. But we are cautious. And curious. We want to know now you plan to meet the emergency should it grow more serious.

We criticized you bitterly when you ordered five Armed Forces general hospitals to shut down. We did it because we felt that you were indifferent to the possibility of an imminent national emergency. You blew hot and cold in the same breath.

What, Mr. Johnson, do you propose now if United States forces need medical treatment? And need it urgently?

You have loaded all existing hospitals to more than 100 percent of their bed capacities contrary to standards of the America Medical Association.

Consistently, you resisted with—we are sorry to say—childish arrogance all arguments presented to you for the continued maintenance of the hospitals now closed. Ninety percent of these arguments stemmed from issues vital to the national defense. Your answer—without credit for security and defense—was a proposed economy of dollars that has yet to come close to proving itself.

You turned a deaf ear to the recommendations made by a congressional subcommittee of elected—not appointed—officials who investigated the situation in its entirety. You based your order, in part, upon misleading figures provided by a man in your own organization whose professional qualifications are viewed dimly by his colleagues. You, yourself, could have checked those qualifications.

* * * * *

The truth of the matter is, you have no hospital in the United States sufficiently equipped and staffed at this moment to care for casualties. You have no place to adequately handle the medical procedures for inductees—and the draft law has been retained on the books.

The truth of the matter is, your Army medical program—such as remains—is shot full of holes, just as was predicted by men of foresight.

What do you propose to do about it?

Wake up, Mr. Johnson.

And open your eyes.

Korean Affair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Daily Evening Item, of Lynn, Mass., of Thursday, July 13, 1950:

CONGRESS SHOULD STAY ON JOB

Notwithstanding the Korean war, Congress is still planning to go home August 1. This being an election year the intention is understandable; but it is hardly wise or practical.

With every passing day it becomes clearer that the war in Korea is not to be a brief affair. Already President Truman is seeking more money to wage it. Even if the fighting doesn't spread to other areas, he may want to come in at any time with requests for still more money, controls on the civilian economy, more extensive manpower mobilization.

Moreover, the new demands thus far submitted are causing congressional leaders to condense their schedule and squeeze out legislation that deserves attention at this session.

A prime example is offered by the House-approved bills providing statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. Recently these measures were endorsed by the Senate Interior Affairs Committee. Chances of ultimate enactment are strong right now.

Much congressional time and taxpayers' money already has been spent in advancing the statehood proposals this far. They've been kicking around Capitol Hill for years and this is the closest they have ever come to final adoption.

It would be not only a foolish waste but a toying with the country's security to let this legislation die at this point. Both Hawaii and Alaska are vital defense outposts in the Pacific, the area most immediately threatened by the Korean war. Were the two Territories woven more tightly into the national fabric, the likelihood is they'd get better protection.

General Eisenhower and many others have called attention to the weakness of Alaskan defenses. Hawaii is better off, but hardly in ideal shape.

Senators don't want to take the bills up because they're controversial and debate would be long. What this really means is that Congress is taking a politics-as-usual approach to the Korean war, and simply doesn't wish to spoil its plans for getting back home to begin campaigning.

Naturally nobody likes to have his plans upset. Our Armed Forces fighting in Korea undoubtedly were happier living the relatively soft life of occupation troops in Japan. But they had no choice. And if Congress wants to measure up in this emergency, its course of duty is also plain.

Let the lawmakers recess for several weeks in September and October when the hot campaigning develops. But otherwise they ought to stick by their posts.

Address by Senator Martin to Veterans of Foreign Wars at Harrisburg, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 17 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by me at the annual convention of the department of Pennsylvania, Veterans of Foreign Wars, at Harrisburg, Pa., on July 13, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, AT HARRISBURG, PA.

At this critical time in world history it is an honor and a high privilege to address an organization dedicated to patriotic services and love of country.

We meet in a time of grave peril to human liberty—a time when the fate of the world may hang in the balance.

Once more we have reached a time when we Americans must be prepared to pledge our "lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor" in defense of freedom.

Otherwise the darkness of tyranny will cover the earth. Enslavement will be the tragic price of failure.

You are an outstanding and select group of Americans. You have served our Nation on foreign soil, on every ocean and in the skies across the sea.

A great majority of you have been tested in the grim ordeal of battle. You have faced the gunfire of cruel, relentless enemies and you have covered yourselves with glory.

Never shall America forget the debt of gratitude we owe to the men and women who wore the uniform of our country's armed services. Never shall we fail to honor the heroes who died to preserve our homes and our freedom. Never shall we neglect our obligation to those who are disabled by war wounds or to the dependents of those who gave their lives that we might live in liberty.

As veterans of foreign service you have had the opportunity of observing conditions in other nations. You have seen how the people suffer when their freedom is destroyed under the iron hand of dictatorship. Your experiences have given you a real knowledge of Americanism and the blessings of the American way of life.

I know I can speak frankly to you because your loyalty is beyond question. For that reason I want to discuss with you today some of the dangers confronting our country.

For many years you and I have warned against the dangers of Communism. We have fought its poisonous influence with straight-forward, patriotic Americanism. We have battled to drive those who have embraced its Godless philosophy from high places in the Government, from labor unions, from our schools and colleges and even from some of our churches.

Yet today we have the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, that subversive activity by Communist traitors is now at a greater height than at any time during World War II.

Mr. Hoover told a Senate Committee that the Communists have a potential fifth column of 540,000 persons in the United States. Of these, he said, 54,000 are known Communists and nearly 500,000 are fellow travellers and sympathizers. These enemies of American freedom are working day and night to dig out secrets of atomic research, radar, jet propulsion, maps of various kinds, and information about military airports and military and industrial resources.

Therefore I say to you, as veterans and as Americans, you must not relax in your fight to drive out communism. It is one of the great dangers we face. It must be destroyed or it will destroy all that you fought to preserve.

For many years I have gone up and down our country trying to point out the dangers of costly and extravagant government. Recently many good friends have told me that it is unpopular to oppose excessive Government spending. They said the people seem to like gifts from a spendthrift government.

Nevertheless, I firmly believe it is fundamental in the preservation of our way of life to keep America sound financially. Therefore, regardless of political consequences, I shall continue to fight, as long as I am in public life, for the things which will make the United States a stronger and better country.

From my point of view, casualties in the arena of politics, fighting for principle, are just as inevitable as they are on the battlefield.

Personally I do not fear the destruction of America by an outside foe. The United States can out-produce, out-work and out-fight the ground forces, the air corps, the tanks, the bombs and the fleets of any country in the world.

What is there then to be feared? What is there to worry Americans? What can interfere with our progress in peace and freedom?

My answer is complacency, disloyalty, apathy and dishonesty. These evils can eventually so weaken us that we will not be in a position to fight for our cause and the defense of American ideals.

We now have costly, cumbersome centralized government.

Let us look at the trend.

In 20 years the number of Federal employees has increased more than threefold. The cost of the Federal Government has increased ten times. Our Federal debt has increased fifteen times.

Originally the Federal Government had control of national defense, foreign affairs, banking and currency and the care of rivers and harbors.

Now the Federal Government not only does these things but in addition it has expanded into the fields of education, health, housing, roads, airports and conservation.

It spends billions to buy agricultural products to support farm prices. It pours out more billions of dollars to rebuild the economy of friendly nations and to build a barrier against communism in foreign lands.

Federal agents, armed with Government directives, now go on our farms, down into our mines, out in our forests, and into every other place where men work and produce.

The cost of all types of Government is now 13 times as much as we spend for education, and 40 times as much as we contribute to all of our churches.

We now pay for Federal, State, and local government almost $65,000,000,000 per year. This is 28 percent of all our production.

In Pennsylvania, more than 200,000 people work for local, State, and Federal Government, and the pay roll is almost $900,000,000 per year.

How do we raise these enormous amounts of money? There are two methods, direct and hidden taxes. Direct taxes are collected through income, real estate and sales taxes. Hidden taxes are not marked as a direct contribution to Government, but they are paid by every one of us.

Economists estimate that every family in this country pays approximately $317 per year in hidden taxes. Whenever you buy a loaf of bread, a pair of shoes, a car, or anything else, you pay hidden taxes. It is not the corporation or the producer who pays those taxes. It is the consumer. Expensive government is paid for by the consumer, not the politician or office holder.

The hidden tax is a cowardly method of taxation, but for the little man it is the big tax.

"Soak the rich" is a popular political slogan, but the little fellow, who contributes more than half of the expenses of government, is really the big taxpayer.

This system is draining the savings of the people into the coffers of government. It prevents business expansion and is depriving the people of future job opportunities.

Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, chairman of the Expenditures Committee, has made the statement that if all recommended spending legislation now before Congress is passed it will increase the cost of Federal Government twenty to twenty-five billion dollars per year.

If we continue the trend that has been going on for the last few years, it will mean bankruptcy for America. We cannot make substantial progress unless we are economically sound.

Where does the money go? Let us look at some figures.

Over 27,000,000 Americans receive a regular check from the Government. That is 1 out of every 5.

Ten billion dollars a year goes to pay employees of Government. Several billions go to aid foreign countries. Several billions are used for public works. I hope you will all study the figures which have been made public. Those billions of dollars that are handed out so freely are your dollars.

It is pleasant to read about our record-breaking national income. It is the greatest income of all history but unfortunately, within less than 20 years the value of the dollar has been cut in half.

Our comrades receiving disability compensation, the widow receiving rents as income, the man or woman working for wages is being paid with a devalued dollar.

Our national debt is now almost two hundred and sixty billions and is growing daily. It is your debt. It is the greatest debt in all history. It would provide every family in America with a $6,000 home. It means more taxes. It means more inflation. Big debt and excessive taxation are real dangers. They can destroy the country you fought to preserve.

There are some other things that are endangering our country. We have so many people who want to enjoy the blessings of America but do not appreciate that we have an obligation to our country. Gambling, racketeering and chiseling cost the American people more than the total cost of all our State governments. Organized crime syndicates operate across State lines and are taking from the people an estimated $15,000,000,000 per year.

We have those in America who do not have the courage to stand on their own feet. In their desire for security they forget that security from government means the loss of many freedoms. A planned economy, controlled by Government, cannot distribute wealth. In the end it distributes poverty.

Freedom of the individual in America is God-given. Each generation has fought to sustain that liberty.

The moral fibre of the American people is being weakened by extravagance, indifference to the public welfare and too little appreciation of the obligation of citizenship. Briefly I would like to sum up for your consideration some thoughts concerning our country:

1. Extravagance: We have individuals who are inclined to live beyond their means. We are tempted by easy credit. Our Government is doing so many things for the people which they could so much better do for themselves. Extravagant Government is being paid for by the savings of those who work. It precludes future expansion that should provide employment for our people.

2. Apathy: There are so many that give such little consideration to their Government, their church, and their duty to their fellow men. They are taking the easy course by letting Government do many of these things. This is yearly, daily, and hourly increasing the cost of Government.

3. Disunity: There are those who criticize our form of government but are not courageous or honest enough to leave this country and become citizens of a nation practicing the Godless philosophy they advocate. America should be for those who are loyal to its ideals and principles and who are willing to fight to sustain them.

4. Racketeering: The desire for an easy way of life has caused so many men to dodge the law, avoid their civic responsibilities, and to cheat their fellow men and their country. Racketeering, chiseling, and law evasion can be blotted out only if the American people will to do so. It cannot be done by public officials alone. It is a job for veterans' organizations, churches, schools, business groups, labor organizations, and the Grange. It can be corrected if we have the will to do our duty.

5. Security and freedom: People came to America to have freedom and an opportunity. They stood on their own feet. They were courageous, tolerant, thrifty, and God-fearing. They brought about the highest living standard and the greatest cultural and spiritual attainments of all times.

Let us all take more interest in our Government. Let us all enlist in that great army fighting to make the United States a greater and finer country. Let us drive from Uncle Sam's household all elements of disunity, disloyalty, apathy, extravagance, intolerance, and bigotry.

Let us all crusade that America may be a land of courage, sympathy, honesty, economy, thrift, tolerance, and love of God.

The conflict in the Pacific is a call to patriotic Americanism.

We have been critical of the course which has led us into our present situation in Korea.

We have found fault with a foreign policy which bungled and fumbled its way into defeat in China and Manchuria, in Poland, and the other satellite nations dominated by Soviet Russia.

We have observed with grave apprehension the falling prestige of American diplomacy in many parts of the world.

But I know I voice the sentiment of the veterans and every other patriotic American when I say:

We will support freedom in the world against every form of armed aggression which seeks to destroy human liberty.

We will give to the limit of our strength and resources to support the United Nations as an instrumentality for peace.

The United States has never fought a war of aggression or conquest. Our aim is to maintain peace and to preserve the integrity of peace-loving nations. To that endeavor all Americans are committed without regard for political differences.

Where the security of the United States is concerned we are not Republicans, not Democrats. We are all Americans.

Conquering our own shortcomings and thanking Almight God for the blessings bestowed upon us, America need fear no dangers either from within or without.

Let us rally around the banner of freedom and march forward to victory.

Tribute to Indiana in Holiday Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 17 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by my colleague, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], calling attention to an article featuring Indiana in the August issue of Holiday magazine.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I would like to call the attention of my fellow Members in the Senate to the fact that Holiday magazine, in its August issue, features my native State of Indiana as "a land where urban hustle and rural calm are mixed in sensible proportions."

I think these words express, as aptly as ever I have heard it, the warm, democratic, neighborly spirit that prevails throughout the land of the Hoosiers.

There are two articles on Indiana in this issue, 18 pages in length, and colorful illustrations with 39 photographs, which describe remarkably well the Hoosier personality and the tremendous industrial and agricultural resources existing within the borders of my home State.

The old national road, U. S. 40, has long been recognized as a sort of friendly line between the north and south portions of Indiana. The north takes justifiable pride in its vigorous and prosperous industries for nearly every town and city there manufactures at least one nationally known product, and many of them make several.

But the king of Indiana, north and south, is "Mr. Hog," who has contributed much to the State's wealth through lean and fat years.

The southern part of Indiana is distinguished for its rich scenery and traditions. People there have a little more time to devote to the gracious mannerisms that mark a Hoosier. I was happy to see that the Holiday article dwells on the beauty of Brown County in this region. Its atmosphere of western pioneer life suggests the historic beginnings of my State, and, in fact, of this whole Nation.

William E. Wilson, author of the lead article, puts it very well when he says that he doubts whether Americans can escape a stirring in their hearts as they travel through this county's settlements of a Bean Blossom, Bear Wallow, Needmore, and Gnaw Bone.

It gave me great pleasure to discover that the Nation is being told, through the pages of this magazine, that the State capital of Indianapolis is a modern city with traditional flavor not unlike that to be found in the cities of France. We are proud that Indianapolis is today the Nation's second most populated State capital, after Boston.

The editors of Holiday have paid my State a further tribute by releasing this issue in Indiana 5 days ahead of the rest of the country. I understand this is an extremely rare practice in the magazine publishing business, and that it marks the first time that it has been done in the history of Holiday.

I hope my colleagues will be inspired by this issue to pay us a visit in Indiana so that we can demonstrate that these fine things that have been said about us in Holiday only begin to discuss the many attributes and excellent qualities that make up the land of the Hoosiers.

Farm and Labor Purchasing Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 17 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Farm, Labor Purchasing Power Drop Alarmingly Since 1947," published in the Trainman News on July 17, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOOM TIME FOR INVESTORS, BUT FARM, LABOR PURCHASING POWER DROP ALARMINGLY SINCE 1947

(By Public Affairs Institute)

The ever-present problem of assuring a fair deal for various groups in the American economy is well illustrated in the present United States economic situation.

Our over-all economic level and activities are very high at the present time. Leon Keyserling, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers to the President, was quoted in a recent issue of the Journal of Commerce as saying:

"The business recovery (since a lag in 1949) was prompt, vigorous, and sustained. We now stand at the peak point of postwar real prosperity."

In spite of such optimism about our grand total economic activity, a critical study of what is going on shows that farmers and labor have skidded down the economic ladder seriously and the prewar trend to lower shares for agriculture and industrial workers has been resumed.

Once again we are witnessing an increase in the shares going to corporate profits, dividends, and other income from investments. Past history of cyclical ups and downs demonstrates that these trends in distributive shares are incompatible with the maintenance of full employment.

No one knows at the moment what effect the war situation is going to have on our economy in the next few years. But if the military situation is disregarded, the farm and labor pictures are quite disturbing. To those who recall that a steady decline in farm income preceded the economic collapse of 1929–33 these farm facts are disquieting:

1. In 1949, the net income of farmers had fallen almost $4,000,000,000, or more than 20 percent below the 1947 peak.

2. In 1950 (this year) in spite of our "recovery" and the fact that farmers have marketed as much food and fiber as in the same period last year, farm income was off another 7 percent during the period January through May.

3. For 1950 as a whole, the total decline in farm income is expected to result in a net farm income one-third below 1947.

4. Even in 1948, when farm income was relatively high, over 3,000,000 farm families earned cash incomes under $2,000. Half of them received cash incomes under $1,000.

Between 1947 and 1949, the price received by farmers for their products had dropped 10 percent or more. On the other hand, farm machinery prices were up 30 percent.

Less income for farmers of course means less purchasing, and ultimately that means fewer jobs for industrial workers in the cities and on the railroads.

Labor is faring about as badly as farmers. Although dollar wages are higher than they were a few years ago, the Monthly Labor Review for June, 1950, shows that spendable income of workers today has less purchasing power than their 1944 wages.

In the table below earnings after taxes and social security are shown for factory workers with three dependents. The first column indicates the average wage drawn by factory workers. The second column shows the purchasing power of those dollars compared with their 1939 dollars:

Period	Current dollars drawn	Value in 1939 dollars
1944 average	44.06	34.89
1946 (June)	42.78	31.90
1948 average	53.17	30.87
1949 average	53.83	31.64

As the table indicates, the real take home pay of such factory workers in 1949 was off $3.25 per week of real income—or 9 percent lower than 1944.

The slight drop in prices in 1949 and moderate wage increases account for a little gain for workers between 1948 and the present.

There are other economic indicators that the mass of people who do most of the buying in the United States have less real prosperity now than in recent past years.

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System recently published some findings which show:

1. The number of consumer spending units with no savings rose from eleven million to sixteen million between 1946 and 1949.

2. More than a third of consumer spending units spent more in 1949 than they earned.

3. The further broadening of the market for durable goods in 1949 was accompanied by an increased use of the installment credit.

These and other facts show the extreme importance of careful study of factors in the economy. Our supposed great real prosperity may still contain very serious unstable elements.

Back in the twenties the United States heard much of prosperity—and completely overlooked facts in the economy which led to the collapse of 1929.

It could be tragic if we again overlooked weakening factors and tried to obscure them with attention only to aggregates and totals.

The Railway Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 17 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "How About Railroad Patriotism?" published in the Trainman News of July 17, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW ABOUT RAILROAD PATRIOTISM?

Some newspaper editorialists are now patting us on the back for delaying a strike to exhaust all possible avenues for a peaceful settlement of our dispute with the carriers.

They say this is a fine thing for the organizations to feel their responsibility so keenly as to put rule considerations aside for a while in the national interest. Very patriotic.

Of course, their applause is phony. It is calculated to water down the militancy of BRT and ORC members and spread the idea with the public that peace on the rails depends solely on our men and not a bit on railroad management.

The record clearly shows that in every wage and rules movement the railroad unions have exhibited patience, loyalty, and responsibility unmatched by industry, particularly the railroad industry.

We have received no orchids for this. And the present editorials do not mention the disgraceful fact that this dispute has been pending since March 1949 and that responsibility to the public has kept the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and Order of Railway Conductors from forcing the issues all this time.

The editorials do not tell of our law-abiding traditions or of the enormous contribution railroad men made in two world wars toward the preservation of democracy.

They do not say that to a large degree the present crisis is a result of our foreging correction of the inequities in the national interest during those wars.

They do not say that conditions sought by the BRT and ORC are now standard throughout the rest of industry.

They have not taken the trouble to study the Emergency Board's report to evaluate it properly and to see how its acceptance would impose hardships on our members and promote anarchy on the Nation's railroads.

The fact is that the railroads are attempting to use the Korean emergency to break rail labor's back once and for all—and the newspapers are doing all they can to help the cause along.

The report of an inexperienced (scrub is a better term) board fits neatly into their plans for wrecking the Railway Labor Act and eventually our organizations. A report that recommends conditions we cannot accept under any circumstances gives them another argument to show how that law has failed.

The newspapers feel no compusion to express these tactics of the railroads—or to show the painfully patient course taken by rail labor while management refused to bargain collectively as other industries do.

Why aren't the carriers called upon to show some responsibility to national interest? How about some editorial comment on that?

The United States Tragedy in Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 17 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article appearing in the July 17 issue of Time magazine entitled "The United States Tragedy in Formosa," written by John Osborne, Time-Life correspondent in the Far East who visited the Formosan capital of Taipei last week.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED STATES TRAGEDY IN FORMOSA

(By John Osborne)

This capital teems with testaments to the tragic miscalculations and near-fatal results of United States policy toward the Chinese Nationalists and Formosa. The visible, jarring fact is that the United States has created a situation which now makes it wellnigh impossible to sustain any effective position whatever on and toward Formosa. If the miscalculations of the State Department are retrieved, it will be only because Formosa's Nationalists, in their extremity, are able and willing to make retrieval possible.

The full import of the United States State Department's attitude toward the Chinese Nationalists in recent months is measurable only in terms of the Nationalists' political position on Formosa. If this position was understood by the State Department, the State Department stands convicted of the deliberate sabotage of the Chinese Government; if this position was not understood, the State Department stands convicted of avoidable ignorance.

BLIND AND STUBBORN

On Formosa, as in every other part of Asia, United States pronouncements are read with extraordinary attention; they eventually reach even the illiterate masses. And the State Department has blindly and stubbornly insisted on the maximum distribution of official American statements that were bound to undermine the Formosans' confidence in their Government. On more than one occasion, Formosa's Nationalists have sharply and justifiably reminded the puny United States representation here that the statements of Secretary of State Dean Acheson and other Washington spokesmen constituted a direct attack on a government which was, after all, host to the very Americans in charge of disseminating these statements throughout Formosa.

The results of this almost incredible situation have not been catastrophic for two reasons: (1) Chiang Kai-shek's present government is definitely better in performance and public relations than any Chinese Nationalist government since the mid-1930's; (2) a bumper rice crop this year has made rural Formosans feel pretty good and allayed discontent that might otherwise have been stimulated by American statements.

CROWNING IRONY

The crowning irony came this week when Nationalist spokesman Shen Chang-huan felt constrained to dispel at least part of the heavy fog surrounding President Truman's statement on Formosa. Said Shen in a statement to the Chinese press: "I believe the United States has no territorial ambitions on Formosa." It was a statement that any local United States spokesman might have beeen expected to make, but of course none did. Any local United States diplomat who said anything reassuring to the Chinese Government would have expected to lose his job.

It makes no sense for the United States to reverse its concept of Formosa's strategic importance and at the same time cling stubbornly to the old, down-the-nose political attitude toward Formosa's Nationalist Government. Yet so far as I can judge here, this is precisely what the United States State Department is undertaking to do. I can state as fact that no instructions to modify

or alter in any way our political diplomatic and military relations with the government of this island have been received by United States representatives here.

The prevailing American attitude is that any help to Formosa, military or economic (beyond the present ECA program), would be a mistake because it would build up the Nationalist Government, again identify the United States Government with it, and thereby contribute to the Nationalist return to the mainland so ardently opposed by our State Department.

All here, including the responsible Chinese I have so far seen, realize that this is no time to rake up the past for recriminations' sake. But all here also realize that this past has created problems to be dealt with now—and to be dealt with by United States officials whose attitudes and capacities, for the most part, can only be measured by the recent past.

CLOSE CALL

Consider the United States position on Formosa after Truman's statement: the senior United States representative was Consul General and Chargé d'Affaires Robert Strong, a State Department career man of modest reputation. The senior military representative was an Army lieutenant colonel assisted by a staff of three other officers and barely enough enlisted men to answer phones, drive staff cars. Not one of the military men had the rank or authority to provide the liaison so urgently required with the United States Seventh Fleet.

Last week an incident symbolized the lack of contact between United States officials here and the Nationalist Government.

Six United States planes appeared over Formosa's west coast. They were reported as strange aircraft because the Nationalists had not been informed that they were coming. Nationalist fighters took off to intercept them. A moment before they would have opened fire, they recognized the United States markings on the planes. At Tainan, where the American planes came in to land, Nationalist ack-ack crews learned only at the last minute, and then from their own pilots, that the "strange" planes were American. Had the identification come a few seconds later, the crews would have fired on the United States planes.

Most responsible Chinese here are fully aware that Washington and the Seventh Fleet have a war on their hands and other things than Formosa to think about. Nevertheless, they have reasonably requested clarification here and in Washington of Truman's rather cryptic cease-fire orders to Chinese forces, and with notable patience and forbearance have tried to learn what is expected of them by the Seventh Fleet.

JUST RELAX

In the early course of these inquiries, the Chinese were told in all seriousness that there would be no problem of communication or plane identification since the Seventh Fleet would stay completely away from Formosa. Incredulous Chinese officials pointed out that planes from a United States carrier would surely at some time or other approach the Formosan coast. What if a United States plane were in trouble far from its carrier—would it ditch at sea rather than land on Formosa? The American attitude remained: You boys just relax, you'll never see Seventh Fleet ships or planes.

The questions Formosa's Nationalists most urgently want answered are these:

Does Truman's ban on mainland operations include aerial reconnaissance?

Does the United States ban on further naval blockade mean that the Nationalists may not watch, search, and seize Chinese ships carrying supplies from Hong Kong to the mainland? If so, will the Americans take their own measures to prevent the supply of the Chinese Communists—and the North Koreans—via the mainland?

Does the blockade prohibition further prevent the Nationalists from policing their own territorial waters—including those off Formosa as well as the waters off the mainland itself (which the Nationalists still consider their waters)?

Pointed as these questions are, they do not include the biggest question of all: Does the United States Government really think that it can protect and secure this island without protecting the government of this island? Does even the State Department persist in the illusion that it can ignore and destroy the government which rules this island without losing a position now acknowledged to be of vital interest to the United States?

MISSION FROM MAC

So far there has been one ray of good sense in United States-Formosa relationships. It comes from General MacArthur. The Nationalist mission in Tokyo has been assured that MacArthur will send a military mission here to inspect and consult as soon as he can.

Otherwise, in all matters affecting United States military contact and security on this island, I see nothing but an indictment of those in Washington who have perpetrated this crime against the vital interests of our country. This feeling has not been stimulated or fostered by the Nationalist officials I have seen here; it stems entirely from what any child can observe in Taipei today.

Truman's Korean Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 17 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, shortly after the announcement by the President of our Korean policy in the present crisis, there appeared in the Jersey Journal, published in Jersey City, N. J., an editorial entitled "Truman Takes Decisive Stand Against Stalin's Hitler Tactics in Korea."

I believe that this particular editorial contributes to our general thinking on the Korean matter, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jersey Journal of June 28, 1950]

TRUMAN TAKES DECISIVE STAND AGAINST STALIN'S HITLER TACTICS IN KOREA

The United States missed the slow boat to China. That was a bad error. But today, because of faster transportation, the United States has "landed" in the troubled Asiatic scene.

President Truman, by his courageous stand yesterday in formulating a new policy in the Pacific—the sending of planes and warships to aid the South Koreans in fighting the Communist invader from the north, the dispatching of a fleet to prevent the invasion of Formosa and military aid to the Philippines and Indochina—has won back the waning respect of a free world.

Don't be alarmed. The Korean shooting will not result in world war III. This Korean conflict might be likened to a bandit on the loose. The United States, under the mandate of the United Nations, has resolved that this bandit must be caught, and now has embarked upon a policy which it is hoped will trap him.

President Truman has struck a blow for universal peace by announcing his determination to halt the Russians in their efforts to grab off territory under the pattern set by Adolph Hitler. The United States does not intend to be labeled as offering "too little too late.' The line has been drawn and the Russian bluff called. The next step is up to Russia. President Truman's action may be looked upon as averting another world war. Also it may prove the thing needed to save the United Nations.

No longer does Uncle Sam wear kid gloves. Instead, bare hands are shown—hands that have punched out victories in two world wars and hands that are capable of holding in their palms the fate of the world. This is not a time for considering the dropping of an atom bomb on the invading North Korean forces. This isn't war and there is no justifiable reason yet to use the bomb—merely keep it in readiness.

The United States, as a member of the United Nations, has a great stake in South Korea, as that government was granted independence in a free election. This Government has spent about $526,000,000 in southern Korea to help get it on its feet; the army spent $380,000,000 and left behind $56,000,000 in equipment. The United States Marshall plan this past year spent $90,000,000 there and proposed spending another $100,000,000 next year. With that investment it was only natural that the United States should protect this free nation from being gobbled up by the Communists without regard to the other considerations.

Free nations everywhere are heartened by the new foreign policy of the United States. Today west Germany breathes more easily because of the firm stand taken by the United States as regards Korea.

Today the American flag waves a bit more proudly.

Nomination of Oliver S. Powell To Be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 17 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article concerning the nomination of Mr. Oliver S. Powell to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, which appeared in the Minneapolis Star. I think this article gives valuable information to my colleagues, who will in the near future be called on to pass on the nomination.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

BANKERS HAIL POWELL CHOICE FOR UNITED STATES POST

(By Herb Paul)

Nomination of Oliver S. Powell, first vice president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System was hailed by Minneapolis bankers today.

President Truman sent Powell's name to the Senate Wednesday, asking he be confirmed to fill the unexpired term of the late

Lawrence Clayton. The term expires January 31, 1952.

On his return from Washington, D. C., Powell said the nomination took him by surprise.

But to his many banker friends the appointment was deemed a recognition of his efforts in banking and civic affairs, and a recognition of the many firsts the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis has accomplished.

Confirmation by the Senate is expected shortly.

Roger B. Shepard, chairman of the board of directors of the Minneapolis bank, said both the bank and the ninth district have been highly honored by Powell's appointment.

"He will be only the third man from this district to serve on the Board of Governors, or the Federal Reserve Board as it was known prior to 1914," Shepard said.

The other two Board members from this district were John R. Mitchell, of St. Paul, who served from 1921 to 1923, and R. A. Young, of Minneapolis, who served from 1927 to 1930.

Upon confirmation of his nomination Powell will leave for Washington immediately, following resignation from his present position with the bank.

A native of White Rock, S. Dak., Powell, 53, joined the Federal Reserve bank in 1920 in the business research division. In 1027 he became head of the bank's research department and editor of its Monthly Business Review. In July 1926 he was appointed vice president, and later that year first vice president.

During the past decade the bank has developed many innovations, which Powell credits to the teamwork, with John N. Peyton, president, as the guiding hand.

Voluntary Censorship by Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 17 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, last week I made a short statement for the RECORD with reference to voluntary censorship of information on troop movements in this country and throughout the world. I ask unanimous consent that an article published by the Chicago Sun-Times of July 15, 1950, under the caption "Announcement," in which the Sun-Times imposes a self-censorship, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCEMENT

American troops are moving from the continental United States toward action in Korea.

To safeguard the lives of these Americans in present or potential danger, The Chicago Sun-Times hereby imposes self-censorship.

For the duration of the emergency, The Sun-Times will not report the departure of troops from American ports, the names or nature of the transports or other vessels on which they are moving, or the ports of destination.

This rule will apply also to photographs that would reveal similar information.

The only exception to this rule will be official announcements which, in our opinion, will not endanger American lives.

The Sun-Times feels that other newspaper will do likewise. But whether they do or not, this will be the policy of the Chicago Sun-Times.

Relations of the United States and United Nations to Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 17 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Tuesday last, July 11, there was an interesting column in the New York Times by Mr. Arthur Krock, giving some of the historic background of the relations of the United States and the United Nations to Korea. Of particular interest is Mr. Krock's quotation from Mr. Owen Lattimore's recent book Solution in Asia, published in 1949.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Krock's column be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—RECENT HISTORY OF OUR KOREAN COMMITMENT

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, July 10.—Soviet Russia was not represented at the Cairo Conference in November-December 1943, where, in association with Great Britain and Nationalist China, the United States took the step—momentous, as it proved—of specifically guaranteeing the postwar independence of Korea in due course.

But dispatches to this newspaper from Cairo at the time prophesied that "the U. S. S. R. will be pleased as China to see the restoration of Korean independence, which completes the elimination of the Japanese threat to the Soviet's maritime province of Vladivostok." And at the Potsdam Conference in July 1945, the Soviet Union joined in the guaranty.

This resulted in the two zones—Russian north of the thirty-eighth parallel and American south of that line—in which members of the United Nations are using armed forces to repel the invasion from the north. Since the United Sates was one of the three original guarantors of Korean independence, and since the United Nations set up the South Korean Government which is the object of the aggression, the course of the United Nations and the United States is seen to be a logical succession.

In the same chain is Great Britain, and for the same reason. This leaves out only Nationalist China among the original guarantors, but that absence was requested by the United States in the effort to localize the war in Korea.

MR. TRUMAN'S REVIEW

Not long after the U. S. S. R. at Potsdam openly joined the Korean guaranty, as it had made plain at Yalta it would upon entering into the war against Japan, it was evident that Korean independence meant very different things in Washington and London, on the one hand, and in Moscow on the other. For the benefit of numerous readers who have written in to ask how the United States became involved so critically in the Korean war the following summary of the President's message to Congress, June 7, 1949, is offered.

Asking continued economic assistance to the South Korean Government, Mr. Truman made these statements:

1. The sole purpose of the line drawn along the thirty-eighth parallel "was to facilitate acceptance by the Soviet and United States forces of the surrender of Japanese troops north and south of that line." It was never intended as a division between nations, and for 2 years after VJ-day the United States directly negotiated with the U. S. S. R. in a vain attempt to restore the unity of Korea.

2. When the General Assembly of the United Nations, November 14, 1947, called for free elections in Korea under the supervision of a commission of the United Nations the Soviet Union refused to permit (the commission) to enter its zone. Hence the new Republic of Korea, inaugurated August 15, 1948, was confined to the south.

3. The United States terminated its military government on that date, and, successively, the U. S. S. R. and this Nation withdrew their troops as the General Assembly had requested.

AFTER THE DIVISION

Now comes another historian whose account of what followed has been somewhat sustained by recent events. The Situation in Asia, by Owen Lattimore, Jr. (Atlantic-Little, Brown & Co., 1949), includes these revealing passages:

"The Russians organized a national army (in North Korea), grounding it on peasants who had land to defend and industrial workers who considered the new government their own, since it had been based on protection of their rights. The army was equipped with Russian, not captured Japanese, material.

"In South Korea the Americans organized, not a national army, but a constabulary, the backbone of which consists of men who served in the police under the Japanese—the most hated of all who collaborated with the Japanese. * * * Various enterprises have been nationalized, but have been staffed with personnel in political favor, whose outlook is not one of serving the State, but of building individual property for themselves and eventually converting public into private property. * * * The army cannot be trusted to fight; the people do not trust the Government; the Government cannot be depended on, and does not depend on itself; it appeals for continued American occupation and protection.

"If there is to be a civil war * * * North Korea would be able to overrun South Korea without Russian help, unless stopped by American combat troops."

One does not have to agree with Mr. Lattimore's past or present Far East policy to recognize the proved authority of these passages.

As for the commitment at Cairo, former Secretary of State Cordell Hull, in his memoirs published by Macmillan in 1948, observed that the President had not consulted with him before making it, and that he considered it "unwise for several reasons." But the commitment was made, and, though Soviet Russia was not consulted at the time, Moscow joined in it later with seeming satisfaction.

Whether or not that satisfaction still exists, and will continue to exist after the military intervention of the United Nations has produced whatever it does, in terms of Korean and global stability, cannot yet be determined or forecast.

The Korean Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 17 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Korean Outbreak—Looks Like We Are Right Back Where We Started From," published in the United Mine Workers Journal of July 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KOREAN OUTBREAK—LOOKS LIKE WE ARE RIGHT BACK WHERE WE STARTED FROM

We hope we are wrong, but it is our considered judgment that the Korean war is the real thing—despite all the prophecies to the contrary. It can well be the sparker of a global conflagration.

Russian military engineers, dedicated to the task of Communist conquest, are said to have perfected an intriguing geographical layout—the time table of which is apparently unknown to our American statesmen—which can be touched off geographically most anywhere at any time on the basis of the Russians pulling the strings in the background.

The events which have followed the alleged termination of World War II could not help but foment war. The partnerships executed out of expediency during World War II were bound to flounder in the abyss of insincerity and impracticality.

Congressmen assert that during the past five postwar years the United States has poured out in gifts and dollars to aid foreign nations a total of $36,000,000,000—of which Russia received nearly $500,000,000—all in addition to $50,000,000,000 of war loans and gifts under lend-lease.

Interest on our national debt of $256,000,000,000 has soared to $5,750,000,000 annually.

Today we are right back where we started from. There are more people enslaved in the world than was the case when World War II started. There is hardly a single nation in the world where the government is not less stable from an economic and democratic appraisal.

Lest we forget, our World War I endeavor was to plant world-wide democracy. The successful campaign slogan of Woodrow Wilson in 1916, "He kept us out of war," was revamped in 1917 into an inspirational call to duty, "To make the world safe for democracy."

Following World War I dicatorships flourished, took over, gaining control of most of Europe.

To crush the dictatorships which developed during and in the aftermath of World War I we thought we had fought and won World War II, but we have learned better. It now looks as though that bloody, ruinous conflict was only a starter.

Even the dumbest of the dumb realize by now that self-laudation of victory was a mistaken gesture. We have never reached a point where we could let go. Our statesmen have failed to locate any terminal facilities.

Our men were killed and maimed. Much of our resources was drained. Our financial stability was impaired by record expenditures for our own actual combat, as well as in support of our allies, to say nothing of our overhanging obligations for the pensioning and hospitalization of our servicemen and the care of their dependents—all of which have already rolled up a total indebtedness that in time is bound to reduce our living standards, the payment of which rests on more doubt than assurance.

We have discovered the eternal truth of what Gian Jacopo Trivulzio wrote King Louis XII of France in 1499: "To carry on war three things are necessary: Money, money, and yet more money."

Let us hope that we do not have to repent in the fashion of King Louis XIV of France, who, on his deathbed in 1715, said: "I have loved war too well."

As a result of our thoughtless favoritism to Commie Russia—which was struggling along and could hardly hold its head above economic despair when World War II started—Russia has grown in dictatorship, power, and continuing spread of satellites to such size and fortitude until Russia now stands, at least as regards the pitted fears of present-day statesmen, as the most feared and volcanic nation of all time.

The confessionals that are being wrung from the administrators of our own Government's policies constitute a show-down of their own show-up.

For the man on the street to discover the now-evident fact that the leaders of our Government were caught unaware—despite the fact that our own Secretary of Defense Johnson and Chief of Staff Bradley, as well as our brilliant Wall Street-Republican adviser, Dulles, the latter having visited Korea, were in Japan on the eve of the Korean explosion and failed to comprehend what the Russian-dominated Northern Koreans were up to—simply stumps credulity.

The common folks who have been on the merry-go-round of paying for continuing foreign aid—and have been fed promising results of American progress in Europe, Asia, and the Orient—are wondering just what the future holds in the way of success as regards our program of securing a toehold for planting the seeds of democracy for universal freedom.

Common folks are wondering if the European nations will flounder in self-defense against Russian aggression and fold up in much the same manner as Southern Korea.

It is now self-evident to the common folks that nothing short of military victory is going to stop Russian aggression.

And it is likewise self-evident that the United States cannot achieve world-wide victory alone.

Guessing the Russian timetable and bluffing epigrammatic statements by our statesmen moralizing a peaceful solution and renewed partnership with Russia distort realism.

Americans are weary of synthetic political excuses.

Americans have been led to believe that we possess the know-how.

Americans want our administration leaders to demonstrate and execute the capabilities and statecraft of the American know-how.

Americans think the time has come for Americans to be taken into the confidence of the administration and given the low-down on how and when our public administrators can be expected to measure up to the facts of the situation.

Americans are willing to fight for the cause of liberty as demonstrated by their productivity at home and their military services abroad in World Wars I and II. But, with it all, American thought is geared to the practicality of efficient direction of the Government top.

Americans don't want to be continually called upon to refight battles they thought they had won to regain the status of a victor—battles stupidly brought about by the blundering and inexcusable errors of judgment chargeable to our own statecraft's lack of know-how of what to do to cement the victorious production and military achievements of our people.

While Americans will patriotically serve their country whenever and wherever called upon, there can be no denying that the man on the street is troubled—wondering if the Korean venture is all in all necessary—American intervention on behalf of the United Nations, to protect a slice of a country forcibly divided against itself—to say nothing of the lateness of the decision to shield Formosa at any and all costs after letting China go by the boards.

Delay on Judge Hastie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 17 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Neglected Nomination," from the Washington Post of July 8, and an editorial entitled "Delay on Judge Hastie," appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of July 15.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of July 8, 1950]

NEGLECTED NOMINATION

Nearly 9 months ago President Truman nominated William H. Hastie to be a judge of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. Congress adjourned a few days after the nomination reached the Senate, and the President gave Judge Hastie a recess appointment, sending his name up for confirmation again in January when Congress reconvened. A Senate Judiciary Subcommittee held a hearing on the nomination April 1 at which no witnesses appeared in opposition. It made a favorable report April 3. But the full Judiciary Committee has taken no action. The recess appointment will automatically expire at the end of this session of Congress.

By all the criteria of character, education, and experience, Judge Hastie is eminently qualified to sit on the Third Circuit Court. An honor graduate of Amherst College, he went on to the Harvard Law School where he took not only the regular law degree but also a doctorate of jurisprudence. He has served as a Federal district judge and as Governor of the Virgin Islands within the Third Circuit. He was dean of the law school at Howard University. There is covert opposition to Judge Hastie's confirmation which finds refuge in vague allegations that he has belonged to subversive organizations. Being a Negro, he was no doubt identified at one time with groups protesting against racial discrimination, some of which may have come under Communist influence. But he has been a consistent foe of communism and has done much to guide Negroes away from the groups that have spuriously posed as their champions.

These charges of leftist leanings were raised against Judge Hastie, were investigated, and were thoroughly refuted when he came before the Senate for confirmation as a District judge and as Governor of the Virgin

Islands. The whole of his record supports the President's promotion of him. We hope the Judiciary Committee will report his nomination favorably without any more delay and that the Senate will give him the confirmation he deserves.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 15, 1950]

DELAY ON JUDGE HASTIE

The Senate Judiciary Committee has been sitting all year on the case of Judge William H. Hastie, of the United States Court of Appeals. A recess appointment was made by President Truman last October, a choice that stirred wide interest and acclaim because it was the first time a Negro had been chosen for such judicial eminence. Other judges nominated at that time have been confirmed by the Senate, but the committee has strangely delayed for more than 6 months in reporting on Judge Hastie. There can be no question of his qualifications. The nominee's legal brilliance is recognized; he has had rich experience as a district judge, dean of the Howard University Law School, wartime civilian aid to the Secretary of War, and most recently as Governor of the Virgin Islands.

The committee's slowness to give a favorable report is hard to understand, all the more so because it now develops that a subcommittee headed by Senator MCCARRAN checked Judge Hastie's record and gave its approval. But on Thursday the full committee examined Judge Hastie for 5 hours on his membership in such organizations as the National Lawyers Guild and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. What the Senators learned is not quite plain, nor is it apparent why any question of Judge Hastie's loyalty and intellectual probity should have been raised in the first place. When one reads that Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi, is strenuously opposed to giving clearance, the suspicion rises that perhaps the color of Judge Hastie's skin has more than a little bearing with some members of the committee. Such suggestion of prejudice, however disguised, should be promptly repudiated. We hope the committee has at last satisfied itself on Judge Hastie's integrity and devotion to country and will now hasten to report favorably to the Senate for confirmation. The decision is long overdue.

Case Against the Mundt Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 17 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column headed "The mirror of public opinion," from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Tuesday, July 11, 1950. Under the heading "Case against the Mundt bill," this great newspaper reprinted editorials from the Christian Science Monitor, the Baltimore Sun, and the Denver Post.

"Anti-Communist measure is type which should never be pushed through in time of excitement," says Christian Science Monitor; Baltimore Sun questions need of bill, urges delay until court rule on Smith Act; Denver Post fears harm to many innocent persons.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

Senator KARL E. MUNDT tried to rush his Communist-control bill through in a surprise move. Supporters of the bill made another attempt the next day. Majority leader SCOTT LUCAS charged these Senators with violating an interparty agreement to take up no important business until after the long Fourth of July week end.

The so-called Mundt-Nixon bill is exactly the kind of measure that should never be pushed through in a time of excitement. This newspaper has questioned the wisdom of many of its provisions under any likely circumstances. The reasons we have given in the past hold good today—some with even greater force.

The bill holds the danger of establishing the doctrine of guilt-by-association in American law and undermining the rule that guilt is personal and hinges on overt acts, not mere words. It threatents to stifle, along with the Communists, that healthy agitation for change and improvement which has always made democracy dynamic. It could easily set up the precedents and the machinery for a kind of political proscription which could be turned by any party in power against any minority it found troublesome.

And the justification for these risks? Even less than when the bill was last debated. The Korean aggression leaves the American Communist Party even more completely exposed and discredited than before. Its most beguiling facade—its claim to being the party of peace and international good will—has utterly collapsed.

It may be wise to tighten up the laws covering espionage. But the Mundt-Nixon bill represents an unnecessary and an exorbitant price to pay for internal security—a price measured in the currency of freedom.

[From the Baltimore Sun]

It was natural and normal that the backers of further anti-Communist legislation would think of their bills again in the light of the new evidence from Korea that communism really does threaten our own security. That is what happened when Senators MUNDT and FERGUSON appeared before the Senate GOP Policy Committee and managed to swing that body behind a demand for consideration in this session of the Mundt-Ferguson bill.

Do we need the Mundt-Ferguson bill in the wake of the Korean crisis? The need of such a bill may be questioned, and on two grounds.

First off, if we aren't going into a deeper crisis, then we may well await court judgment upon present laws already on the books in the general field of Communist subversion. A leading law in this field is the Smith Act. The constitutionality of the Smith Act is now being decided in the second circuit court of appeals, the case being that of the 11 Communist leaders convicted in Judge Medina's court. After the circuit court, the Supreme Court will get its chance.

If the Smith Act is finally upheld, then the Justic Department has already indicated that it can make extremely effective use of it against the Communists. If it is thrown out by the Supreme Court then the probabilities are that the Mundt-Ferguson Act, if on the books, would be endangered. For the Mundt-Ferguson drafters have relied on much of the philosophy expressed in the Smith Act. So why not wait until the Supreme Court itself has spelled out the ground rules under the Constitution for a midtwentieth century drive on communism?

On the other hand, suppose that the Korean crisis worsens. Then the fact is that our protection against communism will probably intensify. Here some statements of the FBI's Mr. J. Edgar Hoover are relevant: "What the FBI is doing is a matter that cannot be discussed, but in the public interest I can recall that we followed this same policy during the days when bundsmen were goose-stepping and speaking their doctrine of hate. But when the time came to act, the FBI knew whom to arrest, where they were and their real designs. World War II witnessed this Nation sabotage-free."

[From the Denver Post]

Just what's wrong with the Mundt-Nixon bill? In an article in the Post, Senator KARL E. MUNDT said there is nothing wrong with the bill. Rather, he said, it will knock the Communists into the open.

"It cannot conceivably affect in any way any loyal American not engaged in a conspiracy afoot to destroy this country, or to subjugate it to the tyrannical operations of a foreign dictator."

That is one of the basic points on which Senator MUNDT and many of the rest of us are in disagreement. The Senator believes the bill could not hurt any loyal Americans. We say it can ruin many, for the bill is not only aimed at Communists but at fellow travelers as well, and the definition of a fellow traveler or a Communist front organization is left up to administrative officials.

Under the act a special board on subversive activities would apparently determine which organizations are Communist, which are Communist fronts, and which are innocent.

This board would have the power to brand and harass any number of organizations. If its activities were carried out on the plane of the House Un-American Activities Committee, it would harass and brand many innocents.

If, as Senator MUNDT says, the Hatch Act and the clean politics bill make the Republicans and Democrats label their literature, make them identify their radio programs, and make them operate completely in the open—then we must assume that this existing legislation could be equally applied to the Communist Party and make that party clean.

Basically, though, the worst thing about Senator MUNDT's bill is that it would not work against the Communists, but would work against many innocent persons.

Acheson Must Be Watched

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 17 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New Hampshire Morning Union of July 15, 1950, entitled "Acheson Must Be Watched."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACHESON MUST BE WATCHED

As events progress, one trade gains perspective that Soviet Russia might accept as the price of calling a halt in Korea. It is possible that the Soviets might call off the North Korea attack in exchange for the seat-

ing of the Chinese Communists in the UN Security Council. It may be, in fact, that one of the objectives of the North Korean attack, in the plans of the Kremlin, was to force the United States to accept the Chinese Communists and thereby open the way for Russia's return to the Security Council.

This is one more step in Russia's attempt to control, or failing in that, to wreck the UN. The question is, if such an offer is made will the Truman administration fall for it? There is great danger that it will. Such a step would be in line with the policy of appeasement that the Acheson group has followed all along with the Chinese Communists. By refusal to give the Chinese Nationalists support, and by flirting with the Chinese Communists, the State Department enabled Mao Tse-tung and his gang to get control of China.

Now Acheson has refused to take a definite stand against recognition of the Communist government at Peiping and simply holds the matter in abeyance. He also has refused to take a stand against seating the Chinese Communists in the Security Council. All Acheson will say is that he will not support the Communist claim, and that he will not oppose it if a majority of the members of the UN give their support. That wishy-washy attitude is a definite bid for the Chinese Communists to press their claim and for those who desire to follow the course of least resistance to support it.

Against this background, it would not be surprising if Acheson should accept the seating of the Chinese Communists in the UN as a reasonable price for Moscow's calling a halt in the Korean war. There would be no publicity about the matter. Britain's Ambassador Kelly is now dickering with Stalin, and Acheson could give an O. K. to Kelly and the people would be no wiser. It is therefore not too early for the American people and Congress to raise their voices in loud denunciation of such a dastardly surrender.

For see what that would mean. Russia would win her fight to coerce the UN into giving a big-power seat in the Security Council to the Chinese Communists. Thus she would double her ability to obstruct and dominate that organization. The prestige of Communist China would be enhanced throughout the Far East. United States prestige would fall proportionately. We would be in the ignominious position of having failed to repel the attack in South Korea and then of surrendering to Moscow's demand for the seating of the Chinese Communists in the UN to accomplish a withdrawal of the North Koreans.

All the hopes built up by Truman's decision to defend South Korea among the free peoples of the world, would be shattered. All the promises of the UN as a defender against aggression would be destroyed. This would be appeasement at its worst. The situation in Korea is bad, but a sell-out now to Russia of this kind would be 100 times worse. This last move, if made by Acheson, would set the stage for complete Communist domination in the Far East, with all that implies for a world struggle.

The Foes We Now Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am, under leave to extend my remarks, including an article by Dr. Willford I. King entitled "The Foes We Now Face." It is a very pertinent article at this time:

At long last, the die is cast. President Truman has overruled the appeasers—men like Service and Lattimore and Acheson—and has decided to stop the Red advance in the Far East—cost what it may.

On July 4, 1776, our forefathers challenged the tyranny of King George III. On July 4, 1950, this generation of Americans is challenging the tyranny of Joseph Stalin. War is a terrible thing. But it is better to fight now when there is a chance to win than to be slaughtered later like a flock of sheep.

Today, patriotic Americans of all parties applaud the President's action, but many of them bemoan its tardiness. At the close of World War II, Russia was exhausted, and we could easily have enforced a peace which would have protected our freedom-loving friends in the Baltic States, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and China. Now they are crushed or devoured by the Russian bear.

If, instead of dilly-dallying month after month, we had, even 2 years ago, called a halt on Russia's advance, we could have had the satisfaction of knowing that we had a goodly stock of atomic bombs, while Russia had none. Today, Russia has some of these deadly devices, and, as a result, we can only hope that the Russians are not sufficiently well-armed and adroit to announce their direct entrance into the conflict by removing from the lanscape Washington, New York, Detroit, and a few other vital centers of national activity.

It must be admitted, however, that delay has given us some benefits, even though these may be relatively minor. Such men as Whittaker Chambers, Louis Budenz, Senators Mundt and McCarthy, Judge Medina, and J. Edgar Hoover have exposed to the light of day the machinations of the pro-Russian fifth columnists who have wormed their way into strategic positions and are waiting to sabotage our war effort as soon as the Russians enter the fray. Perhaps the FBI has identified enough of these traitors to minimize further damage from their plotting. But no future remedial measures can offset the perhaps irreparable injury which they have done to our Nation by transmitting atomic secrets to our arch enemy. However, all this is water over the dam. We cannot turn back the hands of time. What is the outlook now?

There is little likelihood that Russia has, as yet, accumulated a stock of atomic bombs large enough to enable her to put out of the war by slashing surprise attack. Therefore, it is presumably her desire to delay world war III until she feels that she is in a position to paralyze us in a single night. The probabilities are, therefore, that as far as Russia is concerned, we still have the whip hand. But, if we are interested in self-preservation, it certainly behooves us to bring her to time before she can amass a really menacing supply of atomic weapons. To assure mastery of this unscrupulous and powerful foe, we need to utilize our resources with maximum efficiency.

But, if we are to do this, we must overcome on the home front two great obstacles:

1. Ignorance of economics.
2. Devotion to statism.

Because most of our legislators and executives do not really understand either the principles of money, or of taxation, they are likely to attempt to finance war operations not soundly by using excise and withholding taxes, but by the wildcat device of borrowing from the banks, thinking that they are thus postponing part of the cost of the war to some future date. What they really do by such a process is surreptitiously to rob the thrifty of their savings, destroy capital accumulation, and thus hamper both the war effort and postwar recovery.

To some degree, during World War I, and, to a far greater extent, in World War II, the devotees of a planned economy—in other words the Fascists and Socialists—instilled into the minds of the American people the very dangerous fallacy that, in wartime, it is necessary to have Government control the entire economy. So, now, most people assume that, when large-scale hostilities open, we must reintroduce such economic monstrosities as price controls, wage controls, production controls, priorities, allotments, excess-profit taxes, and rationing. They do not realize that every one of these interferences with free competition aided the enemy throughout World War II, and might have cost us the victory had our enemies not hampered their productive systems by restrictions even more burdensome than ours.

Every Member of Congress needs to be ever on guard against those sly, scheming collectivists who hope to use the war emergency as a cloak under which to fasten socialism or fascism on our Nation. They also need to keep steadily in mind the principle that, while in peacetime, interference, with competition injures the economy, in wartime such interference may cause the unnecessary loss of thousands of lives, and, indeed, even bring about the downfall of our great Republic. Eternal vigilance is not only the price of liberty, it may be the price of our very existence.

Situations of Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 17 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Situations of Strength," published in the San Francisco Examiner of Thursday, July 6, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SITUATIONS OF STRENGTH

If South Korea should be conquered by the Communists, our real defeat would not be on the battlefields of Asia.

Defeat was projected for us within the administration at Washington.

Due to President Truman's intervention, and General MacArthur's providential presence in the Far East, a military defeat will not now occur.

However, we may not win by relying upon South Korean fighters belatedly equipped with American arms.

American troops, as well as American munitions, have been required.

But this is a risk which the Nation must incur—a risk that would not have existed if our Far Eastern policy had not been communized within the State Department.

This country's Korean policy has paralleled, and in fact was a part of, our defeatist Chinese policy.

Having liberated Korea, we were duped into dividing the country with Russia.

Then we were misled into withdrawing our occupation forces from the south while

Russia was bolshevizing and militarizing the north.

And we failed completely to provide South Korea with the weapons for self-preservation, as we promised to do.

Last year, Congress appropriated $27,600,000 in military aid for Korea, the Philippines, and Iran.

Korea's portion was to be approximately $11,000,000.

On March 31 of this year, not one cent of the appropriation had been committed, obligated, or expended.

On May 31, only $1,107,667 had been obligated, and only a pittance—$6,498—had been spent.

And Korea received absolutely nothing.

This was exactly the immoral course pursued in our betrayal of Nationalist China under the mentoring of the pro-Communist policy makers in the State Department.

It was a course that intentionally left Korea naked to Communist attack.

Most obviously, our other strategic wards—Iran and the Philippines—have been similarly neglected.

Yet Secretary of State Acheson prates rhetorically of our developing situations of strength abroad to contain marauding communism.

There is another proof of the State Department's culpability.

The invasion of South Korea was officially excused as a surprise.

The truth is that on June 9—week earlier—the central intelligence agency, under Admiral Hillenkoetter, reported to the White House and the Departments that a Communist invasion of South Korea was imminent.

On June 13, the warning was duplicated.

Yet our Asiatic Fleet, and our troops and air groups in the Pacific, were not alerted.

For this, the State Department is responsible, as South Korea has been under its jurisdiction since the military government ceased.

In these circumstances, it will not be enough to save—or to rescue—South Korea.

It is time to rescue the United States.

It is necessary, indeed imperative, to do something final about incompetency and disloyalty in the State Department.

We cannot save the world unless we save America first.

Our immediate need is to develop a situation of strength in our own Government.

Security Dismissals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post:

SECURITY DISMISSALS

The power summarily to fire any employee on security grounds, which would be conferred on the heads of 11 Federal agencies under the terms of a bill overwhelmingly adopted by the House last week, seems to us needless and mischievous. In effect, it would deprive employees of those agencies of such protection of tenure as the Civil Service laws afford them; and it would deeply undermine the loyalty program. The impact on the morale of the 1,000,000 Government workers involved would impair rather than promote national security.

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the discharge of employees who are deemed undesirable—and therefore, in a sense, hazardous to national security—but who cannot fairly be judged disloyal within the terms of the executive order establishing the loyalty program. Some are said to be indiscreet in their conversations or associations, some are suspected of drinking excessively or being heavily in debt. It is true, of course, that such persons might, under certain circumstances, injure national security. But to discharge them as security risks would be to stigmatize them in a way that might make it impossible for them to gain a livelihood anywhere, in or out of the Government. They might much more fairly and accurately be called "unsuitable" or "undesirables."

The terms of the 1912 Civil Service Act do not foreclose dismissal of such persons when there are real and demonstrable reasons to justify dismissal. An administrator has authority under the act to fire any employee for cause; he is required only to give the employee a written statement of the charges against him and an opportunity to reply in writing—at least so far as nonveterans are concerned. The procedure in the case of an employee having status as a veteran is much more complicated and doubtless ought to be modified—particularly since nearly half of the Government's personnel now have such status. But in no case should employees be deprived of the procedural safeguards necessary to protect them from error and prejudice. A specific statement of charges in connection with any dismissal is a minimum protection against political discrimination, personal favoritism and capriciousness. And when a dismissal involves stigmatization as a security risk, it ought to be made only after an appropriate hearing within the agency, with the right of review by some impartial tribunal outside it.

The extension of the security risk system, as contemplated in the bill passed by the House, to departments such as Commerce and Justice, which are not predominantly sensitive agencies in security terms, could not fail to undermine the loyalty program. Its effect might be to set aside Loyalty Review Board clearances whenever the head of an agency should entertain any suspicion about an employee, however unsubstantiated, or whenever a Member of Congress should choose to point an accusatory finger. Good administration no less than justice to individual employees requires that any one whose trustworthiness is impugned be given a chance to defend himself before being thrown out of his job and disgraced. And good administration is an element of national security too important to be quixotically ignored.

Criticism of Foreign Policy Is Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article by Mr. George Sokolsky that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on July 2. While it is true that we must present a united front to the enemy, we need not overlook the tragic course of events under the present administration:

In a critical period, many will say that criticism of the President or Dean Acheson or the State Department is unfair partisanship, designed to influence votes and affect an election. That is a dangerous view because the conduct of our foreign policy should be subject to constant scrutiny and criticism.

Other countries in history, strong within their own boundaries, were destroyed by incorrect foreign policies. Japan and Germany are recent examples. The President's reversal of policy on Formosa is sound, but it should have occurred 5 years ago.

The fact that Soviet Russia ordered her Korean satellite to invade Southern Korea is evidence of the continuing failure in the conduct of our foreign policy. We have failed in every enterprise thus far at the option of Soviet Russia.

While the Berlin airlift is pointed to constantly as the single exception to failure, there is no evidence that eastern Germany will not sooner or later do what northern Korea has done to our policy. When Gerhardt Eisler was permitted to escape on the *Batory*, the United States sent to the east of Germany a competent leader and a vindictive enemy of the United States. Besides, Eisler knows our weakness first hand.

If our policy is based on the assumption that peace can be restored through the United Nations, it is already evident that that international body is without potency and that there is no hope for us in that. That body is stalemated beyond hope, except as a United Nations organization of free nations, with Russia and her satellites out of it.

If our policy is dollar diplomacy of the new order, the scattering of our wealth throughout the world in the hope that we can buy nations and influence their decisions, then we have failed, for no nation has given another subventions of so great an amount as the United States has been handing to Great Britain; yet there is a tendency even in that country to seek a neutral position between the United States and Soviet Russia.

It cost us $11,000,000,000 to buy an enemy, Soviet Russia; how much did it cost us to buy frightened neutrals? No matter what the outcome of the Korean situation, whether it be localized or leads to a general war no nation will long be able to remain neutral. Either they are for us or against us.

That northern Korea was being prepared for war has been known for at least a year. Any person with historic perspective should have known that whoever holds Manchuria will push into Korea, if there is a chance.

Anybody who has made any study at all of Marxist strategy and tactics must have known that sooner or later the Marxist empire will march from its boundaries, wherever they may be fixed at the moment, to the next place.

As soon as Soviet Russia conquered China, with the aid of the American State Department, the next steps were inevitable unless stopped. The next steps were Korea, Burma, French Indochina, the Philippines. Then they would attempt to drive Gen. Douglas MacArthur out of Japan. That would probably be the first step in their march of empire toward the United States.

And on the other side there is Germany to conquer, and Iran, and Iraq, and even Turkey.

We are facing one of those movements that has changed the course of human history. A nation which prefers whodunits to history cannot be sure that it quite understands the march of empire.

Alexander, Caesar, Genghis Kahn, Napoleon, Hitler—there have been predecessors to Stalin, but the patterns of their activities do not vary too much. They move wherever

they can, and when they succeed they build enormous states that seem to encompass the entire human race.

But never quite all of it, because always they expand beyond their tensile strength; always there is a cracking of the controls, particularly on the periphery of empire. Meanwhile humanity suffers.

Those who conduct the foreign policy of the United States should have known and understood all this. It is written in the story of man's inhumanity to man. But they did not understand.

They have failed on every occasion. They have missed every opportunity. They confused obstinate private judgments for high principles.

Now that President Truman has reversed a doctrinaire policy which he inherited, perhaps we shall move in a straighter line in defense of our land.

Plymouth Rock Rededication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding editors of my State is Mr. Alan C. McIntosh, of the Rock County Star Herald, of Luverne, Minn. Mr. McIntosh was invited to speak at the Plymouth Rock rededication ceremony at Plymouth, Mass., on June 25. There is so much of value in his speech that I feel it should be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It follows:

WE STILL HAVE THE SAME STARS TO GUIDE US

From the four corners of this Nation the members of the National Editorial Association have journeyed to assemble here today. These are the homespun newspapermen from the small cities and towns of America. These are the editors who, next to the clergymen and the doctors, hold the closest intimacy with the families of their communities. These are the men and women who mold the lives and thinking of the real heart of America.

We stand here today with reverent humility. The ground on which we stand is holy ground, hallowed for eternity by the sacrifices of our Pilgrim forefathers.

This rock we now face is no ordinary mass of stone. It is an ageless shrine for every patriot. This is the rock that stands as a thundering rebuke to those who say there can be changing standards of integrity or a double standard of morality for individual and government. This rock does not mark the beginning of the belief that freedom is worth any sacrifice. Neither does it serve as an end to that belief.

This is Plymouth Rock.

This simple ceremony today cannot be a rededication of Plymouth Rock. It was dedicated and consecrated for all time three centuries ago by those who died that we might walk as freemen.

This is a rededication instead of our lives so that we can rekindle in the hearts of our countrymen the noblest flames of Pilgrim idealism on the altars of patriotism.

Three centuries after the landing here of the Pilgrims historians still speculate why they chose this site, far removed from their original destination. One theory now says that the captain of the Mayflower was bribed by English colonial interests to put the Pilgrims ashore here. And that on arrival at Plymouth he argued them into staying.

Like the *Mayflower* that was blown off its course and anchored in a strange harbor, our ship of state has been menaced by unscrupulous men who have urged us to steer by something more modern than the true stars that guided the Pilgrims.

Scheming men have tried to bring us, like the *Mayflower's* captain, into false harbors of foreign ideologies not of our choosing. We have been endangered by cowardly navigators who would run with the winds of popular opinion than fight against the storm to stay on course.

Our ship of state wallows in the trough of debt, buffeted by the winds of special privileges and the pressures of vociferous minorities. It drifts perilously close to the reef of disaster marking the belief that the Government should support the people rather than the people support the Government.

There is no need for me to retell today the story that everyone knows—the story of that terrifying, storm-tossed, miserably wretched 66-day voyage of the tiny *Mayflower*, the heartbreak of two return trips to England, the sickness and misery as the mountainous seas smashed at the tiny vessel.

We can imagine the stark terror that swept the seasick company when they learned that the storm had cracked the *Mayflower's* main beam. But—God's hand was on that ship. An artisan on board was bringing with him to the new world a giant iron screw. With that device and the strong arms of stout-hearted Pilgrims the beam of the tiny *Mayflower* was forced back straight into place.

We must resolve today to be the instruments of strengthening and straightening the main beam of our ship of state so that it can withstand the stresses and strains for the centuries to come.

It is time that we resolve to work and live by the same true stars of ideals that guided the Pilgrims. They do not belong only to the emblazoned pages of history. So long as men's hearts still burn with the belief that a man has the right to individual liberty and the right to worship as he chooses, then the Pilgrim spirit still lives.

Before the Pilgrims set foot on this rock, they first met in the crude and dingy cabin of the *Mayflower*. It was there they laid for all time the cornerstone of all the republican institutions of America. It was in that tiny cabin that the first town meeting was held.

It was there that the hand of God helped the Pilgrims write the immortal *Mayflower* compact that still lights up the sky of the world with the nobility of its purpose. And when the Pilgrims set foot on this rock, they knelt and gave thanks to God.

Cynics could say, For what? Truly it took stout hearts to face that waste of sand hills and sea grass, swamps, and briars, wind-bent trees, and unknown savages. The Pilgrims faced realities. We seek out the snug harbors of Utopia where we can avoid all struggle while we sniff the deadly opium that deludes us into thinking we can get something in life for nothing. We have been content to dream of the living the world owes us, while we sneer at those who prize honesty and thrift.

It was a desolate sight that greeted those displaced persons of three centuries ago. There were no government officials on hand to inspect or greet them. No park benches or firewood had been placed there by a thoughtfully considerate parks department. No low-cost housing project has been provided. No inspectors were on hand to demand that they work not more than 40 hours or for less than 75 cents. There were no union organizers to preach that seniority was more important than ability.

Those DP's of 1620 had to survive or perish by their own efforts. And perish half of them did that first cruel winter. But that price of freedom was not too high, for it is to their eternal glory that none turned back for England the next year.

The Pilgrims came here with the same burning desire we echo today—the wish for security and freedom. But they sought the true security of real freedom—not the prison type security where independence of action is forfeited. They could have had that by remaining in England.

Plymouth Rock is more than just a bridge over which the Pilgrims crossed from the Old to the New World. It serves as a monument to the American way of life—it serves as a monument to the failure of communism in America.

It was the love of freedom, not the lust for money, that impelled the Pilgrims to uproot their lives from England. They matched their lives against the funds raised by the 70 merchants of England. We see here today in Plymouth Rock the monument to the American way which is based on the striving for individual freedom and individual gain.

It was here, too, that communism failed. Despite the threat of starvation, the share and share alike system couldn't produce enough food. But when Governor Bradford assigned a parcel of land to each family then corn was raised beyond the wildest hopes.

In the words of the Pilgrim governor, "the women now went willingly into the fields and took their little ones with them to set corn, which before would allege weakness and inability, whom to have compelled would have been thought great tyranny and oppression."

If we today are to be the instruments of strengthening the main beam of our ship of state, we must now rededicate our lives to those noble purposes of the Mayflower compact.

They are:

1. To the glory of God.
2. The advancement of the Christian faith.
3. Frame just and equal laws.
4. For the general good of all peoples.

This is a noble constitution for any nation, a charter for one world.

The names of the Pilgrims are emblazoned in gold on the immortal pages of history because they had the courage to dare. The seed they bore of religious freedom and popular government bore fruit upon the shores of a new land. We too can plant today the seed which will bear abundantly of the rich fruit of liberty and new hope for generations yet unborn.

We cannot achieve this in our own strength alone. We must have God in our daily lives just as God was as much a part of the Pilgrim's daily life as his gun or his ax. We must have the same old-fashioned willingness to freely acknowledge the existence of a supreme being.

Plymouth Rock is the signpost of a successful civilization, the marker that says this was the route taken by others who trod safely on before, that a successful civilization found this the right way to go. The trail blazed here by the Pilgrims tells us that this is the route. But it also warns that there can be no painless road to freedom or security.

We just can't buy freedom. We don't get freedom even by fighting for it.

We only gain freedom by living it. It takes not only raw courage to do that—it takes rare courage, not the explosive type of unreasoning courage, but the rarest kind, sustained courage.

No one possesses sustained courage without faith.

"Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." We need, too, the faith that says "God is with me, I can met the crisis I now face."

These are the days that try the souls of men. Like the Pilgrims we have much to make our hearts falter. Like the Pilgrims

we can make no retreat from our rendezvous with destiny on the outcome of which depends the fate of our children's children.

We cannot meet destiny by our own puny strength alone. We must go forward armed with truth and the love of liberty and sustained by faith in God.

Plymouth Rock will stand here as a monument to liberty just so long as we in America have the courage to keep alive the principles of the Pilgrims. If we trade the precious birthright bequeathed by them to us for a mess of pottage from Washington, then it would be better if this noble rock would crumble to dust as a civilization sinks into the morass of failure.

We must maintain the sovereign dignity of the individual. We must fight the encroachment of bigness in Government, business, and unions upon the liberties of the individual.

Let us join hands here today to strengthen and straighten the main beam of our great ship of state so that it can sail majestically on through the oceans of time.

If we look up, we find the same true stars to guide us on that led the Pilgrims to this new land. Like the Pilgrims, not all of us will survive; but that in itself is not important. Our lives will be justified if the principles we believe to be right and true survive.

We must rekindle in our hearts the simple faith in God that sustained the Pilgrims and cherish liberty of mankind above all worldly treasures. Let us lift our hearts up with prayerful confidence to the dawn of a new glory for America.

The 330 years that have elapsed since the Pilgrims trod this rock are but a pinpoint on the panorama of time, but a landmark in the history of humanity. Because the record of what they achieved here is written for eternity.

If we, too, can once again rekindle for America the fires of freedom and the yearning for true liberty, then we will not have made this pilgrimage of rededication in vain.

New Controls by the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, if it again should become necessary that we have controls during an emergency, the Congress should at all times preserve its powers for use of the people and not let it slip into the hands of bureaucrats.

I am including the following timely editorial on the subject of new controls by Spencer A. Canary, editor of the Daily Sentinel-Tribune, of Bowling Green, Ohio:

NEW CONTROLS BY THE PRESIDENT

Possibly needed controls of the future are being discussed in official circles.

While the question of new powers for the President are apparently still in the discussion stage only and are said to be unlikely unless a third world war develops, it is something for each Representative and Senator to be considering now.

They must have in mind how bitterly the Truman administration resented and fought against gradually releasing controls after victory of American arms in 1945. A definite time limit on them should be set. The wording of such limit will not be easy, if it is to explicit. It should not depend on the authority of the President but upon Congress as the representative of the people.

For example, release of controls should not be designated as the end of a war until declared by the President. The Congress should have the sole power to determine when the successful conclusion of a war shall have made it desirable to release some or all special controls.

Most of our political turmoil in the last 5 years has had its genesis in the desire of bureaucrats to retain their jobs and the desire of President Truman to direct the political and economic future of the nation along lines he and his advisers have thought desirable.

The questions arising as a result have, therefore, been confusing to voters and not been presented on their merits or demerits. Excise taxes, rent control, and the draft law are recent examples.

In its laudable purpose of fully cooperating with Mr. Truman, Congress is likely to forget the need of preserving our people's independence when war is over.

The Great Brains Who Guide Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of July 16, 1950:

THE GREAT BRAINS WHO GUIDE US

Secretary of State Acheson does not seem to be quite so voluble since the dispatch of American troops to Korea reversed his policy of watchful waiting while the Reds mopped up everything. If he is a little less forward than usual, the reasons are easily understood.

ACHESON SHUTS UP

Mr. Acheson was Under Secretary of State in November 1945, when Gen. Patrick Hurley, Ambassador to Nationalist China, came home breathing fire. Hurley charged that Acheson and his clique in the State Department had been dealing behind his back with Mao Tse-tung, boss of the Chinese Communists.

On the day that Hurley submitted an explosive resignation, General Marshall, wartime Chief of Staff, was appointed special envoy to China, with the mission of "reconciling" the Nationalist Government of Chiang Kai-shek and Mao's Communists. Marshall was then on call before the congressional committee investigating Pearl Harbor. The Congressmen wanted him to explain his peculiar elusiveness on the night of December 6, 1941, and the morning of December 7, when the attack occurred. Marshall was glad to have an excuse to get out of town at the earliest opportunity.

BRIGHT IDEAS THAT HAVE COST US DEAR

Marshall's activities in China had an important effect in insuring the subsequent conquest of all China by the Communists. He forced Chiang to accept a truce bringing the Nationalist armies to a halt when they were making encouraging headway against the Communists. While the Nationalists were stalled, the Russians, who had accepted the surrender of the Japanese Kwangtung army, improved the standstill by equipping some 50 Chinese Communist divisions with captured Japanese arms. These represented a material contribution toward the eventual defeat of the Nationalists.

Marshall, however, could not persuade Chiang to accept the Communists in a coalition government. He came home in January 1947 to be appointed Secretary of State, muttering impartial maledictions upon both the Nationalists and Communists. But, while he was still in China, Under Secretary Acheson came up with a really brilliant idea.

On June 19, 1946, Acheson and Robert P. Patterson, then Secretary of War, appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee to give their blessing to Marshall's suggestion that Congress should approve a 10-year program for postwar lend lease to China, including the training and equipping of Communist troops. Marshall naively thought they could be amalgamated into a new all-China Army. He called this a move toward a unified national defense for China and predicted it would lead to stability in the Far East.

Acheson, elaborating on this preposterous scheme, said that the Communists should be allowed one division in six in the proposed unified Chinese Army and that the Communist troops should receive a "a brief period of United States training and * * * minimum quantities of (American) equipment."

This excursion into never-never land remained a dream in the brains of our peerless leaders—Marshall, Acheson, and Patterson—for the civil war in China was soon resumed in full force, and the Nationalists were on the road to liquidation. But that such a proposal could even have been seriously advanced demonstrates the degree of fantasy which pervaded our alleged foreign policy.

ALIBI FOR CRUEL FOLLY

Finally, on July 30, 1949, Mr. Acheson, by now Secretary of State himself, was sadly remarking in his preface to the State Department's white paper purporting to explain the catastrophe in China that the Chinese Communists were the creatures of Soviet Russia, but that "nothing that this country did or could have done within the reasonable limits of its capabilities could have changed that result; nothing that was left undone by this country has contributed to it."

If America's cause does not seem to be faring well in the Orient, remember the geniuses who devised the policy and enjoyed such an intoxication of lunacy as to believe that it would serve America's interests to train and equip Asiatic Communists—the same kind of Communists now fighting the United States with a holy zeal and murdering American prisoners.

The FEPC Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of May 10, 1950:

THE FEPC BILL

For the first time in the 5 years that the battle has been actively waged, there is at least the bare possibility now that a bill to establish a Federal Fair Employment Practice Commission may be passed by Congress. Such legislation is, of course, still unlikely in the face of bitter opposition and

threats of filibuster. But at least the House has already approved an FEPC bill, and the administration seems to be serious in its present effort to push one through the Senate. The measure which the House adopted in February lacked any enforcement provisions; but, as we said at the time, if it had not been for the atmosphere of political cynicism that surrounded its passage it might well have been an acceptable first step for Federal FEPC legislation. Be that as it may, the bill now under discussion in the Senate would establish without further preliminaries a full-fledged fair employment practice system, with the necessary enforcement provisions to give it meaning.

In view of the grossly exaggerated charges that have been brought against this measure (S. 1728) it may be worth while to look at its actual provisions. The bill declares that there exists discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, and asserts the obvious truth, which cannot be too often repeated, that "such infringements upon the American principle of freedom and equality of opportunity are destructive of the basic doctrine of the integrity and dignity of the individual upon which this Nation was founded and which distinguishes it from the totalitarian nations."

The bill forbids both employers and labor organizations (of more than 50 persons) to practice discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin. To enforce this prohibition, it establishes an FEPC which, in cooperation with local agencies, shall investigate complaints, and shall attempt to eliminate violations of the law by conference, conciliation, and persuasion. If these methods fail, the FEPC can, after hearings, order compliance, such orders to be enforceable in the courts.

Two points cannot be emphasized too strongly. One is that the discriminatory practices which the law forbids are only those based on race and religion, etc. Such statements as those of Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, this week that the bill would nationalize industry or that it would establish thought-control are downright silly. But there are serious and conscientious opponents of the bill who fear that it really does represent a dangerous extension of Federal powers. On the premise, however, that discrimination is wrong and is contrary to the basic spirit of American institutions, it would seem to us that if a Federal law would make more effective the struggle against discrimination—as we think it will—then a Federal law should be enacted. And this line of thought leads to the second point to be emphasized in the Senate bill. That is that some form of compulsion is required. It may never be used; it is of course to be hoped that it would never have to be used. But common sense, as well as experience in State and local legislation of this sort, indicates that the enforcement agency should be able to fall back on legal sanctions if its efforts at persuasion fail. There is no tyrannical power here, unless Congress and the Federal courts be viewed as instruments of tyranny.

An effective FEPC bill will not suddenly end discrimination, but it should tend to ameliorate the degrading economic conditions imposed on a too-large percentage of America's population, and—not least important—show the world outside our borders that we really mean it when we say that we believe in equality of opportunity. Both Democratic and Republican platforms in 1948 endorsed the principle embodied in the FEPC bill. It is not unreasonable to believe that if the matter should actually come to a vote in the Senate an FEPC bill would be passed. The great obstacles are, of course, the filibuster and the threats—actual or implicit—that committee work on other important legislation will be held up until FEPC is definitely laid aside. These are tactics of legislative blackmail that disgrace their proponents.

Although we think that the arguments in favor of a Federal FEPC outweigh those against it, honest men may disagree. The issue is debatable and should be debated. But to try to kill this legislation once again via filibuster is to betray the democratic system and the American method of government.

Better Social Security at Last

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for many years now the man living on a social-security pension has been the forgotten American. Therefore, it is refreshing to observe that Congress at long last has come to the realization that what this country needs is an improved and expanded social-security system.

The original Social Security Act was passed in 1935. It is still a 1935 model in spite of the tremendous changes which have taken place in our economy. These broad social and economic developments have completely unbalanced the Nation's social-security system. That is the reason it is so desperately in need of complete overhauling and streamlining to give it a 1950 look.

I have been fighting for a better social-security system ever since I came to Congress in January of 1943. I introduced my first bill to liberalize the social-security benefits payable and to expand its coverage early in the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The legislation which has now passed both the House and the Senate and which will shortly be ready for final enactment into law is a significant step forward in the establishment of a sounder and broader social-security program. For that reason, I have given the legislation my complete support. Many of the provisions included are similar to those in the bills which I have personally sponsored, although many of the changes which I have advocated have not yet been adopted. Nevertheless, we are about to take the initial step which will provide the basis for progressive improvement. Our immediate concern is to alleviate present hardships and to bring social-security pensions in line with increased living costs and to make eligible millions of persons who have thus far been denied these benefits.

Moreover, this new legislation does not effectively deal with the problem of retirement pensions for those who have never been able to engage in covered employment. That class of persons, of which there are many, will be afforded no additional protection. It is for that reason that Congress should immediately undertake the problem of providing benefits for those not eligible to social-security pensions and who are now receiving what is known as old-age assistance benefits.

Our social security will never be completely sound or adequate until every person of retirement age, regardless of his employment status, receives the same degree of protection. But as I have stated, we have made considerable progress in the pending legislation but much remains to be done.

EXTENSION OF COVERAGE

The old-age and survivors insurance program now covers 35,000,000 workers. The new legislation will cover about 10,000,000 additional workers; 8,300,000 of them would be covered on a compulsory basis and coverage would be available to the remainder on a voluntary basis. All self-employed persons, except farmers and certain professional groups, will be covered. Agricultural employees will be covered but not the farmer himself. I personally feel that farmers should be eligible if they desire the coverage, but the present bills do not include them. Domestic workers will be covered as well as employees of nonprofit organizations. State, county, and municipal employees are likewise eligible if they are not already covered by a State retirement system and providing the State consents to the coverage. United States citizens employed abroad by an American employer would likewise be eligible and Federal civilian employees who are not covered by the Federal civil-service retirement system.

LIBERALIZATION OF BENEFIT AMOUNTS

About 2,900,000 persons currently receiving old-age and survivors insurance benefits would have their monthly benefits increased on the average of about 90 to 100 percent, the 100-percent increase applying to those who are now in the lowest pension brackets. Wives who have reached retirement age would receive corresponding increases in benefits payable. Benefits for dependent children will likewise be increased proportionately.

ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS

In order to qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits under present law, an individual must have either (a) quarters of coverage—calendar quarters with $50 or more of wages paid—equal to at least one-half of the number of quarters elapsing since 1936 and before age 65 or death, or (b) 40 quarters of coverage. Under the bill eligibility requirements are greatly liberalized by providing a "new start." Quarters of coverage would be required for only one-half of the number of quarters since 1950—with a minimum of six quarters of coverage required—but such quarters of coverage may include those earned before 1951. Thus any person aged 62 or over on the effective date of the bill would be fully insured for benefits at age 65 if he had at least six quarters of coverage acquired at any time.

This is one of the best provisions of the new legislation, because it will take care of so many border-line cases. I receive hundreds of letters each year from people in our district who have been unable to receive pensions because they lacked a few quarters of the required coverage. Most of these people will now be automatically eligible.

The new legislation also makes the following additional major benefit changes in the present law:

(a) Dependent children of women workers: Benefits to children are payable on a more liberal basis in respect to deaths of insured married women. Thus, if a woman is currently insured at the time of her death—has 6 quarters of coverage out of the 13-quarter period ending with the quarter of death—her children will be eligible for monthly survivor benefits even though the father of the children is present in the household. Under existing law such children would be ineligible for benefits.

(b) Dependent husbands and widowers: A new category of benefits is added for dependent husbands, age 65 or over, of retired or deceased women workers. No benefits are paid under present law to dependent husbands and widowers.

(c) Former wife divorced: Benefits are payable to a divorced wife caring for entitled children of her deceased former husband.

(d) Aid to the blind: Beginning July 1952 all States administering federally approved aid-to-the-blind programs would be required to disregard earned income, up to $50 per month, of claimants for aid to the blind in determining eligibility for and the amount of aid. Prior to July 1952 the exemption of earnings is discretionary with each State. Thus the State legislatures will be afforded an opportunity to make any necessary changes in their aid-to-the-blind laws to conform to the new Federal requirement.

VETERANS

World War II service men are granted the same status under old-age and survivors insurance as they might have had if military service had not interfered with their employment. Accordingly the bill would give servicemen wage credits of $160 for each month of military service performed during the World War II period. These wage credits would be given regardless of whether death occurred in service and whether veterans' benefits were payable. If the protection provided under present law and that provided by the military-service wage credits overlap, the provisions that would result in the most favorable treatment would apply.

In most cases where the individual died in service, the wage credits would be of real significance in providing additional benefits for his widow and children. In many cases such deceased servicemen were insured when they entered military service, but with the absence of wage credits during service, lost insured status or had their benefit amounts sharply reduced. A very real hardship, therefore, results in most death-in-service cases if wage credits are not given or if provision is made for adjustment where compensation is payable by the Veterans' Administration.

EMPLOYMENT INCOME

Under existing law any person on the old-age and survivors insurance benefits rolls loses his benefits with respect to any month in which he earns $15 or more in covered employment. If a retired wage earner himself earns above this amount, not only his own benefit but also all benefits payable to his dependents are suspended.

Thus, in order to enable beneficiaries to supplement their social security benefits to a greater extent, and to encourage those who can do so to engage in productive employment, the proposed legislation would increase to $50 a month the amount that may be earned by a beneficiary without loss of benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned some of the most important aspects of the new legislation. There are many other changes which I cannot encompass in these remarks. A sound social security and retirement system is one of the strongest bulwarks of our democracy. It is consistent with American principles of government and will help preserve and keep it free from communism or any other foreign ideology.

We have made a good start but we must continue to improve our retirement systems in the years ahead.

Dr. Bunche for Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Afro-American for June 3, 1950:

DR. BUNCHE FOR AMBASSADOR

There are fleeting moments when we suspect the white people of America of being stark, raving mad. This always occurs when they try to resolve our domestic race problem against the changing panorama of world events. The latest instance is the suggestion of the editors of Collier's magazine that Dr. Ralph Bunche be sent to Moscow as our Ambassador.

The idea, standing alone, is a laudable one, as Dr. Bunche would be a credit to his country regardless of where they sent him and would be an improvement over most of the political hacks and numbskulls we have deployed around the world.

But the reason advanced by Collier's borders on asininity if not downright intellectual depravity.

Say the editors of Collier's in their advance release:

"It shouldn't be thought that we are advocating Dr. Bunche's appointment as a stunt. Rather, it would be a logical step in America's progress toward better race relations.

"A Bunche appointment would be one way for our Government to turn the tables on the Soviet segregation propaganda and show the world, by deed rather than by word, that the segregation picture isn't so black as it's painted.

"The Russian citizen couldn't very well be denied the knowledge that Washington had sent a colored ambassador to his government. He couldn't be insulated from the contradiction between propaganda and actuality."

We believe that Dr. Bunche possesses too much integrity to permit himself to be used in any such patented lie and would rebel at playing the role of smoke screen for American deceit.

Dr. Bunche, sitting in the Kremlin, or wherever the diplomats are permitted to sit, would be ever conscious of the fact that he is just a cover-up for America's shame. He would be haunted by the knowledge that while he is on parade his fellow men back home are still being segregated, Jim Crowed, and discriminated against.

If Collier's wants to give the lie to the Russians, as they seem so anxious to do, why accomplish this by trick, duplicity, and window-dressing? The honest thing to do would be to use the great power of their magazine pages to bring about some real reforms in America, which would speak for themselves and save us the embarrassment of putting on a false face of piety before the world.

If we sent a carload of Bunches around the world and still denied democracy to millions at home because of race, we would only make a laughing stock of America and fool nobody but ourselves.

We have a substitute proposal. Instead of sending Bunche to Russia, a country which is off limits to American millionaire society, why not send him to the Court of King George in London? There would be something truly democratic about the descendant of former slaves prancing about Buckingham Palace, in silk hose and knee breeches, presenting the pampered daughters of our idle rich to the Queen.

But there also would be a practical service Dr. Bunche could render there which would be wasted in Russia. He could use his good offices to prevail upon the British to loosen their stranglehold on the exploited black colonials upon whose husky backs the British Empire rests. And he might be able to get in a few words for the natives of South Africa whose condition under the Malan Government, makes even Siberia look like utopia.

Yes, like Collier's, we are all for using Dr. Bunche's talents for diplomacy to their fullest capacity, but we object to his being used as a hoax, a sham, and a delusion even to fool the Russians.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, in response to numerous requests, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Frank C. Waldrop's series of articles on communism.

And, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to put four of these articles in the RECORD each day until the series is concluded:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Now we turn to examination of the Communist conspiracy as it has operated in the United States since diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union.

That action of November 17, 1933, can be put down without any hesitation as a major turning point in world history.

It is far more significant than any Pearl Harbor, D-day, VE-day, VJ-day, or such as that. For if the Soviet Union had not been rescued by Mr. Roosevelt in 1933 Stalin would have sunk without a trace then and there. And the root cause for World War II would have withered.

The evidence on that was clear enough at that time in spite of a propaganda fog to the effect that Russia would buy "$500,000,-

000 worth of goods a year" from us in appreciation of diplomatic status.

Of course, nothing like that ever happened, but instead the people of the United States were taxed for multiplied billions of dollars in supplies to save Stalin a second time, in World War II.

In grateful appreciation for all of which we now stand confronted with the state of affairs that is all so obvious.

In evaluating the job that our governmental officers have done with respect to communism for the last 20 years it is necessary always to keep one fact clearly in mind:

At all times, the truth about communism was on the record for understanding by even the simplest mind.

Nobody, in public office or out, can ever say in honesty that he didn't have a chance to use good sense, didn't know the facts, or didn't know where to find the facts.

For instance, the New York State Legislature, on April 24, 1920, authorized a special joint committee under chairmanship of State Senator Clayton R. Lusk, to survey and report revolutionary radicalism, its history, purpose, and tactics.

This committee collected invaluable material on early communism in the United States of America. Then, as now, its four volumes of hearings made a solid base on which to build any judgment.

In addition to the Lusk report, there are several hearings by committees of the House and Senate of Congress between 1917 and 1920 filled with clear and specific material, particularly on things relating to foreign affairs and the conduct of the First World War.

As a matter of fact, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the entire 16 years preceding recognition, presents a clear and obvious set of facts. Against the facts, only arguments.

Then in 1930, a special House committee under the chairmanship of Representative Hamilton Fish, who is now running for the Senate from New York, pulled together a most impressive summary of the material accumulated over the years. Special attention was given to communism in the United States, but the whole world record was noted.

All this was before recognition. After recognition, the volume of material grew at a phenomenal rate. This, I submit, is historical evidence that the Russians never for a minute lived up to the pledges in the protocols of recognition.

For instance, there is the record of the House investigation conducted from 1934 to 1937 under a resolution introduced by Representatives MCCORMACK (Democrat) of Massachusetts and Dickstein (Democrat) of New York.

This was a very unskilled operation and was carried out with great concern lest the Roosevelt administration be put in a bad light by facts. But even so, the truth shines through.

And in several States, the legislatures began soon after recognition to pile up the evidence of Communist activities within their local regions.

The Massachusetts Legislature, 1937–38, produced a very full record on Harvard University.

In 1940–42, the Rapp-Coudert hearings for the New York State Legislature made an invaluable study of the New York City school system. Whoever has examined that record is forever stopped from saying he doesn't know how communism works.

The Washington State Legislature, in 1947–48, pulled together the detailed story of operations in the Northwest, a most sensitive and important region, in view of its nearness to the Siberia-Alaska airfields.

California's Legislature got to work in 1941 and piled up the facts on Hollywood, Harry Bridges, and the waterfront campaigns, and parallel matters.

Some minor work was also done by the Wisconsin and Arkansas Legislatures.

But, of course, the biggest and most important record was that compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, in response to numerous requests, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Frank C. Waldrop's series of articles on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The most important committee in Congress, the one that has had the hardest row to hoe, and the one that has been shown the least gratitude, is my subject for a while.

The Communists in the United States might well by now have our whole Government disorganized through spying and corruption, except for this committee.

In the almost 12 years of its history, this committee has done more for the safety and welfare of the American people than the whole Roosevelt and Truman administrations put together. Indeed, it has had to fight both administrations every step of the way.

The commitee I mention is, of course, the House Committee on Un-American Activities. So far as I know its true and accurate history has never been put together before, though millions of words have been written about it.

I write about this committee in utter detachment and on a cold, factual basis.

Let anybody who thinks he can, come around and show proof that the record here unfolding is in any way false.

This is a promise in advance to give any such critic fair hearing. But I have been in this game too long to let special pleaders work their rackets on me. If you've got a pertinent fact, I want it. If you're just trying to use this hall for your propaganda, go get your own.

Anyhow, here begins the story of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and all that has happened to it so far as that matters to the main theme of a report on communism in the United States of America.

As reported earlier in this space, I began observing and reporting on communism in 1930 as a very fresh cub reporter. By 1933, I was in Washington and in plenty of time to cover the United States-Russian diplomatic recognition proceedings.

I found myself more and more committed, as time went by, to the necessity of bucking the popular trend of the town.

Everywhere, it seemed to me, the ideas of citizenship and responsibility that used to be considered the best Americanism, were being put aside in favor of cleverness, popularity at any price, and a consuming love for official power.

And behind the gaiety and cleverness, deep inside the works where power moves, the footprints of the Communists.

I am not going to run through here all the oft-repeated tales of Dr. William Wirt, the sacrificial victim from Gary, Ind.; the internal wars of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and such matters written so many times before.

Here are a few notes on byways that I followed myself.

First, there was the case of the second bonus march. Everybody has a memory for the time in the Hoover administration when a Communist-inspired crisis occurred in Washington.

How many remember that in 1934, the Communists were back here again with a similar project? But Mr. Roosevelt was more clever than Mr. Hoover. His bonus march was stopped outside town and the miserable tools of the Communists gathered down at Fort Hunt, down near Mount Vernon.

I was down there several times, talked with their leaders, including some openly avowed and some not so candid, members of the Communist organization who were determined to create another street scene.

But clever Mr. Roosevelt used the taxpayers' money in a fashion that would never have occurred to Herbert Hoover. He shipped them down to Matacumbe Key, off the Florida coast, where a convenient hurricane killed off 200 or so.

For a couple of years I had missions involving the Works Progress Administration both in Washington and the South Atlantic regions generally.

I remember a WPA camp outside Atlanta, Ga., where people who had never heard of Josef Stalin were brought under his direct influence.

And a very pretty young lady in Columbia, S. C., who explained a WPA course in "teachers' education" to me thus:

"We are definitely committed to teaching the workers how to escape the slave consciousness in which they are now held from above. I anticipate a break in support of this project by the Government but I assure you we will carry it on, just the same."

And what was the theme being taught? Here is a quote from one of the pamphlets being circulated in the school:

"The country which has insisted that it would be saved by private initiative has now recognized that the way of private capitalism has gone. We are in for state socialism."

That is from a story I wrote in the Washington Herald of March 7, 1936. Clearly—anybody can see it now—there was need for Congress to check upon the behavior of the Executive.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, in response to numerous requests, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Frank C. Waldrop's series of articles on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

One of the most interesting stories I ever covered in my life turned up in the course of investigating communism in the early New Deal of 1933–36.

That assignment had carried me from the incredible experiment in socialism under Mrs. Roosevelt's personal direction up at Reedsville, W. Va., all through the South Atlantic byways.

The Reedsville experiment is by now forgotten, perhaps, but it is an evidence of the noxious growth that can come from pretty words.

As all the world knows, the mountains and valleys of West Virginia are filled with people who can't make a living where they are, but resist the idea of going out in search of a living elsewhere.

Mrs. Roosevelt set about in 1933 to remedy that at taxpayers' expense. Displaced coal miners were "resettled" on a tract of worked-out land, in houses that had been prefabricated by somebody that Louis McHenry Howe, Mr. Roosevelt's personal agent, recommended.

There were 50 of these houses at the start. Later the number was run up to some 200, or more. I went through many of them, talked with the people, and examined the operation in closest detail.

At best, you would have to call it pathetic.

The poor, unfortunate miners were shoved around by a succession of so-called planners, who were bent, bound, and determined that Reedsville would show the world the superiority of their organized operation as against individual initiative.

They had a cooperative dairy, as I remember, little strips of land for personal use of those who dared, and everything else was run from the top.

They set out to make Reedsville a gem of balanced agriculture and industry by trying to bully several firms, including General Electric, into running plants there, no matter what good reasons to the contrary.

The whole thing, in its final factual form, was nothing more than Mrs. Roosevelt's version of the collective farm that is as old as Russia and now is hardened into a government bureaucracy by the Russian Government .

Reedsville had another Russian aspect, too. Everybody has heard of the Potemkin villages that Empress Catherine the Great had her minister, Potemkin, build along the river as she journeyed down with foreign dignitaries.

These fakes were to impress Europe with the health, strength, and happiness of the Russian empire.

As fast as the imperial boats went by, each village collapsed and the actors, actresses, and prop men hurried across short cuts to set up the same scene at another bend in the stream.

So with Reedsville's masters, in a way. For it was soon obvious that the Reedsville project was without a sound basis. The people living there under Government seal couldn't stand it. They dribbled off in all directions, mostly to the hills.

Somewhere around my house there still is today a child's rocking chair that I bought at the Reedsville handicraft shop. It's a good chair. But it cost about five times the price of a better chair, not to mention all the time, trouble, and expense involved in getting it in such an out-of-the-way place.

So that Potemkin village at Reedsville collapsed and ultimately was sold off by the Government at a terrible loss. But the prop men who had built it ran on to build many others at a cost of millions upon millions of the people's dollars.

Those were the days when Rexford Guy Tugwell was out to "roll up my sleeves and make America over."

The image in all such minds was Soviet Russia, which, as I have demonstrated here in the most careful detail, had already by 1933 been blown high sky as a fraud, a fake, and a failure of good government or as an enterprise for human welfare.

Just the same, Potemkin villages, but built of good, solid American lumber, stone, and concrete at staggering cost, were set up all around. I visited many of them and took samplings on a broad scale.

One by one, they all went the same route of expensive construction, attempted socialization, collapse, and sale at a loss.

Yet, never did the executive branch of our Federal Government either acknowledge the error of its policy or bring to punishment those who had saddled it with this multi-million-dollar effort to reduce United States citizens to wards of Government.

The only place in the Government any sentiment in that direction developed, was in Congress and out of that eventually came the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

But I haven't told about that most interesting story that I ran across in checking on the WPA. That one, which has to do with the Indians, will have to keep until tomorrow.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD, Mr. Frank C. Waldrop's series of articles on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Many rackets have been worked on the people of the United States of America, in the name of government, but none so threadbare of excuse for being as that called "The Indian Bureau."

This venerable hoax was created in the name of emergency more than 100 years ago, with the assignment to rush the Indians toward full citizenship by educating and enlightening them in the white man's civilization.

People who want to find out by the test of experience whether government is a reliable instrument of human progress can look at the record of the Indian Bureau.

Instead of getting the Indians into the stream of American life, it has concentrated on self-perpetuation.

The result is that today it spends more money than ever before, has worked the law around to where anybody is an Indian if the Indian bureau says so, and if not, not.

Indians are truly second class citizens, by law, once the bureaucracy clutches them.

But I know one set of Indians who aren't having any. At least, they weren't having any back when I was surveying the influence of communism in the New Deal's social welfare programs in 1933–1936.

This roving inquiry took me down to the Piedmont slope of North Carolina, and there I heard about a row going on back in the Great Smoky mountains between the Indians and the Federal Government.

In the first place, I had no idea any Indians were left in North Carolina and in the second, that any Indians, anywhere, were opposed to the Indian Bureau. So I hit out for the high hills and eventually arrived at one of the most beautiful hideouts you ever saw.

It is called Qualla Boundary, and it is on the east side of the great mountain range as you cross over from North Carolina to Tennessee via Newfound Gap.

Tourists by the millions have poured through there in recent years but when I was in there the road was more promise than reality.

Who were these strange characters? Well, the Southern Highlands were once occupied by a highly civilized Indian tribe known as the Cherokees, who had an alphabet and printing system of their own, elaborate legal codes, and generally excellent taste.

Their one mistake was that they liked to live outdoors and that being simple, they neglected to develop all the equipment and impedimenta that the white civilization had brought into being with resultant strength and power to enforce its will.

So, in time, the issue was who would own the hills, the Cherokees or the whites. Washington settled that.

President Andrew Jackson, somewhere around 1837, sent the troops in to collect all the Cherokees and transport them to a strip in the Indian Territory now called Oklahoma.

But the Cherokees took to the hills and a number of them escaped. These lived in caves, ate roots and berries, and generally suffered terribly. But they kept their independence.

Their hideout was known as Qualla Boundary after a princess, Qualla, famous for some local lover's leap or other.

Until the Civil War, the Cherokees of Qualla Boundary never came down from their hideout, but sold furs and medicinal roots through a white trader named Thomas.

When the war came on, they formed a regiment of scouts and put it at the disposal of the State of North Carolina. Why? I guess they were anxious to get a crack at Washington for what Washington had done to them.

Anyhow, the State of North Carolina in sentimental gratitude, gave to the Cherokees forever and in perpetuity their mountain hideout, to be run entirely as they wanted.

And so it was, as I to the mountain came a-traipsing in 1935, that the Indian Bureau from Washington was trying every way it could to make the Cherokees surrender.

They were to turn over their famous tribal home to the Indian Bureau and forget their independence. In return, they would be showered with blessings in the form of Federal aid, schooling, WPA jobs, and other such happiness.

But the Cherokees only said "ugh," and they didn't mean hello. They meant "ugh."

I went to their meetings and listened to their talk. And I learned that they feared the workings of a strange new law, the Wheeler-Howard Act.

That law, one of the most pernicious ever put on the books, gave the Indian Bureau powers that were a scandal against civil rights and citizenship for Indians.

Its force and effect have been to set the progress of the Indians back as if the 100 years' preceding work had not been done, at all.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities has not investigated this, but it should.

British Oil Sales to Red China Boom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

BRITISH OIL SALES TO RED CHINA BOOM—UNITED STATES BAN AIDS SHELL CONCERN—BUT PEIPING STILL GETS LESS THAN IT DID MONTH AGO

HONG KONG, July 13.—Sale of British gasoline and oils from here to China is booming as a result of the suspension of petroleum exports to Communist China by local United States companies.

At the behest of the State Department Socony and Caltex shut down completely on the supply of petroleum products to the China mainland early this month.

London decided that the British Shell agencies, which with Socony and Caltex comprise the big three of the Far East oil business, would not be required to follow suit.

The British Asiatic Petroleum Co. here not only is now filling its own normal quota of exports to China but also is moving into the gap left by the elimination of United States supplies. Communist government agencies in China are clamoring for maximum cargos and local middlemen as well are buying up gasoline and oil wherever they can for profitable resale to mainland China.

The British company is abiding by the Anglo-United States agreement not to sell aviation fuels to the Chinese mainland. The only gasoline that is known to have gone to the mainland through here recently resulted from a deal made in a South American country.

Before this month's shut-down of American sales Socony, Caltex, and Asiatic Petroleum were sending to the Chinese mainland about 12 percent of the amount of gasoline and oil sold to China in pre-Communist days. It was considered that this took care of restricted civilian needs and involved the sale of about 2,000,000 gallons of gasoline and 50,000 barrels of Diesel oil monthly.

Asiatic Petroleum at present is not in a position to take over the business dropped by the United States companies. The Chinese mainland consequently is receiving considerably less than a month ago, but the fear in American quarters here is that whatever amounts are acquired may go either to the Chinese Communists or the North Korean military machine.

One aspect of the situation that is worrying Socony and Caltex is the position of their representatives in Shanghai. Three Socony and four Caltex American employees are being held by the Communists as virtual hostages. Delivery of oil has been one of the means of easing Communist pressure and of paying the Chinese staff and other expenses.

With no imports coming in to convert into cash these representatives may have to depend on the home office for remittances to keep going. The Communists have refused exit permits and the right to make Chinese staff cuts in keeping with the reduced business.

Hypocrites

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Black Dispatch of June 3, 1950:

HYPOCRITES

Collier's magazine this week suggests on its editorial page President Truman should send Dr. Ralph Bunche as Ambassador to Russia, and the Black Dispatch does not think the suggestion is a bad idea. It would be a much deserved recognition of sheer merit. It might be that, just as Dr. Bunche was able to compromise a hot war in the Near East, he would be able to smooth out our cold war with Russia now seething at a high tempo.

But the editor of Collier's desires to send the black envoy to Russia for an entirely different reason than the one assigned above. He thinks the presence of Bunche in the Kremlin will be a squelcher to Russia's propaganda campaign built around racial segregation in the United States.

While the editor of this national magazine is careful to suggest to his readers that he advocates this appointment not as a stunt, this is the only light in which we can see his proposal. For instance, we do not believe the way to halt segregation in the United States is to launch a propaganda program in the Russian steppes. If we want to stop the Russians from saying Negroes are segregated in the United States the way to halt this truthful statement is to stop segregating Negroes in the United States.

Collier's certainly would not expect Dr. Bunche to join the Ananias society the moment he held an audience with Stalin. Suppose for instance, if and when Dr. Bunche arrives in the Russian capital and holds a press conference, Pravda's representative asks him if he would be accommodated in any and all of the hotels in Washington? What would the Collier's editor suggest as an answer for Dr. Bunche? Suppose again Dr. Bunche were asked why the American Congress refuses to pass a fair employment practice act and in addition refuses to give American citizens living in the District of Columbia the right of franchise. What is suggested that Dr. Bunche say? We know the answers here in dear old U. S. A., but what should Dr. Bunche reply if and when he arrives in Stalingrad and nosy reporters, already alerted to the fact that the Bunche appointment is a propaganda stunt, start asking perfectly legitimate questions dealing with the relationship of the two races here in the United States. We could not send Ralph Bunche to Soviet Russia and insulate his presence there from the actual and sordid relationship existing between the two races here in the United States.

Once before, during the Italian elections we attempted this type of stunt by broadcasting a story to western Europe about the financial exploits of an Oklahoma City Negro couple, who had through their own efforts built a half-million-dollar hospital. We sought to convey the idea that this achievement of two members of a minority group was the rule among minorities here in America, when even the masses of whites, who belong to the dominant race group, know that this is not common among whites, much less blacks.

False propaganda such as suggested by the Collier's editor is not going to cleanse evil from the skirts of this Nation. If Ralph Bunche goes to Russia today, a black woman will still be in prison down in Georgia because she defended her virtue; the Trenton Six will rise like Banquo's ghost to belie our words, and our antimarriage laws and separate school systems are all everyday evidences of our insincerity and dissembling.

Somehow we cannot get away from that graphic description of a hypocrite as found in the Bible when we contemplate upon the suggestion of Collier's, whose management at the moment desires to present a moral front to the world. Examine this Biblical statement to determine if it is not a fitting blanket with which Collier's wishes to cover our national sins, in suggesting the "Bunche stunt."

"For they are likened unto white sepulchers, which while beautiful on the outside are within full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness."

Beautiful Ohio Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, July 9, 1950, the beautiful Ohio Drive was dedicated in a very impressive ceremony held at historic Hains Point which is located about the middle of this magnificent drive.

The dedication program was opened by Robert E. Fowler, director of public relations of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission. Mr. Fowler introduced me as chairman and master of ceremonies.

The following is a copy of the remarks made by Mr. Fowler:

Ladies and gentlemen, if any one person can be credited with bringing about the naming of this beautiful new drive in honor of the State of Ohio, he is the gentleman we are about to introduce to you now—and who will mastermind this colorful program from this point on. He represents the Tenth District of Ohio in the House of Representatives.

A member of the Ohio bar since 1907, he served his State in various capacities—from prosecuting attorney of Lawrence County to the Ohio State Senate in 1922, where he served one term. In 1924 he was elected to the Sixty-ninth Congress and has been reelected to each subsequent Congress, serving his State with distinction for more than 25 years.

He is a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, the House Select Committee on Foreign Aid, and a member of a House subcommittee appointed to make a general revision of all of our tax laws.

Ladies and gentlemen, the father of Ohio Drive, Congressman THOMAS A. JENKINS.

Mr. Speaker, Ohio Drive and all the 6 miles of territory that it traverses and the many acres that it encircles are a part of the National Capital Parks over which the Secretary of the Interior has jurisdiction, therefore it was fitting and proper that Hon. Oscar L. Chapman, the present Secretary of the Interior should dedicate Ohio Drive.

Because the governor is the highest official in the State it was fitting and proper that Gov. Frank Lausche should be the person to accept the drive on behalf of the 8,000,000 inhabitants of the great State of Ohio.

To add interest to the dedication program a ribbon was stretched across the Ohio Drive and Mrs. Erma C. Marting, of Ironton, Ohio, having recently been selected as the "Mother of Ohio for 1950" was selected to cut the ribbon and thereby open the new drive to traffic. In the face of a battery of cameras Mrs. Marting, the Governor, the Secretary of the Interior, and the master of ceremonies entered an open automobile and were driven up the new Ohio Drive thereby opening this beautiful drive to traffic.

It is my hope that this magnificent Ohio Drive will always be maintained by the city of Washington as one of its useful and attractive possessions. May it become a permanent part of the National Capital just as the Lincoln Memorial, the Washington Monument, and the United States Capitol.

Ohio Drive begins at the south side of Constitution Avenue directly north of the Lincoln Memorial and extends south along the east side of the Potomac River, about 3½ miles to Hains Point. It circles Hains Point then extends up on the other side of the peninsula and along the west side of the Washington Channel 2½ miles to the Tidal Basin.

Too much cannot be said of the beauty of Ohio Drive. Across the placid Potomac on one side can be seen historic Arlington Cemetery with its row upon row of graves of our national heroes.

Below this cemetery is the Pentagon Building, the nerve center of the whole National Defense Department. This building contains the offices of the Chiefs of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Marine Corps. Near the Pentagon Building is the huge Washington Airport from which about every minute of the day airplanes move out toward the four corners of the earth.

On the other side of the beautiful peninsula can be seen the great Government store houses, a plain inarticulate testimonial to the strength and greatness of our country. Here, too, one can see the War College which has trained the military geniuses that have led our forces to victory on the battlefields in many countries.

Farther up on that side of the peninsula can be seen in bold majesty the incomparable Washington Monument. Also the beautiful memorial that a grateful people have erected to Thomas Jefferson, probably the most scholarly of our early statesmen. From several points can be seen that most revered of all our shrines, the Lincoln Memorial. And I must not forget the majestic Capitol Building which houses the House of Representatives and the Senate, and which is to the entire world the symbol of liberty and freedom, and the sight of which I hope shall always warm the hearts of millions of patriotic Americans as they journey along beautiful Ohio Drive.

The National Capital Parks officials were prevailed upon to change the name of Riverside Drive to Ohio Drive only after I had made repeated efforts to have a street of avenue in the city of Washington named for Ohio. These efforts were carried on by me for about 10 years. Realizing there was little likelihood that any new streets of appropriate length or location would be available in the city of Washington, I appealed to the National Capital Parks officials to change the name of Riverside Drive to Ohio Drive. The fact that practically all the States had streets or avenues named for them, and the further fact that Ohio and her citizens had made great contributions to the welfare of the Republic, assisted me in my efforts to convince the National Capital Parks officials and the Secretary of the Interior that the most beautiful drive under their control should be named Ohio Drive.

With this accomplished we fixed a day for its dedication. It was on July 9, 1788, that the first Governor of the Northwest Territory, Gen. Arthur St. Clair, took up his duties at Marietta, Ohio. It was on July 9, 1950, that the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Oscar L. Chapman, in an appropriate manner officially named Ohio Drive and presented it to the Governor of Ohio. His dedication speech is as follows:

ADDRESS OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, OSCAR L. CHAPMAN, AT THE PRESENTATION OF SCROLL TO GOV. FRANK LAUSCHE, OF OHIO, DURING THE DEDICATION OF OHIO DRIVE, WASHINGTON, JULY 9, 1950

I have had the privilege of participating in many ceremonies in the National Capital, but I am happy to say that none have given me more pleasure than the official duty which I am called upon to perform today. I am going to have the opportunity of repaying a debt of gratitude. The gratitude of the Federal City to the great State of Ohio which has contributed so generously to the development, beauty, and the artistic and cultural qualities that have made the city of Washington unique among the capital cities of the world.

In their histories the National Capital and the State of Ohio have always been closely associated.

The seat of government was established in Washington in 1800, 150 years ago. This year we are celebrating the National Capital sesquicentennial, commemorating the event which gave our young nation this permanent Capital City. The first State to be admitted to the Union after the capital was established here was Ohio, in the year 1803. Since then Ohio has sent many of her noble sons to Washington to play vital and important roles in the progress of the Nation. Seven of the 31 Presidents of the United States have been Ohioans—more than any other State. Three of our Vice Presidents have been Ohio men. Two Speakers of the House, and a Chief Justice and four Associate Justices of the United States Supreme Court have hailed from Ohio. Her sons have served their State and their country with distinction and honor in the Halls of Congress, in the Cabinets of our Presidents, and in other important governmental posts.

But it is with particular reference to the part which Ohio has played in the development of the National Capital that I wish to speak today. The beautiful parks which contribute so much to the charm of the city of Washington were included in L'Enfant's plan for the National Capital. These, however, were forgotten as the prosaic-minded city fathers stressed priorities for streets and sewers and firehouses and water mains, and the hundreds of necessary but unromantic utilities that go into the process of building a new city Then, in 1849, just 101 years ago, the Department of the Interior was established. The first Secretary of the Interior was on Ohio man—Thomas Ewing. With the love of nature and beauty which sprang from his "beautiful Ohio" environment and an inborn appreciation of the cultural values essential to the development of a great city, Secretary Ewing took the National Capital parks under his jurisdiction, and raised the park office to the level of other agencies enjoying the support and administration of an executive department of the Federal Government. It was then that the foundation for the finest municipal park system in the world was laid.

When another great Ohioan, Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, was elevated to the Presidency by the grateful Nation whose battles he had fought and won, he found that the work advanced by Secretary Ewing had been stalemated by the long Civil War and the tumultuous days of the reconstruction period. Grant set out to make up for lost time. He planted the beautiful American elms around the Ellipse and along Washington's broad avenues. He encouraged the beautification and development of the downtown-rectangular parks and circles and developed the beautiful drives that were famous in the days of the horse and carriage. President Grant was himself an ardent horseman and loved both saddle and harness. One of his favorite drives was this very road we are dedicating today. Then a gravel driveway, it was a popular route for the men who like fast driving and a chance to let their horses out. This gave the road the name Speedway which clung to it for many decades and is still familiar to many Washingtonians of the present generation who probably do not know that the Speedway got its name from fast horses—not from speeding motorcars.

We will always recall another Ohio President, Rutherford B. Hayes—who invited the children of Washington to come into the President's park—the White House grounds—on Easter Monday—to roll their Easter eggs and frolic on the greensward of the Executive Mansion. The practice has become a Washington institution, and each Easter Monday thousands of eager Washington children carry their gaily decorated baskets of eggs to the President's house for this colorful outing on the White House lawn.

The present elegance of the National Capital parks is due largely to the foresight of another Ohioan, President William McKinley, who created the famous Commission of 1901, to restudy the L'Enfant plan and extend it to provide for the Capital City which had outgrown the dreams of its founders. All of the parks and recreational facilites of the Capital city which have been developed in the last half century are the result of the work of this commission and are a tribute to the farsightedness of the martyred President.

It was William Howard Taft, of Ohio, who created the Commission of Fine Arts, which safeguards the beauty and architectural standards of the National Capital. Mrs. Taft was instrumental in obtaining Washington's famous Japanese cherry trees and planted the first tree on the shore of the Tidal Basin. An Ohio sculptor, John Q. A. Ward, gave Washington its statue of another Ohio martyr President, James A. Garfield—and the magnificent equestrian statue of Gen. George Thomas.

Tour the National Capital, and you will be reminded daily of the contribution that Ohio has made to the greatness of the Nation and the Nation's Capital—McPherson and Sherman Squares and Sheridan Circle with their heroic statues are tokens of the Nation's gratitude for these gallant Ohioans who helped to preserve the Union. A monument marks the spot where men of the One Hundred and Fiftieth Ohio National Guard fell in defense of the National Capital during Jubal Early's raid on the Federal city on July 11 and 12, 1864. A city park commemorates the name of the Ohio man who was the tower of strength behind Abraham Lincoln during the dark days of rebellion—his Secretary of War, Edwin S. Stanton.

So I am happy today to be able to do something that will show the appreciation of the National Capital for Ohio, and for her noble sons who have done so much for the Federal city. As Secretary of the Interior, I am charged with the exclusive direction and control of the National Capital park system. Acting within this authority, I hereby direct that this beautiful park drive which skirts the historic Potomac from stately Constitution Avenue past the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials to Hains Point at the confluence of the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers henceforth shall be known as Ohio Drive.

And now, Governor Lausche, it is my pleasant duty to appear here in a dual role today. The President has asked me to represent him in his capacity as ex officio chairman of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission in the presentation of a beautiful scroll to the State of Ohio.

The theme of this one hundred and fiftieth birthday celebration of our Nation's Capital is "Progress Through Freedom." That is the slogan, and the purpose is to spotlight contributions made by States, Territories, industries, and individuals under the Government of a free people. Today, of course, we pay tribute to the grand old Buckeye State.

Ohio has made impressive contributions to our Nation. In a very practical way, its industries, through research as well as through phenomenal production, have contributed much toward prosperity in time of peace and toward victory in time of war.

Indeed, it is an honor to salute the State of Ohio, not only because this beautiful drive is being dedicated as Ohio Drive today, but also because through all the years of its history Ohio has cherished and defended the

traditions upon which our Nation was founded. Governor Lausche, on behalf of the President of the United States, I present this scroll to you, and to all the people of Ohio, as evidence of our appreciation of your contribution to "progress through freedom" in the past and our confidence in your continued active support of the ideals and principles which have made the United States of America a shining beacon light to all the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

Gov. Frank Lausche accepted the New Ohio Drive in a very appropriate speech. The Governor's speech was extemporaneous and I regret that I am unable to have it printed with my remarks.

Many persons and groups cooperated loyally to make this dedication a great success. Among the groups were the Ohio Society, whose president at this time is Hon. JOHN MCSWEENEY. The Ohio Girls Club with a membership of nearly 300 also rendered very efficient service. The executive officials of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission rendered able and competent assistance. The same can be said of the executives in the Department of Interior who have control over the National Capital Parks. Mr. Speaker, the people of Ohio have most enthusiastically approved our selection of this picturesque drive to carry the illustrious name of Ohio. Ohio is an Indian word meaning "beautiful river." As the word Ohio is a fitting name for the most beautiful river in America, and is a fitting name for that great State which was the first State carved from the Northwest Territory, and which now ranks high among the Nation's great States, so is the name Ohio a fitting name to be given to the most beautiful drive in America.

The song Beautiful Ohio has become one of our most popular songs. It is generally considered as our State song. I think the music gives the song much of its popularity but the words are also very expressive. The words are as follows:

BEAUTIFUL OHIO

Long, long ago,
Some one I know,
Had a little red canoe
In it room for only two
Love found its start,
Then in my heart,
And like a flower it grew
Drifting with the current down a moonlit stream,
While above the Heavens in their glory gleam,
And the stars on high
Twinkle in the sky,
Seeming in a Paradise of love divine,
Dreaming of a pair of eyes that looked in mine.
Beautiful Ohio in dreams again I see
Visions of what used to be
Drifting with the current down a moonlit stream,
While above the Heavens in their glory gleam,
And the stars on high
Twinkle in the sky,
Seeming in a Paradise of love divine,
Dreaming of a pair of eyes that looked in mine.
Beautiful Ohio, in dreams again I see,
Visions of what used to be,
Visions of what used to be, to be.

Mr. Speaker, the national press gave complete coverage to practically every feature of the celebration. The Ohio papers, almost unanimously expressed the appreciation of the people of Ohio. The editorial comment was summarized briefly by the editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer in the following short editorial:

JENKINS' VICTORY

May we suggest three cheers and a tiger for Congressman THOMAS A. JENKINS, Republican, Ohio, who has won his one-man fight to name a street in the Nation's Capital after the Buckeye State.

Appropriately, he will preside over an Ohio Honor Day celebration July 9 at which, according to the Associated Press, a scenic parkway extending from near the Lincoln Memorial to Fourteenth Street will be designated "Ohio Drive," It was formerly known as Potomac Drive.

Congressman JENKINS is not the only Ohioan who resented the fact that the great State of Ohio has been the only State in the Union which did not have a street in Washington named in its honor, but he was the only one who did anything about it. Scorning less important streets as unworthy of the name, Congressman JENKINS held out until he got what he wanted.

Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman will make the speech of designation and Gov. Frank J. Lausche will make the acceptance speech. But to those who know the story it will be a one-man show, and the hero will be Congressman JENKINS, who at long last has vindicated the honor of Ohio.

The Columbus Dispatch, which is central Ohio's greatest home daily, carried the following editorial:

OHIO DRIVE

Because of a tenacious 10-year fight on the part of Ohio's Representative THOMAS A. JENKINS, the State of Ohio at long last has received the recognition of having an avenue in the Nation's Capital City named for it.

Ohio's particular avenue is called Ohio Drive. It is a winding and pleasant way which begins near the Lincoln Memorial, winds through the park next to the Potomac River, and eventually reaches and circles Hains Point.

Until Sunday, when Ohio Drive was officially dedicated, every State in the Union save Ohio was so recognized in Washington. Congressman JENKINS' contention that his State should be similarly noted would therefore have seemed to be reasonable and deserving of a prompt and favorable answer. But instead it took him a decade to get the name of the Buckeye State on a Capital street, notwithstanding the primary position of Ohio in the Union.

It is, of course, only right and appropriate that Ohio Drive should exist. It is difficult to understand why its omission was allowed to stand so long. But it is gratifying to know that this recognition has come, thanks to the tireless efforts of Mr. JENKINS.

Mr. Speaker, I have gone to some length to collate the high points in this important event for I think that from the wide interest manifested in the dedication of Ohio Drive, future generations will be interested in the story.

Trade With Communist Countries Must Stop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, I have many times called attention to the fact that huge importations of glass and pottery are rapidly destroying these two industries here in the United States.

I have introduced a resolution to stop such imports from Communist-controlled countries. I have requested a hearing by the Ways and Means Committee and I sincerely hope this hearing will be granted.

The situation has been presented very well in an editorial in the Daily Jeffersonian, Cambridge, Ohio, on July 14, 1950. I hope every Member of Congress will read this editorial:

TRADE WITH CZECHOSLOVAKIA HURTS LOCAL EUSINESS

Cambridge and southeastern Ohio are among those sections that freely voice their opposition to the importation of manufactured goods from certain foreign countries under very favorable tariff terms. It is particularly irksome to learn that some of these goods are being shipped here from Communist-controlled countries which, operating under low-wage scales, are able to land on our shores such items as blown glass that can be sold for less than what it would cost our local glass concern to produce.

Much criticism is aimed at the State Department for permitting Czechoslovakia, with which this ccuntry has been in a cold war since the Czechs came under Russia's domination, to dump goods into the United States. It has been predicted that if this situation is allowed to continue for any length of time our firms engaged in producing high quality glassware, such as is made by the Cambridge Glass Co., would be forced to suspend operations indefinitely.

Herman A. Lowe, writing in the Philadelphia Inquirer, pointed out that in allowing Czechoslovakia to ship its commodities into this country we are neglecting the economic front in our cold war with the Communists.

"People were impressed with how the State Department took no nonsense from these Russian satellites," writes Mr. Lowe in regard to the cold war between the United States and Czechoslovakia. "It was hopeful indication," he continued, "that maybe our striped-pants corps was not going to let itself be pushed around too much.

"Sounds good, huh?

"Well, here's the other half of the story.

"All the time the Czechs are kicking our people out of their country and while we appear to be talking back real fearless, we are allowing them to dump a flood of their goods into the United States under the most favorable tariff terms we extend to anybody.

"Not only Czech china and glassware, but also such things as shoes and hats are beginning to cut into American production of the items and to result in lay-offs in this country.

"Our manufacturers do sell to Czechoslovakia. However, while the Czechs may pour almost any commodity they wish into the United States we do not have the same freedom of export. In the iron curtain countries foreign trade is nationalized.

"Of course, the story has been told that we trade with the Russians and their satellites because we must obtain strategic raw materials for our national defense stockpile. That was partly true a few years ago. But today they are giving us almost no strategic materials.

"Here are some of the strategic goods the Czechs are sending us:

"Motion-picture films, dental burrs, metallic cartridges, motorcycles and parts, machinery parts, sewing machines, light fixtures, brooches, rosaries, gold-plated brass items, table knives with shell handles, upholstery nails, china dishes and ornaments, blown glass, glass chandeliers, glass bottles, plain glass, glass jars, baskets, wood furniture, artificial flowers, rayon fabrics and laces, woolen rugs, woolen apparel, hats, caps, woven worsteds, cotton fabrics, towels, rags,

burlap, handkerchiefs, gloves, cordials, brandies, rubber balls, etc."

This whole business is repugnant to Cambridge folks and, we believe, to others in this country. It is time the State Department puts a stop to this good thing for Czechoslovakia or any other Russian satellite.

Congress Now Has Before It the Most Complete Report Ever Assembled of the Information Provided Under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946; More Lobbyists Reported for the First Quarter of 1950 Than for Any Other Period; Reports Are More Candid and Complete

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, July 14, which was placed before Members of Congress this morning, contains the most complete compilation ever assembled of the information filed with Congress in any calendar quarter under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946.

Most of the material contained in that compilation for the first calendar quarter of 1950 was made public for the first time in the July 14 RECORD. It is highly useful and important information.

For the first time since the act has been in effect, virtually everything filed under it with either the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate has been included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD compilation. Included in this material is the financial data filed by lobbying organizations which, until this year, had never been published in this manner. It is in this material that we find the real "meat" of the informational requirements of the lobbying statute.

This has, of course, contributed to the unusual bulk of the report for the first calendar quarter, running to some 177 pages of the RECORD. But it has also contributed immeasurably to the usefulness of the material printed. I have suggested to the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, Senator HAYDEN, a method of cutting down substantially the size of future compilations, but we cannot cut it back to its previous size without sacrificing this organizational data, and I do not think the Congress will want to do that.

MORE REPORTS THIS TIME THAN EVER; MORE INFORMATION THAN EVER IN THEM

In addition to containing for the first time the financial statements of the lobbying organizations which had never been printed for the information of Congress before this, the compilation for the first calendar quarter of 1950 is noteworthy for these reasons:

First. It contains reports from 333 lobbying organizations, which is more than were ever filed for any previous quarter. The highest previous number was 291, for the second quarter of 1949.

Second. It contains 961 quarterly reports from paid lobbyists or legislative agents, also more than were filed for any previous quarter in the history of the act. The highest previous number was 875, also for the second quarter of 1949.

Third. Both the organizational and individual lobbying reports filed this time are more complete and more candid—give infinitely more information, generally speaking—than those filed for any quarter before this.

OUTSTANDING COMPLIANCE RECORD A RESULT OF THE WORK OF THE HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

The outstanding compliance record we have achieved for the first quarter of 1950 is, in my opinion, largely a result of two things:

First, the establishment by the House of Representatives, House Resolution 298, of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, of which I am greatly honored to serve as chairman, and the resulting work of that committee in hearings and in extensive unpublicized research into the operation of the Lobbying Act, and the reporting thereunder; and

Secondly, the adoption by the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate, at the recommendation of our committee, of a new type of reporting form which replaced five different forms previously in use and which, for the first time, spelled out in specific and clear detail the sort of information to be filed by individuals and groups under the act and the uniform manner in which it was to be reported.

Speaking not only for myself but for the full membership of that committee, Representatives LANHAM, of Georgia; ALBERT, of Oklahoma; DOYLE, of California; HALLECK, of Indiana; BROWN of Ohio; and O'HARA of Minnesota, I am sure that we are extremely gratified by the results we have achieved in this important area of uniform reporting and meaningful reporting.

A GUIDE TO THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE JULY 14 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD COMPILATION

The mere bulk of the compilation of July 14 may discourage some members from seeking to make use of it. Because of that possibility, I would like, Mr. Speaker, to set up a few guides here so that the material, which can be of incalculable value and usefulness to every Member of Congress, to the committees of Congress, and to the general public, can be more readily understood.

REPORTS UNDER BOTH OLD AND NEW FORMS ARE INCLUDED

The compilation in the July 14 RECORD is divided into 4 sections: the registrations made on the old Form B; the quarterly financial statements filed on the old Form C; the subsequent registrations on the new form; and the quarterly financial reports on the new form. The previous Forms B and C are reproduced on page 10336 of the RECORD; the new form when used as a registration form appears on page 10355, and when used as a quarterly report form it appears on page 10361.

The reason for this use of both old and new forms in this compilation is that the new form—the combination registration and reporting form now in effect—was adopted by the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate late in March, following extended discussions and conferences in which members of our committee participated. But by the time it was officially adopted, some lobbyists and lobbying organizations, having in their possession copies of the old forms, had already filled them out and filed them.

I wrote to every registered individual and every organization which had previously filed at one time or another, calling their attention to the new form and suggesting they file under it. It will be noted that most of them, in conformance with my suggestion, held up their reports until they received the new forms.

REGISTRATION

The breakdown we have made of the first-quarter reports shows that most individuals or organizations registering for the first time under the act during the first calendar quarter had already filed their registrations on the old form before the new one was adopted.

The breakdown on that is:

Registrations on old Form B	121
Registrations on new form	86
Total for the quarter	207

QUARTERLY REPORTS

A total of 237 quarterly financial reports on the old Form C were filed during the quarter, including 222 by individuals and 15 by pressure groups or organizations; while only 43 quarterly financial reports under section 305—organizational—had been received on the old Form A.

On the other hand, 739 individuals and 275 organizations filed their quarterly reports on the new form, a total of 1,014.

Pages 10179 to 10186, inclusive, are devoted to the registration statements under the old Form B; pages 10186 to 10198 to the quarterly financial reports on the old Form C; pages 10198 to 10203, inclusive, to registrations on the new form; and pages 10204 to 10355, inclusive, to the quarterly reports submitted on the new form by both individuals and organizations—including the sort of material which heretofore had never been printed in the RECORD.

COMPARING THE INFORMATION SUPPLIED ON THE OLD FORM C TO THAT NOW PROVIDED ON THE NEW FORM WILL SHOW A TREMENDOUS DIFFERENCE IN THE DEGREE OF DISCLOSURE OF FACTS

Mr. Speaker, throughout the hearings which have been conducted by the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, we have heard from innumerable witnesses and experts how difficult it was for registrants to know just what to file under the old forms. This was not the fault of the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate. They were handed a law which called upon them to receive certain information and to set up a system for administering this law. The law itself was passed without any public hearings and with very little floor discussion. There was contradictory information provided in the House and Sen-

ate debates as to just what the law required.

The two officials thereupon sat down and drew up forms to bring out the information the Congress said should be reported. Because of the contradictory debates and the absence of any clear-cut procedure they were to follow, they took the verbatim clauses out of the Lobbying Statute and listed them in the form of questions to be answered by reporting individuals and groups.

The resulting reporting was erratic, to say the least. Some lobbyists and lobbying groups gave rather complete reports. Others took literally the actual wording of the questions and volunteered nothing. Others simply filled out their names and addresses and then wrote "None" "None" "None" after each question. Or: "Not applicable"; or "No activity," or something of that nature.

Neither the Clerk of the House nor the Secretary of the Senate felt it was up to them to "police" these returns or to send them back for better compliance. They filed them. They compiled the Form B and Form C reports for quarterly insertion in the RECORD. There, those of us who were interested in trying to gain from them some idea of the facts about lobbyists, were often disappointed by the meager reports.

It soon became a common dodge for many lobbyists to conceal their financial information by appending it to attached "riders" which they knew would not be printed in the RECORD.

The new single form now in use ends all of those devices for avoiding disclosure. It makes crystal clear the kind of information wanted; it provides a definite line or position or box for the supplying of that information in each case.

WHAT THE MATERIAL SHOWS

In the case of registered, paid lobbyists, the reports now being filed require the disclosure of salary and expenses, the bills or resolutions on which they are seeking to influence legislative action by the Congress, the loans or other financial transactions in which they engage in connection with their work; the publications they are responsible for getting out; the nature of their business or work, and so on. We now recognize from their reports which are lawyers representing clients, which are public relations men or public relations firms, which are corporation executives or trade association or union officials, and so on.

From the organizational reports, printed now for the first time in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we can see what their receipts and expenditures are, from whom they receive contributions or payments or loans of $500 or more, what legislative objectives they follow, and a variety of other informative data vital to an understanding of their place in the lobbying picture, including amounts spent for salaries, advertisements, public relations, booklets, gifts to other groups, and so forth.

EXPENDITURES LISTINGS WILL BE CURTAILED IN FUTURE

In this one compilation, and only for this one time as I understand it, the RECORD contains, for the organizations reporting under the act, the full information they have provided on the new form of all expenditures of $10 or more, as required under section 305 of the act.

This category of information takes up quite a bit of the space in the 177-page section, particular for some of the large lobbying groups like the American Medical Association, the American Legion, some of the unions, and so on.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, none of the information provided on the old Form A had previously been printed in the RECORD. Most Members of Congress had never seen any of these reports. When we took up some of them in our committee hearings and in executive sessions, even some of the members of our committee were surprised to find the intimate and important financial information they provided.

For this one time, then, the RECORD contains all the information they have filed on the new form. This should give a valuable insight to the Members of Congress and to the committee staffs on what sort of information they can find on file on these organizations in the office of the Clerk of the House, dating back to the start of the act in 1946.

I have suggested to the chairman, Senator HAYDEN, of the Joint Committee on Printing that in future compilations this detailed itemization of all expenditures of $10 or more (in some cases, all expenditures are included regardless of amount) should be curtailed and in some cases eliminated for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That will reduce the size of the compilation substantially, while still retaining the items of most importance.

EVERY MEMBER OF CONGRESS SHOULD RETAIN THE JULY 14 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD FOR READY REFERENCE ON ACTIVE REGISTERED LOBBYISTS AND ORGANIZATIONS

The July 14 RECORD is a very valuable reference document, Mr. Speaker, and should be kept handy by every Member of Congress for ready reference both in his own office and for committee work. In it can be found the essential data on the pressure groups which are continually urging the committees of Congress to act in one direction or another on vital legislation. In it can be found the essential facts on the role of the individual lobbyist seeking to influence our votes.

Even when superseded by later compilations, the July 14 listings will remain unique because of its inclusion of detailed information on expenditures by the pressure groups.

In this copy of the RECORD, for the first time, we have before us the complete facts as they have been reported to Congress by the organizations and individuals which are often said to constitute the "Third House" of Congress, who are single-minded and untiring advocates of legislative action along the lines that they support, who are unrelenting foes of bills they oppose. They serve, as I have often said, a very useful function in a democracy, and most of them are highly respectable, useful, upright citizens.

The House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities has always proceeded on the theory that we desire to see lobbying continue unrestricted in any fashion except in the one manner prescribed by the statute, and that is full disclosure of "principal and interest"—who they work for and how much they are paid. That is all the law requires.

I am highly pleased by the results this compilation of July 14 shows. We have achieved some progress in our work so far. This has been as a result of a reasonable, and cooperative, rather than belligerent committee approach. We have received the full cooperation, in turn, of the responsible and straightforward registrants under the Lobbying Act who have been most anxious to help us in clarifying the operation of this important statute which affects them so directly.

Our troubles—and we have had some—have been only with those few groups which believe they can succeed in their legislative goals only if they mask their supporters in anonymity and act through false fronts. Anyone spending large sums of money admittedly for the purpose of seeking to influence legislative action by the Congress of the United States should have no hesitation about the Congress knowing of his identity and his interest, unless, of course he is ashamed of the cause he advocates.

Keys to Soviet Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include parts of a chapter entitled "Soviet Foreign Policy," from a recent book by Robert Strausz-Hupé and Stefan T. Possony, International Relations in the Age of the Conflict Between Democracy and Dictatorship. This excellent work is a textbook which at present is being adopted by many universities and colleges all over the country. It is the most comprehensive analysis of international relations now available and in its hard-hitting realistic discussion of the dangers confronting the United States provides our students with a far better political education than previous textbooks. To my knowledge, this book is the only one on the market which proves that the Soviets do not rely exclusively or even primarily on expansion through cold-war methods but believe in, and prepare for, revolutionary war as the continuation of revolution and as the main road to world communism. The attack on Korea certainly bears out the analysis of the two distinguished authors.

SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY

(By Robert Strausz-Hupé and Stefan T. Possony)

Since the termination of the Second World War, the political fate of the world, and certainly the peace of the world, have been dependent on the foreign policy of the Soviet

Union. The decision as to whether there is to be a third world war lies predominantly in the hands of the Russian Government. Soviet intentions are the crucial factor in contemporary international relations. What are these intentions?

In the Communist Manifesto, Marx and Engels wrote that the Communists disdain to hide their intentions. In effect, the Communists have been very outspoken about their intentions and objectives. There can be very little doubt in the mind of readers of Lenin, Stalin, and Zhdanov that the ultimate strategic goal of the Bolsheviki is the establishment of a Communist regime all over the world. Nor can there be any doubt in the mind of any student of the Soviet leaders' lives that all of them take their Communist creed very seriously indeed. They have made heavy personal sacrifices in the service of their ideology; have braved poverty, exile, and torture, often risking their own lives; and during the more than 30 years of their rule, have sacrificed the lives of many millions of human beings, both Russian and non-Russian. Frivolity is not a characteristic of the Russian followers of Karl Marx. There is not a shred of evidence suggesting that the Soviet rulers have weakened in their belief in communism, or that they have abandoned the goal of Communist triumph all over the world. Nor is there any evidence indicating that the aggressive propagation of the Communist system is no longer the primary objective of their political behavior.

It is quite obvious, however, that the establishment of the Communist imperium cannot be the only motive of the Soviet leaders. There never has been a strategy which is determined only by its ultimate and possibly remote objective. Every successful strategy must steadfastly hold to one overall objective, as an indispensable guide to the separate actions of many people dispersed in space and time. In military parlance, this is known as the principle of the "singleness of purpose." But in addition to this basic principle, which is first in the hierarchy of the rules of political-military action, there are the principles of security of base, adequacy of means, economy of force, offensive action, and many others.

While shortly after their accession to power many doctrinaire Communists were quite unaware of any strategic principle other than singleness of purposes, they have now learned their lesson. In the process of learning that lesson, the names of the ideologists, the Trotskys, Bukharins, and Zinovievs, were stricken from the rolls, and only the master strategists remain. Lenin and Stalin, evidently, were accomplished strategists from the start.

In reading the following discussion of Soviet foreign policy, the reader is cautioned against value judgments and against an interpretation of Soviet acts on the basis of a western morality which is extraneous to Soviet thinking. Russian policy must be judged on the basis of Communist morality, with which it is fully consistent. It must also be judged on the basis of its successes and the singleness of purpose with which these successes were achieved. This chapter does not propose to praise or to condemn Soviet policy but to explain its true motives and considerations. The discussion is based on the fairly self-evident premise that the Soviets are what they say they are; namely, Marxian Communists, and not what some American observers, for reasons that were never clarified, hope they are; namely, a variant of peace-loving Jeffersonian Democrats. While some of the Soviet procedures may be shocking to American readers, it should always be borne in mind that the Soviets have a different set of values; for Communists, Soviet procedures are not shocking at all. A Communist judges according to effectiveness or ineffectiveness. Soviet practices are, on the whole, nothing but Machiavellism, applied with modern methods.

SECURITY OF BASE

Security of base, that is, the safety of the Soviet Union against external attack, is clearly one of the leading motives of Soviet policy. This was the important principle which the enthusiastic majority of the Communist Party ignored when in 1918, against the advice of Lenin, it proposed to continue the war against Germany and to reject the Brest Litovsk Peace Treaty. Upon Soviet refusal to accept the German conditions, the German Army resumed its advance. The Russian Army, demoralized by Communist antiwar propaganda, put up hardly a semblance of resistance. It became quickly clear that all of Soviet territory would soon be in German hands and that both Soviet government and Communist experiment would come to an end. Accordingly, the Soviets submitted to Germany's will, preserved their large, though mutilated territory, and lived to see another day.

In 1918 Soviet Russia came to be considered officially as the base from which the Communist faith would have to gain the world. From that time onward the Russian Army became the master weapon of world revolution, to which insurrectionist forces abroad were subordinated. The Soviets reasoned that loss of Russia would sound the death knell of world communism. Since security of base is the first principle in any strategy, the defense of the Soviet Union became the primary and immediate concern of the Soviet government. This was not in contradiction to their essential and ultimate goal. Quite to the contrary, the successful defense of the Soviet Union and the maintenance of Russian armed forces are the major prerequisites of ultimate world conquest.

Ever since foreign Communist Parties lost their last vestiges of independence from Moscow—somewhere at the beginnning of Stalin's ascendancy in 1928—one principle, and one principle alone, has guided the policies of nations and groups which accepted Russia's spiritual overlordship. It is that the defense of the Soviet Union by the exact methods laid down by the Soviet Union is the sole reason for the existence abroad of a Communist Party and of an individual member. When in 1939 Dimitrov, the former head of the Comintern and later Premier of the Communist government of Bulgaria, called upon all Communists everywhere to defend and support the Nazi-Soviet pact, he said:

"The historical dividing line between the forces of fascism, war, and capitalism on the one hand and the forces of peace, democracy, and socialism on the other hand is in fact becoming * * * not the formal attitude toward Soviet power and socialism in general, but the attitude to the Soviet Union which has been carrying on a real fight for existence during the last 20 years."

ADEQUACY OF MEANS

Adequacy of means was the second principle which Soviet leadership was to assimilate in the hard school of practical politics. When, in 1919, the Communists effected successful revolutions in Hungary and Bavaria, the Soviet Government was not able to come to their help, while in 1920, when the Red army had been defeated before Warsaw, Russia lay wide open to invasion. The Soviets had the greatest difficulty in repelling the small detachments of western troops who fought a desultory war of intervention. When later Communist uprisings in Germany and China were suppressed, the Soviets were powerless to help their allies. If in the early twenties the capitalist nations had launched a united and determined attack, the Soviet Union could not have offered effective resistance. The dangers inherent in that weakness were recognized, and the Soviet Union embarked on a gigantic program of industrialization and rearmament—the series of the 5-year plans. Stalin's entire foreign policy could be summarized by saying that, while maintaining strict allegiance to the ultimate objective, he recognized the imperative need not only for a secure base but also for military strength equal or superior to that of the enemies of communism. Stalin's basic doctrine evokes the analogy of the cross and the sword. Just as, according to medieval theories, the papacy needed the sword of the emperor, so Communist ideology must, if it is ever to succeed, rely on the military strength of a powerful country and army.

It follows that the strength of communism is the strength of Russia through communism, based on a strong Russia, can (and does) draw additional strength from sources beyond the Russian borders. Since, however, the military strength of Russia does not depend on the members of the Communist Party alone but on the Russian people as a whole, it follows, too, that the Soviets cannot safely antagonize the innate patriotism of the Russian nation. On the contrary, by playing up to patriotic sentiments and stimulating the basic and instinctive urge to defend one's own fatherland, the primordial force of nationalism can be enlisted in the service of the Communist cause. Patriotism and chauvinism are thus seen to be, as it were, the wheel horses of present-day Soviet strategy.

The return of Soviet communism to a strong nationalist policy led many observers to believe that Soviet foreign policy is, in this respect, a continuation of the old czarist policy. So it is: Both the Romanov Czars and the Communist rulers followed a policy of making Russia militarily powerful. Accordingly, they pursued somewhat similar intermediate objectives. But here the similarity ends. True, the enemies of Czarist Russia, beginning with the authors of the spurious Testament of Peter the Great, have imputed to the Czars the design of subjugating Europe. Indeed, at times, the Czars launched Russia upon ventures of truly global scope. They attempted, for example, to obtain and sometimes actually did obtain control over strategic areas of the Mediterranean Africa, China, and North America. During the last 50 years of czarist rule, however, their ambitions were more or less limited to the Balkans, the Turkish Straits, the Persian Gulf, and Manchuria.

These territorial ambitions were largely nourished by the desire to secure an ice-free oceanic port—a motive which, measured by the standards of imperialism, appears modest. Part of the czarist Balkan policy was motivated by pan-Slavism which the Communists also use as one of the weapons in their propaganda arsenal—and which, incidentally, they wield far more expertly and boldly than the Czars, although this tactic entails the notorious risk of the boomerang.

Yet whatever their motives, the Czars showed moderation in their foreign policy and were always ready to accept compromise solutions, such as the Berlin Conference in 1878 and the Anglo-Russian Agreement over the Middle East (Persia, Afghanistan, and Tibet) in 1907. Moreover, when the Czars incorporated territory, they did not change the social organization of its inhabitants; they left society as it was and did not introduce an alien and utopian political philosophy. NOTE.—The Soviet Government itself recognized that conquest by Soviet troops may entail changes in the social organization. For example, on April 2, 1944, Molotov made a "Statement by the Soviet Government in Connection With the Entry of Red Army Units Into Rumanian Territory," in which we read: "The Soviet Government states that it is not pursuing the aim of acquiring any part of Rumanian territory, or of changing the existing social order of Rumania, and

that the entry of Soviet troops into Rumania is dictated exclusively by military necessity and by the continuing resistance of the enemy troops." (Quoted from Soviet Foreign Policy During the Patriotic War: Documents and Materials, vol. II, January 1-December 31, 1944, translated by Andrew Rothstein, London, Hutchinson, no year, p. 66.) It may have been true that the entry of Soviet troops was dictated by military necessity but, once in Rumania, the behavior of the Soviets was no longer dictated by military considerations alone or, at least, the term "military necessity" was interpreted very liberally. Molotov himself admitted to Mr. Byrnes that Vishinsky "helped in the formation of the government" and added that the Soviet Government had acted because "there was very serious danger of disorder and civil war" (James Byrnes, Speaking Frankly, New York, Harper, 1947, p. 52). Hence the social order was changed for reasons of military necessity. In Hungary, the social order was changed because a "conspiracy" threatened the Red Army and the new "democratic" regime (see Ferenc Nagy, The Struggle Behind the Iron Curtain, New York, Macmillan, 1948, passim and pp. 311 ff.) In the case of Bulgaria, a military necessity was created by declaring war on the small nation without sufficient reason. The spurious arguments which led to this step are given in Soviet Foreign Policy During the Patriotic War (pp. 111 ff.) Whatever the reasons used in any particular case, occupation by the Soviet army leads always and everywhere to a fundamental change in social organization. Wherever the Soviet army goes, it installs communism, although sometimes in a piecemeal fashion.

The Soviets did not in fact disown the Czar's foreign policy; after a passing period in which they liberated the people who had been "enslaved" by czarism, they resumed the old annexationist policy lock, stock, and barrel. Today they covet the same territorial prizes which lured their imperial predecessors. But they have added a great deal to that policy and greatly enlarged upon traditional ambition. Above all, they pressed the historic drives of Russian policy into the service of a far vaster design, the transformation of other nation's societies—a purpose utterly lacking in the foreign policy of the Czars.

INEVITABILITY OF CONFLICT

There is another and very important difference between czarist and Soviet policy. The Soviets reject as a matter of doctrine the possibility that the Communist and capitalist societies can coexist permanently in peace. They believe, instead, in the inevitability of an ultimate conflict, which will be the Goetterdaemmerung of the bourgeois. That belief follows logically from Marxist doctrine in general and the doctrine of the class struggle in particular, and from the contingent theory which argues that war is one of the chief conditions of revolution.

It is true that Stalin has made a few statements which hold out some hope that he admits the possibility of a peaceful coexistence of capitalism and communism, but these statements are hardly compatible with the bulk of Leninist-Stalinist theories. They mean that it is up to the capitalists to find a modus vivendi. To put it mildly, Stalin as a Marxist cannot be convinced that the capitalists are willing to do this and he clearly fears that one day the capitalist nations will no longer tolerate the further existence of a Communist state. During the Second World War, the United States Government made systematic efforts to dispel that fear, but in vain: as a good Marxist Stalin may be able to believe in the good intentions of individual capitalists, but he will never believe that the capitalists as a class can possibly forego class warfare. Regardless of whether this is or is not sheer moonshine to non-Communists, class warfare—both in one country and between proletarian and bourgeois nations—is to a Communist the most real of all political realities.

It must be admitted that a conflict with Russia, whether along class lines or not, is indeed probable as long as the Communists have not forsaken their intention of overthrowing capitalism and democratic governments and continue to plan the establishment of communism in presently non-Communist nations.

The foreign policy of czarist governments was guided by the thought that, save for an occasional war with neighboring countries, Russia and the other powers could coexist peacefully. Soviet foreign policy does not deny the possibility of a temporary nonbelligerent coexistence with capitalist nations, but it is geared to the probability, if not certainty, of a major war at some future time, in which capitalism will be destroyed. For Communists, peace in the period of capitalism, and especially during the last phases of capitalism, is a dream and an illusion. There is no peace, only interludes between shooting wars. In fact, peace is a tactical maneuver within the permanent and incessant social war.

Of course, there are many additional factors which determine Soviet foreign policy. These comprise such considerations as the general condition of Soviet economy, domestic levels of production; the quality of the domestic output; the size of the food supply; the rate of reconstruction of war-damaged areas; and the performance of key industries, i. e., those producing the most modern and effective weapons. The most important economic question is: How large is the Soviet war potential in relation to the war potential of other nations? And the answer to this question, in turn, bears upon the timing of Soviet policy.

DOCTRINE AND DIPLOMACY

Soviet foreign policy is motivated by the will to introduce communism or, more accurately, the Soviet system in all countries of the world. This motive controls the behavior of all Communists, including the makers of Soviet foreign policy. The ultimate objective is to be reached step by step through the creation and exploitation of tactical opportunities. The timing as well as the strategy and tactics of specific campaigns and historical periods are determined according to circumstances, such as relative military and economic strength, public support, and personal equations.

What ought Soviet diplomacy and foreign policy to be according to official doctrine? Fortunately the Soviets have revealed forthrightly what role they assign to diplomacy in their political endeavors. No less a person than Eugene Tarlé, foremost Russian historian, member of the Academy of Sciences, and coauthor of the official History of Diplomacy, edited under the chairmanship of Vladimir Potiemkine, former Soviet Deputy Foreign Commissar, has taken the trouble to define the mission of Soviet diplomacy. Writing in the History of Diplomacy, Tarlé pointed out that Friedrich Engels called the attention of those "who fight in the political arena" to the need of studying military science: military science, or the art of war, plays "a capital role in the fight for a better future of humanity." (The Communists have always despised pacificism.) However, studies in military matters are not enough, says Tarlé. It is equally important to study the art of diplomacy. The fighter for that better future of humanity must know thoroughly "the tactics and the ruses employed by the adversary on the battlefield as well as in diplomatic controversies." The adversary is, of course, the bourgeoisie. And Tarlé goes on to describe the tactics of "bourgeois diplomacy."

Summarizing his findings, the Russian historian states that bourgeois diplomacy virtually always follows the dictum of the celebrated Swedish Chancelor Oxenstierna: "Simulantur quae non sunt, quae sunt vero dissimulantur" (Make things appear dissimilar which are in reality similar). According to Oxenstierna, the diplomat has two devices at his disposal: simulation and dissimulation. And those devices, Tarlé insists, still serve the bourgeois diplomat, but apparently not the Soviet statesman.

According to Tarlé the standard tricks of bourgeois diplomacy are as follows (NOTE.—The tactics outlined by Machiavelli and Oxenstierna were, in fact, officially espoused by Lenin in his Left-Wing Communism an Infantile Disorder: An Experiment (Popular Talk on Marxian Strategy and Tactics), written in 1920, Moscow, Cooperative Publishing Society of Foreign Workers in the U. S. S. R., 1935. Lenin stresses that the Communists must be masters of all methods of warfare and politics (p. 95) and flexibility (p. 101). The book was written in order to show how democratic parliaments and elections can be used, or rather abused, in a revolutionary manner, in a Communist manner (p. 62):

"Aggression is hidden behind the pretext of defense; aggression can be camouflaged by allegedly disinterested motives; pacifist propaganda is used to deceive the opponent and to lull him into a feeling of false security; treaties of friendship are concluded in order to put vigilance to sleep; conflicts are localized to make possible the destruction of countries by successive aggression (otherwise known as the artichoke strategy); internal dissensions in the opponent's country are utilized to facilitate aggression; national disputes and contradictory interests among the opponents are exploited; aggression is prepared by demagogic appeals for a fight against imperialism; and the protection of weak states is used as an excuse for their occupation. Other standard tactical means are: threats, terror, lies, and blackmail (pressure). If Tarlé were to be believed, bourgeois diplomacy never uses other methods."

It is beside the point whether or not this is an accurate description of bourgeois diplomacy. It is true, to be sure, that such practices were used time and again and by all countries, including the Soviet Union. However, such diplomacy was, on the whole, characteristic of nazism and fascism. Many people would assert that such diplomacy is much more characteristic of Messrs. Chicherin, Litvinov, Molotov, and Vishinsky, than, for example, of Messrs. Hughes, Stimson, Hull, and Byrnes. Yet Tarlé has supplied the official Soviet interpretation of the diplomacy of such countries as the United States and Great Britain. This interpretation has been, and in all likelihood still is, the guide of Soviet diplomats. It is essential to understand that this Marxist interpretation of bourgeois diplomacy has been arrived at on the basis of a priori assumptions which cannot be refuted by factual rebuttal. (NOTE.—The entire line of thought was aptly summarized by Bakunin, who was a great expert in the matter: "The Russian peasant would think that he is slipping if he does not deceive when he has a chance to do so" (quoted from Henri Rollin, La Révolution russe—ses origines—ses résultats, vol. II, Le Parti bolcheviste, Paris, Delagrave, 1937, p. 167).)

Right or wrong, it follows that the Soviets, acting according to this official doctrine, must, for example, interpret an American peace offer as a ruse designed to hide aggressive intentions and an American offer of economic agreement to foster trade relations as an attempt at economic exploitation.

As a general rule, while Americans wish their words to be understood according to their dictionary meaning and insist, for instance, that peace means peace, protest means protest, and friendship means friendship, the Soviets will usually look for a hidden meaning which they often find in the

obverse of the dictionary meaning. This discrepancy in semantics—which, incidentally, follows from the Marxian distinction between the objective meaning and the subjectively assigned meaning of events and the role of individuals—is one of the major causes of the continuous Soviet distrust which has startled so many Americans. It also explains why the Russians abstain from participating, for example, in international economic organizations, which, according to American ideas, should increase prosperity, but which, according to Soviet doctrine, mask the attempts of American "imperialism" to exploit other nations.

It also follows that the Russians must seek to practice a diplomacy suited to counter these alleged bourgeois tactics. In point of fact, if they really believe that they have to contend at all times with diplomacy as described by Tarlé, the Soviets do not have any other choice but to use similar diplomatic tactics; otherwise they could hardly survive in the struggle for power. It is no cause for wonderment that Oxenstierna's formula describes Soviet diplomacy far more accurately than the diplomacy of the democratic nations.

Diplomacy is a major offensive weapon in the arsenal of world revolution. The Soviets are innately incapable of using diplomatic tactics different from those described by Machiavelli, Oxenstierna, and Tarlé, unless they give up their objective of world communism—which would be tantamount to giving up themselves.

American diplomacy might have been more effective if the official Soviet doctrine had been taken into account. There are numerous indications that this doctrine was unknown to the American Secretaries of State who negotiated with the Soviets and who used diplomacy as a means of settling disputes and adjusting interests by compromise, apparently without suspecting that, for the Soviets, diplomacy replaces and supports revolutionary attack and war.

Hoof-and-Mouth Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to include here a statement made by me today to the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture with reference to the request for funds with which to start the building of the laboratory at Prudence Island, R. I., in connection with the hoof-and-mouth disease. That statement is as follows:

I urge that your committee refuse to appropriate funds for the erection of a laboratory in connection with the hoof-and-mouth disease at Prudence Island, R. I.

I would like to submit the latest information I have as to the milk industry in Massachusetts and the northeast. In 1949 there were 121,000 milk cows in Massachusetts. There were 3,164,000 milk cows in the North Atlantic States, i. e., Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. The cows in Massachusetts as of January 1, 1950, were valued at $31,242,000 and $783,059,000 in the North Atlantic States. The average milk production per cow in the North Atlantic States in 1949 was well over the United States average and, in fact, was exceeded only by the average production in Wisconsin, Washington, and California.

The cash farm income from milk in 1949 in Massachusetts was $44,719,000. The cash income from milk in the North Atlantic States was $875,388,000.

Among these herds are some of the most valuable breeding herds in the United States, and I am sure you will understand the concern of all those engaged in this industry as to the possibility of any unintended introduction of this disease into the Northeast. While it is recognized that the Department proposes to take all possible precautions, obviously, there can be no guarantee that some unfortunate accident would bring about this result.

I recognize that any location in the proximity of other areas of the country would create similar concern in those areas. It would seem to me that it would be better judgment to cooperate with the work in existing laboratories in other countries rather than to take any chances of introducing this disease into this country.

May I include in the record a telegram I have received from Carleton I. Pickett, secretary of the Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation, expressing their position with reference to this proposed appropriation. The telegram reads: "Urge you oppose any appropriation for lab Prudence Island."

Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, this is a matter of very real importance to the North Atlantic States, but it also could be of great importance to many other areas, and possibly to all of the continental area of this country. There have been nine outbreaks of hoof and mouth disease of record. One such outbreak occurring first near Niles, Mich., in October 1914, illustrates the point. Before it was brought under control in May 1916 it had spread into 22 States and the District of Columbia, affecting the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Kentucky, Wisconsin, Illinois, Minnesota, Iowa, Kansas, Montana, and Washington. It will be obvious that this spread was westerly to the Pacific coast and easterly to the Atlantic coast. All the States which were fortunate enough not to be affected in that outbreak could well be affected if by any misfortune the safety precautions failed and the infection should start in some area near Prudence Island, R. I.

With this in mind, although I presented to the committee the specific data with reference to Massachusetts and the North Atlantic States, I would like to include here for the ready use of the membership the latest available information listed in terms of each State, as follows:

Total milk cows on United States farms during 1949

[In thousands (000 omitted)]

North Atlantic:	
Maine	116
New Hampshire	61
Vermont	261
Massachusetts	121
Rhode Island	20
Connecticut	110
New York	1,350
New Jersey	158
Pennsylvania	967
North Central:	
Ohio	1,016
Indiana	717
Illinois	944
Michigan	959
Wisconsin	2,303
Minnesota	1,396
Iowa	1,113
Missouri	920
North Dakota	377
South Dakota	334
Nebraska	460
Kansas	580
South Atlantic:	
Delaware	35
Maryland	225
Virginia	455
West Virginia	216
North Carolina	359
South Carolina	156
Georgia	353
Florida	135
South Central:	
Kentucky	577
Tennessee	589
Alabama	371
Mississippi	456
Arkansas	400
Louisiana	258
Oklahoma	590
Texas	1,155
Western:	
Montana	117
Idaho	197
Wyoming	52
Colorado	189
New Mexico	59
Arizona	45
Utah	17
Nevada	105
Washington	307
Oregon	223
California	817
Total	22,741

Value of milk cows and heifers on farms, Jan. 1, 1950

[In thousands of dollars (000 omitted)]

North Atlantic:	
Maine	20,449
New Hampshire	14,000
Vermont	54,720
Massachusetts	31,242
Rhode Island	5,271
Connecticut	29,264
New York	327,743
New Jersey	46,170
Pennsylvania	214,200
North Central:	
Ohio	185,500
Indiana	126,672
Illinois	189,472
Michigan	198,120
Wisconsin	520,448
Minnesota	289,770
Iowa	219,852
Missouri	148,200
North Dakota	79,990
South Dakota	68,978
Nebraska	88,722
Kansas	110,528
South Atlantic:	
Delaware	6,845
Maryland	47,775
Virginia	76,041
West Virginia	32,526
North Carolina	49,536
South Carolina	21,328
Georgia	49,938
Florida	18,240
South Central:	
Kentucky	86,858
Tennessee	82,560
Alabama	50,310
Mississippi	60,273
Arkansas	51,948
Louisiana	42,368

Value of milk cows and heifers on farms, Jan. 1, 1950—Continued

South Central:	
Oklahoma	92,214
Texas	180,144
Western:	
Montana	23,680
Idaho	41,070
Wyoming	10,640
Colorado	39,390
New Mexico	10,440
Arizona	9,400
Utah	22,040
Nevada	4,095
Washington	57,246
Oregon	36,240
California	178,480
Total	4,350,936

1949 average milk production per cow

	Quarts
North Atlantic:	
Maine	2,521
New Hampshire	2,567
Vermont	2,698
Massachusetts	2,902
Rhode Island	3,256
Connecticut	3,000
New York	3,000
New Jersey	3,353
Pennsylvania	2,795
North Central:	
Ohio	2,521
Indiana	2,344
Illinois	2,586
Michigan	2,753
Wisconsin	3,144
Minnesota	2,772
Iowa	2,474
Missouri	2,195
North Dakota	2,135
South Dakota	1,907
Nebraska	2,186
Kansas	2,093
South Atlantic:	
Delaware	2,409
Maryland	2,581
Virginia	2,126
West Virginia	1,907
North Carolina	2,098
South Carolina	1,833
Georgia	1,698
Florida	1,907
South Central:	
Kentucky	1,888
Tennessee	1,837
Alabama	1,721
Mississippi	1,377
Arkansas	1,526
Louisiana	1,209
Oklahoma	1,698
Texas	1,521
Western:	
Montana	2,270
Idaho	2,740
Wyoming	2,442
Colorado	2,395
New Mexico	1,921
Arizona	2,698
Utah	2,963
Nevada	2,814
Washington	3,051
Oregon	2,721
California	3,400
United States average	2,437

Cash farm income from milk in 1949 by States

[In thousands of dollars (000 omitted)]

North Atlantic:	
Maine	27,901
New Hampshire	17,056
Vermont	66,923
Massachusetts	44,719
Rhode Island	8,970
Connecticut	42,550
New York	349,202
New Jersey	61,171
Pennsylvania	256,896

Cash farm income from milk in 1949 by States—Continued

North Central:	
Ohio	181,978
Indiana	113,418
Illinois	155,063
Michigan	184,763
Wisconsin	452,989
Minnesota	208,720
Iowa	139,259
Missouri	123,502
North Dakota	35,050
South Dakota	28,490
Nebraska	45,481
Kansas	62,343
South Atlantic:	
Delaware	8,361
Maryland	62,114
Virginia	63,050
West Virginia	22,164
North Carolina	36,948
South Carolina	13,866
Georgia	33,301
Florida	34,643
South Central:	
Kentucky	54,781
Tennessee	61,171
Alabama	26,332
Mississippi	29,157
Arkansas	24,612
Louisiana	21,040
Oklahoma	54,289
Texas	117,669
Western:	
Montana	16,467
Idaho	32,340
Wyoming	8,435
Colorado	28,935
New Mexico	9,939
Arizona	12,013
Utah	21,599
Nevada	3,883
Washington	74,254
Oregon	49,650
California	254,160
Total	3,781,617

I wish to express my appreciation to the Milk Industry Foundation for making available these facts.

Women Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Boston Herald-New York Times Dispatch]

NAVY, MARINES URGE WOMEN RESERVES ENLIST—HERSHEY HINTS DRAFT EVENTUALLY MAY HAVE TO LIST ALL WOMEN

(By Paul P. Kennedy)

WASHINGTON, July 15.—The Navy and Marines sent out calls from the Pentagon today to their women reservists to volunteer for active duty. The call followed shortly a hint by Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, selective service director, that draft boards might eventually have to register women.

The Navy asked for enlisted women reservists to volunteer for a period of 12 months. The call emphasized the need of women in all petty officer grades, including chief petty officers, in the following emergency and general rates: teleman, radioman, communications technician, yeoman, personnelman, machine accountant, storekeeper, disbursing storekeeper, aerographer, trademan, aviation storekeeper, hospitalman, and dental technician.

ASKS LIMITED NUMBER

The Marines called for a limited number of enlisted women in and out of the Reserve in all ranks and a limited number of lieutenants and captains among the Reserve. No obligated period of service was specified.

The calls followed within a week of similar reservist calls for men in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines.

General Hershey in a Nation-wide broadcast last night said that "quite a little planning" has been done with the idea that draft boards might eventually have to register women. He said, however, this action would require an emergency with the Nation needing "about all the people it's got."

The call for women volunteers was the high light of news from the Pentagon today. Another item revealed by an Army spokesman, however, was that the number of casualties suffered by the North Koreans up to July 13 was vastly higher than those suffered by the United States.

CASUALTIES UNDER 500

General MacArthur this week, while commenting on what he termed an exaggeration of casualty figures in the press said that up to July 13 the United States forces had suffered less than 500 casualties.

The Army spokesman today said that it was estimated the North Korean forces had suffered, up to July 13, between 8,000 and 9,000 casualties. He admitted the figure contains a margin for error, but said it was "pretty close to the truth."

The spokesman commenting on the fact that a tally of North Korean tank losses showed more tanks destroyed than the North Koreans were originally estimated to have had, said that the original estimates were inaccurate.

THREE HUNDRED TANKS AT START

He said that instead of 100 tanks, as reported in possession of the North Koreans when the invasion began, they had, at that time, it is now estimated, 300 tanks. He said there was no confirmation, however, that any of these tanks were heavier than 35 tons.

Reminded by reports that there had been numerous news dispatches from the front telling of 60-ton tanks, the spokesman said there was no confirmation of the use of any North Korean tank bigger than the T-34, which weighs about 35 tons.

The Air Force today announced its decision to reinstate volunteer Reserve officers at their terminal-leave promotion grades but the order has not been sent out. A spokesman said that applications were still being received today for volunteers at their last active grade level.

The decision to recognize the terminal-leave promotion level broke a deadlock that had virtually shut off applications from Reserve officers for voluntary service.

To the Spoils System?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor:

TO THE SPOILS SYSTEM?

Washington long has faced a personnel problem peculiarly governmental in nature.

Should Government administrators be permitted to hire and fire at will, to retain under them only staff members they believe best fitted for their jobs? Before we shout a resounding "Yes" let us recall that that's the way it used to be—in theory. In practice it meant that Government ranks were filled largely by, for, and with politicians and their henchmen. When the other party got in, the good and the bad all were thrown out for a new crew of green hands.

The antithesis is equally unacceptable: To man the Government with a watertight civil service under which tenure is permanent, executives are allowed no discretion, and promotion ignores merit for seniority.

The Government has achieved, by trial and error, at least a workable compromise. Too many inefficients are still "blanketed in." Too many crassly political appointments are still possible. But good public servants can build careers reasonably free from political opportunism and personal capriciousness.

Now the House, in one unedifying stampede, has voted, in effect, to throw this system overboard. The bill does not say just that. It would appear to leave the loyalty safeguards untouched. It says it would only permit heads of 11 departments to discharge without recourse anyone deemed a poor security risk—those who talk too much, get in debt, drink too much, show poor judgment.

But should the bill become law, there would be no need to use the loyalty boards. Anybody could be classed a poor security risk and fired—anyone charged by an enemy or a crank with disloyalty, any Republican whose job some Democrat covets (and vice versa), any incumbent who stands in the way of some friend of the chief.

We believe few department heads would so utterly exploit such an opportunity. And it is reasonable to ask that actual security risks shall not be frozen in Government service by glacial regulations. But this bill furnishes a typical and horrible example of what people can do when they are frightened.

UAW Rids Itself of Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to see that the United Automobile Workers Union has taken steps to rid itself of Communist officials, who have plagued this CIO union of 65,000 members for a number of years. To be sure, the struggle to rid the UAW is still in its preliminary stages, the Communists are not giving up so easily, but definite and decided progress is being made. With the situation as it is in Korea and the need to take precautionary measures in vital industries and industrial areas in this country, it is not at all too late to insist that all unions rid themselves of the last vestiges of Communist leadership and Communist officials.

The following editorial from the Brooklyn Daily Eagle of July 12, 1950, is quite apropos:

LOCAL 600, UAW, UNLEASHES TELLING BLOW AT THE COMMUNISTS

A belated but telling blow was struck against the Communists in Detroit this week. Local 600 of the United Automobile Workers Union, CIO, has voted to compel each of its 550 union officials to sign a non-Communist pledge. The membership numbers about 65,000 workers.

This action of the general council of the UAW is significant in two ways. It shows how far the anti-Communist drive in CIO has gone. It likewise indicates how difficult it is to dislodge the Stalinists once they have established a beachhead in a labor union.

Local 600, which covers the employees of the Ford River Rouge plant at Dearborn, Mich., has been a pivotal point of Communist control and strategy in the automobile industry for a long time. Carl Stellato, with the blessing of Walter Reuther, was chosen president of the local in the last election and has been readying his forces for this climatic move for some time. On Sunday, July 9, the anti-Communists struck the commie rampart.

The final vote among the delegates was 75–63. The closeness of the tally tells a story in itself. In the face of the Korean invasion, the indictment of the 11 Communists in New York, the Nation-wide purge by CIO the anticipated legislative restrictions being prepared in Washington and the over-all anti-Communist sentiment now prevailing throughout the Nation—in spite of all such signs, 63 delegates representing thousands of auto workers could still stand up and offer strenuous opposition to this resolution. This is the kind of incident that inclines level-headed Americans to seek stronger anti-Communist laws everywhere.

The resolution itself was a masterpiece of logic and thorough American sentiment. It first called for unanimous support of President Truman in his effort to combat the Communist aggressions of the North Koreans. It then noted the fact that the Presidential action was one meant to preserve and protect the peace of civilized people. It fanned out into a condemnation of the general Soviet conduct and ended up with the signing of the pledge by each of the union officers "as a means of implementing this declaration of policy."

The pledge left no loopholes. It runs:

"I hereby pledge that I owe allegiance to the Government of the United States and to no other. I support the policy of the CIO as that policy may be determined by the majority opinion within my union.

"I further state that I am not a member of the Communist Party, Fascist Party, or the Ku Klux Klan, nor do I support the policy and the program of Soviet Russia and its satellite nations, nor will I distribute any leaflets or other form of literature for petitions in favor of such policy or program."

The UAW constitution makes the signing of this pledge, democratically decided upon by the council, an obligation of each official. Refusal to sign can result in a trial and dismissal from the union.

The union may have no means to penalize for perjury if a false statement is made. But the pledge, if strictly enforced, can stymie Communist propaganda at the source among the unionists. The Stalinists will not take it "lying down," but the UAW is now well on the way to cleaning up its termites.

Civilian Defense Must Be Expedited and the People Must Be Informed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, "Our lagging civil defense plans are just beginning to move like the halt and the blind."

These are the words of Hanson W. Baldwin, military expert of the New York Times, writing in that newspaper today.

I was glad to read in the same newspaper the following news article:

PUBLIC TO BE TOLD OF CIVIL DEFENSE—O'DWYER AND WALLANDER PLEDGE FULL INFORMATION ON ALL PHASES OF CITY PROGRAM

Mayor O'Dwyer and Arthur W. Wallander, city civilian defense director, pledged full information to the public yesterday on all phases of the city's civilian defense program.

"It is our purpose and our hope through the newspapers, radio, and television to keep our people informed of the measures we are taking to prevent any future emergencies," Mr. Wallander said. "When our plans are completed all the people of our town—and I mean all—will know exactly what is being done for their welfare.

"Our purpose is not only the establishment of emergency committees and agencies. We also want to serve an educational and informative purpose so that every individual will be aware of the part he is expected to take in possible emergencies.

"For this reason we feel that our newspapers, press, and radio will continue as usual to serve as a most important arm of our progress in keeping our citizens enlightened. It is only when people are kept in the dark that fears creep in.

"Everyone should prepare to extend every cooperation to this program. There is no cause for undue excitement or fear. But, though the emergency may never occur, the plans which we are formulating must necessarily be carried through."

For the last year I have been urging more action on the Federal and State and local levels on civilian defense. It was not until last week that we authorized an organization for the District of Columbia.

Discussing the measure I stated that the citizens of our Capital City, even Congressmen, did not know the ABC's of civilian defense—the first thing to do in the event of an attack. I am glad to note that Mayor O'Dwyer, of New York, is going to let the people of New York in on the plans. So should the Commissioners of the District of Columbia here in Washington, and so should the mayors of all target cities and towns. Meanwhile the National Security Resources Board, having jurisdiction on the national level, should give its counsel and advice now.

NEA Seeks a Place To Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Argus, Friday, July 7, 1950:

NEA SEEKS A PLACE TO STAND

In a climate of fear and fast-developing general offensive against academic freedom across the country, the National Education

Association, in general assembly here this week, is seeking a place to stand on the issue of solidarity, where local custom would fragment its membership into racial bits.

The NEA came to St. Louis knowing that some of its delegates would be set upon in one way or another, because of their race. Clearly, the NEA could not ignore this affront as easily as the United Tea Drinkers Association. Educators do not fully discharge their duty to the highest calling by merely saying what is truth—they must also refrain from going through the motions of ignorance and supersitions.

Out of this minimum stature of the educator grows the dilemma now facing the NEA: How to stand for knowledge in a country where no city is free of the acts of discrimination backed by vested interests and the intensely cultivated ignorance of the masses?

The NEA brought with it an amendment which would have placed the association in a position of no compromise with bigotry. This amendment would have kept the NEA representative assembly out of any city practicing discrimination in housing, feeding, and seating of delegates.

By an overwhelming voice vote the assembly backed down from this stand when Dr. Andrew D. Holt, their president, calmly stated the rather terrifying discovery of an investigating committee that no city in the United States could meet such a standard.

A compromise amendment which would enable the NEA assembly to meeting in the United States, binds the site-selecting committee to seek out cities proving a maximum degree of equality for all NEA members.

However, it is to the credit of the educators and their leadership that they did not attempt to disown their obligation to press for the realization of true democracy.

Some delegates expressed the view that the integrity of the board of directors would preserve the practical substance of the original amendment in actual practice. This interpretation we are prepared to accept in view of the fact that the board of directors declared their full sympathy with the spirit of the original amendment.

In our opinion, the NEA cannot compromise or appear to connive in the aggression of local bigotry upon its members, even should it be necessary to hold all of its delegate assembly meetings in a single day.

The NEA's dilemma is a challenge—a challenge to lead an uncompromising counterattack upon bigotry and ignorance. In fact, there is but one course and that is to hold to truth, but the illusion of the alternative of compromise, best serves those forces engaged in a war upon knowledge itself.

On Saturday, the delegates shall vote on the compromise amendment. We believe that they can honestly vote for this amendment, if at the same time they resolve that the compromise is on paper—not in their hearts.

War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "War in Korea," taken from the Lafayette Journal and Courier, published in Lafayette, Ind., on July 13, 1950:

THE WAR IN KOREA

People of the United States need to be told, honestly and frankly, of the dangers which confront them in Korea and around the world.

No further time dare be lost in adopting and following a definite, clear-cut, and positive foreign policy which will safeguard the Nation's interests and those of all free peoples and which will merit and invite the loyal and staunch support of all citizens.

Also, the Government must dedicate itself wholly to the main task confronting it, directing all its energies and resources to bringing about a quick and victorious conclusion of the war in Korea, for war it is. This means that economies must be effected in all other fields so that our national defense may propmtly reach its maximum and most effective strength.

A definite course needs to be charted. The people need to be informed of the road the Nation is pursuing, they need to know its dangers, they need assurance that there will be no diversions, and that the Government will hold steadfastly to this course.

It is best for our people to know what difficulties are being faced. Ignorance led at first to unrealistic expectations. If developments are not too favorable at once, continued ignorance is bound to lead to unrealistic depression. The American people can take bad news. They ought to know what the score is. They need to know the facts. After learning the truth, there is need for assurance that something is being done about it.

There has been confusion because of contradictions and wavering in high places. This needs to be corrected, at once.

Either the Government doesn't know what it is all about, there is incompetence or indecision, there is a studied effort to deceive the people, or there is reluctance to confide in the public. Whatever it is, it must be corrected quickly. In such a critical time the Government urgently needs the support and confidence of the people. This, however, cannot and will not be forthcoming unless the people have confidence that a proper policy is being pursued and unless they know the facts.

A new Federal budget is before Congress. Unfortunately, the administration is seeking to economize on national defense while expanding. even doubling and more, expenditures in many other fields. The huge welfare programs threaten the very survival of America and of all free people at this time. Such a diversion is nothing less than criminal. It is imperative that the situation be reversed. All civilian and nonwar expenditures must be drastically curtailed, so that the Armed Forces may have everything they need to stop the Reds.

Only one thing counts at the moment. The free world is endangered as never before. There needs to be complete national dedication to the job ahead.

The administration is to be supported wholeheartedly in all proper efforts to defeat and throw back communism. This does not mean it should be free of all criticism. Patriotic devotion demands that the Government be held to strict account for its every move. Only in this way can the Nation be assured of maximum success. Opposition when the occasion demands will promote rather than obstruct the war effort.

Since the Nation is at war, regardless of what anyone may say to the contrary, why not employ the most effective war weapons at hand, including the A-bomb, to end it quickly?

The northern Koreans should be given 72 hours' notice to stop fighting and withdraw within their own borders. If they do not comply, dropping a few atomic bombs upon their land will have the desired result. The war can be brought to an abrupt conclusion in this manner, saving American lives and preventing untold other casualties. Incidentally, notice will be served upon Russia in this manner that free peoples mean business. Also, disorganization of American economic life will be halted in the process and real world peace will be brought immeasurably nearer.

United States leadership in the field of atomic energy is the greatest present deterrent, perhaps the only one, against the outbreak of another world war. Use of several A-bombs now should prove an effective and lasting discouragement to new Red aggressions everywhere and stop the present one now. Why wait longer?

Action in Korea Involves the Future of Asia's Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Life magazine. How many innocent young Americans would not need to be suffering and dying in Korea if the plain hard truths in this editorial had been seen and acted upon by our Government long ago. They were as plain in 1945 as they are now. President Roosevelt understood them and instructed Ambassador Hurley accordingly. The instructions were reversed by the anti-Chiang State Department clique, after Roosevelt's death, and the situation has grown steadily worse, ever since. We need a complete, not a partial about-face:

ACTION IN KOREA INVOLVES THE FUTURE OF ASIA'S MILLIONS

A good deal has been said on this page about American policy and lack of policy and failure of policy in Asia. Much of it boils down to the following:

Someday, a President of the United States will have to take a fighting stand against communism somewhere west of California. It will be better to do it today than tomorrow. It would have been better to do it yesterday than today. And a lot better day before yesterday.

On June 27, President Harry Truman, in line with United States' obligations to the United Nations, sent the world's mightiest navy and the world's most modern air force into action against communism in Asia. And the reaction of the plain man seems to have been "At last. It was the only thing to do."

Both the President and the plain man are to be congratulated: the President for the courage of decision and the plain man for net good judgment on a very complicated matter.

For the issues are indeed very complicated. What is involved is nothing less than the whole vast question of how the people of America are going to get on with 1,200,000,000 men, women and children of Asia now living in a state of disorder.

Since VJ-day the Truman administration has made tragic mistakes in this area. The complications provided our Government with endless alibis. Dictators use the big lie; democratic governments are too prone to use, and get away with, the big alibi.

In the case of China, for example, the big alibi of the administration was Chiang Kai-shek. Chiang had many faults. And in his huge government of a huge country he had many bad actors. Out of all this, the left-wingers and the lazy minds manufactured the big alibi for our colossal failure.

But on June 27, 1950, President Truman revised the policy of his administration and therefore, for the first time in 5 years, we can begin to discuss, with hope, a real overall policy toward and in Asia.

The American problem in Asia can be divided into two parts—although actually they are inextricable. There is the question of the military defense of the United States. And there is the question of our constructive, brotherly relations with the people of Asia.

What Truman did on June 27 was primarily to establish the defense of the United States on the western shores of the Pacific. That's fine. In World War II, the United States took command of the 70,000,000 square miles of the Pacific Ocean. Truman's action in sending the fleet to protect Formosa established our intention of safeguarding the whole Pacific.

As to the second point—how to get on with the 1,200,000,000 people of Asia—there we come back to the complication. And, painful though it may be, we come back to the case of Chiang Kai-shek.

The complications of the China situation 5 years ago, great as they were, pale into insignificance when compared to what the United States Government has faced in Asia since communism won the Chinese mainland. Today, as Washington seeks a policy in Asia, it looks about for props and footholds, and finds that (outside of Japan and the Philippines) the one point of strength and order and resolution to resist is in Formosa, the last stand of the despised Chiang, the impossible Chiang. History has no irony more cruel than this—nor any lesson more fruitful for the future if we will read it aright.

The lesson can be summarized (and generalized) briefly as follows:

1. We cannot expect to find in Asia any government which is strongly established—let alone good by our civics textbook standards. All the countries of Asia are going through tremendous changes—with only small handfuls of trained or experienced men to guide them.

2. We can find governments which are (a) anti-Communist, (b) pro-American or prodemocratic, (c) aiming to develop their countries along democratic lines. With such governments we must wholeheartedly cooperate.

Concretely then and logically the next step President Truman should take is to reinstate Chiang Kai-shek as our full ally in the general world-wide struggle against Communism. Of all the world's leaders, Chiang Kai-shek is the one who has fought communism longest—one of the few who has never been taken in by Communist camouflage. He is ready and able to work closely with America in both military and economic affairs. His goal is a democratic China. This is the other side of the Chiang Kai-shek picture which, despite all the complications, was never lost sight of by many Americans—such as Gen. Douglas MacArthur for one, and also the New York Times, Roy Howard of the Scripps-Howard papers and a small but valiant number of Senators and Congressmen.

We have much work to do with many other Asian nations—Korea, the Philippines, Indochina, Indonesia, Siam, Burma, Malaya, and, of course, Japan. These nations are all peripheral to China. They are also nations of real people with not only the ordinary human wants of all people, but also valuable and interesting traits of character and of culture, with ways of life which need to be changed but by no means in our image but according to their own inspiration and aspirations. The temporary loss of China has this one advantage—that it forces us into genuine interest in these other nations at a time when they face great difficulties but also great opportunities for economic, educational, and political advance. Our first job is to make clear—as was begun on June 27—that the armed might of the United States will protect them against all outside Communist aggression. Our second and constructive job is to work with them to help them build up their political economies against the dangers of chaos and overthrow from within. It is a mighty job—a mighty tough one, a mighty interesting one. In the doing of this job, we shall gain as a nation more than we give. We shall gain in the broadening of our participation in the whole human adventure.

Suggestions for the National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, many newspaper columnists, radio commentators, and others who claim to be close enough to feel the pulse of our Nation's Capital, have been writing and talking about the temper of Washington today in view of the situation in Korea.

Most of these people are very learned and know whereof they speak. And yet, to me, as I am sure is the case with a number of other men and women here in Congress, the plea for swift and decisive action in Korea which touches me most deeply is from the young men who were in the middle of the last war.

These men do not like to play the game of bluff any more than any of the rest of us—when our people and Nation are the stake—and the critical situation in Korea has caused many of them to speak their minds clearly.

I received one such letter this morning from J. J. Carmichall, an ex-GI, who is now a student at the University of Texas in Austin, Tex.

In his letter Mr. Carmichall asks many of the same questions that most of us have been asking ourselves—questions that need a prompt and uncompromising reply from the appropriate offices here in Washington.

But, Mr. Carmichall does more than ask questions—he also offers an eight-point program which he feels is urgently needed. I agree with him, and am today writing him saying that I am going to do all within my power to see that the eight points he suggests are immediately acted upon. Like him, I feel that there is no longer any need or any excuse for delay.

I wish all of you would take the time to read Mr. Carmichall's letter, for I believe it is a letter clearly expressing the temper of our Nation and people as a whole—not just of Washington:

AUSTIN, TEX.

Hon. HOMER THORNBERRY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: In view of the present situation in the Far East, I feel compelled to write you my views on the subject.

I have talked to a number of ex-GI's like myself at the University of Texas and I feel that what I have to say is a fair consensus of their thoughts.

Why don't we quit fooling ourselves into thinking that we have "the best equipped, the best-trained armed force in the world?" The Korean war has shown clearly that our armor and antitank weapons are inferior to the Russian-made weapons of the Reds. Are we going on in this idiotic self-conceit until it is too late?

The Air Force has done a grand job in supporting our troops, but the planes have not stopped the ground attack of the Reds. Some so-called experts have been blaring forth the false propaganda that the ground armies are a thing of the past—strategic bombing will bring us victory. The utter falsity of this stand has been erased by the blood of our infantry in Korea and leaves us with only a bitter taste of defeat.

Where, may I ask, are all the wonderful new weapons for our infantry: The recoilless rifle, the super-bazooka, the 90-millimeter antitank gun? Are they still on the drafting boards?

Is the administration waiting for another war to break out before we mobilize? Isn't this enough to wake us up to the cold, indisputable fact that we face both a superiority in numbers and weapons?

In all our history we have never faced a more formidable, ruthless, and resourceful enemy than we face today. Who knows when and where they will strike us? Tomorrow, 6 weeks, a year—the attack could come anytime.

Now is the time to act. Now is the time to mobilize all our resources. Our weakness has been demonstrated; now we must show our strength. The millions of Asia are watching, waiting to see how weak we are. They understand one thing, and that is military power. We must show them that we are equal to the Red menace.

I ask your careful consideration of the following points:

1. An immediate call for all reserves and National Guard.
2. At least a partial mobilization of our war industries.
3. Immediate "demothballing" of our planes and ships.
4. A step-up of our intelligence activities behind the iron curtain.
5. Expansion of the FBI and other security agencies.
6. An adequate and well-directed propaganda program to bring the truth to the people of the world.
7. A bipartisan preparedness policy.
8. Sufficient emphasis on the development and production of tanks, antitank weapons, and small arms. We must get these weapons off the drafting board and into the field.

I urge you, sir, in all sincerity to use all the influence and prestige of your office to back an adequate and well-balanced aggressive, not defensive program. Time grows shorter daily; our mistakes are written in the blood of the "step-child" GI's in Korea. Is this valiant delaying action to be in vain?

Very truly yours,

J. J. CARMICHALL.

The Texas Tidelands Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, on any question or problem facing us, we like to

find a well-thought-out and worded argument which presents facts and conclusions understandable to all. For that reason I think it appropriate that I include at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Dallas Chamber of Commerce concerning the tidelands question and more specifically the recent Supreme Court decision which attempted to give title to the Federal Government to the tidelands off the shore of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the resolution referred to above and I recommend it for the careful reading of everyone:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

On June 5, 1950, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a 4-to-3 decision which attempted to give title to the Federal Government of the tidelands off the shore of Texas. In 1845 the United States Government entered into a written contract with the people of Texas which specifically provided that these lands would remain the property of Texas after the Republic of Texas became a State. This decision of the Supreme Court, if allowed to stand and become effective would be a clear-cut breach of this contract. Today, more than ever before, the United States is looked upon over the entire world as the example of a democratic country which keeps its obligations and treaties faithfully and to the letter. The United States of America should not allow the world to witness it breaking a contract, which its representatives made in good faith, and has stood for over 100 years.

In writing its decision, the Supreme Court refused to allow the attorney general of Texas to present and develop the multitude of evidence it had regarding this case. In making its decision the Supreme Court completely ignored the historical facts which are relative to this case. The entire citizenship of Texas is greatly disturbed and insulted by this action.

The documented facts of history stand, regardless of the varied political interpretations which come and go with the generations of time. We, the people of Texas, ask you to look at the facts:

1. After winning its independence from Mexico on the battlefield of San Jacinto in 1836, the First Congress of the Republic of Texas fixed its limits by a boundary act of December 19, 1836, as follows:

"Beginning at the mouth of the Sabine river, and running west along the Gulf of Mexico three leagues from land, to the mouth of the Rio Grande. * * *" Thereafter, in 1837, President Andrew Jackson advised the Congress of the United States as follows:

"The title of Texas to the territory she claims is identified with her independence."

2. On April 12, 1844, after formal negotiations, a treaty was signed between Texas and the United States, providing for the annexation of Texas. In this treaty Texas was to give up its public land and public property. The United States was to assume the public debt of Texas and was to annex Texas as a territory. On April 22, 1844, President Tyler sent this treaty to the Senate of the United States, which on June 8 voted and defeated the treaty by a vote of 36 to 16. One of the main reasons stated on the floor of the Senate for the defeat of this treaty was the allegation that Texas' lands were "worthless" and would never amount to enough to pay the indebtedness of that Republic. One Senator said: "Let Texas keep her lands and pay her own debts."

3. Accordingly, the same Congress submitted a counter proposal to the Republic of Texas for annexation. From December 10, 1844, until February 14, 1845, 17 drafts of a counterproposal came before the United States Congress. Some of these had provisions which would have required Texas "to cede its minerals, mines, salt lakes, and springs," and to give up its land and mineral rights. None of these proposals passed. Finally Representative Milton Brown of Tennessee, who had previously introduced a resolution stipulating that Texas cede her minerals, offered again the general proposals of his original resolution, but omitted the ceding of mineral clauses, which his earlier resolution had contained and which had just been defeated in the rejection of an amendment of Representative Burke of New Hampshire, which stipulated that Texas cede its minerals and mines. Brown's revised resolution was adopted by a vote of 120 to 98. Thus the claim of the United States to the minerals of Texas was considered and rejected by the House of Representatives in its formation of the resolution which was submitted to and accepted by the Republic of Texas as the basis of its admission to the Union.

This House resolution that finally passed contained two paragraphs; the first proposed that Texas should be admitted to the Union as a State, with a republican form of government adopted by the people of Texas and approved by the Congress of the United States. The second paragraph specified the details of the annexation; namely that the constitution of the new State must be submitted to Congress before January 1, 1846, and that new States, not exceeding four in number in addition to the State of Texas might be formed out of Texas. The most important of these specific provisions was that Texas was to retain its public debt and was to retain title to all of the vacant and unappropriated lands lying within the limits of the Republic of Texas. Nothing was in these first two paragraphs about "equal footing" with other States.

The United States Senate amended this resolution and added a third paragraph which gave the President of the United States the option at his own judgment and discretion to negotiate the annexation of Texas by treaty which would admit Texas into the Union "on an equal footing with the existing States", instead of submitting to the Republic of Texas the proposals of the first and second paragraphs as prepared by the House.

President Tyler chose not to exercise this option to negotiate by treaty, and instead submitted the provisions of only the first two paragraphs of the joint resolution. President Anson Jones of Texas submitted this to the Texas Congress, which unanimously approved it, and then called a convention of the people of Texas to prepare a State constitution and to ratify the acceptance by the Texas Congress. This convention passed an ordinance of acceptance which states, "We, the deputies of the people of Texas, do ordain and declare that we assent to and accept the proposals, conditions, and guaranties contained in the first and second sections of the resolution of the Congress of the United States." On December 29, 1845, James K. Polk, President of the United States, signed a joint resolution of the Congress of the United States, which referred to the offer by the United States and the acceptance of Texas of the provisions of the first and second paragraphs of the initial joint resolution of March 1, 1845, which made the offer, and declared that effective upon December 29, 1845, and upon those terms, Texas was a State in the Union. Thus, although the President of the United States was authorized by the third paragraph of the resolution, at his own discretion to offer Texas an opportunity to come into the Union on "equal footing" by treaty, he instead submitted the alternate proposal which outlined specific provisions allowing Texas to retain her lands. The proposal actually submitted to and accepted and ratified by Texas contained no mention of the equal footing idea.

One of the specific proposals, conditions, and guaranties offered by the United States in good faith and accepted faithfully by the people of Texas was that Texas was to retain the public domain which had belonged to it while it was an independent Nation. These lands consisted of an estimated 237,906,000 acres of public lands which extended to three leagues offshore. The new State of Texas retained the General Land Office, which had been established by the Republic to administer the ownership of these lands. And for over 100 years Texas has had possession of these lands and has administered them accordingly, and its ownership has been recognized by all parties, including the United States Government.

These are the facts of history. It is not the romantic imagination of Texas, nor is it a wishful dream of ours. It is true, pure, and clean factual history. To violate this written contract, made in good faith by both parties and kept by both for over 100 years, is to cast a dark shadow of dishonor upon the whole of American life, public and private, which rests upon the integrity, the faithful observance of agreements.

Four members of the Supreme Court of the United States, less than a majority of the full nine-member Court, have ignored the provisions of the annexation contract by which Texas retained these lands and minerals. In justification therefor, these four members have cited and relied upon the alternative "equal footing" provision which was never submitted by the President of the United States to Texas and was never considered, accepted, or agreed upon by the Republic of Texas. It was contained in none of the proposals to or negotiations with Texas except the above-mentioned alternative and rejected third paragraph. The result is that an alternative proposal which was rejected both by the United States and Texas has been allowed by the Supreme Court to control over the proposal specifically submitted by the President of the United States and accepted by the Congress and people of Texas, and which provided that they retain all lands "lying within its limits."

The ruling of the Supreme Court should not be allowed to stand. As Chief Justice John Marshall said, suits involving constitutional issues and treaties should not be decided by less than a majority of the full court. In no event should four members of the court, over the protest of three dissenters, be allowed to break a provision of the solemn contract between the United States and the Republic of Texas and take away from the State 2,080,000 acres of land which has been in its possession for over 100 years. If the court persists, then Congress should remedy the injustice.

Since it was a joint resolution of Congress which established the provisions of Texas' affiliation with the United States, we, the people of Texas, appeal to you whose high privilege it is to make the policies of this Nation, to uphold the dignity of our great country by endorsing the agreements made by your predecessors over 105 years ago. Today, the United States is the leader of nations in the fight to uphold the high moral principles of honor, and good faith in government. Now, while its representatives are negotiating treaties and agreements with nations all over the earth, is no time for the Government of the United States to exhibit to the world that it will stoop to the depth of regarding a written document made in good faith by two nations as a "scrap of paper." The people of Texas cannot accept such a conduct of government. We respectfully urge that the Eighty-first Congress by a joint resolution uphold the honor and dignity of the Twenty-ninth Congress and support the provisions of its annexation agreement

with Texas, and declare that all right, title, and interest in the public domain of Texas, including its tidelands, three leagues into the sea, remains and is vested in the State of Texas.

Passed by the board of director of the Dallas (Texas) Chamber of Commerce this 7th day of July 1950.

JOHN W. CARPENTER,
President.

UN Can Work Only When Veto Power in Cases of Aggression Is Absent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

VETO BY KREMLIN COULD HAVE STOPPED UN ACTION IN KOREA

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

The United Nations is accomplishing the first great task of its history. For the first time the system of collective security is working as it was intended to work. This task can best be envisaged as that of a vigilance committee of decent citizens in a community infested by bad men. Now a minor bad man, aided and abetted by a tough character, has broken into another fellow's place and is trying to take it over.

A citizen named Sam has taken it upon himself to prevent this outrage. Instead of tackling it alone, Sam, as a member of the local vigilance committee, has called upon the other members to help enforce the law with him.

To a gratifying extent, the other members have consented. Some are already taking an active part in the fight and others, while not actually participating in the shooting, are expressing approval.

This, roughly, is what has been taking place here on Long Island these last few days. It is a rare triumph for all those who have insisted on saying that, under the right circumstances, collective security can be made to work on a voluntary basis. They are insisting—quite correctly—that if the United States had chosen to protect South Korea merely as a sovereign power, it would not have been approved by other peoples far and wide and, most important, would not have found the American people united almost to a man.

NON-RED CAUSE JUSTIFIED

If, which God forbid, the Soviet Union chooses to make of the UN resistance to armed aggression the pretext for launching a major war—world war III, the first atom war—then at least the law-abiding countries will be fighting on the best possible moral and political grounds. Therefore, the UN has more than proved its usefulness exactly as it is—champions will say.

And so far, well and good. But before we become too sure that everything has gone as planned at Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco, we must look at the peculiar circumstances under which the UN has proved it can work.

The first is a fairly common thing; the interest of the UN as a peace-keeping body has happened to coincide with that of a very great power, the United States. Trouble has come in an area, the Pacific, near Japan, a country under military occupation by the United States. Trouble has been made by a great power, the Soviet Union, whose fantastic military expansion since 1939 has aroused the fear and hostility of the entire non-Communist world. For this reason, instead of ratting when the test came—as the great powers ratted under the League of Nations in cases of armed aggression—the United States has accepted political and legal responsibility and rallied the other countries to common defense. Whether any of this could have happened had the Soviet Union, through one of its satellites, seized some other less sensitive country, say, Tibet or Iran, is at least open to question. My conviction is that it would not have happened.

U. S. S. R. BOYCOTT STUPID

There is, however, one even more important circumstance. None of this could or would have happened but for the stupidity of the Soviet Union in maintaining its boycott of the UN Security Council. This boycott—as everyone will remember—came about in a Soviet effort to compel the other countries to substitute Communist China for Nationalist China in the various UN bodies. As such, it was, thanks to the help it was receiving from the Secretary-General, Trygve Lie, apparently succeeding. The United States was not going to claim a veto right to prevent this substitution. Had the Soviet Union not tried to blackmail the international organization, it would, in my judgment, before now have got the Chinese Communists into the UN.

Apparently, the prospect of this success had gone to the head of the Red Hitler in the Kremlin much as too many bloodless victories went to the head of the Nazi Hitler in Germany. The Soviet Union was too proud, too sure of itself, to return to its place at the Security Council table and exercise its veto when the Korean case came up. Had it done so, it could have disclaimed all knowledge of the North Korean attack (which it had obviously prepared and provoked). It could have vetoed all action by the UN Security Council.

LONE ACTION DANGEROUS

In that case the United States would have had to act alone, which would have been much more dangerous and difficult. Or it might have acted under article 51 of the UN Charter, which permits action in individual or collective self-defense. (This would have convinced certain countries that the present trouble is purely a U. S. A.-U. S. S. R. duel.) Or it would have had to desist from action and let the Soviet-backed North Korea take over the UN-protected South Korea. This in turn would probably have been followed by an assault upon Formosa and possibly by another upon Tito's Yugoslavia. A UN that had failed to protect Korea could hardly have protected either of these. And the Soviet Union would have triumphed.

What prevented that triumph by the Soviet and enabled the UN to work was, I repeat, the Soviet decision to stay away from the Security Council table and thereby forfeit the possibility of vetoing a Security Council decision.

In short, what the Korea case has shown to date is not that the UN can normally work as it is but that it can work only in the absence of the present aggressor power, the Soviet Union. This is closer to what Herbert Hoover has been saying than the arguments of UN champions.

In my judgment, the experience of the last 10 days has shown that the UN can work only when for one reason or another the veto right is absent.

To abolish it altogether will, however, require the transformation of the present UN into another and far different type of body, one with power in all cases to enforce its decisions.

United States Korea Blunder Exposes Top Shelf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Bill Cunningham, special writer for the Boston Herald, appeared in that paper on July 16. It is, in my opinion, a valuable contribution toward keeping the record straight in respect to our present difficulties in Korea. The article follows:

UNITED STATES KOREA BLUNDER EXPOSES TOP SHELF

(By Bill Cunningham)

President Harry S. Truman, the members of his indistinguished Cabinet, and all the conglomerate collection of his appointees, advisers, interpreters, planners, mixers, muddlers, and political hitch-hikers, have massive reason at the moment to be glad this is the United States of America. Under any other form of government, their administration already would have fallen through the astounding revelations of lack of preparedness, lack of information, wrongness of over-all planning, lack of coherent policy, lack of supplies, statesmanship, and practically everything else, including any visible way out, stripped naked by the skirmish in Korea. In fact, in some countries, they'd be fleeing across borders.

This time, let's keep the record straight. The decision to strike back in Korea, an admirable and diplomatically well executed maneuver, must not be confused with the revelations of utter inefficiency that striking back brought resounding cheers for our Chief Executive, and his thrilling decision must not be allowed to drown the cries of the wounded in the bogs of Korea and the sobs of the mothers whose next generation of sons may be in uniform soon.

The President of the United States who gave the courageous command, and Harry S. Truman who heads a government-by-crony-and-political-payoff and who had had 5 years to prepare for such a possible command, are not the same persons.

The former was right, but the latter's now revealed as having been so wrong that his decision must cost us lives from our seed, which we can't afford, and at least a billion extra tax dollars which we can't afford, either. It's already lost us face with, and has revealed our unbelievable weakness to, the entire world as well, and that could be fatal.

If a state of emergency is now declared, the Reserves and the National Guard ordered into the field, industries ordered to mobilize, war restrictions clamped on, our economy may be wrecked, and this doesn't even take into consideration that there might be general war. In fact, every new day makes war with Russia less likely. Why should Russia bother? We're bleeding freely already. What should have been a slight scratch is now an open vein because the Truman protectors of our lives and the western world's future failed utterly to see, properly to appraise, and to stand completely ready for trouble anywhere.

We've spent $70,000,000,000—that's 70 billion dollars—in the past 5 years on what was called national defense. Where's the national defense?

DIRECT CHALLENGE

From the almost endless and completely unfathomable Pearl Harbor investigation, we evolved the plan for the unification of the armed forces, and created a new Cabinet member, the Secretary of Defense. This was to insure quick action and everlasting security against surprise.

Comes a baby war on the far side of the globe, with a direct challenge to us, and we are not only taken completely by surprise but we also can answer only by sacrificing insufficiently armed kids in a semi-Bataan, and can generate no quick action at all.

We've taken at face value the new and swashbuckling Secretary of Defense because he'd sat in the Secretary of War's office through two or three administrations, taking time out only to amass a private fortune through investments that had nothing to do with his official connection.

It's no secret that he'd yearned for years to be Secretary of War. The only question was why he hung on through so many rebuffs.

He became precious to Mr. Truman just before the last campaign when even the Democrats thought Dewey couldn't lose and left their candidate to hustle on his own. In this dire emergency or glowing opportunity, depending upon the point of view, a few scattered opportunists, our Hon. Maurice J. Tobin being one, rowed out and boarded the leaking craft from which the rats had fled.

Among these was the perennial bridesmaid of the war secretariat, Louis A. Johnson. He became the most beloved because he raised a million dollars and that put Candidate Truman on the road with a private oratorical train. He was the big man and he got the big reward.

Secretary of War wasn't big enough for him then. Mr. Forrestal was ousted to make room for him. Mr. Forrestal subsequently committed suicide. Possibly it's just now becoming apparent why.

This looked all right at the time, politics being politics. Mr. Johnson certainly had had experience at the top in peace and through war. He was considered honest and able. He still looked all right through the big unification fight, and even through the big tussle with the Navy.

The man had to make decisions and it had to be assumed that, supplied with all the facts and theories extant, he knew more than any other American concerning wars of any future and what they probably would need. That was his job and all the Nation had in the way of information was available to him.

The unification row over, cutting back the Navy was noisy and bitter—so noisy and bitter, in fact, that it's doubtful the bewildered public ever fully understood what it really was about. It was primarily a battle of naval aviation officers against the newly separated Army Air Force.

The Navy fliers wanted Navy aviation to remain huge, as it had suddenly become during the recent war. They fought against a cut-back.

They demanded a role for it in strategic, which means long-range, land-based bombing. They may have been sincere in their strategic reasoning, but there were personal angles. Not the least of these was flying pay and faster promotions. Admirals in Navy aviation were at least a half-dozen Annapolis classes younger than sea level admirals at the end of the war.

WHERE MONEY FOR WAR WENT

The eventual decision was that the Navy had no proper place in strategic bombing, that the Air Force, as such, could handle that responsibility. The decision was to build a mighty Air Force and sacrifice all else to it. With the atom bomb, guided missiles, and general push-button warfare, the next conflict, if any, promised to be a Buck Rogers war. It would be a quick, smashing knock-out of rockets, jet planes, atomic war heads.

That was the decision. That's apparently where our $70,000,000,000 went, and then came Korea. It might not look so bad if Mr. Johnson hadn't started boasting. Last April the Defense Secretary said in a roaring speech, "We are now getting equipment superior to that of any other nation." Again he assured his fellow citizens and the world that we "can lick hell out of Russia." He backed that up by saying, "Joe Stalin knows that if he starts something at 4 a. m. the fighting power of the United States will be on the job at 5 a. m."

Joe Stalin started something at 4 a. m. just exactly 1 month ago today. To date "the fighting power of the United States" has yet to arrive and our "equipment superior to that of any other nation" has proved inferior to that of even the North Koreans, wherever they got it.

This doesn't take into consideration the complete failure of our 500-man military commission to form anything even faintly resembling an army from the 96,000 southern Koreans they were supposed to have been training. It makes no allowance for the $10,300,000 voted by Congress a year ago to arm the southern Koreans—only $200 of which ever reached the now shattered and scattered forces.

It disregards the fact that the Thursday before the Sunday invasion, General MacArthur was told in Tokyo by the United States general who'd been in command in Korea that an overt act was very unlikely. It likewise forgets the fact that the colonel left in charge when the general started home said, "Our intelligence is so good we know what the North Koreans are planning before they know it themselves."

Against all of this, read if your heart can take it, the correspondents' stories from Korea, containing direct quotes from our green, untrained kids, who're outmanned, outgunned, and have been completely outfought. Never in the history of the United States have such stories concerning American soldiers been permitted to reach print. Possibly never before in the history of the United States have such stories been true.

On July 8, United Press reporter, Robert C. Miller, sent from the front: "The panic was on. Artillery (ours) pulled out without firing a shot. Jeeps raced to the rear with men who had only one ambition in life—to put as many miles between them and North Koreans as possible. They fled with fear in their eyes and panic in their bellies."

A week later, his theme was the same. Beaten United States troops came to the correspondents, he said, and begged them to "write the truth about this operation * * * why troops were committed to the field without support, why no reinforcements have arrived, how long things will continue this way?"

Another correspondent, Frank Holman, a combat sergeant in World War II, wrote, "Lifeless hands had dropped their rifles where they stood because somebody had sent them into battle unequipped to fight a modern war."

The most shocking dispatch of all quoted a survivor of that "Lost Battalion" that finally found a way out: "We simply ran, we left our guns, our wounded, and everything else where it was.

WOUNDED GI'S ABANDONED

"Some of my best friends were killed. Some more of them were wounded, but it was either them or us. We just left them there and got out the best we could." Imagine American soldiers abandoning their wounded.

There has been much conjecture among experienced correspondents in this country over why such stories are being written and especially over why they are being permitted to come through. It's taken for granted they are being passed by General MacArthur's censorship.

This, assumes the general, is exercising censorship. That may not be so, since this is technically a United Nations, not a United States, operation. We are not officially at war, and possibly wartime censorship cannot be invoked. Still, the general has always been in command of the United States forces, and he is now officially in command of all combined forces.

Those who know the general say he'd find ways, censorship or no censorship, to stop stories he didn't want the American public to see. The theorizing, therefore, is that he wants these stories to come through, that they're his silent indictment of the terrible and inexcusable bungling that has resulted in what amounts to the murder of Americans, their panic and unashamed flight.

His official communiqués are in the usual technical terms, "* * * orderly withdrawals," "retired to prepared positions," etc., but he lets the correspondents send the true picture of helplessness, terror, and self-saving running for the rear as a shameful indictment of the Department of Defense.

As to what can be done, probably nothing can, unless somebody wants to try to impeach the President of the United States. He's secure in his office until the next election and these are his appointees. He's notoriously loyal to his friends under fire. Johnson, obviously ought to be fired as an incompetent, and our entire Department of Defense carefully investigated for other possible failures.

Everybody who had anything to do with the supposed preparation of southern Korea should be dishonorably discharged from the service, and it might not be a bad idea at this time to reexamine General MacArthur. This would have to be done respectfully and tenderly, for he has been magnificent.

Still the man is over 70 years of age, and he's been supreme so long that it may be he now is too completely egocentric.

The planning back here for what's now been permitted to degenerate into a real facsimile of war has to be done in the Pentagon Building. The Pentagon has been forced to depend for its real information upon teletype conversations with the general, and these have been admittedly so terse and so imperious that our headquarters have been able to get no clear picture. That's why Generals Collins and Vandenberg had to fly out to see for themselves. It's very probable General MacArthur will resent their visit. We've no time now for any of that.

In terms of great battles and major casualties, there really isn't much war out there yet. We've simply sacrificed pitifully green and badly underarmed troops in an attempt to delay the enemy until the men can get there. If they can hold until the men do get there, they'll be relieved and flown out. If they can't they'll perish, and our forces will then start storming the beachheads.

By that time, the headlines will turn heroic; our bombings, blastings, and advances will have the eagle proudly screaming again. President Truman will pick up the fallen mantle as Commander in Chief and any bald truth, such as these lines, will promptly be denounced and forshamed as treacherous wedge-driving, tending to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

NOW IS THE TIME TO GET IT ON THE RECORD

That's why I am getting it on record now, while the great leader to come, possibly the horse that mustn't be changed in midstream, is still just a political accident with a lot of second-rate help. Before the cheering starts and before the rapid chapter of new

history bury the embarrassing facts faster than they can be remembered, let it be placed clearly on the record that there's been disastrous handling, worse even than Pearl Harbor, because we had had Pearl Harbor and were assumed to have learned.

I do this now because I remember how it was not too far back when the ghastly mistakes, costly inefficiencies, and deliberate misrepresentations of the last Commander in Chief and his satellites could not be mentioned in anything approximating plain English without the instant charge of disloyalty and division. This even carried into the field of political campaigning and was there even carried to the extreme of demanding silence concerning the candidate's health.

In the July issue of Cosmopolitan magazine, George E. Allen, the White House insider, inadvertently admits the Democratic Party chieftains of 1944 knew President Roosevelt was a dying man. The Allen words are: "All of them (he was one of them) realized that the man nominated to run with Roosevelt would in all probability be the next President of the United States because all of them saw enough of Roosevelt to recognize that his health had deteriorated rapidly through the war years," and so, the theme of the article is, they didn't want Henry Wallace.

But did they warn the Nation that, in its most critical hour in history, it was being asked to vote for a dying man? No. Instead, those asked deliberately lied. The President was fine. His health was never better. He was keen and quick and as solid as a nut. Anybody who even asked such a question was seeking to smear the Commander in Chief. So the great business of the Nation was placed in a pair of dying hands and a mind that had worn itself out. So came Yalta, Truman, and now this disgraceful chapter due to more political bungling.

Certainly we should have gone into Korea, but Korea should never have been allowed to get into us. Let the campaign-fund collector and the pianist who appointed him give an accounting of their husbandry to the mothers of the dead. Eisenhower's still available. Why not draft him?

Soviet Elements in Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would wish to include the following speech on Soviet Elements in Guatemala by my friend, Dr. (Father) Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs. This address, delivered before the Knights of Columbus, Cumberland, Md., anticipated by 1 month the findings of Mr. Will Lissner, special correspondent of the New York Times, whose series of articles on Marxism in Central America appeared during the last week of June. What Dr. Thorning reports about the treatment of United States Ambassador Richard C. Patterson, Jr., is worthy of special consideration.

There is a Soviet cancer in the Western Hemisphere. This malignant growth has its roots in Guatemala, with Soviet-dominated branches in a number of American Republics. Subsidized and controlled by the Kremlin, Soviet agents terrorize the membership and dominate the policy of labor federations, while farm workers and trade-unionists are intimidated and exploited by un-American dictators masquerading as political exiles from Spain, Chile, Honduras, Costa Rica, Venezuela, Colombia, Honduras, and Nicaragua. The backbone of this anti-American clique consists of Sovietized Spaniards who staff its political murder squads. These gunmen, except for a few who are paid by the Spanish Republican Embassy, have no visible means of self-support. Trained observers believe that their money, which is being spent to wage war on American ideals of freedom, democracy, and social progress, is supplied by Moscow.

The facts about this Red network, whose nucleus is in Guatemala, are recorded in six dispatches in the New York Times by Mr. Will Lissner, June 22–28, 1950. Within the last 3 years a Soviet minority has obtained key posts in the present Guatemalan Government—Soviet agents are on the public payroll; Kremlin puppets, as in other countries, have won access to confidential Government funds; Moscow propagandists operate with immunity on the staffs of three pro-Government newspapers—and, despite this poisonous Soviet infiltration, the administration of the present Guatemalan administration tries to maintain that there is no pro-Moscow movement in the country.

Under these circumstances, it is time for all Americans to take the initiative in liberating Guatemalan labor organizations from their Soviet overlords. The bulk of the Guatemalan people want free labor groups, without any subordination to Generalissimo Josef Stalin. It is the Soviet Union, not the United States of America, that is interfering in the domestic concerns of Guatemala. The "goon squads" in this important Republic are not recruited from United States companies or paid by the United States Embassy; these murderers are the underworld tools of the U. S. S. R. and of its sympathizers.

This is a situation which calls for an immediate investigation by the Organization of American States. In the meantime, all the peoples of the hemisphere have a right to scrutinize the attitude of the Guatemalan Government, face to face with a Soviet cell operating within, and thanks to the financial support of its own administration. Can the Government of President Juan José Arevalo "clean house"? This is a question that concerns every citizen of every one of the American Republics. The cancerous growth in Guatemala, if unchecked, can proliferate everywhere, strangling workers, farmers, miners, artists, intellectuals, and enterprises. In this way the first Soviet Republic in the Western Hemisphere may set a fatal precedent.

One of the most significant revelations made by Mr. Lissner in the New York Times (June 27, 1950) was that concerning the threatened assassination by Soviet agents in Guatemala of the United States Ambassador, the Hon. Richard C. Patterson, Jr. This gentleman, as Ambassador to Yugoslavia, had familiarized himself with Marxist tactics. Consequently, he sized up the Soviet pattern in Guatemala, instantly and accurately.

Fully aware of the Moscow menace to continental unity, Ambassador Patterson decided to do his best to protect North American interests in Guatemala. When he pointed out the injustices done with respect to United States business in Guatemala, Ambassador Patterson became unpopular with extremist elements in the present Guatemalan administration. The New York Times writer makes it clear that pro-Government adherents, not nationalists of the Right, were the agitators who threatened to kill Ambassador Patterson and then staged a public demonstration against him. In other words, the Left-wing elements in the present Guatemalan administration, acting upon orders from the Kremlin, boasted that they were ready to give a United States envoy the Benes treatment. According to Mr. Lissner, the orders to the Communist clique in Guatemala were relayed through Soviet headquarters in Mexico City. Moreover, the New York Times correspondent claims that evidence to prove these reports is in the hands of Guatemalan Government security forces. In brief, the present Guatemalan administration acquiesced in anti-American intrigues on the part of the Soviet Foreign Office. Obviously, such Moscow dictation is the business of all the 21 American Republics and Canada. What the Soviets are attempting to do by force of arms in southern Korea, they are plotting to accomplish throughout the Americas. Actually, without firing a shot, except through the agency of assassins, they have imposed their own Soviet pattern upon the international relations of a Good Neighbor Republic in the heart of Central America.

With regard to the murder squad detailed to despatch Ambassador Patterson, it must be emphasized that the present Guatemalan administration has on file the names of the would-be executioners. None has yet been arrested, although all the details of the murder scheme are known, including the place of ambush. It was to have been an "incident" similar to the entrapment and murder of Col. Francisco Arana, popular candidate for the Guatemalan presidency just about 1 year ago. In an effort to intimidate Ambassador Patterson, offensive slogans were painted on the United States Embassy as well as upon the Ambassador's residence. Threats were conveyed by means of anonymous telephone calls. All these provocations were ignored by the Ambassador.

In the meantime, Foreign Minister Ismael Gonzáles Arévalo of Guatemala, communicating details of this campaign to Washington, requested that the Ambassador, for his own safety, be withdrawn from Guatemala. In the words of Mr. Lissner, this move was a confession that the sovereign Government of Guatemala was unable to protect an accredited diplomat against lawless activty by Communists harbored by that (i. e., the Guatemalan) Government. Furthermore, it was a slur on the Guardia Civil, an efficient and courteous national civil police force. In short, the present Guatemalan administration was unwilling to utilize the forces of public order with a view to preventing the assassination of a United States chief of diplomatic mission, whose only function and sole effort had been the fulfillment of duty in safeguarding American interests.

Although the request of the Guatemalan Foreign Office was rejected by our State Department, this result did not stop Soviet agitation against the United States. On May Day, as a climax of a number of provocative actions, an article was published in the official newspaper, Diario de Centro América, denouncing the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, by name. Curiously enough, this official publication is edited by a known Communist, Alfredo Guerra Borges, although some non-Soviets are on the staff.

Although the United States Government did not yield to Soviet-inspired threats and although Ambassador Patterson is still accredited to Guatemala, the latter is now residing in Washington. Obviously, Mr. Patterson knew too much about Marxist techniques. Moreover, he understood the rights of his own country in the current duel with the Soviet Union. He was not prepared to

stand by, silently, while Guatemala became another Sovietized Czechoslovakia.

The United States ambassador was an effective roadblock to further Soviet infiltration. Consequently, the Kremlin high command ordered his liquidation. And all this happened, not in Albania, not in the Balkans, not in the Orient; but it took place in our own backyard. I repeat that there is a Soviet cancer in the Western Hemisphere. While American boys are shot down in the Far East, what is American policy with respect to Soviet stooges who openly announce their determination to murder an Ambassador of the United States of America? The American Republics ought to be able and willing to answer this question.

Soviet Influence in the Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a large part of the first article in an interesting series that was published by the New York Times, June 22–28, 1950, as a result of an on-the-spot investigation of several months by Mr. Will Lissner, special correspondent. The facts revealed in this study have a direct bearing upon the security of the American people. Furthermore, they may be considered in connection with events in the Far East as well as in Europe.

The article follows:

SOVIET AGENTS PLOTTING TO RUIN UNITY, DEFENSES OF AMERICAS—CENTRAL-AMERICAN NETWORK FOR LONG-RANGE PLAN BASED IN GUATEMALA

(This is the first of six dispatches on Soviet penetration in Central America and on the economic and political relations of that area.)

(By Will Lissner)

SAN JOSE, Costa Rica, June 5.—The Soviet Union has under way in Central America a long-range program for penetrating inter-American defenses in the strategic Panama Canal region and shattering continental unity.

Operations under the carefully calculated plan are being directed by the clandestine Communist Party of Guatemala. This party, tightly organized underground, receives substantial funds and other aid from the Soviet Government, functions as an arm of the official Soviet Information Bureau and uses Guatemala as a base for the infiltration of the five other Central American Republics.

The activities of Soviet agents in the strategic Central American isthmus that includes the sole midhemisphere link between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans were studied by this correspondent in the course of a 2-months' survey of the international economic and political relations of the six countries in the region.

The Governments of the six Republics, and particularly that of President Juan José Arévalo in Guatemala, as well as many private citizens in all walks of life and other observers, gave the New York Times inquiry full cooperation. Communist activities were studied at first hand and documentary evidence of Soviet designs in the region was gathered.

The evidence shows that the new Soviet program is no mere revival of the ill-fated Oumansky plan for commercial and political penetration of Latin America. That plan apparently died with its creator, Soviet Ambassador Constantine A. Oumansky, who was killed in a plane crash in Mexico in 1945. Thus far the development of commercial relations has been only of incidental interest to the Soviet fifth column. Nor is there any quixotic hope of achieving a Soviet Republic of Central America in the immediate future. Indeed, the program looks forward to establishing a strong, left-wing labor movement controlled by the Communists only in 15 or 20 years.

PROGRAM CAREFULLY CONCEIVED

The program has more limited and more practical aims, perfectly adapted to the political situation in Latin America. These are the following:

1. To neutralize Latin America, an important source of strategic raw materials, in the event of a third world war, and thus make good the boast of Juan Marinelio, Cuban Communist leader: "The Latin-American peoples will never fight on the side of their exploiters against the Soviet Union."

2. To cut off profits from United States investments in the region and reduce United States markets there—amounting to 70 to 90 percent of the countries' imports—so as to help bring on that major depression on which Soviet imperalism has banked for the consolidation of its gains.

3. To create uncertainty and hesitation in the United States by continental disunity so as to make it more amenable to Soviet peace maneuvers.

4. If completely successful, to tie down substantial inter-American defense forces in strategic areas as a minimum goal, and to create breaches in hemispheric defenses as a maximum goal, whenever the war that Soviet ideologists consider inevitable does break out.

Thus far only in Guatemala, governed by an alliance between extremist and moderate nationalists and left-wing and moderate Socialists with the Communists, has the Communist Party succeeded in entrenching itself. It had a similar position in Costa Rica, but a popular revolution staged by armed citizens in 1949 suppressed the party, the labor movement it controlled, and the reactionaries who collaborated with them.

But in all the other Central American republics there exists an underground Communist network tied to Guatemala and through it to Communist Latin-America headquarters in Mexico City and Habana, which, through the Soviet Communist Party's Communist information bureau, are linked with Moscow.

MOVEMENT IS UNDERGROUND

This movement not only is underground at present but it is disorganized throughout the region (save only in the Canal Zone itself) because the Governments of El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panama have been vigilant and have acted forcefully to stamp out Communist agitation.

In spite of constant prosecution, in some countries carried to the point of expelling overzealous agitators, efforts are being made constantly in these five countries to reestablish functioning underground parties and recover positions in or rebuild the labor movements. Within the last month or two exiled Communist leaders have drifted back into El Salvador, Honduras, and Costa Rica, and all but the Costa Rican leaders, who have to purge themselves of suspicion of Titoism, are amply supplied with funds.

In El Salvador, where they are being ousted from control of the vital railway workers' union by a vigorous anti-Communist movement, they retained part control of the university students' paper, Opinión Estudiantil, although the students, as everywhere in Central America, are overwhelmingly anti-Communist. The Communists are attempting, with small success, to organize trade unions. Greater success is greeting propaganda directed at youth through the revived left-wing paper, Grito de Juventud, and at the peasants through distribution of the Mexican Communist paper, El Campesino. But government vigilance has prevented the organization of youth and peasant movements.

In Honduras the Communists have succeeded in influencing, but not in controlling, the university students, who are ardent nationalists, and in building a following of some hundreds among the rabble of the cities. Organized leftists are anarcho-syndicalists, followers of Mikhail Bakunin and Peter Kropotkin, who want the state abolished and the economy run cooperatively by the unions. They are bitterly anti-Communist.

In Nicaragua stern Government measures have forced the Communists to lie low or flee to Guatemala, where there is a large Nicaraguan Communist colony.

In Panama the movement, when it was suppressed, consisted only of scores, not hundreds, of members, the strategists preferring to work through intellectuals.

In the Canal Zone itself, the Communists, exploiting the liberal policies of United States administration, still retain strategic posts in the trade unions, though they have been dislodged from many of them by the anti-Communist drive of the United States labor movement. The Communist movement in the zone is autonomous from Guatemala and is believed to operate directly under Vincente Lombardo Toledano, Communist Latin-American chief, whose headquarters are in Mexico.

Except in Guatemala the Communist record in the Central American Republics has been one of repeated failure. But this is true only because vigorous governmental prosecution has kept the movement disorganized. There is much latent discontent in all these countries, which the Communists are ready to exploit successfully once vigilance is relaxed. What will happen then may well repeat what has happened in Guatemala.

In Guatemala, the largest of the Central American Republics in population, though not in land area—it has nearly 4,000,000 people, half of them Indians, on 42,000 square miles—the Communists entrenched themselves in politics in a little more than 3 years. They obtained jobs on the public payroll, won access to confidential Government funds, and maneuvered Dr. Anévalo's administration into a position in which it had to tolerate the illegal organized existence of the Soviet-directed party.

Because of the strategic place the Communists came to occupy in Guatemala's politics, the Arévalo administration has found it necessary to deny the existence of a Communist movement while it obtained key posts in one of the three Government parties, on the staffs of the three pro-Government newspapers and most of the radio stations, in the two principal labor federations, and in the leadership of most of the trade unions.

While maintaining that it would not tolerate interference either by Russia or the United States in its domestic affairs, the Arévalo administration has been obliged to allow the underground Communist party to disrupt Guatemala's international relations, especially with the United States and the other American Republics, seeking only to mitigate the damage the Communists have done to the country's national interests.

This has been achieved by a party that has nearly a thousand members and candidates, including a core of about 300 foreigners who are political exiles. Its backbone is a

large minority of Communist Spanish republicans, who staff its political assassination squads. Two of them, on their most recent assignment, took part in the murder of an unofficial representative of the Franco Government of Spain in Mexico last February.

The other foreigners include Chileans, Venezuelans, Colombians, Salvadoreans, Hondurans, Nicaraguans, and Costa Ricans, as well as one or two Mexicans. The emigrés, mostly intellectuals, have no visible means of self-support, except for a few who work in the Spanish Republican Embassy. Yet they are never short of cash save just before visits to Mexico or (more rarely) Cuba. They live on a scale higher than North American tourists.

In addition there are about 200 trade-union functionaries, half of whom have trade-union jobs; a youth movement of 150, few of them actually students because Guatemalan university students are militantly anti-Communist; and 200 intellectuals, mostly lawyers, journalists, and school teachers, but including writers, artists, and a few physicians and dentists.

Of actual workers and peasants the party appears to have recruited less than 100, largely railway workers, dockers, tenant farmers, and 1 Indian who is being groomed for leadership.

Through this small organization the Communists have controlled until recently the largest party in the governing coalition, the Partido Acción Revolucionaria (PAR). Through it they control the unions in the country's two large labor federations, with a membership of 80,000 mostly of workers who distrust or hate their Communist mentors. Through it they manipulate other thousands of undisciplined fair-weather sympathizers among the agricultural workers.

COMMUNISTS USE TERROR

The secret of Communist control is twofold: terror and organization.

Guatemala has inherited from its nearly 2,000,000 Indians an extraordinary pacifism expressed in a horror of bloodshed and disorder. The Communists have been capitalizing on this.

From the trade-union and pro-Government newspaper staffs the party has recruited goon squads who attempt to keep the opposition terrorized. Most of the goons observed were callow youths, anemic and unprepossessing hangers-on of the intellectuals, who could not survive a day's battle in a New York or Chicago slum. About a dozen, characters who looked like the dregs of the local jails, were observed in the guard of honor at a Communist rally; this small group more closely resembled New York mobsters.

Evidently from among these latter came the unidentified persons who, on succeeding days while this correspondent was in Guatemala, sneaked up behind two Oppositionist students, Carlos Guzman Bockler and Francisco Fonseca Ruiz, and bludgeoned them, leaving them unconscious on the sidewalk.

Not only are students, workers, and intellectuals terrorized. Influential businessmen begged that their identities be concealed "or I'll be killed." Anti-Communist politicians in the administration and the opposition never go out without a pistol in a shoulder holster or an automatic in their trousers pocket.

For private citizens whose marksmanship keeps the "goons" at bay, the Communists have other medicine. Labor trouble, regulations trouble with Government departments in which they have agents, and pressure on customers and clients help to keep them in line.

Interviewing a leading oppositionist presidential candidate, this correspondent found himself sitting next to a loaded revolver. In jesting about it, he received the explanation that the candidate had tossed it there on entering the house. "I have to carry a gun," he said. "I never know when I may have to defend myself against the terrorists."

REDS ORGANIZE THOROUGHLY

Equally important in the explanation of the Communists' influence is their thorough organization. Guatemalans and foreign emigrés who admitted readily that they were Communists or at least (Stalinist) Leninists denied that a party existed. But many of them acknowledged to this correspondent that they were organized into "Marxist-Leninist study groups" that met regularly.

In theory the party is organized in autonomous but linked cells of seven, meeting in strictly private gatherings with attendance by invitation only. In practice the clubs are of varying size, much larger than seven, and everybody knows everybody else. They meet regularly in private homes in Guatemala City, Escuintla, Quetzaltenango, Puerto Barrios, and San José (and undoubtedly other localities not known to the writer).

Far from being conspiratorial in atmosphere, the meetings usually begin with revolutionary and traditional group singing that is clearly audible in the street, giving the sessions the tone of camp meetings. Except for the periods given over to the inevitable lectures and orations, there is much frivolity and conviviality—the Communists are Latin Americans. The Communists sing as well as the student oppositionists, as this correspondent—who has heard both—can testify.

Besides the clubs, they form caucuses in the trade-unions, and certain industries and Government departments where they have members. The caucus meetings are said to be more businesslike but also more perfunctory.

The leading members, known as the internationalists because their first concern and interest is the Soviet Union, are fully indoctrinated, right on the beam ideologically and aware of the latest twists and turns of the Soviet line.

The explanation of this, in remote Guatemala, is simple. Many reported having attended political schools in Colombia, Chile, and Mexico, which authorities on communism in those countries later identified as having been run by honor graduates of the Lenin School in Moscow.

SOVIET BEAM IS POWERFUL

And Guatemala shares with the world's great powers an unusual distinction. Nightly at 9:30 it is the target of a powerful Moscow radio broadcast in Spanish that overrides competing programs in the 19- and 25-meter shortwave bands. It is announced by a man who speaks Spanish with precise diction and an agreeable voice.

Because few of the members have shortwave radios, the broadcast is transcribed and mimeographed. It is circulated to members by the party as an internal bulletin, sometimes along with locally written material. Occasionally the party gets out a printed bulletin for members, candidates, and sympathizers. Persons in Guatemala and El Salvador who follow Communist activities closely have gained possession of several copies of these bulletins.

By some technical quirk of broadcasting, the broadcast cannot be picked up in any of the other Central American countries except by the adept "hams" (amateur radio hobbyists) in Costa Rica. In neighboring El Salvador, however, the English-language broadcast, beamed to North America, is occasionally heard. A Guatemala City newspaperman acts as correspondent, using a Paris mail drop.

Several types of political bulletins are circulated from Mexico by Señor Lombardo Toledano's Mexican Communist Party and his Latin-American Confederation of Labor. His party newspaper, La Voz de Mejico, and the peasant paper, El Campesino, are also circulated.

Marxist Leninist classics, in Spanish translation, are supplied by the foreign language publishing house in Moscow at nominal prices, along with Soviet and Cominform periodicals in Spanish. These are reputedly circulated through a clandestine book shop in an importing house and, in the case of selected works, through an open book shop frequented by trade-unionists. This correspondent saw the books and papers, but he never succeeded in locating the book shops.

In addition, the party has its own sources of information on Latin-American affairs. It has at least one member on the staffs of the Guatemalan diplomatic missions in Mexico and Habana and is reputed to have placed members in certain missions elsewhere. The members in Mexico City and Habana maintain contact with the Communist headquarters in those capitals.

From Guatemala City information and literature radiate through Central America by courier, thus evading the universal mail censorship in the region. Several Salvadorean officials charged that when the border was closed to stop Communist infiltration, Communist couriers came from Guatemala on diplomatic passports.

The Guatemalan party is also the channel through which flows the funds that maintain Communist leaders in all the other Central American Republics (except for the time being, Costa Rica) without visible means of support. None is as amply provided for, however, as the Guatemalans and their émigré allies.

In a few instances, investigators from several governments have traced transfers of funds to Cominform sources. They found that apparently in emergency cases, overseas plane fares for Communist leaders needed abroad had been paid for by transfers from Prague and Paris. Certain other transfers have been established. Apart from these, transfers of funds have been made by courier. The substantial sums being spent, at a time when Soviet resources are spread thin over wide areas, attest to the seriousness of Russian intentions.

Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the Election of President and Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am in accord with the purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 2, now before the House, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the election of President and Vice President.

The office of President of the United States stands out as the most important in all the world. It is therefore particularly appropriate that the method of electing our President shall not only be fair and just as between the several States, but, that it will above all else truly reflect the will of our people.

Under the present provisions of the Constitution the President is elected through an intermediate agency called

the electoral college. The people are thereby denied the right of voting directly for the President. While these electors are pledged, under our present system, to vote for a designated candidate for President, they are not legally required to do so.

It was intended by the original framers of the Constitution that the electors should after their election have discretionary power in selecting the President. This theory prevailed until about 1800. Since that time, however, the discretion supposed to be lodged in them has been whittled away until today the discretionary element has disappeared and in its place has been substituted the political party organization system that binds the electors, if and when elected, to vote for the designated party candidate. Therefore, ever since the discretionary power has been, in practice, eliminated the presidential electors, have performed a function that was useless except for meeting the constitutional requirement that the President must be elected by presidential electors.

The proposed amendment would abolish the presidential electors and the people would vote directly for President instead of electing him by proxy as at present.

The present system of counting the votes for President creates a situation that is unfair and unjust to a large percentage of the voters. This is due to the unit system of counting State votes. Under this system the whole of the State goes to the one candidate who has the plurality, regardless of how small or how large that plurality may be. Thus, no minority vote less than the plurality vote has any constitutional bearing upon the choice of President.

Under this system of computing votes the American people in the last 11 presidential elections from 1908 to 1948, inclusive, have indirectly cast over 372,000,000 votes for President. Of those votes, 163,000,000, or over 44 percent of all cast, were credited in the electoral college contrary to the way voted and as if they were voted for the plurality candidate in each State.

This is a perversion of votes and a disfranchisement of voters that has no legitimate place in a popular form of government. It is a perversion of votes without parallel in the history of popular governments.

The proposed change is to abolish the unit vote. Each candidate would have credit for all his own votes and no credit for the votes of his opponents. If a candidate wins it must be on his own votes, and not on the credit of his opponents' votes.

Thus, under the proposed amendment recognition is given in each State to the number of votes cast for the respective candidates, but, without changing the number of votes to which each State is now entitled in the existing electoral college, namely, one vote for each Representative in Congress and one for each Senator from the several States. For instance in the State of New Jersey with 14 Representatives in the House and 2 in the Senate, a total of 16, would be divided between the respective candidates on the basis of the vote cast for each. The same would be true in each of the States. This would be in place of giving to the candidate with the largest number of votes all of the votes even though a large percentage of the total votes were cast for the other candidate. The present method not only in effect disfranchises voters but actually counts their votes for the candidate for whom they did not vote. The injustice of the present method is readily seen. It calls for the change which the proposed amendment would accomplish if adopted.

Furthermore, regardless of what the individual Member's views of this proposed amendment may be, it is my opinion that the people of the several States should be given the opportunity to reexamine and to change if they so desire, the present electoral college system of electing Presidents. The necessity of submitting this amendment to the several States, and, the requirement that it must be adopted by three-fourths of the States, makes certain that the final action will represent the will of the people, and, at the same time precludes any precipitous change in our basic law.

For the reasons I have stated, and, for others that might be set forth, I will support the pending resolution.

The Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, ever since its inception, I have read a column entitled "One Man's Opinion," which appears weekly in two newspapers published in my congressional district.

Mr. Ralph Heinzen, who for many years served as a foreign correspondent, the writer of this column, draws on his vast experiences in following many wars to give us an insight into his opinion of the Korean conflict.

Because I consider the column informative and worth-while reading, I wish to include it herein:

ONE MAN'S OPINION—WAR IN KOREA WILL END SWIFTLY ONCE WEIGHT OF OUR ARMOR AND PLANES EXCEEDS WHAT RUSSIA HAS THROWN IN

(By Ralph Heinzen)

This time, they cannot throw back at America that in South Korea, she is fighting in defense of her interests. There are no American financial or industrial interests in South Korea. This time, they must admit, America is fighting to resist tyranny and to preserve peace—for the rest of the world, not merely for herself.

It is still too early to calculate the costs of our intervention, but it is not too late to add up the costs of what might have happened had we sought to tergiversate. If ours had been a policy of stalling, of equivocation, Russia would have presented us, the UN, and the world with another fait accompli, as in China. It would have cost a war to have upset a North Korean victory. At least we have avoided that pitfall.

In taking the risk of war, the United States has united the whole of the rest of the world against aggression and for the first time since Communist Russia began her creeping, piecemeal aggression when the shooting war stopped 5 years ago she finds herself isolated from the non-Communist world.

Without a doubt, our greatest victory in this interlude has been getting India to approve the Security Council resolution on Korea. It was the first time that India took sides between the United States and Russia since the world-wide tension of communism and anti-Communist began. That fact is fraught with importance, because the prestige of India among Asiatic countries and in the tropical oil and rubber-rich lands on the Far East is great. Without India's approval, the clever Russian modern day version of Goebbels might have exploited the situation to make the Asiatics believe that this is another white man versus yellow man affair. With India abandoning neutrality for the first time to take sides, it is clear to all Asia that this is a matter of the whole of the free world against Communist aggression and imperialist expansion.

VAST CONTINENT

Our diplomatic victory in swinging India into our camp, even though her approbation of the Lake Success action was delayed, compensates somewhat for our loss of China to Moscow. There are many military and political observers who believe that China will be a millstone around Stalin's neck, as she has so often been in 3,000 years of history.

India's importance is tremendous in holding the line which President Truman has drawn from Korea to the tropics, a line of no retreat. Indian prestige is great in that dangerous perimeter of our Asiatic line. With its hundreds of millions of population, India is the most important single unit of that perimeter. Through India, we may hope to hold the masses of Thailand, Burma, Indonesia, and Indochina on our side. Had India swung to communism, the whole perimeter would have been endangered.

CHINA CAN BE WON

With India in our camp, China is regainable. Without India, China would be written off as lost to communism. The same, in a lesser way, can be said of Formosa and Korea. They are the bridgeheads of democracy in a continent of confusion.

The fighting has been going on for three weeks but there still is no positive proof that Russia has gone into the Korean war as we have done, openly and under our own flag. The North Koreans are using 12 and 35-ton Soviet tanks. They are using Soviet Yak fighter planes. Their artillery is Russian and Japanese, from the great stocks of Jap material abandoned in the arsenals of Manchuria. But, thus far, there is no sign of the presence at the Korean front of a single Russian Red Army unit.

LESSONS LEARNED

The fighting has been most profitable in useful lessons and we have learned these few basic facts already:

1. Our bazookas and small-caliber antitank guns are obsolete. They did not stop the Russian tanks in the North Koreans' hands, although our fighter planes using gasoline jelly and rockets did break up tank concentrations.

2. Despite the A-bomb, the H-bomb, rockets, jets, and all the other modern inventions for mass-killing, it's GI Joe, the foot-soldier upon whom the real fighting falls. The infantry is not obsolete, even though much of its equipment is.

MISTAKES WERE MADE

Those are vital lessons we have learned the hard way. It is timely that we have been able to test out our weapons against the Soviet Red army's material. Apparently, our "top brass" made mistakes. This timely test of material should enable us to correct them.

The pro-Communist crackpot wing of American and British opinion published the belief that Russia set a trap for us in Korea and that we Americans fell into it. The weight of evidence would deny that. Russia surely never believed that we would mobilize our strength against her aggression in Korea after having allowed China to slide by the board without raising a finger.

That same crackpot wing has sought to stir up bad feeling at home by crying: "Higher taxes." They are also stimulating hoarding with a whispering campaign tending to prove that prices will rise and that there again will be shortages of most commodities.

The truth is that our Defense Department has a cushion of between two and three billion dollars in raw and finished materials and in credits which will more than see us through the Korean affair, barring unforeseen toughness on the part of the Korean Communists. There need be no danger of creating shortages or forcing up prices on consumer goods unless the war lasts several months. Those who needlessly and heedlessly stock up on sugar, coffee, and other commodities are merely helping the speculators because only the latter will gain by such speculative buying.

It is this One Man's Opinion that we have not been trapped. It is our opinion that the American armies are not going to be mired down in Korea for the duration of the 6 months monsoon period—even though Russian strategists certainly did bring the monsoons into their calculations. In our opinion the war will end rapidly when the weight of American armor and planes is greater than what Russia has invested is this war. At the rate we are going in our mobilization of force, that will not be long.

The story of Korea adds up to this: Russia has not engaged a single division, a single air squadron, or a single unit of its own armed force. But by use of native forces under its control of Indochina, Russia has induced the engagement in the Far East of the bulk of the French Army, a high proportion of British strength in Burma and now a rising amount of American strength in Korea. If the British, French, and American forces now engaged in various policing and restraining actions in Asia could be put on the Elbe, the defense of western Europe would be a solved problem. As it is, all Russian forces are intact and in what amounts to a strategic reserve available for any possible theater of action. On the other hand the forces of Britain, France and the United States—the strongest of the free countries—are heavily engaged now on the periphery of Asia.

UN Flag in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, an editorial which appeared in the Newark Evening News of July 13, 1950, was of particular significance to me. First it made me proud to note that the blue and white ensign of the United Nations which is now being carried by our boys in Korea is being manufactured in Essex County, wherein I reside.

But more important, as the editor puts it, is the fact that this flag is symbolic of the unity of freedom-seeking nations in their quest for peace even if it means battle against the Communist aggressor.

Yes, this is truly a real manifestation of international progress, the sort of progress which one day may represent our greatest bequest to the future.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the editorial:

UN FLAG IN KOREA

As of today, the blue and white ensign of the United Nations is being carried from Essex County, where it is being manufactured, into the Korean conflict to symbolize the unity of free and peace-seeking nations against Communist aggression.

But in the longer perspective of history future generations will see in it a truly historic evidence of international progress—slow and painful though it be to us of these last war-torn decades.

Consider how the course of history might have been changed less than 20 years ago had the flag of the League of Nations been carried against the aggression of Japan in Manchuria. But the world powers then did not know what they know now—nor had they suffered as they were to suffer by subsequent aggressions which led to World War II.

Instead, the League of Nations was both impotent and confused. The United States, through Secretary of State Stimson, spoke forth firmly enough against the Japanese, but this firmness was itself nullified by America's abstention from League membership. As nationalist powers of that day, Britain, France, and Italy had their own axes to grind. So the League talked, but did not act—a weakness which led to its ultimate collapse.

From the lessons of its predecessor, as well as those of World War II, the present United Nations Organization has drawn the life to act so swiftly and dynamically in Korea. That is the sort of progress which one day may represent our greatest bequest to the future.

Prisoners of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal, of July 2, 1950, entitled "Barbed Wire and Now This," and call to the attention of all the Members the shameful condition which it describes.

It was the Members of Congress who decided the World War II prisoners, or their survivors, should be compensated for inadequate rations and other deprivations which were their lot while in the hands of the enemy. The money for the payment of these claims has been derived from the liquidation of enemy assets, and it is already on hand in the Treasury.

It is indeed a shame that the distribution of this money, which is subject to the direction of Congress, has been choked to the point where only an insignificant percentage of the claims received can be processed. I sincerely hope that, after reading the following editorial, the Members will agree that this situation must be remedied without any further delay:

BARBED WIRE AND NOW THIS!

A merited complaint on behalf of American prisoners of war comes from the Disabled American Veterans.

Congress decided that these World War II prisoners, or their survivors, should be compensated for inadequate rations and other deprivations which were their lot while in the hands of the enemy. The money to pay these claims and the administration of them is derived from liquidation of enemy assets. It is already on hand in the Treasury.

Yet, says the DAV, distribution has been choked down to a mere trickle. The House has cut the 1951 fiscal year release of the funds for administration of claims from $8,000,000, recommended by the Budget Bureau, to $537,900. So, according to the DAV, the War Claims Commission can only process about 280 prisoner applications a week, while the applications continue to roll in at a rate of 12,000 a week.

Prisoners of war who are still suffering the effects of confinement in Japanese camps, heroes of Bataan, families of men who died of disease and starvation behind the barbed wire compounds in Germany, face interminable delay in getting money—enemy money—that has been promised them. And all for no direct saving, if any saving at all, to the American taxpayer.

On the face of it, this is worse than misdirected economy. It is rank injustice unnecessarily to delay distribution of money which Congress has promised to these American prisoners of war or their survivors, money which is on hand and came from enemy sources.

Congress can still rectify this House blunder and this bad faith in fulfilling a pledge to American prisoners of war, and should certainly do so.

Renazification of Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement of the Brooklyn Council for a Democratic Germany, expressing their opposition to renazification of Germany.

The Brooklyn Council for a Democratic Germany is an organization sponsored by the Brooklyn Jewish Community Council, the American Jewish Committee, New York chapter, the American Jewish Congress, Brooklyn division, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the Brooklyn Board of Rabbis, the Jewish Labor Committee, the Jewish War Veterans, Kings County Council, and the National Council of Jewish Women, Brooklyn section.

The statement follows:

The establishment of a western German state and the end of military government in Germany mark the termination of the first phase of American occupation, and require a critical appraisal of our policy in Germany.

In 4 years of military occupation, the formal elements for the creation of a free state have been established; parliamentary institutions, a free press, political parties, an independent labor movement, and a functioning economy. Yet the chief goals of American policy, the democratization of German life, assurance that its economy will not be used for aggression, and the integration of Germany into the European democratic community are far from achievement. The extent to which these goals have been lost sight of is indicated by the reemergence of extreme nationalist political groups; the return of many former active Nazis and other extreme nationalists to important administrative and economic positions, and the proposals for the creation of a German Army. Such a revival of German militarism would recreate the traditional foe of German democracy and would raise well-founded fears of German aggression in the western European community and would create danger of a new alliance between German militarists and the totalitarian communism of the East.

In this connection we are gratified to note that in his statement on the occassion of the opening of the Amerika House in Stuttgart on February 6, 1950, High Commissioner John J. McCloy clearly enunciated the principles that "Germany cannot be allowed to develop political conditions or a military status which would threaten the other nations or the peace of the world"; also that "there will be no German Army or air force"; that "one of the primary purposes of the occupation has been and is to eradicate Nazi influence and leadership from German political, economic, and cultural life"; and that "we shall not hesitate to use all our power and influence to expose and counteract any subversive influences which condone or encourage the revival of nazism in German life."

It is hoped that High Commissioner McCloy's statement of policy will mark the end of present trends toward supranationalism and German militarism. Strengthening German reaction in order to build a bulwark against communism in effect creates one potential totalitarianism in order to combat another. Only genuine democrats can build a Germany which will add strength to European democracy and reinforce the effective opposition to totalitarianism.

In view of the failures and disappointments of the past and the dangers inherent in the present situation in Germany, what is imperatively needed at this point is a full review by Congress and by a Presidential commission of the execution of American policy in Germany and the adoption of a positive program which will:

1. Strengthen the pro-democratic forces in Germany—the democratic labor movement, the cooperatives, the democratically constituted social welfare agencies and the municipalities under effective popular control.

2. Eliminate all active supporters of the Nazi program from policy making and other positions of authority or responsibility in the administrative, judicial and educational systems of the German Government and in that connection the High Commission should bring its influence to bear to secure such action by the German Government and should apply this policy in reviewing its own past and future accomplishments.

3. Democratize the economy and curb the concentration of economic power in cartels and trusts.

4. Maintain such controls of the German economy as may be required to insure that, while Germany will contribute to European recovery and its people will enjoy an adequate standard of living, it shall never again become an aggressor. In that connection the coal, iron, and steel producing facilities of the Ruhr should be developed in concert with the western European countries under a strict system of democratic controls, which must include full labor participation.

5. Facilitate the reeducation of the German people, especially its youth, in a spirit of democratic and peaceful cooperation.

Only with the accomplishment of these measures can a democratic Germany be built and the danger of a Communist or Nazi Germany be avoided. The occupation authorities must effectively use the powers reserved to them under the occupation statutes until the achievement of this minimum program is reasonably assured.

Transmitted by and with the approval of the Brooklyn Council for a Democratic Germany.

ARTHUR J. S. ROSENBAUM,
Chairman, Interim Committee.

New Home Building in May Smashes All Records: 140,000 Dwelling Units Started

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement from the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor titled "New Home Building in May Smashes All Records: 140,000 Dwelling Units Started":

NEW HOME BUILDING IN MAY SMASHES ALL RECORDS: 140,000 DWELLING UNITS STARTED

May home building broke all previous monthly records by spiralling to 140,000 new permanent dwelling units started, according to preliminary estimates of the United States Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics. The May figure was 11 percent greater than that for April 1950, and almost 50 percent ahead of the May 1949 level.

The half-million mark for new housing starts was reached in May this year, 2 months earlier than last year. The cumulative total for the first 5 months of 1950 was 538,000 units, compared with 354,000 units in the like period of 1949. The sharp gain in home construction this year over last has been country-wide, and has been shared by cities as well as outlying areas.

Telegraphic reports of local building permits issued for new dwelling units in May in principal cities of the country show increases over April for all regions but the Middle Atlantic, West North Central, and South Atlantic States, where the volume remained about the same. Two-thirds of the reporting cities showed an increase over April in the number of units for which building permits were issued.

Number of new nonfarm dwelling units started—1948, 1949, and 1950

1948 [1]	931,600
January	53,500
February	50,100
March	76,400
April	99,500
May	100,300
June	97,800
July	95,000
August	86,700
September	82,300
October	73,400
November	63,700
December	52,900
1949	1,025,100
January	50,000
February	50,400
March	69,400
April	88,300
May	95,400
June	95,500
July	96,100
August	99,000
September	102,900
October	104,300
November	95,500
December	78,300
1950:	
January	78,700
February	[1] 82,900
March	[2] 110,000
April	[2] 126,000
May	[2] 140,000

[1] Revised.
[2] Preliminary.

It Needed Saying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid editorial It Needed Saying appearing in the June 15, 1950, issue of the South Boston Tribune, and written by Charles L. Brooks of South Boston, Mass.:

IT NEEDED SAYING

President Truman made a direct break with usual diplomatic practice last Saturday in his St. Louis speech when he lashed out at the Soviet Union and referred to it directly in his charge that its leaders have been an obstacle to peace. Yet what the President said needed saying. Too long has our foreign policy been a shilly-shallying attempt to establish a modus vivendi with Russia.

Our Nation wants peace. So do the Russians, unless they can get more by aggression. Their peacetime armaments show that they will turn from the path of peace whenever they think the moment opportune. The President puts us on record as being aware of Russian aims in the cold war, as our program of aid to the west shows our determination to stop this newest of world imperialisms.

Report on Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it has been my custom to report each year to the people I represent in the Fourth Congressional District of Nebraska. The people are entitled to know how their Representatives vote and how they

feel about legislation presented to Congress. I have a rule in my office that all mail must be answered the day it is received, if humanly possible. I report to my district each week through a newsletter to the papers and a weekly radio report called What's Happening in the Nation's Capital? I try to make these reports interesting, factual, and nonpolitical. At times it has not been easy to sift the truth from all the propaganda which floods the Members of Congress. I have a strong conviction that if the folks at home have the truth, there will be no question about the decision they make. I make frequent visits to my district. I like to attend the county fairs and have meetings with farmers, women's clubs, and civic groups. At these meetings there are question and answer periods. I know these "cracker barrel" discussions are helpful to me. I get the views of my constituents, and they understand my position on national, international, and domestic matters. I have also sent out questionnaires through paid ads in the newspapers seeking the advice of those I represent. Mr. Speaker, this is my report to the people I represent:

In assessing the work of the Eighty-first Congress, it must be remembered that when the legislative branch of the Government is in control of the same political party that controls the executive branch, the program set is the one laid down by the President in his state of the Union, budget, and other messages. So to begin with, we must look at the recommendations made by the President at the beginning of, and during the sessions of Congress. It should also be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that the Democratic Party has a majority of 90 in the House; that this party appoints the chairmen of all the committees and effectively controls all legislation that comes before the Congress for action.

PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS

In the President's message on the state of the Union, he urged the Congress to continue the Marshall plan, set up a global WPA (which is his new point 4 program), to repeal the Taft-Hartley Labor Act, extend and expand Federal socialized housing and rent controls, provide for production payments to farmers (the Brannan farm program), establish compulsory health insurance (socialized medicine), expand social security, provide Federal aid to education, and establish valley authorities. He also gave full approval to the so-called Spence bill, which was nothing more than a super-duper OPA with all the trimmings. He further recommended that Congress enact legislation which would permit the Government, if necessary, to build and operate steel mills. He urged that Congress not make any deep cuts in spending and submitted a budget message recommending expenditures that would put the country several billion dollars further into debt.

WHO CONTROLS LEGISLATION?

Since his party controls all legislation, about all the minority members, of which I am one, can do is to offer intelligent and effective opposition to proposals which they feel are against the welfare of the country and support those that they feel are good. It has been my constant endeavor to follow this course. It is true I have been rather critical many times because it seemed to me that the legislation proposed by the President leads us down the road to bigger debt, deficit spending, increased taxes, and inflation. It seems to me that these are the Frankenstein monsters that may well destroy our country. I have offered many suggestions which I felt were constructive in the place of the socialistic program offered by the administration. Occasionally someone writes me saying that I am too critical and not offering constructive criticisms. I think I am guilty, but I would remind you that the counterpart of criticism is that of being aggressive. To escape criticism; say nothing, do nothing, be nothing. I have learned to expect criticism. I know that you can never please everybody even though you always do right. There is no way of giving uniform satisfaction. If one has undue concern about criticism, it stifles his thinking and action. The folks I represent have been very good to me. I have received little criticism. I know that I have not always been right; but I have a conscience with which I must live, and the mistakes I have made have been of the head and not of the heart.

DEBT, DEFICIT, INFLATION

The present national debt of nearly $260,000,000,000 calls for heavy taxation on all the people. There should be a definite plan for a gradual reduction of this huge sum.

In the last 20 years the budget has been balanced only for 2 years. That was during the Eightieth Republican Congress when the debt was cut $8,000,000,000, taxes reduced, and the budget balanced. My mail indicates that people are greatly concerned about deficit spending, the debt, and inflation caused by this administration.

The people at home realize that no Nation can spend itself into real prosperity. They know that prices are rising, the dollar is shrinking, and that the value of savings, pensions, and insurance has been cut in half. They know that taxes eat at the foundation of free enterprise and stifle the incentive and ambition to produce. They know that the Government, like you and me, cannot keep on spending more than it takes in. Federal expenses must be reduced or this Nation faces economic catastrophe and a controlled economy. I believe they can be reduced.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

I have supported every effort of the Congress and the President to place into effect the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for the Reorganization of Government. To me it is a "must" that the overlapping, expensive, wasteful departments of Government be streamlined to meet the needs of the time. The President has presented some bills under the guise of the Hoover Commission recommendations which were not recommended either by the Hoover Commission or the citizens committee. I did not support the President's recommendation to kill the effectiveness of the Taft-Hartley Act by placing the Office of the General Counsel under the Labor Relations Board, nor did I support his plan to establish a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Neither of these plans conforms to the Hoover Commission recommendations. The last plan would be a long step toward establishing socialized medicine in this country. Many of the bills recommended by the Hoover Commission have been stalled in committees due to the opposition of department and bureau chiefs. Bureaucracy vigorously resists all legislation that would reduce its activities. Their forces gather like a wolf pack, ready to slash the reorganization program to ribbons. These Federal departments, with several thousand full-time public-relation employees, are busy with their propaganda machines to stymie reorganization. They are entrenched, resourceful, and skilled in the tactics of delay and confusion.

BRANNAN FARM PROGRAM

The Secretary of Agriculture with the blessing of the administration makes speeches throughout the country urging the enactment of this measure. The Brannan farm plan would place the agriculture industry completely under the direction and control of Washington. It promises a higher income to the farmer and lower prices to the consumer. It is a good trick if it were possible to do it. It would place the farmer at the mercy of the Government, for he would receive for his products only what they would bring in the market and would have to depend on additional appropriations by Congress for his production payments.

The Brannan farm plan is of interest because of its unquestionable political appeal and its questionable economic soundness. It comes mighty close to promising Utopia—because it promises high wartime prices to the farmer and cheap food to the consumer. There are 15 pages of penalties in this 87-page bill. Farmers would be forced to keep books, records, memoranda, accounts, correspondence, contracts, and documents prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and would be subject to a penalty of a $5,000 fine for failure to comply. The Brannan plan did not originate with the farmers. They had no part of it, nor were they consulted. It looks like a political Christmas tree.

I believe we should have a sound program administered at the grass roots by the farmers themselves. It should guarantee the farmers a fair return at the market place with a minimum of restrictions. We should reexamine our policy of permitting so many large imports of agricultural products. We imported, last year, $1,600,000,000 worth of agricultural products. Many of these products were in competition with our already swollen surplus. The reciprocal trade agreements should not be a one-way street. The dollar gap on agricultural products has been closed for 20 years. It is time

agriculture had some protection, particularly in time of surplus.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

The President's proposal for compulsory health insurance is an expression for socialized medicine. It is on his program for early action. I shall continue to oppose this to the best of my ability.

COMMUNISM—DISLOYAL EMPLOYEES

My mail indicates that the people are thoroughly aroused about the cause of the soft attitude we take toward the Communists in this country. It is time we realized that communism is a blue-hued cancerous growth that must be eradicated from our body politic. I supported the President's request that the Secretaries of his Cabinet and his security boards be given authority to fire anyone when they doubt their loyalty to the United States. I know the American people are tired of those who play "footsie-tootsie" and "palsey-walsey" with these Communists and their fellow travelers. We cannot let these Reds run rampant at home while our boys fight and die in Korea. It is time we cracked down. Membership in the Communist Party must be made a matter of record and these traitors branded. There seems to be no reason why these Red termites should be free members of society and in good legal standing and be permitted to roam the country at will to spew their venom and hate for all to see and hear.

I believe it is time to clear out of all departments of Government those disloyal and immoral degenerates for they are security risks. There are more than 10,000 foreigners who now serve our Government and embassies throughout the world. Many of them have communistic leanings. Surely we have enough red-blooded Americans to fill these positions without resorting to the use of individuals whose loyalty can be questioned. There are more than 3,500 disloyal people in this country who have been cited for deportation—most of them are Communists—200 are dangerous alien criminals and should be placed behind wire fences.

KOREAN WAR

As I write this, war in Korea has just started. I expect to support every effort of the military and our soldiers who are fighting among these unfriendly terrains in foreign countries. The military forces have had more than $56,000,000,000 since the end of World War II, yet the evidence before us at this time indicates they are unprepared with the new weapons and equipment to meet the onslaught in Korea. I am unhappy, of course, to know that our President committed us to a war without consulting Congress. I think that was a mistake. However, the fire has now been started and we must all help put it out. I have urged the President and the Congress to clear the decks for action and to stop dreaming about what they hope might happen. We cannot continue to do business as usual with the world on fire. This action in Korea may be but the sounding of the alarm which should warn us that this is no time to drag our feet in military preparedness. This war, if it develops into global action, will be one of survival of the human race. This gathering storm may break into an atomic fury at any time. The handwriting is on the wall. It is time that we draw in our belts and stop spending on all of the socialistic schemes recommended by this Administration. This is no time for a global WPA; no time for socialized medicine, the Brannan farm program, socialized housing, or a dozen other socialistic suggestions. If global war comes it will be necessary to take steps for total mobilization. I know this is the method of the dictator. I dislike it very much; but in war, such steps are necessary.

LEGISLATION SUPPORTED

I have supported legislation to expand the development of our natural resources and improved living conditions for the people. It has been my feeling that money spent on reclamation, irrigation, flood control, REA, soil and water conservation, comes back into the Treasury either from taxes collected on increased wealth or in the repayment of these loans made by the Government. I have supported all legislation which helped to make our country stronger. I believe that we must give capital and labor and a free people a fair chance in order to continue to develop a great country.

BIG GOVERNMENT AND SOCIALISM

The number of people on the Federal payroll is at an all-high peacetime peak. There seems to be no tendency to cut down on the activities of the Federal Government. It has been my experience that bureaucracy must grow and grow or it withers on the vine. I have also observed that, the larger government becomes with all of its regulations, the smaller the individual becomes with a loss of his freedom and security. The greatest enemy of the democratic way of life are those well-meaning people who have lost faith in the capacity of a free people to manage their own affairs and who wish to set up a Government as a political and social guardian to run the business and make the decisions for them. The more we set up agencies of Government to do our planning and make our decisions for us, the less freedom we will have. The bigger government becomes, the more it costs and an ever-increasing share of the people's wealth will be taken for taxes. The President made proposals to Congress which, if enacted into law, would eventually add $16,000,000,000 to the present $42,000,000,000 budget. It would mean that the Federal bureaucracy would expand its supervision and control over every phase of our lives.

TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

The administration has insisted on the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, but has presented no bill which would either repeal or modify this measure. I believe the people feel this act does not interfere with the legitimate rights of organized labor or industry and that an honest enforcement would result in better labor relations. When I took the poll in my district through the newspapers, it revealed that 98 percent were opposed to compulsory health insurance, and 96 percent were opposed to the Brannan farm program and repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. It has always been my feeling that there were some constructive amendments needed to the Taft-Hartley law, and I introduced legislation to accomplish this purpose. There were amendments suggested by labor and industry.

FAITH IN OUR COUNTRY

I have great faith in the confidence of the American people and those I represent. We are a Christian Nation. The 70,000,000 people belonging to some church are a great moral influence for good. The top leaders of Government must inspire high motives and good character with Christian principles of living. It has been a cause for concern because some officials in Washington seem to be suffering from a disease I would call decay of the conscience. Too many of them have been insensitive to real moral principles. The American people have the know-how of production. We can, under good laws and sound fiscal policy, continue to be the greatest Nation in the world. We will conquer the difficulties that presently beset us; in this I have supreme confidence.

CONGRESSIONAL RECESS

The present unsettled conditions in the world indicate that Congress should not adjourn. It might be wise to take 3-day recesses and be prepared to report back on 24-hour notice in order to tackle the problems of national security which may arise. At this writing, July 17, the situation in Korea and the world is subject to sudden changes.

If the Congress takes the so-called 3-day recesses, I will expect to be at home visiting with just as many folks as I can. It does one good to get back and visit with the people who live a little closer to the soil and the sun and far enough away from Washington to have a clear view of what is going on. Mr. Speaker, there is much more I should like to report to you and the people I represent. The people in the 38 counties of the Fourth Congressional District have been good to me. It is my prayer and hope that I may continue to give the best service possible and represent them in an upright, honest, sincere, and fearless manner.

Envoy Awarded LL. D. at Trinity College, Dublin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN McSWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, the University of Dublin conferred the honorary degree of doctor of laws today on United States Ambassador George A. Garrett. This is the first time the name of a diplomat has been inscribed on the university's rolls. Hitherto its honorary

degrees have been awarded for academic or scientific attainments.

I am especially proud to be permitted to ask for this insertion because, after World War I, I, as a captain of infantry, through an exchange of servicemen, especially those whose scholastic training had been interrupted by the war, was permitted to study law at this time-honored Trinity College. While on a recent visit to Ireland, the land of my paternal and maternal grandparents, my wife and I were the guests at the Embassy of His Excellency and Mrs. Garrett. We learned then of the charm and graciousness of these splendid emissaries of our country. We later toured many of the beautiful counties of Ireland and I learned from Irish people in all walks of life as well as from those in official positions of the marvelous work of Mr. and Mrs. Garrett as our representatives. I speak of both Mr. and Mrs. Garrett because along with untiring and tactful efforts of Mr. Garrett to cement our two countries and improve not only our social but also our economic well-being Mrs. Garrett has endeared herself to all the people of Ireland, but especially to the women. She has shown such an interest in their welfare, as well as in their family and home affairs, that all have a deep affection for her.

On this same visit to Ireland we visited my old Trinity College. It was graciously received by the provost, Dr. E. H. Alton. We spoke of his predecessor, Provost Mahaffey, who presided while I was in the college in 1918.

From these few words it can well be understood why I am glad to ask for this extension of remarks.

The Ambassador, clad in the salmon and scarlet robes of his doctorate, heard Sir Robert Tate, the public orator, say of him in classical Latin:

We rejoice to have this opportunity of greeting and congratulating Mr. George Garrett, who came to us some 3 years ago as United States Minister and has now been raised to the more exalted rank of Ambassador; nunc ad altiorem honoris gradum provectus legati cum titulo patriae interpres ad nos advenit. His stanchness in maintaining the dignity of his native land is equaled only by the supreme benevolence with which he makes it his principal aim to draw closer every day the bonds of friendship that unite our two countries. Himself an ornament of two universities, he holds that he can best compass this end by beginning with our academic youth—quod propsitum ut plenissime assequator a iuventute academica incipiendum esse ratus (quippe quo et ipse universitatem duarum ornamentum sit)—and is working out a plan for founding scholarships to enable Irishmen to prosecute their studies in America and Americans in Ireland. And he will doubtless succeed. For when a man has blended in himself two interests so irreconcilable as banking and music, even the "estranging main" will hardly put asunder those whom he would join together. The university will certainly be ungrateful if it does not salute this generous guest with its loudest applause.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following remarks of Hon. George A. Garrett, United States Ambassador to the Republic of Ireland, in response to a toast proposed by Dr. E. H. Alton, provost of Trinity College, Dublin, at a dinner given on the night of July 5, 1950, by members of the faculty, for a group of six who received honorary degrees of doctor of laws at the commencement exercises held that day:

I came here today with very great diffidence.

I came with diffidence because this is an old institution famous for its learning; and I who, in my time, have served in various capacities, am likely to be remembered least of all as a man of academic distinction.

In your generosity, you have seen fit to offer me distinction by making me an honorary doctor of laws of this historic university. In accepting this degree, those whom I represent as Ambassador in Ireland are honored when you so honor me.

In these difficult days it is more than ever necessary to strengthen the cultural and other bonds which unite closely the Old World and the New. I am, therefore, very happy to have my name associated with Trinity College, an institution which has weathered several troubled centuries and yet has been able to adapt itself to altered circumstances and conditions.

I am content to join humbly the worthy company which has brought honor to this college and to Ireland—to become one of the many thousands to take pride in Berkeley, the philosopher; Burke, the statesman; Goldsmith, the poet; Rowan Hamilton, the mathematician; Emmett and Wolfe Tone, the patriots—and all that splendid host who have shed luster on their alma mater.

On behalf of my President and the people of the United States, I thank you most sincerely for adding my name to the famous roll so long recognized for great scholarship.

Medical Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by my dear friend Ben May, of Mobile, Ala., one of this earth's greatest humanitarians and one of our real successful businessmen in all of his many undertakings. The speech was made at a luncheon given by me in his honor and which was attended by a great many of my congressional friends from both Houses of Congress:

First of all I wish to thank you gentlemen for accepting Mr. BOYKIN'S invitation and for giving me a chance to discuss medical research with you.

I should like to give you my ideas as to why it is to the interest of our country that you give great thought to the importance of medical research. On the lower but important basis of money I say with confidence that money expended by the Government for medical research will pay a tremendous dividend in money itself and later I will give figures to substantiate this statement.

As Mr. BOYKIN has told you, I am a lumber man from Alabama and I confess I would not have left my work and come to Washington if my principal thought had been of money. On a higher and more important basis I say that medical research will save the lives of many Americans. That is what I want to discuss.

If any of you have ever been sick or if someone you love has been sick and you waited for the doctor, and then he finally came, it may have seemed to you almost as though God had come into the room. In a sense the doctor was a representative of God and if as that representative he could not effect a cure it may not have been God's wish that it was thus. Let me try to explain the doctor's relationship to medical research and your possible dependence on medical research for health and even life.

A doctor can only diagnose a patient's illness if, previously, great minds have given him certain rules and facts with which he works and if quite possibly these great minds have discovered certain instruments and materials which the doctor uses to make his diagnosis. When I say "instruments," I mean such things as the stethoscope or thermometer which are comparatively modern discoveries.

After proper diagnosis a doctor can cure his patient in one of two ways. He can practice masterful inaction and permit nature to cure the patient or he may draw upon a reservoir of knowledge and materials and by certain treatments try to effect a cure. I will explain what I mean. In December 1799, George Washington, a robust man of 68, returned from a horseback ride and had an attack of laryngitis. Washington was one of the richest and best known men in the country, yet this was his treatment: The doctor was called in and according to Encyclopedia Britannica, Washington was bled heavily four times, given a gargle of molasses, butter, and vinegar, and also a blister of cantharides (some of you may have heard of this as spanish fly) was placed on his throat. This blister is quite painful.

Washington's strength ebbed rapidly. This is not surprising, for what the doctor did was probably enough to cause his death. Today, if a doctor used like treatment, he would be guilty of malpractice. Bleeding for pneumonia went out of use after a French doctor proved by statistics that many more pneumonia sufferers who were bled died than did those pneumonia sufferers who were not bled.

Washington was doomed not because his doctor was any less humane than a doctor of today but rather because Washington's doctor could only draw from a reservoir of knowledge and materials which was deficient.

Today we have a reservoir of knowledge and materials which enables a doctor to treat pneumonia with sulfa drugs and penicillin and, thanks in large part to these two drugs, the death rate from pneumonia has dropped by more than two-thirds.

Permit me to illustrate a bit more this idea of a reservoir of knowledge and materials. It is almost certain that some of you gentlemen have seen people who suffered from carbuncles. They often had to endure a series of very painful operations and they suffered over a rather long period of time. Sometimes the result was fatal. But now a person suffering from carbuncles is cured without an operation and merely by a 5-day treatment of penicillin. You probably know what mastoid or mastoiditis is. In this case the doctor who operates has to cut through the base of the skull and it is not a pleasant procedure. Most of these operations which formerly were necessary are now avoided by treatment using the sulfa drugs.

Or let us compare two diseases as related to possible sufferers. Until 1922 if a man were told by his doctor that he had either diabetes or cancer, that man felt doomed. He may have felt a little less doomed if he had diabetes because he probably expected less suffering than if he had cancer, but he knew that his days were numbered. Then in 1922 Banting and Best discovered insulin and, as a result, today if a man be told that he has diabetes he is

far from pleased but, thanks to insulin, he can still hope to live out his normal span of life and also to live an almost normal life. On the other hand the sufferer told that he has an advanced case of cancer is doomed, and he realizes it; because medical research has not yet found the answer to that particular riddle.

I have given these illustrations so you may realize fully that it is not, as we often think, the doctor who effects the cure. Rather it is our doctor who uses certain materials and knowledge which others before him have placed at his disposal for the benefit of the patient. We need a doctor with a good brain and education but unless research and study have created a satisfactory reservoir of knowledge and materials from which he may draw, even the greatest doctor is powerless. For example, little is known about the degenerative diseases. One of the greatest doctors in the country has Parkinson's disease. Other doctors respect and love him enough that I think they would give some of their fingers to cure this man, but all are powerless because they have no adequate reservoir of knowledge and materials from which they can draw to cure their friend.

Now, one should not expect to wait until he is sick and then think that he can order research to discover a cure for his ill just as he would order some food from the grocery. Instead it is necessary to think a few years ahead and to aid medical-research workers to make their discoveries before we ourselves are ill. After all, it is not unusual for a businessman or investor to forego a pleasure today and to save and invest money in a stock or perhaps in a piece of outlying property near a growing city. He parts with his money today with the thought that although the investment may bring in nothing for 10 or 20 years, eventually there will be great increment and he or whomever he may choose will profit from that investment. Men often do this for the benefit of their children and yet these same men will not think years ahead where medical research is concerned. They want to leave wealth to their children and yet I wonder at their definition of wealth.

After all, what is wealth? Is a man possessing $500,000,000 but who also has cancer in an advanced state, a rich man? He is not by my definition. If a man have a great deal of money but if he be ill and if with all his money he cannot buy surcease from pain, or preferably a cure and thus the added years of life which he may want above all else; then his money is only partly valuable. I don't know whether you would call his money counterfeit or inflated but I do know that with it he cannot buy the thing he wants most. And yet if we would furnish the funds to the great and unselfish medical research men who are ready to do the job of filling up the reservoirs of knowledge and materials, there is no telling what medicine might achieve.

Let me explain here that when I speak of reservoirs of material I mean the following. It is not enough for a doctor to know that the proper treatment for pneumonia is a course of penicillin. The doctor must also be able to get the penicillin or other desired medicine from a reservoir of materials.

If you should doubt the possibilities and the profits of research, may I remind you that at present the Congress permits the military to spend $500,000,000 a year for research connected with national defense. Over the decades various Congresses have appropriated scores of millions of dollars for research concerning the health of hogs, cattle, and chickens.

We know how much industry believes in research. We have seen the du Pont Co. and other great corporations grow great through research. You probably know that there are quite a few large corporations which individually have spent as much in 1 year as our Government and our citizens together spend annually for research concerning the heart and circulatory diseases, or for cancer research. But lest you think me a dreamer, I would like to quote something written by Mr. Alfred Sloan, chairman of the board of General Motors. Mr. Sloan has written, "Everybody realizes the tremendous accomplishments of scientific research and everyone realizes, I am sure, that there is no reason why what is accomplished in other areas of research cannot be accomplished in cancer, if the talent, the resources, and the time factors are recognized. Of course, all research activities comprise many, many failures to a limited number of successes. That's the way with all things, but we can make the effort; and we ought to make a tremendous effort because of what it means."

What I quote from Mr. Sloan is no secret, since he has said similar things over the radio; and I thing I have read his remarks in the New York Times. Mr. Sloan's remarks about research as relating to cancer apply with equal truth to other problems of medical research. I mention Mr. Sloan because I do not believe you will think of him as an impractical dreamer.

Although I quote Mr. Sloan, permit me to emphasize that he was thinking of private gifts to medical research when he made his statement. Also let me emphasize that I do not know Mr. Sloan's attitude toward Government aid for medical research. I do state, however, that Mr. Sloan believes so much in research that through his foundation he has given millions of dollars to establish the Sloan-Kettering Institute of Cancer Research. If we had more businessmen like Mr. Sloan, we might not need the Government in this, but since there are not enough Alfred Sloans or other businessmen of vision to give research its necessary impetus, then the Government should aid in this matter of medical research, because it is its province to think of the welfare of its citizens and also because it is good business for the Government to be interested in this matter.

Now, you may well ask, if medical research can bring us all of these benefits and if we are dependent upon it for health and if research is such a success in many fields, then why has not more attention been paid to medical research? The cause lies in human nature.

As I have said before, men will think 10 of 20 years ahead where investments are concerned, and corporations think 50 years ahead; but where medical research is concerned or any kind of illness is concerned, people may know that they are going to be ill or to die someday but they act as if they thought everybody else could die except themselves.

One might express it this way. All of us have a stake in the progress of medicine, although many who are well are incapable of realizing that they can possibly fall ill. Consequently, the people most vitally alive to the importance of more progress in medicine, are generally sick and often dying. However, no matter how desperately they may crave progress in medicine when in pain, their then physical condition makes them unable to give aid to the movement. In other words, they become most intensely interested in medical research at the very moment they are least capable of doing anything about it.

Now I have mentioned the profit to the Government from medical research. I will be specific.

The Government carries more than $40,000,000,000 life insurance upon more than 7,000,000 servicemen and ex-servicemen. I do not know the terms of these policies and who gets the benefit as insurance costs go down. I do not know what would happen to costs in the event of another war, which Heaven forbid; but if the policyholders are caused to live longer, the Government may gain, because it saves interest proportionately as payments of claims are delayed. Also if policy holders live longer, the Government should gain; because it will receive added yearly insurance premiums during the extra years each policyholder lives.

Proof that the above statement is sound reasoning is seen in the following. A number of life-insurance companies in this country believe so much that medical research will save them money that they have raised over $600,000 per annum for this purpose. Similar sums are pledged for more years ahead and these moneys are all to be spent upon research concerning the heart and circulatory diseases.

How big are the dividends from research? I answer by saying that the dividends vary, but I cite one tremendous dividend. In 1884 the Department of Agriculture began to study cattle tick fever. The problem was solved by Theobald Smith and others. This tick fever project cost $65,000 to carry through to a successful discovery. Mr. Harding, a Department worker, wrote recently that the country profits more than $100,000 each day, year in and year out, through that discovery.

How will the Government save money through research concerning the heart diseases? Again let me be specific. The Government supports or pensions many ex-servicemen when they become ill or incapacitated. A considerable part of the time it hospitalizes them. And at times I think it cares for their families. As medical research shows how to keep these veterans healthy and at work the Government will save millions.

Under certain conditions the Government also pensions the families of deceased veterans. The longer the ex-servicemen, whose families are eligible for pensions, may live, the more money the Government will save.

The Government also has a stake in the health of many ordinary citizens. If the head of a family fall ill, then the Government or some part of our society may have to support him and his family. When someone eligible under the social-security law dies, the Government must begin monthly payments to the widow during her lifetime, and the Government also makes payments for each child until it is 18. If the same breadwinner remain healthy, he has an earning capacity, and part of his earnings go to the Government through taxation.

The above gains will continue indefinitely, just as the savings through the Government project to conquer cattle tick fever continue right on through today and will continue in the future.

Let me state here that nowadays almost anything that saves a citizen money also helps the Government. The Government is more interested in any large corporation than is the owner of 50 percent of the stock. I say this because if the company makes $100,000 the Government gets $38,000. That leaves $62,000 of which the owner of half the stock of the company gets $31,000. He gets considerably less than the Government takes. People say the Government must stay out of business, but actually through taxation the Government is a partner in business. If it does not own part of my business, then it does better, for it owns part of the earnings. It is like a milk cow. Who cares who owns the cow, as long as he can have the milk?

The following facts are a striking illustration which shows the direct monetary interest of our Government in savings through medical research. In World War I the death rate for all diseases among the Armed Forces was 141 men per 10,000. In World War II

the death rate for all diseases was 6 men per 10,000 in the service. This difference of 135 men per 10,000 men means 168,750 lives saved for an armed force of 12,500,000. Actually there were more people than this in the service, but I understate the figures, because I believe understatement is stronger. Assuming $10,000 cost to the Government for the life insurance and eventual pension for each man lost, the Government was saved more than $1,680,000,000 by the decreased death rate from disease.

The lower estimates state that modern man has been on this planet for tens of thousands of years while higher estimates hold that modern man has been here for hundreds of thousands of years. Yet thus far, comparatively little has been learned about medicine. Therefore one may well ask why we should now expect to make quick progress and great progress through an adequate program of medical research, if previous progress has been so slow. This seemingly difficult question becomes simple if we think about it a little.

The human body is subject to so many variations that one cannot state that medicine is an absolute science. At all events medicine is not an independent science to itself, and therefore progress in medicine is dependent upon such progress as is made in certain other sciences.

Science represents exact knowledge and the basis of science is the reproducible experiment. Although the laws of nature are harmonious to an amazing degree, they are also so complex that no single mind can grasp an entire science. Likewise, no one mind can hope to understand the human body, which is the most complicated thing on this planet.

To understand the body even moderately well, a tremendous quantity and variety of knowledge is required. The world has now accumulated a large store of knowledge and it is this knowledge which is the necessary tool one works with as he strives to learn more and more about the body. The more knowledge available the more possible becomes progress in medicine. And also the more knowledge we have, the easier it becomes to accumulate still more knowledge. Accumulating a store of knowledge can be likened to a snowball rolling down a mountainside. It may be small and it may move slowly at first and accumulate just a little snow, but the further it goes, the faster it will roll and the more snow it will accumulate.

Now let us see why it was difficult to accumulate scientific knowledge prior to the fifteenth century. First, let us think back to the conditions existing thousands of years ago. At that time how could men preserve accurate knowledge when writing did not even exist, when paper was unknown, and when the printing press was undreamed of. As far as we know, hieroglyphics were first used about 3500 years before Christ. They were marked upon clay which was baked. Later came papyrus and parchment and finally paper. Printing is probably man's greatest invention, and it was introduced into Europe in the fifteenth century.

Until the advent of the printing press, what one great mind observed and learned could not be preserved accurately except by transcribing these thoughts by hand and thereby creating a single copy of the book or work. The monks and scribes did a great deal of this work and books were so valuable that a Bible was often held by chain to prevent its theft. Even if a great scientific discovery were put into writing it was impossible to use one single copy of the work so as to disseminate that knowledge over a wide area; and a single copy of any book was always subject to destruction. For example, when the great library at Alexandria was burned, hundreds of thousands of scrolls and volumes were lost and with them went much knowledge. Today, if one library burns, still other libraries have copies of the same books. It was also difficult to disseminate knowledge, because universities, as we know them, are a comparatively modern institution.

Universities came into being less than a thousand years ago and during the first centuries of their existence these universities taught only such subjects as religion, law, philosophy, and medicine. Until about four centuries ago those universities which taught medicine were little interested in science, and all too often they were governed by tradition and superstition. The advocacy of new ideas was often prohibited. Even as late as 1844 the forming of a scientific society was forbidden at Oxford University. Those who wanted to form that society were derisively called the lunatics. In the universities of several centuries ago, medicine was taught, but even then it was only so-called theory which was taught. Rarely was any form of dissection practiced. Men were prohibited from advocating new ideas and the whole mental attitude was set against progress.

With the advent of the printing press, it finally became possible to preserve knowledge and to disseminate it and one great mind was often aided and encouraged by learning what other great minds thought. Great minds are rare and they are often lonely and they do not always thrive on that loneliness.

Hippocrates and others before and after him did something to advance medicine, but medicine only began its real forward march when Vesalius published his book on anatomy. Then in 1628, Harvey published his 72-page book about the circulation of blood, but Harvey could only explain in part the circulation of the blood. For one thing there was a gap in his explanation because he could not tell how the blood reached the veins from the arteries. Shortly after Harvey's death, the use of the recently introduced microscope enabled Malpighi to see the capillaries and to fill this particular gap in Harvey's work. But Harvey was also handicapped in his explanation of the circulation of the blood because probably the most important function of the blood is to carry oxygen to the different cells of the body.

Harvey knew nothing about oxygen because that element was only discovered more than a century after his death. About the time of the American Revolution, Cavendish and Priestley, independently found oxygen but they did not understand what it was. However, a short time after its discovery, Lavoisier, the founder of modern chemistry did explain some of the functions of oxygen.

The body is a mass of chemical reactions, constantly seeking balance. Medicine could not make any great advances before chemistry became a science. How could the medical research worker or practicing physician know that goiter and cretinism are diseases which involve iodine? In children one cures or prevents a form of idiocy and dwarfism known as cretinism, by the use of iodine; but how could one know this previous to the discovery of the element iodine by Courtois in 1811?

Microscopes came into use toward the end of Harvey's life but the microscopes of that period could only magnify up to about 300 diameters before they began to shimmer and to show a rainbow effect. Anything approaching the microscope as we know it today, did not come into being until scientists finally solved the problem of shimmer. Improved microscopes of the type which did away with shimmer were probably introduced between 1815 and 1830, and it was with the improved microscope that Pasteur was able to make his great discoveries concerning bacteria as sources of disease.

Please note here how one scientist is dependent upon the work of another scientist. Pasteur possessed the prepared mind but he could not have proven this theories had he lived a century sooner because the improved microscope, so necessary to enable him to see clearly the bacteria about which he theorized, would not have been available. Pasteur was a chemist but he was dependent upon the physicists to produce the microscope he needed.

Let me repeat the following. Modern man has been on earth tens or hundreds of thousands of years but his progress was slow in all sciences until printing enabled him to preserve the work of different individual scientists and teachers, and to disseminate knowledge over a broad territory.

Up until about the time of our Civil War, such surgery as existed was agonizing, dangerous, and crude. At one hospital in Massachusetts they still have the great bell which was rung to summon hospital workers to hold down a patient while he was being operated upon. Patients often committed suicide rather than endure the agony of an operation. Also they knew the death rate from surgery was great although they did not know that this was caused by infection.

Then in the 1840's a dentist discovered anesthesia, and about 1865 Lord Lister, who said that he based his theories on the discoveries of Pasteur, gave the world antiseptic surgery. With anesthesia and antisepsis, surgery could go forward rapidly.

The advance in surgery was of great importance to medical research because if one wishes to understand the body, an understanding of the various organs and glands is of prime importance. One of the best ways to understand what an organ or gland does or does not do, is to remove the particular organ or gland from the body of an experimental animal, and then study the result. With anesthesia this can be done without cruelty and with antiseptic surgery the research worker knows that his result will not be complicated by death or illness from infection.

And now of late there has come another great advance which may prove as important to medical research of the future as the microscope has proven to be important to past medical research. I refer to the use of the tracer elements or radio-active isotopes which permit research workers to trace a particular food or chemical on its course through the body.

I have mentioned that chemistry is one of the basic sciences necessary for us to understand the body and to cure its ills. Thanks to the work of the physicists we have such instruments as the spectroscope, spectrophotometer, and so forth, which permit the chemist in a matter of minutes to analyze complicated chemical compounds. Formerly just one of these analyses might have taken weeks instead of minutes.

A few decades ago it was impossible for a chemist to analyze extremely minute quantities of chemical compounds, but today, with modern instruments the scientist can analyze a quantity of a chemical so small that the eye cannot detect it. They express the idea by saying that they could almost weigh or analyze the tail of a bacterium. Thanks to an understanding of light waves, color absorption and other laws of physics, the scientist can obtain quickly, chemical analyses which formerly were either impossible or else required weeks of endeavor.

In short, the physicists, the physical chemists, and the chemists by their combined efforts have learned how to harness a beam of light and to let that beam of light solve in a matter of minutes, chemical problems which formerly would have required days or weeks for their solution.

We learn thru our senses of perception. The principal sense of perception where research is concerned is slight and the lens which harnesses a beam of light is almost as important to a modern research laboratory as was the wheel to transportation.

We can compare medicine to transportation. Alexander the Great, Caesar, Napoleon, and the great kings of Europe all desired to be transported faster and easier, but they were limited to the horse, or the horse and carriage, or to sailboats, as means of transportation. It is only since the American Revolution that we have developed modern means of transportation.

Within a comparatively short time the steamboat, the railroad, the street car, the automobile, and the airplane were developed. Their development had to await the advance of physics, chemistry, and various other sciences. Da Vinci visioned the airplane but how could he construct one before metallurgy permitted the building of an internal combustion engine or jet engine, and before science and industry had produced the necessary fuel? How could man produce the locomotive before he had the materials necessary to build it?

Just as transportation made greater strides during the past 150 years than had been during all of the thousands of years previous thereto, so also have other sciences progressed more during the past 150 years than they had progressed during all the previous centuries. The thought has been expressed by saying that thanks to modern science man today has powers which the ancients did not even ascribe to their gods.

Consequently, today after centuries of effort we have at our disposal a sufficient accumulation of knowledge to permit the solution of many medical research problems previously insoluble. We also have modern research laboratory equpiment which can enable us to use our store of knowledge with greater ease and speed than was ever possible previously.

We appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars annually for research projects working toward the improvements of weapons of defense and destruction and we know that each year industry spends hundreds of millions of dollars in an effort to use our store knowledge and our modern laboratory equipment for research the ultimate purpose of which is financial gain. We know that our Government is willing to conduct research tending toward the improvement of methods of production on the farm and for the solution of problems relating to the diseases of trees as well as the diseases of farm animals.

The big question is shall we become the first nation that was ever wise enough to let good will and intelligence be its guide and to use available equipment and knowledge in an intense effort to reduce human suffering and to save human life. That is, will we put medical research in the front ranks of all types of research.

I do not believe that I exaggerate when I state that if the two types of disease which stand to kill more than half of all Americans now living (I refer to the heart and circulatory diseases and to cancer), also affected farm animals, the Government would long ago have undertaken a comprehensive program of research to stop this great waste. Of if slavery had not been abolished, businessmen would have said to the Government, "We are losing some of our finest men in their prime. Some are dying at 40 of heart disease. This is a needless waste. Please help us find the cure for this ill."

The best proof that the above statement is no exaggeration is that a single appropropriation approaching $50,000,000 is to be used in an effort to stop the spread of hoof-and-mouth disease. As you know, this is a disease of cattle and of course cattle have a money value.

There are certain things which in the past have held us back in medical research. One is the fact that we think the practicing physician can conduct research. This idea is based on error because the practicing physician generally lacks the modern laboratory equipment necessary for research and in addition the successful physician is generally overworked. By the time he tries to keep up with new discoveries and by the time he diagnoses the various ills of his patients and decides what treatment to prescribe to cure those ills, the practicing physician does not have much time or strength left for the effort that research requires.

Also, a great part of today's research is conducted by teams. Some of the workers on a research team specialize in segments or even small segments of a particular science. For example, merely to prepare specimens to be studied under the electron microscope may be a full-time job in a large research laboratory.

Another thing which holds medical research back is a sort of Maginot line mentality. You will remember the French allegedly went to sleep because they thought the Maginot line defended them. Our Maginot line is that we think we have progressed in medicine whereas this thought is based in part on false premises. It is true that we have progressed greatly in our understanding of the infectious diseases and in our ability to fight them. Fifty years ago, in proportion to population, funerals were about twice as frequent as they are today. And during some epidemics the death rate rose to 10 times above the usual average. At that time the country had a much larger percentage of orphans than it has today and also, because disease and death are among the principal causes of poverty; destitution was more common than it is today.

In other words, the good old days were not as good as the older folks of today think they were, but neither are our good new days as good as we think they are. I say this not merely because with the advance of the airplane and atom bombs we now feel the same sense of uneasiness where possible attack is concerned as the savages did when they were afraid that a neighboring tribe might raid them suddenly, but also because of the following: While a cure of cancer can usually be obtained if the tumor is detected early, in most cases of advanced cancer modern treatment does not differ very much from that available 30 years ago. All that the doctors can accomplish is to kill the pain and to make the patient as comfortable as possible. In some cases of advanced cancer the doctors can prolong the life of the patient; but often the measures which extend life merely increase the time of suffering. Of what use is it to prolong life if the patient wishes that he were dead? Frequently when the X-ray is used against cancer the patients say that the suffering from the treatment is greater than the pain of cancer. Consequently although patients with advanced cancer may live a few months or even several years longer, they often suffer so much that life is worth little or nothing to them. Their families have added grief as they watch the cancer victims suffer and the expenses often bankrupt the family. Another remedy for cancer is surgery. This is quite efficacious when cancer is diagnosed near its incipiency but otherwise when the life of a patient with advanced cancer is prolonged by surgery, this frequently means that the patient's sufferings are merely prolonged.

The doctors have virtually no other choice because thus far medicine and medical research have produced little else which will help cure cancer. The research men are seeking a cure for cancer through chemical therapy but until the answer is found the doctors can only continue to fight death and prolong life using what they feel to be the best methods available. If these treatments are not good enough and if the patient suffers this is no more the fault of the doctors than it is our own fault. We are all responsible to the extent that we fail to aid the medical research workers who are trying to solve this problem.

The best proof that money can accomplish a great deal in medical research is to be seen in the following facts. After penicillin was discovered, various pharmaceutical companies realized the possibilities of profit to be earned from the antibiotics and accordingly they spent large sums of money seeking new antibiotics. These corporations furnished the funds and equipment to the research workers with the understanding that the corporations could patent any discoveries of these men and earn a profit. There was nothing wrong about that. But because the necessary money was made available to the research men we have made tremendous progress in the discoveries and uses of new antibiotics.

What money can do to aid medical research is seen in the following fact. It is less than 10 years since the first patient was treated with the first dose of penicillin and yet today it is estimated that in from one-third to one-half of all cases where the service of a physician is necessary, the antibiotics are of value and often they are vital in saving the patient.

A few of the pharmaceutical companies are trying to find a cure for cancer. If their research succeeds theirs will be a large profit and we should still be grateful to them. But the problem of cancer is so tremendous that moderate sums of money are not enough. Dr. Millikan who won the Nobel Prize for some of his work studying the atom has stated that understanding the atom is a simple task as compared with understanding the human cell. Yet understanding cancer is in large part the problem of understanding growth in the cell. When we wanted the atom bomb in a hurry we poured $2,000,000,000 into the research and into the building of the plants so that we could get the bomb. If we were similarly interested in finding a cure for cancer it is quite probable that within 5 years' time we would know how to cure some types of cancer and possibly how to cure all types of cancer.

Because our country spends many times as much for industrial research as it spends on medical research, you may wonder if the problems of the industrial research workers are more difficult than those of the medical research worker and if it is for that reason that medical research receives so little funds comparatively speaking.

Medical research is probably the most difficult type of research. A medical research team may consist of scientists from different fields but one of the most important elements of a medical research team is the chemist or biochemist. Therefore permit me to compare the problems of an industrial research chemist with those enccuntered by a medical research chemist.

An industrial research chemist can repeat his experiments over and over again choosing either identical conditions or if he wish he can change the conditions of his experiment as much or as little as he may judge best. By the word "conditions," I mean such things as high or low temperatures or pressures. But the medical research chemist works with the living body of a warm-blooded animal and therefore he cannot vary or control the conditions of his experiments as he might wish.

The industrial research chemist can nearly always obtain large quantities of the chemicals that he studies, but the medical research worker cannot do this for many of the most vital chemicals of our bodies (or of the bodies of animals) are produced in such unbelievably minute quantities that a scientist may work for several years to obtain

a small amount of the particular compound he wishes to study. For example, both animals and man have pituitary glands. Professor Evans of the University of California wished to study one compound produced by this gland and known as the growth hormone. In order to obtain less than one-twenty-fifth of an ounce of the purified growth hormone chemical, it was necessary to obtain the pituitary glands from 12,000 cattle.

Or again, when Dr. Doisy sought to prepare a compound known as folicular H, it is said that he used four tons of hog ovaries and obtained therefrom less than one-thousandth of an ounce of the folicular hormone. Expressed in another way, it would have taken a train of freight cars about three-fourths of a mile long to carry enough hog ovaries to enable medical research workers to obtain 1 ounce of this particular chemical compound. The concentration in the source of material was said to be about one one-hundred-and-sixty-millionth of the same.

Sometimes it takes so long to obtain enough of the chemical which the medical research scientist desires to study that the chemical may begin to decompose or break down before the job is completed. Thus in one case the workers had accumulated a small amount of the vitamin they sought, after 2 years' work. Then they found that the vitamin had decomposed because light was present in the laboratory and they had to work another year to repeat what had been done. It went faster the second time because of the knowledge they had just acquired.

I have said that often there is only a small amount of certain complex chemical compounds within the body. One of the most vital chemical compounds is a hormone called thyroxin.

The essential element of thyroxin is considered to be iodine. The total amount of iodine in the body is estimated to be the equivalent of 10 drops of a medical solution of iodine, yet an insufficiency in the amount of iodine and/or thyroxin may cause idiocy or too much may cause a raving delirium.

Another hormone which you know as adrenalin can speed up the heart by an increase of the 400,000,000th part in the blood and in certain instances less than the billionth part of adrenalin in the blood shows an effect. The minute quantities I have mentioned explain why research laboratories sometimes require microscales which can weigh accurately to as little as the ten-millionth part of 1 ounce. Naturally the amount of the chemical involved is seen through a microscope for it would be invisible to the naked eye.

The industrial research chemist can work his material at almost any temperature or pressure he may wish and he may vary the temperature or pressure whereas the medical research worker cannot. A pressure of 500 pounds per square inch would be nothing extraordinary in industrial research but we would be killed if one tried to work a chemical within our bodies at a pressure of 100 pounds per square inch. We live best at something like the normal pressure of air, which, as you know, is 15 pounds to the square inch.

An industrial research worker can use a temperature of 3,000° in order to obtain a desired chemical reaction, but the medical research workers is limited when he seeks to vary temperature greatly, for in a warm-blooded animal such as man, there are no great temperature changes in the body. For example, in making aluminum, a temperature of slightly more than 2,000° is used, or in making steel by the Bessemer process, a temperature of 2,800° is used.

Men may live during different seasons or in various countries where temperatures vary from minus 60° to above 120°, but regardless of the temperature outside the body, the temperature of a man's body varies little, for the chemistry of our body and all that takes place within this body occurs within an inner environment under our skin, which environment is more or less constant. There is a sort of body thermostat which causes the temperature of the inner body and the fluid which bathes the various tissues and organs of the body to vary little from about 100° F. Although temperature is often one of the vital elements used to obtain a desired chemical reaction, the medical research chemist cannot change the body temperature greatly, for if that temperature were to vary 15°, death would result.

Furthermore, in the case of the living body, one must remember that the very substance of life is protoplasm, which in turn consists in considerable part of proteins. Proteins are quite sensitive to heat, and one can see the effect of heat upon the proteins when one boils an egg. The chemistry of protoplasm changes almost instantly upon death, yet the medical research worker seeks to understand not the chemistry of the dead body but the chemistry of the living body.

Water is the greatest of solvents and one of the great chemical catalysts. The industrial research chemist can control the amount of moisture in industrial experiments, but where the body is concerned there are certain automatic body controls which hold the water content of the blood almost constant. The industrial chemist can use extremely acid solutions, or extremely alkaline solutions, but the blood absolutely does not tolerate great variations where acids or alkalies are concerned. Extreme variations are not possible because the body itself has various controls which prevent any great variation from the normal slightly alkaline condition of the blood.

I have attempted to show how the body conditions remain constant and how therefore a medical research chemist is limited to certain constant conditions. Yet, paradoxically, the medical research chemist also faces problems of the opposite nature. Although in some respects our body conditions remain very constant, yet in other ways they are anything but constant. Each individual body has its idiosyncrasies. Thus the biological sciences have no law in the same sense that physical sciences are subject to law. Boyle's law, the law of gravitation, and other laws of physics or chemistry state that a certain pattern of behavior will invariably follow if the materials studied and the set of conditions under which an experiment be conducted are the same. In fact, the basis of science is the reproducible experiment, but the study of physiology reveals tremendous variations in the behavior of individual organisms or in similar organs taken from different individuals, even when every effort is made to keep conditions constant. Thus, for a man at rest we say there is a normal heart beat of about 70 per minute, yet in some men the normal pulse is as low as 50 and again in other men their normal pulse rate is as high as 100.

Or again we may consider the response of acid secreting glands of the stomach to certain stimuli. If the same quantity of histamine be injected into a number of normal individuals some may secrete large amounts of gastric juice of high acidity, while others may show hardly any secretion, and still others will give results between the two extremes.

Another problem is as follows: An industrial research worker generally finds that if his experiment will work on a small scale it can also be repeated in a pilot plant and eventually in a tremendous installation such as is used in making nylon. But a medical research worker must often begin his study by using the test tube or other mechanical containers in which an experiment is conducted, or he may experiment with animals such as mice, rats, or rabbits. Yet an identical experiment may succeed or fail on mice and then give a contrary result when used on rats or other animals. When Ehrlich began the work which eventually resulted in his discovery of salvarsan or 606, he tried a drug known as atoxyl. He tested the drug against trypanosomes, but found it had no effect in the test tube, so he abandoned this angle of the project. A short time later another research worker showed that although atoxyl was not active in the test tube, nevertheless it was active in killing trypanosomes in animals. Ehrlich began working with atoxyl again, and it was a variant of atoxyl which was the much acclaimed salvarsan.

Permit me to give you two more illustrations. Ehrlich tried a certain dye and found it would cure and prevent infections caused by trypanosomes equinum in mice, yet the same drug was ineffective against this same parasite in other animals such as the rat or horse.

Here is a final illustration. The sulfa drugs were first used when the sulfanilamide group was part of another compound known as prontosil. Previously Rockefeller workers had studied a compound which contained the sulfanilamide fraction in it, but when they tried it in vitro, which means in the test tube, it did not work as well as they thought it should and so they did not try it on animals. If they had only tried this compound on mice, they might have found the curative value of sulfa drugs years sooner.

Thus we see that a medical research group may well spend several years conducting experiments and studies working toward a certain objective. They may have worked in vitro or with animals. If the experiment finally succeeded with animals only then would they begin to work with humans. Medical research has often been held back because the research workers and the doctors hesitated to experiment with the human body until after they had done all possible to eliminate risk of death to the human. Human life is held to be too sacred to be risked on medical research experiments, although unfortunately we have not considered it sacred enough to justify a sufficient expenditure for medical research to save human life.

It is true that we execute murderers instead of permitting them to voluntarily offer their bodies to be used for medical research experimentation in as painless a manner as possible. That may not make good logic, but it is the way the world works and we bow to it. Yet medical research workers need to try their ideas on the human body so greatly in order to check their experiments, they often make guinea pigs of themselves.

Thus while seeking definite proof that mosquitoes were an intermediate cause of yellow fever, two research workers on this project—Dr. Carroll and Dr. Lazear, both offered to infect their bodies. Dr. Carroll permitted a mosquito which had fed on four cases of yellow fever to bite him and he contracted yellow fever and nearly died, but did survive. Dr. Lazear failed when he tried to infect himself, but later in the course of the same project he was bitten by a mosquito and he died of yellow fever, as one more martyr to science.

An industrial research worker can add or withdraw an element of a compound largely as he may wish. How can the medical research chemist control the flow of chemicals into the blood when the glands of internal secretions produce many complex and potent hormones which go directly into the blood? There is no way to stop this flow of chemicals into the body except by removing the glands.

Now let us see where a great part of these chemical reactions take place. They occur within the cell. It is probable that all of you know what a cell is but some of you may have had time to forget facts concerning the cell so I will try to refresh your memories.

The cell is the smallest subdivision of life. The diameter of an average cell is less than the thousandth part of an inch and the thickness is much less than that. Yet a single cell is capable of reproducing itself and of taking nourishment which it converts to energy. It can breathe and excrete. Cells vary in size and weight and it would take about 275,000,000 average cells to weigh 1 ounce.

Within each single cell there probably occurs more chemistry and certainly more complicated chemistry than is represented by the entire du Pont Co. in its far-flung activities. Within a single cell there are probably a thousand catalysts called enzymes and these enzymes enable the cell to convert other chemicals into useful products. These enzymes are not merely in the cel' in the disorderd way that one might throw peanuts into a bag but rather they are in order much as General Motors might have machinery arranged for a mass production line.

Different types of cells perform different functions and produce different chemicals. Thus the cells of the peptic organisms produce the juices for the digestion of food. Extraordinarily potent substances secreted in exceedingly slight quantities by other cells control the balance of some particular organ of the body or they even control the balance of the whole organism that we call the human body. Certain cells produce an innumerable variety of potent products such as the hormones and vitamins which regulate the functions of the organisms. A slight disorder in their secretions may destroy the harmony of the whole organism and if the disorder be great it can result in a change of personality, madness, and death.

Often the medical research chemist must study the reactions which occur within the single cell. It is this which makes his problem so very difficult as compared with the problem of an industrial research chemist who does not deal with such minute quantities of the chemicals he seeks to study and who does not deal with such a minute organism as the cell.

There is nothing so complicated as the human body. A great part of its chemistry is beyond the ken of present chemical knowledge and in addition the whole body is subject to the brain or what we call "the mind." You could have an apparently healthy man enjoying a meal. He then could be called to the phone and receive some very bad news. For example, a doctor might say, "I have checked your X-ray photographs and find you have a cancer." It would not be the cancer but it would be the man's brain or mind which would suddenly stop digestion and cause many other chemical changes in the body.

While our Government and citizens have only been moderately interested in the possibilities of medical research, let us note the attitude of the du Pont Co. as described in a speech by Dr. E. K. Bolton. As you listen to Dr. Bolton's statement, which I quote, please ask yourself if it would not be wise for our Government to adopt toward medical research the same attitude and policy as Dr. Bolton outlines as the policy of the du Pont Co. Dr. Bolton said:

"It is a tradition of long standing that research is a major company activity. It is looked upon as a vital function. It flourishes because of an atmosphere of appreciation, encouragement, liberality, and patience.

"Never was this attitude better illustrated than during the depression days of 1932 when every department of the company was economy-minded. During that period I had occasion to talk with Mr. Lammot du Pont, then president of the company, about the work of the chemical department. He inquired about the progress of fundamental research. I told him that transfers to other parts of the company had reduced the number of men devoted to this work. He asked if I had sought to replace these men. I replied in the negative. His comment perfectly illustrates the company's approach to research. He said, "You know it is more important to carry out research than to pay dividends.'

"Another feature of du Pont research is that of continuity. The fortunes of a research organization should not follow a profit-and-loss curve. It is accepted as axiomatic that satisfactory progress in research over a period of years cannot be maintained if research expenditures are materially reduced when business goes through a temporary slump and increased when business improves. Both neoprene and nylon were 'children' of the depression.

"Since the most valuable research asset is good men, it is the policy of the company to staff our laboratories with the best qualified men available. As stated recently by Dr. James B. Conant, 'Ten second-rate men are no substitute for one first-class man.' This has certainly been the experience of du Pont's research organization.

"In the early days of applied research it was quite possible for an individual to carry in his head a large part of the technical information he was likely to need in the course of his investigations. Today, the situation is quite different. Most of the obvious and easily attained objectives have been reached. Our body of scientific knowledge has become so large and complex as to be beyond the grasp of any individual.

"Industrial research meets this situation through its ability to employ an adequate staff of highly trained research workers, whose various abilities can be focused on a single problem. Through its ability and willingness to venture, without hope of immediate return, sums far beyond the reach of any lone inventor, modern industry advances human knowledge in a way that was utterly impossible before its advent."

The du Pont Co. is a business organization grown great on research, believing in the possibilities of research and acting thereon.

Before I finish this discussion I should again like to talk of some figures and savings the Government can have from medical research. As I constantly speak of savings in money I am not unmindful of savings in life nor am I unmindful that every day more than 2,000 Americans die of heart and circulatory diseases and of cancer.

As Dr. Osler might have expressed it, if the ears of your hearts are open they can hear, as I speak, the beating of the wings of the angels of death as they hasten to the 2,000 appointed for tomorrow. But I will leave this angle of saving of human life to your conscience and will discuss the more prosaic matter of monetary savings to the Government which a program of medical research may achieve.

Businessmen complain of waste in government. Since they conduct research to prevent waste in their own business they cannot logically object to the Government conducting research which will save it money. I believe it is waste to build more and more hospitals and to fill more and more beds in these hospitals with the sick when a comparatively reasonable expenditure for medical research could do away with much of the illness which necessitates these hospitals. Remember that the need for hospitals and the payments for death and pension funds will increase greatly as the exservicemen grow older. This is especially true in the case of deaths from heart and circulatory diseases, for heart disease strikes mostly after a man passes 40.

Is this the statement of a dreamer? I answer by saying that the greatest money maker this country ever knew was John D. Rockefeller. He was smart and conscientious in philanthropy. He often spent large sums investigating a proposed philanthropy before he gave, and it was after investigation that he devoted a considerable part of his fortune to the Rockefeller Institute and the Rockefeller Foundation. These institutions were set up in large part for the purpose of preventing or curing illness through medical research. Mr. Rockefeller considered it wiser to seek means to prevent illness rather than devote funds to building hospitals. Events have proven his wisdom.

One may wonder why large sums are necessary for medical research. The answer is easy. The human body is the most complicated and marvelous mechanism on this planet Among other things it is a vortex of chemical reactions. The body consists of more than 200,000,000,000,000 cells, yet in a single cell of the human body more than 1,000 complicatetd chemicals may be at work. As I mentioned before, the research men seek to understand what goes on within the cell.

If you ask is it wise for the Government to appropriate fairly large sums of money for buildings and other physical facilities necessary to conduct medical research, I answer as follows: The du Pont Co., General Motors, and Ford Motor Co. are not impractical visionaries. Yet each of these companies has deemed it necessary and wise to spend tens of millions of dollars building and installing physical facilities for their research.

No matter how great the need for medical research today, one may ask if the Government can afford to spend the money. I feel that the more intelligent way to phrase the question is, Can our country afford not to act and not to spend millions when, by that expenditure, we stand to save many times the total expenditures.

The author of Alice in Wonderland was a mathematician. Even in his wildest dreams I doubt if he could imagine the contrasting figures I shall mention. In this "never-never" land called the United States we find the following:

We find a country where the people spend over a billion dollars a year for soda water and chewing gum; $2,000,000,000 for beauty parlors and cosmetics; $4,000,000,000 for tobacco products, and over eight billions for alcoholic products. We find that the citizens spend $50,000,000 a year for toy electric trains, and $50,000,000 a year for Christmas trees. They spend more than $200,000,000 a year for potato chips. This year our fortunate country will spend $600,000,000 for toys. The list could be very greatly extended. We find a Government which for years spent more for research projects concerning farm animals than it spent upon medical research concerning the health of its citizens. This "never-never" country spent billions to bomb Germany and Japan during the war, and then has given more billions to help these former enemies. This generous country has given billions to UNRRA and tens of millions to countries like Korea, Iran and Yugoslavia. Apparently it loves all the world and all humans, unless they be Americans. It has money in quantity for everything except the one thing which could save it the most money and which could make its people the most blessed on earth. That blessing would be health and that health must come in large part as a result of more knowledge acquired through medical research.

Address of Hon. Harold D. Cooley of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the House

Committee on Agriculture, our colleague, HAROLD D. COOLEY, on Friday afternoon, July 14, delivered a speech in connection with ceremonies incident to the inauguration of electric service for the quarter-millionth customer of the Carolina Power & Light Co. which operates in both North and South Carolina. I take pleasure in presenting Mr. COOLEY's remarks:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am grateful to my friend Louis Sutton for the splendid manner in which he has presented me and for the kind and generous words he has spoken. As he has said, this day marks a milestone in the progressive march of a great company—a company which is dedicated to public service. This day brings a memorable event to the home of Mr. and Mrs. H. M. Hicks, where we are now assembled. Here in these peaceful surroundings and in this pleasant Carolina countryside we come to inaugurate electric service to the quarter-millionth customer of the Carolina Power & Light Co., and by the turning of a little switch to bring the great conveniences and benefits and blessings of electric light and power to this modest country home.

I can clearly remember when this great event occurred in my own father's home in the little town where I was born. Well do I remember the cleaning of shades and the trimming of the wicks of kerosene lamps in the days of my childhood, and well do I remember what a blessing it was when the lights were turned on at our house.

I rejoice with Mr. and Mrs. Hicks in the happy thought that from now on they will be permitted to enjoy the God-given blessings of electricity. I also take pride in the record of the Carolina Power & Light Co. which has made this happy event possible. On this day 250,000 customers are enjoying service which this public utility has provided.

On this occasion I desire to pay at least a brief tribute to the two great presidents of the Carolina Power & Light Co. whom I have had the pleasure of knowing, the late Paul Tillery and Louis Sutton, the man who now directs the destinies of this great enterprise.

Paul Tillery was a great executive and a competent administrator. He made a thoroughfare for friendship wherever he went, and by his faithful devotion to duty he rose from the bottom to the top of his chosen profession. Under his leadership the Carolina Power & Light Co. made great strides.

Louis Sutton came to the presidency of the Carolina Power & Light Co., as a worthy successor to Paul Tillery—Paul Tillery, whose professional career was abruptly ended with his untimely death which occurred in the very morning of his great life. Louis Sutton has always possessed great capacity and foresight and vision and above all a progressive and a courageous spirit. He has reached the very heights of his profession—not by his personal charm alone but by his untiring efforts and his diligent and faithful performance of every duty which is a part of his great office. As evidence of the faith of his fellows, Louis Sutton was recently given the highest honor that can be bestowed upon a member of his profession when he was elected president of the great Edison Electric Institute—the largest organization of this kind in the country.

Electricity is no longer a luxury but it is, today deemed a vital necessity. Seldom do we stop to think that only in the last few years have the majority of homes of our commonwealth been provided with the comforts of electric light and power. Particularly is this true in the rural areas where farm people have been denied the benefits and the blessings of this modern miracle.

To refresh our memories, we need only to look back through the corridors of time to the good year of our Lord 1935—just 15 years ago, when North Carolina was at the very tail end of the march of rural electrification, with only 3 percent of the farm homes of the State receiving central station electric service. Today almost 85 percent of the farm homes of our State are enjoying the great privileges of electric light and power.

Private industry—the Carolina Power & Light Co. and other private electric and power companies, aided, to be sure, to some extent by the activities of Government, has brought about a remarkable change in the countryside of our commonwealth and in the rural areas of America. To encourage the acceleration of building of transmission lines and distribution systems, the Federal Government brought into being the Rural Electrification Administration and provided Government financing through farmer-owned and controlled cooperatives for constructing facilities for distributing electric light and power to the rural portions of our great country. Although these cooperatives were Government-financed, it was not the Government which provided the electricity; it was provided by the individual initiative of rural people who banded together to form the cooperatives, who had determined for themselves the necessities of their own situations, and who with borrowed money are now making their dreams come true. Both power companies and rural electrification cooperatives have contributed to the progress we have achieved.

In creating the REA and in providing funds therefor, it was never contemplated by Congress that either the power and authority granted, or the funds made available, should be used to throttle, cripple, or control the efforts of private enterprise, or to duplicate existing facilities in communities which are now being adequately served by private industry. Nor was it ever intended that such power and authority in general should ever be exercised in any manner which is not entirely compatible with the cherished and traditional principles of free enterprise, upon which this great country was founded.

I have wholeheartedly supported the REA from the days of its inception, and I take just pride in its great achievements and magnificent accomplishments in bringing the incomparable blessings of electric light and power to those who live in our rural areas. But I know that Congress never intended that the REA should be used as an instrumentality through which private industry could be destroyed and the livelihoods of people imperiled. Generally speaking, I believe the REA has operated well within the authorization given to it by Congress, and I congratulate this agency of our Government upon a big job very well done. Unfortunately officials of REA have on occasions displayed arrogance unbecoming public servants. If the power Congress has granted is well and wisely used, there should never be any reason for us to require certificates of convenience and necessity or for private industry ever to stand in fear of unfair competition at the hands of the Government.

As clear, cogent, and convincing evidence that Congress has not intended that agencies created by it should either hamper or hamstring private industry, we clearly worded the Rural Telephone Act so as to bring about the extension and improvement of rural telephone systems completely within the framework and principles of the American private enterprise system. Loans were actually made available to private enterprise on an exclusive basis for a fixed and definite period of time. Although this law has been in operation for only a few months, and although only 18 loans, totaling $3,568,000, have been made, 16 of these 18 loans have been made to existing telephone companies for extension and improvement of rural service.

The telephone, like electricity, is no longer a luxury but is now definitely a necessity, particularly in the rural areas of America, if the farms of our great country are to be operated on an efficient and businesslike basis. According to the 1945 Census of Agriculture, there were only 14,500 farms in North Carolina with telephones—just a little over 5 percent of the total number of our farms. I predict that by the passage of the Rural Telephone Act, we will witness a tremendous expansion in rural telephone service; and I do not anticipate that private companies will be handicaped in the proper performance of all of their legitimate functions.

Price supports, acreage allotments, quota laws, and diversion programs are all of great importance in the Federal farm program, and it is also important that our farmers be skilled in the arts of both production and distribution. But of equal importance are those things which are making the farm home a better and a happier place in which to live and which are raising the standard of living among our rural people.

For the past generation our theologians, philosophers, and thinkers have been deploring the breakdown of the home as the seminary of sentiment and the cultural cradle of our country. To some extent these views have been justified. Certainly there was a time about 15 years ago when it seemed that the home, particularly the country home, had ceased to be the center of cultural and social activities, and our farm people were looking elsewhere for employment, companionship, and entertainment. Young people wanted to get away from the country; they hankered for the bright lights of the city. They wanted education and entertainment, companionship and music, and a happier way of life than that obtainable on the farm. The automobile accentuated this trend by making it possible for farm youth to get away from the country and to travel to town. The movies stimulated it by painting an attractive picture of gay life and great opportunity in the big cities. The modernization of industrial processes made city wages more attractive than the income to be derived from farm crops.

In the past few years, however, there have been encouraging indications of a reversal of this trend, and the reason is to be found in the very thing we are witnessing and talking about here today—the bringing of electricity, telephones, and all other new conveniences and advantages of modern living to the farm homes of America. Day by day, year by year, the farm is becoming a healthier, happier, and more desirable place on which to live.

Your great Government has played an important part in making the farm home the best place in the world to live by taking the lead in providing good roads, rural mail delivery, better rural hospitals and medical facilities, home-making assistance of various types through the State agricultural college and the Extension Service, loans for the purchase of family-sized farms, and for the building and improvement of farm homes. Yes, and in helping to make possible the benefits of electricity and telephones and other conveniences in the rural areas of this great Republic.

The Government price-support and production programs have opened the doors of new economic opportunities for those who live and labor on the farms of our country; but our Nation grew to greatness and achieved its place of leadership among all nations of the world by the free exercise of the great privileges of individual initiative and free enterprise operating in all spheres of our American way of life. Never should we minimize the importance of private initiative; never should we imperil the American way of life. Industry has provided agriculture many conveniences without which we could not now subsist; but agriculture is the art of all arts and upon it depends the future welfare of the human family. Agriculture is the nursemaid of industry; and in the trying days ahead, industry, agriculture, and

labor must live, work, and pull together if we are to meet our rendezvous with destiny.

I rejoice with those who live on our farms that they may now add to the comforts of their country homes all of the worthwhile things of city life. The modern miracles of electricity are being brought to the remote rural homes of our country and Government and private industry are combining in a great effort to improve family life on the farm. As this trend continues, we can look forward to a renewal of all the sound qualities of citizenship and character and industry that may be better built within the family circle than anywhere else in the world. To this desirable end, the Carolina Power & Light Co. is making a grand contribution and is rendering a distinct public service.

Cooperation, But Not Coercion—Unification, But Not Suppression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we all well remember the discussions of a year ago when the House Committee on Armed Services was conducting the important investigation of the procurement of the B–36 and related matters. A recent editorial in the May issue of the American Bar Association Journal is excellent and very much to the point. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including this editorial:

COOPERATION, BUT NOT COERCION—UNIFICATION, BUT NOT SUPPRESSION

The newspaper accounts of the unification of military services under the Department of National Defense have been given scant attention by most readers. The public generally have felt, no doubt, that the bickering between Army, Navy, and Air Force should be settled by experts or that the whole problem of coordination was the affair of Congress.

It appears, however, that issues have developed that affect the fundamental principles of our form of government. When charges are made that freedom of speech is being suppressed and that distinguished military commanders are being relieved, demoted, and reprimanded because of opinions expressed or testimony given, the controversy has gone beyond the exclusive concern of experts and Congress.

The American Bar Association Journal would not presume to offer counsel on the unification problem. The extent, the means, and the methods of such unification are peculiarly and strictly within the sphere of military science. But when it appears that the supreme legislative power of our country, which is vested by the Constitution in Congress and which includes of necessity the power to investigate and conduct inquiries, is being obstructed by subornation and intimidation, it is natural and proper for the legal profession to be concerned. Through it the public should be informed as to natural and probable consequences of such conditions.

If the sources of information and expert opinion available to Congress can be controlled by Cabinet officers, the Secretaries of the armed services, the high command, general staff, or any group of officers, then Congress will eventually lose control of the Armed Forces and our military might will be directed by autocratic power behind the scenes. It is encouraging that some of the Members of Congress are aware of the dangers of thought control.

If any agency should stifle testimony or intimidate witnesses in a judicial proceeding, it would be the duty of the court to take vigorous action against such obstruction of justice. A similar duty rests upon Congress to keep its channels of information concerning the armed services free and clear.

It is obvious that such information must in many cases be carefully guarded and publicity attendant upon it restricted. Publicity obviously should not be used to cater to political interest or expediency. It must never jeopardize the security of our country.

The honor of our Nation demands that no military officer should have to suffer a demerit or reprimand because of his zeal for his branch of the service or his devotion to American ideals, if he testifies with the consent of his superior officers, or in response to subpena without such consent.

International Insect Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this business of our former allies, the Russians, getting all steamed up over potato bugs and bean beetles has carried international relations to a new height or depth of comedy.

In the first place, everybody knows that a Russian, a German, or a Hottentot cannot plant a potato in a place so secret it cannot be found by the wily potato bug. The Russians seem to be excited about the Colorado beetle. As I understand it, the Colorado beetle is just a shade different from the ordinary potato bug. I think maybe it has a bigger appetite.

At any rate, Russia is not the first nation invaded by pests with foreign names. I recall that we have had plagues of Japanese beetles. We also have Asiatic cockroaches—horrid looking creatures with bad dispositions and no imagination. I would be willing to swap Russia even, if she would take back our Asiatic cockroaches and give us any itinerant Colorado beetles found wandering around behind the iron curtain without proper visas.

Of course, there is this about the bug situation: If any of our Colorado beetles have been so foolish as to crawl through that iron curtain, they probably deserve just what they get. I suppose the Russians could send them off to Siberia with the other capitalists they have corralled over there.

There seems only two solutions to this international insect exchange. Let the nations prepare themselves with proper sprays and powders to take care of destructive bugs. That would be much more effective than a bunch of buggy protests and charges that sound as if they were written by city boys with ants in their pants. Otherwise, the only thing that can be done would be an international agreement whereby the bugs of each country would have to wear the insignia of their native lands prominently displayed on their wings and fuselages.

Whatever is done, one thing is sure: The Colorado beetles—and we have them in Indiana, too—have been more effective in getting under the Russians' hide than some of our own diplomats.

Stockpiling of Worsted Fabrics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include a recent letter from the Munitions Board in answer to a recent intercession by me concerning a resolution from the General Court of Massachusetts relative to the importance of stockpiling worsted fabrics instead of raw wool:

MUNITIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., July 12, 1950.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: In the absence of Mr. Howard, Chairman of the Board, your letter of June 29, 1950, on the subject of stockpiling worsted wool fabrics has been referred to me for reply. This matter has been under review by the Munitions Board staff for some time. In the most recent study completed in June of this year, the Munitions Board determined that it is not necessary to establish a strategic stockpile of wool at this time. The study covered not only the wartime supply and demand for raw wool, but also a study of the processing capacity for worsted and woolen fabrics. In view of this finding, the Munitions Board is not disposed to establish a stockpile program for wool or woolen fabrics at this time.

The National Security Resources Board is fully advised of the Munitions Board action in this matter. Members of the staff of the National Security Resources Board are in constant liaison with Munitions Board staff in all studies of stockpile materials and in this instance are in full accord with the findings.

It should be noted that the resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts indicates that the Federal Government is now stockpiling raw wool. This is not the case. There has never been any program under the Stock Piling Act (Public Law 520, 79th Cong.) to stockpile wool. The Commodity Credit Corporation, however, does engage in buying and selling raw wool and I understand did purchase a considerable quantity of wool in the year ending March 31, 1950. This activity of the Commodity Credit Corporation should not be considered strategic stockpiling because its primary purpose is not adequacy of supply for a war emergency but rather a price-support program for domestic wool growers.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICK W. TIMBERLAKE,
Major General, U. S. A. F., Director of the Staff.

Resolutions memorializing Congress relative to the importance of stockpiling worsted fabrics instead of raw wool

Whereas it is the proposed intention of the Federal Government to mobilize industry within a 6-month period; and

Whereas the Federal Government is now engaged in a program of stockpiling raw wool; and

Whereas it is the firm conviction of competent industrial leaders, based on accurate computations, that the stockpiling of wool is unsound at the present time and the stockpiling of worsted fabrics would assist materially in the Federal plan for mobilization, and would materially assist in relieving the present unemployment situation in the textile industry: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to take such immediate action as is necessary to revise the policy of the Federal Government by the substitution of stockpiling worsted fabrics instead of raw wool; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted, June 13, 1950.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
Clerk.

In senate, adopted, in concurrence, June 19, 1950.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Hon. Isidore Dollinger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, now that this session of Congress is drawing to a close, I wish to speak of the achievements of Representative ISIDORE DOLLINGER, who has so brilliantly served his Nation and the people of the Twenty-fourth District of New York. I think it is fitting that I do so, as I was chairman of the voters' committee to elect him to Congress. Therefore, I take particular pride in his fine record here. I have the opportunity to observe and hear the Members of the House of Representatives, and am in a position to know of their efforts and accomplishments. We have all come to know Mr. DOLLINGER as a gentleman whose ability, sincerity, integrity, and courage, make him an outstanding Member of this body.

As a member of the New York State Legislature for 12 years he had an enviable record. He has maintained his reputation in Congress as a liberal, progressive, and public-spirited legislator.

Congressman DOLLINGER is recognized as one of the strong champions of labor, and his record on this point cannot be matched. His efforts to repeal the Taft-Hartley law continue. He considers the present minimum-wage law inadequate, and favors broader coverage and a minimum wage of at least $1 per hour.

With every weapon at his command, he has fought against discrimination, stating that present discriminatory practices are undemocratic and un-American. He has carried out an aggressive program, introducing necessary measures to wipe out discrimination. Among them were an FEPC bill, a bill to prohibit the poll tax, an antilynching bill, a bill to prohibit race segregation in the Armed Forces, and many others. He protested against the mock trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, pointing out that the Cardinal's trial was a travesty on justice and a blow against freedom of religion and independence of churches. He has said that he will not rest until we have an FEPC which will assure to all the freedom and equal opportunity now denied to so many, and until discrimination is wiped out.

The vital questions of housing and rent control had his conscientious attention. He fought hard in committee and on the floor of the House for an effective, liberal, housing program, and for the extension of rent control. Mr. DOLLINGER has insisted that rent control must be continued on a Federal basis—and he has done all in his power to accomplish this.

The recognition of the new State of Israel, her security and progress are of great concern to him. He protested vehemently against the arms race in the Middle East which jeopardized Israel's peace, demanding that the arms race be halted at once.

A true humanitarian, Mr. DOLLINGER greatly favors the liberalization of our social-security laws. He testified before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and spoke in Congress, urging that old-age and survivors insurance be extended to cover all persons and that the needy be given necessary assistance. Postal employees have indicated to him their gratitude for his hard work in their behalf. In every way open to him—speaking before groups, in committee, and on the floor of the House of Representatives, he gave his best efforts to help the underpaid postal employees. They know they can count on him as a true friend.

Time does not permit me to speak of all his endeavors—for they seem endless. To touch on a few others, I mention his resolution calling for the full and complete investigation of our American military government and civilian administration in Germany. He pointed out that our muddling and woeful mistakes in our German program had cost us our prestige in the eyes of the world.

A stanch defender of democracy, and a believer in freedom for all who seek it, he protested the partition of Ireland and introduced a resolution stating that all the people of Ireland should have the opportunity to decide how they wish to be governed.

He has supported faithfully the President's Fair Deal program, and at no time has he failed the people of the Twenty-fourth District of New York.

Congressman DOLLINGER is a man of high principles—a hard worker, above reproach in his dealings with his colleagues and his fellow man. He is an able lawyer and legislator—yet modest in his appraisal of himself. Such men are needed in our Government today, and I am happy to be associated with him.

I know that his success in future undertakings is assured, and that he will continue to enjoy the confidence and respect of the people he represents. They are fortunate in having such an able man here, whose efforts in their behalf are unceasing, and who never loses sight of the goal he has set in order that they may have the best possible representation in Congress.

Bastrop, Tex.—A Pleasant Place To Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following which appeared in the July 12 edition of the Houston Chronicle. It is a very interesting and informative story about Bastrop, Tex.

The colorful history of this central Texas town is in many respects the story of Texas itself—a friendly, growing community of hard-working men and women who lean heavily on the good earth for their living and who never lose sight of the satisfaction that comes from working and planning with and for their neighbors.

As the story says, Bastrop is indeed "a pleasant place to live." The article follows:

BASTROP TAKES PRIDE IN BEING A PLEASANT PLACE TO LIVE—STANCH, CENTURY-OLD MANSIONS RECALL TOWN'S HISTORIC ORIGIN—"HOME OF THE LOST PINES" PARK CALLED STATE'S MOST BEAUTIFUL

(By Don Hinga)

BASTROP, July 12.—No, you won't find any real rich folks in Bastrop.

"It's just a town where it's pleasant to live.

"However, if you want to come here and work and have hustle and ambition, you'll get along all right. Lots of folks have."

That's Dr. J. G. Bryson talking. He's also Mayor Bryson and for many years was President of the School Board Bryson. And you can get a lot of other titles from civic jobs he's held here.

"Doc" ought to know. He drove in here on April 4, 1911, with a gray horse, a wife, and $100.

MOVED AWAY

In 1917 he decided he was "too big for the town" and left for another place. He won't give you the name—might make some folks there feel bad.

In 1920 he came back.

"Didn't have the gray horse," he chuckles. "Had the same wife, though, plus six kids."

A friend loaned him money to buy groceries and fill his second-hand car with gas, and Doc dug in. Today he's retired, owner of several good ranches and farms, well enough off to start selling his lands and stock and take it easy (as if ever he could).

Doc is a living example of his description of Bastrop, a "place that's pleasant to live in."

SUBJECT TO PROOF

"You know," he says, "I can prove that. We've got a lot of folks who work in Austin, Bergstrom Field and close by who live here. We've got a bunch of retired officers who served at Camp Swift here during the last war. They have come back here to live.

"Guess they think like I do—that it's the closest place to heaven on earth."

Located in the rolling hill country, just where the coastal pine belt plays out into cedar and oak trees, Bastrop is a quiet town.

There's very little industry here, a couple of cedar sawmills, growing herds of cattle, a lot of small farms all around, and pecan trees that bring in good money.

Just about all of the town's income comes from the land.

Charley Eskew, president of the Citizens State Bank, estimates there are around 20,000 head of cattle in the county, which bring in about $300,000 a year.

GOOD CEDAR RARE

H. C. Wilkins and the B & F sawmills will cut about 2,000,000 feet of cedar, pine, and hardwood a year, with red cedar predominating.

"Getting harder to get good cedar now," said Wilkins, who was caught just as he was leaving to fish at Rockport (another instance of pleasant living).

"Farmers are selling it off for cedar posts to get their land cleared for grazing. And the good stands that are left are hard to reach."

Cocking an eye at Gonzales' success in the broiler industry, there is a move on foot to try that around here. M. A. Carpenter, who's in the feed business, is pushing the idea and can't see why it won't work here, too.

One of the reasons that Bastrop County is not more of a farming area is that when the Army build Camp Swift, they took over 60,000 acres of good, sandy land. They still have it.

CAMP BOOOSTED TOWN

Camp Swift was a big boost to the town while it lasted. Most anybody could get a job building on it, and with some 86,000 troops there when the camp was at its peak, Bastrop was jampacked. You couldn't get a room anywhere and the town was full of soldiers looking for a place to spend their money.

"I know in just my bank we work from 5 in the afternoon until 8 in the morning getting up our part of the construction payroll," says President Eskew of the Citizens State.

President H. G. Griesenbeck of the First National, which was established in 1889, and who had worked there since 1914, had the same problem.

WATCHED TRANSFORMATION

Mr. Griesenbeck has watched the transformation from farming to cattle with great interest and has had a hand in most of the things that have made Bastrop the town it is today.

Probably Bastrop's biggest State-wide attraction is Bastrop State Park, called the Home of the Lost Pines, 2,100 acres of pine trees, a spring-fed lake and rock cabins, with hand-carved furniture, that will accommodate groups up to 92 persons.

There is a nine-hole Lost Pines golf course, a 150- by 75-foot swimming pool that is one of the largest in the State, inviting picnic areas that will accommodate hundreds and a refectory building of native rock, hand-carved red cedar and block walnut furnishings. The walks are of polished walnut, pecan, and bois d'arc.

ARTIST WITH FOOD

Manager A. H. Elliott keeps the park in top shape and in Chef G. C. Schaefer, who presides over the kitchen, the park has a cook with the soul of an artist.

Schaefer, who has dished up succulent food in some of the largest resorts in the Great Lakes region, misses just a few things in coming back home to Bastrop to work. He doesn't have much demand for fancy, dressed-up salads, and almost no demand for the figures he loves to carve in ice to adorn a banquet table.

Why is he back here in Bastrop, when he could be top chef in places known over the Nation?

"My mother's sight is failing," the big, bluff chef says. "She's all I've got left."

ASH WORKED FOR PARK

Bastrop has J. V. Ash, automobile dealer, to thank for this park, which is one of the largest wild game preserves in Texas. He was chairman of the State park board when he decided that this area would make one of the most beautiful parks in the State. He worked strenuously and today Bastrop Park bears the title "Most Beautiful in Texas."

Mayor Bryson says that "Bastrop's population stood at 2,000 for 100 years." Now it numbers 3,065, about 1,000 more than were here in 1940.

There has been little new building lately, except for the Swiftex Village housing project which accommodates 85 families of men serving at Bergstrom Field.

Bastrop has an excellent school plant under the direction of Superintendent P. J. Dodson.

BUYING UTILITIES

The city is buying its public utilities and Mayor Bryson says that it hopes to have them all paid for by next year.

"Then we plan to start spending our own money for improvements," he says. "I hope that we never have to have another bond issue."

Bastrop was first incorporated under the name of Mina 3 days after San Antonio in 1834. In 1837 it was changed to Bastrop, being named after Baron de Bastrop, a Hollander, who served as translator to Colonist Moses Austin in 1820. He later served as adviser to Stephen F. Austin and commissioner to Austin's colony under the Mexican Government. He helped Austin organize the colony.

SEVERAL OLD MANSIONS

Bastrop has several hoary old mansions that have stood stanch for 100 years.

The Crocheron home was built in 1849 and the exterior is substantially as it was 100 years ago.

The Wilbarger home was built in 1842 and today the exterior, too, is the same as when it was erected. Josiah Wilbarger established the first cotton gin in Fastrop and died as a result of an Indian scalping. His wife, who lived under four of the six flags that have flown over Texas, gave $2,000 to build the first Methodist church and the Academy of Bastrop. Governor J. D. Sayers purchased the home in 1868.

The Pearcy home was erected in 1836 and City Councilman Alex Waugh lives on the site of what was once the Bastrop Military Institute.

Bastrop has two institutions that claim the honor of being oldest in Texas. They are the Bastrop Advertiser, and the Erhard drug store.

The Advertiser began publishing in 1853, and has been run by Mr. and Mrs. R. E. Sandifer for the past 20 years, being in the family of Mrs. Sandifer for years before that time.

Blunt-spoken H. C. Erhard, grandson of Cayton Erhard, who started the drug store at San Marcos in 1847, and moved it here in 1865, operates the drug store today on the same site.

"Never made enough money to move," he says. "Living on my reputation."

REMEDY FOR EVERYTHING

Erhard has a reputation for having a remedy for just about everything—a whiff of strong ammonia for earache, aspirin for wasp stings, an application of ice to almost instantly relieve pain from an asp bite.

"Don't the doctors kick a little about your remedies?" he was asked.

"I don't charge anything," he replied. "I'm not rich. I just get a kick out of helping humanity."

While Erhard was talking "Sez" Jones, a blind Negro, tapped his cane up to the door. "You sure look nice this morning," he told the druggist.

"How much you want?" Erhard asked him.

"Sez" held up one finger. Erhard gave him a dollar.

JUST A LOAN

"That was not a gift," the druggist said. "It was a loan. He always pays it back."

Despite his blindness handicap, "Sez" used to deliver telegrams without a mistake, can unerringly pull the weeds out of your garden.

There's a story around Bastrop about how Mayor Bryson got into the ranch and farm business. A choice farm was up for sale for taxes and a loan that was past due. He was able to get the farm for $15,000, with $3,000 down and 20 years to pay.

SOW FOR FEE

The doctor got a sow as a fee for a baby case. Instead of butchering it for pork he bred the sow to a boar he picked up cheap. He got four boars and four sows on the first breeding. He kept on breeding the litters to each other until he had a sizable bunch of hogs, which he turned out into well-clovered pasture.

All the money that he got from his hog operations he put aside.

Then one day he got it out and counted it, put it in a bag that he used to carry his radium in, and went to the man who held his loan.

"Want to pay my loan," he told him.

"You want a check or draft?" he was asked.

"Doc" didn't answer him, just opened the bag and poured $20 bills on the desk. That was 17 years before the loan was due.

The mayor is busy these days selling off his land and stock.

"I'm 65," he says. "Slowing down some. No use staying in business if you can't spend your money."

His six children are all well provided for, and "Doc" wants to take it easy. His friends around here, who say that he has done more than anyone else to make the town what it is today, scoff that he'll ever settle down to an easy life.

For one thing he's writing a book on his country-doctor experiences. Writing isn't the term to use. He has two wire recorders, and when he isn't busy he talks his experiences into the machines.

"Can't write," he chuckles, "but I sure as hell can talk."

The mayor, who was instrumental in building the Orgain Memorial Hospital, which was partly financed by the Orgain estate, believes that one thing that has made Bastrop a little slow in developing is the tendency to cling too much to its rich heritage of history.

"Young men are coming here now," he says. "They are taking over. That will mean the salvation of Bastrop."

Heirless Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

which appeared in the Washington Post of July 17, 1950:

HEIRLESS PROPERTY

The Alien Property Custodian now has in his possession certain property which formerly belonged to victims of Nazi persecution who left no heirs—presumably because their heirs also fell victim to the Nazis. This property differs from the enemy-owned assets seized during the war by the Alien Property Custodian. It was not owned by our enemies and cannot properly therefore be catalogued among their seizable assets. Recognizing this, Congress passed a law soon after the end of the war permitting the Alien Property Custodian to return property to any surviving former owner who was himself a victim of racial, religious, or political persecution in an enemy country, or to the surviving heir of such a former owner. That law failed, however, to deal with the property of victims who had no surviving heirs. A bill to remedy this omission has been passed unanimously by the Senate but has failed of action in the House.

The bill adopted in the Senate authorizes the President to designate organizations as eligible to recover property which belonged to heirless Nazi victims and is now held by the Alien Property Custodian. Such organizations would be required to devote any funds they received to the relief and rehabilitation of surviving members of the group to which the former owner of the property belonged. The organizations would be appropriately supervised and their accounts audited. This seems to us to be the most fitting and effective form of restitution possible.

The measure comes up on the Consent Calendar of the House today. We hope the House will act upon it favorably. When it was last brought up an objection prevented action. If critics of the bill feel that its provisions need tightening in any respect to insure proper disposition of the recovered property, they can propose amendments to that effect. But they ought not to sabotage the bill as a whole or allow it to die of neglect at the session's end. It offers a form of restoration which can give valuable aid to surviving victims of nazism. At the same time it frees the United States Government from the imputation that it would be willing to profit from the property of families exterminated by Nazi brutality.

The Situation in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the annual department encampment of the Department of Pennsylvania, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held at Harrisburg, Pa., the week of July 17, 1950, the delegates were highly honored by an inspiring address delivered on July 13 by His Excellency Dr. John M. Chang, Ambassador from Korea to the United States.

It was my pleasure to accompany Ambassador Chang on the trip from Washington to Harrisburg and our brief period together enabled me to appreciate the many fine qualities of the Korean Ambassador.

The Republic of South Korea may well feel proud of Dr. John M. Chang, for he is not only an able representative of his government but he is also a fine Christian gentleman, possessing not only a deep faith in God but also a firm belief that He will deliver the Korean people from the jaws of communism and restore peace to that small, liberty-loving nation.

Ambassador Chang's address was delivered in a forceful and sincere manner and was enthusiastically received by the many delegates in attendance and by a large radio audience who were privileged to hear the distinguished Korean diplomat.

Ambassador Chang's address is as follows:

Thank you for the privilege of being with you this evening. I have grave things to say to you, for these are anxious days and anxious hours.

In Korea a conflict rages that strikes at the roots of the freedom, the beliefs, and the sanctity of individualism upon which our civilization is based. Your comrades—perhaps your sons or young brothers—are fighting side by side with my people in defense of the right to live in security and peace.

The future is hidden from our eyes by the smoke of battle. All we know for certain today is that totalitarianism has thrown a naked challenge into the face of the free world and that the free world has responded with solemn resolve to defend its freedom.

What price may have to be paid we cannot know. Of one thing, however, there can never be any doubt among people who are dedicated to freedom. The price of liberty is never too high. Whenever a godless dictatorship tries to fasten its shackles upon free men and women, then dictatorship must be repelled. Resistance to totalitarian dictatorship is not a choice; it is a necessity. To surrender our freedom of speech, of religion, of action, and of thought would be to resign ourselves and our children to living death. This we Koreans, or you Americans, any of the 50 nations that have joined together to repel this Communist aggression can never do.

It seems to me that there are two questions you might like to have me discuss. The first is, "What happened in Korea?" and the second is, "Why did it happen?"

As for the first question, the answer is not in doubt. The men in the Kremlin decided to test the resistance of the free world. What is happening in Korea is not a civil war; it is Communist aggression. I shall tell you why.

Northern Korea is, and ever since August 1945 has been, a captive area. From 1945 to 1949 it was occupied by Soviet troops. For the past 2 years it has been not so much a satellite as a puppet state. What it does is what Moscow tells it to do. To miss that fact or to fail to face its meaning is to misunderstand the situation we confront.

Even during the period of the Czarist regime Russia always coveted the ice-free ports of Korea. Despite her defeat at the hands of Japan in the early part of this century, Russia never forgot the strategic value of Korea.

Thus one of Russia's carefully calculated aims in World War II was to plant her armies on the Korean peninsula. In this aim she was partly successful, although the American forces held the southern half. Thus the thirty-eighth parallel division of my country took place.

After the United States defeated Japan in 1945, the Soviet Union moved into Korea with its plans carefully laid. Communist expatriate Koreans were brought back, and with them as a nucleus, a Communist police state was set up in North Korea. Over 2,000,000 loyal, patriotic Koreans in North Korea refused to knuckle under to this totalitarian regime, and fled secretly across the border to South Korea. This exodus was one of the great mass movements of history. Families left homes they had lived in for generations, all to escape the Communist yoke.

Upon those who remained the police state was ruthlessly imposed. Along the thirty-eighth parallel the tightest iron curtain in the world came down. No diplomats, no newspapermen, no merchants were permitted inside. Listening to radio broadcasts from the outside free world, was prohibited under heavy penalty. A steady and persistent propaganda of lies was dinned into the ears of the people. Soviet flags and pictures of Soviet leaders confronted them on all sides. Bishops, priests, and preachers were jailed and church properties confiscated. There was no freedom of speech or thought or action.

The Korean people in the north were thus forced into the lockstep of totalitarianism. Their young men were impressed into the army. Thousands of others were forced into labor battalions, or became chain-gang laborers to build military roads and bridges in North Korea.

The army of North Korea was equipped with tanks, and planes, and artillery supplied by Russia.

This is the regime, and this is the army that at dawn on a peaceful Sunday, June 25, struck without warning into South Korea.

That day will be well marked by historians. It was the day that resolved the doubts besetting the free world and resolved the issues of our time. It clarified the minds of men as nothing has done since the defeat of the Axis Powers. The brutal and unprincipled attack of that day brought sharply into focus the danger which the free world faces and which it must overcome.

I have given you a brief summary of what has happened in Korea. But that is background; the foreground also needs to be filled in.

Some sharp-voiced critics have blamed the soldiers of the Republic of Korea for retreating before the Communist attack. These critics have spoken of the low morale and lack of fighting spirit of our troops. You, who are veterans of the battlefield are better able than I, a civilian, to answer such criticism.

However, once again our appeal must be to facts. If there is one lesson that was impressed upon all the world through World War II it was the impossibility of stopping tanks and artillery and planes with courage alone. The mechanized drive of the German Army in Poland and through western Europe, when it faced men of undaunted valor, could not be stopped. When heavy armor is smashed against bare flesh, the living wall of poorly armed men must fall back. That is simply a fact.

I could remind you of many courageous acts on the Korean battlefield. I could tell you of Korean soldiers who tied dynamite around their waists and hurled themselves under the treads of northern tanks, so that many of them were destroyed, and the first attempt against Seoul was thrown back. I could tell you the story of Korean troops fighting until their last cartridges were expended, and of others who are still fighting, cut off in isolated pockets far behind enemy lines.

But to a convention of fighting men, these facts need not be recalled. American and Korean troops are now bearing the terrible brunt of battle side by side. Your boys are dying as well as ours, to preserve the liberties of my people, of your people, and of all the free world.

What is needed now are quantities of tanks and artillery to provide ground power strong enough to stop the great columns of Russian tanks with which the Communist army is supplied. Guns must be met by guns, tanks by tanks, steel by more steel. This is the only answer the invaders will heed.

There remains to be considered one other aspect of the situation in Korea. This is the fact that, regardless of the present course of battle, the Communist attempt in Korea has already failed. The Communists were aiming for quick victory—success so sudden and so complete that neither the United Nations nor the United States would have time to intervene. Their effort failed dismally.

With courageous and clear-sighted firmness the American Government and the United Nations Security Council reacted to the challenge. Within 15 hours of attack, the Security Council was in session; members had their instructions from their Governments; the act of aggression was plainly labeled and denounced, and the United States already had military supplies on the way to Korea.

In all the history of the world there is no other example of united action rendered so promptly on behalf of freedom and security. The United Nations as a world organization, and the United States as a great power bearing the heaviest responsibilities in Korea and the Far East, did not hesitate for an instant when open aggression was unleashed.

To say that the Government and the people of Korea are grateful is but a weak statement of the feeling in our hearts. The days of agony since June 25 have been lightened and made bearable for me because of the warm-hearted and unanimous support of the American people and of the 50 other nations that have pledged their support.

Within 24 hours of the attack, the telephone in the Korean Embassy in Washington began to ring, and the telegrams began to flow in, bringing not alone messages of sympathy and understanding, but hundreds of pleas from young American fighting men to be permitted to leave their homes and fly to the battlefield—many at their own expense—to take part in the fight at our side.

These outpourings of the American people, the brave and firm words of President Truman, and the instant, unanimous accord of leaders of both your great political parties and of scores of other great national organizations have demonstrated a unity of purpose and a clear-sighted understanding of the issues which are all and more than my bleeding people have hoped for.

So the Communist aggressor has struck, and has been met by the resistance of the free world. Let us now turn to the question of why this mad attack was launched.

The briefest answer and perhaps the best one is contained in a phrase used by Mr. Paul Hoffman, Director of the ECA, more than a year ago when he called the Republic of Korea a bastion of democracy in Asia. The continued existence of the Republic of Korea could not be tolerated by the Communists. It was too much of a democratic success.

The map and recent history of north Asia are fresh in your minds. You recall how the net of communism was dropped first over Mongolia, then over North Korea, and finally over China. You recall how the Communist tentacles have been reaching out toward Japan, and Indochina, toward Indonesia and Philippines, and all the rest of southeast Asia. In the midst of that great land mass, including half of the world's area and more than half its population, in the midst of lands already conquered by communism or marked for Communist subversion, there stood the tiny Republic of Korea.

The Republic of Korea was the only part of the north Asian continent that was not in Communist hands. So long as the Republic of Korea continued to exist the people of Asia would know that the United States and the rest of the free world renounced aggression. Thus my country stood as a beacon light of hope to the peoples of Asia, shining forth its brave message that democratic faith in that part of the world still endured. If that light could be extinguished, faith in American support against Communist agggression would be lost. That is one principal reason the Communist attack was launched.

Another reason is equally important. Totalitarianism does not look very attractive when it is placed side by side with democratic freedom. There in the Republic of Korea the peoples of north Asia could see a government laboring for the welfare of its own people. They could see the progressive development of economic and political well-being. And they could see the flight of over 2,000,000 refugees escaping from the Communist-held north down to the democratic sanctuary of the republic.

In the Republic of Korea the democratic system was put to the acid test. In few places where democracy has been tried were the conditions so difficult.

Our nation, without rhyme or reason had been cut squarely in two, with our mines, hydroelectric power, and heavy industries in the north under Communist control; our agriculture and light industries were left to the republic in the south. With such important resources snatched away from us, we had to find means not only of supporting our own population, but also for caring for some 4,000,000 repatriates, including the refugees from the north and an additional 2,000,000 who returned to their homeland from China and Japan.

In all these respects, we had to start our new national life under heavy handicaps, economic, political, and social. And while we were struggling to overcome these problems, we also had to defend our very lives and the life of our nation against the constant threat of attack from outside, and the constant efforts of the Communists to stir up revolt among our people.

I myself returned to the United States just a few weeks before this attack was launched. I could tell you what I saw with my own eyes of progress being made in my country. I could tell you how the threat of inflation was met by a reduction of the won in circulation from seventy-five billions to fifty-eight billions. I could revive memories of my own life as a schoolmaster, and tell you of the satisfaction with which I found our Government's educational program had already reduced illiteracy to a tremendous extent, with continued progress being made. I could tell you of the great revolutionary movement by which farm tenantry was almost eliminated; of how the Korean National Assembly voted to enforce the sale of tenant farms to their present occupants for a small price over a period of years. I could tell you of how our over-all factory and mining productivity had been increased by over 50 percent in the past year, with increases of as much as 800 percent in some vital goods.

There are other witnesses, however, who cannot be considered as biased as I certainly am in speaking of my own people.

To our witness stand we could bring the United Nations Commission on Korea, which has certified that our two elections, one held in 1948 and one in May of this year, were both fair and free, with more than four-fifths of all voters going to the polls.

We could cite the Associated Press, which in its various surveys of world-wide conditions of press censorship has given the Republic of Korea a treasured rating among the half-dozen nations around the world that grant to newsmen full and free access to the news with equal freedom in reporting it.

With deep gratitude in my heart, I also cite the words of a great American, Mr. John Foster Dulles, who visited Korea just a week before the Communist blow was struck. In explaining to the American people why he thought the attack was made, Mr. Dulles said the Communists struck with force because the society was so wholesome that it could not be overthrown from within. Speaking in Washington on the Fourth of July, Mr. Dulles said: "I was in Korea only 2 weeks ago and saw with my own eyes that the republic was a land of freedom. The people has just had their second general election. Eighty percent of the eligible voters had gone to the polls."

To Mr. Dulles' testimony little need be added. It must be clear to all that the Communists struck by force because Korea was a bastion of democracy which had to be destroyed if their aim to subvert all Asia was to succeed.

Without question the Communists also sought to test the will and power of the United States and the United Nations. Well, they have had their answer.

Korea has become a battleground on which the peace and security of the world may be determined. The free world had done everything in its power to avoid this test by force. The United Nations are still doing all in their power to end the fighting in such a way that force will neither spread nor soon again be invoked.

The aim of the fighting in Korea may be easily and simply expressed: to reestablish security and to restore peace. When this aim is achieved, liberty, decency and human dignity are preserved, not only in Korea, but elsewhere throughout the free world.

Will Korea Change Your Plans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, from time to time during the past 2 years, I have been privileged to call to the attention of the Members of this House articles, of great interest to our farm population, published by one of our great farm publications, the Farm Journal. At this time, I should like to call attention to an important article entitled "Will Korea Change Your Plans?" written by an associate editor of the magazine, Robert D. McMillen, and appearing in the August issue of Farm Journal. The article follows:

WILL KOREA CHANGE YOUR PLANS?

(By Robert D. McMillen)

We are shooting. We are being shot at. But we are "not at war."

Official Washington is trying hard to avoid alarming the public, because alarm might conceivably push us closer to a general war. Brass hats in the Defense Department have agreed to make no public speeches for the rest of the month.

How successful General MacArthur's Allied forces will be in stamping out the Korean fuze, no one knows. There is no question here of our ability to do it, if our only opponents are the Communists of North Korea.

In common with the rest of the world, the question here is not whether South Korea can be defended, but whether other fuzes may not flare suddenly in Iran, in Yugoslavia, or in Germany.

As in every other world event, American agriculture is involved.

If we switch to an all-out war basis (as of today that is still a very big "if"), you must eventually expect to find your farming operations rigidly controlled by the Government. This wouldn't come all at once, unless current planning is greatly speeded up.

Controls would most likely come in the form of allocations for equipment, fertilizer, fuel, and other necessities. You may find a clue to Government thinking when wheat acreage allotments are announced in the next few days.

Ralph Trigg, as head of the Production and Marketing Administration, holds one of the biggest, most responsible jobs in Washington, in peace or in war. He has just given this exclusive statement to Farm Journal:

"In view of current uncertainties in the world situation—and ever-present uncertainties about crop weather—there is a good deal of comfort in knowing that we will have around 450,000,000 bushels of wheat, and more than 900,000,000 bushels of corn, in our reserve supplies, before harvest of this year's crops.

"These carry-overs put us in a sound position, ready to meet changing conditions and to make any necessary adjustment in line with such changes."

What a change! Until recently the Government was worried about these surpluses. Now, suddenly, we're taking comfort in them, and we're in a sound position.

No one doubts that war—if it should come on a broad scale—would bring even tighter price controls, wage freezes, manpower drafts, shortages of some equipment and supplies, and other such restrictions, than we had during the past fracas. The Government will try to nip inflation in the bud.

The draft law, just renewed by Congress, means that your sons would be called into service at the discretion of the President, or deferred for specific jobs at home. No one knows now whether that will be necessary. (The weight of opinion here is that it will not, for Russia is not believed to be ready for war.)

In an all-out war effort, steel supplies for farm machinery would again become tight. We can't make steel without manganese, most of which comes from Russia, and our stockpile of that vital metal will not see us through a war. Our supply from Africa and India would be threatened.

Should Russian submarines cut our shipping lanes to Japan and the Philippines, we would be in serious trouble. It is the submarine, not the atom bomb, which is Russia's most dangerous weapon.

As for 1950, no major changes in production are now possible, even if they were desirable. Long before 1951 must be planned for, the situation should be clarified.

A National Fuel Policy Is Urgently Needed To Bolster Our Economy, Stabilize the Coal Industry, and Promote an Adequate National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, because of the imperative need for a national policy on the use of all fuels including coal, oil, and natural gas, and the necessity of determining our national reserves of such fuels, I introduced legislation on May 2, 1950, to establish a joint congressional committee for that purpose.

Conditions in the bituminous coal industry are alarming, and it is necessary that a sincere attempt be made on the part of Congress to assist this industry so important to the economy of the United States.

Some idea of the plight of the bituminous industry in the State of Pennsylvania is revealed in the following statement of Mr. Walter A. Jones, secretary-treasurer of the Central Pennsylvania Coal Producers' Association. Mr. Jones stated on July 10, 1950, that—

In the eastern Pennsylvania area, which includes the central Pennsylvania district and Somerset County, about 50 mines have been closed since January 1, 1949, ranging in size from small operations employing 7 men and producing 5,000 to 6,000 tons per year up to large mines employing nearly 300 men with a production of 270,000 tons per year. The aggregate of these figures shows that 50 mines have been shut down during this period, which mines employed over 3,500 men with an annual production of over 3,000,000 tons. Our survey covered the period up to April 30, 1950. We are satisfied, however, that since that time the number of mines closed and employees thrown out of work has been substantially increased, although we do not have total figures on it.

Production in this area during the year 1940, the year prior to World War II, was 41,363,000 net tons, and in 1947 it had increased to 59,469,000 tons. In 1949 production in eastern Pennsylvania dropped to 38,967,000 tons. During the first 4 months of 1950, this district produced 13,097,000 tons compared with 15,666,000 produced during the same period in 1949.

As I have said before in my plea for establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Fuel Policy, Pennsylvania is a large coal-producing State and when our miners are digging coal and the railroads are transporting it to market, we have a happy population. The effect of a thriving coal industry is reflected favorably in every State of the Union because coal is one of our basic and indispensable industries.

The following article by Mr. Harold Fleming, which appeared in the June 12, 1950, issue of the Christian Science Monitor was one of a series of articles by Mr. Fleming in which he stressed the plight of the coal industry:

OIL MOVES SEEN EFFORT TO HALT COAL'S LOSSES

(By Harold Fleming)

NEW YORK, N. Y.—Current moves in Congress to curtail the import of oil come on the heels of one of the most disastrous setbacks the bituminous coal industry has received in many years.

SHARP DROP IN COAL CONSUMPTION

In the single year, 1949, coal consumption dropped over 25 percent. The various strikes and stoppages did little more than hold production down to the shrinking consumption. Final 1949 use of coal by the country was the lowest since 1940, though in the meantime industrial output nearly doubled, consumption of other fuels had doubled, and output of electric power had tripled. Coal consumption, as a percentage of total energy use, dropped in 1949 to the lowest percentage on record.

To only a slight extent did the drop appear due to the quickie recession of 1949. Or, paradoxically, to put it another way, it appeared in general that where the recession caused a shrinkage in fuel use, coal was the fuel that had to take the reduction on the chin.

The plight of coal is further illustrated this year. It shared in the recession but is not sharing in the recovery. With steel operations at capacity, with industrial activity rapidly returning to the 1948 peak, and with the oil industry again expanding, mine after mine is being closed for lack of market. Coal consumption this year does not look likely to be any better than last year—if that good.

MARKETS BEING LOST TO OIL, NATURAL GAS

The current market losses of the coal industry are sometimes blamed entirely on high wages and frequent stoppages. But this is incorrect. A glance at what is happening to major coal markets will show this. The export market is fading away due to European recovery. The railroad locomotive market is fading away due to the switch to Diesel locomotives, and since many steam locomotives are fired with residual oil the latter is likewise losing this market.

Residential and industrial markets are being lost to oil and natural gas, in part for the above reasons of high price and uncertain supply, but also for technological reasons involved in handling, storing, ash disposal, etc. About the only remaining market in which coal remains impregnable is in the steel industry, though even here the steel metallurgists are trying to figure ways to make iron and steel with other fuels than coal and coke.

What appears to be happening is that the long-term downtrend in coal consumption is again being resumed. The war, it appears, only temporarily reversed that trend. The competition of oil was diverted during the war and then it took the oil industry through 1948 to catch up with its potential markets.

DEVELOPMENTS ONLY DELAYED BY WAR

The extension of natural gas pipe lines was held up during the war and is still retarded by the inability of the new natural gas companies to get all the pipe they would like. The dieselization of the railroad system was likewise delayed by the war. As these developments are now resumed in full swing, the impact on the coal industry is dramatic and in some ways tragic. Additional competitive dangers threaten it in the form of further hydroelectric developments and of the rapidly expanding use of liquefied petroleum gases.

One ominous sign of the times for the industry appeared this year in the weakening of coal prices. For nearly 10 years, operators have been able to pass on all or nearly all wage increases to the consumer in higher prices except as they could offset them, in part by heavy outlays on labor-saving machinery. But this time the price advances to cover the latest wage and fringe awards to the union rapidly faded away.

EFFORTS TO HALT DECLINE UNDERSTANDABLE

Testifying before a congressional committee 3 years ago, John L. Lewis said, "Our country still requires more coal than it did at any time in history. That is a normal process, notwithstanding that perhaps 300,000,000 tons, more or less, are displaced by the competition of natural gas, fuel oil, hydroelectric power, and other substitutes. But that is all right. As long as those things are economically preferable they should be encouraged."

It is understandable that the coal industry, as its markets suddenly begin to lose their war-induced size, should try to get Congress to do something about it, like reviving the old Bituminous Coal Control Act, or stopping the import of oil. It is doubtful, however, whether such moves can do much to spare the industry from the radical readjustment in the fuel markets now taking place.

When you realize the evils that have befallen the coal industry and which have resulted in the closing of mines and the resultant loss of coal miners jobs, it is not difficult to realize the impact on our national economy and the need for a prompt and thorough study of fuel conditions in the United States.

I want to take this occasion to plead that action be taken on House Concurrent Resolution 199 and House Concurrent Resolution 200, which were introduced by me for the purpose of providing the legislative machinery to deal with the distressing conditions in the coal industry.

With the war clouds again hovering over the entire world, I need not remind you of the vital part the coal industry has played in the successful prosecution of two world wars.

The Eighty-first Congress cannot afford to ignore the plight of the coal industry, nor can it neglect to establish a joint congressional committee on fuel policy without imperiling our national defense and disrupting our national economy. These are two sins of omission that in good conscience we cannot allow to be charged against us.

Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following communication that I have received from Mr. F. D. Campbell, president, New England Gas and Electric Association, Cambridge, Mass.:

NEW ENGLAND GAS AND
ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION,
Cambridge, Mass., July 14, 1950.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
Lawrence, Mass.

MY DEAR MR. LANE: I am writing to record with you the concern which the officers of the New England Gas and Electric Association and its subsidiary utilities feel over current proposals in Congress for limiting imports of oil or by duties accomplishing the same result.

Since 1945 we, along with other utilities, have been waging a constant fight to avoid the necessity of raising our rates to our customers, a losing fight insofar as our gas companies are concerned, I am sorry to say, until, in the past year, we were able to take advantage of the dropping oil prices. By pooling our system requirements and arranging for transportation in leased tankers direct from the oil fields and conversion of boilers to use oil, we have made material savings in our fuel costs. It would be discouraging, to say the least, to lose this advantage were domestic oil prices to be increased as a result of an artificial restriction of the imports of foreign oil, and it would penalize the power users of New England.

We have converted enough boilers in our electric generating plants so that at present our base load can all be carried on oil-fired boilers. One of our gas companies now produces gas made entirely from oil, a process which in itself is more economical apart from the lower cost of oil per B. t. u. Our other gas plants use large quantities of enriching oil for their gas as well as heavy oil to fire their boilers. As a result of this extensive use of oil we have been able to hold the line on electric rates and a few months ago reduced the rates of the company which is making oil-gas.

I am sure you can understand why the prospect of an increase in oil prices concerns us and, because it would unquestionably necessitate increasing our rates to our consumers, you can appreciate its undesirability on that account. Gas and electric rates in New England have had enough adverse criticism in the past few years without the further increases which would be inevitable if oil prices were to again approach the 1948 highs.

New England residents, in common with those of the other States along our northern boundaries and to a much greater degree than the majority of the States of the country, need cheap fuel for the heating of homes and places of work. The Federal Reserve Bank of Boston in a recent study states that the petroleum imports have helped to bring down the price of oil in New England. It seems to us unfortuate if the cost of that fuel should be forced up unnecessarily. It is hard to believe that the potential revenue from increased duties is that essential.

It also seems to us that from a national defense viewpoint, with the uncertainty that exists concerning the future, it would be unwise to speed the exhaustion of our domestic oil supply by hampering the free flow of foreign oil to our refineries. We have seen no comment that it is necessary to restrict imports for the benefit of our domestic producers.

We hope that you will agree with us that limitation of oil imports is not in the best interests of New England and that you will actively oppose any such measures.

Very truly yours,

F. D. CAMPBELL,
President.

P. S.—Our subsidiaries are the Cambridge Electric Light Co., Cambridge Gas Light Co., Cambridge Steam Corp., Cape & Vineyard Electric Co., Dedham & Hyde Park Gas Co., Kittery Electric Light Co., Milford Gas Light Co., New Bedford Gas & Edison Light Co., New Hampshire Electric Co., Plymouth County Electric Co., Plymouth Gas Light Co., Provincetown Light & Power Co., and Worcester Gas Light Co., serving our 330,000 customers in 105 cities and towns of eastern New England.

Point 4 and an Intolerant Young Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by John S. Knight from the Detroit Free Press of July 16, 1950:

ROMANTIC NONSENSE

The House of Representatives acted wisely when it voted to restrict President Truman's little understood point 4 program.

The Senate could show even greater wisdom if it concluded to kill the plan outright.

This fantastic proposal to guarantee American investments abroad, and help build up the economies of underdeveloped nations has been accurately described by the Chicago Daily News as "romantic nonsense which reaches its climax when it is advanced as a means of stopping communism."

At present, the "liberal" writers are beating the gong for point 4 with the tune that unless we "give Koreans something to live for, our GI's will have died in vain."

EUROPE WANTS ARMS FIRST

One of these point 4 daydreamers is Blair Moody of the Detroit News. Moody is a good reporter but tends to become emotional whenever anyone challenges appropriations guaranteed to pay the world.

When the Senate Appropriations Committee slashed the point 4 program to ten million, Moody said: "Political leaders of Europe whose countries will not share in point four, but who have been under both the military and political guns of the Kremlin for many months and who know what economic unrest—and also what progress and hope—can mean, have been begging the President to do something to reverse this stupid and dangerous committee decision."

Perhaps Moody and I do not know the same political leaders but the Cabinet ministers I interviewed in Europe only last month were giving first priority to arms and supplies for their own defense rather than handouts for Asia.

Moody thinks that we need a selling campaign to convince the Asiatics that we are not nasty old imperialists who covet their lands but benevolent big brothers who want to give them the know-how to help themselves.

Apparently, he thinks that the psychological impact of freeing Korea from the Japs or seeing green American kids dying in Korean mud is not enough to convince the gallant South Koreans that our heart is in the right place.

SENATE SMEARED

Moody winds up a recent piece on point 4 by smearing Senate extreme conservatives, whose votes so often follow the Communist line.

"They refuse," he says, "to appropriate the cost of about seven bombing airplanes to open the way to a real understanding of American motives and American good will by the Asiatics. They are doubtless not in Stalin's pay, but they might as well be."

Read that again: "They are doubtless not in Stalin's pay, but they might as well be."

In other words, any United States Senator who does not agree with the President and Moody on point 4 might as well be a Russian agent.

Those are strong words to use on men who have been honored by their respectives States with a seat in the United States Senate.

In his own point 4 recommendations, President Truman is either insincere or suffers from faulty memory.

As recently as July 11 he told congressional leaders that no matter how quickly American troops put out the fire in Korea, we cannot win the fight for Asia without point 4.

Just a year ago, in Washington, his Secretary of State Dean Acheson told members of the American Society of Newspaper Editors that the administration had written off Asia.

Just what are we, the public, to believe?

The wisdom of some columnists is apparently, in their own opinion, unlimited. When Blair Moody refers to Senators who opposed point 4, as "extreme conservatives whose votes so often follow the Communist line," he undoubtedly also had in mind Members of the House who opposed that plan.

Of the Senators he said:

They are doubtless not in Stalin's pay, but they might as well be.

Members of Congress are charged by their constituents with the duty of protecting America. With as much logic as that used by Moody, I might reply—Is Moody in his attack on Members of Congress, in Stalin's pay? Of course not.

Moody's statement just illustrates the thoughtless intolerance of some who are in a position to express their opinions, not only of legislative policy, but of the loyalty of those who shape that policy. Blair Moody is a young man, but like altogether too many who never have been elected to any office, who have no responsibility to the people, he is sometimes careless with his words and charges, an emotional, imaginative young man.

Permit me to express the hope that he will live long enough to see and regret the folly of his wild charges which, to say the least, may influence some unthinking individual to lose faith, not only in the individual Members of the Congress, but in Congress as an instrument of government.

Defense in New Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of July 7, 1950:

DEFENSE IN NEW PERSPECTIVE

Recent and current events in Korea have cast the national defense picture in a new light. They have disclosed some pretty bad forecasting in the Pentagon. They have made the defense underdogs, Navy and Marines look pretty good. To a very important extent they have discredited the arguments of the Air Force upon the basis of which the major decisions regarding our national defense were made. Moreover, they proved that in at least one of the five points made in a letter published by the New York Times on April 30, 11 Cambridge men headed by Duncan S. Ballantine, proved extremely prophetic. In this their first and most valid point, the 11 said:

"United States strategy today is not well equipped to deal with problems of limited aggression. * * * There are degrees of Soviet pressure short of open military aggression; and to this form of limited aggression—such as sponsorship of "revolution" or of guerrilla operations in independent countries—the United States may have no effective response except an atomic war. This condition may invite the extension of techniques of guerrilla warfare and internal revolt in marginal areas in the confidence that such local activity would incur only local risks."

Indeed, if the masters of the Kremlin had carefully followed the service testimony in the unification row before the House Armed Services Committee last October, they would have seen that the strategy they have chosen was made to order by the fundamental disagreement within our Armed Forces over the basic concept of national defense. In the extremely detached and informative report of that committee, recently published as House Document 600, the committee reported over and over again how irreconcilable the rival views of the Navy and Marines versus the Army and Air Force appeared to be:

"But the basic reason for this continuing disagreement is a genuine inability for these services to agree, fundamentally and professionally, on the art of warfare."

This disagreement has, beyond question, brought us to a dangerous situation which the ideological foe is going to make the most of. To repeat in generalized form the opposing positions of the naval versus military position—the Navy insists that tactical air weapons should have a priority over strategic air weapons because the latter only become genuinely valuable after the tactical weapons have won air mastery. The military have argued, and won, on the other hand, with the claim that intercontinental strategic bombing should be our No. 1 defense (and offense).

Korea has now made it clear that our dominating military master minds have been running on a single track. They have been so preoccupied with what they would do in case of a direct attack by Soviet arms that they have almost totally neglected what they should do if the Soviet attacked at one or more places, indirectly, through the kind of limited and localized warfare that the men of Cambridge wrote the Times about. It gives us little solace now to point out that the Herald consistently deplored the treatment accorded the Navy and marines all during the unification battle.

If we were right, so were a lot of other people. One of them was John G. Norris who, in May 1947, wrote a series of provocative articles for the Washington Post on the state of our defenses. The late Secretary of Defense James Forrestal sent us a reprint of this series with a note saying, "I believe there is a great deal of substance in what Norris is writing." Among other things, that writer pointed out that with a million men under arms "we would have to scrape the barrel to meet a United Nations call for troops and planes for international police duties."

In the light of Korea it now becomes clear that we did let the Army and Air Force conspire to overweight our defenses on the side of strategic bombing. How can the leading world sea power fulfill its obligations in all the corners of the earth, in all the seven seas, with a mothball Navy and a dazzling fleet of strategic bombers? How can a country which might, at any time, be confronted with a multiplication of Korean incidents, neglect the maintenance of balanced combat teams in readiness such as the much-amputated Marine Corps used to provide?

A bit of testimony which most interested the House Armed Services Committee came from Vice Adm. Robert E. Carney, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Logistics, who testified that the intercontinental method of strategic bombing was twice as costly as any other possible method. He said the No. 1 military problem was to answer the question whether the Air Force, in its present form, is needed to the extent of accepting deterioration and inadequacy of other essential components of the military team.

The answer from Korea would seem to be a resounding "No." The answer from Korea would seem to call for much greater emphasis on tactical, ground-support aviation. But, from where we sit, it would seem to say even more clearly that the Pentagon's greatest folly was to reduce Marine aviation to 12 squadrons and its combat strength to 2 divisions. The Marine Corps is the only individual service which maintains integrated ground-air operations. Its air officers must all first have served with Marine ground troops. The Marine Corps is a combat team, a thoroughly integrated assault army in miniature, trained to work closely with the Navy. It is made to order for such tasks as the Russians have confronted us with in Korea, and might easily throw in our faces elsewhere. The Marine Corps is unification within its several, well-integrated components. Korea cries in a very loud voice for more marines and a larger, functioning Navy to take them where they're needed.

Rather than scrap the Marines, they ought to be built up and strengthened as an example to the other services of how unification can be achieved most effectively at the combat level.

That is our view. But we urgently suggest that Washington itself do some thorough rethinking in terms of Korea and what might happen elsewhere. Sure, we need strength in our strategic air command but not at the sacrifice of losing little wars all around the world. We especially commend to members of Congress and to the Pentagon, the very pertinent and informative report of the House Armed Services Committee, even though we differ with some details of its recommendations.

Reorganization Plan No. 27

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 10, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution, House Resolution 27, which is before us today for consideration.

This resolution was introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. Approval of this resolution would be a veto of Reorganization Plan No. 27 which has been sent from the White House to the Congress for its consideration.

It is our duty to scrutinize this plan carefully, and to understand it fully before voting on the resolution. We must satisfy ourselves that it creates conditions of efficiency and economy and that it satisfies the objectives laid down in the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—the Hoover Commission. If it fails in these tests, our duty to the people clearly is to vote in favor of House Resolution 27.

Let us look at the plan. It abolishes the present Federal Security Agency, and in its place creates a new Department—a Department of Health, Education, and Security. The head of the Department would be raised to Cabinet rank, and a top departmental staff would be created along the lines of those in the other Departments.

Under this plan, three wholly unrelated fields have been joined together into one proposed Department. The organization and its functions would be maintained intact as at present. Since the operations of these units would be continued in this manner, it is not likely that conditions achieving efficiency or economy of operations could be effected.

Now let us turn to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. That Commission proposes setting up a Department of Social Security and Education, transferring into it some activities

of the Department of the Interior and away from it several varied functions dealing with public health, food, and drugs, and employment security.

The significance of these transfers is noteworthy, particularly as pertaining to the health functions. The Public Health Service was specifically excluded from the proposed new Department by the Hoover Commission, in line with its recommendations for setting up a United Medical Administration.

There may be good reasons for modifying the Hoover Commission recommendations in some parts. I, for one, cannot agree with the program for one giant medical administration. Neither can I, with conscience, vote to place the Public Health Service in this new Department which would be headed by the Nation's outstanding proponent of a plan to allow governmental domination of medical services through a compulsory health-insurance program. With the great forum created by a Cabinet position, could he not push this program further? I believe that this is the likely outcome if we allow Reorganization Plan No. 27 to go into effect.

I shall vote in favor of House Resolution 27, at the same time hoping we may be able to achieve reorganization of the nonmedical functions of the Federal Security Agency more in line with the proposals of the Hoover Commission.

Leadership: Our Great Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Altoona Tribune of July 8, 1950:

LEADERSHIP: OUR GREAT NEED

Americans are alarmed and dismayed by the Korean war. Of course, our reaction is nothing like the black depression which has settled over some countries, such as Germany, as a result of the oriental conflict.

It certainly is not true that all of our people are indifferent, apathetic, toward the Korean trouble. Friday afternoon's draft bulletins in the Tribune window served further to increase the undercurrent of worry that has been present in the last week over the deadly potentialities of this menacing situation.

It is time now for all Americans to appraise their leadership. That should be done carefully, before the administration begins to put out propaganda similar to that we heard in World War II political campaigns about the danger of changing horses in the middle of the stream.

Americans undoubtedly will stand united behind their Government and in its defense. Yet, there is no reason why they cannot, as Americans, study carefully the fiasco that Government has caused in international affairs.

If any American administration ever deserved defeat at the polls, it is the Truman administration.

It is bringing us not the peace, which the President preaches, but war.

For 5 years, it has bungled foreign affairs, so that today, while still war weary, we are being thrust, through the failure of our national leaders, into or toward a terrible conflict.

Whether that ultimate conflict will be avoided, only God may know.

It is quite certain that our administration can do little more than guess.

It seems inexcusable that our administration, in the face of the confident utterances of Secretary of Defense Johnson and Mr. Truman, could be caught napping as it was on the Korean affair.

Under postwar agreement, Russia was to sponsor the northern half of Korea. We knew that of course. We knew, what kind of government Russia was developing. We knew she was training an armed force. In fact, we also trained an armed force in our half of Korea, the southern half.

Only, we did a poor job compared to the one Russia did in the northern half.

We not only did a poor job, we failed to maintain that job. Obviously, no one in official circles in Washington expected that Korean invasion. They were all watching Formosa, where Chiang was awaiting assault by Chinese Communists.

We were caught napping again.

Further, our State Department appears to have ignored Korea for some time. We gave every impression that we were not bothering with Korea. In fact, from Washington comes the report that 2 days after the invasion, the State Department was ready to mark off Korea as expendable.

Look at this record of administration failure in the Far East, then consider our need for a strong government before we are catapulted into world war III under the most inept administration of modern times.

On June 18, General MacArthur asked for aid for Formosa.

On June 20, Secretary of State Acheson stubbornly declared that the defense of western Europe is our top foreign objective.

On June 23, Mr. Acheson declared there would be no aid for Formosa. Two days later, the Red Koreans started their invasion.

They had assurance from Mr. Acheson that we were not bothering about the Far East, that we were more concerned with Europe, and that we were not going to concern ourselves in any way with Formosa.

All of this brings back how the administration defended its sorry record with the Communists, the Alger Hiss case, Mr. Truman's denial of Communists in Government, his declarations that charges of spies giving away our secrets were mere "red herrings" used by the Republicans, and then we should recall the arrest of the arch spy Dr. Fuchs, and the arrest of the three other atomic spies in America, and all the disgraceful conduct of Government in these postwar years, and we should resolve that, at our first opportunity, America shall divest itself of this unfit leadership, and face the future in war or peace, with the kind of independent, intelligent leaders with whom America has marched forward through the years.

Korea and the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article by Thomas L. Stokes taken from last night's Evening Star.

Mr. Speaker, I think the questions asked in this article are very timely. These are questions which all Americans want to know and rightly so. We certainly have enough people on the intelligence payroll, which I understand is supposed to be the best in the world, to know something about the actions of our enemies. I have heard no satisfactory answer and I certainly hope the President's message to the people tomorrow evening will clear up some of the problems so vital to us at this time. The article follows:

KOREA AND THE FUTURE—OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN POSES QUESTIONS PEOPLE ARE ASKING

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON, July 17.—Dear Mr. President, it is understood that fairly soon you are going to talk to us about Korea and what it means for us and to us—naturally, of course after you have taken all the many factors into account. They add up to make this another one of the solemn and grave decisions for you who have had so many in so short a time, for this is surely a troubled world. Possibly this is the most fateful decision of all.

We are with you, and pray for you.

A fellow who gets around hears the questions the folks are asking. They need simple, direct answers. Some of the questions may be foolish—but they are what trouble people. It would be good, at the outset for you to take us into your confidence frankly so we can button ourselves up and do the job that has to be done from here out, whatever it may be.

One question you hear is why there are not troops of other United Nations over there slugging it out alongside ours. This is rather important for the reason that this is a United Nations operation; its first test is a case of open aggression, a test that so far our world organization has met magnificently, for which we are thankful, and the faith of our people has been revived. The United Nations flag is flying there now. That's a symbol. Our people would like the troops of other nations under that as a more substantial symbol. It's good to have company when you are walking in the dark. It may be a long walk.

A FEW MIGHT HELP

We know that England, Australia, and New Zealand have air and naval forces operating there and that Canada and the Netherlands have them on the way. We know here, too, that other nations which are solidly back of us have commitments of their own and must be on hand and ready to protect other exposed points of our world freedom front, and so are doing their share. But the eyes of our people naturally are on Korea because our boys are there and hope in the United Nations is now concentrated there, and it might help if some of them—even only a few—were in Korea along with ours. Our folks would like to know more about that.

Another question being asked is like this: If we have been spending fifteen or so billion dollars a year for military equipment and forces, where are they and, bluntly, how come? We here know that we withdrew from Korea in keeping with honorable intentions and pledges and washed it out as a military obligation and know that it's a long distance out there to get stuff in, and that we have many other fronts. But, since we are going to be asked to pay for a lot more stuff that may have to go a long way off to some other exposed point and operate under conditions there, this question ought to be cleared up.

Another question is why we didn't know about North Korean Communist plans in advance. Our intelligence did know a great deal and compiled detailed reports. But apparently no one here evaluated them. There's something missing seemingly in the way of somebody to do the job of pulling all such information together and getting it to the proper authorities. Looks like our Government needs a good managing editor for that. The folks should be assured that hole will be plugged up.

WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR?

Then there's a very simple matter, seems almost silly to mention it, but it boils down to what we are fighting for. Most of us know or should know that instinctively about the great struggle in the world between freedom and the integrity of the individual, on one hand, and totalitarianism and suppression of the individual, on the other. But it needs to be restated clearly in terms of the Korean aggression and in terms of our own leadership and the function of the United Nations. This is mentioned because one of our war correspondents reported that some GI's he talked with didn't know what they were fighting for. We are sure they know instinctively, though they may not be able to put it in words. They ought to have the words again—from their President.

This recalls the story of some of our southern mountain boys in the First World War who thought they were going off to fight the Yankees again—sufficient reason, of ecurse, wherefore they all volunteered and didn't wait for the draft—and said afterward that there was a "mighty big river" to cross to get where the fighting was going on. They found out what they were fighting for when they found out about Woodrow Wilson—a Virginian—and heard some of the things he said.

Our generation needs to hear it from a man from Missouri who knew what that war was about and knows what this one is about.

Still Treading Path

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. WHITAKER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled, "Still Treading Path" appearing in the Park City Daily News of Bowling Green, Ky., on July 4, 1950:

The Declaration of Independence was a ringing testament of freedom. It set the American people in a course no other great country has been able to follow so faithfully.

Fortunately for us all, the United States still is treading that path most of the time. Nowhere else on earth can a man roam about in a broad land as freely as here. He doesn't need the Government's permission to travel, to move, or to change jobs.

America hasn't allowed barriers to arise between its far-flung and widely dissimilar regions. On the vast stage of its 3,000,000,-square-mile expanse a man can work out his own individual destiny in endlessly varied ways.

To be sure, sharp inequalities of economic opportunity sometimes narrow the breadth of his freedom. But no one who understands the American ideal seeks to preserve these. The Nation's goal is to wipe them out.

Where we seem to have strayed most from our course is in safeguarding a man's right to speak and think freely. Our Constitution glistens with language conceived to protect this right. But men in America are not using the privilege with the same assurance they once had.

We can thank world communism for that fact. Quite by design, it has spread fear and confusion in our midst. Many Americans, some genuinely troubled, others merely bent on turning the menace to their own advantage, have helped to magnify these uncertainties.

In our present bewildered state we watch too calmly as suspicion of disloyalty is cast recklessly on innocent individuals. Every time an innocent man is spattered with mud the area of our freedom of thought constricts a little. For not many men will invite such abuse.

Whether they are in the realm of government, of science, education, journalism, business, or the arts, most men will tend to be a bit less bold and imaginative in their thinking, a little more cautious in what they do, in whom they see, in where they go. Projects that call for unfettered minds will not so easily be brought to fruition.

America's greatness was not nurtured in the unwholesome soil of suspicion. Freedom cannot be fed by hate and fear. It will languish in their presence. The threat of communism notwithstanding, we must protect a man's right to think and speak freely.

That's what we declared our independence for in 1776; that's what we still stand for.

Grim Lessons in Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lester Allen, from the Boston Sunday Post of July 16, 1950:

GRIM LESSONS IN KOREAN WAR—CONFLICT EXPLODES IDEA UNITED STATES CAN WIN WITH PLANES, A-BOMBS AND SUPER-COMMANDER

(By Lester Allen)

The Korean war has lifted a great and grim danger that threatened the United States—the kind of danger that left France a sitting duck behind the Maginot Line—the kind of danger that defeated Germany in two wars, in short, the danger of preconceived ideas.

Two central ideas were gaining ground in the Congress and at an even faster rate among the American people when the Korean adventure was launched by the North Korean Communists. One, was the creation of a supermilitary genius, a top military boss, and the other was reliance upon a far-ranging air force and the atom bomb.

Today the lowly infantryman, who flounders in unspectacular mud, the bluejacket, far from public view on the immense loneliness and boredom of the sea, come back into perspective as a first requisite for successful waging of war, and each of the other services, equally valuable, fall into their places as members of a team.

STRATEGIC WEAPON

This is no attempt to minimize the importance of the atom bomb as a strategic weapon. But, it is to emphasize that you don't hunt rabbits with an elephant gun. As a strategic weapon, calculated to take one overwhelming, smashing blow at a concentrated target of prime strategic importance it has no match. As a total weapon it is negligible.

Many important keymen in Congress were infatuated with the concept of a powerful strategic air force equipped with intercontinental bombers which would reach out over continents and seas to drop atom bombs where the enemy lived. There is no criticism of the Air Force in nourishing this concept. As a relatively new arm of national defense this was used to establish the Air Force as a senior partner in the fighting services, not a lesser junior partner.

NOT EFFECTIVE

The conclusions of the United States Strategic Bombing Survey in World War II seemed to have been ignored. It showed that the strategic bombing, carried out at enormous cost of men and planes, did not, until the final phase of World War II produce the expęcted results, and that people living in the smashed-up German cities were coming out of the ruins and carrying on the vital war production.

History offered many examples of the peril of the single concept of warfare. Twice Germany failed to carry through its submarine warfare to its logical and inescapable conclusion by concentrating all its naval power in undersea craft with which to hack in twain the vital supply lines to Britain and the Continent, and concentrated all its attention on land forces, which, in the end, succumbed to the balanced attack of land, sea, and air forces of the Allies.

MAGINOT LINE ERROR

France suffered immeasurable woe from the Maginot line concept of total defense. French military leaders, notably Painleve and Maginot, the Ministers of War, and Marshal Philippe Petain, believed that an interlocking series of fortresses along the French frontier, heavily studded with cannon arranged in such a manner as to create fields of fire in which no army could live and advance solved all the French problems

They failed to comprehend that in order to destroy an army in that way the army first had to enter the fixed fields of fire. When the Germans declined the invitation and instead knocked on the back door through the Ardennes, there were no fortresses there. The French had neglected to cover the flank of the Belgian frontier.

NAPOLEON'S IDEA

Earlier Napoleon with his obsession for conquest, placed all of his reliance upon land armies marching and countermarching across Europe, neglected the French Navy and woke up to find himself stunned by the impact of British sea power upon history, an object lesson that American Admiral Mahan analyzed in a monumental work "The Influence of Sea Power Upon History."

Today the balance of American fighting forces has come back into balance, at least in the thinking of those who do the planning and those who appropriate the people's money for warmaking. It was not a moment too soon, either.

ESCAPE MISTAKE

Another 2 years and the United States might have permitted its Navy to be hamstrung, its land forces to shrink to the status of a small police force and its planning to fall into the hands of a single super chief of staff, who, however capable, could never be all things to all men.

Blinded by bad weather the air forces in the Far East have been able to stage only a minimum of sorties, and then not very successfully against Soviet-trained tank crews in the North Korean forces. The strikes against concentrated targets have not been possible, because the concentrated targets, by a quirk of fate, are in the Soviet Union, and to strike at them would constitute an act of

war against a great power which would most certainly strike back.

LEARN HARD WAY

We are learning lessons the hard way in Korea, but the lessons have been taken to heart and learned thoroughly. And we are learning as we go along. North Korean tactics are Soviet tactics. Korea is a full-dress rehearsal of what would come later when the Soviet Union believes the time is ripe. The North Korean forces operate exactly as the Soviet forces would operate, for they have been trained, are probably commanded and are most certainly equipped by the Soviet Union.

They are deficient in tactical support in the air. They rely upon tanks to burst through a defensive position.

TACTICAL SUPPORT

During one good flying day Fifth Air Force light bombers worked over tanks, trucks, railroad rolling stock, and other vehicles, knocking out a claimed 46 tanks. This was tactical support according to lessons learned in World War II, a concentration on stopping the enemy's ability to move.

One curious circumstance sticks out of the claim of Gen. George E. Stratemeyer, commander of the Air Force in Korea, the claimed knocking out of 46 tanks. The best estimates were that the North Koreans had only about 200 tanks of all kinds. Manifestly they are getting a plentiful supply of tanks from their Soviet masters.

COSTLY LESSONS

Lessons learned at the cost of blood of Americans are grim lessons. They are heeded more quickly than all the dolorous warnings of arm-chair strategists in or out of the Congress. The quick reaction to the needs of the moment is shown by the Army's efforts to secure 20,000 men immediately by the draft.

What a terrible tragedy might have resulted if the United States had, like the other nations cited here, put all its eggs into one airborne basket. What a terrible tragedy would result from putting the conduct of national defense into the hands of a single super chief of staff.

COULD HAVE HAPPENED

It could have happened. Hitler tried the scheme. He had a super chief of staff heading up the German General Staff Corps. Under him were commanders of army, navy, and air force. The top man, of course, was an army man. As a result Hitler got a top-notch army, a third-class navy, and a second-rate air force, which, despite tremendous strides during the final phase of the war, was never able to overcome its deficiency in design or needed categories of planes.

Each new move in Washington indicates a drawing away from the atom-bomb concept of achieving cheap and easy victory. The choice of Stuart Symington to organize the home front against the eventuality of a future war was plainly a move to create a solid base for a balanced war effort.

PERILOUS ROAD

The worst possible news would have been an announcement of a procurement program for heavy intercontinental bombers to the exclusion of all other weapons. It would have been plain notice that the United States was walking the perilous road of a fallacious and preconceived plan in which the tough core of victorious war-making was relegated to minor importance.

If the North Korean drive bogs down, comes to a halt because of a loss of tanks and other material, it will be a strong indication that the Soviet Union has found the Korean adventure too costly and difficult to supply.

VULNERABLE REAR

Sharpshooting tactical air strikes, resolute infantrymen who will permit themselves to be overrun by Communists tanks to get a shot at the vulnerable rear of the low silhouette Soviet tanks and heavy tank busting weapons will have made the diversion in Korea too expensive for the Soviet purse.

But, if the low, tough-skinned Soviet tanks continue to roll down the Korean peninsula, and if the Chinese Communist troops appear on the Korean front, it is a pretty plain indication that Soviet military policy is following its same old tradition, the employment of masses of troops, an immense outlay of human cannon fodder, the use of ponderous bone-crushing troop masses.

OPPOSED TYPES

Then will come into conflict the two opposed types of military establishments, the balanced American forces and the unbalanced Soviet man masses whose only defense is trading space for time with the view of stretching out the opponents' lines of communication and wearing them out by the immense cost of distance.

Had it not been for the furious assault on the European continent in World War II Hitler would have triumphed in Russia and demonstrated the superiority of highly specialized troops over masses of men. The test of that may very easily come in Korea, or somewhere on the sprawling space of Asia.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Frank C. Waldrop's series of articles on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

On June 1, 1938, in New York City, the Communist organization in the United States declared itself affiliated with the Comintern, the general staff in Moscow directing activities of Communists the world over.

On November 8, 1938, the Comintern issued a new directive stressing world revolution as the aim of all parties, and 10 days later Pravda, the official Communist publication in Moscow, carried a long editorial announcing the Soviet resolve to fight for world triumph.

In America there was sharp disagreement among many important public men as to how we should regard native Fascists, Nazis, and Communists.

The newly formed House Committee on Un-American Activities asked $100,000 with which to set up its investigation. It only got $25,000 and so the chairman, Representative Martin Dies, of Texas, who had already told friends that "this thing looks bigger than I had any idea," very nearly turned back the money.

"We can't get anywhere with this amount," he said, "and besides the administration is against it."

Dies, let it be emphasized, was an administration man on almost all issues, most especially on foreign policy.

But his personal clerk, another Texan by the name of Robert Stripling, volunteered to serve as committee secretary on his own time without pay, just to get things started.

Thus with one filing cabinet, three investigators, and an unpaid clerk, the House Committee on Un-American Activities set out to find the facts about people attempting to destroy the United States from within.

In those high old times of the New Deal there was a very cozy arrangement between congressional investigative committees and the Executive—if President Roosevelt so willed.

The WPA was going strong, and it was the custom to "lend" WPA clerical and investigative help to favored congressional inquiries.

And where no direct "loans" were made enormous unofficial help was given in the way of tips, leads, and publicity encouragement.

Not so, however, for Dies.

Instead of friendly encouragement, the committee undertaking to expose subversive activities and recommend legislation for the security of our Government was snubbed and derided.

Dies was called to the White House and told by F. D. R. before the first hearing to "go after the German-American Bund but leave the Communists alone." He refused to do a halfway job, and so the administration turned its publicity guns, not for but against him.

The classical example of that has to do with the famous Shirley Temple incident. Here is what Secretary of the Interior Ickes said in a public speech in 1938:

"They've [the committee on Un-American Activities] gone to Hollywood and there discovered a great Red plot. They have dangerous radicals there, led by little Shirley Temple. Imagine the great committee raiding her nursery and seizing her dolls as evidence."

And Secretary Perkins:

"Perhaps it is fortunate that Shirley Temple was born an American citizen and that we will not have to debate the issue raised by the preposterous revelations of your committee in regard to this innocent and likable child."

Now what was the actual record in this matter, the record which these two Cabinet officers well knew?

On August 19, 1938, a witness was testifying before the committee—by name, J. B. Matthews. Said Matthews:

"The Communist Party relies heavily upon the carelessness or indifference of thousands of prominent citizens in lending their names for its propaganda purposes.

"For example, the French newspaper, Ce Soir, which is owned outright by the Communist Party, recently featured hearty greetings from Clark Gable, Robert Taylor, James Cagney, and even Shirley Temple.

"The League of Women Shoppers boasts of the membership of Miriam Hopkins and Bette Davis. A list of such persons could be expanded almost indefinitely.

"No one, I hope, is going to claim that any one of these persons in particular is a Communist.

"The unfortunate fact, however, remains that most of them unwittingly serve, albeit in their slight way, the purposes of the Communist Party. Their names have definite propaganda value, which the party is quick to exploit."

The contrast between that testimony and the perversions of it by two members of Mr. Roosevelt's Cabinet is too clear and emphatic to need any further underscoring. But how just was the testimony in its own rights? Was it sound? Was it prophetic? Was it worth hearing?

At the time it was given in 1938 both the New York Times and New York Herald Tribune ridiculed the statement that the Communist Party of France owned Ce Soir.

Ten years later, when the first government of France free of communism came to power, the very first act of Premier Schuman was to suppress the Communist newspapers Ce Soir and L'Humanite as foreign agencies. The United States of America applauded his act.

As for Shirley Temple, by 1950 she was grown, married, a mother, and divorced.

But still a lot happier than most of Hollywood. For at last the House Committee on Un-American Activities had managed to impress upon the country that communism has used the movies and movie personalities to perilous ends and with all too much success.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Frank C. Waldrop's series of articles on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Today, all the civilized world is alert to Soviet spying through internal Communist agents who seek to overthrow all non-Communist governments, everywhere.

Our own Government in the last few years has spent many millions of dollars on a direct loyalty check of its employees, hunting Communist spies.

It still is not sure, and one principal reason is the stubborn refusal of such top-policy officers as Secretary of State Dean Acheson, to come clean on their own, personal, private mistakes.

The Atomic Energy Commission, FBI, Civil Service, Military and Naval Intelligence, and other departmental investigative agencies maintain constant surveys every day to spot and smother the Soviet agents who keep on coming, no matter how many are caught.

This is not part of the cold war of diplomacy. It is a very hot war to secure the internal safety of the United States of America.

But it took a long time and a lot of prodding by a committee of Congress to get the executive branch started.

I have, for the past few days, been trying to indicate very briefly, the trend within the Federal Government, most especially its so-called social agencies, in the 1933–38 period.

This trend was not in the executive branch alone.

Two of its most violent manifestations developed in the munitions investigation and the labor investigations of the Senate, the famous Nye and La Follette committees, so-called after their chairmen.

Communists and fellow travelers got both those committees in trouble, as I shall show in detail, further along.

In 1937 the automobile industry in Flint, Mich., was barred from its own property by men who would neither work nor let others work, but stood siege with knives, guns, clubs, and razors while Federal, State, county, and city governments all refused to act.

This episode was the straw that broke the congressional camel's back.

A relatively unknown Democratic Representative from Texas took the floor of the House to denounce his own party for paralysis in the face of anarchy.

His name was Martin Dies, and he proved himself in the years to come one of the most powerful operators in the history of Congress. It should be noted that until the incident above-mentioned Dies was a solid Roosevelt man and, indeed, voted with the administration all through his career more often than not.

Yet because of his activities against communism he became a principal target for administration smears.

Dies' speeches on the sit-down strikes made a deep impression on Vice President John Nance Garner, who said that if Dies felt so strongly he ought to follow up his words with positive action.

And that is how the House Committee on Un-American Activities came into being.

Dies introduced a resolution to investigate subversive activities in the United States of America, with the Vice President guiding his parliamentary strategy, and the House of Representatives so decreed, May 26, 1938.

Today the House committee is more feared by the Communists than any other agency of our Government, except possibly the FBI. It has more than 600 filing cases, indexing and cross-indexing on some 1,000,000 cards, the running stories of communism, fascism, nazism, and Japanese activities in the United States.

More than 15,000 FBI, Treasury, military and naval intelligence, civil service, atomic energy and other Federal agents have used these files.

The committee's subpena has been served on hundreds of Nazi, Fascist, and Communist agents and their dupes and fellow travelers, and committee testimony has been the basis for some of the most important prosecutions of foreign agents in the country's history.

No element of our civil Government has such powerful effect upon public policy. No committee of Congress has such prestige with the Nation as a whole, or commands such respectful attention from the rest of Congress or such fearful concern from the executive.

Looking back over the record, it is fair to say that the Committee on Un-American Activities has been ahead of the news every year of its existence.

Just for the record, let's see what was going on in 1938 among the Communists, Nazis, and Fascists of the world as the committee came into being.

It was a big year for the Nazis. Hitler first had his triumph over Austria. Then at Berchtesgaden and Munich he let the Prime Ministers of Great Britain and France humbly negotiate for "peace in our time," while he and his partner, Mussolini, chortled with glee.

He got most of the publicity and nearly all of the world's attention. But the Communists were no less busy. Stalin, on February 15, 1938, called on the workers of the world to "unite to defend the U. S. S. R."

I will deal with that next.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Frank C. Waldrop's series of articles on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Many public men and women have had to learn the hard way that careless lending of their names to causes and organizations can be a dangerous act. It is not that they necessarily advocate communism.

It is that when their names appear on a letterhead, that is taken by others as wholehearted endorsement of the people or organizations involved, which is all that communism wants. It takes over from there.

Such was the truth that J. B. Matthews tried to point out in 1938, as a witness before the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

He certainly was a qualified witness, as a matter of fact a unique figure of our times and one of the major makers of the current history of the United States of America versus the Communist conspiracy.

Matthews was called before the committee in mid-August 1938, because Chairman Dies had heard that he was very well informed on communism and willing to talk.

Professionally a teacher of Oriental languages who had served on five college faculties, Matthews had strong convictions on man's relationships with man, which had led him from Christianity to socialism to communism, and then out again, after harrowing experiences with the comrades which he undertook to explain.

He told how, in New York, Cuba, Washington, and in five trips to Russia, he had come to learn the hard truth about the Marxist revolution and its brutal realities, as contrasted with its claims.

As he unfolded the details, a committee member asked him if he had ever been an actual Communist, and Matthews thereupon gave the English language a new phrase, today common on every tongue.

He said that he was not a Communist card holder, but "a fellow traveler—one who sympathizes with the party's aims, but who generally for strategic reasons does not hold a party card. There is such a thing as strategic membership in the Communist Party."

So clear and detailed and convincing was Matthews' explanation of how the Communist organization ensnares people who endorse letterhead organizations, then blinds them to reality and uses them to further bloody revolution, that when he had finished the committee hired him as director of research.

He held that post for 7 years and in the course of it built invaluable reference notes on secret as well as public, strategic as well as card carrying, Communists and their dupes and agents and as described in his gifted description, "fellow travelers."

But Matthews was not the first witness before the committee, nor the only one to put prophetic testimony into the record.

The committee's first witness was called at 10 a. m. Friday, August 12, 1938. He was a former newspaper reporter, John C. Metcalfe, by name, and at that time one of the committee's three investigators.

Metcalfe's testimony covered 47 pages and was supplemented by 81 documentary exhibits.

He introduced for the first time in an official congressional hearing some names that were to become infamous the country over: Fritz Kuhn, William Dudley Pelley, Peter Gissibl, German-American Bund, Silver Shirts, Gold Shirts, Black Shirts, Knights of the White Camellia, Knights of the Ku Klux Klan.

Yes, it is a fact that the very first action of the House Committee on Un-American Activities was against Nazi activities.

It is also a fact that after the committee's hearings on these matters the Department of Justice got around to action on its own part.

Following the testimony of Metcalfe, his brother James, and other witnesses on Nazi and Fascist activities, the committee turned to the subversive activities of communism.

On August 16, 1938, John P. Frey, then president of the metal trades department of the American Federation of Labor, filled 30 pages of hearings with extensive, detailed records concerning communism and its infiltration into the union movement, with special emphasis on the National Maritime Union, United Auto Workers, and the central organization of the CIO.

Frey was the first anti-Communist witness to be called by the committee. Reading his testimony, now, in the light of the past 20 years' history, only makes his performance the more amazingly prophetic.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Frank C. Waldrop's series of articles on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Why have the New Dealers lied all these years about the House Committee on Un-American Activities?

The record of fact is easily determined. Anybody can find it by going to the Library of Congress and examining the 10 feet or more of public hearings.

The New Dealers have, for instance, ignored the committee's amazing record of evidence against Nazis, Fascists, and their sympathizers.

And they have lied in charging the committee is antilabor in its exposure of communism. The record, and anybody can examine it, is the best evidence.

The first committee witness against communism, as I stated in this space yesterday, was John P. Frey, then president of the metal trades department of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. Frey was not dragged before the committee kicking and screaming for his lawyer, as so many witnesses have since.

He was a volunteer and an eager one. His story, delivered on Saturday, August 13, 1938, and going through 2 days, covers almost 200 pages of the printed hearings, enough for a good-sized book, not counting the exhibits, which themselves run to a considerable volume.

I propose to review Frey's testimony in some detail, because it is so illuminating and because, above all, it demonstrates so plainly that in 1938 anybody could know the facts about communism if he wanted them.

Mr. Frey didn't pull this information out of thin air. He didn't make it up. He didn't use generalities. He named names and cited sources. He made the facts so obvious that the simplest mind could grasp them.

Anybody who heard him or read his testimony was bound to see the truth of it. And people who had neither heard or read the evidence were utterly unqualified to criticize the committee for accepting his evidences as a base for action of its own.

Yet from Mr. Roosevelt down, the New Dealers were unanimous in denouncing the House committee as "labor-baiting," because it was impressed by what one of the Nation's most respected labor officials told it, with detailed evidence in support of his view.

Why? Because Mr. Frey's testimony was a devastating analysis of the Communist Organization's grip on the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the CIO, which was the New Deal's principal engine in politics, then as now.

He put the facts before the public concerning the National Maritime Union, the United Auto Workers and numerous others.

Sure, Frey was a high officer of the American Federation of Labor, and the A. F. of L. was bitterly jealous of the CIO's favored position in the New Deal. But that didn't change facts.

The facts were that the CIO headquarters and several principal unions were critically affected by Communist infection. Some that he cited were:

National Maritime union.
United Textile workers.
United Furniture workers.
Fish and Cannery workers.
International Wood workers.
United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing and Allied workers.
Agricultural Workers' Industrial union.
Share Croppers' union.
Southern Tenant Farmers' Union.
United Office and Professional Workers of America.
United Electrical and Radio Workers of America.
Department Store employes.
Fur Workers' International union.
Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers' union.
Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians.
Transport Workers' Union.
United Retail Employees of America.
United Automobile Workers of America.
National Marine Workers' union.
Maritime Union of the Pacific.
United Shoe Workers of America.
Steel Workers' Organizing committee.
Worker's Alliance of America.

I will deal with details of this testimony concerning these and other organizations, later. For the moment, let it be noted that Frey, a union leader, warned organized labor against communism in 1938, and foretold the internal wars for power that were to come.

The United Nations and the Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this is no time for the United States to put any confidence in Trygve Lie, or in the United Nations. Lie was Stalin's choice for the position he now holds, that of Secretary General of the United Nations. Do we need anything more than this to convince ourselves that Lie is a Communist? Who knows what his recent mission to the Soviet Union really was? Why did this take place just before the Korean war?

Trygve Lie's call to the other members of the United Nations for ground troops to help our soldiers in Korea is an empty gesture. He well knows there will be no response to his alleged plea. If we get any help in Korea it will not come because Lie has asked it.

There should be no doubt in the mind of anyone as to what every other member of the United Nations will do in this American crisis. It is nothing short of downright sacrilege to fly the United Nations flag alongside of ours in Korea.

We are fighting a Russian trained and a Russian supplied army in Korea while we harbor the Russians and their allies at the United Nations Headquarters in New York City.

The Knowland Amendment to H. R. 6000 Should Be Rejected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Knowland amendment of H. R. 6000, adopted by the Senate on June 20, if finally adopted by this Congress, will have seriously adverse effects on the unemployment-insurance program in the United States. It was passed by the Senate by a narrow margin and after such brief debate that I am sure that the Members of the Senate were not acquainted with the terms and potential effects of the amendment. I am confident that it will not be adopted by this Congress if the significance of the amendment is understood.

Our Federal-State system of unemployment insurance is based on, and exists only because of, the credit that is allowed employers against the Federal unemployment tax for payments which they make under federally approvable State unemployment insurance laws, and because of grants which are made out of congressional appropriations for the costs of administration of the State laws. Congress prescribed in the Social Security Act of 1935 the conditions for such tax credit and grants. All of these conditions are essential to the purposes of the Federal unemployment tax. All States have adopted laws which have been considered to meet the requirements established by Congress. Obviously, in meeting the requirements of the Federal law, the interpretations given to the State law by those administering it are as important as the language of the law. However, under the Knowland amendment, unless the State law has been amended, there can be no finding that the State law does not conform to the conditions necessary to enable employers to secure credit against the Federal tax. Thus, no matter how the State law is interpreted, no question could be raised as to whether the State law meets the requirements of the Social Security Act. Obviously, State unemployment-insurance laws are not less subject than other laws to varying interpretations. No matter how clearly an interpretation by a State administrator or court may violate a condition specified by Congress, the Secretary of Labor must continue to certify the law as in conformity with that condition. Not only, then, will interpretations grow up under the various State laws which will be at odds with requirements of Federal law, but there will also develop interpretations which, among the States, will be inconsistent on those matters meant by Congress to be uniform in their application to all States.

The position taken by the Knowland amendment, of ignoring interpretations of State provisions designed to meet requirements of Federal law, is so unrealistic as to strike at the foundations of

our present Federal-State unemployment-insurance system and to render it only a token system.

The Knowland amendment goes further to raise other obstacles to the operation of the Federal-State system by proposals which wil extend indefinitely the period during which individuals can be denied benefits, contrary to conditions laid down by Congress, before the Secretary can find the State law out of conformity with those conditions.

The total effect of the Knowland amendment would be to create diversity in the interpretation of the Federal requirements and to create conflicts in the Federal-State relation on matters now settled, as they should be, by negotiations between the State and Federal Government to achieve a nationally uniform result. I hope the conferees on H. R. 6000 will reject this amendment on the grounds both of its apparent unsoundness and of the need of having full public consideration of a question so vital to the unemployment insurance system in the United States.

The Ways and Means Committee a few days ago appointed a subcommittee to survey the unemployment insurance laws and recommend any change that it is shown are needed. The principles of the Knowland amendment can well be considered by this committee and if found to be sound could be incorporated in future legislation. This would be preferable to accepting them now without giving them proper consideration.

In the interest of sound legislation the Knowland amendment should be stricken out of H. R. 6000 by the conferees.

Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the Centerville (Iowa) Iowegian has published an interesting statement with respect to Korea, giving the step-by-step developments which took place and led up to the struggle that is now going on in South Korea. Mr. C. B. Depuy has prepared this statement with the aid of one of his friends, a scholar and student of foreign relations, and it is interesting to note the progressive developments which led to our present difficulties in the Orient.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I ask permission to present this column for the benefit of all Members of Congress:

KOREA

A local gentleman, who is something of a scholar, gave us the background to the present situation, just as it actually is as follows:

"At the Cairo Conference (1943) Great Britain, China, and the United States declared: 'In due course Korea shall become free and independent.'

"At the Potsdam Conference in 1945, the Cairo Conference Declaration was reaffirmed by the United States, the U. S. S. R., and Great Britain.

"With the Japanese surrender at the close of World War II September 1945 the Korea area north of the thirty-eighth parallel was surrendered to U. S. S. R. troops and that south of the parallel to United States troops."

From there the step-by-step route by which we find ourselves in the present situation is outlined as follows:

Moscow meeting (December 1945)—U. S. S. R., United States, and Great Britain agreed to 'reestablishment of Korea as an independent state.' (China subsequently agreed.) Joint commission of United States and U. S. S. R. representatives set up to assist in forming a Korean government.

Months of discussion of joint commission brought deadlock on major problems.

United States proposal (August 1947) that Korean problems be referred to four signers of Moscow agreement of December 1945. Great Britain and China agreed; U. S. S. R. objected.

United States referred Korean matter to the United Nations General Assembly (September 1947).

United Nations established Temporary Commission on Korea (November 1947).

Temporary Commission met in Seoul (January 1948) to facilitate formation of Korean Government through elections and withdrawal of occupation forces. Reported to United Nations its inability to contact authorities in North Korea.

United Nations Interim Committee or Little Assembly (functioning when the General Assembly is not in session) instructed the Commission to carry out its duties in such parts of Korea as are accessible (February 1948).

Election held in South Korea under supervision of the UN Commission (May 10, 1948). Reported by Commission to be "valid expression of free will of electorate in those parts of Korea" accessible to the Commission.

Democratic People's Republic of Korea set up in North Korea and recognized by U. S. S. R. in October 1948.

UN General Assembly created new UN Commission on Korea to assist in unification, promote friendly relations between two parts of Korea, be available for consultation, and to observe and verify withdrawal of occupation troops (December 1948).

Simultaneously (December 1948) General Assembly declared the Government of the Republic of Korea to be the only legitimate government in Korea.

Unification of Korea not achieved. UN Commission able to report only withdrawal of United States occupation forces (June 1949) except for American military advisory group of 500 men.

UN General Assembly renewed life of Commission (October 1949) asking it to "observe and report any developments which might lead to or otherwise involve military conflict in Korea."

UN Security Council met (June 25, 1950) at request of the United States which was informed of North Korean invasion. UN Commission on Korea established and confirmed fact of such aggression.

Security Council declared North Korean action a breach of the peace and acting under UN charter provisions, called for cessation of hostilities.

Council asked UN Commission on Korea to inform Council its recommendations and of adherence to UN declaration by North Korea. Council also asked all member governments of UN to assist UN in its efforts and refrain from helping North Korea.

President Truman authorized General MacArthur to respond to appeals from Republic of Korea for help (June 26, 1950).

Security Council (June 27, 1950) heard message from President Truman stating measures United States was taking on Council's request of June 25. (A member nation also has the right, under the UN Charter, to individual or collective defense against an armed attack until the Security Council has taken measures, with immediate notification to the Council of that defense.)

Resolution adopted by the Council (June 27, 1950) noted report of UN Commission on Korea that hostilities had not ceased, and called on member UN countries for help, including armed forces needed to repel the armed attack.

Secretary General Trygve Lie appointed Col. Alfred G. Katzin, a South African, as his personal representative in Korea.

UN Security Council (July 7, 1950) asked United States to appoint a commander of UN forces fighting North Korea. Also asked United States for periodic reports on conflict and permitted use of UN flag (blue and white) by UN forces.

President Truman (July 8, 1950) appointed Gen. Douglas MacArthur commander of all UN military forces defending Republic of Korea and instructed him to use the UN flag along with the flags of nations participating.

Members nations to date (July 10) that have endorsed Council's two appeals: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Israel, Luxemburg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Nonmember nations which have replied favorably are: Italy and Ceylon.

Federal Reserve System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Franklin D. Roosevelt, though a stanch advocate of authoritarianism, and who did much to bring the United States to its present plight, was not the originator of this unhappy condtiion. Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson laid the foundation for the disaster to the United States which impends.

Theodore Roosevelt in 1912 ran for the Presidency on an independent ticket which split the Republican Party and gave the election to Woodrow Wilson.

Wilson, in his first inaugural address, said we must deal with the economy as it is, not as it might be if we had a clean sheet of paper to write upon, and step by step we shall make it what it should be.

If we had a clean sheet of paper to write upon could only mean if there were no economy at all, which would have taken us back to the Stone Age or beyond.

However, he was not long in explicitly expressing what he had in mind when he made this statement. The Government was too small and Federal taxes were too light. So the Constitution was

amended, striking out the provision for proportional taxation and substituting therefor the system of progressive taxation.

Progressive taxation, said M. Thiers, according to D. A. Wells in his book, Theory and Practice of Taxation, is not a principle. To take from one a tenth, from another a fifth, and another a third is despotism; it is robbery.

Progressive taxation, under which we now live, is despotism because it gives the political authority unlimited power to take from the citizens all they have and all they can produce, except the barest necessities of life. Whereas the annual per capita Federal tax before this amendment was adopted was only about $7 per person, it has risen since the adoption of the amendment to approximately $300. And you may be sure that it will continue to rise until the citizens are bled white, unless the system is abolished.

Carl Marx advocated the progressive tax as a means for destroying private enterprise and this is exactly what the system is doing in the United States at the present time. It is from this source that the political authority derives the money for its giant bureaucracy, to construct public works, such as electric-energy producing and distributing plants, telephone service, houses, automobiles, and almost everything else in an ever-increasing amount.

The Federal Reserve Banking System was also established by Wilson during the first year of his tenure as President. He took full credit for its creation. It is not generally understood that this is a wholly political institution. The members of the Board of Governors, who have complete jurisdiction of the System, are all presidential appointees. They are, therefore, directly responsible to the President in all of their acts. It was the purpose of the framers of the act to make the System a "government," that is, political institution.

The essential purpose of the Federal Reserve Act was to give the politicians power to provide the people with cheap money; that is, to furnish them with money at less cost than sound banking deemed to be proper; and to make it otherwise easier for them to borrow money.

The overexpansion of credit which got out of hand so completely as to plunge the Nation into the great depression of 1929 is partly proof of the success of the Federal Reserve System.

The Federal Reserve System and the banks in general were turned into printing presses during World War I. Billions of dollars were printed through these institutions. The political authority deposited bonds in the banking system for which the banks paid nothing. Against these bonds the banks set up deposits. Then the political authority would write checks against those deposits to pay for the cost of the war. Since these checks all found their way back into the banking system it was in the end stuck with this printing-press money, except as the bonds were redeemed by the Government.

Some of these bonds were redeemed after the First World War, and to the extent that they were this credit money was destroyed. When the depression came, however, the banks were again converted into printing presses so that by 1939 there was more of this printing-press money in the banking system than there had ever been before.

In World War II the politicians printed an enormous amount of money through the banking system, upwards of $100,000,000,000. It is this printing-press money that is the real inflation today in the United States, and which has wiped out so much of the value of life insurance, pensions, and so forth.

The Federal Reserve System made it possible for Roosevelt to capture all the gold from the citizens, give them paper money in its place, and to put the Nation on a communistic or politically controlled base. Most of the people's gold was in the Federal Reserve banks when the depression started. This made it easy for the politicians to grab it.

So long as the gold remains freely in the hands of the citizens it is they who control prices. But once the politicians have the gold then they control prices.

World Government Opposed by Thirty-second Annual Convention, the American Legion, Department of Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion, Department of Delaware, at its thirty-second annual convention on Saturday, July 15, adopted a resolution opposing Federal world government. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a copy of the resolution:

Whereas the advocates of the Declaration of the Federation of World, a plan to establish a world government, to maintain world peace, presented to the one hundred and fifteenth session of the General Assembly of the State of Delaware, a resolution known as Senate Joint Resolution No. 6, the purpose of which was to have the general assembly memoralize the Congress of the United States in favor of said plan; and

Whereas on Monday, March 28, 1949, the said resolution came up for a vote and through the joint efforts of representatives of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars, said resolution was defeated; and

Whereas the publicly circulated printed literature of the sponsors of world federation proposes that any nation joining the said federation must be willing to suppress its military, naval, and air forces, retaining only a constabularly sufficient to police its own territory; and

Whereas the fifth paragraph of said joint resolution advocates the creation of a government capable of discharging the functions of sovereignty in the executive, legislative, and judicial spheres; and

Whereas from the foregoing quotations the following facts are self-evident:

1. That we as Americans are to give up a system of government that works for an experiment in world government to a degree that would make us subordinates, because we have only about 6 percent of the world's population.

2. That such surrender of our sovereignty would deprive us of our rights to control our finances, to regulate our international commerce, to fix customs and duties, and to impose tariffs for the protection of our American standards of living.

3. That a sovereign world government with all the power proposed could become a world dictatorship, without sufficient armed forces to oppose it.

4. That inasmuch as fair representation of member nations in any federation of nations must be on the basis of and in proportion to the population, we would be hopelessly outvoted by other nations with different customs, principles, and ideals in the creation of laws for world government.

5. That to assist such a government in policing the world, at its command, obviously would increase rather than diminish our chances of becoming involved in warfare; and

Whereas the members of the American Legion are associated together in order to "uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to maintain law and order * * * to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, department of Delaware, in convention assembled, at Dover, on the 14th day of July A. D. 1950, does hereby go on record as opposing said plan to establish a world government and hereby instructs its officers and executive committee to oppose such a plan whenever it may be presented to the General Assembly of the State of Delaware; and be it further

Resolved, That the delegates from the department of Delaware to the next national convention be instructed to present this resolution at said national convention and do everything possible to secure its adoption by the national convention; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to the national adjutant of the American Legion, at national headquarters, in Indianapolis, Ind., and that a copy of said resolution be mailed to each post in the department of Delaware.

Adopted by the American Legion, department of Delaware, in convention assembled, Dover, Del., July 15, 1950.

Congratulations, Grand Exalted Ruler Joe Kyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the city of Gary, Ind., is very proud that the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks have chosen a member of the Gary lodge as national grand exalted ruler.

Joseph B. Kyle has been a hard working and enthusiastic member of the Elks Lodge during his adult life. He has been active and participated in all worthy projects both civic and fraternal during the war and peacetime for the last 30 years.

The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, in electing Mr. Kyle, selected

one of the most outstanding men in American Elkdom. His wide experience, personality and industry qualifies him to give to his fraternal brothers an outstanding administration as grand exalted ruler.

The following is an editorial by H. B. Snyder of the Gary Post-Tribune, congratulating Mr. Kyle:

CONGRATULATIONS, GRAND EXALTED RULER JOE KYLE

Community congratulations go to Joseph B. Kyle, who has been elected grand exalted ruler of the national Elks lodge.

The election is a climaxing honor to a man who has given signal service to the fraternal organization all the way from the local lodge up to the national board. It came at the completion of a 3-year term as national treasurer, probably the second most important post in the fraternal group.

As grand exalted ruler of the Elks for the next year, Kyle will be traveling throughout the Nation. He'll be working for the brotherhood of Bills, but he also will be doing a national public relations job for the Steel City.

The formal reception for Kyle on his return to Gary should and probably will be a civic event. We know his fellow members in the local Elks lodge will be proud to have other groups in the city join in honoring their most illustrous associate.

A Fraud and a Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from this morning's Washington Post entitled "A Fraud and a Hoax":

A FRAUD AND A HOAX

The long-awaited report of the Tydings subcommittee says of Senator MCCARTHY'S charges concerning the State Department that they are "a fraud and a hoax perpetrated on the Senate of the United States and the American people. They represent perhaps the most nefarious campaign of half-truths and untruth in the history of this Republic." The report is an angry and indignant one. It seems to us, nevertheless, to be essentially judicious and just; its condemnation of Senator MCCARTHY is supported by a thorough analysis of his charges and is warranted by the gravity of the injuries those charges inflicted on innocent individuals and on the security of the United States. Far from being a whitewash as some critics have charged, the report is admirably complete and fair.

The subcommitee came to the conclusion not only that Senator MCCARTHY'S charges of last February that there were 205 or 57 or 81 card-carrying Communists in the State Department were false but also that the charges were made with no facts or with discredited allegations of fact to support them. Neither the information furnished by Senator MCCARTHY, nor the FBI files on which he placed reliance to prove his accusations, nor the witnesses called by the subcommittee at his behest revealed the presence in the State Department of a single employee who could reasonably be called a Communist or an agent of the Soviet Union, or even a security risk.

It is a misfortune that Senator LODGE did not see fit to join the majority of the subcommittee in a condemnation of methods which he gave every indication of having deplored. His individual report is inconclusive in the extreme. It presents no justification of Senator MCCARTHY. Indeed, it concludes that the McCarthy allegations were wholly unproved in respect of Owen Lattimore and John S. Service specifically and that the evidence was inconclusive in the 81 State Department cases generally. It finds fault with the 1945 handling of the Amerasia case; but this was only tangential to the field of the subcommittee's investigation. Senator MCCARTHY must look for comfort to Senator HICKENLOOPER'S silence; he can find little of it in Senator LODGE'S random observations.

On one important point the subcommittee majority and Senator LODGE were in substantial agreement. Both reports recommend appointment of an independent commission of distinguished citizens to make a thorough study of the whole internal security problem. The idea is one which this newspaper has earnestly championed. It seems to us that the establishment of such a commission is now an indispensable means of restoring public confidence in the loyalty of Federal employees so dangerously shaken by the recklessness of Senator MCCARTHY'S attack. The counsel of a commission composed, as the subcommittee report put it, of "high-minded and public-spirited individuals" would be of invaluable aid to the Congress, the President, and the public.

Let Us Be Thankful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, these are indeed days when important decisions have to be made and many times they are not easy decisions to arrive at nor do they call for actions that we find easy to take.

The fighting in Korea is being watched by the entire world and the freedom-loving nations of the world are attempting to halt the onslaught of Communist forces wherever they might move.

Even though the news at first is discouraging, we have many things to be thankful for and this fact was called to my attention by the editor of Vet Times whose editorial appears in the July 15, 1950, issue of that newspaper.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the editorial by Mr. Harold G. Stagg entitled "Let Us Be Thankful":

LET US BE THANKFUL

These are tragic and trying days and the tendency everywhere is to be both critical and fearful. Let us, instead—for a few brief moments—be thankful.

Let us be thankful that this first post-World War II test of strength occurred in a remote area of the Far East rather than in a populous center of civilization such as western Europe.

Let us be thankful for this opportunity to detect early, and without too great disaster, the weaknesses in our military planning and preparations; and for precious time to remarshal our forces and our senses to meet the great threat with which the world is faced.

Let us be thankful that the vast majority of the United Nations stands ready to sustain us in our courge—morally, at least—and by so doing give Russia pause as she contemplates the evidence of the solidarity of the free world.

Let us be thankful that after 3 weeks of fighting—with our weaknesses so apparent—the conflict in Korea remains localized with no outward indications that it symbolizes the outbreak of world war III.

Let us be thankful that, as a people, we are strong of heart and strong of muscle; that our great productive capacity is geared by peacetime prosperity to roar quickly into wartive activity; and that, as a Nation, we stand united in our determination to fight for peace.

Let us be both thankful and grateful for the courage of our Armed Forces; and for the courage of those of us at home—the fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, and wives—whose hearts once again must bleed in silence and in sorrow.

But even as we are thankful for today's apparent blessings, let us not neglect to contemplate in full reality tomorrow's dangers.

Let us be stern in our insistence that the Congress desist from playing politics with our defenses; let us be determined to hold accountable those persons—whoever they may be; whatever high office they may hold—who appear to have deluded themselves and thereby have misled the country into a false sense of security against any aggressor.

Above all else, let us be unselfish in our own willingness to pitch in wherever we are needed; to sacrifice whatever becomes necessary of the creature comforts; to resist any and every temptation to hoard or to profit by shortage or threatened shortages.

Let us be good Americans, so that our men may be good soldiers.

Cut in Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 18 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why a $600,000,000 Slash in Nonwar Spending Would Be Good," which was published in the Baltimore Sun of July 16. It is an explanatory editorial, and I am in total sympathy with the objectives set forth in it. As we consider appropriations for nonessential spending involving materials which will greatly affect the military, I think we should view such appropriations in the light of this editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY A $600,000,000 SLASH IN NONWAR SPENDING WOULD BE GOOD

The proposal of an economy bloc in the Senate for a $600,000,000 cut in the pending over-all budget bill has widely ramifying implications. Like the stone in the millpond, such a cut would make a big splash where it hit the economy, and it would also send circling waves away from the point of the splash and very widely beyond.

Immediately, of course, there is all kinds of sense in a move to cut back nonwar expenditures where war exepnditures are about to be expanded by margins no man can now foresee. Since there is increasing evidence that the American production system—yes, even the American production system—is not totally without limits, sober people will welcome the economy move as a simple recognition of this fact.

After all, at a time when both plant and manpower are employed practically to the 100-percent level, there is not much leeway out of which to squeeze further production. And plant and manpower are now employed at practically capacity level.

Unemployment is down to 3,000,000 which is a minimum largely accounted for by the healthy mobility of people moving from one job to another and by merely casual and temporary joblessness. And even from the tight total of employed men the armed services are about to make deductions which are bound further to tighten the labor market.

As for industry, the state of the whole may be suggested by the state of the basic line, namely steel. For some weeks the steel industry has been operating at a rate which, for statistical reasons too abstruse to go into here, is stated as more than 100 percent of capacity.

But aside from the simple physical fact that you can't get many more goods out of a machine already operating at practically peak capacity, there is the subtler matter of the price dislocations to be expected if you try. For the Government to pile new military expenditures on top of present expenditures will simply work to blow up prices.

The reason is clear enough. When demand is increased more rapidly than supply, prices rise as one set of purchasers bids goods away from another. When one purchaser is the Government, with its overwhelming power to buy, the inflationary effect on prices is even more manifest.

But Government pressure buying at this time would puff up inflation in still another way. Since the Government is and has been spending more than it takes in, it is paying for substantial parts of its purchases with I O U's—various acknowledgments of Government indebtedness. These statements of indebtedness filter into the banking and market system and by expanding the volume of currency still further dilute money values still more and enhance prices in still another way.

Inflation is always and everywhere the enemy of economic order. The last resort against inflation in a war or edge-of-war economy is price controls. The effect of price controls is to hold prices to what they would be were no artificial forces set loose in the market—like Government demand greater than possible supply and Government spending greater than Government income.

Price controls are, however, as even Government planners will agree (if pressed), hard things to manage. The instinct of everyone is to fend them off as long as possible—while realizing also that the economy best prepared for their ultimate application, if it must come, is one in which price dislocations have already been minimized by wise market policy.

Well, then, an obvious way to fend controls off for the present while preparing for their most effective ultimate application, if necessary, is (a) to maintain Government purchases at no greater than present levels by cutting back nonwar buying as war buying expands, and (b) to prevent further dilutions of the currency by new Government expenditure not balanced by Government income.

Both of these primary moves against inflation now and later would be aided by the $600,000,000 cut proposed by the economy bloc in the Senate. The bloc by all means and most emphatically should prevail.

Johnson Blunders: Shall We Impeach Him?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I presume under consent heretofore granted to say that while the Secretary of Defense is affable, that is all one can safely or wisely say about him. He has demonstrated his complete incapacity for the office he holds. He either knew or should have known what confronted us in Korea. His alibis and his attempts to avoid and to evade responsibility are childish. He is not between, but on both horns, of a dilemma. He should admit his incompetence and relieve the President of the embarrassment he causes by continuing in office.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, he is the great obstacle against which unanimity on the part of Congress bumps. He ignored, he defied, he contemptuously told the representatives of the people he was boss and to hell with Congress, as he undertook arbitrarily to stop work on the big carrier; as he did not initiate work on the airplanes for which Congress appropriated the money; as he came back from Asia to tell us about our security—of which we had none—concerning which I said, as appeared in the Burlington Free Press on July 3, the following:

PLUMLEY SAYS JOHNSON SLEEPING AT SWITCH ON KOREAN SITUATION—WAR HAS CAUGHT UNITED STATES UNPREPARED AGAIN, DECLARES VERMONT'S CONGRESSMAN

NORTHFIELD, July 2.—"In my opinion we were never so inadequately prepared for defense, for aggression, or to enforce a peace, as now!" today declared Vermont Representative CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, as he revealed that he enthusiastically approved President Truman's action relative to the Korean situation.

"Defense Secretary Johnson came back from Japan as 'cocky' as ever, with assurances he had all the facts affecting our security in the Far East. Obviously he was asleep at the switch, for the United States has been caught flatfooted, completely surprised and unprepared. Our fleet is in mothballs, its manpower dissipated and numerically weak. Our fighting forces are unequipped.

TO SLAUGHTER AGAIN

"The airplanes for which Congress appropriated money were not even in the process of manufacture.. The construction of the big carrier was canceled, and about everything done that isolationists and pacificists could do to lead us to slaughter again."

Plumley's statement continues:

"I challenge the statements that we are prepared, made by Secretary Johnson, who feels secure in the 'fools paradise' out of which he speaks. I assume to speak as one, who has for over 15 years been listening to evidence from all the services and appropriating money to meet the exigencies of the times. We are unprepared to meet the present crisis!

"Had the expressed will of Congress been carried out, the Communists in North Korea, backed by Stalin, would not have dared to do what they have done. Stalin knows what he is doing and why. We have no policy, or had none until the President so courageously announced it.

HITS TRUMAN PROGRAM

"Assurances made by President Truman within even the last month to the effect that chances for peace were improved, remind me of pre-Pearl Harbor days and of those statements 'no American boy will fight on foreign soil.' We have been fed the same 'baloney' too long.

"It is time for the American people to put a stop to this program of playing dollars against their lives and liberty, before they lost both, and it is later than you think already."

And again on July 6—

JOHNSON IGNORED WILL OF PEOPLE, DECLARES PLUMLEY—VERMONT CONGRESSMAN ANSWERS CRITIC

NORTHFIELD, July 5.—"If believing in adequate preparedness makes me militaristic, so be it," Representative CHARLES A. PLUMLEY declared today.

PLUMLEY made his statement in replying to an anonymous letter, "obviously from a fellow traveler and a coward," which criticized him for his alleged militaristic attitude.

"The facts," he said, "are these: The United States Navy has been relegated to a subordinate position, its aircraft carriers and the marines kept 8,000 miles away from an area bubbling with trouble for many months. If the United States task force had been in Korean waters the Korean aggression would never have occurred.

"The will of the American people as expressed by Congress was willfully and deliberately disregarded by Secretary of Defense Johnson."

Stating that the United States had only one aircraft carrier in the Far East, and no Marine Corps regiment, the Representative asked, "Why have nearly all the carriers been put in moth balls? Where is the personnel to man more carriers if they should be taken out of moth balls?"

"Think that over. I believe in adequate preparedness. Do you?"

That I am not alone in my thinking is evidenced by the editorial from the Lowell Sun, Lowell, Mass., of July 15, 1950, which reads, as follows:

JOHNSON'S BLUNDERS

Much of the blame for the present desperate plight of the United States forces in Korea can be laid squarely at the feet of the men responsible for the decimation of the Navy and the Marine Corps, and the ringleader of these men is Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson.

It was he who canceled out the Navy's experimental supercarrier, the *United States*, that died aborning in the Norfolk, Va., shipyards, and it was he who backed up the claims of the Air Force that it, and it alone, should, of the four branches of the service, be allowed to have anything to do with aircraft—a folly that is only too tragically clear now.

Johnson was a leader of the school of thought that the Air Force could just about win the next war, when, as, and if it came, single-handedly. It was he who bragged some months ago that if Russia attacked the United States, we would be striking back at her in a matter of minutes via the Air Force.

And it was Johnson who failed to support the plea of the Army for more planes designed for close support of ground troops, the consequence of this being that we now see B-29's trying to knock out tanks.

He cut the Marine Corps to ribbons and forced the Navy to reduce its strength to a point far below a safe minimum in view of a tense situation between the United States and Russia, a situation that threatened to flare up at any one of many points throughout the world, Korea among them.

Result: One carrier off Korea, no marines, a handful of jets designed for high-level

enemy interception, no planes for ground support and a lot of B–29's.

What the embattled GI's in Korea wouldn't give for a fleet of carriers standing offshore sending in strike after strike. It is quite probable that had there been such naval air strength available, the situation wouldn't be as bad as it is now. Where are the carriers? In moth balls, per order of Johnson.

And had the Marine Corps been able to move in fast with its efficiently organized combat teams especially designed for just this type of action, the United States flag probably wouldn't now be resting on the south bank of the Kum River. Where is the Marine Corps? Well, what's left of it, after Johnson got through with it, is sitting in California awaiting transportation by a Navy ill-prepared to transport it.

If the Korean war does nothing else, it may teach the Pentagon boys and their bull-in-a-china-shop leader Johnson that a Navy fully prepared with its many mobile landing fields, the carriers, and a Marine Corps that can get there fast and hold on until the more slowly moving Army can reach the scene, are indispensable to our national safety, regardless of what the glamour boys of the Air Force say.

And speaking of lack of appropriate weapons, how come no bazookas capable of stopping a 60-ton Red tank at a greater range than 20 feet? Maybe the Pentagon didn't know that Russia had such tough armor. The Reds used this tank in World War II with great success. Maybe the boys in charge of weapons research just forgot. Maybe one of these days they'll even get around to producing an American tank that's worth more than a darn, one that can slug it out with the Red monsters.

But if they do, it'll probably be despite the incompetent Johnson, not because of him.

It resolves itself into the proposition will the President save himself by getting rid of Johnson—will Johnson resign—or shall the people impeach him? I speak concerning that which I know, when I say the existing situation will not be long tolerated by Congress.

Control Yourself or Your Government Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, two brief articles in the New York Herald Tribune of July 16 indicates the current trend of thinking concerning the problems of rising prices and price control. In one, a noted economist and former OPA counsel outlines a program of action to control run-away prices; in the other, a prominent New York labor leader seeks to determine the cause for rising prices and urges the Government to take immediate action to check price increases.

It seems that we have hardly gotten over the rigors of controls and now must get ready to reimpose them.

Most products and raw materials, too, are in ample supply. Mass hysteria, selfish buying and hoarding and unconscionable profiteering alone will force Nation-wide controls on all things. Only self-discipline of our people can prevent it.

If all of our people, buyers and sellers alike, do not cooperate the Government will step in and compel them to do so.

Hoarding must stop. Profiteering must stop.

I commend these two articles to the attention of my colleagues:

PRICE-CONTROL PLANNING

(By Dorothy Brandon)

WASHINGTON.—Many businessmen and householders are wondering if the Korean crisis will bring a return to price controls and rationing. Scare buying and hoarding, though reported as being spotty at this point, could easily reach stampede proportions, some officials fear, and then require Government action to avert serious consequences.

So far there has been avoidance in official circles of any predictions concerning administration policy in this connection. However, President Truman has denied that it would be necessary to ration food. He gave no hint of how he intends to curb the inflationary cycle—already reflected in mounting commodity prices—and not resort to drastic control of production, prices, and distribution.

What the administration may be planning was revealed during an interview he had with David Ginsberg, former Office of Price Administration attorney who was called in to serve as an adviser to the National Resources and Development Board in the drafting of price-control planning.

Here are steps Mr. Ginsberg outlined that should be undertaken by a price supervisory commission, operating directly under W. Stuart Symington, head of the NSRDB:

1. Reduce purchasing power through increased taxation and rigid credit controls.
2. Increase industrial capacity.
3. More effective use of the Nation's labor resources.

Elaborating on these key activities, he said, "higher taxes would be an economic insurance policy taken out for future protection against inflationary pressure. On the industrial side, a few men, possibly three skilled persons, members of the price commission, could consult with and advise producers of such basic commodities as steel, aluminum, copper, and electric power so that voluntary controls could be imposed."

On an optimistic note, he added, "There is more than enough of basic products to produce for the indefinite future while supplying war production needs, but a limited amount of luxuries will have to be curtailed."

Asked if a widening of the war area might not preclude voluntary controls, he said: "Yes, it would be a much tougher and tighter spot than before. It would be all out, but we are not counting on that at this point. We feel that price stabilization and a full flow of production and manpower can be sustained if we take free spending away from the people."

Contrasting the labor market in 1940 with the present situation, he said: "We had 2 years in which to rearm the Nation—and a labor slack of approxamtely 10,000,000 people with which to do it. Now there is scarcely a quarter of that number unemployed, at the most. Women will have to come in—and they will—because we have neither human nor industrial resources outside the women upon which to draw or operate."

Aside from diversion of male workers from nonessential industries and employment of women from civilian life, the Nation has no pool except those of school age on which to draw for the war emergency, according to Mr. Ginsberg.

FIXING THE BLAME FOR RISING PRICES

(By Robert A. Bedolis)

It is axiomatic that alert labor-union leaders are as sensitive to factors which reduce their members' standard of living as they are to wage increases and other gains which increase it. The frustration of negotiating or striking for such gains, only to have them watered down by rising prices, can—and often does—make them bitter men (just as striving for greater profits only to have them reduced by labor demands often instills bitterness in industrialists). The current flurry of price increases was bound to concern the labor men, and it has.

A forceful labor request that the administration act immediately to insure against price rises getting out of hand was first made late this week by Louis Hollander, president of the New York State CIO and a vice president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Mr. Hollander acknowledged that the upward trend in many prices has been attended by confusion, and he expressed conviction that these rises are "danger signs" of prime importance.

The union leader would not offer an immediate suggestion on how the Government might act specifically at this time to avert an injurious price threat. He urged, however, that some Federal plan be put into effect "right away, before it is too late—before prices get a chance to increase to the point where controls will not bring solace to hardship cases which arise because of a delay."

Mr. Hollander, noting that current supplies and estimates make clear that food is abundant—which is also the appraisal of President Truman and Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan—blamed high current food price rises on profiteers, speculators, and big business. He insisted there is no need for price increases. President Truman and Mr. Brannan also attributed the price increases to profiteering.

The confusion over price rises noted by Mr. Hollander was due in part to the spottiness of many of them, and to the absence of information which will only become available at a later date, if at all.

Secretary Brannan, speaking on food, is among the authorities expressing the opinion that the Korean fighting and its implications comprise an important factor underlying many of the current price rises.

On the other hand, food prices, especially for meat, have exhibited a noticeably upward trend in recent months. The trend was still upward when the Korean fighting began. One problem in seeking a detailed explanation for the current food price increases, then, lies in trying to determine the relative importance of the impact of the Korean crisis while faced with the fact that prices for many food and other items has been tending upward.

Mr. Brannan, for instance, said he could see nothing outside the war situation to account for price increases of meat and bread, and acknowledged that a reasonable deduction was that war profiteering was involved. But in the case of meat he conceded that strong consumer purchasing power, which was also a factor before the Korean crisis, was still involved. Seasonal supply and other factors also enter into the picture.

In instances of price rises in tires, gasoline, and bread, manufacturers offered reasons which included increased labor costs, making a better-quality product, and higher raw material costs. The Korean crisis was not cited by them as a factor.

The Forrestal Tragedy—The Alsops' Column

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted to extend my remarks and to include extra material, may I say I subscribe wholeheartedly to what Joseph and Stewart Alsop say, viz:

Had those plans of Forrestal's been carried out, there can be no doubt whatever that the Kremlin would never have dared to launch the attack upon Korea. Had those plans been carried out we should by now possess a powerful armament, instead of being terrifying weak and appallingly deficient in many of the most critical weapons. Had those plans been carried out, there would be no need to worry today about how to deter a repetition of the Korean attack somewhere else, when all the poor power of this country has been committed in the Korean hills.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I have always resented the attempt of one Louis Johnson, inefficient, incompetent, alleged Secretary of National Defense, whose record is that of complete failure as he by his policies, ill informed, but conceited as he is and always has been, has brought us into this crisis.

I say, Mr. Speaker, James Forrestal, God rest his soul in peace, the patriot he was, the non-self-seeker, the lover of liberty per se—well informed, overcome by the gravity of the situation as he saw it—and he saw it right—forgot more every day than this man Johnson could ever know. I say I resent, and always have resented his attempts to glorify himself at the expense of my friend Forrestal; who gave his life in frustration; driven to death—if you wish to know the truth—by his inability to make men see what he saw—as now we know it. He was crucified.

Johnson is an inflated, self-serving, egocentric, who has brought upon himself by reason of his limitations the disgrace so honestly his due and well deserved. The American people demand that he resign; that the President remove him; or that Congress impeach him—which by the way would easily be done for causes so numerous as to require no enumeration.

The President for whom I have great sympathy, to whom I will offer 100 percent support—provided he deserves it—should get rid of Johnson at once; else he will lose the support of Congress and of the people. I say this advisedly. That statement bears close analysis and will be supported by any poll the President cares to take as to public opinion.

As evidence, only one item of many at my disposal, I insert the following:

THE FORRESTAL TRAGEDY—THE ALSOPS TRACE WAR IN KOREA TO HIS FAILURE TO SWAY TRUMAN

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—It is instructive to look back now, from the grim viewpoint of the Korean war, upon the moment when the final tragedy of James V. Forrestal was acted out upon the sordid Washington stage. Who now remembers how Forrestal's successor as Secretary of Defense used to explain that the first sign of "poor Jim's breakdown" was Forrestal's desire to spend so much upon defense? Who now recalls the charming hints that Forrestal was insanely fearful of the Soviets?

Yet the real tragedy of James Forrestal was not that his heart and strength broke at last, under the heavy burden of his work and the strain of perpetual calumny. The real tragedy of Forrestal was that he failed in his task itself, when he failed, in November 1948, to make the President grasp the need for a serious defense effort. This was the turning point, when we took the road that led us, inexorably and inescapably, to Korea.

In any inquest upon this great error of American policy, one must bear in mind the political atmosphere of the time, which is symbolized by conservative Republicans voting the straight Communist Party line on foreign and defense measures. But in any such inquest, the primary blame must be placed upon the responsible leaders of the administration, who were too timid or too stupid to tell the country the truth, and then to challenge the Republican Partyliners to do their worst.

The moment when this country began to be deceived can be rather precisely dated. As early as 1947, Forrestal and Robert A. Lovett had seen the urgent need to back up our policy of firmness toward Soviet aggression with solid military strength. After the Czech coup d'état, an emergency buildup of American strength was initiated by Forrestal, with the President's approval. By the summer of 1948, when the Atlantic Pact was born in the minds of Lovett, Forrestal and Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, plans were being made to continue this buildup in an orderly manner.

Had those plans of Forrestal's been carried out, there can be no doubt whatever that the Kremlin would never have dared to launch the attack upon Korea. Had those plans been carried out, we should by now possess a powerful armament, instead of being terrifyingly weak and appallingly deficient in many of the most critical weapons. Had those plans been carried out, there would be no need to worry today about how to deter a repetition of the Korean attack somewhere else, when all the poor power of this country has been committed in the Korean hills.

There was nothing unbearable, moreover, in the national effort that Forrestal proposed. For the 1949–50 budget, he urged expenditures of $17,000,000,000, with rises thereafter to an annual level of around $19,000,000,000. This was the cost of real strength, sufficient to defend the Western World, before the problem got out of hand. It is nothing to what we shall have to spend now.

But Louis A. Johnson then wanted Forrestal's job. The great Gen. Harry Vaughan hated Forrestal's guts. Secretary of the Treasury John Snyder wanted no increase of taxes. And President Truman was suffering from the cockiness induced by his victory at the polls.

By a combination of these causes, when the next year's budget was formally closed in November 1948 Forrestal's last plea for a serious defense effort was rejected by President Truman. A $14,000,000,000 budget ceiling was enforced, which meant that we would buy all the permanent overhead of the armed services, with no possibility of increased strength. And a little later Secretary Johnson moved into Forrestal's office in his role as the great economizer.

What Johnson then proceeded to do increased tenfold the effects of the President's refusal to listen to Forrestal. In the name of "economy," a still lower level of expenditure was suddenly commanded. Marine battalions were suppressed. Aircraft replacement rates were slashed to ribbons. Research and development were slowed down. Great gaps in our strength, such as our weaknesses in tank and tactical aircraft for supporting ground forces, were blandly ignored. And the loss of vital strength was veiled in untruth.

The Kremlin saw all this; saw the idiotic administration response to the first warnings, such as the Soviet atomic bomb; saw the Atlantic Pact itself being transformed into a mockery. The whole process of weakening America, of refusing to build up the strength of the West, of trying to get by with transparent fakery, was an open invitation to Soviet aggression. That invitation was accepted 2 weeks ago.

There was no alternative to doing what President Truman then did, to answering force with force. But at this moment it is well to remember who were the guilty men, if only because the drama of November 1948 is now obviously being repeated at the White House. But the issue now is whether all this Nation's resources are to be mobilized at once to repair the defenses of the West in the time that is left to us.

Resolution Adopted by New York State Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of the Members of the House the following resolution which was adopted by the New York State Legislature:

Senate Resolution 149

Concurrent resolution of the senate and assembly urging appropriate action by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States to require the installation and maintenance of certain safety equipment on the Long Island Railroad

Whereas a disastrous and unnecessary collision of two trains occurred on the line of the Long Island Railroad at a point in the village of Rockville Centre in Nassau County, on the 17th day of February 1950, resulting in one of the most serious train wrecks in the history of railroad operation in this State and a heavy toll of killed and injured; and

Whereas this needless destruction of human life and maiming of innocent victims has shocked the people of this State with knowledge of the deficiencies which bring about or contribute to the happening of such tragedies; and

Whereas the immediate cause of the collision of said trains was the failure of the engineer in charge to obey a danger signal, and such railroad was not equipped with any automatic train control or tripping device

designed to bring the trains to a stop on failing to obey the danger signal, and the presence of such equipment on such railroad would probably have averted the wreck; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States has been invested with the sole and exclusive jurisdiction to order and enforce the installation of such automatic equipment on interstate carriers, such as the Long Island Railroad; and

Whereas there is good cause to believe that this division of said railroad was formerly so equipped and the equipment removed by permission of said Interstate Commerce Commission: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby calls the attention of the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States to the lack of such safety equipment on said Long Island Railroad, and earnestly urges the Commission with all convenient speed to reconsider the decision permitting removal of such equipment and to initiate proceedings to compel the installation and maintenance of such safety equipment on such railroad, and to investigate and take such other incidental action in the premises as it may find appropriate; and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That a copy of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to each member of the United States Interstate Commerce Commission and to the Representatives in Congress of the State of New York.

By order of the senate,

WILLIAM S. KING,
Secretary.

In assembly, March 22, 1950.
Concurred in without amendment.
By order of assembly,

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

Illinois Editorial Comment on Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 18 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials justly praising my colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. The first editorial is entitled "Republicans for LUCAS," published in the Illinois State Register of July 15, 1950, and the second is entitled "Washington's Toughest Spot," published in the Quincy (Ill.) Herald Whig of July 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Illinois State Register of July 15, 1950]

REPUBLICANS FOR LUCAS

It is no surprise that many prominent Republicans who are near neighbors of SCOTT LUCAS in Mason County have organized to support the Senate majority leader for reelection next November.

Anyone familiar with popular trends in the county of which Havana is the seat of government knows that the admiration for Senator LUCAS is shared by great numbers of Republicans as well as Democrats because SCOTT is known as a good neighbor, a good citizen, a faithful public servant, and a real statesman.

It is not surprising that Republicans in many other counties are planning to affiliate with the Republicans-for-Lucas League formed in Mason County. There is widespread interparty appreciation of Senator LUCAS' tireless efforts to promote the interests of agriculture, labor, capital, and the public welfare generally.

There is special appreciation of the fact among Republicans as well as Democrats that Senator LUCAS has been a consistent and aggressive champion of an international policy of uncompromising opposition to communism and the establishment of world peace through operation of the Marshall plan in Europe and the MacArthur plan in Japan, Korea, and the Far East.

Management as well as labor and agriculture in Illinois know that Senator LUCAS has supported domestic and foreign economic policies which have brought benefits to this State.

Republicans and Democrats know that Senator LUCAS is quite in harmony with Republican Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, and that leader's forward-looking Republican associates in dealing with foreign affairs.

They know that this is no time to yield to the superficial blandishments of a free-wheeling Republican office seeker, like former Representative Everett Dirksen, who was a champion of the Marshall plan and an advocate of the election of Governor Dewey to the Presidency until he thought it would be profitable politically for him to about-face and become an isolationist to obtain the support of isolationist Robert McCormick and the Dewey-denouncing, VANDENBERG-scourging Chicago Tribune.

Of course, the Illinois isolationist Republican organization and the vote which it controls are committed to the candidacy of Everett Dirksen against Senator LUCAS. They will make a bitter, heavily financed campaign to win.

But the elements of popular strength which organized so many representative Republican for SCOTT LUCAS in his own county will be reflected into every county in Illinois.

This is a widespread victory movement, not so much for an individual as for the collective good and for the substantial fundamentals of which the name SCOTT LUCAS is the symbol.

[From the Quincy (Ill.) Herald Whig, of July 9, 1950]

WASHINGTON'S TOUGHEST SPOT

Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS, who visited Quincy last Thursday on a flying trip from the Capital, has lost none of his poise and earnest good humor despite the fact that for 2 years he has held the toughest job in Washington. It is the toughest because as majority leader in the Senate LUCAS must deal will all problems of domestic and world import and purely sectional issues while at the same time representing his more than 3,000,000 constituents in Illinois.

Each Senator usually finds it necessary to inform himself on bills that come before his committee, but the majority leader must get the facts on all major proposals, an almost impossible job considering the number and scope of bills offered.

But these are not the most difficult of Senator LUCAS' problems. As Democratic chief in the Senate he must try to maintain party unity, to smooth ruffled feathers and mend broken fences. This task has been extremely difficult in the last 2 years because of the mounting differences between northern and southern Senators over the President's civil-rights program.

The majority leader must try to keep peace, but has no control over the proposals of the administration except in a advisory capacity. Yet he is supposed to attempt to carry out the White House program, regardless of its state of popularity. Sometimes the Senator rebels as in the case of the Brannan farm plan and socialized medicine.

The southern revolt is the most serious party break in almost a century. LUCAS found the pot boiling when he took over from the veteran BARKLEY. The South had walked out of the convention which nominated Mr. Truman and had carried four States in the election for the protesting States' Rights Party. The Democrats had a paper majority and the country expected them to act like a majority party. But the southerners were in dead earnest in their determination to block the civil-rights plan. When they teamed with Republicans they could defeat any majority bill.

It was LUCAS' task to keep the southern Senators from bolting. How well he succeeded is shown by the rather impressive program of legislation enacted.

It wasn't easy. Early in his career as majority leader, LUCAS worried himself into a case of ulcers. In the hospital he did a bit of thinking. The country had gone along for 160 years under the present system, he reminded himself. He determined to get along with his colleagues, to use logic and friendliness and quit worrying. The plan worked. No other majority leader since slavery times ever has faced so much opposition within his own party. The business as usual is a tribute to the leader and to the system under which we operate.

Spending by Farm Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 18 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from the Farm Journal magazine, quoting the Iowa Development Commission regarding spending on farms.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEST CUSTOMERS IN UNITED STATES GROW ON IOWA FARMS

The best customers in the country grow on Iowa farms, the Iowa Development Commission pointed out today.

Quoting a survey by Farm Journal magazine, the commission said that in 72 of Iowa's 99 counties, farm families spend at least half again as much money as the national average. That is the heaviest concentration of top-spending counties located in any one State.

Farm Journal added up the $25,000,000,000 spent at retail by farm families in 1948, and divided by the 3,071 counties in the United States. In its average county, farm families put $8,000,000 a year into cash registers of retail merchants.

The magazine rated each county in relation to that average. Of the 591 counties in which farm families spend $12,000,000 or more a year, 72 are located in Iowa. Forty-three are in Minnesota, 42 in Illinois, 38 in Texas, 36 in Wisconsin, 35 in California, and 32 in New York.

In those 591 counties, which are 19.2 percent of the counties in the United States, live 31 percent of the farm families. They do 47 percent of all the retail farm buying.

Iowa counties containing its larger cities still ranked in the top bracket for spending by farmers. Farm residents of Polk, Woodbury, Scott, Linn, Black Hawk, Dubuque, and Pottawattamie Counties all spent more than $12,000,000 at retail in 1948.

Nineteen Iowa counties are in the second above-average category—with farm families spending eight to twelve million dollars in retail. Only eight fell below the national average, and in all of them retail farm spending was above $4,000,000.

In California, which has a total of 58 counties, five are in the eight to twelve million dollar group; six in the four to eight million group; and 12 in the lowest category, below 4,000,000. Texas, which ordinarily competes with California and Iowa for cash farm income honors, has 33 counties in the eight to twelve million dollar group; 82 in the four to eight million category, and 104 counties in which farmers spent less than $4,000,000 at retail.

The 19 Iowa counties in which farm families spend between eight and twelve million dollars are: Madison, Decatur, Warren, Wayne, Marion, Appanoose, Emmet, Worth, Howard, Fremont, Mills, Adams, Taylor, Ringgold, Jefferson, Van Buren, Lee, Louisa, and Des Moines. Eight counties below the United States average in retail farm spending were Osceola, Dickinson, Union, Clarke, Lucas, Monroe, Wapello, and Davis.

Nonvoters and Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 18 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able editorial on the subject Nonvoters and Crime, from the Somerset (Pa.) American of July 5.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NONVOTERS AND CRIME

While it is the duty of citizens to go to the polls and vote, the idea expressed by Senator MARTIN in his Sunday night radio broadcast that nonvoters are responsible for the close relationship between politics and crime in our cities, and even smaller towns, seems to require demonstration.

The fact is that the acquirement of too many voters was one of the factors in the fall of ancient Rome.

The Senator was not sufficiently discriminative.

We have groups that will capitalize upon his words and put forth greater efforts than ever to induce voters to go to the polls and cast their ballots in their interest.

A report comes from Georgia in the echoes of the late election there that a woman repeater has brought action against the group that employed her for the difference between the $1 a ballot she received for voting and the $2 a ballot received by employees of other politicians in the city in which she lives and worked.

Patriotic citizens ought to require no urging to perform their duties. Corrupt citizens require none.

Of course, it is difficult to differentiate between the patriotic and the corrupt in a radio address, yet the Senator may have assumed that the majority of citizens who have radio sets are better reasoners than those who have not and that his words would not excite the latter class.

Candidly, the wisdom of the words of General Eisenhower before the Associated Press luncheon in New York April 24 become more and more impressive as they are mulled over and over.

The voting of citizens urged by Senator MARTIN is that the general welfare may be promoted. Indeed, every act of every citizen ought to have as its chief objective the promotion of the general welfare.

General Eisenhower listed the defenses of America in the order of their importance as the spiritual, the economic, and the military.

If the spiritual defenses of the Republic are in good order, the economic defenses will be in good order.

If the spiritual and economic defenses of the Republic are in good order, the men who comprise our Army, Navy, and Air Force will have right motives and their performances will assure the triumph of our righteous cause.

Before we can go all the way with Senator MARTIN on his proposal that every citizen should go to the polls and vote, we want to be assured that every citizen who votes has a greater interest in the general welfare than in what he conceives to be his private advantage.

The votes by the woman in Georgia who is suing for what she conceives to be her just dues were probably cast upon the names of citizens whom she knew, or her employers knew, would not vote. There is a possibility that the votes she cast served the general welfare better than would have been the case had the registered voters cast their own ballots.

Of course, there is a possbility that voting in the cities of Georgia is carried on as was the voting in Pennsylvania's large cities 50 years ago when the writer had close acquaintance with the subject. During his employment as a reporter on the old Philadelphia North American, this writer discovered livery stables with no living quarters as the "residences" of numerous registered voters who failed to answer to the roll call when their names were used in an effort to make their acquaintance.

In his letter to H. S. Randall, Esq., from which this writer has repeatedly quoted, the great British historian, Lord Macaulay, said:

"The day will come when, in the State of New York, a multitude of people, none of whom had more than half a breakfast, or expects to have more than half a dinner, will choose a legislature. Is it possible to doubt what sort of a legislature will be chosen?"

The abolition of the poll tax has not contributed to the welfare of this Commonwealth nor would a Federal abolition of the poll tax produce any better results in the Nation.

The idea that every citizen ought to pay some sort of taxes to support the Government is sound, even though in some cities politicians purchase the poll-tax receipts of nontaxpayers and send out repeaters to vote on their names.

The welfare of the masses is not guaranteed by majorities told by the head.

We Are Still Arming Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 18 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Are Still Arming Russia," which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of Tuesday, July 18.

It is tragically absurd for us to give away vast quantities of war materials only to have the Marshall-plan countries export the same materials to Russia and other countries behind the iron curtain. Surely this will not go on much longer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE ARE STILL ARMING RUSSIA

ECA GOODS TO RUSSIA

Marshall-plan countries are still shipping American materials into Russia and her satellite countries. Senator KEM, Republican, of Missouri, told the Senate that he has been informed by Commerce Department officials that Britain, for example, shipped approximately $1,000,000 in machine tools to Russia in the first 4 months of this year. This is 10 times the amount sent to Russia by Britain in the first 4 months of 1949. Belgium and Italy have also followed Britain's lead and sent iron and steel into Russia.

Therefore KEM yesterday proposed a substantial cut in ECA funds. During debate on the multi-billion-dollar appropriation bill, he urged his colleagues to save the country $718,000,000 by limiting ECA appropriations in the bill to $1,950,000,000 and eliminating $276,000,000 carried over from last year's appropriation.

KEM, who has consistently voted for all appropriations for our Military Establishments, points out that the slash he proposes would affect only the economic aid to western Europe. It would not touch appropriations for Korea or the military-aid program.

In support of his proposal also, he argues that due to the Korean war this country will soon suffer a severe strain on its resources since it will bear the brunt of the fighting. But in the face of shortages in this country ECA plans to give away more than $200,000,000 in industrial materials next year to Marshall-plan countries.

We agree absolutely with the Missouri Senator. It is utter foolishness for us to give away critical material at a time when we are winding up to a point where we will not have enough to meet our own demands. But we believe KEM's revelation that Marshall-plan countries are passing along the material we give them to Russia and her satellites is a much stronger argument against the administration's freehanded giveaways.

As KEM also points out, it is entirely possible that these materials have been used to make the guns and tanks that are now killing Americans in Korea.

An Army in Western Germany?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a very pertinent editorial, West German Role in Atlantic Defense, which appeared in the July 17, 1950, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette.

The question of permitting an army in western Germany is of increasing current importance, and these editorial comments are timely and interesting.

The article follows:

WEST GERMAN ROLE IN ATLANTIC DEFENSE

Reports over the week end from various spots in Europe, particularly from Frankfurt, Bonn, and Paris, show that the delicate question of permitting a new army in western Germany has risen to the top level of urgent discussion.

Strictly speaking, it is a matter for four-power decision. Yet any thought of Soviet Russia being party to that decision now is quite out the window. If a western German armed force is permitted and organized, it will be for the purpose of helping to defend western Germany (and thus western Europe) from possible Russian attack.

There are logical arguments for encouraging the federal republic at Bonn to build at least a police force roughly equivalent to that which the Russians have whipped together in their zone. That, however, would hardly be sufficient to discourage an outright sweep by the Soviet's own armies. And existing allied forces in Europe are easily adequate to keep the east German police back if necessary, without west German involvement.

Three main points argue against a west German military organization. First, it is doubtful that the Germans themselves would relish a revival of their own military, despite our old feeling that soldiering is their pet pastime. Second, the very idea of German armies risng again causes natural shivers and moral misgivings. Third, some fear that to allow a German force in the west might sooner provoke Russia to all-out attack.

The decision must, however, be based on realism. The west is hard up for military power in Europe. West Germans are overwhelmingly against communism and Russia; and the Bonn Republic, for all its fumbling in democratic politics, is politically alined with the west. Witness its eagerness for the Schuman industry pool with France. As for the fear of a revival of German militarism, it may be far better to have a German force reorganized under supervision of, and in cooperation with, the democratic west than to have it burst forth independently in fear or resentment because western help alone cannot hold off attack. Germany's resources are considerable.

Chancelor Adenauer has for months suggested that Germany's military role can be only one of cooperation with a western European or Atlantic union defense. We are in gradual process of granting the Bonn Republic a greater voice in its own economic and foreign policies. That we should immediately tell the Germans to go ahead with their own army is by no means clear. But steps to bring them into the North Atlantic circle so that they become an asset rather than a liability to the defense of the free world surely cannot be far off.

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 18 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief statement made by me relative to the situation in Korea, published in the Boston Sunday Herald of July 16, 1950.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL-OUT EFFORT TO BACK BOYS IN KOREA URGED BY SALTONSTALL

(By Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, member of the Armed Services Committee)

The present hot war in Korea developed overnight. It started without a warning.

We knew through our intelligence that there were armed forces with plenty of equipment on the 38th parallel but much of that equipment and many of those men had been there for some time. It was impossible to tell just when a D-day might come or whether it would come at all. We were not prepared for what happened. There is no question about that. We know we should have been more prepared than we were. Whether or not we should have been more alive to the intelligence reports that we have received is now water over the dam.

We are not in a declared war. We are fighting under a resolution of the United Nations. General MacArthur is carrrying the flag of the United Nations. He is not only the commander of the American force, he is the commander of the United Nations force. I hope that we will see more and more men from other members of the United Nations join General MacArthur's command. We are fighting to preserve the integrity of nations, to repel an aggressor who has chosen to destroy international conventions—to drive back an aggressor who has provoked a shooting war to gain territory that does not belong to him.

POSSIBILITIES SLIM

To maintain the integrity of the United Nations and its members, our boys are fighting and dying 10,000 miles or more from their homes. Certainly we cannot minimize the seriousness of the situation in which we find ourselves.

Let us look for a moment where it may lead. The best that can happen is that the conflict will soon stop. It may stop because our men are successful in driving back the aggressors or it may stop because they recognize the violation of the United Nations Charter and willingly retrace their steps to the thirty-eighth parallel. Either of these possibilities is mighty slim.

If the conflict does not stop in the near future, it may continue on a localized front in Korea. That is a second possibility. If that possibility prevails, we will gradually put more of our divisions into Korea. We will make it possible for those men to fight more effectively with the equipment and material with which we supply them. Just remember—that for every man who fights there must be three more in the echelons to supply him and 10 to 12 tons of equipment.

These men and this equipment must be landed at the harbor of Pusan where there is only one dock and a small space in which ships can anchor. The terrain surrounding Pusan is mountainous. There are not many roads. While it is a hard place to land, it becomes an easier place for these reasons to defend. The Pentagon said on Thursday that we must expect a gradual retreat for the next three weeks while we brought in more men and equipment. This then is the second possibility.

THIRD POSSIBILITY

The third possibility is that this conflict in Korea can spread and gradually develop into world war III. We pray that this will not happen, but we know that there are sensitive spots throughout the world today. They have been much publicized.

We are all aware of the delicacy of the situation in Iran. We know that troops are reported maneuvering near the Yugoslav border. We know that while the guerrillas in Greece have been driven out, for the time being at least, there are many Communist elements still in that country. We know of the Russian war maneuvers being carried on in East Germany. We know of the long hard pull the French have had in Indochina. We have watched with alarm the threat to Malaya.

The Chinese Communists are biding their time for an attack on the island of Formosa. Our Navy now, under Presidential orders, is patrolling the Straits of Formosa. Whether or not our Navy should have patrolled those straits many months ago is not a subject that I care to discuss or you care to hear today. But, we realize only too well that trouble may break out in that quarter. We have seen the Communist-led Huks operating in the Philippines—those islands that have so long been considered territory loyal to the United States. Any one or all of these situations could become inflamed. That is the worst that we may have to face. We hope for the best, but certainly we want to be prepared.

RESERVES NEEDED

Today we have over 1,400,000 men in our Armed Forces. We have large amounts of various munitions for war—planes and ships in "mothballs." They must be and are being taken out of "mothballs." Our forces cannot, without reinforcements, protect our security today and at the same time carry out our responsibilities in sufficient strength in various parts of the world where we are committed. Today we have something like two divisions in Korea. Soon I expect a third, but if we put three divisions in Korea, we certainly must increase our forces in Japan, and if we increase our forces in Japan, we must supply replacements overseas and increase our reserves here at home, reserves not of green men but men who are trained and ready to go. The reports in the papers which you have read clearly demonstrate all these problems to you.

As we take equipment out of "mothballs" and ship it overseas we must replace it in our reserve. We must replace material that is expended. To do this we will need to turn over to military production various peacetime output. To do this will of necessity demand some type of controls. Depending upon how great the needs of the military are will depend the extent and the type of controls. Depending upon how much the military needs are will depend the type of controls that may have to be put on civilian goods—controls that will not only affect industry but will affect the lives of all of our citizens. I know that you will agree with me that we cannot hesitate to take each and every possible move to support our boys on the fighting front. We can and should be ready to provide the President with standby mobilization powers to be used as the days ahead demand. Whatever controls of any kind that may be necessary to back up our boys I can assure you the Congress will enact.

MUST BE PREPARED

Let us always remember that the only diplomacy that the Russians really understand is that of the armed fist. If our armed fist is big enough, it will not have to strike so hard or perhaps not again. If our President and our State Department are supported in their negotiations by a powerful force behind them, the results of those negotiations will be quicker and more effective.

So let us be determined that in the days to come during our campaign, as well as in our daily working lives, we will join with our fellow citizens to promote any effort that may make complete victory more possible more quickly for the freedom-loving people of America and the world.

I repeat with all the force that I can muster that we must be prepared patriotically for whatever is asked and be ready to do our part whatever it may be.

What the cost of the operations in the days to come will be in men, material, and

money no one can tell. What regulations may be necessary to impose upon individuals, upon business, and upon industry no one can at the moment foresee. In the Congress we are now debating the first omnibus appropriations bill in the history of our country. Over all it includes approximately $34,000,000,000. Thirteen and one-half billions of dollars are for the Military Establishment alone. In addition to the $13,500,000,000 there is roughly, $725,000,000 more for atomic energy and another $300,000,000 for further research and construction in order to produce an H-bomb. Besides this, there is I believe $1,200,000,000 for military aid to other nations.

The continuing studies that I have made of our appropriations bill bring home to me the fact that we are endeavoring to carry two buckets of water—one is labeled defense and security activities; the other, normal peacetime civilian activities. When both pails are full, they are too heavy for us to carry. They produce a deficit of some $5,000,000,000 and unbalance our budget to that extent. An unbalanced budget with the highest production economy in our history means greater inflation. Greater inflation means a dollar of less value. Our 1939 dollar today will buy goods worth 62½ cents. Our job is to keep your dollar and my dollar buying a dollar's worth of goods.

I had hoped the present administration might be willing to cut our normal peacetime activities to stop the evils of inflation and an unbalanced budget. Only the will of the administration to cut can really and effectively cut expenditures, but I have seen no will of this kind in the present administration. I wish I had. So we in Congress are trying to do our utmost to effect some kind of a cut. The obligations which we are incurring in Korea and our increased military costs in this country make this more important than ever.

Welfare State—For Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial comment from a recent issue of Pathfinder magazine:

WELFARE STATE—FOR WHOM?

Sometimes things are not quite what they seem, even though fancy names be used to make them more attractive. This was discovered by the young man who took his girl to dinner at a swank restaurant and, to impress her, ordered pommes de terre boulangère. He was surprised—and disappointed—to find that the dish with the high-sounding name was just browned potatoes with onion.

Chefs are not the only ones who know the great value of a fancy name in cloaking a thing's true identity. Politicians have long used the technique—and are using it today. We hear much about the welfare state. It sounds good. In fact, it sounds like utopia. Everyone will be taken care of—by the Government. Everyone's comfort and security will be assured—by the Government. Free medicine. Free education. Free housing. Plenty of unemployment compensation when one doesn't feel like working.

Millions of people are deceived by such inducements. They forget that all these things are not free, that they must be paid for. Paid for by whom? The Government? Yes, but where is the Government to get the money to pay with? From the taxpayers, of course. So, actually, the people pay for these benefits—plus a big administrative overhead—with their own hard-earned money; the only difference is that those in power do not believe the people are sufficiently intelligent to spend their own money wisely; they can do it better.

But the use of the term "welfare state" is no misnomer. It is a welfare state. But—welfare for whom? Not for the taxpayers who foot the bill, but for the hundreds of thousands of bureaucrats who are thus provided with soft, well-paid jobs.

The deluded people of England voted for a welfare state—only to learn that the welfare was meant for the politicians. They learned, through high taxes and lower living standards, that the free benefits they received were not really free—that they actually cost a lot of money—which they had to pay. And, in addition, pay bureaucrats heavy fees for doing their buying of what they could just as easily have bought themselves.

They learned, too, that nationalization of industry, another gold brick of socialism, doesn't bring the utopia the politicians promised. The only change is in employers—bureaucrats replace private employers. And, as boss, the government can play with marked cards, for if there is no profit shown, it can easily cut wages just by raising taxes, thus forcing the worker to pay back a greater part of what he receives in wages. And, as boss, government can be tough; last year the Socialist Government of England did not hesitate to use soldiers to break the strike of the dock workers.

There's a good reason why the socialistic planners avoid the use of the word "socialism" and prefer instead fancy names like welfare state, fair deal, etc. With intelligent, observant people everywhere, socialism today is in disfavor. The impracticality of such a system has been often and painfully demonstrated. So the planners give it some different and high-sounding name, one that seems to promise the people something for nothing. Fortunately, more and more voters are learning that welfare state is socialism masquerading under a fancy name—just as pommes de terre boulangère is just plain browned potatoes with onion.

GRAHAM PATTERSON,
Publisher.

Our Need for Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, in two world wars we were caught unprepared with respect to our merchant marine and as a consequence paid dearly for neglecting one of the important arms of our national defense. No one can estimate the many millions of dollars we paid as a penalty for our failure to have adequate shipping facilities when World War I and World War II broke out. Nor can we tell how many lives might have been saved or how much sooner the war would have ended had we had adequate shipping facilities. Now we are engaged in another conflict which points up once again the need for ships. I trust that we have learned some lessons from the other wars and will take early action to supply a need which is recognized by all competent authorities, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. Speaker, I am including herewith an article written by David Lawrence which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington Evening Star. The article deals with the need for ships.

SHIP TRANSPORTATION CALLED MOST PRESSING NEED IN KOREAN WAR—PASSENGER VESSELS IN PACIFIC MAY BE TAKEN OVER, WRITER SAYS

(By David Lawrence)

Immediate preparation has been ordered to meet military contingencies that may arise at any moment in Formosa and Indochina as well as Korea.

Here is what it means—summarizing the views of military men who believe that resoluteness and forehandedness now will stave off thrusts by the Communists in critical areas of the world:

1. It means at least 120,000 more American troops for Korea alone—half for combat and half for support. There were about 120,000 American troops in Japan before the Korean war broke out and this Army has to be reinforced.

2. It means that at least three more of the large aircraft carriers of the *Essex* type—of which 17 are in mothballs—must be commissioned promptly by the Navy, and the requisite number of cruisers and destroyers added to protect the carriers against submarine attack.

MORE TRANSPORTS NEEDED

3. It means also—and this is the most acute need of all—there must be more transports made available at once. Auxiliary ships of all kinds, not only to carry troops and planes, but to transport fuel and food and ammunition, must be taken out of mothballs immediately and crews assembled to sail them. More than 150 ships will be needed for this purpose. No requisitioning of the big passenger liners of Britain and the United States will be necessary in the Atlantic unless general war breaks out, but it may be necessary to take over some of the passenger ships in the Pacific this summer.

Perhaps most important of all is that the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff have been unanimous in their recommendations and harmonious in their functioning from the start of the Korean crisis, and it is at the civilian end where things have bogged down. The delays have been due to red tape and a tendency to waste time asking the military people to give detailed breakdowns and justify their requests. This is inexcusable in time of crisis.

STUDIED FROM MONEY ANGLE

It should have taken 15 minutes but it took a full week before the plan—revealed for the first time in these dispatches last Monday—for a call to volunteer reserves was finally authorized. At first it was denied officially that anything like it was being planned, but the fact was the matter was being studied for several days from a dollar-and-cents angle.

It should have been obvious that experienced personnel, especially technicians, ready for active duty in the Navy and the Air Force, could not have been obtained by expanding the draft or by recruiting enlisted men. Likewise, while a division of Marines were alerted and packed up when the Korean crisis broke, they were not ordered to sail for a week and they had not left California 2 weeks after the outbreak of the Korean war. The reason? No shipping was immediately available.

The remedy for these delays lies in putting the White House and the various civilian secretaries of the armed services on a war footing. The three operating heads of the Joint Chiefs of Staff should meet at least once a day with the Commander in Chief and the latter would then get his military advice direct. He could cut red tape and issue orders to reduce civilian "kibitzing" and the lengthy paper work which is all right in peacetime but becomes a frustration in wartime. There are four civilian secretaries for the armed services and various committees set up by them, as well as a civilian agency known as the National Security Council which is interjected between the Joint Chiefs and the President. Congress never intended that to be the practical setup in wartime.

When wartime operations are in progress, the military must be given the right of way and the civilians must assist and not try to direct if serious delays are to be avoided and lives are to be saved on the fighting fronts.

The gravity of the situation increases every day. The United States has been caught unprepared for sudden war. It will take 18 months to put the aircraft industry into full production. Meanwhile, planes in "mothballs," most of them good enough for the interim, must be gotten out and fliers provided for them. The new jets may have to be held in reserve for the time when the Russians may bring out their jets.

The next point of danger is Formosa, which is 100 miles from the mainland of China. The Navy has been ordered to protect Formosa but it cannot do so unless it has more planes in service and this means more aircraft carriers and fliers. If the Chinese Communists start bombing Formosa—expected now any day—the American Navy, with only one carrier task force in those waters, will have to be aided by the Air Force based on Okinawa 300 miles or more away from the bases on the China mainland that will have to be blasted.

More carrier task forces for the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean and more United States Air Force planes and equipment may have to be sent to bases in the Middle East to anticipate a Communist march across the borders of Iran.

What becomes clearer and clearer is that the United States today has a global responsibility far greater than anything exercised by the British Empire in centuries past. But is the United States Government in all its branches streamlined for action? The sad answer is—not yet, not yet.

Hysteria Prompts Bad Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, difficult times, particularly war times, require calm minds and more thoughtful action. Speed without thought, particularly in the enactment of legislation, is dangerous to democracy. I take my hat off to no man in or out of this House in my desire to protect my country from its enemies from within and from without. My record in and out of this House needs no justification on that score.

If I can judge the temper of this House today the Members are going to be stampeded into voting for this bill H. R. 10. Under the guise of protecting this country against communism they will vote for the bill, not understanding its provisions and believing that it is directed against Communists and those guilty of subversion. This is the sixth time that this bill has been presented to the Congress within 12 years. Never has it passed both Houses of Congress, and four times it has been rejected by this House.

I have no doubt that if this bill were presented to this House under an open rule it could be perfected by amendment to protect the country against Communists within our borders. Under suspension of the rules, permitting no amendment and allowing only 40 minutes of debate, with only 20 minutes allotted to opposition to the bill, it is impossible to perfect this legislation or even to properly explain its provisions.

As an emergency or as a wartime piece of legislation the bill could easily be amended to overcome the constitutional objections which are sound and indeed serious. This is not a wartime or emergency measure. It is intended to be a permanent part of our statutes. The bill has been dressed up by the insertion of the words "criminals, prostitutes, procurers or other immoral persons," in hope of scaring those who have not the intestinal fortitude to stand up in times of stress to defend the Bill of Rights and the Constitution. That language may instill the fear in some that if they fight this bill they will be labeled the protectors of such disreputable persons. It is indeed unfortunate that in these critical times, mass hysteria should be permitted to take the place of courageous clear thinking. Other types of persons are referred to in this bill as "anarchists, subversives, and similar classes." There is no definition in the bill of that langauge. Nowhere in the bill are the words "Communist" or "communism" used. There is no provision for a trial of these persons accused of falling within any of these categories.

A person who has been tried and convicted of a crime is a criminal. What about those who are accused of being subversives or of being in a class similar to subversives? As to them all we need do, is to accuse and the Attorney General has the right to confine them indefinitely. There can be no court review of such action. The use of a writ of habeas corpus will confine a court to determining whether or not an alien was accused within the meaning of this law and, if so, whether or not the Attorney General ordered his confinement. When those two things have been done, the Attorney General's action must be sustained and the writ of habeas corpus must be dismissed. Even if a man should have been wrongfully indicted and improperly convicted of a crime the Attorney General has the right to immediately proceed to incarcerate him. That may be done though the case is pending on appeal and the court before which the appeal is pending has released the man on bail.

The last section of this very bad bill provides in so many words that no court can release any alien on bail if he is detained under the provisions of this bill until the court of last resort has determined the proceeding in his favor. At that time the man needs no bail because the court has freed him. But under this bill until that court rules that he was improperly indicted or convicted or that the charge against him was utterly baseless, the man must rot in jail.

This bill will come back to mock those who support it as an assault by them upon our respected and time-honored Bill of Rights.

Let us face up to this situation like men, like real Americans. If during these critical days it is necessary for the preservation of our freedom to jail those who are a threat to our country and its security, whether they be native-born or naturalized citizens, or aliens who have no right to be here, let us set up the machinery to treat with that situation during the emergency in the American democratic way, by court procedure, and not by administrative action.

Address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, Before International Ladies' Garment Workers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 18 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very outstanding and able address by the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], delivered by him on May 29 of this year, at Atlantic City, N. J., before one of the truly great unions in the United States, the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is truly a happy occasion for me. On this platform I see friends and associates of all the time that I have been in public life, and of many years before that. My good and true friend, David Dubinsky, and his colleagues, both on this platform, and in this audience, are my fellow veterans of that historic never-ending struggle, the struggle for human betterment.

Some of your leaders with whom I worked in the past are here in spirit only. How well I remember that grand champion of labor's rights. Morris Hillquit and two of Dave Dubinsky's fine predecessors, Morris Sigman and Benjamin Schlesinger, all of whom helped build the foundations of this great union of yours. And in recent days, another of your notable leaders, David Cohen, passed away. These men gave a great part of their lives to this union.

But in the ILG, these men and others who have gone from among us have a far richer memorial than men can build with mere stone and mortar. This union, holding the loyalty and affection of 423,000 members, and commanding the respect of the entire Nation—this union is today one of the strong pillars and bulwarks of our democracy. I can pay you no greater compliment.

I recognize and accept the welcome you have given me not as a personal tribute, but as a tribute to the principles and programs which together we have fought for through the years. The political support you have given me in the past I acknowledge in the same way, not as support for me personally, but as support for the principles and programs to which we share a common devotion.

The ILG has always been in the front rank of the labor unions which have recognized that their interests and the interests of their country were and are inseparable.

The ILG has always known that the pay envelope is merely the first link in the chain of labor union responsibility to its members.

The ILG has always recognized that the well-being of its members depends on the well-being of the entire industry, which is, in turn, dependent on the well-being of the entire national economy—on the welfare of all workers, farmers, professional people, and businessmen.

And the ILG has always understood the necessity of fighting as hard for the welfare of the national economy and of the world economy, as for the immediate welfare of ILG members.

Because of these policies and attitudes, you have won a place of honor in the Nation's councils. Your voice is heard and heeded not only in New York City, in Albany, and in Washington, but in all the cities and in all the State capitals in which your union is represented.

Yet 50 years go, even 25 years ago, this certainly was not so. Some of your older members may recall, as I do, the days of the sweat shop when garment workers were herded like sheep into dark, airless rooms, and locked up like criminals while they did their work; I can recall when garment workers were required to pay for their own thread, for the electricity to run their machines, for the chairs they sat on, and even for the hooks on which they hung their clothes.

Some few of us can even recall the terrible Triangle Waist Co. fire of 1911, that appalling tragedy which opened the eyes of New York State and of the Nation to the inhumanity of men seeking profits without regard for the safety or even the lives of their employees. Many of us remember the great strikes, the strike of 1926, and the strike of 1932. It was my privilege to play a part as mediator in a number of your labor disputes. I am proud that I had the opportunity of helping to bring recognition and stability to your industry.

But I have talked enough about your union and of the past. We do not live in the past, but in the present and for the future. The present has its own mighty challenge, and the future, an even greater one.

During the 10 days you have been in session here, you have been addressed by many of the great figures of America and of the world. It would be folly for me to try to enlarge upon the themes which they developed here with so much skill.

But there are matters which I, as an old friend should and must discuss with you. We can usefully review some of our common problems and renew some of our common pledges.

Today we live in a world hardly at peace but not really at war. Mutual recriminations and denunciations fill the international air. The people of the world tremble lest some spark set loose a blast which will shatter the structure of all civilization. In this inflammable situation, it matters little who is right or wrong, although we know that we are right and that the enemies of freedom are wrong. But there is no right or wrong in death and rubble.

There has been loosed in the world the greatest danger to our way of life that this country has ever known. The Communist blight frightens us because we cannot comprehend the blind subservience which this false creed inspires in tragically misled people all over the world. And no group in America recognized as early nor as clearly the insidious threat of the Communist Party as did the leadership of your union.

Yes, we face a real and not a fancied danger. In the face of this danger, we cannot sit back and wait for events to run their course. We must respond with all our strength and all our resources. But to meet this danger by purely defensive measures is to underestimate that danger and, in the end, to yield to it.

We must not indulge ourselves in Maginot line thinking. We must take the offensive, both at home and abroad. Rather than seek to defend the status quo, rather than yield up our liberties in order to defend them, we must throw back this enemy by increasing the benefits of democracy, and by expanding liberty and security, both at home and abroad.

But if we allow our Nation to be stampeded by hysteria, fear, and suspicion—if we spend all our energies in hunting alleged subversives or spies, we will only give aid and comfort to our enemies. I say that police work should be done by police, by the FBI, and other police agencies. They can be depended on to protect our internal security. Let our people and Nation devote their energies and efforts to taking the offensive in behalf of democracy, security, justice, and liberty for all mankind.

What better answer to the Communists, both inside our country and outside, than to press forward on every front to provide greater security for our people, equality of opportunity, full rights for all our citizens regardless of race, creed, or national origin.

If we can expand our Nation's mighty productive powers, and arrange to distribute the benefits of greater production to an ever greater number of people, we will have found the answer to the Communist menace at home.

If, at the same time, we will cooperate with all freedom-loving peoples everywhere and aid them in every reasonable and practical way to raise their standards of living and improve their conditions of life, we will have found the answer to the Communist menace abroad.

That great American, the beloved Vice President of the United States, who was one of the speakers at this convention, said recently that the task facing our country was to perfect democracy within America and to preserve it abroad. That is indeed our task. That is the task to which the ILG is dedicated. It is the task to which I am devoting and will continue to devote all my efforts.

This is a vast undertaking. It involves action in Congress and in the State legislatures. It also involves action by our individual citizens and their organizations.

The achievement of this goal involves approval by Congress of a comprehensive and enforceable charter of human and civil rights for all our citizens. It involves the complete eradication from our midst of those prejudices which still force upon some citizens the injustice of discrimination and segregation. I shall continue to devote my efforts to these ends.

Our goal involves also—and unquestionably—the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. It involves the substitution of a labor law protecting the rights of the unorganized to be organized, and promoting the stability of labor-management relations. You may be sure that I will not rest until this is achieved

These are merely two of the fronts for action. There are many more. I would like to discuss one of the other fields in which you and I take a special interest. I refer to the task of providing social security for our citizens.

In this field we have come a long way from our beginnings. It was not many years ago that the aged, the blind, the crippled, the unemployed, and mothers and dependent children were thought fit objects only for charity, and for local governmental aid, if any.

Today our Government recognizes, in principle, its responsibility to protect our citizens from the economic hazards of unemployment, disability, and old age. For this development history accords the chief honor and glory to two men—Robert F. Wagner and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

It is a source of great pride to me, as it is to many of you, to have been associated with both these great men. I am also proud to recall that I helped bring about the enactment of comprehensive social-security laws in my own State of New York, one of the States of the Union to set up such a program.

Of course, if the reactionaries really had their way, they would repeal all social-security legislation. They would return the aged to the county poor houses, while the other beneficiaries of our social legislation would be left to their own devices or to the mercy of private charities. But most of these reactionaries do not dare to express this view today. They pay lip service to social security, but they stand four-square against expanding social security.

They devote their energies to restricting social-security coverage wherever possible and chipping away at the base of social security whenever they can. They allege that the amount of reserves for old-age pensions are insufficient, while they conveniently forget that they were the ones who led the move for cutting down the payments into the old-age reserves.

Today our task is to defeat the efforts of the reactionaries and to press forward with large-scale liberalization of social security.

Our eventual object must be to make our citizens secure against the extremes of want and privation.

We must offer positive social aid for our children and our youth so that they may arrive at adulthood with the fewest possible handicaps due to economic circumstances.

We must provide help for the disabled and the physically handicapped, so that the maximum number of these may be restored to social usefulness.

Finally, we must provide for the health of the Nation and its citizens so that the day may come when no one of our people need go without proper medical care. The main emphasis of tomorrow must be not on the cure of disease but on its prevention.

These must be our general goals in the field of social security.

These needs must be fulfilled. In the field of old-age insurance, for instance, we face the fact that our changing population demands these measures.

As the number of young people entering our labor market grows from year to year, it becomes more and more difficult for our older people to keep their places in industry. At the same time, modern medical techniques and public-health measures have extended life expectancy, so that in New York City, for instance, a child born today has a life expectancy 25 years longer than a child born in New York 50 years ago.

This means that the proportion in our population of men and women over 65 years of age has been increasing rapidly in the past decade. That proportion will continue to increase in the years ahead. We must act now to broaden and extend our system of old-age pensions, if we wish to retain our system of contributory social insurance.

Last year, President Truman, in fulfillment of the commitments in the 1948 Democratic platform, recommended to Congress amendments and improvements in our social-security law. After nearly 8 months of deliberation the House passed a bill, H. R. 6000, greatly improving our entire social-security system. That bill was not a perfect bill. It did not meet all the requirements that you

and I would have set forth. Nevertheless, it was a forward step.

When the House-approved bill came to the Senate, it was considered by the Senate Finance Committee. There were lengthy public hearings. Representatives of the administration and of labor organizations and social-welfare groups came before the committee and advocated amendments to broaden and liberalize the bill. Representatives of various chambers of commerce and of private insurance companies came before the committee and advocated amendments to weaken the bill.

The committee voted to accept three of the liberalizing amendments. But I regret to say that it also accepted every single one of the 10 recommendations made by employers' organizations and insurance companies, diminishing the benefits and cutting down the coverage provided in the House-approved measure.

Our present Federal old-age and survivors insurance program provides insurance benefits to a person aged 65, or to a widow or orphan of a deceased worker. The benefits are grossly inadequate but, some small payment, at least, is made.

But if a man or woman becomes sick or disabled before reaching 65, and cannot work any longer, no insurance benefits are paid until the person reaches the age of 65, or dies.

This injustice was remedied in the bill passed by the House of Representatives. Acting upon the President's recommendation, the House approved a provision to pay insurance benefits to persons who become permanently and totally disabled before reaching the age of 65.

The Senate committee, however, struck out this provision.

A representative of your union came before the Senate committee and testified in favor of these disability insurance benefits. Dr. Leo Price, the able medical director of your splendid union health center, testified along with President William Green of the American Federation of Labor.

Dr. Price told the Senate committee how successful your union had handled the administration of disability benefits. Dr. Price answered all the arguments which had been made by the opponents of disability insurance. But despite this very compelling testimony, the committee struck the disability provision from the bill.

I believe you and the rest of the American people want this disability insurance provision restored. I am going to work on the Senate floor for its restoration.

The Senate committee voted to decrease the maximum monthly insurance benefits payable to a retired single person by about $12 a month and for a married couple, by about $18 a month. They voted to decrease from $3,600 to $3,000 the maximum amount of wages which can be credited toward old-age benefits. They voted to eliminate the progressive increase in benefits on the basis of years of service and thereby struck a heavy blow at the very foundation of the contributory insurance program.

I am going to do all in my power to restore these cuts and to make still further improvements in benefit amounts. I have already introduced an amendment which would increase the maximum wage base to $4,800 and which would give greater increases for length of service than those provided in the House bill. Only through the adoption of such improvements can benefits be brought into a reasonable relationship with increased wage levels and costs of living.

The Senate committee voted to eliminate additional sums approved by the House of Representatives for public-assistance grants to the aged, to the blind, and to dependent children. The committee also voted to eliminate entirely Federal aid for the physically handicapped and crippled who have had to seek help from a public agency.

The committee voted to eliminate the Federal aid provided in the House bill for public assistance to needy persons in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Yet these islands, because of their limited economic resources, are utterly unable to care for their needy people on a level consistent with common decency. I have introduced an amendment to restore this assistance to these American citizens.

I shall also propose or support other amendments broadening coverage to include special groups which have been left out of the measure recommended by the Senate Finance Committee.

It seems strange that the most vigorous opposition to social security comes from individuals who themselves have attained security but who oppose it for you and for others.

Recently a new figure of speech has crept into the vocabulary of those who oppose social security. They cry out that perfect security is available only in prison. They intimate that any move in the direction of security is a move toward the loss of liberty. Yet some of those very individuals who glibly express these viewpoints are themselves the recipients of pensions, by comparison with which the pensions proposed under the Social Security Act are a mere pittance.

I do not blame anyone for desiring pensions or security. I do, however, differ with those who obtain adequate security for themselves while opposing even a minimum of security for the rest of the population.

There is much, much more to be said about social security, and about all the broad problems of economic security in our society. We must press forward toward greater security, because in this industrial age, economic security provides the only climate in which liberty can flourish and endure.

For it is a tragic fact of history that if men cannot have both freedom and economic security, they will often surrender freedom in the false and wistful hope of winning economic security. We in America must show the way by which peoples may win security and yet enjoy freedom. I judge this to be one of the most important missions which America has in world affairs.

If we are able to achieve this, and join with it other measures of social justice, if we are able to bring to every man, woman and child in America, security not only against the economic hazards of the industrial age but also security against the political hazards of this age, we will have brought mankind to the dawn of a new era.

We will have ended the era in which men, having invented the machine, became its slaves, and in which men, having learned the secret of power, were overwhelmed by it.

We will then have pointed the way by which man may escape from the prison of his economic needs, and devote himself to the expansion of his intellectual horizons and the cultivation of the boundless kingdom of his spirit.

Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am asking permission to insert in the RECORD two editorials which I think coincide and in which I concur. One is from the Washington Daily News entitled "Prepare," and the other is from the Los Angeles Times entitled "Let's See the Control Bills."

I agree with the News editorial that we should prepare for the worst, which is all-out war, but in preparing for it we should not lose our heads and pass legislation which would in itself set up a complete dictatorship with no limitations. Frankly, I think the administration is running a clever propaganda program. They are not letting us have the complete story at one time, but are trying to indoctrinate us gradually with the war psychosis. The people are way ahead of them and are not morons as some of the leaders think. The administration believes that by this method they can get absolute control of the people.

The editorials follow:

[From the Washington Daily News of July 17, 1950]

PREPARE

America stands today in deadly danger. Three weeks of the crisis that took violent form in Korea have made our country's peril starkly plain.

President Truman's swift reaction to that crisis was brave and right, and for it there should never be regret.

But every passing day has shown more clearly how ill prepared we are to carry out the task so willingly and proudly undertaken.

Each day has brought some compelling new necessity for revising upward the official estimates of what that task's completion will require.

Responsible authorities assumed at first that American sea and air forces could quickly liberate South Korea from half a dozen invading Communist divisions, believed to have a few Russian tanks which would be ineffective in the mountainous terrain.

How wrong they were.

After 3 weeks of American defeats and retreats it is evident that very large ground forces, well equipped with heavy weapons, will have to be supplied if South Korea is to be liberated in 6 months or longer.

It must be, can be, will be done.

But meanwhile the revelation of our unpreparedness even for a minor war in Korea has alarmed our friends in western Europe and is undermining their faith in our ability to help them in case of need.

And meanwhile our weakness is an open invitation to our enemies in the Kremlin to order new acts of aggression by their puppet satellites, or to attack America itself before we can recover the strength we need.

There is only one safe answer to this threat.

We must prepare. At whatever cost, at whatever effort, at whatever sacrifice of business and politics as usual, we must prepare.

And we must never again fall prey to the delusion that Stalin can be swerved from his career of conquest by preparedness plans that remain on paper.

Volunteering quickly proved not enough to fill the need for military manpower. The draft is not enough. It operates too slowly.

Prudence dictates that members of the National Guard and the Organized Reserve be called up for training now.

Brave Americans in Korea are paying the fearful price of inadequate training and inadequate weapons.

Other Americans who may have to fight deserve the fullest possible opportunity for

adequate training before they are sent into battle.

Official Washington is wasting precious time debating whether it will be necessary to mobilize for all-out war production.

It is urgently necessary right now—and not by the fumbling piecemeal processes of World War II which failed to insure utmost speed in production or to prevent grave inflationary damage to the national economy.

This week the President is expected to call on Congress for large additional military appropriations.

He will do well to ask for more money, not less, than he is said to have in mind. And he would do well to ask, at the same time, for stand-by total mobilization powers.

Nobody relishes the thought of Government controls of industry and materials and manpower, of higher taxes, of ceilings on prices and wages, of rationing of scarce essentials, of all the things that had to be done before, and weren't done well and soon enough.

But no sane American can afford to tolerate the thought of what will surely happen if, while refusing to do these things in time, we attempt to produce the vast supply of military matériel made essential by America's deadly danger.

Make no mistake, have no illusions, about the realness of that danger.

Partial preparedness exposes our own country to fearful risk of invasion, conquest, and destruction.

We need nothing less than all the preparedness work and skill that money can provide and time permit.

Better too much than too little.

And better too soon than too late.

[From the Los Angeles Times of July 14, 1950]

LET'S SEE THE CONTROL BILLS

Everybody knows that if we get into a first-class war—world war III as it has been christened before birth—we shall have controls over almost everything—controls that will make the restrictions of World War II seem mild.

In the top-secret bureaucratic cupboards in Washington are locked away the war powers bills, all ready to be whisked out at the psychological moment for the rubber stamp of a frightened Congress. What is in these bills is known by rumor. The most important of them has been given a name in the reports; it is the emergency war powers bill.

PROPOSED CONTROLS

The bill contains rules for everybody, with regulation of prices, jobs, wages, and all goods. It provides for censorship of telegraph, telephone and mail. It contains provisions for a labor draft, with registration of all men 18 to 45. It empowers the President to seize factories and, of course, to control all profits.

Many of these proposed controls undoubtedly will be necessary in a great global battle for survival. Everybody knows that we can't fight a total war by sending our best young men into the field while those at home conduct business as usual and enjoy the additional pleasure of a boom brought on by war production.

A LITTLE LIGHT SHED

But we are still a relatively free people and as such we ought to study the restrictions and disciplines which we must prepare ourselves to accept. Before the time to do or die arrives we are entitled to reason why.

Yet we are not given the opportunity in advance to know what we must do in wartime. Our bureaucratic betters, who always presume to know what is best for us, won't tell us. They won't even tell Congress.

Why are they so secretive? A quotation attributed to a White House assistant, sheds some light: "To be perfectly frank about it, you could not get a war powers bill through Congress today containing the powers we would actually need in wartime. You would just create dissension. The President won't ask for them until and unless he thinks * * * we are in a real emergency * * *."

You see, they don't trust the people who are to be controlled. They have a low opinion of the people. They don't think the people can achieve the sacrificial mood which will accept all the controls the bureaucrats think are good for them.

Not only that, the bureaucrats also want to make sure that the controls, however acceptable they may be for wartime, are imposed not ony for the duration of the war but for as long afterward as they think is necessary. War controls are a state socialism born of an emergency. Many of the bureaucrats think state socialism should go on forever.

We still have with us a small token of their larger intention. Rent control was imposed during World War II as an emergency measure. But 5 years after the end of hostilities we still have rent control.

SOFTENING CONGRESS

The attempt to "soften up" Congress for the quick, uncritical passage of emergency legislation already has begun. The Members are told that Washington is the first atomic bomb target, and a very accessible target, Secretary Brannan is bleating about food difficulties and, of course, he has his plan ready. All the bureaucrats need is a good enough scare so that they can rush their bills through before anybody has a chance to read anything but the subtitles.

It seems to us that the people, through their Congress, ought to require a study of these emergency bills before enactment. They ought to have a word about what they must do or must not do in the next war. All the wisdom and all the warmaking talent in the United States are not monopolized by the bureaus, as the survivors of World War II know well. Congress certainly ought to spend as much time considering war controls as it did weighing the Marshall plan.

And most important, Congress ought to define sharply the limits of the emergency in which the controls will operate. We have been living for 5 years with the fiction that we are still at war with Germany and Japan, which is supposed to justify those extra-constitutional war powers that are still being exercised.

After the next emergency is over let's not trail the ribbons of war dictatorship into the future on the excuse that there is no formal peace treaty. When the shooting has stopped, war powers should end. There is probably no such provision in any of the emergency bills in the Washington safes, but Congress can write one in if it gets the bills before it is scared jittery by the bureaucratic propaganda.

Mr. Baruch's Mobilization Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 18, more than a month before the outbreak of war in Korea, Bernard M. Baruch delivered an address at Columbia University in New York in which he presented a program for total mobilization in the United States to cope with the rising international crisis. Mr. Baruch's words seem almost prophetic today in the light of events in Korea. I believe his program enunciated just 2 months ago today is an excellent guide for all-out defense. Here is the sound advice of a loyal, patriotic and selfless elder statesman whose experiences in two World Wars in setting our industrial mobilization into motion are matchless.

I am certain that many Members of both Houses of Congress will want to read his views and program. The following excerpts from Mr. Baruch's address dealing with his mobilization program, as reprinted in the New York Herald Tribune on July 16, make very timely reading:

MR. BARUCH ON TOTAL MOBILIZATION—A PROGRAM FOR ALL-OUT DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES PREPARED BEFORE THE KOREAN CRISIS

(The following are excerpts from Bernard M. Baruch's address at Columbia University on May 18, presenting his argument and program for American total mobilization. Mr. Baruch spoke before Korea, but his words are now all the more pertinent.)

In World War I we sailed an uncharted sea. We had to find our way by trial and error. When we were finished we had wrung Hindenburg's admission, "Her brilliant, if pitiless, war industry had entered the service of patriotism and had not failed it. * * * They understood war." But when World War II began those in command threw away the charts we had left. Repeating the mistakes of the past, they eventually drifted back to what had been recommended originally. The war was won, but only after a terrible cost in the needless prolongation of the struggle, and a needless toll of blood and treasure.

I would not bring up this record of the past except for two reasons. First, one object of this seminar is to see that these mistakes are not repeated again in event of another war—which all of us hope can be prevented. Then there is grave doubt whether the mobilization lessons of both World Wars have actually been learned.

Only recently, for example, it was proposed that a selective-service law be enacted on a stand-by basis, to go into effect on proclamation of the President and the Congress. Nothing was said about putting other mobilization measures into law on a stand-by basis, as well. The draft of our young men was to be put on the statute books by itself.

Nowhere have I heard a voice raised in protest against the shocking immorality of this proposal. Our youth would be put on notice that they may be called into service, their education and careers interrupted, but none of the propertied interests would be put on call.

Are profits, prices, wages, and other segments of society more sacred?

I cannot imagine that that is the feeling of Congress. I can only conclude that the lesson of the last two wars, which was so costly, has been forgotten. Were another war to come we would have to mobilize not only our young men but the entire Nation, our whole economic and industrial power—men, money, farms, factories, mines—all our resources, spiritual as well as material. I believe we need a stand-by selective-service law, to be ready for any emergency, but it must be part of a total program of mobilization readiness. It cannot stand alone.

Without such a total mobilization program on the statute books, ready to be put into operation overnight, the risks and costs of war are greatly and needlessly increased.

What prevents the outbreak of another war? It is not primarily American possession of atomic weapons, although that is important. The greatest single deterrent to war is the memory of the crushing military

might this country mobilized and transported to every part of the world in the last war. At the height of that conflict we produced nearly as many tanks, airplanes, ships, and other munitions as the rest of the world combined. We can be sure that will not be forgotten by any potential enemy plotting aggression. But we can also be sure no potential warmaker will forget that it took roughly 2½ years to convert our energies from peace to all-out war production.

There is only one war plan any aggressor can have—to seek to overwhelm us during that "too little and too late" period while our military power is still on order. The longer the time lag in our mobilization that the enemy can count on, the more inviting a target for attack we become—the greater the danger that we may not reach our allies in time, should they be attacked.

Of course, this time gap cannot be closed completely. Because of that we must maintain a military force capable of instant retaliation and of holding a safe line of defense until we have time to mobilize. To the degree that we narrow the time lag in our mobilization our military forces can be safely reduced.

At least a year could be cut off that time lag by enacting into law now a stand-by mobilization program. Were that done our security and that of all free peoples would be appreciably strengthened. Nor would this action require any additional defense expenditures. All that it requires is the courage to put into law now what we know would have to be done in event of war.

Hitler gambled on our delay in mobilization and almost won. With ever-quickening weapons of destruction—airplanes of supersonic speed, atomic weapons, rockets—a repetition of the delays of the past could prove fatal. To wait until bombs are falling before we begin to legislate may cause the loss of the war. It tempts the aggressor into gambling on overwhelming us with some blitz attack before we are able to mobilize.

As all of you know, preparation for a modern war begins many years before the actual start of hostilities. The modern aggressor regiments his economy long before there is any actual shooting. He stock-piles weapons, stores raw materials, converts his factories—while there still is so-called "peace."

In the case of mobilization our procrastination is all the more tragic, since nothing is to be gained by a failure to act. What should be done is so evident. We do not have to wait for someone to devise a "perfect" plan. Let us write into law now, on a stand-by basis, all the measures which were proven necessary in the last war. That is the minimum we should bet on the statute books at once. Then were war to come, we should start from where we left off, instead of repeating the old mistakes.

With this minimum in law, the National Security Resources Board could work steadily to improve the mobilization program. Studies to implement mobilization legislation are fine. What I oppose is making so-called "studies" merely to avoid action, as a cover for a lack of political courage.

I respect the abilities and courage of Stuart Symington, the new Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. I hope he can at last take the Board off the "dead center" of inaction on which it has been for so long, a "dead center" so perilous to our security. The first necessity is to get a sound mobilization program on the lawbooks. That is the real test of how effective the Security Resources Board will be permitted to become.

The issue is a simple one—are we going to stop talking and take action?

Specifically a sound mobilization program requires, among other things: An impartial selective-service law, with a work-or-fight clause; a readied civilian defense; the elimination of profiteering; an over-all ceiling on all prices, rents, wages, and other costs to prevent the inflation that could wreck any mobilization; higher taxes; power to curtail less essential production to give priority to military and essential civilian needs; organization of manpower to direct it where most needed with an index of all essential skills and training facilities; rationing of scarce essentials; a comprehensive system of economic defense controlling all imports and exports.

This stand-by mobilization program would not specify the weapons to be produced nor the size of the armed forces to be raised. The objective would be to provide the organization so that in case of emergency all our resources can be pooled and tapped with a minimum of delay, whatever the weapons to be manufactured, whatever the size Army, Navy, or Air Force. The military should be able to get what it needs, when needed with the least dislocation to the civilian economy.

And, as I have emphasized, all these measures must go together as part of one whole.

One alibi often put forward for neglecting our mobilization readiness is that it will militarize the country. This is like opposing the installation of a fire-alarm system on grounds that it will cause fire. The mobilization program I have proposed is not intended to take effect immediately. These laws would be placed on the statute books, ready to be put into operation in an emergency upon joint proclamation of the President and Congress—not the President alone, but the President and Congress acting together. Like the fire department, these laws would be ready for action if the alarm went off.

There will always be some who counsel, "Let's wait until war comes and see whether these controls are necessary." There will always be some who try to weaken whatever mobilization controls are suggested to exempt their own interests, to leave profits untouched, wages free, prices uncontrolled, taxes too low. The test of a sound mobilization program is that it disciplines all pressure groups and all selfish interests for the sake of the national interest.

To prevent war is our first objective. Our second objective must be to win any war forced upon us. Both these objectives are served by enacting a stand-by mobilization law now. Both these objectives are needlessly weakened by not doing so.

Mr. Ewing Was the Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a recent editorial from the Washington Star:

MR. EWING WAS THE ISSUE

It should be apparent to President Truman by now that if he has any hope of obtaining congressional approval of a reorganization of the so-called welfare activities of the Federal Government he should stick to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Even the Hoover plan for giving the Federal Security Agency departmental status might have hard sledding, it is true, in view of Congress' attitude against increasing the powers of FSA Administrator Oscar Ewing. But the opposition probably would have been less violent if Mr. Truman had left health services out of his plan.

The worst move the President could have made was to submit a reorganization that gave Mr. Ewing any control whatever over Federal medical activities. It was because of this departure from the Hoover program that the Senate last year rejected the President's first plan, calling for a Department of Welfare. And it was largely for a like reason that the House has killed the second plan. Mr. Ewing, ardent advocate of compulsory health insurance, would have attained Cabinet status under either plan—as he would have under the Hoover plan. The thought of the controversial Mr. Ewing presiding, with greatly increased prestige, over a department that included the United States Public Health Service and other medical research agencies was too much for opponents of socialized medicine—and there are a lot of such opponents in Congress.

Under the Hoover Commission proposal, all medical activities of the Government would have been consolidated in a separate agency. Incidentally, the full Commission's decision on this point did not follow the primary recommendation of its task force on public welfare. This task force was composed of a Brookings Institution group of experts who saw nothing wrong with lumping health, education, social security, and certain other welfare operations in one department. The task force said, however, that if the health services were to be divorced from the Federal Security Agency they should be in one department. The Commission elected to adopt the latter plan. Whether it had in mind the possibility of congressional hedging at any scheme for giving a more powerful Mr. Ewing supervision of medical activities has not been disclosed.

In view of what has happened at the two sessions of Congress, the President would be well advised to drop his own plans for the future of the Federal Security Agency and try again with the Hoover-advocated progam. His major successes so far in the organization field have occurred when he adhered closely to the Hoover report.

Community Building Is Good Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. WOOD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, Nationwide attention has been given to a community-development program which was started in Georgia in the summer of 1944. Known as the better-hometown program, it started in a modest way in an effort to make the old home towns sufficiently attractive to the returning veterans that they would stay in Georgia. More than 200 Georgia towns have participated each year and the program has since been expanded to include improved agricultural practices and related activities. The program and the results to date were outlined in a talk by Mr. Charles A. Collier, vice president of the Georgia Power Co., before the national citizens conference on planning for city, State, and Nation, which was held in Washington recently. I ask permission to include Mr. Col-

lier's talk in my remarks and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

COMMUNITY BUILDING IS GOOD BUSINESS

(By C. A. Collier)

The basic principle of the Georgia Power Co.'s better home-towns program is community improvement through self-help. In this program I think you will find an example of the American spirit of initiative and enterprise reawakened to improve living conditions and to enlarge economic opportunities in towns that a few years ago were dying on the vine.

During the past 6 years the Georgia Power Co. has spent several hundred thousand dollars on this development program for the people of its service area, which comprises five-sixths of the State of Georgia's 59,000 square miles and 80 percent of its population. This program is no charity. It is generally recognized in Georgia as an unusually public-spirited activity for a single company to promote, but in no sense is it a charitable proposition. It is good business every inch of the way. It is a good investment in the businessman's sense of the word. As I will show a little later, this program justifies itself in several ways. It is worth what it costs by virtue of the good will it brings the Georgia Power Co. It is a more effective public-relations activity, causes more favorable publicity, than anything else the company has ever done. It has paid its way in the added revenues it has brought the company. And at the same time it has added materially to the socio-economic welfare of the people of the State.

The community development program of the Georgia Power Co. was devised in an effort to help cure the economic and social ills of Georgia. Since you can evaluate its effectiveness only if you have some idea of the conditions that formerly prevailed, let me go back a few years. First I will state the problem, next describe the plan, and finally report the results.

THE PROBLEM

In 1943, Georgia, like most of the country, was enjoying war-production prosperity. Things were better than they had been in a long, long while. But anyone with a long enough memory had reason to wonder if that prosperity would be lasting. During and immediately after the First World War the people of the South had been profligate with their easy money, dissipating it in silk-shirt spending, instead of investing it in ways that would improve the economy in the future. By the end of 1920 the boll wevil depression hit the South, and Georgia especially hard, well ahead of the general depression. Of course, Georgia suffered through the general one, too. In effect, Georgia had many years of depression.

Here are some figures that show how things were skidding. The dollar value of the State's agricultural products, exclusive of livestock, was about $536,540,000 in 1919. In 1939 it had dwindled down to approximately $141,700,000, or roughly one-fourth of the 1919 figure.

The annual dollar value of manufactured products fell by nearly $16,000,000 in the same period. In the 10 years from 1929 to 1939 the number of manufacturing plants in Georgia was reduced from 4,090 to 3,150. Per capita income dropped in the same decade from $329 to $290.

There were aspects of this retrogression that can't be expressed dollar-wise. Many of the towns of Georgia became rundown. In most of the towns there was an almost complete lack of social and recreational facilities such as community houses, public playgrounds, swimming pools, and clubhouses for young people. In 1944 there were only 4,111 general hospital beds in the State having American Medical Association approval, though the need was estimated at 14,000.

Serious as were such deficiencies, there was yet another situation which, in my opinion, was the worst symptom of our economic and social ill-health. That was the loss of our young people. Of that part of the rural population which was between the ages of 10 and 29 years in 1920, over 680,000 persons had migrated by 1940. That number was 58.8 of the total within those age limits. How could we account for a trend like that? Obviously some of them were youngsters who left Georgia because their parents moved away. But it was reasonable to assume that the great majority of these people, the ones in the upper teens and in the twenties, migrated of their own choosing because Georgia failed to offer them the opportunities for a livelihood and successful living that they hoped to find elsewhere. In other words, our lack of economic opportunity and the inferior living conditions in our towns were driving our own young people away from us. Now it is hardly necessary to point out to you that the young men and women who had the initiative to pull stakes were the most enterprising, most intelligent and most courageous ones. They were the young people with the qualities of character and mind that would make the best leaders and the best citizens. And we were losing them.

In 1943 and 1944, when our program was incubating, the State was faced with a special problem regarding that exodus, and a special opportunity to stem it. Georgia had about 350,000 of its citizens, mostly young people, serving in the armed forces. They had traveled, seen new sights and better ways of living. After the war, would they come back to their own dingy little Georgia towns? And if they did return, would they stay? Or would they start a new migration from Georgia to fairer fields?

Georgia was forever wooing new industries, out-of-State capital. Yet more than once an industrialist, taken to look at an otherwise suitable location, had answered, "We couldn't expect our supervisory personnel to live in this kind of a town."

If the economic weakness of the so-called "Empire State of the South" was in the communities, wouldn't its economic salvation be found there, too? Something was needed to clean up and build up the towns of Georgia. War production prosperity wouldn't last forever. But the old aimlessness might. Without some kind of plan, some kind of special effort, what reason to expect a better aftermath this time than followed World War I?

So a plan was evolved.

THE PLAN

The Georgia Better Home Towns program is no fancy social planning. It is no giveaway, no dole, involves no subsidies. Although the Georgia Power Co. has put a good deal of money into it, not one penny has been given to anyone except in the form of prizes for actual accomplishments on a competitive basis. Most of the expenditure has been for personnel to take the program to the people and for advertising and other promotional activities. So far as the communities are concerned, the program operates entirely on the basic principle of self-reliance and self-help.

The Georgia Better Home Towns program hasn't attempted to do things for people. Instead, it has encouraged them to do things for themselves. It has proved to be a highly effective and influential organization to stimulate the citizenry's enthusiasm for community improvement. Instead of paying people to perform chores of sometimes questionable worth, instead of presenting handouts for local projects, it pursuades people to assert their economic independence by rolling up their sleeves and going to work for what they want.

The better home towns program didn't set out to create a new Georgia overnight. As a matter of fact, it got off to a rather modest beginning. It was started in the summer of 1944, during the war, when materials were hard to get. People couldn't build much, or remodel much. So the accent at the outset was on face lifting. Citizens were urged to clean up their communities, repair and repaint their homes, remove the trash dumps, beautify private and public property, spruce up the stores and other places of business. It was a first things first proposition.

Later, as funds and materials became available, came the paving, water and sewerage projects, the new buildings, the new businesses and industrial plants. Communities were encouraged to set up small local industries, financed with local capital and processing local raw products, thus providing new employment opportunities at home.

The organization of the program in a typical Georgia town was something like this. Assisted by representatives of the company, community leaders would form a better home-town committee. Using a detailed check list furnished by the company, they would then make a critical self-appraisal of their town to determine its most serious faults and deficiencies. This, in turn, would suggest various projects of first importance, and a subcommittee would be appointed to promote each one. In many communities the town hall idea has been adopted to enlist the widest possible interest and participation by the citizens.

To introduce the program to the public and implement its progress, the Georgia Power Co. created a community development division, composed of a staff of specialists working exclusively on the better home towns program and related activities. In each of the six geographical divisions into which the company's service area is divided we placed a community development representative. As now constituted, the department includes a manager with headquarters in Atlanta, two research engineers, a field supervisor, the six division representatives, the manager of the industrial section, and the manager of the agricultural section. One member of the advertising department works exclusively on community development matters, and other members give the program part of their time.

At the local levels, a large number of other employees are extremely active in the program. This includes our six division managers, 6 division sales supervisors, 23 district managers, and 73 local managers. Also cooperating are 9 wholesale town representatives, the manager of the rural division and 6 rural engineers, the approximately 50 members of the home service department and other personnel.

In the early days of the movement, when it was being introduced to the people of Georgia, personal contact was a particularly important mode of promotion. Company representatives addressed hundreds of gatherings and met with countless groups throughout the State.

A continuous program of newspaper advertising and widespread publicity have kept the program before the public. Radio also has been extensively used. Folders and frequent bulletins to the local committees have helped keep interest high. A series of booklets, issued from time to time, have provided local leaders with specific suggestions and step by step procedures—how to organize committees, how to check community shortcomings, how to select objectives, how to recruit community-wide participation, how to accomplish the desired results.

Each year the company has sponsored a prize contest as a highly successful attention getter. For several years these affairs took

the form of letter-writing contests on community development subjects, the number of entries ranging from 6,000 to over 7,000 per contest. In 1948 a different idea was tried. Instead of a competition among individuals, it was made a competition among communities and was called the champion home-town contest. This type of contest has been so successful and has produced so many tangible benefits to the participating towns that it is now accepted as an annual institution.

From the beginning, the number of Georgia towns taking part in the better home towns movement has exceeded 200. The first champion home-town contest was entered by 209 communities, and the second one had 266 towns competing.

Hand in hand with this town-improvement activity has gone the company's work in support of improved agricultural practices in Georgia. This includes an annual hybrid-corn-raising contest for 4-H Club members, a winter grazing contest for members of the Future Farmers of America, and a year-round grazing contest for enrollees in the veterans' farm-training program. It may be of interest to note that 1,872 boys took part in the most recent winter grazing contest and 9,824 veterans participated in the last year-round grazing contest. Permanent pastures are of great importance to the growing livestock industry in Georgia.

I have merely outlined the salient features of our community development program. There are also several related activities that cannot be discussed in the allotted time. Now let us see what has been happening since this program began. I believe you will agree with me that something unique has been taking place in Georgia.

THE RESULTS

First, I wish to offer the perfectly obvious comment that whatever the advances that have been made, no single program, no single undertaking, is to be credited with all of them. Of course not. No one pretends that this program has been the sole implement of progress in Georgia. But it is the only one organized on a State-wide scale, with a large personnel, vigorously and consistently promoted through advertising and other means. In operation 6 years now, it was the original program of its kind when established and has since been copied in a number of other States.

I want to say, also, that the success of this program is not so much a feather in the cap of the Georgia Power Co. as it is a testimonial to the basic stability of the people of Georgia. They are the ones who have made it work. Throughout it has been based on a few simple but strong emotional appeals to the community and State pride of the citizens, their sense of shame, their desire to improve their standard of living and their position in life, their eagerness to create better opportunities for their children, their sense of personal dignity and integrity. The citizens, thousands of them, in the communities of Georgia, have responded to those appeals and have done the work. The Georgia better home-towns program has become truly their program.

A basic assumption from the start was that new businesses and industries would be attracted to the better towns, the ones of good appearance that offered desirable living conditions, a pleasant social atmosphere, and adequate recreational facilities. As a consequence, many a Georgia town has practically made itself over. Here are a few high lights of the accomplishments in the period from September 1944 to the first of 1950.

The communities held 864 clean-up, paint-up campaigns. They completed 1,288 recreational projects. There were 822 street- and sidewalk-improvement projects, 363 sewerage-improvement programs, and 400 public-park improvements. New school improvements to existing school buildings totaled 943; 247 community houses were constructed. Church improvements, including new churches, were 1,022 in number, and so on down the list. Note that 180 new hotels and motor courts were built in connection with our efforts to develop a bigger tourist trade.

Here is an item of special significance, I think. A few minutes ago I mentioned that Georgia had been woefully lacking in general hospital facilities, there being only 4,111 beds in AMA-approved hospitals in the State. While there still is a shortage of such facilities, we have almost doubled them in just 5 years. As of July 1, 1949, we had 7,939 beds in general hospitals—a gain of 3,828. I cite that statistics because I believe it is representative of the rapid progress Georgia has made in recent years in raising the public standards of health and welfare.

That a resultant business and industrial advance has ensued is well borne out by the figures. In the past 4 years, 1946 through 1949, a total of 1,699 new manufacturing plants were established in the territory served by the Georgia Power Co. These represent an aggregate capital investment of $124,455,000 and a combined annual payroll of $67,872,000. They employ some 38,000 workers. They are mostly small local plants financed by local capital, as is indicated by the average capital investment of only $73,000.

In the same 4 years a total of 8,661 new service establishments were started. By service establishments is meant a wide variety of business places, including shoe-repair shops, stores, printing shops, theaters, diaper services, laundries and what not. These new establishments employ about 30,300 workers, have an aggregate annual payroll of about $60,750,000 and a combined capital investment of over $127,000,000.

The new industries and the new service establishments, totaling 10,360, provide employment for about 68,700 persons and pay them more than $128,600,000 a year.

You will recall that the dollar value of Georgia's manufactured products decreased substantially during the bleak period up to 1939. But look what has happened since. In 1939 the total was only $677,400,000. In 1948 it was four times that much, the actual figure, according to the Blue Book of Southern Progress, being $2,809,700,000.

What about per capita income? Well, we in Georgia and the South are still behind the average for the whole Nation, but we are gaining faster. In 1930 per capita income in Georgia was a mere $274. In 1948 it was $971, or an increase of 254 percent, whereas the national gain in the same years was only 137 percent.

Now along with this development of the towns of Georgia there has been a widespread movement to put new life into the State's agriculture. Various agencies and interests have contributed to this work, among them the Georgia Power Co. Our participation has included the corn yield and grazing contests previously mentioned, the gift of a $3,500 mobile soil testing unit to the Georgia Experiment Station, donations to the State to finance research resulting in the development of new strains of hybrid corn, and the company's own large-scale soil conservation and reforestation projects on its own lands.

The ruination of southern agriculture was the one-crop system. For years cotton was king, and when cotton fell, the whole agricultural economy crashed. Thanks to the fine teaching of the Soil Conservation Service, the Georgia Extension Service and others, the agricultural economy has been transformed. Diversified farming is the order of the day, and mechanization is well advanced. In 1919 the value of Georgia's farm production was about $536,500,000, of which $356,500,000 was in cotton lint and cotton seed. Cotton was then 66 percent of the total. In 1948, however, the value of agricultural production, not counting livestock, was $528,923,000, of which only $139,241,000 was cotton. That was only 26 percent of the whole. Other major crops include corn, oats, peanuts, and tobacco. Livestock, incidentally, has become an important industry in Georgia, with production in 1948 valued at $164,977,000. That is why my company has been putting great stress on year-round pastures.

Illustrative of the progress in mechanization are the figures on farm tractors. In 1929 there were only 2,200 tractors in Georgia. As late as 1940 there were only 9,000. But in 1945 the number had jumped to about 25,000, and today it is estimated at more than 50,000.

Business, industrial, and agricultural expansion have been more or less general over the Nation, you may say, and that is quite true. But there are two aspects of the progress in Georgia that make it stand out. One is the rate of improvement and the other is its stability.

The United States Department of Commerce reported recently that in 1949 Georgia business not only made a better showing than the Nation as a whole, but also exceeded the rest of the southeast. This statement was based on such indices as value of new building, production of electric energy, manufacturing employment, bank deposits, and railroad revenues.

That Georgia has been having a sound, durable business expansion is indicated by United States Department of Commerce figures on business failures. During the period from 1944 through 1948 the Georgia rate of business failures was less than the national rate in 3 years and more than the national rate in 2 years. But look at the marked difference in 1948. Whereas the national rate was 94 failures in every 1,000 businesses, the Georgia rate was only 43. The next lowest rate was 72 for Maine and Rhode Island.

We people in the Georgia Power Co. are Georgians and naturally take pride in the progressiveness of our State. We want it to deserve having good things said about it. But I cannot truthfully say that the expenditure of our energies, our time and money on the community development program has been motivated solely by State pride. Actually the program was given purpose by what is called an enlightened self-interest. First, we knew that a higher standard of living in Georgia ultimately would enlarge the market for our product, electric service. And we also anticipated that there would be an immediate return in the form of new business, industrial and residential customers.

As to the latter, here are some figures:

Between 1944 and the end of 1949 the number of electric customers of the Georgia Power Co. increased from 282,092 to 419,473, or 48 percent. The amount of electricity sold went up 43 percent, from 2,789,191,291 kilowatt hours to 3,985,923,884 kilowatt hours. During the same years, the national increase was considerably less, being 29 percent as to customers and 26 percent as to energy.

For many years the average annual consumption per residential customer in Georgia has been materially higher than the national average. It has maintained that lead, growing from 1,732 kilowatt hours a year in 1944 to 2,417 kilowatt hours in 1949, an increase of 39 percent. Today the Georgia average is about 30 percent higher than the national average.

The Georgia better-home-towns program has greatly heightened the prestige of the Georgia Power Co. As I mentioned earlier, it has brought us much favorable publicity. So far we have clipped more than 35,000 column inches of free publicity from the newspapers of Georgia. In addition, special articles about the program have appeared in

national publications like Reader's Digest, Coronet, Newsweek, Printer's Ink and Manufacturers Record. It has been the subject of numerous commendatory editorials in the Georgia press.

The Georgia better-home-towns program is but one of the forces for progress at work today in Georgia, but a major force. I think the public now regards it as almost an indispensable. I know that the towns of our territory would not have allowed us to omit the champion home town contest this year if we had wanted to.

After all, we have really just got well started. We must admit that our towns were formerly quite backward. They still have much to do, great opportunity for development. The same is true of business and industry in Georgia. Diversified industrialization is reatively new with us. It has much more opportunity ahead than history behind. The advancement of our section is bound to continue and we can accelerate it by vision and work.

Radio Broadcast of R. W. Frazier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast by R. W. Frazier, professor of government and history of the Southeastern State College, of Durant, Okla., under the auspices of the college over radio station KSEO, June 28, 1950:

Friends of the air, as June the 14 was the one hundred and seventy-third anniversary of the adoption of the American flag by the Continental Congress, so July 4, next, will be the one hundred and seventy-fourth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence—that being a national holiday—likewise the day of the primary election in Oklahoma—of which schools in this State observing both will not be in session—I thought it timely to give you a brief résumé of the Spirit of 1776.

It was Solon, the great legislator and one of the seven wise men of Greece who became chief magistrate in 594 B. C. It was a period of conflict between the peasants and nobles, but by wise application of his authority a revolution was prevented. Solon wrote a new constitution that enlarged the powers of the assembly. This document made property instead of birth the basis of citizenship, thus admitting the common classes as factors in the government. It improved economic conditions by abolishing the provision under which a debtor could be reduced to slavery by his creditor. Luxury in dress and food were prohibited. The ownership of land limited, the education of youth in schools and gymnasiums was provided by statutory law.

The statutes of Solon were written on pieces of wood and the Athenians were bound by oath not to repeal them for 10 years, after which he went on extensive travels to avoid being requested to alter his law. While few of his writings have come down to us, it can well be said that his early constitution gave for the first time, a type of government that permitted the common man a chance to participate in the affairs of human life. And, it may well be said that Solon sowed the first embryonic seeds of a democracy.

Had it not been for the victories of Alexander the Great, one among the greatest generals of the world, and a mighty Grecian scholar, tutored under Aristotle, the story of civilization in western Europe may have been different.

The Grecian contribution—literature and art; the Roman contribution—the Justinian code, the basis of civil law, and the building of roads and acqueducts, not overlooking the contribution of the Arabs in the Core subjects taught in the colleges of western Europe which forms the background of civilization in Europe and the British Empire, which will produce in the minds of the American Colonies 561 years hence, that has startled the world then, and now.

In 1215, when the charter of liberalities, wrung from the hand of King John at Runymede, by baronial compulsion which took pains to secure through it, not only baronial demands but administrative reforms, such as the trial by jury, the Writ of Habeas Corpus, the right of Parliament to control taxation, together with many other liberal reforms of which subsequent kings were forced to yield to barons and to the people in general. This far-reaching document is a forerunner or background to many of our American constitutional rights.

How were these fundamentals transferred to the Colonies? In answering this question, I may say that pivotal events in history, many times have shifted the trends of civilization, commerce, and ideologies by causes of mitigating circumstances. In 1453, the city of Constantinople fell to the Turks under the leadership of Mohammed the Second. And years later the Turks blocked the overland trade routes from India to western Europe, thereby necessitating new trade routes to carry on the profitable trade that had been built up, by the countries of western Europe and India. This necessity led to the discovery of the Western Hemisphere under the discoveries of Columbus in 1492, 1495, 1498, and through 1502; thus creating a rivalry among the countries of Europe to plant colonies in the New World, namely, Spain, France, Holland, and England. From 1492 down to the first permanent English settlement at Jamestown, Va., in 1607, a period of 115 years, known as the period of western discovery and exploration. From 1607 to 1732, a period of 125 years of colonization to establish the complacency of the Thirteen Colonies.

From 1732, the date of the Georgia settlement, to 1775, the beginning of the Revolutionary War, was the critical period of 43 years that tried and tested the courage, conviction, and wisdom, that schooled the budding hope of statecraft through many adversities. Our early English settlers brought with them many ideas of conscientious convictions, that emanated from the fundamentals of the Magna Carta. The Thirteen Original Colonies were the American children, the grown-up children to the age of maturity, with patriotic initiation in seeking many needed reforms. They had breathed the air of a new world. They had been shaped by bitter experiences on a virgin continent, to understand her character, we need to understand her inheritance almost as much as her environment in which they matured.

The Colonial argument rested on two main issues—first, the doctrine of natural rights, with the belief that only free government is restricted government; second, was the assertion that the Empire was not centralized empire, but was a decentralized and diversified Empire. The sum total of grievances leading up to the Revolutionary War were known as the Intolerable Acts, one of which, perhaps the most far-reaching in unpopularity, was taxation without representation, another known as the Boston Port bill, shutting up Boston Harbor, removing the customhouse to Salem, leaving the townspeople to ponder on their poverty until the East India Co. was repaid, in the loss of the Boston tea party. Impartial administration of justice in sending people to England for trial before a judge of the court, in some instances may be referred to as judgment before trial.

The Boston Massacre where British soldiers fired upon innocent people, was met with bitter opposition, while the Quartering Act of royal soldiers in private homes without just compensation and the consent of the owner, undermined the sanctity of our most sacred institution, the home.

The Quebec Act provided for greater fairness and justice in the administration of Canada by recognition of the French law. The extension of the Canadian boundary as far south as the Ohio River was another act of tyranny. The illegal Search and Seizure Act, with all of its molestations, prompted James Otis on his famous appeal of the Writs of Assistance before the courts, of which he stated: "A man's home, regardless of how humble it may be, is as dear to him as the King's Castle, across whose threshold even kings and queens should fear to tread"—summing up all of these unjust acts forced the Colonies to seek remedies for a solution in overcoming the tyranny of the British Parliament, royal governors, and tax collectors.

In 1774, the First Continental Congress met to take stock as to the crystallization of opinions of the respective colonies, and to their surprise and amazement they were practically all of one accord, thus before adjournment, they decided to meet again the next year, if need be, to take up measures of raising an army and conscripting soldiers, raising money and preparing for war, while the Second Continental Congress was in session, as one writer has stated, "Here to April's breeze unfurled the embattled farmers stood and fired the shot heard around the world." This marked the beginning of the War for Independence, in 1775.

In 1776, on July 4 the Declaration of Independence was written by Thomas Jefferson and signed by the most loyal and patriotic citizens the world had ever known, setting forth grievances against the Crown. Its preamble is as follows: "Thus, when in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitles them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive to these ends, it is the right of the people to alter, or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and, accordingly, all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government and to provide new guards for

their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of these colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former systems of government."

With specific charges against the King, the declarations enumerated were timely, bold, and daring. Of all the documents written in this country, this grave challenge rest the hope of a virile people, and with strong and sturdy minds of determination crystallized in written document the "Spirit of 1776" reaching the height of fervor, uncompromising, but by the divine providence of Almighty God, forever holding steadfast.

It was the same spirit that formulated the first flag of 1777. It was the same spirit that wrote the Articles of Confederation in 1778. It was the same spirit that sacrificed and suffered the howling blast of the winter's cold at Valley Forge, that led to victory at Yorktown in 1781. That consummated the Treaty of Paris in 1783. That wrote a new Constitution in 1787. That ratified same in 1789. That brought forth the "bill of rights" in 1791, the very heart of our democracy. That limited the powers of court in 1798. That created the electoral college in 1804. That abolished slavery in 1865. That made him a citizen in 1868, that permitted him to enjoy the privilege of suffrage in 1870, that vitalized the income tax in 1913, that dethroned the legislative caucus, and provided for the election of United States Senators by popjular vote, the same year, that prohibited the sale of intoxicating liquors in 1919 and extended the privilege of suffrage to women in 1920 that equalized the long and short sessions of Congress in 1933, which repealed the 18th amendment to the Constitution the same year.

It was the same spirit of 1776 that prompted Nathan Hale, the patriotic martyr of the Revolution to say, "I regret that I only have but one life to give in the cause and defense of my country." It was a violation of that spirit when Benedict Arnold betrayed the cause for which Nathan Hale died so heroically. It was an unpatriotic expression on the part of Phillip Nolan, after he had spent 2 days on a barge in the lower Mississippi River with Aaron Burr, when he said, "Damn the United States," for which Colonel Morgon sentenced him to exile for the remainder of his life. It is an indictment against the laxity of the law, as well as the spirit of 1776 in the laxity of deportation and light penalties against those who seek to undermine the superstructure, and overthrow the government, for which our American statesmen so patiently and courageously set in motion for coming posterity to enjoy. We, the recipients of such a noble heritage, bequeathed to us by a truly great people, the torch bearers for the sublime principles, incorporated in the great documents of human justice for generations yet to come. To owe allegiance to our government, for this is a duty of every statesman and a moral obligation to every citizen.

In this day of indifference, lethargy, and apathy, when the jewels of freedom and democracy are being challenged, the satanic forces of evil are continuing to overthrow the documents of freedom, the complacency of equality and justice, we are prone to wonder just what is ahead in the mysterious realm of human events.

The Carpenter of Nazareth laid down the fundamental law of precepts and standards to guide the destinies of man here and hereafter. The enumerated grievances in the Declaration of Independence was a stop sign in further aggression. The fundamental document in revising the Articles of Confederation, known as our present Constitution of the United States, penned by its writers on September 17, 1787, had for its purpose of standards, liberalized by the Bill of Rights in 1791, implemented by the other 11 amendments. Queen Victoria, Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Empress of India who served from 1837 to 1901, a period of 64 years, vitalized the Magna Charta, in broadcasting the liberalities, in practical application, that made her one of the world's most able rulers because she loved her people, followed the fundamental principles of Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the American Democratic Party, in that he believed in a liberal government of the people, by the people, and for the people—likewise a government ruled by the masses in lieu of the classes—yes; one of the redeeming virtues of Queen Victoria was love of humanity, harnessed with standards of respect and obedience of law and order—a criterion of good citizenship—like our forefathers, a blessing to mankind.

George Washington once stated that he believed that party organization was dangerous to a republican form of government. That statement causes one to wonder if the League of Nations was a correct solution to make the world a safe place for democracy. Evidently he was right because in 1920, when the League of Nations was a partisan issue, it went down in defeat on a party platform. Thus, the illustrious Woodrow Wilson, and the greatest idealist of his time, who penned the greatest international document known in modern times, that had for its purpose, as contained in the four points later incorporated in the Atlantic Charter, as old as mankind—freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom of speech, freedom of the press—and to make the world safe for democracy.

Today the United Nations Organization, composed of representatives from the freedom-loving nations of the world, trying to formulate another international document whereby we may hopefully look to a brighter day, when peace may reign supremely over the land, and that fear and hunger may not write appalling expressions across the countenances of the impoverished faces of hunger and fear. In the name of good government, in keeping the faith and adhering to the traditions of our worthy forefathers, may we forever hold sacred the fundamental principles incorporated in the Declaration of Independence, magnified in the broad interpretation of our Constitution setting forth the standards, as a torch bearer of civilization, adhering to the Golden Rule. "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

What a proud and fortunate heritage that has been bequeathed to us—not boastfully, but fortunately—we have heard exclaimed, "I am an American." The great war in Europe has made a strong call on the exercise of American patriotism. And why should not Americans be patriotic? If the Russian, under despotic government, thinks that the Kremlin is in every truth divine; if the German believed that his Fatherland was of more value than life itself; if the Englishman thrills at the thought of the British Empire; if the Irishman knows his country so dear as the Emerald Isle; if the Chinese gives his soul's devotion to the Land of the Rising Sun; and the Japanese pities everybody born outside the Flowery Kingdom, shall not we, in this land of glorious liberty, give some thought and love to our country?

At a meeting of school children, held in Madison Square Garden in New York City, to celebrate the Fourth of July, one boy, a descendant of native Americans, spoke as follows:

"I am an American! My father belongs to the Sons of the Revolution, my mother to the Colonial Dames. One of my ancestors pitched tea overboard in Boston Harbor, another stood his ground with Warren. And they hungered with Washington at Valley Forge. My ancestors were Americans in the making. They spoke in her council halls, they died on her battlefields. They commanded her ships. They cleared her forests. Dawns reddened and paled. Staunch hearts of mine beat fast at each new star in the Nation's flag. Keen eyes of mine foresaw her greater glory; the sweep of her seas, the plenty of her plains, the man hives of her million-wired cities. Every drop of blood in me holds the heritage of patriotism. I am proud of my past. I am an American."

Then a foreign boy arose and said:

"I am an American. My father was an atom of dust, my mother, a straw in the wind to his serene Majesty. One of my ancestors died in the mines of Siberia. Another was crippled for life by 20 blows of the knout. Another died defending his own from the massacres. The history of my ancestors is a trail of blood to the palace gates of the great white Czar.

"Then the dream came—the dream of America. In the light of the liberty torch, the atom of dust became a man and the straw in the wind became a woman for the first time.

" 'See,' said my father, pointing to the United States flag fluttering near, 'that flag of stars and stripes is yours. It is the emblem of the promised land. It means, my son, the hope of humanity. Live for it. Die for it'.

"Under the open sky of my new country, I swore to do so; and every drop of blood in me will keep that vow. I am proud of my future, I am an American."

Labor Productivity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including an address on labor productivity by Mr. George P. Delaney, international representative of the American Federation of Labor, at the Thirty-third General Conference of the International Labor Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.

This is a timely and important subject, and it is for this reason that I am including it in the RECORD. The address was well received and created a great deal of favorable comment from many of the foreign delegates to the Conference.

[From ILO News Service of June 14, 1950]

Before proceeding to the discussion, I should like to take enough time to compliment the director general on the comprehensive and enlightening report presented to this conference.

I should also like the privilege, on behalf of the millions of American workers whom I represent, to express our regret that the director general was unable to be present, and to wish him a full and speedy recovery.

American workers believe in high productivity. They know that it brings higher wages and shorter hours. They are not opposed to greater profits for their employers so long as their own standard of living rises in proportion. They have welded together a strong trade-union movement to make sure that such a sharing of increased output takes place.

American workers know that under the give and take of free industry and free labor within the framework of a democratic society their hours during the first half of this century have been reduced in most cases to 40 a week. It means that most industrial estab-

lishments operate on a 5-day week, with premium pay for overtime.

The American workers know that while their hours have been decreased, their real wages have gone up. They have better housing, finer food, improved educational opportunities.

American workers know that increased productivity through the teamwork of intelligent labor and resourceful management has accomplished this.

In the United States, a bicycle is not a means of transport for industrial workers, but the automobile is. I daresay more workers pedal to work each morning on bicycles in the Canton of Geneva, Switzerland, than in all of the great industrial centers of the United States combined. The American worker regards the bicycle as a luxury for sport and exercise, the automobile almost as a necessity. Certainly, there are a hundred times more motor cars on the factory parking lots of the United States than there are bicycles.

I have mentioned the automobile as one of the most obvious examples of the results of increased output. There are many others. The mass production of electric stoves and refrigerators, of inexpensive radios and television sets, was made possible because American industry, given the freedom to produce, saw the opportunity of greater profits which comes by producing goods in ever-increasing volume at prices which workers can afford to pay.

Output has not been geared to provide a small quantity of choice articles for the rich. As costs decline, prices are reduced. More and more people enter the ranks of those who can afford to buy. The market expands. Production is increased.

I do not wish to create the impression that all this has been accomplished without some pulling and hauling. There have been depressions. There have been strikes. Some Americans live in city slums. Some live in rural slums. We have criminals, invalids, and unemployables. But the services and assistance provided for their rehabilitation are constantly improving, too.

No one can measure with accuracy to what extent the strong trade-union movement in the United States has been a stabilizing factor in all these changes. Certainly, the low strike record in the United States during the war was partly a result of the leadership exerted by the unions. Certainly, the shorter hours and higher wages which were necessary to create the vastly increased market for low-cost goods were obtained largely as a result of action by the trade unions. So, too, the labor-management cooperation and the voluntary arbitration and conciliation plans which exist in America today were made possible through intelligent good faith on the part of labor unions.

All those factors have helped to maintain high productivity and high purchasing power even during the difficult period of postwar readjustment. All segments of the American economy are now agreed that increased production must be accompanied by an expanding market.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that there is no point in obtaining a high output if goods are not sold. This leads only to bad times for the worker, who must do without, and for the employer, who cannot make profits without a sufficient volume of sales.

We have found by long experience that our best hope of an expanding market lies at home in the pay envelopes of the very workers who produce the goods. We are anxious to send our products overseas, of course. But it is not a part of the American economic philosophy to rely on foreign trade as the prime target for expansion.

In some parts of the world today, however, large quantities of goods are being stored despite low production. This means that wages are even lower than production. As a result, thousands of workers have inadequate diets, poor living quarters, barely enough clothing, and in many instances no shoes. This is a bad situation. It is worse than bad because it is unnecessary.

It is a situation in which the trade unions can—and should—play a decisive role. They, too, can help develop a high-output, high-wage economy by putting first things first.

It is no secret that American labor's principal aim throughout the years has been to secure higher wages. This accomplished two things.

First, it helped to make sure that the benefits of mass production were used to raise living standards by increasing purchasing power as well as by reducing prices.

Secondly, our unions have both forced and helped along the drive for higher productivity. They forced it by demanding wages so high that employers had to install labor-saving machinery in order to meet increasing unit costs. They helped it because they saw that increased output was a way in which to get still higher pay, shorter hours, and better living standards.

In general, our unions have taken a realistic view of the introduction of labor-saving machinery. They have resisted changes which brought them no benefit. But more often they have cooperated in the application of new discoveries in such a way as to benefit the consuming public, their employers, and themselves. Coal miners, for instance, welcomed the introduction of machinery and cooperated in boosting productivity. As a result, they are today the highest paid and most productive coal miners in the world. In the few but highly publicized cases in which the unions resisted the coming of machinery, they found themselves losing out and eventually adopted more farsighted policies.

Our unions have followed up their wage increases by active cooperation with employers in reducing expenses, eliminating waste and increasing output. Union economists have shown small employers how to operate more efficiently. The unions have even lent money to the employers to keep machinery going in slow times. Only a few weeks ago, one of our milk wagon drivers' unions in Baltimore won a wage increase of $200 a year for its 600 members. When it found that the employer was having a hard time to meet expenses, it went out and campaigned for new customers. The drivers shortly afterward presented their employer with 11,000 new accounts.

It is now generally recognized in the United States that the lowest-income groups represent the best hope of an expanding market for low-cost manufactured items. Consequently, it is generally agreed that these groups must get the largest proportionate increases if the essential market growth is to be maintained. After all, well-to-do people can't eat much more than they do already. They already buy the goods which are advertised for sale. But persons living on substandard incomes can both eat more and can use more once they have been provided with the necessary purchasing power.

It is significant that, in the years since 1935, while every group in America has gained in income, the lowest-income groups have gained the most. The lowest-paid three-fifths of the population of the United States have increased their incomes more than twice as much as the highest fifth. As a result, a larger proportion of our national income is now flowing to the lower-income groups, and a smaller proportion to the wealthy.

I want to emphasize, however, that these gains in the lower-paid groups were not obtained at the expense of the better paid. All have gained, although the lower-paid workers gained the most.

Not all of the benefits of increased production are measured in hours and cash wages, however. Collective bargaining has provided workers with many other benefits. Today 93 percent of collective agreements provide vacations with pay. Rapid progress has been made since the war in assuring greater security against illness and old age. Today at least half the agreements in manufacturing provide insurance, or health and welfare plans, or pensions.

The worker's gains from increased productivity are shown in the striking contrast between his budget today and that at the start of the twentieth century. Fifty years ago, the American worker spent 83 percent of his weekly wage on the bare essentials of food, clothing, shelter, fuel, and light. The tiny margin that was left was seldom enough to provide for all the other expenses such as sickness, accidents, carfares, furniture, etc.

Today he eats better, is better clothed, and lives in a warmer, more attractive, well lit dwelling on 60 percent of his wages. That leaves him 40 percent for other items. After paying taxes and providing for medical care, he has an average 25 percent of his earnings left for savings, insurance, telephone, automobile, furniture and household appliances, vacation trips, books, recreation, or education. No other worker in the world has ever had so much.

American labor is sincerely anxious to extend the benefits of its experience to its fellow workers throughout the world. It does not claim to have a monopoly on cooperative intelligence, but it does have a certain advantage in the matter of cooperative experience. It would like to see the workers of Europe, of Asia, of South America, and of Africa able to enjoy the same opportunities.

It believes that the key to the success of this venture lies in wholehearted acceptance by labor and management of the fact that they must work together in their own plants and work places to increase productivity, to reduce costs, and to lower prices.

The American workers hope that their experience may help to reduce suspicions and to point the way. They know that the principal obstacles to success are lethargy and resistance to new methods, especially when it is feared that the resulting benefits will not be fairly shared.

An example of what can be accomplished is contained in the statistics on the production of shoes. In 1949, the United States produced enough shoes to provide three pairs for every man, woman, and child in the country. Many other countries do not produce as much as one pair of shoes per person per year. And even that less-than-one-pair of shoes is priced as high as to seem almost a luxury.

A program to increase productivity in shoe plants and to reduce costs so that the shoes could be sold at prices within the workers' reach, would immediately benefit large numbers of people.

If employers would turn their attention immediately to producing for the wider market of working-class consumers within their own countries—if they would concentrate on getting the necessary modern machinery and new techniques, an upward spiral of progress could be started which would bring untold benefits, not only to the workers, but to the owners and managers of business, and to the entire consuming public as well.

We feel that the best place to begin is in the productivity centers now being established in Europe. These centers have the advantage of being set up on a tripartite basis—with labor, management, and government all represented. Here can be studied the possibilities and effects of new machinery and better production methods. Here, too, can be established on a basis of mutual good faith real collective bargaining procedures to ensure that there will be a fair division of the profits resulting from increased productivity and the creation of adequate protection against the lay-offs resulting from retooling or the introduction of labor-saving machinery or methods.

These centers will succeed if the trade unions and employers' federations adopt with enthusiasm and vigor a program to educate the workers and their families. There are millions who do not understand the problem or its urgency. There are hundreds of thousands who have been the victims of cynical propaganda programs designed to delude them. There are others who are honestly suspicious. The help of everyone—employers, trade unions, newspapers, governments—must be real and genuine if the people are to cooperate voluntarily and enthusiastically in the democratic way.

The International Labor Organization has a vital task to perform. Its agencies can do a great deal to help spread information. It can and should work closely with the productivity centers. It can compile and disseminate the best methods and organization and the best experience of all countries to get results, and it can report on the best distribution of benefits as they occur.

There is much that can be accomplished only on a high political level, but here, too, the workers and employers can lend their influence. The breaking down of tariff barriers between countries, the completion of currency reforms to make money international, the elimination of quota systems, the free movement of workers to available jobs—all these are vital and necessary steps.

I have described in some detail the way in which the American worker has obtained a high standard of living for himself and his family by his own efforts and with understanding of the problems of his industry and his employer. I have not done this for the purpose of boasting about his material gains. I have stressed these satisfactions of the United States worker because I want all to realize that these gains and satisfactions have been obtained within the framework of a great democracy—by democratic procedures and with democratic goals. The American worker has achieved a high degree of security without the sacrifice of his basic liberties.

Winchell Smears Again?—The Case of Karol Sidor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY CAVALCANTE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, I do herewith tender certain items that deal with the status of Karol Sidor and the accusations made against him by Walter Winchell. The items are as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO WALTER WINCHELL

Your vulgar and vicious attack on Karol Sidor, president of the Slovak National Council Abroad, in the New York Daily Mirror of July 7, 1950, and over ABC July 3 and again July 10, was wholly unwarranted. Mr. Winchell, I am sincere when I say, that I am convinced you are helping somebody make a fool of you.

Allow me to take your Daily Mirror article apart, paragraph by paragraph (relating to Sidor), and show you why I believe that you have been taken in.

Paragraph 1: (a) Sidor did not sneak across the border from Canada.

(b) Sidor is not a democracy hater, as you would have your readers believe.

(c) If the State Department had a good reason for blacklisting Karol Sidor in the past you certainly have failed to mention that good reason. The tripe you mention certainly can't be called a good reason.

Paragraph 2: (a) After Munich, you say Czechoslovakia was divided into three states. What three states, Mr. Winchell?

(b) Karol Sidor was national vice premier of what state? Why use national if you mean Czechoslovakia? Or don't you know?

(c) Joseph Tiso was Premier of Slovakia (one of the states). By whom was he appointed Premier, Mr. Winchell? Or don't you want your readers to know that Czech President of Czechoslovakia did?

(d) On March 12, 1939, Sidor became Premier of Slovakia. How simple. But the historical fact is that the Czech President of Czechoslovakia (Hacha) removed Tiso from and appointed Sidor to that office.

(e) On March 14, 1939, you say. "the Nazis walked in Czechoslovakia." But how could they if, as you say, "Czechoslovakia was divided into three states after Munich in 1938"?

(f) Tiso was elected by Slovak Parliament as Premier of the independent state of Slovakia and, so, headed the Slovak Government, pending the election of the President of the new Republic.

(g) Karol Sidor became Tiso's Minister of Interior on March 14, 1939, but why not add that Sidor was forced to resign that office 1 day later (March 15, 1939) by Nazi pressure? Or would that have spoiled your smear story of Sidor?

Paragraph 3: (a) What you call Tiso's record as a Nazi tool, is that actually Tiso's record, or only your version of it and possibly that of your shameless informer?

(b) Tiso forced his country into the Nazi economy and war apparatus, you claim? Informed and intelligent people know different, Mr. Winchell.

(c) Tiso was arrested after the war for his crimes and tried as a Nazi. What crimes, Mr. Winchell? The vast majority of Slovaks at home and abroad firmly believe that Tiso committed none of the crimes he was charged with. Do you honestly believe that Mindszenty and Stepinac were guilty of the crimes they were charged with? And who said that Tiso was tried as a Nazi? Benes and the supporters of his Red regime? Well, that explains just about everything?

(d) Tiso "was hanged by the Czechs before Russia seized their little democracy," you say. That sound more like Messrs. Zenkl, suicide Masaryk, Papánek, Ripka, Lettrich, Heidrich, Táborsky, and others of Beneš's political outfit—before the Reds in Prague kicked them out in 1948. Yes, note that date—April 1947—Mr. Winchell, because the same boys have been telling us for over a year that Russia and the Reds actually took over Czechoslovakia way back in 1945.

(e) "Karol Sidor and others like him now claim that Tiso was a victim of Communist persecution," you say. Not only now, Mr. Winchell, but ever since the war ended. The Slovaks here and abroad know it and believe it. And they need no such convenient excuse—as you term it—behind which "Nazis like to hide." The Reds talked like that since June 22, 1941; remember, Walter?

Paragraph 4. (a) According to you, Sidor's government "declared war on the United States (by Hitler's order)." Check with the United States State Departments and with the facts, Walter, and find out that you're wrong.

(b). "In his 6 years as an Ambassador for Slovakia," you say, "Sidor was an important cog in the machinery of Axis diplomacy." Now, that is really silly, Mr. Winchell, because the fact is that Sidor wasn't even considered as much as a grease cup in that machinery. If he really was important, Mr. Winchell, you, of all people, surely would have known it before July 1950.

Paragraph 5. (a) The Hlinka Party was not a minority political group as you say, but the largest political party in Slovakia. Even before Munich.

(b) Karol Sidor and Joseph Tiso did not transform the Hlinka Party into a totalitarian group, nor did they "suppress or annihilate all oposing parties." Your ignorance of what happened in Slovakia in those turbulent days is appalling.

(c) Sidor organized and was the first leader of the Hlinka Guard, but why not finish the story, Mr. Winchell? Sidor was the chief of the Hlinka Guard, an organization similar to our National Guard, from October 8, 1938, to March 14, 1939—that is while Czechoslovakia still existed as a state. He was not in charge of the HG after March 13, 1939.

(d) The Hlinka Guard in Slovakia, you say, duplicated the terrors and outrages committed by Hitler's storm troopers in Nazi Germany. This, Mr. Winchell, only further proves that you are not qualified to speak on the subject. Or haven't you read about the terrors and outrages committed by the Nazi SS troopers?

Paragraph 6. (a) Tiso was not "nabbed in Czechoslovakia." Our army was ordered to surrender him to Beneš's government in November 1945. Tiso and the whole Slovak Government had surrendered to our forces earlier in the year and asked for asylum. The United States broke American and democratic tradition when it surrendered Tiso and the Slovaks to Prague. For Tiso it meant death. Today our Government offers asylum to a Commie like Houdek (recently resigned as UN delegate from Czechoslovakia), because it fears Houdek would die if he were shipped to Gottwald.

(b) Sidor was tried by the Czech National Court? Kangaroo court, presided over by Reds and their collaborators, you mean.

(c) You stress the point that in October 1947, the "Commies had not yet seized Czechoslovakia, which was still a democracy under President Eduard Beneš." The Reds held the most important posts in Beneš' government, but you insist that Czechoslovakia was still a democracy. Even Beneš' bankrupt collaborator-politicians, who told us then what you are telling us now, admit that there was little if any real democracy in Czechoslovakia after Beneš walked into the country behind the Red army in 1945.

Paragraph 7: (a) Sidor does not have to pose as a good anti-Communist "conveniently forgetting his pro-Nazi record." The fact is that he and all patriotic Slovaks were outspoken anti-Communists long before you were, Walter. And what pro-Nazi record? Establish one first, Mr. Winchell, then talk about it. Of course, how could you know that the Nazis even planted a bomb outside Sidor's residence to get rid of him?

(c) Sidor has not "duped" the good citizens of Scranton, Pa. But you, Walter, certainly were duped by some of Beneš' trustees, the gang who did not fight the Reds at home, but collaborated with them until February 1948 and some of them even thereafter. Mr. Winchell, the good citizens of Scranton displayed more sense than you did. They know more facts about the Slovaks and their struggle for freedom than you and your friend Klein do. They acted in the American way, Walter, something that you should not loathe to imitate.

(d) About February 1939, Mr. Winchell, I do not know right now whether Sidor sent any delegation to Berlin to discuss anything with Gen. Hermann Goering, but if he did, tell us what was wrong with that. And tell us whether the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, etc., too, had any such discussions with the Germans at that time.

(e) And what's wrong with wanting to be a "permanent resident" of the United States of America? You and I seem to be enjoying it, Walter. And, I believe, Einstein, Kravchenko, and thousands of other refugees and DP's are, too. There is something in this country of ours, Walter, that is utterly lacking in countries over there. Don't minimize or try to destroy it. Our business is to sell

American democracy to the nations of the world, remember?

Paragraph 8: (a) Sidor asked for a visitor's visa and it was granted. I doubt that our State Department conditioned that visitor's visa on "one speech before a Slovak group in Cleveland." The Slovak League of America wanted him here, and the State Department graciously obliged. This is still America, Mr. Winchell, where they do not limit even fellows like you to one speech or article every 3 months. The action of the State Department has met with the hearty approval of the vast majority of Americans of Slovak descent (about 1,500,000 in the United States of America), as well as that of their enslaved brethren in Slovakia and those in emigration in the various countries of the world. But then, why be afraid of speeches, Walter? Sidor really can tell you how the Slovaks have consistently fought communism since 1949 and yet were sold out to the Red Moloch of Moscow by boss Beneš.

Paragraph 9: (a) The stuff you offer to prove the stupidity of the State Department in Sidor's case is just so much tripe. It certainly is proof enough of your stupidity and your utter ignorance of Slovak people, their problems and their traditions. The State Department, if it did have anything against granting a visa to Sidor in the past, certainly must have a good reason for changing its mind. And I firmly believe that the events that have transpired in Czechoslovakia since 1945 had something to do with it. We do not believe foreign politicians and former Red collaborators as readily as we did heretofore. Somebody certainly wants Sidor on a permanent blacklist, that much is evident. We have a good idea who that somebody is, and we may as well tell you, Walter, that we honestly believe it's the gang that's doping you up on Sidor and Tiso, the same anti-Slovak gang that suddenly turned anti-Communist in 1948.

Paragraph 10: (a) What made Sidor a desirable visitor in May 1950, you ask, if he was no good in the eyes of the State Department in September 1949? Check up on your if's, Walter. And if that really was so, then the stuff got into the State Department records in possibly the same way that it got into your Daily Mirror column on June 7, 1950. People opposed to Slovak freedom and independence—Czech chauvinists and imperialists and former Czech Red collaborators and political opponents of Tiso and Sidor—gladly furnish such stuff without charge. Nay, I believe they are even willing to pay to have it accepted and propagated.

(b) You talk about Sidor's rotten record. What rotten record? You still haven't proven that Sidor's record was rotten, Walter. Why not give credit to the American consul in Montreal and the State Department for not seeing the big rotten record that actually wasn't there?

Paragraph 11: (a) Sidor's case is not, as you state, just one more instance of blundering red tape. But you, Walter, certainly have blundered in Sidor's case.

(b) And it's certainly not an idiotic plan on the part of some State Department officials to give American shelter to the killers of American soldiers. A nasty dig, Walter, but you have a chance to convince yourself that Sidor and Tiso killed no American soldiers, but the Czech armament and ammunition plants—which Beneš somehow forgot to destroy before or after he resigned as President—certainly helped Hitler then to do some killing and are helping Stalin's boys to do a bit of killing in Korea right now.

(c) Quite a dramatic ending, Walter. First you make a mess of reporting on Sidor and Tiso, and then ask Secretary of State Acheson to explain it to Gold Star Mothers and crippled GI's in vets' hospitals, because, as you admitted, you could not. Mr. Winchell, you may as well know it that there are quite a few American Gold Star Mothers of Slovak descent who have been insulted by your vicious and vulgar smear of Tiso and Sidor. I know what I am talking about, because I belong to one Slovak outfit that had just about every fourth member in the service of Uncle Sam. And that organization, as well as most other Slovak organizations in America, is behind the Slovak League of America, which in turn is giving moral and material aid to the Slovak National Council Abroad, an organization of Slovak DP's or refugees headed by Sidor.

In conclusion, Mr. Winchell, need I remind you that it is hardly the mission of the American press and radio to poison the minds of the American people with falsehoods, half-truths, and misstatements. In my humble opinion, in Sidor's case you have abused the freedom of the press and radio. You have smeared a man about whom you know practically nothing. Mr. Karol Sidor, former Ambassador and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Slovak Republic to the Vatican (1939–45), is willing to meet you at any time to prove to you that you were wrong about him. He is in America, Walter, and you know it. You've told your version of the Sidor case to the American public, now let Sidor tell you and the American public his side of the story. It's the American way of doing things.

Mr. Winchell, you have spoken and written some nasty things about Mr. Sidor and Father Tiso, two men that shall go down in Slovak history as outstanding champions in the fight for Slovak freedom and independence. The Slovak League of America and the Slovak organizations affiliated with it are American institutions. Prove your charges against Sidor, Mr. Winchell, and they shall be grateful to you for it. They certainly do not want to back anything or anybody that smacks of nazism, fascism, or communism. In the meantime, Walter, don't hold it against Slovak patriots if they keep on fighting for their natural and God-given rights—freedom and independence. I, for one, cannot see how any real American can wish any people less freedom than he himself enjoys.

Yours for democracy,

PHILIP A. HROBAK,
Editor of the Jednota, President of the Slovak League of America.
MIDDLETOWN, PA.

WHAT IS THE TRUTH ABOUT SIDOR?

[The Catholic Light, official newspaper of the Diocese of Scranton, on July 13, 1950, published the following letter from Rev. Nicholas Sprinc, answering Walter Winchell's vicious and malicious charges that Karol Sidor, former Ambassador and Minister Plenipotentiary of Slovakia to the Vatican (1939–45) was a pro-Nazi.—Editor.]

DEAR SIR: While visiting here in Scranton, I had a chance to follow the controversy that has arisen in the newspapers over Mr. Karol Sidor and his wartime record. I was born and brought up in Slovakia and left my country in 1945, 3 months after the Russian Armies took it over. In October 1945 I was named the Slovak Delegate in the third Vatican mission for DP's, which was attached to the American Headquarters in Frankfurt, Germany. The purpose of this third Vatican mission was to bring spiritual and material help to millions of homeless people in Germany and Austria from the Holy Father. From February 1946 to June 1946 I worked in Vatican Central Bureau for DP's in Rome.

I was an eyewitness of the events which occured in Slovakia before the war and during the war. Reading the charges and accusations brought against Mr. Sidor as a pro-Nazi politician, I think, would make every child in Slovakia laugh as it would every honest person in Europe. Because it was and it is still an estabiished fact that Mr. Karol Sidor was the only man who dared to say to Adolf Hitler and to his emissaries in those revolutionary days of March 1939 that he would not take any orders whatsoever from Hitler; that it was up to the Slovak Parliament, elected in the democratic elections during the Czechoslovak Republic to declare Slovakia's independence, and certainly not up to Hitler.

A lot of articles have been written about Mr. Sidor's anti-Nazi attitude, and I think, that for the sake of justice it is proper to bring up at least some of them in order to show to the truth-loving reader the inside story of Mr. Sidor's case.

Here are some of the proofs of Mr. Sidor's anti-Nazi attitude:

1. During the Nuremberg trials the following letter written by Adolf Hitler on March 13, 1939, to Herman Goering was produced:

"I decided late last night to send Keppler as the representative of our Government to Bratislava to find out if the request, supposedly also signed by Sidor, to accord Germany's protection to an independent Slovakia, furnished a suitable pretext for Keppler's going. He was to ask in my behalf, whether Sidor really signed the document mentioned. Keppler saw Sidor at about 4 o'clock in the morning. It became clear that Sidor felt bound by his allegiance to the Government in Prague and that he does not consider, at least at the moment, any possibility of a separation."

2. The Times (London, March 14, 1939) wrote about this visit as follows:

"Saturday night Mr. Keppler, German acting secretary, who from time to time had confidential missions from Adolf Hitler, came to pay a visit to Bratislava. It is known that Mr. Keppler expressed the German intention to set up an independent Slovakia. He mentioned that Sidor should be the president of this new state and Durcansky his prime minister.

"Mr. Sidor reflected about this proposal, but afterward he refused it and became Prime Minister of the Slovak autonomous government.

3. Sidor was attacked by the German press for this anti-German attitude (Le Temps, Paris, March 14, 1939):

"The German party in Slovakia (a branch of Konrad Henlein's party) continues its propaganda against Karol Sidor's government. The President of Slovak Government, Sidor, ordered the Slovak Army to occupy all strategic points of Bratislava. The official German agency DNB points out the fact that the leader of German minority in Slovakia, Karmasin, is not in Sidor's cabinet, with the intention to show, that Sidor would like to destroy the cultural autonomy, which Prague guaranteed to Germans in Slovakia."

4. Koelnishe Volkzeitung (Essen, March 14, 1939) wrote:

"Sidor's government took a very unfriendly position toward the German national group. One of the first acts of this government was to confiscate the newspaper of the German national group in Slovakia, the daily Grenzbote."

5. Mr. Juraj Slavik, Ambassador of Czechoslovakia to Washington, made a speech in New York in May 1939, where, according to the Czech-American newspaper American (May 11, 1939), he said:

"On the night of March 12, 1939, Seyss-Inquart came to Bratislava and called on Sidor, and insisted that Sidor declare Slovakia's independence. Sidor refused very firmly, he said to Seyss-Inquart:

" 'Imprison me, kill me, declare yourself, do what you like. But I will never do it. You have to search for someone else.' "

"So spoke Sidor, not from a safe place abroad, but on the place of war and in face of those three Germans: Keppler, Seyss-Inquart and Burckel."

6. The Doyen of the diplomatic corps in the Vatican, the Polish Ambassador to the Holy See, Kazimir Papée wrote in his letter of September 17, 1947:

"I know Minister Sidor since 1937; he has always been a declared enemy of Hitlerism.

We often exchanged ideas about the main political problems of common interest to us, i. e., the establishment of a closer organization between the peoples of central and eastern Europe enabling them to resist successfully the brown as well as red totalitarism.

"During the whole Second World War the most evident sympathies of Minister Sidor were on the side of the democratic power, and of it he gave me unmistakable proofs. I would like to mention here as a striking example of his ways of acting that he undertook at my request in March 1940 the delicate and dangerous task of smuggling into Poland a considerable sum of money for the Polish underground movement, which was being organized at that time.

"That was why I arranged meetings in 1943 between him and Mr. Harold Tittman, who, at the time, was Chargé d'Affaires of the United States to the Holy See whom I previously informed of Minister Sidor's views and opinions."

7. Guido Gonella, minister of education of today's Italy, a bitter enemy of fascism, wrote in his letter of September 15, 1947:

"I declare spontaneously that I have known Karol Sidor since 1939, when he came to Rome as minister and envoy of Slovakia to the Holy See."

"My sympathies were at once on Sidor's side because of his strictly inimical ideas against the Nazi regime, under pressure of which he had to leave his country. I understood right away that he was the victim of Nazi influence in Danubian Europe and that he has been sent to Rome to the effect to keep him away from the people."

"There are indeed convincing facts of his resistance to the Nazi attempt to occupy Slovakia from within, an attempt, which has been made impossible by Sidor, who had to pay for his opposition by his exile to Rome."

"During the era of clandestine resistance, Sidor had meetings with the President De Gasperi and with Minister Gronchi."

8. Mr. Sidor produced a letter from the IRO in Geneva which clearly stated that Mr. Sidor was not on any war criminal list whatsoever. This was also further substantiated by the fact that the State Department did give Mr. Sidor a visa to enter this country.

9. It is an undisputable fact that Mr. Sidor left Slovakia on June 15, 1939, and took no active part whatsoever in the interior policy of Slovakia, issuing no orders from the Vatican to anybody in Slovakia. And finally is there anybody who believes that His Holiness would give refuge within the walls of Vatican City from 1945 to 1950 to a person, whose record would be so vulnerable as the accusers of Mr. Sidor's think it is?

Sincerely yours,

REV. NICHOLAS SPRINC.

SIDOR ANSWERS WINCHELL

On Sunday, July 9, 1950, Winchell again attacked Karol Sidor over ABC. Among other things he said:

"I have a document from Congressman KLEIN that Sidor, as the chief commander of the Hlinka Guard ordered the guards to kill every American flyer who would be forced down on Slovak territory."

Karol Sidor answered the charge as follows:

"I proclaim that such a charge is a lie. I was the chief commander of the Hlinka Guard during the existence of the Czechoslovak Republic, according to the laws of which the Hlinka Guard was established. So it was an organization that was founded according to the society law of the Czechoslovak Republic. I was its chief commander from October 8, 1938, to March 14, 1939, namely, during the Czechoslovak Republic.

"America entered the war in 1941, and the Soviet Union allowed the United States Air Corps to help the Slovak rebels in 1944. At that time I was at the Vatican, where I had been since June 15, 1939, and from where I never issued such orders as were mentioned by Mr. Winchell, because I had no authority to do so, nor did I have the power to send such orders to Slovakia, because the Hlinka Guard was under a different commander since March 14, 1939.

"I had nothing to do with Slovak internal affairs from 1939 and I only did what pertained to the international section between the Slovak Republic and the Holy See.

"Once again I proclaim Winchell's claims as a common fabrication and a lie." (Phoned to P. A. Hrobak, July 10, 1950.)

SLOVAKS SCORE WINCHELL FOR SIDOR ATTACK

"All of us American Slovaks, who have so cordially received the president of the Slovak National Council Abroad, Karol Sidor, must demand that he be protected against irresponsible attacks on his honor and good name. And we must do that specifically for the reason that Karol Sidor was neither a Fascist, nor a Nazi, nor a Communist."—Rev. Joseph Kusnier, president of the Federation of Slovak Catholics of America, Donora, Pa.

"Walter Winchell's vicious, vulgar, and unwarranted attack on Karol Sidor in his column of July 7, 1950, and his broadcast over ABC, Sunday, July 2, and Sunday, July 9, is highly resented by Americans of Slovak descent. Poisoning the minds of the American public with falsehoods, half truths, and misstatements can hardly be the mission of the American radio and press. Sidor is willing to meet Winchell at any time and prove that he was wrong about him."—P. A. Hrobak, editor of the Jednota and president of the Slovak League of America.

"We, Americans of Slovak descent, assembled 30,000 strong on this 12th day of July 1950, on the occasion of the twenty-seventh annual Slovak Day of western Pennsylvania, proclaim that we stand behind the person of Karol Sidor and the program he represents. We shall support him because he stands for all democratic ideals and is fighting for a free and democratic Slovakia. At the same time we proclaim that the charges made against Karol Sidor by Walter Winchell are false and altogether unbecoming to an American columnist. We, therefore, request our American Federal authorities to investigate the sources of Winchell's insulting and vulgar speeches and articles against Karol Sidor. We specifically request the Federal Communications Commission to investigate Winchell's vulgar and vicious attack on Sidor July 2 and July 9 over ABC." The committee: Rt. Rev. Abbot Stanilaus Gmuca, O. S. B., honorary chaplain; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Clement Hrtanek, honorary chaplain; Rev. John Vlha, president; Michael Wargovich, vice president; Frank Gurchak, vice president; Mrs. Elizabeth Zboray, vice president; Mrs. Margaret Kuzma, secretary; Andrew Haydu, treasurer; Rev. John Sabol, chairman; Mrs. Ella Vlasaty, assistant secretary; Mrs. Ethel Virostek, assistant secretary; Mrs. Anna Gresh, assistant secretary.

This was sent by wire to the Scranton Tribune and phoned to United Press, Harrisburg, July 13, 1950:

"Winchell's vicious, vulgar, and malicious attack on Karol Sidor, former Ambassador and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Slovak Republic to the Vatican (1939–1945), is highly resented by Americans of Slovak descent. Winchell claims his column published on Sidor was documented. Why does he not produce the documents? He refers us to Congressman ARTHUR G. KLEIN, Democrat, New York, who in turn refers us to the accusations made by one Andrew J. Valushek of the New Yorkský Dennik (New York daily), an anti-Slovak paper published in the Slovak language by Czechs. Is that what Winchell refers to as documented evidence? Fine company he is in, indeed. During the war Dezider Benau, the Communist who at present is smearing America in Slovakia, was editor in chief of the New Yorkský Dennik and Valushek worked on the same paper.

"We intend to get to the bottom of this thing and expose all responsible for this un-American, irresponsible attack on Karol Sidor, the President of the Slovak National Council Abroad, an organization of Slovak emigrants fighting for the liberation of their people from communism and the freedom and independence of their homeland.

"The Slovak League of America, an American institution which today represents the overwhelming majority of organized Slovaks in the United States of America, will be grateful to Winchell if he can prove his charges against Sidor. We certainly do not want to back anything or anybody that smacks of nazism, fascism, or communism. We dare Winchell to prove his claims against Karol Sidor.

"Winchell's column published on Sidor and Congressman KLEIN's statements prove their appalling ignorance of the Slovak people and their problems. They have been duped by Valushek and his bosses, the Benes democrats who claim that all nations—except the Slovak nation—are entitled to freedom and independence.

"P. A. HROBAK,
"President Slovak League of America, and Editor of Jednota."

The Ludové Noviny (People's News), a pro-Communist paper (weekly) published in Pittsburgh, Pa., carried an article by Dezider Benau, July 13, 1950.

Under Benau's name we find: the former editor in chief of the New Yorkský Dennik.

Location of Military and Industrial Plants in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I received this morning from Mr. Dan Whetstone, newspaper publisher and leading citizen of Cut Bank, Mont., a letter suggesting the possibility of locating military and private industrial plants, for strategic reasons, in areas such as his own in northern Montana.

As Mr. Whetstone states, there has been increasing consideration in recent weeks of the wisdom of decentralizing our industrial plants to provide greater safety in the event of hostilities.

I include as a part of my remarks Mr. Whetstone's summary of the special advantages offered in Glacier County, Mont., for new industrial plants, and I might add that these advantages are sufficient to merit serious consideration regardless of whether or not defense strategy is being taken into account.

Further, I would like to say that other sections of our States also offer fine opportunities for industrial development with easy access to raw materials, ample and inexpensive power, capable and hard-working men and women to man the plants, and good transportation service both East and West. In the matter of climate, recreational advantages, and similar considerations Montana excels

most other States. A glance at the map will show that we are superbly situated with regard to defense strategy.

Mr. Whetstone's summary of the advantages offered by Glacier County, Mont., is as follows:

GLACIER COUNTY, MONT.

Largest oilfield in the mountain West, with two large refineries.

Abundant electric power from Glacier County REA, via Montana Power Co., with tie-in to Fort Peck and possible future connection with Hungry Horse.

Largest natural-gas area in the mountain West for power and inexpensive fuel.

Main line Great Northern transcontinental railway.

On Western Airlines, Los Angeles-Edmonton route, with two flights daily each way, using 42-passenger Convair planes. Federally financed airport is one of best in the Northwest. Port of entry to Canada.

Adequate labor supply, good workmen available.

Large acreages of open lands, inexpensive, suitable for large installations or decentralized plants.

Sharp, deep river banks (river never floods) could be used for underground installations. Ample water supply from lakes and rivers.

CUT BANK, COUNTY SEAT

New $350,000 hospital for medical care.

Ample school facilities, new $300,000 building.

Several church organizations, modern buildings.

City spending about one-half million dollars for new dam on Cut Bank River, purification plant nearing completion.

Recently expanded storm-sewer system.

Competent construction labor, housing could be made available quickly.

Cut Bank has swimming pool, golf course, many recreational facilities.

Sunshiny summer, crisp winters minus foggy weather. Definite statistics on weather may be had at local airport, compiled for several years.

Harvey Denounces the Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, the Brannan plan is being urged upon the American people as an experiment to sustain a prosperous agriculture. Advocates claim it will operate to the benefit of us all—farmer, consumer, and taxpayer.

As a farmer I have studied the Brannan plan. Like others who believe a healthy agriculture is essential to over-all prosperity, I am convinced the Brannan plan is a dangerous and unsound proposal. Among its chief faults are these:

First. The intent of guaranteeing the farmer a high cash income, while lowering the price of his products in the market place, is so illogical that it could succeed only by increasing general taxes by billions of dollars annually. Furthermore, as every housewife knows, the consumer's cost of food and clothing is due as much to transportation and processing of raw materials as it is to the farmer's share of the ultimate selling price.

Second. The individual farmer, aside from being subjected to strict production control, would find himself dependent on the Federal Treasury for a substantial part of his annual income. He thus would surrender economic freedom to an extent never suggested for any other member of our free enterprise society.

Third. Beyond doubt, operation of a scheme as far-reaching as the Brannan plan would create a new bureaucracy, adding thousands to the public payrolls as police-state employees. They would inspect farms, enforce directives from the Secretary of Agriculture, and saddle every farmer with a year-round burden of detailed bookkeeping.

The Brannan plan would be another step toward socialism.

Behind the War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Korean situation has resulted in widespread discussion of the war of aggression that is being waged against the Republic of South Korea in an effort to stamp out its concept of western-style democracy.

The following magazine article by Dr. Robert T. Oliver appeared in the July 15, 1950, issue of the New Leader magazine and is an authoritative discussion of the reasons for the Kremlin-inspired attack on the Republic of South Korea.

Mr. Oliver is a resident of State College, Pa., in my congressional district, and is a columnist for a group of Korean newspapers. He is recognized as an expert on life in Korea and is well qualified to discuss events that are responsible for the war now being waged against the Republic of South Korea.

Mr. Oliver's article is as follows:

BEHIND THE WAR IN KOREA

(By Robert T. Oliver)

Democracy worked in South Korea. That is one little-noted reason why Stalin ordered his puppet armies on June 25 to crush the tiny Republic which represented an oasis of freedom in the monolithic immensity of his Asiatic empire.

The experiment of trying to establish a western-style democracy in South Korea was launched under difficulties so great that a miracle seemed necessary for even partial success. With most of the country's basic productive wealth in the Soviet zone, and over 4,000,000 refugees and repatriates to be cared for, the tiny Republic faced crushing economic problems. Yet a combination of Korean determination, American advice, and slightly over $100,000,000 annually in ECA funds had pumped new life into its economy. In the fiscal year ending June 30, over-all factory and mine production increased 92 percent. Formerly a food-deficit area, South Korea exported 100,000 tons of rice. The excess of imports over exports was cut from a $47,319,000 quarterly average in 1947 to $23,037,000 for the last quarter of 1949. The sensitive barometer of currency circulation reflected these gains, falling from a high of 75,000,000,000 won in February 1950 to a low of 57,000,000,000 in May.

Outstripping the economic gains, illiteracy was cut from about 70 percent of the adult population to about 30 percent. Women were granted full legal equality with men. Political issues were freely and fully debated, and an average of more than 85 percent of the eligible voters went to the polls in the two general elections of 1948 and 1950. The Associated Press listed the Republic of Korea as among the half-dozen nations allowing the fullest freedom in gathering and reporting the news. A crowning achievement was the National Assembly's adoption of a plan for selling all tenant-occupied farmland to its occupants for one-fifth of the annual yield over a period of 5 years.

ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman aptly termed the Republic of Korea "a bastion of democracy in Asia." Naturally, the Kremlin found this impressive example of political and economic democracy an intolerable threat to its design for subverting Asia's confused and uneasy millions. Hence, the unprovoked attack from the north on June 25.

Another reason for the invasion was that, both militarily and diplomatically, South Korea looked like an easy prize. Compared to heavily armed North Korea, the South was pitifully weak. And its only possible protector, the United States, seemed quite obviously to have decided against defense. America's defense line in Asia was repeatedly described as running through the main islands of Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines. Secretary Acheson, in requesting economic aid for Korea, explicitly told the Senate and House committees that the United States had no "obligation" to the Republic of Korea. To the Kremlin, South Korea must have seemed the ideal spot to test the feasibility of employing outright force to further its expansionist aims. This temptation was undoubtedly strengthened by the May 1950 election, which clearly indicated that the people of South Korea, whatever else they wanted, certainly did not want communism.

The overwhelming military strength exhibited so far by North Korea has derived in part from the huge quantities of modern war equipment—tanks, artillery, and planes—supplied by the Soviet Union. Another factor is the battle-hardening received by an estimated 100,000 North Korean troops in the Chinese civil war. Finally, there is the fighting spirit of the Northern troops.

How, one may well ask, did the North Koreans develop the spirit to fight and die for communism? The answer lies partly in the fact that some 300,000 Koreans had taken refuge in Siberia during the 1905-45 period of Japanese rule, while 2,000,000 others fled to Manchuria and North China. These expatriates naturally allied themselves with the Russians who represented Japan's chief enemy throughout this period. Many became thoroughly indoctrinated with communism. During the Soviet occupation of North Korea, these Communist Koreans were brought back and made the basis of the Communist puppet regime. Meanwhile, some 2,000,000 northerners, constituting the backbone of anti-Communist resistance in the north fled south across the thirty-eighth parallel. Those who remained were subjected to 5 years of intense propaganda, with the strictest iron curtain in the world to keep them from obtaining any news or opinions but those supplied by their Soviet overlords. The results have been abundantly demonstrated in the fierceness of the northern attack.

The defeat and disorganization of the southern army has been thoughtlessly attributed by some commentators to bad morale. Actually, it was bad armaments. There were many cases of southern soldiers who strapped dynamite to their bodies and hurled themselves against northern tanks, of army groups which fought on till their last cartridge was spent, or of isolated pockets of troops which refused to quit although surrounded far behind the enemy lines. They simply lacked the weapons of war. In a startling piece of testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee after the fall of Seoul, it was revealed by Pentagon spokesmen that, of $10,230,000 voted by Congress last July for military aid to the Republic of Korea, only $200 worth of supplies was actually sent. The bazooka and light artillery shells which represented the southerners' best antitank defense simply bounced off Communist tanks like ping-pong balls.

This record of frustration and defeat which characterized so much of the administration's handling of the Korean question was dramatically reversed once the Communists flung the challenge in our face. The United States appealed immediately to the Security Council, which acted with unprecedented speed. President Truman and his advisers correctly interpreted the attack as directed against not only Korea, but the entire free world, and they reacted with courage and resolution.

The present grim trial of strength in Korea might have been avoided, had not naive faith in Russia's good intentions kept the administration from recognizing Syngman Rhee's provisional government of Korea before the U. S. S. R. entered the Pacific war and staked out her own claim. The establishment of a democratic government based on free elections in South Korea, with an adequately trained and equipped army for self-defense, was unconscionably delayed.

Now that the battle has been joined, we must not only throw back the Communist advance but sweep all the way to Korea's northernmost border. If we merely chase the aggressors back behind the thirty-eighth parallel, Russia will conclude that she has nothing to lose by any other military adventure she may choose to launch. Only by moving determinedly to root out the source of contagion in North Korea itself will we show the politburo that any resort to force must inevitably run up against a solid front of democratic power.

Let Us Safeguard the American Tradition of the Right of Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the attached editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle, of Friday, July 14, 1950, epitomizes the reasons which prompted me to vote against H. R. 7439, after the defeat of the amendment which would have provided a right of appeal to persons discharged from Government employment as bad security risks. The editorial follows:

STATUS OF SECURITY RISKS

It seems necessary and reasonable to give certain Government department heads discretion to fire civilian employees they consider bad security risks, as provided in a bill passed by the House.

It seems unnecessary and unreasonable, however, that this power be absolute and beyond appeal. The right of appeal is traditional and, as Representative KATHARINE ST. GEORGE said, should not be tossed aside in this particular application.

By terms of the bill, the heads of certain named agencies and departments that are closely connected with national security, plus any other agencies the President may designate, are given discretion to determine what a bad security risk is. That itself is an extremely broad power. Any civilian whom the agency chief deems a bad risk he may fire. Any review of the matter would be made by the agency head himself or by someone designated by him.

It is contended by the House Civil Service Committee that this sweeping grant of authority is needed so that agency heads may get rid of undesirable employee risks without too much red tape. We do not deny that speed is important in dealing with a suspected employee; Congress, in fact, has previously provided, in annual appropriation bills, for the summary firing of security risks by their chiefs.

Is it impossible to have justice as well as security? We see no reason why this bill could not be safely written so as to provide for the removal of a security-risk employee from the job his chief is reluctant to see him continue to perform, while at the same time allowing him to have a hearing by the Civil Service Commission or some other board of review in order to ascertain the merits of the agency chief's reasons for dismissal. This protection is of crucial, lifelong importance to the employee who is wrongfully suspected of being a bad security risk. Without a way of appeal from an unjust discharge, he would have no possibility of clearing his name. It is not so much his job that we are concerned to see protected, it is the man's reputation and the American tradition of the right of appeal from arbitrary action that need protecting.

The bill got an overwhelming vote, 327 to 14, in the House. That was to be expected, for its major purpose is sound and vital. But it is noticeable that many who finally voted for the bill also voted for an amendment to provide for the right of appeal to the Civil Service Commission. This amendment lost, 193 to 144. The principle behind it, and the American tradition on which it rests, should have the careful consideration of the Senate.

The Senate might particularly consider this possibility: Let the agency head be free to fire arbitrarily, so as to clear his civilian ranks of persons he may personally distrust. But let there be machinery for appeal, and even though it be found on appeal that the reasons for discharge were inadequate, do not require that the employee be restored to his job. In other words, safeguard his name—and the American tradition of the right of appeal—but do not reinvest him with rights to a job in which his boss thinks he ought not to be.

Postman Always Rings Twice in Oak Cliff, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the New York Times of July 19, 1950:

POSTMAN ALWAYS RINGS TWICE IN OAK CLIFF, TEX.

DALLAS, TEX., July 18.—The postman must call twice in Oak Cliff, a suburb within Dallas, a Federal circuit judge ruled today.

An Oak Cliff insurance man, Judge B. Fite, had complained his business had suffered when the single mail delivery was started in Oak Cliff, while Dallas' main business section got three deliveries.

Attorneys for the Postmaster General were expected to appeal the decision of Federal Judge William H. Atwell, first to the circuit court of appeals at New Orleans and then to the United States Supreme Court, if necessary.

Judge Atwell, in making permanent an injunction against H. Howard Payne, Dallas postmaster, to prevent the cut in mail delivery to Oak Cliff, said:

"The postmaster has discriminated against the business section of Oak Cliff, which is, in truth and in fact, a city in its own right."

Prediction of Commodore M. C. Perry in 1856 Regarding Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, during the course of my discussion yesterday on the bill S. 3809, known as the Extension of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, I quoted the historian, Alexis de Tocqueville, of France, and Lord Palmerston, former Prime Minister of England, and I referred also to statements made by Commodore M. C. Perry, United States Navy, in 1856 regarding Russia.

The diplomatic history of the United States has many great chapters, some of them formed by the actions of our naval officers when on cruises to distant foreign lands.

Among these, none is more brilliant than the opening of Japan in the middle of the nineteenth century by a naval expedition commanded by Commodore Matthew Calbraith Perry. This eminent naval officer, like many others before and since, by personally viewing a historic movement and evaluating its significance, was able to foresee events with remarkable precision and to state his conclusions in words of power.

During his famous Asiatic cruise Commodore Perry not only visited the Japanese Empire and other islands of that region but also the mainland of eastern Asia. He was thus able to interpret realistically the movements he discerned.

In order to make the statement of Commodore Perry more immediately available to the Members of Congress I am herewith quoting from a paper written by him and read by him before the American Geographical and Statistical Society at a meeting held March 6, 1856, in New York City, and published by D. Appleton & Co., 1856, page 28:

It requires no sage to predict events as strongly foreshadowed to us all; still westward will the course of empire take its way. But the last act in the drama is yet to be unfolded, and notwithstanding the reasoning

of political empires—westward, northward, and southward—to me it seems that the people of America will, in some form or other, extend their dominion and their power until they shall have brought within their mighty embrace multitudes of the islands of the great Pacific, and placed the Saxon race upon the eastern shores of Asia; and I think, too, that eastward and southward will her great rival of future aggrandizement (Russia) stretch forth her power to the coast of China and Siam, and thus the Saxon and the Cossack will meet once more, in strife or in friendship, on another field. Will it be in friendship? I fear not. The antagonistic exponents of freedom and absolutism must thus meet at last, and then will be fought that mighty battle on which the world will look with breathless interest, for on its issue will depend the freedom or the slavery of the world—despotism or rational liberty must be the fate of civilized man. I think I see in the distance the giants that are growing up for that fierce and final encounter; in the progress of events that battle must sooner or later inevitably be fought.

House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities Plans Public Hearings on Ewing Trip to Europe, Brannan Speech in St. Paul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, at an executive session this morning of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, of which I am chairman, the committee agreed unanimously to a recommendation of mine to conduct open public hearings shortly on matters involving the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles F. Brannan, and the Federal Security Administrator, Mr. Oscar W. Ewing.

These will be based on two much publicized incidents in which the two officials were criticized for alleged improper or illegal use of Federal funds for lobbying purposes. Mr. Ewing, as we all know, made a trip to Europe in December of 1949 for the purpose, as I understand it, of investigating various health and social-security programs in operation in European countries, matters which in the United States are under the jurisdiction of his agency.

Subsequent to his trip there were many charges made that Mr. Ewing had engaged in a form of lobbying activity in making that trip and that therefore any Federal funds which were spent for his trip would be illegal expenditures under section 1913, 18 United States Code, a criminal statute.

We had some discussion of this matter in executive sessions of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities early this year, and then when our hearings into the housing lobby began on April 19 the matter was raised again quite vigorously by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], a member of our committee.

At that same morning's session on April 19, when we were starting our first hearings on the real-estate lobby—the first lobby to be taken up for extensive public review by this committee—the incident of Mr. Brannan's speech to county and community committeemen of the Production and Marketing Administration in Minnesota was also vigorously called to our attention as a possible violation of the same section of the criminal code. It was done by Mr. HALLECK, of Indiana, in these words:

I read that it is charged that members of county committees were called in there to provide the audience, a per diem was paid to them, and traveling expenses, and Mr. Brannan went out there and made a speech, plugging the Brannan plan.

I think that the committee ought to find out who paid Mr. Brannan's way out there, whether it came out of Federal funds appropriated for carrying on the activities of the Department of Agriculture, and as to the per diem and mileage costs of the people who attended. I don't know from whence would come those funds, but certainly I would say ultimately probably out of the Federal Treasury, although about that I wouldn't know; but I think it is something that the committee ought to look into.

As you have very well said, again, Mr. Chairman, we are charged with investigating not only the activities of private individuals and organizations as they attempt to influence legislation but we are specifically charged with undertaking to determine what is likewise being done by Government agencies, and in view of this very recent affair it does seem to me that it would be properly a matter for the committee, or the committee staff, to look into.

I take it it wouldn't require a lot of effort or a lot of expense, nor a lot of time to find out who paid Mr. Brannan's way out there, and what was done out there, if anything, except to try to promote the adoption of the Brannan plan, and who paid for it, from whence came the money that paid the travel and the per diem expenses of the members of the country committees who were in attendance at that meeting.

Our resolution, House Resolution 298, Mr. Speaker, calls upon us not only to investigate "all lobbying activities intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation," but also—at the recommendation of Mr. BROWN when the matter was before the Rules Committee last year—to investigate "all activities of agencies of the Federal Government intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation."

Therefore, on the same day that Mr. BROWN and Mr. HALLECK stated in public hearings that we should look into the Ewing matter and the Brannan matter, I addressed the following letter to the Comptroller General of the United States, the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON
LOBBYING ACTIVITIES,
April 19, 1950.

Hon. LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States, General Accounting Office, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WARREN: On Thursday, March 30, the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, as you know, conducted hearings in the subject, The Role of Government Agencies in Influencing Legislation. It had been our hope that you could appear before us and testify on the activities of the General Accounting Office, as an arm of Congress, in investigating and reporting to Congress all instances of illegal expenditure of Federal funds for lobbying purposes. Although we were deeply disappointed that illness made it impossible for you to be present that day, we considered it fortunate that your assistant, Mr. Frank H. Weitzel, could appear on short notice and discuss the subject with us in the excellent manner which he did.

Mr. Weitzel made the point that it is quite difficult frequently to draw a line between legitimate informational activities of the Government officials and improper or illegal expenditures under the law. I recall he said that in the case of trips and speeches by Cabinet officers particularly, it is awfully difficult to show a violation of law because of the nature of their official duties and responsibilities. His words, and I quote from the official transcript, were that "it is extremely difficult, or even impossible, frankly, to segregate the official from what you might call the political."

I mention this because in our hearings the question has been raised time and time again about the propriety of certain alleged lobbying activities of administration officials. In particular, the issues of Mr. Oscar Ewing's recent trip to Europe, and of Mr. Charles Brannan's recent speech in St. Paul, Minn., have been cited. Both of these issues were raised at our hearing this morning.

Before leaving the witness stand on March 30, Mr. Weitzel emphasized that the General Accounting Office is willing and anxious to assist Congress in the investigation of improper expenditures, including any for lobbying purposes. He declared:

"Should any specific instances of this sort be referred to it by this committee (the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities) or from any other sources, the Office (General Accounting Office) will be glad to assist in every way possible in determining whether Federal funds have been improperly expended and to recover such expenditures to the extent possible under existing law."

In view of this offer, and in view of the frequent references which have been made before this committee about Mr. Oscar Ewing's recent trip to Europe, and the references this morning to Secretary Brannan's speech in St. Paul, at which it was alleged Government funds were used to buy him an audience, I would appreciate very much a report to me as chairman of this committee of the circumstances surrounding both of these incidents based on investigation by the General Accounting Office.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK BUCHANAN,
Chairman.

That letter is, I believe, self-explanatory.

After an acknowledgment from the Comptroller General, I received the following letter from him on June 20:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1950.

Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN,
Chairman, House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your letter of April 19, 1950, there is forwarded herewith a copy of report of investigation by the General Accounting Office of the meeting of the Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture at St. Paul, Minn., on April 3 and 4, 1950, at which meeting Secretary Brannan delivered an address.

This report sets out specific figures, when available, and estimates otherwise, as to the

cost of the county and community committeemen attending this meeting.

Also, there is enclosed a copy of Secretary Brannan's address as made available by him, which it is understood, was made from a tape recording of the talk as broadcast by a St. Paul, Minn., radio station. At the request of this office, Secretary Brannan furnished certain information about the meeting by letter dated June 1, 1950, a copy of which is enclosed.

The last paragraph of your letter of April 19, concerns the propriety of allowance of the expenses of the community and county committeemen attending the meeting. In such connection, the Secretary of Agriculture, by section 388 of the act of February 16, 1938 (52 Stat. 68, 7 U. S. C. 1388), is directed to utilize State, county, and local committees as established by 16 U. S. C. 590h (b), and the programs of the Production and Marketing Administration are largely administered through such committeemen. As you know, the said committeemen are not regular Government employees but farmers elected to assist in carrying out the agricultural programs. To effectively carry out their duties, of course, they must be trained as to their functions and related problems and the regulations of the Department of Agriculture (par. 713.37, Regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture Governing PMA County and Community Committees) provide for meetings "when necessary to the successful administration of the program." The salary and travel expenses of the said committeemen appear to have been in accordance with rates duly established by competent authority under regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture. Also, the said salary and expenses appear to constitute administrative expenses incurred by the county committee in cooperating in the carrying out of the production and marketing program which the Secretary of Agriculture, by section 388b of the act of February 16, 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1388b), is authorized and directed to pay out of funds made available for such program. The meeting considered as a whole appears to have familiarized such committeemen with the workings of the program, and it is believed that the salary and expenses of the committeemen are properly authorized to be paid as administrative expenses of the county committee under section 388b of the said act. While the said section of law makes provision for payment of the administrative expenses of the county committee, the salary and expenses of the community committeemen who assist the county committees in carrying out the program appear properly to be for consideration as an administrative expense of the county which are payable in the same way as would other administrative expenses of this county committee, such as stenographic services, their own compensation and expenses, and the like.

A report on the recent trip by Mr. Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator to Europe, requested by you, will be furnished shortly.

I trust that the information will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

This refers to the report which he transmitted to me at that time from the General Accounting Office giving the full details of the St. Paul affair in which Secretary Brannan was involved. The report is voluminous. It represents, I believe, the work of some 30 investigators sent by the GAO into Minnesota.

Then on July 17 I received the following letter fram Frank L. Yates, Acting Comptroller General of the United States, in transmitting a full report from GAO on the Ewing trip:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., July 17, 1950.

Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN,
Chairman, House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of April 19, 1950, requesting, for the use of your committee, a report as to the circumstances of the recent trip to Europe of the Federal Security Administrator, Mr. Oscar R. Ewing.

This office is in receipt of a report from the Federal Security Administrator in which he explains that the sole purpose of the trip, which was made with the approval of the President, was to gain a first-hand knowledge of certain experiences which other countries have had in the fields of health, education, social security, medical aspects of civil defense, and certain other matters. It is further reported that the knowledge thus obtained provides a more adequate basis for administering programs in such fields in the United States and enables the making of more intelligent and comprehensive recommendations to the Congress with respect to legislative proposals relative thereto. The Federal Security Administrator also furnished a memorandum and enclosures, copies attached, setting forth the purposes of the travel, the members of his party, the work performed in the course of the travel, a detailed outline of his itinerary and schedule of the meetings with foreign officials concerned with the activities being surveyed. There is no information readily available to this office which indicates the facts to be other than as reported.

Section 202 of the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1950 (63 Stat. 296), makes appropriations of that agency for salary and expenses available for travel expenses, and in view of the showing made as to the official character of the travel, the General Accounting Office is in no position legally to question the allowance of expenses in connection with Mr. Ewing's travel, assuming the amounts claimed are otherwise proper under existing laws and regulations. Whether such amounts are otherwise due will, of course, be determined upon post-audit thereof by this office.

I trust the information furnished will meet the needs of your committee.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK L. YATES,
Acting Comptroller General of the United States.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, I recommended to the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities that we conduct public hearings on both of these matters, and the recommendation was unanimously agreed to by the members present as shown in the following press release which I have issued today:

HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE
ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C., July 19, 1950.

LOBBY COMMITTEE PLANS HEARINGS ON EWING TRIP TO EUROPE; BRANNAN SPEECH IN ST. PAUL

Chairman FRANK BUCHANAN (Democrat, Pennsylvania), of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, announced today that the committee decided in executive session this morning to conduct public hearings shortly into:

1. A trip to Europe in December 1949, by Federal Security Administrator Oscar W. Ewing, to study European methods of dealing with problems of human welfare; and

2. A State-wide meeting of Minnesota Production and Marketing Administration committeemen in St. Paul, Minn., on April 3 and 4, addressed by Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan.

Chairman BUCHANAN today made public a letter from the General Accounting Office advising that no violations of Federal law had been uncovered in connection with the expenditures of Federal funds for the Ewing trip. An earlier letter from the GAO, made public by BUCHANAN on June 30, had similarly indicated no violations concerning the use of Federal funds had occurred in connection with the Brannan trip.

An investigation into both incidents had been suggested by minority members of the Lobbying Activities Committee at the start of public hearings in April into the housing lobby. Chairman BUCHANAN on the same day had written to Comptroller General Lindsay Warren requesting that the General Accounting Office make an intensive investigation into the circumstances surrounding both matters.

The chairman said that at the executive session of the committee this morning, he had recommended that public hearings be held on the reports subsequently submitted by the GAO. He said this had been unanimously agreed to by the Members present (Representatives BUCHANAN, DOYLE, HALLECK, BROWN, and O'HARA). BUCHANAN said that the full texts of the two reports will be made public at the hearings.

Hearings will also be scheduled shortly on proposed legislative changes in the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946, and one session of that series will be devoted to suggestions from Members of Congress, the chairman announced.

BUCHANAN said that because of the necessary absence this morning of Representatives LANHAM and ALBERT, no decision was made on pending possible contempt action against Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government, or Joseph P. Kamp, of the Constitutional Educational League. Both had refused on June 6, in answer to subpenas, to submit the names of contributors of $1,000 or more to the work of their organizations. Rumely refused this information again at a hearing into the operations of the CCG later in June.

BUCHANAN said an interim report is being prepared on the results of a questionnaire circulated among approximately 175 business concerns asking for information on funds spent for purposes related to legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the Members of Congress are all interested in both of these matters. I am sure the hearings which we are going to schedule into this phase will develop a great deal of useful information tending to show the role of agencies of the Federal Government and officials of the Federal Government in connection with the advocacy of legislation within the spheres of their own jurisdiction.

The full texts of the General Accounting Office reports on these two matters will be made public at the hearings.

Although there have been some implications that this committee, under my chairmanship, had no intention of looking into the so-called lobbying activities of Federal agencies, I think the record in this particular situation as shown above in the documents I have introduced demonstrates a consistent policy of investigating specific complaints when they have been called to our attention. In the case of both these matters my request to the General Accounting Office for a full investigation followed immediately after the charges had been made.

I have been asked why the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities has not detailed its own staff to file-searching work through the Federal agencies in the same manner that we have sent staff investigators into some of the private lobbying groups. Actually, Mr. Speaker, we did try that in the very beginning in the case of one agency, but it became obvious to me that we would need scores of agents to do an effective job in the maze of the Federal agency files. The General Accounting Office is already set up and charged by law to do that sort of investigative work for the Congress and the results of the investigations they have conducted for us, for the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, show a thorough objectivity which will be fully demonstrated when the reports themselves are made public.

Address of Maj. Gen. Anthony C. McAuliffe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech by Maj. Gen. Anthony C. McAuliffe at Bastogne, Belgium, last Sunday.

With the American armed services at grips with communism in Korea and with the Kremlin aggressors running amuck in the world, it is altogether fitting and proper to remind our people of the extraordinary heroism of which our men and women of the armed services are capable.

There could be no more appropriate reminder of this great fortitude than the immortal Battle of the Bulge as symbolic of the bravery displayed by our youth on three continents, on the seven seas, and in the air encircling the globe.

Last Sunday the Bastogne Memorial was dedicated by General McAuliffe whose eloquent words, I believe, should be made a permanent part of the RECORD so they might be referred to frequently for the inspiration of our posterity. Therefore, I present the following speech delivered at Bastogne, Belgium, on Sunday, July 16, 1950, by General McAuliffe:

Mr. President, Mr. Ambassador, Madame Minister, distinguished guests and Belgian friends and comrades of December 1944.

I am highly honored to have been invited here upon this significent occasion to assist you in dedicating this noble memorial. I am greatly impressed by the grandeur and magnificence of this monument. Its architectural beauty is an outstanding example of Belgian craftsmanship. But the spiritual values it represents stir me even more deeply. Here is a comfort to the bereaved survivors of those who fell and an ageless inspiration to future generations. Here is an enduring symbol to mark not only a great and costly American military victory, but also the heroic resistance of the political prisoners, members of the resistance and of all the Belgian people. Here is a monument that will perpetuate the memory of great accomplishments achieved through the partnership of all the free peoples of all free nations of the world.

Most fitting it is that in front of the monument stands the last milestone of the chain that extends from the Normandy beaches across France and into Belgium to mark "La Voie de la Liberte." For it was right here in the Ardennes country that the last hopes for victory of the German dictator were shattered.

I am not proficient in your language, but I do hope I can convey to you the reverence and humility I feel in the presence of the memories which this monument arouses, memories of gallant comrades who fell on Belgian soil and now rest in hallowed peace. At Bastogne, St. Vith, Malmedy, Elsenborn, from freezing foxholes they resisted courageously against greatly superior numbers. From north and south they fought their way through fire and snow to reinforce the defenders. In the air they flew their planes through withering flak to support the men on the ground.

Their valor, their devotion to the cause of freedom, and their unselfish sacrifices will live forever, symbolized by this impressive edifice.

I hope also that I can convey to you something of American gratitude for your great assistance in the liberation of Europe; something of American admiration and pride in your rapid and effective postwar recovery and reconstruction; something of American satisfaction that our country is united once more with Belgium in the cause of freedom through the medium of the Atlantic Pact.

For over five and one-half years I have waited impatiently for this day when I should again visit Bastogne and its environs and reminisce with you of those grim days we shared together. What a contrast to compare this thriving community of today with the battered, suffering, snow-covered area from which I departed in January 1945. What a miracle of reconstruction you have accomplished.

When my troops first arrived here on December 18, Bastogne and its surrounding settlements showed few of the scars of war. Then Longvilly, Neffe, Magaret, Wardin felt the first heavy blows of the enemy, followed quickly by the very heavy fighting at Noville and Marvie, next Foy and Recogne, and finally early on Christmas morning German tanks and infantry overran Champs and Longchamps, Flamierge, Mande-St. Etienne and tiny Hemroulle of the famous white bedsheets. And so we were all surrounded and engulfed and, although the American defenders destroyed many enemy tanks and infantry, there always seemed to be more to take their places.

Meanwhile, Bastogne itself endured such a cruel shelling and bombing that it seemed impossible that many of the citizens who remained here with us could survive. You will remember, every night at dark, again in the middle of the night, and still again just before breaking dawn, the German airplanes roared overhead, released an umbrella of brilliant flares and then rained their heavy bombs upon the helpless town, thus adding many Belgian dead and wounded to the already large American casualties. The fine shops and homes and buildings of December 18 were soon rubble piles in the streets. Even church and convent were not spared.

Other towns in this area endured equal or greater suffering. I did not see St. Vith, Houffalize or LaRoche, but I know that they and many others also were heavily damaged.

Few civilians in war have faced so many hardships in such a short period of time. No people have faced such hardships more bravely. Your fortitude and patience, your confidence in eventual victory, your uncomplaining help were an inspiration to the American defenders.

Those sturdy traits of Belgian national character have served you well during the difficult postwar period. On every hand I see the visible evidences of returning prosperity—the well-stocked shops, an increasing export trade, excellent and plentiful food, and a freedom from rationing and other government controls so necessary during wartime. American newspapers and magazines have been filled with praise of Belgian independence and self-reliance. Returning American tourists speak in glowing terms of Belgian ingenuity and love of freedom. All Americans are deeply touched that the Belgian people, faced with an enormous problem of reconstruction, should expend time and effort in rushing to completion this beautiful memorial, made possible through the individual contributions of Belgian citizens.

All Americans join us in spirit today in grateful tribute to the gallant soldiers who gave their lives in the Battle of the Bulge. All Americans join me in affectionate greetings to the people of Belgium with sincere wishes for many years of unmolested peace and prosperity. And through the Atlantic Pact we will achieve this objective.

Now, Belgium and the United States, with the other Atlantic Pact nations, are joined again in comradeship to resist a new threat to our liberties. My government has announced that a threat to the freedom of Belgium or to any other free nation is also a threat to the freedom of the United States. We are resolved that never again shall Belgium be overrun. At the first sign of military attack all the resources of the free nations of the world will be thrown into the common cause. With our combined scientific and industrial supremacy and the determination of our peoples not to be enslaved there can only be one answer to aggression, the answer Hitler received.

Let us therefore remain united to preserve our liberties and let us become so strong in defense that no aggressor dare attack us. Let us pray that God grant we never again shall be required to display our strength upon the battlefield.

Business and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. WHITAKER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Speaker, all my life I have in one way or another been connected with politics and I resent with all my being the remarks that are often made with reference to politicians being dirty and crooked. The following address, to me, is very fine and I would like for my colleagues to read it and enjoy same; therefore, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include this article:

BUSINESS AND POLITICS
(By Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer)

Your president has been gracious enough to ask me to talk to you tonight, and I have decided to talk to you on the subject of business and politics. I have made many talks on the subject of business and government; government and politics are not too divergent, so I will not need to depart too much from the import of my earlier remarks.

First, I want to talk about business. Not enough people outside of businessmen talk about business, and not enough Americans

know enough about business. You have been getting an education in business which few young people enjoy. This gives you a great advantage as you move out into the world. You know something about how business actually is run; something of its problems; something of its detail.

Many young people in this country have been led to believe that business is something to be tolerated and not encouraged. They have been taught that business is a rather low order of activity, engaged in for the purpose of making money by selfish people who have little or no regard for the general welfare. They have been given the impression that businessmen must be carefully and continually watched to see that they don't violate the law—that they can be relied upon to exhibit selfishness on all occasions—and that perhaps the best thing which could happen to the United States would be the discovery of some plan by which business and businessmen could be relegated into the background of history.

That type of doctrine did not originate in nurseries or kindergartens; it has been taught in some of our colleges, and of course fits in compactly with certain theories of those behind the iron curtain who believe that of all the manifestations of capitalism American business is the most to be feared and attacked, and if possible obliterated. Needless to say, with none of these doctrines do I agree in any manner whatsoever.

If it were not for business, you and I would not be here tonight. One of the greatest businesses of our time—in fact, of all time—has produced the auditorium where we meet this evening. If there is one typical example of the benefits and the progress of free enterprise, as we call it, it is the National Cash Register Co. It, like many other companies, is a projection of the personality, vision, and the dynamic energy of one man, who has in turn been followed by other men with great vision and energy. It has provided not merely the great structure which we see here tonight, but a method by which business in this country—and for that matter in the world—can be more effectively, rapidly, and profitably conducted, and thereby the blessings of our modern society more pervasively extended throughout this country and abroad.

Many young people think that a profession is the great objective, or should be the great objective, of a young man starting out in the world. I, myself, have been a professional man; I have many professional men among my forebears; I would be the last person to belittle such a concept. I would like, however, to say to you tonight that business today can be made so interesting, and its contribution to our happiness is so great, that a young man can look forward with enthusiasm and pride to a career in business. He can look forward with enthusiasm because he will find there an opportunity to work; and strange as this may sound to you, work is the source of more happiness than play. The happiest and the most contented people in the world are those who are working at something they enjoy, where they can see some progress as the result of their efforts, and where with their fellow men they share in the fruits of their efforts. They can look forward with pride in the knowledge that business has made and is making a great contribution to the high standard of living we enjoy today.

I would say to you, therefore, that the first idea which should come to your minds and remain in your minds with reference to your future careers is the idea that business is a blessing, that a business career is attractive, and that your greatest contribution in business will be your willingness to work. Over the years I have surveyed business problems with many men of wide experience, and without exception they agree that the fundamental quality which makes for success in business is the willingness to work, and work hard. I am not one of those who believe that that willingness is dead, that people are no longer willing to work. We have today, of course, many so-called labor-saving devices. Those have eliminated drudgery in many fields and have made certain types of work unnecessary or at least have reduced materially the amount of work which must be done. But plenty of work remains. I do not believe that the average young man today is any less willing to work than the average young man of 100 years ago; if I am wrong, and the average young man is less willing to work, think what an opportunity this affords for the young men who are willing to work. It makes their probable success easier and their opportunities that much greater.

Most commencement addresses are devoted to telling young people, as I have told you, what opportunities lie ahead and that hard work will produce results. I am sure you have heard these things before, and what I say may be slightly boring. The justification for a repetition is that you may not have taken too seriously what others have said and one more statement on the subject might serve to prove the point or add to your interest in it.

I would not stand here and say to you that any boy, no matter how ill-equipped mentally or physically, could rise to be a great figure in business. Men are given a variety of brain and a variety of body, but the history of the world has been studded with examples of both men and women who have risen above the handicaps originally placed upon them and have shown the tremendous accomplishments of pure and simple will power and determination to succeed. Any boy, no matter what his origin, in this country at least, can attain some success if he works hard and retains his health.

It is important to keep your equipment in good order, and by equipment I mean your mind and your body. We pay great attention to machinery and equipment of that type; we are inclined to pay much less attention to the far more important equipment which God has given us. If we assume that by hard work and ambition, and perhaps a certain element of luck—because I will not deny that luck frequently plays some part in giving us opportunities for success—you should achieve business success, you will some time face the question: What will you do with it? Riches in and of themselves are not quite the objective they were in days gone by, chiefly because modern civilization, and particularly modern business, has given all men so many benefits that the distinction between the man of great wealth and the man of very modest means, from the standpoint of the things he enjoys, is very slight.

There comes a time in the life of a successful businessman when there is not much point to his accumulating more money, because he can't buy with more money more things than he can buy with what he has. When he reaches that point, he may say to himself, "I love the game of business, the occupation of business; I want to stay in it even though I no longer need the money; and I will now undertake to train my sons or my young associates to carry on where I leave off." He may, however, undertake to interest himself in things outside of his business, and among the things in which he may undertake to interest himself is politics. For the remaining time I shall devote myself to politics.

I was asked the other day in Washington a certain political question—my answer was that I know very little about politics. However, I have had some experience in it. I was a precinct committeeman when I was 21 years of age, and elected to the council of the city of Cincinnati when I was 23. I was reelected to the city council when I was 25 and a candidate for mayor of Cincinnati, unsuccessfully, when I was 27. In the intervening years I have held several public positions, and because of this may be qualified to comment briefly to you on politics, although I do not intend to give you any advice on this subject.

Theodore Roosevelt once said that he wanted to enter politics because he wanted to belong to the governing class—politicians ran the Government and therefore did the governing.

People frequently undertake to make a distinction between a politician and a statesman. There is no essential distinction; although it has been suggested that a statesman is a dead politician.

Frequently you hear remarks indicating that politics is a rather dirty business which clean people should shun. I have had a fairly broad contact with human beings in many fields, including politics; in my opinion, the average politician is no more dishonest or selfish than the average man in most other callings. I should perhaps exclude the clergy and the teaching profession, of which last both my father and mother were members, where there is probably a greater average of unselfish service than elsewhere. I am certain, however, that the average politician and the average office-holder, both in local communities and in Washington, is just as good a citizen, just as anxious to do good work, and no more selfish than his fellow men.

But you may say, "Is it not true that a Congressman, for instance, tries to get himself elected?" Of course a Congressman tries to get himself elected. In other words, he tries to achieve and maintain success in his chosen field just like anyone else. This does not show that he is more selfish than his fellow men; it shows that he is like his fellow men.

We frequently hear complaints that men in public office do things to get votes. In other words, they do thing which they think the public wants done. Theoretically, this is exactly what a public official should do. A congressman, for instance, represents his constituents. They put him where he is that he might represent them and carry out their wishes. If, in general, he does not do what his constituents want he will be replaced by someone who will do what they want. The really critical question is what the constituents want.

There are many people who are honest enough and humble enough to admit they don't know exactly what they want or what they should want, and at this point an opportunity for leadership and statesmanship presents itself to the public official.

He should be unmoved by blatant clamor from minority groups who do not represent the general public view, and in addition to that he should use the opportunities for observation and good judgment given him by his position to guide the opinion and wishes of his constituents in the proper direction.

Furthermore, there is frequently a lag between the time of the decision which a public man must make and the time when he can get a mandate from his constituents. Under those circumstances, he must exercise his best judgment—do the right thing and follow what he believes to be the general wishes of his constituents.

One other consideration must be kept in mind—the constituents are rarely, if ever, in agreement. Sometimes, if not frequently, they are in violent disagreement. Under such circumstances, the real problem of the Congressman is to decide what a majority of his constituents want or, as between conflicting views, what he thinks they should want. This is the situation which usually confronts the public official.

Part of a politician's, statesman's, or public official's job should be to see that the public

is well informed and honestly informed. I have been impressed many times by the fact that too little gets back to the people at home of what really goes on in Washington. I myself have seen articles written—some of them involving me—which completely misstated the facts, and which I knew misstated the facts, because I myself was familiar with them first-hand. You may ask, "Why, then, didn't you make immediately a correct statement of the facts, or why didn't you file a lawsuit against the man who made the misstatements?" The answer is easy. I am too busy with the work I have to do to undertake day by day to correct misstatements in the press. I must rely upon the hope that eventually, with the passage of time, the real facts will come out. That hope, I believe, is not misplaced, and my experience indicates that over the years facts do come out.

I would not want you to think that a public officials is not tempted, and strongly tempted, to answer charges made against him, especially when he knows that they are unjust and based upon misinformation. I myself from time to time since I have been Secretary of Commerce and before that in other political positions have been the subject of criticism and wanted to reply to it. I still feel, however, that the wise and, in the long run, the best thing to do is to let the winds of criticism and abuse blow about me unfanned by any comment from me.

When I say that an official should undertake to see that the public is well informed and honestly informed, I do not mean, therefore, to suggest that he should undertake to explain his every official act. I have been criticized for doing things by those who knew nothing whatever of the facts. This is particularly true in questions affecting employees—human beings—where emotions are easily and naturally aroused and where it is easy for critics to whip themselves into a fury of righteous anger.

You might believe from reading the public prints that today the only thing to which a department head gives his attention is the question of loyalty. You might also be led to believe that this is the only matter of any importance. It is of great importance, but there are many other things which a department head must do to be of service to his Government and the people. In the Department of Commerce I have 56,000 employees, The Department includes: Bureau of the Census, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, National Bureau of Standards, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Patent Office, Weather Bureau, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Office of Technical Services, Bureau of Public Roads, and the Maritime Administration. I am sure you will agree that the task of administering this far-flung Department requires continued attention.

A week ago last Saturday night I was in Boston making a speech before the alumni of the Harvard Business School. The following morning I went to the Quincy shipyard, where the Bethlehem Steel Co. is building two large passenger ships for the American merchant marine. One of these—the *Independence*—had been launched the week before. I saw a large oil tanker being constructed, but there were many vacancies on the ways.

This shipyard at one time employed 32,000 men. It now employs about 7,000. When the ships now being constructed are launched, there will be no employment whatever at this yard.

I might also mention the recent census which all of you know about. As you know, every 10 years the Government undertakes to find out how many people there are in the United States and also to find out some things about them. We added 142,000 employees to the Bureau of the Census for that purpose. Many of them have completed their work, but a large number will continue through the coming months to work hard at this task—the biggest peacetime job ever undertaken in the history of the country.

The Maritime Board and the Census Bureau are but two of the agencies within the Department of Commerce which are doing important and interesting work every day.

I have stated that the public should be kept well informed about what really goes on in Washington. This is not always easy to do, but in the Commerce Department we try our best. Most of the facts with reference to business are not as dramatic and exciting as other groups of facts, and therefore do not attract as much attention as others, or as much attention as they should. I would therefore suggest to you—as a group of young people interested in business—that you acquire the habit of reading the business sections of the newspapers, as well as the general news, and—should I say it?—the comics.

Knowing how highly I regard a business career, it will not be necessary for me to state that I think you are about to engage in a fine and worthy calling.

If, however, you should ever decide to go into politics, I might make one or two comments with reference to what is required. Strangely enough, I do not feel that the chief requirement is the highest order of intellectual development, though here, as elsewhere, knowledge and brains are useful. I do not think that what is required is the highest order of physical stamina and strength. Few men of weak physique can stand the strain of campaigning and the strain of doing an honest and thorough job as a holder of public office, especially in the Federal Government.

Furthermore, you must either have originally, or grow, the hide of a rhinoceros. One who is sensitive to criticism should not enter politics. I know men who have left the Government service because they would not take the abuse and criticism heaped upon them. They regarded this criticism as unjust, but whether just or unjust any public official will get it. Strangely enough, you are not often given credit for a worthy motive in what you do. If it is possible to ascribe an unworthy one, that seems to be the fashion.

As I said previously, I have concluded, as have other men in public office, that there is only one sensible course to pursue: On the basis of the facts known to you as a public official, do what you believe to be right and under no circumstances direct your course by what you believe will come forth in criticism or applause. I believe that in the long run this policy will result in reasonable public approval of honest and worthy official conduct; if it doesn't, I still believe it is the one to follow.

Secondly, a politician must be honest. I know, of course, that there are dishonest politicians, but dishcnesty is not confined to politics; I also know that some of these dishonest politicians make money from being dishonest. I am equally certain, however, that most politicians are not dishonest and that those who are usually come to a bad end.

Thirdly, a politician must expect to work with a party group. It is, of course, possible for a man to play a lone hand politically, but if he expects to produce any results he must be prepared to work with others. In this country, of course, we have two parties. While party alinements are fairly rigid, there are occasionally changes in group allegiance, and there is a continual movement of individual voters from one party to the other which gives fluidity to our political make-up.

Other countries, particularly in Europe, are characterized by a wide variety of political parties or blocs. Our two-party system is, of course, simpler than the bloc system of European countries. We are in many ways a much simpler people. We are for or against a thing; we do not have as many doubts and reservations as others; things as a rule are black or white—not gray. You are for a program or against it. It is such definite lines of demarcation which divide and feature the issues which distinguish our two political parties.

Personally, I think the two-party system is desirable. It serves to fix responsibility and enables the opposition to criticize more effectively the course of conduct of the party in power. I, of course, would not undertake to suggest with which party you affiliate. That will be determined by the party allegiance of your parents, the community or the surroundings or the family traditions into which you are born, and perhaps the influence of political events as they unfold before you. If you should ever become active politically, you will find it a fascinating but at times baffling and disappointing occupation; but it is worth while.

I have a great respect for business, and I have a great respect for "politics," using that word in its proper sense. Each plays an important part in our lives. In either field, or both, if you are honest and hard working and maintain your ideals, you can make a contribution to the welfare of your fellow Americans.

Mr. Speaker, with world conditions as they are today I wish every voter in the United States could read this most splendid address.

Making politics a career, to me will be the day our great country will have made a tremendous step forward and I hope and pray that I will live to see that day.

Come Stand With Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Jacques L. Patterson:

COME STAND WITH ME

(By Jacques L. Patterson)

I stand and gaze over the many white and useless crosses.

I stand on a small hill that fringes this place they have named Punchbowl National Cemetery.

Oh, yes, Great King Man has built for himself this beautiful shrine, dedicated to that great god war, and to that elusive angel, peace.

It is stirring, this shrine, for restless souls. But it is quiet. So terribly quiet—for souls create no noise.

No, not much. They only sigh like the wind. They only frown like the sun. They only cry like the rain. And their protest is as real as a heartbeat and as profound as the baby's smile.

The birds ask me: "Why did they die?" I clench my fists and yell so loud my throat seems it will burst: "So that men may live as you—free!"

But the birds only chirp and fly away, singing. (Or is that the way birds smile in sympathy?)

My remorse grows and grows, until, with a sudden convulsion, it overflows into the soft, green turf, and disappears out of sight.

I turn and gaze upon a city.

Honolulu, capital of Hawaii. The land that was forced to prove its loyalty by death.

The same land that some men and women claim is not deserving of statehood.

You, and you, and you, who make these claims, come for a moment and stand with me on this hill. Let us gaze together upon these white, silent crosses of men who gave their lives.

Jim is here, and Bill, Hisato, Manuel, and over there at rest lies Ernie, and all the rest.

Yes; come stand with me and look at this land that is American to the very core of its molten volcanoes and I'm sure you will see, as I do.

If you do not owe statehood to the living, God knows you owe it to the dead.

United Nations Begins Real Existence With Absence of Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson from the Washington Evening Star of July 8, 1950:

UNITED NATIONS BEGINS REAL EXISTENCE WITH ABSENCE OF RUSSIA—DESIGNED TO KEEP PEACE, IT WAS HAMSTRUNG BY SERIES OF RED VETOES

(By Dorothy Thompson)

It was only the other day that Trygve Lie, Secretary-General of the United Nations, was making his great effort to save the international organization by action on China that would bring Russia back to her seat in the Security Council. He predicted that otherwise the United Nations would perish.

Actually, it was Russian abstention which saved the United Nations. The whole purpose and spirit of the UN was being dissipated by a succession of Soviet vetoes and sulks. Designed to preserve peace by creating a solid front against aggression, it was hamstrung by the vetoes of aggressors. Designed in recoil from Nazi crimes against humanity to prevent their repetition, it was rendered a mockery by the presence on the august Security Council of a state and its satellites—everyone of them forced into line under quislings by force or the threat of force—who have persistently committed all the Nazi crimes but one.

The Soviet and Communist regimes have never exterminated Jews, as such, nor practiced genocide, as such. But under the claim of protecting "peoples' democracies" from "class enemies" they have decimated the populations of the Baltic states, deported people by the millions, established slave-labor "corrective" camps, sent men to the gallows or the firing squad from lynch courts, reorganized east German youth into repetitions of Hitler's indoctrinated infant hordes, and distinguished between neither Jew nor gentile, workman nor nobleman, in their universal terror, misnamed revolution.

TERRORISM OVER WORLD

They declared a "cold war" and labeled it "resistance to warmongers." They mobilized Soviet partisans into armies in every country weak enough to tolerate them. They launched civil wars under a universal strategic plan as spontaneous popular revolts. They perpetually advocated outlawing the atomic bomb under strict international controls and vetoed every proposal that would have accomplished this. They cried for strengthening the United Nations while doing everything to render the United Nations impotent. And finally their leader and master walked out until he could get his own way on seating the Communist government of China, declaring, at the same time, that with Russia and Communist China in absentia, the whole structure was illegal and had, in fact and pro tem, ceased to exist.

Then they launched the invasion of South Korea.

Then, for the first time, the United Nations began to exist, because at long last the conscience of the world could function. That conscience—wherever conscience is permitted existence—had already branded aggression as a crime, had already recommended sanctions and, as a last resort, united police action against aggressors. The Charter was, and still is, too weak and too vague. It needs strengthening by clear definitions. It has never satisfactorily, or on paper, created a law, a judge, or a policeman, without which no international body pledged to protect the peace of the weak as well as the strong can successfully function.

It could not create them for the simple, ineluctable reason that one powerful member was intent to live above any law but its own; to be the judge of the acts of all but accept the judgment of none; and to police the world only for its own ends, and by its own terrorist means.

SUDDENLY THERE WAS LAW

But with Russia sulking in her tents and absent from her seat of eternal negation, suddenly there was a law—for it was present in every one's mind; there was a judge—the judgment of mankind; and there was even Russia's own oft repeated "principle of unanimity." Nothing moved me more than when India, great lover of peace and perhaps most truly so of all, stood with Pakistan to approve the course that Communist aggression had finally compelled the rest of the world to take.

What has occurred is not an alliance of states in any previously conceived terms. What has occurred is the will of weak and strong together to affirm that aggression cannot continue to occur with impunity.

God grant that this shall be demonstrated in a single place, and once and for all. But let us demonstrate it in every possible visual and oral way. That the forces of the United States, Britain, the Netherlands, Australia, Canada, China, New Zealand, France, and Latin America should carry the United Nations flag along with their own is capital.

And, at the same time, let all the voices that encircle the globe by air, speak as one voice, whether they speak from London or Delhi, from Pakistan or Paris. Let us have no more "Voice of America," but "the voice of freedom and security" under the United Nations.

We're Not So Hot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the July 17 issue of Steel, a highly regarded trade publication:

WE'RE NOT SO HOT

While we are waiting tensely to learn what will be needed to fulfill our commitment in Korea, it would be well to take a new inventory of the elements of strength and weakness in our Nation and to proceed promptly to correct deficiencies.

From a military standpoint we are probably worse off than is generally realized. The early engagements in Korea indicate a superiority of equipment in favor of the North Koreans which must be embarrassing to every proud American. Also, this inferiority of American weapons is corroborated by an article by Hanson W. Baldwin in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

Mr. Baldwin, who is a highly respected military expert, goes a long way toward deflating our ego as to American prowess in war. He says that the best plane at the beginning of the last war was a Jap fighter, and at the end a German jet. Japan and Germany had mightier naval vessels. Russia and Germany had tanks superior to ours, and even now Russia is ahead of us in tanks, submarines, and some other items. Mr. Baldwin cites some weapons in which we were and are superior, but in the main we are second, third, or worse in many important categories.

Significant is the fact that Mr. Baldwin says the equipment in which we lead the world is that which was adapted from commercial usage—that which was designed and developed by private industry. The equipment in which we trail other nations is that designed and developed by Government personnel.

If this is true—and there seems to be no good reason to doubt it—then we have a lesson that should be heeded immediately. That lesson is to organize so that the Government military experts and the specialists of private industry can collaborate more effectively in the design and construction of military equipment.

Our resourceful, capable, and gigantic private industry is one of the few things in which we lead the world, yet Washington demagogs are condemning it constantly. Now that we are in serious trouble, why not quit smearing our greatest asset. Why not utilize its ability and know-how to correct the weakness of our Government's military system.

Why Should Nazi War Criminals Be Admitted to the United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken before of my apprehension because there seems to be an increasing tendency on the part of some of our top-level officials to forget and forgive the Nazi criminals who plunged the world into the blood-bath of the Second World War, and perhaps greased the skids for a worse war to come.

It was only a few weeks ago that I was depressed and horrified by discovering that Karol Sidor, a Nazi quisling with the blood of American soldiers on his soiled hands, had been admitted to this country and is making a lecture tour here.

Now information has been placed before me indicating that one Ferdinand Durciansky, a convicted war criminal, who has been hiding out from justice in Argentina for many years, has been granted a visa.

I have filed telegraphic protest with the Department of State and have asked the Attorney General to bar the man's entry as an undesirable alien and a dangerous criminal if he appears at any port or station of entry.

I should be disturbed by the admission of these creatures in any case. However, what is most upsetting is that enemy aliens like this can gain admission when other aliens, against whom there is no derogatory information or suspicion of any kind, cannot. It is departmental policy at this time to deny visitors' visas, regardless of legal admissibility, to natives of countries whose annual immigration quota is oversubscribed, or to foreigners who at some time in the past made application for an immigration visa for permanent residence.

There is a growing suspicion in my mind, which I cannot banish, that the law and administrative directives are being rigidly enforced against some minorities, and almost completely relaxed in favor of others. It is noteworthy that in my daily mail the applicants for visitors' visas, who have been refused, are most likely to be natives of Italy or of Israel. That may be coincidence; it may be bias.

Remember that there is no question in this policy of adverse or derogatory information; those factors are provided for in law, and the only way in which I have questioned the operation of the law is in those instances where the derogatory information seemed to be flimsy, or merely malicious gossip, or the denial was based on an unduly rigid application of the law.

My files would yield many instances in which some type of visa has been denied for reasons which seemed to me exceedingly thin; certainly in most of those cases the basis has been for offenses or suspicions far less than the known crimes of Karol Sidor and Ferdinand Durciansky.

Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am including as part of my remarks my telegrams of July 16, 1950, to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General and a press release issued by the Anti-Nazi League which is the principal source of my derogatory information against Durciansky.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE:

I have been informed that a visa has been issued to Ferdinand Durciansky onetime Foreign Minister of the Nazi puppet regime in Slovakia. I have no reason to doubt the authenticity of the information laid before me. This would indicate that Ferdinand Durciansky was convicted by a duly constituted court of the Benes government in Czechoslovakia for grave war crimes and has been a fugitive from justice since that time. There is nothing to show that he is in any sense a refugee from persecution.

I not only protest the admission of this man and ask that any visa granted him be revoked but am asking the Attorney General to prevent Durciansky's entrance into the United States through any port or immigration station.

It is incredible to me that visas should be issued to known criminals who made war against this country at the same time that departmental policy prevents the entry of other persons of good character. I cannot avoid a growing suspicion that the exclusion statutes are being rigidly enforced against some minorities and completely relaxed for others.

ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Member of Congress.

The Honorable the ATTORNEY GENERAL:

I have been informed that a visa has been issued to Ferdinand Durciansky onetime Foreign Minister of the Nazi quisling state of Slovakia. I have no reason to doubt the information given me. This would indicate that Durciansky was convicted by a duly constituted court of the Benes government in Czechoslovakia of grave war crimes and that he has been a fugitive from justice for many years. There is nothing to show that he is in any sense a refugee from persecution.

I have protested the issuance of the visa in a telegram to the Secretary of State and have requestd that any visa which may have been granted to Durciansky be revoked.

However, should this man reach a port or station of entry it lies in your power to bar his entrance, and I request appropriate action on your part to notify all immigration officers to be on the lookout for him and to refuse entrance until and unless he can prove himself admissible under the laws of the United States. Derogatory information given me against him would indicate that he is a dangerous criminal who would endanger the security of this country.

ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Member of Congress.

[News release of Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League, New York, N. Y., of Monday, July 17, 1950]

ENTRY OF SLOVAK QUISLING PROTESTED

The reported granting of a United States entry permit to the former Foreign Minister of the wartime puppet state of Slovakia—described as "the Quisling of Slovakia"—was protested last night in a telegram to Secretary of State Dean Acheson, by the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League.

Subject of the protest is Ferdinand Durciansky, who was Foreign Minister of the Nazi puppet regime of Joseph Tiso, set up in Slovakia by Adolf Hitler. Durciansky, the league pointed out, was the man who "delivered" Slovakia to Nazi Germany, in conferences with Joachim von Ribbentrop. Durciansky is a fugitive from a death sentence imposed after a trial in absentia by the Czechoslovakian Republic, for his collaboration with Nazi Germany. (Important note: This trial and conviction took place under the Republican Government of President Eduard Benes and Jan Masaryk—not under the present regime.)

"With the eyes of the world focused upon the efforts of the United States to perserve freedom in Korea, we can ill afford to welcome to this country such notorious Nazi quislings and fugitive war criminals as Durciansky," the Anti-Nazi League asserted in its wire to Secretary Acheson.

Durciansky has spent recent years in Buenos Aires, Argentina, engaged in an extensive propaganda along lines consistent with policies of the discredited Slovakian regime. His trip to the United States is for purposes of political agitation and propaganda, and is being openly sponsored by former pro-Nazi organizations here, the Anti-Nazi League charged.

Earlier last week the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League protested to the Attorney General, J. Howard McGrath, regarding the presence in this country of Karol Sidor, also a member of Tiso's quisling regime, in which he served as Minister of Interior. Congressman ARTHUR G. KLEIN, Democrat, of New York, has taken the lead in securing congressional support for the expulsion of Sidor from the United States. Sidor was refused a visa by the American consul at Naples, because his name has been on a State Department blacklist. He made his way to Canada, however, and succeeded in getting a visitor's visa to speak at the national convention of the Slovak League in Cleveland, Ohio, about a month ago, since which he has remained here, traveling about the country and delivering propaganda speeches in several States.

The Slovak League, which the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League denounced as a Nazi-front organization in 1940 (because of its support of Tiso's Nazi puppet state) is also directly concerned in the impending visit here of ex-Foreign Minister Durciansky.

According to the July 13, 1950, issue of Kanadsky Slovak (the Canadian Slovak) Montreal, Durciansky is expected to arrive in the United States within the next few weeks. The announcement in Kanadsky Slovak continues: "It has been very difficult for him to operate politically in Buenos Aires, and therefore through efforts of the Slovak League and Minister Sidor and other circles he has received permission to enter the United States."

In view of United States immigration restrictions, Montreal and Buenos Aires have become concentration centers of fugitive members of the wartime Slovakian puppet regime. The editor of Kanadsky Slovak, one Konsta Culen, was himself deputy propaganda minister of the Tiso regime, in which he served as the puppet state's official radio commentator, and also as a Deputy in Parliament.

The Anti-Nazi League's protest to Secretary Acheson continued: "Permitting Von Ribbentrop's Slovak opposite number to enter the United States now for purposes of avowed political agitation, and in spite of the death sentence for war crimes still hanging over his head, is an open invitation for un-American totalitarian-minded anti-Semitic agitators amongst our 1,500,000 residents of Slovak extraction to resume the evil propaganda in which they engaged during the early years of the Hitler regime, in open collaboration with the German-American Bund. Meetings are already being held in New York and elsewhere by Slovak League affiliates under the domination of these agitators, and the recent election to the presidency of the Slovak League of a man who importuned President Roosevelt to recognize the lawless regime of Hitler's puppet state shows that the stage is already being set for a national propaganda campaign as soon as this convicted war crimial manages to set foot on our shores."

The league's protest was signed by Prof. James H. Sheldon, administrative chairman, and Herman Hoffman, chairman of the league's board of directors.

Further Blunders Must Be Prevented

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a radio address made over several Michigan stations Sunday, July 16, 1950:

FURTHER BLUNDERS MUST BE PREVENTED

As the American forces retreat, and as the casualty lists mount, every day it becomes more plainly manifest that we have on our hands a real war in Korea. It is called a

police action, in behalf of the United Nations. It is just that. The flag of the United Nations flies over General MacArthur's headquarters. But nevertheless, it is real war.

And we, as a nation, are bearing the brunt of the Communist onslaught. Ours the expenditure of billions, taken from the earnings of the American people. Ours the sacrifice that others may enjoy the liberties our forefathers fought and died to gain. Ours the blood, the sweat, and the tears.

As yet there are few overt signs in this country, except for the communiqués and the casualty lists, that we are at war. People generally are going about their daily affairs, just as they did in peacetime. Americans, for the most part, have still to realize that their sons are engaged with an enemy of unparalleled ferocity—an enemy already guilty of atrocities unsurpassed in any war of the past. In the past few days, American prisoners of war have been found, with their hands tied behind them, and bullets through their brains. It is a war in which the enemy gives no quarter, and refuses to be bound by any of those common decencies and restraints of which our civilization consists.

As a Nation, we entered upon this war through the impulsive action of a President who ignored the constitutional limitations on his powers in this respect. He did not consult the Congress of the United States, which alone has the constitutional power to declare war. The Congress was given no opportunity to assess the circumstances in the Far East; no information concerning them was forthcoming from the White House or the Department of National Defense. Until the last moment, the Congress remained in the dark, depending upon the earlier assurances of the State Department that all was well; that the Acheson policy in the Far East was safeguarding our interests in Korea, in China and Japan.

How little the Congress really knew of the true situation. With lightning-stroke suddenness the President took action. He pitchforked this Nation into an undeclared war. He did so after private consultation with officials of the United Nations; consultation of which the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate remained in ignorance until after the event. The President did these things on the assumption that his position as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States was authority enough. Either he chose to forget, or he did not know, that he possesses such authority only in the event that armed invasion or insurrection constitute an immediate threat to national security.

No, the President acted unilaterally, so to speak, for reasons other than an immediate threat to national security. Those reasons became evident within 24 hours after he had taken action. In a public statement, over a Nation-wide radio broadcast on "Meet the Press" program, Dr. Chang, the Korean Ambassador, said that 1 month prior to the invasion by North Korean Communist troops, he had warned President Truman, in person, of impending trouble. He said that he had begged for immediate shipment from Japan and from the American mainland of munitions for defense of the South Korean republic. He said further that no action was taken. He said that South Korean soldiers went to war against tanks, machine guns, and long-range artillery with nothing but rifles, and not enough of them.

That is the answer. The President's action was an act of desperation. That is why the President threw the Acheson Far Eastern policy out of the window; reversing the Secretary of State, and discrediting him in the eyes of the American people, and of the peoples throughout the world. The President must have known that nothing had been done to safeguard American interests, anywhere in the Far East. He knew that a blunder, so serious as to threaten our foothold in Japan, had been made. He did not want to wait for the Congress to turn up the facts concerning our failure—the failure of the administration—to take even minimum precautions in Korea. An effort has been made to throw the blame for this failure upon the shoulders of General MacArthur and his Army intelligence section. But you may rest assured that when the truth is known, it will be shown that MacArthur long ago demanded vastly increased military support for South Korea.

Appropriations Committee records show that since 1946, Korea has received approximately $400,000,000 in economic aid from the United States. This includes $60,000,000 voted just a few weeks ago. That amount, incidentally, was reduced later to $50,000,000; and of this, $30,000,000 was paid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as repayment of an earlier advance. So far as military aid to South Korea is concerned, apparently nothing ever was done of any real effectiveness. An item of $10,000,000 was included in the recently approved appropriation for the mutual defense assistance program; but this money is not yet available. Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, declared last week, that only $200 has actually been spent for South Korean military aid. This, of course, was in addition to the 140,000 rifles—and little else—left behind by American occupation troops, when they withdrew from South Korea.

Now from all I have said, it should be apparent that administration policy was to set up a South Korean republic, and then, whether by accident or design, to leave the infant republic at the mercy of the Communists from above the 38th parallel. As a result, the United States once more has gone to war, ill-prepared. This is a fact in spite of the $50,000,000,000 appropriated for national defense since V–J day. It reminds one of the situation a decade ago, when the American people found themselves in the same fix, even though former President Franklin D. Roosevelt had received appropriations of billions of dollars for national defense.

But in spite of all these things; in spite of the disastrous policy of procrastination pursued by the administration in matters of armed defense of our interests in all parts of the world, I, for one, am not inclined to quarrel with the fact we are involved in this Korean war. The President's action, although taken in a way and on terms rendering it plainly unconstitutional, was no more than a belated recognition that my own demands for an end to appeasement, and a totally uncompromising attitude toward Russian expansionism over the past several years, have been completely warranted by the facts. For how many years have I, and other in Congress, been saying that nobody can do business with the Kremlin? Let me tell you that we have been saying these things ever since the end of hostilities in Europe.

Intervention to put a stop to Russian expansionism—to defend one of the free peoples of the world—comes at a late hour. Disastrously late, I am thinking. Maybe not so late as to mean ultimate defeat; but so late as to make the cost of eventual victory excessive, both in treasure and in the lives of American boys. Yet it is never too late to oppose the aggressions of the bloody-handed dictator, or of his satellite-nation stooges, whenever and wherever they are found.

And it makes little difference whether this intervention is to be carried out as a police action under the banner of the United Nations or as a unilateral action by the United States. It makes little difference, because, as you all know, the assistance to our war effort by other western nations thus far has been nothing but token assistance. Already the administration has found it advisable to demand of the United Nations that it call upon its member nations to render assistance with arms and manpower to the limit of their ability, instead of with pious resolutions and mere words of encouragement.

Intervention in the course of Russian expansionism has come, note quite but almost, too late. Yet if demands by myself and others for a strong policy of support to Nationalist China had been granted by the administration; if the money and munitions voted by Congress for Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalist armies ever had been delivered; if the policy of Chinese betrayal earlier had been thrown out of the window—then, I say, we now would have several million well-armed Chinese soldiers on our side, instead of on the side of the Kremlin. Or, rather, I should say, the present conflict never would have started.

Now the admi istration tells us that in Korea we are opposing armed invasion of a sovereign nation by the Communist forces of a separate nation; while in China the war between Nationalists and Communists was a civil war in which we could not properly intervene. But was the situation different in China 5 years ago? No; it was not. The war in China was no more a civil war than is the present one in Korea. China was split into separate nations no more and no less than Korea is today. And in those days Russia had not gained time in which to arm her stooges. If strong and uncompromising action against Communist expansionism in Asia ever was warranted, as I always have believed, then the time for it was while Chiang Kai-shek and his legions still were strong.

But now the die is cast; the battle is engaged. Come what may, we must go through with it. We must win in Korea, and wherever else the Communists see fit to strike. We must win, because only by our ultimate victory can freemen everywhere continue to be free. And as good Americans all, we will support the war effort without reservation, unwaveringly, to the end.

Yet this does not mean that we should yield up our right, and our duty, to criticize where criticism is warranted so long as the criticism is constructive. If this war ceases to be a little war and turns into a big war, as appears likely, then it must be fought with open eyes and further blunders must be prevented.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 19 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Happenings in Washington," which I delivered on Monday, July 17, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 29)

My fellow Pennsylvanians, this is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital and bringing you another discussion of Happenings in Washington.

One topic of paramount interest holds the attention of all our people today. I refer, of course, to the war in Korea, where Ameri-

can boys are fighting to stem the bloody outbreak of Communist aggression.

We are no longer peaceful spectators, observing the crafty maneuvers of diplomats in world affairs.

Suddenly we have been forced to become active participants in a struggle on the other side of the earth—a struggle which may decide the future of civilization and human liberty for centuries to come.

After President Truman ordered American sea and air forces to defend South Korea and Formosa, I received many letters from Pennsylvania citizens. Most of them expressed themselves as completely unprepared for such a complete reversal of the administration's policy in the Far East. They had placed confidence in the public statements by the President, the State Department, and other high officials.

Let me tell you that these citizens were not alone in their shocked surprise. Many Members of Congress learned for the first time of the critical situation in Korea when the President's announcement was flashed to the world.

They, too, had relied on the administration's assurance that we had no worries about Korea and Formosa.

Let me recall to you what President Truman told the American people on January 5 of this year when he formally announced this country's policy for the Far East. He said—and I quote:

"The United States Government will not pursue a course which will lead to involvement in the civil conflict in China. Similarly, the United States Government will not provide military aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa."

And on January 12 of this year the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, warned against what he called—and I quote his exact words—"foolish adventures" in the Far East.

Addressing the National Press Club here in Washington, Secretary Acheson declared very flatly that we would not defend Formosa, and, what is more, that no line of security could be drawn in southern and southeast Asia, where, he said, the United States has no direct responsibilities and only limited opportunities for action. He added that it was—and I quote—"hardly sensible or necessary."

And when Senator KNOWLAND, of California; Senator TAFT, of Ohio; former President Hoover; and others urged that we defend Formosa against invasion, the proposal was attacked by Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator CONNALLY is recognized as a spokesman for the administration on foreign policy. He had this to say and I quote:

"I shall not favor sending a single American boy with a gun in his hand to Formosa to settle a civil war six or seven thousand miles away from his home in order to appease the political ambitions and the oratorical frothings of Senators in the United States Senate * * * I shall fight such a proposal and I know that the American people will fight it."

Now pause just a moment and think of the reaction to those statements. What would a dictator think? How would they be interpreted by a warlike aggressor?

Why, of course, they sounded like an invitation to go ahead. They said in effect:

"Go ahead and take Formosa. We won't object. Go ahead and take South Korea. We won't do anything. We are not going to get involved in any foolish adventures in that far off part of the world."

Now the administration leaders realize, only too late, that such a do-nothing policy had opened the way for the Communist conquest of China.

The Soviet dictators had every reason to believe that they had a free pass into Formosa and South Korea. We had abandoned China to Red aggression and China certainly was more important than Formosa or South Korea.

And more recently, in the middle of June, barely 2 weeks before the North Korean Reds launched their sneak attack, William C. Foster, Deputy Administrator of ECA, testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee.

He declared that the situation in South Korea was more favorable than at any time since the liberation of that country in 1945. Then he went on to make this statement, and I quote him:

"A rigorous training program has built up a well-disciplined army of 100,000 soldiers; one that is prepared to meet any challenge by North Korean soldiers."

This is an example of the kind of misinformation that our public and our Congress were getting.

The facts are that the South Koreans did not have a good army ready to resist invasion from the north.

They were not properly trained and, much more important, they were not properly equipped.

They had nothing—nothing—to meet the advance of the Red tanks. They had no antitank artillery. They had no air force. And their infantry was not disciplined to stand and fight.

The war in Korea today is the result of inept, stupid blundering by our State Department. And I believe that the thinking there has been influenced and colored by Communists and fellow travelers in and out of the State Department—irrespective of whether any work there today or not.

It was this same terrible diplomatic blundering at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam that allowed Russia to swallow up the little Baltic countries and gave the Communists domination over Poland, and the other satellite nations of eastern Europe. It gave them Manchuria and part of China and northern Korea.

One of the most important questions before our country today is whether those in the State Department who came under the influence of Alger Hiss and others of his ilk shall continue to plan and direct the new foreign policy enunciated by President Truman.

Some of us have been warning, not for months, but for years, that armed aggression was part of Red Russia's program. We called for a strengthening of our defenses and for a tightening of our belts.

We knew that aggression could be halted only by a hard-hitting counter force.

Otherwise, we knew, the United States must awaken one day to find itself alone and on the defensive—ringed by hostile Communist nations.

On May 5, 1947, I addressed the national executive committee of the American Legion in Indianapolis. I declared then:

"While war with Russia may not be imminent, we must be ready for any eventuality—strong, alert and united. In the kind of world we live in today, in which things happen swiftly, equal obligation means to me, universal military training. That is the only way to be ready on time when an emergency occurs."

I said then:

"I stand for a highly trained Regular Army backed by a well organized, properly trained civilian reserve. We should have the best and strongest Navy, and the best and strongest Air Force we can conceive."

Speaking in Philadelphia on March 9, 1948, I warned of the spreading Communist menace which had swallowed up Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, part of Finland, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Albania, Czechoslovakia, and raised the question of where this ruthless aggression would turn next. I said, and I quote:

"Will they turn to new portions of the Far East where Russia has already swallowed part of China and Korea?"

"No matter how much we love peace, history proves that strength is the only language that dictators and tyrants understand.

"We need strong military preparations. From my own experience in four wars, I know the horrors of war. I would go to any length to prevent armed conflict. But I do know that adequate military strength is the best insurance against war.

"We must build up our Army and Navy into the greatest striking and defensive force in the world. We must have complete supremacy in air power.

"Our industries, farms, and mines must be prepared for instant conversion to the production of material and food on a scale surpassing their previous record-breaking efforts.

"We must end without delay the intolerable situation under which we have only 30,000 troops in the United States, trained and ready for combat service, while Russia has millions of men under arms.

"We must therefore, without delay, take leadership in bringing the God-fearing, peace-loving nations of the world together in a defensive pact, joining the Old World and the New for mutual protection against communistic domination and enslavement.

I continued, and I'm still quoting:

"We must tell the aggressors, clearly and forcefully, that if anyone of these nations is molested, all will fight to preserve its freedom. We must leave no room for doubt.

"That policy, if backed by powerful military strength, will avert war.

"We must take decisive action before it is too late.

"Delay will prove costly to us and the world."

In that same speech, my fellow Pennsylvanians, I warned against bogging ourselves down in costly Government experiments when we should be building up our military and financial strength. I said then:

"If we love freedom we must be willing to forego the high-priced frills that have become a part of our Federal system. We must insist that all projects not immediately necessary be eliminated or postponed."

I say to you now that those words, spoken more than 2 years ago, are truer now than ever. The struggle in Korea will be expensive. At this moment no one can foretell what we may be led into. Therefore I think that we must cut to the bone all Government spending not related to national defense.

Now, why have I reviewed this situation in detail, pointing out the steps which led to the Korean situation?

I have done this because I believe we can profit from the errors of the past. The blunders by our State Department can be turned to advantage if they teach us how to act more wisely in the future.

We have finally hit back before the wave of Red aggression has reached our own continent. We have taken a strong stand in support of the United Nations and will see it through, come what may. I endorse that policy wholeheartedly.

To have done otherwise would have left the United Nations, the only instrumentality for peace in the world, helpless and ineffective. We would have lost the confidence and respect of all the other nations that have joined with us to maintain world peace.

Finally, as good Americans, there is but one course for us to follow. It is a sound course. At last it has been taken. If it had been taken earlier we would be far better off today.

The duty of each one of us as loyal, patriotic, freedom-loving citizens, is to back our Armed Forces and our Government to the limit.

On this issue political differences go out the window. Where freedom is concerned we are not Republicans or Democrats. We are all Americans.

We must not regard the course we have taken as something that can be followed

without interference with business as usual or pleasure as usual.

We must be prepared to work and fight and sacrifice. We must prepare now, without delay, for any eventuality.

This may be a long and costly struggle. We must face the task ahead with courage, determination, and prayer.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Proposed Legislation Introduced By Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 19 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I believe that it is the duty of legislators to report to their constituents on legislation which they have introduced. Thus far in the Eighty-first Congress since January 1949, I have introduced some 80 bills. I should like now to list some of the major examples of these bills.

Naturally, these bills must be evaluated in terms of their quality and not, of course, in their quantity. I humbly believe that they are, generally speaking, dedicated to the public welfare and I invite the comments of the people of my State on them.

In each instance below, I have included a statement as to the current status of this legislation. Each of us will want to remember, of course, that there have been over 14,000 bills introduced by the 531 Members of the Congress, and the sheer number of those bills inevitably creates a log jam which means that oftentimes worthy bills are unfortunately delayed or for that matter are postponed indefinitely. In spite of that fact, I have always felt it my duty to fight as hard as possible for the legislation which I have introduced. I appreciate the generous support which has been given by Wisconsinites to the legislation listed below.

There being no objection, Mr. WILEY's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY'S LEGISLATIVE LIST

St. Lawrence seaway, Senate Joint Resolution 99: This is the most important single issue now pending before the Congress affecting Wisconsin and the whole Midwest. Senate Joint Resolution 99 is our latest version of the long-delayed, much-debated St. Lawrence waterway resolution. Unfortunately, Democratic majorities in the Senate Foreign Relations and the House Public Works Committees have pigeonholed this crucial legislation. But I believe that the seaway is more essential than ever before to Wisconsin and the Midwest, particularly now that the railroads are clogged by war traffic, and now that we need another transportation artery so desperately. I shall continue to fight for this great project which has been endorsed by every Badger Governor and by unanimous action of every Wisconsin Legislature in the present century.

Aviation Academy, S. 2574: America needs a West Point of the Air—an Air Academy similar to our Naval and Military Academies. That is why I introduced this bill to locate the proposed new Air Academy within the boundaries of our own great aviation-minded State. We furnished more pilots in World War II than any State except Texas. Wisconsin, which gave to America the great aviation pioneer Billy Mitchell, is entitled to this Academy.

A GREAT MADISON PROJECT

Food laboratory, S. 1438: The purpose of this bill is to authorize the establishment of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps of the United States Army at or near Madison, Wis. I feel that the capital of our State is the ideal place to locate this food laboratory, particularly now that the Quartermaster Corps has such increased significance in the Korean crisis. I feel, too, that Madison, with its great forest-products laboratory at the University of Wisconsin and with its nearness to major food manufacturing plants, deserves to have the laboratory located within its region. A site-selection board is now looking into my own and similar bills.

Social security, amendment to H. R. 6000: In the course of the years, I have introduced many bills to liberalize and improve our obsolete social-security system. One such measure is the amendment now pending by which I have sought to secure the integration of the Wisconsin retirement fund with the Federal social-security system. The net effect of this proposal is to protect 30,000 Badger State, county, and local workers, their widows and children, by giving them supplementary Federal benefits in addition to their present modest pension rights. My amendment is backed by Wisconsin employee unions, the League of Wisconsin Municipalities, and other Badger groups unanimously.

Spiritual offensive, Senate Resolution 121: The purpose of this resolution was to express the spiritual intent of the Senate in the North Atlantic Treaty against Communist aggression. We expressed our convictions as being based upon our "most precious heritage—our country's faith in and our dependence upon Almighty God and His guidance in the affairs of men and nations." The substance of this resolution was indeed fortunately adopted in the Senate Foreign Relations report on the North Atlantic Treaty. This treaty was subsequently ratified by the Senate.

EX-SERVICEMEN'S BILLS

Veterans, S. 677: To encourage the employment of veterans with pensionable disabilities. This bill is a measure which I have sponsored for many years with the backing of the Disabled American Veterans' organization. All of us know that many handicapped veterans are not hired for employment and are often discriminated against. So I believe that Uncle Sam should try to encourage such employment by means of this bill. As one of the original sponsors of the GI bill of rights, I have always felt that we must help ease the anxiety in the minds of our veterans and in their hearts.

Veterans, S. 325: To permit veterans and widows of veterans to secure the modest pensions to which they are legally entitled by Federal law even though they may earn small amounts of money on their own initiative on the outside. This legislation was endorsed by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and by other veteran organizations. It is imperatively necessary, I believe, in view of the fact that inflation—rising cost of living—has made it so difficult for veterans and their widows to survive on their present limited pensions.

Among other veterans' bills I introduced were these: S. 1986, to give a national charter to the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, and S. 3599, to give a national charter to the Military Order of the Purple Heart. These two organizations, I feel, are doing a splendid job in meeting the needs of our Reserve officers and our wounded veterans, and it is fitting that they receive appropriate Federal recognition.

Milwaukee, S. 2298: The purpose of this bill was to authorize the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to convey certain lands and to lease them to Milwaukee County. This bill was enacted into public law and has proved extremely helpful to Milwaukee authorities, as reported to me in their official messages of thanks.

Anticommunism, S. 2941: Recognizing the tremendous danger from Communist spying, I introduced this bill in order to extend the statute of limitations on treasonable espionage against our Federal Government. This is but one of the many anti-Communist bills which I have introduced and consistently fought for in order to protect the national security of our country.

Indians, Senate Resolution 245: Wisconsin was rightly shocked by the news of the terrible conditions prevailing among her Indian tribes. In order to remedy those conditions once and for all, as well as to meet the problems of American Redmen throughout the Nation, I introduced this resolution for a thorough investigation of the deplorable conditions among America's original settlers as well as a complete analysis of laws governing them.

Governmental reorganization, S. 810: To establish a little Hoover Commission—a national commission on intergovernmental relations. For many years, I have urged that Uncle Sam straighten out the chaos in the overlapping, duplicating functions between Federal, State, and local governments. More and more Uncle Sam is elbowing himself into State and local affairs and taking over their respective tax functions. By means of this bill and its later version, S. 1946, now pending for enactment, I trust we can streamline Federal, State, and local operations and help get government back to the grassroots.

ANTIPOLLUTION

Stream pollution, S. 1118: The purpose of this bill is to meet the critical stream pollution problem by providing tax credits to industries which develop sewage and other waste treatment facilities. Wisconsin, like other States, has been plagued by this pollution problem, and only by a measure such as this can we meet it successfully and preserve the precious heritage of our fields and streams.

Displaced persons, S. 1315, S. 1316, S. 1317: To provide humanitarian amendments to the displaced-persons law and for expelled persons of German ethnic origin. At long last, the Eighty-first Congress has passed a public law to correct certain inadequacies in the original DP statute. Many of the features of this new law were recommended by myself in S. 1315 and other legislation which others and I introduced and which were backed unanimously by church, labor, and farm groups.

DAIRY BILLS

Wisconsin being America's dairyland, I have naturally introduced many bills for our 175,000 farms, including these:

Senate Joint Resolution 84: Requesting President Truman to promote June as National Dairy Month. I have always felt that one of the ways by which we can lick the problem of declining dairy prices and increased dairy surpluses is by having our Nation recognize the crucial significance of dairy products in the American diet—nutritional products for our adults and youngsters.

Amendment to H. R. 2023: This is the famous Gillette-Wiley amendment under which we could have protected the natural yellow color of butter in interstate commerce. Under this fair-play amendment, the 48 respective States would have been allowed to do as they pleased within their

own borders, but we would have prevented oleo fraud and misrepresentation in interstate commerce. After a bitter 2-week battle on the floor of the Senate, this amendment was unfortunately defeated, principally by southern Democratic votes, with the result that the American butter industry suffered a staggering reverse and with the further result that surpluses are now piling up in Government warehouses—fulfilling my predictions.

S. 538: This dairy bill was introduced as a companion bill to that introduced by Congressman REID MURRAY of Wisconsin. The purpose was to direct the lagging Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of milk at not less than 90 percent of parity—including all milk, regardless of its ultimate use.

For months and months, Secretary of Agriculture Brannan had refused to take action on supporting the price of manufactured milk, with the result that dairy income was nose-diving through the floor. At long last, following constant prodding by Congressman MURRAY and myself, the Secretary of Agriculture announced price support for manufactured milk. Thus the effort that was started on January 17, 1949, with the introduction of S. 538 (and a later version) at last led to success in the slow-moving Agriculture Department.

Amendment to H. R. 4146: The purpose of this amendment was to make sure that our servicemen got butter when eating in Army camps. Unfortunately, this amendment was also defeated on the Senate floor with the result that a large market for butter was unfortunately lost, and oleomargarine once again increased its market at butter's expense. The effects throughout the Wisconsin dairy economy and in our small towns and villages have been severe. If the farmer cannot sell, obviously he cannot buy.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 86: The purpose of this legislation, of which I am a cosponsor, is to make a complete antitrust investigation of the oleomargarine monopoly—a monopoly of a few huge multi-billion-dollar corporations which are capable of juggling prices at will and doing as they please in harming the American consumer.

SENATOR WILEY'S BILL FOR TAX RELIEF

Tax relief, S. 1029: Designed to end nuisance wartime taxes on drugs, baby powder, cosmetics, furs, jewelry, theater admissions, union dues, admissions to county fairs, etc. This bill was introduced in the second month of the Eighty-first Congress, but all this time—for a year and a half—unfortunately, the Democratic majority insisted on pigeonholing it and similar tax-relief measures.

Now, after this terrible stalling, the Democratic majority says that it cannot act on tax relief because of the high military expenditures that will be necessary in the Korean crisis.

Polish observance, Senate Joint Resolution 8: To proclaim October 11 each year in honor of Gen. Casimir Pulaski who contributed so magnificently to the success of the American revolutionary effort.

I believe that observance of this memorial is particularly appropriate in view of the fact that the homeland of General Pulaski—our great ally, Poland, is now enslaved by the Red aggressors. I have been glad to introduce similar Pulaski bills in previous years in the Congress.

Patent system, Senate Resolution 259: The purpose of this resolution was to preserve intact our independent patent system. Patents are the very basis of every American industry and invention. I introduced this resolution therefore in order to keep the independent patent office out of partisan politics. Unfortunately, however, the resolution was not approved by the Senate and partisan politics now menace the Patent Office.

Decentralization, Senate Resolution 30: Why put all our eggs in one basket? This is the question I asked in effect when I introduced this bill to direct the Senate Armed Services Committee to make a thorough study of the decentralization of the Department of National Defense. I submitted this bill within a week and one-half after the Congress convened on January 13, 1949. Now a year and one-half later, War Department officials say that at long last they are starting to get around to the thought of dispersing some of the Central War Department functions from overcongested, overcrowded Washington. I have pointed out for years that if one atomic bomb should hit our Nation's Capital, practically our entire central defense establishment would be knocked out in a matter of minutes. We must avoid such a terrible catastrophe.

Congressional efficiency, Senate Resolution 41: This is another bill which I have sponsored for a long time designed to lay the ground work for automatic electrical voting in the Congress such as occurs at Madison. It is absolutely ridiculous that the 435 Members of the House and 96 Members of the Senate should have to vote slowly in succession, one after the other, dragging on minute after minute, hour after hour, and using up the valuable time of the American people, time which otherwise could be spent in crucial legislative duties.

CONCLUSION

The list of bills could, of course, be extended to include the many measures which I introduced on behalf of the American Legion, on behalf of the International Children's Emergency Fund, on behalf of postal workers, and many other groups in our population. Win, lose, or draw in these various battles, I have been glad to fight for Wisconsin's welfare.

I humbly submit this list to the 3,500,000 people of Wisconsin, folks of all political faiths, and warmly invite their reactions and suggestions. I am here in Washington to serve you. That is and was the purpose of these and dozens of other bills which I have sponsored, from the St. Lawrence seaway onward. Thanks for your kind attention to this report.

The Dairy and Broom Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 19 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles appearing in the July issue of the publication Nebraska on the March, issued by the division of Nebraska resources, department of agriculture and inspection, at Lincoln, Nebr.

One article gives an interesting and highly informative sketch on one of Nebraska's ranking industries—the dairy industry. The second is a historical story of the famous Deshler (Nebr.) Broom Factory, which is the largest broom factory in the world.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE FOURTH IN BUTTER OUTPUT

Processors of dairy foods, particularly butter, constitute a significant segment of Nebraska's manufacturing industry.

Nebraska ranks fourth among all the States in butter production with a 1948 output of 78,240,000 pounds. And Omaha, Nebraska's largest city, rates as the Nation's No. 1 butter-manufacturing center with a 1949 production of approximately 20,000,000 pounds.

Nebraska's processors also account for an important portion of the Nation's cheese, cottage cheese, sweetened and unsweetened condensed milk, condensed and evaporated buttermilk, and ice cream.

The State bureau of dairies, foods, weights, and measures last year licensed 108 butter manufacturers, 89 wholesale ice-cream manufacturers, 364 retail ice-cream manufacturers, 4 cheese factories, and 130 dairies handling fluid milk. (Dairies handling milk from less than 25 cows are not licensed; thus a count of the smaller fluid-milk establishments is not available.)

The total of the figures just given cannot be considered as the total number of dairy processors in the State, since many of the plants are licensed for more than one type of operation. Nevertheless, it seems safe to say that there are more than 400 separate plants and firms in the State engaged in processing dairy foods.

Nebraska's position as the fourth ranking State in butter production appears paradoxical in view of the fact that it ranks fairly well down the scale in milk production.

In 1948 (the last year for which complete figures are available) the State had 478,000 milk cows to rank seventeenth among all the States and produced 2,256,000,000 pounds of milk for fourteenth place among the States.

The explanation can be found in the fact that milk is a byproduct on many Nebraska farms. In other words, comparatively few farmers make dairying a business and depend upon it for a major source of income.

As a byproduct, a higher-than-average percentage of the milk is sold as cream for its butterfat content. In fact, Nebraska ranks third in the Nation in butterfat sales—48,510,000 pounds in 1948.

Twenty-one percent of the milk produced in Nebraska in 1948 was consumed on the farms; 20 percent was sold as milk; and 59 percent was sold as cream. By way of contrast, the 1948 figures for Ohio—which produces nearly three times as much milk as Nebraska but ranks seventh in butter production—show that 13 percent of the milk was consumed on the farms; 78 percent was sold as milk; and only 9 percent was sold as cream.

Nebraska's production of dairy foods other than butter does not place it among the leading States, but the various amounts are large enough to be significant.

Following are the 1948 production figures (with Nebraska's rank in parentheses) as reported by the United States Department of Agriculture:

American-type cheese, 853,000 pounds (twenty-sixth); other type cheese, 3,000 pounds (twenty-ninth); cottage cheese, curd, 2,596,000 pounds (seventeenth); cottage cheese, creamed, 3,323,000 pounds (sixteenth); condensed milk, sweetened, 1,258,000 pounds (eighteenth); condensed milk, unsweetened, 755,000 pounds (twenty-third); condensed or evaporated buttermilk, 15,479,000 pounds (sixth); ice cream, wholesale and retail, 6,607,000 gallons (twenty-sixth); milk sherbet, 432,000 gallons (twenty-second).

Production figures obtained from the State bureau of dairies, foods, weights, and measures indicate that the United States Department's figures may not be complete. For example, the bureau reports Nebraska cheese production was 1,515,000 pounds, or 659,000 pounds over the Department figure; ice cream production, including milk sherbet, was 10,321,000 gallons, or 3,582,000 gallons more than the Department figure.

Figures on the amount of fluid milk processed and bottled are not available. Neither are figures on the production of such items as dry whole milk and nonfat dry milk solids. The amounts of the latter are not believed to be large, however.

The State's dairy history dates back to about 1820, when the first cattle were brought into the area that is now Nebraska. The cattle, including 121 cows, were purchased at St. Louis and driven to Fort Atkinson, the present site of Fort Calhoun, to supply the 600 men, women, and children at the garrison. The fort was abandoned in 1827, and it can be assumed that there were no more milk cows in the Territory until westward-bound pioneers started traveling the Oregon trail.

The Territory of Nebraska was opened for settlement in 1854, and the early settlers brought their livestock with them. The cattle brought into the State at that time furnished meat and milk and were used as beasts of burden.

Census records for 1860 show that 641 farmers in 5 southeastern counties owned 4,541 cattle, including 1,626 milk cows.

As settlers spread over the State the Nebraska prairie lands were considered more appropriate for grain production and the raising of beef cattle. Consequently, comparatively little attention was paid to dairying.

Nevertheless, dairy processing plants—which were a new development in the Nation—made an early appearance on the Nebraska scene.

(Until the middle of the nineteenth century the making of butter and cheese was entirely a home industry. The first cheese factory in the United States was built in New York in 1851, and the first butter factory was built in the same State in 1861.)

As early as 1860, according to the Nebraska Conservation and Survey Division, a Benjamin Whyte was conducting a small cheese-making operation near Brownville.

In 1868 Dexter F. Woods set up a sizable cheese factory at Palmyra, using the milk from a herd of 60 to 80 cows. The plant was converted to butter making in 1870 and continued to operate until 1881.

Additional creameries were built in the 1870's, but the expansion was not on any large scale until the 1880's, when a new wave of settlers arrived. A report submitted to the first annual convention of the Nebraska Dairymen's Association in December 1885 showed 43 creameries and cheese factories in operation.

Many of the creameries established in the State have had short lives, due to a variety of factors, including overpromotion, poor management, drought, and depression. The conservation and survey division reports that of 316 creameries which had been built by 1912, less than 40 were actually operating in that year.

On the other hand, most of the leading plants of today have been in operation for many years. And two of the Nation's largest dairy and produce companies—the Fairmont Foods Co., of Omaha, and the Beatrice Foods Co., of Chicago—were born in Nebraska during the 1880's.

It is difficult to determine accurately the over-all effect of the dairy industry upon the Nebraska economy down through the years and at the present time, because available figures are far from complete. Some sample figures can be used only to indicate that the industry's economic impact upon the State has been highly important.

The value of cows and heifers 2 years old and over kept for milk on Nebraska farms as of January 1, 1950, was estimated by the State-Federal Division of Agricultural Statistics at $88,722,000. The value of younger milk stock was not estimated.

Gross farm receipts from dairy products in 1948, estimated at $72,719,000. This included $59,520,000 in cash receipts and $13,199,000 in products consumed on the farm.

A figure on the amount of capital investment in dairy processing plants is not available, while the value of the plant's production can be estimated only roughly on the basis of average wholesale prices.

The value of 1948 butter production probably was in the neighborhood of $47,000,000; cheese, $300,000 to $500,000; cottage cheese, $1,000,000; ice cream, $8,000,000 to $10,000,000.

Available employment and payroll figures also are not complete. The United States Census of Manufactures for 1947 credits Nebraska with 85 dairy products plants with 1,411 employees and payrolls of $2,873,000.

The Census Bureau count of dairy plants, however, is far from inclusive, as can be seen by comparing it with the count made by the State bureau of dairies, foods, weights, and measures. This is due to the fact that the Census Bureau classifies establishments which (1) manufacture products for retail sale on the premises, or (2) handle fluid milk in addition to making butter or other products, as trade industries rather than manufacturing industries.

Thus, it is certain that dairy processing payrolls are far above the Census Bureau figure.

On the surface, it might appear that the dairy industry has made little progress in the last 65 years, since its chief problems today are those which were discussed at the first dairymen's convention in 1885—markets, improved products, butter substitutes, herd improvement, pastures, and forage crops.

Actually, a great deal of progress has been made. Markets have been expanded; herds have undergone vast improvements; quality of product has been greatly improved and standardized.

Today's problems remain largely what they were 65 years ago, because the industry is not content to rest; it is seeking still further progress and expansion.

Some changes in basic dairying procedures probably can be expected in the future. At present, some quantities of fluid milk are imported into the State to meet the growing demand in metropolitan centers for grade A. Some farm experts believe that eventually more Nebraska farmers will convert their dairy herds to a professional basis to supply all of this demand. Such a conversion would, in turn, create an opportunity for other farmers to breed and raise young dairy stock.

All in all, it seems certain that the dairy industry, important as it has been, will occupy a place of greater importance in Nebraska as time goes on.

Brocm Factory at Deshler Employs Third Generation

The Deshler Broom Factory, Inc., of Deshler, with a 60-year-old history, is now employing its third generation of workers.

Despite a series of three disastrous fires which destroyed approximately two-thirds of the company's plant, it still claims to be the world's largest broom factory on the basis of production.

The company's payroll of 225 people and the payrolls of five other manufacturing establishments place Deshler (population 1,037 in 1940) among the most heavily industrialized towns in the State.

The factory was founded by H. J. Struve, who also played a large part in founding the town. Struve, a native of Indiana, came to Nebraska in 1878, purchasing a mercantile business at Friedensau, a village 2 miles east and 4 miles north of the site that was to become Deshler.

In 1887, F. J. Hendershot purchased a town site along the just-completed Rock Island Railroad branch line through the southern part of Thayer County from John G. Deshler, a Columbus, Ohio, banker and land operator. In 1888, Struve bought the site, and he and his neighbors in Friedensau moved their businesses down to the railroad.

Struve became a community leader, serving as chairman of the town council for many years and as vice president of the Farmers and Merchants Bank. He built the Deshler Roller Mills and started one of the county's early creameries.

In 1890 Struve was approached by a broom maker, Joseph Steiner, who had come to Nebraska from Pennsylvania, seeking relief from asthma. Steiner offered to make brooms to sell in Struve's store if Struve would assist with the capital.

The first operations were set up in the store, which is the present location of Deshler's weekly newspaper, the Rustler. Soon the brooms were being sold in other towns.

In 1895, following Steiner's death, the broom factory was incorporated, starting with a capitalization of $2,000. In 1903, a new building was started. By 1926 a plant which covered approximately two blocks had been completed. The first of a series of three fires hit the factory in July of 1943, destroying the company's warehouse space for finished brooms. The second fire struck in October of 1946, destroying the broom corn warehouse, along with 40 carloads of corn. This space was replaced with quonset buildings.

The third fire hit in December of 1947, destroying the main plant with all of the winding, stitching, and other machines. Again the company fought back, and within 10 days had its first new and rebuilt machines in operation.

The manufacture of brooms is practically an assembly line process.

The broomcorn is shipped from Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Colorado, and Texas. (When the factory was started, some broomcorn was raised in Nebraska. None is raised here now, due largely to climatic conditions.) The handles—turned and finished, except for painting—are shipped from Michigan, Oregon, and Texas.

The manufacturing process starts as one set of workers paints the handles, while another group sorts the corn as to length, color, and fineness of fiber, scrapes off the seeds and cuts off the ends.

The fibers then go to a broommaker who shapes them and binds them to the wooden handles with the same care that a dressmaker takes in shaping a dress.

The brooms go to a drying room and then are stitched on large sewing machines. The edges are trimmed in a final process before going to the shipping room.

Whisk brooms go through virtually the same process, except that they are bound to a short wooden core instead of on a handle.

While the third generation of workers is employed in the factory—along with some workers who have been on the job for 50 years—the second and third generations of the Struve family are represented in the management.

H. J. Struve served as president of the company until his death in 1931, with the exception of a short period in 1918–19, when the Reverend Kollman headed the firm.

When the elder Struve died, his son, H. C. Struve, became president and general manager, serving until last year, when he became chairman of the board.

E. J. Becker, who has been in Deshler since 1923, is now president and general manager. Milton Beckler is vice president and assistant general manager. T. S. Struve, son of H. J., is treasurer, and Milton Struve, son of H. C., is secretary.

Employing approximately one-fifth of Deshler's population, the company feels a distinct responsibility to the community.

"That's why it was so important for us to get back into immediate production following our fire," says Becker. "Without the factory, many families in Deshler would be without support."

The company manufactures approximately 200 different types and grades of house, whisk, toy, and industrial brooms. Present volume is more than $1,000,000 annually.

The business is not particularly seasonal, although there are upturns in the spring and the fall, when women indulge in their semiannual orgy of housecleaning.

What about the advantages of a Nebraska location?

"Considering that we want to—and do—distribute all over the United States, we think our location here in the heart of the Nation is the best that can be found," says Becker.

He also points to better living conditions and a good labor supply as Nebraska advantages.

"Most of our workers own their own homes and are a definite part of the community," Becker adds.

Voice to the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 19 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of July 15, entitled "Voice to the World." This editorial is of particular timeliness in view of the hearings now being held by the House Appropriations Committee on the expanded information program recommended by the President.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOICE TO THE WORLD

The critical importance now ascribed to an effective American information program is indicated by the size of the appropriation President Truman has just requested of Congress for this purpose. He has asked for $89,000,000, which would be in addition to—and is two and a half times greater than—his original request of $36,645,000 for the current fiscal year. In other words, the administration has come to recognize the magnitude of the task and the necessity of bending "our best and most intense efforts" to meet the challenge of the Communist lie-machine. As President Truman and others before him have said, we do possess one priceless asset in this campaign; we can tell our friends and our enemies the facts about our action and our policies at home and abroad. Truth is, indeed, on our side.

The plans for a vastly expanded information program are not something pulled out of a hat in these last few days since the outbreak of the war against the United Nations in Korea. They have been in the making for months; but the eruption in Asia gives sudden and dramatic force to the argument for a large-scale and positive campaign via every possible medium on behalf of freedom and democracy throughout the world. Impressive support for such a program has been given by Generals Marshall and Eisenhower and others at Senate hearings on a resolution which Senator BENTON and 12 colleagues had introduced in March to encourage a gigantic enlargement of our propaganda arm. For while many Americans may not realize it, our efforts in this field have not been able to match those of our adversary. It is a conservative estimate to say that the Voice of America has considerably less than half as many program hours as its Russian counterpart. Furthermore, in various strategic areas—such as Korea—it has been overwhelmed by the sheer weight of Communist propaganda, not to mention the success of Russian jamming.

The proposed new program, which we trust will receive the speedy and favorable attention of Congress, envisages some $41,000,000 for improved radio facilities, both in respect to increased power and intensity of the broadcasts themselves and in respect to more effective measures against Russian interference. Another $43,000,000, or almost half the total, would be expended in improving the quality as well as the quantity of all of our overseas information and educational services. Careful studies have been made to determine the type of material that will be most effective for the specific areas or population groups toward which any given program is directed. Greater specialization and concentration of effort is planned. In short, if the necessary funds are granted, the American information campaign would come of age.

Clearly such a program—carried out by radio, movies, scholarships, libraries, and other channels—is not alone going to win the struggle against Communist imperialism. Force has to be met with force, as in Korea, and political or economic strategy with political or economic strategy, as in the rest of the world. But by the same token, that struggle cannot be won without victory in the realm of ideas. It is an essential corollary to our effort in every other field, and if we fail in this respect our military or political or economic successes are not going to have much meaning.

We Cannot Afford To Burn Down Our House To Get Rid of the Rats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, if this bill is enacted into law, I am confident that we will be saved from its consequences by the Supreme Court, for I cannot believe that it will ever be held to be constitutional.

However, it is shocking that this great House should countenance its serious consideration. This is progress backward with a vengeance.

Law students are amused today when they read the European statutes of the Middle Ages, with their bland assumption that the person of a subject is a chattel of the crown; but when a medieval legislative proposal is brought into the Congress of the United States, and adopted by this House without effective opposition, it is not very amusing.

The sad part is that the gentlemen who have most effectively supported this bill are truly gentlemen—they are conscientious, hard-working Members of this House for whom I have great admiration and affection. I am saddened that they should be so carried away by a very real problem presented to them in the midst of international hysteria that they are willing to burn down the house to get rid of a few rats.

I am further saddened because it takes a very considerable courage to even oppose the bill in the face of the adventitious and fortuitous grounds on which the support is based, and the very tangible problem that is sought to be corrected.

THE GATES CLANG SHUT

This bill is, unfortunately, a symptom of a world malady of fear, suspicion, and exclusiveness.

You remember that when the Nazi drive to conquer the world began, a dramatic phrase was coined—"the lights went out" in country after country.

Today the gates clang shut.

It is easier to escape from Alcatraz than from Russia.

In country after country, nationals cannot get passports, and foreigners cannot get entry visas, under any circumstances except for official travel.

This sad example is not one that we need to follow, and voluntarily to go these further steps down the steep path to authoritarianism is frightening.

This bill provides for surveillance of deportable aliens, as well as for confinement without judicial trial.

How long will it be after this unhappy pattern is established before shadows dog the footsteps of all foreigners as they do now in the totalitarian countries?

Mr. Speaker, this very circumstance has created the problem to which H. R. 10 is a most unacceptable answer.

THERE IS A PROBLEM

There is a problem, I grant you, because more and more gates clang shut, more and more barriers rise in the path of free intercourse of people.

Testimony was adduced, which I do not impugn, showing that more than 1,300 undesirable and deportable aliens are running about loose in the United States. The immigration laws say that they must be deported, and the countries to which they might be deported say they will not take these undesirable people.

H. R. 10 is an effort to provide a disposition of such aliens far more dangerous than the problem.

If this bill ever became settled law, a man could be jailed indefinitely, not for any action for which he was subjtect to penalty of law, but merely because of his being, and there is no adequate limit to the authority of the Attorney General.

The individuals of criminal records toward which this measure is ostensibly directed are, by definition, people who have paid their debt to society; they are individuals who, having been convicted, have served their sentences.

The subversives to whom it is extended may be individuals who have committed no punishable crime but merely have engaged in activities lawful to a citizen but forbidden to an alien.

In my opinion, the partial suspension of the writ of habeas corpus in paragraph (g), as passed in the House, is clearly and directly violative of section

9, article I, of the Constitution of the United States.

A DISSERVICE TO THE NATION

Mr. Speaker, it is a disservice to our Nation to yield to momentary panic and dignify this measure by serious consideration and by its adoption under a peculiar legislative process which evades the provisions we have made for the orderly conduct of the business of the House.

If the same legal ingenuity and perseverance shown by the Department of Justice in drafting and pushing this measure had been devoted to the more laudable end of finding a more acceptable answer, I am confident we might have had a different bill.

I wish I could offer a direct and useful suggestion; I cannot, in spite of my daily contact with those agencies of our Government directly concerned with the problem.

I do know that any acceptable legislation must be framed for long-time enforcement, without discrimination or hardship, and with a full recognition of human dignity, even when the individual to be protected is an admitted criminal; it must not violate either our written Constitution or our tradition of equal application of the laws; and it must be enforceable without the introduction of such novel and dangerous departures as indefinite imprisonment without judicial trial and for no actionable offense.

I want to state categorically that I am offering no defense of the deportable aliens as such. The person of foreign birth who comes into the United States and violates our laws or abuses our hospitality is not only a disgrace to himself and to the country of his origin; he contributes terribly to the very anti-alien sentiment which allows this kind of bill to receive consideration.

It is not the deportable aliens as a class—those with criminal or subversive records, those with maladjusted personalities, those subject to the written statutes of this Nation—that I defend; I defend the basic institutions of our country and the fundamental principles of political, religious, and racial tolerance on which our democracy is based.

Legislation of this kind attacks and subverts institutions and principles more important than the fate of these miscreants.

Mr. Speaker, under the general consent I include in my remarks a memorandum on the subject originally prepared by the joint efforts of the National Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers and the American Jewish Congress, with certain omissions from the original text to fit the changed language of H. R. 10. The analysis is temperate and shrewd, and reflects the careful thought of a number of lawyers of high standing who specialize in the practice of immigration law.

MEMORANDUM ON H. R. 10 (THE HOBBS BILL)

H. R. 10 amends existing law to allow the indefinite detention of deportable aliens of certain categories by the Attorney General without judicial trial; it takes away the power of the lower Federal courts to release aliens under bond; and it partially suspends the writ of habeas corpus in defiance of article I, section 9, of the Constitution. More fully, it amends existing law as follows:

1. To authorize the Attorney General to deport an alien to any country which will agree to accept such alien into its territory when deportation to the country of his birth, citizenship, or last residence is impracticable (sec. 2). It is asserted that otherwise an alien who is deportable will be granted asylum in the United States (H. Rept. 1192, p. 5). On the other hand, although we have the sovereign right to expel an alien, that right should be exercised humanely. Deportation under this section may be to a nonnative country where the language, customs, and mores may be strange or unknown to the deportee. Deportation is possible even to a country where one's life may be endangered (H. Rept. 1192, pp. 17 and 18).

2. To authorize the Attorney General to require an alien against whom an order of deportation has been pending for 6 months or more to submit to medical examination, give information under oath concerning his habits, associations, and activities, and to conform to written restrictions on his conduct or activities prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration (sec. 4b). The main purpose of this provision is to grant the Attorney General specific authority to continue his control over deportable aliens whose deportation is not accomplished within 6 months (H. Rept. 1192, p. 9). The objection to this provision is that no standards are prescribed and restrictions on aliens can be varied from case to case, thus giving the Commissioner an unparalleled and unwarranted power to inquire into the personal life and beliefs of an alien. Such arbitrary power should not be placed in the hands of any man (H. Rept. 1192, p. 19).

3. To authorize the indefinite detention of aliens against whom warrants of deportation are outstanding more than 6 months when they are deportable on criminal, radical, or immoral charges. The purpose of this fundamental change in the immigration laws is to avoid a repetition of the Eisler case (letter of Attorney General Tom Clark, H. Rept. 1192, p. 13), and to pressure deportable aliens to leave the United States by finding a country which will receive them (H. Rept. 1192, p. 10). There were as of April 1949 an accumulation of 3,278 nonenforceable deportation orders. Of these, there were 1,293 cases of aliens deportable on criminal or immoral charges and only 112 in the subversive class (H. Rept. 1192, p. 12, letter of Attorney General). The fact that there are presently only approximately 100 subversives who cannot be deported because of lack of a receiving country has been reaffirmed in the January 1950 House Appropriations Committee hearings for the Department of Justice. At pages 300–302 of the printed hearings the names and file numbers of these cases are set forth. It appears that even of this number some cases are still in litigation and it is therefore premature to include them. And at page 263 of these appropriations hearings the Immigration Service states that there are only 2,066 (and not 3,278) cases as of June 30, 1949, where aliens could not be deported because passports to receiving countries had been refused. As noted by the minority report, the penalties descend upon the innocent and guilty alike. An alien innocent of any wrongdoing who wants to go out but cannot is subjected to the possibility of lifetime imprisonment, without a judicial trial (H. Rept. 1192, pp. 17–19).

A. This provision is repugnant to American principles. If aliens commit offenses, they can be tried before a judicial tribunal and sentenced. If they are law abiding, they should be free on bond available whenever deportation is practicable. As stated in the Washington Post editorial on June 16, 1949, "let us not imitate the police states by throwing even deportable aliens into concentration camps or giving the Attorney General any such sweeping control over the lives of men and women as the Hobbs bill provides."

B. The provision is unconstitutional. "There is no power in this court or any other tribunal in this country to hold indefinitely any sane citizen or alien in imprisonment except as punishment for a crime. Slavery was abolished by the thirteenth amendment" (Petition of Brooks (5 F. (2d) 238)).

In *Wong Wing* v. *United States* (163 U. S. 228) the Supreme Court stated: "To declare unlawful residence within a country to be an infamous crime, punishable by deprivation of liberty and property, would be to pass out of the sphere of constitutional legislation."

Although these cases are old, it is entirely clear that they represent settled law. It has been repeatedly held that an alien in this country is entitled to procedural due process. (*Yick Wo* v. *Hopkins* (114 U. S. 356); *Japanese Immigrant Case* (189 U. S. 86); *Kwock Jan Fat* v. *White* (253 U. S. 454); *Bridges* v. *Wixon* (326 U. S. 135).) Indeed, the very quotation from the *Fong Yue Ting* case (149 U. S. 698) relied upon in the majority report (p. 11) to indicate the broad power of a sovereign nation to expel aliens, expressly recognizes that there are constitutional limits upon it. The Fong Yue Ting case held in 1893 by a divided court that a Chinese alien had to establish his legal residence in the United States by two credible white witnesses. It is questionable whether the decision would be upheld today. In any event, it did not sanction indefinite detention of aliens, and there is nothing in the language of that case or the case of *Knauff* v. *McGrath* (decided by the Supreme Court January 16, 1950)—an exclusion rather than a deportation case—to cast any doubt upon the soundness of the view expressed in the Wong Wing case supra.

4. To deprive the courts of jurisdiction to release aliens on bond in all immigration cases until final decision by the Supreme Court in the alien's favor (H. Rept. 1192, p. 10). This is a bold attempt to oust the courts of their inherent equity powers in habeas corpus cases to release aliens on bond and is thus designed to whittle down even the writ of habeas corpus. The sense of this provision is to declare its lack of faith in the judiciary and to commit exclusively to the Immigration Service absolute jurisdiction to grant or withhold release on bond. The district and circuit courts are deprived of power to release an alien, even where they have ruled that his detention is illegal, if the Government decides to appeal or apply for certiorari.

The net result of the provisions covered above is to vest the Attorney General and the Immigration Service, whose administration of the immigration and nationality laws has been subjected to repeated judicial criticism, virtually absolute power without precedent in our law to regulate immigration and nationality matters without, in the bold language of the majority report, "being subject to possible inroads by the judiciary," and to determine the status and liberties of aliens in this country, and even of persons claiming American citizenship, without restraint by the courts.

The Hobbs bill has been opposed by Americans for Democratic Action, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers, the American Jewish Congress, and others.

I am including also an editorial from the Washington Post of Wednesday, July 19. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that there was no previous consultation or exchange with the editorial writers of the Post; yet there is a startling similarity of argument between my views and those of the Post, even a similarity of phrase, although each statement was

written independently of the other and without prior knowledge.

NOT THE AMERICAN WAY

Passage of the Hobbs bill by a vote of 326 to 15 in the House must be regarded as a popular demand for tightening up the law in regard to deportable aliens. Since the bill was debated for only 40 minutes, it is reasonable to suppose that many Members who voted for it were not familiar with its details. They voted affirmatively, we suspect, because they believe that subversive and criminal aliens should not be allowed to roam the country without check or supervision so long as the countries from which they came refuse to take them back again. We sympathize with that point of view while deploring the drastic remedy that the Hobbs bill would apply.

The bill has been substantially improved by amendment. Its most drastic provisions are aimed only at alien criminals and subversives who have been found guilty of violating the law and then ordered deported. Certainly aliens of this type should not be foot-loose merely because the country from which they came is unwilling to receive them. In some instances subversives from the iron-curtain countries continue to do their nefarious work here because regimes which sent them to the United States refuse to take them back again. This makes a mockery of American law. We should not put ourselves at the mercy of communistic agents in this fashion. But we ought to deal with these people in accord with the pattern of American justice and not merely give the Attorney General power to throw them into concentration camps, which is the Communist method.

The bill would not require imprisonment of the deportable aliens in question. As an alternative, the Attorney General could require them to report regluarly to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, to submit to medical and psychiatric examination, to give information under oath as to their habits and activities, and to conform to reasonable regulations to be laid down by the Attorney General, until their deportation could be arranged. Properly administered, this section of the bill would afford a salutary check upon the activiites of the undesirables in question. It would enable the Government to keep close watch on what they were doing. Under even the amended bill, however, the Attorney General could step in at any time and order that any alien so controlled and supervised be sent to prison.

It is this provision that is utterly out of keeping with the American concept of due process. We have no doubt that some of the subversive deportable aliens now at large ought to be locked up. But let it be done by bringing proper charges and giving each a fair trial. Proponents of the bill made much of the fact that the individuals concerned have already been tried. But they have also paid the penalty for the offenses for which they have been convicted. What is involved under this bill is a second punishment, without any second trial, merely because deportation cannot be carried out. This is certainly un-American and probably unconstitutional. No such sweeping discretion should be vested in the Attorney General.

Any extensive exercise of this power would result in the establishment of concentration camps. The experience of other countries has proved that, once established, the concentration-camp habit grows. How long would it be before citizens regarded as dangerous to our national security would be thrown into concentration camps without trial? The only safe and reasonable course is to hold fast to the principle of imprisoning people only for crimes for which they have been convicted through our established judicial process. The maintenance of liberty within the country is no less important than defense against enemies without. It is up to the Senate to reshape the Hobbs bill into an effective control system over aliens awaiting deportation without turning over to the Attorney General the power to make the United States a concentration-camp country.

The Lesson of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of July 17, 1950:

THE LESSON OF KOREA

While American troops are fighting against heavy odds in Korea, a monument to American heroism from which they and the whole free world may take added inspiration has been unveiled on the other side of the world in Belgium to honor American soldiers who also battled against desperate odds and rode to final triumph and undying fame. That monument stands in Bastogne, the center of the Battle of the Bulge, where surrounded American forces threw back into the teeth of the enemy his demand for surrender and not only withstood the worst he could offer but also broke the backbone of his resistance and sealed his doom.

On a miniature scale similar battles are now taking place in Korea, and if they do not always end in miniature triumphs it is only because the greater forces that rescued the defenders of Bastogne are still far away. But we have the testimony of both General MacArthur and dispatches from the front that, though compelled to give ground, the American troops are fighting one of the most skillful and heroic holding and rear-guard actions in history. It should help to restore a sense of balance and proportion to point out that, while the 21 days of the Battle of the Bulge cost us a total of 77,000 casualties, our casualties during a similar period in Korea have been 500. Moreover, we have the assurance of both General Collins and General Vandenberg, the Army and Air Force Chiefs of Staff, who made a personal survey of the situation, that as a result of this heroism we are buying enough time to rush up reinforcements adequate not only to hold an extensive bridgehead in Korea but also ultimately to drive the invaders back to where they came from.

Unfortunately, this promise of ultimate liberation is of little immediate help to the Korean people caught in the Red tide. For on the heels of the Communist armies march the Communist commissars, who immediately begin to sovietize the conquered territory—executing the officials of free Korea, liquidating all bourgeois and capitalist elements, dividing the land to gain followers who do not know that the land will be taken from them later, and preparing to legalize their conquest by fake election. These events in conquered Korea give added point to the fears of western Europe that its civilization could never survive a similar fate, and that once it is overrun by Communist armies there will be little left to liberate.

The Korean developments demand, therefore, a new appraisal of the whole situation and the role we are compelled to play. These developments have already demonstrated that the Soviets cannot be contained by mere guaranties, either by the United States or the United Nations, nor by the world's moral forces alone, however important these may be. Nor is it possible to hold them in check by mere economic or military aid to the free nations, as was still possible in Greece. For the Soviet answer to the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Pact, and the implied indictment by the United Nations has been a resort to war—a little war, it is true, conducted by a satellite, but a war, nevertheless, which has full Soviet backing, as demonstrated by the Soviet tanks and planes. Such little wars may be duplicated elsewhere to confuse the issue, to disperse the forces of the free nations, and to strain and perchance exhaust their economies, while Russia builds up its own might.

Under these circumstances the free world has only one choice, and that is to embark on a course which it has hitherto sought to avoid, namely, to build up its own armed strength to the point which will enable it both to deter Russia from going to war and to nip in the bud or crush by overwhelming force any aggression by Soviet satellites acting as Moscow's cat's-paws. This will be no easy matter. For the Soviets have been building up their strength on a military and slave economy which for years has been putting guns before butter, while the free world, though possessing far superior resources and skills, has put them primarily in the service of improved living standards.

Yet neither freedom nor the improved living standards will survive unless they can be defended. And they can be defended only by filling in the military vacuums and creating military power adequate to balance Russian might. That means preparedness, which will demand new sacrifices from both ourselves and all free nations. But these sacrifices are the price that must be paid for security and for peace, and unless that price is paid there will be neither.

Address of National Commander Henry Selvitella, of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid, courageous, American address made by a close friend of mine, Henry Selvitella, of Boston, Mass., National Commander of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, at the State convention of its New York department held on July 1, 1950, at Oswego, N. Y. The address follows:

ADDRESS OF NATIONAL COMMANDER HENRY SELVITELLA, OF BOSTON, MASS., AT STATE CONVENTION OF NEW YORK DEPARTMENT, ITALIAN-AMERICAN WORLD WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES, AT OSWEGO, N. Y.

For 20 years before the last war, we in this country were so engrossed in making money and raising our standard of living that we completely ignored the growing events in the rest of the world. We had no foreign policy then—except the policy to keep out of the boiling pots in Europe and Asia, believing we were safe enough between two

oceans. While we slept, we allowed Germany on one flank, and Japan on the other, to build a military potential that eventually brought us into the most destructive war in history.

You and I, and our dead and crippled buddies paid a terrific price for that mistake—the mistake of believing that the problems abroad were no concern of ours. We have had to have it proved in blood and sacrifice that not only do world events directly affect this Nation as a whole, but also affect each and every one of us personally. As a result of Hitler and Tojo, you were called to a mission of hardship and danger from which you might not have returned.

Let's not make the same mistake again. Let's face the simple but serious fact that what happened yesterday, what happens today, what happens tomorrow, on the international scene—whether you like it or not—happens to you. Not merely to the English or to the French or the Chinese or to Korea, but to you, and your future and your children's future.

Therefore, any of us who have been through the last war, and who still confines his reading to the sport page, in my opinion is courting suicide. And those of you who say that the international situation is the State Department's job, are just plain lazy. The Secretary of State can act to the extent of what he thinks the American people want; and in this connection he is not infallible.

For example, those of you who were in the European theater of operations, and who had any contact with the Russians, soon realized that they were a bunch of barbarians and were not to be trusted. In fact some of you felt that while we were there, we should have finished the job by cleaning out the Russians too—as things have turned out, that wasn't a bad idea after all—but at that time you would have been called warmongers for openly suggesting it.

In spite of the fact that you who were there realized this, the State Department bent over backward to make every conceivable concession to the Russians; and it continued that policy for 5 years after the war. Why? Because the American people—you and the person sitting next to you—either didn't give a darn or cried for more cooperation with the Russians and more and more personal interviews with Stalin.

In the meantime, while we were trying to make the UN work and while Russia was using it as a blind, nation after nation fell to the Russians; and today, as a result of that cooperative policy, almost half the people of the world are under Russian domination. It took the State Department 5 years to realize what you boys saw in 4 weeks of contact with the Russians, namely, that the sole objective of communism is world domination, including the United States, and that she is determined to achieve that objective or die in the attempt, because a Communist state cannot hope to be successful unless it is world-wide. To that end Russia has used, and will continue to use, every treacherous trick at her disposal 24 hours a day, day in and day out.

So far, it seems to me, Joe Stalin has won every hand, and he'll continue to hold the winning hand until we learn to play the game in the same way. But we've got to move a lot faster than we have thus far. Today it's Korea, tomorrow it may be the East Indies or in Iran; yes, it may also be in Europe.

President Truman's bold decision to give immediate armed support to South Korea's defense, to defend Formosa, to strengthen the defenses of the Philippines and of Indochina reverses in one powerful move the stagnant course of American passive foreign policy in the Far East.

So far it has created a united American front around the President for direct United States intervention in world affairs. It has restored new life to the stalemated United Nations on whose behalf American armed intervention for peace has been launched. It has rallied to the United States the support of Great Britain, France, Italy, and 40 other nations. Its momentum has even temporarily created a united political front in London, where Laborites and Conservatives were in the throes of a mortal preelection combat.

It has raised American prestige in Asia and in Europe and, carried out unfalteringly and successfully, it will help to reaffirm United States world leadership. Its success will depend primarily on Stalin's reaction which, in turn, depends on the scope which Soviet policy planned to give to its Korean neighbor.

Stalin's attack on South Korea is but another intermediate step in his over-all bid for Soviet Communist world domination. He may, however, have timed it now as a minor but necessary strategic task, preparatory to the taking of Formosa, the last post of Nationalist Chinese resistance. He may regard it as a probing thrust to ascertain to what extent United States foreign policy has really written off China and the Far East. He certainly could not expect direct American armed reaction. He was entitled to regard last year's Department of State white paper on China as reassurance against any such eventuality.

On the other hand, the attack on South Korea may be yet another customary Moscow move to distract American attention from other more important focal points of planned Soviet aggression in the nearest future, such as Iran or Yugoslavia. The decision to overrun South Korea was certainly taken in Moscow on the day when the last detachment of American troops left that peninsula nearly 2 years ago.

Whatever the result of the immediate Korean issue, however, the President's immediate, determined and bold reaction has already contributed to the restoration of some kind of balance and has taught us several lessons.

In our times the security of a world power is global. It is therefore safer and less costly in blood and treasure constantly to stress this axiom in one's foreign relations, before one's security is directly menaced and aggression becomes likewise global.

The Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States have consistently supported programs that would extend humane and judicious assistance to those deserving nationals overseas whose struggles to establish free governments have been handicapped by hunger and illness and the subjugation to communism by the tenets of Stalism, and I am happy to report that on June 29, 1950, as your national commander I sent to the President of the United States a telegram, for and in behalf of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States and praising him for his decisive action and pledging him the support of this organization to stem the tide of further Soviet aggression.

The Nation's Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in view of pending legislation affecting Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, I should like not only to express my own gratification at the Corporation's splendid achievement, but also to read into the RECORD an expression of what a Boston editor believes:

[From the Meriden (Conn.) Journal of March 4, 1950]

THE NATION'S BANKS

In the past 6 years there hasn't been a single bank failure in the United States. President Truman enjoys the unique distinction of being the first President since 1867 who hasn't had a bank failure during his tenure of office.

These are two of the reassuring items that are contained in the latest report of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The Chairman of that organization has informed the President that the Nation's banks are in excellent condition with deposits and loans at an all-time peak. The banks, he says, appear to be entering a new era of solvency and stability, with the number of bank accounts in the country totaling 104,000,000 as of December 1. We hear concern expressed from time to time over the growing tendency of Americans to look to the Government for their security but this data on the country's banks and recent reports on insurance total increases indicate that the people have by no means abandoned those old-fashioned traits of thrift and self-provision that is so aptly expressed in the familiar saying—"money in the bank."

Statehood Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial entitled "Statehood Now," which was published in the Washington Post of July 19. It is an excellent and timely editorial on this vitally important subject:

STATEHOOD NOW

If there was ever a time when the United States needed to set an example to the world of its treatment of dependent areas under its control, this is it. The Korean conflict, far from lessening the importance of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, actually increases it. This voluntary step would have great psychological effect in anticolonial countries such as India and Indonesia. And, as Defense Secretary Johnson has stated, strong elected local governments in Hawaii and Alaska would be important in the case of attack. "Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii," he writes, "would undoubtedly give a considerable added measure of strength to the over-all defense of both areas in event of an emergency."

Fortunately the statehood bills, both of which have passed the House, are high on the administration's agenda and there is good prospect that they will be brought up in the Senate shortly. For this Alaska and Hawaii have cause to be grateful to Senator O'MAHONEY and the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee which he heads. The committee has issued thorough and convincing reports on both bills which effectively dispose of the arguments against statehood. Both Territories, the reports show, are steeped in the traditions of Americanism and self-government, have voted for statehood, and are financially able to assume the responsibilities of membership in the Union.

In the case of Hawaii, the report debunks the charge of communism, citing repeated

investigations and figures showing that there never have been more than 160 Communists in the islands; Communist influence has waned through alertness on the part of the people. The argument of noncontiguity, which applies to Alaska, too, is answered by the fact that both Territories are far closer in terms of air time today than many present States were even 50 years ago. As to the effect of the large non-Caucasian population of Hawaii, the report has merely to cite the magnificent combat record of Hawaiian units in World War II.

Alaska's population has usually been her most vulnerable point. However, this today is estimated at 135,000—nearly the same as Nevada's—and is increasing rapidly. The report emphasizes that full economic development and realization of Alaska's tremendous potential are not possible without statehood. Under the bill Alaska would derive much more benefit from her own rich resources. The eyes, not only of these Territories, but also a large part of the world, will be on the Senate. It ought not to hesitate in strengthening the Union with these Pacific bastions of Americanism.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles by Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

If the current crop of new reporters wants to know something about the operations of the Communist conspiracy in America, I can tell them where to look for good evidence.

But I would add a little word or two of warning. They cannot get by with only looking. They will also have to make an effort to understand.

Also, they will have to get used to the same discovery over and over and over and over again. In fact, making the discovery is so repetitious and constant and compelling that, if it dealt with anything less than the biggest news story of the modern age, it would be monotonous.

But in the circumstances the discovery is like the rolling waves of the sea. Each comes with irresistible regularity following upon the one before. Each pounds with such force that you lose memory of the one under the stunning impact of the next and the next and the next.

I wonder how many supposedly—at least self-proclaimed—journalistic advisers of the public have ever really tried to find out the facts about communism in the United States of America, before screeching that we have only 3 or 4 years to go if we don't mend our ways.

Why is that so? And if it is so, how can these same screeching come-latelys look at themselves when they're shaving—if they do shave?

For they, who are now running around proclaiming the great news that Stalin lives with intent to do us harm, are the very self-same ones who, in 1938, laughed loudest at the Texas hick, Martin Dies.

They had only scorn and contempt for Dies, the demagogue, the labor baiter, the Red hater, who refused to accept instruction from Mr. Roosevelt to go after the Nazis and the Fascists, but leave out the Communists.

Reporters coming on in Washington who want to learn, maybe, a little something about the importance of sticking to facts and avoiding the enticements of politicians in high office who want to use the press as a mere public convenience or utensil, will take a lesson from the case of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Do you consider communism a serious matter, today? Why?

If it is serious today, when did it begin to be a serious matter? What happened? What changed conditions and cases, to make it so?

Young reporters, go to the Library of Congress and start reading the hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. They are all printed in English and it costs nothing to look.

And whoever would look and listen, can learn something.

You can learn, for instance, some things from the testimony of John P. Frey, president then of the Metal Trades Union of the A. F. of L., the first witness on communism before the committee.

Read there the names and affiliations of some 288 men and women, listed by John P. Frey in August 1938, who were then or until recently had been in positions of importance in the organizations of CIO unions.

Names which became famous, if that is the word, in years that followed: Joe Curran, Harry Bridges, Mike Quill, Jack Stachel, Lucien Koch, James Matles, and Abraham Flaxer.

Those are just a few that everybody remembers for one bad reason or another. But there were others, such as George Mink, the walking representative of death.

And there was an obscure character calling himself Eugene Dennis, who 10 years later would be the biggest noise at the trial of the 11 top Communists in New York.

In all, the names of more than 500 persons of importance in and to the Communist conspiracy—not mere placard wavers and cop baiters, but really significant operatives—you will find in Frey's testimony.

How many of them can you identify, if you are a journalist claiming to know what this conspiracy amounts to, and how many more do you know?

What do you know about John P. Frey's testimony in 1938 telling the Communists' part in the precipitation of riots and death in the strikes?

Oh, yes, it is very easy today to talk about the dangers of communism and to demand the people of the United States fork over multiplied billions of dollars to government agencies on the theory that Europe must be bribed to save itself.

But what about 1938 when John P. Frey put on record the facts about communism—not just in Europe, though he did that, too—but most importantly, in the United States of America?

Where were you then?

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

It was no accident that a law was put on the books in 1947 requiring that officers of American labor unions swear themselves to be free of communism.

An examination of hearings 10 years before by the House Committee on Un-American Activities will show why. The testimony was given by John P. Frey, president of the A. F. of L. metal trades.

His warning was later buttressed by thousands of pages of additional testimony taken from hundreds of witnesses the country over, that proved no union could tolerate communism and save itself.

They gave a complete panorama of Communist aims and activities not only in American trade unions but in those of Italy, France, and Britain, and showed with names, dates, and places, just how Communist infiltration into unions was coordinated with parallel work in political and educational fields.

Frey had a motive, of course, in addition to his concern as a good citizen. The A. F. of L. was bitter because John L. Lewis' local had in 1935 broken loose and set up the CIO.

This same Lewis, in 1924, had bought full-page advertisements in newspapers all around the United States to denounce and expose with undeniable fact, the conspiratorial character of the Communist movement as an agency of the Soviet Government in Moscow.

Yet in 1935, for the reasons still obscure, Lewis had opened the doors of the CIO to communism. I say "still obscure" even though it is obvious from even the briefest study of Lewis's character that he loves power and is inclined to grab any stick to beat the dog.

I have no doubt he would use Communists as stepping stones to power just as quickly as he would use and has used, all other kinds of people. But yet, in 1922 to 1924 he had a brush with them that came within a hair's breadth of losing him his United Mine Workers' union. He is not so stupid as to have forgotten.

I have heard it said that Lewis early saw how communism was developing within the New Deal and decided in 1934 to 1935 that he would run in ahead of it with the CIO, the better to head off revolution.

That is a likely face-saving story it is true, but it also has some merit just the same. For sure it is that the Communists in and surrounding the Government were out to capture the labor movement with the Government's help, after 1933.

John L., for all that he sat down with them, used them and was used by them, just can not be pictured as a reliable and faithful Moscow missionary, obedient to the discipline and the orders from the throne that every Communist must meekly obey.

Somewhere in the murky depths of New Deal chicanery there lies a hidden story yet to be told. Lewis put the CIO together in 1935 with Communists running his errands. In 1936 he handed the famous half a million dollars to F. D. R.

In 1937 he began to find himself on the way out, and his ultimate unhappy leave taking from the CIO, as all the world knows, was not his own idea.

His successor in office, Philip Murray, was a much softer and more pliable type, and well the Communists understood it.

It was the intertwining of the Communists throughout the CIO that had John P. Frey busy in 1938 filling the record of the House committee.

He foretold what would happen in such major unions as the National Maritime

Union, the United Auto Workers, the Transport Workers, Steelworkers, and other behemoths.

He warned that unless union labor kept itself free of Communist encirclement labor would one day find itself working for a tyranny which menaces the structure and form of our Government.

The NMU and its president, Joe Curran, tried to live with communism and failed. Curran at one point even denounced his own organization as a Communist captive.

The UAW has gone through the same pattern.

And the CIO as a whole found itself in serious internal straits when in 1947 it was, almost 10 years after Frey's testimony, confronted with a law of Congress at last requiring that officers of unions sign affidavits that they were not members of the Communist Party.

After Frey the witnesses flooded in, and the evidence with them. Evidence of communism in the schools, in the Federal theater, arts, and writers' projects of the WPA, of Communist fronts, such as the Workers' Alliance, International Workers' Order, International Labor Defense, American Student Union, American Youth Congress.

Name after name was entered in the committee hearings of alien Communists in the United States of America, subject to deportation.

But no action was taken. To the contrary, Mrs. F. D. Roosevelt, herself, was a leader in heaping scorn and ridicule upon the committee, and on several occasions actually quartered Communist members of the American Youth Congress in the White House itself.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The purpose here is to show how conclusively, by 1938, the facts on communism were available on the public record for anybody to know.

I started this series by indicating very briefly some reportorial experiences of my own with communism in and out of the Federal bureaucracy.

That was merely to indicate once more the basic proposition of my argument that I know the Democratic administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt willingly and utterly let itself be used by communism, and vice versa, just as it is obvious that the Truman administration is covering up where it can, on both the Roosevelt record and its own.

There was an understanding between Roosevelt, his Cabinet, and communism. Harold Ickes, Francis Biddle, Harry Hopkins, Henry Wallace, just to name a few of the many, all consorted with and associated with Communists in their time.

What excuse have such men today, for what they have done to the people of the United States of America?

I would be interested in hearing Ickes, for example. Or the elegant Biddle. I suppose Wallace, if he should really try to explain himself, would risk being taken for a lunatic.

Here was a man who came within a heartbeat of being President of the United States, who actually had the gall, in 1948, to say that he had never knowingly met a Communist in his entire life in spite of his publicly known associations and behavior.

In making the general survey thus far I have not dealt with one of the most dramatic and conclusive pieces of evidence, the civil war in Spain.

That bloody incident, though it happened in Europe, offered conclusive proof to Americans that communism in the United States is and always has been an arm of the Soviet Union.

I do not propose here to run through the intricate and overwhelming file of evidence on the Spanish civil war that I have in my possession. To do that in anything like comprehensive form, would make a large and obnoxious book.

It would be large because the mass of material is great, and obnoxious because it could only hammer and hammer and hammer home again the fact that America was used by communism against Spain in that war for the profit of Russia.

I would have to tell about a yacht that put out from Spain, in the last days of the war, loaded with bullion, jewels, negotiables, and papers. And how that yacht finally came to land at Vera Cruz, in Mexico.

And of a man who called me from Mexico City to ask me if I would like to put my arm, literally up to the elbow, into gold and gems just to have the experience. He was negotiating to buy that stolen wealth of the Spanish people.

I would have to tell how American citizens whom I knew well, bragged of their part in smuggling bombing planes to the Communist side.

And how, when it was all over, I used to visit the courtly, impeccable ambassador of General Franco's government, Juan de Cardenas, at the Spanish Embassy on Sixteenth Street and see where his predecessors had chiseled the religious ornaments out of the embassy walls.

But instead of all that, I will just pass the Spanish Civil War into the record with a few quotes from an affidavit that can be found in the public hearing records of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, pages 259–264. It was given on June 24, 1938, by one Herbert Hunt Seal, who had been an aviator for the Communists.

Seal said that he was looking around San Francisco in 1937 for some kind of flying job, when he bumped into an acquaintance who by easy stages led him into the hands of a "Mr. Specter." From there it was just a matter of days until Seal was in New York City, and from there to Spain. Then:

"On October 20, 1937, the Plaza was bedecked in this small town (Albacete) with banners, the Spanish Republican flag and the flag of the Soviet Union.

A "small reviewing stand was built and the troops paraded around it practicing for a review before the United States Representatives Jerry O'Connell and John T. Bernard, who were reviewing this Anglo-American Brigade on that memorable day which was the anniversary of the beginning of the Russian Revolution."

O'Connell and Bernard were Democrats loud in those days in their denunciation of all who had a doubtful word to say about Communism, and yet here is what the affidavit says:

"That night on questioning, Nat Wolf, our political commissary, an American boy, with regard to the actions of Representative O'Connell, his speech, and so forth, I was informed that this Representative was one of the originals, that is to say a Communist of long standing in America, and that it was the Communist party through the mine workers that were responsible for his being elected to Congress."

Yes, those were days in Spain and America to be remembered.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Now we turn to a survey of evidence on communism by the second witness ever to appear before the House Committee on Un-American activities.

This witness, like the one who preceded him, fails to fit into any propaganda typecasting.

The first witness on communism, as I have already mentioned, was the president of a labor union and he filled the record with specific, exact, documented and detailed support of his charge and warning that union labor must kick out communism from its ranks or suffer.

It is a matter of historic fact, known to everybody, that union labor did not, from 1938 to 1947, do its patriotic duty to shun and avoid and even make attack on communism. Result:

The clause in the Taft-Hartley law, inserted by national demand, requiring all labor union officers to take oath that they are not Communists.

Further result: Not to this day has union labor fully recovered the Nation's confidence that once it had, and yet willfully threw away because it would not accept the evidence on communism given by one of its own, John P. Frey, president of the metal trades union, A. F. of L.

Now we come to witness No. 2. Neither does he turn to be a larded and plush representative of the few. He is not a pompous clubman come to sound windy generalities against "the radicals" and "the labor skates."

On the other hand, he is a spry, modest, scholarly sort of gentleman who couldn't possibly be more precise or exact or particular in what he says.

He comes on to testify in the afternoon of August 16, 1938. What is his name? Walter S. Steele. Whom does he represent? He answers:

"For the National Republic, and as chairman of the American Coalition Committee on National Security, and 114 organizations that are listed in my statement, and I am appearing at the special request of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Reserve Officers' Training Camps Association of the United States."

Whereupon, he inserts into the record the 114 organizations that had authorized him to speak for them. The estimated total number of Americans he represented in that appearance, he put at something like 20,000,000.

What of it? Merely to emphasize once more that in 1938 there were plenty of people in this country aware and concerned as to communism.

They were not talking about communism in Russia, either, as I shall show, but about

communism in the United States of America. The land of the free and the home of the brave.

They were anxious to interest the Federal Government in the matter and have it stop these enemies within our gates.

There wasn't any atom bomb to steal, in those days.

But such as there was to be had the Communists were making off with it and the 20,000,000 above-mentioned were present before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in the personality of Walter Steele, to call attention.

What did Walter Steele have to tell the House Committee on Un-American Activities?

Item: "An effort will be made to prove to you that the un-American forces in the United States have attained a membership and direction of over 6,500,000 people."

Item: "You will be shown that these movements are highly centralized in control and direction * * * from Moscow. It will be shown that while communism viciously denounces Wall Street, they are not averse to using Wall Street's families in their schemes and that they play with more money annually than many a Wall Street banker."

Item: "It will be shown that while denouncing what they term the 'capitalist controlled press,' Communists have 'the largest monopolized press in the world.'"

Item: "We will show that over 25,000,000 pieces of propaganda have been let loose in the United States during the last two years by the Communists and their mass movements, and this does not include their many periodicals."

Item: "We will show you that the 75,000 composing the members of the Communist party direct are but a small portion of all the Communist forces in the United States, and that they have a direct following and influence of over 800,000 in the New York district alone."

Such were some of the opening premises laid down for several pages of hearing text. And then the cross-examination for nearly 300 pages.

Did Mr. Steele make his case? Why don't you read the full record and find out?

It would reward anybody honestly wanting to know whether communism's true character was available on the public record in 1938.

But for those who haven't the time for that, more details here as we go along.

Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of July 17, 1950:

MOBILIZATION

Paramount among questions yet unanswered which the American people are asking is if there will be mobilization. and if there is an M-day how great the degree of mobilization will be.

In the final analysis there is only a single degree of mobilization. There is no such thing as partial mobilization for reasons which must be detailed to be made perfectly clear. Military and economic mobilization requires a shift in the direction the national economy is going, an alteration in the lives of the Nation's people and even a change in their ways of thinking.

The state of partial mobilization sets loose forces in the national economy which inevitably result in complete mobilization. In a democracy equal opportunity carries with it equal sacrifice. This is true of the mobilization of the service of the people in war, and mobilization of productive facilities for war.

The Nation cannot in fairness command a competitive productive unit to change over to war production and blandly hand consumer markets over to a competitor. The Nation cannot in fairness require a sacrifice of certain units of the National Guard and Organized Reserve and put all the weight of the sacrifice on the people of certain States and sections of the country.

The alternative is gradual mobilization, a step at a time, one step following the other until the emergency passes. It is this quandary that faces President Truman, the military leaders and the people of the Nation.

Price controls, wage controls, rationing, allocation of materials—all the measures a Nation must take to make certain of maximum use of its economy—are certain results of mobilization, and the planning of such a step is beset by the perils of faulty judgment, overconfidence, excessive caution and the whole range of fallibility of the human mind.

By and large, the people of the United States are thinking far ahead of their national leaders in this crisis. Unhampered by the knowledge of the minutae of collateral problems of planning the people see the Korean crisis in accurate perspective even though the picture is colored by emotion.

It has been said that a third world war would make it necessary for the American people to surrender some of their freedoms, to move toward the totalitarian pattern of regimented existence. This the American people doubt. It cannot be said that fear or panic colors the judgment of the Nation today.

Strong in the American mores is the spirit of competition, the tense tightness of the wait for the starting gun, the fierce surge of competitive energy held in check awaiting release, the impatience to get away from the mark. Today, in this crisis, the American people are of the opinion that the breathing spell is almost ended and that the time is at hand to field the first team.

Water Resources of New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 19 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on July 16, I made on many New Mexico radio stations my regular report to the citizens of my State. Because of many requests for copies of this talk dealing with the water resources of New Mexico, I feel that it may have general interest. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hello, friends of New Mexico, this is Clinton Anderson speaking to you from the Nation's Capital with a message which this time will be about water in New Mexico and the development of power as a result of the conservation of water. Naturally there will come into the talk some information as to the possibilities of future development of our water resources.

Incidentally, I want to comment today on a subject which has been attracting a great deal of attention in New Mexico these past few months—the subject of rain-making. We are all intrigued by the idea of changing the climate, particularly in the arid Southwest. We become interested in the possibility that the country itself could change through the use of rain-making devices, that the arid regions of New Mexico could have a climate comparable to that of the Middle West and that it might have a regular, dependable rainfall similar to that of the great breadbasket upon which this Nation has come to rely for its corn, wheat, oats, rye, and barley.

I don't know the answer but I do know that the possibility exists that rains can be man-made, that areas can be saved from prolonged periods of drought by the unusual activities of scientists who understand the skillful seeding of clouds in order that their waters may be precipitated over what otherwise might be barren stretches of parched mesa. So here we go for a few minutes' visit with you on water, power development as a result of falling waters, and the possibilities of man-made rain.

There was a time when we took water for granted. We thought of it as a gift of nature which we could depend upon just as we expect the sun to shine tomorrow. We knew it was essential to the welfare of human beings and animal life but we expected it to be available in the places, times, and amounts that nature supplied it.

However, there developed in this country the desire to dam up mountain streams to catch the early spring runoff of melting snows and flood waters, to store the water in the artificial lakes which man could create behind the huge dams and hold it until it might be needed as supplementary water to dry-land farming. Finally we began the aggressive drive for the construction of irrigation projects to turn areas far too dry for the ordinary production of crops into choice farm lands with a steady supply of water always available at any needed spot.

As the country grew and the old farm lands in the breadbasket seemed unequal to the future task of providing food, feed, and fiber for man and beast, we realized that these irrigation projects were an essential part of our agricultural plant. We learned that America could not depend upon natural rainfall entirely and that if we were to feed a population which now is 150,000,000 people and soon will be 175,000,000 or 200,000,000 people, we might have a meager diet if we could not count as a steady source of additional food and fiber the great valleys which stretched along the side of our streams in areas normally too dry for the production of crops.

Thus from the previous position that it occupied as a free economic good, water began to assume a far more important spot among the resources that were scarce and must be economized. It was only a step from that realization to a determination that we would not only dam up this water so that it could be useful but that we would build multiple-purpose projects to enable the power developed by falling water to be used to light our homes and turn the wheels of our factories. A Federal program of reclamation was inaugurated, and from 1902 to June 30, 1947, the Federal Government spent more than a billion dollars on reclamation projects. Added to this, of course, were growing expenditures by the Corps of Engineers on rivers and harbors and for flood control so that the combined total came to $3,750,000,000.

Today this Nation has approved projects, most of them scheduled for the next 6 years, which will cost more than $10,000,000,000 or nearly three times the total expenditures for all Federal water resources in all our previous history. But that is only a step and in reality a small step. The program we now contemplate, including projects which are already in the planning stage, involves another $35,000,000,000 and perhaps as much as $50,000,000,000 and from that we go on to new goals and new water uses far greater than any we have now contemplated. These may bring the total cost to $100,000,000,000 before we are through.

Why is water in short supply in so many places throughout the Nation? Perhaps we can get a little hint of what is going on when we point out that only a few decades ago a per capita use of 100 gallons a day was regarded as ample. Today with new demands, a consumption of 250 gallons is common and 1,000 gallons a day during midsummer is not at all unusual.

It is that Nation-wide circumstance coupled with our own immediate problems that has led to an announcement by the Bureau of Reclamation of great interest to us. That announcement is that the Bureau will conduct a complete investigation in the State of New Mexico to determine its over-all State water resources. That announcement comes as the result of suggestions and requests made by officers of the New Mexico Economic Development Commission. I am happy indeed that the Secretary of Interior, Oscar Chapman, has decided to approve this over-all survey, that it will be a comprehensive report similar in all respects to reports on the water resources of Texas and Oklahoma recently completed by the Department of the Interior, and that Wesley R. Nelson, well known to all of us in New Mexico but now an Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation in Washington, has been assigned to the over-all direction of the preparation of this report. He is familiar with conditions in our State and is our friend. How fortunate we are that we can count upon him to make a thoroughgoing study of all our water resources—natural rainfall, irrigation, pumping from shallow wells, the conservation of the flow of all our streams, wherever located, and an appraisal of what we may expect in the way of availability of water for generations to come.

Investigation in the Canadian and Red River Basins in the northeast part of the State may be expected to move forward more rapidly now that the Arkansas-White-Red Basins interagency committee has been formed by direction of President Truman to coordinate the efforts of all the Federal agencies in the field of water-resources development. The committee will include representatives of all States of the basin and will participate in the formulation of an over-all coordinated plan for the use of the water resources of the basin States.

Many of us are going to Oklahoma City on July 28 for the initial meeting of the committee. The governors and Senators of eight Southwestern States have been invited there on that date for the kick-off meeting. New Mexico will be represented because our State has a substantial interest in the complete development of the Canadian River.

Of current importance are the investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation to determine the best use of New Mexico's share of the water of the Colorado River as apportioned to the State by the compact and the more recent agreement of the upper-basin States. At present, studies of the San Juan-Chama transmountain diversion are being pushed, but previously studies were completed on the Shiprock Indian project involving around 100,000 acres and preliminary studies have been made of the South San Juan project. The State of New Mexico will soon be ready to work with the Bureau of Reclamation on a complete program for New Mexico's use of its share of the Colorado River waters and all of us should be happy when authorizing legislation has been passed and money made available for this important work.

Investigations of rehabilitation of existing projects is now proceeding. Foremost among these are studies of the Carlsbad project, which include possible means of bypassing the salt cedars in the delta above Lake McMillan and to avoid loss of water by evaporation. Studies for the rehabilitation of existing privately developed lands around Maxwell in the northeastern part of the State which would be known as the Vermejo project, have been completed. Legislation authorizing the project has once passed the Congress, and while it was vetoed, favorable action can be expected to come soon.

The future of rural electrification development in northern New Mexico is directly associated with the development of the hydroelectric resources of the basins in and adjacent to northern New Mexico.

The Bureau of Reclamation is proposing the construction of a transmission line from Socorro to Albuquerque, with an extension from Willard to Bernardo to effect an interconnection between the Rio Grande power system and the utility system at Albuquerque. This will provide for the maximum interchange of energy to serve the REA in the Estancia Valley as an expedient until additional generating capacity can be made available. The extension of this system north of Albuquerque will be made at some future date to interconnect with the future hydroelectric developments to the north. This will permit a more complete integration of power production geared to proper river control for maximum utilization of the water resources. A number of possibilities are now under study by the Bureau of Reclamation to bring to fruition a plan of development for authorizing additional construction for the area north of Albuquerque. The proposed San Juan-Chama diversion project has a hydroelectric potential of 248,000 kilowatts.

Another prospective development is the San Luis which has a potential of 175,000 kilowatts. A third but less significant power development would be the installation of a power plant at Caballo Dam to utilize the head at this reregulating reservoir. This plant would be directly connected to the present power system on the Rio Grande project and would permit the recapture of the energy now lost during outflow from the Caballo Dam.

These projects would be interconnected by transmission lines with the present Rio Grande system to permit the maximum of firm power production. Transmission system extensions, where economically justified, also would be made to serve REA cooperatives and other systems operating in the area.

These projects, including even developments such as the Gunnison-Arkansas project in Colorado, although not confined to our State of New Mexico, are essential components of the more comprehensive development and utilization of water resources of the West and contribute to the welfare of New Mexico.

Can we have all these blessings and still make it rain where and when we want it?

Rainmaking has interested man through the ages as he has sought to combat famine and loss of life in periods of drought. Many of the early approaches involved elaborate tribal rituals based on superstition, but in the nineteenth century suggestions of a pseudo-scientific nature were brought forward.

The experiments of recent years have been based on a somewhat more mature knowledge of cloud growth and rain-releasing processes. Dr. Irving Langmuir and Vincent Schaefer of the General Electric Laboratories in 1946 and 1947 demonstrated that a cloud composed of liquid water droplets at below freezing temperature may be largely converted into an ice-crystal or snow cloud by seeding the cloud with pellets of solid carbon dioxide (dry ice), silver iodide particles or other suitable substances. This result has since been obtained by many experimenters and is generally accepted by scientists. Under certain conditions, which are not fully understood, these snow particles produced by seeding may grow to a sufficient size to fall out of the cloud, and reach the ground as rain or snow. That this has happened following some of the seeding experiments conducted in 1947–50 is the basis for modern rainmakers' claims. However, the conditions under which rain reached the ground following seeding were apparently those favorable for natural rain. And because of the difficulty of differentiation between natural rain and man-made rain, it is hard to say whether or not the rain which fell was a direct result of seeding.

The United States Weather Bureau in cooperation with the Air Force in 1948 and 1949 made over 200 test seedings in different parts of the country and into different types of clouds. An effort was made to experiment under many weather conditions, not just those favorable for natural rain. In most of these Weather Bureau-Air Force experiments, it was found that the clouds were often modified, but little or no rain attributable to seeding actually reached the ground.

On the other hand, there have been many claims of successful rainmaking. Perhaps the most spectacular of these are the claims of Dr. Langmuir that tremendous quantities of rain were produced by seeding in New Mexico in October 1948 and July 1949. Dr. Langmuir states that "on October 14, 1948, the total rain in New Mexico was 180,000,000,000 gallons of which only 5 percent resulted from natural nucleation." He further states: "On July 21, 1949, the total rain was * * * 440,000,000,000 gallons, of which 34 percent resulted from natural nucleation."

What do you think? It's worth a try, isn't it? Maybe a future farmer will be able to telephone Santa Fe and say: "It's dry on my range. Give me a half-inch of rainfall tomorrow." That will be the Buck Rogers age.

This is CLINTON ANDERSON asking you to listen again 2 weeks from today and saying good-by from Washington.

Effects of Inflation on Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 19 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, inflation, runaway prices, as a result of heavy demands for manpower and materials to win the war in Korea, would be very unfortunate. It would work a hardship on the great mass of our people.

The junior Senator from Nebraska, by request of representatives of small-business establishments, made some remarks on inflation over the radio last night, on the eve of President Truman's message to Congress today. I ask unanimous

consent that my statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KENNETH S. WHERRY, OF NEBRASKA

Now I would like to speak directly to the owners of small-business establishments throughout the United States. There are about 3,500,000 of you engaged in a countless variety of businesses.

I am a small-business man myself. And as a member of the Senate Committee on Small Business for several years, its chairman during the Eightieth Congress, I have come to know some of the problems that confront the independent businessman.

Like everyone else, you are eager to know what tomorrow's news will be, and you are greatly concerned over the future.

The managers of large corporations, doing huge businesses, are also deeply concerned, but most of them are better able to withstand the shocks, no matter what they may be, than are you small-business men.

At this time, it is not certain that it will be necessary to reimpose wartime controls upon business; but developments, since the start of the war in Korea, indicate that you businessmen can do much to keep the economy on an even keel, if you will, each and every one of you, make profiteering and price-gouging your number one target.

You know that, where there is today a normal even flow of materials, goods, and supplies, apparent shortages can be created by overbuying and overstocking. Goods lying idle in inventory, whether in the consumer's pantry or in the merchant's warehouse—help create the very condition of runaway prices, which we all want to avoid.

Combined, the millions of you, can voluntarily do much to discourage overstocking. The right kind of leadership, through such organizations as the National Federation of Independent Business, can accomplish miracles in applying common sense to the present situation.

If you could just get over to your fellow businessmen that it isn't smart to hoard, when the Nation is confronted by such conditions as exist today, you will have done a good job for yourself and, what is more important, a patriotic job for your country.

This is the time when the overwhelming majority of American businessmen whose patriotism rises above all thought of personal gain can do a big job for the Nation by making it unpopular for the small, unthinking minority to aggravate price and supply situations by hoarding of goods and by simply marking up prices on the pretext that the increases are necessary because of general conditions.

Rigid wartime controls—OPA, with all its red tape, rules, regulations, and nuisances—are well remembered.

We all know that there are among us people who would like to reestablish ironclad Government control of business for the sheer joy of running other people's businesses.

Failure of businessmen to do their part in their day-to-day contacts with other businessmen will simply make bolder the small minority of chiselers and those whose goal is to establish an all-powerful Government of bureaucratic bosses in Washington.

Some of the representatives of independent businessmen's associations have suggested that in view of my wide contacts among small-business men by virtue of my duties in the Senate I make this statement for broadcasting.

Some of us recall what happened to thousands of small businesses during the First World War, also the difficulties that confronted the independent businessmen during the past war.

It seems to me that out of these experiences, some of them most bitter, we should have gained knowledge on procedures for protecting the rights and opportunities for small-business men to keep strong our system of competitive enterprise and to see that independent business establishments have full opportunity to play their part in maintaining a strong national economy.

So, to sum it up, the immediate job for businessmen generally in the present price and supply situation is to pass along the words in every city, village, and hamlet in the land:

"Don't rock the boat."

And to this might be added that time-honored admonition:

"Together we stand, divided we fall."

The Guatemalan Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 19 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I believe that everyone will agree that it would be absurd to forget that we have the problem of meeting the Communist menace in our own backyard—absurd to forget that problem merely because we are concentrating on the paramount problem of defeating communism in Korea.

On April 27, I commented on the floor of the Senate on the subject of the Communist crisis in Guatemala, and the need for strong State Department backing for the splendid work performed there by Ambassador Richard C. Patterson, Jr. My comments may be found beginning on page 5879 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Since then the Guatemalan situation has received a tremendous amount of public attention, based on articles in the New York Times, Intelligence Digest, and many other leading national and international journals. In my own State, the Milwaukee Journal has carried a reprint on the present situation and the La Crosse Register has also commented on the Guatemalan crisis.

Now in the August 1950 issue of the great magazine the Reader's Digest, there is a very extensive article on this subject by Mr. J. P. McEvoy. This article written necessarily several months ago, prior to the Korean crisis, indicates how necessary it is that we reinforce the Ambassador's stand by strong effective actions. Certainly, the vicious new tactics of the Cominform, as demonstrated in the open aggression in Korea underline the points made in this article.

TWO FINE TEXTS ON RED MENACE

On Monday, July 17, I was delighted to note that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] placed in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages A5164 through A5166, the text of an important address delivered before the Knights of Columbus, in Cumberland, Md., by the Reverend Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs. Following Dr. Thorning's able article, Congressman MCCORMACK placed in the RECORD the first in the series of six New York Times dispatches on Soviet penetration in Central America by Mr. Will Lisner.

The situation in Guatemala must give pause to every single defense expert, churchman, layman, and all the rest of us deeply concerned about security of this hemisphere and deeply concerned about pan-American unity.

WAIT-AND-SEE TACTICS NO GOOD

I am still awaiting news from the State Department of decisive actions—not wait-and-see finger twiddling—unmistakable actions by which the Department will tell the world (a) of its displeasure with the Guatemalan results thus far, and (b) its support of Ambassador Patterson. Assistant Secretary of State Miller in a direct talk with the President of Guatemala indicated in words America's stand, but it will take action to speak louder than those words—frank, logical action.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the article in the August 1950 Reader's Digest, to be followed by the text of the article in the Friday, July 7, La Crosse (Wis.) Register—a diocesan newspaper. This article entitled "Watch Guatemala" was written by Paul H. Hallett, Litt. D.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the La Crosse (Wis.) Register of July 7, 1950]

WATCH GUATEMALA

The series of articles on Central America that has been running in the New York Times confirms charges by the Reverend Dr. Joseph Thorning, well-known exponent of inter-American solidarity, that Guatemala is under Communist domination. The Communists in that nation of 3,000,000 number only 3,000, but that is enough for them to control the country and make it difficult for us if the Korean war should spread. Guatemala is next door to the Panama Canal.

Last month Kenneth de Courcy, editor of Intelligence Digest, declared that Soviet agents had established secret bases on the Guatemala coast, where Russian submarines could be refueled, and that a radio station had been established there to permit them to communicate with Moscow. President Gonzales Arevalo tried to laugh off this accusation, but in view of what has taken place in his country he cannot complain if the suspicion sticks. Arevalo is not a Communist, but he thinks he can use the party for his own ends. He is due to resign next March 15, and the election will be fought out between leftist and more conservative forces. If the elections do not go the Communist way, this may be a signal for Red intervention, Korea style.

Guatemala has been plagued more than any other Central American country with sectarian liberalism. In 1830 every religious order was suppressed and church property was nationalized. From this blow the church never recovered, although in the 25 years between 1845 and 1870 Guatemala enjoyed a religious peace that marked a high point in her culture. Today the worst fruit of anticlericalism is shown in the number of only 125 priests for the entire nation. "When I think of Guatemala with its scarcity of clergy, I cannot sleep," Pius XII told the archbishop of Guatemala.

One thing that emerges from the Times dispatches is that the Central American country that has had the happiest relations with the church, Costa Rica, is also the one with the highest living standard and the friendliest relations with the United States. Also, both Costa Rica and Honduras, a friendly country, have relations with Spain. Guatemala maintains the absurd pretense of recognizing the "Spanish government in exile." It also practically expelled our Ambassador, Richard Patterson, last month. That is something for the State Department to think about.

[From the Reader's Digest of August 1950]

TROUBLE IN OUR OWN BACK YARD

(B. J. P. McEvoy)

"We have reports your life is in danger. Return to Washington at once."

Believe it or not, the State Department found it necessary to send this incredible message recently to a United States ambassador who was not behind the iron curtain, but right in our own back yard. It went to Richard C. Patterson, Jr., who since 1948 had been our Ambassador to Guatemala.

Patterson had served 3 years as United States ambassador to Tito's Yugoslavia and brought to his job in Guatemala first-hand knowledge of Communist tactics. That's where the rub started. President Juan José Arevalo, of Guatemala, claims his regime is "spiritual socialism," but the real bosses of the country are the leaders of the Communist-dominated labor unions. These leaders, irritated by Patterson's blunt savvy, pressured Arevalo to demand his recall for "interfering in the internal affairs of the country."

The State Department categorically rejected the accusation. But Patterson, ordered home because of threats against his life, posted armed guards around the embassy and secretly slipped out of the country.

Patterson says he was genuinely baffled by all this, that his relations with Government officials from President Arevalo on down had been most friendly. But in Guatemala recently I was told by top businessmen that Patterson had gone to bat for American interests—persecuted by discriminatory legislation and unfair labor practices for years—more vigorously than any American Ambassador to Guatemala in a generation. Patterson himself, when queried, replied he thought that was what an ambassador was for.

American interests in Guatemala are enormously important. The United Fruit Co. has $100,000,000 invested there. Last year it spent $16,000,000, including taxes, which equaled 30 percent of Guatemala's national budget. The American-owned International Railways of Central America have $89,000,000 invested. Add to this the Empresa Electrica (a subsidiary of Electric Bond & Share), Pan American Airways, Grace & Co., the oil-distributing companies—and you have some $250,000,000 American dollars plowed into a tiny agricultural country smaller than North Carolina. But that's not all: 91 percent of Guatemala's exports are bought by Americans with dollars, coffee representing more than half of this and bananas a big share of the remainder.

This leaves us wide open to accusations of "Yankee exploitation." But what are the facts? The railway company pays manual labor $1.67 a day; the Guatemalan Government pays 64 cents for similar work. The United Fruit Co. pays agricultural labor a minimum of $1.36 a day; the Government pays 40 cents on Government-owned coffee plantations, while private Guatemalan coffee planters pay their workers from 10 to 50 cents a day and provide a few of the health and educational benefits offered by such American companies as United Fruit. This company, with 13,000 employees, runs modern hospitals and clinics, conducts vast malaria-control programs, and provides 54 schools and 84 teachers for some 3,000 pupils.

"Yankee exploitation?" Even Guatemalan leaders who broadcast this propaganda lie don't believe it privately. In a series of articles in the New York Herald Tribune, Fitzhugh Turner tells of one leader who remarked to an American businessman in a moment of candor: "You people are doing things for your workers that we won't be able to do in 50 years. That's why I hate you."

The Communist Party is outlawed by the Guatemalan Constitution, so of course no self-confessed Communist can be found in any important position. Yet a number of high-ups talk like Communists, parroting the wearisome lies about "pro-Fascist North American forces of imperialism." They act like Communists, following the party line without deviation.

The party platform of the Committee of Workers of Guatemala, adopted in January 1950, contains such familiar double talk as this: "Armed by a revolutionary ideology, faithful to our principles of class, captained by the Soviet Union, we should frontally attack the forces of reaction, imperialism, and war, led by pro-Fascist North American circles who are developing plans to subjugate all countries. * * *"

Labor unions were permitted in Guatemala for the first time in 1945. Seizing the opportunity, Communist organizers moved in fast and organized Guatemalan labor with themselves in control. The Guatemalan unions have largely followed one program: bludgeon American interests with long lists of outrageous demands—the companies can either submit or go out of business.

Guatemala's labor code provides that firms with more than 500 employees must pay time-and-a-half for overtime (against time-and-a-quarter for others) and grant vacations twice as long. It makes strikes illegal in harvesttime except against employers of 500 or more. Few enterprises except the American railroad and fruit companies have so many employees.

After 16 months of strikes, slow-downs and threats of physical violence, the United Fruit Co. signed a pact in March 1949 which expired in February 1950. The company was then presented with 197 new demands. These included a 100-percent increase in overtime pay—twice the rate provided by the labor law. The company was required to designate the number of workers to be used on each farm permanently, with this number never to be less than the total presently engaged. The union demanded that specialized workers be kept on each job and not switched from driving tractors to cutting fruit, to irrigating, etc. Since a worker would be occupied only a few days per month if confined to his specialty, the labor force would have to be increased enormously, with ruinous wage costs.

In addition to these demands, it was insisted that such existing services as free housing and free electric lights and water be controlled and that noncontributory pension at four-fifths the average salary earned during the last 3 months of work be established.

To avoid conflict, the company had already signed a pact which provides that workers shall be paid full wages even when there is no work to do, unless the company can prove that it is not to blame for such lack of work. The resulting "featherbedding" is growing faster than a banana plant.

Unless granted relief from such constant harassment the United Fruit Co. may be forced to pull out of Guatemala entirely.

How are other American interests in Guatemala faring? In April 1949, a labor court ordered Pan American Airways to replace three ranking American employees within 3 days—the airport traffic manager, the assistant manager, and the kitchen manager. Since the latter was ordered deported at once, Pan American had to move its flight kitchen to San Salvador. Thirty days later Pan American had to close its flight control section rather than risk flying operations in the hands of unqualified Guatemalan technicians forced on them by the labor court. This section was also moved to San Salvador. When Pan American's permit to land and operate in Guatemala came up for renewal in May of this year, its application for a 5-year extension was denied and PAA had to announce that it would have to discharge all local employees and overfly Guatemala. Practically on the dead line the Government extended PAA's permit for a scant 6 weeks—"to permit further time for study of the application." Obviously no large, complicated and hazardous business like air transportation can function on a week-to-week basis.

American petroleum companies wished to develop possible oil resources in Guatemala. Offering the same terms that had made Venezuela the richest small nation in Latin America, they were confronted with a decree which opened the gates to foreign oil operators for the first time since the constitution of 1945 went into effect—but strictly on the Guatemalan Government's terms. The oil companies were denied the minimum guaranties necessary for long-term investment and would be subject to potentially fickle government edicts in all phases of their operations. Naturally the oil, if any, is still down in the ground—and all the jobs it might have created are still up in the air.

Meanwhile, according to Ambassador Patterson, the great majority of the responsible people in Guatemala are pro-American and welcome American interests. But they are confused by what is going on—especially the workers, who are woefully inexperienced politically. They are helpless in the hands of their crafty and ruthless leaders, who piously proclaim they are working for the interests of labor and the country when actually they are carrying out their part of a global master plan against the United States.

Paul (ECA) Hoffman does a superb job of laying open the anatomy of this strategy in a recent interview in United States News & World Report: "I can tell you firsthand exactly how the Cominform operates, because we've watched it in every country. You find a hard core of Communists, almost always Moscow-trained. Their operations fall into two general categories: Sabotage of production and propaganda. They have definite programs for cutting down production in given industries, and they incite strikes and riots.

"On the informational front they indulge in diatribes against everything to which they are opposed and they raise false dreams with which to delude their victims. And when the people are bewildered, faced with chaos, loss of their jobs and actual want, the hard core strikes and the military takes over."

The stepped-up anti-American agitation in Guatemala, climaxed by the attack on the United States Ambassador, fits the pattern. It cannot be dismissed as innocent nationalism. It is an underground operation masterminded from outside the country and masquerading as home-grown patriotism.

The real victims are the Guatemalan people. The United Fruit Co. could write off the loss and move to another country; but thousands of workers and their families can't move, and the Government has neither the production knowledge nor the marketing experience and facilities to take over and carry on. Pan American and other airlines can easily skip Guatemala, but without international air transportation the country would suffer.

Guatemala is the scenic Switzerland of our American tropics—rich in beauty and natural resources. But it is woefully lacking in modern roads, bridges, hydroelectric development for cheap power, etc. American dollars are needed to finance such a vast program of public works and improvements. They can come only from private capital—which will not flow freely into a country where old, established companies are being kicked around and forced to the wall—or from a United States Government loan. Guatemala desperately needs at least $100,000,000 and could well afford to service such a loan if she cleaned house of the conspirators who are sabotaging her economy.

We are spending billions in Europe to "contain Communism." What are we doing in Guatemala, a strategic sector in our hemispheric defense? Its airfields in unfriendly hands could doom the Panama Canal. It is an invaluable source of important products which our hemisphere must supply, should war again cut us off from the Far East.

The State Department's official policy is "Let's wait and see." "But that's not good enough," says Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He and many others feel that we must make it crystal-clear to the people and Government of Guatemala that we intend to protect American interests from internationally directed sabotage in our own back yard.

The Brazilian Navy in World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 19 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, we are asking members of the United Nations to aid the common effort now being made in Korea. Many people are anxious to know what contribution other countries can make. It may be encouraging in this period to review things that were done in World War II.

In discussing this recently with the distinguished Brazilian Ambassador, His Excellency Mauricio Nabuco, the part played by Brazil was recalled. To bring a part of that story to American minds, I present a copy of an article entitled "The Brazilian Navy in World War II," for republication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BRAZILIAN NAVY IN WORLD WAR II

(By Homer C. Votaw)

Much of the spontaneous welcome everywhere given President Dutra of Brazil during his visit here a year ago was obviously motivated by a general appreciation of his country's part in the recent world fight for freedom. Because of Hitler's plans for Africa, most of us had been greatly relieved when Brazil placed her very strategic air and naval bases at our disposal. And long before that, materials from her industries and vast natural resources were being routed into anti-Axis arsenals. Later on, favorable first-hand impressions came from our men in Italy who made personal contacts with the Brazilians fighting there; while our air and naval personnel in the Caribbean and South Atlantic often worked side by side with Brazil's to pronounce them serious workers and "regular guys." Now and then, too, our public read censored dispatches concerning other Brazilian war activity, and so knew that a sizable job was being done by that nation in all fields.

However, in spite of laudatory compliments from President Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, President Truman, high admirals, and others in a position to know, not many of us are yet familiar with the important part of the Brazilian Navy played in the over-all war picture. In fact, many Brazilians themselves are still unaware of it. This is the result of strict wartime censorship, the assumed task's usually monotonous routine, and the modesty of the Brazilian naval personnel. Yet without such wholehearted and laborious support the dates of many important victories would have occurred much later than they did.

Like most countries, Brazil was at first naturally confused by the prewar appeasement attitude of the European democracies. And to further complicate her local problem was the well organized Nazi group among her large Germanic population. There were also many Italian- and Japanese-blooded citizens sympathetic to the Axis cause. Nevertheless, even before committing herself officially, Brazil's eventual direction of action loomed up clearly, particularly in the case of naval activity.

Intensified preparations began with the outbreak of fighting in Europe. The first step was the patrol of Brazilian coasts, and the expansion of naval technical abilities. Her fleet at that time consisted of 2 dreadnaught type battleships; 2 light cruisers; 10 destroyers (not all completed); 3 submarines; 12 corvettes; 10 auxiliary, mine, and river vessels. Additional craft were being completed abroad, but these were taken over by the various countries for their own use. Brazil's merchant marine was sizable—305 vessels totaling 487,000 tons, which was increased to 652,000 tons before the end of 1941. Because many of these ships were carrying supplies destined for the democracies, vicious, indiscriminate Axis attacks by submarine and air began as early as March 1941. These increased sharply after Brazil severed Axis relations following the Pearl Harbor attack upon the United States. It was evidently realized by Germany that the recently signed American defense pact, Brazil's traditional friendship with us, and her sympathy with the democratic cause were but indications of her coming declaration of war, which occurred in August. Nevertheless the two nations were officially at peace until then, so the indiscriminate sinking of Brazilian ships, particularly in their own waters, was against the rules of war and decency. Besides small craft, 16 large vessels were brazenly torpedoed without warning that year previous to the declaration, some with heavy loss of life. One of these latter was a Brazilian transport merely carrying 700 soldiers between two Brazilian ports. Later on, passengers were sometimes machine gunned in the lifeboats, as in the case of the *Itapage* which sank in 4 minutes.

Brazil's generally peaceful history—she gained her independence through evolution rather than revolution—probably had much to do with the degree of patriotic fervor that arose following her well-justified war declaration. Upon the call for specialists, for example, professional men even camped for 3 days in the streets of Rio de Janeiro waiting their turn to be signed up and processed. A newspaper editorial summed up the general attitude in the statement, "We are in this war for liberty by the side of our American brothers as a great force dedicated to the defense of justice."

Naval priority was at first given to the rushing of more troops and supplies to the new mainland and island bases along the northeast coast that bulged out toward Africa. This not only reduced the menace from a possible victory by Rommel over there, but also insured the failure of any coordinated local action in the area by Brazil's Axis-blooded residents. It likewise prevented the establishment of hidden U-boat bases such as one previously discovered near the mouth of the Gurupi River. Before the end of the year even United States forces were operating at, or from, many of these bases. And for the sake of combat unity, the northern force of Brazil's navy was voluntarily merged into the allied Fourth Fleet. The principal base was at Recife (formerly Pernambuco), but numerous other ports helped out considerably. Brazil's southern force, although smaller, also had a tremendous convoy and patrol job. It was based at Rio de Janeiro, where our vessels happening through that area were sometimes serviced.

Our lend-lease aid helped by the furnishing of equipment, supplies, capital, and technical knowledge for both combat and industrial use. By mid-1945 over $154,000,000 had been utilized under the plan, with much important raw material and finished products being sent us in return by Brazil. Brazilian naval officers and men were sent up here for instruction regarding the latest naval weapons and combat methods, and Brazilian vessels were outfitted with the best in antisubmarine devices. Eight destroyer escorts were permanently transferred by the United States to the Brazilian flag, along with 8 sub-chasers, 8 motor patrol-chasers, the transport *Orzabo*, and eventually other small craft. The naval shipyard at Rio de Janeiro was enlarged, and besides completing the 1940 class of Brazilian destroyers, it constructed 3 of our *Fletcher* class from plans and much material furnished by the United States.

Although Brazil had over 4,000 miles of her own coast line to guard, nevertheless on January 18, 1943, her war vessels extended their convoy duty another 1,500 miles northward to Trinidad, where many great convoys were made up. Most of the gasoline and oil used in the North African and Mediterranean campaigns were among the valuable cargoes escorted. Yet the raw materials coming north to the United States from the south were probably of still greater importance. Eventually all of the South Atlantic convoy duty was turned over to the Brazilian Navy, an act which relieved still other United States and British vessels for urgently needed service elsewhere.

Submarine attacks continued until even after the German capitulation, but the comparatively heavy losses experienced in the area early in the war were largely eliminated. The Brazilian Navy, alone and together with United States vessels in use at the start, guarded 3,167 ships in 614 convoys, totaling 16,500,000 tons—and this with a loss of not one-tenth of 1 percent.

To further illustrate the importance of the task, here is the national distribution of the tonnage covered:

Ship nationality:	*Tonnage*
American	6,884,823
Brazilian	6,138,506
British	1,618,299
Panamanian	933,082
Norwegian	301,500
Swedish	233,008
Dutch	140,538
Lithuanian	77,350
Belgian	73,976
Greek	27,793
Yugoslavian	16,601
Polish	6,606
Egyptian	8,969
Uruguayan	8,268
Peruvian	2,768

Little rest was allowed. Some Brazilian warships made 77 convoy trips, many over 60, and even the small sub-chasers over 40. In addition several destroyers twice escorted United States transports that carried the Brazilian Expeditionary Force to the Mediterranean. And as usual, the life was grueling and laborious, particularly in bad weather. It was only luck and good seamanship that kept other small vessels from being capsized and lost in storms, as was the unfortunate little corvette *Camaquá* on July 21, 1944.

The Brazilian Navy Department reports that their vessels alone had 38 separate contacts with U-boats in 1943, (a contact being anything from a propeller sound to a torpedo attack), 14 in 1944, and 24 in 1945. The air forces did much to keep the number down, of course, but some credit for their work must in turn be given to the Brazilian Navy, for supplying those bases from which the planes operated. The accompanying map shows the locations of these contacts as well as the spots where Brazilian ships were sunk off South America. It well illustrates the fact that Brazil was far from being "on the sidelines" during the conflict. She had ship losses in other areas, too, with four of them being off New York, and one even in the Normandy landing. Her naval warfare death list totals over 500 men.

Although but three warships and one auxiliary went down, one of them tops Brazilian naval tragedies. This was the cruiser *Baía* (usually anglicized as *Bahia*) blown up July 5, 1945—nearly 2 months after Germany surrendered. Although the cause may well have been a floating mine, the area was one frequented by German submarines; in fact, one turned up in Argentina 2 days later. Moreover the Brazilian destroyer *Babilonga* reported sound contacts in the same location a few days later, and after making six attacks with "mouse trap" and depth bombs reported that a dark object identified by some as a metal hull came to the surface momentarily, to be followed by air bubbles and a large slick. Of the 375 aboard the *Baía*, over half (including four of our own naval technicians) were lost. And many of the survivors were lucky to be picked up from rafts after days of tropic exposure so rigorous that many of their comrades had jumped c erboard to welcome death by drowning.

At the time, like most Brazilian vessels, the *Baía* was on duty as part of the long line of beacon and rescue ships aiding the great airlift of United States troops from Europe, most of whom were destined for the war in the Pacific against Japan. This added naval activity had released over 25 more United States and British vessels for combat duty in the big wind-up.

In commenting upon the work of the Brazilian Navy, our Atlantic Fleet commander, Admiral J. H. Ingram, who followed it very closely, said: "Brazil did nobly, and her help as an ally stands out in Brazilian-American relations." He placed particular emphasis upon the exceptionally ready manner in which officers and personnel had undertaken every job during the war, no matter how much disagreeable labor was entailed, and he added that even the Brazilian press had not given sufficient recognition to the large task that had been so commendably accomplished. Other favorable comments by American and British national leaders are a matter of common record.

Being the largest, richest, and most populous country in South America, as well as having so many combat-experienced men, Brazil could easily have obtained a position of overwhelming fighting power down there after the war. However, she is by nature and tradition one of the world's best neighbors, and so is content to maintain comparatively modest forces, with emphasis upon training.

Naval training is exceptionally thorough, and naval service is looked upon as a lifetime career. The officer-training program consists of five steps, with admission based only upon minimum moral, intellectual, and physical requirements. It begins with a year's general nautical course for all at the naval school. The candidates are then classified into the Naval Administration Corps, Marine Corps, or Naval (line) Corps, for an additional 1-, 2-, or 4-year course, respectively. Practical training included shipboard service for the naval and administration groups, with marine duty service for the other. After graduating from the school the young officer (second lieutenant, and then first lieutenant) is left alone for self-education during a definite period. In the autodidactic stage he studies textbooks while gaining practical experience, and is subject to periodic examinations. As lieutenant-captains the Naval Corps men take a finishing course in armament, communication, hydrography, or machinery. Competitive examinations then admit some to the technical staff, and at a higher rank they attend the Naval War College.

The lower ratings usually come up from naval recruits sent to the naval apprenticeship schools. After a year there they join the fleet as deckhands or cabin boys (grumetes). Combined experience and textbook study follows before the "cabo," or petty officer stage is reached. Then comes the petty officers finishing school which graduates the successful into third naval sergeants. Further study and competitive examinations bring a warrant officership to some.

Of late it has been the practice of the Brazilian officer training vessel, *Almirante Saldanha*, to visit our east and west coasts upon alternate years. This vessel was especially built for training purposes by Vickers Armstrong in England. She is large for a sailing vessel, being 307 feet long, and of 3,400 tons, with an exceptionally high freeboard. Auxiliary Diesel engines give 1,400 horsepower, but she sometimes makes from 12 to 14 knots under sail alone. Her training armament ranges from a torpedo tube on through five types of guns. Besides a complement of 356 officers and men, including 31 spick-and-span red-coated marines, she usually carries about 60 midshipmen.

Today's Costs of Tomorrow's Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very timely and interesting discussion of pensions by Robert C. Tyson, comptroller, United States Steel Corp.:

TODAY'S COSTS OF TOMORROW'S PENSIONS

(By Robert C. Tyson)

When historians of the future write our history for the first half of the twentieth century, they will undoubtedly say that it went out in a blaze of welfare, security, and deficit financing. The opportunity and obligation of the accountant is to make sure that the brightness of the blaze does not blind us to the danger of the fire. Pensions, their costs and their consequences, are complicated and obscure to most people. Pensions, by their very nature, are arrangements which cover the life-spans of individual men and women and reach out even beyond that when groups of men and women are concerned. The things we do today about pensions will have consequences long after we are dead. We had better be sure that those consequences will be good, not evil. The fact that the consequences may be long deferred does not mean that they can be disregarded; it means, on the contrary, that these consequences must be even more vividly envisioned and so brought to bear on our present-day decisions.

The inherent nature of pensions presents an especial opportunity and obligation to the accountant as a member of the management team, and one which his occupation especially equips him to undertake. His obligation begins long before any names are signed to any pension contracts.

Let me tell you why I think this is true. Take the simplest possible example: A company hires a youth at the age of 20 and agrees with him at that time that he will have a pension beginning 45 years later when he stops working. Now look at the questions that pop up: How much will the pension be? Will he live 45 years? If so, how much longer? Will he stay with the company? Where is the money to come from to pay his pension? How is it to be provided? These are only some of the questions. They multiply in their complexity as soon as you begin to consider the pensions of more than just one man. Now who is to answer these questions and answer them before the pension arrangement is made? After that it will be too late. I submit to you that all such questions are to be answered only in terms of records—records of people, their mortality, their turnover in employment, their probability of disability, their normal advancement in the pay scale, their survival spans in retirement, the normal growth of the business and its employment, the sources of funds, the methods of ascertaining and allocating costs, the nature of sinking funds, and so on. These are the things about which accountants and their actuarial counsels are supposed to know more than any other element in the management team. Pensions, I repeat, are matters that present both opportunities and obligations to the accountant.

THE PENSION BASES

In deciding upon a pension plan the first thing to be determined is usually the bases upon which the actual amounts of pension payments are to be determined. In the case of United States Steel's plan the bases are the length of service, age and reason of retirement, average earnings over the last 10 years of employment, with the added feature of minimum amounts inclusive of social-security benefits. An immediate next consideration is what is the cost and can the company stand it. Depending on the cost, the bases are subject to reconsideration and revision.

Once the bases for granting pensions have been proposed, trained actuaries can reasonably determine the actual dollar amounts to be paid to prospective pensioners in years to come. The accountant had best rely upon the skilled actuary for such estimates, supplying to him the necessary company records of employee numbers, age, sex, distribution, compensation, and turn-over.

METHODS OF COSTING PENSIONS—"CASH DISBURSEMENT"

Once the actual dollar amounts to be paid to prospective pensioners are established the accountant is immediately confronted with the necessity of determining the method of meeting the cost of those payments.

There are a number of methods of providing for the cost of pensions. One method is to operate the pension plan on what has come to be called the "cash disbursement basis." In this case no provision is made for the pension cost during the active employment of the pensioner. Upon his retire-

ment he is, in effect, continued on the payroll at a reduced rate of compensation. Some companies use this plan, and some sincere individuals endorse it on principle. Others endorse it because it calls for the least immediate cash outlay.

I personally believe that the cash disbursement method is unwise from a management point of view, improper from an accounting point of view and undesirable from the employee point of view. I think it is unwise from a management point of view because even though we know that it inescapably results in a pyramiding fixed cost through good times and bad, the initially low cost insidiously and deceptively leads both management and employees to think that pensions do not cost very much. An attitude of "after me the deluge" is, almost unconsciously, provoked.

I believe that the cash disbursement plan is improper from an accounting point of view because it ignores in the cost of the product currently produced the cost of the pension currently earned but paid after the employee stops producing. There seems to be not justification for an accountant to ignore a part of a cost simply because the payment of that part of the cost is divorced in time from the performance of the service for which it is paid. No accountant, for example, would defer or ignore the current social security tax cost until such time as the employee upon whose earnings the tax is paid starts to receive social-security benefits.

I believe that the cash disbursement plan is undesirable from an employee point of view because there is no assurance to the employee that the money for his pension will be available when he qualifies to receive it. It is a matter of record that during the 1930's many pension plans using the cash disbursement method were terminated or the pensions had to be reduced, including the pensions of those already retired.

Mr. George B. Buck, a distinguished actuary regularly consulted by business, Government bodies and labor organizations, has publicly stated: "Generally speaking, the cash disbursement method of providing for pension costs is being discarded as inequitable, unsound, and dangerous to the pension security of retired employees."

FUNDING OR RETIREMENT METHOD

So much for the cash disbursement method. A second method of providing for the cost of pensions is to make no provision for an employee's pension during his active service, but to pay into a fund at the time of his retirement an amount of money which, with the interest it should earn, is calculated to be sufficient to pay his pension over his remaining life. From the employee point of view this is slightly better than the the cash disbursement method, because once the money is paid into a fund, the employee is assured of receiving the payments to which he has become entitled. From the company point of view this plan in its early years requires heavier payments than the cash disbursement plan. But over the life of the plan the required company payments are less, by reason of the interest earnings of the fund, which earnings cover part of the payments to pensioners.

Like the cash-disbursement method, however, this second method fails to recognize the cost of the pension during the period of active service. From the company's standpoint it also has the added and serious disadvantage of obligating the company to provide large lump-sum payments at the very times it may prove difficult to do so. This results from the natural and historical fact that in times of good business and labor shortage, retirements for age or for disability both tend to be deferred. But when business subsequently declines and losses may replace profits, the accumulated deferred retirements are added to normal retirement; to impose a sometimes embarrassingly heavy drain on the company's finances.

METHODS RECOGNIZING COSTS CURRENTLY

A third method of providing for the cost of pensions is that which meets the minimum funding requirements under the United States Treasury Department tax regulations. This minimum requirement is that the past service cost at the effective date of the plan must not be permitted to increase. Stated another way, the annual future service cost must be met in full, and an amount at least equal to the interest on the past service cost, at the rate assumed in actuarial estimates, must also be met. The terms, future service cost and past service cost, present something of a mystery to many people. However, their meaning can readily be developed.

Thus this third method of providing for the cost of pensions starts out by recognizing that the current cost of an employee's service is greater than the amount currently paid to him as wages because, as he works, he concurrently establishes a possible claim to a pension. In a sense this is a claim to more pay for the same work; it is therefore deemed to be a part of the cost of that work and hence a part of the cost of the product currently resulting from that work. Under this method, the actuary computes for the employees as a group the probable pensions that will be paid to surviving members of the group. He next determines an amount which, if paid into a fund currently, will, with the interest earned by the fund, provide the amounts necessary to pay the pensions to the survivors of the group based on their service rendered subsequent to the installation of the plan. This annual amount is the item which is given the name, "normal or future service cost."

Note carefully that this normal or future service cost does not provide for the cost of any pension payments based on service rendered prior to the installation of the plan for which employees may be retroactively entitled to credit for pension purposes. As its name implies, the future service cost looks to the future—that is, to pensions based on service rendered subsequent to the date the plan goes into effect.

This leads us to a consideration of the means of providing for pensions based on service previously rendered, and to their cost. This is the part of the cost of a pension plan which has provided the greatest confusion and greatest controversy. These are the more intensified because there is something of a moral question involved. Thus a claim made today for a pension based on service rendered in the yesterdays is tantamount to a retroactive claim to greater compensation. But since the greater compensation was not a part of the employment arrangement in the past it was neither recognized nor provided for. If it is now retroactively to be granted, its cost must be borne by someone in the future. In business life this means that prices today and in the future must be higher in order to pay for the retroactively higher wage costs of products produced and used up in the past.

The retroactivity of the claim to pensions based on prior service finds no ready counterpart in financial legerdemain. If the clock could really be turned backward, and the company state its costs all over again, it would have provided in the past for the same normal cost of that prior period as it now begins to provide for the future. On the date the plan is installed the company would then have already provided sufficient funds which, together with interest already earned and to be earned thereon, would meet that part of the cost of future pensions based on service rendered prior to the start of the plan. The amount of this hypothetical fund at the date the plan is installed is the item to which is given the name "past service cost."

Since the fund is a "what might have been" fund and does not in fact exist, the immediate question is what to do about it. Because the fund does not exist it obviously cannot earn interest. Unless some provision is made to cover the interest amount, the unfunded past service cost will rise each year. Meeting this interest, in addition to providing what I have described as the normal or future service cost, is the Treasury's minimum requirement for funding pensions. This minimum funding, however, leaves the actual financing of the principal of the past service cost to be covered in some other way. So long, however, as the amounts being paid into the fund are greater than the money paid out to those qualifying for benefits the plan may be expected to operate without getting into financial difficulties.

A fourth method of providing for the cost of pensions is to pay the future service cost, the interest on the past service cost and, in addition, to fund the past service cost. Under Treasury regulations the maximum amount of funding, including interest on the past service cost, that is permissible in any one year for tax deduction purposes is 10 percent of the past service cost at installation date. This means that, at a maximum permissible funding rate, it would take about 11½ years to complete the funding. Under this method, after the past service cost is completely funded, the company has only the future service cost to pay.

EFFECTS OF COST RECOGNITION

From the employee point of view it is to be noted that methods 3 and 4, which have just been described as recognizing the cost of an employee's pension during the period of his active employment, provide much greater certainty that when the employee retires the funds will be available to provide for his pension than do the first two methods. Methods 3 and 4 are thus obviously more desirable from the employee point of view, since they afford him more protection. Indeed, this is well recognized by union negotiators, who in recent negotiations have demanded that pensions be funded in accordance with methods 3 or 4.

From the management and the accounting points of view, methods 3 and 4 have the virtue of more nearly stating the true cost of pensions when the work on which they are based is being performed. Under these methods the future service cost can be expressed as a level percentage of payroll. Absolute dollar costs will then fluctuate directly with payroll rather than sometimes oppositely, with possibly embarrassing consequences, as in methods 1 and 2. In other words, methods 3 and 4, by preventing the expansion of any unrecorded pension cost, protectively put management on notice of the true costliness of any pension proposal.

Remember that I said at the outset that I thought that part of the accountant's opportunity and obligation, with respect to pensions, arose before any names were signed to any pension agreement. The accountant's responsibility is to point out to management the extent of the true cost of any proposed pension plan over a long period of time. The preceding discussion of the four basic methods of costing and paying for pensions shows that the accountant and actuary—with one reservation I will mention in a moment—can determine with reasonable accuracy that portion of cost which would be recognized annually over a period of years under each method. Only with this information is management in a position to measure the consequences of adopting a proposed pension plan—the effect upon the company in relation to its competitors both in and outside of its own industry and upon the economy generally. Only with the consequences measured is management able with

intelligence to illuminate pension negotiations and to adopt or reject a particular pension proposal.

YIELD ON INVESTMENT

Once the benefits have been decided upon and the method under which the costs will be recognized has been determined, the reflection of these pension costs in the income accounts follows the pattern of other cost reflections in accordance with company accounting policy. Needless to say, good financial management will provide that any recognized pension cost not immediately payable to pensioners will be represented in funds with an insurance company or trusteed for the purpose of paying pensions when they come due. From there on the treatment of the funds becomes primarily an investment rather than an accounting problem. However, the two are by no means inseparable because the investment policy as reflected in the yield on the funds has a major bearing upon the amounts the accountant must enter as cost. The bigger the yield on the invested funds the less are the accruing costs of the benefits under the plan. For example, if the future service costs have been estimated on the basis of a 2½-percent yield, each one-half percentage point increase in the yield will reduce those estimated costs by about 15 percent. If the past service cost is to be funded over a specified period this cost also would be reduced although not so greatly. If, however, it is intended merely to pay the interest on this past service cost, the higher rate which must be paid will more than offset any gain through reduction in the principal of the past service cost. I only mention these matters to indicate that, although the actual investment of pension funds is not the function of the accountant, the results of that investment nevertheless must enter the accountant's cost calculations.

RECORDING PAST-SERVICE COST

Having considered the income account treatment of pension costs there then remains the problem of how to treat the unfunded past-service amount. It has been proposed by some that the past-service cost should be reflected as a liability in the body of the balance sheet, the offset being a reduction of net worth or some sort of deferred asset. Others would be satisfied to have it shown merely in a footnote of some sort of contingent liability. Still others believe—and I am one of them—that, since we are in what may be termed a "new era" as concerns such an item, it is preferable to move slowly and not reach hard and fast procedures until we have had an opportunity to live with the problem for a while. These latter hold that we are in a period of change as regards old-age benefits under both Federal and company plans. Any amount which might be set forth in the accounts would thereby achieve an appearance of finality that might prove to be unwarranted. For example, the benefits under most company plans are tied in with Federal old-age benefits, and any increase in the latter will result in a corresponding decrease in the company's pension obligation. Up to this time the accounting profession and the Securities and Exchange Commission have reached no conclusion as to a suggested disposition of this problem.

I do not wish to leave any false impression about the cost consequences of changes in the amounts of Federal old-age benefits, while an increase in these benefits will cause a decrease in company paid benefits under many plans and so reduce the company's pension costs as such, it does not necessarily mean that there will be a reduction in the company's total costs. Taxes will have to be increased to support the increased public pensions or else a deficit will accumulate in the social-security fund.

EMPLOYEE INSURANCE PLANS

So much then for what might be thought of as the accountant's particularized responsibilities to his company and to his profession in the matter of pensions. May I next say a few words about the problems involved in employee insurance plans? These problems, for the most part, are quite similar to those involved in pension plans. An estimate of the cost of any proposed insurance benefits is just as important as is the estimate of pension costs. In such cost determination the same factors must be considered even though the problem of past service cost is less in the case of insurance since the benefits, except for life insurance, usually carry no retroactivity. The problem of administration of insurance plans, however, is usually more complicated because of the multitude of Federal and State laws which apply to any company having employees in a number of States. It is also complicated for a company dealing with more than one union. Achievement of reasonably uniform and fair treatment of all employees requires, therefore, seemingly different plans and different administration in different localities. Then, too, when a company is dealing with several unions, each union progressively wants a better deal than that to which other unions have agreed. This rivalry seems more intense in the case of insurance than in the case of pensions, presumably because the benefits could apply immediately to anyone on the current payroll, whereas pensions are more remote in time and will be paid only to those who survive in the service. Most people, I guess, place higher value on immediate gain than upon ultimate benefit.

Another difficulty is that of controlling the benefits to be paid. For example, it is not difficult to determine when a man retires and to make, for all time, the one calculation needed to determine the amount of his pensions; but it may be difficult to determine when and for how long a man may be actually prevented from working because of covered illness. It is for that reason that many companies have provided in their agreements with employees that the company portion of the cost of insurance benefits shall be fixed at, say, so many cents per man hour worked. This provides a limit on its cost.

A CERTAIN MORAL RESPONSIBILITY

Thus far I have adhered rather closely to the accounting aspects of pensions and insurance, concerning which I believe the accountant has a particular responsibility. There are certain other aspects of pensions, the responsibility for which the accountant shares with management and, indeed, with all thoughtful citizens.

There is no doubt that large numbers of Americans in the past 20 years have renounced in considerable measure their independent responsibility to take care of their own individual needs, each in his own way. Instead they have turned to their Government and to their pressure groups in effort to get something for nothing from each other. They have sought—and with some success—to use the power of Government directly or by delegation to take from the more productive and thrifty for the benefit of the less productive and less thrifty. As Kipling put it succinctly:

"In the carboniferous epoch we were promised abundance for all,
By robbing selected Peter to pay for collective Paul;
But, though we had plenty of money, there was nothing our money would buy,
And the gods of the copybook headings said: 'If you don't work, you die.'"

These matters are pertinent to one's contemplation of certain possible long-term consequences of mass pensions established under the direct or indirect compulsion of government. Can you think of a handier and more popular device for power-hungry people to employ in obtaining support than promises to take good care of people when they get old—that is, later on? The "later on" is very important to the promiser; he gets the popularity he seeks today, and as for paying up tomorrow—well, tomorrow is another day, and, if necessary, the currency can be debased. It has been in other times and places. In this country it already has been debased by nearly one-half since social security was first promised to numerous voters.

This brings me back to my opening comment on deficit financing, and to one reservation I made a moment ago. The accountant's calculations of pension costs and his provisions for meeting them are meaningless except on the hypothesis of "honest money"—money whose buying power does not change very much over the years. Thus if there is a continuing debasement of the money, with resulting price and wage inflation, then the dollar amounts of pensions based, as in many company plans, upon the wage level of the last 10 years of service will be greater than were provided for during the earlier years of service at lower levels of dollar wages. The dollars set aside during these earlier periods therefore may prove insufficient and have to be made up as higher costs than were previously calculated. If no money is set aside in anticipation of pensions to be paid later, then the burden of paying the pensions when they come due will be still further aggravated.

In addition to this, as we have already seen in the recent history of both company and Federal old-age benefit plans, the diminishing buying power of the dollar becomes a springboard for demanding still greater dollar pensions. The greater pensions that might be granted would naturally result, as I have already explained, in retroactively creating a new and bigger past service cost.

I suppose that nearly everyone, at least somewhere in the back of his mind, realizes that the maintenance of honest money is important to a country and to its welfare. What I am here pointing out is that, in the matter of pensions, the accountant has an especial reason for realizing and endorsing the need for honest money. The pension contracts, as I noted at the outset, deal with the whole life-spans of men and women.

Pension plans are arrangements announced in terms of dollars to be paid in the far future and to be provided for in the interim. Misery, unhappiness, and failure to provide the expected pension benefit in terms of the real things implicitly involved can be the results if money is not enduringly kept honest. Here then is an intangible but terribly important moral obligation that falls upon the accounting and management professions when they undertake to take care of people as they grow old and are no longer able to take care of themselves. It is an obligation to exert their utmost to make and to keep the dollar honest. I commend this last thought to your especial consideration.

Address by Michael Tierney in Conferring Degree on Dr. Joseph E. Carrigan, of Vermont

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 19 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, for nearly 2 years the administration of ECA in Ireland has been directed by Dr. J. E.

Carrigan, dean of the College of Agriculture, University of Vermont.

Dr. Carrigan has done an outstanding job and his work has been highly appreciated by the people of Ireland.

On July 3 the National University of Ireland expressed their appreciation by conferring upon Dr. Carrigan the degree of doctor of economic science.

I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address of Michael Tierney, D. Litt., vice chancellor of the university, on this occasion.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Everyone familiar with the long and checkered history of western civilization must have been profoundly impressed by one unique feature of the crisis through which it has been passing for the greater part of all our lifetimes. That unique feature has been the extraordinary generosity of the great nation which Providence seems to have designated to be the leader and guardian of the western peoples, the strong defender of those principles of freedom and law upon which the structure of our civilization is built. Never in all the gloomy records of war and conquest has there come into a position of such overwhelming power a nation less touched by the vices which such power traditionally breeds, less infected by the libido dominandi which, as Saint Augustine puts it, magnis malis agitat et conterit humanum genus.

Unlike their numerous predecessors in the seat of power, the people of the United States of America have shown no trace of the selfish, vainglorious, and destructive imperialism which has hithereto been the distinguishing mark of the conqueror. When they have gone to war it has been for no selfish ends, but to insure by their invincible armed might the reign of peace and justice among all nations. When by their unexampled achievements in battle they have come to make a victorious peace, their armies and navies have melted away almost too rapidly, and they have turned all their energies not toward aggression, aggrandizement, or the exploitation of the conquered but toward binding up the wounds of the world. As the blood of American manhood has been freely spilt from Normandy round the world to the China Sea in the cause of peace and justice, so, too, has this amazing nation been willing and eager to expend its abounding wealth to help other nations to restore all the regular and free ways of commerce, industry, and agriculture which have been broken by the violence of war.

The Economic Cooperation Administration is but one of the manifestations of this unprecedented generosity. It has been Ireland's good fortune to be brought into close touch with this beneficent agency through the medium of a distinguished American agriculturist and economist of pure Irish name and descent. The presence among us of Dr. Joseph E. Carrigan since October 1948 has been a perpetual and most pleasing and inspiring reminder not alone of the new spirit which the United States through such organizations as the European recovery mission has brought into postwar international relations, but of the great share taken by men and women of our own race in the growth and expanding life of the Nation which has given the world a new conception of military, political, and economic power.

So well has Dr. Carrigan made himself known among all classes and types during his all-too-short stay among us that it seems superfluous to introduce him, and his introducer must almost feel as if in a properly ordered function the roles should be reversed. As is known to all, Dr. Carrigan is a native of Vermont, a distinguished graduate in the faculties of arts, science, and agriculture of its university and dean of that university's agricultural college, a position which carries with it the function of directing all the educational and other activities of the agricultural department in the State. He has, therefore, a wide and varied experience of every aspect of scientific agriculture and of the economic and organizational problems that confront the farmer everywhere. He has not only been a storehouse of wise and far-seeing advice to Irish agriculturists of every type but a sympathetic friend and guide. Great as has been the financial value to this country of American aid during the past couple of years, I think there will be universal agreement with me when I say that we have valued that splendid gesture from a people with whom we are so proud to be linked, most of all because it has sent among us in the person of Dr. Carrigan a living expression of the spirit of America.

Mr. Johnson's Pearl Harbor—He Should Eliminate Himself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, "Chameleon" Johnson now comes up to try to head a movement to try to undo what he has done. It cannot be done. His defense economy, responsible for dead American soldiers in Korea, cannot be obliterated nor sabotaged by any change of heart of a Johnson. It is too late. He did it; his is the responsibility.

He will go down in history as the great economizer of dollars against the lives of American boys, lost because of his arbitrary defiance of the will of the people, expressed in laws passed by Congress, signed by the President.

When one man lets his head swell to the point that he egocentrically believes nobody is bigger than he, except God; when one man, Hitler or Stalin-like, tries to tell the Congress of the United States, which represents the people, that he will not carry out its directives; when one man contemptuously disregards the Congress of the United States and its orders accompanied by money appropriated to provide the necessary defense for America; when one man assumes to be bigger than Congress and undertakes to disregard and does disregard the directives of the Congress, then he becomes and is and continues to be dangerous to democracy. He should resign, or he should be impeached. He should relieve the President of the responsibility of having to try to alibi for him.

If the executive department does not see fit to rid itself of the incubus of this man Johnson, then Congress should act at once to eliminate him; before he does something else, so wrong again. An article by the Alsops in today's Washington Post entitled, "Mr. Johnson's Pearl Harbor" is apropos. Here it is:

MR. JOHNSON'S PEARL HARBOR

According to current report, Secretary of Defense Louis A. Johnson, of all people, is now getting ready to step forward as the great advocate of a powerful American defense effort. It is long past time for this quick change, since any reader of the newspapers can now see the direct results of Secretary Johnson's previous appearances in the role of the great economizer.

Perhaps the most poignant comment on Johnson's defense economies was contained in a recent report from the Korean front. A shattered American unit, just withdrawn from the battle line, was resting on a rocky hillside. Their exhausted officer spoke for them all, in two brief bitter sentences.

"You don't fight two tank-equipped divisions with .30-caliber carbines. I never saw such a useless damm war in all my life."

The young soldier had good reason to be bitter as the story of the American armored force will show. There has never been the slightest secret about Soviet armored strength. Russian World War II tanks were consistently better than ours. The huge Russian armored force of over 20,000 tanks was retained on combat status when peace came. And as long as 3 years ago, Russian output of new tanks was known to have reached 3,000 a year, many of them the great 60-ton heavies.

When James V. Forrestal launched his American rearmament program, a vigorous attack on the tank problem was conspicuously included. Even after President Truman sharply cut back the Forrestal program, in November 1948, appropriations and authorizations were still provided to give this country a respectable armored force. When Johnson took office, the order had already been given for the first step. During 1949 hundreds of our medium tanks were to be equipped with heavier armor and more powerful guns, so that they would at least be fit to meet Russian tanks of equal weight.

Almost at once, however, Johnson announced his crash-savings program, to cut $1,000,000,000 from the $14,000,000,000-defense outlays approved by President Truman and voted by Congress. Tank modernization was one of the first items to be crashed, being transformed into a Johnsonian economy as early as March 1949. That is why we now have no tanks—literally, none at all—that can defeat the Russian armor in the field.

What is more, this tank story, which should help many puzzled people to understand the course of the Korea fighting, is fairly representative of the way Johnson has fullfilled his promise to increase the over-all combat capabilities of the Armed Forces.

In the case of the ground forces, for instance, the 1949 planned strength was 12 divisions, 6 for occupation duty and 6 for a strategic reserve. In 1949 the Marine Corps, so important in situations like that in Korea, was organized on the basis of 11 combat-ready battalions.

Under the Johnson crash program, however, two ground force divisions, the Eighth, which was being organized, and the Sixth, which was in being and stationed in Korea, were immediately sacrificed. Several other Army divisions lost their essential guts, by being deprived of infantry battalions, or of their artillery or armored components, or in other ways. And the number of Marine battalions was reduced from 11 to 6. Under pressure, Johnson restored two of these battalions, loudly hailing this backdown as one of his "increases in combat capability."

In the case of the Navy, Johnson's "overall increase in combat capability" consisted in cutting the fleet at sea from 8 heavy carriers to 6; from 18 cruisers to 13; from 155 destroyers to 140; and so on. When the carrier cut was made, the Joint Chiefs of Staff advised Johnson that this would make it impossible to hold the Mediterranean in case of war. But now that the danger in the Balkans is the chief threat of a third world war, we have had to send two carriers to the Mediterranean, leaving

horribly inadequate strength in both Atlantic and Pacific.

In research and development, in the planning and organization of the Atlantic Pact defense, in the Air Forces, whose story is so important as to deserve a second report, the picture has everywhere been the same. Screening all that he did with gross and persistent untruth, the Secretary of Defense crippled this Nation's strength. The results were the Korea attack, and what is happening in Korea today, and the immense world crisis which now confronts us. The question is whether a Defense Secretary who has practiced such a fraud, and who has needed such costly education to grasp the need for a serious defense effort, is the right man to lead that effort in a time of danger at least as great as the danger which confronted us on December 7, 1941.

Mr. President, Don't Underestimate the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an excellent editorial from a recent edition of The Dalles (Oreg.) Chronicle:

MR. PRESIDENT, DON'T UNDERESTIMATE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The Chronicle believes that the citizens of this Nation are well informed.

They know that the chips are down. The entire free world is depending on the United States, the only country with potential strength to stop an advance of Red dictatorship and slavery.

They know that Korea is only one small part of the battleground. That free Korea must not only be saved, but saved quickly and that at the same time our strength to move elsewhere must be built up, rather than depleted. They know otherwise world war III is certain and imminent. Not years, but in months, weeks, or even days.

These citizens know what world war III would mean. They know first hand, and from recent and vivid experience. They know the importance of stopping world war III, while it is still in the trial-balloon stage.

These citizens, the Chronicle sincerely believes, have been shocked by some recent news items dealing with statements by public officials on how the emergency is being handled.

For instance, there have been news stories from Washington saying that it would take 60 days for a draft of 20,000 men to become effective—that arrangements would have to be made to hire clerical assistance, etc., before anything could be done.

There have been statements by scientists that we have the weapons to stop the giant Red tanks, but that 6 months will be required to get this weapon in production.

They have been shocked, this newspaper believes, by underestimation of what the people can do, are ready to do and will do, when called upon with or without compensation, before or after the enactment of appropriate legislation and other paper work.

We believe it a certainty that every source of material, every industrial facility, every skilled producer involved in the manufacture or the reported anti-tank weapon could be organized, on a voluntary basis, so that the production of this weapon would be on a 24-hour schedule—weekdays, Sundays, and holidays.

A people who have been through a recent war know what a war can do to vacations and holidays—and know that our soldiers, sailors, and airmen may be fighting an 80 or 90-hour week.

The people also know, we believe, that the kind of strength needed to insure the preservation of freedom cannot be had without sacrifice.

But what is the risk of being over-prepared, compared with the risk of being under-prepared?

What if it turns out that we have tanks, planes, and guns to spare—which means we have borne unnecessary sacrifice? If it turns out that way, it follows that the sacrifice will have been for a short period and that the return to normal will be soon.

This newspaper believes the people of America are solidly back of the United Nations in its new commitment to protect all free nations of the world from military invasion. But it does not appear that the voice of the people has been heard plainly enough in Washington.

This message is being sent to the President, and to the Senators and Congressmen from this State. We invite our readers to write or wire their feelings.

Every American has the means at his or her disposal to be heard. A strong enough will, and strong enough readiness to serve, strongly enough expressed, can be heard even in the Kremlin—and will hasten the day when our soldiers cease to die in battle.

Korean Move an Example of Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I read one of the most human and understanding letters in this morning's paper that I have ever read.

It was a letter which Drew Pearson wrote to his stepson. While it was a letter written by an individual to a member of his family it carried a message which could be addressed by every American father to every American son.

I know and realize that many of you have from time to time disagreed with Drew Pearson perhaps more times than you have agreed with him. That is your privilege but in this instance there is hardly anybody anywhere who cannot find anything but admiration for such a human and understanding and simple approach to a most complex and involved problem.

I hope you like this letter as much as I did and I submit it to you:

MERRY-GO-ROUND

KOREAN MOVE AN EXAMPLE OF UNITY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Drew Pearson's column today takes the form of a letter to his 17-year-old stepson on some of the ideals we are trying to champion in Korea.)

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON, *July 17, 1950.*

DEAR SON: It is a wet, rainy midnight and I can't sleep. So I am in the office at my typewriter, with the kittens trying to crawl up my pajama leg. It isn't the rain that keeps me awake, but some of the problems facing the world, and the fact that you and a lot of other boys may soon have to go off to a strange and distant battlefront called Korea.

So I have been wondering how you, who will soon celebrate your eighteenth birthday, and a lot of other boys around that age must feel when you have to grow up, go to school, and plan your lives with a sword literally hanging over your head.

I know a little bit about this, because I was in college when we entered World War I. That, however, was the first war America had fought in a long time, and to most of us it was a glorious and exciting adventure.

However, the boys of your generation are a lot more sophisticated than we. And the country has now seen two great wars in quick succession, followed by a cold war which has broken out in a bloody, disastrous defeat in Korea. So all the glamour, the novelty, the excitement have worn off, and in a way I don't particularly blame the American lieutenant in Korea who said: "I never saw such a useless damned war in all my life."

A time for decision

I can well understand how this war, fought 8,000 miles away in a strange land, in the defense of strange people, and against tremendous odds, can be considered useless. Yet, I don't think I'm a Pollyanna when I say that the year 1950 may go down in history just because of the Korean war—because it may stop war in the future and lead to a new era of world unity and peace.

There are some people abroad who call us "Uncle Sap." And there are some people here at home, like the Chicago Tribune crowd, who call us that, too; say we are impractical fools to be giving our money, our food, our steel, and now our life blood away to other people.

But there was a man named Jesus Christ who, in effect, was also called Uncle Sap. He, too, was branded an impractical visionary; yet his teachings have formed a goal toward which mankind has been struggling ever since. And I don't think I'm too optimistic when I say that our country, with the Marshall plan and all the other help we have given our neighbors, may have come nearer a practical fulfillment of the Sermon on the Mount than at any time since Christ taught that great doctrine 2,000 years ago.

As you know, I am considered quite a critical newspaperman. I do not hesitate to point out the faults of our Government and our country, but, despite all these faults, I very deeply feel that our country has just about reached a peak of idealism and unselfishness and power for good never before seen in the world.

We have reached it, but we can lose it.

We needed Korea

In fact, some of us were beginning to think more about our stomachs, our dividends, wages and prices, or how many automobiles we had or our neighbors had—than we did about the problem of peace.

So perhaps some of us needed Korea. We needed it to keep us from getting too soft, too selfish, too materialistic. But, above all, we needed it to set an example of world unity against an aggressor.

I think what you boys who are just approaching military age must remember is that the Korean decision had to come sooner or later. A nation cannot live alongside another nation which constantly threatens war. And a free world cannot exist with 1 nation bullying, arming, threatening to invade any peoples who do not bow to their political creed.

So, since this clash of free nations and the police-state nations was inescapable, it is better to get it over with and in such a way that we can build a new international police force, unhampered by vetoes, which will guarantee lasting peace.

This time we moved

Maybe you remember my telling you about some of the international conferences I have covered as a newspaperman where I could literally see the seeds of war planted—see them with my own eyes, and watch them grow and incubate, with the rest of the world watching, too, but powerless to stop the impending crisis.

Well, this time we have not been powerless. We saw the impending crisis and we moved to avert it.

I think it is important for you and the other boys approaching military age to remember this; also to remember that no country in the world today has our unselfishness, our courage, our idealism. And we have got to keep it that way.

So this Korea war, distant as it is, tough as it is, unwelcome as it is, may be the great turning point in the year 1950—midway through the century—when we can establish a world police force and a world authority to put down all wars in the future.

Those are some of the great things which the boys of your generation can look forward to. You are a lot smarter than my generation, and you can succeed where we failed.

Love from,

THE OLD MAN.

Democrats Whitewash American Communists While Our Boys Die Fighting Them in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include a most pertinent editorial that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald today.

THE HERRING IS A LITTLE HIGHER NOW

THE REPORT NOBODY BELIEVES

Tydings & Co. says there are no Communists in the State Department and there is no Communist influence in the State Department. These findings would be welcome, if true. Unfortunately nobody believes them.

We can say with little fear of contradiction that even the three New Deal Senators who offer the country this sugared assurance don't believe their own statement.

What we had in the congressional investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster we are now given again—a large bucket of whitewash. What we had when incredible mismanagement was charged to the Atomic Energy Committee is tossed back at us again—denials and evasions. But, meanwhile, four spies in this country and one in England who were stealing our atomic secrets for Russia have been arrested.

What Mr. Truman called the Alger Hiss case—a red herring—has been served up to us by the administration once more. The herring is a little higher now, and Hiss, convicted as a perjurer-spy, is under sentence of 5 years and has been disbarred.

We have got precisely what we have come to expect from every political investigation by the New Deal—self-exculpation by the party which has fostered, condoned, and protected betrayals of the national interest and public trust such as this country has never before known.

What else could we expect? This is the party of lies. It is the party of Roosevelt, telling America's fathers and mothers "again and again and again" that, on no account, would their sons be sent into a war he was then plotting.

It is the party of Truman, the product of the Pendergast machine in Kansas City, where, when 71 henchmen faced the penitentiary for stealing the primary election in 1946, the simple solution presenting itself was to blow the courthouse safe and steal the fraudulent ballots providing the evidence.

Truman is the man who only 2 years ago said of Stalin, "I like old Joe. Joe is a decent fellow." If the boss Communist is a "decent fellow," then who is to say that lesser, non-Russian Communists are also not "decent fellows"?

Certainly the New Deal Senators who were commissioned to investigate Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY'S charges of Communist infiltration of the administration found nobody who did not measure up to their standards for being a "decent fellow." But why not? Look at the Senators:

MILLARD TYDINGS, of Maryland, New Dealer, was the original sponsor of the present Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, when the latter was presented as nominee for Under Secretary of the Treasury in 1933. TYDINGS conceded at the time that he had initiated the move to put Acheson in the job. To statements that Acheson's law firm had extensive Wall Street connections, TYDINGS replied that Acheson had also represented Russia in American courts and accepted Moscow's fees. Now, as Secretary of State, Acheson presides over Truman's world-wide anti-Communist crusade.

TYDINGS also happens to be the son-in-law of Joseph E. Davies, Roosevelt's Russophile Ambassador to Russia, whose book, Mission to Moscow, was a flagrant piece of pro-Soviet propaganda. By another curious coincidence, Seth Richardson, chairman of the President's Loyalty Review Board, through which there filtered all of the curious characters Senator MCCARTHY has called security risks, is a law partner of Davies, and TYDINGS was appointed chairman by the New Dealers to investigate the whole mess.

THEODORE F. GREEN, New Deal Senator from Rhode Island, is 83 years old and is chiefly distinguished as the one-time little Hitler of the tiny New England State. On January 2, 1935, even before being sworn in for his second term as Governor, GREEN, in the space of less than 2 hours, engineered a coup unique in the history of American government.

He ousted the five Republicans composing the existing State supreme court and replaced them with a Democratic majority. He killed 80 State boards and commissions manned by Republicans. He restored to himself powers long since taken from the governorship.

All of this Senator GREEN accomplished by unseating elected Republican State senators on the basis of a quick recount by two of his henchmen, thus converting a Democratic senate minority into a majority.

GREEN'S lieutenant governor, Robert E. Quinn, his chief agent in this bloodless revolution, succeeded GREEN when the latter became a Senator. Quinn is chiefly remembered for using the State militia to shut down the Narragansett race track in order to put a political enemy out of business.

The third New Dealer on the Tydings whitewash majority is BRIEN MCMAHON, an old hand at sweeping New Deal dirt under the rug.

MCMAHON for years was one of the officials of the New Deal Department of Justice, the agency charged with exposing and prosecuting subversives. If the justice of Senator MCCARTHY'S assertion that the State Department was loaded with protected Communists and fellow travelers were admitted, MCMAHON would have been in the position of exposing the culpability of the Department he so long served, and, furthermore, his own dereliction as chief of its criminal division.

As chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, Mr. MCMAHON previously had bent all of his efforts toward proving that the Atomic Energy Commission had properly safeguarded the secrets of the atom bomb. Only later did the arrest of members of the Soviet atomic spy ring demonstrate the spuriousness of the whitewash applied to the charges of Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER that the atomic secret had not been guarded.

These three—TYDINGS, GREEN, and MCMAHON—abruptly voted to stop the McCarthy investigation when the war in Korea afforded a convenient diversion. They hurried to completion the report now announced, clearing every single suspect. They did not permit their two Republican committee colleagues, Senators HICKENLOOPER and HENRY CABOT LODGE, to inspect their report.

They departed from the rules of the Senate by releasing the report to the press before they even tendered it to the full Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in whose name they acted as a subcommittee. Senator CONNALLY, the New Deal chairman of that committee, limped forward with a summons for the committee to meet and receive the report 24 hours after it had been published in the Nation's press.

LODGE and HICKENLOOPER would have none of TYDINGS' phony clearance. Internationalist and supporter of the administration's foreign policy though he is, LODGE found the whole proceeding too much for a sensitive stomach. In a separate statement, he asserted:

"The investigation must be set down as superficial and inconclusive. The proceedings often lacked impartiality; the atmosphere was too often not that of seeking to ascertain the truth. The subcommittee's record is a tangle of loose threads, of witnesses who were not subpenaed, of leads which were not followed up * * * this business will never end, clearly or otherwise, if the practice of having the majority party investigate the majority continues to hold sway."

The pretext of the Tydings New Dealers for giving clearance to all of the men and women whom Senator MCCARTHY had dubbed Stalin's little helpers was that the State Department loyalty files which the subcommittee, after months of Presidential obstruction, was finally permitted to inspect showed nothing derogatory.

Senator MCCARTHY had anticipated this weak defense. He had produced, in advance of the release of the Tydings report, statements from one present and three former employees of the State Department that in 1946 the administration had a team of eight persons working for 5 months to weed everything from the files which was derogatory or incriminating.

A deadline was set for this task: It had to be completed before the Democratic congressional majority was replaced by a Republican majority elected to the Eightieth Congress. State Department officials were even permitted to strip their personal files, so that the men who were defendants were able to destroy the evidence against themselves.

So, all provision having been made, and a rigged investigation undertaken for the purpose of ratifying a predetermined judgment, the Nation is now told by the New Deal that Prof. Owen Lattimore, the New Deal pilot of America's policy in the Orient, was never of service to Russia. The public is informed that Dr. Philip Jessup, Ambassador at Large, who was knee deep in Communists in all of his years with the Institute of Pacific Relations, is neither a knave nor a dupe, as Mr. MCCARTHY called him.

The people are told that John Stewart Service, State Department far eastern "expert," cleared no less than six times by the New Deal loyalty boards (would a man whose loyalty was unquestioned have to make as many farewell appearances as Sarah Bernhardt?) may have been "indiscreet" in his dealings with Communists, but that is all.

And the Nation is also told that there was no fix in the case of the six persons arrested for wartime espionage in the theft of 1,700 secret Government documents which found their way to the offices of the pro-Soviet magazine Amerasia.

In fact, by assurance of TYDINGS and his New Deal friends, the people need not feel disturbed about anything, and least of all about Communist manipulation of New Deal policy. The three Senators thus have made themselves a part of the Communist conspiracy at a time when it is obvious that our weakness in Korea was made known to the Communists of the Kremlin, and when it is certain that that weakness was promoted within the administration.

The American people now have a simple criterion for determining Communist influence in this country. It will be evidenced fully by counting up those who support the Tydings report.

Strongest Nation in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, William H. Fitzpatrick, editor of the New Orleans States, is more and more each day demonstrating an ability to graphically paint a picture with words which leave an indelible impression on those who are privileged to read his editorials.

He punches and punches hard.

He rarely misses his objective when he throws a punch.

Here is Mr. Fitzpatrick's most recent editorial with a punch which appeared in the New Orleans States on July 14, 1950:

STRONGEST NATION IN THE WORLD

The United States of America is the strongest Nation in the world. Our strength is greater than all the other nations combined.

We can do anything.

On paper.

But you can't fight a war on paper.

You can't save American soldiers fighting a losing battle in South Korea on paper.

You've got to have the power—in guns and planes and tanks and ships and rockets and men—to win a war.

You can't stop Korean tanks with .30 caliber rifles any more than you can stop them with paper tanks or paper threats.

You've got to have the power to do it.

Paper and talk will never do it.

American prisoners of war are being murdered by the Reds after they surrender.

Whose fault is that? The Reds, who are Asiatics and care nothing for life, or our Government's, for not being prepared? A victorious army doesn't surrender. A winning army doesn't have to give up.

But you have to give up when nothing's back of you but paper. For a long time and a long ways off, nothing but paper.

On paper, we looked pretty good.

On paper, we could whip the world.

But you can't fight with potential alone.

You've got to have it right there with you.

The great American Nation is being forced down the peninsula of Korea by Russian satellite and mercenary troops.

They knew we were the greatest, strongest, most powerful Nation in the world; but only on paper.

Top Government officials have been telling us for months that we could kick Stalin's teeth in if he started something. We had the power to do it—on paper.

Sure, we'll win in Korea—eventually. When the paper becomes steel and powder and gasoline and ships and tanks and men.

But there'll be other Koreas around the globe. And we'll have to win there, too, to keep the whole world from war.

But for the sake of every American mother's son who goes into future battle let's be better prepared next time.

Or won't we learn any more from Korea than we learned from Bataan and Corregidor?

For World Peace, Not Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the July 20 issue of the Machinist which contains a most pertinent and useful factual analysis of the origin of, and motives behind, the so-called Stockholm Peace Declaration Petition.

I am sure that no one in Congress is under the slightest illusion as to the viciousness of this particular deceptive piece of Communist propaganda. Yet its very boldness is startling.

I am sure that all Members did see recently, when this petition started its circulation on the streets of Washington, that the local head of the Communist Party told newspaper reporters that the Communist Party here was circulating the petitions.

I think it is quite probable that many Members were approached recently by delegations composed, at least in part, of sincere but misled American citizens, urging consideration and endorsement of these petitions.

I am convinced that the Communist Party in this country will continue to make every effort to obtain the signatures of honest and patriotic Americans. I know that most Americans do want to work for peace and will do everything in their power to bring it about. Consequently, I believe that it is an obligation we should accept to do everything in our power to make the facts clear so that there will be resounding rejection of this vicious effort to deceive and mislead decent, patriotic, and peace-loving Americans.

The editorial is as follows:

FOR WORLD PEACE, NOT COMMUNISM

Trouble with so many folks, they don't know how to spot a liar. When you're honest, you always figure the other guy is honest, too. Most times, you're right. But once in a while we get taken by a real slicker. It's happening to some of us right now in a number of American and Canadian cities. We don't like war and we wish to hell someone would figure out a way to keep peace in the world. We don't like what we hear of this atom bomb either, and we wish some way could be worked out to outlaw the bomb.

With all this on our mind, we meet a fellow on the streetcar, at the union hall, at the corner saloon, in the shop, or maybe even at church. This fellow is talking about how bad things are going in Korea and, he supposes, the next thing will be the atom bomb and then the whole world will be in trouble. We worry right along with him until, finally, this guy gets around to his point: Why don't we do something to help restore peace. He agrees there's not much we can do, of course, but we can let the world know where we stand, personally. Here, he says, why don't we sign this peace petition. At least, it can't do any harm this fellow says, and maybe if a billion people sign up against war and human slaughter the big shots would have to pay attention.

This fellow's peace petition says:

"We demand the absolute banning of the atom weapon, arm of terror and mass exterminator of populations.

"We demand the establishment of strict international control to insure the implementation of this banning measure.

"We consider that any government which would be first to use the atom weapon against any country whatsoever would be committing a crime against humanity and should be dealt with as a war criminal.

"We call on all men of good will throughout the world to sign this appeal."

It reads all right. Do we sign? If we do, we're one more sucker on the Commie roles. Once more we've made the mistake of thinking that the guy we're talking to is as honest as we are.

These Commie peace petitions are taking in thousands of Americans who honestly want peace in the world. They are sucking in hundreds of thousands of war-weary folks in Europe. What the suckers don't know is that this peace petition they are signing is a weapon of war—just as much a weapon as the Russian tanks, the Russian Yaks, and the Russian rifles being used by the North Korean troops in their invasion.

Sound far-fetched to you? Well, listen a minute.

First off, there's no question of the parenthood of this peace petition. They haven't tried to keep it secret. This petition was drawn up and carefully worded by the Cominform, the Communist foreign-propaganda organization. It was publicly launched on March 19, this year, at the Communist-controlled World Congress of Partisans for Peace. Six days later, on March 24, the official paper of the Cominform kicked off the signatures-for-peace campaign, to get the petition signed by plain people all over the world. On June 8, the Daily Worker, official Communist Party newspaper in New York, announced the campaign to get signatures for the peace petition in this country. On June 20, the campaign received the official endorsement of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. (In Russia you sign, or else.)

So what's wrong with the petition? Let's check back in our memories a minute. Remember, it was the Russian and the other Communist delegates at the United Nations who vetoed the UN plan to outlaw production of the atom bomb and to establish a United Nations inspection commission with power to investigate and make sure that every nation, including Russia, was living up to the law. The United States, on the other hand, agreed not only to permit full inspection of United States atom plants, but also to destroy all atom bombs on hand if Russia and the other countries would accept the plan to outlaw the bomb.

Two years ago and more when the United States and Britain were urging that the atom bomb be outlawed, Russia wasn't interested. This spring the Russians began whipping up

this petition against use of the atom bomb. In March when the Cominform began this campaign, the Russians could have outlawed the atom bomb either by accepting the UN proposal or by advancing an acceptable proposal of their own. Instead of making the motion in the UN meeting, they began this drive among plain people to get their petition signed.

From this we are forced to assume that the Communists are not trying to outlaw the atom bomb. They are simply trying to delay its use until the Russians can catch up in the armament race. In March, when this "peace" petition was launched the Russians already had decided to pull the trigger in Korea. They thought then that the atom bomb was the only thing that could defeat the Communist aims in Korea.

Finally, let's look at this petition again. It is called a "peace" petition, but nowhere does it oppose those who start wars. Nowhere does it suggest that war be outlawed or that the United Nations be given authority to punish those who start wars.

This business of someone talking peace just as he is getting set to start a war is not something new with the Communists. We've heard it and been taken in by it before—as anyone knows who remembers those Nip ambassadors of peace who came to Washington the day before the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor.

Next time someone talks peace to us or asks us to sign a "peace" petition, we're going to ask him who he hopes will win in Korea—the Northern Korean Communists or the United Nations forces under General MacArthur. If he tries to duck or evade an answer to that simple question we know that guy is a liar when he says he is for peace.

Next time anyone proposes a peace resolution at any meeting, we're going to offer a substitute motion proposing that the United Nations be given power to try the leaders of any aggressor nation as war criminals.

If a man or woman is honestly for peace—as are most of us—he or she will not oppose United Nations action against any country that starts a war. If a man or woman talks peace but doesn't want any part of the United Nations, then he or she is a liar and a hypocrite.

One thing, we may not always be able to spot a liar right off, when we do we can take good care of him.

A Total Peace Offensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following proposal made by Walter P. Reuther, president of UAW-CIO. It is a timely and historic document. I withhold further comment upon it lest I detract from its force.

A TOTAL PEACE OFFENSIVE TO STOP COMMUNIST AGGRESSION BY TAKING THE INITIATIVE IN THE WORLD CONTEST FOR MEN'S MINDS, HEARTS, AND LOYALTIES—A POSITIVE PROGRAM OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL ACTION TO ELIMINATE POVERTY, HUMAN INSECURITY, AND INJUSTICE WHICH ARE THE SOURCES OF COMMUNIST POWER

(By Walter P. Reuther, president, UAW-CIO)

We can win with a combination of adequate military defense plus a positive peace offensive. This proposal suggests such a peace offensive.

FOREWORD

In view of the character of world communism and the impossibility of predicting the next power move of the Politburo, no one can be certain that war is or is not inevitable. What we can be certain of is that America, the strongest nation among the free peoples of the world, has a moral obligation and duty to ourselves and to the world to make an all-out effort to avoid war and to build a just and lasting peace.

This proposal is suggested in the sincere belief that our best prospect of avoiding war and winning the peace lies in our pursuit of a plan of action that combines a fully adequate military defense with a positive peace offensive. The proposal set forth herein is an effort to outline the essentials and scope of such a peace offensive.

We cannot give up hope for peace. To do so would weaken the moral fiber of our people and our allies, drying up the wellsprings of hope and aspiration which are the source of the spiritual strength of a free people. To give up hope for peace makes war inevitable.

We must not lose faith in the cause of peace. We must not lose faith in ourselves.

We must believe in peace. We must be prepared to work and fight for peace.

There are no pat answers to the problem of our complex and explosive world situation. There is no one simple action to stop the threat of Communist aggression and to establish lasting world peace.

America rejects the theory in preventive war as the answer to Soviet aggression. We could not live with ourselves nor stand before the world as a defender of human freedom and of the worth and dignity of the individual if we accepted the moral responsibility for launching a war of aggression.

We must work at the task before us on every sector of the world problem—on the military front—the political front—and the economic and social front. This proposal is an effort to underscore the importance and the compelling need for bold positive action on the economic and social front.

The Marshall plan and the work of ECA were an important beginning on this front, but a broader, more comprehensive, long-range program of economic and social action must be launched as a total peace offensive.

During the past year many men of good will all over the world in their search for peace have made important contributions through bold and imaginative proposals.

The ideas and suggestions set forth herein are not advanced as a finalized plan of action, but rather as an effort to contribute to the thinking and discussion of the over-all problem. In the belief that in a society of freemen, the pooling and exchange of ideas and thoughts are the sources of democratic decision and constructive action, I offer this proposal for the consideration of my fellow Americans.

When the crisis is so great, and so much is at stake, each of us I feel has an obligation to speak out the faith that is in him. This I have tried to do in this proposal.

WALTER P. REUTHER.

DETROIT, MICH., *July 15, 1950.*

A LETTER TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN

JULY 15, 1950.

The HONORABLE HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington 25, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your prompt and decisive action to stop Communist aggression in Korea has given renewed hope and strengthened determination to the people of the world.

As you indicated in your historic statement before the American Newspaper Guild convention on June 28, we must defeat the Communist combination of force, propaganda promises, and systematic confusion by democratic performance. This is democracy's propaganda of the deed against which all the weapons in the Politburo's arsenal are futile. We know this to be a fact because it has worked in our Union. We beat the Communists, not with propaganda but by performance, by hard work and progress toward the objectives for which our Union was formed. Other unions have done and are doing the same job.

We support your determination and your plan of action because, instead of mere defensive, negative anticommunism, you have defined the necessity for a positive 3-day hitch of military defense, economic cooperation and political cooperation.

Addressing the Guild convention in your first statement after setting in motion the free world's answer to Communist aggression in Korea, you said:

"We must not be misled into thinking that our only task is to create defenses against aggression. Our whole purpose in creating a strong defense is to permit us to carry on the great constructive tasks of peace. Behind the shield of a strong defense we must continue to work to bring about better living conditions in the free nations.

"Particularly in the underdeveloped areas of the world we must work cooperatively with local governments which are seeking to improve the welfare of their people. We must help them to help themselves. We must aid them to make progress in agriculture, in industry, in health, and in the education of their children. Such progress will increase their strength and their independence.

"The growing strength of these countries is important to the defense of all free nations against Communist aggression. It is important to the economic progress of the free world. And these things are good for us as well as good for them."

I share your conviction.

Later in the same statement, you said:

"If we fail to carry out a vigorous point 4 program we run the risk of losing to communism, by default, hundreds of millions of people who now look to us for help in their struggle against hunger and disease."

Your view of the future as we can make it, lighted as it is by a steady optimism based on courage and clear thinking, should give confidence and inspiration to every American and to other peoples. I refer particularly to these words in your Guild statement:

"Point 4 is a successor to the old colonialism idea, the exploiting idea of the middle seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. We want to have a prosperous world that will be interested in buying the immense amount of surplus things that we are going to have to sell. And now to do that they have got to have something to give back to us in order that they can buy our goods. I want to keep this factory organization of ours going at full tilt. In order to do that we must help these people help themselves.

"Point 4 is an investment in a peaceful and prosperous world. It is a program which will bring increasing results over the years. It will bring about a chain reaction in economic development. It will serve to create economic health where poverty existed, and to equip the people of underdeveloped areas to carry forward their economic gains and preserve their independence."

With this, Mr. President, I most wholeheartedly agree.

In full support of your policy and as a contribution to its earliest possible application, I have attempted to draft a proposal equal in scope and force to the Communist challenge that must be dealt with everywhere in the world.

I present it herewith in the hope it will receive your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER P. REUTHER,
President, UAW-CIO.

THE INITIATIVE FOR PEACE CAN BE OURS

The North Korean puppet army acting for the Kremlin must be pushed back to the thirty-eighth parallel. At a cost no one can now predict, this will be done. The price, high though it may be in lives and money, will be less than the cost of appeasement of Soviet aggression.

How many aggressions, manned by peoples of puppet states equipped and trained by Russian Communist commissars and generals, can be resisted and thrown back before one explodes into full scale international warfare?

Can we do nothing more than turn back today's aggression; drain our economy in wholly military preparation for tomorrow's aggressions; wait, hopelessly and helplessly, for the ultimate explosion of world-wide conflict?

Must the initiative for peace or war be left to the members of the Russian politburo who, themselves, are prisoners of the very power they use to rule the people of Russia and other peoples inside the churning concentration camp of misery which they have put together out of the wreckage of World War II?

Positive action for peace is needed now

The world still staggers, stunned by the impact of violence, death, and destruction of the last war. Hundreds of millions of people everywhere, of every faith, nationality and race, pray for peace while the world again prepares for war.

The race to produce the H-bomb creates a great emptiness in the world, blasting man's hope for peace and filling his heart with hollow uncertainty and fear.

The moral vacuum created in the world by the H-bomb must be filled. The United States has and must accept the major responsibility for filling this moral vacuum with positive, human, democratic values that, in practice, will reestablish the worth and dignity of the individual human being.

The war in Korea has finally awakened us to the creeping Pearl Harbor of aggression that is being engineered by the men in the Kremlin. American democracy must and, I believe, can demonstrate the moral strength and economic and practical know-how necessary to develop and present to the world a tangible and comprehensive plan of action to achieve economic and social justice which will win for the cause of freedom the loyalties of hundreds of millions of people whose poverty and misery are now exploited by the Communists.

Even at this late hour and perhaps because of the very lateness of the hour, such a program will mobilize a positive spiritual and material force in the world greater than the negative power of the H-bomb. It will release the pent up powers stored in every man's hidden reservoir of hopes and aspirations everywhere in the world. It will provide hope against despair and promote revolt against rule by terror.

Only the United States has the material resources for the bold, constructive action needed to banish the fear that holds the world paralyzed on dead center, hypnotized by negative values based on men's fears and hatreds.

The compelling necessity for quick, positive, daring action is more than a matter of high purpose, it is a matter of democratic survival. If we fail now to launch a bold, tangible, practical program for peace, we will surrender the world to the apostles of fear, hatred, and hysteria. The negative values in which they trade will contribute further to world panic and will make war inevitable.

More than military victory in Korea is needed

The Korean situation is not an isolated development. It is part of total Communist strategy. The dictators in the Kremlin will repeat the technique employed in Korea with varied patterns of infiltration, subversion, and aggression whenever and wherever they find a soft spot. We may push the Communist aggressors back in Korea only to find a repeat performance in Indochina, Burma, Iran, Turkey, Berlin, or in any one of a dozen other spots.

This pattern of aggression is now clear. The prompt and decisive action of President Truman and the United Nations has united and inspired the free peoples of the world with new hope and determination. And the Politburo was no doubt startled to find that the free world has at last profited by the tragic lessons of the appeasement at Munich.

The experts generally agree that the rulers of the Soviet Union are not yet ready for total war and that therefore the Korean situation will remain limited in scope. American forces, supported by forces of other nations acting through the United Nations, will be successful in pushing back the Communists and in reestablishing the political status quo in Korea based on the thirty-eighth parallel. While this task must be pursued with the full strength and united determination of free peoples acting through the United Nations, we must not delude ourselves into believing that, having achieved this military objective, we have brought about any fundamental change in the basic circumstances out of which the Korean aggression developed.

The Communists have perfected the technique of exploiting poverty and human insecurity and are forging human misery into a political weapon of aggression. They did this in Greece and in Italy. They have done it in China, in Korea. They are doing it in Southeast Asia, in South Africa and in Latin America. In terms of the cold war invented and launched by the Politburo, this political and propaganda weapon, now in use around the globe, can be as devastating as a stockpile of H-bombs.

Eight hundred million people now under Communist domination

Since 1945 the number of people under Soviet domination has increased from 180,000,000 to 800,000,000. This vast reservoir of humanity is being tapped for slave labor and military manpower to meet the requirements of Communist aggression. The engineers of Soviet aggression have shown that they can recruit by propaganda and pressure vast numbers of satellite troops, thereby holding in reserve the entire Russian army, navy, and air force. They need commit little more than equipment and military advisers while we must throw our own men into battle. This means that our manpower and the manpower of the few nations that can supply troops for the United Nations' armies may be bled white whenever and wherever the Kremlin decides to launch a new aggression.

This danger was recognized by Walter Lippmann when he recently said: "Unless our present position in the Asiatic Far East can be held in large measures by the will and the native force of Asiatic peoples, even larger bodies of American troops will become frozen there. Then the advantages of holding these positions will—in view of our global interests—have to be weighed against the heavy liabilities."

Only by a combination of fully adequate military measures and prompt bold action to wipe out human misery and desperation can we be successful in winning the loyalty and support of hundreds of millions of people and strip the Kremlin of its power to exploit them and sacrifice them in battles of aggression. Only by such a combination can we mobilize the will and the force of peoples to defeat the Politburo's plan for world conquest.

Freedom's fight for Asia must be won in the rice fields

The cold war is essentially a struggle for men's minds and hearts and their loyalties. The propaganda of the Communists is based on deceit, distortion, and outright falsehood. We must meet the challenge of communism, not by pious slogans about democracy's virtues, but by a positive program of social action that can and does win a fuller measure of economic and social justice for people everywhere.

The current Korean situation is a by-product of our failure in China. Communism did not succeed in China; we failed in China. Our failure in China was typical of the general failure of the West to understand or pay heed to the social dynamics and ferment that stir the exploited and oppressed Asiatic peoples. Western powers too often have attempted to sit on the lid and at best to treat the people of these countries as children, entitled only to second-class economic and political citizenship. Even the most enlightened type of colonial policy will not satisfy people who aspire to full independence.

We made the tragic mistake of believing that freedom's fight in China could be won on the battlefields alone, when all the time we should have known that basically freedom's fight had to be won in the rice fields. When hundreds of millions of people are hungry, when they are struggling to get the bare necessities to keep body and soul together while their officials are living in luxury, we cannot fill their empty bellies with pious slogans about the virtues of democracy. The Communists have not conquered China; they have merely moved in to fill the vacuum created by our failure.

The loss of China and the resulting developments in Korea should make us understand the method in the madness of the men who sit in the Kremlin and plan to rule the world. They are carrying out a planned program of provocation designed to throw the United States and our allies off guard and off balance. First, Greece, then Berlin, then Indochina, and now Korea. On the Kremlin's world-wide checkerboard, there are still many more power moves to be attempted.

The Politburo strategy is to promote panic

The Politburo strategy is to create a series of crises, each serious in its proportion and potential, in order to condition and influence American policy in the direction of relying more and more on military power as the sole means of meeting the power of communism. The Kremlin dictators seek to divert us entirely from the pursuit of a positive program of social action which is the key—the only key—to winning the loyalty and support of the hundreds of millions of people who are living in a state of dire poverty and who are being denied the smallest element of economic security and human dignity. The unceasing fury of the Communist attack upon the Marshall plan is proof of the power of positive programs which help people help themselves to win a better life.

The Communists can and in many areas are now outmaneuvering us. They provoke and force us into greater military expenditures while, posing as the liberators of enslaved people fighting for bread, peace, and freedom, they circulate throughout the world their dishonest petitions for peace.

The success of the Kremlin strategy in throwing us off balance is sharply illustrated in the United States Senate. In the face of the Korean situation, while the Senate voted unanimously for the necessary $2,000,000,000 increase in military funds, it cut ECA funds by $250,000,000. The Senate Appropriations Committee then cut President Truman's recommendation for $45,000,000 for point 4 aid to $10,000,000. A day or so later, Governor Dewey proposed that the United States go on a "hardship economy," not for the purpose of stepping up both military strength and constructive aid to other nations, but solely for the purpose of increasing military strength. Ex-President Hoover followed

through by stating that all we need to do about communism is to oppose military aggression "and trust to time for this evil to abate."

Such proposals to place sole reliance upon military strength in the world struggle against Soviet aggression would commit us to a policy of sending more and more American troops to fight throughout the world against more and more troops recruited from the increasing millions of people who would fall under expanding Soviet domination. Under such a policy of sole reliance on military power, there would have been no Marshall plan and the Communists would now dominate western Europe.

Poverty and human insecurity—The source of Communist power

We shall not make effective lasting progress against the Communists, we shall not win the millions of democratic allies needed to convert the negative defense against the Kremlin into a positive building of the peace until we understand and do something practical about the basic unsolved economic and social problems that are the source of Communist power. Until we understand why deeply religious peasants attend mass in the morning and Communist rallies in the afternoon, we have not grasped the fundamentals of Communist power.

It is not a historic accident that in the countries of Europe, such as the Scandinavian nations, England, and Switzerland, where there is an acceptance of social responsibilities with strong free democratic labor unions and where the average person enjoys a measure of economic security and human dignity, the Communists are without any appreciable strength or influence.

The propaganda of the deed will win for democracy

It is not enough merely to make the Voice of America louder and stronger so that democratic slogans may be carried to more people. Slogans and phrases ring hollowly in the ears of hungry men without concrete action to give the words meaning. Without the proof of performance, they are ignored, rejected and, if shouted too often and too loudly, are resented and become ammunition for the enemy.

We cannot win in a battle of words. There is no ceiling on promises except men's respect for the truth. The agents of the Kremlin, therefore, find it easy to outpromise us. They have in many countries a wealth of real grievances to denounce; in too many instances they have the mistakes and failures of anti-Communist nations to exploit.

But communism cannot compete in performance. The Voice of America will be able to rekindle hope for peace and belief in freedom and justice in the hearts of men when it can answer totalitarian promises with democratic performance.

Our propaganda must be the propaganda of the deed. We must prove in action that bread and freedom can live together in the same house.

We must launch a total peace offensive.

A PROPOSAL FOR A TOTAL PEACE OFFENSIVE

It is proposed that along with the building of adequate military defense we further strengthen our position in the world by launching total war against poverty and human insecurity, thereby striking at the heart of Communist power and influence.

We can seize the initiative for peace by putting into effect a greatly expanded foreign-aid program geared to the economic and social needs of people throughout the world, while promoting a practical program of economic and social justice at home. This direct attempt to destroy the sources of Communist power will have to be supported by an adequate system of defense based on joint planning and pooling of strength with our democratic allies.

It is proposed in effect that we take the price tag off peace. It is proposed that we agree to win peace with freedom and justice with whatever it takes to win it. It is proposed that we mobilize our people morally, spiritually, economically, and politically in a total effort for peace.

A nine-point program for building lasting peace

It is proposed that the American people, through their Government, express concretely their devotion to peace, justice, and humanity by making a fixed commitment to the peoples of the world as follows:

1. For the next hundred years (1950–2050) the people of the United States through their Government pledge themselves to make available through the United Nations an annual sum of $13,000,000,000. (This, over the 100-year period, will equal the final money cost—$1,300,000,000,000—of the last war to the American people.)

Other nations will be asked to make similar investments in peace according to their ability, but the United States investment will not be conditional upon payments by other nations.

2. The annual sum of $13,000,000,000 made available by the people of the United States through their Government shall be deposited in a special United Nations fund for economic and social construction. This fund shall be used solely to help people in other nations to help themselves by developing and expanding the economic resources and facilities of the participating nations and for other purposes that will contribute to improvement of living standards, including nutrition, housing, health, and education of their people. An annual report will be made to the people of the world listing expenditures and specific results achieved.

3. The annual sum of $13,000,000,000 shall be made available to the peoples of all nations, including the Soviet Union and its satellite nations on equal terms, subject to the conditions set forth below, and shall be allocated among the participating peoples according to a formula based on objective measures of their respective economic and social needs.

4. This proposal, upon adoption by the Congress of the United States, shall be submitted to the peoples of the world by the President of the United States through the United Nations.

5. Upon acceptance of this proposal by a majority of its member nations, the United Nations shall convene an international conference for the purposes of achieving total disarmament, establishing universal inspection, and other appropriate security controls, and creating an international police force. The refusal of one or more nations to cooperate in disarmament shall not affect the commitment of the people of the United States, who shall nevertheless through their Government make the $13,000,000,000 annual payment into the United Nations fund for economic and social construction. Aid from the fund shall in that case be made available to those remaining nations which agree to cooperate in a program of mutual defense until such time as a disarmament program is universally accepted. Such mutual defense program shall be developed by the United Nations; and all participating nations shall agree not to employ their armed forces outside their boundaries except at the direction of the United Nations.

6. After acceptance of this proposal in principle by all or a majority of its member nations, the United Nations shall convene a Peoples' World Assembly for Peace to discuss the proposal in detail and to make recommendations to the United Nations concerning its implementation.

Each member nation of the United Nations shall be entitled to be represented in the Peoples' World Assembly for Peace by 18 delegates in all, composed of 2 each from the organization or organizations most representative of the following groups in its population: dirt farmers, industrial workers, housewives, youth, veterans, educators, scientists, professional persons, businessmen, and religious leaders.

The Peoples' World Assembly for Peace shall present its recommendations to the Secretary-General of the United Nations who shall forward them to the governments of all member nations for official action by the UN Assembly. The Peoples' World Assembly for Peace shall be reconvened annually to hear reports on expenditures, projects and achievement, and to discuss and make recommendations concerning future operation and projects of the peace program.

7. The United Nations shall be requested to expand its existing agencies and to create such new agencies as may be needed to administer the world-wide program of economic and social construction made possible and financed by the funds made available by the people of the United States through their Government and by other peoples through their governments.

8. The United Nations shall create a special agency which shall be authorized to employ scientists and technicians to develop programs and techniques for the development and application of atomic power and energy for peacetime use within the limits permitted by security measures made necessary by the refusal of one or more nations to agree to universal disarmament and inspection. Such atomic project shall be financed out of the United Nations Fund for Economic and Social Construction and the services of this agency shall be made available to assist the peoples of all participating nations to build a richer life for themselves and the world community.

9. The United Nations and its member nations who accept and pledge cooperation in carrying forward this peace proposal shall take effective steps to expand and strengthen the means of mass communication and to use them to familiarize the peoples of all nations with the commitment of the peoples of the United States and of other nations and with the provisions, possibilities, and concrete economic and social achievements of this peace proposal.

A POSITIVE PROGRAM WILL WIN THE LOYALTY OF PEOPLES

The facts of performance can penetrate the iron curtain. People now in the free nations who came originally from any nation rejecting this proposal should be asked to make direct appeals to the peoples of those nations. Such appeals, based on personal knowledge and experience, are more effective than professionally written statements, as was proved in the letter writing that preceded the Italian elections in the spring of 1948. They, plus United States action on the Marshall plan, did much to defeat the Communist drive for power in Italy.

We must develop the techniques to penetrate the iron curtain so that people in any country which might reject this peace proposal will realize the magnitude of their losses because of inability to share in the United Nations Fund for Economic and Social Construction and because of being forced to continue to bear the crushing burden and anxieties of armament for aggression.

The cost of armaments must be spelled out in bread and butter terms. The Russian people must be made aware, for example, that in 1947 their expenditures on national defense came to 56,700,000,000 rubles, an amount equivalent to 51 percent of the 130,000,000,000 ruble total value of their entire industrial output. They must be helped to

realize what their own industries could provide in shoes for their feet, in shirts, dresses and coats for their backs, in chairs and tables for their homes, in scarce drugs for their sick children, in all the necessities and comforts that they now lack, if only their Government could be gotten to agree to join with others in universal disarmament and inspection.

Spell it out to the victims of Communist domination

The victims of Communist domination must be told how much more they could have in food, in clothing, in improved shelter, in comfort and convenience, in machinery to lighten their toil and to enable them to produce more with less effort if their governments would permit them to share in the $13,000,000,000 a year that the people of the United States are putting up on behalf of peace in the world and a better tomorrow for all peoples.

Day by day, the Voice of America must be enabled to reach the farthest corners of the vast totalitarian prison behind the iron curtain with reports of factories built in other countries to produce the things that make life richer; of stoves, radios, refrigerators, washing machines, and automobiles made available to new millions; of lands cleared of malarial mosquitos; of new dams preventing floods, irrigating arid lands and producing vast supplies of energy; of crop yields rising; of empty bellies filled and of deficiency diseases banished; of infant mortality declining and literacy rising; of thousands of new homes, hospitals and schools; of labor eased, hours of toil shortened, and real wages and living standards rising everywhere on the face of the earth where governments have responded to their peoples' yearnings for peace and plenty in place of war and weapons and the costs of war.

We must create the realities, the factual conditions that will make such reports possible. With the people in Communist-dominated satellite countries fully conscious of the cost in bread-and-butter terms of the refusal by their governments to join with other nations on the basis of this peace proposal, the internal pressures would be such that no police state could for long continue to defy the will of the people by refusing to participate in the program for universal disarmament and peace.

Faced with the loss of their satellite nations, and the weakening of their ability to further exploit poverty and misery as political weapons for the expansion of their sphere of domination, the Commissars in the Kremlin may recognize that they cannot conquer and enslave the world.

The strategists of the Politburo are schooled in the politics of power. They respect only superior power. If they are forced to recognize that they can neither win nor hold the loyalty of other peoples throughout the world, they may yield to the facts of superior strength possessed by aroused and united peoples. Thus the world may be saved from the catastrophe of total war. But even if worst comes to worst and the power-drunk men in the Kremlin decide to stake all on victory in total war, we shall have taken millions of potential allies away from them; we shall have won these people to our side by having made a supreme effort to avoid war by the launching of a positive peace offensive.

Whichever decision the men in the Kremlin make, we must intensify the fight against Soviet enslavement in the field of economic and social action where the weight of our advanced technology and developed productive resources gives us an overwhelming margin of superiority in power which the Communists cannot ignore.

We must do more than fight defensively in the Kremlin's cold war, and do more to win the peace our way, the way of ECA and point 4, with the fire power of our peace offensive stepped up at least four times its present intensity.

Politburo steals wealth and conscripts manpower

A total peace offensive will expose, by contrast, in all its cynical and coldly calculated brutality, the Kremlin's exploitation and enslavement of the people under its control. Once it has established domination and installed its rule by force and terror, the Politburo systematically drains wealth out of the nations governed by its puppet dictators. In eastern Germany and throughout its sphere in eastern Europe it has already dragged living standards down toward the appallingly low levels of the Russian people.

The manpower and the wealth of Soviet satellite nations are conscripted to feed the insatiable Communist war machine. Millions of Poles, Germans, Czechs, and other eastern Europeans now serve as slave labor. To these are to be added uncounted millions of the peoples of China and Asia drawn into the Soviet war machine as slave laborers and as expendable front-line troops.

Winning partners in peace and allies if total war comes

Instead of taking, we propose to give.

Instead of reducing the living standards of other people, we propose to help them raise their living standards.

Instead of confiscating their crops, we propose to help them modernize their agriculture for the production of more food.

Instead of drafting men and women for forced labor in the service of the Soviet war machine, we propose to feed them and assist them in the building of a richer life.

Instead of draining their countries of mineral wealth and other natural resources, we propose to help them develop and use these resources for the fulfillment of their own needs.

Instead of driving their bodies in speeded-up production for the Soviet war machine, we propose to assist them in achieving decent wages, hours, working conditions, and the right of collective bargaining, and obtaining medicine, hospitals and schools for them and their families.

This is an offer understandable in any language because it talks in terms of tools, jobs, food, housing, health, education, security and freedom.

It is on this front that we can achieve our greatest success in winning the loyalty of millions of people as partners in the positive job of building the peace or, in the event of war, as fighting allies in the defense of freedom.

Blessings of peace and disarmament at home

The achievement of universal disarmament would bring the blessings of lasting peace to America in terms of intangible human values on which no price can be set. In addition, it would make it possible for the American people to make substantial social progress in the form of higher living standards, greater security, increased social services and a fuller and richer life in educational and cultural values.

The heavy financial burden of war is reflected in the current Federal budget of over $40,000,000,000 of which approximately 75 percent is earmarked to meet the cost of past and possible future wars.

We are currently spending approximately $15,000,000,000 annually out of the Federal budget for military purposes and this will no doubt be sharply increased if the world situation continues to deteriorate.

The achievement of universal disarmament would permit America to divert the billions of dollars now being spent for military requirements and national security to the task of meeting the unlimited peacetime needs of our people.

WE MUST PRACTICE AT HOME WHAT WE PREACH ABROAD

Nowhere is the gap between our promises and our performance as great as in the field of civil rights. Among peoples in underdeveloped countries, greatest doubt about our high moral statements on democracy, freedom, and the worth of the individual is caused by our continued practice of a double standard of citizenship here at home. The United States cannot provide unassailable moral leadership in the world in this time of crisis and panic until we end that double standard.

The serious gap between what American democracy preaches and what it practices in the field of civil rights has provided and daily continues to provide the Communists with one of their most effective weapons in winning ground among the Asiatic and other peoples.

The daily propaganda broadcast beamed out of Moscow and released in other centers of Communist propaganda and agitation exploits to the fullest the ugly facts of racial discrimination and violation of civil rights practiced in America and tolerated even in the Capital of our Nation.

Enactment of the President's civil-rights program is more than a matter of justice and decency. In the world struggle for survival it is a must on democracy's agenda of unfinished business if we are to provide moral leadership along with material aid and guidance in the building of the peace.

THE WORK TO BE DONE

There is no lack of work to be done in the world with the $13,000,000,000 a year which it is proposed that we invest through the United Nations in the cooperative job of building peace for people.

In fact, to attain within the measurable future a standard of living approximating the level now to be found in the more highly developed nations, substantial supplementation of our investment in peace will be required.

Some indications of the need

The needs are shocking. They explain the hatred of colonialism and its postwar variations. They explain the initial success of Communist promises, infiltration, and aggression. Hundreds of millions of human beings have literally nothing to lose but hunger, disease, and the prospect of early death. Even the threat of forced labor and rule by terror will not always outweigh Communist promises of food, shelter, and clothing.

For example, of the one and a quarter billion population of Asia, 875,000,000, or 70 percent, depend for their livelihood upon agriculture.

For every member of its population living on the land, Asia produces little more than one-twelfth as much as North and Central America.

As against our infant mortality rate of 31 per thousand live births, Ceylon has 101, Korea has 116, Formosa has 125, India has 151, Burma has 204.

As against our life expectancy of 65 years for white men, life expectancy for Chinese men is 41; for Siamese, 37; for the men of India, 27.

As against our illiteracy rate of 2.7 percent, Ceylon has 42 percent; Korea, 69 percent; Turkey, 79 percent; India, 91 percent.

Modernized agriculture in Asia can release millions of workers

The living standards of the Asiatic peoples can be materially raised by producing more food per man, thus freeing tens of millions to work in industries. But bellies must be filled first, and, where men on the land can grow barely enough to feed them-

selves and their families, workers cannot be spared from the land to produce necessities and comforts beyond the primary necessity of food to keep body and soul together.

Even when billions are actually invested in Asia for river development, for fertilizers, for agricultural machinery and implements and insecticides, the job will be only begun. If we help Asia, with technical advice and equipment, to restore its eroded land and to use dams and related projects to prevent floods, to irrigate arid land, to produce fertilizers, and to generate power for its farms, transportation facilities, and industries, the major job will still remain. Only the first stage of the greatest pioneering job of the twentieth century will have been completed.

Of the 700,000,000 persons who would be displaced from the land in such a change over a period of years, possibly one hundred and fifty to two hundred million, would be workers, after allowance is made for women needed in the home, for children, and for other nonworking dependents. Here is a labor force as large as the total population of the United States. Its energies could be employed in the filling of human needs and wants beyond the basic need for food.

If we assume, as does the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, that it requires $1,000 investment per worker to provide capital facilities (a place to work and tools to work with) for each worker added to the industrial labor force in underdeveloped countries, there is an investment need for industrial purposes in Asia alone of one hundred and fifty to two hundred billion dollars, on top of other billions to improve agricultural efficiency and increase food production.

Peoples must be helped to do vast job themselves

If it were intended to do a job of this magnitude on a world-wide scale with nothing more than $13,000,000,000 a year, generations would elapse before all peoples would be brought to a parity with our own standards, which would continue to rise in the meantime.

It is not proposed that we underwrite the entire job ourselves. This is not a proposal for an unending international relief program but a program to help other peoples help themselves.

Our job is to provide the hope and the material impetus. Men who live by plowing exhausted land with sticks to make it yield a few grains of rice are too occupied with the business of keeping alive from day to day—and too poor—to hope, plan, and invest for a better tomorrow.

We have the opportunity and the resources to provide the hope and the seed capital for investment and the know-how for production. As the first investments, provided by us through the United Nations, begin to bear fruit, hope will come to life. Out of the proceeds of the first investment it will be possible both to increase living standards immediately and to conserve part for further investment for still higher living standards tomorrow. Each new investment from savings at home and from the United Nations fund financed by the people of the United States and perhaps other nations will yield a larger surplus above bare necessities out of which savings can be made for still further investment in expanded production facilities.

CAN WE AFFORD THE COST OF THIS INVESTMENT IN PEACE?

The United States can afford the cost of peace. We must stand up and demonstrate that we have the courage to remove the price tag from our efforts to lead the world to honorable and lasting peace. Whatever such a peace may cost, it is infinitely less than the cost of war.

We can afford the cost of the total peace offensive outlined herein, including adequate armed defense, short of total war, $13,000,000,000 annually in foreign aid, and social progress at home. If worst come to worst and circumstances compel us to fight total war, the American people will be willing to make whatever sacrifices will be needed to put our total resources and maximum effort into winning that war. However, by waging an all-out peace offensive we shall have the best prospect of avoiding the infinitely greater costs and sacrifices of total war.

World War II lasted 44 months and according to ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman, its total final cost to the American people will be one trillion three hundred billion dollars ($1,300,000,000,000).

It cost $29,500,000,000 per month.

It cost $985,000,000 per day.

It cost $41,000,000 per hour.

The above figures make no allowance for the incalculably greater cost of war in human lives and human values.

How big is $13,000,000,000?

The sum of $13,000,000,000 a year seems big standing by itself. But it is insignificant when measured against our alternatives and our capacities.

Thirteen billion dollars is one one-hundredth of the cost of World War II.

Thirteen billion dollars is less than 5 percent of our current yearly output. Within 5 years it will be less than 4 percent.

Thirteen billion dollars is less than the increase that we can normally expect in a 2-year period in the total output of the American economy.

Full employment will meet the cost of building lasting peace

The last depression cost the American people $500,000,000,000 in lost production. This is nearly double the value of our gross national product in 1948, the highest in history.

At present there are about 3,500,000 unemployed persons in the United States able to work and actively looking for work. There are an additional 2,000,000 or so working part-time who want and are available for full-time work. The full or partial idleness of these two groups alone represents the equivalent of perhaps 4,500,000 to 500,000,000 full-time workers whose output is being lost. Since our gross national product last year approximated $4,400 per civilian employee, it would take the equivalent of only 3,000,000 additional full-time jobs to produce the $13,000,000,000 a year required to cover the cost of the program for a total offensive for peace as outlined herein.

When we decide to wage peace with the same vigor and determination with which we wage war we can enlist the labor of millions of people not now in the labor market who would be glad to participate in the creative job of building the peace. With the increase in production made possible by the full employment of this expanded labor force we can meet the cost of a total peace offensive, build adequate military defenses, short of total war, and provide further social and economic progress for the American people.

The proof that we can do this job by mobilizing our full productive potential was furnished by the unprecedented production achievements during World War II. Faced with the challenge of war, millions of women left their kitchens and old folks came out of retirement to help produce the needed goods and services to back up our fighting men.

If we achieve comparable mobilization of our 1950 manpower potential in the same ratio as we achieved in 1944, we can increase our working force to 71,000,000 with which to meet civilian and military manpower requirements. This will permit doubling our present number of men under arms and still make available approximately 8,000,000 additional workers for civilian employment.

"Where's the money coming from?"—New tax sources

The $13,000,000,000 annual investment in peace which is here proposed represents an increase of only about $9,000,000,000 over the foreign economic aid we have been providing.

Part of the additional funds could be obtained by restoring wartime tax rates on corporations and upper-income taxpayers. Corporations paid taxes of approximately 57 percent on their profits during the war.

At present profit levels, a 60 percent average rate of tax on corporate profits would provide $7,000,000,000 of increased taxes. If, in addition, taxes on individuals with gross incomes of $15,000 or more were restored to wartime rates, a substantial part of the additional $9,000,000,000 in tax revenue would be obtained.

But large increases in revenues would flow from the proposal without raising tax rates. By putting enough people to work to produce $13,000,000,000 in additional wealth, the entire tax base is broadened. At least $2,000,000,000 in additional Government revenue would be provided at present tax rates from the increase in personal incomes. Corporation tax payments would increase by perhaps another $2,000,000,000 due to the increased profits resulting from increased production.

This total peace offensive is proposed in the belief that in the cause of total peace as in total war we must step up production to the limits of our resources. Therefore, with the wartime rate of taxation restored on corporation profits and on incomes of the well-to-do, it would be possible to increase Government revenue toward meeting the increased cost of foreign aid and stepped-up military expenditures.

This is no time for men of little faith

With our human and material resources fully mobilized for peace, we can do the job before us. Our ability to do so will be challenged by the men of little vision and no faith who have dedicated their lives to a perpetual losing struggle against every next step in mankind's progress.

These same little men were without courage or vision when we faced the challenge of Hitlerism and Nazi aggression. Until June 22, 1941, they joined Communists, Nazis, and Fascists in announcing that "the Yanks aren't coming." They dragged their feet and clung to the policy of too little and too late both before and after Pearl Harbor. They challenged President Roosevelt and said that the production goals he set for the United States were fantastic and could not be met. The record of achievement on the production front proved these little men to be wrong and President Roosevelt to be right, for his production goals were met and doubled. By their cries now for sole reliance on military force to save the world from Communist aggression they are again demonstrating the same lack of faith in the strength and capacity of America to meet the challenge of peace.

We must free ourselves from the paralyzing effect of the campaign of moral and political intimidation that is being waged among us by these men of little faith who would sell America short and leave the world with no hope for peace.

WE MUST BREAK PRODUCTION BOTTLENECKS

The steel industry currently operating at full capacity cannot meet our present needs. We must take positive steps to expand our basic steel production capacity to meet both our expanding military and civilian requirements. We are faced now with a situation comparable to that faced in the period immediately before and after Pearl Harbor. The owners of the steel industry, wedded to

a program of planned economic scarcity with low volume and high prices, said then as they say now that the steel industry's capacity is adequate. They failed then as they fail now to take steps to expand capacity. It was not until the then Senator Harry S. Truman, chairman of the Senate War Investigating Committee, exposed their willful negligence that the Government took steps to assure the expansion of steel production facilities necessary to win the war.

Steel production must be expanded

At the end of the war the monoply interest in the steel industry rushed back to normalcy and again reinstated the policy of planned scarcity with low production and high prices. Three years ago when this matter was raised before the Senate Committee on Small Business, conclusive evidence was developed clearly indicating the need for further expansion of steel production facilities to meet America's growing needs. Again the forces of monopoly and scarcity who control the steel industry, represented by the American Iron and Steel Institute, denied the need for further expansion, claiming that America's needs were temporary and that excess steel capacity would soon develop.

Their stubborn refusal to recognize requirements and to expand capacity to meet our needs jeopardized our national security in the period before and after Pearl Harbor and now again jeopardizes our future. Failure of the steel industry to take immediate practical steps to expand steel production capacity will compel the Government again to take action to break this production bottleneck now as it was compelled to do in the war.

Idle war plants must be put to work

Production bottlenecks in other basic industries must be dealt with in a like manner where the owners and managers of such industries continue in their refusal to expand production capacity to meet our military and civilian needs. Until these bottlenecks are broken, basic materials in short supply must be allocated with priority given to essential military and civilian requirements.

Idle Government-built war plants of all types, which stand today as monuments to our failure to plan for the future, must be immediately and fully mobilized as functioning production units. Fully manned with a highly trained working force these plants could be producing both military and civilian goods and would be acceptable of quick shift to all-out war production when needed.

YOUTH HAS A STAKE IN THIS PROPOSAL

Each year our high schools, colleges, and universities add approximately 1,000,000 new workers to our potential wealth producers. These youth look to us to provide the opportunity for use of their training and talents. This peace proposal will provide opportunities for them to help in the creative and positive job of building the peace. It suggests an all-out effort to avoid the necessity of giving these young Americans the job of fighting an all-out war.

This proposal offers our sons and daughters an opportunity to participate directly in the constructive work that must be done at home and in the world. It opens up new frontiers in the valleys of the Yellow, the Yangtze, the Ganges, the Jordan, and other great rivers where young American engineers, agricultural specialists, doctors, nurses, and teachers can use their energies, training, and creative ingenuity to assist and train the people of underdeveloped countries to restore and increase the productivity of their land and to improve their health and living standards.

Our young doctors, engineers, and teachers of the years to come can be offered opportunities to travel voluntarily to the ends of the earth with medicines, slide rules, and books in their hands or they can be drafted for shipment to the same areas with rifles slung to their backs.

From their earliest years of consciousness, our young people have found inspiration in the adventurous years at the beginning of our history when pioneers year after year moved forward the advance posts of civilization. This proposal for peace offers opportunity for adventure and pioneering on new social and economic frontiers.

This is pioneering for peace and freedom which can be made secure in the world only if they rest upon a broad foundation of social and economic justice. We in America must dedicate ourselves and give leadership in the building of that foundation for a lasting peace.

Freed from the crushing burdens of armaments and war, equipped with the tools of modern technology and science, all peoples can cooperate in creating a world of abundance in which man can enjoy peace, economic security, the fullest measure of political and spiritual freedom and human dignity.

THE TIME FOR ACTION IS NOW

Prompt and decisive action by President Truman and the United Nations in resisting military attack on South Korea has undoubtedly forced some revision in the Communist timetable of aggression. We cannot know whether total war will come or if so, when. We owe it to ourselves and to the people of the world to make an all-out effort for peace in the hope of avoiding total war. This proposal is suggested in the sincere belief that our best prospect of avoiding war and winning the peace lies in a plan of action that combines fully adequate military defense with a positive peace offensive.

We are at the place in world history where we must recognize that the best hope of saving freedom and achieving a just and lasting peace is in action—action so challenging, so vast in scope, so practical in design and so sincere in purpose that it will fill the moral vacuum in the world with reborn hope and a renewed spirit of cooperation among the people of all nations.

We're Not the Best in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin should be read and studied by every American who is responsible for providing a defense for this country. I am more personally familiar with the Ground Forces, and I do know that much he says about ground warfare is absolutely true. Within the past few months there has been considerable evidence that the high command of our Army is discounting the use of tanks.

Secretary of the Army Frank Pace, Jr., told the West Point graduating class that "it may be that tank warfare as we know it will soon be obsolete." Gen. J. Lawton Collins, his Chief of Staff, predicted squash-headed atomic antitank weapons that would put tanks in the scrap heap.

Mr. Speaker, as long as this earth exists we will need strong ground forces and as long as we use ground forces we will need armor tc go with our ground forces. Mr. Speaker, I hope this Korean situation will cause all of us who are responsible for providing a defense for this great country of ours to stop and think. We are depended upon more than any other nation to maintain peace in the world. To do this we must provide for our men, the best weapons in the world, and to date we have not done this.

Mr. Speaker, I hope every Member will read and study this very interesting article by Mr. Baldwin, and realize there is much truth in what he says.

WE ARE NOT THE BEST IN THE WORLD

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Americans have a puffed-up ego. We think in superlatives; Hollywood adjectives and ballyhoo have conditioned our minds. In our own opinion we are a "supercolossal" Nation, so far ahead of all the rest of the world in all the necessities and amenities of life that there is not even a close second. We produce the best bathtubs, the "most adorable" women, the most magnificent kitchens, the largest numbers of cars, telephones, radios, and so on.

Nowhere is this astigmatic self-satisfaction more pronounced than in the military field. A good many of our hard-headed pragmatists in uniform realize our deficiencies in tangibles and intangibles. But the average American thinks we can lick the world, and he points to the outcome of World War II as proof. The old idea that one American can lick four or five foreigners dies hard.

"We won, didn't we?" the man in the street says. "Americans are the best soldiers in the world."

But they are not—in many particulars not by a damn sight. We did not win World War II because we were best in soldiering, in generalship or in equipment. On the contrary, we were often woefully second best—sometimes a poor third or fourth. In some fields—general education, mechanical aptitude, technical skills and factory output—we were greatly superior to our enemies. We also enjoyed lesser advantages in other details. We had some crack fighting units, some good leaders and some excellent equipment. But our qualitative deficiencies—spiritual and physical—were many and major. We won, not because we were always best but because—with our Allies—we were biggest.

Take soldiering. Thermopylae has gone down the ages as an epic of soldiering because the men who fought there stood and died. In the past war, it was our enemies who chiefly exhibited the steadfastness of the Greeks. The Japanese fought to the death—no matter how hopeless the struggle—there were no Japanese Bataans. This struggle to the death sometimes has been described correctly as stupid fanaticism, and from the point of view of western civilization this is its proper characterization. But if this militant and fanatic spirit had been coupled with proper leadership and sound professional experience—a quality the Japs often lacked—the road to Tokyo would have been paved with the bodies of many more Americans thar the 109,459 who died to buy victory in the Pacific. Even so, the Japanese will to fight was the spiritual and combat basis of all their operations; it cost us dear. The Germans—and often the Russians—gave repeated demonstrations of the will to fight, even against great odds. Our own forces—with some outstanding exceptions—rarely showed such fanatical determination. A very small minority of American combat troops, as the military historian S. L. A. Marshall has pointed out, "carried the ball" for the bulk of our forces.

Perhaps this deficiency in determination reflects the changing spirit of our Nation—the substitution of easy living for a pioneer

psychology; the weakening virus of "work less and make more;" the substitution of collective security for individual initiative. Perhaps it reflects the failure of our way of life to dramatize itself in terms of values worth fighting for—our boys fought for blueberry pie and the right to go home. The Japs fought for a Shinto Valhalla—death in battle meant life in heaven. The Germans died the death of martyrdom—a Wagnerian end—to perpetuate 1,000 years of Hitlerian rule. The Russians fought for their motherland and died with some of the Oriental fatalism so peculiar to the eyes of the West.

We followed no shining oriflamme. Most of our men fought because they were drafted and had to fight; they did no more than they had to do. They were not cowards in a collective sense; rather, they fought for no positive goal, but for a negative fear of the opinion of their fellow men.

To this generalization there were, of course, outstanding exceptions as there are to all generalizations. Most Marine Corps units and the Army's paratroopers, as well as numerous individual divisions—imbued with that intangible élan which makes elite units—fought bravely and well. But the bulk of our forces had a negative rather than a positive combat aim.

Captured enemy intelligence documents repeatedly mention the lack of aggressiveness of the American infantry. Our own training program constantly tried to step up the battlefield initiative of our troops. Given equal armament and equal numbers, the enemy usually won. Our victories were fashioned out of overwhelming superiority in weight of metal and in numbers. There were, of course, refreshing exceptions. At Midway an inferior American force defeated a superior Japanese Fleet. At the Coral Sea we gained a strategic victory against somewhat stronger enemy forces. There were other instances in the Solomons and elsewhere in which American will to fight, superior leadership and Lady Luck bought us victory against odds. But generally, these were naval or air victories, where technical skills were dominant. In the land battles of man against man, when élan and fighting spirit were of great importance, I know of few instances where a battle was won by American forces inferior in strength or even equal in strength to their enemy. We needed superiority in numbers and in fire power.

We also showed marked deficiencies in specialized types of combat. After our bloody Huertgen Forest battle, for instance, an intelligence appreciation of the German One Hundred and Eighty-third V. G. Division commented—according to the First Army's official history—that "in combat in wooded areas the American showed himself completely unfit." (Shades of Daniel Boone.)

But there are other qualities to a soldier besides the Thermopylae brand of stubborn courage—there are other qualities, though none so important, besides the will to fight. Discipline, the tie that binds the shattered battalions when the going is toughest, is one of them. Ours was not a disciplined army. Ours were not disciplined forces. Ours is not a disciplined nation. In discipline, the cement and mortar of soldiering, we could not compare to the Germans or the Japanese.

We were, moreover, an extravagant nation in arms. In this respect our Armed Forces merely reflected the psychology of the Nation. We are a rich, sprawling land of plenty. We have always lived in an economy of waste in men and material. Our military tables of organization and equipment reflected the prodigal land that is America—probably no other army in history had such a vast amount of administrative overhead and such a variety and quantity of weapons, equipment, paraphernalia, and impedimenta. In disgust at the vast amount of unnecessary staff work and busy-busy colonels making work, an officer of the Twelfth Army Group during the war drew up the tables of organization and equipment for a "gift wrapping" section. Overstaffing was the rule, not the exception—especially in supply and rear-area installations. Behind the lines we maintained extravagant empires, an administrative tail that sometimes wagged the combat dog.

We are not by any means the best soldiers in the world. That may be, in one sense, to our credit. For the will to fight, amenability to discipline, the Spartan nature are qualities usually associated with a more primitive culture. Our civilization has led us to higher things. We have not been a militaristic nation. The qualities of soldiering have not been extolled for their own sake as they have been in Germany and Japan.

We did display, moreover, the assets of our nonmilitaristic culture, and they helped powerfully toward victory. Intelligence and initiative were American strong points. Particularly in the construction, engineering, and supply fields these qualities were applied with such success that our services wrought minor miracles. In communications and communications intelligence we also outstripped our enemies. Broken Japanese codes—broken by the genius of a few men—enabled us to win the Battle of Midway. Anglo-American code-breaking efforts helped us to learn German plans in the latter phases of the war.

But take generalship. In our pride in victory we have set our military leaders up on pedestals: Eisenhower, Bradley, MacArthur, and so on, are the best generals in the world; Nimitz, Halsey, and so on, the best admirals; Spaatz, Doolittle the best airmen. Even if one makes allowance in this appraisal for the natural conceit of victory, one cannot justify the superlatives we have used.

But in these days of big factories and big bombs, generalship—as distinguished from leadership, which is always important—does not have the same priority as it did in the days of the big battalions. War today is primarily a clash of the nation in arms. A modern general in high command is much more a coordinator, administrator, and general manager than he is a tactician.

Yet the test of generalship is still the test of adversity. Any general should be able to win, given overwhelming material superiority. After the factories of America achieved their tremendous output no American general should have lost. To do much with little, to win despite enemy superiority—that is the test of generalship. So measured, few, if any, American leaders of the last war are comparable with the Washingtons, Lees, and Jacksons of the past.

When the enemy was equal or superior to us in strength we usually lost. Bradley was a fine general—probably our most skillful tactician. Patton was an aggressive, smashing leader. But Rommel, the German, was a great tactician and personal leader. He won victories against markedly superior foes, and his last masterly retreat in north Africa is a classic of retirement. We had none to match him. Von Mannstein, the German, was a great strategist and tactician—his campaigns in Russia and his concept of the conquest of France will long be studied by the war colleges of the world. We had none to match him. Lt. Gen. Mitsuru Ushijima, the Japanese who commanded at Okinawa, and Rear Adm. Raizo Tanaka, the Japanese admiral in command of some of the Solomons engagements, taught us a lesson in persistence and skill.

We produced good generals and good admirals and good airmen—remarkably good for a nation with so little recent practice in the art of generalship—but the superlative, "best," is rarely justified. Our victories were the product of massed matériel, rather than of the highest military skill.

Take equipment. In this field most Americans are cocksure. "Of course," they say, "we had the best-equipped Army, Navy and Air Force in the world."

There is no doubt that in some items of equipment we lead the world in quality as well as in quantity. But those items which are best—and this is a considerable indictment of our military development system—are usually those which are the outgrowth of commercial usage, designed and developed by private industry or research scientists. Those items in which we lag—and they are many—are primarily the product of military designers and have been developed chiefly at Government arsenals or proving grounds.

We did have the best-equipped military forces in the world at the end of the last war—but in considerable part by virtue of prodigal quantity, not alone quality. We did develop the atom bomb first, but the basic scientific steps which led to its development were worked out primarily by expatriate scientists from other nations. And the bomb was built chiefly because of the genius of American industrial and engineering know-how, not because of American military-development skill.

Let's look at our Navy. Japan and Germany—not the United States—built the most powerful battleships in the world. The *Yamato* and *Musashi*, sister ships, each armed with 18.1-inch guns and displacing about 75,000 tons full load, were far stronger fighting ships than our most powerful ships of the *Iowa* class, which mount 16-inch guns and displace about 57,000 tons full load. In the Solomons battles, even the older Japanese battleships, like the *Kongo* and *Haruna*, showed a toughness that surprised our naval designers. Samuel Eliot Morison, in The Rising Sun in the Pacific, volume III of an official naval history of the war, states that "the *Fubuki* class [of Japanese destroyers] led the world's navies in design and armament." The German battleship *Bismarck*, finally brought to bay and sunk by a large portion of the British Fleet, demonstrated a strength and toughness which no American battleship could then match.

The British, not the Americans, first introduced the armored-flight-deck aircraft carrier. British ships at Okinawa, struck by Kamikazes, brushed the wreckage of the Jap "suiciders" off the flight decks and continued operating. Many of our own carriers, similarly hit, were severely damaged when the "suiciders" burst through the thin flight decks into the hangar decks. Our first armored-flight-deck carriers of the *Franklin D. Roosevelt* class were not commissioned until after the war.

The Italians, not the Americans, first introduced the splinter-proof gun housing for antiaircraft guns; the Italians and the French first utilized the conical-shaped armored foremast structure. Our lag in light antiaircraft guns was notorious. Our naval 5-inch gun was excellent. But the 1.1-inch "hose gun," used prior to the war, proved a complete failure and had to be hurriedly replaced by two foreign models.

The power and reliability of the American torpedo were greatly inferior to the Japanese and German torpedoes. In Battle Report—the End of an Empire, a volume in a semi-official series about the naval war, written by Capt. Walter Karig (U. S. N. R.), from official documents of the Navy Department, it is stated, "Japanese torpedoes * * * were better made than the American. There were fewer duds; few 'went crazy' to run in circles." And this was written apropos of the Leyte invasion in October 1944 after we had been at war almost 3 years.

Long before we had even started serious experimentation, the Germans introduced the electric torpedo which leaves no wake, and the magnetic detonator, which exploded the torpedo when it passed under the target ship's hull. The Germans were far ahead of us in sea mines. The acoustic mine—which for a time threatened to throttle

Britain—and the pressure mine were unpleasant surprises to the Allies.

The Nazis, developing and adapting a Dutch invention, introduced the snorkel, or breathing tube, to U-boat warfare. This development, plus the use of more powerful batteries, streamlining and strengthening of the hulls, and later the development of gas-turbine engines—like the Walther—have revolutionized submarine warfare. We did not begin to catch up until after the war. There are some indications that the British are still ahead of us, particularly in the development of turbine engines for marine use. A British motor torpedo boat equipped with one gas-turbine engine has been making an experimental cruise of the Baltic during the past few months.

This list of naval deficiencies, as revealed by the last war, could be more or less indefinitely extended. But this catalog is sufficient to indicate that our Navy was not by any means—as we used to say so proudly—"the best in the world." We were good—fortunately—in naval aviation, not strongest, but probably best. If we had not been, we might have lost the decisive Battle of Midway. We were good in submarine techniques. If we had not been, we could not have overcome the handicap of defective torpedoes and limited numbers of them.

Today, with Germany and Japan temporarily out of the race for seapower, the competition is not so tough, but the British are ahead of us in several particulars, especially in anti-submarine-warfare training. They are building 10 aircraft carriers to our 1. They have experimented with a flexible-deck carrier. The Russians have little naval tradition, but their naval development—particularly their submarine development—has been aided since the war by top German experts.

What about air power? The best fighter plane in the Pacific at the start of the war was the Jap Zero. The best fighter plane in the world at the end of the war was the German Me 262, the first jet fighter to see combat. The British developed the pathfinder technique for bombing, the first radar-control system for fighter interception, and a host of other firsts. Their Whittle jet engine was the first operating jet in the world. Today, chiefly because of Rolls-Royce development of the jet, the British are still giving us a run for our money. With several prototypes of jet airliners already flying, they promise to skim the cream from the world's commercial air routes a few years hence.

The Germans first used air-to-air rockets in combat. The Germans first used the pilotless buzz bomb—the V–1—and the stratosphere long-range rocket, the V–2. Their developments in the guided-missile field were far ahead of the world, and their aviation developments—the jet engine, swept-back wing, arrow wing, and so on—have since the war served as a basis for aeronautical designers in the United States and Russia. Both American and Russian postwar fighter planes owe much to the German wartime designs.

In the postwar race for air superiority we have certain definite advantages. Our heavy bombers—the offensive spearhead of air power—are probably as good or better than those of any other nation. But in fighter planes the Russians, with German help, may be at least equal to us in quality. And in one important field of air power—basic to the defense of western Europe—the Russians have a clearly demonstrable superiority. Our tactical air force, to be used against enemy ground armies and in close support of our own ground forces, has been something of a stepchild since the war. In over-all effectiveness the Russian tactical air force is better than our own.

And ground warfare? Throughout the war American armored forces in the European theater fought against German tanks more powerful than ours. Consistently outgunned and outarmored, often outmaneuvered, our "tankers" won by superior numbers, not by superior quality. The German Panther and Tiger tanks were better than any armored vehicles we could bring against them. Not until the closing days of the war did we put a small number of General Pershing tanks, with 90-mm. guns, into action. Even this gun, with its short barrel, was not fully a match for the improved German 88 mm. Russian World War II tanks, particularly the T–34 and the Josef Stalin, were a match for the German vehicles.

Today, 5 years after the war, the Russians still have an admitted clear superiority in tank quality. The Josef Stalin III has a 120-mm. gun. Our heaviest gun in a serviceable tank is the same short-barreled 90 mm. we used during the war, though ammunition for it has been improved.

Russian tanks not only outrange our own but they are better armored. If we were to go to war today, the tragedy of Normandy—when German tanks out of effective range of American tank guns picked off the Shermans at will—might be repeated. Those parts of the American tanks which have been furnished by commercial industry—engines, suspension, transmission, and so on—are excellent, probably well superior to similar components of other nations. But those important elements developed by our military designers—gun power and armor—are still deficient. Fortunately, we recently adopted, for the first time, a reasoned and far-seeing tank program. But the Russian lead is great and it will be difficult to catch up.

The Germans, Russians, and even the Japanese taught us much about the use of mortars. The circular bed plate for the mortar, adopted in our Army since the war—though not yet issued to troops—has been used by the Russians for years. The Russians were the first to use field-artillery rockets. They probably still lead us in this field, since our own development has been meager since the war.

The German light machine gun was superior to anything we utilized. Flash hiders for German small arms made detection difficult. Muzzle brakes, once scorned by our artillery designers, were long used by Germans and Russians and were tardily accepted in this country.

In land mines and detectors we once lagged woefully. The Germans were past masters of this art of land war. They first introduced the nonmetallic mine. The progress we have made in this and a great many other ancillary military fields since the war stems directly from German wartime developments. Some of our postwar efforts have been made possible only because of the help of German researches and German technicians. We had, of course, good artillery and developed fine techniques for massed fire. The proximity fuze was an American first. It did much to defeat the Jap kamikaze and the German buzz bomb. In radar development we outstripped the Germans, the Japs, and eventually even the British.

This abbreviated catalog of deficiencies is in no sense intended as a slur upon the American military virtues. We have great assets as well as some major liabilities. But the greatest of our assets—one which must be preserved and fostered—has been and still is our enormous industrial strength and our capacity for mass production. We have not always been in the past similarly distinguished for quality. In World War II we followed part of the tactical maxim attributed to Nathan Bedford Forrest "to git thar fustest with the mostest." We got there with "the mostest," but not always "fustest," and frequently not "best."

We have produced some of the best in every field—the new Navy 3-inch antiaircraft gun and the B–47 jet bomber are examples. Under the spur of our war effort, we have eliminated some of the glaring deficiencies which cost us so dearly in combat.

But we still lag in some vital particulars—especially in tanks, self-propelled guns, tactical aircraft, armored personnel carriers for infantry, new aircraft carriers with improved equipment, field-artillery rockets, antiaircraft guns. Contrary to so much of our optimistic wishful thinking, the Russians are no slouches at military development. They have long had some of the finest small arms and best field artillery in the world. Today they have a clear lead in tanks.

And what about our present "will to fight," our élan, our leadership?

These qualities in the next war might well be vital. The great quantitative superiority which we enjoyed in World War II would be somewhat neutralized by Russian numbers. Not only numbers of men but numbers of machines, for the Russians are constructing and stockpiling during this cold-war period far larger quantities of tanks, tactical aircraft, guns, and munitions than are we, and they are probably expanding their capital-goods industries faster than we are. In other words, our past advantage in quantity, which has won two wars for us, is no longer a sure thing. Initially, at the start of any war, we are certain to be fighting against superior, not inferior, numbers, against superior, not inferior, fire power.

These facts must mean, therefore, a greater emphasis than ever before upon quality—quality of men—elite troops; quality of leaders—the finest generals; quality of weapons—the best tanks and guns and planes and ships. The America of tomorrow can no longer rely solely on mass production. Quantity without quality could be catastrophic.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 19 (legislative day of Saturday, July 1), 1950

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, now that a war is upon us and we all must realize what construction of the St. Lawrence seaway could mean to us in terms of national security, there is a renewed and vital interest in the development of this greatest of our natural resources.

The June 3 issue of the Dakota Farmer contains an excellent article on this subject by Senator MILTON YOUNG, of North Dakota, and I ask to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

(By Senator MILTON R. YOUNG)

On the map, the St. Lawrence is a far-away river—1,000 miles east from the Dakota prairies. And its water flows into the Atlantic, still another 1,000 miles farther east.

Yet the St. Lawrence River is truly the lifeline of the land-locked midcontinent of Canada and the United States. It is a neighborly river, which stands ready to bring a richer and safer life to the people of the United States and Canada. The farmers of the West, in particular, can look to the St. Lawrence for real help, with the increasingly troublesome problem of paying their farming costs, with enough left over for care and comfort of their families.

This would come with full development of the river. Then it would be a great seaway,

linking the broad ocean highways of the Atlantic with the rich agricultural and industrial regions of the Great Lakes. Then it would be a great powerhouse turning out 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours every year in energy for farms and factories of the Northeast. This, in brief, is the St. Lawrence seaway and power plan.

TO REACH LAKE TERMINALS

Today, the seaway itself stands 90-percent complete from Duluth's huge lakeside wheat terminals at the head of Lake Superior, all the way (2,450 miles) to the open sea, except for a stretch of 113 miles from Odgensburg, N. Y., to Montreal, Canada. The work to be done lies mainly within 48 miles along the International Rapids. Here the United States would share with Canada the cost of a dam and 7 miles of ship canal with three locks. New York State would pay the American share of the powerhouses which would convert into electricity 1,100,000 horsepower now going to waste in the rushing waters of the St. Lawrence's world-famed rapids.

Once the seaway is open and turbines are in place, the St. Lawrence would have the capacity to float 75,000,000 tons of cargo in and out of the Great Lakes every year. It would add dollars and cents to the net income of Dakota farmers. The seaway and its power would help corn, wheat, and cattle producers hold the markets they now serve, and reduce their costs of farming and farm living. Increased farm income is badly needed now to ease a farm-price squeeze of growing intensity. In the past 2 years, the prices which farmers receive have been cut back nearly five times further than the the prices farmers pay. The ever-tightening squeeze, which is continuing without sign of letup, has its roots in stubborn problems of marketing and production.

The long-awaited improvement of the St. Lawrence could bring its helpful contribution to the solution of those problems within the short span of 4 to 6 years. These benefits, however, are going to waste now, just as they have gone to waste ever since the seaway and power plan was first put forward nearly 30 years ago. Prior to the postwar price inflation, these losses were estimated at $1,000 an hour.

This loss could be turned into profit for farmers as well as all the people of the Nation by the immediate approval of the St. Lawrence project. Expected farm benefits from the proposal have won the pledged support of the Farmers' Union, American Farm Bureau Federation, and National Grange (the Nation's big three in farmer organizations), and many farm cooperatives, both large and small. The benefits these groups have seen, include:

GRAIN EXPORTS

Cost of shipping grain to foreign countries would be reduced as much as 10 cents a bushel. This reduction has been figured from engineering plans which would give shipway to ocean carriers drawing 25 feet of water and lifting 10,000 tons. The saving, including an allowance of 1 cent a bushel for ship-canal tolls, which would enable the project to pay its own way, represents the margin under the cost of exporting wheat by water to Buffalo and rail to New York.

Lower transportation costs could bring the St. Lawrence route upwards of 250,000,000 bushels a year in out-bound American grain cargoes—wheat, corn, soybeans, barley, oats, rye, and flaxseed. The prewar shipments moved through convenient export channels which, by their location, served their own production areas and their own export markets. The cities of the Gulf coast and the Pacific Northwest are examples. These, in the main, would continue to be export ports for grain produced in their own regions.

The estimated saving on 250,000,000 bushels could range as high as $26,750,000 a year. The seaway would help answer the Dakota farmer's long search for a larger permanent share of the world's peacetime grain trade, especially in wheat. The Dakotas have produced in recent years an average of 165,000,000 bushels of wheat, and North Dakota is the second greatest wheat-producing State.

CHEAPER FERTILIZERS

The new seaway would cut the cost of bringing fertilizers to the farmers of the Central and Western States. This saving, estimated on shipments of phosphate rock from Florida, would run from $1 to $3 a ton. Similar reductions would apply to transportation of nitrates from Chile and potash from Germany. Lower waterway rates would reduce railroad freight charges as well, so that the net saving in fertilizers needed for efficient low-cost farming would be spread throughout the Corn Belt States.

FARMING AND LIVING COSTS

Additional savings would be possible in cost of importing such commodities as bulk sugar. The same principle likewise would bring down the cost of many imports used in farming. Among them are sisal, which comes from Central America for twine, forest products of many kinds, jute and other fibers for bagging, and the like.

FARM MACHINERY

Unless the St. Lawrence seaway is completed, the iron and steel industry faces the necessity of migrating to the east coast. Here the blast furnaces and rolling mills could count on foreign ores from Labrador, Venezuela, and other countries to take the place of Minnesota's Mesabi deposits, which are now nearing exhaustion. This migration would spell higher prices for farm machinery in the West, where wheat farmers, by using tractors and combines, have virtually completed the mechanization of their farms. Still higher farm machinery prices, based on an estimated increase of $4 a ton in steel produced for east-coast plants, would add substantially to production costs.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The seaway and power project would strengthen the Nation for defense. The protected St. Lawrence route would shorten by 1,000 miles the distance over which American transports and supply ships would have to travel in peril of submarine warfare on their way to Europe. The Great Lakes, in combination with the iron and steel mills now located there, would give the Nation a haven for shipbuilding near the industry's source of supplies. The new waterway would relieve car shortages and other transportation difficulties, which hampered the Nation's railroads in both World Wars. Additional hydroelectric power in the East would likewise reduce the need for extra labor and equipment to mine coal and haul it to steam power plants to generate electricity for the greater needs of wartime. These are some of the concrete benefits which the St. Lawrence project would bring to a nation at war, and they would count for just as much on a Dakota farm—also producing for war—as on a battlefront itself.

Resolution of Roy L. Lewis, Jr., Post, No. 5570, VFW, Decatur, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the great majority of the people of the United States are good, solid, patriotic citizens. They pay their taxes. They support the Government. They believe in liberty and freedom, and they fight the wars to defeat those who would destroy liberty and freedom.

Communism is the greatest threat to liberty and freedom in the world today. The fight against communism is costing the American taxpayers many times more than any other one item in our budget today. The war against communism now going on in Korea is spilling American blood, taking American lives, and maiming and wounding American soldiers.

We can no longer trifle with communism in our Government, and we can no longer be indifferent to Communists and their sympathizers in this country.

The American people have endured from those sources about all they intend to endure. The time is here to take firm and forceful action.

Legislation is now pending to control these avowed enemies of our Government, our free institutions, and our people. This pending legislation should be promptly enacted into law, and I urge that immediate steps be taken to enact such legislation, and to enforce it.

The people of America are demanding that communism be curbed in this country, and that Communists and Communist sympathizers be cleaned out of our Government. I am in complete accord with these sentiments, and urge that legislative action to this end be promptly taken.

The Roy L. Lewis, Jr., Post, No. 5570, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Decatur, Ga., at its regular meeting on July 11, 1950, unanimously adopted a resolution dealing with this subject. Mr. James P. Drew, commander, and Mr. Gilbert E. Sells, adjutant, of that post have forwarded to me a copy of the resolution. I insert this resolution herewith as a part of my remarks:

The members of Roy L. Lewis, Jr. Post, No. 5570, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Decatur, Ga., at a regular meeting on July 11, 1950, unanimously approved the following resolution:

Whereas for the past 3 years and 6 months, since the cessation of hostilities of World War II, we believe the State Department foreign policies have been vague and indefinite; and

Whereas since the outbreak of Communist aggression in South Korea, and the firm stand taken by the United States, we feel that the policy of the State Department is now becoming firm and clear; and

Whereas we stand collectively behind this line of action taken by our Government; and

Whereas we believe the time has come when we should quit appeasing Communists; and

Whereas we believe we should, once and for all, show Russia and the rest of the world that if we cannot have peace we will fight to the death; and

Whereas since we are fighting Communists we believe they become our enemies, and all Communists residing in our country therefore become our enemies, and a menace to the internal security of our Nation; and

Whereas we believe that time has now become the essence of freedom, and immediate action is imperative: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the desire of this body that the United States use every available method of warfare known to it, including the atomic bomb if necessary, to bring

about the immediate cessation of hostilities in Korea; and that all Communists in the Continental United States and its possessions be treated as enemies and, to help insure the security of our Government, be imprisoned; and should there be any Communists in the State Department, or in any other department or agency of the Government, they be the first to be dealt with accordingly; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the following: Hon. Walter F. George, Senator, State of Georgia; Hon. Richard B. Russell, Senator, State of Georgia; Hon. James C. Davis, Congressman, Fifth District, State of Georgia; Hon. Carl Vinson, chairman House Armed Services Committee; Gen. Omar Bradley, chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; Clyde A. Lewis, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; Emmett R. Culbreth, commander, Department of Georgia VFW, Bainbridge, Ga.; M. D. Kallfelz, commander, Fifth District Department of Georgia VFW, Atlanta, Ga., with the request that they exert their utmost efforts to secure immediate action pursuant to this resolution.

JAMES P. DREW,
Commander.

Attest:

GILBERT E. SELLS,
Adjutant.

Foreign Fishing Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution adopted unanimously by the Atlantic Fishermen's Union, Boston, Mass.:

Whereas by Forty-sixth United States Code 251, "Vessels of 20 tons and upward, enrolled in the pursuance of sections 251–255, 258, 259, 262–280, 293, 306–316, 318, 321–330, and 333–335 of this title, and having a license in force, and vessels of less than 20 tons, which although not enrolled, have a license in force, as required by such sections, and no others, shall be deemed vessels of the United States entitled to the privileges of vessels employed in the coasting trade or fisheries" (R. S. No. 4311); and

Whereas further by section 4.96, Customs Regulations of 1943: "(a) No vessel employed in fishing, except vessels of the United States and vessels of less than 5 net tons owned in the United States, shall come into a port of the United States, except in distress or to secure supplies, equipment or repairs"; and

Whereas for more than 30 years foreign nations have sought to procure for their fishing vessels the right to enter into the United States ports in order to directly land their catches caught by and in their fishing vessels; and

Whereas the Treasury Department, through the Bureau of Customs, ruled that a foreign fishing vessel carrying its catch from the fishing banks may, en route, stop at a foreign port, there change its papers to a cargo freighter, and may then proceed, so conveniently documented, to the United States as a freighter rather than as a fishing vessel and thereby enter and land its catch in the United States ports; and

Whereas this apparatus of subway continuous voyage is a patent subterfuge to circumvent the purpose and intent of the aforementioned American laws and to dilute the national concern for the American fishery as now defined in the Federal Statutes; and

Whereas such ruling if permitted to become effective will bring about direct transplanting of primary foreign production into the United States and the installation in the United States of the low standards of living prevailing in such foreign countries; and

Whereas present importations of foreign produced frozen fish will, at the present rate of going this year, approximate 60,000,000 pounds or an increase of approximately 700 percent over the volume imported in 1939, and all this in the ordinary course of trade; and

Whereas if the ruling of the Treasury Department shall become operative, countries whose vessels operate off our shores but which now do not even export frozen or processed fish into the United States will thereby additionally join with those which do export to the United States; and

Whereas such landings into the United States by these foreign fishing vessels without first returning to their own countries will glut the American fishing ports to the detriment and sure destruction of the American fishing industry and the livelihoods of thousands of American working men and women: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be requested—

(1) To call upon the State Department and the Treasury Department to (a) Rescind the afore-mentioned ruling; and (b) amend the customs regulations so as to conform with the real purpose of our laws to protect the American fishery; and

(2) To enact legislation to prohibit landings in American ports by foreign fishing vessels of catches caught by foreign fishing vessels or brought in by foreign mother ships.

ATLANTIC FISHERMEN'S UNION,
By PATRICK MCHUGH,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Guest Column by Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following guest column which the Honorable James A. Farley wrote for Victor Riesel and which appeared in the Los Angeles Daily News of Thursday, July 6:

VICTOR RIESEL

(NOTE.—Victor Riesel is now in Europe on vacation. During his absence, we shall publish guest columns written especially at Riesel's request by men with international reputations. The list includes outstanding names of both labor and capital, many of whom are famous aside from their labor activities.)

(By James A. Farley)

When Mr. Riesel asked me to be his guest columnist I felt that this would be a good opportunity to discuss the relationship between labor and political parties.

Since labor unions became an effective force in our economy it has been suggested by some that labor might conceivably form a political party of its own, with the avowed objective of presenting its aims through the medium of a platform sponsored by an independent labor party.

I want to say at the very outset that I am definitely opposed to such an idea because I am a firm believer in the two-party system.

Labor has sufficient leeway, within the scope of this system, to protect and further its interests. There would always be the temptation to hew too closely to the labor line. A political party loses its effectiveness when it lacks a universal viewpoint. Whether it be the Democratic party or the Republican party, the interests of all the people must be considered in framing a philosophy or platform when an appeal is made to the voters.

Let there be no misunderstanding of my attitude toward labor. I believe that in the rapid and evolutionary changes in our country labor has borne its share of the burden and has demonstrated its usefulness in our economic life.

Labor stands for the dignity of the individual.

I believe that in most instances its leaders have fought against the infiltration of its ranks by those who sought to introduce foreign and un-American ideologies among American workers.

I have always been able to maintain fine personal relationships with many labor leaders in the Nation whom I have met. I have always endeavored to be frank and when I could not see eye to eye with them I would say so quite frankly. I have never deceived them and they know exactly where I stand.

It is my sincere belief that labor most certainly belongs in the Democratic party.

It may be argued that this statement is rooted in partisanship. I certainly will not deny that my association with the Democratic party has conditioned my thinking down through the years, but I have nothing to regret about either my thoughts or deeds. But I should like to point out to those who are doubtful about labor's place in the political arena that the Democratic party has traditionally been the party that has fought for both the workers and the underprivileged since its very inception.

The record is quite clear. In the State of New York, and here I am close to home, labor became the object of serious consideration in the Smith administration and it has made tremendous gains through three Democratic administrations, beginning with that of the late Governor Smith.

Most of us remember how Al Smith initiated and carried through legislation to improve the lot of the worker and the underprivileged. He had come up the hard way, he understood the needs of the worker, and he pursued a policy not of paternalism but of practical cooperation. Al Smith was an apostle of good government, and his successors, Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt and Gov. Herbert H. Lehman, followed in his footsteps closely and zealously.

Let us consider labor's progress from a national standpoint. A Democratic president, Franklin D. Roosevelt, gave to labor, through various forms of legislation, the greatest impetus that it has received in the history of the whole labor movement in this country.

I remember the first years of the Roosevelt administration for I was part of it; I had some share in developing favorable sentiment, not only among the public generally but among those in the Halls of Congress, for the worker. It was not an easy task, for there were many with unfair prejudices and attitudes who would not yield to the aims of the Democratic Party with respect to labor as stated in our platform.

These prejudices and unfair attitudes had to be broken down, and this was accomplished not in a spirit of dominance and aggression but by compromise.

As Al Smith pointed out in one of his great speeches, compromise is the basis of all human relationships in a democratic form of society. The leaders of the Democratic

Party in the years gone by have never failed to approach the subject of labor legislation in a spirit of compromise.

The leaders of the Democratic Party know it is fatuous to take a position and hold to it unyieldingly without giving ear to the views of those who do not agree.

Both labor and industry would do well to remember the wisdom of Al Smith who saw that where two human beings or factions held varying viewpoints the solution of the dilemma lay through the road of compromise.

Labor has been stubborn on occasion and the same has been true of management. Some dishonest labor leaders plied their nefarious practices for a time, but when they were discovered they were ousted.

It is dead wrong to condemn the whole labor movement because of the evil machinations of a few leaders.

When strikes occur neither labor nor management gains. All of us are the losers. Some short-sighted labor leaders have done harm to the cause of the worker, but I think none will deny that both the majority of leaders and those in the field of management are doing their utmost to adjust their differences.

"Mine Eyes Have Seen"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker—

Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord;
He is trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored;
He hath loosed the fateful lightning of His terrible swift sword;
His truth is marching on.

At this moment God is trampling out the vintage where bitter grapes of wrath are stored—for our folly.

President Truman told Congress today that he needs $10,000,000,000—plus partial war controls—to carry on what, on June 25, he called "police action" in Korea. Congress voted, 359 to 1, to give him the military-aid funds.

This is only the beginning of cruel realities facing the American people.

For the third time in about a single generation the doctors must operate. Dare we permit the same doctors to experiment again? Dare we trust the fate of our country to them?

Look at China: The masters of the U. S. S. R. have 6,000,000 Chinese conscripts in their International Communist Army, and 10,000,000 conscript laborers to build military installations and supply the fighting forces.

This is not something new and hard to understand.

It is the return to human slavery.

We have talked of slave labor in Russian camps, but there is a distant sound to it. Well, it is not far off.

Unoffending villagers are ordered at the point of a gun to slavery; they work for tyrants who drive them to exhaustion, then let them starve to death, because there is never enough food for all the people under a Communist regime.

Did our agents, the American State Department, help China into slavery? So long as we condone their policies, permit them to remain in office, we are morally responsible. As the Germans said of the concentration centers, we can argue we did not know what was going on. But freemen are charged with learning the facts about what is done in their name and with their financial help.

The free Chinese on Formosa are ready to fight slavery. It is their fathers and brothers whom the Communist storm troopers seize when they enter a town to pick young men for the army, the women for slave labor, or worse, and the old men and women for the firing squad. Chiang Kai-shek has offered 35,000 seasoned Chinese troops, ready to battle by the side of our men in Korea. But the State Department says "No." So our men fight alone.

Free China has a million guerrilla fighters on the continent of Asia sabotaging the Communist effort to move soldiers, equipment, and food toward Korean front lines. Chiang wants those doughty patriots to attack flanks of that communistic army, so far extended. But the State Department says "No."

Our diplomats have told Chiang, head of a sovereign state, that he may not send his own troops to his own country. This is the same Chiang who held 2,000,000 Japanese soldiers at bay when we desperately needed time to clean up the Japanese on the islands of the Pacific.

The State Department employees are still telling Chiang that he must take Communists into his government. Our State Department informs the free Chinese they are not good enough to fight with us.

Everyone knows the danger of a white man's army fighting alone in Asia. Think of the immense value from the standpoint of propaganda of having the Chinese battling side by side with us.

For whom are these State Department appeasers working?

Certainly not for America.

Why Our People Do Not Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, ever since I introduced House Resolution 641, there has been an enormous public response. This interest shows the seriousness with which public-spirited men and women take the solution to this question. Our very faith in the democracy which we are seeking to implant throughout the world at such a cost of blood and treasure is at stake. It is the highest patriotic duty to join with other Americans today in deciding our policies and assuming the responsibility for them by voting in every election. There is appended hereto a splendid letter which I have received from the publisher of the Tulsa World and Tribune of Tulsa, Okla., on this subject:

THE TULSA WORLD—THE TULSA TRIBUNE,
Tulsa, Okla., July 5, 1950.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Your appeal to the 48 Governors appeared in a news story in our newspaper this morning and interested me very much.

For many years I have been thinking that we as Americans are skating dangerously close to the brink and if the condition continues it is highly probable that one day we will lose our form of government of which we all are so justly proud.

It has been my observation that instead of this condition improving, it is gradually getting worse. Something must be done very soon to correct it.

Your thinking on the matter is entirely right and I heartily endorse it. My thoughts as to the matter of correcting this vicious evil are a little more extreme than yours, and probably would meet with much opposition among professional politicians.

It is my belief that we must sooner or later place a law on our law books making it compulsory for every qualified American voter to cast his ballot in every election.

I realize that it is not in tune with true Americanism to think of compulsion, but it is far more important that we maintain our free democracy, than it is to sacrifice a small part of our freedom under a compulsory act, that would insure us all, that when our officials are finally selected, it would represent the will of the majority of our fellow Americans.

I have discussed this plan with many of our influential citizens, both Democrats and Republicans, and in no case has there been any opposition, on the contrary everyone believes that it is the only way to solve our problem of living under a government of minority, which is absolutely contrary to what our founding fathers intended that it should be.

In my opinion it is far more important to every American that we insure the safety of our form of government of the majority, than it is to insure the collection of money for our Treasury.

We are now living under a compulsory law to collect income taxes. I agree that it is good law, because without the penalty, it is certain that we would have a hard time collecting the money to operate our Government. But it is my contention that the compulsory voting law is far more important, and that a law of this kind would insure our form of government for all time.

It has been proven over the past 25 years that education and reward will not get the job done. The qualified American voters are staying away from the polls in increasing numbers, and if it continues on this course, I fear what is to happen.

The American people are now operating effectively in the matter of income taxes, because of the threat of penalty; I am certain, they would operate just as effectively under the threat of penalty in the matter of casting their vote in every election. It is also my belief that this law could be just as efficiently enforced as the income-tax law, without a great deal of difficulty.

Of course, I could go on and on regarding this subject; I am only a small voice living out here in the State of Oklahoma, and I realize that what I might say would not even resemble a whisper.

I am sincerely excited about this matter and anxious to see something done before it is too late. I hope that some day a voice much stronger than mine will catch fire with this idea and lay it before the American people, who are sure to realize and appreciate that it will mean the continuance of our democratic form of government.

The majority of Americans are fair and honest. If they could awake the morning after each election, and know definitely that the officials chosen to govern us were tho

selection of the majority of their fellow Americans, we could all then join the team selected and help make our country even greater than the dreams of the most optimistic.

You are very kind to wade through this, but it is my fervent hope that some day soon we can get back to a majority rule government, instead of the minority rule, under which we are now operating, and one that fails to get the cooperation and sympathy of all our people.

Sincerely yours,

CARL P. FLYNN.

The American People Must Stand Steady and Swallow Hard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting editorial from the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., Monday, July 17, 1950:

HISTORY REPEATING ITSELF?

On occasions in the past this column has referred to the parallel between the history of the rise of the Roman Empire and the rise of this Nation to its present position of greatness.

We sincerely hope that history is not going to repeat itself and if we look we may be able to learn.

Rome fell because its people became too soft. They became followers of the circuses, while being given bread by their rulers.

They loved the life of ease that their conquests and their sweat and their blood and tears had given them. They were content to rest upon their laurels.

They preferred a life of ease and luxury and softness, while all around them the rest of the world was literally an armed camp. They preferred this soft life to serving in their own legions. They hired aliens and paid soldiers to fight for them. Then up rose an enemy that swept them off their feet because they are unprepared, too soft, and ignored the warlike attitude of potential enemies.

Are we in the same position?

Have we been lulled into a false sense of security by our leaders?

Have we, as a people, been content to scrap our Armed Forces while other, aggressor, nations have been building their war might?

Haven't we just passed a law permitting 2,000 aliens to serve in our Armed Forces, rather than keep our own young men trained and ready?

Haven't we declined to adopt compulsory military training while others, all over the world, have been giving their youth the advantage of this same training?

Haven't we scrapped our Navy, much of our Air Force, and considerable portions of our Army, while others have been increasing their armed might?

Frankly, it's later than we think, and unless the American people, the fathers and the mothers, chiefly, see the light, and vote to permit preparedness, we too may well go the way of the Romans, down into oblivion, all because we were too soft, too content with easy living, too complacent, and lacked the drive and the fight that was ours when we were forcing our way upward for recognition as one of the greatest nations of the world.

Mr. Goss Discusses Agricultural Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on July 13, 1950, at the Institute of Public Affairs conducted by the University of Virginia, Secretary of Agriculture Brannan and Albert Goss, master of the National Grange, were invited to discuss United States agricultural policy. Secretary Brannan's statement consisted of the same old arguments with which we all are too familiar. Mr. Goss' statement is a refreshing analysis of the problem that I believe merits the study and consideration of all of us.

UNITED STATES AGRICULTURAL POLICY

1. The subject assigned for discussion is United States Agricultural Policy. The well-being of agriculture demands an adequate transportation system at reasonable rates; a dependable source of farm supplies, including fertilizer and equipment, at fair prices; a dependable system of credit fitted to the borrower's needs and capacity to pay; good schools, including an effective system of research and extension; a sound soil-conservation program; adequate public-utility services at reasonable costs, such as electric power and telephone service; dependable medical service; an equitable system of taxation; and other items far too numerous and complex for discussion tonight. In addition to this, we must recognize that the problems of the subsistence farmer are very different from those of the commercial farmer and must have altogether different treatment, so one might be at a loss to know where to begin were it not for the fact that the panel discussion of tomorrow morning starts right in with the Brannan plan. With this lead, we will confine our discussion to one phase of this complex agricultural problem—that dealing with farm income and commodity prices. It should be our agricultural policy to maintain a price level consistent with the contribution which farmers make to our national welfare. The question is, How is this to be done?

2. Let me make it clear at the outset that we think there has been too much talk of the Brannan plan or an anti-Brannan plan. Too many people have been taking sides as if there were no other issue—as if there were no better way. We do not approve of some the features of the present program and we do not approve of some features of the Brannan plan; neither will meet our needs. We prefer to be constructive and we have, therefore, developed a positive program designed to do the job in a practical way. We prefer to devote our energies to working for a practical, positive program rather than to criticizing or condemning somebody else's plan.

3. In working on problems of this kind, we constantly keep in mind the principles of the three Grange guideposts:

(1) All prosperity springs from the production of wealth.

(2) The compensation of each should be based on what he contributes to the general welfare.

(3) The prime purpose of government is to protect its citizens from aggression both physical and economic.

4. We measure every proposal by these three rules to see if it rings true. They help us to establish clear-cut goals.

5. Basically, we believe in an economy of abundance. In saying this we do not refer to an abundance of food alone. We also mean an abundance of labor and an abundance of industrial products. Prosperity for all will reach its maximum by exchanging abundance for abundance. He who would advance his own interest by trying to exchange restricted production for abundance does violence to the national welfare and limits the opportunity for all. Production must be intelligently guided to provide for maximum exchange opportunities.

6. Within this economy of abundance, the goal we seek is a farm commodity price structure which will yield farmers an income consistent with their contribution to the national welfare. We want every farmer free to develop his own talents in his own way, to use his land resources to the best advantage, and to make for himself the kind of livelihood his energies and capacity will provide, so long as he does not interfere with others. As far as practicable we want him free from dependence on Government aid and free from Government controls. It is this kind of free economy that has made America what it is, and we do not want to trade it for more Government and more controls.

7. This desire for a free self-supporting agriculture is not based on sentiment, but rather upon substantial reasons. Government controls and Government aid cost money which must be paid in taxes. Most of our taxes are passed on to the consumers in the form of higher prices of things we buy. Most taxes are compounded and pyramided between the time they are paid and the time they show up in the consumers cost of living, and we believe it provable that for every dollar collected in Federal taxes, partically another dollar, and possibly more than a dollar is added to consumer prices, thereby cutting down the purchasing power and curtailing our markets for farm products and manufactured goods. We cannot extend benefits through Government aid or subsidies with one hand without taking away practically an equal amount with the other in the form of increased living costs, and unfortunately these increased costs hit hardest the people in the middle- and low-income brackets whose purchasing power we need most to protect.

8. Thus we recognize that the farm problem is but part of a great national economic problem which agriculture cannot solve alone. We must approach it as part of a national problem and our farm policy must be part of a national policy all designed to foster full production, full employment, and exchange upon a fair and equitable basis.

9. This is a long introduction to a farm-policy discussion, but we must recognize some basic factors before seeking the answer. We lay down as our ultimate goal therefore a national economy built upon the enterprise of the individual, with the Government sitting in only to the extent necessary to assure fair play for all. That is a fundamental which we should constantly keep in mind.

10. If there is anything we should have learned during the past 30 years' struggle with the farm problem, it is that there are no pink pills to cure all our ills. We vainly sought a panacea too long. There are almost as many problems as there are commodities. The measure which might meet the needs of cotton may be of no value to hogs, and a remedy for the hog problem probably

wouldn't work at all on potatoes. Furthermore, something which would meet the problems of the flax grower this year might prove utterly inadequate next year. A wide range of measures is needed to meet so complex a situation and such a constantly changing problem.

11. If we are to have a wide range of measures, it follows that someone must have authority to exercise discretion in using the measure best adapted to meet each problem as it arises. We propose that this discretion be exercised by the Secretary of Agriculture subject to the advice, and in some cases the direction, of a bipartisan Federal Farm Commission. We have proposed a unique method of selecting the Commission by the President with the advice of interested producer, processor, and distributor groups in the field, and with the advice of a special joint committee representing the Agricultural Committees of Senate and House, but we will not burden you with the details. We believe the proposed method would give us the most broadly representative Commission free from political influence.

12. This Commission would have two major responsibilities; first, to advise with the Secretary on measures to be employed in any action program, and, second, to assist in making our private and cooperative marketing systems more effective. We will discuss the second responsibility first.

13. The Commission would be required to maintain a running inventory of available supplies of farm products and the prospective demand, and should have access to all Government agencies in the maintenance of this up-to-date supply-and-demand picture. The Commission would have power to establish advisory boards of producers, processors, and distributors who would be convened periodically, or as occasion warranted, to consider the production, processing, and marketing problems as they arose. We believe that a large part of our problems could be eliminated right there, especially in the field of fruits and vegetables.

14. For example, last January the cranberry interests were faced with the possibility of the largest carryover of cranberries in their history. At the end of the holiday season there was every prospect of having to send more than 30,000 barrels of cranberries to the freezers. We do not know what the other farm organizations did, but we took the matter up with 29 of the largest distributing groups in the Nation and urged them to put on special drives to sell cranberries. Within 60 days this carryover had been reduced to less than a thousand barrels. Many similar instances could be cited. The proposal has been highly commended by the heads of independent grocers and chain stores alike as being the most practical plan of meeting the surplus problem in perishables, and applicable to all food products, either fresh or processed. Obviously special drives cannot be instituted on every commodity and there must be some determination as to what commodities should be pushed and what commodities should be spared. A determination of this can best be reached with the full knowledge of the facts by the producers, processors, and distributors engaged in the production, processing, and marketing of the products. It is just plain common sense but it has not received too much attention probably because it is neither spectacular nor does it call upon the Government for a lot of money. We would name this as the first point in a farm program. In this connection the Commission could aid materially in the pushing of health-fortifying foods such as milk, butter, meat, eggs, and similar products. It is altogether possible that a sound educational program carried on in this field would soon eliminate most of the surplus of grain and pasture.

15. Before discussing any further steps in a farm program we should recognize that we must have a yardstick for determining what are fair and equitable price levels. We believe it is possible to develop a sound parity formula which will currently indicate what a fair and equitable price level should be. The original parity formula adopted in the thirties got badly out of kilter. The modernized formula in the Anderson bill is a very great improvement. We do not consider it perfect and have developed a formula which we believe could be kept currently accurate and be more sound, but we believe the formula referred to will serve very well and provide approximately the right answers for some time to come. It would probably be best to operate under this formula for the time being, until other more badly needed reforms can be accomplished. One section in the Anderson bill provides for the use of either the old formula or the new formula whichever would indicate the higher price. We consider this provision indefensible, and believe the new formula should be used in all cases.

16. As the second step in the Grange program, we advocate expanding the Marketing Agreements Act making it applicable to any commodity which might be in a position to use it.

17. Third in our program would be the development of a sound two-price or multiple-price system, or possibly systems, because it is likely that different measures may be necessary to meet the problems of different commodities. The principle is the same as under the Marketing Agreements Act. Under such a system a fair and equitable price is maintained for the major portion of any commodity, diverting any surplus to secondary uses. As an illustration, let us take the much discussed and cussed item of potatoes. Assume that we are able to determine a fair and equitable price for potatoes. If the whole crop would not move at this price, the surplus should be diverted to secondary uses such as making starch or alcohol. Potatoes diverted to starch or alcohol would not yield as high a return as potatoes sold for food purposes, and the loss should be distributed among all the producers of potatoes on a ratable basis. If this loss were heavy it would serve to discourage production for the next year.

18. Note that these first three steps of the Grange program would not cost the Government a nickel except for the nominal expense of administration.

19. The key to the National Grange program is that these various steps of handling commodities would be set up in a very definite order of preference, and the Secretary and the Commission would be charged with following a definite order or priority in applying them. Any recommendations for action made by the Commission to the Secretary would also be submitted to the Joint Congressional Committee on Agriculture so that this committee could keep in constant touch with the operations of the program and any needs which might develop thereunder.

20. Proceeding in the order of preference, the fourth step would require some Government assistance. This step would consist of price supports. In the order of preference flexible supports would be preferred to fixed supports.

21. Again referring to potatoes, the tremendous expenditures of the last 2 years have been due to the price supports at 90 percent of parity. The parity price suddenly became a highly profitable figure due first to the discovery of DDT for insect control, and second to the availability of fertilizer which enabled growers to increase their yields tremendously. When the support price became highly profitable as compared to other commodities, naturally many people produced all the potatoes they could. The support price was too high. If it is true that it was too high, the correct remedy would be to lower the support price, and the volume of surplus would be a sound indicator of the amount by which the support price should be lowered. That is known as the flexible support.

22. On the other hand, in the case of such commodities as cotton and wheat, of which we normally produce and export large quantities, the surplus measure would not be a sound indicator of the basis of support. Even assuming that we take normal export figures into consideration, we must recognize that in these days of governmental operations, foreign governments could easily manipulate the timing and flow of these crops so as to make any established rules difficult to operate. In such case fixed supports may be necessary.

23. In the case of all supports we do not believe it is possible to write into law definite percentages. The type of support which would fit wheat might not work at all in tobacco, and the type which would work in tobacco might prove utterly inadequate in the case of pork products. It will be necessary to permit a wide range of discretion to the Secretary subject to the approval of the Commission, such discretion to be exercised to obtain certain specific production goals.

24. This brings us to step 5—controls. If fixed supports are used instead of flexible supports, it will be necessary to have controls either of the acreage or the marketing of the crops. Marketing controls are preferred to acreage controls although they may be exercised jointly. Marketing controls are positive, while acreage controls are subject to all kinds of abuses, such as planting the most fertile acres and the use of unusual quantities of fertilizer.

25. Sixth in the order of preference, to be used only in the case of emergencies, are production payments or subsidies. We feel they are ordinarily unsound, for reasons stated earlier, but we can conceive of emergencies where it might be necessary to use them to prevent injustice and yet assure adequate production for the Nation's need. We would not rule them out but would put them at the bottom of the priority list.

26. There is another authority we would give to the Commission, which is somewhat difficult to locate definitely in the order of preference because the desirability of its use would vary under different conditions. War demand called for plowing out of approximately 30,000,000 acres of pasture land or unused land for the production of field crops. Much of this acreage will have to go back into pasture, but who can say which acres they should be? The Commission would be in the best position to determine where the biggest problem of surplus existed and what relief might be obtained, through a sound program of land diversion from crop to pasture. In many instances this might be more expensive than the farmer could himself afford to meet. In all instances the development of good pasture would be in the interest of the national welfare in prevention of erosion and storing fertility which would be quickly available for field crop production in the event of any emergency. We would recommend that, within certain limitations, the Commission be authorized to enter into contract with farmers for developing and maintaining pasture, either in the form of a contract or a lease, the terms of which would provide for offsetting any payment to the farmer by payment from the farmer for benefits derived from the pasture. Under the present program we have paid enormous sums for taking land out of production on a wide scale. It is thought that

this could be done on a sounder basis by a practical determination of what land could best be diverted, accompanied by a definite pasture program, and probably accomplish better results at a very great saving of costs. The development of a broader pasture program in connection with stepping up livestock farming has very great possibilities.

27. Summing up, the Grange believes in an agricultural economy of plenty, brought about by a very definite well-coordinated program developed through a Commission working with producers, processors, and distributors. We believe this program should be self-supporting as far as practicable and should be subject to a minimum of Government control. We believe that more Government aid and Government controls than are ultimately desirable may be necessary in getting agriculture adjusted from a wartime production basis in which it now finds itself to a peacetime agricultural economy, and that such aids should be granted, but that every step taken should be directed toward a self-supporting agriculture with a minimum of controls. We are opposed to injecting as a major feature of any farm program measures calling for more governmental controls and more governmental expenditures. We believe that with the proper administrative set-up, farmers can adjust their agriculture to the Nation's needs in a manner which will bring the best results to producers and consumers alike. We believe that such a program will fit in best with the full production economy necessary to maintain prosperity in America.

Westchester County, N. Y., Answers the Communist Military Road at Peekskill—Our Grand Jury System Is an Invisible Wall Against Invasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I must pay tribute to the law-abiding spirit of our local communities, and their Anglo-Saxon institutions. The local police, the local grand jury, and the local jury trial are strong walls which will protect our people even against military insurrection by the Communists.

The Westchester County, N. Y., grand jury, investigating the disturbances at the Robeson concert in Peekskill, has made its findings and report. It has announced officially that the concert was a military mobilization on American soil.

These strong-arm forces, whose militant strength was revealed in the security guard at Cortlandt, must be recognized—

The grand jury said—

for what they are—the shock troops of a revolutionary force which is controlled by a foreign power, and committed to methods and ultimate ends incompatible with our constitutional system.

This report is a complete vindication of the communities of Peekskill and Cortlandt. The grand jury found no evidence of rioting by the people of the area. There was no anti-Negro or anti-Semitic disturbance. Police arrangements were excellent. All the conspiratorial organization, the racism, and incitement to violence were on the Communist side, not on ours. The grand jury also denounced the supposedly objective report issued by the American Civil Liberties Union, which repeated the Communist charges against our people, as "so far from the truth as to be scandalous."

LOCAL PROBLEM IS NATION-WIDE

The work of this grand jury deserves to be known in every community in the United States. As the jurors said, they were dealing with a local issue, but it is a local issue any community in the Nation may face at any time. They need to know the danger.

The report is a model of what a free community can do, within our inherited pattern of local self-government, to protect itself against attempts by a foreign government to destroy our liberties. The people of Westchester, and indeed of the United States, can be proud of the work of the jurors, of Supreme Court Justice James W. Bailey, of District Attorney George Fannelli, and of the counsel and investigators who helped in the preparation of this historic report.

SMEARING AN AMERICAN COMMUNITY

Last fall, when I returned to Washington after a short recess in the House, I was astonished to hear Members of Congress, on the floor and in the press, refer to anti-Semitic and anti-Negro riots, which they said had taken place in my district. Congressman VITO MARCANTONIO insisted that the disturbance had been an organized one, with the aid and connivance of county officials, and that our police had refused to provide protection. Congressman JACOB K. JAVITS, also of New York City, put it more smoothly. He said that the "Peekskill riot" involved the constitutional rights of minorities throughout the United States. He demanded that there should be "an overriding power in the Federal Government" that would go beyond considerations of the community or the State. That was obviously a subtle plea for Federal control of our local police, and local law enforcement, one of the pillars of Anglo-Saxon freedom.

Naturally I investigated, but I found that our local people had engaged in no riots. On the contrary, I found that a peaceful American village had been the scene of carefully planned violence. The Communists had recruited their strong-arm squads far from Peekskill, and sent them into our county, on a Sunday afternoon, in military formation, under military orders. What was more alarming, there was almost no protest in the press against this sinister behavior, though the Communists were using every medium to "tell the world" their story—that our neighborhood was a center of racial and religious hate.

The grand jury investigation was started, in fact, partly because of Communist complaints against our law-enforcement officials, rather than because of American protests against armed invasion of a peaceful village.

MILITARY CHARACTER OF THE INVASION

I immediately reported to my district, and put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a statement that we were dealing with a Communist attempt to exercise military and police functions on American soil.

The grand-jury report now puts the military character of the meeting beyond all doubt. It calls the second so-called concert "a full-scale demonstration of the power of the Communists to mobilize their militant forces quickly and in sufficient strength to constitute a potential challenge to the authority of government."

The report goes on:

The testimony before the grand jury shows that more than 2,500 men were assembled * * * as the security guard. They came from Brooklyn, Manhattan, the Bronx, Long Island, from Westchester, and from Communist camps located in other counties. * * * They were stationed, in military formation, shoulder to shoulder, in two huge circles. This force remained in position for 8 to 10 hours.

LONG PREPARATION FOR MILITARY ACTION ON OUR OWN SOIL

The presentment said that this was the first time the Communists "had disclosed their organized and militant forces on so large a scale." As I said earlier, "their squads had been used for many years, in the dark places of our cities, in trade-union warfare and left-wing party fights, but every such battle was training for the time when in daylight they would try to overwhelm the orderly government of a quiet American community."

Ben Gitlow has told us in "I Confess" how the Fur Workers' Union, in a strike in 1926, 24 years ago, organized the strong-arm squads of "fearless and able fighters, who were exemplary in wielding the knife, the blackjack, and other weapons," and again, a "wild and audacious lot who went into action like ferocious wild beasts." Men from this union led the raid on Cortlandt, except that the younger generation had the benefit of training in the United States Army, and works under Communist officers who took an oath of allegiance to our country.

The grand jury rightly says:

The speed and dexterity with which the Communists organized the demonstration of September 4, assembling with only 3 days of preparation in a rural community 40 miles from New York an audience of 15,000 people with a "security guard" of 2,500 men, points to an alert and thoroughly prepared organization.

These two statements together, that the meeting was strictly military, and that the leaders were able to mobilize in 3 days and invade a community 40 miles away, are the warning to other sections of the country that they need to be on guard.

The grand jury says that, although they conducted themselves in a military manner, the Communists did not actually violate the military laws of the State of New York. We cannot, however, take too much comfort from this. The leaders of these goon squads have many of them been trained in Moscow schools for insurrection where the aim is to teach them how to carry on military action without technically violating the law. Witness the carrying of baseball bats

and pop bottles, clearly peaceful implements, except in the hands of goons trained like commandos to use them on police at close quarters, to gash an eye or cut a throat.

This careful technical observance of the law may only mean, as the jurors suggest, that our legislatures ought to find out now whether they have all the legal powers they will need, to block these experts in insurrection.

CLEARING OF OUR VETERANS

Our veterans bore the heaviest brunt of the Communist smear charges. Not only were the veterans' organizations severely criticized, without excuse, but some of the members reported to me that they were in danger of losing their jobs, as a result.

The grand jury says that the veterans behaved with remarkable restraint. The sporadic violence that broke out after the concert did not result from planning or organization by any local individual or groups.

There was no anti-Negro or anti-Semitic violence on the part of the community or the veterans. The parades, the grand jury said explicitly were a protest in orderly fashion against communism and communism alone. The Jewish war veterans took part with the others.

This restraint is the more remarkable because witnesses heard the master of ceremonies at the concert refer to the veterans as "un-American filth."

The grand jury did warn, however, that patriotic and loyal Americans "must be on the alert against being drawn into Communist traps, which may be set for the purpose of inviting violence." Churches, schools, veterans, business groups, and other civic groups should, they said, actively discourage their members from being present when meetings of subversive groups are being held. This deprives the Communists of that which they want most, free advertising.

We know that the smearing of American veterans is standard practice in Communist strategy, as we can see from the many novels in which they depict our soldiers as lacking in every good quality of character, morals, and even intelligence. Veterans are important barriers against the spread of communism. Therefore they have been, and will continue to be, the butt of Communist smear tactics.

The presentment reminds us also that—

It is a part of the Communist strategy to create a distrust of public officials by distortion and magnification of incidents such as these, and also to bring about incidents to harass these officials, and to distract them from their functions of serving the community.

In fact, the police protection was a model of good planning. For this we can thank the local and State police officials and the special instructions of Governor Dewey.

COMMUNISTS THE INCITERS OF HATRED

It was also clearly part of the Communist strategy to foment the racial and religious hatred about which they later were so vocal. Articles in the Daily Worker, meetings, leaflets, and posters in connection with the concert were all designed to plant race hatred, and the expectation of race hatred, in the minds of the poor victims of mob psychology who made up the crowd at the concerts. We are fortunate that most of our citizens refuse to respond to such appeals.

While the grand jury inquiry was going on, the American Civil Liberties Union issued a pamphlet on Violence in Peekskill which purported to be the result of a factual investigation. Apart from the impropriety of issuing such a report while the grand jury was investigating, the American Civil Liberties Union not only set out with a fixed thesis of what happened, but an examination of the report itself indicated that gossip, rumors, and unverified stories of prejudiced persons were accepted as evidence by the association, while competent testimony which did not support their thesis was rejected.

The grand jury could not comment on another feature of the Civil Liberties report. Their pamphlet pictures the village of Peekskill and the surrounding area as a worn-out, decadent community, a middle-class Tobacco Road. The resemblance of this picture to the propaganda picture the Communists so assiduously paint of the South will be clear to anyone familiar with their literature. The Civil Liberties report even said that the inhabitants of the older Westchester communities were people without culture, and the friction came from their jealousy of the higher culture of the new settlers.

To this smear of an entire community, the grand jury gives a final answer. It says dryly:

Inasmuch as the American Civil Liberties Union has considerable influence on a large number of persons, this grand jury feels an obligation to point out the flimsy foundation upon which the report was based. Much of its text and some of its conclusions are so far from the truth as to be scandalous.

Thus we see how the Communists even in military action have their supporting propagandists operating under the guise of protecting civil liberties.

COMMUNIST CELLS IN THE LOCAL COMMUNITY

The grand jury's most important contribution is its description of the root of the trouble, the continuing attempt of the Communists to penetrate into the local communities of our county, and plant their cells there. There are many colonies and camps of summer visitors in the region around Peekskill.

On the surface these would seem to have no different purpose than that of the many hotels and resorts which are found throughout this popular vacation area. * * * These camps however constitute important units in the Communist organization * * * serving as recruiting and indoctrination centers and in some cases as training schools for the Communist Party.

In explicit warning, they say:

The grand jury doubts that the potential risks of having Communist "cells" in Westchester County are fully appreciated by its residents. Community leaders and local organizations should undertake to make certain that ignorance regarding this movement is dispelled.

They add:

The grand jury is convinced that the presence of these Communist groups constitutes a serious potential menance to the community.

I received a great many letters from various parts of the country, after I sent out the first statement on the Communist invasion of Peekskill, asking what was the matter with the local people who did not seem to know what was going on. I answered in each case. I asked them how many individuals who had bought land in their countryside recently were secret agents of the Communist Party, assembling parcels of land for training schools or encampments for party purposes. Of course they did not know. It is a dangerous error to think that communism is centered in a few large cities. Every community is potentially in the same danger that Peekskill was in, of deliberate colonization by Communists in the guise of vacationers or other residents. The Communists will not let their real activities appear above the horizon until they are sure their power is complete. But, it is easier for us to deal with military colonization by a foreign power, before it is full grown, and not after the fire breaks out.

THE LOCAL COMMUNITY DEFENDS ITSELF

Most American towns, like ours, either do not know how busily the Communists are undermining local government, or do not believe it possible they can succeed. But the danger is real. Communists are drilling their military forces in hundreds of local American centers, especially in rural areas. They put their trained agents into our local community organizations, our labor unions and chambers of commerce, women's organizations, churches, schools, even our business concerns and, if they can, on our juries.

Obviously private citizens living quietly in their homes cannot protect themselves as individuals against the sleepless efforts of a conspiratorial army, but they have a protection in our inherited system of local preservation of the peace.

I said in September that the people who planned the concert with Robeson as a front, were planning a Nation-wide series of concerts in every section of the United States. I said they would be carefully spaced so that the reverberations from one would not have died down before the next outbreak began. They were to hold their last and biggest meeting in Washington near October 13. They hoped to so inflame public sentiment that they could stage a riot in the Nation's Capital, as they did in that of Bolivia, when Marshall was holding a peace meeting there. Then they would have made a world-wide propaganda about it.

Let us not forget—this is the way the Communists and Nazis defeated the law-abiding people of Europe. They set out to break the peace on the streets, in meetings, in schools until the people grew weary and trusted none of their officials. Then it was easy, with a few blows, to send the whole Nation crumbling to ruin.

I said in September that—

The failure of the military demonstration and collapse of the whole project is due to the fact that the Communists were not able to carry away their martyred dead.

The fine police work in preparation for the concert kept the sparks from igniting.

That was no simple accident, but the finest fruit of our tradition of local responsibility for maintaining the peace. Our police serves the whole community, not the ruling powers, and enforces law, not the will of officials. Our kind of police works so quietly that we can hardly imagine what it protects us against. Good police work always keep the sparks from igniting, whether they are from the work of individual criminals, or from a secret political conspiracy, directed by a foreign power.

Today we have, in the grand jury report, the second triumph of our institutions of local self-government. The grand jury system, like the local police force, is a link in our great tradition. It goes back to medieval England, and has been the hallmark of free societies for centuries.

The grand jury acts for all the people, not the rulers, in making inquiry as to whether a crime has been committed, and who can justly be charged with it. It is no star-chamber proceeding, where the Government tells the investigators what verdict they are to end up with. No one can be lightly charged with a crime, or forced to defend himself unless a grand jury chosen from the people themselves, not from the ruling power, has made a complete investigation and finds there was a crime and indicates who may properly be accused. On the other hand, no local community is helpless in the face of a criminal uprising. It does not have to rely on vague fears and suspicions. In the grand jury it has an institution whose task it is to investigate, to get clear and precise information on what has happened and who is responsible for any disorder. The guilty can be apprehended and the innocent be freed from fear.

What the Peekskill report means is that our grand jury system has worked as well to investigate the Communist conspiracy as it works to investigate a forgery or the theft of an automobile. Our local American communities are not helpless before Communist penetration, even if every step is planned in Moscow, by specialists in sabotage. So long as they have individual men of intelligence and courage, they can be drawn upon to serve as a citizen grand jury, and make whatever investigations are needed. When they come to conclusions all men of good will can agree. So long as we have local officials like these men concerned with honest observance of the law and the peace, we can meet any assault upon our local communities planned by the men of the Politburo.

Our local communities do not have to turn to Washington for protection. Every American county, town, and city, is protected by an invisible wall, the sum of its orderly processes of justice, built by "unknown generations of dead men."

The walls of our local institutions of justice will protect our local communities as long as the people are alert to man their walls and defend their citadels from attack. We must heed the warning of the Westchester County Grand Jury that the danger comes from a new quarter, in a new guise. But if we alert ourselves to this new kind of danger, we need use only our time-tested methods of law and justice, and we can make this network of tens of thousands of citadels of local freedom into a mesh so strong that no foreign invaders can ever get a foothold within it.

The dictator states have a glamor synthetically produced by cynical experts in the arts of fooling the crowd. Our great free institutions are quiet and simple, but they have a radiance like that of the eternal stars.

The Politician and the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable James A. Farley on the Catholic Hour program of the National Broadcasting Co. on Sunday evening, July 16:

THE POLITICIAN AND THE NATION

With true insight, the founders of the Republic acknowledged the dominion of Almighty God over the affairs of the Nation. On the great seal of the United States they wrote in Latin, "He has favored our undertakings." On the coinage they put in English, "In God we trust." With profound wisdom, Lincoln developed the same basic idea when he said at Gettysburg that this Nation's "new birth of freedom" would be "under God."

The great Civil War President could, and no doubt did, hark back much further for the inspiration of his sage humility. He could have gone back to St. Paul's epistle to the Romans. There you will find political teaching that is part and parcel of the Christian tradition. The epistle to the Romans says: "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers; for there is no power but from God, and those that are, are ordained by God." The apostle is not talking merely of spiritual things, for he says, as part of the same thought: "Princes are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil."

What St. Paul is telling us is that those who hold political offices are, so long as they operate in the lawful scope of their authority, ministers of God in the temporal order, in a manner similar to the clergy who are ministers of God in the spiritual order. God, who created society, wishes it to be kept in smooth running order. And so He confers authority on the public officers so that they can fashion and enforce laws binding the citizens of the state and thus exert a true moral force in order to maintain social and political order.

Lincoln might have gone back even further yet and drawn on those majestic and dramatic words of the Master Himself, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." Caesar and God, state and church, matter and spirit, time and eternity—these are the contrasting principles that dominate the minds and hearts of men. In our Lord's time they were striving against each other for man's allegiance. With a great burst of light He showed us that this should not be so. Caesar's state and God's church are in different orders of things—one political, the other spiritual—one temporal, the other eternal. Christ meant us to know that they should work in harmony, each in its own proper field, for each has rights over man and both have their common origin in God. Man is a citizen and so owes obedience to the government; he is a child of God and so owes obedience to Him.

We Catholics acknowledge that the teaching of our Lord binds us in conscience, strictly and entirely. With more or less success we try to carry that teaching into effect in our daily lives. But whether our success be great or small, we recognize the obligation. We realize when we have fallen short, and we are always trying to do a little better.

So the Catholic view combines two things; a sane and sound judgment of the place assigned to politics in the order of God's creation, and a constant desire to see that politics and politicians perform their proper function in preserving the well-being of state and citizen.

To the Catholic, then, the profession of politics—the seeking and holding of political office—is not only an ancient one but also an honorable one in the strictest and truest sense of the word.

Obviously, a political office is not only a public trust but also, in the ancient Christian and Jewish view, a sacred trust, held in the name of God Himself. How can it be doubted that this is something to be desired, honored, and cherished? There is, believe me, no flippancy in the statement that a political career, pursued for the proper motives, is a true vocation. From my own experience, I can testify that the preparation for a political career deserves as conscientious care and study on the part of the young people as engineering, law, or medicine. Unfortunately, the prevalent attitude has been that politics is unworthy of the attention of a capable mind and a good character. It is not so. Only one who has been close to the scene for a long time can know what a vast amount of public good is being done by able and conscientious public servants who, increasingly in recent years, have devoted themselves to politics out of a sincere desire to contribute their talents to the improvement of public administration. We have not nearly enough of them; we need many more; and if we had them, they would gradually replace that caricature of a public officer, too often found in actual life, who thinks of a public office as a device for private gain. This is an effort in which we Catholics can apply our ethical precepts with telling effect.

In this Nation politics has always, to some degree, meant party politics. Let it be understood that this also is right and proper. The wise regulation of the temporal order of human welfare requires a host of specific measures on subjects as to which there is no certainty about what is better and what is worse. As to these matters there can only be opinions. Whatever differences of opinion may arise in the application of governmental power for the common welfare, it is right and just that there should be contending views as to which is best. Hence, we have political parties, and it is most healthy that they should thrash out their views in public debate against each other.

Always the common welfare is the goal. In a public order under God neither the heads nor the members of the political parties should try to advance merely partisan

or group interest. Self-enrichment is a betrayal of the sacred trust of the public officer in his office and of the political party in its power. It violates sound ethical principles and is an offense against good morals. We must never forget that it is the common good which is commanded by the natural law—that is, by the eternal law of God which we learn by examining human nature with our human reason.

Look at it as you will, from the point of the Creator or of the creature, from reason or from revelation, politics and politicians have a double honor. In the order of temporal society they are the representatives of God in the civil and the political life of men. From that double honor flows a double responsibility. They are responsible to God to keep a just account of their stewardship. They are responsible to man for the wise and temperate exercise of their God-given authority.

Let no one think that these are trifling matters. Let no one think that they are easy matters. Let no one think that they are matters which can be responsibly handled except reverently and prayerfully under God.

The Hobbs Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there is appended an editorial from the Washington Post of July 19 on this bill entitled "Not the American Way." As a lawyer it was impossible for me to support the bill for the very reason given in this editorial. To give the power to incarcerate another person in a camp or prison to one Government official—the Attorney General—without trial and solely at his own discretion is to go back, it seems to me, to the days of the lettres de cachet of the Bourbon kings of France and to the sort of abuses the British, French, and American revolutions were leveled against. Support for certain other phases of the bill and recognition of the need for a bill to deal with the problem cannot condone an action so fundamentally opposed to American ideas and to the foundation of our constitutional Government. In the interests of the people of my district, I felt that a devotion to these ideals was paramount. It was unnecessary to have so drastic a provision in this bill as the one for incarceration without trial. The same result could have been achieved by orderly governmental processes through the courts. It is regrettable that the bill was brought up without a chance for amendment and so that it either had to be voted up or down.

NOT THE AMERICAN WAY

Passage of the Hobbs bill by a vote of 326 to 15 in the House must be regarded as a popular demand for tightening up the law in regard to deportable aliens. Since the bill was debated for only 40 minutes, it is reasonable to suppose that many Members who voted for it were not familiar with its details. They voted affirmatively, we suspect, because they believe that subversive and criminal aliens should not be allowed to roam the country without check or supervision so long as the countries from which they came refuse to take them back again. We sympathize with that point of view while deploring the drastic remedy that the Hobbs bill would apply.

The bill has been substantially improved by amendment. Its most drastic provisions are aimed only at alien criminals and subversives who have been found guilty of violating the law and then ordered deported. Certainly aliens of this type should not be footloose merely because the country from which they came is unwilling to receive them. In some instances subversives from the iron-curtain countries continue to do their nefarious work here because regimes which sent them to the United States refuse to take them back again. This makes a mockery of American law. We should not put ourselves at the mercy of communistic agents in this fashion. But we ought to deal with these people in accord with the pattern of American justice and not merely give the Attorney General power to throw them into concentration camps, which is the Communist method.

The bill would not require imprisonment of the deportable aliens in question. As an alternative, the Attorney General could require them to report regularly to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, to submit to medical and psychiatric examination, to give information under oath as to their habits and activities, and to conform to reasonable regulations to be laid down by the Attorney General, until their deportation could be arranged. Properly administered, this section of the bill would afford a salutary check upon the activities of the undesirables in question. It would enable the Government to keep close watch on what they were doing. Under even the amended bill, however, the Attorney General could step in at any time and order that any alien so controlled and supervised be sent to prison.

It is this provision that is utterly out of keeping with the American concept of due process. We have no doubt that some of the subversive deportable aliens now at large ought to be locked up. But let it be done by bringing proper charges and giving each a fair trial. Proponents of the bill made much of the fact that the individuals concerned have already been tried. But they have also paid the penalty for the offenses for which they have been convicted. What is involved under this bill is a second punishment, without any second trial, merely because deportation cannot be carried out. This is certainly un-American and probably unconstitutional. No such sweeping discretion should be vested in the Attorney General.

Any extensive exercise of this power would result in the establishment of concentration camps. The experience of other countries has proved that, once established, the concentration-camp habit grows. How long would it be before citizens regarded as dangerous to our national security would be thrown into concentration camps without trial? The only safe and reasonable course is to hold fast to the principle of imprisoning people only for crimes for which they have been convicted through our established judicial process. The maintenance of liberty within the country is no less important than defense against enemies without. It is up to the Senate to reshape the Hobbs bill into an effective control system over aliens awaiting deportation without turning over to the Attorney General the power to make the United States a concentration-camp country.

The President's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The President's Message," published in the New York Herald Tribune of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

The President's message on mobilization for victory in Korea and preparedness elsewhere has far greater stature than its economic and military features alone could give it. It stands as an unanswerable indictment against those who planned the unprovoked attack on the Republic of Korea, and it asserts with the sincerity universally credited to Mr. Truman the sole objective of American intervention—"a world where all men may live in peace and freedom with steadily improving living conditions, under governments of their own free choice."

The message to Congress maintained a calm which was fitting in an executive document. In his later talk to the American people the President, while covering much the same ground, used blunter words and rose to moments of real eloquence. The American people have never faced a difficult hour with steadier nerves or higher morale. It was good for them to hear from their President's own lips a candid and complete statement of the situation which confronts them.

Mr. Truman did well to remind the free world that just 1 day before the Communist attack of June 25, the United Nations Commission on Korea had completed a 2-week tour of the military positions of the Republic of Korea south of the thirty-eighth parallel. Those United Nations observers "found no concentration of troops and no preparation to attack." They concluded that "the absence of armor, air support, heavy artillery, and military supplies precluded any offensive action by the forces of the Republic of Korea."

This was the situation when North Korea launched its well-prepared offensive, in contempt of Korean integrity, in defiance of the United Nations and in disdain of American military power in the Far East. That the invader and his mentors have ended by taking on more than they expected, by setting themselves starkly against the cooperating forces of the United Nations and the mobilized strength of the United States, is due to the instantaneous resistance of free peoples mustered under the initiative of the President.

These, then, are the dimensions of the Korean struggle. It is no peninsular campaign. It has no certain time limit. No price can be named for its completion. The first steps to be taken are consequently of vast importance. The President's message on the requirements we must meet is a first installment on the costs of a firmly peaceable world. As a first word on mobilization, it is reassuringly strong.

The President's request of $10,000,000,000 to meet the costs of military expansion and industrial mobilization bespeaks admirably the seriousness with which he views our

danger and his determination to avoid half measures. His demand for a lifting of ceilings on military man power must, of course, be met. His care to point out the indispensability of Congressional approval for the mutual defense assistance program is equally to be approved. Our own resistance to raw aggression will increase in effectiveness as it is fused with that of our many allies in the United Nations. As the aircraft and warships that the United Nations powers have assigned to General MacArthur testify, this is a common campaign.

Yet the superior economic strength, and military potential of the United States, as well as our unique position in Korea, require that we bear the greater burdens. We now have a measure of the initial impact of Korea on the domestic economy. And we have the President's first appraisal of the self-denial and the restrictions on economic freedom involved. It is conservative to say that the President's request for economic powers is certainly not more than the situation demands. It is heartening to say that he has asked for the basic minimum of necessary powers.

The President's economic program includes mandatory authority to allocate and assign priorities for materials essential to the military effort and authority to limit the production of non-essential civilian goods using strategic materials. The program calls for cutbacks by governmental agencies in construction or other programs that would require essential man power facilities, or materials. It provides for stepped-up procurement, and it asserts the need for loans and loan guaranties for producers of military equipment. All of these measures should be approved.

Recognizing the actuality of unjustified price increases and the danger of runaway inflation, the President asks properly for controls over consumer installment credit, for authority to curb speculation on the commodity exchanges and for power to restrain private real estate credit. These are anti-inflation musts. Most important of all, Mr. Truman promises a message calling for increased taxes. Without this, the others could be of little help.

What the President has not asked for may seem reassuring to some; actually it leaves a serious question unanswered. He sees no immediate need for price and wage controls, for rationing, or for a job freeze and manpower controls. We believe he is correct in judging that these measures are not needed now. Yet their possible future necessity should be faced now and planned for now. As Mr. Bernard Baruch has insisted, the onset of total war gives no opportunity for the kind of careful mobilization planning that total war demands. In the firm belief that the surest way to avoid that catastrophe is to be fully and openly prepared for it, we express the hope that Mr. Truman's next message on the state of the economy will outline the stand-by plans he would have Congress enact.

Editorial Comment by the New York Times on the President's Message to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "The Message to Congress" and the other entitled "Mr. Truman to the Country," published in the New York Times of today.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

The purpose behind President Truman's message to Congress yesterday was to present his recommendations for adapting the national defense and the national economy to the new demands, actual and potential, placed upon it by the armed attack in Korea. In addition to reactivating the system of selective service, said the President, the Secretary of Defense has now been authorized to call into Federal service "as many National Guard units and as many units and individuals of the Reserve forces * * * as may be required." Moreover, the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been directed "to keep our military manpower needs under constant study, in order that further increases may be made as required." Mr. Truman recommended to Congress, finally, that since we may find it necessary to exceed the present statutory limits on the size of the Armed Forces, these limits be removed.

The proposed expansion in the Military Establishment is based, said Mr. Truman, not merely on the actual needs of the Korean situation, but also on the possibility that armed aggression may take place in other areas. That possibility must be taken into account in our preparation program, he said, since the attack on Korea makes it plain beyond all doubt that the international Communist movement is prepared to use armed invasion to conquer independent nations.

The increases recommended in the size of the Nation's Armed Forces, and the additional supplies and equipment which will be needed will call for new and large appropriations. These, said the President, will amount roughly to $10,000,000,000, and he will present requests for such appropriations to Congress within the next few days. But this figure does not cover the additional assistance that we shall have to extend to other free nations in the strengthening of our common defenses. As soon as it can be determined what the proportions of this joint effort are to be, the President will call upon Congress to provide the needed funds.

Having defined the Korean situation, in general terms of military expansion and in its dollar costs, Mr. Truman outlined a program for the national economy appropriate to these two magnitudes. The objective of such a program, he declared, must be to see that the military procurement program is carried out "promptly, at a reasonable cost, and without disrupting the efficient functioning of the economy." As he pointed out, the productive capacity of the American economy is enormous, but we are now confronted with a situation in which military and related procurement will need to be expanded more rapidly than total production can be expanded. This means that production must be redirected at certain points if material shortages are not to be created or intensified and if price inflation is to be averted. For achieving this Mr. Truman makes three basic recommendations. These are (1) such legislation as is necessary to assure prompt and adequate supplies for military and civilian services; (2) measures designed to compensate for the expanded demand necessitated by the military effort, and (3) steps looking to the acceleration of production of essential materials and services.

The first of these three steps would be effected through the establishment of priorities, the allocation of essential materials, limitations on the use of such materials for nonessential purposes, and the requisition of supplies needed for the national defense. The second would be achieved by a number of contributing devices, all designed to lessen civilian demands for materials, services, and manpower which would compete for available supplies with the Government. Government programs, for one thing, would be cut to the bone. For another thing, credit expansion would be restrained. Mr. Truman had issued directives on Tuesday lowering the ceilings on the supply of such credit in the field of housing. Yesterday he proposed a restoration of Federal Reserve controls over consumer credit, the second of the two most inflationary areas in the economy at the present time. Taxes, of course, will have to be increased, since this is the least inflationary way of raising the additional billions that are going to be required in the military effort. Mr. Truman did not indicate the form of taxation he would propose, except in the most general terms. The fact that specific recommendations have been deferred, however, does not mean that the taxes themselves will be deferred. It is probable that whenever new tax legislation is enacted it will take effect as of January 1951.

The President's recommendations are necessarily general and will have to be refined and pointed up by Congress. By and large, however, he has presented Congress and the country with a clear picture of the problem raised in Korea and has outlined a mobilization program—military and economic—that is realistically equated to that problem.

MR. TRUMAN TO THE COUNTRY

President Truman's message to Congress yesterday was followed last evening by a radio address to the American people. In this address, as in his message, Mr. Truman laid before the tribunal of world opinion both the issues involved in the Korean conflict and the reasons why it is necessary to call upon the United States and upon all free nations to make further sacrifices in the defense of peace and freedom. The issue, he declared, is the challenge of unprovoked and long-plotted aggression in Korea—aggression which, unless squarely met, would have meant the end of the United Nations-sponsored Korean Republic and might have meant the end of the United Nations itself as an instrument of world order.

This challenge, attested by United Nations observers on the spot at the very time of the invasion, was met by prompt action both by the Security Council, since backed by no fewer than 52 of the 59 members of the United Nations, and, in conformity with that mandate, by the United States and other nations whose forces are fighting in Korea or who have offered aid. These nations acted in disregard of the immediate superiority of a well-armed enemy and irrespective of the difficulties of meeting his onslaught from bases 5,000 miles away. But they as well as the South Koreans have fought with skill and valor to delay the enemy until reinforcements could arrive. They have already frustrated the enemy's plan of crushing the Korean Republic within a few days. And though Mr. Truman freely recognizes that they face a hard and costly military campaign, he is confident that the forces of the United Nations will triumph.

Beyond this, Mr. Truman emphasizes that aggression in Korea increases the urgent necessity of creating sufficient defensive military strength among the free nations capable of rapid mobilization in the event of further emergencies. At the same time he declared again that the United States is following a basic moral principle, that it seeks no selfish advantage for itself either in territory or in domination over others, whether in Formosa or elsewhere, and that our only aim is to put down lawless aggression and to establish a system of collective security under

which all men may live in peace and freedom under governments of their own choice.

These statements refute Soviet propaganda, which seeks to turn facts inside out and to stigmatize the defenders of the United Nations and of peace as aggressors. They also provide an additional answer to Prime Minister Nehru of India, who, in a laudable effort to end the Korean conflict, is permitting himself to be sidetracked from the issue of aggression to the Soviet-propagated issue of Chinese representation in the Security Council. The facts speak for themselves, and dictate a course which will demand fortitude and high resolve, but from which there can be no retreat.

Control Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Control Program," published in the Washington Post of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTROL PROGRAM

In his message to Congress President Truman pointed out that industrial production is 81 percent higher than in 1939 and food production is a third higher than at any time before the war and practically as high as it was during the war years when we were sending far more food abroad than we are now. Furthermore, there is still some leeway for increasing the national output. Under these conditions the country can unquestionably support a substantial increase in military expenditures without serious strain. However, it will be necessary to restrict civilian consumption of steel, construction materials, and various other products already in short supply in order to provide additional supplies of such materials for the Armed Forces.

If businessmen, labor, farmers, and consumers show good sense and exercise restraint in buying, the control program recommended by the President will, we believe, enable the Government to meet its military needs without an inflationary rise in living costs necessitating resort to price controls and rationing. This is a very big "if," and there is no certainty that the warning that drastic controls will be recommended if prices continue to rise will put an end to profiteering and hoarding. But the President has wisely decided to test the efficacy of a system of limited and indirect controls before turning to methods that are difficult to enforce, costly to administer, and deeply resented by the public. He has asked Congress for authority to establish priorities and allocate materials needed by the military. Otherwise he is relying on credit controls and increases in taxation to check consumer buying of goods in scarce supply and to curb inflation. The mere authority to requisition supplies needed for national defense would check excessive inventory accumulation. And if industrial managements succeed in working out voluntary plans for insuring prompt and adequate supplies of goods for military use, it may not be necessary for the Government to issue allocation orders.

The proposal to reestablish controls over consumer credit would also make it possible to reduce the buying of automobiles and other durable goods on the installment plan, thereby releasing steel and various scarce materials for military use. His orders for a cut-back in public-housing construction and tighter restrictions on Government-insured home mortgages will slow the pace of a building boom fostered by extremely liberal housing credits that has boosted the cost of building and intensified scarcities of materials needed for military use. The President further recommends application of controls to prevent an expansion of privately financed real-estate credit, but does not indicate the type of legislation required to effect it. In this case, too, the mere authorization to apply such controls might induce bankers to take steps to restrict such loans of their own volition.

All these plans for tightening credit serve the dual purpose of relieving inflationary pressures on the economy and releasing materials for production of military equipment. They will not, of course, prevent a general rise in prices and living costs, unless steps are taken to offset increases in the Federal budgetary deficit brought about by an unexpected expansion of military spending. The President is requesting approximately $10,000,000,000 more for defense purposes. That sum, added to a prospective deficit in the neighborhood of $5,000,000,000, would lay the foundation for runaway inflation unless taxes are raised. Tax increases are in fact, as the President says, "our basic weapon in offsetting the inflationary pressures exerted by enlarged Government expenditures." And it is important to remember that heavier taxes make direct controls over prices and rationing less necessary.

Civilian Government agencies have been instructed to review their spending program for the purposes of cutting down outlays that compete with the military for manpower and scarce materials. It is to be hoped that Congress will take steps to see that substantial economies are effected by such means. At this juncture, however, it is impossible to estimate with any approach to accuracy the effect of the expanded military program. The one thing that is certain is that the 1951 deficit will be large enough to make higher taxes imperative. For that reason we hope that Congress will not adjourn until it has voted for an increase in taxes that will be at least sufficient to offset the inflationary effect of the larger expenditures that lie ahead.

Defend America and Be Smeared

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an article by the able and well-known columnist, George Rothwell Brown, appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of July 20, 1950.

Mr. Brown has correctly appraised the result of any attempt to defend our country. The article follows:

POLITICAL PARADE
(By George Rothwell Brown)

Not since Dr. William Wirt was vilified by the Roosevelt-controlled House of Representatives in 1934 has there been in congressional annals so braze a job of partisan whitewashing as that accomplished by the Tydings committee in the matter of the McCarthy charges of communism within the State Department.

The two cases are similar in this, that 16 years ago the Roosevelt New Deal was aroused to vindictive fury by Wirt's allegations that the left wing was bent on taking over the Government.

He was hounded by a special committee of the House, threatened with jail, precluded from examining witnesses, and denied the services of former Senator Jim Reed as counsel.

Wirt has long since been vindicated. His charges were true.

A thinly disguised Socialist regime is today in control on the Potomac, and its defeatist foreign policies are being expunged in the blood of American boys in the jungles of Korea.

The violence of the castigation of Senator MCCARTHY as the author of a fraud and a hoax, in his single-handed efforts to cleanse the Government of Communists, is without precedent in Senate history.

No Senator could make such a charge against another Senator in the Senate without violating rule 19 of that body.

It may be doubted that a committee has the authority to make such a charge.

Significantly the full Foreign Relations Committee, of which the Tydings body is a subcommittee, has washed its hands of this palpable political whitewash of the Truman administration, in a campaign year.

It refused 9 to 2 to approve the report—which its members had never read—merely received it and terminated the investigation.

But this is not the end.

The democratic Foreign Relations Committee, and the democratic majority of the Senate, probably will not have the moral courage to approve this report, and then take the next logical step.

If MCCARTHY has lied to the Senate as the Tydings report alleges in denouncing his charges as "perhaps the most nefarious campaign of untruth in the history of our Republic," obviously he is unworthy to sit in the Senate.

If a motion for his expulsion is not made by the timid Truman leaders it is not improbable that MCCARTHY himself will make such a motion from the floor of the Senate.

It is known that he is considering doing so.

The psychology of the situation as it affects both the Senator and the future of the Republican Party clearly calls for bold attack.

The Senator deserves and should be given a chance for vindication.

A motion by him for his own expulsion, which would be possible under Senate rules, would put the Truman administration and its Senate stooges right on the spot.

The democratic leadership frightened by an aroused public opinion might move to table such a motion, or to refer it to a committee, there to die unacted upon.

Either course would be a complete vindication for the Senator.

If an expulsion motion were brought to a test the administration could not hope to muster the constitutional two-thirds vote required to expel him.

Again vindication. And repudiation of the Tydings committee.

If expelled there is not the slightest doubt that the State of Wisconsin would reelect him to the Senate by an overwhelming majority.

The people are with MCCARTHY. They now perceive that the debacle in Asia is the logical consequence of State Department policy.

The Tydings committee made no real effort to fix the responsibility for that policy. Why?

The Wirt committee could not make its whitewash of the New Deal stick.

The Tydings whitewash cannot forever conceal the plots and blunders of its successor.

What Company Winchell?—Who Is Valushek?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY CAVALCANTE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include there extraneous items, I now wish to offer an item by P. A. Hrobak, the editor of the newspaper Jednota, and also an item by Joseph Bendik, a good American citizen of my congressional district. The items are as follows:

[From the Jednota of July 19, 1950]

WINCHELL AND VALUSHEK

(By P. A. Hrobak)

On two successive Sundays, July 2 and July 9, Mr. Walter Winchell attacked Karol Sidor, former Ambassador and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Slovak Republic to the Vatican, charging that Sidor was a wartime Nazi and a Nazi louse, and demanded that the United States throw this bum out. In his column of July 7, 1950, Mr. Winchell told his readers what he had on Sidor and demanded the State Department to do something about it. In last week's Jednota we took Winchell's article apart, paragraph by paragraph, and refuted every claim. Of course, we do not expect Mr. Winchell to answer. When Broadway's famous columnist is cornered and knows that he's been duped and exposed, he usually clams up.

Walter Winchell claims that his column on Sidor was documented. Winchell has spoken, so it must be the truth—say his admirers. But Wincheli still has not produced any documents proving his charges against Sidor.

Winchell simply refers us to Congressman ARTHUR G. KLEIN, Democrat, New York, who "knows Sidor's notorious record." Congressman KLEIN, in turn, refers us to one Andrew J. Valushek, of the New Yorksky Dennik (the New York Daily), who, according to the Congressman, accused Sidor of having been prominent in the Nazi government of Czechoslovakia during the war. KLEIN further charged that Sidor is a notorious Slovakian quisling who during the war helped trap American airmen forced down in Czechoslovakia.

The New Yorksky Dennik is an anti-Slovak paper published in the Slovak language by Czechs. During the war a Communist—one Dezider Benau—was its editor in chief. Valushek at that time was one of its editors. Benau is now in Slovakia smearing America and Americans. The L'udove Noviny (People's News), a pro-Communist weekly published in Pittsburgh, Pa., published an article written by Benau just last week, July 13, 1950. Under Benau's name we see in bold type: Former editor in chief of the New Yorksky Dennik.

Fine company Broadway's famous columnist is in, indeed.

The fact that Walter Winchell's vicious attack on Sidor was published July 7, 1950, is significant. Of course, Winchell could hardly have planned it that way. It just happened. On that day Slovaks everywhere celebrated their patron saints, Cyril and Methodius. Over 1,000 years ago these two saintly brothers were smeared by Germans, who falsely accused them of spreading heresy in the land of the Slovaks. They were vindicated, after presenting their case before proper church authorities. Like the saintly Cyril and Methodius, so Sidor and the Slovak Nation as a whole shall be vindicated. That is the belief of the overwhelming majority of Americans of Slovak descent.

When Karol Sidor branded the Winchell charges as "lies, lies, lies," Winchell repeated that his allegations still stand and he can prove them with documentary evidence. We are still waiting for that evidence. Mr. Sidor is willing to meet Winchell any place and at any time to prove that he is wrong about him.

It can hardly be the mission of the American press and radio to poison the minds of the American public with falsehoods, half-truths, and misstatements. It is our conviction that in Sidor's case, Mr. Winchell has abused the freedom of the press and radio. He has the use of facilities which Mr. Sidor has not. Mr. Winchell, it seems, has the right to smear and to express his opinions about anybody over the air and in the press. I suppose Sidor and we do, too. But there is a difference. When we request the use of the same facilities to neutralize the poison injected into the minds of the American public by Winchell, we are curtly advised, as we were by the American Broadcasting Co. in Sidor's case: "We must decline your request for the use of our facilities."

A decent, conscientious columnist or reporter will admit a mistake and try to right a wrong done his fellow man. It takes a big man with a lot of heart and a straight conscience to do that. It's the American way of doing things. Walter Winchell has a chance to prove himself in Sidor's case. He certainly can learn the truth not only about Sidor and the Slovaks, but also about his informers—Valushek and the un-American gang behind him, all Benes "democrats," who are opposed to Slovak freedom and independence. We wonder if Broadway's famous columnist is interested in ascertaining the truth?

WHO IS VALUSHEK?

UNIONTOWN, PA., *July 17, 1950.*

ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Member of Congress,
Congress of United States of America, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE MR. KLEIN: Your remarks about Karol Sidor in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 7, 1950, are such that I regard it my duty as an American citizen to call your attention to the unreliability of the source of your information. Your remarks seem to indicate that your only source is the letter of Andrew Valushek.

I speak about Mr. Valushek as one who knows him well. He and my wife are first cousins. Precisely, Valushek's mother and my wife's father are children of the same parents. Valushek was born of Slovak parents, but he now claims that he is a Czechoslovak. It should be known by informed people that there is a nationalistic difference between a Slovak and a Czech. A Slovak who espouses the aims of Communist Czechy as against the aims of democratic Slovakia cannot in reason deny that he is a traitor to Slovakia and its people. Further, Valushek was born of Catholic parents and was baptized a Catholic. If Valushek presently believes in a God or church it is not known to his relations.

During the last world war, Valushek circulated a report to the effect that his mother had died in Slovakia as the result of torture by the Nazi. Walter Winchell made this report a subject of comment on one of his broadcasts. To all those who listened to Winchell's broadcast, Mrs. Valushek had died at the hands of the brutal Nazi. Later, however, Mrs. Valushek appeared in the surrogate court of Hudson County at Jersey City, in a matter involving the estate of one Fred Ribar. Valushek had succeeded in having himself appointed administrator of the estate by concealing certain facts. Mrs. Valushek had returned from the dead to give her son, Andrew, and Winchell the lie of her death and that she had suffered Nazi torture. She had returned to demand her inheritance and rights in the estate of Fred Ribar, her nephew.

Fred Ribar's mother and Andrew Valushek's mother and my wife's father, John Medlen, are sisters and brothers. Although Andrew Valushek had neither rights nor inheritance in the Ribar estate except through his mother, he had obtained his appointment as administrator of the Ribar estate concealing the truth and whereabouts of those of Ribar's aunts and uncles who were rightfully entitled to administer and inherit the estate. After Mr. Medlin and other relations took up the matter in the surrogate court of Hudson County, N. J., Valushek was ultimately compelled from the post of administrator.

I am certain, Congressman KLEIN, that you will not want to base your case against Sidor on any information furnished to you by this man, Valushek. Truthfully, I cannot force myself to believe that a man who has attained your station could level such damaging accusations against a person of the standing of Sidor on a simple statement in a letter written by a person of the type of Valushek. It is more reasonable and fair to believe that you are attacking Sidor for some thing other than what is stated in Valushek's letter.

Will you be so kind to advise me whether you have based your attack on Sidor solely on what Valushek has written to you, or is there something else upon which you rely?

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH J. BENDIK.

Right Course on Copper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, as an example of almost complete editorial unanimity supporting the House action on Monday, in continuing the suspension of the import tax on copper, I submit the following editorial from the July 19 issue of the Waterbury (Conn.) American:

RIGHT COURSE ON COPPER

The House of Representatives showed intelligence and foresight in recommending suspension of the duty on imported copper. It would be unthinkably foolish for the Senate to refuse to follow suit.

In times of peace the copper industry is rated second only in importance to the iron and steel industry. In times of military crisis the availability of adequate supplies of copper, like the availability of adequate supplies of steel, becomes absolutely indispensable.

Yet at the very moment the Korean difficulties were starting, Congress was caught napping and was persuaded to allow the lapse of the duty suspension on imported copper that had been in effect since early in World War II.

Congress was persuaded to let the suspension lapse by Members from the copper-mining States where the copper interests

were clamoring for a restoration of the import levy so that their prices could be raised. To these copper producers and to the men who represented them in Congress it apparently made little difference that domestic copper production fails by a wide margin to meet our normal needs for industrial purposes. It apparently made little difference to them that their plan would strike a serious blow against the program for stockpiling copper for strategic defense purposes. They were oblivious to the fact that higher copper prices would result in serious crippling of the copper and brass industries in the east.

On Monday, when Congress was finally induced to begin a new consideration of the copper tariff question, it didn't require much more than a few references to the Korean war to bring the vast majority of the national legislature to its senses.

When the Senate takes up this same matter, in the near future, it shouldn't require any more than a reference to the present military needs either. There are numerous and powerful arguments for maintaining the suspension. There has never been one good reason for the restoration of these levies.

Identifying Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from this morning's Washington Post titled "Identifying Subsidies":

IDENTIFYING SUBSIDIES

For 17 months the obviously sensible recommendation of the Hoover Commission that air-mail pay be separated from subsidies to airlines has been languishing in Congress. Now the House Interstate Commerce Committee is reported to be ready to act on the Kennedy bill, which encompasses the Hoover recommendation. Yet there is disturbing indication that, despite the preponderance of evidence in favor of the bill, a small group of determined opponents have made considerable headway and may be in a position to block it.

It would be a dodge to put off positive action pending more study. The Kennedy bill has been amended to take account of most of the points raised by the Civil Aeronautics Board. It would direct the CAB to fix fair rates for carrying the mail and to prescribe methods for compensation, the rates to be determined on the basis of the cost of services actually rendered plus a reasonable return. The board would then determine what airline subsidies as such were warranted from the standpoint of defense and essential commerce, with the burden of proof on the carriers themselves. In order to provide standards of administration, the CAB would be called upon to conduct a comprehensive study and report to Congress by April 1, 1951, as to the probable cost for the next 5 years. A sum of $300,000 would be authorized for this study—an essential provision in light of the CAB's present load.

The difference between this kind of study and that asked by opponents of the Kennedy bill is that the former would be a sequel to a definite declaration of policy by Congress and the latter would be mere obfuscation. Certainly the separation cannot be made effective at once, but if the opponents were to have their say the decision would drag on indefinitely. There is no implication in the separation that the airlines would receive less subsidy. What is important, however, is to take the burden of subsidies off the back of the post office. As it is now, no one knows how much of the $125,000,000 a year paid to the airlines by the Government is for carrying the mail and how much is subsidy. Such subsidies need to be out in the open. If the airlines can continue to justify support, as we have no doubt they can in most instances well and good. But the public has a right, without further delay, to know where its money goes.

Senator McCarthy: Martyr to Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Tydings subcommittee has reported. It has "cleared" all those mentioned by Senator McCARTHY as being Communists or Communist-sympathizers in the State Department. Senator McCARTHY, himself, has been brutally attacked.

Gentlemen, Senator McCARTHY has been crucified upon the hammer and sickle. He has been crowned with a thorny crown of Red stars. The Tydings "Mission from Moscow" has been accomplished.

A few weeks ago the Washington Daily News published an editorial explaining the popular triumph of Senator HICKENLOOPER in the Iowa primaries. The News attributed the Iowa Senator's overwhelming popular support to the fact that he had backed Senator McCARTHY's charges every inch of the way. The News tersely commented that midwestern public opinion was not made in Georgetown apartments.

I thank God that Iowa public opinion is not formed in undercover Georgetown apartments. I thank God that clean Iowa thought is not born in dim-lit barrooms adjoining the State Department.

Prime Minister Nehru's Offer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., July 19, 1950:

ANSWER TO BLACKMAIL

America's answer to Prime Minister Nehru of India is only formally a reply to Mr. Nehru; fundamentally, it is a reply to Soviet Russia.

And fundamentally only one kind of answer can be made today to any proposition from international communism, whether the proposition concerns withdrawal in Korea, recognition of Communist China, threats on Yugoslovia, or "unification" of Germany.

The controlling consideration behind American—and United Nations—policy at this point must be to establish the fact that international crime does not pay.

Aggression is an international crime. Aggression is what has taken place in Korea.

Now Premier Stalin in response to Pandit Nehru's offer of mediation says "reactivation" of the Security Council must be the first step toward ending the Korean dispute. This sounds ironic when it is Russia that has walked out of the Security Council and other United Nations forums. The language is plainly a bid for the seating of Communist China on the Council.

Admission of Red China to the Council is one question. Restoration of peace in ravaged South Korea is another.

To link them together in an overall settlement may sound plausible to those who would like to get out of Korea. But to do so would be appeasement, to put it in the mildest terms, and it well could be called something uglier.

Actually, the American State Department is not altogether averse to Council membership for Communist China under proper circumstances and when the other members of the Council feel ready to vote it. The United States has indicated it would not use its veto against consideration of a seat for the Mao Tze-tung government.

But to grant that seat now not on its merits but as a price of obtaining negotiations about withdrawal of North Korean Communist forces from South Korea would be political bargaining on a low and cynical level, practically selling out the stand which the Security Council has made on Korea as a matter of morality.

The situation would be very much as if mobsters for a gambling syndicate took over a certain street for their illegal operations and then offered to withdraw in return for election of a representative of their syndicate to the city council.

Would the answer be to accept the deal or to send in the police on a determined raid? Success in the strong-arm tactics would only embolden the invaders.

American diplomats know that Prime Minister Nehru's motives are of the highest. They can appreciate not only his influence in Asia but his desire to assist from a relatively neutral position any prospect for peace.

Yet in view of the direction taken by the Kremlin's note to him, the American State Department has made the only right and logical answer by insisting that withdrawal from Korea stand on its own merits.

It will not do to reward aggression or submit to international blackmail.

Who Authorized It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of July 2, 1950:

WHO AUTHORIZED IT?

Pravda, official newspaper of the U. S. S. R. and journalistic spokesman for the Politburo, in a strident page 1 editorial the other

day, demanded to know who "authorized" the entrance of the United States into the Korean war.

Who authorized it?

Th Security Council of the United Nations, by the vote of the overwhelming maj rity of members, authorized it when summoned from sleep at 2 a. m. on Sunday morning and shocked awake with the news of the outrageous attack on a peaceful people.

The President of the United States, called from the companionship of his family in the placid community of Independence, Mo., and after consultation with leaders of our Government, authorized it.

Governor Dewey, Herbert Hoover, Senator Lodge, Senator Taft, John Foster Dulles, and other leaders of the differing political faiths here in America authorized it when they unanimously supported the President.

The cheering House of Commons, with Attlee and Churchill in odd agreement, authorized it when they placed the British Asiatic Fleet at the disposal of General MacArthur.

But there were others.

The parents of 10 naval airmen who were flying unarmed over the Baltic not so long ago and were shot out of the skies by "heroes" of the Red air force, authorized it.

The mothers and fathers of the little Greek children, kidnaped from their very homes by invading Red guerrillas, imprisoned in a Communist concentration camp and never returned, authorized it.

The relatives of people held behind the iron curtain—brave people who would not bow to a Red star and were spirited away to the silence and suffering of a Soviet slave camp, there to live or die, despised and unwanted—authorized it.

And there are more.

The ghosts of those gallant Americans who gave up their todays that the free people of the world might have tomorrow—at Tarawa, in the hedgerows of Normandy, on the beach at Guadalcanal, and in sight of the shore of the Elbe, authorized it.

The men and women whose crime was a different race or religion and who wasted away in starvation cribs or were thrust into fiery crematories in the hell camps of Belsen and Dachau, authorized it.

All the people who have grown tired of bullies and blusterers and are sick of seeing other defenseless people pushed around by dictators, authorized it. Shall we go on?

Authorized it?

The United States of America, born 174 years ago that freedom might supplant the ruthless rule of a mad king, authorized it when fearless Americans pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to die rather than supinely submit.

Authorization did not begin when our planes went into action over Korea, nor a few years back when Bevin pounded the table in the face of Molotov and told him appeasement was all over.

It was authorized in the ages so dim that they are almost forgotten when a few bandits brought war into the world to subject the many, and it will go on until at last, at long last, there shall be peace in the world.

Retirement of Dr. T. B. Symons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement of the impending retirement of Dr. T. B. Symons, dean of the College of Agriculture of the University of Maryland, next September, is an event of more than local importance. His 48 years of constructive service have not only meant much to the citizens of Maryland but have been of benefit to all who have an interest in the fields of his labors. The University of Maryland has just given his name to its agricultural building in recognition of his outstanding contribution to the function of that great institution.

Dr. Symons is a native of my home county, Talbot, and his former neighbors and his many friends have followed his career with pride and satisfaction. We wish him continued success and happiness in whatever path he may pursue on leaving the university he has served so well.

Under leave, I am including an editorial from the Sun, of Baltimore, that appeared in the issue of July 13, last:

THE IMPENDING RETIREMENT OF DR. SYMONS

The retirement of Dr. T. B. Symons, dean of the College of Agriculture of the University of Maryland and director of the extension service, will bring to a close a truly remarkable career.

To begin with, his career has been uniquely and exclusively a Maryland career. He was born in Maryland, grew up in Maryland, and was educated at the Maryland Agricultural College, predecessor of the University of Maryland. Having finished his formal studies, he went into Maryland agricultural work back around the beginning of the century, and in that work he has remained.

Though Dr. Symons has spent his life in a field of applied science, no one has ever accused him of being a great scientist. Who's Who does not disclose so much as a single formal scientific contribution. In his studies he was content to stop when he had gained his master's degree (his doctorate is an honorary degree).

But the truth is that Dr. Symons has never had scientific pretensions. His work and his extraordinary talents have been devoted to another and almost equally important task. His work has been in the field of organization and primary agricultural instruction. And his work has been truly prodigious.

Dr. Symons entered on his work at a time when farmers, for the most part, were solitary toilers, almost devoid of organization whether political, economic, or for the purposes of instruction. He began his work at the birth of a new era in American agriculture. He has lived to see it converted into a series of closely knit political and economic pressure groups. He has seen the traditionally solitary life of the farmer displaced by a life that teems with a bewildering array of interlocking groups, associations, cooperatives, clubs, and special-purpose groups. He has seen agricultural instruction brought to the door, free, on a platter, of every farmer who will accept it.

So far as Maryland is concerned, Dr. Symons has been for years the unchallenged leader in this work of knitting the farmers together into a compact and self-conscious community.

It is a work which has required tireless energy, infinite patience, easy sympathy, and an instinctive feeling for the right platitude. Dr. Symons has these virtues in abundance. The Symons smile and Symons platitude are known and welcomed in every hamlet and four corners of this State. Let there be a corn husking in Harford County and Dr. Symons is there to tell them that corn is the backbone of American agriculture and corn husking a most laudable form of labor. Let there be a cattle judging, a meeting to fight the tobacco mosaic disease, a gathering of canners, a plowing contest, and Dr. Symons is there with that unwipable smile to offer a few benevolent and appropriate remarks. No wit or humor, mind you. Nothing profound. Nothing provocative or controversial. Just that ready smile, that pat on the back, those words of encouragement.

The cumulative effect has been tremendous. More than any other man, he has brought the benefits of organization to our farmers and has made his college the political, economic, and cultural—especially the political—focal point of Maryland agriculture.

Congress Must Set Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my opposition to the bill H. R. 8951 introduced by the gentle lady from New Jersey which would raise the salaries of Congressmen to $20,000 a year.

With the serious conditions confronting the Nation at the present time, I think it would be a mistake if Congress should take such action.

It is said that if Congressmen's salaries were raised, it would doubtless encourage more capable and able men to seek congressional office. I disagree with this contention.

I believe history will prove that from the first Congress assembled in the United States up to 20 years ago when the salaries were very low, this country was never represented in the House of Representatives by a more able group of men than during that era.

The Congress of the United States which sets and controls the salaries of all the Federal employees must set an example of economy, so to speak, in the fixing of their own salaries and expenses.

When the Constitution was written in 1787, Congress was given the power not only to fix their own salaries, but the salaries of all people employed by the Federal Government from the President down.

I think the Members of the various sessions of Congress, since the founding of this country, should be commended for holding their own salaries down. I want to see this House preserve that fine record of the past. I am against any raise of congressional salaries.

FEPC Fails Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I wish to include the following excellent editorial on FEPC legislation from the New Jersey Herald-News of July 22, 1950. As is pointed out in the article, the Korean crisis makes it imperative that all our manpower be utilized so that we can get on with the job ahead, and, in the absence of FEPC legislation, the situation calls for issuance of an Executive order by the President:

FEPC FAILS AGAIN

The Senate has again failed to invoke cloture and secure a vote on the FEPC bill. This is most discouraging to those of us who felt that in the face of war, all efforts would be made to extend the full rights and privileges of citizenship of all Americans.

Again the South was in the driver's seat and again there were certain northern Senators who joined with the Dixiecrats to defeat this worthy piece of legislation. It is a most disgusting spectacle to see this type of coalition formed to deny civil rights to a deserving segment of the population.

The suggestion of Mr. A. Philip Randolph that the President issue another Executive order similar to the one issued by the late President Roosevelt should be followed out immediately. This country should be able to utilize every bit of its manpower in an all-out effort to end the war in Korea as soon as possible. This can only be done by giving every man and woman an opportunity to work, regardless of race, color, or creed.

In the meantime, there should be no relaxing in the effort to have FEPC legislation enacted. This measure holds the future economic security of 15,000,000 in its grasp. This fight must be continued until victory is won and we have a democracy in fact, as well as name.

For Safety's Sake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Nashua Telegraph (N. H.) of Tuesday, July 18, 1950:

FOR SAFETY'S SAKE

The Nashua Rotary Club, at its regular luncheon meeting, yesterday adopted a resolution calling for the ousting Secretary of Defense Louis A. Johnson and his replacement by a nonpolitical, competent man. We applaud the club's action. It isn't often that the Rotary Club expresses itself on public matters, and it is to the credit of the membership of that organization and in keeping with its fundamental ideals, based on a devotion to this country and its way of life, that the Rotarians saw the need and acted with dispatch. We not only applaud the action, we agree fully with the conviction thus expressed. We would go one step further and request not only the replacement of Mr. Johnson, but also similar ousting of Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

We are of the opinion that it was Mr. Acheson's policy which paved the way for the Korean crisis. It is too late now to backwater there, but it is not too late to take steps looking toward avoiding other Koreas.

The fact that it is too late to avoid the Korean mess is what focuses the spotlight on Mr. Johnson. For so long that we shudder in rememberance, now that the cold facts are laid bare, Mr. Johnson has orated and made public statements on our great strength, our impregnable defenses, our ability to wage a war and our readiness to meet the most acute situations. We heard, and we believed. Our confidence was based in the fact that, of all men in the land, the Secretary of Defense should be correctly informed on such matters for it is his job to ascertain that such things are so.

Now comes the Korean incident to ram the now apparent fable of our strength and readiness back down Mr. Johnson's throat. The Korean incident is not, and we pray God it will not become, a full-scale war. Yet it has demonstrated, at the dreadful price of American lives, that we are in no ways prepared for trouble. That this should be demonstrated in a spot where the administration could not but know that trouble was brewing makes the disclosure the more infamous.

Mr. Johnson must have known. If he did not, many others in high places should go into immediate discard with him. Knowing, it was his duty to prepare himself, the Armed Forces, and the country. His incompetence to meet the task is obvious in his failure which, in turn, is obvious in every report from the scene of operation.

The people of the Nation have been lulled into a false sense of security based on the assertion that America is invincible. An informed America, a trained America, and a properly geared America is invincible. We have been rudely awakened to the fact that our America of today can claim none of the necessities of invincibility. How many men must die and how much must be lost, to be regained later at a still more frightful price, before politicians and political considerations are set aside for the welfare of the Nation?

Conspiracy of Optimism Hid the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Johnstown Democrat of Tuesday, July 18, 1950:

CONSPIRACY OF OPTIMISM HID THE FACTS

President Truman tomorrow will tell Congress—and the American people—what it will take in men, in war machines, in money, in home-front belt-tightening to win the war in Korea.

The rose-colored-glasses era of post-World War II is over. The easy optimism which has deluded high administration Defense officials has been laid aside.

It's about time. For we have been talking big while carrying a very little stick. Now we must face realities.

The American people were totally unprepared for the reverses suffered by the United Nations forces in South Korea. They were stunned because they had been told, over and over again, that we were strong and that war wasn't going to strike us.

President Truman himself has been the No. 1 optimist. He has been run a close second by his Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, who has just brimmed over with the glad tidings that, boy, oh boy, were we ready for whatever was to come.

To get an over-all picture of this conspiracy of optimism that has enveloped the American people, we went back over the news files in the Democrat's library, beginning with January 1, 1950.

Read in the light of the news from the Korean front, the day-to-day Pollyannaish utterances from official Washington assume a tragic significance because of their misinformation.

Secretary Johnson launched the God's-in-His-heaven-all's-right-with-the-world theme January 10 of this year. He proclaimed then that the $13,500,000,000 military budget was adequate to defend this Nation in any situation that may arise in the next 2 years.

That budget had been cut from the $15,000,000,000 recommended by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, who later warned against inadequate defenses.

It was that same budget which shaved naval carrier air groups from 24 in 1949 to 10 in 1950, and projected a further cut to 9 in 1951. But Secretary Johnson insisted it was adequate. Obviously, he did not foresee the need for carrier task forces in the Pacific within 6 months.

Twenty days later, on January 30, Secretary Johnson confidently told the President and Congress, in a report from the Defense Department, that the possibility of war has been reduced.

So optimistic had Secretary Johnson become that in a February 2 speech he went in for a little ranting and roaring. He said he wanted "Joe Stalin to know that if he starts something at 4 o'clock in the morning, the fighting power and strength of America will be on the job at 5 o'clock in the morning."

Well, Stalin did start something—in Korea—at 5 o'clock in the morning of June 25, Korean time. It's now well past 5 o'clock in the morning of July 18 and we haven't, in the words of Secretary Johnson, licked hell out of Russia yet.

Secretary Johnson's easy overconfidence had affected President Truman by this time, for on March 2 the President announced to the American people that United States defenses were the strongest they have ever been in peacetime.

The next day, on March 3, Secretary Johnson grabbed back the headlines with the boast that the United States defense situation is more encouraging than at any time since VJ-day.

Maybe it was the March wind that encouraged such outpourings. Whatever it was, the confidence was not shared by all. Retiring Air Force Secretary W. Stewart Symington let it be known that he had argued for a 70-group air force—as had Congress—for years. And a nationally syndicated columnist accused the administration of deceiving the American people.

Optimism is heavy stuff, however, and to the politicians it makes nicer fare for the public than caution. President Truman shrugged off the criticisms and denied, on March 30, that any arms cuts made in the interest of economy would endanger United States security.

On April 12, Mr. Truman concluded his fifth year as President. He was in a cocky mood. The next day, as he entered upon his sixth year in office, the President announced expansively that things never had been better on the home front—and he took credit for it, you will remember. As for foreign affairs, why, prospects for lasting peace were better than ever since the start of the cold war in 1946.

By April 21, Secretary of State Dean Acheson had joined the happy throng. On that date he said he saw no immediate danger of war.

May was a banner month for the everything is O. K. boys. May also was the month before June. And June was the month of the invasion of South Korea.

President Truman got things off to a good start on May 4. He said he saw no reason to fear that the cold war was about to turn into a shooting war. As of May 4, he said,

world troubles were not as bad as those in the first half of 1946.

As a matter of fact, so optimistic was the President, that he promised to reduce the United States defense budget in 1951. The European recovery program would be the main United States weapon in the cold war from then on out, he said.

The following day the President's easy optimism was challenged in Congress and by an anonymous Pentagon official. Chairman CARL VINSON, of the House Armed Services Committee, said he would rather accept the appraisal of Gen. Omar N. Bradley than that of Mr. Truman.

General Bradley, only the day before, had warned that the accumulation of Soviet pressure had made the cold war worse in recent months.

On that same May 2—the day before the President had talked with so much confidence—war-wise old Bernard M. Baruch had warned that nobody knows whether another war is likely because the United States Government was so secretive about many potentially important cold-war developments, was lacking a peace strategy board, and was holding back information private citizens needed to estimate the danger of war.

And on May 3 UN Secretary-General Trygve Lie observed that the world was in its most critical situation since 1945.

To President Truman, however, perhaps with his eye on 1950 congressional elections, defense expenditures could be cut next year.

Secretary Johnson shared his chief's easy feeling. On May 11 he told a group of Kiwanians, "War is not on the horizon."

Not all the Nation's civilian defense department people agreed, however.

Navy Secretary Francis P. Matthews, on May 13, said, "We face a greater threat [than] 10 years ago when Hitler's legions overran France."

Secretary Matthews was in a position to know what had happened to the United States Navy—both on the sea and in the air—under Secretary Johnson's guidance.

Maybe, too, Secretary Matthews was recalling the futile protests raised by Adm. Louis E. Denfeld, who lost his top naval job because, as a prophet, he cried in the Washington wilderness of Mr. Johnson's brand of service unification.

President Truman jumped back into the headlines to start June off on a here-we-go-again spree of optimism.

It will be recalled that Mr. Truman outguessed the Gallup poll pretty accurately a couple of years back. On June 1, 1950, when reporters pointed out that a Gallup poll had shown that most Americans expected a war within 5 years, Mr. Truman offered as his opinion that the world was closer to peace than it had been in 5 years.

Echoing these sentiments, Secretary Johnson on June 5 estimated that the foreign-aid arms program would get smaller, not larger, in years to come. Secretary Acheson had taken the opposite view. The Cabinet, obviously, had its differences.

On June 13 Secretary Acheson warned that Russia uses its military power "as a poised bludgeon to intimidate the weak," but he hastened to climb back behind the official administration line, adding that "I do not believe this creates an immediate danger of war."

The fighting men, however, recognized what the Defense foreign-policy administrators in mufti chose to ignore. Writing in the June issue of the Army Information Digest, Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff, had this to say about our lack of preparedness:

"The police states have * * * more than 40,000 medium and heavy tanks * * *. We have approximately 6,000 combat-worthy (light and medium) tanks * * * and, except for prototypes, we have purchased no new tanks since the end of World War II."

Developments on the Korean front in the past 3 weeks have underscored—in blood—General Collins' warning.

As that Gallup poll of last May showed, the majority of the American people were right in expecting war within 5 years. And President Truman, unfortunately, was mistaken in his cracked-phonograph-record peace predictions.

The President tomorrow has the unhappy duty of asking Congress to correct the mistakes of his administration, which chose to follow the lead of Secretary Johnson, ignoring the warnings of the Eisenhowers, the Denfelds, the Symingtons, the Collinses, the Bradleys, the Baruchs.

Let's hope the administration will not continue to sweeten things for the American people. Let's hope we'll be told the unadulterated facts.

Deportation of Aliens From the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. BOLTON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I was happy to support H. R. 10, a bill to deport certain undesirable aliens from the United States and to provide for the supervision and detention, pending eventual deportation, of aliens whose deportation cannot be readily effectuated because of reasons beyond the control of the United States. Frankly, I think this legislation should have been enacted long ago, and I think this bill gives the prostitutes, the procurers, the dealers in narcotics, those with criminal records, and subversives a great deal more consideration than would be given American citizens in the same categories by any country in the world today. I was extremely happy to see this measure pass the House and hope it will receive favorable consideration of the Senate as soon as possible in order that these undesirables should be taken out of circulation until such time as we can find a country that will accept them.

I understand there are outstanding nearly 3,000 orders for deportation of these people and by refusal of their native country to take them back or by their own refusal to obtain necessary travel documents, they are today enjoying the freedom of the United States.

The bill provides that the Attorney General has discretionary power to hold such aliens as he may believe dangerous to the security of the United States or he may release them if he sees fit to do so. This seems to be all the consideration they are entitled to.

I should like to point out that the aliens covered by this bill are only those who have been convicted of some crime in the United States. I see no reason why we should coddle these people and endanger the future security of this country. Why should we release criminals and subversives to continue their nefarious occupations?

Some of the Members of Congress opposed this legislation because these people have not been given certain constitutional safeguards such as trial by jury before incarceration. We must remember we are dealing with aliens who violated our law, have had a trial by jury, and now are regarded as dangerous to the safety of our Nation.

What about the rights of law-abiding American citizens? Should they be exposed to criminals awaiting deportation and who are in the country only because no other country will have them? Their rights are guaranteed under the provisions of the administrative procedure law, and they also are entitled to petition of habeas corpus. This seems to be enough protection for hardened criminals, after conviction by trial by jury, who aim to destroy the Government that protected them. So why all the tears over potential saboteurs?

The American Newspaper Guild

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter:

AMERICAN NEWSPAPER GUILD,
New York, N. Y., July 19, 1950.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE:
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: The following resolution regarding the issuance of a memorial stamp to honor the late Heywood Broun was passed at the seventeenth annual convention of the American Newspaper Guild recently held in Washington:

"Whereas the American Newspaper Guild has gone on record for the United States Post Office to issue a memorial stamp to honor its founder and first president, Heywood Broun, as well as to honor the theme of freedom of the press; and

"Whereas the Honorable THOMAS J. LANE, of Massachusetts, has filed a bill (H. R. 8551) for such purpose; and

"Whereas the Honorable PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, has read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the original resolution of the 1949 Columbus convention as well as the resolution of the Newspaper Guild of Boston on said memorial stamp; with a request to all Congressmen to vote for the issuing of the Heywood Broun memorial stamp: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the American Newspaper Guild, meeting in convention at Washington, D. C., on June 28, 1950, does hereby gratefully extend to Congressmen THOMAS J. LANE and PHILIP J. PHILBIN its sincere gratitude; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to both herein above-mentioned Congressmen as well as a copy to the Postmaster General."

I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of the members of the American Newspaper Guild to thank you for your efforts in their behalf.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH B. NOVAK,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Hoarding Is Panic Buying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the initiative displayed by L. Bamberger & Co., one of Newark's leading stores, in taking up a full page of advertising space in the daily newspapers warning the public against "panic buying" is commendable.

It would be well for other merchants and suppliers to take note and follow suit. I am certain that they are all desirous of helping to maintain a sensible economy and will do their share to guard against inflation. The buying public should take heed as well. In this manner we can all pitch in and stave off "higher prices and inflation."

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Newark Star Ledger on July 19, 1950: "Don't Hoard Trouble":

DON'T HOARD TROUBLE

When a merchant spends his advertising money on an appeal to the public against thoughtless buying, that is news almost on a par of the story about the man who bit the dog.

The timely appeal against thoughtless buying was made yesterday in this and other newspapers by the Bamberger store in a full-page advertisement. Whereas this advertising space is usually devoted to persuasive arguments in favor of buying, yesterday's advertisement pointed out that any panic buying as a result of the Korean scare can lead only to higher prices and inflation.

There are no shortages in essential goods today, and none in sight. The rubber shortage that occurred in the last war when Japan seized the countries producing natural rubber cannot occur now because we still have all the plants we built then to produce artificial rubber and because the natural rubber countries appear to be in no immediate danger. As for food, our warehouses are bulging with surpluses.

No matter how plentiful our supplies, panic buying will speedily produce excessive prices, inflation and, ultimately, real shortages because panic buying inevitably produces wholesale waste. Hoarders thus are troublemakers, for themselves as well as for their country.

The Historical Background of the Korean Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the war in Korea has made it necessary to reassess our whole position in Asia, politically, socially, and economically. How do our objectives in 1950 differ from those of 1850, when we first had extensive contact with China? And how do they differ from our objectives in 1900 when John Hay initiated the "open door policy"?

It is important to note in the first place that the urge toward closer relations with Asia which led to our negotiation of a treaty of friendship with China a hundred years ago, and in our sending Commodore Perry to force Japan to open her doors to the foreigner, had an overwhelming economic motive. Our clippers from Salem rounding the Horn stopped at Astoria for furs and then set sail for Hong Kong, where a shipload of merchandise would be exchanged for silk and tea. Other clipper ships sailing from the Atlantic ports rounded the Cape of Good Hope, and stopping in India picked up valuable cargoes of opium for which there was a ready market in China. The British and French in 1842 had fought the first opium war with China and had established the right to trade at Hong Kong and other open ports. Our first treaty with China was not concerned with anything but the right to trade on the same basis as the "most favored nation." We set up shop in the treaty ports which France and England had wrested from China, and by 1853 we were doing more business with China than either of them.

The second opium war, which ended in 1860 with a granting of more concessions by China to France and England, was not our fight. Shortly after that, as our own Civil War raged at home, the Taiping rebellion was devastating China. An American soldier of fortune was helping build an ever victorious army which finally defeated the Chinese emperor's enemies. His name was Ward. But officially we had kept out of the opium wars and the Taiping rebellion. We had goods the Chinese wanted and they had goods we wanted. Moreover, we had the fastest clipper ships in the world to transport these goods both ways. Naturally our main interest in China remained economic.

Mr. Speaker, this was not true of some of the European countries. Russia had one overweening ambition, an ice-free port on the open sea. Her attempts to achieve this ambition in the Baltic, in the Bosporus, and in the Persian Gulf had all been checkmated by Britain. Meanwhile the Russian bear-that-walks like-a-man had crossed the frozen steppes of Siberia and was looking across China to the sunny, ice-free shores of the Pacific. By 1858 the Czar had acquired the left bank of the Amur River and by 1860 had annexed the maritime province facing the Japan Sea. Vladivostok was founded in July of that year. But, while it was far south and near the borders of Korea, its harbor was frozen 7 months of the year. The ice-free port was still to be achieved, so Russia's covetous eyes turned to Manchuria and Korea.

In July 1884 an understanding was reached between Russia and Korea by which Russia agreed to send Russian officers to assist in the training and reorganization of the Korean Army, in return for the use of a port near Wansan Bay. This port was ice-free all the year round. This development aroused both Japanese and Chinese suspicions. Japan was championing Korean independence against China and the Russian possession of Port Lazarief was unbearable. To China the Russian advance was an unmistakable challenge to her claim to leadership in the Far East and her dominant position in Korea. To meet the situation Great Britain occupied Port Hamilton in Korea in April 1885. China then pulled wires in Seoul, the Russian project was dropped, and the German Von Mollendorff who had arranged for the Russian officers to train the Korean Army was dismissed. The dropping of this Russian project was only temporary, however. Russia continued her plans for expansion which finally culminated with the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–05.

With Japan's defeat of China in 1894–95, she became the dominant power in the Orient. With her defeat of Russia 10 years later, her own career of conquest and expansion began. Acquiring Formosa from China in the first war, she took over Russia's interest in Manchuria, including the fortified ice-free Port Arthur, and the South Manchurian Railway in 1905 after President "Teddy" Roosevelt had arranged the Treaty of Portsmouth, N. H. By 1911 Japan had annexed Korea and was well on her imperialistic course which was halted only with her defeat in 1945.

Mr. Speaker, for nearly 60 years Japan had been the watchdog that had kept the bear at bay in Asia. Every Russian move in north China, Korea, and Manchuria had been checkmated by Japan's watchfulness and force. Imagine Stalin's glee, therefore, when President Roosevelt, with Alger Hiss at his elbow, agreed at Yalta to return Manchuria, the Kuriles, and the southern half of Sakhalin Island to Russia. This showed both an utter lack of any historical sense of the gravity of the step and a judgment so warped as to ignore entirely the vital American interests that were involved.

For over 100 years our paramount interest in China has been that of trade. The open-door policy of 1900, enunciated by John Hay and accepted grudgingly by Europe, declared for equal opportunity in China and upheld China's territorial integrity. We neither took nor coveted 1 square inch of China's territory in all that 100 years. On the other hand, we have invariably thrown our weight and power against those who would.

Despite this policy, President Roosevelt was inviegled at Yalta into forcing Chiang Kai-shek to sign a "treaty of friendship" with Russia. This was done the day before the war ended, or on August 14, 1945. Under its terms China agreed to what we had given away of her territory at Yalta. A year later, because Chiang Kai-shek would not take the Communists into his Government, General Marshall declared "a plague on both your houses" and withdrew all support from Chiang Kai-shek.

Mr. Speaker, the situation we face in Korea today is the inevitable outcome of these tragic mistakes. With the teeth pulled from the Asiatic bulldog, the bear-that-walks-like-a-man is stalking slowly but surely down the Korean Peninsula. Japan today is constitutionally restrained from joining in the war. If

we had not pulled this latest fiasco, Japan could place a million men in Korea and save the situation. But our planners knew better. The Joint Chiefs wrote off Korea as indefensible, but the President has now decided to defend it. As a result of this right-about-face, General MacArthur was called upon overnight to defend a post that we had practically abandoned.

What is more, the President's attempt to define this as a police action or a 2 months' war is grossly misleading and flies in the face of history. With 10,000,000 Chinese Communist troops all dressed up and no place to go, Russia is not going to call it off. As long as Japan is impotent and we have to transport every weapon that we are fighting with 10,000 miles, Russia is going to keep up the struggle. With the British occupied by the Communists in Malaya and the French in Indochina, we can look in vain for any trained and well-equipped body of ground troops to help the United Nations in this struggle. We are it, and as we commit more and more of our scanty land power to the Pacific in a full-blown war against 10,000,000 well-armed Chinese Communists things will begin to happen in Iran, Yugoslavia, and Berlin. By Christmas 1950 world war III will be on in earnest, and our discredited guessers who thought it would be decided by dropping an atom bomb on Moscow will be giving frantic orders to mobilize for a long, hard struggle. Unless we stop taking "calculated risks" with American lives and treasure, this country may find itself facing world defeat. The time to mobilize for world war III is now. The blueprints we have been talking about should be welded into tanks, the Air Force should be built up, the strength of the land, sea, and air forces increased and trained. This is no Whisky Rebellion. This a full-sized war.

Voice of America in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the fact that the so-called Stockholm peace petition gained any measure of success in having affixed to it the names of many well-meaning, loyal Americans and others who definitely have no sympathy with any Communist ideology points up a significant fact. That, to my mind, is an understandable lack of knowledge of what constitutes communism among our own people.

It is my belief that a Voice of America in America itself can be created to offset this. Clergymen of all faiths should be united in the formation of a common front of knowledge in the pulpits so that God-fearing Americans can be made aware of the insidious danger of atheistic communism. Congregations, individually and collectively, can learn through religious teachers they trust most the dangers and almost incredible cleverness of the advocates of antigod communism. The clergy can help to act as watchdogs against communism penetrating our back yards in the guise of some humanitarian cause.

It is the duty of the clergy to inform the people. For if communism triumphs—religion will be destroyed. This is a time when men and women of all faiths, including their priests, ministers, and rabbis, must rally together—and if necessary, fight with every resource at their command for survival.

Those of us who are aware of propaganda warfare as it is waged between truth and falsehood recognized the Stockholm peace petition for what it is. It is not a peace petition but a war petition calculated to give Soviet Russia time to stockpile atomic weapons while we are lulled into a false sense of security.

I am confident that if the many Americans and others who innocently signed this had known the truth—and had been informed of the purpose of this petition—their signatures would not have been included.

We need a Voice of America in America—and the clergy of the United States should constitute that voice.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein the following editorial which appeared in the Newark Evening News of July 19, 1950.

DON'T BLAME STOCKHOLM

Last March something called the Partisans of Peace met in Stockholm and drafted a world peace appealed. It calls for the outlawing of atomic weapons and brands as a war criminal the first nation to use atomic weapons. The Partisans of Peace are Communist stooges and their appeal is phony. There would now be international control of atomic weapons if Russia wanted international control.

But neither the Communist inspiration of the document nor its patent hypocrisy has prevented millions from signing it under the sincere illusion that they were helping the cause of peace. The world-wide notoriety given the world peace appeal by Communist propaganda has angered and embarrassed the Government of Sweden, for the Communists persist in describing it as the Stockholm appeal.

Prime Minister Erlander has found it necessary to issue a statement expressing considerable disgust over the misuse of his capital's name. Directly accusing the Communists of exploiting mankind's love for peace and abhorrence of war, Mr. Erlander says that this so-called Stockholm appeal has no more connection with Stockholm or Sweden than earlier appeals emanating from so-called peace congresses in Paris and New York.

It also has no connection whatever with peace.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles on communism by Frank C. Waldrop:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Dean Acheson should be fired out of the Department of State. He is either incompetent to deal with the Communists or indifferent to the responsibilities of his office. Or both.

How is this so? Well, consider the case of the new war just opening up in Korea.

There is no point in working up a high emotional blood pressure against Stalin for this bloody caper. He is only doing what he has been invited to do by 20 years of government in the city of Washington, D. C.

You can't criticize him for taking advantage of the opportunities such men as Acheson have thrust upon him in smothering profusion ever since the Soviet Union was given diplomatic status in this country, November 16, 1933, under circumstances of obvious fraud and abuse of American confidence.

For some days now I have been reviewing in this space evidence on Communist operations in the United States since that perfidious event.

The evidence here surveyed is not somebody's mere "it happened to me" account of his personal worm's-eye view of the conspiracy against civilization.

I have been reporting on sworn testimony, supported by exhibits and attests, presented to the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The present section deals with the account rendered by Walter S. Steele, testifying on behalf of some 114 American patriotic societies.

Steele's testimony is specific, detailed, clear, and overwhelming. From description of the Communist aims and organizational structure he goes on to set forth actual operations up to the time of his testifying, August 1938. For instance, the national network of schools in revolution, ranging from coast to coast and all operated on a pattern set in Moscow.

Then the summer camps, where children are made Communists in the American woods.

There were listed also camps for grown-ups. Washingtonians may well remember stories of the time concerning the celebrated camp Nitgedaiget out in Prince Georges County. The word is Russian for "nothing matters" or, maybe a little closer to the point, "take it easy."

At any rate there were several hundreds of these hang-outs listed by Steele in all parts of the country specifically designed to catch the vacationing adult or the summering child and make him a Communist.

What happened in the Government as Steele disclosed all this. "Nitgedaiget."

Steele even gave the Communist plan for penetrating Federal departments here in Washington. He surveyed the "united front" program of world communism started in 1935 which, in effect, directed every Communist to adopt the tactics of the Greeks in the battle of Troy—inside the horse.

On and on his survey went. Radicals and Educational Institutions. League of Professional Groups. Financial Sources of Communism.

Reds Try To Disrupt Army and Navy. Red Secret Work. World Crisis. These are a few chapter headings of Mr. Steele's voluminous and precise presentation. It rolls on for page after page, giving names, dates, places.

In all, there must be well over 5,000 names in Steele's testimony, names of people to be examined, names of organizations to be studied, names of publications to be accounted for.

He was putting the facts on record for the House Committee on Un-American Activities

to use as a base-line for action. Did it? Well the fact is that the committee was timid, indeed, about receiving such items as his disclosures on the American League for Peace and Democracy, regardless of the ice-hard factualness of what he had to say.

The committee was new at its work, and the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt was attacking it at every point, rather than helping. So even with the facts, Steele had his troubles. Was he right?

Well, eventually the league would be listed by the Attorney General of the United States as subversive. But in 1938, all Steele got for his pains was a hissing.

What has all this to do with the need for firing Dean Acheson? The connection is obvious. Acheson is the very archtype of public official who in 1938 made fun of Walter Steele and his testimony.

Acheson is the very model of the kind who thought the House Committee on Un-American Activities should make a little propaganda on Capitol Hill against the Nazis and the Fascists, but under no circumstances to annoy the Communists.

People of Acheson's brand cannot be trusted to deal with the Communists on an intelligent basis of American self-interest. Hence, in times of such extreme danger as the present, get them out of places where they can cause harm.

Now to proceed with further survey of the evidence available in 1938 to forewarn us against the day when Stalin would start this war in Korea.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles on communism by Frank C. Waldrop:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

How much evidence settles a point and becomes final proof? You can get an answer to that one without even going all the way through volume 1 of the many hearings on communism by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

For any honest and inquiring mind, the proof that communism is an international conspiracy working for the Soviet Union in Russia, can be found in conclusive form in the testimony of the first two witnesses the committee heard on that subject in August 1938.

Further, that this foul enterprise was carried on in the United States from 1933 onward with the full knowledge and consent of the administration in power and full control of the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of our Government.

It is asking too much, therefore, for anybody in possession of the facts to look on Secretary of State Dean Acheson as a genuine and reliable opponent of Stalin.

The most charitable interpretation of Acheson's career, in the matter of communism, would be to call him incredibly stupid. Either he doesn't know a Communist when he meets one or he is glad of their company.

For certainly he has kept their company, all through the years. To say that he didn't know it is to put him in the same basket with Henry Wallace, whose memorable claim is that he never knowingly met a Communist in his life.

Well, let's get on with the evidence, as filed with the committee in August of 1938 by Walter S. Steele, spokesman for a coalition of some 114 patriotic societies which wanted Congress to know the facts and act on them.

After Steel laid down his general propositions, he proceeded to file the supporting data.

He put into the record the answer to the question, "How did the Communist Party come into being?" Then he entered as an exhibit the constitution of the Communist International, the general staff at Moscow for world revolution. To that he attached the famous "21 Conditions" set forth by C. Piantnitsky as the basis for allowing Communists from any given country to be represented on that general staff.

These all sum up to saying that every Communist everywhere is a Soviet agent and must be prepared under the most complete discipline, to do whatever Moscow tells him, from holding public office in the United States Government, to committing murder in the streets.

Then, Steele listed the galaxy of "international" working teams that operate under the direction of the general staff, and these cover the whole spectrum of human interests, from the "International of the Godless" to the "International Workers' Soccer League."

Next, he listed the structure, district organizations, and territorial assignments of the Communist network in the United States of America, even down to postal address of their offices in all principal cities.

Following that, he gave the names of all known officers of the Communist organization, not only at their headquarters, but by States and cities.

He surveyed the financial structure of the system, even down to the dues and assessments milked in an endless stream from the weak-minded "rank and file" membership of the sort you see carrying placards in front of the White House from time to time.

Next he listed by name some 328 organizations operating among the working people and the unemployed on what might be called the economic front. Then, 200 in educational and cultural and even sports and athletic fields.

Next, 62 organizations especially aimed at youth, 33 more assigned to "defensive" and "legal aid" and "protest" agitation, and finally, four specifically designated to agitation for atheism.

After that, he took up the gigantic enterprise of propaganda through the printed word, and listed the addresses of Communist word factories in every important city of the Nation.

He listed some 89 foreign language journals, and 483 in English, plus 79 more in English printed in Russia and distributed over here in spite of the flat promise by Soviet Foreign Minister Maxim Litvinov at the time of Soviet recognition that nothing of the sort would happen.

Now, was this evidence from Mr. Steele something unknown to the Government of the United States? Hardly that.

Was it any secret to anybody? Not to anybody who cared to use eyes and ears.

Was it conclusive? It was overwhelming.

I have hardly scratched the veneer on top of the veneer of its surface. Next, I will set forth a synopsis of Steele's evidence on the things the Communists were doing, with the machinery here indicated so briefly.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles on communism by Frank C. Waldrop:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Nobody knows how much undiscovered dynamite still lies buried in the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The committee began work in 1938 very much under a cloud of administration disapproval.

For years it skulked along unsure either of where it was going or where it had been.

It got no cooperation from the executive branch, but instead, direct opposition. Instead of the Department of Justice working in close association with the committee to stop communism, it worked to stop the committee.

Yet even so the committee's record of achievement in nailing some of this country's worst enemies, is remarkably good. Maybe it looks so good because the Department of Justice looks so bad.

But anyhow, here is a sample of the sort of dynamite its record holds.

One day in December 1939 the committee called to the witness stand a Negro, William Odell Nowell, of Detroit, Mich.

Nowell had two important characteristics. First, he had been a Communist from 1929 to 1936 and had become an extremely important agent traveling between the United States of America and Moscow, on missions of great importance to the party.

Second, Nowell had one of those freak minds. He was capable of almost absolute and total recall of names, dates, places, and remarks.

He filled the pages with information, the value of which it was impossible to estimate at the time.

While he was in the midst of testifying, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt actually came to the committee rooms and, attended by numerous young Communists, took up her knitting at a conspicous corner of the committee table.

Rhea Whitely, former FBI agent and then chief counsel of the committee, was in the process of asking Nowell about other Americans he had seen in Moscow in 1931, and Nowell was rattling off names at a great rate.

He paused for breath and said:

"Also, I met in Moscow a Mr. Gebhardt, who was from the German Communist Party. He was a German by birth. He was a representative of the German Communist Party but in recent years he had been interested in and working on American problems.

"So he had worked with the American commission of the Communist international. He traveled through America in 1933 and a portion of 1934. I believe I met him in 1933. As a representative of the Comintern he traveled under the alias of Edwards."

Nobody knew it then, but those 10 lines of testimony were pregnant with news that would break years later on every page one in America. That news would send men to jail.

It would drag in the name of Mrs. Roosevelt and give Hollywood goose pimples, and embarrass ex-Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles.

For the "Mr. Gebhardt" whom Nowell had met in Moscow was none other than Gerhardt Eisler. The fact that Nowell sa'd he had seen "Mr. Gebhardt" in America in 1933 traveling under the alias of Edwards, was the clue that committee agents caught and followed, patiently and silently, from 1939 to 1947.

With no more evidence to start on than that, they ultimately hit a trail that led to:

Gerhardt Eisler, singled out later by the FBI as the most dangerous Communist in America, now in Berlin heading a cold war on this country that may turn hot at any moment.

Hanns Eisler, his brother, whom Mrs. Roosevelt had interceded for with Welles, with one of those famous "Dear Sumner" letters on White House stationery.

Leon Josephson, who told an American consul in Denmark once that he was the party's man, and "anything short of murder," he would do on order of the party.

False passports, theft, fraud, perjury, all these and more were put in the RECORD that afternoon as Mrs. Roosevelt listened and knitted for the newsreel cameras, while Nowell testified. But how many administration officers had interest in it?

All in all, 1939 was one of the committee's biggest years for hooking big names and identifying organizations for the public's understanding.

Some of the main consequences that came on in time:

Fritz Kuhn, fuehrer of the German-American bund, was sent to prison for mishandling of the funds of his organization.

Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist party, and William Weiner, party treasurer, were indicted on false passport charges.

Nicholas Dozenberg was charged with counterfeiting American money on orders from the Communist International.

Officials of Bookniga, Soviet propaganda agency, pleaded guilty to the charge of failing to register as foreign agents.

Arno Bissi and Mrs. Leslie Fry, west coast Nazi and Fascist leaders, fled the country.

But did anybody thank the committee for its efforts? Did you?

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles on Communism by Frank C. Waldrop:

COMMUNISM
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

To this day there are people foolish enough to insist the House Committee on Un-American Activities is useless and lacks public support, just as they insist it lacks public necessity.

If that is so, why has the committee survived so many years of brutal attack from the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, and from the Communists? How has it persisted, in spite of the bungling and worse, of so many of its membership?

The answer, of course, is obvious. The committee serves a vital public necessity. And in spite of all its own lapses, in spite of all the propaganda rolled up against it by the administration and the Communists, the central truth of its mission keeps it in existence.

Consider, for instance, the findings it turned in with its first annual report in 1939, after a first, tentative, stumbling year of inquiry.

These findings, published and reported to Congress, should have been sufficient for the executive branch of our National Government to swing on the Communists at once if it had been of a mind to.

But, of course, it was of the exactly opposite mind.

The committee found that among the Communist front organizations operating then in this country were the League of American Writers, Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy and Friends of Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

The committee found that Communist leadership was entrenched in the following organizations: National Maritime Union; United Cannery, Packing and Allied Workers; Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians; Fur Workers International Union; American Communications Association; United Electrical and Mechanical Workers of America and United Furniture Workers of America.

The committee found from the evidence received that William Dudley Pelley, Silver Shirt leader, was a racketeer engaged in mulcting thousands of dollars from fanatical and misled followers.

The committee found that the following attempted to form a united Fascist movement in the United States: Knights of the White Camellia; Militant Christian Patriots; National Liberty Party; American Rangers; American White Guard; Constitutional Crusaders of America; William Pelley; Gerald Winrod; Charles B. Hudson, James True; E. N. Sanctuary; Robert E. Edmondson.

By that time, the detractors of the committee had come to realize they were up against something more formidable than a mere demagogue from Texas and a handful of amateur sleuths.

Twice the industrious Mr. Gallup put the question to the voters of the public as to whether they felt the House Committee on Un-American Activities should go on.

And twice the voters answered in percentages no President or candidate for President has yet been able to match.

But the most solid, continuing evidence of national support, from 1938 right down to date, has always been the size of the committee's victories in roll call votes of the House to support it in any test.

This is all the more significant when it is realized that any Congress, from 1938 to 1945, could have put the committee out of business by the simple act of not renewing its special authority.

Committee Chairman Martin Dies always had to go on the floor at the beginning of each session and convince the House, against the will of the administration that ordinarily commanded it in all matters, that the committee's continuance was necessary.

He was able to win every time, but only because the evidence of committee achievements was so overwhelming that no propaganda could stand against it.

Here are some samples of the tests the committee won. February 3, 1939, Dies asked renewal of the authority first granted in 1938. He won on a roll call vote, 344 yeas, 35 nays, and 51 not voting. In 1940, the same test came on January 23.

The yeas were 354, nays 6, and 71 did not vote. March 11, 1942, yeas, 331; nays, 46; not voting, 54. February 10, 1943, yeas, 302; nays, 94; no vote from 38.

The authority of 1943 carried over until 1945, when, dramatically, and by a single Representative's strategic use of parliamentary law, the whole course of the committee's career took a new turning.

Request for Investigation of RFC Transactions With Pickering Lumber Co.

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the California War Memorial Park Association, a nonprofit organization, which was formed in 1948 for the purpose of preserving the magnificent sugar pines and sequoias of Tuolumne County, dedicating them to the American war dead of World War II, is slowly but surely reaching its objective.

The membership of the association, which reads like a who's who, has had the wholehearted support of the press. The Los Angeles and San Francisco Examiners, Los Angeles Herald-Express, Los Angeles Times, Los Angeles Daily News, Sacramento Bee, Sacramento Union, Fresno Bee, San Francisco Call-Bulletin, San Francisco Daily News, and many other newspapers have editorialized in favor of this project.

There are 1,967 acres involved, 369 of which are termed the largest and most beautiful sugar pines in the world. Such noted conservationists as Frederick Law Olmsted, Harold Ickes, and Willard Van Name claim it will be a forest disaster if this area is logged for commercial purposes.

Governor Warren, of California, has continuously supported the association's objective, which calls for Federal and State cooperation. The California State Assembly and the California congressional delegation have urged that this unsurpassed forest be saved and dedicated to our war dead.

The opposition comes from the Pickering Lumber Co., owner of the land. This company would rather log these giant sugar pines for commercial purposes, despite the fact that the 369 acres is only a fraction of the vast holdings of this company within Tuolumne County where the trees are located.

The United States Forest Service has agreed to exchange Federal-owned lumber for this 369 acres so the area may be preserved, but Pickering continues to resist.

The history of the Pickering Lumber Co. is very interesting. In 1934, the company was practically bankrupt. In 1936 it received a $2,500,000 loan from the RFC.

Shortly thereafter the company was reorganized and three new members appeared on the board of directors. One of these, Mr. Ben Johnson, was special assistant to Jesse Jones in RFC in 1936 when the company received the loan. Another new member of the board of directors was J. M. Kemper, who was chairman of the advisory committee of the RFC in Missouri. The third new member of the board in 1938 was A. A.

Calkins, who was manager of the RFC in San Francisco when the loan was made.

Poor's Standard Corporation Records of 1948 lists among other assets of the Pickering Lumber Co. 83,000 acres of uncut timber lands in California.

In the belief that other interesting facts would come to light if Senator Fulbright's committee investigates the RFC transactions with the Pickering Lumber Co., I am today formally requesting Senator FULBRIGHT to investigate the interesting series of transactions which resulted in three former high officials of the RFC transferring their vocation from that of RFC employees to that of controlling officers of the Pickering Lumber Co.

It seems very strange that a company which has benefited so greatly from the use of RFC public funds should wage such a strenuous campaign to prevent the people of California from establishing a State and Federal park dedicated to the deceased veterans of World War II.

On July 26, 1949, the Senate passed Senate bill 1871, by Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, the purpose of which was to prevent RFC officials from resigning from the RFC and accepting employment with a corporation which had benefited from their official actions as loaning agents.

I regret to say that this bill has not as yet been reported from the House Banking and Currency Committee. In my opinion, it should be reported and passed before the end of this session of Congress.

JULY 20, 1950.

Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing a copy of the remarks which I expect to deliver today, July 20, on the floor of the House of Representatives.

These remarks contain pertinent information regarding an RFC transaction which I believe will be of special interest to your committee which is now engaged in investigating this type of procedure.

The information contained in my remarks came to me as a result of my 17 months' fight to preserve the last primeval forest of sugar pines in the world as a memorial park for the deceased veterans of World War II.

The Pickering Lumber Co. owns the land which the State of California seeks to acquire by cash purchase and exchange of national-forest lands pursuant to a Federal act which was passed in 1909 enabling such exchanges. The Pickering Lumber Co. has opposed in various ways the acquisition of this property.

In view of the fact that the proposed park acquisition contains the finest primeval stand of sugar pines in the world, and the further fact that the company has planned to cut these trees down in the near future, the members of the California congressional delegation who are interested in this matter believe that an expeditious investigation would be of value, both in saving the trees and in disclosing the means by which the property involved was originally acquired by its present owners, I respectfully request your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

CHET HOLIFIELD,
Member of Congress.

Stalin Blackmail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SID SIMPSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Macomb (Ill.) Daily Journal:

STALIN BLACKMAIL

It is reliably reported that Joe Stalin is favorable to negotiating an end to hostilities in China and that his price is acceptance of Communist China as a member of the UN permanent Security Council. If this is the proposition it has to be put down as blackmail.

There is no proper connection between the Communist assault on the Korean Republic and the Chinese Communists' claim to a UN seat. Negotiating with Stalin on such a basis would inevitably suggest to him that future ventures in aggression might be equally profitable. The western world can hardly afford to establish the precedent of paying him to be good.

The Stalin attitude right now is of far less importance than the attitude of the 52 nations which were called upon by Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations, to support United States armed action with more than token forces.

A deep silence followed Lie's urgent appeal. Not one of the nations which are morally and legally bound to assume a full share of responsibility in Korea are meeting that responsibility.

Selfishness and cowardice are apparently causing them to pass by the one great opportunity they have had to give some meaning to the term collective security.

If there is an apparent unwillingness on the part of practically all of the UN members to support their pledges in behalf of world peace and order, Stalin will be encouraged to employ blackmail. He will also know that future ventures in aggression will not be very risky.

The chances of stopping him cold would be very good if all of the world, except his satellite states, were all at once arraigned against him; against him not in empty debate but upon the battlefield he chose.

Republican Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an excellent article on Republican foreign policy by Raymond Moley:

[From Newsweek Magazine of July 24, 1950]

REPUBLICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(By Raymond Moley)

A congressional election is at hand, in which the minds of voters will be heavily laden with thoughts of the conflict in the Far East. Republican leaders approach the election with confidence that they can and should make important gains. At the moment, their most serious problem is whether to present a positive foreign policy of their own or to limit themselves to mere criticism of the faulty Truman course of action. In either case, they would fully support the President in his Korean police war.

The reasons why it seems to me that the Republicans should present a positive program of their own are:

1. Democratic strategy already shows that the party line will, in this campaign as in those of the past 10 years, seek to smear Republicans for their voting record in Congress. An example of this is the charge that Republicans voted against Korean aid.

2. Republicans have a crushing answer to this. The record shows that the objection of Republicans, notably in the House, to Korean aid was that they wanted real military aid, and the administration proposed civilian aid such as fertilizer, farm machinery, etc. A year ago, five Republicans on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Messrs. CHIPERFIELD, SMITH, JACKSON, LODGE, and VORYS, issued a warning in which they predicted almost exactly the tragic current events. This fell on deaf ears, for again, in January, the administration presented a request only for civilian aid. At that time, JUDD of the same committee, in an off-the-record House speech solemnly warned that economic assistance would not help without military aid. On Formosa, Republicans were right 6 months ago. On China generally, they have been issuing warnings for years. In the whole course of the past 5 or 6 years Republicans have an excellent record on foreign affairs.

3. Republican foreign policy for a century has marked out the Pacific as our legitimate sphere of defense. Under Republican Presidents and Secretaries of State, Alaska, Hawaii, and the Philippines were acquired. A great navy was urged by T. R. There is a legitimate historical reason to expect the Republican Party to offer leadership now as in the past.

4. Bipartisanship in foreign affairs has dwindled down to little or nothing.

5. Above all, the country needs and demands from someone a clear definition of a proper and honorable course in the perils ahead.

Space prohibits a full delineation of what a Republican foreign policy should contain. A few points will show the direction.

1. In the peripheral struggle, of which Korea and Hawaii are two of the danger spots, aggression must be resisted with major force. We must draw the line of our vital concern for the peace of the world and the limits of aggression.

2. We must, with all speed, reverse the fatal policy of reducing Germany and Japan to industrial and military impotence.

3. In case of aggression, the UN should initially declare resistance. We shall have to provide major force, but there must be actual material force added by every peace-loving nation.

4. We must keep faith with the Atlantic community and within reason maintain Marshall aid.

5. There must be more than a mere Voice of America thrust into the vitals of the satellites and Russia. The printed word and picture must also go everywhere within the iron curtain to sow the seeds of discontent and resistance. A powerful and daring agency of political penetration must be created, not under the State Department. Such an innovation, however distasteful to Americans, is required by an unprecedented situation.

6. Meanwhile, we must work directly for peace by every effort to wrest from our Communist enemy acknowledgment of the futility and catastrophe of general war.

7. We must by word and deed prove that we want no aggrandizement, no new territory, no unfair advantage, no imperialism—only a prosperous and peaceful world.

Here are a few elements in a possible and constructive Republican foreign policy. American voters should have the opportunity to pass upon such a program.

Comment on Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Press of Farmington, Mo., entitled "Comment on Korea":

COMMENT ON KOREA

Once again our country is paying the heavy initiation fee of a democracy in war. The United States, by her very nature, is never really ready for war in the sense that her present and past enemies have been. The present Communist aggressors in Korea and their backers in the Soviet Union have gone through the years of comparative peace since the end of World War II in what we would term a heavy war economy, building and maintaining a big military establishment and jockeying for advantage and position in their eventual planned world conquest. Now with the element of surprise apparently very heavy on their side, our enemies have gotten the jump on us and are administering the military setbacks that we have come to associate with our early months of war. The overwhelming force of military might which is ours when we have had time to muster our men and produce our weapons is but a shadow in the early bitter weeks when the knowing enemy is driving for a knockout before this force he fears can be brought to bear. Such is the case in Korea.

We have always had our timid souls who fear the worst, doubt our ability to hit back in the last battle, the one that really counts. A few of these "sad sacks" are sounding off now but they are few and those who pay any heed to their hysterical walls are fewer. Without being smug and complacent about it, the average American knows our capabilities in war from the record of past performances and is not put in despair by the present situation in Korea. Our present losses in the holding action are severe as is always the case when a force inferior in numbers and equipment tries to halt a superior force. It is a bitter experience for a nation, the most powerful in the world, to be pushed around this way, but the final battles are yet to come and it is quite likely that even the enemy has a haunting fear of what the outcome will be.

Critics are outspoken about the comparative weakness of our forces now in battle, their lack of adequate equipment, the failure of our forces to anticipate the attack, the failure of our proteges, the South Korean Army, the inability of Air Force and naval units to halt the aggression by their action alone, the failure to date of other United Nations forces to take more part in the action, etc. While criticism has its bounds of usefulness, especially in wartime, it is a part of democratic way and perhaps a source of our ultimate strength. Behind the enemy lines all voices blend in praise of the efforts of the leadership—or else. With all of this criticism, which is a very natural procedure to us, we are united in the over-all effort in a way that the aggressors have underestimated before to their downfall.

While at the moment the hot war is a small and confined one despite the alarm, it is but a part of a huge one, the other fronts of which are cold for the moment. A show of force such as we have now undertaken may prevent the cold fronts from blazing and enveloping the world in a full-scale job. That is our aim at the moment. It is now time to prepare fully for what might happen if the Korea war should spread. The initial cost of democratic unreadiness in Korea could be greatly magnified if transferred over the other fronts where tougher opposition than the North Koreans are waiting for the word "go."

Excerpts From Address of Mohamed Kamil Abdul Rahim, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Egypt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to insert and extend my remarks into the RECORD, and to include therein excerpts from an address made by the Egyptian Ambassador to the United States, Mohamed Kamil Abdul Rahim, at a recent round-table discussion at the School of Oriental Studies and Literatures at Princeton University. Others who participated in the discussion were Dr. Charles Malik, of Lebanon, and Ambassador Genni, of Iran. The subject was: What the Near East Expects of the United States.

Ambassador Rahim made an excellent presentation of the near-eastern viewpoint. His plea for an understanding near-eastern policy has the endorsement of many of us here in the Congress. We certainly need a Government policy that will maintain the good will and friendship of the Near East.

Now, with our forces participating in actual armed conflict in the Far East, it should be a warning to us to prepare for similar pressures against non-Communist areas in other parts of the world.

The speech of Ambassador Rahim, made on May 26, constituted a timely warning, as later events have so definitely proved:

The keen interest in the Near East manifested by this country in recent years, is most reassuring to those of us who are anxious to preserve the integrity of the area, and encourage closer cooperation between it and the United States. This great university has been a pioneer in stimulating interest in, and disseminating information about, that important area. It blazed the trail many years ago when it established the department of oriental languages and literatures, under the able direction of Prof. Philip Hitti, and is continuing the good work by holding meetings like this, and giving spokesmen of the Near East an opportunity to talk to the American people.

I am not going to dwell at length on the importance of this area to the world and especially to the United States, but we all know that there is more than one reason why America should interest itself in the Near East. The area comprises over 1,500,000 square miles and has a total population of nearly 100,000,000 people.

It is rich in natural resources, and has one of the world's largest oil pools.

Its strategic importance has always been recognized, and was amply demonstrated during the last two World Wars. Centrally located where Asia, Europe, and Africa meet, it has always been the goal of conquerors, the highway of nations, and the meeting place of east and west. Its three straits, the Dardanelles, the Suez Canal, and Bab El Mandeb, which greatly reduce the distance between continents, as well as nations, have always been the envy of maritime countries. Its airports are today greatly prized by the air fleets of the world.

Geographically, economically, strategically, and politically, this area is one of the most important in the world. But ironically enough, it is one of the most politically neglected areas of the world by the western democracies.

For generations Russia has been attempting to gain an outlet to the Mediterranean, the world's central sea. The drive for this outlet, and for the strategic Near East, is now at its height.

For the Soviet the Near East area is most prized because it is highly vulnerable not only from the military point of view, but also from the economic and political, and worse still, from the psychological points of view.

The resources of the Near East remain largely underdeveloped. The distribution of wealth is the most inequitable and the standard of living is the lowest in the world.

Over and above, it has 1,000,000 refugees; 2 years have passed and the refugee problem there has not been solved. These unfortunates are still living in tents and caves and are dependent on others for support.

The refugees do not only present an economic problem, but also constitute a grave danger to the stability and security of the Near East. They offer a fertile ground for Communist propaganda.

From the military point of view the Near East is most vulnerable. Let us bear in mind that the Near East is the only area which borders directly on Soviet Russia. Western Europe is separated from the Soviet Union by Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, and Bulgaria. Southeast Asia is separated from Soviet Russia by China. The Near East has 2,500 miles of direct frontiers with the U. S. S. R. Such frontiers are considered by military strategists as the easiest and the weakest that can be attacked by the Soviet Union in time of war. These experts say that troops and motorized forces can dash down from Azerbaijan in Iran, down to Iraq and the Syrian Desert to the rich oil fields of the Persian Gulf and the Arabian Peninsula, and in less than a week they would be on the shores of the Suez Canal. They could thus outflank Turkey and leave Bulgaria and Rumania to keep the Turkish Army busy.

The Communists have been shrewd enough to recognize all these facts: The importance and the vulnerability of the Near East. Since the last war they have been working hard to infiltrate through this area, using the most poisonous weapons of their Communist propaganda. I am afraid they are finding a very fertile soil. Many factors have helped the Communists in their damaging propaganda in the Near East, but, believe me, one of their strongest allies is the policy hitherto followed by the western democracies in the Near East.

Let us survey the policy actually followed by the western democracies. What would we see? A great political importance is at-

tached to western Europe. Political importance is now attached to southeast Asia after the Communist thrust of China. Economic aid is also offered to southeast Asia. We hear of western Europe, Latin-American policy, southeast Asian policy, but we would like to hear of a totally homogeneous, strong and just near eastern policy. I foresee a great tragedy looming on the near eastern horizon. Are we waiting for a similar tragedy such as that of China to pay some attention to this troubled area of the Near East? Isn't it wiser that immediate steps be taken by western democracies to remedy this danger before it takes the form of a lamentable tragedy?

All who are well acquainted with the Near East view with concern, regret, and dismay, that clouds are gathering and that an outburst may take place at any time.

Go to the Near East now, take a trip through Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Palestine, and you will sense that there is a feeling of frustration, resentment, and disappointment. You will find what is more dangerous—a feeling of impending trouble fills the air. The causes are not hard to seek.

Briefly, the causes of this charged atmosphere are:

First, the great injustice inflicted on Arab countries in Palestine.

Second, the problem of a million refugees stemming from that conflict.

And, last but not least, the failure of the British to evacuate their forces from Egypt and Iraq and reach an agreement with Egypt regarding its natural and inalienable right of unity with the Sudan.

These problems, weighing upon the Near East, are the real disturbing factors in the politics of that area and the real causes of Arab grievances. These are the deadly weapons used by Communists.

These causes are mainly responsible for the strides which communism is making there. That communism has made strides in the Near East is obvious. I need only remind you of the most subversive Communist propaganda exploiting the miseries of the refugees, the recent activities of the Tudeh Party in Iran, the public declarations of leaders in one Arab country, and the introduction of resolutions in the parliament of another, advocating a reorientation of foreign policy and better relations with Russia.

You may ask what the people of the Near East expect? If you seek a near easterner he will answer you: "We expect nothing. The sad experience of the past injustices taught us to expect nothing and to depend on ourselves to help ourselves with our rugged tools, so with sweat, blood, and tears we shall muddle through and do our utmost best to solve by ourselves our own problems."

Someone might say: "Let us give them technical assistance. Let us give them facilities of the point 4 program. Let us develop these countries economically and raise the standard of living of the population." I assure you we are badly in need of all this and we welcome it, but we people of the Near East are more in need of something more important, something more essential and life-giving; that is to say, justice and a straightforward foreign policy from our friends.

What the people of the Near East expect and need more than anything else is that western powers give their problems a certain degree of political priority; that the United States of America have a real political leadership in the Near East, as it has in other parts of the world. If you give the Near East technical assistance and any amount of dollars, which they are badly in need of, while neglecting their basic and most important political problems, you are doing exactly what the Sultan's daughter did when she found the populace demonstrating and clamoring for bread. She exclaimed, "Why don't they eat cake?"

For the Near East solution, and the early solution, of political problems is most urgent. A just solution of the Palestine problem, as well as the early evacuation of British troops from Egypt and Iraq, and the realization of the unity of Egypt and Sudan are more important to the Arabs and should come ahead of technical, economic, or cultural aid.

What the near eastern people expect and need is a political and foreign policy based on justice and put into effect immediately.

What the near eastern people want and need is that the western democracies realize before it is too late the danger inherent in the political negligence of the Near East. They expect to see America assume a real and just political leadership in the Near East. They expect that if this policy is taken up by the United States it should be, unlike the past American policy in Palestine, a policy based on justice and the genuine aspirations of the people.

I think the time has come for the west to realize the urgency and the gravity of the situation in the Near East, and to try to understand the psychology of its people, and apply to them the democratic principles which they uphold everywhere else.

It is useless to try to get us to sell our birthrights for a mess of pottage. We believe that man does not live by bread alone.

How To Lose a War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the present crisis in Korea is momentous. It presents the leaders of our Nation, especially those in the armed services, with their first major test since the establishment of the Department of National Defense. As widely recognized by students of world affairs, this test has tremendous implications, not yet clearly discerned, which may affect not only the life of our own country for many years to come but also that of the entire world. Their magnitude requires that the Government be alert to the dangers so well developed during the hearings before the House Committee on Armed Services in October 1949 and in the report of its findings.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 18, 1949, before the start of the indicated hearings, I commented at some length on the important subject of "A Balanced Military Policy for the United States," and included in my remarks an instructive article by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, one of the Nation's most outstanding soldiers.

Another informative paper on the broad questions of future military policy by the distinguished military authority and critic, Maj. George Fielding Eliot, was published in the United States Naval Institute Proceedings, July 1950, volume 76, No. 7, pages 707 to 714. In this, Major Eliot analyzes the lessons of history with respect to the organization and leadership of the armed forces of several great powers in what is a most timely and valuable contribution to the literature on that subject. The article carries the following biographical sketch of its author:

An officer in the Australian Imperial Force, 1914–18, and in the Military Intelligence Reserve, United States Army, 1922–30, Major Eliot is internationally known as a writer and lecturer on military and naval affairs. Author of seven volumes of studies, he contributes a weekly column, running in 18 newspapers, and was a lecturer at the United States Naval War College in 1942 and again in 1948.

To make Major Eliot's study more readily available to the Congress, other agencies of the Government, and the country at large, under leave granted, I am extending my remarks to include its full text:

HOW TO LOSE A WAR

(By George Fielding Eliot)

There are two military ideas which this Nation should avoid as it would avoid the plague:

1. The single military boss or super chief of staff.

2. The single military concept—the freezing of thought and effort by adopting one chosen means of maintaining the national security to the exclusion of others.

We are in some danger of being eased into accepting the first idea and in very great danger of drifting into acceptance of the second. These are very real dangers, indeed.

Congress came perilously close to enacting the super-chief-of-staff idea into law during the recent discussion of the Tydings amendments to the National Security Act, and pressure for this plan still continues with undiminished zeal.

As for the single concept of war, both public and congressional opinion seem fascinated by the theory that all we really need is a strong strategic Air Force and a large stockpile of atomic bombs, which will dispose of any possible enemy neatly and quickly should the necessity arise.

To accept either of these ideas would virtually assure our defeat if we have to fight another war.

This is no off-the-cuff opinion. It is the evidence of all modern military history—all available experience.

Rather than argue the pros and cons of these proposals on their merits, this article will merely seek to review the record, and to show what has happened to states which drew their military policy from a single source, unchecked and unbalanced, or which allowed their strategy to be frozen in a single concept of war, narrowing their strategic vision until they had no chance of dealing with the unexpected.

Without any exception whatever, during the three or four centuries of modern military history, nations with completely separate armies and navies, and in consequence with two sets of coequal military advisers for their governments, have invariably been successful in war against nations with one-man military leadership. The same is true as to three sets of advisers when in very recent years air power has assumed a separate stature.

Further, nations which have adopted or had foisted upon them a single, exclusive concept of war have invariably been defeated when faced by changed conditions or by an enemy who declined the role established for him in the concept.

Arguments in favor of the single chief or the single concept, when analyzed, always turn out either to be pure guesswork as to what the next war is going to be like, or conjecture as to how such-and-such a particular phase of the last war might have been handled better—if this-and-that had been done—a type of argument which can never be susceptible of definite proof.

To repeat—the whole of the established experience of modern military history warns us that both the single military chief and the single concept of war—which frequently go hand in hand, of course—are the forerunners of defeats.

The period of "modern military history" may be assumed to begin when war at sea became distinct in its strategy, its tactics and its techniques from war on land. This period begins with the development of the science of navigation, the invention of the cannon, and the improvement of the sailing ship to the point where long cruises and fleet maneuvers under sail became practicable. These are the signposts which mark the dividing line between the period where all warfare consisted in bringing armed men together for hand to hand conflict, whether on land or on the decks of rowing galleys, and the period when sea warfare became a distinct and separate activity, requiring the experience of a lifetime for its competent direction, and bringing into being the professional naval officer as its specialist.

This period of modern military history may be divided further into two parts: preair and postair. The second part is, of course, that during which air warfare has likewise assumed a separate and distinct status, with the professional air officer as its specialist.

Let us reflect upon the lessons of experience during these centuries. For this purpose the most graphic method of illustration is to take history on a national basis.

1. Great Britain has had separate military and naval establishments since Tudor times. The War Office and the Admiralty have generally been coequals in advising the Government on military policy. A separate air force was established in 1916. During this period Great Britain has lost only one war, the War of the American Revolution, and then chiefly because her ministers were so hopelessly inept as to permit her Navy to fall into decay, with the consequent temporary loss of command of the sea which led to the defeat of Cornwallis at Yorktown. During this period, Great Britain has on six occasions fought against adversaries which in whole or in part had adopted the single military chief or the single concept of war, or both. These were the Spain of Philip II, the France of Louis XIV (especially during the ascendancy of Louvois as Minister of War), the Napoleonic empire, the Russia of Nicholas I (Crimean War), the Germany of the Hohenzollerns, and the Germany of Hitler. On all these occasions Britain was victorious. In the 1947 reorganization, in which the War Office, the Admiralty and the Air Ministry were reduced from cabinet to subcabinet rank under a single Minister of Defense, the three chiefs of staff, army, navy, and air, continued to have joint responsibility for providing the government with military advice. Sweeping through the postwar reorganization of the British military system is the idea of having a single super-chief-of-staff has not been even seriously considered.

2. France, as Admiral Abrial remarks in the Revue de la Défense National, has been two periods of one-man military control—"that of Louvois, and that of Napoleon. The result of the one was La Hogue, of the other Trafalgar. These names are also prominent in English history, but to the English they are names of victories. It did not occur to the English people to place Nelson, for example, under Wellington's command, or vice versa."

Of course command in a given theater of operations is not here under discussion—the single commander in chief for a task whose dimensions have been previously determined is now generally accepted as necessary. But command in the field is a very different matter from the formulation of high strategy in its relation to national policy as a whole. It is in this field that all experience shows the single military chief and the single concept of war to be so pernicious.

In French history, the classic example of this universal rule is certainly that of Napoleon, than whom perhaps no greater master of war on land has ever lived. But, as Maj. Gen. C. E. Callwell observes (Military Operations and Maritime Preponderance) "in spite of his marvelous grasp of facts, his close study of details, and of his genius for adapting his objects and purposes to meet the conditions which presented themselves to him, [he] never mastered the secrets of the element which proved his undoing." In the words of Jurien de la Gravière, "but one thing was wanting to the victor of Austerlitz—le sentiment exact des difficultés de la marine." He would not permit his naval leaders that voice in his military policy which alone could have saved his empire. His imperious temper rejected advice and would brook no contradiction.

Napoleon's own Maxims of War make very clear his lack of understanding of naval warfare. "The art of land warfare," he writes, "is an art of genius, of inspiration. On the sea nothing is genius or inspiration, everything is positive or empiric. The admiral needs only one science, that of navigation. The general needs all of the sciences, or a talent which is equivalent to all; that of profiting by all experience and all knowledge. An admiral needs to divine nothing; he knows where the enemy is, and his strength. * * * He has no reconnaissance to make, no field of battle to study. * * * An admiral has personal influence only over the crew of his flagship." And this from a man who had Nelson for an opponent.

So believing, Napoleon continued to send fleets to sea which were composed of good ships, but with inexperienced admirals, unskilled captains, and half-trained crews. The result, in the end, was the ruin of all his hopes. Cut off from overseas supplies and trade, he could only continue to seek expansion of his empire by land, and so eventually exhausted the resources of France.

How sharp is the contrast between Napoleon's attitude toward naval war and that, a century earlier, of Britain's great general, the Duke of Marlborough, when his influence was for a time paramount in British military policy. Perceiving the need for the firm establishment of British sea power in the western Mediterranean, he was yet, in all his letters on the subject, as Callwell has written, "studiously careful not to express opinions on technical naval matters, or to assume an attitude which might offend the susceptibilities of the naval chiefs." Quotations from Marlborough's correspondence are illuminating: "There is no one but admits the necessity of having a winter squadron in the Mediterranean, but when all is said and done we must submit to the judgment of the admirals and sea officers on the safety of the port and other accommodations."—"All the orders that can be given in England must be entirely subservient to the judgment of the fleet."—"The sea service is not so easily managed as that of land. There are many more precautions to be taken, and you and I are not capable of judging them."

This is the mind of a man whose experience of military command was one long unbroken record of victory, who knew no retreat from Moscow and no Waterloo. Yet there would be few military students who would assert that, as a general, Marlborough was Napoleon's superior.

French history contains another, more recent example of the single military concept which may be usefully examined—the so-called Maginot idea, which dominated French military policy between the two world wars and which was originally conceived not by Maginot but by Paul Painleve, his predecessor as Minister of War, and by Marshal Philippe Pétain.

The heart of the Maginot idea was static defense, depending on a series of permanently fortified areas on the Franco-German frontier with carefully prepared fields of fire, into which the enemy was to be lured and there destroyed. Behind it was the almost mystical insistence of Pétain, supported by the legend of Verdun. Pétain's motto, "Fire kills," became the military dogma of the French people, eager to lie in safety behind a wall and to shrug off the burdens of military responsibility. The vast expenditures on the Maginot forts absorbed a great part of the French military budget. The term of military service was reduced from 2 years to one on the plausible theory that the forts would give plenty of time for the mobilization of the reserves. The number of first-line divisions went down from the 42 of 1914 to 20, and these had the heart cut out of them by the lack of the second-year men who had been the leavening bulwark of the old French Army. While a respectable naval establishment was kept up, the air force dwindled away until it was all but worthless.

"The dogmatized defensive theory based on fire power," writes Edward M. Earle (The Makers of Modern Strategy) "was finally reduced to a credo and published by General Chauvineau in a book which obtained great popularity, because it summed up the Maginot mentality, the defense doctrine, and helped to confirm Frenchmen in their cherished illusion about a comfortable war in which fire power would consume the legions of the enemy and protect the French Army in its impregnable fortifications. What the fire power doctrine and the Maginot mentality really did to the French Army was to petrify the tactical and strategic lessons gained from the World War, kill imagination and initiative, and nullify the efforts of those who believed in the offensive and tried to make something out of the only positive element in the French military doctrine—the idea of elastic defense. The brilliant innovators like de Gaulle, the air expert Rougeron, Generals Velpry and Doumenc and their spokesmen in Parliament, Paul Reynaud and his group, hurled their arguments in vain against this Chinese wall of prejudice."

Confronted by an enemy who declined to conform to the preconceived idea, who devised an unforeseen strategy and the tactical means to execute it, the defense of France collapsed in a 6 weeks' holocaust.

There is no better illustration than this of one of the gravest failings of the single military concept—that it stakes the existence of the state which adopts it on an attempt to foresee the unforeseeable. It abandons flexibility, substitutes dogma for healthy growth, and assumes that neither technical and scientific advance nor the devices of the enemy can overcome the present wisdom of its managers. It attracts to itself men whose reputations and careers are staked upon it, and who can, alas, be proven wrong only in the very presence of disaster—when it may be too late, as it was for France. And like Pétain and Gamelin in France, such men become increasingly deaf to all opinions which do not coincide with their own, increasingly inclined to treat as insubordination any expression of a differing view, and increasingly clothed with power to silence criticism as their pet idea takes hold on a public mind which is always seeking for simple answers to complex problems, for something plain folks can understand and believe in—and for a bloodless and painless method of achieving victory in war.

Moreover, in these days when the adoption of such a concept means its translation into a vast program of industrial production, absorbing the lion's share of any budget that can conceivably be available in peacetime, its errors even when perceived cannot be quickly corrected. It is possible that with greater fighting spirit and will to resist, the French might have corrected their Maginot error in time to check the German onset

somewhere behind the frontier. It is far from likely that today any state which commits itself to a similar error will be granted time for a second try.

(3) Germany. Military thought in Germany has always been dominated by the army. Indeed before the creation of the German Empire in 1871, no German state had possessed a real fighting navy. The rise of the great German navy under Wilhelm II was a purely synthetic creation, opposed and later ignored by the haughty general staff which went right ahead with its plans and with the opening operations of World War I, almost as though the navy did not exist. The navy (at first) fought its own separate war more or less under the personal direction of the Kaiser, who interfered with and limited the authority of his admirals as he never dared to do with Hindenburg or Ludendorff.

"The great naval program," writes A. J. P. Taylor (The Course of German History), "was carried through at the prompting of the navy league (itself subsidized by heavy industry and secretly guided by Tirpitz and the navy department) and carried through against the will both of the foreign office and the general staff." As a result, we are told by Captain Von Bohnen and Commander Mohr, "During the years of expansion up to the beginning of the world war, the tremendous organizing, technical and political activity under Tirpitz used up all the best force of the navy. It did not permit the admiralty staff to gain any importance. The most difficult task that ever confronted a naval command was to wage war against the greatest sea power on earth, without sufficient authority."

The navy which resulted from this program was far too strong and too expensive to be a mere North Sea covering force for the army's right flank (as which the general staff contemptuously dismissed it) and far too weak to contest the command of the sea with the stronger and more favorably located British fleet. Sound naval judgment, had it been heard in the higher realms of German military planning, would doubtless have suggested from the first that British sea-borne supplies were the sole useful target for German naval effort, and the submarine the sole available weapon for attacking them. As it was, the submarine effort was begun too late, and when it was pushed to extremes in the vain attempt to make up for lost time, brought final ruin to Germany by drawing the United States into the war.

Hitler went farther than merely shunting naval opinion to one side. He created the Oberkommando der Wehrmacht, a supreme command for all the armed forces of Germany, with himself as commander in chief and with a superchief of staff (an army general, of course) immediately under him. Under this chief of staff were commanders in chief for each of the three branches—army, navy, and air. This was the organization with which Germany fought World War II.

The result was a first-rate army, a second-rate air force, which was never quite equal to its responsibilities except against a weak or irresolute enemy, and a navy which, like the Kaiser's, was divided between costly surface ships which the all-highest was reluctant to risk for reasons of prestige, and a submarine fleet which if it had been stronger by the money and material wasted on useless battleships might have accomplished much more than it did. No one who has read the curious record of the Fuehrer conference on military policy and the conduct of the war, or Admiral Doenitz' piteous pleas for cooperation between submarines and long-range aircraft, can fail to realize how dangerously near Germany might have come to winning the war if in its planning and in the conduct of its operations, the army, navy, and air chiefs had stood on an equal footing, and if the head of the state had listened to their advice with an open mind. But he remained the prisoner of the single concept.

It is grimly amusing, in the light of the outcome, to read the words of Colonel Blau, written in the German military yearbook for 1939: "Even in times of peace, a single military authority is preferable. In total war, which requires the complete cooperation of separate resources, it is an absolute necessity. With the example of Germany before them, it is rather difficult to understand how the democracies can fail to perceive the overwhelming importance of this military truism."

With the example of Germany before them, it is to be hoped that the democracies will continue to perceive the demonstrated superiority of their own tried and proven system.

(4) Russia. In Russia, as in Germany, the navy has always been in an inferior position to the army, especially as regards influence on high policy. To this fact must be attributed in large part the uphappy record of the Russian Navy, which has few indeed of the traditions of victory.

Russian military policy has been dominated ever since the days of Peter the Great by a single military concept—defense in depth, yielding territory to gain time and wear down the enemy. This policy succeeded against Napoleon and Hitler; it failed against Japan and Hohenzollern Germany. Analysis shows that it succeeded only in wars which were purely land wars, in which sea power was not seriously involved. In the Napoleonic campaign the Baltic was controlled by the British Fleet; Hitler's fleet in 1941–45 was not strong enough to be a factor. But the Imperial German Navy was a powerful instrument in the later stages of the German advance into Russia in 1916–17, and the Russo-Japanese War was one in which military and naval factors were of roughly equal importance. It should further be noted that the Russians lost a "limited liability" war in the Crimea in 1854–56, chiefly because (with all the strategic advantages heart could wish) they were not prepared to contest the mastery of the Black Sea with the allied navies. The Russian admiral, after his victory over the Turks at Sinope, could think of nothing better to do with his ships than to sink them to block the harbor mouth and land his men and guns to help hold the forts. When Russia was chained to the defensive concept she was defeated.

The Russo-Japanese War provides an excellent case history. At the outset of that war, in 1904, the Russian naval dispositions were dominated by the idea of the Fortress Fleet, a direct outgrowth of the defensive concept. Unwarned by the experience of the Crimea, it was still considered that each maritime fortress should have a number of warships attached to it to contribute to its defense. Thus the fleet was made to serve the base instead of the base serving the fleet—as though the defense of bases, rather than command of the sea, were the object of having a navy. This idea was not concurred in by many accomplished naval officers. "The Russian Naval General Staff," says Mahan, "clamored for command of the sea, but in influence upon the Government, the responsible director and formulator of policy, it did not possess due weight." The idea of concentrating naval forces to obtain sea command "not having been adequately grasped—whether from neglect, or because the opposite factor of the Fortress Fleet was already in possession of men's minds—was never able to secure expression in the national plans." As a result, the available Russian naval forces were not only divided between the Baltic and Pacific stations, but those in the Pacific, on the eve of war with Japan, were divided between the two naval bases of Port Arthur and Vladivostok.

The Japanese Army and Navy were separate forces of equal standing and authority. The concentrated power of the Japanese Fleet, used in accordance with correct naval principles, destroyed the three Russian squadrons in detail, making possible the victories of the Japanese Army in Manchuria and before Port Arthur.

The Russian Navy (third in strength in the world in 1904) never recovered from the blow. In World Wars I and II, it operated, with a few ill-provided ships, as a flank guard for the Russian armies, being divided between the Baltic and Black Seas.

As for the Russian Air Force, during World War II, it operated as a branch of the Red army, and was in consequence limited throughout the war to the functions of tactical support and reconnaissance for ground troops, plus air defense for localities. It undertook virtually no strategic bombing or other independent operations. Soviet naval aviation was nonexistent to all intents and purposes; the Soviet Navy has not yet, as far as is known, produced an aircraft carrier.

We have reviewed the history of the four principal military states of modern times, exclusive of the United States. We find that whenever a state with a dual or triple system of military planning has fought a state with a single military chief, the former has been victorious. We find that the single concept of war twice brought defeat to Germany and twice to France, and that it has likewise brought defeat to Russia more often than victory—the latter only when the enemy conformed to what was expected of him and sea power was not seriously involved.

But what of our own experience?

We have always fought with a separate Army and Navy, each represented on equal basis in our highest councils, and we have never been defeated.

In the last war, we assured coordination of effort by creating the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a group having collective responsibility for the military conduct of our war effort. This body was in turn joined with the similar British group to form the Combined Chiefs of Staff, with representatives of the British Chiefs sitting permanently in Washington.

Napoleon's scornful dictum, "You cannot make war with a committee," was disproved for all time. The Anglo-American war effort, from the moment this system came into effect to the very end, produced one unbroken series of victories. It is possible in reviewing the work of the combined or Joint Chiefs of Staff, to argue that on this or that occasion better results would have been obtained if a minority opinion had been adopted instead of the decision actually taken. But it is not possible for any thinking reviewer to assert that in any phase of the war it would have been better to have had one-man rule. In the first place no one man could have borne the physical burden, and in the second it is obvious that a better average of success was obtained by the interplay of several minds.

A system of military planning and high command which successfully faced the interlocking problems of a two-front war and achieved victory on both fronts, bringing the Japanese Empire to utter collapse, knocking Italy out of the war and contributing materially to the defeat of Germany, without a single major defeat or unsuccessful campaign, is a system not lightly to be laid aside by the American people as they face the heavy responsibilities of the future.

When the development of weapons and techniques is proceeding as rapidly as it is now and when we add to this the complete uncertainty as to when, and under what conditions, we may next have to fight, and against what sort of enemy, the danger of the single concept—and therefore of the single directing military mind—becomes glaringly apparent. If all experience warns us against it, we may today add to that warning the dictates of ordinary common sense.

Yet we Americans are at this moment in great danger of adopting the single concept—the atomic concept—as the cure-all and end-all of our military problems. This is an attempt to escape responsibility, to evade the hard work of thinking things

through, to provide a panacea for our military anxieties. It is not by chance that it is the isolationist press which cries most loudly for more atomic bombs and a bigger Air Force so as to get away from the need of supporting allies across the sea. Instinctively recoiling from the acceptance of distant responsibilities, they fall back on something which they think they can understand and seek in it a security which will prove as false as the Maginot security in which the French people rejoiced for a few years and on which they wasted their national substance.

In the field of actual military planning, the same tendency is to be perceived in those who champion the idea of a single Chief of Staff. Let us end the bickerings and disagreements of our three Chiefs of Staff, it is urged, by appointing one man to tell them all what to do. As though that would answer the question of what sort of military policy is best designed to serve this Nation's needs. The idea is escapist rather than constructive. No officer is available with adequate military experience who is not the product of a lifetime spent in one of the three services which he would be expected to coordinate. No officer is available who could divorce himself from the ideas and the training which he has received during that lifetime. At the time of the congressional hearings in November 1949, the Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force had never been on board an aircraft carrier, nor had the then Chief of Naval Operations ever flown in an Air Force bomber. Yet Air Force opinion, officially and unofficially expressed, was very free with views as to the obsolescence of the carrier as a weapon of war, and naval opinion was just as free with insistence that the big bombers of the Air Force could not accomplish anything like the results claimed for them. To appoint any officer who is the product of such a system to supreme military authority, with the right to override the views of his associates, is simply to insure that one point of view—not necessarily the right one—will prevail over all opposition to clothe a champion of a single concept of war with the power to commit the national security to the chance that he may be right.

John J. McCloy, former Assistant Secretary of War and now High Commissioner in Germany, one of the strongest advocates of the single Chief of Staff, wrote in a dissenting opinion attached to the report of the Hoover Committee: "I would have the Chief of Staff sit as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff meetings and I would give him at least the power of terminating discussion in that body after he had given full opportunity for discussion." It does not seem to occur even so to able and brilliant a military statesman as Mr. McCloy that terminating discussion is not an end in itself, and that it is just possible that a decision with which one of the three Chiefs of Staff cannot go along requires further discussion, not arbitrary silencing of dissent. The power to terminate discussion leads inevitably and inexorably to the single concept of military policy—by order—and to disaster when confronted by the unexpected.

What assurance can there possibly be that the decision of the superchief would be better than the decision which would have been reached by compromise if there had been no superchief? Experience warns us that it would generally be worse rather than better. To give to one man the power to terminate discussion and make the decision himself is the surest means of stifling that free flow of thought which is the very foundation of the national security, and of shutting off the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Congress, and public opinion from free access to the military views of any save the single superchief on whose supposedly infallible judgment the national security would be staked.

No doubt it is annoying to be confronted by constant differences of opinion, arising in part from a deep sense of responsibility on the part of each service and its chief and in part from a contest for a larger share of a fixed total budget. There is no quick and easy way to bring this condition to an end. In the long run, it will be gradually ameliorated by the leavening of present service loyalties through constant association of the officers of all three services in service schools, in the Armed Forces Staff College, and in the National War College, as well as in the new joint commands overseas.

From these sources we may presently acquire a military generation of wider vision, endowed by experience and association with that ability to view war as a whole which so few military leaders—even those of the greatest genius—possess today. Such a prospect may not be as presently comforting to the anxious citizen as the contemplation of our atomic stockpile, or as the feeling of security (however treacherous in fact) which he might derive from the appointment of a generalissimo. But it is in this prospect that our future safety finds its surest foundation.

"The one safe conclusion to draw from the lessons of history," writes Sir Frederick Maurice, "is that those who may have to wage war must prepare their minds to deal with the unexpected."

Only by the preparation of professional minds to guide our future military policy in the midst of perils we cannot now foresee, rather than the solidification of thought and authority under one-man control or within the limits of a single doctrine, may we find security in a world in which, alas, security is still purchased at the price of being prepared to defend it.

Watkins Demanded Bold Action To Stop Russia, but Truman Used Halfway Measures While World Burned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address which I made over Utah stations on July 17.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATOR REPORTS, BY SENATOR ARTHUR V. WATKINS

(Radio broadcast over Utah stations, July 17)

ANNOUNCER. This is your Washington reporter bringing you The Senator Reports, a program featuring Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS. These programs are transcribed in Washington and are brought to you as a public service by this radio station. And now, Senator WATKINS.

Senator WATKINS. Hello, everybody.

I want to make a further report on the Korean crisis and my connection with the events that transpired. I think the people of Utah are entitled to know the truth about my actions in this very important matter, and particularly since the press has presented what I consider a very unfair and garbled account of what happened in the Senate the day the President announced that he had ordered the Air Force and the Navy to support South Koreans. I shall also make some additional comments on the situation as of the time this transcription was made.

I have with me today my executive secretary, Mr. James McKinney. He will aid in presenting this program.

Imagine yourself seated in the Senate of the United States on June 27. The Senate has barely begun its session. Senator LUCAS, Democratic, of Illinois, the majority leader, has just been reading the historic statement made by the President. The news of the President's action had just been made public outside of the Senate, and the news hadn't yet reached us. Mr. LUCAS was presenting it.

From here on, Mr. McKinney and I will reenact a part of what took place between me and Senator LUCAS as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27. Mr. McKinney will impersonate Mr. LUCAS. Previously I had asked a number of questions for information and then came the following colloquy:

"Senator WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

"Senator LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

"Senator WATKINS. Mr. President, I came into the Chamber late. Was the document referred to by the Senator from Illinois a message to the Congress?

"Senator LUCAS. No, it is a statement by the President that was given to the conference this morning, and also to the press of the country. No doubt every newspaper in the United States has it on the front pages now. The commentators have it. I am sorry that the statement was not passed around. I brought one copy from the White House. Perhaps it would have been much better if I had brought a number so that every Senator could have had a copy of it on his desk.

"Senator WATKINS. Will the Senator yield further so I may make an observation?

"Senator LUCAS. Certainly.

"Senator WATKINS. Mr. President, I have asked a number of questions with respect to this matter, and particularly with reference to the power of the President to order our Air Force and our sea force to back up the southern Koreans against the northern Koreans. In spite of the fact that the distinguished majority leader has said that that power is pursuant to the power granted to the United Nations to require a defense of nations which are subject to aggression, it seems to me that the action taken is a step which in effect is war.

"Senator LUCAS. Just a moment.

"Senator WATKINS. Will the Senator permit me to finish?

"Senator LUCAS. Yes.

"Senator WATKINS. It is in effect war or a step leading to war. It may be that that is the very thing we ought to do. I am not one of those who have been taken into the confidence of the President and the Defense Department of the Government, so I do not know the facts. But it seems to me that this should have been called to the attention of the entire Congress. The Congress is now in session, and unless there is power in the United Nations to order our forces into an action of this kind which may result in a major world clash, then I think we should have been informed by the President direct by a message to the Congress. As I recall, we were told time and again when we were considering the Atlantic Pact that nothing would take us into war under that pact without the action by the Congress. The President could not do it.

"Senator LUCAS. Let me say——

"Senator WATKINS. Just a moment, please. Now, according to the action taken, by the mere order and the request of the United Nations, our troops can be sent into a fighting war without the Congress saying 'Yes' or 'No.' That is the observation I wished to make.

"Senator LUCAS. In reply to the Senator from Utah, I should like to read from the statement by the President again:

" 'The Security Council of the United Nations called upon the invading troops to cease hostilities and to withdraw to the thirty-eighth parallel.'

"The Senator from Utah will not deny that they had the right to do that under the United Nations treaty?

"Senator WATKINS. I think that is true.

"Senator LUCAS. I continue to read:

" 'This they have not done, but on the contrary have pressed the attack. The Security Council called upon all members of the United Nations to render every assistance to the United Nations in the execution of this resolution.'

"After we have become a member of the United Nations in good faith and the United Nations Security Council by a unanimous vote made that sort of a request, what would the Senator from Utah do if he were President of the United States?

"Senator WATKINS. I would have sent a message to the Congress of the United States setting forth the facts and asking for the authority to go ahead and do whatever was necessary to protect the situation."

From that colloquy has gone out press reports that I was highly critical of the President's program to aid the Koreans.

Well, you have heard the exact words which were used. I find no criticism either direct or implied of the general proposition of aiding the Koreans. What I said had to do with the way that help was brought into being and it could not be considered in any way a full expression of my views.

May I say I have a firm conviction in the wisdom of the constitutional provision that only Congress can declare war and send our Armed Forces into battle.

Remember, this was all done on the spur of the moment—nothing was prearranged—at least on my part.

I have made no recent public statement on the Korean situation except the one above referred to and the one I made in last week's radio report to Utah.

But I am on record on several occasions on the subject of help for Korea and on what should be done to contain and stop Communist Russia.

To get to that record, let's return to scenes in the United States Senate: The first time April 22, 1947—the occasion, the debate on the first Greek-Turkey loan, otherwise known as the Truman doctrine, a measure which I supported.

As a freshman Senator, I was making my maiden speech in the Senate.

Here are some quotes.

"Mr. President, in my campaign last year for election as Senator from the State of Utah, I pledged my full support of the United Nations to give it every opportunity to succeed in its purposes. This I should like to do now. I favor the resolution introduced by the senior Senator from Virginia, Mr. BYRD, and his accompanying speech in which he proposed in substance that this entire matter be referred to the United Nations, that the United States and Russia lay all of the facts before that body; that we have a show-down between Russia and the democracies; that in the event Russia will not agree to a policy which will prevent war, we oust her from the United Nations."

Later in the same speech delivered more than 3 years ago in April 1947, I said:

"Mr. President, I am voting for this bill with the belief and the hope that this is only the first step; that we shall now come back to the first principles as set forth in the Atlantic Charter not only in Greece and Turkey, but in China; that we will reverse the action we took in that nation recently when we decided not to take sides as between the Nationalists and the Communists, but decided to get out; that we will redeem our promise made to the Koreans that they shall have their independence * * * that we lay all the facts on the table before the United Nations."

When I made that statement in 1947 the nationalists were still in full control of China, but were waging a bitter war against the Communists.

Military experts have said that a vigorous support of Nationalist China by us at that stage could have saved China. I demand that we help her.

South Korea was threatened, although not in immediate danger. I urged that we protect her independence. I did that because of our commitments at Cairo even though I thought we were unwise to make that commitment because of the heavy burden we were assuming.

Again I quote from the 1947 speech:

"By taking this stand, Mr. President, I sincerely believe we can stop the present ideological war and prevent a shooting war of world war III. Halfway measures, in my opinion, will not do. We must go the full distance. This is a case which requires the boldest of action. By any other methods I believe we court disaster, and I say this notwithstanding the fact that we have the atom bomb.

"Mr. President, unless we act promptly and resolutely and with firmness we are in grave danger of losing our friends among other nations. The passage of this bill (Greek-Turkey loan) will be but the first step. From here on, no matter what the cost in money may be—and I believe it will be less if we act firmly—we must proceed to do everything in our power to win the war we are now waging to bring about a just and lasting peace."

I claim no special wisdom in what I said in 1947. I dislike to take an "I-told-you-so" speech and wouldn't do so now had not my record been challenged.

Have events justified my 1947 demand for the boldest of action? Have halfway measures been sufficient?

Have we courted disaster?

The muse of history has written the unhappy and tragic record since that time of one disaster after another.

Following the Greek-Turkey loan, Russia's answer was to take Hungary and Czechoslovakia behind the iron curtain.

As a counter-measure we were forced to adopt the Marshall Plan which when its course has run will have cost the United States approximately 18 billions of dollars.

Then came the Berlin blockade. More hundreds of millions were spent, and Russia can repeat the performance any time she wishes.

Then China, with her great manpower, was lost to the free nations of the world.

American and English traitors gave Russia the atom bomb secrets and now that nation holds that lethal weapon as a threat to the security of the rest of the world.

One disaster after another, and the end is not yet.

On September 22, 1949, I repeated in the United States Senate parts of my speech of 1947 and reaffirmed my stand.

On Sunday, September 27, 1949, a few days after the President's announcement that Russia had the atom bomb, I made a radio speech in Washington in which I declared:

"The United Nations Assembly is now in session; our opportunity is before us for a show-down. We can frankly state our case, what we expect and what we are willing to do. We can invite Russia to tell us what her needs are, what she wants, and what she thinks she is entitled to, and then as a Christian nation, and with the held of other Christian nations, and in the spirit of true Christianity, we should be able to help her get what she really needs and what she is equitably entitled to. There is a chance we may succeed.

"And as a consideration we can insist upon disarmament. We can require cooperation backed with guaranties. If Russia and her satellites in this show-down are not willing to cooperate, are not willing to agree to disarmament, then we can decide whether to go on with our present policy or to take advantage of the strength that is ours before Russia and her allies can reach the same stage of preparation. Still other policies may suggest themselves."

That speech was made part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 25, 1949.

And now Korea. It should be clear that it is no longer a police action, but a full-blown war even though it isn't global at the present time. It is the duty of every loyal American to back to the limit our Armed Forces who are fighting and dying in the hills and rice paddies of Korea.

How we got into the war is important for future guidance, but it is not as important now as the absolute necessity of doing everything we can to win the victory in our present fight. In the end we shall win; we cannot afford to lose.

In Washington and throughout the country today there is deep resentment that after Congress appropriated some $60,000,000,000 for defense purposes since 1945, there is a deplorable lack of preparation. It makes us wonder if we shall be ready for world war III when it comes.

There are many who are now questioning the timing of our fight to restore the independence of South Korea.

Many feel that we had no right to sent our GIs into battle, as one soldier described it, "With one hand tied behind his back." The President's decision to send our troops into Korea when they weren't prepared is causing a reappraisal of the whole situation.

Military authorities here say it will take many months to drive the Communists out of South Korea. They say there are many bad days ahead for us.

Press dispatches quote Senator LODGE of Massachusetts as demanding an investigation as to the fitness of Secretary of Defense Johnson to hold his job.

Washington seems to be in the dark as to future policies.

Official Washington, in administration circles, is seething with recriminations over the Korea debacle.

Here are some of the pointed questions that are being asked in Washington with increasing emphasis:

When we have driven the Communists back to the thirty-eighth parallel, then what? Do we continue to occupy South Korea? Well, will we dare let it go?

What happens if and when Communist China attacks us?

Will we pour munitions and men into China, that historic sinkhole of lost armies?

What will we do in other countries where Russia's satellites become aggressors against the smaller nations? Will we repeat the Korean policy over again?

Should we now call for a show-down with Russia?

Next week I hope to discuss some of these questions and the latest war developments. Until then, good-by.

Radio and Television Broadcasting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, Jack Gould, a feature writer for the New York Times, in the Sunday,

July 16, issue of that great newspaper, wrote a timely, hard-hitting article on radio and TV carnage. I believe it to have so much merit and interest that I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 16, 1950]

TIME FOR A HALT—RADIO AND TV CARNAGE DEFIES ALL REASON

(By Jack Gould)

If radio and television aren't careful, somebody's going to call the cops. In their desperation to find inexpensive fillers for their summer schedules the two media have exceeded the bounds of reasonable interest in murder, mayhem, and assorted felonies. Both the kilocycles and the channels are fairly dripping with crime and it is time that a halt was called.

Last week the broadcasting industry's admiration for the violent way of life reached the inevitable denouement. The National Broadcasting Co. put a sordid mystery show right in the middle of its delightful Saturday morning schedule for children. The youngsters at home who had just finished hearing a recording of Jack and the Beanstalk were regaled with a lurid tale about a two-timing wife and her husband who was beaten to death with a beer bottle.

Actually it may be doubted if even the television and radio broadcasters themselves realize to what extent they have been gripped by the fad for shooting it out in front of microphone and camera. The figures are both startling and shocking.

STATISTICS

Taking into account any form of show embodying violence or the threat of violence, including both adult and children's offerings, there was available on the radio last week a total of more than 85 separate time periods at which a listener could tune in a show of this type. This total, incidentally, involved only the four major network affiliates.

In television the situation was just as bad. On the 7 stations in the New York area the listener had his pick of more than 75 periods during the week when he could find a taste of life outside the law, the figure including both live and film shows. If anything, this total is low because some programs, although ostensibly dedicated to wholesome drama, often incorporate in some degree the theme of homicide.

No matter how many novels may be written by disgruntled emigres from radio row, broadcasters are not stupid men and they know full well that they are playing with fire. The volume of protests against the orgy of crime on the air has deluged many a desk in Washington, and Wayne Coy, chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, months ago issued a warning.

The crime shows are justified by the broadcasters primarily on the grounds of expediency and economic necessity. But there is something fundamentally askew when an industry which constantly prates about its freedom is incapable of enforcing two of the most essential conditions for continued enjoyment of that freedom: moderation and self-control.

NO BAN

No person either expects or wants a blanket ban on mystery shows; their appeal is as old and durable as literature itself. And the broadcasters have a thoroughly valid point when they note that other forms of entertainment—magazines, books and the movies —rely heavily on the crime story.

But they err seriously if they think the problem of crime shows on the air can be told in terms of quantity alone. Rather more serious, as a matter of fact, is the quality of such programs after they have been put through the rewriting mill and tailored to fit the needs of two arts which always are in a hurry.

The majority of crime shows are presented within a span of 30 minutes and this time often is reduced further by the minutes consumed by the commercials. Although a program series may derive its basic source material from outstanding fiction writers, what is euphemistically known in broadcasting as the adaptation generally squeezes out of an original work much of whatever distinction it may have had.

HASTE

There is not time in broadcasting for extended characterization or detailed description of setting. The writer's job is to "hop up" the narrative so that it captures the audience's eye or ear in the shortest possible time and holds the attention of that organ until the Hooper rating is tabulated.

In practice this means that the major emphasis must be put on the so-called action. The exposition, the climax, and the resolution fall all over each other, with the delights of genuine suspense, characterization and the understated phrase sacrificed to the demands of the stop-watch. It's scant wonder that many a viewer feels he has heard or seen every mystery show before; he probably has.

Ultimately, of course, broadcasting's current preoccupation with crime probably will be tempered by the public itself, just as the worst of the give-away fad finally ran its course. But as with the mania for prize contests, very likely this will not come about until radio and television needlessly have incurred another batch of black eyes. If radio and television suffer many more of the same, the public may be justified in coming to the conclusion that the broadcasting industry is incapable of seeing where its going.

James F. Byrnes: From Supreme Court to South Carolina Governor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in a recent edition of the Washington Post entitled "From Supreme Court to South Carolina Governor," written by James A. Hoyt, formerly speaker of the South Carolina House of Representatives, and formerly a distinguished editor of the Columbia (S. C.) Record. The article relates to the former Senator from South Carolina, James F. Byrnes.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM SUPREME COURT TO SOUTH CAROLINA GOVERNOR

(By James A. Hoyt)

For one who has been Secretary of State, Justice of the Supreme Court, "Assistant President," United States Senator and Congressman, to become Governor of his State in this day and time may seem to be a retrogression, but it was not always so, for there was a time when to be Governor of South Carolina was esteemed the highest honor that could come to a citizen of that State.

Robert Y. Hayne resigned as United States Senator to accept election as Governor, and then John C. Calhoun resigned as Vice President to take the seat in the Senate vacated by Hayne.

John Rutledge resigned as Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court to become chief justice of South Carolina.

John Quincy Adams, after a troublous one term as President, and after having previously served abroad for many years as Ambassador and also as Senator and Secretary of State, became a Member of the House from Massachusetts, and in that capacity rendered what was by no means the least distinguished (and certainly the best remembered) service of his career.

James Monroe, after his two terms as President, became a justice of the peace in his Virginia community. This, it should be added, was after Monroe had been Ambassador to France, England, and Spain, United States Senator, twice Governor of Virginia, as well as Secretary of State. Like John Quincy Adams, Mr. Monroe thought no office was too humble in which to serve his country.

As to Hayne, after he had won lasting fame in the historic constitutional debate with Senator Daniel Webster, he resigned his seat in the Senate to become Governor of South Carolina in 1832.

The Nullification Party in South Carolina was preparing for the fight then already begun in the State for and against nullification. Contrary to what is generally believed, South Carolina was by no means a unit for nullification. Some of the ablest political leaders of the State, in Congress and out, were bitterly opposed to Mr. Calhoun's doctrine and as strongly Unionist in their sentiments as the native South Carolinian then in the White House—Andrew Jackson.

It was virtually necessary for the Nullificationists to control the State government in order to carry out their policies in national affairs and the campaign of 1832 was fought to control the legislature, which then elected the governor, and to control it by a two-thirds majority in order to insure the calling of a State convention to pass on the nullification issue.

The Calhoun-Hayne faction won. An extra session of the legislature was called, and the necessary action taken to call a State convention, which duly passed the nullification ordinance. The legislature, meeting in regular session immediately after the convention, proceeded to organize for the Civil War which seemed imminent. Senator Hayne was called from Washington to become governor. Then Mr. Calhoun resigned the Vice Presidency to take the seat in the Senate vacated by Hayne.

It is also interesting to note that Hayne after serving out his term as governor became mayor of Charleston (1834–36) and devoted the balance of his life largely to the far-sighted project of a railroad across the mountains from Charleston to Cincinnati.

John Rutledge, a member of the first Supreme Court bench selected by President Washington, resigned as Associate Justice to become chief justice of South Carolina. Later, when Chief Justice John Jay resigned to become Governor of New York (another precedent), John Rutledge was appointed by Washington as Chief Justice, but the appointment was not confirmed by the Senate, which is another story.

President Washington then wrote to both Charles Cotesworth Pinckney and to Edward Rutledge, brother of John, offering to either of them who would accept the associate justiceship which John Rutledge had resigned in 1791. Both declined, stating that as members of the Legislature of South Carolina they could be of more service to the General Government.

Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, who had been a member of the Convention which

framed the Federal Constitution, not only declined the appointment as Justice of the Supreme Court but also declined the proffered appointments as Secretary of War and as Secretary of State, but in 1796 he became the Ambassador to France and negotiated the famous Pinckney Treaty, which is until today the subject of debate. He was the Federalist candidate for Vice President in 1800 and for President in 1804 and 1808.

To resign from the Supreme Court, relinquishing an office of the very highest honor, with life tenure, and with congenial duties and pleasant surroundings, and carrying a salary of $20,000, to undertake for half that sum a job even as "assistant President" that had nothing but hard work, disagreeable and difficult, even impossible, tasks, with the possiblity of being unable to accomplish expectations—that showed that Mr. Byrnes is capable of great patriotic sacrifice.

In his present candidacy Mr. Byrnes has undoubtedly taken into account the national effect of his election as governor of a comparatively small State.

The waning prestige and strength of State governments generally would be favorably affected. The tendency to belittle the importance and power of the individual States is one of the most dangerous and deplorable tendencies of the last decade or so, threatening the very form of our government. For Mr. Byrnes to become Governor of South Carolina, after his noted and unprecedented career in Washington, will vitalize the politics and patriotism of every State in the Union. At least that is probably the view that "Jimmie" Byrnes takes of it.

The President's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, the President's message gives definitive recognition to a situation already etched in grim realities apparent ever since our decision to make a military stand in Korea. There must be no disposition in the Congress, or in the Nation, to deny immediate availability of the men, the money, and the matériel essential to successful completion of the tragic task at hand.

We must realize that this is war, and that there can be no partial mobilization of resources for war. To do less than inaugurate all-out prosecution of the fighting is to invite once again the too-little-and-too-late strategy. The $10,000,000,000 asked as a starting point by the President will most certainly grow to a sum much larger. How much no one now can foretell. The other essentials beside money must be provided and accepted as readily as we have accepted the challenge of armed aggression. This will inevitably mean control of essential materials, prices, profits, and wages. To go less than all the way is to go nowhere it all. We cannot wage half a war on the home front any more than on the battle front. The President must make this clear to the Nation. The people must accept it now, rather than to have it forced on them later after even greater damage has been done to our economic solidarity which is necessarily the bulwark of our military power.

Certainly, as I asserted 10 days ago, it is the duty of the Congress to remain in session. Congress must not shirk its full share of the task of readying the Nation for the global responsibilities now inescapably ours as the one nation giving power and force to the efforts of the United Nations to halt the shooting war before it spreads from a localized struggle to a global conflict. The President must make known the requirements on the military front and on the economic front. The Congress, as the representative of the people, must weigh those requests and give immediate attention to them. This must not be a blank-check approval, but a solemn, understanding support for every action essential to victory.

There must be an immediate reversal of peacetime spending policy in relation to nondefense activities of Government. Every possible dollar must be pared from the Government-as-usual appropriations for diversion to the war effort in order that the great and inescapable additions to our necessary spending may be offset as much as possible. Higher taxes are a certainty, and to be honest with the people we should tell them so. But the increased revenues should go only to the task at hand. There can be no business as usual, but neither can there be government as usual.

The President's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The President's Message," published in the Wall Street Journal of July 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

We commend two steps which President Truman has taken in the past few days. And, we think, the President should proceed further and more decisively in the direction he himself has indicated.

If he will do so, the unusual measures which he proposed in yesterday's message on Korea need not now be enacted; there need be no immediate authority to set priorities and allocations of materials, and the demand for higher taxes can be dropped or at any rate postponed.

One of the commendable steps was the President's direction to the several Government agencies which deal with housing programs to crimp down their extension of credit. Thereby the President did two things. He cut demands on the Federal Treasury and lessened the demand for the myriad of materials going into housing—lumber, metals, etc.

The other step was the announcement in his message that he had directed Government departments to review their spending programs. How firmly the President will insist on more than token cuts we do not know. If he really means to go through with an effective program, the results will be just the same as those of the order for housing curtailment; Government expenditures will be reduced and the demand entailed by those expenditures will be cut.

One of the categories to be cut should be the funds allotted for gifts to Europe by the Economic Cooperation Administration. With increased arms spending American imports from Europe will be greatly increased. Those imports will earn dollars for Europe. The sole remaining justification for the gifts is to supply Europe with dollars. To now insist that the gifts proceed under changed circumstances is to confuse means and ends to the point of fantasy.

There is a third step which should be taken and which can be taken within existing executive powers. The President only flirts with that step when he suggests the reenactment of controls over instalment credit. But to single out this one type of credit is not enough. The Treasury, the Federal Reserve, and the bank supervisory authorities should use their power for a general tightening. Thereby not only will brakes be put upon instalment credit, but in addition the inventory hoarding, over which the President suggests direct controls, will be discouraged.

Mr. Truman says that what we do to meet the Korean situation and others which may follow must not be allowed to injure our basic economic strength. And perhaps his advisers would argue that the steps advocated here would be injuriously deflationary.

We think they would not. We think that a cut in Government spending and a change in the Government policy which encourages private spending would be the policy least calculated to send the economy into a tail spin. It would slow down a pace which was far too fast even before the fighting in Korea broke out. We think it would do no more than that.

But for the sake of argument suppose that the steps we suggest might be attended by considerable readjustment. What, then, is the alternative?

The alternative is to allow civilian demand to clash with Government demand and attempt to handle the matter by the direct controls which Mr. Truman suggests. We know very well that however small those controls are at the start, the imposition of one seems to create the necessity for another and that additional one for still more. How long before Washington will be full of citizens who might be useful in their own businesses trying to administer an impossibility? Will that cause no readjustments?

And will an addition to an already staggering tax burden have no bad effects on the economy? Will the taxes enacted just for the emergency be repealed when the emergency passes? We should know the answer to that.

President Truman and those about him certainly have seemed to say that a government can live in a tense world, in a war without shooting, and still spend as though nothing unusual were going on. This newspaper has loudly and consistently said that we could not. We say it again and we are glad that Mr. Truman seems less sure than he was a month ago.

We hope he will now throw completely overboard the vestiges of a mistaken policy.

Sound Sense From a Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the journal Every Evening of July 19, 1950, entitled "Sound Sense From a Senator." In this editorial my colleague the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], is commended for his protest against indiscriminate Government prosecution of big business on the theory that size alone is a sign of badness.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUND SENSE FROM A SENATOR

No one who knows Senator J. ALLEN FREAR, JR., or has noted his common-sense attitude toward public problems, will be surprised by his protest against indiscriminate Government prosecution of big business under the antitrust law. He has shown before and now shows again that he is no subscriber to the Department of Justice theory that size alone is a sign of badness.

While referring specifically to the du Pont Co. and the damage done to the American economy by the suit against it in the cellophane affair, Senator FREAR bases his case on much broader grounds. The question is not whether a firm is large or small but whether it is rendering a service to the public. Or, in the Senator's own words, a company's "right to exist and to manufacture and sell its products can most properly be determined by the American people themselves."

This statement, we believe, reflects the judgment of most of du Pon't Delaware neighbors and, indeed, of the vast majority of Americans.

Beware of the Booby Trap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, our country's greatest deficiency during the last 5 years has been men and women with genuine understanding of the nature, objectives, and tactics of the Communist world conspiracy. Our worst blunders have come not because our leaders were evil but because they were trying to be good. They insisted on believing that Communists wanted the same things as free men want, that militant atheists would act according to the principles of Christian brotherhood which principles they violently deny. We must continue to act according to our principles but it is worse than folly to imagine Communists will.

It is heartening beyond words to find occasionally someone who understands the conspiracy and has the courage to explain it, in order to warn the innocent against their own destruction. I have seen no clearer exposition of the unpleasant facts of the case than the following editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune of July 18, 1950. Beware indeed. The editorial follows:

BEWARE OF THE BOOBY TRAP

Indian Prime Minister Nehru's attempt to prevent the Korean conflict from spreading undoubtedly is well-intentioned. The way Nehru has gone about it, however, serves the purposes of the Communist aggressors rather than the cause of peace with justice and security.

Nehru's intervention gives the Communist aggressors a welcome opportunity to pull more wool over the eyes of the simple-minded. It creates doubts and confusions in the minds of the well-intentioned. It makes more difficult the task of those who are trying to deter further aggression by mobilizing the free world against Communist aggression in Korea. It conceivably could subject the United Nations to the kind of Communist sabotage which almost destroyed it and again deprive the peace-seeking nations of the world of an effective instrument for collective security.

A statesman better versed in the aims and methods of Stalinism would not have given Stalin such a boost and the cause of collective security such an unnecessary burden.

So the defenders of collective security must take time out to explain to the uninitiated the booby traps in Stalin's reply to Nehru's intervention.

Stalin doesn't want to reactivate the UN Security Council. He wants to deactivate it as he has done by his vetoes so many times and as he nearly did permanently by his attempts to force the Council to replace the Chinese Nationalist member with his Chinese Communist stooge.

Nehru hopes that admission of Communist China to the UN would result in his powerful Red neighbor stopping support of Communist aggression in Korea, Indochina, and behaving decently toward India. He hopes that Russia will cease to menace the non-Soviet world if it gets its way about Communist China in the UN. This is a pathetically naive concept of what the Communists are up to and how to thwart their evil purposes. But unfortunately a great many people in the western world as well as in India are still unable to comprehend Soviet tactics.

Knowing that and counting upon such innocence, the Communists cynically act out the role which Nehru and his kind cast for them.

A careful reading of Stalin's reply will show that the dictator doesn't say he would help stop the Korean war if his Chinese stooges are seated in the UN. He merely says he would talk about it. Five years ago Stalin promised to join in making a peace treaty for Austria. He is still talking about it, meanwhile keeping Soviet troops in that country to blackmail it and neighboring countries into doing what Russia wants. He could talk about Korea until his stooges had remade the entire country to their hearts' desire if we yielded to the sort of blackmail Nehru unwittingly paves the way for.

Once Stalin got his Chinese Communists into the UN by such tactics and Russian delegates returned they could resume their sabotage of every effort to deter Soviet aggression, every effort to provide the UN with the sort of peace-preservation force required to deal with such situations as the Korean.

All the lives, effort, and resources expended to deter aggression such as the Korean would have been in vain. All the progress made since June 25 toward converting UN into the genuine collective security system it was intended to be would be scrapped. Stalin would have us back where we were between 1945 and June 25, 1950.

Spare us, good Pandit, from that kind of reactivation. India's condemnation of Communist aggression in Korea was a brave and wise forward step for a country opposed to taking sides. India should not take two steps backward in its eagerness to demonstrate that it hasn't taken sides with the western democracies. If it cannot see its way clear to helping them put down aggression in Korea, it at least should not make their task harder by helping the Communists make aggression pay.

A Bill To Extend Medical Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, on July 17, of this year, I introduced a bill (H. R. 9128) to establish the Southern Medical College; to assist in the establishment of mental health clinics, and to facilitate the provision of medical care to areas insufficiently provided therewith.

This bill is, broadly speaking, a companion bill to H. R. 8746 which I have previously introduced providing a plan for National Health Service, without socializing the practice of medicine. That bill is known as Federal Health Reinsurance Act and an explanation of it appears on page A5057, of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This second bill, H. R. 9128, to which I have referred is a companion bill to the former bill, H. R. 8746, is an endeavor to present specific proposals for progressive action by the Federal Government that can be and should be taken, without making the serious mistake of Federal socialized medicine.

H. R. 9128 goes directly to four phases in which our present very excellent medical and health service is admittedly deficient. The bill seeks to improve each of these deficiencies in a constructive and sound manner.

The first phase involves the fact that in the southern part of the United States there are not sufficient opportunities to study medicine. In many of the Southern States the number of doctors available in ratio to the population is less than half as compared to the Northern States. This, of course, reflects not only a general deficiency in medical education but specifically a very sad lack of opportunity for Negroes to study medicine. It appears to me that assistance of the Federal Government in the establishment of an outstanding southern medical school, which would admit qualified students without discrimination, would be a very major step in the advance in the health of the South and of the entire Nation. It is anticipated that leading medical schools of the country shall assist in establishing and supplying the needed medical faculty for such a southern medical school. To bring this about, it is provided that each of the six regents appointed shall at the time of his appointment be affiliated with a medical faculty of some other college or university or with the administrative or medical staff of some accredited hospital.

This extreme shortage of doctors in the South is frequently used in references to national statistics as a reason for a complete and radical change in the whole health program of the country. It is submitted that a direct approach to the deficiency where it exists is by far the most intelligent and desirable approach to make.

The second major deficiency in the present national health picture is that in mental health. One-half of all of the hospital beds occupied in America today are occupied by mental patients. This is an admitted and recognized governmental responsibility and it has not been met in keeping with the superb progress in medicine generally. Therefore specific major assistance is provided for mental-health clinics to be established and affiliated with existing medical schools. This is a highly desirable and long-overdue step in the advance of medicine in America.

The third phase is that of the need for constant improvement in the quality of medical care in America. This is even more important than the question of the number of doctors. Provision is therefore made that the life-insurance companies, who have an obvious interest in improved medical care, might provide for graduate medical scholarships under which practicing doctors could further improve their own special knowledge in medicine. The scholarships should be at least $2,000 and not more than $4,000 per year for not less than 1 nor more than 5 years, and the payments for the scholarships may be deductible from the net income of life-insurance companies for tax purposes provided the amount with respect to any one company shall not exceed in any one taxable year one-fiftieth of 1 percent of the total gross income of the company.

The fourth phase is the recognized present deficiency in lack of doctors and medical facilities in a large number of the more sparsely settled or very low income areas of the country. Provision is made under which these special-need areas may be designated by the Surgeon General and a contract may be entered for part-time service of a duly licensed, registered doctor for a 5-year period for $100 per month in exchange for his performing of certain public-health services, such as immunizations, examining school children, and other services of preventive medicine and sanitation.

Further provision is made under which $1,000 per year in medical and surgical supplies may be furnished to such a doctor which he in turn is to furnish to the needy public without charge.

Beyond these public services the doctor is to practice in every respect as a private practitioner, charging for his services of those who are able to pay.

The total approach is one of providing the essential public-health services for a small, guaranteed income, which in turn becomes the underlying assurance which makes it possible for a young doctor to go into a rural or economically deficient area and develop his own practice.

It is submitted that these four steps, if taken in company with the Federal health reinsurance approach of the voluntary health-insurance groups provided for in the companion bill, will together gradually work out an American health program of ingenuity and resourcefulness that will produce superb results. It will also avoid the tragic consequences of a compulsory health-insurance scheme and of the socialized medicine program so evident in England and the continent of Europe.

This measure, just as the other measure, is presented in a preliminary manner subject to such suggestions for amendment and revision that may arise from the study of its provisions by all who are sincerely interested in the advance of the health of the American people. Proposed amendments are not only anticipated but will be welcomed in the light of continuing study.

President Truman's Realistic Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's message to Congress on the mobilization of our military and economic resources to cope with the situation in Korea and to be prepared for any future eventualities which may arise in other parts of the world contains a candid and complete evaluation of the problem confronting us and it is a realistic approach to its ultimate solution.

To be sure, his message contains a strong and unanswerable indictment of the evil forces that deliberately planned the attack on a peaceful nation which had been created by the United Nations only 2 years ago. The attack on the Korean Republic was not only deliberate and well prepared militarily but it was done in defiance of the United Nations and of the free peoples of the world.

To deal with this act of brutal aggression which constitutes a threat to the peace of the entire world the United States had no other alternative than to take the action it has taken in the past several weeks. Our country also has no other recourse to action than the plans and steps outlined by the President in his message to Congress. They are costly plans, they may prove to be of longer duration than any of us anticipate, but they are well-laid plans for a peaceful world, or as the President defines it so clearly and eloquently in his message—

> A world where all men may live in peace and freedom with steadily improving living conditions, under governments of their own free choice.

President Truman has informed us that in order to attain the necessary military and industrial mobilization of our manpower and material resources, it will require at least $10,000,000,000, and this is only a first step. Much as all of us hate to utilize our resources for purposes of preparedness and war, the security of our people, our country, and the free world take priority over everything else. In that respect I am happy to note that President Truman fully understands the seriousness of the threat to our Nation and that he is determined to take full and necessary measures to deal with the emergency.

In the months ahead we will be required to bear greater burdens, but if we are serious in our determination to emerge victorious it is imperative that we act with fortitude, high resolve, and patriotism. It will be required of us to undertake a certain degree of self-denial and some restrictions of the economic freedom which we have enjoyed in the last few years, but if this is done in good faith by all citizens of our great country and with a minimum of hysteria and selfishness the probabilities are that we shall have to give up much less than we had expected and that we shall not be wanting in any essential needs, whether it be food, clothing, shelter, or comforts.

While the President has asked for certain controls over installment buying and commodity speculation, it is most reassuring to know that he has not found it necessary to ask for price control, rationing, the control of manpower and wages, and so forth. Whether he will be forced in the long run to ask for such controls depends in good measure upon all of us. If we are selfish, if we become panicky, if we begin hoarding foodstuffs and other commodities which are more than plentiful, then we shall bring on these controls much sooner than we may expect.

The recommendations presented by the President in his message to Congress are realistic and plausible. They were presented in a calm and fitting manner. Let us, too, receive them with utmost calm and steady nerves in order to best deal with a difficult situation in a crucial hour.

Role of Motion Pictures in the Foreign Information Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we are all aware of the fact that the Voice of America's overseas information program must be tremendously expanded if we are to antidote the Communist propaganda which is booming throughout the world. Right now this matter is being considered by our Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Earlier this month I wrote to the State Department for a report on the extent to which motion pictures are being used in the present overseas information and educational exchange program. As I have previously commented on the Senate floor, I feel that the dynamic medium of motion pictures brings about the strongest possible impact on the minds of the people of our own country and the world. Yes; this medium is, in fact, the most powerful instrument we have for getting across the American story.

I feel that the motion-picture industry is to be congratulated for the great job that it has done in cooperation with our Federal Government in telling our story overseas through films and newsreels, and special commendation should

be given to the Motion Picture Association of America, under the inspired leadership of Mr. Eric Johnston, who contacted President Truman immediately upon the outbreak of the Korean conflict, offering assistance.

By means of the MPA and the Motion Picture Export Association, the 16-millimeter motion-picture film is proving as powerful as 75-millimeter or 150-millimeter artillery—each in their respective ways. Hollywood has thus given us not only a tremendous industry for entertainment and culture, not only a tremendous wealth and job-creating industry, but it has helped provide the sinews for United States victory in the cold war that has suddenly grown so hot in Korea.

I believe the report which I received from Mr. Edward Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State, will be of interest to my colleagues, so I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of Mr. Barrett's letter to me, followed by two enclosures he sent with his message, one consisting of extracts from Federal reports on the USIE film program and the other consisting of an interesting article which was published in the May 1949 issue of Educational Screen, a magazine devoted to audiovisual materials.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C., July 18, 1950.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Your inquiry of July 6, 1950, regarding the role of motion pictures in the Department's overseas information and educational exchange program is very much appreciated. The Department has always considered films an indispensable part of this program.

At the present time 150 Foreign Service establishments maintain libraries of documentary and educational films with an average of 250 subjects each. The films show a wide cross section of American life—the character of our people, Government, industry, agriculture, and institutions. All emphasize the inherent strength and peaceful purposes that undergird our democratic processes and institutions. These pictures are being exhibited in more than 300,000 showings annually to an estimated audience of 115,000,000 people comprised of labor organizations, youth groups, schools, Government officials and employees, farmers and rural groups, churches, civic organizations, and many others. The films are loaned to these groups. If they have no projector or operator, these, too are made available by the film library. In addition, mobile units tour the surrounding villages and rural areas, exhibiting films and distributing informational material.

In many countries the film program is operated in close cooperation with local government agencies, such as ministries of health, education, and agriculture. These agencies make extensive use of the Department's films in connection with their own programs; also, some of the Department's films are distributed abroad by the Hollywood companies and exhibited extensively in overseas theaters.

Approximately 70 percent of the films used in the program are acquired from such sources as industry and commercial organizations, other Government agencies, private motion-picture producers, educational institutions, philanthropic organizations, etc. Others are produced by the Department under contract with private documentary film companies and designed specifically for use in the program. All these films are currently recorded in an average of 15 foreign languages selected from a total of 29 different languages. Approximately 300 exhibition prints of each title are distributed to the field.

In addition to the above films which are designed primarily for the general public, the Department supplies a limited number of films showing the achievements of our scientific and professional people in such fields as medicine, dentistry, agriculture, and education. These films are welcomed and used extensively by specialized groups throughout the world.

The motion-picture program is conducted in close cooperation with all organizations and groups in the United States making motion pictures that serve to implement our information objectives. Every effort is made to encourage and facilitate the overseas distribution of films of an educational and informational nature.

The Department maintains close working relationships with American newsreel companies to secure adequate coverage of news events that contribute to this Government's information objectives abroad. The Department assists the newsreels in arranging coverage of official events of international significance and makes its own coverage of special events available to them for overseas use.

Your comments on the value of films in furthering this Government's objectives abroad is much appreciated. In this connection you will find attached a few extracts from field reports which serve to illustrate the effectiveness of the program.

The Department will be happy to furnish any further information you may require.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD W. BARRETT,
Assistant Secretary.

[Extracts from field reports of the USIE film program]

Greece, November 1949: "Showings of USIE films to Communist prisoners continue at the political reorientation camp on the Makronessos Islands. At this camp one of the most unique experiments in the modern political world is taking place. USIE films form a regular part of the re-education program for Communists being detained there. Greek Army officers working on the project express warm appreciation for the films and confidence in their effectiveness."

Chile, December 1949: "Once again this year, USIE films were the basis for annual semester projects in the local schools. Students constructed models of things seen in USIE films and these were presented in a city-wide exhibition. Sixty thousand students from 160 local schools participated in the exhibition."

Denmark, May 1950: "In order to reach key groups USIE has concentrated on multiple film showings to small groups with specific interests. As a result of this policy, more than 600 showings take place each month. In Copenhagen alone, the film section frequently arranges showings by each of six projectionists on the same evening. Responsible officers state that the film section has accomplished near miracles with the equipment available and request the allocation of additional equipment."

Indonesia, April 1950: "Reports indicate that many people walk 10 kilometers to see USIE film showings and that even heavy rains fail to keep the people away."

Finland, February 1950: "On numerous occasions when projectors are sent to outlying districts, this office is amazed at the considerable use they are given. A high-school teacher in one town borrowed a projector and several films for 3 days. During that time she gave 10 different performances to 2,735 persons."

Italy, March 1950: "When USIE advertised a film showing in a small town near Florence, the local Communist Party immediately announced the showing of a Sovexport film at the same time. When the showings were held 250 spectators came to the USIE show while 15 attended the Communist exhibition. It was later discovered that many who attended the USIE show had contributed to the rental of the Soviet picture."

Mexico, May 1950: "An ambitious and carefully planned mobile unit tour was undertaken in the State of Hidalgo to continue from March 9 to April 23 covering 1,800 miles. The tour was conducted in close cooperation with state and community officials and in the company of local agricultural, educational, and health officers. The mobile unit visited 45 towns and showed films to at least 60,000 persons. Everywhere Embassy representatives were cordially received by the people, labor union and civic leaders, as well as all local authorities. The good will engendered is hard to visualize for persons who have not experienced similar occasions in Mexico.

"The Embassy has received invitations from the governors of two other states to arrange similar mobile unit tours."

Philippines, April 1950: "The USIE-Davao mobile unit reached an audience of over 82,000 persons during a 23-day tour of the Island of Mindanao. Despite the prevalent unrest throughout the countryside, the unit was warmly welcomed everywhere it went."

[From Educational Screen magazine of May 1949]

FILMS IN THE UNITED STATES OVERSEAS INFORMATION PROGRAM—THE WORLD SEES AMERICA

(By Herbert T. Edwards)

During the war, millimeter referred not only to the size of guns but also the gage of a new weapon—the motion picture. Both 16mm. and 35mm. films were used extensively to help train the Armed Forces and war-production workers. Others helped to solidify the Allied nations and served as psychological weapons against the enemy. Today, along with press and radio, they are being used by the United States Information Service abroad to wage the peace.

Documentary and informational films depicting the American scene are reaching a foreign audience of approximately 100,000,000 people annually. Within the last 24 hours films have gone out from 200 distribution points around the world for showing in countless cities, towns, and villages. Knowing the films are coming, people have left their work or their homes to crowd into small, hot rooms in central India; to squat on the jungle floor in the Philippines; to pack labor halls in Italy, France, and Norway; to stand for hours in open plazas of small South American towns. They have filled the auditoriums, churches, and school rooms in 90 countries and their dependencies on four continents to see America live on a thousand screens.

The films used cover a wide cross section of our national life. They depict the daily lives of farmers and teachers, artisans and professionals. They describe our big industries and our small private businesses. Some present our great artists and musicians as well as museums. Others show the accomplishments of our people in the fields of science and education. They describe our great power projects and explain other activities of our Federal, State, and local governments. Responsibilities assumed by the individual citizen in community affairs are indicated. They show people participating in local and national elections and taking active part in deciding other matters of pub-

lic concern. They reflect the individual citizen's concern for his fellow man as demonstrated in ordinary neighborliness and in the work of our great philanthropic organizations. Others explain our traditions and aspirations. These and other aspects of our national life constitute the subject-matter content of the films used. Together, they present the vast panorama of American life that this Nation seeks to have understood abroad.

Showing these films is accomplished through a variety of arrangements. In all cases United States Information Service loans them free of charge to users. Many foreign posts are also able to supply operators and 16 millimeter projectors when film borrowers have no equipment or projectionist of their own. In addition, some mobile units are used. These travel to isolated communities in the interior and carry motor-driven generators for operating projection equipment in areas where there is no electric current.

While the USIS field staff frequently organizes its own showing, special effort is made to develop cooperative distribution projects with local groups and governments.

In Norway for instance, the labor party has found its members so interested in the United States that they prepare prints of USIS films at their own expense and distribute them for regular showings in over 50 labor halls. In some countries, as in Mexico and Egypt, these cooperative projects are on a national basis. Here the ministries of education, public health, and agriculture assume responsibility for the distribution and exhibition of USIS films throughout the country. In Mexico, that Government defrays the entire cost of the showings, including the salaries of the operators, while the United States supplies the prints. Likewise, through official cooperation, these USIS films are exhibited throughout Egypt by agencies of that Government. Arrangements similar to these have been developed in most of the American Republics.

All showings to community groups are identified as nontheatrical. They include civic, religious, and educational organizations; labor, business, and commercial groups; youth movements; institutes; professional society, military forces, and the general public. Some of the films are also shown in theaters abroad through arrangements made with the American motion-picture industry.

The program described above stems from the Office of International Information in the Department of State. The International Motion Picture Division is a part of this office. The Division plans and conducts activities that implement the broad objectives of the overseas information program with appropriate films and utilization procedures. To do this, the Department of State acquires many informational and documentary films made for domestic audiences. Such films represent a major portion of those used in the overseas program and are obtained from industrial sponsors, institutions, scientific and professional associations, Government agencies, and many other sources.

While films of the above type play an important role in the program, they do not fill the need for pictures which are conceived and produced in terms understandable to foreign audiences and which, at the same time, show representative phases of American life. To obtain these films, the Department contracts for their production by private documentary film producers.

Practically all films shipped abroad are 16mm sound prints and scored in languages appropriate to the region served. As many as 24 different languages have been used in the past; however, budgetary limitations, have made it necessary to reduce this to approximately 14 for films currently distributed.

Several projects are now being developed whereby major American industries can cooperate with the Department in the joint production of films with the sponsor using the picture domestically and the Department taking it for the overseas information program.

In addition to these activities, arrangements are made for the coverage of special events. Material of this type is furnished by the Department to the American newsreel companies and is included in their overseas editions.

Written materials and discussion guides are also prepared to accompany the principal documentary films. These materials supply information pertinent to the subject of the film and are made available to persons conducting the film showings in order that they can be conversant with topics directly related to the theme of the picture. Such supplementary information is helpful in leading discussions and answering questions. Incidentally, it is particularly useful in schools, where approximately 25 percent of USIS showings are held.

This Government has now accumulated a decade of experience in using motion pictures as a medium of international information. Catapulted into this activity largely by events associated with World War II, it is now recognized as a continuing responsibility rather than an emergency program. Enactment of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, with its directive to promote better understanding of the United States among the people of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations, marked this change of policy.

The Office of International Information in the Department of State now performs the overseas information functions previously carried out by the Office of Inter-American Affairs and the Office of War Information. It has also absorbed similar functions performed by the Department since 1941.

The use of motion pictures as part of the overseas-information program is based on the premise that the evidence of the eyewitness is the most conclusive, that such evidence is as conclusive in human relations as in law, and that the sound motion picture is the nearest equivalent to direct observation and actual experience. The sound films are taking America to the millions who cannot actually visit this country. They are visualizing the American, his land, and his way of life, that the people of the world may see for themselves.

The Bastille of Tyranny Is Falling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which I delivered before the Order of AHEPA at its national convention in Cincinnati, Ohio, on August 21, 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BASTILLE OF TYRANNY IS FALLING

From Florida, from beautiful Tarpon Springs, the most Hellenic city in the United States, I bring most cordial greetings to a distinguished American institution—the Order of Ahepa.

As a citizen and a Senator of the United States, I bring you the greetings of a Nation which is grateful for the loyalty, the public spiritedness, and the wholesomeness of its Greek citizenry. You, of course, are justly proud of the record of a people which is the most law-abiding of all emigrant stocks in the United States—a people who, by War Department records, were more numerous in the United States Army in the World War than any other foreign racial element in the United States—a people who produced an immigrant boy—George Dilboy—one of the outstanding heroes of the World War, awarded posthumously the Congressional Medal of Honor and in whose memory stands today a commanding monument in Somerville, Mass.

These distinctions are not new to the Hellenic name and tradition. Where in history has liberty and the sentiment of freedom found firmer lodgment than in the Hellenic world?

For more than a hundred years it has been the privilege of the United States to lend a helping hand to the heroic struggle of the Greek people for freedom in their own ancient land. President Monroe, in a great message to Congress on December 2, 1823, said:

"A strong hope has been long entertained, founded on the heroic struggle of the Greeks, that they would succeed in their contest and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth. It is believed that the whole civilized world takes a deep interest in their welfare. Although no power has declared in their favor, yet none, according to our information, has taken part against them. Their cause and their name have protected them from dangers which might ere this have overwhelmed any other people. The ordinary calculations of interest and of acquisition with a view to aggrandizement, which mingles so much in the transactions of nations, seem to have had no effect in regard to them. From the facts which have come to our knowledge, there is good cause to believe that their enemy has lost forever all dominion over them; that Greece will become again an independent nation. That she may obtain that rank is the object of our most ardent wishes."

How tragic the necessity for another message by another American President—President Roosevelt, when your Supreme Lodge of the Order of Ahepa, on April 25, 1941, visited the President at the White House. Said the President:

"The heroic struggle of the Hellenic people to defend their liberties and their homes against the aggression of Germany after they had so signally defeated the Italian attempt at invasion has stirred the hearts and aroused the sympathy of the whole American people.

"During the Hellenic war of independence more than a century ago, our young nation, prizing its own lately won independence, expressed its ardent sympathy for the Greeks and hoped for Hellenic victory. That victory was achieved.

"Today, at a far more perilous period in the history of Hellas, we intend to give full effect to our settled policy of extending all available material aid to free peoples defending themselves against aggression. Such aid has been and will continue to be extended to Greece.

"Whatever may be the temporary outcome of the present phase of the war in Greece, I believe that the Greek people will once more ultimately achieve their victory and regain their political independence and the territorial integrity of their country. In that high objective the people of Greece and their Government can count on the help and support of the Government and the people of the United States."

"Was the glory that was Greece" ever more illustrious than the glory that was Greece in the last tragic year? The whole world opened its heart in unrestrained admiration to the gallant heroism of the Greek nation which, in the face of overwhelming odds, chose to die heroes rather than to live slaves. Against this tyrannical assault, how many times did an admiring world speak again and again the words of Lord Byron, who wrote of the patriots of Greece who waged the same fight in an earlier age:

"The sword, the banner, and the field,
Glory and Greece, around me see!
The Spartan, borne upon his shield,
Was not more free.

Awake! Not Greece—she is awake!
Awake, my spirit! Think through whom
Thy lifeblood tracks its parent lake,
And then strike home!

Seek out—less often sought than found—
A soldier's grave, for thee the best;
Then look around and choose thy ground,
And take thy rest."

If on the other side of the River of Life the heroes of an earlier day who gather together to tell the epics of their time were privileged to look down on the Hellas of 1940–41, what homage they must have paid to those who bore with luster unsullied the proud Hellenic name. Be not afraid. The moving finger which has written another sad chapter in your long history will move on yet to write again other chapters of other golden ages which shall be worthy of your Pericles. It is not too much to say that those who look back upon these sorrowful days will see more clearly than we can now that it was again from the heart of Greece that came the first bright rays of a new dawn for the race.

Yet, it is only natural that you who have so translated the beauty of the spirit and the mind into those things which the eye could see and the ear could hear should be among the most steadfast defenders of those intangible realities which are the souls of men. You know how true, countless ages beyond the measure of time it has been the inside of man which made him real and of moment, and not the outside. "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he" has been the truth in every age and land.

Jail the spirit of man and no liberty of the body can make it free. Leave free the spirit and no shackle can bind man.

You know that it is those inner satisfactions for which men make the great struggles, and if needs be, the last sacrifices. Deny that honor and peace to the man within and all life is "but sounding brass and tinkling cymbal." Your whole history is an epic of the race's struggle toward the holy city of the spirit. It is a long, hard road. It is strewn with the bones of many pilgrims. Monuments of heroes line the long avenues which wind back to a misty past and for immeasurable distances beyond that lie the unknown and the unsung. The echo of their many marching songs comes back again and again. Why is the way so long, the struggle so hard?

Today other men are dying to preserve those things which are theirs in the sight of God against a devil's assault. The sword of tyranny again smites the earth. The bloody hand that wields it defies every sentiment which expresses the refinement of man and the progress of civilization. No Satan ever in fantastic imagery held writhing sinner over devouring flame with more fiendish satisfaction than does that heartless man whose name is twisted into a curse upon every godly tongue, destroy those who would dare defend against him their sacred homes, the graves of their fathers, their own mountains or valleys, the integrity of their minds and hearts.

He has prostituted modern science with which a beneficent God has blessed the race to make the human family his slave. He has made the lie his chief weapon and enthroned vice as a goddess to be worshiped. He has torn down the temples and profaned the altars of those who sought their God. He has driven out of the pulpits and chained to the concentration camps those who are the messengers of the spirit. He has ravaged the intellectual virtue of every being he could touch. He has plundered and robbed and murdered the helpless and unoffending. Every commandment he has violated. At least he has torn from the heavens every vestige he could reach of that God to whom every human heart is lifted and builded as high as he could the graven images of savage gods who are the dull-eyed, motionless, and feelingless pagan gods of the ancient forests.

Yet this horrible spiritual monster claims to be the Messiah to bring a new order to the earth.

Of what material does he build this new order? All the sorrowing, tear-dimmed eye which gazes upon the spectacle of what he has wrought can see is broken pledges, broken people, the bended bodies of the enslaved, the wan, ghostlike remains of what were happy and healthy children, mangled bodies strewn over a continent, the pattern and the heart of the world torn and bruised into the ugly shape of the mutilated.

And hardly a one whom he would convert by his engines of war to his new order but curses the thought of his name and writhes and prays to gain deliverance from his cruel bondage.

From your long past you know that those things which this wicked man now calls new are but the tyrannies against which man has struggled from the dawn of time, and those things by which he wreaks his wrath on the race are but the vices against which the virtue of every age has spent itself in mortal assault. Countless times in the long years of your forebears have you seen such a monster raise his head to devour all who came within his bestial reach. Yet, always, however long it took, however great the sacrifice, however painful the struggle, these mammoth beasts have been overthrown, their captives liberated, the traces of their bloody triumphs washed away, the fair fields scorched by their fiery breath brought to life again, the valleys and the mountains over which rolled the tumultuous echoes of desperate struggle and the sad sighs of death come to rest again in the arms of a soothing peace.

The good, the brave, and the steadfast have at last been the victors. If the good, the brave, and the steadfast have in all these older struggles of the race been the victors, shall it not be so in this age, in good time? Those things for which they fought are no less precious now than then. They are still the pearls of such great price that they cannot be purchased, let alone taken away. Surely we who are the heir of every gallant one who has lived, every brave one who has died, are not less worthy stewards of these precious things than they.

Today the world of the oppressed and the free has new hope from those momentous events of the last days. Like ancient giants, two men rose to Olympian heights while a breathless world waited. At last came their thrilling words to a thrilled world. In language and thought as clear as the blue ocean, sky under the vault of which they met, they laid down the commandments of a new world. They spoke not for governments, not even for nations, but for mankind. Like Moses of old, who communed with his God, these mortals, both from their own communion with nature and nature's God, raised words of new purpose and new policy for mankind.

They spoke as men with authority, because they were speaking truths eternal. They gave eloquent expression to those hopes which were maturing in the hearts of men everywhere.

In this great ocean under this blue sky they thought not of selfishness, but of selflessness. Two aging men thought of the human family and the countless millions yet to live upon earth. They thought of the kind of a world it ought to be, of the kind of a world it could be. They dreamed dreams of the long promised land. They felt the mellowing spirit of what was right. They were moved by the impulse of justice.

They forgot not little nations, or little men. They forgot not the problems of little nations, or little men. They forgot not the fears that little nations and little men shrink from, neither did they omit consideration for those things which besides bread are the staff of life.

In this testament of faith those who bear the galling yoke of slavery, those who are hard beset by mighty assault, those who are threatened, and those who contemplate the dreary future all found renewed hope and new determination.

Man is always best when he dreams. We are all indebted beyond measure to these men who in the midst of a chaotic and bloody world dared to choose to dream dreams of the quiet ways of peace. It will be for the world for which they labored and dared to dream to determine whether those dreams shall come true, or whether they shall be shattered on the shoals of selfishness. Another dreamed for mankind a quarter of a century ago and held up the torch of a new hope for the world. He labored long and mightily to built a temple to house justice for all nations and all men. He toiled mightily to lay down, to point out the way which men might follow to the paths of peace.

Yet "a little group of willful men," selfish, vain politicians, greedy, avaricious men, and alas a tired and short-sighted people broke the heart and the body of the dreamer, and soon the dreams of Woodrow Wilson, like his tortured, broken body, were strewn in miserable wreckage in a chaotic world. Not the dreamers have had to pay the price for shattered dreams, but those for whom the dreams did not come true.

But these ways of peace which Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill have dreamed for us they knew lay far over the distant horizon. Between us and the realization of those dreams lies the hard ways of struggle, the bitter dregs of pain and suffering, sacrifice, for many, death. For so hideous a monster, so colossal a giant as the force of tyranny which today menaces the world can be thrown back only by the most heroic and determined effort of those who would oppose them. Already millions have given themselves as hostages to the destruction of these evil forces. They have given all that these wicked things might be destroyed.

We all know that no less than our greatest effort has hope of avail against these satanic powers. Each in every free land must do his, or her, part without a thought of self, or selfishness, and in every one of those weary lands upon whose neck rides the galling yoke of slavery, there, too, must the fight be continued.

Daniel Webster once said, "God grants freedom only to those who love it, and who are always ready to guard and preserve it." How sad has been the spectacle of a government pledging its troth to a dictator who has ravaged its fair people. Who is not heartened, however, by the signs that France—ancient, glorious France—is stirring out of its lethargy and that the indomitable French spirit is rising in irresistible wrath to strike down this modern Caligula who has tortured it.

You Greeks of America, I know, would want to have your part in lifting America, your chosen land, to the incomparable challenge which it today confronts. Upon what this Nation does, must you well know, shall hang the destiny of the world. This unsurpassed power, which a beneficent God has cast upon us, we hold in stewardship for

mankind. America is no longer, thank God, a land of sluggish conscience and callous heart. America is today the land of the Puritan, the land of the crusader, the moral land which wills to do right because before God it is right; which is not afraid because it knows its cause is just, which counts not the cost because the end cannot be measured in cost.

This America has planted itself across the path of tyranny and defied every tyrant upon the fact of the earth. This America has rallied good men, godly men, honest and decent men, noble and heroic women, hopeful children all over the earth to the side of those who love liberty, respect man, and revere God.

And America pledges its faith that those paths which shall destroy tyranny shall not be used to father new tyrannies anywhere in all the world. Rather shall these forces which in good time shall emerge the master of the earth be employed to make a better home for the race, richer lands, fuller fields, better homes, healthier lives, wider horizons for every human being.

There is to be a new order, we agree. But it is to be the new coming of the old things, the old virtues, the old good life, the old faith, the old brotherhood, the old spirit, the old God, and in the old way these old things new come back shall rule upon the only thrones which are permanent—the hearts of men.

These old things in their new raiment shall shine more richly than ever before, for they bear the scars of more sacrifices, the crown of more glorious deeds.

This is the message which you men of Hellas, I know, would give to the world. Teach us all to be men of faith, who do not fear, who are steadfast. Meanwhile, know that you are not alone in your faith, and others with you wear the red badge of courage. Know that the giants of the earth are stirring from their slumber; the timid are coming out of their hiding places; the uncertain are beginning to feel sure of themselves; the ground is moving under the march of rallying men; the roar of machines, out of which come the illimitable volume of weapons, is rolling across the hills and the oceans; banners which men follow are waving in the breezes of many continents; the earth is rising against the tyranny of hell; Armageddon is being fought, and the hosts of the Lord are advancing along the whole front.

Although you of Hellas and others who share your sad plight can only say now what Tennyson said of you in Ulysses:

"We are not now that strength which in old days moved earth and heaven; that which we are, we are;
One equal temper of heroic hearts,
Made weak by time and fate, but strong in will
To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield"—

Yet be of good cheer. The old days are breaking anew over the horizon. The bastille of tyranny is falling.

"Operation Rat Hole"—In Periscope and Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, the magazine Newsweek has a page in front called the Periscope, an anonymous column, and a page in back called Perspective, by Raymond Moley.

On July 10 the Periscope said:

GOP AMMUNITION

The Republicans will have trouble making use of the Korean issue in their fall election campaign. This is their voting record on Korean aid: On January 19, when the House rejected the aid bill, the Republicans voted 130 against, 21 for the bill. Representative JOHN M. VORYS, of Ohio, who led the GOP opposition dubbed it "Operation Rat Hole." On February 8 when the amended bill, including aid to Formosa, as well as to Korea, passed, 91 voted against, 42 in favor of the measure.

On July 18 Raymond Moley, in his syndicated column in the Columbus Dispatch and other papers, said:

ADMINISTRATION FALSELY TRIES TO BLAME GOP FOR KOREA

(By Raymond Moley)

Since in two wars and in the failure of peace after the first war, great political hay has been gathered by blaming Republicans for isolationism, administration people are again swinging the old scythe. Spokesmen for the administration already are saying that the Republican voting record on Korean aid is that on January 19, when the House rejected the bill, the Republicans voted 130 against and 21 for the bill. They say, further, that Representative JOHN VORYS, who led the opposition, called it Operation Rat Hole.

That is the charge that will be shouted in scores of districts this fall.

Here are the facts: Congressman VORYS, on January 19, did say on the House floor that "we should not vote money down the Korean rat hole that will not help them militarily." He referred to the bill which was rejected that day. The bill did not provide 1 dime for military aid. VORYS meant that if we gave fertilizer and farm implements and the like and took no steps to protect South Korea from the attack which was already in readiness, our money and goods would go to North Korea and the Russians.

Long before that, on July 26, 1949, Republican members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs protested against a bill for aid to Korea on the same ground. Their words, uttered a year ago, have a profoundly prophetic sound. After noting that the Soviet was pushing North Korean forces into shooting on the frontier, their report went on to say:

"This development may well presage the launching of a full-scale military drive across the thirty-eighth parallel. Unless this Nation is prepared to meet force with comparable force, economic assistance cannot of itself insure the safety or the integrity of South Korea. To the contrary, there is every reason to believe that the lending of economic assistance at this time will only enhance the prize to be taken by force of arms and internal intrigue.

"Our forces, with the exception of an advisory mission, have been withdrawn from South Korea at the very instant when logic and common sense both demanded no retreat from the realities of the situation. With our forces on the scene of action, there might have been advanced substantial arguments in favor of economic assistance, but without the presence of an adequate force to protect delivery of, and guaranteed practical utilization of, the great volume of material and supplies, it appears folly of the highest order to embark upon the program."

This was signed by Congressmen ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, LAWRENCE H. SMITH, DONALD L. JACKSON, JOHN D. LODGE, and JOHN M. VORYS. Such Republican warnings continued in both House and Senate for a year.

Meanwhile, in July a year ago, $10,230,000 was appropriated for military aid. Since hostilities began, Major General Lemnitzer admitted to the Senate Appropriations Committee that only $200 worth of signal wire had been provided for Korea.

It is poor business for an administration, that ignored these warnings and neglected this opportunity to aid, to seek to place responsibility on Republicans.

In Newsweek for July 24, the Periscope said:

Political effects of the Korean crisis are uncertain at this stage.

In the same issue Perspective said:

REPUBLICAN FOREIGN POLICY

1. Democratic strategy already shows that the party line will, in this campaign as in those of the past 10 years, seek to smear Republicans for their voting record in Congress. An example of this is the charge that Republicans voted against Korean aid.

2. Republicans have a crushing answer to this. The record shows that the objection of Republicans, notably in the House, to Korean aid was that they wanted real military aid, and the administration proposed civilian aid such as fertilizer, farm machinery, etc. A year ago, five Republicans on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Messrs. CHIPERFIELD, SMITH, JACKSON, LODGE, and VORYS, issued a warning in which they predicted almost exactly the tragic current events. This fell on deaf ears, for again, in January, the administration presented a request only for civilian aid. At that time, JUDD, of the same committee, in an off-the-record House speech solemnly warned that economic assistance would not help without military aid. On Formosa, Republicans were right 6 months ago. On China generally, they have been issuing warnings for years. In the whole course of the past 5 or 6 years Republicans have an excellent record on foreign affairs.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the political implications of the Korean tragedy are seen more clearly by Newsweek in Perspective than through its Periscope.

Lessons From Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New Leader of July 8, 1950. What a price the young men of America are paying because as a nation we preferred illusions to facts despite the endless warnings of many like Chamberlin, Eugene Lyons, Max Eastman, Freda Utley, Alfred Kohlberg, Louis Budenz, Felix Morley. A true diagnosis is the beginning of hope of recovery. The article follows:

KOREA HAS RID US OF ILLUSIONS ABOUT THE KREMLIN'S REAL AIMS

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Commenting in a weekly on a changing situation like the Korean is no easy task. A few permanent lessons stand out, however, regardless of shifting battle lines.

1. The technique of Soviet aggression has been boldly stepped up. The chief cause of international tension in the past 5 years has been Soviet determination to achieve world mastery through a combination of military and internal subversion. But until Korea,

the Soviet Government operated with a certain amount of camouflage. Hitherto, its expansion was accomplished either by coordinating Red army occupation with the political activity of Red quislings (eastern Europe), by underhanded support of civil strife (Greece and China), or by bloodless pressure tactics (successful in Czechoslovakia, unsuccessful in Berlin).

Now the mask has been dropped. A Soviet-trained and equipped army has crossed a frontier in an undisguised act of aggression. The challenge to world peace, to the United Nations, to America's far eastern and world position is direct, brutal, unmistakable.

2. This challenge has been taken up. Instead of resorting to futile words and handwringing, the United States Government has committed itself, beyond possibility of retreat, to stopping imperialistc communism in Asia, as in Europe, with all the means at its own and its allies' disposal.

Not only have we gone farther in support of South Korea than many observers expected; we have also reversed one of Dean Acheson's worst mistakes: to yield Formosa to the Chinese Communists without lifting a finger. Now Formosa stays on our side of what is becoming an ever-clearer military and political line of demarcation. It would have involved less risk of conflict had this decision been announced 6 months earlier; but, at least, the mistake has been corrected.

3. Korea has been a powerful solvent of illusions. The notion had been gaining ground that over Soviet aggression was abating, that there was some semblance of truth in the peace offensives which party-liners were staging all over the world. The Trojan dove to which Acheson referred in his Harvard commencement address is now revealed unmistakably as a bird of prey.

Then there were the soothing assurances that the iron curtain wasn't really iron—this in the face of the concerted drive to tighten Soviet controls in the satellite countries and eliminate United States influence. We heard the incurably gullible plead that, if only we would listen to the siren-song of Trygve Lie and appease Stalin by admitting China to the UN under Soviet pressure, everyone would live happily ever after.

And there was the curious illusion that miraculous new weapons—actually not slated for mass production for another 3 or 4 years—would somehow counteract Soviet military predominance in Europe and exempt us from the need to integrate Germany and Japan into realistic defense plans. All these fantasies are gone—and good riddance.

4. The smash-and-grab attack on South Korea means the end of the United Nations in anything like its present form. An irreconcilable issue has been fairly joined. This has stemmed inevitably from the big loophole in the UN Charter dealing with aggression; the right of any permanent member to stop action against the aggressor by use of the veto. UN procedure on the Korean issue was simplified when Russia's boycott over the Chinese question forced it to be absent. But, since the UN has authorized military sanctions in defense of South Korea and the Soviet Union not only denies the legality of these sanctions but is actively aiding the North Korean aggressor, the Soviet Union, as when it attacked Finland in 1939, has virtually excluded itself from the community of free, civilized nations. Again, we say, good riddance.

5. There are two questions which many Americans must be asking themselves. Was the decision to commit American forces in an undeclared war inevitable? Does this decision make all-out war more probable?

I think the answer to the first question is "Yes." To the second, "No." For reasons which we set forth here 2 weeks ago, appeasement does not and cannot buy peace. Our policy now, as always, has been carefully defensive, perhaps too defensive. If the cold-blooded and hard-headed members of the Politburo think they stand an overwhelming chance of winning a third world war, they will start one, regardless of what concessions we might make. If they don't think they are sure to win, there will be no all-out war.

Have Our Leaders Learned a Lesson in Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the editorial from the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier, under date of July 13, which I offer for insertion in the RECORD, is representative, I believe, of the thinking of a majority of the people in the Third Iowa District which I have the honor to represent.

In only one or two details do I differ with the content of this editorial. One of these differences is with the statement that "by allowing their commitments to outrun their defenses the American people have done a shameful thing."

I insist that neither the American people nor a majority of the Members of Congress have had any worth-while knowledge of the foreign commitments on the part of President Truman and his State Department.

Repeatedly, Members of Congress, including myself, have asked on the floor of the House for a statement of American foreign policy. Silence or evasion has been the answer to all such attempts for enlightenment. The fact is that American foreign policy and commitment has largely operated on an improvised basis for the last 5 years—from hour to hour and day to day—until Korea.

I do not believe the American public can be held responsible on this score unless by the indirection of having placed the present administration in power. Neither do I believe it is fair to hold a majority of Members of Congress responsible when they were denied even the most elementary information.

I further agree with the statement in the editorial that "this is not time for political recrimination." But this is the time to fix responsibility for the slaughter of American youth in Korea. The editorial follows:

OUR COMMITMENTS OUTRUN OUR ARMS

For the second time in a decade a few poorly armed American troops have been thrown hastily into battle against a better-armed, numerically superior enemy operating on a carefully planned timetable of aggression.

Thus the greatest industrial Nation in the world sends its sons to bloody sacrifice and asks them to uphold the honor of American arms with equipment inferior to that of a semibarbaric enemy.

It is not right or fair or—if there had been proper planning—necessary. Again in Korea the United States has been woefully outsmarted and victory there will come only after an agonizing struggle. By allowing their commitments to outrun their defenses the American people have done a shameful thing. It is unjust that a thin line of men in Korea should be forced to bear the penalty for our incompetence.

This is no time for partisan recriminations. Given the situation at the time when the North Korean attack occurred, President Truman made the right decision. A refusal to assist the South Koreans would have resulted in more dangerous and difficult conflicts elsewhere.

But American leaders in the administration, in Congress, and throughout public life are responsible. They must learn by this error. They must never again allow a commitment to be made to defend an area unless we have the physical equipment and the trained troops in sufficient quantity to defend it.

No doubt it will be argued that Russia, being the aggressor, is able to plot attacks anywhere along the fringes of the iron curtain and strike without warning. But tanks and airplanes cannot be kept a secret. Hundreds of thousands of men cannot be assembled overnight. If we are to play this dangerous game with Russia, our intelligence services have got to be improved.

And if we are going to fight, it is essential that we draw a line, declare we will fight if the enemy crosses it and be fully prepared for combat. A study of the public statements by responsible administration spokesmen last spring would lead anyone to conclude that the United States would not fight to defend South Korea. Yet, when the crisis came our whole policy in the Far East was reversed without warning and troops were thrown into Korea on an improvised plan of defense.

This generation of Americans is engaged in a continuing struggle against a cunning and skillful enemy. Winning our survival is going to reduce our standard of living and require many sacrifices. But we cannot coast blithely along in our usual careless way—making economic and military commitments all over the world—and then not be prepared to back them up. If we must send American troops into action, it is imperative that they be equal to the enemy in the effectiveness of their arms. Surely that, at least, is possible.

UNESCO Says Racism Is an Evil Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the false theories of racial superiority and the misleading myths about doctrines of blood, whether Aryan, Nordic, Pan-Slavic, or what have you, have just received a blow which they justly deserve. These racist theories have been a source of much trouble, needless tension, and unwarranted bloodshed ever since late in the nineteenth century when they were enunciated by certain European philoso-

phers who had no real grasp of human understanding and whose sole purpose was to utilize these misleading doctrines for political reasons.

The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—UNESCO—has just completed a study of the concept of race and has reached the conclusion that racism is an evil force in the world. UNESCO has been doing a fine job in the fields of education and culture throughout the world since its inception as a United Nations organization several years ago, but even if it had done nothing else but make the present study on racism and its evil effects on human civilization it has made a worthwhile contribution to human understanding and world peace. I congratulate UNESCO for undertaking this study. I hope it will take all possible steps to bring its findings to the attention of all peoples throughout the world, including our own people of the United States.

I commend to my colleagues the following brief editorial on the subject from the New York Times of July 19, 1950:

THE MYTH OF RACE

The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization has performed a valuable service in making a study of the concept of race. The conclusion that there is no basic superiority or inferiority due to race confirms the expectations of students, but, as the world learned to its cost during the Nazi era, this is a truth that needs popularization.

The racist theory in modern times began with the premise that the white man is innately superior to the colored simply because he is white. The father of racism was Count Arthur de Gobineau, writing in the middle of the nineteenth century. He was the one who first popularized the so-called superiority of the Aryans, the greatest of the white races, according to him. Since the Germanic peoples of antiquity were Aryans, it was easy for the Nazis to claim superiority for the modern German.

De Gobineau's theories took firmest root in Germany, where they were fostered by the Germanized Englishman, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, at the end of the nineteenth century. Kaiser Wilhelm II was an enthusiastic follower, but of course, it was Hitler who carried the theory to its full, evil flowering in his doctrine of blood and leadership. "All that is not race in this world is trash," he wrote in Mein Kampf. Alfred Rosenberg, the philosopher of the Nazi movement, went on to glorify the Nordic race that supposedly formed the principal ingredient of the German people. Hitler it was who forced Mussolini in 1938 to introduce racism and its vicious corollary, anti-Semitism. Before the Fuehrer was through he had reached the absurdity of classifying the Japanese as Aryans.

To Hitler and the Rosenberg school the Slavs were an inferior race. From the other side of the fence, however, Pan-Slavism has been a racial movement of some force. We hear echoes of it now and then from behind the iron curtain. Wherever it is, whatever form it takes, racism is an evil force, and to the extent that UNESCO can kill it by the truth it will do good. To eliminate race as a scientific term is a step toward ending it as a myth that dictators and movements use as political instruments to gain and exercise power.

Conditions in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I received a letter today which I think should be made available to the Congress and the country. The writer is the daughter of a former Colorado Member of Congress, who lost her only son in World War II. She is a keen observer, alert, and well informed, so her views and her report on conditions in Europe are not only pertinent, but significant and important at this particular time. For these reasons I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: It was nice seeing you and Mrs. Johnson before my trek to Europe. It is because of my finding there that I am writing you. I went with a double purpose: To contact my sons' POW buddies in Europe whom we had been trying to help since my son's going. Study for my own information just what Europe's evaluation of us was, and what their attitude on possibility of another war; for having lost so much personally in last war, I have given my time over largely to measures of understanding among the world's people and efforts toward peace.

Naturally my contacts did not take me to envoys, brass, or high government officials. Rather, I mingled with the common people—for I was in homes of many of my son's old Japanese POW buddies.

I went into many country districts, talked with not only my son's friends, but their friends. I was in France, Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, Germany, England, and Scotland.

I came away heavy-hearted. These people have only one subject of conversation—World War II and its devastation and horrors. Such a possibility of new war within 5 years had never entered their heads, so you can imagine my shock when we docked in New York June 27 and found all papers' headlines screaming with news of starting of war in Korea.

I feel very sure I gathered the correct pulse of the people—the ones whom we had expected to fall on their faces to help us because of diplomats' words or because of Marshall plan. But such reaction was not in my findings. They do not intend to become the battleground of European wars because we shared our wealth in their rehabilitation; nor in any Far East trouble unless it touches them personally as a nation.

They say this openly. The French people say we cannot engage them in another world war. Their spirit, they say, is completely broken, for they and their forefathers for generations have been in wars and so know nothing save devastation, desolation, and death from them.

I found Italians in south of Italy very antagonistic to Americans, but the feeling did grow more favorable somewhat as I went north. They say they too are through fighting. Very open in this attitude. Even my private or tour-guides did not hesitate to say: "These Italian conditions could not have existed had Mussolini lived. His great mistake was not that he was not a great man and leader, but that he chose the wrong side to line up with."

Holland is utterly crestfallen. She's digging out of her misery somewhat, but her economic condition with loss of her cattle during German occupation and now the return of her East Indies citizens with no jobs and no place to live leaves her in a state of anxiety and restlessness. They feel, too, it was United States who insisted most upon freeing the East Indies before they were ready for freedom, so this makes them a bit bitter toward us.

The Germans where I was in their country—are utterly discouraged. They loathe occupation, say they won't try to do much until that period is over. One even dared to say to me she thought Hitler regime terrible, but it was far better then than conditions are now. I was only in English zone—making my main stay at Munster.

England shows scars of war everywhere. I know, for I traveled by motor coach or auto over both England and Scotland, pausing in south central England in a little country district for 4 days just to study people and conditions.

Things are going to have to threaten England itself, I believe, before we can count on her throwing manpower and war materials and weapons into the next fight. She is not, as I interpret her mood, going to come to our aid as we went to hers. No, never.

Of course, they (England) want our dollars over there, for our money, I suppose, is the world's stablest. So does France, but, underneath, I felt France would strike us if she dared. Those countries all consider us officious, too talkative, conceited. They feel we put out too much world war III propaganda—keeping the world on edge all the time.

One of Holland's boys talked to me a long time on this subject. He said we were forever talking about new weapons we'd made, always making threats as to what we would do if this or that happened.

Heavens, I wonder what he thinks of that gaff now. All unprepared again, full of talk, but with our blessed boys dying because of our lack of knowledge of real conditions here at home

Of course, this same thing happened to my son in Manila. I remember almost the last letter we had from him before the *Houston* ducked off to hide for a while—before censorship came in. He wrote: "For God's sake, Pop, can't you go see Senator JOHNSON and see if he can't get us a few planes over here. We're absolutely helpless as we are."

I know you're doing everything you can to help—and always have done. If I didn't have the faith I have in you, I wouldn't write this letter. But, Senator JOHNSON, we must watch our step. We do not have the warm friendships of nations that we think we have. I know we don't.

I felt I must tell you this. I have given over almost my entire time since my son's going to programs and projects to further peace and world understanding. That was the entire object of my trip. I thought I'd do all the good I could among the many all over Europe with whom I had these splendid contacts, then come home with a better knowledge as to how I should carry on from there. Then, war news met me as I got off the *Caronia*.

I feel a tragic uneasiness about your land and mine. We are going to be in a world war by ourselves if we are not careful. Many whom we hope to have as allies would, secretly, I feel, like to see something happen to let us down a bit, to make us realize what war really means when one's country is the battleground.

I am definitely against use of A-bomb and so much threat of it. Suppose Russia used this threat all the time as we are doing. What would our reaction be?

This is way too long already. I felt I must give you my findings for I went at my own expense—went to go among the common people such as myself to find out what they thought of us as a nation, what their real attitude toward us if another world war flared up. And, I found out.

My heart is very heavy these days, for I know the United States better watch her step.

My very best to my very fine friends, the Johnsons.

Cordially.

Mobilization and Price and Wage Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Arthur Krock concerning the Korean situation and related matters, which is extremely pertinent. The article was published in the New York Times of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 21, 1950]

IN THE NATION—ANOTHER EFFORT TO BYPASS EXPERIENCE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, July 20.—The President's decision to try to enforce priorities and allocations of materials essential to his partial mobilization program without price controls, his failure to mention wage controls at all, and his current attempt to prevent hoarding and profiteering by appealing to the patriotism and common sense of individual citizens represent an experiment which failed 10 years ago at great and enduring cost to the national economy.

Then, though the crisis caused by the European war was mounting, the Roosevelt administration first long delayed action and then tried to deal by inches with the problem of controls. It left wages to the last, and the result was an economic system that kept bursting at the seams and has had to be patched with political thread ever since.

The close alliance between organized labor and the Roosevelt administration was the root of the effort to control prices, after part of the nettle was grasped, without tackling the large component that wages constituted. That was the period in which, writing in the Harvard Business Review, Donald M. Nelson and Leon Henderson professed to believe the wage component would be satisfactorily regulated by the patriotism and common sense of labor and management.

President Truman's immediate program is far from the mobilization for total war which came after the United States became involved on December 7, 1941. But it can require an increase of $20,000,000,000 in the military budget for fiscal year 1951 before all the requirements, starting with $10,000,000,000, are met. And that is a far step forward toward a military economy and begins a period where defense needs have priority.

WHAT FOLLOWS ALLOCATIONS

Hand in hand with priorities must go allocations, and the lesson of experience is that these cannot be effective without price controls in which controls of wages are included. Allocations follow this course: Materials one businessman wants are awarded to another; the first man then normally tries to get the materials in any kind of market he can; and this endeavor raises costs, which in turn brings demands for wage increases. The temporary structure the President has recommended to Congress somewhat resembles the classic German cartel, but it is being erected on a partial war footing, and that calls for the additional factor which price-wage controls alone can furnish.

If Mr. Truman can move the economy into the partial military phase which is his program, and deal effectively with priorities, allocations, hoarding, and profiteering without this final factor, it will be a historic example of a triumph over experience. This achievement may be his if very soon he asks, and Congress grants, stand-by powers to institute price-wage controls when he finds them necessary—the club-in-the-closet which in some matters does a fine job of inactive policing. But if he does not soon make the request and gain the assent of Congress to it (this could be assured by a proviso of consultation before final action), the lesson of experience is that the miracle can't be passed in Washington.

The entire problem, of course, will vanish if a certain kind of miracle can be passed in Moscow. But even the most credulous readers of the stars see no approaching signs of that phenomenon.

THE BARUCH THESIS

The voice of this particular experience about economy in a crisis provoked by war or the threat of war is Bernard M. Baruch. He does not play in the Truman administration the advisory role he played in previous ones. There are no personal relations between the President and Mr. Baruch. Yet this does not take validity from Mr. Baruch's statements on the subject, and the absence of personal relations with the White House does not remove it either. Among his statements this, published in March 1941 in the Harvard Business Review, is typical:

"Priorities should be applied as soon as the action of the Government in carrying out the armaments program has made impending shortages apparent in any of the components of production. Then there is a more delicate timing problem after the system has been launched which must be dealt with carefully to attain the maximum possible synchronization of all elements of the Nation's industry * * *.

"The priorities system cannot work alone. It is the heart of industrial mobilization, but it needs other organs. Above all, it must have the assistance of price control, conservation, the search for substitutes and commandeering. Price control is necessary because the priorities system is actually a means of short circuiting the laws of supply and demand."

In November 1941 in a letter to Representative GORE, of Tennessee, Mr. Baruch wrote, "I do not see how control of prices can be effective without taking into consideration wage levels and agricultural schedules. * * * A ceiling over wages can be adjustable so as to give consideration to increases in the cost of living. * * * But wages form the biggest component of all price structures."

That is even truer now than it was 9 years ago.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the great interest of people all over the country in having their deposits in banks guaranteed, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Bankers Close To Success in 'Raid' on Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Fund," which appears in this week's edition of Labor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BANKERS CLOSE TO SUCCESS IN "RAID" ON FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION FUND

A $68,000,000 steal for the Nation's banks came closer to success this week when the House Banking Committee reported out a Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation bill. It already has passed the Senate, but progressives in the House have promised to put up a fight against it.

The daily papers speak of it as a bill to increase from $5,000 to $10,000 the amount of an individual bank deposit which the FDIC can insure. What really counts is a provision cutting down the small cost for this insurance which the banks pay.

The banks would save about $68,000,000 a year. That means, of course, that there will be just that much less money in the fund to protect the cash of the bank's depositors.

Mrs. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE, Democratic Congresswoman from Connecticut, and a member of the Banking Committee, was one who fought against this grab for the bankers. She said the action of the bankers in trying to chisel away at the fund is just like the efforts employer groups have made to cripple unemployment insurance funds in the various States.

Employers got the tax rates they pay lowered, she explained, with the result that some of the funds are in bad shape now and benefits paid to the unemployed have not kept pace with rising living costs. If the bankers have their own way, she said, the deposit insurance fund, too, may be found inadequate when it is most needed.

The bankers used similar tactics years ago in chipping away at State bank deposit insurance systems, with the result that the last one had gone out of existence just before the Federal system was created.

MIGHT HAVE HALTED SLUMP

If the FDIC had been organized about 10 years earlier, before the Hoover depression, many people believe there would have been no depression. Certainly there would have been none of the "bank runs" and closing of banks all over the country.

But now, when the banks are all in a most prosperous condition, the bankers are so greedy that for less than 1 percent of their deposits they are seeking to weaken the protection for the depositors, throwing in the "sop" of doubling the guaranty, although that will only further jeopardize the fund.

International Information and Education Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I had the honor of serving in Geneva in May of 1948 with Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby on the United States delegation at the UN Conference on Freedom of Information. I learned to admire her not only for her insight and her wisdom, but for her conscientious devotion to the responsibilities to which she was assigned. There was no harder working member of the delegation.

She was invited to join General Marshall, General Eisenhower, Secretary Acheson, Mr. Bernard Baruch, John Foster Dulles, and other eminent witnesses 10 days ago in testimony before the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, headed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Although she could not leave Houston at this time, she took the time to write a most penetrating statement, which will be carried in the record of the hearings. Because the matters discussed in this statement are so urgent, and because of the wisdom and experience of the writer, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD so that it will be called immediately to the attention of the Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY OVETA CULP HOBBY, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, THE HOUSTON POST, HOUSTON, TEX., ON SENATE RESOLUTION 243

In as few words as possible I would like to state why I believe that the United States must expand and improve its information program along the lines suggested by Senator BENTON.

I have seen for myself on many occasions how public opinion about our country abroad is being formed and also distorted—as a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors' committee which studied the problems of world dissemination of news, as a member of the American delegation to the United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information in Geneva as well as on several other trips abroad.

These experiences have left me with the strong conviction that our American information program abroad, though steadily improving, is still insufficient. It has too little money, too little equipment, too small a staff, and too limited a field of action.

It is not true, and Senator BENTON has made this point clear, that America has failed to produce truly great, courageous ideas in the field of foreign affairs.

UNRRA, the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, the military-assistance program, and others were great ideas.

No world power that has ever been charged with the task of guarding the peace has brought forth more measures of enlightened self-interest—enlightened altruism, you might want to call it—than has the United States in so short a period of time.

Where we failed is in providing the educational effort without which the greatest ideas remain ineffective in the struggle for men's minds.

When UNRRA trucks, loaded with American goods for starving populations, rolled along every highway in the countries which are now behind the iron curtain, we allowed local Communist dignitaries to take all the credit for themselves—to hide the origins of the goods and bury in silence the thoughts of friendship and solidarity that in our hearts accompanied those trucks.

We were more successful with the Marshall plan, but not successful enough.

Despite the Russian charge that we want to "coca-colonize" Europe, an overwhelming majority of western Europeans today see the Marshall plan as what it is: The greatest mass humanitarian effort in history.

What even friendly Europeans, however, fail to see is the fact that the Marshall plan would not be possible without the very real sacrifice on behalf of millions of Americans.

The average European still sees us as something like the legendary rich uncle in America who can afford to go on paying forever because he is so rich he doesn't notice the difference. The average European is genuinely surprised when he discovers upon arriving in the United States that not only Europeans but many Americans find it hard to make ends meet and that many of the 130,000,000 taxpayers from whose contributions the Marshall funds are drawn deprive themselves to help the rest of the world.

Little facts like this about our daily life should be known abroad as well as the basic principles of our foreign policy and our democratic institutions.

Our contribution to the welfare of the world is so great and Russia's contribution in turn is so small. The choice between our friendship and that of the Russians is the most preposterous choice ever offered in history.

Russia is offering the peoples abroad neither the most elementary freedom nor the simplest goods and physical comforts. It has nothing to give or to sell but despotism.

If Russia can expand with falsehoods and a gaudy doctrinaire, we can surely confine her with the story of a people's government and a people's effort in behalf of freedom, peace, and rehabilitation. Our story is not doctrinal, merely informative.

We apologize sometimes for being guilty of materialism. We should be proud. The blessings of American materialism are apparent everywhere.

The struggle for men's mind was illustrated for me in a talk I had not long ago in Paris with one of those shrewd, simple women of peasant stock who have given France much of its strength.

I asked her how she felt about the opposing Russian and American claims.

"The Communists use the radio," she said. "They tell us that if we accept the Marshall plan we are selling our souls for American dollars. And many of my friends shrug their shoulders and say 'that's right' because America does not use the radio and does not have newspapers in Paris to tell about the Marshall plan.

"But," she said, "I notice that they all want to live like Americans, dress like Americans—maybe go to America to get rich."

And there you have the difference. The elementary facts about the United States are enough to be convincing, if we make them known.

But we have failed to make them known.

In 1949 half the people of Europe thought that Americans were too materialistic—interested only in the pursuit of the almighty dollar. One out of three Europeans who were interviewed believed that big business dominates American policy, controls the press, radio, and motion pictures. Almost as many believe that big business controls labor.

These statistics are taken from an excellent survey, European Beliefs Regarding the United States, which was made and published under the direction of Henry Lee Munson by the Common Council for American Unity. The figures may look a little more favorable today, but there has been no basic change.

The survey showed—and this was well after the Atlantic Pact had become a reality—that a substantial number of western Europeans do not understand what American foreign policy really is. It showed that about one out of four people feel the United States is imperialistic at least in the economic sense. A similar proportion felt that we are trying to force the American form of capitalism on Europe.

A majority of those interviewed said that American motion pictures were creating much unfavorable sentiment toward the United States by "convincing increasing numbers of Europeans that America consists of gangsters, sadists, pin-up girls, cowboys, and skyscrapers."

Over one-third of Europeans believed that American foreign policy was "too changeable" and a typical comment added to this observation was "Our government makes mistakes too, but they affect only ourselves. Your Government's mistakes affect the whole world."

This, I believe, is the central point of the entire problem which is facing us here.

Whether we are happy and proud about it, or not, it is an inescapable fact that the United States is the strongest and the leading democratic nation in the world.

It has to be the guardian of the peace or peace will be lost.

It has to make decisions—bold decisions and also dangerous decisions like the one we have just made in Korea.

It has to make decisions which affect the citizens of Milan, Italy, and Seoul, Korea, as much as they do those of Houston, Tex.

If these decisions are not understood and supported by the people of Milan and Seoul, our leadership is ineffective. An ineffectiveness of our leadership spells disaster for the world and for us.

It is doubly important that the world be informed of the motives that underlie our decisions and our actions because we are the only ones who have the military power—because we are the ones who must make use of military power if this is necessary as it was in Korea.

But we do not dare to use our power for our and the world's benefit unless our motives in doing so are above reproach not only in fact but in the eyes of the world.

For this—and for the urgency of Senator Benton's proposal—Korea is the perfect illustration.

Despite United Nations' solidarity and despite the fact that a neutral UN commission gave a documentary report as to what happened in Korea on the morning of the invasion, the men in the Kremlin have the nerve to reverse the charges.

They have the nerve to tell the world that we—not they—are the aggressors.

And what is more, their charges—and not our fact—are believed not merely in Russia, but throughout eastern Europe, in east Germany, in large parts of the Middle East, in Asia, and even in some quarters of western Europe and the United States.

Stalin would not dare to lie so brazenly, and he would not be able to lie so successfully, if our information program had been adequate.

It would not be quite as difficult and dangerous for us today to do our duty as the leading democracy, if we had told the story effectively.

We cannot, of course, hope to convince the entire world that our motives are pure.

But we can convince many who so far have had no access to the truth. We can do so by making every possible effort in order to get the truth to the people behind the iron curtain; by expanding, as Senator Benton suggests, our program of information, and by using all our influence and power in behalf of world-wide freedom of information.

We can also convince many who do not distrust our motives but our skill and wisdom in carrying them out. We can convince those who are inclined to see us in the role of Lennie, the strong youngster in Steinbeck's Mice and Men who loved the rabbits of all colors and wanted to caress them, but who was so strong that in his affection he squeezed them to death.

How many Asians are still afraid even to accept our assistance and our friendship for fear that the sheer weight of our bigness and power might lead us to strangle them and to stifle their freedom?

We can—and must—convince them that their fears are unfounded.

This is not a task that can be done by the Government alone. It requires the assistance of the millions of private American citizens whose efforts, talents and resources the Benton resolution strives to mobilize and to coordinate.

Lenin has written that the Soviet regime rests on a balance of coercion and persuasion.

We are negating and, indeed, combating coercion. We distrust persuasion as long as it is propaganda.

But there is a form of persuasion that we can and must use; the force of persuasion that springs from the facts of our achievements and of our life, from our Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.

We have over Russia the tremendous advantage that we do not have to lie.

We should make better use of this advantage.

Senator Wiley's Record Against Communist Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we are told that history repeats itself. As an illustration of that fact, at this time I should like to ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain materials dating from prewar days showing a parallel between our efforts against communism in those times and our efforts today.

There being no objection, the materials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ANTI-RED FIGHT IN 1940 AND 1941

The amazing thing about the Korean crisis is the way in which it almost duplicates our bitter Pearl Harbor experiences. Then, as now, our defense experts were caught by surprise, woefully unprepared, smug, complacent. Then, as now, America's heroic fighting men had to face superior forces of the foe—an enemy armed with better tanks, better equipment, better training than our own valiant warriors had.

Our Government—our executive branch—unfortunately did not learn the lessons of history. Congress appropriated over $80,000,000,000 in the past 5 years, but still we find that the National Defense Department has not equipped itself adequately for the challenge. Eighty billion dollars—where did it go?

Neither have we equipped ourselves adequately for the challenge of meeting the menace of subversive groups in our own country. During this present Eighty-first Congress and in the past Eightieth Congress, the House of Representatives has approved legislation for coping with Communist espionage and sabotage.

Both times, however, this House-approved legislation has unfortunately been allowed to languish in the Senate.

SENATOR WILEY'S COMMITTEE HEARINGS

When I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee during the Eightieth Congress I personally conducted many weeks of hearings on this subject of Mundt-Nixon anti-Communist bill. I gave opportunity to every Communist leader who wanted to testify against this bill to do so, hour after hour, day after day. I felt that they were entitled to have their say and that after that Congress was entitled to have its say and to put the Reds down in their place.

Unfortunately, because the hearings were held in the closing days of the session, it was not possible to pass the anti-Red bill. Now, however, a new anti-Communist bill, S. 2311, is pending on the Senate Calendar, and it is my earnest hope that before we recess we will take action on it; amending it wherever necessary to conform completely to the constitutional rights and civil liberties of our people.

ATTEMPTED SMEAR OF FBI

Yes, one of the parallels between the Pearl Harbor situation and the present situation is that then, as now, we were bothered by termites in our midst. In 1940 we beheld the brave fight of little Finland against the Communist aggressor. How well I remember those days. In 1941 we were confronted with a vicious smear campaign which was conducted against the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its great Director, J. Edgar Hoover—then, as now, one of the finest public servants who graces public office—a man whom the Congress implicitly trusts and respects.

Today again we find the National Lawyers Guild and similar Communist-front organizations attacking the FBI for the simple reason that the FBI is the best single weapon we have in the war against subversion.

I believe that the parallel between 1940 and 1941 and 1950 will be of interest to my colleagues, and so I have selected certain excerpts from various comments that I made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during those years, and I present them herewith for what I believe will be some historic interest to those of us who are interested in preventing history from again repeating its bitter lessons.

We want to learn the lessons of history—the lessons of fifth-column betrayal from within—rather than see us repeat the mistakes of the past. We don't want to allow the fifth column to undermine the American system and allow more Pearl Harbors to occur. Let's hit the Red problem now.

FINLAND'S BATTLE AGAINST REDS

Excerpt from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 19, 1940, containing text of radio address praising brave little Finland's stand against the Soviet Union's invading hordes:

"Mr. WILEY. * * * Finland and the Finnish people need help. Finland is a God-worshipping nation. We are a God-worshipping Nation. The Finns are a liberty-loving people. We are a liberty-loving people. Our Christian sympathy and heart throbs in this great Finnish national emergency must result in the American people, individually and in groups, meeting the situation by providing immediate help so that the heroic defense that the Finns have been making to preserve their liberty and save their Christian institutions can be continued.

"The Finnish people are a devout, genuinely devout, people. They live Christianity. They believe in keeping international law. They are honest. They are industrious. They are clean physically and mentally. The invader threatens not only the homes and cities and churches and the political freedom of this people but also, if successful, the invader would threaten the life and the faith and the liberty of the other Scandinavian nations and democracy everywhere.

"Yes; as was said by one of the great leaders of Finland to the Finnish people, a Lutheran bishop, 'With a clear conscience and with a feeling of complete solidarity we have arisen as one man to defend everything that is holy and precious for us Christians—we feel that we are the advance guard of western Christian culture in the north,' this is wholly correct.

"We in America, because we are so far away, do not realize the danger—the danger to the natural rights of man to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—on this globe.

"Yes, my friends, Finland stands as the first line of defense—your line of defense and my line of defense—against the forces of evil, chaos, and godlessness. We here must realize that if Finland and Scandinavia should become provinces of Russia, communism would overrun these Christian lands. What is more, it would give communism an outpost on the Atlantic. What is communism?

"Communism is based upon the theory of Marx, and it means abolition of all private property, complete control of labor by the state, the state having unrestricted power to draft individuals for labor without reference to their personal desire, the individual having no rights whatsoever. Communism asserts there is no God. It strips man of his liberty and makes him a mere cog in a machine for the production of material things by the collective labor of slaves in a godless state—a state under the iron heel of a despot.

"We cannot take time in this fast-moving world to hate persons, because if we do we cannot take time to love. We love Finland for her integrity, for her courage, for her righteousness. America, I am sure, has no time for the communistic doctrines of Russia which deprive men of the great freedoms that man possesses under a democracy. But is America awake? Are the citizens of America awake to the danger; awake to the wonderful opportunity that is presented to each individual and each group in America to aid the Finnish people and at the same time to strike a blow against communism and aid to our own land and the liberty-loving people everywhere?

"It is a deep shadow that has fallen across our modern world—the shadow of an advancing communism that forces its way forward through bloodshed and war. Already villages and churches and homes have been destroyed and many lives sacrificed. Repercussions of this strife are felt the world around, in new feuds that arise, in a disrupted economic order, in the curtailment of charitable and mission enterprises, and in unparalleled sufferings reaching far and wide. We may not be able to heal all the wounds this present strife is causing, but we can, at least, heal some. Like the good samaritan, we can help those in dire distress. Like Christians, we can help keep the lamp of faith burning by generous deeds; we can insist that the Gospel shall find expression in the cooperation we give to sustain those of our own ideals and faith in this their dark Gethsemane hour."

CLEANING OUT THE TERMITES

April 25, 1940: A plea to European-minded individuals to think of our own country first:

"Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we do not want any American Hitler or Stalin in American industry, American labor, or American politics. We do not want any fifth column in America. If I had my way, in these perilous times I would double the appropriation for the FBI.

"In this land of ours there are many persons who call themselves Americans who have gone wrong in recent years because of material inequalities. They have been listening to the lilting voices of those who want us to go the way of Europe. As a result there have grown up in this country certain organizations whose taproots cross the Atlantic and reach down into the heart of foreign capitals.

"Because of the demagogic doctrines which are preached in our land, the clergy and the learned men in our universities have today a priceless opportunity to display far-seeing vision by leading American youth away from radical organizations and into sound American activities.

"Under the policies that have always obtained in America we have proceeded on the theory that years would bring light, and those who had gone astray would see the light and return to the fold. Under ordinary circumstances I still believe that is a correct theory. But, Mr. President, we do not live in ordinary times. We live in a period in the world's history when foreign nations send to other countries men who come in ostensibly to enjoy the hospitality of their hosts, but when they enter the house they take it over. I, for one, am ready to say to any foreigner who comes to this country: 'You are here as the guest of this Nation; obey the rules of the house and you can remain here.'

"And to American citizens who have joined up with un-American organizations I am ready to say: 'Cease having intercourse with those who would despoil America. Give up your membership. Give the Government the benefit of information you now have. Your obligation to America is the greatest obligation in life. Prove faithful to it.'

"Every country in Europe now knows what the 'fifth column' is. Every country in Europe now, since Norway has been martyred, has taken steps against spies and termites. You, Mr. President, and I can do very little personally, but the FBI can guard our treasures; it can guard the portals to America. It can protect our rights not only against the foreigner whose presence in our midst would abuse our hospitality but against those Americans who have been inoculated by the fever of hate and deception and class warfare brought into being by the dictators of Europe.

* * * * *

"There are today a great many people who are not influenced by jittery war headlines, yet who believe it entirely possible for agents of foreign governments to be engaged in espionage in connection with the large amount of war contracts placed here by the Allies. Naturally, this would result in a certain amount of skirmishing between the FBI and foreign agents who would find it distinctly to their advantage to discredit the Bureau.

"There is another phase of this 'smearing' campaign. The FBI has been actively concerned with the investigation of Communist activity. That investigation has in recent months been more effective than ever before. The arrest of certain persons in Detroit for securing enlistments for the Spanish loyalists is an example of one investigation which has resulted in a verbal bombardment of the Bureau.

"Mr. President, I do not want an Ogpu in this country. I do not believe in an American Gestapo. I realize that a Federal bureau set up as an investigational agency of the Government might conceivably, under an autocratic and dictatorial administration, invade private rights and trample roughshod on our traditional sacrosanct American civil liberties. But, Mr. President, such an abuse of power appears unlikely at this time. Despite all efforts to besmirch the character of the FBI Director on the basis of his record, I, for one, am willing to believe that his character and known integrity would prevent any misuse of his powers.

"This does not mean that I subscribe to a blind, unreasonable trust in the FBI. On the contrary, I believe that we must exert an unceasing vigilance to see that there is no unwarranted growth in its power. However, I believe that the possible menace inherent in a Federal Bureau of Investigation lies not in the Bureau itself, but in the suspicious activities of any left-wing groups who would seek to discredit the Bureau, so that they themselves may control it and then undermine its vigilant enforcement of Federal statutes."

WHO ARE THE FIFTH COLUMNISTS?

May 31, 1940: In the course of a defense of the great Federal Bureau of Investigation, the elements of the fifth column are described:

"Mr. WILEY. * * * I want to enumerate a few more 'fifth columns' that have helped to demoralize this America of ours.

"First. The group of aliens or citizens who live in this country and who are not devoting themselves 100 percent loyally to America. Some of these folks belong to organizations that have taproots in the various capitals of Europe. The members of this group think more about the welfare of other nations than about the welfare of America. America needs, as I have said, 100-percent loyalty.

"Second. The second group I call the 'parlor pinks' and the internationalists who have found it convenient to hobnob with the communistic group with headquarters in Russia. Some folks high up in Government have been associating with this group.

"Third. The third group consists of certain public officials whose laxity has permitted disciples of communism, Nazism, and fascism to come to America and teach their doctrines, not only in various labor and social groups but in our colleges.

"Fourth. The fourth group consists of pseudo intellectuals who have been guilty of causing a patriotic erosion in our youth. We find many of these in our educational centers. For years they have talked America down and never talked her up, but they themselves are always ready to live on the fat of America.

"Fifth. Another group is the defeatist group. We find them everywhere. Looking at the situation, they can see no hope, economically or politically, for America. They see our unpreparedness, and through their defeatist attitude, slow up every constructive activity. They are a factor which must be reckoned with in our present situation."

IDENTIFYING FOREIGN AGENTS

Eleven months before Pearl Harbor, a bill is introduced to identify sources of foreign propaganda. Excerpts from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 14, 1941:

"Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for some time propaganda agents of foreign powers have blitzkrieged our citizens with their propaganda. Our mails have been flooded with it, and citizens all over the United States have received propaganda—leaflets, letters, pamphlets, and books—gratuitously from foreign propaganda offices.

"The average citizen reads these publications when they are sent to him and accepts their arguments at face value. For the most part, it does not occur to him to question the sources of the material, and if he were so inclined it would be difficult for him to trace the matter.

"Mr. President, I have had a bill drawn under the provisions of which such situations can be met. Under the provisions of the act approved June 8, 1938, there is required the registration of all persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States. However, it is not required that the propaganda which they disseminate be identified as such.

"My point is a simple one. I believe that in addition to requiring the registration of propaganda agents of foreign powers we must also require that their writings and their leaflets and their newspapers, or whatever it be, be definitely labeled, so that the average American citizen will know that he is reading propaganda.

"We have rigid labeling requirements for food, drugs, cosmetics, so that the public may identify what it is getting. It is equally important that we make certain that the American public may identify the mental food which is being fed by foreign powers and when I say 'foreign powers' I do not lay my fingers upon anyone in particular, but we know that every foreign power in the world that is interested in the great world war, so to speak, is feeding propaganda into this country.

"Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to prohibit the mailing of propaganda disseminated by agents of foreign principals unless the source of such propaganda is identified therein, and I ask that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee. I believe this bill can plug up an important loophole in our national defense—our mental defense, if you please. Consequently I will urge that the committee to which the bill may be referred give it prompt and favorable consideration."

The Tydings Whitewash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 21 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Tydings Whitewash," published in the Indianapolis Star of July 19.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TYDINGS WHITEWASH

The Tydings committee investigating communism in the Government and the Amerasia case is finished. The Democratic majority issued a report completely exonerating everybody concerned and everything done, and we are right back where we started. Senators LODGE and HICKENLOOPER, the Republican minority, issued separate reports. LODGE said the investigation was "superficial and inconclusive; * * * lacked impartiality; * * * the atmosphere was too often not that of seeking the truth." HICKENLOOPER said the whole investigation was incomplete and no report could possibly be made taking any position.

As far as Senator MCCARTHY is concerned, the majority report completely discredited everything he charged. It is obvious that MCCARTHY did exaggerate when he called Owen Lattimore the "top Communist spy" in the State Department. No evidence that Lattimore was a spy has been uncovered. Other MCCARTHY charges remain unproved.

But this is not a case of MCCARTHY versus TYDINGS. It is a case of Communist influence and infiltration in the United States Government. Hiss, Marzani, and others

already convicted of Communist associations have cast long shadows over the Government's executive branch. There is still a great public suspicion that their cases are not isolated ones and that the administration is trying desperately to cover up past Communist influences.

The Lattimore case is still, in Senator LODGE's words, "incomplete" and the conclusions "inescapably tentative." The fact is that whether Lattimore is a Communist or not, the proposals he has made in his writings on Asia were the same proposals made by State Department officials—and they failed. If Lattimore is not proved a Communist, he is proved wrong, credulous, and he favored policies that, when followed, lost China to communism.

John Stewart Service was not proved a Communist, either. But he admitted giving classified information to a Communist editor of Amerasia, and he admitted that he was a follower of the "Lattimore line" in far-eastern affairs. He, along with others still serving in the State Department, has been proved guilty of amazingly poor judgment, naivete, stupidity, and unreliability. Yet he still holds an important position in the State Department.

The issue in these cases is not so much communism as it is poor judgment and stupidity. The same people, right on up to Secretary Acheson, who formulated the far-eastern policy that failed the United States are running the State Department. Is it any wonder that so many Americans have lost confidence in their ability and common sense?

Family Fare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my own appreciation—and I believe that of many of my colleagues—to the Department of Agriculture for the cookbook recently issued by it and made available in limited quantities to the Members of the Congress for distribution among interested constituents.

This cookbook received wide publicity in the newspapers and over the radio prior to its publication, with the result that for a time we were deluged with requests for copies. Most of us by this time have about completed the distribution of the copies available to us.

The response which I have received from homemakers in the Second District of Illinois has been highly commendatory of the excellent work of the compilers of this book, which is intended to advance the family health of the Nation and aid the homemaker in her four-point food program: First, to serve enjoyable meals; second, to keep the family well nourished; third, to practice thrift when need be; and, fourth, to save time and energy where possible. I congratulate the Department of Agriculture on a good work well done and on its substantial contribution to the well-being of our country. Its campaign to aid the families of America to conserve to the maximum the nourishment as well as the appetite appeal in food, and to get when necessary the most in nourishment and in appetite appeal for the least outlay of money and with the greatest saving in time and energy, is another notable achievement in the field of constructive public service of the Department of Agriculture under the inspired direction of Secretary Brannan.

As reflective of the favorable reception of this cookbook by the constituents in the district which I represent, I am including the following letter, typical of the many I have received:

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 17, 1950.*

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: We, my mother and I, thank you for the booklet Family Fare, published by the United States Department of Agriculture, and sent to us from your office in Washington on June 29. It contains many facts on nutrition that everyone should know about and also numerous recipes easily understood and easy to follow. These recipes are all, it is a pleasure to note, good old American standbys. There are no directions for making Hungarian goulash, Russian blintzes, or hot tamales. "Just good food" as the Harvey restaurants advertise.

On page 81, for instance, is a recipe for white layer cake which my mother has been using for over 60 years. When the layers are put together with lemon filling and the cake is covered with white frosting and sprinkled with coconut, you really have something good to eat for dessert.

With best wishes for your continued health and strength during these troublesome times.

I am,
Sincerely yours,
(Miss) REGINA FRANKEN.

Thanks to the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I attach an editorial, Thanks to the Marshall Plan, from the July 12 issue of the Milwaukee Journal. In our thinking about the present and the future in Korea and the Far East it is well that we should remember the experience of our successes in western Europe. The Marshall plan is the most outstanding of those successes. It has not only strengthened the will of the peoples of Europe to resist Communist aggression on their own continent, but to support our fight against it in far-off Asia.

This editorial should also serve as a reminder to those whose shorter memories and lesser understandings now seek to dictate cuts in foreign aid, both through the Marshall plan and the point 4 program, our best hope of building strong democracies in Asia.

THANKS TO THE MARSHALL PLAN

Western Europe is standing firmly beside the United States in the Korean crisis.

Our allies of the North Altantic Pact have acted jointly with us in the Security Council of the United Nations. They have endorsed the series of forceful UN courses concerning Korea. The British have moved naval vessels into Korean waters; other western European countries have offered assistance of one kind or another.

It is a heartening demonstration of the unity of the North Atlantic community, overshadowed only by that displayed by the United Nations itself in its speedy and determined action in Korea.

The Marshall plan program of American aid to Europe has made this possible. It is the money, the food, the machinery, and the technical aid that has flowed from the United States since April of 1948, that saved western Europe from hunger, from inflation, from chaos, and, finally, from communism.

If there are those who would still deny this, let them think back on the dark days of 1946 and 1947.

Western Europe was plunged in despair. The war had wrecked its economy. Industrial and agricultural production were not coming back. Standards of living were dropping fast. Communism, which feeds on such conditions, threatened to sweep across the continent unopposed. Have we forgotten how narrowly Italy and France escaped the Communist grasp?

Today western Europe is revived. Its people are eating and working. The economies are becoming stronger. The nations are cooperating politically, economically, militarily. The Communists have lost ground in every country. The great area that Soviet Russia saw ready to topple into its clutches but three short years ago is gradually becoming a major road block in the way of aggressive communism.

Since April 1948, the United States has spent $9,500,000,000 in saving Europe. That is a lot of money. But it may well turn out to be the best investment that the American people have ever made. It has given us purposeful and potent allies now and for the future.

Progress in Our Vital Soil Conservation Service Program and Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. WILSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, today our Nation is faced with grave national and international problems, and it is time indeed, as never before in our history, that we give consideration to the problem of the protection of and prudent use of our natural resources. No nation has ever remained strong and free without an adequate supply of these resources. It would be folly to presume that our Nation could be an exception. But even now we can see that our resources are dwindling. What are we doing about it? Are we doing enough?

I am troubled especially concerning the future of one of our basic resources, the soil which supplies our food and many of the materials which, if we again must make war, are essential. Our soil during World War II responded bountifully to the demands we placed upon it, with the food, the oils, and the fibers we needed for our war production at home

and for our energies on distant battlefields. Since the day of victory, we have needed the products of our soil continuously to feed the weary, weakened, and confused people of other lands. This is not only a part of the cost of victory; it is a cost which we must pay to keep our own way of life.

These demands upon our lands—the demands of war and the struggle for a lasting peace—have placed a burden upon our agricultural plant. We have called upon our lands to produce year after year without the rest and the restorative practices which they ought to have to maintain their productive power. The continuous cropping to supply our emergency needs has taken much vigor from our soils. At the same time we have gambled in a way, using lands for these crops that could be safely used only for pasture or range—crops that keep an unfailing cover on the soil. This gamble has been costly. Hundreds of thousands of acres of land that could have been permanently useful in grass, have been damaged, some of them to the point of bankruptcy. Their productive power has been reduced in greatly varying degrees by both wind and water erosion and by the depleting effect of continuous cropping.

Then here is an added reason for our concern. Our national family has gained by 10,000,000 of souls, 10,000,000 more mouths to feed and bodies to clothe with the products of our farms and ranches. And we can guess that in another 10 years, and another 10 on top of that, that the demands upon our agriculture are going to be pretty close to what it actually can supply. At that time a continuation of our present trend will mean less and less for our people to eat and wear.

Less than two decades ago we became concerned over what might be happening to our land. We formed on organization, the Soil Conservation Service, and assigned it to find out for us what erosion was doing to our soil. We asked it also to find out what could be done to correct the evil. At the head of this organization was Dr. Hugh Hammond Bennett, the man whose voice had cried out for years against what he, a student of soils, was able to interpret as a costly abuse of our lands, a national carelessness which we one day would regret.

The Soil Conservation Service performed its task well. We learned, as we had suspected, that we were losing the productive power of our agriculture at a most alarming rate, that 100,000,000 acres of our land had been damaged seriously already. Also we were able to learn, from investigations and study, the practices that would give our land the protection needed against the forces that would have destroyed it.

In the 1930's the rains were far too few in the Plains regions which lie across the western portion of the Eighth Congressional District of Oklahoma. The winds, day after day and year after year, swirled up the soil in clouds of dust. In some fields on which no crops could grow the soil blew out. In other fields the sands piled up in dunes as on a desert.

Before the dust stopped blowing in those disastrous years, the Oklahoma Legislature in 1937 passed the State's soil conservation district law. This law provided that farmers and ranchers could join together in a given area to solve their problems relating to the soil, that they could elect their leaders to help manage the affairs of their district organization. This was one of the first manifestations of a new concept in the American agricultural mind—that farmers and ranchers were competent to solve their own problems according to the principles of democratic government.

In the wind-erosion years before the passage of the soil conservation district law, 6,500 Oklahoma farmers moved off the land. The State lost one seat in Congress. In the words of one wit, the soil went to Louisiana and the people to California. It is difficult to put a dollar mark in front of tons of soil lost, but wasted land nonetheless does have a definite cost. The soil lost to wind erosion in those years in the Eighth Congressional District of Oklahoma meant uncounted millions of dollars. Lost soil meant a thinning of population, a decline in the consumer purchasing power in the areas affected. Businessmen lost in the sales of farm machinery, in the purchases of food, clothing, and other merchandise.

Cimarron County lost 47 percent of its farmers, and the size of the average farm increased by more than a section. Texas County lost 34 percent of its farmers. Beaver County gave up 54 percent. This was a trend for which the years of wind and water erosion can largely be blamed.

Was it necessary for this blight to fall upon our land? Had we had our present know-how in regard to wind erosion control, the answer would be "No." As it was in those years, we were unable to cope with the emergency with the meager information we then had at our disposal.

But let's put the question this way: Can we halt this downward trend in our soil's productivity and return these battered acres to stability and productive power? For the answer we can go to men like H. C. Hitch, A. P. Atkins, and E. L. Brewer of near Guymon in the Texas County Soil Conservation District, and Lloyd Barby of Beaver County. These men and many others engaged in soil-conservation practices would tell us that you can farm successfully in their country, that you can make a living and a good one, but first you must know the limitations of your land and how to use it in a way that will guard against harm. They are men who are making good use of the measures developed by the Soil Conservation Service in the control of wind erosion. They are keeping residue on the surface of their soil to protect it from wind and blowing sand, to improve its fertility, and increase the rate at which it will absorb the rain that falls. When they plow, they do so on the contour; they use cover crops, and they are getting their easily erodible land—marginal land—back into grass as fast as they can. These men are interested in keeping plant cover as much as possible on their land, in the rotation of crops so that fertility may be preserved. Their farms and ranches, damaged in the 1930's, have become increasingly productive in the last decade, and with their neighbors they are on guard, with the help of their soil-conservation district, against a repetition of the blow disaster.

Science in recent years has given us improved varieties of wheat which resist rust and drought. We estimate that our wheat yields as a result have been increased by 5 bushels an acre. The development of better farm machinery also played a part. Our machinery which we now have permits us to finish our plowing much earlier than when we used a horse or mule. This milestone in our farming progress has added 7 bushels more to the average yield from an acre. That is a total of 12 bushels of wheat to the acre more than we were able to grow not so many years ago.

This gain in our farm output has helped to dim our vision somewhat. Soil erosion followed our plows. With each hard rain and high wind our lands lost some of their topsoil and with it some of their power to produce. The history of our wheat lands shows a gradual decline in yields where they are planted to wheat year after year.

These are grim facts. But they are facts that the Congress must have in mind when they are devising ways to keep our economy at a high level. There are too few men in our national legislative body who truly understand the problems of the farm and the means we have of solving these problems. It would appear that we must be challenged by a crisis—such as the Dust Bowl in the 1930's—before we are ready to act.

Agriculture is Oklahoma's biggest business. Last year Oklahoma farmers sold more than one-half billion dollars' worth of the products of their land. Almost one-fourth of that great wealth was deposited in the banks of the Eighth Congressional District. But with the near failure of the latest crop of wheat, we have become alarmed in the Eighth District. A quarter of a million acres of good land has been damaged by plowing. There are familiar danger signs.

It is my opinion that many of the farmers and ranchers of Oklahoma are prepared for a renewal of the dry years. The State has come a long way in soil conservation. Our 81 soil conservation districts cover 97 percent of the State's area. These districts have one purpose: to help farmers with the problems of their land. These districts call upon State and Federal agencies for help. The United States Department of Agriculture has made the resources of the Soil Conservation Service available to them. Soil conservation districts can make use of the help of any firm, organization or individual who can give assistance in the work of the district. And the five farmers and ranchers who have been chosen by their neighbors to manage the affairs of the district are men able to bear their part of the responsibility to achieve the goal they have set.

The soil conservation district is the keystone of the conservation farming program. A little reflection and you will realize that the development and spread of soil conservation districts in the last 13 years represents history's greatest land movement. More than three-fourths of all farms and ranches in

the United States now are in soil conservation districts and have the benefit of the help that these districts can give. Eight states are covered entirely by districts: Alabama, Delaware, Massachusetts, New Hempshire, New Jersey, Rhode Island, South Carolina and Vermont. Nine others have over 90 percent of their agricultural land in district boundaries.

There are 2,194 soil conservation districts in the United States, with a combined area of 1,204,000,000 acres. That is 63 percent of all the land in the 48 States. There are 812,200,000 acres of land in the farms and ranches in these districts. There are 26 more districts in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Hawaii and Alaska.

At present there are more than three-quarters of a million conservation plans being applied on farms and ranches totaling 202,310,397 acres. These have been worked out by the farmers and ranchers with the trained help of Soil Conservation Service men. The practices that are being applied include: contour cultivation, cover cropping, stubble mulching, range and pasture improvement, seeding of range and pasture, woodland management and tree planting, farm and ranch ponds, terraces, farm drainage, irrigation, wildlife area improvement, field windbreaks, and so on.

The farmer-elected, unpaid district boards of supervisors, before the district receives assistance from the Soil Conservation Service, complete an exhaustive study of the agricultural problems of their district. They learn the kinds of soil that are there and the limitations of the soil. They go into the kinds of crops and rotations that are best suited to that area. They study the problem of water, its kind and availability, and its uses. They take into account the problems of the people, their traditions, customs, and the preferences of the people regarding various farming enterprises. When the supervisors of the districts have finished with this study they are ready to assume the task of managing the affairs of the district in its soil-conservation efforts. And, at this time, the Soil Conservation Service is ready to give the farmers and ranchers of the district the assistance of its trained field men in solving the problems of farm and ranch.

Because of their special study of the agricultural problems of their district, the supervisors are in a position to help the farmer and rancher to plan and apply an effective soil and water conservation program. In the Eighth Congressional District of Oklahoma, in the areas in which wind erosion is a serious problem, the seeding of native grasses has been one of the important measures designed to tie down and return to production land damaged by wind and water erosion. The seed for this program, a comparatively new movement, has been the main limiting factor—a bottleneck. However, the Woodward County Soil Conservation District leased a half section of land and began producing varieties of native grass seed which were not available on the market. They made the seed available to farmers and ranchers of the district at a nominal price. The district harvested the first grass from this plot in 1947. In addition, the district purchased combines which harvested 30,000 pounds of native grass seed on a share basis. The work of this district has been most helpful in providing seed for the revegetation work that farmers and ranchers there are engaged in.

The Woodward County district, joined by other districts in that section—Texas County, Beaver County, Harper County, Ellis County, and Dewey County—helped in developing a special grass seed drill for seeding the native grasses. Ordinary drills on the market at that time would not do this job. These districts also have built or purchased warehouses for seed storage.

It recently came to my attention that the soil conservation districts of Oklahoma were encouraging farmers to plant grain sorghums on land which would be susceptible to blowing next fall and winter. I have learned that the 1950 plantings of grain sorghums and sudans for this purpose in Oklahoma soil conservation districts have reached the encouraging total of nearly 1,500,000 acres, against less than a million acres in this crop a year ago. The stubble of these sorghums and the litter left following harvest serves to protect the surface of the soil against the wind's force. It also increases the organic content of the soil and provides a protective cover for the seeding of range and pasture grasses. It is heartening indeed to know that our farmers and ranchers are working at their erosion problem so earnestly and intelligently.

I have mentioned only a few of the ways in which these soil conservation districts help the farmer and rancher solve the problems of his land and put his enterprise on a sounder, more stable footing. In other sections of Oklahoma the problems are basically the same. But in every district the problem of the individual farm or ranch is the problem that must be solved with a program designed to give each acre the treatment it needs and to put that acre to the use to which it is best suited to keep it continuingly productive.

There are problems in conservation that have not yet been solved. We need a safer way to till the land in areas in which wind erosion is a continuing hazard. We need legumes that will prove adaptable to the climate and cropping practices of the Oklahoma Panhandle area. But most important of all our need is for a national appreciation of the necessity for protecting our agriculture by mean of this program of soil and water conservation. I am thinking not only of the farmers and ranchers—they are well on the way to accepting this program as something they cannot afford to do without—but I contend that every man, woman, and child in our Nation should learn to understand the reasons for conserving our soil resources and the means by which we can keep our lands productive forever.

Soil conservation should be a part of our national thinking. There should be no question as to whether we should have it. The only logical question we ought to ask is: How fast can we get it applied?

And now as we stand on the threshold of another great conflict, when all our resources and all our people will be called upon to give the utmost toward another victory, we in the Congress have need to reflect on whether we are doing as much as we should, as the controlling force in this movement, to accomplish the conservation of all our soil and water.

We have the farmer-organized and farmer-managed soil conservation districts ready to carry forward this program. We have a trained force of workers in the Soil Conservation Service. And we have had 15 years of experience which has given us the know-how to do the job. It is my prayer that enough of us will recognize the need and the cost of delay in time to speed this vital movement toward its goal: a conservation plan applied and maintained on every agricultural acre in our Nation.

Public Must Be on Guard Against Commie Tricks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I have included as part of my remarks what I consider a timely warning that appears in an editorial of the Courier-Post, Camden, N. J., issue of July 19, 1950. It is entitled "Public Must Be on Guard Against Commie Tricks." It reads as follows:

PUBLIC MUST BE ON GUARD AGAINST COMMIE TRICKS

An organization with the high-sounding title of "Campaign Committee for the World Peace Appeal" has made its appearance in Camden and other cities, circulating peace petitions obviously inspired by the Communists.

These petitions follow the Kremlin line of demanding the outlawing of atomic weapons as instruments of aggression and mass murder of peoples and asserting that signers believe that any government which first uses atomic weapons against any other country whatsoever will be committing a crime against humanity and should be dealt with as a war criminal.

The self-styled veterans of World War II who have been circulating the petitions here apparently haven't fooled many citizens into signing. Reports from other cities indicate a similar lack of success.

Signers who have been questioned afterward invariably say they didn't realize the petitions were Communist-inspired and wouldn't have signed if they had understood their true purpose.

The apparent failure of the commie drive is encouraging. It indicates people aren't so easily hoodwinked as the Reds may have expected.

The fake "peace petitions" should put everyone on guard against other tricks the comrades will be trying. As far as signing petitions or papers of any kind goes, the only safe thing to do is follow the advice any lawyer would give you, and sign nothing that you don't understand and subscribe to 100 percent.

There's more than a possibility that carelessly signing your name to something you

don't thoroughly understand can get you into trouble later on. This is particularly true of anything that there is any reason to believe may have any connection with the commies.

A good many Americans, some of them of high reputation and standing, have been misunderstood, or worse, because they innocently allowed themselves to become involved with and by the Communists during the last war, when we and Russia were fighting the same enemy and we held the trusting belief that after victory Russia would honestly collaborate with us in building a lasting peace.

That illusion has been shattered now.

No wise American will allow himself to be taken in by Communist propaganda, no matter how clever and seemingly harmless on the surface, at this late stage of the game.

Mr. Speaker, the desire for peace is universal among all people. This is especially true in America. As a nation we have not only supported, but, we have in fact been the leader in every effort to establish principles of freedom and justice on which could be built world peace and security. But, this does not mean peace at any price. We must ever be watchful that in our desire for peace we do not compromise on principles that are necessary if there is to be a peace that is permanent and secure.

Furthermore, having in mind the idealistic character of our people it is extremely necessary that we be on the alert at all times not to be led into movements that sound good but beneath which is to be found the machinations of an enemy who is neither sincere nor honest. It is this thought that the Courier-Post editorial has so well emphasized and made plain.

An Epic of Liberal Ideals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I was profoundly impressed as I listened recently to a lecture delivered on the Message of Israel program of the American Broadcasting Co. by Rabbi Roland B. Gittelsohn on the subject Who Is a Liberal?

Rabbi Gittelsohn was a chaplain with the Armed Forces of the United States in the Pacific during World War II and became world famous for the eloquent eulogy he delivered in honor of the American soldiers who died on Iwo Jima.

I believe that his exposition of the ideals of liberalism is worthy of a permanent place in the annals of American democracy. Under unanimous consent, I include this lecture in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHO IS A LIBERAL?

I can't possibly commence this final sermon of my series for the month of June without expressing to you, Dr. Wise, my deep sense of personal gratitude at this renewed opportunity to serve as one of the Message of Israel preachers, and adding my appreciation to that of our listeners for the energy and devotion you have given to make this program possible. I am extremely happy also to share this morning's pulpit with the distinguished president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and to congratulate Dr. Maurice Eisendrath on the fact that in less than 2 hours ground will be broken here in New York for the House of Living Judaism.

It is not an accident or coincidence that I have chosen to speak today on the subject, Who Is a Liberal? The Union of American Hebrew Congregations is the great national organization of liberal Jewish congregations on this continent. On this historic day, when the first step is taken to establish its national headquarters in New York, it would be both timely and appropriate for all of us to put the word "liberal" under a semantic microscope, so to speak, in order to see what it really means. I haven't any hesitation at all in saying that both in religion and in political life, liberal is one of the most popular, and at the same time one of the least understood words in current usage. So let's try to see, if we possibly can now, what the ingredients of real liberalism are.

In the first place, I would say that the real liberal is the man who puts human needs and human rights above every other kind of need or right. The greatest enemy of true liberalism in our world today is any system of government or of thought which uses the individual human being as an expedient means toward some other end which is given higher priority than the individual being used. Russia, of course, is the first and one of the most flagrant examples. But Russia is far from the only present instance of illiberalism on this score.

In economics generally, for example, the liberal is the man who starts with a premise that the most essential goal of all is the economic welfare and security of the individual. Any theory or system which, in actual practice, serves that goal, the liberal accepts and retains. Any system, by the same token, which fails to give individual human beings a decent measure of welfare and security, he either amends or discards. In short, the liberal is a person who starts with the human rights of man and then searches for a system which will protect and preserve those rights. The conservative or reactionary in economics is a person who begins with the premise of a system, and then restricts the individual's security to the capacities of such a system. The liberal says the system must be modified and improved to suit the man. The reactionary insists it is rather the man and his needs that must be altered, while the system remains sacrosanct and rigid.

Our rabbis tell us in the Midrash that the cardinal sin for which the people of Sodom and Gomorrah were punished was the fact that they forced every visitor who came to them for hospitality to fit a standard-size bed. If the visitor happened to be shorter than the bed, he was stretched; if perchance longer than the bed, then just enough of his legs was amputated to make him fit perfectly. Thus with liberals and their opposites in economics. The timid reactionary would stretch or cut the man to fit the system. The liberal prefers to modify the system to fit the man.

And the same thing is true precisely of the liberal versus the conservative in theology or religion. The conservative commences with a set of practices and beliefs which he believes were fixed permanently and immutably by divine revelation. If, in any specific instance, that theology fails to enhance the dignity and value of human life on earth, there must be something wrong with the individuals concerned; it is they who must be changed to fit the religious system. This time it is the liberal who says no. He insists, to the contrary, that in such a case it is the religious "revelation" which must be changed to fit the individual and his needs.

So, whether it be with reference to politics or economics or religion, or whatever area of life you choose, the first sign of a liberal is that to him human rights come first, ahead of every vested interest, and the individual man or woman is the most precious thing on earth.

A second symptom or sign of the liberal is his steadfast, stubborn refusal to let anyone else do his thinking for him. For a long time there were men and women of considerable intelligence in the world who considered communism to be liberalism, only more so. That is to say, it was assumed by many that a Communist was an extreme form of liberal. Now we know that nothing could be further from the truth. Now we understand that the Communist cannot by any stretch of the imagination be called a liberal, because he fails by any reasonable definition to meet this second criterion; he most definitely does not refuse to let others do his thinking for him. I wish there were time now to consider specifically even a small part of the sound, sober, documented evidence brought to this point in the last year or so by men like George Counts and Richard Crossman and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. Because there isn't time, suffice it to say that no one who even begins to be familiar with the evidence can suppose for a second that the Communist is the master of his own independent intelligence. To an extent which at times actually approaches the comic, he is a performer who twists and turns and tumbles at every crack of a whip over which he himself has no control whatsoever. Someone else does all his important thinking for him. He can't even answer any vital political question until first he finds out what today's party line is on that point. Therefore he can't possibly be labeled a liberal.

It ought to be added here in all honesty that the same thing is true of anyone who follows a party line determined by someone else. It's just as true of the frightened little souls who slavishly follow the Communist Party line, but in reverse, who wait with bated breath for the party line to be proclaimed so that they can automatically oppose it without doing any independent thinking of their own. And the same thing is true, again, in religion. The liberal religionist, be he Christian or Jew, is one who is perfectly willing to be guided by the collective experience of the past, but who insists also on doing his own thinking and reaching his own convictions.

The liberal, to be sure, is not a man who ignores the opinions of others, or who refuses to be guided very considerably by those whose wisdom in a given field is manifestly greater than his own. But he is a man who trusts his own mind and the facts, and who isn't ready or willing to take up a position on important matters in any field until he has sifted the facts through his mind and thought about them with intelligence and integrity. In short, the true liberal refuses to follow any party line, whether forward or in reverse; he does follow his own conscience, and no one else's.

We come now to a third and final criterion for true liberalism in both politics and religion. In a sense, it is the inevitable consequence of the first two. The liberal is a man who isn't afraid of change. Because he proclaims that human institutions must meet human needs and because he insists on doing his own independent thinking, therefore he not only accepts but welcomes change. Many years ago Carl Sandburg told the fable of a man who played a cello with only one string and always played the same note. When his attention was called to the fact that no one else played the cello that way, he answered: "Of course; other people use four strings and keep moving their fingers around because they are looking for the right place. I don't have to do that; I've found it already!"

We laugh at that, but while laughing let's not overlook the fact that it comes pretty close to portraying the opposite of a liberal. The man who is absolutely positive that he has found the one right place or the one only answer—whether in politics or in religion—has no right to call himself a liberal. That title belongs only to the man who approaches life and its problems experimentally, who says human needs change; therefore our method and manner of meeting those needs must also change. The conservative says: All other things being equal, what was good enough for yesterday is good enough for today. The liberal answers: All other things being equal, what was good enough for yesterday can't possibly be good enough for today. Because today is a bridge between yesterday and tomorrow. And one doesn't live permanently on a bridge; he uses it to move from one place to another.

So the liberal is a man who isn't afraid of change. He understands that social evolution, unlike biological evolution, doesn't just happen through the automatic operation of nature's inevitable laws. We have to create the mutations, so to speak, which lead to social change. We can't just sit back and confidently wait for them to happen by themselves.

Who, then, is a liberal? I would say, that man—in politics and in religion—to whom human rights and needs come first, who refuses to yield the independent thinking-power of his own mind, and who not only believes in but actively strives for a continual process of evolution and change. The same Carl Sandburg whom I mentioned a moment ago, and who next to Walt Whitman is the greatest poet of American democracy, tells that one day Henry Clay was riding in a carriage with a friend. Suddenly he stopped his horse, descended from his buggy, and knelt down with his ear to the ground. When his friend asked the reason for such strange behavior he answered: "I am listening for the footbeats of the people." That, dear friends, is a liberal: a man who, all his adult life, in politics and in religion, listens to the footbeats and the heartbeats of the people.

Now Is the Time To Cut Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the July 21, 1950, issue of the Washington Star appears an editorial that should appeal to the good sense of every Member of Congress. Reduced Government for nonmilitary is more than a matter of good sense, it is a matter of vital necessity.

The editorial follows:

NOW IS THE TIME TO CUT SPENDING

It is a matter for regret that the President, in his message to Congress on the Korean war, did not forcefully advocate a program of stringent reductions in Government spending for nonmilitary purposes. Such reductions are as necessary now as the heavy new expenditures required to fight the Korean war and to put the country on a firmer footing for other emergencies.

The President did refer to the subject. He has directed all executive agencies to review and if "practicable" to modify their programs, wherever such action will lessen demands for services, commodities and materials needed for national defense. The Government, he said, along with the public must exercise "great restraint in the use of those goods and services" now needed in defense.

There has not been time, of course, for anything but the decision to begin such reviews of programs. But the proper place to begin necessary retrenchment of nonmilitary spending would be the omnibus appropriation bill of $34,600,000,000, now before the Senate. If the domestic projects approved for that bill before the Korean war began met the standards of peacetime economy, they cannot meet the new standards imposed by our involvement in Korea.

Yet the President is represented by his Senate majority leader, Mr. LUCAS, as opposing any of the blanket reductions in that bill that are being devised now by a nonpartisan group of Senators. Arbitrary reductions across the board, aimed at percentage cuts, such as the House voted, may not be the best way to cut Federal spending. But they seem to be about the only way to force such reductions and Congress should not hesitate now to force them. The better method would be for the reduced spending program to begin in the executive departments under vigorous pressure by the President. But there has been little evidence of such pressure.

We cannot hope to reduce nonmilitary spending by any such amount as the $10,000,000,000 increase in military spending which the President will request. Most of that $10,000,000,000 must come from higher taxes. The two tax reductions since the end of the fighting in World War II amounted to about $10,600,000,000. Imposition now of the wartime excess-profits tax alone might produce half that much. Higher taxes are inevitable. But a substantial part of the money needed should come from cutting nonmilitary spending to the bone, and the place to begin is with the pending omnibus appropriation bill.

Address by Hon. Frank Pace, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. H. HEDRICK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following remarks by Secretary of the Army Frank Pace, Jr., before the Twenty-fourth Reserve Officers Association Convention, Washington, D. C., June 30, 1950:

I have looked forward for sometime to being with you tonight and the events of this past week have only underscored my anticipation of this opportunity.

You are representative of the Reserve officers of this Nation. The extension this week of the selective-service law, with its amendments, empowers the President to call to the colors the Reserve forces of this country. This emphasizes clearly and forcefully our traditional dependence upon such forces and our recognition of them as a vital and substantial part of our military posture.

I want to emphasize that important as our efforts may be to bring the organization, training and equipment of our Reserve forces to new peaks of effectiveness, all of this is overshadowed in the final analysis by the measure of your willingness and your preparation as individuals to hold yourselves in meaningful readiness for the defense of our Nation.

The will to defend our heritage is, of course, a requirement accepted by every American. However, the will to rise to the common defense is not alone, enough. As members of our Nation's military forces, you have given and you must increasingly give your time, thought, and energy over and beyond the literal requirements of training schedules, prescribed courses of instruction, and the like. Upon those of you who are already trained and experienced in military matters, there rests a particularly heavy responsibility to provide the clear-sighted leadership in your communities, so necessary in these times of crisis and stress. You have chosen this responsibility voluntarily and I feel sure that you will justify the confidence our Nation reposes in you. That the people of this Nation are ready and eager for such leadership is apparent to me in their unanimous approval of the President's courageous action of last week.

The real strength of our Nation rests in the sum of the strength of its individual citizens. This is nowhere represented more vividly than in the thousands of you who make up our Reserve forces.

I need not describe to you the historic events of the past 6 days. As responsible citizens you have been fully mindful, I am sure, of the world significance of that fateful hour last Sunday morning when Communist forces from North Korea violated by force of arms the frontier of a peaceful neighbor. This attack was a clear challenge to the peace and safety of all freedom-loving nations.

Within a matter of hours, the Security Council of the United Nations convened in emergency session and directed the marauding forces of North Korea to cease hostilities and withdraw, calling upon member nations to support this resolution. Our Nation, under the leadership of President Truman, responded to the appeal by sending naval and air forces to the aid of the stricken people of the Republic of Korea.

By our action we have clearly and forcefully demonstrated our determination, through the United Nations, to support peace and security in the world. We have demonstrated by deeds as well as by words our firm resolve that the United Nations shall not fail in its mission to bring forth an enduring and honorable peace by resisting with force of arms, if need be, the aggressive designs of any state.

Ours is not a nation at war and consequently our military forces today are the minimum required for this Nation's defense needs. But they represent a large part of the free world's armed forces in being.

We are committed with other free nations in the cause of common defense. These commitments support, but at the same time transcend, purely national considerations; and each nation must contribute according to its capabilities. This mutual effort is a historic milestone in the progress of international cooperation. The keynote is mutual support and interdependence.

It is against this backdrop of mutual support and interdependence among the free nations of the world that I would like to discuss with you tonight the equivalent relationships among our own Armed Forces.

The role that each service would play in the event of war will be dictated entirely by the responsibilities that have been assigned to it—by the character of the forces the enemy brings to bear—and by the nature of the war to be fought. While emphasis may shift from day to day, land, sea, and air forces of the most effective type employed in the closest joint effort, will be required to win any major war in the foreseeable future.

Thus, the role of the Army today is not dictated by whim or desire, it is dictated by the missions that have been assigned to us

and by the hard, cold facts of our current situation in the world.

Briefly, these facts are that the Soviet Union is the only nation in the world today capable of threatening our security. It is a land power, and it has built up, and continues to build up, a tremendous ground army. And its immediate objectives would normally be neighboring land areas, bordering upon it to the south, east, and west.

As opposed to this threat, the inherent objective of the United States is to support the United Nations in its efforts to restore and keep the peace.

In the event that a full-scale aggression should be thrust upon us, it is obvious, then, that any truly major war in which we might become involved in the foreseeable future would center around large-scale land operations, and that we must gear our defense forces to fight this type of war.

The role of the United States Army in these circumstances becomes starkly clear: It must be prepared to meet the land armies of the police states with smaller forces that are better trained, better led, and better armed and equipped, to overcome this numerical disadvantage. It must also be prepared to mobilize far more swiftly than ever before the millions of well-trained, well-equipped men who would be required to launch an offensive and to win.

Should a major war be forced on us—and I repeat our objective is to avoid that—it undoubtedly would open with simultaneous land, sea, and air action against us. We would have to be able to meet this attack with our land, sea, and air elements combined immediately and smoothly in close mutual support.

Our ground forces on the frontiers of freedom throughout the world might bear the brunt of an initial attack, and we would have to reinforce them promptly by air and by sea. In this we are completely dependent upon our sister services.

But in addition to our primary problem of carrying out land operations against the enemy, we would also be responsible for providing for the security of vital installations within the United States after such an attack, including antiaircraft defense, as well as for the protection of existing overseas bases and the seizure and expansion of other advanced bases from which the Navy and Air Force could operate more effectively. Thus, they would be depending upon us for much vital assistance.

Meanwhile, the Navy and Air Force would be carrying out their primary missions in support of the total effort. Air action in the initial stages would involve heavy employment of our long-range air potential to cripple and impede the aggressor's offensive capacity. This would include not only bombardment of his industrial, transportation, and communication centers, but also the supply dumps and troop concentrations disposed in immediate support of his attacking forces.

In short, our long-range air elements would hit him anywhere and everywhere that would materially weaken both his immediate and ultimate offensive capacity, and thus hasten the defeat of his invading armies.

Also vital to our success is tactical air support of our ground forces, and here, too, the Air Force would be our partner. The infantry-tank-artillery force that can call down fighter and light-bomber assistance, as needed, can command any ground situation.

Meanwhile, our great Navy has its traditional and vital role to perform in keeping the sea lanes clear for movement of troops and supplies, and to provide tactical support. We must have unquestioned control of the seas in order to supply and reinforce our ground and air operations against the enemy's forces.

Thus, each service has its role, and each role is indispensable. Our modest forces today are geared to minimum defense needs, but in case of attack our Nation would shift promptly to an all-out offensive effort designed to insure ultimate victory. This would entail a faster, more effective mobilization of our manpower, industrial, and other resources than we have ever managed in the past, and we are making every effort to prepare for such an eventuality. Your role thus becomes soberly clear: You and all of our Reserve forces must be more immediately ready than ever before in our history to take up your arms in event of emergency.

We who would be the first to fight, therefore, feel a closer affinity and comradeship than ever before with you who would be the first to spring to our side. We no longer think of the active establishment separately from its Reserve forces. The Armed Forces today include their Reserve forces, as full, working partners with essential roles to perform. We are depending upon you heavily, and from the spirit of this meeting it is clear to me that our trust is well placed.

"It Is High Time That Men Stop Venting Their Personal Spleen and Cease Their Endeavors To Make Political Capital Out of the Human Misery, Death, and Destruction Now Occurring in Korea—Let Them Refrain From Vicious and Unwarranted Attacks on Prominent Administrative Officials"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard some very highly passionate partisanship denunciation as to the lack of armed preparedness on our part to meet the world crisis which faces up today.

You know, sir, as I know, that much of what is spoken with regard to lack of preparedness for war is just not true. We who appropriated the billions of dollars for the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marines, to say nothing of the extra billions that we voted for the Atomic Energy Commission on top of all else, know that these United States, in all of our long history, was never one-tenth as well prepared to meet the emergency of war as well as we now are.

Never except at the height of World War II did the United States ever have so powerful a Navy as we now possess, nor did we ever have as great a standing Army in any peacetime period.

No nation in all of history has had an air force equal either in tonnage or in the number and types of various airplanes that is comparable to those which today are possessed by the United States Air Force, the naval and the marine air arms, to say nothing of the Air Reserve and the Air National Guard.

Mr. Speaker, the regular peacetime strength of the United States Marine Corps today alone is now as great as was the full peacetime strength of the whole United States Army in prewar days, to say nothing at all about the half million men which constitute the peacetime strength of each of the three major services—the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, on top of all of this we have the atom bomb. Yes; and we have a huge stockpile of them; and, moreover, we have the greatest airship that was ever built—the United States Air Force long-range intercontinental bomber, the B–36, ready to start on its journey carrying the atom bomb loaded with death and destruction to all possible enemy targets, and not in 1 hour after the enemy strikes, as Louis Johnson said we could, but in virtually less than a minute after Russia dares to so much as touch anything in these United States.

Mr. Speaker, I need not tell you that it would be virtually impossible for the people of this country to pay out of peacetime earnings the cost of supporting the huge Army, Navy, and Air Force that would be necessary to meet any and all contingencies, in any part of the world, without forever destroying our American standard of living and the American way of life.

We in this House have debated for hours the maintenance of such a force, and all that we could ever hope to maintain prudently is that highly integrated, unified, well-trained, manned, and equipped national-defense team that Louis Johnson has built for us and which can be expanded almost at once to meet any emergency or condition that will arise.

I have heard enough about the economy drive that might possibly have wrecked the Nation's defenses, but you know, Mr. Speaker, that economy drive was in a large part political propaganda projected by the Members of this House 2 years ago in order to influence the votes of that year's election.

One thing I know above all else and that is that I can go to sleep nights and you can go to sleep nights, Mr. Speaker, knowing that we in this Congress under your leadership have done all that was possible to achieve the maximum defense strength of this Nation commensurate with the abilities of our people to pay for it, and moreover, that under Secretary Louis Johnson we obtained that defense strength with a minimum expenditure of the taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest sense of responsibility as an American citizen and a Member of this Congress that I rise to address myself to what, in my opinion, is today one of the gravest dangers facing these United States.

To my thought, that danger does not arise from any lack of military preparedness. It is not the shooting war that is going on in Korea. It is not that we have to make war against a ruthless, unscrupulous, powerful, and cunning adversary who wants to shackle the entire world with the slave chains of Godlessness, international communistic doctrine and government.

The greatest danger that we in America have to face today, is, in my opinion, the suicidal tendency of many, in and out of Congress, who, in order to gain personal or political preferment, are now using the tremendously dangerous situation in which America stands, as an excuse to attack its public servants without

discrimination, restraint, or even respect for truth.

This wholesale destructive and bitter politically inspired criticism, untempered by any measure of appreciation of truth, is a deadly fifth column tactic which in view of the coming election is seemingly becoming the custom in this House.

The American people will soon realize that Joe Stalin himself could not have devised or ordered a more deadly blow to be directed at American interests and welfare than that which finds many here in the Congress of these United States, those in the legislature fighting those in the executive branch of the Government, our military and other leaders, instead of closing all ranks and fighting the Russian-directed hordes which at his orders are now killing our boys in Korea.

In her address to the House on July 18, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] touched briefly on this subject. In discussing what she referred to as "the professional experts on criticism," she urged "that we not spend our time in recriminations; let us profit from our lessons—together plan wisely for the future of our country—a future to be characterized by strength * * * and let us beware of the fear and distrust that is every day being injected by some of those among us—into the very broad streams of American life."

Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 18 and in today's issue of July 19 appeared the sort of destructive, hysterical hypercriticism against which the gentlewoman from California had warned us. This time it emanated from my long-time friend, the gentleman from Vermont, who offices with me in the same corridor of the old House Office Building.

This exhibition of political hysteria on the part of CHARLIE PLUMLEY has distressed many of his friends by virtue of the unwarranted and unseemly attacks he has launched against our hard-working, capable, and efficient Secretary of Defense, the Hon. Louis Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking not as a Democrat. I am speaking as an American who is determined to do all in his power to help his country in this time of crisis, confirmed in my belief that the dignity and freedom of individuals necessitate that they behave fairly, speak truthfully, factually, and calmly of their fellow men. I hold that free speech, free thought, and the immunity granted to all Members of Congress give us a never-ending responsibility to abuse neither the freedom given us nor the immunity granted us.

Mr. Speaker, moreover, I am convinced that when that freedom or that immunity is abused, that he who abuses it is putting the ax to the very foundation of our American way of life as well as our national safety and defense.

He who ignores the good that has been and is being done by a public servant or official either in or out of Congress and concentrates solely upon destructive criticism does not alone afford aid and comfort to the enemy but is paying lip service to the cause of Stalin and the Russians, and in a far more deadly and effective manner than could be done by 50 Russian divisions on the Korean field of battle.

Mr. Speaker, any man who uses public office as a platform from which to make political talks by striking unfairly at men who have well merited public faith is a traitor to the ideals of democracy, a traitor to the flag that affords him protection, and a traitor to the ideals of a democratic system of government, a system for which our every last effort as a nation is being expended today.

I was an American long before I was a Democrat, and it is as an American that I plead that all who speak today give due weight and consideration to all facts as they relate to our domestic relations, but particularly so with respect as to how what they say will be understood by those within and without our borders.

Let us take a look at my good and long-time friend, Louis Johnson, the most capable man ever entrusted with the defense and security of these United States, and appraise just a few of the great contributions that he has made to the country in the 14 months that he has held his present position in the Government.

Mr. Speaker, every contemplative man in this Nation knows that it is the solidarity of our people, coupled with the economic strength and solvency of our country, which the Russians most fear today.

The Russians know that if they could but destroy the faith of the American people in our leaders, weaken our morale, then our financial, industrial, and productive capacity, our country would readily fall prey to the political and military might of international communism, and these United States would cease to be a sovereign Nation.

The Russians know also that the most powerful voice that has been raised in years, either in or out of Congress, telling us to set our house in order, and maintain the economic solvency of our country, was the voice of Louis Johnson.

There is no one within or without the sound of my voice that would dare deny the fact that Louis Johnson, immediately upon assuming the job of Secretary of Defense, instituted action programs that have saved upward of a thousand million dollars in these last 14 months to the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, these savings were through reductions in waste, elimination of unnecessary duplications and extravagant overheads, the money so saved was not transferred as cash back to the United States Treasury, but it was used to increase the combat effectiveness of our forces in being.

Savings effected by the closing of establishments—which were nothing but "fat"—were transferred in such a way as to more completely bring combat units up to fighting strength. The technique was used by the Secretary of Defense equally throughout the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to improve combat effectiveness.

As an example, on January 1, 1950, the Army had 4,000 more men in combat units than it had in such units 6 months earlier. This was achieved by the discharge of civilians, closing of facilities, and the use of funds thus saved to pay for troops in the field. This increase of 4,000 is even more striking when one realizes that there was a decrease in the strength of the Army during the same 6-month period of over 20,000 men.

Similarly, the Navy combat effectiveness improved during that same selected period. There was a substantial improvement in the manned strength of all ships afloat through the same technique of transferring saved funds to the improvement of the combat effectiveness of the fighting arms of the Navy. On June 1, 1950, units of the Navy were manned at 67 percent of wartime strength as compared to a 61 percent manned strength 18 months earlier. This achievement could not possibly have been made without a planned and forceful conversion from unnecessary functions to combat effectiveness.

Most striking of all is to be noted the fact that on January 1, 1950, the Air Force had 416,000 men manning 48 combat groups. According to Air Force estimates these 48 groups were an equivalent to 52½ groups of the size originally envisioned in the previous concept of a 70-group program. Additionally, both the size and effectiveness of all of the aircraft which now makes up an air group have improved; and the number of aircraft in each group has materially increased at the same time. Thus, though the figure of 48 groups is rather loosely used, the country at large perhaps does not appreciate that it means 48 stronger groups, larger groups, and better groups, made up as they are of more airplanes, larger airplanes, faster and better gunned airplanes, all better and more effectively manned.

Mr. Speaker, great misconception exists in the country today because of false and deliberate mishandling of facts as to what the economy program of the Secretary of Defense intended to do. I think that the Congress and the Nation should realize that the Secretary of Defense was attempting, within his budget ceiling, to get for the Nation a maximum in effective fighting forces in being.

For each "empire builder" whose unnecessary little empire was destroyed, there appeared a few new soldiers ready to fight, a few new guns ready for use, and a few more people manning our ships and air aircraft at sea and in the air. But also, for every small empire which collapsed, for every balloon which burst, there appeared a critic of the Secretary and of his policies. The number of critics speaks of the number of useless empires eliminated, the number of bubbles burst.

Mr. Speaker, I was myself in attendance at the Pentagon when Louis Johnson told us of the economies and improved efficiencies that he planned to effect, and it was patent there that he was encouraged to make all possible economies, and by every Member of this House that was present, provided, however, that he made them in some other fellow's congressional district or at some other Congressman's expense.

Do you not remember his thundering response:

> That if Congress expects me to make the Defense Department a Federal WPA relief project merely to provide jobs, I will quit this job right now.

How well I remember the day he told a congressional delegation that among other efficiencies and economies that would come out of the unification program would be the release of 135,000 civilian employees—and that these cutbacks would be attended by increased departmental efficiency.

Well, he made good on that promise. Actually 177,000 superfluous civilian employees were taken off the Federal payroll and the backs of the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. Speaker, for this attainment he received, ardent Democrat though he is, an award of merit and commendation given by ex-President Herbert Hoover and the Hoover Commission on the reorganization of the various departments of the Federal Government. Subsequent thereto, newspaper editors, hundreds of civic organizations, and leading citizens everywhere joined in public acclaim, wishing that there were more Louis Johnsons to head up and effect similar benefits in all other departments of Government.

Mr. Speaker, now hear me well on this: At the same time that Louis Johnson was cutting superfluous civilian employees off the payrolls of the Government, he was directing especial attention to building up the combat units of the United States Army, its Navy, its Air Force, its Marines. Military security alone forbids revelation as to just how many more thousands of men are in combat service in the Army, Navy, and Air Force today than there were 14 months ago when we stood beside Louis Johnson as he took his oath of office in that courtyard of the Pentagon.

It is always to be remembered that in his every act—whether it had to do with the number or type of naval ships, airplanes, tanks, guns, missiles, communication equipment, food, and clothing, or with training, equipping, transporting troops or the materials—he had firm reliance upon his great staff of military experts and advisers—Navy men, airmen, Army men, and the head of the United States Marine Corps, the Reserves, and the militias of the several States.

He received advices from the Chiefs of Staffs and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, from the Munitions Board, the Civilian Components Policy Board, the Weapons Evaluations Board, and a veritable catalog of other boards and agencies staffed with highly specialized personnel dealing with finance, material, personnel, health, hygiene, as well as the military operations of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the United States Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, in the doing of what we think is right all of us make mistakes, and even my good friend the gentleman from Vermont, who sits on the other side of the aisle, as well as my good friend from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM], who sits here on this side of the aisle with me, may conceivably have made a mistake or two in the course of their own long and useful lives.

But, Mr. Speaker, I insist that the same democratic system that gives me the freedom to examine facts, to criticize, evaluate, to praise fairly, also decrees that we do what is right as seen in the light that God gives us to see the right.

Mr. Speaker, no one may deny the fact that we are in a stronger position today to meet the crisis which now confronts us in Korea and elsewhere throughout the world because Louis Johnson had the courage to insist that we maintain our financial strength, and he did so in a period when making us strong militarily through unification and economic management was politically unpopular.

In being fair to him as well as to ourselves, we must recognize that the courageous work of Louis Johnson has left our country far more solvent than it would have been, and because of that America owes Louis Johnson a debt of appreciation which my partisan friend from Vermont entirely ignored but which thoughtful people throughout the country will never, never forget.

Mr. Speaker, 14 months ago when Louis Johnson assumed office, in addition to the cries that we heard about waste and extravagance in the armed services, the membership of this House was loudly bewailing the fact that no real unification of the armed services in these United States had been accomplished—despite the passage of the National Security Act in 1947.

The criticism was then as loud against the failure of the late James S. Forrestal to effect unification of the services as it has been in the last 48 hours against Louis Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, 14 months have now passed since Louis Johnson took office. Who is there in this House that now argues that the unification of the armed services, so long desired by this House is not now a reality?

Who in this House now has occasion to raise his voice to find fault either with Louis Johnson or with President Truman with respect to lack of unification in the armed services?

The long-drawn-out investigation by the Armed Services Committee into the ugly rumors that were peddled in the very cloak rooms of this House were proven to be vicious lies made out of whole cloth. The man who drew up the papers that were handed to one of our colleagues and who caused the investigation to be made abjectly confessed that there was no truth in any thing that he had written.

Mr. Speaker, you all remember the case of the Navy officer who passed out to the press a second sheaf of documents—late at night in the dark corridors of a downtown office building, and what the Armed Services Committee report had to tell about that instance in the fight against Louis Johnson to unify and increase the efficiency of our military and naval arms.

Who is there who will say that interservice rivalries now exist or now stand in the way or have in the last few weeks stood in the way of the immediate and swift retaliation and deadly blows delivered by our Army, our Navy, and our Air Force acting as a combined team against the common enemy in Korea?

The breath of life has been breathed into the United Nations. The Atlantic Defense Pact binding all nations which border on the north Atlantic Ocean to our military aid and assistance is now an accomplished fact.

Here again, Secretary Johnson exhibited his foresight in developing international unification of military strength and he did so against the bitter opposition of his most avowed critics who long stood in the way of national military unification.

Military assistance is strengthening the fighting forces of the European nations.

The flag of the United Nations is flying beside the Stars and Stripes in far-off Korea.

Mr. Speaker, who is there in this House who will deny the fact that Louis Johnson has not alone achieved the unification of the armed services of these United States, but that he has also achieved unification of the armed services of these United States and the armed forces of practically all of the free nations in the free world?

Mr. Speaker, I have no misgivings as to our future in Korea. It is a mistaken notion to say we ever met with reverses in these past several weeks.

The question that faced General MacArthur was whether he should let the North Koreans overrun southern Korea—or else hold on with what few troops, airplanes, and other equipment we had in that theater—until the Regular Army and Air Force moved in with the proper weapons and manpower to take over and carry on.

He figured right. Very shortly you are going to know that the United States armed forces are in Korea—and the Russians pushed back beyond the thirty-eighth parallel.

What follows in the wake of that is in the hands of destiny.

Why the Delay in Creating National Science Foundation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, a timely question is asked by an editorial which appeared in the July 20, 1950, issue of the Courier-Post, Camden, N. J., and which is made a part of my remarks. The title of the editorial is "Why the

Delay in Creating Science Foundation?" It reads as follows:

WHY THE DELAY IN CREATING SCIENCE FOUNDATION?

Our dismal lack of preparedness to resist aggression has been made glaringly clear by the war in Korea.

It is easy to see why we were unprepared in some ways, not so easy in others.

One notable deficiency which is hard to explain is our lack of weapons. Why were such vast quantities scrapped at the end of World War II? Even more to the point, why have we been so slow to develop modern ones?

We are learning only now that few of the weapons about which we have heard so much boasting have advanced beyond the planning boards, or, at most, the mock-up stage. In fact, we are told that some of them still exist only in the minds of the scientists, who have not been given the chance to go ahead and build them.

The Nation as a whole, and each of us as individuals, must share the blame for our present unpreparedness. Congress and executive officials share in the blame.

But for lack of preparedness at one point Congress is not to blame. Months ago it passed a bill creating a National Science Foundation, with one of its main objects of scientific research and development of military weapons.

The need for such a foundation had been evident since 1945 and several bills to create one were introduced, one cosponsored by Senator SMITH and Congressman WOLVERTON in 1948 reaching the White House but being vetoed because President Truman objected to certain administrative provisions.

Another bill was introduced in this Congress, meeting the President's objections. It was rushed through in a nonpartisan, nonpolitical spirit and became law last March.

Military leaders testified for the bill and it was understood the White House felt the need for it was urgent. But in the months that have elapsed since the bill became law, little has been done about setting up the foundation.

Presidential Secretary Charles Ross says prospective members of the foundation's advisory board and its director are being studied. One report is that Senator FRANK P. GRAHAM, recently defeated for reelection, will be named director. Other reports are that no director will be chosen until after the November election, meaning that the foundation cannot begin operations before then.

If the foundation is as badly needed as the scientists and military men say, it is difficult to understand why its creation is being so long delayed.

Mr. Speaker, each day it becomes more evident that scientific research is necessary if our Nation is to hold its own in a world that is moving rapidly onward in scientific development. If we lag in this important matter we are thereby weakening our present and future peace and security.

The creation of a National Science Foundation to carry on the important study of basic science has been a subject well considered over a period of years by the Congress. Never has any legislation had a more deliberate and intense study before enactment. The result has been legislation that will mean much to us as a nation when it starts functioning. If the Foundation is to attain the results expected of it, then, men of the highest integrity and ability must be selected. This may cause some delay upon the part of the President. I hope not too much.

First International Food Exposition To Be Held in Chicago, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed gratified that the Ways and Means Committee reported my resolution, House Joint Resolution 496, to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Food Exposition, Inc., to be admitted without payment of tariff. I appreciate also that Chairman DOUGHTON again favored me by calling it up on July 20 and securing its approval. Unfortunately, I was unable to be present on the floor when Chairman DOUGHTON asked for its immediate consideration, as I was presiding at an important meeting of the Committee on Rules at the time.

This International Food Exposition to be held in Chicago June 9 to 15, 1951, will be the first of its kind ever held in this country. It is sponsored by the National Association of Retail Grocers in conjunction with the fifty-second annual convention of the association.

This resolution follows the pattern of my resolution providing for the duty-free importation of products from foreign lands to be exhibited at the First International Trade Fair to be held in Chicago in August of this year.

It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that both of these expositions dealing with international products have selected Chicago as the center in which to bring to business and to our people a knowledge of what our friends across the seas are producing, developing, and marketing. In selecting Chicago, these organizations were undoubtedly motivated by the fact that Chicago is the hub of America's breadbasket—the center of the great agricultural section of our land.

In the last few years we have made great strides in increasing our farm crops and our basic food commodities with the result that today we are in position to export tremendous quantities of foodstuffs, thereby helping to feed the peoples in many sections of the world. Not only do we excel in the production of foodstuffs, but we have kept pace in the production of labor-saving devices for the farm which has made it possible to reach these heights, aiding the tillers of the soil in all parts of the world. Chicago is the home of one of the greatest of these plants—the International Harvester Co. In addition it is the center of the marketing of grains, foodstuffs, fruits, and vegetables to millions of our people. Its huge stockyards, the board of trade, and the produce exchange contribute tremendously to this activity.

Mr. Speaker, in due course, I shall again present a resolution requesting the President to extend an invitation to our friendly nations and to businessmen in foreign lands to participate in this international exposition, to benefit from our marketing activity and to bring our peoples closer together. To those attending we can give assurances of delightful weather in the month of June, with full enjoyment of the manifold attractions our hospitable city has to offer in the summer months.

This exposition will be centered on our navy pier. Its purpose is to acquaint our good neighbors with the method of operation of our retail food stores under the free-enterprise system, and to bring to our own retailers and our people the delicacies of foreign lands. Two complete retail stores will be set up on the pier, typifying the average retail food store in the average American community, with the addition of foreign products available to the American housewife. There will also be displayed the mechanical equipment necessary to the efficient operation of food stores.

The National Association of Retail Grocers was established more than 50 years ago. It is an organization of independent retail food merchants. It is the oldest and largest independent trade association in the United States, numbering in its membership some 375,000 independent retail grocers, doing an annual business of over $20,000,000. These merchants serve over 100,000,000 people. It is composed of 600 State and local affiliates. Its individual members do an annual business of from $10,000 to $22,000,000. The national headquarters of the association is in Chicago. Gerald Klomp, of Ogden, Utah, presently is president of the association.

An enviable record of achievement has been accomplished by the association in advancing the cause of the independent food merchant, in protecting his interest against unfair methods of competition, in bringing to him the tools of progress in his business, in facilitating marketing and providing every convenience for the busy housewife charged with maintaining the family larder. Today the independent grocer in your community is an established institution. He is equipped with every modern facility to render efficient service. He is a leader in community activity; he is a solid citizen. The unity established through the National Association of Retail Grocers is another tribute to the great free enterprise system. Its contribution to the continued progress and development of our great country has been a noteworthy one.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me state that the Department of Commerce and the Economic Cooperation Administration are giving this International Food Exposition their blessing and active support. They are going to distribute information about it through our missions, the commercial attachés of our embassies and all Consular offices to the appropriate officials in foreign lands. They have offered their full cooperation in making this First International Food Exposition a real success. As author of this joint resolution I wish to extend a personal invitation to our independent retail grocers and their families to be with us in Chicago next June during the period of this great exposition, to mingle

with your business associates in the important field of food handling, to learn what producers in foreign lands have to offer to the family fare, and to enjoy a vacation in America's most interesting city—Chicago.

Hoarding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by Macy's:

CONVERSATION IN KOREA

The earth turns. The shadow of night rushes swiftly westward. Behind Korea, all is in darkness.

In the valleys of Korea, too, there are already deep pools of night; but on the mountain peaks south of Kumchon, the light still gleams defiantly in crimson and gold.

By a campfire in the valley, two GI's are talking:

"I wonder," says the boy from Brooklyn, "if the folks back home are starting to hoard things?"

"They couldn't be such fools," says the boy from Kansas. "They'd just start another inflation. Take my folks—they've got nothing but Pa's pension and my allotment. They just can't afford an inflation."

"Nobody can afford an inflation," says the boy from Brooklyn.

HOW MUCH MONEY CAN YOU AFFORD TO WASTE THROUGH FEAR?

Already, under the impact of scare buying, some prices have started to rise again—5 years after VJ-day, in the most productive Nation on earth—just when the forces of inflation seemed to have been halted.

As the world's largest store, we're in a good position to know the truth about consumer goods.

And the plain truth, so far as we can see, is that there's no important shortage of anything, right now. Our own counters are bulging with merchandise. In many, many lines there's a surplus.

And America's productive capacity today is at such a high level—nearly double what it was in 1939—that it can cope with just about everything except a stampede of hoarding and panic buying.

Don't get us wrong. We're neither military nor political experts, nor do we possess any crystal ball that can foresee the future. But we believe, based on such knowledge as we do have, that any talk of genuine shortages is nonsense—and dangerous nonsense.

The struggle in Korea may well last for a long time. And it's a deadly serious struggle—to those who must fight it, and to us who must support it.

But many experts believe it will remain limited in area and scope, though vast and far-reaching in moral and political meaning.

Its material requirements can be handled by the productive miracle of America—without, it seems to us, reducing in any important way the adequate supply of civilian goods.

But suppose the worst happens. Suppose we do, despite all we hope for and pray for, become involved in another full-scale war.

All the more reason why every sensible American—and every decent American—should look on hoarding with revulsion. It always plays squarely into the hands of our enemies.

In any state of affairs—peace, half peace, or all-out war—hoarding is the worst thing we can do. Hoarders only hurt themselves, and their families and their neighbors. Hoarding is always stupid because it disrupts our economy. Doubly stupid today.

So, buy what you need or really want, but please don't be stampeded into buying what you don't want, for you'll pay for it twice.

You'll pay for it because you'll be spending money with no immediate benefit to yourself. And you'll pay for it again because it will help raise the prices you'll later have to pay for most everything, including things you really will need.

And, if you're one of those people who simply have more cash than they can normally spend—why not buy United States savings bonds?

How Much Defense for Our Dollars?

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial entitled "How Much Defense for Our Dollars?" that appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune on July 20, 1950. The editorial deals with the figures that make up the appropriations for national defense beginning with the year 1946, and extending to, and including, 1950. The appropriations add up to the astounding figure of more than $89,000,000,000.

Recently, in his special message to the Congress, the President asked for an additional $10,000,000,000 to be expended for national defense. The question of national defense and preparedness at this moment is very timely as well as pertinent. Before appropriating additional billions, it would seem to be only fair that the Members of Congress know, or should know, how well we are prepared, or in what respect our national defense is weak—if it is weak at all.

Daily reports obtainable concerning the way the battle is going in Korea are not too complimentary to those authorities having to do with expending $89,000,000,000 for national defense. How, and for whose benefit, was the $89,000,000,000 spent? is the next question.

The Chicago Tribune editorial says: "A congressional investigation is in order." In the light of what has transpired, it is my opinion that an investigation is not only in order but should be undertaken by Congress forthwith. The editorial follows:

HOW MUCH DEFENSE FOR OUR DOLLARS?

Mr. Truman is seeking billions in additional defense appropriations. Some of this money is to offset the immediate costs of the Korean War. More of it is to rectify the serious deficiencies and weaknesses in the Defense Establishment which have been demonstrated by the fighting in Korea.

Since the opening of that conflict American forces have been driven steadily back. American tanks have been no match for Soviet tanks operated by North Korean Communists. We are assured that improved tanks are in production, but none is yet in action. We learn, too, that the Air Force and Navy air wings are down to 4,600 first-line ships, with 7,900 in storage. The performance of the services has not been good on the showing to date.

Yet in the 5 years since the end of World War II, according to the reports of the Secretary of the Treasury, Congress has voted a total of more than $89,000,000,000 for national defense. The appropriation for each of these years exceeded by many times all previous defense budgets in a peacetime year. The defense expenditures for these years were:

1946	$42,961,000,000
1947	11,809,000,000
1948	10,217,000,000
1949	11,519,000,000
1950	12,618,000,000

None of the civil functions of the Army, such as river and harbor improvements and the administration and operation of the Panama Canal, are covered in these figures, nor are the costs of occupation of Germany and Japan.

The 1946 expenditure covered the costs of demobilization and the settlement of war contracts, but beyond all this the Defense Establishment was handsomely provided for.

In addition, the Atomic Energy Commission and its predecessor, the Manhattan ordnance district, which were principally concerned with military applications of nuclear fission, received in this 5-year period at least $3,000,000,000.

Expenditures for foreign aid since the end of World War II, which are invariably justified by the administration as contributing to the security of the United States, totaled $36,000,000,000, so that, altogether, about $128,000,000,000 went, directly or indirectly, into national security. Yet our soldiers in Korea are short of arms and ammunition and complain that Red tanks can't be stopped with .30 caliber carbines.

If, after this vast outlay, we are unprepared and weak, it is not for lack of money to spend on the job; it is because the Truman Defense Establishment has not spent the money wisely. It has had annually over 35 percent of the record peacetime Federal budget. It has more civilian employees than any other department—every third civilian employee out of the more than 2,000,000 on the Federal payroll. It has 1,370,000 soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen on the muster roll.

With all of this, we have not yet succeeded in stopping the army of what is perhaps the least considerable of all of the Soviet satellite nations.

We plainly have not been getting a dollar's worth of defense for a tax dollar. We haven't been getting anything like it. Our men on the firing line are the sufferers. An investigation by Congress is in order.

Electoral Reform Suffers Set-Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON C. JONES
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the

very timely and able editorial in the Charlotte (N. C.) News of July 19, 1950, on the proposed Lodge-Gossett amendment to the present electoral college system of the Constitution of the United States. I consider this editorial, although brief, a fair and intelligent presentation of the proposed amendment and one which is concurred in by many thoughtful citizens and is information that should be available not only to Members of Congress, but to the public generally, as this important question of an amendment to the electoral college system will probably arise at future sessions of the Congress and possibly as early as the Eighty-second session of this body:

ELECTORAL REFORM SUFFERS SET-BACK

By the time the House of Representatives got around to voting on the Lodge electoral reform amendment Monday, logic and justice had given way to politics. The amendment was rejected by a vote of 210 to 134, not because it was a bad bill but because Democrats and Republicans from pivot States feared it would curtail their influence in national party affairs.

The Lodge amendment—which, incidentally, would have had to be approved by 36 States—sought to do away with the archaic and illogical formula whereby all electoral votes of each State go to the Presidential candidate who leads in that State. Under the present electoral college system, those who vote for the losing candidate in each State are effectively disfranchised. Their votes actually count for nothing.

Senator LODGE's plan got a 64–27 endorsement by the Senate last February 1. It retained the electoral-vote structure, but proposed to divide the electoral vote of each State in direct proportion to the popular vote cast in that State. Under the Lodge plan every Democratic vote and every Republican vote in every State would count in the selection of a President and Vice President. Besides the simple justice of such a proposal, two very important practical results were anticipated:

1. At present the big key States are swung by a minority group. Both major parties overextend theimselves to curry favor with minorities in order to carry those States, so that we really have rule by minorities instead of by the majority. The Lodge plan would have sharply limited the influence of minorities and freed both parties from the shackles of minority favoritism.

2. At present neither the Republican nor the Democratic Party is a truly national party. The Democrats put up only token opposition in rock-ribbed Republican States, and the Republicans virtually ignore solidly Democratic States. Under the Lodge plan every vote would count and each national party would be encouraged to campaign aggressively in every State, every county, and every precinct of the Nation. That would make both parties national parties in fact as well as in name.

Apparently Republican and Democratic Representatives from closely contested areas were unwilling to sacrifice their dominant positions. It is encouraging that the North Carolina delegation voted solidly in favor of the amendment and that southern Democrats generally supported it. One effective argument against the amendment was that it would give the Southern States with their heavy Democratic majorities a much bigger voice in National Democratic affairs. It certainly would have had that result. But it would also have opened the way for the development of a real two-party system in the South by making it worth while for the Republicans to scurry around in Dixie rounding up votes.

Electoral-college reform is not dead. Justice demands that the millions of voters now disfranchised have a voice in the selection of a President. And sheer logic will eventually convince the Congress that reform is needed. Though it has been dropped for this session, we are confident that a good start has been made and that one day the archaic, cumbersome, and inequitable electoral-college system will be overhauled.

What Price Defense?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, today we are facing an alarming situation with respect to our apparent shortage in war equipment and the necessary supplies to maintain our national defense.

This condition of affairs is all the more surprising in view of the fact that in the 5 years since the end of World War II, the Congress has appropriated a total of more than $89,000,000,000 for national defense.

The above amount, with the exception of that appropriated in 1946, is entirely for national defense. The appropriation of 1946 includes cost of demobilization and settlement of canceled war contracts. But, even these expenses when deducted from the 1946 appropriation leaves an enormous amount for purely national defense. Approximately $3,000,000,000 has been appropriated during these 5 years for atomic and related research and development.

Furthermore, we have expended for foreign aid since the war ended the sum of $36,000,000,000. We have done so on the representation of the administration that this was part of our program to strengthen our national defense. Thus there has been a total of $128,000,000,000 appropriated for defense purposes.

It is regrettable that after all this expenditure of taxpayers' money we find our boys in Korea complaining of inadequacy of weapons to meet the enemy that outclass us, and that our defense weapons are not of sufficient caliber or power to stop them. We can be proud of the spirit of our soldiers as they face the overwhelming odds against them.

If our forces are not as adequately equipped as they should be, it cannot be said that it is the fault of Congress in not having made sufficient appropriations. Congress has done its part. The fault lies elsewhere. The answer is plain, we have not gotten a dollar's worth of defense for each dollar expended.

Furthermore, it would seem that our policy of disposing of military equipment since 1945 has not been wise in the light of present need. A news article appeared in the Times-Herald, Washington, D. C., issue of July 20, 1950, that deals with this matter in a very comprehensive way. Because of its informative value, I am including it as a part of my remarks. It reads as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of July 20, 1950]

FIFTY-ONE BILLIONS IN WAR SUPPLIES SOLD AS SURPLUS SINCE 1945

Fifty-one billion dollars of war supplies were declared surplus at the close of World War II and have been sold by the administration. This was revealed last night by Senator FERGUSON (Republican) of Michigan, who was chairman of a Senate committee which investigated disposal of surplus property and reported his findings to Congress.

Of the $51,000,000,000 of Government-sold surplus property, $11,000,000,000 was disposed of abroad and $40,000,000,000 went to buyers at home. The home surplus included war plants, airports, hotels and a vast range of civilian items as well as war supplies.

THREE BILLION IN AIRCRAFT

The $11,000,000,000 of surplus abroad was largely weapons, ammunition, goods, and supplies. It is estimated that $3,000,000,000 of aircraft were disposed of and an even larger sum in tanks, guns, and other weapons.

These weapons would now be useful to the American forces in Korea. Military sources reported that the Army still has $15,500,000,000 worth of ordnance, but several billions of these have been earmarked for rearming western Europe under the North Atlantic Pact.

Last March, Maj. Gen. E. L. Ford, Chief of Ordnance, told Congress the Army and Air Force have $15,500,000,000 of weapons and ammunition. Former War Secretary Gray said there is $8,000,000,000 of ammunition and $7,500,000,000 of general munitions in ordnance stores.

WAR STOCKS UNBALANCED

The stock of munitions approximates the $16,200,000,000 worth used by the Army's 89 combat divisions during the last war. However, the Army contends that war stocks are adequate only for 20 to 25 divisions, because they are unbalanced with large supplies of items like rifles and 105-mm. howitzers and too little of other items such as rocket guns, antiaircraft radar and mobile equipment.

Congress voted $1,300,000,000 for European aid last year and is about to approve $1,200,000,000 more this year. Much of the $2,500,000,000 will come from the ordnance reserves. What form the aid will take is a military secret, although Senator TYDINGS, Democrat, of Maryland, said about one-third of the sum will be in airplanes and parts.

TEN CENTS ON THE DOLLAR

American military might was sapped by the surplus program and will be sapped further by European arming program. Members of Congress recalled that this country was almost bled white of military strength in the months before Pearl Harbor when President Roosevelt sent military supplies to Britain.

The sun never sets on American arms which were given away or sold as surplus, usually at 10 cents on the dollar. American weapons were used in clashes between the Dutch and Indonesians, the fighting between Arabs and Jews, in Latin-American revolutions, in the Chinese civil war, and now by both sides in the Korean conflict.

Disposal of surplus property in the various theaters, as reported to Congress, is as follows:

War theater:	*Cost*
Africa and the Middle East	$350,000,000
Europe	4,600,000,000
Pacific and Far East	4,000,000,000
Western Hemisphere	500,000,000
Aircraft sales in United States	20,000,000
Other disposals including abandonment and donations	1,650,000,000
Total	11,020,000,000

EVERYBODY GETS IT

The estimated value of abandoned material was $750,000,000. Much material evaporated. Guns, planes, and other materials disappeared and undoubtedly went into mills and factories where they were transformed into civilian goods.

Every country in the world—friend and enemy—received surplus goods.

The Defense Department reported that in the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1949, ordnance which would cost $141,000,000 to procure was transferred to Greece, Turkey, and Iran. Latin America and Iran in the same year received ordnance which would cost $79,200,000 to reproduce.

Life—and Billy Petersen—Goes to the Boy Scout Jamboree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I call to the attention of the House of Representatives the story of Billy Petersen's trip to the Boy Scout Jamboree at Valley Forge, Pa.

Billy made the cover of the July 24 issue of Life magazine. Although the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is not equipped to carry his picture, I am inserting the story as carried in Life and also a news article which appeared in the Hungry Horse News under date of July 21.

Billy—along with 87 other Boy Scouts and Scoutmasters—honored me by calling at my office on his way home to Montana. The honor paid to him is also paid to the other Boy Scouts of Montana as well as the Nation. As Billy's representative in the Congress, I am indeed happy that this constituent of mine has received such a signal honor and I want to extend to him and to his friends my best wishes for a successful career in the years ahead.

May God be with you and yours, Billy, and let us work together to keep our country the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Mr. Speaker, the stories from Life and the Hungry Horse News follow:

[From Life magazine of July 24, 1950]

LIFE GOES TO THE BOY SCOUT JAMBOREE—FOR A MONTANA BOY IT IS A TRIP THROUGH A WONDROUS NEW WORLD

When word got around to Boy Scout Troop 38, near Hungry Horse, Mont., that 47,000 Scouts were going to the Second National Boy Scout Jamboree in Valley Forge, Pa., this month, one eager 12-year-old decided right away that he was going to be one of them. He was Billy Petersen, blue-eyed, red-haired, and with a grinning face full of freckles.

Billy had joined the Scouts in September. His father already had taught him camping on hunting and fishing trips into the rugged mountain country that surrounds his home in northwestern Montana, and Scouting came easy for him. In 9 months Billy rose rapidly through the ranks of tenderfoot, second class, first class, and Star Scout, to become a Life Scout and leader of the Stag Patrol. He earnestly took one merit badge test after another until he had accumulated a total of 24 badges. He needed only 4 more, and the nod from his Scoutmaster, to become an Eagle Scout, the highest rank.

Billy had never been east of the Continental Divide. His family agreed that the 2,500-mile trip to the jamboree, with big-league baseball games and sightseeing jaunts in Chicago, Detroit, New York, and Washington, D. C., along the way, was a reward for Billy's hard work at Scouting and his daily good deeds around the house. But it would cost $300, and the Petersens were not sure they could manage it. Billy's father, who runs a filling station on Highway 2, had little cash to spare. Billy's mother worked as a substitute teacher at the Hungry Horse school and made $48. But it was up to Billy to make a lot of the money himself. So he washed windows for the Hungry Horse Cafe and Bar (50 cents), spaded a neighbor's garden ($2.50) and got sick cleaning out Chris Lund's cesspool, for which he got $1. He made another $16.30 digging up angleworms and selling them to fishermen along the highway at 15 cents a dozen. Eventually he and his family had saved and banked the $300. In his spare time Billy collected gadgets to trade at the jamboree for souvenirs, and at last he was all set to head east.

Of the 35 Scouts who went to the jamboree in Billy's group, 30 (including Billy) had never eaten on a diner or slept in a pullman berth before. Along the way Billy took in the Chicago stockyards, West Point, a boat ride down the Hudson, and Coney Island. By the time he got to Valley Forge the jamboree itself was almost an anticlimax. The tents for his troop failed to show up for 2 hours, and because someone forgot to order box lunches for the trip from New York, the Scouts had had nothing to eat since breakfast. But a history student in the crowd joked that Washington had had it tougher on the same campground, and everyone felt better. The rest of the week was spent sightseeing, though Billy's group filed past the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia so fast he "didn't even see the crack." And a newsreel truck blocked his view when President Truman visited the camp, so Billy didn't see him either. But he got in a lot of trading, received four letters from home on 1 day and agreed when it was over that the trip had been worth all the trouble—even cleaning out the cesspool.

[From the Hungry Horse News of July 21, 1950]

BILLY PETERSEN ON LIFE COVER

There's magic in the words "Hungry Horse." It helped bring about a big event for local scout, Billy Petersen, 12. His picture is on the front cover of the July 24 issue of Life magazine.

The story starts last February. Mrs. Bill Petersen at Martin City on impulse sent a picture of freckled-faced Billy to Life magazine, New York City. She wrote a note that here was a scout aching to go to the jamboree at Valley Forge, Pa., in June.

Coles Phinizy of Life's news bureau contacted the Hungry Horse News. His question: "What type of boy is Billy, and give all details?"

In late March big-hearted Wallace Kirkland, Life photographer from the Chicago office came to the Flathead on an assignment. It was to get pictures of Hungry Horse Dam in connection with a water-resources-of-the-Nation story, which didn't jell out. Kirkland was also advised to take a few pictures of then 11-year-old Billy Petersen, his family, home, scout troop, and town. Kirkland worked long hours and hard. He took hundreds of pictures from every angle They were good.

On June 14, 30-year-old Bob Kelley, former Seattle boy, from Life's Washington office arrived at the Flathead county airport. Billy, the Petersen family, and the community became subjects for another few hundred pictures. Kelley's "Hopalong Cassidy" picture was on Life's cover earlier in June.

Then Kelley and the Martin City boy scouts went to Missoula June 17 to board the jamboree train. Kelley became Billy's shadow. George Shiras, Life magazine reporter, joined the group in the East.

All this time there was no way of knowing whether Billy Petersen's picture would be in Life magazine. There were a lot of "ifs." The big magazine can take its pick of pictures.

Martin City isn't mentioned in the Life magazine story. The town is a mile away from the Hungry Horse project. Life's editors preferred to tell their story of the 1950 jamboree of 47,000 scouts at Valley Forge, Pa., by a 4½-page camera recording of Billy Petersen, 12, the boy from near Hungry Horse, Mont.

Now Billy has a horned toad obtained at the jamboree from a scout from Texas. Billy affectionally calls the toad, "Bob Kelley."

The Need of Limiting by Constitutional Amendment the Spending Power of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert B. Dresser:

THE NEED OF LIMITING BY CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT THE SPENDING POWER OF CONGRESS

A few years ago, Malcolm McDermott, a distinguished professor of law at Duke University in North Carolina, and Democratic Presidential elector in 1928, wrote an excellent article on Government Unlimited in which he said:

"The one force man has never learned effectively to control is government, and therein lies the great secret of human ills.

"* * * It is the most potent force known to us human beings. It controls and determines the lives, the happiness, the destinies of every one of us. It can command even the forces of nature and direct them against its enemies or against its subjects who may dare oppose it. Within its control are life and death, happiness and misery, freedom and servitude, for every man, woman, and child.

"We in America have long forgotten this basic concept of government; for, happily for us, we have hitherto lived under a Government that was placed under restraint. But even in this so-called enlightened day well-nigh half the world is controlled by just such governmental power. That is government unlimited. It is at once the most diabolical, the most treacherous, and the most uncontrollable force known to man.

"* * * While man has learned to cope with the forces of nature, he has never yet learned effectively to cope with this force he himself creates.

"While a student at Princeton I heard Woodrow Wilson make one of those profound observations for which he was noted, one that was later embodied in a great public utterance. He said: 'The history of liberty is the history of limitations upon the powers of government.' That is true. It is eternally true. Man's long, hard, slow climb up

to liberty and freedom is found written in the limitations he has been able from time to time to place upon this dangerous power called government. The tragedy is that by one device and another, ambitious men, self-seeking men, ruthless men have succeeded in writing off those restrictions."

As one views the steady increase in the powers and duties of our Federal Government and the accompanying decrease in the powers and duties of the States, one cannot escape the conclusion that "Government Unlimited" is being substituted for the "indissoluble Union of indestructible States" established by our Constitution. The increasing control of the Federal Government over the lives and fortunes of the American people, if unchecked, will inevitably lead to the establishment of a socialist state and the loss of the people's liberty.

This concentration of power in Washington at the expense of the States has been effected largely through an abuse of the taxing and spending powers of Congress and an unwarranted extension of the power to regulate interstate commerce beyond the limits of any reasonable definition of that term.

To put an end to this menace, the following three amendments to the Constitution should be adopted: (1) An amendment limiting the taxing power; (2) an amendment limiting the spending power; and (3) an amendment defining interstate commerce so as to limit the Federal power of regulation to matters which come within a reasonable definition of such term.

I propose to deal here only with the limitation of the spending power. My suggestion is obtained in the draft of an amendment, sections 1 and 2 of which provide as follows:

"SECTION 1. The purposes for which the Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises and to appropriate money shall be limited to the following: namely, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence of the United States and to provide the funds required for the exercise of the other specific powers, excluding the general welfare of the United States, granted to the Congress under the Constitution and its articles of amendment.

"SEC. 2. The courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction in a suit brought by a State of the United States to decide whether an appropriation made by the Congress is for a purpose authorized by this article of amendment, and to grant appropriate relief by injunction or otherwise."

To understand the full import of this amendment, it is necessary to have in mind the present state of the law on this subject.

In section 8 of article I of the Constitution Congress is given power "To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." This section also lists a number of other powers which Congress shall have.

From the very beginning there has been a sharp difference of opinion as to the true interpretation of the phrase, "the general welfare of the United States." Madison asserted it amounted to no more than a reference to the other powers enumerated in the subsequent clauses of the same section. Hamilton, on the other hand, maintained the clause confers a power separate and distinct from those later enumerated, is not restricted in meaning by the grant of them, and Congress consequently has a substantive power to tax and to appropriate, limited only by the requirement that it shall be exercised to provide for the general welfare of the United States.

In 1936 the United States Supreme Court, in the case of *United States* v. *Butler* (297 U. S. 1), decided this question for the first time and held that Hamilton's view was the correct one (see pp. 65–67).

In the case of *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon* (262 U. S. 447), decided in 1923, the United States Supreme Court held that a taxpayer has no right to enjoin the execution of a Federal appropriation act.

The practical effect of these two decisions is to give Congress the power to spend money for any purpose which it determines to be for the general welfare of the United States, without the right on the part of anyone, except in a certain few cases, to question the validity of that decision.

The proposed amendment does two things:

First, it excludes the general welfare of the United States from the purposes for which Congress may raise revenue and appropriate money, thereby putting into effect Madison's view that the general-welfare clause adds nothing to the powers specifically granted Congress.

Second, it gives to a State, but not to an individual, the right to raise in the courts the question of whether an appropriation by Congress is for a purpose authorized by the Constitution.

This amendment would do more than anything else, I believe, to curb the power of the Federal Government and return to the States the powers and duties which should properly be exercised and performed by them.

At the present time, by the levying of exceedingly heavy taxes, the Federal Government collects each year huge sums from the people of the States and then proceeds to hand back to the States a part of the sums so collected. These grants are ordinarily made on conditions, a practice which makes the States dependent on and subservient to the Federal Government.

It should be remembered that with minor exceptions every dollar spent by the Federal Government comes from the very sources of revenue that are available to the States. They should raise the revenue and spend it themselves. Responsibility for the raising of the revenue is one of the best checks upon extravagant and unwise expenditures. It is too easy to spend money raised by someone else.

Moreover, the States and municipalities are much better fitted than the Federal Government to perform the services which are primarily of State or local concern, and they would do so at much less cost. Performance of these services by the Federal Government has meant the maintenance at great cost of a vast horde of bureaucrats on the Federal payroll, many of whom could readily be dispensed with.

"Bring government back home" should be the watchword of the American people, a precedent for which has already been set by the Indiana Legislature in a joint resolution passed in January 1947, followed by similar action in the same year by the Legislatures of Michigan and New Jersey, and the Rhode Island Senate.

So serious has the fiscal situation become that Senator BYRD, of Virginia, in a speech on the floor of the United States Senate on July 14, 1949, referring to President Truman's speech the night before on the economic report, said:

"I say that the fiscal program announced last night by the President is the certain road to ruin. Unless the Congress and the people can defeat this program, we will go over the precipice of financial disaster.

"Such a program can only hold in prospect for business increased taxes or national insolvency. Increased taxes applied to a declining business probably would reach a point of confiscation, and insolvency would mean default on the public debt, in which is now invested a great part of the security of the American public. Confiscation would mean socialism, and default would mean national bankruptcy."

This speech was delivered in the last fiscal year, ending June 30, 1950, in which the expenditures of the Federal Government were over $40,000,000,000, and the deficit over $3,000,000,000. Moreover, in five peacetime years under President Truman the Federal Government has spent $214,000,000,000, an amount greater by $34,000,000,000 than the total spent by all the Presidents from 1789 to July 1, 1941.

But this is not all, the present administration has proposed social-security legislation that according to some estimates would eventually add over $20,000,000,000 to the present budget.

Can anyone doubt that national insolvency and an end of our venture in individual liberty will result unless something is done about it and done promptly?

Sister Kenny's Concept of Cause and Cure of Polio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the work that has been done by Sister Kenny in behalf of polio victims has been noteworthy and outstanding. The success that has attended her efforts entitles whatever she does or says on the subject of polio to be given consideration.

In this connection I was interested and I am sure others will be in a news article appearing in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., issue of Thursday, July 20, 1950, which states that she believes that she finally has scientific proof of the controversial concept of the cause of polio. While I am not able to express any opinion on the subject, yet I sincerely hope that the theory she propounds will have the careful and sympathetic consideration of those who are qualified by training and experience to make such study as is necessary and express an opinion thereon. No one can estimate the joy and the hope that will come to thousands of families if the cause and cure of polio can be ascertained.

The article, which I include as a part of my remarks, is as follows:

SISTER KENNY OFFERS NEW DATA TO BACK CONCEPT OF POLIO CAUSE

Miss Elizabeth (Sister) Kenny, still crusading after 40 years, believes she finally has scientific proof of the controversial concept of the cause of polio, which has kept her at bitter odds with doctors for the last decade.

The Australian-born nurse, who has won world-wide acclaim for her work with polio victims, gave her scientific data yesterday to Representative JUDD, Republican, of Minnesota, himself a physician.

Sister Kenny has never claimed she could cure polio. But she insists her techniques of treatment can prevent many of the crippling defects the disease causes.

TECHNIQUES ADOPTED

Indeed, most doctors have adopted many of her principles and techniques. What they object to is her iron-clad insistence that her methods be followed to the letter and that treatment be given only by people trained under her supervision.

But at the base of the controversy is Sister Kenny's concept that the virus that causes polio can settle in any part of the body, exclusive of the nervous system. Most doctors believe the polio virus initially attacks the nervous system—the brain and spinal cord—and that crippling effects result from this damage.

The large, white-haired nurse told reporters the data she gave Dr. JUDD proved by microphotographs that the virus has been found in muscles and tissues lying close to the skin and in internal organs. Removed from these infections, she said, the virus transmitted polio to monkeys.

YEARS OF RESEARCH

These results, she said, came from years of research at New York's Columbia Hospital, the Cajal Institute in Madrid, and the Neurological Institute in Brussels.

She gave them to Dr. JUDD, she said, for transmission to the Premier of Queensland, Australia, as an official report of the work she has done since coming to this country as an official visitor on a mission 10 years ago.

In her talk with reporters, Sister Kenny at times lashed out at the medical profession, criticizing particularly the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis for refusing to go along with her teachings.

EVIDENCE LACKING BEFORE

But she made clear her hope that the new data will give doctors the scientific evidence that, she said, was lacking before.

Without understanding the basic concept she proposes, Sister Kenny said, proper treatment is impossible. She showed X-rays, which, she said, showed damage had been done to muscles treated with other methods.

Her method, she said, involves nursing the affected part of the body with hot, moist pads, to maintain adequate blood circulation. Muscles also are shortened or relaxed, during the acute disease. Later, she said, she uses bodily mechanics and manipulation to bring muscles into proper use.

DESCRIBES NEW VACCINE

Sister Kenny (sister is the Australian designation for a nurse) also described development of a new polio vaccine developed by the Pasteur Institute in Algiers. She has assigned a technician, she said, to collect data on the vaccine project.

Sister Kenny also said evidence has been presented to indicate a connection between onset of polio in children and dual vaccinations for diphtheria and whooping cough. As a result, she declared, such dual in noculations have been prohibited in both Britain and Australia.

Sister Kenny said 26 of her treatment centers now are set up, including 18 in iron-curtain countries. In addition, she said, one of the most recent is in west Germany.

Our Farm Program—A Realistic and Constructive Endeavor to Make Democracy Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEO. HOWARD WILSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the most encouraging word to come out of Washington recently was the announcement of wheat acreage allotments for the coming year. Wheat and livestock represent well over half of the cash income for Oklahoma farmers. My district in Oklahoma produces approximately half of its wheat. With support prices for wheat at about $2 and with acreage allotments at least equal to those of last year, the farmers of my district can plan hopefully for the future.

At this juncture it is well to reexamine the basic needs for a farm program. Price-support legislation was the direct outgrowth of the great depression of the thirties and the recognition of certain fundamental facts about farm-price behavior. Without a reasonable floor under farm prices the farm family is the pawn of a vicious price squeeze. Prices of farm supplies and equipment are fixed in the industrial North and East. Prices paid for farm commodities are set by speculators in the large grain markets who extract as much profit from their transactions as they are able to take.

Too, when prices of farm commodities fall the farmer invariably bears the major part of the cut since marketing and processing charges remain relatively fixed. Experience proves that farm prices fall faster and farther than any other and the loss of farm purchasing power not only leads to depression but gives momentum to the downward trend of prices. Depressions are literally farm led and farm fed.

In the years from 1921 to 1940 the average annual fluctuation in the price of wheat amounted to 82 percent. Almost invariably the lowest prices were recorded at harvest time when the farmer most needed cash to pay harvest expenses, interest, and short-term debts. The precarious position of the farmer without effective supports is apparent. Last year grain storage qualified for commodity loans was thought to be scarce. Wheat prices dropped dizzily. The Government then announced its policy of making emergency loans on wheat stored on the ground. The price of wheat in Oklahoma rose 20 cents immediately, though actually it was not necessary to make such emergency loans in that State.

The continuance of the price-support program after the last war was a recognition by Congress not only of the basic needs for such a program but also of the fact that reconversion of agriculture should be counted as one of the war costs. After the First World War the adjustment of wheat production was left to supply and demand. No reckoning was taken of the fact that with falling prices the farmer was compelled to plant more and more acreage and produce more and more grain to keep his family and home together. Surpluses were piled on surpluses. The disastrous decade ending in the great depression brought bankruptcy and foreclosure to countless thousands of farmers and agriculture suffered losses of 40 percent.

Our present farm program was evolved from the travail of those painful years. It involves price supports to offer stability of prices and a fair return. It involves the encouragement of conservation practices. It is no longer necessary to practice soil mining to keep home and family together. For the first time less productive acreages may be diverted to soil-building crops or other conservation practices. The rebuilding of our Dust Bowl is a tribute both to our soil-conservation program and the tenacious farmers who clung to the soil when all was dark about them.

Farm Credit Administration figures show that whereas Oklahoma farm mortgages increased over two and a half fold from 1915 to 1923 in the First World War period, price supports and sound management enabled Oklahoma farm owners to cut their mortgage indebtedness from $153,000,000 in 1941 to $115,000,000 in 1949. They now own a 93-percent equity in their real estate.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that our farm program has proved its worth and should by all means be continued. It has served to stabilize our economy and prevent depression. It has built markets for the products of merchants, manufacturers, and labor and has thus contributed to our goal of full employment. It permits and encourages the practice of soil-conservation methods as against the soil-depletion methods that prevailed before its inception. It has provided us with a reasonable accumulation of commodities against possible crop failures and the eventualities of world conflict. Today in the face of a critical world situation it is well suited to keep our country economically strong.

Our farm program is a realistic and constructive endeavor to make democracy work.

Resolution of Japanese American Citizens League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Japanese American Citizens League, composed of 16 chapters located in southern California and Arizona have passed a resolution at their first postwar convention, which I would like to call to the attention of my collegaues in Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed with my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Most of the members of the Japanese American Citizens League are veterans of World War II who rendered great service to their Nation. The resolution indicates clearly their patriotic purpose and their loyal adherence to the principles of true democracy:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, throughout the world, a major crisis has developed between the democratic and totalitarian forces of the world so as to endager the very security of our Nation; and

Whereas persons of Japanese ancestry, through the trying experiences of the last war, have emerged with a deeper appreciation of the basic freedoms which the United States affords to its people; and

Whereas the Japanese American Citizens League has always answered the call of her country in any national emergency or crisis; and

Whereas the Japanese American Citizens League has always opposed any form of totalitarianism, and has never shirked its responsibility to defend and protect our Nation against infringements on our democratic institutions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Pacific Southwest District Council of the JACL, convening at its first postwar convention in Santa Monica,

Calif., on July 1 and 2, 1950, reaffirm our past pledge to do our share as responsible American citizens in any national emergency or crisis; and be it further

Resolved, That the chairman of the Pacific Southwest District Council convey this resolution to the President of the United States, Senators from California, and Members of the House of Representatives from the area covered by the Pacific Southwest District Council.

Conditions in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 24 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, the great Italian language newspaper, Il Progresso, asked me to summarize some of my observations on my trip to Italy, last month. My article appeared in the issue of July 5, 1950. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a translation. In this article I attempt to point out to the readers of Il Progresso how the economic problems of the Italian people which are complex and difficult at best, are further complicated by long historical background. The economic havoc created by the war is being overcome, and the program is amazing, but age-long problems, such as land reform and tax reform, still remain. The solution of these deeper economic problems by the Italian Govenment may require, among other things, changes in the attitude of key industrialists and large landowners.

Finally, Mr. President, I want to report to the Congress that no objective observer can visit Italy without again reaffirming the remarkable qualities of the Italian people, their energy and patience and individualism, their gayety and their unquenchable hope.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(President Harry Truman appointed United States Senator WILLIAM BENTON as one of two congressional advisers to the United States delegation to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in Florence. On the basis of his personal visits to many areas of Tuscany, Roma, Naples and Sicily, together with visits to high government officials, including Premier De Gasperi, and His Holiness, Senator BENTON has written the following story exclusively for Il Progresso.)

One of the most hopeful things going on in Italy today is what is happening in the labor movement. I took a greeting from the CIO council of Bridgeport to the new free Italian labor movement, known as CISL, and to its remarkable leader, Louis Pastore. Mr. Pastore has led about 1,600,000 of the union members out of the Communist-dominated unions and set up this free labor movement. The failure of the last big Communist-led strike is an indication—we hope—of the trend. All the key jobs in the big dominant union—the Confederazione Generale Del Lavoro—are filled by Communists, and not mere Communists but well-trained party members.

Extraordinary progress—really amazing progress—has been made in economic recovery. I attribute this to three things: First, the Italian people are perhaps the hardest working people in Europe (perhaps because by temperament they are individualists). There is a core of highly skilled workers and especially a fine tradition in engineering. One of the ECA officials stated categorically that there are no finer engineers anywhere in the world than the best of the Italians. Second, through our ECA programs, and kindred programs, the United States has put $3,000,000,000 into Italy since the war—an act unprecedented in human history. Third is the personal skill and ability of Mr. De Gasperi, who has done an outstanding job in pulling together and forming a stable government despite very complicated problems.

On the bright side we have Italy's rate of recovery; the apparent fiscal stability; the virtual disappearance of the black market; the secure position of the government; the fact that exports are increasing and the dollar gap is being narrowed, and the apparent decline of communism. We see splendid land reclamation projects under way—I believe there are more than 250 in progress right now.

There is in Italy, however, a deep-seated problem which is a European problem as well. It dates back to the industrial revolution.

The day I reached Italy, Count Sforza had spoken before the French Assembly, pleading for a customs union between France and Italy—a project with which he has been identified for many years—his dream of a more unified Europe. Mr. Hoffman calls this "integration" and Italy, as a nation, seems willing to play its part. I would call integration catching up with the industrial revolution, within the framework of economic and political freedom.

What troubled me deeply in Italy was not the attitude of the ordinary people or of the government. It was the attitude of those who haven't yet realized the true meaning of the industrial revolution, and who are obstructing progress toward a true adaptation to it. Communism is a false adaptation, but the obstructionists may accidently help make the case for communism. (I am sorry to report that communism is still a vital and threatening force in Italy: over half the voters of Milan, that great industrial city, voted Communist in the last election, as did 65 percent of those in Florence, where UNESCO met; our consul general in Florence told me that 90 percent of the mayors of the towns and villages of Tuscany are Communists.)

Now let me take land reform as a major example. If anything is cryingly needed in Italy, it is land reform. This is an age-old problem, but its solution can no longer be delayed. The Italian Government has recognized this and has within the last week or two announced a vigorous program. Much of the land of southern Italy is owned by absentee landowners, many of whom reside in Rome and other big cities. Often the farmers who work the land live huddled in little hilltop villages, walking out 4 or 5, 10 or 15 mies a day to take care of a field, then trudging back again, often with no more than 100 days' work a year. In many places the land has been deteriorating. In others it has needed draining for centuries. Tens of thousands of acres need reclaiming. The workers need education and need to learn the new methods so urgently required if Italy is to step up her food production to keep pace with her rapidly expanding population.

Another example is the tax laws. Almost every economist I know, and most enlightened American businessmen, agree that an income tax is far preferable to a sales or transaction tax as a major source of government revenue. The income tax is based on ability to pay, the sales tax on the need to consume. In Italy the transaction tax is the mainstay of the tax system. I was told that the Italian consumer had to pay 43 different taxes before he drank a cup of coffee. As the law now stands, a man can earn $100,000 a year and negotiate with the tax collector. As a result he may end up with a small tax. His land may not be on the tax rolls at all. A tax reform is most urgent and Premier De Gasperi agreed with me on this.

Perhaps even more important than land reform or tax reform is the need for business reform. As in France, England and other European countries, the businessman's idea of capitalism is a protected market and a tight cartel. The lesson of the American dynamic economy—a large, free, and open market with competition in favor of the consumer and in developing better products at lower prices—seems to be ignored. Most European and Italian businessmen think in terms of a restricted market, with low volume and high prices. They are acting against their own long-time interest in doing this.

I do not believe that the United States, through the ECA, should try to force its economic ideas on Italy. But Americans should be able to make constructive suggestions. I favor greater emigration from Italy, and would favor liberalizing the quotas to permit greater immigration into the United States. But I also believe, in all sincerity, that the realization of a more dynamic economy in Italy, which would mean greater employment as well as greater exports, would significantly reduce the need for emigration. Yes, it could provide tens of thousands of new and better jobs and develop a higher standard of living for all.

The Korean Cricis and Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 24 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding address delivered by the able National Commander of the American Legion, George N. Craig.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Americans, there no longer can be any doubt of the gravity of the crisis facing America and the world today.

The President has told us in no uncertain terms that the Communist act of raw aggression in Korea is an outright breach of the peace.

He has confirmed the belief of many of us that soon armed aggression may take place in other areas. * * * It could be Greece, Turkey, or Iran. It may be Indochina, Formosa, or the Philippines.

The duration and course of this onslaught by atheist Communists against the God-fearing peoples of the world no one at this moment can foresee * * * but the American people can forestall it.

It is not too late to avoid world war III.

But we must make our decision now. Eventually may be too late.

The United States is faced today with what may prove the major crisis of our history.

This may be it. And unity is a must.

Realizing the herculean task confronting our Nation, the entire membership of the American Legion has been mobilized.

The services of the 3,000,000 American Legionnaires in 17,418 posts throughout the length and breadth of our land have been pledged to the President of the United States and the American Government.

These 3,000,000 men and women * * * veterans of experience in two world wars stand ready to perform whatever tasks our Government may assign to us.

There are no ex-servicemen in the American Legion.

The President is asking for billions to combat Communist aggression and to defend democracy. We believe the President has acted with courage and firmness in meeting lawless aggression with every force at the command of the United States.

We earnestly urge immediate curtailment of governmental expenditures in all fields that do not make a direct contribution to the national security and which may be postponed without injury to the welfare of our people. To give this plea the weight of its patriotic example, the American Legion as of now throws overboard for the duration of the present crisis its advocacy of any new veterans' pension legislation.

Also for the duration we shall support no bonus bills.

And we shall ask no additional benefits or extensions of time under the GI bill of rights except to make them applicable to those now fighting your war in Korea.

It is a case today of powder or pensions * * * bullets or bonuses.

This new policy has been approved by the national executive committee of the American Legion.

The American Legion realizes that in this continuing crisis our dollars are mighty weapons. They must be fighting dollars from now on. They must not be dissipated. Our Nation can needlessly spend itself into disaster. The time has come when national security must have top call upon our national wealth.

There must be no profiteering in the name of national security. Anyone who profiteers in time of emergency is as much a traitor as those who sell or purvey the country's vital secrets to its enemies.

Today all of our State commanders from coast to coast are gathered there at national headquarters in Indianapolis to map out the American Legion's program of assistance in support of our Government in its endeavor to win world peace.

The handwriting on the wall indicates that the invasion of Korea is but an item on the timetable of communism to destroy world peace. It is to destroy that timetable of violence that a decision now must be made by the American people.

Many of our brave American youths are falling and dying today in Korea * * * paying the fearful price of inadequate training and of insufficient weapons and supplies.

We believe that our able Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson made a prophetic statement when he said, "Peace can be secured only through strength."

And I say force is the only language an enemy of peace understands. From now on we must lead from strength. Whatever it takes in sacrifices to generate that strength, we must produce it.

Permit me to quote these words from a great American:

"Had we had a trained army in the beginning * * * we never should have had to retreat."

Those might have been the words of General MacArthur, but they are not. They were spoken by none other than George Washington.

That is how far back this Nation has been admonished to give adequate training to its young men, so that should the occasion arise when they might have to face an enemy on the field of battle they would be fit, and fitted for the task.

And those words apply to the present action in Korea—and to other actions that may follow—just as they did in the battles of the American Revolution.

The preamble to the Constitution of the United States says that, "We the people * * * provide for the common defense * * * and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

We can go back centuries before that. In the twenty-first verse of the eleventh chapter of the Gospel of St. Luke it is written:

"When the strong man, fully armed, guardeth his court, his goods are at peace."

What most disturbed the veterans of World War I who organized the American Legion in 1919 was the fact that there had been such needless sacrifice of lives due to a lack of preliminary training of the men who were sent overseas. They were determined that this inexcusably cruel situation should never happen again.

From that time until now it has advocated and insisted upon a universal military training program.

No segment of the American people could be more fervent in their desire for peace than those who have felt the hardships and pain of actual conflict, and these veterans of the American Legion have never retreated in this peace objective.

Time after time the great minds of our Nation including the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense have urged our Congress to act. Had that advice been followed there might have been no World War II, and certainly no crisis such as we have today.

Now we are balancing on the perilous brink of world war III and still no training program is in force in spite of the fact that Nation-wide polls have indicated that a vast majority of the American people are in favor of universal military training.

This is an appeal to the mothers and fathers of our American youths. Universal military training does not mean the immediate drafting of your son into the Armed Forces.

It is a training program to discourage international bandits from perpetrating acts of violence that make necessary the drafting of your son into the fighting forces.

Universal military training is security insurance for our Nation and survival insurance for our young men. In war the trained live—the untrained die.

No mother raises her boy to be a soldier, but should the need arise requiring his military service, she wants him to return as a living and able-bodied veteran. Without training his chance to so return is greatly reduced.

Universal military training will provide a vast manpower pool of trained civilian reservists from which, in case of war, our country could draw, but, pray to God, we'll never need it. Universal military training will provide military training and experience in advance of any possible military service.

I have personally seen men die in battle because they did not have such training. I have a son who is approaching military-service age. This gives me a father's deep and compelling interest in universal military training. It is my fervent hope that my son will never have to go to war. But if he must go, I want him to go prepared by the best training in advance that he can receive.

Our youth are entitled to this advance training. We must have it.

We must have a decision now.

The freedom, the happiness, the very lives of your sons are at stake.

We have won our wars up to now.

God has been good to America, but "God helps them who help themselves."

The American Legion is not a prophet of fear, but all of us should have been sufficiently concerned by what has happened in the past few weeks to take drastic action to remedy our weakness.

Three million men who have been through it are trying to give you the benefit of their painful experience so that you and your sons will not have to go through it again.

It is our fervent hope that millions of Americans will implore their Senators and Representatives in Congress to remain in session until universal military training, imperative to proper national security, is enacted.

Time is on the Kremlin's side. Moscow can strike again with satellites when Moscow is ready.

But there still is a wholesome respect throughout the world, including Russia, for the power of an aroused and prepared United States.

Now is the time for us to show Moscow and the world that America has awakened and means business.

Let us not sugar-coat the seriousness of this crisis. We must abandon wishful thinking and "business and spending as usual."

Blowing and bragging are not the answer.

The forensic vapors of rhetoric will not run the engines of war, nor will they train our boys.

There has been enough palaver and pussyfooting. This is the time to act.

Universal military training has gathered dust in congressional pigeonholes too long. With your help now it will win.

In your messages to your Senators and Representatives ask for a reply. By that means you will get action.

So long as Americans have confidence in one another, so long as we have confidence in ourselves and are self-reliant, so long as we have faith in divine gudance, so long as we are prepared spiritually, physically, mentally, and materially, so long will peace and human dignity and freedom reign throughout the world.

It is your decision now.

Korea as a Test of World Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 24 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, all of us realize that the United Nations action in directing the use of military force to curb aggression by northern Korea constitutes a landmark in the history of international law. When the UN came to this momentous decision within a few hours after the news of the attack below the thirty-eighth parallel, it took an action which had never been taken by the League of Nations throughout its history.

The legality of the UN action is a matter of tremendous interest to all of us who are determined that there shall

be a strong foundation of international law to prevent further acts of aggression.

This very interesting theme has drawn the attention of one of our finest legal minds, Dr. Paul F. Douglass, president of American University. Dr. Douglass, however, in writing an article for the United Nation's League of Lawyers has considered not merely the immediate legal phases but some of the larger implications of this epochal action. He is uniquely qualified to comment on this subject by virtue of a long and intimate understanding of the origins of the Korean Republic as well as an extensive background in the efforts of previous international organizations to lay the basis for an enduring world law. I ask unanimous consent therefore that the text of Dr. Douglass' article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEST OF WORLD LAW

(By Paul F. Douglass)

On the eve of the fifth anniversary of the signing of the Charter of the United Nations on the Pacific coast, events in the Far East put the principles and machinery of world organization to legal test.

To lawyers concerned with the legal foundations of world order the substantive and procedural performance of the United Nations in summer, 1950, set precedents historic in legal history. Those precedents grow out of international coaction of sovereign states to suppress aggression and to maintain international peace and security.

KOREAN LOCUS OF TEST

No other locus on the globe could furnish so vivid a background for the test of world law as Korea. Historically Korea has served as a buffer in the political movements of Russia, China, and Japan. Geographically Korea hangs off Soviet Manchuria and Siberia. Politically southern Korea has been administered directly and indirectly by United States military from Japan, a country whose treaty of peace has not been negotiated with the United States. The aggression came with the blessing of a great power allied with the United States in World War II. This power has already overrun China which since 1919 befriended the provisional Government of Korea, the country gone hermit to protect itself.

KOREA—FOOTBALL OF POWER POLITICS

In the political tussle for control of strategic Korea, Japan eliminated Chinese influence in 1895. It eliminated Russian influence in 1904. It annexed Korea in 1910. By World War II military action in the Pacific theater the United States liberated Korea and divided the occupation of the country with the Soviet Union which had been mildly helpful in the liberation. A provisional government was established in February 1946 as a joint project of Americans and Soviets.

UN ACTION BREAKS DEADLOCK

The joint commission composed of American and Soviet representatives after 2 years deadlocked. To break this deadlock the United States proposed a four-power conference with China and the United Kingdom joining the United States and the Soviet Union to seek agreement on the independence of Korea. Following the rejection of the proposal by the Soviet Union, the United States pursuant to provisions of chapter IV of the Charter asked the General Assembly to consider the problem. By resolution on November 14, 1947, the General Assembly created the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea and recommended a Korean election not later than March 31, 1948, to choose representatives with whom the Commission might consult regarding the prompt attainment of freedom and independence of the Korean people.

A LAWFUL GOVERNMENT ESTABLISHED

The third session of the General Assembly declared that a lawful government had been established in South Korea as a result of the elections. It declared that the elected government was the only lawful government, created as it was a valid expression of the free will of the electorate as observed by the United Nations Commission. By international coaction a political sovereignty had been brought into being. This fact is important to lawyers.

The United Nations observed the complete withdrawal of United States forces by June 1949 and took steps to facilitate the removal of barriers to economic, social, and other friendly intercourse caused by the division of Korea.

KOREA NORTH OF 38°

On May 1, 1948, Korea north of parallel 38° adopted a constitution claiming jurisdiction over all Korea. The second fact of importance to the lawyer therefore is the coexistence of two claimant sovereignties. South of parallel 38° the Government had de jure status before the United Nations. North of parallel 38° the Government had accepted de jure status within the orbit of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, a world organization operating from the Kremlin rather than from Lake Success. The absence of the Soviet Union from the Security Council meeting on June 25, 1950, therefore was appropriate. The Soviet Union was operating a world organization of its own and utilizing its own methods for the extension of its Soviet world order.

RAW POWER VERSUS LEGAL PRINCIPLE

The assault launched by ground forces, amphibious landings, and aircraft attack collided not with military force in the early hours of the dawn but with the legal provisions built into chapter V of the Charter of the United Nations. This is the third fact important to lawyers. Raw power collided with legal principle.

Article 28 provides that the Security Council shall at all times be represented at the seat of the Organization. Chapter VII provides for international coaction with respect to acts of aggression. The fourth fact important to lawyers is that promptly international coaction was taken with respect to an act of aggression in support of legal principle to sustain a sovereignty legitimate before the United Nations.

PROCEDURAL PRECEDENTS CREATED

The procedural questions involved in the decision of the Security Council are likewise of interest to lawyers. International coaction is creating precedents and usages which even in crisis are binding on members of world organization.

NO ONE-SIDED CHANGE OF RULES

Or again, the precedent is important that no one sovereignty can change the rules of the international game unilaterally to suit its own fancy. Nationalist China was still in the United Nations by consent of the great majority of its members.

JOINT POLICE ACTION

Or again, the precedent of response of members to plans for the application of armed force becomes a historic bench-mark in the maturing of international jurisprudence and the enforcement of legal principle.

WORLD CONCERN OF REGIONAL ORGANIZATION

And finally, the unanimous action of the Council of the Organization of American States declaring firmest support of the United Nations action against aggression and affirming the continental solidarity which ties the American states set this tremendous precedent: the only and oldest regional organization for the first time since World War II and for the first time in its history faced a world issue and made a decision broader than the immediate interests of the nations which compose it. A regional organization participated as a unit in world policy supporting and sustaining the United Nations.

FREE CONSENT VERSUS COERCED ASSENT

The United Nations League of Lawyers, organized to sustain and support the rule of law in the community of nations now finds an humble satisfaction in its mission while civilization struggles with savagery at the international frontier. The United Nations League of Lawyers as a representative world organization joins individual lawyers of all nations in professional association and practical action to see that civilization wins out.

Abandonment by Norway of Subsidy Plan for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 24 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Norway Subsidy Plan Too Expensive, Agriculture Minister Tells Val Bjornson," published in the St. Paul Dispatch of Thursday, July 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORWAY'S SUBSIDY PLAN TOO EXPENSIVE, AGRICULTURE MINISTER TELLS VAL BJORNSON—BRANNAN PLAN VIRTUALLY OUT, OSLO REPORT

(By Valdimar Bjornson)

OSLO.—Norway has virtually abandoned its "Brannan plan" for the frankly acknowledged reason that it costs too much. The action was explained in detail in an interesting visit with Statsraad Kristian Fjeld, Norway's minister of agriculture.

The striking thing about the visit with the Social Democratic cabinet minister from Hedemark was its setting. His office is in Victoria Terrace, as are those of many other government bureaus. And one doesn't even approach Victoria Terrace without recalling tragic scenes enacted there when the big white double building served as Gestapo headquarters for the Nazi invaders. "Trials," torture and imprisonment were the order of the day throughout the building for 5 years.

The minister of agriculture sits in an office now only a short distance from the room in which he was imprisoned for a month. When the Nazis arrested him, he was mayor of Stange, near Hamar. After his month's incarceration at Victoria Terrace, he was a prisoner in Grini concentration camp for 3 years. As a matter of fact, all but one of Norway's present cabinet ministers have been prisoners of the Nazis during the war.

Mr. Fjeld traced the record of subsidies for farmer and consumer, as it operated in Norway for more than 20 years. The plan, paralleling others elsewhere in Scandinavia, has many features identical with the Brannan proposal. Subsidies have aided agricultural production which has always faced numerous handicaps in mountainous Norway. They

have at times run as high as a full 100 percent.

When this year's budget was adopted last spring, it became evident that continuance of the farm subsidy program at established levels would triple in cost. Devaluation of the krone was the major factor. Straight farm subsidies ran to 400,000,000 kroner 2 years ago. At the same level for this year, their cost would have been 1,200,000,000 kroner. That is just about half Norway's total budget of 2,600,000,000 kroner. Rigid curtailment in government payments was the only possible course.

There are subsidies still. Most of them go toward making imported goods cheaper for the ultimate consumer. The budget still carries a 100,000,000-kroner item for farm product subsidies. One of the major payments is on butter at the rate of 5 kroner per kilo, the equivalent of close to 32 cents a pound. Good butter sells at 7½ kroner per kilo, or about 48 cents a pound. Oleomargarine, of which all Scandinavia produces a great deal, sells at 2.25 kroner per kilo. With butter still in surplus, the subsidy does help keep its price down to consumers while giving the farmer considerably more than the normal market would afford.

Some of Norway's principal farm organizations went on record in favor of virtual elimination of subsidies when their enormously increased cost became evident last spring. Many are dissatisfied with the present arrangement, however. The choice was one as to relative merits of budget items. Military outlays remain constant, at a sizable level. Reconstruction costs have been heavy since the war.

The Finnmark area of northern Norway, victim of the Nazis' "scorched earth" policy when fighting proceeded there, has been gradually built up again. Conditions are difficult there still, but as Minister Fjeld explained it, "Everyone in Finnmark at least has a roof over his head now."

The range of topics covered in a pleasant visit with Mr. Fjeld was broad. They included the inevitable inquiry about relatives in the States—and the prompt response, "Oh, yes, I have a sister in Minnesota. She lives in Minneapolis. Her name is Helen; she's Mrs. Backe now, and visited Norway a little over a year ago, for the first time in many years."

Norway would just as soon reclaim some of those who migrated to America years ago, Mr. Fjeld smilingly commented. "We have a labor shortage in just about every field now," he explained. "It was different after World War I, when we had a surplus of labor, but not enough for people to do. Now, it is hard to get workers in the skilled crafts, and it is getting to be a problem even to recruit manpower for our principal industries, shipping and fishing."

"We've had too much stress on white collar jobs here in Norway," the minister of agriculture complained. "What we need is more emphasis on trade schools, less on the professions and office workers. We have plenty to do and, through determination, helped considerably by Marshall plan aid, we're making real progress toward our recovery goals."

To the Spoils System?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor on July 14, 1950, published an editorial entitled "To the Spoils System?" This editorial points out some of the weaknesses of H. R. 7439, the security-risk bill, recently passed by this House and now pending in the other body.

The Christian Science Monitor is concerned with the far-reaching ramifications of the proposed legislation. The editorial follows:

TO THE SPOILS SYSTEM?

Washington long has faced a personnel problem peculiarly governmental in nature.

Should Government administrators be permitted to hire and fire at will, to retain under them only staff members they believe best fitted for their jobs? Before we shout a resounding "Yes," let us recall that that's the way it used to be—in theory. In practice it meant that Government ranks were filled largely by, for, and with politicians and their henchmen. When the other party got in, the good and the bad all were thrown out for a new crew of green hands.

The antithesis is equally unacceptable: To man the Government with a watertight civil service under which tenure is permanent, executives are allowed no discretion, and promotion ignores merit for seniority.

The Government has achieved, by trial and error, at least a workable compromise. Too many inefficients are still blanketed in. Too many crassly political appointments are still possible. But good public servants can build careers reasonably free from political opportunism and personal capriciousness.

Now the House, in one unedifying stampede, has voted, in effect, to throw this system overboard. The bill doesn't say just that. It would appear to leave the loyalty safeguards untouched. It says it would only permit heads of 11 departments to discharge without recourse anyone deemed a poor security risk—those who talk too much, get in debt, drink too much, show poor judgment.

But should the bill become law, there would be no need to use the loyalty boards. Anybody could be classed a poor security risk and fired—anyone charged by an enemy or a crank with disloyalty, any Republican whose job some Democrat covets (and vice versa), any incumbent who stands in the way of some friend of the chief.

We believe few department heads would so utterly exploit such an opportunity. And it is reasonable to ask that actual security risks shall not be frozen in Government service by glacial regulations. But this bill furnishes a typical and horrible example of what people can do when they are frightened.

Wisconsin Is Beautiful Place To Start Seeing America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Washington Star there appeared an article by Fred de Luna entitled "Wisconsin Is Beautiful Place to Start Seeing America." I am glad this truth has been called to the attention of the people of the District of Columbia. I take pleasuse in calling the article to the attention of my colleagues.

WISCONSIN IS BEAUTIFUL PLACE TO START SEEING AMERICA

(By Fred de Luna)

The early French explorers, giving the Indian pronunciation a Gallic twist, called it Ouis-con-sin—the gathering of the waters.

An apt name, but modern-day Wisconsin, for all its 8,289 lakes, is much more than that. As anyone who has seen a Wisconsin automobile tag knows, it's the Nation's dairyland.

And as anyone who has visited the State knows, it's also one of the country's most beautiful vacation lands.

It's a land of rolling meadows and sparkling lakes, of ultra-scientific dairy farming and virgin pines, of cherry trees and canyons, of cheese and beer.

I spent 9 days touring the Badger State recently, covering more than 1,200 miles with travel editors from a score of other papers. My own conclusion: It's breathtakingly beautiful; if you want to see America first, Wisconsin is a good place to start.

VARIETY ENOUGH

There's variety to suit virtually all vacation tastes—and pocketbooks. You can stay in a rustic log cabin for $25 a week or in a swank hotel for $25 a day.

The metropolis is, of course, Milwaukee—thirteenth largest city in the United States—which hugs the shores of Lake Michigan some 70 miles north of Chicago. A major market, Milwaukee also is famous for its beer—or have you heard?

The State itself is divided, more or less roughly, into two major areas—the southern dairying half, with its miles upon miles of clean, picture-bright meadows, and the northern wooded areas, devoted almost exclusively to the resort trade.

With its 4,000,000 cattle, more than its human population, Wisconsin rightfully boasts itself the Nation's dairy capital. Half the country's cheese and 10 percent of its butter comes from Wisconsin.

But it is not statistics which strike the first-time visitor. It's the sharp, natural beauty of the dairyland countryside. For some reason, trees seem greener, meadows smoother and brooks brighter in Wisconsin.

IN CLEAR RELIEF

Most striking of all, there appears to be no such things as weeds or underbrush in the dairy country. Barns, farmhouses, and wooded hills stand out in clear relief against the broad skies, as clear and colorful as a Grandma Moses painting.

Most of the resorts in the southern areas have a gay, country-club atmosphere, offering fishing, swimming, horseback riding, and other summer sports, besides bobsledding and skiing in the winter. The real vacationland, however, is the northern part of the State.

There a man and his family can really rough it in authentic North Woods atmosphere, or if he likes his North Woods served up with all modern conveniences, there are dozens of places sure to suit his fancy.

For instance, there's the Northernaire, a plush, hotel-type resort at Three Lakes, Wis. (Incidentally, the Three Lakes chain includes some 30 lakes.) The Northernaire is like a splinter of Manhattan in the wilderness, with deer, porcupines, and a night-club within a gem's throw.

By contrast, the real fishing or just plain nature enthusiast can live in contentment in any one of dozens of housekeeping cabins on any one of dozens of remote lakes, all chockful of wall-eyed pike, bass, and the pride of the North Woods—muskies.

HOLDS VISITORS

Surprisingly, many of these small resort operators are not really North Woodsmen at all. Many of the guides have lived in

their particular area all their lives, but many of the resort men are like Charley Johnson, who has a small place on High Lake.

"I used to come up here for fishing each summer," grinned Charley, a former Chicago newspapermen, "and I always hated to go back. Finally, I decided I wouldn't go back. So here I am, and I haven't regretted it yet."

After every first-time visitor to the Badger State sees his first deer glide gracefully across the highway, usually the next thing he wants to do is catch a muskie—or muskellunge, one of the fightin'est game fish of them all.

Muskies come 3, 4 or even 5 feet long. No less than two regions, Hayward and Boulder Junction, call themselves "the muskie capital of the world," both with pretty good reason.

For the sportsman who wants more fish and less fight, all Wisconsin lakes boast plenty of wall-eyes and northerns, bass, trout, and panfish.

Odd as a fishing center is the far northern county of Bayfield, at the tip of Lake Superior, which offers in one relatively small area 300 miles of stream trout fishing, small lake fishing, and deep-sea trout fishing in Lake Superior.

Headquarters for the last is the picturesque little city of Bayfield. Scattered off in the lake from this resort town are the 22 Apostle Islands, a prime tourist attraction.

It was around this general area that Longfellow's famed Indian, Hiawatha, is supposed to have had his hunting ground, by the shining big sea water—Lake Superior.

CHERRYLAND AREA

Another section of Wisconsin stretches out into Lake Michigan to the south, forming a sort of stream, with the lake on the outside and Green Bay (home of the football Packers) toward the palm of the State mitten. This is the quaint Dorr County or "Cherryland." The strange county name is said to derive from an Indian legend about death's door.

The nickname is an appropriate one. Door County is almost a solid block of limestone, with a veneer of earth, and cherry trees just thrive on limestone. Years ago an enterprising farmer put them both together, and now the area is covered with cherry trees. The picking season is just getting into full swing now.

One of the Wisconsin sights best known out of State are the famous Dells on the Wisconsin River. These are beautifully and grotesquely wind-and-water-carved canyons.

Some 40 miles south of the Dells, in the southern part of the State, is the capital, Madison. Although the lake region is for the most part in the northern glacier area, Madison, too, is part of the gathering of the waters.

It touches on four lakes, one of them, Lake Mendota, ranking among the most beautiful in the country.

Veterans' Benefits for Men Fighting in Korea

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, since the fighting started in Korea many questions have arisen concerning the protection which our servicemen will receive as veterans of service in Korea. I hope this statement will clarify the situation at least to some degree.

The National Service Life Insurance Act, which was originally enacted in 1940, is in full force and effect and any member of the Armed Forces is eligible to take out and carry an insurance policy up to $10,000 and to choose such beneficiaries as he may desire. In addition, the committee has directed its staff to study the possibilities of a new insurance law.

Any serviceman injured or contracting a disease in line of duty will be entitled to full disability compensation pay at the wartime rates based on duty performed under extra-hazardous conditions or conditions simulating war. Certainly the present activity in Korea fully complies with this definition which already exists in law. It follows, of course, that dependents of those who lose their lives in action will be entitled to death compensation at the wartime rates. The law today provides that wartime compensation rates shall be payable: First, as a direct result of armed conflict; second, while engaged in extra-hazardous service, including such service under conditions simulating war; or third, while the United States is engaged in war. The peacetime rates applicable under peacetime conditions are 80 percent of the wartime rates.

The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act is also in full force and effect and gives protection to any man called into service by suspending the enforcement of civil liabilities such as debts, mortgages, or other liabilities which he may have and is unable to pay as a result of his military service. Guaranty or premiums on commercial insurance policies may also be provided for under this law under certain conditions.

Any veteran of the fighting in Korea who suffers a service-connected injury is, of course, entitled to hospitalization under the present laws governing hospitalization by the Veterans' Administration. In addition, he would be entitled to out-patient treatment for his service-connected injury.

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act, which among other things provides education and training and assistance in procuring homes for World War II veterans, does not apply to veterans now engaged in action in Korea. It will be recalled that this law was enacted 3 years after World War II began and that the Vocational Rehabilitational Act which applies to service-connected veterans was enacted 2 years after the last war began. It seems entirely possible that Congress may desire at a later date to extend to veterans of the Korean service some such privileges in the education and training field as are now given to World War II veterans. I believe that this matter merits the most careful consideration. With that in mind, I have already addressed inquiries to the four veterans' service organizations chartered by act of Congress, as well as interested Government agencies and associations operating in the education field, with a view to obtaining suggestions for the very best training for our veterans of the present conflict.

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THURMAN C. CROOK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, fully realizing that many of our aged people, who pioneered and helped build our great democracy, are now, from no cause of their own, in difficulty as they try to keep body and soul together under our present economic system, I deem it expedient that their condition should attract the vital concern of this Congress that remedial action may be consummated in the near future.

That we may grow fully cognizant of this humanitarian problem that is ours, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an article by Clarke Beach, Associated Press, appearing in the July 20 edition of the South Bend Tribune, of Indiana:

THREE MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND IN 65 BRACKET SELF-SUPPORTING, 2,600,000 LIVE ON OLD AGE AND PAYMENTS

(By Clark Beach)

(More than 11,000,000 persons in the United States are aged 65 or more. Their problems are employment, support, health, and activities. This is the second of a series of articles on this important responsibility that is growing from year to year.—Editor Tribune.)

How are the old folks getting along financially? A statistical expert at the Social Security Administration in Washington recently figured out a partial answer to this question.

He estimated about 11,300,000 Americans were 65 or older in June 1949. He divided them into groups according to their sources of income or upkeep.

He learned 3,700,000 persons in this age group were self-supporting. About 2,800,000 of them were earning their own living, and 900,000 of them were women who were married to men who were working.

The largest group, about 5,200,000, were either entirely without income or were living on allowances. Of these 2,600,000 were living on old-age assistance, the national plan, administered by the States. Under it persons 65 and over, who have no other income and cannot depend on relatives for support, get monthly allowances ranging from $18.80 in Mississippi. The average payment was $43.60 to $70.55 in California.

NO CASH INCOME

The other 2,600,000 in the large group had no cash income and presumably were depending on relatives for support. (The Census Bureau recently estimated there were 3,500,000 persons of 65 and over with no income, but the social-security expert pointed out that 900,000 of these were wives of workingmen. About 2,000,000 of the remainder were women, leaving about 600,000 men in this category.)

Continuing his breakdown, the social-security man found that about 1,800,000 of the old persons were drawing old-age benefits from social-security insurance. As an individual's monthly check averaged only $26, about 10 percent of these old persons also were being given old-age assistance by the States as a supplement.

OTHER PENSIONS FIGURED

He figured that about 250,000 of them were receiving pensions or widows' benefits

from the railroad retirement fund. Another 90,000 were getting Federal civil-service pensions. About 20,000 were receiving other types of Federal pensions—Army, Navy, Coast Guard, Tennessee Valley Authority, etc.

Another 260,000 were recipients of Veterans' Administration benefits, either veterans or their aged dependents. And 175,000 were pensioners of State or local governments.

About 225,000 old folks were inmates of institutions. Of these, about 126,000 were in homes for the aged infirm or needy, 88,000 were in mental institutions, 5,000 were in jails, and 8,000 were in other types of institutions.

SOME GROUPS OMITTED

This tabulation leaves out some large groups whose numbers cannot be estimated, even roughly. These include persons living on savings or drawing annuities or other payments from individually financed old-age insurance plans.

Still another group is drawing from pension plans maintained by industry. The social-security experts reckon that about 7,000,000 workers are covered by such plans. How many of them are drawing pensions they do not try to guess, since no reliable national statistics are available.

The State-aid plan obviously fills the big gap, providing a minimum upkeep for those persons who have no other means of support. It is part of the national social-security system. The Federal Government matches funds supplied by the States and local authorities. In the fiscal year ended June 1949, the Federal Government contributed 55.1 percent of the cost; the States, 40.5; and localities, 4.5.

The total cost for the year was $1,259,445,000, all of it coming out of the Public Treasury since the beneficiaries make no contributions to it. The old folks supported by the system receive little or no help from the old-age and survivors insurance plan, as they were too old to have come under it or for other reasons were unable to take advantage of it.

Stand Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Bruce Barton from the Washington Star of May 21, 1950:

STAND ALONE

(By Bruce Barton)

The other night I attended a lecture by a famous scholar who should have drawn a full house. The hall was more than half empty. People looked around at each other self-consciously; it was easy to read their thoughts—"How disappointing. We understood this was to be something good. But such a small audience. We must have made a mistake."

The same psychology of self-doubt is at work in our political life. Insidiously, we are drifting toward one-party government. After each election you hear more people say, "I'm tired of never voting for a winner. Everything I used to think was true, politically and economically, seems to be labeled old-fashioned. The majority against me is too great. I must be wrong; they must be right."

To this defeatist thinking I say: Distrust majorities. Have faith in your own mental processes. In many of the most tragic crises of history the majority has not been right.

A majority crucified Jesus. A majority backed Napoleon in the wars that bled France white. Hitler had huge majorities; so did Mussolini.

In every war truth is the first casualty. Government propaganda concentrates its gun fire on independent thinking. And after the war the forces of propaganda are not demobilized. The party line of thought control in respect to America's foreign policy, for example, is fearfully powerful today, and sometimes shockingly intolerant.

It would be good for the United States if every citizen who wants to do his own thinking, but is finding the odds against him almost too much, would spend some time with Henry Thoreau and Ralph Waldo Emerson.

Emerson said, "It is easy in the world to live after the world's opinion; it is easy in solitude to live after our own; but the great man is he who, in the midst of the crowd, keeps with perfect sweetness the independence of solitude."

And Thoreau, "If a man does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer. Let him step to the music which he hears, however measured or far away."

False Boasts Have Misled the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, many people today are asking the question, "What and where is all our defense about which the Defense Secretary has been boasting for the past year?" There is no doubt we were caught unprepared in Korea.

We recall the Defense Secretary's so-called economy program. Most of that economy removed not only the fat from our defense program but cut deeply into the muscle of our armed services. He held back funds which had been appropriated by the Congress for defense purposes. The holding back of such funds, no doubt, has impaired the fighting effectiveness of our Armed Forces.

The Menominee Herald-Leader, a leading daily newspaper of my district, carried a most timely editorial in its issue of July 19, 1950, on this subject which I commend for your reading. It follows:

President Truman gave Congress today his first request for war measures. They are only a start, but they compose a $10,000,000,000 program to provide men and weapons for fighting in Korea and other places where it may be necessary. Mr. Truman did not ask for a tax increase to cover this huge addition to Federal spending; that will come later. The manpower of the armed services is now limited by law, and he asked that these limits be removed so the services can be expanded, but he did not say how much. Washington report says his first request will be for 220,000 more men than the present 2,005,882 authorized strength of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces. He also asked for partial home-front mobilization.

The President's requests for war needs appear necessary. Had a smaller expenditure for them been made earlier the larger one might not be necessary now, but the present national administration has made a historical wrong guess about Russia's war intentions, prepared a defense based on that miscalculation, preached confidence to the people, boasted a state of preparedness which the war in Korea has shown to be false, and effected economies in arms spending when an increase would have been more realistic and would have better served the needs of the American people and of the world.

Only 4 months ago Defense Secretary Johnson declared that the United States had all the armed strength it needed, the world situation considered. Nearly a year ago he said Russia's possession of the A-bomb hadn't changed the strategic position of the United States. With war blazing in Korea, Johnson boasts that his economy program prepared the fighting services for the emergency by making them into a compact fighting team. The team wasn't ready when the test came. The Nation shares responsibility for our lack of preparedness through refusal to be actively concerned about our ability to meet Russia's threats, but we have been led in error.

Turn To

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in these critical, troubled, and unstable times we need to bury our differences and unite in the common fight to preserve our system of individual liberty and democracy. The times demand that we stand together in unity and harmony and against discord among our people. We need team work and cooperation both of which are keys to achievement. Let us join in building instead of tearing down.

I am enclosing as a part of my remarks a most splendid and timely editorial appearing in the Palm Beach Post of Thursday, July 20, 1950, written by Charles Francis Coe, chief editorialist of the Perry newspapers, of Florida. Mr. Coe is an editorial writer of no mean ability and a good American. The editorial follows:

TURN TO

Listen, Buddy.

The Commies are on the march. The future of our Republic, which is likewise the future of mankind, stands imperiled. As freemen, we entertain each, his own opinion on a variety of subjects. As Americans, we submerge our differences in a common front against Communist aggression. Only so do we prosper. Only so we defend and protect the Republic. Only so can America follow its tradition. Only so can we perform a vital joint enterprise.

In the White House sits a man harassed beyond human endurance. He is called upon for decisions which stagger the imagination. He is forced to resist a thousand tides, a bewildering array of fogs, the whimperings of sycophants and the pleadings of cravens. He is Harry Truman. He is President of our United States. He is Commander in Chief of our fighting forces. If we divide, he will fail. If he fails, we will be enslaved.

Turn to, Buddy.

Drown your misgivings as to this political absurdity or that petty chiseling. There is

bigger game to be hunted. There is more valorous service beckoning. Of course, we have made mistakes. Of course, we will make mistakes. Of course, we will resist the mistakes made and endeavor to prevent recurrence of them. But that is for executive chamber meetings. That is for us, not for the world. Maybe we would rather have someone else President. What of it? The majority of us put Mr. Truman there. We can do not less than presume that he is sincere; that he will fight with us, not against us.

We must rely upon him to open his mind, his conscience, and his heart to the cry of all humanity, that, during the fighting to conclude three wars, he place above all else, the safety of the Republic. Then, turn to. Fight with him, against all who would assail us. If controls appear, accept them as the unavoidable demands of public security, until they are proven to be other than that, then yowl complaint constructively. Let no man, anywhere in the world, get the impression that we divide in time of crisis. Let all men know that the ultimate fruit of our system is individual liberty. That individual liberty is nothing more than a coordinated series of sacrifices, in connection with our individual license.

Turn to. Let Stalin see that America is on the march, standing firm and stalwart behind its chosen and vested leadership. Mr. Truman himself would decry any renunciation of the American privilege and duty of expressing opinion. We can and should do no less than give to him a unified, fighting support in a common cause.

As for us, he can rely upon that as a policy.

Hoarding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE MAGEE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, the first 4 weeks of the conflict in Korea has brought forth in this country the most pronounced wave of buying and hoarding ever witnessed. It is sad, selfish, and senseless. It is causing prices to skyrocket. Continued, it can only bring upon us the controls which we dislike. Our boys are being slaughtered on far-flung battlefields and we play into the hands of the enemy and stab our own people in the back. It is unconscionable and unpatriotic. It is venal and mercenary. Does anyone imagine that Russian housewives are hoarding or that preceding the invasion of South Korea, the North Koreans were buying up all the staples on grocery shelves? German civilians did none of this; nor did the Japanese before or during World War II. Must we admit that we are less patriotic than those who are now or have been our enemies? Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely and worth-while editorial from the Unionville Republican, published in Unionville, Mo.:

WRONG

The threat of war has brought about a sorry spectacle among our own people. For the past 2 weeks fearful buyers have been hauling out about everything from stores they can lay their hands on and storing much of it away in attics and cellars. This includes, sugar, tires, coffee, cigarettes, and even automobiles.

This is about as wrong a thing as can be done. The object, of course, is to have a reserve to escape rationing. The fear is that goods and foods may be again placed on a ration basis, and to escape that the buyer buys and stores. As a matter of fact, there is plenty of all staple articles in the Nation, and there is no threat of rationing unless it be for certain metals or material essential to war.

But the very wild buying and hoarding going on is the thing which can cause the very thing these people hope to escape. This sort of buying does two evil things. It produces an artificial scarcity which will increase the prices to even greater heights, and this very scarcity can bring about the rationing which people dread. If people would remain calm, and buy only as they need things as usual, rationing could be at least delayed for a long long time, even though war comes now. But with things scarce because of artificial and needless buying, rationing would be necessary at once to see to it that everybody had a fair chance at whatever is left.

The war outlook is indeed gloomy, but there is no reason for frantic buying, and there would be none for a long time until the normal surplus has been used up. Frantic buying and hoarding brings about the very condition the people do not want.

Let's Stay on the Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the Korean crisis, I have advocated that Congress forget its plans to adjourn and stay on the job.

I am pleased to note that the Escanaba Daily Press, one of the leading newspapers of my district, concurs in this viewpoint. I would recommend, Mr. Speaker, each Member of Congress read the Escanaba Press' timely editorial of July 19, 1950, quoted below:

CONGRESS SHOULD STAY ON JOB

Notwithstanding the Korean war, Congress is still planning to go home August 1. This being an election year the intention is understandable; but it is hardly wise or practical.

With every passing day it becomes clearer that the war in Korea is not to be a brief affair. Already President Truman is seeking more money to wage it. Even if the fighting doesn't spread to other areas, he may want to come in at any time with requests for still more money, controls on the civilian economy, more extensive manpower mobilization.

Moreover, the new demands thus far submitted are causing congressional leaders to condense their schedule and squeeze out legislation that deserves attention at this session.

A prime example is afforded by the House-approved bills providing statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. Recently these measures were endorsed by the Senate interior affairs committee. Chances of ultimate enactment are strong right now.

Much congressional time and taxpayers' money already has been spent in advancing the statehood proposals this far. They've been kicking around Capitol Hill for years and this is the closest they have ever come to final adoption.

It would be not only a foolish waste but a toying with the country's security to let this legislation die at this point. Both Hawaii and Alaska are vital defense outposts in the Pacific, the area most immediately threatened by the Korean war. Were the two Territories woven more tightly into the national fabric, the likelihood is they'd get better protection.

General Eisenhower and many others have called attention to the weakness of Alaskan defenses. Hawaii is better off, but hardly in ideal shape.

Senators don't want to take the bills up because they're controversial and debate would be long. What this really means is that Congress is taking a politics-as-usual approach to the Korean war, and simply doesn't wish to spoil its plans for getting back home to begin campaigning.

Naturally nobody likes to have his plans upset. Our Armed Forces fighting in Korea undoubtedly were happier living the relatively soft life of occupation troops in Japan. But they had no choice. And if Congress wants to measure up in this emergency, its course of duty is also plain.

Let the lawmakers recess for several weeks in September and October when the hot campaigning develops. But otherwise they ought to stick by their posts.

The Hydrogen Bomb: A Panacea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, the semiannual meeting of the Wholesale Drygoods Institute was held at Elmira, N. Y., on July 16, 17, 18, and I include the following address delivered by me at the dinner meeting of the institute at the Mark Twain Hotel, Elmira, on July 17:

THE HYDROGEN BOMB: A PANACEA?

These are times which could well be described as a succession of more confusing days. Every one of us gropes for information which will give indication of where this Nation is going. However, with all the pronouncements which emanate from Washington there is little help or guidance for the interested citizen. All of us try to understand what our national policy is with regard to this or that issue, and this very groping only leads to more confusion.

In none of our national issues is there more confusion than in the field of atomic energy. It is an area concerning which much has been said and written, but with it all the average person has difficulty in understanding what the issues are. Most recently there has been much fanfare made over the hydrogen or superbomb.

On January 23 the President made a short and momentous announcement that he had "directed the Atomic Energy Commission to continue its work on all forms of atomic weapons, including the so-called hydrogen or superbomb." He assigned as his reason that this was to be carried forward on a basis consistent with the over-all objectives of our program for peace and security. To date there has been no official amplification of that statement. In fact, on March 14 the Atomic Energy Commission prohibited personnel under its jurisdiction from making

public statements relative to the hydrogen bomb. This strict prohibition was later softened in language, but the intent to block discussion was still clear. So far there has been nothing from official sources upon which the American people can make a decision as to the relative value of such a weapon in terms of national security.

It is because there is so much confused thinking, and because this is an issue that every American has an interest, that I would like to direct your thinking to the problems posed by the hydrogen bomb.

There have been many conflicting statements about the superbomb and what we should do about the program of research and development which it would require. Many of these statements have been so extreme as to warrant no serious consideration. Some of the statements which have been made by our scientists have been very frightening to us all. Back of these statements seems to be the idea that if the people of this and other countries are sufficiently frightened we will not have any war in the future. This tactic was employed by some of this group in 1945 and 1946 in an effort to sell this country and the world on the idea of international control of atomic energy. As we all know, our efforts in this direction met with failure because of the obstructionist tactics of the Soviet Union. A similar campaign of terror surrounds the secrecy with reference to the development of the hydrogen bomb. The people are not given the information which necessarily and properly should be given them in order to reach a determination of the momentous problem. It is wrong, entirely wrong, for these decisions to be made by one person or a group of persons, however well-intentioned they may be.

We must consider these matters carefully and dispassionately. We must decide what this country should be doing in terms of national security. We must keep our heads and use our best judgment, but we must have some enlightenment, a thing which has been sorely lacking to date.

Many people look on the problem only from the moral point of view and quickly come to the conclusion that this country should have nothing to do with the development of another weapon of tremendous mass destruction. Of course atomic bombs are weapons of mass destruction but are they immoral? Any more than block-busters or incendiary raids? War itself is immoral and any part of it bears elements of immorality in varying degrees. Perhaps it can be argued that since hydrogen bombs are weapons of tremendous mass destruction that they are more to be condemned than the lesser weapons. It can be said that their increased power makes them less selective and therefore indiscriminate in their application.

It seems to me that the underlying problem to be considered is what the United States should be doing to reduce the probability of world conflict. Will the development of a hydrogen bomb hold an aggressor at bay? Did the development and use and production of the atomic bomb have any real effect on the probability of another conflict? Reduced to other terms the question may be put: How important is the development of a hydrogen bomb to our national security? Will the possession and possible use of hydrogen bombs increase our chances of preventing or winning a war with minimum losses?

The theory of the hydrogen bomb came from the suggestion of Dr. Hans Bethe that the fusion of light elements was the source of energy of the sun and the stars. The main light element under consideration is hydrogen which has several isotopes varying in weight from normal hydrogen with a weight of 1. These are deuterium (2) and tritium (3). It has been determined that common hydrogen will not work in a bomb. It is the other two isotopes of hydrogen which hold promise. It is believed that if either or both of these could be raised to a sufficiently high temperature (50,000,000 degrees centigrade, comparable to the temperature of the sun) tremendous energy would be released. This potential release has been estimated to be one thousand times more powerful than the original bomb used on Hiroshima in 1945. Also it has been indicated to be an "open ended weapon," that is to say the more material added the bigger the resulting explosion, with no limitation whatever other than mechanical. The next problem which confronted the theorists was a source of heat sufficiently great to set off such a bomb. With the development of the atomic bomb the source of heat is available.

If it takes an atomic bomb to trigger the hydrogen bomb we might ask ourselves what the hydrogen bomb will do that the atomic bomb cannot do? It has been many times stated that the Hiroshima bomb was the equivalent in explosive force to 20,000 tons of TNT, and has been estimated that the hydrogen bomb would be equal to 20,000,000 tons of TNT. The radius of a big explosion increases as the cube root of the energy released; therefore since at Hiroshima the radius of complete damage was approximately 1 mile, with a hydrogen bomb one thousand times more powerful, the radius would be 10 miles. Such a bomb could be expected to destroy the metropolitan area of a city like Los Angeles.

To go on and consider other effects from such a super weapon let us take the matter of flash burns. At Hiroshima people in the open exposed to the light of the bomb were seriously burned. With a hydrogen bomb it would be expected that the danger of such burns would be greater and would extend for a greater distance than the blast effects. However, the radiation which causes these burns is easily absorbed. For example, a heavy smog could cut off a good bit of this radiation. It might be expected that the radius of such a hazard would be as the square root of the power of the bomb. Therefore since at Hiroshima the effects of flash burns were severe out to two-thirds of a mile * * * without interference similar burns might be expected to go out to 20 miles. Trees and other objects which would cast shadows would be very important in cutting down the direct effect of flash burns.

In considering nuclear weapons another factor to be dealt with is the problem of radiation. Atomic bombs do and hydrogen bombs may be expected to release neutrons and penetrating gamma radiations. These particles and rays are easily absorbed in the air, and therefore would not be expected to have a greater radius of action for the hydrogen bomb than for the atomic bomb. One could reason from this that persons close enough to be killed by penetrating radiation would very likely be killed from the blast effect. either direct or indirect.

We can assume that if such a bomb can be developed it would be a weapon of gigantic power, however, would it really be an effective military weapon? I think we must agree that since the President has directed that the hydrogen bomb is to be developed we can take for granted that in scientific circles it is considered to be feasible. I would point out that there are many problems to be solved, and one cannot say that the solution to these problems has been accomplished until a hydrogen bomb has been made and exploded.

Theoretically it can be stated that the hydrogen bomb is capable of destroying the metropolitan area of almost any large city. Thus far we have made all of our comparisons to the Hiroshima bomb. However, the Atomic Energy Commission has stated that we have bombs which are more powerful and efficient in the use of fissionable materials. These bombs, according to reports, were tested at Eniwetok in 1948. It is to be expected that we have significant quantities of the new type bombs.

More complete damage can be accomplished by the strategic use of a number of small bombs than by one block buster. This is true since in such large explosions there is a considerable waste of energy, that is to say that much of the potential energy of the bomb destroys objects and people of no military relationship. By the pin-point use of a number of small bombs a certain selectivity can be exercised over what is to be destroyed. In almost any city there are areas the destruction of which would be considered unprofitable. The destruction of these areas would not contribute to the effectiveness of the bomb. It has been proved that saturation raids greatly hampered fire fighting and thus caused damage beyond the areas of blast effect.

It is safe to say that there is no metropolitan area in the world which could not be completely wiped out by the use of 25 atomic bombs. It is much more likely that 10 bombs could do the job. On the average many large cities would succumb with the use of just one atomic bomb. Except for the possibility of certain psychological effects—which cannot be estimated—the hydrogen bomb might cause more damage, but would be no more effective from a military standpoint than 10 atomic bombs in the demolition of a large city. For smaller industrial targets it would not be much more effective than one atomic bomb. With these thoughts in mind one might well question just how useful such a weapon as the hydrogen bomb would be. Is it worth the hundreds of millions of dollars needed to produce it? To the extent that we produce hydrogen bombs we must in some degree curtail our production of atomic bombs. All of us have the right to inquire into these facts. We have the right to know whether the development of a hydrogen bomb will give us any measurable increase in military strength.

If we assume that the United States has a large stockpile of improved atomic weapons, it is in a position to blast any other nation as thoroughly as bombing alone can be effective. If this be the case, of what strategic value is the superbomb? Apparently there are those in the Government who feel that such a bomb would be a useful weapon in our arsenal. I would pose this question, Is the size of the explosion sufficient reason for pinning our hopes on such a weapon?

Several writers have pointed out with accuracy and justification that if such a weapon is feasible this Nation is far more vulnerable than the Soviet Union. The problem of the delivery of such a weapon is a most difficult one. It has been suggested that the bomb might be conveyed in the hold of a tramp steamer or set up in a small unmanned ship and directed against coastal cities. Such devices could be readily used against the United States, but what cities in the Soviet Union could be thus attacked, If we consider as a possibility the clandestine delivery and assembly of such a superweapon in our midst, again we are vulnerable since people are free to come and go in this country. We would have little chance of such action against Russia where travel is tightly controlled. In considering all the aspects of the tactical use of the hydrogen bomb I feel that this Nation is much more vulnerable than Russia.

There are many in this country who feel that the solution of the problem is to develop this weapon in secrecy so that the Russians will not be able to manufacture the superbomb on their own. I do not subscribe to this idea. At least one writer has indicated that certain of the basic data already found its way to the Soviet Union through the efforts of Dr. Klaus Fuchs. The atmosphere of hush-hush about the hydrogen bomb seems to have created the impression

that it can save us from another major war. This, in my opinion, is not so and furthermore, I have very grave doubts as to whether such a bomb would be a very useful addition to our arsenal.

So far we have not touched on the cost of such a developmental project. I think that the American people are entitled to know what such a program will cost, and equally entitled to know what to expect from the investment of the money. It would be incomplete to look on this project as one costing dollars alone. This project if conducted on a full-scale basis will be costly in dollars, indeed, but equally important it will be costly in scientific manpower—in terms of engineering effort—and in terms of precious materials. If we use as a yardstick the cost of developing the atomic bomb we are safe in assuming that such a program will greatly overrun the initial estimates. Everyone is forced to admit that such a project is going to be costly. The question is: If such a bomb is successfully developed how much will we have gained in military strength?

If Russia decides to move into western Europe, or in fact in any direction, this country is faced with fighting another global war. We could, and might well, use atomic bombs in the waging of such a war, but there are other, and equally important, elements to the successful waging of such a conflict. We haven't found a device to take the place of the foot soldier, nor have we found anything which takes the place of a strong, well-equipped Navy. Many extravagant claims have been made for the revolutionary effects of strategic bombing in modern war. Many of the claims are true, but it still takes men and materials, in the conventional sense, to fight any war. The proof of this assertion is the type of warfare now being waged in South Korea.

In order to ship vast quantities of material in the event of another war, we will need strong naval forces to protect our shipping from the dangers of the submarine. In World War II our supply lines were almost cut off by the Nazi submarine attack. With the development of the snorkel the threat of the submarine is even greater. These we know the Soviets have and are using. It seems to me that this is an area which should be getting equal attention to the development of a weapon like the hydrogen bomb. The answer to this problem does not lie in air transport for we learned as result of the Berlin airlift that such a method is not successful in carrying goods in bulk.

There are other needs for developmental work. Guided missiles is a field which needs great attention. World War II found us woefully lacking in this development. Also there is need for technical work in the development of tactical aircraft. These are but a few of the problems which deserve support and attention. They should not be sidetracked just for the all-out development of a bigger and noisier weapon such as the superbomb.

From what I have said I do not wish to leave the impression that I am against the development of any weapon which will give one ounce of protection to this country in the event of another major conflict. I do mean to say this. In my opinion it is wrong for the Chief Executive to lower the curtain of secrecy around the hydrogen project so the people of this country cannot tell what is being done, what are its implications or what we can expect from this new development.

We are now engaged in a shooting conflict with Russia which has been variously described. It is, regardless of the description, a conflict. Russia and the United States have the same stake in the conflict, namely, survival in a divided world. What turn this conflict will take remains to be seen: Realism demands that this country exert its every effort to insure that whatever the course of the conflict we have our defenses balanced so as to be able to meet emergencies as they arise. This we have not done in the past 2 years.

It is poor planning and dangerous business to pin our hopes on strategic bombing alone. No one can deny this is an important feature of modern warfare but we cannot rely on it to win single handed. There are other and equally necessary elements which must be added to break a nations power to make war. We must not allow ourselves to be enraptured by the potency of any single weapon to the detriment or exclusion of other developments which are needed for a balanced national defense force.

From 1945 till September 1949 this Nation was lulled into a sense of false security by the thought that we had a monopoly on atomic weapons. It has been said that our monopoly was the only reason the Soviets did not immediately overrun all of western Europe. This I seriously question. We now know that our hopes that this monopoly might run on for at least several years more were based on incorrect data. It was estimated that the Soviets could not develop the bomb for a period of 5 to 15 years without our help. In fact they had our help all along through the efforts of Dr. Fuchs and others.

From now on nothing can be left to chance. We have full proof of the effectiveness of the Soviet espionage machine. We have felt the sting of their propaganda. We must now gird ourselves for the conflict we are now in and ready ourselves for whatever may come. We can well afford to reflect upon how we got where we are. We must not be misled by false prophets into the pitfall of feeling we are secure by the mere possession of this or that weapon. We must push forward with our research across the board. We must enlist the best minds of this country in considering all the facets of modern warfare so that we may emerge from this third global conflict victorious if there be one. We must be prepared to fight again against totalitarian aggression in the firm conviction that our way of life is superior to any philosophy based on the degradation of the individual. To us in our time must come victory not only physical but more important ideological. Ours is a way of life handed down by hardy God-fearing people who realized the importance of the individual to the society. We have listened too long to the prophets of doom who have lead this Nation down the path of socialism, to these witting or unwitting traitors who have advocated change for change's sake. Once again we face the test of defending that which we hold dear and we must not fail.

The People of America Should Adjust Themselves Immediately to a War Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, for 5 years the war clouds have been gathering over the world. Decent mankind everywhere has been striving toward world-wide peace. The forces of evil that have been marching steadfastly forward seeking to overturn and conquer the free governments of other peoples in other nations seem to be determined to continue their plan to conquer the world and rob mankind of freedom and liberty.

These two great forces of good and evil seem to be marching steadfastly toward a world-wide conflict. Good men everywhere still cling to the great hope of permanent world-wide peace. Recent events have been a great shock to those who hope for peace, but it has in a measure clarified the situation and points out clearly that the forces of aggression will not only use fifth columns and traitors to infiltrate other nations, but they will, if necessary, go to war to invade and conquer other nations.

The American people living in such a world and in such times must realize that whether the inevitable blow is to be struck in the very near future or whether it will be put off a few years, that our entire economy, if we are to survive, and if freedom, liberty, and Christianity are to triumph on this earth, then we have to adopt the rigors of a war economy.

The American people and the American taxpayers have been pouring many billions of dollars each year into what they thought was a building up of the Armed Forces and security of this Nation. Recent events in Korea and our helplessness, lack of preparation, and lack of implements of war, after all this expenditure, was a great shock to the American people.

The Congress of the United States appropriated many hundreds of millions of dollars to increase our striking power in the air and for other departments of our over-all Armed Forces, much of which was never expended, never put into effect in accordance with the will of Congress by the executive branch of this Government. Furthermore, it is hard to realize how weak we are to defend ourselves and the freedom of the world after considering the vast sums that were appropriated and spent for what we thought was building up the armed strength of this Nation.

It is apparent to every thinking citizen that although we have greatly burdened ourselves with military expenditures that what we have is not enough for our security and that rapid and tremendous steps will have to be taken in order to build up our Armed Forces to a point where they can protect this Nation and that our Armed Forces will have to be implemented with a vast number of modern weapons of war.

If we successfully survive these trying times, immediate steps will have to be taken to prevent this country from plunging into inflation. Inflation could come as near destroying this country as war itself. In fact, in the over-all scheme and design of the Kremlin where Stalin and his cohorts are planning the destruction of America, they count heavily upon a financial crisis in this country to help them accomplish their diabolical purposes. The emergency which now faces us comes at a time when this bountiful country of ours has great surpluses of food and fiber. Practically every essential thing that mankind needs for his nourishment and shelter, his clothing needs, and other needs, are in abundance.

Yet with these facts being true, since the outbreak of the Korean war, prices on a broad front have begun to sky-

rocket; many items of food and wearing apparel have had price jumps placed upon them that clearly point the way toward destructive inflation unless stopped at once by a general freeze of the entire price structure from top to bottom. In some of the chain stores you can pick up some of the canned goods and see two or three price mark-ups on the same can. Many cuts of meats have had price increases of as much as 10 cents per pound per day. Articles of women's clothing are being bought in large quantities and at advancing prices.

This evil situation comes as a result of two things: a rush to buy when there is no scarcity, and a desire for unreasonable profits by those who take advantage of the present situation.

Most of the millions of the American people who consume and use these goods have incomes that are more or less fixed and their earning capacity will remain the same or nearly the same while their living expenses could go beyond all reason. Most of the great labor organizations of America have already negotiated their collective bargaining contracts for their many millions of members, and if we were to have unreasonable runaway prices hit most, if not all, of the things which our people use, it will knock our domestic economy all out of joint and if inflation ever gets loose in a country, the pressure becomes so great that it gets worse as time goes on instead of better.

In the vicious process, it crushes the life out of many millions of people. The American free-enterprise system and the profit motive are two of the things that made this country great. No one wishes to see price freezes and the ordinary course of supply and demand interrupted by Government-controlled price freezes. Such measures are not justifiable except in extreme emergencies and they should never be tolerated in ordinary times and they should only be put on for a limited period and removed as soon as the emergency passes. They are un-American in substance and hurtful in that they detract from the liberty and freedom of the people. Yet on the other hand, if ill-advised people force this country into inflation the enormous quantities of goods which this Government must have to prepare properly our defense may cost the taxpayers two or three times as much as they would cost if prices were held down and if inflation gets bad, a very large portion of the people will be destroyed while only a very few profiteers may be made rich out of the war psychology. This should not be permitted.

If controls are put on, every man and every product should be treated alike, they should be universal, and if they are put on they possibly should be put on for a period of only 6 months. By that time the Eighty-second Congress would be in session next year and if there were no more need for them they could be immediately removed.

Although many mistakes have been made in the failure of this country's leaders to prepare our Armed Forces to meet the present emergency, there can be no doubt but what we should all unite now to furnish whatever is necessary to build our national strength up as immediately and rapidly as possible because if we are to have war, we will certainly need them and great national strength on the part of the United States, in my humble opinion, will be a contribution toward world-wide peace in case we have no world war immediately.

I suggest to my colleagues that if there is any further evidence of inflation and runaway prices, that an immediate freeze be put on all prices and that every necessary step be taken immediately to build up our Armed Forces to full strength.

Congressman Crawford Helps Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in calling to the attention of the Members of the House an editorial which appeared in the Ketchikan Alaska Chronicle last week. In pointing to the belated Federal efforts to build up the economy of Alaska and to provide proper defenses there, the editorial praises the accomplishments of our colleague, Representative FRED L. CRAWFORD, of Michigan, in these fields. I personally desire to second what the editorial has to say. As much as any one man, FRED CRAWFORD is responsible for the awakened and timely national interest in our great western frontier:

THE NATION'S PROBLEMS ARE ALASKA'S PROBLEMS

Readers of this newspaper may not realize it, but their attentiveness to the message of Mr. Truman yesterday demonstrates again that Alaskans are just as much Americans as are the residents of any of the 48 States.

The sizable appropriations for defense construction in Alaska—much of it long overdelayed by a distant, misunderstanding Congress—and the passage of the Eklutna power project for all-important Anchorage do indicate that there are those in Washington who treat Alaska as a vital portion of the Nation, even though many have forgotten General Billy Mitchell's statement that "he who holds Alaska holds the world." (Mr. Truman's plea for $10,000,000,000 for arms would probably have been up around $50,000,000,000 yesterday if Russia still owned Alaska, and had its submarines and bombers only 700 miles north of Seattle and the Hanford atomic works.)

A large share of the credit for America's realization of what Alaska means—as an arrow aimed at the center of the aggressive Soviet heartland and a vast treasure chest of minerals, pulp, power, and fishery products for American needs—must be accorded to hard-working FRED L. CRAWFORD, the Michigan Congressman. We browse occasionally through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and are happy to note that he has taken the problems of the insular possessions and Territories with much more than passing interest. In so doing, he has belied the oft-repeated statement that midwestern people and their Representatives are isolated and unreal in their thinking. Mr. CRAWFORD has done what this craft usually thinks only expert newspaper reporters can do—come to a country and see its problems as its residents see them. He did it in Alaska, he did it in Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands.

You may think this is unimportant in these days of colony-gobbling dictatorships, but it isn't. The propagandists of Moscow not only proclaim regularly that the Czar sold Alaska to the United States illegally (which means they may plan to grab it back), but the millions of people in Asia who are tasting democracy or autocracy for the first time wonder what America will do for its Hawaiians and Alaskans.

Mr. CRAWFORD was statesman enough to see what the elections for statehood in Alaska and Hawaii were as important to world peace as the plebiscites in South Korea, Greece, and Western Germany. A nation that taxes its own people without representation, conscripts their manpower and wealth in time of war, and denies them the right to vote for Governor, Congressmen, or President, can hardly proclaim itself the unqualified champion of the little people and their right to self-determination. The Japanese seizure of the Aleutian Islands was, after all, part of the same kind of plot as the Communist invasion of South Korea and resulted from the same look-away attitude in Washington, an attitude that could yet cost America its last frontier, whose strategic value is certainly several billion dollars.

For the fine leadership he gave the statehood fight in the House, which resulted in a similar forward-looking front for it in the Senate, Alaska is grateful to FRED L. CRAWFORD. His enthusiasm, his energy, and his statesmanship will long be remembered in these parts. We hope his Michigan friends realize that the fight for freedom these days is a part of the fight for world peace and progress, in which the Wolverine State has an interest as much as anyone.

Political Profiteering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of Monday, July 24, 1950:

POLITICAL PROFITEERING

In calling for higher corporation and personal income taxes to meet the $10,000,000,000 in additional spending he demands for his war in Korea, Mr. Truman stated, "This tax program will have as a major aim the elimination of profiteering."

He also had some remarks about speculation in agricultural commodities and about hoarding of food and consumers' goods, but that old devil profiteering was foremost in his mind: "Every businessman who is trying to profiteer in time of national danger—every person who is selfishly trying to get more than his neighbor—is doing just the thing that any enemy of this country would want him to do."

THE PRESIDENT NO. 1 PROFITEER

Let us see who the profiteers really are:

We would say that the New Deal President is unquestionably profiteer No. 1. His business is political profiteering at the expense of his fellow citizens from an emergency which exists only because of the ineptitude

of his administration in the conduct of foreign relations, because of his own and his predecessor's appeasements of Russia at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, and because of his need to seek by means of foreign adventures to divert the minds of his countrymen from the coddling of Communists by his administration.

There is more political profiteering in a budget suddenly raised from an astronomical peacetime figure of $43,500,000,000 to $53,-500,000,000. Money is political power to the politicians who have charge of spending it. Mr. Truman now is privileged to spend more in 1 year than the entire cost of World War I, and more than Roosevelt spent in the first full year of World War II.

One result of this political profiteering will be to keep the boom going. The politicians may claim credit for military successes won by the sons of ordinary citizens on a far-away firing line, and for fake prosperity engendered and prolonged by war inflation. Roosevelt called that kind of false wealth "fool's gold" before he began chasing it himself to escape the dilemma of his domestic failure.

PEOPLE HAVE SHORT MEMORIES

People have short memories, indeed, if they do not recall that Mr. Truman repeatedly justified his vast spending for foreign aid as the means of assuring peace. Just a year ago—on July 19, 1949—he made a speech in Chicago in which he put it in these terms:

"And I am saying to you, which is better—to spend three, or four, or five billion dollars a year for peace, or spend $100,000,000,000 a year for war? You have got to make up your minds. It is one or the other. And it is not going to be the one. We are going to do the other for the welfare of the world."

Maybe the proposition sounded reasonable, put as a choice between spending and war, but the fact is that Mr. Truman has achieved both the spending and the war without producing peace. He is already more than halfway toward the one hundred million a year he used as a club to threaten the reluctant taxpayers.

Through his whole administration runs the same itch to profiteer politically through the disturbing crisis the administration itself has brought upon the people. Secretary of Agriculture Brannan seized the occasion to boost wheat acreage allotments and increase production goals by 200 million bushels, just, as he remarks, "to be on the safe side"—and, of course, to make political capital with the farm vote.

It is political profiteering for the New Dealers of the Tydings committee to seize upon the diversion of the Korean war, when alarmed public attention is focused upon developments thousands of miles away, to wind up a fake investigation into Communist influence in the State department with a politically motivated report. At such a time, few Americans have time to penetrate the verbiage and analyze the flaws.

UNION BOSSES GET IN THE ACT

The union bosses who team up with the New Dealers also are busy investigating what's in it for them. The AFL and CIO are demanding equal representation with industry on all boards and agencies having to do with economic mobilization, and argue that only in this way does labor feel that it can enlist the complete cooperation of the 13,500,000 organized wage earners. The union czars have their price for patriotism.

We even note that the New Deal's fair-haired boy in industry, Henry J. Kaiser, who has tapped the administration's lending agencies for tens of millions of dollars, and whose venture into automobile manufacturing ran up a 30-million-dollar loss last year, has again blossomed out as a production genius and has been summoned to Washington to advise on industrial expansion for war.

We ask: Who are the profiteers?

Where Is the International Police Army?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excellent article from the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., July 23, 1950:

THE MATTER OF GROUND FORCES

It will be to her everlasting glory, particularly in the United States, that when the nations of the free world were called upon to supply ground forces for the war in North Korea little Bolivia was the first to stand up and be counted.

In a moment when America is getting ready to augment her standing armed forces with hundreds of thousands of men, not only that General MacArthur may have more ground power and replacements but also as a safeguard against outbreaks elsewhere in the world, one of earth's smallest nations offers a token of manpower.

The population of Bolivia is less than 4,000,000. By comparison, it contains only one-sixth of the number of people who inhabit Korea. Her standing army consists only of 15,000 men, with a national police force of 12,000 in addition.

Yet, in answer to the plea of Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations, for men in arms who would slog it out in the rice paddies and the hills of Chosen, Bolivia asked to be counted in with 30 officers of her regular army.

In numbers, such a force is nothing. In spirit, it will raise the hearts of the GI's who have been taking it. Symbolically it will give meaning to the forlorn emptiness of American soldiers fighting under the flag of the United Nations and, save for the South Koreans, battling it out alone.

One cannot chide all the 52 nations which have not responded. England, Australia, the Netherlands, France, New Zealand, and Canada have, in a sense, other commitments. Yet, they are aiding or have offered to aid with ships and planes.

But where are the rest? Can they, too, not make more than token offers of field hospitals, supply ships, or transport planes? With them has the initial hurrahing with which they greeted America's decision to march into battle under the banner of the United Nations worn off?

America did not ask for these troops. Trygve Lie did when he cabled all the free nations: "The unified command is in need of additional assistance—particularly ground forces."

One excuse is offered, and no doubt with some it is legitimate, that the matter of sending ground troops requires the consultation of the governments concerned. Such things take time. It is the democratic way to take time, much to the handicap of democracy, even though time runs out.

It would be a more readily accepted excuse if 3 weeks had not gone by since Russia launched the South Korean invasion. It would be more acceptable if the forces in South Korea were not in retreat. But the big tragedy is that a great opportunity is being missed by the United Nations.

The first response to the Korean situation by that body lifted the free world. From an ineffectual debating society, without force or power behind it, overnight it became in the eyes of free people the instrument for peace which, since 1945, it had struggled to be.

In that instant when the Security Council condemned the invasion, the chance dawned not only to rush badly needed help to MacArthur, it opened the door to the one thing the United Nations has suffered from a lack of since the beginning—an international army.

Around the fighting in Korea one could be formed that would stand and grow after the Korean episode was ended. It would not only be ready to keep the peace and thereby cause Russia to hesitate committing another outrage.

Most important it would reassure the people of the United States, who are footing most of the bills to keep freedom alive, that they would not be doing it for a lot of wallflowers. It is one thing to pay the piper. It is another to have to do all the dancing. We trust and hope Bolivia will not stand alone.

Rumely's Answer to Spayth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN], chairman of the House Committee on Lobbying, inserted in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A4860, a letter from Mr. George W. Spayth to Mr. Edward A. Rumely, who, it is reported, has been threatened with contempt proceedings by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

At Mr. Rumely's request, I am inserting his answer to that letter. The letter reads as follows:

JULY 17, 1950.

Mr. GEORGE W. SPAYTH,
Editor, the Spayth Weeklies,
Dunellen, N. J.

DEAR MR. SPAYTH: Your letter of June 26 to me has the no mean accomplishment of pleasing both Representative BUCHANAN, chairman of the House Select Committee on Lobbying, and me. I was pleased because you go along with the Committee for Constitutional Government in opposing rent control, Government health insurance, and repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. But you do not go along with us in upholding constitutional rights. Consequently, Mr. BUCHANAN was so pleased with your approval of unconstitutional practices of his committee that he inserted your letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Because I refuse to give Mr. BUCHANAN the names of purchasers of literature of the Committee for Constitutional Government, you conclude that I must have something to hide. Before reaching that conclusion you must first concede that Mr. BUCHANAN has a right to demand this list. With that assumption I disagree so emphatically that I am willing to incur contempt proceedings so that the courts may determine whether Mr. BUCHANAN has invaded constitutional rights to privacy.

The Buchanan committee was set up to investigate lobbying activities. But if the book, pamphlets, and other publications of the Committee for Constitutional Government constitute lobbying, then the excellent Spayth weeklies engage in lobbying every time they carry editorial comment on pending legislation, and Mr. BUCHANAN has a right to hale you down to Washington to demand the names of your subscribers and whether any one of them bought more than one copy of your papers. In one breath, Mr. BUCHANAN terms this lobbying. In another he informs

the House of Representatives (see June 15 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD) that "the Committee on Lobbying has come to no conclusion as to any definition of the word 'lobbying'." Whereupon, Representative PHILLIPS of California demanded, "How can you investigate something if you don't know what it is?"

This ridiculous situation reminds one of the Mad Hatter's tea party in Alice in Wonderland:

"Have some wine," said the March Hare.

"I don't see any wine," said Alice.

"There isn't any," said the March Hare.

You express the belief that "congressional investigations are beneficial because it [sic] throws light in dark places." But, you add, "there are cases, of course, where privacy is invaded in violation of the Constitution, but if yours is one of those cases I feel sure the courts will protect you."

My dear sir, mine is one of those cases. I, too, feel sure the courts will protect me in my refusal to answer. The courts have protected me before; this is not the first time congressional investigators have demanded names from our committee, cited me for contempt and then been told by the courts they have no business doing so.

In one paragraph you take me to task for refusal to reveal what Mr. BUCHANAN demands. In another you advise me that if privacy is invaded the courts will protect me. But how can the courts protect me unless I first refuse—a refusal which makes you suspicious I have something to hide?

No, I have nothing to hide. But I do have something to protect. My work and the work of this committee is to uphold constitutional rights and to fight invasions of those rights.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD A. RUMELY.

I have just read Mr. Spayth's letter, the last paragraph of which reads as follows:

If your right to print and distribute literature is ever questioned, get in touch with me and I will help you all I can. But, frankly, I would like to know who your sponsors are. I am sure the American Bible Society, who are doing even a better job than the fine one you are doing, would not object to naming their contributors, and, for the life of me, I can't figure out why you yell so loudly.

I, too, have an answer to the question as to why political organizations object to disclosing the names of those who contribute to the printing and circulation of their literature.

If the publications of an organization carry propaganda which does not seek to overthrow our Government by force, which does not advocate disregard of the law, which is in no way harmful to good government or high standards of morality, public and private, why should anyone care who writes it or who pays for its circulation? To Mr. Spayth, I would say, who cares who pays the bills of the American Bible Society to which he refers? Who cares who pays for the publication or distribution of Bibles put out by the Gideon Society?

Some of us know that Communists and Communist-front organizations and a few corrupt political machines frequently have endeavored to silence their critics by smear campaigns. For that reason, and to avoid persecution of those who contribute to patriotic organizations, some, like Mr. Rumely, have refused to disclose the names of those contributors. Apparently Mr. Spayth is somewhat unfamiliar with "realities" when it comes to political maneuvering.

Subversive Activities in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., Sunday, July 23, 1950:

COMMUNIST PARTY IN THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTES AN ORGANIZED FIFTH COLUMN—DIRECTOR OF FBI SAYS THE VOLUME OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES LARGER THAN DURING ANY PERIOD OF WORLD WAR II

(By John Griffin)

"There is a larger volume of subversive activities in this country than existed at any period during the last Word War. Communism today is at a greater height in the United States than either nazism or fascism was during the last World War."

The above quotation is from testimony given by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations, now recently released to the public.

Most of Hoover's observations speak for themselves, and we are going to set down a few of them so that readers can draw their own conclusions.

As for loyalty checks, Mr. Hoover stated that 6 percent of those who applied for civil-service appointments were turned down as a result of loyalty checks.

On civil rights and domestic violence work: "Our work in this field increased 45 percent during the past year. In that connection I would like to point out that our problems have been extremely aggravated by Communists and Communist-front organizations who go into these areas where civil-rights problems arise and endeavor to aggravate the situation rather than leaving it in the hands of the Federal and local authorities."

On the Communist Party of the United States: "That movement has changed its name many times, while the party line changes from day to day. There is, however, one fact that prevails and that is that the party line is based upon the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism."

ADVOCATE VIOLENCE

"Their doctrine, as their own documents set forth, advocates the violent overthrow of capitalistic governments. They state that in their documents and in their speeches. That doctrine further advocates the establishment, in place of the capitalistic governments, of the dictatorship of the proletariat by the Communists. It further states that they cannot be obtained except through force and violence.

"One of the great instruments and weapons used today by all Communists throughout the world is the resort to propaganda and the resort to boring and termite tactics. That is an entirely new technique that came into being during the last World War, as I have indicated, in the fifth-column movement.

"That is the type of warfare they are resorting to today to take over countries without a direct attack of arms, but rather by penetrating into governmental functions, into schools and into churches, where they will have access to public expression and opinion.

"Many Americans have been lulled into a sense of complacency by the claim that there are comparatively few members of the Communist Party of the United States. Personally, I would have no fear if the Communists could be brought out into the open, but so long as there is a branch of a world-wide underground movement, inspired from abroad, they cannot be dismissed lightly. According to our best information, there is a total of 54,174 members of the Communist Party in the United States at the present time.

"Even though there are only 54,174 members of the party, the fact remains that the party leaders themselves boast that for every party member there are 10 others who follow the party line and who are ready, willing, and able to do the party's work. In other words, there is a potential fifth column of 540,000 people dedicated to this philosophy."

NO POLITICAL PARTY

"The Communist Party is not a bona fide political party. It is a highly organized, militant and disciplined conspiratorial group following the whims and dictates of international communism. That was proven in the New York case which resulted in the conviction of 11 members of the executive board of the Communist Party. The Communist Party in the United States constitutes a fifth column if there ever was one.

"With the penetration of their apparatus, as shown in the investigation into the New York case, the Communist leaders have become increasingly security conscious, and have developed certain security measures to protect their organization.

"The trend has been toward a highly developed underground apparatus and decentralization of the Communist Party operations. This has almost tripled the number of Communist Party clubs, the purpose being to avoid congregating in large groups.

"The party is today in the process of selecting individuals for secret leadership of its underground apparatus. They have a loyalty program of their own in operation to counteract the FBI's penetration.

"I do not mean to infer that we do not have good sources of information, or that we do not have good representation in the party in varying degrees of trust. But it is more difficult to penetrate the party today.

"The Communist Party has endeavored to exploit youths, veterans, civil rights, foreign nationality, the press, radio, television, the motion picture industry, educational, political, women and labor groups. That statement can be corroborated by overwhelming facts which we have in our possession.

PROPAGANDA MACHINE

"The Communists have long advocated working through trade unions. Forty-eight percent of the membership of the Communist Party is in the basic industry of this country. In this manner, they would be able to sabotage essential industry in vital defense areas in the event of a national emergency.

"The Communists have developed one of the greatest propaganda machines that I think modern civilization has ever known. They capitalize upon ill-founded charges designed to enlist honest, progressive liberals to support left-wing causes.

"Of the many professions, penetration of the legal profession is the most amazing. As officers of the courts, well trained and educated, lawyers have made some of the finest contributions to American life. It is regrettable, therefore, that any association of lawyers will permit itself to be used and parrot the Communist Party line.

"Communist schools and Communist fronts have offered training courses in connection with radio writing, acting, and directing. Special Communist-front organizations having to do with radio have been organized. Many Communist fellow travelers and stooges have been able to secure positions enabling them to actually control personnel and production.

"Communists, masters of pressure tactics, are always on the alert to chastise those who would oppose them. One front group boasts of having thousands of monitors in every section of the country, who will take up a letter-writing campaign against any commentator who disagrees with what they advocate."

More War—More Profiteers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Nation are solidly in back of the United Nations and our own Government's action in opposition to the aggressors in Korea. The maintenance of this unanimous support and wholehearted cooperation of the American people is most important.

I would like to call to the attention of the House a fine editorial written by Mr. Vernon W. Ittner and published in his newspaper, the Highland (Ill.) Journal, on Thursday, July 20, 1950, which bears on this matter. There would be nothing more demoralizing to our troops and to our efforts to halt the aggressor than the attempt on the part of some to profit from the fighting in Korea. I commend Mr. Ittner for sounding this warning and I hope that it will be heeded not only in the area in which his publication has influence but throughout the entire country.

Mr. Ittner's fine editorial follows:

MORE WAR—MORE PROFITEERS?

We're not at war. War hasn't been declared—yet. So far the shooting in South Korea is the attempt of the United States, with the assistance, moral and tangible, of other nations comprising the United Nations, to police that part of the world. The bullets that are being fired are just as deadly as though we were really at war.

Moreover, this Nation is experiencing all the apprehensions, the fears and heartaches that go with genuine wars.

Democracies are notoriously slow movers, although watch for them once they get speed up.

From Washington comes the information that the Government is reexamining all plans to control manpower in the fast-breaking military developments. The probability is that the controls will come in more quickly than in connection with World War II. The delay after Pearl Harbor is probably explained by the fact that there was greater unemployment at that time, but in view of the situation in the Far East, the Government is probably wise in making arrangements to ration manpower, if necessary.

We hope the Government will act with equal promptness to control war profits. As soon as the conflict flared up in South Korea, there was immediate reaction in business circles.

In every war the United States has fought, involving the loss of life, with brave men defending their country, there have been war profiteers at home. The people of the Nation are sick and tired of the spectacle—after all, if world war III materializes out of the Korean conflict, it will be the third within one generation.

By the time you read this, you will know what preliminary steps the Government plans, as it is probably along these lines that President Truman will address the Nation over the radio Wednesday night.

Public Administration in a Democratic Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to call to the attention of the Members of Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two reviews of a new book on public administration in government.

The author of this book is Dr. W. Brooke Graves, a senior specialist in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Dr. Graves has been acting as the Staff Director of the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments during the Eighty-first Congress.

Dr. Graves' new book is receiving wide approval from those who are interested in the subject of better public administration in government.

I ask unanimous consent to insert with these remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD the review by Dr. Herman Finer of the University of Chicago which appeared in the Public Personnel Review of July 1950, and the review by Dr. Joseph M. Ray of the University of Maryland which appeared in the American Political Science Review of June 1950:

[From the Public Personnel Review of July 1950]

THE BOOKSHELF

Public Administration in a Democratic Society, by W. Brooke Graves. D. C. Heath & Co., Boston, 1950; 759 pages; $6.

Mr. Brooke Graves, now a Senior Specialist in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, is a past master in the science of public administration. Hitherto mainly concerned in his writings with the financial side of the subject, he has turned his hand to a massive and comprehensive text. He has done this fortified by nearly three decades of study and reflection and many years of actual experience in State, local, and, more recently, Federal Government.

It is quite impossible to traverse the individual doctrines contained in this work of nearly 750 pages. The questions are: As a text, does it meet the requirements of intelligent and enlightened understanding of the problems of the subject matter? Does it expound these in an appropriate relationship of the value and place of each theme to the others? Does it adequately convey the sense of historic development and the evolution of thinking on the problems history has raised for solution? Does it provide a present contemporary picture in good proportion with a sense of potential change? Does it agitate the human elements before the mind of the reader? And, finally, does it do all these things lucidly?

The answer to every one of the questions is: Emphatically, yes.

The reader will see public administration as a whole. The work falls into five parts, the titles of which may be reproduced. Part I is Administrative Structure and Organization; part II, Personnel Administration; part III, Fiscal Management; part IV, Internal Management and Control; part V, External Relations: The Execution of Policy. Since part V may not readily yield its content, and to give some idea of the thoroughness of Brooke Graves' comprehension and width of survey, its chapters may be indicated. They are: administrative procedure; administrative legislation; registration, permits and licenses; inspection; administrative adjudication; judicial review of administrative action, forms of control over administration; and public relations.

The amount of learning condensed in this work is astonishing. It is conveyed with enlightened good sense and good judgment. A very good example is the treatment of "bureaucracy," but it is only representative of practically every topic treated.

The student or practitioner already in possession of the elementary principles of the subject will benefit from this work more than those who come to it unprepared. Not that it cannot be of great value to the tyro. But it is necessarily written in a highly condensed form, so that it must be read between the lines or with a teacher, whether he is present in person or whether the teacher is past experience. For example, the pages on morale must sacrifice philosophising to concision; the same holds good of the pages on training for the public service. Yet even here and in similar places, the hints are given, and the intelligent reader may use his imagination and analytical power on the basis the author has provided for him. It is a very valuable asset to the public administrator.

The references to authorities are excellent in comprehensiveness and selection; and what is especially to be admired in the bibliography is the author's practice of providing a short characterization of the references listed.

In comparing the text with those of White and Marx, one's judgment might be this: It is fuller in detail than White, but less selective of the points of reflective interest, and it is on the whole rather wider in scope. It is fuller than the Marx symposium, and has the tremendous advantage over it that almost all texts written by one author have over symposia, namely, integration, a single drive, and the exclusion of underlapping and overlapping.

HERMAN FINER,
The University of Chicago.

[From the American Political Science Review of June 1950]

Public Administration in a Democratic Society, by W. Brooke Graves, Boston; D. C. Heath & Co., 1950. Pages xvi, 759, $6.

One of the Nation's foremost political scientists presents us with another textbook in public administration. There is always room for another textbook, especially if it is as good as this one. In principal outline the book is orthodox. Its five parts are structure and organization, personnel management, fiscal management, internal management and control, and external relations. The book accepts the general "concept of administration as concerned with the transaction of all of the public business, whether legislative, executive, or judicial; whether international, national, State, or local." Part IV, devoted to problems of internal management and control, emphasizes, more than has been done heretofore, the importance of coordi-

nating organization, personnel, and finance in the processes of management. The chapter on leadership in administration stands out as most effective and instructive. In the final section an excellent presentation is given in the chapter on administrative procedure.

The book is well and lucidly written. Upon first examination it appears too highly organized. There is hardly a page that does not have an outline heading, a table either of factual or of conceptual materials, or a change of type for a special presentation. These techniques, however, permit the inclusion of more material than appears in comparable texts. The student will find the book readable. The teacher may well receive a reeducation from it. The book is a worthy competitor for those previously in the field.

JOSEPH M. RAY,
University of Maryland.

UN Sponsored Selective Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following enlightening editorial from the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., July 22, 1950:

WHY NOT WORLD DRAFT?

Here are some questions to think about: Why not prorate the Korean police operation? Why not divide up the responsibility and the cost in terms of both men and money? Why doesn't the United States demand help, instead of merely suggesting that help would be appreciated? As far as most of the UN members are concerned, there exists a sharply defined lack of enthusiasm for actual involvement in the Korean fighting. France pleads her trouble in Indochina; Great Britain is mulling it over; Sweden is going to send an ambulance corps. Generally speaking, the international attitude toward Korea seems to be one of concerted apathy—an apathy which is blinding itself to the enormity of the aggression there being resisted.

Korea has provided more bloody data to support the axiom that military success in the final analysis depends, as it always has depended, on foot-slogging ground troops. Our boys have been fighting heroically against odds ranging from 10 to 1 to 20 to 1, according to various estimates. They are fighting a so-called delaying action. And why? To hold as much of Korea as they can until reinforcements arrive. And the question that Americans are asking is, Why does it have to be American reinforcements—that is, exclusively? Why not British, or Italian, or Canadian? Each of these countries must at this moment have under arms a certain number of trained (and probably battle experienced) troops it could immediately dispatch to the Korean front. If altogether they mustered 100,000 fully equipped infantrymen, it would certainly be a factor in shortening the Korean war. The need for men is now, everyone agrees. But our GI's must go on swapping miles for time, as they say, so that there will be something left to fight for when we have scraped together enough of an Army, Navy, and Air Force to mount a counteroffensive. This prompts us to say, and very flatly, that the burden is too much on us.

Selective Service is once again operating in this country. What's wrong with having a UN-sponsored selective service to distribute some of the burden we speak of, and what is even more important, to get the Korean war over in a hurry? Why doesn't the UN establish quotas for all member countries—even Russia (for its propaganda value)? If the fighting in Korea is theoretically a UN police action, why is it not made so in actual practice? The UN is seeking to impose discipline in Korea by force of arms. It therefore should not balk at self-discipline if it is to be truly a world organization. As things stand, the UN is sort of a United States-endowed soup kitchen for Marshall plan largess. Its meetings have up to now been fairly well attended because representation involves no taxation. We think that the rest of the free world should buy a piece of the Korean war if it's interested in staying free.

Tydings Subcommittee Praised in Newspaper Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the July 21, 1950, issue of the Washington Post:

The Republicans in the Senate showed poor judgment in going bail for Senator McCARTHY. Their united attempt to prevent the filing of the Tydings subcommittee report condemning Mr. McCARTHY's fulminations against the State Department as a "fraud and a hoax" comes about as close as the Senators could to making a party issue out of their colleague's discredited conduct. The treacherous nature of the ground on which they took their stand was made abundantly clear in the devastating speech of Senator Tydings. Yet the votes taken on the issue of filing the report were cast strictly along party lines. The Republicans of the Senate have thus taken upon themselves some of the opprobrium of McCarthyism.

It is especially unfortunate to have this proper rebuke to Mr. McCARTHY made a partisan issue at a time when the country urgently needs unity in its firm resistance to Communist aggression overseas. The controversy was not started by the Tydings subcommittee. The subcommittee was created to investigate certain specific charges which Senator McCARTHY made and which he promised to prove. He was given every opportunity to submit evidence; and it turned out that he had no evidence. He was allowed to call supporting witnesses; and he called a collection of former Communists one of whom "blacked out" and ran away, one of whom had nothing to offer save the assertion that the runaway had once been a paid stool pigeon, and one of whom presented hearsay to the effect that certain Communists a decade ago thought they could use Owen Lattimore—called by Senator McCARTHY the top Russian spy in the United States—to project a propaganda line about China. The subcommittee even secured access to the confidential State Department loyalty files because Mr. McCARTHY asserted that those files contained material to corroborate his charges; and it turned out that the files provided no corroboration whatever.

All that the subcommittee did in the end was to call a fraud a fraud. We think its candor was highly commendable in a body which has been all too prone to consider itself a private club and to shield its members from justifiable censure. What would Senator TAFT and his Republican colleagues have had the subcommittee say of a performance like Senator McCARTHY's? When a Senator is caught in a barefaced falsification, as Senator McCARTHY was caught in connection with his Wheeling, W. Va., speech, should the fact be glossed over? When a Senator uses his senatorial immunity from suits for slander to call loyal, conscientious employees of the Government spies and Soviet agents—and then fails to back up the vilification—would the Senate minority let the injustice go unchallenged? When a Senator wantonly plays on popular anxiety in a time of crisis to create doubt and dismay in the minds of his countrymen, should the matter be ignored? If the Tydings subcommittee had done less than it did in exposing Senator McCARTHY, it would have insulted the Senate and the people of the United States.

It is absurd to complain that the Tydings subcommittee failed to canvass the whole problem of internal security or to investigate the loyalty of every Federal employe. It was neither commissioned nor equipped to do such a job. It was commissioned by the Senate to discover the truth or falsity of Senator McCARTHY's charges. That job it carried out thoroughly and courageously, and the Senate properly recognized its good work by accepting its report. Senator LODGE himself having looked at the available evidence, refused to go bail for Senator McCARTHY. If the Senate now wants a genuine, comprehensive study of the loyalty-security program and of the measures necessary to protect the Government from untrustworthy employes, the subcommittee, like this newspaper, has proposed the one effective mechanism—a commission of eminent American citizens commissioned to do just that job on a wholly unpartisan basis. In addition to this, a motion of censure against Senator McCARTHY is clearly in order.

Amendment of Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act to prohibit the employment of certain personnel of the corporation by organizations receiving loans or other financial assistance therefrom.

The Fulbright committee in the other body has proven beyond doubt that many officials of the RFC having policy-making power in the approval of loans to corporations have subsequently accepter highly remunerative positions with the same corporations which have benefited from their official actions while in the employ of the United States Government.

I recently called the attention of the House to the Pickering Lumber Co., a

Missouri corporation, which owns and operates a large timber project in northern California. The Pickering Lumber Co. is one of the corporations whose board of directors comprise three former officials of the RFC. These three officials in their official capacity approved or processed a loan of $2,500,000 to the almost—at that time—bankrupt Pickering Lumber Co. Shortly thereafter these same three officials participated in a reorganization of this same company and assumed places on the board of directors. To prevent future developments of this type, Senator FULBRIGHT introduced S. 1871, which has been passed by the Senate and referred to the House.

The bill which I am introducing today is an identical bill to S. 1871. I urge that the House Banking and Currency Committee speedily enact the substance of these bills to protect the taxpayers from future actions of Government lending officials such as the reprehensible ones disclosed in substantial numbers by the Fulbright committee:

An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act to prohibit the employment of certain personnel of the Corporation by organizations receiving loans or other financial assistance therefrom

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection 4 (b) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) Each loan made hereafter by the Corporation to any borrower pursuant to paragraphs (1) or (2) of subsection (a) of this section shall be conditioned upon the execution of an agreement between the Corporation and such borrower by which such borrower shall undertake that it will not, within 2 years after the date of the making of such loan, employ, tender any office or employment to, or retain for professional services any person who on the date such loan was made or within 1 year prior thereto shall have served as a director of the Corporation, or as an officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Corporation occupying a position which the Board by resolution shall have determined to involve the exercise of discretion with respect to the making of loans to borrowers pursuant to paragraphs (1) or (2) of subsection (a) of this section unless—

"(A) the Corporation shall have determined that such person, on the date such loan was made and within 1 year prior thereto, was employed by the Corporation only in a branch or field office of the Corporation which did not, and under ordinary procedures of the Corporation would not, perform any function in connection with the negotiation, modification, supervision, or collection of such loan; or

"(B) such person (i) shall be employed at the request of the Board upon its determination by resolution that such employment is advisable to safeguard the interests of the Corporation, (ii) will receive compensation from the Corporation for such employment, and (iii) will receive no compensation from such borrower for such employment: *Provided*, That compensation so paid by the Corporation shall be deemed to be a nonadministrative expense of the Corporation.

"As used in this paragraph, the term 'loan' shall include any extension of financial assistance, by loan or otherwise, pursuant to this act."

Passed the Senate July 26 (legislative day, June 2), 1949.

Attest: LESLIE L. BIFFLE, *Secretary.*

VFW Recommends Reserve Training Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a press release of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States proposing a reserve training plan to provide an adequate reservoir of military manpower for the present emergency:

JULY 19, 1950.

A reserve training plan to provide an adequate reservoir of military manpower for an emergency without resorting to an immediate general mobilization or enactment of a universal military training law, was proposed today by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

In brief, the proposed program would utilize selective service and existing National Guard and Reserve components to induct and train youths between the ages of 18 and 21, inclusive. Each inductee would receive 6 weeks of intensive training, after which he would be required to continue for a stated period as an active member of a National Guard or Reserve component.

"The world situation today demands that we have available a pool of military manpower which at least has had basic training," VFW Commander in Chief Clyde A. Lewis explained in presenting the program. "Ever since World War I, the VFW and other veteran groups have been urging enactment of universal military training as a security measure. Congress has looked unfavorably upon these proposals, and continues to do so today, in spite of the grave Korean crisis and other conditions which could lead to the outbreak of world war III at any moment.

"Similarly, the administration, presumably with the concurrence of our military leaders, has indicated there is no need for a general mobilization at this time.

"The Veterans of Foreign Wars is convinced of the urgent need for some form of military training for at least a minimum number of those who will be inducted for service in an emergency, and we believe that the plan submitted herewith will accomplish that objective with a minimum of expense short of a general mobilization or enactment of a universal military training law."

The Reserve intensification program as proposed by the Veterans of Foreign Wars would bring all National Guard and Reserve units to full war strength in both personnel and equipment, personnel to be provided by means of inductions through the existing Selective Service machinery of young men between the ages of 18 and 21, inclusive.

Induction for the training provided for in the Veterans of Foreign Wars plan would be an alternative to service in the regular Armed Forces as provided in the Selective Service law, though eligibility for training would be the same as now provided in the draft act.

The training program would be the responsibility of the respective Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps commands. A minimum of 6 weeks of intensive, full-time training would be required, and a trainee completing the 6 weeks' tour would be required to continue active training as a member of a National Guard or Reserve unit.

Existing National Guard and Reserve units would be called to active duty for 6 weeks for training purposes, their ranks to be filled to authorized strength with trainees inducted under the program. Upon completion of the 6 weeks' training, the units would return to their home bases and continue training on an accelerated basis. This would include a minimum of four full calendar days of drill or training each month, in addition to the customary summer-training periods.

Voluntary enlistment for the Reserve intensification program would be authorized, but an individual electing such training in lieu of induction for service in the regular Armed Forces would be required to serve throughout the present national emergency, or for a minimum of 3 years, whichever is later.

What Gives?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a statement, which I present herewith, which is in reply to an editorial from the San Francisco Call-Bulletin of Tuesday, July 18, and which statement was forwarded to the editor of this paper by four of my California colleagues and myself:

EDITOR, SAN FRANCISCO CALL-BULLETIN.

SIR: On Tuesday, July 18, the Call-Bulletin published an editorial under the following caption: "What Gives? Votes against ban on poor security risks by five California Representatives puzzling."

The undersigned Members of Congress, whose names were mentioned in this editorial, are glad to answer the question it poses and to state clerly and emphatically our reasons for voting against the so-called security risk bill.

We opposed that measure, H. R. 7439, solely because its sponsors refuse to allow a right to appeal to Government employees who may be discharged from their positions as bad security risks.

All of the undersigned had previously recorded our approval of the primary purpose of the bill, which is to safeguard the security of our Government, by voting for an amendment proposed by our colleague, Representative GEORGE P. MILLER, of Alameda. This amendment would have given a discharged employee the right to appeal to the United States Civil Service Commission from the decision by his immediate superiors to discharge him.

We point out that the Miller amendment received bipartisan support and lost by only six votes, thus indicating the concern of almost half of the Members present about the danger inherent in a bill which allowed discharges on secret charges without the right of impartial review.

It must be remembered that there is a very definite difference between a person who is "disloyal" to the United States and one who may be a "poor security risk."

The President's loyalty program, set up under Executive Order No. 9835 dated March 21, 1947, has effectively dealt with disloyal employees. The security risk bill would negate the proven value of the President's loyalty program.

A person may be a poor security risk without the slightest taint of disloyalty attaching to him. He may be merely indiscreet in conversation or given to overindulgence at social affairs.

This proposed law makes an agency for which a man works his judge, jury, and prosecuting attorney. He has no right to appeal to an impartial, disinterested party; a completely loyal person may be stigmatized and barred from employment for life. This is repugnant to our highest American standards and traditions.

All of the undersigned wish to reaffirm our desire and intention to protect our Government against bad security risks and to give to Government department heads the right to discharge employees who are considered bad risks. But we also believe that it is unnecessary and unreasonable to make this power absolute and beyond appeal. We consider it our duty as elected representatives of the American people to safeguard the sacred American tradition of the right of appeal, and we are convinced that this measure will not become permanent law unless a proper opportunity for appeal is provided. It is certainly possible to have justice as well as security. That is what this whole world-wide fight is for.

HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
FRANCK R. HAVENNER,
JOHN F. SHELLEY,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
CHET HOLIFIELD,
Members of Congress.

A Comment on the Mundt-Ferguson-Nixon Bill by an Outstanding Authority on Civil Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD a comment that appeared in the July issue of the Harvard Law Review on the subject of the registration of Communist-front organizations, as provided in the Mundt-Ferguson-Nixor bill currently pending before the Congress.

The name of the author, Zechariah Chafee, Jr., is well known to anyone who has taken interest in the field of civil liberties, and is universally respected. Professor Chafee has been writing in this field for many years, and his intensive study of the history of civil liberties in the United States especially qualified him to throw the much-needed light of perspective on our present problems that touch on this field.

I invite particular attention to Professor Chafee's discussion of innovations, such as woman suffrage, which are now universally accepted, but which were adopted only as the result of the gigantic efforts of a few extremists who were very unpopular in their day. I suspect that American women today are thankful that these extremists were allowed to persevere.

The article follows:

THE REGISTRATION OF COMMUNIST-FRONT ORGANIZATIONS IN THE MUNDT-NIXON BILL

(By Zechariah Chafee, Jr.)

The Mundt-Nixon bill, now pending in Congress, is entitled "A bill to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities, and for other purposes." Among other things, it establishes an elaborate scheme for the compulsory registration of every Communist political organization and every Communist-front organization. The scheme is to be administered by a Subversive Activities Control Board, comprising three members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and serving for staggered terms of 3 years. Not more than two members shall belong to the same political party. The Board will have the power to classify any organization as either Communist political or Communist-front and then order it to register. The Attorney General is to keep open to public inspection the registers of both types of organizations and the annual reports of the officers, finances, etc., which they are compelled to file. Every day of failure to register and every false statement or willful misleading omission in a registration statement or annual report is a separate offense on the part of the organization and individual officers.

The bill provides for judicial review of Board decisions, but in practice, this is not likely to be important. The findings of the Board as to the facts, if supported by the preponderance of the evidence, shall be conclusive. While the reviewing court may order additional evidence to be taken before the Board, it has no power itself to receive any new evidence. And any lawyer knows that the way in which testimony shapes up depends considerably upon the competence, experience, and fairness of the persons presiding at the actual trial. Moreover, the definitions in the bill are so broad that it will be hard for judges to upset the Board's classification. Therefore, the operation of this bill depends very largely on the three persons composing the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The present discussion will be confined to the provisions relating to Communist-front organizations. Inasmuch as these provisions are likely to reach many groups whose purposes are cultural as well as political and who are engaged in exchanging ideas rather than winning elections, the interference with the lives of private citizens is much more extensive than in the case of Communist-political organizations. For the most part, however, the bill treats both types of organization alike. The principal differences are that the members of Communist-front organizations need not be listed in registration statements and annual reports, are not made ineligible for appointive Federal offices or obliged to disclose their membership in seeking any office, and are not denied passports.

Something might be said for a registration law requiring all groups which attempt to influence public opinion to disclose the pertinent facts about themselves. The harmfulness of nondisclosure is by no means confined to Communist-front organizations. For instance, virulent anti-Semitic pamphlets falsely accusing long lists of decent citizens with being disloyal are often widely mailed by organizations with high-sounding names, which take care not to mention their authors or the men who put up the money. A broad statute to break through this vicious anonymity of defamers of every sort is recommended in the 1947 report of the President's committee on civil rights. On the other hand, there is room for serious doubts whether such a statute will be a desirable remedy for this evil; it is likely to be enforced inefficiently and to stifle more good views than bad views. At all events, if Congress thinks a compulsory law for propaganda is needed, then it is needed for all sides of political, racial, and religious controversies. Such a law should seek to force into broad daylight all the enemies of democracy and not just a particular portion of them as in this bill.

Leaving the lopsidedness of the bill for later attention, let us see what this part of the bill actually does. It enables three Government officials to pick out certain groups and classify them as Communist-front organizations. They are then subjected to numerous burdens from which social and propagandist groups are normally free. They must register, file lists of officers, keep supervised records and accounts, file annual reports, etc., under very severe penalties. Supporters will not receive income-tax deductions for their contributions, and the organizations themselves will no longer be tax-exempt. Finally, they must label every publication and the outside envelopes of all mail as coming from a Communist organization; this novel stigma recalls the practice of medieval princes to require Jews to wear special marks on their coats. All this virtually outlaws whatever organizations the three officials object to. Even if they are able to survive, they will have lost most of their moderate members and be wholly in the hands of extremists who don't care. Thus, they will be rendered more harmful than before.

First, I should like to point out the great dangers of thus interfering by law with freedom of discussion through organizations. The bill proposes to twist out of all recognizable shape one of the leading traditions of American life: the possibility of freely forming associations for all sorts of purposes—religious, political, social, and economic.

If we look back over our national history, we see that many of the most significant political and social changes began with the efforts of some small informal group disliked by the ordinary run of citizens. The abolition of slavery grew out of Garrison's Anti-slavery Society and similar associations. The nineteenth amendment is the culmination of the activities of a few unpopular women in the middle of the last century. The popular election of Senators, the Federal income tax, and several other reforms largely originated with the Grangers and the Populists. American political, social, and economic institutions have developed to a very large extent through the interaction of propagandist groups. The appearance of a group favoring one side of an issue often aroused a group of opponents, and the public profited from its opportunity to judge between the competing presentations of both sides of an important national problem. Freedom of speech under the first amendment has always meant more than the liberty of an isolated individual to talk about his ideas or put them into print. From the very beginning, freedom of speech has involved the liberty of a number of individuals to associate themselves for the advocacy of a common purpose. Thus, freedom of speech and freedom of assembly fit into each other. They are both related to the possibility of petitioning Congress and the State legislatures for redress of grievances, which is only part of the wider freedom to submit the views of the individual or the group to the people at large for judgment.

It may be argued, however, that the so-called "Communist-front organizations" present an entirely new problem because they have objectionable purposes and include objectionable persons in their membership. This brings me to my second point. It has

always been true of a great many propagandist organizations that their purposes were denounced by numerous law-abiding citizens and that their memberships included some extremists whose actions or ideas were open to serious adverse criticism. The books are full of denunciations by prominent citizens of abolitionists, women suffragists, labor unions, Populists, etc., which would more than match anything which has been written about the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee or the National Lawyers Guild or any of the other contemporary organizations listed as subversive by the House Un-American Activities Committee and the California legislative committees.

The membership situation is much the same now as it has always been. Propagandist organizations are not likely to be made up of men and women with conventional ideas. The very nature of a propagandist organization is that it wants to change something; obviously, then, it is likely to be made up of the kind of people who do want change. Such people vary a good deal. The core of the propagandist organization often consists of those whom Woodrow Wilson described as forward-looking men and women, who disagree with the complacency of the ordinary run of citizens about some issue but still are fairly moderate in the changes they desire and so do not seriously offend their neighbors. Yet these are rarely the only members of a propagandist organization; it is likely also to include what Theodore Roosevelt called the lunatic fringe. The organizations opposed to slavery had members who urged violations of law, such as rescuing fugitive slaves and transporting them to Canada on the underground railway. Some of them even favored or participated in the attempt of John Brown to start a slave-rising in Virginia. Time and again the whole labor movement has been denounced as lawless because some unionists undoubtedly engaged in violence against their employers and nonunion workers. Saloons were smashed by some prohibitionists, like Carrie Nation. It is plain that there is nothing new in the adherence of extremists to organizations with desirable or at least legitimate purposes.

Hence, we should not be surprised or frightened if some contemporary organizations for upholding the rights of minorities attract some members who are more in sympathy with communism than the rank and file of the organization like. It is equally possible that organizations for upholding free speech or a fair trial or other fundamental constitutional rights may attract extremists whose interest is not in constitutional rights but in getting a Communist off. In short, it is inevitable that the membership of organizations formed to bring about change should include some persons who want a great deal of change.

The supporters of this bill assume that the moderate members of an organization always have an obligation to oust the extremists or else resign themselves. But this is by no means plain. Throughout the history of this country, the propagandist organizations which I have been describing were engaged in a hard fight against determined opponents. Their chances of winning this fight would clearly have been weakened if they had also waged an internal war with their own extremists or if moderates had got out and stopped supporting the cherished purpose of the organization. The practical question must have arisen hundreds of times: Was it better to put up with the extremists and continue the fight for an important cause, or disrupt the organization and probably kill the cause?

Now, what would have happened in the history of our country if the policy of this bill had been embodied in law during the nineteenth century? There would have been different tests, of course, aimed at the kind of organization whose purpose was hated by the authorities of the particular period. Yet the general principle would have been exactly the same. The idea is to condemn an organization because of the objectionable ideas or conduct of its extremists and thus make it difficult for the moderates in the organization to accomplish their basic purpose. For example, suppose that the standards of permissible membership in antislavery societies had been fixed by a board chosen by slave owners and the owners of northern cotton mills. Again, suppose that the associations of employers and their friends in Congress had been able to set up a board to outlaw a trade-union affiliated with men devoted to industrial violence.

When the membership and policies of an opinion-forming organization can be judged and controlled by outsiders with governmental power, all sorts of opportunities for the suppression of legitimate ideas arise. The officials, being outsiders, may be rather unsympathetic with the legitimate purposes of the organization. There is a tremendous temptation to opponents of those legitimate purposes to influence the selection and the behavior of the controlling officials. The presence of extremists can easily be made an excuse for outlawing an organization when the real reason for getting rid of it is not fear of the extremists but hatred of the legitimate purposes. The organization is suppressed, not because it might promote a revolution but because it might win elections and produce legislation.

There are many important public questions to be settled in this country today, on which much can be said on both sides. For example: Should we (a) oppose the totalitarian regime in Spain, or (b) resume normal diplomatic and commercial relations with Spain? Should we (a) give some measure of legal recognition to the present government of China, or (b) continue to supply billions of dollars to Chiang Kai-shek? Should we (a) decrease financial and military aid to western Europe, or (b) continue or increase such aid? Should we (a) refuse to arm western Germans for fear of a revival of the Nazi, or (b) arm them as a bulwark against the Soviet Union? These are vital questions, on which honest and reasonable men differ. They cannot be wisely decided unless individuals and opinion-forming organizations on one side are as free to present their views as are those on the other side.

The significant thing is that in every one of these questions an organization which takes the (b) side cannot possibly be touched by the bill, while any organization which takes the (a) side can conceivably be outlawed. Although there are plenty of honest reasons why many patriotic American citizens stand for the (a) side, it happens in every case that this side coincides with the views of the Soviet Union and its supporters, whose reasons are quite different. One of the factors which the Subversive Activities Control Board could take into consideration in determining whether an organization is Communist-front is "the extent to which the positions taken * * * by it * * * on matters of policy do not deviate from those of any * * * Communist foreign government." Thus, this bill leaves organizations on the (b) side untouched, no matter if they include Fascists, anti-Semites, and advocates of religious and radical hatred, and also greatly aids them by silencing a large number of their most vigorous opponents. Insofar as there are errors on the (b) side, the law will be increasing public danger enormously by making it very difficult for those errors to be combated by reason.

Actual experience amply justifies the expectation that the vague characterization of "Communist-front organizations" in this bill will be used to outlaw or suppress many organizations which serve very desirable purposes, even if they do include some leftist people among their supporters. Remember always that everything depends on the three men who make up the Subversive Activities Control Board. The lopsided character of the determinations that may be expected is shown by the California list, which includes organizations opposing totalitarianism in Spain but none of those upholding it, many organizations favoring peace but none of those urging a devastating war, several organizations on behalf of Negroes but none of those upholding white supremacy. Its bias on purely domestic issues is shown by its including committees for freeing Tom Mooney, who was freed by the Governor of California; a committee for the defense of prisoners, who are guaranteed the assistance of counsel by the sixth amendment to our Constitution; and a committee to abolish the poll tax, which is surely a subject for legitimate political activity.

The reasoning by which many of these and other organizations are condemned consists of heaping one dubious inference on another dubious inference. An individual, A, is condemned because he belongs to X organization. Then the Y organization is condemned because it includes A. Then B is condemned because he belongs to the same organization as A. That brings down the Z organization, to which B also belongs. Since C is a fellow member of B in Z, is also a member of the X organization, that proves that X is subversive and we are right back where we started with no real evidence at any stage of the argument. When you discover that A and B are men like Prof. Charles A. Beard and Senator FRANK P. GRAHAM, of North Carolina, the absurdity of this whole process ought to be manifest.

Anything can happen when people get started on this business of outlawing groups, not for any crimes committed by either the group or any of its members, but for having some vaguely bad ideas or some vaguely bad members. Judge Dorothy Kenyon and Ambassador Philip Jessup are denounced to a Senate committee for belonging to various subversive organizations such as the Institute of Pacific Relations. When it is pointed out that this institute included many persons of the highest reputation, the reply is made that any organization can attract some good members. Yet the attackers insist on judging both the institute and Mr. Jessup by the supposed bad members and not by the admittedly good members. The whole business is based on the maxim, "Give a dog a bad name and hang him."

The enactment of this bill will create a tremendous risk of outlawing a considerable number of groups of law-abiding people with inquiring minds, engaged in furthering some end which they believe to be in the very best interests of the United States. And, on the other hand, this law will encourage those who hate the patriotic purposes of such groups to do all they can to suppress them by influencing the selection of the three officials on the control board and by bringing pressure of every sort upon those officials. Instead of an orderly and enlightened search for the truth and wise policy, public opinion will be formed by coercion and intrigue. This bill asks us to establish government by misrepresentation.

Operation of Oil Leases Involved in Tidelands Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on July 21 the senior Senator from Wyom-

ing introduced a bill (S. J. Res. 195) which proposes a formula for the continued operation of oil leases involved in the tidelands controversy. The bill also provides for the release of impounded funds to State and other political subdivisions.

In my opinion Senate Joint Resolution 195 should be scheduled for hearings and legislation on this subject should be passed before Congress adjourns.

I recognize the fact that it may be necessary to clarify or amend certain sections of the bill as first introduced.

I am today introducing a companion bill in the House and shall urge its early consideration.

Under unanimous consent the bill will be printed herewith:

Joint resolution to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes

Whereas certain mineral leases on submerged lands on the Continental Shelf were issued by coastal States under claim of ownership by such issuing States, and lessees have expended large sums of money in conducting operations under such leases; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States on June 23, 1947, rendered an opinion in the case of United States versus California and on June 5, 1950, rendered opinions in the cases of United States versus Louisiana and United States versus Texas, holding that the United States has paramount rights in, and full dominion and power over, the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the shores of California, Louisiana, and Texas, and that the respective States do not own the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf within their boundaries; and

Whereas it is in the national interest and important to national defense in the present emergency that the orderly development of the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf should continue without interruption, and it is not feasible at the present session of Congress to enact permanent legislation covering the exploration, development, production, and conservation of the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, thus making it essential that this resolution be enacted in order to protect the interests of the United States and permit continued development under existing leases pending the enactment of permanent legislation by the Congress respecting the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That (a) any person holding a mineral lease covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf issued by any State or political subdivision or grantee thereof prior to December 21, 1948, or so issued subsequent thereto with the approval of the Secretary, which is, on the effective date of this resolution, in force and effect in accordance with the terms and provisions of such lease and the law of the State issuing it, may, subject to the provisions of this resolution, continue to operate in accordance with the terms and provisions of such lease.

(b) All rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a mineral lease after the effective date of this resolution, or, as to a lease issued by the State of Louisiana or the State of Texas, payable after the entry of a decree by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of United States versus Louisiana (Original No. 12, October Term, 1949) or United States versus Texas (Original No. 13, October Term, 1949) if the decree is adverse to the defendant's claim of proprietary rights in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, shall be paid to the Secretary, who shall deposit them in a special fund in the Treasury pending the enactment of legislation by the Congress concerning their disposition.

(c) With respect to any mineral lease that is within the scope of subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary may, after the effective date of this resolution, or, as to a mineral lease issued by the State of Louisiana or the State of Texas, after the entry of a decree by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of United States versus Louisiana (Original No. 12, October Term, 1949) or in the case of United States versus Texas (Original No. 13, October Term, 1949) if the decree is adverse to the defendant's claim of proprietary rights in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, exercise such powers of supervision and control as may be vested in the lessor by the terms and provisions of the lease.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized, upon the application of any person holding a mineral lease issued by or under the authority of a State on tidelands or submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of such State, to certify that the United States does not claim any proprietary interest in such lands or in the mineral deposits within them.

SEC. 3. In the event of a controversy between the United States and a State as to whether submerged lands held under mineral leases issued by or under the authority of the State are submerged lands of the Continental Shelf or submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters, the Secretary is authorized, with the concurrence of the Attorney General of the United States if the controversy is being litigated, to negotiate with the State an agreement respecting the continuation of operations under such leases pending the settlement or adjudication of the controversy.

SEC. 4. (a) In order to meet the urgent need during the present emergency for further exploration and development of the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, the Secretary is authorized for a period of 3 years from the effective date of this resolution, or, as to submerged lands of the Continental Shelf within the boundaries of Louisiana or Texas, for a period of 3 years after the entry of a decree by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of United States versus Louisiana (Original No. 12, October Term, 1949) or in the case of United States versus Texas (Original No. 13, October Term, 1949) if the decree is adverse to the defendant's claim of proprietary rights in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to grant to the qualified persons offering the highest bonuses on a basis of competitive bidding oil and gas leases on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which are not covered by leases within the scope of subsection (a) of section 1 of this resolution.

(b) A lease issued by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall cover such area as the Secretary may determine, shall be for a period of 5 years and as long thereafter as oil or gas may be produced from the area in paying quantities, shall require the payment of royalty at the rate of 12½ percent and shall contain such rental provisions and such other terms and provisions as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe in advance of offering the area for lease.

(c) All moneys paid to the Secretary for or under leases granted pursuant to this section shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury pending the enactment of legislation by the Congress respecting their disposition.

SEC. 5. The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he may deem to be necessary or advisable in performing his functions under this resolution.

SEC. 6. When used in this resolution, (a) the term "submerged lands of the Continental Shelf" means the lands (including the oil, gas, and other minerals therein) underlying the sea and situated outside the ordinary low-water mark on the coasts of the United States and outside the inland waters and extending seaward to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf; (b) the term "mineral lease" means any form of authorization for the exploration, development, or production of oil, gas, or other minerals; (c) the term "tidelands" means lands regularly covered and uncovered by the flow and the ebb of the tides; and (d) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

Where Do We Go From Here?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from the Dowagaic (Mich.) Daily News of July 21, 1950, published by Harry Whiteley, comes the following editorial which to me indicates that long past is the day when we should begin to think of how best to preserve our national independence, protect our future national security, or, if you prefer, the American way of life.

This is the editorial:

As we sat listening to Mr. Truman's radio address Wednesday night, we thought how many times in our short life have we heard the same general appeal to the patriotism and sacrifice of the American people. In days before the radio we got the message via the newspapers and through extra editions. The first of these were in the days of the Spanish-American War when the *Maine* was sunk. And since then we have had two great World Wars and are threatened with a third.

We are again summoned to exert ourselves to our own salvation. In those earlier days when we were considerably younger we felt the spirit of July Fourth and were easily aroused. World War I was an exciting experience. World War II brought a realization that this was getting to be a habit and that the expectation of settlement of world difficulties had not been realized. A grimness and a tautness came into our lives which now became plainly overshadowed with dread not only for ourselves but for our children.

What price must we eventually be prepared to pay for peace, and is a permanent peace possible? History recalls such European wars as the Thirty Years' War and the Hundred Years' War. Will future historians, if there are any left, be writing about the present wars in even longer terms? The President's address sounded strangely familiar; we know the words by heart. The same call for a diversion of our habits from a world of peace to a world of war. More money. More young men called to the altars of Moloch. More plowshares to be beaten into guns and armament. The same call to endure as patiently as may be. And in our inner souls the cry goes up, "How much longer; how much longer must we endure this condition of existence?"

We wonder if by some supreme exertion we could once and for all time eliminate this menace for the future, and we know there is none so long as man is the kind of an animal

he is. And that is what strikes us as hopeless about the whole thing. We know, despite brave words, there is no peace. But what can we do except as we are doing—again gird ourselves for battle, trusting as ever in the righteousness of our cause and conducting our fight for the right to live as we want to live, as free people?

Conquerors have come and gone; strange migrations, inspired by changing economic conditions, have swept the world; always from the East have sprung new ideologies and philosophies; some have lived and survived and some have gone the way of all flesh; so it must be eternally, and all we can bequeath to our descendants is more of the same. But so long as we live our tack is plainly in sight—we must fight for our way of life. There is no other road for us to travel. Either we win and survive as free men or we lose and die as slaves. Our choice is predetermined.

There is no indication in Mr. Truman's appeal for power and money to prosecute the war of any desire to curtail in local political and economic fields. As Senator BYRD, of Virginia, puts it, he is disappointed that the President is opposed to cutting nondefense domestic expenditures. It is in this field that Congress will have to interpose its own will and judgment, for it is obvious this administration is going to try and carry on a war and prosecute its social revolution at the same time, expecting the war to cover up the obvious economic weaknesses of the social program. War brought us these new innovations which have been so costly, and war can be used to cover up many mistakes. It was obvious that under the circumstances the ECA bill appropriating a billion and a quarter dollars to aid other countries should have passed, although a few days earlier it would have been scrutinized much more severely. But in view of the disappointing interest taken by the United Nations in backing up their resolutions against Russia with a fighting force, we wonder what we are going to get for our further investment of millions to help them defend themselves.

Where Did Defense Money Go?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the July 22, 1950, issue of the Evening Star (D. C.) entitled "Where Did the Money Go?"

WHERE DID THE MONEY GO?

Letters to the Star are asking what a great many war-worried citizens and taxpayers are asking these days: Where did all the billions appropriated for defense since World War II (95.6 billion) go? Why, with such enormous expenditures to make us militarily strong, did the Red attack in Korea find us so tragically weak? Why have we so few modern tanks, so few modern antitank weapons, so few planes, so few ships, so few of everything needed for national safety? Just how were our defense dollars spent?

In an effort to find the answers to these pertinent questions, the Star asked defense officials for a breakdown of military expenditures since VJ-day. The figures supplied reveal how amazingly little of the defense dollar goes for the purchase of actual fighting equipment. Few persons realize that of every dollar they have contributed to the Army, Navy, and Air Force, only 18 cents have gone for guns and ammunition and tanks for the ground troops, aircraft for the flyers, ships for the Navy. The biggest slice of the dollar—40 cents—went for pay, food, clothing, and transportation. The tabulation below gives a rough breakdown of the defense dollar, based on expenditures since the close of the late war:

Item:	*Cents*
Salaries, food, clothing, transportation	40
Operations and maintenance of equipment	26
Weapons, planes, ships, etc	18
Research and development	5
Administration and secret work	4½
Reserves and National Guard	4
Industrial mobilization	1
Retired pay (nearly)	1
Construction, public works	½
Total	100

Defense expenditures for the 5 years since VJ-day have far exceeded the peak World War II budget of $84,500,000,000 for 1945. The postwar budgets were: 1946, $45,134,000,000; 1947, $14,316,000,000; 1948, $10,961,000,000; 1949, $11,914,000,000, and 1950 (exclusive of Korean supplementary budget), $13,335,000,000. That totals $95,650,000,000. This sum includes stockpiling and certain other costs not regularly encompassed in the military budget. The Defense Department lists the expenses, exclusive of stockpiling and the other extras, at a little less than $91,000,000,000 from July 1945 to June 30 of this year. Nearly $42,000,000,000 of this was spent during the let's-bring-the-boys-home-quick demobilization period, from the latter part of 1945 to June 1946. Vast sums during this period also were paid for material already used in the war, much of which was destroyed or consumed and hence did not add to our postwar strength. Included also were contract settlements. From July 1, 1946, to June 30, 1947, we continued demobilization and spent about $14,000,000,000. Since then we have spent approximately $35,000,000,000 for defense.

Defense officials say the best measure of military spending, as it relates to what we have to show for our money today, is the authorized outlays for the 4-year period from July 1, 1946, to June 30, 1950. During this time Congress authorized $49,300,000,000 for the military, of which $48,400,000,000 has been spent to date and nearly a billion more will have been spent by the end of this fiscal year. Almost $20,000,000,000 went for payrolls, food, clothing, and travel; $13,000,000,000 for operating and maintaining military installations and tactical equipment around the globe; and $8,500,000,000 for procurement of planes, tanks, rifles, artillery, ships, and other combat tools.

During this cold-war era, it should be remembered, occurred the costly airlift operations and the support of our occupation troops in Europe and Japan—expenses not ordinarily budgeted in time of so-called peace. In summation, our defense dollar has had a huge chunk eaten out of it by ordinary and extraordinary expenses that produced no tangible equipment for our foot soldiers, flyers, sailors, and marines. In fact, 70 cents of the dollar went for housekeeping and operational costs. If there is any possible way to reduce the drain on the defense dollar, the Defense Department has been unable to find it. For our fighting men must not only be supplied with arms but must be paid, fed, clothed, housed, and transported. It is for such essential things that our money—nearly $100,000,000,000 of it—has gone during the past half decade of an uneasy peace.

Some A-Bomb Fallacies Are Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, to a layman whose knowledge of the atomic bomb is indeed limited, the following article by former Commissioner Lewis L. Strauss which appeared in the most recent issue of Life magazine is indeed interesting, educational, and sense-making :

SOME A-BOMB FALLACIES ARE EXPOSED
(By Lewis L. Strauss)

On the inside of the doors of several committee rooms in the Nation's Capitol are small neatly lettered signs. They read, "Please leave quietly."

This advice has always appealed to me as especially sound for retiring government officials. I followed it upon my recent retirement from the Atomic Energy Commission. Since then, however, I have been surprised and concerned at the amount of misinformation that I encounter. This observation has persuaded me to interrupt briefly the quiet of my departure in an effort to dispel some of the fog of contradiction and confusion that has settled over the subject of atomic energy—at least to make a statement of my position. Essentially my position is that we must be strong if we expect to preserve our way of life.

It was well established in a long series of congressional hearings that there has not always been complete agreement among the original members of the Atomic Energy Commission on the course we should follow. It was disclosed in these hearings that many decisions were taken by a vote of 4 to 1 and that I was that one. By time-honored principles of American procedure, I was in these circumstances officially wrong; my distinguished colleagues were officially right and, for my part, the Nation's atomic energy program has progressed satisfactorily in the main. But the minority is still respectable in the United States, even if its only function is to keep the majority thinking. In any event the report of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy last fall stated: "The fact that one Commissioner has demonstrated the courage and independence to dissent upon occasion lends added validity to the decisions in which he concurred. * * * The existence of invariable unanimity would create doubt as to whether the five-man directorate were functioning as Congress intended."

The Atomic Energy Commission, of which I was one of the five original members, first convened in November 1946. When the Commission started work there was a fairly widespread belief that the negotiations, initiated in the UN by that unprecedented gesture called the Baruch plan, would bear fruit. We were continuing to make atomic weapons, but we looked hopefully ahead to a time, apparently not far distant, when the benign purposes of the act might become our primary concern. By early 1947, however, hope for the Baruch plan began to grow dim in the shadow of Russia's deceptive counterproposals. Of course, we did not know then that long since we had been the victims of espionage of a particularly penetrating character. We thought that we were generously offering unique scientific and industrial know-how which we had acquired at the cost of some $2,000,000,000. Our plan did offer

the incentive of peace of mind for the world, but evidently that was not a sufficient inducement to the Soviets.

As a result of these years of disappointment we had to put the major emphasis upon preparing ourselves against a contingency which we pray may never arise—atomic attack. We had to concentrate on weapons and to increase the rate of their production. We had to improve (if that word can be used in such a context) the lethal effectiveness of these weapons.

FALLACY NO. 1: THE "GOLDEN AGE"

Despite all this, the benign byproducts of the program prospered. The business of making weapons and the peaceful processes of atomic energy branch apart only near the end of the road. Among other things, this meant that pathologists, surgeons, radiologists, chemists, botanists, metallurgists and a host of other professionals were handed a new set of tools, more revolutionary than the miscroscope.

As the peacetime program prospered, however, a number of misconceptions grew up, due mainly to the understandable overenthusiasm of many people. Unfortunately a few of these misconceptions still persist. Left unchecked, they might cripple and ultimately paralyze our whole atomic program.

One early and rather common fallacy was the assumption that atomic energy would quickly supplant all other sources of power and that the realization of a golden age was almost at hand. But the optimism has proved unfounded. The people who are actually trying to do something about atomic power merely shrug their shoulders when asked how soon and how useful it will be. Some of their diffidence will soon be resolved by performance. A power plant for submarine propulsion is now actually under development. But at present no serious-minded engineer sees an early likelihood of atomic power as an economic competitor with water at the falls, petroleum at the derrick, or coal at the tipple. The best that can be said at the moment is that it might be economically indicated for areas deprived of the usual neighboring sources of power.

Another fallacy which has persisted from the early days represents atomic energy as a modern version of the Fountain of Youth, providing a specific for every human ill. This understandable hope, again due to initial overenthusiasm, was sparked by the early discovery that the thyroid gland gathers iodine from the bloodstream and that consequently some cases of thyroid cancer and other thyroid abnormalities may be subdued by dosages of radioactive iodine. If only other parts of the body were similarly selective, it would be a very wonderful and convenient thing. For example, if one could find a radioactive substance which was collected by the liver, then it might be used to destroy cancerous tissue there without traveling to other parts of the body and thereby injuring normal tissues and organs.

Unfortunately this has proved to be nothing more than a hope. In 5 years only a few instances of such selectivity have been uncovered. Perhaps at some time in the future we will be able to deal with other than thyroid cases, but the progress to that goal will be long and arduous. Atomic energy is no panacea for all the troubles in the human body, even though the click of the Geiger counter can now signal what is taking place inside the cell itself. This knowledge will certainly lengthen the span of man's life, but no cure-all for his afflictions is in the offing.

Of comparatively recent origin is one of the most confusing of all fallacies about our atomic energy program. This fallacy takes the form of proposing "to turn the program over to private enterprise." The proponents of this idea say that the Atomic Energy Act, which created a Federal monopoly, ought to be amended to allow private industry to operate in that field. The plausible virtue of this thesis (its adherents argue) is that so much more gets done, more quickly and more cheaply, under a system of freewheeling, competitive enterprise than under the stifling hand of government. Naturally this argument has considerable appeal to all of us—in sound if not in substance. For, in the case of atomic energy, it is without substance. The fact is that the Government does not operate a single atomic installation; every one of them is managed by some American private enterprise, big or little. And the monopoly lies mainly in the fact that the chief end product is a deadly weapon and the United States Armed Forces are the sole customers for that product.

Were this a true issue, I should find myself caught in a paradox since I am a businessman profoundly convinced of the superior efficacy of private (versus public) enterprise. But the proposals for releasing the atomic program to free enterprise are thus far rather vague generalizations, and we can quickly canvass the only possible courses of concrete action implied by these proposals. The possibilities are four:

1. That industry be supplied enough data and fissionable material to make atomic bombs competitively.

2. That industry engage competitively in certain steps of that process.

3. That industry be supplied enough data and enough fissionable material for a competitive power program.

4. That industry be given enough data to use radioactive isotopes in research and thereby discover new uses for them.

Let us consider these possibilities.

1. That industry make bombs: Actually industry does make our bombs, though not competitively. A second group of concerns, wishing to engage in competition, would need a budget of billions, a truly prohibitive figure, to duplicate existing facilities. And the security problem would be enormously multiplied if the manufacturing of atomic weapons were to be thrown open to general competition.

2. That industry compete in parts of the process: For this to be feasible in terms of industrial budgets it would have to take place at such early stages as mining uranium or manufacturing uranium metal. And under present world conditions it would have to be regimented to a degree completely out of keeping with competitive enterprise. Strict control would be necessary also because our uranium supply has to be husbanded. This is just where we are today.

3. That industry compete in a power program: Current estimates of the cost of a power pile run from $25,000,000 to $50,000,000. No American business, unless subsidized in some way, is today likely to invest in such an experimental facility the necessary scores of millions of its stockholders' capital. If it is subsidized, then we are right back where we started. The AEC itself is building a new pile at Brookhaven, Long Island. It is far simpler than a power pile. Yet it is now a year behind schedule and is costing millions more than originally anticipated. Moreover, there is not enough of the scarce uranium in sight to permit anyone and everyone to set up an atomic facility and obtain a critical amount of uranium to run it. This Nation has to keep a fast-paced atomic program going. Only a governmental budget can face the risks which that involves.

Atomic installations are furthermore attended by health hazards of uniquely troublesome nature. The location of atomic energy installations where large industry is now located—in densely populated areas—must await much more experimental work on protection of personnel and on the understanding and prevention of radiation damage from wastes, stack gases, etc. Progress is being made on this aspect, but much remains to be done.

4. That industry learn to use isotopes.—The techniques for using isotopes are already being taught interested people in industry and other fields at the laboratories of the commission. The isotope field is about as free to competitive industry as anything in the United States. All that is required is that the user be able to handle the items without danger to human life and health.

All these fallacies, however, are not to my mind the gravest which threaten either the atomic energy program or the life of the Nation. The most menacing misunderstandings concern (a) security of information, and (b) whether we can have atomic disarmament by "gentleman's agreement."

These issues began to take form very early in the atomic age. More recently were added to these misunderstandings the considerations involved in the decision to make or not to make the thermonuclear weapon—the H-bomb.

One of the earliest problems has been to draw the line between reasonable secrecy which is necessary and secrecy which is unreasonable and unnecessary. Some proponents of the position that the atomic energy program is bogged down because of foolish and unreasonable secrecy go so far as to advocate that the number of atomic weapons in our national stockpile and the rate at which they are being produced should be revealed in order that the public may make wise decisions as to future policy. Other men, equally sincere, would so tighten atomic security that, to be logical, a part of the ordinary physics courses would have to be dropped from the curricula of the public schools. During the early phases of atomic development one literal-minded security official precipitated a minor crisis by demanding that the periodic table of elements be classified. Astonished scientists finally talked him out of it by explaining that the table hung in nearly every high school in the country and was of Russian origin besides.

HOW MANY ROUNDS IN THE LOCKERS?

The heart of this matter is simply that the United States does not ordinarily disclose its military potential even in weapons of quite orthodox types. It has not done so historically, and we would be shortsighted to do so in the present state of world affairs. No other country publicly catalogs the weapons in its arsenals. In a shooting war it would be a short-lived commander who announced how many rounds he had in his lockers.

Let us assume that other counsel prevailed, and that it was accordingly disclosed that we had a certain number of atomic weapons and were making them at the rate of a certain number per unit of time. That information could not possibly help even the most diligent student of public affairs to conclude that we had just enough weapons or too few or too many. To reach any such reasoned conclusion it would be necessary to know also what use (strategic or tactical) was planned for such weapons, the number and size of the targets, what calculated proportion of weapons would be lost operationally—in other words, the detailed war plans of the United States. We may well ask: How would this be of benefit to anyone except rival military establishments?

The truth is that the largest—and all possible—areas of atomic energy information are completely open and public. The 5-year-old Smyth Report tells more about the use of "atomic energy for military purposes" than is known today by more than one person in a thousand. These areas of public knowledge are being expanded constantly by

AEC releases, and secrecy is maintained today solely in defined areas vital to the national defense.

It is an unhappy fact that these misconceptions about secrecy can never be demolished entirely. The man in the street is naturally beguiled by the allegation that something which he has a right to know is being arbitrarily withheld from him. Today he generally believes that the policies of secrecy and security either originated with the commission or were inherited from the Military Establishment. The fact is that secrecy in the field of nuclear fission was wisely initiated by scientists themselves as early as 1939. Recognizing the existence of a state of cold war with fascism, they set up a committee under the National Research Council to control publication in all fields of research of possible military significance and, specifically, the military application of atomic energy. It was indeed an abridgment of the cherished freedom of interchange of scientific information but was spontaneously instituted by scientists themselves in the interest of the long-range protection of that very freedom. Today those who recognize a state of cold war with communism seek to maintain the same policy that was sound during the cold war with fascism. Those who see it otherwise may be able to draw some fine metaphysical distinction between militant dictatorships of the right and those of the left. I cannot. One of the distinguished scientists of our day once insisted to me that "distrust among nations is the result of secrecy in research." I submit it is the other way around.

ARE THE SCIENTISTS QUITTING?

Out of this fallacy concerning the origin, purpose, and extent of security has come still another: That large numbers of scientists have deserted the atomic energy program and will not work for national defense in this area. It is true that after the war a number of outstanding men who had worked at Los Alamos and other installations went back to their classrooms and laboratories. I would note that a contemporary exodus of business leaders from Government agencies likewise occurred. Both groups simply went back to their accustomed duties. The top personalities in science who returned to their former pursuits resumed the vitally important task of training the new crop of young scientists, now badly needed because of the hiatus in undergraduate education during the war. But still larger numbers than those who left—and mainly younger men—remained at Los Alamos, Oak Ridge, and other installations. It is not unlikely that the new developments which will keep us ahead of our competition will come from younger men. Creative years in physics are said to be the early ones. However, the senior scientists still visit the atomic energy installations and contribute invaluable inspiration and assistance. It is unfair to the individuals concerned and, moreover, untrue to believe that the best scientific talent has been driven out of this field of work for the Government.

In this same connection it is also widely believed that all leading scientists are unwilling to assist in the development of the H-bomb. It is true that several scientists have voiced their opposition to this weapon. Others, certainly no less prominent, have made statements in support of the President's decision. From contacts on both sides of the question I believe that the great majority are content that the choice made by the President, while not a pleasant choice, was the only prudent one.

I have already noted that, in the split votes in the AEC during the last 3½ years, the dissenter very often was I. I should explain that the great majority of the actions of the Commission were taken unanimously. Besides dissents which centered on differences in interpretation of the Atomic Energy Act, including the question of exporting radioactive isotopes to foreign nations (which I approved for medical use but opposed for general and military research), the greatest issue of division was whether or not to proceed with the hydrogen bomb, as for some time I had strongly urged we do.

With regard to the H-bomb, I felt that there were four clear points. First, we could not expect that the Soviets would be dissuaded from manufacture and possession of such a weapon by moral considerations. Second, their success in producing an atomic explosion warranted the assumption that the H-bomb, if physically feasible, was within their technical competence. Third, we could not afford to choose to be less well equipped militarily than any other country. Fourth, by merely making more A-bombs, we could not with any assurance maintain the relative lead which we had formerly enjoyed while diplomatic attempts were still being made to control atomic energy.

This last point seemed to me critical. Merely to rely upon maintaining arithemetical advantage in A-bombs made no more sense than a father addressing two children aged 10 and 5, who instructed the elder always to stay twice as old as his younger brother. It would be equally frivolous for the United States to restrict itself to an armament race in which its relative advantage would inevitably shrink.

This debate over the hydrogen bomb has produced a whole series of Buck Rogers fallacies. For example, I read in a Washington newspaper one morning that one of my acquaintances had made the staggering calculation that "the hydrogen bomb would blow a chunk the size of the moon out of the earth." I happened to meet him later and took the opportunity to ask him whether he had said it. Somewhat embarrassed, he affirmed that he had and that he regretted it as a bit of exuberance.

Another expert has announced his calculation that the H-bomb could pollute the atmosphere to the point where life could not exist. This is most unlikely unless we are discussing an organized effort to commit race suicide. Used for military purposes, atomic bombs would not produce such a result until tens of thousands had been exploded. Even if it were possible deliberately to construct a hydrogen bomb, or bombs, so that the earth's atmosphere could be saturated with lethal radioactivity, the experiment would be just as fatal to the experimenters as to their intended victims.

The truth is that such peril as exists is essentially nothing new. Man for years has had the capacity to exterminate himself—and by easier methods.

As I have said, the most dangerous fallacy of all is the belief that it is possible to come to terms with foes of democracy and to disarm ourselves on the basis of some kind of gentlemen's agreement and a mutual respect for solemn covenants. A starry-eyed extension of this notion goes so far as to presume that if we unilaterally renounce atomic weapons, then the enemies of democracy will somehow be compelled by moral suasion not to manufacture atomic weapons for use against us. This is the same worn theory of disarmament by example which cost us a good-sized fleet 28 years ago and lengthened the last war.

It is fortunate that this fallacy is not too widely entertained. But it is unfortunate that its complete rejection is difficult, because those who do believe in it are deeply committed emotionally to what they feel is a moral justification for unilateral disarmament that transcends reason and cancels common prudence. I have learned, in conversations with those who oppose the hydrogen bomb on moral grounds, that many of them sincerely believe the Soviets can be deterred from making this terrible weapon by our own restraint.

No plan, in my opinion, which does not provide for international control and inspection of atomic enterprises the world over, and the effective lifting of all iron curtains, can be safely accepted by the people of the United States. For no nation can be assumed to be governed by the moral standards to which we subscribe if it is a nation which has a record of treating solemn covenants as matters of temporary expediency and which, as a matter of public doctrine, ridicules religion and denies the existence of moral law.

My hope is, naturally, that our country may be blessed with the ability honorably to avoid future wars by constructive international policies and by firm, but just, action. If it cannot, I think our course must be fixed on three premises:

First, the destruction of civil populations is abhorrent whatever the means or weapons used—no matter how "orthodox." (Ordinary bombing raids on Tokyo are reported to have killed more noncombatants than the atomic bomb at Hiroshima.)

Second, our possession of weapons of great power does not compel their inevitable use. (We prepared for bacteriological warfar as a contingency in the last war but did not have to use it.)

Third, if our country is subjected to a new and more horrible Pearl Harbor with atomic bombs or hydrogen bombs, or our national existence seriously endangered by some other new and terrible form of warfare, then and under those circumstances we would be justified in using every weapon we possessed to insure the preservation of our freedom and our way of life.

Mankind, it seems to me, tends increasingly to blame its misfortunes—its suffering in war—on the developments of science. The sciences, and the weapons of science, are not the causes of wars. Planes, radar, proximity fuzes, even explosives, do not start wars. Einstein's famous equation is no more responsible for the mass destruction of life than is Newton's law of gravitation from which we derive the scientific probability that bombs, released from aircraft over a populous city, will fall to a point of impact on that city.

The blame is not with science—nor with the fruits of science. The evil clearly is in the heart of man. It looks as though we will continue to fight and rend one another until we are restrained by a force set up among nations just as individual lawlessness is restrained by police force. Until that day we must—if we believe in our own moral position—accept the fact that there is neither solace nor sanctuary in surrender.

Resettlement of Displaced Persons in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 24 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have previously commented on the great job that has been done in my State in the resettlement of displaced persons—a job which has enabled some 3,500 of these individuals to be located within the Badger State. In this connection, I was glad to see in the Friday, July 21 issue of the diocesan newspaper, the La Crosse Register, a survey article showing the splendid work of the Governor's Committee on Resettlement of DP's headed by Prof. George W. Hill at Madison, as

well as the work of the Catholic agencies, Protestant, Jewish, Polish, and other religious and national origin organizations.

We of Wisconsin have always prided ourselves that we are a blend of many peoples, many races, many cultures, many tongues and it is only natural, therefore, that we should have acted with particular humanitarian interest in resettlement of the DP's.

Now that Congress has fortunately enacted changes in the statute, we are hoping that we will be able to complete our humanitarian responsibility along this line, in addition to taking up the still very unsolved question of handling the needs of expelled persons of German ethnic origin.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this La Crosse Register article on the DP's be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DP'S ARE RESETTLED THROUGHOUT STATE—LA CROSSE DIOCESE LEADS WITH TOTAL OF 600; PROGRAM CALLED SUCCESS

(Walter Dushynck of New York is a graduate of the University of Louvain, Belgium, and of Columbia University, New York City. A linguist, he served as an interpreter in General MacArthur's G–2 foreign liaison in Manila and Tokyo in the past war, and has written several articles and pamphlets on DP's. A staff member of NCWC War Relief Services, he recently made a 5-week survey trip through Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois, covering more than 3,200 miles. His findings about the resettlement of DP's in Wisconsin are incorporated in this article, written exclusively for the Wisconsin press.)

A great majority of Wisconsin's 3,500 displaced persons are well on the road to permanent rehabilitation and resettlement in the State, according to a State-wide survey made by the writer. The success of the DP program is due largely to the wholehearted cooperation of public and private agencies, operating on both State-wide and local levels. The encouraging findings in Wisconsin boded well for the implementation of the new amended DP Act, which authorizes an increase in the number of DP's to be admitted to the United States.

LIBERALIZED DP LAW

Signed by President Truman on June 16, the amended DP law extends the period of their entry to June 30, 1951, and opens the way for the entry of an additional 136,000 homeless to this country. The latter includes categories of refugees not classified as DP's proper, such as the 18,000 former soldiers of General Anders now in England; 10,000 Greek refugees, most of whom have American relatives; 2,000 refugees from Venezia-Gululia; 5,000 IRO orphans; 4,000 so-called Shanghai refugees; 15,000 persons who came here on temporary visas prior to April 30, 1949; and 500 behind-the-iron-curtain refugees whose admission is recommended by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense.

The most important feature of the new DP bill is the authorization of admission to the United States of 54,744 persons of Germanic origin who were forcibly driven from their homes in eastern Europe as a result of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements. This refugee category also must have proper sponsorship by American citizens in order to receive United States visas, a requirement which is now extended to all DP's as a prerequisite for entry into this country.

It is estimated by United States immigration authorities that at least 50,000 new immigrants will come to Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, and both Dakotas under the extended law, a great number of whom may be German, if speedy sponsorship be provided for them by Americans.

OVER-ALL PICTURE IS THAT OF AN OVERWHELMING SUCCESS

If the results of many hours of talking with these former victims of war and its aftermath are any indication, then it can be definitely said that the DP's have come here to stay, and that they rapidly are becoming integrated into and adjusted to American economic life. And on the bases of the reactions of the American sponsors, there is no doubt that the DP's are proving to be an asset to this country.

The DP's in Wisconsin come from almost every eastern and central European country that found itself under the totalitarian heel of Soviet Russia or one of her satellites. While the overwhelming majority of them are Poles, there are substantial numbers of Latvians, Ukrainians, Slovenes, Serbs, Hungarians, Lithuanians, Estonians, and Jews from various countries.

The task of bringing these people over has been met and admirably discharged by a number of religious and voluntary welfare agencies. Among them are the National Lutheran Council, Church World Service, HIAS, and United Service for New Americans—both Jewish welfare groups—the United Ukrainian American Relief Committee, and, above all, the NCWC War Relief Services.

VISITED WISCONSIN CENTER

This latter agency has been one of the most active in the field, operating through its 119 archdioceses in every State of the Union (five are in the State of Wisconsin: Milwaukee, Green Bay, Madison, La Crosse, and Superior) and through 18 different nationality groups. Its headquarters is located in New York City and operates under the general direction of the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward E. Swanstrom.

The DP's in Wisconsin are resettled throughout the entire State, not only in the rural areas but also in the cities and small towns. The writer interviewed them in such areas and centers as Milwaukee, Cudahy, Sheboygan, Chilton, Valders, Green Bay, Shawnee, Antigo, Merrill, Medford, Rice Lake, Superior, Menomonie, La Crosse, Bangor, Stevens Point, Portage, Sun Prairie, Madison, Fort Atkinson, Lancaster, and others. In almost all cases the DP's were found to have made great strides in adjusting to and adopting the American way of life.

There are, of course, inevitable difficulties and shortcomings in the DP program, readily admitted by both sponsors and DP's. In some areas, a substantial number of DP's have left for other places, usually such large cities as Milwaukee and Chicago, enticed by the prospect of higher wages and a higher standard of living. That there should be such casualties is a source of unending concern for the sponsors, the voluntary agencies, and in a good many cases for the Catholic priests and Protestant clergymen who are striving to make the resettlement program a success.

REASONS FOR LEAVING

The reasons for leaving are many and varied. In addition to a desire for better living conditions, there is the understandable wish of families which were separated in Europe and which have been resettled here in different States to be reunited. Loneliness and strangeness have forced some to seek out friends or their own nationality group. Finally, there is the inability to meet the demands of farming on the part of those DP's who never worked on a farm. Yet the casualty rate has been surprisingly and encouragingly low. The overwhelming majority, 80 to 85 percent of the DP's, are staying in Wisconsin. These people have not come empty-handed. On the contrary, they bring with them a wealth of different trades and skills, such as time-tested experience in agriculture, dairy farming, horticulture, forestry, and all branches of industry. Many of the highly trained professionals and specialists among the DP's have found congenial employment.

Such is the encouraging picture of this humanitarian undertaking in Wisconsin, garnered from interviews with literally hundreds of sponsors and displaced persons alike; State and county officials, religious and civic leaders, and school authorities.

GOVERNOR RENNEBOHM LAUDS DP SUCCESS

The Honorable Oscar Rennebohm, Governor of Wisconsin, when asked for his views on the success of the DP resettlement program, stated:

"In my opinion, the resettlement of displaced persons in Wisconsin has been extremely successful. All information received in this office indicates that the experience of those who have employed displaced persons has been very good and that the displaced persons who have emigrated to Wisconsin are making valuable contributions to the general welfare of our State."

Similar sentiments were expressed by Prof. George W. Hill, socialogy department of the University of Wisconsin in Madison, who also is chairman of the Wisconsin committee on DP resettlement. An exceedingly active crusader for the program, Professor Hill declared that approximately 3,500 DP's have found home and job opportunities in Wisconsin, and more have become eligible for emigration to the United States and Wisconsin under the new DP law. He continued:

"The majority of the people settling in Wisconsin are living in rural areas. They are often far from people of their own nationality or religion and need friendship and sociability of their neighbors. For the past 5 to 10 years, many of them have lived in camps or thickly populated areas. The change to the isolation of a rural home brings loneliness and sometimes discouragement."

He added that "patience and wisdom are needed in dealing with social problems involved. We feel that each incoming person or family is capable of making a valuable contribution to the local community as well as to receive benefits from it."

Professor Hill is confident that the program will prove to be of mutual benefit to sponsors and DP's alike, but pointed out that the responsibility for a good adjustment rests not only with the displaced person but also with the sponsor and the community."

In Medford, H. Paul Schmold, another member of the Wisconsin resettlement committee and chairman of Taylor County Republican Committee, stressed that the "program is a definite success," and said "that there is plenty of room in our State for these worthy people."

RELIGIOUS GROUPS ACTIVE

In Milwaukee, the Reverend Werner G. Spiegel, resettlement director of the National Lutheran Council for Wisconsin, disclosed that about 400 DP's have been resettled in Wisconsin through the services of the Lutheran agency and that "90 percent of them are a marked success in the resettlement." Some, he said, could not stay on farms because their physical conditions were unequal to the work. All in all, he concluded, these once homeless people have found a home in this great country of freedom and will contribute immensely to its growth and development.

Miss Rebecca Tanenbaum, executive director of Jewish Family and Children's Service, said that the Jewish community has been working for the admission of Jewish refugees since 1933, when the persecution of Jews in Germany started. Most Jewish DP's, she said, are relative cases and have resettled in Sheboygan, Madison, Kenosha, Racine, Stevens Point, and other places. They are

a hard working people who have quickly adapted themselves to the American way of life.

MILWAUKEE HAS 400

The Catholic organization is responsible for bringing a great number of Wisconsin's DP's, perhaps more than half of them. In Milwaukee, Charles A. O'Neill, executive secretary of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, spoke in the name of Monsignor Leonard W. Lieven, archdiocesan resettlement director. He said that more than 400 DP's have been resettled through his agency in the 10 counties of southeastern Wisconsin, and with the exception of a few misplacements on farms, all have become successfully adjusted. These DP's, he added, were in the main Polish, Lithuanian, and Slovenian, with Ukrainians, Hungarians, and Serbs forming the minority. Mr. O'Neill also said that the DP's save money to a much greater extent than many native citizens.

"They certainly do not feel," he continued, "that the public owes them a living; they are most grateful for the opportunity afforded them to make a living, but more particularly are they grateful for the chance of becoming American citizens."

Mr. O'Neill's office has more than 100 new applications for DP's.

In Green Bay, Father Thaddeus Kiszarek revealed that his diocese has sponsored more than 300 DP's most of them being Poles who came to this country on the so-called designated assurances. They are resettled in farms around Green Bay, De Pere, Shawnee, Peshtigo, Kewaunee, Algoma, Chilton, Valders, Pulaski, and North Chase.

In his office in Sun Prairie, Monsignor George Haeusler, diocesan director for the Diocese of Madison, told the writer that more than 140 DP's—Lithuanians, Poles, and Ukrainians—have been brought to the area. A few dozen of them, mostly women, are engaged by hospitals in Portage and Stevens Point.

There are nearly 200 DP's in the area of Superior, Phillips, Ashland, Birchwoods, and Rice Lake, according to the Very Reverend George F. Mahan, diocesan director of the National Catholic Resettlement Council for the Diocese of Superior.

SIX HUNDRED DP'S IN LA CROSSE DIOCESE

In western Wisconsin, especially in the area of La Crosse, more than 600 DP's are resettled, according to Father Charles Wolf of Bangor, diocesan director for the La Crosse diocese. A courageous crusader for the program, Father Wolf said that a "good number of his DP's" left for other parts of the State or the big cities.

"But in most cases" said Father Wolf, "the motives were perfectly justifiable, such as family reunions, lack of farm experience, and the like." He added that he has applications for more than 300 DP's.

INTELLECTUALS AND PROFESSIONALS AMONG THE DP'S

In Milwaukee, Father M. G. Barnett, S. J., vice president of Marquette University, disclosed that there were six DP professors on the staff of the university: Roman Smal-Stocky, Ukrainian associate professor in the department of history; Bella Kovrig, Hungarian, associate professor of political science and sociology; J. V. Talacko, Czech, assistant professor in the department of mathematics; Stanislaw Ratajczak, Pole, technical assistant in the department of biology; Paul J. Labanauskas, Lithuanian, instructor, college of engineering; and Michael Laskowski, Pole, associate professor of biochemistry.

Father Barnett said that all of them have been extremely valuable to his institution. Of Professor Smal-Stocky he said:

"He is a scholar of the highest type. We regret that the limitations of our institution are such that they do not allow full play to Dr. Smal-Stocky's abilities in research and graduate instruction." Dr. Smal-Stocky was subsequently invited to give summer courses in Slavic philology at the University of California in Berkeley. He also is the author of a historical treatise, Slavs and Teutons.

There are highly skilled professionals and specialists among the DP's in Wisconsin. In Madison, for example, is a Russian DP, Dmitri Pronin, who came with his family under President Truman's directive in 1947. He fled Russia at the time of the revolution in 1917, studied in Czechoslovakia, and was employed by the Ministry of Agriculture in Poland until 1939. He has been engaged for more than 2 years by the soils department of the University of Wisconsin. His two daughters work in the university library, and a third one is married to a United States Army sergeant.

Twenty-eight-year-old Michael Holowaty, a Ukrainian engineer, works as a technician in the laboratory of the Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co., in Ishpeming, Mich., on iron-ore beneficiation, a process which separates iron ore from worthless rock. His wife, Jean, is employed as a nurse at St. Mary's Hospital in Marquette, Mich.

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE AT WORK FOR DP'S

In Milwaukee the writer talked to Sharon L. Hatch, executive secretary of the International Institute of Milwaukee County. His organization has been extremely active in helping the DP's to adjust themselves to the American way of life. Each Saturday the institute sponsors open house, an informal gathering of displaced persons from Poland, Yugoslavia, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Hungary, Austria, and Russia. The newcomers are attending Americanization classes at the institute, where not only English is taught but also American history, economics, labor laws, and customs.

Another outstanding contribution by the institute to the rehabilitation of the DP's is the establishment of an advisory committee on technical and special employment of newcomers. Unemployment as such, has not been the major problem, said Mr. Hatch. Rather, it has been unsuitable employment; technical skills and professional training and experience are not being used. To meet this problem, the institute organized this committee, comprised of more than 25 members from industrial management, employers, the professions, civic organizations, the public employment office, and vocational schools.

THE SPONSORS OF THE DP'S

This picture of the resettlement of DP's in Wisconsin would not be complete without the presentation of the views of both the sponsors and the DP's themselves.

In Cudahy, of the 1,650 employes that the Cudahy meat packing plant employs, 110 are DP's. Most of them are sponsored through NCWC War Relief Service, American Relief for Poland, and the Serbian Relief Society. The majority of the DP's are Poles, with the Serb group next in size.

Lawrence M. Kenny, plant personnel director, reported that the DP's have proved to be excellent and efficient workers. The native workers, moreover, have accepted them as equals. Some of the DP's have joined the union, which they are free to do as the plant is an open shop. Michael F. Cudahy, owner of the plant, is very anxious to help these people and is willing to take more of them into his industry.

Valders Lime & Stone Co. in Valders employs two Polish DP families as stonecutters—that of Stanislaw Jadowski and that of his father-in-law, Bonifacy Kosarzycki, including his three adult sons, Fabian 27, Mieczyslaw 22, and Romain 20. H. C. Brennan, general manager of the quarry, and Ernest Phipps, personnel manager, expressed satisfaction with these DP employees.

The farmers with whom the writer talked are content with their DP workers. In Chilton, for instance, Hugo Salm, owner of a 250-acre farm, praised his Polish DP, Victor Grzelak, as an experienced farmer who knew farm machinery. In addition to a substantial monthly wage and the use of a house, Grzelak receives eggs, chickens, and milk. Henry G. Schroeder, owner of a 520-acre farm in Antigo, treats his Polish DP, Joseph Burzynski as generously.

In Birchwoods, near Rice Lake, the writer talked to Mrs. Elmer Knapmiller, who is in charge of the local post office. She employs a DP domestic, Maria Oseredchuk, a 20-year-old Ukrainian girl. Maria, whose parents are now living in Akron, Ohio, came to this country in 1949. In just a year, she was graduated with highest marks from the public high school and won commendation from its principal. Mr. Knapmiller said that Maria is a very talented girl and has a promising future, if she is allowed to study.

DR. SKEMP RESETTLES 60

In La Crosse, Dr. Arthur A. Skemp, a prominent citizen and owner of a clinic of his own, has 9 farms, comprising 2,000 acres outside the city, for which he has sponsored some 16 DP units, involving approximately 60 persons—10 Polish, 4 Hungarian, and 2 White Russian (Byelorussian). Dr. Skemp said that most of his DP's were honorable and humane, hard working, and reliable. They had a rough beginning, he said, because they did not know how to operate farm machinery, and also because they had an exaggerated opinion of America. There was not a single case of crime or subversion he declared. Dr. Skemp is so well satisfied that he has prepared 3 new houses for some 7 to 10 additional DP families whom he has sponsored. They are expected to arrive shortly.

One of Dr. Skemp's DP's is Sophie Lipski, 52, a widow from Poland. When the Russians joined the Nazis in 1939, her village was taken by the Communists. Immediately, she said, the NKVD began arresting and deporting all able-bodied men. First, they took her husband, Roman, then her five brothers—Julian, 36; Leon, 32; Franciszek, 29; Martin, 26; and few days later, her uncle Nikodin Janek, 23. A few days later, her uncle, Nikodin Siencki, also was arrested and deported. All are now dead. A few weeks ago, Sophie's two children arrived in La Crosse from a DP camp in Europe. She hopes that now she will find a measure of hapiness here with what remains of her family.

LA CROSSE TAILOR

Also in La Crosse is Klemens A. Obrebski, a 27-year-old Polish DP from the environs of Warsaw. In the war he participated in the Polish underground. Arrested in 1944, he was deported to a slave-labor camp near Leipzig. He was sponsored here in 1949 by J. Mendralski for whom he worked as a tailor for 14 months. Klem is a good tailor and could easily have found well-salaried employment in La Crosse.

"But I wanted to be with my sponsor the longest possible time, so that he could get back the money he invested in bringing me to this country." And Klem paid his inland transportation and other expenses incurred in his immigration. Now he is employed by the P. Newburg Clothing Co. in La Crosse, and in addition, he has opened his own tailoring and pressing shop, where he works nights. He speaks English well and is extremely grateful for this opportunity to start life anew in this country.

At Fort Atkinson the writer spoke to the Reverend Charles M. Brown of the First Congregational Church, who is responsible for bringing several Latvian DP families to this community. Some 80 applications have been filed through his church for more DP's, he said. He highly praised the DP's as worthy, extremely productive, and reliable,

and said that the members of his congregation are enthusiastic about them and are doing everything possible to help them.

A typical DP brought by his congregation was Mrs. Evelina Petersons, Latvian. She works at the parish house, while her husband, Janis, is employed at Larson's Canning Co. in town, and their daughter, Ligita, 21, works as a nurse in the local hospital. Mrs. Petersons said that she was a teacher in Riga while her husband, an orthopedist, was with the Latvian Red Cross.

NEW CITIZENS OF WISCONSIN

Such are the people who have come to Wisconsin. In addition to their skills and experience, they bring along their rich and heterogenous cultural wealths, which will greatly enrich our way of life and culture as immigration has in the past. But they also serve to remind us of the dangers of Communism, which was responsible for their plight and misery.

The survey of Wisconsin's DP's was made possible through the cooperation rendered by Miss Hazel Courtier, of Madison, executive secretary, Wisconsin Resettlement Committee; Ted Hommerding, of Antigo, Wis., area director, NCWC War Relief Service, as well as those religious, civic, social welfare leaders, State and county officials, and the sponsors and the DP's themselves, who so liberally and sincerely gave their time and knowledge.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles by Frank C. Waldrop on Communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Would you approve the use of your money to help destroy the United States? Well, it has been done.

Now we turn to the case of something called the Federal theater project, one of those Harry Hopkins productions of the wild times in the WPA.

I have not wasted much space on Hopkins here. His public character has been well-delineated and there is little I could add except to say that of all the men in public affairs I have ever known he was the deadliest.

Hopkins liked luxury and ease. But he had a passion for power that was all-consuming. He would go far for a dollar's worth of comfort, but for a dime's worth of power, he would spare nothing, least of all himself.

He was one whose nature reflected itself in his appearance, all right. He was always sick, as he appeared sick. But his sickness was that of the man who would be king.

Once in my presence he scandalized a lady by saying that if the citizens he called "poor whites" couldn't be made over according to his ideas, they might as well all be poisoned.

She made a to-do about it, but explained it to herself as mere big talk and overstating of a case by a man who, after all, had not been prepared by life for the job in which he had suddenly found himself.

But Hopkins was not exaggerating his point of view. When the war finally came along, he made that plain enough with all his declarations of how the people of the United States of American must be ordered and shoved around as mere dumb, driven cattle.

Such was the man in charge of something called the Federal theater project, when a Miss Hazel Huffman came on to testify before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, August 19, 1938.

Miss Huffman's testimony in full should interest Americans who have forgotten, or never have heard, how the taxpayers' money was used back in those days to ridicule and subvert the Government of the United States.

Miss Huffman appeared before the committee to ask that the theater project be separated from Communist influence. Well, was it under any such influence?

You may have heard the name, Whittaker Chambers. Turn to pages 777–779 of volume I, Hearings by the Committee on Un-American Activities and learn something new about him. Here are quotes from the record that, without any abuse of context, tell all:

"Miss HUFFMAN. Mrs. Hallie Flanagan the national director of the Federal theater project * * * was known as far back as 1927 for her communistic sympathy.

"In April 1931, Mrs. Flanagan in cooperation with a student of hers, Margaret Allen Clifford, wrote a play called Can You Hear Their Voices. This play was adapted by Mrs. Flanagan from a story entitled 'Would You Know Their Voices' which appeared in the March 1931 issue of the New Masses.

"Please note the 2-page drawing of the world which accompanies that article. This drawing is in the middle of the story and after reading the story by Mr. Whittaker Chambers you will find it used to illustrate the story, 'The Making of a New World and the Decay of the Old.'

"This picture brings out that there is unemployment and unrest throughout all the countries of the world except Russia. In Russia: 'Here Are No Unemployed—Everything Is Ours,' are written on the picture.

"Mr. STARNES. In other words, the exhibits you are showing us are communistic publications?

"Miss HUFFMAN. Yes, the New Masses."

At the time when he wrote that story, Would You Know Their Voices, Whittaker Chambers was a Communist and by his own subsequent confession under oath, was to go on to become a major Russian spy, working with another spy for Russia called Alger Hiss.

Hallie Flanagan was, in 1931, director of the experimental theater at Vassar College.

Just why she never had the theater project perform the play she had adapted from Chambers' piece in the New Masses the record does not say. For she was obviously very proud of it and took bows right and left, mostly left, after it came out.

Certainly it was not because of any objection to the theme of the work, which was simply put in the play:

"Don't you see, Rose, it ain't Purcell that's wrong. It's the plan we live under, the whole system. Listen. Maybe I think, like you, that there'll come a time when there'll be shootin'. But today ain't the time."

No, Miss Flanagan couldn't have been timid about the sentiments of her little work, courtesy of Whittaker Chambers, produced at the experimental theater of one of America's richest and plushiest colleges for women.

I will report on some of her productions on the Government payroll, just to make that point obvious. She wasn't timid about the ideas in the play.

Maybe she was just modest about having her own stuff used.

After all, she had so much power, as head of the whole show, and besides so many more skillful playwrights were working for her. And all of the same mind in the matter at hand.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles by Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

We are reviewing here in 1950 some things done with the taxpayers' money between 1933 and 1938 to show that the high connections of communism in the Roosevelt era were never secret.

Anybody who wanted to find out the facts could do so with the greatest ease. Indeed, you had to turn aside, deliberately, to avoid facts.

A Miss Hazel Huffman came forward in August 1938, for instance, to spread on the record of the House Committee on un-American Activities the doings of a project supported by the taxpayers and called Federal theater project.

This project, a part of the Works Progress Administration, was supposed to be designed primarily to make temporary relief work for unemployed playwrights, actors, stage hands, and others in the theatrical line.

Mrs. Hallie Flanagan of the Vassar College experimental theater was in charge of this gift from the taxpayer to people in need. And how were the taxpayers thanked? Here is Miss Huffman's testimony:

"Then there was one (WPA play) with the title 'Triple A Plowed Under.'

"That was one play which on the opening night required 30 New York policemen to guard the play and prevent a riot.

"It contained a scene in which the secretary of the Communist Party condemns the judiciary of the United States Government. Such characters as George Washington and Andrew Jackson were removed from the play to give a prominent part to the secretary of the Communist Party, Earl Browder."

If in this summer of 1950 you wonder where the Communists get the boldness they show in the face of Mr. Truman's undeclared war, Miss Huffman gives you an idea. Boldness paid them in the past, why not now?

That Federal theater project, incidentally, had something in it for everybody, including the children.

For example, there was a something called The Revolt of the Beavers, of which Brooks Atkinson, theater reviewer for the New York Times wrote:

"Many children now unschooled in the technique of revolution now have an opportunity at Government expense to improve their tender minds. Mother Goose is no longer a rhymed escapist. She has been studying Marx; Jack and Jill lead the class revolution."

The Federal theater offered the juvenile aid bureau of the city of New York 1,400 free tickets to this little gem, only to have them refused by a deputy police commissioner.

Mrs. Flanagan's testimony about all these and other matters was given to the Committee on Un-American Activities in early December of 1938. It is a very model of what not to do when appearing before a committee of Congress.

She and her associates came down here armed with the notion that the Committee on Un-American Activities was a fraud to be horse-laughed away.

The members of the committee obliged her impression in a multitude of ways.

They groped and stumbled. Their questions wandered aimlessly around and around the subject of what a theater enterprise is supposed to do, and just what might be the rights and wrongs of using the taxpayers' money for propaganda.

For instance, Representative Joe Starnes, Democrat, of Alabama, noted that she made reference to a certain Marlowesque madness. Then:

"Mr. STARNES. You are quoting from this Marlowe. Is he a Communist?

"Mrs. FLANAGAN. I am very sorry. I was quoting from Christopher Marlowe.

"Mr. STARNES. Tell us who this Marlowe is so we can get the proper reference, because that is all we want to do.

"Mrs. FLANAGAN. Put in that he was the greatest dramatist in the period of Shakespeare, immediately preceding Shakespeare."

Now, that is the kind of thing that caused all the trouble. The Flanagan-type snobs never did take time to consider what Joe Starnes and those other comedians were doing.

Nobody can deceive a prissy, lecturing type of intellectual more horribly, anyhow, than a politician of the kind that happened by chance to be on the committee as it got to work.

More on this as we go along, but for the moment, just consider the end result, alone. In 1938, Federal theater glittered and glowed in a publicity that proclaimed it vital and answering a national need. The Committee on Un-American Activities was hammered and denounced in a publicity that proclaimed it a fraud and nuisance.

Which was correct? Well, survival means something and it is the committee which has survived. By national demand, too.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles by Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

As on the stage, so in the writing and graphic arts, has the money of the American taxpayer been used to seek destruction of the Constitution under which we live.

And so it was that the Communists were happiest when the sensitive artists of the Federal theater project, Federal writers' project, and Federal artists' project, went on the Federal payroll in the Works Progress Administration under the generalship of Harry Hopkins.

Some of their work was so awful that even a pig wouldn't stay in the same room with it. Some was extremely clever. All, whether acting, painting, or writing, had the unmistakable stamp of governmental patronage across its face.

In some instances, communism flamboyantly wrote its signature right over Uncle Sam's. For some insight into that, see the hearings by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the first year of its operations, 1938.

In other instances, communism concealed its identity and laid the mechanism deep out of sight, but working powerfully just the same.

But instead of facing up to the issue squarely, the responsible authorities in charge generally undertook to deny communism's very presence. And then they made a major mistake, for they were denying the obvious and therefore were open to charges of either lying or inexcusable ignorance of facts they should have known.

Mrs. Hallie Flanagan, taken from the Vassar College experimental theater to head up the Federal theater project, is typical. She was brought on by the committee in December of 1938 to testify concerning charges of communism in the FTP.

In the manner of her kind, she just assumed that if she showed the members of the committee what boobs they were, the evidence would kindly oblige and go away. And so she rambled on until the chairman of the committee, Representative Martin Dies (Democrat), of Texas asked:

"The CHAIRMAN. Then this Federal theater is a very powerful vehicle of expression, isn't it, and of propaganda because, as you say, it reaches 25,000,000 people. It therefore can be used or abused.

"Mrs. FLANNAGAN. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. With serious consequences, can it not?

"Mrs. FLANNAGAN. Yes, sir."

Having then established the genuine importance of the theater project, Chairman Dies asked Mrs. Flannagan if she knew of any communistic activity.

Now, an intelligent and well-thought attitude in such a situation would have dictated an answer to the effect that Mrs. Flanagan knew charges of communistic activity had been made by many people and that she well realized how badly the Communists would want to get hold of such a magnificent propaganda weapon as the Federal theater project.

She would have listed some record of her personal struggles with them, if any.

But such an approach and response would have been admission that the Committee on Un-American Activities itself had good reason for being, and such an admission was, for the administration's purposes, out.

So Mrs. Flanagan, instead of talking horse sense with the committee, took to the high ground and got haughty. So:

"The CHAIRMAN. You say you are here to refute testimony of other witnesses. You can't refute any of the testimony that appeared in this record dealing with communistic activity on the projects, can you, because you admit you were not there, you did not see it, you do not know it. So you can't refute that, can you?

"Mrs. FLANAGAN. I want to take it up, charge by charge.

"The CHAIRMAN. I see, but you have already stated in your testimony that you did not know of any of those communistic activities, you did not see it * * * so you, yourself, are not in a position to deny, under oath, to refute any of the testimony."

Thus did retribution come. In the end, it was clear on the record that getting fresh and upstage with the committee might give satisfaction to the witness, but it did not give satisfaction to the country.

For preliminary inquiries by the House Committee on Un-American Activities had sufficient effect on the Nation to result in a full-scale investigation in 1939 by the House Committee on Appropriations.

The scandals that disclosed were sufficient and so, as soon as possible, the theater project, art project, and writers' project were all given quick funerals.

But to this day, in post offices and public buildings around the country, you can still see some of the surviving marks of that venture in State propaganda with the arts.

Outside Soviet Russia itself, never had there been such a massive undertaking of that kind. Never had so much hack work been dignified with the patronage of the State.

Never had the taxpayers been so rooked. It might have lasted forever, except for the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles by Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

One more witness is all we need at this point to show how the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in its very first year of operations, built a record of lasting value to the country, outweighing all propaganda to the contrary.

The committee began work in August of 1938.

Its very first witness, it may surprise some to learn, was on Nazi activities. And the very first people to go to jail as a result of committee effort, were of the same general category.

But the Roosevelt administration and its national claque paid no attention to that. All the fire was concentrated on trying to bully the committee away from inquiry into communism. And no wonder.

For the committee's first two witnesses on communism showed how it had penetrated the administration's political associations and affiliations.

These two witnesses were John P. Frey, president of the Metal Trades Union, American Federation of Labor, and Walter S. Steele, representing some 114 patriotic organizations.

Their evidence, alone, was enough to make a national scandal. It was detailed, specific, and crystal clear.

It showed without any doubt that the Communists, following Mr. Roosevelt's extension of diplomatic status to the Soviet Union, had become a major force in our national affairs.

Following these two witnesses, the committee looked briefly into Communist campaigns to use Americans as cannon fodder in the Spanish civil war, then turned to Communist propagandizing in the Federal Government, through such agencies as the Federal theater and writers' projects.

I do not propose here to survey every witness or even every line of testimony that popped up as the committee got going.

The purpose here is not to write a history of the Committee on Un-American Activities, but to show how its very earliest work should have been sufficient to warn the Roosevelt administration against the folly of its Communist associates.

Thus, the next witness serves to show how communism used both the knowing and the innocent, the willing and the—not unwilling—the unconscious.

The name of this witness is J. B. Matthews, who has been mentioned here before, indeed, has been quoted on several points of testimony.

Matthews was the first to give an inside account of communism for the express purpose of warning Americans against making

themselves the instruments of a foreign power.

In 1938, he made plain the prospect of such Soviet utensils as Alger Hiss, Julian Wadleigh, Harry Bridges, and so many others who are now a decade and more later the objects of governmental action.

Nothing that can be said or done today concerning these matters is new in concept or fact. Any or all of it could have been made effective in 1938–39, had the Roosevelt administration so willed.

As a matter of fact, the committee's material on Harry Bridges in 1938 was conclusive, comprehensive, and clear.

But did it get results? It only got sneers and insults from Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins, the responsible authority in office supposed to rid us of undesirable aliens, of which Bridges was a revolting but not exceptional case.

Now as to the significance of Matthews, here was a native-born American, who had taught oriental languages in American colleges and had turned to Marxism.

In explaining his career to the Committee on Un-American Activities, Matthews for the first time made it a matter of public record that Communists and the agents of communism do not always belong to the official organization itself.

Communism requires only a state of mind. Said Matthews:

"I hope it will not appear immodest but for a period of years I was probably more closely associated with the Communist Party's united-front movements than any other individual in this country. That may also be an indictment.

"I had official or other consultatory connections with at least 20 of the Communist Party's united-front organizations from the end of 1932 until 1935.

"I was what is known in party circles as a fellow traveler—one who sympathizes very closely with the party's aims but who, generally for strategic reasons, does not hold a party card. There is such a thing as a strategic nonmembership in the Communist Party."

That testimony, remember, was given in 1938. It opened up a field of affairs suggesting careful and prudent judgment in examination of every suspect circumstance. The case of the fellow traveler was up for first examination.

It is in that connection I will develop Matthews' testimony for a little space of time, here.

The Case of Mr. Krips

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 24 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the New York Times of Friday, July 21, carried an editorial on the case of Mr. Krips. I know nothing about the case of Mr. Krips except what is stated in this editorial.

It seems to me, however, that the conclusions drawn by the New York Times are conclusions which should receive careful consideration.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE OF MR. KRIPS

Refusal of the authorities to reveal why they barred Josef Krips, conductor of the Vienna State Opera, from entering the United States is the latest but not the worst in a long series of incidents that have made certain aspects of our immigration procedure look little short of ridiculous.

Josef Krips was scheduled to make his American debut leading the Chicago Symphony Orchestra Tuesday night, and to return to Austria within a few days. He received his visa from the American consul in Vienna without trouble; but on arrival here Sunday was detained without explanation by the immigration authorities for further investigation. Rather than wait at Ellis Island for the investigation to be completed, with the possibility that he would be deported without a hearing anyway, Mr. Krips decided to return to Europe without further ado. The upshot of this case is that no one—except perhaps the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Justice Department—knows why he was barred from this country, nothing has been proved for or against him, a blot is inferentially left on his record, and an American audience has been deprived of becoming acquainted with a gifted conductor.

There is no question but that the Attorney General and the Immigration and Naturalization Service are acting within the law. The Attorney General has the power to deny admission to the United States of any alien whose presence he feels would be prejudicial to the interests of this country, and to deny admission without a hearing. But there is a very large question as to the wisdom of refusing to hold such a hearing, except perhaps in the most extreme emergency. What we are doing is to say to aliens who seek access to our shores that our democracy functions for everyone within our borders, but our democratic principles do not necessarily apply to those knocking at the gates.

Rumor, hearsay, slander—these may be the bases on which an alien is excluded, and under our present practice he may not merely have no chance to fight back but he may not even know the nature of the charges. This is an outrageously undemocratic procedure. It demands revision. Surely, if they put their minds to it, Congress and the State and Justice Departments could work out a better and more democratic method of protecting the security of the United States against aliens suspected of subversion.

"Runaway Pappy" Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, my Hoosier colleague, ANDREW JACOBS, has been trying to get his "Runaway Pappy" bill reported out of the Judiciary Committee for over a year. In my congressional district the costs of support for children of fathers who have fled to other States is more than $100,000 per year. A Federal law to return these fugitives is the only solution. Favorable action should be had on the Jacobs bill this session. The following is an editorial from the Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune on this legislation:

CATCHING RUNAWAY FATHERS

The recent conference of governors gave its indorsement to the model State law for forcing runaway fathers to support their wives and children. The Indiana general assembly will have a chance to adopt it next year. It should enact it.

The problem is a serious one among the States. The State welfare department recently estimated it costs Indiana about $420,000 a year to aid dependent children in cases where the father has run away to another State and cannot be forced to accept his family responsibility.

Ten States already have adopted the model law which provides for cooperative action in catching up with deserting fathers and forcing them to support their children. Many of the problems involved could be solved by reciprocal arrangements between the States, welfare administrators believe.

The most effective way of handling deserting fathers, when they get away across State lines, would be by Federal action. Several proposals along that line already are pending in Congress.

The State must step in with its help when there is no other way to care for dependent children. However, that aid must be spread thinly if it also must provide for children whose parents are dodging their responsibilities behind the relative security of a State line.

Address by Governor Warren, of Florida, Before the Investment Bankers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Governor of Florida, the Honorable Fuller Warren, before the Investment Bankers at the Biltmore Hotel in New York City on June 22, 1950. Governor Warren addressed the Investment Bankers on the investment opportunities in the State of Florida. I should like to call everyone's attention to the very able, eloquent, and significant address of our Governor in setting forth the investment opportunities in our State. I should like to have the address inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR WARREN BEFORE INVESTMENT BANKERS, BILTMORE HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, JUNE 22, 1950

My friends, I consider it a great compliment to the State of Florida, and incidentally to me, that you gentlemen who control such a great portion of the world's wealth have come out to be with us tonight. On behalf of Florida and all its people, I want to express appreciation for the interest in our State which your attendance here so amply demonstrates.

During the past few minutes, when I glanced about the room at the faces of you

who are our welcome and honored guests tonight, I could not help but recall the tremendous changes that have taken place in the whole philosophy of banks and bankers during the past few hundred years. All of us can remember from reading history that during the eighteenth century the world's great banking fortunes often were used to overthrow governments, manipulate currencies without regard for public good, and sometimes even to start wars.

But all that is changed today. Today you men, and the investors you so capably represent, are bending all your efforts toward building a better and a more orderly society. You and the customers of your institutions expect to make steady and reasonable profits, as indeed you must do in order to keep up the constant flow of investment capital which has made the American standard of living the highest in the history of time.

And I think you will agree with me that you and all other financiers worthy of the name have long since discovered that capital is safer and that it will produce more consistent returns when it is used to build, as it is being used today, than when it was often used to destroy in the instance I mentioned a moment ago.

That is what we are talking about tonight. We are interested in building Florida. You are interested in finding safe and lucrative fields for investment of your institutions' money and that of those clients who come to you for financial advice. We propose to show you that you have the answer to our problem and we certainly have the answer to yours. We think that we can convince you that Florida, Unlimited, is not just a blue-chip security; it's a gold-chip investment the like of which you won't find anywhere else in the world.

When I first started thinking about a topic for my brief remarks tonight, I happened to recall an incident in one of the late Will Rogers' old pictures. Will was talking to a typical rural banker, and he asked him:

"Squire, how do you go about deciding whether to give a fellow a loan when he comes to the bank and applies for one?"

"Well," the squire answered, "I go a looooong, looooong way on character. But I go a whole lot farther on collateral. And when a man has got both character and collateral, I give him nearly half of what he asks for."

Now my good friend, McGregor Smith, has told you something about Florida's collateral—our natural climate and some of the other advantages that result from this inexhaustible resource.

The collateral he has talked to you about are advantages which can be proven statistically. But we have other attractions for new business and industry which, while perhaps less tangible, are nonetheless just as important to potential investors. For want of a better term, and in line with that Will Rogers story I just mentioned, we might sum up these advantages under the word "character."

One of these character attributes which we consider especially important to investment capital is our warm and friendly governmental and tax climate. That friendly climate makes it certain that your money and that of your customers will be safe in Florida—safe both from excessive taxation and from the punitive laws that sometimes are passed against business and industry in other areas.

In the first place, I think you ought to know that Florida's system of government is unique in the United States. More nearly than any other State, it is patterned along the lines of a large corporation, with the Governor serving as chairman of the board and the six elected cabinet members serving as the board of directors.

The Governor, like the chairman of the board, naturally has considerable authority and influence. But the Governor can no more seize control of Florida than the board chairman can seize control of a big corporation to the detriment of its stockholders.

The cabinet system is one of the big reasons that Florida always is assured of orderly, stable government. The Governor and the cabinet make up the cabinet budget commission, and not 1 cent of State funds can be spent without the commission's consent and approval.

Thus, if the State legislature were to make an unwise or extravagant appropriation, Florida's taxpayers have no need to worry. The board of directors—the cabinet budget commission—would simply refuse to release the money.

Our six cabinet members—the secretary of State, the commissioner of agriculture, the superintendent of public instruction, the treasurer, the comptroller, and the attorney general—are elected to 4-year terms, and each must face the voters at the end of his term. I think it is a pretty good recommendation for the cabinet system when I tell you that only two cabinet members have been defeated for reelection in the last 30 years. During that time, no more than one cabinet member has been defeated in the same election.

That means, in substance, that for more than 30 years we have had at least five experienced men on that seven-man board of directors which controls the purse strings of the State Treasury. They have not been the same men, of course, since some have died in office or voluntarily retired because of age. But history shows that we have never had the wholesale shakeups in our Government which sometimes have produced chaotic conditions in other States. As a practical matter, this would be impossible as long as the cabinet system continues, and the voters of Florida certainly have shown no inclination to change it.

The Governor of Florida cannot succeed himself. Hence, he has little personal reason to build up a political machine at taxpayer expense. The holdover directors, or cabinet members, are there to provide the experience and the mature governmental judgment which is essential to stable and orderly government. And the new board chairman, having been freshly elected by the voters or stockholders direct from private life, is there to provide a fresh viewpoint on State government and what it should do.

I should mention in passing that neither the Governor nor any member of the cabinet ever runs as part of any ticket or slate. In fact, politicians in Florida do everything they can to keep their own races completely separate from those of candidates seeking other offices. This makes every cabinet member completely independent, not only of the Governor but of his fellow cabinet members as well, so far as political obligations are concerned. This unique system assures that governmental decisions in Florida cannot be dictated by any one man, no matter how capable or popular he may be. Instead, major decisions are made as the result of the considered, balanced judgments of the cabinet board of directors.

And Florida's judiciary is equally sound and equally independent. Because of that unique cabinet system, it would be impossible for any chief executive ever to dominate our supreme court, even if he wanted to try it. We have had a consistently fair, impartial, and independent supreme court, and our people have confidence in it. As a matter of fact, the public has so much confidence in it that only one supreme court justice has been defeated for reelection since the adoption of Florida's present constitution in 1885.

Yes, my friends, I think these facts speak for the stability of Florida's system of government. It is capable of change to meet changing conditions, but there are plenty of iron-clad checks against any sudden upheavals that sometimes take place in other States as a result of momentary hysteria.

But if we need further proof of the fact that Florida has an orderly government which looks kindly upon new business and industry, let's look for a moment at the third branch of government—the State legislature. Florida's House of Representatives has 95 members, and the Senate has 38, making a total of 133.

And it is quite significant, from the standpoint of potential investors, that businessmen have a heavier representation in the legislature than any other occupation or profession.

When I speak of businessmen, I mean virtually everybody except those engaged in such professions as law and medicine. Just about everybody else is a businessman in the sense that he operates an enterprise in which other people work for him, and he has the problem of meeting a weekly or monthly payroll.

Well, in the Florida Legislature of 1949 we had 51 lawyers. Naturally you'd expect the lawyers to be in there at the public trough in pretty heavy numbers, but in Florida's case they can't outvote the businessmen, because we had 82 members who could be placed in that category. I think you might be interested to know that of those 82, 10 were farmers, 6 were cattle ranchers, 4 were newspaper publishers, and 4 were bankers.

I want to say also that from working closely with the members of the 1949 session of the legislature, I can tell you there was not a single member who could by the wildest stretch of the imagination be classed as a radical.

Another characteristic of the Florida Legislature, year in and year out, has been its complete independence from domination by anybody. No governor, and we have had some pretty strong ones, has ever been able to bull whip a Florida Legislature into following him blindly. In my own case, while I found the legislature reasonable and willing to listen to suggestions, it was necessary to convince the members of the genuine merits of every proposal I made before that proposal would be written into law.

However, if any doubt remains that Florida's government is run along stable and businesslike lines, we have only to look at the number of bankers who are participating actively in it.

For example, our State road board, which has the greatest financial responsibility of any department under the direct jurisdiction of the Governor, has five members. Of these five, four are active bankers.

The State board of control, which supervizes the University of Florida, Florida State University, and Florida A. and M. College, and administers a $57,000,000 biennial budget, has five members, and three are bankers of outstanding ability.

The State improvement commission, which has a broad range of activities but which is most widely known as a public-works and financing agency, has five members, and of these four are men with considerable banking background and experience.

Incidentally, I hope you won't think me immodest if I mention that I was one of the organizers of the Riverside Bank at Jacksonville, a thriving suburban institution, and that I still am a director of it.

So you see, we down in Florida have certainly changed our opinions about the banking fraternity in the last 100 or so years. When the 1845 Florida Constitution was written, bankers apparently were in pretty bad repute—in fact, they seemed to stand then a few notches below horse thieves. The constitution at that time specifically prohibited any president, director, cashier or any other officer of a bank from serving as governor or even as a member of the legislature.

But we've learned better since then. We've learned to appreciate the sterling worth of the profession you gentlemen represent in

such distinguished fashion. I hope none of you will get the ridiculous idea that our opinion of bankers started changing as soon as we began to realize that we needed outside capital to develop Florida.

But while Florida's government is inherently stable and is protected by its system against sudden upheavals and against any form of one-man control, there is nothing in our constitution or our statutes to prevent the State from making steady progress forward along sound lines. In other words, our system prevents excesses and abuses, but does not keep us from moving ahead toward Florida's great destiny.

Let us take the question of cattle on the highways as an example. After a fight which lasted many years, the progressive elements in the 1949 session of the Florida Legislature passed, on my recommendation, a law which will remove cattle from the highways of our State. I say that when a State passes such a law so that the lives of motorists will be safe and so that stockmen will be able to improve their herds, that State is on the highway to progress. For a long time, Florida has been coming out of the backwoods stage of its development, and the cattle fencing law definitely establishes us as one of the more progressive States in the entire South.

No, the State of Florida is not just sitting back and resting on its oars. Instead, we are constantly moving forward and making our State a better and better place in which to live, work, play and invest money.

Just as an example, we have in less than 2 years raised the standing of Florida's public schools, in the amount of money spent per pupil, from thirty-fifth to twenty-ninth place among the 48 States.

We have enriched the once poverty-stricken citrus industry by legislation requiring citrus fruits to pass a taste test before they can be shipped to consumers in either fresh or processed form.

Another sign of the progress Florida is making is the determined effort that is being carried forward to not only conserve our vast natural resources but to replenish them. In a period of a few months, for instance, we have planted more than 28,000,000 pine seedlings as part of the foundation for a great deal of money to be made in the future from forestry products.

Of course, one of Florida's biggest assets for new business and industry is that it is a pleasant, healthful place for both workers and managers to live. But we are not content with such God-given blessings as our climate and our matchless fishing and other recreational opportunities.

In the field of sanitation, for example, Florida is one of the most progressive States in the Nation in requiring high standards for restaurants, hotels, and other establishments serving the general public. We have a strong tuberculosis program and we are forging ahead rapidly in all phases of public health work.

We have two fine State institutions of higher learning and a number of other excellent universities and colleges. This fact is important to the prospective investor—it means that skilled and expert workers will be available to help run any type of plant or factory or business you can name.

We have something else in Florida which I believe is virtually unique in the United States and perhaps in the world—that is a great many cities and towns where property taxes are going down instead of up. The thriving community of Mount Dora, for example, has just reduced property taxes for the fourth year in succession, and I don't believe you can show many towns anywhere outside Florida which can make that statement.

There are two reasons why Florida's counties and its cities and towns are in sound and solvent financial shape today and why their already strong financial positions are constantly improving.

One is that the staggering debts incurred during the boom of the middle twenties—you fellows heard about that boom, didn't you?—are steadily being paid off. Some counties and cities have paid out completely, while for others the end is in sight within a few short years. Naturally, this lightens the tax load many Florida political subdivisions have had to carry. The fact that the over-all debt total has been so sharply reduced naturally makes it easier for those which still owe money to refinance on much more favorable terms.

A second reason why property taxpayers in Florida cities are getting a break is that the 1949 Florida Legislature diverted to each municipality all the cigarette tax collected within its corporate limits. But the legislature was careful to see that the money thus diverted from the State treasury was not dissipated or squandered. As a condition of getting the cigarette tax money, each municipality has to guaranty to apply at least half of it on the reduction of property taxes. Consequently, all over Florida today municipal property taxes are going down instead of up—a trend a lot of us would like to see copied elsewhere.

As for the credit of the State government, it couldn't be better for the simple reason we aren't allowed to use it at all. The State constitution strictly prohibits the State government from issuing bonds, so that puts us on a pay-as-you-go basis, whether we like it or not. However, when we realize that a single extravagant administration can plunge a State hopelessly into debt most of us are happy that we have that ironclad prohibition against issuing State bonds. That prohibition also means that if a manufacturer decides to locate a plant in Florida he can be assured from the beginning that he won't be taxed for some State improvement which has long since become worn out or obsolete.

There are some other features of the Florida Constitution which help make the State attractive from the standpoint of new business and industry. As a matter of fact, if that document had been drawn at the corner of Broad and Wall Streets it couldn't be any more airtight in its provisions protecting both outside investors and Florida residents from confiscatory or excessive taxation.

The constitution absolutely prohibits any form of State income tax. Some of you fellows may think that present Federal income taxes are reasonable and moderate, but the citizens of Florida don't feel that way. They feel that when Uncle Sam gets through with you on income taxes, you've just about had it. So our constitution guarantees that if you live in Florida and can keep the Federal Internal Revenue Department happy, you've done enough in this respect and we won't bother you with a State income tax superimposed on the Federal levy.

That provides an additional incentive for more people to go to Florida. You can go down there and make money from an industry or business, and the beautiful part of it is that we'll actually let you keep some of it—all that Uncle Sam doesn't need, that is.

The same thing is true of the inheritance tax. Florida has no duplicating inheritance tax, and the constitution prohibits us from ever having one. Oh, sure, we accept that kickback from the Federal Government, but that tax is levied anyway and the only difference is that instead of keeping it all the Federal Government gives us back some.

In other words, gentlemen, we offer a double-barreled reason for moving to Florida. You can be assured of living a whole lot longer down there, and during those bonus years you can have the satisfaction of knowing that when you finally do leave that paradise for another, your estate won't be riddled by another inheritance tax on top of the one levied by the Federal Government.

And Florida's constitution also prohibits the State from levying any property tax. You can build a factory or a new business in Florida and be perfectly sure that the State won't take it away from you through excessive or confiscatory property taxes.

We in Florida want new businesses and new industries, and we believe in making them welcome with actions rather than just words. We're extending some material considerations to go along with our warm and friendly handclasp of welcome.

But before I close these remarks, I certainly want to mention Florida's greatest asset from the standpoint of a character reference. That asset is Florida's people.

Our people are progressive, but they will never be deluded into following any kind of radical movement. This is true today and you can be sure it will be even truer tomorrow because of the type of citizens who are moving into Florida in increasing thousands every year. I refer to persons who have retired on insurance annuities or pensions from industry in other States. They have fixed incomes, mature judgment, and sound common sense. Today, and even more in the future, they will be a solid anchor which will keep the ship of state from being swept on the rocks of extravagance by the winds of momentary hysteria.

As a matter of fact, many of these new residents are transplanted Republicans. But we welcome them just the same, try to convert them to the true faith, and treat them with every possible consideration. In some cases we even intermarry with them.

So you see, gentlemen, Florida today offers the investment all of us dream about—opportunity for a good rate of return combined with absolute security. If you have any doubt of this, I invite each of you to come down to Florida and look over the situation for yourselves. I am sure you will find Florida has so much collateral and so much character you'll want to go all the way, not just half, with us. Thank you and good night.

"Hurray—But" Behavior Is Politics More Than Usual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of our House Committee on Education and Labor, and as the chairman of a subcommittee of that committee, I have devoted, together with many of my distinguished, hard-working fellow-members, many months of intense effort toward producing acceptable legislation which would help solve the crying need for financial assistance to many school districts throughout the country which today are suffering the burdensome impact of Federal activities in their areas.

Those months of labor had gone unheralded and virtually unnoticed until just a few short weeks ago when our committee finally reported its finished product to this floor in the form of House bill 7940. But on that day all those months of detailed and time-consuming work were more than amply rewarded by the very gratifying unanimity with which this proposed legislation was accepted by this body. And the crowning glory was the deep satisfaction that came with the overwhelming adoption of that bill by a voice vote.

Since that day our committee has continued without let-up the work begun just as many months ago on the construction phase of the same educational problem. And despite the unfortunate cataclysmic interruption of the Korean outbreak I and the other members of our committee have tried to pursue the remainder of this problem which so seriously threatens the fundamental education of hundreds of thousands of children throughout the United States.

But despite my every effort to concentrate on concluding these many months of legislative endeavor, I find the Korean conflict jutting into my thinking as I know it has into the minds and work of all of us. Yet not the conflict alone disturbs me, but, even more so the ominous rumblings which it seems to have generated in our ranks.

For although it is to the credit of our democratic institution that the opinion not only of every segment of the public but of the public representatives could so quickly and spontaneously congeal in full support of the President's historic Korean decision, it is indeed sad and disgraceful to note how quickly we here have reverted to the most crass and degenerate level of not "politics as usual" but "politics more than usual."

If those valiant sons who today have the bloody burden of carrying out our Korean decision were to have disintegrated so quickly as did the momentarily glorious unanimity of this Congress, we today would not be trying to hold Korea; we would be trying to get it back.

I suppose that it is to be expected that some shall criticize no matter what. That is what I suppose is meant by "politics as usual." And there is no doubt in my mind that those critics speak out of a belief in their utterances. But to have sunk to the low level of name calling and degenerate brick throwing, which I have heard and read to emanate from these halls in recent days, is not even "politics as usual." It is treasonous aid and comfort to the enemy which must surely put even the viciousness of Pravda to shame.

I refer to the unmitigated slurs and cheapest form of scathing, juvenile scurrility directed at a member of the Cabinet of these United States, our Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Louis A. Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, at what I have heard and read coming from some of my distinguished colleagues in recent days, I simply had to address myself.

Never in my years in Congress have I seen the dignity of this body so shabbily treated as by those esteemed Members who have risen in these time-honored chambers to utter remarks which we would not tolerate even in the sanctity of our private homes. I certainly do not wish to be accused of becoming a party to such regrettable behavior by the nature of my own reply, and so I shall contain myself—great though the effort be—and restrict myself rather to the facts. For in no greater instance do the facts speak louder than all the sticks and stones than in the case history of Louis Johnson.

I want to recall at this moment Secretary Johnson's own statement in his annual report for the fiscal year 1949, for I believe that it expresses the real feeling and attitude of our Main Street citizen toward the position which this country has traditionally sought to maintain. And I quote:

In our search for security, we face the fact that as a democracy we do not fight until attacked and therefore in time of peace can never be in a state of total readiness for war. The only nations that can be completely ready are those that deliberately plan war in secret and strike without warning, hoping to take their victims by surprise. We must rely on the best preparation we can devise during the precarious peace which exists today, so that our armed forces, if we should ever be attacked, would not be called upon suddenly to go into battle without proper training, but would have the advantage of effective weapons and equipment and would be able to retaliate with rapidity and force.

Under these circumstances, we are exerting our efforts to keep ourselves sufficiently strong to command the respect of all who might desire to disturb the peace. We have taken a firm stand against further international expansion at the expense of free peoples. We are striving to expurgate the evils and injustices which cause war, and to revive the hope, confidence, and normal way of life of friendly peoples all over the globe, and provide them with the means to safeguard their national integrity. It may take a long time and cost large sums to complete these tasks, but they are well worth the investment, because they have a direct bearing on our national security and on the preservation of world peace. When we appraise our national security, we must not think in narrow terms of this country alone.

We must give thought to what is going on in the rest of the world. We must consider our troops in the occupied areas overseas and our efforts to restore Germany and Japan to the status of self-supporting nations. We must ponder the plight of hungry and destitute human beings in strange and remote lands and what we can do to alleviate their distress and prevent them from becoming infected with the insidious and virulent ideological doctrines which prey on human misery. We must weigh our programs for the economic recovery of western Europe, and for military aid to our partners in the North Atlantic Pact and to Turkey, Greece, and other deserving nations which are living in fear of aggression. All these undertakings are closely allied to our national security. They are prime factors in our struggle for world peace, and their success demands that they have the backing of a strong Military Establishment.

Failure to keep our Armed Forces at a strength commensurate with our requirements and risks in carrying out these extensive responsibilities would jeopardize our very existence as a free and independent Nation and betray our hallowed heritage of the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness which we are striving to share with all mankind.

So spoke Louis Johnson even 6 months ago. And I defy any man, then or yes, even now, to take that statement of policy, those words of objective, to Mr. and Mrs. America and criticize. No true American can quarrel with that statement of principles. For therein lies the crux of the problem which perennially faces us as a democracy; how much shall go for guns, how much for bread and butter.

Some of those same professional critics who today are loudest in their abuse were just a few months and a few weeks ago shouting equally loudly for economy. Not because they did not believe at all in the achievement of certain goals, but more because they felt that it was better to have a little of everything and still have America than a lot of any one thing and no more United States. That, in plain, was likewise Secretary Johnson's objective: to have as many planes and guns and ships and tanks as would still permit us to have a healthy, balanced American economy.

And as I believe someone else recently stated, if we had been loaded in Korea but the outbreak had been elsewhere, the same critics would have screamed because we were not loaded elsewhere.

I personally have not agreed with Secretary of Defense Johnson on certain phases of his program. I voted for a restoration of the 70-group air force and I supported the appropriation bill necessary to provide added naval and marine air facilities. There can be, I hope, honest differences of opinion without resorting to abuse.

But permit me to go on with the facts.

Unification has actually become a reality under Secretary Johnson. He may have had to pound a few desks, issue some peremptory orders and bang a few heads, but the results are there.

About 100 obsolete and useless boards and committees of the National Military Establishment have been abolished under Johnson; joint use of office and storage space; transportation, communications and similar facilities and services have been consolidated. Procurement has been assigned to a single service wherever possible: the Navy buys the coffee; the Army Quartermaster gets the uniforms. Common procurement regulations, standard specifications and uniform contract forms for all three services have been and are being further developed. A common catalog system for the millions of items used by the three services; a central information center for small-business men seeking service contracts—these are facts, not epithets.

The Research and Development Board is coordinating over 13,000 research and development projects of all the armed forces.

The weapons systems evaluation group is filling the need for technical and operational evaluation of weapons on an interservice basis.

The joint long-range proving ground is a reality.

The Personnel Policy Board develops civilian and military personnel policies for the entire Department of Defense. And the Division of Medical Services has unified and is unifying the administration and operations of Army, Navy and Air Force medical services.

The Office of Civil Defense Planning has worked with the State and with communities in preparing an appropriate civil defense set-up, including plans for civilian participation in an aircraft observer system to supplement the radar screen and for establishment by the Department of the Air Force of an air raid warning system for the United States.

We in this very body have seen evidences of working unification in the coordinated, comprehensive legislative program submitted for the entire Department of Defense and in such items

as a single defense budget an integrated military construction program, a uniform code of military justice.

These are facts not brickbats.

The Air Navigation Development Board is devising a single basic system of air navigation and traffic control to serve civilian and military needs. The Navy and Air Force are using common navigation, bombardment, and target charts and instrument-approach procedures, and are cooperating in Arctic region mapping and charting studies.

For every slur against our Secretary of Defense I could give you a dozen facts to the contrary. Facts such as the Berlin Airlift, Operation Snowbound, Operation Hayride, and unified commands under the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Facts which show that insofar as the National Security Act derived its name from the purpose which it sought to achieve, Secretary Johnson has given full meaning to that name, to that act and to its purpose.

Our Army today, and I mean before Korea, had more men in combat units than it did a year ago. Our Navy before Korea was manned at nearly three-fourths of wartime strength with trained career personnel. And our Air Force has just been authorized, by legislation which preceded Korea, its highest statutory personnel basis. And with all this there was, during the last 6 months of last year, a net decrease of 2,000 officers and 63,000 enlisted men, including in the latter 43,000 1-year or 21-month enlistees or selective-service inductees.

As of just a few short months ago it was reliably reported that our Army was unquestionably the best peace Army the Nation has ever had; and our Navy without a doubt stronger than it had been previously. The development of our jet planes—whose recent critics should by latest Korean developments have now been effectively silenced—speaks for itself insofar as the state of our Air Force is concerned.

And just a few more facts for each of the slurs that have been hurled at our Defense Department and its able Secretary:

Last October the Defense and Military Committee of the North Atlantic Treaty Council held its first sessions in Washington. Louis Johnson chaired that session at which all the member nations agreed that first priority be given to completing the organizational structure and development of a strategic concept to resist armed attack by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid. This strategic concept for an integrated defense was approved at the Defense Committee's Paris meeting last December, still under the chairmanship of Secretary Johnson. After the completion of the North Atlantic Treaty plans, the Department of Defense assumed the lead in the military and munitions planning required to carry out the 12-power agreement. The Munitions Board which Louis Johnson established furnished the United States membership on the staff of the Military Production and Supply Board and became responsible for United States interests in the jointly prepared munitions program. The Research and Development Board, set up under Johnson, was assigned responsibility for the research and development aspects of foreign-aid programs.

This close interrelation between foreign and military policy demonstrates a new kind of American leadership which Louis Johnson has more than adequately provided. His record at statesmanship and accomplishment in the far-flung field of foreign affairs is further illustrated by the Defense Department's work in implementing the mutual defense assistance program. Immediately after enactment of the appropriations legislation for this program, military survey teams were dispatched to survey each country's needs. The proof of the value of these and other efforts has filled the Halls of this Congress in recent attestations to the effective accomplishments of the mutual defense assistance program to date.

In addition to all this, the Department of Defense has given vital assistance to Greece and Turkey. Our military missions assisted in the training and development of armed forces in Iran and the Philippines; yes, and in Korea where they did a magnificent job against overwhelming odds in those first critical moments of history's second sneak attack.

All these correlations of foreign and military policy, whose official symbol is the National Security Council—on which the Secretary of Defense is the sole regular defense representative—have become fully accepted by the American people as a part of our daily government. The close integration of our defense and other governmental activities in the development of the all-important field of United States foreign policy is today an essential factor in national security.

Louis Johnson has filled to overflowing the ever-expanding shoes of his responsibilities in this regard. He has in his every deed manifested a more than little regard for the proper balance between not only foreign and military policy but also between defense and other Government policies, through which balance alone can the United States position of world leadership, founded upon a sound economy and integrated operation, be maintained.

These then are the facts—not all by any means—but enough, I trust, to give the citizenry of our country and their sons who today are embattled in Korea, a true picture of our great Defense Secretary—a picture of forward and progressive leadership; of stalwart determination to achieve not only a balanced defense team but a balanced defense team within a balanced framework of government; a picture of a man whose tremendous capabilities and great vision gave us more peacetime defense developments than our country has ever before had in all its history.

Why then the slings and arrows? Do they emanate from some honorable Member whose district might have lost a military installation by the well-conceived and well-intentioned defense economies?

If this alone were the cause, I would gladly be among the first, though howsoever reluctantly, to mark it down to politics-as-usual.

Are the brickbats because we did not have an armed camp precisely in Korea at precisely the right moment? Even this I might forgive, for no man, nor group of men, including our foremost and distinguished arm-chair strategists would look sillier loaded to the teeth in Korea if the Red bear chose to break out elsewhere. And even they must concede that if we were to maintain an armed camp at every potential trouble spot to which our position of world leadership commits us, we here at home would have guns for breakfast bullets for lunch and missiles for dinner. It is the sad but precarious liability of our democracy in these recent troubled years to have had to make a noise like a bear without living like a dog.

But when, in the face of this knowledge and in the face of a dim but foreseeable improvement of our precarious position in Korea, the scalp-hunters still beat their drums, then I say this can no longer be dismissed for politics as usual. Such reprehensible conduct can only be regarded as politics more than usual. It must be condemned by the American people as an attempted Operation Bootstrap by which the few try to lift themselves at the expense of the many.

I am proud to be able to say that I do not hear our military chiefs decrying. Their differences, such as they were in peacetime, are now subverted to the all-important task of a speedy victory. I am proud to say that no GI in Korea has been heard to shout "Hurray—but now I'll go back to my grousing as usual." Their leaders have given them their guns and stick by them they must. Our Commander in Chief has given us the facts and stick by them we must. Our fighting sons are made to feel that they can face the front without fear from attack in the rear. Our servants of defense deserve no less from us.

Address of Gen. William J. Donovan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gen. William J. Donovan on the occasion of the presentation to him of the Alexander Hamilton award by Columbia University at the Ritz Carlton Hotel, February 16, 1950:

The Soviet Union has completed the conquest of China and this has been given formal approval by the 30-year peace treaty.

Throughout the Far East this marks a defeat for the United States.

This victory now makes Russia the dominant power in Asia as well as in Europe.

There may be disagreement whether this breach of the former balance of power in Asia has already gone so far that it threatens our security. But there can be no difference of opinion that the balance of power on which formal peace depends will be hopelessly upset if the Russians carry out their projected

extension of the Chinese conquest to Indochina, Hong Kong, the Philippines, Siam, Malaya, Indonesia, and Burma. This was the path by which the Japanese before them got all the way to India.

I visited all these countries, except Burma and Korea, and also visited Japan. During my trip the Russians boldly announced that they were going to try for just such an extension of their continental conquest. They made that announcement by recognizing the Communist revolutionary parties as the Government of French Indochina. Within a week the Western Powers had to accept the challenge. The British, the French, and ourselves recognized the opposition government of Bao Dai. In Asia it is completely appreciated that the Russians have declared a subversive war on the rest of non-Communist Asia and ourselves. I wonder if the significance of that choosing up of sides has really come home to us here in the United States.

They want to be on our side if we're safe to be with—if we can be relied upon to stick with them when the going gets bad.

What is there we can do to justify their reliance upon us? What are the elements in that area that we can pull together for the sake of the people there as well as for our peace and security? As a line of departure I accept the statement of the Secretary of State that "It is hardly necessary for me to say that an attack on the Philippines could not and would not be tolerated by the United States but I hasten to add that no one perceives the imminence of any such attack." Let us see how, even at this late day, this defense could be accomplished.

Southeast Asia stretches from the subcontinent of India to the Australia subcontinent. In the center of this great south Asian triangle lie the spreading culture of southeast Asia—on the Indochinese Peninsula, on Burma, Siam, and Malaya: On the island arc at its base the archipelagoes of Indonesia and the Philippines.

Within this trangle live almost 600,000,000 people or about 25 percent of humanity.

The first thing we have to do is to recognize that the theater is one theater—Burma, India, Siam, Indochina, Manila, Malaya, Formosa, Korea, Japan.

That is all one in spite of the differences that lie between. That it is one in which victories won, time gained or material salvaged, in Indochina or Formosa may greatly help in an intelligent defense of the Philippines or in the reconstruction of Burma or Indonesia.

When we look at our map and wipe out of our minds the wartime artificial separation into theaters of operation, we see that the western Pacific is a strategic unit of which the Philippines are an integral part.

There is disorder to the point of chaos in Burma. Yet it is the bulwark before India and only speedy political and economic reform can save it from Soviet exploitation. In Indochina the Soviet has picked Ho Chi-Minh, to do there what they used Mao to do in China proper. In Malaya the British are contending against a campaign of ambush and assassination by the Malayan Communist Party.

Japan and its associated islands 1,600 miles from the Philippines give it protection from the north and Formosa almost halfway between must be denied to enemy occupation by National China until next June at least.

Indonesia is the master key for the defense of the Philippines because with Malaya it forms a protective shield against the south and that shield is given depth by Australia only 300 miles south of it. Strategically, southeast Asia is of more than local interest. Whoever controls the Strait of Malacca and Singapore dominates a sea route comparable in importance with the Panama Canal. Indonesia is an island gate between the Pacific and the Indian Oceans. In 1942 Japan took the islands and broke out of the Pacific to extend its operations as far west as Ceylon. The Indian Ocean may well be the warm-water target that Russia has always sought.

The American naval and air bases in the Philippines are only a thousand miles from Saigon in French Indochina.

Indonesia is the most important of the southeast Asian countries that have emerged from colonial status into nationhood. An archipelago stretching nearly 4,000 miles or one-seventh of the way around the earth and having some 750,000 square miles of land area, and a population of 75,000,000.

It is probably the most westernized of the Far Eastern countries. Its economic, financial, and even its transport system are based upon western models. It is even by modern standards rich in resources, and is fully able to repay any loans advanced to it for reconstruction and capital expenditures.

Its top leadership is anti-Communist by conviction. Although on lower levels there is needed experience in organization and administration, the Government in control is about the best that could be obtained. The 4 or 5 leading men are competent and honest. They seek United States technical advice both of an industrial and military nature. If we could meet this request for aid as well as counsel, our position would gain strength from the fact that for the last 2 years we have carried out a policy there, consistent, definite, and to a degree successful.

In addition our Ambassadors in the vital countries of India, Siam, and Indonesia are men of training, experience, and understanding. They already have the respect and friendship of those countries to which they are accredited.

There is general agreement among those whose opinion should be given weight that Russia has a program in southeast Asia and that the timetable for that program has been stepped up in an endeavor to take full advantage of the momentum from their speedy victories in China.

The urgency requires leadership now. It requires a leader—whether you call him a supreme commander or a high commissioner with the authority, the experience, and the ability to deal with political as well as military problems. He should be vested with the discretion to deal with those problems on the spot and should be located in the theater close enough to see it at first hand, yet not so close as to lose his perspective.

The cooperation of the British, the French, and the Dutch would be eagerly given and they know our leadership is needed. The establishment of such leadership would be welcomed by the people of the countries concerned and would allay their present fear that we would abandon them.

We must make clear to them that having picked our friends we will stay with them to the finish whatever the consequence.

We have a precedent for this action.

In June 1948 Russia, in the Berlin blockade, employed a menacing and dangerous tactic to test the will of the Western Allies and to stop the European recovery program at the outset.

General Clay met the challenge with boldness and resolution. The dramatic success of Operation Vittles which maintained Berlin's food supply despite the seizure of the city, caught the Soviets flat-footed with surprise.

General Clay saw that if the Soviets intended war—war could not be avoided by a retreat from Berlin. On the contrary, it would mean that we would be driven progressively to weaker positions. He saw, too, that if Russia was bluffing—that the moment had come to call the bluff or to surrender the initiative he had won.

The courageous and common-sense action of General Clay in that crisis, is a guide and an example for us all.

We have shown our great desire for peace with Russia and our willingness to settle differences. But we have learned that up to now at least agreement with the Russians is a hopeless illusion.

We now see that what happens in Berlin or in Peking has its repercussions in every area of the world where our country and the Soviet Union face each other. It is a war of subversion on a global scale—in which Russia is trying to whipsaw us from one side of the world to the other.

We must win now the war in which we find ourselves. It is a war which on many fronts Russia has been waging and winning.. A war that we can lose without a shot being fired. A war that if we win may make impossible a shooting war. We can neither buy our way out nor appease our way out. Our strength must be found in ourselves—in our decision and in our resolution.

Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, the President's message to Congress was remarkable in that it did not contain a single word about the all-important matter of civil defense of the United States. The lack of a comprehensive Nation-wide plan of civil defense in case of emergency is a disgrace.

The history of civil-defense planning in Washington is one of typical bureaucratic bungling, starts and stops, and all-around lack of intelligent action. Early this year the President abolished the wartime Office of Civil Defense Planning and transferred its duties to the National Security Resources Board. This new agency within the Resources Board came into being in January, but it is difficult to learn what it has accomplished to date. Plans have been made, exhaustive reports have been submitted, and then they have all been shelved. The Federal Government has failed to give mayors and other local officials the proper guidance on steps to cope with atomic explosions or any other form of enemy attack.

Mayors of cities throughout the country have complained bitterly of the fumbling operations of Federal agencies attempting to set up a civil-defense program. Papers, plans, and schemes have been shuffling back and forth from Washington to the municipalities, one report superseding another, creating confusion throughout the country. On top of that, the Federal Government has been pursuing a hush-hush policy toward the men responsible for local civil defense, which has made an intelligent and comprehensive defense plan impossible. One city has one plan, one city has another, and there is no coordination between the cities and States and Washington.

As a matter of fact, only 20 of the 48 States have any sort of legislation calling for the financing and implementation

of a real defense plan. This seems like a disgraceful lack of proper cooperation and direction from the Federal Government.

In contrast to the inept and stumbling civil-defense functions in Washington, the State of New York has set a fine example in preparing defense measures to meet possible emergencies. Governor Dewey has a most comprehensive and effective plan of civil-defense operation, which is being carried out under the direction of Gen. Lucius Clay. I call upon the proper Federal authorities in Washington to promptly get down to work and develop a workable key plan of civil defense which should be in keeping and in time with the other measures being planned by the Government in the present situation.

Military Support Requirements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, a month ago the Korean crisis broke into open warfare, and in the 30 days succeeding that outbreak it has become necessary to take inventory of our national defense potential. We have, before the Congress, proposals which will increase our military might to a strength deemed absolutely necessary, and proposals that will enable our industries to support our military needs.

In composing a balanced defense team, many elements must be brought together. We are increasing the ranks of Army, Navy, and Air Force. We will produce more aircraft, and heavy and light armament, more supplies, and material.

We will, for some months to come, increase our military strength in Korea. We will, necessarily, increase our military strength in other parts of the world, and must be ever alert to the outbreak of further conflict. Wherever we run up our flag, those men serving under it must receive supplies in quantities both timely and ample. I will address my remarks today to this element of supply, and am introducing a bill which proposes early action by the appropriate governmental agencies and by the Congress to assure a sufficient number of transports, cargo-vessels, and tankers for military support requirements.

The bill which I send to the desk directs the Secretary of Commerce, in conjunction with the Secretary of Defense, to survey American-flag vessels in operation and those in our reserve fleet and, within 90 days, to recommend to the Congress the construction of the minimum number of passenger and cargo vessels, in excess of those available, that will be needed for defense purposes in the foreseeable future.

This bill also directs the Secretary of Commerce to survey and repair 134 vessels now in our reserve fleet, which have been designated as auxiliary vessels, at a cost not to exceed $25,000,000. To facilitate the beginning of this most vital repair work, the bill authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Coorporation to advance $15,000,000 to get the work under way, which advance will be repaid from funds therein authorized. The bill proposes geographical distribution of construction and repair work to provide a nucleus of skilled labor in all our maritime areas, and it directs all construction and repair authorized thereunder to be effected in private shipyards.

In 1947 the President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine pointed out shortages then existing in our merchant fleet available for military support. In April 1948 the Secretary of the Navy, in testimony before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, stated that we were then 50 percent short of wartime troop-lift capacity, and that 171 tankers must be built by 1951 to meet our tanker-vessel needs in wartime. In a restricted memorandum dated March 22, 1949, the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended to the Secretary of Defense that an immediate program be instituted, on an annual basis, to bring 439 military auxiliary vessels in our reserve fleet into condition for defense support.

In the peak of World War II we had 1,300,000 persons employed in our shipyards. Appropriate authorities have recommended an absolute minimum of 60,000 peacetime employees as vital to preparedness, other authorities have placed this number as high as 100,000. Today, our shipyard employment totals about 33,000.

It is in the memory of all of us that we were fortunate in having, at the outbreak of World War II, a grace period in which to build and man our ship construction and repair yards. We cannot rely on that good fortune being repeated in the event of another war. Prudence requires that we undertake the minimum program to ready our fleet which is proposed in the bill I have today introduced. We have been forewarned, as I have heretofore stated, by those charged with meeting our defense obligations. I ask your early and earnest consideration of this important measure.

Inquiry Urged To Fix Military Responsibility Prior to Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of July 25, 1950:

INQUIRY URGED TO FIX MILITARY RESPONSIBILITY PRIOR TO KOREAN WAR—MACARTHUR RAISES ISSUE IN SAYING DEFENSE WAS A NEW MISSION

(By David Lawrence)

General MacArthur has completely disassociated himself from any responsibility for the defense of Korea prior to the aggression by the North Koreans.

This step is significant because it means that some day Congress will have to place the blame elsewhere for the failure of adequate United States forces to be in the far eastern area. The exact words of General MacArthur are to be found in a message telegraphed to President Truman last week. Mr. Truman made a brief reference to that message during his recent broadcast and the full text of the communication was subsequently made available.

Since the message itself was concerned primarily with Korean operations, the pertinent paragraph about responsibility for the unpreparedness of America in the Far East was generally overlooked. Here is what General MacArthur said:

"I do not believe that history records a comparable operation which excelled the speed and precision with which the Eighth Army, the Far East Air Force and the Seventh Fleet have been deployed to a distant land for immediate commitment to major operations. It merits highest commendation for the commanders, staffs, and units concerned and attests to their superior training and high state of readiness to meet any eventuality.

COMPLETELY NEW MISSION

"This finds added emphasis in the fact that the Far East Command, until the President's great pronouncement to support the epochal action of the United Nations, had no slightest responsibility for the defense of the free Republic of Korea. With the President's decision, it assumed a completely new and added mission."

The foregoing second paragraph quoted could not have been inserted by the general without purpose. Possibly it was to refute the bitter attack which was made on General MacArthur by a former Cabinet officer of the Roosevelt administration, writing recently in the New Republic.

But, whatever the reason, General MacArthur's statement opens up new avenues of discussion. For if the far-eastern command wasn't responsible for military contingencies that might arise in Korea, who was responsible? Was it the Navy or the Army or Air Force or the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington?

COMPLICATED PROCEDURE NOW

There was a time when, weeks ahead of a crisis—the moment the newspapers began making mention of any possible trouble in areas where American interests were not far away—the Secretary of the Navy would walk over to the Secretary of State and ask if there would be any objection to sending a cruiser or a battleship to patrol somewhere near the area where there might be danger of friction.

Usually the Secretary of State would say he had no objection provided the ships didn't get too close to cause any speculation as to the reason for their presence. So the Secretary of the Navy would station ships 2 or 3 days' sailing distance away—but they would be handy. Today a carrier task force or two is the equivalent of the cruiser or battleship of yesteryears.

Nowadays, however, under unification, the procedure is far more complicated and clumsy. The Secretary of the Navy doesn't go direct to the Secretary of State at all. He has to lay such a matter before the Joint Chiefs of Staff. After they find out how much money the Secretary of Defense will allot to them, the Chiefs have to decide what ships the Navy shall or shall not have in commission.

The matter of what areas shall or shall not be defended has to go before the National Security Council which meets rarely. It takes a persistent Secretary of the Navy to get anywhere. By this time, the whole problem can be lost in a maze of red tape and complex unification machinery. In this instance, nothing at all was done. Everybody's business was evidently nobody's business.

INQUIRY NEEDED FOR ANSWER

Inasmuch as the Air Force enthusiasts promised that all wars would start a certain way—namely by atomic-bomb attacks, with B-36's knocking out the enemy in a few days—the Navy wasn't permitted to have carrier task forces to patrol troubled areas in the Far East even if it had a Secretary of the Navy who wanted to keep such forces or a division of marines stationed near the danger zones in the Pacific.

The question of why adequate naval forces and marines to handle a mission in Korea were not on hand, either in the Philippines or at bases in Okinawa or even in waters near Japan, is one that should soon be answered by a nonpartisan board of inquiry. Such an investigation is essential if America is to develop a system of command—civilian and military—which will be prepared for contingencies that can arise in fulfilling the new American responsibility of policing the seven seas.

Either new legislation or a sharper delineation of responsibility for command areas is needed to protect American interests against sudden outbreaks of aggression.

Sgt. Keith P. Rigney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DIXIE GILMER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. GILMER. Mr. Speaker, on July 14, while serving with the Twenty-fourth Infantry Division, in the Korean conflict, Sgt. Keith P. Rigney, 26 years old, was killed in action in the service of his country. He was the only son of Mrs. Nellie Richter, 3949 East Admiral Place, Tulsa, Okla., and was the first reported casualty of the Korean engagement from Oklahoma's First Congressional District.

Word of his death came 11 days after Mrs. Richter received a letter from her son, saying he was being sent to the battle area from Japan, and just 1 year to the day after he left the United States for the Far East.

He was one of the brave and gallant group who helped to fight an heroic rear guard action against odds which were most prohibitive. Sergeant Rigney was a World War II veteran who reenlisted 18 months ago, intending to make a career of service in the Army. At that time, he was majoring in mathematics at Tulsa University, where he was a member of Kappa Alpha Social Fraternity.

Sergeant Rigney was educated in the public schools of Muskogee, Okla., and was an all-State football end on the Muskogee Central High School in the early 1940's.

Upon his graduation from high school, he received scholarship bids to several of the country's leading universities. He attended the University of Oklahoma for 2 years before entering World War II in 1942, where he served with a field artillery unit attached to the Ninty-fifth Division. He was in the European theater, and was a member of the late Gen. George S. Patton's Third Army. During this service he received a citation for valor. This gallant patriot has made the supreme contribution to the welfare of his country. Mrs. Nellie Richter has made a sacrifice of equal measure. She has given her only son, and has become one of those sad but incredibly brave American mothers, who, through the years, have been likewise bereaved when our country was at war.

Certainly, these are desperate and uncertain days. Days when our very national existence may be in jeopardy. Assuredly, those of us who might be tempted to succumb to the evil of panic buying, or to the greedy and selfish pursuit of hoarding, might well give heed to the example set by Mrs. Nellie Richter, and by Sgt. Keith P. Rigney, her hero son.

McCarthyism Confounded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to preserve for the record the expression of the able and usually temperate Marquis Childs.

It is evident that he is convinced by his study of the Tydings report that the unjust and unfounded charges leveled against the State Department and its more than 20,000 loyal employees by Senator MCCARTHY, as stated in the report, resulted in the demoralization of the entire Department. This distinguished columnist gives vent to his feelings as he relegates these charges to the proper place. He does not mince words. His language is clear and understandable. It is plain that his feelings are in line with that of a score of other fair and well-informed observers who have expressed themselves in accord with the Tydings report, and who have condemned the tactics and the political objectives of the Republican Party.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his article from the Washington Post of July 25, 1950, as follows:

MCCARTHYISM CONFOUNDED

(By Marquis Childs)

REAL THREAT MISSED

The McCarthy affair has ended as it began—in the mire of politics. The hope is that it may now be consigned once and for all to the garbage heap of history where it belongs.

But that is probably a vain hope. With varying degrees of enthusiasm, the Republicans in the Senate are now on record as a party in defense of the party position of McCarthyism. This will enable the Jenners, the Wherrys, and the Malones to campaign on the lowest levels of sex perversion and communism with the seeming sanction of a great political party.

What a strange sound debate on McCarthyism has had. (If, indeed, it could be called a debate.) This Nation is in such mortal peril as even the blindest should now perceive.

On the near horizon the baleful light of imminent danger throws the whole scene into sharp and unexpected relief. It is a pitiless light that exposes what must seem to any rational observer a kind of lunatic dance on the ramparts.

It was probably too much to expect of human nature that Senator TYDINGS should have taken for nearly 6 months the abuse and the attacks heaped on him, as chairman of the investigating subcommittee, without answering back. Even many of the opposition concede privately that his answer was a masterpiece of analysis and denunciation.

He might have rested on the report of the majority of the subcommittee. He might have said that in view of the times it was not his intention to inflame and exacerbate the political quarrel that has grown up out of MCCARTHY'S reckless and unfounded accusations.

The report seems to me, in its thoroughness and its documentation from testimony, a convincing statement. Repeatedly, MCCARTHY'S charges are set out and repeatedly the absence of even the slightest proof is shown.

Even Senator LODGE for the minority concedes that in the case of Owen Lattimore, on which MCCARTHY declared all his charges would stand or fall, nothing was proved. Staking out a curious position somewhere between the Democrats and the Wherry wing of the GOP, LODGE says the investigation was incomplete. He is in favor of a commission to be named by Congress to go into the whole business more thoroughly than a committee of Senators could possibly do.

The Lattimore case illustrates the essential unreality of the McCarthy affair insofar as any vital American interest is concerned. MCCARTHY charged that Lattimore was the "architect" of American foreign policy in the Far East.

Events have helped to prove this absurd. Lattimore was not in favor of committing American strength behind the Government of South Korea. In his book, Situation in Asia, published nearly a year and a half ago, he calls the turn on the weakness of South Korea and the preponderant military strength of North Korea. If Lattimore had in fact been the architect of far eastern policy, the course followed in Korea would undoubtedly have been different.

Its unreality, its irrelevance to the peril of this hour, may well be the most frightening aspect of McCarthyism and its political aftermath. There is reason to believe that a real danger of Communist sabotage exists.

In its most threatening aspect it would be directed against what is the only real shield to the security of the west—the Strategic Air Command. If the planes intended to carry the atomic bomb to an enemy, or their bases, were effectively sabotaged immediately before the outbreak of a global war, America's power to retaliate would be crippled.

That kind of threat implies the most thorough and hard-boiled advance preparation for an underground of skilled and highly trained agents willing to go any lengths to carry out their assigned mission. Such agents will not be caught nor such a plot uncovered, in a crowded congressional hearing room before the television and the newsreel cameras. It can be balked only by equal skills such as we believe we have in the FBI, counterintelligence of Army and Navy, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

There were in 1946 and 1947 some bad security risks in the State Department who were for the most part misfits in other ways, too. They were removed. That is the past. When will we learn that to quarrel among ourselves over the mistakes and the blunders of the past is the surest way to guarantee that we will lose the future?

Shall We Scuttle the Marines?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, recently, in a considerable number of newspapers published throughout the country, there appeared a series of articles relative to the Marine Corps which I feel are of timely interest and special importance. In view of the outstanding record of the Marine Corps during the last war, its neglectful treatment during the postwar years, and the sudden discovery by the Defense Department of the strategic military value of an effective military service such as the Marine Corps has displayed they are capable of performing, I commend these articles to your attention:

SHALL WE SCUTTLE THE MARINES?

(By E. F. Tompkins)

I. THE ECLIPSE OF THE CORPS

At the outbreak of Korean hostilities, this country's armed services were deployed in many parts of the world.

General MacArthur commanded 160,000 troops in Japan.

We maintained small occupation armies in Germany, in Austria, and on the Adriatic.

The Air Force had bombers in Great Britain, fighter planes at Wiesbaden on the Rhine, and a base in north Africa.

The Navy had Asiatic and Mediterranean Fleets.

Never before in a period of technical world peace, did we have so many land garrisons and sea and air detachments stationed abroad in a posture for war—stationed in danger areas where alert attention was essential and warlike moves impended.

But a familiar element was lacking.

Even a cursory survey of our foreign placements invited the question: Where are the United States marines?

The answer was, on June 25, 1950, the marines were here at home—all 71,000 of them, except a few on temporary naval assignments.

Consequently, in the Korean emergency marines had to be transported across the Pacific to support General MacArthur.

And the fact that marines were ready to go to Asia proved anew the indispensability of the corps in our national defense.

But the marines were not being confined to drill yards because the marines wanted it so.

They were detained and their ranks had been much reduced because military policy, under the National Defense Act, apparently sought to abolish the Marine Corps.

For not only were there no marines on shore duty overseas—the Commandant of the Marine Corps had been debarred from the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Thus the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force no longer had the expert consultation, as they no longer had the field collaboration, of the most versatile section of our Defense Establishment.

Yet the Marine Corps unquestionably belongs in our organization, both afloat and ashore.

Marine training, as well as marine tradition, admirably equips marine regiments for occupation tasks at such outposts as Trieste.

In large-scale hostilities, marine companies are best adapted to lead amphibious actions, as the marines proved in the Pacific war.

And when it comes to plans and operations, only the marines can provide seasoned officers who combine both Army and Navy education and experience with their own specialty.

For the purpose of improving our military councils and preserving a martial institution that brought luster to our annals for 175 years, Representative VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, has introduced a bill (H. R. 7580) to amend the National Defense Act.

This bill deserves attention.

II. WHY WE NEED THE MARINES

It required the Korean incident to reveal the fact that on June 25, 1950, for the first time in our history the United States had armed garrisons or occupation forces abroad with no marines among them.

This was a complete reversal of a sound and venerable policy.

In the old days, when armies and navies were relatively small, it was the Marine Corps which made foreign landings to protect American interests, besides providing naval police on the seas.

In the First World War the marines went ashore with the Army in France, fighting at Chateau Thierry and Belleau Woods.

In the late war, the marines—as masters of amphibious actions—preceded the Army at Guadalcanal and captured many of the Pacific islands that became advanced positions for our land-based air power.

At present, Soviet imperialism has made a large Army and Navy, and an unprecedented Air Force, American necessities.

Amidst these immense mobilizations, the Marine Corps looks numerically unimportant, and there has been a tendency to suspect that its usefulness is over.

In fact, however, when Soviet imperialism is destroyed—as destroyed it must be—our vastly extended Army, Navy, and Air Force will be constricted to a rational peacetime basis.

In that better day, we shall again want the marines as an elite, mobile agency to help keep order in the world—not forgetting that the marines will also have their special role in another war.

There are other reasons, growing out of its origin, for retaining and not impairing the Marine Corps.

By a somewhat common error, the marines are often regarded as merely a part of the Navy.

But the marines were never that.

The Marine Corps was separately created by Congress in 1798 and made subject to the President's orders.

Subsequently, in the departmentization of Government, the marines became part of the Naval Establishment under the Secretary of the Navy and the President.

Marines on ship duty are under naval discipline; but the Marine Corps is not commanded by the Navy.

The Marine Corps has its own commandant, whose rank and title are equivalent to those of an Army general.

And, subject to Presidential directions, marines are assigned to shore duties in which the Navy does not partake.

A descriptive statement says:

"Marines many times during the last century and again during World War I have acted as couriers for the State Department and on two conspicuous occasions have been called upon to aid the Post Office Department in guarding the mails.

"The President's assignment of marines to United Nations' truce teams is another example of this type of employment."

As a separate service, a specialized service, and a select service, the Marine Corps should have a place in our defense organization.

Equally, the Marine Corps—while executing its nonmilitary duties—should have a voice in our defense planning.

Representative VINSON'S bill (H. R. 7580) would assure these objectives.

III. MARINE CORPS LEADERSHIP

From 1940 until 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt consulted three military advisers—Gen. George C. Marshall, Army Chief of Staff; Admiral Harold R. Stark, Chief of Naval Operations; and Maj. Gen. Thomas C. Holcomb, Commandant of the Marine Corps.

America's basic strategy for World War II was formulated by this group.

In 1942, when the Joint Chiefs of Staff was organized, Admiral Ernest J. King, as Chief of Naval Operations, had the Marine Commandant excluded from strategic planning at the highest level.

In 1943, General Holcomb retired as Marine Commandant.

President Roosevelt proposed him for the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Chief of Naval Operations again objected; and General Holcomb was sent to South Africa as United State Minister.

When the existing Joint Chiefs of Staff was created under the National Defense Act of 1947, the Chief of Staff of the new Air Force was seated with the Army Chief of Staff and the Chief of Naval Operations.

Exclusion of the marines from the top echelon of planning deprives the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the widest training which any of the Armed Forces can provide.

Army officers are educated for Army duty.

Navy officers are developed for naval command.

Marine Corps officers attend professional schools and have combat or other experience in the other services as well as their own.

The Marine Corps has had 19 Commandants.

All except one had sea service as officers in the Navy.

Sixteen had battle experience with the Army.

The corps now has 44 generals.

Thirty-five of them have been graduated from Army, Navy, Air Force, or foreign military institutions of higher learning.

Actually, those 35 officers attended a total of 55 such institutions.

In brief, Marine Corps officers possess both the education and the training to qualify them for consulations in a unified national defense system.

But the other armed services do not provide the same diversity.

Thirteen officers have been members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff or its equivalent since 1941.

Only one, General Holcomb, the former Marine Commandant, was ever graduated from a professional school or had any combat duty outside his own service.

The truth is that, since General Holcomb was eliminated from the high councils by the Chief of Naval Operations, the Army influence has dominated the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

For the Air Force is a derivative of the Army.

And, as evidenced by cancellation of the Navy's projected supercarrier and the harsh cashiering of Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, the Navy itself has been subordinated.

"During most of my service as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff," Admiral Denfeld has written, "all my colleagues were career Army officers, graduates of West Point."

This imbalance tends to distort the essential purpose of unification, which is to utilize fully all the services.

IV. SNUBBING THE CORPS

Not only does the debarment of the Marine Corps Commandant from the Joint

Chiefs of Staff deprive our unified national defense of important counsel.

By a process of unofficial demobilization of the Corps, our armed forces may soon be deprived of their most mobile element in any field actions, especially those of an emergency nature.

A statement made available to the Vinson committee in Congress says:

"By means of mobilization planning a service can be denied effectual participation in defense of the country.

"The mobilization base may be so diminished by piecemeal employment of forces as to militate against further mobilization.

"Decisions on mobilization can deny a service effectual expansion in time of war and exclude it from effective action."

Under the current organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Marine Corps is being subjected to the described process of attrition.

In a formal statement to the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives on October 17, 1949, General Clifton B. Cates, the Marine Corps Commandant, notified Congress of the prevalent discrimination, which tends to eliminate the Marines entirely.

And evidently, such a design is in mind in the Army-controlled Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The statement before the Vinson committee says, with respect to joint training of the Armed Forces:

"The Marine Corps was practically excluded from the only major landing exercises of the past year, those made at Oahu and Vieques.

"This is the very field in which the Marine Corps has been granted primacy in landing force development matters.

"Surely such a policy is of major import to the Marine Corps and should receive the attention of the Commandant."

The same statement observes that mobilization and war plans involving a service should at least be "subject to the consideration" of its commander.

"However," the statement continues, "the Commandant has never been consulted on these war plans, and no marines are members of the committees formulating strategic plans for war."

In World War I, and also in the last war, marine exploits were an inspiration to the Nation.

"In every war engaged in by the United States," the statement to the Vinson committee says, "marines have served as a national force in readiness.

"In the most recent of these wars marines in far-flung areas were both first under attack and first to initiate offensive operations against the Japanese at Guadalcanal.

"They were also the first sent to insure the defense of Ireland prior to hostilities.

"In World War I the bulk of the Marine Corps served with the Army; in World War II they served as the landing spearhead for Pacific operations.

"In world war III they may serve in either, both, or a different capacity, but one fact is etched with clarity—the Marine Corps, because of its readiness to fight, will have a vital role in any future war."

V. THE VINSON BILL

When legislation to unify the Armed Forces appeared in Congress fear was expressed that the hateful Prussian General Staff system might be adopted.

Brig. Gen. Merritt Edson was the foremost spokesman of this view.

As a colonel in the Marine Corps, he had captured Henderson Airfield, winning the crucial action on Guadalcanal, for which he received promotion and the rarely awarded Congressional Medal.

Because of restrictive regulations, the distinguished officer felt compelled to resign his commission in order to express his expert opinion.

His warning went unheeded; and only now is there recognition that General Edson may have been right.

As now constituted, with the Marine Corps excluded, the Army prevails in the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Three of the four members are Army graduates, all without naval experience, and two with no aviation background.

The fourth member—the Chief of Naval Operations, has no Army training.

All are veteran commanders of high attainments.

But in the present set-up the Navy is a very minority factor.

On one hand, it is outnumbered in the old Army-Navy rivalry.

On the other hand, the Air Force is jealous of naval aviation.

The Vinson bill would provide a balance by making the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the only service that has triple training, one of the Joint Chiefs.

This would also assure the preservation of the Marines.

Under the Vinson plan the Marine Corps Commandant would be ineligible for the chairmanship of the board.

At the same time, it is considered that, under the present law, the chairmanship may permanently become any Army prerogative or monopoly.

And, in a semimilitarized nation, this might indeed produce the Prussian general-staff system.

Representative VINSON therefore proposes that the chairmanship shall rotate, for 2-year terms, among the commanders of the three major services: The Army Chief of Staff, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and the Chief of Naval Operations.

To the argument that the marines are part of the Navy Department and need no representation at all, the replies are made:

1. The Marine Corps is not subordinate to the Chief of Naval Operations and should speak for itself.

2. Marine Corps interests do not always coincide with Navy interests.

3. Orders affecting Marine Corps operations are now sometimes issued without consulting the Marine Commandant.

4. In general planning, Marine Corps experience and education would be helpful to the larger services, and would give us a better organized national defense.

In recent proceedings in Congress, as well as in the pages of history, the marines have had their accolades.

Testifying as Chief of Staff of the United States Army in 1947, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower said:

"There is real need for one service to be charged with bridging the gap between the sailor on the ship and the soldier on the land.

"This seems to me to be properly a function of the Marine Corps."

Comments by Howland H. Sargeant on Report on Fifth General Conference of UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter on a report on the Fifth General Conference of UNESCO. I think it deserves the attention and interest of Members of Congress, as well as the public, as an indication of this particular effort of the United Nations to build a permanent peace.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 13, 1950.

The enclosed informal report of the United States delegation to the Fifth General Conference of UNESCO is designed to give you quickly and briefly the highlights of the Florence meeting. It will not, of course, take the place of the detailed official report of the delegation, which can be issued only after thorough check of the documents and other necessary but time-consuming processes have been completed. I hope this informal report will give you in summary form a more orderly and comprehensive view of what was accomplished at Florence than has been available in accounts published up to now.

As I finished my final reading of the informal report, it seemed to me that there were certain points which I, as chairman of the United States delegation, would especially emphasize. Also, in a report which will necessarily be distributed beyond the membership of the National Commission, there are certain points omitted which I wish to comment on directly to you.

First of all, I am happy to emphasize the fact that the recommendations to which the United States National Commission had given greatest attention and on which highest priorities had been placed were in fact adopted by the Fifth General Conference. These included:

a. Development of a program to help the German people—and especially German youth—equip themselves to share democratic leadership in the free world, through expanded activities directed particularly toward youth groups, teachers and teacher training, and to social scientists.

b. Adoption of a plan to spread information about the universal declaration of human rights to as many nations as UNESCO can reach—and to advance the practical acceptance and observance of these rights.

c. Modification of UNESCO's basic program to provide for future concentration on fewer but more significant tasks directly related to UNESCO's central purpose of contributing to peace and security. Here I should say that, although the delegation was not as successful as we hoped to be in securing agreement on greater concentration of the program in 1951 by eliminating activities considered of less importance by the National Commission, I nevertheless agree with George Stoddard's appraisal that the General Conference unanimously emphasized the principle of concentration; wrote this principle into the revision of the Executive Board's basic program; gave a strong indication to the Executive Board that it should go much further along this line in the future; accepted, with budgetary responsibility, several concentrated large-scale tasks or projects; and pruned a fair number of miscellaneous items and eliminated a few.

The debates of the general conference, often heated and at times attaining genuine heights of eloquence, did more than in any previous sessions to bring home to all member states the necessity for accepting the political hazards of UNESCO's work. I may be over optimistic, but I personally felt that we were approaching a realistic common ground of agreement on UNESCO's role in making immediate contributions to the peace. I am certain that the General Conference took a more realistic view than before of the absolute need for member states to take up UNESCO's work at home and carry out the responsibilities each

member state accepted under UNESCO's Charter.

With all these accomplishments being largely on the plus side, I do not want to give you the impression that UNESCO does not have a long distance to go if it is to discharge its mission. Specifically, there are too few active national commissions among the member states. Too few delegations come well prepared to contribute to the substantive work of the Conference. Too few delegations come with leadership which is able on its return to the countries represented to influence significantly either the policy of the government or the attitude and active participation of the important private groups. Further, it is apparent that there is still a tremendous need for promoting accord and unity even among the so-called free or non-Communist countries who belong to UNESCO.

All these things point, in my judgment, to a continuing need for United States leadership. This means a tremendous responsibility for leadership by the United States National Commission. I think it requires further creative ideas and the development of a far greater appreciation in this country of the exact nature of UNESCO's problems. To mention two specific things that are required, I believe that we must broaden cultural interchange on all levels, particularly between the countries now providing leadership in the field of cultural relations and those lacking in this field; I also see that we in this country must provide concrete support for the expanded program in Germany, an area which I described in my talk before one of the opening plenary sessions at Florence as "an integral part of the great world problem—the problem of peace."

I cannot commend too highly the distinguished work of the United States delegation at Florence. With the National Commission members providing a strong nucleus of experience and continuity, the delegation, in fact, made its influence and leadership felt throughout the Conference. Equally important, the United States delegation was not only respected; it was liked for its sincerity, its honesty, and its willingness to entertain points of view other than its own.

Since my return to the United States I have found a few people who, shaken by some accounts they have read of the debates at Florence and of the resignation of the Director General, feel discouraged over UNESCO's future prospects. I would like to conclude this letter by repeating something I said in one of my last statements to the General Conference at Florence:

"UNESCO consists of 59 nations, and the peoples of those nations who believe that education, science, and culture are matters of vital importance, that ideas have changed the world time and again, and that ideas will continue to change the world. UNESCO has survived 5 years of skepticism and criticism and has steadily continued to evolve its own shape and its function in the world. I think that all of us who believe in UNESCO have known from the start that it was a long-range proposition. One generation after another has to be educated for peace. There is no magic word for peace. It is a long, hard pull, and patience and persistence are required. Yet at times when our faith is inclined to falter and our impatience to get on with the job leads us to feel that we are not making sufficiently rapid progress, I call to mind the fact that in my judgment there is no other organization in the world which is prepared to attack the problems which UNESCO has chosen to attack. If there were no such organization as UNESCO, I feel sure that all of us here would believe it our duty to try to bring such an organization into being."

Sincerely yours,

HOWLAND H. SARGEANT,
Chairman, United States Delegation.

Triumph Moscow's If We Become Police State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from one of the leading papers in my State—the Bridgeport Sunday Herald—entitled "Triumph Moscow's If We Become Police State." This important editorial quotes my colleague the senior Senator from Connecticut and I particularly commend to the Congress his phrase, "freedom of dissent is not a privilege but a right; it is not a luxury but a necessity if our democracy is to be maintained."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sunday Herald, Bridgeport, Conn., July 9, 1950]

TRIUMPH MOSCOW'S IF WE BECOME POLICE STATE

The harsh dilemma of a democratic state, faced with the prospect of fighting for its existence against totalitarian aggression, while at the same time maintaining its cherished freedoms, was clearly outlined by United States Senator BRIEN MCMAHON in an address delivered last week at the graduation exercises of the FBI National Academy.

Recalling his own early career with the FBI, Senator MCMAHON told the graduates "the world was only learning to know the name of Hitler, and the fifth column was yet unheard of."

But, he continued, when these adversaries were encountered, "the men of our police forces were better than the perverted best of the Nazi sabotage schools. During the entire war, in fact, our Nation suffered not a single successful case of sabotage."

Today, said the Senator, law-enforcement officers have a new public enemy No. 1—the men in the Kremlin.

"Instead of shaking down terrorized individuals, these men have shaken down and now hold in terrorized subjection entire nations. Instead of being armed with sawed-off shotguns, they flaunt tanks and jet planes and atomic bombs. Instead of violating merely State and national laws, they violate international law and the conscience of all mankind. Behind the iron curtain they have made one-third of the world their secret hide-out."

However, in the shadow of an atomic war, which would involve soldiers and civilians alike, "our law-enforcement officers face enormous new challenge," Senator MCMAHON went on.

What makes the problems of all-out warfare doubly difficult, he continued:

"Is the fact that we are concerned not only with saving our lives; we are concerned even more with maintaining those liberties that make life worth living.

"If we tried to secure complete and total security against the ravages of atomic or hydrogen weapons, we might end by destroying our free society in the process. In seeking to guard ourselves against the possible attack of a garrison state, we might ourselves end up by becoming a garrison state.

"This harsh dilemma—reconciling freedom and security—is one we cannot escape so long as the arms race continues. Nor can I, in honesty, predict—so long as the arms race is unabated—that the dilemma will become less cruel. I fear that the minimum demands of survival may pressure us toward more and more abridgements of our democratic heritage. It is not a few short-sighted Americans who will bring this about; it is the relentless logic of a world of uncontrolled weapons."

On our new law-enforcement officers and their awareness of this dilemma may hinge our emerging from this time of crisis with our democracy intact, Senator MCMAHON pointed out, warning:

"* * * freedom of dissent is not a privilege but a right; it is not a luxury but a necessity if our democracy is to be maintained. * * * Police manuals are no more required reading than is the Bill of Rights. * * * Due process is the most sacred precept of our jurisprudence."—N. H.

The Practice of Genocide by the Authorities of the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have received from Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, who is president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, a statement concerning the practice of genocide by the authorities of the Soviet Union. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to print in the Appendix of the RECORD this comprehensive statement by Dr. Dobriansky.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY PROF. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, PRESIDENT OF THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, FOR RATIFICATION OF THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION, BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

As president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, which represents over one and a half million Americans of Ukrainian descent, I should like to express our appreciation for this opportunity to demonstrate the necessity for the ratification of the Genocide Convention by the Senate of the United States. By virtue of our close kinship with over 40,000,000 Ukrainians in the Soviet Union, we strongly urge this necessary step in world leadership chiefly because we can truthfully declare that through their concrete experiences, we have felt the full impact of the brutal meaning of genocide. In truth, we have waited 20 years to be given this sort of opportunity to present the case of systematic Soviet genocide of the Ukrainian nation, which, I might add, bears a crucial and vital relationship to the moral and physical security of our country. Sharply contrary to the fallacious over-all contention of a few lawyers, this convention applies unquestionably to the peoples behind the iron curtain, and most powerfully to the people constituting the Ukrainian

nation. Every word in it is written in their blood and tears and sufferings that still surpass the comfortable comprehension of most Americans.

In dispelling the confusion that pervades the minds of these lawyers and others, I should like to emphasize first certain prominent points of consideration on Soviet genocide as practiced on the Ukrainian nation.

Without diminishing the significance of other similar testimonies, the outstanding fact is that, in the systematic annihilation of a nation in select part and therefore as such, the case of the Ukrainian people is classic in the contemporary period. Of the enslaved European nations, it has had the earliest, longest, and broadest experience with Soviet genocide which in terms of magnitude and extent far exceeds what the Nazis diabolically produced. Referring to the institutionalized receptacles of mass deportation and national liquidation, Dr. Julius Margolin, a prominent Polish Zionist leader, offers the illuminating testimony in the authoritative work of David J. Dallin on Forced Labor in Soviet Russia that "The Soviet camps have swallowed more people, have exacted more victims, than all other camps—Hitler's and others * * *." Since the Bolshevist rape and extinction of the independent Ukrainian Republic in 1920—20 years before the Baltic peoples were subjected to a similar fate—the Ukrainian people have painfully understood the macabre meaning of genocide under blood-stenched Soviet auspices.

The systematic practice of national genocide is an integral part of Soviet political strategy as oriented toward the all-important objective of world domination. As everything else in dialectical Communist thought, genocide has its ideological basis. It constitutes the very core of the philosophy of calculated terrorism as laid down by Lenin and followed religiously by his parrotic successor. Its thoroughgoing aspect may be best appreciated by reflecting over these axiomatic words of the master: "Three-quarters of mankind may die, provided the remaining one-quarter become Communists." I repeat, similar in substance to the ulterior motives of native Communists in their campaign even for a babies' milk fund, every act of the Kremlin is political in nature, and this of dialectical necessity conspicuously applies to its methodical destruction of nations in select part and as such.

The integral character of Soviet genocide is further borne out by the fact that there is in existence no alternative basis of explanation in the form of anti-Communist political parties or counterrevolutionary agencies in the Soviet Union. The problem is definitely not one of any counterrevolutionary opposition. Instead, it is conclusively one of a rapid consolidation of an empire consisting of nations, which, like Ukraine, culturally belong to western society and thus do not fit into the patterns of Communist Russian dominance. Since 1920–23, when they were thoroughly liquidated, there have been no anti-Communist parties nor counterrevolutionary agencies in Ukraine. Instead, there have been, as now in the form of the efficient Ukrainian Insurgent Army, which the Kremlin classifies as a bandit force, outbursts of spirited resurgence against the planned attacks on the Ukrainian national entity as such. And there is a world of difference between the two situations. As will be shown shortly, the patent fact is that the Ukrainian Nation itself is intrinsically anti-Communist because it has never surrendered spiritually to the prime objective of the Kremlin to create the Soviet Nation (Sovietsky Narod) and its Soviet man, speaking only the Russian language, thinking only in terms of nonbourgeois Soviet concepts, and taught to forget his non-Russian cultural tradition, his language, his history, his church, his art and customs—all the sensitive fibers that sustain the life of a national group. The greatest myth exported abroad by the Soviet Government, for which, I am sorry to say, most American intellectuals have fallen hook, line, and sinker, is its supposed peaceable solution of the nationalities problem. Behind a facade of nominal representation, a technique analogously employed by our native Communists in their front organizations, the Soviet Government is in truth solving this problem—by exterminating the Ukrainian and other subjugated non-Russian nations in select part and therefore as such.

The intrinsic nature of genocidal activity in terroristic Soviet world politics is further reinforced by the striking compatibility existing between traditional imperialistic Russianism and Russian Soviet communism on the effective recognition of conquered nations. The established policy of Russification under the tsars is well known to scholars of Russian history, and the forcible propagation of the great and mother Russia idea by Russian bureaucracy, scholarship, and police reached its summit of expression in 1863 when, with reference to the Ukrainian Nation, the Minister of the Interior, Valuyev, banned the use of the Ukrainian language with his famous declaration that "there never was, is not, and never will be a Ukrainian language." This barbaric mentality has been carried over into the Soviet phase of Russian history, and, supported by the brute execution of genocidal techniques, it is wholly congruous with the Soviet program of decimating subsumed nations for the creation of the Soviet Nation. More and more Americans are coming to understand this nexus between Russification and world communism. Significantly, it is one of the major themes of Lt. Gen. Walter Bedell Smith's current work on My Three Years in Moscow. As he aptly put it, "considering Soviet objectives and intentions, communism today is great Russianism." It is this monstrous exigency that has precipitated in the main the phenomenon of Titoism today, as it prevailed unnoticed and powerless in Ukraine from 1928 to 1933. Russification and Soviet genocide are clearly founded on common ground—the liquidation of non-Russian nations in select part and therefore as such.

The particular case of the Ukrainian Nation places in bold relief the essential significance of the meaning of destroying a nation in select part and therefore as such. In contrast to the relatively small populaces of the Baltic nations, which by virtue of this fact face the real possibility of being completely obliterated physically, the large population in Ukraine presents obvious difficulties for the extermination of all of it in short historical time. Yet despite this, the Ukrainian Nation is being destroyed as such through the thorough excision of its select and determining parts. Contrary to the insular assumption of certain lawyers, genocide is not merely a physical manifestation of additive quantity, but, as concerns nations, a spiritual and cultural phenomenon striking at those elements of organic quality which alone provide cohesive unity to the national entity. Extinguish these spiritual, intellectual, and cultural elements of a nation, its select parts, and the entire nation as such will automatically be rendered inert, formless, amorphous, without guidance and leadership, and thus, in effect, structurally and operationally destroyed. The destruction of a nation in select part is fundamentally more important than simply killing off any part of a nation, because the former is equivalent to the effacement of a nation as such.

It is of particular significance that the Russian Communist Party, soon after the establishment of its dictatorship, ordered the popular glorification of such wanton genocidists as Ivan the Terrible and Peter I, and in this past war Stalin appropriately crowned this Genghis Khan tradition by decreeing the Suvorov decoration as the highest military award.

Let us examine the record of the national victims of Soviet genocide, so that we may clearly understand that the Soviet Union is the burial ground of nations and not merely a slave confinement. Taking in order first those that have been totally or nearly so obliterated and those that are rapidly approaching this fate:

The Ingrian Nation, which consisted of 400,000 civilized people of Scandinavian culture and who inhabited Ingermanland, was wiped out in 1921–23, accommodating thereby the Russification of this hinterland of Leningrad;

The Don and Kuban Cossack Nations, who considered themselves separate national groups, were annihilated between 1928 and 1930;

The Greek population of the Kerch Peninsula, an ethnic group of some 8,000 people, was deported to a forced-labor camp in the Arctic in order to allow the Russification of this strategically important region;

The Volga German Republic was abolished in 1940 and a population of 800,000 was deported to the Arctic;

The Crimean Tartar Republic was erased in 1944, with some 700,000 improperly clothed humans cattled to the Asiatic Arctic, most of them having died along the route from exposure;

The Chechen-Ingush Republic of the Caucasus met a similar fate in 1945 and a deportation of 600,000 to Asia ensued;

The autonomous region of Karachev was liquidated in 1945 and its population ruthlessly scattered; and

The Baltic nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, for whom there are able and free spokesmen.

What the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union have been and are experiencing, what those in the Soviet political orbit are now beginning to experience, and what others, like China, have in immediate prospect, is best portrayed by the application of Soviet genocide to the Ukrainian Nation. Indeed, the methodical steps in this application demonstrate the cold logic that has been developed in the art of Soviet genocide, and bluntly explain the recurring pattern of genocidal activity in all countries submerged by the Soviets. It is through this process that the Russians will emerge as the most powerful ethnic group in both Europe and Asia.

Let us therefore observe these steps of Soviet genocide in its application to the Ukrainian Nation:

The initial attack is directed against the cerebrum of the national organism, against its intelligentsia, its leaders, and brilliant personalities: in short, a deadening mass blow on the head of a nation so to paralyze its entire body. In the years of 1920, 1926, 1930–33, this attack was undertaken by the Kremlin to destroy the mental fibers of the Ukrainian nation. Eastern Ukrainian intellectuals were liquidated or deported to certain death in Siberia en masse. In 1931 alone, 51,712 Ukrainian intellectuals were deported to Siberia. Even leading Ukrainian Communists, as Panas Lubchenko, a Prime Minister of Soviet Ukraine, Mykola Skrypnyk, Minister of Education and an old friend of Lenin, Chubar, Shumsky, Khvylovy, and scores of others were murdered or committed suicide to protest Moscow's policy of national genocide. When the Soviets occupied western Ukraine in 1939, then part of Poland, this initial step was repeated. It is most significant that the political and intellectual leadership in Ukraine today is conspicuously Russian.

The second attack, usually in part concurrent with the first, is aimed at the soul of the nation, against the churches and

priests. Between 1926 and 1932, the Ukrainian Orthodox Autocephalous Church, with Metropolitan Lypkivsky and about 10,000 lay and monastic clergy, was thoroughly liquidated. In 1945, when the Soviets established themselves in western Ukraine and in Carpatho-Ukraine, the Ukrainian Catholic Church was similarly annihilated, an event to which Pope Pius, in his famous encyclical, Orientales Omnes, called the world's attention. Thus, even before the cases of Stepinatz, Mindszenty, and Beran emerged, the extreme case of Metropolitan Joseph Slipy and the entire loyal Catholic hierarchy, who were deported for certain death or outrightly murdered, was a closed chapter. It is most significant, here too, from the viewpoint of Russification, that an attempt was made to force this clergy to pay allegiance to the Russian Patriarch in Moscow, who, of course, is presently the political tool of the Kremlin, as his predecessors were for the tsars.

The third attack is canalized against the conserving organs of the nation's body, against the tillers of the soil, the large peasantry which conserves the traditions, the arts, and the distinct language of the nation. By exterminating this select part of the nation, the ethnographical territory of the nation is sufficiently disrupted to prepare the way for the fourth step. The unprecedented man-made famine in 1932–33 in Soviet Ukraine, which resulted in the forced starvation of up to 5,000,000 Ukrainians and in moral protest of which the humanitarian members of our Seventy-third Congress passed a resolution on May 28, 1934, decrying it, serves as the classic model of this type of attack. One of the most naive ideas circulating abroad is that this was merely an economic phenomenon of Communist liquidation of a social class, the kulaks. The outstanding facts are that there were relatively few large-scale farmers in Ukraine, that during the NEP policy the Ukrainian peasantry, the main social source from which most prominent Ukrainian intellectuals emerged, became the major force in the preservation of the Ukrainian national idea—the very thing that the Soviet writer, Kossier, was referring to when he declared in Izvestia, December 2, 1933: "Ukrainian nationalism is our chief danger." Economic collectivization is not only an effective means for rigid political control, but, in its genocidal form, as in Ukraine during 1932–33, it aids to annihilate a nation.

The fourth and last step is the systematic settlement of Russians or Asiatic tribesmen in the disrupted area in order to mix up the nationality in question and thus create a mixed ethnic territory. This obviously follows the full performance of genocide on a nation in select part and therefore as such. It will be observed that whereas, according to the 1926 Soviet census, the total population of Soviet Ukraine was 29,000,000, of which Ukrainians made up 23,200,000, or 80 percent, and others, 5,800,000, or 20 percent, in the 1939 Soviet census, the total population of Soviet Ukraine is set at 31,000,000, consisting of 19,600,000 Ukrainians, or 63.2 percent, and of others, 11,400,000, or 36.8 percent of the total. It should be noted, too, that the total increase over these 13 years was barely over 1,000,000 in a country which prior to World War I occupied the foremost place, not only in Europe, but in the world, with respect to its natural increase of population, about 800,000 a year. On the basis of the latest normal period of 1924–27, when its yearly average was 2.36 percent, a natural increase which would practically double the population within the span of one generation, the total population of Soviet Ukraine by 1939 should have been close to 40,000,000, as against the actual 31,000,000. The impact of Soviet genocide on the Ukrainian nation is unmistakably clear from these Soviet figures, and it is noteworthy that since 1939, the Soviets have for obvious reasons drawn down a statistical iron curtain.

This presentation on Soviet genocide of the Ukrainian nation would certainly be incomplete if adequate mention were not made of the outstanding Soviet crime in the city of Vinnitsia, the true meaning of the slave-labor camps in relation to the Ukrainians and other non-Russian peoples, and the geopolitical significance of systematic Soviet genocide. Let us analyze each in order:

The Czechs have their Lidice, the Poles their Katyn, and though it is tragically little known, the Ukrainians have their Vinnitsia. In the city of Vinnitsia, 91 mass graves, containing 9,432 bodies, most with three or four bullet holes in the back of the head, were discovered in the period of May 25–October 28, 1943. It was established by the French, Swiss, Swedish, and Italian doctors who were invited to witness this spectacle of Soviet genocide that the tragedy occurred sometime in 1937–38, under the murderous auspices of the NKVD, and all the available data relating to this mass murder have been filed with the International Red Cross in Geneva. Several witnesses of this crime are living on this continent today. Writing in the December 1948, issue of "The Socialist Herald," a Russian-language paper in New York City, in an article entitled "I Was at Vinnitsia," Dr. George Alexandrov vividly describes his horror at the time of the excavation of these mass graves in the "Park of Culture and Rest." "I, for one," writes he, "can no longer keep silent; I will talk about what I saw and heard. I will talk and testify about that crime in the name of those who have been left unrevenged." In its issue of November 12, 1948, "America-Echo," an American-Polish publication, corroborates this with the eye-witness story of Dmytro Melnyk.

As for the true meaning of the Soviet network of slave-labor camps for the non-Russian peoples, there is an inseparable relation between these camps and Soviet national genocide. One of the gravest errors that we can fall into is to think that the millions who end their lives there, are mere "political offenders." I regret to say that I am compelled to disagree with Mr. Dean Rusk on his testimony before this committee that the convention does not apply to the concentration camps. The glaring fact is that the mass of innocent Ukrainian nationals deported to these camps are doomed to perish from physical exhaustion, undernourishment, or murder after they have passed the limits of usefulness. These institutionalized depositories of mass deportations are the monumentless cemeteries of millions of Ukrainians from whom the MVD squeezes every remaining ounce of physical resource before they are rubbed out of existence.

Finally, we must not overlook the geopolitical significance of Soviet genocide. Implemented throughout by national genocidal activity, Soviet action is applying General Haushofer's geopolitical principles in the following clockwise directions: (a) On the basis of the Zange principle, the Soviet pincers of Leningrad and completely Russified Koenigsberg have already embraced the victim nations of the Baltic; (b) Siberia, which is being built into a huge reservoir of manpower and industry with deported and doomed non-Russian nationals, has become the Soviet base of Asiatic domination and a powerful springboard to Alaska and the western Canadian coast; (c) in the direction of Iran and the central Middle East, the Volga-Caucasus base has been solidified with the annihilation of the Volga-Germans, the Don and Kuban Cossacks, and the Chechens and Ingush peoples and with the current Russian colonization of the area; and, lastly, (d) by liquidating the Crimean Tartars, the Soviets, through similar colonization of Crimea, which strategically dominates the mouth of the Dnieper, have established a "Stuetzpunkt" in relation to Ukraine, which is the vitally important springboard to the Dardanelles, Balkans, and central Europe; but, because of the millions involved, their genocidal and colonizing efforts have not yet succeeded in the total embracement of Ukraine, thereby necessitating a strategic dependence on Ukraine's western neighbors, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, as the western line of defense. Thus, national genocide has its military and geopolitical reasons, but, whatever the reason, murder and biological destruction are undertaken to destroy nations, and the implications of this for the security and well-being of the peaceable communities of the world are amply conveyed above.

When one scans over these frightful events of genocidal reality, one can only view with puzzled wonderment the wholly misapplied arguments advanced by a meager few. Against the background of this mass Ukrainian experience with calculated Soviet genocide, their chief arguments opposing the ratification of the Genocide Convention appear, by sheer contrast, outstanding for their utter confusion, their total inapplicability, their flagrant naïveté, and, I regret to say, for their inadvertent apology of nefarious Soviet genocidal practice. Let us briefly review some of them:

That the convention does not apply to the peoples behind the iron curtain. If this is so, then it absurdly reduces itself to applying to no people anywhere, at any time. The whole intent, the wording, and the objective of the convention are unmistakably aimed at the prevention of the very genocidal acts recited here, by outlawing such mass murders and biological destruction. Indeed, the living monuments of Soviet genocide and tyranny are the millions of displaced persons scattered about the free world today;

That the convention does not apply to genocide committed for political, economic, or other reasons. This is patently untrue. Reasons for criminal acts or motivation in genocide are not limited by the convention. Aside from situations of reasonable self-preservation and the like, in the manner that criminal homicide is established when one kills a human being qua human being, whether for money, love, grudge and so forth, criminal genocide is established when one nation or state destroys another as a nation, whether for economic, strategic, religious, or political reasons.

That the convention is of no value. It is a logical truth that where objects are not properly understood, no value can be assigned to them. This applies poignantly to the baseless stand taken by the ABA representatives. We are not obtuse to think that the Genocide Convention will, under current conditions, effectually resolve this vicious issue of genocide, but we possess at least that requisite vision and perspective to appreciate its significance as a vital step in the right and necessary direction. Its specific values are as follows: (a) it will impart immense and genuine hope and strength to the suffering hearts and minds of the enslaved Ukrainians and others who are persistently haunted by the deathly ax of Soviet national genocide; (b) it will focus the moral condemnation of the world on the businesslike Soviet genocidists and indirectly reinforce judicious popular obstruction and opposition to their subversive agencies abroad; (c) because of this, it may serve to moderate the rate of Soviet genocidal advances which may be caused to become more secretive and hence more difficult to execute; (d) placed on the books of international law, it will stand as a formidable promise of human liberation and concrete redress; and, finally, (e) our true and candid adherence to its provisions will serve to enunciate the civilized principles for which we stand to fight and to which we aim to attract loyal minds in Ukraine and elsewhere in the Soviet prison and cemetery of nations.

The Knowland Amendment to H. R. 6000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the conference committee on H. R. 6000, the social-security bill, is today completing consideration of that measure. One of the still unresolved problems which they must answer today is whether the Senate will recede from its amendment to the House bill, numbered section 405, the Knowland amendment.

While H. R. 6000 was up for debate on the floor of the other body on June 20, the gentleman from California offered an amendment to the bill which he innocuously stated, "merely requires the Secretary (of Labor) to continue this long-established principle" of recognizing that the claims procedure of the States must be complied with before the Secretary may withhold payments to which the States are entitled when their unemployment compensation laws are administered in conformity with Federal requirements; or, more important, may refuse at year's end to certify that the State's laws comply with the specifications of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act for the purpose of allowing Federal unemployment-tax credits against contributions paid under State laws.

With the benefit of the gentleman from California's persuasive arguments, and after 10 minutes of debate, 2½ of which were generously allowed the opposition, the Knowland amendment was adopted by a vote of 45 to 37. There are many more things which can be said about the Knowland amendment than can be said in 10 minutes of debate. I should like to say some of them now so that the House will fully realize, which the other body apparently did not, the real implications and purport of the amendment.

The author of the amendment did not say that his "mere recognition of long-established principle" would require a clear violation of the basic principle of administrative law which provides that all administrative remedies be exhausted before the courts are resorted to. Under the Knowland amendment the procedures for Federal administrative review would not be permitted to operate until after the State courts, at the highest level, had ruled upon the question at issue. We all know what a time-consuming business the carrying of appeals through all the various levels of the State courts can, and would, be. The amendment disregards established principles of law in order that time be consumed—for, make no mistake about it, it is this element of time which plays the most important part in the proposal. Time during which an unemployed insurance claimant may be faced with the bitter alternatives of starving, or of accepting a strikebreaking job. Time during which a justified economic strike may be broken by forcing an unemployed, nonstriking, member of a trade to take a job in a struck plant or on a picketed ship—in short, to scab on his fellow workers. The present threat of withholding payment of administrative expenses or of noncertification for tax credits, is the only means of preventing such strikebreaking now, in certain States where employer-dominated State agencies administer the unemployment compensation laws. This was proven in San Francisco in 1943 during the maritime workers' strike, and in Spokane, Wash., in the spring of 1949 in the course of a carpenters' strike for contract improvements. It was only the threat of noncertification in California, and an actual ruling by the Secretary of Labor that Washington's laws were changed by administrative ruling, which forced the States to review their policies. If the Knowland amendment is permitted to become law we may be sure that California's and Washington's experience will be repeated again and again in State after State, with no opportunity for redress.

The author of the amendment stated, in introducing his amendment, that the scope of this amendment is very limited, and the changes it makes in existing law are more of a clarifying and procedural than of a substantive nature. Let us examine one of these clarifying and procedural changes—and mark the word "change": Paragraph (a) of section 405 of the Social Security Act as amended by the Senate (the Knowland amendment) amends section 1603 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code by striking out the phrase "changed its law" and inserting in lieu thereof "amended its law." Section 1603 of the Internal Revenue Code specifies the procedures for approval and year-end certification or noncertification of State laws as to their compliance with Federal law requirements. Paragraph (c) now states that any State which has changed its law so as not to be in compliance shall not be certified—and will, therefore, not be eligible for credits against the employer's Federal unemployment insurance tax payments. The word "changed" has been interpreted, and rightly so, to include administrative rulings and practices at the State level which serve to avoid the intent of Congress in passing the Federal law. The Senator does not say that by substituting the word "amended" he would make it completely impossible for the Secretary of Labor to refuse year-end certification of any State law in any case where the intent of the law had been perverted through administrative procedures rather than amended through legislative action. The hamstringing to which good law can be subjected by poor administration is too well known to require proof. The Knowland amendment proposes to legalize and encourage such hamstringing of the unemployment compensation laws to suit the purposes of the administrators and those who influence them. If we are to uphold the intent of Congress in passing the Federal unemployment compensation laws, rather than serve the purposes of those who try to influence their administration, we should not allow the Knowland amendment to become part of the law.

Senator KERR, of Oklahoma, has pointed out that this amendment has no relation to the broadening of the scope of the Social Security Act which was intended by H. R. 6000. For that reason the Senate Finance Committee quite properly refused to consider the Knowland amendment during the course of their hearings on the bill. Legislation of this nature should be the subject of thorough hearings before the proper committees before it ever reaches the floor of either branch of Congress. Ten minutes discussion on the floor does not permit proper evaluation of its far-reaching effects. Too many good laws have failed of passage by reason of the tricky and extraneous riders attached to them. We should not enact this proposal as law by appendage. We should not risk losing the gains which H. R. 6000 now promises by attacking the broad principles which it supports.

I feel very strongly that the conference committee should eliminate the Knowland amendment from H. R. 6000 before it is reported back to the respective bodies for consideration. If they should not do so, I urge the House to vote to send the entire bill back to conference with instructions to our conferees not to agree to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of July 16, 1950, contained a very illuminating editorial urging the rejection of the Knowland amendment. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD following these remarks, and I now submit it for that purpose:

KNOWLAND AMENDMENT

The Senate bill amending the old-age and survivors insurance system carries a rider sponsored by Senator KNOWLAND that would have far-reaching effects on the administration of the unemployment compensation system. We trust that the amendment will be rejected by the conference committee to which the House and Senate old-age-insurance bills have been referred (1) because it does not belong in a bill dealing with old-age insurance and welfare programs, (2) because it is a very complex measure introduced from the floor without prior hearings, and in face of the opposition of members of the Finance Committee, and (3) because it would make it possible for State officials and State courts to deny unemployment benefits to workers contrary to the standards set by Congress.

The Social Security Act provides States having approved unemployment compensation laws with Federal grants to pay for administering those laws. Employers in such States are also entitled to have 90 percent of the Federal unemployment compensation tax credited against contributions paid under State laws. To qualify for these grants and credits, however, the States must put their laws in conformity with labor standards set up by Federal law. For instance, unemployment benefits cannot be withheld for refusal to accept new work if the proffered job is vacant because of a labor dispute, if the job seeker is required to join a company union or resign from a bona fide union, or if the conditions of work and pay are out of line with prevailing standards.

Constant vigilance is required to make sure that, after the State laws have been approved, State agencies and officials comply with these requirements by proper in-

terpretation of the law. Under the Knowland amendment, however, the Secretary of Labor could not charge a State with failure to conform with Federal requirements until an appeal had been taken to the highest State courts.

According to Senator KNOWLAND, the amendment "simply postpones action by the Secretary of Labor until the State judiciary has spoken; it does not deprive him of any power he now has but merely restricts its premature exercise." In refutation, opponents of the amendment declare that the only authority remaining under the amendment, so far as labor standards are concerned, would be to insure the carrying out by State unemployment compensation officials of the orders of the State courts. No action could be taken, as at present, to prevent State agencies from denying benefits in contravention of State laws as well as Federal requirements, unless or until cases reach the State courts. And it is pointed out that most administrative decisions never reach the courts. Moreover, if appeals were taken, the only question at issue would be the interpretation of the State law, and not the application of Federal standards.

In short, the amendment would, as Senator KERR stated in the course of debate, "destroy the Federal minimum requirements in the program which has been created by Federal legislation." As a matter of fact, that appears to be the real purpose of the Knowland amendment, which is backed by various west coast employers' associations.

Walter Reed Widow Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, an item in the Washington Post for July 24 carries the story of the death of Dr. Walter Reed's widow at the age of 94. In the brief notice concerning this wonderful couple, reference is made to the doctor's famous work of a half century ago, about which the world has heard much but not nearly enough.

A minor item concerning this famous family refers to their marriage in Arizona Territory at old Fort Apache in the days of the Indian wars. The fact that the bride had made a 2-month trip to Arizona by boat, train, and covered wagon recalls the old West of 1876. In those days a trip into the little known region was almost as hazardous as the famous doctor's work in the pestilential tropics.

The Walter Reed Hospital in the Nation's Capitol, named in his honor in 1906, 4 years after the death of Maj. Walter Reed, is only one memorial to the long life and great service of this family. The newspaper clipping follows:

WALTER REED WIDOW DEAD; RITES TUESDAY

Mrs. Emilie Lawrence Reed, 94, widow of Dr. Walter Reed, died yesterday at her home in Blue Ridge Summit, Pa. She had been ill several years.

Her husband, for whom Walter Reed Hospital here was named, headed a medical commission sent to Cuba in 1899 to investigate the cause of yellow fever. His discovery that the disease is carried by mosquitoes led to the eradication of yellow fever in most of the Western Hemisphere.

Mrs. Reed was born in Murfreesboro, N. C., and attended schools there. Her parents were John and Hannah Rea Lawrence. She married Dr. Reed in 1876.

At that time Dr. Reed was stationed at Fort Apache in the Arizona Territory. To join her husband, Mrs. Reed made a 2-month trip west by boat, train, and covered wagon.

After Dr. Reed's death in 1902, Mrs. Reed lived for many years at the Cairo and Burlington Hotels. Ten years ago she retired to her home in Pennsylvania, where she was well known for her luxurious gardens.

Mrs. Reed is survived by a son, Maj. Gen. Walter Lawrence Reed, retired Inspector General of the Army, 2810 Thirty-sixth Place NW.; a daughter Miss Blossom Reed of Blue Ridge Summit; and two granddaughters, Mrs. Daisy Reed Royce, Fort Riley, Kans., and Mrs. Landon Reed Monro, Singapore, Malaya.

Funeral services will be held in Blue Ridge Summit Tuesday. Burial will be in Arlington National Cemetery.

The Faith of Our Fathers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the address I delivered before the Auburn (Mass.) Rotary Club on the occasion of their monthly dinner meeting, July 19, 1950. The address follows:

I was honored to receive your invitation and very glad the current congressional legislative schedule is such as to permit me to enjoy this dinner with you today.

You, and the people of Auburn, have been consistently kind and generous to me. I am always grateful for an opportunity to visit here.

I have remarked, on several occasions, that it is a particular and refreshing pleasure to attend a Rotary Club meeting. In your every-day business and professional activities, you come face to face with the material facts and hard realities of earthly existence. For a man in public responsibility, to exchange ideas with you is a most valuable experience. It is quite different, let me assure you, from trying to talk to star-gazing visionaries and wild-eyed prophets.

Amidst your genial hospitality, friendly kidding, enthusiastic singing, is the substantial wholesomeness of a healthy Christian American atmosphere. These fundamental good things cannot help but bestow essential good feeling upon each member and any guest who is privileged to share them with you. I am happy to be here.

If I had my heartfelt wish today, and yours too, I know, I would like to be able to bring you a message of glad tidings, that there is peace on earth and all is right with the world. It seems as if only a few hours ago we concluded the most terrible war in history, in order to achieve peace. We are impelled to ask ourselves why it is that, after two great World Wars, we still do not have any peace. The answer is stark and real and challenging and it must be squarely faced. What we are now, and have long been engaged in is a life and death struggle between two ideals of government. It is a struggle for supremacy between two basic philosophies of life and government that are diametrically opposed.

On the one side are the Communist groups, and it makes no difference whether they call themselves Communists, Fascists, or Nazis, or a people's government. They all believe that the state is supreme, that man lives for the state and must do the bidding of the state, which plans the destinies of all its subjects.

On the other side are the Christian groups who believe in a system of government based upon the dictates of Almighty God and the dignity of man; who believe that the inalienable rights of the individual citizens are supreme and that government exists to assist him in the honest pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness.

The boasted and acknowledged objective of communism is to gain tyrannical control over the spirits and minds of men, their social and economic thinking and their whole lives. That is the issue that confronts America today and that is the problem with which we must deal.

Since the cessation of World War II hostilities, the Soviet Government has, by pressure of armies of occupation, by subversion and propaganda to create internal disunion, spread its communistic police-state power across the map of Europe and into the Far East. One after another small, defenseless countries have fallen under their subjugation. Whenever attempts have been made to stop Russian aggression, by discussions in the United Nations Council, they have consistently exercied their power of veto. Throughout this irritating and exhausing period, this country, with other members of the United Nations, has patiently and persistently sought to arrive at peaceful understanding with Russia, but it has proved to be wellnigh impossible.

The so-called cold war that has been dangerously smoldering around the globe has finally broken out into flame in Korea, by Russian direction. The President's almost immediate announcement that the United States, with United Nations' sanction, would oppose the unjust attack upon Southern Korea by force of arms, was direct, forceful and courageous. Now that we have taken action, it is essential that we make such action effective. No further deterioration of our prestige or of our all-around strategic position should be tolerated. The United States Government and the American people have now concretely expressed their conviction that Russian imperialism, with its Godless influence and aggression, has gone far enough.

Korea is the focal point where the purposes for which the United Nations was founded must be tested. It is a focal point of the stresses of two mighty and conflicting concepts for deciding the future of mankind's relationships with the government and the dignity of men's individual lives. Korea is now the place at which a test must be made as to whether unprovoked assault and violence shall be justified by success, or shall be subjected to proclaimed standards of law established by the general and pledged consent of Christian humanity.

Our objectives in this action are still world peace and the ideals of human freedom. These are not ideals to be suppressed, apologized for, or encircled by political argumentation. They are definite responsibilities which, once undertaken, cannot be abandoned without shame.

It would be a bold and brash prophet, indeed, who would dare predict the exact potentialities in the Korean situation. Whether it is another inhuman communistic exploratory gesture, whether it is the first move in a Russian world attack—only the Soviet high command knows. It is even quite probable they themselves are doubtful and perplexed by the decisive action that has been taken. It may be our firm stand has

discouraged their further plans of encroachment. Who can be certain about any of these things?

The situation confronting the United States, and the United Nations, today is without precedent, but if we do not falter and weaken in the course we have set, then we will inevitably succeed in working things out in the traditional American way.

The road ahead appears to be long, hard, rough and disagreeable, especially for our people, because we are going to carry the load. We have been joined by most of the member countries in the United Nations, but none of them are currently capable of giving us any substantial aid. Divine Providence has thrust upon us the responsibility of world leadership in this crisis.

The survival of a free world and Christian civilization mainly depends upon American economic strength, continuous growth and united determination. To this end, every element—business, agriculture, labor, and the Government—must unselfishly contribute. I am confident we will successfully rise to meet this challenge.

Grave problems have confronted this country many times during our history. If the American people had always surrendered abjectly to difficulty, if we had customarily defaulted to obstacles, if we had always retreated in the face of fears, the United States would long since have disappeared into obscure humiliation.

In some sense, it is, perhaps, true we have become, in these nerve-racking postwar years, a little dull and weary. Now that the actuality of Russia's intention is clear, we must stop any self-belittling, we must shake off any uncertainty, we must broaden our outlook and boldly confront the facts. I am sure you will agree with me that there is nothing fundamentally wrong with the modern heart, spirit or faith of this blessed country.

The foundation stones of our united integrity, as a Nation, are the individual communities. I know your Rotary Club, here in Auburn, and similar organizations throughout the land, will immeasurably aid in influencing our communities to hold fast to the true American courage, so vitally needed at this climax in our destiny.

We are all equal partners and share in the obligation to discharge the duties imposed upon us by our heritage and from which we must not shrink,

I am happy to tell you I do not know of any man in the Congress who does not fully appreciate the heavy responsibilities resting upon him night and day. I am proud to say that the center aisle that separates party affiliations in the House of Representatives does not divide the united devotion to a common patriotic objective.

This country was great yesterday and it is great today. If we have the good common sense to persevere in the faith of our fathers. I am confident we will remain great for the fulfillment of tomorrow's responsibilities.

The Fiasco in Korea Raises Question "How Did It Happen?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. JENISON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, with the American people on the brink of what may well be the start of world war III, and with Congress asked by the President to approve once again a conscription of men and of money for fighting abroad, it becomes the duty of the Representatives of the people to give heed to the attitude of the people themselves concerning our present perilous position in the world.

The American people are loyal to their country and to the cause of freedom at home and elsewhere throughout the world. Their response to the outbreak of aggression in Korea proves that. But their loyalty to our country and our cause does not, and should not, keep them from questioning the succession of events that brought us step by step to our present desperate position. This altogether sound and proper attitude is so well reflected by an editorial in the Danville (Ill.) Commercial-News, published in the district I have the honor to represent, that under permission granted to me by the House I am including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I commend it for reading by all my colleagues who seek sincerely to find a road to victory and ultimate peace in the world. The editorial follows:

THE FIASCO IN KOREA RAISES QUESTION "HOW DID IT HAPPEN?"

What has gone wrong in Korea?

Within three short weeks, the North Korean Communists have overrun better than one-half of the free Republic of South Korea.

They have been able to accomplish this against the combined opposition of world opinion, the South Korean Army, and American land, sea, and air forces.

The North Koreans, branded as aggressors by the United Nations, are well-organized, trained, and equipped.

Their Russian-made war matériel seems superior to what the United States has been able to put into the field.

They are amply supplied with Russian armor and heavy artillery. Yak fighters bear the Red Star insignia of the Soviet Union. Huge Russian tanks resist American bazookas and aerial rockets.

The South Korean Army, American-trained and equipped only as a police force, crumbled under superior Communist fire power.

The first American troops, dispatched hastily from our garrisons in Japan and on Okinawa, term the Korean action a "slaughter."

It is clear that this was not a spontaneous attack on the part of the Soviet-inspired North Koreans.

Such a concentration of troops and matériel requires great time and attention. It is easy to observe the deploying of troops and the massing of supplies for a major offensive.

Then why didn't we know about this in advance?

What decisions have brought us into this grave crisis?

The United States apparently has committed the worst possible blunder of underestimating the strength and intentions of the opposition.

This basic error in world strategy goes to the very root of our national defense.

It affects the underlying concept upon which our military and diplomatic leaders have been proceeding since the end of World War II.

Basic concept of our grand strategy was this:

The Russians would not be willing to run the risk of a general war until they had time to build up their war machine, including an atomic stockpile. The deadline was supposed to be 1953 or 1954.

An act of aggression in Korea would risk a general war; therefore, we could rest assured there would be no such aggression.

Our top leaders in the White House, State Department, and Pentagon were so obsessed with this thinking—the Russians don't want war now—they continued to assume the attack on South Korea was merely a raid in force until the fall of Seoul, the capital.

It is now apparent how ridiculous it was for us to proceed upon such an assumption.

Then why didn't somebody change the theory?

Who was responsible for leading us, unprepared, into Korea?

This is a constructive question to ask at the present time, before a more grievous debacle may occur.

It seems there was plenty of evidence to indicate that the Communists were building up the crescendo of a major offensive against Korea.

This information, via diplomatic and military intelligence channels, came in dibbles and dabbles across various desks of the Pentagon and State Department.

No single person, no single competent Government agency, it appears, had the basic responsibility for evaluating all this material, and changing the basic concept of our grand defense strategy.

The machinery of Government was too cumbersome. Lines of authority and responsibility overlapped in a tenuous maze.

In the last analysis, it was a single man—the President of the United States, Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces—who had to make the final, fateful decisions.

And it is not clear that he was furnished with adequate, comprehensive, and reliable information by his advisers on which to base all of those decisions.

Tactical error of the Korean war may well be the commitment of American ground forces to a land campaign on the Asiatic mainland, instead of confining it to our superior air and sea power.

Americans may yet be ejected in another Bataan or Dunkerque, before adequate support can arrive, for all Communist-threatened nations to observe.

President Truman says this won't happen. And Defense Secretary Louis A. Johnson has proclaimed that we can lick the hell out of Stalin.

But that remains to be seen.

Another major error in the Korean affair seems to lie in the manner in which the gravest decisions, committing us as a nation to a war of unknown consequences, were handled here at home.

The President of the United States, in the last analysis, made those decisions.

Congress was not consulted in advance. Nor were the American people.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and the diplomatic planners, urged that President Truman go immediately before Congress in a dramatic personal appearance to state the case for resisting Communist aggression.

That was not done. Advice of other quarters prevailed.

Presumably that advice came from the Defense Department, and the White House palace guard.

We should not like to think that such a decision was guided by such persons as Maj. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan, the President's clownish military aide.

Nor are we completely convinced of the military wisdom of Defense Secretary Johnson.

It might be asked:

What has happend to the billions of dollars which American taxpayers have been putting into the military budget every year since VJ-day?

Where is the military might to support our extensive diplomatic commitments to freedom-loving nations of the world, and the United Nations?

And where is the elaborate defense machinery—the unified Armed Forces, the National Security Council, the Central Intelligence Agency—created since World War II?

The best thing about Korea so far is that perhaps it has saved us from even greater disaster.

Faults are coming out. It must be hoped they are coming out in time, that we may yet remedy them, before a final, cataclysmic world struggle for freedom.

If Harry Truman is sitting like an amateur poker player in a game loaded with international professionals, holding a stacked deck, then the American public should know about it. Maybe President Truman's radio report Wednesday will answer this.

Nor can Congress disclaim responsibility for our state of preparedness, by pretending ignorance of what is going on at home or in the rest of the world.

The American public has rallied behind the vigorous protest against Communist aggression in Korea.

The crisis certainly calls for national unity.

But it also calls for unity behind an effective and informed leadership, with a realistic course of action.

Federal Aid to Medical Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, on July 13 I made an address to the House in which I pointed out the urgent need for Federal aid to medical education, a need made even more urgent by the Korean crisis. I cited the present shortage of doctors, dentists, nurses, and other medical personnel, a shortage daily accentuated by the unfilled requirements of the Armed Forces. Without Federal aid, the medical schools, many of them in desperate financial straits, are unable to meet these critical requirements.

In support of the statements I made July 13, I offer a letter from Dr. George W. Bakenman, associate dean of the School of Medicine of the University of Virginia. Written 11 days after my plea, it is further evidence that this legislation should be approved without delay.

MEDICAL COLLEGE OF VIRGINIA,
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
OFFICE OF THE DEAN,
Richmond, Va., July 24, 1950.

The Honorable ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIEMILLER: The aggravation of the international situation in Korea with its accompanying increase in American armaments naturally brings with it a still heavier demand by the armed forces for medically-trained personnel and accentuates still further the already distressing shortage of doctors in this country.

Up to this time the administration of the Medical College of Virginia has hesitated to take any strong stand in regard to the question of Federal support for medical education, as we have hoped that under peacetime conditions the somewhat slower but more normal current development of institutional facilities would take care of the increased demand for medical personnel. We have felt keenly the need of additional funds in this medical center, but we have at the same time so strongly disapproved of increasing Federal expenditures that we have been reluctant to give voice to our own needs. Now, however, the national emergency is going to require so many more doctors in the armed forces that there seems no possibility of our existing schools' meeting the requirements of the country over the next 10 years without materially increased funds. I doubt very seriously that we can obtain sufficient support from local sources and am, therefore, herewith urging you to support H. R. 5940 if it is available or H. R. 8886 if the first mentioned bill is impossible of passage.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. BAKEMAN,
Associate Dean.

A Challenge to the Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me I am including in my remarks herein an address by Hon. Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, entitled, "A Challenge to the Citizen." The address was delivered by Mr. Ewing before the Colgate Conference on American Foreign Policy, at Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., on July 13, 1950.

Mr. Ewing's address follows:

A CHALLENGE TO THE CITIZEN

It is something of an advantage to take part in this conference on its closing day. You have spent almost a week exploring the problems of the world with some of the men and women who know most about these problems. You have probed the fundamental unrest of a smoldering world, and the headlines of the past few days have served as exclamation marks for almost every idea expressed here.

So there is no need for me to review with you the details of the international situation. Our questions today are the basic ones: What do these details add up to, for us as Americans and as inhabitants of the planet Earth? And, even more intimately, what can the citizen do to achieve the peace, the prosperity, the harmony for which all of us yearn?

The events in Korea have pointed up the fact that today the United States, as the leader of the free world, has a policy. It is a simple policy. It is a clear policy. We are committed to the halting of Communist aggression in a land only recently liberated from another aggressive totalitarianism—that of Japan. We are acting within the framework of the United Nations. We are not waging war in Korea; we are waging peace. If it is necessary for our young men to risk their lives for any cause, then I am sure we all agree that peace is the most worthwhile cause they could choose.

The totalitarian world has been put on notice that, in keeping with our responsibilities as one of the United Nations, we have called a halt to conquest by seepage.

At the same time, we are carrying out a far-flung policy of economic as well as military assistance. We believe in the ancient precept that the Lord helps those who help themselves, and the whole point of our European recovery program, of our point 4 plans, and of all the other means by which we are working with our friends around the world, is that we want to make it possible for all free people to help themselves. We believe that free peoples want to stand on their own feet. Where history and accident have prevented them from doing so, we are making it possible for them to overcome the road blocks created by the past. That is the crux of our economic policy, just as firmness is the crux of our military policy.

We have a policy, too, in the conflict of ideas. We believe in total disclosure. We have faith in our democratic way of life, and we believe that it is attractive to people who understand it. This does not mean that we try to hide our faults and infirmities. It is the essence of democracy that we can boldly recognize what is wrong with our country, as the first step toward setting things right. We believe that we have more than refrigerators and television sets to offer the world—and I do not want to minimize the attractiveness of comfortable living. But we add to the material advantages of a free society the spiritual advantages as well. We believe that men can only be happy when they are free—free politically, intellectually, and physically. That is the crux of our information policy, which ranks alongside the economic and the military.

Our fourth major policy is support of the United Nations. In Korea, we have proved to the world that we insist upon acting through the framework of international organization. At the same time, we have proved to ourselves that, by doing so, we strengthen rather than weaken the possibility of resisting totalitarian aggression. Korea has put the United Nations to the ultimate test, and the United Nations, as an organization, has emerged stronger than ever in its tumultuous 5-year history. It is true that the policy has been successful partly because the Soviet Union was absent from the Security Council when the decision was made. But absence was a free choice by the Soviet Government. No one compelled the Russians to stay away. There is, perhaps, a logic in history; and this logic made it inevitable that, when the test came, there should not have existed at Lake Success the obstructionist force which might have torpedoed the United Nations when it was on the verge of achieving its greatest success.

So we have the fourth great policy in the conduct of our foreign affairs—the policy of acting as a member in good standing of the international community, and of accepting our responsibilities as one of the United Nations.

All of these major policies, along with others of slightly lesser significance, have emerged clearly during recent weeks. They mark no deviation from the road we have followed ever since we broke away from the tradition of American isolationism. Isolationism is dead in America. It was not President Roosevelt who killed it; nor the prewar Committee to Defend America nor the prewar Fight for Freedom Committee. History killed it, plus geography, plus science, plus economics—plus education, by which I mean the increased public understanding of what history and geography and science and economics mean to America.

What I am saying is that public opinion, spurred by the events which influence public opinion, shifted the United States completely away from isolationism in the 1930's and 1940's. Public opinion today has, in the final analysis, created our policy in Korea. Public opinion has made possible the Marshall plan, and our whole program of economic and military rehabilitation throughout the world. Public opinion, by its steadfast dedication to democratic ideals, makes our world-wide information policy effective. Public opinion makes it possible for our Government to continue working with and through the machinery of the United Nations.

What, then, is public opinion?

The totalitarians give us one answer. To them, public opinion is something formulated and manipulated in the secret councils of the dictatorial clique, to be handed down through a controlled press, a controlled radio, a controlled educational system, a controlled propaganda organization penetrating

the farthest reaches of the mind. Public opinion, in the Soviet Union, is simply what the people are told to believe by the daily headlines in Pravda.

In one of his lesser playlets, written a quarter of a century ago, Bernard Shaw put into the mouth of a militarist a summation of the attitude toward public opinion which symbolizes the totalitarian view even better than Shaw himself might have guessed in the 1920's. I quote his lines:

"There's no such thing as public opinion. There are certain persons who entertain certain opinions. Well, shoot them down. When you have shot them down, there are no longer any persons entertaining those opinions alive; consequently there is no longer any more of the public opinion you are so much afraid of. Grasp that fact and you have grasped the secret of government. Public opinion is mind. Mind is inseparable from matter. Shoot down the matter and you kill the mind."

The Shavian wit, unfortunately, is not so funny. It comes too close to totalitarian reality for laughter. For the essence of the totalitarian technique is simply this: To capture the minds that are too unformed, too weak, or too ignorant to resist capture. As for those dangerous people who prefer to think for themselves, shoot them down. That is the totalitarian way. It leads to discipline, to conformity, to obedience, to the herd-mind. Sometimes, when the discipline becomes too great, the conformity too rigid, the obedience too severe, the herd may stampede in revolt. But, until that happens, the dictator himself is the public opinion of his subjects. And the individual has no say in the decisions that are made for him. His job is always to obey, sometimes to cheer on order, very occasionally to vote "Ja!" or "Da!" and to keep his mouth shut the rest of the time.

We who live in the atmosphere of freedom, of course, have a different idea of the function of public opinion. In our society, public opinion is the combined force of private opinions. It is overt on election days; and it is also overt throughout the year in the sense that, through representative government, we enact one law and do not enact another, that we adopt one governmental policy and do not adopt another. It is overt, in recent years, by virtue of the public opinion polls—which have frequently reflected the attitudes of the American people but have not, and perhaps cannot, achieve total success in doing so. It is overt through the letters that are written to Congress; through the resolutions of organizations large and small, and the appearances at congressional committee hearings; through the mail every public official in Washington receives, from the President down; through the letters to the newspapers; through all the other ways in which citizens make their views known.

But public opinion expresses itself in less obvious ways as well. There is the power of the private conversation; the power of having read a book or a magazine article or a newspaper editorial, and of having absorbed the information and the viewpoint they contain; the subtle, pervasive power of being well informed. For many people this may seem not altogether satisfying. It is possible that someone who has, for instance, attended the sessions of this splendid conference here at Colgate University may ask, "Now that I have explored the international situation, now that I have listened to the experts, now that I have myself, perhaps, participated in some of the discussions, where do I go from here?"

The answer, fundamentally, is a political answer. As one who has for years taken a rather active interest in the art of politics in this country, I can tell you that you go very far from here. It is not the letters to the editors alone that will tell the story. It is not even the organizational resolutions alone. Nor is it solely the mail received at the Nation's Capital.

There is a latent but powerful force that truly expresses the opinion of the public. When President Truman made his resolute decision in the face of the North Korean aggression, it was obvious overnight that the Nation supported this decision. There were some carping critics, true. But every newspaperman, every political leader, every Government official, every person who understands America, knew in a matter of hours that the President's decision was the people's decision.

The people, individually, did not make this decision. They could not have done so, in specific terms, because the decision had to be made on the basis of intelligence reports and dispatches arriving in Washington from halfway across the world. There was no secret about the general contents of this information. But obviously the individual citizen does not consider himself the repository of every single item of detailed information about the disposition of our own forces, about the nature of the North Korean aggressor forces, about the logistical and economic and diplomatic nature of the crisis out of which the decision grew. What the citizen did know, because he had a press and radio to inform him, and because he had the broad outlines of the international situation presented to him by the officials who are responsible to him, was the fundamental meaning of the problem with which we were confronted. He knew that we could either put a stop to aggression in Korea, or we could knuckle under. This he knew; and when President Truman decided to take a firm stand, each citizen in our democracy had a clear understanding of the implications of this stand. Having understood, the citizens overwhelmingly supported the President. And the family conversation on a front porch here in Hamilton was as much an expression of this support as was any editorial in the New York Times.

"In this Nation," President Truman said last summer, "foreign policy is not made by the decisions of a few. It is the result of the democratic process, and represents the collective judgment of the people. Our foreign policy is founded upon an enlightened public opinion."

The plain fact is that we would not have won World War II if, after Pearl Harbor, the American people had not been determined to win the war. That was an expression of public opinion, in the most obvious sense, at a time when winning the war was the fundamental tenet of our foreign policy.

When the war was won, the plain fact was that the American people overwhelmingly favored our joining with other governments in the establishment of the United Nations. That too was an expression of public opinion from which there stemmed our whole policy of support for the United Nations from 1945 to this moment. When the Senate approved the United Nations Charter by a vote of 87 to 2, it was doing no more than to reflect the public opinion of this country.

During the postwar years, the plain fact was that the majority opinion among Americans favored our participation in the European recovery program. It was not necessary for every last one of us to be economists in making up our minds on the need for a program that would help our friends get back on their feet so that they could stand by themselves. What was involved here, first of all, was common sense and foresight. The Congress reflected American public opinion when it enacted Marshall plan legislation by a vote of approximately 4 to 1.

That is what I mean when I say that our basic foreign policy is guided by public opinion, and that public opinion is nothing more than the sum of all our private opinions.

The obvious conclusion to be drawn from this is that the private opinion of the private citizen, because of its importance, must rely on truth rather than on distortions, on candor rather than on exaggerated secrecy, on knowledge rather than on ignorance.

We derive our opinions partly from emotion and partly from reason. Without a knowledge of the facts, both our emotional drives and our reasoning capacities are dangerously limited. The citizen has a right, therefore, to expect honest and full information from his Government, limited only by acceptable standards of national security. It is important, in our time, to know what the atom bomb is, what it can do, and who has it. But most reasonable men will agree that, in this time of tension, it would not be in the national interest to make public the precise facts on the number and types of such bombs which may be in our possession. The point here is quite clear. It is not always so clear in other situations, and the responsibility resting on the shoulders of those whom the people have placed in high office is not very enviable.

To the same extent, the responsibility imposed on our press, our magazines, our radio and television broadcasters, and on all our other channels of communication, is equally great. They have both the right and the duty to report the facts and to express opinions. But they have no moral right to lie, to libel, to distort, and to deceive. Short of outright libel and slander, we Americans are inclined to bend over backward rather than insist upon policing this question of morality. Our concept of freedom of speech and press causes us to leave the question of moral rights and wrongs to those who exercise that freedom. Yet this does not mean that the responsibility is nonexistent. It is a responsibility to the fundamental unity of the American people. We have a united people today—as united as any people ought to be in a democracy. This does not mean that we have—or ever ought to have—uniformity. It means that we are prepared, as you have done this week, to examine the facts about America's position in the world; to discuss the pros and cons of our foreign policy; to disagree on some issues; and, out of debate and discussion, to arrive at the private opinions which—multiplied by 150,000,000—add up to the public opinion of the American people.

Here at the Colgate Conference on Foreign Policy, you have given a full and impressive demonstration of how the challenge to the citizen is accepted by the citizen. You have gone to the heart of the matter: The citizen must inform himself. He must seek out the facts. He must strive to know the opinions of the experts. And then he must, in the privacy of his own thoughts, arrive at his own conclusions. By virture of these conclusions, and of the behavior that stems from these conclusions, the citizen of the United States becomes a powerful force in the shaping of American foreign policy.

Federal Prison System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the RECORD a splendid article by J. Pope Dyer, head of Chattanooga's Central High School's social science department. This article appeared in the June 29, 1950, issue of the Chattanooga News-Free Press and describes the efficient manner in which the Bureau of Prisons is managed under the able direction of James V. Bennett.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DYER PRAISES UNITED STATES PRISONS FOR EFFICIENCY

(By J. Pope Dyer)

(Editor's note: J. Pope Dyer, head of Central High School's social-science department, has visited a number of Federal prisons during the past 10 years. Here he writes his impressions of how the institutions are managed under direction of the Honorable James V. Bennett, of Washington, D. C., national Director of Federal Prison System.)

A few years ago a distinguished criminologist wrote a conspicuously prominent book which he titled "Prison Life Is Different." If I were called upon to properly classify our Federal prison system, I should state without a moment's hesitation that they are splendid. The National Director, Hon. James V. Bennett, of Washington, D. C., is a man of rare foresight, courage, and ability. He has selected an exceedingly efficient corps of workers and everywhere the institutions which are under his administration are characterized by a high degree of cleanliness, efficiency, and progressiveness.

It has been my good fortune during the past 10 years to visit many of these institutions—Atlanta, Terre Haute, Ind.; Chillicothe, Ohio; Alderson, W. Va.; Natural Bridge, Va.; Washington, D. C.; El Tuna, Tex.; El Reno, Okla.; and Alcatraz Island, Calif.

THREEFOLD

These institutions have a threefold classification. Some are minimum security prisons, some are medium security prisons, and Alcatraz is a maximum security prison. These institutions are administered in a very progressive manner. The inmates are fairly, but firmly treated. Every means available is used to rehabilitate the person who is confined to the institution. For example, the various textile mills in the Atlanta Federal Prison could not be surpassed. The airplane mechanics school at Chillicothe is probably the best school of its type in the Nation. No one could hope to see a more beautiful library than the one found in the Terre Haute institution, and the herd of cattle of the El Tuna prison is one of the best. The grounds of the Federal Institution for Women at Alderson, W. Va., are among the most beautiful that I have viewed anywhere in this country.

Within the past month it has been my pleasure to visit the well-known institution at Alcatraz Island, Calif. This institution is strictly administered but I should characterize it as being extremely efficiently administered. Particular care is used by every employee. To illustrate this point I should like to say that they required me to pass through the electric eye four times before I was admitted and I had nothing on my person of a metallic nature more than a small pocket knife. I found the prisoners, every one of them, assigned a definite piece of work to do. There were no loafers. They were under strict supervision and guidance, with an exceedingly efficient personnel directing the industries and the institution. It is no show place. It is an institution where men are incarcerated who have committed many serious crimes and who are there because they require maximum security prison facilities.

NO PICTURE

I have frequently thought of what one of the authorities at Alcatraz said: "If all of the agencies in our society and especially the newspapers would quit glorifying and spectacularizing the heinous crimes of dangerous men, very few boys and girls would be interested in entering the field." This statement reminded me of what a warden told me that a dangerous criminal asked shortly before he was executed in one of the State electric chairs. The criminal asked, "What, no picture?"

The people of this Nation need the assurance that our prisons are being operated humanely, efficiently, and fairly. I can make this report with a great degree of emphasis. If the other institutions of our Nation were being operated as well as our Federal prison system, I feel that the people of our Nation would commend our Government for its economy, foresightedness, and superb administration. Again let me say that I cannot too highly commend Director Bennett and his fine corps of workers for their outstanding service to our Nation.

Communist Party in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, July 22, I was asked to attend a meeting at Steubenville, Ohio, at which the veterans committee, Local No. 1190, CIO; the Argonne Post, No. 33, American Legion; the Disabled American Veterans, chapter No. 65, Steubenville; and the Peter DeMark Post, Italian-American War Veterans, had representatives in attendance.

At that time the representatives of these four organizations presented me with the resolution which I attach herewith, which was originally passed by the Veterans Committee, Local No. 1190, United Steelworkers of America, and expressed to me verbally their very deep concern about the activities of the Communist Party in the United States at a time this country is engaged in a war with communism, and asked that I support legislation outlawing the Communist Party.

Mr. Speaker, it is well known that the Communist Party is not a political party, but is a revolutionary organization designed to overthrow the American system of government and to impose a dictatorship on all the people of the world. Since this is a well-known fact, it seems to me rather stupid that we should tolerate the activities of these revolutionaries on our home front when they are undermining and trying to sabotage the activities of our fighting men at the war front.

I am preparing legislation, Mr. Speaker, which will in my opinion effectively deal with this threat on the home front, which I will introduce subsequently.

The following persons represented the above-named organizations at this meeting, and I am submitting the resolution which they have adopted: Richard Carr, veterans' committee, Local No. 1190, CIO; John F. Scott, Argonne Post, No. 33, American Legion; Dominic Nocera, Disabled American Veterans, Chapter No. 65, Steubenville; Amedia Mininni, Peter DeMark Post, Italian-American War Veterans.

A RESOLUTION

Whereas the Veterans' Committee of Local Union No. 1190, United Steelworkers of America, CIO, does unanimously concur in an opinion that the peace, security, and welfare of the people of these United States, are now being jeopardized by the constant spread and encroachment of communism upon the lives and welfare of all free people.

Whereas as veterans of both World Wars, we do hereby solemnly vow, that the life blood of our comrades in arms, that has flown so freely upon all battlefields abroad to preserve world peace, dignify the human rights of all people, and to consecrate this great Republic under God, as a citadel of freedom, will not have been in vain.

Whereas we are convinced that the strength of these United States and her Allies is now being tested by Soviet Russia in Korea to sound out the possibilities of a world conquest by Soviet Russia, in order to indoctrinate the world with the philosophy of communism. We further agree that history itself gives us the pattern of aggression by Russia in recording a similar incident, with the same intent and purpose, when the soil of Spain was stained red by the blood of thousands of innocent people, when it became the testing grounds for Hitler's Legion of Death, Stalin's red hordes, and Mussolini's Facist that eventually set off the greatest holocaust in the history of the world.

Whereas we are firmly convinced that threats of world-wide communism are not confined to European and Asiatic countries alone but are threatening us from within our own borders; that members of the Communist Party in this country who are allegiant to Soviet Russia, will aid her in times of duress and are now subversively plotting against the United States and the people thereof.

Whereas with definite overt acts of aggression being committed by Soviet Russia in Korea that are undermining the peace of the world, we do hereby unanimously agree that all members of the Communist Party, both here and abroad, openly commit themselves as enemies of this country and should be treated as such.

Whereas we consider a national emergency to be existing, creating the necessity of constant vigilance by all citizens of the United States in the preservation of our freedom; now be it

Resolved, That we believe the facts set forth in this resolution are basically sound, therefore, we petition you to exercise the powers of your high office to draft and secure the necessary legislation outlawing the Communist Party in the United States and to establish by law a severe penalty for a violation thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That as veterans of two World Wars and as citizens of the United States, we do not consider such action to be in violation of any of the individual rights and privileges guaranteed us by the Constitution; and be it further

Resolved, That we seek the aid and assistance of all local veterans organizations in securing the passage of this legislation; and further

That a copy of this resolution be mailed to: Senator Robert A. Taft, Senator John

W. Bricker, Congressman Wayne L. Hays, Mayor Walter C. Sterling, Steubenville City Council, Steubenville Herald Star, and Station WSTV.

RICHARD CARR,
Chairman, Veterans Committee.
SAM K. LONETTA,
Cochairman, Veterans Committee.
NELLO J. AMEDEI,
Member, Veterans Committee.

Another Effort to Bypass Experience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House last week I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article by Arthur Krock titled: "Another Effort to Bypass Experience," which appeared in the New York Times:

The President's decision to try to enforce priorities and allocations of materials essential to his partial mobilization program without price controls, his failure to mention wage controls at all, and his current attempt to prevent hoarding and profiteering by appealing to the patriotism and common sense of individual citizens represent an experiment which failed 10 years ago at great and enduring cost to the national economy.

Then, though the crisis caused by the European war was mounting, the Roosevelt administration first long delayed action and then tried to deal by inches with the problem of controls. It left wages to the last, and the result was an economic system that kept bursting at the seams and has had to be patched with political thread ever since.

The close alliance between organized labor and the Roosevelt administration was the root of the effort to control prices, after part of the nettle was grasped, without tackling the large component that wages constituted. That was the period in which, writing in the Harvard Business Review, Donald M. Nelson and Leon Henderson professed to believe the wage component would be satisfactorily regulated by the patriotism and common sense of labor and management.

President Truman's immediate program is far from the mobilization for total war which came after the United States became involved on December 7, 1941. But it can require an increase of $20,000,000,000 in the military budget for fiscal year 1951 before all the requirements, starting with $10,000,000,000, are met. And that is a far step forward toward a military economy and begins a period where defense needs have priority.

WHAT FOLLOWS ALLOCATIONS

Hand in hand with priorities must go allocations, and the lesson of experience is that these cannot be effective without price controls in which controls of wages are included. Allocations follow this course: materials one businessman wants are awarded to another; the first man then normally tries to get the materials in any kind of market he can; and this endeavor raises costs, which in turn brings demands for wage increases. The temporary structure the President has recommended to Congress somewhat resembles the classic German cartel, but it is being erected on a partial war footing, and that calls for the additional factor which price-wage controls alone can furnish.

If Mr. Truman can move the economy into the partial military phase which is his program, and deal effectively with priorities, allocations, hoarding and profiteering without this final factor, it will be a historic example of a triumph over experience. This achievement may be his if very soon he asks, and Congress grants, stand-by powers to institute price-wage controls when he finds them necessary—the club-in-the-closet which in some matters does a fine job of inactive policing. But if he does not soon make the request and gain the assent of Congress to it (this could be assured by a proviso of consultation before final action), the lesson of experience is that the miracle can't be passed in Washington.

The entire problem, of course, will vanish if a certain kind of miracle can be passed in Moscow. But even the most credulous readers of the stars see no approaching signs of that phenomenon.

THE BARUCH THESIS

The voice of this particular experience about economy in a crisis provoked by war or the threat of war is Bernard M. Baruch. He does not play in the Truman administration the advisory role he played in previous ones. There are no personal relations between the President and Mr. Baruch. Yet this does not take validity from Mr. Baruch's statements on the subject, and the absence of personal relations with the White House does not remove it either. Among his statements this, published in March 1941 in the Harvard Business Review, is typical:

"Priorities should be applied as soon as the action of the Government in carrying out the armaments program has made impending shortages apparent in any of the components of production. Then there is a more delicate timing problem after the system has been launched which must be dealt with carefully to attain the maximum possible synchronization of all elements of the Nation's industry. * * *.

"The priorities system cannot work alone. It is the heart of industrial mobilization, but it needs other organs. Above all, it must have the assistance of price control, conservation, the search for substitutes, and commandeering. Price control is necessary because the priorities system is actually a means of short-circuiting the laws of supply and demand."

In November 1941, in a letter to Representative GORE, of Tennessee, Mr. Baruch wrote, "I do not see how control of prices can be effective without taking into consideration wage levels and agricultural schedules. * * * A ceiling over wages can be adjustable so as to give consideration to increases in the cost of living. * * * But wages form the biggest component of all price structures."

That is even truer now than it was 9 years ago.

Garibaldi's Exile in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following story by Vincent A. Caso that tells of the exile in this country of Gen. Giuseppe Garibaldi:

GARIBALDI'S EXILE IN NEW YORK

One hundred years ago Giuseppe Garibaldi landed on our shores. The Hero of the Two Worlds spent 3 years in exile in our hospitable land. From the day of his arrival, on July 30, 1850, until his departure, he led an exemplary life and endeared himself to all who came in contact with him. Those years spent in the modest home of an humble Florentine furnished Americans with a better insight into the character and personality of the distinguished Italian general. It is most fitting, therefore, that we should recall some of the phases of his stay here, phases which have been dimmed by the passing of a century. We also recall the interesting letters exchanged by American officials and the Fighter for Freedom, who ardently desired to aid the cause of the Republic in the trying days of the Rebellion.

The arrival of the famous exile was announced in the New York Daily Tribune. On the morning of July 30, 1850, this publication carried the following item:

"The American packet *Waterloo* arrived this morning from Liverpool, bringing Giuseppe Garibaldi, the man of world-wide fame, the hero of Montevideo, the defender of Rome. He will be received by those who know him for his chivalrous character and for his services for the cause of liberty."

For quite some time it was known that Garibaldi had planned to come to America. After his strenuous and heroic defense of the Roman Republic against overwhelming forces in 1849 and his escape across Italy, Tunis, Gibraltar, Tangier, he went to Liverpool, and from there left for New York on June 27, 1850.

The Italian residents of New York, encouraged by the reputation Garibaldi enjoyed in America, constituted a committee to make arrangements for a suitable reception in his honor. Americans, Frenchmen, Germans, Poles, Hungarians, and others indicated their desire to participate in the festivities being planned. Hon. Caleb S. Woodhull, mayor of New York, would participate in the reception. The city council would welcome him and offer to Garibaldi the use of the Governor's room at City Hall. The proprietors of the Astor House, 221 Broadway, the largest hotel of those days, offered him the hospitality of their hotel. The initiative was also taken to tender him a banquet planned for August 10, 1850.

General Garibaldi avoided every possible manifestation and excused himself with the following letter sent by him to the chairman of the committee:

"I hope you will permit me to repeat to you more earnestly, if possible, the wish that I have often expressed, to see the projected demonstration abandoned.

"Although a public demonstration of your sentiments would be a great satisfaction to me, an exile from my native land, severed from my children and mourning the overthrow of my country's freedom by means of foreign intervention, however, believe me I would prefer to avoid all demonstrations and become an humble and tranquil citizen of this great Republic of free men and sail under its flag, pursue a career that would permit me to earn my bread and wait for a favorable occasion to liberate my country from its domestic and foreign oppressors.

"After dedicating myself to a cause, there is nothing that is nearer to my heart than the approbation of these great people, and I am certain I will obtain it, when they convince themselves that I have honestly and faithfully served the cause of liberty."

Another reason for General Garibaldi to avoid all sorts of festivities was because he was ill with rheumatism, a disease the origin of which he ascribed to the fatigues of the late war. In the hope that it might hasten his recovery, Garibaldi had gone to the residence of Mr. Ferrero, in Hastings-on-Hudson, where he remained for about 15 days. He then returned to New York City where he lived for 6 weeks with Foresti at the home of Pastacaldi in Irving Place. Though Gari-

baldi preferred almost exclusively the company of his compatriots, he received frequent visitor from distinguished Americans and foreigners, letters of affection and esteem from many parts of the Union. In a letter to Garibaldi, dated Washington, August 14, 1850, Senator Lewis Cass, United States Senator and former Governor of Michigan, welcomed the Italian to this land of freedom, assuring him that he possessed the regard and the sympathy of the American people. Recalling Garibaldi's glorious deeds in his defense of Rome, Senator Cass went on to say: "It is not success that hallows a cause; it is the principle involved in it. You yielded to an overwhelming force; to another descent of the Gaul upon Italy. * * * Your glorious exertions, followed by misfortunes, borne with equanimity, are a passport to the hearts and homes of my countrymen."

On August 12, the Italians of New York City held a meeting at Monteverde's in Barclay Street, and after acceding to Garibaldi's wishes to avoid receptions, voted to present the funds remaining in the hands of the committee to Dr. Bovi, who had lost his right hand in the discharge of his duty as an artillery officer during the siege of Rome. At the request of the original committee a new committee was appointed, consisting of Messrs. Magnesco, Madini, and Piatti to wait on Dr. Bovi with the gift of the Italians. The meeting voted the warmest acknowledgments for the sympathy which the press of New York had shown toward General Garibaldi and the course of Italian liberty, especially the Evening Post, the Herald, and the Tribune.

The Italian colony in New York City at that time numbered aboout 3,000 persons, a good percentage of whom were political refugees. Among them were Gen. Giuseppe Avezzana, former Minister of War of the Roman Republic; Quirico Filopanti, former Secretary of the Triumvirate of the Roman Republic; Antonio Meucci, who had established a candle factory in Staten Island; Felix Foresti, who taught Italian at Columbia and New York Universities; Michele Pastacaldi, at whose residence in Irving Place, Garibaldi would spend hours with his friends; Secchi di Casali, the editor of l'Eco d'Italia, a New York weekly newspaper that had been established in 1850.

At that time, in the little village of Clifton, Staten Island, the island that now constitutes one of the five boroughs of Greater New York, the Borough of Richmond, a Florentine exile, Antonio Meucci, had established himself there a year before and his name is bound to one of the most wonderful inventions in the second half of the nineteenth century: the telephone.

As soon as Garibaldi landed in America, he went to live with Meucci. In his memoirs Garibaldi wrote: "Landing like a weight in a barrel in Staten Island, I met a good man, a Florentine. He decided to establish a candle factory and asked me to help him in his establishment. No sooner said than done. I could not take part in this speculation for lack of funds. I adapted myself to do some work. I worked for Meucci, who did not treat me as an ordinary laborer, but rather as a member of the family and with much affection and tenderness."

The house where Meucci lived, and where the "hero of the two worlds" was a guest, had previously belonged to a certain tenor whose name was Salvi. Later it was acquired by an impresario whose name was Maretzek who then gave it to Frederick Bechmann, a beer manufacturer, a good German from Baden, who let Meucci live in it.

On June 11, 1882, 9 days after Garibaldi's death, an impressive ceremony took place, attended by thousands of Italian immigrants. It was on this occasion that Frederick Bechmann, owner of the house where Garibaldi had resided, announced that he was donating the property to the Italians, on the sole condition that Antonio Meucci be permitted to live there during his natural life.

Frederick Bechmann received the gratitude of the Italians and as the echo of his munificence reached Italy, the municipality of Civitavecchia with a solemn vote, proclaimed him an honorary citizen. Antonio Meucci lived in this house until his death.

Within less than 2 years of Garibaldi's death, compatriots and personal friends placed on the house a marble slab bearing the following inscription: "Qui Visse Esule Dal 1850 al 1853. Giuseppe Garibaldi, L'Eroe Dei Due Mondi. 8 Marzo 1884. Alcuni Amici Posero."

Since 1915, the Order of the Sons of Italy in America was appointed custodian of the property (Garibaldi Pantheon). For many years, on July 4, which marks not only the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, but also Garibaldi's birthday, the Order of the Sons of Italy held appropriate exercises on the grounds to honor the hero. The order also unveiled a monument to Antonio Meucci on September 16, 1923. Since July 3, 1932, when an unfortunate incident occured, in which Fascists and anti-Fascists clashed, the order decided to discontinue these gatherings.

The Pantheon has been sadly neglected. It is in a deplorable state of deterioration. I recently visited it and felt a deep sense of humiliation. Here was a landmark, a monument to a great world figure who had devoted his entire life to the cause of liberty; a figure the mention of whose name still kindles enthusiasm in the hearts of lovers of freedom everywhere; a man beloved by Italians and Americans; and it is slowly going to seed. It seems incredible that such a condition should prevail. The custodians, the Order of the Sons of Italy, should most certainly do something to right this grievous situation. If it cannot rebuild or repair this historic building and adequately provide for its maintenance and upkeep, then it should give up its custody to a more active body. I suggest the formation of a nation-wide committee of public spirited Americans of Italian origin for the purpose of raising funds to properly care for this shrine. And I also suggest the revival of the annual pilgrimage to Staten Island to honor the memory of the "Hero of the Two Worlds, the Washington of Italy."

THE MONUMENT IN WASHINGTON SQUARE, NEW YORK

On June 8, 1882, Il Progresso Italo-Americano promoted a drive to erect a monument to the hero of the two worlds in Washington Square, New York. The drive was highly successful and the Italian community responded generously and enthusiastically to the Progresso idea.

The monument was erected and has been visited by many pilgrims. It is strategically placed in an important section surrounded by various buildings of New York University which is destined to expand into one of the city's greatest cultural centers with the addition of other annexes of the great institution of learning.

HOW THE DISTINGUISHED EXILE LIVED

The cordiality and hospitality of the Meucci family in the modest little home in Staten Island, free from the noise of the great city, and the visits of patriots in exile served as a balm to his heart which was lacerated from the recent death in the Pineta of Ravenna of his wife, Anita.

The little house in Staten Island was more than modest. It was barely furnished. What little furniture there was in it was of antique make and of doubtful comfort, consisting of a bed and some rustic chairs which Garibaldi himself made from vines which he had gathered in Clifton. Among other things in this rather barren house were a glass case, containing a red, white, and green candle, made by the general himself, antlers of a deer which Garibaldi had brought from South America, a photograph of himself in his red shirt on the reefs of Caprera bearing the following inscription: "to my dear boss, Antonio Meucci," a dozen letters also autographed—all dated from Caprera, an oil painting of himself wearing a morning coat, and a parrot whom Garibaldi taught to yell out "Viva l'Italia."

With Garibaldi was Col. Paolo Bovi Campeggi, who had accompanied the general into voluntary exile in North America.

General Garibaldi and Colonel Campeggi made weekly trips from Staten Island to New York to pick up mail and to meet with Giuseppe Avezzana, Quirico Filopanti, Felice Foresti, Michele Pastacaldi, and other distinguished exiles. These were periodic meetings in which these illustrious gentlemen read together, with palpitating hearts and quivering emotions, the latest news from Italy and the correspondence from the revolutionary committee in London and from Giuseppe Mazzini.

Among the friends of Garibaldi and Meucci whom they visited each Saturday and Sunday were Giovanni Morosini, who was an adventurous sailor seeking his fortune on Staten Island and he too worked for Meucci, and later became a prominent banker and partner of Jay Gould, the famous Wall Street banker; Luigi Tinelli, one of the pioneers of silk production in America; Giuseppe Tagliabue, inventor and manufacturer of hydrographic and meteorological instruments, and Giovanni Freschi, father of the late Judge John J. Freschi, who came to America in 1843.

Neither Garibaldi nor Campeggi had to work for a living in Staten Island. If the general sometimes made wax candles and Campeggi, who was from Bologna, sometimes made salami and mortadella, it was because they merely did it to pass the time away and to fraternally help their hosts, since Meucci thought of everything and provided everything. If General Garibaldi distributed among the poor Italians the $500 given to him by a rich American who was an ardent admirer of his and also of Italy, it was not only because of his innate generosity but also because he did not need the money.

In Staten Island Garibaldi was grave, melancholy, and spoke very little. Unable to adapt himself to the idle life lived by so many exiles, he was tormented by his anxiety for movement and for work. Sometimes he would leave early in the morning with his rifle on his shoulder and some bread and cheese in his game-pouch and he would remain in the surrounding woods all day, returning home late at night when he was tired and loaded down with game.

One day when he went hunting out of season without being aware of it, he was arrested and later released through the intervention of friends. When he returned home, one of the persons present complained about American laws, but Garibaldi observed that "Americans make and enforce the laws proper to the regulation of their communities, just as we hope some day to do with ours in Italy."

On other days he would take off in a beautiful sailboat which he had painted red, white, and green and which he had christened *Ugo Bassi* in memory of the heroic priest. Garibaldi, who was a born sailor, made his craft fly over the waves like a sea gull, and spent whole days and calm nights fishing. Several hours each day he dedicated to the study of the English language. On his visits to New York, Garibaldi often stopped to play dominoes and chat with his friends at Lorenzo Ventura's Restaurant, located at 289½ Broadway. In those days Ventura's was a favorite cosmopolitan rendezvous for actors, newspapermen, and literati.

Garibaldi looked with sympathy on the country that had shown him hospitality in the darkest hour of his life. "This nation is certainly living up to its reputation and will soon become the first among the great nations;" he had written soon after his arrival in New York. Three years later, Garibaldi wrote: "This people—the Americans—is today the only intrepid bulwark against European despotism."

Those who surrounded him remembered with emotion the kindliness and generosity of the hero. Mrs. Meucci has quite a time furnishing him with linens and underwear. The first poor Italian who came asking for aid would carry them away. And as far as money was concerned, it would disappear as soon as it had entered in his pocket.

Toward the end of 1852 Garibaldi assumed the command of a merchant ship, the *Commonwealth*, and made a voyage to China. The trip was uneventful until he reached Canton. On his return the navigator encountered a terrible storm, during which he was hardly able to restrain the members of the crew who were on the verge of mutiny because of the lack of food supplies. On his arrival in New York he visited friends and places that were dear to him and, after a brief stop-over, sailed for London and then for Italy. He later returned to New York with the same ship, but the unsettled European situation toward the end of 1853, caused him to give up his command and keep himself in readiness to return to his fatherland. The last day Garibaldi spent in America he stayed with the Meuccis in their home in Staten Island in the company of Avezzana, Felice Foresti, and the British Colonel Forbes. At the moment of departure, the good and grateful hero, with tears in his eyes, took leave of the Meucci family and this hospitable land.

In Staten Island Garibaldi was remembered with veneration up to 75 years ago by the old folks of the town. During his sojourn in Clifton he joined the Tompkinsville Masonic Lodge No. 401, to which his friend Meucci also belonged, and the fire department was proud that his name was on their books where he was registered as a member of the sapper company.

LINCOLN OFFERS GARIBALDI THE COMMAND OF AN ARMY

There is, however, another unwritten page in American history which proved the extent of the admiration in the United States for the Italian hero as a soldier and champion of liberty.

In the summer of 1861 in an article in Century magazine in New York, President Lincoln appealed to Garibaldi to lend the power of his name, his genius, and his sword to the cause of the North by assuming command of an army. The documents referring to these negotiations were not published in the diplomatic correspondence of the United States, and the newspapers had not succeeded in getting official confirmation of the insistent rumors. To many, the appeal for aid made to a foreign general seemed humiliating to national pride; but today there is no longer any reason to hide the facts concerning that offer, more so because it was frank and sincere and represents the finest tribute to the sterling character and military genius of the great Italian.

Soon after the glorious, legendary Expedition of the One Thousand, in January 1861, an article by Henry T. Tuckerman, a learned writer who had traveled extensively in Italy, appeared in the North American Review, full of enthusiasm for the great Italian general. Augusto Vecchi, delegated by Garibaldi to thank Tuckerman for this tribute, wrote a few lines in the name of his chief, but secretly added a letter of his own in which he referred to the bitter American crisis and suggested, as a means of a speedy solution, that Garibaldi be invited to lend the valuable aid of his sword. Tuckerman's letter of reply to Vecchi was never published, but the rumor became widespread in the United States that Garibaldi had offered his services to the North in the war against the South for the suppression of slavery, and many people used their influence to have the offer accepted. On the 8th of June, J. W. Quiggle, American Consul at Antwerp, who had shortly before met Garibaldi, wrote as follows:

"GENERAL GARIBALDI: The newspapers report that you are on the verge of coming to the United States to join the Army of the North in the conflict now raging in my country. If this is true, the name of Lafayette will not excel yours. There are thousands of Italians and Hungarians ready to join your ranks and thousands and tens of thousands of Americans who will be proud to serve under the command of the "Washington of Italy." I will be grateful if you will let me know if such is your intention. In which case I will give up my position as consul and join you in supporting a government created by men like Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, and other compatriots whose names I need not mention. With the assurance of my deep regards, yours,

"J. W. QUIGGLE."

Garibaldi replied from Caprera on June 27 as follows:

"MY DEAR FRIEND: The report published by the newspapers that I am going to the United States is incorrect. I have had and still have a great desire to go there, but many things prevent me from doing so. If, however, in writing to your Government, it should deem my services of some usefulness, I would go to America, unless I were engaged in the defense of my fatherland. Please inform me also if this agitation really concerns the emancipation of the Negroes. I would be most happy to be your comrade in a war, in which I would participate both as a matter of duty as well as sympathy. I affectionately kiss the hand of your wife and am, gratefully yours,

G. GARIBALDI."

A transcript of all the correspondence with Garibaldi was sent by Quiggle to the State Department in Washington and since the North, at that time, was having a disastrous time of it, the Government decided to ask the aid of Garibaldi and entrusted Sanford, American Minister at Brussels, with a special mission to Caprera. The instructions given Sanford stated textually:

"Enter in communication with the distinguished soldier of liberty; say to him that this Government believes that his services in the current conflict for the unity and liberty of the American people would be immensely useful and therefore warmly desired. Say to him that this Government is confident that he, if it is possible, will accept this invitation, because it is most certain that the fall of the American Union, even if it were possible, would be a disastrous blow to the cause of human liberty here, in Europe and all over the world. Say to him he will receive the rank of major general of the Army of the United States with the compensation of that rank and with the hearty welcome of the American people."

Sanford then visited Quiggle at Brussels, then went to Turin where he visited Marsh, American Minister to Italy, who informed him in minute detail on the true political conditions in the kingdom, and particularly on the last phase of the Roman question. The Action Party was expecting an imminent solution with the opening of hostilities in which Garibaldi would head the volunteer forces and in which case there would be no possibility of his accepting the American offer.

In order to get an idea of Garibaldi's intentions, Sanford sent him a letter by means of an employee of the American Legation at Turin, and the general replied that he would consult Victor Emanuel and that, if the King did not deem his services necessary, and the conditions offered by the American Government were the same as those outlined by the envoy, he would be ready to sail.

Vecchi went to see the King, who in flattering terms replied that Garibaldi was free to sail; that the Government had no intention of adopting his program in the Roman question, and did not see the probability of military operations for the occupation of the Papal Territory which might require his aid in the near future.

Sanford quickly chartered a private steamer and sailed from Genoa for the Maddalena on September 8, bringing with him the reply of the King, entrusted to him by Vecchi. Sanford thus describes his interview with Garibaldi:

"I have found the general still convalescing, but also to leave the room to which he had been confined for many months, and had a long conversation with him regarding his departure for the United States. He said the only way he could serve the cause of the United States, which he ardently desired to do, was as commander in chief of the forces; that only in that capacity would he go, and with the faculty, depending on events, to declare the abolition of slavery, because without this it would be merely a civil war for which the world could not feel any special interest or sympathy."

Garibaldi was asking for something which could not be granted, because under the Constitution of the United States, the Commander in Chief of the Army is the President. On the other hand, Sanford himself recognized that Garibaldi was right in refusing a lesser position; accustomed as he was to executing his own plans, he might perhaps not be successful in a common action. Besides, the emancipation of the slaves, for which he wanted discretionary powers, was not yet an integral part of Lincoln's program. And thus the negotiations did not produce the result desired by Sanford.

The American Minister had been successful in keeping secret his conversation with the general, but the friends of Garibaldi, fearful of his imminent departure, talked freely. L'Italia, of Turin, announced that Garibaldi had accepted the command of the American Federal Army and the entire liberal press broke out in a chorus of protests, and hundreds of petitions to the general were swiftly circulated throughout the land.

The question of Garibaldi's departure for America seemed definitely settled in the negative, but a year later there was a brief revival of the negotiations, which likewise remained fruitless. On August 29, 1862, Garibaldi was arrested at Aspromonte, and on September 1 the American consul at Vienna, Theodore Canisius, without the authorization of his Government, wrote him saying that because it was impossible for him to carry out his "great patriotic work" he could now perhaps offer his valorous sword in the struggle which the Great Republic was waging for liberty and unity.

Garibaldi replied from Varignano on September 14:

"SIR: I am a prisoner and gravely wounded; consequently it is impossible for me to act as I would like. I believe, however, that I shall soon be freed, and if my wounds shall be healed, the favorable occasion shall be at hand when I can fulfill my desire to serve the great American Republic, which is today fighting for universal freedom.

"GARIBALDI."

Despite the gravity of the wound he received, Garibaldi on March 5 sent Vecchi to Marsh, American Minister at Turin, to reopen negotiations in regard to command of an army. But the dispatch which Marsh sent on October 8 to the State Department com-

municating Garibaldi's offer reached the United States after Minister Seward had sent a telegram announcing the removal of Canisius from his post as consul at Vienna, not only for having reopened negotiations with Garibaldi without the authorization of his Government, but also for having given the press his letter to the general and the reply he received and because in his letter he described as "great patriotic work" the Aspromonte expedition, thus offending the Italian Government.

Meanwhile on the field of battle in the United States able generals were being developed; Garibaldi's convalescence was proceeding too slowly; the hour in which America could have used the services of the great Italian had passed.

The following transcript is from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 23, 1888. The resolution introduced by the Honorable William M. Evarts, United States Senator from the State of New York, and his speech on the life of Giuseppe Garibaldi in the United States Senate.

[CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senate]

"BUST OF GARIBALDI

"Mr. EVARTS. I ask that now may be taken up the resolution of the Senate which was reported from the Joint Library Committee and laid on the table, accompanied by a notice on my part that when it was taken up I would ask leave to accompany it with some observations.

"The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

"The Chief Clerk read the resolution reported from the Committee on the Library August 17, 1888, as follows:

" 'Whereas the Italians, residents of the city of Washington and citizens of the United States, have, through the president of the Society for a Monument to Garibaldi, presented to the United States a life-size marble bust of that great patriot and distinguished representative citizen of Italy, Giuseppe Garibaldi; and

" 'Whereas the Joint Committee on the Library have, under authority of the statute (Rev. Stat., sec. 1831), accepted the same for and in behalf of the United States: Therefore, be it

" '*Resolved,* That the Senate of the United States expresses its sense of the patriotism and liberality which prompted this noble gift from these adopted citizens of Italian birth, and extends to them, the countrymen of the great champion of Italian liberty, the assurance of the admiration of the people of this land for his noble life and distinguished deeds.'

"Mr. EVARTS. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on the Library has authority by law to accept in behalf of Congress any gift that may be made of works of art and to take order for their disposition and display in the Capitol. In pursuance of that authority the committee accepted in behalf of the Congress this gift of the Italian patriotic citizens who have presented to the Government this noble work of art and this fitting monument to the great character and the great fame of Garibaldi.

"The death of Garibaldi occurred in 1882, when he was I think in his seventy-fifth year. Very soon after that a body of Italian citizens of the United States, residents here, formed a society for the purpose of making some permanent commemoration of their great admiration of Garibaldi and of their great respect and affection for the United States, their adopted home.

"Under the lead of an eminent physician and a public-spirited citizen of this city, Dr. Verdi, this organization proceeded to procure the execution of a work of art which should be an illustration, as well, of the genius in the art of the sculptor that their country is so prolific in. An eminent artist, Giuseppe Martegani, has produced as fine a work as could be offered from any sculptor, and of as beautiful a specimen of the famous marble of Italy as could be selected from all its quarries.

"The committee have taken order, on the receipt of this completed bust, that it should be placed on a suitable pedestal, which accompanied the gift, in the principal corridor of the Senate galleries, over the main entrance to the Senate House on the eastern front. There, undoubtedly, many of the Senators have examined this beautiful work, and those who have had any opportunity to compare it with the descriptions of this famous general and patriot will have perceived that it is an accurate representation of his features and a noble expression of his character.

"Garibaldi was born in very humble circumstances. A native of Nice, the son of a sailor, and the grandson of a sailor, he was brought up to the sea in the ordinary capacity of a sailor before the mast. Nor had he any great associations, either in respect of education or of kinship; and from the beginning until he opened into an illustrious path of the glory of his country and of himself, his lot was cast in the most ordinary condition of life.

"But this great good fortune happened to him. In early life he was thrown into companionship with some of those burning spirits among the students of Italy, whose names afterward became famous as patriots, and his native genius drank in from these cultivated minds all the inspiration that had moved their hearts and inflamed their hopes.

"It is a notable thing of Garibaldi that, without education and without other than the casual associations that I have mentioned, there grew up in him a spirit of wide investigation, a thorough appreciation of a deep reverence for the great glory of Rome as transmitted from ancient times. His spirit, too, was lighted, as by a torch, with an inextinguishable hate to tyranny in every form. But with this deep reverence for ancient Rome he also nursed and cherished a dear love for Italy as it lay before him, dismembered and bound by tyranny.

"As early as 1834 he had become so enlisted and so ardent and courageous that rather a fantastic desire than a formed hope for the liberty of Italy first brought him to public notice. He, by good fortune, escaped from Genoa in disguise, to avoid arrest, and a few days afterward he saw for the first time his name in a newspaper, and that name was coupled with a sentence of death.

"Garibaldi pursued this ordinary tenor of life, his wandering fortunes, always honest and laborious, planning for nothing but for an opportunity to arrive when he could play his part in securing the unity of Italy. We find him, after 1840, for some years fighting in South America in behalf of Montevideo against the oppressions of a neighboring nation.

"One would not expect to find in this experience much of a school (for he was, through these years, afloat or on land as might be, in the lead of any force that would follow him) for the great scenes that were to await him in Europe. Nevertheless the same great powers of mind, of authority, of predominant impetuosity and courage, his readiness to try conclusions against tyranny and oppression at whatever odds, found here a preparation of spirit and of discipline better than any schools of military science or tactics could give him.

"He was back in Italy at the period of 1848–49, when all Europe was pervaded with a spirit of revolution, and he bore a part, with the great triumvirs of whom Mazzini was the chief, in that short-lived effort of founding a Roman republic.

"That failing, Garibaldi became for 2 years a resident of New York or its vicinity, where he became well known to our citizens, and his marked character, although not then distinguished by great achievements, encouraged in the knowledge and expectations of those about him the hope that he would have great things to do for Italy.

"Although Garibaldi was turning everything in his mind and in his action toward the great consummations which he aimed at, it was not until 1859 that there came the first opportunity of opening that brilliant career of arms that dazzled the world.

"As general in chief of the volunteers he took part in the war between France and Italy allied and the Austrian empire. That war ended with the peace of Villafranca, and, practically, with the annexation of Lombardy to Piedmont under Victor Emanuel. This constituted the first stage of Italian unity and independence.

"These preparations, these movements, and first steps towards unity and strength among the divided provinces or kingdoms of Italy had, in 1860, reached a point where Garibaldi found that he could strike a decisive blow, and he descended upon the island of Sicily with only a thousand soldiers. The Kingdom of Naples, under King Bomba, as he is generally called in history, had 30,000 troops on the island, and it was well fortified throughout.

"By ingenious strategy, Garibaldi, after effecting a landing, threw himself, with his thousand men, into Palermo, and there, raising the population to follow his flag, he encountered the 20,000 troops of the king in that city, and fought them through every street, and hand to hand, till Palermo was under the control of Garibaldi and the 20,000 royal troops expelled from it. In less than 3 months he overran the whole island, meeting at every point and beating such rallies as the king's forces could make, until Garibaldi was the master of all of Sicily, and the royal troops were driven from it.

"Victor Emanuel at this point, under some complication of diplomacy, sent an order to Garibaldi to be satisfied with this acquisition, and not attempt the Kingdom of Naples. Garibaldi sent back to the king a message, 'You know how much I love you, but your order comes too late; Italy must be free.' Crossing the Straits of Messina he entered Naples alone, the population carrying him in triumph, the king and his troops flying in panic from the city. Here for the first time a name was given to Garibaldi by his grateful fellow-citizens that has never ceased to be a part of his fame. 'Liberator'—'Liberator of Italy'—hailed him as he entered the city of Naples.

"But, Mr. President, the king did not surrender, and with 50,000 troops made a stand at a point of resistance of his own choice in the open plain, and defied the approach of Garibaldi with his troops of only 20,000 men, at Volturno. With these new levies, new soldiers, but lovers of freedom and of Italy, through a stubborn fight lasting a whole day, before sunset Garibaldi and his 20,000 followers routed the 50,000 troops of the king. King Bomba retired from his kingdom and never returned. In a few days after this final triumph Garibaldi met the king, Victor Emanuel, who would have stayed his hand, and took off his cap to him, with this simple salutation: "The Kingdom of Naples is yours."

"Mr. President, we can all feel, I think, that there never was in a career of arms or in a triumph of a great cause a career or triumph that more completely turned on one man. It may be conceded that without Garibaldi these things would not have happened, and with Garibaldi and all who aided him these were great things to accomplish, either by himself or with his followers. Garibaldi refused every honor and every emolument, retired to Caprera, his little island home, off the coast of Sardinia, but 3 miles wide and 5 miles long. This place that he greatly loved he has made illustrious. Never

for one moment, from the first step he made toward public action, public fame, public achievements, did he desire or accept any honors or emoluments for his great deeds for Italy.

"Here for 2 years he meditated how he could compass the conquest of the Roman States, for without that acquisition Italy was not and could not be united. The time, however, had not arrived, as was supposed, when the Kingdom of Italy, so far as it had been consolidated, could attempt a solution of this great problem of the Roman States. While in his little home of Caprera the frigates of Victor Emanuel watched its shores to prevent his reaching the mainland. But Garibaldi escaped and undertook, then obviously prematurely, an attack upon Rome. At Aspromonte he was met by King Victor Emanuel's army, an army that he could not contend with either in strength or in the affections of his heart; but to him it was a bitter disappointment that he should thus be turned away from his purpose and checked in his own advancing glory for Italy by the kind and kingdom which he had so much exalted.

"In 1863 Garibaldi by invitation visited England. His fame was great. The enthusiasm of the people of England for him was unbounded. It lit such a flame that the Government of that sedate kingdom found itself in an awkward predicament toward this guest; but at length it was politely intimated to Garibaldi that he should not prolong his stay. It was my fortune, Mr. President, to be in England at that time, and my delight there to make the personal acquaintance of Garibaldi.

"I assure you that, with this remarkable career behind him, yet to be followed to more brilliant results, with this unbounded enthusiasm that agitated England in all quarters, in all circles of the great and of the common mass, Garibaldi's appearance, dress, attitude, conversation, was as simple as you would conceive it to have been and as it was in which he appeared on the deck of one of his own South American corsairs or among the first thousand men which he threw into Palermo.

"In 1866 the war broke out between Prussia and Italy against Austria, and Garibaldi was put in command of 50,000 troops to invade Austria and wrest from the great power the Tyrol Provinces, which properly belonged, as Garibaldi and the Italians thought, to Italy. He carried everything before him, penetrating rapidly into the very heart of the country that he was to occupy and subdue. But alas, again his own government stayed his hands; but then upon the very necessary and proper situation that by the loss of the Battle of Sadowa and the armistice that followed, the war with Austria was at an end. But this was a bitter disappointment to Garibaldi, for acquisition, restoration, of what belonged to Italy was the darling passion of his heroism and of his statesmanship; and thus, when these provinces were in his grasp, to retire by the martial situations that had been produced elsewhere was a great disappointment to him.

"In 1867 Garibaldi, still acting on his own movements and on his own resources of volunteer followers, undertook an attack upon Rome and was carried almost to the gates of Rome. But at Mentana he was met by the French Army, which was then protecting the Roman States in Rome in the interest of the engagements which France had made, and it was impossible for him to proceed further. His time was not long delayed. In 1870 war came up between France and Prussia, and all the resources of the French were needed to cope with the great adversary that was waging that terrible war.

"Then Italy by its King and by its troops entered Rome and Italy was united. But Garibaldi was not ready to relinquish his career of arms for liberty against strong power, though he had thus triumphed for his own country and for himself. He offered his services to the French Republic to carry on the war against Prussia, and there he won battle after battle with great prowess and great distinction. He had the singular honor, it is said, of taking the only battle trophy taken by the French from the Prussians throughout the war. It was a terrible battle at Dijon for that flag, and it was lost and won, back and forth, over heaps of corpses, but Garibaldi carried it off and kept it for France. The phrase went in France, as the war went against them, that if there had been more Garibaldis there would have been more victories for France.

"He was chosen by the French in three departments a member of the Assembly of the Republic, but finding the scene uncongenial, he resigned and returned to Italy. At one time after his first triumphs for Italy he was chosen a member of the First Italian Parliament before the unity of all Italy had been accomplished. He went there, it is said, only for the purpose of reproaching Cavour that he had surrendered Nice to France, and immediately resigned and returned to Caprera. Hard fate for Garibaldi, born in Nice, that in the accomplished unity of Italy his own birthplace should be alienated to France.

"From 1870 to 1882, when his death occurred, his health and his strength much broken, he passed his time in honorable occupations and efforts, but without any public rewards or desire for rewards.

"In 1882 he was chosen to the Parliament of Italy, but his health wholly gave way and he retired to Caprera to die.

"Mr. President, when all modern nations have looked back to ancient Rome, its long history, its crowd of geniuses, of heroes, of patriots, it would seem not likely in the renovation of Italy there should be found a name that should be added to that list and lose thereby no luster. Heroes, statesmen, lawyers, wise men, philosophers, and poets make out the long roll of ancient Roman glory. But, after all, though these, for history and for scholars, may make up the illustrious groups, for universal human nature there must be found, if the names are to live in the hearts and be ever on the lips of the human race, some 'touch of nature that makes the whole world kin.' The name of Lucretia, whose outraged virtue could bear no lighter expiation than her own life taken by her own hand, and whose blood, thus spilt, could brook no lesser vengeance than that the whole name and lineage and race and brood and breed of tyrant kings should be forever driven from the polity of Rome and a republic founded; or Cornelia, whose bright example of the fame and frame of Roman matronhood, throws into insignificance the pomps and attires and decorations of women; whose jewels of the Gracchi stand out to all the world as the glory of woman, as the mother of sons; of Horatius, who set his own strength and his own life against the tide of war at the bridge to hold it back long enough to cover the safety of the city; of Regulus, the monument of Roman faith, the hostage sent by Carthage to give advice to Rome concerning peace, and his promise to return if peace did not follow, who advised the Senate, for the glory and the interest of Rome, to make no peace with Carthage, and returned to Carthage to torture and to death—these names and such as these are names to be remembered by the world. These are the names of power, of fame; the names to conjure with; and Garibaldi's name, Garibaldi's inextinguishable name, shall be a name to conjure with, for liberty and love of country, so long as and wherever those great sentiments shall warm the human breast. [Applause.]

"The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the preamble and resolution proposed by the Senator from New York.

"The preamble and resolution were agreed to unanimously."

Guiseppe Garibaldi was born in Nice on July 4, 1807, son of Domenico Garibaldi and Rosa Raimondi. He died at Caprera on June 2, 1882, at the age of 75.

Demand Costly Reclamation Plans Be Put In Mothballs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I call upon Congress to put in mothballs unnecessary and costly reclamation plans which would burden the Nation's war effort.

While our fighting planes and ships are being reactivated, and our military and naval units are being called to service, we must concentrate on working to win the war in as short a time as possible. We should not waste our time and effort in fighting over gigantic reclamation schemes for the distant future, such as the billion-dollar Central Arizona project. This fantastic scheme, now proposed by Arizona, would add more than a billion dollars to the national budget at a time when our finances are under terrible strain. It would also mean a loss of $2,000,000,000 in interest to the Nation's taxpayers. Secretary of the Interior Chapman himself has stated that. The taxpaying citizens, and the national Treasury, cannot stand such expenditures and losses.

In addition, the proposed Arizona project would take enormous amounts of water from the great national defense area of southern California. We narrowly averted a disastrous water shortage in certain areas of southern California during the last war, and the demands for water there are now far greater. Almost every type of national defense plant requires enormous amounts of water. The vast airplane plants, now reopening and expanding under orders from the President, require hundreds of millions of gallons a day.

The Pacific war activities must funnel through the west coast. That means a tremendous increase in population in an area that already has known the greatest upsurge in population in history during the last few years.

Even aside from these factors, reclamation developments such as the Arizona project, could not possibly be constructed during the war emergency. Neither manpower nor material would be available. Nor should they be available for a project that could not contribute to the war effort.

There could be no sound reason for Congress to authorize a gigantic, infeasible project such as Arizona wants in the face of an emergency that will take every ounce of our national strength and every

available dollar. To authorize such a project would be to disregard all the people for a chosen few, and to ignore the vital task of paying for and winning the war.

The Uniform Support of Dependents Act—Abandoned Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of a resolution passed by the Committee on the Judiciary, I have been instructed to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report of Subcommittee No. II, submitted by its distinguished chairman, Hon. SAM HOBBS.

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE NO. II TO THE FULL COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The following letter which was written and sent by me to every one of the six authors of the eight bills, popularly known as the "runaway pappy" bills, by order of Subcommittee No. II, is hereby submitted to the full committee as the report of the subcommittee:

"DEAR COLLEAGUE: The members of Subcommittee No. II have given serious and lengthy consideration, both in hearings and in personal study, to your bill. We are keenly aware of the pressing problem presented by it and the arguments you and other witnesses have presented in advocacy of it. Every one of the members of our subcommittee feel that they would love to assist in such a worth-while cause personally. However, in view of the utter lack of departmental approval and what we regard as the constructive suggestion made in their reports, the subcommittee is constrained to withhold its approval at this time.

"The subcommittee was also impressed by the testimony of Miss Katharine Lenroot, Chief of the Children's Bureau, Social Security Administration, Federal Security Administration, expressing the opinion that laws regulating domestic relations and the administration of such laws are closely interrelated and should be developed and improved through State and local action and interstate arrangements. She also called our attention to the Uniform Support of Dependents Act which has been endorsed by the Council of State Governments and already adopted by a number of States.

"It was intimated from a number of sources that the subject of domestic relations and child welfare is of most important consideration from a national standpoint, yet it is as local as the family.

"So, while all of the reports and the witnesses and the subcommittee members were thoroughly sympathetic with the ultimate objective of your bill, I was instructed to write every one of the authors of bills touching these subjects, that in the studied opinion of the subcommittee we should make haste slowly and that we regretfully declined to approve any of the bills at this time.

"The concluding paragraph of the report of Hon. John L. Thurston, Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, should not be ignored. It reads as follows: 'We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that while there would be no objection to the presentation of this report to your committee, this advice should not be construed as indicating that enactment of the legislation, either in original form or if amended as we suggest, would be in accord with the program of the President.'

"Cordially your friend,
"SAM HOBBS,
"Chairman, Subcommittee No. II."

Respectfully submitted.
SAM HOBBS,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. II.

Cotton-Acreage Allotments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following items about cotton-acreage allotments:

[From the Progressive Farmer for June 1950]

EAST TEXAS AND ITS COTTON ALLOTMENT

We have followed with interest and sympathy the efforts of Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH to get a larger cotton allotment for east Texas.

In recent years many east Texas farmers have voluntarily quilt growing cotton or greatly reduced their acreage. Even before the war, when acreage control was in effect, a considerable number of east Texas counties failed to use a large percentage of acreage allotted to them. Then war came, and thousands of farmers marched away to fight, or took jobs with defense plants. But now they are back on the land again. And they find that their cotton allotments are practically nil because very little, if any, cotton was grown on their farms in 1946, '47, and '48.

East Texas is a section that should not put a large percentage of its cropland into cotton. But we have the feeling that the movement out of cotton in this area went too far. Cotton is still one of our best row crops, and a moderate acreage of it has a logical place on an east Texas farm. In recent years, east Texas has planted no more cotton than was required for a sound cropping system. Therefore, it is a movement in the wrong direction—a step toward an unbalanced agriculture when a still greater reduction in cotton acreage is forced on the area.

We can't get away from the conviction that our control programs should be based insofar as possible on what is good for the land (land utilization) and what is best for the farmer (farm management). It may happen that all the land on a 50-acre farm is best suited to trees and grass. If we were considering only what is best for the land, no part of the farm would be cultivated. But this would mean moving the farmer off the land. In addition to grass and trees, he must have row crops. In order for him to make a living, part of the 50 acres must be cultivated. This is what we mean by saying that both land utilization and farm management should be considered in making acreage allotments to individual farms. On some farms, it would be necessary to compromise between what is best for the land and what seems necessary for the farmer to make a living. But even so, such a crop-control plan would be far superior to anything yet tried.

Elsewhere in this issue (p. 8), Congressman ALBERT, of Oklahoma, explains why his State received perferential treatment when the national cotton allotment was divided among the States. As the Congressman points out, Oklahoma had already cut its cotton acreage to the bone. Like east Texas, many Oklahoma farmers have about quit growing cotton. For this reason, the State was not required to go as far as other States in cutting its 1950 acreage. This is as it should be. But if it was right to give a State preferential treatment under the allotment law for making a voluntary reduction in its cotton acreage, why wouldn't it be equally fair and wise to do the same for a section of a State. After all, east Texas has an area as large as any one of several States.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News of May 4, 1950]

TENANT FARMERS HURT BY COTTON ACREAGE CUT

(By Roy Roddy)

FULBRIGHT, TEX., May 3.—Cotton acreage cuts will hurt tenant farmers in the Red River County prairie-land almost as much as a surplus-caused market collapse would.

The end result will be the same—less money, too frequently not enough to live on.

"If the Government cuts us any more next year, I don't know what we'll do. I'll just have to take out and look for work."

That's what Homer Cavender said, as he crawled off his tractor and fumbled in his pocket for a cigarette. Cavender is a third and fourth tenant on an 80-acre place east of Fulbright. That means the landlord gets every third bushel of grain and every fourth bale of cotton Cavender produces.

"Last year I made a total of 21 bales off 65 acres. I got 26 bales in 1948. But the Government cut me back to 28 acres of cotton this year. I'm not even gonna make enough to buy tractor gas with," he said.

He has a wife and six children to support. He has no way in the world to make up the loss in income. He is one of Red River County's 2,000 cotton farmers. Most of them are on the southern prairie. Many of them are tenants on absentee-owned land.

Another renter, T. H. Solomon, saw dark days ahead. "I don't know," he admitted, when asked about his future. "It's a mess."

Solomon is the head of one of three families that are working 233 acres on R. F. D. No. 2 out of Deport. The 220 acres of cotton on the farm made 117 bales in 1949 and 134 in 1948. Acreage restriction has cut cotton back to 93 acres for 1950.

Three-fourths of the yield from those 93 acres must be the main cash support for nine persons—the three in Solomon's family and the six in the other two.

A farmer working with Solomon said that acreage had been taken from cotton farmers on the prairie—the farmers who wrote the county's cotton history—and had been given to other farmers in other parts of the county.

"When Red River's final 1950 acreage is added up, I don't believe half the county's allotment will be planted," he commented.

Under cotton-marketing quotas voted in by farmers last December, Red River County received an allotment of 50,064 acres for cotton planting. When the new cotton bill was passed by Congress in March, the county's allotment was refigured at 51,207.5 acres, an increase of only 1,143.5 acres over the first allotment.

But the new allotment of 51,207.5 acres still is far below the county's estimated 1949 planting of 70,000 acres. And it is a sharp reduction from the 56,000 acres Red River County farmers planted in 1947 and the 60,500 acres they planted in 1948.

Farmers voted in Federal acreage control last December when they accepted the Department of Agriculture's marketing quotas on cotton. The Department backed the bill as a means of holding down a growing surplus that threatened to wreck the industry.

Planters knew that something had to be done. They expected cuts under the bill.

But they didn't look for such severe cuts. And—as many have complained—they expected the cuts to be equal and fair to all cotton farmers. But now many fear the cure will prove as tough as the disease.

"I don't see how a fellow can make a go of it," Marvin Betterton, of Rugby, said. "All I've ever raised is cotton and a bit of corn. I can't raise anything on my idle land that a fellow would want—or pay money for."

Betterton saw his acreage sliced in half—from 70 acres in 1949 to 34 in 1950. He got 31 acres under the original marketing-quota law, picked up three extra acres on the new bill. Last year he made 31 bales of cotton on the 85-acre farm he rents.

He has a wife and two children to support. Like Cavender, Solomon, and scores of other tenant farmers, he is worrying about the future. What will it bring? More acreage cuts? Men forced from the farm? Men competing for rough labor? Depression? Federal relief—again?

He and his companions on the farm would like to know.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News of May 5, 1950]

COTTON CONTROL RAISES DISTURBING QUESTIONS

(By Roy Roddy)

MOUNT VERNON, TEX., May 4.—Federal restriction of the Nation's cotton acreage has raised a surplus of disturbing questions in the minds of east Texas farmers.

"What cash crop can we plant to take the place of cotton? What can we plant on these acres withdrawn from cotton production that will not create a surplus in other crops and drive prices down?

"If we create surpluses of other crops with those withdrawn acres, will the Government step in and demand control of those crops, too? What's coming next anyway? Will the Government tighten still further the cotton acreage cuts in 1951?"

Those are questions that are repeated over and over across east Texas fence rows, in crossroads stores, in small-town banks, grocery stores and general merchandise firms—wherever farmers and businessmen gather. Correct answers are vital to that segment of the old southern cotton economy that lingers in the region.

Cotton farmers accepted the Department of Agriculture's cotton marketing quotas last December. The quotas cut the State's acreage 11 percent—7,637,029 acres—under the 1947–48 acreage. A later bill last April figured the cotton farmer's individual allotment on one of three provisions.

1. He could plant cotton up to 65 percent of his average cotton acreage in 1946, 1947, and 1948; or

2. He could plant 45 percent of his highest cotton acreage during any one of those 3 years;

3. But in no case—unless he was given a higher figure in the December marketing quotas—could he plant cotton on more than 40 percent of his total cropland acreage. Application of these laws has caused a drastic cut in the acreage the east Texas farmer usually plants to cotton.

The bill and its application—designed to curb national cotton production in order to avert a devastating surplus—is the cause of the questions. For the little cotton farmer and the tenants, the law carries the haunting fear of men out of work, men roaming the country and competing with other men in the labor marts.

The law hit A. B. Fortner, of Bogata, pretty hard. On the 150 acres he had in cotton last year, he now can plant only 59.4 acres. He owns 50 of the acres, rents the other 100.

"I guess I'm luckier'n some," he said. "If the worst comes to worst, I can go back to carpentering, because that's my trade. And I have a few cows, too."

He made 54 bales last year. Now, he plans to do exactly what all east Texas farmers will do—put his best land into cotton.

"I'm going to plant hubam, sudan, corn, and soybeans. I'm going to turn it under. I'm going to build up the land with green manure until I can get a bale to the acre from it," he explained.

The law has raised a big question for C. A. Swinford, who rents 1,800 acres of Franklin County land 7 miles northwest of Mount Vernon.

"What about the mechanized farmer? I've got $7,000 tied up in machinery. I can't operate efficiently unless I have at least 300 acres of cotton," he said.

Swinford is a cotton and legume farmer who has been putting 320 acres regularly into cotton. Actually, of the 1,800 acres on the farm only 481 are in cultivation. But the original law gave him only 100 acres. The new bill raised his allotment to 170 acres.

"I wanted at least 30 more acres. I think these cuts should have been equal. I don't think cotton acreage should have been taken away from cotton farmers in one part of Franklin County and given to other specialized farmers in other parts of the county," he said.

Jeff D. Parchman, Mount Vernon beef and cotton farmer, also had a question.

"Why did east Texas take such a heavy cut when it was not the section that produced the heavy cotton surplus?" he wanted to know. "This is a poor country here. We have no truck crop markets. I wish someone would explain these things to me."

Parchman wanted 30 acres of cotton. He got only 21. He had 28 acres last year on his 243-acre farm. "I needed it," he explained. "I can raise more stock feed growing cottonseed than I can any other way."

Earl Grogan of Detroit in Red River County solved part of his extra acreage problem—but not with a cash crop.

"I planted four rows of cotton and left four rows open across one 40-acre field," he revealed. "That takes care of 20 of my acres."

He can plant only 73 acres in cotton on the 190 acres he is working. Last year, he planted 175 acres and made 91 bales. One hundred acres of the farm are his, the remainder his sisters'.

"I'm putting in some corn, feed, and peas on the other acres. I don't know about the 'off-brand' crops. Seeds are too high, and so is combining and all the other operations that go with them," he said.

Like other counties, Franklin's acreage figures are in dispute. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics gave the county 5,900 acres in 1946. The farmers said they had 9,041. BAE figures for 1947 were 7,550 against the farmers' 9,916. For 1948 the conflicting totals were 10,000 against 11,088.

The first allotment was for 8,426 acres. The new bill adds around 600 acres. "The county definitely is not going to get enough acreage releases to offset the demand," one official said.

"The little man with no past cotton record is hurt," another official said.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News of May 6, 1950]

COTTON PLAN EMBITTERS GROWERS IN EAST TEXAS

(By Roy Roddy)

TROUP, TEX., May 5.—The Federal cotton acreage-control program has seeded the grass roots of East Texas to bitterness, fear and—in a few isolated cases—revolt.

"The present program is the most unfair, the most unjust thing ever slapped against the cotton farmer," Hubert Moore, Troup farmer, declared. "Now, don't get me wrong. We need a program. But this program won't do what it sets out to do."

Moore's denunciation is one frequently heard throughout north and central east Texas. Dissatisfaction is rife among cotton farmers from Red River County down through Franklin, Wood, Smith, and into Cherokee County.

The source of the cotton farmer's anger is the small number of acres on which the Government will let him grow cotton this year. "If the State as a whole can plant around 95 percent of its 1947–48 average acreage, why am I cut back to 50 percent or less of my acreage?" he wants to know.

Under the present program, Texas farmers can plant slightly under 8,250,000 acres of cotton in 1950. In 1949 they planted 10,400,000 acres. In 1948 they planted 8,801,400 and in 1947 around 8,425,000 acres.

Cotton farmers think the over-all State reduction is not at all unreasonable. They agree with the Federal Government that acreage reduction is necessary if the United States is to avoid a cotton surplus that will wreck the market.

"The unreasonable part comes in," they point out, "when the Government distributes the over-all acreage among the individual farmers. Instead of giving it to the cotton farmers whose cotton history established it, the Government has given it to all farmers—to beef, hog, dairy, and every other kind of farmer."

In east Texas the result has been that only a few farmers have received enough cotton acreage to make the crop a profitable venture. The situation has aroused a storm of angry criticism.

Reports indicated that a few farmers had planted more acres of cotton than the Government said they could. One elderly farmer whose dimming eyes have seen many Utopian dreams fade away, voluntarily admitted he had overplanted his acreage.

"They can shoot me. They can kill me. They can do what they please. I'm planting cotton," he grimly said.

How the bootleg cotton will get by the Production and Marketing Administration, the powerful Government bureau that is administering the program, remains to be seen. Ralph S. Trigg, of Washington, D. C., PMA Administrator, said in Dallas earlier this year that farmers next fall would receive marketing cards showing how much cotton they could sell.

One small merchant in a northern county saw no political significance in the reaction to the program.

"I'd rather see this country go Communist than Republican," the merchant declared. "If this country goes Republican again you'll see bloodshed and destruction of property in the street out there."

Hubert Moore said that he could plant only 17.4 acres of cotton on his 400-acre farm 2 miles north of Troup. He has been planting around 75 acres, made 40 bales of cotton in 1949.

"I had two tenants, a white family of six and a Negro family of seven," Moore continued. "I had to let one of the families go. The Negro had the seniority, so I kept him."

Horace Grissom, Cherokee County farmer, said the program had hurt diversified farmers. Grissom has 800 acres of cropland on his 1,400-acre place near Gould.

"I've been averaging from 130 to 150 acres of cotton. Now, I can plant only 75. For good farming practices, I needed exactly the acreage I'd been growing," Grissom said.

He has six families on his place and intends to keep them as long as he can. He has put them on bale-to-the-acre land. Even the smallest tenant has at least 10 acres for cotton. "They can make a living in that way," he explained.

Carl L. Jordan of Troup had to drop one of the two tenants on his 540-acre farm. He can plant only 45 of the 120 acres he con-

sistently has put to cotton. His yield last year was 62 bales, probably will get only 15 or 20 this year.

"Here's the point," Jordan stressed. "I run beef cattle. I have to raise feed to carry them through the winter, or I'll lose more than I make buying feed. Now—with a tenant gone—I won't have the labor to work my feed crops."

The program probably is going to cost D. N. Shaw, another Troup planter, more than 100 bales. Shaw owns five farms in Cherokee and three in Smith County. On the 855 cultivated acres in the farms he can plant only 200 acres to cotton. His 1949 yield was 240 bales.

"The relief legislation passed last March to give the State around 600,000 acres more cotton was too little and too late," Shaw said, "You can't run a renter off, or reach out and get one this late in the season."

The legislation Shaw referred to followed a national referendum on the present program last December. In that referendum cotton farmers voted to accept the program, which previously had been passed by Congress.

The injustices in the December program, however, caused so much protest that Congress voted an additional 600,000 acres for Texas late in March.

"But about all the March legislation did was to make farmers hopping mad all over again," an official in one county observed. "By the time the increase got down to county level, it was only from several hundred to a thousand or more acres. And that amount divided among a thousand or more farmers helped only a scant few."

In Wood County, for example, authorities revealed that the December law gave the county 9,306 acres. The March legislation gave the county only 373 acres more.

Since Wood County has 1,670 farms, the largest allotment in the county is around 33 acres. Eleven hundred of the farms have allotments ranging from 5 to 15 acres.

In 1949—before the program—the county had an estimated acreage of 15,918. The cotton acreage had been growing steadily since 1946, when the county had 3,070.

"Cotton was on its way back," the farmers explain. "But it was coming back as a cash crop in a diversified farming program, not as the old one-crop system that proved so disastrous in the past." They believe now that if the present program is continued it will sign the death warrant for cotton in the region.

"We have a strong tenant system in Wood County," one official said at Quitman. "Therefore the tenant is the one hardest hit. The tenant who moves from a cotton farm to one that has no cotton history is really hurt."

Our Goals Are Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excellent editorial from the Lynn Item, Lynn, Mass., Saturday, July 22, 1950:

IT'S EVERYBODY'S FIGHT

Two currents abroad in the world must be observed rather sadly by Americans. One flows directly from our military reverses in Korea, the other from the wider struggle between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Newsmen in Europe report that a good many Europeans have been gaining smug pleasure from the early defeat of our troops in the Far East.

Possibly it's natural to enjoy seeing trouble descend on the big fellow who has been telling everybody else pretty much what to do. Nobody is ever too fond of the man who gives the orders or make the chief "suggestions."

Yet Americans must hope this sentiment is distinctly a minority one. They would hate to believe that petty resentments would find large expression among free men in times so critical for freedom.

Any sensible person here, in Europe, or in Asia, if he has the facts, knows United States forces have been battling against big handicaps in Korea. Time will be needed to make our strength count. The man who cannot put that perspective on America's performance is poorly qualified to judge events.

More unfortunate than this reaction, however, is the notion that has grown up in certain European and Asiatic countries that the cold war is strictly a United States-Russion power fight. According to this view, the wise course is to steer clear of this struggle between two stubborn giants—if possible.

Nothing could be more unfair or shortsighted. One would think the United States had asked to be plunged into the cold war. But it's evident to anyone with an appetite for realities that our role as adversary to Russia was thrust upon us, that we accepted it grudgingly because every other nation defaulted.

It is wrong to imply, as these would-be neutrals do, that the United States is blind to reasonable prospects of peace and is obstinately committed to settling accounts with Russia at whatever cost.

In truth, this country is fighting the cold war—as it is fighting in Korea—for every free man who walks the earth. In every real sense it is the champion of liberty in its gravest hour.

Up to now foreign peoples could have had—and did have—sincere doubts what America would do when the showdown stage came. And this despite the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Pact, foreign arms aid, and point IV economic help.

But our action in Korea, however short of its goal thus far, is a conclusive answer to all doubters. We are pouring our substance and the lifeblood of our soldiers into a battle 7,000 miles from home. To be sure, we need to do a great deal more, but our goals are right.

In such a crisis for liberty, it ill behooves a free man anywhere to smile smugly at our reverses, or to declare that this is not his fight.

If he does not make it his fight, the Russians may some day be knocking at his door. And then that smile will disappear.

Maintenance of Land and Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum entitled "Statement of Pacific Coast Council of Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., to Water Resources Policy Commission, San Francisco," a report made available to me by Mr. John B. Ebinger, of Klamath Falls, Oreg., one of the great conservationists of my State, and one who thoroughly understands the problems set forth in this statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF PACIFIC COAST COUNCIL, IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC., TO WATER RESOURCES POLICY COMMISSION, SAN FRANCISCO

The national security, maintenance of the Nation's position of responsibility and leadership in world affairs, and the ultimate survival of our people, depends upon land and water resources. The rapidly increasing population, the expanding industrial and agricultural economy, demands sound water resources management and water resource development. Already we have experienced in widely separated regions of dense population, acute water shortages.

With all major water courses and their extensive tributary systems traversing several and in some cases many States of the Union, the problem of shaping a Nation-wide water resource policy is difficult. There is great and wide-spread confusion in the field of the use and development of the water resources caused in the main by the uncertain boundaries of legal rights based on the constitutional premise, the lack of courtesy on the part of Federal Government in failing to approach the States to propose and discuss plans for projects, or in disregarding States entirely and going forward with projected programs of tremendous proportions involving water courses and water use vital to the life and economy of the people of such States. Much of the confusion has been caused by Federal agencies operating in what has come to be a state of rivalry, competing with one another in the development and construction of huge water projects running into sums of vast millions of dollars.

All this has been done without correlation or coordination whether between States and the Federal Government or between the agencies of the Federal Government. There has been no policy of any sort. Most of the large projects already constructed or now projected are the result of the activities of one or another Federal agency operating on its own without regard to what any other agency was doing and without thought of any general policy of water resource use, management or development, State or national.

It is now imperative to the continued development of our people and the Nation and essential to their ultimate survival that the water resources of the country be administered under sound, comprehensive, foresighted policy and that water resources be developed and used to their highest potentials.

Such policy and administration should, must, and can be worked out within the limitations of the grants of power to the Federal Government under the Constitution, in keeping with the fundamental concepts upon which the Union was established and under which the Nation has grown to greatness, namely, recognition of the sovereignty of the States and of the Union of these States under a Constitution of granted and limited powers to a Federal Government with all other authority reserved in the States.

The management, use, and development of the water resources are of such vital importance to all the people of the Nation and to the Nation itself that all endeavors toward finding and making a policy with respect thereto should be above political partisanship, be approached and considered

earnestly and seriously on the basis of the best interest of the people and the Nation. It is in this spirit that we submit this statement in the faith that the members of the Commission are approaching the responsibility of their task on a basis likewise transcending political partisanship and partisan ideologies as may exist in relation to this vital natural resource.

Before turning to the specific questions desired to be considered by the Commission we wish to incorporate as a part of this statement the "recommendations of the Izaak Walton League of America, Inc.," dated March 22, 1950, being Document No. 768-D and the "discussion of recommendations" dated March 22, 1950, being Document No. 769-D. We believe these recommendations express sound general policy with respect to the water resources, their use and development in the best interests of the Nation and all its people.

We also wish to incorporate as a part of this statement for the purpose of illustrating with specific cases the present confusing, enormously costly practices of independent Federal agencies which have been and are endangering the orderly development of the land and water resources of the Nation, the article written by the Honorable Leslie A. Miller, former Governor of Wyoming, Chairman of the Natural Resources Committee of the Hoover Commission, The Battle That Squanders Billions, published in the Saturday Evening Post, May 14, 1949.

Question 1. "To what extent should the Federal Government participate in major water resources programs and what should be the character of such participation?"

Answer. With regard to general principles of participation, we desire to include as a part of this statement the Policy Statement of the Pacific Northwest Development Association heretofore filed with the Commisison by Daniel B. Noble, with application to all major water courses.

The Federal Government should, within its constitutional powers, in cooperation with the States within the watershed of the respective major water courses of interstate character, study and consider the utilization and development of the water resources within such watershed for comprehensive multipurpose highest-potential utilization and development. The Federal Government should exercise leadership in proposing discussions for the consideration of such water resources development, prior to intensive engineering surveys. If the States within the watershed approve such proposal in whole or in part and such proposal is found on further cooperative survey to be feasible, economically sound, and in the interests of the people and resources of that region, the Federal Government should participate by carrying on the actual construction required by such program, financed by Federal funds, on a cost allocation and amortization basis mutually agreeable to the Federal Government and the States involved.

We favor Federal participation by means of coordinated agencies under appropriate department correlating and integrating in the field the various Federal services required in a sound over-all land and water administration program on watershed area basis, cooperating with the respective State agencies of the States involved.

Federal Government participation should consider and safeguard private enterprise, as traditionally known, and no private enterprise, individual or corporate, should be discriminated against in the right to acquire for distribution, power, water, or other utilities or services available from such water resource development. The Federal Government should not participate in any retail distribution.

We do not favor regional or valley authorities in corporate form such as the corporate authority proposed for the Columbia Valley Administration. We oppose the corporate form as a means of administration of public resources, regions or areas, for the reason that such form of authority or administration is foreign to our constitutional form of government, our philosophy of government, and is inimical to the democratic process in government and free enterprise. We believe that the necessary objectives in water resource use and development can be achieved by coordination of existing administrative agencies and by intelligent sincere cooperation between the Federal and State governments and their respective agencies.

Question 2. "To what extent should industry's growing concern for adequate water supply be considered in forming national policy?"

Answer. The question presupposes growing concern on the part of industry. Whether or not there is concern now there will be, unless we mend our ways. Certainly the water needs of expanding industry should be considered in formulating national water policy.

The concern of the Federal Government in this regard should be the rehabilitation of the watersheds for the production of more water, stabilization of water supply by normal ground storage thereby augmenting and assuring adequate stable summer flows.

The participation of the Federal Government should be: (1) rehabilitation to a high degree of production of all the federally owned lands on such watersheds and, (2) making available as needed, reasonable matching funds or loans to States to enable States to rehabilitate State-owned lands on such watersheds.

The major water courses of the country cover vast distances and offer ample areas for industrial expansion. Present water resources of the major water courses augmented by increased waters resulting from proper watershed management, should provide adequate water supplies for expanding industry in all the major water courses.

Industry has always considered water supply in selecting industrial location and industry should continue to do so. The Federal Government should not promote or encourage location of industry in places of inadequate water supply or permit itself to be moved into the view that Government should deliver water from other water courses to any locations preferred by industry in water problem areas.

Question 3. "How can erosion be reduced?"

Answer. In the study of water resource policy this question has tremendous significance. Our answer will be directed solely to erosion control on the Federal lands. The reason for this will be obvious.

In the region covered by the hearings of the Commission, more than 300,000,000 acres of land are owned and under the exclusive control of the Federal Government. These 300,000,000 acres form the important water-producing areas of the watersheds of all the major water courses of this vast region—as well as the minor water courses. The headwaters and sources of all the major western rivers and their extensive tributaries are in this 300,000,000-acre area. No factor more greatly affects or is more important to the water resources of this region than the condition of these 300,000,000 acres.

The present condition of most of this land with regard to erosion is bad. Most of the commercial forest lands have been cut over. Much has been denuded by earlier bad logging practices and by fire. In recent years selective logging has been put into practice but this does not leave lands in a satisfactory condition with regard to erosion or water conservation. Roughly, 138,000,000 acres of these lands are in the national forests, approximately 131,000,000 acres under Taylor grazing classifications and roughly 54,000,000 acres in Indian reservations. Nowhere on all these Federal lands, generally speaking, are land conditions what they should be. With but rare exceptions the range lands generally are almost denuded of grass. Erosion in many places is in an advanced state. Sheet erosion is not uncommon. A typical illustration of the general condition of the western ranges is that of the Modoc National Forest in northeastern California where in 1949 the cattle-to-land ratio was one animal to 73.3 acres and that for less than half the time cattle were formerly grazed. Such destroyed lands, of which there are millions of acres on the great western watersheds, have reached a state of deterioration or are fast reaching the state where they can be written off insofar as being of value to livestock, timber production, or water conservation.

On this question we desire to incorporate in this statement for the purposes of this record the address of Dr. Walter P. Cottam of the University of Utah, delivered on February 19, 1947, entitled "Is Utah Sahara Bound?" This address has been printed and we will endeaver to send each member of the Commission a copy. Also the booklet, Watershed Improvement for Summer Flood Control in Utah, United States Department of Agriculture, miscellaneous publication No. 639. These conditions prevail throughout the range lands in Nevada, Idaho, California, Oregon, and all the other Western States from the Rocky Mountains westward. Conditions of erosion, absence of vegetation, immediate run-off of water and flash floods from hard-baked barren lands, now under consideration in Oregon by a legislative interim committee in relation to studies with respect to the creation of a department of natural resources for that State, are such that Dr. Paul Packer, chancelor of higher education of the State of Oregon, familiar with the relation of water resources to watershed conditions, commented to that interim committee. "If you expect eastern Oregon to be habitable in 200 years it's time to get busy."

Proper land management can prevent and stop the erosion on practically all these millions of acres of watershed lands. (We do not include the limited areas in the higher mountains too precipitous for land management but such areas are not extensive in relation to the areas susceptible to management.) Proper management calls for seeding of grass on practically all these range lands and the reforestation of all the watershed forest lands in order to obtain maximum vegetative cover for holding and building soil and for holding and conducting water by the normal and natural process to ground storage.

Thus by one process in good land management, erosion and siltation are controlled and an unproductive watershed is made into a heavy sustained yielder of water. Moreover, by the improvement of millions of acres with grass the livestock resources and economy of the country can be tremendously expanded, and the reforestation of millions of acres with trees will restore our rapidly depleting timber resources and provide a continuous stable production of forest products. This in itself is vital to the national security.

To illustrate that seeding of the range lands to grass can be successfully done on a sound, economic basis, we desire to incorporate in this statement the booklet, Sage Brush to Grass, United States Department of Agriculture, publication AIS 27, a copy of which we will endeavor to send to each member of the Commission. Although planting of grass and trees can both be done successfully, extremely little of either is being done and the hundreds of millions of acres continue in the main unproductive, serving erosion and floods during rains and melting snow, filling costly reservoirs with silt for removal at enormous cost, and diminishing stream flows and drying water courses in the summer.

There is no factor in the administration of the water resources so important to the

security and well-being of the people, in peace or in war, as the rehabilitation of these hundreds of millions of acres of Federal lands and maintaining same at a reasonable maximum potential of productivity in grass and trees. The responsibility of doing so rests squarely and exclusively upon the Federal Government. Participation of the Federal Government under any national water resource policy should include, as fundamental and a primary step, the rehabilitation of these vast Federal watershed land holdings.

Minor land areas are held by States and private ownership within the "source" watershed area. The States should assume and discharge the responsibility of rehabilitating such State lands. Certain minimum requirements as to private lands on "source" watershed areas should be considered.

Every completed water project should include in maintenance budget adequate allocations for watershed improvement and maintenance, reflected in consumer rates for water or utility use. Because of the tremendous importance and vital need for immediate beginning on large scale, adequate appropriations should be made to enable the Federal Government to carry on this work.

Question 4. "How can we get cleaner water in our streams?"

Answer. By eliminating of excessive siltation by control of erosion as outlined in the preceding paragraph, good land management practices on public and on private lands, the latter developed by good land practices through education and soil conservation districts.

By elimination of pollution caused by sewage, industrial waste and the like by enactment of more effective Federal antipollution laws and effective enforcement. Many States have been struggling ineffectively to enforce antipollution laws because of pollution entering interstate water courses from another State. The Federal Government should participate by enacting and enforcing effective antipollution laws and by cooperating with States in their enforcement and control efforts.

The Federal Government should also participate by institution and carrying on experimentations in the field of utilization of industrial wastes and in discovering methods of disposal of wastes that cannot be utilized and of rendering such wastes harmless, and making such processes available to industry.

The Federal Government should also participate by making loans available on amortization plan to municipalities and industry for sewage and waste disposal plants and systems.

Question 5. "How can we assure adequate municipal water supplies?"

Answer. By rehabilitating the watersheds and maintaining same at reasonable maximum level of productive potentials of grass, timber, or other vegetative cover as outlined in the answer to question 3. Increased sustained water flow resulting from good watershed management will be reflected throughout the entire water course.

The Federal Government should participate by rehabilitating the Federal lands as outlined in the answer to question 3. This would assure adequate water supplies for all municipalities now in this vast region, including decentralization-dispersal requirements.

The Federal Government should also participate by making loans available to municipalities for watershed improvement on amortization plan, repayment to be made by means of additional reasonable water charge by municipality to consumer.

Question 6. "What basis should be established for decisions to authorize water resource projects of various kinds?"

Answer. Economic feasibility, determined by sound business standard and valid benefit allocations, and the mutual agreement between the Federal Government and the State or States involved, subject to approval or review by an independent Federal board of review or water resources planning board.

A water resources planning board or board of review should be created by act of Congress, to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, which board should be in the executive department but not in any Cabinet department. It should be the duty of such board to review and examine independently and impartially every project with respect to multipurpose usefulness, economic feasibility, protection of all resources affected and the effect such project might have on other areas within the watershed and on the national security.

Question 7: "How can we assure adequate consideration of all purposes which water resources can serve, including recreation and fish and wildlife?"

Answer: By an enlightened concept on the part of Government personnel—from top to bottom—of the interrelationship and interdependence of the natural resources and of man's dependence upon them and personal consciousness that the life of a people is in its soil, water, forests, grasslands, fisheries, and wildlife.

By requiring coordination of the Federal agencies operating in the development of a project from inception and extending such coordination and cooperation to the State agencies involved. Such cooperation should be earnest, sincere, and real, so that there may be realized for the general welfare the maximum multipurpose potentials of the water resources involved.

By creation of the board of review or water resources planning board above mentioned, whose duty it should be to consider and examine each project not only with regard to economic feasibility but also in the light of the interrelationship and interdependence of these natural resources and man's dependency upon them.

Question 8. "To what extent does sound development of water resources become a factor in the event industrial dispersal becomes necessary in connection with national demands?"

Answer. Sound development of water resources is a factor of utmost importance in the event industrial dispersal or decentralization becomes necessary. As has been pointed out, there are thousands of miles of length and breadth of major water courses and there is ample room for satisfactory dispersal throughout these major water courses. However, because of the generally bad conditions of the watersheds, water shortages might come to pass even in major water courses, depending upon season, conditions, and quantities of water required. The only way this can be forestalled is by watershed rehabilitation in the manner above suggested.

The Federal Government should participate in the interest of national security by instituting large-scale watershed rehabilitation programs of reseeding and replanting operations on its more than 300,000,000 acres of watershed, beginning at earliest date.

CONCLUSION

1. We support the theory of water resource administration on watershed or valley basis comprising the entire watershed of the watercourse involved from mountain top to the sea.

2. We support the theory of administration by coordination and integration of existing Federal agencies cooperating with the State and State agencies involved. Such coordination of the Federal agencies should begin at department level and be integrated in the field.

3. We are unalterably opposed to the theory of administration of resources on land and water areas by administrative authorities such as the TVA or as provided by pending bills for a Columbia Valley Administration or any other form of corporate administration for the reasons stated in answer to question 1. We believe satisfactory administration can be had by coordinating existing agencies. We believe the present Federal administration should cease its political activities for corporate authority and control of regional or valley development and management and should devote attention to coordination and integration along the lines of present Government in keeping with the concept, philosophy, and enduring principles of self-government traditional with and fundamental to the continued development of the American people.

4. We believe that Federal Government participation in water resources programs should be limited to water development at sources by watershed rehabilitation and improvement as outlined, and with respect to Federal construction of projects, to large multipurpose programs of interstate character or significance. The Federal Government should not promote development of construction projects on watercourses lying wholly within one State except at invitation of such State. All projects should be self-liquidating within a reasonable period, with costs of benefits properly allocable to Federal Government to be borne by the Federal Government.

5. We believe that in the interest of the general health and welfare decentralization and dispersal from areas of heavy concentrations of population should be encouraged and presently begun through voluntary initiative of industry.

6. We believe that the water resources of a watercourse or watershed where populations have become settled and where large and permanent investments have been made in the development of the resources of the region and in the economic and industrial development and where a civilization, society, and culture has become established, should be developed within and for the benefit of the inhabitants of such watershed and should not be diverted into other watersheds except by compact of the States involved.

7. We believe in the prerogative of individuals to choose where they desire to dwell and where to establish their enterprises. We believe their choice in so doing should be subject to the water resources capacity of the watershed wherein such locality may be situated and in the event of overpopulation or overexpansion of industrial development in such locality overtaxing the capacity of such watershed, such overpopulation should be expected to accommodate to changing location as has been done in the normal course of mankind during all ages and should not expect diversion of waters from established societies in other watersheds except by compact between the States involved. To adopt any other course would result in inconceivable confusion, in endless proceedings to determine conflicting interests in water, in perpetually changing situations so complex under varying circumstances and conditions as to be impossible of solution and would plunge the people into internal animosities and strife without end.

8. We believe that neither the Federal Government nor any of its agency elements should promote, encourage, suggest, or speculate in, nor should populations in present water problem areas speculate with the possibility of diverting through huge Federal projects, waters from other watercourses in other States or regions, and we believe it to be important to the sound and orderly development of the water resources of the country, to the domestic tranquillity of the people and to the peace and security of the Nation, that it be basic in any national water resource policy that there shall be no diversion of waters from any watercourse or watershed in one State to another watercourse or watershed in another State except by compact of the States involved, provided

that States having areas in watersheds contributing water resources to watercourses in another State or States should be equitably entitled to divert from such watercourse at own expense with or without participation of the Federal Government such flow of water as shall reasonably reflect the water resources so contributed, provided such diversion should not disturb existing compacts or vested rights.

9. We believe with respect to management of completed projects that management of intrastate projects should be by the State and projects having interstate character by the Federal Government under contract with the States involved, in every case under reasonable assurances of repayment to the Federal Government of the costs to be liquidated, provided that inclusion of an intrastate project in interstate hook-up of electric energy transmission lines shall not of itself change the character of an intrastate to an interstate project.

Respectfully submitted.

I. H. CORY,
Chairman, Executive Board, Pacific Coast Council, Izaak Walton League of America, Inc.

Prepared and presented by John B. Ebinger, Klamath Falls, Oreg., national director, IWLA, Inc.

American Labor Gives Full Support and Cooperation in Korean Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "Labor Supports Uncle Sam" by R. G. Soderstrom, president of the Illinois State Federation of Labor, which appeared in the Federation's Weekly News Letter of July 15, 1950:

LABOR SUPPORTS UNCLE SAM

(By R. G. Soderstrom, president, Illinois State Federation of Labor)

The end of the cold war came early in July of this year when the United States of America decided to intevene in the Korean civil conflict, between Communists to the north and those who were trying to maintain a democratic form of government to the south, in that troubled country. Both nationally and internationally nothing is more vital to advance the principles of democracy and freedom than the work of our labor movement. It is especially important to let the world see its operation in time of war.

In Korea wage earners have been the object of infiltration and communistic propaganda and something concrete should be done in the field of American propaganda to counteract this evil program. The free trade-unions of America, better than any other group, can demonstrate to these people, and the peoples of the earth, that totalitarianism is not interested in their welfare. The entire American labor movement is a living, breathing, fighting protest against the communistic philosophy of absolutism which makes human beings slaves of an all-powerful state.

Our free trade-unions are the best agency to illustrate or demonstrate to oppressed people of other lands that the democratic highway of freedom and not the communistic blind alley of oppression is the road to independence and economic betterment. Democracy is a potent force. It is the machinery of freedom's government. It is universal in its appeal and can solve the problems of a war-torn world.

Now is the propitious time for trade unionists everywhere to rally with every ounce of their strength, to the defense of the United States of America in our country's determination to assist democratic Korea maintain her independence against communistic forces of evil and oppression.

Information seeping through the iron curtain indicates that Russia itself, the country which gave birth to this form of spastic government, is seething with agitation. Freedom-loving people throughout the Soviet nation are fanning indignation into a hurricane of rebellion. They have found that their dictatorship arrangement is worse than their former monarchy of the czar. No free government was ever destroyed by revolution. Revolutions are the nemesis of monarchy and dictatorship. History fails to record a single instance where any important free government was destroyed by a rebellion. History does record that war and economic conditions cause the people to vote themselves into slavery under the delusion that an all-powerful communistic government would be their protection. This is what happened in Russia.

The usual remedy for contagious sickness is to isolate the patients. The Government of the United States is trying to accomplish just that by throwing a quarantine around the nations infected with the plague of communism. In this tremendous step to protect the balance of the world from the spread of such a poisonous and dangerous disease the Government of the United States is entitled to cooperation and support. It will be forthcoming from every member of the Illinois State Federation of Labor 100 percent!

American Policy in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to obtain leave to have printed in the RECORD an address of Dr. Emory W. Luccock, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Wichita, Kans., which he delivered to the Wichita Rotary Club on Monday, July 3, 1950.

Dr. Luccock is an authority and student of the affairs of the Far East, having spent many years in the Orient. His analysis of the affairs leading up to the present international crisis will, I believe, be informative to Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WICHITA PASTOR SCORES YALTA PACT, BLAMES UNITED STATES POLICY FOR KOREAN WAR

(Following is the text, in part, of a speech made Monday, July 3, by Dr. Emory W. Luccock, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, before members of the Wichita Rotary Club. Copy of the speech for publication was taken from wire recordings of the talk made by radio station KFBI.)

I hesitate to talk on the White Paper that has been issued by our State Department, undertaking to account for the policy in the Far East that has had its inevitable conclusion in what is happening now in Korea. I say I hesitate to talk on it as I am going to have to today because, at long last and very much overdue, the present administration has taken a stand in the Far East that ought to have been taken a long time ago.

We ought, therefore, all be united in being behind the stand that the administration has taken, and yet, we must recognize that in being behind that stand unitedly there is in the back of our minds the understanding that had this same stand been taken earlier, events that are now taking place could have been forestalled.

When the late President Franklin Roosevelt dedicated the new bridge in Chicago, I was in Shanghai. I was called out of bed about 2 o'clock in the morning by the far eastern representative of the Associated Press. He read me the address the President Roosevelt had made there and asked me for comment on it to be cabled back to the Associated Press. I was so very enthusiastic about what President Roosevelt said at that time, his accurate diagnosis of the world situation, particularly of the acute situation that was then developing in the Far East, that I went completely overboard in my endorsement of it. What has bewildered me, and made me feel that we, ourselves, as citizens of this country, have a serious indictment of the present administration's policy in the Far East, is that although our leader so clearly understood the situation, he did not have the courage to follow his understanding with action when it proved a political risk.

After General Wedemeyer had brought his report back from the Far East in 1947, that report was suppressed. In the white paper you will find a reason given for suppressing that report, a reason that is out-and-out false. The point that I am making here, however, is that the report was suppressed because it was a year in advance of a Presidential election, because Wedemeyer's report so clearly exposed the stupidity and fallacy of our American policy in the Far East that had it been released in 1947 there would today be a different occupant of the White House.

President Truman in making his statement about the action in Korea said that he believed that he knew more about Mr. Stalin than anybody else living today. He said that his knowledge of Stalin dated from 5 years ago. I cannot understand why, if that is true, the action in the Far East has been so long delayed.

And now I want to talk to you about things that I have missed as I have been studying this white paper, undertaking to justify, to account for our American policy in the Far East. I don't know how many of you have read it. I hope all of you have read it. I am sorry to say that the majority of American citizens never will read it. It is, of course, too voluminous, somewhat difficult to get. Any of you can get it by waiting long enough, if you will send to the Department of State your request for it, together with a check for $3.

Now, I want you to know that I am, in no way, an expert on the Far East. I lived out there too long to be an expert on the Far East. I knew a great deal more about China and the Far East after I had lived there 17 months than after I had lived there 17 years. But with this limited knowledge that I have of the Far East, in studying this white paper, I am presenting to you what I believe have been serious omissions.

And, by way of beginning, I want to read from what you will find at the beginning of that white paper, Secretary of State Acheson's justification for having written it. Now, here is what Secretary of State Ache-

son says, "No available item has been omitted because it contains statements critical of our policy or might be the basis of future criticisms. The inherent strength of our system, that is of democracy here in the United States of America, is the responsiveness of the Government to an informed and critical public opinion. It is precisely this informed and critical public opinion which totalitarian governments, whether rightests or Communists, cannot endure and do not tolerate."

Now, having made that statement, which is a learned statement and which is a profoundly true statement, he proceeds to give us, not what he says a free people have to have, not what he says a government must make possible for its people to have in the way of an informed and enlightened public opinion with which to be critical of the government policy. He proceeds to give us a lawyer's brief in which he does exactly the thing that he says the Communists and totalitarian governments have to do in order to keep their people uninformed or misinformed.

Let me give you now some of the things that I missed as I read, and anybody who is a much better student than I am of the Far East and of our policy in the Far East will find a great many more omissions than I, individually, have been able to find.

Back in 1941, in November, the Japanese offered peace terms to the United States, offering to withdraw from Indochina if we would accept terms at the expense of China. Cordell Hull, at that time, refused to accept this overture of peace by the Japanese on two grounds. One was that we were fighting against the spread of totalitarianism in our world, and the second one was that we considered a free China a necessary citadel of freedom in the Far East. Why are neither of these documents included in a white paper that undertakes to inform us about our far-eastern policy?

Weeks before the Japanese attacked us at Pearl Harbor, it is now a matter of record that Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek cabled to President Roosevelt warning him that the attack was being prepared for. It is also a matter of record that Russia had that same information and did not pass it on to us.

There is no notation in this White Paper on China as to the receipt of General Chiang's telegram. There is no reason given why we paid no attention to the telegram.

After Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt's secretary, Early, was sent on two secret missions to Gen. Chiang Kai-shek. After his two conferences there, he came back with his reports. Why is nothing included as to what he found on his trips to the Far East? Is it because in both, and before the White Paper was published, the statements by Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley, Early's loyalty was called into question?

Owen Lattimore was sent by President Roosevelt, without any request on the part of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek, a man who was unacceptable to Gen. Chiang Kai-shek, appointed by President Roosevelt as his adviser in the Far East.

Why is there nothing in the White Paper on China telling us about the impressions of this special Presidential adviser who was there in the Far East representing our country. Is it also omitted because subsequent events have brought to light some of the things that our State Department does not want associated in print with its policy in the Far East?

In 1942 Wendell Willkie went to the Far East. In my own books, Wendell Willkie was one of the great men of my generation, regardless of what you may think about him politically. He was there at a critical time; he had access while he was there to information denied anybody else there at the same time. He came back and was summoned to the White House. Why is there nothing about his report to the White House on what he found out on his trip to the Far East?

Donald Nelson was in the Far East as an appointee of President Roosevelt. As head of the Chinese War Production Board, he certainly found some things out about the economical situation in China that were important enough to warrant his recall to Washington where he could give the information that he had. Why is nothing about Donald Nelson's findings in this White Paper on China?

It has since become a matter of record that in the conference at Cairo, when Stalin and Churchill and Roosevelt and General Chiang Kai-shek sat down together, Chiang was urged to keep his Chinese Nationalist soldiers in the field because it was the belief that they were containing at least a million and a half Japanese soldiers that would otherwise be released against our American forces.

General Chiang, at that conference in Cairo, asked two questions. He said first, "Can we count on you continuing this war after you have won it in Europe, until the Japanese have been defeated?" And the answer was given to him with a categorical, "yes." And then he said, "Can I tell my people and my soldiers in the field that there will be no special concessions given to Russia in Manchuria?" Again, he was given the categorical assertion, "Yes."

And yet, it has since come to light as a matter of record, that there were, in the absense of General Chiang, secret agreements arrived at between Roosevelt and Stalin and Churchill, giving Russia the very concessions that they had, in good faith, promised General Chiang would not be given to Russia.

And yet, these concessions that are now a matter of record are entirely absent from this White Paper on China that is supposed to inform the citizens of a free country on what actually has taken place in order that our Government may have the benefit of our enlightened and responsible criticism of that policy.

Also, it has since come to light, as a matter of record, that we made commitments to General Chiang in 1943 of military equipment and of military divisions. These commitments were never carried out. Why is there not included in this White Paper just what these commitments were and the reason why we didn't make good on our promise?

In July 1944 Henry Wallace brought home a report from the Far East. After President Franklin Roosevelt's death, the cables were sent from the State Department to our diplomatic representatives in the Far East, telling them (and these cables are now a matter of record) that the Wallace report could be considered by them as the basis of our policy in the Far East.

If they wanted to know what that policy was, they could refer to Wallace's report, and yet that report is omitted from this white paper that is supposed to enable us to understand our policy in the Far East.

Ambassador Hurley came back with a report on China. His report is omitted from this white paper, but strangely enough there is included in the white paper the report of the three assistants that he had dismissed because of their Communist tendencies and because of his questioning their loyalty to the Government of the United States.

In December 1945, Hurley testified before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. In his testimony before the committee Hurley identified coded documents in the files of the State Department as recording the reasons for our change in our policy in the Far East to a pro-Communist policy. Neither Hurley's testimony nor these documents to which he referred specifically are included in this white paper on our policy in the Far East.

The white paper includes Vinegar Joe Stilwell's castigations of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. It does not include either Hurley's analysis of those charges nor does it include the statement by General Wedemeyer saying that he believed, of all the men whom he had ever encountered and with whom he had become acquainted, General Chiang Kai-shek was one of the most honorable and trustworthy.

Neither does it include the counsel by General Wedemeyer that the giving of aid to the Nationalist Government at that time would effectively arrest the spread of communism in the Far East.

There is much made of the recall of "Vinegar" Joe Stilwell from his appointment as commander of the theater in China, but this report erroneously, although it does not explicitly state it, gives the reader the impression that the report was made with the approval of Ambassador Hurley.

It omits President Franklin Roosevelt's insulting telegram to Gen. Chiang Kai-shek demanding civil and military control in China by Stilwell, a control that General Chiang could not possibly have given. This telegram threatened General Chiang, who at that time was President of an Allied nation, with the ending of American lend-lease to China and also the withdrawal of American forces in China.

The white paper omits not only Roosevelt's telegram to Chiang, but Chiang's telegram in reply to Roosevelt, in which he said that under no circumstances would it be possible for Stilwell to remain in China and that China would do its best to continue the war, with or without American aid.

In 1944, there was prepared, what is now a matter of record, by our Joint Chiefs of Staff, a statement about the Far East based on 2,500 field reports. This was released August 20, 11 months ago. But it had been suppressed in 1945. Why? In 1945, the best documented, the most informed, the most reliable statement about the situation in the Far East on the basis of which the administration ought to have based its policy in the Far East was suppressed. Why?

Because in the light of reading it now, it flatly concludes that what our State Department was then saying about communism in China, what Owen Lattimore was then saying about communism in China, what Wallace was then saying about communism in China, that it was an aggravative uprising. That it was the rising of the people to demand their rights was completely refuted and it was made clear, on the basis of this evidence, that communism in China was nothing more nor less than the stooge of Russian communism emanating from Moscow.

And, yet, instead of basing our policy in the Far East on that document, that document was suppressed and we followed the advice of Secretary Wallace and his colleagues.

Wedemeyer's report, issued in 1947, was suppressed as a top military secret. Only extracts from that report are given in that White Paper on China. And here is the reason that is given in print for the suppression of the Wedemeyer report. It is difficult for me to say this without emotion.

The reason given is that the recommendation of Wedemeyer included a trusteeship for Manchuria, that Gen. Chiang Kai-shek had, in confidential memoranda, approved of the recommendation but that it would be unfair to him to have his approval released to the Chinese people at that time; when in 1945, 2 years previously, Gen. Chiang Kai-shek had gone on public record accepting the proposal of the trusteeship for Manchuria.

Of course, as we now know, the reason Wedemeyer's report was suppressed as a top

military secret at that time was that there was a national election coming up and the party that was then in power and wanted to be reelected to power couldn't possibly expose its complete fiasco in its policy in the Far East by release of that well-documented testimony.

It is interesting that in the excerpts from Wedemeyer's testimony there is no mention of Wedemeyer's testimony of Americans who were killed by the Chinese Communists, but the names are given of Chinese killed by Chinese Communists.

Yalta, which is to my mind the blackest mark on the escutcheon of America's previously very honorable record in the Far East, is undertaken to be justified in terms of a necessary military expediency, that it was calculated to save a great many American lives.

Granting that that may have been true, granting that President Roosevelt, at that time, was a sick man, that he was too tired mentally to handle that kind of responsibility, as his apologists are telling us now, granting everything that you want to say in terms of hindsight being more accurate than foresight, I want to know, since when has this country, in its foreign policy been willing to break faith with its plighted word on the ground of military expediency.

Not only that, but it has since become a matter of record that the whole give-away of Manchuria to Russia at Yalta has not the justification even of military expediency.

Who was the senior commander in the Far East? Who was the man who had access to more information than any other man? Who was the man to whom we ought to have listened if we were undertaking to work out a responsible policy in the Far East?

You will look in vain through the more than a thousand pages of this white paper on China for quotations from General MacArthur. Can you tell me why, in undertaking to explain to us the basis of our policy in the Far East, it does not include any counsel on the part of General MacArthur?

Chennault's reports in the area in which he had command are omitted from this white paper. Instead of that, Stilwell's reports, not only in the theater over which he had command, but in the theater over which Chennault, himself, had command, are substituted for Chennault's reports because Chennault saw the threat of communism, because Chennault believed that communism could be and must be stopped by a change in our pro-Communist policy in China.

His advice, his facts, his reports are excluded from this white paper and Stilwell's are included in the area over which Chennault had control.

In March 1946 the Chinese Communist Politburo issued an official statement that they planned to use General Marshall as a cat's paw for a series of delaying actions during which they would be able to arm and train additional troops for a civil war immediately after Marshall had returned to the United States.

Any record of this statement is omitted in the white paper on China and instead of it there is an indictment of the Nationalists for their unwillingness, in the light of that published statement by the Communists, to cooperate in Marshall's plan, insisting upon their coalition with the Communists.

In this white paper on China, we do find very clearly set forth how our policy in the Far East brought pressure to bear on the Chinese Nationalists with our refusal to permit any Chinese plebiscite and also with our threat to withhold lend-lease aid to the Chinese and to withdraw our troops from China.

We find the record of our release of the Chinese Communists who had been successfully bottled up in Manchuria by the Nationalists, under the order of General Marshall so that they were able to start their victorious march to the south.

We find our desertion of the Chinese Nationalists when the Chinese Communists became victorious.

And, on the basis of reading these more than a thousand pages of the white paper on China—and this is what frightens me—Prime Minister Nehru of India expresses his misgivings as his own great country of India undertakes to decide with which it shall throw its lot, with the Communists or with the democracies.

We find him expressing his misgivings as to what he can count on from American policy in the Far East as he reads the record of this policy in the white paper on China.

Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Universal Military Training," from the New York Times of Sunday, July 23, and a letter from Dr. Daniel A. Poling, the distinguished clergyman, to the editor of the New York Times, which appeared in the same issue.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

The report submitted to President Truman 3 years ago by his Advisory Commission on Universal Training was one of the first official documents to point up for the American people the military dangers inherent in Soviet expansionism. Dr. Karl T. Compton, the Commission's chairman, has performed a valuable public service in calling attention to some prophetic sections of the report, on which too little action has even now been taken. Dr. Daniel A. Poling, a member of the Commission, supplements Dr. Compton's statement in a letter published elsewhere on this page today.

Many of those who felt the report was unduly pessimistic when it was issued in 1947 must now regret the lack of more effective implementation of its eight-point program for a balanced national security structure. There can be no doubt, in the light of world developments, that the United States would have been well advised to institute a system of universal military training in the period immediately following the Second World War as repeatedly recommended by the President and the Armed Forces.

Such a program would have increased our readiness for military mobilization and for civilian defense. Even more important, it would have served as a powerful deterrent to aggressive action on the part of Communist forces anywhere in the world. The Korean conflict might never have developed had we taken more concrete steps 3 years ago to demonstrate our ability to back up the authority of the United Nations in checking Soviet imperialism.

FOR MILITARY TRAINING—MORAL ASPECTS CONSIDERED OF COMPTON COMMISSION PROGRAM

(The writer of the following letter, a clergyman, is editor of the Christian Herald and president of the World's Christian Endeavor Union. He is a member of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Dr. Karl T. Compton's open letter addressed to his fellow-members on the President's Advisory Commission of Universal Training called attention to the fact that in May 1947, or 3 years ago, this Commission recommended a comprehensive defense program. This program if adopted would have fully prepared the United States for the aggression of North Korea and, indeed, for any major offensive against us.

As a member of Dr. Compton's Commission, I was interested in every phase of the Commission's activity. But with Father Edmund A. Walsh, vice president of Georgetown University, I was particularly concerned with the moral safeguards and religious guidance activities recommended by the Commission.

Beyond all other particulars of the report, it was the unanimous conviction of the Compton Commission that only such a program as was proposed, in the event of any new "shooting war," would insure American youths against being committed to battle undisciplined and untrained. Now current dispatches from Korea tell of young soldiers who had never heard a "screaming shell overhead" dying at the front. In two world wars we did this evil thing to our own flesh and blood. Today in South Korea, for the third time having committed this sin against our own sons, we stand naked in conscience and without excuse.

LACK OF BLAME

Had the report of the Compton Commission been adopted by Congress and its recommendations activated full, every man now under fire and every man presently called to the colors would have been trained and conditioned for his ordeal. The President of the United States is not to blame. He accepted the report, transmitted it to Congress, and repeatedly urged that it be adopted. The Chiefs of Staff and the Armed Forces are not to blame. They too accepted the report and, even though it was not adopted went forward to activate many of its recommendations. The American people were not to blame, for repeatedly in public opinion polls they expressed their overwhelming support of universal training.

Congress, and Congress alone, is responsible for failure to adopt and activate the recommendations of the Compton Commission. We have just voted $10,000,000,000 for national defense. But even so, we cannot go back 3 years, and the Nation's sons must pay the greater price of delay and refusal. Incidentally, the estimated cost of universal military training as recommended by the Commission would have been $1,750,000,000.

Dr. Compton's open letter is an objective and statesmanlike summary of the Commission's technical recommendations, some of which at least were adopted and all of which, as already stated here, were heartily accepted by the President of the United States and by the Chiefs of Staff.

RELIGIOUS LEADERS' ATTITUDE

As a Protestant churchman I was particularly distressed by the attitude of religious leaders generally and of men of my own faith particularly toward the report of the President's advisory commission. Significant of this attitude was an editorial in the distinguished Protestant journal, the Christian Century, entitled, "Universal Military Training Is Conscription." And constantly, although universal training as recommended

by the commission was not conscription in the military sense, and in spite of the fact that the basic differences between the two were made abundantly plain, religious leaders continued to support the error. Beyond this they ignored the moral safeguards and religious guidance opportunities provided in the report, which are unique in the defense history of the United States and never before written into the defense program by any country.

Specifically, universal training as recommended by the President's commission maintained the civilian status of the trainee. He would not have been under the Articles of War. He would not have been subject to court martial. He would not have worn an Army uniform, and he could not have been sent overseas. In these and other military particulars he would have been no nearer induction than in his own home. An act of Congress would have been required to induct him. In any national crisis, of course, Congress will act and, whether at home or in training, youth will be called. Now, under the draft but without training, he has been and is being called, with tragic results already indicated.

EXPERIMENTAL UNIT

Under the head "Moral and religious aspects of training" our Commission pointed out that a high moral level could be maintained with the program recommended. The experimental unit set up at Fort Knox in January 1947 was under the command of Brig. Gen. John M. Devine, an officer of proved character and combat experience. This unit made a pattern and set a standard that committed the Army and all other services to our Government and to the parents of American youth. The particulars of the report and the demonstration of the Fort Knox unit justified the nine members of the President's Commission in pleading with Congress and their fellow Americans to make such a program both universal and compulsory.

When it was charged that this universal, compulsory training was undemocratic and un-American because compulsory and universal, the Commission replied: "To the contrary. Being universal and compulsory, it is both democratic and American, as democratic and American as taxation and free education, both of which are universal and compulsory."

Already a few religious leaders have directed attacks at our Government for not being fully prepared to meet the crisis in Korea and the Far East. Presently those in command will be condemned for needless sacrifice of life and treasure. But let those who would condemn first consider their former attitude toward the alternative which was offered in May 1947.

DANIEL A. POLING.

NEW YORK, *July 20, 1950.*

Film Flummery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Film Flummery," by Bosley Crowther, the New York Times motion-picture editor, which was published in the New York Times of Sunday, July 23, last. I have been criticizing the motion-picture industry for the shortcomings to which Mr. Crowther refers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FILM FLUMMERY

INSPECTING SOME PICTORIAL WOOL THAT IS PULLED OVER AUDIENCES' EYES

(By Bosley Crowther)

A dull little newsreel compilation which came along last week—another of those looking-backward essays, entitled "Death of a Dream"—serves to provoke us into mentioning the twaddle that does get to the screen in the guise of pictorial information and journalistic report. Not that we want to cast discredit upon the responsible endeavors in this line nor upon the many respectable and even brilliant documentary films. But with violent world troubles once more brewing and with the step-up in the battle for men's minds, we feel this the time for a reminder of the guff that may be spewed from the screen.

This "Death of a Dream" now showing at the Embassy Forty-sixth Street, is a fair and regrettable sample of substantially what we mean. Pretending to be a broad reflection upon the events of the past three decades, to discover in them some lesson for the present guidance of ourselves, this hackneyed assemblage of newsreels is actually nothing more than an excuse for a verbal editorial thumping for aid to the Chinese Nationalists. Nor is it a sober editorial. Quentin Reynolds, who allegedly wrote the words and who most certainly intones them, gives out such sweeping remarks as "the Communists' military victory in China does not mean that they have won over the Chinese people" or "Britain hopes, by recognizing Red China, to buy peace." And the pictures to support these observations are actually nothing more than shots of Chinese soldiers, peasants, children, and Chiang Kai-shek.

PICTURE-HAPPY

It is in this specious use of pictures—any pictures—to accompany words that the peril, as well as the weakness, of the angled editorial film lies. For we are a picture-happy people; a picture, willy-nilly, is accepted as proof of almost any commentary (or caption) that you want to tag to it. And, although a news reel compilation must have drama and design to pack real punch, it will still give its comments some authority with some people just because it is "news film." Keep your eyes open for pictures that may fool you in this respect.

Another device for fooling the public with pictures is displayed in a current fiction film entitled "711 Ocean Drive." This cryptically tagged little item, now on the Paramount's screen, has been rather boastfully touted as a daring and dangerous exposé of the big-time gambling syndicates that have recently been in the news, as a consequence of investigation by a special Senate committee on crime. So what? Many pictures have been touted as something which they are not.

But here is the trick on this one: Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, who happens to be a member of that committee, speaks a foreword to this film in which he says, looking directly at us, "It is honest motion pictures like 711 Ocean Drive that can be a tremendous factor in informing the public of the meaning of that innocent $2 racing bet at the candy store." In short, Senator WILEY gives this picture the endorsement and prestige of his authority.

And what, you may tensely wonder, is it? What staggering secrets does it expose? Well, let us cruelly disappoint you. "711 Ocean Drive" is no more than an average crime picture in which an apparently decent telephone man takes a job putting relay amplifiers in a racing bookmaker's wire room, decides to muscle into the bookie business and pretty soon is a successful bookie boss. In this refined situation, he is beset by a big-time syndicate which insists that he become a powerless partner, to which he is attracted only by the charm of one partner's wife. And the rest of the film is a runthrough of a conventional racket rivalry with the boy for whom we are mildly rooting getting plugged by the police in the end.

STANDARD GANGSTER

In short, there is nothing in this picture, with the exception of a few wire-room shots and a little bit about the devices whereby information is delivered from the tracks, that is not standard gangster film theatrics. And with Edmond O'Brien and Otto Kruger in the leading roles, the racketeers have a most familiar and unimpressive Hollywood look. Yet this is what a United States Senator labels an "honest" expose. Maybe the Senator has heard the saying that you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

Not that it follows in this connection, but we want to close off with a few words about an honest attempt to say something that doesn't quite come off. This is Twentieth Century-Fox's endeavor to display in Broken Arrow, now showng at the Roxy, that the American Indian had his fine and noble points and that he was the first American to suffer racial prejudice. However, the story for this thesis, about a Civil War veteran who attempts to make a peace between the Apaches and the white men, and shows his honorableness by marrying an Indian maid, runs to rather conventional romance which looks as manufactured and unreal as do the pretty Hollywood Indians who talk a bit like Longfellow wrote. Jeff Chandler as Big Chief Cochise acts like a floorwalker in an Indian costume, and Debra Paget as the walnut-stained maiden is a musical comedy ideal. The Indian rituals are all very starchy, particularly the one in which the blood of the Indian maiden is mingled with that of James Stewart. Mr. Stewart, we should add very quickly, plays the genial, high-minded young man who wants to bring peace and understanding between the Indians and the whites.

The misfortune here is that a purpose and an idea have been submerged in a typical rush of prettification and over-emphasis. Sure, the American Indian has been most cruelly maligned and his plight as a "minorities" person has not yet been fully clarified. But in trying to disabuse the public of a traditional stereotype, the producers have here portrayed the Indian in an equally false, romantic white idea. Why couldn't the Indians in this picture be as natural, inelegant and unkempt as Mr. Stewart and the other white men?

The Hamilton-Jefferson Pathway to Economic Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject, The Hamilton-Jefferson Pathway to Economic Progress,

recently delivered by Mr. Bertram M. Gross before the Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Virginia.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HAMILTON-JEFFERSON PATHWAY TO ECONOMIC PROGRESS

AN ADDRESS BY BERTRAM M. GROSS, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS, INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS, UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA, CHARLOTTESVILLE, JULY 13, 1950

I can conceive of no better place than the University of Virginia for one to discuss the philosophy of economic progress voiced by America's first great economist and first Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton.

Here in Charlottesville, at the university founded and designed by Thomas Jefferson, the spirit of Hamilton's great adversary is in the very air. Here we all pay deserved homage to the name of Jefferson, who has become a colorful symbol in American folklore—a symbol of the march of democracy and of the power of the free and inquiring mind.

While they lived, Hamilton and Jefferson fought each other vigorously—in Washington's Cabinet, in the Halls of Congress, in the press, and at the polls. And when Hamilton died, he too became a symbol, a symbol for those with a somewhat different conception of what the American way of life should be.

As we look back on the history of American progress we should realize that America has grown and prospered because of a mixture of Hamiltonian and Jeffersonian theories. This was true even of Jefferson's 8 years in the White House. When Jefferson became President, he himself combined the two philosophies in practice. He handled Presidential powers with enough vigor to delight the heart of any good Federalist. With the Louisiana Purchase, he departed—though reluctantly—from his fondest theories of strict constitutional construction. His Secretary of the Treasury proposed the first comprehensive program for internal improvements financed by the Federal Government.

And as for Jefferson's political and economic enemy, if only Aaron Burr's revolver had been a little less accurate, Hamilton would probably have lived to become in some degree a Jeffersonian. In any case, let us remember that it was Hamilton himself who, by switching the Federalist votes in the House of Representatives away from Burr, helped install Jefferson in the White House.

As we look forward into the future, we must remember that in a democracy progress cannot emerge from any plan, panacea, program, or formula advocated by any one man or any one group. It comes rather from the process of conflict between divergent groups and from a slow and sometimes painful synthesis of conflicting conceptions of the common weal.

In the future as in the past, progress will emerge from a combination of Hamiltonian and Jeffersonian concepts. It is for this reason that I have chosen to talk today first on the Hamiltonian philosophy of industrial progress and second on the Jeffersonian philosophy of local initiative, and then to end with a brief word on the unprovable assumptions that hold the two together.

THE HAMILTONIAN PHILOSOPHY OF INDUSTRIAL PROGRESS

In the year 1800, when the Federalists were engaged in their unsuccessful struggle to prevent Jefferson's Republicans from taking over the reins of Government, the total production of goods and services in the young Republic—according to the best estimate that can be pieced together—was somewhat less than $1,000,000,000.

Today, the total output of our economy has reached the highest level in history—about $270,000,000,000.

The early portion of this phenomenal process of growth was mapped out in a document which might well be called the first economic report to Congress, a document which in its foresight and clarity can well serve as a model for the economic reports prepared today by the President and the Council of Economic Advisers. I refer of course to Hamilton's Report on Manufactures which, with the approval of President Washington, was sent to the House of Representatives in December of 1791.

This report had a double significance.

First of all, it seized upon the growth of our infant industries as a lever to promote the progress of the country. By promoting industrial enterprise, Hamilton pointed out, we would provide more widespread employment, encourage immigration, open up wider horizons for skill and talent, and create a larger demand for the surplus products of agriculture.

This insight of Hamilton's was confirmed by the pattern of subsequent economic growth.

One hundred and fifty years ago this was primarily an agricultural country. Manufacturing accounted for only a small percentage of the national income. The portion of our national income arising from agriculture was about nine times greater. Over the decades this relationship has shifted in the most dramatic fashion. Today manufacturing accounts for about 30 percent of the national income, about three times the portion arising from agriculture, forestry, and fisheries combined. Moreover, agriculture itself has become increasingly industrialized.

It is largely because of this shift in the structure of our economy that we have grown strong, built the highest standard of living in the world, survived major wars and become still stronger.

The Report on Manufactures also high lighted the necessity of alert, active, and creative government. In the Seventieth Federalist Paper, 3½ years earlier, Hamilton had stressed the value of energy as a leading characteristic of good government. In the Report on Manufactures he translated this general conception into action by advocating a broad program of tariffs and bounties to promote business enterprise.

Here, again, he touched at a vital nerve center. Industry would not have grown with such rapid strides in America if governments of all persuasions—Federalist and Republican, Democrat and Whig, Republican and Democrat—had not played an active role in its encouragement through a variety of direct and indirect subsidies and expenditures.

Having come this far in the last 150 years, it would be a sad mistake if we acted like the country boys in the musical comedy Oklahoma who were so amazed at the fact that in Kansas City they had seven-story skyscrapers and houses where you can walk to privies in the rain and never wet your feet. The refrain to their song was: "They've gone about as fur as they can go."

In his midyear economic report a year ago and again in his economic report of January 1950, President Truman pointed out that we can, and should, keep on going. He set our sights on a $300,000,000,000 national economy over the next 4 or 5 years. And in his state of the Union message he indicated that we could look forward to an economy, which, by the year 2000 would reach a total production of goods and services amounting to a trillion dollars at current prices. This figure may sound fantastic but no more so than the idea of a hundred-billion-dollar national economy would have sounded in 1900.

To reach these goals, we should keep in mind both points in the Hamiltonian philosophy of industrial progress.

First, we should keep our eye on the importance of business investment in new plants, new machinery, new technological processes. These lie at the heart of our growing productivity. In recent years the large volume of business investment has helped increase the productivity of American workers by an average of 3 percent a year. With sufficient industrial progress, there is no reason why this rate of increase cannot be stepped up in the future.

Historians in past decades were prone to talk about the industrial revolution as something that started in the early nineteenth century and presumably has already come to a close. But with the rapid strides of modern science in such fields as atomic energy, chemistry and electronics, I believe it is now becoming clear that this historical interpretation will have to be recast. Fifty to a hundred years from now the advances that started in the nineteenth century will probably be regarded as but a minor prelude to the real industrial revolution which began in the middle of the twentieth century.

Second, we must remember that it is as true today as it was in the days of Hamilton that business cannot be strong if government is weak. Those of us who may become impatient with certain specific policies of government should not jump to the conclusion that active and vigorous government is somehow antithetical to business expansion. It will be as true in the future as it was in the past and as it is today that business cannot expand unless Government takes positive steps to create conditions favorable to expansion.

THE JEFFERSONIAN PHILOSOPHY OF LOCAL INITIATIVE

As I come to the Jeffersonian philosophy of local initiative, I cannot ignore the fact that in one respect Jefferson was overruled by history. Jefferson constructed an economic model based predominantly upon land ownership by small farmers. This conception lost out in competition with what Jefferson called "the contracted, English, half-lettered ideas of Hamilton."

Yet many other parts of Jefferson's multihued philosophy contributed to the fabric of American growth. As an opponent of excessive centralism in government, Jefferson developed a full-blooded philosophy of local initiative. This philosophy is best evidenced in the concrete achievements of himself and his colleagues in the State of Virginia. Under their leadership the feudal system of entails and primogeniture was abolished. They promoted the development of olive plants and rice in the South. They established a university where there would be no "restraint imposed * * * by the shackles of a domineering hierarchy, and a bigoted adhesion, to ancient habits." Religious freedom was advanced. And it was the bill of rights in the Virginia constitution, written by Jefferson's friends, that went beyond even the Declaration of Independence in its recognition of man's right not only to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, but also to the means of obtaining happiness.

At a time when many of us are trying to learn how to think in global terms, and have become accustomed over many years to concentration on national problems, one feels as though he must apologize if he talks about such microscopic matters as local government and community action.

Yet local initiative has played a commanding role in the growth of America. As our population moved westward, and as America became a great melting pot for people from all parts of the world, a multitude of problems were born and were solved at the country crossroads and the county court-

house. The vast surging energies of a pluralistic society did not have to be channeled through a central administrative structure. They could be harnessed or dissipated at the grass roots. If this had not been the case, the conflicts would probably have become too sharp. There would certainly have been more explosions. The Union might have been broken apart.

Even today when the Federal Government has become such a substantial part of the economy, local governments loom large in the picture. In 1949 expenditures for goods and services by the Federal Government amounted to $42,600,000,000, or about 16 percent of the gross national product. During the same year the comparable expenditures of State and local governments amounted to $17,500,000,000 or about 40 percent of Federal expenditures.

Many of our great economic problems are so vast that when viewed nationally they almost defy diagnosis. When they are viewed locally as well, it becomes possible to think confidently both of diagnosis and therapy. It becomes possible to release imagination, enthusiasm, and self-dedication to a degree that is feasible only under circumstances where almost everyone can be a big or a middle-sized fish in his little pond.

If we are to find all the pathways to economic progress, we need a new spirit of home-town community action. We need a rebirth of the Jeffersonian philosophy of local initiative.

Of course, there are those who wrap themselves in the mantle of Jefferson and speak sanctimoniously of "States' rights." In their refusal to recognize the proper role of the Federal Government, they suffer—to use Jefferson's words—from a "bigoted adhesion to ancient habits."

But "States' rights" is a limited and negative concept. We must think instead of State responsibilities, and of county responsibilities, and of city and town responsibilities.

This concept of local responsibility is envisaged in the Employment Act of 1946, where State and local government is placed on an equal plane with business, labor, and agriculture in the promotion of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

If we are to achieve and maintain the goal of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, our local communities must learn to appraise their needs and their resources. They must think of local progress in rounded, balanced terms. They must see themselves not as isolated islands but as a part of the total national economy.

I have no formula on how to go about this. I don't believe that such a formula is possible. We must learn from each other and learn in the doing.

In recent weeks the council of economic advisers has taken an interesting step toward the promotion of grass roots economics. We have set up a committee of experts on the New England economy and another committee on the economy of the southwest. Each of these committees is composed of outstanding economists who are affiliated with local universities and research institutions and are intimately familiar with local economic trends. We have asked each of these committees to harness the research potentialities in their respective areas. We have asked each to prepare a full report analyzing the economy of the region and giving us and the public their best advice on the policies most conducive to stable growth in the future.

Here in Virginia, despite those who speak superciliously about the benighted South, one can find many valuable examples of the Jeffersonian philosophy of local initiative applied in a modern and progressive manner. Only a few months ago legislation was enacted in Richmond to broaden the functions of regional planning commissions within the State so that they can deal not only with physical planning but also with economic and social development. This is a pioneering step that might well be studied in other areas of the country.

The quarterly economic reviews published by the State division of planning and economic development have tackled the national problem of low-income families through a county-by-county analysis of incomes in Virginia. A recent issue shows that in some counties per capita income, despite recent progress, is still between $200 and $400 a year. It points out that progress for the State as a whole depends to a large degree upon finding some way of raising these low-income areas. A group of research committees embracing about 300 men and women in almost all areas of the State is now actively at work in an effort to find answers to this problem.

Here at the University of Virginia a vigorous extension service has for many years been performing invaluable work in studying community life and in advising the people in local communities on how to work together productively for the common welfare. In some parts of the State citizens' organizations have set an example for the entire country in their efforts to build an up-to-date educational system. Throughout the State local governing bodies are out to prove the virtues and benefits of home rule and local self-government, as opposed to the backwardness of top-heavy, over-centralized State government.

It is from little things such as these spreading across the continent that a rebirth of the Jeffersonian spirit will emerge.

THE ASSUMPTIONS THAT HOLD US TOGETHER

One of reasons that Americans of diverse backgrounds and divergent beliefs can work together is that we really believe in progress.

Most of us are amused, rather than bemused, by those historians who liken American society to that of the ancient Romans and predict that the mystical, cyclical forces of history will inevitably bring our civilization to ruin.

We are sickened by the cynicism of the small minority who assert that unemployment is the price we pay for freedom and that depressions are inevitable so long as we maintain our capitalistic mode of production and distribution.

We cannot stomach the heavy-handed theory that another global war is inescapable.

Most of us act—we cannot help but act—on the hypothesis that our future is one of unending growth and progress, that the misery and frustration of mass unemployment can be forever prevented and that we shall be strong enough and wise enough to pull through current and future emergencies without becoming engaged in total warfare.

These assumptions we cannot prove. Let us leave that to future historians. They are articles of faith. They provide an indispensable confidence in our ability to determine our own destiny.

They allow us to carry on the ideal voiced by Jefferson upon the founding of this university, the ideal of being unafraid "to follow the truth wherever it may lead or tolerate any error so long as reason is left free to combat it."

They make it possible for us to look forward, as did Hamilton, to future economic progress of a character and magnitude that is only dimly presaged by the present.

Recommendations for Federal Power Policy by Portland General Electric Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Recommendations for Federal Power Policy," submitted by the Portland General Electric Co. to the Water Resources Policy Commission, prepared by Thomas W. Delzell, chairman of the board of the Portland General Electric Co., of Portland, Oreg.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FEDERAL POWER POLICY SUBMITTED BY PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC CO. TO THE WATER RESOURCES POLICY COMMISSION, JUNE 1950

INTRODUCTION

The members and staff of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission undoubtedly are by this time fully aware that the completion of their assigned task will represent no mean attainment in scholarship, and that good answers to all of the questions which the Commission has asked of the public cannot be simply and quickly produced off the cuff.

This witness is not so immodest as to attempt to button up the entire work of the Commission with a single statement of views. We think it entirely proper that our national water resources policy should be a welding of ideas and viewpoints from many individuals, groups, and interests representing all segments of our people and all sections of our country. We have been very pleased to see the Commission proceed to obtain these ideas and viewpoints in the manner that it has, and are confident that when its investigations are completed it will have before it the good answers it seeks.

For that reason we feel we can risk, in this statement, silence of many phases of water resources policy, leaving them for others who can speak with more authority. We have decided to stick to our own last, and most of what we have to say deals with but one phase—electric energy production and distribution—because it is that business in which we are engaged.

Portland General Electric Co. is the medium through which approximately 200,000 consumers of electricity in the State of Oregon are supplied with this vital necessity. Its lines and associated facilities blanket an area of approximately 2,500 square miles in the most populous corner of the State. It serves customers of all kinds—large and small industries, commercial businesses, residences, and farms. The great bulk of its service, however, is to residential and farm customers, who account for more than half of the electrical load on our system.

PGE is the pioneer electric utility operation in Oregon, with 60 years of experience behind it in serving the public. For most of the time since the Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects were built on the Columbia, it has been the largest single distributor of federally produced power to the general consuming public of the Pacific Northwest. It

operates under regulation by the Public Utilities Commissioner of Oregon.

Ownership of the company rests in the hands of some 15,000 investors, many of whom reside in Oregon, and over 70 percent of whom reside in Pacific Coast States. Management is composed entirely of Oregon business and civic leaders, all of whom are possessed of distinguished careers in the service of their State. A number of them have entered the service of the company with former experience as public officials. Nearly all of them have been prominently identified with resource development for many years.

For all of these reasons, we feel we can speak at this hearing as representative in a very real sense of the interests of our section of Oregon and of many of the people who live there.

THREE PRINCIPLES

The self-reliance, enterprise, initiative, imagination, independence, and individuality of the American people constitute this Nation's greatest resource. Beside it all other resources of the country pale. It is the one resource which beyond all others should be conserved and preserved. A first principle, therefore, in any national plan or policy for governing the development and use of water resources as well as other natural resources ought to be one which would give highest priority to the maintenance of the self-reliant and stalwart character of our people.

Perhaps the most basic tenet in our philosophy of democratic and represenatative government is the belief in equality and the abhorrence of discrimination and privilege. Based upon this tenet, a second principle which ought to be followed in the preparation of resource development policies is one which would guarantee all segments of an affected population equal consideration for their legitimate interests and an equitable share in the benefits of development.

Another vital ingredient of our democratic philosophy is the fear of unchecked governmental power, and of the coercion which it can exercise upon the people. This fear of coercion cannot be dissipated merely because the objective of the coercion may be a noble purpose such as the conservation and development of our water resources. A third principle arises from this fear, and it would caution against the grant of any extraordinary Federal power to do things in water-resource development which can be efficiently and adequately accomplished by States, municipalities, private concerns, and individuals. The principle also would require a maximum of local autonomy, and that the powers now possessed by the Federal Government in this field, and those which later may be granted to it, be subjected to the check of democratic processes and controls, and the counterbalancing power of independent arms of government.

The recommendations which follow are based upon these three principles.

WHAT BASIS SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED FOR THE DECISIONS TO AUTHORIZE WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS OF VARIOUS KINDS?

Such projects should be authorized by Congress and appropriations made subject to the following conditions precedent: (a) Thorough investigation of the merits and demerits by the sponsoring Federal agency; (b) full and complete hearings and a report thereon to Congress by some type of board of impartial review and analysis, and the Federal Power Commission, or both, as to the need, costs, and feasibility of such projects, the part or parts which local, public, or private enterprise can and should undertake, and the part or parts which should be undertaken by the States through agencies, of an interstate character, using in each case non-Federal capital for financing; (c) with the understanding that approval of the Congress of a plan of basin development will not preclude subsequent construction of parts of the over-all project by local, public, or private agencies, as they become able to assume the responsibility for the construction of such parts; (d) the Federal Government should undertake such projects preferably at times when the expenditure of such Federal funds will aid the Nation's economy, overcome the effects of potential depression, and not contribute to an inflationary spiral.

HOW CAN WE ASSURE ADEQUATE CONSIDERATION OF ALL PURPOSES WHICH WATER RESOURCES CAN SERVE, INCLUDING RECREATION AND FISH AND WILDLIFE?

By requiring in the manner heretofore outlined adequate hearings, findings, opinions, and orders by a board of impartial review and analysis, or its equivalent, and the Federal Power Commission, or both, prior to the authorization of water resource projects. Necessarily, the hearings should be broad enough in scope to receive the careful attention of and secure evidence from all manner of affected interests.

WHAT SHOULD BE THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF FEDERAL WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT?

The Federal Government possesses long-established legitimate powers to develop our country's streams for purposes of navigation, flood control, reclamation, the national defense, and incidental production of electric power. It would be difficult to find individuals in the Pacific Northwest who would debate as a general proposition the propriety of these powers. Certainly it would be difficult to find any such who are identified with Portland General Electric Co.

If this witness were required to select the one thing he deemed most important to impress upon the Commission, it would be his desire, once and for all, to bury the dead cat of alleged opposition within the power industry of the Pacific Northwest against the propriety of appropriate Federal Government participation in the development of the Nation's water resources. It is unfortunate that allegations of this kind have been clothed in the anonymity of such phrases as the Power Trust and the special interests. We should like to state most emphatically that the past record of Portland General Electric Co. certainly, and we think of most other Pacific Northwest companies who, like ourselves, have been pioneers in our field and who are acquainted with the special problems and needs of the West, justifies specific exemption from misleading generalizations of the kind mentioned.

We are wholeheartedly in favor of multipurpose projects such as Bonneville Dam and Grand Coulee Dam, of the McNary project, and of other similar projects. We have given our endorsement to the principle that where these projects have power-producing facilities, that they should be interconnected with trunk transmission lines and that these lines should be extended over economical transmission distances to the load centers of this region. We have contributed hard cash and the time and influence of our officers in repeated, and we think successful, attempts to obtain in Congress the authorizations and appropriations for Federal works of this kind which the great majority of us here in the Pacific Northwest believe will bring benefits to our region and to the Nation.

Further, we are of the opinion that projects which involve purposes beyond the scope of private initiative such as flood control, improvement of navigation and reclamation projects which frequently are interstate in character and require financing on easy terms over long periods of time, and projects which come within the constitutional authority and responsibility of the Federal Government require its continued participation in water-resource development of such a region as the Pacific Northwest.

Very emphatically, however, we think that works of this nature carried out by the Federal Government should not preclude participation in water resource development by States, by municipalities, and by private companies or individuals in conformance with such over-all and coordinated plans for the river basin as may be developed by competent statutory bodies. And by participation we mean to include active initiation, planning, financing, building, and administration of projects by non-Federal groups to the full extent of their willingness and capability. Furthermore, it is our view that participation of this kind should be encouraged by the Federal Government's policies and by its administrators, rather than discouraged. There seems to be a growing tendency to adopt as a concept, that because the Federal Government now does part of the job, it should do it all. We do not agree with that concept; we in fact believe it to be an exceedingly dangerous one to our way of life. The recent history of our times demonstrates the dangers to free people and free institutions implicit in Government monopoly.

A self-reliant, stalwart people—the requirement of our first principle—cannot be maintained under a system in which everything is initiated, engineered, financed, built, and administered for them.

Nor can equality of different ideas and of different methods and of the different interests and desires of local people be preserved under a system that does not afford the maximum of local freedom to express and execute them, which is the requirement of our second principle.

Again, the third principle we have set down would require that freedom of action be maintained for local people below the level of Federal participation, through effectively democratic means for making their voice and influence heard in a positive and controlling way. If the danger of unchecked Federal domination and power is to be avoided, the extension of mere counseling and advisory privileges to local people will not suffice. Rather, in the ultimate proposals for sound policies governing over-all, regional water resource development, there is need for making the State, their subdivisions and their citizens equal with the Federal Government and its agencies, all of them partners in the gigantic task of making our water resources work for us. And inasmuch as the administration of such a gigantic task is complex, involving the interpretation of many laws and the formulation of many regulations based upon them, wisdom demands that as a final protection to local interests there be in the ultimate structure of governmental water resource policy a place where those who feel aggrieved can conveniently seek redress.

Our specific recommendations to achieve some of these ends, largely in respect to electric power, follow:

1. The Federal Government should participate in electric-power production only in connection with works for improvement of navigation, control of floods, and reclamation of arid lands. Such participation should come under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act in the same manner and to the same extent as such act now controls installations by municipal bodies and private persons. All projects not involving navigation, reclamation, and flood-control purposes should be left for development by States, municipalities, and private individuals or companies, and they also should have the prior opportunity to develop all or such parts of the multiple-purpose projects as they can.

2. A clearly established limitation should be placed upon the Federal Government's responsibility for marketing the power it

produces at multipurpose projects. This responsibility should include the construction and acquirement of only such transmission lines and related facilities as are necessary to interconnect projects in accordance with sound engineering and business principles and to achieve delivery of power in wholesale quantities to distributing systems and to large industries. The sales to industry should be confined to those able to take service in large quantities direct from the Federal system and unable to secure adequate service from the public and municipal utilities. The Government should not seek to extend itself beyond this point, into the field of distribution to the general public, nor should it seek in any way to influence or dominate the ideological pattern of distribution to the general public by the practice of subsidization, discrimination, proselyting, or any form of coercion.

3. The danger of monopoly is not lessened by making it the agency of government. Because power-marketing agencies of the Federal Government have become important suppliers of a public utility service, and because the essence of a public utility service is that it be made available to all who require it upon reasonable and nondiscriminatory terms, it is not fitting that these agencies themselves should be permitted to determine what is reasonable and what is nondiscriminatory. Such agencies should have no powers to regulate others as in some respects is now the case. Rather they should themselves be regulated by an independent and impartial arm of the Government, whose findings and orders are subject to judicial review. Such an independent regulatory arm could and probably ought to be the Federal Power Commission.

4. The powers of the regulatory arm should include the licensing of both Federal and non-Federal generating installations upon streams, over which the Federal Government has jurisdiction; the determination of the public convenience and necessity of transmission lines and other facilities proposed to be built or acquired by Federal power-marketing agencies or by others where Federal interests are involved; supervision of accounts in accordance with law and standard regulatory practices; approval of rates and tariffs; and enforcement of reasonable and nondiscriminatory standards of service.

5. Subsidization, in whatever form, creates an area of economic vacuum from which unsubsidized enterprises are expelled and into which the subsidized enterprises rush. If the foreclosure of individual enterprise is to occur in our business, it will be by this route more than any other. Therefore, rates for the sale of power from Federal projects should be at least sufficient to cover (a) the full cost of maintenance and operation of power production and transmission facilities; (b) interest upon the capital investment allocated to power at least equal to the cost of capital borrowed by the Federal Treasury; (c) amortization of capital investment allocated to power over a reasonable period; (d) the cost of interim replacements of power facilities; (e) repayment over a reasonable period of any capital costs not allocable to power, but which must be repaid from power revenues in order to make projects self-liquidating; (f) taxation or payments in lieu thereof equal in amount to those which would be assessed were the facility in non-Government hands.

6. It is proper that there exist guaranties in Federal statutes governing the marketing of federally produced electric power, which prevent its monopolization. The preferences granted public bodies and cooperatives in present Federal laws are partly based upon such a premise. However, there are hundreds of thousands of people in the States of the Pacific Northwest, and elsewhere, who do not receive electric service through the medium of public bodies or cooperatives, but instead through Government regulated utility companies. These people have a right to expect protection from monopolization of benefits from Federal projects. The experience of the last few years has demonstrated the need for additional guaranties in Federal law which will assure equitable allocation of power benefits as between the people of States and areas affected by Federal projects, and which will carry out more fully the original intent of Congress that consistent with sound business principles the widest possible distribution of federally generated power, particularly for the benefit of the domestic and rural consumers, be achieved.

Present preference and priority provisions should be reviewed and amended to provide a proper guaranty against any abridgment of rights to the use and benefits of water resources, including the energy that can be produced therefrom, presently vested in the States. This guaranty should provide, in the interests of equity, that all power generated at Federal projects within a river basin should be fairly and equitably distributed or allocated among the several States within such river basin by a properly constituted independent Federal commission or agency (the Federal Power Commission is suggested) after giving effect to all relevant factors and subject, from time to time, to revision and judicial review.

The amended preference and priority provisions also should grant a priority right to regulated public utilities which distribute federally generated power without profit upon the Federal investment, ahead of large industrial users.

Specific language also should be incorporated into the statutes which clearly prohibits any interpretation allowing administrators of Federal projects of marketing agencies to:

(a) Deprive the general pubilc of any State or area within economic transmission distance of a Federal power project of its fair and equitable share of the benefits of such project.

(b) Prevent agreement upon long-term firm power contracts with State-regulated public utilities upon essentially the same basis, and containing essentially the same provisions applicable to contracts with other purchasers for resale to the general public.

(c) Withhold contracts from State-regulated public utilities serving the general public, on grounds that regulation by duly constituted State or local authorities is insufficient to determine that rates for resale are reasonable and nondiscriminatory.

(d) Require the inclusion in contracts with State-regulated public utilities any provisions, as a condition to agreement, which impose onerous and unreasonable sell-out requirements, or options for purchase, either by Federal or non-Federal agencies.

The management of Portland General Electric Co. is fully cognizant of the benefits to accrue from proper use of the resources of the region. We are ready, able, and willing to do our share in the development thereof. We wish you well and sincerely hope that as a result of your studies and recommendations a water resource policy will be adopted which recognizes fully State and local rights, the virtues of local controls and responsibilities, fair and equitable distribution of the benefits, private enterprise and initiative, and the values that can be obtained through the combined and cooperative efforts of Federal, local public and private capital working as equal partners.

THOS. W. DELZELL,
Chairman of the Board,
Portland General Electric Co.
PORTLAND, OREG., *June 15, 1950.*

Extension of Mutual Defense Assistance Act, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in casting my vote for this measure, which provides $1,200,000,000 for the arms aid program designed to strengthen our allies, I do so with the feeling that today's critical situation requires a nonpartisan approach to the problem of defending America's vital interests all over the world.

Right at this moment we are engaged in a bitter struggle in southern Korea, a struggle in which we are temporarily facing nothing but set-backs and heartbreaks. It is obvious that many months must pass before this tide can be turned so that victory will crown our efforts under the able leadership of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

We do not know at what minute of the day or night we may receive word of further outbreaks of trouble in other quarters of the world. All of Asia and most of Europe provide danger spots that threaten world peace and American security. The next 6 or 8 weeks may well be critical ones for all of us, and every loyal American must keep in mind constantly the great danger, both actual and potential, that confronts the Republic.

This is no time for bitter partisan recriminations. This is not the proper hour for passing judgment on the mistakes and the tragic errors that have brought us to this sad pass. It is, on the contrary, a time aptly described in the phrase "it is later than you think." America is at war regardless of whether that war is disguised by such a term as "police action." American boys are fighting and dying once more in a strange land overseas, only five brief years after our arms had triumphed everywhere in World War II.

In approving this expenditure of more than a $1,000,000,000 to arm friendly foreign nations, I know that all Members of Congress feel keenly the responsibility that those allies must bear in today's struggle and in those that may come tomorrow. Certainly the United States cannot continue to bear the entire brunt of the fighting in all possible theaters of war. Our resources, although gigantic, are nevertheless finite. Our manpower, although extensive, is also limited. Our willingness to carry the whole burden now and for some time to come is conditioned by our expectation that our allies will join us in the front lines as quickly and as fully as is humanly possible.

There can be but one answer to the naked power of willful aggression, and that answer is force. We must speak in the only language that the aggressor understands. We must take a firm stand against the spread of communism into

any new areas that would jeopardize our security here and abroad.

All of these tragic facts represent hardships for the American people, both in terms of our sons' blood, that is being shed on foreign fields, and in terms of vast disruptions of our domestic economy. It would be a travesty if we were to make these sacrifices without pledging ourselves, as representatives of the American people, to a full and comprehensive inquiry into all phases of these wartime operations, to make sure that this sacrifice will not again be in vain.

Our first task is to rally behind the President as Commander in Chief and to give him unfailing support until the battle is won. Our second task, hardly less important, is to keep faith with all citizens of our land by making sure that everything possible is done to prevent any future recurrence of these tragic circumstances. If this sum of $1,200,000,000 can help achieve this outcome, then it will be well-spent indeed.

Unnatural Partition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement of Mr. Sean MacBride, Minister for External Affairs, Dublin, Ireland, which appeared in the weekly bulletin of the Department of External Affairs entitled "Ireland":

MR. MACBRIDE ON KOREAN WAR

When introducing the estimate for his department, Mr. Sean MacBride, Minister for External Affairs, Dublin, Ireland, made the following statement on recent events in Asia and their possible repercussions in the rest of the world:

"I need not here recite the events which have caused the gravest anxieties to the governments and peoples of the world in recent weeks. Having entered into onerous covenants in good faith, but in an era of unfinished peace amidst the shambles that resulted from the last war, the United States and the United Nations organization had little or no alternative but to adopt the course which they pursued. With a full and sympathetic understanding of the motives of the United States and the United Nations we have watched with anxiety their efforts to maintain international peace under most difficult circumstances. The events of recent weeks are the outcome of conditions resulting from many grievous mistakes made in the recent past and of even more grievous mistakes made in the more distant past by European and Japanese imperialism.

"This heritage from the past, coupled with the unnatural partition of Korea, was an easy target for unscrupulous exploitation. As one of the architects of the unfinished peace, Russia was not slow to exploit a situation which she had in no small measure helped to create.

"PARTITION OF KOREA

"While in no way wishing to take away from the very real sympathy which we extend to the United States in this crisis we, in common with the other democratic nations of the world have much to learn from it. Partitioned, unarmed, and living under a doubtful democratic rule, in conditions of economic insecurity, the people of Korea were an easy prey to an ideology that promised national unity and economic welfare. Partitioned, unarmed, politically and economically weak, the South Koreans had neither the enthusiasm nor the material resources necessary to resist an invasion led under a banner of national unity and sovereignty and backed by a strong and unscrupulous power. In these circumstances the battle for the human conscience of the people of Korea was lost before the first shot was fired, and now the sincere and, I am convinced, altruistic motive of the people of the United States will be misrepresented throughout Asia as forming part of a desire to dominate a portion of Asia.

"More isolated from the center of the storm than most other nations and partitioned ourselves, we are possibly able to view these events more objectively. Once you partition a nation and depart from the ordinary rules of democracy and liberty, you nullify the power of that nation to protect and defend itself physically and morally. Once you interfere with the sovereignty or unity of a nation you create conditions that inevitably sow the seeds of civil war and disaster. Is it too much to hope that even in the midst of this turmoil, the pages of history that are being written in these days in Asia will bring about a realization that the partition of our nation constitutes a dangerous festering sore in the body politic of the democratic world. The partition of Korea was the result of an unfinished peace. The partition of Ireland too is the result of the unfinished peace between Ireland and Britain. The efflux of time has in no way minimized the constant danger which the partition of our country involves for our people and for the democracies of the world.

"UNITED STATES OPPOSITION TO KOREAN PARTITION

"Lest anything I have said should be capable of being construed as attaching blame to the United States for the partition of Korea, let me hasten to remind the House that only a short time ago President Truman made a declaration setting out in unmistakable terms the opposition of the United States to the continued partition of Korea. He declared:

" 'All Americans who have come to know the Korean people appreciate their fierce passion for freedom and their keen desire to become an independent nation.

" 'The debilitated state in which the Korean economy was left by the Japanese has been accentuated by the separation of the hydroelectric power, coal, and metal and fertilizer industries of the north from the agricultural and textile industries of the south, and by the effects of continuing Communist agitation.

" 'The Republic of Korea, and the freedom-seeking people of North Korea held under Soviet domination, seek for themselves a united, self-governing and sovereign country, independent of foreign control and support and with membership in the United Nations.

" 'The United States has a deep interest in the continuing progress of the Korean people toward these objectives.'

"This clear-cut statement by President Truman made a deep impression on my mind at the time it was made because of the parallel it held for us in relation to the enforced partition of our country against the overwhelming wishes of our people.

"It may also be appropriate to deal here with some of the more fundamental issues that keep the world in a state of agonizing insecurity and that preclude its people from enjoying that peaceful security which it so ardently desires.

"BASIS OF THE CONFLICT

"The struggle which divides the present day world into two camps reaches far deeper into the foundations of our civilization than a struggle which is based solely on the territorial or national ambitions of one or more nations. It is a struggle which will be won or lost in the conscience of mankind, rather than in the field of strategy or diplomacy."

The Communist Peace Petition Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Un-American Activities has in preparation a report on the recently initiated Communist world-wide peace offensive, with particular reference to its significance in the United States. In connection with this report, our attention has been called to a Nation-wide drive now being conducted by the Communists at meetings, on street corners, in shops, homes and churches, and communities throughout the Nation, to secure signatures to a so-called peace petition.

We were particularly struck by the fact that Marcel Scherer, an individual with a long public record of Communist Party affiliation and activities, who has been identified as closely associated with a Communist atomic espionage ring, appeared before our committee on June 21, 1950, and admitted that he was one of those in charge of this drive in the city of New York.

Pending the publication of our full report which will take some time to prepare, it would be unfortunate if many Americans, unaware of the insidious aims and purposes of this drive, should be misled into lending their names and signatures to this spurious peace petition. In conformance with its tradition of alerting the American people to current Communist practices, the committee has decided to issue this preliminary note of caution so that all may be properly forewarned and forearmed.

It should be noted at the outset that the petitions are intended to confuse and divide the American people and paralyze their resistance to the march of Communist aggression. The petition drive is part of the present Soviet cold war against the United States to prepare the path for treason.

Americans should not affix their signatures thoughtlessly to this appeal and should be aware of the implications and seriousness of their action. The names and addresses gathered by Communist solicitors will constitute a gigantic and invaluable Red mailing list for the Communist Party, U. S. A., and its headquarters in Moscow and numerous Communist-front organizations. This list will be used not only for the distribution of subversive literature throughout the country, but it will also serve as a means of blackmailing for years to come, those

who may have innocently lent their names to peace petitions.

Strange as it may seem the present peace-petition drive occurs simultaneously while Soviet-made planes, tanks, and artillery are being used to launch a furious and unprovoked attack upon the peaceful Republic of South Korea, an attack which President Truman has characterized as part of an effort to "conquer independent nations" through "armed invasion and war."

The text of the peace petition as adopted in Stockholm on March 15–19, 1950, by the so-called World Peace Congress at the third session of its permanent committee, is announced to the world in the March 24, 1950, issue of For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy, official organ of the general staff of the international Communist conspiracy, the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers Parties—Cominform. In conformity with this directive, the Communist Party, U. S. A., formulated its own "peace plan" in the Worker for June 11, 1950. Calling for a "Nation-wide drive for millions of signatures," every Communist is notified that he "has the duty to rise to this appeal." On June 20, 1950, the peace petition received the official stamp of approval from the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R.

The petition itself is worded most deceptively. Oddly enough its sponsors who condone, defend, and support the present outrageous onslaught against the peaceful South Korean republic, as well as every form of totalitarian tyranny and brutality, address themselves to "all people of good will." Thus they hope to entrap individuals who are uninformed about Communist wiles. At the bottom of the document is a quotation from Trygve Lie intended to give the false impression that the Secretary of the United Nations has given his approval to the petition. The appeal is backed by no reputable organization or individuals. It carries union label 209 which is to be found on numerous pieces of Communist Party literature.

It carries a post office box number rather than a well-known address, for the obvious purpose of concealing the fact that the proposed recipient of the mail is a person identified before a congressional committee as an active member of the Communist Party, namely, Elizabeth Moos, the mother-in-law of William Walter Remington, now under indictment for perjury relating to his Communist Party membership.

Well aware that the United States, for its own protection against Soviet aggression, has established superiority in the development of atomic weapons, the Communists in their petition hope to paralyze our armed forces by demanding the outlawing of the atomic weapons as instruments of aggression. The demand flies in the face of the fact that our Government being answerable to the American people and bound by constitutional processes, cannot and does not unloose surprise acts of aggression as dictatorships have done repeatedly in recent years, and as the Communist forces did recently in Korea.

The second misleading demand in the petition is for strict international control of atomic weapons. Authorized representatives of the American Government in the field of atomic energy have pointed out that international control is impossible without provision for international inspection of plants within each country by an international authority. Under these conditions, the United States generously offered before the United Nations to turn over to the international authority all the materials, facilities, and know-how in our possession, as well as the disposal of all atom bombs and other atomic weapons. Every nation in the world except Soviet Russia and her satellites accepted the American plan as fair, generous, and workable.

It is to incite Americans against their own Government and to tie its hands in the face of the aggression designs of a foreign nation that the petition demands that "any government which first uses atomic weapons against any other country should be dealt with as a war criminal." The position of the United States is that it does not intend to give up its atomic weapons except under a system of control sufficiently effective to guarantee that other nations do not have, and cannot secure these weapons. Though they may not be aware of it, those who sign the peace petition are in fact proposing that our country commit national suicide.

Though labeled as a "peace petition," the document is actually intended to be the entering wedge for a campaign of civil disobedience and defiance of our Government, in the interests of the war effort of a foreign nation. Commenting on this "peace movement," Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, ranking woman leader of the Communist Party, tells Daily Worker readers: "Don't be nervous about signing your name and address. You're on J. Edgar Hoover's list of 1,000,000 already. You ought to be insulted if you are not."

The Committee on Un-American Activities desires to acquaint the American people with the facts in regard to the most recent and active effort of the Communist Party in this country. We have every confidence that, knowing the facts, Americans will treat this latest manifestation of Communist chicanery with deserved contempt.

A Menacing Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune on Thursday, July 20, 1950:

A MENACING MESSAGE

Mr. Truman's message to Congress reveals what he's up to. He proposes to use the war in Korea to win ever larger opportunities for graft for the wholesale corruptionists in his administration. He intends to break down our form of government.

The dangers of the moment are so grave, he tells Congress, that you must proceed at once to make me the dictator of a garrison state.

The police action, as he called it a few days ago, has now become a war requiring an immediate down payment of $10,000,000,000. Congress has set a limit of 2,000,000 men on the number that may now be in arms. That and any other limit must be removed, says Mr. Truman. He is preparing to call up the National Guard and the organized Reserves. He wants immediate power to control raw materials and production. As soon as he can get around to it, or as he put it, as soon as the need for it becomes apparent, he will present legislation for rationing and price control. His recommendations for large tax increases are already in preparation.

He had nothing to say, however, about reductions in nonwar spending by the Government, but he did ask Congress to appropriate further billions for arming the nations which Mr. Truman regards as allies but which have shown very little stomach, indeed, for the Korean war.

Mr. Truman has always yearned for the dictatorial powers he exercised briefly at the close of World War II. Congress had to pry them from him. He is the same fellow who seriously considered sending the Army out into the country to seize the farmers' hogs and cattle when his price controls discouraged the orderly marketing of the animals. Instead, Congress insisted on abandoning the controls and the problem disappeared with them. Mr. Truman wants the problem back.

The man who now is striving to spread hysteria in Congress so that he may wield all power once again is the gent whose inadequacies got us into the present mess. Even if the war in Korea were a much bigger show than it is and even if it is destined to grow in scale, Congress would still be making a grave mistake if it gave the President the free hand he is asking, for the congressional judgment is better than his and it is certain that any powers given him will be abused for the benefit of his corrupt cronies.

It should never be forgotten that the Communists are in Korea and in control of China because Mr. Truman let them get there. He said he liked Old Joe and proved it. Now, with nothing but this record of wrong headedness to recommend him, he is asking or is about to ask authority to direct everything, draft everybody, and run the country the way he thinks it ought to be run.

Mr. Truman is asking Congress to commit suicide. Only a Congress of Bolsheviks or lunatics would yield.

Communists in the United States—Official FBI Figures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the official figures given out by the Federal Bureau of Investigation as to the number of Communists in each State of the Union.

There being no objection, the figures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICIAL FBI FIGURES ON COMMUNIST PARTY MEMBERS IN THE UNITED STATES TODAY

Alabama	141
Alaska	5
Arizona	151
Arkansas	49
California	6,977
Colorado	200
Connecticut	997
Delaware	38
District of Columbia	210
Florida	200
Georgia	83
Hawaii	160
Idaho	50
Illinois	3,361
Indiana	650
Iowa	54
Kansas	6
Kentucky	15
Louisiana	150
Maine	25
Maryland	754
Massachusetts	1,022
Michigan	1,250
Minnesota	727
Mississippi	1
Missouri	458
Montana	80
Nebraska	57
Nevada	23
New Hampshire	43
New Jersey	1,708
New Mexico	87
New York	25,000
North Carolina	138
North Dakota	75
Ohio	2,834
Oklahoma	190
Oregon	250
Pennsylvania	2,876
Rhode Island	54
San Juan	100
South Carolina	14
South Dakota	30
Tennessee	27
Texas	247
Utah	76
Vermont	10
Virginia	150
Washington	1,485
West Virginia	136
Wisconsin	740
Wyoming	10
Grand total	54,174

Dependence on Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader, Evening News:

DEPENDENCE ON COAL

The emergency that has developed in Korea lends emphasis to warnings and suggestions of anthracite boosters that the Government should not sacrifice the hard-coal mines for oil through installations in public buildings.

During the Second World War and subsequently, the importance of hard coal was firmly established. The Government was forced to order many oil burners converted to coal because of the demands for oil in other phases of the war effort.

During the past year or two, oil has made gains in the field of household heating at the expense of anthracite. Eventually, many who switched to oil may have cause to regret their decision. The Government, which is supposed to know the score and set the good example, should not be among them.

The protests, entered recently, were based on the need for bolstering the local economy. The fighting in the Far East furnishes an additional argument for keeping the anthracite industry healthy, for America never knows when it will call on the full resources of this industry, among others, in a struggle for survival.

Mutual Defense Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago this administration decided to embark upon a policy of helping to rearm western Europe and other nations in the hope of helping to build up a military machine that with our help could stand up against Russia in the event she decided to conquer those countries.

Last year the Congress authorized an appropriation of $1,314,000,000 as military aid to the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Italy, Norway, Denmark, Iran, Korea, the Philippines, Greece, and Turkey.

This bill provides $1,225,500,000 for the second year of such military help to these nations.

I am supporting the legislation this time, because it has become a fixed policy of our Government, a contract or promise to these nations before the world. This policy having been originated, and because of the serious conditions that have broken out between this Nation and Korea, I feel that the Congress, for the psychological effect it will have on the other nations, must keep our Government's pledge, and I hope the legislation may be approved by unanimous vote.

A year ago I felt that if Russia intended to conquer the rest of Europe, due to the great military machine she was building, she would be able to do it before a sufficient military machine could be builded in western Europe with our aid. I still feel that even though Russia holds off in such a move for another year, or maybe longer, that she will have the power to overrun and conquer these countries when she decides to move. I think our top military leaders feel about the same way about it.

Notwithstanding the concern of many Members of Congress who are voting for this legislation, I feel that we must carry out the established policy of the Government, and I sincerely hope that possibly the passage of this legislation and our cooperation with these countries may make a substantial contribution in preventing the Russian Government from taking over more of western Europe, and expanding her aggression against other countries.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles by Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Fellow travelers, and Washington knows them well, are in many ways more dangerous than Communists. For they are the Judas cows of communism, the leaders of innocents to destruction.

Here we have the testimony of a former fellow traveler on the subject, and he was one of the most important captives the Communist organization in this country ever had.

He specialized, in his day, on peace drives. His testimony, therefore, is very important in this moment of Korean maneuvering. For it is certain that at some stage the United States of America will be confronted again with a Communist-organized peace campaign.

The witness: J. B. Matthews, who appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in August 1938 and made such an impression that the committee as soon as it could hired him as director of research.

For 7 years Matthews stayed with the committee and made amends to the United States for his past Communist associations by filling an invaluable record with evidence of the conspiracy.

It doesn't matter that the people and events chronicled under his direction are all of years past. The formula never changes. Communism works in set ways and once you have learned those ways you can recognize Communist tactics as they develop.

Matthews told the committee how one of the most influential of all the Communist-front organizations of the 1930's came to be organized. This was the American League for Peace and Democracy.

He testified that Earl Browder, then head of the Communist organization, went to Moscow in 1933 and got instructions to lay the groundwork for an international organization of people the Communists could influence.

War being particularly unpopular, it was decided that the best way to approach the innocents on the blind side would be to get them to organize "against war."

This was in 1933–34. And so:

"Mr. MATTHEWS. Simultaneously there was set up the American League Against War and Fascism, the Canadian League Against War and Fascism, the British League Against War and Fascism, and the French League Against War and Fascism. They were set up simultaneously and last winter (1937) all four simultaneously took new names."

The new name for this international system of Communist fronts was the "League for Peace and Democracy," of each country involved.

Matthews was the first chairman of the American league, and its principal organizer.

If any man on earth should know its origin, he was the man. Matthews told how the money was raised, some with "nickel, dime and quarter drives upon the innocents." Some with banquets, of which more later.

Then, "sometimes we got in difficulty and I had to borrow money," Matthews swore. "The procedure then was for Mr. Corliss Lamont to sign a note to make a loan at the Amalgamated Bank of New York City."

And how did things go?

"Mr. MATTHEWS. Donald Henderson, as secretary of the American league, ran our national headquarters in New York. Henri Barbusse from France, and Tom Mann, Lord Marley and John Strachey from England, made speeches in many parts of the United States on behalf of the newly formed American League.

"Mr. STARNES. Each of those men whose names you mention are known to be Communists?

"Mr. MATTHEWS. At least three of the four are widely known as such.

"Mr. STARNES. And who are those three?

"Mr. MATTHEWS. Henri Barbusse, now deceased, was the most famous Communist of this generation.

"Tom Mann has long been a Communist leader in Great Britain. John Strachey is perhaps the chief theoretical exponent of communism in Great Britain, and Lord Marley has worked very, very closely with Communist and united fronts in various parts of the world, but I think his connection is not so readily admitted."

Do any of those names mean anything to you?

John Strachey is, at this very writing, the Minister of War for Great Britain's Socialist Government. How far has he left the party line behind?

Fellow travelers are not always people of public renown.

Just at the end of World War II, one Igor Gouzenko, the Russian code clerk, spilled the beans in Canada on the Soviet spy ring that took out of America the atom bomb, the secrets of our high explosive, RDX, the inside facts on radar and other military machinery.

It was discovered that one of the principal spies the Russians had was a Canadian clerk hooked through the Canadian League Against War and Fascism.

This miserable creature, bearer of disaster for western civilization, was never even allowed to join the Communist Party. He fellow traveled.

In Washington, the fellow travelers of the 1930's did incalculable damage to this country and served Soviet Russia so utterly that some were even offered Soviet medals.

As then, so now. Somewhere, this Sunday, the Communists are organizing a new international system of transmission belts.

When these begin to operate, you may well be approached by some outwardly impeccable citizens asking you to join a society that stands for motherhood, peace, or some other such noble purpose. Look well before you sign.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles by Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

One of the most peculiar side ventures of communism has to do with religion and with people in religious orders who claim communism is a project for good, rather than what it is in fact.

The most notorious example in this line is an Englishman, the Very Reverend Hewlett Johnson, the Dean of Canterbury.

This weird old party, just at the end of World War II, actually had the effrontery to address a mass meeting in Madison Square Garden with exhortations to submit to Moscow.

But, of course, he had good reason to assume it was all right, for as the meeting opened telegrams of greeting were read from the Washington powers that would make him seem to be the administration's most honored guest.

Who is this Red Dean and what makes him tick? It is little understood in America, but the Church of England is not an independent religious organization. It is an arm of the Government.

The King of England is the titular head of the church organization. Its hierarchy, rituals, and system of doing business are all subject to parliamentary law.

Indeed, one of the biggest uproars in Britain between wars concerned an effort of the House of Bishops to rewrite the Book of Common Prayer. Parliament refused.

Thus, since the King takes "advice" on churchly appointments from the party in power, it came about that in the 1929–31 Socialist administration of Ramsay MacDonald a vacancy occurred at Canterbury Cathedral's head office, of which Dean of Canterbury is the chief administrative officer.

The Socialists wanted one of their tame boys to get the job. And so Hewlett Johnson was appointed for life, and so it is the world finds this politician in pastor's clothing, who has put in all his effort ever since on the line of advocating Marxism.

Given that Karl Marx, founder of "scientific socialism," hated religion, how does the dean's conscience reconcile his politics with his office?

It's a very interesting question, and you should be glad you don't have to furnish a convincing answer.

The man in churchly office who tries to reconcile Marxism with religion has his job cut out for him. Nor can it be made any easier by claims that there is any primitive general aim in communism similar to the welfare aspects of religion.

Some very interesting evidence on that point appears in the testimony given the House Committee on Un-American activities by J. B. Matthews back in 1938.

Matthews, the fellow traveler of communism, had by then decided he would make amends to civilization for his mistakes, and not only testified on communism to the committee, but spent 7 years with it directing its research.

Concerning religion, Matthews explained that the Communists have shifted, after many failures to destroy religion by head-on attack, to boring from within.

It was not an easy trick to work, because their fundamental attitude had been so clearly established and convinced Communists were so utterly determined against religion as an influence in human affairs. Here is Matthews:

"The new party line on religion was slower in coming than other features. As late as 1936, Corliss Lamont (son of the eminent Morgan partner, and author of The Illusion of Immortality) wrote a pamphlet published by the Communists in which he quoted approvingly Marx's statement that 'the social principles of Christianity are lickspittle, whereas the proletariat is revolutionary.'

"In this pamphlet, which is a direct broadside against all religion of whatever form or temper, Lamont writes:

" 'A reformed and liberal church * * * is even more dangerous basically than an out-and-out reactionary religious organization.' "

Thus as late as 1936, the true contempt of communism for religion was clearly stated in English for any churchman outside Russia to read and understand. This is leaving aside entirely the voluminous and terrible record of religious persecution within Russia, itself.

But did that warn off those of the cloth who wanted to play with the fire?

Here again is Matthews:

"In the Communist Party it is a matter of pride and boasting that the party has its friends and sympathizers situated strategically in every important institution in the land—newspapers, magazines, churches, womens' clubs, trade-unions, Government agencies, and educational institutions.

"Ofttimes party members themselves are so situated.

"Individually, the strategically situated persons may not do a great deal for the party, but cumulatively, their influence on behalf of the party is of the highest importance.

"Earl Browder (then head of the party in the United States of America), himself has stated publicly that there are active clergymen who are secretly members of the Communist Party. In addressing the Union Theological Seminary, Mr. Browder said:

" 'You may be interested to know that we have preachers active in churches who are members of the Communist Party.' "

More on this, tomorrow.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles by Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Listening to Moscow radio these days is serious and important business for Americans who want to keep ahead of developments in communism.

Right now the short wave from Moscow, Budapest, Warsaw, and Prague is coordinated to pursue a project started in Stockholm this last March.

All over the Western Hemisphere, in Europe, Asia, and Africa, Communists are circulating petitions which state:

"We demand the outlawing of atomic weapons as instruments of aggression and mass murder of peoples.

"We demand strict international control to enforce this measure.

"We believe that any country which first uses atomic weapons against any other country whatsoever will be committing a crime against humanity and should be dealt with as a war criminal.

"We call on all men and women of good will throughout the world to sign this appeal."

This manifesto, under the heading "Sign for Peace" then has places for the signers to put down "name," "occupation," and "contributions."

Each sheet has a serial number and a place for certification by the collectors.

Thus it is clear the Communists are, as usual, very intelligently using a single instrument for multiple purposes. They are getting up a formidable propaganda machine, made up of the signatures of many millions of people everywhere, who want peace.

They are clearly aiming to brand the United States a war criminal. We invited that with the Nuremberg trial, of course, and so have no just cause for complaint.

And, most importantly, they are collecting money in large sums and vital personal facts about people who sign up.

These petitions are circulated by hand, naturally, and so the carriers of them are able to do a good deal of personal propagandizing as they go and make confidential notes on the side of individuals likely to be usable for espionage.

And the radio barrage laid down nightly reports in English and numerous other languages the very freshest and latest developments not only in Korea but in the United States.

This past week end I heard from Moscow detailed accounts of meetings in this country a few days before, at which the Stockholm Peace Appeal was circulated and signed.

What has this to do with the problems of the clergy in relation to communism on which I am supposed to write?

People who are old enough to remember the pacifist campaigns of the 1920's and 1930's will be able to link it up.

In that era American clergymen in large numbers were caught up in a campaign to argue that the United States, already disarmed to its danger, should disarm further.

They not only preached it from the pulpit, but even circulated petitions and led mass meetings until in 1933 Gen. Douglas MacArthur, then chief of staff of what passed for our Army, led a reply.

MacArthur laid it down that undefended riches is the surest invitation to attack and argued that the United States, being rich and being incapable of self-defense, was provoking war.

For that, he suffered brutal personal and professional slander from clergymen and others, the effect of which has not entirely dissipated to this day. Yet, was he right, or wrong?

The same pattern of events is now in progress, again. The clergy, as a class, is bound to be enticed and interested in searches for peace.

Yet, in the era I have cited above, clergy were led from pacific campaigns into Marxism.

Do you want evidence? Then look in the record of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. See the story there of the Church League for Industrial Democracy, the United Christian Council for Democracy, the record of the publication, the Protestant, and its editor, Kenneth Leslie.

Examine the case of Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr, of Union Theological Seminary, who managed to convince himself that capitalism is ridden by a demon of hypocrisy and Marxism with a demon of vengeance. He took vengeance.

That was nearly 20 years ago.

A generation of experience has had some influence on Professor Niebuhr, they say.

But in the 20 years between, men have died and so have women and little children, too, by the millions, to teach him.

Be sure that if the Stockholm peace appeal comes your way, you remember all that.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles by Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

How long will the House Committee on Un-American Activities be necessary? How long will it continue? Why has it lasted as long as it has?

Of these three important questions, only the last can be answered in any detail now.

I have been reviewing in this space for some days the story of how the committee came into being at all, and showing how in its very first few months it proved its necessity.

Remember, the House Committee on Un-American Activities started out as a mere temporary undertaking with little money and less encouragement. Its first chairman, Representative Martin Dies, Democrat, of Texas, very nearly turned back his first appropriation and quit.

But, as I have indicated here, the very first witnesses he heard on communisim demonstrated the tremendous importance and force of the idea behind the committee.

Result: the committee, in 1939, really moved to a first-rank position in congressional affairs and has stayed there ever since, in spite of disasters among its membership.

It is the only committee in the history of Congress, so far as I am able to learn, that started out as a special investigative inquiry and evolved into a permanent arm of the House.

To understand the significance of that, you must know what happened in 1944, the year of term 4 campaigning by Mr. Roosevelt, who had by then tried twice to control Committee Chairman Dies and having failed, marked him down for the famous Roosevelt purge.

More than that, Mrs. Roosevelt had also marked down Robert Stripling, the committee secretary and chief investigator, for a purge on her own.

Mrs. Roosevelt wanted to get her protege, Joe Lash, into the naval intelligence. The Navy wouldn't grant request because of a Dies committee record.

Her secretary called Mr. Stripling on the phone one day and asked him to meet Mrs. Roosevelt at 4 p. m. in her office. When he asked what it was about, he was told it was personal, but he'd certainly come.

He replied he couldn't go until he knew what it was all about and cleared with the committee. The secretary then said, "You think it over and call me back, as I'm sure you will want to see Mrs. Roosevelt."

Mr. Stripling then referred the matter to Dies, who was also called later in the afternoon for lunch at the White House the next day.

Dies has never told all that went on between himself and the President at that meeting. But the upshot was that Lash came before the committee to declare his complete disassociation with the Communists.

He said that he learned just how wrong they are and that he was sorry he had ever had any dealings with them.

Now there is one test of a citizen who claims he has broken with communism that is absolutely essential. Communism is a conspiracy to destroy the United States. It is comparable to a conspiracy between individuals to commit murder.

If a member of a murder gang runs to the police and says he has had enough, the police very sensibly ask him who else is in the gang. And he, if he has really ended his attachments to the gang, sees the need to answer.

Just so, when anybody says he has done with the Communists, his duty as a citizen is to tell everything he knows about the conspiracy and everybody in it.

Thus, when Joe Lash, the White House protege, went to tell Chairman Dies, of the Committee on Un-American Activities, that he had done with the Communists, Dies asked him for names.

Lash drew himself up and declared he could not "squeal." So Dies laughed and refused him that which Mrs. Roosevelt had asked.

A furious letter from Mrs. Roosevelt arrived in Dies' office soon thereafter. I would give a good deal to know what it said in detail, but all I know is that it was "hot."

I do know that shortly thereafter the administration's attack on Dies grew intense.

Dies, who was sick, anyhow, and tired of the abuse he had to take from the Roosevelts and their friends, announced he would not seek reelection.

And Stripling, the only man in the United States of America who knew the whole project of the committee in all its details, was suddenly called up in the draft. It looked as if the committee would then fold up.

Communists in the United States and the War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 25 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "The Enemy at Home Is Dangerous: Uncover Him," from the Philadelphia Inquirer of this morning.

There being on objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ENEMY AT HOME IS DANGEROUS: UNCOVER HIM!

The war in Korea and the partial mobilization of men and matériel which has been set in motion in this country to stay Communist aggression will inevitably produce increased efforts on the part of our enemies in espionage, sabotage, and other subversive activities.

It is imperative, therefore, as President Truman stressed yesterday, that our own enforcement programs to counter such activities be tightened up and that the FBI be given all possible citizen help in this connection.

Just as the Nazis had their agents and sympathizers here and in other allied countries before and during World War II, the Communists have their party-members and their leftist affiliates who will stop at nothing to help the Red cause—in Korea or anywhere else. Their assistance may take the form of securing information on troop and ship movements and on the type of

weapons sent to the front; of sabotaging war supplies and crippling transportation lines; of promoting strikes in war essential industries; of circulating subversive propaganda.

It is not easy to track down Communist agents, as the tedious task of uncovering the atom bomb spy-ring centering about Klaus Fuchs has shown. It is the patriotic duty of anyone who has information on suspected spy activity to report it without any hesitation to the nearest field representative of the FBI.

Sabotage prevention is an essential security measure which is tied up with the work of keeping military and military production information out of enemy hands. Heading off enemy propaganda is another measure of importance. A notorious example of such propaganda is the phony peace petition now being circulated throughout the Nation.

This device is intended to mislead our people into believing that only the Soviet Union supports world peace, that the United States is a warmonger and that it is waging an imperialistic war in Korea. It promotes sabotage also: a writer on Pravda has made it clear that signing it is a promise to "stop trains, refuse to load ships carrying war materials; seize the arms of mercenaries; not allow son or husband to go to war."

The new policy of tighter Government enforcement should consider the possibility of arresting the circulators of this anti-American petition, not for disorderly conduct or littering the streets, as has happened at times, but for promoting sabotage and lying propaganda.

The enemy striking from within is just as dangerous as the visible enemy outside. He must be overcome by every means at our disposal.

Constitution Drafted for State of Hawaii Demonstrates Complete Mastery of Democratic Principles of Self-Government—Address of Delegate Joseph R. Farrington to the Concluding Session of the Constitutional Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of a speech that was made by myself as Delegate to Congress from Hawaii at ceremonies for the signing of the State Constitution for Hawaii on July 22, 1950 at Iolani Palace, Honolulu:

Mr. President and delegates to the State constitutional convention, distinguished guests and friends of Hawaii nei: To you of this convention who have completed the historic task of drafting a Constitution for the State of Hawaii I extend my warmest congratulations. You have earned the lasting gratitude of all of us of Hawaii and of the friends of free government everywhere. You have won a place in the history of these islands, this vitally important segment of our common country for whose future and welfare we share the same concern as the people of the 48 States.

We hope it will not be long now before we are one of the United States of America. The document you will sign today most certainly will hasten the day when we are admitted to the Union of the States. It is the complete and final demonstration that we are prepared in every respect to assume the responsibility of a State.

The election by which you were chosen was not held under the authority of a law of Congress. It was held under the authority of a law of our own legislature and at the expense of our own people. And so were your meetings and every step that has brought into being the Constitution for the State of Hawaii that you are to sign today. The entire proceeding that brought this document into being are purely and entirely the work of our own people.

There is ample precedent for this. But this is not the road that has usually been followed in bringing about the admission of a State to the Union. The entire procedure, therefore, has become an unusual demonstration not only of the initiative and great creative ability of our people in the field of democratic government, but the determination of our people, the overwhelming majority of our people, to win statehood and win it now.

I am sure that it will be approved by our people by a vote that will be practically unanimous. It most certainly should be.

ACTION TIMELY

The action you are taking today in signing the constitution is particularly timely. The bill to admit Hawaii to the Union as a State—H. R. 49—has passed the National House of Representatives and been favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. As reported by this committee, it recognizes the work of this convention, provides the procedure for approval of the Constitution by Federal authorities, the steps necessary for the admission of Hawaii to the Union as a State and the election of State officers. The bill is now on the calendar of the Senate.

The leadership of the Senate has announced that as soon as consideration of the omnibus appropriations bill, which provides funds for the operation of the Federal Government for the fiscal year 1951, is completed, the calendar will be called. On the calendar appears a list of all the legislation favorably reported to the Senate. The bills providing statehood for Hawaii and for Alaska are on this calendar.

The customary procedure in the Senate is for the leadership, representing as it does the majority, to decide which of the bills on the calendar will be called up for consideration and in what order. The present plan of the leadership is to call up some minor legislation that can be disposed of promptly, then call up, first, the bill providing statehood for Alaska, then the bill providing statehood for Hawaii.

LEGISLATIVE SITUATION

Opponents of statehood have announced they they will oppose the attempts of the leadership to bring up the statehood bills by moving that the Senate proceed instead to the consideration of the Mundt-Ferguson anticommunism bill. This is a measure about which there is much controversy and likely to be extended debate. If this fails, then the leadership plans to call up the bill providing statehood for Alaska.

Several reasons have been given for calling up Alaska first. The principal one is that the majority desire statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska. It is recognized generally that the case for Alaska is easily the weakest of the two. Those who are for both believe, therefore, that the best way to win Alaskan statehood is to require its consideration first. This procedure accomplished this result in the House and is therefore being used in the Senate.

Favorable action at this time on statehood for Hawaii, therefore, may very well turn on the result of action on statehood for Alaska. Close to two-thirds of the members of the Senate have already expressed in one way or another their belief in statehood for Hawaii. But there is a great question as to whether those who feel as strongly or more strongly about statehood for Alaska will continue to support statehood for Hawaii in the event statehood for Alaska fails.

LEGISLATIVE BATTLE AHEAD

It will be apparent from this that having completed the task of drafting a State constitution, much remains to be done in order that it be effective. The legislative battle ahead of us in Washington may be the last but will be one of the most difficult and one of the most important in our long fight for statehood. If this can be won, then the rest of the steps necessary can be readily taken.

The fact that this constitution has been drawn, the methods by which this has been done and the final result certainly should prove of telling importance in winning this fight. I am sure that every Senator who takes the time to examine this record will have difficulty in finding any good reason for voting against us.

It is unthinkable that while American lives and American fortune are being spent to protect free government in the Far East and other parts of the world, that the United States Government should deny the full privileges of free government to its own people in Hawaii.

The position of Hawaii and its people in the world today is an extremely significant one. We are the Pacific frontier of our country. For half a century, if not more, we have been the proving ground of great experiment in democracy. The success with which our people have mastered the principles of democratic government could not be more completely or dramatically demonstrated than in the work you have done in drafting this constitution. It stands today as a great tribute to Hawaii's people who chose you for this responsibility and to the great ability and patriotism with which you have discharged this responsibility.

It stands, too, as a great tribute to the American system of free government.

I am sure that I express the sentiments of all of our people when I say that we not only are grateful to you for a task well done, but proud of you fellow American citizens of Hawaii Nei.

Farm-to-Market Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered at the road builders' conference and forty-sixth annual meeting, sponsored by the American Road Builders' Association, February 7, 1949, Washington, D. C.:

Mr. Chairman, members of the American Road Builders Association, and guests, I appreciate the privilege of being with you today and discussing briefly some of the issues confronting us relative to our road-building program. Really I think I should say—to discuss with you the economic and military issues which confront our Nation, as most certainly our road program is a major part of both of these subjects. I have been asked to speak on a subject very close to my heart—"the program of secondary or local rural roads—farm-to-market roads."

We must not be interested in roads, or any other legislation for that matter, from a selfish viewpoint. We must consider what is best for all of us—not only from the viewpoint of highway contractors but from the viewpoint of citizens we should carefully analyze and agree on a policy that will benefit all, and formulate a program that will make ours "A greater America."

Secondary roads—farm-to-market roads—how shall we define them? When we speak of them do we mean the feeder roads, the tributary roads, the farm-to-market roads, country and township roads, local roads, or do we mean all the roads below the level of the primary system? Certainly some of the terminology we use in classifying our highway systems is rather misleading. For instance, take the term "farm-to-market road". When most people use this term they certainly are not referring to our primary highway system, yet many of our main roads would warrant such a classification. Many of our farmers and industrial workers are located along this primary system and so to them the main highway becomes the farm-to-market road.

And even the farmer who resides on the tributary roads may use the main road in the last lap of his trip to the market. So as farmers travel to their markets they may travel over a route which includes sections of township, county and State roads. And they all can rightfully be called farm-to-market roads.

The crops, upon which depends the economic well-being and continued existence, not only for farmers, but for the American people, must be transported in a large part from the farm to the market and ultimate consumer on our roads, including farm-to-market roads. Both consumers and farmers, therefore, suffer from an inadequate road system.

Of the 3,300,000 miles of roads, alleys, and streets in our Nation, 3,000,000 miles are in rural districts, only 23 percent of which are graded and drained but not surfaced, and 31 percent are primitive, undrained, and not surfaced. Thus more than half of the roads serving farmers are not "all weather" roads. Over the secondary and feeder roads 4,000,000 children ride to school daily; 33,000 rural letter carriers travel each day approximately 1,500,000 miles serving their mail routes. In doing that they directly serve 30,000,000 people of this country.

About 80 percent of our total road mileage is under local jurisdiction. Studies of our highway travel characteristics show that our paved roads aggregate about 10 percent of the total rural mileage. They carry more than 70 percent of our total vehicle miles. Yet this 10 percent of paved rural roads provides direct service to less than 25 percent of all our rural dwellings. This leaves 75 percent of our rural dwellings on the remaining gravel, earth, or unimproved roads.

It is estimated that between 65 and 70 percent of our raw materials from the farms, the mines, and the forests are transported over the roads under local jurisdiction to the factory and to the city. While 70 percent of the total vehicle miles occur on 10 percent of the paved rural roads, much of this traffic is generated by rural activities, which are dependent upon the use of the gravel, earth, or unimproved road in travel to and from market.

From a defense standpoint these farm-to-market roads are also important. During the war when gasoline was rationed highway traffic was divided into essential and nonessential classifications. It was determined at that time that 67 percent of all farm-car travel was essential whereas only 53 percent of the automobile travel of other classes was considered essential. These farm-to-market roads are the supply lines of our Nation. They are also the roads which would enable traffic to disperse from the arterial system in case of atomic bombing of our cities. If our main roads should become blocked, they would serve as alternates or relief roads.

The 1948 Highway Act provides for a reduction of 10 percent in appropriations. If continued on the basis of present Federal-aid appropriations for a perlof of 15 years, this program will be barely sufficient to construct a mileage of principal secondary roads of over 15 percent of the total rural mileage. It can, however, act as a sparkplug for the local highway program and can serve as an instrumentality to bring about improved local highway administrative practices. It can serve to stimulate cooperation between the Federal, State, county, and other local agencies.

It is interesting to note in the annual report of the Public Roads Administration that the cost per mile for Federal-aid secondary roads has averaged about one-third that of primary roads. The progress we have made to date on our highway system represents the united effort of the Federal, State, and local governments. With a varying degree each has exercised responsibility and control of roads within its own jurisdiction. A sound, integrated highway program is an essential part of our economy. If we are to meet the transportation needs of all of our people, we must not only improve our primary system, but must extend adequate highway facilities to the people living on our farm-to-market (county and township) roads as well. In such a program it is necessary that we enlist the cooperation of the Federal, State, county, and township units of government.

With automobile registration expected to reach 50,000,000 by 1960, and the entire highway system in need of overhauling, a greatly accelerated highway program is a vital need. Congress must recognize that need. State legislatures and local officials must aid in solving their highway problems. The road building profession and industry now face the biggest challenge in their history. With cooperation and teamwork we can meet that challenge.

A great many people, including me, wonder why our own "farm-to-market roads" (county and township) are not being improved more rapidly. Let us take Ohio for example.

Ohio's allotment of funds for secondary roads is $13,836,000. The November 30 report from the Public Roads Administration indicates that Ohio has now a program under way which adds up to $27,178,000. This will finance the construction of 568 miles of secondary roads. Two hundred and twenty-five miles have been completed involving an expenditure of $8,832,000, a little less than one-half of which is Federal funds. The balance of funds are in the various stages of programing, contract awarded, and under construction. Thus it would seem Ohio has quite a sizable program, yet it involves improvement of only 568 miles, as compared to the 28,737 miles under county control, and 40,938 miles of township roads in Ohio.

What is wrong? And to be perfectly honest there is something wrong, and it is time to find out what and see that it is corrected. Is it red tape? Is it overlapping of power? Is it caused by unnecessary plans and specifications? Or is it just indifference on the part of someone in authority?

In my opinion, we need a complete reorganization of that branch of our various highway departments, National and State, that has control of the road program dealing with farm-to-market roads, county and township. Why not establish, National and State, a division to handle farm-to-market roads, county and township? A division to cooperate with the county and township organizations and to delegate to the county and township officials as much responsibility for planning, engineering, and construction as they are organized and equipped to undertake. The creation of this division will give to the local people an opportunity to put practical knowledge into our road program. They will know local problems, need, and conditions, and then we can truly design and build a road to fit the traffic which it bears.

Give to rural Americans, the farmer, the shop worker, the mailman, and the school-bus driver, an opportunity to get to and from their work 12 months out of the year. We want, and certainly are entitled to, an all-weather road.

War Emergency Measures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Hon. Lee B. Wyatt, associate justice of the Supreme Court of Georgia:

STATE OF GEORGIA,
SUPREME COURT,
LaGrange, Ga., July 19, 1950.

Hon. A. SIDNEY CAMP,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SID: I am writing you for the reason I am deeply concerned about the present conditions, and know that in the tremendously responsible position you now occupy, suggestions will be welcomed on your part for whatever they may be worth.

We are, in my opinion, definitely in a fight for survival. One of the main objectives and hopes of the enemy is that we will destroy our economy. In all wars, the one whose economy is first destroyed, is the loser.

Last Saturday, a pound of bacon of a certain brand in LaGrange was priced at 50 cents per pound. Monday, the price was 55 cents, the marked price clearly having been erased and changed, indicating the same bacon, priced 55 cents on Monday, was in the possession of the merchant on Saturday, when the price was 50 cents. This is only one instance of what appears to be going on all over this land of ours.

May I suggest that all prices and wages in this country be frozen as of the date the United Nations issued the cease-fire order to North Korea until the end of the present emergency, and that if the power does not now exist, that it be provided at once. I see no reason for a rise in prices since that date other than a desire to profiteer.

Drastic? Yes, but what I saw in Europe during my 7 months stay following the end of World War II, convinces me that the danger is sufficient to justify drastic measures.

Sacrifice, our personal political welfare, our position or office, our property, or even life itself is not too high a price to pay for victory. Much of all of this must be done before we can attain victory. There must be no profiteering now in this country.

I wish every person in the United States could go to Europe and see what defeat in modern warfare means to a nation.

I am as opposed to unnecessary Government controls in peacetime as anybody, but unfortunately, we are not now at peace, but, on the contrary, are engaged in the most dangerous war in our history as a nation.

I pass this thought on to you for whatever it may be worth.

With highest personal regards and best wishes, I am

Yours very sincerely,

LEE B. WYATT.

What Hawaii Has Done To Combat Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the attempts that are being made by opponents of statehood for Hawaii to stress the extent of Communist activity in the Territory of Hawaii, I wish to include a memorandum, prepared by the Hawaii Statehood Commission, outlining the steps taken by the people of Hawaii to meet this problem.

I am confident that anyone who examines this record will conclude that while Communist activity there constitutes a menace, as it does in every part of the country, the people in no State have dealt with it more vigorously or effectively than have the people of Hawaii.

The memorandum follows:

WHAT HAWAII HAS DONE TO COMBAT COMMUNISM

I. TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT

A. Non-Communist oath for public employees: Act 137, Laws of Hawaii, 1949, requires oath that public employee is not a Communist or a member of the Communist Party, and has not been at any time within the past 5 years. (Effective May 4, 1949.) The oath is as follows:

"I, ——— ———, do solemnly swear and declare, on oath, that I am not now nor have I been at any time within the 5 years next preceding the taking of this oath a Communist or a member of the Communist Party; that I have not at any time within the 5 years next preceding the taking of this oath held membership in, paid assessments, dues, or made contributions to any organization or any political party which advocates the overthrow of the constitutional form of government of the United States of America or any change in the Government of the United States of America, except as provided by its Constitution; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; so help me God."

B. Territorial commission on subversive activities: Joint Resolution 5, Laws of Hawaii, 1949, creates and appropriates $75,000 to a commission on subversive activities of seven members to be appointed by the Governor. At least three members must be attorneys, and no more than four members may belong to the same political party.

C. Legislative committee on un-American activities: The Territorial legislative holdover committee has organized a subcommittee on un-American activities.

D. Territorial government seizure and governmental operation of struck stevedoring companies: Acts 2 and 3 of the special session of 1949 is cited as proof that the Territorial legislative acts in the public interest independently of pressure groups.

E. Territorial government prohibits by law interference with government operation of stevedoring facilities: Acts 2 and 3, session laws of 1949, special session, relating to Territorial operation of stevedoring facilities, requires non-Communist oath of persons employed in the stevedoring activities of the Territory, and prohibits picketing of Government operations.

F. Requested House Un-American Activities Committee investigation: By resolution of the Legislature of Hawaii, the House Un-American Activities Committee of the United States Congress was formally requested to make an investigation of Communist activities in Hawaii.

G. Hawaii state constitution authorized: Created Hawaii state constitutional convention (Act 334, Laws of Hawaii, 1949) each elected delegate to which signed a non-Communist affidavit, and whose members adopted for the proposed State of Hawaii a constitutional provision that "no person who advocates or who aids or belongs to any party, organization, or association which advocates, the overthrow by force or violence of the government of the State of Hawaii or of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office of trust or profit under the state constitution."

H. Known Communists ousted from public office and employment: Department of public instruction after a long public hearing ousted two teachers who were suspected of Communist leanings; the Hawaii state constitutional convention removed two delegates identified with communism.

II. COMMUNITY GROUPS

A. Hawaii Residents Association, Inc., a community group, was formed in October 1949 to combat what it believed were subversive elements in Hawaii. A junior organization was organized soon thereafter.

B. The Bar Association of Hawaii requested the House Un-American Activities Committee of the United States Congress to investigate alleged communistic influences in Hawaii so that they might be combatted.

C. The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union made a separate request which was referred to the United States House Committee on Education and Labor.

D. The Honolulu Japanese Chamber of Commerce unanimously voted that all members (457) must take a non-Communist oath.

E. Conference of Civic Organizations was formed to combat communism in Hawaii.

F. Citizens Committee planned an anti-Communist program.

G. Individual efforts. Numerous individuals in Hawaii requested the House Un-American Activities Committee of Congress to investigate the extent of communism in Hawaii; many individuals served on committees the purpose of which were to combat communism in Hawaii.

III. ELECTION RETURNS

A. The 1948 general election shows Hawaii to be a normal political commonwealth and not controlled by subversive elements. More than 112,000 voters—comprising more than 85 percent of those registered—cast ballots for 118 territorial and 107 county candidates. Of the 91 elective offices, 55 went to Republicans and 36 to Democrats. In the Territorial Legislature, 29 Republicans were elected and 16 Democrats, the control being 9–6 in the Senate and 20–10 in the House. In county offices, the GOP elected 20 officials and the Democrats 20. Candidates endorsed by the P. A. C. were generally defeated.

Statistics show that the various races in Hawaii take a normal interest in politics; 20 percent of the Legislature are Hawaiian in heritage, 46 percent are Caucasian, 6 percent Chinese, and 26 percent Japanese.

B. The 1950 election of 63 delegates to the Hawaii State Constitutional Convention shows widespread interest in State government by outstanding citizens. The second largest vote in Hawaii's history—more than 97,000 voters—on March 21 showed that, although candidates ran without party labels, the people elected 29 Republicans, 23 Democrats, and 11 other candidates as delegates to Hawaii's State Constitutional Convention. Elected were 27 Caucasians, 20 Japanese-Americans, 11 Hawaiians, and 5 Chinese. Delegates elected include a judge, 16 attorneys, 2 district court practitioners, a physician, 4 dentists, 7 educators, 2 pineapple company presidents, 7 other sugar and pineapple company men, 3 real-estate men, 2 insurance men, 2 tax consultants, 3 ranchers, 6 store owners, 5 county supervisors, and 4 housewives. The so-called left-wing I. L. W. U. candidates, with 14 entered in the primaries, emerged from that runoff with 7 contenders, and finally won 2 seats in the convention, one of which was vacated by the convention because the delegate in question refused to cooperate with the House Un-American Activities Committee.

IV. DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF HAWAII DEALING EFFECTIVELY WITH COMMUNIST ELEMENT

Though Hawaii's political life has been traditionally sound and free from radical leadership in the government, militant labor leadership infiltrated the Democratic Party in Hawaii after World War II. The threat of subversive influences in the Democratic Party is being removed by the membership as rapidly as is consistent with the democratic process; the 15 suspected Communists in the party were recently dealt with as follows—9 signed loyalty oaths to the United States Government, 4 were ousted from the party by the executive board, and the remaining suspect resigned.

The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, after hearing testimony from the chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee which investigated during April 1950 subversive influences in Hawaii, reported in July that: "The committee is convinced that the people of Hawaii generally are alert to the importance of guarding against Communist infiltration."

Address by Dr. Vojtech Krajcovic Before the Members of the National Committee for the Liberation of Slovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address by Dr. Vojtech Krajcovic before the members of the National Committee for the Liberation of Slovakia delivered on July 7, 1950, in New York City:

SAINTS CYRIL AND METHODIUS, SLOVAKIA AND COMMUNISM

On this memorable day of Saints Cyril and Methodius it is exactly 1 year since the democratic world learned with great satisfaction of the outbreak of open hostilities between the Communist authorities and the vast masses of the staunchly democratic population of Slovakia. Catholics of Slovakia using fists, scythes, and clubs attacked and drove off police and Communist Party's leaders who came to arrest priests throughout our enslaved country in order to prevent the reading of pastoral letters, which for the Slovaks mean immensely more than the ukazy of a godless government of Prague directed by Kremlin.

Hundreds of priests and the masses of devout Slovaks have been terrorized, tortured, and finally thrown into the prisons or sent into the labor or concentration camps, while their bishops have been gradually silenced and interned nourishing in their gallant hearts and conviction that their fight, humiliation and suffering for Christianity and democracy was and is not in vain and that the truth will ultimately prevail and win.

Thus Slovakia rising first among the satellites of Soviet Russia became a symbol of resistance. Slovakia has risen because she is carrying through centuries a glorious torch of light—a torch which she received 1,100 years ago from the hands of two saintly brothers, Saints Cyril and Methodius. Due to this fact Slovakia became an attractive example for the peoples of central and eastern Europe in their fight against communism—so, as Slovakia was an example for the whole Slavdom 1,100 years ago, when she has "risen" in accepting Christianity by merit of Cyril and Methodius, against the kingdom of darkness in order to bring the light into the very heart of the then newly born Russian Empire.

On this day of Saints Cyril and Methodius we remember with pride that the Slovaks accepted the Christianity some 177 years before the Russians or Magyars and at least 100 years earlier than the Czechs or Poles. In view of the fact that their neighbors long continued to worship pagan gods, a most noteworthy characteristic of the eraly national life of the Slovaks was that they were the first of the peoples in central and eastern Europe to accept the God of Christianity. This was a characteristic so well inculcated in our nation that even at the present time it gives us courage not only to resist the kingdom of darkness, but to rise against it—to become again the first among the central and eastern European nations in fighting the evil forces of communism.

Who, then, were Saints Cyril and Methodius that their influence is still actual? Why did they come to Slovakia?

In those years 800 and the century which followed Slovakia resisted successfully the world empire of the German kings. It was a period of her history which was very much alike to that one in which she found herself shortly after the World War II, when she had to face the problems of an imposing world empire of international communism. How did Slovaks resist the German world empire in the ninth century and what was their plight in the twentieth century against communism?

In the year 863 Slovaks, fearful of the political influence that walked hand in hand with German missionary work inspired by the dream of German empire, sent a mission to Emperor Michael III of Byzantium to ask for missionaries capable of teaching the Christian faith in their own language. In those days of history it was this great "moral plan" which the Slovaks espoused in their resistance to the Germans.

The Emperor Michael III responded in sending to the Slovaks two Slav-speaking missionaries, Cyril and Methodius, the two most famous brothers in the history of Christianity, known as the Apostles of the Slavs in the liturgy of the church for their own work in Slovakia, and the later fruitful apostolate of their disciples beyond Slovakia's borders among all the rest of the Slavonic nations. SS. Cyril and Methodius translated the Holy Bible into the old Slavonic language then spoken by the Slovaks, and introduced a form of written script known as glagolic—later revised as cyrillic—and thus performed a work for which civilization itself must ever remain indebted to them.

The missionary work of SS. Cyril and Methodius belongs among the greatest historical events in the history of Europe. At their request, as at that of the Slovak princes, the Slavonic language was placed on a level with Latin and Greek by Pope John VIII. The significance of this fact has been formulated by a Russian historian with the question: "What was Slavdom before Cyril and Methodius came? Scattered far and wide over the plains of central Europe, Russia, and Balkans, and surrounded by foreign and hostile nations on all sides, the Slavonic race, for all of the great spiritual leaders with which it was endowed by nature, represented not a mighty and united people but a mass of tribes broken up into most fragmentary and diverse elements without any consciousness of their racial kinship and strength."

The two missionary brothers from Salonika, therefore, enriched the Slovaks and through them the rest of the Slav people, not only with a Christian culture but with culture as such, made these people conscious of their nationality, and thereby opened up the way for them to civilization itself. From Slovakia, then, the missionary work of SS. Cyril and Methodius spread throughout all of Pannonia to the Croatians, Serbs, Bulgarians, and later to the Ukrainians and Russians and even, finally, to the Latin Rumanians.

Were the Slovaks, therefore, to have contributed nothing more to history than this fertile soil for Christianity to take root and spread, by bringing into use the Slavonic liturgical rite among the rest of the Slavs, their name would have to be recorded in history for all time.

But the old Slovaks, by adopting and carrying out this moral plan, saved their freedom and independence.

The drawing of parallels between the early history of Slovakia and the contemporary history of Slovaks, enslaved by international communism, clearly proves that the Slovaks will prove great again only if they will have a place in the family of independent nations, where again they will be permitted to invent and to apply political devices unhampered as they did in the nine centuries for common good of Europe and humanity when they became the tool for the spread of light there, where only the darkness was at home up to that time.

Acting Governor Long Cites Outstanding Features of the Constitution Drafted for the State of Hawaii in Addressing the Concluding Session of the Hawaii State Constitutional Convention

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an outstanding address delivered by the Acting Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, Oren E. Long, at the closing session of the Hawaii State Constitutional Convention in the throne room of Iolani Palace, Honolulu, Saturday, July 22, 1950:

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the convention, in behalf of the people of the Territory, it is my privilege to receive this Constitution for the State of Hawaii. I wish to assure you it is an unusual privilege, because in very truth, this is a signicant occasion.

The document I hold in my hand belongs neither to you nor to me. To you has been given the privilege of creating it; to me is given the opportunity of accepting it in behalf of the people of Hawaii. To the voters of Hawaii will be given the prerogative of adopting the principles, the concepts, the ideals, and the framework for government which makes this document a living, dynamic frame of reference for generations to come. Hawaii's state constitution belongs to posterity.

Your accomplishments to date are the first step in a program that points to an event of great importance to the Nation—the actual granting of statehood to this Territory. When this is done, it will show to the people of the world that the United States not only proclaims its belief in democracy, but practices democracy.

HAWAII IS AMERICAN

We who know Hawaii know, too, how American we are; how able we are in our capacity to live up to the precepts of democracy. Ours is, in all truth, an American tradition brought to our shores a century and more ago, from the very cradle of American democracy itself. But ours, too, is a Hawaiian tradition—a tradition of friendliness, of tolerance, and of good will toward all men—a tradition embodied in the word "Aloha." There remains but the formal action of the American Congress to enable us to demonstrate what our American heritage and our Hawaiian heritage can mean to us, to our country, and to the world at large.

Personally, I have but one regret with reference of this constitution. I regret that I have had no formal share in the deliberations, the debate, and the final decisions which brought it into being. While I cannot affix my signature to this historic document, I take pride nevertheless in having played a role in the drama of which it is the climax. I have seen it emerge through the successive stages of the enabling act of the legislature, the elections, the organiaztion of the convention, the individual proposals, the committee proposals, the free and democratic debates on the floor of the convention, the painstaking scrutiny of the committee on style. I have seen emerge from more than 4,000,000 spoken words on the floor of the convention, and perhaps as many again in the committee meetings, a document of 14,000 words—a document pleasing to the eye, but one that is complete in its statement of principles, succinctly expressed.

DELEGATE ELECTED ON MARCH 22

On March 22, you were selected by the people of this Territory to perform a task of vital importance to the future of Hawaii. That task was the writing of a constitution in keeping with the best traditions of American life, a constitution that will enable the people to preserve all that is good in our tradition, and at the same time to provide for future social, political and economic growth.

As of this date, you have completed this assignment.

Only experience under this document can indicate the thoroughness of your deliberations and the soundness of your judgment. There are strong reasons for believing that the verdict of posterity will be favorable.

I wish to evaluate your accomplishment in the light of a statement it was my privilege to make at the opening of your convention. At that time, I said:

"The Constitution which you will write should be an expression of faith—faith in the future, faith in the capacity of the people of tomorrow to cope with their own problems.

"There should be no effort to fix the affairs of the Government. Any effort to make the Government static or to set up legislative blocks against change, would be the equivalent of announcing that you only have wisdom and that future representatives of the people will not have the ability to meet the problems of their day.

"Any such attempt to legislate for the future would be an admission of fear of the future.

"Your challenge, then, is not to solve the problems of tomorrow, but rather to provide a guide under which those problems may be worked out, a guide that will at the same time stimulate social growth and change in accordance with our democratic tradition.

"It is this flexibility, this invitation to growth, that gives distinction to our Federal Constitution—the greatest document

ever struck off by the minds of men. Its greatness was not that it contained all truth, but rather, it provided for growth in meeting changing conditions, for such great amendments as the Bill of Rights, and for other amendments that have served the best interests of the Nation. You will wish to keep these qualities before you as you work on a constitution for the State of Hawaii."

It is my measured judgment that you have had these guiding principles in mind, and that your work is good.

HIGH DEGREE OF UNANIMITY ACHIEVED

While there have been sharp differences of opinion in your deliberations, this constitution represents a rather high degree of unanimity of thought, and you have wisely provided procedures for amendments that may seem desirable to meet the changes that are inevitable in our dynamic society.

One of the really significant parts of this constitution is section 2, article XV, which provides automatically that the people shall have an opportunity at least once every 10 years to propose amendments. This provision represents wisdom that is unique in the State constitutions of America. Furthermore, it is significant that this section had the approval of almost every member of the convention.

In connection with the lack of complete agreement, it is well to keep in mind that even the Federal Constitution was not approved until there was general agreement that a number of basic amendments, the Bill of Rights, would be submitted and supported for adoption. Hawaii is assured of this privilege, and, I am confident, will show the same wisdom in amending her constitution that the Nation has shown in amending the Federal Constitution.

CONSTITUTION EVALUATED

It is, of course, difficult to view this constitution in the light of historical perspective. It is possible, however, to evaluate it in terms of similar documents. And this I have tried to do. My observations lead me to believe:

First, that Hawaii's State Constitution will be noted for its conciseness, force of expression, and draftsmanship. In these respects, it really excels.

Second, that it is a people's constitution, rather than a lawyers' constitution. It is singularly free from statutory provisions; its various articles reflect those matters which are of concern to all the people; it is a document as free as one can be, of obstruse technicalities.

Third, it is a modern document—modern, without departure from traditions sacred in American thought and practice. I note, by way of example:

A bill of rights, guaranteeing the individual freedoms so much a part of the American heritage, but a bill of rights that gives recognition to the dynamics of change in a modern world; a framework for legislation in the traditional bicameral pattern, but brought close to the will of the people; provisions for a strong and efficient executive, but with reasonable limitations to guard against abuse of power; a judiciary removed from partisan politics; the opportunity for the development of local government in accord with the will of the people; provisions for the conservation of natural resources, and for improved and more universal land utilization; the expression of basic principles relating to the health and general welfare of the people; a framework for the development of public and higher education, confined to fundamental law and not restrictive in character.

These features indicate that, in the main, the constitution you have just signed is fairly conservative. I say fairly conservative, because it does contain provisions that are in keeping with liberal trends. You have not hesitated to recognize the principle of change in government.

For instance, you have indicated your belief in the youth of Hawaii, by lowering the voting age to 20 years. Only one State, Georgia, has departed from the traditional 21-year requirement.

You have assured labor the right to organize for the purpose of collective bargaining, a provision found only in three other State constitutions, New Jersey, New York, and Missouri.

You have made certain the right of the people to amend their constitution, either through legislative action submitted to the people for ratification, or through the provision that every 10 years they shall have the right to request amendments.

You have provided for more effective administration of the Government by holding within 20, the number of departments that may be established, thus assuring greater coordination of all functions of government.

You have laid the basis for improving legislation, by placing limitations on the pocket veto and by doing away with the practice of ice-boxing bills in legislative committees.

You have provided for the automatic reapportionment of representation every 10 years on the basis of registered voters in the various districts.

Hawaii's State constitution may not be the best of such documents, but I know of none better. It is an indication of a belief in the right of the people to participate in government; it is an expression of faith in their capacity to deal intelligently with problems and opportunities as they arise. And this is as it should be. The purpose of a constitution is not to limit progress but to serve as a basis for progress.

Mr. President, in behalf of the people of Hawaii, I accept this constitution in humble tribute to those who throughout the years have dreamed of statehood, of those who have so ably represented the people of these islands in the preparation of this document, of the Members of the Congress who have so valiantly fought for our cause, of the countless friends on the mainland, in and out of official life, who have stood by our side. We, the people of Hawaii, can now do no less than approve a work so well wrought.

Cotton Should Be Stored in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fall River Herald-News of Monday, July 24, 1950:

STOP SECTIONAL POLITICS

Fall River's textile industry is justified in requesting the Federal Government to store some of its cotton in this area in order to take it more readily accessible to the plants here.

At present the Government buys the cotton in the South and pays for its storage in the South. When Northern mills want some of it they wait 6 weeks for a delivery.

Since an emergency may arise and production of large quantities of cloth may become essential to the war effort, delays in securing raw materials can be injurious to all concerned.

The Government can place in this section of New England cotton that will be needed here and avoid later unnecessary pressure on the railroads systems when boxcars will be in strong demand.

The only difference will be that the Government will pay someone in New England for storage space. The desire to give preferences to the South, evident in most actions of the Government, cannot be justified in this instance. National welfare suggests immediate transfer of some cotton to New England.

Air Attack Would Catch Nation With Immature Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert E. Geiger, from the Washington Star of July 23, 1950:

AIR ATTACK WOULD CATCH NATION WITH IMMATURE CIVIL DEFENSE

(By Robert E. Geiger)

If an all-out war should develop now, it would catch the United States with an immature civil-defense organization.

Planners have been aiming at 1953 as the date to bring a Nation-wide organization into full strength—12,000,000 to 15,000,000 civilian volunteers trained to help professional rescue teams.

Officials here say no State has a complete, ready-to-work, organization now.

However, Paul J. Larsen, Chief of the Civil Defense Office of the National Security Resources Board, says the Korean fighting has caused some States to speed their plans. He believes a Nation-wide organization could be set up within 6 months.

CITIES AND STATES WARNED

Federal officials are warning cities and States it will be up to them to aid their own citizens if and when they should have a bombing raid, that the military probably will be too busy fighting an offensive war to dig out bombed cities.

The Government is providing information on what damage might be expected from A-bombs and from germ and chemical warfare. It also is working out a national plan to help eliminate duplicate defense efforts by city and State organizations. It is helping to train civil-defense workers.

Nearly all of the States now have some sort of a civil-defense plan in existence or in the discussion stage, Mr. Larsen says.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BILLS PENDING

(Legislation which would permit the District to set up a civilian-defense program is expected to come up in the Senate Wednesday. It already has House approval.

(Meanwhile, President Truman's request for $290,000 to finance the program this fiscal year is pending before the House Appropriations Committee.

(District officials have been working since last March on a paper plan for civilian defense. Plans have been worked out for action in the various fields such as fire and police protection, water service, and utilities, but it is expected the average citizen will not be drawn into the program before fall.)

CLAY HEADS NEW YORK GROUP

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, former military governor in Germany, was appointed head of a defense commission in New York State. He

has announced an extensive program for the State's civilian defense.

For weeks military experts have been warning Congress and the public that Russia apparently has the atom bombs and the planes to attack the United States.

They testified before congressional committees that industries and the population cannot go completely underground nor be scattered sufficiently to eliminate all attractive targets.

Before the Korean disturbance started, Mr. Larsen said that for planning purposes, and to have adequate reserves of such things as blood, food, and fire-fighting chemicals, the worst possible situation must be assumed. At the worst, he said, as many as 15 United States cities might be hit on the first day of war. Mr. Larsen emphasizes this is an assumption for planning purposes only.

GREAT DISASTER POSSIBLE

Experts have estimated there may be up to 100,000 casualties from an atom bomb. At that rate, 15 bombs could cause 1,500,000 casualties—the greatest war disaster, in human lives, in world history.

How Americans act in such a disaster might mean the difference between victory and defeat. If they panic, W. Stuart Symington, chairman of the NSRB, has said, the first sneak raid could be fatal.

Mr. Larsen is making studies of recent disasters, like the South Amboy, N. J., munitions explosion that killed 31 persons and injured 312 on May 19, for hints on how panic can be averted.

Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Air Force Chief of Staff, says that in any war first Air Force priority must be given to knocking out the enemy industries and military installations, second priority to defending American cities with interceptor planes and antiaircraft devices.

"If we could foresee the possibility of achieving 100 percent effectiveness against enemy air attacks, through any system of air defense technologically and economically feasible, we might be inclined to reverse these priorities," General Vandenberg told a Senate appropriations subcommittee.

DEFENSE FAR BEHIND EUROPE'S

United States civilian defenses probably are far behind those of European countries and Russia. A pamphlet by the Joint Congressional Atomic Committee says 20,000,000 people are reported to have participated in 1947 in Russian "voluntary" civil-defense exercises. About 5,000,000 are believed to be receiving civil-defense training each year.

The United States began talking of a peacetime civilian defense plan as long ago as 1946. Organization of volunteers is incomplete now because the target date of 1953 was set.

Defense officials say there were two arguments fo not creating a huge defense organization years before it might be needed.

First was the cost, which they say will be extremely heavy. Second, they believe if great numbers of volunteers were enlisted and no emergency occurred for years, it would be difficult to hold their interest and keep them from dropping out.

DEBATE DELAYS PLAN

Debate over how much responsibility the Federal Government should assume for rescuing people from bombed cities has delayed some city and State plans.

Mayor Elmer E. Robinson, of San Francisco, has demanded that the Government place more emphasis on military help for civilians. He also told the Joint Atomic Energy Committee that the Government should designate primary target cities—the cities the enemy would be likely to hit first. He said if this were done cities that aren't primary targets could plan to help the others.

Mr. Larsen has told mayors that the argument over whether civilian defense is a military task has long since ended. He says the military's primary mission is to win the war, that civilians must be organized to take care of themselves.

The committee of Eastern States civilian defense heads will meet Tuesday with Mr. Symington.

SEEKS TO LEARN PLANS

Leonard Dreyfuss, New Jersey defense director, who is chairman of the eastern conference of State defense directors, said the committee will seek to learn what plans have been developed at the national level. The committee includes, besides Mr. Dreyfuss, Brig. Gen. Clement H. Wright, of New York; Don C. Leonard, of Michigan; Maj. Gen. Ernest Vandiver, Jr., of Georgia, and Col. Spaulding Bisbee, of Maine.

The Atomic Energy Commission and the NSRB have sponsored courses in atomic warfare subjects for people chosen by governors to serve as State civil-defense advisers and teachers.

Courses have been completed by 148 physician-teachers from 39 States in medical aspects of atomic warfare and 49 science professors from 30 States have completed courses in detecting radioactivity, or harmful substances that might be left after bombing attacks.

WILL TEACH RESCUE TEAMS

These trained people will instruct physicians and rescue teams in their home States.

Volunteers will work with fire and police departments and other full-time rescue workers that cities will train in defense methods.

Cities are expected to join with each other for mutual aid.

Each State is expected to appoint a salaried director of civil defense, who will employ a staff.

Cities are expected to have salaried directors with staffs to do the bulk of the planning work, calling upon citizens for help.

The Civil Defense Office says 22 States and Hawaii have legislation of some kind authorizing a paid civilian defense organization. Ten others have authority by order of the governor.

Mr. Larsen says the most important job is getting the paid staffs set up and functioning smoothly. He says a training program for the volunteers can be speeded in an emergency.

ASSUMED ATTACKS BASIS

An "interim" will be based partially on results of a series of assumed atomic attacks against three American cities, Washington, Seattle, and Chicago.

Teams have mapped theoretical atomic attacks against each city. They are estimating damage on the basis of known facts about atomic bombs and assuming bombs burst at certain times and places.

Experts will prepare civilian defense plans for aiding the stricken cities and then determine how successfully they could have been carried out with only the people and facilities that survived the imaginary attacks.

There are plans for fire and police work, for providing shelter, food, and medical care for survivors, bringing in aid and supplies, controlling traffic, and meeting other problems.

The Nehru-Stalin Appeasement Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, while our boys are bleeding on the battlefields of Korea we hear the siren's voice of appeasement calling to us across the Pacific. Mr. Nehru and Mr. Stalin are fixing up a deal. The deal, which Mr. Nehru says has no connection with Russian aggression in Korea, is that Russia will call off her dogs of war in Korea if we will seat Communist China on the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, it was in 1938 that Mr. Chamberlain returned from Munich. He brought Peace in Our Time to the cheering crowds of Downing Street, but true Englishmen shrank from what this implied. Again England had sacrificed principle to policy; England had trafficked with the enemy in order to buy time.

It is not difficult, Mr. Speaker, to see that we are in the same situation today in regard to Communist China. Like Britain at Munich, we are being taken to the top of the mountain while the voice of Stalin behind us whispers "All this I will give unto you if you but bow down and worship me." Britain succumbed to the voice of the tempter in 1938. Britain bought peace in our time by forfeiting principle for all time. Britain was led into a fool's pardise. Lulled into a sense of false security, she was ill prepared to meet the onslaught of the relentless foe when World War II came. Far from buying peace in our time, she bought war in our time because she listened to the voice of Hitler at Munich.

Munich has become synonymous with appeasement in any glossary of World War II. But for Munich there would have been no false British security. World War II, had it come in 1938 instead of a year later, would have found Germany less prepared and England more ready than she was a year later.

The advocates of appeasement today can find no connection between the events of June 25, 1950, and those of July 1, 1946, when we abandoned China to the Reds. On that earlier date, we too sacrified principle to policy, because we abandoned the Hay doctrine of the open door and territorial integrity in China. In its place we adopted a policy of aloofness; a policy of a "plague on both your houses." We washed our hands of the recognized government of Chiang Kai-shek, and we said, in effect, to Stalin, "Come and get it." Stalin came and Stalin got it. China and its 500,000,000 people, through no choice of their own, and without any plebiscite whatsoever, were taken over by Red masters who have now been appointed by Moscow, the vanguard that is to bring all Asia under Red domination. Under the Moscow-indoctrinated Mao Tse-tung are the Red puppet leaders in French Indochina, North Korea, the Philippines, Malaya, Burma, and Siam. It is well for Mr. Nehru to ponder these developments because Mr. Nehru is suffering from a delusion. He identifies the Communist puppets in China with the Nationalist movement of India. Mr. Nehru will find to his sorrow that they are not the same. Mr. Nehru may not be a Communist, but he associates with Communists, and one cannot associate one's self with communism without becoming tainted. We are known by the company we keep. One rotten apple

will contaminate the barrel. "We cannot serve God and mammon."

Mr. Speaker, we intervened in Korea in behalf of the United Nations at their request because the Republic of Korea was a creation of the United Nations. Nehru and Stalin would now have us believe the action that the Communists of China represent a bona fide revolutionary party which we should recognize. But that is not true. The Nationalist Government of China ever since 1920 has been threatened by a foe from without, not by a bona fide revolution from within. Despite the efforts of John S. Service and others to characterize them as "harmless agrarians," the Reds in China have been from the very beginning the pawns of Moscow. In 1920 when Borodin was sent to Canton by the Third International, the Soviet instrument of world revolution, to "bore from within," he first encountered the stern opposition of Sun Yat-sen's young brother-in-law, Chiang Kai-shek. When Sun Yat-sen died in 1925 the mantle of Kuomintang authority fell upon the shoulders of this young leader. He made it so hot for the Reds in Canton that they trekked all the way across China to the northwest province of Kalgan. Here in closer touch with Moscow they received help and aid from Soviet Russia. Chiang was always more apprehensive of them than he was of the Japanese. It was only when Chiang was kidnaped and threatened with death that he agreed to fight Japan in 1937. When the Red Nineteenth Route Army was thoroughly beaten by the Japanese at Shanghai in 1937, Chiang did not lift a finger in their behalf. After Russia was attacked by Hitler and we got into the war as an ally of Russia, Franklin D. Roosevelt used all his persuasive powers to get Chiang Kai-shek, then driven into Szechuan Province and with his headquarters at Chungking, to bring the Reds into his government. Stilwell, Wallace, Lattimore, John S. Service, and John Carter Vincent all joined in the chorus proclaiming the Reds "harmless agrarians," with no Moscow ties. But Chiang remained adamant. Finally after Japan's surrender General Marshall was induced to try to bring about a reconciliation. By this time the Reds were being well armed with the Japanese weapons surrendered to Russia in Manchuria. When Marshall failed, he withdrew all further support from Chiang Kai-shek on July 1, 1946. That was the beginning of the end for Nationalist China. That was when we sacrificed principle for policy.

If we fail to read this plain interpretation of the history of the last 30 years in China, we shall fail as Chamberlain failed at Munich. If we listen to the tempter on the mountain, we will have taken a long step toward our own undoing.

Communist China, if seated on the Security Council of the United Nations, would be just another pawn for Soviet Russia in its attempt to conquer the world. As a permanent member of the Council and with Russia back on the Council, the United Nations will have been rendered impotent as an instrument of world peace.

Mr. Speaker, it is later than we think. This is no "police action" in Korea. It is the first battle of world war III, and in it we face a more relentless foe, a more skillful propagandist than Adolf Hitler. Coiled in the Kremlin is the snake of Moscow, ready to strike in half a dozen directions against the free peoples of the world.

We should not "wait for the dust to settle" any longer. We should tell Mr. Nehru and the other gentlemen who cry "Peace" that there is no peace. Like Patrick Henry, we must once more voice those immortal words, "Give me liberty or give me death." The voice of Nehru is the voice of Stalin now seeking a compromise in the face of the set-back at the hands of the United Nations of his open and naked aggression in Korea. There can be no peace in appeasement of Soviet Russia, for the masters of the Kremlin can never be stopped in their insane desire to conquer the world except by overpowering force.

Our Challenge Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, my home city of Altoona, Pa., was privileged to play the role of host to the members of the Pennsylvania Cemetery Associations during the week of June 19, 1950, on the occasion of the annual State convention of that organization.

The delegates in attendance were afforded an opportunity to hear an eloquent and inspiring address delivered by Patrick F. O'Leary, Esq., of Hollidaysburg, Pa., at the annual convention banquet held at the Penn-Alto Hotel on June 19.

Mr. O'Leary is a prominent member of the Blair County (Pa.) Bar Association and is a highly respected and widely known jurist in the State of Pennsylvania.

An orator of no mean ability, Mr. O'Leary's address was widely acclaimed and since it is of such timely importance to all thoughtful Americans I am pleased to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all those who read it may profit by the inspiration embodied in such an eloquent discourse.

The address follows:

I consider it a distinct privilege to be present this evening, and to have the opportunity of addressing this splendid group of serious-minded citizens who are engaged in the performance of one of the most essential services and the fulfillment of one of the most sacred trusts that man can render to his fellow men.

You have assembled here in serious sessions to discuss your mutual problems and, by mutual aid, find their solution; to keep informed on the advancements made in business practices and methods of management; to learn from each other and from representatives of allied industries how to do a better job that you may serve your community and the public more efficiently; and to rekindle and reawaken your consciousness of the hallowed profession that is yours and the sense of responsibility that rests upon you in the fulfillment, according to the highest American ideal and the holiest Christian tradition of your obligation to your sacred trust of serving the living and honoring the dead.

In this modern age with all its progress in science, its inventive genius and strides in education, with all that it has produced to make life more livable, to overcome disease and drudgery, to combat poverty and distress, to make life richer, happier, and more complete, we have witnessed the rise of sinister influences and forces using that same scientific progress, those same marvels of modern invention, those same opportunities of education to attempt to wreck our civilization, to bring more suffering to humanity, to create unrest among people and nations, to overshadow the world with fear and foreboding and to bring unhappiness and despair to the minds and hearts and souls of mankind.

If, in our day, we have seen the excess of nationalism produce a militaristic power bent on world conquest plunging the nations of the world into the frightful holocaust of the First World War, to be overcome only after it had bled the peace-loving peoples of the world of their most precious resources, human and material; and then only to end in sowing the seeds of more hatred, distrust, and greed that nurtured and produced the even more despotic, brutal and bloody monsters of nazism, fascism, and communism—monsters that have left weak nations in slavery, and strong nations staggering and dazed; if, even, here, in our own beloved country, the only strong bulwark of freedom left today to bolster the spirits and keep alive the hopes of men of good will the world over, we have seen signs of moral termites eating away at the foundations of our national strength—increase in crime, destruction of family life, progressively rising divorce rates, juvenile delinquency unscrupulous competition and dishonesty in business, disregard of ethics in professions, racketeering in labor unions, unrest among workers, corruption in politics, disloyalty in government, and the increasing tendency by businessmen, farmers, workers, and even educators, the organized and the unorganized, to look to the government, local, State and national, for the solution of their problems and the panacea for their every ailment, then we must realize that as we have been progressing materially, we have been retrogressing spiritually.

We seem to be losing our sense of true values—discarding hallowed traditions in the name of progress; substituting new ideologies for ancient ideals, selfishness for charity, paganism for morality, the ephemeral things of time for those that are eternal.

As the song hit goes, it may be "later than we think." But the task that confronts us all today, in whatever walk of life, is not to curse the darkness. It is a challenge to strike a light, and the spark that we must fan to flame is a return in our private, business and national life to those spiritual ideals upon which this Nation was founded, in adherence to which it has prospered, and upon which alone it, and the civilization of the world that depends upon it, can survive.

Upon what vocation, profession or business in American life, excepting only that of the service of God and fellowman in religion, is the importance of spiritual ideals impressed more firmly than upon you who devote yourselves to the operation and maintenance of our cemeteries—those sacred acres where lie till the Day of Judgment the mortal remains of those who handed down to us the faith of our fathers, the traditions of our race, the ideals of our land? And, therefore, upon what group in our society is there placed a greater responsibility to preserve

those ideals, to maintain those traditions, to keep that faith? And how in our vocation can we best meet this challenge of today and fulfill our special obligation of honoring with the reverence and dignity they merited our dear departed, and serving with fidelity and charity the living they have left behind?

Upon every individual borne into the world there are placed certain obligations and responsibilities to God, to his country and to his fellowmen—to each according to the talents, the abilities, the vocation or place in life with which he has been endowed and blessed by his Creator. And according to the use he makes of those talents, that vocation, that state in life in the fulfillment of these obligations shall he be judged here and hereafter, and shall he be truly happy and successful in carrying out his destiny.

To some the field of service is the church; to some it is in education and institutions of learning; to some, in the professions of healing the sick; to some, in the courtrooms and legislatures of the land; to others, in tilling the soil or producing for the needs and comfort of humanity in the mines, the factories and the workshops of the world.

To us in the cemetery profession—whether as proprietors, directors, managers, or agents—is assigned the noble duty of burying the dead, memorializing them by creating and maintaining for time and for posterity, for the consolation of the living and the inspiration of people yet unborn, living shrines to the remembrance of their lives and the perpetuation of their ideals.

From the earliest ages of antiquity, one of the most distinguishing characteristics marking the difference between civilized and cultured nations and races of uncivilized barbarians was the reverence, respect, and honor shown their dead. The Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans kept inviolate their burial places and erected to the memory of their departed monuments and memorials that have come down to us through the centuries as symbols or their enlightenment and wonders of the ancient world; and the exploits of their heroes have been preserved in poetry because of their consecration to the defense of the relicts of their ancestors.

'For how can men die better
Than facing fearful odds,
For the ashes of their fathers,
And the temples of their Gods?"

But it was the Jewish people which gave to civilization its greatest contribution, by the preservation of religion and spiritual ideals. It was this people who impressed upon this duty of burial and respect for the dead, a sacred character.

Of all the ancients it was the Jewish race alone which maintained the Christian principle of the dignity of the human person as a creature made to the image and likeness of God, possessed of a soul that will never die, and that will be reunited to the mortal remains of man on the day of the general resurrection.

And from the beginning of Christianity, this work of ours has been impressed with a sacred, spiritual, and religious character. Our divine Master Himself emphasized in all His teachings the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the life everlasting to come after death. He lent His divine dignity to burial service by attending the funerals of His friends; He consoled the bereaved and promised in His Sermon on the Mount, "Blessed are they that mourn for they shall be comforted."

The great apostle of the Gentiles, St. Paul, wrote to the Corinthians in his epistle that our bodies were "temples of the Holy Spirit," and the church has always taught that this being true in life, therefore, in death these bodies have not lost their sacred dignity and, consequently, they and their resting places must be considered, consecrated, and so held and maintained. Thus the burial of the dead has come down through the ages a religious rite, a corporal work of mercy; and the consoling of those bereaved by death, the comforting of those that mourn, has also descended from the beatitude of Christ on the mount as a religious duty, a blessed work, a spiritual work of mercy.

This, then, is the solemn and religious nature of our vocation; this is the spiritual ideal that ennobles our profession; this is the fundamental and basic motive that should guide and govern our aims, our objectives, and our attitudes in the fulfillment of our duties and the performance of our services, in our manifestation of reverence for the dead and our consideration for the bereaved.

If we in the cemetery business are imbued with this ideal of the sacredness of our duties, if we instill this ideal into the hearts and minds of those who work with us in the operation and maintenance of our cemeteries, then we cannot fail in the performance of our special responsibility, the perpetuation of the finest traditions of our people and preservation of our American ideals. For these also, in their deepest and most significant sense, are spiritual ideals. We are a proud people—proud of our heritage of freedom, made possible by the blood, the sweat and tears, the enduring sacrifices of those who have gone before us.

We are justly proud of the achievements of those who built our country into the strongest and most productive that the world has ever known; proud of the toil and initiative of our people of the past who, in so short a period of world history, created out of a wilderness this Nation of unparalleled prosperity, unequaled abundance, and unbounded opportunity. No other nation observes more holidays in honor of and homage to its heroes than we Americans.

We are also a sentimental people. No others on earth are more generous in manifesting their affections and devotion to those they love in life than are we. Birthdays and anniversaries are festive occasions in almost every American home. Special days are set apart to honor, religiously and reverently, privately and publicly, the mothers and the fathers of our land.

And when the inevitable happens and death enters to separate us from our loved ones, we want to perpetuate our family ties, to keep alive the memory of the beautiful lives and noble virtues of those we loved so dearly in life, and hope to join again in the great hereafter. It is our religious convictions and this deep abiding sentiment of loyalty and devotion that, nurtured, fostered, and increased, will constitute our strongest defense and safest insurance against the influences that attack our national security and the termites that gnaw on the foundations of our national strength.

It is these same religious convictions and abiding sentiments of love that with our increasing affluence have developed our American burial places from the small and, of times, neglected graveyards and churchyards of the past into the beautiful and expansive cemeteries, memorial parks, and gardens of today.

No; our vocation is not just another business, nor are our cemeteries mere places for disposal of the dead, operated for the enrichment of their proprietors. It is a noble profession, rich in spirituality, tradition, and ideals, and ethical and moral standards should be demanded of those who would embrace it of as high an order as those required in any of the recognized professions in our modern life.

For the operation of a cemetery or memorial park, in addition to being a sacred trust, is a public trust as well, a calling that challenges the best of character, talent, and ability of those who make it their career. Promoters of spiritual idealism, guardians of sacred traditions, creators of memorials to the dead, destined to be a lasting heritage for the ages, the cemetery administrators of today occupy a place of importance in the life of a community, shared only by the administrators of its other religious, educational, and cultural institutions.

We have the responsibility of upholding and enhancing the dignity of our calling by constantly keeping before us the ideals of the profession while always striving to improve the service that is ours to render to the people of our communities. Keep sacred the graves of the departed, memorialize the dead by providing and maintaining for them resting places of lasting beauty that will be sources of consolation and inspiration to the living.

But let us not neglect the importance of our duties to the living. No one in the fullness of life likes to think of dying, but all of us know that death is the one and only certainty of life. It is our nature to anticipate and plan for the uncertain things of life. But few, indeed, plan for the only thing that is inevitable. The family home, its comfort, its embellishments—all these are planned, sometimes for years, but the final resting place for ourselves and those nearest and dearest to us is much too often a place not planned but only acquired when acquisition is forced upon us at a time of extreme family grief.

No one in this vocation need be told of the difficulty at such a time of assisting the bereaved family. We fail in our duty to the living when, as cemetery administrators, we neglect to educate and counsel the public to make provision for this inevitable need before that grief-striking hour when the need arises.

In your own daily experience and in the course of this convention, I know that you have been impressed with the fact that the proper management and maintenance of a cemetery today is a complex operation, requiring an administrator to be a combination of executive, salesman and sound investor, an architect and engineer, an accountant, a mechanic, a gardner and a diplomat, a labor-relations genius and a public-relations expert, and with the threat of undue governmental interference, somewhat of a politician too, but the thought that I would leave with you tonight is that by putting first things first, that by being religious men if you will, men of character, imbued with spiritual ideals, loyal men, faithful to your sacred trust of honoring the dead and comforting the sorrowful by the practical application of these ideals in your service to the public, you will be meeting the challenge of today.

You will be lighting a candle that will show the way to better public appreciation of the great service you perform. You will defeat alike the aims of those who would make this sacred vocation an opportunity for profiteering on the sorrows of the living and the memory of the dead, and the objectives of those politicians who would make great collective burial grounds of cherished community shrines and consecrated cemeteries. You will be fulfilling your special responsibility to God, our country and to posterity, by reawakening the religious convictions of others; by restoring spiritual ideals in our business and professional life; by preserving the best of our American traditions and leaving an everlasting and inspiring heritage for the ages.

Merchant Marine Shortage Now at Crisis Stage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the importance of immediately entering upon a program to make seaworthy the merchant marine reserve fleet, now in moth balls and a real shipbuilding program is clearly set forth in an editorial of the Courier-Post, Camden, N. J., issue of July 25, 1950, which I include as part of my remarks. It reads as follows:

MERCHANT MARINE SHORTAGE NOW AT THE CRISIS STAGE

Men and supplies to fight the Korean war must logically be transported from our Pacific coast.

But reports from the three west coast States are that, bad as the condition of our merchant marine and shipyards is on the Atlantic, it is worse on the Pacific.

Congressman JOHN J. ALLEN, of Oakland, Calif., says that the labor force of men working in shipbuilding and repair yards in the San Francisco Bay area has fallen from a wartime peak of 143,000 to less than 3,000.

There are hardly enough workers to repair ships now operating, and there are none at all to refit or build others.

As we know in Camden, the picture is almost the same up and down the Atlantic coast. We are building a handful of new ships and reconditioning some, but generally shipyard work is near or at an all-time low.

Since Korea is many thousands of miles from even our west coast, it takes a long time for troops or equipment to reach the fighting zone.

Ships should be operating in a continuous stream, like a pipeline or a conveyor belt, to keep men and material flowing.

Should trouble break out in some other part of the world, the need would be doubled or tripled.

According to ALLEN, there are 2,200 ships lying idle in drydock today which carried supplies during the last war. Last year the Navy asked that 134 of them be put back into shape but objections from the Budget Bureau caused the House Appropriations Committee to reject a $25,000,000 appropriation for the purpose.

Extreme cases cited by ALLEN are two ships in the refitting yard at San Francisco, the *Monterey* and the *Mariposa*, each capable of carrying 3,800 troops but laid up since the war for reconditioning for passenger use.

The *Monterey* is two-thirds refitted, the *Mariposa* one-third. The Navy and the Army want them, and west coast shipping interests want them, but the Maritime Commission hasn't been able to make up its mind although the work remaining to be done to get the vessels sailing again would be not much more than a matter of hours.

Most of what merchant fleet we have is in the Atlantic trade and this makes supplying the Korean front that much harder.

The west coast, ALLEN says, is convinced that we are at war regardless of whether others think so, and considers the shortage of active merchant shipping as approaching a national crisis.

For years the Courier-Post has been warning that our neglect of the merchant marine and the shipbuilding industry might bring on such a crisis in an emergency. Now we're very much afraid it is here.

The Government should take the most prompt and energetic measures to place all available shipping back in active service, to call workers back to the shipyards, and to swing back into capacity production of the new, modern types of vessels that the country needs in quantity even in times of peace.

Statement by Senator Wiley and Correspondence on Korea With Pro-Communist Milwaukee Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 26 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me relative to the so-called Stockholm peace petition and correspondence with the Milwaukee Labor Peace Committee.

There being no objection, the statement and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 26, 1950.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH PRO-COMMUNIST MILWAUKEE GROUP ON KOREA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, all of us are aware, I believe, that the world-wide Communist movement has taken the propaganda offensive by collecting millions of signatures for the phony and misnamed Stockholm peace petition.

With all the peoples of the globe deeply concerned that a third terrible world war may occur, the Reds know that they can play upon the natural sympathies of the average man by pretending that the Soviet Union wants to banish atomic war, whereas allegedly, the warmongering, imperialistic, blood-thirsty west wants to wage such war.

The Reds know that America's greatest military advantage at the present time is her stockpile of atomic bombs, which we all presume to be considerably larger than the Russian stockpile; therefore, the Reds have urged in this phony Stockholm peace petition that existing stockpiles of bombs be destroyed, because naturally such destruction would favor the Soviet Union and cripple western defense and possible offense.

In our country, the House Un-American Committee has clearly shown that every Red and Red fronter is trying to use the Stockholm petition as the principal weapon in psychological warfare. Unfortunately, I have noted that violence has broken out in some cities of our country, including in my own State, over the signing of the petition.

Let me state categorically that—

1. Every American whether he is a Communist or not, has a right to petition his Government.

2. If a Communist petitions our Government, we in the Congress have the right to read the petition and throw it in the waste basket, because we recognize that the Reds are not loyal to America in the first place, but owe their allegiance to the Soviet fatherland.

3. Undoubtedly 90 percent of the individuals who sign the Stockholm peace petition in our country will be innocent dupes of the Communists—gullible individuals who have swallowed the Communist peace line. Therefore, the fact that any individual signs the petition does not mean per se that he or she is a Communist.

4. On the other hand, there will be undoubtedly some signers who are real fellow travelers who consistently parrot the Communist party line.

5. I deplore the violence that has occurred over this petition. One does not change a man's mind by cracking open his skull. On the contrary, we have learned that physical violence on the fanatic only makes him that much more fanatic and arouses support for him in the minds of foolish individuals who think that the fanatic has become a martyr to his cause.

6. If any of the peace petition signers or circulators are threatened and then beaten up, such violence merely plays into the hands of the Communists. The Reds thrive on chaos and confusion, on street riots and the like. Every time they can get a group of factory hands to start beating each other up even on a picnic (as has occurred) that delays assembly-line operations by just that much, because inevitably the individuals will have bitter feelings when they return to the work place and production will suffer.

7. I sumarize my position by stating that every American should be on his guard against the signing and circulation of these phony peace petitions. Every American should, moreover, attempt to acquaint his neighbor with the fact that the Soviet Union and its North Korean satellite is now and has been the aggressor, and that it is the Soviet Union which has been building up this trend toward a third world war. But under no circumstances should any citizen of the United States attempt to make himself the law or to take the law in his hands. Under no circumstances should any individual manhandle any other because of the latter's political views. Let us write strong anti-Communist legislation, but let such legislation be in accordance with the Constitution of the United States and the civil liberties of our beloved country.

MILWAUKEE LABOR PEACE COMMITTEE,
Milwaukee, Wis., July 20, 1950.

Senator WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We, the undersigned trade unionists of Wisconsin, are deeply concerned for fear that the Korean war might grow into a world-wide atomic war which would kill and cripple millions of Americans and people of other countries.

The best way to prevent this is to bring to an end the hostilities in Korea as soon as possible by withdrawing all American troops and weapons from Korea immediately and giving full freedom to the Korean people to decide their own destinies free from all outside interference.

We agree with the Wisconsin CIO News editorial of July 7, 1950, when it says: "As in China and the Philippines, the United States has repeated the same mistake in Korea. In our hurry to find somebody to take hold in Korea we took hold of the wrong friends."

We oppose any support by the United States Government to the south Korean government of Synghman Rhee, which has imprisoned and killed tens of thousands of trade unionists and political opponents in the past 5 years.

We oppose the use of the atomic bomb against the Korean people. In 1925 the United States took the lead in proposing the outlawing of poison gas in warfare. We urge now that the United States Government take the lead in bringing about the outlawing of the atomic bomb by all nations and declaring the Government which first uses it to be an enemy of mankind.

We support the Stockholm world-peace appeal, and call on all other trade-unionists of Wisconsin to sign that appeal and to circulate it in the interest of peace in the world.

Robert Berberich, Milwaukee, vice president, Lodge 191, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; Edmund V. Bobrowicz, Milwaukee, international representative, Fur and Leather Workers; Robert Buse, Greendale, former president, Allis-Chalmers Union, UAW-CIO; John Chaplock, Milwaukee, member, Local 75, UAW-CIO; Harold Christoffel, Milwaukee, former president, Allis-Chamlers Union, UAW-CIO; Emil Churchich, Milwaukee, steward, Local 75, UAW-CIO; James DeWitt, Milwaukee, international representative, UE-FE; Alfred Hirsch, Milwaukee, former editor, Wisconsin CIO News; Joseph Horton, Milwaukee, member, A. F. of L. Linoleum Layers Union; William Landrum, Milwaukee, member, A. F. of L. Laborers No. 113; Perry Love, Milwaukee, member, CIO Steel Workers Union; Charley Moore, Milwaukee, executive board member, Local 47, IFLWU; Matt Pirkir, Milwaukee, member, Hosiery Workers Union; George Sommers, Milwaukee, member, Brewery Workers No. 9, delegate.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
July 21, 1950.

Re: Your phony "peace" petition.
MILWAUKEE LABOR PEACE COMMITTEE,
Milwaukee, Wis.

GENTLEMEN: Today, July 21, I received a copy of the petition of July 20, typewritten under the title of "Milwaukee Labor Peace Committee." I am always interested in hearing from all segments of Wisconsin public opinion, even though on an occasion such as this, the opinion comes from individuals who intentionally or unwittingly are parrotting the subversive Communist Party line.

I am writing this open letter to you, therefore, to express my complete disapproval and rejection of the stand you have taken. I respect your right to hold whatever opinions you feel like, but I do think that you are absolutely wrong in identifying yourself in any way with unions in Milwaukee or anywhere else. I note that you have referred to your unions and then placed in parenthesis the words "for identification only." Apparently, therefore, your respective unions have gotten wise to the fact that Communist fronters have been too long getting away with covering themselves with the cloak of a union label, making believe that rank and file union members support their vile position.

I should like to set forth the following points with regard to your appeal:

1. I share your concern that "the Korean war might grow into a world-wide atomic war which would kill and cripple millions of Americans and people of other countries." I go that far with you but no further. For that matter, there isn't probably a single sane individual in America who looks with glee on the prospect of a third terrible world war in which our own and Russian cities would be blasted into rubble, in which millions of innocent civilians would be killed, in which the whole clock of western civilization would be set backward.

2. In spite, however, of our detestation of war, I do not believe that your peace appeal is anything more than a vicious play on the natural sympathies of the American people. As such, it is just so much phony Communist-front bunk. Peace would definitely not be secured by withdrawing all American troops and weapons from Korea. On the contrary, if we were to abandon the South Korean people, that would constitute the greatest possible impetus to the start of world war III. It would show that the American people were so weak and so timid that instead of backing up individual lands against aggression, they would sacrifice those lands to the insatiable appetite of the Communist aggressor. Thus, country after country would fall, one after the other, in the Hitler, pre-World War II pattern, and the Soviet Union would become so cocky with power that eventually it would decide to take on Uncle Sam himself and we would be left without allies, without friends, fighting on our own shores.

3. Your comments on the matter of giving full freedom to the Korean people and allowing them to decide their own destinies without outside interference are absolutely absurd. I say that particularly when one considers the fact that a free and open election was held in South Korea under United Nations auspices, but no such election other than the "Ja" bayonet-at-your-back type was held in Northern Korea. The people of South Korea freely and voluntarily chose to set up their own independent republic. They were entirely free from American controls, so much so that they were practically helpless when the attack came. Why do you not wire or write the Soviet Union to allow UN observers to go into North Korea to supervise a free election there, or for that matter, to go into eastern Germany to supervise a free election there?

4. You refer to a Wisconsin CIO newspaper editorial, although the CIO in Wisconsin, as throughout the rest of our Nation, patriotically backs our Korean war effort. No one says that the South Korean Government is composed of angels any more than any other government with which we are allied is composed of angels, or for that matter, our own Government is so composed. What we do know, however, is that the South Korean Government is the free choice of the South Korean people, whereas the North Korean Government consists simply of hand-picked stooges and muscle men of the Soviet Kremlin. We are sure that if the Korean people were to be allowed peace, eventually they would get rid of any undesirable elements in their own government, just as any other free people would. We are fighting for their right to eliminate undesirables in their own way, just as we are hoping that any other allied country will similarly eliminate undesirable elements.

5. Your comments on the atomic bomb are ridiculous in light of the fact that it is the Soviet Union which has forestalled our efforts in the UN to come to an ironclad agreement outlawing atomic weapons, by providing effective UN controls. America has taken the leadership to end the atmoic menace over the world, but the Kremlin refuses to allow international inspection of atomic-producing facilities.

6. You give your whole phony case away when you refer to the Stockholm world peace appeal—a misnomer if there ever was one—because it is not a peace appeal, it is an invitation for the Soviet Union to commit aggression. The Stockholm world peace appeal has been effectively exposed by American newspapers and by the American Congress as the latest in the series of tricky Communist strategems to mold world public opinion so that the free world lies down like a helpless kitten while the Communist lion proceeds to prowl and devour at will.

In this war, as in every other war, American workingmen will constitute the most numerous element of our Armed Forces. Certainly, therefore, there is no element in Wisconsin or American society which knows better than the rank-and-file laboring people the bitter price of war. Our workers know, however, that there is even a worse price to appeasement. When one attempts to appease an aggressor, one gets neither peace nor security nor liberty.

I reject completely, therefore, your appeal. I note that among your signers are a group of individuals whose very names have become so completely odious that the average, decent citizen will have to hold his nose every time he hears them mentioned. These individuals, by their obvious pro-Communist activities, have damned themselves in the eyes of the world. There are among you, perhaps, some innocents, but the time has long come for you to wake up that you are in the company of Red wolves parading in sheep's clothing. You are in the company of men who support the very group in the Kremlin which is murdering American boys in the fox holes of Korea.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

The Fall Guy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an important editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of July 23. It calls the turn on the Cabinet split over foreign policy:

THE FALL GUY

The first political casualty of the Korean war, as distinguished from the real article at the battlefront, looks to be Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson.

In Korea, Americans are being killed as a result of decisions, or the lack of them, in Washington. And in consequence political strategy demands a fall guy. The evidence is clear and unmistakable that Mr. Truman has chosen his one-time campaign finance genius for this sacrificial missioin of "no return."

If there had been any doubt about it before, the Presidential seal of approval was graciously stamped on the execution decree in that by now all too famous speech to Congress on Wednesday, July 19. Here is it:

"I have authorized the Secretary of Defense to use the Selective Service System to such extent as may be required in order to obtain the increased strength we must have.

"I have also authorized the Secretary of Defense to meet the need for military manpower by calling into active Federal service as many National Guard units and as many units and individuals of the Reserve forces of the Army, Navy, and Air Force as may be required."

Nobody in his right mind thinks Johnson will really make any controlling decision to snatch more citizens from their homes and send them off to the wars.

That will be decided by Mr. Truman.

But every time the order goes out for another batch of recruits whose name will be on the paper?

The fall guy's. And his will be the unpopular head to go on the block when, as every politician knows it must, the inevitable public reaction sets in.

It must be confessed that the groundwork for this Johnsonian sacrifice has been well and truly laid, with all the best Kansas City style.

HE COMMITTED ORIGINAL SIN

Johnson himself committed the original sin and asked for it back when he took the job he now holds. He had done his boss a magnificent job of financing an apparently hopeless election campaign. And now he was on the road to his reward.

Inevitably, the boss must some day leave the White House. Who would suc-

ceed him? Johnson let it be known that such questions were "bothering" him.

It was a fatal notion, and one that has ruined his likes, before. No kind-emperor cares to look at candidates for his crown. Roosevelt used to lay such characters dead in long rows and why Johnson ever dreamed Mr. Truman would be any different nobody knows.

But he did. And he coupled with that a judgment in opposition to Secretary of State Dean Acheson on numerous critically important issues affecting the peace and safety of the United States.

Johnson, it so happens, is usually guilty of holding that whatever is good for the United States should be the first consideration in our foreign policy.

Such an attitude was bound to bring him in conflict with Acheson and immediately after it did so the very first time, Acheson set his journalistic hatchetmen after him.

And Johnson, of course, helped them out by making such large round assertions as the one to the effect that if Russia attacks the United States at 4 a. m., we will be over Moscow by 5.

That one was sour to a Nation remembering the late Secretary Frank Knox's declaration of December 6, 1941, that "the Navy is ready."

From these early starts, the operation has since narrowed down to increasing more official lines. The most significant of these preceding the actual blow on the neck in the boss's speech of Wednesday, last, came from Mr. HENDERSON LOVELACE LANHAM, a completely Truman representative from the Seventh Georgia District.

Representative LANHAM demands that Johnson resign for having "grossly misled" the country on the state of preparedness. LANHAM is, of course, utterly silent on such items as Mr. Truman's order forbidding the 70-group Air Force provided for by Congress in accordance with the proposal of Truman's own commission on minimum needs in air power.

ACHESON IS THE ONE TO BE FIRED

Now, we do not argue Louis Johnson is the greatest Secretary of Defense this country could produce. But we do believe he is the best the Truman administration will ever let take such a job. Until there is a change in the White House, therefore, Louis Johnson is better for this country's interest than any likely successor if for no other reason at least because he is man enough to stand against Acheson to the best of his ability.

He is not the one who got us in the jam we're in, today, nor can he be justly blamed for policy decisions that guided that man. He is just a typical fall guy.

The man who should be drummed out of Washington between now and the soonest possible election day is Acheson. He is the master mind of our disasters.

Merchant Marine Shortage Requires an Immediate Remedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the emergency that confronts us in Korea presents a very serious situation from the standpoint of transportation, among the many other problems.

The necessity of getting men and supplies across 8,000 miles of water is a tremendous task. At the present time it is a matter of prime importance. We cannot carry on a successful operation without both. Unfortunately we are handicapped by insufficient shipping facilities.

At the present time we have at least 134 ships in our merchant reserve fleet that could be utilized if they were in condition. But they are not ready. They are in so-called moth balls. They cannot be used until they are repaired and conditioned for use on the seas. The importance of making them available at the earliest possible moment cannot be overestimated. Without their use we are seriously handicapped in the prosecution of the war.

Recognizing the importance of readying these ships at the earliest possible moment I have introduced a bill, H. R. 9234, authorizing and directing the Secretary of Commerce, under whose jurisdiction they now are, to proceed with the repair of these vessels that are now in the merchant reserve fleet, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense. The bill also provides that $25,000,000 is authorized for the purpose.

During my service in the House I have time and again emphasized the importance of having an adequate merchant marine as an auxiliary to our fighting forces. Our experience in World War I and World War II has demonstrated the importance and, in fact, the absolute necessity of having such. Now we are face to face with the same situation in our present Korean emergency. Our military leaders, both Navy and Army, have likewise time and again acknowledged the need of a supporting merchant marine. Why, then, notwithstanding our experiences and demonstrated need have we as a Nation been so negligent in this important matter? Foreign countries have not been so derelict. Since World War II, they have been building like mad. If we as a Nation can afford by appropriation of American taxpayers' money to assist foreign countries in building up their merchant marine, then we should do the same for our own security. There is no justifiable excuse for our not doing so.

I trust that the Committee on Merchant Marine, to which my bill has been referred, will recognize the necessity of acting speedily so that the matter can have the early consideration of the Congress.

REA Program in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, progress in rural electrification in Montana since I have been in Congress is so gratifying to me, and I think it will be of such interest to the rural families of Montana, that I wish to include in the RECORD at this time a tabulation of the REA program in our State.

All of us who have been working to bring electricity to Montana farms and ranches have been aware of the steady and consistent progress of the lines, but it is not until you see a comparison of the figures today with those of 5 years ago that you realize fully the great work that has been done.

When I came to Congress I was already well aware of the advantages of the REA program. My own farm is served by the Park Electric Cooperative, and I was the first president of that REA co-op. I was, therefore, determined to do everything I could to extend similar service to those Montana farms and ranches which could not receive it otherwise. Accordingly, soon after arriving in Washington, I asked the Administrator of REA, Mr. Claude R. Wickard, for a tabulation of the REA program in Montana at that time. He prepared me a report as of December 31, 1945, and I have received such reports at intervals since, using them in my efforts to secure adequate loan authorizations to continue the program and to publicize its progress.

At the time of my election to Congress, REA had been in existence for 9 years, and the first report, December, 1945, shows that Montana had 17 REA cooperatives. During these years these cooperatives had received loans in the amount of $7,409,598, of which they had used $3,571,668 to build 3,377 miles of line serving 8,372 rural consumers.

The report of June 30, 1950, just 5 years later, shows that since I came to Washington the total of loan funds approved has grown nearly 450 percent, to $31,871,598. Funds actually used now amount to $23,063,541, a sevenfold increase. There are now 25 Montana REA cooperatives, and they are serving 26,282 consumers on 14,456 miles of line. When the loans already approved are used, 32,991 consumers will be receiving service on 18,945 miles of line, roughly four times as many consumers as we had 5 years ago.

I take pride in having had a part in building this remarkable record, particularly in sponsoring adequate loan authorizations to keep the work going at a maximum rate. The loan authorizations of the coming year should permit continued rapid progress, provided war shortages do not interfere.

The Montana REA story is not complete unless the development of our water and water-power resources also is mentioned. Since I have been in Congress I have helped to secure funds to complete the second and third generators at Fort Peck, supplying thousands of kilowatts of electric power for Montana consumers, and to begin construction of the Hungry Horse and Canyon Ferry power plants which will add greatly to the available supply.

The record of increased progress in the development of our resources compares favorably to the impressive record of REA expansion. It is also encouraging that power is now available to REA cooperatives from the Montana Power Co. at the same rate as Government power is sold to those cooperatives having direct connection with the Fort Peck plant. Also, favorable wheeling contracts have

been made with the Montana-Dakota company. This is a tremendous advance in providing exceptionally low-cost power to rural consumers.

For the benefit of those not familiar with the REA program, I will add that the money used to build these lines is a loan from the Government to the REA cooperatives, repayable within a reasonable period of time. As of June 30, 1950, only 1 Montana REA cooperative was behind on its payments, and that for a small sum which will soon be adjusted, while 11 cooperatives were actually paying in advance in sums ranging from $2,000 to $90,000.

The same principle of loaning funds for the extension of service to rural areas is now being followed in the REA telephone program which we established a year ago. Those of us who worked to set up the telephone program have every confidence that it will prove to be as successful as the rural electrification has been.

The following chart gives details of the Montana REA program:

REA program in Montana

Borrower	Date energized	Loan approvals			Operating report			Debt service report		
		Amount	Estimated number of miles June 30, 1950	Estimated number of consumers	Funds advanced, June 30, 195	Miles energized, May 31, 1950	Consumers connected, May 31, 1950	Principal and interest payments	Advance payments, June 30, 1950	Overdue more than 30 days
Ravalli County Electric Cooperative, Corvallis	Jan. 14, 1938	$495,800	332	888	$436,273	322	837	$116,478		
Sun River Electric Cooperative, Fairfield	Jan. 21, 1938	1,888,500	1,586	2,193	1,691,616	1,502	2,098	327.319	$55.507	
Lower Yellowstone Rural Electric Association, Sidney	Dec. 14, 1937	1,131,600	717	1,247	924,191	624	963	89,805		
Yellowstone Valley Electric Cooperative, Huntley	Dec. 24, 1937	1,298,498	820	2,182	1,144,279	811	2,062	275,217	20,950	
Vigilante Electric Cooperative, Dillon	Dec. 31, 1937	1,743,000	1,096	1,760	1,493,665	989	1,621	246,549	18,066	
Missoula Electric Cooperative, Missoula	Jan. 28, 1938	1,145,000	545	1,093	508,888	383	741	123,672	5,500	
Flathead Electric Cooperative, Kalispell	Dec. 16, 1938	1,218,700	512	2,095	807,200	435	1,599	141,920		
Fergus Electric Cooperative, Lewistown	Mar. 14, 1939	2,476,000	1,669	2,177	2,182,613	1,558	2,087	268,819	40,742	
Park Electric Cooperative, Livingston	Nov. 4, 1939	1,005,000	587	1,137	852,639	536	1,073	89,840		
Mid-Yellowstone Electric Cooperative, Hysham	May 16, 1940	563,500	349	624	398,578	306	595	100,519	15,244	
Beartooth Electric Cooperative, Red Lodge	Feb. 15, 1941	1,302,000	870	1,568	1,173,749	858	1,505	235,597	90,000	
Big Horn County Electric Cooperative, Lodge Grass	June 10, 1941	1,212,000	720	1,262	925,452	603	1,119	113,817	16,660	
Big Flat Electric Cooperative, Turner	Oct. 13, 1947	469,000	329	640	431,804	337	408	1,800		
Sheridan County Electric Cooperative, Medicine Lake	Nov. 6, 1946	2,640,000	1,616	2,070	1,434,264	813	1,049	830		
Northern Electric Cooperative, Opheim	Oct. 25, 1945	1,355,000	834	1,084	1,017,849	463	664	10,000	10,000	
Valley County Electric Cooperative, Glasgow	Oct. 21, 1947	860,000	531	840	628,456	412	568	4,510	2,268	
McCone County Electric Cooperative, Circle	Oct. 14, 1945	1,515,000	790	1,468	829,132	418	953	8,099	5,000	
Goldenwest Electric Cooperative, Wibaux	June 14, 1948	1,139,000	726	806	885,818	617	627	40,000	40,000	
Glacier County Electric Cooperative, Cut Bank	June 28, 1946	1,706,000	582	2,597	834,617	246	2,195	99,232		
Marias River Electric Cooperative, Shelby	June 28, 1946	1,655,000	623	1,808	1,570,575	620	1,938	168,497		$0.56
Hill County Electric Cooperative, Havre	July 3, 1947	2,450,000	1,831	1,568	2,114,202	1,296	1,010			
Tongue River Electric Cooperative, Terry	Aug. 8, 1949	1,276,000	805	775	308,745	240	152	97		
Southeast Electric Cooperative, Ekalaka	Nov. 17, 1949	500,000	211	417	303,195	[1] 2	[1] 204			
Lincoln Electric Cooperative, Fortine	Dec. 20, 1949	607,000	171	406	60,234	16	24			
Elmo Electric Cooperative Association, Polson	Nov. 16, 1949	220,000	93	286	105,507	[1] 49	[1] 190			2,217.00
1950 totals for State		31,871,598	18,945	32,991	23,063,541	14,456	26,282	2,462,717	319,938	2,217.56
1945 totals for State (17 cooperatives)		7,409,598			3,571,668	3,377	8,372			
Progress, 1945–50		24,462,000			19,491,873	11,079	17,910			

[1] Estimated.

The Need for an Expanding American Economy—Even During One of Our Greatest Business Booms We Have Still Not Solved the Problem of Attaining and Maintaining Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Employment Act of 1946 established, in the office of the President, the Council of Economic Advisers, whose duty it is to study the economy with a view to determining its strengths, weaknesses, and needs, and to recommend to the President such economic policies as may be necessary to keep our economy healthy.

I am sure that Members of this House will recall that the Employment Act, as originally introduced, was called the full employment bill. That goal of full employment, stated so clearly in the original bill, was not so clearly stated in the bill that finally was enacted into law. In my opinion, America—and, for that matter, no nation—should ever lose sight of that economic goal.

Full employment does not strictly mean jobs for all. There will always be a certain movement of labor in any economy—constant readjustments and changes. Economists generally agree that in so-called full employment, roughly 2 to 3 percent of the labor force will be classified as unemployed.

One of the excellent publications of the Council of Economic Advisers is the monthly booklet entitled "Economic Indicators." The July issue of this publication contains some statistics on employment and unemployment which I believe should be called to the attention of this House.

We see newspaper stories these days that tell us that production and employment are very near their all-time peaks reached during the tremendous boom of 1948. The peak in employment was reached in July of that year when 61,615,000 Americans had jobs.

In June of 1950, we had nearly reached this peak: 61,482,000 jobs were filled, an increase of over 1,750,000 jobs over May. This seems to be encouraging indeed.

But what had happened to the total labor force from May to June? When we look at the figures we find that in June there were slightly over 2,000,000 more Americans on the job market than there had been in May. This was predicted by the economists, who knew that during the month of June well over a million and a half young Americans would be pouring out of schools and colleges, many of them looking for work.

The percentage of unemployed persons, compared with the total labor force, actually went up between May and June, despite the tremendous increase in employment. In May 4.9 percent of the labor force was unemployed. In June 5.2 percent were unemployed. When you compare this with the 2 to 3 percent that is allowed during full employment, you realize that even during one of our biggest business booms, we have still not entirely solved the problem of attaining and maintaining full employment.

If America is called upon to mobilize once more, we will soon reach this thing called full employment, and we will find ourselves short of manpower once again. But this is an artificial full employment. The fact is, we have never been able to reach this goal in times of peace.

Like it or not, America—and all the other nations of the world as well—is faced with a growing population and a growing labor force that it must put to work if we are to have a healthy economy and if we are to preserve the roots of democracy. This means one thing: an expanding economy, growing demand for a greater production.

The Art of Double Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 30, 1950, the East Grand Forks (Minn.) Record published a Government news release under the headline "Huh?"

After reading this piece of double talk distributed by the Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture, I strongly recommend that the Department's writers sit down and read "The Art of Plain Talk." The article follows:

[From the East Grand Forks Record of June 30, 1950]

HUH?

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Since this is a beet-raising area and the item below evidently applies to sugar beets, we decided we'd better print it, although after reading it over umpteen times we still don't know what it means. But we've had a hard week, and maybe the beet growers will be somewhat brighter, so for their benefit we offer this information as received from Washington.

The Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture today announced the minimum "fair price" condition under which processors-producers of 1950 crop sugar beets will be eligible for Government payments under the Sugar Act of 1948.

The condition is that prices not less than those provided for in the 1950 crop purchase contract between a processor-producer and a producer shall be used as a basis for settlement for sugar beets purchased from a producer and processed by the processor-producer.

Department officials stated that, "Following the policy adopted in the 1948 and 1949 crop price determination, no attempt has been made in the 1950 price determination to evaluate prices payable for sugar beets at net return levels materially above or below those expect to result from the current price of sugar."

A processor-producer is a producer who directly or indirectly is also a processor of sugar beets.

[From the Federal Register of July 12, 1950]

TITLE 7—AGRICULTURE—CHAPTER VIII—PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION (SUGAR BRANCH), DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SUBCHAPTER F—DETERMINATION OF NORMAL YEILDS AND ELIGIBILITY FOR ABANDONMENT AND CROP DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS

[Sugar Determination 846.2]

PART 846—HAWAII—1950 AND SUBSEQUENT CROPS

Pursuant to the provisions of section 303 of the Sugar Act of 1948, the following determination is hereby issued:

SEC. 846.2. Normal yields and eligibility for abandonment and crop deficiency payments—(a) Farm normal yields: The normal yield of commercially recoverable sugar per acre for any sugarcane farm in Hawaii shall be established for the 1950 and each subsequent crop year as follows:

(1) For a farm on which sugarcane was grown and marketed (or processed by the producer) for the extraction of sugar in three or more of the next preceding five crop years, the normal yield shall be the simple average of the annual average yields of sugar per acre of sugarcane harvested from the farm for the extraction of sugar for all of such years in which sugarcane was harvested.

(2) For a farm on which sugarcane was grown and marketed (or processed by the producer) for the extraction of sugar in less than three of the next preceding five crop years, the normal yield shall be that established by the Director of the Hawaiian area office of the Production and Marketing Administration (hereinafter referred to as area office of PMA) on the basis of the average yield which could have been reasonably expected on the farm in the next preceding five crop years considering the average yield of other farms in the same local producing area (as defined in paragraph (c) of this section), variations in soil productivity, climatic conditions, cultural practices and other pertinent factors.

(b) Eligibility for abandonment and deficiency payments: The director of the area office of PMA shall approve for abandonment and/or deficiency payments any farm located in whole or in part in a local producing area in which the actual yields of sugar from 10 percent or more of the sugarcane acreage harvested from all farms or parts of farms in such local producing area, were not in excess of 80 percent of the applicable normal yields: *Provided,* That (1) such acreage abandonment and/or crop deficiency was directly due to drought, flood, storm, freeze, disease, or insects, (2) the acreage abandoned or the acreage with respect to which there was a crop deficiency was suitable for the production of sugarcane and was cared for up to the time of harvest or abandonment, as the case may be, in a manner which could have been expected under average conditions to produce a normal crop of sugarcane, and (3) the other conditions for payment specified in title III of the act with respect to the farm have been met. Such approval on the application for payment by the director of the area office of PMA shall constitute determination that such farm is eligible for abandonment and/or deficiency payments.

(c) Definitions. (1) Acreage of sugarcane "harvested" shall mean the acreage from which sugarcane was harvested for the extraction of sugar plus the acreage of sugarcane with respect to which there was bona fide abandonment as a result of drought, flood, storm, freeze, disease, or insects.

(2) "Sugar" shall mean hundredweight of sugar commercially recoverable from the sugarcane grown on the farm and marketed (or processed) for the extraction of sugar.

(3) "Local producing area" shall mean all contiguous or nearby farms or parts of farms which are similar with respect to types of soil or with respect to typography, as determined by the Director of the Area Office of PMA: *Provided, however,* That farms separated from other farms by any natural barrier or large area of land shall not be included within the same local producing area.

This determination supersedes, with respect to the 1950 and subsequent crop years, the "Determination of Normal Yield of Commercially Recoverable Sugar per Acre and Eligibility for Payment with Respect to Abandonment and Crop Deficiency for Sugarcane Farms in Hawaii," issued May 25, 1945 (10 F. R. 6154).

STATEMENT OF BASES AND CONSIDERATIONS

Requirements of the Sugar Act of 1948. Section 303 of the act authorizes the Secretary to make payment to producers of sugar beets or sugarcane with respect to bona fide abandonment of planted acreage and crop deficiencies of harvested acreage under certain conditions. The payments are based on normal yields of commercially recoverable sugar as established for individual farms under determinations issued by the Secretary.

Historical background. Normal yields for farms in Hawaii have been based heretofore on the average yields of commercially recoverable sugar per acre obtained during base periods consisting of three consecutive crop years deemed to be representative of the yields to be expected under normal conditions. For the crop years 1937–1942 the base period consisted of the crop years 1934, 1935, and 1936. Beginning with the 1943 crop the base years were the crop years 1939, 1940, and 1941. The average yield in Hawaii for the 1934–1936 base period was 7.64 tons of sugar per acre as compared to 7.19 tons for the period 1939–1941. The average yield for the 1942–1949 period increased to approximately 8.00 tons. This increase in yields has been due largely to higher yielding varieties of cane and improved production methods.

Base periods. The use of fixed base periods covering selected crop years does not adequately reflect changes in yields. It also tends to benefits those producers who obtained abnormally high yields in the selected base years, while the effect is the reverse with respect to those producers who obtained subnormal yields in the base years. It is believed that the use of moving base periods will reflect current changes more adequately, will assure equitable treatment among all producers, and will provide a sounder basis for the computation of any acreage abandonment and crop deficiency payments which may be applied for in the future. Accordingly, the foregoing determination provides that normal yields for any crop year will be established from the average yields obtained during the next preceding five crop years. The average yield per acre in Hawaii for the base period (1945–49) which will be effective for the 1950 crop is 8.15 tons.

Computation of farm normal yields. Under this determination normal yields for farms will be computed directly in terms of hundredweight of sugar commercially recoverable per acre from applicable data on harvested acreage and yields of sugar. This is a more direct method than that formerly used whereby normal yields were computed by multiplying the average number of tons of cane produced per acre by the average yield of sugar per ton of cane. The normal yield for each farm having a sugarcane production record for three or more years of the applicable base period will be computed by averaging the annual yields obtained on the farm within such period.

The former determination provided that if sugarcane was not harvested on the farm during each year of the 3-year base period, the normal yield was based upon the average yield of all farms in the same local producing area. Since this could have resulted in unrealistic normal yields in some cases, the proposed determination provides that for farms with production history in less than 3 years of the applicable 5-year base period the normal yields shall be established by the Director of the Area Office of PMA on the basis of the yields which could have been reasonably expected on the farms during such base period. This will permit the area office to take into account variations in soil productivity, climatic conditions, cultural practices and other pertinent factors when establishing such normal yields.

Eligibility for abandonment and deficiency payments. The provisions regarding eligibility for these payments have been in effect for

several years and have proven to be generally satisfactory. Except for the inclusion of the phrase "or nearby farms or parts of farms" in the definition of a local producing area, other provisions remain the same.

Accordingly, I hereby find and conclude that the foregoing determination will effectuate the provisions of section 303 of the Sugar Act of 1948.

(Sec. 403, 61 Stat. 932; 7 U. S. C. Supp., 1153. Interprets or applies sec. 303, 61 Stat. 930; 7 U. S. C. Supp., 1133)

Issued this 7th day of July 1950.

[SEAL] CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture.

[F. R. Doc. 50-5990; Filed, July 11, 1950; 8:45 a. m.]

Will the Philippines Fall to Russia Because of American Negligence?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, all too often in assaying the role of America in world affairs, too little attention is paid to the position of the Philippine Republic and its very necessary preservation.

As surely as night follows day, the Soviet plan of world domination provides for the annexation of the Philippine Islands either by coup or by force. Yet we, as a nation, complacently neglect to aid by economic means the republican government of this Pacific outpost. We hear and read of the instability of this territory which we have only recently granted full independence, and fail to take into consideration the disaster which will follow in the event of Communist domination of the Philippines.

The United States should grant material aid to the war-ravaged Filipinos who demonstrated their love of freedom, and their affection for this Nation by fighting side by side with us during World War II.

A report on conditions in the Philippines has been made available to me, and I submit, as a portion of my remarks, a letter from Rey L. Parker, president and general manager, Engineering Equipment & Supply Co., Manila, Philippine Islands; an address by Judge John W. Haussermann to the Rotary Club of Manila, delivered March 23, 1950; and a clipping from the Manila Bulletin of June 2, 1950:

ENGINEERING EQUIPMENT
& SUPPLY CO.,
Manila, Philippine Islands, June 2, 1950.

Subject: Business Conditions—Philippine Islands.

FACTORY SALES & ENGINEERING, INC.,
New Orleans, La.

DEAR SIRS: During the past several months you have probably noticed from press reports that conditions in this country have deteriorated considerably from what they were up to the end of 1949. We have been intending to submit a general report to you on current business conditions in this country as we see them. We have hesitated to make such a report due to the fact that the general situation has not stabilized to the point where we can submit a report with any degree of certainty that the reports would be a reliable forecast of conditions that are likely to develop in this country within a few months from now.

The general level of business at the present time is materially below the level of a year ago and the decline continues. We hesitate to predict an improvement in the near future. There is much evidence to sustain the belief that the recession will continue, Much, though not all, of the trouble which has developed is due to governmental regulations and the failure of the Government to take adequate steps to deal with the problem of law and order in this country.

You will probably recall that in December of 1949, import controls were put into effect. In January of this year, foreign exchange controls were also put into effect. Exchange controls reduced the available exchange by 28 percent of the amount used during the calendar year 1949. The immediate results of these measures were a lowering of the general-business level and a sharp increase in unemployment.

The matter of deteriorating internal law and order, which is undoubtedly sponsored by Russia, has been an acute problem in this country for a long time. This situation has deteriorated at an increasing rate in the past 5 months, though it would appear at the moment that there has been some improvement over the worst of these disorders which took place during the past 2 months.

It is the writer's belief that, if there is to be correction of existing difficulties here, it will be necessary for the United States Government and the Philippine Government to agree on a program of assistance to this country.

From what has been reported in this letter, it would appear that the Philippines are developing a pattern similar to that which enabled the Reds to take over all of China. A view of the map of east Asia will readily show that with China, Formosa, and the Philippines within the Russian sphere, it will be only a short time until the Dutch East Indies and all the Malaya will be taken over by the Reds. This inevitable development, unless checked now, will isolate the United States from present supplies of tin, natural rubber, coconut oil and copra, hemp fiber, refractory grades of chromite, together with several other strategic items of tropical products. Russia is presently short on all of these products, the acquisition of which will greatly improve her war potential. Further, this development will insure the loss to the United States of a good foreign export market. Japan fought World War II to acquire this area. We fought about 3½ years to recapture the area, and at great cost in life and material. Current United States State Department policies are delivering these areas to Russia practically without cost.

There is a substantial element within the Philippine Government headed by Vice President Fernando Lopez who are endeavoring to rid the government of graft. It seems probable that this endeavor may have considerable success because there is much sentiment in its favor from within the government and also outside the government.

The United States Philippine War Damage Commission operating in the Philippines under the chairmanship of Dr. Frank Waring, has done a competent job here and has accomplished much toward assisting the rehabilitation of damage and destruction caused by the war.

Their appropriation is $100,000,000 short of the amount required to pay approved claims up to the extent of the 75 percent of the prewar value of the claims, as provided for in the war-damage law. Bills have recently been filed in the United States House and Senate to appropriate the amount required. Hearings have been held on the appropriation bills but no further action has been taken. The appropriations should be made promptly and the funds made available with as little delay as circumstances permit.

A program should be worked out between the United States Government and the Philippine Government which would provide for:

(a) Repayable loan to the Philippine Government to sustain the position of the Philippine peso for the next 4 years until their exports can be brought into balance with imports. This could be accomplished within 3 to 4 years at the outside.

(b) Abolish present exchange controls and import controls. With a substantial tax on the importations of luxury items.

(c) The United States Government should appropriate the $100,000,000 needed to pay the approved balance of war claims to within 75 percent of losses sustained as provided for in the law, thereby placing the United States Government in the position of having met their commitments.

(d) An informed commission from the United States, preferably selected from the present United States War Damage Commission, should be appointed to supervise the administration of the loan to the Philippines.

Would it be worth while to forward copies of this letter to the Senator and Representative of your district with the request that the situation be reviwed with their respective committees on foreign policy?

Trusting that these general comments may be of interest to you, we are

Very truly yours,
ENGINEERING EQUIPMENT & SUPPLY CO.,
REY L. PARKER,
President and General Manager.

THE INFLUENCE OF EXCHANGE CONTROL ON PHILIPPINE ECONOMY

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY JUDGE JOHN W. HAUSSERMANN BEFORE THE ROTARY CLUB OF MANILA, MARCH 23, 1950

I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the Rotarians of Manila to express my views as to the effect of our present foreign exchange controls on the economy of the Philippines. I am especially pleased to see so many ladies present. The women of the Philippines are a very powerful influence for good in this country. In the language of the late former President of the United States, Grover Cleveland, the Philippine Republic is "confronted with a financial condition and not a theory."

Spain, by the Treaty of Paris, ceded the Philippine Islands to the United States, therefore, from 1898 to July 4, 1946, it was the moral and legal duty of the United States to protect the Philippines from invasion by any foreign power.

In 1935, the United States established the Commonwealth of the Philippines and promised to grant the islands its independence on July 4, 1946. From 1935 to 1941 the Philippine Commonwealth made wonderful progress in every respect. Its financial position was A No. 1. There was peace and prosperity throughout the islands. The peoples were happy, contented, and reasonably prosperous. The standard of living of the average Filipino was much higher than the standard of living of any people in the Far East. Then came December 1941.

The islands were invaded by Japan. The United States failed to protect the islands from that invasion. For more than 3 years the islands were occupied by a foreign enemy. The economy of the islands and of private industry was practically destroyed. Its cities were ruined, its public buildings, roads, and bridges destroyed. That was the condition when, on July 4, 1946, the American flag was lowered and the Republic of the Philippines established.

In other words, the republic inherited a country despoiled by war with all the disagreeable aftermath of every major war.

Let me, at the outset, forestall any misunderstanding or misinterpretation of what I may say in these remarks. I want to impress upon those present and upon my unseen audience that I have great faith and confidence in the future of this republic and in the Filipino people.

There are very few undeveloped territories in this world as rich in natural resources as the Philippines. This is the only nation in the Far East whose foundation is built on the concept of western civilization—the only democracy in the Far East.

We have enough tillable agricultural land to grow enough food to sustain a population of more than 30,000,000 people. Nature has endowed this archipelago with everything required to support, in peace and contentment, a very large population.

The Philippine Islands were reduced to the present unhappy conditions through no fault of its own. All this destruction happened while the islands were a possession of the United States and under its protection. Having failed to give the protection to prevent this terrible destruction, to say nothing of the loss of lives of innocent people, what is the moral, if not legal, obligation of the United States?

The least that the United States can do is to restore the economy of the Philippines and also to reconstruct the public buildings, roads, and bridges.

The war threw our foreign trade out of balance, the exportation of products is far below normal and to reconstruct and rehabilitate the destroyed property, necessarily increased our imports to an abnormal amount. This was, and is, a very severe drain on our dollar reserves and something had to be done to—

1. Prevent the flight of capital.

2. Restrict the importation of nonessential or luxurious goods.

The restrictions on foreign exchange will not solve our problem, and unless these restrictions are relaxed they will, in time, produce untold hardships on the people of the islands. The cost of living will rise to such an extent as to force down very materially the standard of living; unemployment will grow to an alarming extent; confidence in our peso has already been shaken. I understand the pesos are selling all the way from ₱2.50 for $1 to ₱3 for $1. This is a danger signal.

All of this will not solve our problem. Nothing short of an increase of production of our exportable products to bring our exports and imports closer in balance will bring the necessary permanent relief.

The United States can, and should, come to our relief by way of long-term loans of not less than $1,000,000,000 at the rate of $250,000,000 annually for a period of 5 years—each loan to be payable in 30 years from its date with a very nominal rate of interest. These loans will protect our dollar reserve until our exports balance our imports.

The United States made a loan of more than $3,000,000,000 to England to sustain the English pound, but, nevertheless, the pound had to be devalued. The people of the Philippines remember this and cannot be blamed if they wonder whether the peso will be officially devalued.

People of the Philippines, let us all adjourn politics until we are over this crisis. Let all of us stop, look, and listen. Keep in mind that Communists thrive, grow, and expand on misery and discontent of the people. Do not permit communism to smother or destroy this young, promising and only democracy in this part of the world. The only Christian nation in the Far East. If the people of the Philippines and of the United States will take a realistic view of the chaotic condition of the world, and if they have the courage, wisdom, and patience to apply the proper remedy, all will be well.

The United States can do its part by granting the necessary loans to sustain the dollar reserves until the production of our exportable products will be in line with our imports. Such loans will enable the Philippine Republic to give a freer rein to those who have the desire and the financial strength to develop the resources of this country. It would be the greatest contribution to permanent peace in the Far East.

Time will not permit further development of this thought. The Filipino people have their duty to perform.

We must establish law and order throughout the islands. President Quirino cannot do this by himself. He needs the full, patriotic cooperation of all the people. The provincial officials must do their part, the constabulary also has an important duty to perform. The members of this force should so conduct themselves as to win the respect and confidence of the people. The press must carry on a vigorous and sustained campaign for law enforcement. The public schools, our colleges, and all of our churches should teach the importance of every individual doing his very best to make this Republic a real success.

A vigorous, sustained, and intelligent campaign of this kind by all of these various agencies may convince the people of these islands that there is no room nor excuse for what some are pleased to call dissidents.

The fact that a person or group disagrees with the policy of our Government does not justify the kidnaping of a citizen for a ransom, neither does the fact that a person feels he has a just grievance against the authorities excuse robbing an innocent priest and then slaying him.

I hope something that I have said today may give you a glimpse of the hope and visions I have for the future of the Philippines. We are blessed with our full share of natural resources. We have a form of government under which a human being can advance to the limit of his capacity. If due advantage is taken of our opportunities, there is no reason why this Republic should not develop to be one of the great nations of the world and lead the other nations of the Far East into the path of peace, contentment, happiness, and prosperity. The necessary capital will come if given reasonable assurance of security. Do not fear capital. Remember the power to tax is the power to destroy. That fact is the principal reason why capital is so timid. Thus you can see how important it is for our Government to retain the confidence of the investing public.

[From the Manila Bulletin of June 2, 1950]

UNITED STATES CONCERN OVER PHILIPPINE ISLANDS SAID MOUNTING

NEW YORK, June 1 (UP).—Newsweek Magazine reported that "concern over the Philippine situation is mounting in Washington."

"Strong voices in both the Pentagon and the State Department are urging United States action before a complete collapse occurs," the magazine said. "A major Soviet effort to destroy the yearling Republic is under way, some officials believe.

"They argue that this country's attention is purposely being diverted to Southeast Asia while Moscow's agents undermine the weak Philippine Government.

"Two approaches to the problem are being put forward in official circles. One group advocates sending United States troops to the islands by 'invitation' of the Government. Another thinks stronger efforts should be made to induce President Quirino to institute wide reforms.

"Pressure for action is likely to increase. The Philippines is a vital link in United States defenses in the western Pacific. There was some argument about Formosa's importance. There is no question in this case."

Gov. Luther W. Youngdahl Is Minnesota's Pride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent editorial from the Crookston (Minn.) Daily Times.

The following editorial—printed under the heading of "Minnesota is proud of Luther Youngdahl"—is a fitting tribute to a great and able governor:

"If the people of Minnesota should entrust me with the responsibility of the governorship for another 2 years I will work for and fight for the continuance of honesty and humanity in our State government."

Thus did Luther Youngdahl announce Saturday he would be a candidate for governor of Minnesota for a third term. The pride he took in being able to make that statement is matched throughout the Nation by the pride of Minnesotans in the kind of government their native State has had during the terms of Governor Youngdahl. Minnesotans of every political shade take full measure of pride in being able to point to the accomplishments of the last three administrations.

The State now is the leading one in the Nation for its care of those suffering from mental derangements. It is a State that has paid a bounteous bonus to its war veterans. It is a State which has maintained and continues to maintain large funds for its schools, funds that are not touched for any other purpose. It is a State in which the laws of the land are enforced equally in all places, where there is no favoritism for political parties or corrupt practitioners. Its social benefits are widespread; the aged, the blind and infirm, the unemployed, orphans, all have available to them the humanitarian assistance of their fellow citizens. Juveniles who have missed the straight and narrow are given particular aid in efforts to get them back inside the law.

There are few if any States in the Union which are able to point to the planned program of welfare, education, and law enforcement as can Minnesota. As the man who has headed the administration of that State, and in many cases prodded its legislators into enacting such programs, Luther Youngdahl has gathered honor and renown at home and Nation-wide. He has earned his way to renown by far-sighted statesmanship, down-to-earth humanity, and personal integrity. We feel certain that he will be returned to the governorship easily. His record is unapproached by competitors, and voters can be certain of what he will do.

Straight Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Olean (N. Y.) Times-Herald.

The editorial follows:

STRAIGHT TALK

Sometimes, we Americans seem determined to get ourselves "in a hole."

We are doing it now with regard to rationing.

Most of us don't like rationing. We hate the idea of having to go back to books of tickets, and be able to get so much of this or that and no more.

Yet we are doing—or a considerable proportion of our people are doing—the very thing that inevitably will bring about rationing.

We are rushing to stores to purchase inordinate supplies of certain foods.

Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of Rochester, N. Y., put the matter very plainly the other day.

Nothing will cause food rationing as quickly as war-scare buying and hoarding, he said.

He pointed to the actually ludicrous rush on the part of many people to buy large quantities of sugar and coffee.

"Merchants have attempted to warn consumers that sugar will harden on their shelves and coffee grow stale; yet there is plenty of both commodities," he said, "and with a million-ton surplus in Cuba alone there is no justification or logic in purchasing sugar beyond routine needs."

Unfortunately, the Rochester legislator added, the people who are penalized most by hysterical buying of foods are "the housewives who refrain from participating in a wild dash to stock their shelves."

Mr. KEATING also dropped a hint that may be noted.

If, as a result of the unwarranted rush to purchase unjustified stocks of foods, rationing later should be imposed, he said "some sort of check is probable so that housewives who have overstocked are more than likely to be left holding the bag with stale coffee and hard sugar, and only empty ration books to show for their trouble."

Representative KEATING added an appeal—"nonpolitical and sincere"—that "all of us exercise self-restraint and avoid the temptation to stock up needlessly on essential foods."

"Let's not furnish an excuse for action by those who are anxious to reimpose controls on our economy," he declared. "The best way to avoid that is by a voluntary application of the Golden Rule."

He's perfectly right, of course. It's bad enough to have a "hoarding rush" when foods are actually in short supply; but to have one when supplies are abundant and thus needlessly and artificially create a shortage is not a very patriotic or advantageous proceeding, is it?

The National Ballet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 15, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the importance to the Nation of the Capital City of Washington as the source of cultural inspiration as well as a shrine of patriotism is fully appreciated by all of us. Art, literature, music, architecture, sculpture all have here, as properly they should in the beautiful city on the Potomac, which is in all truth the Capital of the world, a vibrant expression the influence of which is Nation-wide. The beneficial effect of this influence upon the national character and the impetus it gives to developments on the cultural side in all the communities of the United States is clear. Moreover, it gives to the visitors from other lands a better and a clearer understanding of our country and of our people, who in the great strides they have made in industry and in the economic and political fields of endeavor have traveled, with equal zeal for the attainment of the best, the path of the cultural.

Many of us in this body regret that long ago the authorization was not given for the establishment of a great national theater, but unfortunately the present demand upon our thought and means coming from a grave international situation remove from our list of priorities those projects and developments which in times of assured peace hold cultural appeal for us. It is to be hoped that when the clouds of a war emergency have cleared, and we are again free to go the ways of peace, there will come into reality the long dream of a national theater here in our Capital which will be the instrumentality of developing the American theater to heights hitherto unreached anywhere in history or in the world today.

While the national theater is not immediately in sight, it is nevertheless a matter of congratulation and of promise that the National Ballet, through the devoted efforts of a group of artists associated in a nonprofit organization, has been assured.

The activities of and the interest in the National Ballet will not, of course, detract from the war emergency effort, which with all of us everywhere in the United States must come before everything else. To the contrary, it is reasonable to be expected that the first year of the National Ballet coming at such a time as this will prove a real contribution to morale.

Foremost in the movement which has resulted in the establishment of the National Ballet was Marion D. Venable, and I am including in my remarks the statement made by her, and for the National Ballet, on the occasion of the last performance of the Washington Ballet Soiree, which Miss Venable has directed since its inception. The statement follows:

FAREWELL AND HAIL

This is the "swan song" of the Washington Ballet Soiree. Tonight's performance is the last to be given under the name which we have tried to keep bright for 6 years. The Ballet Soiree passes into history, but it will not cease to exist. Instead, it is to enter upon a new span of life and art as the nucleus of the National Ballet, recently incorporated as a nonprofit, self-supporting company, dedicated to the same esthetic and social ideals that inspired its endeavors from 1944 onward.

The great source of the Ballet Soiree's vitality in the past has been found in stimulating and developing young dancers capable of responding to such influences, and the same policy will be pursued by the National Ballet to the same constructive purpose. Technical perfection is essential in dance art worthy of the support of the public, and the highest technical standard will be maintained for the dancers of the new organization. But the spirit of the individual artist must be encouraged. The radiance of the soul, imperative for the authentic beauty of the ballet, too often in the past has faded under the blight of long waiting for opportunity to dance with a ballet company of distinction.

It is to meet this need that the National Ballet has been established upon the foundation supplied by the Ballet Soiree. We will strive to afford greater opportunities to young artists than they ever have had in Washington previously. Each candidate for the new ensemble will be auditioned for physical attributes and technical proficiency, but in addition we shall seek in each one the quality of inner beauty without which there can be no art.

We believe that you, our Washington audience, will rejoice with us at the prospect of having the National Ballet here in Washington. We are grateful for your interest in the years that are gone and we hope that you will join with us in making the National Ballet a notable achievement in the years to come. Help us to make the National Ballet truly worthy of the Nation's Capital and our beloved country at large.

MARION D. VENABLE,
For the National Ballet.

Production and Consumption of Abacá

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and enclosures:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., July 25, 1950.

Hon. JOHN MCSWEENEY,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCSWEENEY: In reply to your request for information relative to production and consumption of abacá, there are no satisfactory figures available on world consumption of abacá. Consumption is roughly indicated, however, by export trade data, especially if they are available over a period of years. The enclosed table taken from a recent Department of Commerce publication entitled "World Study of Hard Fibers and Hard Fiber Production" shows the distribution of abacá exports by countries of destination before World War II and in 1947 and 6 months of 1948. We regret that it has not been possible to compile more recent data.

In the Philippines, abacá fiber is ordinarily produced by hand-stripping methods. The process is described in Miscellaneous Publication No. 518, United States Department of Agriculture, pages 52–53, as follows:

"The first stalks for fiber production are harvested from the abacá plants about 2 years after the suckers are set out. Only the largest stalks are cut, leaving the others to continue growing. The entire trunk is cut down, and the leaf blades are cut off at the top. The trunks weigh from 35 to 120 pounds (15 to 50 kilos) or even more. They yield only about 2 to 3 percent of their weight in clean dry fiber; so it is not economical to transport them very far.

"The fiber is prepared, usually by hand, from freshly cut green stalks. The fiber-bearing outer layer of each leaf stem is

stripped off in ribbons, called tuxies, 2 to 3 inches (5 to 8 cm.) wide and ½ to ⅛ inch (2 to 4 mm.) thick. The tuxies from the outer leaf stems, yielding brownish fiber, and those from the inner leaf stems, yielding finer and whiter fiber, are kept separate. These tuxies are pulled by hand under a finely serrated knife pressed against a block of wood by means of a spring pole. This process usually scrapes away all of the pulp at one pulling. The fiber is dried in the sun, then made up into bundles and taken to a warehouse, where it is sorted into grades, inspected, and certified by fiber inspectors of the Philippine Government, and baled for market.

"In some places a small machine (known as a hagotan) is used. The workman using this machine places a tuxie under the knife, which is pressed down by weights or springs, and holding one end of the tuxie, gives it a turn around a revolving spindle and pulls it enough to make the loop cling to the spindle and draw the tuxie under the scraping knife. These machines, sometimes operated by water power, relieve the workman from the strenuous labor of pulling the tuxies under the knife.

(In Central America and on one large plantation in the Philippines, abacá fiber is recovered by decortication in a large machine known as the Krupp decorticator.)

"* * * In these machines sections of the abacá trunks are fed sidewise. The trunks are cut into pieces not more than 70 inches (180 cm.) in length, and these are split usually in quarters. The coarse brownish fiber from the outer-leaf stems is mixed with the finer white fiber from the interior unless the outer-leaf stems are taken off and kept separate, as is done in cleaning by hand or with the smaller machines (hagotan). * * *"

We hope that this information and the attached materials will serve your needs.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director Legislative Reference Service.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURE CIRCULAR—OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

JUNE 20, 1949.

WORLD HARD FIBER PRODUCTION REMAINS BELOW PREWAR AVERAGE [1]

The world production in 1948 of the three principal hard fibers—abacá, henequen, and sisal—was approximately 8 percent less than the average annual production during the five prewar years, 1934–38, according to the best available information at this time. Wartime production during the years 1941–45 averaged about 25 percent below the prewar average, principally because of the decline in output in the Philippines and Indonesia. Production fluctuated during the early stage of World War II and again in the early postwar years of 1946–48.

The total production of these three fibers was made up in prewar years of about 43 percent sisal, 36 percent abacá, and 21 percent henequen. That proportion was changed under the influence of war conditions in the years 1941–45 to about 54 percent sisal, 13 percent abacá, and 33 percent henequen. Slow recovery in the Philippines and Indonesia and increased production in Mexico, British East Africa, and many of the other henequen and sisal-producing countries have combined to keep the ratio among the three fibers little changed since the war closed. Preliminary estimates of 1948 production indicate about 53 percent sisal, 28 percent henequen, and 19 percent abacá.

Abacá is the fiber most preferred for hard wear, particularly where resistance to deterioration by water is important. Production in 1948 is estimated at 208,800,000 pounds, compared with a prewar average of 427,000,000 and a wartime average of 111,600,000 pounds.

The principal source of abacá is the Philippine Republic where about 97 percent of the total abacá production originated before the war. Wartime data for the Philippines are incomplete, but it is believed that not more than an average of 100,800,000 pounds was processed in 1941–45. During the Japanese occupancy from 1942 to 1945 many plantations were destroyed and others were badly neglected. Since 1945 there have been many uncertainties concerning the working of the Davao plantations.

Fibers: World production of the principal hard fibers, representative prewar average of 1948

Commodity and country	Average (5-year) 1934–38	Calendar years 1939	Calendar years 1940	Average (5-year) 1941–45	Calendar years (preliminary) 1946	Calendar years (preliminary) 1947	Calendar years (preliminary) 1948
Abacá:	*Million pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Million pounds*
Philippines, Republic of [1]	415.0	317.8	379.9	[2] 100.8	109.3	221.6	163.3
Indonesia [3]	8.0	10.0	9.0	3.0	.1	(4)	5.0
British North Borneo	[2] 4.0	4.7	[2] 3.9	[2] .6			
Central America			.2	7.2	12.2	36.1	40.2
Other					.1	.7	[2] .3
Total abacá	427.0	332.5	393.0	111.6	121.7	258.4	208.8
Henequen:							
Mexico	212.1	188.9	212.2	256.7	238.3	258.2	264.6
Cuba	[2] 28.2	32.9	37.9	27.5	30.5	28.7	28.3
El Salvador	6.4	7.2	7.8	8.3	6.9	5.1	6.5
Other					.1	.2	.1
Total henequen	246.7	229.0	257.9	292.5	275.8	292.2	299.5
Sisal:							
British East Africa	261.0	301.1	290.6	291.6	299.8	299.8	357.4
Indonesia [5]	167.0	216.0	196.0	[2] 90.0	[2] 15.0	([2] 4)	[2] 6.4
Mozambique [6]	32.3	26.3	23.8	35.3	35.0	36.3	41.7
Haiti	[7] 13.3	[7] 16.5	[7] 17.4	[7] 22.5	[8] 38.8	[8] 48.4	[8] 65.9
Angola (Portuguese West Africa)	[9] 11.3	[9] 12.7	15.0	21.3	30.9	27.9	35.3
French West Africa	[9] 9.8	[9] 6.8		[2] 5.6	[9] 3.0	3.3	3.3
Madagascar	[2] 5.3	6.2	5.5	5.0	0	2.4	5.5
Brazil	(4)	(4)		[2] 5.7	20.7	21.2	52.9
Formosa (Taiwan)				1.9	.1	2.4	4.3
Other British Africa [2]	3.0	1.4	.7	.7	.7	.9	.9
Other Western Hemisphere [2]	1.5	.7	1.4	3.3	6.0	6.8	7.5
Other countries	1.5	.3	4.4	.9	.5	.4	.4
Total sisal	506.0	588.0	554.8	483.8	450.5	449.8	581.5
Total abacá, henequen and sisal	1,179.7	1,149.5	1,205.7	887.9	848.0	1,000.4	1,089.8

[1] Years 1934–40 converted on basis of 278.88 pounds to the bale, but years 1941–48 converted on basis of 278.3 pounds to the bale. Data for the years 1939–40 and 1946–48 include only fiber inspected by the Philippine fiber inspection service and represent only about 90 to 95 percent of total production.

[2] Estimates based on incomplete data.

[3] Estimated at about 4 percent of total hard fibers produced in Indonesia for years 1934–40, and at less than 4 percent of total hard fibers exported plus an estimate of domestic consumption for the year 1941. The years 1942, 1943, and 1945 are estimated from partial data on production.

[4] Less than 50,000 pounds.

[5] Estimated at less than 95 percent of total exports of hard fibers in 1934 and 1941, and at approximately 90 percent of total production of hard fibers in the years 1935–40.

[6] Exports, excluding tow for crop-year ending June 30 of the year indicated for 1934–45. Production, including tow, for calendar years 1946–48.

[7] Exports for year ending Sept. 30 of the year indicated and excluding local consumption which probably amounted to less than 1,000,000 pounds annually prior to 1946.

[8] Total production for calendar year, including peasant-cleaned fiber which has increased in quantity in recent years to between 6.5 and 10.0 million pounds per year in 1946–48.

[9] Exports, which are approximately equal to production, or production estimate based on trade data.

Source: Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. Compiled from official statistics when available, supplemented by reliable trade estimates and reports of Foreign Service officers, except where noted.

Indonesian production was practically at a standstill during the late year of World War II and the succeeding years of political unrest within the country. The data shown for 1946 may relate to fiber processed from earlier crops. Abacá, sisal, and cantala are not separated in data for production and exports of Indonesia, and the relative proportion of these fibers must be estimated from general information relating to the situation. It is believed that a larger percentage of the prewar production of abacá was retained within the country than was the case for sisal; therefore, production data **would comprise a slightly larger percentage of abacá than would export data. Reports of late years indicate that abacá production is recovering better than sisal, and that cantala which, it is believed, was formerly about 6 percent of the hard fibers of Indonesia, is now negligible.**

Abacá has been produced in North Borneo but has been neglected in recent years.

[1] Digested from regularly scheduled Foreign Service reports, foreign publications, and other reliable sources.

However, reports indicate that production may be revived again, at least on an experimental basis.

Prior to the war, Central American abacá was grown on an experimental basis, starting with a few plants set out in 1925. When the oncoming war threatened to cut off the Philippine fiber supply from the Western Hemisphere, commercial planting was undertaken and the area was expanded rapidly. From the limited crop of about 200,000 pounds in 1940, production has now increased to 40,200,000 pounds, excluding waste.

Abacá is now produced in several other countries, including Ecuador, Martinique, Burma, British Honduras, and British Malaya, but the fiber is obtained principally from small or experimental acreages and from scattered plants, and is generally consumed domestically.

Henequen is used mostly for binder twine and cordage for purposes where cost is of first importance, strength important but secondary, and appearance relatively unimportant. Mexico accounts for about 88 percent of henequen production, with an output of 264,600,000 pounds in 1948 compared with a wartime average of 256,700,000 and a prewar average of 212,100,000 pounds.

Cuban production of henequen, which was estimated at 28,300,000 pounds in 1948, is approximately equal to the prewar average output and only slightly greater than the wartime average of 27,500,000 pounds.

The fiber produced in El Salvador is actually Agave letonae but is marketed as "Salvadoran sisal" or "Salvadoran henequen" and has qualities much like henequen. Production in 1948 was estimated at about 6,500,000 pounds compared with a prewar average of 6,400,000 and a wartime average of 8,300,000 pounds.

The demand for hard fibers during the war and early postwar periods has encouraged expansion in production, and experimental plantings with small production of henequen fiber have been reported in Honduras, Costa Rica, and Spain.

Sisal is somewhat coarser than abacá and generally more flexible than henequen. It is, therefore, suitable for strong cordage with good appearance. It is used both as a substitute for abacá in heavy rope and for commercial twine of good quality.

British East Africa accounts for the greatest share of the world production of sisal, with 357,400,000 pounds or 61 percent of the total of 581,500,000 pounds in 1948, compared with a prewar average of 261,000,000 pounds or 52 percent of the total of 506,000,000 pounds in 1934–38. The wartime average of 291,600,000 pounds in British East Africa is in line with the steady upward trend of sisal production throughout the whole sisal producing world.

Indonesia, as was explained in the foregoing paragraph on abacá production in that country, was an important source of hard fibers prior to 1941 but was reduced to a minor source because of war damage and civil unrest. Recovery of the sisal industry has been negligible, and production in 1948 is estimated from fragmentary information to approximate only 6,400,000 pounds.

Mozambique ranked third in sisal production until 1948 when its output of 41,700,000 pounds was exceeded not only by British East Africa, which consistently ranks first, and Haiti, which replaced Indonesia in second place toward the close of the war, but also by Brazil where production increased from a negligible quantity as late as 1939 or 1940 to 52,900,000 pounds in 1948.

The only decreases in production since the prewar period occurred in African and Asiatic countries where food production competed with the fiber industry for labor or where shipping or economic conditions tended to discourage fiber output.

Abacá (manila fiber): World production and distribution to countries of initial destination, 1935–38 average, 1947, and January–June 1948

[Quantity in 1,000 pounds]

Country of initial distribution	1935–38 average		1947		1948 (6 months) [1]	
	Philippines [2]		Philippines [2] and Central America		Philippines [2] and Central America	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
Production [3]	400,000		[4] 277,210		[5] 136,942	
Exports,[3] total	364,850	100.0	[6] 246,489	100.0	[7] 121,901	100.0
United States	83,089	22.8	[6] 182,998	74.2	[7] 65,527	53.7
Canada	3,474	1.0	2,338	1.0	822	.7
United Kingdom	93,343	25.5	18,571	7.5	13,132	10.8
Belgium	11,600	3.2	7,738	3.1	3,125	2.6
Denmark	1,726	.4	5,795	2.4	4,044	3.3
Finland	84	[8]				
France	8,214	2.2	4,863	2.0	4	[8]
Germany	9,577	2.6	1,489	.6	2,787	2.3
Iceland	48	[8]				
India			2,125	.9	135	.1
Italy	3,393	1.0	195	.1	431	.4
Netherlands	5,677	1.6	619	.3	1,006	.8
Norway	4,385	1.2	4,681	1.9	2,968	2.4
Portugal	4	[8]	537	.2	689	.6
Sweden	999	.3	2,903	1.2	569	.5
Turkey	282	.1	111	[8]	202	.2
Spain	1,924	.5	2,553	1.0	296	.2
Australia and New Zealand	6,056	1.6	1,457	.6	12	[8]
South Africa, Union of	912	.2	2,360	1.0	406	0.3
Japan	114,262	31.3	2,573	1.0	23,148	19.0
China	981	.3	2,010	.8	1,666	1.4
South America	400	.1	573	.2	794	.6
Others	14,420	4.0			138	.1

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Includes loose and unbaled fiber consumed locally.
[3] Production and exports from Indonesia included in statistics on sisal. Production and exports from British North Borneo negligible. Negligible quantities are produced and consumed in Ecuador.
[4] Includes 36,480,000 pounds of Central American abacá.
[5] Includes 21,016,000 pounds of Central American abacá.
[6] Includes 35,094,000 pounds of Central American abacá.
[7] Includes 20,211,000 pounds of Central American abacá.
[8] Less than one-tenth of 1 percent.

Source: Official statistics and trade estimates. (Copied from Department of Commerce publication, World Study of Hard Fibers and Hard Fiber Products, pt. I, page 11.)

Our Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker members of the Merchant Marine Committee have frequently commented among themselves, and sometimes publicly, on efforts which are constantly being made to curtail our merchant marine. We have deplored these efforts as well as the equally dangerous lethargy of the public toward national defense in general and its component part, the merchant marine, in particular.

As the present emergency unfolds, our position as stanch advocates of a large merchant marine becomes more and more justifiable. As a marine in the South Pacific during the early phases of World War II, I learned the hard way how essential the merchant marine is to all military operations, especially the amphibious ones far from home.

I read with great interest an article in the May issue of Marine News, written by Brig. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, an aviator, and national president of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association, setting forth the essential character of the merchant marine in connection with aviation. It is a very timely article and I strongly recommend it to Members of Congress. General Maas, in addition to being a distinguished Marine Corps officer, will be well remembered as a Member of Congress and an outstanding authority on national defense.

His article follows:

WHY DO WE NEED A MERCHANT MARINE?

(By Brig. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, USMCR, national president, Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association)

Why are we letting our shipping and our shipbuilding industry fall into a dangerous state? Is it just carelessness upon the part of national leaders? Is this indifference merely thoughtlessness, or is there something far more sinister underneath it all, that is capitalizing upon our indifference and carelessness?

How can we be so thoughtless, however, in the face of the fact that Russia is striving mightily to speed up the creation of a great merchant marine, a powerful navy, and a vast shipbuilding industry? How can our leaders longer ignore the lessons of history and the glaring facts of today? Is there some subtle sabotaging going on to lead us into the same trap that befell us after World War I?

As an aviator, who has participated in two world wars and is subject to call for any future war, like thousands of other aviators, I want to know what is happening to our future supply lines. We can't fly the planes and drop the bombs where they will have to be dropped, unless the supplies and the bombs can be delivered to our advanced air bases.

It is useless and a waste to build the airplanes if we aren't to have the gas to fly them and the bombs to drop from them available at our operating bases.

We want to know what goes on here.

An aviator with 33 years' flying experience, I know that we are in the "air age." Today the dominant arena of war is in the air.

Millions of passengers now fly. Mail, express, and even freight now go by airplane. The Berlin airlift fed a huge city for months, even flew in coal to keep it warm.

Then why do we need a merchant marine? Hasn't the airplane made the ocean surface vessel obsolete?

No; the airplane has no more supplanted the oceangoing vessel than it has the railroad train.

I am an ardent enthusiast of aviation, both in commerce and in military security, but as a practical businessman, and a marine aviator, service in two wars has taught me that a merchant marine is not only still essential, but is, in fact, more vital to our future economy and our military security than ever before.

The great nations of history have been the successful maritime ones, and they were great only when they were active and aggressive in world commerce. It was the nation which had the most and the best ships that usually dominated the world, for good or bad.

A nation with a large successful merchant fleet, plying the trade routes of the world, if peacefully inclined, can be the dominant factor in maintaining the peace of the world, or if bent upon conquest and aggression, can upset the peace of the world.

This is true even of a nation that might lead the world in aviation. Until airplanes can carry all of the intercontinental commerce of the world, including the bulky grains and fuels, and can carry them as cheaply and as safely as ships can, the airplane will not supplant ocean ships.

So long as the bulk of the world's shipping and passengers can be transported cheaper and more safely in surface transportation, so long will the railroads and shipping lines be a major factor in the economy and defense of this Nation. To gain and maintain air supremacy for peace or war, requires a tremendous support from surface transportation on land and sea. The astounding amount of gasoline and oil alone for refueling the planes that are away from their own base still must be transported on the surface. The repair and maintenance supplies and machinery, the replacement parts—yes, the very food to feed the maintenance and operation personnel all over the world necessary to a world air force, civil or military—must be transported in unbelievable quantities by a huge surface transportation system, over land and on the water.

Many people, even air experts, seem not to realize or to forget this fundamental fact.

I commanded two combat air bases on Okinawa during that last combat operation of the war. Fantastic amounts of fuel, parts, food, ammunition, and supplies of all kinds were needed in a never-ending torrent. Most of the aviators there had not the slightest idea that every ounce of it came across the ocean in hundreds and hundreds of shiploads.

Not only most of these same aviators, but unthinking thousands of laymen, took the delivery of these vital supplies to Okinawa for granted. All they thought of was the thrilling "delivery" of these supplies to the enemy—in bombing raids. How they first got to Okinawa never entered their heads. So they thought that all there was to bombing Japan into submission was flying the bombs from Okinawa to Japan.

Actually, that is not what knocked Japan out, anyway. It was the failure of Japan to maintain her supply routes. She failed because we sank too many of her ships and she didn't have the capacity to build replacements fast enough to keep supplies moving.

Japan already was defeated before the major sustained bombing raids on Japan proper even began. It was principally submarines and carrier-based aircraft that sank the Jap shipping. The shore-based aircraft alone could not have done it. But land-based air power could not have even helped in the job without the surface Navy, including its vast troop transports and cargo ships, as they had to first secure and then maintain the Air Force's overseas bases.

The advent of the A bomb and the prospect of the H bomb have not made surface ships obsolete; quite the contrary. These postwar developments have emphasized the vastly increased need for more and better, and particularly faster, surface vessels.

The Liberty and the Victory ships will no longer be adequate. We must build up a great merchant marine of the newest and most modern passenger and cargo ships to be ready instantly to perform this gigantic but absolutely vital transport job for the military, if another war comes.

We will never again have time to get ready after the world is set on fire. We will have to start fighting such a war with what we have on hand the day such a war starts.

At the same time, we will have to have in operation a great shipbuilding industry, for the war losses will be staggering, and we must be prepared and capable of not only replacing those losses but of tremendous expansion in the production of merchant-type ships as well as war vessels.

Therefore, in peacetime we must build up the United States into the leading position in the shipping world, for two vital reasons.

First, we must have in being and fully manned a great merchant fleet. This means it must be in daily operations.

Second, to keep such a fleet modern, and to be capable of expanding shipbuilding in time of war, we must keep the plant not only fully operating but abreast of every latest development and improvement in ship construction. Otherwise, we will fall far behind in the latest techniques and advances in ship design and building. We will try to start up again, but we will have to start where we left off. That won't be good enough. That will be too late. We simply have to keep ahead day by day. We cannot afford to fall behind for a single day.

Because this is vital to our very existence as a nation, because the future of civilization, as we know and love it, is dependent upon the continuance of a vibrant, healthy, and vigorous shipbuilding industry in this country, a very substantial share of the responsibility devolves upon the Government to aid the shipping industry in attaining this result.

Postwar Defense Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 26 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Where Did Defense Billions Go?" published in the U. S. News and World Report.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE DID DEFENSE BILLIONS GO?

PAY, SUPPLIES, OVERHEAD TOOK MOST DOLLARS

What fifty billion defense dollars bought.

No new tanks, no new Navy, no big guns. Only $1 in $7 has gone to buy arms. Most of the money went for salaries, supplies, freight, other services performed.

Defense housekeeping takes $2 of every $3 spent. That's why new billions are needed.

Taxpayers, in 4 years of cold war, put up a record $50,000,000,000 for military defense. At that price—more than twice the 4-year cost of World War I—the American public was assured that it was buying security.

War, a minor war in Korea, is providing the first test of that $50,000,000,000 defense. It shows United States to be short of almost everything. Mr Truman wants an additional $10,000,000,000 just as a starter. He is planning to seek other new billions for military aid to other countries and for new weapons.

Even top-ranking generals and admirals are asking what happened to the $50,000,000,000 already spent. They want to know: Where are the new guns? Where are the new tanks that were planned? Where are the planes that were to stop land attacks and win wars? How about the new postwar weapons? Where did all the money go?

In what follows, you get a factual report of just what happened to the $50,000,000,000 spent between June 1946, when postwar demobilization ended, and June 1950, when the Korean war began. During the 4-year period:

Half of those defense dollars have gone to pay military salaries. With the pay scale raised far above wartime levels, this cost amounts to $24,900,000,000 of the $50,000,000,000 spent. Wages of civilian defense employees alone cost about $8,000,000,000, or more than the total spent on all weapons, planes, and equipment.

Two-thirds of all military spending has gone for services performed, not for expensive weapons or supplies bought. That includes pay, travel, telephone bills, freight costs, rents, pensions, other services. In addition, $8,000,000,000 has been spent for supplies already used—food, fuel, ammunition, clothing, materials of all kinds.

Only $1 in $7 since the war has been spent on arms of any kind. One in sixteen has gone for equipment other than aircraft. Out of $50,000,000,000, $4,000,000,000 was invested in aircraft, $3,100,000,000 for all other equipment—guns, ships, trucks, radar, new weapons, machinery, and noncombat equipment such as furniture, typewriters and passenger automobiles.

Spending on combat equipment has been less than enough to replace worn-out items. No new tanks have been bought; only a few World War II left-overs have been remodeled. Buying of new weapons has scarcely begun—most are in the planning or testing stage. No big artillery guns, rifles, machine guns, or new naval guns have been purchased. Deadly new skysweeper antiaircraft guns have been developed, but none bought. No new Navy ships have been ordered, only a few completed or remodeled. Even the $4,000,000,000 spent on big bombers and fast fighter planes has not replaced the number of planes worn out during postwar years.

On weapons alone spending over four postwar years totaled only $600,000,000. That's less than the amount spent on military travel, half the cost of shipping military freight, and barely twice the amount spent for rent and utilities at military installations. Construction, largely of housing on defense posts, cost half again as much as the total spent on new weapons.

After spending fifty billions in 4 years, military planners now can give the following accounting of war strength bought:

On land the number of fighting divisions has actually dropped from 17 divisions when cold war began in mid-1946 to 10 divisions now. The amount of combat equipment—tanks, armored cars, trucks, artillery, jeeps, and small arms—has grown smaller, not larger. New antitank weapons and airborne tanks have been developed, but none bought

with the fifty billions. Manpower of the Army, too, has been cut back gradually. Army ground, air, and service forces numbered 1,891,000 then, compared with a combined Army and Air Force strength now of 1,003,000 men.

In air power, the number of air groups has declined from 52 to 48, the number of available planes reduced sharply. With more than half of the billions spent on combat equipment going for new aircraft, the Air Force and Navy have bought a total of 8,684 new planes. Yet a much larger number of planes has been worn out during this period, cutting the number of planes on hand from about 47,500 to 30,000, including those now in storage. Most of the country's new combat equipment has been in big, long-range bombers and fast jet fighters. But, even so, the rate of production has failed to replace the number of planes being junked. Output at the end of the 4-year period reached about 215 aircraft a month, compared with 1,350 a month being built 6 months before Pearl Harbor.

At sea the picture is the same. Number of combat ships in service during the time fifty billions was being spent, declined from 291 to 245. A few ships, ordered in wartime, were completed, but more were junked. Manpower for the Navy went down from 985,288 to 379,900. The number of Navy installations was cut far back.

The only big Navy building project planned, for a super aircraft carrier, was scuttled. Plans for an atomic submarine were made, but no construction was paid for out of the fifty billions.

Where the fifty billions went, with so little real combat strength bought, may be seen by digging a little deeper into the figures.

Military housekeeping took most of it. Of the defense dollars going for pay, about $18,700,000,000 went to noncombat servicemen and civilians, with only $6,200,000,000 going to men in combat units. Of the $8,000,000,000 spent on supplies, only about a fourth went to combat personnel—the rest was spent on maintaining service troops and overhead personnel. Service costs in the form of transportation, printing, rent, telegraph and telephone bills, and other expenses amount to a flat $5,500,000,000. Pensions and other outlays add $3,600,000,000 to noncombat costs. Total charges for housekeeping may be computed at $34,700,000,000 of the $50,000,000,000. That's more than $2 out of every $3 spent.

Actual war strength, bought with the remaining billions, amounts to a force of fighting men that cost about $8,200,000,000 to pay and support, plus a fleet of new planes costing $4,000,000,000, and a stock of other war equipment costing $3,100,000,000. That is a total of $15,300,000,000 spent directly on men and machines, for use in fighting, out of $50,000,000,000 paid by United States taxpayers.

What it all points to is a big increase ahead in military spending to step up that actual war strength, which got only 30 percent of the billions poured into defense since the war's end. This means a sharp rise in orders for weapons, tanks, planes, ships, trucks, other equipment that has been neglected in order to pay high housekeeping costs. It also means a rise in pay and support of actual fighting men, now only a quarter of the Nation's defense manpower.

More billions needed to bring fighting strength up in line with overhead size appear likely to raise United States defense commitments for the year ahead from a planned $13,500,000,000 to $28,000,000,000 or more. Most of the increase is to be in orders for industry, not in immediate cash outlays. Needed tanks, for example, will take more than a year to start producing in quantity. Output of support planes and ships will take even longer to step up. Antitank guns will take at least 6 months to get into production. At the same time, an increase in combat manpower will mean some larger outlays at once for pay and support.

These added billions, moreover, are largely for arms that could have been bought with a portion of the dollars spent on housekeeping. If the amount spent on weapons and equipment had been 50 percent instead of 14 percent of postwar defense outlays, for example, military buyers could have purchased new postwar weapons and full equipment for 100 army divisions, or more than were used in World War II; plus 100 air groups, more than are now asked by the Air Force; plus 50 big aircraft carriers, twice the number in use at the peak of the last war.

That's the amazing picture of this country's 50 billion defense dollars—how they were spent and the results of that spending. It shows a vast housekeeping job that has eaten up about 70 percent of every dollar that has gone into postwar defense.

It explains, to a large degree, why the United States now is setting out to police the world with only 10 divisions armed largely with World War II equipment and supported largely with wartime planes and ships, against a potential enemy that has 170 well-equipped and well-supported divisions.

And it indicates that future arms spending must rise far above the present rate if real strength is to be bought, especially if overhead outlays continue to be made in the style to which the planners are now accustomed.

National Defense Investigating Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is quite apparent that with the program for partial mobilization, it becomes necessary that a special committee be appointed to study the operation of this program, particularly in terms of procurement, the types and terms of contracts awarded, the methods of such awards, with special emphasis on the utilization of the facilities of small-business concerns. To maintain the structure of our economy, I deem it essential that the geographic distribution of contracts and the location of plants and facilities be taken fully into consideration in the awarding of such contracts.

Of special importance to such a committee would be the continued surveillance of the performance of contracts and the accountings required of contractors, concerning which the experience in the late war demonstrated a need for congressional inspection.

The solid work of the Truman committee during World War II conclusively proved that such a committee is an integral and essential part of an active and vigorous mobilization program. Fraud and deceit in all procurement orders must be ferreted out and severely punished. Undue and fraudulent profits must be prevented. We are all working together in this emergency. No one segment of our population and no one individual must profit at the expense of our country. Vigilance must be the watchword.

The following is the text of the resolution (H. Res. 735) I have introduced to create such a committee:

Resolved, That a special committee of seven Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the operation of the program for the procurement and construction of supplies, materials, munitions, vehicles, aircraft, vessels, plants, camps, and other articles and facilities in connection with the national defense, including (1) the types and terms of contracts awarded on behalf of the United States; (2) the methods by which such contracts are awarded and contractors selected; (3) the utilization of the facilities of small-business concerns, through subcontracts or otherwise; (4) the geographic distribution of contracts and location of plants and facilities; (5) the effect of such program with respect to labor and the migration of labor; (6) the performance of contracts and the accountings required of contractors; (7) benefits accruing to contractors with respect to amortization for the purposes of taxation or otherwise; (8) practices of management of labor, and prices, fees, and charges, which interfere with such program or unduly increase its cost; and (9) such other matters as the committee deems appropriate. The committee shall report to the House, as soon as practicable, the results of its study and investigation, together with is recommendations.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistance, to require by subpena, or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents to make such investigation, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to incur such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Arms for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of July 24, 1950:

ARMS FOR FREEDOM

Spurred by the war in Korea, which has set alarm bells ringing throughout the whole free world, the permanent organization of the North Atlantic Council begins work in London tomorrow to bolster the defenses of the Atlantic community against both the Soviet menace and the possibility of new Koreas closer home. This organization, consisting of deputies of the 12 North Atlantic Treaty nations, was created at the Council's last session, in May, to give effect

to defense plans previously agreed upon. But the Korean war, by reason of its revelations and its implications, has changed the entire world picture since that time. That has also changed both the scope and the timetable of the previous defense plans, and therewith also the task which now confronts the deputies.

The United States has already taken account of the new situation by embarking on a partial mobilization of both its military and civilian resources at an initial cost of $10,000,000,000, which may swell to twice that amount before the year is out and may raise the total all-around military expenditures to around $30,000,000,000 a year. The United States is therefore going into the London meeting prepared to call upon our Atlantic allies to match our effort by a proportional effort on their part, and is prepared to help them in it far beyond the $1,222,500,000 already appropriated for the second year of foreign military aid, up to an additional $5,000,000,000 if that much can be used efficiently and effectively.

Even if this additional foreign military aid is already included in the prospective total of military expenditures, that total still represents a staggering sum which would raise the Federal budget far above the present level and would allot one-half and more of all Federal expenditures to military purposes. In comparison Britain and other European countries are spending no more than 25 percent of their budget for military purposes, and some considerably less. The American Government is fully aware, of course, that the European countries still labor under the after-effects of the last war, and are therefore unable to rearm either as far or as fast as the United States, with its population of more than 150,000,000 and its vast productive machinery. This is one reason for American economic and military aid to them. But the American Government does feel that the European countries can and must do far more to help themselves than they have done heretofore, and that on their willingness and determination to do so depend both their own safety and that of the whole free world.

These considerations are based both on the lessons of the war in Korea and on a new appraisal of the world situation, for the Korean war has shown that the Soviets are no longer satisfied with a cold war, but are willing to plunge, by proxy to their satellites, into hot wars whenever and wherever this appears advantageous, irrespective of the risks involved. In consequence, the Western World must be prepared for similar developments elsewhere, not only in Asia but also in the Middle East and Europe itself.

Yet the same Korean developments have also demonstrated how ill-prepared the free nations are to cope with such contingencies. For though the United States and five other nations, acting under a mandate from the United Nations jumped into the breach within a few days after the outbreak of hostilities, they have not as yet been able to stop the Communist attacks and have suffered reverses which the Communists can exploit to shake confidence in their military prowess. Moreover, the deflection of Allied forces to Korea and other Asiatic trouble spots has left western Europe even more defenseless than it has been heretofore.

All these developments have been possible only because the free world, putting its trust in Soviet promises and paper bulwarks, dismantled its mighty military machine after the last war and sought to return to peacetime normalcy and business and politics as usual before peace had been achieved. As a result, it is today less well prepared to withstand a new totalitarian onslaught than in the days of Hitler and the Japanese war lords. The Korean war has at last dispelled the last shreds of our complacency, and the whole American people stand united in determination to meet the Communist challenge and to bear whatever sacrifices this may involve. They are confident that their allies and all free nations will follow the example they have set. If these sacrifices prevent a world war, as we hope they will, they will be worth all they cost.

Authorize That Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach an editorial from the July 15 issue of the Milwaukee Journal. It is a clear statement of the faith of the present administration in the St. Lawrence seaway project and the country's need for its immediate authorization.

AUTHORIZE THAT SEAWAY

President Truman has denied a Canadian report that he would bypass Congress and order the Army engineers to start immediately on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

Washington points out that if the President should bypass Congress it would still have to supply the funds for the work. Congress might be reluctant to do so if it felt that the President had tried to put something over.

This doesn't mean, the President was careful to point out, that he is any less eager to get the seaway project under way. He thinks it is vital to national security. And he has the recent report of the National Security Resources Board to back him up

President Roosevelt thought that the project was so important to national security that he wanted to build it during the last war. His advisers talked him out of it. But the need is even greater now. The United States could well use the additional power that the project would bring the Northeast and other heavy industrial areas, including New York State. The industrial Middle West needs access to Labrador and Venezuela iron ore.

These things are important now. They would be immensely more important in any war, or in any all-out effort to build up our defenses to stave off war. If TVA power had not proven its value before World War II it certainly justified itself in aiding wartime manufacturing. The same would be true of the seaway and its parallel power projects.

The seaway project should be authorized now. If trouble comes before it can be built, we will lose nothing. If trouble holds off, we can build the entire project and add to the industrial strength for the day when we may need it even more than we do now.

Letters From Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, our operations in Korea have focused the attention of the American people upon the explosive potential in the Far East. Public interest in our Pacific problems may well be the force which will bring about awareness of the difficulties we face and prevent further Communist expansion in that hemisphere.

I am including with my remarks excerpts from a series of letters appearing in the July 1950 issue of Connecticut Industry. They are anonymous and point out the author's fears as to Russia's intentions in the Far East. They show particular foresight as they were written prior to the Korean war. I do not agree with many of the author's conclusions or his premises, but feel that as a first-hand account they are of value to the Members of Congress.

LETTERS FROM ASIA

BY A CONNECTICUT MAN WHOSE IDENTITY MUST REMAIN ANONYMOUS FOR THE PRESENT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Because the following excerpts from letters written to the editor on December 11, 1949, and April 28, 1950, are so revealing of conditions in China and elsewhere in Asia, and contain some thought-provoking suggestions as to the role America should play in order to have a chance to win the cold war, Connecticut Industry reproduces them for its readers. The writer, because of his present connections, must remain anonymous as a protective measure. However, if any reader of these letters desires to dispatch a message to the writer, it will be forwarded by Connecticut Industry to his last address "somewhere in Asia.")

LETTER OF DECEMBER 11, 1949

I left Shanghai on January 19, 1949, and went to Peiping. I never did get back to Shanghai. My mail accumulated there for 10 months. Among my several letters was one from you which I never saw. When the boys who had been awaiting me in Shanghai finally got out in September they had a hell of a time with the Commies who were particularly difficult about any documents or written material in the possession of the "American imperialists." To keep my mail out of the hands of the Communists the boys had to destroy it.

All during the fall of 1948 the Kuomintang officials were making desperate efforts to steal everything of value in China with a view to liquidating and converting it into United States dollars in their private bank accounts in the States. As a matter of fact the war has been merely a stalling for time on the part of the top Kuomintang officials for some time now. They long ago knew the war was lost and since then have been prolonging it as a source of quick income and as a means of winning time to convert and transfer assets.

Well, the United States millions that I had been watchdogging for 3 years was a nice piece. I successfully countered every move those crooks made. By the end of the year they were desperate. On January 5 they threw us out on the pretext of necessary curtailment of staff despite the fact that the whole foreign staff were down in writing offering to stay on the job through June 30 without pay or compensation of any kind On the fifth we got notice to turn over to the Chinese management on the sixth and quit the premises forthwith. As late as October 1947 I had had word through the Communist underground that the Communists planned to continue and expand my program when they took over. In fact at that time they were offering us $10,000 payable in the United States in advance, plus all living expenses in China, for every man I would send into their territory. I note this as being of historical importance because it shows that up to that time the

Chinese Communist Party was independent of Moscow and anticipated collaboration with the western powers when and if they took over China.

It was to recheck these facts that I went to Peiping in January 1949.

Sometime between these two dates the Russians took over.

I believe this happened sometime in the winter of 1947–48.

After Wedemeyer's second visit to China, the United States Government gave quite a good deal of additional military aid to the Nationalists. This was mostly in the way of ammunition, training of Chinese troops, aircraft, field artillery, and the like.

No amount of indirect military aid would have been properly used by the Kuomintang. But inefficiently as they were using it, we gave them so much that it was turning the tide against the Communists by late winter and early spring in 1947 and 1948 respectively. It was not so much that the Kuomintang was winning so many battles nor that they were killing so many Communist troops. It was just that the Communists were very, very tired and the new energy and fire power of the Kuomintang was a little more than they could take. This was probably more true of the civilian peasantry than of the troops.

As far as the peasantry were concerned, the Communist army could not afford to meet the Kuomintang in pitched battle; so whenever the Kuomintang decided to launch an offensive in any area the Ba Lu had to fall back and leave that territory to the tender mercies of the Kuomintang. They would eventually harass the Kuomintang out of there again, but in that interim the poor peasants got it in the neck, particularly those who might have been friendly to the Communists. So the civilians were really having a very rough time and had no means or any hopes of means of defending themselves or being protected by the Ba Lu.

In areas where the Kuomintang could not penetrate, they mercilessly bombed and strafed. Here again it was morale destroying to the peasantry because the Ba Lu couldn't defend them against air attack. They couldn't even shoot at the attacking planes.

Under this strain for year after year the peasants were getting around to where they wanted to see some real successes for Communist arms and that damned soon or they didn't want to play ball on their team any more.

The Communists in the Ba Lu on the other hand were helpless to meet the new strength of the Kuomintang. Their old Japanese equipment was wearing out and they were running out of ammunition for it. Their newly captured American equipment was wonderful but they had no ammunition for it and didn't know how to use it. Also they had no gasoline. Also they were completely out of drugs for their wounded.

MOSCOW ASKED TO TAKE OVER

The Communists went to Moscow on bended knees because they had no choice. They were losing. For them to lose in China meant that every Communist, every relative of a Communist, every friend of a Communist would have been hunted down like a mad dog and at least shot, and probably tortured first and shot afterward. You must understand that fact. The Kuomintang were a vicious bunch. Hitler had nothing on them for viciousness.

There had always been a pro-Moscow element in the Chinese Communist Party. When the Communists finally had to turn to Moscow there was a sort of coup d'état within the Communist Party and from that time on Liu Hsiao Chi, not Mao Tse Tung nor Chu Teh, was boss of the Communist Party of China. Russia picked up China for a song. All the Russians did in return for full control was to guarantee the Communists against military defeat and the loss of their heads.

Now here is the next important point.

Most foreigners expect the Communists to fall on their faces in China and have to come crying to the western powers for help. This would be true. It is a fact that under Communist administration and without aid from the western powers China will face famine and epidemic within 3 years. But this is provided they get no industrial capital support.

If it works out that way, the Russians will hack off Manchuria and Sinkiang, and throw the carcass of China back to the United States to feed for a few more years.

But the Russians do not expect it to work out that way. They expect to get the industrial capital. They expect to get Japan.

If it works out that way, then you can write Asia off. Five hundred million Chinese under Russian Communist dictatorship, tooled and equipped by 80,000,000 Japs also under Russian Communist dictatorship, will constitute the largest single wealth-producing unit in the world with the exception only of the United States. Combined with Russian resources, it will command 50 percent more production potential than does the United States. This force will sweep all before it in Asia and be in Delhi in 5 years.

With the fall of Asia, upon the exploitation of which all European nations depend, the rest of western Europe will go down the drain quickly.

The Americas will become a world island of capitalism with parts like the Argentine pretty much undependable in a fight. This isolated island can then be destroyed at leisure. If it sees fit to compete in world trade it will be bankrupted by subsidized competition. If it sees fit to fight, it will be destroyed by attrition. If it sees fit to sit tight and arm for defense, it will be engaged in an ever-more expensive arms race that will reduce the standard of living of the people to that of Asiatics and rob them of any vestiges of democratic process.

And, believe you me, if the Communists ever take America, they will strip the United States in such a manner as to make their stripping of eastern Germany, and Manchuria look like child's play. They will leave not so much as a screwdriver to the American people. They will leave us a handful of seed potatoes and tell us to go back to the soil until we shrive our souls of the poison of capitalistic education. I am not kidding. These Commies are playing for keeps and they hate our guts. And don't think that it will make any difference what popular opinion might be among the people of Communist countries if there were such a thing as popular opinion. The Communist Party rules not only the bodies but the minds of their victims. Whatever they do to us will be accepted as necessary for the good of our souls just as good Catholics once thought that heretics were fortunate to be burned alive because it got the devil out of them and gave their immortal souls a break.

KICKED OUT OF CHINA

So much for that. I hope that the American people will not stand idly by and watch this happen. Anyway, learning this kept me in Peiping until July 23. The Communists wiped out our services. They moved most of the best equipment to Manchuria. They reduced each individual shop to a small factory for making simple farming equipment, mostly of wood with a few bits of iron. They cursed out all the foreigners and said that we had been sabotaging the operation in the interests of American imperialism. Now that they had taken over in the name of the people things would be different. They were. They eliminated the bus service for the employees. They turned our model dormitories into unsanitary slum barracks, they eliminated the training program, gave the former mess hall to the Communist army as sleeping barracks, and put a wretched mess hall with a filthy, unsanitary kitchen into the former training building. They did away with the medical clinic altogether. They stopped production of lathes, planers, milling machines, etc., and started making wooden fan mills and the like.

It sure is different.

Well, I left Peiping on July 23, Tientsin on August 20, Inchon in Korea on August 28, Tokyo on September 20, and Hong Kong on October 30.

What I saw in Japan convinced me that the Russians have a damned good chance that their hopes may materialize and they may get Japan.

AMERICAN POLICIES MUTUALLY ANTAGONISTIC

MacArthur is doing a very good job of military occupation and administration. But economically he is helpless. He cannot do a thing within the framework of the confusion that is passed off on us as an American world economic policy.

The United States Government is trying to do several mutually antagonistic things at once.

1. Trying to prop up Britain. Britain cannot survive without the Empire. The names may be changed but unless Britain can dominate economically the areas that were the Empire, she cannot compete with Germany, Japan, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, Norway—not to mention the United States, Canada, and Australia. Propping up the United Kingdom reacts against the economic rehabilitation of Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, Holland, etc.—again not to mention Japan and India.

2. Trying to prop up the western European nations. These nations are natural competitors of England. They also depend heavily on the exploitation of the people in the so-called backward areas of the world. If they are built up England suffers. If England is built up they suffer. If either of them is built up, the backward areas suffer.

3. Trying to rehabilitate Japan. This brings a third interest into the conflict. Japan, the western European bloc, and Britain are all natural competitors for the privilege of exploiting the backward areas.

4. Trying to build up the backward areas, to introduce democracy there, to bulwark them against communism. Essentially this means giving them capital equipment to work with and breaking the stranglehold on them of the western European bloc, Britain, Canada, Australia, and Japan. This is diametrically opposed to the first three.

In the face of this situation, MacArthur can occupy and police Japan which he is doing well, but he cannot do a thing fundamental about permanent economic rehabilitation. Hence when he is forced out by public opinion not only throughout the world, but in America itself, I fear that Japan will fall into the hands of the Russians within a year from the time the American occupation forces pull out.

THAILAND

Thailand, formerly known as Siam, is the eastern anchor point for India. Turkey is the western anchor.

This is an unusual country. Nobody goes hungry over here. The climate is tropical. It is cool about three months out of the year and hot the rest of the time. Food grows the year round. These people need rice, fish, fruit, wooden houses, and cotton clothes. They produce a surplus of over one million tons of rice a year, there are fish in every mud puddle, fruit grows on the trees, they have an abundance of timber. All they need to import is cotton cloth.

They export in addition to rice, tin, lead, wolfram, teak, and shellac. This brings in some three hundred to five hundred million dollars a year. With this they buy

cloth, radios, telephones, automobiles, road building machinery, railroad equipment, aircraft, air-conditioning equipment, ice plants, refrigerators, and so forth. Most of this is done through the government, which controls about everything. The government officials are interested solely in how much "squeeze" they can make out of the purchases, and the foreign trading firms which sell to them are interested only in profits. Nobody gives a damn about construction, installation, erection, maintenance, repair, or the training of Siamese workers to operate and take care of the equipment that is brought in.

Nevertheless, the industrial equipment in use is increasing daily and gradually the people are coming to understand it and depend upon it. The time will shortly come when the government can no longer afford to totally ignore the necessity for operating the equipment with some degree of efficiency.

There is no such thing in the country as an engineering service or a first class engineering workshop.

The people are 100 percent pro-American.

Along with 10 of my former staff engineers from China, 5 of them British and 5 Americans, I have set up an engineering service organization. Our plans for this operation include a consulting engineering service (among the 11 of us there are very few aspects of engineering about which we do not know enough to give a very adequate consulting service); a construction, erection, and installation service; maintenance and repair service; a general purpose engineering works. * * *

(NOTE.—The remainder of this letter outlines in detail the preliminary plans for the operation of this engineering service.)

LETTER OF APRIL 28, 1950

Further on the score of United States policy in the Far East:

The most vicious mistake being foisted on the American people by the leading newspapers and magazines is the daily repeated fallacy that we must either cooperate with the Communists or support characters like Chiang Kai-shek. This smells very much like the Communist propaganda that people must chose between fascism and communism. I say to hell with this kind of phony talk. At home we want neither communism nor fascism and we make that very damned plain. We want something to which we give various names—many of them misleading, by the way—but which are all intended to convey the same idea: Democracy, free enterprise, popular government, representative government, government by the people; etc., etc.

While any of us who are intelligent freely admit that this concept is a hard one to achieve and to maintain, and that at best we never hope to achieve and maintain it in a state of 100-percent perfection, nevertheless, we insist on striving for it and refuse to accept an ultimatum that we must give up our hopes and efforts and settle either for fascism or communism.

We should take the same position in the international sphere. We don't have to accept Stalinism in China; nor do we have to accept Chiang Kai-shekism. The Chinese people do not want either of them any more than we do. However, the Communists all over the world have succeeded in convincing a lot of people that there are but these two alternatives and it is their successful propaganda to this effect that is their most powerful weapon in their continuous capturing of one people after another. If ever the people in any country come to the conclusion that they must choose between the two, they will in every case choose communism.

By taking the popular American press position, therefore, that there are only two choices, we are playing directly into the hands of the Communists.

Make no mistake, the alternative is not easy and it is the appalling aspect of the alternative that makes vote-conscious politicians shrink from it. I cannot outline the details of an alternative policy in this letter, but it would have to be derived from certain brutal and almost—to Americans—unbelievable facts which I shall outline briefly below:

1. There are not enough decent people in the ruling class of any Asiatic nation to make up a government. The reason for this is that the ruling class in any Asiatic nation is the educated class. An educated Asiatic, with a handful of exceptions, is a social menace. No matter how much western technology he may have learned, he has developed his philosophy along Asiatic lines. The fundamental psychosis of educated Asiatics is that it is stupid to work productively. The vicious type of western capitalist whom Marx portrays willfully exploited labor but was a little ashamed about it and tried to think up propaganda to justify it. The educated Asiatic is ashamed if he fails to exploit labor.

I know this is hard for you to believe, but it is a fact. The educated Asiatic is convinced that no man will do any productive work unless he absolutely has to. To do work then is public admission of the fact that you have been forced to it. This is prima facie evidence that you are not clever enough to avoid it. This in turn marks you as a dope.

Hence, there are not enough individual human beings among the upper classes of Asia from which to form decent governments for the several countries out here.

I am not moralizing or preaching, I am stating hard facts. How can you form governments of men who sincerely believe that it is stupid, futile, and undignified to plan and direct social production? How can you form governments of men whose honest conception of a brilliant man is one who knows that hunger will force some people to produce something and concludes from this that it is the role of the intelligent man carefully to protect himself from being sucked into this necessity-imposed labor so that he may have the leisure and mobility to scheme out the best way of manipulating the market, the laws, government officials, taxes, interest, and politics so as to enable him to appropriate the largest possible hunk of the wealth produced out of sheer necessity? How can you form governments of men who consider famine, plague, drought, and general poverty as a social asset in that it increases the leverage of those in power?

2. If I am right—and I assure you that I am—it follows that any government out here that is to be worth a damn must be protected against the educated ruling classes. This means it must be made up of a lot of poor devils who are uneducated, illiterate, inexperienced in management, and scared to death all the time.

3. This, in turn, means that if the American people are to do any real good for the Asiatic people they must through the United States Government go directly to the people of these Asiatic countries. They must assist them financially. But above that they must educate and guide them. The people here, in contradistinction to the educated ruling class, want American education and supervision. They, the people, never scream, "Sovereignty," when an American supervisor bawls them out for making mistakes and shows them how to go about the job in the right way. They, the people, grin in their utterly disarming Oriental way, thank the American for his assistance, and proceed to follow his instructions.

There are Americans who know this, but they fall into two categories: those like myself who are not politicians; and the politicians. The former are powerless to do anything about it. The latter, seeing the political dynamite in it, prefer to disacknowledge it.

Believe me, before we can assist democracy in Asia, we shall have to create some democracy to assist. Before we can assist free enterprise in Asia, we shall have to create some free enterprise to assist. The present governments of Asia are made up of men who are political tyrants and economic monopolists as well as being the worst kind of corrupt politicians.

The small savings of most of the rest of my staff engineers have been wiped out during the past 15 months. As an effective 14-man all-around engineering team (mentioned in letter of December 11, 1949) we no longer exist. The men are scattered from Karachi to Tokyo working for various firms and agencies. Four of us are digging in here and starting from the bottom. We are doing small construction and installation jobs for Standard Vacuum Oil and other dependable American firms here. Our plan is to build up a small staff of trained and dependable Siamese foremen and mechanics. I believe that there is going to be a fight and that this is probably the most strategic spot in the east. In fact, I believe that as American policy clarifies, Siam will become the Turkey of the east. In any case, whether we can keep this war to a cold one or whether it gets to the shooting stage, or whether Uncle Sam allows himself to be pushed out of here and has later to fight his way back in, or if he is smart enough to entrench himself here in the first place, either way it goes, American engineers with a loyal and trained Siamese working force might prove to be worth a great deal to our side.

The going is very rough though. We have to underbid the Chinese who bid dirt cheap and then cheat on materials, paying "squeeze" to cover it up. After underbidding these pirates, we then have to do work of American standards of quality with Siamese labor and practically no equipment. It takes a lot of engineering and a lot of plain hard work to make this trick come out right, believe me that it does.

Korea and Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a radio interview over Station WHAM, Rochester, N. Y., on the program Congress Speaks:

KOREA AND OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. COAR. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, this is Bob Coar. From the radio studios in the Nation's Capital, we bring you another edition of WHAM's weekly program, Congress Speaks. Tonight, WHAM presents an interview with Congressman KENNETH B. KEATING, of the Fortieth New York District.

Since the President's message concerning the Korean campaign and its effects on the domestic scene are uppermost in the minds of everyone these days, I want to ask Representative KEATING a few questions concerning his reaction and that of other Republican Congressmen.

Mr. KEATING, what did the Republicans in Congress think about the President's message last Wednesday?

Mr. KEATING. I think everyone reacted quite similarly. President Truman is our Commander in Chief and we must present a

united front to any threat to our national security. The Republican Party is resolved to back the United Nations action in Korea to the utmost and do all in our power to bring that war to a speedy and victorious conclusion.

The Republicans in Congress are cooperating to the fullest extent and will continue to do so.

Mr. COAR. Then you don't think that the President will have any difficulty in getting his recommendations relating to the war effort through Congress?

Mr. KEATING. No; I don't; that is, any reasonable recommendations. The Congress has acted very quickly thus far on such measures as the draft and the military-assistance program for Europe.

Mr. COAR. Mr. KEATING, there has been a good deal of discussion in the House of Representatives concerning the events and policies which preceded the aggression by the Communist forces of North Korea. What do you think of our past policies in Korea and Asia?

Mr. KEATING. Well, of course, our primary attention now must be directed to the exigencies of the present situation and how we may best cope with the terrific fight which we have on our hands in Korea.

However, while there is no sense in crying over spilt milk, it is a very foolish person who does not try to learn from past mistakes, and I must confess that I think our foreign policy toward Russia has contained some very grave errors in the past few years.

I think the American people are entitled to documentary evidence as to the chain of events which has led to the grim fact that our boys are dying in the rice paddies of Korea. Without speaking from any partisan point of view, I think some of the gaps in the President's speech might well be filled in a bit.

Mr. COAR. Where do you think the first mistakes in our foreign policy occurred, Congressman?

Mr. KEATING. I think that in order to get a clear picture of the entire sequence of events, you have to begin with Yalta, Tehran and Potsdam, those disastrous peace conferences with the Russians in which we allowed them to talk us into giving them so much of the territory which American boys had won at such a terrific cost.

Mr. COAR. You mean, for example, a large portion of Berlin?

Mr. KEATING. Exactly. And if we are not well prepared and very much on our guard in Berlin, that may well turn into the Korea of Europe. Just as, if we lose Korea to the northern Red troops, our prestige in the East and the will to resist communism will collapse, so if we lose Berlin, belief in American ability to contain Russian aggression in Europe will collapse, and Russia would be able to take over a demoralized Europe without difficulty.

In fact, with regard to Berlin and our unenviable position there, a constitutent from Henrietta recently wrote, "Even a Monroe County farmer would not think of disposing of all his property except a pasture in the center without at least providing for a lane in order to bring the cows home for milking."

Mr. COAR. That is certainly an apt illustration. But wasn't Korea a product of a United Nations decision?

Mr. KEATING. Yes; the United Nations actually created the two separate political entities in Korea; that is, it officially divided the country in half at the thirty-eighth parallel, but the United States and Russia had agreed to this division at previous conferences.

Mr. COAR. You think the division was the initial mistake in Korea, then?

Mr. KEATING. I certainly do. No sooner had the country been divided, than the Russians began to annex the northern half through treaties and Communist propaganda, in a pattern which has become all too familiar lately.

But even after the division was confirmed by United Nations action, we should have immediately decided on a foreign policy toward the Republic of Korea, instead of writing it off one moment and then, the next, deciding to defend it with American troops.

Instead, we seem to have merely been, in the words of Secretary of State Acheson, "waiting for the dust to settle," rather than formulating a definite policy.

Mr. COAR. What was the Army opinion on Korea?

Mr. KEATING. The Army was quite frank to say that they were not anxious to stay in Korea, but according to testimony given before congressional committees, there wasn't much agreement on any other phase of the situation.

For example, Congressman JUDD asked Secretary of State Marshall in 1948, "If North Korea and Manchuria should be taken over and organized by the Communists, do you think our position in Korea would long be tenable?" Marshall replied, "I think it would not be tenable." Later, in June 1949, General Helmick testified, "If the Russians decided to do so, they could take over South Korea without any great military difficulty. They are right there with large armies. Any troops that we have there would suffer another Bataan."

Mr. COAR. You mentioned that not all the generals shared that opinion.

Mr. KEATING. That's right. General Bolte testified later in the same hearings that he felt the Southern Korean troops were better equipped than the Northern ones and further that the Koreans would be definitely able to fill the vacuum left by the evacuation of our troops. These were the experts, the men on whose advice Congress was forced to base its decisions about the wisdom of providing military or economic aid for Korea.

Mr. COAR. How did other Government officials feel about the situation in Korea?

Mr. KEATING. There seems to have been a considerable difference of opinion there, too.

On February 7, 1950, Representative MCCORMACK, the majority leader of the House, who states the official administration view on important legislation, commented, "We established the Korean Republic. It is capable of maintaining internal order. It is capable of resisting any aggression from Northern Korea." This was his reason justifying the sending of economic aid to Korea when we did not have sufficient arms there to protect these supplies and assure that they would be used by the right people.

Yet, after this economic aid had been authorized, Senator CONNALLY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who is the spokesman for the Democratic foreign policy in the Senate, was asked in an interview whether "the suggestion that we abandon South Korea is going to be seriously considered?" To this question, Senator CONNALLY replied, "I am afraid it is going to be seriously considered." Then he was asked if Korea was not an essential part of defense strategy, to which the Senator replied, "No. Of course, any position like that is of some strategic importance. But I don't think it is very greatly important."

Certainly the Senator knew as well as anyone what the administration policy toward Korea was at that time, and he stated that Korea had been abandoned to her fate. Here the Congress was asked to send millions of dollars in economic aid to a country which the administration at that time did not believed we could defend, nor was it policy of the administration to attempt to defend it.

This was practically an engraved invitation to the Northern Korea Communist troops to come ahead and invade the southern part of the country.

Mr. COAR. You believe, then, Mr. KEATING, that the Russians had become convinced that we would not come to the rescue of South Korea in the event of attack?

Mr. KEATING. I think the Russians were undoubtedly as surprised by our action in sending troops and matériel to Korea, as we seem to have been over the attack from the north.

Mr. COAR. How do you account for our surprise at the attack?

Mr. KEATING. Of course, I am not a professional soldier, so I am not in a position to comment upon our intelligence operations, but I do think that the American public had been lulled into a false sense of security by the rash statements of responsible officials in high positions. For instance, on February 2 of this year, Secretary of Defense Johnson said he wanted "Joe Stalin to know that if he starts something at 4 o'clock in the morning, the fighting power and strength of America will be on the job at 5 o'clock in the morning."

On March 30 of this year President Truman said that none of the arms cuts that had been ordered would in any way endanger United States security.

Then, on April 12, when the President concluded his fifth year in office, he announced expansively that things never had been better and prospects for lasting peace were better than they had ever been since the start of the cold war in 1946—and he took credit for it, you will remember.

By April 21, Secretary of State Acheson had joined the happy throng. On that date he said he saw no immediate danger of war.

May was a banner month for the "everything is O. K." boys. May was also the month before June. And June was the month of the invasion of South Korea.

President Truman got things off to a good start on May 4. He said he saw no reason to fear that the cold war was about to turn into a shooting war. As of May 4, he said, world troubles were not as bad as those in the first half of 1946.

Finally on June 1, President Truman said the world was closer to peace than it had been in 5 years.

Mr. COAR. You think the American people should have been warned by the President of the seriousness of the situation?

Mr. KEATING. I certainly do. The American people do not have to be coddled or kept in the dark when the situation gets worse. The net result of these Pollyanna statements was that we only fooled ourselves and led the Communists to believe that they could march in and take over South Korea whenever it suited them.

If we had taken a firmer line and announced our intention to hold Korea, perhaps they would have realized the risk they assumed when they sent the Northern Korean troops to invade the southern Republic.

Mr. COAR. Mr. KEATING, do you think the Republicans will be influenced by these past actions to make an issue of the situation?

Mr. KEATING. No, I do not. The Republicans feel that the American people should know the facts about past mistakes, but that will not interfere in any way with our cooperation in the present undertaking in Korea. However, I do hope that in making plans for future foreign policy, more efforts will be made to consult with the Republicans and thus take our foreign policy out of politics. Foreign policy in these perilous days should be an unpartisan effort so that no administration, whether Democrat or Republican, would be tempted again to feel that the American people should be told only the bright side of the picture in an election year.

Mr. COAR. Thank you, Congresman KEATING, for your views on the current Korean situation and the United States position in the Far East.

Tribute to Paul M. Herzog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 26 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post carries a fine tribute to my friend, Mr. Paul M. Herzog, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, who has just been nominated for reappointment by the President.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NLRB CHAIRMAN

In nominating Paul M. Herzog for a second 5-year term as Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, President Truman made it plain that he had applied to the situation a form of selective service. "I know you had desired particularly to relinquish your duties on August 1," the President wrote to Mr. Herzog. "But the times are grave. All circumstances considered, I feel that I have no recourse except to ask you to continue to give your Government the benefit of your wisdom and your long experience." So, perforce, Mr. Herzog stays in harness. From the point of view of the national interest in this crucial period, the Presidential draft and Mr. Herzog's ungrudging acceptance of it deserve warm applause.

Mr. Herzog has served as Chairman of the NLRB since 1945. His tenure embraced, therefore, the difficulties of postwar reconversion and of adaptation to the Taft-Hartley Act, which drastically changed the Board's composition, functions, and procedures. The job has certainly not been an easy one, although he has done it with very little fanfare. He has dealt with labor and management in so fair and even-handed a fashion that his reappointment will be warmly endorsed on both sides. The country can feel relief that he is sticking at his post in the period of stress that lies ahead.

Expansion of the Business of the Equitable Life Assurance Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 26 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very interesting statement relative to the expansion of the business of the Equitable Life Assurance Society.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Equitable Life Assurance Society wrote $574,084,335 of new business during the first half of this year, bringing the Society's insurance in force at mid-year to $14,454,569,023, a record high, according to Thomas I. Parkinson, president.

Total assets of Equitable stood at $5,435,000,000, a record high.

Since the end of World War II, "life insurance investment funds have aided in keeping industry in high gear, ready for any emergency," Mr. Parkinson noted. He cited the Society's purchase-lease freight car plan as one example. Existing contracts and those now being closed will put the total fleet of approximately 18,000 freight cars on the rails within the next few months, he said. Under this 4-month-old plan, Equitable buys freight cars from manufacturers and leases them to the railroads on a daily rental basis. Equitable's investment in freight cars is expected shortly to approach $100,000,000.

A somewhat similar plan, recently announced, for the purchase-lease of Diesel locomotives has already resulted in contracts with Diesel manufacturers and railroads for 202 Diesel units, at a cost of $29,000,000, Mr. Parkinson revealed. Still pending are contracts for 111 Diesels, at a cost of $15,000,000.

"It is heartening to realize that the productive capacity of many key industries is far greater than it was in 1940," Mr. Parkinson said, "and this is due in large measure to life-insurance investment funds." Most of the capital being used to construct the 1,000-mile crude-oil pipeline from Longview, Tex., to Lima, Ohio, he said, is Equitable investment money. The society has investments of more than $100,000,000 in pipeline companies, and its total investment in the oil industry, which now operates a third greater capacity than in 1940, is in excess of $480,000,000.

The vitally important steel industry, with 21 percent greater capacity than a decade ago, has been able to do much of its postwar rebuilding with life-insurance funds, Mr. Parkinson continued. Equitable alone has approximately $150,000,000 invested in steel, he said. The electric-power industry, now considerably enlarged over prewar years, is another large outlet for investment funds, and Equitable's bond holdings in this industry are approximately $475,000,000.

Excerpt From Publication by Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 26 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from a recent publication by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover report.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM A RECENT PUBLICATION BY THE CITIZENS' COMMITTEE FOR THE HOOVER REPORT

Members of both parties want to go home with a good record on the Hoover report because of the strong public interest in it. But there's a bigger reason. Most Congressmen, remembering the mistakes of the past, realize that, in time of crisis, duplication, overlapping, and waste are doubly dangerous to the Nation.

This is a good time to remember that the late James V. Forrestal was a member of the Hoover Commission. This gallant public servant gave greatly of his waning strength to the preparation of the report. In it he saw promise of an end to the disunity and waste which hog-tied the armed services under his command (and very nearly produced another Pearl Harbor in 1948.)

Forrestal saw the Hoover Commission adopt the Eberstadt Task Force Report. Would that he could have lived to see it enacted into law through the Tydings Act. In the short year since then, the Armed Forces have made giant strides toward real unification for which the Nation may today give thanks.

In some quarters it has been implied that economies resulting from unification have crippled our troops in Korea. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Let's go back to the words of the Eberstadt Task Force: "Victory by bankruptcy may be the Machiavellian aim of the Kremlin. Burdens such as we are now bearing, if substantially increased, might become intolerable. The premium on economy therefore, becomes higher than ever before in history." Signatories of this statement included Raymond B. Allen, Hanson W. Baldwin, Chester I. Barnard, John J. McCloy, Robert P. Patterson, Gen. Robert E. Wood and such military advisers as Doolittle, Eisenhower, Mrs. Hobby, King, Moreell, Nimitz, and Spaatz.

Remember also one of the most significant findings of this great task force: In 1948 the heads of the three armed services were told that the Nation could afford no more than $15,000,000,000 for defense without endangering the economic stability of the very Nation they were assigned to protect. What happened then? Each one went off and drew up budgets, disgracefully padded budgets, of $10,000,000,000 apiece—total $30,000,000,000.

And what did we learn from that? That each of the three services believed its part of the defense job to be two-thirds of the whole job. This is a dangerous psychology, in peace or war. It was the psychology that brought the Nation blundering to the brink of all-out, full-scale, face-to-face war with Russia itself in 1948.

The Unification Act, to date the greatest achievement of the Hoover Commission, has put a stop to uncoordinated budgeting which, dull as it sounds, was at the very heart of military disunity. It has established lines of responsibility and authority which were sadly lacking before. Over the long run, this will save money. More importantly, it will save lives.

Remember, finally, that neither the Eberstadt committee, the Hoover Commission, the Citizens Committee, nor the Tydings Act made any recommendations, one way or the other, for cut-backs or increases in the amount or nature of military appropriations. It was not their job.

The Hoover Commission was concerned basically with two things: (1) Unified military thinking, planning, and organization; and (2) operating economies.

Endless opportunities exist and are being found for operating economies through coordinated purchasing activities. Defense Secretary Louis Johnson last year assigned Gen. Joseph T. McNarney to launch a hunt for operating economies in all the armed services. General McNarney retained Robert Heller & Associates, industrial engineers, to head up the search.

Some examples: 30,000 passenger vehicles, needlessly operated, were taken off the road on January 1, 1950, at an annual saving of $20,000,000. Thus, 3,500 officers and men were released for other duties at an additional saving of $10,000,000 a year. Still another example: The number of military attachés in foreign embassies were reduced 30 percent and their work coordinated. With a few millions here and a few there, General McNarney and his group are confident that operating savings well above $1,000,000,000 a year will result.

Putting the Finger on Raver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. JACKSON. of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in connection with remarks I made on the floor of the House on Monday, July 24, concerning the reference to Bonneville Power Administrator Paul J. Raver in a recent Reader's Digest article as another Socialist, I insert in the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Portland Oregonian, one of our leading Northwest newspapers, on July 25, on this subject.

This editorial sets forth clearly and concisely the facts which I presented to the House 2 days ago. The facts are that the editors of the Reader's Digest inserted this reference into an article entitled "What Does CVA Mean to You?" by former Governor Leslie A. Miller, of Wyoming. In my opinion, this is dishonest journalism. If the readers of the Reader's Digest have certain views, they should express them through their own editorials, and not through the pen of another person. They have every right to express these views, so long as they do so honestly.

The editorial appears below:

PUTTING THE FINGER ON RAVER

The article on the proposed Columbia Valley Authority in the July 21 issue of Reader's Digest, under the byline of ex-Governor Leslie A. Miller, of Wyoming, is a poor piece at best, with some errors in the few facts presented and consisting mostly of opinion and flat assertions without offering of evidence. But the odd part is that Mr. Miller denies having written at least one part of it, or knowledge of its inclusion.

This is the section which calls Dr. Paul J. Raver, Bonneville Administrator, a Socialist, and links him with two other old-time Socialists, Stephen Raushenbush, and Dr. Carl D. Thompson. These three, the article says, were neatly placed in strategic spots for promoting their Socialist dreams.

Though Administrator Raver, personally and as the official administering the Bonneville Act, has been thoroughly in accord with the public-power movement, no evidence has been produced by his detractors that he is now or ever has been a Socialist. (Mr. Raushenbush left the Interior Department in 1947 and became a United Nations consultant. Dr. Thompson died more than a year ago, after several years of retirement. They are not a present menace, if they ever were.)

The reference to Dr. Raver as also a Socialist led the Administrator to telephone Mr. Miller and ask how come? Mr. Miller said he did not know who had put that reference in the article, but that a piece such as that goes through many hands. This leads to speculation as to whether the entire article was ghost written. The question merits consideration since Mr. Miller, besides serving as Wyoming's Governor, was chairman of the Natural Resources Committee of the Hoover Commission for Reorganization of the Executive Branch. His name has weight.

Perhaps a clue to the use of this method of attack against CVA—the socialism line—may be found in a booklet published in January by the Electric Companies Advertising Program. It gave results of a public opinion poll showing, among other things, that: 48 percent of those questioned favor private ownership of electric light and power companies, 43 percent favor Government ownership, and 9 percent have no opinion; 63 percent approve TVA, 10 percent disapprove, and 27 percent have no opinion, but only 10 percent think socialism would be a good thing for the United States, 69 percent think it would be a bad thing, and 21 percent have no opinion.

"From the preceding charts," the booklet observed, "it is apparent that to link our fight to the TVA question would run us into a lot of opposition, most of it based on lack of knowledge. But to link our fight to socialism is something else again. The people do not want socialism. We're on favorable ground there."

It touches absurdity for opponents of a CVA—any sort of a CVA—to blanket out facts which may be advanced on both sides with a chorus of socialism. The issue needs better consideration than that. But since Mr. Miller denies sole authorship, we suspect that the article calling Administrator Raver a Socialist falls into this pattern, hence is suspect throughout.

Homebuilders Shatter All Records This Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 12, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a release of the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor titled: "Homebuilders Shatter All Records This Year—687,000 New Dwelling Units Started During First 6 Months of 1950."

HOMEBUILDERS SHATTER ALL RECORDS THIS YEAR—687,000 NEW DWELLING UNITS STARTED DURING FIRST 6 MONTHS OF 1950

The Nation's homebuilders between January and June 1950 scored an all-time high for any half year on record with a total of 687,000 new permanent nonfarm dwelling units started, according to preliminary estimates of the United States Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics. Late reports are expected to make the total even larger. The January–June total for 1950 was 53 percent above the 449,000-unit total for the comparable 1949 period.

The 142,000 dwelling units placed under construction in June outstripped all previous monthly peaks, but the volume was only slightly above the preliminary May figure. However, the June total represented a gain of almost 50 percent over June 1949.

Final reports brought total dwelling units started in the first quarter of 1950 up to 278,900, a sharp increase of 109,100 units, or 64 percent, above the same months of 1949. One-family home construction, the focal point of the present housing activity, accounted for 81 percent (226,000 units) of total housing volume for the first quarter of this year, against 77 percent (131,300 units) for the same period last year.

Although the increase in homebuilding was apparent in all sections of the country, urban housing assumed greater importance during this year's first quarter. New housing in urban areas accounted for 60 percent of all new dwelling units started, compared with 55 percent of the total last year for the January–March period.

Publicly owned housing accounted for a smaller proportion of all new housing this year than last, when the March quarters are compared. Less than 3,000 public units were put under construction during January, February, and March 1950, compared with more than 10,000 in the comparable months of 1949.

Although there was an increase from May to June in the number of dwelling units started, telegraphic reports indicate that the number of units for which permits were issued declined moderately from May levels in a majority of the reporting cities. Regionally, the largest decrease in permit issuance for new housing occurred in the Middle Atlantic, West South Central, and New England States. The Mountain States reported increases and the permit volume in the Pacific States remained about the same.

Number of new nonfarm dwelling units started, 1948, 1949, and 1950

	Number of dwelling units
1948	931,600
January	53,500
February	50,100
March	76,400
April	99,500
May	100,300
June	97,800
July	95,000
August	86,700
September	82,300
October	73,400
November	63,700
December	52,900
1949	1,025,100
January	50,000
February	50,400
March	69,400
April	88,300
May	95,400
June	95,500
July	96,100
August	99,000
September	102,900
October	104,300
November	95,500
December	78,300
1950:	
January	78,700
February	82,900
March	[1] 117,300
April	[2] 126,000
May	[2] 140,000
June	[2] 142,000

[1] Revised. [2] Preliminary.

Plant Gambling: Mobsters Move In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 26 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Plant Gambling: Mobsters Move In," published in the magazine Modern Industry for June 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLANT GAMBLING: MOBSTERS MOVE IN

Organized gambling in plants is a constantly increasing management headache.

Aside from any legal implications, gambling in the plant wastes time, depresses morale, hurts employee relations. It murders community relations. The gambling employee who loses in the long run—and who doesn't—sinks in debt, becomes a poor producer, gets his wife down on the job and the company.

Industrial unionism has incidently provided a perfect machinery for large-scale industrial gambling, which needs to be corrupted to be used.

To give the unions their due, gamblers would have been as interested in foremen as in union stewards. Foremen generally have access to other departments and would make good collectors, for either horse-race or numbers bets. But foremen are responsible to management, whose chief interest is in making a profit from production. If gambling interfered with maintenance of a productive work force, management would banish gambling. And, by and large, it has so far as foremen are concerned.

The union, on the other hand, is not committed to making the company profitable. If gamblers can see that friendly officers are elected, and that the latter appoint or help elect friendly stewards, all they need is a bit of demagoguery to keep their men in office while they collect the bets.

Best indication of how big the problem has become is, perhaps, the attack on Walter P. Reuther, president of United Automobile Workers Union, 26 months ago, and the similar shotgunning of his brother, Victor Reuther, 13 months ago.

Various theories have been advanced for these two ambushings, and for the melodramatic but ineffective dynamite threat upon UAW international headquarters last winter. It was done, said the dopesters, by either a disgruntled red, a disgruntled manufacturer, a disgruntled and discharged union organizer, or disgruntled gamblers.

Detroit police have investigated, the FBI has probed, the union has posted large rewards. Yet the names of the assailants, and their motives, are a greater mystery—publicly—than the answer to that congressional puzzler, "Who stole the Kansas City ballots?"

Similarity between union politics and big-city Democratic or Republican politics does not end with flare-ups of violence, nor with the unsolved mystery that shrouds not only the crimes but the very investigation of the crimes.

Little doubt remains that the Reuther shootings had their origin in gambling rackets. This belief, investigated by all who had official connection with the case, is the conviction of those who know the shootings best, MI can reveal. It is reinforced by the fact that no report has even been issued on the findings of two ace investigators the UAW brought in.

Even, or especially, in Detroit, no publicity has been given the activities of these sleuths, who once conducted a famous investigation of industrial espionage, piecing together damning evidence from torn notes discovered in detective agencies' wastebaskets.

The two were on the case at least from last October to last March, and may still be conducting their inquiry.

Had their probing turned up anything against the Communists, the employers, or even a lone disgruntled ex-employee of UAW, the union would undoubtedly have blazoned forth their findings. Newspapers know of their activity, but so far not a word has appeared of their hiring, their investigating, or their findings. Some force more persuasive than the union seems to be blanketing their probe in complete silence.

They are not talking, but the bulk of evidence still points at aggrieved gamblers.

Gambling interest in union machinery preceded Reuther's rise to power. When Walter Reuther was still a long-hair in the eyes of his top UAW colleagues, abstemiously withholding from poker games, and more interested in the long view than in the day-to-day unionism that absorbed his fellow executive-board members, gamblers were already infiltrating auto union locals, as well as others.

Once Reuther was established in the presidency, he had a natural desire to see that his fences were mended, his skirts clear. In at least one or two large local unions where numbers collectors had free run of the plant, two pro-Reuther slates popped up after Reuther's election, one consisting of friends of the numbers collectors who had been pre-election Reutherites; one of purer Reutherites.

The cowardly attack on the UAW president followed a local election in which pre-election, progambling Reutherites were defeated by the new Reutherites, despite presence of a left-wing slate in the election which split votes. The shooting of Victor Reuther followed similar maneuvering.

These facts have led to the conviction that gamblers were responsible: They would have the money to hire gunmen, would have no moral compunctions, would have no popular support to lose by the act, and would have the motives of revenge for loss of their privileges, or of warning union officers against further interference.

Where gamblers have gained a foothold, in unions as well as in politics, it is difficult to dislodge them. An employer may well think twice before fighting a group which can impute his opposition to antiunionism, can disrupt his work force, and can threaten him with the penalties of labor laws.

Only a joint effort by employer and anti-gambling union officials can gradually clean out such gangs by getting the gambling leaders off union members' necks.

Politics and Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the past there has been a tendency on the part of business people to say: "I am in business. Politics and business do not mix. It will hurt my business to take part in politics. Therefore, I must leave politics to other people."

This has been a great mistake on the part of business people. Politics is simply the machinery through which the citizens of the United States operate our Government.

It is the responsibility of every good citizen to participate in politics. This responsibility and obligation rests equally upon each citizen. It is only through active participation by everyone that our Government can remain sound, and America be preserved as the land of equal opportunity.

Of one thing we can be certain: If the good people do not participate in politics continuously and actively, the demagogs and machine politicians will always control the elections, and thus control the Government. This is one of the eternal truths so far as government is concerned, and the sooner this fact is recognized and accepted, the sooner business people can make their influence felt in the councils of government.

During the past one or two decades the trend to socialism has increased in this country, as well as throughout the world. Defenders of free enterprise have been fighting a desperate battle, but they have not had the support which they should have had.

This is the year when every person who believes in free enterprise, and who opposes socialism, should make an all-out effort to elect Representatives and Senators to the National Congress who believe in these principles.

I am glad to see an awakening to these facts on the part of business people. I hope that this awakening is just a beginning and that these influences which heretofore have been on the negative side will now become a great and positive influence on the side of those who believe in free enterprise and the American system and who are staging the battle in behalf of these principles.

As a part of my remarks, I include herewith two fine articles written by Mr. Clarence Haverty, president of the Haverty Furniture Co., in Atlanta, Ga. One of these articles is entitled "Don't Wash Your Hands of Your Liberty," and was printed in the June issue of the National Furniture Review. The other article by Mr. Haverty is entitled "Danger to Free Enterprise Lies in Our Ignoring Public Affairs." It was printed in the Chicago Market News, issue of June 22, 1950. I commend these articles to thoughtful people everywhere.

DON'T WASH YOUR HANDS OF YOUR LIBERTY

(By Clarence Haverty, president, Haverty Furniture Co., Inc., Atlanta, Ga., 1943 president NRFA)

We merchants have many obligations. Four of them are of major importance.

The first responsibility is to our customers. We must be sure that they receive full value in merchandise, service and courtesy.

The text is to our associates; to be sure that those who work for us, and with us, are fully and fairly compensated. In return, they must be required to give commensurate service. A retailer must be sure that his treatment of them is considerate and that they are happy in their work as well.

Third among our obligations is that due our stockholders. They have to receive a fair return on the investment they have entrusted to us to manage for them.

The last, and by no means least, is the distinct obligation to our community and our Nation. This is the responsibility that I want to stress at this time. It is not only an obligation. It is a measure of self-defense.

In the past 17 years our Nation has gone off on a tangent. It has departed from the principles that made it great. False doctrines of something for nothing have abounded. Soak the rich. Break up the successful operators. Contract unpayable debts. Create deficits. Borrow against the future. Promise largess to all for their votes. Take away from him who has earned to give to the many who do not want to work hard to earn it.

This cancerous growth has permeated every fiber of our Government. It is especially serious in our Federal Government. We businessmen have let it get that way because we did not like to mix into what we called dirty politics. As a result, we have let the politicians get control of our Nation.

And, it is later than we think. It is up to us now to take some interest in our community and in our Nation, or, to express it differently, to defend ourselves.

Happiness and success, to paraphrase Patrick Henry, bear the same price tag as liberty—eternal vigilance.

Unless we are willing to see our businesses, our efforts, our life's work, and our Nation absorbed into some socialistic state—unless we are content to let it go that way by default—we must give attention to our own interests.

We can do that by keeping posted and by cooperating with our fellow businessmen. It is necessary to keep in contact with the executives of our trade associations, to express our opinions, and to vote. What is needed is for us to express our opinions by voice and by vote. We must encourage our associates to register to vote and vote for principles rather than political slogans. In addition we must refrain from asking for handouts whether they be called grants-in-aid or what.

There are some excellent spokesmen among our businessmen who can represent us. We should make our positions clear and register them with our Congressmen and our Senators. And we should give support and financial aid to them in their campaigns.

We should make definite our advocacy of measures and our protests plain and forceful.

Our obligation to our community, and to our Nation, is the most important one at this time.

Danger to Free Enterprise Lies in Our Ignoring Public Affairs

(By Clarence Haverty, president, Haverty Furniture Co., Inc.)

While sales, collections, merchandising, and financing are all important, the most vital activity that a businessman can engage in these days is to take more interest in, and to keep better posted on, public affairs.

Many years ago Mark Twain said, "People are always talking about the weather, but nobody ever does anything about it." In the past few years people have done much about it. Air-conditioning and ventilating systems are commonplace today.

And so with public affairs. We businessmen are constantly complaining about and criticizing conditions, the times, or the Government for this, that, and the other.

But too seldom do we do anything positive about it.

We see our Nation becoming more and more centralized in Washington; we see citizen's rights and States' rights being absorbed by the Federal Government; we see that same Government burdening us with taxes and deficits; and we see much of that money so taken being devoted to competing with us—in teaching and promoting so-called cooperatives and giving them advantages in the way of subsidies and relief in taxes.

How many votes?

We see unfair discrimination between different types and groups of people. Penalizing the successful, and the thrifty, rewarding the indolent. Promising free this, and free that. The only criterion being, "How many votes?"

No businessman is opposed to the proper organization of workers. But, it is utterly unfair to have stringent laws and rules applied to business and businessmen, and have other groups exempt from restraint, and from taxes. We do not understand the suits which the Justice Department is conducting against certain corporations which control only a fraction of their industry, alleging monopoly, simply because they are big and successful. And, at the same time, to note the complete approbation and assistance given labor bosses who exact complete and dictatorial power over the whole Nation.

Social security has been overdone. Each one's real security is in his own heart, and his own right arm.

We are appalled by the billions voted for supports for agricultural products, resulting in the outrageous wastes with reference to potatoes, eggs, and other crops. The terrific deficits in our Government budgets, endangering our savings, life insurance, and our children's future. Above all, the constant drawing into the center of all controls and activities.

People get about as good government as they deserve.

If we businessmen allow our Nation to become socialistic, which is the way it is headed now; and do it by default, we will have no one to blame but ourselves.

Headed for downfall

If we haven't the interest to exert ourselves, or haven't the intelligence to know what is going on around us, or haven't the energy to do something about it, we may as well reconcile ourselves to the inevitability that we are going along the same lines that England has gone, that Germany and Italy went.

There is not the slightest basis of common sense in the apparently accepted idea that there are a few self-appointed and self-anointed men in Washington who know more about everything than anybody else.

It might be reasonable to suppose that businessmen, who had the ability and the energy to bring their businesses to the position where they are in America today, would know more about running those businesses than some man whose entire qualifications consist of being personally popular or persuasively eloquent.

Nearly all of us belong to some organization—a national organization, a State organization, a local organization, or a trade organization. In my own business the National Retail Furniture Association, the American Retail Federation, and the United States Chamber of Commerce keep me constantly posted.

We should use our heads and appraise the situations. Keep in touch with our representatives in Congress, in both House and Senate. Tell them what we are thinking, and why.

And don't always complain and disapprove. Tell them when you approve of their positions also.

Vote independent

Where there is a choice of candidates be sure to vote. Vote for one who represents the principles of which you approve, and not because he is a so-called Democrat or a so-called Republican.

Remember, you can't discharge all of your obligations in this respect by pats on the back, or encouraging words. Frequently candidates have considerable expense, especially when they are engaged in election contests against one who is already entrenched. So, be sure you make personal contributions to campaign funds.

Also keep in touch with your fellow businessman. Inform your colleagues of your position, and tell them what you think and how you feel. And, back things and people. Above all, back principles, and not just political slogans.

That, I think would be about as important a message as I could deliver for the consideration of my fellow merchants.

Surrounded as we are by threats all over the world, I am fully convinced that our greatest dangers are not what Stalin, or some other outside forces may do to us, but what we are doing to ourselves.

Frontiers of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, all of us are justly proud of the recognition given to Texas and to Texans for the contribution made by them in governmental and business affairs, in a recent address made by Assistant Secretary of State Edward G. Miller, Jr., before the Houston Foreign Trade Association is no exception to the rule that we like to hear nice things said about us.

However, one important addition is contained in this address by Mr. Miller, and that is the equally important part played by the American Republics in our common fight against Communist aggressions. The Communists are attempting to divide the American Republics just as they have succeeded in causing unrest and chaos in other parts of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely urge the Membership of this Congress and others who have access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to read the address of Assistant Secretary of State Edward G. Miller, Jr., who describes the work being carried on by the Department to maintain the solidarity of the American Republics. We cannot emphasize too much the importance of preventing the enemies of democracy from dividing this hemisphere.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the address made by Mr. Miller before the Houston Foreign Trade Association on July 25, 1950.

Frontiers of Peace

It is a great pleasure for me to be with you today. This is only my third day in Texas, but I have been receiving indoctrination from the many Texans in the Department of State for some time past. In fact, our National Capital is pretty densely populated with your fellow citizens, with a considerable number of them where you expect to find Texans—in strategic posts. If I attempted to call the honor roll of Texans on Capitol Hill, in the Department of State, and in the other agencies of the Government, I should use up all the time allotted me long before completing the list.

I can the better understand the magnitude and quality of Texas' contribution to our country's greatness because of my visit to this exhilarating city. Houston is typically twentieth century, typically American, and, above all, typically Texan. I say that in no narrow regional sense, of course—even if the term "narrow" could be applied to a region so extensive. I speak rather in salute to those Texas qualities which Houston so obviously possesses—vision, brains, and muscle.

One thing is certain. It does not take more than 3 days to feel at home in Texas. Your hospitality thaws out a newcomer's sense of strangeness very quickly. Furthermore, you Texans get about over the globe quite a bit. And it is my experience that wherever you find Texans, you hear talk of Texas.

My own work as Assistant Secretary of State is directly concerned with Latin America. Because Texas is our great natural frontier with Latin America, and has innumerable special ties—historical, cultural, and economic—with the most immediate neighbor, Mexico, you in this State have a unique responsibility in furthering inter-American relations. Your recognition and acceptance of that responsibility is a constant factor in our foreign policy. We have learned to count upon it.

Since that is the case, I would like to talk to this audience today about our relations with our neighbors.

First, I want to make an affirmative statement, and to make it emphatically. Whenever there is a threat to the security of this hemisphere, the American Republics stick together. That is good sense: solidarity is our mutual safeguard. I think that it is also something beyond practical policy; it is proof of the underlying solidarity of democratic principle in our 21 countries; it is inherent in our common birthright of independence and freedom.

The present crisis in Korea is showing us beyond all question the solidarity of the Americas. The Council of the Organization of American States, the unit of the inter-American system which meets regularly at Washington, has unanimously approved the United Nations action with respect to Korea; and I shall have more to say about that. World War II afforded many proofs that the Americans stand together to repell aggression. What country was first in this hemisphere to declare that a state of war existed with Japan because of the attack on Pearl Harbor? Was it our own country? No. As you will recall, that "day of infamy" fell upon a Sunday, when our Congress was not in session. So, by a matter of hours, little Costa Rica beat us to it, declaring that if any country of the Americas had been attacked, Costa Rica also was attacked.

We cannot forget the support given to our common cause by Latin America in World War II. The other republics of this hemisphere met the test of our common danger by consistent and enthusiastic support of the cause of the democracies. They are meeting it again now, and with the same unanimity.

Nevertheless it must be admitted that Latin America, since World War II, has felt a growing suspicion that the serious problems now engaging so much of our attention in Europe and Asia may be making us somewhat forgetful of the sister countries in this hemisphere. That suspicion reveals itself in different places in different ways. Communist propaganda is doing all that it can to foster mistrust. The downright fact is that it is trying to divide this hemisphere. You know and I know that our friendship is sincere, our interest is real. The best possible way of proving this is the simple method of showing the peoples of the other American Republics what we as a people are really like; what we believe in, what we do. In other words, what makes us tick.

That is no simple assignment. You cannot explain the United States of America by logistics and statistics. You cannot draw its picture with reports and graphs. Oratory and songs cannot convey the solid strength of our people, their fierce hatred of tyranny, their compassion for the weak and the oppressed, their refusal to entertain even the possibility of defeat. All these things, and many more, are the United States; but the whole truth about the United States is not in any one, nor can it be arrived at by any single path.

So when I say that the Department of State is portraying us as a people as fully as possible to the rest of the world, I mean that it is trying to show you, and me, as we are: what government is our own free choice, what things we live by and what things we are willing to die to preserve. It portrays above and beyond all problems and difficulties—and the Department does not conceal the fact that there are such—the greatness and the promise of our land and of the people whom it brings forth. And to the rest of the Americas it lays stress on the common factors in our historic past, theirs and our own, and in our free and democratic present.

To state this in another way, a main objective of our information policies as a whole is to demonstrate the workability of our national way of life, to prove in the current struggle for the minds of men, the strength and integrity of our system of free enterprise; and its place in the inter-American system. That is to some extent a job of salesmanship. The Department of State carries on this responsibility of telling the world, including Latin America, through two major services. They are a program of international information and a program of educational exchange.

The international information program makes use of radio, press, and motion pictures. Its radio arm does world-wide broadcasting over the Voice of America in 24 languages. It also makes extensive use abroad of local broadcasting arranged through our diplomatic missions. In neither method does it compete with commercial broadcasting.

In the field of motion pictures—and here we deal with educational materials not in competition with Hollywood—the Department sends out films with sound-track in Portuguese to Brazil, French to Haiti, Spanish to the other American republics. The subject matter, extremely varied, helps build up that composite picture of the United States at which we aim. One of the most popular films for school use portrays a coast-to-coast trip on a bus. Among adult groups in Latin America, films most in demand include those on public health, such as malaria control, and on agricultural methods. If you are wondering as to audience size, our Embassy in Mexico reports that in 1949 the total audience for these educational films of ours in that one country was well over 9,000,000 persons. That meant more than 21,000 separate showings, about 85 percent of which were given by Mexicans themselves, with films lent by the Embassy. These pictures were used in every Mexican state and territory, usually by such official agencies as the Ministries of Education, Agriculture, Public Health, Army, and Navy.

And while I am giving some figures about our program in Mexico, let me add that radio stations in that country gave us 16,000 hours of free radio time last year. Furthermore, our Benjamin Franklin Library in Mexico City would impress every one of you, as it impressed me when I visited it earlier this month, by its activity and its effectiveness. It houses a compact, basic collection of 23,000 books with a consultation record of 434,830 in 1949. What library in the United States, or elsewhere in the world, has a turnover to equal that? The number of loans of books by that library last year was 134,564. As a matter of fact, the Benjamin Franklin Library was the first in Mexico to permit books to be taken out.

In the field of press in Latin America, in which likewise we do not compete with commercial agencies, the Department deals largely with background and supplementary material to round out the picture of current events; and it supplies the exact text of official United States Government documents and statements.

These immediate, timely, information arms of the program—press, motion pictures, and radio—are what we call the mass media divisions. They are intended to reach large over-all audiences; and the figures that I have just cited prove that they do. The educational exchange arm is more long-range in nature; and it is aimed, as the name indicates, at the educated groups.

On this educational exchange side, we have, in addition to the obvious interchange—that of students and professors and leaders in life and thought—contacts established and maintained through books and libraries, lecture courses, and language teaching.

One of the most effective means of such contacts is through cultural centers. Such centers, with membership made up of citizens of the country where they are located and of United States citizens resident there, promote better knowledge, friendship, and cooperation. The cultural centers are largely self-supporting. Most of their income is derived from English-language courses. At the cultural center in Sao Paulo, Brazil, 5,000 Brazilians are currently studying English. The centers also, along with many other cultural activities, maintain small but well-selected and much-used libraries. In addition to these, we have in Latin America four large United States libraries which are of immense importance in providing information on all aspects of the United States. I have mentioned the Benjamin Franklin Library at Mexico City. The others are the American Library at Managua, the Artigas-Washington Library at Montevideo, and the Lincoln Library at Buenos Aires.

As a further method of presenting the full and fair picture of the United States, the Department encourages, and on occasion distributes translations of representative works produced in this country. You may be interested to know that of United States Government publications thus translated and distributed, far and away the most popular are, in the order named: The Constitution of the United States and Other Historical Documents, Work With Safety, Infant Care, and the Road to Good Nutrition. Other books in the translation program include leading works in medicine, public health, science and mathematics, American literature, education, agriculture, and history.

Now we come to our program of Exchange of Persons, which is a method of bringing about the personal acquaintance that is a necessary preliminary to personal friendship. Under this heading are grouped grants by the Department both for students from Latin America to study in colleges and universities in this country, and for our own students—usually on the graduate level—to pursue studies in Latin-American universities. Grants are also given for exchange professors. The two-way aspect of these interchanges is one of their most beneficial factors. At your own State university, Agricultural and Mechanical College, and many other Texas schools, both public and private, you have long since found out for yourselves how valuable such exchanges are, especially with our neighbors south of the Rio Grande.

All these programs keep continually in mind, and, in fact, as I have indicated, are largely based upon, the likenesses rather than the differences among the peoples of this hemisphere. There are certain interests which are identical to all 21 of the American Republics. They include the maintenance of political stability within the hemisphere; economic development, along lines designed to raise the standard of living of the population; military strength, adequate not only to defend the hemisphere against external attack but to deter aggression from within; and social advances calculated to

aid in the development of free institutions and free individuals.

The security of its own citizens and its own territory is the paramount consideration of every people as a nation. For the American Republics, the individual security of each depends upon the collective security of all. Obviously, the great objective of each is, and must be, hemispheric security. The guardian and guarantor of that collective security is hemispheric solidarity; and hemispheric solidarity is a concept that has persisted in the minds and hearts of the American people for more than a century.

The whole purpose of the Department of State's program of information and educational exchange, which I have presented to you in such detail, is to acquaint other peoples with our way of life in the United States—our historical background, our racial and religious composition as a citizenry, our widespread and diversified economic system, our political and educational institutions, our scientific and cultural contributions, and the all-important functions of the great American public as such in the national life. Through the programs that I enumerated—press, radio, motion pictures, libraries, cultural centers, and exchange of persons—we are trying to reach the minds and hearts of our neighbors in this hemisphere; to extend their acquaintance with and intensify their respect for the way of life in our own country, which in many ways parallels theirs. All this is a positive, continuing process that assumes greater and greater importance as social and political conditions for the peoples of the hemisphere improve.

In the past few weeks we have all been seeing and feeling what inter-American solidarity means. On June 25, Korean time, armed forces from North Korea launched their unprovoked attack against the Republic of Korea. The Security Council of the United Nations called upon the member states to help repel this aggression. President Truman, with a vigor and integrity that made history, voiced the response of our country to that appeal. Within a few days the Council of the Organization of American States had declared its unanimous support of the United Nations and the decision which it had taken. From every capital of Latin America messages have poured in pledging solidarity and assistance. The whole hemisphere is awake, alert, and angry, in the face of this outbreak which menaces the very foundation of the United Nations, and therefore the peace of the world.

I am not speaking from hearsay when I emphasize the immediate indignant reaction of Latin America against the aggression in Korea. I was in the Gulf of Mexico off Yucatan when the Communist army attacked the Korean Republic. In the following 2 weeks I visited Honduras, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Mexico. Everywhere there was the same blaze of anger against those guilty of this threat to the United Nations, and the same solidarity in support, the same stern determination to force back the invading forces which menace not only the independence of Korea but the peace of the world.

There is absolutely no doubt that the Americas are unified in this support of the United Nations. It is a dynamic fact that once again the United States and the 20 sister republics of this hemisphere stand firm and stand together.

Latin America has taken part actively and constructively at every stage of the developing defense of Korea. One of the neighboring Republics, El Salvador, has a representative on the United Nations Commission on Korea, whose report was the basis of our own Government's recognition of the Republic of Korea on January 1, 1949. Two Latin-American countries—Cuba and Ecuador—have, like the United States, representatives on the Security Council of the United Nations, which gave the aggressors the stern command to halt.

Unanimously and swiftly, the Council of the Organization of American States resolved "to declare its firm adherence to the decisions of the United Nations, and to solemnly reaffirm on this occasion the pledges of continental solidarity which unite the American states."

Messages from governments poured in to the United Nations, and to President Truman in congratulation and support. The total effect was, and is, tremendous.

Let me sum up all that I have been saying about inter-American solidarity in one statement of fact: In this hemisphere all our peoples believe in peace, and when they are forced to act against the breakers of world peace, they act together.

Texas, which has contributed so powerfully to victory in war, has a contribution no less great to make toward victorious peace, constructively envisaged; a peace wherein the victory will be for good will and the advancement of mankind along paths of freedom and prosperity. It is a considerable satisfaction for the rest of us citizens of the United States, resolute as we all are to secure and maintain such a peace, to know that on our good-neighborly frontier with the other American Republics is this great State whose name is derived from a term meaning "friends," and whose motto is the one unswerving word, "friendship."

The Price of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. H. LICHTENWALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the American people want peace in the world above everything else and are willing to make the necessary sacrifices to attain such peace. However, I believe that all Americans should be alerted to the fact that in our fight to bring about world peace and a free America we are threatened with regimentation and Government control by some of the proposals recommended by the President, which basically could cause us to lose our freedom and liberty here at home. Under extension of remarks, therefore, I would like to have inserted in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the July 20 issue of the Allentown (Pa.) Evening Chronicle:

THE PRICE OF PEACE

President Truman's actions yesterday in putting the Nation on what amounts to a wartime footing came as no surprise to anyone. In fact, if any surprise is attached to his announced program, it is because he didn't go as far as expected.

Washington's policy appears to be to administer these tremendously important doses of war tonic to the public in installments, in the belief that the people will accept the medicine more readily and more thoroughly if it can be assimilated piecemeal.

Thus far, however, the American citizen appears to be ahead of his leaders in accepting the necessity for all-out preparedness and at the same time prosecuting the Korean campaign with full vigor. Washington has not found it necessary to do a sales job. We have been seasoned for all this by years of cold war. There is general relief rather than annoyance that at long last we are recognizing the Soviet for what it is—an implacable and ruthless foe. There no longer is doubt that we must fight on terms the Russians understand.

This public attitude has, of course, been stimulated by outrage over what has happened in Korea, which Mr. Truman so aptly described as "an act of raw aggression, an outright breach of peace, a sneak attack." And there may be some tendency to think we will be immediately relieved of the pressures of a state of emergency when and if the North Koreans are driven back of the thirty-eighth parallel.

Nothing could be more wrong than to assume this kind of an optimistic outlook. We might as well reconcile ourselves to the realities of the situation. There is nothing temporary about what Mr. Truman proposed yesterday.

Unless all signs fail, the United States will be on a wartime footing for years to come. Our Armed Forces will be kept at peak strength; our incomes will be more heavily taxed; our businesses and our lives will be controlled in many ways not yet announced. That is the price we will be called upon to pay for peace all over the world and for our own freedom. The $10,000,000,000 requested by the President is but a starter.

So long as the Americans are asked to do all these things for the specific purposes already outlined, they will not and should not object. But while they are thus fighting communism, eternal vigilance must be maintained lest those who are inclined that way use the exigencies of the times as an excuse to make America a controlled state on a permanent basis.

Let us always remember this: There is no point in winning a war against communism if in so doing we lose forever our basic freedoms.

National Day of Repentance and Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the receipt of the attached letter from Rev. Paul Stewart of Cowpens, S. C., evidences the attitude of the proud people of our congressional district and their recognition of the necessity for divine guidance. I attach hereto a copy of my reply to the said letter together with a clipping from the New York Times of Sunday, July 23, containing statements by the President made at Cleveland, Ohio.

We have thus far hopelessly failed in establishing peace upon the earth nor shall we ever succeed in so doing without God.

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH,
Cowpens, S. C., July 24, 1950.

Hon. JOSEPH BRYSON,
United States Congressman,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRYSON: Our congregation assembled in its regular Sunday morning worship, July 23, adopted the following resolution:

That we ask our United States Senator, Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON, and our Congressman, Hon. JOSEPH BRYSON, to implore President Truman to call our American people to a special day of repentance and prayer. It was in the providence of God that Amer-

ica was discovered and established. And we believe it shall be through His providence she shall be maintained. It is time for us to realize that only God and the Gospel will overcome communism; and that we must move forward on our knees.

"Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord." Psalm 33: 12.

"Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it; except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh in vain." Psalm 127: 1.

"Righteousness exalteth a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people. Proverbs 14: 24.

"If God be for us, who can be against us?" Romans 8: 31.

As Americans, we need to repent of our sins, confessing our neglect, trifling and indifference. We need to pray that God will make us submissive to His will and way, and spare us another world conflict.

We, therefore, ask you, sir, to please implore our President to proclaim a national day of repentance and prayer.

Respectfully submitted.

PAUL STEWART, *Pastor.*

P. S.—Every Sunday morning we have special prayer for those who are in authority, you who are in Washington, our fighting men. Our people have pledged they will pray at least once a day for our country and for a revival of religion.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington D. C., July 26, 1950.

Rev. PAUL STEWART,
First Baptist Church,
Cowpens, S. C.

DEAR BROTHER STEWART: Thanks ever so much for your kind letter of July 24 advising that your congregation at the First Baptist Church of Cowpens are praying for the President, Members of Congress, and others in high places of authority during these extremely dark and troublesome days.

The President advised the World Baptist Congress meeting at Cleveland, Ohio, that "material survival of nations depends upon their spiritual redemption." It is a consolation to know that our President, who incidentally is a member of our own faith, thus pleads "for a revival of religion and a rededication of the Nation to the unchanging truths of the Christian faith."

Lately it was my privilege along with others to arrange a conference for Rev. Billy Graham with the President, at which time, your own suggestion of a national day of repentance and prayer was discussed.

I shall convey your message to the President and to my colleagues in the Congress to the end that all of our people may be called to a day of prayer.

Please remember me to all the good folks of Cowpens. With kindest regards, I am

Very respectfully,

JOSEPH R. BRYSON.

[From the New York Times of July 23, 1950]

RELIGIOUS REVIVAL URGED BY TRUMAN—LETTER WARNS BAPTIST CONGRESS THAT MATERIAL SURVIVAL RESTS ON SPIRITUAL REDEMPTION

(By Walter W. Ruch)

CLEVELAND, July 22.—Material survival of nations depends upon their spiritual redemption, the eighth world Baptist congress was told today by President Truman in a plea for a revival of religion and a rededication of the Nation to the unchanging truths of the Christian faith.

Prevented from personal attendance by the international situation, the President, himself one of the 18,000,000 Baptists represented at the congress, sent his appeal in writing. It was read this evening to the 20,000 delegates, joined by thousands of others, at an open-air service in the municipal stadium.

"Sadly we reflect upon an enormous retrogression in individual liberty and a denial of all human rights behind an impenetrable iron curtain in the satellite states where love—either of God or of man—is proscribed," the President said in his letter. It was read by the Reverend Dr. C. Oscar Johnson, of St. Louis, president of the World Baptist Alliance.

"We reject the communistic teaching that Christianity is untrue; that religion is unnecessary," the letter continued. "It is for us, in these days of doubt and despair, to bear true and valiant witness to the faith of our fathers—the faith delivered to the saints and transmitted to us through long generations of Christian forebears.

"To one and all—to those who have come from our own country and to those journeying from overseas—from the remote corners of the earth—I would give this warning: The nations of the world—our own included, with its unprecedented wealth and unlimited natural resources—cannot survive materially unless redeemed spiritually.

"I believe there is no problem, moral or economic, in the field of our national sphere or among the nations of this troubled world that would not yield to the intelligence, the courage, and the faith of free men if those who seek solution approach the problem in the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount."

The solution is one not easy to apply, Mr. Truman said, and he declared:

"We must face the problem in a spirit of steadfastness and humility, remembering the admonition of the ancient King of Israel: 'Let no man that putteth on his armor boast as he that taketh it off.' "

"The way ahead is long, the struggle hard, but we shall win if we march forward in amity with all Christian forces," the President said.

Among the delegates were representatives from 48 nations, joined in a federated body of more than 100 autonomous denominational organizations. The congress, continuing through Thursday, is the eighth meeting of the alliance in a series that began in London in 1905.

Bearing the American and Christian flags and behind them the colors of 52 nations—a flag for each country of the alliance—the delegates returned Cleveland's formal welcome late this afternoon with a parade over a mile-long course.

Earlier, at the opening session in the Cleveland Auditorium, the delegates heard Dr. Wilfred L. Jarvis, of Australia, taking note of "black storm clouds" over the world, declared that the peoples of the free nations would prevail should another world war ensue.

Dr. Jarvis suggested that in the past, "Those in charge of the ship of state have tried to steer by the waves of personal expediency, the wind of popular opinion, or the clouds of vested interests, rather than by the everlasting light of Christ."

Any democracy that followed any other leader, Dr. Jarvis warned, would surely fail, as would any godless dictatorship.

The delegates' attention was turned somberly to the atomic age by the Reverend Dr. Robert McCracken, pastor of the Riverside Church of New York. He asserted that nothing in the world could save humanity but a change of direction "in the spiritual trek of mankind."

"The material elements in civilization," Dr. McCracken said, "must be subordinated to the moral, because moral values are ultimate values and alone give stable foundations to the world. Or, to put it in terser, starker terms, secularism is bankrupt, humanity is undone, unless it gets back to God."

The tragedy, Dr. McCracken declared, is that man, intelligent enough to split atoms, has shown himself incapable of organizing for community and brotherhood and for peace and prosperity.

"Man is himself the greatest barrier to the fashioning of a new world," Dr. McCracken asserted.

In the proposed spiritual resurgence throughout the world, the Baptists were called upon to take the lead in healing the divisions among Protestants.

The Reverend Dr. E. McNeil Poteat, former president of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, declared that the Baptists could become leaders in this work. He proposed that the congress work toward that end, first among the hundred groups in their own denomination, and then among all the free churches.

Unless that is done, Dr. Poteat said, the congress here will have failed and faltered before the demands of this stricken world at this crucial hour.

The threat to religious liberty today comes, he added, from a secularist totalitarian state that denies all freedom as Baptists know it, and from a totalitarian church that promises freedom to those surrendering to its authority.

"What is the answer to the demands of the Russian state and the Roman Church? It is united democracy and united Protestantism," Dr. Poteat said.

The Communist Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter received from one of the prominent citizens of my congressional district in which she sets forth her views regarding the threat of communism in this country with special reference to the infiltration of Communist thinking in our institutions of learning. The letter is well worth the time and thought of every American who still believes in our form of government. The letter is as follows:

BATTLE CREEK, IOWA,
July 14, 1950.

Hon. CHARLES B. HOEVEN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOEVEN: Thank you very much for your prompt and encouraging reply to my letter. It is good to know you are so forthright about your views on communism.

Since writing to you, I've threshed over the leniency of some people toward communism, and in some cases their downright approval of it.

For many years I have been a student of international relationships and, studying as I have, the Russian technique and strategy, foresaw with clarity the present impending dangers.

You know as well as I do that communism's chief line of attack is through our schools and colleges. An open attack such as this is a deceptive gesture to protect their methods. We know that their largest conquests come by well-planned, smooth, nonwarfare methods. Even if we win, we lose, for the cost of our regimentation and the inevitable broken morale that follows will be the meat of this vulture.

I recall a young lady who became very enthusiastic about a speaker named Harrison Forman, who in his itinerary also spoke

at the Knife and Fork Club in Sioux City. His talk dealt with the Chinese situation. His chief claim and the embodiment of his speech was that Chinese Communists were "mushroom Communists," with no seeming origin, totally independent of Russia. Having made several talks at women's clubs on China that year, I was quick in giving her the correct information about their history and told her how aware she must be. Had I not been mentally equipped, I suppose she would have been more susceptible to more of this bosh.

Now, since we are again under the stress of war, you Congressmen do not let us slip internally. Fortify our home front, it will not be enough to ask professors if they are Communists. That would only merit a lie anyway. I plead with you, inaugurate a committee within the Un-American Activities Committee to visit college classrooms for long periods of time, especially in the history, government, and economic classes. It must be done. We have made our institutions of learning so large and prosperous through our GI-bill education that it should be our first place of vigilence. We have a right to demand that in these classrooms where are many boys who fought for a principle, that this principle be honored and defended. The cost of such protection would be small compared to the sacrifice of our liberties. The college classroom influence has far-reaching ramifications, from it stems our future way of thinking, our leaders, and our ideals.

Premeditating Stalin must be laughing, watching usurpation accomplished through education. And, to boot, the victims paying for it. There must be a reorientation for good Americanism in all our classrooms and textbooks.

Thomas Jefferson said, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Russia theoretically does not believe in war. In diplomacy and strategy, she is the smartest nation on the globe; she knows blatant, warring conquest is a thing of the past. Her greatest attacks come unarmed and silently through the unwatched inroads of our institutions. It is hard to tell how much damage she has already done.

Hysteria may grip those who see only the surface danger. On the other hand, the thinker and informed know that unless we guard against and destroy the hidden termites in our foundation we can and will go the way of all flesh in Europe.

It is a prettty mess when individuals must dig into their own purse to defend their liberties. Of course, it is necessary to find and convict spies, but more damaging by far than any stolen military secrets is felony by ideological conversion. What country need inflict a prolonged attack when they have established friends who eagerly await their arrival? It is necessary and proper that not only Communist Party members, but anyone sympathetic to this ideology should be punished by law, especially when communism has become powerful enough to furnish a source for political rivalry. Thomas E. Dewey said to outlaw the Communists would drive them underground. Well, they were better underground with laws to uproot them than running around on top without any control.

Of course, it will eventually be necessary if we are not to commit social suicide to outlaw the Communist Party, but anyone teaching or talking sympathetically should also be considered as subversive as card-carrying members and by report be investigated by proper Government agencies to avoid the ensuing expense of a personal law suit. Government, not individuals, should pay for our defense.

Now, while in open combat with Communists, it would be timely for such action. It would be justified and Russia would no longer laugh at us while furnishing us with a political football. We would be dupes to allow this in another Presidential election.

May Congressmen in gratitude watch the country God has given them to guard.

Very truly yours.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles by Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Just as Vice President John Nance Garner and Representative Martin Dies, Democrats of Texas, must be credited with founding the House Committee on Un-American Activities, so must Representative JOHN RANKIN, Democrat of Mississippi, be noted as the one who saved it.

The committee started out in 1938, with the Democratic administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt fighting it every step of the way, just as it still to this day has to carry the inherited burden of hostility from the Truman administraion.

How does it survive? Only because the people of the United States are for it. A certain business of 1944 demonstrates that. For it was in that year Representative Dies wore out physically and emotionally on the job.

Six years of trying to get the facts on record against the eternal, scandalous sniping of the New Deal wore him out.

The committee's secretary and chief investigator, Robert Stripling, was suddenly drafted.

The committee appeared all through and its invaluable files, so dreaded by every subversive agent in America, were shoved in a single room where they were open to anybody who might dare to raid them.

At the very least, they were headed to the Library of Congress and the tender mercies of Archibald MacLeish, then the Library's head and one of the committee's most vocal foes.

Communists breathed easier.

But when the new Congress convened in 1945, the parliamentary know-how of just one man, Representative RANKIN, saved those files and kept the committee in existence.

On the day that the House first met to organize and adopt its rules of order, Mr. RANKIN suddenly introduced a resolution to amend the rules of the House to the effect that the committee on un-American activities would be a permanent committee of the House, instead of a temporary and special committee required to appeal each year for authority to continue.

His motion carried 207 to 186, with 41 not voting, and so far the first time in the existence of Congress, a special committee which had started out under the presumption that its work would be only temporary and short, was made into a permanent arm of the House on equal legal footing with the Committee on Foreign Affairs, or that on Currency and Banking, or Rules, or Education and Labor.

However, during 1945 and 1946, the committee's main problem was one of survival, still, and reorganization of staff and renewal of contacts.

In 1947 the committee really buckled down under a new chairman, Representative J. Parnell Thomas, Republican, of New Jersey, to deal with subversion effectively.

Chairman Thomas, the sole survivor of the original committee headed by Dies, laid it down as a strict rule that the proceedings in all cases would be the very model of adherence to congressional rules on witnesses, evidence, and testimony.

And the record supports the claim that the committee's performance under Thomas was strictly in accordance with congressional rules of procedure. For evidence, see the record, not the propaganda against it that omits or avoids the record.

The main committee was divided into subcommittees specializing on particular phases of work. A new staff was set up, with tested experts on the validating of evidence.

And posted for all to see was the chairman's declaration that the committee would remember at all times its aim and purpose—to secure information on the basis of which to recommend legislation.

That is a matter not too well understood. It is well known, of course, that the congressional subpena is the most powerful legal instrument in the whole body of constitutional law. Nobody can refuse to testify, except that Congress has taken the general stand that a witness who says that his testimony may tend to incriminate him may be excused from answering questions that he thinks would reveal evidence which would jeopardize him.

He cannot refuse to testify in general on such ground, however, and he must convince the committee that any such plea is not just evasive action, but based on specific facts.

In view of the many problems raised by dealing with Communists, THOMAS made it the rule to swear all witnesses at all times, including Cabinet officers and Members of Congress and the committee's own staff.

And he made it the rule that all witnesses would be told why they must answer questions, why their lawyers could not cross-examine, why the all-powerful subpena must be respected.

All this, because the purpose of the investigations was, and is, and always will be, not to send people to jail, not to expose sensational personal histories, but to get facts on the basis of which to advise Congress just what laws the country needs on subversion.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles by Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The fact that the House Committee on Un-American Activities survives in spite of all the blunders and disasters that involve its membership, is the clearest possible proof that it serves a vital purpose.

Consider the case of Representative Parnell Thomas, who started with the committee in its first year, 1938, and rose in 1947 to become chairman.

Thomas was disclosed by his secretary as a violator of the law in matters of employment

of his office help. For that he went to the penitentiary.

But was Thomas a good chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities? The record shows that he was. It was in his time that the committee reorganized with Robert Stripling as chief investigator.

Stripling had learned his job in the years under Representative Martin Dies' chairmanship, but was called up for Army duty in 1944, and until Thomas brought him back little work was done.

It is to Stripling more than any other person that credit must go for the ultimate exposure of such infamous characters as Gerhart Eisler and Alger Hiss and for the invaluable information collected from such ex-spies of Russia as Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley.

Under Thomas, too, the committee was actually organized for the first time to analyze evidence effectively.

The committee opened for business in 1938, with three investigators, an unpaid clerk and a couple of stenographers.

From 1939 to 1945, there were never more than 12 investigators working for the committee, with clerical and stenographic help in proportion.

In 1945–46, there were three investigators. In 1947, under Thomas, the investigative staff was increased to six, and some clerks added. As this was written, the total force, except for the committee members themselves, is just 25 persons.

And how about the money? The first appropriation, granted June 9, 1938, was for $25,000. The next year, the committee got $100,000.

In the years following, the annual appropriations ranged from a high of $150,000 in 1941, to a low of $7,500 in 1943. From 1938 to 1950, inclusive, the committee's funds have amounted to $1,427,500.

Whenever did the taxpayers of this country get such value for so little investment in their national security?

The need for further action by the committee is obvious. For example, Thomas started a special project of his own that is certainly of first rank urgency right today.

He sketched out the organization of a pan-American legislative program to make the information of each of the American Republics concerning subversive activities, easily available to the others.

It has long been known that the Russians have networks of spies all through Latin America, and the incredible revelations of Igor Gouzenko and the Canadian royal commission concerning Communist atomic spying in the United States and Canada are just a sample of the things yet to be surveyed both north and south of the United States of America itself.

Another major project was started in early 1948 by a special subcommittee under chairmanship of Representative RICHARD M. NIXON, Republican, of California, to collect legal opinions on whether the Communists of the United States of America shall be legally defined as agents of a foreign power and required to register with the State Department as such, or whether communism shall be outlawed entirely.

Evidence on that was heard from not only the then Attorney General Tom Clark; FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover; and the late Secretary of Labor Lewis Schwellenbach, but strangely enough, volunteer opinions were delivered by such famous New Deal legal minds as ex-Ambassador and Assistant Secretary of State, Adolf Berle; the voluble specialist on civil liberties, Morris Ernst; and Donald Richberg, once general counsel of the NRA of blue eagle times and for years counsel to labor unions.

The attacks on communism by these gentlemen far exceed in ferocity anything Representative Martin Dies ever attempted on the floor of the House, but if any of Dies' critics has yet apologized for their own attacks on him while he was chairman of the committee in the Roosevelt era, the record does not show it.

All in all, the committee's place in contemporary history is by now secure, well above and beyond the reach of the Communists and their friends.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles by Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Many people have written me for detailed evidence on some phase or other of communism, or of activities by the House Committee on Un-American Affairs.

It is impossible to deal with all these in full. But I can tell everybody interested where to look for the basic material, for each to develop in his own way.

The committee has furnished me with a comprehensive list of its publications over the years from 1938 down to the present. It follows here, the only such compilation I know of, and it is worth keeping:

SEVENTY-SIXTH THROUGH SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESSES, 1938–44

Seventeen volumes of public hearings.
Eight appendixes to public hearings.
Seven executive hearings (never available for public distribution).
Index to public hearings.
Appendix part IX (never available for public distribution).
House Report No. 2, 1939.
House Report No. 1476, 1940.
House Report No. 2277, 1942.
House Report No. 2277, pt. 2 (1942).
House Report No. 2748, 1943.
Majority and minority report of the subcommittee investigating the War Relocations Authority, 1943.
House Report No. 717, 1943.
House report No. 1311, 1944.
Report on Tule Lake riot.
Minority views on Tule Lake segregation.

SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS, 1945–46

Hearings, Office of Price Administration.
Hearings on the Communist Party.
Hearings, Gerald L. K. Smith.
Hearings, executive board, Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.
House Report 1996—Sources of Financial Aid for Subversive and Un-American Propaganda.
Citations by official Federal Government or State or municipal agencies, regarding the character of organization named.
House Report No. 2233.
Hearings—Louis F. Budenz.
House Report No. 2742.

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, 1947–48

Hearings on Gerhart Eisler.
Hearings regarding Leon Josephson and Samuel Liptzen.
Hearings on H. R. 1884 and H. R. 2122, bills to curb or outlaw the Communist Party of the United States.
Hearings regarding Eugene Dennis.
Hearings regarding communism in labor unions in the United States.
Hearings regarding Hanns Eisler.
Hearings regarding the Communist infiltration of the motion-picture industry.
Hearings on H. R. 2948, H. R. 4422, and H. R. 4581, bills to curb or control the Communist Party of the United States.
Hearings regarding Communist espionage in the United States Government.
Excerpts from hearings regarding investigation of Communist activities in connection with the atom bomb.
Hearings regarding Communist espionage in the United States Government, part II.
The Communist Party of the United States as an agent of a foreign power.
American Youth for Democracy.
Southern Conference for Human Welfare.
Civil Rights Congress as a Communist-front organization.
Report of the Subcommittee on Legislation of the Committee on Un-American Activities on proposed legislation to control subversive Communist activities in the United States.
Protecting the United States Against Un-American and Subversive Activities (on H. R. 5852).
Report on the Communist Party of the United States as an advocate of overthrow of Government by force and violence.
100 Things You Should Know About Communism in the United States of America.
Interim report on hearings regarding Communist espionage in the United States Government.
Report on Soviet espionage activities in connection with the atom bomb.
100 Things You Should Know About Communism and Religion.
100 Things You Should Know About Communism and Education.
100 Things You Should Know about Communism and Labor.
100 Things You Should Know About Communism and Government.
Soviet Espionage Within the United States Government, second report.
Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the United States House of Representatives, Eightieth Congress.
Citations by Official Government Agencies of Organizations and Publications Found To Be Communist or Communist Fronts.
House Committee on Un-American Activities.
Further list tomorrow.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles by Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Somebody new shows up almost every day now to fight communism, as they say.

And often enough these come-lately recruits get a bit of a pushing around from veterans of the long and rough campaign to impress the truth about communism on the public mind.

It's an understandable attitude, for whoever tells the truth about communism has problems.

You have to learn how to mind your business and ignore snubs, lies, and false witnesses.

Hence it is only human for those who have watched so many others run away from facts to be a little bit upstage.

It's human, but it's not very bright. Communism is a deadly force. And the most deadly aspect of it is not over the seas in Korea or in Berlin.

Washington is the key. It is here that communism needs to be known and understood and exposed and defeated. Thus, it is important that anybody who wants to act against communism be made welcome.

Yesterday, I started on a list of references to published material by the House Committee on Un-American Activities for the years 1934 to 1948, inclusive. Below, the rest.

All of these make the finest factual account I know, of communism in the United States of America.

If you want to understand this communism that you would fight, see these.

And good luck. Now, for the second half of the list:

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION (1949)

Spotlight on spies.

Documentary testimony of Gen. Izyador Modelski, March 31 and April 1, 1949.

Soviet espionage activities in connection with jet propulsion and aircraft, June 6, 1949.

Hearings regarding Steve Nelson, June 8, 1949.

Hearings regarding Toma Babin, May 27 and July 6, 1949.

Testimony of Paul Crouch, May 6, 1949.

Testimony of Philip O. Keeney and Mary Jane Keeney and statement regarding their background, May 24 and 25, and June 9, 1949.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of radiation laboratory and atomic bomb project at the University of California, Berkeley, Calif., volume 1, April 22, 26, May 25, June 10 and 14, 1949.

Hearings regarding Clarence Hiskey, including testimony of Paul Crouch, May 24, 1949.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of minority groups—part 1, July 13, 14, and 18, 1949.

Hearings regarding communism infiltration of minority groups—part 2, July 14, 1949, Manning Johnson.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of labor unions—part 1 (UERMWA), August 9, 10, and 11, 1949.

Hearings regarding communism in the District of Columbia—part 1, June 28, 29, July 6, 12, and 28, 1949.

Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace.

Report of the American Slav Congress.

Report on atomic espionage (Nelson-Weinberg and Hiskey-Adams cases).

Report on the Congress of American Women.

Statement of J. Edgar Hoover (reprints).

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION (1950)

Testimony of James Sterling Murray and Edward Tiers Manning (regarding Clarence Hiskey and Arthur Adams), August 14 and October 5, 1949.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of labor unions—part 2 (security measures relating to officials of the UERMWA-CIO) December 5 and 6, 1949.

Annual Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities for the Year 1949, March 15, 1940.

Hearings regarding shipment of atomic material to the Soviet Union during World War II.

Exposé of the Communist Party of western Pennsylvania—based upon testimony of Matthew Cvetic.

Hearings regarding Communist infiltration of radiation laboratory and atomic bomb project at the University of California, Berkeley, Calif.—volume II (identification of Scientist X) August 26, 1949; July 1 and September 10, 1948; August 14 and September 14, 27, 1949.

Hearings regarding communism in the United States Government—part 1, April 20, 21, 25, 29; May 4, 5, and 6, 1950; July 30 and August 7, 1948; and June 8, 1950.

Extension of Enlistments in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, in voting today to extend the authorized personnel strength of the Armed Forces and to authorize the President to extend enlistments in the Armed Forces, we should also solicit the cooperation of the people on the home front.

Our men in the Armed Forces, and those who will be entering, will be called upon to make sacrifices for their country in this critical period. Surely the people at home should be willing to show their patriotism by heeding the call of the President to refrain from excessive purchases of items they fear may be in short supply. Our Government officials who are in a position to know, have assured us that our supply of food and consumer goods is more than ample to provide for those in the armed services and those at home. Our farms and factories are much better equipped to supply all of our needs now, than they were at the beginning of World War II.

In order to have a strong America, the people of the United States must be united in an all-out effort to defeat the threat of communism at home and abroad. While in Europe recently with a Congressional Committee, we visited some of the countries behind the iron curtain, and had an opportunity to observe communism in action. The Communists are working and planning ways and means to divide our people and to cause dissatisfaction and dissension among us. By excessive purchases, we are creating artificial shortages which will cause hardships later and bring about the very conditions we are trying to prevent. By such actions we are doing exactly as our enemy would have us do.

In recent weeks we have passed several measures for the protection of our country, including the national security bill and the bill to provide for the detention of aliens, pending their deportation. The bills now before the House will also strengthen our national security. I urge the Members of the House to forget politics and to unite in approving these bills, and whatever additional legislation may be necessary for the protection of our country and its democratic principles.

But the Congress alone cannot preserve our freedom and security. We must have the help and cooperation of each and every individual citizen. Therefore, I urge the people on the home front to restrict their purchases, and to support the Congress and the Government. Let us present a strong, united front in our opposition to communism and our determination to protect and defend our democracy.

Federal Deposit Insurance Assessment Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I submit herewith an editorial from the American Banker for July 25, 1950.

Last week when the House had S. 2822 to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act under consideration I offered an amendment deleting from the bill the provision returning to the banks 60 percent of the net assessment income of FDIC. In my remarks on the amendment I noted that such a return would not be in line with our current fight on inflationary trends.

I am glad to see that the attached indicates at least some support—if belated—in banking circles for this point of view. It might also be pointed out that the Korean action was well under way on July 20—the day S. 2822 passed the House, with the approval of the banker groups.

BECAUSE WE ARE AT WAR WHY NOT FOREGO FDIC CUT TILL IT'S OVER?

At first thought the suggestion we want to make today may seem hard to take. But, like the medicine grandma used to offer, it may, on second thought, look "good for you," and very wise for banking to consider as a possible major national public relations gesture from which vast future good would be derived.

We are at war. Men are giving up their lives and all they hold dear on this earth in Korea. What can anyone do to match that?

Our suggestion for banking is that it tell Congress that the Federal Deposit Insurance assessment cut can wait. Let it wait until we see the end of this United Nations police action in defense of the liberty of all nations, including our own. Let Congress go ahead and agree on a bill and send it to the President as planned. But include a proviso that the effective date of the assessment rebate plan shall be, let us say, 6 months after peace has been restored in Korea, and any other part of the world where American troops may be engaged.

The action in Korea will be expensive. But it is only a down payment on the real cost of security and defense against the menace which is now out in the open against the peace we desire so much. Anything which American banks can contribute toward ab-

sorbing this cost is important. Even more important, however, is leadership in measures against the inflation which can result from piling new defense expenditures on top of the present rate of other spending, both national and consumeral.

For banks to forego temporarily the rebate on FDIC assessment contained in the bill now awaiting passage by the House would be a double-barreled gesture. It would help in absorbing Government spending and it would be leadership in the kind of business and personal self-restraint that is necessary to fight inflation.

It won't hurt at all for the FDIC to have some more millions in its reserves. Bank deposits are growing and the inflationary expansion that has swollen business and banking since peace with Japan contains seeds of deflation in which a fatter FDIC won't hurt public confidence, and as long as the prospect is for good business loan volume and added United States Government securities holdings while the defense crisis lasts, few, if any, banks will feel the lack of FDIC rebates.

It will be a multi-million-dollar gesture by a multi-million-dollar industry if banking announces that it will forego the FDIC assessment cut in the present crisis. But we can't thing of any move that would be more in keeping with the spirit of American banks or with American public sentiment today.

Anything which any of us in business and industry can do is insignificant alongside of the supreme sacrifice which the hometown boys of America are making today for us. We do not know a single American banker or bank stockholder who would not give up the bank itself, no matter how large, if by doing so he could save one American boy's life, perhaps his own son's, in Korea.

Wherefor our suggestion that banking would be wise indeed to consider telling Congress and the American people that the FDIC assessment rebates can wait until the present unpleasantness east of the iron curtain has been disposed of.

That's our thinking. What do you think? We'd appreciate your answer by letter, pro or con, in confidence or for publication.

UN Gains Stature Taking Positive Korean Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Peter Edson:

UN GAINS STATURE TAKING POSITIVE KOREAN ACTION

(By Peter Edson)

WASHINGTON.—Future action by the United Nations in dealing with the North Korean aggression offers interesting possibilities for speculation.

In the first place, it must be fully recognized that for the first time in the world's history 56 nations—out of 59 UN members—have agreed on sanctions against an aggressor. The 56 have agreed to furnish such aid as they can to put down this North Korean invasion of South Korea.

The most optimistic interpretation of this action is that it may mark the beginning of the end for Soviet initiative in world-wide aggression. If these first sanctions can be made to stick, it may mean that the United Nations itself will henceforth be able to take the initiative in maintaining peace.

The big question now is, Can this bloc of 56 peace-loving nations be made to stick together?

One of the chief objectives of Moscow propaganda has been to break up this combination. The effort has been to separate the other anti-Communist powers from the United States. It has been an effort to sell the idea that the United States provoked the South Koreans into an attack on the North Koreans. So far, nobody outside the iron curtain has really bought this line.

Yugoslavia's action in abstaining from voting on the United States resolutions against North Korea in Security Council was something of a surprise. If Yugoslavia had been under attack from, say Bulgaria, there would have been no such vote.

Egypt's delegate gave as his excuse for not voting for the resolutions that he could not get instructions from his Government. There was also believed to be some feeling that the UN had not given the Arab countries protection against Israel.

If any of the Arab countries ever were attacked by an aggressor, however, their greatest protection would be through the precedent set by UN resolutions against North Korea.

As Pakistan's Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan put it, if North Korea's aggression is not put down, no small nation can ever again feel safe. This is the great unifying force.

British and Indian attempts to mediate the Korean crisis and persuade the Russians to withdraw their support of the North Koreans are individual nation feelers. Any final settlement must be made by the United Nations.

When the Security Council is called into session later on, it is anticipated that the Russians will present a resolution charging the South Koreans with aggression and blasting the "United States imperialist warmongers of Wall Street" in usual fashion.

Such a resolution would require 7 out of the 11 member votes for approval. It doesn't stand a chance. Even if it did, it could be vetoed by the United States, making the Russians take some of their own medicine.

If action by the Security Council should become stalemated, it is always possible to call a special session of the General Assembly. That is the way the UN has met a number of its difficult problems in the past.

The possibility of Russian withdrawal from the UN is not considered likely. One reason is that the Communists need the United Nations. They need it as a sounding board for their propaganda outside the iron curtain.

The Communists need a weak United Nations, however, not a strong one. That is why they may be counted on to continue trying to disrupt and hamstring its operations.

As for what will happen after the North Koreans withdraw or are forced back of the thirty-eighth parallel, no official in Washington will commit himself. President Truman dodged the question at his last press conference. The objective now is merely to force the aggressors back to the line.

But a close reading of the UN resolutions reveals that the UN Commission for Korea is directed to make recommendations on further steps the world organization should take to restore peace.

This is believed to leave the way open for additional action north of the thirty-eighth parallel, if that is deemed necessary.

"The United States Is Waging War With a Truly Unified High Command—In the Pentagon a Well-Knit, Integrated Team Is Running the Show—The Same Is True in the Far East—Louis Johnson as the Man in Charge Must Be Given the Credit for the Improved Team Play"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the above quotation is from a special feature article written by the nationally known Capitol Hill Post correspondent, John G. Norris, and published in the editorial section of the Washintgon Post of Sunday last. For the benefit of my colleagues who have not read that special feature, I shall at the conclusion of my talk include the article as part of my remarks and insert the same into the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, in the last 48 hours I have received a number of local as well as long-distance calls together with several telegrams commenting upon the talk which I made in this House with respect to the extremism of the vilification and abuse recently loosed against public officials in the Federal Government.

These comments came from Democrats and Republicans alike. Included among those with whom I discussed this question were leaders of both parties sitting in both Houses of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I did not, however, receive a single adverse comment. None took exception to what I had stated. All were in hearty agreement that there had been far, far too much political sniping done already and that it should cease right now.

One of my friends caustically said that when one reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD he concludes that some among us here in Congress might not think there is a war going on in Korea, but, he contined, "the boys over there who are stopping the bullets have no false notions about the reality of the conflict."

All with whom I spoke were in agreement that Louis Johnson had accomplished a most stupendous task in the very short time that he was in office, not alone as to the manner in which he had actually brought unification about but with it greater efficiency and economy of operation as well as increased morale in Army, Navy, and Air Force, civilian as well as military personnel.

This morning's mail brought to me a clipping from the Chicago News, one of the great dailies published in that midwestern metropolis. This article signed by John Knight, editor of the News is captioned: "Johnson unfairly criticized for our reverses in Korea."

Mr. Speaker, John Knight has no ax to grind. His editorial is the expression and disinterested opinion of a recognized

newspaper editor, well and highly qualified to speak and what John Knight had to say is tersely expressed in that signed editorial which reads in part, as follows:

JOHNSON UNFAIRLY CRITICIZED FOR OUR REVERSES IN KOREA

Our military reverses in Korea have unloosed a flood of recriminations against Defense Secretary Louis Johnson, Congress and military intelligence.

Johnson is bearing the brunt of this criticism because, with President Truman's approval, he insisted that the military forces live within a $14,000,000,000 budget. The Defense Secretary announced that his economy program would give us a compact fighting team which would be ready for any emergency.

His most consistent critics are the Alsop brothers, a team of writing men who defied the late James Forrestal and recognize no stateman other than Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG.

The Alsops say that under Johnson, marine battalions were suppressed; aircraft replacement rates were slashed to ribbons; research and development were slowed down. Great gaps in our strength, such as our weakness in tank and tactical aircraft for supporting ground troops, were blandly ignored, and the loss of vital strength was veiled in untruth.

Johnson's answer, as I have heard him give it on several occasions, is that he was simply frying the fat out of the military establishment. He contends that the cost of maintaining obsolete forts and military posts which have absolutely no value in time of war runs to nearly $3,000,000,000 a year.

The Secretary insists that he could fry that much additional fat out of the military budget if it were not for the vanity and local pride of the Congressmen and Senators in whose districts or States these installations are located.

IMPOSSIBLE TO KEEP GARRISON EVERYWHERE

My own judgment is that the truth lies somewhere in between these two contentions.

At the time when Secretary Johnson was holding down military costs, there was a great clamor in this country for economy. Neither President Truman nor Secretary of the Treasury John Snyder wanted to face another huge deficit. The Hoover proposals for reorganizing Government on a more efficient and less costly basis met with widespread popular favor. Little credence was placed in the possibility of an early military crisis and the price of rearming Europe was rising rapidly.

Still, it is a physical and financial impossibility for the United States to be ready for global emergencies everywhere.

Are we prepared for a sudden onslaught in Western Europe, Greece, or Iran? Have we the manpower and the resources to garrison the world?

Conceding that the United States must resist Soviet agression wherever and whenever it crops out, was the country willing to draft millions of American boys for that job prior the Korean war?

CONGRESS AND PEOPLE SHARE RESPONSIBILITY

"Louie" Johnson's big shortcoming is that he talks too much. His blustery speeches about licking Russia with one hand and being prepared to meet any crisis at 5 o'clock in the morning contained more pugnacity than common sense.

But he cannot be indicted and convicted as the scapegoat of Korea unless the President, Congress, and the American people are willing to share the responsibility.

Nor should the impression be allowed to grow that, under Johnson, we have disbanded the Army, scuttled the Navy, crippled the Air Force, and abandoned essential research.

Even by present-day standards, $14,000,000,000 is still quite a lot of money.

What did the Army, Navy, and Air Force do with it?

From what I have seen at Fort Benning, Newport News, and Eglin Field, the money has not been wasted.

Proof of that lies in Friday's announcement that 50 B–29 superfortresses plastered North Korean military targets in the heaviest single air blow of the Korean campaign.

As Russell Brines, of the AP, writes from Tokyo: "It took exactly 8 days to deliver this new punch—from the date overseas orders were first delivered to the release of the bombs. In that time, the men, their planes, and most of their equipment were moved 8,000 miles and prepared for an air blow that meant a round trip of more than 1,500 miles."

We have quality equipment and a compact fighting team, if not the mass strength which is possible only under a general mobilization.

Was the country in the mood for such a step before Korea?

I don't think so.

Mr. Speaker, in my address to this House of 48 hours ago, I pointed out that the voters and taxpayers in my district—and I believe the people everywhere throughout America—are wholly conscious of the remarkable job that had been done by the Honorable Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense.

Certainly the editorial from the Chicago Daily News proves that the innate sense of decency and fair play, which has always characterized American newspapermen, is not dead. You can bet your last dollar that our press will not remain mute or permit hard-working and capable public officials to be maligned for political reasons—by persons who though they blame him—lack the courage to direct their bitterness against our President himself.

Mr. Speaker, the fullest cooperation and understanding has existed between the Armed Services Committee of this House under the splended leadership of our most able chairman, Carl Vinson, and Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson since the very day he assumed that office. It is an insult to this Congress, to our Committee on Armed Services, and to our very able chairman for anyone to say that the military service of these United States were not or are not now readied as at this very moment to defend our country against attack by any nation. The fact is that the United States Air Force is capable of delivering swift, overpowering counter-attack and retaliation by way of the strategic use of the atom bomb carried by our great Air Force's B–36 intercontinental long-range bomber to any quarter of the globe on almost a moment's notice.

Mr. Speaker, you and I know full well that this Congress never intended that Louis Johnson keep in active service a peacetime American Army, Navy, and Air Force of such size as would guarantee the security of every nation in the world against attack from either within or without their own countries or from whatever source inspired. That fact is made evident by the limited enlisted and commissioned officer personnel ceiling which we established on each of the several branches of the armed services, the limited appropriations which we made for the purposes of national defense as well as by the refusal of this Congress to adopt the universal military training bill, which Louis Johnson has long argued we should adopt in order to insure the proper preparedness and defense that he though necessary to the continental United States.

Mr. Speaker, speaking of national defense, the problem as to the adequacy of defense of this country is no different today than it was 60 days ago.

In the past the question as to just how adequately we could protect any and all countries of the world from attack was never raised. The Congress declared that its purpose was the establishment of a balanced land, sea, and air force that could give the United States all reasonable security and do so with military forces so trained as to afford reasonable security to the maintenance of the independence of other nations to whom we might be obligated under the charter of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I was particularly intrigued by the full-page article published on the front page of the editorial section of the Washington Post, to which I previously referred, as written by John G. Norris, and headed "Unification works as Korean war ends bickering."

Mr. Speaker, the publication of that article finds my faith in the American people as well grounded as in my faith in our great Secretary of Defense and appreciation of the colossal task he accomplished in bringing about the solidarity and complete unification of our armed services in these last 14 months.

Mr. Norris' article is of such an informative nature and so replete with factual accomplishments of such interest that I am inserting all pertinent parts of the same into the RECORD of today's proceedings.

UNIFICATION WORKS AS KOREAN WAR ENDS BICKERING

(By John G. Norris)

For the first time in history, the United States is waging war with a truly unified high command.

At the Pentagon a well-knit, integrated team is running the show, undisturbed by the dissension and divided authority that too often have prevailed both in peace and war. As far as can be determined at this distance, the same is true in the Far East.

This is no accident, nor simply the result of the passage of the Armed Forces Unification Act 3 years ago.

It is the end product of a happy combination of both men and circumstances—an event that came none too soon. A few months ago there was unification in form at the Pentagon—but not in spirit.

But now—as a result of both events and some changes of faces—both the top civilian and military commanders all are pulling in unison. This is worthy of note in light of the recent attacks on Secretary Louis Johnson for failing to have the Armed Forces fully prepared for the present trouble. He should have been building up our military strength instead of economizing, say the critics.

But Johnson—as the man in charge—also must be given considerable credit for the improved team play in the high command. Not all, for perhaps the major factor was the cathartic effect of last year's Navy-Air Force row on Capitol Hill and realization that real unification could come only from a free willingness to cooperate and not by edict from the top.

The new high-level appointments since last fall's upheaval all have been particu-

larly well chosen from the point of view of team play.

Who makes up the new smooth-working Pentagon high command? Here they are, with especial emphasis on the newcomers who have made such a difference:

Big, bald Louis Johnson, himself, World War I captain, top-flight lawyer, American Legion head, and money-raiser for the Truman 1948 campaign. Though he has stayed very much behind the scenes since the Korean fighting began, he is too well known to need profiling here.

Deputy Secretary of Defense Stephen T. Early, also a World War I captain, newspaperman, and President Roosevelt's press secretary for many years. Now on leave from the Pullman Co., he was expected to leave the Pentagon August 1, but probably will remain on for a time.

Lincolnesque Gen. Omar N. Bradley, now Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and probably America's outstanding tactician of the last war. Like Johnson and Early, he needs no treatment here.

NEWCOMERS IMPORTANT

There are some important new personalities on the two top policy levels in the Department of Defense. And the newcomers have had much to do with making the new joint Secretaries and the older Joint Chiefs of Staff click during the present emergency.

First, there is Frank Pace, Jr., who succeeded able Gordon Gray as Secretary of the Army in April. Within weeks the 38-year Arkansan made his mark and since the Korean war has become one of the truly powerful men at the Pentagon. There are three reasons for this: (1) The fact that Army is the executive agent of the Department of Defense in the Far East theater; (2) he has President Truman's full confidence and liking; and (3) Pace's own unusual abilities and self-assurance.

Another top-level official took office about the same time as Pace last April and the change had an even greater effect on Pentagon unity. Thomas Knight Finletter replaced W. Stuart Symington as Secretary of Air Force.

Symington, an aggressive and able exponent of air power, was not exactly a team player. Finletter, the advocate rather than the salesman, kept quiet for a good two months after taking office. Then—with the trained lawyer's knack of learning the essentials of a complicated case in a short time—he spoke his mind.

In his first public address as Air Force Secretary, Finletter stressed the importance of Armed Forces unity. Never once did he mention 70 groups, and the only time he spoke of air power or the Air Force were in phrases like "the Army, Navy and Air Force team."

That determination on unity and teamplay is paying off today. Finletter, Pace and Secretary of the Navy Francis Matthews have formed what is known as the Joint Secretaries. The group functions in the broad, political-military field much as do the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the strategic level.

COMMUNICATION KEPT UP

They meet several times daily, and are in constant communication by squawk-box, reaching agreement on many joint problems that can be carried out without further ado. On other matters they present their recommendation to the Secretary or Deputy Secretary.

This speeds up defense business, as formerly similar questions often had to be decided by the Secretary after receiving unilateral, conflicting recommendations from the three service heads. Finletter explained the functioning of this new body this way:

"We are seeking to apply the joint task concept to the broad planning of the Army, Navy and Air Force just as has been done in combat operations."

The new Air Force Secretary was born 57 years ago in Philadelphia, the son and grandson of jurists. He studied in Paris and then took degrees from the University of Pennsylvania. During World War I, he was a captain of field artillery.

During the twenties and thirties, Finletter built up a reputation as a New York corporation lawyer, author, and law lecturer.

Throughout World War II he was an official of the State Department, and when made Air Secretary he was chief of the ECA mission to Britain, with rank of minister. Finletter, however, is best known as the head of President Truman's Air Policy Commission, which on January 1, 1948, submitted a report called Survival in the Air Age. The Finletter report counseled an expansion of American air power and other forces to meet the danger of Russian aggression.

Like Pace, the spare, quiet Air Force chief is a tennis player, and the father of two daughters. His girls, however, now are married. Mrs. Finletter is the daughter of the music conductor, Walter Damrosch, and an author herself.

A BRILLIANT CHOICE

The third member of the new Joint Secretaries—Navy Secretary Francis Patrick Matthews—is well known. He's been Navy head since May 1949, and figured prominently in the interservice row of last year. Matthews was bitterly criticized then by a Senator who has since made equally sweeping charges against many others in public life—JOSEPH MCCARTHY of Wisconsin. But MCCARTHY did not jump on Matthews—a prominent Omaha lawyer, banker, and Catholic layman—for Red leanings, but because he fired Admiral Louis E. Denfeld as Chief of Naval Operations.

Whatever the merits of that controversy, Matthews' choice of a successor to Denfeld was without question a brilliant one.

For in the relatively short time he has been CNO and Navy member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Forrest P. Sherman has been the main factor in transforming that body into what it always was supposed to be. Until 1950 and Admiral Sherman, the JCS too often had been a battleground, with 2 to 1 decisions leading to constant strife, and a conviction among many naval officers that they weren't getting a fair deal.

That's all changed today. Aided by reaction to the congressional investigation of the Pentagon row, the 53-year-old Navy flier soon had the other members of the defense high command listening respectfully to his views and agreeing to much of what he wanted to do.

EXAMPLE OF CHANGE

As an example of the different atmosphere now prevailing in the Joint Chiefs, when the Army and Air Force chiefs of staff decided to fly to the Far East for a first-hand look at the war, one problem arose. They were supposed to go before a congressional committee for previously arranged testimony. Sherman offered to represent them, and the suggestion was instantly accepted.

That would not have happened a year or even 9 months ago. Then an absentee chief would have sent his deputy. Today, the concept is growing that each member of the Joint Chiefs sits as a ranking member of the Armed Forces rather than as a partisan representative of his own service.

The other members of the Joint Chiefs, of course, are Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army chief of staff, and Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Air Force chief of staff.

Peppery, pug-nosed "Lightning Joe" Collins was one of the few high-ranking military men who fought against both the Japs and Germans in the last war. The 55-year-old West Pointer commanded the Twenty-fifth Division in the conquest of Guadalcanal and later operations in New Georgia. He led the Seventh Corps ashore on the beach during the Normandy D-day, captured Cherbourg, and then spearheaded the St. Lo break-through. Collins' corps played a leading part in the drive across France, Belgium, and into Germany, capturing Aachen, Cologne, and Paderborn, before driving to the Elbe. In 1947, he became Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army, and last summer succeeded Bradley as Chief of Staff.

ALWAYS AN AIRMAN

Vandenberg, also a West Pointer and nephew of the Senator, has been airman all his military career. During the war he was chief of staff of the Northwest African Strategic Air Force, flying many missions. After a brief stay at the Pentagon and a mission to Moscow, he was made commander of the American air forces of the Allied Expeditionary Forces.

"Van" took command of the Ninth Air Force before Normandy and teamed up with Bradley. Vandenberg's tactical air and Bradley's army group played a major role in winning the war.

Production of Aluminum and Other Light Metals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I feel that I should make a matter of permanent record a release which I put out last Monday, July 24, 1950. My reason for so doing is to point up some of the critical situations that we find our natural resources in when called upon for an all-out effort.

Much reference of late has been made to our deficiencies in manganese and the bearing of these deficiencies in our overall production of steel. Reference could also be made to a fundamental shortage in nickel particularly, and also to deficiencies caused by (1) the high cost of production or (2) a shortage of known ore reserves in practically all of the alloying metals so necessary for the production of armor and armored bearings, shafts, gun barrels, etc.

In the light of this situation, I feel that it is rather reassuring to know that we are able to step up, and look forward to the completion of a heartening program in the production of aluminum and other light metals.

Here ores either exist or are obtainable in the Western Hemisphere. The only foreseeable handicap could be a shortage of electrical energy. Aluminum and magnesium, of course, have been called nothing more than frozen kilowatts. It is because of the presence of available and virtually unlimited potential electrical energy from hydro sources in the Pacific Northwest that we find it today the growing center of the American light metal production.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that this Congress has authorized

many additional projects on the Columbia River. The war effort upon which we are now launched probably will see an immediate demand for the speedy completion of both Chief Joseph Dam and the authorized Albeni Falls Dam near Spokane.

The news release follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Henry J. Kaiser today set the pattern for American industry in the present national emergency by taking immediate and positive action to comply with President Truman's recommendation that a program be started to "accelerate and increase the production of essential materials, products, and services," it was disclosed by Congressman WALT HORAN, Republican, of Washington.

Mr. Kaiser has informed me, the Congressman said, that the Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., directing its efforts toward expanding its aluminum production capacity by 400,000,000 pounds a year, today purchased from the General Services Administration a large part of the production equipment of the Government's inactive aluminum plant at Riverbank, Calif.

Congressman HORAN said that the company expected to spend $2,000,000 on the project which would be financed privately. The equipment purchased includes 128 aluminum reduction pots, now comprising the entire third line of pots at the Riverbank plant, 12 additional pots from another line at the plant, a complete line of rectifier equipment and four 6-ton cranes.

The Munitions Board, according to Congressman HORAN, has approved dismantling of these facilities and their removal to another location where adequate electric power is available.

Mr. Kaiser told me, the Congressman stated, that this equipment would increase the capacity of the company 40,000,000 pounds a year. The equipment will be in operation at the earliest possible time. The Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. has a huge aluminum reduction plant near Spokane, Wash., and is the third largest producer of aluminum in the country.

It is evident from this amazingly fast action that Mr. Kaiser has lost none of the ability that made him the production genius of World War II, the Congressman added. Within a matter of a few days after the President's appeal for action, Mr. Kaiser has accomplished virtually 10 percent of his plan to expand aluminum production capacity. It is also worth while to note that in 1949 his aluminum company turned out 257,400,000 pounds of aluminum products.

It is extremely gratifying to me, and I am sure to other Members of Congress, to see such response on the part of American industry, Mr. HORAN said. The expansion of the production capacity of Mr. Kaiser's company is a warning to the totalitarian nations. When American industry rolls up its sleeves in support of our Armed Forces they are an unbeatable combination.

President Refused To Be Stampeded Into Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Marquis Childs:

PRESIDENT REFUSED TO BE STAMPEDED INTO ACTION

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON.—President Truman's message should find an immediate and welcome response in the country. It is what most of us have been waiting for—a calm yet forceful statement of the issues together with a program to create American strength in being above and beyond the immediate needs for Korea.

The President has refused to be stampeded into hasty and perhaps unwise action. His are the words of a man determined to proceed with a grim and fateful task; in recognition of an evil that can no longer be ignored.

In some respects the President's recommendations go further than had been anticipated. The ten billions requested for rearmament is twice the amount that had been predicted. As a matter of fact, the sum was not finally agreed to until late Tuesday night, long after the main elements of the message were assembled.

Military advisers pressed for the larger amount and they carried the day. Likewise they argued for the right to call up, if necessary, all the National Guard.

How the Kremlin will respond to the President's declaration is something else again. On that reaction may well depend whether the Korean conflict spreads to the entire world. The little group of men who exercise absolute rule over so many millions of people could decide that the creation of American strength, in being, was too great a threat to the superiority in military striking power that they now wield.

The sign of such a decision would probably be additional Communist attacks at tension points—Iran, Yugoslavia, Indochina with the immediate use of Chinese Communist armies in the Korean war. The Truman message frankly recognizes that this may happen.

On the whole there was remarkable agreement among the various advisers helping to shape the program. They were generally for the middle course between the extremes of all-out mobilization and the wait-to-see-what-happens theory.

If a party struggle develops over the economic controls the President will request at a later date, the conservatives are bound to center their fire on one particular point in the program. That is the recommendation for production-loan guaranties and loans to increase production. This is in order to accelerate and increase the production of essential materials, products, and services.

Back of this is the thinking of Chairman Leon Keyserling of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and others who, for more than 2 years, have been urging an increase in facilities to produce steel and other essentials. In line with this argument was the suggestion, which stirred a tempest of debate, that the Government might have to finance the construction of steel plants in order to get sufficient steel capacity.

As one result of this whole controversy, Keyserling became the No. 1 demon of conservative business interests. But whatever one thinks of the Keyserling school, and many, including esteemed economists, think less than nothing of it, the fact is that growing shortages of the past 6 months have seemed to prove the point that basic productive capacity was not sufficient for an expanding economy.

While it is an oversimplification to put it this way, the debate, in coming weeks is likely to be between the belt-tightening sacrifices for all groups and those who argue the need to expand productive capacity for both war and peace. Keyserling has repeatedly urged expansion of the economy at an annual rate of 3 percent in order to provide new jobs for new job seekers who come into the market in ever increasing numbers.

Even if the Korean war is localized, it is bound to be drawn out, and the belt-tightening school will have powerful emotions on their side. But they will also have a serious handicap. Among them for example, are earnest Republicans who have always stood for international cooperation and assistance.

But other Republicans, both more numerous and more influential in their party, are likely to balk at even the limited allocations and priorities which the President will recommend in a later message. They are talking about voluntary controls in the face of the price gouging already taking place.

It is such talk from those who may be able to veto any and all controls that makes the belt-tightening line sound unreal. In trying to map a middle-ground position, the President has taken what seems to me to be a sane and reasonable course, and I believe he will have wide support in the country.

An Open Letter to the Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an open letter to the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, addressed by the United Polish Press of America, which has come to my attention and I ask the Members of the House to read it and to consider the questions that are asked therein and the answers provided which hinge very much on the Yalta agreement. This open letter has had wide distribution and the excerpt which I present here is from Jednosc, a Polish weekly newspaper in Philadelphia, published June 22, 1950.

AN OPEN LETTER TO SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN ACHESON

SIR: You have enriched the history of our political methods by introducing a question and answer period in our Congress, thus following the democratic pattern of European parliamentary procedure. Since you speak and act in our name it is only proper that we too be given a chance to ask questions and receive answers to check whether what you say and do is in accordance with our wishes and the mandate issued to you through our democratic system of government.

Members of Congress represent us in that body of Government, but it seems to us that as representatives of the fourth estate, no less representative of public opinion, we deserve the same privilege of asking questions and receiving answers. Not for the sake of satisfying curiosity, but out of a sincere and deep desire to know our foreign policy, especially now, when our foreign policy directly affects the present and future of every American.

From your excellent exposé we get a fairly clear picture of the situation in Europe. Almost every one of the many vital problems is reviewed and our attitude stated. Vast are the boundaries of the territory covered by your report but it stops short at the iron curtain. Not a word is said about the countries behind it, no ray of hope, no word of encouragement as if our foreign

policy had definitely written off Poland and Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Hungary, Lithuania and Latvia, and other countries as lost positions in our political calculations. Yet tens of millions of enslaved peoples who listen to the Voice of America, as broadcast by radio and pronounced by you, also listened to your report to the Nation but heard no mention about themselves.

Hence these questions which we take the liberty of asking you publicly: What about the countries behind the iron curtain? No hope for them? Do they mean nothing to us today or in the future? Do we or do we not count on them—should a third world war break out? Are their potential contributions less important than the expected contribution from the millions of Nazi youths in Germany of the former SS men who now are the foremen in our revitalizing plans of Germany?

Have we any debts, any obligations toward the nations behind the Red curtain comparable to the consideration we now show the Germans? Do we accept the present status of these nations as permanent and basic in our thoughts about the future of Europe? In other words, do we still subscribe to the Yalta agreement? Is our foreign policy based on commitments entered at Yalta? We have radically changed our views regarding Germany of the Yalta period, we have de facto altered our course by a wide and rapid swing over the curb, yet Poland and China seem to be the same in the imaginary picture as they were in 1945, in spite of the great changes that took place since that time, changes which should have caused us to veer far away from the disastrous path chosen and dug by us at Yalta.

There is no step open to our foreign policy that does not hinge on the Yalta agreement. It is our belief that no political course can be fortuitous without a radical, definite, and clear severance from Yalta. This skeleton in our closet weighs heavily on every word and every deed of ours, it is the criterion of our morality, the test of the faith other nations are expected to have in us.

In this same Congress of the United States which you have recently addressed, hundreds of times solemn statements, irate accusations, and fervent hopes were expressed that our country will at some time admit its failure at Yalta and do something about it. Many Senators and Representatives have spoken in Congress about the betrayal of our Allies: Poland and China which ultimately led to the present dangerous situation.

Were we to grow rhetorical we would appeal to you to open the closet and remove the skeleton of Yalta from it, open the windows for a fresh breath of American idealism. The forgotten man in the street knows by now that the dollar curtain will neither lift nor replace the iron curtain. Not even the H-bomb could do it. Yet new faith in American idealism could do it and will do it if we prove to the rest of the world that besides dollars and bombs we still have ideals and traditions of justice, liberty, and morality.

You have told France and England, Holland, and Belgium, etc., what to expect, what to count on, what the United States will contribute toward their future and common defense against possible aggression. Why not tell Poland something about our plans, a message of encouragement, a statement of our attitude and promise? Poland—and the rest of the countries behind the red curtain—needs such a message. The time and place was in Congress, when you spoke about our role in shaping the future of the world. It is still time, and it is still imperative that you do so in the name of the United States and the American people, to let these nations know that they are neither forgotten nor abandoned. To do so is in the interest of our country.

Respectfully yours,

UNITED POLISH PRESS OF AMERICA.

The Grim, Grisly Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Sioux City Journal, Sioux City, Iowa, on Monday, July 24, 1950:

THE GRIM, GRISLY TRUTH

The Journal deeply regrets the necessity of expressing herewith a conviction anent the international situation of today, which is that there will be no peace on this earth unless and until the free peoples of the world fight it out with the Russians and their satellites, utterly destroying their power for evil. The Journal realizes how grim and grisly a thing that is to say, but it cannot see in any direction even a glimmer of hope for anything else. It is the truth of the matter to say that the democracies must come to grips with the Red bloc nations sooner or later if humanity is to have an opportunity for peace and happiness in the world.

In a conference a few days ago in the room where this is written an associate asked these questions: "Suppose Soviet Russia did order the North Koreans to get out of South Korea and stop fighting, what would happen then? Could we trust Soviet Russia in any promises she made, in any agreement she signed? Wouldn't the cold war be resumed and wouldn't we still be compelled in the interest of our security to spend fifteen or twenty billions of dollars a year indefinitely, finally having to go to war with the Soviet bloc when the Red nations were stronger than they are now?"

The answers to those questions do not make pleasant reading for anyone in this country. As the Journal sees it, no patched-up situation such as would be created if Russia told the North Koreans to cease fighting and retire north of the thirty-eighth parallel would mean anything as a contribution to permanent peace. We could not trust the Russians on anything they said, or signed, or promised. The cold war would be resumed if the fighting ended in Korea and we'd still have to put billions on billions of dollars into our defenses year after year for decades, or even generations. It would be an armed truce, during which the Communist nations would prepare for the day when they felt they could strike and win.

No sensible American possibly could want another world war. But no sensible American could want this constant pressure of gigantic taxes, of increasing anxiety, of growing fear and doubt and suspicion, of threat and challenge such as would result from a continuance of the cold war. Yet that is exactly what is coming—unless the opposing forces fight it out to a decision as a result of the developments now occurring.

What the Journal means is this: There cannot be and will not be any peace for the free, sovereign nations of the world as long as Soviet Russia remains sufficiently powerful to threaten or destroy the liberty of other countries. That power must be broken some time. There's no logic whatever in suggesting that Russian leaders can be made to see the light and change their attitude toward humanity, or that through the United Nations agreements can be reached in the interest of friendly cooperation and collaboration among the powers to put an end to war. The Russians have their red ideology. Nothing can convince them that it is wrong, evil, inhuman and cruel. They will adhere to it and use it at every opportunity in trying to reach their objective, world domination.

That is what the free nations and peoples of the world face today. It is grim and grisly, but it is the truth and we might as well accept it for what it is and make our plans accordingly. It is inconceivable to us Americans that our freedom and independence and happiness could be ended by the superior military might of any other nation in the world. But we must look at this thing as it is, rather than as we'd prefer it to be. Soviet Russia definitely has an aim. That aim, that intent, that design, that purpose is this—to destroy us, our way of life, our institutions, everything we possess as a sovereign people. She already has brought such destruction (at least temporarily) to many nations, and her objective is to add others to the list of enslaved. Only superior might, or its employment against her, will stop it.

Everybody is familiar with the expression, "this is it." Men in war who felt they were about to die have thought of this if alone or have spoken of it to their comrades in arms. That expression with propriety is applied to the situation we of the free world face at this moment and will face henceforth. This is it, indeed. The test is coming today or it is coming tomorrow. It will come now or it will come later. We might as well accept this grim and grisly truth and then go on with what we must do.

Strong United States Economy Is Called as Necessary as Armed Might

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mark Sullivan appearing in today's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, there are all sorts of wild guesses as to what Russia contemplates doing. We definitely know that already our President has asked us for $10,500,000,000 to take care of the Korean war. If this is the beginning of a series of similar contests throughout the areas which Russia controls, the Russian plan to break down our economy is well on its way. One shudders to think what all this might lead to.

It may be a fantastic notion, but I am one who would hate to see this Nation break down economically in the torture of dying by inches. For this reason, as wild as it may seem at this moment, would it not be better to have a showdown and strike the trouble at the source? Certainly we have spent a lot of money for atomic bombs. Why are we continuing the making of these bombs only to dribble away our strength in the methods of warfare now being used in Korea? This may become a war of survival, and have the American people reached the stage of the old Roman Empire, where we have become too soft to

take it? If this is the beginning of an all-out war, let us gird ourselves for a complete show-down, and this means sacrifices on the part of each and every one of us.

STRONG UNITED STATES ECONOMY IS CALLED AS NECESSARY AS ARMED MIGHT—MARK SULLIVAN, CITING KREMLIN'S BLUEPRINT FOR AGGRESSION, CALLS FOR WISE DECISIONS

(By Mark Sullivan)

Our people, thinking intently and anxiously about prospect of major war, commonly phrased as "a third world war," know half the prospect fairly well. The United States will not initiate world war, nor what would amount to that. We will not make a direct all-out military attack upon Russia. That is not contemplated either by us or the United Nations. So far as military action is contemplated, in statements of either President Truman or the United Nations, the action is to be defense of free nations against aggression, the kind of action now being taken in Korea.

But what is contemplated by the United States is only half the prospect, or less. We need to know what Russia contemplates. About this there is light in a book published last week, Behind Closed Doors, by retired Rear Admiral Ellis M. Zacharias. The author's background is suggested by the fact that during the war he served for some time as Deputy Director of Naval Intelligence. The present book includes recent information acquired by Admiral Zacharias in his personal capacity. One chapter is an account of a meeting of the Politburo in the Kremlin on January 28, 1949. The account was given Admiral Zacharias by a special officer courier who was present, became shocked, and later escaped from Russia. This Politburo meeting was the final one of a series which discussed and came to conclusions about what amounted to a blueprint or time table.

OUTLINES STALIN'S POSITION

In addition to the inside account of the Politburo meeting, Admiral Zacharias' book includes similar accounts of positions taken by Stalin, and other inside information from various sources. Though the sources do not always agree on all points, some important net inferences are strongly tenable. One is that Russia does not intend to make direct and overt war on the United States at this time or in the near future.

Some of the Communist heads advocated war on the United States in 1952, before the military strength of our western European associates in the Atlantic Union could be effectively mobilized. This, however, Stalin vetoed. His reason for certainly postponing direct and all-out war on the United States, and possibly avoiding the necessity of it at all, can be understood from the Russian blueprint. The blueprint as a whole is in two parts, one called the military estimate, the other called the economic estimate. One gathers that, as respects overcoming the United States, Stalin relied most on the economic estimate.

Again and again the economic estimate predicts economic cataclysm in the United States. "Stalin," says Admiral Zacharias, "accepted the conclusions of the economists and now bases his plans on an inevitability of an American depression in 1954." The Russian economists were positive about the coming of an economic cataclysm in the United States some time between 1952 and 1956.

The prediction of the Russian economic experts, and the plan of Stalin based on it, were as of early 1949, before Korea. Regardless of the effect of Korea and its consequences on the American economy, expectation of the break-up of the American economic system is a permanent tenet of the Communist ideology. Likewise permanent is the determination of communism that capitalism must be destroyed throughout the world, especially in the United States as the leading country practicing that economic system. This must be understood in every calculation of Americans about the future.

PLAN CALLED FOR AGGRESSION

While the Russian plan as of early 1949 did not contemplate making early direct war on the United States, it did contemplate a series of aggressions in various parts of the world, comparable to the one in Korea. It contemplated, also, extension of possession or influence by force or threat of force to points regarded by the Russians as desirable to dominate, including the Dardanelles, Trieste, and territory in central and northern Europe. And the Russian plan as of early 1949 by no means foreclosed direct war on the United States. The plan contemplated war on us if and when desirable, perhaps during and in order to promote the economic cataclysm it anticipated in the United States.

An over-all deduction from the Russian "military estimate" of 1949, and the corresponding "economic estimate" is that the United States faces a double need. To preserve our economic system is as important as to build up our military strength. Preservation of the economic system calls for wisdom in setting up the temporary economic changes made necessary for military strength.

Draft Profits, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion an editorial in the Clear Lake (Iowa) Reporter reflects the thinking of a majority of people in the Third Iowa District on the subject of war profiteering.

On several occasions since the outbreak of war in South Korea I have informed Congress of the existence of unwarranted and unconscionable price increases, and have urged the administration to take the necessary steps to wipe out now and for all time this and other unconscionable methods of war profiteering, including cost-plus contracts.

Mr. Speaker, the Clear Lake Reporter is to be commended for the forthright editorial which follows:

LET'S CONTROL WAR PROFITEERS

From Washington comes the information that the Government is reexamining all plans to control manpower in the fast-breaking military equipments.

The probability is that the controls will come in more quickly than in connection with World War II. The delay after Pearl Harbor is probably explained by the fact that there was greater unemployment at that time but, in view of the situation in the Far East, the Government is probably wise in making arrangements to ration manpower, if necessary.

In this connection, we have seen no news from Washington that the Government is acting with equal alacrity to control war profits. As soon as the conflict flared up in South Korea, there was immediate reaction in business circles, with trade associations advising clients of prospective profits. Certainly, if the Government is intelligent enough to control manpower, it should do something about profits.

In every war that the United States has fought, involving the loss of life, with brave men defending their country, there have been war profiteers at home. The people of the Nation are sick and tired of the spectacle. Considerable discussion about the possibility of limiting profits in wartime followed World War I, but nothing very effective was accomplished. Before world war III, if it is to unfortunately occur, legislation should be passed to curb the profits of businesses in connection with the war efforts of the Nation.

Should the Facts Interfere With a Good Story?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, if each Member of Congress arose here to protest every misleading or distorted article on his activities or on the work of committees on which he serves, we would have time for little else but protests and corrections.

As chairman of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, I could present to the Congress innumerable instances of reports on our work which have been deliberately distorted in order to serve the purposes of one or another of the groups which we have been investigating. I have never felt that to be necessary, however, because so much of this misleading reporting has been completely irresponsible on its face.

Furthermore, it has been overbalanced by the straight, factual reporting which has appeared in most of the reputable and responsible newspapers and magazines and over the radio.

Nevertheless, I do feel it necessary to call to the attention of the House a recent editorial in Life magazine which I think needs some clarification. In doing this I do not necessarily accuse Life magazine of any deliberate attempt to distort the facts. I think the facts can speak for themselves, and I am sure a periodical of such wide circulation and influence would be anxious to have the facts set straight.

Life is, of course, one of the largest mass-circulation magazines in the Nation, and any misstatements which may be carried in it will be read by millions of citizens, most of whom will have no reason to doubt the thoroughness of its reporting.

The editorial to which I refer appeared in the issue of June 26, 1950. It was entitled "The Right of Petition." It appeared shortly after I had announced the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities had addressed a circular questionnaire to the executives of about 175 business corporations in the United States asking them for detailed information on the funds which they spent for purposes related to the influencing of legislation by the Congress.

There was, as you know, Mr. Speaker, a great howl raised in some quarters about the motives of this questionnaire and the alleged unreasonableness of it. It so happens that this questionnaire was blown up into a major issue at just about the time when the Committee for Constitutional Government, a propaganda organization coming under the jurisdiction of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946, had announced that it would defy a subpena requiring it to submit to this committee a list of its financial supporters—its large contributors.

The two matters were completely unrelated. The Committee for Constitutional Government, however, seized upon the questionnaire issue as a means of attracting attention to its own position in its defiance of this committee.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, a very tiny fraction of the business corporations included in our so-called corporation letter list felt that we had gone beyond our jurisdiction to ask these executives for information they preferred not to give us. At the same time, the Committee for Constitutional Government feared—for some unexplained reason about which we can only guess—feared, as I say, being required to make public the names of those who had contributed sizable amounts to its propaganda activities.

Being one of the most adroit propaganda agencies in the country—and I do not say that disparagingly; it is a fact—the Committee for Constitutional Government began a daily barrage of press releases to newspapers throughout the country designed to identify its private feud with the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities as a crusade in behalf of business concerns allegedly being victimized by my committee. This was a very transparent strategy and technique, but apparently some people fell for it.

In any event, as a result of the constant screams from the Committee for Constitutional Government, which, you will recall, was intent on discrediting this committee and was in any event determined not to give us the information we had first requested and then subpenaed, this totally unrelated matter of the business-corporation questionnaire was given a great deal of publicity.

A good example of the results of that campaign is this editorial I have referred to in Life magazine entitled "The Right of Petition."

President C. B. Randall, of the Inland Steel Co., had written to me stating the information we had requested was unreasonable. The Committee for Constitutional Government thereupon made Mr. Randall's cause its cause and circularized newspapers throughout the country with material based on Mr. Randall's public protest.

President W. C. Mullendore of the Southern California Edison Co., Ltd., also made public a protest to me about the information we had requested from his company. This letter, too, was duplicated by the Committee for Constitutional Government and distributed broadside throughout the country by it.

The strategy of the Committee for Constitutional Government, was, as I said, extremely transparent. This organization and its executive secretary, Edward A. Rumley, had decided that rather than make public the names of those who contribute large amounts to this lobbying organization, they would risk a contempt of Congress prosecution. If this committee of Congress could be discredited in the public eye, however, as irresponsible or partisan or vengeful, such a citation could perhaps be avoided. Here were several reputable business executives protesting the scope of information we had asked from them. If the business community of the Nation could be enlisted in a drive against the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, it would certainly damage us in our effectiveness.

It was at this point the following editorial appeared in Life magazine.

THE RIGHT OF PETITION

There is a big to-do in Congress about the lobbying activities of 166 leading United States corporations. On June 1 the House Committee on Lobbying Activities gave the heads of these corporations 15 days to fill out meticulous reports of expenditures on travel to Washington, on contributions, and on advertising dealing with public issues.

In this connection we happened to look up article I of the United States Bill of Rights. "Congress," so the law reads, "shall make no law abridging the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." In the old days, prior to the Civil War, people took this right quite literally. Abolitionists flooded Congress with petitions to legislate an end to the grievance of slavery. In the 1830's the normal business of Congress was often tied up for weeks as southern representatives tried to stop the receipt of abolitionist petitions from New England.

Today the direct petitioning of Congress has gone out of fashion. It saves time and energy for everybody when President C. B. Randall of the Inland Steel Co., for example, goes down to Washington to see Senator PAUL DOUGLAS. In speaking to Senator DOUGLAS, Mr. Randall has presumably exercised his constitutional right of petition. But, according to Congressman BUCHANAN, head of the House Committee on Lobbying Activities, there is apparently something nefarious about Mr. Randall's visit.

Since BUCHANAN is out to "get" business for advertising its point of view on public issues, we can suggest to him a prime culprit. We refer to the Revere Copper & Brass Co. In the New York Times for June 13, 1950, Revere offered a paid advertisement attacking the idea of a copper tariff.

Personally, we welcome this sort of petitioning, and not merely because it fills the tills of the newspaper industry. Copper users everywhere have a right to know what Revere thinks of a tax on imported copper. It's their business as well as Revere's. Incidentally, the fact that important segments of business are coming over to free trade is news in itself. Boss Grundy, high priest of protectionism, was recently licked in Pennsylvania by Governor Duff. We choose to interpret his defeat as a symbol of a healthy national change of mind on tariffs.

I think I have explained several times to the House, Mr. Speaker, the development of this questionnaire and the motives behind it. I will not repeat that now. This editorial in Life magazine, however, proceeded on the glib assumption—one which the Committee for Constitutional Government had striven mightily to foster—that "BUCHANAN is out to 'get' business for advertising its point of view on public issues." I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this is the "line" which the Committee for Constitutional Government had been employing in its private vendetta with the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. And Life magazine, I am afraid, swallowed it.

So far as I know, no one from the staff of this magazine approached me or any member of the staff of my committee for the background on this particular corporation letter or on the general background of our investigation. If any effort was made by the magazine to assess this corporation questionnaire in terms of the over-all objectives of my committee, I am not familiar with it. I know that this has been a busy time for reporters in Washington and it is, of course, possible that the magazine may not have had staff people available to assign to the day-by-day work and hearings of our committee.

Soon after this copy of the magazine containing the editorial appeared, I addressed, on June 23, 1950, the following telegram to Mr. Henry R. Luce, editor in chief:

JUNE 23, 1950.

Mr. HENRY R. LUCE,
The Editor in Chief, Life Magazine,
New York 20, N. Y.

The House Select Committe on Lobbying Activities, of which I have the honor to be chairman, is as devoted as your editorial writer to the Bill of Rights, including the right of petition. My questionnaire to representative business corporations, labor unions and farm organizations is to ascertain expenditures by such groups in connection with legislative issues. The committee is not out to "get" anyone. It is out to get the facts on a voluntary cooperative basis, and the responses for the most part are straightforward and conscientious. There is nothing illegal or improper in lobbying as such. Indeed, it is helpful to the Congress, so long as it is openly conducted with full disclosure of its financial supports. The questionnaire is providing factual data that I hope will be helpful in improving the present lobby registration act.

FRANK BUCHANAN,
Chairman, House Select Committee
on Lobbying Activities.

This letter, in part, appeared in a subsequent "Letters to the Editor" section of Life on July 17, 1950, as follows:

RIGHT OF PETITION

SIRS: There is nothing illegal or improper in lobbying as such ("The Right of Petition," Life, June 26). Indeed, it is helpful to the Congress, so long as it is openly conducted with full disclosure of its financial supports. My questionnaire to representative business corporations, labor unions and farm organizations is to ascertain expenditures by such groups in connection with legislative issues. The committee is not out to "get" anyone. It is out to get the facts on a voluntary cooperative basis, and the responses for the most part are straighforward and conscientious.

FRANK BUCHANAN,
Chairman, House Select Committee
on Lobbying.

In the interest of conserving space, apparently, Life deleted from my reply the first sentence and the last sentence.

The first sentence said "The House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, of which I have the honor to be chairman, is as devoted as your editorial

writer to the Bill of Rights, including the right of petition."

I can, perhaps, assume that the editors of Life regarded that as so obvious a fact as not to be worth the space of including it in its Letters to the Editor column. I can presume that since every Member of Congress takes an oath to uphold the Constitution, the editors of Life would feel that of course I am devoted to the Bill of Rights and the right of petition. I hope so. But I also feel that it would have been very nice if they had included those few additional words, valuable as is the space in their magazine.

The last sentence which was deleted, referring to the questionnaire to business corporations, said:

> The questionnaire is providing factual data that I hope will be helpful in improving the present Lobby Registration Act.

There again Mr. Speaker, the editors of Life apparently assumed that everyone reading their editorial, of the June 26 issue, entitled "The Right of Petition," would know automatically that the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities has been seeking for months to determine the adequacy of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946, to determine if it has loopholes in it which militate against a full disclosure to Congress of the sort of information required by that Act, to determine if the Act is bringing out into the open—as its sponsors intended it to when it was enacted as part of the LaFollette-Monroney Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946—information on the funds collected and spent for the purpose of influencing Congress on legislation.

My experience has been that a great many citizens are not as yet aware that this is the prime purpose of our investigation and that in seeking to make the Lobbying Act not only effective but fair in its application, we have spent many, many hours of hearings and research of an unpublicized nature into the mechanics of this legislation and of the reporting thereunder.

So, although many Americans are not familiar with this phase of our work, I can only presume that the editors of Life magazine felt that the readers of their publication knew all of this background and were completely familiar with the purposes. Unfortunately, however, I do not think I have ever seen anything in Life magazine discussing the objective basis on which we function, the scrupulousness of our policy in covering organizations and activities on both sides of the street on any area of lobbying activity we go into, and the fact that our entire record discloses no effort on our part to get any group or interest, be it business or labor or agriculture or the profesional groups, or any other.

And so I, personally, feel a little bit unhappy about the fact that Life magazine was too pressed for space in its "Letters to the Editor" column to include that last sentence in my communication pointing out that the information we requested from business concerns is information which we need if we are to do a fair and objective analysis of the operation of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946, and if we are then to make a fair and objective analysis of the need for amendments to the act.

In its desire to be helpful to our work—and I am sure that there was some motive of that sort behind its editorial of June 26 entitled "The Right of Petition"—Life magazine has said:

> Since BUCHANAN is out to get business for advertising its point of view on public issues, we can suggest to him a prime culprit. We refer to the Revere Copper & Brass Co. In the New York Times for June 13, 1950, Revere offered a paid advertisement attacking the idea of a copper tariff.
>
> Personally, we welcome this sort of petitioning, and not merely because it fills the tills of the newspaper industry. Copper users everywhere have a right to know what Revere thinks of a tax on imported copper. It's their business as well as Revere's.

Not going into the subsequent sentences tying the tariff issue into Pennsylvania Republican politics, and skipping over this business about me being out "to 'get' business for advertising its point of view on public issues," I would like to comment on Life's suggestion that Revere Copper & Brass Co. is "a prime culprit" for us.

Here again the research was a little bit bad. It should have been a simple matter for Life magazine, with its very competent Washington bureau—many of the members of which I know as good reporters—to learn that the Revere Copper & Brass Co. is one of the corporations in this country which not only takes a strong interest in legislative matters vital to that company's prosperity, but that it does what most other companies fail to do, and that is, it reports its financial transactions in this regard under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act.

The Revere Copper & Brass Co., therefore, far from being any "culprit" insofar as this committee is concerned, is entitled to our congratulations for having done what few business corporations in the United States have done, and that is, report under the Lobbying Act on the receipts it has received from other corporations for a joint effort, spearheaded by Revere Copper & Brass, for repealing the copper tariff, and also for reporting to Congress on the money it spends in behalf of this objective.

The Revere Copper & Brass Co., insofar as I have been able to determine to date, has been acting completely above board in this matter, has correctly made no bones about its legislative interests or its expenditures for that purpose, and is doing all that the Lobbying Act would seem to require. I assume their reports are correct, but if they are not, it would be a simple matter for any enforcement agency to question them about their reports. My committee is not an enforcement agency. We are not prosecuting anyone. We are trying to make a law which is a good law in concept a good law also in operation.

The Revere Copper & Brass Co. has received contributions ranging from $6,000 to $30,000 each from 11 different corporations interested with it in killing the special import tax on copper. It has hired former Senator John A. Danaher, of Connecticut, as its legislative representative in behalf of this objective. All of that is a matter of public record and has been for a long time. Former Senator Danaher registered for this account under the Lobbying Act in February of 1947. Mr. Danaher receives $15,000 as a retainer to represent Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., "as its Washington attorney before the various Government departments, agencies, and commissions in such matters as may be assigned from time to time," and $1,000 a month for "legislative activity."

I am quoting from the official report of the Revere Copper & Brass Co., Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York, and of John A. Danaher, made to the Clerk of the House of Representatives under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act.

Revere Copper & Brass has had no hesitation whatsoever about complying with this act by reporting the following contributions from other firms since May 1947:

American Brass Co	$30,000
General Cable Corp	7,500
Scovill Manufacturing Co	7,500
Bridgeport Brass Co	7,500
International Nickel Co	7,500
American Metal Co	7,500
American Smelting & Refining Co	7,500
General Electric Co	15,000
Rome Cable Corp	6,000
Okonite Co	7,500
Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co	7,500

They have received, therefore, $111,000 in 3 years to help them carry on this fight. Their expenditures include the regular payments made to Mr. Danaher plus an item of $5,000 to St. Georges & Keyes, Inc., 250 Park Avenue, New York, for "consultation, and so forth, public statements re copper shortage." I presume that the advertisement in the New York Times of June 13, 1950 referred to in the Life magazine editorial will be accounted for by Revere Copper & Brass in its statement under the Lobbying Act to the Clerk of the House for the second quarter of 1950. Those have not yet been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but I have no reason to think that the one corporation singled out for us by Life magazine as a "prime culprit" would not automatically report to the Congress the expenditure Life magazine referred to, since it has been reporting these expenditures right along.

So Life magazine's little suggestion falls rather flat, for want of checking a few facts.

I would be very much surprised, Mr. Speaker, if anyone familiar with the work of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities could in any good conscience agree with this editorial in Life magazine that we have demonstrated a determination to "get" anyone. And I very much doubt also, Mr. Speaker, that anyone familiar with my work on this committee could agree with Life magazine in this editorial that I have indicated or implied any belief that there is apparently something nefari-

ous about business corporations or business executives contacting Members of Congress about legislation in which they are vitally concerned and which could have profound effects upon their profits or their ability to do business.

Everything I have stood for in this investigation has been to the opposite effect: That business not only has a right to engage in lobbying activities, but that actually businessmen have an obligation to their stockholders in keeping up with the complex legislative issues with which we deal and which affect every business in the Nation.

To be charitable I can only say that this magazine with its tremendous mass circulation and its wide influence among the public went off a little half-cocked and glibly pulled a boner insofar as the facts are concerned.

If I were to be uncharitable I would charge, perhaps, that Life magazine connived with the Committee for Constitutional Government to sell a bill of goods irrespective of the facts. That would not only be uncharitable to say, but it probably would not be true. It is so easy to make such general statements without being able to substantiate them, and I think we have had enough of that around here to last us a long time.

A Look Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as soon as time permits, I will attempt an answer to the queries as to why we are in war, the probable area of that war, and how it may affect America's future.

You may think it presumptuous, and perhaps it is, for me, just an average American citizen, with no personal knowledge of conditions abroad, with no accurate information as to our military strength—only—I hope—common sense, ordinary judgment and nothing more than the lessons drawn from experience and history, to even venture an answer to the above questions.

Nor would I do so, were it not for the fact that, after listening to the top so-called political and military experts here in Washington for the past 10 years, the conclusion that they are no more able—or, it may be, willing—to give accurate answers than am I, is forced upon me.

As an example: On June 1, last, at a press-radio conference, President Truman said that he thought we were closer to permanent peace now than at any time in the last 5 years. But today we are in a war—a battle being fought some 14,000 miles east of New York, some 5,000 miles west of San Francisco.

Recently, Secretary of Defense Johnson in effect told us that we were well armed, amply able to defend ourselves; that appropriations for the Military Establishment might well be cut a billion or more. In Korea we were neither adequately nor sufficiently prepared.

A year or two ago I heard the military experts testify that the next war would be a push-button war; that our great danger came from the possibility that Russia might obtain the secrets of the atomic bomb, of guided missiles, but that we, having those secrets, were masters of the world. From the President's message of this week I learned that neither our guided missiles, our latest offensive weapons, the hydrogen bomb, nor the atomic bomb are sufficient for our defense.

I learned, too, that again our foot soldiers are fighting on foreign soil. The President said that he would ask not only for an immediate appropriation of $10,000,000,000, but that we must continue to give other billions to other nations. More alarming, he said that he must have absolute control, not only of military operations but of production and of our civilian activities.

Now here is the point I am trying to make: Stalin and communism, we are told, threaten our individual freedom, the security—yes, the very existence—of our Nation. We must again, it is said, fight throughout the world if we would avoid becoming the subjects of a dictatorial tyrant. Here is the simple question: If in order to save ourselves from the aggression of communism in other parts of the world we are to surrender our constitutional guarantees of liberty and freedom; if the Congress, the people's representatives, is to be a rubber stamp; if the executive departments, under the orders of the President, are to take over all civilian functions, will we not, for the future preservation of our freedom, the security of our Nation, after the war, be wholly dependent upon the whim or will of Mr. Truman or whoever may succeed him?

A LOOK AHEAD

Do I hear you ask, "Well, what would you suggest?" My answer is that as long as we have now, by the actions of Mr. Truman and his administrative supporters, been forced into this war, our military authorities, rather than the State Department, should plan the war campaigns, direct and fight the battles.

Those at the head of our Armed Forces should tell us what they want in the way of men, munitions, and equipment, and then, instead of Mr. Truman and his advisers taking over civilian activities, the Congress should be consulted, our skilled and unskilled workers, our industrialists, and production men be given free rein to go ahead and produce what the military people say is necessary.

Yes; and as an afterthought, I suggest that if Mr. Truman thinks Stalin and the Communists abroad threaten us he kick the Communists out of the executive department, quit trying to pull the wool over our eyes and make us think that we do not have, have not had, Communists and traitors in the executive department. He should clean house.

The Fake Peace Petition Campaign Backed by the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to make available to my colleagues the text of House Concurrent Resolution 247, which our legislative counsel drafted at my request and which has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It is as follows:

Whereas there is a petition, commonly referred to as a "peace" petition, now in circulation in the United States, in the following terms:

"We demand the absolute banning of the atom weapon, arm of terror and mass exterminator of populations.

"We demand the establishment of strict international control to insure the implementation of this banning measure.

"We consider that any government which would be first to use the atom weapon against any country whatsoever would be committing a crime against humanity and should be dealt with as a war criminal.

"We call on all men of good will throughout the world to sign this appeal"; and

Whereas this petition was prepared by the Cominform, the Communist foreign propaganda organization, and was publicly initiated on March 13, 1950, by the Communist-controlled World Congress of Partisans for Peace; and

Whereas on March 24, 1950, the official paper of the Cominform initiated a "Signatures for Peace" campaign to persuade people throughout the world to sign this petition; and

Whereas on June 8, 1950, the Daily Worker, the official Communist Party newspaper in the United States, announced a campaign to obtain signatures to this petition in the United States; and

Whereas on June 20, 1950, this campaign for signatures to the petition received the official endorsement of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (1) because of the genesis of the above-quoted petition, and because of the well-known propaganda methods used by its sponsors, it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that citizens of the United States who sign such petition will not aid in bringing about peace, but, on the contrary, will give aid and comfort to those nations, organizations, and individuals who have consistently hampered the efforts of the United States, and of the other members of the United Nations, to promote and further the cause of peace; and (2) citizens of the United States be encouraged to support actively the program of our Government through the United Nations to prohibit and punish aggression and outlaw war, to establish the machinery for an effective international control of atomic weapons through international inspection and to establish and maintain peace in fact rather than in deceitful propaganda.

I am very glad to note the widespread attempt on the part of the American press and our radio commentators to make the facts clear to the American public and to warn patriotic

and peace-loving Americans against giving any aid or comfort to this cynical and deceptive piece of Communist propaganda. I am including six such editorials as evidence of the effort being made by the press. I believe there are compelling reasons which I hope will lead our House committee to give the full membership an opportunity to add its formal statement with reference to this petition and spread even wider the warning to our constituents.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram of Monday, July 24, 1950]

DON'T SIGN PEACE PETITIONS

A few days ago Representative JOHN HESELTON sent word to his own district, and also got his directive before the general public, that there was a grave issue in the signing of the so-called Stockholm peace petitions. The signer would be involving himself in his responsibilities under the Constitution.

He would be pledging himself, or, in most cases, herself, to sabotage his and her own Government. The peace petitions have the label Stockholm because the meeting that set them up was held there. They are not of Swedish origin. They are part of the propaganda to weaken opposition to the spread of communism. O. John Rogge, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States, was present at the Stockholm conference and went along with the petitioners to present it to Moscow. He was American representative at the World Peace Conference.

Mr. Rogge is a personality instead of a name in print to several hundred people around here who heard him at Mount Holyoke last week. Mr. Rogge was to have flown to Prague on Saturday to attend an emergency meeting of the executive committee of the World Peace Congress. Mr. Rogge seems to have gotten off on a peace track which, by sympathy with his special friend, Henry Wallace, has had to be retraced. And this is a good time to say that the measure of Mr. Wallace as a crackpot rather than a Communist seems to be working out.

However, Mr. Rogge did not sail. Just as he was about to take his plane he got word that the emergency meeting at Prague had been postponed. The next date is August 15. It will be held in Budapest instead of Prague. Maybe it won't be held at all. Meantime, Mr. Rogge spent the week end at Tanglewood where he heard some very good music.

It is stated at the Peace Information Center in New York that up to now there are 1,350,000 signers for the peace petition. Such signatures as have been gathered upon street corners have not been read. Most of the signers are women. They are told the petitions would suppress the use of the A-bombs.

That is not all. The Stockholm peace pledge was printed in Moscow's Pravda and translated by the London Economist (of which Barbara Ward is editor).

"I vote against war—this is not merely a matter of words. It means that I shall do my utmost to prevent war. I shall stop the trains; I shall refuse to unload ships carrying war materials; I shall not supply fuel for the planes; I shall seize the arms of the mercenary; I shall not allow my son or husband to go to war; I shall deprive the ministers of food, drink, telephones, transport, and coal."

Such a pledge—and they tell us officially that they have those 1,350,000 signers—would be sabotaging the very life of the Nation and of the signers themselves. It would, in action, make any defense of their country against attack by an enemy impossible. To sign such a pledge would be being accessory to treason. It should be part of the daily pledge of women going down street not to sign any pledge whatever.

[From the Daily Hampshire Gazette, Northampton, Mass., of Monday, July 24, 1950]

PHONY "PEACE OFFENSIVE"

During the winter of its inception, World War II was called the "phony war." Historians, in turn, may define the interlude between its end and the outbreak of Red hostilities in Korea as the period of the "phony peace." In substantiation, the current Communist "peace offensive" provides incriminating evidence.

Soviet "peace rallies" and the collateral Stockholm peace resolution are integral parts of this apparatus. Its true purpose is to mask Red aggression, actual in Korea and threatened in the Balkans, and to drum up opinion in the world and at home against atomic weapons.

Already in the United States a million signatures are claimed to "peace petitions" demanding that atomic weapons be outlawed on Russia's terms. How whole peoples are thus victimized by Communist duplicity is revealed by the fact that more than half the population of Northern Korea had signed similar petitions immediately before its Russian-equipped armies began to march.

In such manner is the world's yearning for peace converted by the Red propaganda machine to its own conspiratorial ends. Its "peace offensive" is a feint calculated to confuse peaceful nations, to keep them off balance, to sow suspicion and instill distrust among neighboring nations.

This country should go all out in its efforts to keep before the world the indisputable fact that the armed aggressor is the real war criminal, the real foe of the peace for which he hypocritically shouts.

[From the Springfield Union, Springfield, Mass., Monday, July 24, 1950]

STOCKHOLM PEACE APPEAL

The fact that the highly controversial "peace campaign" was initiated and is being promoted by Communists, should be enough to condemn it as being either pure propaganda or containing hidden and sinister implications.

Of course we want peace, and would deplore use of the atomic bomb, but there has been much misunderstanding of the petitions being circulated by Communists in most parts of the world. These misunderstandings have now been cleared up by no less a figure than Comrade Leonid Sobelev, who has frankly explained the purposes of the so-called Stockholm Peace Appeal, in the Communist newspaper Pravda. The following translation of his article appeared in last week's Economist of London, with this peace pledge:

"I vote against war—and this is not merely a matter of words. It means that I shall do my utmost to prevent war. I shall stop the trains; I shall refuse to unload ships carrying war materials; I shall not supply fuel for the planes; I shall seize the arms of the mercenaries; I shall not allow my son or husband to go to war; I shall deprive the ministers of food, drink, telephones, transport and coal."

This world peace appeal, in other words, is a bald attempt to enlist fifth-columnists in the democratic nations of the world to sabotage both their economy and defense preparations. It is not hard to imagine what would be the fate of any Russian citizen who attempted to carry out this pledge against the Soviet Union. Yet any person, according to Pravda, who signs the Stockholm Peace Appeal, obliges himself to act as a fifth columnist and to commit sabotage and treason against his own country.

The West has made it plain that it wants peace and that it will continue to seek solution of all outstanding problems by peaceful means and has no intention of threatening Soviet independence. The very extent of Western disarmament was proof that it was limited to purposes of defense and excluded any possibility of aggression, for which it was wholly inadequate.

It took the West a long time, however, to realize that peace with Soviet Russia, as with Hitler Germany, cannot be attained by appeasement or by standing aside while the forces of Soviet imperialism go on a rampage. That lesson has been learned in the hard school of experience and at a price which has brought slavery to millions.

For that reason the West has now taken steps to remedy a situation in which such things have been possible, not only by safeguarding itself but also by trying to create situations of strength where there is now weakness. In other words it is trying to restore a balance of power, which in the world of today is still the only check on aggression, and which is designed not only to safeguard Western security but also to enable other nations to withstand Soviet pressure and perchance to liberate themselves from subjugation without fear of a new Soviet assault.

Only when such a balance of power has been restored will conditions have become ripe for new attempts to negotiate with the Soviets on an equal basis, and only then will it be possible to obtain terms which will permit the free nations to live in peace and security.

[From the Union Leader of Manchester, N. H., July 21, 1950]

WATCH OUT FOR PHONY PETITION

A million Americans in 40 States have signed their names to a world peace petition specifically aimed at outlawing atomic weapons. Probably not more than a few thousand of the signers realized that this campaign is being run by the United States Communist Party and is Moscow-inspired.

The peace proposal was adopted last spring at a Stockholm meeting of the Partisans of Peace, a Communist-sponsored international organization. Since then it has been circulated widely in Europe, Asia, and now America. Many millions of signatures have been obtained.

Secretary of State Acheson properly branded the whole effort as fraudulent and cynical. He pointed out that just before the North Koreans attacked South Korea, it was reported half the population of North Korea had signed the petition.

This proposal is still going the rounds in America. Often it bears the cloak of labor-union sanction, though the nature of such sponsorship is usually quite vague.

From here on out, every American will do well if he turns away from his door the bearer of any peace petition that talks of outlawing the atom bomb, mentions Stockholm or boasts of labor sponsors. Almost certainly that proposal will be Moscow's handiwork.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Friday, July 21, 1950]

THE LANGUAGE OF COMMUNISM

Communism not only operates an international conspiracy; it also speaks an international gibberish. The same phrases and epithets crop up in Pravda and the Daily Worker, at the peace congress in Stockholm, and the conspiracy trial at Foley Square. Now they have made a fresh appearance—in leaflets ostensibly signed by captured Americans and dropped by Yak planes flying over our lines in Korea.

Through one of their typical misconceptions, the Communists evidently believed that these crude and queerly worded messages would be accepted as genuine statements offered freely by the captured Americans. "Hurrah for the people's army of Korea. * * * May Syngman Rhee's clique die," concluded one of the leaflets, in words as foreign to an American soldier as the language of the moon. However effective may be some of the Russian-made weapons the North Koreans are using, words and ideas are not among them.

Sometimes, as in the so-called Stockholm peace petition, the Communists manage to insinuate some amount of subtlety into their manifestos. This petition, which the American Communist Party is laboring to circulate in this country, apes the Soviet position on the atom bomb and brands as a war criminal any country which employs the bomb, even under provocation. There is nothing in the petition banning acts of unprovoked aggression by one country against another, which is the Russian system. The Stockholm peace appeal and the North Korean leaflets both speak the same language and tell the same lie. The voice may be Jacob's voice (though it is not a very good imitation), but the hands are the hands of Esau.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Wednesday, July 19, 1950]

WHEN PEACE IS WAR

The Stockholm peace petition has reached St. Louis, as a writer of a letter to the editor reports. This is the document which many millions of people, including Americans, have signed under the false impression that they were thereby subscribing to the cause of peace.

In reality, however, anybody who signs it is supporting war. For the peace it talks about is the Kremlin's version of peace, the kind of peace the people of Korea are now experiencing. It is just one more case of Communists giving words meanings either radically different from or diametrically opposed to the meanings found in any dictionary.

The Stockholm resolution, adopted at a meeting of the Communist Partisans of Peace there last March, sets up its own special definition of a war criminal. It is "any government which first uses atomic weapons against any other country whatsoever." The petition says nothing at all about aggression. And, as Secretary Acheson remarked, it is aggression which is the real crime against humanity.

The hollowness of the document is best shown by its demand for strict international control to enforce outlawing of atomic weapons. This is a strange demand from Communist sources, since the American Acheson-Baruch-Lilienthal proposal is the only one made thus far which really does provide for strict international control. And only the Communists have blocked adoption of that plan.

Whoever signs the document is helping Communist imperialism. For if the United States does not use atomic weapons, no matter what the circumstances, then a vital part of our arsenal of defense is immobilized, and Russia is the gainer.

If, on the other hand, we are forced to use atomic weapons to throw back Communist aggression, then the Kremlin could claim public support for a contention that the United States is the war criminal, and broaden its attack against us under a cloak of false legality.

And anybody who signs the petition is also approving the Communist definition of war criminal, a definition which Korea has proved to be as phony as the Communist definition of democracy.

House Lobbying Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, that the left-wing political maneuvering of some of the staff of the House Lobbying Committee is understood and repudiated is indicated by the syndicated article written by Father James M. Gillis, appearing July 17, 1950, in 30 Catholic newspapers.

The article is as follows:

ENEMIES WITHIN OUR HOUSE

Most Americans probably think that Patrick Henry's warning "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," concerns only attacks made upon us by an alien nation. But it was spoken in the first instance to put the colonists on guard against what was at the time their own government.

Legally, the Americans still were subject to Britain. When they finally broke with England they made the fact clear in the preamble to the Declaration that they did so because their own mother country, not some foreign nation, had abused them.

Recently a book has appeared with the title, "Our Enemy the State." Its author, Albert Jay Nock, is no Communist but a patriot in the tradition of Patrick Henry. He seems to have taken the Gospel text "A man's enemies shall be those of his own household," and applied it not to an individual but to the Nation. He presents the thesis that the most dangerous and potentially the most successful enemies of our original and traditional form of government are not in Moscow but in Washington.

For months, perhaps for years, I have been the recipient of communications from the Committee for Constitutional Government. It sends out leaflets, pamphlets, even sometimes books written in defense of American liberties. What I have received and read seems to me as genuinely American as the Declaration of Independence. It is in the spirit and often in the phrasing of the Bill of Rights.

But now it seems that the Government in Washington—no, not the Government but the administration (the Government remains, administrations come and go), the administration in Washington has come down upon the committee, as upon some 165 other groups, with an inquisition which seems to them and to me a violation of a basic American right: The right to agitate, to reason, to argue, to persuade one's fellow Americans to join in a protest against the trend toward excessive interference of the state in the affairs of the citizen.

A questionnaire has been sent—mark you—not to all but to some of the organizations which attempt to influence public opinion. Among the 166 on the list are those in particular which have been critical of the economics and the politics of the powers that be in the Federal Capital.

The inquisitors are a congressional Committee on Lobbying, headed by Representative FRANK BUCHANAN, of Pennsylvania. The ostensible purpose of the committee is to influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any Federal legislation.

That wording is obviously, and perhaps purposely, too sweeping. It might include even this present piece of writing which—heaven knows—is far removed from professional lobbying.

I am exercising here and elsewhere my right as a citizen to communicate an opinion to others and to ask them to join with me in opposing the encroachments of big government upon our individual liberties. I am practicing the "vigilance" of which Patrick Henry (or as some say, Thomas Jefferson) speaks.

If, as recently happened, I commend a book which contains facts, figures, arguments alleged to prove that our Government has set its feet upon the road which Great Britain is following to its ruin; if I write to my Congressman and ask others to write to theirs; if I discover certain pamphlets which argue my case better than I can argue it myself, and if I send those pamphlets to others; if I give a lecture and at the end of the lecture ask some hundreds or thousands to join my little crusade against excess government; if I go on the radio and broadcast an appeal to possibly millions; if I have a friend who is going to Washington and I ask him to stir up the minds of men in that city, as another might in Keokuk or Kalamazoo or Menominee, do I thereby become a lobbyist? Must I register as a professional?

BUCHANAN admits that he cannot define the word "lobbyist." Nor can I. Nor can anyone. But the wording of the ad under which he and his committee operates would make every zealous American citizen a lobbyist. In that case the citizen might be called upon to answer under penalty these questions:

"What is the name of the man who went to Washington?" "What is his title?" (whatever that may mean). "On what date did he go?" "How much did he spend?" "Upon what?" "Who paid his expenses?" "What did they total?"

Any American citizen who does not see the general trend of this sort of inquisition and its possible dangers is not in the Patrick Henry-Thomas Jefferson tradition. He does not practice the eternal vigilance which is the price of liberty.

James A. Shanahan, who sent a copy of Father Gillis' article to each Member of Congress, asked Mr. BUCHANAN a very pertinent question when he wrote him, stating:

Is it illegal, in your opinion, to defend the Constitution?

For good measure, Mr. Shanahan added a postscript as follows:

I have distributed 500 copies of the Road Ahead and hope to circulate many more.

Wonder when Mr. BUCHANAN'S staff will get around to investigating the New Deal lobbying which has been carried on at public expense by some of the staff members of the committee.

Strategy? What Is It? Where Are We Going? People Have a Right To Know if We Intend Defending Every Nation in the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the people in my district are insisting that President Truman and the Congress announce just what our strategy is at this time. Are we going to dissipate our resources piece-meal all over the world and bleed ourselves white?

Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin writing in the New York Times for July 24, raises some interesting questions and indicates a course of action. I am extending the article as part of my remarks:

STRATEGY OF COMMITMENT—LIMITED WAR IN KOREA HELD NECESSARY TO PRESERVE MIGHT FOR DECISIVE AREAS

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

More and more the strength and interest of the Nation was focused on Korea last week as partial mobilization of the country's immense potential power got under way.

Politically and psychologically the successful defense of Southern Korea and the ultimate defeat of the Communist invaders was important to the friends of freedom; if we were to be forced into the sea the loss of prestige would be severe, and the smaller nations—already insecure—would undoubtedly feel that the might of the United States was inadequate to their defense. Emotionally, the tie of Korea is the tie of blood; American blood is being shed there and thus far we have taken some lickings; there is a natural human demand for more men, more money, more force in Korea.

But there is a point of no return in Korea; there must be a definite limit set to our commitment there.

For Korea is strategically of very limited importance; no decisive victory in the world struggle against Russian-backed communism can be won there.

BASIC TENET OF WAR

A basic principle of war—and it applies equally well to power politics—is the principle of concentration. Concentration to Admiral Mahan, famed military strategist, was the ABC of strategy; to General Forrest, it was "to git thar fust with the most." Concentration means a clear view of the objective toward which a nation's main effort should be directed; it means economy of force, or reduction of peripheral or side show commitments to a minimum; it means the concentration of the bulk of a nation's strength toward the main objective.

Viewed against the yardstick of these principles of strategy, Korea is a side show; in Asia the main theater was in China, not Korea; once China and Manchuria were gone Korea would be strategically indefensible. And in the world picture it is western Europe, not Korea, that is the objective; if Russian communism could be sent reeling to the eastern reaches of the Pripet Marshes and behind the Dniester, the victory would be far more decisive than any retreat of the northern Korean Communists to the thirty-eighth parallel.

It is quite possible that the men in the Kremlin are chortling today, that one of their primary aims is to involve our strength more and more in Korea, and then to strike, by proxy, with satellite forces elsewhere.

Although the typhoon season is starting, Formosa is by no means secure, as the shelling of Quemoy has shown. The Chinese Communists are building up—with Russian help—a sizable air force, and they have available thousands of powered and sailing junks. To defend Formosa adequately may well require the permanent assignment to the area of far more sizable United States naval and air forces than are now there.

Iran is another trouble zone. It is virtually defenseless; a combination of internal coup, a carefully led revolt of the Kurdish tribes and the sudden appearance across the frontier of some Iranian exiles armed with tanks might quickly overrun much of the country. If such a Russian conquest by proxy should start—or even if an actual invasion by native Russian armed forces should occur—should we, can we, commit troops, or armed force, to the area?

What about Yugoslavia? Since the invasion of southern Korea and the remarkable performance of the Communist puppet army the Yugoslavs have lost some of their assurance about their ability to handle, without outside aid, the satellite armies of Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary. Distinct signs of nervousness have been reported from the Balkans, and the satellite troop concentrations along the Yugoslav frontier, regarded prior to the Korean invasion as part of the war of nerves, are now viewed as possibly a more active menace.

FOCUSING OF MILITARY MIGHT

What should we do about Yugoslavia if a satellite invasion occurs—aid her with material or our own troops or do nothing?

And what about Western Europe, where perhaps our strength is needed more than anywhere else in the world?

Now these are grave and weighty questions, and the answers to all of them are complicated by Russia's strategy of war by proxy.

But several points are immediately clear:

1. We must not become too committed in Korea, a strategic side show, lest we do not have enough strength for the strategic main show.

2. We must keep ever before our political and military planners the principle of concentration and of objective; in other words we must keep our eye on the ball.

3. Our political commitments must be limited to the ability of our military strength to back them up.

4. We should frankly inform friendly governments what help they can expect from us in case of an attack from Russia by proxy.

5. If we intend to go to war with our own forces to help repel any such attack by proxy, we should announce it now. It may be objected that Congress declares war, but it did not do so in Korea, and there is no mistake about it—we are in a full-fledged war in Korea. The President, with the approval of the National Security Council and after prior consultation with congressional leaders, could well announce that if—for instance—Yugoslavia were invaded, we intended to aid her with armed forces.

6. To meet the threat of war by proxy at various points on the globe, more manpower is needed. We cannot commit United States manpower everywhere. We do not want to be defeated piecemeal or bled white in indecisive theaters. Our present allies already have committed most of their present available resources in Indochina, Germany, Malaya, Hong Kong—they must raise more—a larger military budget is essential for all Atlantic Pact nations. But even this is not enough, more manpower is needed.

This manpower can come only from two principal sources—Japan and Germany. A separate peace treaty with Japan should be concluded immediately and the Japanese should be given the responsibility of the defense of their own islands, with the right, reserved to us to retain bases.

A Western German police force or army, under allied control, should be formed. And foreign legions of Germans, Japanese, and other foreigners under United States or allied high command could well be organized and offered to the United Nations, to oppose conquest by proxy wherever it is tried.

A National Fuel Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I made before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in behalf of Senate Resolution 239, to establish a national fuel policy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS (DEMOCRAT, PENNSYLVANIA) BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, ON BEHALF OF SENATE RESOLUTION 239, TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL FUEL POLICY

I wish, Mr. Chairman, to thank you and the Members of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for this opportunity to come before you and explain briefly my purpose in introducing Senate Resolution 239, calling for the formulation of a national fuel policy.

Certainly in coming before this particular committee, it is unnecessary for me to make any elaborate, detailed explanation of the near-crisis situation in which coal—both bituminous and anthracite—finds itself today. This is, I am sure, a matter with which all of you are quite familiar.

On the other hand, I should like to develop briefly for you the reasoning which led me to conclude that we must work out a national fuel policy at the earliest date possible. At the outset, too, I might also explain that I have discussed this matter at length with a great many men who are regarded as expert in various phases of our fuel economy.

I believe we must accept as fundamental the assumption that we will continue in the future to need ever-increasing supplies of energy if we are to go forward with an expanding economy. It is also fundamental that this energy must be available at reasonable prices. And it is also fundamental that we must be assured that we will not find ourselves energy-rich in one year, and energy-poor in the next.

Up to this time, we have more or less taken for granted the fact that we can get our energy in abundance and at reasonable prices. Our experiences during the recent war demonstrated, however, that we could not take for granted the perpetual existence of an immediately available supply of energy at reasonable prices. We can all recall the gasoline rationing, the brown-outs which resulted from overtaxing our electric power capacity, and the other difficulties involved in meeting our energy needs.

We were forced by the demands of total war to extraordinary measures all along the line. Coal mines which had been abandoned for years were reopened, although in many instances it was a year or more before substantial production could be obtained from them. Through a more liberal depletion allowance, we gave the petroleum industry a tax reduction as an inducement to further discovery and development of oil and gas fields. And throughout our energy economy we were compelled to allocate high-priority materials in an effort to get the energy production we needed. We saw, too, that we were particularly hard-pressed in the distribution of fuels. Threats to shipping made more hazardous the importation of materials which we needed, and our overburdened domestic transportation system was pushed to the limit in carrying fuels to the places they were most needed.

These are, all of them, familiar instances where the requirements of total war placed us under a considerable strain in meeting our national energy needs. I feel, however, that we must keep these lessons in mind, not only against the possible contingency of another total war, but these same lessons will, I believe, be before us in the future in terms of a peacetime economy as well. It is of course true that an expanding peacetime economy gives us more time for developing the energy we need because peace-

time developments lack the disruptive, overnight requirements of war.

Now while we are aware of the acute energy shortages experienced during World War II, I do not believe there is such widespread awareness of the vast changes which have taken place in our energy economy during the past half century. Apart from the time-honored energy supplied by men and animals—and by the sun itself—coal was our major energy source in 1900. It furnished, overwhelmingly, the power which made our turn-of-the-century standard of living possible.

We have seen, since that time, the development of an enormous market for liquid fuels. Liquid fuels have powered the twentieth century revolution in the field of transportation—the automobile, the truck, the airplane, and the Diesel locomotive. It might of course be argued that these liquid fuel developments did not replace coal as such, but I think all of us will agree that this is not wholly true.

With the evolution of specialized liquid fuels, the refining process has become increasingly important. The refining processes which give us high-octane gasoline also produce intermediate fractions of distilled petroleum which have found use as home fuels and for the Diesel engine. A by-product, or left-over, of this refining process is the so-called residual fuel oil—that fraction of the petroleum which is not distilled over. Residual oil has been put to use industrially for steam-turbine generation of electric power—a field previously supplied almost exclusively by coal.

Natural gas has entered the energy picture prominently in recent years as well. At an earlier day, natural gas was burned harmlessly into the air—a great waste of energy, but one which was not put in harness until pipeline networks became available for transporting it to cities all over the country where it found a ready market as a fuel cheaper to produce than coal.

These changes—and they are far from the complete picture—merely reflect the more obvious trends of the past half-century. Curiously, while these shifts in the energy pattern are evident, there has, I discover, been relatively little attention paid to any over-all evaluation of these trends in terms of where we are going as a result of such developments.

Apparently, our attention has been confined to studies of the individual energy sources—that is, the vast army of statisticians who keep the records on our fuels have for the most part devoted intense study to a particular energy source. If we look at the petroleum industry, we discover that there exists a body of information which charts the development of that industry, and which can furnish reliable estimates of the petroleum reserves known at the present time. Similarly, studies of the coal industry are available which map its history and chart its reserves. This is equally true of water power and natural gas.

But here we are confronted with a paradox. We know today a great deal about the coal industry, the petroleum, gas, and water-power industries—individually—but for some inexplicable reason, it is extremely difficult from the information we have about each of them to make sound comparisons between any two of them.

The reasons for this are not easy to explain. Without question, the difficulty arises in part from the fact that in many instances, two fuels do mutually exclusive jobs. As a result, the units of measurement used for coal differ from those developed for oil, and we frequently find ourselves adding apples and elephants when a comparison is attempted.

We might hazard the guess that we could reduce the various energy sources to a common basis of comparison by expressing their production figures in the same energy units. Engineers can, and have, expressed the various industry statistics in the same energy units, but here again we are met with other difficulties. A brief example will illustrate what I mean. The chemist in a laboratory can measure the theoretical energy content of a pound of coal, or a gallon of petroleum. But such theoretical calculations neglect the efficiency of the means used to obtain the energy from the fuel. A steam locomotive may make use of 10 percent of the energy in a ton of coal. A Diesel may use 40 or 50 percent of the energy in a barrel of oil.

Now I do not pretend that I have come before you today with a solution to this difficulty. I am merely stating what I have found to be the problem.

The expert opinions which I have received on this question serve to convince me of two things: One, we know a great deal, individually, about each of our major energy-producing industries. Secondly, we have done very little to work out a basis of comparison between these industries; we have not, in short, developed the factual background which we must have to put them into any sensible perspective.

As I see it, the job which really needs to be done is to work out a basis of comparison between our several energy sources. I believe this can be done only by a thorough-going study of the entire fuel picture in terms of the trends in fuel tastes up to the present time, and by an estimate of the direction these trends will take in the future. I believe we must examine carefully, in terms of those projected future needs, the reserves which we have of the various energy sources. This must be done with a watchful eye cast at our national security needs, as well as our future needs for a growing national economy.

The information which has come to me also satisfies me that we do have at the present time a quite clear picture of the coal industry as such—just as we do of the oil industry, as such—and of natural gas and of water power. A study which merely had as its central purpose an inquiry into coal alone would, I believe, lead to little that is not already available. A study of the coal industry, I am convinced, would for the largest part, merely plow over ground which has been tilled many times before.

I am, of course, aware that any study labeled as a coal inquiry would necessarily require collateral inquiry into the other fuels. But I still regard the primary job to be one of working out a fuel policy in terms of our needs as we can anticipate them, and our reserves which can be called up to meet those needs. And I repeat my conviction that until we have worked out an adequate method for putting all fuels in a reasonable perspective—a job which I am satisfied has not yet been done—we will not be able to direct our attention satisfactorily to the real questions confronting any one of our basic-energy sources.

It was for this reason, Mr. Chairman, that I submitted my fuel-policy resolution although I was thoroughly familiar at the time that other proposals had been made for studies of the coal industry. With little question coal—both bituminous and anthracite—is the one of our fuels confronted with the most vexing difficulties. But I sincerely believe that the solution of coal's difficulties awaits the day that we have the necessary facts to determine a national fuel policy which will permit us to fit coal into its proper relation to our other fuels.

Whether your committee decide to confine the study to coal—or whether an over-all effort is made to arrive at recommendations for a national fuel policy after a study of all energy sources—the question is still left to your consideration as to the vehicle you will choose to make such an inquiry. My resolution, as you are aware, suggested that this study be conducted by a duly-appointed subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. My reason for this was my firm belief that immediate action, particularly in the coal situation, was imperative. I felt that a study by this committee could be got under way with the greatest dispatch. The several proposals for a commission-type study, while they are obviously of merit, appeared to me to suffer from the handicap of requiring action by both Houses of Congress at a time when both the Senate and House were heavily pressed with other work—and where the very real possibility presented itself that there might not be final action on a commission proposal taken during this session of Congress.

I readily recognize that your committee has its own heavy work load—and I recognize too the members of the committee have many other obligations as well. I nonetheless wished to suggest a committee study because I knew that the committee, if it could find the opportunity to do so, was prepared to do the kind of thorough job which must be done—and prepared to bring us needed results in the shortest possible time.

I wish to thank you once more for this opportunity to appear before you, and if any of you have further questions about my resolution, I shall be happy to answer them if I can.

Why We Are Taking a Beating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from Life for July 24, 1950:

WHY ARE WE TAKING A BEATING?

On the Korean front retreating American soldiers, bitter at their own blameless failure and the brutal execution of their comrades, were asking some savage questions. "Why don't you tell them how useless it is?" said Lt. Edward James, of Columbus, Ga. "Why don't they send over something we can really fight a war with?"

On the home front the questions were much the same. The best way to answer them was to begin with the words of another lieutenant: "I hope that guy Johnson is satisfied. I hope all those politicians are happy with the way they saved money on the Army."

But in the 12 months before the war began the United States budgeted $14,400,000,000 for defense. Was that saving money?

Most of that $14,400,000,000 paid housekeeping expenses, leaving an ineffective percentage for combat strength.

Should we have spent more?

Yes. In 1948 the late Secretary of Defense James Forrestal and the Joint Chiefs of Staff worked out a minimum budget of $18,000,000,000 that would have provided 18 divisions, 70 air groups, and 420 combat ships—enough to have given the North Koreans the resistance they deserve.

Why didn't we spend the extra $4,000,000,000?

Because Harry S. Truman is a politician. During the 1948 campaign he promised the people some expensive things—continued high farm price supports, increased social security—and in order to pay off his campaign promises he took the money from the military budget. He gambled that we would not need Forrestal's combat forces and lost the gamble.

If it was Truman's fault, what did the lieutenant mean when he said he hoped that guy Johnson was satisfied?

He meant that Defense Secretary Louis Johnson, claiming "we're in grand shape," cut the armed forces' money even more. For example, the lowered budget call for 12 aircraft carriers. Johnson made it seven. And Johnson cut the Marine Corps, traditionally the readiest fighting force the United States has, as if he meant to do away with the Corps entirely.

What's wrong with our equipment?

"Our shells bounce off those Red tanks like ping-pong balls!" cried a sergeant. In Washington the Defense Department said, "Ten tanks have been lost and two disabled."

Our troops are fighting with World War II weapons. New ones have been developed—the 3.5 inch bazooka that can pierce 11 inches of armor, the recoilless 75-millimeter rifle—but apparently few have been manufactured. As for armor, the few tanks we had in Japan are far lighter than Red tanks and are hopelessly outgunned.

Can't our planes knock out Red tanks?

Yes. But the Air Force has overemphasized strategic power (B–36's and the atomic bomb, and neglect tactical power (ground support). Our jet fighters, when they flew from Japan, could spend only 10 to 15 minutes over the targets, and their 600-mph speed hampered their accuracy.

A United States Infantry commander told Life Correspondent Carl Mydans, whose report fills the next four pages, "Man for man, we're better than they are any day of the week. But they're coming at us 15 to 1."

Haven't we any first-line troops to send?

We have but can't send too many. In a major war the Army expands by building new divisions around cadres of veterans. If we used up our cadres now, we would be in desperate shape.

What can we do, then?

We can fight with what we have. Two of MacArthur's four divisions are reported in Korea. They have not been kept in combat condition and apparently have not even maintained the inadequate equipment they had—some of it has failed in combat. We will reinforce these divisions with troops from home; Truman was expected to call up some Reserves and National Guard units this week. Total mobilization will be put off as long as possible—it might wreck the United States economy, upon which the free world depends.

Our defense line has been broken on the Kum River, and we may well wind up holding only a big beachhead around the supply port of Pusan. "We definitely expect to stay on the Korean Peninsula," says Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In time, after we have lost many brave men and great prestige, and after we have spent perhaps $10,000,000,000 to do it, we will fight back to the thirty-eighth parallel. Until then we will go on being kicked around.

Out on a Limb

When Carl Mydans, Life correspondent in Korea, stumbled with a group of reporters upon the hidden forward quarters of a United States battalion, the colonel in command shook his head in a gesture of exhaustion. "We were just wondering," said the colonel, "if there was any more American Army coming in here, and we were kind of hoping that if it came it would come soon enough for us to see it."

We hope the colonel—Ayres is his name—gets his wish. We hope the American Army he wants to see is already on the way to Japan—or better still, to Pusan, which is the United States supply port in southern Korea. Armies, however, don't spring into being overnight. Because an army materializes only as a result of long-range policy and planning, our main editorial this week is devoted to some of the policy mistakes of the past that have left Colonel Ayres temporarily out on a limb in Korea.

Good and Bad on Formosa

Let's keep the record straight about Formosa and the Nationalist Government there, because it is one of the keys to our success in the west Pacific. We need the Nationalist Government as an all-out ally, but the Nationalist Government has still not purged itself completely of the bad characters in it. Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek owes it to the many brave and honest men in his Government and Army to get rid of what they call mainland rotters. And he will be owing it to the United States, too, when the United States is prepared to meet him halfway.

Check List of Errors

At Cairo in 1943, speaking of the Russians, President Roosevelt remarked to Gen. Joseph Stilwell, "I think that they consider they've got enough as it is. * * * Stalin doesn't want any more ground. He's got enough."

This trustful view of Soviet aspirations was characteristic of top-level United States political leadership in World War II. In the atmosphere of the time it was understandable. Nevertheless, as events have since proved, it was just plain wrong. It was a major error rooted in a profound misreading both of Russian history and of Marxist-Leninist social philosophy. The general error embodied in this view has been slowly and partly corrected since 1945. The Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and the Atlantic Pact are markers on the road toward correction. But all through the cold-war period the correction has been oriented toward Europe. What is not yet generally recognized is that a whole series of specific mistakes in United States policy toward Asia has continued to flow from the one big original mistake. These mistakes have never been acknowledged. And, since they will continue to breed fresh blunders in Asia, it is important that every American set up a check list of the main errors in his own mind. To help clarification along, we offer our own check list of errors herewith:

1. The widespread attempt, lasting from 1944 to 1947, of United States far eastern policy advisers to arm the Chinese Communists and to get them admitted to the Government of China. Propaganda put forward by influential policy advisers for the pro-Chinese Communist view provided the emotional background for the Marshall mission to China.

2. The Yalta agreement to give Soviet Russia special rights in Manchuria, leading to outright take-over. In return for the gift of rights in Manchuria, Russia was to enter the far eastern war against Japan. Since the United States already had the atomic bomb, and since Japan was already beaten in any case, this amounted to giving Russia some very substantial concessions for free. It was stupid to bribe the Russians into something they could hardly have been bribed out of.

3. The partitioning of Korea along the thirty-eighth parallel.

4. The Marshall mission of 1946. This was based on an unrealistic view of both China and Marxism. The Chinese yearned for peace in 1946, not Soviet-style reforms; and Marshall's attempt to foist Mao Tse-tung, the Communist leader, on Chiang was roughly equivalent, say, to foisting Communist Togliatti on the postwar Italian Government.

5. Suppression of the Wedemeyer Report on China in 1947. When the Wedemeyer Report was suppressed Life published its own William C. Bullitt Report. Had the specific recommendations in either the Wedemeyer Report or the Bullitt Report for extra military aid to China been accepted the United States would not today be fighting in Korea.

6. Withdrawal of General Hodge's United States occupation forces from Korea in 1948.

7. The White Paper of 1949 and the Acheson allow-the-dust-to-settle China policy. Plus the various semiofficial announcements that "we don't need Formosa" as a part of the western Pacific defense line.

8. The Truman-Johnson economy on defense (see below). If the recommended $17,000,000,000 budget had been accepted in 1949 there would be more stuff moving to Korea now.

9. The Truman statement of June 1949 that "we are closer to world peace now than at any time in the last 3 years."

So runs our own check list of blunders in Asia. Other checks lists will differ on some points. But does anyone now doubt that great mistakes have been made? Or that recognition of these mistakes is the first step toward bringing their corrections?

Johnson or Acheson?

In the last 2 weeks or so, while inadequate American forces were being beaten back in Korea, it looked as if Louis Johnson would have to take the rap. But to put the biggest part of the blame on the Secretary of Defense is to judge matters superficially. Our weakness in the west Pacific was caused by fundamental errors. These fundamental errors were the errors of the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson.

Johnson is wide open to criticism. He made much too much blather about economizing, and a case could be made for his retirement. But he was carrying out the orders of the President. It was Truman who scuttled a minimum adequate defense program in 1948, and this year, when Congress wanted to reinstate some of the cuts, he opposed it.

Nevertheless the fundamental reason that we were so unprepared to meet the Red attack is that Acheson refused to face the danger of the Communist advance in Asia. He offered the military chiefs a phony choice: All-out commitment of United States strength to anti-Communist forces in Asia or no effective resistance at all. Naturally the military men, hamstrung by economy cuts, backed away. Discouraged, they made no plans for fighting communism in Asia.

It was Acheson who was Truman's chief adviser on basic policy, and Acheson was also Truman's chief alibi-ist. It was Acheson, not Johnson, who befriended Alger Hiss and was mixed up with the Owen Lattimore crowd in the State Department who stupidly or deliberately played into Communist hands in Asia. Johnson and the Joint Chiefs of Staff were for sending a mission to Formosa; it was Acheson who persuaded Truman to override them. Acheson would not only have let Formosa go to the Communists, he might have recognized the Communist government of China, if he could have got away with it—and he still might.

The country can have no confidence in the conduct of our struggle against communism in Asia as long as Acheson is Secretary of State. Acheson should go.

Do Your Share

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Chelsea

Record, Chelsea, Mass., Tuesday, July 25, 1950:

A JOB FOR AMERICANS

If it was not so before, it certainly is clear from the President's recommendations to Congress on the situation in Korea that there is a tough job to be done there, and that all Americans must help to do it. His requests are for substantial manpower for the services, controls over industry and business, and a fund of $10,000,000,000.

The money expended in a military campaign is the least important item of its cost. Far more significant are the lives lost and injuries suffered, the extravagant consumption of materials and energies, and the disruption of the Nation's normal economy. Yet the money cost is the first startling impression. Ten billion dollars is instantly recognizable as a big sum; it is an addition of about one-fourth to the previous national budget and will presumably multiply by three the amount of the anticipated deficit for the current fiscal year. When this cash price tag on the Korean operation is appreciated, then perhaps it can be realized how great may be the accompanying price in real wealth and humanity.

We have a job to do, and it is not an easy, casual one. For most of us the chief part at the outset is to calm down, to realize that we are in for a hard pull and adjust our stride to it, to avoid doing foolish, panicky things like rushing to buy up tires or sugar or something else. The more quickly we buckle down to the job at hand, the sooner we should be able to end it.

Cleveland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1950

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of participating in a unique celebration in Cleveland this past Sunday where the Cleveland Cultural Gardens League had its twenty-fifth birthday. There was a gaily costumed pageant of the different nationality groups and a most interesting program in that part of Rockefeller Park set aside by the city for these cultural gardens. We call it One World Day.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks that I may paint the picture of this unique celebration.

Mr. Speaker, Sunday last, July 23, marked the culmination of the twenty-fifth anniversary celebration of the Cleveland Cultural Gardens. It was my privilege to participate in the final parade and pageant. On the 21st of June Cleveland's Mayor Thomas A. Burke issued the following proclamation:

PROCLAMATION DESIGNATING JULY 19 TO JULY 23, 1950, AS CLEVELAND CULTURAL GARDENS DAY

Whereas July 19 to July 23, 1950 inclusive, will mark the twenty-fifth anniversary and silver jubilee of the Cleveland Cultural Gardens in the city of Cleveland; and

Whereas the development of the Cleveland Cultural Gardens during the past quarter century has been the basis for cementing the various racial groups of Cleveland and has resulted in mutual understanding and amity between citizens unrelated in origin and national background but united in purpose; and

Whereas throughout the years the beautiful gardens have become world renowned and contain the statues of many national cultural heroes of the nations of the world; and

Whereas on July 22, 1950, the Cleveland Cultural Garden League will unveil a statue honoring the memory of our great President, Abraham Lincoln, whose humane policy and fatherly wisdom was the inspiring force in the unity of this great Nation: Now, therefore

I, Thomas A. Burke, as mayor of the city of Cleveland, in response to the resolution of council passed June 26, 1950, do hereby declare the days of July 19 to July 23, 1950, as Cultural Garden Days, in the city of Cleveland and urge all citizens of greater Cleveland to acquaint themselves with the Cleveland Cultural Gardens and congratulate the Cultural Garden League of Cleveland upon this anniversary celebration by participation in the program planned for this occasion.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand at Cleveland, Ohio, this 21st day of June 1950.

THOMAS A. BURKE,
Mayor.

On Wednesday, July 19, a plaque was dedicated in the Shakespeare garden. Dr. Luther H. Evans, Librarian of Congress in Washington, D. C., made the address; Mr. Charles J. Wolfram, president of the Cultural Garden League, accepted the plaque.

On Saturday, July 22, the Lincoln shrine in the American Garden was dedicated with the following moving program:

LINCOLN SHRINE DEDICATION, AMERICAN GARDEN

Charles J. Wolfram, president, Cultural Garden League, presiding.

National anthem, raising the colors by the American Legion.

Greetings, Mrs. Norma Wulff, president, American Garden.

Spirituals by St. John's Gospel Choir, Robert Crowler, director.

Dedication address, Hon. Frank J. Lausche, Governor of Ohio.

Lincoln in Cleveland, Albert A. Woldman, vice president, Abraham Lincoln Association of Ohio.

Reading Gettysburg Address, Anthony D. Maresh, president, Abraham Lincoln Association of Ohio.

Address, Nathaniel Howard, editor, Cleveland News.

Unveiling of Lincoln memorial, Sally Cummins, granddaughter of Peter Witt.

Acceptance of Lincoln memorial, Hon. Thomas A. Burke, mayor of Cleveland.

America.

On Sunday, when it was my privilege to march in the gay parade and to witness the final international pageant, we celebrated One World Day as shown in the following program:

SUNDAY, JULY 23, 2 P. M.

One World procession from American Garden to Yugoslav Garden, Lt. Col. Jack Persky, marshal.

St. Joseph's Slovenian Band, Louis Opalek, director.

One World Day chairman, Mrs. Lewis W. Phillips.

National anthem—Posting the colors by the American Legion.

Greetings, Charles J. Wolfram, president, Cultural Garden League.

Hon. Thomas A. Burke, mayor of Cleveland.

Hon. James Donnelly, president, city council.

One World pageant, adapted from Walt Whitman's poem, "Salute the World."

Adaptation of script, James Morrison.

Folk lorist, Leonard Austin.

Winifred Hodges, director.

Jane Stephens, radio station WJW; Esko Townlee, radio station WHK, narrators.

Participating groups in native costumes: African, American, American Legion, Chinese, Czech, Dutch, English, French, Finnish, German, Greek, Hebrew, Hungarian, Irish, Italian, Japanese, Lithuanian, Mexican, Norwegian, Polish, Slovak, Slovenian, Swedish, Syrian-Lebanon, Ukrainian.

Singing of America.

A special little ceremony took place on this Sunday afternoon in the Hungarian Garden under the able chairmanship of Judge Julius Kovachy. This was the unveiling of an interesting bust of the great Hungarian writer whose master work, The Tragedy of Man, has been translated into many languages. This bust was made possible by the gifts of a great number of Cleveland citizens of Hungarian extraction. It is the work of Frank L. Jirouch, of Cleveland Heights.

We in Cleveland feel that our cultural gardens, extending along the East Boulevard in Rockefeller Park, are a tangible and living manifestation of the workability of the doctrine of human brotherhood.

Planning and achieving together, representatives of some 26 nationality groups constituting the units of the Cleveland Cultural Garden League and reflecting the spirit of the diversified elements of Cleveland's population, have met together through the past 25 years to develop this garden chain in all its beauty. In this project the league has had the support of the United States Government and of the city of Cleveland.

Eighteen beautiful gardens lie side by side each representing the culture and traditions of a nationality group. As a whole they signify the understanding, cooperation, and the respect for each other's traditions of the many nationality groups of Cleveland. Envisioned by Mr. Leo Weidenthal, its honorary president, carried forward by its president, Charles J. Wolfram, its treasurer, Anton Grdina, its secretary, Mrs. Peter Mokris, and its executive secretary, Mrs. L. W. Phillips, they are unique in America and have a reputation far beyond Cleveland and even the United States.

The Cultural Garden League has become a vehicle for our fine citizens who brought to America their many cultures. The cultural garden movement has for 25 years demonstrated in a miniature way in this laboratory that people have no inherent hatreds. If they are but permitted to know each other they work together for a common goal. These cultural gardens of Cleveland stand as a symbol of unity and equality as well as brotherhood. They are a revelation of devotion to an ancient truth and bespeak the foundation principles upon which American democracy and civilization must rest.

Mr. Speaker, it would give us in Cleveland the greatest joy if you and all the Members of the House of Representatives would visit our cultural gardens. We would take you in at Superior Avenue where the American Garden is and the American Legion Peace Garden, and then we would take you quietly through the Hebrew Garden, the Shakespeare Garden, the Hungarian, German,

Ukrainian, Greek, Italian, Slovak, Russian, Czech, Yugoslav, and Polish Gardens. You would find there statues and busts, bronze plaques, 50 in all, honoring cultural leaders who have contributed to world thought and the advancement of human civilization. In the name of the Cleveland Cultural Garden League I extend to you all a cordial invitation to visit us.

The Schaefers Talk Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, the web of bureaucracy today reaches into practically every home. Our citizens are finding it increasingly difficult to cut the red tape in order to receive justice.

I am taking the liberty of inserting in the RECORD the following very concise and to the point letter from Mr. and Mrs. Raymond M. Schaefer, McMillan, Mich., which illustrates how little our Government is concerned over the problems of the individual:

McMILLAN, MICH., *July 14, 1950.*
Hon. CHARLES E. POTTER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are farmers. We live simply by the Golden Rule. Every year in May we grade, cut, and plant seed potatoes. When they come up we cultivate, spray, and roque them. For 4 months we nurse them. In September we dig and store them. By January or February we are grading, bagging, and shipping them. At last the crop is sold. At last we get paid for 9 months' hard labor. We think, but—

The Government buys them. So we wait for our money. We wait and wait. We plant and cultivate another crop and wait. For 8 months now we have waited. We need the money. We are building a home, and raising children. We ask you, is it fair? In March Mr. Government is Johnny-on-the-Spot to collect the few dollars income tax we pay. "Pay or go to jail." But we must wait for our year's labors until he gets in the mood to pay us. We live simply, but living costs money.

So we implore you to stick a pin in the seat of the big fat Government worker with his feet on the shiny desk, smoking quarter cigars we pay for, and make him send us our honestly earned money.

Yours sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. RAYMOND M. SCHAEFER.

Reserve Officers Association Opposes World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 24, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a resolution adopted by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States on the subject of federal world government. This outstanding patriotic organization is definitely opposed to any effort to inject our Government into a world group wherein the sovereignty of this Government is placed in jeopardy.

The resolution is as follows:

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1950.

The following resolution was adopted at the Twenty-fourth National Convention of the Reserve Officers Association held in Washington, D. C., June 28-July 1, 1950:

"Whereas under the sponsorship of an organization known as United World Federalists, there has been made and will be made to appear on the election ballots of several States a referendum which, in effect, mandates the congressional delegations from those States to take the lead in the creation of a world federal government; and

"Whereas the creation of a world federal government as proposed by the United World Federalists would require the surrender of a portion of the sovereignty, liberty, and freedom of the United States of America; and

"Whereas such action would be dangerous to the welfare of the United States of America, under existing world conditions, and would weaken our position in world affairs for peace and stability: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, in convention assembled, hereby records its opposition to such a referendum and calls upon the people of the Nation to defeat such referendum; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Reserve Officers Association of the United States urge those States who have ratified this united world federalist movement to rescind such ratification."

E. A. EVANS,
Executive Director.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles by Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Reporters who would like to go out and crack some unsolved Washington mysteries can find a life's work in the hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Bigger news stories than the Hiss case still hide in those files, waiting only the ingenuity and determination and push of Americans after the facts.

Just to mention a couple, what do you know about Sam Carp and Walter Krivitsky?

You will find the first trail of Sam Carp beginning in volume 8, page 4941. From there it takes off into the incredible wild blue yonder, in a fashion that bewilders even the most experienced inquirer into Washington wild life.

Sam Carp has a brother-in-law of whom you may have heard. He is known as Vyacheslav Molotov, deputy to Josef Stalin in the managment of the Russian Empire.

Sam Carp, of Bridgeport, Conn., came on before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on September 18, 1939, to tell the following tale, and please don't get the idea he came unasked:

1. That he came to the United States from Russia in 1911, entering at Philadelphia on February 16 of that year. His age then was 23 years.

He started out, as so many Americans have, working with his hands and, as so many Americans have, he rose in time to own his own business, a chain of gasoline filling stations.

In 1917, he became an American citizen. Sometime in those years, Sam's testimony does not say when, his sister married that Vyacheslav Scriabin who took the revolutionary alias Molotov, meaning "hammer."

So while old Hammer was helping kill and enslave people over in Russia, Sam Carp was learning how to be a free United States citizen and property owner.

2. But something inspired Sam to go back to Russia in 1934; what, he does not say. The significant thing is that back to Russia he went within a few months after F. D. Roosevelt so foolishly invited disaster by granting diplomatic status to the Soviet Union. Sam's testimony is that he went over in 1934 "to make a dollar."

How? Sam's testimony is that he thought he could get commissions from the Soviet Government as its agent here.

Why? They already had a large organization in New York called Amtorg, which has been found in the years since to do a neat job of combining espionage with trade. Surely the Amtorg staff was at least as competent as a lone filling-station operator at making contracts for the things Stalin wanted.

Just the same, Sam came back to the United States of America from that 1934 exploratory trip, and in 1936 he set up the Carp Export & Import Corp., of 220 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Then he went back to Russia and, according to his own sworn testimony, he received an order to buy $100,000,000 worth of goods for the Soviet Government from United States manufacturers.

The man who gave him the commission was not his brother-in-law, Molotov, but the commissar of foreign trade, named Rosengoltz.

Rosengoltz, just for a little side-bar story, was commissar of foreign trade in 1936, full of important bureaucratic dignity.

But within a few months he was a prisoner, charged with treason against Stalin. Andrei Vyshinsky, the present Soviet Foreign Minister, was prosecutor.

One of the weirdest of all courtroom fantasies in that whole long-drawn, eerie proceeding commonly called the Moscow purge trials involved Rosengoltz.

Vyshinsky asked him if, when arrested, he had not in his hip pocket a piece of bread. He admitted it. And inside the bread was there not a cloth? Yes. And inside the cloth there was a piece of paper? Yes.

And on that hidden piece of paper, inside the bread and inside the cloth, guess what?

On that piece of paper was written a prayer.

Rosengoltz collapsed and admitted the awful truth, but said he didn't carry the prayer around because he believed in it himself. He did it just to please his wife.

He blubbered all over the place and "confessed" all manner of crimes, and in due time he was shot. Naturally.

But nothing in Rosengoltz' fantastic case compares with the facts on Sam Carp's Export & Import Co. and the commission he brought home to buy, among other things, two United States-made battleships, complete.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles by Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Could you arrange, please, to buy a United States-made battleship for Stalin? Make it two, while you're at it. And to be safe, hire a Democratic national committeeman as attorney, for $32,000. And be sure also to get a $25,000 publicity man.

He'll be worth it, for he learned his trade at the Democratic National Committee under the command of Charlie Michelson, master penman.

The above is a true story.

Volume 8 of the hearings by the House Committee on Un-American Activities will show you sworn testimony on the subject. The witness is one Sam Carp, of Bridgeport, Conn.

Until 1936, Sam Carp was just as obscure filling-station operator in Bridgeport. But that year, for some incredible reason, the Soviet Government of Russia gave him a commission to buy $100,000,000 worth of items in the United States of America, including two 35,000-ton battleships.

What's more, it actually gave him very large chunks of cash, the total amount undisclosed to this day, which he used to buy and hire in a very grand way.

How could this have happened to a filling-station operator? A good question, and not entirely answered by the fact that Sam Carp's brother-in-law was Vyacheslav Molotov, No. 2 man to Josef Stalin.

I have touched on this almost unbelievable story of Sam Carp, his brother-in-law, and the two battleships for a reason. The Committee on Un-American Activities started on it in 1939 but never got the case finished.

It still ought to be explained in full. Maybe somebody, somewhere, will read this and come up with the missing evidence.

The facts of record show that Carp actually went to Gibbs & Cox, the famous ship designers, and showed them credentials sufficient for them to go to work on the battleships.

There naturally arose the question of whether an American ship-designing firm doing business with our Navy all the time could undertake the job.

Enter one Joseph Z. Dalinda, of New York City, who appears before the committee on September 19, 1939, and says that he is a patent developer.

Mr. Dalinda is one of those international operators who live by their wits, and so tells a long story of intrigues and struggles from the time he left his native Russia in 1915.

In 1937, Mr. Dalinda was introduced to Sam Carp by a Mr. Benenson, whom Mr. Dalinda had met at the Republican Club. And so it went.

Sam Carp showed Dalinda his credentials as a $100,000,000 special buyer for Stalin. They started negotiating on a fuse that Dalinda held, but soon got onto the battleship issue.

How could permission be obtained for Gibbs & Cox to draw those plans and how could the shipbuilders get authority to build if plans were drawn?

I cannot here reweave the whole pattern. It is too complex.

Carp swore he hired one Preston McGoodwin, ex-assistant to Charlie Michelson at the Democratic National Committee, for $25,000. He hired Scott Ferris, Democratic national committeeman, for $32,000.

Dalinda testified that he had recommended these gentry to Carp and further testified that he got $12,500 of the money paid Goodwin and $8,000 of the money paid Ferris.

A memorandum of Dalinda's stated that Secretary of State Cordell Hull discussed the little business of Sam Carp's battleship buying with "his superior," meaning President Roosevelt, and that it was further debated at several Cabinet meetings.

Upshot, Gibbs & Cox were told to go ahead. So they drew plans for a battleship not of 35,000 tons, but nearer 60,000 tons, and got a fee of $150,000, paid cash-in-hand by Sam Carp.

The plans were taken to Moscow, studied by the Soviet Navy and, as the Japanese used to do in such matters, refused.

Dalinda's files were a crazy house of oddities. One item was a cablegram to Stalin in Dalinda's admitted handwriting, saying "deeply sympathize with your sorrow losing your mother, June 10, 1937."

But the old international traveling man was vehement in denying that was his own message. He claimed it was Sam Carp's. But how did Sam Carp write in Dalinda's handwriting?

This business of Sam and the battleships has never been unraveled all the way. The record is studied with unsolved clues and names of note. Who will pick it up and finish the story?

For now another mystery—the Krivitsky case.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles by Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Here is a murder story, unfinished, from the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Like the unfinished mystery of Sam Carp, brother-in-law to Molotov, who tried to buy two United States-made battleships, it invites action by reporters who think they have seen everything.

I have introduced these sample cases from the committee's published records just to show how much untapped news they still contain, and further to demonstrate the effrontery and force of the Communist conspiracy in the United States of America.

The present case concerns an ex-spy for Russia known to the world as Gen. Walter Krivitsky, who testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1939 and next made the news, found shot dead in a Washington hotel room.

Whittaker Chambers, the man who has never yet told all, knows some things about the Krivitsky case.

Krivitsky was born in the Russian Ukraine in 1899. His name was Samuel Ginsberg. From childhood he was a revolutionary against the Czarist government, and in 1921 he got his reward.

He was made a political commissar of the Soviet Army. His duty was to see that soldiers were properly disciplined in communism, and so well did he do his job that in 1923 he went to Germany as one of the advance guard to precipitate the revolution there that was to overturn all Europe.

The revolution in Germany was a bloody failure, but Krivitsky was a rising star in communism's bureaucracy, so the failure did not matter. He rose in the Red Army to become a general, and eventually to chief of Soviet military intelligence for western Europe.

His headquarters were in Paris, but he roved the Continent, hiring spies and corrupting Europeans of all possible shades and kinds for Stalin.

But back home in Russia things were not so good again. Dear old Stalin had begun to kill off everybody who might conceivably differ with him on how the Communist system should operate.

To get killed you didn't have to be anti-Communist. You just only needed to offer Stalin an argument on anything.

By 1937 the Moscow trials, as they were called, had Krivitsky coming apart at the seams. No doubt, too, he was influenced by the life of western Europe, so superior to anything he had known back home.

So Krivitsky jumped.

He made his way to the United States of America, and did an amazing feat of prophesying. The Saturday Evening Post of April 22, 1939, carried it.

Krivitsky forecast the Stalin-Hitler pact that came on in August of 1939 to pull the trigger for World War II.

He continued to tell the inside story of communism's nature until he was shot dead, here in Washington.

The most interesting and important aspect of Krivitsky's disclosures deals with a matter I have mentioned in this series before, the close understanding the Communists had with German desperado factions both before and after the rise of Hitler.

According to Krivitsky, Stalin decided as early as 1934, when Hitler shook Germany with his famous blood purge of the Nazis, that here was a man with whom he could do business.

Indeed, as early as December 28, 1933, Stalin's No. 2 man, Molotov, declared:

"Our relations with Germany have always occupied a distinct place in our international relations * * * the Soviet Union has no cause on its part for any change of policy toward Germany."

How much plainer could the invitation be? And the developing records show even plainer that it was not Stalin, who refused to do business with Hitler, between 1933 and 1939, but Hitler, who brushed off Stalin.

In 1936 Krivitsky disclosed he was ordered to soften up Soviet activity in Germany and, in 1937, while all the propaganda mills were grinding out a line against the Nazis, Stalin sent one David Kandelaki to Berlin as his private and special envoy to make a deal.

And so, Krivitsky said, the wooing continued until the great success of 1939. Krivitsky's story has since been confirmed by captured German Government records.

But when he told it in the months before the war, who in the Roosevelt administration listened? Stalin listened, anyhow. And the end was a bullet for Krivitsky. That, next.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles by Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Murder as a fine art is an item that hardly fits into the average daily calculation of Americans. Least of all is it our habit to think of murder as an ordinary instrument of politics here in this beautiful city of Washington.

Nevertheless, I have for today some facts on a political murder in this capital, still unsolved, in the sense that the murderer has never been arrested even though his probable identity is known.

I have already told how one Walter Krivitsky, a general of the Soviet army intelligence, quit Stalin in 1937 and came on here in 1939 to testify before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, giving details on the background of the Hitler-Stalin pact of August 1939 that pulled the trigger on World War II.

Now, to tell as much as there is to tell, about how he died.

There is a record that Krivitsky left the United States in December, 1939, but where he went, I do not know, and so far as I can find there is no record of when he returned. He next appears in the public record on the Thursday before his death on Sunday, February 10, 1941.

On this Thursday he showed up at the home, near Charlottesville, Va., of Eitel Wolf Dobert, former Nazi storm trooper, and his wife Marguerite. He came unannounced and nobody knows who brought him.

On Friday, February 8, Mrs. Dobert drove him to Charlottesville where he purchased an automatic pistol.

On Sunday Mrs. Dobert drove him to Washington. He said he was going to New York.

Mrs. Dobert let him out of the car at the Union Station plaza late on Sunday afternoon. But instead of leaving town, Krivitsky checked in at the Bellevue hotel, 15 E Street NW.

The next morning a maid, Thelma Jackson, rapped at the door several times and received no answer. About 9:30, when she still got no answer, she opened the door with her pass key and saw Krivitsky, dead with his pistol by his left hand.

Three notes in Krivitsky's handwriting were found in the room. One was to his lawyer, a respected citizen of New York named Louis Waldman, asking help for Krivitsky's wife and child and further protection for the Doberts who "didn't know why I bought the gun."

A second saying much the same thing was to a friend, Suzanne La Follette, cousin of the former Wisconsin Senator.

The third was to his wife, saying, "I want to live very badly but it is impossible."

None was an explanation of matters surrounding or leading up to Krivitsky's death.

The nearest thing we have to that is a disclosure by Waldman that on January 7 Miss La Follette received a letter from one Paul Wohl of New York:

"Please inform our honorable friend that an ominous person is in New York—Hans."

When Krivitsky learned of this, said Waldman, he cried out: "I am a dead man. Hans never misses."

Did Krivitsky kill himself at the direct instruction of Hans to purchase the lives of his wife and child? Or did he just voluntarily kill himself in the hope that would satisfy Stalin and maybe the other two would escape by neglect?

Either way, it was murder just as much as if Hans held the gun in his own hand.

Well, there is just this to add: Mrs. Krivitsky and the little boy were taken to Florida by Whittaker Chambers, the man nobody believed.

Then they were hid out by Chambers on two different Marland farms. They are still in hiding to this day.

Chambers' own life was at stake, yet he risked it again for these two other fugitives from Stalin's guns, and that is a thing in his favor.

And now you have read all I have to tell you for now on this matter, but you are welcome to finish it, if you can.

I also leave the whole chapter of the House Committee on Un-American Activities at this point. I have undertaken to show that its files have never been properly reported and that much remains to be developed, and I think that is established. So on to the next installment.

Soviet Russia and the Korean Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations has lawfully decreed cessation of hostilities and withdrawal of the North Korean invaders.

The United Nations further lawfully decreed that all member nations render every assistance in enforcing that decree.

The United Nations further decreed that no member nation give any assistance to the North Korean invaders. The Soviet Union is a member of the United Nations.

Now, it is known that North Koreans are using Russian-made implements of war in prosecuting this insurrection against constituted and lawful authority of the United Nations.

The record seems to disclose that the de facto government of North Korea was established in collusion with the Soviet Union and in defiance of the United Nations. It is that de facto government which is prosecuting this insurrection—with Russian weapons.

In law, Mr. Speaker, one who knowingly furnishes the weapons by which a crime is accomplished is equally guilty. He may never lay a finger to a trigger. But if he performs his agreed role in an unlawful enterprise, he is a coconspirator. He shares equal guilt, for in the eyes of the law the hand of one conspirator is the hand of all, and the voice of one is the voice of all.

It is therefore an indisputable fact, Mr. Speaker, that if the Soviet Union is arming this insurrection, then she is in contempt of the lawful decree of the United Nations.

No government can survive unless it upholds its lawful authority against contempt and crimes and violent insurrection, not only against the immediate offender but against his accessories and coconspirators as well.

Authority is an attribute of sovereignty. Sovereignty arises from the will of the people, from their consent to be governed and protected.

Sovereignty based upon the consent of the governed does not degrade; rather it elevates individual dignity. The same must henceforth be recognized by individual nations.

So it has been with the illustrious 48 States of our Union. This formula of law and order under constituted authority must encircle the war-torn world if it is to escape a universal reign of terror.

This is now an age of horror. Forces that trifle with creation itself are the slaves of mortal and fallible men.

Sovereignty arises from the people. From 2,000,000,000 people, through their respective governments, the United Nations became the repository of their consent to be governed and the guardian of their protection.

Mr. Speaker, I speak for over a half million of those people, one of every 3,700 persons on this globe. They are brave people. They will fight for law and order.

I believe they do not expect us to police the world alone. I doubt, and I believe they doubt, our ability, our duty, or even our right to do so. But they do expect us to uphold, and what is just as important, submit to lawful international authority. And what is more, they expect other nations to do likewise. And they expect me to ask our Government to advocate law enforcement in the councils of the United Nations.

That is why I am speaking to you today.

The United Nations is the only hope of the peoples of the world. If its lawful authority fades away like the setting sun, then the sunrise of peace may look down upon a bleak and lifeless planet.

So while the Soviet Union is a powerful nation, we cannot, and we must not, let timidity and indecision dissolve the authority which is our only hope for peace under law and order.

The United Nations cannot, and must not, ignore the accessory nor the coconspirator, else it renounces the greatest principle of justice, equal rights under law.

The United Nations must, if it is to survive, determine at once if the Soviet Union is arming the Korean insurrection in contempt of her lawful authority. If she does not, then the United Nations is dead. The United Nations should convene its proper body or tribunal and summon the Soviet Union for such an inquiry. Our Government should, if we have the facts, prefer the charge and demand an immediate determination of the facts. We should make it clear we will be bound by any lawful decree or legislation of the United Nations and that other nations must be likewise bound. If the Soviet Union fails to appear, she should be tried in absentia.

If the charge is found to be true, then the United Nations should use every available weapon at her command, or at the command of her loyal members to enforce her lawful decree against the Soviet Union. And every loyal nation must be expected to vigorously act at every point where Soviet Union activity is sustaining this armed insurrection. It is not proper that we carry the burden alone.

The United Nations should not permit the Soviet Union to select and concentrate her power at one point. If she is making war upon the United Nations,

then she should understand that the United Nations, all of them, will take such measures as are necessary to subdue her.

It is a frightful suggestion, Mr. Speaker, but in the light of history, the alternative is unspeakable.

Mr. Speaker, the hopes of the civilized world have been dimmed. The United Nations, once our bright hope, electrified the world by swift action in Korea. But now that hope ebbs as she trifles with the real aggressor.

If the action I suggest here were taken, and if the loyal members of the United Nations will, as America has, fight with everything they have, we can subdue this contempt for law and order.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that what I suggest may mean, in a practical sense, war with all its horrors.

But we also know that unless we establish law and enforce order in the world, then there can be no peace.

If I am to ask the boys I represent to die, I want to believe that the goal for which they fight is worth dying for. Each generation must live and struggle for future generations as well as for itself. But the time for blind struggle is past.

And above all, Mr. Speaker, I believe that in this dangerous era we must gird ourselves, either to protect ourselves, or as I hope, to uphold United Nations authority.

But as our sons make their sacrifices, I, as a Member of this House, will insist that we on the home front must match their sacrifices as best we can; it will not be soft for them, and we should not expect it to be soft for us.

Return of Certain Territories to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an open letter to the Secretary of State Dean Acheson, addressed to him by Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish American Congress, representing over 6,000,000 persons of Polish antecedents. This excerpt is from the Polish Weekly Pittsburgher, published June 23, 1950:

Hon. DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State, State Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: At a plenary meeting of the executive board of the Polish American Congress, held on June 9, 1950, at Chicago, Ill., it was unanimously resolved to register with the State Department our objection with its recently expressed attitude regarding the question of present Germany, and more particularly, regarding the Polish-German agreement concerning the Oder-Niesse boundaries.

The Polish American Congress, reflecting the views of Americans of Polish descent, considers the opinions expressed by officials of the State Department to the effect that the Oder-Niesse boundary lacks all finality as being inconsistent with the acknowledged policy of our Government and not in the best interests of the United States.

President Truman at Potsdam recognized Poland's right to the given territory and gave his consent to the evacuation of the German population from it. Furthermore, our Government agreed to Poland's administration of this land. The clause in the Potsdam agreement about ratification of the boundaries by a peace conference has been properly understood to be a mere formality and nothing else.

The attitude taken by our responsible representatives from the statement of Mr. Byrnes at Stuttgart to the recent statement of officials of the Department of State obviously calcultaed to appease Germany—only tend to break the spirit of resistance in Poland and in other countries behind the Iron Curtain. The faith of the Polish people as well as that of other countries whose hopes are pinned on the moral leadership of the United States is shaken as a result of the inconsistency and unreliability of our political trends.

The Polish American Congress has until now successfully counteracted the Moscow propaganda and pressure by reassuring the Polish people and encouraging them to have faith in America and to resist Russian domination.

Today Moscow engineered this new fraud as a strategic move in the psychological war by appearing as the champion of a cause that is close and dear to every Pole. Yet our Government expressed itself in way that will undoubtedly hurt the Poles, undermine their faith and break their spirit of resistance.

We share the conviction of the Polish people that the Oder-Niesse line and the return of the recovered territories to Poland is wholly justified while the position taken by the United States in this matter only tends to demoralize and weaken the peoples behind the iron curtain. The attitude of our officials also encourages the Germans in the western part to inflame their youth with a new line of propaganda based on America's policy regarding that area. The German Frankenstein has already unleashed a new fury of nationalistic fervor which constitutes a great danger.

We plead, therefore, with you, Mr. Secretary, that your Department abide by its original approval of the Oder-Niesse boundary and thus prevent the United States from appeasing an enemy at the expense of an ally.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President, Polish American Congress.

Sugar Quota Suspensions Are Imperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing concern throughout the country regarding the problem of maintaining adequate sugar supplies. My information is that the large sugar supplies in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii could be made available for consumption in this country by further relaxing the restrictions of the Sugar Act of 1948. On Monday of this week, the Journal of Commerce carried a strong editorial urging the administration to suspend sugar quotas. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include portions of this editorial statement and trust that those in charge of the program will act vigorously to protect the American consumers:

American import restrictions on sugar constitute an open invitation to Russia and her satellites to grab at least a part of these supplies in Cuba from directly under our own noses. For some time, there has been a strong suspicion that Russia has been doing exactly that, because sugar purchases from Mediterranean and Persian Gulf areas have been sharply expanded.

Since the current wave of sugar hoarding has not been restricted to the United States but has been world-wide, a large part of the Cuban sugar surplus actually has already disappeared into thin air. If we don't act quickly to increase the flow of sugar into the United States, we may find out to our sorrow that, before the year is out, the sugar surplus actually has turned into a shortage.

It is not yet too late to act. But no further time should be lost in suspending the quota provisions of the Sugar Act.

This would enable us to purchase what remains of Cuba's sugar reserve stocks, estimated at some 700,000 tons before the start of the Korean war but drawn down to a mere 177,000 tons by now. In addition, there still are 125,000 tons of sugar surplus in Puerto Rico and another 100,000 tons in Hawaii which are now being kept away from domestic consumption under the restrictions of the Sugar Act.

Sugar experts believe that quota suspension would attract an additional 200,000 tons of sugar from foreign producing areas other than Cuba, because prices in the United States still are above the world price level.

So why hesitate?

There is no other commodity that holds a similar key position in the fight against food hoarding as sugar. Even coffee runs a poor second when it comes to this dubious distinction.

That is why determined action by the administration is necessary to stop the hoarding of sugar. Since there is an effective way of doing this by suspending sugar quotas and thereby opening the way into the United States for every pound of surplus sugar available anywhere outside this country, this is exactly what should be done and done immediately.

If there is any chance of stopping the sugar hoarder—and that includes the commercial user as well as the housewife—this is it.

Resolution of Polish Legion of American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, Col. Benjamin T. Anuskewicz, double-Purple Heart veteran of both World Wars, of Great Neck, Long Island, chairman of the National Security Committee of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, presented to Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson a resolution of the Polish Legion of American Veterans strongly supporting President Truman in the present Korean conflict. Under

leave to extend my remarks, I include the resolution.

The Executive Committee of the Polish Legion of American Veterans in special session held in Chicago, Ill., this 18th day of July, 1950, resolve as follows:

"Whereas the invasion of Southern Korea by the Communist armies threatens the peace and safety of the free world; and

"Whereas the United States, acting under authority of the United Nations, has taken active measures to uphold the rule of law by halting Communist aggression; and

"Whereas the more than 50,000 American veterans of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, traditionally patriotic citizens who have fought in both World Wars, appreciate the peril to the Republic and therefore desire to place themselves on record with their steadfast loyalty and support in this crisis: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Polish Legion of American Veterans commend President Harry S. Truman for sending military aid to South Korea; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Polish Legion of American Veterans pledge itself and its members to support our Government with our lives and our honor in the present crisis, and further pledge itself to do the utmost to secure and preserve peace and liberty for all mankind; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; Louis E. Johnson, Secretary of Defense; and to the Members of Congress."

LAWRENCE M. KOCINSKI,
National Commander.
HELEN K. KMIEC,
National Adjutant.

Korean Crisis Versus "Yes Man" Psychology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on April 5, 1950, I addressed the House on the subject "Yes Man" Psychology Is Ruining Our National Defense.

In view of the current crisis in Korea and the discussion by the American people of the condition of our national defense my remarks last April are very timely. For that reason I wish to call them to your attention:

[Remarks by Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, in the House of Representatives, April 5, 1950, titled "'Yes Man' Psychology Is Ruining Our National Defense"]

"YES MAN" PSYCHOLOGY IS RUINING OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I know that all of you enjoyed Chairman VINSON'S comments on the question of national defense. There is no man in the Congress of the United States who is entitled to more credit for the building of our national defense than is the gentleman from Georgia. His long career here in Congress as a champion for our Armed Forces properly labels him as a spokesman for those of us who believe that the security of our country can best be protected by an adequate national defense.

To further Chairman VINSON'S discussion of national defense I should like to consume the time allotted me in discussing what I consider one of the most dangerous practices that has ever been permitted to develop. This practice which is commonly referred to as "yes man" psychology, concerns information given to congressional committees by spokesmen of our armed services only after it has been screened by the head of their department or by someone in the Defense Establishment. It simply means that congressional committees are not getting first-hand information on the needs and the state of our national defense by those qualified by position and experience.

There are two factors in this "yes man" psychology that brought about this dangerous practice. First, directives issued by the President and heads of departments; and second, the threat of reprisal against those spokesmen for our Defense Establishment who dare to speak their own mind when called upon to do so by various congressional committees.

This practice of telling spokesmen what they can or cannot say before congressional committees had its beginning on November 15, 1946, when President Truman issued a memorandum in which he said:

"I have noticed that on several occasions certain department and agency officials have shown a tendency to seek from Congress larger appropriations than were contemplated in official budget estimates."

Then the President said this to the Director of the Budget:

"When you notify the heads of the various departments and agencies of the amounts to be included in the 1948 budget for their activities I wish you would include a reminder that I shall expect them and their subordinates to support only the President's estimates in hearings and discussions with Members of Congress."

This "yes man" psychology really came into being in the spring of 1947 when the House Armed Services Committee of which I am a member, behind closed doors and off the record, had to extract from the civilian heads of the Army, Navy, and Air Force information as to how much money was necessary in their minds for the fiscal year 1949 to give the American people the type of an Army, Navy, and Air Force the civilian heads felt necessary. Very reluctantly, and with red faces, the civilian Secretaries gave the committee the information concerning the following budget request for 1949.

Budget requests, 1949

[In millions]

	Army	Navy	Air Force
Amount requested	$3,978	$5,310	$4,422
Present request	3,013	3,510	3,054
Difference	965	1,800	1,368

Since 1948 much has been said about the fact that the Bureau of the Budget was requesting appropriations that were far less than the amounts the civilian secretaries felt absolutely necessary. This brought about denials on the part of the administration and others who spoke for the administration.

In addition to these denials, it was freely said that spokesmen for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps could appear before Congress and give any information they were asked for and without any restrictions.

Well, we all know what happened to Admiral Denfeld after being given assurance by the Secretary of the Navy that he was free to testify and to give any information he wished without fear of reprisal.

On the heels of Admiral Denfeld's dismissal we have now the transfer of Rear Adm. Joel T. Boone, Chief of the Joint Plans and Action Division, Office of Medical Services, Defense Department, who violated this "yes" man psychology when he spoke his own mind before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services.

It is said that there were plans to transfer Admiral Boone beforehand. But from the hearings of the subcommittee it is learned that the day he left his office to come to Capitol Hill to testify he was literally told that he should be careful what he said and to keep in mind his fitness report had not yet been submitted. To any fair-minded person, the action in transferring Admiral Boone is nothing more than another act of reprisal.

According to the Associated Press, and I quote:

"Both Admiral Sherman and his admirals appeared so reluctant to quarrel with the budget handed them by Defense Secretary Johnson that a House subcommittee held a separate hearing to determine whether they had been gagged. Of course, Secretary of the Navy Matthews denied that they had been."

Anyone who reads the hearings on this bill which concerns naval appropriations will understand that Admiral Sherman, the Chief of Naval Operations, was not satisfied with the budget although his remarks were very guarded and exceedingly discreet.

The country as a whole is fed up with this yes-man psychology and the newspapers of the country editorially have this to say about screened information.

From the March 2, 1950, issue of the Christian Science Monitor we read:

"Purposed or not, the effect is to impose a gag on the services and to nullify the investigative powers of the representatives of the people."

The Washington Evening Star on March 3, 1950, had this to say regarding the shoddy treatment of Admiral Denfeld in an editorial titled "For Free and Honest Testimony":

"Many persons inside and outside the Pentagon will agree with the commitee's finding that the summary dismissal of Admiral Denfeld from his top-level Navy post was a blow against representative government, in that it tends to intimidate witnesses and hence discourages the rendering of free and honest testimony to the Congress."

Continuing, the editorial says:

"If the effect should be lasting—and it is difficult to eradicate so intangible a reaction—Congress and the American people cannot be sure of learning the true state of our military strength. Congress has a right to receive, and defense authorities have an obligation to give, free and honest facts and opinions on the Nation's security, however distasteful or embarrassing the testimony may be to someone at the Pentagon."

In regard to the transfer of Admiral Joel T. Boone, the Washington Evening Star on March 9, 1950, commented as follows:

"But ordinary courtesy, to say nothing of the cause of good service relations, would have justified more considerate treatment of these key officers in a matter so vitally concerning their services. * * * Coming so close in the wake of the Denfeld ouster, however, the unfortunate effect will be to create a yes-man psychology at the Pentagon that is not good for national defense."

I know that every Member of this House realizes what is going on. The issue is simply whether or not our country's Defense Establishment is to be controlled by us who are the elected representatives of the people or by a small clique of political appointees.

In my opinion the Congress of the United States should take action to eliminate this yes-man psychology and make certain that we get nothing but first-hand information on our national defense and not screened information. Congress is also entitled to correct information, but under the present policy we do not know whether the spokesman is telling the full story, or what he has been ordered to come up and tell us.

I agree with the Washington Evening Star that yes-man psychology at the Pentagon is not good for national defense.

Hubert Kregeloh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members to an honorable-mention award won by Station WSPR of Springfield, Mass., and its news analyst, Hubert Kregeloh, for the program, Understand the Peace. The award was won in national competition sponsored by the Institution for Education by Radio of Ohio State University.

The award was granted for precise, objective illumination of important and timely topics in a series of intelligently planned and soundly developed programs.

We in the Second District are pleased at the award made to WSPR and commentator Hubert Kregeloh in national competition.

Military Intelligence System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, with the hue and cry being raised as to our military intelligence activities in Korea, it might be well to examine the background of the situation in the light of what has been told by both proponents and opponents of the Central Intelligence Agency.

It is admitted that information bearing upon the massing of North Korean troops along the thirty-eighth parallel was procured by Central Intelligence agents and sent to Washington. Some contend that it was not conclusive and that no warning of a possible attack was given. Admiral Hillenkoetter, Chairman of Central Intelligence Agency, in his appearance before the House Armed Services Committee, defended his organization and contended that it was impossible to predetermine the time or place of the Communist attack.

In the face of the obvious deficiencies of our military intelligence system, it should be noted that time after time since 1946 I have stressed the need for a more highly integrated and completely independent intelligence network. This incident, coupled with the lack of warning of the revolt in Bogota, Colombia, when our diplomats were gathered there for a discussion of Pan-American affairs, indicates the need for a complete revision of our thinking in this area of strategy.

Had my warnings been heeded and my suggestions adopted, we would now have a competent, highly trained corps of intelligence agents. They could have been recruited from all walks of civilian life and have given of their individual talents without hardship.

In my district in Connecticut there are cities like Waterbury, Ansonia, Torrington having large populations of foreign-born citizens who are familiar with the people, the terrain, and, above all, with the language of other nations. Their abilities would have been made available upon demand, as they are freedom-loving Americans, proud of their adopted land.

With our present system of intelligence no proper evaluation of information is possible. The chain of command does not provide for facility of information, and too often proper analysis is obtained too late to be of use.

Let us profit by the mistakes which have been made in the past, so that lives may be saved in the future.

As a portion of my remarks I include a news article by J. M. Roberts, Jr., Associated Press foreign affairs analyst, which appeared in the Ansonia (Conn.) Sentinel of Wednesday, July 26, 1950:

IS UNITED STATES OF AMERICA STILL BABE-IN-WOODS IN SPY BUSINESS?

(By J. M. Roberts, Jr.)

President Truman's call for public support of Government agencies against espionage and sabotage serves to remind that the country has a score to settle with its Government on the reverse side of the coin.

By that I mean the failure of our own espionage and intelligence evaluation system in Korea and perhaps elsewhere.

There has been a general admission that the United States was taken completely by surprise, diplomatically and militarily, when the Communists launched their invasion of South Korea.

Central Intelligence made a pretty good show before a congressional committee, at a brief and quickly ended hearing immediately after the fighting started, that had reported the facts of North Korean military actions. But nobody has made any showing that our officials know what it meant.

The situation immediately raised the question: Is the United States still a babe-in-the-woods in the spy business?

For no matter how good your information may be, if you can't tell what it means it is of no value.

For weeks now, reports have been reaching Washington of military activities just across the iron curtain from Yugoslavia and Greece, but so far as can be learned their meaning, if any, is still obscure.

A recent black-out on intelligence from behind the iron curtain in Europe suggests strongly that the United States still has been relying heavily on its old system of legal observation by attachés of diplomatic missions. As these staffs have been reduced under Cominform pressure, intelligence has fallen off.

The United States, traditionally, has not gone in for illegal intelligence. But the United States traditionally, has not been the military guardian of world democracy, either. Changed times demand changed approaches. Americans thought they were getting that when the Central Intelligence Agency was created. Now there is doubt.

During the war, because of the failure of American intelligence, the Germans were able to prepare and stage their great counter-attack in the Belgian Bulge without the high command being aware of more than a calculated risk.

Other countries, old hands at this business of war and international intrigue, don't do business that way. Compare the Bulge thing with the German invasion of Holland in 1940. At that time the Dutch knew days in advance what German armies would strike, when and where. That's the type of intelligence the United States needs today throughout the world.

There is no public clamor for scalps in connection with the Korean surprise, although there is word in Washington that that will come, too, when there is a more propitious time for washing dirty linen. To settle its score with the country all the Government needs is to do now what it didn't do before—take steps to insure adequate intelligence, which means evaluation just as much as it means collection of facts.

Boy Scouts From Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, this week Washington has seen some of the finest young people in the country in the Boys' Nation delegates.

The two young men who are representing the State of Massachusetts are Lawrence T. Zimmerman, of Springfield, and Dana Daggett, of Leominster.

The selection of these two young men has been a great honor for each, of course. Massachusetts is very proud that they had two such fine young men representing the Bay State.

I am particularly pleased that one of the two young men, Lawrence Zimmerman, comes from Springfield, Mass., a city in the Second Congressional District. We in the Second District are all very proud that Lawrence Zimmerman was chosen in the State-wide competition as one of the two selected to represent the entire State of Massachusetts.

Congressman PHILBIN, who represents the district that includes Leominster, joins with me in these remarks.

Meeting on the Brannan Plan in Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED MARSHALL
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House from Minnesota I was very much interested in the hearing which was conducted Wednesday morning and afternoon by the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities into the recent State-wide meeting of county and community committeemen of the Production and Marketing Administration, a meeting which had been made into a very controversial subject in Minnesota as a result of charges of illegal expenditure of Federal funds.

The report on this matter which the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman BUCHANAN, of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, had obtained from the General Accounting Office completely established the legality

of the expenditures for the payment of per diem to the community as well as to the county committeemen who attended the Production and Marketing Administration meeting in St. Paul.

I think the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities has performed a notable public service in the fair-minded and objective way it went into this whole matter, getting all of the facts and making them public. I attended the hearing as an observer, and I can attest to the fact that the questioning was searching and thorough and complete. The procedures of this committee of Congress, as I watched them unfold, deserve the highest commendation.

Since I am not a member of that committee I cannot, of course, speak for the committee or for its members, but as an observer I can give my own opinion as to the results of this hearing. I think it proved conclusively that there was no difference in concept between the 1950 PMA meeting and the previous Statewide meeting in 1948. I think it proved conclusively that the county and community committeemen who attended were assembled in St. Paul for a completely proper purpose. The General Accounting Office report certainly demonstrates that fact. The General Accounting Office is an arm of Congress. It is responsible only to Congress. It is completely independent of the executive branch.

The whole issue at the hearing by the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities seemed to me to boil down to only one point: Was the Secretary of Agriculture acting properly in making the speech which he made?

Some of the minority members of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities made clear that, in their opinion, Mr. Brannan's speech had only one purpose, and that was to lobby for the so-called Brannan plan.

In that connection I listened to the recording of the speech played back before the committee, and I read the transcript of the speech which the committee had. The Secretary's delivery was vigorous and interesting, and, of course, he presented his point of view on agricultural policy. He certainly has that right.

But one thing struck me about this speech, and it is a point I do not think has been emphasized sufficiently, particularly in connection with this charge that he was lobbying for the Brannan plan. Here is what the Secretary said:

> And so, ladies and gentlemen, your Department of Agriculture, following out what in my opinion is your statutory obligation and duty, decided to make some recommendations, or were called upon to make some recommendations. In the meantime, over this country other people were discussing the farm problem. And, as we came along to the period of time when our recommendations went before the Congress, there was a lot of concentration of thought on those recommendations. Now, so today just starting out here today right off the bat, I just want to start talking about them, ask you to consider them, and think about them. Ask you above all to be critical of them and ask you above all and above that to say to yourself, if I have a better suggestion or a better solution, I would like to get it into the pot. Send it down to your Congressman. Send it down to your Senator. Send it down through your farm organizations. Send it down through your cooperatives or however it is. It is your obligation as much as mine to see that the problems that we have get solved. And, by that token, it is your problem as much as mine to take some thought and consideration of where we are and what has been said on the subject.

What did that indicate, Mr. Speaker? It indicated that Mr. Brannan is interested in the solution of this problem of surpluses which threatens our price support and farm stabilization program.

I believe we are all interested in that.

It also indicated that he thinks the so-called Brannan plan is a good solution but that he does not insist that it is the only solution. He asked everyone present at that meeting to think over the various recommendations for solving our farm problem, to be critical of them—to be critical of all of them including the Brannan plan—and to make up their own minds. And then, when they make up their minds, they are to do something about it; they are to act; they are to fulfill their obligations as good citizens and express their views to Members of Congress.

That is the sort of talk that Americans like to hear. It brings them closer to their Government. The strength of democracy is the interest that people take in government. The Secretary of Agriculture is rendering a real service to the Congress and the people of the United States when he interests people in their problems and our Government.

Freeze Food and Commodity Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. Philip A. Guarino, president of Restaurant Beverage Association of Washington, D. C., to which is attached a resolution adopted by that organization urging that the President and Congress of the United States take immediate action to first, freeze all food commodity prices; second, roll back prices to a period consistent with sound and practical economy; and third, institute a form of control necessary to further stabilize the food industry from the producer to the consumer in order that a continuous and uninterrupted flow of food products shall be maintained at a fair and reasonable cost.

In the preamble of this resolution the organization sets forth the reasons why it believes its suggested action is pertinent at this time. One of the reasons set forth is that in recent weeks an alarming increase of food commodity prices has occurred which, it is believed, has been caused by artificial stimulation, hoarding and the unscrupulous operations of small groups of individuals seeking unethical profit and gain.

The Restaurant Beverage Association, under the leadership of Philip Guarino, is to be congratulated for taking this action. It realizes that we are in an all-out struggle and that if we are to restrain the desires of selfish men to profit through the sacrifices caused in war it is necessary that bold steps be taken to write comprehensive regulations and that this be done now.

The Restaurant Beverage Association of Washington, D. C., pioneers the trail to preserve economic freedom for private enterprise in this country.

The letter and the resolution are made part of these remarks that they may be preserved and made available to the public generally.

RESTAURANT BEVERAGE ASSOCIATION
OF WASHINGTON, D. C., INC.,
June 25, 1950.

Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The recent uncalled-for price rises in food commodities has created a serious crisis for our membership body. Unless checked, for many members it means bankruptcy and elimination from our American economy.

The urgent need for remedial action which prompted the adoption of the attached resolution is accompanied by our willingness to accept the responsibilities which such action entails. We sincerely hope you will give our request favorable consideration.

Respectfully yours,

PHILIP A. GUARINO,
President.

RESOLUTION

Whereas on the 19th day of July 1950, the President in his message to the Congress of the United States and the American people, stated that the American people are united in their belief in democratic freedom and united in their detest of communistic slavery; and

Whereas the Armed Forces of the United States are presently engaged in combating an act of raw communistic aggression in Korea; and

Whereas these series of events are of signal importance to every citizen who will be called upon to do his share in order that our inherent rights and the freedom of this Nation are preserved; and

Whereas it will be necessary to increase our military strength with men, equipment and supplies; and

Whereas it will be necessary for our Government to bring about a considerable adjustment in our national economy by proper legislation; and

Whereas the Restaurant Beverage Association of Washington, D. C., a trade association affiliated with the National Licensed Beverage Association, comprising retail restaurants serving food and drink to the general public, desires to fully cooperate with the President of the United States in order that the purpose of the United Nations to maintain peace among all nations may be fulfilled and our generations of young people throughout the world will not be compelled to take up arms again but may continue to pursue the paths of freedom, equality, opportunity, and happiness in a world truly at peace; and

Whereas the members of this association are desirous of offering their services, goods, and processed foods for human consumption at a fair and reasonable cost to consumer and server; and

Whereas in recent weeks an alarming increase in food commodity prices has occurred, which it is believed, has been caused by artificial stimulation, hoarding and the unscrupulous operation of small groups of indi-

viduals seeking unethical profit and gain; and

Whereas the members of the Restaurant Beverage Association faced with these alarming, unjustifiable, and unnecessary increases and being further unwilling and unable to pass such increases along to the consuming public; and

Whereas the members of this association comprising small-business men with life savings invested and little or no capital reserves, are faced with bankruptcy, ruination and certain elimination from the American economy unless these conditions are corrected; and

Whereas the extreme urgency of the situation requires prompt remedial action and relief: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President and Congress of the United States take immediate legislative action embracing:

1. A "freeze" of all food commodity prices.
2. A "roll-back" of prices to a period consistent with sound and practical economy.
3. The institution of a form of control necessary to further stabilize the food industry from the producer to the consumer in order that a continuous and uninterrupted flow of food products shall be maintained at a fair and reasonable cost.

RESTAURANT BEVERAGE ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON, D. C.,
ELMER F. RICHTER, *Executive Secretary.*

The Truth About CVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] delivered a speech on Saturday, July 8, in the city of Rupert, Idaho, on the Truth About CVA. I believe that this explanation of the CVA should be printed in the RECORD, because it is a matter of great importance that not only the people of the great State of Idaho, but all the people of this Nation, should learn the truth about the vital question of developing our natural resources in the quickest, cheapest, and most efficient way possible.

Not only is the economic welfare of our people involved, but our national security is being endangered by further delay. The Senator from Idaho is qualified to speak on this matter because of long years of thoughtful study devoted to the problem of resource development. He is interested in the Columbia Valley, and the welfare of the people whom he represents so well here in the United States Senate.

I therefore ask that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE CVA

I have chosen as the subject of my talk today the question of how we may best develop our natural resources here in this great State of ours, particularly how we are to find ways and means of proceeding with our reclamation development and the development of the hydroelectric resources of our State. I have chosen this meeting in Rupert as the occasion for this discussion because you people are vitally interested both in reclamation and in cheap power. There would be no city of Rupert had it not been for the fact that water was put on the fertile lands which surround this beautiful community. You are all familiar with the benefits of cheap power, because for many years you enjoyed an abundance of cheap hydroelectric power which was generated at the Minidoka Dam just a few miles from here. Now I understand that due to the growth in population the people of Rupert, like most of the people of Idaho, are suffering from a power shortage. I might well wish that the specific issue that I am going to discuss with you would just take wings like a flying saucer and disappear over the hills someplace. Because it's a rough one. Since I have been in Idaho a number of well-meaning friends have said to me, "Senator TAYLOR, you have got this election in the bag. You have got it won, if you will just keep still and not talk about the CVA—the Columbia Valley Administration." They said to me, "There has been a lot of propaganda put out against the CVA. A lot of folks are scared. You can't hope to educate them in 30 days, and if you insist on being for the CVA, Senator TAYLOR, you are just likely to lose enough votes to lose this election." Well, if that's the way it is, that's the way it will have to be. I am not going to come out here and lie to you people to try to get a few votes. I would rather tell you the truth and be defeated and retain my self-respect. I am for the CVA because I believe in my heart that that is the only way we can ever get reasonably quick development of the resources of this great State of ours—a wonderful State. We have a wonderful State here, one of the finest in the Nation. Beautiful scenery, wonderful climate. Those are just extra dividends we get for living in Idaho. But we have all the material resources necessary to make this one of the most prosperous and fastest-growing sections of the Nation. Back here in these mountains we have minerals and metals of all kinds and descriptions—scarce, rare, precious, common, and otherwise. As it is now, our prospectors and small-mine operators go down in the mines and bring up a spoonful of ore when it could be tons, if we had some cheap power to work with. The mountains back yonder are covered with forests that need to be harvested. But we have no cheap electricity to run the mills. Some folks haul Diesel oil back in there and try to operate in that fashion. But that's horse-and-buggy stuff in this day and age. Down here in southeastern Idaho we have 60 percent of the Nation's phosphate fertilizer. The farmers of the Nation are in desperate need of that fertilizer. We should have a great fertilizer industry, but it requires tremendous amounts of cheap electric power to process that phosphate and Idaho does not have cheap power. We have all these great resources and many more. But the census shows us practically standing still. Simply because we have no hydroelectric power with which to develop our resources. Oregon and Washington are growing at an unprecedented rate. They do have cheap power.

WHY WE MUST HAVE CVA

There is no way in the world for us to get cheap power here in Idaho the way we have been going at it, for this reason: It costs more to develop power on our small streams, and our streams are small in comparison with the Columbia. They can develop power cheaper down there on that big river. Now, the Government will not give you a nickel to build a power dam unless you can demonstrate that there is a market for the power. And there is no market for our more expensive power. Nobody is going to be fool enough to build a factory here in Idaho and use expensive power when they can go right down on the Columbia and get cheap power. So we can't demonstrate a market for the power. So we can't get any money to build dams. So we will get no cheap power, and we will have no development under existing conditions.

CVA IS THE ANSWER

Now, here is what the CVA proposes to do about this matter, and I want you to listen to this. This is an important argument. The CVA proposes to build a power grid to cover this entire Northwest—one big power-distributing system. They propose to dump the cheap power from the big dams on the Columbia into that grid and the more expensive power from our dams here in Idaho, mix it all up, and level it off, and charge the same rate for power all over Idaho as would apply down at Bonneville. That way our power would be salable. Cheap power would be available as soon as we could build this power grid. Then the mills, plants, and factories would rather stop here in Idaho because here is where we have the resources. Then we would have jobs for our Idaho workers—opportunites for our young people.

WE EXPORT CHILDREN

Now we send our children to Moscow to educate them, and that's expensive. It costs money. They come home, eager to help with the building of our State, and what happens? They can't go to farming. There's no land left. There aren't any jobs because there are no factories, because there is no cheap power. So, reluctantly, they pack their bags and head west to Oregon or Washington, where there is cheap power and opportunity, or they head east. About our best export is our children—educated children at that—and there isn't much profit in it.

NO POWER—NO INDUSTRY

Here is what happens now. Last year a big farmers' co-op down at Walla Walla wanted to build a fertilizer plant so they cold sell fertilizer cheap to the farmers. The logical place to build that plant would be down at Montpelier, in southeastern Idaho, where the phosphate beds are. So the co-op asked the private power company for a rate, and what do you think it was? Twenty-five percent more than Bonneville? Fifty percent more than Bonneville? Seventy-five percent more than Bonneville? I'll raise you 25—it was 100 percent more than Bonneville juice—twice as much. So at last reports the co-op was going to build the fertilizer plant down on the Columbia, haul the unprocessed rock clear from Montpelier, clear across the State of Idaho, clear across the State of Oregon, clear down to the Columbia and process it there. That would be cheaper than paying the Idaho power rate. So we lose the plant. We lose a great new industry that would help give us a tax base so we could fix up our roads, pay decent wages to our school teachers, and give our old people decent pensions. We lose the jobs that should have gone to Idahoans, and, believe me, the farmer will pay for that fertilizer when he gets it. He will pay for hauling that raw rock clear across two States.

Last year I heard that the Government was going to build a billion and a half dollar installation to test airplanes. That's as big as the atomic energy plant we got for you down here in southeastern Idaho. I heard they needed a lot of land for this big job.

So I grabbed my hat and rushed downtown to see if I couldn't get another big project for Idaho. I said, "Now wait a minute before you make this decision. If its land you need, we have got plenty of it out in Idaho—thousands of acres. Just as flat as a floor. Nobody living on it. All you have to do is chase off the jack rabbits and smooth out the sagebrush and you're in business." They said to me, "Well, Senator TAYLOR, we need a lot of cheap power." And I said, "Well, what

are you talking about—we have got 40 percent of the Nation's potential hydroelectric power running down our rivers right there in the Northwest." They said, "We know that, Senator, but we aren't in the business of building power dams. We are just going to build this billion and a half dollar installation for the Air Force. What we need is power on the line." So I took my hat and walked out, because we don't have power on the line. In half the State of Idaho we have so little power we can't even run our electric clocks on time. That billion and a half dollar job would have meant a lot to Idaho. A lot of jobs building it and a lot of jobs for Idahoans after it was built. Where do you think it went? It went to Tennessee. Because down there they have the TVA. They have power on the line. They had to smooth out the hills—it's rough country. They had to move people off—it's thickly populated—but they did have power on the line.

RECLAMATION DEVELOPMENT BOGGED DOWN

Now, we are just as bad off here in Idaho with relation to reclamation as with regard to this question of cheap public power. We have come to the end of our reclamation development. We have hundreds of thousands of acres of the best land on earth. All it needs is water on it to make wonderful farms for our GI's and other young people who would like to go to farming. But we can't do a thing about it under the existing setup, for this reason. The cheap projects are all done. The land that is left is up on the benches. We have to pump the water to get it up there, and it's expensive. Too expensive for the farmers to be able to pay for it.

The Government has tried to help us out in this matter. There is a ruling that on these reclamation dams you have to collect 2½ to 3 percent interest on the money invested in the power features of the dam. You include that interest in the rate you charge for the power. But the Government has kindly said: "You don't have to repay that interest to the Government. Just repay the principal. Keep the interest and apply it against the reclamation costs. That way, maybe you can bring it down to a place where the farmers can pay the balance." That helped a little for a while. But it's not enough now, and new legislation is needed to clarify use of this interest. We were turned down this year on the best reclamation project we have left—Mountain Home. There was quite a bit of power to be developed with that project, too. But the interest off that power investment wasn't enough to make the project feasible. Palisades Dam has also been declared unfeasible under present policies and laws. So we are at the end of our reclamation development.

CVA IS SOLUTION

Here is what the CVA proposes to do about that. And I want you to listen to this. This is important, also. The CVA proposes to broaden this idea of collecting interest on the the money invested in power development to include not only, as it does now, our little reclamation dams, but the big power dams down on the Columbia. And that great power grid we propose to build over the Northwest. By collecting interest on that entire investment we would have a fund to work with amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars a year. That way, our reclamation projects would be feasible. We can then go ahead with our development—fish and wildlife conservation and propagation, range improvements, erosion control, and all the things that need to be done to make this State a land of golden opportunity. This fund would come right out of the Northwest. We would literally be lifting ourselves by our bootstraps. Now we have to run to Washington for every little old appropriation. And it's very wasteful.

PRESENT METHODS WASTEFUL

Take the Lewiston Orchards project, for example. We got an authorization one year. The next year they got an appropriation. Contracts were let. Contractors came from as far away as Tacoma. They rounded up workers and started to work. In a few months the appropriation ran out. The contractor took his machinery and went back to Tacoma. The workers all left. The next year we got another appropriation. The contractor brought his machinery back. The workers reassembled. They worked a few months and the appropriation ran out. Five times they stopped and started. Such procedure makes these projects cost twice what they should. And the people who are going to get that water have to foot the bill. During this whole period of time there has been a reclamation office in Lewiston, costing $6,000 a month to operate, whether any work was being done on the project or not. Of course, the contractors don't mind this stop-and-go technique—in fact, they like it. They get paid for hauling their machinery back and forth, so most of the contractors are against CVA. They like the old boondoggling methods. With a CVA we would have this fund coming right out of the Northwest. And when we started a project we would finish it.

POWER LOBBY PROPAGANDA

Now, they have put out a lot of propaganda against the CVA, and when I say "they" we might as well name them. It's the private Power Trust. They have a monopoly now, and they don't want to lose it. That is understandable. It's their privilege to put out propaganda if they want to. But it's only fair that you should also be told the truth. All the power companies in the United States have gone in together and have set up a big lobby back there in Washington with elaborate offices. Their head man, Purcell Smith, gets $65,000 a year; but he earns it. His sole job in life is to think up the phony arguments against public power and particularly the CVA that are being dished out to the people of Idaho.

I doubt if there is an adult listening to my voice who has a mailing address who hasn't received some of this slick-paper anti-CVA literature, and if you have saved it all, you probably have a bushel basketful sitting around the house somewhere. It is equally doubtful if you have ever received one piece of literature in favor of the CVA, for the simple reason that there is no lobby to pay for it. It costs money to put out that slick-paper literature by the truckload, but they have got money. Not only all the power companies contribute to this lobby, but all the gas companies, the oil companies, and the coal companies. They don't want you people using cheap hydroelectric power. They would rather you would use coal, gas, or oil.

Here are some of the arguments that they use against CVA. Wherever anybody has a water right, they tell them, "If you have a CVA they are going to take your water right away from you." Well, that's effective. It scares the farmers to death. Because a water right is all he has. Take the water and the land is no good. Might as well let it go back to the sagebrush. But who ever heard of the Government stealing a water right from anybody? Who ever heard of the Government stealing anything from people? The Government builds dams to give validity to water rights. It takes money to build dams. And with the CVA and this fund that we would get off the interest collected on the power investment, we could build dams and store water to make water rights better than they have ever been. The language in the CVA bill pertaining to water rights is exactly the same as it is in the present reclamation laws, with one minor exception that I shouldn't have to mention; but if I don't, they will say we are misrepresenting things.

There is a provision in the CVA bill giving high priority to water for atomic energy. We have two plants, one building at Arco, and one down on the Columbia. They don't use a hatful of water, but you know how the lawyers are—whether they want a spoonful or a river full—they put it in the bill. And there it is, but it's not going to endanger anybody's water right.

DICTATORSHIP?

Another argument they put up is that the CVA is going to be a dictatorship. They don't tell you why. It just is. They have had a TVA down in Tennessee for 15 years, very similar to what we propose out here. There is no dictatorship down there. So why should we have a dictatorship? I went down to Tennessee and I talked with city officials, county officials, and State officials. And not one of them complained of any dictatorship. In fact, they all said that their relations with the TVA directors were most cordial and friendly and that there was excellent cooperation all up and down the line.

CENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT

They say this is going to be centralization of Government. That is the exact opposite of the truth. Now everything is run from Washington. The long arm of the Federal Government reaches out here and directs every phase of our development. With the CVA, the headquarters would be right here in the Northwest. The final answer would be here. No more running to Washington every time you wanted a little old reclamation project or a dike or whatever it might be.

THEY TRY TO SCARE PEOPLE

Another argument they like to scare people with is this one. They say, "Look out, look out, you good people. This CVA is going to have power of condemnation. Yes, sir; do you know what? They can take your place of business or your farm or your house away from you if they want to." That's what they tell you. Well, that's just half the truth. The whole truth is that existing Government agencies, practically every one of them, have that same power of condemnation. If the Bureau of Reclamation wants to build a dam and your farm is behind it and about to be flooded out, they will offer you a price for it, and if you don't take it they will condemn it and take it anyhow. You folks know as well as I do that if the highway department wants to straighten out the road and your house is in the way, they can run the road right through your front room and you can't stop them. And they can run the yellow line right under your bed, and you can't do a thing about it. So don't let them scare you with that argument. There is nothing new or terrible about it. And they certainly don't tell you this. The private power companies have that power of condemnation. They can run a power line right across your farm antigoddlin, cut your fields to smithereens, and spoil the value of your place, and you can't do anything about that, either.

Down in Tennessee, where they have the TVA, they have done a complete development job for those people in 15 years. Here in Idaho we have been trying to get an authorization for one dam, Palisades, over there in eastern Idaho, for 20 years.

CVA WOULD PROVIDE COORDINATED EFFORT

At the present time there are some 20-odd Government agencies operating here in the Northwest, all dealing with resource development in one way or another, with little or no coordination among any of them—all going off in different directions like turkeys chasing grasshoppers. Suppose, for example, we should get an authorization for Palisades Dam, and suppose further that the watershed behind that dam was denuded—that there

had been a forest fire. Or maybe it was overgrazed—no trees, no grass to hold the water. And we knew that if we built the dam it would soon be filled with rocks and silt, and we would only get about half our money's worth out of the project. Under present conditions there is not much that can be done about it. The Soil Conservation Service is not going back there in the hills and plant grass where nobody can see them operating. The people who run that agency are human—they want to use their limited funds where farmers will benefit and put in a good word for them with their Senators and Congressmen so they can get another appropriation to work with next year.

The same thing would apply to the Forest Service. If we ask for funds to do the job in the bill authorizing the dam, that would make it even more expensive, and it has already been declared unfeasible—no way to pay for it as it is. So we don't dare to ask for extra money for fixing up the watershed. We just go ahead and build the dam and let her fill up with silt.

The CVA would have power to do something about it. They couldn't coerce these agencies, but they could say to them, "You soil-conservation boys have the facilities and the know-how—go up there behind that dam and plant some grass, will you? And we'll pay you for it." That way, we could get a little cooperation. Frankly, I think that practically all these Government agencies should be combined and come under the direction of the CVA. That was our idea at first, but we kept dropping the agencies, a few at a time, hoping we could find some place where the opponents of CVA would be satisfied. We have finally gotten down to where we presently propose to combine only the Bureau of Reclamation, the Army engineers, and the Bonneville Power Administration. But the organizations and stooges that front for the power lobby are still against the CVA. We could retreat looking for a place to compromise until we disappeared behind the distant hills, and these same interests would be opposed to any development, as long as there was one kilowatt of public power generated.

But certainly any fair-minded person must agree that the functions of the Army engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bonneville Power Administration should be combined. The engineers and the Bureau both build dams and generate power; the Bonneville Power Administration sells the power. There has been no coordination between these agencies in the past. Here come the Army engineers building dams up the Columbia; and here comes the Bureau of Reclamation building dams down the Snake River. They meet at Hell's Canyon, just above Lewiston. There in that narrow canyon is to be erected the highest dam in the world—a sort of devil's darning needle; but it is to be the highest. Both the Bureau and the engineers want to build the dam. There was nobody to say, "You built it," or "You build it." So both agencies rushed in and started surveying like mad, trying to beat the other fellow to the punch. They spent $250,000 of the taxpayers' money, and now the job has got to be done all over again, because they were in such a hurry that they didn't do it right. Is that the way you people want your money spent? I don't think so. The blood of my Scotch ancestors cries out against such waste of the public's funds. I want to see us invest money wisely in development programs, but I don't want it poured down rat holes.

CVA WOULD BE RUN HERE IN THE NORTHWEST

Under the existing set-up, no matter what you want from the Federal Government, you have to go to Washington get the final answer. Now, the opponents of CVA will say, "Tut, tut, Senator, most of these agencies have offices over in Boise." Sure, they do. But try to get an answer out of them; just try. If it is an answer worth having, you won't get it. The buck will be passed to Washington. I see people back there in Washington all the time trying to get the answer that they couldn't get in Boise. Ten days and $500 to $1,000 shot to pieces on the trip. When you get back there, you are lucky if I can get you an appointment with the fellow you want to see. He has the troubles of the entire United States on his shoulders, and when I do get you in to see him, he has probably never been to Idaho, knows little about it, and cares less. He is in a hurry to get rid of you, because there are 4,999 other people from all over the country out there waiting to see him. So you don't get much attention or satisfaction. With the CVA, we propose to have the headquarters right out in the Northwest. The farthest away it could possibly be would be Portland, unless they put it on a barge out in the ocean some place. And when you have a problem to discuss, you could jump on a plane, be down in Portland, transact your business, and be back in Idaho that same night—the next day at the latest. When you got down there, you would find three men whose sole aim in life, according to the language of the bill, would be to develop our resources as quickly and as economically as possible. Three men who would be intimately familiar with this comparatively small region. It stands to reason that you would get more attention and better results. These three men are to be appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate, and that is exactly the way the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Chief of the Army engineers get their jobs. They run things now from Washington. Obviously it would be easier to remove a regional director than it would the Secretary of the Interior. At least one director of TVA has been removed in the past. Not because he tried to pull any shenannigans on the people of Tennessee, but simply because he was always fighting with the other directors.

DELAYING TACTICS OF THE POWER LOBBY

The power lobby has had their stooges put the idea into people's heads that these CVA directors should be elected. They know better than that. That is just a stall. There is no provision in the Constitution for electing any Federal officials except Senators, Congressmen, the President, and Vice President. They know that if you set out to elect these CVA directors it would take a constitutional amendment. That would take a hundred years, and that is what they want—anything to delay.

Any time there is any power to be developed at a project, the power lobby throws every possible stumbling block in the way. Take Palisades, for example. First, they said we had to get agreements among all the water users up and down the Snake River Valley before we could build the dam. Perhaps that was legitimate—anyhow, it took years to do it. Finally, when that agreement was reached, I heaved a sigh of relief and said, "Now we can go ahead with Palisades." But immediately they came up with a new sticker. They said, "Whoa, now, wait a minute. You have got to get an agreement with Wyoming." Well, the truth of the matter was that Wyoming didn't give a hoot. Some of the water rises up there, but they didn't have any way to make use of it. It is significant to note that a Senator from another State raised the objection. There are always plenty of people around handy to do the work of the power lobby. Of course, after the objection was raised, the Wyoming Senators had to agree that a compact was necessary, so we got the compact. The legislature did not meet for quite a while and that delayed things as the power lobbyists had planned. Well we finally got it all straightened out. I had to call personally on the Attorney General and Pat Parry, one of the most prominent Republican water attorneys in the State, appreciated the work I did and gave me full credit for jarring the agreement loose.

Some Republican politicians have said that I have sabotaged Palisades because I want a CVA or nothing. That just isn't true. I have worked hard trying to get things for Idaho a little at a time, even though I knew that CVA could do the whole job quicker, cheaper, and better. Now we finally got the interstate agreement ratified, we were all ready to go ahead, when somebody said, "Wait a minute. There's a tribe of Indians you haven't done anything about." If it hadn't been the Indians, it would have been the Hottentots, or someone else. At any rate, the power lobbyists succeeded in delaying Palisades so long that now the costs have risen due to inflation to the point where it has been declared unfeasible.

OUR OPPORTUNITY WON'T LAST FOREVER

Our opportunity to get a CVA won't last forever. Washington and Oregon are willing to go along now. They have seen the advantages of cheap power. They are anxious to get the rest of their dams built, and they realize that CVA would do the job faster and better. To be sure, they would have to average their power rate up a little in order to establish a uniform rate throughout the Northwest, when our more expensive power was averaged in, but they realize they owe us an obligation. A good deal of the water rises in Idaho, and they are willing to make that concession to get the job done. But if we wait until they get all their dams built and a low power rate firmly established, then, when we wake up, 5 or 10 years from now, and say, "Hey, wait a minute, we would like to have a CVA." They will very logically say, "No, thanks. We have got our power; if we let you in now, we might have to raise our rate a little, so we are satisfied. You go ahead and develop your power." We would develop our power when their cheaper power was all sold. And then we and our children and our children's children would labor under the disadvantage of high-cost power with low-cost power just across the State lines. Idaho would remain the economic stepchild forever.

HOW ANTI-TVA RESOLUTIONS ARE ENGINEERED

It is a sad thing to contemplate. Idaho stands to benefit more from the CVA than either Oregon or Washington, and yet Idaho is the only thing that is holding up CVA. The President is for it. The administration is behind the bill. Sentiment in Washington and Oregon is preponderantly for it. The Granges in both Oregon and Washington have endorsed the CVA, but here in Idaho most of the Granges and most of the chambers of commerce and many other organizations have passed resolutions against the CVA. I have had farmers and businessmen tell me how those resolutions were obtained. They say: "We have a meeting of the Grange out here, and there is a slick lawyer, paid directly or indirectly, by the power lobby. He makes a big speech against the CVA and scares everybody silly, and then there is a stooge with a resolution ready to introduce and another one to second the motion. Maybe a good many of us don't like it, but we know that if we open our mouths that slick lawyer will make a monkey out of us, so nobody says anything, and the resolution goes through. And the next day the newspapers tell a big story about how the Grange unanimously condemned the CVA."

Here is the usual procedure for obtaining resolutions from chambers of commerce and other groups: In every community of any size

there is a power company office. The fellow in that office gets paid half his salary for being a good Joe, a back slapper, a joiner. He joins everything in sight—the Kiwanis, the Rotary, the Lions, and the chamber of commerce. And he says to the boys: "Now, look. They passed a resolution over here at Podunk and one at Hooperville against the CVA. If you fellows don't give me a resolution pretty soon, I am going to lose my job." And the boys say: "Gee, Joe is a good fellow. We don't want to see him lose his job. Give him a resolution there, Bill. Guess it won't hurt anything anyhow." Now, if it was innocent, I wouldn't care. I would like to see Joe keep his job. But it isn't innocent. Every time we bring up CVA back there in Congress they fish out these phony resolutions, wave them under the noses of the Senators, and they say, "Look, Idaho doesn't want any CVA." And the Senators say, "Well, this is impressive. Where are your resolutions, Senator TAYLOR?" And I haven't got any. Maybe a half a dozen, from various parts of the State. So the Senators say, "Well, it's a little hard to understand after what the TVA has done for Tennessee, but if those people don't want it, we surely won't force it on them." It's up to the common people of Idaho to get busy and do something about this situation. I am willing to do the best I can, but I can't overcome the effect of these engineered resolutions.

Here's another example of how they operate. One Grange had a meeting and printed letters against the CVA were passed out addressed to me. Even the address on the envelopes was done on a printing press. Then, with the instigators breathing down their necks, the poor grangers signed the letters and mailed them to me. As soon as I started getting these phony printed letters I started getting letters—hand-written letters—from the grangers saying that they didn't want to sign, but that they were on the spot and practically had to do it.

MY VISIT TO TVA

When you people first elected me, when I first got back to Washington, I went down to Tennessee at my own expense to take a look at TVA and see what it had done for those people. I figured that was the best way to decide whether it was wise for Idaho to follow their example. I spent an entire day walking up and down the streets of Knoxville. I shook hands with everybody I met, farmers, bricklayers, carpenters, housewives. I went into every place of business, including the banks. To each person I met, I said, "I am Senator TAYLOR, from Idaho. We are thinking some of the CVA out there. What do you people think of your TVA?" I didn't find one person who had a mean word to say about the TVA in that whole day. I didn't find one person who said, "Oh, it's okay," and let it go at that. Practically everyone I talked to started waving his arms in good old southern style and preaching me a sermon about what TVA had done for them. And no wonder. They started from scratch down there—literally. They had been scratching that soil for generations and raising one crop, no rotation, no diversification, no fertilization, until they were about as poor as people could get. They didn't have the wonderful resources that we have in this great State of ours. Each year the rivers flooded them out, to add to their troubles. There was practically no industrial development. Their livestock generally consisted of razorback hogs and dried-up old cows.

Then the TVA came along. They went through everything we are going through here in Idaho. All the big shots opposed the TVA as socialism. Chambers of commerce all passed resolutions against it. But now you can just point your finger at the map of Tennessee and write a letter to that chamber of commerce, and 99 times out of a hundred and maybe every time, you will get an answer back saying—"It's a great thing and you had better try some of it." Most folks down there were awfully poor before the TVA came. They lived in tar paper shacks and lived on fatback and corn pone. They didn't send their children to school, because they didn't have shoes. They didn't go to church, because they didn't have clothes to wear. Modern conveniences were unheard of. When they started building the TVA dams, these so-called poor white trash got jobs as construction workers. They started nailing a little siding on over the tar paper and added a little prune juice to their fatback and corn pone to supplement their diet. Then when the dams were finished and they started generating power, industries started moving in and these people got steady employment. They built new homes, dressed up their children and sent them to school and went to church. Now everything is electrified—they heat with electricity in many places. All have modern electrical appliances. It turned out that these poor white trash weren't poor white trash at all. They were just poor folks that never had a chance to earn a decent living.

The TVA, in cooperation with State agencies, taught the farmers modern farming techniques, helped them get blooded livestock, and now, believe it or not, Tennessee produces more livestock than the State of Idaho.

The dams stopped the floods on the rivers. They never used to have any fish down there to speak of. Everything was so silted up that the fish couldn't live in the water. Now the water runs clear and blue between the dams, and it's cold, coming out of those deep lakes. They have stocked the rivers with trout. In the reservoirs themselves the water is a little too warm for trout to thrive, but they have every other kind of fish imaginable—bass, bream, crappie, perch, pike, sunfish. They have so many fish they never close the season. You can fish any day of the year in Tennessee.

They never used to have a tourist down there. Nobody wanted to see those poor folks starving to death, unless it was some author who wanted to write a book about them. Now they have more tourists than any part of the United States, not excluding the Northwest, with Yellowstone Park thrown in. As a result, there are all sorts of business opportunities in this line—tourist camps, hotels, gas stations, boat landings, sporting goods stores.

There is a provision in the CVA bill permitting the setting up of experimental plants and factories. This has been condemned with loud complaints that the Government is going to go into business in competition with private enterprise. There is not a word of truth in that. The same provision was in the TVA bill and here is what happened. The lumber industry in Tennessee was a thing of the past. It had flourished once, but the trees were gone. New forests were growing up, but it would be a hundred years before they were ready to lumber by conventional methods. So the TVA set up some experimental sawmills. They made little boards out of the little trees. They tongued and grooved them, perfected a process for gluing them together under pressure, and now they can make you a board just as wide as you want it and just as long as from here to yonder. And it's a better board, too, because it won't warp or split. But the TVA didn't go into business in competition with anybody. They simply said to any who were interested, "Here's the process. Does anybody want to go into the lumber business?" And they did. Private capital took over. The TVA was helpful. They said, "Now, here's a good stand of timber, and there's some unemployment in this nearby community. We can bring in the cheap power from this dam. Perhaps you had better build the sawmill right there." And they did. And now they have a lumber industry down there again going great guns.

The TVA experts found clay. People had been walking on it for generations and figured it was good for nothing. The TVA technicians discovered it was pottery clay. They perfected the process, developed electrical ovens to bake the pottery. They said, "Come and get it," and they came and got it. And whereas we used to import practically all of our pottery, a large percentage of it comes from the TVA area now.

I don't propose to be able to tell you what new industries the CVA would develop for us here in the Northwest, but there would doubtless be many of them, in addition to the obvious variety of natural resources we have. The people of Tennessee started from way down low, and now they are way up with the rest of the Nation. We are starting from a position up equal with most parts of the Nation, and with all our wonderful resources we can really go places.

By voting for CVA you can demonstrate that you are a patriotic citizen devoted to the preservation of our way of life. Recently, Stuart Symington, Chairman of our National Security Resources Board, whose job it is to see that we are prepared for any emergency, made the statement that if this Nation should become involved in another war, our greatest weakness would be lack of electrical power. He said that there would be blackouts and brownouts the like of which we never dreamed of, that practically all available electricity would be necessary for national defense production, and that the citizens of our country would literally be left in the dark and forced to cook on campfires. He warned that we should proceed immediately to develop our resources in the quick and efficient manner demonstrated by the TVA. This has ceased to be a question to be batted about by lobbyists and stooges of the power monopoly—it has become a question of national security. If we hesitate to go ahead with our resource development at this critical moment, our sons may be called upon to pay for our vacillation with their life's blood.

Full-Scale Mobilization of Nation's Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement having to do with an address I delivered at the annual reunion of the Society of the Twenty-eighth Division.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

American freedom can be destroyed by total war even though we crush Communist aggression everywhere in the world, United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN warned here today.

Addressing the annual reunion of the Society of the Twenty-eighth Division, Senator MARTIN called for full-scale mobilization of all the Nation's resources in manpower, labor, and industry to be ready for the supreme emergency should the conflict in Korea lead us into war on a global scale.

He declared that the cost of such a war would be so stupendous that even a Nation

as rich as the United States could not assume such a staggering burden of debt and retain individual freedom.

"You veterans know what total war means," Senator MARTIN said. "Your patriotism has been tested and proven in the agony of battle. That is the kind of patriotism we need on the home front.

"Your service as soldiers has made you better citizens. Many of you are leaders in your communities and in a great variety of business, professional, and industrial activities.

"I know that you are deeply concerned over the Korean situation. You may call it police action in support of the United Nations or by any other name, but you and I know we are at war, with all the grim tragedy that goes with it.

"Right now it might be classified as a one-alarm fire but let me warn that in a short time it might develop into a four-alarm fire that would consume a large part of the world.

"Our hope for peace in the world depends upon the ability of the United States to defeat and disarm the enemies of freedom. This we must do at any cost.

"Let me remind you, however, that in a long-drawn-out war on a world-wide scale we can win the war and still lose our individual freedom.

"The combat cost of World War II, which lasted 4 years, was $356,000,000,000. About 45 percent of that cost was paid for by taxation. The balance, approximately $215,000,000,000, was added to the national debt in the 4-year period.

"The price of weapons, equipment and everything that enters into waging war is almost double today. I have gone into the costs pretty carefully and I have figured out that a 4-year war would call for the expenditure of a minimum of $600,000,000,000.

"If taxes were levied to pay 45 percent of this war, as in the last war, we would come out with a new debt of about $330,000,000,000 in addition to the present national debt of more than $257,000,000,000.

"That would mean a total debt of nearly $600,000,000,000.

"Such a debt would put the whole economy of the United States in a straitjacket from which we could never free ourselves. We would live forever in a planned economy, with regimentation, regulations, and directives controlling every activity of our daily lives.

"This is a gloomy picture but we must have the courage to face the facts.

"In my opinion, if we are to have a chance to escape this fate we must do five things:

"1. We must have immediate and complete mobilization of all our forces—military, industrial, agricultural, financial, and spiritual. We now have conscription of military manpower. Has the time come when we should give serious consideration to conscription of industrial manpower and industry itself?

"2. We will have to submit to priorities, allocations, rationing, and price and wage controls. But safeguards should be written into the law to guarantee their removal within a reasonable time after the cease-firing order is given.

"3. We must cut to the bone all governmental spending not connected with national defense. That means every nonessential project or service must be eliminated as well as many desirable functions that we now enjoy.

"4. We must submit willingly and patriotically to sharply increased taxation in order to pay as much as possible of the costs of war out of current revenues.

"5. We must employ every force at our command to shorten the duration of the war. A single day, a single hour, can save precious lives and millions of dollars.

"The future of the world depends upon the strength of the United States. Complete mobilization may yet persuade Russia to back down. Weakness is an invitation to further aggression."

Millions for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the editors of Commonweal, one of our most ably edited journals, have been kind enough to send me a copy of their recent editorial entitled "Millions for Education." This editorial points out the deadly parallel between the recently announced $3,000,000 propaganda campaign of the American Medical Association and similar campaigns by the National Association of Manufacturers and the so-called Committee for Constitutional Government.

I believe the editorial will prove of interest to the Congress. While it emphasizes the growth of voluntary medical and hospital insurance for the class of citizens who can afford such a program, it also points out that American families are still on the lookout for available means of meeting ordinary, and occasionally extraordinary, medical expenses.

I believe also that this editorial will prove of interest to many of our progressive-minded doctors who are paying a compulsory levy of $25 a year in order that the American Medical Association's public relations experts can carry on a campaign of so-called education. I would call their attention to the fact that, insofar as education is concerned, the leaders of the AMA are blocking passage in the House of the Federal aid to medical education bill. This bill was sponsored by all 13 members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and was approved by that committee without a single dissenting vote. It passed the Senate unanimously. This measure was badly needed even before the Korean crisis broke, the deans of our medical, dental, and nursing schools assured us. It is even more urgently needed now.

I sincerely hope that the officers of the AMA will take the time to study carefully the social and economic needs of our time before they undertake to spend the millions they are collecting to confuse the people on this important issue. If they did, I am sure we would find the AMA playing a positive role in health education, as it should—a role which I am convinced most of its members wish to play; a role in which the AMA would help to draft and help to pass forward-looking legislation for the welfare of our people, instead of blindly blocking all our efforts to meet the problem of the high costs of modern medical care.

I ask unanimous consent that this able editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Commonweal of July 7, 1950]

MILLIONS FOR EDUCATION

The American Medical Association has announced from its meeting in San Francisco a $3,000,000 advertising and public relations campaign to educate the American public on the evils of socialized medicine. It is to be financed by a membership assessment of $25 a head.

In an effort to spreadeagle the country next October the AMA will use big ads in 11,000 newspapers, full pages in 30 national magazines, and spot announcements over 300 radio stations. "The principles which the AMA copy will seek to strengthen and bulwark is the basic American ideal of individual freedom, individual initiative, and freedom of opportunity—under a free economy, as opposed to the alien philosophy of a Government-regimented economy."

This is a familiar refrain. It recalls the Liberty League, the reaction of the National Association of Manufacturers to the New Deal, the present fulminations of the Committee for Constitutional Government. The well-worn phraseology itself raises doubts.

However, the AMA has changed its tune considerably in one strategic sector; it has shifted from an adamant opposition to cooperative health plans to their warm advocacy—to stave off enactment of the administration's national medical insurance plan. The commodity which the AMA copy will advertise (next October) is an already widely accepted and thoroughly recognized American product—voluntary health insurance.

The prospect of such a splash to spread the idea of cooperative medicine is not without its welcome aspects. It should spur on the movement a little. But the American public does not need to be sold on this idea. Hospital plans of the Blue Cross type continue to expand at such an accelerated pitch that they will soon reach a majority of the population. Hospital-surgical plans are next in numbers and growth. Finally, cooperative plans for meeting ordinary doctors' bills—the drain or impossibility for many low-income families—are gradually shaping up.

The thing about the AMA announcement that is so disquieting is that the $3,000,000 are to be spent for strictly educational purposes. The money is to be allocated for selling the general idea rather than for setting up new cooperative facilities. The public will hardly be satisfied simply to know that there is another, and better, way than socialized medicine. American families are still on the look-out for available means of meeting ordinary, and occasionally extraordinary, medical expenses.

Broadcast by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, to People of Pennsylvania, No. 31 in Biweekly Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast

by me over Pennsylvania radio stations on the week end of July 21–23, which is No. 31 in a biweekly series of broadcasts I have been making to the people of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Koreans, who are today caught in the tight, evil grip of an aggressive power bent on world conquest, have had their troubles before.

While I do intend to devote the largest part of this broadcast to the present dangerous and unhappy situation in Korea, I would like to develop, in rough outline at least, something about Korea and its history.

The maps in recent weeks that have appeared daily in the papers deal for the most part with small sections of the Korean peninsula where the major battles are taking place. I suggest to you that you look carefully, the next time you have an opportunity to do so, at a larger map of Asia. On that larger map you will note the Korean peninsula projecting to the south from the mainland of Asia, with Manchuria lying directly to the north of the peninsula. To the west of Korea is the Yellow Sea, and beyond that to the west is China itself. The home islands of Japan, separated at the closest point by about a hundred miles of ocean, lie to the south and east of Korea.

For 35 years, until the Japs were defeated in World War II, Korea was managed completely by the Japanese.

During that 35-year occupation, the Japs gave Korea the new name of "Chosen," and subjugated the country and its people, forcing them to grow food for the Japanese homeland, and robbing Korean mines of raw materials which poured into the war machine the Japs were fashioning.

The Korean people, of course, came out second best during the Jap occupation. The ancient Korean language was outlawed, and the Japanese language was instituted in its place. In short, the Koreans were forced at sword's-point to obey their Jap masters. They had no chance to develop self-government, little opportunity for education, and no opportunity to raise their living standards.

At the Cairo Conference, President Roosevelt pledged American support for a free, independent and democratic Korea after the Japs had been defeated. Russia, as a wartime ally, made similar promises to Korea and the world.

The story of what Russia did in fact after the Jap defeat is well known to all of us. The Soviet military authorities in control of northern Korea threw an iron curtain across the country along the line of the thirty-eighth parallel. Soviet military officials refused to recognize leaders of democratic elements representing the Korean people, and would only do business with those who agreed to Communist control.

When the United Nations sent a special commission to Korea with instructions to supervise free elections that could unite the country under one government the UN commission was not allowed to enter the Soviet zone.

This United Nations commission, unable to observe conditions in North Korea behind the Soviet iron curtain, took the only steps which were left open to it. The UN body supervised free elections in the American zone of Korea on May 10, 1948, and assisted the elected representatives of the Korean people in setting up a constitution for the Republic of Korea. The constitution provided for additional seats in the Korean Legislature which could be filled when future conditions made it possible to hold free elections among the people of North Korea.

This republic established in South Korea under auspices of the United Nations General Assembly has been recognized by a majority of the United Nations. The Russian veto on the Security Council, however, has prevented the Republic of Korea from admission to the UN. The Russians and their satellites have held out for the puppet "Democratic People's Republic of North Korea," which was set up by the Soviets alone, a puppet regime created behind their iron curtain by some sort of elections which the UN commission was not permitted to observe.

When it became clear that the efforts of the United Nations to create a unified Korea were being frustrated by the Communists the decision was made to train Korean forces and equip them for defense of the country. Neither the United Nations nor the United States intended to build a Korean military force designed for aggressive action. Instead, as I have already indicated, the Korean troops were trained to preserve the internal security of the country. To this end American ground force equipment valued at more than $100,000,000 was turned over to the Koreans in 1949. This equipment included 100,000 small arms such as rifles and machine guns, and some 50,000,000 rounds of ammunition. In addition, there were more than 2,000 bazookas, quantities of 37- and 57-millimeter guns, mortars, and large howitzers. For naval patrol purposes 79 American vessels were also turned over in 1949 to the South Koreans.

I think it is most important to emphasize that the purpose of this equipment was to prevent border raids and Communist-inspired uprisings within South Korea.

Late last year after the Senate had ratified the Atlantic Pact, Congress approved the military aid program over bitter isolationist objection and funds were made available for the program late in October. Much of the equipment needed to assist the free nations in building their defenses was not available as surplus, and thus it was necessary to enlarge our arms production to fill the demands needed for the new program.

The military officials of South Korea sat down late in March of this year with American military authorities and drew up a list of equipment which it was felt would be needed to strengthen the Korean defenses further. The material on this list had been decided upon after a thorough survey of the conditions as they existed at that time. American military commitments, which as a result of Soviet pressure are spread over much of the globe, have called into use most of the available military equipment of the kind requested by Korea, and as a result fulfillment on the Korean request was just getting under way when the attack came from the North.

The Red authorities in North Korea, seeing that new defense strength would soon reach the free Koreans, decided, apparently, that if they were to gamble with world peace, they must act now or never.

By their planned and unprovoked aggression, the Reds undoubtedly expected that all of southern Korea could be overrun in a matter of hours. By surprise attack upon a nation which had not armed itself for aggressive warfare, the North Koreans gained the tremendous initial advantage any bully gains when he picks the time, place, and manner of beginning a fight.

Without question, the Red apple cart was badly upset when 52 of the United Nations joined in opposition to their aggression. Instead of the overnight victory in South Korea, the Reds have paid dearly for every foot of ground they have taken. The defense effort by the South Koreans bearing American arms was quickly joined by the military forces which the United States and other United Nations had available in that distant area of the Pacific.

These forces of the United Nations have put up a valiant delaying fight against the overpowering odds in favor of the Reds who made their attack with forces and equipment brought together after long planning behind their iron curtain.

Reinforcements and more equipment are now pouring through the 5,000-mile pipeline which separates us now from the Korean front. More of this is reaching Korea daily, and though more time will necessarily be required to get enough men and equipment in to match the Red strength, these reinforcements are on the way as fast as they can be sent, and we can be confident that enough power is already in motion to turn the tide in Korea.

The President, in his message to Congress last Wednesday, and in his address to the Nation that evening, made clear the full significance to us of the deliberate Red aggression in Korea.

He pointed out that the free nations of the UN have learned the lessons of history—that the unopposed aggression during the 1930's led inevitably to war—and that this latest act in Korea was in direct violation of the United Nations and everything it stands for in terms of future world peace.

The President also made it clear that the military preparations of the free world must be advanced with the full realization that the flames of war may not be confined to Korea alone. Now that the Reds have once tasted aggression, only the Kremlin knows whether aggressive tactics will be attempted elsewhere. Fifty-two free nations in the world are standing together to stamp out the fires the Communists have set in Korea. They intend to make aggression taste so bad to the Reds that they will never resort to it again.

We know that the free world can be preserved only by direct reply to any attack upon free nations. In doing so, we must recognize fully that the Kremlin may suddenly go insane in the face of opposition, and decide to plunge the world into total war—a war which could only spell out their ultimate doom.

In order to give us the maximum opportunity of stamping out the Korean aggression, we must at the same time take the steps necessary to meet other moves the Reds might decide upon. We cannot afford to be caught short-handed.

As an American, I am intensely proud at the immediate and united support of our people for the grave responsibility we have undertaken. We have kept our heads, as it is imperative for us to do if we are to succeed. The responsibilities before us impose greater burdens upon our Nation and upon our people.

The President's moves this week to allocate a greater fraction of our vast productive wealth to the task before us is obviously necessary if we are to stand ready to meet any sudden threat which may pose itself. Furthermore, readiness of this sort on our part serves as the strongest notice possible that we will not submit to aggressive tactics designed to pick off free nations one at a time.

We here at home, just as much as the brave men who are fighting for freedom in Korea today, must pitch in to do our share of the job. And we, just as they, must continue to keep our heads cool and our hands steady.

No man among us can foretell the events which may lie ahead of us. What we do know with certainty from the lessons of history is that a failure now to meet aggression would be suicidal. We have, throughout the growth of our postwar bipartisan foreign policy, stood firm on this position, and have, by quick action, halted Communist moves to crush democracy in Turkey and Greece. The Berlin airlift stopped cold the Communist effort to dominate all of Germany. The Marshall plan, as economic rather than military warfare, saved Europe from financial and political collapse which seemed imminent by the spring of 1948. None of these

moves—though in each of them war was a possibility—led to all-out war in fact.

Total war is, of course, a possibility in the present crucial situation. It does not have to result. The free world is, without question, united by the deep belief that there is no other possible way to avoid war than to move out and stop aggression now. And that is precisely what we are doing at this moment, and it is what we fully intend to see through. We pray, all of us, that total war will not result, and we are devoting our fullest efforts to the end of saving the peace.

Appeal for Civil Defense for American Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me under the heading "Appeal for civil defense for American cities."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPEAL FOR CIVIL DEFENSE FOR AMERICAN CITIES

Mr. President, I have just received a telegram from the Appleton Convention of the Wisconsin State Fire Chiefs Association, pointing out that Mr. Symington, Director of the National Security Resources Board, has called upon individual community organizations for civil-defense planning, "but to date no information has been forthcoming from either the national level or the State level as to any adopted plans for such civil-defense organizations."

The association therefore, resolved, requesting me as United States Senator from Wisconsin, "to lend every effort to obtain for the communities of Wisconsin such information necessary to any community to establish a solid civil-defense organization in each community as directed by Mr. Symington."

Mr. President, I agree absolutely with the resolution of the Fire Chiefs Association, and it is my intent to do everything that is within my power to help obtain comprehensive civil-defense plans by which our Nation's municipalities may get ready for any possible emergency. Tin hats and sand buckets a la 1942 and 1943 definitely will not do in the atomic age.

It is quite obvious that Mr. Symington inherited a terrible mess in a lackadaisical Resources Board. For a long time, unfortunately, the Chief Executive of our country chose to leave the post of Director of the NSRB vacant until the President could possibly secure the appointment of Mr. Walgren, whom the Senate decided was definitely not qualified for this crucial post.

I believe that the failure to fill that vacancy for so long and the failure of the Resources Board to live up to our people's expectations thus far is a shocking disgrace to the national administration and could be a suicidal disgrace if things should go from bad to worse as far as Korea and war are concerned.

Mr. President, time after time, I have taken the floor of the United States Senate in years past to appeal to the White House, the United States Bureau of the Budget, the NSRB, the Office of Civilian Defense, and similar agencies to quit talking in the clouds and start laying actual detailed plans by which our cities could get ready. I have written articles for the February 1948 and 1949 issues of the magazine, The Reserve Officer, and for the current issue of the magazine, Air Affairs, along this line of civil defense.

I am proud to say that the largest city of my State, Milwaukee—which has always been a municipal model—is further advanced in its civil-defense planning than any other large city in the country. Yet, even Milwaukee's energetic plans would be pitifully small indeed if an emergency should come with Soviet-guided missiles or bombers coming over the polar cap.

The mayor of Milwaukee, the Honorable Frank Zeidler, is well justified in the criticism which he has recently directed against Federal delay in aiding the State and local planning of civil defense and disaster relief.

So far, Milwaukee has held preliminary discussions with key persons, agencies, and agency officials, to make each aware of their respective responsibilities. The officials of Milwaukee are the first to admit, however, that these discussions are necessarily incomplete without detailed Federal aid and direction.

We are confident that we can prevent a third world war and that it will not be necessary to activate the civil-defense organizations for full-scale "invasion day" operations. But we are also aware that it would be a major deterrent to the Soviet Union if it knew that America's largest cities—New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Detroit, San Francisco, Houston, etc., were adequately prepared, rather than waiting like helpless giants for solar plexus atomic blows.

I appeal therefore, to Mr. Symington to redouble his efforts to awaken the "sleeping beauties" in other Federal agencies to the need for action—now. The welfare of 150,000,000 Americans is at stake.

Arming of France and Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able editorial entitled "France and Spain," which appeared in the Memphis Press-Scimitar on July 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Memphis Press-Scimitar of July 20, 1950]

FRANCE AND SPAIN

If Congress votes additional money for European armament, it should be spent where it will do most good.

We have been a soft touch long enough. We should begin to demand results.

France, for example, was expected to provide most of the ground troops under the North Atlantic defense program, but is not fulfilling that obligation. Easily capable of organizing 15 or 20 divisions, France has just 4 in being, and 3 of them are committed to occupational duties in Germany and Austria.

No more money should be allocated to France until a better performance record is shown. The same yardstick should be applied to all other recipients of American assistance. We cannot defend both Europe and Asia with American troops alone. It's time to get tough.

Meanwhile, what about Spain? With 23 active divisions and 16 more in reserve, Spain needs only modern equipment to bring them up to present-day standards. There is a place where our money could make a genuine contribution to European security.

Spain, of course, hasn't been invited to join the North Atlantic Pact. But politics should yield to military necessity in the present crisis. This decision should not be delayed. Troops must be trained in the use of new equipment, and if the equipment is withheld until Russia is on the march Spain cannot help us much.

Air bases will be needed in Spain if the rest of western Europe is overrun by the Communists. They should be under construction now. That is something else that can't safely wait.

The State Department has temporized too long with this situation. The Joint Chiefs of Staff should be given a green light to go ahead and get ready. They will have to direct the fighting, if America is forced to fight again.

New Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "New Taxes, Yes: But Push Economies," from this morning's Philadelphia Inquirer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW TAXES, YES; BUT PUSH ECONOMIES

It is no longer merely desirable that Federal finances be put on a pay-as-you-go basis to the limit possible. It is now imperative.

This basic principle, set forth in President Truman's request for an immediate tax increase of $5,000,000,000 and again in his economic report, has met with almost universal approval of Republicans and Democrats alike in Congress.

The necessity, we believe, is just as apparent to all segments of the public. Americans are standing firmly behind their Nation's determination to halt Communist aggression. They are prepared to pay the cost.

To have a share in the financing of the rearmament program should be regarded as a privilege of citizenship, just as is the privilege of voting. For this reason we believe that the added tax burden which we are about to assume should be distributed over the widest practical base with Americans of every economic level contributing to the common cause.

If $5,000,000,000 in new tax money is the amount needed—and it can scarcely be called excessive in view of the President's request for $10,500,000,000 additional for the military establishment in the current fiscal year—it will have to be provided. And every man and women whose standard of living will permit should shoulder a portion, however small, of the burden.

It is to be regretted that Mr. Truman, in outlining his proposals to chairman WALTER F. GEORGE, of the Senate Finance Committee, did not refer to the advantages of tapping a greater number of incomes. It is true that he was calling for an interim measure to be enacted with the unusual speed which the emergency requires. But this reform, we believe, should be instituted at once.

Quite apart from considerations of patriotism, it should be recognized that there are other practical reasons for broadening the base of the tax load. The measure the President proposes has two primary purposes: To enable the Treasury to meet more fully from current revenue the tremendous cost of rearmament and to relieve the domestic economy of some of the inflationary pressures which make their appearance in every period when there is a sudden shift from production for civilian use to production for military use.

Mr. Truman appears to be more concerned with the first of these purposes than with the second. It is obvious that the anti-inflationary intention of the bill will best be served if the base of the tax is extended downward. At present nearly 95 percent of our income-tax payers are in the brackets under $5,000. Their net income is 79.3 percent of the total but their tax liability is only slightly more than that of the remaining 5.1 percent of the taxpayers.

Mr. Truman might well have accompanied his request for higher taxes with a solemn assurance that the expenditures of the Government would be reviewed, that less essential projects would be halted and that every effort would be made to effect savings that would make the tax burden no heavier than absolutely necessary.

It should be realized at the outset that higher taxes—corporate as well as individual—will not alone be sufficient to guarantee the stability of our domestic economy in the face of the tremendous strains placed upon it by the needs, civilian and military, of western Europe, the requirements of our troops in Korea and the over-all program of rearming for any future crisis that may arise.

Our citizens will be called upon to make other sacrifices, as Mr. Truman noted yesterday in his Economic Report. Controls on the civilian ecoomy far more rigid than the credit restrictions already invoked may well be in the offing.

Americans, aware that stability on the home front is just as important to the survival of a free world as success on the battlefield, will accept any restrictions that may be necessary. They ask only that the Government itself streamline operations in the interest of efficiency and economy to the end that every civilian sacrifice will contribute directly to the victory which ultimately must be won.

Retarded Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Retarded Mail Service," which appeared in the Mandan Pioneer of July 7, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETARDED MAIL SERVICE

Some advocates of Government economy are pleased with the curtailed postal service. Others, more analytical, remember that the Hoover report, in recommending cuts in expenditures, proposed that this be done by reorganization in the interest of efficiency, rather than by blanket cuts in service.

The cut in appropriations was summarily followed by cuts in service, and many protests have been heard. Few would object to higher rates for mail now carried at a loss as price rises are so widespread in every line as to be accepted with a minimum of protest.

Rural residents have always accepted one delivery a day without a murmur, but town and city dwellers are accustomed to seeing the blue-uniformed carrier approaching their door twice a day in some localities, three times in others, with watch-setting regularity, and it is a habit hard to break. If the letter from husband or child away from home did not come in the morning, it could be expected in the afternoon, a wait of 24 hours seems endless. That bit of endurance can be learned, but retarding business mail is another matter.

Any slowing of mail holds up the general flow of business. A sharp accounting might show a general loss rather than gain through fewer deliveries.

The Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "After the Present Phase," by Walter Lippmann, which appeared in his column Today and Tomorrow in the Washington Post of this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—AFTER THE PRESENT PHASE

(By Walter Lippmann)

Since the North Koreans broke through the Kum River line it has been most probable that the best we could hope for in the months to come was to hold a small bridgehead around the port of Pusan. At the Kum River line it was shown that the South Korean Army could not hold even if assisted by American air and naval forces and by what the President in his fateful announcement of June 30 called "certain supporting ground units" that General MacArthur was authorized to use.

The Kum River battle showed that the American Army would have to do much more than the words "supporting ground units" implied. The American Army would have to fight the Korean war, using the remnants of the South Korean Army as supporting ground units. After that, excluding miracles, it was a mathematical certainty that the area which could be held would be small. For General MacArthur has only three divisions, none at anything like full strength. It is usually assumed, I believe, that one division can screen—which is different from holding in force—no more than a front of 30 miles. If General MacArthur can stabilize a semicircle 100 miles long with Pusan at the center, he will have achieved a remarkable result with the small forces he commands.

We have no right to count upon anything better than that and we must be prepared for the possibility that Pusan may not be held. In either event, whether we consolidate a bridgehead in Korea or are pushed back to Japan, many months must pass before the Army can take the offensive. Very much larger and stronger forces than are now available in the Far East will have to be assembled in the United States and put ashore in Korea.

The period of time between the end of this defensive campaign and the beginning of the counteroffensive will present grave questions which we must now begin to define, even though none is able as yet to see what are the best solutions.

We must begin by recognizing that it is optimistic to assume that we shall be allowed the undisturbed time necessary to prepare the offensive back to the thirty-eighth parallel. The forces at the disposal of the Communist world on the Eurasian Continent are enormous and the opportunities open to them are varied. It is most unlikely that they will do nothing while we mount the amphibious operation in Japan for the recovery of South Korea.

It seems probable, however, that the Russians will use all their ingenuity to exclude a diplomatic solution of the Korean affair and to keep us nailed to the task of concentrating wholly on a military solution. For while they possess the means of frustrating a military solution and of containing the eventual counteroffensive, the months of preparation which we must have open to them great political advantages which they are most likely to exploit.

On the one hand, there will be the terrible but inescapable fact that in order to reoccupy South Korea to the thirty-eighth parallel we shall have to destroy by air bombardment all the principal cities and the main public utilities and industries of North and South Korea. There is, on the other hand, the hard fact that when we land and counterattack, the North Korean Communists will have had many months' time in which to reunite the artificially divided country, to carry out the land reforms, and to liquidate the reactionaries who have dominated the government of Syngman Rhee. At the worst we shall find the mass of the people regarding us as foreign invaders. At the best, as against those who welcome us as liberators, we must count on carefully trained and fanatically indoctrinated guerrilla bands which have been organized in the Korean mountains during the lull between the two campaigns.

In this connection I should like to quote Peter Fleming, who each week has been writing a military critique for the Spectator (London). "The harder one tries to look ahead into the conflict, the more important (to my mind) do the Koreans themselves become. In theory, the South Koreans, groaning under the knout of their conquerors, will be pining for a glimpse of the blue and white United Nations pennants on the liberating tanks. But will this be so in practice? I doubt it. Elections, even if they are rigged; land reforms, even if they cause some hardship; above all, the consciousness that their country is united and free of overt foreign domination (except for a few square miles) for the first time for two generations—these are factors which are bound to harden the hearts of the South Koreans against their would-be rescuers. Add to them the bitterness which bombing always breeds, the bad smell which a defeated army cannot help

leaving behind, and a natural resentment—deeper than any they may have acquired for the methods of their new rulers—against the foreigners who propose to use their country for a battlefield in order to reimpose on it an artificial division into two parts; and then see how you like the wicket on which the United Nations forces will have—on the present form—to open their second innings—it looks to me equally sticky from both the political and the military points of view."

Mr. Fleming may be wrong. But he knows a lot more than most about war, especially about war inside Asia. The more one studies the history of Korea since 1945, the more probable it seems, at least to me, that he is right. I might add for what it is worth that the oftener I reread the Nehru-Stalin-Acheson documents, the more I begin to wonder, whether Stalin is not very pleased that Acheson insisted on a military decision and the unconditional retreat of the North Koreans.

Usually, when the aggressor is winning military victories, it is quite a problem for him to push aside the mediators who might break his momentum and stop him short of his victories. It might have been quite awkward for Stalin if he had been asked to bring about a cease-fire to be followed by negotiations in the United Nations. But as Mr. Acheson played the game, Stalin could let the negotiations fail without having to take all the responsibility for making them fail. It would have been much better, I think, to answer Stalin's terms, which he must have known we could not accept, by inviting negotiations that would have been hard for him to refuse.

In the period after the present defense campaign and while the counteroffensive is being mounted, the Korean war as such will be primarily a political war. Let us be sure that we do not deprive ourselves of all the instruments of political warfare which are to be found in the practice of the ancient but neglected art of diplomacy.

Antidote for Communist Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, convinced as I am that the surest antidote for Communist propaganda is a deep appreciation of the benefits and privileges of American citizenship and a determination to convince others of these advantages, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a sermon delivered at Grace Methodist Church, Takoma Park, Md., on July 2, by the Reverend H. R. Hodgson, which is expressive of the type of Americanism which we need in these troubled times.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERMON DELIVERED AT GRACE METHODIST CHURCH, TAKOMA PARK, MD., BY REV. H. R. HODGSON

MY COUNTRY

America, you are my country. You belong to me. Of course I belong to you. I was born upon your soil and cradled in your arms. Your gentle winds blowing through the pines and the maples sang to me lullabies. The food from your gardens and fields nurtured me. The house in which I was reared was built of brick from your quarries, the lumber in its walls and floors came from your forests. The wagon, and the buggy, and the automobile came from your factories. So I belong to you. I shall always belong to you. But you belong to me. No other country does, but you do. And I possess you with pride. I possess you with jealously. So far as I am able, I shall not let others hurt you. I shall let nothing but Providence come between you and me. You are mine.

You are mine because your beauty is mine. Scotland may boast of its green braes, Norway its deep fiords, Switzerland its snowy Alps, France its sunkist vineyards, Italy its ancient beauty, Spain its Gibraltar, Argentina its vast pampas, Brazil its mighty Amazon and dense forests. Every nation has home beauty of which to boast, but few have as much, and none has more than have you, O America of mine. You have your Great Lakes and your great rivers, your Missouri, Mississippi, and Ohio. You have your western rockies scraping the sky, and your eastern Appalachians carpeted with maples and oaks, hickory and hemlock. You have your deserts studded with cactus, and your plains blanketed with grass. You have your snows of the north, and your sun of the south. Your beauty is mine to see, to appreciate.

"O beautiful for spacious skys, for amber waves of grain,
For purple mountain majesties, above the fruited plain."

You are mine because your riches are mine. Your western border is fringed with giant redwoods and sequois. Your midwestern plains are gold with wheat and green with your corn, your South is white with cotton, your Washington and Michigan and New York and Virginia are red with apples and cherries and peaches, your Florida and California are yellow with oranges and lemons. Your Southwest is gushing with oil, and your hills and mountains have filled their pockets with gold and silver, iron, and copper. You have given me in return for labor a fair portion of your tremendous resources until I with millions of Americans have more money, better homes, and more food, than the people of any nation on the earth.

You are mine because of opportunity you have given me. Many years ago my grandfather and my father came from a land where opportunity existed only for the select few of wealth and title. So they came here, and you gave them a piece of land in northern Michigan, inhabited by deer and bear, rabbit and squirrel. You gave them the right to cut the trees and build a house and a barn, and clear the fields for oats and potatoes. You gave them the privilege of helping to build a community of stores, and schools, and churches. You gave me the privilege of attending the school at the foot of our hill, free. It was only one room and one teacher, and eight grades; but it had a good teacher, a few good books, and the pictures of Washington and Lincoln; it provided me the inspiration to take a worthy place in this country; to succeed. When I finished the eight grades, you gave me the opportunity, with no cost, to go to a high school. When I finished high school you gave me the opportunity to choose almost any college in any State of the Union. Freely, I could choose schools in Michigan, Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. You gave me all the opportunity to satisfy my yearning for knowledge, to equip me to perform my chosen task in life.

You are mine because you gave me equality. There are no kings in our country, but we can all be kings if we choose. There is no upper and lower class, but all of us can be first-class citizens. Though I was born with no golden spoon in my mouth, and no blue blood in my veins, I have the aristocracy of the common man. I can rise above the level of my birth or descend beneath it. I can cross social boundaries and make friends and marry a wife. I can take any job of which I am capable and for which I am prepared. I am equal with all.

You are mine because you gave me brotherhood. You opened your doors to the oppressed of many nations and brought them into my community. There I was born and reared, with Englishmen and Irish, with Swedes and Germans, with Danes and Dutch. We played and worked together, we went to school together, we built our community together. We were taught by the great practical method of living together that brotherhood and democracy work.

America, you are mine because you gave me freedom. Down at the foot of the hill, across the road from the schoolhouse was a little white stucco church. Separated from the school by the road, it was separated even more by the Constitution of the United States. Because I went to that school did not mean that I had to go to this church. There was no state church; Roman Catholic, Lutheran, or Anglican. My father and his neighbors built the church of their choice, in this case a Methodist church. But I was free to go to a Presbyterian, Baptist, or any other church of my choice. America, you gave me the greatest of all freedoms, a freedom basic to all freedom, freedom of religion.

'TIS OF THEE

America, you are my country but even more, far more, you are God's country.

In your beginning you were conceived in the spirit of God. The man who founded you came to glorify God. Our Pilgrim Fathers by the dingy lamp of the Mayflower, before they landed at Plymouth, wrote these lines in the Mayflower Pact: "We whose names are underwritten have undertaken for the glory of God to establish in Virginia the first colony for the advancement of Christian faith." Ten years later in the sixteen thirties, other pilgrims said in the New England Federation Compact: "We all have come into these parts of America with one and the same end, namely, to advance the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ."

John Witherspoon, Presbyterian elder, only clergyman to sign the Declaration of Independence, was a professor at Princeton University. In his class sat James Madison, learning from him the sovereignty of God, the freedom of the individual, and representative government. John Whitherspoon drew up the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America. James Madison drew up the Constitution of the United States of America. So great was the contribution that Green, famous historian of the English people, said that the Constitution of the United States was the gift of the Presbyterian Church. The denominational aspect is unimportant, but it is tremendously important this fact, that American history is inseparable in its origin from Christianity.

The Pilgrims came to Plymouth in the name of Christ. The Huguenots came to New England in the name of Christ. William Penn and his Quakers came to Pennsylvania in the name of Christ. The Roman Catholics came to Maryland in the name of Christ.

America, you belong to God because God has helped you to grow to a nation of 150,000,000 people. God has prospered you and given you the highest living standards of any nation in the world. God has made you the strongest Nation on earth. God has made you the refuge of the poor and oppressed from the crowded countries of Ireland and England, Holland and Germany, Italy and Hungary. God has made you a

proving ground of democracy. God has demonstrated through you that there is a divinity in democracy.

America you belong to God because He has given you a task to perform, a destiny to fulfill; namely, to spread freedom's holy light to all the world. Today we are concerned lest the evil forces of the world extinguish that light. In wisdom and in courage, you must remember your destiny, and hold high this torch of holy light.

I do not advocate a narrow nationalism or that you are the only nation chosen by God. You are God's country because you are chosen for a purpose, to spread the light of freedom. But the light that shines farthest abroad must first shine bright at home. In the words of G. Ashton Oldham:

"America first, not only in things material,
But in things of the spirit.
Not merely in science, invention, motors, skyscrapers,
But also in ideals, principles, character.
Not merely in the calm assertion of rights,
But in the glad assumption of duties.
Not flaunting your strength as a giant,
But bending in helpfulness over a sick and wounded world like a good Samaritan.
Not in splendid isolation,
But in courageous cooperation.
Not in pride-arrogance, and disdain of other races and peoples,
But in sympathy, love, and understanding.
Not in treading again the old, worn bloody pathway
Which ends inevitably in chaos and disaster,
But blazing a new trail, along which, please God,
Other nations will follow into the new Jerusalem
Where war shall be no more.
Some day, some nation must take that path—
Unless we are to lapse into utter barbarism—
And that honor I cover for my beloved America.
And so in that spirit, and with these hopes,
I say with all my heart and soul, 'America first.'"

The War in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "An Opinion: Maybe Moscow Wasn't Surprised," found in this week's issue of Newsweek.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek magazine of July 24, 1950]

AN OPINION: MAYBE MOSCOW WASN'T SURPRISED

(By Harry F. Kern)

Have we walked into one of history's best-laid traps in Korea?

This terrible question is not easy to answer—or even to ask. But I have just returned from Tokyo, and there day after day the question asked itself as I watched the sickening surprise of American leaders faced by events that were developing contrary to everything they had predicted and expected. Had the Russians indeed planned it all this way in order to entice the United States Army into Korea? And if Korea is a Kremlin trap, then is not also the currently held theory in Washington that Moscow is "dismayed" by our intervention?

I hope this appalling conclusion is wrong. It may be. But many factors indicate otherwise and it is in that spirit that the sequence of events in the Korean crisis is here analyzed:

1. We set up the South Korean Government, undertook to train its army, and then last year withdrew American troops. But we gave South Korea only a defensive army for the very good reason that the South Korean Government threatened to "liberate" North Korea as soon as it had planes, artillery, and enough ammunition. Behind this policy also lay repeated warnings by the United States Army that Korea was indefensible. In fact, the State Department had difficulty persuading the Army not to pull out American troops 6 months before they actually were withdrawn. The Army refused to allocate to South Korea certain military equipment recommended by the State Department. The National Security Council had decided to send arms to Korea if it was attacked but did not formulate a policy beyond this step.

2. In view of this almost official American attitude that Korea was a military trap, the Soviets might have staged the attack in such a way that the United States would not have been forced to intervene or lose prestige throughout the world. For example, the attack could have begun with a guerrilla uprising and then turned into a slow struggle the North could certainly win. Instead, the attack began with a blatant "declaration of war" that gave South Korea an opportunity to appeal for United States aid. Furthermore, one of the first Communist objectives appeared to be to capture the 2,000 Americans in Korea. This would have succeeded except that Ambassador John Muccio ordered air evacuation before Tokyo headquarters thought it was necessary. It was just in the nick of time, as it turned out.

3. For weeks American intelligence agencies had reported North Korea concentrations on the thirty-eighth parallel. But these reports did not reach or did not impress top officials. For example, even in General MacArthur's headquarters, for the first 2 days the war was regarded as a sort of border raid the South Koreans could handle with some American aid. It was at this time that Washington made the decision to send air-naval assistance.

The wisdom of committing United States ground troops on the Asiatic mainland was questioned in both Tokyo and Washington. It was a military decision and up to the Army, but the Pentagon was reminded of its previous disinterest in Korea and was warned that air and sea action would be sufficient to fulfill American obligations in a policy sense. The Army view was that the national interest demanded the United States meet so overt a Communist challenge with the fullest intervention.

4. Whether they planned on American military intervention or not, the Communists obviously were prepared to meet any United States ground forces on better than even terms. No force so large and strong as the North Korean army was needed to overwhelm the South Koreans. In fact, the Communist Army is largely composed of Asiatic divisions of the Soviet army. Two entire regiments of Soviet Koreans which fought at Stalingrad have been identified, as well as Chinese, Mongol, and renegade Japanese troops. The timing of the attack also seemed to take American air intervention into consideration. The dry season would have been ideal for the tank attacks featured by the Communists. Instead, they chose the wet season, apparently so that they would receive frequent respite from American air attack. Finally, there was the mysterious pause in operations that occurred after the South Koreans had been crushed during the first few days. The Communist forces could then have dashed south and gained all Korea before American aid became effective. Instead, the Reds marked time for one week and attacked only after the American forces were well committed.

WHAT NEXT?

Washington statements that we are eventually bound to win in Korea must be based on the assumption that Russia will limit its commitments. It has always been admitted that the Russians can outmatch us in manpower, and in Korea they are in a position to do so with Asiatic manpower alone. The Soviets also can afford to throw in more ground equipment than can the United States. For example, they have 10 times as many tanks as the United States Army—including those in moth balls. In fact, the Korean campaign could have been shrewdly planned to draw off the equipment and supplies needed for Europe and tie down American forces exactly as the British and French are tied down in Malaya and Indochina.

Those closest to this crisis still fear a sudden assault any day against some other western position in Asia. At first they suspected Korea was the first of a three-part operation, with the next blows falling successively on Formosa and Indochina. However, the day reported set for a Chinese Communist assault on Formosa—July 14—passed without incident. Hong Kong is another spot in imminent danger. Chinese troops have been heavily concentrated around Canton, although there is no sign yet that the Chinese are sending south any of the 150 jet planes they have at Shanghai. The British privately admit that their 40,000-man army could not hold Hong Kong against a major assault.

But those dealing directly with the problem are most deeply concerned over the possibility of an amphibious assault against Japan, coupled with a Communist uprising in that country. The Korean campaign has greatly weakened American strength in Japan. Japanese police and other defense forces cannot be effectively organized for months to come. Soviet air and submarine forces are in sufficient strength to make the naval defense of Japan extremely hazardous. The chief deterrent to such a move against Japan, of course, lies in the strong possibility that it would mean a third world war.

Nonetheless, the stakes are high. The ultimate Russian purpose is to control and direct against the West the forces of Asiatic nationalism. And the spectacle of American troops being defeated by an Asiatic Army in Korea could have been planned just that way, with such an ultimate goal in mind.

Foresight Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in simple but compelling language, the following editorial which appeared in the Bloomfield Independent Press of July 21, 1950, echoes the sentiments of all true Americans.

I wish to include it herein as part of my extension of remarks:

FORESIGHT NEEDED

Now, while the battle rages on the Korean front, there is another battle raging on the home front—a battle of words. Those to whom talk is more important than action are trying to place the blame—on anyone but themselves. Those who argued for cuts in arms appropriations have forgotten their previous stand and are waving the flag for all they are worth. Too many of those who saw the danger are devoting themselves to shouting "I told you so," and trying to pat themselves on the back.

But what we need now isn't hindsight, but foresight. Of course, it was all plain to see—if we had wanted to look. But no, we were too interested in ourselves, in our group's wishes, in what we wanted out of life. And all the talk in the world won't change that picture.

There isn't any use in going into what has happened. We must put aside the indoor sport of post mortems and look ahead. Whether we call it policing for the United Nations, or preventing the further spread of communism, it still remains a war. American lives are being lost, American boys are being called up, and each and every one of us needs to look ahead.

We do not mean that we are to become armchair strategists and plan out the course of the war. That is up to the military. We do not mean that we are to become cracker-box philosophers and map our Government's policy. We elected men to do just that.

As individuals, we must look ahead. We must recognize that this is our crisis, that we have a part in it, a role to play. We said we wanted peace, not only for our time, but for all time. So we set up machinery to curb aggression, for we had learned at too dear a cost that the only security for our freedom was freedom everywhere. Now we must stand ready to make that machinery work.

We do not know what will be asked of us in the days ahead. We cannot tell how long we will have to endure, nor what will be the tension put upon us. But we do know that we must be ready to do our share in work, in money—in sacrifice. We must pull our part of the load, putting aside personal desires and prejudices, proving again—as we have done in the past—that we are a Nation united, standing by our duly elected authorities, accepting necessary restrictions in good spirit, serving as best we can wherever we are of the most use.

The foresight we need is the kind that looks beyond the present crisis to the goal which we have set—a goal of peace on earth and fair play for all. We have been given another chance to prove our desire to attain that end. It is up to us how we use that opportunity.

Moscow Decrees "Peace" Sabotage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 27 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a most revealing article by Alexander Feinberg, which appeared in the New York Times last Saturday morning. Of special interest to the Congress will be the quotation from Pravda that "nearly 100,000,000 citizens of the Soviet Union have set their names to the peace appeal." Also of interest will be the single-handed campaign of the Copenhagen newspaper Berlingske Tidende, a campaign which I should like to see emulated by the United Nations and others. Why indeed should not the United Nations interest itself in these false and falsifying petitions? Ominous indeed is the report in this week's Economist, covered by the article, on the new form of the so-called "Peace Pledge," which is, of course, as the notorious Russian propagandist Ilya Ehrenburg points out, an invitation to sabotage and to treason.

Mr. President, this article is describing one of the major arms of the world-wide offensive of the Soviet Union. To defend ourselves from this attack must become a major aim of American policy. I have suggested that 2½ percent of our increased expenditures in the field of military defense would be a most modest allocation to an area which, as Ambassador John Foster Dulles has testified, may determine war or peace within the next few months. Here is an area in which we can move quickly. In my speech on the floor of the Senate on Tuesday, July 11, I outlined certain areas for fast action, and there are many such which could be readily developed if we unleashed the creative talents of those people who have had most experience in this and similar fields.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOSCOW DECREES "PEACE" SABOTAGE—NEW LINE BIDS FIFTH COLUMN WRECK ECONOMY TO CRIPPLE DEFENSE OF FREE NATIONS—PETITION MILLS FLOOD UNITED STATES—CENTERED IN CITY, THEY TURN TO "AGGRESSION" TALK WITH KOREA NOW BEING AS TEST

(By Alexander Feinberg)

Korea has now been made a test of the Moscow-inspired "peace campaign."

First confined to beating the drums for outlawing the atomic bomb (on Russian terms), the call has gone out from Moscow for the creation of fifth columns in all free countries to sabotage both their economy and defense preparations.

Recent developments clearly indicate the new line. It is reflected in an article in the Communist newspaper Pravda, written by Lonid Sobelev, the Soviet writer. He said that the so-called Stockholm peace appeal had other implications than just to outlaw the atomic bomb.

The signing of a "peace" plea, he declared, meant giving a pledge to stop trains, refusal to unload ships, seizing of weapons, keeping kin from military service, and disrupting fuel, supply, food, and communication lines.

A translation appearing in this week's Economist of London quotes Mr. Sobelev as having written this "peace" pledge:

"I vote against war—and this is not merely a matter of words. It means that I shall do my utmost to prevent war. I shall stop the trains, I shall refuse to unload the ships carrying war materials; I shall not supply fuel for the planes; I shall seize the arms of the mercenaries; I shall not allow my son or my husband to go to war; I shall deprive the ministers of food, drink, telephones, transport, and coal. Let those who are dragging us into war do the fighting themselves."

REVISION OF PETITIONS HERE

Moscow radio issues instructions daily for the "correct" attitude to be adopted, the Economist says, noting that for months the Communists have been conducting a frenzied "peace" campaign.

"Peace" workers here, Communist-led, are not yet using this drastic line on petitions. With American youth battling Communist forces in Korea against heavy odds, home-grown Communists are busily engaged in flooding the city and the Nation with "peace petitions."

A comparison with earlier petitions shows that since the Red invasion of Korea they have changed the phrasing of the demand for outlawing atomic weapons, now calling them "instruments of aggression" instead of "instruments of intimidation."

The official Russian distortion that Americans committed an aggression in intervening in South Korea when North Korean Communists crossed the thirty-eighth parallel, thus was being followed.

In addition to the central distributing point of the peace information center located in two rooms of the Chelsea Hotel, Communist-dominated unions are lending a willing hand to the cause.

The headquarters of the Brooklyn division of the New York Labor Conference for Peace were found in the office of the Amalgamated Machine Instrumental and Metal Local 475 of the United Electrical Workers Union (ousted by the Congress of Industrial Organizations as Communist-controlled) at 160 Montague Street, Brooklyn.

NEW CALL FOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Volunteer workers there said the petitions would go to trade organizations and fraternal groups. These were post-Korea petitions. The wording was identical with the earlier pleas except for the word "aggression" and omission of the names of alleged sponsors other than Trygve Lie. What was made to appear as an endorsement by the Secretary-General of the United Nations was a brief quotation bespeaking his earnest desire for peace.

Also, there appeared a space for contributions for which no provision was made on the petitions distributed by the peace information center.

Both petitions carried an individualized serial number in the lower right-hand corner, an obvious aid to quick filing for future reference and ready use.

The Daily Worker, Communist Party organ, said a goal of 1,000,000 New York signers of the peace petition by August 2 had been set, with 5,000,000 sought in the Nation. It reported that since June 30 nearly 100,000,000 citizens of the Soviet Union have set their names to the peace appeal.

A special drive was being made among Negroes in Harlem and the deep South, the paper added.

As for who was sponsor of the appeal in this country, the Daily Worker said it was issued by the permanent committee of the World Congress of the Defenders of Peace at its meeting in Stockholm, Sweden, March 15–19, and that the committee was set up by the World Peace Congress held in Paris in April 1949.

PRAGUE SESSION FACES STORM

An "emergency meeting" of the executive committee of the World Peace Congress has been called for July 25 in Prague, it was learned here yesterday. A storm that has been in the making since the Communists began to wage war in Korea was held likely to break there over the heads of original American signers of the appeal who have

since been assailed as non-Communists and Titoist.

One of these is O. John Rogge, former Assistant United States Attorney General, who will fly to the meeting tomorrow from LaGuardia Airport. Mr. Rogge said it was likely that the Korean situation would be discussed.

The executive of the Progressive Party took occasion to say that he had "already taken the position, along with Henry Wallace, of supporting the United Nations-United States action in Korea."

Mr. Wallace, the Progressive candidate for President in 1948, announced on July 15 that he was "on the side of the United States and the United Nations" in the conflict. Mr. Rogge, 2 days later, said that "the Communist aggression must be opposed" and that he "could not condone change by violence." Since then both have been subjected to abuse by the Communist press.

Mr. Rogge, before his departure, will hold a press conference in the lounge at the Overseas Terminal at LaGuardia Airport at 11 a. m. The Prague meeting is expected to last 2 days.

Mr. Rogge was one of a committee that presented a copy of the original peace appeal, addressed to all world parliaments, to the Kremlin on March 8. Adopted by the Supreme Soviet, or Parliament, on June 19, it would ban atomic warfare and brand the government that first resorted to it an aggressor.

STOCKHOLM PLEA REPUDIATED

A categorical denial that he had signed the so-called Stockholm appeal was cabled here from Paris yesterday on behalf of Edouard Herriot, former Premier of France. The assertion had been made here by Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, chairman of the Peace Information Center.

Tage Erlander, Premier of Sweden, has protested the use of the name of Stockholm in the appeal, which he termed "international Communist propaganda."

In a statement issued here yesterday the Danish conservative newspaper Berlingske Tidende disclosed that it had provided an opportunity for "dupes" who had signed the appeal to recall their signatures.

Almost 10,000 persons, 1 of every 10 who had signed, recalled their pledges in a wave of revulsion that followed disclosure of the true nature of the appeal, the newspaper said.

This was made possible by daily publication of a coupon reading:

"As I have signed my name to the Stockholm Peace Appeal under false pretenses I hereby wish to revoke my signature. I hereby request Berlingske Tidende to forward my revocation to the Partisans of Peace.

The appeal was circulated in Denmark by the Partisans, headed by Prof. Mogens Fog, a member of the Communist Party. People were approached to sign a protest against the use of atomic bombs and the names of the Danish Red Cross and an organization known as Save the Child were used.

Tidende, in its statement, quoted a Reuters News Agency dispatch on the Sobelev article in Pravda which appeared on July 8, and a later article in Pravda by Ilya Ehrenburg, Soviet political writer, to show that the appeal had deeper and sinister meaning.

Ehrenburg wrote, according to the newspaper: "Signatures for the Stockholm Peace Appeal are not exercises in handwriting. It is an oath sworn to by millions of people * * * to block the road to war. * * * Their talk is not mere words—but action."

"From these interpretations," the Tidende statement said, "it would appear that a person who signs the Stockholm Peace Appeal obliges himself to act as a fifth columnist and to commit sabotage and treason against his country."

Dr. Paul J. Raver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 5, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the August issue of the Reader's Digest, dealing with Columbia River power developments, in which Dr. Paul J. Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration since 1937, was accused of being a Socialist.

I have known Dr. Raver for many years, had frequent contacts with him, and frequently have heard him make speeches, and never once have I been of the impression that he held any socialistic ideas whatsoever. The charge made by the Reader's Digest that he is a Socialist is in my opinion misleading, unfair, and untrue.

The article in the August Reader's Digest was purportedly written by Mr. Leslie A. Miller, a former Democratic Governor of Wyoming and a former chairman of the National Resources Commission of the Hoover Commission and undoubtedly a man of high standing.

Mr. Miller, however, since the appearance of the article in the Reader's Digest, made a statement that he did not write that part of the article in the Reader's Digest which referred to Dr. Raver as a Socialist. The article obviously was rewritten in the Digest editorial offices to make an attack on Dr. Raver that was entirely unfair and unjust and one that was never intended by the purported author of the article, Mr. Miller.

While there are those who doubtless disagree with some of Dr. Raver's policies, I have never heard him referred to by anyone except as a sincere, intelligent, able, and conscientious public servant. It is regrettable that he should have been subjected to this entirely unfounded and unfair attack.

Recently, I had a letter from Oliver S. Morris of Hoquiam, Wash., a retired successful businessman and a former Republican State senator of Washington State. Former Senator Morris, who, I know, has no sympathy with socialism, says of the Reader's Digest charges against Dr. Raver:

I am in a position to have known Dr. Raver and his attitudes on the subject of public power and its purported connections with socialism for approximately 10 years. During that time I have personally conversed with him and enjoyed the privilege of hearing him address public meetings on the subject of public and private power and their relations with each other and the people as a whole many, many times, and at no time was I ever even slightly impressed with a thought that he was even slightly imbued with socialism.

I believe that in this article the word "socialism" is merely used in an attempt to discredit a worthy public servant for lack of any other available honest criticism. Certainly his ability cannot and has not been questioned.

Mr. Speaker, I concur in every statement former Senator Morris made in his letter to me.

The Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Appendix of the RECORD the story in last Sunday's Bridgeport Herald entitled "South Koreans Cold to Americans—Why?"

I also ask unanimous consent to insert the most constructive column by Mr. Marquis Childs this morning in the Washington Post.

I also ask unanimous consent to insert the remarkable letter in this morning's New York Herald Tribune under the headline, "The T-bomb of truth" written by Mr. Harrison Brody, past commander United States Department of State War Veterans Association, New York.

These three articles reaffirm the testimony of Generals Marshall, Eisenhower, and Smith, John Foster Dulles, Dean Acheson, General Sarnoff, Bernard Baruch, Senators Sparkman, Graham, Mundt, Assistant Secretary Barrett, and others, who testified before the Thomas subcommittee.

Mr. President, I urge upon Congress, upon the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress the rapid consideration of the President's request for increased funds in this area. The present request is far too small. It is really a pre-Korean budget. But however, inadequate, it should be approved immediately so we can get advance in this area which offers hope to all mankind, an area in which we can move ahead rapidly and forcefully and do not have to wait upon the slow-moving processes of military production.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bridgeport Herald of July 23, 1950]

SOUTH KOREANS COLD TO AMERICANS—WHY?

(By Landrum Bolling)

When United States forces made their amphibious landing on the east coast of Korea the other day they were not opposed by gunfire, but the native villagers greeted them apathetically, perhaps sullenly. Such was the report of an American correspondent on the spot.

Almost every day's dispatches from other areas of the fighting front tell of sniping, ambushes and guerrilla bands operating behind the American lines.

Koreans in the battle areas are said to be uncooperative when asked to disclose the

hiding places of North Korean army units or guerrillas.

Why?

Why is it that Americans who are risking and losing their lives to stop Soviet-directed aggression, and to prevent the extension of a Communist dictatorship over helpless people, are being subjected to this kind of treatment from the South Koreans they are trying to help?

First of all, chalk up a victory for Soviet and Communist propaganda.

The Koreans are being told constantly that it is white men—Americans—who are killing Koreans; that the Soviet Union is carefully keeping out of the conflict; that the North Koreans are unifying the country—something every Korean desires; and that if outsiders would only stay away then there could be peace and a Korea for the Koreans.

This is a highly plausible line to simple, uninformed people who have not been told or they do not understand that the country could have been unified peacefully 2 years ago if the Soviets had paid any attention to the UN call for free elections in both zones to establish a united government.

They forget that it was the Soviet Union which prepared the North Korean military machine and set it in motion.

Perhaps of greatest importance at the moment, the initial sweeping victories of the North Korean military machine have impressed many Koreans.

Finally, many South Koreans blame us for the corruption, inefficiency and brutality of the South Korean Government we helped to set up and now are fighting to defend.

On top of that, the Communists were constantly stirring up trouble, including armed uprisings.

Many innocent non-Communists got hurt in the process.

Inevitably, the United States reaped much of the blame.

In 4 years of occupation we never figured out how to deal most wisely with such a tangled, difficult problem.

A major part of the tragedy so far as it concerns United States responsibilities and actions is that there were and are so few men of deep understanding and experience—in the political and social field—on the scene in Korea.

This time, if there is the slightest foresight in Washington, the best brains and experience available must be mobilized to get through the propaganda-befogged minds of the Korean people and to help them effectively deal with the job of building a free and decent state.

To fail at that part of the job is to make mockery of the blood spilled and treasure spent to win the military victory.

[From the Washington Post]

WHY WE'RE FIGHTING

(By Marquis Childs)

NEED FOR TROOP UNDERSTANDING

So much has been said about a propaganda of truth to be directed by America at the peoples of the world. This would be an antidote to the campaign of falsehood and slander carried on by Communists everywhere.

The need for this is so urgent and so obvious that it is hard to see how any American can stand in the way of it. But there appears to be need, at least as urgent, to tell our own troops who are doing the fighting what this conflict is all about.

War correspondents in Korea have reported the bewilderment and confusion of young Americans suddenly dropped into a strange country, and told to stop the advance of a powerful military machine. In one of his early dispatches, Homer Bigart of the New York Herald Tribune, described a combat unit that had just come out of the fighting. An officer estimated that one-fourth of his men were barely literate, having only the equivalent of a fifth-grade education. They were obliged to take a special study course in order to pass simple Army general classification tests.

"I have talked to enlisted men and some younger officers," Bigart wrote, "who had not the slightest inkling of why they were fighting in Korea and what they were fighting for."

Judging from these reports, you would hardly know that there is an information and education program in the armed services intended to give the men in the three services an understanding of what it is all about. President Truman even appointed a Committee on Religion and Welfare in the Armed Forces. That committee, which included some prominent names in the field of religion and education, made a survey and wrote a report.

The report went across the desk of Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson more than 6 months ago. It went on through bureaucratic channels and shortly got stalled. As with so many of the other steps intended to prepare this country to meet the challenge of communism, it was still on paper.

"It is essential to the national security," the Committee declared, "that our service personnel have knowledge and information, but such knowledge and such information may be meaningless unless they are related to the ideals and principles by which we live and for which we may be forced to fight. Democracy and the democratic way of life remain but philosophies, until they are put into practice by the individual in his own local environment."

In many respects the Committee report was too charitable. It praised the half-hearted efforts being made in the direction of education hoping to encourage a greater effort, and for the most part ignored the weaknesses and failures. A member of the Committee's staff made a survey in Europe which showed among other things the following:

"Education of illiterates is a big problem to the commanding officers in this theater (western Germany). At present over 4,000 men with low I. Q.'s (equivalent to less than a fifth-grade education) are studying at one of the three basic schools in Frankfurt, Munich, Nuremberg. Many officers to whom I talked complained that the training of these servicemen overseas was time-wasting, money-wasting, and personnel-wasting, and does not contribute to the occupation mission.

"I recommended that service personnel, lacking a basic education be trained first in the zone of the interior before being sent overseas. One commanding officer I talked to was about to go on maneuvers minus 17 men he had never seen who were attending the basic school. A high percentage of delinquencies are charged to servicemen who are in the lowest I. Q. groups, and such misconduct only makes the occupation task more difficult."

One might add that it also makes for an army low in morale and, therefore, deficient in the will to fight. Hanson Baldwin, military analyst of the New York Times, said recently that this was a serious deficiency of American combat forces in World War II.

It should be pretty clear by this time that what fighting men understand and believe—and how strongly they believe it—is almost as important as the weapons they fight with. Some important recommendations are contained in the report of the President's Committee on Religion and Welfare. That report was sent over to the Secretary of Defense last December. It should now be dusted off, and the information and education program in all three services should be geared to the urgent needs of a democratic society faced with the gravest challenge in its entire history.

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

THE "T-BOMB OF TRUTH"—AN APPEAL THAT ITS MECHANISM BE POWERED BY THE APPROPRIATION ASKED OF CONGRESS

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

At this fateful hour when the Soviet propaganda machine has stepped up its worldwide campaign of creating hatred and distrust for the United States, an economy drive has hit the Voice of America a knockout blow on the point of the chin. America's overseas information service's admittedly inadequate budget of $36,000,000 has been further decimated and reduced. The President has now requested a supplemental appropriation from Congress of $89,000,000 as a stopgap to power the mechanism of what Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower has called our "T-Bomb of Truth" weapon to counteract Russia's barrage of lies.

It is hoped that Congress will speedily grant this request for an adequate American information service concurred in by such psychological warfare experts as Gen. Walter B. Smith, our former Ambassador to Moscow; Bernard Baruch, John Foster Dulles, Gen. David Sarnoff, of Radio Corporation of America; Averell Harriman, Gen. George C. Marshall, Mark Ethridge, Erwin D. Canham, Philip D. Reed, of General Electric; Senator William Benton, and former Secretary of State Cordell Hull.

Wars begin and end in the minds of men. America enters the struggle for the minds of men just 5 years behind the Russians. America's "T-Bomb" is more feared by the Soviet Union than all the armaments of the universe. America's first line of defense is no mere ocean, river, valley, or mountain range, but the frontier of ideas. If this frontier falls, we all fall.

Fifty Kum River lines can be breached and overrun and still America and the free world will stand; provided in the words of Cordell Hull, "we back up our force of arms with the forces of world opinion and make America's peaceful purposes and objectives * * * clear to mankind."

This means that the Voice of America, the voice of truth, representing freedom of information, must be transmitted on a vastly wider scale to hundreds of millions of people in China, India, Pakistan, Africa, and Europe, lest they, too, fed on the daily poisons of anti-American propaganda, lose faith in the democratic world and stumble weakly into the Soviet orbit.

At this instant and for 24 hours around the clock, for they neither sleep by night nor rest by day, the Russian radio network, almost girdling the globe, compounds the following time-tested propaganda prescriptions formerly used by the late Dr. Joseph Goebbels:

The Communist propaganda potion, calculated to spread a form of mental paralysis to the free world, is brewed from the following ingredients:

1. Charges of American imperialism. America has invaded Korea to protect its Wall Street investments.

2. Charges of American atrocities. American troops use Korean children for bayonet practice.

3. Charges of American gangsterism. This charge is mainly geared to American air blows, i. e., American flyers are deliberately bombing civilians.

4. Charges of United Nations bankruptcy. Trygve Lie has become a stooge for American diplomats; the lackey of the aggressors, etc.

5. Charges of democratic decadence. This theme has many obvious variations, but can be boiled down to the rough generalization that all Americans and their institutions smell like skunks.

Meanwhile, as the Voice of America strives to reach those areas of the world in which there has been a black-out on truthful news and information—critical areas in the Far East, southeast Europe, the Near East, and the captive areas behind the iron curtain—it finds its broadcasts, because of insufficient funds, jammed and outranged by Soviet transmitters broadcasting in twice as many languages on many more frequencies and on weekly schedules aggregating 5 to 10 times as many hours of broadcast time.

If America wishes to keep its friends and influence peoples, if America wishes to keep the lights of freedom burning in the free countries of the earth, it must do better—vastly better—in the field of peoples speaking to peoples and in the communication of mankind to men.

Elmer Davis has defined Russian propaganda, in part, as a totalitarian technique which seeks to divide Americans at home by setting them to quarreling among themselves while at the same time it seeks to alienate our friends abroad.

Russian propaganda has the following aims:

1. To destroy our will to fight. (Observe the Kremlin's constant "peace offensive." Latest agitation in this sphere is the notorious "Stockholm peace appeal," which, without outlawing armed aggression, is directed toward nullifying America's atomic stockpile. Swedish Prime Minister Erlander has denounced the appeal as a disgusting Communist fraud. Even so, 100,000 or more Americans have been duped into signing the spurious appeal.)

2. To create confusion among us by spreading false rumors and misinformation. (Food shortages, profiteering, labor unrest.)

3. To convince us that our cause is lost, even before we fight. (The Red army is invincible, etc.)

4. To somehow cajole us into believing, in spite of the evidence to the contrary, that Russia has no aggressive aims.

If we continue to allow the Russians to use their wedge-driving tactics against us, while we do little to attempt to counteract their wave of insidious lies through a weak or undermanned Voice of America, national morale will be gravely undermined.

Mark Ethridge, Chairman of the President's Advisory Commission on Information, has posed this question to the American Society of Newspaper Editors: Can we permit the Russians * * * who are spending billions on ideological warfare * * * to conquer men's minds by default?

Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of RCA, has declared that America's overseas information services require the expenditure of at least $200,000,000 yearly.

Senator WILLIAM BENTON has eloquently stated that what America requires to counteract Russian propaganda is a "Marshall plan of ideas." Senator BENTON believes that the Korean war is due to "a direct failure of America to project the idea of democracy in this world."

Remember, too, that the North Koreans are fighting fanatically because of their indoctrination with Communist dogma. Our complete propaganda defeat in China has been caused not by lack of power, but rather because of indifference, carelessness, and neglect.

Has America learned its lesson? Gen. George C. Marshall has told Congress that concerning the world's picture of America "there is a confusion of the mind. Something must be done, and it must be more dynamic."

Assistant Secretary of State Edward W. Barrett, in charge of America's international information program, has accurately stated the issue as: American truth versus Russian lies.

Now the question is: Can American truths shot from a toy popgun compete with Russian lies fired from a steel cannon?

Irrespective of party or partisanship, Americans in all walks of life are united in respectfully petitioning Congress to restore and amplify the funds for an adequate Voice of America. It is sincerely believed by many that the cost of an adequate American "T-bomb" of truth would be but a small down payment to make on the total price of peace.

HARRISON BRODY,
Past Commander, United States Department of State War Veterans Association, New York.

NEW YORK, *July 21, 1950.*

Hoarding and High Prices in Butte, Mont.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to call to the attention of the Congress the very serious situation developing in Montana and throughout the country in the matter of high prices and hoarding. The results of these factors will be to place the burden on people who can least afford to pay for the necessary things of life.

Mr. Speaker, I am including with my remarks a letter I have just received from a number of housewives living in the Silver Bow Homes project in Butte, Mont. I know many of these people and I know what they are up against. They are decent, hard-working Americans and I believe they are entitled not only to consideration at this time but full protection by their Government.

I am immediately contacting the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and urging him to call his group together for the purpose of considering legislation to deal with this spiral of inflationary high prices and hoarding. We do not have much time, Mr. Speaker, and there is no need for hoarding and high prices because we have more than enough foodstuffs, cotton, and other supplies in hand. The time for action is now.

The letter referred to follows:

BUTTE, MONT., *July 24, 1950.*

Mr. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Representative, Montana State,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR MANSFIELD: It is very essential to us that you do not ignore this letter. You have been to Butte, so you know how large our Federal housing project is. It is in behalf of all these folks and little children living in the project that I am writing this letter.

The war-scare here is just awful. Sheets and sugar have practically disappeared. One store today was selling sheets at the staggering price of $4.25 each sheet. These sheets are actually worth about $2.79 each.

Bread, coffee, sugar, lard, meat and cotton goods have gone up as much as 5 to 10 percent in the last week. The crowning point was today when bread and other bakery goods went up in price to the tune of 5 percent.

To us here in the project, these profiteers are helping Russia in their war effort. They are doing (along with the hoarders) exactly what Russia wants them to do.

Hoarding and higher prices go hand-in-hand and something will have to be done. We claim your immediate attention to these matters. It looks to us, like price control is needed right now.

We sincerely hope you can do something about this dreadful war-scare.

Thanking you for your attention, we remain,

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Everett F. Beacher (two children), Mrs. D. J. Larkin (two children), Mrs. L. McClung (two children), Mrs. A. McCloskey (two children), Mrs. G. Blewett (four children), Mrs. Ted May (four children), Mrs. D. Badovinoc (five children), Mrs. F. Resch (three children), Mrs. Vesta Lawney (one child), Henry Gardner (two children), Mrs. Jack Schulte (two children), Mrs. Rance Edden (two children), Mrs. Griffin L. Smith, Mrs. Gene Dufresne, Mrs. Adelia Hackman, Mrs. Mary Delaney (one girl), E. A. Sheehan (four girls), Mrs. Robert Leeson (three children), Mrs. W. V. Lanning (one boy), Mrs. Antonielti (four children), Mrs. Wm. Honka (three girls), Mrs. Charles Hollahan (two girls), Miss Evelyn Sampson, Mrs. Virgil L. Hills (one child), Mrs. Olivia Menard (four children), Sang Howard, Mrs. Sang Howard (one child), Mrs. Dale Kittel (two children), Mrs. Albert Cutler (six children), Mrs. Florence Campbell (two children), Mrs. A. Albright (two children), Mrs. John T. O'Donnell (one child), Mrs. Herbert J. Malone (two children), Mrs. H. L. Edwards (two children).

The signatures on this letter represent about 250 families living in Silver Bow homes, with an average of three children to each family.

Sincerely,

MRS. JACK SHULTE.

Sound Health Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a highly informative article by the well-known New York columnist, Sylvia F. Porter, which, under the title of "Sound Health Plan," appeared in the New York Post on July 18.

This article tells very briefly of the enlightened policy for more adequate health protection undertaken by the Seamen's Bank for Savings of New York City. While I may not agree with all of the writer's conclusions as set forth in the final paragraph of her article, it

is my feeling that she has rendered a public service, as has the Harvard Business Review, in setting forth the salient high spots of what the Seamen's Bank for Savings is doing in a vitally important field.

It may be of interest to know that one of our colleagues, Hon. W. KINGSLAND MACY, First District, New York, is a member of the Board of Trustees of the Seamen's Bank for Savings and has been for over 20 years. Our esteemed associate in this body has had a real part in the formulation of this program, which is meeting such wide acclaim, and which seems to be a common-sense answer to the fantastic schemes for Government-controlled medicine which the bureaucratic planners would foist on us.

The Sylvia F. Porter article follows:

SOUND HEALTH PLAN

(By Sylvia F. Porter)

There's a bank in Wall Street which has hit on a major alternative to "socialized medicine"—a sound, practical answer to the plea of all of us for more adequate health protection.

It's the Seamen's Bank for Savings, one of the most prominent and long-established institutions of its kind in the land.

Its experiment in industry-financed preventive medicine is outlined for the first time in fascinating detail by Robert Clarke and David Ewing in this month's Harvard Business Review.

It's so significant a story, so important an experiment, that it cries out for a Nation-wide audience—for the attention of industry, labor, and Government. Here's the tale:

Seamen's has a deal with Grace Clinic in Brooklyn under which all its employees and their immediate families get the full facilities and services of the clinic's staff and consulting specialists.

The bank bears the cost of the complete diagnosis; in addition, it pays the premiums for hospital and surgical insurance so, if necessary, the employee can get this care too without cost.

Before an employee is hired, he or she must go to the clinic for a physical. This is "the works"—with the exam lasting an hour and a half on average (against the usual 10-20-minute brushoff) and at least two doctors in attendance. It covers everything, eyes, teeth, etc.

This is one of the best angles of the plan. For through this preemployment physical, the clinic obtains a case history from the beginning, builds up a "family doctor" relationship which is so indispensable to the goal of preventive or "constructive" medicine. The family doctor concept of the clinic's relationship to the employee underlies the whole philosophy of the health maintenance program.

After this physical, the employee's use of the clinic is entirely voluntary. Only in rare instances, when a worker is obviously ailing and not getting care, will the bank urge a clinic checkup.

NOW, HOW HAS IT WORKED?

Although the plan has had virtually no publicity, Seamen's has been operating since 1941. Thus, it has a wealth of data on costs and results to give us. For instance:

Costs to the company: Between 1 and 2 percent of the payroll. And significantly, the bank has found costs tend to decline over the years as employees get the benefit of the clinic's care.

Results: These have been tremendous.

1. A sensational drop in employee absenteeism. Before the program, absenteeism at Seamen's was about 7 percent over a year, the national average. Now it's down to 2.27 percent.

2. A spectacular rise in on-the-job efficiency. The bank doesn't even need to hire extra summer help any more. Regular employees easily take over for those on vacation.

3. A wonderful improvement in employees' health, from the top layer to the bottom. That's the logic of preventive medicine.

4. And maybe most important is the human relations angle. Morale is reported superb. There has been no labor-management strife. And management admits the health program has been a primary factor.

Private industry must find a positive answer of its own socialized medicine. Otherwise whether or not industry likes it, socialized medicine will come to America—if not today, then tomorrow.

Private management must take the initiative in filling the deep, widespread need for health maintenance in industry.

Otherwise, whether private management faces the alternative or not, the need will be filled by the Federal Government.

And that will course our Nation with another massive layer of bureaucracy.

Seamen's is pointing toward one way out. Its experiment is intelligent; its results, heartwarming.

Education and Training of Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a letter which I have received from Gen. Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, concerning the initiation of courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act by July 25, 1951.

The Veterans' Administration has interpreted their recent regulation regarding initiation of such courses by that date to exempt any veteran who has already initiated his course and who is prevented by reason of reentrance into the active military or naval service from resuming his education on or before July 25, 1951.

In order that the Members may have full information on this subject, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point the text of the letter received from General Gray.

The letter referred to follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1950.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RANKIN: This is to invite your attention to a determination which I have made with respect to the right of veterans who enter the active military or naval service to resume education or training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, after their release from the active service. That determination is set forth in the following telegram which I have this date dispatched to managers of all Veterans' Administration regional offices and centers having regional office activities:

"Questions have been raised concerning the right of veterans who enter the active military or naval service to resume education and training after the statutory cut-off dates. I have determined that any veteran who has initiated his course of education and training, whose conduct and progress in such course has been satisfactory, and who is prevented by reason of reentrance into the active military or naval service from resuming education or training before July 25, 1951, or the date 4 years subsequent to his discharge, will be permitted to resume education or training within a reasonable period following his release from the active service, even though such release is subsequent to July 25, 1951. Such education or training is limited of course by the extent of the veterans' remaining entitlement and by the statutory provision that no education or training may be afforded beyond July 25, 1956, or in the case of a person who voluntarily enlisted or reenlisted under provisions of Public Law 190, Seventy-ninth Congress, the date 9 years subsequent to the veteran's discharge from such enlistment."

Sincerely yours,

CARL R. GRAY, JR.,
Administrator.

Utilization of Peat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED MARSHALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, in several statements introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in several bills, we have urged legislation for the utilization of peat, byproducts of peat, and taconite.

We did that because we were convinced that legislation for developing these untapped raw materials is vitally important for our national defense, safety, and security.

During the hearings on H. R. 7330, experts testified that we must build electric power plants generating power from peat, and such peat-generated electric power will enable us to reduce taconite and get inexpensive and economical iron ore.

On another occasion I said:

Minnesota's history and record has not been very good in connection with the conservation of its natural resources. Acre after acre of fine timber was simply destroyed to get that timber off the land in order to put that land into agricultural use. Destruction of timber by some of the earlier lumbermen was also a tremendous waste of excellent timber.

In connection with the utilization of our ores, we have handled those in somewhat of a costly manner as far as our resources are concerned, and it would seem to be very desirable that something be done, since this is also a natural resource, if this legislation is promulgated, to protect the citizens of the United States in the conservation, you might say, of the resource so it isn't purely exploited.

That may, at the present time, seem to be like a far-reaching step because, as has

been brought out before here in the hearings, at the present time it has been something that is wasted, no use can be made of it, but it is very possible that in the near future that it may become of such value that it will lead to exploitation, and the time to prevent that would be at the beginning.

It is well known that our high-grade iron-ore resources are already being depleted. It is also known that if the present emergency continues imports of iron ore from foreign countries will be increasingly difficult, if not entirely impossible.

Under those circumstances we feel obliged to ask that immediate steps be taken to build power plants generating power from peat to be able to reduce taconite, low-grade iron ore, and produce inexpensive iron ore from our available resources.

There has also been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report of the United Press telling about Ireland having several peat-generated electric power plants in successful operation. Since then we have received more satisfactory reports about those activities. The research on this phase of plant construction is not required as the plants are now in successful operation.

Therefore, we most seriously urge action at once before the shortages and costs created by war make more costly plant construction. The need of steel is obvious to all. This Nation must not delay. We must act. The time we have is limited; we cannot delay.

Racial Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco Chronicle, in an editorial under date of July 22, 1950, makes some pertinent comments upon the finding of UNESCO's international panel of experts on race problems.

The San Francisco Chronicle is to be congratulated and commended for this editorial, and I am privileged to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it can be preserved for immediate and future reference:

RACIAL SENSE

A useful finding is that of UNESCO's international panel of experts on race problems just announced in Paris. The panel declares that there is no scientific justification for race discrimination.

Thomas Jefferson's idea expressed in the Declaration of Independence, that all men are created equal, receives the fullest support. Fundamentally, no race has anything in natural endowment to justify it in looking down on any other. Range of mental capacities, say the experts, is much the same in all races. This, of course, was already common knowledge among informed persons honest enough to admit it. We have seen in every race examples of the highest intellects as well as of the lowest.

Race itself is in many instances far more fictional than real. More than two centuries ago Daniel Defoe, the author of Robinson Crusoe, wrote a witty poem satirizing the idea of an English race. The true-born Englishman, he pointed out, is a hodgepodge of Briton, Pict, Scot, Roman, Angle, Saxon, Jute, Dane, Welsh, Cornish, Manx, and Norman French—these last themselves a hybrid of Norsemen and Gauls—with liberal dashes, by immigration, of Irish, Flemish, and Dutch. "These," said Defoe, "are the heroes who despise the Dutch and rail at new-come foreigners so much."

What is true of the English is true in its degree of all the peoples of Europe. Conquest, migrations, the institution of human slavery, have left them all mixtures of this and that. The Swedes, more than any others, are said to be fairly close to their original stock but even they have taken on elements of Danish, German, Lapp, and Finnish blood—these last two not even Nordic.

The same thing and for the same reason is true in Asia and Africa. Even the Japanese, isolated on their islands, are patently a mixtures of several peoples, just as the Icelanders, even more isolated, trace back to Irish and English settlement as well as Norwegian. It would be hard now to find a people on earth that can boast truthfully of absolute purity of race. It is a wise child that knows which of the sons of Adam was his progenitor.

Under such circumstances how is any people to support a claim of superiority? Even Hitler, asserting that the German Nation was better than any other because it was German, had to overlook the fact that his Prussians were originally Slavs.

The panel finds no evidence that race mixtures produce biologically bad results. Without the full text of the report we do not known whether the panel limited this conclusion to the biological. If so it can hardly be disputed. On other aspects there continues to be argument. It ought to be said, however, that the question is usually based on observation of products of mixtures of something less than the best specimens and under the handicap of social disadvantages. In most cases, probably, the true elements are hard to disentangle.

This report should be a great encouragement to the cause of persuading people that no genuine ground for race discrimination exists.

Washington News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Washington news letter issued by me on July 20, 1950, a personal report to the people of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington News Letter of July 20, 1950]

Slum-clearance plans are being drawn up in communities all over Pennsylvania. Rundown residential areas and shabby commercial districts are being eyed by local planning officials for redevelopment into parks and modern residential or commercial districts.

Community planning takes years of patient work. Adequate housing must be available for families living in areas to be cleared. Careful thought must go into deciding whether an area is best suited for dwelling, industrial, or commercial purposes. Questions of handling traffic become important. And, of course, the matter of raising funds for urban redevelopment presents difficult problems.

Slum clearance is a deficit operation. Newly cleared land rarely sells for what it costs to purchase land and clear away existing buildings. Private enterprise has done little slum clearance for this reason, and most communities lack funds to finance such projects.

Community modernization does pay off in the long run, however. Slum buildings are often unprofitable to their owners. Slums provide inadequate housing and a wretched environment for the families forced to live in them. Communities frequently find that tax revenues from run-down districts rarely meet the much higher costs required for additional fire, police, and health facilities needed to combat the disease and delinquency existing in slum areas. But once a way is found to clear off the land, new housing and profitable commercial properties can be erected to put the area on a sound economic footing.

The 1949 Housing Act gave community redevolpment a big boost. Under the act, the Eighty-first Congress authorized a 5-year program of Federal grants that will enable communities to offset two-thirds of the costs involved in clearing away blighted areas. Here are the details:

One hundred million dollars are authorized yearly for local redevelopment grants.

Any Pennsylvania city or county, by a vote of its governing body, may request that a Federal grant be reserved for a local project.

A local public agency is created to plan and carry out the project.

Federal loans are also available for (1) preliminary study of community redevelopment needs; (2) detailed study and final plans for identified projects; and (3) the purchase of the land to be cleared.

The reserved Federal grants are available after local funds equal to one-third of the total cost have been raised.

Local communities must draw up their own programs, and are allowed broad discretion in drafting plans to meet local needs. However, the Federal law requires that certain factors be considered before approving grants for a local program. A project cannot be approved unless—

It offers private enterprise a maximum opportunity to redevelop the land once it is cleared.

It is part of an over-all, long-range community modernization plan.

Its primary purpose is to move families from slums into adequate housing, that is, run-down residential areas may be cleared for ultimate commercial use only when decent housing is available elsewhere. On the other hand, dilapidated industrial areas may be redeveloped for dwelling purposes only. In no case may cleared land be resold for speculative purposes.

A dozen Pennsylvania redevolpment projects are in the planning stage now, and $15,000,000 in Federal grants are reserved for authorized programs in Allegheny and Beaver Counties; in the cities of Ambridge, Beaver Falls, Easton, Harrisburg, McKeesport, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Uniontown; and in the boroughs of Rochester and East Rochester. Philadelphia and Beaver Falls have projects in the final planning stage, and others are nearing that point.

It's not too late to reserve a Federal grant if your city or county hasn't done so. It takes time to plan, and it's worth while to have a community redevelopment plan on the shelf, ready for use when future events permit work to start. If you're interested, ask your local officials what they're planning, and further details may be had by writing the Division of Slum Clearance and Urban Redevelopment, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington 25, D. C.

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

Development of Peat Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED MARSHALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1950, I spoke about the development of peat resources and my speech was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In my speech I said:

According to the Soviet newspaper For Industrialization of October 11, 1946, there were in the U. S. S. R. "in process of construction a number of peat-chemical plants in which a large number of products were to be made, including ammonia." (S. A. Tsurupov, The Peat Institute and Its Problems in 1946. The Peat Industry, No. 2, 1946 (summary).)

The institute has at present 1,400 students, which is more than before the war. Beginning with 1945, 400 students will be accepted annually and at least 200 to 250 engineers will graduate. In the next 3 to 4 years the number of students in the institute is expected to rise to at least 2,000. For more than 2 years the institute has had a preparatory section.

Since then I have continually urged action for the development of peat and its byproducts.

Recently we voted to give technical assistance to underdeveloped areas and entrusted to other countries of the United Nations effective use of those funds. There are countries around the world we are making some effort to aid, backward countries. One of the main reasons why they are backward is that they never had any fuel or a fuel that they could use. I think everybody agrees that we are a great nation industrially because of the very fact that we have been well blessed with fuels. Fuel puts behind every man a form of energy that multiplies his armed strength considerably.

Now, if we are going to aid other countries, and many of these backward countries do have peat, we might commit ourselves in aiding them to a position where we would have to provide them with a lot of petroleum, which is getting expensive, or difficult to transport and deliver around to these places in the world.

We might even have to commit ourselves to provide more coal; coal, as we see it, in the form of bituminous and anthracite.

It seems to me that it would be much better if we could help them to use their indigenous supplies of fuel materials, and very often it is the swamp bogs—it is peat.

Now, in order to render that help, we ought to know more about it, so personally I again say that we should get all the knowledge and advance it, if possible, because in that way we take the burden of the cost of aiding other countries off our own backs. We aid them in two or three different ways by letting their own people go to work in mining and producing and handling this material in the form of peat.

There are two ways to render technical assistance to those underdeveloped areas:

First. To send our engineers to make local studies there and provide the knowledge needed there, or

Second. To build a center of study on the utilization of peat and byproducts to teach and train our people and bring the people of the underdeveloped areas here and share with them our knowledge and also acquaint them with the American way of life and with those principles we believe in.

The U. S. S. R. does it, why do we not do the same?

Therefore I would seriously urge the establishment of an institute for teaching the utilization of peat and its byproducts. It must not be on the university or college level, but created for the purpose of getting able and well-trained technicians. We should leave the science to the higher institutions of learning.

I most seriously urge action in the interest of our own safety and security, for a better balanced economy and friendly international relations.

Norway and Communist Aggression in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article prepared by His Excellency Wilhelm Morgenstierne, the Ambassador from Norway.

Ambassador Morgenstierne is loved and respected by the American people. For many years he has represented the great nation of Norway with distinction and honor. His friends in America are legion. His words are respected by all people. Ambassador Morgenstierne's article as published in the News of Norways issued from the Norwegian Information Service under date of Thursday, July 20, 1950, outlines the policy of the Norwegian Government in its support of the United Nations resolution calling upon the members of the United Nations to offer all possible assistance in stopping the North Korea attack on South Korea.

I am sure that all liberty loving people were inspired by the courageous action of Norway in supporting the United Nations resolution and in joining with the United States and other nations in the cause for peace and world order.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORWAY AND COMMUNIST AGGRESSION IN KOREA

(By Ambassador Wilhelm Morgenstierne)

For years the free world had been facing the creeping, elusive machinations of indirect Communist aggression. Then on June 25, the Cominform made the fatal mistake of letting North Korea start an open, well-prepared and brutal attack on the Republic of South Korea, a country established by the United Nations and an integral part of the free world.

The reaction was immediate and world-wide. Here was something concrete for all men to see. Here was open, barefaced aggression against a free, peaceloving country, in clear violation of the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations. Being dedicated to the proposition that aggression is a crime against humanity which must be prevented, and if necessary stopped by force, the Secretary General and the Security Council of the United Nations took prompt and unequivocal action. In full harmony with the United Nations, the President of the United States, with American military forces in nearby Japan, acted with the utmost dispatch and vigor. The free world in an exhibition of unity, as rare as it was inspiring, overwhelmingly and enthusiastically approved the action taken and rallied around the United Nations.

NORWAY DID NOT HESITATE

Norway, true to its ideals and traditions of peace and the rule of law between nations, as a member of the Security Council, from the first took a firm stand. Ambassador Arne Sunde, Norway's representative, in a speech in the council on June 27, wholeheartedly commended and supported the action taken by the council and by the President of the United States. Said he: "For my part I would like to congratulate and thank the President of the United States and his Government for this prompt action. It shows that there is no doubt and no vacillation in this great republic when the peace, security, and justice of the world are put in jeopardy by reckless aggression."

This fully expressed the attitude of the Norwegian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Halvard M. Lange, and the Norwegian Government and people. The press and public opinion in Norway with striking unanimity voiced its approval and a grim realization that at long last circumstances had made it possible for an outraged free world to come to grips with unabashed aggression.

Elsewhere in this issue of News of Norway there are quoted statements of Mr. Einar Gerhardsen, Norwegian Prime Minister, further emphasizing the stand of my country. Among other things, he appeals to Mr. Stalin to do what everyone knows to be within his power: to say the one word necessary to call off the North Korean aggression.

NORWAY CAN CONTRIBUTE SHIPS

The Norwegian Government, however, has not confined itself to condemn the aggression and to recommend warmly the steps taken by the United Nations and the United States. Replying to the request of Secretary General Trygve Lie for material support of the United Nations' police action in

Korea, the Norwegian Government has repeated its earlier offer of Norwegian tonnage for the transport of men and material to Korea. The further details in this connection will be worked out directly with the American Government.

As to sending troops to Korea, the Norwegian Government has pointed out that our military forces being strictly limited, it is afraid that Norwegian troops could not be sent in sufficient numbers to constitute effective help. It should be remembered in this connection that Norway is carrying its full share of the allied occupation of Germany, and keeps ground forces there in considerable strength relative to our available military manpower.

THE FREE WORLD INSPIRED BY AMERICANS

The eyes of the world these days naturally are directed primarily toward Korea, and our hearts go out to the brave young Americans who, more than 8,000 miles from their own country, are fighting against overwhelming odds. It is in itself an amazing military feat how under such circumstances they have stood up as they have, and it is inspiring how they are fighting for the principles and ideals of the United Nations.

But the fighting in Korea cannot blind us to the much larger issue of the free nations against aggressive world communism. We do not know where the next eruption might take place. But we do know that we are facing an unscrupulous and ruthless adversary, who will not refrain from any device, covert or open, to reach his ultimate aim of world domination. The version which the Cominform presented to the world of the origin of the Korean affair, must now have convinced every decent, truth loving person that we are up against evil forces which do not hesitate to use the most blatant perversion of truth as one of its weapons.

These are facts which we cannot blink. The lines are drawn like never before in human history. The free world is in mortal peril and must close ranks in order to survive. Everybody who believes in freedom, government by the people, justice, truth, and decency, must take on his share of the defense of our common ideals. We must all back up to the hilt the uncompromising stand of the United Nations, and never allow it to become impotent in face of aggression. We must make every possible attempt to unite all the members of the United Nations in a common front against aggression. "A house divided against itself cannot stand." We must back up Secretary Acheson when he said so truthfully that aggression is the real crime against humanity, and that the weapons used to repeal aggression are incidental.

THE FREEMAN'S BURDEN

The free world is standing at the crossroads. It faces the hard fact that the price of freedom is higher than we thought, and that it is still going up. Our choice today is to pay that price, or go down to the ignominy of slavery and Communist lawlessness and brutality.

We cannot have the blessings of freedom, without being willing to carry the burdens of freedom. That is the stark reality now facing the peace- and freedom-loving world.

Kipling spoke of "the white man's burden." That was the voice of a world gone by. Today it would be much more appropriate to speak of the freeman's burden. The challenge to all freemen, irrespective of race or color, to take upon themselves the tremendous burden of defending their common freedom and all that goes with it.

The Dairy Industry and Its Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I recently presented to the Gillette Subcommittee on Agriculture some testimony about the dairy industry and the problems confronting that industry and in their relation to the present price situation.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from that testimony be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR LEHMAN BEFORE SENATE AGRICULTURE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DAIRY PROBLEMS

Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to you and to the members of this committee for agreeing to hear what I have to say on the problems of the dairy industry. I am aware that this committee has been studying this particular problem, as well as other phases of the agriculture situation, not only for many weeks but in a larger sense, for months and years.

I hope, therefore, that you gentlemen will realize that I do not presume to be here to instruct the members of this subcommittee in dairy matters. Rather I am here to present my own views on the dairy industry in more or less summary form, so that this committee may have before it a sketch of the dairy problems from the particular viewpoint of New York State.

As you gentlemen may be aware, I have pending before this committee Senate Joint Resolution 162, calling for an investigation by the Secretary of Agriculture of the effects upon the dairy industry of the repeal of taxes on oleomargarine. I shall address some of my remarks to this resolution and to the situation which called it forth. I am very hopeful that the Agriculture Committee may soon see fit to report out this resolution. I hope that my remarks here today may be considered pertinent to that resolution and in support of it.

It has always been my habit to face facts squarely and not to dodge them. Today, certain facts must be faced, by the dairy industry, and by the entire Nation. It is my profound conviction that the dairy industry is a vital and essential part of the national economy. Any fundamental harm suffered by the dairy industry as a whole will be an injury which will be passed on with ever-widening effects upon every phase of American agriculture and, consequently, upon the national economy.

As the members of this committee know, I am not a dairy farmer nor a farmer at all. But my State does have a great dairy industry. During my 10 years as Governor of New York, I had frequent occasion to be concerned with and interested in the dairy industry. So I have some background of experience from which I may speak. At the same time I have always had the interests of the consumers at heart. When I speak in defense and in behalf of the dairy industry, I am thinking of the interests of the consumers as much as I am of those of the producers and other elements in the dairy industry.

It has always been my thesis that no solution of the problems of the dairy industry can be arrived at unless it includes a reconciliation with the interests of the consumers. At the same time the consumers must realize—I think most of them do—that any fundamental harm suffered by the dairy industry is a threat to the health of the Nation and especially to the health of the younger generation. To my mind, nothing is more precious and nothing calls more for our best thoughts and our best efforts than this relationship between the dairy industry and the national health.

As this committee knows, I am no special friend of the big dairy combines—the great corporate organizations which process and distribute milk on a vast national scale. Insofar as they serve the producers and serve the public, I have no protest against them. But I insist that the interests of the producers and of the consuming public must come first.

Now I should like to list the approaches which, in my judgment, must be made to the problems of the dairy industry.

I am not one of those who believes in the simple panacea of simply higher prices. In the dairy market, as in any other market, the price must reflect a fair and just return to the producer but it must also anticipate the ability of the consumers to buy. The price must not discourage the consumers.

One basic problem of the dairy industry is to maintain stable prices at a level assuring to the producer a fair and just return. But a much larger problem is that of stimulating consumption. This consumption must be increased in all its forms.

The problem is also one of stabilizing the national milk market and of preventing one group of producers from being set in ruinous competition against another, to the ultimate disadvantage of both, without any permanent advantage to the consumer.

And finally, the problem is one of striving for ever increasing efficiency and production in order to lower production costs and to increase output. This last I consider the most important phase of the problem, since in this line of effort, the consumer stands to benefit. Under this heading would come research in new uses for milk and the development of new products that will either create a demand or meet an existing demand.

The approaches I have just suggested, Mr. Chairman, do not furnish a final answer to the problems of the dairy industry. I have merely indicated some directions which need to be followed. I insist to the point of being repetitious that this whole problem must be studied in a most intensive and comprehensive way not from a narrow viewpoint, but from a national viewpoint, utilizing all the resources of the United States Government and of the producers and of all their organizations. If ever there was a problem that required attack from a national angle, this is one.

I know that this committee is primarily interested in inquiring into the spread of prices received by farmers and the prices paid by the consumers. This is a vital question and was never more vital than it is today in the face of recent price increases. In many, if not in most of these cases, these price increases seem to be the result of shameless profiteering. In my opinion this profiteering in these times of national crisis is subversive of the national interest. It is a threat to that national stability which must be maintained at whatever cost and at whatever sacrifice.

I know that the dairy farmers of my State are not participating in this profiteering. The milk price they are getting today is somewhat higher than 6 months ago, but this is due largely to a seasonal increase and is still in many cases below what many farmers consider a fair and just return.

Adequate purchasing power for the farmer is a necessary part of our economic stability. The profiteering on the part of many elements in our economy is a violent threat to that stability. I hope that this committee in its study of not only the dairy industry but of every other food product industry will track down and expose all those who would make undue profits from the national peril.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that this committee is well aware of certain basic facts about the present status of the dairy industry. You are aware, no doubt, that even with the relative high level of employment and consumer income in the past year, the demand for milk and its various byproducts was not strong enough to induce consumption of the total available supply.

During the past year the Department of Agriculture has had to purchase substantial quantities of butter, nonfat dry milk solids, and cheese. In the first 5 months of 1950 the Government has had to buy relatively larger amounts of these dairy products than in the corresponding period in 1949.

The Department of Agriculture will need to dispose of these surplus stocks. They cannot indefinitely accumulate. If the recent military developments, with the consequent increase in military purchases, do result in a diminution of these stocks, we still must face the facts of the future. I am not going to propose a solution to this problem either. But this is another problem that needs to be solved.

Now I should like to say a few words about the dairy industry in New York State alone.

Few persons realize that New York State is one of the great agricultural States of this Nation. In 1949, the gross income from farm-milk production alone in New York was almost $367,000,000. As a matter of fact, New York's gross farm income from milk production was exceeded in 1949 by that of only one other State—Wisconsin—where such income amounted to almost $468,000,000. New York State was also second in volume of milk produced on farms in 1949—8,708,000,000 pounds as compared to 15,568,000,000 pounds in Wisconsin.

Farmers in New York State kept 1,350,000 cows in 1949, a figure exceeded only by Wisconsin and Minnesota.

It might be useful to compare these figures with those for the Nation as a whole. In 1948 total United States milk production on farms was 115,527,000,000 pounds, the lowest production since 1941. In 1949 production recovered to 119,316,000,000 pounds. Indications this year are that production will be about the same as last year.

Values have declined. Gross farm income from milk in the United States in 1949 was $4,517,000,000. This was a decrease of $786,000,000 from the 1948 total of $5,303,000,000. This decline amounted to almost 15 percent.

In New York State, gross farm income from milk declined $51,284,000 from 1948 to 1949, a decline of more than 12 percent. This was in spite of the fact that New York milk production is intended largely for the fluid market. Fluid-milk prices generally hold up better than butter prices in a declining market. This is due in no small part to the bargaining activities of fluid-milk cooperative associations, which help to make price adjustments in an orderly rather than in a chaotic manner.

A second positive factor in the New York situation has been the fact that fluid-milk consumption, while showing a diminution from the peak reached in 1946, nevertheless has been maintained at a considerably higher per capita level than was the case prewar. In other words, demand has been reasonably strong. Nevertheless total farm milk income declined.

In looking forward, it seems reasonable to conclude that the dairy farmer faces even more trying times in the future. Cow numbers are again on the upgrade. Even slight decreases in demand can result in a serious depression for dairy farmers. In New York State, this also means financial loss for a large number of city people who depend on farm trade and who prosper when the farmer prospers.

Perhaps the most serious problem confronting the dairy farmer is the condition of the markets for the manufactured dairy products, particularly butter. During the war, strongly increased demand for other dairy products, coupled with deliberate Government policy, resulted in a sharp drop in the production and consumption of butter. Since the war, production of butter has been increasing but it is still considerably below prewar levels. For example, in 1949, United States production of creamery butter was 1,409,000,000 pounds, as compared to 1,872,000,000 pounds in 1941 when our population was much smaller.

A part, I believe a large part, of the difficulties of the butter producer are due to the competition of oleomargarine. Before the war the people of this country ate about 17 pounds of butter per capita. Last year they ate between 10 and 11 pounds per capita. On the other hand, the prewar per capita consumption of oleo was slightly under 3 pounds. Now it is about 6 pounds per capita. This change in consumption took place even before Congress saw fit to remove the 10-cent-per-pound tax on the manufacture and sale of yellow oleo. Now, in 33 States, oleo manufacturers can imitate butter in every important characteristic.

I have no doubt that oleo will further replace butter on the American dinner table. No one can deny oleo the right of sale as oleo. However, it is indeed questionable to permit a synthetic product to imitate all the major characteristics of a natural product.

It is my belief that the cotton and soybean farmer will gain little or nothing by this tax-repeal legislation. They have had a full market for their commodity heretofore. The prices for their commodity cannot increase as a result of this legislation, simply because the prices of cottonseed and soybean oil cannot get out of line with the prices for imported coconut oil. If the price of the domestic oils increased, oleo manufacturers would merely shift to coconut oil.

Nevertheless, the Congress has acted, and the butter industry stands in great danger. Something must be done to cushion the impact on that industry. Accordingly, I have proposed that the Department of Agriculture be directed to make a continuous study of the effect of an expanding oleo industry upon the dairy industry of the United States. If my fears that oleo will seriously damage the dairy industry are as well founded as I believe they are, then the Congress and the dairy industry, itself, needs to have all the facts available so as to correct the situation.

The committee undoubtedly is well aware of the developments in the oleo price situation since the repeal of the oleo taxes on July 1. There is at present underway an oleo price war. The price of oleo is approximately half that of butter today. I do not, however, judge this to be a good sign.

The greater part of the oleo in this country is manufactured by six firms. With such a restricted number of firms doing the bulk of the business, the opportunites for monopoly are great indeed. As soon as the marginal producers can be driven out of the market—and there are indications that this is exactly what is going on—the big producers can, by tacit conspiracy, raise or lower the price to any desired level.

The price war in the oleo field is having an inevtiable effect on the sale of butter. Once the smaller marginal producers have been driven to the wall and the consumption of butter has declined, the big oleo manufacturers can manipulate the market to their own advantage.

For this reason I have proposed to Congress an investigation of the monopolistic elements and tendencies in the oleo industry.

As this committee knows, New York State is not a great butter producing area. Its major product is fluid milk. But I need not tell the members of this committee how the drop in the sale of butter will affect the fluid-milk market. Milk which formerly went into butter will inevitably pass into other forms. The entire market will be disrupted. There will be growing pressure for the shipment of fluid milk from other milksheds into the northeastern market. That pressure is already accumulating. I would dislike to see the milksheds broken up. It would produce chaos among the producers and in the market. This is why I have said and say again that the problem of milk must be approached on a national basis, in order to avert national chaos in the dairy industry. That is why New York feels strongly about this oleo matter, although butter is not one of our primary dairy products.

New York City receives its milk supply from several States including Vermont, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and some even from Connecticut. This is another reason why milk prices cannot be regulated by the States. This is why the Federal power has had to be invoked to control and regulate the movement and price of milk.

In the New York area the Federal milk order operates jointly with an order issued by the State under its own milk-control law. This has been an outstanding example of Federal-State cooperation in the field of milk price and market stabilization.

But the events of the past 2 years have shown very conclusively that this machinery is not enough. This machinery is satisfactory for the purpose of stabilizing the market. It protects the producer from some of the hazards of price fluctuation. But these milk marketing orders do not solve the problems of even the fluid-milk industry.

The income of the dairy farmer has gone down in response to many factors, only one of which has been the price factor. While there has been a recent strengthening of the market and a recent indication of increased income for the milk producer, I do not judge this indication to be much more than seasonal. With the impact of decreased sales of butter as well as other effects, the prospects of the dairy industry are, as I have said, far from bright.

The fact of the matter is that although the problems of the dairy industry must be attacked with regard to the immediate factors affecting that industry alone, that problem must also be attacked as part of the entire farm problem which is, in turn, part of the entire national economic problem.

All I have said is intended to indicate that the dairy industry requires a thorough, deep, and many-sided study. This study cannot be carried out by a committee of Congress or by the dairy industry itself. It must be carried out through the mobilization of the best minds which can be brought to bear on this subject whether in Government or in the dairy industry itself.

Thus, the question of prices, as far as the dairy industry is concerned, cannot be considered as a separate and isolated question. It must be considered in context with all the other aspects which I have mentioned and many which I have not had time to mention.

I do not know whether the investigation with regard to the advance in food prices here in the last few weeks is going to be carried on by this committee or by the Banking and Currency Committee or by both, but I feel strongly that it is an absolutely essential thing to do.

As I said on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, I can see no justification whatsoever for the price increases that have been made in the last few weeks. Food, as the President stated last night, is in sufficient quantities available to care for any apparent needs now or in the near future, and I think that it is a terrible thing to foist these food-price increases on the consuming public.

I think it has a direct effect on the milk industry, because, if a family has to pay more money, an unreasonably high price for its meat or for its other food products, it just leaves that much less for the consumption of milk, which I believe is the most economical food product that exists today.

Therefore both from the standpoint of the larger interests of the entire consuming public throughout the country and also in the immediate interests of dairy farmers, I very much hope that these investigations will be carried out.

Subversive Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a special bulletin dealing with subversive forces issued by the American Legion, Department of Idaho.

There being no objection, the bulletin was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF IDAHO,
Boise, Idaho.

To all Post Commanders:

At all of the recent district meetings in Idaho, Earl Chandler, national field representative for Idaho, Utah, and Montana warned Legionnaires that children's phonograph records produced by Young Peoples' Records, Inc., are being used as a part of the curriculum in some of our elementary schools and are being sold to the general public through many of the leading music centers throughout Idaho. The alarming fact is that the producers of these records have been cited as subversive by the California Un-American Activities Committee, and its president, a Mr. Horace Grenell, has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States.

We do not maintain that communistic teachings are injected into all of these phonograph records, however, we do know many of the producers and artists themselves have a record of affiliations with Communist-front organizations.

It is an interesting fact that in the June 11, 1948, issue of the Daily Worker, official Communist Party New York daily paper, that a Mr. Abraham Pomerantz, chief attorney for the Communist spy Gubichev, who was convicted along with Judith Coplon for espionage, was listed as a major stockholder in Young Peoples' Records, Inc. Pomerantz has a long record of affiliations with Communist-front organizations.

The national Americanism director of the American Legion has advised us to bring these facts to the attention of all Legionnaires and the public. If any group then continues to support these records they will be doing so in defiance of the facts pointed out and will indicate their disregard for the best interest of loyal Americans. Not many school officials or music-store operators will want to be placed in that position.

We urge you to appoint a committee in your post to investigate and bring these facts to the attention of business establishments where children's records are sold in your community and contact school officials to warn them of the source of these records. The best and most effective way to rid this country of these communistic threats is by exposing the facts to the public. More detailed information may be secured upon request.

You may be interested to know that some of these recordings and their effect have been discussed with Mr. Alton B. Jones, State superintendent of public instruction, who assures us of his desire to fully cooperate with us in preventing this subtle means of propaganda conditioning the minds of our children. He plans to brief and advise the teaching profession relative to the dangers in his forthcoming school bulletin.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. WILLIAMS,
Department Americanism Chairman.

Manufacturing in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, new markets, abundant raw materials, efficient and dependable labor are some of the pillars of strength upon which the South forges ahead in manufacturing.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the July 16, 1950, issue of the Decatur Daily:

MANUFACTURING IN THE SOUTH

The economic progress of the South since 1930 has been almost matchless. Still a long way from the goal of economic independence for great numbers of people, we have nevertheless made astounding progress just within the past 20 years.

Thurman Sensing, director of research of the Southern States Industrial Council in Nashville, sums up this progress and points to the goals ahead in the following article on the southern scene, saying:

"Manufacturing plays a much larger part in the economy of the South than perhaps most people realize. It is difficult to get the traditional concept of the South as mainly an agricultural region out of the minds of some people. It is equally as difficult to get out of the minds of other people the belief that the South largely exports its raw materials instead of processing them. Both ideas are wrong."

It is true, of course, that the economy of the South still depends upon agriculture to a larger extent than that of the rest of the country. There are still a great many more individual farms in the sixteen Southern States than in all the other States of the Union—3,114,800 in the South compared with 2,744,400 in the rest of the country.

However, the average southern farm is much smaller than the average farm in the rest of the Nation, and the total value of farm production in the South for 1949 was only $11,260,100,000, compared with total value of farm production outside the South of $21,304,900,000. Even so, this still gives the South a full proportionate share of the Nation's agricultural production, both on an area and on a population basis—33⅓ percent.

But the value of manufactured goods produced in the South now far outreaches the value of farm products in the South. For instance, the total value of farm production in the South in 1949, $11,260,000,000 is only 29 percent of the value of manufactured goods produced in the South in 1949, $38,950,100,000. Of course, this is still a considerably larger percentage than the comparable figure for the States outside the South, where the value of farm production amounts to only 14 percent of the value of manufactured goods.

And this is not discounting the value of agriculture to the southern economy by any means. Many of the farm crops are processed in manufacturing plants.

There are 11,868 food-manufacturing plants in the South, employing 364,500 persons. Their sales for 1949 amounted to $7,617,200,000.

There are 329 tobacco manufacturing plants in the South, employing 62,900 persons. Their sales for 1949 amounted to $1,822,900,000.

There are 2,119 textile manufacturing plants in the South, employing 628,300 persons. Sales from these plants in 1949 amounted to $5,749,000,000.

We therefore have in food, tobacco, and textile plants a total output of $15,189,100,000, or 38 percent of the total value of manufactured goods produced in the South.

We have seen a steady increase in the processing of its agricultural products by the South for many years. In 1900 the South only turned out 41 percent of the Nation's manufactured tobacco products. it now turns out 73 percent. In 1890 the South was using only 21 percent of the cotton; it is now using 88 percent. The South is now turning out about 20 percent of the Nation's manufactured goods.

In its recent report, the Committee of the South of the National Planning Association found that industry was growing rapidly in the South for three main reasons: First, it brought many industries closer to their market; second, it brought many industries closer to their sources of raw materials; and third—and perhaps most gratifying of all to southerners—it found that labor in the South was more efficient and more dependable than in other parts of the country.

All indications are that manufacturing in the South will steadily increase until the region has its full one-third share of the Nation's total.

This Is the Time To Put First Things First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle:

The editorial follows:

CAUTION ON POINT 4

The atmosphere of lukewarm interest in which the House passed a whittled down version of the point 4 program of aid to foreign nations, was the result largely, no doubt, of the much more pressing problems in Korea. As in the case of the tax revision bill, which was shelved by the Senate, the point 4 business is definitely something that can wait.

But it is probable also that many in the House felt as Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, that the measure passed, authorizing $250,000,000 to guarantee investors in foreign countries against certain hazards and to assure convertibility of profits into American dollars, was a bill to benefit the few at the expense of the many.

Referring especially to the convertibility provision, he said "we are being asked to do

for a few international bankers and financial interests what we are not doing or even pretending to do for our other citizens."

Early enthusiasm for the point 4 program, as originally presented by President Truman, has cooled under practical consideration of the objectives in mind. Within limits, the use of American technical skill and advisers to help backward countries raise their living standards, is fine, but what are the limits and how shall they be defined? Congress has not found answers, although a beginning has been made in the authorization of $35,000,000 to be used under careful supervision.

With the Korean situation imperatively demanding first call on funds and technical experts, our global aid programs must wait.

A Beloved Churchman Goes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in our American way of life the man of the cloth—no matter what his denomination or faith—is and shall always be a source of inspiration. The flock to which he ministers and the group among which he walks is always enriched in character and spirit because of his works and because of his words.

The man of God is an integral part of our democracy—and our democracy grows because of him. In these days, then, when men's souls are again being tried, and when the bonds between ourselves and the men of God grow closer and stronger, it is well to point out the good works of some of our men of the cloth. I know that the towns people of Nutley, the parishioners of Grace Episcopal Church, the members of Nutley Post of the American Legion, the Reenheimer Boys' Clubs, and the Nutley Rotarians join with the editor of the Nutley Sun in his tribute to Rev. L. Harold Hinrichs and echo "a job well done." Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following editorial which appeared in the Nutley Sun of July 21, 1950:

A BELOVED CHURCHMAN GOES

Ending a pastorate of 13 fruitful years, the Reverend L. Harold Hinrichs has submitted his resignation as rector of Grace Episcopal Church. His magnificent record of accomplishments, the visible fruit of his labors both in the structure of his parish and in the structure of the Gothic building and of his devotion to his parishioners and to his community will remain behind him when, in September, he leaves to take up a new pastorate on the Eastern Shore of Maryland.

Devoted men of the cloth, whether they be pastors or priests or rabbis, inevitably leave behind them a hallmark of their ministrations. Rev. Hinrichs' long pastorate in Nutley included the 5 years of the war during which he devoted endless hours to the men and women in service and their families through his presence on the social service bureau board.

The magnificence of Grace Church has been embellished by the windows that were installed during his stay. The moral happiness of many families, his parishioners, has been heightened by his ministrations. His devotion to the community has endowed here a rich memory of an able, beloved churchman.

Karol Sidor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article concerning Karol Sidor, which appeared in the Evangelist, the Albany, N. Y., diocese weekly under date of July 21, 1950:

FORMER SLOVAK AMBASSADOR TO HOLY SEE BRANDS WINCHELL'S CHARGE AS "LIE"

MIDDLETOWN, PA.—Karol Sidor, one-time ambassador of Slovakia to the Holy See, branded as "a common fabrication and a lie" the charge that as commander of the Hlinka Guard in Slovakia, he ordered the guards to kill every American flier who would be forced down in Slovak territory.

Sidor spoke with particular reference to accusations he said Walter Winchell made on a Nation-wide radio broadcast, Sunday, July 9.

"I was chief commander of the Hlinka Guard during the existence of the Czechoslovak Republic, according to the laws of which the Hlinka Guard was established," Mr. Sidor said. "So, it was an organization founded according to the law of the Czechoslovak Republic. I was its chief commander from October 8, 1938, to March 14, 1939, namely, during the time of the Czechoslovak Republic.

"America entered the war in 1941, and the Soviet Union allowed the United States Air Corps to help the Slovak rebels in 1944. At that time I was at the Vatican, where I had been since June 15, 1939, and where I never issued such orders as mentioned by Mr. Winchell, because I had no authority to do so, nor did I have the power to send such orders to Slovakia, because the Hlinka Guard was under a different commander since March 14, 1939.

"I had nothing to do with Slovak internal affairs from 1939, and I was concerned only with what in the international section pertained to relations between the Slovak Republic and the Holy See."

The Reverend Joseph Kusnier, of Donora, Pa., president of the Federation of Slovak Catholics of America, has issued a statement vigorously declaring that Karol Sidor "was neither a Fascist, nor a Nazi, nor a Communist," and that "all of us American Slovaks, who have so cordially received the president of the Slovak National Council abroad * * * must demand that he be protected against irresponsible attacks on his honor and good name."

Philip A. Hrobak, editor of Jednota, published here, and president of the Slovak League of America, said the "vicious, vulgar, and unwarranted attack" upon Mr. Sidor is "highly resented by Americans of Slovak descent." "Poisoning the minds of the American public with falsehoods, half-truths and misstatements can hardly be the mission of the American radio and press," he added. He said Mr. Sidor is willing at any time to meet those who make such charges against him and prove they are wrong.

The Catholic Light of Scranton, where Mr. Sidor recently lectured, this week prints a communication from the Reverend Nicholas Sprinc, who states that he was born and brought up in Slovakia and left there in 1945, 3 months after the Russian armies took it over. He says that while visiting in Scranton he followed the controversy that has arisen over Mr. Karol Sidor and his wartime record.

"Reading the charges and accusations brought against Mr. Sidor as a pro-Nazi politician, I think would make every child in Slovakia laugh as it would every honest person in Europe," Father Sprinc writes in the Catholic Light. "Because it was and it is still an established fact that Mr. Karol Sidor was the only man who dared to say to Adolf Hitler and to his emissaries in those revolutionary days of March 1939, that he would not take any orders whatsoever from Hitler that it was up to the Slovak Parliament, elected in the democratic elections during the Czechoslovak Republic to declare Slovakia's independence, and certainly not up to Hitler."

The Communist Challenge in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the appended editorial from the New York Times of July 20 is of importance to every Member. It emphasizes again that while we enforce UN military sanctions to repel aggressors the work of economic improvement must go on in a decisive way as the "behind the lines" answer to the Communist challenge:

COMMUNISM IN INDIA

Recent changes in India's Communist Party shed additional light on the Kremlin's plans. An announcement in Bombay on July 19 told of the election of a new central committee. It castigated the old Politburo for its left sectarian policy and called the path followed by China the only correct one for India. In the future, agrarian reform proposals are to be the basis of the party's policy, with the objective of winning recruits for national liberation.

The present purge and shift in the party line represent the culmination of internal convulsions among the Indian Communists as they have striven to obey the orders given them editorially in the Cominform's organ last January 27. Instead of relying upon individual acts of violence and sabotage, as they have done in Hyderabad and elsewhere in India, their new goal is the creation of a revolutionary army based on the land-hungry peasantry to overthrow Nehru and other representatives of the national bourgeoisie. If this policy succeeds, the newly elected general secretary of the party, Rajeshwar Rao, will become the Indian Mao Tse-tung.

Numerically, India's Communist Party is still small, with fewer than 100,000 enrolled members. But no one acquainted with Indian conditions can doubt that abundant inflammable material exists there for the Communist incendaries. Here, unlike Korea, there is still time to meet the Communist challenge by improving the lot of the masses rather than by force of arms. Much depends on the speed and effectiveness with which this challenge is met.

Psychological Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Peter Edson that appeared in the Washington Daily News on July 26, 1950. Mr. Edson points out the tremendous importance of psychological warfare in Korea, one more example of why Congress should act promptly on an expanded information and education program.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE

(By Peter Edson)

Fighting in Korea is psychological warfare, as well as shootin' war. All the propaganda tricks that the Russians have mastered in 30 years of stirring up trouble all over the world are being used in an effort to break the will of the South Koreans and Americans fighting to put down North Korean aggression.

Radio broadcasts, pamphlets, handbills, posters, sound truck amplification of recordings and leaflets dropped from low-flying airplanes enter into this war of ideas—communism against freedom.

United States and South Korean psychological warfare teams are replying in kind. Assistant Secretary of State Edward W. Barrett estimates some 10,000,000 United States-prepared leaflets have been dropped on North Korea by American planes in the first month of the war.

In charge of psychological warfare against North Korea is Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, of General MacArthur's staff. General Willoughby is in frequent telecommunication with the Joint Chiefs of Staff psychological warfare section and the Public Affairs Office of the State Department, who shape the policy on telling the Koreans the truth about the war.

Comparison of the first samples of these word bullets released here in Washington shows the Russians to be much more cunning and poisonous in their approach. American information leaflets and radio broadcasts are factual, truthful, somewhat colorless. The North Korean propaganda is exaggerated, skillful in playing on people's weaknesses and prejudices, frequently repeating lies to drive home points.

In their pamphlets and leaflets, the Communists use many cartoons. In these drawings, President Syngman Rhee of Korea, General MacArthur and all Americans are drawn to look like Japs. The Koreans hate the Japs. Tricks of this kind make quick impressions on the gullible peasants.

A copy of one Communist, plane-dropped leaflet sent back to Washington shows a South Korean officer ordering two South Korean soldiers to shoot a girl and a woman, "Who orders you to shoot your own people?" asks the caption. "Kill those vile officers and come to North Korea," it directs.

By contrast, one typical American-prepared leaflet dropped on the North Koreans carries a picture of General MacArthur with the caption, "Listen each day at 2100 Korean time, over 950 kilocycles, to truthful news broadcast from General MacArthur's headquarters."

On the other side of this leaflet is a prisoner of war warning, "Personnel of the Armed Forces of North Korea * * * who are taken into custody of Armed Forces now under my command * * * will be treated in accordance with humanitarian principles * * * I will hold responsible any individual acting for North Korea who deviates from these principles. MacArthur."

Other American-dropped leaflets show pictures of President Truman with some of his recent pronouncements, the United Nations flag with excerpts from the UN resolutions on Korea, pictures of United States jet-plane fights, with more notices of news broadcasts and the slogans, "Ever increasing aid is on its way. Korea is not alone in her hour of need."

Voice of America broadcasts beamed at Korea have been stepped up. Some of the programs originate in the United States. Most are recorded and rebroadcast from local stations in Japan and Korea.

A 15-minute daily UN broadcast in Korean, originating in New York, is rebroadcast from Japan. This program plays up the angle that 50 countries have now joined in support of the South Korean Republic, and are united to put down North Korea.

As soon as hostilities broke out, the State Department's United States Information Service staff in Korea went to work on keeping up the morale of the South Korean people and preventing the spread of panic. The small USIS staff under James L. Stewart, a young public affairs officer, was driven out of Seoul almost immediately. So it lost facilities of the higher powered stations in the capital.

But there were four smaller stations in South Korea. They have been used constantly to help stabilize internal conditions and to offset Communist propaganda.

One of the principal assignments has been in trying to keep the roads clear, and to direct the movement of civilian refugees so they won't interfere with troop movements and supplies. Posters and sound trucks also have been used for this purpose.

These same radios tell the North Koreans their communication lines are being cut, their tanks are being destroyed; that more opposition is coming, that they can't win.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop which appeared in the July 27, 1950, issue of the Washington Times-Herald, with respect to the Katyn massacre:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Why does the Voice of America fear to broadcast the facts it knows concerning the infamous Katyn massacre?

It has given orders to its Polish expert, Jozef Czapski, specifically not to mention the Katyn case, even though that one has special meaning to Americans who have recently seen pictures of United States soldiers shot with their hands tied behind their backs.

This order, therefore, closes the mouth of one who knows the facts. For Czapski, in World War II, was sent to Moscow by the Polish Government in exile, to hunt for the 10,000 to 18,000 Polish army officers who had disappeared into Russia never to reappear.

The Katyn massacre title to the story of these missing officers comes about thus:

As Germany crashed into Poland from one side in September 1939, and Russia from the other, thousands of Poles were invited by Russia to hide behind the Soviet borders.

Long and difficult negotiations were necessary to get any of them out, afterwards. And the officers above-mentioned disappeared without trace.

Then, in 1943, the Germans broadcast to the world that in the Katyn forest they had discovered mass graves, all grown over with trees, in which the missing Poles were found.

The Germans said the Russians had done the massacre. The Russians blamed the Germans. And what did the evidence say? I print below some from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that speaks for itself:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D. C.,
October 6, 1949.

The DIRECTOR, MILITARY INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Some time ago I inserted an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding the murder of several thousand Polish officers, probably by the Russians.

It has recently come to my attention that certain British and American officers were taken to the scene of the execution of these men while such officers were prisoners of the Germans.

It has been rumored that at least two of the American officers were Lt. Col. John Van Vliet, Jr., now stationed at Fort Lewis, Wash., and a Captain Stewart, otherwise unidentified.

It is quite possible that a committee will be formed to investigate this matter officially, and the purpose of this letter is to inquire whether or not the above-named officers have made a report on this matter and, if so, whether such report is available. If so, I would be very much pleased to receive a copy of the same.

Thanking you in advance, I am

Very sincerely yours,

GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
GENERAL STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY,
Washington, D. C., October 19, 1949.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DONDERO: Reference is made to your letter of October 6, 1949, in which you request information on a report of the Katyn massacre. The Intelligence Division has recently acquired a report on this subject, which was partially based on Lt. Col. Van Vliet's observations of the German exhumation of the Polish graves at Katyn in 1943. The report is classified, and therefore cannot be released at this time.

In the event this report is declassified, it will be a pleasure to furnish you a copy.

Sincerely yours,

S. LEROY IRWIN,
Major General, GSC,
Director of Intelligence.

Now, if the Germans were guilty, nobody would have ordered the evidence "classified" and thereby sealed off from public knowledge.

Instead, the criminals would have been denounced from the housetops long ago.

Arthur Bliss Lane, former United States Ambassador to Poland, has formed up an organization called The American Committee for the Investigation of the Katyn Massacre, Inc., to pursue the disclosure of known facts in the case.

This committee has just had the clamps put on it by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which says that its purpose of investigating one of the great murder mysteries in world history is not tax exempt in the meaning of the clause that lets so many such projects get by.

And the Voice of America directs Czapski, who knows the story of Katyn inside out, to keep silent on it.

Why? It would seem that if any episode in all the bloody book of communism illustrates the Soviet technique of deception and death, the Katyn massacre does.

It should be instructive to Koreans, north and south.

Why the hush-hush?

Answer: To tell the story of Katyn would not only show up Russia, but also would embarrass the record of the State Department, which couldn't believe the facts when it heard them in 1943.

On Prices and Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 27 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared entitled "On Prices and Profits," together with some news items and the letter from the Malleable Iron Range Co. on the same subject.

There being no objection, the statement, articles, and letter, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON PRICES AND PROFITS

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

Congress should immediately investigate ways and means of halting the rising prices and irresponsible profiteering now taking place at the expense of the American people.

Recent drastic price rises are unpatriotic and dangerous in that they can lead only to inflation and hardship for the American people, the American Government, and the American defense effort.

War profiteering and price gouging should be branded as un-American activities. Those who rig prices to take advantage of a critical international situation are guilty of undermining the strength and productivity of our country. Our industrial production and the faith and confidence of our people can be seriously injured by drastic price increases and the creation of false shortages of critically needed materials.

The Congress must act to halt the unmerited, unpatriotic, and dangerous price gouging which is now taking place at the expense of the American people. While our Government and our people mobilize themselves to resist aggression and protect the dignity and prestige of the United Nations as the only means of preserving world peace, a few speculators on the American market are engaging in the irresponsible practice of price gouging in an attempt to profit from the invasion of South Korea at the expense of the American defense effort.

There is today no shortage in the market. Price rises are without basis of economic fact. The supply, particularly in food products, is abundant. The price rises as they are now taking place are the product of manipulation and not the product of supply and demand. This can only result in inflation which in turn will cause hardship for the American people, the American Government, and the American defense effort.

The irresponsible speculators, whether they be processors, retailers, or manufacturers, must be curbed.

Price rises have been so high since the invasion of South Korea that with markets at their present levels, rearmament would cost our Government today close to 10 percent more than would have been the case when hostilities first broke out in Korea.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has recorded price advances of almost 10 percent in its index of 28 key commodities since June 25. Included in the list of sensitive items are such goods as rubber, tin, wool, zinc, copper, lead, and cotton.

Cotton jumped from $5.59 to $9.90 a 500-pound bale on the New York market, sending prices from 5 cents to 6 cents per pound above 10 days ago.

The American Woolen Co., the world's largest manufacturer of woolen and worsted fabrics, announced in New York price increases ranging from 12½ cents to 17½ cents a yard on all worsted goods for men's and women's clothing. This is the second increase by this company in 2 months.

The A. & P. announced an increase in coffee prices of from 4 cents to 5 cents per pound.

Wool has increased 5 cents per pound.

Wheat is up as much as 2⅜ cents per bushel.

Lard has increased 60 cents per hundredweight.

Increases ranging as high as 17 percent for rubber, 14.8 percent for print cloth. Rubber set a postwar high of 36.5 cents per pound. Print cloth was at 17.8 cents per yard for the first time since July 1948.

Hides, which can directly affect the prices of shoes and leather goods, have now set new 1950 highs at 26.5 cents per pound.

During the past month we find a 26-percent rise for rubber; 19.6 percent for hogs; 18.7 percent for print cloth; 13.6 percent for resin; 12.7 percent for cocoa, 11.5 percent for coffee.

At the start of this year natural rubber was priced just above 18 cents per pound in New York; it is now 34 cents. Tin was 77 cents per pound just before the Korean outbreak; it was 83 cents this week. On July 3 pepper was selling for $1.33 per pound in New York; it sold for $1.55 last week.

If the American market cannot so discipline itself and control itself and act responsibly in this crisis, it is necessary that the Congress act immediately to bring about a roll-back in prices at least to the June 25 level.

[From the Washington Post of July 23, 1950]

HEAVY FOOD BUYING HELD UNWARRANTED

(By John W. Ball)

Uncle Sam told the country last night not to get alarmed about any shortage of food, "even if the Korean situation results in some increase in military procurement."

"Speculative buying and price increases are not warranted," the Bureau of Agricultural Economics said, in its regular mid-year report on the national food situation.

Supplies available to civilians are expected to continue at about the same high level as in the past 2 years, it added. In spite of possible demands by enlarged Armed Forces, supplies for civilians will not be noticeably affected.

"The principal effect of the Korean situation on food for the next 6 months is likely to be the strengthening of consumer demand as employment and consumer income rise with the impact of an accelerated defense program," BAE continued. "Although mobilization will be stepped up, military purchases are not expected to have a substantial effect on the over-all demand for food products this year."

4-PERCENT PRICE RISE LIKELY

Food prices are "unlikely to rise more than 3 or 4 percent above the July level," the report added. However, even that reassurance virtually promised a sharp increase over recent costs.

Coincident with the BAE report, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that between May 15 and June 15, before the Korean attack, food costs jumped 2.1 percent. (That means that a family that spent $100 on food early in May had to pay $102.10 for the same food in June.)

The BLS index is out of date already. The Korean fighting, that brought sharp price increases in nearly every food category, started a week after June 15—the last date of the BLS report.

BAE went on to discuss the recent buying panic that swept the country.

"There has apparently been some speculative buying and price increases in food in recent weeks substantially similar to those occurring in 1939, which receded as soon as consumers realized that food supplies were adequate," it said. "The current food supply is again such that speculative buying is not warranted."

FOOD OUTPUT SAME AS 1949

Other high lights in the report included:

1. Food production this year is expected to be about the same as in 1949, 88 percent more than the 1935–39 average and 20 percent above 1941.

2. Stocks of most foods are substantial.

3. Exports have been and are expected to continue smaller than during last several years.

4. Average consumption per person is expected to be 11 percent higher than 1935–39 and a little above 1941, the all-time high before World War II.

5. Meat supply will be at least as good as last year and better than the years before World War II.

6. Wheat and corn crops may be about 200,000,000 bushels short of 1949, but carryover stocks are very large. Supplies will be plentiful.

7. Fruit crops are smaller than last year. However, large stocks of processed fruits and vegetables are available rom 1949 packs.

UPWARD TREND REVERSED

8. There will be some increase in eating of pork, poultry and eggs, frozen vegetables, sweetpotatoes, vegetable oil products, and sugar. A drop was predicted in consumption of beef, veal, fresh fruits, and butter.

A reversal of the upward trend that had marked the commodity markets for recent weeks was registered yesterday. Only one item—lard—managed to maintain a firm tone.

Wheat was down 1 to 1½ cents a bushel; corn one-eighth to 2 cents lower; rye 1¾ to 2¾ cents lower.

July oats were down the full limit for 1 day's trading—6 cents. Soybeans crashed down as much as 8 cents a bushel.

New York reported a sharp drop in wholesale meat prices, although livestock quotations held nominally steady in Chicago. One New York firm reported drops of 4 to 16 cents a pound on lamb and pork.

The American Meat Institute in Chicago predicted meat will continue downward as soon as the panicky buying has spent itself. People have now filled their freezer lockers, it said, and a down movement can be expected.

LIQUOR WHOLESALERS BLAMED

Announcement that several large distilleries were allocating deliveries of straight or

bonded whiskies, as well as increasing prices on some brands, was blamed on apparent hysterical buying.

However, this time it wasn't the public to blame, the distillers admitted. Chief offenders are wholesalers who are trying to build up their stocks of the kinds of whiskys that were shut off during the war. Retailers, bars, night clubs, hotels, etc., were reported loading up with similar supplies, particularly Scotches and bonded bourbons.

Howard T. Jones, head of the Distilled Spirits Institute here, called the action foolishness. Jones said he feared some people in the industry started the story because it was good for sales.

"I'm afraid," he said, "a lot of warnings about allocations and higher prices came from salesmen."

Jones pointed out that there are about 640,000,000 gallons of whisky now in bond, compared with roughly 450,000,000 gallons in 1941.

Liquor stores reported they were having trouble getting bonded liquors, although none reported any extensive public buying. Prices of some brands were marked up, they said. Wholesale prices of I. W. Harper, for instance, were up $7 a case. Deliveries for Old Granddad were virtually shut off yesterday.

Among companies either allocating orders, or planning to, are Brown-Forman, Park and Tilford, Schenley, Continental, Kinsey, and W. A. Haller. The brands affected are Old Hickory, Charter Oak, County Fair, Old Forrester, Old Charter, Ancient Age, and Gibson's, and Kinsey and Philadelphia.

Market basket price changes shown by the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported the following average prices on June 15 for 25 of the 50 foods checked in the Washington price analysis:

Food	Unit	Average price (cents)	Percent change from previous month	Range of prices
Flour	5 pounds	51.8	+0.2	39-59
Vanilla cookies	do	43.8	+1.9	35-64
Round steak	do	100.9	+6.2	89-100
Chuck roast	do	59.7	+6.0	55-70
Veal cutlets	do	111.6	+2.7	89-139
Pork chops	do	79.1	+0.9	69-89
Bacon	do	64.7	+4.0	55-79
Ham, whole	do	63.9	+4.1	55-73
Butter	do	75.6	+0.4	68-89
Eggs	dozen	52.9	+6.1	49-60
Apples	pound	16.5	+23.1	10-21
Oranges	dozen	46.4	+6.9	37-69
Green beans	pound	15.6	−27.8	12-21
Lettuce	head	16.1	−17.9	12-28
Potatoes	15 pounds	79.3	+8.6	68-125
Sweet potatoes	Pound	10.7	−8.5	5-14
Tomatoes, fresh	do	34.2	+66.8	24-45
Peaches	No. 2½ can	27.2	+1.5	22-39
Corn	No. 2 can	17.2	−3.9	14-22
Tomatoes	do	14.2	+4.4	10-19
Navy beans	Pound	15.2	−1.9	13-23
Coffee	do	74.3	−.5	67-85
Sugar	5 pounds	47.9	−.1	46-55
Lard	Pound	17.2	+3.6	15-21
Salad dressing	Pint	35.9	+1.4	29-50

[From the Washington Post of July 10, 1950]

KOREA CONFLICT JOLTS UNITED STATES ECONOMIC STUDY

(By Alfred Friendly)

The Korean conflict has presented the Council of Economic Advisers something of a dilemma in the preparation of the President's Midyear Economic Report to Congress.

As of the last week of June, the Council had at hand data showing the United States in a stronger economic position than ever in its history. The Council's problem now, however, is how to figure the impact of the Korean war on the American economy and to suggest to the President what economic legislation, if any, is needed to deal with it.

In view of the Korean affair, the report, expected before the end of this month, cannot now be written in the optimistic and relatively certain terms that had been thought of 2 weeks ago.

The general feeling in the Council, however—for the most part shared among other Federal economists—is that even though the fighting in Korea will be much costlier and more prolonged than originally thought, it would not pose a difficult economic strain on the United States.

BUT THERE'S AN IF

This estimate is, of course, based on the assumption that the conflict will stay localized in Korea and not spread to a world war or anything like it.

It is felt that in the light of the underlying strength of the economy, an increase in military spending up to as much as $5,000,000,000—directly for Korea and indirectly to build up American and Allied strength—could be sustained without dangerous inflation.

Grounds for this belief rest in figures showing the Nation is now producing goods and services at an annual rate of $8,000,000,000 above the previous peak, in late 1948. This is after adjusting for price changes and despite recession in 1949.

Furthermore, indications are that this rate will be boosted another $8,000,000,000 by the end of this year. This would indicate that the economic and production growths of the country are well above the rate of acceleration felt necessary to keep the economy expanding at a safe and healthy rate.

RESERVE INDEX TO RISE

Another sign of economic strength, it was learned, will be found in the Federal Reserve Board index of industrial production for June. It will probably be at 197, or four points above the previous month, and two above the previous all-time record, rung up in November 1948.

A further indication of the expansion and absorbtive nature of the economy is the fact that between May and June, when vacationing students swelled the labor force by 2,100,000, all but 300,000 found jobs at once.

In view of these optimistic signs, the council probably will not advise the President to ask Congress for special control and anti-inflation measures to deal with the impact of the Korean situation.

Although such legislation is felt by some economists as desirable, for standby purposes and for emergency use, it is felt that if the President asked for it, his request would touch off a storm of congressional protest. In an election year, charges might fly that the President was using Korea as an excuse to impose economic dictatorship.

MAY ASK CREDIT CURBS

One piece of control legislation that Mr. Truman probably will request, however, is restoration of the wartime power of the Federal Reserve Board to limit consumer credit and installment buying.

The President has consistently asked for this authority ever since it lapsed after the war, and believes it necessary, quite apart from the Korean situation.

Consumer credit outstanding is now at the highest dollar level in history, although in proportion to national income, the ratio is not unusual or abnormal.

CORPORATE GIANTS REPORT RECORD PROFITS AND SALES

(By Sam Dawson)

NEW YORK, N. Y.—Record profits are reported today by some of the Nation's biggest corporations. Earnings go hand in hand with an all-time high in the volume of sales.

Still other corporate giants, yet to publish their first half statements, are expected to join the happy parade. Many who can't top a record set a few years back are reporting that this year's operations have been well above last year's first half results.

But with few exceptions, the earnings statements which are pouring in now in a steadily rising stream show how very healthy was the Nation's industry when the Reds marched on Korea.

The gains in sales and profits are fairly well distributed among the key industries, although there is much variation in performance by individual companies.

Steels, motors, electrical appliances are expected to lead the profit parade when all the returns are in.

Record sales and earnings are reported by Republic Steel Corp., the Nation's third largest. Six months' profits jumped to $37,700,000 from last year's $25,400,000. A smaller company, Allegheny Ludlum Steel, also reports all-time highs in sales and earnings.

The two giants of the industry, United States Steel and Bethlehem, will report next week, and everyone expects that the stockholders will be very happy. The companies have been operating at near capacity or better most of this year, with some time lost in the coal strike.

General Electric's sales so far this year are 10 percent above a year ago. Its earnings are up 66 percent, from $46,500,000 to $77,400,000. The whopping market for electrical appliances is expected to do great things, too, for the other electrical companies yet to report.

Let's look at some others already in:

Ohio Edison Co.'s profits for 12 months ended June 30 were $13,900,000, compared with $12,600,000 in the preceding 12 months.

Nash-Kelvinator Corp., which makes both autos and home appliances, set new records in sales and earnings in the 9 months ended June 30.

The giants in the auto industry are yet to report, but some are sure to set new records, based on their all-time high output and sales.

United Fruit Co. estimates its first half profits at $34,200,000, a new record, against $24,200,000 a year before.

The oil industry is doing all right, too. Atlantic Refining Co.'s first half earnings jumped to $17,600,000 from $12,500,000 a year ago. Sun Oil Co.'s profits are ahead of a year ago. So are Plymouth Oil's. The largest oil company, Standard Oil (New Jersey), hasn't reported yet, but its top men estimate earnings will be well ahead of last year.

A sharp gain is shown by Johns-Manville Corp. Profits of the big building supply firm went to $10,100,000 in the first 6 months, from $5,700,000 the year before.

The building boom hasn't hurt the earnings of the glass companies a bit. Owens-Illinois Glass Co. profits in 12 months ended June 30, jumped from $13,000,000 last year to nearly $22,000,000 this year. Libby-Owens-Ford Glass Co.'s first 6 months' earnings were $9,100,000 a year ago, but $15,000,000 this time.

Television did all right by Admiral Corp. First half profits are nearly $8,500,000, up from $3,100,000 a year before.

Other companies with profits running ahead of last year include Gillette Safety Razor, Magna Copper Co., Reynolds Metals Co., St. Regis Paper Co., Liggett & Myers Tobacco, and a long list of others.

It's on a sound and prosperous economy that the Nation is starting to build its defense production.

GE FIRST HALF NET $77,445,000 FOR NEW RECORD

SCHENECTADY, N. Y.—The General Electric Co.'s net profit for the first 6 months of this year soared to $77,445,000—a 66 percent boost over the same 1949 period, and a new record for a first half-year.

GE President Charles E. Wilson said the company and its consolidated affiliates had record net sales of $881,050,000 from January 1 through June 30 this year.

The total topped by 10 percent the previous all-time high of $801,757,000 set in the corresponding 1949 period.

GE's old profit mark for the first 6 months of a year was $34,602,000 in 1948.

The record sales and earnings brought good news to company stockholders. GE said a dividend of 60 cents a share of common stock would be paid July 25 for the second quarter of this year.

This brings the total dividend for the 6 months to $1.20 a share. A dividend of $1 was paid for the same 1949 period.

The 1950 half-year earnings were equal to 8.8 cents on each dollar of sales and $1.61 per share of common stock.

MALLEABLE IRON RANGE CO.,
Beaver Dam, Wis., July 17, 1950.

TO MONARCH DEALERS:

Due to increased cost of labor, raw materials, and supplies it is necessary to increase prices approximately 10 percent.

We have been absorbing these increases for some time as we do not believe higher prices are good for any of us; however, we have no alternative under existing conditions.

Yours very truly,

MALLEABLE IRON RANGE CO.,
M. J. MAIER, *Vice President.*

High Costs in the Building-Materials Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, on May 23, 1950, I submitted to the House, House Resolution 610 calling for an investigation of the high costs in the building-materials industry.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from one of my constituents, Mr. George Mardenfeld, who tells of his experience with the soaring cost of lumber:

ROSEDALE, N. Y., *July 23, 1950.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I would like to congratulate you concerning this little clipping which I enclose about the greedy price rise in lumber.

Recently I wanted a small room built on my property next to my garage, and the carpenter told me that the entire job would be $45. Ten days later he came and told me that because of the rise in lumber prices, the price was now $59. It seems that to too many businessmen, greed and more greed is the only rule by which they run their businesses.

Perhaps you can do something about the lumber so that I'll be able to have that room built at a reasonable price, and also, keep your sharp eyes on all types of greedy men who seem to think that there doesn't have to be a reason for them to raise their prices. I'd still like to get that room built.

It is my sincere hope and prayer that the war in Korea will be localized, but with the events and the cold war of the last few years, I'm getting to be a pessimist. But one thing I would like to see, this time, that if one item is controlled, all items should be controlled. The good Lord knows that taxes are going to take wings and fly high, but when the merchants want too much more for their goods, then I and many like myself will ask for a raise, and who knows where that will end? The $1 that's worth 50 to 60 cents might be worth 5 or 6 cents.

Keep up the good work, Congressman, and let's hope that all will come out well.

My best wishes to you.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. MARDENFELD.

Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the refugee situation in central Europe is a blot on the escutcheon of our civilization. These poor unfortunates have had to wander aimlessly with no place to rest their weary heads. Something must be done about this problem. In the name of common decency and humanity, it must be solved. The New York Times has done a good job in publishing a series of articles on the subject of refugees, which I insert herewith. These articles were written by the distinguished correspondent of that distinguished paper, Mr. Michael L. Hoffman. I also insert the letter I sent to the publisher of the New York Times, Mr. Arthur Hays Sulzberger, in appreciation.

The letter and articles follow:

JULY 20, 1950.

Mr. ARTHUR HAYS SULZBERGER,
Publisher, New York Times,
New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. SULZBERGER: I congratulate the New York Times on the publication of the first of 6 dispatches from Michael L. Hoffman concerning the problem of refugees. I look forward with anticipation to reading the additional five dispatches. With your kind permission, I would be pleased to insert the entire series in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

So little is known about the unfortunate plight of these refugees, so many of whom were made homeless and stateless through no fault of their own. Little is also known about the dangerous impact these unfortunate persons have had on the economy of the countries in which they have found temporary haven. It is for these reasons you are rendering a distinguished service in publicizing information and throwing light on the resulting inhumanity and economic displacement created by the plight of the refugees.

Relief and remedy are desperately needed. This is indeed a world problem. We took a small bite of the apple when we passed the Celler Displaced Persons Act. The relief it accords is woefully inadequate. The act contains a provision which encourages the setting up of a commission to study the plight of the Volksdeutsche—the seven or eight million natives of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania and the Baltic countries, who were of German national origin. They were expelled and forced into Germany when those countries were freed by the Allied armies. Their situation is desperate, and although many of them were Nazi sympathizers, not all of them were. In the interests of the rehabilitation of western Germany, if for no other reason, they must be aided and resettled.

The Volkdeutsche does not tell the whole story. There are displaced Italians, Arabs, Jews, and those who have escaped from behind the iron curtain. There are also millions of Asiatic refugees. The world will never be at rest until the problem of these unfortunates is solved. You do well, therefore, to give the public information concerning the facts on the central European refugees and on those who fled from the sadism and terror of the totalitarian countries.

May I be so bold as to suggest that a symposium be held under the auspices of the New York Times, which would be made up of men and women particularly informed on and familiar with this problem. The International Refugee Organization goes out of existence soon. As yet no genuine effort has been made to set up an adequate organization to take its place. I would be more than pleased to help the New York Times in arranging for such a symposium. As chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, which has under its jurisdiction matters concerning immigration and refugees, I am well aware of the difficulties attendant upon the solution of this momentous problem.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

CENTRAL EUROPE'S REFUGEES REMAIN PROBLEM OF THE AGE—JUST THIS SIDE OF THE IRON-CURTAIN CROWD 8,000,000 TO 10,000,000 AS THE IRO MOVES TO END ITS GREAT, HUMANE TASK

(This is the first of six dispatches from a correspondent of the New York Times who has surveyed in central Europe the problems presented by millions of refugees from totalitarianism.)

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

MUNICH.—Between 8,000,000 and 10,000,000 refugees in central Europe are facing a new period of uncertainty as to their fate.

On July 1 the International Refugee Organization, a United Nations agency, turned over to the German and Austrian authorities full responsibility for caring for those refugees hitherto receiving international aid. All over central Europe, posters are proclaiming that the IRO is winding up its operations, including resettlement, March 31, 1951.

Even though the great bulk of today's refugees never qualified for IRO care on the spot or for IRO resettlement, this impending liquidation of the only international organization equipped to handle the large-scale refugee problems, has cast a shadow of fear over the camps, barracks, and hovels in which those who have escaped some form of totalitarian tyranny are surviving and awaiting a chance for a new start in life.

This correspondent has just completed an intensive inquiry into the problems of the refugees as they are today, in the course of which he has visited the most important, although by no means the only region along the borders of the iron-curtain zone facing critical refugee problems.

This is the region from Bavaria through Austria to Trieste. Tens of millions of persons in this critical frontier of the west are refugees, have recently been refugees, expect to be refugees, or feel that refugees are crowding them in their homes.

"This was to be the age of the common man," remarked an Austrian official recently. "I think it is more likely to be known as the age of the refugee." He summed up central Europe's feeling that it was living with a permanent refugee problem.

Perhaps an encouraging sign of the basic strength of Christian civilization is that after the brutalizing experiences of the last 30 years, new refugees piling in upon the old, are cared for, not simply shot in desperation, by the people into whose lands they stagger across the mine fields, barbed wire and bullet-swept no-man's lands that bound the Communist world.

Nobody knows how many people there are in central Europe in the broad category of refugees. No government and no organization is responsible for finding out. A minimum figure on the basis of official statistics

is about 8,700,000 for Germany, Austria, and Italy. There are probably nearer 10,000,000.

Who are these persons? From 6,500,000 to 7,000,000 of them are Germans who formerly lived in parts of Germany now under Russian or Polish occupation. Many of these are actually resettled in western Germany, but many are not. All are regarded by the western German authorities as expellees and all are a problem.

From 850,000 to 900,000 are Volksdeutsche—persons of German language and culture formerly living, often for many generations, in Russia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, or Hungary—dumped into western Germany.

FEW IN LINE FOR RESETTLING

Official German figures list 501,000 refugees of other nationalities. Of these the IRO is caring for about 250,000 and it gives legal and political protection to that many more. It is unlikely that as many as 100,000 of these can be resettled before the end of the IRO operations.

None of the German expellees or Volksdeutsche is eligible for any kind of IRO aid.

There are nearly 350,000 registered refugees in Austria of whom 232,000 are Volksdeutsche and the remainder mostly of eastern European nationalities. The IRO is caring for 18,000 now and gives legal and political protection to nearly 26,000 more.

Of these the IRO does not expect to move more than 14,000 out of Austria by the end of March 1951 although only 4,000 are true hard-core cases—that is, old, sick, or otherwise incapacitated persons who cannot emigrate.

There are about 50,000 refugees in Italy of whom some 20,000 are under the IRO care. The IRO is making every effort to move all or nearly all these out of Italy, where conditions facing the refugees not receiving international care are much worse than in Germany or Austria.

GROUP AIDED IN TRIESTE

Some 1,160 refugees from iron-curtain countries are being cared for by the United States military authorities in Trieste.

It is clear that the IRO does not and never has cared for the bulk of the refugee problem in central Europe. It was not given the authority to do so by the governments that established it.

REFUGEES' FLIGHT FROM EAST SCANT—THOSE WHO NOW TRY TO COME OUT THROUGH IRON CURTAIN FACE TIGHTENED HAZARDS—YET SOME DO ESCAPE—WITH IRO ENDING ACTIVITIES, TALLY OF NEW FUGITIVES IN GERMANY, AUSTRIA IS VAGUE

(This is the second of six dispatches from a correspondent of the New York Times who has surveyed in central Europe the problems presented by the presence of millions of refugees from totalitarianism.)

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

SALZBURG, AUSTRIA.—Compared with the millions of refugees already in that part of central Europe outside the iron curtain, the flow of new fugitives from the east has been reduced to a trickle.

With the possible exception of a few rich Hungarians who are still able to buy their way out, western allied and local officials report that nobody is coming out of eastern Europe today merely because he believes life is softer in the west.

When an individual leaves home, risks being shot and chewed by dogs, or imprisonment, or forced labor, crosses dozens, sometimes hundreds of miles of Communist-occupied territory, he only does so in the face of a clear and present danger.

For about 18 miles along the Czechoslovak frontier, a band of territory has been cleared of everyone except identifiable, permanent residents. No Czechs may enter this area without a special pass. If he is picked up in it without a pass, he is summarily convicted of illegal frontier crossing.

TIGHT RULE OF THE BORDER

Near the frontier a smaller band of cleared land is being fenced with barbed wire. Large searchlights sweep all roads and the cleared areas at the frontier. Patrols with dogs pass frequently.

"In the first 3 weeks of June," a young Czech political refugee in Germany told this correspondent, "we know of only seven people that have come out alive. Probably three times that many have been shot and 10 times that many caught alive."

The Hungarian-Austrian border looks from the Austrian side—which is in the Soviet zone—like the no-man's land of World War I. Double or triple lines of barbed wire line the border. Back of this are mine fields throughout a strip 1 or 2 kilometers wide from which all trees, bushes, and buildings have been removed.

Of 700 roads formerly crossing this frontier, only 14 are now usable by persons with the proper papers. The boundary, which even after the separation of Hungary from Austria in 1920 was a more or less nominal frontier for local villagers of the flat Burgenland, is as impassable as if it ran across a crest of the Alps.

The Yugoslav-Austrian frontier does run across a chain of the Alps. It is not barricaded, but it is well guarded by trigger-happy picked O. S. N. A. (Special Political Police) men who will shoot at anything that moves, including the Austrian frontier patrols.

More people have been escaping recently into Austria from Yugoslavia than from any other country. This correspondent talked with nearly 50 of them who had arrived in Villach; most of them knew personally of at least one person who had been shot trying to escape.

REGISTRATION NOW HAPHAZARD

It is impossible to get anything like reliable figures as to the numbers of such fugitives. Because the International Refugee Organization of the United Nations is known to be liquidating, many newcomers do not register with it, even though by so doing they would be entitled to legal and political protection and would receive recognizable identification papers.

Many refugees not only escape the frontier police, but manage to avoid being picked up for many months after being in the west. Some, on the contrary, will appear on two or three registers, having destroyed one set of papers in the hope of getting a better deal at the next place of registration.

The consensus of western allied and west German officials is that, apart from east-zone Germans, from 500 to 1,000 people monthly are coming illegally into Germany.

Because Austria is still under four-power administration, that country is regarded by refugees as less safe than Germany. Many of those arriving in Germany have simply passed through Austria.

"They come to us for 2 or 3 weeks; then they disappear," one Austrian camp manager said. "We think they go 'back' into Germany."

The consensus of western allied and Austrian officials is that 100 to 200 monthly are still entering Austria from the east. But 157 new arrivals were actually registered in the British zone during April. Everyone close to the problem agrees that it is impossible to reconcile the various figures.

Since the 1st of January more than 900 refugees, mostly White Russians and other Russians formerly bearing Soviet passports—although most of them have been out of Russia 30 years—have been recorded as entering Trieste.

One thing is clear: the new refugee problem in the sense of current inflow is a matter of hundreds of persons monthly, not of thousands.

But one thing equally clear from experience is that this situation may change overnight. Within a few days the number of escaping Yugoslavs has mounted and 20 to 30 daily are being picked up in the British zone of Austria.

REFUGEE PRESSURE APPEARS RENEWED—WESTERN EUROPE RECEIVES AGAIN HUNDREDS EARLIER THOUGHT SETTLED BY THE IRO—OTHERS FROM YUGOSLAVIA—PROBLEM OF THE WHITE RUSSIANS WHO MUST MOVE ON ANEW IS AMONG THE MOST PERPLEXING

(This is the third of six dispatches from a correspondent of the New York Times who has surveyed in central Europe the problems presented by millions of refugees from totalitarianism.)

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

SALZBURG, AUSTRIA.—Creation of new refugee groups appears to be a permanent characteristic of totalitarian states.

Although the movement of people escaping Communist countries has recently been reduced, all the new arrivals in the west with whom this correspondent has talked agree that the flow may increase again. New avenues are discovered. New pressures develop within the eastern countries.

There are even groups of "refugees from refugee camps," who are victims of jurisdictional disputes between western governments or organizations or even branches of the same organization, losing status in one place and unable to gain status in another.

There are, finally, refugees coming back to Germany and Austria from places to which they had gone for resettlement, notably Israel. More than 700 Jews have returned to Germany from Israel this year. Austrian authorities guess that 200 to 300 have returned to Austria.

DOUBLE PROBLEM CAUSED

These people have lost all their rights to international care or assistance. They are a double problem, because the word they spread about conditions in Israel is making it difficult to persuade other Jews to go there.

The best current example of why it is hopeless to count on some definite end to the influx of new refugees is the movement of White Russians out of Yugoslavia. As recently as a year ago, no responsible western official would have dreamed that the White Russians in Yugoslavia would be a refugee class.

Yet, according to some White Russians to whom this correspondent recently talked, from 5,000 to 6,000 of these people who had been settled in Yugoslavia since the time of the Bolshevik revolution are being expelled by the Yugoslav Government. Everyone must go, even those who married Yugoslav women.

The White Russians interviewed said the expulsion had started in December 1949. All said that no question of political affiliation was involved—after all, these are the people who were the first refugees from Russian communism. They are pitiful victims of the Tito-Cominform split.

The White Russians themselves believe most of their community is being sent to the Cominform countries, especially Bulgaria and Rumania. Nobody knows why, but the Soviet Government, which will not accept these people in Russia—even if they wanted to go, which they don't—permits them to go to satellite lands, where their fate is unknown.

SOVIET GOVERNMENT'S POSITION

Despite this opinion of the refugees themselves, 1,700 are said by British sources to be in a camp just across the Austrian frontier, apparently placed there by the Yugoslavs preparatory to their being pushed into Austria. Many are coming out into Trieste.

No more tragic group of refugees exists. Wholly unassimilable into the Austrian economy, twice forced away from homes they had built in reasonably satisfactory places to raise their children, ineligible for any existing form of international resettlement aid, these White Russians are just about as hopeless cases as can be imagined. Yet there are children among them for whom the elders still have hope.

Western allied and Austrian officials are apprehensive that another large impending inflow will materialize.

Fifty gypsies showed up one day at the Salzburg reception camp with three horses, a cow and about 25 dogs. They were all from Czechoslovakia. According to these new arrivals, nearly 12,000 gypsies in Czechoslovakia are moving out. They are all supremely confident that the International Refugee Organization will resettle them—whatever resettling gypsies might mean.

This is an entirely false hope, because, like the rest of the new arrivals, they are postdeadline cases under the rules of the United Nations agency. Anybody arriving since October 15, 1949, is ineligible for IRO care or resettlement assistance.

Nobody familiar with recent history doubts that there will be other groups forcibly ejected or simply determined to migrate from some other country or other. Many western allied officials fear that when the occupations end, the Germans and Austrians themselves will forcibly eject many non-Germanic refugees, despite repeated official assurances that nobody will be forced to return to an iron-curtain country.

There is no evidence whatever that the kind of problem that was regarded as necessitating international refugee aid in the past is diminishing. It is the unanimous opinion of all those persons wrestling with refugee problems with whom this correspondent has talked, civilian and military alike, that the basic assumptions of past United States policy on refugees are very badly wrong.

GERMANY, AUSTRIA ENDURE REFUGEES—OFFER THEM NECESSARY CARE BUT RESENT THE DRAINS ON NATIONAL ECONOMIES

(This is the fourth of six dispatches from a correspondent of the New York Times who has surveyed in central Europe the problems presented by the presence of millions of refugees from totalitarianism.)

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

VIENNA.—Despite the difficult economic circumstances of their own peoples neither the Austrian nor German authorities are letting the newly arrived refugees starve.

Neither the Austrian nor German authorities on the other hand feel that it is right for the end of the International Refugee Organization to mean that the sole responsibility for what they regard as a problem for the whole non-Communist world should rest upon them.

Western Allied officials are fearful that as the control of the occupation authorities is relaxed the German and Austrian Governments will resort to extreme pressure and even forcible repatriation to reduce the numbers of foreigners dependent on their economies. Some western Allied officials in Austria say that local frontier units already are driving refugees back at gun point, although this is contrary to Austrian Government policy.

While the procedure differs according to country and zone of occupation, generally the first thing that happens to a new escaped person is that he is arrested for having no papers. He is sent to some kind of collecting center, deloused, receives some clothes if there are any available, fed, and put in a barracks. He is questioned by the local police. He is questioned by the western Allied counterintelligence. Sometimes all this takes 2 weeks.

GERMANS REGISTER REFUGEES

In Germany, a new refugee is generally registered with the International Refugee Organization to whom he may henceforth appeal for aid in case his legal rights under German law are infringed.

In Austria with the end of the refugee organization's responsibility for the care of the camps, the new arrivals generally do not register with that organization. No effort is made by Austrian authorities to have them do so. In Trieste there is no refugee organization representative.

In Germany the refugees go from a reception camp to some other camp where they are cared for by the Germans under the general supervision of the occupation authorities. As the new arrivals are ineligible for resettlement by the refugee organizations and as German authorities give Germans preference in employment, this camp is often the end of the road unless some relative in Germany or elsewhere in Europe exists who can get the refugee out of the country.

In Austria, virtually all refugees are put to work almost immediately. They receive jobs from the Austrian Employment Service and are paid the same as Austrians. Of the 300,000 refugees only about 20,000 are receiving relief but more than half of them still live in shabby barracks camps.

Officially when a refugee has received a job he has been "absorbed into the economy." What this means in human terms is that he is doing the most menial of tasks, is living in constant dread of being discharged, is unable to move, and no longer has contact with organizations that might possibly arrange for his emigration and generally disappears from sight.

STILL VIEWED AS REFUGEE

But he is still a refugee and will always be a refugee unless he is a Volksdeutsche. In Germany the Volksdeutsche are automatically considered citizens. In Austria, despite strong Russian objections, many of them are being made citizens.

In Trieste the United States military government is caring for the refugees arriving from Yugoslavia. The Army is taking over where the refugee organization left off and is doing a systematic high standard job. But 1,100 refuges (in addition to nearly 100,000 former residents of the Yugoslav-occupied part of Trieste and former Italian areas incorporated in Yugoslavia) are in Trieste camps with absolutely no chance for work outside the camp, for moving anywhere else or for resettlement.

In Italy there is no possibility for work. The camps are bad and full. The refugee organization has managed to stretch its rules in Italy to continue aid for several thousand persons who would not be eligible under its ordinary date-line rules. But in the opinion of the refugee organization those that reach Italy in the future will probably starve except for what private charity may do.

In human and economic terms the people coming out now are considered by all standards a finer group than the remainder of the original wartime displaced persons still eligible for resettlement. They are mostly young, strong, and ambitious. They are neither idle and rich, nor aged and infirm. They are farmers, small officials, clerks, lawyers, masons, construction engineers, and others employed in professional and semiprofessional work.

A recent curiosity has been the substantial number of Yugoslav deserters from Premier Marshal Tito's army who arrive with full kits. All new arrivals from Yugoslavia agree that the main factor in the current exodus is the appalling food conditions and general living conditions. Refugees describe the conditions simply as impossible. None of them with whom this correspondent talked expected anything after his escape except a chance to work. All of them had heard that somehow, sometime they might get to Australia or America. All of them wanted to know how.

REFUGEE PROBLEM IS RESETTLEMENT—EUROPEAN COUNTRIES PROVIDE RELIEF BUT MAJOR NEED OF MILLIONS IS NEW HOPE—JOB IS VAST IN ITS SCOPE—UN UNIT, NOW ENDING SERVICE, HAS THE ONLY MACHINERY NECESSARY FOR THE TASK

(This is the fifth of six dispatches from a correspondent of the New York Times who has surveyed in central Europe the problems presented by millions of refugees from totalitarianism.)

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

VILLACH, AUSTRIA.—From the international viewpoint, the continuing problem of refugees in central Europe is one of resettlement, not one of relief.

From both the material and the far more important psychological and moral viewpoints the significance of the end of the operations of the International Refugee Organization is that the refugees lose the last visible hope of being able to make a new start in line.

For the older generations there is no such hope, anyway. But as a group of White Russians, refugees for the second time in their lives, told this correspondent: "We would accept anything that looked as if it would mean a chance for our children."

It is because the hope of resettlement is waning that suicides are increasing in the camps. It is because this hope is waning that the younger and stronger members of the new refugee group are showing two tendencies both dangerous to United States interests.

The first is to form highly political groups that conduct their own little cold wars, their own propaganda, their own espionage, and their own agitation within Germany and Austria. These groups are small, but in the end, despite occasional cooperation, they can be regarded by the occupation officials and German and Austrian authorities only as trouble makers.

RESENT UNITED STATES PUBLIC'S STAND

They resent indifference in the United States to their political aspirations and what they regard as United States stupidity about the real situation in their home countries. These groups might be guided into activities of political value to the West. As it is, they are developing into a source of serious trouble.

The second tendency among the newer refugees is to give up and go back. According to western Allied sources, very few will go back. According to many refugees with whom this correspondent has talked, they don't know.

Oskar Helmer, Austrian Minister of the Interior, said that from 1,000 to 2,000 of the Volksdeutsche [expelled German persons], the youngest and best of the group are shortly returning to Hungary in response to the propaganda of the Hungarian Legation in Vienna. In the first 4 months of 1950, 56 Yugoslavs went back to Yugoslavia from the British zone of Austria.

Recent arrivals from Czechoslovakia have told this correspondent that a good many are going back. Western Allied authorities really do not know.

The word that even the few returning carry back about the free west that they have seen from the inside of a camp is not likely to be helpful in keeping the spark of love of liberty alive behind the Iron Curtain.

RELIEF PROBLEM HANDLED

The relief problem proper can be and is being taken care of by local authorities in Austria and Germany where most of the new refugees come and by the military government in Trieste. But no European government can even contemplate engaging in mass resettlement. The west Germans have from 9,000,000 to 10,000,000 refugees from their own former areas to absorb into their overcrowded economy. The Italians

are trying to effect the emigration of more than 1,000,000 of their own people.

The Austrians say the maximum number of Volksdeutsche they want to keep is 100,000. Western Allied sources estimate that 150,000 could usefully be absorbed by Austria. All sources agree that all non-Germans must get out and, western Allied sources add, get out soon if their lot is not to become a world-wide scandal.

It is the universal opinion of all who have any close contact with the problem that unless some organization from outside continues the resettlement work now being done by the refugee organization, a whole generation of children will be lost, political tension between the refugees and local populations will increase, and shabby miserable collections of barracks surrounded by barbed wire will clutter up the landscape around the rim of the Iron Curtain as far in the future as anyone can see.

One of the least understood things about the refugee problem always has been the fact that mass resettlement is an enormous administrative problem. It requires full-time people working in areas of refugee concentration. It requires international communications on a large scale. It requires tons of records. It requires ships and trains.

The International Refugee Organization has the machinery to do the job but this machinery is being dismantled. No other machinery is in existence or in process of construction that can do this job.

Even if immigration laws were eased, even if the doors of every country in the world were opened, not a handful of the refugees could move out of the camps—unless some organization got their papers in order, moved them to embarkation points, put them on ships, and met them on the other side.

To expect this to be done for several million persons by friends, relatives, and charitable organizations is to live in a dream world.

DANGERS FOR WEST IN REFUGEES' PLIGHT—IRON CURTAIN FUGITIVES, FORCED BACK BY LACK OF POLICY, ARE A DESPAIRING PEOPLE—PROBLEM VITALLY HUMAN—CHIEFS OF UNITED STATES OCCUPATIONS IN EUROPE ARE STILL OBLIGED TO IMPROVISE SOLUTIONS

(This is the last of six dispatches from a correspondent of the New York Times who has surveyed in Central Europe the problems presented by the presence of millions of refugees from totalitarianism.)

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

TRIESTE.—The problem posed for United States policy by the millions of refugees now stranded in Central Europe is many sided, but its most critical aspect at this stage of the "cold war" is political.

This is not to say that it is not also an appallingly human problem. Many individual Americans will, as in the past, want to form their judgment of the proper policy of the United States by placing the human element foremost. They will find no better statement of what this human problem is today than that of the International Committee of the Red Cross in the appeal it issued recently from Geneva.

"Whatever complications there may be in individual cases," the appeal said, "one thing stands out and it is revolting to the sense of humanity.

"There are men who find themselves legally and materially barred from ordinary life. For them, the most elementary human rights might as well not exist, for they cannot found a family, recognize a child or, in spite of their longing for a normal existence move to some other place."

THE EDGE OF THE PROBLEM

Much can be done by individuals through organizations such as the National Catholic Welfare, the International Rescue Committee, the American Friends Service Committee and other voluntary groups to alleviate hardship and find new homes for some refugees. But the nature of the problem and the nature of the modern world are such that no individual and no private group can hope to do more than whittle at the edges.

Today's refugees are government-created, not refugees by act of God, and they will remain refugees until a governmental solution is developed to fit their problem.

These refugees present the United States with both dangers and opportunities from the political viewpoint. As seen by those in closest touch with the problem in Central Europe, there are three main dangers.

The first is that the United States will continue to have no political basis for a refugee policy and will just try to muddle through. There is at present no common directive and very little coordination between the United States authorities in Germany and those in Austria.

The German occupation forces govern the admission of refugees from Austria by considerations of purely German orientation, not by considerations based on the whole United States position in central Europe. This is all they can do at present.

The United States authorities in Trieste have practically no knowledge of what is being done about refugees in other occupied military areas.

All are trying to do the best they can, but none is conscious of any overriding United States policy to guide them, because there is none.

OUT THROUGH IRON CURTAIN

Refugees repeatedly report that they have bee ninduced to come out through the Iron Curtain by Voice of America programs. Yet when they come out, they are at first arrested, then turned over to the German or Austrian authorities, not all of whom treat them kindly. If they ever see Americans it is only to hear them say that there is nothing the United States can do for them.

Trieste is the exception, because in Trieste the Western Allied forces are running camps. But even in Trieste the refugee finds he has reached the end of the road when he enters a camp.

A second danger is that under present circumstances as the refugees are left as burdens on the local economy, they become hated and discriminated against more and more and finally persecuted or driven away. This correspondent has been told over and over again by Western Allied officials on the spot:

"It is all right now, but the minute we get out of here, these people are in for it."

The Germans, Italians, and Austrians rightly or wrongly consider the refugees a United States problem, not theirs, and they treat the refugees accordingly.

The refugees own political activities add to the strain. There is danger among those who settle in Germany or Austria of the growth of Fascist-type parties living on the bitter stimulus of revenge. There is danger among the non-Germans of violent outbreaks against German or Austrian authorities.

If this were Brazil or Australia, the United States might be able to afford simply to watch local solutions work out; but this area, 100 miles wide, borders the Iron Curtain.

THOSE WHO DESPAIR

The third danger is that even a small number of persons going back after becoming hopeless about the west will undermine the United States' effort to convince the people of the satellite states that they are not forgotten.

"Are we," one Czech refugee wrote in a despairing letter to the International Refugee Organization of the United Nations, "to go back and strengthen those who are against you, forsaken by the free world?"

A new approach to the refugee problem would have to be based on some decision as to whether the United States does or does not want to encourage people oppressed by the Communist regimes to seek asylum in the west. This is fundamentally a political decision.

If it does not, the Voice of America and the United States missions should cease encouraging people to come out and the United States should insist that those who do come out are sent back. That would quickly stop the outflow.

The United States and the local authorities so far refused to send people back. Thus, by implication, the decision already has been made, but it has not been consciously made and it has not been followed up by consistent action.

POSSIBILITIES IN THE WEST

Only in Germany have refugees from the Soviet-occupied zone been required to prove that they are political refugees in order to remain in the west. This policy in west Germany was adopted from absolute necessity in view of the overwhelming numbers that would otherwise flood westward.

If the western world is to be the asylum for victims of Communist oppression, then the United States must accept the responsibilities of that policy. In conjunction with the European governments, it must decide how many additional people can be settled in western Europe. Most European governments already have studied this question in great detail.

For the rest, which will certainly number several million persons, some other place of settlement must be found. Only the United States can mobilize western governments to act in this matter; only the United States could finance such resettlement; only the United States can force other western governments to cease regarding refugees solely as manpower to fill the need of national economies and to start dealing with them as a matter of urgent socio-political importance for the future of western civilization.

The refugees from communism on the whole are good people. They make good settlers. They would make up strong communities of people who know what communism means in the parts of the world where the Communists are still gaining among the dissatisfied. Many of the new arrivals would make good soldiers.

Possibilities for turning the refugees into useful citizens of the world are enormous. But unless the United States Government acts, and acts soon, most of them will rot in camps, degenerate into near-slaves, or die in desperate revolt against their present unhappy lot.

Giuseppe Garibaldi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago—on July 30, 1850—Giuseppe Garibaldi landed in New York City. His arrival had been eagerly awaited. Not only the Italian community, but all of those who had followed the general's heroic struggle for Italy's independence were anticipating his appearance with excitement.

Driven from his homeland, Garibaldi had first gone into exile in Tangier a few

months before. Here he dreamed of returning to the sea—taking the wheel of a vessel of his own once again; but this time beneath the flag of the United States. His loyal followers in Italy had promised to subscribe enough money to make the purchase of a vessel possible. His friend Francesco Carpanetto was to secure it for him.

The general turned to the American consulate in Tangier for American papers and for the right to place his ship under American registry. Unfortunately, this was impossible under the circumstances, although the consul made every possible effort to obtain a special dispensation to fulfill the general's hopes. Failing this, and each day feeling greater pressure from the north African government who seemed intensely embarrassed by his presence, he decided to sail for this country. Here he could find protection against his enemies, and here he could take steps to acquire the American ship of which he dreamed. Carpanetto agreed to purchase a ship for him in this country or have it built under his supervision. Garibaldi took passage for Liverpool and thence to the United States.

The New York Tribune for July 30, 1850, carried the following paragraph:

> The ship *Waterloo* arrived here from Liverpool this morning, bringing the world renowned Garibaldi, the hero of Montevideo and the defender of Rome. He will be welcomed by those who know him as becomes his chivalrous character and his services in behalf of liberty.

A brilliant popular demonstration had been planned for his arrival. He was to be met at the Battery, welcomed by Mayor Woodhall, and then riding at the head of a great procession was to proceed to the Astor House where a room had been placed at his disposal. The general declined all of these honors. His refusal stemmed from two causes.

First, he had been seized by a severe attack of rheumatism in the course of the ocean passage, and he was unable to walk or take part in such festivities. And second, his natural modesty and his fear of excessive political demonstrations, led him to decline the tributes and ovation.

In his letter to the planning committee, Garibaldi declared in his usual dignified and gracious manner:

> I regret being obliged to announce to you that my continued ill health will forbid my participating in your proposed demonstration of Saturday next. * * *
>
> No such public exhibition is necessary to assure me of the sympathy of my countrymen, of the American people, and of all true republicans in the misfortunes which I have suffered, or of the cause out of which they have flowed.
>
> Though a public manifestation of this feeling might yield much gratification to me, an exile from my native land, severed from my children, and mourning the overthrow of my country's freedom by means of foreign interference, yet believe me that I would rather avoid it, and be permitted, quietly and humbly, to become a citizen of this great Republic of freemen, to sail under its flag, to engage in business to earn my livelihood, and await a more favorable opportunity for the redemption of my country from foreign and domestic oppressors.
>
> Next to the cause to which I have devoted myself, I value nothing so highly as the approbation of this great people, and I am convinced I shall enjoy that, when they become satisfied that I have honestly and faithfully served the cause of freedom, in which they have themselves set so noble an example to the world.
>
> G. GARIBALDI.

Regrettably, Garibaldi's stay in the United States was filled with disappointment. The ship for which he had made such plans failed to materialize. Carpanetto was unable to collect the money for its purchase, and the general was forced to abandon the project.

Rather than become a burden to his friends, he set out to find work for himself. He was determined not only to support himself, but he needed money to send to his wife who was attempting to preserve a home in Italy. One of his officers, Antonio Meucci, had just established a candle factory on Staten Island. He offered the general a position in the little plant, and Garibaldi accepted with gratitude. The great vat where the Italian Washington stirred tallow beside his American friends has been preserved to this day.

Notwithstanding his appreciation of the help which had been given him, Garibaldi's life in New York was most unhappy. He and his friends attempted to obtain a Presidential appointment in the Post Office Department, but failed. He spoke English with great difficulty, and his close friendships were limited to the people with which he lived.

Yet throughout his 10-month stay in this country he received a flood of letters and testimonials from American supporters and well-wishers. It was said, "Everywhere he won respect by his modesty, simplicity, and thorough integrity of character, as well as by his pure patriotism and firm faith in the future of Italy."

A few Americans were able to pass his wall of dignity and reserve. Theodore Dwight helped him in many ways, and it was to him that Garibaldi entrusted the manuscript of his memoirs. William Cullen Bryant knew him, and Henry Theodore Tuckerman obtained his permission to paint his portrait while he remained here.

Yet it was with a feeling of release that he welcomed his friend, Carpanetto early in April 1851. Carpanetto, an enterprising trader in his own right, sought to compensate the general for his failure to produce the promised boat. Would he like to accompany him on a voyage to South America? Garibaldi seized the opportunity with relief, and sailed for Peru on April 28, 1851. From this point on, the tide of his fortunes turned, and the road led straight to his ultimate victories and Italy's freedom and independence.

It is with regret that we recall the disappointments and melancholy months which he experienced in our country. Yet we cannot help but feel both pride and gratitude that our Nation and our city were given the opportunity of providing asylum in his months of exile. In the years past, the nations and leaders of the world have looked to America as the champion of freedom and liberty. One hundred years ago Garibaldi turned to us for help in his struggle to achieve these things for his people. America was to him a place of strength and refuge.

It is our responsibility to see that America will always have this place in the mind of the world's people. We must guard this reputation with all the vigor we possess as a Nation. We must see to it that we will always represent the strong right arm in the fight of any oppressed people in their struggle for freedom, liberty, and the right to live their life peaceably in the traditions of their native lands.

Evidence of Communist Sponsorship of False Peace Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily I would not place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD anything appearing in the Daily Worker because I realize fully that it is the official voice of the Communist Party in this country.

However, in connection with the so-called peace petition campaign initiated and now being pushed by the Communist Party, I think it is important we should all have available to us the conclusive evidence from the pages of this official spokesman of the Communist Party in this country as to the sponsorship of this petition. With that in mind, I requested that our legislative reference service check its files and furnish this evidence to me.

On the front page of the issue of June 18 in scare headlines and in a block 9¾ by 4 inches, occupying approximately one-third of the page, the following was printed: "Youth Roll Up Names For Peace; Goal: 1,000,000." In the upper right-hand corner of this page is a cartoon showing the figure of death holding a bloody scythe with a storm of these fake petitions falling about the figure, five of them being identically headlined with the words: "Outlaw atomic warfare."

On page 3 is an article entitled: "Youth Roll Up Names for Peace." The article is as follows:

> Teen-agers and young Americans of draft age are embarked on a whirlwind campaign to get a million signatures to ban the A-bomb. With 50,000 names of youngsters on their petition lists in little over 2 weeks, they are confident they can reach the million mark within shortly after summer's close.
>
> "We have just started rolling," Miss Dorothy Gottlieb, administrative secretary of the group, said. It is the Sponsoring Committee for the World Peace Appeal, whose main office is in New York.
>
> Co-chairmen are the Reverend Frederick B. Jansen, rector, St. James Episcopal Church, West Somerville, Mass., and Miss Estella Freeman, shop chairman, Local 836,

AFL Retail Clerks of Philadelphia. Miss Freeman, a Negro worker, is one of the outstanding youth leaders in that city.

The Reverend Jansen, this week, called upon "all Christian youth" to join with the young of other faiths and colors to ban the A-bomb and to ensure peace.

He said, in a press statement, "There seems to be only one chance in this whole wide world for the youth of all countries to find the opportunity to grow and work with their minds free of the gnawing and debilitating fear of total war."

That chance, he declared, "is a united move of the youth for peace—youth determined to make their leaders acquiesce to the rightful demand for a lasting peace."

The young rector said the task of averting a job rests "upon our shoulders."

"This is no time for Christian youth to turn their backs upon the stark facts of atomic stockpiles, hydrogen bombs and bacteriological warfare. It is time for Christian youth to join hands with their brothers of all races and all creeds and form a solid front against war."

He warned that "in 10 years' time we may no longer have hands to join. Help the cause of man and God" he pleaded "by joining the World Youth Appeal."

The organization has charted a whirlwind program to get those million signatures. It includes caravans across the country, house to house and street petitioning in the industrial centers, crusades to the farmsides, to the beaches, to all places where youngsters are to be found.

Plans are completed to hold joint meetings at the borders with Mexican, and with Canadian youth. Four caravans for peace are scheduled for New York State alone. A bulletin "A Peal for Peace" is published every 2 weeks.

The 50,000 signatures already received were gotten mostly in New York. Visits to the beaches, to the shops, schools, and parks, resulted in heartening successes. Miss Gottlieb showed the various petitions they have, which include a teen-age petition and one for Spanish-speaking American youth—Puerto Ricans and Mexicans.

Miss Hortense Sie, secretary of the Committee for International Student Cooperation is cooperating with this peace organization. She said all national student organizations in the United States as well as all campuses are being invited to join the crusade for a million names.

Miss Gottlieb asked that all young men and women, as well as teen-agers interested in peace, call the committee at 144 Bleecker Street—Al 4-9822.

Beside this article is a picture entitled: "A President Signs the World Peace Appeal." It represents President Klement Gottwald of Czechoslovakia signing it as Chairman of Parliament. The legend continues that it was reported to him that 9,267,172 people in that country signed the petition in 2 weeks time. Beneath this is a picture entitled: "Teen-Agers Sign the World Peace Pledge." There is another article on that page entitled: "We Buttonholed the First Lad." The article is as follows:

"The word 'peace' has magic that opens doors everywhere" a young peace leader said this week when she told why her group confidently expects to get a million names in several months.

"This is what I mean," Miss Dorothy Gottlieb, administrative secretary of the Sponsoring Committee for the World Peace Appeal explained. "We were in our office writing a letter to Trygve Lie," she said, "and it came lunch time. So we adjourned to a nearby restaurant and continued talking it over. We had written 'Young America wants to thank you, Mr. Lie, for your efforts for peace.' Then one of our associates said, 'We can't say Young America. How do we know all young America wants to do that?' One of us said to him jokingly, 'Just go outside and ask any young American and see what he says.'

"He did that, buttonholed the first lad of about 20, and put the question to him. 'Of course,' was the reply he got. 'I'm for it, I don't want war. Sure, here's my name.'

"The young peace worker returned to the restaurant and said, 'I guess you're right. That would seem to show it.'

"As they talked about it, the woman who owns the restaurant passed by, evidently overheard us. 'So you're working for peace,' the restaurant keeper said. 'Well, why don't you use one of our tables here, and sign them up. You'll get a lot of my customers. I'd like to see it.'

"The invitation was promptly accepted, and as the group spoke a young woman sitting at a nearby table rose and introduced herself. 'I couldn't help overhearing what you were doing,' she said. 'Let me have a few of those petitions. I can get them signed up in the shop where I work.' "

Miss Gottlieb told this story and smiled. "I don't mean to say it's all as easy as that." "But," she added, "this little episode is typical of hundreds which our peace members are encountering. I could tell you scores of similar episodes that took place on the beaches of Brooklyn, in the streets of the Bronx, everywhere we are working. We'll get that million—soon."

The entire first page of section 2 is devoted to an enlarged reproduction of the petition. On page 3, section 2, are two pictures purporting to portray the signing of these petitions at Flint, Mich., on Armed Forces Day. This is accompanied by the following article:

There was no resting for Flint auto workers this Saturday morning. After 5 days of sweating through the grueling speed-up in the General Motors' factories, many looked forward to a late rising and a bit of relaxation in order to gather up enough energy to go back to the routine grind again. So thousands of tired men and women were angry when their rest was disturbed this quiet Saturday morning.

Then it happened. They stretched out across the sky like long fingers to pry into the tranquility of every home. The roar of low-flying jet engines shouted to the slumbering populace. Wake up! Wake up! We are heating up the cold war and you must not sleep. You must get up and see how strong we are arming ourselves to police the world. See our big bombers capable of dropping atom bombs anywhere into the world from bases of every continent.

And they kept coming over—jets, bombers, and all types of roaring, ugly, and bestial weapons of imperialism.

It is 10 a. m. on Saginaw Street—the main street. Already men and women with their children are pouring into the stores for weekly shopping. The department stores, specialty shops, five and dimes are in the heart of the downtown area.

But while the Pentagon brass and the Wall Street merchants of death were drawing up their plans for this day, others with different ideas were also at work.

All through Friday night young auto workers were making colorful posters with peace slogans—ban the bomb, negotiate for peace, end the cold war. Workers' artists did expert jobs portraying on placards the dove of peace, of depicting the horrors of atomic war. These were the Flint auto workers and their families who went to town securing signatures to the petition of the labor peace conference.

And so at 11 o'clock into the troubled and bewildered mass of hurrying men, women, and children there appeared the volunteer of brigades of peace crusaders. Placards were set up at corners with groups of three or four signature solicitors around them. A group at Kearsley Street, and across the street, another on First, at Second Street, and so on.

The sun now shone through the dark hovering clouds and illuminated the posters. A group of ex-GI's pass. Words are exchanged. One GI asks, "Why are you doing this?" The workers answer, "To keep from getting blown up in an A-bomb explosion." Hands are clapsed warmly. Smiling, all three sign.

The people are curious. They read the petition carefully. Many are now signing. A few walk away skeptical. By 12 o'clock 100 people had already signed. The whole town is already discussing peace. Some groups stop along the way to argue some differences—in a friendly sort of way.

It is 2 o'clock. More volunteers have arrived to relieve the early participants. The young people, Negro and white, are outstanding in their enthusiasm as are the women, who are well represented. The youth are especially proud of their poster with the slogan on top of an exploding A-bomb, "This must not be our future—ban the bomb." Already hundreds of signatures are obtained. Discussion grows along the busy streets and is carried on into the shops and homes. Suddenly a racket is heard coming from a side street.

Banging, clanging, and loud noises again disturb the peace. Out of the street come two vehicles—these are the locomotives loaded with the jeering Legionnaires. They shoot firecrackers, ring bells and shout to whip up the war hysteria. Again people are pensive. The decision must be made. Which way to go? One path is the path of the American Legion, the Pentagon, and Wall Street. And of Walter Reuther, the arch agent of American imperialism. The alternative is the path of the peace crusades—the working man and women of Flint.

Hundreds of people are signing the petitions and demonstrating their strong desire for peace. The peace movement is taking roots.

How To Save $10,000,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of July 25:

How To Save $10,000,000,000

Here is a way for Congress to find that $10,000,000,000 Mr. Truman is asking as a down payment on the cost the Nation is called on to pay for the administration's bonehead operations in Korea and elsewhere.

This plan does not call for added taxes. It calls for less costly civil government, and it is not dream stuff. Senator Harry Flood Byrd, Democrat, of Virginia, is the draftsman of its principles.

Senator Byrd is known from one end of the country to the other as a practical authority on government. If he says a thing can be done, it can be done.

Therefore, we offer this program for consideration in full confidence that any citizen can support it who sincerely wants the United States pulled safely through the misadventures of the Truman gang without the destruction of our domestic life.

Last December, Senator BYRD made a proposal to save $5,200,000,000 by cutting back Government domestic expenditures to the 1948 level.

BYRD's plan excluded any reductions in defense of any lessening of stock piling atomic energy, veterans' aid, foreign aid, or interest on the public debt.

The Virginia Senator picked 1948 as a base because it was the soundest postwar year. The budget was balanced in 1948, Government expenditures were trimmed and taxes were cut.

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS ECONOMICAL

It's also worthy of note that the Republican Eightieth Congress was in power that year and received as its reward for work well done a scathing attack from Truman, who called it the "worst Congress" in our history. In 1948 the Federal Government spent $6,400,000,000 on its domestic programs. In the 1951 budget Truman has asked Congress to give him $11,600,000,000 for the same programs, therefore a return to the '48 budget would result in the five and two-tenths billions savings.

However, when Senator BYRD recommended this plan the country was not proceeding into a wartime economy as it is now. It was looking forward to another year in which the Government would be geared to peacetime operations. Now with the abrupt change to wartime operations it is only logical that we follow up Senator BYRD's basic program with even further cuts from the 1948 budget he proposed.

For example, there were two hundred millions in that 1948 budget for work relief. Certainly our increased production demands will wipe out need for any such expenditures. In that budget there were also $100,000,000 for housing. The President in his message recommended knocking out all housing money. There were also in that 1948 budget, five hundred millions for peacetime public works. In wartime such are unnecessary and undesirable.

That budget also carried thirty millions for agriculture support. That can be justified. Another item on which the saving can be made is the three hundred million postal deficit which should be wiped out immediately, regardless of whether we are to operate a peacetime or wartime economy. The Hoover reorganization report gives a full blueprint on how to accomplish this.

If these cuts were made it would bring the savings to six and three-tenths billions.

FOREIGN AID CAN BE CUT

Although Byrd did not recommend slashing the veterans' program for his peacetime budget it appears that there is sufficient room in the six billion asked by Truman in the '51 budget to save at least 25 percent or $700,000,000. In that '51 request, for example, there are two and seven-tenths billions for the veterans' readjustment program. Certainly there will be a considerable cut in such activities as we build up the armed services.

Thus, the domestic cuts would save seven billion.

And we think that since America must tighten its belt again it would be a good time to look at the foreign-aid program for immediate relief. Since the war we have set up approximately 23 foreign-aid programs into which we have poured $35,000,000,000.

The 1950 budget carries three and seven-tenths billions to build up Europe's civilian economy over and above the military aid we are giving.

Considering the lack of response from these countries when the United Nations asked for troops to help our foot soldiers in Korea, it would be a good thing if we stopped some of our dollars from going abroad next year.

There is no valid reason for putting the people in this country on a wartime basis and still keep gouging them to build up peacetime economy in Europe. We will do enough along this line when we begin spending the ten billion for military purposes. We will increase our imports of tin, rubber, etc., and they will get the profits. And beyond that we may expect the administration to siphon off some of the goods as well to increase European munitions production.

Therefore, we urge that the civilian foreign aid be cut to a liquidation figure of $700,000,000. The three billion cut on this item will then bring the total saving to ten billions. This will produce a complete setoff to the ten billions to be spent.

To us it seems that economy is a much sounder method of meeting the increased military costs than burdening the American people with more taxes and more Government controls.

Education and Training of Teacher Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter. This is evidence of one further benefit granted to teacher veterans, through the constructive help of the American Federation of Teachers. The letter follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 1, 1950.

Mr. JOHN M. EKLUND,
President, American Federation of Teachers, Denver, Colo.

DEAR MR. EKLUND: This is in reference to your letter of May 19, 1950, addressed to the Administrator pertaining to continued pursuit of education or training under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, during consecutive summer sessions subsequent to July 25, 1951, by persons engaged in the teaching profession.

The Administrator has determined that in this particular the position of the veteran-teacher in respect of the requirement for continuous pursuit of a course of education or training under the act after the statutory delimiting dates may be said to be unique among other classes of veteran beneficiaries. Accordingly—and only because of the historical aspects of the matter, that is, the long-recognized practice of the members of the teaching profession—it has been determined that an eligible veteran who pursues a course under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, pointing directly to a graduate degree, in a college or university during the summer session 1950, who is regularly employed as a teacher during the school year 1950–51, pursues graduate study under the act during the summer session of 1951 (or is regularly enrolled in a summer term on or before July 25, 1951) and is regularly employed as a school teacher during the school year 1951–52, may be permitted to continue graduate study during successive summer sessions following employment as a teacher during successive school years and that this shall be deemed to be continuous pursuit of his course of education or training within the meaning of the governing law and regulations.

It is to be understood that this determination is limited to the pursuit of graduate study only, that is, in a course leading to a graduate degree, and to situations involving consecutive summer sessions following teaching employment in consecutive, succeeding school years. Where a veteran-teacher ceases to be employed in or for any school year he will not have satisfied the requirements of the regulations pertaining to the continuous pursuit of his course until completion, so far as any succeeding summer session is concerned, and he will have no right to further education or training under the law.

Very truly yours,

H. V. STIRLING,
Assistant Administrator for Vocational Rehabilitation and Education.

Death of Rev. August F. Bender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, July 22, 1950, a rare human spirit passed on into eternity. On several occasions heretofore, I have paid tribute in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the noble qualities of mind and heart which characterized Rev. August F. Bender, pastor emeritus of the Second Dutch Reformed Church in Jersey City and Protestant Chaplain of the Jersey City Police Department, who died on the above date. Pastor Bender, as he was affectionately called, will be deeply mourned and long remembered by most of the citizens of that community. He had borne his cross of disabling illness for several years with resignation and equanimity. He observed to the fullest degree the direction of Sir Aubrey De Vere:

Count each affliction, whether light or grave
God's messenger sent down to thee; do thou
With courtesy receive him, rise and bow.

As an indication of the respect and affection in which this great servant of God was held by his fellow citizens I append herewith editorials from Hudson Dispatch, Jersey Journal, and Jersey Observer respectively, in their issues of July 24:

[From the Hudson Dispatch of July 24, 1950]

PASTOR BENDER'S KINDLY MINISTRATIONS WON'T BE FORGOTTEN

Kindly, lovable, considerate, able Pastor Bender has gone to his reward. We refer to him by the title we personally knew him by for many years, one which we believe he was affectionately greeted by everyone fortunate enough to have known him, One only had to meet the long-time Jersey City clergyman once and he was your friend and you his.

Rev. August F. Bender, pastor emeritus of Second Reformed Church in the Heights section of Jersey City, a church he served for 33 years as pastor, was truly a man of God. He lived the kind of religion he preached and he wore the cloak of kindliness like a shining mantle.

If all those he blessed by his many thoughtful words and acts could be gathered together they would be legion but even if

all his ministrations and benefactions could be recalled and written down, the many volumes that would result still couldn't depict the good he did in his ministry.

For Pastor Bender wasn't only minister to his flock and his community in formal church services or even in his limitless pastoral visits. He was a disciple of the Lord every waking moment. For 32 years he served as Protestant chaplain of Jersey City Fire Department. But his pastorate and chaplaincy were by no means the limit of his services. We have marvelled ever since we first knew him how he could find time to send so many messages of cheer, condolences and greetings as was his wont. How many folk received cards from him when they were ill, when there was death in the family or at Christmastide or Easter can never be estimated. He was a constant writer of verse and many of his poems were published.

Pastor Bender gave up the active pastorate of Second Reformed 4 years ago as of August 1. He suffered from diabetes and for the past several years his life has been one operation and one hospital stay after another. He had undergone amputation of both his legs as his surgeons attempted to halt the ravages of the disease. Each time he rallied, never once complaining and never losing his infectious good humor. After the last surgery, in February of last year, he enjoyed comparative good health until complications set in several weeks ago, resulting in his death Saturday.

All during the series of operations his affliction made necessary, Pastor Bender continued to send cards or phone to others who were bedridden. During his several stays at the Medical Center, the minute he was recuperating after an operation he'd hobble about the wards visiting friends and strangers alike.

In addition to all his other ministrations, the Jersey City cleric took part in all kinds of civic enterprises and in fraternal work. He assisted at one time in raising funds for Irish independence and he was a minuteman in the Liberty Loan drives of World War I. He was active in the Elks, in Masonry, in Red Men, Woodmen of the World, Order of Independent Americans, and Sons and Daughters of Liberty. He was a devoted champion of Americanism. He took an avid interest in fishing and was chaplain of Belmar Fishing Club for many years.

The day that he died was the fifty-fourth anniversary of his marriage to the former Miss Hauser, of Bloomfield, whom he met while he was a student in Bloomfield Theological Seminary. They were married 2 weeks after his ordination.

[From the Jersey Journal of July 24, 1950]

PASTOR BENDER'S DEATH ENDS A KINDLY, USEFUL CAREER

Rev. August F. Bender, pastor emeritus of the Second Reformed Church on Jersey City Heights, who died Saturday, aged 75, after a long illness, was a pastor who knew how to win, hold, and cultivate the affections of a multitude. He was Protestant chaplain for the Jersey City police for many years. He was a mixer in the highest and best sense of the word. His hold on his church, which he did so much to build up in his earlier days, indicated the high regard in which he was held.

The fact that the church retained him as its pastor for 33 years testifies to his popularity. His tenure as head of the church covers the development of Jersey City since 1917, the year Hague became mayor.

He saw Jersey City participate in two world wars and was a leader among those who took more than a passing interest in the youths who left home to risk life and limb for their country. He was active in many civic improvements. He was a devoted chaplain of Americanism and sounded the patriotic note at every suitable opportunity. He preached the religion of kindliness and sympathy, and proved himself a good neighbor inside and outside his fold, over which he presided with a tact and tolerant devotion that won for him a great personal following, now mourning the passing of a fine friend and worthy citizen.

[From the Jersey Observer of July 24, 1950]

THE REVEREND AUGUST F. BENDER

The career of the Reverend August F. Bender, brought to a close by death Saturday, was one in which its statistics are noteworthy. Reverend Mr. Bender was 75 years old. He had been a clergyman of the Reformed Church for 55 years and pastor of the Second Dutch Reformed Church in the Hudson City section of Jersey City for 33 years, retiring in 1945 when he became pastor emeritus. He had held the post of chaplain to the Jersey City police department for 32 years.

But the statistics of those long years of service, impressive as they are, are not the important part of the story of the life of Pastor Bender. That life, centered in service to and spiritual guidance of his flock, was broadened to the extent of making its influence felt through the whole of the heights section and the entire city as well.

Reverend Mr. Bender was a man of highly spiritual character, of mental vigor, and oratorical skill. Before he was stricken with the illness that forced his retirement, he had physical strength that enabled him to meet the calls for addresses and other services that came to him in great number from all parts of the city. He was a member of many civic committees and a leader in charitable and war activities.

The Hudson City minister was also a man of great tolerance and counted as his friends those of all religious faiths. He was a prolific writer of both prose and verse, and many of his writings have appeared in the Jersey Observer, some of them attracting wide and favorable attention. The writings were very often in appreciation of the services of others—tributes to war heroes, clergymen of other faiths, heroic policemen and firemen, and messages inspired by special occasions such as Mother's Day and the great festivals of the church. Always they stressed the embracing love of God for mankind.

In the end, Pastor Bender was called upon to demonstrate courage along with his other fine qualities. His illness necessitated the amputation of one of his legs a number of years ago, but he kept up his work. Even when he lost his other leg in a second amputation, he kept up his keen interest in the affairs of the city and was ever ready to take up his pen in praise of the accomplishment of some group or individual. His cheery outlook despite his misfortune deepen the respect and admiration he had won from all who knew him over the long period of his pastorate. Now he has achieved the peace of God he so often prayed for others.

Development and Production of Low-Grade Iron Ores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced H. R. 9202 to provide long-term RFC loans for the development, production, and utilization of low-grade iron ores.

The supply of low-grade iron ore in northern Michigan is practically unlimited. Development and production in this field would create a stabilized and expanding mining industry for many years to come.

Most of this country's high-grade iron ore is produced in northern Minnesota and northern Michigan, but this great supply is not inexhaustible. There was an unusually heavy drain upon our ore reserves during World War II, and the postwar demand has taken an even greater supply.

In addition to its national importance, the development and production of this great natural resource is intimately connected with the welfare and future prosperity of northern Michigan. To give you an idea of what it would mean to our area, let me point out that if 10,000,000 tons of low-grade ore concentrates were produced annually, it would provide an industrial potential for the next 80 years. Moreover, it would provide employment for thousands of our citizens in the iron districts of the Upper Peninsula, and it would insure a balanced and stabilized future for that area.

The steel industry of the United States rapidly expanding to meet an ever-increasing civilian demand for all types of products made of steel has reached the point where it finds itself hard pressed to obtain sufficient iron ore. Our Government experts who have been following the progress of the growing steel industry have calculated that without any increase in war production or national defense production, the steel industry will soon find itself 8 percent short in its supply of iron ore.

Although vast quantities of ore have been located and explored in Venezuela and Labrador and other areas, shipment of this iron ore to the United States cannot be delivered at any early date or in sufficient quantities to make up for the depletion of our domestic supply.

Moreover, we cannot safely place ourselves in the position of depending upon foreign countries for our domestic supply of steel. To do so would be dangerous indeed. Furthermore, there is no need to rely upon steel from Venezuela and Labrador or any other foreign country as long as we have billions of tons of known iron-ore reserves which can be produced and developed in the United States. The vast treasure of Lake Superior high-grade ores is rapidly being depleted, and within the next 10 years will sharply decline, particularly if the accelerated rate of production is continued.

The need for increased war production indicates that the United States must spend every effort to develop its low-grade ores as an insurance against the day when the steel industry would find itself poverty stricken for iron ore. The process for developing magnetic types of low-grade ore has already been perfected, and is now ready to go into effect. From known reserves of magnetic taconite the steel industry can draw from 10,000,000 to 30,000,000 tons of rich iron ore per year. This is considered to be sufficient iron ore to give the steel industry a new security against ever-increasing demands.

The low-grade ores of northern Michigan and northern Minnesota have been

practically untouched from a production standpoint. The Federal Bureau of Mines has advised me that in northern Michigan alone they estimate there are available approximately 2,000,000,000 tons of low-grade ores capable of producing approximately 800,000,000 tons of concentrates.

For many years the steel companies have been carrying on experimental and research work on these ores, but actual production has never gotten under way. The present international emergency points to the necessity of going ahead with the actual production without delay.

In my judgment, we should not wait to get into this field of new development until our present high-grade sources of iron ore have reached a point of exhaustion. The development of the actual production of these low-grade ores will require millions of dollars in capital expenditures, and the Federal Government ought to make long-term loans available in order to encourage private industry to get under way now.

To beneficiate these ores requires a large capital investment for plant facilities, namely, from $15 to $20 of capital for each annual ton of output, or $15,000,000 to $20,000,000 for each 1,000,000 tons of annual output. This is a higher capital outlay than is required for most other types of mining.

The beneficiation of low-grade ores has been studied for many years. Tests indicate that the use of iron ore produced from these ores, because of its high iron content, increases the capacity of a blast furnace; and the use of beneficiated iron ore would enable the blast furnaces to produce more pig iron without expansion in blast-furnace facilities. That is why it is so essential for Congress to encourage the construction of plants to beneficiate these minerals not only to replace shortages but also to improve the qualities of iron ores.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Congress will give immediate consideration to this important legislation.

How Much Defense for Our Dollars?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the people of our country are greatly concerned about the condition of our national defense. Weaknesses have already become apparent. The people are inquiring about it. Every day I receive letters from serious-minded citizens who are alarmed. They are asking, What is the reason? Who is at fault?

The President has asked Congress to appropriate $10,500,000,000 for defense purposes. It is readily conceivable that some of this money is necessary because of the expense incident to our Korean engagement. However, there is no doubt that much of it will be used to meet the serious deficiencies that have become apparent in our Defense Establishment.

American forces in Korea have been driven backward not because of lack of fighting spirit on the part of our soldiers. Their accomplishments and the courage they have displayed is highly commendable. The odds have been tremendously against them. They have been greatly outnumbered, but what is more inexcusable is the failure to provide them with the arms and supplies that are necessary to enable them to make an adequate defense. Their opponents are well armed with equipment that in some respects far exceed our own.

Well may our people ask why does this condition exist. Since the close of World War II the Congress has appropriated over $125,000,000,000 to strengthen our own defenses and that of our allies. Notwithstanding this vast expenditure we find ourselves woefully lacking in equipment. Why is this? Who is responsible?

I include as part of my remarks a detailed statement of expenditures prepared by Paul O. Peters, editor of News Bulletin, issued daily in Washington, D. C. The Informational Bulletin, No. 146, issued by him on July 24, 1950, contains the following:

Expenditures for national defense, foreign aid and relief, and Atomic Energy Commission, fiscal years 1946 to 1950

[Compiled from annual reports of the Secretary of the Treasury and Daily Treasury Statement for June 30, 1950.]

EXPENDITURES REPORTED FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

1946	$42,960,582,798
1947	13,790,557,877
1948	11,093,252,287
1949	11,863,809,793
1950	11,840,043,032
Total	91,548,245,781

NOTE.—The total expenditures shown do not include expenditures for War Shipping Administration, United States Maritime Commission or Civil Functions of the Army.

EXPENDITURES FOR FOREIGN AID AND RELIEF

Total loans, grants, credits and capital investments to June 30, 1950	$32,001,101,919

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

1947	$170,211,260
1948	465,586,869
1949	647,331,951
1950	524,464,824
Total	1,807,594,904

Total expenditures for national defense, foreign aid, and Atomic Energy Commission, five fiscal years, 1946–50, $125,356,942,604.

Import Tax on Copper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, it seemed to me of vital necessity both to our war potential and to our civilian peacetime necessities that the present import tax on copper be suspended. I regret that the leadership saw fit to reduce to 1 year the period of suspension of the import tax on copper. This bill is in other respects similar to the bill introduced by my friend and colleague, Representative JAMES T. PATTERSON, of Naugatuck, Conn.

It has been stated on the floor of this chamber that our domestic production of copper falls far short of the normal domestic need. The sharp curtailment of the use of copper for civilian consumption as the result of military consumption would necessarily increase the gap between supply and demand. In order to accomplish the accelerated procurement program for stockpiling of strategic materials it was obvious that some action by this legislative body was mandatory.

Rockbestos Products Corp. of New Haven; Bristol Brass Corp. of Bristol; Chase Brass & Copper Co., of Waterbury; the Bridgeport Brass Co., of Bridgeport are but a few of the many industries throughout the State of Connecticut which are dependent wholly or in part upon the availability of copper to insure full production and employment.

It became evident shortly after World War II that this Nation had become a buyer of copper, rather than a producer of surplus copper. Accordingly, our position in the copper market has been changed radically.

The number of items and industries which have need of copper or its alloys are untold. It would be far easier to name those which do not use this metal. It is urgent that our domestic production, together with our imports of this vital material, be held at a point which will satisfy our increased military needs and at least a part of our civilian requirements.

Patents: The Builders of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following summary of a speech delivered by Mr. I. Walton Bader of New York, at a meeting in New York of an association of small manufacturers. Mr. Bader, a patent attorney, is the son of Mr. Maximilian Bader, an attorney of New York who is widely known in Washington:

PATENTS: THE BUILDERS OF SMALL BUSINESS

Our patent system, the system that rewards an inventor with the exclusive rights, for a limited period of time, to exclude others from making, using, and selling the patented invention, is under severe attack today. The occasional abuses of the patent grant, primarily by a few large corporations, have caused many well-meaning persons, some Congressmen, a few Federal judges, and the like, to treat a patent as a monopoly and therefore consider them like all monopolies, ipso facto bad. Many patents have been invalidated, the standard of invention has been raised to an unreasonable degree, and the patent owner has been subjected to

a variety of harassments and burdens, all under the purported purpose of suppressing monopoly and causing our system of free enterprise to operate more successfully.

I have no quarrel with the efforts of those connected with our Government to destroy harmful monopoly wherever it is encountered. Uncontrolled monopoly brings about high prices, artificial scarcities, and thus causes destruction of our competitive system and our American way of life.

No person will quarrel with the statement that in this country we regard competition as the lifeblood of business, and the preservation of competition an important duty of our Government.

However the limited monopoly granted to an inventor by a patent is not a harmful monopoly but rather a beneficial one. It is a limited monopoly that allows a small-business man, with small capital and a new product, to grow. Were it not for the protection afforded by the patent, the small new enterprise would be at the mercy of its large competitor, who, with his greater efficiency and stronger sales organization, could cause the new business to go under in a very short time.

Let me give two concrete examples. It is well known among informed persons that the steel industry is in the hands of a few large firms. This is generally due to the fact that a tremendous amount of capital is required to build a steel mill. Let us assume that an inventor discovers a process that will produce steel at half the cost of the conventional process. With his patent, therefore, and with the protection that it gives to him, he can get together a small amount of capital, build a small mill, and with his lower prices due to better methods of manufacture, can obtain a larger and larger segment of the market. The larger corporations presently in the field cannot compete with him for a period of 17 years. They can, however, try to discover a better process that will not infringe the patent and thus scientific progress is promoted.

However, were it not for the protection afforded by the patent, the small inventor would be at the mercy of the corporate giants in the business, who would learn the new process, equip their plants for its employment, then reduce their prices to a point low enough to drive the newcomer out of the field.

Let me give another illustration. Suppose that a small manufacturer develops a new type of automobile power plant which consumes only one-half of the gasoline of the conventional engine. Here again, with the limited monopoly granted by the patent he can enter the automobile business with a reasonable assurance of success. Without the protection of the patent, however, he cannot prevent the established manufacturer from copying his engine, and with his greater productive facilities price him out of the market.

The present hostile attitude by several of our governmental agencies and our courts have produced a number of harmful results. Many of our large corporations, who are frequently cited by congressional committees and by the Department of Justice for monopolistic practices, are beginning to ignore patents held by small inventors. Recently one of the heads of the patent department of one of these large corporations made a private statement that, "He didn't care what patent a small inventor held, because the inventor could not afford the litigation expense to sustain it, and that the chances were that it would be held invalid anyway." Thus our large corporations are getting the benefit of numerous inventions made by small inventors, robbing small-business men of the means of starting competing businesses, and infringing patents with impunity, while our legislative and judicial branches of our Government believe that they are thereby sustaining a competitive economy.

What then is the solution. As I see it the solution is divided into two parts. While it is important to sustain the patent grant for the protection of the small-business man and the small manufacturer, it is equally important to prevent abuses of patents in the hands of the large enterprise.

The strength of the patent grant can be increased by giving to the patentee the benefit of the presumption of regularity given to the acts of all other administrative agencies, namely, that if the grant of a patent by the Commissioner of Patents is supported by substantial evidence, the validity of the grant will not be challenged.

Furthermore our present district courts are poorly equipped to deal with patent litigation since an appreciation of the technical grounds upon which a patent is to be sustained or held invalid are generally not within the knowledge of the average district judge. I therefore suggest the establishment of separate patent courts for this type of litigation staffed with technically trained judges.

The measure of damages in a patent infringement action should also be increased to penalize the willful infringer of a patent. Patent litigation is expensive and the infringer should pay for its cost. Should the patent be sustained the infringer should be required to pay all of the expenses of the litigation including attorneys' fees, and, if the infringement is proven to be willful, treble damages should be awarded.

However, while these changes in the law will increase the strength of patents, it is just as necessary to prevent abuses of patents.

Many large corporations use the grant, not to protect the invention claimed therein, but to restrict competition in unpatented items by requiring the licensee to purchase unpatented items from the patent owner as consideration for the license, by demanding that the licensee cease to deal in the goods of a competitor of the licensor, or by controlling the price of goods supplied to the licensee.

These practices should be forbidden under penalty of forfeiture of the exclusive rights granted by the patent.

There is one other matter that I would like to discuss before I close regarding the suppression of inventions by patenting them and then not using them. There is much loose talk concerning suppression of inventions, but, in general, the number of outstanding inventions suppressed is not great. In any event such suppression can be eliminated by providing that any person may obtain a license upon a patented invention if the invention has not been produced commercially within 5 years subsequent to the grant of a patent upon it.

With the acceptance of these recommendations I believe that our competitive economy will be strengthened and monopolistic practices by large organizations reduced.

Declaration of Policy on the Present World Crisis by Italian-American Labor Council, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I insert the following letter from the Italian-American Labor Council, Inc., and the praiseworthy resolution passed by the council:

ITALIAN-AMERICAN LABOR COUNCIL, INC.,
New York, N. Y., July 24, 1950.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: I have the honor of forwarding to you the enclosed document in which is reflected the experience gained by our organization in its struggles against all forms of totalitarianism.

I hope and wish that you will accord us the special kindness of giving to this document your personal reading and consideration.

May I also ask you to have this document inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the United States and use it as a reference in whatever you may do in your activities as a lawmaker?

Respectfully yours,

LUIGI ANTONINI,
President.

DECLARATION OF POLICY ON THE PRESENT WORLD CRISIS

The Italian-American Labor Council assembled at a special meeting on July 20, 1950, hereby officially defines its stand on the present world crisis in which are involved not only Korea but all of humanity.

Our organization was formed a few days after Pearl Harbor at a call issued by representatives of unions who had fought uncompromisingly against fascism, nazism, and bolshevism for many years.

A new, reliable, and vigorous leadership was given to all Americans of Italian descent who furnished during the entire duration of that war magnificent proofs of loyalty and a tremendous contribution to the victory of our country over black and brown totalitarianism.

While aimed principally at winning the war against Fascist and Nazi totalitarianism, the policies of the Italian-American Labor Council also took into account the potential dangers deriving from the so-called united fronts with totalitarian Communists and, therefore, refused to enter any tactical combination with these enemies of freedom. The present world crisis, precipitated by the Moscow instigated, planned, and directed aggression against South Korea, is a definite confirmation that the freedom-loving people can never expect any fair play from Stalinite totalitarianism.

It is also a reminder that when in its honest and sincere search for agreements, harmony, and peace, democracy allows totalitarians to take control of strategic positions of any kind, these enemies of liberty utilize them to attack democracy on the first favorable occasion.

So while our present aid is to win the war in Korea under the flag of the United Nations, we should be careful to prevent the defeated totalitarians of yesterday, black, brown, or yellow, being given the possibility of returning to the control of economic, political, geographical, and military positions from which they could attack and destroy the freedom of mankind in a fourth world war. This warning is not the result of dreams into the future but is based on historical experience and on clear signs of neo-Fascist and neo-Nazi come-back that can be observed in many places.

The Italian-American Labor Council pledges its full and energetic support to the stand taken by President Truman on behalf of the United States, and by the United Nations, to resist and defeat aggression in Korea, and calls on all the workers of Italian descent, who are such an important factor in the basic industries of our Nation, to cooperate fully and enthusiastically to the successful mobilization decided upon by the

leadership of the entire American labor movement.

We as Americans of Italian extraction welcome news from Italy showing that only Togliatti's Communists and his satellites of Nenni's party are supporting Moscow aggression, while all the Italian democratic parties, including the Socialist Party of Italian workers and the Unitarian Socialist Party, have condemned the Cominform aggression in Korea and denounced the fake and fraudulent character of the so-called petition for peace being circulated by Moscow agents all over the world.

The Italian-American Labor Council feels that in this new world crisis, we can defeat more surely and quickly our enemies and safeguard the best interest of democracy, if we are careful to avoid:

(a) All policies that could help bring water to the mill of Moscow propaganda which is busy picturing the United States as the citadel of reaction and exploitation, of monopolistic capitalism, and which tries to link and identify our free democracy with fascism and Wall Street special interests.

(b) All policies and acts which could endanger or restrict our civil liberties, the very foundation of the invincible power of our Republic.

(c) All such nonsense as collective discrimination against native born or immigrants who had been deceived for some time into falling into Communist outfits, and who have later sincerely broken away from Muscovite communism, opposing effectively and skillfully for several years its principles, aims, policies, and organizations.

(d) All attempts to retreat from the road of social progress or to renounce the legislative reforms aimed at enlarging the horizon of social justice in America and in the world.

As an organization with much experience in international struggles, we warn the American people that enemies of freedom of any kind can never be our sincere and sure allies. These totalitarians have joined hands in the past, and they can do the same all over again in the future.

The road to victory, definite victory, is to be followed with democratic methods and democratic forces serving democratic ideals. Along this road the peoples of the world, including the enslaved people of Russia and the masses of European and Asiatic workers deceived and betrayed by the Cominform, will join us and work with us in building the unbreakable pillars of world freedom and peace.

Department of Justice Regulations for Applicants for Adjustment of Status Under Section 4, Displaced Persons Act, as Amended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the regulations published in the Federal Register of July 13, 1950, governing the adjustment of status of aliens in this country and apparently eligible to file under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 as amended by Public 555, Eighty-first Congress. While it is a little unusual to insert in the RECORD extracts from the Register, I feel it is justified in this instance by the wide interest in these regulations and the difficulty many applicants have had in obtaining copies of them:

TITLE 8—ALIENS AND NATIONALITY—CHAPTER I—IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—SUBCHAPTER B—IMMIGRATION REGULATIONS—PART 105—HEAD TAX

PART 129—ADMISSION AND DEPORTATION OF ALIENS ENTERING THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE DISPLACED PERSONS ACT OF 1948, AS AMENDED

Part 171—Displaced persons residing in the United States

Admission, deportation, and adjustment of status of displaced persons.

JUNE 21, 1950.

The following amendments to Chapter I, Title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations, are hereby prescribed:

Part 105—Head tax

Section 105.3, Aliens not subject to head tax, is amended by adding paragraph (r) as follows:

"(r) Eligible displaced persons, eligible displaced orphans, and persons of German ethnic origin. Eligible displaced persons, eligible displaced orphans, and persons of German ethnic origin as defined by sections 2 (c), 2 (d), 2 (e), 2 (g), and 12 (a) of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended."

(Sec. 23, 39 Stat. 892, sec. 24, 43 Stat. 166, sec. 37, 54 Stat. 675; 8 U. S. C. 102, 222, 458. Interpret or apply sec. 5, 62 Stat. 1011, as amended; 50 U. S. C. App. Supp., 1954.)

PART 129—ADMISSION AND DEPORTATION OF ALIENS ENTERING THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE DISPLACED PERSONS ACT OF 1948, AS AMENDED

The following part is added:

Sec.

129.1 Examination by immigration officers.
129.2 Evidence of support; likelihood of becoming public charge.
129.3 Affidavit upon arrival.
129.4 Effect of misrepresentations.
129.5 Deportation.

AUTHORITY: Paragraphs 129.1 to 129.5 issued under sec. 23, 39 Stat. 892, sec. 24, 43 Stat. 166, sec. 37, 54 Stat. 675; 8 U. S. C. 102, 222, 458. Interpret or apply sec. 3, 39 Stat. 875, 41 Stat. 891, 45 Stat. 1551, 58 Stat. 746, sec. 21, 39 Stat. 891, secs. 3, 6, 10, 13, as amended, 62 Stat. 1009, as amended; 8 U. S. C. 136, 158; 50 U. S. C. App. Supp., 1951.

SEC. 129.1. Examination by immigration officers: An applicant for admission to the United States for permanent residence under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1009, 50 U. S. C. App. 1951–1963, Pub. Law 555 81st Cong.), who does not appear to the examining immigrant inspector to be clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to land in the United States under the provisions of the immigration laws and eligible for admission under the terms of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, shall be detained for examination in relation thereto by a board of special inquiry. In determining whether an applicant has the eligibility qualifications specified in the applicable provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, the certification and report of the Displaced Persons Commission prepared pursuant to section 10 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, shall be accepted as establishing, in the absence of specific knowledge or substantial belief showing ineligibility, that the applicant is qualified to enter the United States under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, except insofar as such report relates to requirements for admission under the general immigration laws. Such certification and report shall not preclude full inquiry by immigration officers concerning the applicant's admissibility under the general immigration laws. In addition, such certification and report shall not preclude, when the immigration officer has specific knowledge or substantial belief showing ineligibility under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, any interrogation of the applicant or of other persons, or any investigation or the consideration of any other evidence deemed necessary in order that the applicant's admissibility under the displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, may be determined, and any such additional evidence may also be considered in the determination of his admissibility.

SEC. 129.2. Evidence of support; likelihood of becoming public charge: An applicant for admission to the United States for whom assurances of employment, housing, and against his becoming a public charge have been furnished pursuant to the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, shall not be required to submit any affidavit or other evidence of support. However, such an applicant shall also be required to establish, in conformity with the requirements of the general immigration laws of the United States, that he is not likely to become a public charge, and, in appropriate cases, he may be required to furnish a public-charge bond as specified in sections 110.20 and 110.21 of this chapter.

SEC. 129.3. Affidavit upon arrival: Any alien 18 years of age or older applying at a port of entry for admission into the United States under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, shall be required to subscribe to Form I–144, in which he shall declare under oath or affirmation that he is not and has never been a member of the Communist Party of any country; that he does not adhere to, advocate, or follow, and that he never has adhered to, advocated, or followed the principles of any political or economic system or philosophy directed toward the destruction of free competitive enterprise and the revolutionary overthrow of representative governments; that he is not and has never been a member of any organization which is named in a list on Form I–144a, attached to the said Form I–144, and which has been designated by the Attorney General of the United States as a Communist organization; that he is not and has never been a member of or participated in any movement which is or has been hostile to the United States or the form of government of the United States; that he has never advocated or assisted in the persecution of any person because of race, religion, or national origin; and that he has not voluntarily borne arms against the United States during World War II. Any alien who refuses to subscribe to the said Form I–144 under oath or affirmation, or who subscribes to such form under oath or affirmation knowing any part thereof to be false, shall be excluded and deported from the United States in the manner provided by law. In addition he shall be liable to prosecution for perjury if such oath or affirmation is wilfully false.

SEC. 129.4. Effect of misrepresentations:

(a) An applicant seeking admission as an eligible displaced person as that term is defined in section 2 (c), (d), and (g) of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, shall be excluded and deported from the United States if he has ever wilfully made a misrepresentation for the purpose of gaining admission into the United States as an eligible displaced person. As used in this part, the term "misrepresentation for the purpose of gaining admission into the United States" shall mean a wilful misrepresentation, oral or written, made by any such applicant to any person while he is charged with the enforcement or administration of any part of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as originally

enacted or as amended, of any matter material to the applicant's eligibility for any of the benefits of the said act, as originally enacted or as amended.

(b) An alien whose admission under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, is based on the submission of an assurance of suitable employment, shall be deemed to have made a misrepresentation for the purpose of gaining admission into the United States if it is found that the applicant's statement required by section 6 of that act, relating to the acceptance in good faith of employment, was falsely made.

SEC. 129.5. Deportation: In addition to the other grounds for deportation specified in the general immigration laws, an alien admitted to the United States under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, shall be subject to arrest and deportation in the manner provided in parts 150, 151, and 152 of this chapter, irrespective of the date of his entry, if it is found, on the basis of evidence presented at a hearing:

(a) That he falsely represented, in his signed statement under oath or affirmation executed under section 6 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, that he accepted and agreed in good faith to abide by the terms of employment provided for him in the assurance upon which his application for a visa under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, was based: *Provided*, That in determining whether such a false representation was made consideration shall be given to the manner, conditions, extent, and duration of such alien's employment following his admission to the United States and to other relevant evidence;

(b) That he made any misrepresentation for the purpose of gaining admission into the United States as an eligible displaced person;

(c) That he was not entitled to a visa because of membership in any of the organizations or movements referred to in section 129.3; or

(d) That at the time of his entry into the United States he was otherwise inadmissible under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended.

PART 171—DISPLACED PERSONS RESIDING IN THE UNITED STATES

1. Section 171.1 is amended to read as follows:

SEC. 171.1. Eligibility for adjustment of status—(a) Qualifications: Subject to the limitation described in paragraph (b) of this section, an alien is eligible to be considered for adjustment of his immigration status as a displaced person residing in the United States to that of a permanent resident under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011, 50 U. S. C. App. 1953, Pub. Law 555, 81st Cong.), if:

(1) The entry upon which his residence in the United States is based occurred prior to April 30, 1949, and was a lawful one as a nonimmigrant under section 3 or as a nonquota immigrant student under subdivision (e) of section 4 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended; and

(2) He was in the United States on April 30, 1949, except as provided in paragraph (c) of this section; and

(3) He is presently admissible to the United States under the immigration laws; and

(4) He is a person displaced from the country of his birth or nationality, or of his last residence as a result of hostile military action, or persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinions, occurring subsequent to the outbreak on September 1, 1939, of World War II; and

(5) He cannot return to any of such countries because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinions; and

(6) He has been of good moral character for the preceding 5 years; and

(7) He has filed his application described in section 171.2 on or before June 16, 1952, and while he is in the United States.

(b) Limitation: The number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to this section shall not exceed 15,000.

(c) Temporary absence: An applicant shall not be considered ineligible for adjustment of his status under this part solely by reason of—

(1) A temporary absence from the United States on April 30, 1949, provided that his entry upon returning is a lawful one as a nonimmigrant under section 3 or as a nonquota immigrant student under subdivision (e) of section 4 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended; that he has not abandoned his residence in the United States during such absence, and that such temporary absence was occasioned by one or more of the following special circumstances:

(i) The duties of applicant's employment, which required him to travel outside the United States;

(ii) The serious illness of the applicant;

(iii) The death or serious illness of a relative;

(iv) The protection, recovery, or liquidation of property interests or the prosecution or defense of any claim or lawsuit;

(v) Any other exceptional circumstances which are found by the Attorney General to have justified such temporary absence;

(vi) The temporary absence to accompany a member of the applicant's family group whose absence was attributable to any of the special circumstances specified in subdivision (i) to (v) of this subparagraph; or

(2) A temporary absence from the United States commencing after April 30, 1949, provided that his entry upon returning is a lawful one as a nonimmigrant under section 3 or as a nonquota immigrant student under subdivision (e) of section 4 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and that he has not abandoned his residence in the United States during his temporary absence.

2. The second sentence of section 171.2, Application for adjustment of status, is amended to read as follows: "After Form I–500 is filled out, it shall be mailed by the applicant in duplicate direct to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Temporary Federal Office Building X, Nineteenth and East Capitol Streets NE., Washington 25, D. C."

3. Paragraph (b) of section 171.3 Receipt of application by Commissioner, is amended to read as follows:

(b) Transmission of application to field office: Verification of the applicant's last entry into the United States prior to April 30, 1949, and any entries subsequent thereto shall be made from Central Office records where possible and endorsed upon the original and duplicate applications. The Commissioner shall send the duplicate copy of the application to the Immigration and Naturalization Service office having jurisdiction over the applicant's place of residence.

4. Section 171.4 is amended to read as follows:

SEC. 171.4. Documents and investigation: Upon receipt of the duplicate copy of the application, the officer in charge of the Immigration and Naturalization Service office having jurisdiction over the applicant's place of residence shall advise the applicant to obtain promptly the following documents: Two photographs as described in sections 364.1 of this chapter; birth certificate; passport; marriage certificate, if any; affidavits of three witnesses, preferably citizens of the United States—and if the applicant is employed, one from his employer—attesting to the applicant's good moral character; police records covering the period of the applicant's residence in the United States and, where such residence in the United States has been for a period of less than 5 years, foreign police records, if obtainable, covering the applicant's foreign residence within the 5 years immediately preceding the filing of the Form I–500; and any documentary evidence the applicant may have to establish his eligibility under section 171.1. The applicant shall be instructed to forward to the officer in charge photostatic copies of all documents, whenever possible, and to submit the originals at the time he appears for the hearing. The officer in charge shall obtain verification of the applicant's last entry into the United States prior to April 30, 1949, and any entries subsequent thereto where such verification has not been furnished by the Central Office when transmitting the duplicate application. The officer in charge shall also cause an independent character investigation to be conducted covering the period of the applicant's residence in the United States. Where the applicant has resided in the United States for a period in excess of 5 years, the independent character investigation shall cover the last 5 years of such residence. The investigating officer shall make a written report of his investigation, to be included in the record as provided in section 171.5 (d) (2).

5. The first sentence of section 171.5 (a) is amended by deleting the words "entry has" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "entries have", so the the sentence will read: "When the necessary entries have been verified and the documents required of the applicant and the report of the investigating officer have been submitted, the applicant shall be notified to appear for a hearing at a time and place to be designated by the officer in charge."

6. The third sentence of subparagraph (2) of section 171.5 (d) is amended by deleting the word "entry" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "entries", so that the sentence will read: "The examining officer shall enter of record, as exhibits identified by number, the copy of the application; the documents presented by the applicant; depositions, if any; certifications and affidavits submitted by the applicant; the written report of the investigation, and the reports as to record of applicant's entries and of the entries of such other persons as may be material to the case."

7. Subparagraph (3) of section 171.5 (d) is amended to read as follows:

(3) The applicant shall then be interrogated under oath or affirmation as to his eligibility to be considered for adjustment of immigration status as a displaced person residing in the United States under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, and section 171.1. Eligibility of the applicant as to subparagraphs (4) and (5) of paragraph (a) of section 171.1 shall be comprehensively covered by oral interrogation of the applicant and of the witnesses presented by him, if any.

8. The first sentence of section 171.6, Evidence and Burden of Proof, is amended by inserting after "Displaced Persons Act of 1948" the following: ", as amended,".

This order shall become effective on the date of its publication in the Federal Register. The amendatory regulations prescribed by the order are necessary for carrying out the various amendments to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 made by Public Law 555, Eighty-first Congress, which was approved on June 16, 1950, and which became effective on that date. Compliance with the provisions of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 238; 5 U. S. C. 1003) relative to notice and delayed effective date is impracticable and contrary to the public interest in this instance, since such compliance would unduly delay and impede the

administration and enforcement of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 as amended by the said Public Law 555.

(Sec. 23, 39 Stat. 892, sec. 24, 43 Stat. 166, sec. 37, 54 Stat. 675; 8 U. S. C. 102, 222, 458.)

[SEAL] A. R. MACKEY,
Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization.

Approved: July 7, 1950.

PEYTON FORD,
Acting Attorney General.

[F. R. Doc. 50-6037; Filed, July 12, 1950; 8:54 a. m.]

Widespread Exposure of Communist Support of False Peace Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday I inserted the text of House Concurrent Resolution 247 in the Appendix of the RECORD at page A5419.

This deals with the false peace-petition campaign now being sponsored and circulated by the Communist Party in this country. I included several excellent editorials which make it clear that our American press is doing an excellent piece of work in providing the public with the facts, and warning patriotic and peace-loving Americans against giving any aid or comfort to this cynical and deceptive piece of Communist propaganda.

I now want to provide my colleagues with several other equally effective editorials and they are as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 23, 1950]

A SOVIET PEACE MANEUVER

In a new effort to disarm the west and clear the road to further Soviet advances, the masters of the Kremlin have stepped up the pace of their peace offensive by ordering Communist fifth columns in every country to solicit mass signatures for a petition which in the name of peace would ban all atomic weapons and brand the government that first used them, even in self-defense, as an aggressor. This petition was framed by the recent Communist-sponsored World Congress of Peace Partisans in Stockholm and has been approved with the usual unanimity by the supreme Soviet in Moscow. It is such an obvious and transparent attempt to cover up the Soviet record of aggression, and to sabotage all efforts to ban atomic weapons under genuinely effective safeguards, that it is difficult to see how people on this side of the iron curtain can be taken in by it. Yet the petition is acquiring a considerable number of signatures in many countries.

One reason for this, pointed out by Lewis L. Strauss, until recently a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, is the "silliest of all atomic fallacies"—the fallacy, namely, that if we disarm, "then Soviets will be under some irresistible moral compulsion to do likewise." But another and perhaps even more potent reason is that, as in the case of Hitler's Mein Kampf, few persons outside the Communist leadership have read or absorbed the Communist Mein Kampf, as written by Lenin and Stalin. These people therefore do not fully comprehend Communist aims or see through Communist maneuvers. For in these turgid volumes anyone may read that Moscow's aim is a Communist mastery of the world, already one-third accomplished, and that in the pursuit of its final goal the Kremlin has not only repudiated as a matter of doctrine all western standards of morality but has made a science of mendacity and is using, in Lenin's words, "any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, and concealment of the truth" to gain its ends.

Even those unread in Leninist-Stalinist dialectics should have been made wary by recent history, and by their own previous experience. For the latest Soviet maneuver merely repeats the tactics which the Communists found useful in the past and which Hitler also tried to adapt to his own purposes. Instead of the democratic front which the Soviets built up everywhere, after adoption of the Trojan Horse strategy in the thirties, they are now attempting to build a peace front, or an antiatomic front, to enlist the support of trusting people. Like Hitler, who constantly shouted peace and concluded innumerable nonaggression pacts to cover up his aggressive aims, they likewise pay lip service to peace, while swallowing one country after another, and offer any pact that will tie up their prospective victims while leaving the Soviets themselves a free hand to break it.

The record speaks for itself, and explains why there is no peace, and why the threat of atomic warfare still hangs over the heads of all of us. Immediately after the war, placing their trust in paper agreements with the Soviets, ranging from the Atlantic Charter to Potsdam, the western powers disarmed to the point of helplessness and pressed forward proposals for the abolition of atomic weapons as soon as effective safeguards against their secret production had been agreed upon. Yet the Soviets not only retained the largest peacetime armies in history but also proceeded to expand their armaments to the limit of their capacity and to militarize, regiment and put in uniform their entire nation. Backed by this military preponderance, they broke every agreement they had made, whether in Europe or in Asia, sabotaged every peace plan that did not deliver the nations involved into their hands, and expanded their slave empire to one-third of the human race. They blocked, boycotted, and sabotaged the United Nations, and in particular, they repudiated the only feasible plan for control of atomic energy and abolition of atomic weapons advanced thus far, and agreed upon by all nations except Soviet Russia and its satellites.

Yet today the Soviets pose as the champions of peace and denounce as warmongers intended victims who still have the means and the courage to look to their own defenses. That, too, was one of Hitler's methods. It failed. There is enough intelligence and instinct for self-preservation left in the West to assure a like failure of this method, when used by the Soviets.

[From the Baltimore News-Post of July 21, 1950]

THE PEACE PETITIONS

The most flagrant and effective campaign of sabotage being carried on in the United States against the security of the American people is the Communist-conceived peace petition program.

The professed objective of the program, which originated at a Communist conclave in Stockholm, is to persuade all nations to abstain from any preparation for future wars, defensive or otherwise.

But all of the Communist nations, and especially Soviet Russia, are arming to the hilt, not for defensive war obviously, because none of them are menaced in any manner, but plainly and boldly for aggressive war as the current war of conquest in Korea attests.

So it is only the non-Communist nations which are being abjured and persuaded to disarm and weaken themselves as the real purpose of the peace-petition program.

This is being done in the hope and with the intent that they may be easily and cheaply taken over by the Communists, as so many formerly free and sovereign nations have already been.

It is a matter of undeviating record that no nation has ever accepted communism voluntarily, all of the satellite nations having been overwhelmed by Communist invasion or having been the victims of Communist betrayal.

As fast as the non-Communist nations become weak enough they will be overrun by Communist hordes or betrayed by Communist traitors, and the only reason the Stockholm peace petition program was initiated was to make more nations weaker more speedily.

Since the United States is the one Nation in all the world the Communists most desire to take over, it has been inevitable that the Communist peace petitions should be most assiduously circulated among the American people.

Every American should be told, and must understand, as National Commander George N. Craig of the American Legion warns, that his signature on the Communist peace petitions constitutes his support of the sinister scheme of our Communist enemies "to soften up the minds, morale and will power of the American people to resist aggression."

Professing peaceful purposes, the sponsors of the petitions are the willing agents of the one nation on earth today which is obstructing peace and committing acts of violence and aggression against its helpless neighbors.

Proposing disarmament and unpreparedness for war, their only loyalty is to Soviet Russia, which has 6,000,000 men under arms today, although no other nation in the world contemplates aggression against Russia and few are even capable of posing a serious threat against Russian security.

No loyal American will knowingly lend himself to a movement which has the weakening and undermining and destruction of his country as its real and only object.

Let no American be deceived by the peaceful professions of those who, wittingly or otherwise are doing the evil work of our enemies.

[From the Daily Kennebec Journal (Augusta, Maine) of Monday, July 24, 1950]

PHONY PETITION

A million Americans in 40 States have signed their names to a world-peace petition specifically aimed at outlawing atomic weapons. Probably not more than a few thousand of the signers realized that this campaign is being run by the United States Communist Party and is Moscow inspired.

The peace proposal was adopted last spring at a Stockholm meeting of the Partisans of Peace, a Communist-sponsored international organization. Since then it has been circulated widely in Europe, Asia, and now America. Many millions of signatures have been obtained.

Secretary of State Acheson properly branded the whole effort as fraudulent and cynical. He pointed out that just before the North Koreans attacked South Korea, it was reported half the population of North Korea had signed the petition.

This proposal is still going the rounds in America. Often it bears the cloak of labor-union sanction, though the nature of such sponsorship is usually quite vague.

From here on out, every American will do well if he turns away from his door the

bearer of any peace petition that talks of outlawing the atom bomb, mentions Stockholm, or boasts of labor sponsors. Almost certainly that proposal will be Moscow's handiwork.

[From the Houston Post of July 16, 1950]

THEY TALK OF PEACE

Simultaneously with the outbreak of the Korean war a sudden interest in peace is being manifested at Moscow and in certain quarters in this country. The Stockholm pledge to ban the atomic bomb is being assiduously circulated, and appeals are being made to the American people to end the hostilities.

It is noteworthy, however, that the petitions make no mention of the quickest way of achieving peace—by North Korean Reds complying with the United Nations cease-fire order and getting back where they belong, which, as Secretary of State Acheson insists, they must do before there can be peace.

[From the St. Louis Dispatch of July 19, 1950]

WHEN PEACE IS WAR

In reality, however, anybody who signs it is supporting war. For the peace it talks about is the Kremlin's version of peace, the kind of "peace" the people of Korea are now experiencing. It is just one more case of Communists giving words meanings either radically different from or diametrically opposed to the meanings found in any dictionary.

The Stockholm resolution, adopted at a meeting of the Communist Partisans of Peace held last March, sets up its own special definition of a war criminal. It is "any government which first uses atomic weapons against any other country whatsoever." The petition says nothing at all about aggression. And, as Secretary Acheson remarked, it is aggression which is the real crime against humanity.

The hollowness of the document is best shown by its demand for strict international control to enforce outlawing of atomic weapons. This is a strange demand from Communist sources, since the American Acheson-Baruch-Lilienthal proposal is the only one made thus far which really does provide for strict international control. And only the Communists have blocked adoption of that plan.

Whoever signs the document is helping Communist imperialism.

And anybody who signs the petition is also approving the Communist definition of war criminal, a definition which Korea has proved to be as phony as the Communist definition of democracy.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 18, 1950]

SLAVERY, NOT PEACE

For months Russian and satellite propaganda has doted on this peace move. All the techniques of the Russian propaganda mill, which has nothing to learn from the late unlamented Herr Doktor Josef Goebbels, have been mustered for this drive.

Its purpose is clear—to paint the United States and the West in general as "imperialistic aggressors" and the Russians and their allies as peace-loving states.

Overlooked is the fact—about which the millions under Soviet control never were aware—that Russia itself put up the barrier to "strict international control" of atomic resources.

The plans made through the United Nations were automatically, and out-of-hand, rejected by the representatives of the dictatorship that now has the temerity to talk of peace.

When it comes to covering aggression with false words, the Russians are past masters. Hitler always promised peace provided it was his kind of peace. The Russians are slicker. They make the peace-seeking peoples of the world believe they are protecting "a people's" peace.

The peace build-up is today being used as a cover to gloss over Russian aggression through the North Koreans. Yet if peace is desired, it could be restored at a word from the Kremlin. The United States has an obligation to make this clear to the peoples of the world before more are deluded by this suicidal peace.

The Russian organs, Pravda and Izvestia, and Moscow harp ceaselessly on the theme. Characteristic is a statement on the radio the other day from a Pravda editor, Sobolev:

"I vote against war—and this is not merely a matter of words. It means that I shall do my utmost to prevent war. I shall stop the trains; I shall refuse to unload the ships carrying war materials; I shall not supply fuel for the planes; I shall seize the arms of the mercenaries; I shall not allow my son or my husband to go to war; I shall deprive the ministers of food, drink, telephones, transport, and coal. Let those who are dragging us into war do the fighting themselves."

Sabotage, not of the aggressors, but of the constituent members of the United Nations who are unifying to put down aggression. This sort of peace would give the Russians clear sailing to world conquest. Its brazen, lying enormity is flabbergasting. It is against this kind of peace that the free peoples of the world must organize to insure true peace, for the Moscow peace is the yoke of totalitarian slavery.

[From the Omaha Sunday World Herald of Sunday, July 16, 1950]

THAT "PEACE" PETITION

The curious thing about the "peace petition" is that it is not a peace petition at all, but a devious bit of Communist propaganda. The "outlawing" of the atom bomb that the petition calls for is not the sort proposed in the Baruch report and approved by an overwhelming majority in the United Nations—that is, outlawing with international inspection. It is "outlawing" a la Russe—that is, the United States would throw away its atom bombs on the mere promise of the Russians to do likewise. Since the Russians have kept no promises up to now unless it suited their convenience, no sensible person would have confidence in their promise to throw away atom bombs.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution]

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA DOESN'T FOOL MANY

The encouraging aspect of the apprehension of the woman charged with soliciting signatures to the Communist Stockholm peace proposal petition is that her efforts were met by citizens alert to the ways of the Communists and their sympathizers and the police promptly called.

It is not at all strange that the Communist authors of the petition omit aggression, such as that by Communist troops in Korea, from the category of criminal acts. The Soviet Union's stockpile of atomic bombs is low compared to this country's. But by the terms of this petition Soviet troops could overrun every country in Asia and Europe with tanks and infantry and TNT bombs, as Communists have done in South Korea, without being labeled a "war criminal." It would be criminal only to resist aggression with atomic bombs.

As adroit as is Communist propaganda, it is difficult for it to deceive many in a country where factual information is available.

Communists Invade Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, while our boys are engaged in fighting communism abroad, it seems to be running rampant here in the United States.

On last Tuesday representatives of a well-known Communist-front organization, known as the Civil Rights Congress, headed by a well-known Communist named Aubrey Grossman, invaded Mississippi and attempted to browbeat the Governor of that State, Hon. Fielding Wright, into violating his oath of office.

Governor Wright would have been perfectly justified in sending these Reds to jail, and keeping them there for the duration of the present emergency.

This so-called Civil Rights Congress was cited as subversive and communistic by the Attorney General of the United States in his letters to the Loyalty Review Board, which were released by the United States Civil Service Commission, on December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948.

The report of the Committee on Un-American Activities on this so-called Civil Rights Congress, among other things, says:

Having adopted a line of militant skullduggery against the United States with the close of World War II, the Communist Party has set up the Civil Rights Congress for the purpose of protecting those of its members who run afoul of the law. This new project was founded at a conference held in Detroit on April 27–28, 1946, effectuating the merger of the International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. The latter organizations had been so badly discredited by repeated exposure as to injure their usefulness in the newly envisaged campaign of Communist lawlessness. It will be found, however, that the sponsors of the Civil Rights Congress in many instances are the same as those of its predecessor organizations.

It has been a time-honored Communist tactic to set up a hue and cry for civil liberties precisely at a moment when boldest attacks upon democracy are intended. Invariably this appeal finds a response among Communist sympathizers and ingenuous professional bleeding hearts, who would rather sacrifice the interests of their country than do violence to the Communist conception of civil liberties as applied to the United States. For some curious reason these standards are never applied to any territory under the Communist dictatorship.

Remember, this is the same Communist outfit that marched on Peekskill, N. Y., sometime ago, over the protest of patriotic ex-servicemen, whom this gang has been attempting to persecute through the courts of New York ever since.

If anybody has any doubt about this man, Aubrey Grossman, being a Communist and an enemy of this country, let me call your attention to the follow-

ing report from the Committee on Un-American Activities, which says:

The Worker, Sunday edition of the Communist Daily Worker, for June 20, 1948 (p. 4, sec. 3), contains an article written by Aubrey Grossman, identified as an organizer of the Communist Party in the mission section of San Francisco. The article is entitled "Some of Our Fundamental Tasks."

In other words, this same Aubrey Grossman was a Communist organizer in San Francisco 2 years ago, and it seems that he is following the same program in New York now.

This same report from the Committee on Un-American Activities, says further:

Aubrey Grossman's party membership is also revealed in the Daily People's World of May 17, 1948, page 3, which states that he was a member of a delegation against the Mundt-Nixon anti-Communist bill. The Daily People's World is the official organ of the Communist Party on the west coast.

On a list of Communist Party officials submitted to the Committee on Un-American Activities by Walter S. Steele during his testimony in public hearings on July 21, 1947, Aubrey Grossman's name appears as the educational director of the Communist Party, San Francisco. (Testimony of Walter S. Steele regarding Communist activities in the United States, p. 13.)

He is not just a new convert to the Communist Party, but has been a member probably ever since he has been in this country. This same report to the Committee on un-American Activities says that:

Aubrey Grossman, whose address is given as 864 South Lucerne, Los Angeles, Calif., was a signer of Communist Party petition No. 59C in 1932.

And the report further states that:

In 1941, Aubrey Grossman was one of the signers of a statement which urged the President and Congress to defend the rights of the Communist Party, as shown by the Daily Worker of March 5, 1941 (p. 2).

According to the Daily Worker of April 3, 1941 (p. 3), Aubrey Grossman conducted the defense of Harry Bridges in the second deportation proceedings. His photo appeared in the Daily Worker in connection with this article. His photo also appeared in the People's World of June 30, 1944 (p. 6), with his client, Harry Bridges.

The October 28, 1947, issue of People's World (p. 4) revealed that Aubrey Grossman was the campaign manager for the Oleta O'Connor Yates for supervisor committee. Oleta O'Connor Yates was named in the People's World of August 16, 1947 (p. 3), as the chairman of the Communist Party in San Francisco. In 1947 she was the Communist candidate for county chairman, San Francisco, as shown by the Daily People's World of September 18, 1947 (p. 1).

It is useless to burden the House with further recitation of the Communist activities of this man, Aubrey Grossman.

Everybody knows that communism in this country is treason; and that it is time these traitors were rounded up, deported to the countries from which they came, or sent to prison where they cannot endanger the security of the Nation or jeopardize the safety of our servicemen who are risking their lives in defense of our country.

Where To Save Another $5,000,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following timely and pertinent editorial from the Washington Times-Herald, printed in its editions of July 27, 1950:

WHERE TO SAVE ANOTHER $5,000,000,000

We have something here for the special attention of Representative CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and for the even more special attention of the American taxpayer, whose money is involved.

It is a proposal to enforce the saving of $5,000,000,000 a year now being thrown away by the Department of Defense.

Two days ago the Times-Herald showed how, by proper operation of entirely civil functions of Government, Congress can find the $10,000,000,000 Mr. Truman asks as down payment on his blunders.

This $5,000,000,000 here mentioned is altogether separate and apart from that, and is all to be taken out of the waste, and worse, within the military system. The method is well known and has the very highest authority behind it.

It is peculiar that Mr. Truman, therefore, should have sent to Congress a message for $5,000,000,000 in added taxes without having put this saving into effect.

There is nothing magic about the $5,000,000,000 savings plan. Anybody interested can find out the facts by examining the reports of the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government or by looking at hearings on H. R. 321, held in May 1949, by the Armed Services Committee.

NO MAGIC IN THE METHOD

This proposition, which was introduced by Representative JACK Z. ANDERSON (Republican), of California, is entitled "A bill to promote more economical and efficient use of the Nation's resources by providing for a single supply catalog system for the National Military Establishment."

Now, everybody in the United States of America has some time or other heard how the Government hoards and misplaces supplies so that one agency pays vast sums for items that another agency has in surplus.

And every man and woman who was in uniform during World Wars I and II can testify that nowhere is this practice worse than among the military.

Thus it is that ever since World War I experts on purchasing and supply have been trying to get a single catalog for listing the variegated materials used in the operations of armies, navies, and air forces.

Once listed that way, the things needed by the fighting forces can be located promptly and moved as required for the safety and security of the United States.

Simple? Yes. Logical? Yes. From World War I down to the present, nobody has ever yet come forward to oppose the single catalog system, or to show anything better.

HOOVER REPORT GIVES THE FACTS

Here is what the Hoover Commission's report on the catalog says:

"The Secretary of Defense should in terms that are unmistakable, serve notice on the bureaus and technical services that a standard catalog shall be speedily prepared and adopted; after its preparation it must be used in all supply operations of all bureaus and technical services without modification; and that each bureau and technical service must assist in the preparation of the catalog by accepting and promptly completing cataloging assignments by the agency in whatever commodity classes it is made the cognizant body. * * *

"Simplification undoubtedly can be achieved and it must be if this undertaking universally recognized by military authorities as of crucial importance to national defense is to be completed and made effective within the work schedule of 4 years."

That was the case put to the Eighty-first Congress when it convened. Representative ANDERSON'S bill, H. R. 321, was designed to make this policy law.

Hearings were begun on May 11, 1949, but were closed down without conclusion. The theory was to give the military a year in which to show progress.

COURTS MARTIAL ARE IN ORDER

Well, the year is up. The job is not being done, even though Congress in this present session passed a resolution (H. Con. Res. 97) on Mr. ANDERSON'S motion, declaring the catalog "Congressional policy." And now the United States of America is being drafted into another period of overseas wars, high taxes being shot up higher still, vast amounts of material wealth consumed in machinery of war, and lowered living standards for everybody.

It is a scandal of first importance that the Hoover commission's recommendations, as above, have not been put in force already, and that now the defense bureaucracy is looking to the Korean war as an "emergency" excuse to drop the whole thing.

If the catalog should be postponed any further, some high-class courts martial are going to be in order.

There is just no excuse for the people's money being wasted in this matter and Congress, as the agency which both spends the money and fixes the taxes, is squarely responsible to the people for enforcing a correction.

Report From West Coast Upon False Peace Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to make available to my colleagues two excellent articles appearing in the Oregonian on Friday and Saturday of last week.

The first is by Al McCready, staff writer of that paper, under the headline "Reed College students, Progressive Party members circulate Communist-sponsored world peace petition." For emphasis I want to quote a portion of the statement of Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States who has succeeded Eugene Dennis as the No. 1 Communist during Dennis' confinement in jail:

I want to state as emphatically as I can that the Communist Party must get into

this campaign as we have never entered one before. * * * This must become the central task of the party. There will be no exception to this. No district, no section, no club, no member is exempted from participation with the maximum energy in this campaign.

I also want to quote for particular attention the following two paragraphs from the statement by Dr. Frank Munk, of Reed College, an outstanding opponent of communism:

Every signature will be used abroad as ammunition; it will be taken as proof that the American people are opposed to aiding the United Nations in its efforts to retain peace in Korea, and as a proof of the strength of communism and near-communism in this country.

Every signature marks a vote of encouragement for more Soviet aggression and brings world war III that much nearer.

The editor included with the article a reproduction of the petition and is certainly to be highly commended for taking this means of advising the reading public of the appearance of the petition so that they could identify it. The full article is, as follows:

[From the Oregonian, of Friday, July 21, 1950]

REED COLLEGE STUDENTS, PROGRESSIVE PARTY MEMBERS CIRCULATE COMMUNIST-SPONSORED WORLD PEACE PETITION

(By Al McCready)

Copies of the Communist-sponsored Stockholm peace petition are making their appearance in Portland.

Only a few of the petitions have been circulated in the city since Portland Communists and their supporters began importing them from New York several weeks ago, but plans are afoot for a high-voltage campaign to obtain thousands of signatures locally, the Oregonian has learned.

Formerly known as the World Peace Appeal, the petitions call for the outlawing of atomic weapons and the punishment as a war criminal of any nation which first uses them.

The Communist-controlled World Committee in Defense of Peace issued the appeal last March at Stockholm, Sweden, in the third of a series of international conferences held to promote the conception that Soviet Russia wants peace and the Western Powers are saber-rattling imperialists.

COMMUNIST BACKING RECORDED

The petitions, dramatically headed: "Your hand can stop atomic war! Sign for peace!" already have been signed by many thousands of United States citizens, most of them probably ignorant of their sponsorship, in the opinion of prominent Portlanders willing to speak out against the movement.

That the Communist Party is backing the petitions is a matter of record. The full text of the World Peace Appeal is reprinted in a current issue of the magazine Political Affairs, accompanied by a lengthy article on the petitions by Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States.

Hall, who succeeded Eugene Dennis as No. 1 Communist in the country when the latter went to jail, had this to say about the movement:

"I want to state as emphatically as I can that the Communist Party must get into this campaign as we have never entered one before. This is one central campaign, and not the circulation of separate petitions in different cities and States, as has been the case thus far.

"This must become the central task of the party. There will be no exception to this. No district, no section, no club, no member is exempted from participation with the maximum energy in this campaign.

LEG WORK REQUIRED

"Each section and club will work out a plan for the collection of signatures. This means leg work, house-to-house canvassing, ringing door bells. It will take thousands of meetings, speaking at unions, churches, clubs, county fairs."

Oregon's estimated 275 Communist Party members can be expected to respond with vigor to this directive, said Capt. William Browne, Portland chief of detectives and head of the Oregon American Legion's anti-subversive efforts.

"The Soviet Union fears the atom bomb, which they apparently do not have in any great quantities as yet. The Communists obviously hope that these petitions will mold world sentiment against atomic weapons and restrain the United States from using the bomb in the defense of itself or its allies, while giving the U. S. S. R. time to build up its own weapons," Browne said.

While no formal committee seems to have been organized as yet in Portland to promote the petitions, individuals and small groups have been quietly gathering signatures here for several weeks.

PROGRESSIVE PARTY ACTIVE

Involved in the local petition movement so far are Progressive Party members, several Reed College students and ex-students, members of the Civil Rights Congress, and members of old-age-pension groups.

First steps toward organizing Portland young people to push the petitions have been taken by a Reed College contingent calling itself the youth peace group.

It held a strategy meeting Tuesday night at the YMCA, in a room reserved by Homer L. Owen and Kytja Scott. Plans were made to send a mimeographed letter to Portland young peoples' groups such as the Epworth League, Christian Endeavor, YMCA, and YWCA organizations urging support for the peace petition.

Owen was identified as a 1950 Reed graduate who served 3 years in the Army. He quit school temporarily in 1948 to become an unsuccessful candidate for the State legislature. He was president of the Students-for-Wallace organization at Reed and was active in the Progressive Citizens of America, which later became the Progressive Party.

Miss Scott is the daughter of Dr. Arthur F. Scott, professor of chemistry at Reed and coordinator of Portland's emergency radiological monitoring team in the civil defense setup.

FATHER, DAUGHTER DISAGREE

Miss Scott said she and her father don't see eye to eye on the peace appeal petition. Asked if she is a Communist, she replied:

"No; not in the least. But I am in favor of peace and I think if an issue is an important one we can ignore the sponsorship. After all, the Communist Party also favors FEPC legislation, and this does not prevent non-Communists from supporting it, also."

No friend of the Stockholm peace appeal or its adherents, Dr. Scott termed it "a ruse which may result in the intimidation of many unsuspecting Portlanders who have no knowledge of a connection between the Kremlin and the peace proposal and how it has been used to the advantage of Communists in European countries."

His attitude was shared by Dr. Frank Munk, Reed professor of political science, who said there is "danger that honest, loyal, and well-meaning citizens may be misled into signing the documents and thus become accessories to one of the most colossal and successful hoaxes of modern history."

REAL PURPOSE NOT PEACE

The petition, he said, is the latest stage of a movement going on since 1948 by the Partisans of Peace, a Communist-spawned organization controlled by Cominform (Communist information bureau) headquarters in Bucharest.

"The real purpose of the 'peace' movement is not peace, but achievement of definite power-political objectives," he said.

The objectives, as listed by Mr. Munk:

1. The petition acts as a smoke screen, picturing the Soviet Union as the great advocate of peace while it continues to resort to "naked acts of aggression," such as in Czechoslovakia in 1948 and Korea in 1950.

2. It is supposed to weaken the front defending genuine freedom and democracy by creating dissension, vacillation, and doubts, and thereby impair its ability to act.

3. It gives the Communist Party a list of names from which additional cadres of party workers can be recruited.

4. It commits nonparty members to association with party activities and makes them susceptible to all sorts of subtle, or not so subtle, pressures in the future.

VOTE ENCOURAGES U. S. S. R.

"Every signature will be used abroad as ammunition; it will be taken as proof that the American people are opposed to aiding the United Nations in its effort to retain peace in Korea, and as proof of the strength of communism and near-communism in this country.

"Every signature marks a vote of encouragement for more Soviet aggression and brings world war III that much nearer," he declared.

Prominent in the Reed campus propetition movement is Dell Hymes, 23-year-old ex-Progressive Partyite and an ex-GI who served 1½ years in Korea's occupation force.

A 1950 Reed graduate, Hymes said he has been taking time out from rehearsals for his part in the college summer theater production of Much Ado About Nothing to get signatures on peace petitions.

PARTY MEMBERSHIP DENIED

He said he first learned of the peace appeal from Mrs. Margie Owen, secretary to the Reed College dean of men and women and the wife of Homer Owen.

He said he did not know if the petitions were sponsored by the Communist Party in the United States, but that he would continue to circulate them, even if they were.

"On this issue, I would," he said. "I feel if we get a great many signatures on petitions to outlaw the atom bomb, it will put Russia in the hole and make it difficult for her to continue to refuse to agree to international control of atomic energy."

Hymes said he is not a Communist Party member.

"I was asked to join, but I refused," he said.

In addition to Mr. and Mrs. Owen and Miss Scott, Hymes said the Youth Peace group membership includes Mimi Weeks, a Reed junior, and Duff Dretzin, a senior.

While the Progressive Party has taken no official stand on the petitions, individual members are making plans to circulate them.

Paul Lehmann, 3419 Northeast Eightieth Avenue, chairman of the party pension committee, said he obtained a copy of the petition at a party meeting. His fellow members were enthusiastic about the appeal, he said, adding that he intends to get some signatures on his copy.

Lawrence Lusk, Gardiner, Oreg., serving as volunteer secretary in the Progressive Party headquarters in Portland, said "a great many" Progressiveites intend to push the petitions as individuals.

A decision to make the campaign a formal part of the Oregon party program may be made at a meeting of the state central committee in Portland Saturday, he said.

SALEM WOMEN ACTIVE

Each recent edition of the Progressive Party's national newspaper, The National Guardian, has featured an advertisement

inviting readers to write to the Peace Information Center, post office box 349, Grand Central Station, New York City, for copies of the anti-atom petition.

Other pioneer petition pushers in the Progressive ranks include two Salem women, Mrs. Maude Morlan and Mrs. Pearl Formick, members of the Townsend Club and the Salem Progressive Club, according to party spokesmen.

John M. Dyhr, chairman of the Portland Civil Rights Congress, said several of his members are interested in the movement.

"I have signed one of the petitions, and I expect to begin circulating them," he said.

First of the three international conferences which produced the peace appeal was at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York in March 1949. Speakers at this conference castigated the Atlantic Pact, the Marshall plan, and "Anglo-American capitalist imperialism."

ROBESON SPEECH RECALLED

The second was in Paris April 20 to 23, 1949. A high light of this meet, sponsored by Communists and their front organizations, was a speech by Paul Robeson, American singer, in which he declared American Negroes never would go to war against the U. S. S. R.

In Winston-Salem, N. C., one of the United States cities where the petitions are being distributed, Editor Wallace Carroll of the Journal and Sentinel found an effective antidote.

According to Columnist Marquis Childs, the newspaper editor promptly started a petition of his own.

Editor Carroll's counterirritant, dubbed the "appeal for true peace," said the Korean war is a danger to peace, and called on the governments and peoples of the world to persuade the North Korean forces to obey the United Nations and return to their starting point.

"We believe the governments and individuals who proclaim their devotion to peace can prove that devotion by using their influence to stop the Korean war in this way," the petition said.

The article Saturday is by Dr. Frank Munk. It appears with an editorial notation that he was among those quoted in the previous full article, but that the editors believe that the full text of the statement should be made available to the public. It is as follows:

[From the Oregonian of Saturday, July 22, 1950]

PEACE PETITION HOAX ANALYZED

(By Frank Munk)

The spurious Stockholm peace petition is now being circulated in Portland and there is danger that honest, loyal, and well-meaning citizens may be misled into signing the document and thus becoming accessories to one of the most colossal and most successful hoaxes of modern history. The so-called peace petition, calling for prohibition of the atomic weapon is only the latest stage of a well-organized movement which has been going on for the last 2 years, led by the Partisans for Peace, a Communist-spawned and sponsored organization, master-minded by the Bucharest headquarters of the Communist information bureau.

Anybody asking to inform himself about the background of the movement can do so by consulting the weekly bulletin of the Cominform. It presents a perfect illustration of Lenin's concepts of "belts," "levers," and "directing force," whereby innocent persons and groups are incorporated into the system of Soviet power and propaganda. The supreme soviet of the U. S. S. R. has added its official backing to the resolution by adopting it on June 19.

The Soviet Union could have achieved atomic weapons control perfectly well in and through the United Nations had it not obstinately refused to consider the Lilienthal-Acheson-Baruch proposals and, more particularly, had it not insisted that any control mechanism would still have to be subject to Russian veto in the Security Council. They were offered fool-proof, veto-proof control of atomic armament, and refused even seriously to consider it.

The real purpose of the peace movement is not peace, but achievement of definite power-political objectives:

1. It acts as a smoke screen. Ostensibly the Soviet Union is the great advocate of peace, while in reality it is resorting to ever more naked acts of aggression (Czechoslovakia, 1948; Korea, 1950).

2. It is supposed to weaken the front defending genuine freedom and democracy by creating dissension, vacillation, and doubts, and thereby impairing ability to act.

3. It gives the CP a list of persons from whom additional cadres of party workers can be recruited.

4. It commits nonparty members to association with party activities and makes them susceptible to all sorts of subtle, and not so subtle pressures in the future.

The "peace" movement has been holding conferences in many capitals for quite a while. However, its appearance in the United States was timed so as to coincide with the Communist attack on South Korea. Every signature will be used abroad as ammunition; it will be taken as a proof that the American people are opposed to aiding the United Nations in its effort to restore peace in Korea; as a proof that a potential and powerful fifth column of Soviet sympathizers in this country eagerly awaits a Soviet offensive, as a proof of the strength of communism and near-communism in this country.

Every signature of the Stockholm petition marks a vote of encouragement for more Soviet aggression and brings world war III that much nearer. It has nothing to do with a genuine desire for peace and peaceful settlement of international conflicts.

As Marquis Childs suggested in yesterday's Oregonian, it should be countered by a free world peace movement and an effort to reach the minds of people all over the world on whom the Soviet propagandists are preying for their sinister ends.

How To Lose a War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

HOW TO LOSE A WAR

The war in Korea is a little one. Korea is a peninsula and the United States commands the sea and air around it. At present, men and supplies are being landed below the enemy's line and others could be landed behind it should that strategy be required.

It is absurd to pretend, as the administration spokesmen do, that to defeat the North Koreans will require full mobilization of our resources. The proposal is itself evidence of the determination of the New Dealers to use any excuse to get control of the men, the industries, the farms, and the money of the Nation.

The great strength of our country lies in its productivity. The great enemy of productivity is Government control. The only excuse for imposing controls now is the probability that war production this year will strain supplies of a few raw materials and require the conversion of some factories from production of civilian goods to war goods.

It is easy to exaggerate the difficulty. The thoughtless will assume that the Korean war will drain our resources as the world war did.

The absurdity of the assumption is apparent in the mere statement of it. This time we aren't fighting two of the strongest military powers on earth. There is no need this time to divert tens of millions of tons of steel to the construction of ships because we have all we need. We need military supplies of many sorts, but not in the stupendous quantities required from 1941 to 1945.

In short, the requirements of this war will impose some industrial problems, but they will all be of a sort which can readily be solved by voluntary action. The steel industry and the buyers of steel can easily agree on priorities which will provide the few million tons that may be required for war uses. Reasoned appeals to the public to restrict purchases of scarce articles to the minimum will go a long way toward preventing prices from rising unduly.

To operate the full-scale control of the economy that the President is aiming for would require an army of clerks and "snoops" and directive writers who would accomplish less than a voluntary system will produce.

Once the New Dealers got their hands on the economy, which has been their ambition for a generation, they would fight to keep it and they might succeed this time, using the prospect of other Koreas as their excuse.

The United States will not long remain the most productive nation on earth if the Government tries to run the mines, the factories, the farms, the stores, and the railroads. It ought to be hard for us to lose the war in Korea, but if the controls the New Dealers want are established, our chances of winning it speedily will be greatly lessened.

Problems Confronting Milk and Dairy Products Marketing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 28 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I made before the Subcommittee on Milk and Milk Products of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, relating to the problems which exist in the field of milk and dairy products marketing.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILK AND MILK PRODUCTS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, JULY 28, 1950

Mr. Chairman, I wish first to thank you and the members of your subcommittee for the

cpportunity to testify and present my views for your consideration. I also want to commend your subcommittee for the excellent work you have already performed in bringing to the public eye and to the attention of the Congress, through your studies, problems which now exist in the field of milk and dairy-products marketing.

In testifying before the subcommittee I am honored to represent one of our Nation's largest and most important dairy States, the State of Minnesota. For many years our State has been a leading butter- and milk-producing State. During World War II Minnesota became one of the Nation's important producers of nonfat dry-milk solids. Our citizens, therefore, have a direct interest in national dairy marketing problems. Whether or not Minnesota dairy farmers receive a fair return for the milk and butterfat they produce depends largely on the national market for these products.

Before going into the over-all problems facing the dairy farmer, I wish to bring to your attention a vital specific problem affecting our section of the country, the Midwest dairy industry. In recent years a number of significant regional shifts in the dairy industry have taken place. From 1940 to 1949 milk production of the United States as a whole increased 8.8 percent. New York, for example, showed an increase of 14 percent, New Jersey 18 percent, and Pennsylvania 24 percent. The North Atlantic States as a whole showed an increase of 13.7 percent, the South Atlantic States 29 percent, and the East North Central States 16.2 percent. These would all be commendable increases, Mr. Chairman, which we in Minnesota and neighboring States would applaud, were it not for the fact that in the same period, in spite of the increase in population and increased activity because of the war effort, milk production in Minnesota decreased 1 percent; in the West North Central States as a whole there was a decrease of approximately 4 percent. It is my understanding that in your own State of Iowa, the decrease was 10 percent and in Nebraska 16 percent. Recent years have shown a trend whereby many of the fine herds of dairy cows of the Midwest, very much needed for soil-conservation programs in our area of the country, have been moved eastward by train and truck. This is of great concern to us, because of the fact that for many years our milk producers have improved their herds, their facilities, their sanitation methods, and their product in order to compete with and meet the eastern market. With the developing trend, however, supported somewhat by Federal marketing orders, our milk producers now find themselves losing many of their eastern markets. As a result, our farmers and dairy industry are being forced to process an increasing amount of our surplus into butter and nonfat powder, which in turn has to be supported by the taxpayer through Federal price-support programs.

We in Minnesota are directly affected by eastern milk prices. I do not wish to be a party to any growing feelings of rivalry or bitterness between the dairy industries of the Midwest and the East. The future of that industry and the future welfare of the American dairy farmers depends upon unity in dairy ranks—unity of purpose and unity of program. It is true, however, that present Federal marketing orders have resulted in growing resentments. Decisions made in the milksheds of the East directly affects the interests of the Midwest. If I may quote, Dr. E. W. Gaumnitz, a former head of the Dairy Branch and now executive director of the National Cheese Institute:

"Certainly, producers and manufacturers who operate outside milksheds are affected by and therefore are directly concerned with decisions made in milkshed, just as fluid-milk producers are affected by developments in the manufacturing segments of the industry. In a sense the industry is one, although it may appear to have many parts."

I wish to bring to your attention a meeting held on January 12 in St. Paul, Minn., sponsored by the National Creameries Association and attended by dairy farmers and processors in 12 States, called to consider the effects of governmental regulations upon Midwest dairy industries. I know that you have in your files communications from their representatives. I have been in communication with them and their representatives as well. I submit for your attention a copy of a letter dated March 20 written by Mr. J. M. Punderson, chairman of that conference and general manager of the Rochester Dairy Cooperative in Rochester, Minn., to Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan and a copy of a resolution forwarded by him which was adopted at the January 12 conference.

It is also my understanding that Mr. John Brandt, president of the Land O' Lakes Creamery, and one of the leading dairy producers of our State, has likewise been among those who communicated with the Secretary of Agriculture protesting that the present Federal marketing regulations do not give due consideration to the historical marketing differentials and to the normal marketing practices of our dairy producers.

Following these and other communications I received, I had a conference with Mr. Preston Richards, Director of the Dairy Branch, Mr. John Thompson, Assistant Administrator of the PMA program, and with other representatives of the Department of Agriculture, bringing the views of our Minnesota dairy farmers and producers to their attention and urging a reexamination of the Federal program so as to consider providing recognition to quality of dairy products and to area price differentials. It is with this in mind that I bring these facts to the attention of the subcommittee as well. I now wish to discuss for a few moments the over-all problems affecting the dairy industry.

For the past year and a half prices for milk and butterfat have been maintained by the price support for manufacturing milk. This support has been at the relatively low level of 79 percent of parity equivalent for manufacturing milk. It is most significant to note that over a national United States average farm prices for milk and butterfat have declined 30 percent during the past 2 years (July 1948 to July 1950).

In order to support present price levels it has been necessary for the Commodity Credit Corporation, during the past year and a half, to purchase 228,000,000 pounds of butter, 94,000,000 pounds of cheese, and 609,000,000 pounds of powder. Intensive efforts have been made within the liimtations of existing legislation to dispose of these commodities through the domestic-market outlets—school-lunch programs, foreign-assistance programs, and public- and private-relief programs in the United States and private relief abroad. Nevertheless, in spite of these efforts the CCC still holds 192,000,000 pounds of butter, 8,000,000 pounds of cheese, and 322,000,000 pounds of nonfat dry-milk solids. It is true that the total quantities of dairy products removed under the price-support program represents only 3 percent of our total milk production, but these statistics present us with a serious problem on both an economic and a moral level. I urge the subcommittee to give serious attention to these problems.

It is true that the current international crisis may well serve to temporarily postpone the need to give them immediate attention. But I prefer to believe, Mr. Chairman, that now is the time in fact to find their solutions. I fear that the American consuming public, not too aware of the intricate and complex economic and social problems which the American dairy farmer faces every day of his life, may come to minimize the importance of maintaining a high level of income for the American dairy farmers as they face increasing consumer costs. I fear that the picture of huge agriculture- and dairy-product stores in Government warehouses, at the same time as high consumer prices prevent the potential consumer demand from being met, may lead to a breach between the American consumer and the American farmer. This would be a most unfortunate development, for the welfare of our economy as a whole depends upon the interrelationship between consumer and agricultural interests. The health of our economy depends upon a firm economic foundation for the American farmer. And economic prosperity for American agriculture depends upon our ability to satisfy consumer demand at reasonable prices which the American people can afford to pay.

It is necessary that we consider the possibility of adjusting our price support program for American agriculture in such a way as to permit an adjustment in market prices which would encourage consumption, minimize the need for accumulating inventories of perishable dairy products, and assure a fair price for the American consumer.

I am proud to say, Mr. Chairman, that this problem which I now bring to your attention is one in which many of our leading citizens in Minnesota have already expressed a keen interest. In recent months I have been in communication with scores of our Minnesota citizens who expressed their concern over the growing disparity between farm prices and consumer prices. Your subcommittee has already seriously studied the effect of this disparity on the price of coffee when compared with the cost of producing this essential family commodity. The most acute demonstration of this problem is the growing disparity between prices paid to the farmers and prices which consumers must pay. I therefore had the honor of sponsoring a conference held in our State at which this subject was thoroughly explored by a number of our most prominent Minnesota citizens, representing the cooperative, business, labor, agricultural, and consumer movements. Represented at this conference were organizations from our neighboring States, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, and Wisconsin.

At my invitation, and with the active cooperation of the Minnesota Association of Cooperatives and District Lodge 77 of the International Association of Machinists, a citizens committee conference was held on Monday, March 20, at the Nicollet Hotel in Minneapolis. At my request, Commissioner John Carson of the Federal Trade Commission was present and brought with him Dr. Corwin Edwards, chief economist of the FTC, and Mr. John Sheehy, of the FTC legal staff.

The purpose of our conference was to provide an opportunity for representatives of the FTC, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Labor to discuss with our citizens' group the reasons for the price spread and possible solutions in the problems this price spread raised for our economy.

The conference was a commendable success. One of its most significant results was the adoption of a resolution requesting the FTC to investigate the methods and costs of distributing farm products. I have endorsed that resolution. I have placed it in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on March 30, 1950 (p. 4411), and I now bring it to the attention of your subcommittee as being meritorious of your consideration. I urge its support. In view of the importance of this conference, I am taking the liberty of bringing to your attention for your record a

list of the individuals and organizations registered for the conference, and a copy of the resolution which was adopted.

I should also at this time like to stress my support to you of Senate Joint Resolution 162, introduced by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], calling for an investigation by the Secretary of Agriculture of the effects upon the dairy industry of the repeal of the oleomargarine tax. This resolution is before your full committee, and I have already written to the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, urging its favorable consideration.

Before World War II, the American people consumed approximately 17 pounds of butter per capita. Last year that consumption was reduced to between 11 and 12 pounds per capita. On the other hand, the prewar consumption of oleo was slightly under 3 pounds. It is today approximately 6 pounds per capita. These changes in consumption took place even before the 10-cents-per-pound tax on the manufacture and sale of oleo removed by the Congress earlier this year. With the recent decision by Congress the butter industry stands in great danger. Something must be done to cushion the impact on that industry. Members of the committee will recall that in the course of the congressional debate on oleomargarine, I brought the attention of the Senate the fact that the major part of the oleomargarine manufacturing in the United States is in the control of six firms. I pointed to the threat which our economy faced from the opportunities for monopoly in the oleo industry. There is a price war taking place in the market, which has been on since July 1—the day when the repeal of the oleo tax took effect. We must be wary, Mr. Chairman, let this price war further accelerate the tendency toward monopoly by eliminating the marginal producer from the market. The result of such a development would be a further concentration of control in the industry, thereby giving the large producers the power, by tacit conspiracy, to raise or lower the price of oleomargarine to any desired level at the expense of the American consumer. It is for this reason that I support the proposal of the Senator from New York for an investigation of the monopolistic elements and tendencies within the oleo industry. Such an investigation is necessary both for the protection and the preservation of the American dairy industry and the protection of the American consumer.

There is one further question to which I wish to address myself. One of the subjects which your subcommittee is studying has concerned itself with sanitary requirements for milk in the District of Columbia. Unnecessary regulatory trade barriers in the marketing of milk should be abolished and it is because I consider the regulations in the District of Columbia to be designed primarily toward maintaining those trade barriers that I believe those regulations should be eliminated, too.

The marketing of milk is subject to a great deal of Government regulation. Controls are imposed not only by our municipal and State governments but in certain cases by our Federal Government as well. Much of this regulation is necessary since milk, of all our foods, is perhaps the most vital to the nutritional health and well-being of our people. Milk, as one of our most highly perishable foods, can menace the very high health standards we seek if it should be carelessly handled. The consumer must, therefore, be protected so as to assure him of an adequate supply of pure and wholesome milk at all times.

I therefore have no objection to Government milk regulation in itself, provided these regulations do not operate unnecessarily as trade barriers and in so doing become opposed to the public interest. It is not in the public interest for local health authorities in the District of Columbia to impose regulations beyond the point necessary adequately to protect the health of the consuming public.

Here in the District of Columbia the issue being debated has been placed in terms of chemical sterilization of milk utensils as opposed to steam sterilization. The evidence is overwhelming, Mr. Chairman, that chemical sterilization is fully adequate to protect the public health of any American community and is in fact in operation in many of them. The conclusion is unmistakable that to restrict sterilization to the steam process is to build a ring around the District of Columbia market and prevent competition from outside milk supply.

These views which I express are fully consistent with the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1937, authorizing Federal regulation of milk markets. This act is very specific when it reads:

"No marketing agreement or order applicable to milk and its products in any marketing area shall prohibit or in any manner limit, in the case of the products of milk, the marketing in that area of any milk or product thereof produced in any production area in the United States."

It is possible to import practically anything to the District of Columbia produced elsewhere in our Nation. As has been pointed out to you, it is possible to import the product of Kentucky distilleries, but it is impossible to import healthy Minnesota bottled milk. Yet, Mr. Chairman, our milk in Minnesota is every bit as nutritious and vitamin-rich as milk produced by Maryland and Virginia farmers.

I do not believe in monopoly, whether it is monopoly of a large industrial combine or whether it is monopoly by Maryland and Virginia milk producers. I do not believe that the movement of dairy products between States should be restricted, and I certainly do not believe that here in the District of Columbia, under authority of Congress, those restrictions ought to be allowed. The freest possible movement of dairy products between States should be encouraged. The importation of milk in the District of Columbia should be encouraged rather than have obstacles placed in its way, particularly in the light of the statistics brought to light by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] indicating that the sale of alcoholic beverages is heavier per person than the sale of milk.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you and the members of your subcommittee for giving serious attention to my views. I have attempted to review for your information problems faced by our Minnesota dairy farmers and by our Midwest dairy industry. I have also attempted to discuss the problems of the dairy industry as they affect our economy, and particularly as they are related to the consumer interest and the necessity for investigating the spread between the prices paid to the farmers and prices which the consumer must pay.

In this connection I urge your support for legislation calling for an investigation of the effects upon the dairy industry of the repeal of the oleomargarine taxes, as well as an investigation of monopoly within the oleomargarine industry, since these two aspects of the problem are interrelated and directly affect the interests of the dairy farmer and the interests of the American consumer.

Finally, I associated myself with the attempt now being made to remove the unnecessary regulatory trade barriers in the marketing and distribution of milk here in the District of Columbia.

I thank you for your courtesy, and I want again to commend you for the breadth and purpose of your investigation.

Senator Tobey Raps Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 28 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article headed "Senator TOBEY Raps Administration," published in the Manchester Union, of Manchester, N. H., on July 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR TOBEY RAPS ADMINISTRATION—SEES BRANNAN PLAN BEING PUT IN LAW BY INDIRECTION

WASHINGTON, D. C.—United States Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY lashed out Tuesday at administration attempts to insert parts of the Brannan farm program by indirection in legislation giving the President emergency economic control powers.

TOBEY is the ranking Republican member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, which is considering the Defense Production Act of 1950. The act would authorize the President to establish certain economic controls in order to regulate the production of goods and services necessary for the national security.

MAKES ACCUSATION

Taking the Senate floor, TOBEY pointed his accusation at section 412 of the bill, which would allow the President to direct the sales of Government-controlled agricultural commodities at the full support price, when the support price is not below the market price. In effect, TOBEY declared, this could bring nearly 100 percent of the production of these commodities under direct Government control.

Led by Senator TOBEY, Republicans on the committee maintain that the President has the authority to accomplish these ends by declaring that a state of national emergency exists. By using special legislation for the purpose, they charge, the administration hopes to extend these controls beyond the emergency period, thus making them an integral part of Federal control of the national economy.

TOBEY was joined in the Senate debate by Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, who commended the New Hampshire lawmaker for his observation that the administration is attempting to do by indirection what it could not do directly.

Declaration of War Against the Gangsters in the Kremlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 28 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial

entitled, "Time for a Formal Declaration of War Against the Gangsters in the Kremlin," which appeared recently in the Ashland Daily Press.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME FOR A FORMAL DECLARATION OF WAR AGAINST THE GANGSTERS IN THE KREMLIN

It is time for a formal declaration of war by America—not against the Russian people, but against the murderous gangsters in the Kremlin.

A check list of 100 leaders of the present Russian Communist government should be issued to the world, and America should formally launch war against them to the death.

Let them save the Russian people by surrendering for life terms or execution.

Let these criminals against society and against all humanity know that we are formally dedicated to exterminating them.

Let these preachers of hatred and envy and dishonesty and dishonor know that America and the world are out to "get" them—exactly as we would go out to get a mad dog, exactly as we went after the Capone gang and smashed it, exactly as we went after Hitler.

The fountainhead of the poison in the world today—so far as our age is concerned—was Lenin. His mausoleum in the Red Square should be blasted off the face of the earth as an ugly disgrace to the human race.

Then the Russian people should be informed that America is formally launched on a war to exterminate its leaders.

Let us start at the source of this worldwide infection. Let us destroy these leaders as we destroyed Hitler. Htiler learned all of his dastardly tricks from a study of communism. His implanting of cells within opposition organizations, his secret police, his attitude toward God and toward women as breeders of war fodder—all this he stole from the master criminals in Russia. Then he added war on the Jews to his devilish witch's brew. The world had to rub him out.

It is now time to rub out the original source of all this infection.

We certainly have no primary war with the Russian people, who have been indoctrinated with poison for 30 years, though we may have to kill hundreds of thousands of them before this is over—unless we can kill their leaders first.

Let us proclaim to the world that we have no war with the Russian people.

Let us name 100 Russian leaders beginning with Stalin and let us tell the world that they must abdicate or be rubbed out. Then let us get down to business and finish the job, which by our own folly we have allowed to grow so big that it represents the greatest challenge that ever faced America and that ever faced humanity.

Our Quest for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 28 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address broadcast by me over radio station WGN, Chicago, Ill., on July 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It appears quite obvious at this moment that negotiations for world peace must await the return to the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea of Communist troops now pushing an invasion across the southern half of that country.

That return of Communist troops to the thirty-eighth parallel will be by force.

It will be by the force of American arms and American fighting men.

When that feat is accomplished, then America should call upon Joe Stalin to halt his plan for world domination through agreements made and approved by responsible representatives of both Russia and America and confirmed by the representatives of the peoples in both nations. No more secret agreements to be kept from both peoples.

We are united in our fight to preserve the agreements made in the many secret conferences during the last war—but we should be equally united in a demand that future efforts to give the world a lasting peace shall not be confined to the judgment of a small group of men whose respective diplomatic statures are not equal.

Our heritage guarantees that bond—our country right or wrong, our country.

We are fighting a Godless foe today and in such a fight we cannot be wrong.

I read with great interest a few days ago a statement on the Korean situation issued by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

The opening sentence of that statement was quite significant.

It said—and I quote:

"There is no single agreement under which we are 'in' Korea."

Then the statement proceeds to explain that we are "in" Korea by virtue of declarations made at the conferences in Yalta, Tehran, Cairo, and other places throughout the world, including Moscow.

Those declarations—termed by some "agreements"—never became a part of any treaty.

They were never presented to the people of America, or Russia, or England, or any other nation involved in them, for confirmation.

In fact, they were never made known by their makers until a congressional demand in 1948 resulted in a report by President Truman as to the violations charged against Russia.

That report was in answer to a Senate resolution in which 30 other Senators joined me in asking on March 19, 1948, what Russian violations had prompted Mr. Truman to say in a speech on March 17, 1948, that one nation has "persistently ignored and violated" agreements which "could have furnished a basis for a just peace."

Russia, at the time, was enforcing its Berlin blockade, and we were learning for the first time that the Potsdam agreements did not include a corridor through which we could reach Berlin.

In the report on the agreements which Russia had violated, President Truman listed numerous charges of violations in Germany, Austria, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Manchuria, and Korea.

It is quite interesting to note the first agreement violated in Korea. The agreement was reached by the United States and Russia in the Moscow Conference of January and February 1946.

The agreement was quoted as follows:

"Reestablishment of movement of persons, motor, rail transport, and coastwise shipping between the zones of North and South Korea."

This is the charge of violation, and I quote from the President's report submitted to the Senate through the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on June 2, 1948:

"The Soviet command in North Korea has since 1946 refused to discuss or implement the agreements reached on these matters, resisting efforts toward reestablishing the natural economic unity of the country.

"Concessions to economic coordination have been made only on a barter basis.

"No regularized movement of persons or transport has been established beyond that allowing the limited supply by the United States of its outposts that are accessible only by roads through Soviet-occupied territory."

There again we failed to provide access to our holdings.

It was a duplication of the Berlin error.

It has been said that we have made four serious blunders since the war, and one of them was the belief by certain policy makers that we could deal with Joe Stalin.

I believe the declarations, or agreements, made in those secret conferences were, for the most part, in good faith as far as our representatives were concerned.

I want to emphasize that I believe most of them were. Being done in good faith does not make them right, or wrong.

Nevertheless, they are our agreements, and we shall fight for them.

When that victory is won, we shall strive to prevent a repetition of the course which led to the present conflict.

It is my belief that our national position would be stronger today if the agreements we are now fighting to preserve had been made a part of a treaty that had won the approval of the representatives of the people in Congress.

I believe that should be the first objective of our future negotiators.

In addition, I believe that the initial agreement made toward any future peace negotiations should be that each nation involved in the agreement shall obtain approval of the treaty by its people before the treaty can become effective.

Let us reflect back for a moment and recall just who it was who approved the so-called agreements for which we have gone to war to preserve.

It happened at Yalta, according to the record.

Who represented us in the final Yalta Conference?

President Roosevelt, of course. He died just 2 months later.

The only other American in the room was Alger Hiss.

A few days ago Fred Remington, a writer for Scripps-Howard papers, wrote an interesting article in which he reviewed an interview he had with Mr. Hiss 2½ years ago about the agreement on Korea.

Mr. Remington said Hiss told him that we had given Russia a mortgage on half of Korea because we needed Russia's help in the war with Japan.

Mr. Remington wrote that he asked Hiss why President Roosevelt had given Russia so much for coming into the war with Japan when the war was virtually over.

Mr. Hiss replied, according to Mr. Remington—and I quote:

"The war with Japan was far from won in early 1945. It seemed possible then that it could drag on for another 2 years."

That was Mr. Hiss' reply.

Russia entered the war with Japan just 5 days before Japan surrendered.

Alger Hiss went on to explain to Mr. Remington that Russia was given the rich and industrial northern half of Korea because Russia could reach it through Manchuria, and we took the nonsupporting southern half because it was closer to our occupation forces in Japan.

Alger Hiss, the only adviser President Roosevelt had in that room with Joe Stalin,

was at that very time charged with being disloyal to the United States and has since been convicted by a jury in a United States district court.

When we have won this war and preserved the agreements which Russia has chosen to violate, we must be certain that no more Alger Hisses participate in our efforts to obtain peace for the world.

The words that Mr. Roosevelt spoke when he came out of that meeting at Yalta, accompanied by Alger Hiss, had a deathly echo today.

He was asked why he and Hiss had given Russia three votes to our one vote in the postwar plan for peace.

President Roosevelt, whose death was not far off, replied:

"I know I shouldn't have done it. But I was so tired when they got hold of me. Besides, it won't make much difference."

It has made a great difference.

In our all-out effort to win this new war we must not lose sight of the steps of failure that have been taken to win the peace—for we shall win this war and we can win the peace that follows it only if we recognize what failed in the past.

We have behind us now the inconsistent foreign policies which left us unprepared for the action we face in Korea and the Far East today.

We have behind us the misrepresentations of those who were influential in framing our foreign policies.

There is but one course now.

That is to fight and to win.

We can no longer consider the fact set forth by the Library of Congress that no single agreement exists for our being in Korea.

We are in Korea and we shall stay in Korea until Joe Stalin is convinced that his program of Communist domination of the world cannot succeed.

I was just a youngster, a high school graduate, when I enlisted in the First World War.

The fight then was for freedom and liberty.

We fought that war and won. Freedom and liberty were ours without threat until the Axis dictators attempted to throw the cloak of socialism over the world.

Again we fought to preserve freedom and liberty—not only for ourselves but for the other peoples of the world.

We fought and won again.

For 5 years since that war we have poured out to the world the riches of a Nation that has known the advantages of freedom and liberty for all its life.

We were fighting another kind of war. A war of kindness and hopeful understanding against a growing menace of godless power known as communism.

Whatever is godless is spiritless—it knows no kindness; it has no understanding.

For this reason we are called upon to resort to that course best understood by this atheistic creature.

Those of us who have fought communism within our own country for many years, and who warned of the dangers of its growth here, could probably find it easy to say now that our policy should have been more determined long ago.

But what is past is past.

We look to the future now.

We look to an early ending of the war and a settlement of the issues to insure a lasting peace.

We look to a resumption of negotiations by American processes, not by individuals who falsely feel they have a blank check on foreign policy.

We look to a period of greater honesty by those who are chosen to lead us in our quest for peace.

Elimination of Gambling and Rackets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 28 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Wisconsin Could Be Guide to Nation for Elimination of Gambling and Rackets," which was written by John Wyngaard, and published in the Appleton Post Crescent, of Appleton, Wis.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN COULD BE GUIDE TO NATION FOR ELIMINATION OF GAMBLING AND RACKETS

(By John Wyngaard)

MADISON.—In national politics these days there is a considerable fuss being made about controlling and eliminating gambling and rackets. There seems to be little recognition of the fact that the State of Wisconsin has done exactly that, and so quietly and so efficiently that the event has almost been forgotten.

The accomplishment has been good politics. There is overwhelming evidence that the politician in Wisconsin who would want to relax the State's prohibitions against gambling would be on the defensive and would lose his campaign. Indeed, not a single candidate or politician has seriously offered such a program since the antigambling statute backing up the constitutional ban on lotteries was adopted 5 years ago.

For all practical purposes, commercial gambling has been extinguished in Wisconsin. The violations occasionally brought to notice serve to remind the electorate that the State gambling patrol remain on the job, and to recall the huge numbers of such offenses only a few years ago.

GOOD POLITICS

There never was any doubt about the governor's attitude toward gambling. He made that clear in private conferences with the State field officers immediately after he took office in 1947, and in numerous acts since. It was not generally known, for example, but one of the reasons for the reorganization of the beverage tax division was the governor's wish that the division remain completely free to do its job.

Governor Rennebohm has a strong conviction of duty—including the duty to see to it that the laws of the legislature are vigorously and fairly applied.

But it has now become apparent also that in this instance a firm enforcement policy, even to the confiscation of relatively innocuous wheels and other devices at picnics and bazaars, is good politics.

But the Governor's reply to a lawmaker of his own party the other day illustrated his attitude.

The legislator evidently had had some reactions from local gambling establishments that had felt the lash of the State beverage tax division lately. Half jokingly, he asked the Governor why such raids had to be made while he, the local legislator, was running for reelection. The Governor replied, according to the narrative, that this legislator ought to know by this time that the people of Wisconsin disapprove of gambling and want the prohibition laws enforced positively and without exception.

LOOPHOLE PLUGGED

There is another untold story in this connection. It had not been publicized, but one of the deficiencies of the new State law on gambling is that it provided no weapon, according to statehouse lawyers, for the apprehension of race horse bookmakers and bookmaking establishments. That was a job for the attorney general, according to this interpretation, rather than the men of the beverage tax division who had pretty effectively policed the State otherwise. The attorney general's office was not staffed for police work.

The recent and spectacularly successful raids upon bookmakers in southern Wisconsin resulted from a quiet agreement between Attorney General Thomas E. Fairchild the Democrat, and Gov. Oscar Rennebohm, the Republican. Fairchild initiated the campaign, with men detached from the tax division at the order of the Governor. Here is nonpartisan enforcement of the law, anyone will agree.

The complete success of the State's prohibition on gambling is somewhat surprising in perspective, although it is now so commonly accepted that it is rarely commented upon. At the time it was proposed, a good number of persons who were not themselves sympathetic with gambling or the racketeers looked upon it as a blue-nose proposition, and with a notable lack of enthusiasm. There were doubts that it would succeed in the long pull. Those doubts have been removed. It will be a long time before anyone in State politics dares to tamper with the law or with its stern enforcement.

We Can't Sell Our Ideals Abroad if They Die at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 28 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "We Can't Sell Our Ideals Abroad if They Die at Home," published in the Saturday Evening Post of July 29, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE CAN'T SELL OUR IDEALS ABROAD IF THEY DIE AT HOME

Hardly had the Korean incident settled down to the status of normal war news when Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, made in the United States Senate a remark which represents one thing that we hope will be avoided for the duration. Senator TAFT had urged the resignation of Secretary of State Acheson on the obvious ground that events had cut the heart out of the Acheson policies. LUCAS' comment was that TAFT'S speech gave aid and comfort to Stalin, and there should be nothing but unity from now on.

The public and Members of Congress will have to be on the alert lest present events provide the opportunity for closing the book on the blunders of an administration which made this Red thrust inevitable. Unity is all very well, but a group of politicians who messed up a peace the way the Truman-Acheson policy makers have done will bear watching as they try their skills in a new field. If it is to be considered immoral to

criticize the man who wouldn't defend Formosa 24 hours before President Truman ordered that such a defense should be set up, it is difficult to see what area for free discussion remains. Freedom of criticism is now more important than ever, but it will take stout men to defend it.

The Truman administration will be sorely tempted to use the fracas in Asia as a pretext for pushing all sorts of socialist planning and governmental boondoggling, on the theory that it is needed for national defense. As the Wall Street Journal warned on the first day of the Korean incident, "National defense in the lexicon of Washington means more Government regulation, more Government control over the economy and over the people. Any man who now speaks up for economy or freedom from controls can have a shooting war thrown at him." Senator Lucas set the pitch on the very first day.

Another thing we ought to be thinking about is political warfare, whether the war remains cool or gets hot. We must be far clearer than we have been in explaining what we will settle for. "Unconditional surrender" convinced the Germans and Japanese that for them it was victory or destruction. In Russia and its satellites there are millions of people who regard war as the one hope of liberation. Millions of Russians felt that way about Hitler's invasion of their country in 1941. At least two Ukrainian armies went over to the Germans in the first few weeks, and more would have followed had Hitler paid any attention to political warfare. Why must we wait for a general war before making the American position more attractive to outsiders.

Up to now, evidence of confidence in our own way of doing things must have come through only dimly to the Orient. Our diplomacy has been party to betrayals and intrigues with Communist infiltrators. Almost at the hour of the strike in Korea, American officials were assuring reporters that Korea was not our baby. When we propose economic assistance to backward areas, it is not by means of the tried American way of private investment, but via a gigantic boondoggle sifted through the United Nations bureaucracy. The peoples who have run under Stalin's umbrella have not done so from love of communism, but from fear that they will be abandoned. President Truman's forthright act did much to restore the prestige which Roosevelt and Acheson had done so much to shatter. But not even MacArthur and a flock of B-29's can keep hope in free America alive in the world if liberty and individual enterprise are assassinated here at home—by the same breed of planners and stuffed shirts who have done so much to murder them abroad.

Endorsement of Reelection of Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 28 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I was delighted to note that two fine Wisconsin newspapers have come out practically simultaneously in recommending the reelection of our able colleague the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

I understand that many other weeklies in Wisconsin have in the past endorsed his candidacy and additional weeklies will do so.

I believe these editorials will be of interest, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hillsboro (Wis.) Sentry-Enterprise of July 20, 1950]

REELECT WILEY

United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY should be reelected this fall as senior Senator from Wisconsin. We base this assertion on the fact that the Senator was one of those Federal legislators who fought strenuously against the repeal of the oleomargarine tax law.

Irrespective of any other issue, we must first remember that rural Wisconsin is absolutely dependent upon the success of dairying for its income and its progress. If dairying suffers any reverses, then the economy of farmers and those with whom they have business dealings will suffer in like proportion. Those who are willing to stake their future on a fight to protect dairying deserves our support.

When most of the Senators were talking against sustaining the Federal oleomargarine tax, Senator WILEY and other Senators from nearby dairy States resolutely opposed repeal. They were not afraid of the censure of the big city populations, and representatives from the cottonseed-oil South; nor were they deterred by the fact that President Truman was sure to approve the repeal. Senator WILEY and those who were loyal to the farmers of Wisconsin and the dairy belt fought through to the last roll call.

We need men in Congress who will fight for dairying and for that reason we need to send ALEXANDER WILEY back to Washington. There will be many other issues raised, some of them patently synthetic, in an effort to influence sentiment against Mr. WILEY. But let us not be confused. Let us not forget the true friendship is display of action. A vote for Mr. WILEY shows that we agree in his stand against oleo and a vote for him is also a rebuke to those imprudent legislators who voted for oleo tax repeal.

[From the Palmyra (Wis.) Enterprise of July 27, 1950]

SENATOR WILEY

ALEXANDER WILEY, the senior Wisconsin Senator from Chippewa Falls, just now completing 12 years of service to the people of Wisconsin, is presently a candidate for reelection to the United States Senate on the only ticket he knows, the Republican ticket.

During his 12 years of service he has incurred the wrath of at least two Presidents and of the entire administration. Any man who will not issue a blank check to the President or use a rubber stamp to O. K. administration projects is marked for the well-known Fair Deal purge. Senator WILEY is such a man. He has been labeled the man who works for his constituents; diligently safeguarding the interests of Wisconsin's prime industry for all of his 12 years, he is well known for his strict policy of making the interests of his constituents his first consideration; be they widow, orphan, farmer, or small-business man, or veteran, he can be relied upon to do the things asked of him.

Throughout the entire State one can hear hundreds of instances of poor and rich alike who, perplexed over some personal problem, have written their senior Senator for aid, and at all times his help was forthcoming.

He has in his 12 years demonstrated the fact that he is a man who can be relied upon to do all in his power to preserve the American way of life, ready at all times to battle the left-wing labor leaders who are even now, as in 1944, spreading their gospel of hate in an effort to unseat him. Thousands of dollars are being spent in Wisconsin to do the bidding of the administration, "Beat WILEY."

But the honest workers, farmers, professional men, doctors, lawyers, bakers, grocers, Mr. Average Citizen wasn't fooled then and won't be now.

Senator WILEY has always maintained that America should have a Cabinet Department for Peace. He can be depended upon to fight for an adequate approach to our world problems. He is the kind of man Wisconsin needs in his high office to safeguard America from another war, a world war III, bloodier than all other wars combined.

He is the kind of man, who knew and knows now, that the mothers and dads of our Nation do not want to send their sons into battle now or at any future time. He deplores the Korean incident, which was occasioned by the stupidity of some of our State Department advisors. Wisconsin and America need more men like WILEY in office. Men who have the interest of the common man at heart and who are willing to go to bat for them. We know that Senator WILEY is a free, clear-thinking statesman, answerable to no one man or group of men. We know that in his battles on the floor of the Senate he is endowed with the courage of his own convictions, and that in every case he approaches his problem with full and complete knowledge of that for which he speaks.

Senator WILEY has always been the champion in the Senate of the St. Lawrence seaway and other causes dear to the Midwest.

He is, in fact, the kind of man we would like to have as our representative in diplomatic encounters with the wiles and cunning of the Communists, who know no God and have no compunction in dealing with the Christian world.

Senator WILEY can be depended upon to support the principles of promotion of the system of private enterprise, of conservation of resources, of equitable taxes, effective foreign relations, of fairness to the consumer and an effective farm program.

The people of Wisconsin will go to the polls in November knowing that the man they want in the United States Senate will be ALEXANDER WILEY and that the rantings and ravings of his enemies are not something new, but a rehash of the 1938 and 1944 campaigns, designed to tear down and defeat the principles of check and balance in the Government. They know that placed in the hands of men like Senator WILEY, the American way of life will survive.

Analysis of Defense Production Act of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, it seems very evident that the much-maligned "business as usual" will be replaced in America with "socialism as usual" if H. R. 9176, introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], becomes law in its present form. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent analysis of H. R. 9176, issued by Catherine Curtis, of the Women Inves-

tors' Research Institute, Saturday, July 22:

Present plans of House administration leaders call for hearings on H. R. 9176 to open Monday, July 24 and close Wednesday, July 26—with only Government witnesses to be heard and the bill to be reported to the House floor as speedily as possible. A Senate companion bill has been introduced by Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK (Democrat, South Carolina) and hearings on that bill also will open Monday before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee—which is further proof of the "rush, rush" plan.

Administration authors of H. R. 9176 claim the bill is designed to assure sufficient, speedy production of all matériel needed to enable our troops to win in Korea quickly with the minimum loss of American lives.

An analysis of the bill indicates that not more than 30 percent of it relates to speeding production for the Korean front. The remaining 70 percent evidently is a rewrite of the welfare state economic controls proposed in H. R. 2756 which Representative SPENCE also introduced, at administration request, in February 1949. It has been openly stated on Capitol Hill that after introducing that bill Representative SPENCE read it, realized it was nothing but a blueprint for the Socialist welfare state, and refused to hold hearings on it.

The result is that H. R. 2756 has remained buried in a House Banking and Currency Committee pigeonhole, while its administration authors waited for an emergency to force it out.

Evidently the authors now believe Korea is that emergency.

FREE ENTERPRISE REMOVED FROM ORIGINAL BILL

While the final objective of both bills is the same—complete socialization of the productive capacity and credit resources of the country—there are some significant differences in the stated policies of the two bills.

The stated policy of the 1949 version—H. R. 2756—was "to promote free competitive enterprise * * * the general welfare, and to carry out the foreign policy of the United States."

The stated policy of the 1950 version—H. R. 9176—is "to promote peace by insuring respect for world law * * *." In addition, the policy section states that Congress intends the President will use the powers of the bill "to promote the national defense by meeting, promptly and effectively, the requirements of military and other programs in support of our national security and foreign policy objectives."

The Supreme Court has consistently held that, in order to interpret any law passed by the Congress, consideration must be given to the intent of the Congress in enacting such legislation and to the policy enunciated by the Congress in such legislation.

Proponents of world government made considerable headway in this country with their proposal "to promote peace by insuring respect for world law" between the end of World War II and 1948. By subterfuge and misrepresentation, the legislatures of approximately 22 States passed resolutions endorsing world government. Resolutions calling for congressional action on this proposal were introduced in Congress by nearly 100 House and Senate Members—many of whom were misled into endorsing such resolutions by the claim that in so doing they were "only going on the record in favor of peace."

WORLD GOVERNMENT APPROVAL?

The tide seemed to turn last year when a number of prominent national organizations—including the DAR, SAR, and others—went on record opposing world government movement. Following this, Members of the Congress began withdrawing their names and support from world government resolutions. State legislatures began to repeal their resolutions endorsing the movement. The movement apparently received a deathblow early this year when—during hearings on a number of proworld government resolutions before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, State Department representatives declared the State Department was opposed to Congress taking any action on world government proposals at this time.

Since the stated purpose of world government is "to promote peace by insuring respect for world law"—can an internationally minded Supreme Court later declare that the Congress intended the United States to become part of a world government if Congress accepts that phraseology in H. R. 9176?

Since a world government necessarily would be a planned economy—a world socialistic state—wherein there could be no free competitive enterprise—is that the reason all reference to "free competitive enterprise" was removed from H. R. 2756 when it was rewritten into H. R. 9176?

REAFFIRMS GIFT TO STALIN?

No American will question that it is—and should be—the intent of Congress to grant the President all powers necessary to promote the national defense by meeting, promptly and effectively, the requirements of military programs in support of our national security—as H. R. 9176 proposes.

But what is meant by this bill when it declares it also is the intent of Congress that the President will use the powers of the bill "to promote the national defense by meeting, promptly and effectively, the requirements of * * * other programs in support of our * * * foreign policy objectives?

What foreign policy objectives? Those of the State Department in Asia—which call for abandoning all of Asia to Stalin and communism?

That has been the "foreign policy objective" of the State Department since Yalta, Tehran and Potsdam and Secretary of State Acheson reiterated it only yesterday at a Washington press conference when, in answer to questions, he stated our policy in Korea will be to drive the North Koreans back to the thirty-eighth parallel and then submit the differences of North and South Korea to the UN Security Council for settlement—after Communist China replaces Nationalist China on that Council.

Mr. Acheson did not state it that plainly. In clever diplomatic language, he stated we would accept the decision of the UN Assembly on the question of seating Communist China on the Security Council and would not use our veto power to prevent it. It is admitted at Lake Success that the only way Communist China can be kept off the Security Council is by the United States vetoing that proposal.

Since Mr. Acheson states we will not use that veto, does he not mean that the State Department intends to continue its "foreign policy objective" for Asia, delivery of Roosevelt's Yalta-Tehran gift to Stalin? (See our Special Reports Nos. 500 and 707.) If Congress accepts the present policy language of H. R. 9176 cannot the State Department interpret such action as congressional approval of the above-stated foreign policy objective for China and Asia?

NO WAGE CONTROLS

While, as stated above, the common objective of H. R. 2756 and H. R. 9176 is to give the President power to completely nationalize and socialize the productive capacity and credit resources of the country, another significant difference between the two bills is that while H. R. 2756 provided for rationing and wage controls, there is no such provision in H. R. 9176.

If rationing and wage controls were considered necessary in 1949 by the authors of H. R. 2756 "to promote free competitive enterprise * * * the general welfare and carry out the foreign policy of the United States" when we were only in a "cold war"—why do these same authors now consider such provisions are not necessary in 1950 when we are in a hot, shooting, "police action" to "promote peace by insuring respect for world law" and for "other programs in support of our * * * foreign policy objectives"?

Were any arrangements made—or pledges given—at the luncheon conference held within the last 2 weeks by NSRB Chairman Symington and CIO-AFL-UMW labor leaders that caused these authors to change their opinion on the need for these provisions? (See our special report No. 707.)

It is true that Mr. Truman has stated he will ask for rationing powers if prices continue to mount and Philip Murray of the CIO has issued a statement calling for immediate rationing and a "rollback" of consumer prices to June 25—the day North Korea invaded South Korea. But, neither Mr. Truman, Mr. Murray, nor anyone else associated with the administration to date, has said anything about that all-important factor in price control—wage control.

WHY MORE GOVERNMENT PLANTS

Under the provisions of H. R. 9176—as in H. R. 2756—the President is authorized to buy and/or build such plants and other productive equipment as he deems necessary to "carry out the objectives of this act." Throughout both bills continual reference is made to alleged "shortages" in critical materials—such as steel. In view of this—if H. R. 9176 is enacted into law as written—can it be interpreted that Congress intends the President is either to buy or build steel and similar plants—to put the Government in the business of producing basic materials, as has been done in England under its Labor-Socialist government?

The bill also authorizes the President to organize Government corporations to carry out the "purposes" of the act and to finance them—out of the Treasury—up to $2,000,000,000. In addition, this bill gives the President the power either to take over any facilities he deems necessary to effectuate the purposes of the act—or to direct the use of such facilities as he sees fit. Does this mean the President can tell each businessman just how his plant and/or business will be run—and how each farmer will operate his farm? Many English farmers had their farms taken from them under similar legislation—on the grounds they were not operating their farms in a manner best suited to the Government's objectives and the war effort during World War II.

The steel productive capacity of the United States was sufficient in the two-ocean war of World War II to supply the war needs of the United States and our Allies—as it had done in World War I. That great, free enterprise, mass-production steel plant produced enough steel for guns, ammunition, armor, trucks, new plants, airplanes, ships, etc., to win that war—and additional steel to produce consumer goods in limited supply.

It also was established during the recent steel-industry hearings before a House Judiciary Subcommittee, despite the efforts of Chairman EMANUEL CELLER (Democrat, New York) and his Special Counsel Edward Levi to prove otherwise, that not only had our free-enterprise steel-industry plant done all of the above, but also had provided the steel to rebuild Europe while expanding its productive capacity over that of World War II.

Therefore, since our steel productive capacity is greater today by more than a million tons annually than it was during the two-ocean war of World War II, why must the President be given the power to build new Government-owned steel plants? The steel used to build such new plants must be diverted from steel for weapons, ammunition, and other war matériel. Certainly, with all the merchant-marine ships now in "moth balls" the provisions of this bill, in this instance, cannot be intended to build more ships. And, with a number of World War II plants still in stand-by condition, will there be need to divert steel to build still more

plants? To produce what? Equipment to meet our foreign-policy objective under the President's point 4 program without asking Congress for additional appropriations for that program, or telling either the Congress or the people what is being done under that program, until it is accomplished?

WHO WILL PAY THE BILL?

Who will provide the men, matériel, and money for the Korean police action?

In his special message to Congress on July 19, Mr. Truman stated that 52 members of the United Nations have joined us in this action and that "we and the others must expect a hard and costly military operation in Korea."

That would seem to indicate that the blood, sweat, tears, and cost of the Korean military operation is to be equally borne by the United States and the 52 members of the United Nations joined with us in this action.

What was the reaction of the other 52 nations to the President's message? Press reports from London stated it "was greeted in Downing Street with relief for it ended the grim specter of a return to the austerity program," and from Paris "the French Government continued its plans for an expansion of its export program after listening to the President's message."

Does that sound as if these nations interpreted the President's message as meaning they would be expected to give other than "token" support to the Korean military operation in which "we are all common partners?"

RECIPROCAL TRADE PROGRAM SAVED BY KOREA?

There had been a growing concern in the administration over the mounting opposition in Congress and among business and labor groups to the reciprocal trade agreements program. There had been some question as to whether the International Trade Organization conference scheduled for next September at Torquay, England—at which it is planned to further reduce tariffs on foreign, cheap-labor-produced imports into the United States—should be held, although it is a high-priority "foreign-policy objective" of the State Department.

The testimony given during hearings before the Steed House Labor subcommittee on the "Effect of Imports on Employment" (see Spec. Rept. No. 703) and the Neely Senate Labor subcommittee on the effect of imports on coal, oil, and minerals (see Spec. Rept. No. 704) had caused the Administration considerable concern. It was recognized that the record of this testimony would be used in the months ahead by Republicans to attack the Administration and its entire foreign trade program and policies so as to awaken workers in this country that such a program meant our high-wage workers would be compelled to compete in our own markets with the low-wage workers of other countries. It also was recognized that the appearance of Chairman John Kee, Democrat, of West Virginia, of the House Foreign Affairs Committee before the Neely subcommittee in favor of a higher tariff on oil—in direct opposition to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements policy—would be used effectively in more than one speech—particularly in the pivotal State of West Virginia.

Administration leaders now believe they can make use of the Korean military operation to prevent effective use of material from the records of the Neely and Steed subcommittees in the months ahead. They hope they can lead Republicans into a "Unity-Bipartisan" program and an agreement to forego all such discussions as "unpatriotic" and "against the military effort" until at least next November.

POSSIBLE SOLUTION FOR DOLLAR SHORTAGE

As for the Marshall plan countries—businessmen of those countries accept the President's message as proof that the United States will—single-handed—provide the men, production, and money needed for the Korean and similar military operations. They recognize this will mean that a large portion of our mass-production plant will be diverted from producing consumer goods—and they expect to supply those consumer goods from their plants, built with Marshall plan funds—for a price.

It should be remembered that—prior to World War I—the United States was a debtor nation in world trade. We became a creditor nation during the First World War and emerged from World War II in a stronger creditor nation position while Britain, France, and other pre-World War I creditor nations continued to be debtor nations.

If H. R. 9176 is enacted as written and the United States does provide the men, production, and money for the Korean military operation, and such additional similar operations as Stalin may choose to inflict upon us, can it not well be that one of the final results of this entire program will be that key Marshall plan countries once more become creditor nations and the United States returns to its pre-World War I world-trade position of a debtor nation?

Such a result would, of course, solve the present dollar shortage which is another high-priority, foreign-policy objective of the State Department.

In World War I the French Poilu proved himself one of the world's greatest soldiers when, at Verdun, he stood fast in the face of seemingly unbeatable odds and wrote into history that famous slogan "They shall not pass."

In World War II that slogan gave the Poilu at the front the courage to face again a well-armed enemy, but the same slogan was not used against the Communists and fellow travelers in the rear. They were allowed to pass into key Government and production positions to become an important secret weapon for the enemy.

The fall of the Republic of France was aided and abetted by the legislative chicanery of this enemy within the gates. The free men and women of east Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, China, and many other countries now behind the iron curtain were tricked into Communist slavery through the glittering promises of Socialist security by the same type of enemy within the gates.

Today—now—American soldiers are gallantly fighting just as courageous a "they shall not pass" battle in South Korea as was fought at Verdun. When their courage brings victory—will they return as free men and women to a free country—the Republic of the United States—or will they find that our freedom has been crushed under the socialist steamroller as was individual freedom in France and many of the countries now behind the iron curtain?

The hour is very late. Therefore, it should be the emergency assignment of every American to make sure that any emergency legislation enacted under the guise of a "defense production act" is designed for the defense of the Republic and not for the advancement of socialism.

The Genocide Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 28 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, following prolonged consideration by its committee on human rights regarding the United Nations Convention on Genocide, the Maryland State Bar Association, at its annual meeting in Atlantic City earlier this month, adopted a resolution declaring that the Convention on Genocide at present before the United States Senate "raises important constitutional questions and does not resolve them in a manner consistent with our form of government." For this reason the resolution recommended that the convention be not approved.

In the report on the matter to the association by the committee it was suggested that "genocide could not be an international crime unless a government participated in its perpetration." The committee expressed the belief that this might be a solution to American difficulties regarding the convention in that, if genocide were so defined, a treaty would meet with none of the objections which have caused so much difficulty.

Because of the importance of the subject discussed, and the high standing of the association which has given it so much study, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD both the resolution of the Maryland State Bar Association and the statement as to why the suggested solution would be preferable.

There being no objection, the statement and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE

The matter would no longer be one only of domestic concern such as the crime of murder. A government which strays so far from civilization as to itself condone or engage in such killing, under the modern view has become a subject of international concern. A treaty in which the United States and other nations undertake never to be guilty of complicity in genocide would in truth be international in scope.

Such a treaty would not affect the relation between the States and Federal Government at present existing under our constitutional law. It would, as formerly, leave domestic matters subject to domestic control. It would limit international agreement to those matters involving charges against the nation itself.

As so defined, there would be no cutting across constitutional divisions of power between State and Federal Governments. It is at present a violation of the fourteenth amendment of our Constitution for any State to be guilty of complicity in genocide. It is a violation of the fifth amendment for the Federal Government to do so.

If genocide is so defined, a treaty not to commit genocide would become, under our existing constitutional law, a matter which is subject to the treaty-making power of the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. As such, it could constitutionally take its place under our law as part of the supreme law of the land.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE MARYLAND STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Maryland State Bar Association that the conscience of America, like that of the civilized world, revolts against genocide, that is to say: the mass killing and destruction of people or groups with the complicity of Government because of their national, racial, or ethnic origin, or their religious or political beliefs: *Provided, however,* That genocide, hereinabove referred to, shall not be deemed to include acts of war permitted by international law, which result in death or injury to non-

combatants. That genocide as thus understood should have the constant opposition of the Government of the United States and of all its people; and be it further

Resolved, That the Convention on Genocide at present before the United States Senate raises important constitutional questions and does not resolve them in a manner consistent with our form of government. It therefore should not be approved; and further

Resolved, That the President of this association be and he is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution together with the reports of the committee on human rights of the association, to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate; and to the Secretary of State; and to Maryland's two Senators.

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH BERNSTEIN,
ALBERT H. BLUM,
EDWARD H. BURKE,
CALVIN HARRINGTON, Jr.
HON. GEORGE HENDERSON,
HON. WILLIAM J. MCWILLIAMS,
HON. EMORY H. NILES,
CHARLES G. PAGE, *Chairman.*

Evidence That False Peace Petition Is Communist-Inspired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, the editorial in the July 11 issue of the Daily Worker attacks President Truman and states:

Finally, it is the Truman-GOP forces who alone have blocked the outlawing of the A-bomb and atomic war.

Then, we find the following false and deceptive paragraph:

The Soviet Government urges outlawing atomic war and all atomic weapons. Its Supreme Soviet has unanimously endorsed the outlawing of all atomic weapons by all governments. Soviet leaders have taken the lead in getting 56,000,000 Soviet signatures already to the world petition for banning atomic warfare from the world.

The editorial concludes with another piece of sheer hypocrisy:

We must protect America from atomic war. We must protect America from suicidal dreams of world conquest of Asia, Africa, Europe, etc. America needs not more atomic hell-bombs, but a genuine peace policy to save itself. The campaign for signatures to the world peace appeal is therefore as much in the interests of the American people as of people everywhere in the world.

The July 13 issue announces in black headlines on the front page "Million in United States sign A-ban plea." Pages 3 and 8 of this issue are devoted largely to reports on the number of signatures obtained. The main story is under the headline "Million in United States sign petition to outlaw the atom bomb." The article is as follows:

MILLION IN UNITED STATES SIGN PETITION TO OUTLAW THE ATOM BOMB

One million Americans have already signed the world peace appeal, the Peace Information Center announced yesterday, as the campaign to outlaw atomic weapons completed its first stage. The goal is 5,000,000 by the end of September. In releasing the latest figure, the Peace Information Center, whose chairman is Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, noted anthropologist and historian, emphasized the fact that close to 500,000 petitions were collected since the outbreak of the Korean war.

Thus, despite the artificial hysteria the press is whipping up since the Korean crisis and the attack on the world peace appeal, the tempo of signature collections has stepped up. More have signed in the few weeks since Korea than previously.

The peace center cited experiences of peace crusaders nationally to show that while there is more tension, and more questions about Korea, and in some cases confusion on the question of the Soviet Union, there is even greater anxiety and desire to prevent the war from spreading.

The signatures come from 40 States, "because," the peace center said, "there is no part of America where the people do not want peace and do not want to avert the possibility of atomic catastrophe."

Signatures arrive in every conceivable way: Folded in small envelopes from Texas, packed in brown wrapping paper from Seattle, they roll in from Butte, Mont., Portland, Oreg., from farms in Minnesota and Nebraska, from ministers in Ohio.

A TYPICAL LETTER

A glance at the accompanying letters reveals how deep the desire for peace has struck. The following is typical; a housewife from Joliet, Ill., writes: "My husband spent 3 years in the Army. I have a baby 2½ months old. With what is going on in Korea, I feel I must do something for their sake."

Prominent Americans like Emily Greene Balch, 1946 Nobel Prize winner and honorary chairman of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and the Reverend Francis I. Sheeder, executive secretary of the Board of Christian Education, have added their names to those like Aubrey Williams, publisher of the Southern Farmer; Prof. E. Franklin Frazier, of Howard University; Dr. Anton J. Carlson, University of Chicago scientist; Dr. Philip White, head of Cancer Research Institute in Philadelphia; Dr. Philip Morrison, who worked on the atomic bomb; Bishop Sherman L. Greene, African Methodist Episcopal Zionist Church, Birmingham, and many similar.

For, as Miss Balch said when she signed the world peace appeal, "It cuts across all ideological and political lines and merits the support of all those who want peace, regardless of any other differences among them."

NEXT TASK

"We can be proud of having achieved these first million names," the peace center said, "but we must not rest on our laurels. We must collect 5,000,000 by the end of September, and we must roll up our sleeves and triple our efforts to get signatures from everyone who wants peace, and that is every American man, woman, and child, Negro or white; Protestant, Catholic, or Jew in the churches, on the farms, in the schools, the factories, the streets."

The peace center pointed out that Dixiecrat Congressmen and others have already urged Truman to drop the atomic bomb on Koreans and spread world war III. "All who want peace must go forward with confidence and faith that every signature on the world peace appeal is a demonstration of the will to peace and of the American people," the peace information center concluded.

WORLD SIGNATURES

World-wide, nearly 130,000,000 names have already endorsed the Stockholm petition of the World Peace Appeal. This asks that the A-bomb be banned and that the first government to drop it be branded a war criminal.

The end of September is the dead line for the collection, prelude to the world conference of peace partisans to be held in Warsaw, October 16–21.

Outstanding States in the collection of signatures include New York, with 450,000 to date; Illinois, 150,00 ; California, 80,000; Ohio, 50,000; Massachusetts, 40,000; New Jersey, 32,500; Michigan, 17,000.

Despite terrorism in the South, Texas and North Carolina have 3,000; Florida and Alabama, 1,000.

Letters pour in from hundreds of cities and towns like Tucson, Ariz.; Pueblo, Colo.; Salt Lake; Joliet, Ill., asking "what can we do?" They represent men and women, and often teen-agers from every religion and political background, the Peace Information Center declared.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how accurate a report this is. I suspect it is definitely inaccurate. Yet it is certainly sound evidence of the deceptiveness of this appeal if there are anything like 40,000 signatures from among the people of Massachusetts. I know that my colleagues from New York, Illinois, California, Ohio, New Jersey, Michigan, Texas, North Carolina, Florida, and Alabama will be interested and concerned about the alleged number of signers from their States.

Also, on page 3 is a report on a meeting called by the Kings County committee of the Communist Party in connection with this petition. It is under the headline "Hall asks link of peace, 'hands off Korea' drive." Having in mind that on July 13 American troops were fighting a desperate and gallant battle in Korea, it is certainly worth while to study such a statement as the one made by this man Hall, national secretary of the Communist Party in this country. The article follows:

HALL ASKS LINK OF PEACE "HANDS OFF KOREA" DRIVE

Gus Hall, national secretary of the Communist Party, said Tuesday night that the peace petition drive must be accompanied by a vigorous hands-off-Korea campaign. Hall said that the successful campaign for peace signatures, that is still underway, is a magnificent example of mass work.

The party's national secretary spoke at a crowded meeting at Webster Hall, while the rain poured down outside. The meeting was called by the Kings County committee of the Communist Party. Hall speaks on Korea and the peace campaign again tonight at Manhattan Center, under the auspices of the New York County committee of the party.

The peace petition drive has already netted 170,000 signatures in Brooklyn, reported Charles Loman, organizational secretary for the Communist Party there.

Loman said that the peace forces were seeking 75,000 more signatures by July 21, when a dinner will be given to the best signature getters at 13 Astor Place. Two hundred signatures will win a ticket to the dinner.

WARNS ON A-BOMB

Hall shook hands warmly with Sol Wexler, pace setter in the petition drive, who has collected 1,700 signatures already.

Hall emphasized the hatred of the American people for the atomic warfare, which the Stockholm peace pledge seeks to avert. He warned, however, that MacArthur may be reckless enough to order the first atom bomb dropped in the present war in the Pacific area unless the peace forces prevent it.

With the anti-atom-bomb drive must come a great campaign to end the intervention in Korea and other Pacific areas. This "hands off" Korea campaign, said Hall, will get support from vast numbers of Americans who are asking, What are we doing over there?

But hands off Korea is not enough, Hall continued. Many Americans, who confuse Korea with the Soviet Union will join the peace front on the issue of China.

NOT AN "INCIDENT"

Americans don't want war with China, went on Hall. And they will oppose America's aggression against Formosa, which is leading toward bigger hostilities with China.

The last 2 weeks have seen enormous historical changes, said the Communist leader. In those 2 weeks United States forces have attacked the people of Korea, committed aggression against Formosa. And the warmakers have for the present destroyed the United Nations and roused the hatred of the people of the world against the United States.

"Korea is not an incident in United States policy," said Hall. "The present United States policy is to intervene wherever the people of the world are struggling for liberty and socialism."

INTERVENTION "BANKRUPT"

This American policy of intervention against the colonial peoples is bankrupt, however, said Hall.

"Wall Street has no control over the colonial peoples any more," he continued. "The puppets on whom American policy depended are being defeated."

Nevertheless, intervention continues, and only the strength of the forces of peace and of socialism are preventing the launching of a full-scale world war.

This war can be prevented, however, said Hall. And the peace forces of the United States can play a big part in averting the third world war.

Hall warned American workers that they could not expect to win the economic gains in a third world war that they achieved when the United States was engaged in a just war against the Fascist Axis. The policy of the big employers in another war will be to crush the trade unions and attack the Communist Party and the Negro people, he pointed out.

The American Communist Party has an enormous responsibility in this crisis, Hall said.

Every Communist, said Hall, must engage in mass work—even though he is working with very small masses at first.

The success of the peace signature drive is a convincing example of effective mass work, he went on. It's the best mass work seen in this country in years, he said.

Finally, on page 3 is a story from Moscow, under the headline "Ninety-six million sign for peace in U. S. S. R.," reading as follows:

Moscow, July 12.—More than 96,000,000 signatures were obtained in 10 days to the Stockholm peace petition to ban the atom bomb, the Literary Gazette, Soviet magazine, reported today. The big news about the peace campaign took precedence in the magazine's pages over the Korean news.

The Soviet press drew a picture of American aggression, but emphasized that the strength of the Soviet Union and the ability of the Soviet-led camp to prevent a world war could maintain peace.

The Gazette's military observer, P. Krainov, reported a large concentration of Korean forces approaching Taejon, threatening to outflank the invasion forces, and said the nervousness of MacArthur's staff was evidenced by the fact that routine war communiqués were being delayed.

Krainov wrote that "American aggressors looked upon the bloody adventure in Korea as a proving ground for a 'big war' in the Far East," and gave as evidence the visit to Formosa of Vice Adm. A. E. Struble, commander of the United States Seventh Fleet, military preparations in Formosa and other areas, and the visits to Tokyo of American military leaders.

Paid Farmers to Hear Brannan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 28 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Paid Farmers to Hear Brannan," which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on July 27, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAID FARMERS TO HEAR BRANNAN

The Government paid 2,291 Minnesota farmers $42,109 to hear Secretary of Agriculture Brannan plug his farm program last April, the General Accounting Office disclosed yesterday.

And at least one of the farmers considered it "a type of coercion" for him to urge others to attend the meeting in St. Paul.

The GAO report on the controversial meeting was made available as the House Lobby Investigating Committee dug into the facts.

Republicans have accused the Agriculture Department of forcing farmer members of the Minnesota Production and Marketing Committee to build up an audience to hear Brannan plug his controversial Brannan plan.

Charles W. Stickney, of Spear Lake, Minn., chairman of the Minnesota committee, told the House group that "no pressure, verbally or otherwise," was exerted to make the federally paid committeemen attend the meeting.

He denied the meeting was called to influence Federal legislation and said the farmers of Minnesota "hold a Cabinet member in high esteem—we thought we were extremely fortunate to have the Secretary."

The GAO, which looked into the situation at the House committee's request, said payment of Federal funds for salaries and expenses of the farmers attending the meeting was legal.

The GAO report said George E. Woodward, chairman of the Washington County PMA office, was "reluctant" to urge community committeemen to attend. It said "he considered it a type of coercion, but finally was persuaded by other county committee members to do so."

The report quoted Frank Bellizi, manager of the St. Paul Hotel, as saying that former State Democratic Treasurer Stephen M. Harrington paid $280 for a cocktail party attended by Brannan and State agricultural officers at the time of the meeting.

Further Evidence of Communist Stockholm Appeal Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, while I wish now to furnish further evidence of the true nature and motives underlying the so-called Stockholm peace appeal as contained in the official voice of the Communist Party in America, first, I want to call my colleagues' attention to an article appearing recently in the Washington Star reporting on an able analysis of this "project of evil minds" by an eminent and respected American priest, the Very Reverend Francis J. Connell, C. SS. R., of the Holy Redeemer College, Catholic University. It is as follows:

PRIEST ASSAILS REDS FOR STOCKHOLM PLEA

The Communist Stockholm appeal to outlaw use of the atom bomb was denounced yesterday as a "strange combination of shrewdness and stupidity that so often characterizes the projects of evil minds" by the Very Reverend Francis J. Connell, C. SS. R., of Holy Redeemer College, Catholic University.

The shrewdness of those now circulating the petition throughout the world lies in the cunning concealment of a deeply malicious design under the apparently noble statement outlawing the bomb, Father Connell said.

If the resolution were accepted, he pointed out, the Communists could use large armed forces to weaken the defenders of human rights in one country after another.

"Their stupidity," said Father Connell, "consists in their failure to realize their design would be discovered by intelligent persons, and that ultimately their plan would prove a boomerang."

As to the moral problem raised by the use of the atom bomb, Father Connell urged that it be employed only against military targets of great importance.

"It is hoped that our leaders will refrain from using atomic weapons unless it is absolutely necessary for the very preservation of our national existence," he added.

[From the Daily Worker of July 14, 1950]

PEACE SIGNATURES STING ACHESON

Secretary of State Dean Acheson has been stung by the growing number of patriotic Americans signing the petition to ban the atomic bomb under strict international control and inspection.

So great has been the impact of the people's demand for peace that Acheson was forced to blurt out the real intentions of the men in charge of the war against Korea. The weapons used in war, Acheson says, "are quite incidental." Thus he confirms Truman's statement that he is ready to drop the atomic bomb again.

War criminals prefer to hatch their plots in secret. But faced with an organized peace movement—especially with the petition campaign—the would-be atomic murderers cannot conceal their real aims. On the contrary they are now trying to whip up an unthinking hysteria to justify the supreme atrocity of our times—atomic murder.

Ninety-six million citizens of the Soviet Union have signed the Stockholm petition. Both the Soviet Government and its people are not afraid to pledge they will consider the first government which drops an atomic bomb in the future a war criminal. But those who are planning just that can only assail the petition and seek to justify atomic genocide.

What a shock it was to the conservative Newark Star Ledger when it sent its reporters out to find out what the people thought about the dropping of the atomic bomb in Korea. "Jerseysites say 'No,'" was the headline this paper had to print over its findings.

So even at this zero hour, when the Wall Street wirepullers have created the imminent threat of a world atomic war, it is possible to stay their hands.

If 1,000,000 signatures to the ban-the-bomb petition has created such consternation in Washington the attainment of 5,000,000 would be of inestimable importance.

Furthermore, the people should let Secretary General Trygve Lie know how they feel about this threat to drop atomic bombs in the name of the United Nations. As the Communist Party message to Trygve Lie puts it, "peace-loving people everywhere will demand * * * guarantees that the UN is doing more than wait again until the damage has been done in order to give its blessing to disaster."

Lie has sanctioned United States aggression in Korea and the bombardment of women and children through saturation bombing. Now he must learn that the people will not stand for his agreement to atomic murder. Let Trygve Lie, at the United Nations, Lake Success, N. Y., hear your voice. The issue is life or death.

[From the Daily Worker of July 17, 1950]

ONE THOUSAND AT PLANT SIGN FOR PEACE IN HALF HOUR

CHICAGO, July 16.—More than 1,000 packing-house workers signed the world peace appeal petitions in less than a half hour as they streamed out of the plant homeward bound. A group of some 40 packing-house union members carried out the peace signature collection, including top officers of big locals of the union here.

The unionists stationed themselves at the three main gates of the stockyards as well as the two elevated stations inside. A sound truck toured the area. Almost all workers asked to sign the petition did so.

Leaflets warned that "our contract is on the firing line" because the packers would seek to use the military intervention in Korea to freeze wages and shatter working conditions.

An open letter to Dr. Albert Einstein, backing his stand against an atomic arms race, was released here. The letter was signed by 107 members of the University of Chicago faculty.

"An armaments race with the Soviet Union is not the way to peace," the letter declared.

A spokesman for the University of Chicago faculty-graduate committee for peace said the letter to Einstein had been written before the Korea fighting but that "these unforeseen events make all the more imperative the message of this open letter."

The signers took issue with Representative JOHN RANKIN that Einstein is "simply carrying out the Communist line" in urging agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Among the signers are Dr. Anton Carlson, physiologist; Dr. Lester Dragstedt, head of surgery; Dean John B. Thompson, Rockefeller Memorial Chapel; and Prof. Hans J. Morgenthau, physiologist.

[From the Daily Worker of July 18, 1950]

A BRAVE PEACE ARMY

A brave American army of peace has already won some signal victories. We refer to the men and women throughout the country collecting signatures to ban the atomic bomb.

Let's size up the heavy artillery that has been leveled at these peace crusaders. In city after city, police have tried to harass the signature collectors. Many have been arrested.

Not a single day passes without stern warnings from every radio newscaster telling people not to sign.

In Washington, Secretary of State Acheson lost his striped-pants dignity and exploded against the world-peace appeal as though he had gotten one right in the solar plexus.

Every big-business newspaper from the Hearst press to the social democratic New York Post, from the Chicago Tribune to the New York Daily News, has blasted the petition. They have no arguments against the petition, so they try to scare the signers.

Newspapers like the Daily News warn the people that the petition seems harmless. What they mean is that the petition makes sense—but they wouldn't devote so much space attacking it if it were harmless.

No, the world-peace appeal, which originated at Stockholm, Sweden, is not harmless. It has already created a crisis among those who wanted to drop the atomic bomb on the Korean people. Throughout the world, the revulsion is so great against the use of the atomic bomb that even United Press reports universal opposition to it in western Europe. Hanson Baldwin, the military analyst of the New York Times, condemned the proposals to use the bomb in Korea because he's worried it would alienate the people of Asia.

These things are a tribute to the effectiveness of the peace army collecting signatures to ban the bomb.

For example, the hell-bent-for-war newspapers say this is a Soviet atomic pledge. But the petition has a very simple message. It says that the atomic bomb should be banned under international control. What embarrasses those who try to smear this petition is that the people were told all along that this was the United States Government stand on the bomb. Now they must admit it isn't.

The petition doesn't propose that America give up the atomic bomb and let Russia keep hers. It does not propose that a simple appeal be made to ban the bomb so that any agreement could be violated.

It provides for world-wide scrapping of the bomb and world-wide control and inspection to make sure that the bomb really is scrapped. It also provides that the first government that uses the bomb—in the future—be branded a war criminal.

So when people actually read the petition they learn what liars the big-business press and radio are. And they can be gotten to sign for a very simple reason. The lives of our loved ones and our own lives depend on the struggle to ban the atomic bomb.

[From the Daily Worker of July 26, 1950]

THE YOUTH WANT NO WAR

More and more young Americans are saying they don't want to die 7,000 miles away in Korea so that Wall Street can make some more dough. They're saying so by signing the world peace appeal.

These young people want peace—jobs with decent union wages, homes—a future of progress and security—not mass slaughter.

Young people have already collected a quarter of a million signatures for peace under the auspices of the United States youth sponsoring committee. And the majority of these have been collected since Truman began his war on the Korean people.

The next milestone in the youth campaign is August 6, the anniversary of Hiroshima. The slogan is being raised that United States youth must not be the first to throw the A-bomb—there must be no first. American youth does not want to be the instrument for committing war crimes against humanity.

[From the Daily Worker of July 26, 1950]

TENANT COUNCILS SET GOAL OF 150,000 PEACE SIGNATURES

The New York Tenant, Welfare and Consumer Council is now distributing its own peace petitions as a result of requests from 106 affiliates which asked that the council include peace work in its program.

Setting a goal of 150,000 signatures by Labor Day, council leaders view the response of signers during the first 10 days of the drive as good, and look forward to the successful completion of the goal.

Tenants canvassing for signatures find that they are scoring their best success in organized houses where they are known for their militant fight in behalf of tenants' needs.

A thousand petitions have already been dispatched to Brooklyn, 2,000 to the Bronx, 1,000 to Queens, 1,000 to Manhattan, and 200 to Staten Island.

DEPICTS ATOM BLAST

A three-color job, the petition depicts an atomic explosion with a terrified child and burning homes in the background.

"Tenants support world peace appeal," states the petition. "We tenants are alarmed at the threat of war and the use of the atom bomb as a weapon. We know that tenants as well as soldiers will be annihilated in another war and that thousands of homes will be destroyed by one A-bomb. We also know that good housing can be built and maintained only during peacetime. We therefore support the Stockholm peace appeal."

The full text of the World Peace Appeal is reprinted in the tenants' petition.

Although the petition was drawn up several weeks ago, the council foresaw that an increased war program would jeopardize new private and public construction. Since its distribution, President Truman has issued a decree which curtailed housing construction, thus bearing out the council's petition.

"We have found that where the membership of a mass organization goes to the community where it is known," said Sol Salz, executive secretary of the New York Tenant, Welfare, and Consumer Council, "the response has been best of all."

Star petition collectors in their local communities are John Elmore, of Brooklyn, who has already obtained 600 names; Fay Hirsch, of upper Williamsburgh, Brooklyn; Eugenia Pennington, Chelsea Tenants Council; and Mary Auston, of Freeman Street Council, Bronx.

THEY WORK FOR PEACE—CONEY ISLAND YOUTH CLUB TOPS GOAL ON PETITIONS

(By Michael Vary)

Coney Island is noted for lots of summertime doings, but the biggest story out of Coney Island this year is the stupendous job done by the Sacco-Vanzetti Club of the Labor Youth League in collecting peace-petition signatures.

The pace was set early in the campaign by club president Sol Wexler, who has 1,800 names to his credit to date. Ten other members have collected more than 75, six exceeded 350, while one topped the 750 mark.

The club prepared hundreds of balloons with the inscription "Ban atom war," which were distributed to children as they stream out of the BMT on weekends. And the children's parents promptly signed for peace.

One man refused to sign by pencil, insisted on using his gold pen. Another passerby took two petitions and returned a half hour later with 30 names.

The club had set a quota of 5,000 signatures by September 14. This quota was revised upward when July 4 found the members with 5,200 names on hand.

[From the Daily Worker, New York, of Wednesday, July 26, 1950]

TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND IN PHILLY SIGN PEACE PLEA

PHILADELPHIA, July 25.—Rev. Francis I. Sheeder, executive secretary of the Board of Christian Education and Publication, Evangelical and Reformed Church, is among the prominent Philadelphians who have signed the world peace appeal to outlaw atomic warfare.

Other signers announced by the Crusaders for Peace here include Rev. C. W. Derrickson, Mt. Zion Methodist Church; Rev. D. W.

White, Temple Baptist Church; Francis Fisher Kane, former assistant United States district attorney; Dr. Philip White, of the Cancer Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania; Blanche Nicola, St. Martha's Settlement House; Irving Bachman and Albert Gerber, attorneys, and Alvin B. Christman, president, eastern division, National Farmers Union.

Local peace leaders estimate that a total of 25,000 have signed the world-peace appeal in this area.

While it is tragic that so many adults have been misled into lending their good names to this Communist effort, it is even more sinister and vicious to note the reports of the use of fine young men and women as unwitting agents in the Communist Party's campaign.

Republican Platform Text

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 28 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, for the edification of the Senate and for the information of the Nation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the Republican platform text adopted at the South Dakota Republican Party convention in Pierre, S. Dak., as published in the Daily Argus-Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM TEXT

(Following is the text of the platform adopted at the South Dakota Republican Party convention in Pierre this week:)

We call upon Almighty God to witness the distress of this Nation. We invoke His inspiration and guidance in this, our country's hour of challenge.

PLANK NO. 1—WORLD CONDITIONS

Throughout American history, the Republican Party has been the party of peace and prosperity and the protector of the people's opportunities, rights, and liberties. We rededicate ourselves to the fulfillment of this historic mission.

Since the turn of the century, each Democratic national administration has led us into a world war. Now, it appears, we are threatened with another tragic global conflict.

Since the betrayals of our free society at Yalta and Potsdam, the foreign policy of the New Deal and Fair Deal high command has given aid and comfort to the spread of communism and has led us away from conditions essential to a lasting peace and a sound national security.

Our occupation authorities in Berlin are surrounded by the hostile forces of Communist Russia.

China has been betrayed to Communist domination.

As this convention meets, our American boys are dying in an undeclared war in Korea for which the national administration was grossly unprepared militarily, economically, psychologically, and diplomatically. No one in authority is able to tell the American people where all of this will lead.

We pledge the support of our State and our party to full and energetic support and cooperation in an all-out effort to bring to a victorious, honorable, and permanent termination the battles against communism to the end that there may be lasting world peace and a sound national security for our country. We shall oppose any further appeasements of communism either at home or abroad.

PLANK NO. 2—COMMUNISM

We concur with Director J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI when he says that communism in America has become one of our greatest perils at home as well as abroad. We deplore the record of the Truman administration in coddling communism here at a time when it is seeking world domination. We denounce the President's refusal to cooperate with Congress in making factual records and files available so that Communists, sex perverts, and other security risks could be removed from the Federal payrolls.

Both communism and national socialism attack private enterprise, individual initiative, and the political independence of the individual citizen. These creeds are especially destructive for the youth of this country, since they deny them the attractive opportunities which all preceding generations have considered as part of their American heritage. If communism and national socialism ever come in America it will be through the concentration of political and economic power in Washington. Communists should be barred from the Federal payroll, they should be forced to strip the mantle of secrecy from their conspiratorial cells, and the Communist concept of the all-powerful state should be resisted. We pledge ourselves to such a program of action.

PLANK NO. 3—THE CHALLENGE TO FREEDOM

The basic domestic issue before the American people today is whether we shall remain a free people or whether we shall delegate to an all-powerful Federal Government and to ambitious social planners and politicians, the unlimited power to tax and spend, and the authority to direct agriculture, industry, labor, professional pursuits, and the daily lives of our citizens and their local communities. In short, it is liberty against socialism.

The election of 1950 will determine whether the United States goes further down the road to big government, more controls, and more spending or whether our country turns toward less government, more opportunity, and less public spending.

The New Deal-Fair Deal Democratic administration in Washington has been kept in power by cries of crisis and emergency. Each proclaimed crisis is accompanied by demands for more power or more money—and generally both. The only way for the United States to avoid continuing emergencies is to get an administration in Washington which will solve problems instead of producing them. Most of our problems are directly traceable to bungling administration, confused policies, and incompetent or inefficient leadership by ambitious politicians. It is difficult to defeat a Red menace abroad with a budget in the red at home.

South Dakotans have shown the way out of this morass of confusion and contradictions by their handling of their State affairs. Governor Mickelson and his Republican predecessors have wiped out an inherited overdraft left in the State treasury by South Dakota Democrats and have maintained a substantial surplus in our general fund while steadily reducing the State debt. State institutions have been built up, highways have been increased and improved, taxes have been reduced and the general welfare of the people has been promoted.

In South Dakota, we have kept the government out of the red and the Reds out our government. We shall continue this record and we commend it to the attention of the present national administration in Washington.

PLANK NO. 4—REPUBLICAN ACHIEVEMENTS

We commend our State administration under the able direction of Gov. George T. Mickelson who has demonstrated, by example, the practical application of sound Republican principles.

We likewise commend our congressional delegation in Washington, all Republicans, Senators CHAN GURNEY and KARL MUNDT and Representatives FRANCIS CASE and HAROLD O. LOVRE, who have continuously advanced the best interest of the people of our State and Nation.

The Republican Party in its pledge to the people for continued good government in South Dakota presents a record of 14 years of accomplishment in economy and efficiency.

1. We have brought the per capita costs of South Dakota government $7 under that of any other State in the North Central region.

2. We have built up a sound general-fund balance and wiped out the $850,000 deficit inherited from the last Democratic administration.

3. We have retired $36,000,000 in bonded indebtedness.

4. We have paid the Nation's most liberal bonus to veterans of World War II.

Governor Mickelson and the thirty-first legislature met the accumulated needs of the State and its institutions, postponed during the war years, with accumulated funds and also maintained a sound, adequate general fund balance. Compare this record with that of the deficit spending of the national Democratic administration.

We commend them for the forthright manner in which our State's World War II veterans' bonus has been paid and financed. We note, with pride and satisfaction, that the special bonus taxes will have produced the necessary revenues by the end of next year and will be removed, and that the total net interest cost of paying a $28,500,000 bonus will be approximately $350,000 to the taxpayers of South Dakota. No other State can present such a record. (Before the bonds for the $6,000,000 bonus paid to World War I veterans has been retired, bondholders received $7,200,000 in interest payments from the taxpayers of South Dakota.)

These, and other constructive accomplishments tell the story of Republican leadership in South Dakota.

PLANK NO. 5—AGRICULTURE

A prosperous agriculture is fundamental to a prosperous America. It is as important to the wage earner, the businessman, the industrialist, and the consumer as it is to the farmer. National solvency depends on it. Without it we cannot hold on to what we have acquired.

The Republican Party proposes a long-range farm program, one which is within the framework of free enterprise. A plan under which agriculture abandons the negative and false concept of scarcity as a means of acquiring plenty, embraces the philosophy of an expanding economy and enters an era of full production. With it we can reject regimentation and controls by the overlords in the Department of Agriculture. We restore the farmer to his traditional position of independence, and with it we assure farm incomes at 1948 peaks and correspondingly high ones in all other fields in the Nation.

The Republican Party, with its sights on such objectives, proposes that they shall and can be attained through a long-range farm plan having the following main principles:

1. Administration by farmers through a system of farmer-elected township and county committees and State directors and majority representation on a national farm board with consumer representation.

2. One hundred percent parity price at all times in the market place on all products

of agriculture domestically consumed, self-suported and self-sustained with commodity loans to maintain such prices if necessary.

3. Encouragement of livestock production as a means of reducing crop surpluses and providing a better diet for our people.

4. Facilities for storage of nonperishable food crops on the farm.

5. A sound soil and water conservation program.

6. Special encouragement for the development and ownership of family-sized farms and ranches and improvement of rural living conditions.

7. Encouragement of research and new uses of agricultural products and the development of new industries to utilize additional production.

8. A flexible tariff at the parity levels for all products of agriculture.

The Republican Party, in conjunction with these proposals, urges:

1. That the State department of agriculture be suported so as to give further service to the farmers of this State.

2. That research and experimentation be continued so that improved grains, grasses, and livestock may be further developed in our State.

3. That we encourage the Extension Service, Future Farmers of America, and Future Homemakers of America, and pledge ourselves to provide suitable buildings at the State fairgrounds for 4-H Club purposes.

4. The Republican Party notes the significant repudiation by the South Dakota Democratic convention of the Brannan farm scheme offered by its national leaders and the fact no constructive, long-range farm program was offered as an alternative. As the party under which farmers have made their most impressive gains nationally and in the State, the Republican Party realizes fully that a prosperous agriculture is fundamental to a prosperous America.

PLANK NO. 6—POWER AND POWER DEVELOPMENT

We commend the Republican State administration for calling a special session and enactment of legislation authorizing the formation of consumer power districts following extensive study and research. The Republican Party pledges itself to make such changes in the present law as experience may show to be desirable and necessary.

The Republican Party at all times dedicates itself to the firm belief that full benefit should be received from development of the Missouri River. We believe that power from the generating plants on the river should be distributed to farms, homes, and industry at the cheapest possible rates consistent with sound business principles at the earliest possible date.

PLANK NO 7—REA

The 1947 Republican legislature adopted our present Rural Electric Cooperative Act under which our REA cooperatives are organized and operating. The Republican Party recognizes that through the creation and development of REA our rural population had derived untold benefits. We pledge ourselves to continued promotion of the expansion and development of the program so that the greatest number of persons will benefit therefrom.

The Republican Eightieth Congress, despite the fact that it not only reduced taxes but produced the only balanced Federal budgets since 1932, demonstrated its vigorous support of REA by authorizing in loans for rural electrification twice as much money as any previous Congress.

PLANK NO. 8—HIGHWAYS

The last Democratic administration in the State between 1933 and 1937 diverted approximately $10,000,000 in highway revenues for nonhighway use. From surpluses in the general fund, built by subsequent Republican administrations, it is now possible to restore these diverted highway revenues over a period of years. These facts have been recognized by the Republican Party, and at the 1950 special session of the legislature the sum of $1,200,000 was returned from the general fund to the highway fund. We commend this action and recommend that such restoration program continue in an orderly manner, consistent with sound fiscal policies.

South Dakota's 4-cent gasoline tax is 1 cent below the average of the 48 States. Recognizing the vital importance of our highway system to the people of our State and that the gasoline tax is the fairest means of taxing for highway use, the Republican Party favors increasing said tax 1 cent per gallon.

Farmers, ranchers, businessmen, tourists, and all citizens can best be served through a long-range program of planning and adequate financing of a State-wide highway system, including trunk highways, farm-to-market roads and municipal streets. We urge that more study and planning be done along the lines suggested by the interim highway committee and that ways and means be devised for carrying out this planning.

PLANK NO. 9—EDUCATION

We reaffirm our devotion to continued assistance for and support of public education in South Dakota.

We pledge our support to a continuing program of adequate financial support for public elementary and secondary education. We recommend legislation for the expediting of the reorganization of school districts toward a more economical and efficient administration of the affairs of the districts concerned whenever the voters of the districts involved so desire. We endorse recodification of the school laws.

We also pledge our continued support for the preservation and maintenance of the permanent school fund and school lands inviolate.

We further pledge ourselves to continuance of adequate financial support of our State institutions of higher learning, the department of public instruction, and the teacher retirement program.

PLANK NO. 10—TAXATION

Under the leadership of the Republican Party, a balanced tax program has been carried out. This program has enabled the State to:

1. Operate on a pay-as-you-go basis.

2. Sell veterans' bonus bonds at less than 1 percent interest.

3. Afford the citizens of South Dakota outstanding services and benefits.

The Republican Party pledges itself to a continuance of a sound fiscal policy, and recognizes that the present financial condition of the State is such that no increased taxes or new taxes are necessary excepting for highway purposes.

PLANK NO. 11—VETERANS

We pledge ourselves to the continuation of the South Dakota Veterans' Department; of the war veterans' fund; payment of an adequate bonus to the surviving kin of the veterans of World War II not covered by the 1949 bonus act; and strengthening and strict enforcement of the veterans' preference laws.

PLANK NO. 12—MISSOURI BASIN DEVELOPMENT

Appreciating the tremendous scope and possibility of the Missouri basin development, the Republican party supports continuous study of the impact of this development on the people and industries of this State. To safeguard and promote the interest of the farmer, rancher, sportsman, new and existing industries and units of local government, the State Government shall cooperate with the Federal Government and scrutinize the effects of activities undertaken by Federal agencies. To assist in attaining these ends, we urge the expansion of the functions of the Natural Resources Commission, in order that maximum benefits from Missouri River Basin development may be had.

PLANK NO. 13—INDIANS

The Republican legislature of 1949 passed an act creating a commission of Indian Affairs in South Dakota to promote education, employment, housing, betterment of living conditions, medical care, hospitalization, and the general welfare of the Indian populati of the State.

The Republican Party pledges itself to a continuation of this commission's work and to an active response to its findings and recommendations. The Republican Party further pledges itself to seek equal rights for all Indians with other citizens of the State and Nation, and we recommend that adequate assistance be continued to the Indian scholarship fund in our institutions of higher learning.

PLANK NO. 14—PUBLIC WELFARE

The Republican Party recognizes that there are certain of our citizenry who, by reason of age, illness, or other incapacity or affliction, are unable to properly care for themselves. We recognize our moral obligation in these cases to adequately provide for the care and comfort of our less fortunate citizens. We pledge ourselves that in all such cases the aid shall be commensurate with the need.

PLANK NO. 15—LABOR

The Republican Party of South Dakota recognizes the right of labor to organize, to bargain collectively, and to strike. It pledges itself to protect these fundamental rights.

We commend the 1947 and 1949 Republican legislatures for their attention to the problems of labor by the establishment of a division of labor and by the liberalizing of the provisions of the workman's compensation law and the enactment of an occupational-disease law.

PLANK NO. 16—ELECTION LAWS

The Republican Party recognizes that the present election laws are inadequate and unsatisfactory and recommends a general revision thereof regarding the registration of voters, opening and closing of the polls, voting by the sick and absent, the election of precinct committeemen and precinct committeewomen, and the selection of nominees under existing law.

PLANK NO. 17—MENTAL HEALTH

We recognize the need for additional facilities to care for and treat all of the mentally ill, the senile, the inebriates. This, we will endeavor to bring about, and we recommend—

1. A revision of existing insanity laws with a view to removing all injustices, hardships, and stigmas.

2. A complete segregation of tubercular patients from other patients.

3. A separation of senile from mental cases.

PLANK NO. 18—FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

The Republican Party commends the newspapers and radio facilities of South Dakota for their fairness and honesty in informing the people of current events.

A free press is one of the foundation stones of our Republic and the independence of our newspapers is necessary for its preservation. The newspaper editors of our State have been notably unselfish and unrewarded in their efforts to maintain the moral, spiritual, economic, and political welfare of South Dakota.

CONCLUSION

To the foregoing program of National and State objectives and principles we subscribe; to them we dedicate our party and our individual efforts, confident that the overwhelming majority of South Dakotans of both political parties will join us in this purpose.

Our people must arouse themselves as never before to preserve our precious liberties and freedoms and to deny power-hungry politicians the right to take unduly from their income, their resources, and their rights of individual choice.

The right to worship God in our own way; to speak freely our minds without fear; to conduct our lives and our affairs without officious meddling by too powerful Government—these individual rights must be preserved and protected by our active efforts or they can be lost in America as they have already been lost to too many people throughout the world. We must revive those qualities of diligence, economy, courage, initiative, and patriotism which enabled our forefathers to make this Nation great.

This Republic is the custodian of human liberty. The Republican Party will endeavor to continue to see to it that we are worthy of this guardianship.

The Tydings Subcommittee Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 28 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials regarding the Tydings subcommittee report, one from the Monroe Times of July 21, 1950, the second from the Green Bay Press-Gazette of July 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Monroe Times of July 21, 1950]

SMART POLITICIANS

Politicans are supposed to be smart, at least politicians who spend nine-tenths of their time making sure they're elected, again and again.

In the case of yesterday's Senate vote, however, on the subcommittee report castigating Senator McCARTHY, the supposed wizards of the public pulse certainly built up a beautiful case for the opposition.

Of course, the first bumble was made when the subcommittee's Democratic majority denounced Senator McCARTHY's charges of red infiltration into the State Department as a fraud and hoax. But acceptance of the report by the full Senate on strict party lines with the Trumanites lined up solidly with the fraud claimers was the No. 1 mistake of the campaign.

The excitement over Senator McCARTHY's charges had simmered down pretty much in recent weeks. Then the Korean war came along to take the Democrats' embarrassment over their strange bedfellows out of the headlines. The McCarthy probe and the implications were well on their way to being forgotten by those with short memories, meaning a large section of the public.

Then up pops the majority report which even conceded some half truths in the McCarthy claims but denounced the Senator as worse than unpatriotic. The obedient party line then formed up at the left in the Senate and approved the report despite the warnings and angry denunciations of the Republicans.

All of which gives the GOP a beautiful new campaign issue. They now can charge, with plenty of reason, that the report and muzzling of the inquiry represented a whitewash of a betrayal of the Nation through public officials.

They also can explain the why of that whitewash, the fact that the surprise turn in Korea was proof positive that a pinkish section within Government either deliberately paved the way for the Korean crisis, or merely brought it about by inept foreign policy tactics.

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette of July 22, 1950]

SO HERE IS HOW IT STANDS

The three Democrats on the Senate committee investigating the McCarthy charges have found them to be wholly without foundation.

The two Republicans differed violently with this conclusion. They characterize the investigation as "superficial and inconclusive, the atmosphere too often not that of seeking to ascertain the truth, whereas the committee's record is a tangle of loose threads, of witnesses not subpenaed, of leads not followed up."

The people who want to arrive at the correct conclusion in a matter of this importance must thread their way through a maze of closed doors, suddenly secret sessions and a battery of obvious defamers who tried their level best to prevent the committee from investigating the charges by preferring charges against the Senator himself.

But even the Democrats on the committee are forced reluctantly to conclude that some of those attacked by Senator McCARTHY were, to quote these Democrats, "naive and gullible" and that others were guilty of conduct described as "extremely indiscreet."

So a man who admittedly gives to a Red "top-secret information" and whose voice is recorded by the FBI as he tells that Red that it is a secret is slapped upon the wrist and told that he was extremely indiscreet, while he is returned to his position where he may commit further indiscretions.

In attempting to get order out of confusion let us look at some of the presented evidence.

On June 21 Senator TYDINGS asserted "that a special inquiry by the Federal Bureau of Investigation had established as false Mr. McCARTHY's asserticns that the files had been stripped or raped before being turned over to the subcommittee."

A short time thereafter Senator McCARTHY sent out a photostat of a letter written to him by the head of the FBI, as follows:

"I have received your letter dated June 27, 1950, inquiring whether this Bureau has examined the 81 loyalty files which the members of the Tydings committee have been scrutinizing and whether such an examination by the FBI has disclosed that the files are complete and that nothing has been removed therefrom. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has made no such examination and therefore is not in a position to make any statement concerning the completeness or incompleteness of the State Department files."

So much for that Tydings whopper.

Continue along the same road because the scenery is quite interesting.

Unable to get the Tydings committee to subpena further witnesses who would testify that they were directed to strip the records, Senator McCARTHY sent to the President the affidavits of four such witnesses, and supplied the press of the country with photostatic copies of such affidavits. Three of such witnesses gave their names. One was a junior at Georgetown University, another was an FBI agent, a third was employed in private industry, and the fourth still works for the State Department and said that he would supply his name only if the President would assure him that he would not be fired for telling the truth. No such assurance ever came from the White House.

Let us see what these four witnesses said in their affidavits. Quoting from the one who is still employed by the State Department will be sufficient because the statements were much the same. He swore:

"In August 1946 I started working as a clerk in the State Department * * * I was assigned to a project with other clerks on the State Department personnel files. We all were instructed to remove all derogatory material from the personnel files and we were instructed to dispose of these materials. The derogatory material consisted of letters, memorandum which reflected on the employee. I cannot remember any specific file because we all worked on many files. But we worked on this project from August until the end of December 1946. All of the derogatory material in the files was destroyed or thrown away."

It is more than passing strange that a committee appointed to investigate charges refused to even listen to the evidence of four witnesses, one of them still working for the State Department, and refused stubbornly to let the people of this country have their evidence.

The people will draw their own conclusions. From Senator McCARTHY they have received all the evidence he could gather. This evidence showed that men were employed to destroy evidence. It also showed that the Tydings committee willfully falsified to the country by pretending that the FBI had gone through the records which the FBI deliberately says it never went through.

Moreover, the Tydings committee acted as though it always had something to hide. When it had a piece of evidence that seemed to refute the McCARTHY charges, it brought it out in public with a brass band. When it was time to inquire why men high in the State Department gave secret documents by the hundreds to fellows like Jaffe, the committee locked the doors and drew the curtains.

We expect that the public conclusions on this case will not be far out of the way.

What Are Our Aims?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 28 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a page 1 editorial entitled "What Are Our Aims?" which appeared in the New Hampshire Sunday News of July 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ARE CUR AIMS?

President Truman's actions, thus far in the Korean war, have made much more sense than his words.

Both in his initial decision to fight the Red attackers, and in his prompt movement of men and munitions toward the war theater, the President electrified the free world. His boldness quickly carried the day in UN, and committed a majority of its members to the principle for which America is fighting.

But there has since been a sharp let-down in world sentiment, and Mr. Truman's two major pronouncements of the week just passed did nothing to bolster it.

What his listeners anticipated—and did not get—was some indication that America realizes the bankruptcy of its policies with respect to Red imperialism, and is at least attempting to formulate new ones.

The President told Congress and the people to get ready, on an impressive scale. He did not tell them what to get ready for.

"Any eventuality," is the barren phrase which sums it up.

But this negative and defensive attitude is not a policy. Still less does it represent a political or military objective.

It leaves entirely in the hands of the Kremlin that precious command over future events known to military leaders at the strategic initiative.

We are told that, at any time, Russia can order more fires to be started, on farflung borders all round her gigantic perimeter.

We are to stand by like a lot of volunteer firemen, with a corporal's guard in West Berlin, another in Greece, a third in Turkey, a gamble in Yugoslavia and a prayer in Iran.

Stalin will call the tune. We are to listen carefully so we will recognize it, and go into our proper dance.

Nuts, as the man said at Bastogne.

We ourselves must call the tune.

The way to obtain the initiative is to seize it.

The place to seize it is in Asia, where Stalin has invited such action by turning loose his war dogs. (Which he cynically offers to tie up again, if we will bargain with him on Red China.)

Let us, as General Eisenhower so wisely suggests, spare nothing from our efforts to annihilate the military force of the Red aggressor. Let us drive him back, not merely to the thirty-eighth parallel, but across the Manchurian border.

Let us do it as the Japanese did it, at the turn of the century. The situation then bore many striking resemblances to the present. Russia, then as now, was at the full tide of a campaign to dominate Asia.

Firmly entrenched in Manchuria, where she had remained in full military occupation following the Boxer Rebellion, her czaristic precursors of the modern commissars grew more and more arrogant.

Their attempt at open subversion of the Korean Government at Seoul was too much for the Japs, who declared war and whipped the Russians soundly, retarding for another 50 years their age-old drive toward the Orient.

What the Japs did in 1903, America can certainly do in 1950. We will have the Japs on our side, if we offer them suitable rewards. We will also have Chiang Kai-shek and his well-trained battalions. And before such a war had progressed for 6 months, it is an overwhelming likelihood that two dozen old-fashioned Chinese warlords would be in the thick of the fray. Asia would be in flames, and so would Stalin's czaristic dreams of world conquest via the Pacific.

Let us then help establish, on the Asiatic plain of Manchuria and Eastern Siberia a free republic, peopled by the Chinese of Manchuria, and the overflow of Japan's cramped millions. Let us ourselves support the slogan: Asia for the Asiatics. An Asiatic republic, self-governed, but aided by American agricultural and technical know-how, would serve for centuries as the indispensable buffer state between this country and Russia.

Who believes that, once such a design became plain, Stalin would have any stomach for overrunning western Europe, or for adventures in Arabia, India, or the Balkans.

Even if he did, would not Britain and the Empire be rallied to the struggle in full determination? Would not the Dutch, the French, the Belgians, and even the Scandinavians be roused from their torpor?

We cannot, with a mere 150,000,000 Americans, continue to fight these border wars, all around the world, in defense of peoples too sluggish to comprehend their own peril. We can offer powerful help. We can even fight two wars at once, as we effectively proved the last time.

We can't fight 40 wars at once.

We cannot fight even one war if we do not move, instantly, to the formulation of tangible objectives and the seizure of the strategic initiative.

B. J. McQ.

Disposition of Water From the Colorado River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on July 19 I was permitted to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my radio broadcast to the people of New Mexico dealing with the water resources of New Mexico. Since that time I have delivered another broadcast, which describes a meeting held in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, and is a follow-up on the general subject of the disposition of water from the Colorado River for the benefit of the people of New Mexico. I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hello, friends of New Mexico, this is CLINTON ANDERSON speaking to you from Washington with another report. Two weeks ago my report dealt with the water resources in New Mexico and this time I am pleased to give you a follow-up on that report. I am glad to talk to you today about a conference which people from New Mexico had with Secretary of Interior Oscar Chapman, with Assistant Secretary William Warne, with officials of the Bureau of Reclamation from both districts 4 and 5, officials of the Indian Service, the Indian Irrigation Service and other agencies in the Department of the Interior. That took place this past week in Washington and it was a great pleasure for me to be able to attend it.

There was present on that occasion the entire congressional delegation from New Mexico, either in person or by a representative. John Erickson from the office of the State engineer at Santa Fe was there to represent Governor Mabry and State Engineer John Bliss.

Most encouraging of all, it seemed to me, was the wide representation from over the State of New Mexico. There were representatives present from the San Juan area, from Espanola and that part of northern New Mexico which lies along the Rio Grande, from Springer representing people interested in the diversion of some water from the Rio Grande to the Canadian River, from Albuquerque, Belen, Socorro and other cities within the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District and particularly auspicious it seems to me was the presence in the conference of a representative from the Elephant Butte Water District which has been outstanding in the contribution it has made to the agricultural resources of New Mexico.

There were perhaps others there whom I ought to mention but these at least will be sufficient to show that the gathering was State-wide and that it indicated the widespread interest in the conservation of our water resources and particularly in the use of New Mexico's share of the water from the Colorado River system.

Well, right away you'll want to know what we talked about and so I am going to review as best I can the subject matter of that long conference which lasted 2 hours in the Department of the Interior. I mention 2 hours because the Secretary of the Interior himself was with us for an hour and a half. I think it remarkable that that fine public official, busy as he is in times like these with problems of strategic minerals, power resources and statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, was willing to remember that he once had lived among us in New Mexico and that he was still our neighbor although his home is in Colorado. He came to us as a friend and neighbor and spent an hour and a half hearing what we had to say about the use of the waters of the Colorado River.

First in all our discussion was the size of the proposed Shiprock project for Navajo Indians. How big should it be? Well, we had all sorts of answers and that is to be expected because all projects seem to depend on the Shiprock project. It is the star to which the beneficial use of our water from the Colorado is to be hitched. Judge Fred Wilson, of Albuquerque, long active in water compacts and greatly interested in the progress of our interstate streams negotiation, was present and told the history of the compact dividing the waters of the Upper Colorado Basin. He pointed out that in all the preliminary discussions which lasted nearly 2 years before a final compact was signed by the States and approved by the Congress, the figure most generally accepted as limiting the size of the Shiprock project was about 70,000 acres and that at one time there had been a direct statement made that 70,000 acres would be the top amount which would be developed under the Shiprock project.

I felt compelled to remark that the Shiprock project was like the motto of our State: It grows as it goes. With the passing of years and with Nation-wide interest in trying to assist the Navajos and make them self-sufficient, the project grew to nearly 90,000 acres and then to 113,900 acres which has been and still is the top limit for a gravity flow project. Of course, when that top limit for gravity flow was reached, proposals were made for the generation of electricity at dams and the pumping of water to other areas so that the Shiprock project then spread out to where it seemed likely to involve 150,000 acres. In the opinion of engineers and officials representing New Mexico, that was too much because such a huge Indian project seemed to forever seal the doom of white users in the San Juan area or a possible transmountain diversion out of the San Juan to other river valleys of the State.

When it did get to that high figure an agreement was reached, mainly at the direction of Assistant Secretary Warne, to bring it down to a project that would utilize only gravity flow and hence be limited in its size to not more than 113,900 acres.

It was pointed out by Assistant Secretary Warne that while that top figure had been used, it unquestionably involved land that was in irregularly shaped tracts and required canals that might be too long and, therefore, when the final engineering was complete, the project might come down to something substantially less than that, possibly and probably not as low as 70,000 acres but in the neighborhood of 90,000 acres and that it might settle down to a size that would make possible some of the other dreams which the people of New Mexico have had.

Second, there was discussion of the use of San Juan water on the land of whites in the San Juan Basin. The talk revealed that there might be 20,000 acres of land near

Blanco which should be developed along with the Shiprock project for the Navajos.

Third, there was mentioned the possibility that some of the land could be irrigated from the Animas River and that we should not contemplate taking all of New Mexico's water out of the San Juan but should leave open the possibility that Animas water could be used.

Then the conference got down to one of the most controversial of all the items, namely, the size of the San Juan transmountain diversion by which it is proposed that some of Colorado River water be lifted over the mountain and dropped into the Rio Grande. This, of course, is of extreme importance to the State because of the rapid growth of many of the cities along the Rio Grande. Santa Fe and Albuquerque have had tremendous growth these last few years, with Albuquerque jumping to metropolitan size. It was pointed out that to insure the domestic water supply of the cities of the Rio Grande Valley, the transmountain diversion was more and more necessary and the development of power along the stream as a result of the diversion would be very welcome to those defense establishments at Los Alamos, Sandia Base and even farther south in New Mexico, as well as to the industries which are gradually developing in and around Albuquerque.

Therefore, the size of the San Juan transmountain diversion is of first importance. Reclamation engineers had contemplated that there would be about three surveys made for study, one based on the use of about 295,000 acre-feet for the diversion, another using around 279,000 feet and then a very small one at about 175,000 feet. The 290,000-foot diversion would be feasible but might cut too deeply into the amount of water available for lands that should be cultivated in the Shiprock and other San Juan areas and, therefore, there were many expressions that 279,000 acre-feet might be about right. Such a diversion would, of course, permit some new land to be irrigated in the Middle Rio Grande Valley and that raised new questions. It was asserted that the 175,000-acre-foot diversion was not large enough because it gave the Rio Grande Valley supplementary water only and, therefore, might have a cost out of proportion to the benefits. Naturally, the people from the Middle Rio Grande Valley were extremely anxious that the diversion be large enough so that it would be a feasible project so that the Congress of the United States might look with favor upon its authorization. If it is to be feasible it looked as if some intermediate level would have to be decided upon, where not much new land would be brought in and yet enough water so that some water could be utilized in other needy areas.

For example, there are people who think we should make water available to the San Luis Basin of Colorado to be used as supplemental irrigation water. The area receives almost enough moisture from its present rainfall but it would be desirable to have some supplemental irrigation.

Then, too, it seemed reasonable that some water should be developed around Santa Fe and Espanola and that some of the areas in the northern part of our State that now depend upon inadequate diversions and small ditches could be fed by small dams and that new diversions could supply them with a guarantee of water so that this area could be more secure in its irrigation needs.

Finally, of course, there is the great value of having an additional guaranty of water so that the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District will not have to be steadily borrowing from Colorado and from the Elephant Butte project. It was pointed out in the meeting that the additional water represented by the diversion should to some degree be held in trust to guarantee that there would always be sufficient water for the Middle Rio Grande and Elephant Butte projects. We know that it is gradually becoming drier all over the West and that there seems to be not as much rainfall as we once had. Therefore, our calculations as to how much water would usually flow down the Rio Grande may hereafter not be too exact and it might be wise to hold back a little extra water as a guaranty that the Middle Rio Grande district would always have enough and that the Elephant Butte district would always have enough and that we might as well make sure that there would be water flowing past both projects and down to the lower valley of the Rio Grande in Texas for use there or to fulfill some of our treaty obligations with the Republic of Mexico.

Well, that about winds up the story. You see, there was a desire for cooperation on the part of Federal and State officials and the people from all over our State and from other States. There was the thought that we might cooperate so well together that there would be water for a large Indian project and a medium-sized white project in the San Juan area, water for the San Luis Valley of Colorado for supplementary irrigation; that there might be a diversion from the Rio Grande to the Canadian to accommodate up to 10,000 acres where a new supply of water is needed; that the diversion from the San Juan to the Chama could then be used to protect the existing supplies of the Middle Rio Grande Valley, add protection to the lower valley in New Mexico where the Elephant Butte project so successfully operates, and give additional service to those along the lower valley in Texas, as well as those who depend upon the Rio Grande for irrigation projects in the Republic of Mexico. The whole thing could unite forces in Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, the State Department, with all trying to develop a joint project which all might assist in sponsoring and pushing through the Congress.

Excellent suggestions were made by Congressman MILES and Congressman FERNANDEZ. I tried to do my very best to express the over-all water needs of my State. It was a heartening experience that could be the means of hastening the development of our plans to use the Colorado River water now allocated to New Mexico.

And so until 2 weeks from today this is Clinton Anderson thanking you for listening and saying good-by from Washington.

Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Jan Ciechanowski, appearing in the Boston Herald of July 29, 1950. Mr. Ciechanowski served for many years as Ambassador to this country. The article follows:

EX-POLISH ENVOY MAKES CLEAR THE NUB OF OUR KOREA PROBLEM

(By Jan Ciechanowski)

It is becoming daily more urgent to adjust American foreign policy to the new situation created by the Korean war.

However insistently the United States Government stresses that American intervention in Korea is only a UN police action, all the world knows that in reality it is a curtain raiser to a possible armed show-down between the United States and Soviet Russia. Whether the drama will be limited to the curtain raiser still depends on Stalin. But whatever may happen, President Truman's bold initiative of July 27 called a halt to Soviet Communist expansion. The United States challenged communism on behalf of the UN. It assumed active world leadership with all the responsibilities that it entails.

IT'S OUR BABY

So far, apart from the UN flag which waves over American soldiers on the Korean battlefields, the UN police action is, in fact, an American war. Only token British, French, Austrian, and Dutch naval and air force units support the United States war effort.

The military lessons of the first weeks of fighting are certainly most valuable to the American high command and Department of Defense. Unfortunately, this experience is being acquired the hard way. It has disproved the over-optimistic statements of Secretary of Defense Johnson on American war preparedness. The disturbing factor of these first weeks of war lies in the prospect that the Soviets, emboldened by their successes in Korea, may be tempted to launch other diversionary aggressions elsewhere. This is more likely to happen when the American forces succeed in assuming the offensive.

So much for the military aspect of the fighting in Korea. The national, American aspect is no less important. It bears on American foreign policy.

In his broadcast to the Nation on July 19, the President made two direct references to American security. Hitherto, official statements on defense matters mostly stressed collective security only and the requirements of western European nations as regards American financial, economic, and military aid and support.

The President's mention of American security is both welcome and significant. Previous failure to emphasize American security was regrettable. It gave to the American people and to the western European nations an exaggerated feeling of safety and too great a reliance on American military power and preparedness.

This overconfidence has been somewhat shaken by the record of the first phase of the Korean campaign. The absence of references to American security also helped Soviet propaganda in spreading the accusation that the United States of America, though apparently unconcerned for its own security, was rearming itself and its western Allies and increasing its atomic stockpile for imperialist reasons alone.

No power can afford to base its foreign policy on lesser considerations than concern for its national safety. From the outset Stalin realized the advantage of continually stressing his anxiety for Russia's safety, even when making his most far-reaching expansionist demands.

How successfully Stalin used this argument is shown by the fact that he managed to get President Roosevelt to accept it on its merits at Tehran and Yalta. Had the United States of America opposed the requirements of its own security to Stalin's demands, the postwar world situation would certainly have been less precarious.

Moreover, American reticence to use this argument was unjustified. For the first time in history the security of all free nations depended entirely on the security of one power—the United States—the only one whom no other nation could justly suspect or accuse of imperialism.

It is to hoped that the President will now see fit frequently to stress American security and will openly base United States foreign policy on its growing requirements. This alone will make clear to the American people and especially to American soldiers what they are fighting for.

While American military measures are now being speeded up, there still appears to be

no outward sign in Washington of any change in foreign policy to fit in with the President's reversal of its former passivity. Indeed, as one observes the Washington scene, one notes disturbing signs of latent appeasement.

In usually well informed diplomatic circles the belief prevails that the Department of State still wishes to see Communist China admitted to the UN Security Council. Secretary Acheson's recent utterances on Formosa and his declared decision not to veto the admission of Chinese Communist delegates to the UN, still appear to express the official American attitude on these questions.

CRITICAL MATTER

It is to be feared that the Soviets may read into the wording of Mr. Acheson's reply to Pandit Nehru the the United States Government will not oppose the seating of Communist China as soon as the North Koreans retire behind the thirty-eighth parallel.

Former wartime experts on Soviet Russia have apparently been recalled to the State Department. This is being interpreted in Washington diplomatic circles as a proof that officials of the Yalta period of appeasement of Russia will again advise the Department on its policy toward the Soviets.

James Reston comments in the New York Times-Boston Herald on the new task of the State Department of teaching the public to distinguish between the United States Korean intervention, which is a UN undertaking, and the policy on China, Formosa, Indochina, and other Pacific problems which, apparently, are to be regarded as problems of American foreign policy, distinct from the Korean action.

The average American, after hearing the President link the Korean war with American security, may find it difficult to draw such fine distinctions between the various far-eastern problems especially if he studies the map.

How can one reconcile the President's decision to defend Formosa with the orders given to Chiang Kai-shek to suspend all action against the Chinese Reds, except as a futile gesture to placate the Soviets?

How can one reconcile American fighting in Korea against a Soviet-led aggression with the seating of Red China in the UN in order to bring the Soviets back to Lake Success, except as yet another appeasement gesture to placate Stalin?

How can anyone, in the face of the record, still succumb to Pandit Nehru's illusion that such a gesture would now make the totalitarian Soviets abandon their successful policies and sincerely negotiate for a stable peace over the UN council table with democratic America?

AND SO ON?

How can anyone hope during a shooting war effectively to use the same futile appeasement tactics that failed during the cold war and even when the Soviets were fighting on our side against a common enemy and were dependent on our support for victory?

Surely it is time finally to reject a policy which was so unsuccessful.

It is urgent to adjust one's mind to the existing threat to American security and to work out a new policy better adapted to actual developments.

An American policy of gestures cannot hope to win against a Soviet policy of threats and action.

The American Government may not conspicuously intend to appease Soviet Russia. But, at this time of looming world conflict, it is essential to remember that it is not our intentions that count, but the interpretation which the enemy places on them. Experience should have taught us that Soviet logic and realism always interpret even the smallest concession as an admission of weakness to be fully and ruthlessly exploited.

Communistic Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, last week Justice Burton of the United States Supreme Court issued an order on the eve of the scheduled execution of a Negro, Willie McGee, thrice convicted of the dastardly crime of raping a white woman in Jones County, Miss., which stayed that execution.

While Jones County is in my congressional district, I know no more about the merits of the case, whether the defendant was guilty as charged or not, than do you, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues here; but, Mr. Speaker, in order that the record may be kept straight, I do know that the record shows that a Jones County grand jury and three petit juries of Jones and Forrest Counties, on the panel of which were Negroes, say that he was guilty.

My purpose here is to point out that again the Communist Party, aided and abetted by the "do-gooders," fellow travelers, and left-wing press is again about its task in fomenting discord and disunity between the Negroes and the white people of the South. A few days before the third scheduled execution of this convicted rapist the representatives of the Civil Rights Congress, an organization listed by the Attorney General of the United States as a subversive organization, sent representatives from New York and Chicago to Mississippi for the purpose of fanning the fires of discord between the races, and to heap insults upon the Governor, the courts, and the people of the great State of Mississippi. It is significant that prior to their departure from Mississippi their mission was heralded throughout the Daily Worker and the left-wing press generally. It is, also, significant that since the FBI recently disclosed that Mississippi had the fewest Communists of any of the 48 States—one—the efforts of this subversive organization could be counted upon to bring about discord and trouble, the chief weapon of the Communist Party. Therefore it is pertinent to inquire whether these emissaries of the Kremlin really wanted to save the life of Willie McGee or whether they wanted to incite the people of Mississippi into mob violence.

Be it said again for the record, to the credit of the Governor, the other officers, and the people of Mississippi, that if this was their mission they failed. Willie McGee is safely held in the Hinds County jail where he will remain until the United States Supreme Court again passes on his case. Mr. Speaker, the people of Mississippi have again proved that they believe in the orderly and legal procedure of justice even if outsiders attempt to try their patience.

Here is the text of the statement issued Wednesday night by Gov. Fielding L. Wright, Chief Justice Harvey McGehee, and Attorney General John Kyle on the Willie McGee case:

In view of the distorted statements which have been made by some sections of the press with reference to the Willie McGee case we, as Governor, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and Attorney General of Mississippi, feel it is time that the entire controversy be placed in its proper light.

Willie McGee was convicted three times, each time by a different jury, of the crime of rape which requires a death penalty in our State if all 12 jurors agree on it. His last execution sentence was stayed in Washington today (Wednesday) by Justice Harold Burton.

McGee's first two convictions were reversed on legal technicalities. Once because the Mississippi Supreme Court felt he should not have been tried in the town which was the scene of the crime. The second was reversed, also by the Mississippi Supreme Court, because it found alleged discrimination against Negroes in the jury panel.

His last conviction was upheld when the case was judged on its merits.

McGee's execution date, after his last conviction, was set almost at the legal time limit, giving his attorneys every chance to take whatever steps they chose.

It was not until this time had nearly expired that they acted, seeking a new writ of error.

The Department of Justice of the United States has branded the Civil Rights Congress of New York as a Communist organization. That congress has been the mainstay of McGee's defense. It has used every means at its command, and they are numerous, to delay the orderely administration of justice in this State.

The congress knew time was running out but it was not until 6 days before McGee was to die that it suddenly announced it could prove McGee was convicted on perjured testimony and that the State's attorneys had participated in a conspiracy to convict him.

Since then there have been reports of threats of violence, fear of violence, actual violence—all made by representatives of what the Department of Justice calls a Communist-front group or those associated with them.

McGee's attorneys claimed they could not appear in court in Laurel because they feared physical violence. Their supporting claims were disputed by witnesses.

"They told our supreme court that their witnesses were scared to appear in open State court. They refused repeated offers to hear their evidence and protect their witnesses.

"In Biloxi today (Wednesday) they had no witnesses present, even though those witnesses would then have been under the automatic protection of the United States Government.

"We heard the representatives of the Civil Rights Congress ask clemency for McGee Tuesday. Their statements, and particularly those of Mr. Aubrey Grossman, their chief spokesman, were calculatedly made to antagonize the people of the South.

"Mr. Grossman insulted every tradition of the South, every court, every judge, and every officer of the State of Mississippi.

"He did it deliberately, provokingly, as is the accepted process in his organization's operations.

"Last night a New York Compass reporter was reported attacked at our railroad station. Later a member of the delegation was said to have been mauled at our airport."

[The reporter of the New York Daily Compass was Stephen Fischer. The delegation member was Sidney Ordower, of Chicago, a radio commentator and Progressive Party candidate for United States Senator from Illinois.]

"Today Mr. Grossman told police he was assaulted in his hotel room by six or eight men.

"None of them were more than slightly injured.

"We do not know if the people who made these attacks were from Jackson or even from Mississippi.

"These attacks are being thoroughly investigated. Our authorities are handicapped, however, by the failure of any of the victims to give any sort of description of their assailants.

"The Governor of Mississippi went personally to Mr. Grossman's hotel room this (Wednesday) morning, after he had been told in a telegram from New York that he was "barricaded in his room by a Jackson mob." This was not true. Mr. Grossman was offered the personal protection of the Governor if he was in such fear that he wished to leave immediately.

"It was refused.

"It is our considered opinion that the events of the past 36 hours were provoked for their propaganda effect.

"From the actions of these persons who have pleaded for Willie McGee—and only two of them by their own admission had even bothered to familiarize themselves with the true facts—we are convinced that they are more interested in racial strife and civil strife than they are in justice of any kind, legal or moral."

The Time for Price and Wage Control Has Arrived

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, last week I sat through the several days of important hearings as a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee which had under consideration a bill to establish priorities and allocations for strategic materials and to provide certain credit controls.

Today the committee goes before the Rules Committee for a rule on this bill which was reported out of our committee with only one dissenting vote. I supported the bill, but I likewise feel that it does not go far enough and so stated and voted in the committee.

I am today introducing a bill which will provide not only all the features of the bill as amended and reported out by our committee but will likewise provide for ceilings on prices and wages now.

As an indication of what the folks back home are thinking, I read this short statement from a letter, similar to many that I am receiving:

I have just read that you plan to introduce a bill to control prices and wages. I think this will be the best thing that could be done for the American people. In my small business prices within 3 weeks have increased from 5 percent on hardware to an all-time high of 20 percent on paper materials.

This small-business man goes on to say:

I have talked with a large number of people in the last few days and every one I have talked to agrees we must have some type of control. Unless—

He says—

such a control program is instituted the big companies will get all the materials and we little outfits will be pushed out in the cold.

My bill, as I have pointed out, not only carries all of the language of H. R. 9176, as amended by our committee, but provides that both prices and wages be stabilized as of June of this year.

Unless some type of legislation to control the unwarranted spiral of prices is passed the country within a very short time will be faced with a general demand for wage increases in every major industry. Unless prices are controlled, it would be nothing but right to consider these demands for wage increases as not only fair but also as proper.

Mr. Speaker, controls are not desirable. But I respectfully point out that we face daily one emergency after another. We are deeply concerned with what is taking place in Korea and with the serious unrest in other vital areas of the world. We should likewise be seriously concerned with the set-backs that are now so plainly evident on the economic home front.

Yes, there will be hoarding and black-marketing. But penalties will be provided in keeping with the severe sacrifices that are being made by our American lads on the battlefields of Korea.

It is my feeling, my colleagues, that in this critical hour politics must be thrown out the window.

We cannot do less than place in the hands of the President legislation that will serve to stabilize this excited and jittery American economy.

It is my further opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the President will approve of such a bill. In fact, I believe that the President long before this hour has been giving serious consideration to stronger measures to cope with the serious economic problems facing the country today.

New City Hall at Birmingham, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of Congress the laying of the cornerstone for the new city hall in Birmingham, Ala. The significance of this occasion, in addition to marking a milestone in the progress of our great industrial city, is the filing of various messages for posterity. It is my privilege to write a letter to the Congressman from the Birmingham district in the year of 2050 and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include it at this point:

AUGUST 3, 1950.

REPRESENTATIVE OF THE NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF ALABAMA,

One Hundred and Thirty-first Congress of the United States,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OF 2050: As the cornerstone for Birmingham's magnificent new city hall is being laid today, thoughts of the international crisis in Korea hang over our heads like an ominous shadow and dominate all of our thinking and activity. It has been almost 6 weeks since the Russian-inspired invasion of South Korea, and since the United Nations, our world organization to preserve peace, went into action to repel the invaders. Yet we believe and pray that the fighting in Korea can be isolated and prevented from spreading into world war III. If this can be done, then we should be capable mentally, spiritually, and physically of bringing about a new era of peace and prosperity because we will have learned that it is necessary to stop aggression before it gets started and threatens the peace and security of the world.

Even though this crisis dominates our thinking at this time, we pause to recognize the development and progress made here in our own community which is a good example of the spirit and effort necessary to bring about peace and progress in our world community.

The laying of this cornerstone represents another milestone in the development of the magic city and the Birmingham metropolitan area. The construction of this great city hall represents much time, effort, and money given in the spirit of development and advancement for unselfish reasons. Much credit goes to our forward-looking city commission, its president, William Cooper Green; commissioner of public improvements, James V. Morgan; and commissioner of public safety, Eugene "Bull" Connor, for their untiring efforts. It has been my privilege as the Representative from this Ninth Congressional District, which corresponds to Jefferson County, to cooperate and work with these public servants in every way possible for the advancement and benefit of our people.

As we look around us today, August 3, 1950, the people in our entire area have good reason to share in the civic pride expressed here because of their contribution toward making Birmingham the greater center we expect it to be in 2050. We think of you who follow us, as we work to advance medical science and to improve the health of our people. We are now in the process of building a new veterans' hospital which is a part of the great medical center that has been established in Birmingham for the benefit of our whole area. Federal funds make this veterans' hospital possible, and help in the building of other medical buildings for this splendid center. Our new public health building was finished just last year and a new crippled children's clinic is under construction. Birmingham and Jefferson County are moving forward.

There are even discussions of locating an atomic-energy plant in our area, with special emphasis on the construction of hydrogen bombs due to the critical times we are experiencing. Should this plant be set up in our section, we are hopeful the building of bombs can soon be replaced by the production of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. Some of our people are most anxious to bring this new plant to Alabama to help solve our unemployment problems, while others are fearful of the danger involved. Of course,

Birmingham is already a critical target for a potential enemy mainly because of our coal and steel industry.

Birmingham is taking a big part in our national defense. We have had a new naval air station recently located at the Bechtel-McCone plant which was used in the last war to put the finishing touches on our bombers. We have several Air Force, National Guard, Marine and Army Reserve units training in the same area near the airport and they are in excellent condition.

By the time this letter is opened, we feel confident that Birmingham, this industrial child of the South, will have grown into full manhood and will have a leading role in world production—production which we hope can be used for peaceful purposes, but production which, if necessary, will give us the strength to remain free. If we may speculate, perhaps our production will take the form of peaceful atomic capsules that will send a ship around the world, or rocket ships for business and pleasure trips to neighboring planets. But whatever form it takes, we hope it will have added to the well-being, the happiness, and the security of all Americans. You, Mr. Representatives of 2050, are better able to judge these things than we.

Congress was scheduled, according to the Reorganization Plan of 1946, to adjourn a few days ago, July 31, 1950. But due to the Korean situation the talk of adjournment has passed. Instead we are getting ready to consider the measures suggested in the President's message dealing with controls, taxes, increasing the size of the Armed Forces, etc. We have already extended the draft and Congress seems to be in the mood to go all-out 100 percent to back our boys in Korea and bring about peace in the world again. The American people seem to have been ahead of our Government and were relieved to some extent by the President's message when he called a halt to Russia's kicking the United States around. Although the people in our Government realize that calling Russia's bluff might mean world war III, there is great unity in the belief that this was the right action because we could not stand by and let Russia eat up one country after another in the Far East like she did in Europe until she is strong enough to attack the United States; also, it is the consensus of opinion that a continued weak policy at this time would certainly mean war, and now at least we have a fighting chance for peace.

I hope we have learned the hard lesson that it will be necessary in the future to stop war before it begins if we are to have this period of peace that we all hope for and are working for. When we know a firebug is loose in a community, like Stalin is loose in the world community, the time to stop him is before the first fire is set. There have always been plenty of warnings of aggression long before any attack ever came, but our policy heretofore has been one of retaliation rather than war prevention, and I think this must be reversed immediately if we are to survive.

I hope we will be able to strengthen the United Nations so that we may pass on to you, Congressman, 100 years hence, a sturdy and significant international organization capable of keeping peace in the world.

Now, for the first time in the history of the world, the United Nations flag is flying over international troops, and we, the United States, have been called on to lead this bold venture. It is the first time the Security Council has authorized police action. This action was possible only because of a Russian blunder. When Russia boycotted the Security Council and withheld her usual veto, she made it possible for the Council to take firm, swift, and constructive action in behalf of what is right and honest and decent in the world—in behalf of peace and democracy. Now, Russia has realized that blunder and has returned to the council tables of the United Nations. It is my deep and sincere hope that she will not be able to block the United Nations' valiant efforts for world peace.

I hope, as you read this, Mr. Congressman of the One Hundred and Thirty-first Congress, that our efforts in these crucial years will have made it possible for you to live in a world of peace, or prosperity, and of challenge, where there is freedom and security for all.

Respectfully yours,

LAURIE C. BATTLE.

Russia Returns to Security Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Jan Ciechanowski, appearing in the Boston Herald of July 30, 1950. The Members of Congress are familiar with Mr. Ciechanowski's long and distinguished career in diplomacy.

RED UN MOVE CLEVERLY TIMED

(By Jan Ciechanowski)

The spontaneous return of the Soviets to the UN Security Council is a monkey wrench thrown by Moscow into the creaking machinery of the UN.

This sudden move on the part of the Soviets is cleverly timed and coordinated with the spectacular success so far of the Soviet-led Korean aggression. Its primary aim is to force Nationalist China out of the UN and replace it by the vote powers of the Soviet-controlled Communist China. This should present no serious difficulty, if the United States Government adheres to its decision of not using its own veto against the seating of the Chinese Communists. Voting alignment in the UN Council should make it possible for the Soviets to achieve their aim.

The Soviet return to the UN is not inconsistent with Soviet mentality and tactics, although it is a direct reversal of their declared decision not to attend meetings as long as Nationalist China is represented on the UN Council. It shows that the realistic and totally uninhibited Stalin is past master in taking full advantage of any new situation created by his own dynamic policies. It proves that he rightly regards the success of his operations as sufficient excuse for any move which allows him to retain the initiative in international relations.

It is regrettable that Soviet Russia is still the only big power that never hesitates to change its course of action in accordance with its own interests, without giving any excuse for doing so.

The new situation created by this last Soviet move is both interesting and instructive.

It destroys Trygve Lie's illusion that seating Communist China would be regarded as an amicable gesture by Moscow, which would then return to Lake Success and gratefully settle down to friendly negotiations on stalemated problems of peace and atomic disarmament.

It disproves similar pet theories held by some American policy planners still inclined to propitiate the Soviets by futile gestures of appeasement. It is a warning to the world that Soviet Russia still rules the roost and calls the tunes.

HIGHLY PROBABLE

If the Soviets succeed in seating Communist China on the UN Council, which is highly probable, they would certainly take advantage of their privilege to veto further UN police action in Korea, which they have already declared to be illegal. They will certainly not fail to take the initiative for restoring peace in Korea on terms that will show UN nations that, in the present world situation and after the short, sharp Korean lesson of Soviet war preparedness, negotiating peace means accepting Soviet conditions or risking a major war.

Unfortunately, the prestige of ruthless and dynamic power is more convincing than that of high moral principles and of self-righteousness on the defensive. Nations forced to seek security by gravitating to the strongest power have certainly been inspired by the initial phase of the war in Korea to revise their previous unlimited confidence in American readiness to defend them against Soviet aggression.

The Soviet position on peace in Korea will be stronger than that of the UN western bloc of nations, as the Soviet will doubtless insist that they are anxious to reunite Korea, while the American group of nations in the UN are fighting merely to restore a Korea partitioned by the thirty-eighth parallel between communism and democracy. The fact that the Soviet impracticability was responsible for this division will not worry the Soviet "peacemakers" any more than the present reversal of their decision to stay out of the UN until the ousting of Nationalist China.

MISSED CHANCE

By staying out of the UN the Soviets missed their chance of vetoing the American-led "UN police action" in Korea, but so far their military success has appeared to have approved their far-sightedness in letting the UN risk its prestige in an intervention deprived of Soviet sanction. The Soviets now return to the UN strengthened by their initial Korean successes.

Their return at this stage of the fighting may seem that they are preparing other "push button" aggressions elsewhere and intend to be in a position to veto further UN police intervention. Viewed from the American angle, at this unfavorable stage of the Korean test case in our preparedness, the Soviet return to Lake Success with its drive to increase its veto possibilities by the admission of Communist China, must be regarded as another test case—a test case of rival statesmanship.

If American foreign policy lacks the determination to veto Communist China's admission to the UN, if at the very outset it fails to place squarely on Soviet Russia full responsibility for the Korean aggression, if it allows the Soviet to steal a march by using the UN forum for accusing the United States of aggressive imperialism while quibbling in defensive protest, it is to be feared that Stalin's sinister tactics of intimidation will enable the Soviets to further their bids for world leadership, which by all standards belong to the United States.

Thus the nearest future may mark another turning point in history. The issue will be which of the two remaining world powers—the United States or the Soviet Union—will by its statesmanship succeed in calling the other's bluff.

The destiny of the world depends on how this issue is resolved.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, in response to numerous requests, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Frank C. Waldrop's series of articles on communism;

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Now we turn again in this survey to an examination of actions in Russia from 1938 forward, to see if those furnished any clue to the United States of America, as to the real nature of communism.

For the past several days, I have concentrated on communism in this country and the activities of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

These alone, it is obvious, should have warned President Roosevelt and all his associates, that there is no way of making any deal with Stalin. For the Communist law of life is simple and it is, as stated so long ago by Lenin, the founder of the present Russian Government:

"The bugle will blow taps over one or the other, socialism, or capitalism."

By socialism he meant exactly that same kind of government we see today in Russia, England, and other nations that have run backwards to primitive concepts of life.

It doesn't matter that in England the powers of socialism are still too shaky for the men in charge to risk shooting and imprisoning whoever differs with them. They are willing.

For in England, as in Russia, the Government seeks to own the factories and the farms and to say who shall work in them and for what wages. The Government claims the power to say how each citizen is to spend his money and use his time.

The Government of Russia took all such power in one bloody and ruthless attack. In England, the Government creeps an inch at a time, but the important thing is that it creeps.

The progress of socialism in Russia, by 1938, was plainly marked by gravestones. Stalin soon exhausted the prestige and success granted him by Mr. Roosevelt's catastrophic decision of 1933 to grant the Soviet Union diplomatic status.

From 1935 to 1938, Stalin had carried on open war against the factions within the Communist organization itself that sought to amend his ideas of how Russia should be run.

Even the stupidest could see that the Soviet Union was in the hands of a ruthless conspiracy of the few, and that no part of its government was open to adjustment according to the ideas of the citizens at large.

In 1936, Stalin produced a constitution, advertised as the freest in the world, and handed it to the country for adoption. You might ponder the meaning of this clause, the final one in its preamble:

"The principle applied in the U. S. S. R. is that of socialism: 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his work.'"

I will discuss this constitution only very little here, and recommend to others who want a really complete analysis that they get the two-volume survey of Soviet Law by Dr. Vladimir Gsovski, published by the University of Michigan Press.

But just consider the significance of that statement above.

Not to each according to his need. Only according to his work. Now, words sometimes let slip intentions in spite of all efforts of concealment.

In that constitution, Stalin abandoned all pretense that the Socialist state is a welfare state, guaranteeing the citizen what he needs regardless of his own abilities or condition.

He ran it up for all to see that in the Soviet Union, the man who does not deliver to the government according to its demand is out of luck.

You get the meaning of the "Great Stalin Constitution" as it was billed at the time, from these further plainly put points:

1. There is allowed only one political organization in the country, by law. That, of course, is the Communist Party, which is not open to everybody but only elects its members according to fixed and rigid rules.

In effect, politics in Russia is a closed corporation.

It is harder to break into than would be the most exclusive social club in the United States of America.

2. This above-mentioned constitution, supposedly the freest in the world cannot be amended except by decision of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R., and when the Supreme Soviet decides to amend it, nobody else has any say-so.

Compare with our own. Amendments to our Constitution can be offered by Congress or by constitutional conventions started by the citizens in the various States.

But no amendment is law until it is ratified by a vote of the citizens themselves.

Thus it was clear in the 1936 constitution, if it had not been before, that Stalin's supposedly good government for the people of Russia inherently was based on fraud. But did that shake the Roosevelt New Deal faith in communism? See the record.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles on communism by Frank C. Waldrop:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

What has the Soviet Government's conduct under communism publicly advised us to expect of Russia? Could anything have been easier to understand and predict?

Never in the history of government has any organization made its nature more clear.

Even the simplest mind is without excuse for wobbling on this matter. Least of all can a President of the United States excuse himself for having the attitude of "I like old Joe Stalin," or of such transactions as Roosevelt's at Yalta.

This series of studies on communism has run long and now is drawing to a close. It has touched on a wide variety of matters, ranking from murder to literature, from espionage to fighting in the streets.

There are a few more to add, pending the completion of the story on July 31, but all have one central characteristic. They serve to illustrate the obvious: Communism is the mortal enemy of American civilization.

That being so, why has communism been allowed its undenied place in Washington, D. C.? Never mind Korea. How about Washington?

Yesterday I did a little citation of the Soviet constitution handed to the people of Russia by Stalin's royal decree, effective December 5, 1936.

Was this constitution drafted in a convention of delegates as ours was, then debated and thought out by the people?

Was it so written that the people by their will could amend it? And have they?

Never forget that the United States Constitution was hardly a law of the land before it was amended 10 times, to ensure the citizens' Bill of Rights.

Not until that Bill of Rights was in effect did the United States Constitution sit well with the citizens. And with that Bill of Rights it has endured longer than any other present governing body of law, against everything from civil war to foreign, against enemies within and without.

WHY HAS IT SURVIVED?

Because it is open from the bottom as well as the top. The people can get at it to change it as they will. Furthermore, it has a concealed asset little discussed and even little enough understood by us as we live with it, but this concealed asset works its wonders just the same.

This is the proviso that all powers not specifically granted the Government belong to the people. That was a novelty, when conceived, and it remains a novelty today.

It is the true sign that ours is a people's Government in its fundamental nature and that no matter how much any one class may try to run away with power they can always be overtaken in a lawful way.

The people of Russia, however, have no such inherent constitutional power in their own hands.

Power is all on the side of the government, and the government itself is ruled by one single exclusive class.

The true keys are held by the Communists, an aristocracy of the few who hold a monopoly of power over the many.

You cannot become a Communist in Russia or anywhere else by going down to the office when the books are open and registering.

Communism, as I have said here before, is a closed corporation, an exclusive club, a body of aristocrats.

You may apply for membership, but they don't have to take you and indeed they won't, until you qualify in such ways as they set up from the inside.

Nothing in communism can possibly be called a people's movement, or what we are talking about when we use the word "democracy."

Thus, when certain members even of the Communist organization itself differed with Stalin just as he was handing down that so-called constitution in 1936, they were risking their lives.

They lost their lives, too. And over here in Washington our President and other responsible men in office saw the workings of despotism in Moscow just as plainly and clearly as it is possible for human minds to know anything.

Yet did Mr. Roosevelt, as the Moscow purge trials of 1937–38 carried on, offer any sign of understanding? The clearest possible sign would have been to delouse Washington of its Communists in office.

Instead of doing that he let them visit in the White House.

No wonder Stalin has been so sure of himself in his dealings with the U. S. A.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of Frank C. Waldrop's articles on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Now we pass over the already well-told tales of Communist performance in the years just leading up to World War II to get at a development not so well known, that we will see renewed, soon, in one form or another.

Many an American now looking to Korea and wondering when he will get that notice from Washington, has heard little about some of the most significant portents of the years 1942–45.

Yalta, Potsdam, and their sequels, yes. But did you ever hear about the Free Germany Committee? Many a citizen answers that by saying, "I was too busy trying to bust Germany to know about it."

Thus, here the story of the Free Germany Committee, all from the public record, at least in the sense that men in high Washington office had it available to them.

As early as October 1941 there was held in Moscow a conference between certain German prisoners of war and the Russians, on prospects of a free Germany, Soviet style.

This was at a moment when Hitler's armies had already come so close that a scouting party had actually taken long-range photos of the city.

But Hitler let his celebrated intuition get the better of his generals' military judgment. Not only did he alienate the wobbling Russian people by the most ghastly and brutal slaughtering of civilians behind his own lines but he also imposed his own ideas of field operations at war.

He staked everything on the conquest of Stalingrad on the Volga and failed. The collapse of the German armies at Stalingrad put into Russian hands the weapon for which they had been waiting.

One of the Soviet captives was Count Heinrich von Einsiedel, a famous flyer and great-grandson of the Prime Minister, Otto von Bismarck, last man of modern times to make war a profitable business for his country.

Others included Field Marshal Friedrich von Paulus, commander of the Stalingrad operation, and 16 of his generals.

Then, on July 12, 1943, there flashed from Moscow a pronouncement every bit as significant as the crossing of the thirty-eighth parallel by the Soviet extension army of Koreans.

This Moscow announcement was that a Free Germany Committee had been formed there of officers and soldiers captured at Stalingrad, and of anti-Fascist Germans including five former members of parliament, who had taken refuge in Russia.

Several of the general were among the captives claimed to be supporting the Free Germany movement, and Bismarck's great-grandson was actually heard—or someone saying he was the great grandson—broadcasting to Germany.

Wilhelm Pieck, the present head of the Communist operations in Germany, was chief cook and bottle washer.

And what was their line?

Not that Germany must surrender unconditionally and take the worst. Oh, no. Germany was to be a free, democratic nation, self-governing with its own army and master of its own household. All it had to do was revolt against Hitler.

Soon after they set up shop, the official Moscow paper Pravda said they had the support of all world Communists.

I well remember the day that pronunciamento was published in the Communist press of the world, including the New York Daily Worker.

An eminent American diplomat held the Worker in his hand as he said:

"This is the gravest development since Hitler invaded the Rhineland."

It was plain in Washington what had happened. And it was plainer, as Free Germany societies sprang up all through the world.

But yet, Mr. Roosevelt stubbornly insisted he knew how to handle the situation. As it turned out, he didn't.

And now as we are rushing to put out the fire in Korea, watch Germany.

In a matter of weeks, perhaps of days, you will see an outbreak there of demands for Free Germany, Stalin prides himself on following through on those things.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles by Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Those pictures now beginning to come in of Americans shot in Korea with their hands tied behind their backs ring a bell of memory. Have you ever heard of the Katyn Forest massacres?

Germany attacked Poland in the first 2 days of September 1939. On September 18, 1939, the Russians invaded from the east as Hitler's iron divisions crushed Poland from the west.

Between them, the blood-spattered Nazis and Communists soon ground Poland to pieces and set to work systematically to make sure it would never come to life again.

For their own part, the Nazis drafted Poles into the German slave-labor camps.

The Russians, in one of the earliest of their sideline double-crosses on Hitler, who was busy also double-crossing them, opened a gap in their own border and invited Poles to escape through it.

Thousands upon thousands of men, women, and children fell for the bait and have never been heard from since.

One of the great mysteries of the time had to do with the large number of Polish officers and men who had barely been mobilized into active service before their government was destroyed and they were left to run for their lives as best they might.

Early in 1940 the Russians interned some 10,000 to 18,000 Polish officers behind barbed wire in the Katyn Forest near Smolensk.

They were still there when Hitler attacked Russia in June 1941, then suddenly no more was heard of them. Stanislaus Mikolajczyk, ex-Prime Minister of Poland, and Jan Ciechanowski, ex-Ambassador of Poland to the United States of America, have since told how they asked Stalin for information on the men in a visit to Moscow after 1941.

Mikolajczyk said that when he mentioned the matter, Stalin touched a button and sent a flunky for the facts.

The flunky came back, Stalin looked embarrassed at the information he had been handed, and murmured there had been a mistake.

Just what the mistake was, it remained for the Germans to disclose in April of 1943.

They were still at that time holding the Smolensk regions.

Suddenly the Berlin radio began to screech of "mass graves" uncovered in the Katyn Forest, in which "thousands" of Polish corpses were piled.

At German invitation, a number of Swiss and other as nearly respectable a posse of investigators as could be raked up in Europe at the time went in to investigate.

Indisputable evidence disclosed that in these mass graves were the missing Polish officers.

Letters from relatives abroad were found and diaries that ended in the middle of a sentence as the executioners arrived. Also, army identification papers, uniforms—all manner of indisputable proof of identity.

Even in the midst of war the proofs flowing out of German hands were sufficient that Stalin did not long deny the identities of the victims.

The next tactic was to deny that the Russians had done the dirty work.

When the Russians tried later to demonstrate their innocence to a body of correspondents, including the daughter of the then United States Ambassador to Russia, Averell Harriman, embarrassment developed.

One of the things they couldn't explain was the fact that the Poles had their hands tied behind their backs with grass rope of a kind coming from Russia.

The typical Russian execution method of a bullet through the back of the skull, the make of ammunition, the fact that trees growing on the graves all showed growth rings checking back to Russian time of control over the Katyn region, and a lot more such circumstances of fact had to be ducked.

Nobody could quite bring the thing off, and so the Russians finally just shut up and refused to discuss the matter any further.

The significant thing is that here in Washington Mr. Roosevelt was put on notice by such evidence that Stalin had postwar plans for Poland that did not include the opinions of the Poles.

He was wiping out, as early as possible, everybody who might give him trouble when he would be ready to take over.

Mr. Roosevelt was warned not only by the Katyn Forest episode but by a dozen other clear evidences. I will describe another tomorrow.

Stockholm Peace Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to continue to report to my colleagues on the excellent service over the radio and through our press in informing the American public of the origin, sponsorship, and falseness of the so-called Stockholm peace petition.

I quote from a broadcast by Albert L. Warner, the widely known and able

commentator on Station WMAL, on his July 21 news program, Congress Today:

Peace petition: Representative JOHN W. HESELTON, Republican, of Massachusetts, proposes a congressional resolution to expose the Communist peace manifesto now being circulated in this country and around the world, and to warn off possible American signers. The resolution points out that the manifesto is definite Communist propaganda from Moscow, aimed narrowly at the atomic bomb. To sign the petition would give aid and comfort to countries which have hampered the United Nations.

Affirmatively, Mr. HESELTON's resolution calls on American citizens to support actively the program of our Government, through the United Nations, to prohibit aggression and outlaw war, to establish the machinery for an effective international control of atomic weapons through international inspection and to maintain peace in fact rather than in deceitful propaganda.

Here is opportunity not only to nail a Communist trick but to advertise our affirmative peace program for the free world.

I now quote from excellent editorials in the American press:

[From the Berkshire Courier, Great Barrington, Mass., of Thursday, July 27, 1950]

PHONY PEACE PETITION

Our own Representative in Congress, the Honorable JOHN W. HESELTON, of Deerfield, has publicly exposed the Communist influence behind a so-called "peace" petition which is being circulated in Washington and undoubtedly in other cities throughout the country. While it does not seem likely that the Communist fifth column will bother circulating the petition in such small communities as we have in the Southern Berkshires, it is just as well for all of us to be familiar with it and its origin.

On its surface it looks innocent enough. The petition reads:

"We demand the absolute banning of the atom weapon, arm of terror and mass exterminator of populations.

"We demand the establishment of strict international control to insure the implementation of this banning measure.

"We consider that any government which would be first to use the atom weapon against any country whatsoever would be committing a crime against humanity and should be dealt with as a war criminal.

"We call on all men of good will throughout the world to sign this appeal."

But read the appeal again, and you will see that while it is supposed to be a "peace" petition, the word "peace" is not used in the appeal a single time. Neither does the appeal say anything about outlawing war. It mentions only outlawing the atomic bomb. And that is significant.

First: let's look into the history of this petition, as outlined by Congressman HESELTON in a concurrent resolution which he introduced in the House of Representatives last Thursday. The petition was prepared by the Cominform, the Communist foreign-propaganda organization, and was publicly initiated on March 13, 1950, by the Communist-controlled World Congress of Partisans for Peace. Eleven days later, on March 24, the official paper of the Cominform launched a "signatures for peace" campaign to get common people throughout the world to sign this petition. On June 8, 1950, the Daily Worker, official Communist Party newspaper in the United States, announced a campaign to obtain signatures in our country, and on June 20 the campaign for signatures received the official blessing of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (U. S. S. R.).

These petitions, according to Marquis Childs in one of his recent columns, are patterned after those being circulated in both zones of Germany. They are almost identical with petitions signed by several million north Koreans beginning in 1947, when they were first introduced on orders of Moscow.

If the Communists wanted the atom bomb outlawed, why didn't they support the efforts of the United States to have such weapons banned through the United Nations? Why didn't they support our plan to have all atomic weapon plants, those in Russia as well as those in other countries, inspected by delegates of the United Nations? Finally, why doesn't the petition mention something about outlawing war?

There are several possible answers to the last question. One is that Russia is too involved in the Korean war through Communist-controlled northern Korea and Communist-dominated China. Also, could Russia be playing for time, by gaining delay in the use of the atomic bomb, until she builds up her own stockpile of the same weapons?

The world has been taken in before by those who talk peace while they prepare for or actually launch wars. Americans who read the newspapers will recall the Japanese Ambassadors who came to Washington the day before Pearl Harbor. If anyone is honestly for peace, he will be opposed to war, not the atom bomb alone. And if anyone is honestly for peace, he will favor United Nations action against any aggressor country. If he is against such action, then he's a hypocrite.

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune of July 14, 1950]

COMMUNIST "PEACE" PETITION SIGNED BY AMERICANS IS SOVIET-SPONSORED FRAUD

A million "Americans" have signed the current "peace" petition circulated by the Communists, according to an estimate of the House Un-American Activities Committee. At a time when Americans are being killed and wounded in Korea because of an unprovoked and brutal act of Communist aggression, this is a shocking statement. At a time when most of us are reading news from the Far East with deep concern and anxiety, it is incredible that there should be so many gullible or disloyal individuals in this country.

This petition is pure fraud. In schools, meetings, street corners, homes, shops, and churches throughout the world, the Communists are offering this petition for signatures. It is part of Stalin's fake peace propaganda, designed to cover up the Soviet Union's war moves and real intentions.

Such chicanery should be exposed. The Communists know, of course, that there are millions of Americans who genuinely love peace, but the signing of such a petition has about as much relation to peace as black to white. It is another step in world-wide Red imperialism, and those who have put their names on the petition have the duty of informing themselves of its real meaning. A writer to the Forum column of this newspaper the other day stated that he would put his name on any piece of paper that meant peace. No doubt many feel that way, but the point here is that this petition does not mean peace. It means a furtherance of tyranny, aggression, totalitarianism, and the most brutal slavery that our world has seen. If there are any doubters outside of the Communist Party, let them read the record.

President Truman has just asked Congress for $89,000,000 to step up our information program and launch a "campaign of truth" throughout the world. An effective and factual presentation of the record is in order. The peoples of the world have a right to know the truth, but, in the meantime, at home we ought to see that a false sham like the Communist "peace" petition is thoroughly discredited and disavowed.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Saturday, July 15, 1950]

ANOTHER "STOCKHOLM APPEAL"

In the very city where the Soviet launched its fake peace petition an effective answer has just been made. Elinar Gerhardsen, Prime Minister of Norway, called for another appeal for peace—to be sent first of all to Russia.

He would ask the Soviet to really do something for peace—by calling off its stooges in North Korea, by cooperating in the United Nations, by agreeing to effective atomic controls, and by joining in genuine peace treaties for Austria and Germany.

The list could be greatly expanded, of course. Stop its campaign of hate and lies, reduce the Red Army by a few million men, disband its fifth column in free countries—all these might well be asked of Moscow. Those who were duped into signing the Stockholm petition's deceptive call for outlawing the atomic bomb should at least have insisted that the appeal include free and effective international inspection to enforce the outlawing.

Korea is really the clearest answer to Communist peace appeals. As Mr. Gerhardsen points out, the pretense that South Korea was the aggressor reminds us that Mussolini wanted us to believe that Eithiopia threatened Italy and Hitler tried to make us believe that Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland were bullying Germany.

Low, the famous British cartoonist, has put it more humorously in a sign carried by a Soviet propagandist: "South Korea kicked North Korea in the boot with the seat of its pants." The Stockholm petition hoodwinked a multitude; Korea should have awakened an even larger host.

[From the Brooklyn Eagle of July 25, 1950]

DISTRIBUTION OF RED PEACE PETITIONS MAY FACE HALT AS SAFETY MEASURE

If the Korean situation continues very long it might be advisable to put a stop to the distribution of Communist peace petitions by the enactment of local or State ordinances. Even in time of war or possible war we must preserve our primary freedoms for the individual citizen as far as possible. But if the Commies insist on waving red flags in the faces of their fellow American workers someone is going to get hurt. It would be better to anticipate the difficulty and forestall rough treatment by outlawing the Communist technique.

A week or so ago a United States conciliator who is in constant touch with conditions in the plants around the country remarked to us that the boys in the shops would take care of a good deal of any potential sabotage that might be attempted. A report from Detroit this week confirms the opinion.

In the Kaiser-Frazer Willow Run plant twice within 5 days Communist sympathizers have been threatened by angry workers. The taunters persisted in handing out Communist peace leaflets to the chagrin of all around them. On one occasion the offender was lifted bodily out of the shop and on the second occasion the workers requested plant protection agents to "get them out of here" before something happened to them.

The ordinary American worker is a pretty tolerant guy. He will put up with a good deal of guff from a lot of sources before he finally lowers the boom. When he does, watch out.

In ordinary times he is pretty apathetic to the screwballs and crackpots who peddle Joe Stalin's phony merchandise. That is one of the reasons why the Commies can line up so many dupes among the unsuspecting public. But now there is a shooting war, limited but real, going on. Large majorities of the men in the plants are ex-GI's. They know what it means to be under shell fire. They know

all about fox holes and battle fatigue. They know that their own kind of guys are over there going all through the same thing again and that they may be called up soon themselves.

It should not be surprising and it is certainly understandable if they blow their tops when some slimy stooge comes around sticking red flypaper under their nose. The chances are someone is going to get hurt if this practice is allowed to go on. Congress may not as yet have got around to passing the Mundt bill, but GI Joe still has red blood running through his veins.

The city of Detroit has banned the sale of the Daily Worker and the Michigan Commie smear sheet from the newsstands. We think the legislators, city and State, might do well to stand by and ready a law to label this peace literature of the Commies treasonable and forbid its distribution. Our liberal friends may look at the suggestion in horror, but better to scandalize a few wobbly intellectuals than to make street fights the order of the day.

The danger at present is not clear, but the air is charged with emotional electricity. A continued series of bad reports from the Korean front could strike the spark that could cause a conflagration of local disorders. This is a phase of the present crisis which should not be overlooked.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of June 25, 1950]

DON'T BE A SUCKER FOR STALIN

There may soon be a visitor at your front door asking that you sign a petition. Or a stranger may confront you with the petition as you shop, or walk in the park, or enjoy your beer in a tavern.

The petition, you will be told, is for peace, against war and against the use of the atom bomb.

Now you are for peace and against war and the use of the atom bomb. Aren't we all? So your inclination may be to say: "Sure, I'll sign, gotta pencil?"

But this time, fellow American citizen, resist that first impulse. Take a look at the petition. And if it is called a world peace pledge, turn it away. If it starts out like this: "We demand the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon as an instrument of aggression and mass extermination * * *" just say, "No, thanks."

Why? Because, fellow citizen, it is a trick of Joe Stalin. It is a part of the clever campaign of propaganda to convince the people of the world that Soviet Russia stands for peace and that its opponents stand for war. It is one of the tactics of confusion in which the Communists excel. It is an attempt to halt the progress of this country and its allies in building up the strength of the free world against Communist subversion and its companion Russian aggression.

The Soviet wolf is shouting "Peace! Peace!" in hope of lulling the free peoples into thinking that the wolf is a lamb. If he shouts it often enough, and loudly enough, and can get the gullible among the free to shout it with him, he may be able to make the world forget these truths:

That there would be peace in the world today if it were not for the attitudes and acts of Soviet Russia.

That Russia maintains the largest armed force in the world.

That Russia has refused to cooperate with the other allies in settling the problems left by World War II.

That Russia has used the veto to destroy the effectiveness of the United Nations.

That Russia has walked out of session after session of the UN and its auxiliary commissions.

That Russia has refused to reach agreement on prohibition of the use of the atom bomb and on establishment of a meaningful control over atomic-energy development.

The petition that you may soon be handed is known as the Stockholm petition. It came out of a Communist-led affair, known as the World Peace Partisans congress, held in Sweden in March. The Communists have been making a great show of getting it signed in Russia and other satellite nations. Now the American Communists and their stooges have swung into action.

A unite-for-peace rally, held June 8 in New York, got it under way. All the familiar red and pink faces (except those in jail for contempt of Congress or courts) were around. The Communist Daily Worker worked itself into hysteria over the affair, devoting its front page to gigantic headlines.

Here in Wisconsin, the Communist Party is in such a bad way as to be practically useless in the game. So the People's Progressive Party is going to carry the ball. This is the Henry Wallace outfit, sired, nurtured, and controlled by the Communists in 1948. It was announced at the Milwaukee convention last week end that the drive for signatures would be hooked up with the party's 1950 political campaign in the State. If the People's Progressive Party gets as few petition signers as it gets votes in November, all will be well, indeed.

So before you sign any petition in the next few months, look before you sign. Don't do a job for Joseph Stalin.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 12, 1950]

GOOD ADVICE ON FAKE PEACE PETITIONS: DON'T SIGN

If any further evidence were needed to bolster the conviction that the phony peace petitions being circulated in this city and elsewhere have their origin in the Communist Party, the set of instructions handed to the circulators ought to provide it.

First, it's part of the Communist tactics to invite martyrdom—for the lower level of saps who embrace Communist causes, anyway. So, the peace petition brigade has been furnished with a complete set of instructions on what to do if they're arrested—and the Commie high command hopes lots of them will be arrested.

Second, the Commies make a practice of askings others to do things they won't do themselves. They scream for civil rights, but deny them to whole populations. In their campaign to build up a false picture that thousands of people are against the United Nations effort to thwart Red aggression in Korea, they ask gullible people to sign petitions, but warn their loyal workers to beware of signing anything.

The marching orders handed the misguided—or worse—petition circulators were complete and detailed instructions for dealing with the enemy. The enemy in this case is the police, guardians of law and order. And the key instruction to these Communist line pluggers is "don't sign anything."

We can leave to the police the problem of handling law violations by these local purveyors of Moscow propaganda. If there should be misinformation in the instructions on the rights and obligations of citizens dealing with the police—and there is—we can depend on the police and the courts to set the would-be martyrs straight.

But the petition carriers have received advice which ought to be followed by citizens who are asked to add their names to the list of those who can't tell Communist propaganda when they see it. The peace petitions are Soviet-inspired efforts to twist the plain fact that the bulk of the civilized world is opposed to Red aggression. Philadelphians and Americans everywhere should break up this effort by embracing the Commies' own slogan: "Don't sign anything."

[From the Detroit Free Press of Friday, July 14, 1950]

A LIVING LIE IS NAILED—ACHESON'S STAND

Repeatedly we have reiterated our belief that the United States should not pass up even the faintest prospect of bringing this Nation and Russia together to work for an agreement fostering world peace.

More than once we have criticized Secretary of State Dean Acheson and the administration for giving the cold shoulder to openings presenting at least a vestigial hope that the two great powers might eventually meet together in productive council.

But a distinction must be made. Going more than half way to meet an honest offer is one thing. Being duped by Moscow's cynical propaganda is something else again.

Secretary Acheson was wholly right and his action praiseworthy when he issued a formal statement declaring to the world that the United States will not be fooled by the world-peace appeal of the so-called Stockholm resolution.

That device of the Kremlin propagandists was foisted on the gullible by a Commie international organization calling itself Partisans of Peace. It is a major item in the Red effort to delude the world into accepting Russia as the international peace party and to jockey the United States into the role of warmongering imperialist.

With the Commie faith in the propaganda lie's ability to blind all men to facts, the Partisans of Peace is pushing its spurious peace drive at the very moment the Kremlin is embarking upon a war of aggression while the United States, almost single-handed, is trying to defend a small nation whose existence Soviet imperialism seeks to wipe out with war.

Partisans of Peace petitions are being circulated, not only abroad but in this country. Doubtless some signers will be found here, and not necessarily party members. We have our quota of citizens who dwell in the world of unreality and stand ready to fall for any hoax so long as it has an appealing label. Actuality, to such people, has no weight.

Strongly stressed in the Red propaganda line, not alone by the Partisans of Peace, is cultivation of the idea that America means to wipe out civilization with the atomic bomb. Russia, the country which blocked its effective control, poses in this Commie propaganda as a shield between mankind and that fate.

Happily, these fantastic distortions are making scant progress. From Lake Success comes word that Herbert Hoover's proposal to oust the Communists from the United Nations was much more cordially received when he renewed it last Tuesday than when it was first voiced in April.

There is not, it is believed, any prospect that this will occur at once, but the trend of sentiment has begun to set in that direction.

The United Nations is dedicated to the preservation of world peace. Russia has demonstrated itself to be an incorrigible warmonger and the saboteur of every effort made to further the cause of peace.

Acheson nailed the living lie which Russian peace propaganda presents to the world when he issued his statement. Hoover recognized the realities of the world's effort to attain peace when he spoke for closing the UN to Russia and its satellites.

Letting Communists participate in the UN's work is exactly like drawing legislative representatives from murderers' row in the State prison or giving burglars executive positions in a police department.

[From the Rochester Times-Union of Tuesday, July 18, 1950]

SWEDEN PROTESTS

Sweden wants no part of the World Peace Appeal, a new Communist front which claims

to have obtained the signatures of a million Americans to a "peace petition."

The petition has been propagandized as the Stockholm declaration because it was formulated at Stockholm in one of a series of Communist "peace rallies" in that capital. Others were held at Madison Square Garden and at Paris, but the Stockholm resolution is the one chosen by the Kremlin to use in world propaganda.

Swedish Prime Minister Erlander has expressed public disgust that the name of the Swedish capital is being linked to international Communist propaganda.

This petition purports to advance the cause of peace. It upholds the Soviet line on control of the atomic bomb and brands as war criminals the nation that first uses it. It says nothing about armed invasions such as broke the peace 3 weeks ago in Korea.

Something To Be Thankful For

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. WALSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following clear-cut statement on world conditions:

[From the New York Times of July 28, 1950]

IN THE NATION—A FEW THINGS TO BE CHEERFUL ABOUT

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, July 27.—There are many differences between this period and that of 1940–41, but since an expanded program for national security is common to both certain comparisons are in order. Viewed from the administrative and substantive standpoints, the present activity is being better managed.

United States soldiers and sailors were not fighting and dying in 1940–41 (before December 7) and the Nation was not as now, darkened by the depressing cloud of retreat, in battle. Also, the voice of authority was saying to the public that no very great sacrifices of France, President Roosevelt, discussing preparedness measures, said that American people need not be "discombobolated"—interrupted in their usual routine of life—by any of these plans.

But, then as now, the existence of the American system was gravely threatened from abroad—by Nazi Germany, which had signed a pact with Soviet Russia, and by Fascist Japan. This called for military and industrial mobilization for security, establishing a resemblance to the present time.

The invasion of South Korea in June 1950, may in one way be compared with the fall of France in June 1940, in that it shocked the American Government and people into realizing that the United States could be in danger. But throughout the Presidential election year of 1940, and until President Roosevelt submitted the lend-lease bill to Congress early in 1941, the Government met the danger largely by what Bernard M. Baruch was later to describe as faltering steps forward. An exception was our trade with Great Britain of 50 aged destroyers for certain island bases in the Western Hemisphere after long hesitation.

A COMPARATIVE RECORD

The record in that period offers the principal contrast with the present. Mr. Truman, once the nature of the aggression in Korea was certified in the resolutions of the United Nations, moved promptly and firmly on the military front. When it developed, as it did almost at once, that United States air and naval forces could not check the advance of the North Koreans, the President as promptly and firmly ordered infantry to the peninsula. When the fighting disclosed the immediate and prospective perils of the Korean war, he called for the partial preparedness program which has now been submitted to Congress and accepted the appropriation figure of $10,000,000,000 which Secretary of Defense Johnson submitted.

In addition, he at once exercised some of the war controls over finance and industrial production that remained in the Presidential powers; asked Congress to give him several more, and repeatedly stated that, if he did not find these sufficient, he would request a number of others.

This record, if it is reasonable to compare the present crisis with that of 1940–41, is much firmer and more positive than the one in which a light form of industrial mobilization was first attempted under two cochairmen (W. S. Knudsen and Sidney Hillman), and the Stettinius security program for comprehensive preparation was suppressed. It is more vigorous also than the piecemeal approach to industrial and economic controls in the prior period of crisis.

Another difference of great importance is that President Truman, in the opinion of men who worked closely with his predecessor, is a much better administrator and comes promptly to the momentous decisions which times of national peril require of a President.

THE SOFT SPOTS

However, Mr. Truman also has begun to grapple piecemeal with the preparedness program. He did not ask Congress for the stand-by powers which may, and probably will, soon be required to put the partial war footing on a sound foundation—controls of profiteering, of all imports and exports, and so forth. These are the powers which Mr. Baruch told the Senate Committee yesterday should not be stand-bys at all, but should be exercised at once if inflation is not to get an unshakable foothold and the preparedness program is to be carried out fairly and efficiently. And when the President spoke of powers he "would not hesitate" to seek and use, if and when he deemed them necessary. He mentioned price control without including that control of wages without which price control won't work, as the country painfully discovered almost a decade ago.

These are the weak points in the record. And they are inconsistent with the military moves and with the President's prior statement that the Government should be in the position of a fire department, "ready to go into action the moment the alarm is sounded." The fact that many in Congress, including several Republican leaders who oppose granting Mr. Truman some of the powers he seeks, would make a last-ditch fight against the stand-by's is not a sufficient reason for failure to ask for a fire department, adequately equipped.

But, going back to the credit side of the ledger, another factor of superiority exists with respect to 1940-41. This is the high degree of unification of the Armed Forces attained under Secretary Johnson, together with the progressive elimination of military waste and duplication that were chief concerns of the Hoover Commission and of its task force under Ferdinand Eberstadt. In its July bulletin the Hoover Citizen's Committee said: "In some quarters it has been implied that economies resulting from unification have crippled our troops in Korea. Nothing could be further from the truth."

Severe Economies and Heavier Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

MEANWHILE, IN KOREA

Even if the Korean crisis grows no more acute and is not followed by other crises the civilian population of the United States is in for some severe economies. To begin with, we will have to pay heavier taxes, both direct and indirect. The money we individually planned to spend on various luxuries and conveniences won't all be ours to spend. To put the fact in another way, we will have to spend more of our working day working for the Federal Government and less of it working for ourselves.

(Meanwhile, young men with such names as Calahan, Frazier, Gerhart, Sansky, Stahl, Taber, and Waits will be wounded in Korea. Some of them will recover their former health and strength. Others will never again be sound and whole.)

Taxes are only part of the picture. Certain strategic materials will have to be diverted from peaceable to warlike uses, as will labor and machines. There will be no shortage of food but there may be shortages of many things many of us would like to buy. New houses, for example.

(Meanwhile, young men with such names as Barrick, Brockman, Cole, Cosnahan, Dupuis, Eltzroth, Felhoelter, Kelly, Koskinas, Skaalerud, Smith, Turczyn, and Wilson will be reported missing in Korea. Some of them may return. Some may be prisoners in enemy hands. Some will never be back and their burial places will never be known.)

It is true that the necessary emergency measures for conducting a police action in the Far East and for putting ourselves and our friends in a position of defense may not require more than one-eighth of our total national income. In money terms, with no allowance for inflation, our collective income is three or four times what it was during the bad years of the depression. Nonetheless, we cannot take out one-eighth without altering our lives somewhat, changing some bright plans, giving up some cherished hopes. What goes into war cannot go into improving the condition of mankind. Liberty and security are expensive investments.

(Meanwhile, in Korea, young men with such names as Argenziano, Klein, Kriwchuk, Lopuhovsky, Reed, Saunders, and Yanez will be reported dead.)

The news from the fighting zones will be good or bad, according to the support we can give to such young men as Calahan, Barrick, and Argenziano and the others before they are missing in action, or wounded, or killed. The support we have to give, to stop a war in Korea, to prevent wars elsewhere, will make like in this country a little duller for most of us for some time to come.

In Korea, meanwhile, young men who would gladly endure a bit of dullness at home will be taking tanks into action, holding gun positions for us, standing enemy fire, suffering thirst, hunger, and exhaustion, being wounded, lost, and slaughtered. Perhaps if they can face what is happening to them we can face what will happen to us.

The Blood-Stained Gavel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the United States News and World Report of August 4, 1950:

THE BLOOD-STAINED GAVEL
(By David Lawrence)

By established procedure, a different member country in the Security Council of the United Nations is entitled every 6 months to designate its ambassador as the presiding officer of the Council.

It is Russia's turn now, and the chief Soviet delegate, Jacob Malik, announced last week that he would wield the gavel.

The hands of the Russian envoy, however, are covered with the blood of American boys and the boys of other countries who have been killed or wounded as a direct result of the aggression motivated by the Soviet Union in North Korea.

Everybody knows this to be a fact. But with that convenient blindness which diplomacy sometimes affects, the UN chooses apparently not to take notice of the Russian aggression. Will the UN let a nation which has brought death to the troops of its own side go scot free?

Why is the Russian envoy permitted to preside over any council or committee of the UN? The Soviet Government, in fact, forfeited its membership by withdrawing from all UN meetings during the last 6 months. Is the UN to be trifled with as members whimsically abandon or resume their membership activity at will?

Has the Moscow government sent its envoy back now only to make a mockery of the UN—to conduct a propaganda of harassment and obstruction? Even if the Soviet Union makes a mock offer of peace negotiations, does this mean that an aggressor state is not to be punished for its own wrongdoing and is to be accepted again as if nothing had happened?

Article 6 of the Charter says: "A member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the Organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

What is the value of that article if it is not to be enforced?

It is, therefore, incumbent upon the United States to point out now that Russia has violated the resolution of June 25 which demanded that all nations which did not help the UN forces should at least refrain from helping the aggressor forces in Korea.

The test of the UN as an organization that can maintain world peace is at hand. If it is only a debating society or a convenient meeting place for propagandists and counter-propagandists, the sooner the world recognizes that self-imposed limitation, the sooner the free governments which have the real responsibility of maintaining peace by their own forces must get together for collective action unimpeded by Russian tactics of harassment.

If, however, the UN is the strong world organization which the peoples of the democracies earnestly want it to be, then the UN will expel or suspend the Communist representative until the whole aggression in Korea is thoroughly investigated and penalties are imposed for the aggression which the Soviet instigated.

This is a time for the exercise of moral force, the faith that is based on conviction, the faith that is unafraid. Too much lately has been said in official circles about the possibility of "offending" Russia. The Soviets do not hesitate in their propaganda every day to offend and insult the free governments and peoples of the world. Strong language is perhaps something they fully understand.

The Kremlin will not long endure as a government if the Russian people learn the true story of what their own government has been doing behind the scenes to destroy the chances of orderly settlement of disputes and world peace. That story can and must be told, and the UN should take the first step in telling it.

The UN should not permit in its councils any government whose hands are stained with blood. The Communist regime in China has had a vital part in aiding North Korea. It has been sending reinforcements there. It is in league with Russia in these acts of aggression. The Communists should not be recognized nor any other government representing China be given a seat in the UN until it can demonstrate that it is discharging international obligations faithfully and that it holds power through the will of the people. Plainly the application of Communist China for membership should be tabled for consideration only when these conditions have been met.

The UN, when created in 1945, raised high hopes throughout the world. It can fulfill the expectations of the free peoples who set it up by acting resolutely and boldly in the present crisis. It must not be timid. It must not pussyfoot.

The world expects the UN to function as a group of brave nations wants it to function, with the moral strength of conviction and the firmness that comes out of a righteous purpose.

Joint Statement on the Current Situation by 15 Members of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Korea has exposed the fact that a tragic diplomatic and military inadequacy exists. It has crystallized the serious nature of our present position. Americans are quite rightfully looking to Washington for guidance and leadership. Lack of leadership at this time will breed either hysteria or complacency. Both can be avoided by a vigorous program of positive action of which the American public is made aware.

We consider that the present military action in Korea cannot be deemed an isolated event. It is a manifestation of the Communist intent to achieve world domination. The free nations of the world, therefore, can expect a series of such outbreaks at the several points of friction at which the free and Soviet worlds come into physical contact. This conflict will not be resolved either quickly or easily, and will require a large measure of sacrifice by all freedom-loving peoples. Given adequate and trustworthy leadership, they will meet this challenge.

The responsibility is not alone the burden of the United States. Circumstances have necessitated immediate action by this country. Leadership is in our hands at this time. But, all free nations must be prepared to implement further the decisions of the United Nations. Each must, with vigor and determination, contribute men and resources according to its ability.

The problem is twofold. The immediate objective is the successful repulse of the Communist aggression in Korea. The ultimate objective must be peace in a free world. This goal can only be achieved by military strength and a firm and consistent policy both foreign and domestic. Evident Communist aims for world domination make this fact inescapable.

America's responsibility requires foresight and continuity of effort. Military, industrial, and civilian components must be integrated.

NECESSITY FOR SHARING THE BURDEN

Modern warfare requires the equal sharing of the burden of war by all citizens. The possibility of total war requires that plans be drawn now for the utilization of all of the resources of the Nation. It is essential that legislation be enacted for an immediate and continuing inventory of these human and physical resources.

The Congress should immediately draft and enact stand-by legislation providing in detail for the total mobilization of American manpower, industry and resources for the civilian and military defense of the Nation. Immediate legislation should provide a military training program for all male citizens of military age. (Mr. DAVIS, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. LOVRE expressed reservations concerning this recommendation. With this single exception, the full statement is unanimous.) Provision should be made for the full utilization of the services of those not qualified for military service.

LEGISLATION IMPERATIVE

Total mobilization requires an orderly and fair distribution of the necessities of life, and an assured and steady flow of military equipment and supplies.

Congress should immediately draft and enact stand-by legislation to establish a system of price, wage, profit and rent controls, rationing of essential commodities in short supply, allocations of critical raw materials and other essential necessities. Legislation in each case should be so drafted as to permit frequent legislative review by the Congress and should contain termination dates in each delegation of authority. The legislation should not become effective until passage of a resolution by the Congress. The Congress should retain the right to "pull the trigger" or unload the gun.

SPENDING

To the extent possible, the cost of our security program must be met currently and not deferred to future years. This action is dictated by our responsibility to future generations and by the need to combat the forces of inflation.

Recognizing that taxes today are at an abnormally high rate, first emphasis must be placed upon a diversion of present nondefense spending to meet defense needs. Spending for activities of government that in ordinary times may be desirable must give way to the greater and immediate needs of the national security. This requires the elimination of all spending not essential to the basic civilian and defense requirements of the Nation. New legislative proposals

both foreign and domestic which do not bear directly upon the defense effort should not be instituted during the period of the present emergency.

To avoid current deficits, taxes on income and profits must be immediately increased.

Preparation for total mobilization requires that Congress immediately draft and enact tax legislation to provide against excessive profits and excessive income.

MILITARY

Manpower and equipment mobilization programs for all branches of the armed services must be vigorously pursued.

We deem it necessary to remind defense officials that the Marine Corps always has been and now is America's most effective expeditionary police force. Its maximum effective readiness must be immediately established and its integrity and instant readiness maintained.

The importance of the Reserve and National Guard components and individuals have been largely neglected in recent years. In light of the historical fact that our arms have depended for success upon the civilian in our fighting forces, immediate emphasis must be placed upon the expansion, training, and equipping of such units. Efforts should be made to establish Reserve Officer Training Corps programs at all colleges and universities where not now existent.

An adequate number of American ships and shipyards should be kept available to meet transportation requirements on short notice.

Immediate mobilization needs should not obscure or displace research and armament readiness programs.

Censorship should be immediately imposed on all troop and naval distributions and movements.

SURPLUS COMMODITIES

The Federal Government holds great quantities of foodstuffs and other agricultural products acquired through purchase under commodity price-support programs. Whenever prices are rising because of scarcity of such commodities, the stocks of the Government should be made available for stabilizing purposes through normal distribution channels when and where needed.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE

The cities, towns, and villages of America today stand almost defenseless in the face of the threat of atomic bombing. Civilian defense has been sorely neglected. The matter of legislation to accomplish the orderly and rapid organization of the civilian defense system is of the most urgent necessity. Immediate steps should be taken by the Congress to encourage and assist vulnerable and strategic areas of the Nation, to organize and place in a constant state of readiness such civilian defense components as are considered essential to the safety and security of life and property.

COMMUNISM

Communists should be required to register at once, and the Government authorized to place restrictions upon their movements. Increased penalties for sabotage and espionage should be immediately enacted into law. It is folly of the highest order to draft Americans for combat against communism abroad and at the same time to permit Communists unlimited freedom of action at home.

Legislation should be enacted immediately by Congress which will insure adequate public knowledge of Communists and their activities.

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

In order to carry out the recommendations contained herein the Congress should remain in session during this critical period. Legislation to meet possible future requirements should be prepared so as to be immediately available. Congress must be kept constantly and fully informed on the progress of our defense effort. Constant surveillance should be maintained by the Congress over authorizations and appropriations to insure that the legislative intent is not disregarded nor defense funds again arbitrarily impounded.

PUBLIC CONFIDENCE

Administration of any program designed to facilitate the successful prosecution of the defense effort will require the services of men in whom the people of the Nation have confidence, without regard to considerations of partisan politics. Public confidence in officials at policy-making levels is essential to cooperation in the mobilization effort. Inept management, lack of foresight, inadequate quantities of weapons of effective nature, poorly equipped troops thrown into combat against devastating odds have combined to shake the confidence of the American people in the capabilities of some public officials now in office. These should be replaced by men of vision and determination.

THE SACRED TRUST

Unfortunately, individual liberty becomes the first casualty of mobilization. It will avail us nothing if we destroy dictatorships and totalitarianism abroad, only to find that in the fight we have lost our own sacred freedoms.

Power must be delegated into the hands of a few men and the habit of living in power is a strong one. When a little of the individual's liberty goes to Washington it seldom finds its way home again. For that reason we recommend checks and restrictions upon the exercise of authority to be delegated to the President. So long as the Congress of the United States retains its own constitutional power the liberties of the American people cannot long be held hostage. It is only when the Congress abdicates its duties and responsibilities that a real and terrifying danger comes into being.

The powers delegated for the defense effort must be considered a sacred trust by those who receive them. They must be exercised wisely on an administrative plane above partisan politics for the welfare and safety of every American. But what is of primary importance is the fact that the essential powers must be returned in that moment when the threat against our safety has passed.

The American people are rightfully jealous of their liberties. They will hold responsible those to whom they entrust the most sacred of their personal and civil rights.

JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr., Seventh District, California; J. CALEB BOGGS, at Large, Delaware; JOHN W. BYRNES, Eighth District, Wisconsin; NORRIS COTTON, Second District, New Hampshire; GLENN R. DAVIS, Second District, Wisconsin; GERALD R. FORD, Jr., Fifth District, Michigan; BEN GUILL, Eighteenth District, Texas; DONALD L. JACKSON, Sixteenth District, California; KENNETH B. KEATING, Fortieth District, New York; HAROLD O. LOVRE, First District, South Dakota; THRUSTON BALLARD MORTON, Third District, Kentucky; CHARLES P. NELSON, Second District, Maine; RICHARD M. NIXON, Twelfth District, California; WALTER NORBLAD, First District, Oregon; CHARLES E. POTTER, Eleventh District, Michigan.

American Defeats in Korea Paradoxically Have Good Effect on European Attitudes Toward United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Human Events by the distinguished French journalist, Bertrand de Jouvenel:

PARIS, *July 1950.*

IMPACT OF THE KOREAN WAR

The United States has astonished Europe twice in this month: by the readiness of its will and the unreadiness of its means.

President Truman's announcement burst as a fanfare upon Europeans dispirited by the dispatches of their informants in the States. These were unanimous in foretelling inaction, which did not seem improbable to the Europeans: the unchecked progress of the aggressor's columns, the moral condemnation by international councils—all this evoked the thirties and it was readily believed that the similitude would be rounded out by the same old military inaction. In these 2 days a curious contrast was noticeable between France's experienced politicians who spoke of a democracy's difficulty in implementing its diplomatic promises and on the other hand France's chief diplomats who never doubted American determination.

As a consequence of the Truman thunderclap, opinion at large expected the folding up of the Red offensive. The danger seemed to lie in Soviet intervention: but short of that it seemed obvious to the public that the local war was done away with by the mere appearance of American forces. That these should have had to go into really serious action and that they should suffer reverses are developments quite unexpected by European opinion.

It seems that all of us western liberals think far too much in terms of potentialities; not enough in terms of actualities. In the League of Nations structure the expectation was that moral condemnation of the aggressor would shame him into retreat, by a combination of moral pressure and vague threat. When collective security was built upon the League fabric, and the concept of common military action mooted from 1922 to 1924, nobody thought that the combined forces would have to go into action: their mere putting into motion, it was felt, would frighten away the transgressor. The picture in our minds was always that of the wicked retreating in disorder before the banners of the crusaders. It was a case of action at a distance, and no image of pushing the aggressor back by weight of immediate impact was present in our conscience.

Now it is possible that this image of action without contact was justified at the outset, when the world scene comprised a plurality of first-class powers, accepting common standards. Anyone or any pair of the 1914 powers would have been discouraged from aggression by the moral condemnation of the other powers and the threat of their superior force, if it was merely said that this force would be brought into play.

But the international scene has been transformed disastrously in three respects. First, the loss of common moral standards: to Red North Koreans, the moral condemna-

tion of western democrats means nothing. Second, the reduction in the number of first-class powers: as the world has fallen into two camps, the Koreans or the Russians have nothing to fear from an overpowering combination of powers. Third, there has grown up a barbaric disbelief in mere words and even in mere sight: where a civilized statesman or general will retire before the prospect or appearance of superior force, the barbarian retires only under the physical pressure of superior force actually applied. Not surprisingly, this is the most frightening aspect of the present situation.

It was the hope of the west that the potential strength of the United States would warn off aggression from the countries to which a check has been given, good for military support, cashable at the Pentagon. This was not an unreasonable hope but it turns out to have been unjustified. If the checks are to be presented for payment, then America must have the military liquidities necessary to face these commitments. The potential strength must be actualized, and it has to be applied physically. This is an extremely wasteful process forced upon the west.

EFFECT OF UNITED STATES MILITARY REVERSES

American military reverses in Korea exert a favorable influence upon European opinion. That the aggression came from the south under American inspiration was the Soviet and Communist assertion: in France it was believed by a number of people. It is not to be forgotten that the Communists are the exclusive purveyors of news to about one-half of the wage-earning population. The speed of Red advance and evidence of American improvisation have not only refuted a falsehood but refuted it so rapidly that the impression of having been lied to is very vivid in the masses. In this intermediate and influential layer of opinion which is at the same time anti-Russian and anti-American, adversity in Korea has also produced a favorable impression. In such circles the inhuman efficiency of the American is held against them and, worst of all, the formidable efficiency of their war machines: the fact that things were bungled, and that troops broke, dispels the robotic aspect which journalism had given to American strength. Candid reports from the front, describing disorderly retreat as we have known it, bring the American combatants very near to French hearts. They can also be thought of as "les petits soldats," a term of affection previously reserved to our own and which conveys a world of things: that soldiers are somewhat fragile young men not transfigured by uniform into archangels of war.

While American adversity is decidedly good propaganda (the use of the atom bomb would have a most deplorable effect), it also teaches the Europeans a practical lesson. It is clear to them that intervention is meeting with misfortune because too few troops were hurled into the breach too soon. This, of course, is a consequence of the almost immediate breakdown of local resistance, which should have held a front behind which American troops could be stored up until they were ready to hit out in adequate numbers. The lesson to be drawn is of importance not only to Americans but mainly to Europeans. If it is a great military imprudence to rush troops into battle as they land, in the hope of stopping the enemy somewhere and somehow; if intervention can be effective and should from the military angle be undertaken only under cover of local forces; it follows for the Europeans that they must set up forces adequate to hold back a Russian thrust for as long as it will take the Americans to bring over adequate forces. And adequate forces for the western front cannot be ferried over in less than a year. Consequently western Europe has to fight its own battle, expecting help from strategic bombing within something like 10 days, a small number of divisions within 2 months, but a real army not before as much as a year.

The problem of European rearmament thus becomes Europe's main concern. This is sensed by the public. The avalanche of Red columns and American impotence to stem them has suggested to almost everyone the transposition of this same course of events in Europe, and opinion would have responded wholeheartedly to a call for rearmament. This has not come. No politician of any stature, either in England or in France, has stated the urgent priority of defense over all other political objects.

Lost Illusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Globe of July 27, 1950:

LOST ILLUSION

Fifty billion dollars is a lot of money. It is approximately one-fifth of our national debt, after two World Wars. At 5 percent interest it is the annual income of a trillion, a thousand billion dollars.

We have spent the vast sum of $50,000,000,000 to maintain a Defense Establishment since the cold war began in 1946. Yet we have only 10 divisions of fighting men, and these are largely armed with weapons that are now out of date. We possess only prototypes of modern tanks and antitank guns. It will probably take a year to get the first into production and the second will not be ready for 6 months.

People are asking what has happened to the money appropriated from the taxpayers for defense.

There has undoubtedly been a considerable amount of waste. We have heard, from time to time, of money spent on junkets for public relations purposes, and sometimes of the use of service aircraft for the private trips of the top brass and Congressmen. There has probably been a good deal of what the services call "empire building," which means the expansion by certain officers of unnecessary jobs to inflated proportions. But the United States News, in a breakdown of the figures, shows us that six-sevenths of the $50,000,000,000 has gone for military housekeeping, and this includes vast occupation costs in Germany, Japan, Korea, and elsewhere, which have sometimes been inflated.

The sum of $24,900,000,000 has gone for pay, a third of it for civilian employees. An additional $12,500,000,000 has been spent for supplies and overhead costs, $3,600,000,000 of this for pensions. That has left only $7,100,000,000 for equipment of all kinds, $1 out of every $7 spent for defense, for durable equipment of all kinds, including trucks and typewriters. Of the same $7,100,000,000, $4,000,000,000 has gone for aircraft and their equipment. Of the remaining $3,100,000,000 only $600,000,000 has gone for weapons.

That is only 1.2 cents of the defense dollar. Much of this has properly been spent on research, which is necessary if the services are to be kept up to date. It is also true that it is often poor economy and dangerous over-all strategy to go into the mass production of weapons that may be obsolete by the time they appear. It is also probably true that our great skeleton defense organization places us in a position to throw our weight into a great war far more quickly than has ever been possible in the past.

But when all is said and done our present situation is the result of certain illusions that have been common to most of us. Until a year ago we placed too great reliance on a belief that our atomic bomb monopoly would continue a good while longer. While we sought to exercise leadership in world power politics, we remained too much under the spell of the old American belief, the result of our geography, that we could prepare for armed conflict after it had been declared. We wishfully deluded ourselves in the belief that victory could now be won in a major war without the ugly business of infantry fighting on the part of large bodies of our young men, and failed to equip ourselves with modern ground weapons. We appear to have been oversold on strategic bombing, perhaps to the neglect of tactical air power.

Most of all, we failed to have ready a powerful, mobile ground force, with up-to-date equipment, in case of such an emergency as the Korean conflict. Perhaps our greatest failure was in not maintaining a large Marine Corps, which, by its nature, must always be ready for immediate action. It is true, as Secretary of Defense Johnson told a Senate committee yesterday, that we have increased our quick strength since his predecessor, the late Secretary Forrestal, became worried over our unpreparedness at the time of the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia 2 years ago.

But what we now have is very little and very late. We face the problem of organizing our Regulars into combat divisions, and with filling their military housekeeping duties with replacements from the National Guardsmen, Reservists, and draftees. We have a difficult problem of quickly producing modern ground weapons in quantities sufficient to equip our full manpower, if it must be called up later for an all-out war. But we have gained something, because many of our illusions must be gone.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Address of Samuel Wilder King to Final Session of Hawaii State Constitutional Convention in Honolulu—Document Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, After 79 working days, extending over 110 calendar days, the 63 delegates elected by the people of Hawaii last March to draft a constitution for the State of Hawaii completed their task last Saturday morning, July 22, 1950, in a picturesque and historic ceremony in Iolani Palace, the seat of Hawaiian government in Honolulu. I was personally present at the ceremony.

The constitution was very aptly described as "a splendid document" by Samuel Wilder King, who served as president of the constitutional convention with ability and distinction. For the 8 years preceding my tenure of office, Mr. King served as Delegate to Congress from Hawaii and is well known to many of the present Members of Congress who served with him.

Mr. King pointed out that during the proceedings of the convention, debate was unrestricted, every contention was fully expressed, and every alternative thoroughly explored, so that in its final form the constitution in substance and form expresses the will of the majority of the people.

The election of the delegates to the convention and the convention itself was held under the authority of a law enacted by the Territorial legislature, and all of the expenses thereof were met by funds provided by the Territory.

The constitution is an outstanding document, and the method by which it was formulated demonstrates the mastery of the democratic processes of government by the people of Hawaii.

In opening the final session of the convention at which the constitution was approved, the following address was delivered by Samuel Wilder King, president, Hawaii State Constitutional Convention:

About 6 months ago, 243 citizens of Hawaii, men and women, offered themselves for the task of drafting a constitution for our community.

In accordance with the provisions of the law authorizing a convention for that purpose, 63 of us were selected by the voters of Hawaii to prepare a constitution for their approval.

With two vacancies filled by appointment, we have accepted the obligation to draft the best document our collective judgment could devise.

The people of this community have shown their interest in our labors, by the high vote case in the election that selected us, and by the close attention to our deliberations since we began on April 4.

After 79 convention days, covering a period of 110 calendar days, we have before us for our signatures the results of our work, a document which we shall as a body urge the people of Hawaii to ratify as their constitution.

It may be that some of you are concerned at the exclusion of some provision which you may have considered essential, or possibly concerned over the inclusion of a proposal that you feel may occasion future difficulties.

I feel strongly that no such misgivings are justified.

The constitution we have drafted is a splendid document, providing an excellent framework for the government of an American commonwealth.

As well as can be, we have anticipated the problems of the future without seeking to bind that future irrevocably and provided sufficient elasticity in the constitution to meet those problems.

Those who administer the government we are founding may be trusted to apply the principles we have laid down in the light of their own times, just as the Federal Constitution has been interpreted to fit the needs of a great and growing nation.

To those who may for one cause or another hesitate to approve this document in its entirety, I recommend a perusal of Franklin's remarks on a similar occasion.

Upon the completion of the drafting of the proposed Constitution for the United States, Franklin addressed his fellow delegates, in part, as follows:

"I confess that I do not entirely approve of this Constitution at present; but, sir, I am not sure I shall never approve of it, for, having lived long, I have experienced many instances of being obliged, by better information or fuller consideration, to change opinions even on important subjects, which I once thought right, but found to be otherwise."

And at the end of Franklin's remarks he said:

"On the whole, sir, I cannot help expressing a wish that every member of the Convention who may still have objections to it would with me on this occasion doubt a little of his own infallibility, and to make manifest our unanimity, put his name to this instrument."

Let me remind such hesitant delegates, if any there be, that this constitution is not the product of any one person or group of persons, but the considered judgment of all of us, to which every one of us has contributed his share.

Every word of it, every section and article, has been examined and debated in our several standing committees, in committee of the whole, and in the convention.

Debate has been unrestricted, every contention has been fully expressed, every alternative thoroughly explored.

In its final draft this constitution, in substance and in form, expresses the will of the majority of the convention.

This is the essence of democracy; the exemplification of the democratic processes that began with our selection for this task by the people, and was carried out in the organization and procedure of the convention to today's formal approval of the completed document.

I therefore feel that every one of us can with a clear conscience sign this constitution and go from this final convention session in historic Iolani Palace to our respective island homes and districts to urge the people of Hawaii to ratify and confirm our work, and accept this constitution for the State of Hawaii.

Despite differences of opinion we have maintained a unity of purpose and adhered to the objective of providing Hawaii with the organic law essential for a dynamic future in the Union.

We have been joined together in a great endeavor. We are fortunate in having had the privilege of being a part of this historic process. We may well look back upon our service in this convention as one of the outstanding achievements of our lives.

May I thank you all for the consideration extended me as president of this convention? In the problems and difficulties that arose during the course of our long and arduous labors I have been sustained and encouraged by your cooperation.

My warmest personal regards to you all.

Mahalo me ke aloha nui loa ia oukou apau.

No Profiteering, No Sharpshooting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly and pointedly on the most important issue facing this Congress right now—how far we should go in clamping controls on the economy of this country.

I favor a three-point program.

First, I think the President's proposals should be accepted in the form reported out of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Second, I think simultaneous action by the Congress should give the President complete stand-by controls on every sector of the economic front. I think the President should be given legislation which is sufficiently flexible to meet rising and falling states of emergency, but I advocate that any price freeze include a roll-back to June 25.

Third, I urge immediate passage of a drastic excess-profits tax on a retroactive basis.

Why? The answers cry out from Korea to the last extension of the home front, the local grocery store.

I can't pretend to cover the whole situation in these few minutes, but let me speak to the consciences of us all on one subject.

There must be no profiteering, no sharpshooting, no traffic in misery in this war effort.

All of us know that we paid more dearly for victory in World War II than was necessary. That extra price was not paid the decent, honest citizens of this country, the 90 percent who know that their lives and fortunes are the life and fortune of this Nation. It was paid to the greedy, the dishonest, the underhanded. It was paid to the businesses who jacked up the price of freedom to Government and individuals alike. It was paid to those who pretend there is a difference between the black market and the gray market, to those who were as happy to take money under the table as over the table.

I'm not talking now about the businessmen, big and small, who absorbed sacrifices while others were maneuvering for greater profits—during and after the war. And I'm certainly not talking about the farmer, the worker, the consumer in every part of our country who made up our war effort, paid for it—and then were forced to pay again by those who did not make equal sacrifices.

I think we are all determined that this not happen again. And I think the three-point program I have outlined is the best way of seeing that it does not happen. The controls asked by the President are needed now, not next Tuesday or a week from then. And they are needed as written, not as blunted into meaninglessness by the Kunkel bill, as misrepresented a piece of legislation as this House has seen this session.

Still further controls must be authorized now. The world situation is so fluid, so completely in flux, that any iron-bound, inflexible program might bring economic disaster as quickly as failure to have any program at all. The President has shown that he is not anxious to have more controls than necessary, but he must have at his disposition every possible economic control to meet the exigencies and contingencies of this world—a world which an unpredictable

Communist dictatorship may set aflame at any moment. There should be no exceptions in this matter of controls.

While the controls must be flexible, I seek one certainty, that profiteering be eliminated from the economy. When the economic controls go into effect, if they do, there must be a roll-back to June 25. Most of us remember that day as the day when the United States made it clear that we will fight for freedom wherever it is threatened. Others, fortunately still few, seem to remember it as the day they began to raise prices and hoard goods against a later day when they could mark them up again.

As for the third need, the excess profits tax, what more should be said? At a time when you ask all Americans to put aside the extras, an excess profit is in itself an anomaly. The word excess means what it says and I think it should be stripped from the bulging treasuries of American corporations. Not even the anguished shrieks of those corporation executives who don't believe there is such a thing as an excess profit can drown out the noise from their counting houses these days. American business has never made so much money in its history. To put war on a pay-as-you-go basis, we need money badly and from the sources best able to pay.

In this mobilization, whose duration and extent no one can guess from day to day, we cannot wait to begin to tap our resources. Now is the time. Let any increases in our individual and corporate income taxes be retroactive to the beginning of this year and let our excess-profits taxes be the same. There will be sacrifices, in some cases hardships, but I think the sacrifices and hardships pale when placed alongside the ultimate sacrifices of men who have been asked to stand or die 5,000 miles from home.

United States Blunder in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Bill Cunningham, special writer for the Boston Herald, entitled "United States Korea Blunder Exposes Top Shelf." The article which follows is in a sense a continuation of the previous Cunningham article, and in my opinion again makes another valuable contribution in keeping the record straight:

UNITED STATES BLUNDER IN KOREA

(By Bill Cunningham)

After Tuesday, the helpless and staggered people of this Nation may start to get some intimation as to whether President Harry S. Truman and his second-rate advisers, through their lack of statesmanship and lack of preparation, have already plunged us into world war III, or have merely thrown away what was left of the victory of World War II.

Tuesday is the date when Jacob Malik, the Russian, due through the simple process of alphabetical rotation, to become president of the United Nations Security Council, will stalk in, sit down, and take over.

Russia has boycotted every United Nations meeting since last January, the Security Council included. The reason officially given and evidently correct has been the refusal of the UN to replace Nationalist China with Red China as an equal member of the all-important and all-powerful Big Five. Red China would give Russia two certain votes in the master committee, and two vetoes to throw, although one is enough.

Our experts have been congratulating themselves that Russia outsmarted herself completely in boycotting the Security Council meeting, called, at our insistence since the action in Korea. If Malik had been in his chair when the United States asked the Council to declare the North Korean invasion an act of aggression and sanction the shooting intervention of the United States Armed Forces as a United Nations police force, he could have thrown Russia's veto. What would have happened after that is anybody's guess, but Russia, at least, wouldn't have been left in the anomalous role of an unconsulted absentee.

The same has been true of the subsequent sessions, which saw General MacArthur appointed the United Nations commander, etc. The same experts are now wondering what the new Russian reasoning is, why the reversal, and what to expect.

There was nothing cordial nor mollifying about the official notice of the Russian about-face. "I consider it necessary," Commissar Malik informed Secretary General Trygve Lie in writing, "to inform you that, in accordance with established procedure, I am assuming the presidency of the Security Council in August of this year, and I am setting the date of the meeting of the Council for August 1 at 3 p. m. * * *"

"I consider it necessary * * * I am assuming the presidency * * * I am setting the date * * *" sound as if the gentleman is intending to try to take charge. To what end? You can find the guessing all over your newspapers. This could herald the ultimatum serving as a prelude to general war, a hypocritical offer to serve as mediator, but only on condition the United States withdraw our forces. It could be an effort to block further action in Korea, which the UN will be in honor bound to ignore or overrule.

The phantom possibility that it could mean a Russian apology and promise to be good needs perhaps to be recorded, because that's what ought to happen, but if that develops, we can prepare to salute the millennium—after examining the promise with a microscope and a Geiger counter.

RECORD IS ALREADY BLACK ENOUGH

But what of what's happened to us in the meanwhile? What of the revelations concerning our leaders? What of a President who didn't know what the score was, and an advisory staff, including a Secretary of State and a Secretary of Defense who now should be charged with murder? If war with Russia comes now, or even eventually from the now Russian-called sessions at Lake Success, that will simply be heaped on the already bleeding disaster. If war, as such, doesn't come, the record is already black enough.

No case for impeachment can be made against President Truman. Formal impeachment calls for treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors. It says nothing about sacrificing the lives of untrained soldiers, throwing away the dearly bought position of world leadership and jeopardizing the safety of the Nation, and all civilization, in order to play personal politics.

Impeachment is one of the hardest of all convictions to get. There've been only 11 such trials in all United States history, and but 3 convictions. The most famous cases were those of Justice Samuel Chase, of the Supreme Court, in 1805, and President Andrew Johnson in 1868.

Mr. Truman can't be impeached. The impeaching needs to be done by the voters themselves, and versus themselves. That goes for the 24,105,812 who fell for the now tragically discredited political clap-trap of the Truman 1948 Presidential campaign, and especially for the possibly 40,000,000 deadheads who didn't vote at all.

The shocking revelations concerning our lack of strength, intelligence, or even accurate information, after the President's admirable decision to establish peace in Korea is complete condemnation of a political party that has sold out our safety in the unholy effort to keep its conscienceless grip on the Government. Its leaders now stand condemned before the world by their own official statements, and shown up for what they are by the illiterate natives of Korea.

It all started back when United States Senator Harry S. Truman was perhaps the least distinguished member of the Truman Committee. Page 356 of the John Gunther book, Roosevelt in Retrospect says of President Roosevelt:

" * * * When close friends commiserated with him just before he left Washington about how tough Stalin was going to be, he replied that he, Roosevelt, was just as tough. 'Everybody expresses sympathy with me for having to do business with Churchill and Stalin, too.' Preparing for the conference, he had moments of superficiality, frivolity and even cynicism, 'Stalin—I can handle that old buzzard,' he told one intimate."

Vice President, and later President Harry S. Truman had ample opportunity to see how that worked out. He even had the chance to try it for size himself at Potsdam.

RECORD NOW RIPPED NAKED

His responsibility was to try to correct the mistakes, and rapidly to get this country everlastingly prepared for whatever emergency. Instead, the record now ripped naked by the tragedy of Korea, reveals that he was principally interested in getting elected. He worked for Harry S. Truman, not the American Nation.

Proof? If you need any beyond the cries of the dying in Korea, and the fact that they're now sneering at our military attachés, instead of according them the former bowing deference, in the capitals of all countries, read on:

Reduced to one sentence, the indictment against President Truman is that he sacrificed national defense for personal politics. They weren't even party politics. His party gave up on him. Defense Secretary Louis Johnson has taken the hardest beating since the unbelievable subject blew open, and he has much of it coming, but the major responsibility belongs with the President.

There are, in fact, some excuses for Johnson. The public has been demanding in angry tones, "What became of the $50,000,000,000?" without realizing that that's only about half of what we've spent ($95,600,000,000) since World War II, and without realizing what it was Johnson had to support.

The public's forgotten that twice in 8 years, we've tried to glamorize the dirty, deadly, but necessary profession of soldiering to something approaching the country-club level. There was politics in this too. The rush in Congress to be known as the soldier's friend, thus grabbing the votes of the GI and his people, was tantamount to the Oklahoma land rush back in 1942.

How can you pay a man what it's worth to offer his life to his country? What does

he really need but his care, and a few cents? But a mighty pay raise roared through as a political measure. Buck privates were upped from $21 to $50 per month. This was rescaled all the way up to $1,125 per month for a general.

There was still another adjustment when the war was over. That was the great gripe area, the terrific revilement of the caste system. The professional belly-achers and mental malingerers paraded in 2 months' stream before a board superintended by Gen. Jimmy Doolittle, to protest against saluting, demanding the right to get drunk in the same lush surroundings as the officers, and similar improvements, including more money. This resulted in upping the private's pay to $75, and the scale went northward from there.

When revealed, as it was this past week, that $20,000,000,000 of the $50,000,000,000 went for payrolls, food, clothing, and travel, and another $13,000,000,000 for operating and maintaining military installations and equipment, that wasn't on Johnson. That left him $8,500,000,000 for procurement, and that's where he fell down, but only in the frame the President set for him. That was the push-button war frame—big planes and atom bombs at the expense of old-fashioned soldiers, sailors, and marines. Then came the Korean war calling for old-fashioned soldiers, sailors, and marines.

GROUND FORCES IN PATHETIC CONDITION

It's now only too apparent that our ground forces were in pathetic condition. MacArthur's holding troops in Japan were not veteran soldiers, but the next generation of kids, rotted by the easy life as all occupation forces always have been, and probably always will be. A Thursday dispatch from "With the United States Forces, South Korea" by the AP's Tom Lambert closed with this significant line, "The GI who came here from Japan, as most of them did, is developing a nostalgia for Japan, haunted by memories of the beer in Osaka, a Japanese girl in Yokohama, the car he left behind in Kyushu."

MacArthur "divisions" were far below strength, thanks to the Johnson economy drive. Time quotes a front line officer, who, last week, said bitterly, "What can you do with a damn two-battalion infantry regiment? You have no base to deploy around, no reserve—and no tactics because all your tactics are founded on the theory that you'll have three battalions to maneuver."

All this, and all the rest, came from completely wrong planning, false economy and lack of even token preparation. The public had a glimpse of this during the great unification hearings. It's now obvious that, although the Navy was as awkward as Senator MCCARTHY about the presentation of its case, like Senator MCCARTHY, it had a powerful case.

Possibly one of the greatest wrongs in the history of American arms was the Presidential humiliation of Admiral Denfeld. If President Truman were a really big man, he'd call the admiral to the White House today and publicly apologize to him. It would certainly be more in keeping with public dignity, personal nobility and national unity than the recent private seance accorded the hill-billy evangelist, the Rev. Billy Graham.

All this cutting and slashing really began in 1947 and 1948. Things were getting no better with Russia anywhere. In fact they were far worse in Germany in early 1948, and they got worse still around June of that year when the Russians declared their blockade and we were forced to retaliate with the now famous Berlin air lift, which threatened a war excuse with the flight of every plane.

Congress was properly concerned about our national safety, and tried its uttermost to vote a 70-combat group Air Force into being. Who was its principal opposition? President Harry S. Truman. The President insisted a 48-group Air Force would be sufficient. The Congress wouldn't agree. The President finally came up to 55. The air-minded House and Senate wouldn't budge. The President finally made it 66, but the thoroughly aroused Congress finally voted the 70 over his protest.

This particular Congress likewise voted $17,000,000 in cash and $33,000,000 in contracts toward the first year's construction of a giant radar screen that would circle this Nation completely as a warning device. This was the celebrated Eightieth, or "do-nothing" Congress, the belaboring of which comprised the entire Truman campaign platform that was to come along so shortly.

For the campaign was swiftly approaching. Big appropriations in an election year are bad because they mean higher taxes. The Truman theme must have been already set in his mind. If not, he found it between the weeks he was balking against what Congress considered minimum national defense requirements, and the time he went forth upon the hustings.

That theme was the same that had worked so well for the previous administration—the more abundant life, more Federal help for everybody, the dirty Republicans who'd take it all away, and who objected to everything.

COMPLETELY IGNORED WORLD CONDITIONS

His campaign followed exactly that plan. If he knew anything about world conditions at all he completely ignored them except in looping generalities. The impression he gave, and the message he sold, was that everything was just fine, except that the miserable Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress had snatched away all the blessings he'd tried to distribute and had done its bitterest to return emancipated freemen to the greedy clutches of special privilege.

He changed his speech at every stop and promised whatever the locality was interested in. In places such as Charleston, W. Va., and Akron, Ohio, it was all about the greater benefits for the workingman. In Texas, it was cotton. In Denver, it was conservation. In Oklahoma City, "the heart of the Nation," he said he felt it fitting to show the Republicans up for their despicable charges that Communists had infiltrated the Government.

By the time he reached Salt Lake City the theme had changed to irrigation and reclamation. At El Paso it was more reclamation and hydroelectric power. When he hit the big cities, he got on labor, except here in Boston, where he extolled the greatness of a man he probably never even saw, the late Al Smith, and accused the Republicans of having helped the Ku Klux Klan smear the former New York Governor with "a vile whispering campaign" just because he was a Catholic.

"I have often thought," he piously and probably thoughtlessly intoned, "what a different and better world we would have had if Al Smith had been President." If he means the last time Smith tried it, millions will agree, because if Franklin D. Roosevelt hadn't outmaneuvered the Smith he nominated in 1928 and got the nomination himself in 1932, the Nation might have been spared its present mess and, incidentally, Harry S. Truman.

All this, nonetheless, elected the gentleman. The enraptured recipients of pie in the sky—on order—gave never a thought to atom bombs in the sky, and the crafty candidate never mentioned such an uncomfortable possibility.

The truth is the Eightieth Congress had balked at general domestic hand-outs in order to pass the following measures: The foreign-aid program; separate military aid for Greece and Turkey; a bill for American participation in an international refugee-aid program; peace treaties with Italy, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania; a resolution asking the President to work out agreements with other nations for this country's safety; extension of reciprocal-trade agreements for a year; a bill giving legal status to the Voice of America; the Armed Forces Unification Act; the authorization of a 70-group air force, with generous sums for the support of the Army and Navy.

This was the celebrated do-nothing Congress upon the denunciation of which the new President was elected. Then came Acheson, Johnson, and the cut-backs, and Russia took it from there. Who was right? Candidate Truman or his mute punching bag?

If ever in the history of mankind a nation has been misled to the brink of potential disaster, that nation is ours at the moment. Already the historically unfrocked defenders of the faith are beginning to arise and in violent but hollow tones demand more respect for our tortured President and our great Secretary of Defense. One such, the Honorable FRANK W. BOYKIN, a Congressman from Alabama, has been doing it in Congress.

Certain hermaphroditic Republicans, such as the funereal John Foster Dulles, are lifting quavering bleats for unity. We've got plenty of unity. What we need is some leadership. This entire administration, since it can't be impeached, ought to have the unsuspected grace to resign.

Application of War Claims Act of 1948 to Resident Aliens Should Be Clarified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend section 12 of the War Claims Act of 1948 in order to clarify the intentions of Congress in the application of this law.

The bill proposes that section 12 be amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

This section shall not be construed as a limitation upon or as repealing, modifying, or otherwise affecting in any manner whatsoever the provisions of sections 2 and 9 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (defining an enemy or an ally of an enemy to be any individual of any nationality resident within the territory of any nation with which the United States is at war, and authorizing suit for the return of property vested under such act by any person not an enemy or an ally of an enemy). The effective date of this amendatory act shall be July 3, 1948.

There seems to be a serious difference of opinion as to the intentions of Congress with respect to the application of the War Claims Act of 1948. It is evident from decisions rendered already that the construction placed on the intent of Congress in certain cases may very well jeopardize the property of aliens that Congress had no intention of covering under the provisions of the law.

Whatever the case may be, the situation needs prompt clarification.

I am prompted to call this to the attention of the House by the tragic experience of a resident of the Territory of Hawaii of more than 50 years, and the father of an American citizen, who was caught in Germany by the outbreak

of the war, is now 80 years of age and blind and confronted with poverty as the result of the seizure of his property by the Alien Property Custodian.

His name is Richard Guessefeldt. He was born in Germany in 1870 and came to Hawaii in 1896. He and his wife, who settled there in 1909, have one child, a daughter, who is a natural-born American citizen.

Mr. Guessefeldt immediately entered the employ of one of the large sugar agencies in Hawaii, finally becoming head of their merchandizing division. He saved his money and retired in 1917. He placed his entire estate in trust with the Bishop Trust Co. of Honolulu in 1934.

In April 1938, he and his wife and their daughter took a temporary vacation trip to Switzerland, Germany, and Italy. They placed their household goods in storage until their return. They were to return to Hawaii within 1 year. Five similar vacation trips had been taken in 1903, 1913, 1922, 1930, and 1934. The outbreak of war in Europe prevented getting return passage booked in time to leave for home.

Neither the State Department nor any American officials gave them timely admonition or warning. As a result they became virtual prisoners for nearly 11 years, suffering great hardships because of harassment by military police, insufficient food, shelter, and clothing.

In July 1949, through the help of friends, they managed to get to New York, where they now live on the charity of relatives. They are almost destitute. Their daughter is employed as a saleswoman by a New York department store.

The loyalty of Guessefeldt and his family to America has not been questioned. Neither he nor his wife or daughter own or have owned property of any kind abroad. They have never belonged to any group or organization hostile to the United States. The daughter was employed by the British Royal Navy at Sylt in the British zone as a secretary and interpreter from August 1945 to March 1946. She was able to return to New York later in that year.

The cash value of the trust property is about $145,000. The Alien Property Director also seized in 1949 the stored household property. A substantial portion of it belongs to the daughter. Thus the Director has actually taken the property of an American citizen.

Mr. Guessefeldt filed a suit under the Trading With the Enemy Act, in the District of Columbia to recover back his property. A trial judge here has refused to order it restored although admitting that the result is unduly harsh, but shifts the responsibility to Congress and says Mr. Guessefeldt's remedy and relief must come from Congress. The judge concedes all these facts to be true, but holds that the War Claims Act of July 3, 1948, permits confiscation of all property of every long-time loyal resident of America who has not become a naturalized citizen. Both Mr. Guessefeldt and his wife applied for citizenship when they were finally able to get home after an enforced absence of 11 years, during which time they were virtual prisoners.

Two days after this opinion, another district judge in Chicago held exactly the opposite. He pointed out that the Trading With the Enemy Act permits such suits and defines an enemy to be one who has an actual or technical residence in an enemy country. He went further and stated unequivocally that these provisions were not changed or affected in any way by the War Claims Act of 1948. In the opinion of Mr. Guessefeldt's attorneys, that judge is correct. They point out that Mr. Guessefeldt is not now and never was an enemy, is a permanent resident of Hawaii, that this fact was even admitted by the trial court here, and that Congress intended in the 1948 act that only the property of enemies of this country should be kept.

The bill I have introduced provides specifically that these two provisions in the Trading With the Enemy Act remain unaffected in any way by the 1948 law. The questions which have been raised concerning construction of the act seem to me to warrant a prompt hearing on the measure so as to clarify the intentions of Congress and protect alien residents from unfair treatment.

The memorandum which follows is intended to present the issues which have arisen in the controversy.

MEMORANDUM RE WAR CLAIMS ACT OF JULY 3, 1948 (H. R. 4044, PUBLIC LAW 896, 80TH CONG.; 62 STAT. 1246, 826; SEC. 12, 50 U. S. C., APP. SEC. 39)

I

The above act provides that property of German nationals seized after December 17, 1941, pursuant to the Trading With the Enemy Act, shall not be returned by the United States. It apparently repeals section 14 of the "Settlement of War Claims Act" of March 10, 1928 (45 Stat. 254–279, ch. 167; 50 U. S. C., App. sec. 9 (m)) which authorized restoration of 80 percent of all German enemy property after World War I and the retention of the balance of 20 percent by the United States.

During World War II, all Germans living in and loyal to the United States, its territories and possessions, were not enemies under the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Question 1. Did Congress intend by the above act of 1948, over 3 years after the war ended, to change the status of hundreds of thousands of these loyal German residents to that of "enemies"? Was it intended by the act of 1948 that such a German citizen living here and, for example, whose American born son lost his life fighting for this country, should now forfeit his property of every description?

Question 2. Or did Congress intend only to keep the entire property of those Germans who were actual or technical enemies, hostile to the United States, and to change the former policy of allowing enemies to have 80 percent restored to them as was the case after World War I?

II

For more than 25 years the Federal courts have consistently ruled that a citizen of an enemy country (Germany, Italy) having a permanent residence in the United States and loyal to this country, could recover back property seized by the Alien Property Custodian under the Trading With the Enemy Act; that he was not an enemy under that act; that he was not an enemy even though he had gone to Germany or Italy for a temporary trip and was prevented from returning home to America because of the war. Those decisions have been followed, notwithstanding the act of 1948, by the District of Columbia Court of Appeals (177 F. 2d 649), October 10, 1949.

Question 3: Did Congress intend by the 1948 act to nullify this rule?

III

A Federal district court in New York has even held that now, under the 1948 act, the United States can keep the property of a naturalized American citizen because he had not received his final papers when the property was seized after the war although he had become an American citizen when he filed suit for recovery of the property (*Schill* v. *McGrath*, 89 F. Supp. 339, decided Feb. 21, 1950).

Another Federal district court in the District of Columbia has held that a German citizen who has lived in Hawaii for over 50 years, whose only child is an American citizen by birth, is an "enemy" since July 3, 1948, but was never an "enemy" before that date; that, therefore, all his savings of a lifetime may be confiscated (*Guessefeldt* v. *McGrath* (89 Supp. 344, decided Mar. 14, 1950)). Both courts rely upon the statement made during the debate in the House that the bill H. R. 4044 was designed to permit "legalized robbery" and that this result was intentional and deliberate on the part of every Senator and Representative. Similar remarks in the debate and hearings on the bill were also relied upon.

IV

Question 4: Was the act of 1948 intended to modify, repeal, change, or affect section 2 (defining an "enemy" to be one who is a resident within an enemy country), or section 9 (a) permitting suits to recover seized property, of the Trading With the Enemy Act?

There is no reference whatever to those sections in the entire legislative history of the bill, H. R. 4044.

V

Census statistics indicate that several hundred thousands of Germans over 21 years of age are permanent residents of the United States. Great numbers of them, of course, live in such cities as Cincinnati and St. Louis. Many of them, through neglect, procrastination, and ignorance, have not become naturalized. On the other hand, undoubtedly many thousands have applied for citizenship.

But the House debate in January 1948 does not indicate that the American Congress was warning them of its intention to confiscate their property unless they became citizens immediately or transferred their property to American citizens to escape seizure.

Of course, many instances will occur where, because of technical residence in Germany or other enemy countries, or other circumstances, the person is an "enemy" regardless of loyalty to the United States. But it is in those cases where many perfectly innocent people will, under the bill, lose their all, as stated during the debate in the House.

Question 5: Is it to be presumed that, for example, the Ohio and Missouri Senators understood the bill H. R. 4044, to require forfeiture of all property of innocent residents of Cincinnati and St. Louis, of the class indicated, many of whose sons died to protect the very Government that would now seize their all?

Twenty years ago in the same type of legislation, the War Claims Act of 1928, Congress used that term as will be seen in these parallel quotations:

WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1928 (50 USCA APP. SEC. (Q))

"The return of money or other property under paragraph * * * relating to the return to Austrian and Hungarian nationals * * *."

WAR CLAIMS ACT 1948 (50 USCA APP. SEC. 39)

"No property or interest therein of Germany, Japan, or any national of either such country * * *."

It is also difficult to understand the variances in the following views:

GUESSEFELDT CASE (89 F. SUPP. 344, DECIDED MARCH 14, 1950, DIST. OF COLUMBIA)

"It is evident that Congress was well aware, in enacting this section (39) of the act, that persons situated as plaintiff is here, would be hurt. However, plaintiff argues that Congress did not intend section 39 to be a limitation on sections 2 and 9 (a), but this argument is untenable. Had Congress not so intended it would have been a simple matter for it to have used in section 39 the language employed in sections 2 and 9 (a), but in choosing the term 'national' it must be presumed to have intended that that word should be given the meaning which Congress itself had used."

NAGANO CASE (88 F. SUPP. 897, DECIDED MARCH 16, 1950, N. DIST., ILLINOIS)

This section (39) provides that no property or interest therein of Germany and Japan or of any national of either country shall be returned to the former owners or their successors and no compensation shall be paid them. The defendant has suggested that this section prevents recovery by the plaintiff herein because she is a national of Japan. I do not think this section is relevant to a case brought under section 9 (a) of the act. If a plaintiff in a section 9 (a) suit is an enemy or an ally of an enemy, the suit fails under the provisions of section 9 (a), not because of the provisions of the new section 39.

"The real purpose of the new section 39 is indicated by the provision that the net proceeds of property vested under the act, after administration, liquidation, and disposition pursuant to the provisions of the War Claims Act of 1948, shall be paid into the Treasury, in which, under section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948, * * * there is created a trust fund known as the War Claims Fund consisting of all sums paid into the Treasury pursuant to the provisions of section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act. "In connection with other sections of the War Claims Act, these sections reveal a third purpose not mentioned by plaintiff among the reasons for vesting enemy property, namely, the application of enemy assets to the relief of the victims of enemy aggression."

Prosperity in Washington State Under 17 Years of Democratic Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a document prepared by me regarding certain appropriations and benefits to the State of Washington in the past 17 years under the various appropriation bills.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROSPERITY IN WASHINGTON STATE UNDER 17 YEARS OF DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT

Here are the highlights:

IN THE UNITED STATES

Personal income, 1933: $46,273,000,000; 1949, over $206,000,000,000; national income, 1933: $46,000,000,000; 1949, over $210,000,000,000.

IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Wages up: The $62,117,000 in wages in manufacturing plants in 1933 had risen to $354,596,000.

Bank deposits up: The $291,000,000 deposited in Washington banks in 1932 had risen 528 percent—to $1,827,000,000 in 1949.

Farm income up: The cash farm income of $88,000,000 in 1932 was up to $570,179,000 in 1948.

Business and labor gains: Were reflected in personal income of more than $3,500,000,000.

Health and education: Programs benefiting thousands of residents had Federal support.

Veterans: Were being trained to undertake careers of their choice, and aided otherwise.

Old-age assistance: Was helping nearly 70,000 families.

Farm electrification: Not 50 percent, but 96.6 percent of them, electrified.

Land-water development: Involving Federal investment of more than $500,000,000.

National security: Nudging the billion-dollar mark in Federal investment at Hanford alone.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Democrat, United States Senator from the State of Washington.

DEMOCRATIC POLICIES BRING ECONOMIC GROWTH, IMPROVE WELFARE OF PEOPLE OF WASHINGTON

Federal Government programs carried out by Democratic administrations since 1933 have materially contributed to the prosperity and economic development of the businessmen, workers and farmers of Washington State, a recent survey reveals.

Every indicator of economic good health points to the fact that the dollars which the people of Washington have paid to the Federal Government in taxes during this period have brought substantial returns in the form of a higher standard of living for the individual citizen, and higher production and profits for industry and the business community.

The Democratic administration's policies have enabled the free-enterprise system to become stronger than ever before in its history, the survey indicated.

The record provides a sound basis for the assumption that a continuation of the Democratic program of a Fair Deal for all will bring the Nation nearer to the phenomenal standard of living predicted by President Truman in his state of the Union address.

As an example, personal incomes in Washington from 1933 to 1948 rose from $598,000,000 to $3,578,000,000. The number of manufacturing plants increased from 2,307 to 3,410 during the same period. The number of production workers arose from 67,752 to 123,488, while total wages paid to these workers jumped from $62,117,000 to $354,596,000. In terms of the value added to commodities and goods as a result of manufacturing processes, the 1933 total amounted to $160,612,000, the 1947 total reaching $874,036,000.

As of September 30, 1949, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had made 3,216 loans totaling $156,935,098 to Washington businessmen.

A total of $3,360,093 was allotted by the Federal Government in 1949 to the State to help pay for the costs of employment and unemployment system services.

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the Government spent $922,000 to help build airports, and the Bureau of Public Roads allotted $5,455,000 for highway construction in Washington.

Here are the convincing figures of Democratic achievement in other phases of the economy.

BANKING SYSTEM BECOMES SOUND AND PROSPEROUS

America's banks, which are custodians of the individual's savings and which provide a large share of the funds for investment in private enterprise, play an important part in keeping the economy stable.

Everyone remembers the 1932 days of bank runs and bank failures which had such a depressing effect on economic recovery. Twenty-eight Washington banks with deposits of $24,000,000 failed in 1932. None have failed in recent years.

Deposits in the State's commercial banks amounted to $291,000,000 on June 30, 1932, but 17 years later the banks held $1,827,000,000—an increase of 528 percent.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation spent $935,000 to help one bank with deposits of $1,538,000 from 1934 to 1948. None of the other banks in the State needed FDIC aid, so sound was their position. At the end of 1948, the FDIC had insured 99.2 percent of all money in the banks of Washington at a rate up to $5,000 for each depositor. A total of 117 commercial banks with assets of $2,017,891,000 were insured in Washington by FDIC in 1948.

MORE ADEQUATE HOUSING FOR THOUSANDS ACHIEVED THROUGH GOVERNMENT AID

Government housing programs have enabled millions of Americans to enjoy decent homes, and to raise their children in pleasant, healthful surroundings. While they have frequently been labeled as socialistic, these programs have strengthened one of the bulwarks of the free enterprise system—the opportunity of the individual to own his home.

On December 31, 1948, the Federal Housing Administration had outstanding in Washington 210,493 insured loans on small homes and property improvement. The FHA insurance on these loans totaled $73,798,000. On that same date FHA had insured 76,280 mortgages on one to four family homes for $364,089,000 in the State. It had underwritten the construction of 4,032 units in large apartment projects for $28,482,000 by the end of 1948.

The Veterans' Administration had guaranteed 32,974 home loans in Washington for $78,769,000 as of July 25, 1949.

A total of 59 member institutions of the Federal Home Loan Bank System was reported in Washington as of December 31, 1948. At that same time they had $162,687,000 outstanding in home-mortgage loans.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation aided 24,108 families in Washington by refinancing home loans totaling $42,646,000. All but $868,000 of these loans had been repaid by June 30, 1949.

The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation listed 54 Washington associations insured with $156,937,000 outstanding in home mortgage loans at the end of 1948.

As of June 30, 1949, the Public Housing Administration had spent $189,973,000 on 76,794 public-housing units in Washington. These included veterans' housing projects, war housing, as well as units built under the United States Housing Act.

VAST IMPROVEMENT NOTED IN FARM STANDARDS OF LIVING

Historically the family farm has been the backbone of the Nation's economy. Depressions in farm prices have invariably led to declines in all other phases of economic activity. Democratic administration programs to improve the farmer's way of life have contributed to our general economic strength in many ways.

The cash income of Washington farmers totaled only $88,000,000 in 1932; by 1948 it had risen to $570,179,000, well above the $208,000,000 in the Republican boom year of 1929.

Farm mortgages, an excellent index of rural prosperity, have decreased steadily since 1933. More than $146,000,000 in mortgages was outstanding in Washington 17 years ago. On January 1, 1949, the debts had been reduced to $86,201,000.

Rural-electrification projects have brought all today's conveniences directly into the homes of the farmers, ending the isolation

of farm citizens from those living in cities and towns. In 1935, when the Rural Electrification Administration was established, only 50 percent of Washington's farms used electric lights. Today power lines have been extended to energize 9,384 more miles than in 1935, and 96.6 percent of the State's farms use electricity.

On July 1, 1949, 68.2 percent of the farm land in Washington was included in soil-conservation districts. The total of 1948 payments to farmers under the agricultural conservation program was $5,636,511; 76 percent of the State's cropland was included under this conservation plan.

Federal land banks in the State had 4,359 loans worth $13,063,132 outstanding on June 30, 1949. Production credit associations had 1,629 loans valued at $5,256,824 outstanding at the same time. Commodity Credit Corporation loans made on 1948 Washington crops through August 31, 1949, totaled $56,129,568; loans on 1949 crops as of that date stood at $18,270,569.

In addition the Farmers Home Administration made 22 loans totaling $198,835 to help persons buy farms in Washington, and 606 operating loans totaling $1,177,520 during the 1949 fiscal year. It insured five farm ownership loans in the State for $52,650 that year.

The school-lunch program, begun in 1935, meant a better balanced diet for 106,397 Washington children in the 1949 fiscal year. A total of $1,371,352 was spent on the program in the State that year.

Of great value to the State's agriculture was the $584,109 which the Federal Government allotted for agricultural experiment stations and cooperatives' agricultural extension work in Washington in the year ending June 30, 1949.

WELFARE ACTIVITIES BENEFIT 153,000 WASHINGTON CITIZENS

Federal welfare services have broadened the opportunity of millions of Americans through health and education services, have brought security to aged persons who are no longer able to work. In the year ending June 30, 1949, the Federal Security Agency spent $41,553,676 in Washington State on these programs. A total of 153,892 persons benefited directly from these funds.

The Federal share of the old-age assistance program in the State accounted for $22,865,000, which aided 69,133 families.

Every month about 48,783 Washington residents received an average of $1,045,489 under the old-age and survivors insurance program.

Federal credit unions numbering 58, with 19,370 members, participated in the Social Security Administration's credit union program. They had savings of $3,257,547, of which $2,620,385 was in outstanding loans.

Washington received $328,698 for vocational programs and $89,815 under the land-grant college program during the 1949 fiscal year.

Since 1933, Federal funds have been allotted for the betterment of educational facilities in the State. The total spent on education from 1933 to 1948 was $120,014,281.

ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS BRING AID TO VETERANS

Expenditures by the Veterans' Administration represent the Government's determination to assist those who served the Nation in time of peril to make up for lost time in a peacetime economy. The Veterans' Administration spent $97,284,635 in Washington during the 1949 fiscal year through medical and vocational programs, and business and home loans. Pensions, compensation, and retirement payments amounting to $28,392,568 were allotted to 43,233 veterans and survivors of deceased veterans in the State.

A total of $9,085,259 was distributed in Washington under the employment and self-employment allowances programs. The average number of unemployed claims made each week was only 8,921. The number of claims made by self-employed veterans who needed aid averaged 660 each month.

VA hospitals discharged 10,336 of the State's veterans from June 30, 1948, to June 30, 1949. The average number of Washington ex-service men in training under vocational rehabilitation, 2,867; they received $3,655,799 in subsistence allowance.

The GI education and training program benefited 25,572 Washington veterans, brightening their chances for the future through educational opportunity. Those enrolled in various colleges and schools received $21,515,616 in subsistence allowance and $11,189,195 for tuition and equipment.

The VA loan-insurance guaranties aided materially in creating job opportunities for ex-service men, who were thereby able to buy farms or launch small-business ventures. Through June 25, 1949, the VA had guaranteed 351 farm loans in Washington; the guaranties covered $791,161 while the total amount of the loans was $1,756,687. During the same period, the VA authorized 2,069 business loans in the State; they covered $2,488,918 of total loans amounting to $6,585,346.

BETTER USE OF NATURAL RESOURCES ACHIEVED THROUGH POWER, RIVERS AND HARBORS PROJECTS

Federal Government expenditures for power projects and rivers and harbors development have added tremendously to the productive use of Washington's natural resources. Irrigation, reclamation, and flood-control programs save landowners many times the original cost of such projects.

The Bureau of Reclamation estimates that for every person living on an irrigated farm two are required in urban communities to service the farmers' wants. Irrigation, reclamation, and flood control, therefore, benefit not only the farmers themselves but provide the economic base for surrounding communities as well.

Hydroelectric power is Washington State's answer to lack of energy producing fuels—oil and coal. Under Democratic administration the Federal Government embarked upon and has pledged itself to a program of full development of the Columbia River and its tributaries.

In 1950 the Democratic Congress authorized flood control, navigation, reclamation, and power projects in or near the State estimated to cost over a billion and one-half dollars. Upon completion, these projects will produce an additional 3,500,000 kilowatts of electric energy. The significance of this development can best be demonstrated in terms of new investment and new jobs.

Studies indicate that 100,000 kilowatts will sustain a new investment of $50,000,000. A $50,000,000 investment, in turn, will create direct and indirect employment for over 20,000 people. With their families, this means an additional population of as much as 75,000 per 100 kilowatts of new power.

Kilowatts mean jobs. Irrigation means jobs and new wealth. Flood control protects existing lives and property. Navigation, water transportation will reduce freight rates and open new markets.

From June 30, 1933, through June 30, 1950, under Democratic administration the Federal Government has invested over $116,000,000 in river and harbor improvement, over $24,000,000 in flood-control works—dikes and levies, over $439,000,000 in reclamation projects, and more than $800,000,000 in the atomic-energy plant at Hanford. These Federal investments total approximately $1,380,000,000.

SUMMARY

These figures indicate the many ways in which the Federal Government is spending the tax dollars of the citizen. These expenditures have proved in the past 17 years to be among the most useful investments the American people have ever made.

The New Deal recovery programs from 1933 to 1940, using the powers of the Federal Government wisely and with restraint, enabled the United States to mobilize in short order for the great challenges of World War II. We were able to unleash the vast productive capacity of our economy in the cause of world freedom because intelligent leadership in Washington had given the type of administration under which the economy could prosper. Faulty political leadership had brought the Nation near the brink of chaos in 1933.

Today our freedom is once again imperiled. Our economy is strong, because the conditions reflected in the State of Washington through this survey are the same throughout the Nation. We must keep the economy strong to meet this new threat to our democratic institutions. Our soundest guarantee for the future growth of the Nation lies in the continuation of the programs which have brought us to the heights we enjoy today.

The signs and substance of improvement in our State are at hand everywhere.

There are the farms utilizing the wonders of electricity, the workers on stable jobs, the banks on firm foundations, the transition of wasteland into rich cropland, and the harnessing of the electrical might of the great Columbia River.

Seventeen years of forward-looking administration have dealt abundantly with the State of Washington—and with the Nation—hand in hand.

The figures that tell the story of what has been wrought, under our free-enterprise system, are contained herewith in these pages and speak eloquently.

How Washington Has Prospered Under 17 Years of National Democratic Administration

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a bulletin entitled "How Washington Has Prospered Under 17 Years of National Democratic Administration," published by the Democratic National Committee.

There being no objection, the bulletin was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW WASHINGTON HAS PROSPERED UNDER 17 YEARS OF NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION

Americans have a tradition of teamwork, and during the past 17 years the most highly developed teamwork between businessman, farmer, and workingman in our history has paid off in the greatest expansion of productivity and rise of living standards any nation has ever seen.

How the partnership of all classes and sections, blossoming under a progressive National Government, has brought about great gains in our free enterprise economy is shown dramatically in the fact that personal income in the United States has increased from only $46,273,000,000 in 1933 to $206,011,000,000 in 1948—an increase of 345 percent. These figures are from a newly completed comprehensive analysis of official Government statistics

on the expansion of the American free enterprise system which has raised total national income from $46,000,000,000 in 1933 to $210,000,000,000 in 1949.

The statistics, gathered by an independent analyst at the request of the Democratic National Committee, tell for the first time the full story of the tremendous progress the United States has made since 1933. Here are high lights of Washington's accomplishments as shown in the report which reveals how every resident of the United States has benefited from the national Democratic administration's policies for economic stability and continued prosperity.

HIGH LIGHTS OF WASHINGTON'S GAINS

Wages: In 1947 wages paid to persons in manufacturing plants in Washington totaled $354,596,000. The 1933 figure was only $62,117,000.

Farm income: From a low of $85,000,000 in 1932 Washington cash farm income had climbed to $570,179,000 in 1948.

Bank deposits: Between June 30, 1932, and June 30, 1949, Washington bank deposits increased 528 percent—from $291,000,000 to $1,827,000,000.

Details of the comprehensive economy survey of Washington follow:

BUSINESS AND LABOR GAINS

Expansion of industrial and agricultural productivity in Washington has resulted in personal income of its citizens increasing from $598,000,000 in 1933 to $3,578,000,000 in 1948. Higher employment and higher wages have been a major factor in this increase. Details follow:

In 1933 income payments to individuals in Washington totaled $598,000,000. In 1948 residents of the State received $3,578,000,000.

There were 3,410 manufacturing establishments in Washington in 1947. The average number of production workers employed in these industries during the year was 123,488. Total wages paid to production workers in Washington in 1947 amounted to $354,596,000. And the value added to commodities and goods as a result of manufacturing processes totaled $874,036,000.

By contrast, in 1933 there were only 2,307 manufacturing plants in the State. The average number of production workers during the year stood at only 67,752. The total payroll for production employees in Washington in 1933 was but $62,117,000. And the value added by manufacturing amounted to only $160,612,000.

By September 30, 1949, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had made 3,216 loans totaling $156,935,098 to businessmen in Washington.

The Federal Government spent $3,360,093 in the State in 1949 to pay for the costs of administering employment service and unemployment insurance system services.

In the year ending June 30, 1949, the Bureau of Public Roads spent $5,455,000 for highway construction in the State. And $922,000 was spent by the Federal Government to help build airports in Washington.

HEALTH AND EDUCATION AID

Federal assistance has enabled Washington to do a better job of conserving and preserving the human resources of the State in the years of national Democratic administration which followed the great and costly depression of the twenties and early thirties.

Here are the figures which show how Federal assistance has enabled the State to expand its activities in the fields of health, education, and social welfare:

In the year ending June 30, 1949, the Federal Security Agency spent $41,553,676 to aid health, education, and social welfare activities in Washington. A total of 153,892 men, women, and children in the State benefited directly from these funds.

The Federal share of the old-age assistance program in Washington accounted for $22,865,000. This money helped 69,133 families.

Every month about 48,783 residents of the State received an average of $1,045,489 under the old-age and survivors insurance program.

A total of 58 Federal credit unions with 19,370 members were participating in the Social Security Administration's credit union program. They had savings of $3,257,547 of which $2,620,385 was in outstanding loans.

During the year the State got $328,698 for vocational-education programs. And $89,815 was allotted to the State under the land-grant college program.

From 1933 to 1948 a total of $120,014,281 in Federal funds was spent for education in Washington.

BANKS MADE SOUND

Bank deposits have risen from $291,000,000 to $1,827,000,000 in Washington during the years from 1932 to 1949, while bank failures which robbed depositors of their life savings have become a thing of the past.

The following figures tell the story:

On June 30, 1932, only $291,000,000 was deposited in Washington commercial banks. By June 30, 1949, deposits in banks in the State had increased 528 percent to $1,827,000,000.

In 1932, 28 banks with deposits totaling $24,000,000 failed in the State. None failed in 1948.

From 1934 through 1948 the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation spent $935,000 to help one bank with deposits of $1,538,000 in Washington.

At the end of 1948, 99.2 percent of all money in banks in Washington was insured by the FDIC at the rate of up to $5,000 for each depositor.

A total of 117 commercial banks with assets of $2,017,891,000 were insured by FDIC in Washington in 1948.

VETERANS AIDED

Medical and educational programs voted by a Democratic Congress are aiding war veterans to become trained, productive workers, successful businessmen, and useful citizens.

During the 1949 fiscal year alone, the Veterans' Administration has spent more than $97,284,635 in Washington on these worthwhile projects, part of the best care and assistance ever given by any Nation to those who fought for its flag. Here are the details:

In the year ending June 30, 1949, the Veterans' Administration spent $97,284,635 in Washington. Here is how the money was distributed:

During that 12-month period 43,233 veterans and survivors of deceased veterans received $28,392,568 in pensions and compensation and retirement payments.

A total of $9,085,259 was distributed in Washington under the unemployment and self-employment allowances programs. The average number of unemployment claims made each week was 8,291. The number of claims made by self-employed veterans who needed aid averaged 660 each month.

The number of veterans living in Washington who were discharged from VA hospitals during the year totaled 10,336.

In the 1-year period the average number of ex-servicemen in training under vocational rehabilitation legislation was 2,867. They got $3,655,799 in subsistence allowance.

The average number under the GI education and training program stood at 25,572. They received $21,515,616 in subsistence allowance and $11,189,195 for tuition and equipment.

From the start of its loan-insurance program after the end of World War II through June 25, 1949, the VA had guaranteed 351 farm loans. The guaranties covered $791,161 while the total amount of the loans was $1,756,687.

In this same 4-year period the VA has insured 2,069 business loans. These guaranties covered $2,488,918. The total amount of the loans was $6,585,346.

BETTER HOUSING ACHIEVED

More residents of Washington own homes than ever before—many assisted by housing programs put into effect by the national Democratic administration to prevent foreclosure or to make home financing easier and cheaper.

The Federal Housing Administration had outstanding on December 31, 1948, insurance totaling $73,798,000 on small home and property improvement loans in the State. And as of July 25, 1949, the Veterans' Administration had insured a total of $78,769,000 in home loans in Washington.

Those figures are just two of the many that show how the national Democratic administration has translated the dream of home ownership into reality for millions of Americans. Here are the details:

On December 31, 1948, the Federal Housing Administration had outstanding in Washington 210,493 insured loans on small homes and for property improvement. The FHA insurance on these loans totaled $73,798,000.

On that same date the FHA had insured 76,280 mortgages on one- to four-family homes for $364,089,000 in the State.

In addition, the FHA had underwritten the construction of 4,032 units in large apartment projects in Washington for $28,482,000 by the end of 1948.

As of July 25, 1949, the Veterans' Administration had guaranteed 32,974 home loans in the State for $78,769,000.

There were 59 member institutions of the Federal Home Loan Bank System in Washington on December 31, 1948. At that time they had $162,687,000 outstanding in home mortgage loans.

At the end of 1948, 54 associations in the State were insured under the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. The associations had $156,937,000 outstanding in home mortgage loans.

The Home Owners Loan Corporation aided 24,108 families in Washington by refinancing home loans totaling $42,646,000. All but $868,000 of these loans had been repaid by June 30, 1949.

As of June 30, 1949, the Public Housing Administration had spent $189,973,000 on 76,974 public-housing units in Washington. These include special veterans' housing projects, and war housing, as well as units built under the United States Housing Act.

AGRICULTURE PROSPERED

Fair prices and increased production have brought cash farm income in Washington from only $88,000,000 in 1932 to $570,179,000 in 1948.

Following are the figures which show the farm prosperity which has been brought about in the State during 16 years of national Democratic administration.

Cash income of Washington farmers totaled $570,179,000 in 1948. It was only $88,000,000 in 1932. And the State's farmers earned only $208,000,000 in the Republican boom year of 1929.

Farm mortgages, an excellent index of rural prosperity, have decreased steadily since 1933. More than $146,000,000 in mortgages was outstanding in the State 17 years ago. On January 1, 1949, the debts had been reduced to $86,201,000.

On June 30, 1949, 96.6 percent of Washington's farms had electricity. When the Rural Electrification Administration was set up in 1935, only 50 percent of the farms had electric lights.

In 12 years REA has helped farmers in Washington to energize 9,384 miles of lines.

On July 1, 1949, 68.2 percent of the farm land in Washington was included in soil-conservation districts.

In 1948 payments to Washington's farmers under the agricultural-conservation program totaled $5,636,511. Seventy-six percent of the State's cropland was included under this conservation plan.

The Farmers Home Administration made 22 loans totaling $198,835 to help persons

buy farms in the State in the 1949 fiscal year. It also insured five farm-ownership loans in that year for $52,650.

In addition, the Farmers Home Administration made 606 operating loans totaling $1,177,520 in Washington in the 1949 fiscal year.

On June 30, 1949, the Production Credit Association had 1,629 loans valued at $5,256,824 outstanding in Washington.

Federal Land Banks in Washington had 4,359 loans worth $13,063,132 outstanding on June 30, 1949.

Commodity Credit Corporation loans made on 1948 crops in the State through August 31, 1949, totaled $56,129,568. Loans on 1949 crops on that date stood at $18,270,659.

The school-lunch program, started in 1935, served 106,397 children in Washington in the year ending June 30, 1949. A total of $1,371,352 was spent on the program in Washington in that year. In the 1949 fiscal year $584,109 was spent for agricultural experiment station and cooperative agricultural extension work in Washington.

DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

In 1949, the Army purchased $20,095,275 worth of supplies in Washington. Of this amount $10,702,144 went to small business firms.

In the year ending June 30, 1949, the Navy spent $12,219,000 for equipment purchased in Washington.

And the Air Force bought $29,700,000 worth of supplies in Washington last year.

In the year ending June 30, 1949, the Federal Government contributed $1,553,341 to the cost of maintaining the State's National Guard.

The Federal Government spent $711,195 in the State for the Army Reserve program in the year ending June 30, 1949, and $5,776,777 for the Navy Reserve program.

PUBLIC POWER, RIVERS AND HARBORS

In the 1949 fiscal year the Department of the Interior spent $35,312,600 in Washington for power facilities at or in connection with federally constructed multiple-purpose developments.

In addition, the Interior Department spent $2,313,000 in the State for construction of dams and reservoirs which have or will have power facilities.

In the same fiscal year the National Military Establishment spent $2,262,754 in Washington for rivers and harbors projects. This compares with only $1,466,629 expended for those purposes by the Army in 1933.

Since 1933, the Federal Government has invested $540,000,000 in power, reclamation, and flood-control projects in Washington State.

In the 1951 fiscal year the President has recommended over $120,000,000 more.

In addition, it has invested over $800,000,000 in the Hanford project.

Statement by Bernard M. Baruch on Mobilization Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article written by Mr. Arthur Krock, published in the New York Times of Sunday, July 30, in which he discusses the testimony of Hon. Bernard M. Baruch before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MUCH TO CONTROL IS NOW THE PROBLEM—LIMITED PROGRAM OF ADMINISTRATION OR ALL-OUT RESTRICTIONS CALLED FOR BY BARUCH ARE DEBATED—PRESIDENT SEEKS LESS POWER

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, July 29.—A man who will be 80 years old in August came to Washington this week on what most political observers thought was a hopeless errand and electrified Congress with the voltage of an idea. The man is Bernard M. Baruch, and the purpose of his errand was to persuade Congress to go far beyond the President's immediate mobilization program to deal with the Korean war and the increasingly tensive international situation.

Mr. Baruch, drawing on his experience with mobilization in two World Wars, urged Congress in impressive language to give rigid controls over the national economy to the President and make their use mandatory; or, if Congress would not do that, to equip him with these in stand-by form for use the moment he decided they were necessary.

Against Mr. Baruch was the official front of the administration, expressed in the President's message to Congress and in a report to him from the Council of Economic Advisers. In both documents the opinion was given that, for the present, all needed results could be achieved by a tax increase of $5,000,000,000, concentration of labor and management on the task of attaining peak production (assisted by financial incentives from the Government), and certain controls over credit, hoarding, priorities, and allocation of essential commodities. If, said the President, he found these insufficient, he "would not hesitate" to ask for others, including full industrial mobilization under a complete set of controls and rationing.

ADVISERS' VIEWS DIFFERENT

This was the official front of the administration, but it did not represent the views of all the President's advisers. Some of them—including W. Averell Harriman, W. Stuart Symington, and Dean G. Acheson—urged a much more rigid program, ranging from the Baruch proposals downward to a level well above that occupied by the President. But the decision was naturally Mr. Truman's to make. His message went to Congress on the very day Mr. Baruch appeared before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

For him it was old stuff, but it had been tested in the fires of national experience and by his intimate personal knowledge. He could show that by July 1918 he had transformed the fumbling mobilization of World War I into the effective and coherent movement which was managed by the War Industries Board, of which Mr. Baruch was Chairman. He could demonstrate from his close association with the same effort in World War II—and no man's was closer or more comprehensive—that priorities and allocations will not work without price-wage controls and other regimentations; and that, when the Nation goes onto a war footing of any breadth, taxes should be "higher than a cat's back" ("a high cat's back," interposed Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois).

DRAMA IN PLEA HEIGHTENED

Mr. Baruch's dramatic appeal to the committee was heightened by his vivid memory of this second period, and its effect was augmented by the fact that many of those who heard him, and read what he told the committee, share that recollection. The Senators remembered how, when the War Production Board, under Donald M. Nelson, was finally established with powers essential to the task, it permitted, or was obliged by higher authority to permit, large sections of its jurisdiction to be nibbled away by the regular departments of the Government. They remembered the attempt to control prices without controlling wages, the inflation that resulted and still weakens the economy, the various reluctant moves toward the inevitable which Mr. Baruch at the time characterized as faltering steps forward.

They recalled that when James F. Byrnes was appointed Director of War Mobilization to pull the scattered and conflicting elements together, he was empowered rather as a judge over disputes than as a direct executive, and had no authority to correct weaknesses of administration and personnel in the several units which reported their differences to him. And when Mr. Baruch made his proposals they knew he spoke with the voice of experience, and that every criticism he made as its errors were developing was proved by the event.

WARNING BY PATTERSON

Mr. Baruch himself may have recalled something said to him by Robert P. Patterson after Mr. Patterson became the Assistant Secretary of War in July 1940. "This," said Mr. Patterson, tracing a roundabout, wavering line, "is the path the Government followed until it reached the War Industries Board set-up under you in 1918. Must we follow it all over again, or can't we proceed from the point where you left off?" Events proved the question purely rhetorical, for that is what happened. Mr. Baruch's attempt this week was to prevent its happening again.

The President, his message to Congress having encountered the unexpected counterblast, stood his ground, however. In a press conference next day he had no intention, he said, of asking even for stand-by possession of the powers enumerated by Mr. Baruch as essential now. But he repeated he would unhesitatingly ask for any and more if and when he thought he needed them.

The obvious consequence was to leave Mr. Baruch's program in the inactive record for some days or weeks at least. But, for all the reasons given above, the obvious did not occur. A House committee lacked only one vote to put the program in the administration's partial mobilization bill the day after Mr. Baruch testified. Strong support appeared in the Senate committee, and leaders in both branches who nearly always follow the wishes of the President gave signs of uneasiness over the limitations of his requests.

FUTURE EFFECT AWAITED

No one can say at this time whether the astonishing effect Mr. Baruch created will take form in the powers program in its present legislative phase. No one can say whether before that phase is ended the President himself will not call for its expansion in the direction to which the witness pointed. But if the war footing broadens, as is the nature of such activities and as Soviet foreign policy and the Korean battle may require it rapidly to do, and if the human failings revealed in comparable periods are again revealed, it is a certainty that more and stricter controls will be imposed. One reason for this—and a reassuring reason—is that President Truman is a better administrator than President Roosevelt and totally undisposed to put off a decision because it must be bold and call for heavy sacrifices.

Some associates of Mr. Baruch over the years were inclined to attribute part of the effect he made to an uncanny sense of timing. However that may be, the effect was prompt and powerful. And it seemed to indicate that once again the country is way ahead of the Government in its sense of reality.

Korea's Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the first of a series of five articles by Clarence Streit, editor of the magazine Freedom and Union, published at 700 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C., and author of Union Now, which have appeared in various newspapers in the United States and Canada, pointing up the urgent lesson which I find Korea teaches, namely, that the Atlantic Union resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 57, cannot be agreed to too soon.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREA'S LESSON
(By Clarence K. Streit)

Once again President Truman has chosen the courageous course. His Korean policy deserves the heartfelt applause of all who cherish individual freedom. He deserves their prayers that this time he may have the wisdom, and greater courage, that are needed to win a decision, not just another round.

For years now a "still small voice," as Time put it, has warned with ever-rising strength that there is but one way to win enduring peace. That is for us to honor our own principles of liberty and federation by leading the democracies into a great Atlantic Union of Free Men, as the nucleus of an eventual world federal republic.

Now Canada has given the lead that our own Federal Union should have given long ago. With only one dissenting voice, the senate at Ottawa, after much debate, has passed Senator Euler's history-making resolution, calling for a convention of the seven sponsors of the North Atlantic Treaty to explore how far they can apply among them, within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of Federal Union.

The resolution is practically the same as the one introduced in Congress July 26, 1949, by Senator KEFAUVER with 19 other Senators, and by Representatives BOGGS, CLIFF DAVIS, JUDD, SMATHERS, and WADSWORTH.

There is only this significant difference. Instead of the United States inviting Canada, Britain, France, Belgium, The Netherlands, and Luxemburg to the convention, Canada would invite us and them to the convention. But the resolution leaves the door wide open for the United States to act as a cohost with Canada, and Senator Euler has expressed the ardent hope that the United States will do this.

We cannot rebuff this friendly, neighborly nudge in an hour of peril, this invitation to return to our greatest days, and begin uniting democratic nations on the federal foundation by which our forefathers first united democratic states.

On June 26, a few days before Canada acted, Will Clayton, vice president of the Atlantic Union Committee which Justice Roberts heads, and former Under Secretary of State, telegraphed President Truman. He urged him to answer the Kremlin's Korean move by making this Atlantic Union move.

Congress, by speeding the Atlantic Union resolution through, can hearten free men everywhere with the spectacle of the United States and Canada leading together, both federal union sponsors of the Atlantic Pact inviting their European cosponsors to explore with them federation of the free. The New World bidding the Old to join in building the truly new world that men too long have merely dreamed of building—what a sight for tired eyes!

Let us fool ourselves no longer. So far we have not been winning enduring peace, but merely time, merely months. Each bold act the President has taken has left us facing a still more dangerous choice hardly more than a year later.

In 1947 we faced a threat that we could check by nonmilitary aid. In 1948–49 came a threat that we needed our own airpower to check—but could check without bloodshed. And now in 1950 has come the threat that we are trying at present to check by waging war—police war—against a puppet. At this rate the next threat will leave us by 1952, engaged in world war, with our own country a bombing target.

We are losing, not winning the peace. To win it we need the greater wisdom, the greater courage that our forefathers showed when they constituted the first union of the free.

Examine the record more closely.

President Truman chose the courageous course when the Kremlin threatened Greece and Turkey in 1947. Impressive success was his reward. The country and the Congress followed him—the people and the politicians who, cautious counsellors had said, were not ripe for daring action. Stalin rocked back on his heels. Italy, France, all western Europe took new heart. The time favored striking decisively at the root of the danger. What was it used for? The Marshall plan. That plan was put forward and hailed by many as a decisive blow. Some of us then warned that, with all its obvious merits, it was only another stopgap. Events have proved this true.

Soon the Kremlin faced us with a still more dangerous choice by blockading our part of Berlin. Again President Truman chose the courageous course. Again astonishing success rewarded courage. Again the time favored striking a decisive blow. And again the President listened to the cowardly counsellors who have no confidence in the common sense and courage of their countrymen. Again the time was used for another pull-the-punch blow—the Atlantic alliance.

Thus we have reeled from crisis to crisis, from threat of war to war itself.

Korea now—Kansas when?

Let us fool away no more irretrievable time.

Korea proves it is truer now than it was in 1938. The free cannot federate too soon.

Visitors From Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Saturday, July 29, 1950, there appeared in the New York Times an editorial entitled "Visitors From Japan." This editorial, in a very fine way, interprets the spirit of the appearance before the Senate on Friday last of our distinguished visitors from Japan. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VISITORS FROM JAPAN

It is sadly true, among nations as among individuals, that the friends of yesterday are not always the friends of today. In compensation, the enemies of yesterday may not be enemies today. Vice President BARKLEY, receiving a delegation of 60 Japanese officials, businessmen, and labor leaders, could recall a long period of peace and amity that preceded the recent war and could hope for another such period. Chojiro Kuriyama, member of the Japanese Diet, could have an attentive hearing as he told the Senate of his regret for Japan's big mistake and his recognition of American forgiveness and generosity. All this in Washington, D. C., on July 28, 1950, a little less than 5 years after the atomic bombs fell on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

One thinks back to 1945 and one thinks ahead to some date not yet unveiled. To befriend the Japanese now, to hope the best for them, is not to condone the crimes their leaders committed in their name and with their aid. It is merely to make clear that peace and good will can return, even after the most terrible events; that though we must continue to hate the evil-doers—who could without shame forgive the butchers of the Nazi internment camps?—we know that no nation is beyond redemption. The word "Russian" has a sinister sound for us today. In God's good time, when today's shadow has passed from the world, it may have a pleasing and genial sound.

The mayors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were among yesterday's visitors. If they felt that they, too, had something to forgive they had achieved that miracle. For a moment one could see out of the present darkness into the years when all men may be brothers.

Kansas City Vote Frauds of 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article entitled "Vote Fraud Echo," which appeared in the Kansas City Star of July 20, 1950.

The theft of the ballots constituting the evidence of the notorious Kansas City vote frauds in 1946 is a key case. Subsequent crimes like the recent killing of Binaggio and Gargotta show that clean elections are the foundation of law and order.

It is indeed encouraging that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], as a member of the Senate Crime Investigating Committee, has undertaken to ascertain the facts about the unholy alliance between crime and politics in Kansas City. The people of Missouri will be grateful to him for his efforts. I hope that as a result of further hearings planned for Kansas City, this wicked combination of politics and the underworld, under the inglorious tutelage of the Pendergast machine, will be broken forever.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOTE FRAUD ECHO—SENATOR TOBEY BELIEVES BINAGGIO SLAYING IS LINKED TO 1947 BALLOT THEFTS—A CALL TO PENDERGAST—NEW HAMPSHIRE LEGISLATOR WANTS TO TALK OVER SEVERAL THINGS WITH FACTION HEAD

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY, a member of the Kefauver investigating committee, said today he wants to question James M. Pendergast.

The New Hampshire Republican conducted a briefing session which followed the morning's crime hearings here, at which Henry McKissick, Binaggio's right-hand man in his rise to political power, and Edward (Eddie Spitz) Osadchey, race-wire front man for Binaggio, were called as witnesses.

STILL HAS LEADS

During the briefing, Senator TOBEY said:

"I want a chance to examine Mr. Pendergast. I've got questions I want to ask him which I believe may be very material and I've got several leads."

Senator TOBEY, a long-time critic of the investigation into the ballot theft, was asked if that was the subject about which he desired to question Pendergast.

"I want to ask him about several things," the Senator replied.

He asserted he believes there "is a very definite connection between the Binaggio thing (the murder last April of Binaggio and Charles Gargotta) and the stolen ballots."

"I believe," he said, "we will prove this before we get through. Somebody knew the ballots proved somebody was guilty of vote fraud."

Senator TOBEY said that the ballot theft was the sort of thing which would lead Pravda, Russian Communist party organ to declare, "Comrades, this is America."

EXPRESSES HIS ALARM

"What we need in this country is some righteous indignation," he continued. "This is one of the most vicious things in America."

Referring to the morning's witnesses, Senator TOBEY said that Binaggio apparently had been the "tutelary deity" of Spitz.

He said Spitz had testified as to the operation here of a race news distributing company, with the information coming from "the new Capone gang in Chicago."

Senator TOBEY asserted that he had asked Spitz if the witness were apprehensive if he "would be the next" person to fall before gangland bullets.

"The witness made no response," Senator TOBEY related, "but I could see he was troubled by the thought."

The legislator said one of the things in the testimony of Spitz which had interested him most was the recital of how he negotiated to buy half interest in a gambling place for $20,000 and then "got some other suckers to put up the $20,000."

IOWA DEAL REFERENCE

That apparently was a reference to Spitz buying into the Stork club at Council Bluffs, Iowa.

Senator TOBEY said Spitz also described his operation of five or six other gambling places.

"He admitted he was ashamed of himself," Senator TOBEY said, "but said that when he got out of the war he wanted to make some easy money."

The Senator said McKissick's appointment was of no great importance.

"He is just what he looks like," Senator TOBEY said, "just big, good-natured, of no deep ideals or principles of glory, who has been in politics."

He said McKissick had told of going to see Gov. Forrest Smith on several occasions and of seeing the "tax board to get favors done."

Turning to the situation in general, Senator TOBEY asked:

"Who is running this country anyway? Our children must be brought up to accept the ideals of decency and good citizenship. There are generations growing up to believe that this crowd is the norm in Kansas City."

A BLOT ON NATION

Going back to the ballot theft, he said:

"This is a blot on the escutcheon not only of Kansas City but of the whole United States. This country is too big to let them get away with it."

After the briefing session the committee went back to work, calling in Sheridan E. Farrell, former police commissioner and a Federal narcotics agent.

Senator TOBEY and the committee chairman, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, had luncheon with the junior chamber of commerce at the Hotel President. Senator KEFAUVER and most of his staff were to leave by plane for Washington this afternoon.

Senator TOBEY, however, said he thought he would stay on in Kansas City for a while. He did not say for how long.

"I just want to get better acquainted with Kansas City," he said.

The committee plans to return to Kansas City for further hearings, for which no date has been set. If Pendergast is called upon to testify, it undoubtedly would be at later hearings.

Things To Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, we are faced today with the Korean crisis and for that reason there are many things the American people should remember.

Editor Herman Reifsnyder, of the Altoona Mirror, Altoona, Pa., wrote a very timely editorial on the subject, Things To Remember.

The editorial follows:

THINGS TO REMEMBER

Not even a confirmed optimist will deny that much of the news we are getting these days is bad news. Reverses afield in Korea are not the most significant portions of the bad news, although they are getting the most attention from our headlines and commentators.

The really bad news is that once again America has been caught sadly unprepared for war despite assurance from those in positions of authority to the contrary. As taxpayers we have been paying for preparedness, but evidently we have not been getting full value for our money. Once again American boys have been sent into action against unbelievable odds. If reports reaching us from the front are true, they have not had enough potent weapons or enough ammunition to do the job expected of them.

It is bad enough to send troops into action in insufficient strength to meet the thrusts of the enemy; it is even worse when they do not have the necessary arms and ammunition to make it a fair fight. If the American people are in an indigo mood there is plenty of reason for it. The wait-and-see attitude that seems to have been adopted by those in high places does not rest easily with the mothers and fathers who have boys over there or boys who might soon find themselves over there.

Inept civilian leadership seems to be at the apex of the present problem. It is hard to believe that a military leader of the status of Gen. Douglas MacArthur has been deceived by the purely military aspects of the situation.

As on previous occasions when top civilian brass has been guilty of poor leadership, Washington is preparing to hand out the penalties to Americans in all walks of life. Stringent regulations will be pushed upon us by the planners to cover up for their own mistakes, if we stand for it.

Newspaper readers can remember without too much effort the gallant effort made by some of our trained military men to keep the public informed as to some basic needs for global defense. Several prominent naval leaders were severely penalized for having expressed their honest opinions. It seems to us that some way should be devised to penalize the civilian leaders who make such tragic wrong guesses. Certainly they should not be retained in high office any longer than necessary.

The money supposedly saved at the expense of military preparedness seems to have been spent for other projects. Whether or not these projects were in the interest of the country as a whole is a moot question. Some of the money at least was spent on some rather expensive trips which were avowed nonpolitical in their purpose.

Reports from Washington say that Senators who have access to confidential testimony on Korea before the Senate Armed Services Committee are appalled by what they have learned. It may not be the proper time for this information to be made public, but certainly, once the military crisis has passed, the American voters should be given an honest accounting as to what really has happened in the past 3 months in Korea.

It might be well to examine carefully the documents pertaining to the American withdrawal from Korea before that time. It will be very interesting to know what State Department advisers contributed that advice to our over-all far-eastern strategy.

American voters might well launch an investigation of their own after the present bad news has been turned into good news, thanks to the American troops and American initiative at home. They might investigate thoroughly the handling of money entrusted to their elected officials. It seems reasonable to ask why we are not better prepared to meet this emergency when we have been paying the highest peacetime taxes in history.

The old cry of "not changing horses in the middle of the stream" is likely to be heard again when these people who have been spending our money without getting results are candidates for public offices. It might be well to remember at that time that nations as well as people can go broke by continually backing a horse that never seems to win. Our armed men have won the wars. The horses that don't want to be changed in the middle of the stream seem to be opposed to winning us anything at the peace tables.

Above all, our leaders should be instructed not to make secret peace pacts or agreements of any sort. We cannot afford another Yalta.

Total Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "We Must Have Total Preparedness," which appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal on July 18 last, setting forth with splendid logic the reasons why we should have full preparedness.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST HAVE TOTAL PREPAREDNESS

Sad and bitter is the Korean news. The Kum River defense line has been smashed. The big transport center of Taejon has been abandoned and new withdrawals are under way. The best that numerically inferior and poorly equipped American troops could do was not enough; it was far from enough.

The reality of that lack applies in even greater measure to everything being done to meet the danger of total Communist aggression.

The danger is great in the extreme. It is present and it will grow worse before it lessens—if it does.

It can be overcome only through immediate total preparedness.

President Truman will send a special message to the Congress tomorrow (Wednesday) covering needs as he and his advisers view them.

We hope he will ask for total mobilization powers and that he will direct the Nation to go into all-out war production now. A limited mobilization such as Washington has been talking about will not be enough. Any limitation on the quality and extent of preparation will be an invitation to actual invasion and national catastrophe.

This is no "scare cry." The President knows, the combined chiefs know, and his Cabinet know that the United States is in greater danger now than it ever has been before in all its history.

That is not the type of challenge to be met by pussy-footing or wishful thinking. There's already been too much of that and an overabundance of infinitely bad guessing on the part of some of our top political and military leaders.

Let us have no more trial balloons on preparedness. Let's not invoke limited mobilization now when the White House knows that total mobilization is inevitable. The people have been kidded about that too long.

Give them the raw truth and the people will go along—all the way. Personal and economic sacrifices are not new to them.

The National Guard and Organized Reserves should be activated without delay.

Vast naval fleets must be recommissioned. The wraps must be taken off armored equipment stored at tank and armored vehicle depots. Arsenals and ordnance depots must be operated on war basis.

Industry must be geared to produce whatever will be needed to support all-out offensive or defensive operations at home and abroad.

Curbs will be necessary on credit and materials. Inflationary buying must be checked. Control thinking and planning will have to bear in mind that wage and price increases beget in kind and that it would not take long for an intolerable economic situation to develop.

The means for establishing all necessary controls must be at hand.

Total preparedness by no means justifies total spending-as-usual. Peacetime public works spending should be tossed out the window forthwith and construction permitted only on those projects related to the people's safety and immediate economic well-being.

Pet projects should be out "for the duration" and no new work which can be deferred should be undertaken.

New Armed Forces expenditures are going to run into many billions. There will probably be tax increases. The people who have to foot the bills will not look with favor on needless and extravagant domestic expenditures in any domestic field not war-related.

The Korean situation is the cue for critical reexamination of funds allocation in the entire public works field. This has become a war year as well as a political campaign year.

Internal security is a major phase of total preparedness. American Communists are going all-out in efforts to thwart mobilization efforts. They'll spy and sabotage wherever they can.

The President must have at hand the authority which will enable the Federal Bureau of Investigation to launch its long and meticulously planned internal enemy round-up.

Stronger alien-control laws are needed. Dangerous, deportable aliens who are on the loose because Communist nations of origin will not accept them must be placed where they can do this country no harm.

Internal security requires a new and completely hard-boiled attitude where spies, traitors and saboteurs are concerned.

As the Commercial Appeal sees it—and it was one of the first and most outspoken opponents of the world Communist trend—a grave national emergency exists. It should so be declared.

Official guessing has been bad in the Korean situation from the start. Piecemeal measures have been made vain and costly substitutes for totality.

The blood of American dead is on the hand of the equivocators, the compromisers and the business-as-usual politicos.

The American people were told that the troops could and would hold the natural barrier which was the Kum River line when those who fed us that sort of cruel and ghastly pap knew that it just couldn't be.

For everything tragic which has happened there has been a pat answer or explanation. Defeat was excused on the ground that it was orderly withdrawal.

The pap-feeders know that every foot of ground lost has got to be retaken and that the price for retaking is going to be American lives and a tremendous amount of American equipment. It will not be done on a limited-mobilization basis.

Adequate training and equipment and the proper type of skilled command leadership alone can keep casualties at minimum and hasten combat successes. Total preparedness means saving the lives of combat individuals.

It is the man in the line we have chiefly in mind now and he's the lad in the air and on and under the sea. He's the brave and lonely soldier in the trench.

He's the American fighting man doing a dirty job about which he has no choice. He's entitled to support in overwhelming strength. He has a right to everything which will increase his efficiency and his chances for survival.

It is time to give it to him even if it takes the shirts off our backs.

Statement Before the United States Committee for Reciprocity Information Re Rice and Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, at the request of many interested parties, I ask unanimous consent to include the statement which I made on June 9, 1950, before the Committee for Reciprocity Information at hearings on that date in connection with the proposed negotiations with 17 nations regarding tariff agreements respecting sugar and the effect that any tampering with these agreements at this time might have with respect to rice and other commodities, particularly with reference to our agreements with Cuba and other countries.

Mr. Speaker, in submitting this statement before the Committee for Reciprocity I think it is fair to say that I prefaced my remarks by giving credit to the United States Cuban Sugar Council; the State Department; the Commerce Department; the Department of Agriculture; the Tariff Commission; and others, in assisting me and furnishing most of the material in the preparation and presentation of this statement.

I also desire to state that Representatives BOGGS and WILLIS, of Louisiana, also appeared at this same hearing and made statements which are of record in the hearings.

Mr. Speaker, we trust that the present existing arrangements with Cuba will not be disturbed, for so to do would disrupt and have dire effect upon many of our industries.

STATEMENT OF HENRY D. LARCADE, JR., UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE, SEVENTH DISTRICT, THE STATE OF LOUISIANA, CONCERNING THE UNITED STATES TARIFF ON SUGAR AND THE PREFERENTIAL RATE FOR CUBAN SUGAR IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROPOSED NEGOTIATIONS WITH 17 NATIONS AT TORQUAY, ENGLAND

This statement is submitted in response to an announcement by the Committee for Reciprocity Information that public hearings will be held, beginning May 24, 1950, on all phases of the forthcoming negotiations at Torquay, England, with 17 nations, etc.

The committee's announcement states:

"In the case of each article in the list with respect to which the corresponding product of Cuba is subject to preferential treatment, the negotiations referred to will involve the elimination, reduction, or continuation of the preference, perhaps with an adjustment or specification at the rate applicable to the product of Cuba."

This argument is made and filed in behalf of the Seventh Congressional District of the State of Louisiana, the largest rice-producing district in the United States, and in opposition to the disturbing or tampering with the mutually beneficial economic and political relationships existing between the United States rice industry and Cuba from the preferential tariff rates granted to each other on a large scale ever since the Reciprocity Convention between the two countries became effective in December 1903. In support of this position, I wish to read in the RECORD the following letter from my constituents, the Louisiana State Rice Milling Co., Inc., of Abbeville, La., dated June 1, 1950, and signed by Frank A. Godchaux, chairman, as follows:

LOUISIANA STATE RICE MILLING CO., INC.,
Abbeville, La., June 1, 1950.

Hon. HENRY DOMINIQUE LARCADE, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I understand that hearings are now on the way before the committee for reciprocity agreements and that certain Government officials are considering eliminating the Cuban sugar tariff preferential of 12½

cents and that Cuban officials are very much disturbed. Our company and all who are interested in the rice industry in this country including farmers who grow rice, are very much interested in maintaining our tariff preferential on rice in Cuba.

Cuba imports approximately 5,000,000 bags of rice annually and because of the tariff preferential enjoyed by this country over rice shipped into Cuba from the Orient and from South American countries, we have been getting the greater portion of this business during the past few years. As you know, our rice production in the United States has increased tremendously. Even with moving around 5,000,000 pockets annually to Cuba, we are now faced with a large rice surplus. If we should lose all or any larger part of Cuba's rice import requirements, it would be disastrous.

Also, the Cuban Government is now encouraging rice growing by their own farmers. This is a threat to our rice business in that country. They have made considerable progress in Cuban rice culture and any unnecessary antagonism on the part of our Government officials could easily increase their efforts toward growing their requirements in rice.

A very large portion of your constituents in Louisiana have a vital interest in retaining profitable outlets for as much rice as possible. Cuba is the only large export market in the Western Hemisphere and we need their rice business badly. We cannot compete with rice grown in the Orient on a low-wage basis unless we have an adequate tariff preferential, and we are afraid that if we remove Cuba's preferential on sugar, they may retaliate by removing our preferential on rice. We, therefore, urge you to look into this question seriously and make sure that nothing is done to endanger our Cuban rice business.

Sincerely,

FRANK A. GODCHAUX,
Chairman.

Also a telegram dated Lake Charles, La., June 8, 1950, signed by Homer Brinkley, General Manager, the American Rice Growers Cooperative Association, as follows:

LAKE CHARLES, LA., *June 8, 1950.*

Congressman HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We request that you present our views set forth herein to the Committee for Reciprocity Information. Our association represents producers of approximately one-half of the rice crop grown in Texas and Louisiana. We are deeply disturbed over the uncertainty and instability in our industry and in Cuba resulting from repeated reopening of the historic policy of mutual tariff preference between our two countries, grounded as it is in mutual benefits to hundreds of commodities in both countries and a four hundred million dollar United States export business to Cuba. The policy has worked for half a century and to bring it under periodic review with its recurring threat of disaster to a vast number of producers is a disservice to both countries.

Elimination or reduction of the tariff preferential on Cuban sugar might well serve as a precedent and be a first step toward downward adjustments of the Cuban sugar quota. If this should happen there would inevitably be tragic repercussions in this country, since our own rice quota in Cuba would unquestionably be similarly reduced.

The United States rice industry depends upon Cuba as a steady and dependable market for about one-fourth of our entire crop. It is the only reliable export market for our rice in the entire world. If the preferential treatment granted Cuba, and particularly Cuban sugar, is reduced we can be sure of like treatment on the part of Cuba affecting United States rice. This would bring us in direct price competition with Asiatic rice. The current support price program in this country establishes a firm price structure at levels which renders our industry completely helpless to meet this competition. The only alternative would be to dump an ever growing surplus on the Commodity Credit Corporation. In turn the only alternative to such dumping would be rigid marketing quotas in order to reduce our production by an amount which could conceivably be more than one-fourth of our present acreage, which would spell disaster to rice producers of this country.

Under recurring threats of war this country needs more than ever to consolidate our position in Cuba. This means we must take no chance of damaging the Cuban sugar industry. In turn rice is of growing importance in the United States. Southeast Asia has always been the rice bowl of the world. Today it is the hot spot of the world. For many years rice has been one of the world's greatest strategic crops. With our deteriorating position in Asia rice produced in the western hemisphere and particularly in this country assumes a degree of importance greater than it has ever heretofore known. We cannot afford to so deplete our production facilities by sharp and needless measures of artificial curtailment that our industry may not adequately serve in the event of an emergency just as we served in both World Wars.

HOMER L. BRINKLEY,
General Manager, American Rice Growers Cooperative Association.

The Louisiana State Rice Milling Company, Inc., and the American Rice Growers Cooperative Association, both operate in the States of Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas, and are reputed to be the largest growers, millers, and exporters of rice in the United States, and particularly in Louisiana and the Seventh Congressional District.

Cuba was the first nation to enter into a reciprocal trade agreement with the United States under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 and has continued to cooperate with this country in encouraging trade between the two nations by amendments to the original agreement and by joining with the United States in the general agreement on tariffs and trade. Reciprocal tariff preferences have constituted an integral part of all these agreements.

There are many reasons why these tariff preferences should be continued.

President Harry S. Truman, in addressing a joint session of Congress on April 19, 1948, the anniversary of Cuba's liberation, said:

"I believe that few nations of differing languages and cultures have drawn so closely together during the last 50 years, freely and without duress, as have Cuba and the United States. Trade between the two nations has increased steadily in volume and in importance. Although our two countries are separated by only 90 miles of water, and vary greatly in size and strength, they collaborate harmoniously on a basis of equal sovereignty and independence of action. This relationship provides living proof of the ability of nations great and small to live in peace and to enjoy the full benefits of commercial and cultural exchange."

President Franklin D. Roosevelt in requesting approval of a new treaty with Cuba on May 29, 1934, said:

"Our relations with Cuba have been and must always be especially close. They are based not only upon geographical proximity, but likewise upon the fact that American blood was shed as well as Cuban blood to gain the liberty of the Cuban people and to establish the Republic of Cuba as an independent power in the family of nations."

LOSS OF CUBAN TARIFF PREFERENTIALS WOULD SERIOUSLY AFFECT UNITED STATES EXPORTS

Reducing or eliminating the United States tariff preferential for Cuban sugar would be injurious to the economy of Cuba, which is largely dependent on its sugar industry, and there is every reason to believe that Cuba would object strongly to any such action, as it did at the Annecy Conference in 1949.

It would be only natural for Cuba to respond by taking the necessary steps under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to reduce or eliminate preferences in its tariffs on United States products. Such action would be certain to have a restrictive effect upon United States exports to Cuba.

Sales of rice to Cuba in 1949 amounted to 592,000,000 pounds, 3½ times the annual average for 1936–40. They were equal to about 23 percent of this country's total rice crop and 52 percent of total rice exports. Rice production in Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, and California, the four States producing virtually the entire United States rice crop, has increased about 69 percent from its 1936–40 average. Increased sales to Cuba have been a major factor in this expansion, and maintenance of the high postwar level of sales is essential to the continued profitable operations of both rice growers and rice millers.

United States exports of lard to Cuba in 1949 were valued at $16,500,000, 21 percent of the total exported from this country. Shipments of United States lard to Cuba have been larger than those to any other nation in each of the last 3 years—1947, 1948, and 1949. Cuban purchases of lard are a significant factor affecting the income of farmers and meat packers in the principal hog-growing States of Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, Minnesota, and Ohio.

Exports of wheat flour from the United States to Cuba were valued at $15,000,000 in 1949, an amount exceeded by sales to only one other country. During the 23-year period ended in 1949, this country's sales of wheat flour to Cuba totaled about $187,000,000. About 15 percent of United States exports of wheat flour went to Cuba prior to 1946. The value of flour exports to Cuba from 1946 through 1949 was greater than in earlier years, but abnormal demands from war-devastated Europe caused the proportion sent to Cuba to decline. Sales of wheat flour are important in maintaining profitable operations in the flour-milling industry of such States as New York, Minnesota, Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Illinois.

Cuba is a major market for dry beans produced in the United States. Exports of dry beans to Cuba in 1949 were valued at $5,000,000, nearly one-third of the total sold abroad and an amount exceeded by sales to only one other country. The Cuban market is vital to the profitable operations of bean growers in the principal producing States of California, Michigan, Colorado, Idaho, New York, Nebraska, and Wyoming.

In 1949 Cubans purchased $18,000,000 worth of cotton manufactures from the United States and another $18,000,000 worth of synthetic fibers and manufactures. Only four nations purchased more cotton manufactures from the United States and only one purchased more synthetic fibers and manufactures than Cuba in 1949. The industrial production and economic prosperity of important textile-manufacturing States, such as North and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Virginia, Tennessee, Texas, Massachusetts, and Connecticut are thus affected by the volume of Cuban purchases.

The United States exported $73,000,000 worth of machinery and vehicles to Cuba in 1949 and another $28,000,000 worth of other metal products. This included automobiles and parts worth $24,000,000, electrical machinery worth $19,000,000, and iron and steel products worth $24,000,000. Sales of these products are particularly important to heavily industrialized States, such as Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey.

Cubans purchased $20,000,000 worth of petroleum products from the United States in 1949, the most important item being motor fuel. Only three nations purchased more motor fuel from the United States in 1949 than Cuba. The Cuban market is thus an important outlet for the products of petroleum refineries in such important refining States as Texas, California, Pennsylvania, Louisiana, Illinois, Indiana, and New Jersey.

Reduction or elimination of Cuban tariff preferentials for this country's goods, therefore, would affect adversely almost every section of the United States. It would be particularly serious to producers of rice, lard, wheat flour, dry beans, cotton and synthetic textiles, machinery and vehicles, other metal products, and petroleum products. Reduction of agricultural exports from the United States to Cuba would, of course, aggravate the problem of surpluses now becoming of serious concern to this country.

UNITED STATES-CUBAN TRADE ADJUSTED TO SYSTEM OF TARIFF PREFERENCES

Trade between the United States and Cuba, important to both countries, has long been adjusted to the existing system of tariff preferences. Since 1902 Cuba's imports from the United States have averaged about two-thirds of its total visible imports.

The United States in this same period has taken an average of about three-fourths of Cuba's visible exports.

The value of both United States exports to Cuba and imports from Cuba reached their recent peaks in 1947, when exports were valued at $492,000,000 and imports at $514,000,000. Invisible items of trade such as interest on loans from United States banks to finance the production of sugar, payments for freight and insurance, and return on United States investments in Cuba should be added to the value of this country's exports to Cuba.

Obviously upsetting the system of preferences would seriously disturb this mutually beneficial trade relationship.

CUBA LONG RECOGNIZED AS PART OF UNITED STATES SUGAR ECONOMY

Historically the United States has always considered Cuba as definitely a part of its sugar economy. Abandoning or reducing the preferential would represent an abrupt and unwise change in what may well be termed the nucleus of a policy repeatedly enunciated by the United States and relied upon by Cuba.

Such change in policy would be contrary to the spirit of the Messersmith-Cortina correspondence of December 1941. At that time, United States Ambassador George S. Messersmith gave assurances that the interest of the Cuban Government in maintaining the position of the Republic of Cuba as a supplier of sugar for the United States market, at least in the same proportion as provided for in the Sugar Act of 1937, which is considered of vital importance to the maintenance of the existing economic relations between both countries, is fully appreciated, and that therefore my Government will make at all times every appropriate and possible effort to safeguard that position. This correspondence was given important recognition in the formulation of the Sugar Act of 1948.

Further, in the reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Peru in 1942, it was stated that the advantages now accorded or which may hereafter be accorded by the United States of America, its territories or possessions or the Panama Canal Zone to one another or to the Republic of Cuba shall be excepted from the operation of this agreement.

Again at Geneva in the negotiations of 1946–47, even though the elimination of all international trade preferentials was considered, the United States-Cuban preferentials were so well recognized that their continuance was specifically permitted by the terms of the general agreement on tariffs and trade which resulted from these negotiations.

On the occasion of the Annecy conference in 1949, it was once again the decision of the United States Government to maintain the tariff preferential in favor of Cuban sugar. There seems to be no reason, a few months later, to alter this decision. The fact that the forthcoming negotiations will be with Peru instead of with the Dominican Republic is of no consequence since the elimination of the Cuban preferential in favor of any party to the general agreement would apply to all parties thereto.

CUBA MOST RELIABLE WARTIME SUPPLIER

During both world wars sugar produced in Cuba was vital to the United States, supplying about half this country's needs. In both emergencies Cuba was the only source from which the United States could obtain the substantial increase in supplies so urgently requested from all areas.

In contrast to the achievement of sugar producers in Cuba in doubling their output in World War II, sugar production in Peru throughout the period of wartime scarcity in the United States was smaller than in the crop year 1940–41. Moreover, sugar producers in Peru did not sell their sugar to the United States at prices offered by this country as did the producers in Cuba, but sold their sugar wherever they could get the highest price.

Sales by producers in Cuba of huge quantities of indispensable sugar at low prices were an important contribution to the war effort. The elimination or even the reduction of the preferential on sugar would certainly not be regarded by producers in Cuba as fitting reciprocity for their cooperation.

REDUCING PREFERENTIAL CONTRARY TO POINT 4

Producers of sugar in Cuba, including many United States citizens whose investments in the industry anticipated President Truman's point-4 program by several decades, have, since 1903, relied upon the tariff preference for Cuban sugar in planning their operations. To lower or eliminate this preference would endanger existing investments of United States citizens in Cuba, contrary to the spirit of the point-4 program.

Wage scales and living conditions in the different areas should be carefully considered in arriving at a final decision. The sugar industry in Cuba, through its liberal wage policy, has made possible standards of living in that country far superior to those of other sugar-exporting nations despite the fact that during the period when these advances were made the other countries were receiving approximately the same price as Cuba for their sugar. It is, therefore, obvious that any dollars accruing to Cuba from the operation of the preferential receive the widest distribution.

Tampering with the preferential would also endanger this country's supply of sugar from its most important source—Cuba—at a time when for reasons of security careful consideration is being given to safeguarding supplies of all strategic materials, including sugar.

EXISTING AGREEMENTS

Both the Reciprocal Trade Agreement of 1934 and the Reciprocity Convention of 1902 between the United States and Cuba provide that the tariff preference on sugar from Cuba shall be at least 20 percent. These agreements are still in existence, although inoperative as long as both the United States and Cuba are parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The operation of the reciprocity convention is suspended also when the trade agreement is in force.

If either the United States or Cuba should withdraw from the general agreement, the 20-percent preference in the tariff rate on Cuban sugar would be effective unless both the trade agreement and the reciprocity convention were abrogated.

EFFECTIVE RATES

The effective United States charge on entering sugar from Cuba into the United States for consumption is $1 per 100 pounds, raw value, and the effective charge on entering sugar from other countries, except the Philippines, is $1.1875. These effective charges consist of an excise tax of 50 cents per 100 pounds, and a tariff of 50 cents on sugar from Cuba, and 68.75 cents on sugar from other countries.

Although the excise tax of 50 cents per 100 pounds is collected on domestically produced sugar, producers of sugar beets and sugarcane in the United States receive subsidies from the Federal Government which are larger than the excise tax paid on their sugar. Since producers in Cuba and other countries receive no subsidies, the sugar excise tax has the effect of an additional tariff on imported sugar.

Thus, the present tariff preferential of 18.75 cents per 100 pounds for Cuban sugar really amounts to only about 15.8 percent of the effective charge, in contrast to the 20 percent preferential provided in the Reciprocity Convention of 1902.

The original provision for a 20-percent tariff preference on Cuban sugar was effective for about 30 years before the present sugar tax and subsidy arrangements existed. The present margin of preference of 18.75 cents per 100 pounds would amount to only approximately 17.6 percent if applied to an effective charge for Cuban sugar at 87.50 cents, which would consist of 37.50 cents tariff, the lowest point to which it can be reduced under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, plus 50 cents excise tax.

CUBAN RATE CAN BE FURTHER REDUCED

The full duty rate on raw sugar from Peru was reduced on January 1, 1948, from 93.75 cents per 100 pounds to 68.75 cents, or by 25 cents, the same amount as the reduction in the tariff on Cuban sugar. This reduction in the full duty rate conformed to the provisions of article I, paragraph 3, of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, although the United States received no concessions from any other nation in return. This reduction certainly should be an important factor in the negotiations with Peru or any other nation.

The United States can rightfully request concessions from Peru or any other nation, therefore, without offering any further reduction in the full duty rate on sugar.

However, if further concessions in the tariff rate on sugar appear desirable, the full duty rate could be reduced another 12.50 cents to 56.25 cents per 100 pounds without reducing the present Cuban preferential providing the rate on sugar from Cuba was reduced to 37.50 cents, to which the President can reduce the Cuban rate under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

QUOTA SYSTEM DOES NOT REMOVE NEED FOR PREFERENTIAL

The system of sugar quotas now in effect in this country under the Sugar Act of 1948 does not remove the need for a tariff preferential in favor of Cuban sugar.

The United States quota for Cuban sugar was originally established and has been maintained solely by United States legislation. New legislation here has at various times changed these quotas. Even at the present time a bill introduced by Puerto Rico is pending in Congress which would reduce the quota for sugar produced in Cuba. The Dominican Republic is also attempting to bring about changes which would lower the quota for Cuba.

Since the quota for Cuban sugar was established and may be changed or abolished unilaterally by the United States, it does not remove the need for a tariff preferential on sugar from Cuba if existing trade and security relationships between the United States and Cuba are to be maintained.

CONCLUSIONS

Maintenance of the present preferential of 18.75 cents per 100 pounds, raw value, in the tariff rate on sugar produced in Cuba is in the best interests of the United States.

If the full duty rate on sugar is reduced, the rate on Cuban sugar should be lowered by an identical amount.

Lowering or eliminating the tariff preference on sugar from Cuba would be injurious to the welfare of the United States because:

1. It would repudiate unilaterally the close and special 47-year-old trade relationships between the United States and Cuba;

2. Cuba might reasonably be expected in turn to lower or eliminate preferences in its tariff on United States goods, thus reducing its imports of the products of this country's farm and factories;

3. It would damage Cuba's economy which has been built largely upon the long-established policy of reciprocity with this country; and

4. It would tend to jeopardize the supply of sugar for the United States in the event of another emergency.

It is recommended that if the full duty rate of sugar (i. e., the rate for countries other than Cuba and the Philippines) is reduced, the rate on Cuban sugar be reduced by at least as great an amount, thereby at least maintaining the present tariff preference of 18.75 cents per 100 pounds, raw value, applicable to sugar from Cuba. Even the present preferential is, in effect, below the historical 20 percent established in 1903. As will be shown later in this statement, the fact that there is presently in effect a United States sugar quota system does not remove the necessity for this preferential.

The Tragic Blunders of Trumanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in view of the war raging in Korea and the general discussion taking place throughout the country as to how the United States now comes to find itself involved in bloody commitments on such far-distant shores, I would like to call the attention of the Congress and the country to a careful and comprehensive analysis of this chain of events which was recently written by Fred C. Christopherson, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., in the form of an editorial appearing in the Daily Argus-Leader of which he is the editor. I think this significant commentary on the fundamental problems of our times merits the thoughtful reading of every freedom-loving American.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column by Jack Lait which is referred to in the Christopherson editorial. Jack Lait is the editor of the New York Daily Mirror and is substituting for Walter Winchell while that columnist is taking a vacation. Mr. Lait's column is an important contribution to our American knowledge of foreign attitudes and policies.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Daily Argus-Leader]

THE TRAGIC BLUNDERS OF TRUMANISM

(By Fred C. Christopherson)

It is becoming increasingly clear that the United States is entering the worst crisis in its history with the most inept leadership it has ever had.

President Truman has blundered on every front—the Washington front, the home front, and the international front. He and his administration have displayed an amazing capacity for doing the wrong thing, the thoughtless thing.

His administration has tolerated the Reds at home and coddled them abroad. With threats of war prominent on the horizon, he dismantled and discarded the greatest fighting machine the world had ever seen. Impotently and blindly, he has moved along a vacillating path.

THE KOREAN DEBACLE

The immediate cause of concern is the fiasco in Korea. The development there reflects a dismal failure in thoughtful leadership.

Apparently we did not know that the North Koreans were massing for battle with great power—an inexcusable blunder on the part of our Intelligence Service.

And we thrust American men and equipment into that battle with an almost criminal lack of understanding of what was in prospect.

Americans generally approved the American stand in Korea at first because they believed our authorities knew the strength of the enemy, had accurately appraised our own power on the scene, and felt that that enemy could be readily repulsed.

Now we know the unpleasant facts. First, we didn't understand the strength of the Koreans; second, we were not qualified to match that strength; third, we did not have the substantial support of the South Koreans, and fourth, we had no certainty of an early victory.

Thus it was a speculative excursion, wholly unwarranted with the flimsy information at hand.

Before President Truman embarked upon the fateful venture into Korea, he should have known the score—what we could do and what the enemy could do. To say that his assistants and advisers were at fault is to dodge the issue. The administration is his. The advisers are his.

POOR SELECTION

It may be assumed that sooner or later circumstances would have compelled us to come to grips with Russia on the battlefield. Recognizing this, the first battlefield should have been one in which we could have functioned to better advantage. Now we are being forced off a narrow peninsula in a desperate rearguard action. The area is one remote from military aid from our potential allies. It appears that we could not have made a poorer choice of a position in which to make our first military stand against the Russians.

DESTROYING OUR STRENGTH

Leaders of the Administration in Washington now say they knew that such a test with Russia was inevitable—that they were certain it was coming.

If that be so, it only accentuates the error.

Why then weren't we more adequately prepared to resist the invader? Congress has not been niggardly in respect to defense appropriations. It has sought—rather feebly at times, to promote economy elsewhere in the Government but few objections have been presented to granting funds for defense in almost any volume declared necessary.

And what happened to the great fighting machine of 1945—a machine so powerful it startled the world by its magnitude? Well, a Sioux Falls soldier says that some of the tanks used by the Russians in Korea are American tanks. The Huron Plainsman pointed out a few days ago that we had 25,045 tanks at the end of the World War II but in 1943 we had only 15,960. Responding to an inquiry from the Hoover Committee, Army officials said they didn't know what had become of the missing 10,000 tanks. Just a slight error in bookkeeping, perhaps. But the tanks that we considered obsolete are among those being employed with effect by the Russians in Korea. Was it common sense to discard our equipment as obsolete before we had improved replacements? No man in his good sense discards a 1948 Ford, for example, because better Fords are being produced in 1950—not at least until he has obtained a 1950 Ford.

Tanks were sold at a fraction of their cost to foreign countries—tanks costing us $270,000 to Belgium for only $10,000, tanks costing us $568,000 to Canada for $17,000.

"What made these tanks obsolete is not clear," the Huron editor says. "We have not produced for use yet any tanks bigger or better than the World War II General Sherman and General Pershing types. A few of those obsolete tanks in Korea with the Twenty-fourth Division in the first 2 weeks of fighting could have done a terrific amount of damage to North Koreans."

The same editor points out that we had 89 fully equipped ground infantry and armored divisions at the end of World War II. Now the Defense Department says it has material enough for only 18 such divisions. Then he asks this pertinent question: "What happened to the equipment for 71 divisions?" Yes, what happened to the equipment? Let the administration answer as best it can.

TRUMAN'S "RED HERRING"

The coddling of the Communists and their sympathizers on the home front has been a national disgrace—a reflection upon our common sense. When Alger Hiss, a top man in the Department of State, was convicted of charges involving the giving of secret documents to a Russian agent, President Truman still maintained that the outcry about Reds in the Government was just "a red herring." And Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, made the almost incredible statement that he did "not turn his back on his friends." He was speaking about Hiss, a man guilty of the infamous crime of treason.

Other revelations of strange attitudes in high places were hushed. Important authorities rushed to the defense of Owen Lattimore, who publicly admitted he had sent his son to be educated in a Communist school in Czechoslovakia. The administration actually sought to besmear the men who were exposing the unpleasant facts instead of doing something about cleaning out the Government.

DUPED AT HOME, TRICKED ABROAD

What is of the past is of the past, we realize full well. But if it be treason to question the purpose and the merit of a governmental policy in this critical period, then so be it.

But the American people should know where we are today and where we are going. What lies ahead, along the course outlined, is the darkest path in American history—not only for America but for the world.

We have been duped at home. And we fear that today we are being tricked abroad—tricked into the type of conflict that will exhaust our resources while sapping only gently those of our major enemy.

Let the truth be known. Let us understand. Let us realize that the small peoples of the world are not so firmly on our side as we would like to believe. In this connection

read carefully the article by Jack Lait in another column on this page today.

WE MAY BE WRONG

What is the answer? What must we do? What should we do? We confess perplexity. In a notable address to the Republican State convention last week Governor Mickelson referred to the "fuzzy thinking" among the Truman Democratic leaders. Therein lies our problem. Our leaders are fuzzy thinkers, and because they are let us not follow them with blind acceptance. Let us think for ourselves. Let us reason out what the prospect is. Let us appraise our war situation and our domestic problem.

Let us be prepared to think with understanding, fully appreciating the fact that as the war situation becomes more acute our sources of information will become more curtailed. And let us be ready to change our minds as the circumstances suggest. We may be right in what we are doing—and we may be wrong.

[From the New York Daily Mirror]

REDS INFECT EUROPE WITH ANTI-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA

(By Jack Lait)

From a keen, trained, professional observer just back after a tour of Europe, I am posted on the up-to-the-hour dope on what dopes we are to expect support or even sympathy from our poor relations over there.

He finds the continent infected with Communist propaganda, which is constant powerful, plausible, attuned to the miseries of each country and its every locality, all anti-American. Thus millions who would not vote for red governments are pounded into the convictions that we are their enemies, that we are doing nothing for them despite Marshall-plan aid, which the average man can't see; that we are smug and rich and fat, shaking our overfed bellies with disgust as we throw a few coppers to the beggars we disdain.

Frenchmen will not fight on our side. They would rather see their country go Communist. They say that couldn't be much worse than what they're getting now. The average workman earns between 10,000 and 15,000 francs a month, $30 to $45. Food and clothing are too expensive. Communism would at least guarantee a minimum of life's staples. The Frenchman resents the GI of the recent war, who was the best-dressed, best-victualed. He refers to our country as "the giant." He remembers that we were the last to enter both World Wars, and says it will be a fine lesson for us to see how it feels to be the first in once for a change. Knowing nothing about national economics, he can't see where the Marshall plan is getting him anything.

The Italian, especially from Rome to the tip of the boot, is existing in squalor and need, 6 years after the shooting stopped. Even in Rome, hundreds of families still live in caves. In the small towns along the invasion coast there is scarcely a home that does not still show the ravages of bombings. The worker earns 24,000 lira a month, about $40, and basic necessities are beyond his means. He sees Yankee tourists throwing their dough around, but he thinks none of it gets to the poor in the cities or the peasants scratching for existence.

Italy, the Balkans, Trieste and Yugoslavia would not stage great popular uprisings against Communist invasion. The Reds have saturated these regions with anti-United States poison—that the Yanks wrecked their houses, their roads, their business establishments; that the Russians came in as foot-soldiers, not with block-busters; that the thousands of families living in ragged tents and roofless houses can thank Uncle Sam. All this is something the simple Italian can visualize, and he shakes his head and says there is something to it, all right.

It is held certain in Trieste that Tito will never go along with any enemy of the Kremlin. He is and always will remain a Communist. No friction with Stalin will change his allegiance. Our State Department, which poured out millions to the Jug dictator, knew it was a gamble, got no substantial assurances in return. In any event, the impression there is that Russia will make no move in the Balkans until after the October harvest is in.

The English openly hate us. The man on the street, who voted the Labor Party into power, is fed up with regimentation and underfed with rationing—a quarter of a pound of meat, two eggs, etc., a week. Wages are lousy, taxes are murder. Instead of feeling that we pitched in with England he thinks we ducked the fight until we were attacked, then did too little too late. American tourists are sidestepping England, where there is no nightlife, no Scotch, no steak, no fun. Our movies show our lives of luxury at home and our newspapers charge the Englishman with ingratitude; he sees nothing to be grateful for—to anyone. He is miserable, confused, shabby and hungry. What happens in Korea means not a thing to him. What happens to the United States is as negligible. And who cares what Russia pulls off in Asia? If Uncle Sam does, let him do something about it. It's none of Britain's business.

Ireland feels that Korea is just another horrible example of the inevitable havoc of arbitrarily dividing politically a nation formed naturally, as has been the sorry case in its own island. If we want to fight to maintain such an anomaly, we're somewhat crazy. Ireland is anti-Communist internally, but not actively hostile to Russia.

The Scotsman, essentially a conservative, has no resentment against us, but shrugs at the Marshall plan, thinks if it were wiped out the Labor government would fall and bring a return of something like sanity. He is against socialization, which is a colossal flop. He wants none of it in practice or in theory. A Scottish member in the House recently raised an uproar, saying Scotland hasn't bitten into an apple within a year. Fruit and other good things of life, the littler Britain gets at all, are gobbled up in London, he charged. Rural areas do with the leavings.

Getting displaced persons into the United States is everywhere abroad regarded as a racket. Bribery and subterfuges have largely taken over the paths to priorities with the International Refugee Organization. Many DP's have money, a good deal of it already transferred to the United States by shady processes. The top trick for those who can grease the ways is to sign up as cooks, farmers, laborers, etc., with no intention of pursuing such occupations over here. The IRO favors those with humble aspirations, apparently suppresses skilled artisans and practitioners who would enter competition against our higher-bracket earners. A 24-year-old Yogoslav aristocrat and his mother, who inherited a shipping company, are high on the list—as a chauffeur and chambermaid. They have arranged to buy a home in Westchester and he is registered at Harvard.

Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is with great satisfaction that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a public statement recently released to the newspapers by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, dated July 20, 1950, which supports S. 3147, introduced by me and 41 other Senators. I welcome the support of the Citizens Committee for this bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Increasing Government expenditures due to the Korean war crisis provide a new and urgent reason for adoption of a Hoover Commission recommendation affecting Federal-State relations, according to Dr. Robert L. Johnson, chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

A bill for creation of a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, based on a proposal of the Hoover Commission, was recently reported in revised form to the Senate.

"Mounting costs of the Federal Government under grants-in-aid to the States for social welfare and other purposes will aggravate the acute fiscal situation brought on by the Korean war crisis," said Dr. Johnson, who is also president of Temple University. "It is increasingly urgent that the Congress set up an agency, as recommended by the Hoover Commission, to make a study of the problems involved in relations between Federal, State and local governments, including the proper functions and activities at the different levels of Government, overlapping taxation, and a growing and uncoordinated burden upon the Federal Government from grants-in-aid to the States.

"The Hoover Commission pointed out that the rapidly increasing demands upon Government in the development of our industrial society, two world wars and a major depression have greatly expanded and extended public services and governmental activities. The cost of all Government—Federal, State and local—the Commission stated, increased from $3,000,000,000 in 1913 to $55,000,000,000 in 1948. Another war will add to the permanent as well as temporary responsibilities of public bodies at all levels.

"An extensive system of grants-in-aid has been developed in an unrelated and haphazard fashion as a means of meeting the financial problems of the lower levels of Government. The Hoover Commission estimated that approximately 40 percent of all funds expended by local governments and 15 percent of all funds expended by State governments were derived from grants-in-aid.

"Assistance to the States has required an expansion in many departments of the Federal Government and an increase in Federal taxation. The States in turn have been forced to assume new obligations with respect to local governments.

"The Federal Government now is faced with the probability of new appropriations for military purposes and with higher taxes rather than the anticipated decrease. New problems are certain to confront the States and local governments if the war situation grows worse.

"By reason of these as well as other factors, it is imperative that steps be taken toward clarifying the chaotic conditions now prevailing in the field of Federal-State relations.

"Recent approval by the Senate Expenditures Committee of a revised bill for creation of a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations should improve the prospect for enactment of this legislation at the present session of Congress. Joint hearings on the subject were held by subcommittees of the Senate and House Expenditures Committees more than a year ago. Revision of the bill originally reported by the Senate Committee in June 1949

should help to speed its passage and enactment into law."

Senate bill 3147, introduced by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, for himself and 41 other Senators and reported by the Senate Expenditures Committee on June 22, would create a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations composed of seven members appointed by the President. All of the members should have experience with or knowledge of the major problems in the field of intergovernmental relations. Not more than four should be from any one political party. The Commission would submit a final report not later than the end of the second fiscal year after enactment of the legislation.

A similar bill, H. R. 8843, has been introduced by Representative MITCHELL, of Washington, and is pending before the House Expenditures Committee.

The bill asserts that since the establishment of the Federal system of Government, no comprehensive survey has been made by the Congress of the relationships existing among the National, State, and local governments, of the allocation of functions and powers among the three governmental levels, or of the distribution of jurisdiction of functions and powers exercised by two or more governmental authorities.

It would be the duty of the Commission under the bill to submit to the Congress specific recommendations as to functions and powers at the different levels of government. In connection with a purpose to provide greater consistency in the fiscal policies of the several levels of government, the Commission would give particular attention to intergovernmental tax immunities, revenue sources, and means for reducing or eliminating intergovernmental tax competition, and grants-in-aid, tax sharing, and other similar measures for adjusting financial resources to the needs of State and local governments.

An earlier bill reported by the Senate Expenditures Committee in June 1949 provided for a permanent rather than a temporary Commission, for 15 members rather than 7, and for selection of members by the President from panels submitted by State, county, and municipal organizations in addition to other members chosen by the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House.

Let's Protect This Country From the Enemies Within Our Gates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is about time that Congress woke up to the fact that this country is being endangered by the enemies "within our gates," some of whom are on the Federal payroll and in key positions to render the greatest disservice to the Nation.

There is no use to mince words about these Communists, traitors, and fellow travelers, who are sabotaging our country from within while our boys are dying on foreign soil.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting at this point a copy of a bill which I have just introduced (H. R. 9271), which, if passed, will do more to protect this country from these subversive elements than anything else that has yet been accomplished.

I hope every Member of Congress, in both Houses, will read this bill carefully and join me in helping to get it enacted into law at the earliest possible moment.

The bill referred to follows:

[H. R. 9271, 81st Cong., 2d sess.]

A bill to protect the American home front against subversive activities, constituting a part of the world Communist movement, which threaten the existence of free, representative self-government in the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950."

NECESSITY FOR LEGISLATION

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) There exists a growing and menacing world Communist movement, the basic objective of which is to overthrow systems of free, representative self-government in those countries where they still survive and to establish in lieu thereof Communist totalitarian dictatorships.

(2) The establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in any country results in the ruthless suppression of all opposition to the party in power, the complete subordination of the rights of individuals to the state, the denial of fundamental rights and liberties, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of religious worship, and results in the maintenance of control over the people through fear, terrorism, and brutality.

(3) The direction and control of the world Communist movement is vested in and exercised by the Communist dictatorship of a foreign country.

(4) In addition to resort or threatened resort to armed aggression, directly or through nations which have become subservient to it, such Communist dictatorship, in furthering the objectives of the world Communist movement, establishes or causes the establishment of, and utilizes, in various countries, organizations which commonly designate themselves as political parties and which are constituent elements of the world Communist movement. Such organizations are not free and independent, but are controlled, directed, and subject to the discipline of such Communist dictatorship.

(5) The organizations so established and utilized in various countries, acting under such control, direction, and discipline, and utilizing tactics of treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups (governmental and otherwise), espionage, sabotage, and terrorism, endeavor to bring about the overthrow of existing governments and the setting up of Communist totalitarian dictatorships which will be subservient to the most powerful existing Communist totalitarian dictatorship.

(6) In working toward the objective, and in carrying on the activities, referred to in paragraph (5), such Communist organizations in various countries are organized on a secret, conspiratorial basis and operate to a substantial extent through organizations, commonly known as Communist fronts, which in most instances are created and maintained, or used, in such manner as to conceal the facts as to their true character and purposes and their membership. One result of this method of operation is that such affiliated organizations are able to obtain financial and other support from persons who would not extend such support if they knew the true purposess of, and the actual nature of the control and influence exerted upon, such Communist fronts.

(7) The successes of Communist methods in other countries and the nature and control of the world Communist movement itself present a clear and present danger to the security of the United States and to the existence of free American institutions, and make it necessary that Congress, in order to provide for the common defense, to preserve the sovereignty of the United States as an independent Nation, and to guarantee to each State a republican form of Government, enact appropriate legislation recognizing the existence and threat of the world-wide Communist conspiracy and designed to prevent it from accomplishing its purpose in the United States.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act—

(1) The term "person" means an individual or an organization.

(2) The term "organization" means an organization, corporation, company, partnership, association, trust, foundation, or fund; and includes a group of persons, whether or not incorporated, permanently or temporarily associated together for joint action on any subject or subjects.

(3) The term "Communist political organization" means any organization in the United States having some, but not necessarily all, of the ordinary and usual characteristics of a political party, which (A) is substantially dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign governmental or political organization controlling the world Communist movement referred to in section 2, and (B) operates primarily to advance the objectives of such world Communist movement.

(4) The term "Communist-front organization" means any organization in the United States (other than a Communist political organization and other than a lawfully organized political party which is not a Communist political organization) which (A) is under the control of a Communist political organization, or (B) is primarily operated for the purpose of giving aid and support to a Communist political organization, a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2.

(5) The term "Communist organization" means a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization.

(6) The term "publication" means any circular, newspaper, periodical, pamphlet, book, letter, post card, leaflet, or other publication.

(7) The term "United States," when used in a geographical sense, includes the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Canal Zone.

(8) The term "interstate or foreign commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication (A) between any State, Territory, or possession of the United States (including the Canal Zone), or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof, or (B) within any Territory or possession of the United States (including the Canal Zone) or within the District of Columbia.

(9) The term "Board" means the Subversive Activities Control Board created by section 13 of this act.

(10) The term "final order of the Board" means an order issued by the Board under section 14 of this act, which has become final as provided in section 15 of this act.

CERTAIN PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to combine, conspire, or agree with any other person to perform any act which would substantially contribute to the establishment within the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship, the direction and control of which is to be vested in, or exercised by or under the domination or control of, any foreign government, foreign

organization, or foreign individual. For purposes of this subsection, the term "totalitarian dictatorship" means a form of government, characterized by (1) the existence of a single political party, with such identity between such party and its policies and the government and governmental policies of the country in which it exists as to render such party and the government itself indistinguishable for all practical purposes, and (2) the forcible suppression of all opposition to such party.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, or of any corporation the stock of which is owned in whole or in part by the United States or any department or agency thereof, to communicate in any manner or by any means, to any other person whom such officer or employee knows or has reason to believe to be an agent or representative of any foreign government or an officer or member of any Communist organization as defined in section 3 of this act, any information of a kind which shall have been classified by the President (or by the head of any such department, agency, or corporation with the approval of the President) as affecting the security of the United States knowing or having reason to know that such information has been so classified, unless such officer or employee shall have been specially authorized by the head of such department, agency, or corporation to make such disclosure of such information.

(c) It shall be unlawful for any agent or representative of any foreign government, or any officer or member of any Communist organization as defined in section 3 of this act, knowingly to obtain or receive, or attempt to obtain or receive, directly or indirectly, from any officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof or of any corporation the stock of which is owned in whole or in part by the United States or any department or agency thereof, any information of a kind which shall have been classified pursuant to subsection (b) of this section as affecting the security of the United States, unless special authorization for such communication shall first have been obtained from the head of the department, agency, or corporation having custody of or control over such information.

(d) Any person who violates any provision of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or by both such fine and such imprisonment, and shall, moreover, be thereafter ineligible to hold any office, or place of honor, profit, or trust created by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

(e) Any person may be prosecuted, tried, and punished for any violation of this section at any time within 10 years after the commission of such offense, notwithstanding the provisions of any other statute of limitations.

(f) Neither the holding of office nor membership in any Communist organization by any person shall constitute a violation of subsection (a) or subsection (c) of this section. The fact of the registration of any person under section 7 or section 8 of this act as an officer or member of any Communist organization shall not be received in evidence against such person in any prosecution for any alleged violation of subsection (a) or subsection (c) of this section.

EMPLOYMENT OF MEMBERS OF COMMUNIST POLITICAL ORGANIZATION

SEC. 5. (a) When an organization is registered, or there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring an organization to register, as a Communist political organization, it shall be unlawful for any member of such organization, with knowledge that such order has become final—

(1) in seeking or accepting any office or employment under the United States, to conceal the fact that he is a member of such organization; or

(2) to hold any nonelective office or employment under the United States.

(b) When an organization is registered, or there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring an organization to register, as a Communist political organization, it shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the United States to appoint or employ any individual as an officer or employee of the United States, knowing that such individual is a member of such an organization.

(c) As used in this section, the term "member" shall not include any individual whose name has not been made public because of the prohibition contained in section 9 (b) of this act.

DENIAL OF PASSPORTS TO MEMBERS OF COMMUNIST POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 6. (a) When an organization is registered, or there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring an organization to register, as a Communist political organization, it shall be unlawful for any member of such organization, with knowledge that such order has become final—

(1) to make application for a passport, or the renewal of a passport, to be issued or renewed by or under the authority of the United States; or

(2) to use or attempt to use any such passport.

(b) When an organization is registered, or there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring an organization to register, as a Communist political organization, it shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the United States to issue a passport to, or renew the passport of, any individual knowing or having reason to believe that such individual is a member of such organization.

(c) As used in this section, the term "member" shall not include any individual whose name has not been made public because of the prohibition contained in section 9 (b) of this act.

REGISTRATION AND ANNUAL REPORTS OF COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 7. (a) Each Communist political organization (including any organization required, by a final order of the Board, to register as a Communist political organization) shall, within the time specified in subsection (c) of this section, register with the Attorney General, on a form prescribed by him by regulations, as a Communist political organization.

(b) Each Communist-front organization (including any organization required, by a final order of the Board, to register as a Communist-front organization) shall, within the time specified in subsection (c) of this section, register with the Attorney General, on a form prescribed by him by regulations, as a Communist-front organization.

(c) The registration required by subsection (a) or (b) shall be made—

(1) in the case of an organization which is a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization on the date of the enactment of this act, within 30 days after such date;

(2) in the case of an organization becoming a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization after the date of the enactment of this act, within 30 days after such organization becomes a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be; and

(3) in the case of an organization which by a final order of the Board is required to register, within 30 days after such order becomes final.

(d) The registration made under subsection (a) or (b) shall be accompanied by a registration statement, to be prepared and filed in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall be regulations prescribe, containing the following information:

(1) The name of the organization and the address of its principal office.

(2) The name and last-known address of each individual who is at the time of the filing of such registration statement, and of each individual who was at any time during the period of 12 full calendar months next preceding the filing of such statement an officer of the organization, with the designation or title of the office so held, and with a brief statement of the duties and functions of such individual as such officer.

(3) An accounting, in such form and detail as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, of all moneys received and expended (including the sources from which received and the purposes for which expended) by the organization during the period of twelve full calendar months next preceding the filing of such statement.

(4) In the case of a Communist political organization, the name and last-known address of each individual who was a member of the organization at any time during the period of twelve full calendar months preceding the filing of such statement.

(5) In the case of any officer or member whose name is required to be shown in such statement, and who uses or has used or who is or has been known by more than one name, each name which such officer or member uses or has used or by which he is known or has been known.

(e) It shall be the duty of each organization registered under this section to file with the Attorney General on or before February 1 of the year following the year in which it registers, and on or before February 1 of each succeeding year, an annual report, prepared and filed in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, containing the same information which by subsection (d) is required to be included in a registration statement, except that the information required with respect to the 12-month period referred to in paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of such subsection shall, in such annual report, be given with respect to the calendar year preceding the February 1 on or before which such annual report must be filed.

(f) (1) It shall be the duty of each organization registered under this section to keep, in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, accurate records and accounts of moneys received and expended (including the sources from which received and purposes for which expended) by such organization.

(2) It shall be the duty of each Communist political organization registered under this section to keep, in such manner and form as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, accurate records of the names and addresses of the members of such organization and of persons who actively participate in the activities of such organization.

(g) It shall be the duty of the Attorney General to send to each individual listed in any registration statement or annual report, filed under this section, as an officer or member of the organization in respect of which such registration statement or annual report was filed, a notification in writing that such individual is so listed; and such notification shall be sent at the earliest practicable time after the filing of such registration statement or annual report. Upon written request of any individual so notified who denies that he holds any office or membership (as the case may be) in such organization, the Attorney General shall forthwith initiate and conclude at the earliest practicable time an appropriate investigation to determine the truth or falsity of such denial, and, if the Attorney General shall be satisfied that such denial is correct, he shall thereupon strike from such registration statement or annual report the name of such individual.

If the Attorney General shall decline or fail to strike the name of such individual from such registration statement or annual report within 5 months after receipt of such written request, such individual may file with the Board a petition for relief pursuant to section 14 (b) of this act.

(h) In the case of failure on the part of any organization to register or to file any registration statement or annual report as required by this section, it shall be the duty of the executive officer (or individual performing the ordinary and usual duties of an executive officer) and of the secretary (or individual performing the ordinary and usual duties of a secretary) of such organization, and of such officer or officers of such organization as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe, to register for such organization, to file such registration statement, or to file such annual report, as the case may be.

REGISTRATION OF MEMBERS OF COMMUNIST POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 8. Each individual who is a member of any organization which he knows to be registered as a Communist political organization under section 7 (a) of this act, but which has failed to include his name upon the list of members thereof filed with the Attorney General, shall within 60 days after he shall have obtained such knowledge register with the Attorney General as a member of such organization. The registration made by such individual shall be accompanied by a registration statement, to be prepared and filed in such manner and form, and containing such information as the Attorney General shall by regulations prescribe.

KEEPING OF REGISTERS; PUBLIC INSPECTION; REPORTS TO PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

SEC. 9. (a) The Attorney General shall keep and maintain separately in the Department of Justice—

(1) a "Register of Communist Political Organizations," which shall include (A) the names and addresses of all Communist political organizations registered under section 7, (B) the registration statements and annual reports filed by such organizations thereunder, and (C) the registration statements filed by individuals under section 8; and

(2) a "Register of Communist-Front Organizations," which shall include (A) the names and addresses of all Communist-front organizations registered under section 7, and (B) the registration statements and annual reports filed by such organizations thereunder.

(b) Such registers shall be kept and maintained in such manner as to be open for public inspection: *Provided*, That the Attorney General shall not make public the name of any individual listed in either such register as an officer or member of any Communist organization until 60 days shall have elapsed after the transmittal of the notification required by section 7 (g) to be sent to such individual, and if prior to the end of such period such individual shall make written request to the Attorney General for the removal of his name from any such list, the Attorney General shall not make public the name of such individual until 6 months shall have elapsed after receipt of such request by the Attorney General, or until 30 days shall have elapsed after the Attorney General shall have denied such request and shall have transmitted to such individual notice of such denial, whichever is earlier.

(c) The Attorney General shall submit to the President and to the Congress on or before June 1 of each year (and at any other time when requested by either House by resolution) a report with respect to the carrying out of the provisions of this Act, including the names and addresses of the organizations listed in such registers and (except to the extent prohibited by subsection (b) of this section) the names and addresses of the individuals listed as members of such organizations.

MEMBERSHIP IN CERTAIN COMMUNIST POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 10. It shall be unlawful for any individual to become or remain a member of any organization if he knows that (1) there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring such organization to register under section 7 of this act as a Communist political organization, (2) more than 30 days have elapsed since such order became final, and (3) such organization is not registered under section 7 of this Act as a Communist political organization.

USE OF MAILS AND INSTRUMENTALITIES OF INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE

SEC. 11. It shall be unlawful for any organization which is registered under section 7, or for any organization with respect to which there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring it to register under section 7, or for any person acting for or on behalf of any such organization—

(1) to transmit or cause to be transmitted, through the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce, any publication which is intended to be, or which it is reasonable to believe is intended to be, circulated or disseminated among two or more persons, unless such publication, and any envelope, wrapper, or other container in which it is mailed or otherwise circulated or transmitted, bears the following, printed in such manner as may be provided in regulations prescribed by the Attorney General, with the name of the organization appearing in lieu of the blank: "Disseminated by ————, a Communist organization"; or

(2) to broadcast or cause to be broadcast any matter over any radio or television station in the United States, unless such matter is preceded by the following statement, with the name of the organization being stated in place of the blank: "The following program is sponsored by ————, a Communist organization."

DENIAL OF TAX DEDUCTIONS AND EXEMPTION

SEC. 12. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no deduction for Federal income-tax purposes shall be allowed in the case of a contribution to or for the use of any organization if at the time of the making of such contribution (1) such organization is registered under section 7, or (2) there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring such organization to register under section 7.

(b) No organization shall be entitled to exemption from Federal income tax, under section 101 of the Internal Revenue Code, for any taxable year if at any time during such taxable year (1) such organization is registered under section 7, or (2) there is in effect a final order of the Board requiring such organization to register under section 7.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

SEC. 13. (a) There is hereby established a Board, to be known as the Subversive Activities Control Board, which shall be composed of three members, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, not more than two members of the Board shall be members of the same political party. One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 2 years, and one for a term of 3 years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of 3 years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Board. Any member of the Board may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

(b) A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Board, and two members of the Board shall, at all times, constitute a quorum. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(c) The Board shall at the close of each fiscal year make a report in writing to the Congress and to the President stating in detail the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees of the Board, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed.

(d) Each member of the Board shall receive a salary of $12,500 a year, shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(e) It shall be the duty of the Board—

(1) upon application made by the Attorney General under section 14 (a) of this act, or by any organization under section 14 (b) of this act, to determine whether any organization is a "Communist political organization" within the meaning of paragraph (3) of section 3 of this act, or a "Communist-front organization" within the meaning of paragraph (4) of section 3 of this act; and

(2) upon application made by the Attorney General under section 14 (a) of this act, or by any individual under section 14 (b) of this act, to determine whether any individual is a member of any Communist political organization registered, or by final order of the Board required to be registered, under section 7 (a) of this act.

(f) Subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, the Board may appoint and fix the compensation of a secretary and such examiners and other personnel as may be necessary for the performance of its functions.

(g) The Board may make such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, as may be necessary for the performance of its duties.

PROCEEDINGS BEFORE BOARD

SEC. 14. (a) Whenever the Attorney General shall have reason to believe that any organization which has not registered under subsection (a) or subsection (b) of section 7 of this act is in fact an organization of a kind required to be registered under such subsection, or that any individual who has not registered under section 8 of this act is in fact required to register under such section, he shall file with the Board and serve upon such organization or individual a petition for an order requiring such organization or individual to register pursuant to such subsection or section, as the case may be.

(b) Any organization registered under subsection (a) or subsection (b) of section 7 of this act, and any individual registered under section 8 of this act, may, not oftener than once in each calendar year, make application to the Attorney General for the cancellation of such registration and (in the case of such organization) for relief from obligation to make further annual reports. Within 60 days after the denial of any such application by the Attorney General, the organization or individual concerned may file with the Board and serve upon the Attorney General a petition for an order requiring the cancellation of such registration and (in the case of such organization) relieving such organization of obligation to make further annual reports. Any individual authorized by section 7 (g) of this act to file a petition for relief may file with the Board and serve upon the Attorney General a petition for an order requiring the Attorney General to strike his name from the registration statement or annual report upon which it appears.

(c) Upon the filing of any petition pursuant to subsection (a) or subsection (b) of

this section, the Board (or any member thereof or any examiner designated thereby) may hold hearings, administer oaths and affirmations, may examine witnesses and receive evidence at any place in the United States, and may require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, correspondence, memoranda, and other records deemed relevant to the matter under inquiry. Subpenas may be signed and issued by any member of the Board or any duly authorized examiner. Subpenas shall be issued on behalf of the organization or the individual who is a party to the proceeding upon request and upon a statement or showing of general relevance and reasonable scope of the evidence sought. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such documentary evidence may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing. Witnesses summoned shall be paid the same fees and mileage paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States. In case of disobedience to a subpena the Board may invoke the aid of any court of the United States in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence. Any of the district courts of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such inquiry is carried on may, in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person, issue an order requiring such person to appear (and to produce documentary evidence if so ordered) and give evidence relating to the matter in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. All process in any such case may be served in the judicial district whereof such person is an inhabitant or wherever he may be found.

(d) All hearings conducted under this section shall be public. Each party to such proceeding shall have the right to present its case with the assistance of counsel, to offer oral or documentary evidence, to submit rebuttal evidence, and to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts. An accurate stenographic record shall be taken of the testimony of each witness, and a transcript of such testimony shall be filed in the office of the Board.

(e) In determining whether any organization is a Communist political organization, the Board shall take into consideration—

(1) the extent to which its policies are formulated and carried out and its activities performed, pursuant to directives or to effectuate the policies of the foreign government or foreign governmental or political organization in which is vested, or under the domination or control of which is exercised, the direction and control of the world Communist movement referred to in section 2 of this act;

(2) the extent to which its views and policies do not deviate from those of such foreign government or foreign organization;

(3) the extent to which it receives financial or other aid, directly or indirectly, from or at the direction of such foreign government or foreign organization;

(4) the extent to which it sends members or representatives to any foreign country for instruction or training in the principles, policies, strategy, or tactics of such world Communist movement;

(5) the extent to which it reports to such foreign government or foreign organization or to its representatives;

(6) the extent to which its principal leaders or a substantial number of its members are subject to or recognize the disciplinary power of such foreign government or foreign organization or its representatives;

(7) the extent to which (i) it fails to disclose, or resists efforts to obtain information as to, its membership (by keeping membership lists in code, by instructing members to refuse to acknowledge membership, or by any other method); (ii) its members refuse to acknowledge membership therein; (iii) it fails to disclose, or resists efforts to obtain information as to, records other than membership lists; (iv) its meetings are secret; and (v) it otherwise operates on a secret basis; and

(8) the extent to which its principal leaders or a substantial number of its members consider the allegiance they owe to the United States as subordinate to their obligations to such foreign government or foreign organization.

(f) In determining whether any organization is a "Communist-front organization," the Board shall take into consideration—

(1) the extent to which persons who are active in its management, direction, or supervision, whether or not holding office therein, are active in the management, direction, or supervision of, or as representatives of any Communist political organization, Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2; and

(2) the extent to which its support, financial or otherwise, is derived from any Communist political organization, Communist foreign government, or the word Communist movement referred to in section 2; and

(3) the extent to which its funds, resources, or personnel are used to further or promote the political objectives of any Communist political organization, Communist foreign government or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2; and

(4) the extent to which the positions taken or advanced by it from time to time on matters of policy do not deviate from those of any Communist political organization, Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2.

(g) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the Board determines—

(1) that an organization is a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order requiring such organization to register as such under section 7 of this Act; or

(2) that an individual is a member of a Communist political organization (including an organization required by final order of the Board to register under section 7 (a)), it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such individual an order requiring him to register as such under section 8 of this act.

(h) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the Board determines—

(1) that an organization is not a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts; issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order denying his petition for an order requiring such organization to register as such under section 7 of this act; and send a copy of such order to such organization; or

(2) that an individual is not a member of any Communist political organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts; issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order denying his petition for an order requiring such individual to register as such member under section 8 of this act; and send a copy of such order to such individual.

(i) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (b) of this section, the Board determines—

(1) that an organization is not a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts; issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order requiring him to cancel the registration of such organization and relieve it from the requirement of further annual reports; and send a copy of such order to such organization; or

(2) that any individual is not a member of any Communist political organization, or (in the case of an individual listed as an officer of a Communist-front organization) that an individual is not an officer of a Communist-front organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts; issue and cause to be served upon the Attorney General an order requiring him to (A) strike the name of such individual from the registration statement or annual report upon which it appears or (B) cancel the registration of such individual under section 8, as may be appropriate; and send a copy of such order to such individual.

(j) If, after hearing upon a petition filed under subsection (b) of this section, the Board determines—

(1) that an organization is a Communist political organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such organization an order denying its petition for the cancellation of its registration and for relief from the requirement of further annual reports; or

(2) that an individual is a member of a Communist political organization, or (in the case of an individual listed as an officer of a Communist-front organization) that an individual is an officer of a Communist-front organization, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and cause to be served on such individual an order denying his petition for an order requiring the Attorney General (A) to strike his name from any registration statement or annual report on which it appears or (B) to cancel the registration of such individual under section 8, as the case may be.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 15. (a) The party aggrieved by any order entered by the Board under subsection (g), (h), (i), or (j) of section 14 may obtain a review of such order in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia by filing in the court, within 60 days from the date of service upon it of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the Board be set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Board, and thereupon the Board shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including all evidence taken and the report and order of the Board. Thereupon the court shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and shall have power to affirm or set aside the order of the Board. The findings of the Board as to the facts, if supported by the preponderance of the evidence, shall be conclusive. If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Board and to be adduced upon the proceeding in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper. The Board may modify its findings as to the facts, by reason of the addi-

tional evidence so taken, and it shall file such modified or new findings, which, if supported by the preponderance of the evidence, shall be conclusive, and its recommendations, if any, with respect to action in the matter under consideration. If the court shall set aside an order issued under subsection (j) of section 14 it may, in the case of an organization, enter a judgment canceling the registration of such organization and relieving it from the requiremnt of further annual reports, or in the case of an individual, enter a judgment requiring the Attorney General (A) to strike the name of such individual from the registration statement or annual report on which it appears, or (B) cancel the registration of such individual under section 8, as may be appropriate. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court upon certiorari, as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

(b) Any order of the Board issued under section 14 shall become final—

(1) upon the expiration of the time allowed for filing a petition for review, if no such petition has been duly filed within such time; or

(2) upon the expiration of the time allowed for filing a petition for certiorari, if the order of the Board has been affirmed or the petition for review dismissed by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and no petition for certiorari has been duly filed; or

(3) upon the denial of a petition for certiorari, if the order of the Board has been affirmed or the petition for review dismissed by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia; or

(4) upon the expiration of 10 days from the date of issuance of the mandate of the Supreme Court, if such Court directs that the order of the Board be affirmed or the petition for review dismissed.

PENALTIES

SEC. 16. (a) If there is in effect with respect to any organization or individual a final order of the Board requiring registration under section 7 or section 8 of this act—

(1) such organization shall, upon conviction of failure to register, to file any registration statement or annual report, or to keep records as required by section 7, be punished for each such offense by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000; and

(2) each individual having a duty under subsection (h) of section 7 to register or to file any registration statement or annual report on behalf of such organization, and each individual having a duty to register under section 8, shall, upon conviction of failure to so register or to file any such registration statement or annual report, be punished for each such offense by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000, or imprisonment for not less than 2 years and not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

For the purposes of this subsection, each day of failure to register, whether on the part of the organization or any individual, shall constitute a separate offense.

(b) Any individual who, in a registration statement or annual report filed under section 7 or section 8, willfully makes any false statement or willfully omits to state any fact which is required to be stated, or which is necessary to make the statements made or information given not misleading, shall upon conviction thereof be punished for each such offense by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not less than 2 years and not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment. For the purposes of this subsection—

(1) each false statement willfully made, and each willful omission to state any fact which is required to be stated, or which is necessary to make the statements made or information given not misleading, shall constitute a separate offense; and

(2) each listing of the name or address of any one individual shall be deemed a separate statement.

(c) Any organization which violates any provision of section 11 of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished for each such violation by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000. Any individual who violates any provision of section 5, 6, 10, or 11 of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished for each such violation by a fine of not less than $2,000 and not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not less than 2 years and not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 17. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remaining provisions of this act, or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

The Struggle With Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 31 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the interesting article yesterday in the New York Times Sunday magazine section by Miss Barbara Ward, the famous foreign editor of the Economist of London. In this piece Miss Ward points up the strange paradox of today's world by which the Soviet apostles of materialism have appropriated to themselves the peace campaign and, far from preaching a creed based on their economic dogma, they are as Miss Ward says "the poets, the romantics." On our side, as Miss Ward points out—in spite of the lessons of the war and the Marshall plan, and in spite of the extraordinary achievements of western thought—it is we who have been the apostles of economics, "the gloomy science." Miss Ward brilliantly summarizes "the Russian idea, for all its hideousness, presents a picture of the world; we, for all our good intentions, have none." She is to be congratulated on this remarkable piece and I commend it not only to all Members of Congress but to political leaders not only in the United States but throughout the western world.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE ARE DAYS FOR POETRY, NOT STATISTICS—TO WIN IDEOLOGICALLY, AS WELL AS IN THE FIELD, WE MUST MAKE OUR VISION MATCH OUR ECONOMICS

(By Barbara Ward)

LONDON.—The peoples of the West have been reluctant to believe that they are engaged in a life-and-death struggle with communism in which every power, every technique, and every resource of the enemy is ranged against them. They are peaceable folks and cannot bring themselves to admit that any world movement could be as ruthless and single-minded as is the Communist faith. But open aggression in Korea has perhaps shaken the last unwilling soul into an admission of the facts. The struggle is engaged on every front—above all, on the decisive frontier of the human spirit.

The old saying, "Know thy adversary," is especially vital to this struggle of ideas. The Korean war must be seen in its wider context of a Communist attempt to capture the mind of the whole world in its net of propaganda. Unhappily, it is precisely in relation to propaganda that we in the West make the worst mistakes about our adversary and are most ill-judgedly complacent about our own performance. Ask most of us in the West, who are all interested in "the Soviet view of life," to define it, and we will quickly tell you that its fundamental mistake is to confuse economics with life.

To be a Marxist, we explain, is to believe that economics fundamentally determine all the rest and that the ideas and philosophies and aspirations of any given society are simply a sort of superstructure built on top of brute economic facts, such as its property relations and its methods of producing wealth.

Then we make short work of this preposterous vision of man and history. Who can convince us of the "class conditioning" of Shakespeare? Who can explain the incredible role of Jewry in world history by referring to its origins as a pastoral hill people of Judea? Why should American capitalism differ in most of its political objectives from German capitalism? Why should Tito break away? Why, if we go back to the dawn of history, do we find man, the "tool-using animal," adorning his cave with hunting scenes of unparalleled force and grace?

Up go the skittles of Marxist theory and down the alley thunder our triumphant rebuttals. We note with grim pleasure the antics of our Communist opponents as they gather for their intellectual congresses in Wroclaw or the Waldorf-Astoria and call us the jackals of capitalism and imperialist lick-spittles. "Ah," we say, "our criticisms have struck home," and we lay down our pens with the exhilarating feeling of having won a round for freedom and the Western way of life.

But have we? The one point which seems most marked about Soviet policy and Soviet propaganda since the war is its indifference to economics. The motives to which the Soviet leaders try to make the greatest appeal have little or nothing to do with economic self-interest and at no time is it ever suggested that any Russian policy might be changed or conditioned by economic factors.

This is not only true of the peace campaign. It is true in a much more general sense, since Soviet propaganda seeks to infuse into every issue the vision of a vast cosmic war proceeding between the powers of Communist light and capitalist darkness. In apocalyptic terms, they paint the struggle between the world's toilers and their imperialist oppressors and proclaim that mankind is witnessing the death throes of the beast. Through this darkened world of menacing evil, the Soviet Union with Stalin at its head cleaves the radiant path of deliverance. While the tanks thunder by in vast military reviews, the Soviet radio breaks into poetry and broadcasts to the world:

"Spring has come. It has come here, it has come in China, in the new streets of Warsaw, in Prague, in the gardens of Bucharest, in the villages of Bulgaria. The banner of victory flies over us. The spring of humanity is with us. It is nearing the workers' suburbs of Paris; it is marching like a master upon the piazzas of Rome. In Calcutta, Karachi and Bombay, it sings of freedom. Our Stalin, whose hand guides the

spring of humanity, is leading us to victory."

No, decidedly, the Russians are not economists. They are poets, they are romantics. Their strength is the scale of their huge and perverted view of the world. To devote one's self to ridiculing their economic view of history is a waste of time. They have no such thing. In fact, the opposite is the truth. It is we in the West who are the economists. We are the economic men.

For a hundred years we have seemed to run our world on a profit and loss account. Our international relations have been a web of commercial treaties, exchange rates, gold points and standards, commodity schemes, bulk purchase and balances on international account. In our domestic politics, the great event of the parliamentary year has been the elaboration and infinitely prolonged discussion of the budget.

Nor is our economic bias betrayed only by the content of politics. For years, our methods and tactics, too, have seemed to be rigidly determined by economics. Who but men permeated with economics to the core of their being could have worked out theories of international trade according to which the blind workings of economic forces would be relied on to bring trade and wealth and employment perpetually into balance? Who but the most complacent economists could have adopted theories of internal development in which a natural equilibrium would be perpetually restored between demand and supply, provided the hand of man did not intervene in the mechanism?

Economists at this point became more than the staple content of policy. It was elevated into a destiny, a goddess of the market place, an ultimate arbiter beyond which neither politics nor humanity nor hope nor vision could be permitted to go. Round the universe, round the state, round each small life rose these bastions of economic possibility and impossibility. In their name, world trade fell by two-thirds in 1929. In their name, 2,000,000 men never found work in Britain between 1930 and 1938. In their name, American steel production fell from 60,000,000 tons to 11,000,000 in the deepest year of the depression, 1932. But since it was the blind goddess that willed these things, they could not be undone. Can it be denied that all this amounted to an almost totally economic view of man?

Only in certain desperate crises was the West apparently prepared to seek out another deity. After a brief attempt in the autumn of 1939 to fight a war as though all the economic rules still held good, Britain returned in 1940 to the headlong effort of 1917 and 1918 and soon far surpassed it. Then the American economy put itself into gear, and by 1944 it had performed the prodigious feat of doubling itself. Another economy as large as that of 1939 had been placed on top of the earlier one in four short years.

One can assign an infinite number of practical reasons for the achievement, but the crucial reason is that western man ceased to be an economist and became instead a being in pursuit of a vision—the vision of victory. The ineluctable economic laws were no match for that ardent pursuit. The community of which the economists predicted saturation with a national income of $90,000,000,000 found double the quantity at its disposal. The idea vanquished the supposed law. Economic conditioning gave way to political decision. Vision conquered necessity.

Since 1945, since the very day of victory, the economist and the visionary have struggled for mastery in the western breast. The instinct to return to the rigidly economic computation of possibility is strong in all of us. The economists' picture of a world in which natural forces of balance do man's work for him has the weight of a century's tradition behind it. It has also the immense appeal of simplicity. It is easier to let things be than to seek to control them. Passivity is more congenial than creation. The poet is notoriously an uncomfortable fellow. It is true that the whole experiment of the Marshall plan has shown in the last three years that we are not yet all of us economists and that the western nose is not yet tightly pressed back to the balance sheet of international exchange. And we have had our reward in stealing, for these years at least, the initiative from the Promethean propagandists on the other side of the Iron Curtain.

But now, with Stalin's Korean adventure clear in our minds, we have come to the parting of the ways. Up to the very moment of the Communist aggression of June 25, we were showing every sign of drifting back to the old adoration of blind economic deities. We could catch ourselves out quite seriously saying that trade would balance at such and such a level and that it was a great pity it did not permit Europe to feed as well as it did before the war. We could hear ourselves arguing that the flow of international capital would be so and so and unhappily this did not permit any striking economic development in southeast Asia.

We estimated that the world's demand for raw materials would be so much and remarked that "It is really sad that such a level condemns the East to unrelieved economic depression." We contemplated settling Europe's trade balance with the United States by a further slashing of imports, although the cuts made already have sent 500,000 people out of America's export trades. The British wondered whether they could accept the economic risk of a Schuman plan; the Belgians declared they dared not expose their "hard" franc to the risk of higher domestic investment; the Germans and the Japanese demanded their share of the world's export markets, and other traders could see no way in which international trade could expand to hold them all.

It looked as though, in spite of the lessons of the war, in spite of the lesson of the Marshall plan, in spite of the extraordinary achievements of western thought and experiment and technique since 1939, "the gloomy science," the unchanged habits of economic thought, were creeping back on us on every side. While the Russians fought with visions of angels and devils, of world chaos and world salvation, we were putting on the high black hat and dusty coat of Ricardo and unfurling the umbrella of John Stuart Mill. While they "struggled with beasts at Ephesus," we totaled up our columns and announced with a sad shake of the head, "It cannot be done. We cannot afford it."

The lightning American reaction to aggression in Korea has called a halt to this terrifying process. It was not as a calculator or as a defender of narrow economic interests that President Truman decided to place the might of the United States behind the United Nations. He acted—and the people acted with him—on the strength of an idea, the idea of driving aggression from the world by collective action to check it at its very source. The effect has been electrifying. The sagging mood of the west has grown taut. Congress, unwilling to vote a few millions for the development of backward areas, has agreed to an extra $10,000,000,000 for military expansion. The spirit of the audit office has faded. In its place has come determination and courage placed at the service of an idea.

But what next? The Korean campaign is only one incident in a tremendous battle for the soul of the world and, while it is more inspiring to prevent aggression than to sit back and say we cannot afford to, it is nevertheless still a partly negative and defensive attitude. We have served notice on mankind that we are opposed to communism and can be so effectively. They do not yet know what we are effectively prepared to support.

This is the crux of the matter. The Russian idea, for all its hideousness, presents a picture of the world. We, for all our good intentions, have none. To the peoples most menaced and most tempted by communism—the workers of Europe, the peasants of Asia, the emerging peoples of Africa—it is not enough to say, "We will prevent this vile thing from spreading." This is the point at which the test comes—are we economists or are we visionaries, are we profit-and-loss experts or have we some spark in our souls of the infinite spirit of man? Korea is a start. It shows that the mood of the Battle of Britain and of the Pacific campaigns is not dead. But the peoples of the world ask more. They ask first for defense, perhaps, but beyond it they seek a rational hope.

If today some poet or statesman or prophet among us would give us this rational hope and this unifying idea of a free world order and would create in us the sense of common purpose that defeated all our tired physical and economic calculations after 1940, the resources actually necessary to create such a world are probably not one-tenth those which are absorbed in the destruction of war. A 50-year era of development would be infinitely less costly than a 5-year era of total war.

But our imagination is still not stirred by any such vision of unity and expansion, and since it is not, we may still fall back into the hands of the calculators, of the economists who can tell us how much we can afford at this level of activity and industry but can never saddle Pegasus and raise us to those higher levels of effort and achievement at which our present physical inhibitions would seem no more than a bad dream.

The economic men of the West, as they sharpen their pens and denounce the materialism of the Marxists, are a spectacle indeed for the sardonic gods of history. The men they criticize have in their own perverted way long since left economics behind. They have opted for poetry even if it is the poetry of death. And we, it seems, hope to counter Orpheus with a balance sheet, and win the greatest struggle in human history with a very precise calculation of figures and not a thought for the real allies of the free spirit, for the exultations, agonies, and love, and man's unconquerable mind.

Fight for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at the public hearings of the Banking and Currency Committee on H. R. 9176 the Honorable W. Stuart Symington, chairman of the National Resources and Security Board, brought home to us the seriousness of the world situation we are facing when in next to the final paragraph of his prepared statement he used the words, "If this Nation is to survive."

Today on my desk I found the August 1, 1950 release of the Independent Editorial Services of which Gen. T. A. McInerny is the editor and publisher, and in which appears the following:

This is a fight for survival and it is not wise any longer to undermine public confidence in our constitutional leadership.

I am extending my remarks to include the entire text of General McInerny's article titled "Truman's Task."

TRUMAN'S TASK

Most of us believe in giving credit where it is due. Without regard to political taste, we believe that the man and President Harry Truman is getting open and covert support for his handling of the gigantic responsibilities which have descended upon him like an avalanche since he took office.

He alone made the decision on the use of the atomic bomb which probably saved the lives of a couple of hundred thousand GI's.

He instituted the Truman program which saved Greece and probably the Mediterranean from Bolshevism.

He used no gloves when it was a case of the United States versus John L. Lewis.

He O. K.'d the various moves of the Justice Department in the cases of the top Communists and Bridges.

He pushed the Marshall plan, steadily and patiently.

He has faced in order the problems of demobilization, reconversion, reconstruction, renewal of public works, economic dislocations, and then rearmament and now war again.

The problems were complicated by domestic politics, labor unrest and furious attacks of special interests. Powerful columnists and commentators have ridiculed and harassed him. Only human, and possibly lonely in the cloistered responsibilities of the greatest crisis in all human history, he has persevered.

He has made mistakes and slips of the tongue. He is a natural target for little men although some of them sound big.

The people who shout "He got us into this mess," seems to forget Joe Stalin. People who find events of the past 10 years too tough, have forgotten Hitler and Stalin both.

The President pretends to no occult powers of divination. He has had problems hurled at him of size and intensity, given to no other man in history.

He has thrown some shrewd punches, but his antagonist is a puncher too. We can all get out of this crisis if we are able to give and take as the President is doing.

Many less humble and more pretentious men have buckled and broken under strains far less than those which have been imposed on Harry Truman.

It should be the hope of every American that less captious clamor be heard. This is a fight for survival and it is not wise any longer to undermine public confidence in our constitutional leadership.

Without hero worship, we should learn to be temperate as we consider the tasks of the Presidency.

Thoughts for a Grim Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave of extension of remarks, I include a very appropriate editorial from the July 30 issue of the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., which I commend. The editorial follows:

THOUGHTS FOR A GRIM DAY

There are a few things that should not be forgotten on this grim Sunday, as an American Army prepares to stand or die in the South Korean hills.

The order which General Walker has given to his troops is pitched to a note of harsh finality. "Everybody in this Army knows we must hold along the lines we now have. * * * There is no thought of a Dunkerque. * * * It would be impossible for us to get out. * * * The thought in the minds of every one is to keep fighting—that no one individual, squad, company, or higher unit under any conditions will surrender."

So there they are, a few thousand boys from Washington, Virginia, Maryland, and most of the other States, backed into the hills of a far-away land and committed to a battle which they must win if they are not to die.

We, the American people, sent them there. The actual decision, of course, was made by the President upon the advice of his military and civilian advisers. If our troops should be driven into the sea it may be argued that both the decision and the advice were bad. But that question is not the thing that should concern us most today. As we sit here, comfortable and far from the scene of battle, we should be asking ourselves why it is that the most powerful Nation in the world (at least, this is the way we like to speak of ourselves) is shown, when the test comes, to be so shamefully weak. Why is it that an American Army, short of manpower, lacking in equipment, and starved for reinforcements, should find itself in such a desperate position?

It is easy to blame a few individuals—to say that one man made a bad decision, that another blundered here or there. But we must know in our hearts that this is not the real answer. The truth probably is many-sided. After the last war we demobilized too drastically because the people clamored to get the boys back home. Universal training, which would have provided a reserve of military manpower, could not survive the assaults of articulate ignorance. In the name of economy, and lighter taxes, too little money was provided for the Armed Forces. Yes, we did spend billions. But we did not spend enough. Underlying all of this, and perhaps of even greater moment, was the mood of America. Although we had warnings enough, we would not comprehend the real nature of the rising threat. We preferred the more abundant life to the sacrifices that should have been made, and which will have to be made now. We were unwilling, when there still was time, either to make the hard decisions or to act on them.

And so an American Army, outnumbered and outgunned, is fighting for its life in Korea. That battle is not lost, and we may hope that the disaster lurking between the lines of General Walker's order will not come to pass. Whatever the final result in Korea, however, there is one thing that all of us can do. We can store away the memory of this grim day, and we can make up our minds that we will not let it happen again. Long, hard years lie ahead of us. If we let down, if we hesitate, if we are not fully determined that security is our first concern, and that we will pay the price of security, then we must expect the time to come when all of us will be making our last-ditch stand, and making it here in the United States—not in some far-off Korea.

Fighting Tanks With Garden Seed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Santa Monica (Calif.) Evening Outlook of Thursday, July 27, 1950:

FIGHTING TANKS WITH GARDEN SEED

In an attempt to shift the blame for the bad Korean situation, the administration wizards have dug up the Korean economic aid bill defeated by the House in 1949. The Republicans who led this revolt against a State Department mandate, they claim, are the ones responsible for American failures in Korea.

By this ill-considered and absolutely unfounded charge the Fair Dealers have unearthed some past history which can only boomerang to their own discomfort. Congressman DONALD L. JACKSON of this district has set the record straight in a telling speech on the House floor. The administration's Korean aid bill, he recalled, was an economic measure which completely ignored the military threat of which Republicans warned. The State Department believed it would be useful to send mine equipment, hydroelectric plants and agricultural supplies at a time when a hostile North Korea was giving every indication that it would attack at the first opportunity.

It was Representative JACKSON who wrote the minority report of the Foreign Relations Committee, opposing pure economic aid. "Without the accompaniment of adequate military force," he said at that time, "the use of economic assistance could only enhance the prize in the eyes of the aggressor."

The Korean invasion has, of course, proved him an accurate prophet. Had Congress passed the economic aid bill the Communists would now be capturing extensive equipment virtually laid at their feet by our State Department. Even though it was plain that outside aggression and not internal dissension was the main threat in South Korea, the administration sent virtually none of the military aid previously voted by Congress.

We have DONALD JACKSON and other far-sighted Republican leaders to thank for preventing this folly and saving the United States many millions of dollars. But for the present Korean failures we can thank an administration which was following a policy of meeting, as Representative JACKSON describes it, "the threat of bayonets and 60-ton tanks with tons of manure and garden seed."

A Six-Point Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious from the recommendations made by the President, as well as the alternatives proposed by Mr. Bernard Baruch, that this Congress, which has refused to pass any civil-rights legislation and failed to repeal Taft-Hartley or provide adequate housing for the people, will in one manner or another place the burden of the war on the shoulders of the common people of the United States, and will relieve those who profit from this war of their responsibility.

These recommendations reveal the true character of the war. They again demonstrate that it is not a war conducted in the best interests of the American people nor to protect their security.

In order to protect the people against profiteering and the voraciousness of the real war makers, I project the following six-point program, and have today introduced legislation to implement it:

First. A bill providing for rigid price control and rolling back of prices to February 1, 1950, the date of lowest level of prices before the war began.

Second. A bill providing for strict rent controls which are particularly needed because of the curtailment in new building and the failure of present Federal and State decontrol programs.

Third. A bill limiting to $25,000 the net income of individuals after the payment of other Federal income taxes, rather than the inequitable increase in income taxes on lower income groups proposed by the President which takes money out of the paychecks of those least able to afford it.

Fourth. A bill providing for an excess-profits tax to stop the profiteers. I believe in freezing profits, not wages or labor.

Fifth. To protect servicemen, who are the first victims of this war, a bill providing that the benefits of the G. I. bill of rights be made applicable to all members of the Armed Forces from June 27, 1950 on.

Sixth. I now call upon this Congress to live up to its obligations and enact immediately FEPC, anti-poll-tax, anti-lynch, and other parts of the civil-rights program which it has shelved.

The fight for these bills is a fight to protect the American people against the attack on their welfare by those who are responsible for the present war. It is inseparable from the fight for peace.

Sound Regional Planning Demands South Crossing of San Francisco Bay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include excerpts from a report prepared for the assembly interim committee of the California State Legislature, appointed to deal with the problems of tideland reclamation and development in northern California, related traffic problems, and relief of congestion on transbay crossings.

The members of the committee are: George Collins, Jr., Arthur H. Connolly, Jr., Randal F. Dickey, Francis Dunn, Jr., Edward M. Gaffney, Ernest R. Geddes, Robert I. McCarthy, John F. Thompson, Richard J. Dolwig, chairman.

The excerpts follow:

San Francisco and Oakland are two large, important, and rapidly growing cities. In population size they may become twin cities before many years have gone by. Oakland has its satellites to the north and to the south. San Francisco's satellites are almost entirely to the south (except for suburbs served exclusively by the Golden Gate Bridge). Industrial growth is spreading southward on both sides of the bay, and also northward on the Alameda side. The same is true of residential growth.

These two almost twin cities, with their satellites, are now connected by one bridge, which leads from the downtown heart of San Francisco to a point approximately 2 miles north of the downtown heart of Oakland. It is of the very essence of sound long-range regional planning to provide for orderly and spreading growth and to discourage overconcentration and congestion. This is recognized not only in the trained thinking of the planning profession but also in the practical good-business sense of the general public. Everyone seems to be in agreement that congestion on the bay bridge can only be remedied by constructing a second transbay facility. At no time have we claimed that reconstructing the bay bridge with cantilevered lanes is a substitute for a second crossing. It is only an adjunct of a second crossing, though a very important adjunct.

To relieve congestion by constructing a second crossing, and at the same time to spread out the future growth on both sides of the bay, it is manifest and self-evident that the second crossing must be in a location well separated in distance from the Bay Bridge. This well-separated second crossing cannot physically be located to the north. That is agreed upon. It can only be to the south. Many southern locations and types of structure have been examined. We and the division are in entire agreement that the best location for the southern crossing is at Army Street. We are also in agreement that the best type of structure is a combination of causeways and subaqueous tubes. The Toll Bridge Authority has officially gone on record that it will build a southern crossing at the Army Street location. Further, we and the division are in agreement, and it is reasonable to expect that the authority will also concur, that the southern crossing can be four lanes, not six lanes, provided that additional traffic capacity is created at the Bay Bridge location. The division agrees in its report of October 1949 that the amount of additional capacity that would be provided by reconstructing the Bay Bridge in accordance with our proposal would be sufficient to render a four-lane southern crossing adequate for its prospective traffic load.

We cannot overemphasize the basic principle that the southern crossing is a regional planning as well as a traffic solution of the increasing congestion problem on both sides of the bay. Understanding of the concept of two well-separated crossings is absolutely fundamental. It is a simple exercise in elementary geography.

On the other hand, parallel bridges would be only a traffic solution—and at that only a partial and most unwise solution. These twin bridges would, of course, handle the actual bay crossing traffic; but they would choke central San Francisco and northern Oakland with the traffic they pour out. Oakland would have a congested northern gateway, and no southern gateway at all. As Oakland is growing faster than San Francisco—and may outstrip its big sister—its need for spreading out and its present opportunity to spread out are even greater than San Francisco's. San Francisco is already congested. Oakland has only begun to suffer the pains and frustrations of congestion. It is not too late to save Oakland from strangulation and from progressive gangrene at its core.

The proposed parallel bridges completely ignore the problems of regional growth and overconcentration. Representatives of the division indicated in testimony at Sacramento last May that the regional planning problem was not their concern; that they were only interested in providing a facility to handle the transbay traffic. But the regional planning problem is the lively concern of all the people who live in the bay area. It is the lively concern of the Legislature of the State of California and presumably of the executive department. It is even the concern of the Congress and the President of the United States.

In our June 1, 1949, report we laid primary stress on the principle that there must be two well-separated crossings. The very first pages of our report were devoted to an exposition of the regional planning problem and this fundamental principle for its long-term solution. At no time has the logic of this principle been adequately answered by the division. In its October 1949 report the subject is not even mentioned.

To build the parallel bridge first and then at some indefinite and distant future date to build the southern crossing is neither adequate recognition nor proper understanding of the principle of well-separated crossings, as that principle applies to today's planning problems in the bay area. It would be to lock the door after the horse has bolted. If the southern crossing is built very soon and quickly, it will be in time to provide for orderly growth and a prosperous future. Since little industrial land remains in San Francisco proper, Oakland might become the industrial metropolis of northern California. But if the southern crossing is not built very soon and quickly, then the commercial and industrial prospects of both sides of the bay are dark and dim indeed. We will see repeated once again the history of the rise and fall of great cities the world over: unplanned growth, overconcentration, congestion, blight, progressive exodus to other cities, decay, diminishing population. One can look at the census records. The cause of decay is always the same. It is the age-old plague of the cities of men. It can be stated in one three-syllable word: Congestion.

The division seems to be in agreement with us on everything important pertaining to the southern crossing except as to its priority of construction. It is our considered judgment that the southern crossing cannot be put off into the distant future; that the time to build it is now.

The United States has learned that Soviet Russia has the atomic bomb. The people and the Congress have become far more security-minded than they were last year. It is no stretch of the imagination to envisage an atomic bomb, made in Russia, exploding near the twin bridges, with results that could paralyze all vehicular and all transit traffic between the two sides of this great region of war industries.

In our previous report we pointed out the frequent risk of local fires. A fire is not an atomic bomb. It would not destroy the twin bridges, but it could and would close off the approaches to both bridges for hours at a time. This has not and cannot be refuted. It has actually happened at the San Francisco approach to the existing bridge.

Oklahoma Doctors Will Do Their Part

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. WILSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, first of all as Americans interested in the preservation of our great Nation and in the American way of life, the physicians of the State of Oklahoma—as will be the case in all the States of the Union—will respond to any call for the defense of our country

and they will do their part in the present critical times.

In a communication to me dated July 27, 1950, by Dr. F. Redding Hood, chairman, committee on military service of the Oklahoma State Medical Association, stated:

I pledge that the Oklahoma State Medical Association will make every effort to meet the requests of the military forces for physicians but not without due consideration for the care of the civilian population. I think that you might be interested to know that in World War II the State of Oklahoma was the third State in the Union to meet its procurement objective for physicians and upon each subsequent quota requested by the military forces the physicians of the State of Oklahoma provided adequate number although there were certain States in the United States who never met even the initial quota set for them on the basis of the number of physicians per population.

Attention was called to the fact that, while the Oklahoma Physicians Veterans Association is in no way a part of the Oklahoma State Medical Association, nevertheless there is concurrence in general with the statements of Dr. Johnny A. Blue, the secretary of that group, which statements were in a recent newspaper release and are as follows:

The Reserve medical officers of Oklahoma, in reply to a recent statement in the press, that medical officers were reluctant to volunteer for active duty, defended that reluctance during the present Korean crisis through their organization, the Oklahoma Physicians Veterans Association, in a statement released today by their spokesman, Dr. Johnny A. Blue, secretary of the group.

Dr. Blue stated that the great majority of Reserve medical officers were willing to do their part when those physicians who were of the same age and with the same independent status who did not serve in the last war, together with those physicians who were deferred from military service and whose medical education was paid for by the Government have been given the opportunity to serve their country.

Dr. Blue pointed out that the military forces had not as yet called upon these physicians to serve. It is significant, Dr. Blue stated, that the Army and Navy saw fit to lose control of the young physicians deferred and paid to secure his medical education.

Dr. Blue, in speaking about Reserve officers said, a doctor is in most instances not a Reserve officer by his own choice. All Navy medical officers are required to retain Reserve commissions, unless discharged because of some physical disability. Many Army medical officers dropped their commissions upon parting from service, but are still subject to call as Reserve officers.

Speaking for the Oklahoma Physicians Veterans Association, Dr. Blue stated that a survey questionnaire circulated among the veteran physicians of World Wars I and II revealed the following:

1. Out of approximately 1,700 practicing physicians in Oklahoma, over one-third are veterans of either World War I or World War II.

2. The average length of time in service per doctor was 40 months.

3. Over two-thirds of these physicians saw overseas duty.

4. The average length of time spent overseas was 30 months.

5. The average age of these same doctors now is 39 years.

Other recommendations made by the executive committee of the association are:

1. That there should be no waste in medical manpower as was the case in the last war.

2. That men of military age deferred in World War II for the purpose of completing their medical education at the expense of the Government and who are not yet now available for call to service be first to go to active duty. Many of these are single and without dependents.

3. That men who did not serve in the last war due to some minor disability, but remained at home, should be called on to serve.

4. That all physicians be registered with Selective Service irrespective of age and physical condition and that all physicians be made available for military duty with Selective Service utilizing the advice of the medical profession concerning withdrawal from civilian life for military duty, in order that civilians, hospitals and medical education be adequately provided with medical personnel.

5. That physicians be called for military duty in the following order, unless they desire active duty:

Physicians trained at Government expense with no active military duty.

Physicians with minor defects and those who did not serve in the last war due to dependents, etc.

Next should come physicians according to the time served in the last war, with overseas duty counting in this exemption.

6. That medical doctors not be assigned to nonmedical tasks.

The Oklahoma Physicians Veterans Association was organized June 4, 1950, with the following aims and purposes:

To stimulate good will and fellowship among those physicians who have served in the military forces and with the profession and public at large.

To encourage eligible physicians to associate with the recognized veterans' organizations.

To promote Americanism in all of its aspects and to oppose socialization.

To recommend and act in an advisory capacity with the Armed Forces in the utilization of medical and allied manpower to the end that there shall be no wastage of these highly specialized and necessary services.

To consult and advise with all agencies of the Government and voluntary organizations, in the event of another cataclysmic disaster.

To seek clarification in the minds of the public, veterans' organizations, and the medical profession of the functions and limitations of veterans' hospitals to the end that these facilities will render maximum medical and hospital care for veterans with service-connected disabilities.

To promote and plan with other agencies for the protection of the health and welfare of all communities and individuals against any form of disaster. To cooperate with any other like organizations that may be organized or exists in other States with the same or similar aims and purposes.

Officers of the organization are Dr. Paul Gallaher, Shawnee, president; Dr. Shade D. Neely, Muskogee, president-elect; Dr. Ralph Hubbard, Oklahoma City, vice president, and Dr. Johnny A. Blue, Oklahoma City, secretary-treasurer.

The Communist Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THURMAN C. CROOK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, by virtue of the fact that we of the United States, the affiliated countries of the United Nations, and all freedom-loving people of the world have taken a stand against—are in conflict with—the ruthless aggressors advancing their destructive machines over the Republic of South Korea, I deem it most expedient that we in this Congress and all true Americans fully acquaint ourselves with the one and only motive harbored in the minds of those perpetrating the Communist movement against the lofty ideals of freedom and democracy which we have cherished and courageously fought for since the inception of our Republic.

Hon. Lawrence L. McKenna, in his article Communism Struggling To Capture Minds of Men appearing in the Sunday, July 30, edition of the Washington Star, has, in a most enlightening manner, given us bountiful food for thought in regard to the struggle for freedom down through the ages and the motives of the destructive aggressors today, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include said article, trusting it will attract deliberation by all that are privileged to peruse it:

COMMUNISM STRUGGLING TO CAPTURE MINDS OF MEN—WESTERN CIVILIZATION IN TURN STRIVES TO CONVINCE PEOPLE THAT INDUSTRIALISM AND DEMOCRATIC NATIONALISM ARE BEST

(By Lawrence L. McKenna)

In this time of troubles, this period of great disunity in western civilization, the people of this Nation, which has fallen heir to the leadership of the Western World, have a profound sense of bewilderment regarding the general state of affairs throughout the world.

It is virtually impossible for the common man in America, interested only in the better life for all, to comprehend why victory on the battlefield, both in 1918 and in 1945, has resulted in defeat at the peace table. He does not understand why backward people throughout the world do not love us sufficiently to want to establish their own national states after the democratic pattern as we see it, and then go about the business of creating the better life for themselves.

All around, the American people are witnessing attacks—in many cases successful attacks and in all cases attacks that weaken—upon the foundation of western civilization. That trinity of pillars which over the centuries has risen up to constitute the foundation of western civilization—namely, the cultural pillar, which finds expression in the philosophy of Christianity; the political pillar, which is organized in national states and rooted in democratic principles, and the economic pillar, which has been built (solidly, we hope) upon the capitalistic system—is being scornfully ridiculed and attacked by ruthless and vicious men in the Communist world who, since 1917, have used every artifice known to Machiavellism to capture the minds of men throughout the world so that they might impose Communist universalism upon mankind.

STATESMEN BAFFLED

Not since the fifteenth-sixteenth centuries has the Western World experienced a struggle like the one presenting itself today. From that time onward until the late war, conflicts in the Western World were more or less tribal wars which did not extend to the ideological sphere. Although great differences may have prevailed among various people regarding phases of ideology, the basic philosophy and ethics of all nations in western Christendom were essentially the same. Consequently, the objectives in these wars were not the extermination of the vanquished, as for example, in the struggle between ancient Rome and Carthage.

During the last war, leaders in the Western World failed to understand that while they were fighting for the integrity and preservation of the ideal of the nation as it evolved out of the struggle between ideals of universalism and nationalism in the fifteenth-sixteenth centuries, Russia, although fighting to preserve the territorial integrity of the motherland which has been attacked by a western nation that had gone berserk, was, over and beyond this, fighting for the ideal of universalism—universal communism with its nebulous promise to mankind. Only when the military victory had been won, and western leaders began to discuss the peace of the world with Russia, did it begin to dawn on them that here was something new. Russia's elusiveness proved to be most baffling for statesmen of the West, who appeared not to recognize the struggle as the beginning of this present conflict between universalism and nationalism in which we now find ourselves.

TOYNBEE QUOTED

In a learned masterpiece, The Study of History, Dr. Arnold J. Toynbee observes that:

"When civilizations pass from breakdown through disintegration into dissolution, they regularly leave behind them a deposit of universal states and universal churches and barbarian war-bands. What are we to make of these objects? Are they mere waste-products of the disintegration process—a tangle of spoiled threads from a piece of tapestry which the wearer, on an impulse of his inscrutable caprice, has willed to unpick before it has been half completed? Or will these debris prove, if we pick them up, to be fresh masterpieces of the wearer's art which he has woven, by an unnoticed sleight-of-hand, on some more ethereal instrument than the roaring loom that has ostensibly been occuping all his attention and energies?"

After carefully studying this observation of Dr. Toynbee, we might ask ourselves whether or not this idea of universal communism, which arose out of the "breakdown through disintegration into dissolution" of Russian civilization in 1917, might not, indeed, be one of those "fresh masterpieces of the weaver's art." In short, "will these debris, if we pick them up," prove to be a fresh pattern of world order. That is, is communism here to stay, and will it envelop us?

That the Communist ideal and idea have strong appeal to the humble and the weak, as well as to many intellectuals, is all too obvious. The promise of the Communists are not, however, different from those which have been made by others who throughout the centuries have, from time to time, advocated universalism. The Communists say to mankind:

"Sacrifice to us your human personality and we shall divide the wealth of the world with you; sacrifice to us your freedom, and we shall create an empire which embraces the whole world and in which order and peace shall eternally prevail; sacrifice to us your judgment and we shall reveal to you the absolute truth."

The modern historian, Toynbee, not only contends that Marxian socialism—which Communist Russia professes—as well as the Marxian concern to convert the world, is derived from the Christian tradition. Be that as it may, we know that present-day western civilization is the product of the Christian tradition, and Christian ideology, like present-day Communist ideology, found its first roots in a great state during the period of its "breakdown through disintegration into dissolution."

ROME FELL APART

Rome was perhaps the first truly great state, in the modern sense of that word. As in the case with the United States today, historical events constantly compelled Rome to expand its sphere of influence. Ultimately, it became one of "those institutions into which decaying societies incorporated themselves in the last phases of their lives." In the end, it became like an "old tree whose roots decayed until the wind tore them up and overthrew the solid trunk." Thereafter Rome ceased to be a truly political state which spread its rule throughout the world. And, as breakdown and dissolution felled that mighty oak, there arose a profoundly powerful universal ideal and idea which had organized itself around the cultural base of the dying Roman pagan world, just as the universal ideal and idea of communism has today organized itself around the political base of Russia and various other states.

Truly, the idea of universal power was the essence of Christian Roman imperialism, just as today it is the essence of Russian Communist imperialism—although the promises of the former to the humble and the weak were promises to be fulfilled in another life, while those of Communist Russia today are to be fulfilled in this life.

Christian universalism officially came into being with the Emperor Constantine's edict of Milan in 313 A. D. The great conglomeration of peoples that flowed, fluidlike, into the Roman crucible as each Roman military victory was won, had the effect of destroying the unity of the Roman world. And as the ancient pagan gods lost their influence over the people, Christian universalism became the rallying point. It was the idea which, like communism today, called for sacrifice and at the same time held out hope and promises of reward.

Thereafter, throughout all the Middle Ages, man's allegiance was, upon peril of eternal salvation, to the Christian ideal of universalism. And, as man in the Western World became more and more imbued with the idea of death and salvation, religion ceased to be merely an aspect of life, but instead provided the entire background of life. Faith, which "is not an opinion but a certainty," became the determining consideration in the making of every cultural, political, and economic decision; reason played only a very small part in those decisions. The king was first of all "the defender of the faith." Whenever he ventured upon a military campaign, it was either to defend the faith or to convert the heathen—although other objectives no doubt inspired many enterprises.

SOMETHING NEW INTRODUCED

During this period of the Middle Ages there was no feeling for the state in the modern sense. Instead, the modern state had not yet been conceived, so there could be no feeling of patriotism. Supreme power was vested in the papacy; and the king, together with his subjects, was under its rule. The unity of western Christendom was thus maintained for more than 1,200 years.

Since, as the adage goes, nothing corrupts like power unless it is more power, it is indeed surprising that more than 1,200 years elapsed before this absolute power of papacy became sufficiently corrupt to cause a serious breach in the unity of western Christian civilization.

Although the Reformation which gave birth to the idea of the modern state in the Western World, was the final political act that brought about this break in the unity of western Christian civilization, that struggle might be said to have begun during the Renaissance—that period of awakening from the Dark Ages during which the writings of the Greek philosophers became accessible to scholars in the western Christian world. And as the Italian city-states began contending fiercely among themselves to maintain a balance of power during the Renaissance period, something new was introduced into the political structure and a new Italian version of western civilization emerged. In consequence of this, the seeds of humanism, absolutism, and the balance of power were planted in northern Italy between 1275 and 1475 A. D. And as the northern barbarians scaled the Alps to destroy the nearly four centuries of Italian isolation, they become imbued with a knowledge of the Machiavellian technique, which had been developed in order to maintain a balance of power among the Italian city-states, and introduced it as the ruling principle in the government of that area Christendom north of the Alps.

This political technique, developed first in northern Italy during the Renaissance, is the technique which was used in Christendom north of the Alps during the period of the Reformation in the fifteenth-sixteenth centuries to break the hold of the idea of universality in the political sphere. Significantly, it is the same technique which today is being used by Russia against the West in the cold (and hot) war.

MACHIAVELLI'S TEACHINGS

Because Nicholas Machiavelli (1469–1527) set down an account of this technique in the Prince, and in other writings, it became known to history as Machiavellism. Machiavelli was not merely a student of political philosophy concerned merely with ideals and ends. He was a student of political science, interested primarily in finding ways and means to achieve desired ends. He made a broad distinction between political science and ethics, as well as between political science and religion. He was careful to explain that he was addressing himself only to those who governed, for, he said, "the politically conscious groups are the determinant forces in the social order"; the rest, he wisely observed, only passively seek security. He was truly a patriot, perhaps the first patriot in western Christendom to preach the religion of patriotism, something which has played so great a part in establishing nationalism. For example, he wrote:

"Our religion places (the highest good) in lowliness and contempt for things of the world; or if it calls upon us to be brave, it is that we should be brave to suffer, rather, than to do. This manner of life * * * seems to have made the world feeble, and to have given it over as a prey to wicked men to deal with as they please, since the mass of mankind, in the hope of being received into paradise, think more of how to bear injuries than how to avenge them."

POLITICAL REVOLUTION

Rome, the Renaissance, the Reformation, the American Revolution and the French Revolution are the principal elements influencing political thought and action in the western Christian world today. Prostrate Rome has given it the Christian ethic and the ideal of universalism, while the ideal of nationalism which was conceived in the Renaissance and born of the Reformation was fully developed during the American and French Revolutions. Thereafter, western society gradually ceased being religious with mankind seeking a spiritual end, and instead became secular with mankind striving for materialistic objectives, until today life's whole purpose, it would seem, is directed toward achieving social security.

But, be that as it may, the Reformation was one of the most decisive political acts in the history of the western Christian world. Although it gave rise to what history recorded as religious wars, it was nevertheless a political revolution. Except perhaps in England there was no full victory for either side. In Germany, the peace of Augsburg (1555) was a compromise, while the defeat of the movement in France, ultimately gave rise to the French Revolution. Indeed, Hitler claimed that nazism, which was committed to the destruction of Christianity, was merely a continuation of the Reformation. But this is not true, for the Reformation did not aim at destroying the Christian philosophy and ethic while nazism did.

Under the peace of Augsburg the ideal of universality in the cultural (religious)

sphere was destroyed by a substitution of the godly prince for the Holy Father as the supreme head of the church and state in geographically limited principalities. Those who refused to subscribe to the religion which the prince established for his particular principality were compelled to migrate. Thereafter, the prince ruled by divine right. In order fully to comprehend the power of this divine right idea, we might recall that Bismarck once remarked that "take my King from me and you take away my God." Indeed, had the Allied leaders understood this in 1918 the German monarchy may not have been destroyed. Truly, we now know that it was the loss of this authoritarian rule of a king, which Germans require even today, that gave rise to Hitler and nazism.

GLOBAL ECONOMIC NET

At any rate, the peace of Augsburg fully enthroned nationalism, and gradually a new religion—the religion of patriotism—began to impose itself on society. In time wars ceased to be the "sport of kings," which might be settled profitably to the victor by the vanquished ceding a province or by a marriage among members of the families of the contending princes. As the prince was replaced by the president as chief of state man ceased to be a "subject" who hired himself for pay to fight in the wars for the prince and became a "citizen" who, fired by patriotism, fought and died for the fatherland. Valhalla and heaven no longer lured him; he was now content with a hero's medal as his reward.

Ultimately these nations became small universes which radiated their political and economic philosophy throughout the world, each contending for leadership. Thereafter wars became peoples' wars—that is nothing more or less than tribal wars—instead of wars between princes. Thus monarchy and feudalism in western Christendom yielded to the impact of the new social forces of representative government and capitalism.

In the end the struggle between these western nations which emerged out of the Roman Christian western world during the period of the Reformation found one group fighting another in alliance with the mortal enemy of the whole of western Christian civilization. It was not until victory was won that leaders of the Western World realized this salient fact. As a result, we became confused, and we are still confused.

So today we find ourselves making rather desperate efforts to reunite western Christendom in order to preserve western civilization. Since unity in the cultural sphere has been irreparably broken, thus making it impossible for us successfully to compete with the Communists in any struggle for the capture of mind of man through faith, we are striving with all our might to convince the peoples of the world through reason that the good life through industrialism and democratic nationalism is the goal toward which they should strive.

WAY OF LIFE DIFFERS

True, western civilization has cast a net of its economic system 'round the world. Too, this economic unification (of the world) on a western basis has (to some extent) been followed by political unification on the same basis. However, this unification does not represent unity. In that sphere which deals with the mind of man there is not even unification, much less unity, among ourselves. Our Military Establishment is designed only to preserve the territorial integrity of the Nation and protect our political and economic interests throughout the world. We are not attempting to spread out either geographically or ideologically. Ours is a defensive and not an offensive position in all spheres—the cultural, the political and the economic spheres.

Therefore, unity with other peoples cannot be considered as a likely export product of our propaganda. In short, the Western World does not have a way of life in all spheres—the cultural, political and economic—upon which there is complete unity as is the case with Russia, although in Russia this may be imposed with an iron fist. Moreover, there is no likelihood, or even possibility, of such unity being developed—except as it might arise from a breakdown through disintegration into dissolution, such as Toynbe describes—and no American believes that that day is at hand. Therein lies the Achilles' heel of western civilization, the preservation of which the United States is today responsible.

SUPERPROPAGANDA URGED

Our propaganda, which is limited to the political and economic sphere, is an appeal to reason with the view of creating favorable opinion. On the other hand, Russian propaganda, which knows no such limitation as ours but extends to all spheres, is directed primarily toward converting mankind to the Communist faith—something which is not concerned with reason and opinion, but rather something which aims at anchoring the mind of man on certainties which are felt emotionally and not arrived at through a reasoning process. The one develops intelligence and creates the reasonable man while the other produces fanatics who are unscrupulous precisely because they are sincere upon a narrow issue.

POWER OF IDEA

If western civilization is to be preserved, leaders in the United States must realize that there is no power on earth like an idea—unless it is a better idea. And they must honestly recognize that today the idea, ideal, and promise of communism, directed to the faith, and not to the reason, of man, has powerful appeal. Consequently, any new Voice of America legislation which the Congress might consider should contemplate building a propaganda machine that would employ only those who possess: (1) The technique of the writers of modern advertising copy; (2) the wisdom of the philosopher; (3) the skill of a Machiavellian political scientist; and (4) the intuition of the mystic. Through such a machine we may hope to capture the mind and persuade him away from the Communist idea, ideal, and promise.

The alternative, it would seem, is the introduction of the worship of the terrible and the ethic of fear into the world—which means using the atomic bomb.

FREEDOM OR SLAVERY?

Today, the Anglo-Saxon world—the United States and the British Commonwealth of Nations—hold the determining political, economic, and military power of the Western World, if not of the whole world. And peoples everywhere are holding their breath, awaiting to see just how that world will decide to use this great power, for they know that upon this decision hangs their fate—whether they shall be free or slaves.

Like the ancient Greeks who admired only themselves, and the ancient Romans who admired only the Greeks and themselves, during the period of disintegration of the Greco-Roman civilization; modern-day Englishmen appear only to admire themselves, while we Americans seem to admire only the English and ourselves. The English word "native" has ugly connotations for millions of people in the world today, while, on the other hand, the word "communism," which is a vicious thing in action, pleasantly disturbs the minds of men throughout the world. To destroy this psychological disequilibrium is a mammoth task for the Voice of America which should be seriously undertaken, for the magic of words constitute the ammunition which men use in any war for the capture of the mind of man, and this war is first a war for the capture of the mind of man.

The False Communist Peace Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to make available to my colleagues the first portion of another excellent analysis of the origin of the Stockholm peace petition. The following appeared in the July 4, 1950, issue of the Reporter, and is entitled "Isolationist Wave in Europe—The Stalinists' Political Blitzkrieg Confuses and Endangers the West":

ISOLATIONIST WAVE IN EUROPE—THE STALINISTS' POLITICAL BLITZKRIEG CONFUSES AND ENDANGERS THE WEST

In growing numbers, Europeans are becoming convinced that the whole East-West conflict is America's affair and Russia's affair, and that Europe has everything to lose and nothing to gain by taking sides. That is a disturbing conviction; this state of mind is perhaps the most upsetting phenomenon that has appeared in Europe since 1945. It is also a simple state of mind; it can be, and has been, reduced to a slogan which now is being sounded throughout Europe—"The cold war is America's cold war."

Europe's incomprehension of American policy and America's incomprehension of the methods now being used by Russia in that strange struggle misnamed the cold war have risen to a dangerous degree. As a result, the true aims of the West—its political principles, the valid reasons for western resistance to communism—are now reduced to vague generalities, when they are not almost forgotten. Thus it has become possible for many Europeans to see the whole international situation as depending upon the uncertain tempers of two men, President Truman and Marshal Stalin.

This state of affairs has been caused by the failure of the West to produce strategic and tactical methods adapted to today's international strife, which amounts to civil war far more than to direct threats of military aggression.

The best way to understand what is taking place in Europe today is to draw a parallel with what took place in Europe 10 years ago.

In May and June 1940, the French, after they had erected what they thought was a rampart—the Maginot line—against the German threat, suddenly found themselves in an unheard-of position: They were beaten, though their fortifications had not even been attacked. The blitzkrieg had taken them by surprise and had rendered all their preparations totally useless. The Maginot line was turned, its strength paralyzed, its might conquered, not by enemy cannon but by the enemy's superior imagination.

America now—like France in 1940—is one war behind. In 1940 the French Army faced Hitler—and was prepared for the trench warfare of 1914. In 1950, America faces Stalin in political warfare—and is equally unprepared.

This time the Maginot line is "the policy of containment," a policy which to Europeans seems based upon the idea that the real danger is the Red army and that the real problem is to prevent this army from advancing. But what is completely evident even now is that although the "line of containment" has not even been attacked, America is losing the battle for Europe behind that line—in France, Italy, and Germany. For the true battle for Europe is a bloodless civil struggle, a political and psychological war,

now being fought by the Soviets and the European Communists with extraordinary swiftness of maneuver.

Sometimes the Soviets call their political battle "the peace offensive," sometimes "the neutrality campaign;" but whatever name they give it, its purpose is apparent: to separate Europe from America politically. The Communist aim is to create so much misunderstanding between the two segments of the Atlantic community that Europe will break away from America on every plane—political, economic, military—and form a third force. If that day comes, the Soviets will have won the civil war in Europe. The line of containment will not have been driven back an inch. It will simply have crumbled without ever having been attacked.

In this internal European conflict, the recent London Conference of Foreign Ministers indubitably marked a major Soviet victory. For the Conference demonstrated a high point of American incomprehension as to the real nature of the Europe peace offensive. The political reaction to the Conference, whether from men of the Right (like Konrad Adenauer and General de Gaulle) or from men of the left (like Socialist leader Jules Moch), was precisely the reaction most pleasing to the Kremlin: "This is America's cold war; let's get out of it."

The London Conference resulted in great new support for the peace offensive that is the Communists' major weapon in Europe's internal struggle. When did they first use it? How do they apply it?

Three months ago the Communist parties of western Europe organized a World Peace Congress meeting in Stockholm. Europe's most neutral capital. They succeeded in assembling a certain number of intellectuals, writers, and scientists who were fellow travelers rather than party members. These people proceeded to draw up a manifesto which has since acquired great notoriety under the name of the Stockholm peace appeal. Here is its text:

"We demand the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon as a weapon of intimidation and one for the mass extermination of people.

"We demand the creation of a rigorous international control system to insure that this ban will be carried out.

"We consider that the first government to use the atomic weapon against any nation whatsoever will have committeed a crime against humanity and must be treated as a war criminal."

This is an extremely clever text. On the surface, it is "neutral"—it mentions neither America nor Russia. Actually, it is anti-American in that it aims at the destruction of military atomic stockpiles without providing controls for atomic plants. The American stand at the UN has consistently been that such controls must precede the destruction of atomic weapons. The text speaks of an international control system, but only for weapons, not for atomic factories.

In other words, it contains nothing to embarrass Russia—the atomic factories in the Urals remain undisturbed. America today still has the greatest atomic military potential. A text attacking atomic weapons bears a heavy emotional content. The emotions it arouses are directly aimed at America. But the Stockholm manifesto speaks only of peace; it mentions no nation by name, and the plain European who lives in dread of atomic warfare has some difficulty in finding valid reasons for refusing to sign it—even if he is not anti-American.

Armed with this providential text, fellow travelers all over Europe have been busy creating "Committees for the Partisans of Peace" whose function is to collect the greatest possible number of signatures. In every city, town, and village of France there exists today a committee which goes from house to house asking people: "Are you in favor of peace? Are you against the atomic bomb?" Nobody ever says "No." So the committee says, "Sign up for peace right here on the dotted line."

In France alone, the committees have already collected nearly 4,000,000 signatures. In Europe as a whole the total has already exceeded 20,000,000. Judges, eminent politicians, actors, and journalists have fallen into the trap.

The Communists are now inducing local authorities—the mayors of villages and their councilmen—to sign up. Somebody calls for a meeting in the town hall. Somebody gets up and describes the horrors of a future war and how civilization will be exterminated by the atomic bomb. Somebody gets up and asks, "Who favors outlawing the atomic bomb?" Nobody ever gets up to say, "I like the bomb." The motion is passed unanimously. That is what is going on in the villages, but that is also what went on when two Cabinet Ministers in the French Government found themselves in the extraordinary position of not being able to refuse to sign an appeal directly aimed against their own administration's policy for an Atlantic Alliance.

Little by little the Communists are succeeding. They have muddied the waters so thoroughly that many Europeans are convinced that America is preparing for a war it wants and that Stalin is the champion of peace.

The emotional appeal of the word "peace" is so great at the present moment throughout Europe that other political organizations are afraid to leave it a Communist monopoly. That is why a Christian committee (of politicians) recently launched its own grandiose manifesto in favor of peace and, of course, against the atomic bomb. "See how the anti-American peace front is broadening," the Communists pointed out at once.

There is no stopping the process. How, for instance, can the International Red Cross remain silent when it is a matter of proclaiming the undeniable advantages of peace over war? This strictly nonpolitical organization sent out its appeal from Geneva—city of good intentions. It was entitled "Christians Against the Atomic Bomb." The Communist press at once put it on the front page with a banner head "The Red Cross Is With Us."

Behind a smoke screen of pacific verbiage, the idea the Communists seek to implant in every European mind sweeps onward like a forest fire, "America is making ready for war because America thinks that war is inevitable."

Ten years ago Hitler had discovered the principle of blitzkrieg, and, taking full advantage of his adversaries' incapacity to adapt themselves, he exploited the principle to the extreme. It was between February and April of this year that the Communists discovered the extraordinarily high potential that lay in the technique of a popular, nondiplomatic peace offensive.

On February 13 Pierre Courtade, editorial writer for the Communist newspaper L'Humanitá, wrote: "No neutrality will do. The only way to stop crime is to take a stand against crime." In May his line changed: "True neutrality, a neutrality inspired by a sincere desire to spare France the horrors of a war imposed by a foreign will, will bring France into the camp of peace."

Germany's champion of the "neutralist" idea is Dr. Ulrich Noack, leader of the Nauheim Circle. Here the same dates are prominent. In February a meeting of the circle in the Russian Zone was forbidden by Soviet authorities. But in April Professor Noack was cordially invited to lecture at East German universities.

During March and April, roughly speaking, the new Communist strategy was born. In May it was vigorously put into execution on the western side of the "line of containment."

Considering to what extent this offensive is progressing in the very heart of Europe, in every village of France and Italy, in the political parties that now control Germany, in the columns of the Labor press in Britain, it is impossible to conceal one's stupefaction at hearing diplomats, especially in Washington, declare that they are expecting any day now a diplomatic peace offensive from the Kremlin. They are "expecting" this offensive as if it would come to them some morning in the mails or in a diplomatic pouch, or as if Mr. Vishinsky would soon go up to the rostrum of the United Nations and declare peace.

The peace offensive has already infiltrated our lines, swept around our defense. If it is necessary to read about it in print, it has been published by a thousand committees; if it is necessary to hear it cried out, it has been cried out by hundreds of thousands of "partisans of peace." Some of these partisans, as I have pointed out, have no connection with the Kremlin.

Pledge of Puerto Rico To Support UN in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous material, I insert a cablegram dated July 27, 1950, which I have received from the president of the Senate of Puerto Rico and the acting speaker of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico.

This cablegram reveals the action taken by both Houses of the Puerto Rico Legislature at the opening meeting of the fifth special session in condemning the avalanche of communistic aggression rolling into southern Korea from the north. It pledges the support of the people of Puerto Rico to the cause of the United Nations Organization and the United States, within whose political system we live as free American citizens.

It reflects, I think, the love of the Puerto Rican people for freedom and democracy, their disgust with communism, and their profound solidarity with their fellow citizens of the mainland. I recently returned from a visit to Puerto Rico where I observed the intense feeling among my people for the situation now prevailing in South Korea. I found that the youth of Puerto Rico are ready to answer the call to arms to join with the forces of the United States in order to uphold our ideals. I dare say, from what I have seen, that an army of no less than 75,000 could be raised in Puerto Rico without resorting to the draft. The Puerto Rican youth, able and willing to take up the duties of soldiers, are just waiting for the call.

The cablegram which I received reads, as follows:

JULY 27, 1950.

The Senate and House of Representatives of Puerto Rico at the opening meeting of its fifth extraordinary session unanimously approved a resolution condemning Communist

aggression upon democracy at southern Korea and pledging the support of the people of Puerto Rico to the issue of the United Nations Organization and the United States.

SAMUEL R. QUINONES,
President, Senate of Puerto Rico.
BENJAMIN ORTIZ,
Acting Speaker, House of Representatives of Puerto Rico.

Urgent Immediate Need for Emergency Funds To Prevent Profiteering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the Korean war has created an urgent need for emergency appropriations to enable existing control agencies to conduct an adequate fight against inflation and profiteering.

I direct the attention of the Members of the House to the following statement by William A. Bledsoe, director of the San Francisco Bay Defense Rental Area, which graphically illustrates the need for such appropriations:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM A. BLEDSOE, DIRECTOR, SAN FRANCISCO BAY DEFENSE-RENTAL AREA, AT MEETING OF RENT ADVISORY BOARDS, SAN FRANCISCO, JULY 24, 1950

As a result of Communist military aggression against the Republic of South Korea and the threat of Communist violations of peace and security in other parts of the world, the United States is now engaged in a bitter struggle with the Red invaders. We are leading the military efforts of the United Nations to push the Communists out of South Korea and we are standing guard at many other points where the Reds may strike.

To meet this crisis, the Nation has been partially mobilized. The President has asked for more billions for our armed services, for foreign military assistance, for greater security measures. The draft is in operation, the Reserves and the National Guard are being called up. Materials and men will soon be diverted from some nonessential uses to war production.

This national-defense program will put our economy, already operating at near capacity, to a severe test. The President has said that he will not hesitate to ask for price control and rationing if and when they are needed. Prices are already jumping because of "war scare" buying and there are reports of gray and black markets in building materials.

The home-building industry, which was making such remarkable progress in meeting the housing shortage, will, according to informed estimates, be curtailed not less than 20 percent under the recent all-time high volume. Credit will be restricted and building materials will be needed in the war effort.

The San Francisco Defense-Rental Area, comprising the counties of San Francisco, San Mateo, Marin, and Sonoma, is now feeling the impact of this strain upon our economy. Once again the Bay area finds itself in the critical position of a funnel for men and supplies on their way to the Pacific theaters of military operation. Local military bases are greatly expanding.

The San Francisco rent-control office is a good listening and observation post for measuring this impact. What have we heard and seen so far?

Violations of rent ceilings have taken a violent upswing.

Rent gouging is rampant.

The demand for rental housing is skyrocketing.

How do we know this? From the 300 people a day who have been pouring into our office in the last 2 weeks. From the hundreds of telephone calls we have been getting every day. From the desperate pleas of housing and personnel officers at military bases from Moffett Field to Hamilton Field. From the people who wander into our office thinking we can help them find a place to live. From law-abiding landlords who are aghast at what is going on. Our information is from the grass roots.

In view of this emergency, the rent-control office faces a new problem and a new responsibility. During the postwar period, all of our major policies have been founded on the assumption that the housing situation was getting better day by day. It was; and our policies correctly recognized this fact. Now the housing problem is certain to get worse in this defense-rental area during this crisis and it would be irresponsible administration not to put the entire resources of the area rent office in support of a policy and a program designed to meet the emergency. And it would be unrealistic not to recognize the inflationary potentials of our enormous defense program; it would be negligence of office for the area rent director not to adopt a policy which will, within the framework of present legislation, contribute toward the curbing of inflationary pressures in the rental market.

Accordingly, with the concurrence of the rent advisory boards of this defense-rental area, the area rent director proposes to place into effect at once the following program:

1. The administration and enforcement of rent control in this area shall be geared to the present emergency. Our basic policy will recognize the fact that the San Francisco Bay Defense-Rental Area is a critical area of our Nation's military and industrial operations.

2. To the full extent of our present legal powers, all of the activities of the rent-control office shall be enlisted in support of the home-front fight against runaway inflation.

3. To curb the violent upswing in rent gouging, the prosecution of willful violators of legal rent ceilings will be sharply accelerated. Cases which cannot be promptly settled on a voluntary basis will be immediately referred for court action.

4. As provided by law, treble damages, or three times the amount of the overcharge, will be more frequently demanded as a penalty necessary to obtain general compliance with the law.

5. Where there is evidence of an overcharge in any one unit of a large multiple-unit building, we will make a thorough investigation of all rents being collected throughout the building.

6. We will step up our prosecution of cases involving tie-in sales, bonuses, side payments,, and decreases of essential services.

7. To halt the threat of evasion of eviction regulations, we will demand more complete proof that all legal requirements for the issuance of a certificate of eviction have been fully complied with.

8. All applications for rent increases will now be carefully examined in light of their possible inflationary effect. Continuing studies of the general rent level in this area will be made to determine the effect of increased demand upon the supply of rental housing and to detect the first signs of an inflationary spiral in the rental housing market.

9. As a contribution toward holding the price line, and as a matter of fairness to all owners of controlled properties, we shall reactivate our program of reducing rents on the basis of comparability for those accommodations which are rented for the first time or have been recontrolled under the present law.

10. We shall regard it as our increasing responsibility in the present emergency to have up-to-the-minute information on the housing situation in this defense area in order that our policies may at all times be realistic and that we may be forewarned of critical developments. In this connection, it will be necessary to rely more and more on the intimate knowledge of local and neighborhood situations board members have in their possession.

11. More active participation of rent advisory boards in the over-all rent-control program will be called for. In order that the policies and programs of the area rent office may always reflect the current needs of local communities and neighborhoods during this critical and fast-changing period, we will require more than ever before the recommendations, suggestions, and criticisms of board members based upon their close-up view of conditions in their own districts. This is necessary to assure that the administration of rent control shall always be from the grass roots up and not from a far-away source at the top.

Further Evidence That Stockholm Peace Petition Is Communist Inspired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I now wish to make available to my colleagues a portion of the remarks made by Commissioner Gordon Dean of the United States Atomic Energy Commission before a symposium of the American Medical Association at San Francisco, Calif., June 26, 1950. He points out strikingly the origin, the purposes, and the supporters of the so-called Stockholm peace petition.

The remainder of his remarks refer to our own program for the development of atomic energy:

ATOMIC ENERGY IN WAR AND PEACE

I do not propose to review for you how atomic energy was utilized to bring about a speedy climax to World War II, for this is recent and vivid in all our memories. I do not propose to discuss how atomic energy might be utilized to bring about a speedy cessation of hostility should another war break out. We have made it a rigid policy in the Commission, and I think wisely, not to discuss weapons information. I do wish, however, to discuss with you some of the efforts being expended toward peaceful applications of atomic energy.

Before I do so I wish first to explore with you an alleged peace campaign now being instigated and directed by the leaders of the Kremlin. I refer to the drive to secure signatures to the so-called Stockholm peace petition. This movement has not had sufficient attention.

It should be obvious to people throughout the world that there has been a difference in the approach of the United States and that of the U. S. S. R. to the organization which we know as the United Nations. Our approach to the UN has been to try and make it work—work for peace. The whole

Soviet approach has been to use it. We have looked upon the UN as a forum; they as a sounding board. We address ourselves primarily to the delegates present; they to the absent galleries.

The Russians today are making the most sustained appeal to the galleries which they have ever attempted since the close of the war—a drive to undermine world confidence in the 46-nation plan for the control of atomic weapons. You should know of this—of its origin, its supporters, and its purpose, for it does have a bearing on the prospects for genuine peace.

On March 19 of this year, at a meeting of the Communist-dominated World Congress of Partisans for Peace in Stockholm, a resolution was adopted which read as follows:

"We demand the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon as an instrument of aggression and mass extermination of people, and the establishment of strict international control over the fulfillment of this decision. We will regard as a war criminal that government which first uses the atomic weapon against any country. We call upon all people of good will all over the world to sign this appeal."

The resolution is short and, superficially read, rather innocuous.

It is important to analyze what it does not say. It does not brand as a war criminal that nation which first commits an act of aggression. Rather it states that that nation which first uses the atomic bomb is to be branded as the war criminal. Ten million Russians equipped with tanks, artillery, bombs, and bombers might be overrunning the world, but if one of the western powers should attempt to break the invasion and retaliate with the atomic bomb, the nation so retaliating—not the original aggressor—becomes the war criminal.

Was the Stockholm resolution purposely so framed? I shall leave it to you. For the past 3 months close to 50 percent of all commentaries on the Russian radio which have been beamed to foreign ears have dealt with this signature campaign. The Moscow press and the Communist press of all foreign countries carry extensive daily reports of the progress of the campaign. The New York Daily Worker, for example, is now in the midst of a virtual paroxysm of print. The Cominform Journal has described the campaign as a "main link" in the party line. According to other Soviet sources, it was purposely phrased to appeal to all people of good will. Moscow has at the same time called for Communists to demand from persons who refuse to sign the petition a public statement of why they oppose the abolition of atomic weapons. A person who does not sign, they assert, thereby proves himself to be an enemy of peace. This perhaps explains why so many signatures are coming from eastern Europe. No signatures, no bread.

And Moscow can well afford to press such a campaign because it can do no harm and in fact does some good to its military position. The resolution does not call for the destruction of existing bombs; it does not prohibit their continued use; and most significant of all, it completely ignores the 46-nation insistence upon really workable, enforceable international control of atomic energy. That the U. S. S. R. does not want. Its delegates refuse even to discuss truly effective control.

The phony peace campaign is being used to make the western nations out to be warmongers and the Russians, who today are so madly preparing for war, the doves of peace. If peace should really come to this world, it is of no moment who brought it about. We are not concerned that the western democracies may not get the credit for bringing about the peace we sincerely seek. We are concerned, however, lest there be those who would help the Kremlin win a cold or hot war in the name of peace, who would divert our attention from the hard task of insuring real peace. The French have pinned this Russian trick down for just what it is—a plot to divert world attention from the Russian arms race—a plot to enlist those who really want peace in the cause of those who refuse to wage peace—a plot to turn the gaze of the world from the lurid performance of the only rulers in this world who cannot stand inspection.

There was recently introduced and passed in the French National Assembly a motion inviting the government to take every initiative in the Security Council for the conclusion of an international convention that would, among other things, establish, prior to every other measure, international control of the production of atomic energy, forbid the use of atomic energy for war purposes, provide for the destruction of present stocks of weapons, codify existing prohibitions on poisonous gas and bacteriological weapons, prepare conditions for general disarmament and declare it to be an international crime against humanity within the meaning defined by the Nuremburg International Tribunal the refusal to submit to control measures concerning employment of atomic energy for war purposes and also making it an international crime for a country to be the first to employ any arms of mass destruction. As I stated, the motion was passed.

Did the French Communist delegates vote for the resolution? Ah, no! To the man, they voted "niet" (in French, of course). To the French, then, we owe a debt for having first flushed the tricksters. The French Communists were so red-faced when they did vote "no" that they saw fit, and understandably so, to issue a prolonged apologia for their vote to the people of France. And well they might have. Upon this action by the Communists there immediately followed floods of editorials in the French press pointing out the complete and utter hypocrisy of the Stockholm peace appeal.

The Stockholm peace petition has now hit our shores. In New York City today there are tables in certain shops and on the sidewalks with these petitions. The sign inviting signatories simply says: "Sign here for peace." And many are signing—a few because they know who is running this campaign—many because they genuinely want peace. They are being duped.

And one of these days, probably in September when the General Assembly again convenes, someone will dramatically drive a truck up to the UN hall, some willing workers in their cause will unroll these scrolls of paper with thousands of names upon them—all of this in the presence of the delegates and with great fanfare. Yes, the campaign will build up to some such climax. It is an old technique. Watch for it. Perhaps then the John Does around the world, and particularly those who enjoy the freedom of this country, will suddenly awaken to the realization that by the single act of signing a sheet of paper labeled peace they had, one spring day on the streets of Manhattan or San Francisco, become the pawns of the Russians in the game of talking peace as a means of waging war.

All of this fits perfectly with the oft-repeated Russian assertion that the atomic-energy program in that country is devoted to peaceful uses, to the removal of mountains, to changing the course of rivers, to the irrigation of arid lands and generally to the betterment of mankind. Let us look rather carefully at this phase of the party line.

If a country is really devoting its atomic-energy efforts to such peacetime projects, one would think, since no security problems are involved, that the world might be told just which river has changed its course and just which mountain has been moved and if arid plains are now being irrigated by the power released from the Russian atom, which plains, pray tell. If their piles are being used to irradiate elements for therapy or as tracers, which hospitals are getting the isotopes and with what results? A peace-loving world awaits this proof. If a country is really turning the atom to peaceful ends, and it is quite clear that the Kremlin would like the world to think that this is the case, would not good propagandists—and they are good propagandists—spread the answers to these questions, with accompanying photographs of the peaceful utilizations, to every corner of the globe? This would be a truly powerful peace offensive. I shall not labor the point by inquiring why they have not done these things. When you receive the next copy of the semiannual report of the Russian Atomic Energy Commission you might look for the answers to these questions. In fact, you might look for the semiannual report; but don't look too long.

Iowa Republicans Recommend Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the Iowa Republican Convention assembled at Des Moines, Iowa, on July 21, 1950, adopted the following resolution, much of which was recommended by the Iowa Republican Farm Policy Council, composed of farmers from all parts of Iowa and representing every type of agriculture within the State:

We deplore the exploitation by the administration of temporary farm emergencies including the so-called Brannan plan, for political purposes.

We, therefore, commend the Iowa Republican Farm Policy Council, composed of farmers from all parts of Iowa, representing every type of Agriculture within the State, for their conscientious study of and approach to a permanent farm program.

Believing that it is possible to have both prosperity and freedom in American Agriculture, both for ourselves and our posterity, the Republican Party in convention assembled, in line with the complete recommendations of the Iowa Republican Farm Policy Council, make the following proposals for a long-range, workable farm program. Within the framework of these recommendations we believe it is possible to maintain our liberties and our free society; achieve full distribution and constructive utilization of complete production; conserve our soil and water resources; maintain a balanced national budget and have a stabilized and prosperous farm economy.

1. A Federal bi-partisan Agricultural Commission should be created to govern policy-making powers over agriculture as delegated by the Congress of the United States. The majority of the membership of this Commission should be men of practical and proven farm experience. The greatest possible administrative authority should be held at the State and local levels, administered by non-partisan farmer-elected committees.

2. The broad base of the plan must be good, permanent soil and water conservation practices and improvements achieved through research, education, effective technical assistance, placing more land in grasses and legumes, reforestation to take submarginal lands out of crop production.

3. New domestic and foreign markets should be created by: Improved merchandising methods for farm products; development of new industrial outlets; promotion of consumer education and advertising programs to encourage better diets; starting a feasible program of exchanging American farm surpluses for raw materials and other products in foreign trade that can be profitably used in our own country.

4. A long-range program of balanced exports of private capital to underdeveloped countries of the work in the form of a capital export insurance program operated somewhat after the pattern of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is recommended. Such a program would create new markets and new sources of wealth.

5. A system of Federal agricultural supports to go into effect during distress periods should be maintained at all times. It should utilize for each farm commodity the methods best suited to assure both market stabilization and farmer stabilization at reasonable levels, and would require good soil-conservation practices of each participating farmer to be determined at the county and township level.

6. A comprehensive program of improved marketing and market conditions should be undertaken to narrow the gap between prices received by the farmer and those paid by the consumer.

7. Our total national prosperity must be maintained by all necessary measures, with agriculture recognized as an integral part of the national economy. Special emphasis must be put on full employment and capacity production by industry.

Therefore, the Republicans of Iowa, in convention assembled, endorse the recommendations of the Iowa Republican Farm Policy Council and urgently request that the first session of the Eighty-second Congress create this bipartisan Agricultural Commission and empower it to take the necessary steps to put this plan into action.

Unemployment Insurance System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial appearing in the Washington Post under date of July 17, 1950.

The unemployment insurance system established by Congress is a Federal-State system. The interest of the Federal Government in protecting its working people against hazards of unemployment was demonstrated in passage of the Federal Unemployment Insurance Tax Act of 1935. States were encouraged to pass unemployment insurance laws which, if approved under standards placed in the Social Security Act by Congress would entitle employers within those States to a 90-percent offset against the Federal tax. Moreover employers were entitled to an additional credit if the State law contained other standards established by Congress. The determination of whether or not State laws measured up to these requirements was placed by Congress in the hands of the Social Security Board and its successors, the Federal Security Agency and the Secretary of Labor. In this manner the Congress sought to preserve and protect the Federal-State system. Such protection meant equitable treatment to all States with consequent uniformity and consistency of interpretation of Federal law and standards. This in turn eliminated the possibility of competitive advantage between States in dealing with the same problems.

The Congress also provided for review of State administration for the purpose of ascertaining whether the State was complying with its own law and with the administrative standards of the Federal law, especially the provision requiring payment of unemployment benefits when due. The Congress provided that the Secretary of Labor after notice to the State and opportunity for hearing should withhold administrative grants, if the facts warranted, until such time as the State made proper correction. Only four hearings have been necessary since the act was passed 15 years ago.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, this is a remarkable record. Why then seek to change? Why remove the Federal authority to maintain adherence by the States to Federal law? Who is to be advantaged? Who is to be disadvantaged? Why should Congress on the spur of the moment, without hearings and any opportunity for review and study of this great program which affects millions of American workers, override its initial action which was passed after months of study and deliberation? I submit there is no pressing need for such action. All interested parties should be afforded an opportunity for full hearings if any changes are to be made in the system.

In this connection, I bring to the attention of the Congress the following editorial appearing in the Washington Post for July 17, 1950:

KNOWLAND AMENDMENT

The Senate bill amending the old-age and survivors' insurance system carries a rider sponsored by Senator KNOWLAND that would have far-reaching effects on the administration of the unemployment-compensation system. We trust that the amendment will be rejected by the conference committee to which the House and Senate old-age insurance bills have been referred (1) because it does not belong in a bill dealing with old-age insurance and welfare programs, (2) because it is a very complex measure introduced from the floor without prior hearings, and in face of the opposition of members of the Finance Committee, and (3) because it would make it possible for State officials and State courts to deny unemployment benefits to workers contrary to the standards set by Congress.

The Social Security Act provides States having approved unemployment compensation laws with Federal grants to pay for administering those laws. Employers in such States are also entitled to have 90 percent of the Federal unemployment compensation tax credited against contributions paid under State laws. To qualify for these grants and credits, however, the States must put their laws in conformity with labor standards set up by Federal law. For instance, unemployment benefits cannot be withheld for refusal to accept new work if the proffered job is vacant because of a labor dispute, if the job seeker is required to join a company union or resign from a bona fide union, or if the conditions of work and pay are out of line with prevailing standards.

Constant vigilance is required to make sure that, after the State laws have been approved, State agencies and officials comply with these requirements by proper interpretation of the law. Under the Knowland amendment, however, the Secretary of Labor could not charge a State with failure to conform with Federal requirements until an appeal had been taken to the highest State courts.

According to Senator KNOWLAND, the amendment "simply postpones action by the Secretary of Labor until the State judiciary has spoken; it does not deprive him of any power he now has but merely restricts its premature exercise." In refutation, opponents of the amendment declare that the only authority remaining under the amendment, so far as labor standards are concerned, would be to insure the carrying out by State unemployment compensation officials of the orders of the State courts. No action could be taken, as at present, to prevent State agencies from denying benefits in contravention of State laws as well as Federal requirements, unless or until cases reach the State courts. And it is pointed out that most administrative decisions never reach the courts. Moreover, if appeals were taken, the only question at issue would be the interpretation of the State law, and not the application of Federal standards.

In short, the amendment would, as Senator KERR stated in the course of debate, "destroy the Federal minimum requirements in the program which has been created by Federal legislation." As a matter of fact, that appears to be the real purpose of the Knowland amendment, which is backed by various west coast employers associations.

Stalin's Peace Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I include for the further information of my colleagues an excellent article by Louis Jay Herman, entitled "Stalin's Peace Fraud" which appeared in the New Leader of July 29, 1950.

May I call particular attention to the report that the drive to obtain signatures to the false so-called Stockholm peace petition is keyed into a Communist-inspired peace congress scheduled to meet in Warsaw next October and to emphasize the soundness of Mr. Herman's advice contained in the following final paragraph of this article:

By ruthlessly exposing this latest ruse to pave the way for Soviet world domination, an informed and aroused world public can still make next fall's Warsaw conclave of the mailed-fisted "peacemongers" a mournful one.

To anyone who might still be inclined to doubt the complete conclusiveness of all the evidence that this peace petition is exactly what Mr. Herman calls it, Stalin's Peace Fraud, I also call attention to this sentence:

Neither has the rumble of Russian-built tanks and the tramp of Russian-trained soldiers in Korea, with its irrefutable evidence of the Kremlin's warlike intentions, muted their breast-thumping protestations of devotion to peace.

The article follows:

STALIN'S PEACE FRAUD—PEACE PETITION STILL CIRCULATING DESPITE RED AGGRESSION IN KOREA

(By Louis Jay Herman)

For the past 4 months, in virtually every corner of this hydrogen-haunted world, millions of people have been affixing their signature to a document bearing the disarming title of "World Peace Appeal." Few of the signers have any motive other than a sincere desire to promote peace; the petition puts them on record in favor of banning atomic weapons and designating as a war criminal any government that first uses them. The sponsorship sounds innocent enough: According to a legend at the bottom, the appeal "was issued at Stockholm in March 1950 by the 'World Committee in Defense of Peace'." It even seems to carry the endorsement of UN Secretary-General Trygve Lie, who is pointedly quoted as saying: "I bless everyone, every man and woman, who works for peace."

The only hitch is that the "world committee" far from being a group of disinterested devotees of peace, is actually a Communist apparatus zealously toiling for the greater glory of Stalin; the petition is in no way supported by Trygve Lie, who has indignantly repudiated it; and, in short, the whole enterprise is part and parcel of a cynical Soviet maneuver aimed at exploiting worldwide longing for peace in order to achieve these three practical objectives:

1. Create the illusion that the world's masses are alined with the peace-loving Soviet Union and against the warmongering United States in the cold war.

2. Stampede public opinion in favor of the one-sided Russian proposals for atomic control, which have long since been rejected by an overwhelming majority of the members of the United Nations.

3. Divert attention from the crucial question of who launches the aggression to the secondary issue of which weapons are employed.

The sponsors of the Stockholm petition have spared no effort to convince the world that their motives are as pure as the wording of the appeal, whose every syllable is a model of semantic neutrality and nonpartisanship. When Johannes Steel, who attended the Stockholm meeting, returned to the United States, he observed sweetly: "This peace movement is neither pro- nor anti-Communist. It can be called political only if peace is politics." Representative VITO MARCANTONIO, who surprised absolutely no one by being the first (and only) Member of the United States Congress to sign up, demanded: "What is this nonsense about peace being Communist-dominated? You're either for peace or war. I don't want war."

To date, the committee claims 224,000,000 recruits on both sides of the iron curtain for its "non-Communist-dominated," "nonpolitical" peace crusade, including 10,000,000 in France, 10,000,000 in Italy, and 1,250,000 in the United States—750,000 of the latter since the outbreak of war in Korea. Those apparently convinced of the petition's bona fides have included, in addition to perennial dupes like Thomas Mann and Albert Einstein, such notables as former Italian Premiers Orlando and Nitti, former UN General Assembly President Aranha, and former Mexican President Cardenas.

If these eminent gentlemen think that peace is not a matter of politics, Stalin suffers from no such delusion. Since the drive got under way, the Russian press has treated it precisely as what it really is: the latest phase in the Kremlin's world-wide offensive against democracy. Reporting on the Stockholm meeting 3 days afterward, the leading organ of the Soviet foreign office, New Times, got right down to cases:

"The greater the number of these signatures, the greater will be the isolation of the warmongers. * * * The paramount task today is to make the * * * Stockholm decisions effective instruments in the struggle against the Anglo-American warmongers."

In a later article, the New Times laid it right on the line for the benefit of Soviet citizens:

"It has become a matter of duty for every upright individual to subscribe his name. * * * Whoever does not march with the people in this matter * * * it an abettor of the enemies of peace."

Quick to take the hint, 96,000,000 upright Russians had signed up at the latest official count. In the eastern European satellites, the number of "peace partisans" has all but outrun the population totals; in Hungary (population 9,200,000), 7,200,000 have signed; in Bulgaria (population 7,000,000), 5,700,000; in Rumania (population 15,800,000), 10,000,000; in Czechoslovakia (population 12,300,000), 10,000,000; and in Poland (population 23,900,000), 20,000,000.

Outside the iron curtain, where such near unanimity is a little more difficult to attain, the whole world network of Communist affiliates and fronts has swung into action. Typical transmission belts like the World Federation of Trade Unions, World Federation of Democratic Youth, and International Democratic Women's Federation are out plugging for signatures. The WFTU has declared the gathering of signatures to be "the cardinal task of the moment"; and, in a move that shed considerable light on the curious Communist interpretation of "peace," it followed up its May 22 appeal to the workers for signatures with another resolution, 2 days later, according "all honor and glory to the dockers and railway workers of France, Italy, Belgium, Holland, western Germany, and North Africa, for their disruption of the supply of American arms to the participants in the aggressive North Atlantic bloc." In France and Italy, the Communist-dominated General Confederations of Labor have sparked the campaign.

The American drive was launched on May Day by the Daily Worker, which announced magnanimously: "If you are for peace, it doesn't make any difference if you think the Soviet Union is responsible for the war fears, or whether you think it is Wall Street, or both." Thereupon, the job of collecting signatures was promptly turned over to a team of organizations and individuals whose past records made it a reasonably safe bet that they would never be found giving the benefit of the doubt to Wall Street. Over-all direction of the drive is handled by a "peace information center" with headquarters in downtown New York. Members of the "center" include such party-line stalwarts as W. E. B. DuBois, former contributing editor of the New Masses; Howard Fast, who comes in for regular accolades in the Soviet press as the leading "progressive American writer"; Albert E. Kahn, coauthor of the Great Conspiracy Against Russia; and Rockwell Kent, president of the Communist fraternal organization, the International Workers Order. Labor unions are being canvassed by a Labor Peace Conference, headed by Marcel Scherer, who is scheduled for early congressional contempt citation for refusing to disclose whether he is a Communist. Also doing their bit are the American Labor Party, Progressive Party, and the CP's legal arm, the Civil Rights Congress.

The Stockholm petition drive is now at its height. But it is actually only the climactic phase in a long Soviet-directed campaign to monopolize the word "peace" and turn it to useful political advantage. For 2 years, the Kremlin has mustered every weasel word and obedient stooge at its command for a "peace offensive" of vast proportions.

It all started in August 1948 with the holding of a World Congress of Intellectuals in Wroclaw, Poland (formerly the German city of Breslau). The tone of the Wroclaw kulturfest was set by Alexander Fadeyev, president of the Soviet Writers' Union, who denounced trashy American literature and other disgusting filth, while a battery of veteran Stalinists, including Frédéric Joliot-Curie (French Communist recently dismissed as head of France's atomic energy commission); Pablo Picasso; Albert E. Kahn; Hewlett Johnson, the Red Dean of Canterbury, and Hanns Eisler (brother of Gerhart) efficiently brushed aside minority non-Communist protests.

The Wroclaw congress set up an international liaison committee to keep the cultural ball rolling. The American members included Kahn and Fast, as well as two prize fellow-traveling exhibits and pioneers of the Wallace movement, Jo Davidson and Harlow Shapley. The following March, a Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace convened at New York's Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. In attendance was probably the most imposing collection of Communists, fellow travelers and Alices in political Wonderland ever to assemble under one roof on the North American continent—the inevitable Kahn and Fast, Stalinist luminaries like Rockwell Kent, Corliss Lamont, Paul Robeson, Johannes Steel, and W. E. B. DuBois, 7 of the contemptuous Hollywood 10, and more than 500 others. Hatchetman Fadeyev showed up to get in a few more licks at the warmongers, but the star attraction was Dmitri Shostakovich, who called on progressive artists to combat the new aspirants for world domination.

The peace crusade really hit its stride the following month, when the World Congress of the Partisans of Peace convened in Paris. One thousand seven hundred and eighty-four delegates from sixty-four countries gathered in the city's largest concert hall, the Salle Pleyel, after months of preparation designed to assure the most extravagant spectacle yet staged. Participating was every conceivable Soviet and satellite organization from the Mongolian Youth League and Artists' Union to the Viet-Nam People's Association. After a quick reckoning the Moscow New Times decided that no less than 600,000,000 people were represented at what was a demonstration of how isolated the Anglo-American imperialists are and—even more candidly—an impressive answer * * * to the North Atlantic Treaty.

Before adjourning, the Congress created a permanent committee of partisans of peace—the same which today circulates the Stockholm petition. Gracing the new group were Fast, Kahn, DuBois, Paul Robeson, O. John Rogge, Joliot-Curie, Picasso, and the "Red Dean."

Since Paris, the World Committee in Defense of Peace has been busier than ever. Yugoslavia has been expelled to protect the peace movement from Titoist-Fascist influences. Peace congresses have been held in Moscow, Mexico City, and Rome, and subsidiary peace committees set up in 46 countries. What is more, the work of the world committee has been of an increasingly practical nature: It has gathered 7,000,000 signatures in Italy urging that country's withdrawal from the Atlantic Pact, and watched approvingly as peace partisans dumped American arms shipments into the Mediterranean Sea.

With the preliminaries over, the committee met in Stockholm on March 15–19 to inaugurate the big push. On the motion of the chairman, Joliot-Curie, the peace appeal was quickly approved. The only major snag has been struck in North Korea, where special circumstances forced a halt in the collection of signatures after only half the population had signed. Elsewhere, the petition is to be circulated until October, when the next peace congress is slated to assemble in Warsaw.

The Stockholm petition peddlers have been in no way deterred by the protests of the Swedish Premier, who voiced his disgust at the "brandishing about of the name of our capital in this way by international Communist propaganda." Neither has the rumble of Russian-built tanks and the tramp of Russian-trained soldiers in Korea, with its irrefutable evidence of the Kremlin's warlike intentions, muted their breast-thumping protestations of devotion to peace.

Nor will it. For Moscow's minions are old adepts at taking over the words and ideas that strike the deepest chords in men's hearts and cynically exploiting them for their own ends. They sell slavery in a package labeled "freedom," invoke anti-fascism as they impose their own special brand of fascism, and turn back the clock in the name of progress. Today, in the shadow of the bomb, they find it easiest to hit the average man in his emotional solar plexus by hypocritically harping on the theme of peace.

By ruthlessly exposing this latest ruse to pave the way for Soviet world domination, an informed and aroused world public can still make next fall's Warsaw conclave of the mail-fisted peacemongers a mournful one.

The Old Fox Calls the Turn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a news story from one of the great newspapers of the country, the Youngstown Vindicator. This article is carried in the issue of Sunday, July 30, 1950. MIKE KIRWAN'S speech is remarkable because it was made almost 2 years ago. It will be well worth the time of the membership to read the remarks MIKE KIRWAN made on November 11, 1948.

Mr. Speaker, the news story from the Vindicator follows:

KIRWAN IN 1948 PREDICTED WAR UNLESS UNITED STATES REMAINED STRONG

"If we don't do our part to protect the boy who is guarding us in Berlin, Korea, and in Italy, then we'll be going over to join him."

This prophetic statement was made on November 11, 1948, by Congressman MICHAEL J. KIRWAN. Ironically enough, it was at the one hundred and seventy-third birthday observance in Youngstown of the Marine Corps.

KIRWAN, one of the Nation's foremost leaders for a strong America long before Pearl Harbor, sadly reflected Saturday on the words of his speech in the Hotel Pick-Ohio nearly 2 years ago.

"If anything goes wrong now," KIRWAN warned in that speech, "blame it on 'we, the people,' not the President of the United States. This is the only country in the world run by the people.

"You can't buy liberty," KIRWAN declared. "You need the Marines, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps. Draft bars will have to be lowered, or we'll lose our freedom."

KIRWAN continued: "We veterans of World War I are to blame for the last war (World War II). It was our job to see that war didn't happen again. We fell down; we paid no attention to our Government."

"GOT THEM HOME"

In his talk, the prophecies of which have sadly come to pass, KIRWAN declared that some Congressmen who had voted against the draft had to have something to strengthen their positions after the fighting ceased, so they began clamoring, "Why aren't the boys home?"

"Yes," KIRWAN said, "they got them home while the Russians were still preparing. We put our fleet and planes in mothballs because that is what most of the people wanted."

KIRWAN spoke that evening to a crowd attending a Marine Corps birthday celebration sponsored by the Merle J. Alexander detachment of the Marine Corps League.

It was not the first time KIRWAN had called his shots so well on the international picture.

For many years he was one of the staunch supporters of a plan to fortify Guam, a move which might have changed the whole course of Japanese participation in World War II.

Negro Troops Fighting Valiantly in Korea Give Lie to Soviet Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune of July 24, 1950:

LET'S TELL THE WORLD

We hope the Voice of America is letting the whole world know that it was the Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment which blasted Red Koreans out of Yechon while spearheading the Twenty-fifth Division's drive to halt enemy pressure on the east Korean front. We hope newspapers throughout the free world prominently featured the Twenty-fourth's part in the Korean fighting, as it was prominently featured in Saturday's Tribune.

We hope that each of the announcements made clear that the Twenty-fourth is a Negro regiment.

Ordinarily we do not call particular attention to the color of an individual about whom we publish news. We do not single out the fact that a good singer or athlete or a law violator is white or colored in reporting the news. We did not lay particular emphasis on the performance of colored as distinguished from white Americans in World War II. They are all Americans and normally should be thought of as such rather than in terms of their color.

But there are special circumstances in the Korean crisis which make it important for the whole world to know that Americans with dark skin are helping put down Communist aggression in Korea.

The Communists are trying to take over Asia and win control of the colored peoples of the world by portraying the United Nations effort in Korea as a case of whites fighting the colored peoples.

This is a propaganda technique the Communists have used with considerable success for many years. They have persuaded many millions of people throughout the world that Negroes in the United States are shamefully exploited and constantly subjected to lynching and other outrages. Every injustice (and unhappily there remain some injustices) is magnified a thousandfold. Millions of people abroad who have heard of injustices to Negroes in the United States have no idea that the great body of Negroes enjoy the rights and privileges which go with American citizenship. They do not know that Negroes are judges, scientists, lawmakers, policemen, editors, artists—and soldiers—in the United States. They do not know that Negroes fight for free institutions and the rule of law as gallantly and willingly as white Americans.

So a Communist propaganda weapon is refuted in making known the role of the Twenty-fourth Infantry on the east Korean front, and the fact that Negroes are fighting in other combat groups in Korea. Those dupes who think of the United States as a place where Negroes presently will be at war with whites can see that the Communists have lied to them about conditions in the United States. Those who think of the American effort in Korea can see that it is not a white attack upon the colored people of Asia but free men fighting to prevent Communists from taking away their freedom and security.

We hope that before long Pakistani, Filipinos, Thailanders, Brazilians and other non-Caucasians from outside the United States will soon be helping Americans put down aggression in Korea. It is everybody's responsibility, not ours alone. But in the meantime, let all the world know that Americans of color are pitting their courage, skills, and convictions against Communist aggression along with the rest of their countrymen.

Unity Would Be Best Served by Dismissal of Acheson and Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Harold (Doc) Wright, editor of the Horicon Reporter, published at Horicon, Dodge County, Wis., is not one who speaks without deliberation. Nor does he waste a lot of words. In two concise paragraphs he has given voice to the growing sentiment that Secretary Acheson and Secretary Johnson are incapable of regaining the public confidence which they have lost. Mr. Wright speaks as a distinguished Marine veteran of World War II. His brief editorial in the July 27 issue of the Reporter is set forth:

The tragedy of the American failure in Korea, and even though we eventually taste victory there we have already lost immeasurable prestige, can be laid mainly to three men: President Harry S. Truman, who is first a politician and only secondly a President, for his playing of politics with our military security; Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, also a politician first and a statesman second, for his almost criminal statement that we were in fine shape militarily after he completely took the guts out of our Navy and almost scuttled the Marine Corps; and last but, perhaps, foremost, the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, whose blundering association with the left wingers in his department, and absolute inability to comprehend a situation that has long been all too clear, have brought us to the position we are in today.

For the good of the Nation, Johnson and Acheson should go.

Censorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, now that we are engaged in a shooting war it is only natural that the problem of censorship of press and radio news should arise. No loyal American wants any information to fall into enemy hands which could be used to harm our national security or our military operations in any part of the world. However, I trust that the military authorities will handle the problem differently than it was handled during World War I and World War II. Let our military authorities impose censorship along intelligent lines and not with a regiment of uniformed blue-pencil fanatics. Let censorship be handled on a common-sense basis.

Our enemy nations have detailed maps of the entire United States and Canada. They have the figures of our Government departments on production of steel, ships, aluminum, airplanes, and other vital commodities for waging war. They have the stock-market records of companies controlled by du Pont interests, oil and electric companies. They have photographs in national magazines and newspapers of atomic-energy plants and airfields, of late-model planes and rockets, and they have copies of congressional hearings when military witnesses testified.

The military and probably the public generally would be indignant toward any publisher who today published a photograph of the atomic-energy plant at Richland in my own State of Washington. But if you go to any public library and look through the files of several of the well-known magazines, you can see attractive pictures of this plant from the air and close-ups of some of its buildings. The same goes for the Oak Ridge plant in Tennessee.

Let us be practical about the problem. Everyone knows that when we decided after World War II to put certain carriers and ships in what we call the mothball fleet there was no secret about it. We even had debates in which I took part to try to keep these mothball ships in good condition. Then, after the Korea shooting started a general announcement was made that instead of curtailment, spending for the military would be in order. The military went in reverse gear and economy words of Secretary Johnson have been recalled to haunt him. Announcement has been made—and the whole world knows it—that "mothballed" vessels are to be "demothballed." Is it not a waste of time by someone to worry whether announcement is made that the carrier "Tiddledewinks" is to be taken out of mothballs is published or announced over the air? I notice the Navy announced with pride a record-breaking 8-day crossing of the Pacific by a carrier—but at the same time the Navy said the name of the carrier must not be made public. The Communist chiefs of staff must be greatly worried over whether the carrier is the "Vodka" or the "Cossack."

Perhaps we can learn something from the way the British handled censorship in World War II. I was impressed by their getting over to the individual citizen the importance of not spreading rumors and of not talking about what goes on in factories where they worked. To my mind this is more important than checking on editors and publishers and radio stations who have been through two world wars and are alert to the danger of conveying any information to the enemy that might prove harmful.

In closing I want to say that no part of the Nation is more "security"—I might say "war"-conscious than the Pacific Northwest. We are the closest States to Soviet Russia. We produced a big share of the implements of war used in World War II and we are an important segment of airplane and atomic energy production. I am in favor of keeping our secrets in the hands of those who are entitled to share them and I want every precaution taken to prevent these secrets falling into enemy hands. But I do not want the cure to be worse than the disease and I hope those in charge of information security will use common sense.

The Issue Now: Americanism Versus Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, the important news in Washington today centers around the conflict of Americanism versus communism. People all over the country have been rudely awakened to the sad fact that communism has become the greatest threat the world has ever known. I feel impelled today to talk about a problem that is on the mind of nearly every American citizen, and in fact, on the mind of nearly every thinking adult in the whole world.

There are, of course, hundreds of side issues which might be discussed on this subject of Americanism versus communism, but it would be impossible for me to go into detail concerning all the ramifications this theme naturally brings to mind. I believe that the chief question uppermost in the minds of millions of Americans today is not whether we will become embroiled in a world conflict, but how soon this world conflict will develop. Dozens of callers at my office from the Eighteenth Congressional District, newspaper men, radio commentators, political friends and enemies—all have been asking these questions: "What chance will America and the combined forces of her allies have to eventually win out over the forces of communism?" and "How will you and I be affected in our daily lives when a world conflict comes?" These questions are extremely difficult for me to answer. They are extremely difficult for any person to answer, but I feel it my duty to attempt some response because I have had considerable experience dealing with Communists and feel I know something about their technique.

In the first place, I firmly and wholeheartedly believe that Americanism and our constitutional form of Government, as we have enjoyed it since the days of the Pilgrims, will eventually win out. Sometimes I feel that I am being a little optimistic in making such a prediction, especially when faced with the situation which exists in the world today. I repeat, however, that I firmly believe that right eventually wins over might, and I feel that America and her true American citizens are in the right on this issue.

Another reason why I say that America will win out is because we are fundamentally religious in nature and practically all of us worship God as being the greatest power known to man. This is not true in Russia. Time and time again the leaders of Russia and her satellite nations have drilled into their own citizenry the principle that the state is all powerful and more mighty than God, in fact, it is their God. It is a fundamental theory of communism. Our American Communists also preach the superiority of Stalin and Lenin over God.

Coming back to the second question, that is, How will you and I be affected in our daily lives when a world conflict comes? This presents a real problem to Americans, since we do prefer living without the threat of war hanging over our heads, and continuing our normal peaceful pursuits in life along our usual high standards. We can get a little hint of what is to come for each and every one of us from the President's message to Congress last week. We can expect higher taxes, we can expect more governmental controls, we can expect to be deprived of most luxuries, and probably a good many of the necessities of life. The indications are that we will shortly see a shortage of such commodities as rubber, steel, and oil, and all the millions of products that are composed of these precious elements. A good many of our young men and women of draft age can expect to be wounded and many lose their lives. I realize all this sounds grim and foreboding, but sooner or later we must wake up to the stark realities confronting us.

When North Koreans first marched on our sister republic of South Korea, we practically all reacted in the same manner. We felt we must prevent further Communist aggression in the world in order to prevent its reaching our own beloved land. But after the first flush of fighting spirit had cooled down, practically every American, and I am certain the citizens of my own congressional district, sat down and began to ponder over the mistakes of the past that have led us into the present critical situation. At the present time the administration, which undeniably has been linked both directly and indirectly with the cause of

communism, is now placating the American citizens with the calm assurance that we are adequately prepared to resist invasion by the Communists. This administration, through its chief living spokesman, President Truman, is busy uttering the ridiculous statement, "This is water over the dam—let us forget about it and buckle down to present realities."

Are we actually prepared to resist Communist aggression, and shall we forget about the past mistakes as the President would have us do? In answer to the first part of the question just propounded, "are we actually prepared?"—let me mention a few down-to-earth facts. We need at least three basic materials in order to win a modern, mechanized war—and those are steel, rubber, and oil. Soviet Russia has secured a lot of the iron and steel necessary by taking over Manchuria. She would not have that steel if the Chinese, after being promised at the Cairo Conference that Manchuria would be returned to them at the end of the war, had not been sold down the river and Manchuria turned over to Soviet Russia. Who has been responsible for that? Because of our weak and contradictory foreign policy, China has been turned over to Red communism. I believe the RECORD will show what Members of the House and Senate have continually pleaded for a strong foreign policy, and the majority of these were the Republicans. We have been told repeatedly by the Secretaries of State, Defense, and various other members of the administration forces that it was not our responsibility to defend Korea or any part of the Orient—that if we were attacked at any place at any time, we would be ready less than an hour later to defend ourselves. Now our foreign policy has been completely reversed and we are in the one spot we were told we would not be in, fighting a deadly battle with insufficient men, insufficient material and weapons of war to back up these men, and, in other words, not prepared. And yet we have given away under the ECA to Europe and the Near East over $35,000,000,000. Had we not been so shortsighted in preparing others instead of ourselves, we might now be having different news reports from the Korean front—in fact, I dare say if the Communists knew we were completely prepared and ready, they would not have dared to attack us in the first place.

There is a very stupid charge being aimed at Republican Members, and that is that we are to blame for the Korean crisis because we did not vote for economic aid to Korea. This is all the more unfair, in view of the fact that economic aid to Korea was entirely without value unless backed up by military assistance. By sending fertilzer, farm machinery, hydroelectric equipment and other machinery to develop South Korea a much greater loot would have been prepared for the Communists to take over.

Congress has twice appropriated funds for the construction of a big modern aircraft carrier, but it was canceled. But by whom? Why is it that we will have fewer cruisers, fewer heavy aircraft carriers, fewer destroyers, fewer submarines, fewer escort vessels, and all other types of ships with which to carry on a war across the ocean? You doubtless will remember the B–36 hearings of last year, which created such a stir. Time has now proved that Congress was correct in insisting that carriers which could be operated as mobile bases were necessary and essential. The Secretary of Defense should never have stopped the construction of the super-carrier, *United States*. The Armed Services Committee investigation also uncovered the fact that the administration was seeking to wipe out the Marine Corps, which had had extensive experience in the Far East and in amphibious operations. The Eightieth Congress, Republican-controlled by the way, saved the Marine Corps but its fighting strength was materially weakened by the administration's policies. The Navy also was found to have been weakened. This situation today would have been much more heartbreaking had not Congress intervened. I must mention the fact also that the Eightieth Congress attempted to put into effect a program for a 70-group Air Force. This also was vigorously opposed by the administration, and even though Congress had appropriated almost a billion dollars more for a strong Air Force, it was not used. In view of the fact that economy at home was definitely not practiced, one wonders which was the more important to the administration—our safety, or its political power. All this makes the accusation that Republican Members of Congress are responsible for the present unprepared state of our defenses sound like the rantings of a spoiled child. What party has been in power these many years—what party holds the purse strings of the United States?

So, to the question "are we prepared?" the undeniable answer will have to be, "No, we are not prepared." Too much of the life blood of our economy has been expended in foreign countries. We have forgotten our own defenses and now all we can hope for is the tremendous productivity of what is left of our capitalistic system of free enterprise to bolster up our national defense. We must also depend upon the willingness and aptitude of our American citizens to tighten up their belts. We must, in spite of the past mistakes of a befuddled and corrupt administration, work together in a spirit of cooperation to the end of the survival of our American Republic and its constitutional form of government.

Now comes the second part of the question: "Shall we forget the past mistakes as the President would have us do?" What do you say? Shall we excuse this corrupt administration and blithely assume that these mistakes have been entirely eradicated? Most of you remember the thousands of warnings issued by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and other internal security forces, concerning the dangers of Communist aggression and world domination of the Kremlin as set out in the Communist manifesto. Back in 1924 when Mr. Hoover took over the leadership of the FBI, his major concern was with this very problem. Through the information he was able to gather, even at that time 26 years ago, he could see clearly the pattern of this world design-for-domination. At that time most of us considered bolshevism and communism as mere crackpot theories and were certain that the people who followed these ideologies would eventually come to their senses and conform to our own spirit of Americanism. The FBI, however, was wary of these so-called crackpots sent to our shores by various dictators of the Kremlin. The FBI learned of the treachery of the agents of Lenin and Stalin and periodically issued warning concerning their dangerous activities. Like most American citizens, I did not consider the comparatively small band of traitors as being really dangerous to our American institutions until I was inducted into the FBI and learned first-hand of the treachery and intrigue of their far-reaching plans and diabolical methods used to draw American citizens into their net in order to gain control of this country. It was then that I realized the Kremlin was using every scheme and device possible to place its agents into positions of power in our United States. The Kremlin caused our free American institutions to be infiltrated with these agents, whose first purpose was to divide, then conquer us. These agents were responsible for promoting the breach which now exists between management and labor. They are also largely responsible for the divisions and animosities created between our different faiths and races. They have been operating for the last 20 years under an administration whose chief purpose in life seems to have been the furthering of the monstrous plans of these clever traitors. A great group of highly educated brain-trusters came to power shortly after 1932 and fell for the line handed out by the Kremlin.

It did not take long for our Government to decide to recognize Communist Russia, and by this recognition opened the doors of our country to Stalin's diplomats and consuls. These flocked into our country by the dozens, ostensibly to promote world trade and world peace between the different nations of the world. We soon found out, however, that the first purpose of the Russian diplomatic corps was to assist those Communists who had already made such remarkable progress in gathering up our war secrets and the secrets of our tremendous productivity in their prescribed tasks. At the beginning of World War II, Russia had not only obtained our scientific secrets through her espionage network, but had been successful in establishing confusion among our people the like of which we have never seen. Most of you can remember that in 1939 Stalin and Hitler stood side by side under a peace pact. They were both dictators and knew it. Let us take a look at the American Communists and the Russian diplomatic officials in the United States at that time. What were they doing? They were busy picketing the White House with signs that read "the Yanks are not coming," and "we shall not send our boys to foreign soil."

The latter statement, by the way, was echoed by our late President Franklin D.

Roosevelt on many occasions. This picketing of the White House and this movement, designed to prevent the delivery of war materials to our allies, came to an abrupt halt on June 21, 1941. Most of us will remember that day when Hitler sent his forces to invade Poland and Russia, thus breaking off the peace pact. For a period of 2 weeks our American Communists did not know what to do. One thing they did do was to stop the picketing of the White House post haste. During those 2 weeks these American traitors were in a state of great confusion. They were at a loss as to what the party line would be. They had to wait until they got word from Uncle Joe Stalin. Usually it does not take 2 weeks for the party line to come from the Kremlin to the leaders of American Communists but we must remember that Uncle Joe was a little confused himself by the suddenness of the attack from his hitherto friend. He was at that time considerably more concerned about his local situation than he was about his Communist allies in the United States. But 2 weeks after June 21, on our own Fourth of July as a matter of fact, Communist Party members in the United States at last had their instructions all set out for them. The party line had suddenly become reversed.

Now they were for all-out war against Hitler and his dictatorship. They were for aid to Russia primarily, and aid to France, England, and other Allied Nations secondarily. Does that give us any picture of the real intent of the American Communist Party? Does it give us any idea of the treachery of which they are capable? I think it does. June 21, 1941, the day Hitler attacked Russia, will go down in the minds of all our citizens—excepting those closely connected with the administration—as the day when we finally learned the true plans for world domination nursed by Soviet Russia. The proof is undeniable. But the administration, whether deliberately or accidentally playing into the hands of the Russian dictatorship, actually coddled and pampered our American Communists, and have continued to do so. It allowed to actively engage in their despicable work, such traitors as Alger Hiss in our State Department, Communist agents in our Commerce and Treasury Departments, and Judith Coplon in our Justice Department. This administration failed to heed the warnings of J. Edgar Hoover, although FBI reports of the Communist espionage ring, the greatest and most powerful the world has ever known, were regularly sent to the White House.

My friends, it is long past the time to be serious about the danger facing our beloved country. We must somehow make our President, his Cabinet members, and others of his administration forces realize that it is long past time for a change to take place—for good government to take the place of petty politics. Should we forget the mistakes and blunders of the past? I say no. Rather we should remember the mistakes and profit by them. We should cease permitting Communist sympathizers and fellow travelers to dictate our foreign policy in the State Department and other executive departments of Government. The administration now has an opportunity given it to correct its mistakes and show an honest and sincere desire to cooperate with the various investigating agencies and committees set up for the purpose of protecting our country. Instead of the cries of "red-herring," "witch hunt," "publicity seekers," and various other insulting epithets, we should now like to hear some common-sense statements from the White House on down through the various governmental agencies. We are waiting for the green light and trust it will not be too long a wait.

Males Haven't Cornered the Uniforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of July 31, 1950:

MALES HAVEN'T CORNERED THE UNIFORMS—SERVICES SAY WOMEN ARE AS WELCOME AS MEN, IF—

(By David O. Tyson)

WASHINGTON, July 30.—The Korean crisis found 22,000 American servicewomen—7,000 of them nurses—already in uniform, backed up by an estimated 25,000 in the Reserves.

The Armed Forces made no distinction in sex when they called for volunteers and enlistments. If a woman can fit into a specialist grade, the services say she's as welcome as a man.

The Women's Army Corps (WAC), which reached a peak wartime strength of 100,000, now has more than 7,000 women in Army posts throughout the world. About 1,200 are overseas in Germany, Austria, the Caribbean, and Japan. None was in Korea when hostilities began, but a dozen were there during the American occupation.

These 7,000 girls in khaki release about 7 infantry battalions for combat duty. In addition, 4,852 Wacs are training in Organized Reserve drills.

The 2-year-old WAF (Women in the Air Force) has 4,000 in uniform. About 200 are overseas, mainly in Germany and Newfoundland, with some in Alaska, Hawaii, Japan, Okinawa, and England.

They are supported by an estimated 3,500 WAF reservists taking part in drills at Air Force bases. No WAF's are assigned to flight duty and the Air Force does not expect to assign any. It believes flying, a job better left to men.

RELEASE SAILORS FOR TWO BATTLESHIPS

The Navy's Waves claim an active strength of 3,400—enough womanpower to release sailors to man two battleships like the *Missouri*. About 100 of them are overseas in London, Alaska, Hawaii, and Germany.

In addition, over 4,000 civilian women are members of the Navy's Organized Reserve, taking part in all drills except cruises. The only seagoing Waves are two lieutenants who went aboard transports in the spring of 1949. They stood no watches, but merely had 2 weeks' training in the administrative details of transporting naval dependents by ship.

The Korean invasion found the marines with nearly 600 women in their ranks, most of them in Washington, none overseas.

The Marine Corps was the first service to establish an organized Reserve platoon for women and now has an estimated 1,900 skirt-wearing reservists. Women who are members of organized marine ground Reserve units are being called to duty along with the men, except those with only brief service. The latter are expected to be called later.

The Coast Guard has no Spars on active duty, but about 250 in its Reserve. It hopes to get an organized Reserve program started for them shortly.

NURSES ARE STILL ON ACTIVE DUTY

Nurses, all with officers' commissions, are found today as always wherever servicemen need medical care. The Army had 3,460 on duty last June 1, more than 1,000 stationed abroad. About 63,000 Army nurses saw service during World War II and 5,140 are standing by in the Reserves.

The Air Force now has its own Nurse Corps, 1,100 on active duty and 400 to 500 more in reserve.

More than 2,000 Navy nurses are on active duty with 153 naval stations and hospital ships. More than 11,000 served during World War II, and best available estimates place the Navy Nurse Reserve strength at 5,000 today. The Navy even has five women doctors on active duty, one of them aboard a hospital ship.

Another type of service open to the feminine world is the Women's Medical Specialist Corps (WMSC), made up of dieticians and physical and occupational therapists. The Army has 322 in its WMSC, 43 of them overseas, plus 456 in its WMSC Reserve. The Air Force WMSC has 80 active, with fewer than 50 in its Reserve.

The training for women joining the regular services corresponds to that given men. WAC enlistees, taken between 18 and 34, are given 13 weeks' basic training at Camp Lee, Va. Among other subjects, they now get a course in weapons demonstration, designed to acquaint them with weapons lingo used in Army offices.

PACK KNAPSACKS TO GO HIKING

Camp Lee Wacs also pack a knapsack and hike off for a week of bivouac living. Several hundred Wacs lived and worked for months under field conditions in World War II. The Army wants its recruits to be prepared for the same duty.

No stranger to the rough outdoor life is the WAC director, Col. Mary A. Hallaren, a 43-year-old former school teacher. The pint-sized Colonel Hallaren has hiked through the Northwest, across the mountains of Yugoslavia and over the Andes. She averages half a dozen speeches a month today.

The WAF takes 175 recruits a month. It sends them to Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex., for indoctrination. This now lasts 11 weeks but may be accelerated. The fledgling WAFS don't get up in planes, but they do take aircraft recognition and plenty of physical training and drill.

Col. Geraldine P. May, first WAF director, was a WAC until the Air Force women gained their independence in June, 1948. The 55-year-old colonel, a former Campfire Girl, was in the first group of WAC officers commissioned in August 1942.

WAVE RECRUITS ARE REAL COEDS

The WAVE takes about 160 recruits a month and sends them to boot camp at Great Lakes, Ill., for 13 weeks. Here they attend classes and drill with the men in true coed fashion. They even "go to sea" for a day on Lake Michigan to learn what a ship is like.

The WAVE skipper, Capt. Joy B. Hancock, had a World War I tour of duty as a yeomanette and was discharged a chief petty officer. Now 52 years old, she is twice

widowed. Both her husbands were killed in line of duty in Navy dirigible crashes. She was commissioned in the WAVE in October 1942 and has been WAVE director since July 1946.

Marine women recruits, taken between 20 and 31, are sent to Parris Island, S. C., where they don the traditional forest green and scarlet marine uniform for 6 weeks' boot training. Their director is Col. Katherine A. Towle, 52, former assistant dean of women at the University of California.

Feminine service fashions are affected both by changing styles and a wish to integrate the women more closely into the service.

The WACS are replacing their old uniform with a new number designed by Hattie Carnegie, who has done away with the masculine necktie and followed definite feminine styling.

The WAVES, on the other hand, are replacing the distinctive light blue of their officers' uniforms with the midnight blue and gold which male officers have always worn. The design, by Mainbocher, remains the same.

Falsehood Gushes and Gushes While Patriotism Blushes and Blushes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, radio announcers gushed forth many times during last Sunday afternoon, July 30 with statements to the effect that generally speaking the people of the Republic have become and are angry, and want to know what their pre-Korean money had been spent for, and also broadcasted to the effect that Secretary Louis Johnson had failed to tell the truth and had committed a real wrong by lulling our people into security in that he did not disclose the true military strength of our Nation and its general preparedness for a sudden conflict like that which is now going on in Korea and therefore, he, Secretary Johnson, should be relieved pronto of his present duties. If there was not available to me, as a loyal American, any better publicity subjects than the foregoing to "shoot the breeze" about, surely I would be constrained to keep real "mouse-still" about such friction-producing subjects which make for bad public relations at home and abroad.

Everybody in the United States for the last several years knows that almost every thought, word and deed of ours has been channeled mostly in the cause of peace and not in the advancement of the cause of war.

From our great President down, we were all building sincerely and honestly for a lasting peace, talking incessantly for a lasting peace, bragging and boasting for a lasting peace, and nothing proves these statements any better and puts the lie to the morally and mentally diseased men controlling Russia at this time that we were warmongers, than the fact that we were so totally unprepared for the diabolical Russian-inspired aggression in Korea.

I wish to direct the attention of my readers to a very timely article written by Mr. Jim G. Lucas which appears in the Washington Daily News of Monday, July 31, 1950, at page 27 thereof, which concisely answers the question as to what the money of the people really bought. This article is as follows:

WHERE THE MONEY WENT—$90,000,000,000 DIDN'T BUY A GREAT DEAL OF DEFENSE

Where has the money gone—the $90,000,000,000 Uncle Sam has spent on the armed forces since the war's end?

Nearly half of it—$42,000,000,000—went to liquidate our World War II machine. Military officials tried to stop that quick liquidation, but the public demanded it.

Even so, many Americans can't understand why the billions we have spent haven't been enough to stop Russia's North Korean puppets. We've been able to throw only three undersized divisions against nine fully mobilized Red ones. Our tanks are badly outgunned. Day after day, our GI's have been forced to retreat.

The demand for an accounting has reached such a pitch that Defense Secretary Louis Johnson has prepared a balance sheet.

TWO CONCLUSIONS

Two conclusions seem inescapable. One, the Defense Department has been so busy with its housekeeping chores, that it's had little time—and less money—for fighting forces. Two, we let ourselves become so preoccupied with preparations for a big future war that we overlooked the obvious necessity of getting ready for an immediate little one.

To hold any one man or group responsible is difficult and probably not justified.

Housekeeping is something that couldn't be put off. On the second count, the job of preparing for a big war was engrossing and exciting. It let the experts give full play to their imagination.

Scientists, generals and admirals hesitated to build a good tank, a good plane or a good gun now when, with a little more research, they expected to develop a better one next year. Without realizing it, they made perfection, rather than strength, their goal. They forgot the clock and the calendar.

THE EXPENSIVE GI

Of the $48,000,000,000 spent for needs other than the liquidation of World War II, we spent $19,800,000,000 just to pay, feed, clothe and move our men from one post to the next. That sum is high because Americans demand the best for their men. They're the best paid, best housed, best clothed and best entertained soldiers in the world.

We've spent $12,800,000,000—or $3,000,000,000 a year—to operate and maintain our equipment. A lot of that went to civilians. There were 743,000 on the pay roll June 30, even though Mr. Johnson fired 140,000 last year.

MORE FOR NEW WEAPONS

Another $8,500,000,000—or 18 percent of the $48,000,000,000—went for new weapons. That is not much, but our score is improving. It climbed from 6 percent in 1947 to 19.5 percent last year. Moreover, 60 percent of the $10,500,000,000 Mr. Truman wants for Korea will go for new weapons. We have spent $6,200,000,000 on planes, $810,000,000 on ships and $1,400,000,000 on antiaircraft, tanks, electronics, vehicles and antisubmarine warfare.

Research and development of new weapons—few ready for Korea—has taken $2,200,000,000. The National Guard and Reserves spent $1,800,000,000. New buildings and public works got $500,000,000; retired pay, $780,000,000; administration, finance and classified projects, $1,300,000,000; industrial mobilization plans, $400,000,000.

As far as firing Secretary Johnson for what he said, that is positively the most useless suggestion which I have heard up to this writing. Fire him, for what? Fire him for fooling and boasting for ear-cocked Russia's consumption? Not by a—well let us say to be proper—a jug full. Why should any real American aspire to be Joe Stalin's "firing boss"?

Heretofore in both of our National Legislative bodies, and in the public press, and over the radio, many patriotically foul, misguided persons have joined in an un-American smear campaign and have asserted falsely that our Nation was soft and weak and vascillating from a military standpoint; that our Government, particularly in the State Department was honey-combed with Communists and reeking with homosexuals, degenerates, and other moral perverts; that "top-drawer secrets" of our Government could be and were stolen and abstracted at will by American born aides to Russian spies; that we were spending or had spent, ourself into bankruptcy, that our currency was on its way to a valueless status; that inflation and depression were about to stalk over our Nation; that pribery and dishonesty and incompetency was tolerated in high places in Government; and that our Government, in reality the strongest and best in all the world, was in the withering clutches of moral weaklings, booby-minded wastrels, and superlative scoundrels.

To suggest that Secretary Johnson should be asked to resign, in my opinion, falls in the same general category as the smears hereinabove referred to because it implies that Secretary Johnson made false statements in his official capacity.

All of the foregoing vicious and un-American mouthings have crippled the effectiveness and prestige of our great and good Government at home and abroad. No proof is required as regards the damnable effect which such a false and cruel smear campaign has had upon some of the people of our Republic. It, too, may have caused the Korean Communists to strike and thus been the cause of many of our fine American soldiers to be killed and maimed, and a goodly portion of our financial resources to be lost forever. Why cannot the "smeary boys" wake up before it is too late?

The following article, somewhat revised, which appeared in a recent issue of Washington Post, is typical, I believe, of the harm which this false smear campaign has had in Italy, and I believe that this is a typical illustration of what has occurred and is occurring in other foreign lands:

SMEARISM'S EFFECT

In June an Italian said to me in Rome that he and other people he knew were greatly disturbed because of the large number of Communists in the United States. "Most of your officials are Communists," he said. "We wonder if it won't develop soon that President Truman is a Communist."

By that time I was sputtering. I managed to ask him where he got such ideas.

"From the smear investigation," he said. "The stories in our papers indicate that the

investigation involves everybody, even your President."

I told the Roman, an intelligent lawyer, that a great many things could be said about President Truman, but that his greatest enemy in the United States would hardly accuse him of communism. In fact, I assured the man, President Truman is a distinctly uncommunistic type.

"Why would anyone accuse so many people unless he has proof?" the man asked.

For obvious reasons, I could not answer that one.

When one's high ranking public servants are held in disrespect and disrepute at home, we can never expect them to be treated with honor and repute elsewhere.

As a final suggestion, why cannot all of us in the coming trying days resolve to button up our mouths and quit giving aid and comfort, wittingly or unwittingly, to old pipe-smoking, traitor-promoting, mentally and morally filthy and debased, old Joe Stalin et al.

Is the H-Bomb Worth It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Buffalo Evening News of July 24, 1950:

IS THE H-BOMB WORTH IT?

A number of scientists but not many Congressmen have dared to question whether we should go overboard for the building of a hydrogen bomb. One who has done so—and who should know something about the subject—is Representative W. STERLING COLE, of Bath. A member and former vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Eenergy, he bluntly asks if the H-bomb will be worth the cost of researching and producing it—even assuming that it can be built and that it would do everything claimed for it.

His objections are practical, rather than moral. First, he notes that the hydrogen bomb would cost hundreds of millions to produce and, more important, it would require considerable quantities of fissionable materials and thus necessarily curtail our production of atomic bombs.

"If we assume that the United States has a large stockpile of improved atomic weapons, which we must assume," he says, "it is in a position to blast any other nation as thoroughly as bombing can be effective." In that case, he asks, "of what strategic value is the super bomb?"

Several scientists familiar with the theoretical problems involved in making the superbomb have voiced the same sort of criticism. In effect, they ask: "What could one H-bomb do that 10 A-bombs couldn't do?" The answer, of course, presupposes a lot more knowledge about the subject than the public is allowed to have.

Mr. COLE, for instance, says the problem of delivering an H-bomb "is a most difficult one." Presumably this means it would be either too heavy or too bulky to be carried by conventional aircraft, though we have no way of knowing for sure. Neither have we any information as to how many A-bombs would have to be sacrified to make one H-bomb. We don't even know how large our atomic stockpile is, or how much or how little we can afford to divert those scarce materials elsewhere.

Yet without the answers to these and many similar questions, no layman can have an intelligent opinion whether, on balance, the attempt to build an H-bomb will add to, or detract from, our national security. Certainly Mr. COLE is in a position to know some of the answers, so the questions he raises can't be dismissed lightly. At the least, they should occasion some discreet inquiries by the congressional Atomic Energy Committee—if only to give reassurance that they are getting adequate consideration from the atomic powers-that-be.

Guiseppe Garibaldi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago, July 30, 1850, Guiseppe Garibaldi fled his beloved, tempest-tossed Italy and found refuge with us in the United States for a short time while he gathered strength to be prepared for the call back to his own country's aid. It must have been an increased spark to his zealous love for liberty to be among men who believed and, what is more, lived the way he knew all men are divinely privileged to live.

This love of freedom and of country had lifted this man, of simple background, of little formal education, of beginnings devoid of what we term life's niceties, to the liberator of Italy, to a general renowned among the generals of the world, to a figure of international fame. This love, his courage, and his native genius led him to victory over the most overwhelming odds; enabled him to light up the hearts of his countrymen with the glory of freedom's cause and recruit armies to follow him.

Although his stay in America was but a few years, our people quickly recognized the sincerity, the integrity, the greatness of Garibaldi. They tried in many ways to publicly honor him but, as always, he humbly chose to remain unknown.

In 1888 a life-size marble bust of this great patriot was presented to the United States by citizens of Italian descent and was placed in the Capitol. I think that perhaps this is one honor the humble Garibaldi might have accepted; to have his statue placed beside those of other common men who burned with the love of freedom and of country.

On this one hundredth anniversary of his exile in the United States, I wish, by the inclusion of these remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to pay my respects to the countless thousands of American citizens of Italian ancestry who have joined with all the other peoples who make up our country in contributing so completely to the fulfillment of Garibaldi's prophecy when he was here, "This Nation is certainly living up to its reputation and will soon become the first among the great nations."

Statements of Australian Minister for External Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statements:

EXTRACT FROM STATEMENT OF AUSTRALIAN MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, MR. P. C. SPENDER, TO THE AUSTRALIAN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON MARCH 9, 1950

It is therefore thought desirable that all governments who are directly interested in the preservation of peace throughout south and south-east Asia and in the advancement of human welfare under the democratic system should consider immediately whether some form of regional pact for common defense is a practical possibility. The concept of a Pacific Pact is of course not a new one, but it seems to me that this concept has in the past been surrounded by a good deal of confusion.

After the North Atlantic Pact had been drawn up and concluded last year a number of people fell victim to an easy assumption that what could be done in Europe and the Western Hemisphere could be done just as effectively in Asia and the Far East. Others again have felt quite sincerely that a counterpart in the Pacific area of the North Atlantic Pact, lacking its military commitments and emphasizing political, economic, or cultural cooperation, would meet the needs of the area.

What I have in mind is something between these two conceptions. I fully realize that under conditions as they are today the North Atlantic Pact is not capable of being transposed to the Pacific. On the other hand, I find it hard to imagine that a multilateral agreement that had nothing to do with defensive arrangements would be of much use in meeting a sudden emergency.

What I envisage is a defensive military arrangement having as its basis a firm agreement between countries that have a vital interest in the stability of Asia and the Pacific, and which are at the same time capable of undertaking military commitments. I would like to think that Australia, the United Kingdom, and I fervently hope other Commonwealth countries might form a nucleus, and that such other countries as might wish to do so, should be given the opportunity of associating themselves with it, providing as I have said that they are capable of contributing military commitments.

I have in mind particularly the United States of America, whose participation would give such a pact a substance that it would otherwise lack. Indeed it would be rather meaningless without her. But a pact, confined to mutual defense arrangements is, by definition defensive. Defensive pacts are in many ways negative. We look toward a pact that has also positive aims—the promotion of democratic political institutions, higher living standards, increased cultural and commercial ties.

It is obvious that there are a large number of important factors which have to be explored before any such pact is possible. The

Government regards this as an urgent objective of policy in the fast-moving events of southeast Asia today. No effort will be spared in pursuing this idea further.

EXTRACT FROM STATEMENT OF MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS OF AUSTRALIA TO HOUSE ON JUNE 8, 1950

In my opening address to this debate, I stressed that any pact aiming at the preservation of peace in the Pacific area would need to embody specific military provisions. I also made it clear that, in my opinion, no such pact could hope to succeed without the support and cooperation of the United States of America. Before the United States can be expected to assume responsibilities in connection with the defense of Pacific countries, some of those countries at least must themselves give evidence of their willingness to unite in their own defense. The immediate need, then, is for some initiative from among the countries of the Pacific area.

In my earlier address I expressed the hope that the countries of the British Commonwealth might take the lead and form the nucleus of a Pacific alliance. That suggestion, however, was not intended to exclude other initiatives. Any move which might contribute to the development of an effective regional organization in the Pacific area should be encouraged and supported. Australia alone, if called upon to respond by the United States, would be prepared to enter into such an agreement.

Message to German Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I attach the statement by Victor Reuther, director of the education department of the UAW-CIO. It is a forceful statement of the meaning all Germans can find in our action in Korea under the auspices of the United Nations. It has been used as a Voice of America broadcast from Berlin and beamed into Soviet sectors of both Austria and Germany. It is especially important as a message to members of trade-unions behind the iron curtain.

The statement follows:

KOREAN SITUATION

(By Victor G. Reuther)

The Soviet-inspired aggression in Korea has made it unmistakably clear that Russia would prepare to pursue a policy of international blackmail, of piecemeal conquest by force, holding the threat of a world war over the heads of those who might propose to resist.

The United Nations' decision to resist this aggression has brought the policy of blackmail to an end. The free world has at last defined the boundaries within which tyranny must be contained. That decision has been warmly concurred in by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, to which virtually all of the American labor movement is affiliated. That decision is applauded by all free labor unions.

We wish to state categorically that in supporting the United Nations' determination to meet the use of force by force, the American labor movement is in no way abandoning its constant struggle against the reaction embodied in monopoly capitalism, nor its insistence that the fruits of American productive power be shared with a world in need. While we are prepared to accept the added responsibility which national economic mobilization may impose upon us, we are determined to surrender no rights in the process.

My own union, the Automobile Workers, has today proposed to the President and the Congress that America make available, through the United Nations, the annual sum of $13,000,000,000 to be used solely to help people in other nations to help themselves by developing and expanding economic resources, to improve their living standards. While resisting the Korean aggression with all the force at our command, we propose at the same time to launch a total war against poverty and human insecurity, for we consider that regardless of the purely military outcome of the struggle in Korea, the permanent destruction of Communist power and influence can only be achieved through the abolition of need throughout the free world.

Those of you who are temporarily prisoners of Communist imperialism can give eloquent testimony to the fact that Soviet nationalism, despite its propaganda disguises, has finally bared its true face. The systematic exploitations of east German workers by the Russian administration and its German Communist stooges has given the lie to Soviet pretensions to being the caretaker of the international labor movement. Communism is the gravedigger, not the guardian, of free trade-unions. Soviet workers, like workers everywhere within the sphere of Soviet coercion, are shackled to a ruthless state machine which gives them as little freedom as it does bread.

American labor demands that the workers of the world be given both bread and freedom. We assure you who are waiting for liberation from the handcuffs of the Soviet police state that our efforts to bring economic democracy and security to all workers everywhere will be no less militant than our resistance to the unprovoked aggression against the peace which Russia has unleashed in Korea. We offer this assurance not as Americans alone, but primarily as free trade-unionists, recognizing and accepting the fraternity of laboring men and women everywhere.

All-Out Industrial Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith insert the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on July 28, 1950:

FIRST STEPS FIRST

There is a strong appeal in Bernard M. Baruch's call for all-out industrial mobilization as a means of preparing for any new threat that may come from aggressive Communist forces. Mr. Baruch was a foresighted adviser on the mobilization of our national strength in both World Wars, and it is now generally believed that the country would have made fewer mistakes in preparing for the last war if his advice had been accepted. But it does not follow that the same advice is applicable to the present situation. Urgent though our need for additional military strength may be, the United States has not embarked upon a general war. Its policy is geared to halting the aggression in Korea and to expansion of its military forces in preparation for any other emergency that may arise. This certainly calls for limited economic controls, and the developments of the next 2 months or 6 months may compel the adoption of more sweeping restrictions. But that is a bridge which can best be crossed when we come to it.

It is true, of course, that many prices have risen in an alarming manner. Drastic anti-inflationary measures are certainly in order. But many observers of the economic scene believe that excessive price rises can be held in check by taxation, consumer credit control, and continued production of a plentiful supply of civilian goods insofar as that is possible. Price control and rationing at the consumer level, without these other measures to curb the spending of excess purchasing power, would be under a severe strain from the beginning. And with these more basic restraints upon inflation, it may not be necessary to clamp obnoxious ceilings upon all wages, prices, rents, and so forth.

As to the imposition of new taxes, we quite agree with Mr. Baruch that they should be drastic. His plea was for taxes high enough to cover all defense costs and reduce profiteering. If we assume, as the administration appears to have done, that a higher level of spending for defense will be essential for some years in the future, this reasoning becomes the more unassailable. We cannot forever continue to pile up debts on the flimsy pretense that our economic outlook in the years ahead will be brighter. The people can and will pay what is necessary to safeguard the Nation against attack and do our part toward defense of the free world. And if Congress has the courage to enact such taxes, there need be far less concern about clamping wages and prices into a straitjacket. The chance of escaping wage and price controls will be nil if the international situation should continue to worsen, but a democratic country must necessarily deal with these problems step by step and we think it is important to take the first steps first.

Mobilization of America's Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday last, 15 Members of the House released a joint statement on the current situation. In that statement we have called for immediate action with respect to the mobilization of America's industrial and human potential against the possibility of an extended period of hostilities.

In this hour Americans are looking to Washington for leadership. They will make sacrifices necessary to repeal aggression and insure the peace, but they are rightfully demanding considered and detailed legislation by the Congress on a score of vital subjects.

The Congress should provide leadership and should protect its constitutional prerogatives. It may be necessary to enact some palliative to meet the present

emergency now, but we should immediately begin the greater task of preparing and enacting other vital legislation to be placed in effect at the will of the Congress should the need develop.

We invite the attention of the membership of the House to the statement referred to herein.

Address by Harold Russell, National Commander, AMVETS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Pennsylvania State Convention of the AMVETS was held in Johnstown, Pa., during last week. On Friday afternoon, July 29, Harold Russell, national commander of the AMVETS, addressed the convention. It is of interest to all persons to know that this great veterans' organization has taken such a positive stand against military aggression by Russia or any of her satellites. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address of Commander Harold Russell of the AMVETS:

It is not only a pleasure to be in Pennsylvania at this convention but it is also a tremendous responsibility and opportunity.

Yesterday, Russia announced her intention of rejoicing the Security Council and accepting their chairmanship thereof on August 1.

AMVETS recognizing the grave dangers inherent in this eventuality did on last Wednesday, address another letter to the State Department restating the suggestion of the men who fought and won the Second World War that the United States take the lead in establishing a series of treaties between the freedom loving nations of the world to implement majority decisions of the General Assembly of the UN. By this means it would be possible to forward the democratic principles of the UN and to carry forward their decisions despite the obstructiveness of a flagrant use of the veto power by any nation determined to reduce the UN to a feeble debating society.

AMVETS has a proud record on international affairs that is recognized by the leaders of our country. It is not with the desire to be a Sunday morning quarterback that I point out that we might not be faced with a Korea now if the steps AMVETS had recommended had been followed. For example: We tried to alert our country to its dangerous military weakness by re-enacting Paul Revere's ride in 1948. If UMT had been adopted 3 years ago as AMVETS wanted it to be, we would now have over 2,000,000 well trained men, and even if there had been a Korea, American lives would have been saved. I think that was dramatized to everyone's satisfaction when one read of the untrained American soldier who fired a bazooka at a tank and then stuck up his head to find out where the shot landed, only to be shot through the heart. His life was lost because of inadequate training.

Back in February of 1949, and it seems incredible now that AMVETS could have had such foresight, on testifying before the Foreign Relations Committee on the Atlantic Pact, Elliott Newcomb, speaking for us before that committee said, and I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"Unfortunately, our foreign policy seems to consider communism a European problem only, when in fact it is a world problem, and while we favor the Atlantic Pact, the Marshall plan, and now the arms program in Europe, we deplore our do-nothing policy in the Pacific, where rampant international communism is spreading unchecked.

"We would like to see as much aid as possible also given to those free nations in the Pacific who can agree with us on some form of regional defense. If Russia, by securing its back door in the Pacific, can assure herself of only a one-front war in Europe, we have grave misgivings about the future of peace. We ask that this arms program be extended as much as possible in the direction of our problems in the Pacific. We are asking as the veterans who fought across those jungle islands of the Pacific, that Uncle Sam take a look over his shoulder before he is outflanked.

"The price of peace is high indeed, but infinitesimal compared to the cost which may result if we fail to pay that price."

Remember, this was said 15 months ago.

And then you people in Pennsylvania, as well as all over the country, are well aware of AMVETS position on a world police force, asked then why we should not have a 70-group Air Force, stronger Army and Navy, and so forth.

Why, only last February I was on a Nationwide radio address in which I, as your national commander, called attention to the following: The executive branch of the Government has not been frank enough with the people, we do not have power sufficient to enforce our newly aimed foreign policy. I asked then why we should not have a 70-group Air Force, why we should not have more than a three-area radar defense system, why our fleet carrier strength should not be redeployed to strengthen Alaskan defenses against airborne invasion?

Russia has been building the greatest war machine in history and stock piling military equipment since the conclusion of World War II and doing this with one purpose and one purpose only, in mind—for actual aggression against the freedom-loving nations of the world. For the first time in our history, our Nation—the United States of America—is the major target of a great military power. Let us as veterans never forget that.

But enough of this Sunday morning quarterbacking. Who is really to blame? Let's not kid ourselves. We are. And even more than we, are the other millions of veterans of World War II who fought and won the most horrible war in history and then did not join this organization in order to enforce our opinions. How many of us said as we laid in the bunks and in the troop transports and in the fox holes and sitting in the cockpits of planes and down in the submarines and on the ships, "By God, when I get home I'm going to do everything in my power to see that this doesn't happen again."

Now is not the time to rock the boat by singling out individuals in high government or other positions and placing the blame on them. Perhaps some must go because of bad decisions and bad leadership, that, time will tell. But let AMVETS take the constructive position and especially let us point with pride at some of the World War II veterans who have led this country well in strategic positions. Last year at our convention we called for a shakeup in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department and further that a World War II veteran be appointed as the head of that division. When Dean Rusk was appointed some 3 months ago a swift and sure change took place with a firm attitude in the Far East, an attitude that is now applauded by all Americans but it was too late to stop the chain of events that had been set up long before he had had an opportunity to be as effective as he is now. We are proud of our World War II Congressmen, both Representatives and Senators by and large from both parties. The World War II veterans with few exceptions are giving our country good leadership.

It is too late to correct these mistakes made in the past, but let's not repeat them in the future. Let's not be panicked into bad decisions, but let's find out just where we should go, for war affects us all, each one of us, every man, woman, and child in the United States and throughout the world. Nothing is more important than to make right decisions concerning that now. I am very proud of the program adopted by our national executive committee. Let's review that quickly; it is the most forward looking and comprehensive international affairs program adopted by any veterans organization.

The most important resolution called for the use of the dreaded A-bomb on a conditional basis. In other words, we gave our Nation's leaders our support in using their judgment in the use of the bomb in support of our freedom, so long as they were aware of the full moral implications inherent in the use.

At the same time, we passed resolutions favoring the retention of the seat of the Soviet Union on the Security Council of the UN because we feel that the door to the conference table should remain open and in the hopes that we could still come to some basis of agreement to prevent another world war. We called for a world police force and a Pacific Pact with fullest necessary mobilization.

We passed other resolutions which were part of this blueprint. They called for tight controls over the economic and industrial life of the Nation during any emergency to prevent shortages, profiteering, hoarding, and panic.

But time moves swiftly and now what should be done? I urge the leaders of labor, industry, and agriculture, the manufacturers and the workers, the farmers and the businessmen, yes, and the veterans to tell their representatives to go into the Congress of the United States and remove all Federal subsidies; to take the billions of dollars saved and put it into national defense. We know the veterans are willing to forget all benefits for the able-bodied, to drop demands for bonuses and pensions, for duration of combat conditions, for no group has loved their country more, nor made greater sacrifices, nor is more willing to do it again. Let's pour these billions into the defense of the country and into the fight against world communism. The veterans of World War II gave 309,000 lives toward winning a victory, toward bringing forth what we thought and hoped then would be an orderly world and peace for ourselves and our children. Now that that is threatened again, let us not forget those hundreds of thousands, let us turn to a total effort and back up our men in Korea.

Let's not kid ourselves, it looks more and more as though we are in a death struggle with totalitarian forces again, it has grown from a cold to a cool to a warm to a hot war in pretty short order. Let's not try to do business as usual, let's mobilize our manpower and industry and labor and agriculture to win that war. At the same time we must build for a peace—a lasting peace.

The strategy of the Russians is already very clear and very dangerous to our national

and world security. Greece, Berlin, and now Korea form a pattern that is unmistakable. It is a push-button warfare all right, but a different kind than we anticipated—Russia is pushing one satellite after another into major aggressive moves without actually being engaged themselves. This type of strategy can weaken us economically and militarily to the point where Russia can pounce on us and thrash us while she is initially remaining aloof from it all. We just had to appropriate $10,000,000,000 for the Korean situation, and when they quiet down you can expect to see an Iran, Yugoslavia, and other Koreas elsewhere throughout the world. A policy of just meeting these satellites' aggressions as they come, could be disastrous. We all know who is pushing the buttons and who is behind it. I call upon the Congress to notify the President by resolution and for our President to make it clear to Russia that another major military aggression by a satellite power against the free world will be considered an act of war, and I urge that the United States request the United Nations to make the same issue clear to Russia.

We know in this country that the attack on Southern Korea was a Communist-inspired movement of international outlawry. We know that as a result of this act of brutal aggression that the 12 men in the Kremlin cannot wear the fig leaf of peace much longer. They talk peace based on lies, but they make war through their satellites. Only the self-deceived can believe otherwise.

And let's not forget that while we are fighting the enemy abroad that they are trying to burrow from within in this country. We hold no brief for those who hurl unfounded attacks at individuals or agencies in the Government not based on facts, but it is plain to see that the danger of Communist infiltration into our Government in the Departments of State, Justice, Defense, and so forth, as well as in our nongovernmental organizations, is a real problem and a dangerous one. Only fools underestimate the effectiveness and danger of the Communist apparatus in this country. In order to meet this problem I call upon the Senate to immediately pass the Mundt-Ferguson bill to make the Communist come above ground and admit they are Communist or be in violation of Federal laws. The issue is very clear; they are either with us or against us and we know they are against us. This bill would let us know who they are or they would take the chance of going to jail. How can any honest American fail to support this legislation, why isn't it through the Senate? The Mundt-Ferguson bill first of all does not outlaw the Communist party, which admittedly might just drive them further underground—this bill exposes their activities and places them in the public eye. This bill makes unlawful for any group to seek to overthrow the United States Government by force of arms. And that is what the Communist Party seeks to do. Is it too much to ask every Senator and Member of the House to immediately vote this bill through?

But even this is not enough. It is vitally important in these crucial times that the American people have full confidence in the executive branches of their Government. I refer specifically to the Department of State. Basically, we in AMVETS have a great deal of confidence in our State Department, although we do realize that the Department, like any other large agency, is not perfect. Basically committees in Congress are not able to do a continuing job of surveyance over our Government agencies, follow up leads and investigate possible penetration of these agencies by communistic apparatus. Let's immediately establish a commission that will have that as their continuing responsibility. A commission that will have the confidence of the American people, that will have access to the loyalty files and be in a position to report to Congress, working closely with J. Edgar Hoover and his FBI. We know that there are many Senators and Congressmen and top administration advisers, who approve the principle of such a commission, but they don't seem to be able to get together on the method of appointment. Well, AMVETS suggests this method and I think the American people will applaud—let's ask Judge Medina who presided over the Communist trial in New York and whose decision has been applauded by the entire free world, to head up this commission and make all the rest of the appointments. Let's get this subversive activities commission in operation at once so that the confidence of the people can be never again upset about subversive activities in our important Government agencies.

Already we read about armed rebellion behind the iron curtain in Manchuria—perhaps we can cause rebellion in Russia. If it is possible we should organize a fifth column in Russia and give them a taste of subversive activities.

And let's ring Russia with the most modern means of telling them about a free way of life, let's put the most powerful radio stations and our finest advertising brains into an effort to break through the iron curtain and get the people of Russia to know some of the facts about our way of life. We must use every means we know to communicate the value of freedom to the four corners of the earth. Our message must go out through leaflets, through our free press, radio programs, and films, through a hundred other ways. This doctrine of freedom will carry conviction because it comes not out of the Government alone, but out of the hearts and souls of the people of the United States, because it is the authentic voice of America and will ring around the world. We must win the victory in Korea and must meet aggression wherever it arises, but let us never forget that fundamentally the decision must be made by our selling democracy as our forefathers sold it to us. We must sell it around the world. America speaks with a thousand voices—all the views of our labor leaders, our church leaders, our education leaders, our leaders of women and men groups, our veteran organization leaders. All the things they do and say flash around the world. Everything that we do or say enters the picture of America which is seen abroad as well as at home. Foreign nations are continually watching to see whether the United States is cool, whether it is determined, whether it is strong, whether it will go through with its intentions. To make up their minds they look at everything that is happening in the whole country.

And that is why AMVETS must speak. That is why you must go out and get other people to join our organization so that our voice swells into a roar. So that our organization can take the leadership in formulating public and world opinion. There is no time in the history of America that AMVETS has been so much needed and future lies in your hands.

When the black tide of fascism threatened to engulf the world, one of the great leaders of our time said what should now be said again—when our free world is again threatened—this time by the totalitarianism of communism. Let this message ring again.

"We shall defend our country whatever the cost may be. We shall fight on the beaches. We shall fight on the landing ground. We shall fight in the air and on the sea. We shall fight from the fields and in the streets. We shall fight from the hills. We shall never surrender."

Annual Report of Dairyland Cooperative Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the annual report of the Dairyland Cooperative Association, of Juneau, Wis. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAIRYLAND COOPERATIVE—A SYMBOL OF THE GREAT AMERICAN COOPERATIVE MOVEMENT

The other day I received from Mr. L. A. Zahradka, General Manager of the Dairyland Cooperative Association, of Juneau, Wis., a copy of the annual report of that fine cooperative. I got a tremendous kick out of reading that report because it impressed me with its text and pictures as symbolic of the great cooperative movement of my State and of the entire Nation. It is this cooperative movement which is the very backbone of the contribution which American farming made in World Wars I and II, and which it is going to make in the current emergency. None of us can ever forget the superb production record of the farmers of the Midwest who with less machinery, less manpower, less governmental assistance than seemed humanly possible to get along without, they surpassed all previous production records, in feeding our troops, our civilian population and stricken populations abroad.

The Dairyland Cooperative Report cites the fact that during 1949 this great association processed and marketed over 143,000,000 pounds of milk. The pictures of the report show the tremendous sales and merchandising program that is carried on by the association, symbolized by its Christmas cheese gift package on which sales were tripled over last year's output.

The report rightly mentions that Dairyland's plants "are recognized by the dairy industry as some of the finest in regard to construction, efficiency and design of equipment." These plants include the main office and plant at Juneau, as well as plants at Waterloo, Wyocena (where the Nation's largest Bleu cheese operation is located) and Watertown.

The Dairyland Digest, the official monthly publication of the cooperative reaches thousands of people vitally interested in the dairy industry, such as:

Dairyland members, customers, local businessmen, county agricultural agents, agricultural teachers, veterans' trainers, United States Department of Agriculture officials, University of Wisconsin College of Agriculture staff members, dairy trade associations, farm organizations, State department of agriculture officials, and other milk-marketing organizations.

The directors of the Dairyland Cooperative, elected from nine production areas, are:

Elmer Cook, Pardeeville, Alwin Voigt, president, Ashippun; Ben Miller, vice president, Beaver Dam; Fred Germer, Iron Ridge; Lawrence Buckley, Oxford; Oscar Kreuziger, Johnson Creek; John Leistico, Jr., secretary and treasurer, Beaver Dam: Hilmer Groth, Watertown; John Blaska, Marshall.

I have singled out this particular cooperative because I have said it symbolizes many other fine organizations in my State whose examples I have previously mentioned in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Folks from the cities don't appreciate the problems of American farming because they lack experience in the farmer's approach, and I humbly think that by pointing out facts of fine grass-roots organizations such as this association, I may help to increase understanding of agriculture's problems.

The dairy industry, which enriches the Nation's bodies, the dairy industry, which is so important for the health of the Nation's soil, must have the understanding of the American public if it is to do its job in the present emergency. Without such understanding we will find that vicious legislation such as the oleo law which went into effect as of July 1 will continue to raise havoc with the dairy industry.

The dairy cooperatives of Wisconsin, together with private dairy companies—cheese plants, creameries, fluid-milk plants, dried-milk plants—is ready, willing, and able to do its patriotic job, and it asks only the sympathetic understanding of the American people.

Keynote Speech by Senator Thomas of Utah to the Utah Democratic Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 1 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the keynote address which the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] delivered at the Utah State Democratic Convention on July 29, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR ELBERT D. THOMAS AT THE UTAH STATE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, JULY 29, 1950

My friends and fellow Democrats, I appear before you with gratitude in my heart. When my name appears on the Democratic State ticket next November it will be the fifth time that Utah Democrats have so honored me. I appreciate it. I sense in the fullest the obligation it imposes. I promise you will have my wholehearted devotion to our cause and an undivided giving of myself to our program in service to our State and our people in whatever task I am called upon to perform.

I am a team man. In the future as in the past, if I am called upon to lead I will move on in the spirit of "let's go" not in the spirit of "follow me." When victory comes, it will be our victory. And victory will come to Utah for reasons as meaningful as America itself, for we are all Americans—Americans in hope, Americans in ideal, and Americans in aspiration. We shall strive to bring the blessings of America to all of our people. And to the whole world we say—while we must be zealous in our vigilance for liberty, we must never be selfish of liberty. If we assume that the fruits of liberty are for the few, we destroy the promise of liberty itself. The great principle of freedom carries with it the concept of the dignity of the human soul. Liberty and the worth and dignity of the individual go hand in hand. Both are in very deed God's greatest gift to mankind.

The principles for which the Democratic Party stands today are the principles formulated under the inspiration of heaven, by Franklin, Madison, and their associates under the leadership of the good and great Washington in 1787, and preserved for us by such men as Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman.

There is opposition in our land today to what the Democratic Party has done and is trying to do. But there has always been opposition to those who contended for liberty and who tried to promote the welfare of men, women, and children. The great men I have mentioned all had opposition, even greater than the opposition to Truman and his friends. The fight today is as it has always been, because it has always been on two fronts, from the enemies of American principles from without and the opponents of true American principles here at home.

It was not President Roosevelt or President Truman who wrote the principle of providing for the general welfare in the Constitution of the United States. It was Washington, it was Franklin, it was Madison, and their associates. It was not Harry Truman or Franklin D. Roosevelt who challenged for the first time the right of nations, ruled by dictatorial despots, to crush liberty in the world and especially here in America. It was Jefferson, it was Adams, it was Franklin, it was Sherman, and it was Robert Livingston and later, following in their footsteps, it was President Monroe. It was not Harry Truman or General Marshall, or Secretary of State Hull or Acheson who proclaimed to the world that an attack on one state to destroy its liberty was an attack on all. It was Tom Jefferson who said that, and by so doing brought unity to the Thirteen Colonies. But it is the Democratic Party and its leaders who are preserving liberty in America today in the American traditional way.

It was not the Republican Party or any one of its representatives who brought forth the Strategic Materials Acts of 1940 and 1946 which provide for the common defense by acquiring stocks of strategic and critical materials. These acts were opposed by every element in American society which is trying to destroy American preparation in unity now. It was the Democratic Senator from Utah who wrote and introduced these bills and led the debate on the floor of the Senate against the opposition of those who thought it was foolhardy to spend when a budget ought to be balanced. Today, America is grateful for her stockpiles of critical and strategic materials.

The first bill had strong opposition and it took years to get it passed. The second bill passed almost by unanimous consent. The principle proved itself and helped us in war. Having the principle established gave us the opportunity to act when action was necessary.

The primary objective of stockpiling legislation is to see that the Government will have sufficient materials which are called critical or strategic to see it through any emergency. Stockpiles will become full or incomplete according to the severity of the emergency and the length of time we are in that condition. Without our stockpiles I just do not know how the Second World War could have been won. With the stockpiles now on hand, we can move into accelerated production with some certainty.

The mining industry of Utah has benefited greatly by the Strategic Materials Act. The Government and all of the people have been beneficiaries. Those who have produced minerals have found sales for them to our Government amounting in 1947 over $68,000,000, in 1948 over $252,000,000, and in 1949 over $477,000,000. The Korean incident finds us prepared and will, in my opinion, speed up the demand for minerals which will open our closed mines.

It was not Wilson, Roosevelt, or Truman who saw for the first time the worth of the United States and its unity. But it was Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln. These are facts of history. Everyone knows the spirit behind those who are challenging America's leadership in America today. Everyone knows the spirit behind those who are attempting to hold back American unity at home. We need not call the names of Tory and Copperhead. We need merely to point out the fact that both Tories and Copperheads were reactionaries and lacked faith in America's mission.

I repeat again, the fight today is as it always has been. That Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, and Roosevelt lived through their opposition is the marvel of history. Most of them were broken men before they died. Only Jefferson lived to write just before his death to his old friend and at times political enemy, John Adams: "I will not believe our labors are lost. I shall not die without a hope that light and liberty are on a steady advance. * * * In short, the flames kindled on the 4th of July 1776 have spread over too much of the globe to be extinguished by the feeble engines of despotism; on the contrary, they will consume these engines and all who work them."

Utah will do her part to consume the engines of despotism which are at work in the world today, because we now have in Utah the Deseret Chemical Corp. Depot at Tooele, Hill Air Force Base at Ogden, Ogden Arsenal at Ogden, Ogden-Tooele Ordnance Subdepot at Tooele, Utah General Depot at Ogden, Wendover Air Force Base at Wendover, Western Chemical Center-Dugway Proving Ground at Tooele, and Camp Williams at Lehi. In addition, the Navy has its Naval Supply Depot at Clearfield, the Naval Reserve Training Center at Salt Lake, and the Naval Reserve Training Center at Ogden. Are we sorry we have these installations in Utah today to help combat communism and its spread? Are we sorry that the Federal Government spent over $243,000,000 since 1940 for these establishments? Yet, when I was chairman of the Military Affairs Committee during most of the war period the reactionaries here at home opposed them. They did not want these installations to come to Utah.

We also have the Geneva steel plant in operation. It cost the Government over $200,000,000. But when we were working to have this plant built at Provo we had the reactionaries with us again, and they said: "You know, THOMAS, this will never be built." In the campaign of 1944 the Republicans had a Senator come down from Wyoming to campaign against me, and he said that the Geneva steel plant would be folded up and shipped to Russia. When he was up for reelection in 1946 we distributed photostats of this statement. It is needless to say he was replaced by a Democrat.

The Geneva steel plant is the only strategically built steel plant in the United States. It was not an accident. It was thought out. It was planned for, and it will still prove itself to be one of the Nation's best investments. Expansion of our steel industry in the West is already being planned.

The principles at stake in America are as great today as they were in Washington's, Jackson's, and Lincoln's time. I say in all

candor and I say with all honesty to those who are opposing the great American program here at home and in the world, would you be proud to point out to your children that you were one in America who stood against Washington, that you were one in the North who stood against Lincoln, that you were one who thought that Jackson's stands for the common people and for American unity were bad?

I tell you my friends, it does not pay to oppose liberty. It does not pay to be unhappy because the principle of the dignity of the human soul is taking root in the world. It does not pay, just because you feel secure, to be angry because a few of your fellow citizens have become secure, too. Liberty for the few becomes secure as the many begin to enjoy it.

There are those who are unhappy because dependent old age is no longer a nightmare; because children are better trained, enjoy better health; and their teachers, while still not properly rewarded for their lives of sacrifice and devotion, are better off than they were in 1933. There are those who are unhappy that a farsighted Government provided that the returning soldier boys and girls should have their jobs back after completing service for their country. Those who are unhappy because educational training was offered the soldier boys and girls fail to realize the worth of a trained citizenry in America. These all cost money and they were opposed because they did cost money. But who can measure their worth or who can show a greater return from any other investment of the tax dollar.

In the First World War we lost more men getting them into the service than were shot by German bullets because of the lack of facilities, trainers, equipment, and housing. Does anyone regret now that the Democratic Senator from Utah was successful in having his amendment to the Second World War Selective Service Act of 1940 adopted, which provided that men should not be called to the colors until adequate facilities, trainers, equipment, and housing were ready for them.

As chairman of the committee which handles all veterans' civil, medical, hospital, and educational affairs I have cosponsored the bills which are responsible for the great veteran-hospital system built in connection with medical schools and medical centers, thus affording the best that science and service can give the ill and injured veterans.

Utah's business, banks, laborers, farmers, teachers, schools, hospitals, men, women, and children all have benefited from what some people call the New Deal or the Fair Deal. Our enemies call it by other names—stateism, paternalism, the welfare state. I care not what our enemies call it, the people of America and the people of Utah call it good. As for me, believing as I do in representative government, or "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," I am perfectly satisfied with the judgment of the people.

Those who criticize us for the various farm programs we have struggled with fail to realize that what happiness has come to the farmer has come to him over the protests of Presidents who vetoed farm bills. But out of it all, the war, if nothing else, has taught us that the greatest security in time of war and the finest defense in time of peace is a full food basket.

At the beginning of any emergency, or in any depression, or in any rapid change in our economic conditions, the farmer is the first affected, and generally adversely affected. This is not because he is a farmer, but because he is the primary producer of man's greatest necessity, food. If inflation strikes our land the price of those things which the farmer buys will rise very much more rapidly than what the farmer has to sell. If war comes the need for food almost overnight becomes universal. The profiteer in this situation is the man closest to the ultimate consumer. The farmer is farthest away. Therefore he may suffer greater loss while others are making great gains. Thus the Government's first interest must be the farmer not only to protect the life of the people but to protect the sources of that life. No matter what anyone may say, Government must be interested in the farmer. And no matter how much anyone may bewail what has been attempted by our Government, almost since the beginning of our national existence our Government has been interested in the farmer by making land cheap, by creating agricultural colleges, by trying to solve the farmer's scientific problems, by soil conservation, and by the actual taking of a product like sugar and legislating for it not only nationally but internationally. These are facts and they must be faced. No administration has tried to face these facts and tried to solve the problem more than have the administrations of Roosevelt and Truman. The farmer in Utah is not unhappy with what has been done. Cash farm income in Utah has risen from only $26,000,000 in 1932 to over $160,000,000 in 1948. A good index of rural prosperity is shown in the decline of farm mortgages from $46,000,000 in 1943 to $34,000,000 on January 1, 1949.

The world is not in war, neither is it in peace. Our country is not at war, but our boys are dying in Korea. Since the beginning of this incident I have been in constant consultation about what has taken place both from the military standpoint and the international standpoint. If the Korean affair can remain an international incident and if, through cooperation with the United Nations, we can sustain its purposes great things will have been done for the world.

Let us stop a moment and consider the meaning of the Korean situation. Korea, situated as she is, a peninsula pointing to the heart of Japan, has been fought over throughout the centuries. In modern times she was the primary cause of the Chinese-Japanese War and of the Russian-Japanese War. Finally she was annexed and made part of the Japanese Empire. Her independence and her division are both part of the after-war change and, in a sense, both are interests of the United Nations. If Korea remains merely a question of preserving a United Nations understanding we may from this fact alone give the world the best illustration of what it means for a united world to stand against an aggressor. As of today, America is carrying out a mandate from the United Nations. If we succeed, the principle for controlling an aggressor will have become established in the world, thus creating a new epoch of world understanding. Is this not worth fighting for?

If Korea is used as an incident in the eternal fight of those who hate liberty and love force, of those who hate freedom and want to dictate, of those who represent the single will in the world and who want to destroy democracy and its freedoms, then we will have embarked upon the eternal struggle, the struggle which I have already mentioned that Washington had to meet, that Monroe had to meet, and that Roosevelt had to meet. It is a struggle, from America's standpoint, of right against wrong, of wickedness against righteousness. In such a struggle America can take but one side.

When Communist aggression undertook open military action against the Republic of Korea last month, it was met squarely by the united action of 53 nations of the free world, under the banner of the United Nations.

The fact that we have at our side, in our efforts to put down this act of unprovoked and undisguised aggression, 52 other nations and the organization of the United Nations, is the logical consequence of the foreign policy our nation has been following since the war.

We have dedicated ourselves as a nation to a foreign policy which supports the United Nations and helps to build the strength of the free world. The purpose of our policy has been to work with other free nations so that our combined strength would be sufficient in the first place to deter aggressor nations if possible, or, if aggression be committed, to defeat it.

Since we are not willing to follow the Nazi or Soviet Communist example of complete militarization of our society, we are not in a position to have great armies at all places where aggression might conceivably strike. Therefore, the aggressor may have, in some places in the world, the initial advantage.

But the strength of free nations, aroused by this naked aggression, is invincible, and it will put down the aggressor hard and firmly.

The combined resources of the free world, now being mobilized in a common front against the present act of aggression, and the threat of further aggression, is a mighty and invincible force.

The citizens of this country are proud of the leadership which this country has exercised among the nations of the free world. The firm and prompt response of the President to the challenge of the Communist aggression, and the flat rejection of any policy of appeasement, has galvanized the free world and strengthened our position of moral leadership in the world.

If we had sought, in the years since the war, to act unilaterally in Asia, by sending our troops into China or Formosa, we would have been regarded by the rest of the world as merely one great power struggling with another power for strategic advantage.

Our position in supporting the United Nations in Korea is based on moral principle—the principle that armed aggression against independent nations is wrong and must be stopped by force if necessary. Our support of this principle finds us allied with the overwhelming majority of the nations of the world. It has drawn more instantaneous support from these nations than did even the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Our strength lies not only in the unity of our country with the other nations of the free world, but in our unity at home. In a matter so vital to the security of our country and the preservation of our freedom, it must give the aggressor or the potential aggressor pause to find our Nation speaking out with a single, strong, determined voice. Responsible leaders of both parties have declared to the world that this urgent matter finds us united at home.

Our first and most important task is to gather our strength so that we can send to our forces in Korea sufficient support to drive back the invaders. We must also gather our strength so that the free world may be able to survive against the threat of tyranny.

This task is too important to be delayed or interfered with by partisan considerations. The times urgently require that we put the interests of the Nation above any partisan advantage, and anyone who played politics as usual at this critical time would be a short-sighted politician and an irresponsible American.

The people of this country are overwhelmingly in support of the President and the needs of the country he has put before the Congress and the people. They will respond vigorously and patriotically, and we shall win by putting down aggression and thereby build a world in which we and our children can live at peace.

In war or peace, the program I have fought for I will continue to fight for until the ideals of my motion offered at the industry-labor conference of 1941 become universally accepted by both industry and labor—that all strikes or lockouts shall cease and all disputes shall be settled by peaceful means. But this must be brought about by voluntary acceptance of the principle, not by destroying men's liberty to associate, men's right to assemble, and men's freedom of speech. We can never settle any question in America by a Hitler-Stalin, single-will method. American citizens are American citizens, regardless of how they earn their livelihood. They are not subjects or pawns of a dictator. The progress of the program made for the workingman and for peace in industry since 1933 has been unbelievable and every historian recognizes it.

The Fair Labor Standards Act bears my name. It is the basic labor law of America today. At the last session of Congress we modified the original act by raising the minimum wage to 75 cents, which was done by almost unanimous consent. Thus a principle which took years to establish became recognized by all of the people. I care not who my opponent will be. This I say to him, despite the fact he may represent the very forces that fought my bill—you, meaning my opponent, dare not tell the people of Utah, you are in favor of its repeal.

I am proud of all we have been able to do in education. We are going to do more, for democracy in America depends upon an understanding citizenry. Trained men and women are the bulwark of our Nation in peace and in war. When I say I am in favor of better schools and better education everyone knows what I mean because my name has been on a Federal-aid-to-education bill for years. But when someone who wants my job says he is in favor of better education and better schools you do not know what he means because that is exactly what every opponent of my bills has said. During these years, what have they done for education?

Health programs are developing. They will be reported as we get complete support from our various committees. We will work out in the American way the proper way to promote better health for our people. It will not be done drastically. It will be done as the need presents itself. Who can say that America did not need the hospitals she has gotten as a result of our program? Who can say that America does not stand in need of children's health programs? Who dares say that the aid-to-medical-schools bill which is now tied up in the House of Representatives but which was reported unanimously by our committee—both Democrats and Republicans voted for it—and which passed the Senate without opposition, is not needed by the medical schools of America? They are dependent upon that aid. Is there anyone here who does not know that the State of New York has had to take over two private medical schools because they could no longer sustain themselves? New York could not afford to see them close. America needs them too. We believe in private schools, in public schools, in church schools, in endowed schools. We need them all in our system because that is the American way. But if the aid-to-medical-schools bill does not become law, private schools, endowed schools, and church schools will have a struggle for their very existence.

Our study on health insurance will have been completed by next February. Then we will know what should be done. Until we know you may rest assured there will be no action.

Medical science has become completely revolutionized in the last 40 years. Our Federal grants for research in the medical fields are proving to be great investments for the American citizens. A new discovery costs money. It takes patience, it takes time, it takes energy, it takes brains, but, above all, it takes faith. I had a talk lately with one of America's greatest industrialists, who supports all we are doing publicly. He supports also by donations running into the millions all that we are doing privately. He was a great supporter of my Science Foundation bill. He gave me one illustration which will help us in our understanding of what we are doing. He said it cost $50,000,000 to develop the fluid drive for the automobile, but he said also that it would pay off. If research and investigation pays so well in industry, surely everyone should appreciate, as this great industrialist did, the need of more research to overcome the economic loss through illness, the soul unhappiness through illness, the pain and misery through illness. Do not let any member of the Democratic Party get himself frightened by words. Know that research is going on, that health is being improved, and that happiness is being developed as a result of what is being done. And out of it all those who will benefit the most will be the doctors of our country.

I shall support an expanded social security.

I shall support farm programs such as we have already worked out for sugar and wheat, which have brought success to producer and grower and has operated for the benefit of the consumer both on the national and international scale.

I shall continue to support the wool programs.

I believe in full employment. You will find me in the future as in the past attempting to overcome unemployment wherever it exists.

The RFC and our Federal banking system should be changed so that our whole country will think in terms of helping the small-business man. We have already started with this.

Reclamation projects have made greater and faster progress in Utah under the Democratic administrations than at any other given period. Utah is a public-land State, approximately 74 percent. What chance would Utah have for the completion and development of present and future reclamation projects under a Republican Congress when the spokesman for the Republican Party "debunked the idea of 'free land through Government reclamation?' "

It is time to be thoughtful about what will happen if a Republican Senate is elected in November.

At present, Senators from the following Western States are chairmen of Senate Committees: Utah, Wyoming, Nevada, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona. In other words, the West holds 6 out of 15 chairmanships. If the Senate goes Republican and the Republicans now in the Senate up for reelection are returned, three States will have both their Senators as chairman, i. e., New Hampshire, Wisconsin, and Nebraska. To further the concentration of power in the East, one Senator from each of the following States will become a chairman: Vermont, Massachusetts, Delaware, Michigan, Maine, Ohio, and North Dakota. Only one State from the Rocky Mountain region would have a chairmanship, Colorado. The one remaining chairmanship would go to Washington.

These are troublesome times. America, having the highest standard of living in the world, faces peril because of this fact. We must preserve that standard of living. We must preserve America. The world needs her as it has never needed her before. Without the American dollar, all international business turns to barter. Without the American credit, the economic world is without hope. Without American cooperation, the world is indeed in despair.

I have no fears for the future because I believe in America with a faith that is absolutely and completely unsullied. But I have seen the ideals of the American people completely changed. After the First World War in the election of 1920 the American people deliberately turned their backs on what they called the idealism of Woodrow Wilson and fought for a return to normalcy. The American people did not know then what a return to normalcy meant. But they know now. It was the invitation formally extended to the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse to ride forth carrying war, famine, death, and pestilence—to raid and ravish the earth.

The Four Horsemen accepted that invitation. We had starvation. We had war. We had death. We had disease. With all of these were planted the seeds of the greatest depression our country and the world has ever seen. While the youth of our land know not what that depression did to the morale of our people let me point out this one fact: It was in the prosperous farm land of the State of Iowa. It was there that a judge was pulled from the bench and publicly mobbed. That is what the depression meant to the most basic of all American principles.

Our Democratic administration remembered what took place after the First World War and we did not invite the Four Horsemen to ride again. Indeed we worked to stay them. We created UNRRA, the United Nations, the Marshall plan, and the Atlantic Pact. That is the Democratic program presented to the world. We have accepted the injunction of Lincoln's second inaugural address—we will bind up the wounds of the Nation and the world. We will build a national unity by means of a program that justifies the sacrifices made and which will bring the realization of the hopes and aspirations of a united, free, and prosperous people.

Slave Labor in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, now that we have accepted the challenge of world communism, it is more important than ever to emphasize the necessity of recognizing the extent of slave labor in Russia.

For many months I have been pleading with the present administration to stop the importation of foreign products manufactured by slave labor and which are destroying the jobs of American workmen.

Various American industries are in a terrible plight because of the flood of cheaply made foreign goods. These industries include coal, furs, pottery, glassware, leather, textiles many of which are located in my congressional district.

The American Federation of Labor has furnished me with a copy of the case presented by A. F. of L. to the United Na-

tions and I have secured a digest of the case from the Library of Congress, which makes interesting reading.

The digest is as follows:

SLAVE LABOR IN RUSSIA

DIGEST

The American Federation of Labor, as a part of its total drive against all forms of slave labor, deemed it advisable to compile in one booklet the major documents and accounts of this struggle. The foreword by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, points out that in this volume "there is much food for thought and concern about the most tragic trend of life in our time."

For many years it has seemed that the last remnants of slavery were disappearing from the earth. But the process of creating huge forced-labor armies began in Russia under the first 5-year plan. The network of this slave system now extends over the entire Soviet Union and into the countries of eastern Europe. The Soviet system alone victimizes at least 10,000,000 workers (excluding prisoners of war and other non-Soviet citizens).

The American Federation of Labor views the expanding system of slave labor as a dire threat to the free workers of all countries. The Soviet Union in what might be seen as degrading hypocrisy, condones and allows this immoral and pernicious slave system within its own borders while it joined with the Allies in condemning it at Nuremberg, and, with the Allies, sentenced Fritz Sauckel, director of the Nazi forced-labor enterprises, to death.

Russia has given birth to a new form of slavery—one that is more applicable to the technique of modern industry than was the old individual slavery. The Nazis and the Fascists made their contributions to this new slavery but only under the hammer and sickle have from 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 people been brought into forced-labor systems where they dig canals, build roads, set up military projects, mine uranium, and perform other important economic tasks.

Without justifying the old individual slave system, a comparison of the older system and that of the modern totalitarian forced-labor program shows the latter to be much worse. Historic slavery was, with all of its evils, an advance over savagery. It made no moral pretenses as to the reasons it exploited its chattels. But twentieth century slavery is a thoroughly retrogressive social phenomenon which hides its callous exploitation behind high-sounding phrases.

Slave-labor systems are also deadly in their effective destruction of the freedom of workers outside the slave-labor camps. The "free" workers must carry "working books" which bear a record of jobs previously held, he cannot leave a job without permission, and for certain categories there is a compulsory yearly minimum of work set by decree.

Under these conditions the American Federation of Labor, in its convention of October 6–16, 1947, held at San Francisco, adopted a resolution calling upon the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations to commission the International Labor Office to make a thoroughgoing survey of the extent of forced labor, and recommend a positive program for eliminating this evil (text of this resolution appears in the section of this report entitled "Extracts"). This resolution was submitted to UN Secretary-General on November 24, 1947, and the opening address in the debates over the proposal was made on February 14, 1949, by Mr. Willard Thorp, United States representative to the United Nations Economic and Social Council. Mr. Thorp stated "Evidence exists that these millions of people [slave laborers] are being used to develop resources and facilities in many areas of the U. S. S. R. where ordinary Soviet recruitment methods have failed to attract sufficient numbers and where conditions of life are so severe that the survival rate is tragically low."

On the day following Mr. Thorp's address, Miss Toni Sender, assistant to the A. F. of L. consultants to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, asked rhetorically if the work of these millions of men and women constituted forced labor. Her answer to this question was:

"Yes; according to the definitions in international instruments. Article 2 of the convention of the ILO on forced labor, of 1930, to which the delegate of Byelorussia had referred in the discussion in the agenda committee, defines forced labor as follows:

" 'The term "forced or compulsory labor" means all work or service which is exacted under the menace of any penalty and for which the person has not offered himself voluntarily.' "

Miss Sender quoted from several affidavits from former inmates of these Soviet concentration camps (such affidavits form a section of the booklet, and quotations from them form a large part of the section of this report entitled "Extracts"). These statements point out the lack of formal trial procedure in many convictions and commitments to these corrective labor camps. They point out the threat of extension of sentence if workday quotas are not met. Poor living conditions and low morality are shown to be the tragic norm of existence in these camps. The work of mining gold or uranium, felling forests, or making the steppes of Russia fertile, is done at the cost of a high death rate and the deprivation of the freedom of millions of innocent persons.

In the fourth section of the booklet it is pointed out that this slave system has not been confined to the borders of the Soviet Union but has spread westward with the advent of totalitarian communism to the countries of eastern Europe. It is charged that between 50,000 and 100,000 German forced laborers, including both military and political prisoners, are at work mining uranium in the Erzgebirge area (Germany, Saxony, and Czechoslovakia). Many of the skilled labor and professional classes in Germany were deported for forced labor in the Soviet Union beginning in 1945. In Czechoslovakia there were at least 160,000 persons imprisoned at the beginning of 1949, one year after the Communist coup d'etat, and of these about 70,000 are in forced-labor camps. The camps usually furnish farm labor and the prisons furnish labor to hundreds of enterprises including brick factories and coal mines. The Czech Minister of Justice, Czepiczka, said in a broadcast in December 1948, "In the Soviet Union the canals were built by people who did not agree with the regime. Here in Czechoslovakia all opponents will also receive shovels and pickaxes so that they will understand that the people think seriously about the road to socialism."

After these facts were presented and the case made for the American Federation of Labor proposals the United Nations Economic and Social Council opened general debate on the question. The Soviet representative, Mr. Semyon K. Tsarapkin, attacked the charges against the Soviet Union as Goebbel-like lies. He stated, and this theme was repeated in subsequent debates by the Soviet and satellite representatives, that forced labor was a phenomenon of the capitalistic nations and the force employed was economic pressure. He cited the labor conditions of the colonial areas. Then he contrasted this capitalistic-colonial system and its problem of unemployment with conditions in the U. S. S. R., where no problem of unemployment arose and everyone has the right to work.

Mr. Christopher Mayhew, the United Kingdom representative, answered Mr. Tsarapkin by calling attention to the testimony of those who had deserted the Soviet orbit. The Chilean representative, Mr. Santa-Cruz, applauded Mr. Mayhew and contended that the Russian representative hardly spoke to the item of the agenda at hand.

The Council then authorized Miss Sender (American Federation of Labor) to make a statement. Miss Sender refuted the picture of a Soviet paradise and a capitalistic hades for workers which had been drawn by the Soviet representative. Whatever the charges of the Soviet Union they did not improve conditions within Russia, and, besides, the proposed investigation would be made in all member states of the United Nations and not just the Soviet Union.

The Soviet representative and the representatives of the eastern European satellite nations attacked the position of workers in the United States and charged that the American Federation of Labor proposals were part of a campaign of hatred on the part of warmongers. Then Mr. Tsarapkin introduced a draft resolution which attempted to point out that forced labor was an inherent characteristic of capitalism and that the constitution and socialist base of the Soviet Union guaranteed the worker freedom from exploitation. It called for an international commission consisting of representatives of all trade-unions on the basis of one representative for every 1,000,000 trade-union members (to a total of 110 to 125 representatives), and other representatives from existing international trade-union federations. The purpose of this commission would then be to study conditions of unemployment in all countries where unemployment has not been eliminated, to investigate working conditions in the colonies and dependent territories, and to draw up reports and recommendations on the information received.

After lengthy debate the Soviet proposal was rejected by 15 votes to 3. The American proposal (the final amended form of this resolution appears in the section of this report entitled "Extracts") was adopted by the Economic and Social Council on March 7, 1949.

NOTE.—The appendix to the booklet contains the text of the Corrective Labor Codex of the R. S. F. S. R., which, it is explained in a foreword to the appendix by Matthew Woll, was made public originally by the Government of Great Britain (the points under the heading "Basic propositions" of this Codex are quoted in part in the section of this report entitled "Extracts").

EXTRACTS

1. International bill of rights:

Chapter 4, section 10:

"Involuntary servitude in any shape, manner, or form or under any guise shall be outlawed and discontinued by all nations and all peoples."

Chapter 4, section 12:

"Paragraph C: All economic or political discrimination and punishment for differences of political opinion or religious belief and practices are to be eliminated. The threat of being sent to concentration or labor camps as a punishment for differences of opinion with any government authority or dominant political party must be completely removed.

* * * * *

"Paragraph E: Freedom from the terror of secret police surveillance, arrest, or torture. This can be assured only through the abolition of all political police and concentration camps in every country (p. 3)." Excerpts from the proposed "International Bill of

Rights" submitted by the American Federation of Labor to the United Nations Economic and Social Council for "consideration and action" in August, 1946.

2. Paradoxical as it may appear, it is the land which calls itself Socialist, the government of which parades as a "worker's republic", that is the worst and biggest slave center on earth today. It is from Soviet Russia that the tidal wave of labor enslavement has swept westward. The Irkutsk Pravda only recently boasted that 5,000,000 prisoners of war are being used at penal labor in Siberia (p. 8). From Manifesto of the Free Trade Union Committee of the American Federation of Labor issued in March 1947.

3. The Nazis and Fascists made their own venal contributions in developing Twentieth century slave-labor projects. But neither in Fascist Italy nor in Nazi Germany did forced labor reach the gigantic proportions that slave labor has in Russia. Under the banner of the hammer and sickle there are from 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 people in slave-labor projects—digging canals, building roads, setting up military projects, mining uranium—under barbarous military supervision (p. 14). Slavery Old and New, article by Matthew Woll, second vice president of the A. F. of L., reprinted from the April 1949 issue of the American Federalists.)

4. It (Gulag—chief administration of camps—the organ which manages the many scores of "corrective labor camps") is a vast penal institution. But it is also a gigantic industrial and commercial enterprise. It has contacts, blueprints, budgets, credits, and represents an expanding section of the whole Soviet economy. This growth is inseparable from the successes of all of Russia's 5-year plans over which so many beguiled liberals in our own and other democratic countries have waxed enthusiastic (p. 15) (ibid.).

5. Whereas forced labor has become a postwar institution in many lands, constituting nearly one-third of their productive work; and

Whereas under the euphonius name of "corrective" labor, this new slave system is being increasingly used as a means of punishing political opponents, and robbing them of their basic human rights; and

Whereas these reversions to servitude are callous and crass violations of the Geneva Convention of March 1929, and a deliberate flouting of the Nuremberg verdict against forced labor; and

Whereas the governments resorting most extensively to the employment of slave labor have consistently and systematically shrouded it in secrecy; and

Whereas this expanding system of slave labor is a dangerous threat to the working standards, hard-won gains and human rights of the free workers of all nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Federation of Labor herewith calls upon the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations to commission the International Labor Office:

(1) To make a thoroughgoing survey of the extent of forced labor in all member nations of the United Nations;

(2) To recommend a positive program for eliminating this tragic and inhuman evil, and

(3) To foster human rights, humane standards and decent conditions of employment as free men; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Federation of Labor strongly urges the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations to take all necessary measures to insure early and favorable consideration of this proposal. In this connection, we especially call for a careful investigation of the role of United Nations' member governments in the inhuman deportation and condemnation to forced labor of many thousands of miners, textile workers and railwaymen, and other workers in what was once Sudeten area (pp. 23–24). ("Proposed Survey on Forced Labor and Measures for Its Abolition"—American Federation of Labor Convention, October 1947.)

6. The word "camp" entails an entire complex of camp sites. Several sites constitute a division, and several divisions make up a camp. My BBK (Baltic-Belomor-Canal) camp included a division No. 14 with its administrative center in the city Poodosz, and a No. 28. There may be more than 28 divisions, but that was the highest number of which I knew. My own division was No. 2. Each division contained about 10 to 15 camp sites. Thus the entire BBK camp, which spreads from the coast of Lake Onega to the White Sea embraced in my time several hundred camp sites, each with a population of several hundred to several thousand people. For example, at camp site Nedvegegorski alone there were 3,000 persons. The total number of inhabitants of camp BBK was estimated at about 500,000. About 50,000 Polish refugees, sent there in August 1940, were, without any difficulty, divided among the hundreds of camp sites of this one camp.

BBK is among the giant camps of Russia. The total number of such camps is in excess of 100, and if we are to assume that each of 100 camps contains about an average of 100 sites and that in each site there are about 1,000 persons, we reach a minimum of 10,000,000 population of such camps. The true number may be much greater. The huge death rate, on the one hand, and spasmodic additions of persons in given years (for instance, in 1937 and 1944), on the other hand, lead to the great oscillations in the estimated number of prisoners (p. 38–39). (From pt. III, Affidavits by Former Inmates of Soviet Concentration Camps—affidavit of Julius Margolin of Tel Aviv, Israel, a Zionist scholar.)

7. The inmates of the camps work under the control of armed guards. Sanctions which are enforced for not fulfilling the work norm are punitive hunger rations, prison, and—for systematic refusal of the appointed work—trial with the possibility of the death sentence (p. 40) (ibid.).

8. In 1945, the ration of workers of the 100 percent norm consisted daily of 500 grams of bread, 2 watery soups and a small portion of gruel, with an insignificant addition of vegetable fat and irregular and insufficient additions of meat or fish. Sugar, 20 grams daily, was issued only to sick persons and that not always. The standards which exist on paper were not kept in reality. The severe undernourishment of the prisoners is a steady mass phenomenon in the camps (p. 41) (ibid.).

9. According to stories told by Russian prisoners, deaths from slow starvation, especially far in the north, are normal occurrences. But there are other factors causing a high mortality rate. In the first year of my imprisonment (1940–41), many of the prisoners from the west died of pneumonia, being unused to working in the woods at temperatures of 30° below zero, centigrade. When the temperature fell below this we were left in the barracks, but such a day was deducted from the free day we had in every 10 (p. 42) (ibid.).

10. The lot of women in the concentration camps is dismal for another reason, too. They made up from 2 to 3 percent of all prisoners, and there was therefore a "hunger for women" in the camps. The administration and guards forced the women to live with them by all sorts of threats (to transfer them to worse jobs, etc.) and by offering them their protection, material help, etc. Under the hardship conditions in camp, the women almost never succeeded in getting out of the propositions; I observed several instances where good family women, separated from husbands and children, were compelled to turn to debauchery (p. 54). (From pt. III, Affidavits, op. cit.—affidavit of Gennadi Khomyakov, a Russian miner.)

11. I should like to add one incident characteristic for the Soviet system. In 1929–30, about 40,000 prisoners of the northern camps worked in Archangel, whence the U. S. S. R. exported most of its lumber. They were housed in abominable conditions; beatings and killings of prisoners in Archangel were customary phenomena. Suddenly, there was a rumor that a foreign commission was to arrive to investigate whether there was forced labor in the U. S. S. R. (this was at the time of the Soviet "dumping" incident). Evidently, the authorities received instructions from Moscow; all railroad, river and sea transport in Archangel was mobilized, and within 2 days all 40,000 prisoners were transferred to other camps. The barracks in which they had lived were cleaned, scrubbed and provided with signs, "Barracks No. 1, No. 2, etc., for Seasonal Workers." Thus the Soviet Government managed to conceal its deeds from foreign eyes—(p. 55). (Ibid.)

12. Mrs. Neumann: "The penal block was surrounded by barbed wire, with savage dogs roaming outside all the time. Naturally, living conditions in the penal block were worse than those in the so-called 'free camp.' As I have already said, the work was harder, the food poorer, the filth more repulsive. In the eyes of the Stalin regime, the task we had to fulfill was one of honor in this camp. The Kazan steppe was to be made fertile by these people. Before being sent to this camp, I had read in Pravda that the Kazan steppe was to be cultivated and made fertile in order to produce another victory for socialism. But Pravda said nothing about those who were to make the steppe fertile—that it was cultivated by slaves" (p. 80.). (From: (reprint) Populaire Dimanche, national weekly organ of the French Socialist Party (S. F. I. O.), vol. 2, No. 20, March 13, 1949.) (Mrs. Margaret Neumann, here a witness in the lawsuit brought in Paris by Victor Kravchenko against Lettres Françaises, is the wife of Helinz Neumann. Mr. Neumann was a former member of both the Politburo of the German Communist Party and of the Executive of the Executive of the Communist International as well as former member of the German Reichstag. He was arrested in 1937 for "deviating" from the party line and disappeared later in the same year.)

13. The administration of the prisons is receiving from 90 to 120 kroner for a prisoner's daily work. Such payments are provided in agreements concluded between the management of the various prisons and the enterprises concerned. The value of food and clothes given to the prisoners is about 16 to 20 kroner daily. Among the prisoners there is circulating a report that the Czechoslovakia Republic has a net income of 100,000,000 kroner each year from forced labor (p. 96). (From pt. IV, Soviet Totalitarianism Extends Slave Labor System Beyond Borders of Russia. From a report by a Czechoslovak labor leader whose identity cannot be disclosed for reasons of personal safety.)

14. In the Soviet zone of Germany, both the concentration camps and the Nazi technique have been taken over and improved on. Research undertaken a year ago indicated that the German concentration camp population was denser than in Germany up to 1939. There are, we have reason to believe, 200,000 to 300,000 prisoners in 6 major and 6 or 7 smaller camps (p. 109). (From an address on February 15, 1949, by Mr. Christopher Mayhew, United Kingdom representative to the UN Economic and Social Council.)

15. The Economic and Social Council—

Having noted the memorandum regarding a survey of forced labor and measures for its abolition submitted by the American Federation of Labor.

Believing that an impartial inquiry is desirable into the charges concerning forced labor made during the present debate.

Considering that international regulations on the question of forced labor have been adopted by the International Labor Organization.

Considering that members of the United Nations have solemnly pledged themselves under article 55 to promote universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

Invites the ILO to give further consideration to the problem of forced labor and its nature and extent in the light of all possible information, including the memorandum of the American Federation of Labor and the records of the Council's discussions of this subject which it has decided to transmit to the ILO.

Requests the Secretary General to work in close cooperation with the ILO in carrying forward its work in this field;

Requests the Secretary-General to approach all governments and to inquire in what manner and to what extent they would be prepared to cooperate in an impartial inquiry into the extent of forced labor in their countries, including the reasons for which persons are made to perform forced labor and the treatment accorded;

Requests the Secretary-General to keep the ILO informed and to consult with the ILO on the progress being made on this question, and to report to the next session of this Council on the results of his approaches and consultations; and

Decides to transmit the memorandum of the American Federation of Labor and the records of the Council's discussions of this subject to the Commission on Human Rights for consideration in connection with the drafting of the Covenant on Human Rights (p. 153). (Final resolution on survey of forced labor and measures for its abolition adopted by the UN Economic and Social Council on March 7, 1949.)

16. Basic propositions:

1. The task of the penal policy of the proletariat during the period of transition from capitalism to communism in the defense of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Socialist construction being carried out by it against encroachments by class-hostile elements and infringements not only on the part of the déclassé elements but also of unstable elements among the workers.

2. In accordance with this, corrective labor policy pursues the following aims:

(a) To put the condemned in conditions which debar them from the possibility of committing acts which inflict harm on Socialist construction; and

(b) To reeducate and adapt them to the conditions of the laboring community by means of directing their work to socially useful ends and by organizing their labor on the principle of the gradual approximation of forced labor to voluntary labor based on Socialist emulation and the shock-brigade systems.

3. The basic types of places for the deprivation of freedom are the labor colonies of different sorts to which the condemned are sent in accordance with their labor habits, their degree of class-dangerousness, their social position, and the success with which they are being corrected.

4. The duty of socially useful work proclaimed by the constitution of the R. S. F. S. R. for all citizens extends also to those deprived of freedom and capable of work. Political educative work is obligatorily carried out among those deprived of freedom. The labor of those deprived of freedom and the political educative work carried out among them must serve the aim of reeducating them to work and live in the conditions of the laboring collective and of enabling them to participate in Socialist construction.

5. In respect of all condemned to whom there is no need to apply isolation, the basic measure of corrective labor coercion is corrective labor without deprivation of freedom. The aim of such work is compulsory labor education in discipline without the restrictions which are applied to persons deprived of freedom, linked with political educative influence.

6. The special purpose of exile with corrective labor is the isolation of the condemned from their previous milieu by means of removing them to certain localities and simultaneously educating them in discipline by means of corrective labor.

7. Labor, political educational work, the regimen and the system of privileges in all corrective labor institutions are constituted in accordance with the basic tasks of the corrective labor policy of the proletarian state and may not be accompanied by the infliction of physical suffering or the lowering of human dignity (p. 159). (Corrective Labor Codex of the R. S. F. S. R.)

A Word About Santa Claus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the House having granted permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Holly Herald of Holly, Mich., for July 20, 1950.

People of Holly have not lost their self-reliance nor spirit of independence. They propose to take care of their own community without turning their eyes to Washington. They know that something for nothing is costly in the end. The example set by the people of this village ought to be followed in the Nation.

The Bureau of Government Research made a study of bills as they apply to the State of Michigan. They state: "Michigan taxpayers will pay $45,336,800 for only $2,327,000 in Federal public-works projects if the 1951 general appropriations bill, approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee, becomes a law."

The editorial referred to follows:

IF THERE IS A SANTA

Since the WPA and PWA days of the middle thirties cities and villages throughout the Nation have held up on public improvements awaiting the expected economic depression and revival of Federal public works programs. The attitude of public officials has been like that of children eagerly anticipating the coming of Christmas. The reasoning has been much the same too, Santa Claus is coming—they hope.

Last week we pointed out the obvious fact that all money in the Federal Treasury has been contributed by all of us. Everyone divies into the pot whether he pays an income tax or not. So it is equally obvious that if we continue to put pressure on the Government to assist us in building schools, highways, sewer systems, and such, we are in effect demanding another boost in taxes. It's as simple as that.

If there's a Santa Claus, we're it.

It is encouraging to see the village of Holly preparing to step out on its own and build a sewage disposal plant which will allow extension of lines to more than 200 homes which cannot attach to the present system. It will be another step in the right direction when residents of Holly area school districts pool their assets to improve educational facilities.

Every public improvement costs money and all of us have to pay the shot, but if we pay it on a local basis we are actually practicing economy—and we can see and know exactly what we are paying for.

When our village or township tax statement comes around with an amount listed for specific improvement it may seem like a high price for the facility purchased. But this method has its compensating features which appeal to the money-conscious as well as the community-conscious. The former is assured that it is costing him less than if he paid the money to the Federal Government and then had it doled out to the community on a political pressure basis. The latter, aware that he is helping to make his community a better place in which to live, will take a personal pride in having done so.

We're first believers in local taxes for public improvements—it's economically sound; it's the democratic way.

Love Thy Neighbor as Thyself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very fine article from the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., Sunday, July 30, 1950:

THE BELL RINGER

(By Steve Walsh)

Five years ago, a Catholic lady was laid to rest who, in her time, was known and highly respected for her graceful essays. Her name was Agnes Repplier, a Philadelphian who lived quietly, produced many volumes of distinguished work, and had a style of her own which brought forth witty and scholarly writings. She is mentioned here today because she was as good an example as one could find for being what was known as an exponent of the "good old days." To her the age of enlightenment and sophistication of the early twentieth century was unfavorable. What shs liked was a return to her era—a disciplined age of faith, sentiment and purity.

FOR TWO LONG YEARS

Without question, the present generation and those which follow will not be keen on looking back on the "good old days." Five years have gone by since Agnes Repplier was placed in the good earth, and nothing but regimental headaches have ensued. Most of us have the faith to carry on. If we didn't, this place we live in would be a bigger maelstrom of mystery than it portends to be.

Sentiment still lies within the heart of the man and woman who remembers the things of yesterday, but what pleasure it will be for the adult of tomorrow who looks back on the sight of people fleeing from war is an enigma. The human procession of the twentieth century has been nothing more than that—civilian population scrambling

on any vehicle which seemingly will take them to an uncertain destination so that they can go through the same act all over again.

It is true that this condition has not, as yet, been evident in our own back yard. We have been spared the quick getaway, the loss of personal belongings, the hunger, disease, filth, and bewilderment which everyday news show us exists in far-away places. But these repeated flashes bring all this into our living room, and that we are part of it lies in the fact that our own flesh and blood is trying to curb its ugly head from moving toward our direction.

The derivation of purity hasn't changed except that a noticeable meaning has been added to it by individuals who twist its sense around for their own benefit. By their reasoning they literally have a religion of their own—a way of living which, while bringing temporary pleasure, will eventually produce an anathema terrible in all its aspects. It's the supreme act of kidding one's self.

HE THOUGHT OF THIS

With the ancients, courage was regarded as practically the main part of virtue: by us, it is to be hoped we are not less brave to regard purity as such. Courage, however kindled, is fanned by the breath of man; purity lives and derives its life solely from the Spirt of God. Our purpose in seeing this latest irritation through needs all the purity of purpose we can command and the faith, which we have inherited, should strengthen our position.

But it nevertheless is a wierd period of time in which we and our children are living. Thirty years ago, we emerged from a conflict licking our wounds, and determination made a few remaining idealists bend every effort to see that it would not happen again. But a few mad men, so well remembered, thought differently and, for a while, had their way due to the smug complacency of the content.

They unleashed a new type of shuddering abhorrence that no sentimentalist since the beginning of man would care to recall. They crushed what the Reppliers would have you know as the "good old days." They buried fond memories of the past even though isolated cases strived to live like a fading bloom does without water. They produced nearly 10 years of suffering and misery that left an ugly scar on the face of the world, a festering cicatrix now reopened.

Things like concentration camps, death chambers, explosive traps, and horrible torture were finally arrested due to the overhanging fear of atomic destruction. Five years ago, all this and more, seemed to be on its way out, and the sleepless eyes of the world began to regain their natural focus. Sad part of it was that those who were awake couldn't see what was going on from the insensate machinations of other maniacs more dangerous than those condemned by war trials.

So here we are again giving the young generation a daily fare of pictures showing tanks, howitzers, mines, recoilless rifles, bazookas, multiple rockets, mortars, and such spectacular weapons which the brains of Jules Verne of H. G. Wells never could compete with. Here we are again showing the young the story of hospital trains, obituary lists, the fortune of the fishbowl, and the tread of marching feet. In years to come how will they react to the good old days.

LOVE THY NEIGHBOR

That we had to meet this exigency, in due time, has been universally accepted. Two ideologies have been pulling against each other. One of them must go, and for that end the disciples of faith, sentiment, and purity were compelled to unsheathe the sword. At the beginning, things looked optimistic. Unbelievable news, however, has proven the leaders whom we had faith in failed to match strides with the bear who walks like a man.

Therefore the young generation reads scarelines that are glum—lines which in due time will be remembered just as pertinently as those their fathers recall of the doing of the first half century. Whether they can produce a final solution of the problems now confronting their forebears is very hard to evaluate—hard in the sense that most of them will live happily ever after.

That this over-all picture must not be permitted to remain smudged with the daubs of maniacal slap-stick artists unfortunately is their inheritance. Maybe in the future they will have enough progressivism to do a better job than was done by those who preceded them. But what has been known as the good old days will unhappily pass them by.

They will walk along the path which was taken by millions who followed in the wake of the Romans centuries ago. They will look upon the scientific wonders of their time with a furtive eye—the good which has been beneficial being overbalanced with the evil. They will be regretful that in their young manhood they were deprived of things which bring laughter, joy, and peace.

Their good old days will be a veritable nightmare—a far cry from the hour of the Repplier belief that youth to enjoy the teenage should have the characteristics of zestfulness and innocence instead of the worriments of butter and guns. How this will be accomplished I do not know, being one of those fuddy-duddys who has lived in the sphere of 4 American wars. But I think the youth of today would agree with John Crown's legacy.

John Crown lived in this era of precocious technology, hydrogen bombs, guided missiles, and all the additions to the horrors that have caused an epidemic of anxiety and tension throughout the world. This pain-wracked boy's prescription of peace among men fits into the feeling expressed by Agnes Repplier and her kind. It merits thoughtful reading and, if practiced, will bring back the good old days. Otherwise man is a failure.

FOR THE LOVE OF GOD

"My name is John Crown. I am a paraplegic at Halloran General Hospital. My physical wounds are very small in comparison with my spiritual wounds. I have come back from death to a world that I no longer care for. I, who have been engaged in the great struggle to save the world from tyranny and having seen my comrades die for this cause, can find no peace in the world or in my country.

"Having lived close to death for 2 years, the reasons why there is no peace seem infinitesimally flimsy. Russia wants the Dardanelles. Yugoslavia wants Trieste, the Moslems want India, labor wants more wages, capital wants more profit, Smith wants to pass the car in front of him, junior wants more spending money. To these, I say, is it necessary to kill and cripple human beings for these petty gains?

"Anyone who thinks a human body is so cheap that it can be traded for a tract of land, a piece of silver, or a few minutes of time should be forced to listen to the moans of the dying night and day for the rest of his life. All the troubles of the world originate in the common man. The selfish and greedy ways of nations are just the ways of each individual man multiplied a hundredfold.

"When the morals of the common man drop, so do the morals of the nation and of the world. As long as our individual morals remain at a low ebb, so will the world. Until each of us stops hogging the road with his car, stops fighting over the seat on the bus, stops arguing over who is going to cut the grass, there will be no peace in this world. If man wishes peace again, he must return to the great commandment, 'Love thy neighbor as thyself for the love of God.'"

Hoarding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, a most timely editorial has been written on a subject of vital importance at this time by an alert and progressive editor, the Honorable Leodel Coleman, editor of the Bulloch Herald, a newspaper published in my home town of Statesboro, Ga. His splendid editorial on hoarding is worthy of being read by every patriotic American and in order to give it additional publicity I include it herewith as part of these remarks:

IT'S THE SAME CROWD

The same ones who were smart during the last war are playing it smart now.

The same ones who could take a trip to Atlanta when gasoline was short.

The same ones who could have steak on their tables when meat was short.

The same ones who had good tires when tires were impossible to buy.

The hoarders, we're talking about.

The smart operators.

They're smarter this war than they were during World War II—they think.

They are buying up tires, sugar, meats, and autos, when they don't have to deal with black marketeers.

Statesboro tire dealers report an unusual demand for tires. One has completely sold out. Others say the demand is much greater than normal.

A person frightened at the prospect of having to give up personal comforts with the life and liberty of his country at stake is, indeed, a sad sight.

A person so frightened that he resorts to hoarding is giving aid and comfort to the enemy just as much as the high Government official who reveals top-drawer secrets.

We can think no greater disservice to our country in times like these, than for these scared people creating shortages.

The Nation not only suffers, but the hoarder's neighbor gets it below the belt. He pays high prices because his hoarding neighbor is playing it smart.

We were part of the last World War. We remember the tightening of our insides when we read of hoarding at home. We said some pretty hard things then. Some of the boys at our side said some things, more bitter than the things we said, for they were much younger and couldn't understand the weakness upon which greed and fear is built.

With the first phase of hoarding over, let's look at the picture.

The things hoarders are stashing away include food, tires, nylons, sugar, refrigerators, and other things they remembered as being hard to buy in the last war.

We get it direct from our President that there is plenty of food. "Hoarding food," he said, "is especially foolish. There is plenty of food in this country." He might have cited the fact that the Government's Commodity Credit Corporation has on its hands millions of bushels, bales, bats, crates, or barrels of wheat, corn, cotton, potatoes, peanuts, cheese, butter, eggs, and other farm products.

Before the hoarders got busy, Cuba had a prospective surplus of 1,000,000 tons of sugar. Import quotas have been increased by 350,000 tons.

Take nylon hosiery. The hoarders are forgetting that nylon production capacity

has been multiplied many times over from what it was at the end of World War II—and there must be a lot of satisfaction for the nonhoarders to tell the hoarders that nylon hosiery deteriorates after being put away for a while.

Automobiles, refrigerators, home appliances, may necessarily be affected by steel allocation orders. But natural rubber for tires should be available, unless an Asiatic tidal wave of communism should sweep down through Malaya and Indonesia.

And it's completely possible that the war may be confined to Korea; and it's completely possible that peace could break out. Then the supposedly smart buyers would find their pantry shelves and basements stocked with deteriorating, over-priced goods.

We hope they would feel not only a little silly, but also a little ashamed.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles on communism by Frank C. Waldrop:

COMMUNISM
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Now that the United States of America is bombarding North Korea with leaflets, here is a story of World War II that our psychological warriors might be able to use.

The facts in it are unshakable and provably true. They should demonstrate in the clearest and plainest form to the Koreans just how Russia uses simple-minded believers to do the dirty work, then leaves them to suffer for it.

There is just one possible embarrassment in bringing it up at this time. It demonstrates what a pack of fools, if not worse, the Roosevelt administration were in the matter of Russia. But an honest confession of that would not hurt the prestige of the people of the United States. It would, I firmly believe, elevate us. For it would show that we have learned a little something.

But here is the story. The moral of it is plain.

As everybody knows, Germany and Russia together crushed Poland in the first month of World War II. Germany attacked as of September 1, 1939, and Russia on September 18.

Thereafter, the Poles became the objects of a concerted policy. Both Hitler and Stalin were resolved to wipe out this troublesome people who insisted in being a nation free of either.

Yet the spark of national life would not go out and in spite of everything there was formed in the ruins of Warsaw an underground Polish army, headed by one Michael Kamarowski, going by the code name of General Bor, for "forest."

They were determined to kill as many Germans as they could, as the broken wehrmacht in 1944 staggered homeward.

And, incredible as it may seem, this underground army collected pistols, rifles, machine guns, and other such scrapings of war for one flash fight.

For this purpose, they put aside all other thoughts. The Polish Government-in-exile, from London, sent agents to Moscow with explicit information so the Russians would know just how big a hidden army there was around Warsaw, and where.

And the Warsaw force was told to lie low for the big one.

There was in Moscow, at that time, a short-wave radio on the exact same frequency as the London short-wave frequency of the Polish Government-in-exile.

This Moscow station was called the Kosciusko station, after Poland's famous Col. Andrew B. Kosciusko, who had helped train the American revolutionists of 1776.

The Kosciusko station made it a regular practice to break in on London broadcasts and advise the Polish secret army.

A huge Russian army was just outside Warsaw when, on July 30, 1944, Station Kosciusko sent out the following flash:

"The walls of Warsaw are shaking with the thunder of guns.

"The advancing Soviet armies approach to the suburb of Praga. These armies bring you liberation.

"The Germans, after having retreated from Praga, will try to hold in Warsaw, and destroy everything. Bialystok was plundered by the German armies in 6 days. The Germans have murdered in Bialystok thousands of our brethren. We have to do everything in order to make the recurrence of these events in Warsaw impossible.

"To arms, Warsaw!

"The entire population should rally to the underground army. Attack the Germans.

"Help the Red army units in their crossing of the Vistula, supply them with all necessary information and lead them to the most convenient crossings.

"The million population of the capital should turn into a compact army striving to destroy the German invader and liberate the city."

The single-minded Poles leapt to the fight. They were absolutely sure the Russians would crush the Germans from the rear if they could only trip them up from the front.

In Gen. Bor Kamarowski's headquarters there was a captain of the Russian intelligence who had just parachuted in with short wave to tell his commanders everything.

So, the Poles leapt!

And the Russian armies sat down on the bank of the Vistula River at that suburb of Praga, just 10 miles from the heart of Warsaw, to watch while the German wehrmacht with its tanks and artillery and skilled infantry slaughtered Poles.

Once the Poles were utterly destroyed, the Russians marched in. I will tell tomorrow why all this happened as it did.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles by Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM
(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Our master minds of propaganda should pound home to Korea in every way they can the story of Poland, regardless of embarrassments.

For Poland was the great test case of communism's intentions as World War II began to subside.

And no matter what idea it is that has inflamed the North Koreans to fight so well, it can't be that they want to become another Poland.

To tell the truth about Poland, therefore, will be to remind them that Moscow is sending its planes and colonels and generals down to Korea with a purpose of its own that does not include the wishes of any Koreans.

And that is extremely important, in spite of the embarrassment such truth inevitably must cause in Washington. For the truth shows Mr. Roosevelt to have been, putting it most charitably, foolish.

And it does nothing better for Mr. Truman, either.

I have already told in this space how Stalin and Hitler leaned together upon Poland, regardless of their fighting so fiercely on other issues.

Each, for reasons of his own, wanted the war to guarantee that there would be not one spark of national life left in Poland.

Thus, the enemies were hunting companions in killing off Poles who might one day be capable of constructing a government or a tradition of independence. They wanted to be sure that the Fourth Partition of Poland would be final.

As one episode in that, the Russians directed the Polish underground army of Warsaw to rise up against the Germans at a strategic moment, in 1944. Then when the Poles were out in the open the Russians sat still and let the skilled and organized German army cut the pitiful Polish amateurs to pieces.

It was as cold-blooded and deliberate a maneuver as any in all history. And it was just as effective as any German gas chamber ever used.

Now for the crowning installment, I must tell how the Russians, having let the Poles destroy the nucleus of any army they might hope to develop, next moved to destroy any prospective civil government.

Poland, as an organized nation, was burst like a paper bag when Hitler invaded from the west on September 1, 1939, and Stalin from the east 17 days later.

Soon thereafter, Hitler's foreign minister, Ribbentrop, and Stalin's Molotov broadcast together in these exulting words and I quote Molotov:

"This ugly offspring of Versailles is destroyed, never to rise again."

That was in 1939. But it reflected little understanding of the Poles' stubborn will to live. For a fugitive government set up in London and kept contact with the people in spite of all.

Occupied Poland had an underground civil government just as it had that underground army mentioned above. This government even issued and actually sold bonds against its day of public reappearance.

It was the government the people of Poland followed.

But then, as Russia's armies of 1944 and 1945 spread westward again to Berlin and beyond, the recognized government of Poland was wiped out.

The wiping out has been told in full and official detail by Poles, Americans, and British who were present as the dirty work was done at the conferences of Yalta and Tehran.

In its place, Stalin substituted what he called a provisional government formed at Lublin, an ancient Polish city, and this Lublin committee step by bloody step has since made Poland submit to Moscow.

Our master minds should open up the secret archives of 1944–45 and tell how, for instance, a deputation of Polish Government officials from London were brought to Russian-occupied Poland in a British plane to meet with Lublinites.

Then tell how they were loaded into trucks, to vanish and never be seen again.

Our master minds should tell what they know about the members of the Lublin committee—how many of them were really

Poles, how many were not, how many of them had never put foot in Poland for a decade until sent by Moscow.

This was the gang that our Government ultimately accepted as the true ruling force in Poland, and which thereafter has worked only to make Poland a Russian province.

Poland is just one of the many victims of Russian policy, but it is an example sufficient to demonstrate all the others. I have used it because the evidence of Russia's purpose is unmistakable, and for that matter was well known in Washington at the time.

If nothing else had done so, the case of Poland told Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman after him, the nature of communism in world affairs.

Why did they refuse to accept it? Why did Mr. Truman say "I like old Joe Stalin?"

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles on communism by Frank C. Waldrop:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Why does the Voice of America fear to broadcast the facts it knows concerning the infamous Katyn massacre?

It has given orders to its Polish expert, Josef Czapski, specifically not to mention the Katyn case, even though that one has special meaning to Americans who have recently seen pictures of United States soldiers shot with their hands tied behind their backs.

This order, therefore, closes the mouth of one who knows the facts. For Czapski, in World War II, was sent to Moscow by the Polish Government in exile, to hunt for the 10,000 to 18,000 Polish Army officers who had disappeared into Russia never to reappear.

The Katyn massacre title to the story of these missing officers comes about thus:

As Germany crashed into Poland from one side in September 1939, and Russia from the other, thousands of Poles were invited by Russia to hide behind the Soviet borders.

Long and difficult negotiations were necessary to get any of them out, afterwards. And the officers above-mentioned disappeared without trace.

Then, in 1943, the Germans broadcast to the world that in the Katyn forest they had discovered mass graves, all grown over with trees, in which the missing Poles were found.

The Germans said the Russians had done the massacre. The Russians blamed the Germans. And what did the evidence say? I print below some from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that speaks for itself:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 6, 1949.

THE DIRECTOR, MILITARY INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Some time ago I inserted an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding the murder of several thousand Polish officers, probably by the Russians.

It has recently come to my attention that certain British and American officers were taken to the scene of the execution of these men while such officers were prisoners of the Germans.

It has been rumored that at least two of the American officers were Lt. Col. John Van Vliet, Jr., now stationed at Fort Lewis, Wash., and a Captain Stewart, otherwise unidentified.

It is quite possible that a committee will be formed to investigate this matter officially, and the purpose of this letter is to inquire whether or not the above-named officers have made a report on this matter and, if so, whether such report is available. If so, I would be very much pleased to receive a copy of the same.

Thanking you in advance, I am, very sincerely yours,

GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
GENERAL STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY,
Washington, D. C., October 19, 1949.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DONDERO: Reference is made to your letter of October 6, 1949, in which you request information on a report of the Katyn massacre. The Intelligence Division has recently acquired a report on this subject, which was partially based on Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet's observations of the German exhumation of the Polish graves at Katyn in 1943. The report is classified, and therefore cannot be released at this time.

In the event this report is declassified, it will be a pleasure to furnish you a copy.

Sincerely yours,

S. LEROY IRWIN,
Major General, GSC, Director of Intelligence.

Now, if the Germans were guilty, nobody would have ordered the evidence classified, and thereby sealed off from public knowledge.

Instead, the criminals would have been denounced from the housetops, long ago.

Arthur Bliss Lane, former United States Ambassador to Poland, has formed up an organization called the American Committee for the Investigation of the Katyn Massacre, Inc., to pursue the disclosure of known facts in the case.

This committee has just had the clamps put on it by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which says that its purpose of investigating one of the great murder mysteries in world history is not tax exempt in the meaning of the clause that lets so many such projects get by.

And the Voice of America directs Czapski, who knows the story of Katyn inside out, to keep silent on it.

Why? It would seem that if any episode in all the bloody book of communism illustrates the Soviet technique of deception and death, the Katyn massacre does.

It should be instructive to Koreans, North and South.

Why the hush-hush?

Answer: To tell the story of Katyn would not only show up Russia, but also would embarrass the record of the State Department, which couldn't believe the facts when it heard them, in 1943.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following of a series of articles by Frank C. Waldrop on communism:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Now we turn again from communism in the general world to communism in the United States of America as the final chapter of this long story in which I have undertaken to show how Stalin's motives at the end of World War II were plain and unmistakable.

The purpose of all the evidence is to demonstrate the justice of accusations that the Roosevelt and Truman administrations have never met the issue of communism squarely.

The state of things in Korea, of course, may be taken by some as evidence enough. But the state of things in Korea is better evaluated when you have before you details of the past state of things in other parts of the world, including Washington, D. C.

Let's look at the state of things in the United States of America back in 1935, when United States soldiers now in Korea were, for the most part, knee-pants children.

Here is something as of February 24, 1935, from one Prof. Frederick L. Schuman, of the University of Chicago:

"The people have lost faith in the liberalism of Washington, Jefferson, and Adams, and now demand economic security regardless of what may happen to the capitalistic system or religion.

"On the face of it, communism seems the antithesis of liberalism. This appearance is false. The antithesis is unreal. The point conceivably may be reached where liberalism will be perpetuated by communism.

"Communism is the product of liberalism, and liberalism's ideals are inherent in communism.

"Once the present Russian leaders are sure of their foundation it is their intention to abolish the dictatorship and restore democracy. The repudiation of democracy in Russia is only temporary and tactical. It is a means of an end.

"The temporary suppression of free press and free speech has been necessary in order to insure the defeat of class enemies.

"The Communist leaders are not forgetting their ideals of democracy. The ideals of liberalism and communism are identical."

Now that is a remarkable statement, worth your reading again. Professor Schuman admitted that in Russia, as of 1935, there was no freedom for the citizen. But he said it was just a temporary thing.

Also, he said that in the United States of America, people were no longer interested in freedom, or even in religion, but only in what he called "security."

Yet he argued that communism, which had taken away freedom as the price of security promised, must be regarded as the home of freedom even through people were no longer interested in freedom.

Typical tail chasing by a professor? You may say so, but it was influential on the minds of policy makers in our Government. Those of us who were in Washington in 1935 well know and can testify how regularly the New Dealers parroted:

"The people have lost faith in the liberalism of Washington, Jefferson, and Adams, and now demand economic security, regardless of what may happen to the capitalistic system or religion."

During World War II, Professor Schuman was one of a number of his kind that I helped chase out of important public offices in Washington. And as he was leaving town, I had the impulse to ask him to lunch.

I wanted to see what he would do, across the table from one he well knew to be instrumental in his departure from these halls of marble.

I can't report that he was very happy about the whole thing, even though he accepted

lunch and ate heartily. But it was a satisfaction to see that at least he knew that one citizen understood him, very well, indeed.

Fifteen years since 1935, and 7 years since Schuman left Washington in the middle of the war one jump ahead of the House Committee on Un-American Activities—how are things in Moscow?

What has become of the vaunted Soviet liberalism? Have the Communist leaders yet released freedom from the temporary handcuffs? Has anything changed?

The record shows that freedom in Moscow and everywhere else that communism has laid on its hand, is behind more bars than ever. The citizen walks in even greater danger and fear.

And what of security?

That, too, remains temporarily out of commission.

How did the New Dealers find it in their hearts to inflict upon the American people the philosophy of government neatly summed up by Schuman?

That question—and the lack of an answer—have something to do with current events in Korea and all over the world.

Halt Unbridled Profiteering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter sent by the Lynn Council of Labor, Lynn, Mass., to the President of the United States:

LYNN COUNCIL OF LABOR,
July 26, 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Massachusetts State Labor Department, in an official report issued July 25, 1950, revealed that the cost of living in large Massachusetts cities has made its biggest increase in 3 years during the last month.

The department reported its survey showed the cost of living went up 2 percent between mid-June and mid-July, or approximately the period since the unprovoked act of Communist aggression was committed in Korea.

According to the report "food prices alone climbed 4.2 percent, biggest jump in any one month since July 1946. Meat price went up 6 percent, with individual increases ranging from 1.5 percent for lamb to 16.3 percent for pork chops. Prices rose 12.6 percent for eggs, 4.7 percent for poultry, 3.7 percent for beverages."

You are doubtless aware that this sudden increase in the cost of living, especially in food prices, is widespread throughout the Nation.

Therefore, on behalf of 40,000 organized workers who are members of the 42 local A. F. of L., CIO, and independent unions affiliated with the Lynn Council of Labor, we earnestly urge that you take immediate steps to ask the Congress for authority to impose price control and higher excess-profits taxes to bring to a halt this unbridled profiteering.

As members of organized labor, we are prepared to make all necessary sacrifices in the interest of the common struggle to prevent the free nations from being overpowered by totalitarian aggression but we do not feel that such sacrifices should be made for the benefit of profiteers who are playing into the hands of Stalin and his ruthless Communist schemers by threatening the economic stability of the United States in an hour of mounting crisis.

Very truly yours,

FRANK E. PRIOLI,
President, Lynn Council of Labor.

A Report to the People of Burlington and Mercer Counties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the highest obligations that a Congressman owes his constituents is to report directly to the people who elected him to office. What follows is my report to the people of Burlington and Mercer Counties on my first term in office.

WHAT THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS HAS ACCOMPLISHED

A question which many people have asked themselves about the current world crisis is "What has the Eighty-first Congress done to strengthen the United States and the rest of the world against the tide of communism?" The answer is found in the positive legislation Congress has enacted in its first and second sessions. The Eighty-first Congress has:

First. Authorized continuance of the Marshall plan and extended economic assistance to Marshall-plan countries, Korea, and underdeveloped countries requiring technical aid as part of point 4.

Second. Authorized $60,000,000 economic aid to South Korea and $10,500,000 to Chinese Nationalists.

Third. Ratified the North Atlantic Pact.

Fourth. Authorized over $1,000,000,000 military aid for North Atlantic Pact nations, Korea, Greece, Iran, Turkey, and so forth.

Fifth. Is currently considering and will soon pass the emergency legislation which President Truman called for in his message to Congress July 19, 1950.

Other important legislation passed by the Eighty-first Congress affecting our international relations includes passage of a liberal Displaced Persons bill, restoration and extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements and extension of Selective Service in the United States.

In the field of domestic affairs, the achievements of the Eighty-first Congress have been equally as positive. Such legislation includes:

First. A good-low-income housing and slum clearance bill.

Second. An increase in the minimum wage to 75 cents per hour.

Third. Extension of rent controls.

Fourth. Creation of a national science foundation.

Fifth. Acceptance of 24 major reorganization plans—along the lines suggested by the Hoover Commission.

Sixth. Repeal of the tax on oleomargarine.

Other important legislation which has passed both the House and the Senate and is now in final committee conference is a Social Security provision which will add about 11,000,000 people to the total number of persons now covered by the present law, and will increase the benefits of those eligible for retirement by nearly 100 percent.

YOUR VIEWS ON MAJOR ISSUES AND HOW I VOTED

As many of you know, I have circulated during each session of Congress a questionnaire asking for your views on many of the controversial issues which have faced your Government during these past 2 years. Your cooperation in answering these questionnaires has been greatly appreciated; your views as expressed in them have been very helpful to me in making important legislative decisions. From the sample of the people I polled in the fourth district, the majority of you voted in favor of the following issues which came up for a vote before Congress:

First. Extension of Selective Service.

Second. Continued appropriation for the Marshall plan.

Third. Repeal of excise taxes.

Fourth. FEPC with enforcement.

Fifth. Extension of Social Security.

Sixth. A low-income housing bill.

Seventh. Increased minimum wage.

Eighth. Extension of rent control.

On every issue my vote in the House of Representatives coincided with the will of the majority of my constituents.

BILLS I HAVE INTRODUCED

During my first term in office, I have not introduced any unnecessary legislation or any duplicate bills merely for the purpose of padding my congressional record. There have been, nevertheless, several instances where I felt that it was necessary to introduce legislation which I believed to be in the best interests of the country and the people of Burlington and Mercer Counties. I have introduced the following:

First. A bill which establishes in the Department of Labor a Labor Extension Service similar to the Extension Service in the Department of Agriculture. (The bill has been discussed by committee and is ready for final action.)

Second. A bill which authorizes the Postmaster General to detail employees to postal units at armed services camps and to authorize allowances not exceeding $4 per day in lieu of actual expenses. (Passed, Public Law No. 552, the 81st Cong.)

Third. A bill which creates and assigns duties to the Office of Assistant Secretary of the Marine Corps, and fixes the personnel strength of the Marine Corps at a minimum of 6 percent of that of the other armed services, this to include land combat, and aviation forces. (Pending.)

Fourth. A bill which authorizes the return to Mexico the Mexican flags captured during the United States-Mexican War. (Passed Senate and House.)

Fifth. A bill to prohibit the payment of awards of annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930, as amended in the case of Government

officers and employees convicted of a felony. (Pending—this bill would take care of such cases as J. Parnell Thomas.)

Sixth. A bill to prohibit—with enforcement—discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion or national origin. (A similar bill with no enforcement provision passed the House.)

Seventh. A bill to provide that compensation of a Federal officer or employee shall be subject to State tax only in the State where he is domiciled, and for other purposes. (Philadelphia wage tax) (Pending.)

Eighth. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make available grain to egg producers at such prices as may be necessary to establish an equitable egg-feed ratio. (Pending.)

Ninth. A resolution encouraging the study of foreign languages.

I have also introduced several private bills, three of which are now law.

THE RECORD OF YOUR CONGRESSMAN

Attendance: To date, during both sessions of Congress, there have been 455 roll calls in the House of Representatives. Of this number, I have been present to vote on all but 10 relatively minor issues. I have done my utmost to be on the job at all times.

WHERE YOU AND I STAND ON OTHER ISSUES

Since this is a summary report made brief for your convenience, it has been impossible to include the tabulated results for all of the issues on which you voted in the two questionnaires. At your request, however, I will be only too glad to send you the complete returns. Furthermore, if you would like my stand on other major issues facing the country today, or if you wish to be included among the recipients of the questionnaires I hope to send out during the Eighty-second Congress, please drop me a penny postcard so I can have your name and address.

I want you, the people of Burlington and Mercer Counties, to know that it has been a privilege and an honor to serve you during my first term in office.

The Main Street View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very timely and interesting editorial which appeared last week in the Nashville Journal in my district at Nashville, Ill.

This editorial very cogently and intelligently points out what I believe to be a sample of the thinking of the people in the smaller towns and rural sections of the Nation with reference to the problems facing us in these chaotic times. The editorial follows:

THE MAIN STREET VIEW—THOUGHTS IN PASSING

It was left for Governor Dewey, in our opinion, to make the most intelligent remark of the week: "It must now be clear to all that Communist imperialism does not intend to stop with Korea. But we find in this country politics as usual, business as usual, and strikes as usual."

It is not for us to be critical, but it seems to me that the attitude of Washington is much too complacent or else the news reporters at the front are exaggerating to make better copy and we don't believe that to be the truth.

What has happened is done and there is no use crying over spilled milk so to speak, but we do wish the administration from the President on down would quid kidding and let's admit that the situation isn't good.

Mr. Truman said only last Friday that the Korean Reds will be driven back, which of course is true, but Mr. Truman's main reason for the statement seemed to be the fact that we've never been licked yet and it won't happen this time. That's a nice patriotic thought but it doesn't make much sense from a practical standpoint.

Too much such statements had been made by high officials before this thing ever broke. Not too long ago, the President in a public speech said that war was farther away than at any time since the last one and the future looked rosy. These remarks are not intended to badger Mr. Truman. The poor guy has a job that none of us would want, certainly in these times, and we think every one should give him as much moral support as they honestly can but for gosh sakes let's get out of this dream world we have been living in and face the facts.

The facts are that while we live better than the rest of the world, have more to eat, make more automobiles, washing machines, and ice boxes, we were still unprepared for this police action now going on, and it seems now as we look back that practically everybody realized the fact except those that should have known the most. It's easy to second guess, and hindsight is always better than foresight, but I can't pass up a remark made by one Mr. Louis Johnson, head of the important Department of Defense only a few months ago. For months the better-informed columnists, the real military brains, and even insignificant country editors like ourself have been shouting preparedness and urging that if billions had to be spent in Washington that they be spent for preparedness instead of being thrown away on domestic boondoggles. Some of the criticism from the bigger columnists of Mr. Johnson's cutbacks in the defense departments finally got under his skin and one day in the heat of a press conference, he blurted out: "If the Russians attack at 4 o'clock, we'll be ready at 5."

Instead of being ready, a small token force of brave Americans have had to fight with their backs to the wall; to be mowed down because they didn't have the ammunition with which to fight back; to face superior weapons in the form of heavier tanks and without the proper fire power with which to stop these tanks. In the meantime, marine reinforcements sat alerted on the west coast for 10 days awaiting shipping. So reads the record, and it was long after 5 o'clock.

The sad commentary is, of course, the loss of life as the result. It seems that the United States in the beginning of its wars invariably starts behind the eight-ball. We suppose that this is due to our age-old policy of always waiting for the other fellow to start something. However, it costs lives at the start just as Pearl Harbor did when we got caught with our pants down there.

The United States today is paying the price of unpreparedness in American lives and prestige and what might have been a short inexpensive war in Korea has now developed into a long costly war, because we were not able to deliver a knock-out punch in the first round. Now let's get down to cases and forget politics and business as usual.

Another theory that has been exploded in the fighting to date is that the shooting when it came would be the kick-off of a push-button war. The admirals and the Air Force fought that one out some months ago and the Air Force, with the backing of Mr. Johnson, won. But instead of sitting at a desk and pushing a button for an atomic bomb or a "man from Mars" rocket, the war to date has been fought in the mud and filth of mother earth by the good old infantry just as it has been in all wars to date.

While it's ghastly to think of the sacrifice of lives in these early stages, perhaps it's a lesson that Washington may heed. Nine years ago, the people of this country were not mentally ready for war. Disaster came at Pearl Harbor, and while it was ghastly too, the very suddenness of the blow probably did more to unite a confused people and stiffen their backbones for total war than any other one thing. Today we think the people are more cognizant of the situation than Washington itself seems to be. In any event, maybe Korea will serve the same purpose as Pearl Harbor, at least from a military standpoint. If it does that in the next 60 or 90 days, we will be lucky.

This thing is much more serious than most people will admit, and the sooner we make up our collective minds that it's going to be a long, hard, and costly struggle, the better off we'll be in the long run. Only a miracle, in my opinion, will prevent a continuing series of conflagrations which could well keep the world aflame for the next 5 or 10 years.

While there seems to be a slow awakening on many fronts, such is apparently not the case among war profiteers. At the sound of the first gun prices jumped. Paper has gone up all along the line, as much as 20 percent in some grades. Practically every order of raw material in the shop shows a sudden and not inconsiderable price increase since the last one. The general cost of living has followed suit. There are obviously some all over the country who are out to get theirs while the getting is good.

The public, too, is not to be excused for its sudden run on hard-to-get items. The quickest way in the world to upset the general economy and shoot prices really skyward is to hoard. There are, of course, always selfish people in the world, and war brings out that trait mighty quickly. You can't control human nature, and for that reason we don't think that the administration should hesitate any longer in putting the country on a war basis as far as controls are concerned. We've got to have wage and price ceilings to protect the little fellow in business; and if the people themselves insist on being greedy, we've got to have rationing along with price control.

When a local grocery store tries to buy home-grown tomatoes for 10 cents a pound and then offers them to the public for 40 cents, you can be sure that it's time to crack down.

Welfare State Plan Assailed by Richberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, the inevitable transition from a welfare state

to totalitarianism is so logically traced by Donald R. Richberg as reported in the Washington Times-Herald of July 25 that I include the article herewith under leave to extend my remarks:

WELFARE STATE PLAN ASSAILED BY RICHBERG

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., July 24.—The welfare state was assailed in its spiritual birthplace, Harvard University, by Donald R. Richberg, Washington attorney. He said it is leading to the police state.

At a conference on the welfare state, sponsored by the university which sent thousands of young men to Washington to fashion and guide the New Deal and Fair Deal, Richberg declared that private associations, including labor unions, cannot survive in the welfare state.

FEARS DEPRESSION

"It became evident that the welfare state must become eventually a state of national socialism, or else engulf us in the most calamitous depression of our history," he said.

"It is no defense of national socialism to assert that a complete socialization of our political economy might at least make it financially possible to maintain an orderly society under rigid control of a national police."

To make it plain why a welfare state must become totalitarian, Richberg analyzed its fiscal problems as follows:

1. The national income has been inflated in dollars to two and one-half times what it was 20 years ago by dollar devaluation and borrowing of over $200,000,000,000.

2. Taxes and Federal expenditures have been increased from $31.60 per capita in 1929 to $268.23 per capita in 1948.

3. The National Government is spending twenty-five billions a year for general welfare at home and for other people abroad in addition to national defense and debt expenditures.

FORTY PERCENT IN TAXES

4. President Truman's program for a welfare state would add another twenty-five billions to annual expenditures, at an annual increase in taxes of $166 for every man, woman, and child in America.

5. Adding State and local taxes, the annual tax obligation of the American people would be more than 40 cents out of every earned dollar.

6. Major part of all taxes must be paid by persons of small and moderate incomes. It is an illusion fostered by liberal spenders that taxes are largely paid by the rich.

7. As voters become exasperated by increased direct taxation, political spenders resort to indirect taxes. Indirect taxes paid by the average family today exceed $700 a year and when direct taxes are added, it is evident that the average wage earner's family is paying over $1,000 a year for "the support of an infant welfare state that has just begun to bite."

Democrats and Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the July 29, 1950, issue of the Indianapolis Star:

DEMOCRATS AND ISOLATIONISM

According to the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, the Democrats are going to campaign against "isolationists" this fall. Whom are they going to campaign against—Henry Wallace, the Communists, or President Truman?

If Democrats expect to campaign against Republicans for their "isolationism" in the Far East, and Korea in particular, they will be grabbing a bear by the tail. The strategy is to blame Republicans for voting against Korean aid last January and to say that, therefore, Republicans are responsible for the Korean debacle.

But let's look at the record. Republicans fought against the Korean-aid bill in January because it was an economic-aid bill and not a military-aid bill. Do the Democrats want to claim that the South Koreans could have defeated the North Korean tanks with fertilizer, farm machinery, bales of cotton, and Cokes?

Republicans joined Democrats last fall in passing a Korean aid bill with $10,500,000 earmarked presumably, for arms, guns, and tanks. But the Truman administration by the time the attack occurred had spent only $200, as recorded in testimony, of this fund. State Department officials now say that it was the deliberate policy of the United States to keep South Korea unarmed, unable to defend itself, weak and vulnerable to attack. While Republicans who voted for Korean aid last fall thought they were voting to arm South Korea, the Democratic administration was refusing to send a single tank or gun or plane to South Korea.

Who was isolationist in Korea? Mr. Truman, Senator Connally, Secretary of State Acheson. All of them said Korea was indefensible.

Who was isolationist in Formosa, now guarded by American ships and planes? Mr. Truman said he would give neither economic nor military aid to Formosa last January. Republican Senator TAFT demanded that the United States Navy protect Formosa last January. So did Herbert Hoover.

Who was isolationist in China? President Truman, Secretary of State Acheson, and most of the Democratic leaders of Congress. While Republicans for the past 5 years have been pleading for an anti-Communist policy in China, the administration's isolationist do-nothing policy was to let the dust settle.

Democrats cannot even accuse Republicans of isolationism in Europe. It was the GOP Eightieth Congress that passed the Marshall plan and the Greek-Turk aid bill. GOP majorities approved the Atlantic Pact. The records show that the GOP leaders wanted a consistent policy of anticommunism all over the world. The Democrat administration wanted such a policy only in Europe. "In Asia," said the administration, "the Truman doctrine is dead."

A good campaign can be made against isolationism this fall—by the Republican Party against Democratic isolationism in the Far East. We hope that campaign is made.

Let's Have the Taxes and Avoid Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to include an editorial on the subject of taxes and controls as it appeared in the Des Moines Evening Tribune of July 26, in which the editor sums up the whole situation in a splendid way:

LET'S HAVE THE TAXES AND AVOID CONTROLS

When we began our armament program for World War II the American economy was idling along at depression speed. We had lots of slack in employment, slack in the heavy-goods industries, slack in the use of transportation equipment.

We were able to add a major military production program to our civilian economy and take several millions of our most productive workers for the armed services, therefore, and still suffer no loss of output of civilian goods.

In fact, we were able to increase production and consumption of civilian goods at the same time we were building a vast war machine.

This time it's different.

This time even Mr. Truman's "limited mobilization," costing only $10,000,000,000 more a year, will have to be squeezed out of an economy going full blast.

It will have to come out of an industrial plant which was making virtually complete use of capital resources and manpower before the Korean war broke out.

It is plain, therefore, that the military expansion program is going to hurt.

It is going to mean reductions in output of automobiles, refrigerators, and other durable consumer goods very soon. It will mean severe cutbacks in housing and other civilian building projects.

There is no choice in this matter.

Once we have decided to use a large proportion of our productive resources for war, then we have necessarily decided to "do without" certain peacetime goods.

This is the way we pay for a war in material terms—by sacrificing our civilian standards of living.

Since we went into the last war with much idle plant and manpower, these sacrifices seemed small. The pinch was really felt only in a few household goods. We had more of most things than we had had during the depression years.

But although there is no alternative to the way we must pay for a heavy armament program in terms of real goods, there is a wide choice in how we manage the bookkeeping.

One way is for the Government to print more money and simply bid up armaments against the civilian economy. This drives prices higher, and the cost is borne by the people in the proportion that they spend their incomes for necessities. That is, the free price system becomes the arbiter. People with the lowest incomes and the more fixed incomes suffer most.

Another way is for the Government to slap tight controls on the use of materials, the investment of capital, the employment of manpower, and the consumption of goods and services. This holds prices in check and maintains roughly the same distribution of goods as before.

A third way is to siphon off purchasing power of the people by income taxes, based on ability to pay. This reduces the civilian demand for goods to allow room for the new demands of Government. It allows the free market to function about as before.

In the last war we used a combination of all three methods. But we placed heaviest reliance upon direct controls.

This was an improvement over the unrestrained inflation which had been accompanied earlier wars, but it had serious disadvantages. It resulted in gross distortions of distribution—especially of "tight" commodities like tires, gasoline, butter, meat, etc.

Moreover, it required an enormous administrative staff to make it work, and it led to cheating, black markets, and disruptions to morale.

There is no substitute for direct controls in allocating heavy industrial goods and raw materials. The Government must assure positive control of the vital materials of defense.

But the great bulk of the economy can operate more efficiently if we permit the free markets to decide who gets what.

That is why Senators TAFT and O'MAHONEY, as well as some other congressional leaders, already have started a move toward increasing income tax rates. If Congress acts rapidly and decisively, we might be able to avoid many of the unpleasant controls which so annoyed us and handicapped our World War II productive effort.

In addition, Congress needs to look over the whole list of excise taxes. The excises now on the books were set to limit consumption of certain kinds of goods in World War II—and to raise revenue, of course. But our new situation is different. We need to adjust these taxes to the prospect, as Senator TAFT puts it, of 10 or 15 years of a "partial" war economy.

Eliminate Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following enlightening editorial from the Lawrence Sunday Sun, Lawrence, Mass., July 30, 1950:

TIME TO CUT NONESSENTIAL SPENDING BY THE GOVERNMENT

Asserting that past blunders in international and fiscal policies have placed this country in such a position that the present conflict may result in a crucial test of our economic and moral stamina, the First National Bank in a public statement has called for elimination of nonessential spending by the Government. The statement said:

"Since we are now engaged in a struggle for existence that will be grim, bitter, and prolonged, it will call for the full cooperation of all groups in a united all-out effort.

"For more than a decade and a half our country has unwillingly been playing into the hands of Russia by pursuing national fiscal policies which have been based on the theory that Government spending generates purchasing power, and we have been told not to worry about our debt since we owe it to one another. The Government has played the role of Santa Claus to the people, giving them the impression that they are getting something for nothing. For the 5 years since the end of the war, Federal expenditures have aggregated $200,000,000,000, or more than was spent during the first 150 years of our Republic. Nearly $50,000,000,000 has been spent on defense since our demobilization in 1946. Yet we are grossly ill prepared to carry on even a minor campaign in Korea.

"Our taxes—Federal, State, and local—even before we launch upon the expanded military program, constitute more than 25 percent of national income. At the same time, notwithstanding a business boom with income near the highest on record, this country has not been able to pay its way but resorted to deficit financing.

"First of all, then, we must adopt sound fiscal policies and realize that we do not have unlimited resources at our command. While the Government must spend whatever is necessary for defense purposes, it is imperative that nonessential items be cut to the bone. It has been estimated by authorities of both political parties that by eliminating waste and extravagance at least $5,000,000,000 could be saved without in any way impairing necessary governmental services. This should be done. Wasted money not only diverts manpower, materials, and facilities from the defense effort but also provides comfort and aid to the enemy and menaces our national security.

"The American people will be called upon to make great sacrifices and to reduce their living standards. In all fairness, then, the Government should eliminate unnecessary expenditures, particularly those which directly compete with the military program. While waste of public funds cannot be countenanced at any time, during this grave emergency it should be branded as a blow to our national security. The granting of subsidies to pressure groups under whatever pretext should not be tolerated. Public works not essential for national defense should be postponed.

"Furthermore, there must be a curb on inflation as it greatly increases the cost of war and saddles the Government with a heavy debt and interest charges. In the First and Second World Wars, inflation was responsible for very substantially increasing the military costs."

The speedy adoption of more of the Hoover Commission's recommendations for reorganization of the Federal Government might well be the first move toward saving money.

Business Conditions in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

SAYS SENATOR MYERS SHOULD STUDY MANUFACTURERS' FIGURES

In a statement last week, Secretary of Commerce Theodore Roosevelt III, said:

"The newspapers have quoted United States Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS as saying it is incredible that business in Pennsylvania has improved under the administration of Gov. James H. Duff. If he has been quoted correctly, the feature of his statement which really is incredible is its disclosure of how little Mr. MYERS knows about the State he purports to represent.

"Before undertaking to issue any more statements about business conditions in Pennsylvania, it would be so much better if Mr. MYERS obtained some facts about what really has been going in this State. That would confuse the public less, and also make Mr. MYERS appear less ridiculous.

"Inasmuch as he does not seem to trust the figures issued in Harrisburg by the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce, it may be that he will trust figures issued in Washington by the Federal administration with which he is allied. I will suggest where he can get such information for his course in the fundamentals of economics.

"He might go to the United States Department of Commerce and ask for a copy of its latest estimate of State and national income. In its discussion of 1947 and 1948 income, compared to 1946, the Department said: 'In line with the longer-run tendency, manufacturing payrolls in New York increased at markedly less than the Nation-wide rate. In Pennsylvania, on the other hand, increases in factory payrolls substantially outpaced Nation-wide advances.' Mr. MYERS will find that quotation on page 13 of the Survey of Current Business, issued by the Department of Commerce in August 1949.

"While at the Department of Commerce he might examine the report of the latest Census of Manufacturers issued by that Department. It shows there are approximately 50 industrial classifications in which Pennsylvania leads the Nation in employment.

"He also should study the Census of Manufacturers figures on capital expenditures by industry. These figures show that Pennsylvania leads all States in the amount of money spent on new plant and equipment. They report that manufacturing firms spent $533,800,000 to expand in Pennsylvania in 1947. That was $35,000,000 more than was spent in the second State, Ohio. Those figures show not only that business was expanding in Pennsylvania but also that industrialists considered Pennsylvania the No. 1 State in which to expand their operations.

"Our department, by the way, conducted a questionnaire of industrial expansion in Pennsylvania. The companies which reported spending $1,565,592,855 in Pennsylvania in 1946, 1947, and 1948 estimated they would spend $1,384,070,131 additional for plants and equipment in Pennsylvani during 1949, 1950, and 1951. When Mr. MYERS comes to Harrisburg the next time, if he comes to this department instead of spending his time issuing misleading statements from Democratic campaign headquarters, we will be very glad to show him these reports, each signed by a responsible official of the reporting company.

"In his tour to acquire more economic information about Pennsylvania from Federal departments, Mr. MYERS also might go to the Treasury Department. The United States Treasury knows a great deal about Pennsylvania business, because it took $3,213,432,048 in taxes out of Pennsylvania in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

"The Treasury can tell Mr. MYERS that in the percent of change in individual income tax payments for this year. Pennsylvania was well above the national average. New York, New Jersey, Illinois, and California, among the larger industrial States, all dropped below the national average.

"In corporate income and profits tax payments, Pennsylvania's rate of gain was twice as large as the national average—a gain unmatched by any industrial States except Texas and Michigan.

"In total income and profits taxes from individuals and corporations, only five States showed increased payments and Pennsylvania was one of them. The others were Texas, Michigan, Oklahoma, and West Virginia.

"In employment taxes, the Treasury collected $252,009,778 in Pennsylvania the second largest amount for any State.

"Study of these reports should convince even Mr. MYERS that business has improved in Pennsylvania under the administration of Governor Duff. Employment taxes are not paid unless persons are employed. Individual and corporate income is earned. Factory payrolls do not outpace national averages unless employment and wages are high. Industries do not invest hundreds of millions in new plants unless their own surveys show sound economic reasons for doing so in the State they have chosen.

"The fact that Pennsylvania's record was so far above the national average might suggest something to Mr. MYERS. It might indicate that Pennsylvania was able to prosper because of its inherent advantages and wise administration here, but that other States—and especially industrial States without all of Pennsylvania's blessings—could not operate under the handicaps of the Democratic policies in Washington without suffering declines."

United States Planes, Pilots, Dangerously Few

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Planes, Pilots, Dangerously Few," written by Bob Sibley, aviation writer of the Boston Herald and printed in the July 9, 1950, issue of that publication. The article deals with the possible shortage of pilots in addition to the difficulty we have had about planes. Some time ago the Congressional Aviation Policy Board recommended the 70-group Air Force. Mr. Sibley points out that pilots may be lacking. I think the article is a very valuable one.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES PLANES, PILOTS, DANGEROUSLY FEW—WASHINGTON KNOWS BUT DOES NOTHING AS WAR CLOUDS GATHER

(By Bob Sibley)

Sooner or later, as the Korean situation and other world-dotting hot spots continue to sizzle and boil, a likewise red-hot issue is going to land right in Washington's lap, and quite likely there isn't going to be any suitable solution for it. The issue will be this: What are we going to do for pilots? How are we going to get enough—in a hurry? Plus other trained air crew men?

No doubt there are enough airmen available right now for military aviation purposes, for the lamentable reason that the total number of aircraft available for national security is below suitable totals.

NOT ENOUGH FOR WAR

But there are not enough aircraft and pilots for a drawn-out, shooting war. Especially pilots. You can't train them overnight. It takes months of procurement, selection, training, elimination of some, and final selection of the best of the crop.

The Department of Defense knows all about this situation, because the Air Force and the Navy have been trying to hammer home the point for months.

In Washington, for a long time there was a cozy feeling that several hundred thousand airmen trained during World War II could always be called back in a hurry if the need for more pilots developed.

This hopeful view has been fading, year by year, for the reason that it's well established these men become less and less eligible for such duty as time goes on. To put it bluntly, the World War II airmen are going to be too old for air combat. A small percentage might do for some assignments—Military Air Transport Command work, for example. But not for the rough stuff.

SAME OLD STORY

Altogether, it looks like the same old pre-World War II story all over again, with slightly different details.

Then as now the Air Force (then the Army Air Corps) had no means with which to train the fliers its commanders knew were going to be needed.

Resourceful Gen. Henry H. (Hap) Arnold called a secret meeting of civilian aircraft school operators, put an Air Corps stenographer out of the room, and outlined an unheard of proposition. He asked the aviation school executives if they could train pilots for his Air Corps. Arnold couldn't offer any pay or contracts; he didn't have the money. So the aviation cadet training program by civilian schools and civilian instructors had to start with nothing but a hope and a prayer then Congress would come through with the money at some time. Congress did, ultimately, and it helped win the war.

BELOW SAFE LIMITS

Since then Air Force pilot training has dropped to rock bottom levels, and what was once the world's greatest military air machine has likewise shrunk to a point which, President Truman's own advisers have told him, is below safe limits.

Since the war plenty of ex-military men have received Government-paid flight training under the GI bill of rights. But they, too, are in age brackets which leave them too old for air combat.

The Air Force and the Nation would be a good deal better off today, securitywise, if all that money or a comparable sum had been spent to create a pool of more youthful pilot talent, with reserve status.

Most of the advocates of air power and adequate air strength have centered their arguments on the need for more planes, and among these advocates is Representative CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

But a recent warning from VINSON concerning the need for more aircraft could be applied to pilot procurement as well when he said:

"We are backsliding into impotency in air power. We are critically jeopardizing our Nation's security. We are again encouraging war through weakness, for the Kremlin responds only to force. The safest road to permanent peace is for this Nation to maintain modern and powerful Armed Forces, and especially an adequate air power both in our Navy and Air Force.

RUSSIA'S LARGEST

"It is universally known that Russia is building the largest air force in the world. What are they building it for?

"They are building it for use whenever their carefully timed Pearl Harbor day comes around.

"And here we are, the richest and most powerful nation in the world, year by year withering our Air Force on the vine."

There is one other angle of this pilot problem which may come to the fore some day if the selective-service machinery begins operating again to any extent. That is the matter of whether youngsters with flying skill and other aviation talents get their chance with flying units, or are sent to nonflying branches where their special attributes will be wasted.

It happened in the last war. There were some strange incidents, such as a flight instructor with 5,000 hours being assigned to the infantry. Other airmen were delegated to such equipment as typewriters, cook stoves, and trucks.

Something of the sort also happened within the Air Force.

MANY FLAWS CITED

A competent, trained observer at that time wrote me from an Air Corps base:

"Things are better organized at an operational base, but many of the things I squawked about still irritate me; trained technicians assigned to fields where there are no planes for them, radiomen raking walks, armorers typing, mechanics doing KP. And in this and other air base subdepots civilians do work on Army planes at a nice hourly rate. I don't get it.

"The Air Corps is pulling in a lot of manpower, but doesn't seem to know just what to do with it. They send a man to a technical school for months, and when he comes out he finds that some rookie in the Army 2 months has been put on the job without schooling, and is getting stripes and experience while the school-trained man gets neither."

A most authoritative warning on this sort of misfitting of manpower came recently from John F. Victory, executive secretary of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, who cautioned:

"We shall not have time if another war occurs—time in which to fumble with manpower requirements, time in which to classify our millions of men and women as to skills and wartime needs.

"Nor will we have the manpower resources to allow profligate waste of skills and brains.

"We must begin thinking in terms of job assignment instead of in terms of job deferment. Future wars will be won or lost in the research laboratory, in the development centers, and in the production plants.

"Germany funneled immense amounts of money into the continued training of technical and research personnel early in the war. But Hitler, bemused by the false signs of victory in the early forties, countermanded orders and the young German technicians were assigned to strictly military duties. When it was too late, he reversed this decision. But the damage had been done.

"Here in the United States we flirted with scientific suicide. We permitted enrollment in our scientific institutions to be cut to little more than 10 percent of their former level. We adopted a policy that men 26 years old or younger could serve their nation best only in the fighting forces. Our manpower thinking was in terms of numbers of men and masses of equipment rather than brains of men and quality of equipment.

"If the United States becomes involved in war, we shall not then have the precious time to solve this manpower problem."

Thus the Nation's air power problem is not only planes, but it is also pilots, and all the technical experts down the line in development and research, to back them.

The Voice of America and a Marshall Plan of Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "A Clear Voice Needed Instead of a Whisper," published in the Louisville Courier-Journal of July 4, 1950, the other entitled "Let Us Give the World Ideas as Well as Bullets," published in the Louisville Times of July 10, 1950.

Both editorials contain appropriate and high tributes to our distinguished colleague the able junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON].

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of July 4, 1950]

A CLEAR VOICE NEEDED INSTEAD OF A WHISPER

Dollars don't mean everything, but the use of them is often a revealing yardstick. Applied to the cold war, such a yardstick shows

the United States currently spending about $15,000,000,000 a year on its own armaments, several billions more to strengthen the economic and military defenses of its friends—and only $34,000,000 to tell the rest of the world what it's all about.

Since the cold war is, as Senator WILLIAM BENTON and others have described, is essentially "a struggle for the minds and loyalties of mankind," such a dollar-disparity is all the more striking. It has long distressed the energetic BENTON who as an Assistant Secretary of State first wheedled from a reluctant Congress the pin-money with which to start an American information service. Dollars and arms are a necessity in our efforts to aid anti-Communist forces throughout the world, but we must remember that "bullets, bombs, shells, and flame do not change men's minds or win their loyalty." The money problem is there, but it is incidental. The basic need is a greater and more effective program to increase the free flow of ideas, to counteract the distortion of Russian propaganda and vilification of the United States and the West by putting before the peoples of the world a true mirror of events and an understanding of the minds and motives behind them.

Senator BENTON and 12 other Senators introduced last March a resolution calling for affirmative action on this neglected front. Now, at a time made more propitious by events in Korea, a Senate subcommittee at last is holding hearings on this proposed "Marshall plan of ideas," and an imposing number of notable Americans stand ready to endorse it.

Among them are General Eisenhower, General Marshall, Secretary of State Acheson, and an impressive number of Senators. Millions of other Americans, we believe, will agree with them in supporting the Benton proposals.

These call for steady pressure through the UN and diplomatic channels for freedom of the press for all kinds of communications media, for greater support of the UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and the program of exchanging students with foreign nations, and for development of an uncensored world-wide radio communications network able to reach all receiving sets.

The radio network, of course, is the proposal calling for the heaviest outlay in dollars. But it is also perhaps the most practical of the three. We are already broadcasting to the world our Voice of America programs on a 24-hour basis, an activity long since endorsed by majorities of both major political parties—but much of this is literally wasted on the desert air for lack of facilities that could make it heard everywhere. Our failure to spend dollars, no less than the frantic jamming with which the Russians pay tribute to the effectiveness of our broadcasts, has made the Voice of America a muffled whisper instead of the true, clear voice the times demand. Congress should quickly afford it the amplification it deserves.

[From the Louisville Times of July 10, 1950]

LET US GIVE THE WORLD IDEAS AS WELL AS BULLETS

It may sound naive, we suppose, to say that this world-wide conflict in which we find ourselves is a war of ideas, and that it is an idea rather than a gun which will determine the winner. Too often we have heard sophomoric cynics scoff: "What good is an idea against a bullet?" The best and most immediate answer we know is spread out before us in Asia.

There, in Korea, American men are dying today because the United States failed, and Russia succeeded, in projecting an idea. There, in China, the awesome masses of the Chinese people are in the hands of followers of Moscow not because they were conquered by the Russian Army but because they were lured by the Russian idea. Chiang Kai-shek, with whom we allied ourselves, had no lack of bullets; his fatal weakness was the lack of an idea in which the Chinese people would believe.

These bullets in which the hard-headed place so much reliance cannot aim themselves; they can be fired only by men with minds. It is not the least of our tragedies that we have concentrated so deeply on furnishing our allies arms that we have neglected to furnish them with reasons for using them in defense against Communist aggression. Thus in China Chiang's army in 1945 was stronger than that of Mao, yet Mao won (and so did Russia without using a soldier) because Moscow-trained Chinese propagandists convinced the Chinese people that land reform and true national independence could only be realized through communism. And there seems to be some reason for believing that the South Korean Army was not markedly inferior in equipment or numbers to that of North Korea. There does, however, seem to be a considerable difference in the will to fight.

Why should we have made it so easy for the Russians to get native peoples to do their fighting for them? Why could we have not told the Chinese peasants that the land reform promised by the Communists meant in reality the forced collectivization of their farms, that national independence meant the same kind of freedom enjoyed by Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary? Why could we not convey to the South Koreans the idea that while conditions were not ideal (and it would be pointless to contend that they have been), those conditions would be infinitely worse under the Communists? Does it not seem likely that if we could have brought those truths home to the Chinese and Koreans the course of recent history would have been changed, and in our favor?

The United States has done some work in trying to convey the American idea across the seas. The Voice of America, the various information services, the student-exchange programs—all of these have contributed to a more general understanding of what America is. Yet these are not enough.

An expanded program clearly is necessary. Congress soon may be asked to take two steps to provide what Senator BENTON calls "a full-throated voice and not a whisper." One of these steps was outlined by Secretary of State Acheson the other day when he said his Department had drafted plans for a great campaign of truth to counter Moscow's propaganda. He cited specifically Moscow's claims that the Korean fighting was American aggression.

The second and more ambitious step was proposed by BENTON and 12 other Senators March 22, in a broad resolution calling for a Marshall plan of ideas. It urges maintaining an increasing pressure in behalf of world-wide freedom of information, accelerating the work of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, development of the activities of the Offices of International Information and Educational Exchange, promotion of democratic education abroad, calling of a conference of non-Communist nations having information programs so as to formulate common themes, and to encourage establishment of a non-governmental agency to help private citizens who might contribute to the program.

Both of these programs will cost money. But it will be only a fraction of what we are spending on bullets. And bullets, as we have seen in China and Korea, are not always the most effective answer.

The Case Against Yellow Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Assemblyman Sharon J. Mauhs, of Schoharie County, N. Y., recently gave a very interesting and provocative speech over the radio concerning yellow oleomargarine.

This subject must continue to be of interest, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Mauhs' thoughtful remarks be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE AGAINST YELLOW OLEOMARGARINE

(By Assemblyman S. J. Mauhs)

During the recent session of the legislature, the assembly, of which I am a member, defeated all attempts to legalize the sale of yellow oleo. Let me make it clear that uncolored oleo can be and will continue to be sold in this State without restriction.

The question of permitting it to be sold colored yellow in imitation of dairy butter, is a question which must be decided by each separate State. For many years New York has made it illegal to sell yellow oleo, both for the protection of the consumer and the protection of the farmer. There is no earthly reason why the State of New York should foster and promote the welfare of the peanut and cotton farmers of the South to the harm of its own farmers and its own consuming public. Every year our farmers pay to our State millions of dollars in taxes. Agriculture is the number one industry of our State. Fifty-six percent of the land area—more than 17,000,000 acres—is farm land. Eight billion pounds of milk was produced in this State last year, 40 percent of which went into butter, cheese, and ice cream. New York ranks third as a dairy State among all the States in the Union and its dairy cow population is exceeded only by Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa. Six hundred thousand citizens of our State live on farms and the well-being of another 2,000,000 rural citizens of New York depends directly on whether or not the farmers of this State get a fair income and they are not getting it today.

The sale of yellow oleo, in my judgment, will start a series of circumstances moving which will bankrupt one-third of our dairy farmers. I do not say that the decline in the dairy industry will occur overnight, but it will creep like a fog, slowly involving more and more geographic areas, and the consequences will be lasting.

We need only to ask what will happen to the 40 percent of the fluid milk of this State which now finds its way into butter, cheese and ice cream? I am not picking a crisis out of the air. I am saying that when the livelihood is taken away from thousands of farmers and when 40 percent of the milk production is taken away from its legitimate channel, then a major crisis is created. The day yellow oleo is legalized in this State, that day we shall have started a chain reaction, the effects of which I hesitate to predict, for this will be but the first step to obliterate all other segments of the dairy industry. The blueprints are already out for filled milk, filled cheese and filled ice cream.

Filled with oleo instead of pure milk and cream.

Is there not a moral right for the dairy industry to protect its common law trademark? Many products are allowed to protect their color from imitation, and the best example is a soap company which demanded that its soap color be protected and they got a court order stopping anybody else from using the color of their soap, but they don't want farmers to protect the color of butter.

The manufacture and sale of oleo is controlled by the soap industry, one of the largest operations in existence today. I heard it stated that you could take a bar of soap, remove the chemicals and the perfume, and you would have left a pretty good cake of oleomargarine.

Already the oleo people have been allowed to imitate butter's flavor, butter's packaging, butter's melting point, and butter's specific gravity. The oleo people are permitted to add a chemical preservative to their product—butter makers cannot. The oleo makers have a tariff of 22 cents a pound against foreign competition—butter has only a 7-cent tariff.

The oleo industry has never sought to develop a new product. It has at all times worked solely to imitate butter in every respect.

Now what is the housewife's side of the picture? I think it is safe to say that perhaps a third of all the families in this State use oleo. Uncolored oleo sells in this State today for 21 to 31 cents a pound. Butter is 69 cents a pound, and a great many of our citizens use this 21-cent table spread because of their lower income.

Some oleo manufacturers say you can color a pound at home in 90 seconds. Others say 2 minutes. They print that on their package. Now if they are telling the truth, it might be well to note that it takes twice that time to poach an egg or to make a pot of coffee. It requires many times 2 minutes to mix a cake, or make a salad, or get a pie ready for the oven. The difference in requiring those few seconds of coloring in the home, in my opinion, will spell the difference between the continuation or the destruction of the dairy industry in this State. Housewives do not want to destroy the dairy industry. What they want is to be able to buy, as they do now, a cheap substitute for butter, even if they have to color it at home. The sale of yellow oleo will not only deprive them of that right, but it will help the oleo people take over the entire table spread market by deception.

The oleo monopoly may win. The consumers of this State may be defeated. The farmers of this State may be defeated, but the defeat will weigh heavily on the hearts of those responsible for it.

When oleo sells for two or three times as much as it does now, and when the dairy herds no longer fertilize the soil and our beef and veal supply is depleted, and when we have to import what we have now in abundance, then the words of those of us who fought for the consumer and the farmer alike, will be remembered.

Let me call your attention to a survey made last December which shows the price spread between white and yellow oleo in 150 super markets of the major cities of those States which permit the sale of yellow oleo. Where they have uncolored oleo the price ranged from 13 to 21 cents a pound, or an average of 17 cents. But yellow oleo, which by the nature of the Federal tax, should have sold for only 10 cents a pound more, or an average of 27 cents a pound, actually sold from 40 cents to a high of 60 cents a pound. That happened from one end of the country to the other. In Texas yellow oleo sold as high as 55 cents and in California as high as 60 cents a pound. Just a few cents under butter, which did not help the housewife and it demoralized the butter market.

In other words, by the mere addition of color, which by the way, costs the oleo people 30 cents a ton, the difference in the price of yellow and uncolored oleo was 33 cents—more than three times the amount of the Federal tax, and who got clipped, who paid this tremendous spread? The consumer paid it.

According to the New York State Journal of Commerce, the total cost of the raw ingredients in a pound of yellow oleo is about 10 cents, so you can see the size of the spread between the 10-cent cost and a consumer price of 55 cents a pound.

There is one other factor which needs to be mentioned. In every State where yellow oleo was legalized, it first came out at a low price in order to corner the market, and then the price went up to a few cents under butter.

The day we legalize yellow oleo in this State, that will mark the day we take away from many families of this State a cheap substitute for butter.

I don't want the oleo monopoly to take over the table spread market of this State. I don't want it for two reasons. As long as I am in the assembly I will not vote to put out of business a third of the farm families of this State. And I will not vote to make thousands of families in this State pay 50 cents a pound for a butter substitute they can buy today for 21 cents.

The Salvation Army in Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the General of the Salvation Army on conditions in Czechoslovakia.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SALVATION ARMY IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA, A STATEMENT BY THE GENERAL

Statements have been broadcast and published reporting that on June 17 last, under a decree issued by the central executive of the national committee (the recently established organ of local government in Czechoslovakia), the Salvation Army in that country has been disbanded.

Having no direct communication with our officers in Czechoslovakia, I am naturally without detailed news, though we are aware that at least two of our faithful officers are imprisoned, that the rest have been forbidden to continue their work, and our properties have been confiscated.

Speaking with full responsibility as the international leader of the Salvation Army, I deny that any Salvation Army officer in Czechoslovakia has been engaged in any action which the government of that country could accurately describe as subversive. As all informed quarters have known for many years, the Army is nonpolitical, and any officer so misguided as to participate in political activities would come under the immediate discipline of the Army's own regulations without waiting for action by any secular authority.

I am aware that no word or deed of mine can prevent my comrade-Salvationists in Czechoslovakia from suffering the unwarranted restrictions imposed by this latest decree. I must, however, point out that by this order their government has brought to an untimely end the beneficent activities of a small but influential group of their own countrymen who, for the past 31 years, have labored solely to benefit their own land and people.

The Salvationist is the servant of all, and he is willing to work and witness for Christ in any land, whatever the political color of the government. His preaching is a simple and uncontroversial testimony to the saving grace of God which he himself has personnally experienced, and his service is expressed by an eager hand outstretched to any in need. How can such activities be deemed subversive—unless the very gospel itself be regarded as such!

In the name of Christ I record my protest, and call on Salvationists everywhere to protest against an order which forbids our officers and soldiers to preach the gospel.

Though our public work in Czechoslovakia must cease for the time being, the Salvation Army will not accept as final the authority of any secular government to forbid spiritual work. Therefore we shall continue to think of our comrades in Czechoslovakia as Salvationists in spirit and purpose, and still regard them as a living part of the international body of the Salvation Army. We shall retain upon our roll the names of all Czechoslovakian officers. Though deprived of the outward signs and symbols of Salvationism, they will remain one with us in heart.

Communicate with them we cannot, but pray for them we can—and shall. That is a power no secular authority can suppress, and I call upon all Salvationists everywhere to pray that their comrades may be upheld during this time of testing, and that the will of God may overrule the passions and prejudices of men.

It is my desire that in every territory throughout the Salvation Army special meetings for prayer shall be held.

ALBERT ORSBORN,
General.

Manpower Resources of Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Mr. Henry G. Mazlen, a demographer at the National University in Washington, D. C., has written an analysis of the manpower resources of Communist-controlled China.

Because of the relationship between the resources of Red China and the resources of the North Korean forces, I think this monograph is of vital interest today.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this paper in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANPOWER RESOURCES OF RED CHINA

(By Henry G. Mazlen)

POPULATION STATUS AS OF JULY 1, 1950

A complete census of the population of Communist China has never been accomplished. Estimates of the total population of China have been advanced from time to time, with allowances being made for the decimations inflicted by famine, pestilence, and war.

It is here estimated that the total population of Red China as of July 1, 1950, numbered 472,809,000, and the attached table provides estimates of current population characteristics by age, sex, and possible utilization for military or industrial service.

Of the estimated total population, males numbered 247,142,000 and females 225,667,000. In this particular respect, the reverse of Russian manpower totals should be noted inasmuch as in the U. S. S. R. there is a marked excess of females over males. In Red China, the total of both sexes under 15 years of age was 204,694,000; the total between ages 15 and 49 was 207,478,000; those 50 years of age and over numbered 60,638,000. Males between 15 and 49 years of age totaled 107,507,000, whereas females in these ages totaled 99,971,000.

MILITARY MANPOWER

It is here estimated that 30 percent of the total number of males 15 through 49 will not be available for general military service due to physical or mental disability or because of essential assignments, industrial, or agricultural or administrative. Therefore, considering the pool of males and assuming a total commitment, there would be available for some form of general military service 75,255,000 men. The part that women would play in a militarized China, under the principles of utilization of womanpower laid down by the U. S. S. R. and accordingly patterned along these lines, would take a number of years to accomplish. Doubtless, women have to some extent already been trained as military camp followers, but their practical military utilization at this time is considered very doubtful.

The greatest problems which face adequate utilization of males for military service in Red China have their roots in the economic chaos within the nation. Essentially China is a nonindustrial and economically depressed nation. The population depends practically entirely upon the production of food within China's territorial borders. The great rivers draining China tend to make the land very suitable for agricultural development, but the Government's inertia has failed to develop scientific crop production and to insure against natural and other calamities by storing surplus crops. Even assuming that there was sufficient food for all, adequate military equipment must come from other sources. Again, any sizable military undertaking must include in its plans the supply of foodstuffs for the armies. In a land where the supply of food is never adequate under the best conditions, such hoarding by the military would accentuate the hardships suffered by the civilian population. Even today famine stalks the Chinese.

THE VALUE OF NUMERICAL SUPERIORITY

In the Korean war we have seen in recent months how a relatively small number of troops, even with inadequate training themselves, but with highly trained leaders and with adequate arms and other supplies essential to highly mobile warfare, have successfully attacked numerically superior but comparatively very poorly equipped forces.

From this standpoint, the Korean campaign has itself given the final evidence that superiority in numbers is not of itself an important factor in winning a war. More especially is this true in a short, concentrated campaign. In a protracted war numbers may assume considerably greater importance. As it is we have yet to halt the North Korean onslaught; we have yet to assess the cost to us due to our own unpreparedness.

But whether we are joined in political or military battle or both, there is greater danger in underrating than in overrating the potentials of an insidious enemy which receives support from a power or from powers in a position to help the smaller nation overcome the major problems of logistics, if not of manpower.

In this respect it is well to recall that in September of 1947 Gen. Hsiung Shih-hui, commanding the northeastern Nationalist Chinese front, reported the capture of Russian arms from Korean units fighting with the Chinese Communists. Of course, the consensus of military opinion has long been that Russia turned over to Communist China the vast stores of arms taken from the defeated Japanese armies in Manchuria. With these arms Red China equipped at least 50 divisions.

In other words, the ramifications of a prolonged struggle—should such condition materialize, makes our commitments clearer. We must face the manpower problem much more realistically than we have to date. This is a United Nations' war—not an American escapade in Korea. If Russia chooses to become the arsenal of China which in turn supplies Korea with arms and manpower—we can see that the stores of both which would be available to the North Koreans are of major significance. The United Nations cannot afford, under these circumscribed conditions, to be second-best in anything; manpower or weapons.

CONCLUSION

The manpower resources available to Red China which may be shuttled into North Korea for action against United Nations' armed forces, is overwhelming and a major obstacle to the success of United Nations' military actions if not recognized for its true potential weight. Chinese and Koreans are blood-related; it would be difficult, if not impossible to tell one from the other when both wear identical uniforms. North Koreans have fought in Red China's armies. It is not impossible to believe that the gesture is being reciprocated on Korean battlefields today.

Manpower resources of Communist China (July 1, 1950)[1]

[In thousands]

Classification	All ages	0 to 14	15 to 49	50 and over
Both sexes (total)	472,809	204,694	207,478	60,638
Males	247,142	109,237	107,507	30,398
Available for general military service	76,255	.....	75,255	.....
Females	225,667	95,457	99,971	30,239

[1] Calculations are based on population total extrapolations and estimated distributions by single years of age and by sex. Original population data estimates obtained from the Demographic Yearbook, United Nations (1948) for July 1947 and from the American Encyclopedia (China, 1948).

Seaway's Last Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Seaway's Last Chance," written by Alfred D. Stedman, feature writer for the St. Paul Pioneer Press. This article appeared on June 18, 1950. Mr. Stedman has been a consistent proponent of the St. Lawrence seaway. His article is timely and worthy of the study of the Congress. The St. Lawrence seaway should be considered as a vital national-defense project. The Nation needs the St. Lawrence seaway as a means of guaranteeing the movement of vital minerals and food which are produced in such abundance in the great Midwest. The St. Lawrence seaway should be listed as a priority project for our national security. The present system of locks and canals connecting the Great Lakes is inadequate to meet the requirements of national defense.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed as follows:

SEAWAY'S LAST CHANCE

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

A rather interesting test is coming soon of the effectiveness of this region's representation in Congress. The test will arise first in the United States Senate. It concerns waterways development.

Up to now, the successes of this region's representation have not been brilliant or frequent. One after another, our Nation's other great regions have been voted projects of tremendous benefit to agriculture, business, labor. The Pacific Northwest has the Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams and many others. The Southwest has the great Hoover Dam, Shasta, and many more. The Southeast has the TVA helping to bring prosperity to a once impoverished region. The Atlantic and Gulf coasts have vast networks of harbors, deepened rivers, and coastwise canals.

And the east and west coasts are the economic beneficiaries of the Panama Canal, bringing them much nearer together than before in terms of transport costs. These vast works have been constructed or improved and maintained at public expense.

But what about the vast region that is tributary to the Great Lakes? What has its representation achieved while every other region in the country was being voted these mighty developments?

One answer could be that this region has the upper Mississippi 9-foot channel. But the upper Mississippi is a barge route and not a shipway, does not lie in the east-west lane of traffic to Europe and carries very little out-bound commerce.

The real answer is that our representation has been unable to prevent the blocking of the St. Lawrence seaway for almost a quarter century. It is nearly that long since the Hoover administration negotiated the treaty with Canada. It is 18 years since that engineer-President hailed the seaway as "the greatest internal improvement yet undertaken on the North American continent."

Given the same rate of progress achieved for other regions, the treaty could have been ratified and the project built and operating long ago. Access to our Great Lakes ports could have been open right now to the fleets of Liberty ships and Victory ships that our taxpayers helped to build and pay for during the war. Those ships could be carrying at much lowered costs the products of our farms and factories to the markets of the world. Our inland economy could be helped right now when the postwar farm income decline is really beginning to pinch. The West North Central region might not today be the only one in the entire United States that in absence of immigration, is officially forecast to suffer a net loss in population in the next 25 years.

Fighting the St. Lawrence seaway has been probably the greatest lobby ever known of eastern ports, harbor interests, power companies, and railroads. Again that lobby, our region has been unable to win in Congress. We have had to sit here and watch the projects of other regions go sailing through Congress, while ours has been stymied year after year.

And, now, one more rival project directly affecting this region and the seaway offers this area's men in Congress a test and a great chance to prove or redeem themselves.

For there's an attempt to put on a rush act for Senate ratification of the Niagara diversion treaty with Canada. This treaty would allow immense diversions of water from the Falls through power plants there. Niagara power interests are bringing great pressure on Senate leaders for fast action.

Is it that these interests want the power? That's one reason, for there is now an acute power shortage in the East. But another reason is that getting this Niagara power would help those interests to head off the St. Lawrence seaway, which also would develop power.

How the Niagara interests stand on the seaway is fortunately a matter of record. They are against it. Listed with the tremendous lobby fighting the seaway are the chamber of commerce, Frontier Industrial Traffic League, and Frontier Planning Board, all of Niagara Falls. Out in the open also is the attempt of eastern power interests to stymie the seaway forever by getting the Niagara treaty first. The New York Times on March 1 this year told the story, saying:

"As to the effect that application of the treaty provisions would have on the 50-year-old proposal for a St. Lawrence seaway and power project, utility officials said realization of the Niagara River proposal would tend to negate the need for the project."

So a straight issue of priority is now raised as between the St. Lawrence seaway and the Niagara Falls diversion project.

On one side is Herbert Hoover's "greatest internal improvement on the continent." This would develop both navigation and power. It would benefit, not just a limited eastern area with power, but a vast interior of the United States and Canada with deep-water navigation besides. It would develop much more power than the Niagara project without affecting the beauty of the falls. But it would still leave the way wide open for the latter project if some form of it not harming the falls' grandeur were found advisable at some future time.

On the other side is the Niagara Falls diversion. This proposes to conserve the falls by diverting enormous quantities of water away from them. Instead of developing any navigation aid to the interior, it would tend to negate that, as the New York Times said, or, in blunt words, to thwart and block the seaway for all time.

On the straight issue of priority this region's spokesmen in Senate and House have the clearest possible ground to stand and fight. They can block that Niagara treaty in the Senate, block enabling legislation in the House, and keep them blocked until there is affirmative action all along the line on the seaway.

They can demonstrate once and for all that there's no way for the East to get the power for itself without simultaneously granting the Midwest seaway navigation. When that's made plain this region's chances to get the seaway will take an upward bound. But if our congressional spokesmen let the East get the power without granting us the navigation, then we'll continue as the Nation's forgotten region for a mighty long time to come. This looks like the seaway's last real chance.

Household Hints for Hoarders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 1 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, all of us have been greatly disturbed by the reports of excessive buying in these critical times. Indeed, it has been a reflection on the patriotism of some of the American people.

Mr. David L. Cohn, one of the distinguished writers of this era, has written a poem on that subject. I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSEHOLD HINTS FOR HOARDERS

(By David L. Cohn)

("Hoarders are on the run for goods. Panic buying, in full stride, despite warnings, is pushing United States toward rationing. Sugar, soaps, nylons are being snatched from store shelves. Hoarding is creating artificial shortages, forcing prices up."—United States News and World Report, July 28, 1950.)

Get in there and shove, mama.
Push the others out of the way, sis.
Strip the shelves to the bare boards
Where lie the tiny droppings of midnight mice.
Buy anything and everything.
Clean out the store.
Then run to the wrapping counter
Pursued by the barehanded
As barnyard hens pursue the lucky one that has a choice bit of offal in its mouth.
This still being a free country
Every citizen has certain inalienable rights.
Among them the right—especially dear when the Nation's life is at stake—
To be a hog; or, if that sounds offensive, a buzzard.
Buy tea, coffee, spices, canned goods—anything.
Store it, hide it, bury it.
You'll agree with me that there's no sweeter fat than sticks to your own bones.
Ignore the President. Give him the razzmatazz.
You're no godless Communist trying to destroy this country; a blind but destructive termite.
On the contrary, you're a church-going, tax-paying, God-fearing patriot, with a passionate interest in yourself; your illimitable, eternal, inexhaustibly fascinating, infinitely precious self.
So think now, as men die for you,
Of your gut.
Of your dear, precious, well-beloved gut,
Of the whole 228 feet of it
Coiled in your abdomen.
In time of peril men instinctively think of what is most precious to them.
Soldiers die for an inch of ground.
But don't revere them for it. That's easy.
For, as simple arithmetic reveals,
You must stand guard over 2,736 inches of gut.
Well-larded, coiled, greedy, peristaltic gut.
The ancients believed that the soul resided in the bladder.
But we know better, don't we?
It lies in the gut.
In the well-larded, coiled, greedy, peristaltic gut.
Be sure to store plenty of sugar.
If your neighbor can't get any, that's his fault.
For, as the Good Book says,
Where there's no vision the people perish.
(And soap. You remember the song "Soap and water will surely wash you clean.")
Sugar's good in time of war.
Its sweetness cuts the gall-bitter taste of defeat which, to the palate, is as the stinkingness to the nose of the pus-running wounds of soldiers.
Beforehanded with sugar, you can have your cake and eat it too,
One layer blood-red in memory of the war dead,
In tender token of your patriotism,
And example to your children.
Grab all the nylons you can.
Grab 'em, lady, before they become parachutes.
Lucifer, you know, thrown from heaven's battlements,
Fell from dawn until dewy eve.
Well, by God, there's nothing he did that a GI—your own son, perhaps—can't do.
In short—this is my final advice—
Buy everything that isn't nailed down.
Go the whole hog, as we say.
And if the worst comes to the worst,
And if the bomb gets you,
You will die with larder overflowing,
History recording that you were caught napping,
But not—praise the Lord—caught short.

India's Second Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by me on the Voice of America broadcast celebrating India's second independence day, August 15, 1950:

INDIA'S SECOND INDEPENDENCE DAY

In this time of great unrest and strife in the world, it gives me especial pleasure to look to India on her second Independence Day. I find democracy there, not only functioning still, but developing and breathing the life it must create.

I have been for many years a friend of India. In 1949, on the date of the celebration of your first independence day, I spoke to you in happy greetings, aware of the tremendous impact of the day, and of the friendship and cordial mutuality that exists between our two countries. I paid tribute to your great leaders and their consummate skill and brilliance in directing and molding the future of India. And I paid tribute, too, to the people of India, without whose cooperation such statesmanship would be futile.

Today is a new day—part of a new era. My country and all the democratic nations of the world have girded their loins to face this time of difficulty and discord. All of you know of the action of the United States and of the United Nations including India and their determination to stem totalitarian aggression despite the sacrifices that must be made.

Today, I wish again to pay uninhibited tribute to your leaders, and to Prime Minister Nehru in particular, for his forthright and unquestioning appraisal of the momentous fighting in Korea. Through the alinement of India with the United Nations' decision on Korea, a new light is thrown on the continent of Asia, and on its potential force for harmony and goodness in the world.

My country celebrated its Independence Day on July 4 of this year, on which day Prime Minister Nehru sent a message to our Secretary of State in which he stated: "My visit to your great country last year has strengthened my belief that in cooperation with other democratic and liberty-loving nations, the United States of America can make a mighty contribution toward world peace and prosperity."

Secretary Acheson replied, "International peace and expanding prosperity are the only

conditions under which democracies can continue to enjoy the fruits of their hard-earned independence. The world's best hope that these conditions can be obtained lies in the continued and greater cooperation amongst the democratic and liberty-loving nations. Your recent visit to the United States further strengthened the already close bonds of friendship between India and the United States and confirmed American convictions of India's dedication to the common effort of all free peoples."

I take this opportunity, also, to report to you on the good work of your distinguished lady, and your Ambassador to my country, Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit. Her grace and charm, her keen intelligence and diplomacy have redounded to the credit of both our countries. Finally, I have introduced a bill in the Congress, which has become law, to erect a monument to the great leader, Gandhi, and for the purpose of maintaining and building the spiritual forces which he imparted not only to India, but to all the world. To a great country on the occasion of a great event, your second independence day, I offer my kindliest congratulations.

Withdraw Recognition From Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 19, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article appearing in the August issue of Forbes, one of the Nation's most highly regarded business magazines:

WASHINGTON
(By Policrax)

Withdraw American recognition of Russia? More and more legislators are coming out for it. Senator PAT MCCARRAN (Democrat, Nevada) is the latest, following House Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMACK (Democrat, Massachusetts) who mentioned it when the Russians shot down the naval transport plane over the Baltic Sea several months ago.

But there is one Republican who has been trying, unsuccessfully, to sell the idea to his party and to the American people for years. He is Representative PAUL W. SHAFER (Republican, Michigan), who has been plugging for withdrawal of American recognition of Russia since it became apparent the Russians were using the United Nations as a propaganda sounding-board and nothing else.

Ex-President Herbert Hoover, only one of four Presidents, including Woodrow Wilson, who would not do business with the Soviet outlaws, has come out for withdrawal of American recognition and for banning Russia from the UN.

SHAFER has contended that, by recognizing Russia and Russian satellite nations, Uncle Sam has left himself wide open for internal spying and sabotage on a wide scale. There are thousands of Soviet agents, under various guises, in the United States, he maintains, either building friendships (a la Gubitchev) or otherwise boring from within.

At the same time, pictures showing Acheson and Soviet diplomats balancing teacups or cocktails leaves a bad taste in the mouths of most Americans and misleads others, he points out, since this indicates the Russians are sociable, nice people who are reasonable and amenable.

"The men who have murdered millions of their compatriots and maintain their rule through tyranny have no right, legally or morally, to American recognition," SHAFER has thundered in Congress.

He points out that the 35 or fewer Americans allowed in Moscow are restricted in their movements to within a few miles of the Soviet capital and are under constant observation by Russian secret police.

"Any 'flow' of information between the Russian leaders and our leaders, the Russian people and our people, is a farce," he asserts.

The SHAFER campaign yet may bear fruit. He first put it forward as a plan for the Republicans to follow in building a foreign policy of their own several years ago, but it was useless to expect the Republicans generally to pick up anything good. Now, the Democrats have grabbed his thunder. Fact is, withdrawal of American recognition of Russia may come before the elections. It is being talked up quite widely in Fair Deal circles, particularly among those from Northern States.

Practical Economy in Current Government Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a very timely editorial entitled "So the Government Needs More Workers," which appeared in the July 26, 1950, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette.

Realizing Russian declared intention of trying to make us spend ourselves into bankruptcy, we must not overlook any reasonable method to effect economies in the presently expanding Government employment program, due to our war activities.

This editorial presents some very common-sense economy suggestions which merit the study of our Cabinet heads and all Members of Congress. The article follows:

SO THE GOVERNMENT NEEDS MORE WORKERS

The United Press carried a story the other day to the effect that the mobilization speed-up will involve an addition of about 100,000 Government jobs. That will mean an expenditure of about $350,000,000 in salaries, plus more money for office equipment, supplies, and the like.

No doubt a big increase is necessary. For every two fighting men in the armed services there must be about one civilian job holder in the Defense Department. Economic control measures—particularly if they get to the stage of rationing or price control—require hordes of Federal inspectors and clerks.

However, the Government has about 2,000,000 people on its payroll already. They are doing hundreds of different things, each of them perhaps useful in some way. But some are infinitely more useful than others. Why not just drop some of the nonessential programs, and the employees with them, and shift the employees over to the new jobs?

The great mass of those new 100,000 jobs will be clerical, for record-keeping, correspondence, filing, and the like. People in myriads of the Government agencies are capable of doing the same work in the Defense Department and other war-connected agencies. By all sound business standards, they should be shifted.

To make this decision is admittedly difficult. It means robbing Department heads of programs and personnel which they consider important. But are they necessary? The Hoover Commission has reported, for example, that 10,500 people are employed full time gathering Government statistics, and it adds that many of the statistics overlap, are published in unnecessarily large quantities and "are of questionable value." Why couldn't some of these people make up part of the 100,000?

Of course the decision to cut down or eliminate present programs will have to be made before the Defense Department hires all its new employees, if the shifts are to be made. Furthermore, it might involve a grant by Congress of the authority to abandon specific programs for which appropriations have already been made. But such a decision could make an important difference in the huge cost of carrying out our war activities.

Snap Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following timely editorial from the Boston Herald, Saturday, July 29, 1950. It succinctly and accurately tells the true story of the present Korean crisis:

SNAP DIPLOMACY

In June 1949, just about a year before the crucial day on which President Truman decided that South Korea must be defended, Administration officials and Army officers informed Congress that South Korea could not be defended.

The hearing was on the Korean aid bill. Gen. Charles Helmick, Army expert on logistics, admitted in a reply to a question that Korea was absolutely untenable in the face of any determined opposition be it military or by infiltration.

Gen. Charles L. Bolte, Director of the Plans and Operations Division of the Army, did testify that the South Korean forces were "far better equipped than the North Korean forces," and that the Korean Government could fill the vacuum caused by the withdrawal of the occupation forces.

But the administration position was contradictory. It regarded South Korea as untenable in a military sense, yet it was willing to risk large quantities of American material that would fall into Communist hands if the Communists wanted it.

In other words the administration was inviting Communist aggression by sending hydroelectric plants, mine equipment, and other capital investments as a prize for overrunning South Korea, while at the same time providing nothing to protect those investments but some small arms for the South Koreans. And to compound the thing, we announced through Secretary Acheson a defense line which did not include Korea.

But the failure to protect, or even to pretend to protect, the aid material we were preparing to ship, is not so appalling as the snap judment reversal of our military policy.

In June 1949 we believed South Korea absolutely untenable in a military sense. There was nothing to change that view on June 25, 1950. Yet President Truman decided to fight against aggression. This was an act of high heroism—all the more heroic when you think that it was directed at the defense of an "untenable" position.

But what will history say of this President, who never prepared for an obvious contingency, but threw his country into a military unknown on the spur of the moment?

Confidence in the Face of Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, according to reports life in Israel is not so easy these days. The young republic is plagued with economic problems, peace with its Arab neighbors is still a thing of the future, immigration still continues at a high rate and so does the cost of living. Notwithstanding these seemingly insurmountable difficulties, the people of Israel go confidently about their task of building their state, they are optimistic about the future and have not lost faith in mankind and its ultimate goal of a better and saner world.

In an article published in the New York Herald Tribune, July 30, Ralph Chapman speaks of his visit to Israel in terms of "exuberance" and "a tonic atmosphere." This is the spirit of a free people which enjoys its freedom to the fullest measure. In this respect, Israel is so much like our own United States. In these trying times, little Israel seems to tell us not to lose courage or confidence in our own fate. I commend Mr. Chapman's article to the attention of my colleagues:

A NATION THAT LAUGHS—ISRAEL GOES CONFIDENTLY AHEAD AT JOB OF DOING THE IMPOSSIBLE

(By Ralph Chapman)

TEL AVIV.—Coming from Cairo to Tel Aviv is like going from an all-night poker game into the fresh air of an April morning. Win, lose, or draw, the air is refreshing. Egypt, one feels, is living in its past. Israel, one hears, is living on its future. The difference is that between a murmured "enchantee" and a shouted "sholom."

Tea time on the veranda of Cairo's Semiramis Hotel is the playing of a sadly outmoded tune on the strings of a muted violin. Here it is the raucous screaming of a trumpet whose forebears may well have blown down the walls of Jericho. Egypt smiles; Israel laughs.

There is an exuberance here which this writer has found nowhere else in the Middle East. It seems compounded of feelings of freedom, adventure, and newness. No one is tired yet. The only tradition is that of the Promised Land. Anything can be accomplished now that the land is controlled and occupied by Jews.

"As far as we are concerned economic theories do not apply," an official told this writer. "Economists have said that the land can support but a fraction of those who are already living here. Everyone knows that a strong, independent state is impossible in the area which we occupy but we are building one. The fantastic, the impossible are part of our everyday existence."

He and others are careful to point out, however, that optimism and enthusiasm alone will not solve the multiple problems which confront this state, now slightly more than 2 years old.

Item: Israel is still at war with the Arab States. Of its current budget, 35 percent is allocated for military purposes and there is an additional secret budget for security which probably brings the total to half of the nation's expenditures. A peace treaty would allow diversion of most of these funds into productive channels.

Item: The national policy of unlimited Jewish immigration is taxing the economy to the breaking point. There have been suggestions that for a limited period, immigration be controlled or suspended entirely. These have been consistently rebuffed by the government on the grounds (1) that the state was established as a homeland for all Jews and (2) that it may be "now or never" for tens of thousands from such countries as Rumania and Iraq which have let down the bars to Jewish emigration but which might raise them again at any time.

Item: As long as several millions of Jews live in the Soviet Union and are not permitted to leave, Israel's foreign policy, especially as concerns the cold war, must remain vague. Leaders of this state do not feel that they can jeopardize the position, perhaps the lives, of Jews in other parts of the world by taking too firm a stand with one side or the other.

Item: The continuing unfavorable balance of trade, though only to be expected in the early years of any state, is a gnawing worry. Increased productivity with a resultant increase in exports, decrease in imports or, best of all, both, is the answer. But the only immediate way to achieve this is to get large increases in investment, particularly from abroad.

Item: Despite phenomenal population growth, there is an acute shortage of skilled labor, and this naturally deters foreign investors. Technical and agricultural schools have been set up and are filled to capacity, but the situation is similar to that described by the service-station attendant putting gas in an expensive car. "Please shut off your motor," he begged the owner; "you're gaining on me." There is an almost unlimited need, as Mrs. Golda Meyerson, Minister of Labor, said in the United States recently, for highly skilled labor.

Item: Cost of living is still extremely high despite rigid rationing of food and certain other consumer goods. It has dropped about 17 percent in the last 14 months, but the picture, especially from the important tourist angle, is still not good. This is discovered by most newcomers soon after their arrival in the matter of "luxury" items. A cocktail in most hotel bars costs as much as a meal. Two packages of local cigarettes cost more than either.

Nevertheless, the urban population seems happy, well fed, and well dressed. In the rural areas the first two apply even more noticeably, and if agricultural workers do not dress as well as their city cousins that is true elsewhere in the world. There are no beggars. The dragomen and guides who made life miserable in Egypt and elsewhere in the Middle East are conspicuous by their absence.

Women one sees in cafes and hotel lounges are just about as handsomely decked out as their sisters elsewhere, but they seem to be having more fun and, a not unmixed blessing, they bring their children with them.

It's a tonic atmosphere.

Air-Sea Trouble Shooters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the following is an article by Mr. William H. Hessler entitled "Air-Sea Trouble Shooters," as found at page 14 of the August 1, 1950, edition of the Reporter magazine. I have asked to have it included here because of its thoughtful approach to the very important role of carrier-based planes in the present emergency:

AIR-SEA TROUBLE SHOOTERS—THE CARRIER, A NATURAL WEAPON FOR LIMITED WAR

(By William H. Hessler)

As the pattern of Soviet strategy unfolds, it defines the present task of the United States Military Establishment. That task does not appear now to be the gigantic, global war which our military planners anticipated. Evidently Soviet strategy, for the time being at least, calls for a series of smaller thrusts—political coups, civil wars, and localized offensives—around the margins of the Soviet world.

This strategy was underscored by the attack in Korea, which found us with only one aircraft carrier in the Far East and no force of marines within 6,000 miles. Two of our best tools of limited war—sea-based air power and the amphibious forces of the Marine Corps—had been cut back to help pay for the development of once-and-for-all weapons like the atomic bomb and the B-36.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff and Congress prepared us tolerably well for the awesome task of unlimited global war, but not for the nerve-trying, frustrating job of fighting small fires all around the Soviet periphery. It is the duty of a military high command, of course, to anticipate and prepare for the worst possible contingency; ours did. But it is also its responsibility to foresee the enemy's alternative strategy and to have suitable forces and war plans in readiness. For 5 years, Russia's strategy has been to get all it can with minimum risk, chiefly by infiltration and by fomenting civil wars.

Among the various arms and weapons suitable for small-scale conflicts in remote places near seacoasts, none is more flexible and efficient than carrier-based air power. This arm has a unique value for the United States, since we are separated from all conceivable enemies by broad oceans and must do our fighting at great distances.

As perfected in the Second World War, the carrier task force is a completely self-contained tool of warfare. It is a floating air base for fighters, bombers, and attack planes. It has its own flight and maintenance personnel, repair shops, fuel, food, and ammunition supplies, reconnaissance forces, and communications. It has its own defense, and it can shift its location at will by 800 miles a day.

In 1944 and 1945 the fast carrier task force was a gigantic fleet of 150 combat vessels, with its own auxiliary forces for logistic support—a mobile base for 1,500 aircraft. For the purposes of police action or limited war, the carrier task force can better be visualized as a smaller force of perhaps 4 aircraft carriers, 6 cruisers, and 20 destroyers. Such a force would have about 400 aircraft of various types, mostly versatile fighter-bombers. It would have jet fighters for fast interception work; conventional fighters, with their greater endurance, for patrols. It

would have heavier dive-bomber types for delivering greater bomb loads.

The four carriers steam in the protected center, of a circular formation, roughly a mile apart. They are surrounded by a screen of cruisers (and possibly fast battleships). Outside these, in a concentric circle, the destroyer screen is on the watch for hostile submarines and aircraft. These 30 ships can toss up stupendous antiaircraft fire. Besides, the task force has it own combat air patrol—fighter planes circling 10 miles out at various altitudes—to deal with hostile planes located by radar from any of the ships of the force.

A carrier force of this sort does not need a home port or even an anchorage. It can be fueled and restocked with ammunition, food, and other stores while it is under way. Replacement aircraft can be ferried out by escort carriers. The force can stay at sea as long as its men can.

The United States Navy currently uses four carrier types. Some of each are in active commission. There are three 45,000-ton carriers of the *Midway* class (CVB's). Next come the 27,000-ton ships of the *Essex* class (CV's), handling about 100 planes each. These are the backbone of our air-sea fleet, but only four of them are in active commission. Then come the light carriers (CVL's), which are much smaller, but fast enough to steam with cruisers and destroyers. Finally, there are the escort carriers (CVE's). They are smaller and slower, but are useful for convoy duty, ferrying planes, antisubmarine duty, and close air support of amphibious forces. Four CVE's are in active commission, and scores are in the moth-ball Navy. Several additional carriers are being taken out of moth-balls to make up for the Secretary of Defense's economies of last year.

The missions of such a carrier task force are many and diverse. It can strike at enemy airfields and naval or ground-force bases with precision bombing, strafing, and rocket fire. It can conduct fighters sweeps to destroy hostile fighters. It can spread an air umbrella over the area designated for an amphibious landing. It can give close air support to landing forces, or to any Ground Forces within 200 miles of the sea. It can seal off enemy forces, by sea blockade, from any reinforcement or supply by water.

The flexibility of sea-based air power lies in the fact that it can provide an intense concentration of combat air strength in any chosen area within a radius of several hundred miles. To set up an advanced fighter or bomber air base on land, in a new threater of war, is a long, costly, and hazardous undertaking, because countless tons of equipment and supplies must be shipped by slow, vulnerable cargo vessels. If the going is rough and evacuation of the area is necessary, the new base is left for the enemy to use. A carrier force can withdraw at anytime. It can conceal itself by rapid movement, or by utilizing cloud cover, and so escape much of the punishment visited on advanced bases ashore.

All the fighting of any consequence in Korea has been within 60 miles of blue water. No point on the peninsula lies beyond easy range of carrier-based planes. Lacking carrier forces initially, General MacArthur had to use heavy bombers from Japanese bases for missions far better suited to fighter-bombers and attack planes. His jet fighters used up virtually all of their range reaching the battlefield and returning. Targets have been for the most part small enemy tank units or troop concentrations, bridges, railway trains, modest supply dumps, and coasting vessels. These don't call for strategic bombing, but for precision strafing with machine-gun or rocket fire, or at most for 100- to 500-pound bombs. It has been a job for tactical aviation, closely coordinated with the ground forces.

Formosa is even better suited to defense by carrier-based air power. It lies a hundred miles off the China coast. The Chinese Communists have virtually no surface sea power and few landing craft, but they do have a great number of miscellaneous small vessels. Our one aircraft carrier in far eastern waters was assigned primarily to Formosa, not Korea, because with its 90 or so planes it could maintain a constant surveillance of Formosan shores and the intervening straits. However, Korea and Formosa are only about 700 miles apart. A carrier force could be shifted in 24 hours to whichever of these areas needed it more urgently. A second *Essex*-class carrier, the *Philippine Sea,* was quickly ordered to the Far East, but that, it was estimated, would hardly give us adequate air-sea power for the tasks in hand.

Of course, even in limited war, carriers cannot be employed without recognizing the potential hazard from hostile submarines. In the Second World War, the great enemy of carriers was the dive bomber or Kamikaze rather than the submarine; but now it might be otherwise. The Soviet Union has about 300 submarines. Possibly one-third are modern boats like the German type 21, whose speed submerged is twice that of standard Second World War subs. The new ones can operate for indefinite periods submerged, drawing air for engines and personnel through a schnorkel, or breathing tube. When schnorkeling, a sub shows nothing above water except a small steel island. There is hardly enough to reflect an electronic pulse, so these submarines are wellnigh immune from detection by radar, seaborne or airborne. And by the time they are close enough for detection by underwater sound, they are close enough to fire their torpedoes.

Our antisubmarine warfare techniques have been improved, but hardly as yet in proportion to the increase of the danger. Still, properly screened and alerted, carrier forces do not run an unreasonable military risk from submarines. Of course, as we increase our carrier forces in Korean or Formosan waters, we are tempting the Russians to abandon their nonintervention without warning and turn their undersea fleet loose in the hope of shattering American air-sea power overnight. However, if we are exposing ourselves by sending carriers to the Pacific, we are also challenging the Russians. For any submarine operations against our naval forces would amount, on Russia's part, to a declaration of war, an indication of the Kremlin's desire for a showdown. Unless it wants a great showdown, therefore, its subs will probably not attack.

If more disturbances break out on the margins of the Soviet world, our need for sea-based air power will be even greater. Indonesia and the Philippines lend themselves admirably to protection by these floating air bases, which could be put on the scene in a day's time if they were already in far eastern waters. Viet Nam poses a different problem. It would be venturesome and costly to put American ground forces into Indochina, against the limitless manpower under Communist command to the north. But it would be easy to give very substantial support to the French and other anti-Communist forces there from carriers cruising offshore.

Iran, one of the manifest danger spots, is singualrly remote. It can be reached quickly by long-range bombers from bases in Europe or North Africa. But the problem there—if that pot boiled—would be bombing and strafing of invading Soviet columns or north Persian units. Unfortunately, we have no aircraft carrier within 4,500 miles of the Persian Gulf. When the Korean crisis arose, the United States had in the neighborhood of 15 carriers in active commission, some on training duty. One was in the Mediterranean, 1 in the Far East, 12 or so in home waters, chiefly the Atlantic. Now 2 are in the Mediterranean, 2 in the Far East, and perhaps 11 in home waters.

The Navy faces a dilemma in the deployment of the few carriers it has in active commission. To meet the threat of unlimited war, it ought to keep most of its carrier-based air power in strategic concentration, and in safe waters. But if the months and years are going to bring only scattered civil wars on the rim of the Soviet empire, it would be wise to have several smallish carrier task forces, stationed perhaps in southern Japan (near Korea and Formosa); in the Philippines (near Indochina, Malaya, Indonesia); at Trincomalee in Ceylon (near Burma, Thailand, and the Persian Gulf); and in the eastern Mediterranean (near Greece, Turkey, and Yugoslavia).

It is a matter of calculating the alternative risks, of compromise between handling carrier forces as a prime weapon for a possible full-scale war and handling them as units of a European-Asian police force. And the calculation still is not easy, even after one convinces himself beyond any doubt that periodic, scattered civil wars are in fact the pattern of today and tomorrow. A sound compromise certainly calls for activating more carriers.

It is not to be supposed that with ample sea-based air power alone this country can wage and win a succession of limited wars. Anyone who argued thus would be a Seversky of carrier-based sea power, putting his trust in a single weapon. We cannot flush out guerrilla troops from mountain and jungle with dive bombers. With aircraft alone, we cannot reclaim territory seized by Communist forces. Airplanes, wherever based, whatever their armament, cannot do the work of infantrymen.

But in the special conditions of limited war, where friendly forces may need additional firepower quickly, a carrier with its brood of planes can intervene with telling effect—without the time lost in transporting troops or artillery, or the still greater time lost in setting up advanced air bases on land. In this sense, carrier air power has a sort of first-aid function for wounded or demoralized anti-Communist ground forces anywhere within a few hundred miles of blue water. To put it another way, carrier forces may or may not be able to win limited wars; but unmistakably they pack a terrific punch in the first critical fortnight—if they are near enough to the scene of trouble.

The over-all strategic pattern that is now being revealed is not really new. Only the weapons and techniques are new. The Russian Empire was contained for many decades by Britain's surface sea power, and was kept from reaching the oceans around the rim of Asia. The Soviet Union is still reaching for ice-free access to the oceans. Surface sea power no longer will insure containment, but the air-sea power of carrier forces is a weapon of greater range and mobility, and is able to strike far deeper inland. Wisely used, it still can perform this historic task.

In its central position at the heart of Eurasia, the Soviet Union is able to strike out at any chosen point on the perimeter of its territory. It is above all a massive land power, with infantry and armor that the free peoples cannot hope to match. But whenever it thrusts outward, it reaches into the rimlands of Asia and Europe. These lands (excepting central Europe) can be kept within the strategic control of the United States and Great Britain with the effective use of their air-sea forces.

It would be foolhardy, of course, to ignore the somber possibility of a great show-down that would demand the employment of our entire armory, including the B–36 and B–50 bombers and the atomic and other bombs. But the apparent intent of the Soviet Union is to avoid any such show-down, and to use Communist Parties, puppet armies, and other

low-risk tools for expansion into every soft spot.

To combat such a hydra-headed Soviet strategy, more political than military, our engines of atomic destruction are neither appropriate nor efficient. Our present need is for highly mobile and flexible tools of intervention—weapons which can be sent instantly to the aid of any people threatened by invasion from the citadel of Communist power.

We have one such weapon in the carrier, another in the marines and marine aviation, but these forces have been the victims of the Defense Department economy. They need to be refurbished and strengthened, and then deployed for maximum coverage of the far-flung areas of danger.

Defense Act Needs Rule on Returning Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Leslie Gould from the New York Journal-American for July 27, 1950:

DEFENSE ACT NEEDS RULE ON RETURNING PLANTS

(By Leslie Gould)

Unless there are some safeguards and congressional checks on the President's powers, the proposed Maybank-Spence defense production bill will open the door for furthering socialism in this country.

In view of some of the men around the President and down in the bureaus, such an opportunity will not be neglected.

The President must be supported and the way cleared for any mobilization of the economy that the world situation calls for. But at the same time, those seeking to make over this country along socialistic lines should not be allowed to capitalize on the situation.

Incidentally, it is a situation created largely by their bungling and fumbling. That, too, is something to be remembered, particularly when November rolls around.

A year and a half ago, Congressman SPENCE, of Kentucky, sponsored a bill labeled the Economic Stability Act of 1949. It was an attempt in peacetime to install Government controls and restrictions on economic life of the country. It was considered so socialistic in its intent that it never saw the light of day in Congress.

The same authors of that blueprint for an American socialism have drafted the present Maybank-Spence bill, now called the Defense Production bill. The wording of the two is much the same.

In view of this same authorship and the fact these authors still have the same ideas for making over this country, this new bill needs to be checked carefully to see that it is not an effort to sneak over what these do-gooders were unable to do last year.

This means that safeguards will have to be inserted to insure that any plants, companies or industries taken over are returned to private hands after the emergency.

As pointed out here the other day, one of the jokers is to extend these powers for the duration of a defense emergency. That could mean forever.

Under title II of the new bill, the President gets the right to requisition "such property or the use thereof * * * upon the payment of just compensation."

Then, the bill states:

"The President shall determine the amount of the compensation to be paid for any property or the use thereof."

If a company or individual doesn't like the price, he will receive half what the President offers and then try to get the balance through the Court of Claims. It might take years to recover any balance claimed.

There is no provision for the return of such property to its former owners once the emergency is passed. So the limit on the bill's powers of June 30, 1952—the next presidential election year—is meaningless. The Government would have the property.

An effort is being made to jam this bill through without any extended hearings or debate. Before it is passed, there should be an opportunity for business, stockholders, and the general public to be heard.

Federal Government Spending as Percent of Reported National Income and Relative Purchasing Power of the Dollar, 1931–50

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from News Bulletin of July 31, 1950:

Federal Government spending as percent of reported national income and relative purchasing power of the dollar, 1931–50

	Reported national income (calendar year)	Federal Government spending (fiscal year)	Government spending as percent of national income (average)	Purchasing power of United States dollar (average)
				Cents
1931	$54,479,000,000	$3,651,515,712	0.067	96.6
1932	39,963,000,000	4,741,015,145	.118	108.1
1933	46,273,000,000	4,681,348,827	.101	112.5
1934	49,455,000,000	7,345,185,993	.148	106.3
1935	55,719,000,000	6,591,519,287	.118	102.7
1936	64,924,000,000	8,540,505,845	.131	100.5
1937	71,513,000,000	7,806,260,951	.109	96.3
1938	64,200,000,000	7,031,277,825	.109	98.9
1939	70,601,000,000	9,026,981,666	.127	100.2
1940	77,574,000,000	9,305,143,831	.120	99.4
1941	92,269,000,000	13,766,484,210	.149	94.5
1942	122,232,000,000	34,289,303,979	.280	85.4
1943	149,392,000,000	79,702,073,074	.534	80.8
1944	149,660,000,000	95,572,319,509	.638	79.7
1945	152,705,000,000	90,397,470,706	.592	78.5
1946	178,200,000,000	63,713,969,417	.357	73.5
1947	201,700,000,000	42,505,045,529	.210	65.0
1948	226,200,000,000	36,326,072,233	.160	61.1
1949	221,300,000,000	40,057,107,857	.181	59.1
1950	[1] 229,100,000,000	[1] 55,000,000,000	.250	[1] 55.0

[1] Estimates for calendar year 1950 and fiscal year 1951.

In the period from June 30, 1931, to June 30, 1950, the public debt increased from $19,025,125,364 to $257,357,352,351. This represents an average annual increase for the period of $11,916,606,349 per year.

The big deficits were incurred during and since the war years with the exception of fiscal 1947 and 1948 when a surplus accumulated in the Treasury. A study of available statistics indicates that the inflationary trend is reaching proportions which threaten the fiscal solvency of not only the Federal Government but the whole Nation. The Korean war has caused a new inflationary spurt, which requires the attention of Congress now.

PAUL O. PETERS.

Stalin's First Target Is United States Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Karl H. von Wiegand from the Baltimore American for July 30, 1950:

STALIN'S FIRST TARGET IS UNITED STATES ECONOMY, WIEGAND IS TOLD

(By Karl H. von Wiegand)

UNIVERSITY SURGICAL CLINIC, MUNICH, July 29.—The primary aim of Generalissimo Joseph Stalin and his all-powerful 12-man Politburo in the Kremlin is the economic destruction of the capitalistic system of the United States.

War with America is secondary and an alternative that will be avoided, if possible, and postponed as long as possible, if it is unavoidable.

The view in the Kremlin is that the capitalistic United States is the "keystone" to the entire capitalistic system of the West. If that "keystone" can be brought down, the whole western economic system in Europe, in North and South America, and what is left of it in Asia and Africa will crash.

It is a grandiose concept and plan from the Russian standpoint.

KEEP WEST OFF BALANCE

The spearpoint of Soviet Russian political ideological, economic, and military strategy to attain this great objective is continual "war alarms" on the world-encircling "front of American commitments," calling for ever-increasing appropriations of vast sums of money in the United States for armaments and war preparations, and in Britain, France, Greece, Turkey, Persia, and other countries dependent upon America for economic and financial aid and military support.

This may go on for some years.

All this time Russia will be in radar and trigger readiness to ward off any attack from the United States should the latter lose patience, its nerves begin to break and decide to have recourse to might with a preventative war to bring an intolerable situation to an end.

That would enable the Soviet regime to convince the Russian people they were fighting a defensive war against imperialist capitalist aggression.

The Russian people are being prepared for such a war.

REPORT BY EXPERT

The above is the substance of a most interesting report made to me here in the surgical clinic by a former German general staff officer whose particular specialty for many years has been both political and military intelligence work and who, in inner circles, was known in the east as the master secret agent in Asia.

This man has just returned from a close study of the situation in Soviet east Germany and was in contact with some important officials there. He said:

"In America you are constantly stressing the danger and imminence of war and a Russian attack on the west and on the United States."

RUSS DODGING WAR

"From all the information I have had in recent months from many sources and from good sources and from my own knowledge of the Russians, Stalin does not think of bringing open war with an attack upon America anywhere on the long political front.

"If my information is reliable, and I have every reason to believe it is, Stalin's orders are to avoid giving the United States any legal basis for a declaration of war, but to intensify by every possible and conceivable means efforts to bring about the collapse of America's capitalistic economy through war alarums, enormous appropriations calling for ever higher taxation, dislocation and disruption of normal business, and ever-increasing demands by other countries dependent on American financing for aid and armaments, thus building up gigantic national debts."

My visitor added:

"The British see through the scheme, but in Washington they are unwittingly playing Stalin's game today just as they have done since the day of 'unconditional surrender'."

PANZER MANEUVERS

My informant said there were big panzer maneuvers going on to east, north, and south of Berlin. He said it was difficult to say how many panzers there were, but from all his information he estimated them at around 2,000.

He said that day and night one can hear the rattle and clank of the panzers and that when the maneuvers are over the roads will call for a lot of repairs. He continued:

"Stalin is 'sitting pretty,' as you would say in your country."

KOREA AN EPISODE

"Korea is just an episode. For Stalin it is a very successful one. But for America a very bitter one.

"Stalin can repeat that episode at half a dozen other strategic points and need not once show his hand until he wants to. In almost every place it will be done, not by Russians but by others.

"Wherever, as in Korea, Stalin makes a move, America must react. Every such reaction costs vast sums of money and men, ships and arms, and scatters your forces. This means dispersion of America's strength.

"Stalin can keep on doing that indefinitely unless you decide to stop him with war, and in that you would again be playing his game.

"Stalin has the initiative. Your statesmen and their policy during the past 5 years have given him that initiative and you are not going to tear it away from him soon, nor easily."

World-Mindedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL F. WHITE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, once more our Nation has been plunged into war. All of us must be fully conscious by now of the extreme necessity for an international organization strong enough to establish and maintain the peace of the world.

In this connection I am inserting in the RECORD below an editorial from the July 28 issue of the Reedley Exponent, of Reedley, Calif., a reliable and highly respected newspaper in my district. This article bears on the importance of our being world-minded in order to avoid these periodic and catastrophic wars:

WORLD-MINDEDNESS

In spite of human shortcomings, we are being inexorably impelled to reconstruct our society on a larger, more inclusive scale than hitherto. World mindedness is growing. World-wide institutions are in the making.

The UN is building a house and, we hope, a real home will emerge. The huge composition of stone and steel and glass will contain a population greater than Reedley. Cement will hold the bricks together. What spiritual or mental cement shall bind the peoples of the world into a working unity? Can the UN operate efficiently if it yields to separatism, to exclusion of certain groups?

Some folks think in the long run Nehru's attitude regarding this point is probably more rational than Hoover's. We recall that the Covenant of the League of Nations went by the board by a wave of separatism. History need not be repeated except by those who have not learned from history.

Mismanagement by Politicians Is Costly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Louis Bromfield:

THIS IS YOUR COUNTRY—MISMANAGEMENT BY POLITICIANS IS COSTLY

(By Louis Bromfield)

In this morning's paper I saw a new headline that threw the fear of God into me. It read "Eight billion dollars, 100,000 men needed in Korea." On reading the story which followed I discovered that authoritative sources in Washington advocated these figures. My immediate reaction, like that of millions of other citizens, was, "Why?" "Why?" must be the question asked over and over again by any thoughtful citizen about a wide variety of things going on today. The Korean situation has precipitated a cloud of whys.

Why did our Government have apparently no inkling of the situation in advance? If it had any information why did it not take even the smallest action in preparation? Why should the defense of Formosa which Secretary Acheson considered silly suddenly and overnight become an important, indeed a key measure of defense?

Why should all of us have been told again and again by the administration that we were equipped to meet any crisis a few hours after it broke and then find ourselves helpless in battle against a small Oriental people and not even the whole of that nation but less than half of it?

Why should the President declare one day that there would be no draft calls and the next morning call for the selective service machinery to go into operation?

Why did General MacArthur's recommendations go unheeded? But perhaps most important of all is the big "why" as to what has become of the biggest defense budget appropriations in the history of the United States in peacetime and why should we need to expand eight billions more on top of the fourteen billions and more already provided the Armed Forces for some time past. There are a hundred other "whys" but let's examine this one.

Fourteen billion dollars is a tremendous sum of money for the Armed Forces even in wartime. Where did it go and to what result? The Army was long since reduced to a skeleton force. The Navy had been put up in mothballs. Only the air arm of our forces has been apparently spending money on expansion.

DOLLAR WORTH LESS

Meanwhile because of these vast expenditures taxes have become crippling to our economy and have virtually eliminated the margin of savings in millions of families.

At the same time because of these vast expenditures and because of deficit financing and other administration policies, plus the war, the dollar will buy about half as much as it did 10 years ago and it is buying less every day.

With more vast expenditures, inefficiency, Socialist plans, political skulduggery, and general economic and political confusion, the dollar continues to slip downward as confusion increases.

Countless people who expected the incomes of savings invested in annuities and other forms of insurance, in stocks and in Government bonds to keep them in modest security have found that although they invested a 100-cent dollar of hard-earned, carefully saved money in all these measures of security they are being paid back with a 50-cent dollar.

Ask yourself what the Government bonds you bought 10 years ago will be worth in actual value when you redeem them. How far will they go on building a new house which today costs at least three times as much to build as in 1940, or for the food you purchase while you are paying taxes to keep the price of that food higher and higher?

If you are benefiting by social security payments remember that the deductions from your salary and from your employer were largely paid in 100-cent dollars and you are being paid back with 50-cent dollars.

If you had put those deductions long ago in a house or even better, a piece of land, you would have much greater security today, because there is no certainty, absolute or otherwise, that under present conditions the dollar may not be worth 10 cents in a few more years. Social security is meaningless if a government cannot or will not maintain the value of its currency.

REFUSE TO CUT EXPENSES

Meanwhile there is not the slightest effort on the part of the administration from President Truman downward to cut unnecessary expenditures, to stop the flood of taxpayers' money going into every sort of public project and socialist panacea which are not necessary in time of peace, let alone time of crisis.

On the contrary, the administration constantly asks for more and more money to be spent, pushing the country further and further into the red. If this is a time of crisis and demands sacrifices, the best place to begin is for the bureaucratic semisocialist Truman administration to make a few. Where you and I can sacrifice a few dollars the administration can save billions in a hundred ways. If it merely carried out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission instead of sabotaging them at every turn, it could save hundreds of millions.

There is something rotten in Denmark and the odor is, I think, beginning to reach the average citizen.

If any business, industry, or farm were run as our Government is being run it would be bankrupt within 6 months. The only thing which saves our Government is

taxes, taxes, taxes, and now it is beginning again to ask for more.

The Russians are doing very well. If they ruin the economy of this country, aided by the mismanagement of the politicians now in power, the cold war need never become a hot war. The Russians will have won anyway.

Their greatest victories at the moment are not in Korea and the satellite nations but in the economic collapse which they hope to produce inside this Nation. Once that occurs they can take us over along with Korea and Bulgaria.

Don't Look Now, but Your Horses Are Going in Opposite Directions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 17, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, many of us are rubbing our eyes and also our ears as we see and hear our Republican friends wriggle and squirm. The shouts had hardly died down that our President was asking too much power, when the noise became terrific from the same source charging that the President was not asking enough power.

The following column, which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of July 29, 1950, is most apropos. I commend it to the attention of our colleagues who do not know in what direction to proceed:

NEWS BEHIND THE NEWS—BARUCH PROPOSALS CHANGE MANY MINDS IN WASHINGTON

(By Ernest Lindley)

Bernard M. Baruch made some converts in Congress with his arguments for all-out economic controls, including wage and price freezing now. He changed, at least half-way, the minds of a number of administration officials also. At least, he gave added impetus to a trend of thought generated by the price increases of the last few weeks.

Until Baruch testified, most of the criticism of the President's new economic control program was from the other side. It was to the effect that the administration was going too far. Comparatively little of this criticism was outspoken. It was revealed, rather, in the questioning of W. Stuart Symington, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and in comments to the press by congressional leaders, especially on the Republican side.

The early Republican theme was that the President should be granted the powers he really needed but that Congress should take a close look to be sure he was not asking for too much. This was accompanied, in a few instances, by hints that the President was trying to use the war as an excuse for socializing the country permanently.

Baruch's firm line of attack from the other side was a counterbalancing force. Curiously, it seemed to impress most certain of the congressional Members who previously had indicated that they thought the President had asked for too much authority. A few of them swung overnight from one extreme to the other. This was not, in some cases, a manifestation of altered intellectual convictions, but was, rather, an indication that some Congressmen decided suddenly that it was better politics to oppose the administration on the ground that its policies were soft rather than on the ground that they were too hard. These switches are significant indications, however, of what some of the politicians believe public opinion to be.

The same kind of shift has been evident in thinking about taxes. During the first weeks after the Korean crisis, a few voices were lifted in favor of higher taxes immediately. Most of the Democratic congressional leaders hung back. So did the administration. Senators O'MAHONEY and TAFT and a few others came out for higher taxes right away. The public reaction, so far as it could be gauged, seemed favorable. Overnight, the President decided to push ahead with a substantial interim tax program.

Some of the most experienced men in the administration still believe that the economic controls plus the increased taxes asked by the President are sufficient. This assumes that the control legislation is promptly passed and is energetically used.

Drastic consumer credit restrictions would in themselves go somewhat in counteracting the inflationary boom. If the purchase of all household goods and appliances—say all items up to $500 each—were put on the basis of cash or full payment within 30 days and 50 percent cash down were required for the purchase of an automobile, there would be, certainly, a sharp contraction in sales. Less stringent consumer credit restrictions probably would suffice. Credit restrictions could brake down sharply the construction boom.

And if restrictions on business inventories went into effect in, say, a couple or 3 weeks, another check on inflation would take hold. Requisitioning by the Government of some excessive inventories or speculative hoards of a few commodities would discourage speculation. Then in October, higher income taxes, with a higher withholding tax, would go into effect.

Such measures, in the considered opinion of some experienced officials, would reverse the rising trend of prices. Then, as the new defense production program gets under way, allocations combined with use-cutbacks of critical materials would come into play. If all these powers are used vigorously, it is held, there will be no need for more elaborate controls, such as wage and price freezing, unless or until we move into full-scale mobilization.

But even those who hold to this view admit that delay in enacting limited controls and timidity in applying them could require, even within a few weeks, the more drastic controls which Baruch advocates.

Letter From Dr. George Packer Berry, Dean, Harvard Medical School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I attach a letter which speaks in strong terms of a need which I have been calling to the attention of Members of the House for some time.

As dean of the Harvard Medical School and a member of the executive committee of the Association of American Medical Colleges, Dr. George Packer Berry is among the best qualified individuals in this country on the subject of the desperate position of medical and dental schools as well as other health personnel training schools.

I might note that Dr. Berry's further expert qualifications include membership on the association's committee on preparedness for war, a most important factor in the current consideration of Federal aid to medical education.

HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL,
Boston, Mass., July 25, 1950.

Hon. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIEMILLER: The rapidly rising tension in our international relations focuses attention on a new financial crisis now facing the Nation's 79 medical schools. Having run at an operating deficit of $10,000,000 last year, it is clear that these schools are ill-prepared to contribute effectively to the growing need for national defense.

The professional schools in the field of medicine, health, and public welfare are the only source of professionals trained and qualified to meet the needs of the day. Therefore, I bespeak your favorable consideration of HR 8886; without the emergency financial aid contemplated therein I do not see how these professional schools can continue to discharge their responsibilities to the Nation.

In urging your support for H. R. 5940 during the winter and spring I wrote to you in detail about the financial plight of medical education. Because H. R. 8886 provides for emergency support in much the same way, there is no need to repeat here what I have written previously.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE PACKER BERRY, M. D.,
Dean, Member of the Executive Committee of the Association of American Medical Colleges.

(Member of the Association's Committee on Medical Student Personnel Practices and of the Association's Committee on Preparedness for War.)

As the Peasant Goes, So Will Go Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 1 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "As the Peasant Goes, So Will Go Asia," written by Wolf I. Ladejinsky and published in the Washington Post of July 30.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS THE PEASANT GOES, SO WILL GO ASIA

(By Wolf I. Ladejinsky)

The Chinese peasant seemed out of his mind. He kept jumping up and down, making strange gestures with his fingers and palms, working them in a semicircular fashion around his mouth. My interpreter chatted with him briefly, then explained the situation to me.

It was the paper the peasant held in his hand that caused his hysteria. That paper was the deed to the single acre of land which he had worked as a tenant for the past 32 years. Now that precious acre of land belonged to him.

This scene, which I witnessed not long ago in the courtyard of the land office of the small village of Kwangsi, deep in the heart of China, epitomizes the problem and promise of all Asia. It sums up the present and perhaps the future of a continent where agrarian discontent is gnawing at the vitals

of the old order. It is on this strife the Communists have been able to capitalize so successfully by posing as advocates of reforms designed to benefit the peasantry.

Four-fifths of the continent's vast population are peasants. Agriculture is the pivot of its economic life. Industry has made but a small dent in the character of Asia, notwithstanding oil gushers in Iran, tin mines in Malaya and Siam, jute and cotton mills in India. The ambitious postwar schemes for industrialization throughout Asia as yet remain mostly blueprints. The heart of the problem of Asia today lies in the countryside. An overworked and overexploited peasantry that for centuries was inertly miserable is now alertly miserable.

The reasons for the age-old wretchedness of the Asiatic peasant can be summarized in a brief sentence—too many people, too little land. Pitifully small holdings, inadequate tools and institutional arrangements over which the peasant has no control intensify his plight.

A large part of the misery and hunger arises from the relationship between the peasants and the landowners, a relationship which the courts and local officials have given official sanction through the centuries. The peasants have been obliged to pay exorbitant rentals, for they have no bargaining power. Nor is their contract of tenancy worth the paper it is written on; it may be altered or abrogated at any time at the whim of the landlord.

Now the forces that keep the peasant within well-defined bounds are breaking down under rising agrarian discontent. The peasantry is at last in motion. The Communists have exploited this fact and placed it in the center of Asiatic politics.

The catastrophe of China is a case in point. Many are the reasons that explain the victory of the Communists and why in 1949 Nationalist China could not boast of a single Leonidas holding a single Thermopylae. But one cause seems to me beyond dispute: Nationalist China was pressed and pushed over not so much by force of arms as by the Russian Communist tactic of giving land to the poverty-stricken, landless, hopeless peasantry.

The peasants know nothing and care less about Marxism, Leninism, and Stalinism, and they are surely not eager for collectivization. The Communists, however, promise them not collectivization as it exists in the Soviet Union but land with which the peasants may do as they please. And the peasants, in sheer despair, believe the promises, if for no other reason than that thus far in Asia the Communists have not yet had the opportunity to betray their promises as they did in Russia.

Toward the end of his life, Lenin despaired of a Communist victory in western Europe. He visualized the final crucial battle as a conflict between a communistic east and a capitalistic west. In this struggle, China and India were to join Russia as the forces of communism. To win Chinese and Indian support, Stalin developed a program for those countries consisting of three stages: A struggle against foreign imperialism, an agrarian revolution under the leadership of the Communist Party and, finally, a proletarian dictatorship. The key step was to be the wooing of the peasants.

Stalin's 3-stage program of revolution, as exemplified by China, is now being exported to Indochina, to Burma, the Philippines, and Indonesia, and even into little-known Hyderabad. The revolt last year in Hyderabad was a peasant uprising, about the largest, and for a brief moment perhaps the most effective, in Asia outside of China, and it was under Communist leadership. The uprising was finally crushed and the Communists jailed, yet it is worth noting that, as in China, the peasants of Hyderabad were not enticed by Communist dogma but merely followed the welcome Communist bait of "land and liberty in Asia."

Many people wouldn't hestitate to approve of a revolutionary movement if it is the only way the common man can secure his elementary wants. But we must realize how serious a threat an agrarian revolution could be at this point of history, even if the upheaval seems justifiable from that point of view. The only way to thwart Communist designs on Asia is to preclude such revolutionary outbursts through timely reforms, peacefully, before the peasants take the law into their own hands and set the countryside ablaze.

Encouraging in the seemingly dismal situation in Asia is the fact that the American agrarian tradition of "40 acres and a mule," or an Asian variety thereof, offers a better solution of the agrarian problem than the new Communist ideology. This is quite apart from the consideration that the latest events in China and the implied threat to the rest of Asia oblige us to bolster our position there with something more lasting and effective than we have done thus far. The positive and prompt decision to place the peasant "in the center of the piece," as Nehru once put it, is essential if non-Communist regimes are to survive.

According to Nehru, India and Asia as a whole are confronted with no more urgent task than agrarian readjustment. This presupposes: (1) the improvement of agricultural techniques in order to raise farm production; (2) an approximation to an adequate standard of life through raising the output per man, providing good credit and marketing facilities, fair taxation, health and educational facilities; (3) proper utilization of land and water resources; and (4) a basic change in landlord-tenant relationships, which in certain parts of Asia is immediately the most important objective, both intrinsically and because of the threat of communism.

Technological improvements alone will fall short of our goals. Increased production must be accompanied by a fairer distribution of farm income. Improvements in the use of land can come about most effectively if the tiller knows that the land or a reasonable share of the product of the land will belong to him. Otherwise, not all prerequisites will exist for the technical progress envisioned, for instance, by the point 4 program, and our political aims will be made more difficult of attaining.

Douglas MacArthur in Japan, Nehru in India and, more recently, Gen. Chen Cheng, of Formosa, have understood the urgency of taking the wind out of the Communist sails in a peasant ocean. MacArthur knew how to do it and did it. A successful land reform under his direction has created in Japan a new, large class of private owner-cultivators, and has rendered rural Japan practically impervious to communism.

Nehru is trying hard to do it. India's needs for technical farm improvements are overwhelming, and Nehru is well aware of it. But he is just as conscious of the urgency for a concurrent land-reform program which will give the Indian peasant an incentive to improvement and a sense of responsibility.

Suggested farm reform can become a powerful political instrument. The native governments friendly to us would be more likely to win popular support, and popular support in Asia is peasant support or nothing. An owner-cultivator, or a reasonably satisfied tenant, would acquire a stake in society. He would guard that society against extremism. Private property would be strengthened where it has been weakest, at the huge base of the social pyramid. The common man of Asia would become a stanch opponent of Communist economics and politics—not necessarily to favor the interests of the United States, but simply because his own interests lay in the same direction.

CLIMATE IS LACKING

Secretary Acheson summed up the causes of Asia's tensions in the San Francisco address on United States policy toward Asia. "They (the Asian people)," he said, "have been striving for independence, spread ownership of land and control over their own destiny." He continued, "it is no accident that their goals and our goals are the same." But while we are busy enriching the economic, political, and social insitutions the American people have already achieved, Asia is yet to create the beginnings from which a democratic society may evolve. Such conditions cannot be handed to Asia as a gift; they must grow out of Asia's wishes, opinions and activities.

Nor is this easy. For Asia, unlike western and perhaps also central Europe, lacks almost entirely the traditions, institutions, habits of thought and experiences which are essential to democracy. That indeed is the principal political and psychological reason why communism is a much greater threat in Asia than in Europe. The natural defenses against communism that a tradition of individual dignity, the rights of man and of democracy sets up, in different degrees in various countries, are yet to be created in Asia.

We are still to demonstrate in that part of the world that democracy is better and more profitable, too. And it is through helping to solve the problem closest to the heart of the peasant that such demonstrations can be made.

The need for United States material and technical assistance in far-eastern programs of agricultural improvement is accepted as an integral part of our policy in Asia. The point-4 program is a good example of that. Another instance in the same direction is the economic aid being rendered now to southeast Asia by ECA. Less widely accepted and often even unrecognized is the necessity to dissuade the recipients of our aid in Asia from allowing narrow institutional interests to stand in the way of a progressive rural policy, through which the maximum economic and political benefits of our technical and financial assistance could be realized.

We must make an effort to persuade the more conservative Asian groups that rural reform is essential to their own preservation, as well as in the interest of the peasantry.

THE COMMON MAN

Secretary Acheson is addressing himself to the core of the problem when he urges that "We must increasingly in all we do and say affirm the positive goals of a free people." If Mr. Acheson's words are to carry meaning for the common man of Asia, we cannot remain indifferent to the dominance of the traditional beneficiaries of the prevailing feudal systems. From ambassadors and ministers to foreign service clerks, we must begin to feel and act in terms of the common man, and in Asia he is the peasant.

We must make a special effort to seek out and encourage in every way possible the native liberal groups who might otherwise be lost to our common cause. It is in the vast numbers of the cultivators of the soil and in the small yet important elements concerned with the welfare of the people where we would be well advised to find and win our most potent allies. A strong, fairly contented peasantry and progressive native forces supporting them provide a more solid base for cooperation with the west, and for the struggle against communism, than the forces at work in many parts of Asia, to whom the very words "reform," "change" and "concession" partake of the devil. They suffer from myopia, a disease likely to be fatal.

The landlords of Szechwan refused to support a mild reform program even though the Communist armies had already penetrated the gates. In the rest of Asia, too, landlords also may be their own gravediggers, and of their own governments.

In country after country one sees feudal classes bent on maintaining the status quo unsullied. They are the unwitting and unwilling allies of communism, for they are the creators of the revolutionary situation. It is these and such forces that today hold great and decisive power in Asia.

One of the basic tasks of United States representatives abroad should be to convince these groups and their governments to follow the example of Czar Alexander II, who saw in time that his only chance of keeping the throne was to initate reform. He warned the Russian landowners a 100 years ago that "it was better to begin the abolition of serfdom from above than to wait for it to begin itself from below." He abolished it from above, and the Romanov dynasty retained the throne for another half century, until Alexander's less-wise grandson lost it.

TOO LATE IN CHINA

Fortunately, we already have a technical and social agrarian program that has been developed and successfully tested by the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction (JCRR). This organization, created in China as part of ECA under authority provided in the China Aid Act of 1948, held its first meeting in Nanking October 1, 1948. The work of JCRR came too late to alter the course of events in China itself. But what I saw of the JCRR's operation in China and in Formosa, where the operation is still going on, convinces me that it was one of America's most fruitful ventures. It points the way to what might be done on a larger scale, and in better time, elsewhere.

JCRR is not an American but a joint American-Chinese Commission, with a Chinese chairman and two Chinese and two American members. We Americans furnish the money but do not call the tune. With nationalism in Asia at white heat, we must be careful not to do so.

The Commission works through local organizations and finds local sponsors among them for its projects. These projects are not based on preconceived theoretical notions but on indications as to what the farmers themselves wish most. From such grass-root needs JCRR has evolved a practical national plan with this order of priority: (a) land reform, (b) irrigation, (c) fertilizers, (d) farm organizations, (e) farm credit, (f) plant and animal disease, (g) seed multiplication, (h) animal breeding, (i) rural health and (j) audiovisual education.

The response of the Chinese and Formosan peasants to JCRR has been enthusiastic although the Commission has actually spent little money—only $5,000,000 from its inception to date. It made more friends for the American cause and did more actual good than many an elaborate diplomatic act backed by the richest of treasure.

THE HARDER JOB

Most significant was the reform of the tenure system. "Why," I asked Dr. Chiang Mon-lin, Chairman of JCRR, "are you engaging in this work when the landlords are certain to oppose you?" "To give meaning to the nine other branches of our work," Dr. Chiang Mon-lin replied. "We know that using science to increase production is relatively easy, but solving social problems is difficult. If we had not developed a land-reform program along with our production program, the better part of the good results would have gone to the landlords and not the tenants. That would defeat our purpose."

JCRR did not create or impose agrarian reform upon China. Its Chinese Chairman convinced the Nationalist government that rent-reduction and land-purchase programs, which had already been on the statute books for more than two decades and never applied, should be given a trial, if only as enlightened self-interest.

Within the short space of a few months the land reform produced substantial and immediate results, in terms of greater security of tenure and more rice for the tenants. It is questionable if years of farm improvements would have given the tenants benefits anywhere near as great as these.

ARMED RESISTANCE

Remarkable also was the manner in which tenants asserted their new-found rights. This was impressed upon me as I watched the land commission of Yang Chia Tza village, in the province of Szechwan, as it considered an eviction case in the presence of landlord and tenant. Calmly and with deliberation, a tenant contended that under the reform he could not be evicted—something that would have been unthinkable a few years ago.

Or take the case of Gen. Lin Wen-hui, governor of Sikiang, one of Asia's largest landlords, chief purveyor of opium throughout southwest China, most recently in the service of the Communists. Reforms were not meant for him, he thought. He sent one of his estate managers with a detachment of troops to collect rents—the high, old rents. The tenants did something they had never done before—they armed themselves.

When the manager and the troops appeared, they announced that they intended to defend their rights under the new rent-reduction scheme and would not permit collection at the old rate. Whereupon the manager hastily agreed to accept payments at the reduced rates.

In the province of Szechwan alone, more than two million tenant families were direct beneficiaries of JCRR. Yet JCRR disbursed but $218,000 on a reform that went to the heart of China's rural and political problem.

POSITIVE ACTION

The reform came too late to give the Nationalist Government even a measure of popular support. But our last-minute efforts in southwest China—and at present in Formosa—nevertheless carry with them a most important lesson. ECA through JCRR has demonstrated, in a practical way, that the United States can act not merely against communism, which has little meaning to the average Asian peasant, but also for certain ideas understood by the most ignorant of peasants.

It is true that a final solution of problems of the Asiatic peasant—final in the sense that most of them will live happily ever after—cannot be achieved. There is simply not enough land for the great multitude of farmers. But progressive rural reform in Asia is not a question of the whole loaf; any effort to ease the peasant's burden is welcome and lays a foundation for a middle-of-the-road, stable, rural society.

The tenant in the village office of Kwangsi, half-crazed with joy over the receipt of a deed that gave him ownership of but one acre of land, spoke for Asia's millions.

Controls to Prevent Profiteering and Hoarding

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, again a distinguished South Carolinian has come forth with, what is believed by many to be, the only effective solution to our economic plight as we move into what threatens to be another World War.

It will be recalled that during a similar period shortly before the outbreak of World War II, one of the country's outstanding senior citizens, the Honorable Bernard M. Baruch, a native of South Carolina, advocated complete controls over our economy so as to prevent unwarranted price spirals which would invite general demand for wage increases in major industries.

No doubt, had Congress authorized complete controls, we would have avoided many of the unpleasant distressing experiences of the other war. It is a strange coincidence that another distinguished South Carolinian, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, while serving as Director of War Mobilization, was called upon to deal with these intricate problems without sufficient legal authority.

As we take up control legislation, may I respectfully call your attention to the proposals of Mr. Baruch, since his experience is far more comprehensive than that of any other citizen.

We rebel against restrictions and controls. Normally we would not submit to the regulations which are unquestionably now imperative. We must act without delay on this important matter.

As evidence of the attitude of the people of my district, I attach hereto the following letters, newspaper clippings, and editorials, as sent to me by Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of South Carolina:

[From the Spartanburg (S. C.) Herald and Journal of July 24, 1950]

VFW FIGHTS HOARDING, PROFITEERING

South Carolina's some 14,000 Veterans of Foreign Wars and their families are being mobilized in an intensive drive to prevent hoarding and profiteering in the State.

State Commander Rufus W. Gosnell, following a Sunday conference on the move to discourage "excessive buying, hoarding, and cornering of vital food, and other necessities," said:

"We do not want high prices, hardship for our people, and possible inflation just because our boys are fighting and dying in Korea. Their bloodshed and sacrifice are a tragedy—not an excuse for such flagrant bad citizenship here at home.

"We cannot afford to have profiteering and cellar and cupboard stuffing, and the people of the State should not permit it."

Simultaneously, he contacted commanders of all the State's 70 VFW posts, urging them to work with their members and the public in general to discourage and prevent "needless war-scare buying." He also cautioned them to "stand watch against profiteering" in their communities and to realize that "a vicious trend of hoarding and price increases has started in some sections and may spread if not immediately checked."

The commander's message to the post commanders went forward by special letter.

He commended the Sunday Herald-Journal's "Appeal to Reason" editorial and the newspaper and sponsoring merchants on their full-page Sunday advertisement against hoarding and profiteering.

"The editorial and the sentiment conveyed in the advertisement should stand out as a good lesson to every person," he said. "Certainly this is no time for our people to rush helter-skelter to our stores to buy and and stock up unnecessarily on commodities that they do not need.

Neither can there be any justification for unreasonable price mark-ups or profiteering. The production cost and supply of things the people need have not been thrown that much out of line by the Korean war. Virtually everything being sold now or to be sold for some time had been produced before the Reds struck and the present war began," he declared.

"Now, above all, we need calm and serious thinking," he said. "Instead of hoarding, price scares, excitement, and selfishness we must have unselfishness and a community-wide concern for the welfare of our country. Certainly we do not need and cannot afford hoarding or profiteering. Should our people indulge in this shameful and costly self-created spectacle, then we can only hope that word of their conduct does not ever reach our soldiers, sailors, and marines in service, especially those who are actively engaged in the war against Communist armies on the Korean front."

[From the Spartanburg Herald]

FEAR AND HOARDING

Not yet are there to be controls—as we knew them in World War II—but with the first breath of war there was evidence of fear and hoarding. However, fear and hoarding are not the major evils of such periods. The war profiteer is the real criminal, who buys to hold and sell at higher prices, profiting deliberately upon the strain, stress, and discomfiture of others.

Experiences of other wars are so recent it is not surprising there should be going to Washington from many parts of the country requests for controls on the essential things of life.

If this country goes on the all-out program of preparedness for war, the war profiteer should be anticipated with all the controls that may be imposed upon him.

[From the Spartanburg Herald of July 23, 1950]

AN APPEAL TO REASON

The Government is appealing to the people of this country to be reasonable in the purchase of their supplies, to avoid hoarding and to check the profiteer. The President of the United States in his report to the people of this country made that appeal. Still there came from all parts of the country reports of hoarding and accounts of profiteering in certain commodities.

At present the appeal is to the good judgment and the patriotism of the people. To sustain that appeal we are told the Department of Agriculture is preparing a report to the consumers of the country on food supplies. The Government contends there is no shortage of food supplies and there is no justification for hoarding or for price increases. The report being prepared is designed to substantiate this position and will be given to the public before the week end.

This is the proper approach to this problem. If the public is not responsive or cooperative we may rest assured the many requests for immediate controls going into Washington will be productive of results.

Incidentally, it might be very well for those so concerned with tiding themselves over a war period with the luxuries and the necessities piled about them, to figure on that war period. It can be for a generation. And there is a very considerable bank of opinion holding to that view. In that case this county will be on a war basis far beyond any period hoarding may hedge against and the sooner there is a broader concession to that possibility the more rational will be the country approach to what is ahead.

Persistent hoarding can establish controls as a way of life this Nation will know for generations.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Spartanburg, S. C., July 1, 1950.

The Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FELLOW VETERAN: The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the Department of South Carolina—numbering some 14,000 overseas service veterans of all the Armed Forces in your home State—have taken strong and determined action to combat hoarding and profiteering affecting the vital necessities of life, since the outbreak of the Korean war.

Knowing that your convictions and reaction incident to this problem are the same as ours, we are taking the liberty of sending you clippings of articles appearing recently in the daily newspapers of Spartanburg—in your district—reporting the action of the VFW on a State-wide basis; also clippings of editorials appearing in the Spartanburg newspapers.

Further, for your information, the undersigned recently attended a meeting of General Wade Hampton Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars, in your home city of Greenville, where similar action against hoarding and profiteering was taken by that post in the form of a unanimously passed motion, brought to the floor there by Post Chaplain Frank Dietz with Post—District 4 VFW Commander Pat Martin presiding. The Marine Corps League here, composed of Marine Corps veterans, followed with strong action via a resolution, as did the Gaffney Post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

We shall be grateful if you will use your good influence to have the enclosed clippings inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with appropriate remarks by yourself, as a fellow war veteran and our representative in Washington; also this letter in full.

Certainly, all of us, as veterans and fellow Americans and as officials of our Government must do everything within our power to combat the shameful and dangerous practices of hoarding and profiteering while our fellow Americans are fighting, enduring great hardships and making enormous sacrifices on the United Nations' battlefield in Korea—which will continue to furnish, in the mud and filth of bloody warfare, graves for many of them. Surely, their sacrifice and bloodshed is not to become a dollar sign via an excuse for all-out selfishness instead of all-out sacrifice and patriotism here at home. If this be true, then home-front America's opportunity will soon become home-front America's shame.

Please help us in our efforts. We know you will.

We were honored and grateful to have you among the speakers at our recent annual South Carolina Veterans of Foreign Wars encampment in Spartanburg, and warmly welcome you back to see us whenever you have the opportunity.

We wish you well in your endeavors as our congressional representative in the Fourth District of South Carolina.

May God bless and keep you and your loved ones secure.

RUFUS W. GOSNELL,
State Commander.
GLEN W. NAYES,
State Historian and Member, State Public Relations Staff.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES—SPECIAL ANTIHOARDING AND PROFITEERING BULLETIN, JULY 24, 1950

To All Post Commanders:

DEAR COMRADE COMMANDER: Again we must be on guard. This time we must take up our posts of vigilance in our own communities—not on some foreign shore—in respect of profiteering and hoarding. The emergency has been unnecessarily created but the situation is serious.

Hoarding and profiteering have begun tracing a trail of slime and shame across our State.

Both must be stopped. We must mobilize every member and every post and every VFW family in an all-out drive to stop them before they become widespread. It is well established, as we all know, that there is no reason for war-scare buying among our people. Certainly there is no justification for profiteering. We do not want high prices and hardship for our people—and possible inflation—just because our boys are fighting and dying in Korea.

We must stand watch in our home communities and throughout the State against the viciousness of profiteering. We must discourage hoarding. Already, a dangerous trend toward both is well under way. Unless this trend is checked and stamped out, it will spread.

Now above all, we need calm and serious thinking. Instead of hoarding, price scares, selfishness, and greed, we must have unselfishness and constant concern for the welfare of our country. We cannot countenance the shameful and costly spectacle of hoarding and profiteering.

Comrades—as Veterans of Foreign Wars, we must frown upon even the very appearance of evil in this respect. We cannot afford to have civil atrocities of rush buying and excessive profiteering here at home. The Veterans of Foreign Wars and their families are well schooled in sacrifice and hardship by the toll of two world wars. They cannot permit these evils to be perpetrated upon our people.

There is no patriotism or good citizenship in profiteering and hoarding, but only greed, disgrace, and bad example. Aid and comfort to the enemy and hardships here at home will result unless we act now.

I call upon every comrade and his family to take the proper and essential action to prevent hoarding and profiteering.

Yours in comradeship,
RUFUS W. GOSNELL,
Commander.

P. S.—This letter went to 70 VFW posts in South Carolina.

Mr. and Mrs. Ian Ross MacFarlane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, Maryland is very proud of the great contributions which so many of her citizens have made toward the building up of this great democracy of ours. Many of their exploits and many of their names are well known to every student of history. However, Mr. Speaker, it is not for the purpose of extolling Marylanders of the past for whom I arise to speak.

It is, rather, to point out and have recorded a story of self-sacrificing appreciation in behalf of democracy which has been carried on quietly and unostentatiously by two of my fellow citizens of Baltimore.

I refer to Ian Ross MacFarlane and his wife, Louise, both radio commentators and members of the radio galleries of the Capitol.

Ever since I first came to Congress I have noted these two hard-working correspondents covering every phase of political activity in the Nation's Capitol and daily returning to Baltimore in order to report honestly and accurately that which has been transpiring. Every National and State political convention in the past many years has been covered by this fine husband and wife team. The love and devotion of the wife for her almost totally blind husband has won the admiration and respect of everyone who know them in the State of Maryland.

Ian Ross MacFarlane is a Scottish immigrant, and consequently has a deep sense of responsibility and respect for our Government.

He and his wife are noted for their leadership in every worth-while civic enterprise in our State.

Following his return from overseas as a war correspondent, Mr. MacFarlane became the voice of comfort to thousands of mothers and wives and other relatives of men in the armed forces. With his intimate knowledge of the operations as well as the personnel of various branches of the Government, he was able, at his own expense to advise and aid hundreds of dependents of the men in service.

Following the close of World War II, he conceived the idea of rewarding the returning GI's, not with a bonus, but rather with an opportunity. He carried his idea to, and secured the complete cooperation of our then great Governor and now Senator from Maryland, HERBERT R. O'CONOR. His plan resulted in the granting by the State of Maryland of franchises to 158 ex-GI's to own and operate their own taxicabs in the city of Baltimore. He formed this group into a company and under his skillful guidance these men, known as the GI Veterans' Taxicab Association, have built up a corporation which today is valued in conservative circles at three-quarters of a million dollars.

This is but one of the many things Ian Ross MacFarlane has done to further the cause of democracy.

I would like to point out how the unique manner in which this adopted son of ours and his energetic wife are helping to build a better America. Due to the nature of their work, they are naturally keen students of political affairs. They have wondered like all of us why not more than approximately one out of every two Americans exercises his right to vote. Their observations brought them to the conclusion that at least many citizens failed to take an active interest in politics and affairs of State because of a cynicism that stemmed from ignorance of the functions of the executive, the legislative, and judicial branches of our Government.

With this in mind they evolved a plan whereby they at least in a small way could stop this political deterioration. They bought a station wagon and invited their listeners to their morning radio program merely to write in for an invitation to accompany the MacFarlanes on their biweekly reporting trips to this very Capitol. No charges, no contest, no gimmicks whatsoever were attached to this offer. As the listeners wrote in the MacFarlanes would allocate certain dates to them. Each Tuesday and Thursday from 5 to 7 interested citizens meet in their Baltimore radio station—WCBM, Mutual—to hear their morning program prior to their visit to Washington. While Mr. MacFarlane gathers news from the various Representatives, or sits in the Senate or House, Mrs. MacFarlane conducts this group throughout the Capitol, presenting them not only to their own Senators from Maryland, but to many others. After their tour, Mrs. MacFarlane visits the individual offices of the Maryland Congressmen in whose districts the visitors reside. Through this medium I have personally met hundreds of constituents whom otherwise I might never have known. I know the experience of my colleagues from Maryland has been identical.

It is somewhat difficult to know how to reward people of the caliber of the MacFarlanes.

We of Maryland, regardless of our party affiliation, are proud of them; and we think of no better way of showing them our appreciation in a manner in which they would best understand our pride in them than by drawing up and individually signing, with a great deal of personal pleasure, the following resolution and which, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have inserted in the RECORD:

The members of the Maryland State delegation of the Eighty-first Congress take this opportunity to recognize and express to Ian Ross MacFarlane and his wife, Louise MacFarlane, their approbation and appreciation for the civic work they have done in the operation of their radio program, Baltimore's Busiest Couple, in Baltimore.

They have given unstintingly of their time and efforts to keep the citizenry informed and to further good government. It is therefore proper and fitting that recognition should be given their services.

MILLARD E. TYDINGS.
HERBERT R. O'CONOR.
LANSDALE G. SASSCER.
GEORGE H. FALLON.
EDWARD T. MILLER.
J. GLENN BEALL.
WILLIAM P. BOLTON.
EDWARD A. GARMATZ.

Hats Off to the Fighting GI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include the editorial from the New Orleans Item of July 22, 1950, entitled "Hats Off to the Fighting GI":

A HANDFUL OF AMERICANS—HATS OFF TO THE FIGHTING GI

We would like to take time out from all the talk about mistakes in Korea and just say a word of thanks to the mythical average GI in the Twenty-fourth Division.

Soldier, nations are grateful for the job you've done.

This war hit out of a blue sky. Before you knew what had happened there you were in a place called Korea trying to kill without being killed.

The enemy had tanks, heavy artillery, twice as much stuff as you did, not to mention 5, 10, or 15 times as many men.

You had to keep falling back. Hit and run. Get out and walk back down the road you had just come up, leaving your wounded behind.

So a few of you cursed and called it a "useless damned war." But you did what you had to do. And you made it so tough on the Communists they couldn't do what they started to do—knock out South Korea before the UN forces could get a good foothold.

We read about the wounded guy you had to leave behind, who was still firing his mortar at the enemy when last seen, holding it with his hands.

We read about the only casualty in the American patrol that killed or wounded a couple of hundred North Koreans—a machine gunner who burned his hands firing his own weapon.

And we read about your C. O., General Dean. Maybe a general shouldn't get himself into a spot like that, but if he does there's a lot to be said for him joining a bazooka team in person and blasting some tanks.

All the time it's been man against tank, or light tank against heavy tank. It's been a business of coping with Communists in baggy white pants or even American fatigues who showed up suddenly behind your own lines.

You've had good air and naval support. And, since that first confusion, the South Koreans have been fighting hard on your flank.

But most of that help was where you couldn't see it, and you still had the pressure of maybe 40,000 North Koreans against 3,500 Americans.

So you had to fall back. But you killed 8 or 10 of the enemy for every American lost. And, when you pulled back, you took your own sweet time doing it.

That gave us time to bring in more troops, and that's what we needed.

In short, you are what kept it from being what it might have become—a useless war. And all we can say to you and the rest of the 24th is that you've done one helluva good job.

Ignoring Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of July 15, 1950:

IGNORING ASIA—WESTERN ALLIES CRITICIZED FOR CONFERRING ALONE

To the New York Herald Tribune:

On the question of Indochina and Formosa, it would be unrealistic to assume that the Security Council of the United Nations will support President Truman's decisions, as it did in the case of Korea.

In his original statement on June 27, President Truman said, "I have similarly directed acceleration in the furnishing of military assistance to the forces of France and the associated states of Indochina."

I have reasons to believe that India did not welcome this announcement just as it did not welcome the decision of the Foreign Ministers (United States, Britain, and France), with regard to Indochina in their London meeting in the first week of May 1950.

The Asian leaders have rather resented the fact that the Foreign Ministers of three western powers decided the fate of an Asian country without even showing the courtesy of discussing the matter with the governments of the other Asian countries.

To most Asian leaders, this action had the tinge of old colonialism. It also showed complete disregard, by the Western Powers, for the sensitivity and national pride of the Asian countries.

I have had the opportunity of getting reactions to the Indochinese (Viet-Nam) situation from leaders of various Asian countries, including Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan, of Pakistan, with whom this matter was discussed during his stay in New York in the early part of May, this year. The general consensus of the Asian leaders is that "any

responsibility for international discussions affecting the sovereignty of any Asian nation rests in the first instance with the Asian nations themselves."

It is fully realized that the situation in Indochina (Viet-Nam) is most difficult, because on the one hand you have the allegedly pro-Communist leadership of Ho Chi Minh, and, on the other hand, the leadership of Bao Dai, who is considered by the vast majority of the Indochinese a puppet of French colonialism, who enjoys neither respect nor following amongst the people of Viet-Nam.

It is also argued that when you are faced with two evils, perhaps, it is better to accept the lesser evil. It is stated that the United States had no choice but to accept this lesser evil—Bao Dai, the puppet of the French.

But what the Asian leaders are annoyed about is, Why were they not consulted? Why were they ignored? It is alleged by them, and very rightly, too, that if a conference of the Asian leaders had been called, and a decision arrived at, such a decision would have had moral force behind it.

It is further suggested that the decision arrived at in consultation with the Asian countries would have made it impossible for the Soviet propagandists to smear the United States actions in Indochina as the acts of an imperialist power.

Before matters get worse and other Soviet-inspired eruptions take place, a conference of the Asian countries should immediately be called, perhaps in New Delhi. This conference should specifically discuss a plan for Formosa and Indochina. These are the two imminent danger spots in Asia.

If a mutually agreed upon plan, fully backed by the Asian countries, is reached within the next few weeks, it would not be too much to hope that the Korean war will remain localized.

The people of India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, Indonesia, are freedom- and liberty-loving people. They will not turn against the United States. But the United States, too, should accept them as friends and allies and show due and proper respect for their feelings and aspirations.

J. J. SINGH,
President, India League of America.
NEW YORK, *July 12, 1950.*

We Can't Sell Our Ideals Abroad if They Die at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 1 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Can't Sell Our Ideals Abroad if They Die at Home," which appeared in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE CAN'T SELL OUR IDEALS ABROAD IF THEY DIE AT HOME

Hardly had the Korean incident settled down to the status of normal war news when Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, made in the United States Senate a remark which represents one thing that we hope will be avoided for the duration. Senator TAFT had urged the resignation of Secretary of State Acheson on the obvious ground that events had cut the heart out of the Acheson policies. LUCAS' comment was that TAFT's speech gave aid and comfort to Stalin, and there should be nothing but unity from now on.

The public and Members of Congress will have to be on the alert lest present events provide the opportunity for closing the book on the blunders of an administration which made this Red thrust inevitable. Unity is all very well, but a group of politicians who messed up a peace the way the Truman-Acheson policy makers have done will bear watching as they try their skills in a new field. If it is to be considered immoral to criticize the man who wouldn't defend Formosa 24 hours before President Truman ordered that such a defense should be set up, it is difficult to see what area for free discussion remains. Freedom of criticism is now more important than ever, but it will take stout men to defend it.

The Truman administration will be sorely tempted to use the fracas in Asia as a pretext for pushing all sorts of Socialist planning and governmental boondoggling, on the theory that it is needed for national defense. As the Wall Street Journal warned on the first day of the Korean incident, "National defense in the lexicon of Washington means more Government regulation, more Government control over the economy and over the people. Any man who now speaks up for economy or freedom from controls can have a shooting war thrown at him." Senator LUCAS set the pitch on the very first day.

Another thing we ought to be thinking about is political warfare, whether the war remains cool or gets hot. We must be far clearer than we have been in explaining what we will settle for. "Unconditional surrender" convinced the Germans and Japanese that for them it was victory or destruction. In Russia and its satellites there are millions of people who regard war as the one hope of liberation. Millions of Russians felt that way about Hitler's invasion of their country in 1941. At least two Ukrainian armies went over to the Germans in the first few weeks, and more would have followed had Hitler paid any attention to political warfare. Why must we wait for a general war before making the American position more attractive to outsiders?

Up to now, evidence of confidence in our own way of doing things must have come through only dimly to the Orient. Our diplomacy has been party to betrayals and intrigues with Communist infiltrators. Almost at the hour of the strike in Korea, American officials were assuring reporters that Korea was not our baby. When we propose economic assistance to backward areas, it is not by means of the tried American way of private investment, but via a gigantic boondoggle sifted through the United Nations bureaucracy. The peoples who have run under Stalin's umbrella have not done so from love of communism, but from fear that they will be abandoned. President Truman's forthright act did much to restore the prestige which Roosevelt and Acheson had done so much to shatter. But not even MacArthur and a flock of B–29's can keep hope in free America alive in the world if liberty and individual enterprise are assassinated here at home—by the same breed of planners and stuffed shirts who have done so much to murder them abroad.

A Professional Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the Nation has been properly directed elsewhere in recent weeks but it is interesting to note that the reaction against the unseemly tone of the June 27 inaugural address of Dr. Elmer Henderson, new president of the American Medical Association, is beginning to reflect itself in the periodical press.

The AMA's flagrant failure to concern itself with the national crisis, particularly in the need to train more doctors in a hurry, deserves considerable condemnation. I addressed myself to the subject on the floor of the House July 5 and 13.

With permission to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach an editorial from the respected Catholic weekly, America, published in its July 22 issue. This interesting editorial points out that the Catholic Physicians' Guild takes a far more serious view of its social responsibilities in the present crisis than does the AMA.

A PROFESSION'S RESPONSIBILITY

Speaking in a tone astonishingly like that of Col. Robert McCormick, publisher of the Chicago Tribune, the new president of the American Medical Association, Dr. Elmer L. Henderson, on June 27 addressed the 9,300 physicians registered for the AMA's ninety-ninth session on the theme, the Responsibility of American Medicine. An audience of two Nation-wide radio networks also heard the speech broadcast from the Gold Room of the Palace Hotel in San Francisco. Dr. Henderson had just taken a newly contrived oath of office that pledged him, among other things, to promote the public health and welfare. The responsibilities of American medicine, in the view of AMA's president, call for political action:

"And tonight I call on every doctor in the United States, no matter how heavy the burden of his practice may be, to dedicate himself not only to the protection of the people's physical health but also to the protection of our American way of life. * * * The moral and spiritual health of a people is certainly of equal importance with their physical well-being."

Undoubtedly it was his oath to promote the general welfare that moved Dr. Henderson to point out to his fellow practitioners how they were to advance the moral and spiritual health of America. Issuing a mandate for the defeat of the Democratic Party, the president of the AMA declared:

"It is the administrative arm of our Government in Washington that has failed us in this generation—a Government which is sick with intellectual dishonesty, with avarice, with moral laxity, and with reckless excesses. That condition we must change if we are to survive as a strong, free people and all of us—everyone listening to me tonight, regardless of what his way of life may be—must share the responsibility."

There is no way of polling the Nation's 190,000 doctors to discover if such is their conception of the responsibility of American medicine.

At a luncheon at the Fairmont Hotel the next day the members of the Federation of Catholic Physicians' Guilds and their guests gathered to discuss Health Insurance and the Social Responsibility of the Catholic Physician. Judging from the text of the papers, this meeting showed a refreshing absence of solution by slogan and proof by political name-calling. Dr. Arthur J. Offerman, of Omaha, struck a positive note:

"We men of medicine have a tremendous responsibility and a great opportunity. We must be as diligent in the field of medical social economics as we have been in scientific problems concerning the health of our patients."

In Dr. Offerman's view, "the big problem is how to make medical care available to the

public on terms it can afford and which will still insure continual improvement of service by rewarding individual education, knowledge, skill, application, and initiative." Invoking the Catholic social principle of "subsidiarity," assigning primary responsibility to subordinate groups, the Omaha surgeon called for a "social-minded profession" to make voluntary plans work effectively. Dr. William P. Chester, of Detroit, added a warning:

"Negation won't provide John Doe the medical care that he and his family must have, and it won't help John pay the doctor, pay his hospital bill, and retain his dignity as a solid citizen of these United States. * * * If we don't provide John Doe the opportunity of access to our abilities and help him pay our just hire, then a Socialist state is going to step in and attempt to fill the vacuum that our failure creates."

Such salutary talk shows an awareness of the burden of medical costs on the average family—in Dr. Chester's words, "the other 85 percent, the good, solid, backbone folk in the middle." "And I do mean in the middle," Dr. Chester added. It shows a heartening realization, moreover, of the genuine responsibilities of American medicine. Cardinal Stritch, in his address at the thirty-fifth annual convention of the Catholic Hospital Association on June 14 in Milwaukee, called on hospitals and the medical profession to "face squarely the problem of medical care for the little man." Only a social-minded profession can solve that problem.

Why Continue Business With Aggressor Nations and How About Economic Sanctions?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, 72 Republican Congressmen joined today in a letter to W. Averell Harriman, Special Assistant to the President on foreign affairs. The letter sought answers to questions in connection with the United States and members of the United Nations continuing to trade and do business with aggressor nations and other supporters. The Congressmen also inquired if economic sanctions were being considered.

The text of the letter follows:

JULY 31, 1950.

Mr. W. AVERELL HARRIMAN,
Special Assistant to the President,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HARRIMAN: We, the undersigned Members of Congress, all are deeply conscious of the critical situation that currently confronts our country. We are well aware of the realities that compelled the administration to draw a line and demand that the series of aggressive acts that threaten the world peace be met with force.

The United States, and most of the member states in the United Nations, are today committed to repelling an act of aggression that seriously threatens the world peace, not merely in Korea, but in other sections of the world. We have considered, and support in principle, the steps recommended for mobilizing our country against these contingencies.

We have noted with a great deal of concern that while we have acted to resist the aggression in the case of North Korea, and are preparing to resist similar acts of aggression and threats to the world peace in other quarters of the world, we still continue to trade and "do business" with the "seconds" or supporters of these same aggressors or potential aggressors. Why?

Cannot this trading with these countries be stopped under existing legislation and authority granted to the President?

Has the question of economic sanctions been considered?

It is our feeling that it is not enough to merely offer armed resistance to the aggression of North Korea and her supporters. We suggest that there exists no justification for continued trade on a business-as-usual basis with governments supporting the North Koreans.

Does the President at the moment have the authority to apply economic sanctions against these countries?

Will a request for legislation to provide the necessary authority be made?

Has the administration considered submission to the United Nations of a request for economic sanctions against the aggressor, future aggressors, and their supporters? The United Nations Charter, article 41, specifically authorizes complete or partial interruption of economic relations.

We would greatly appreciate your acknowledgment and reply to this letter and the questions contained therein.

Sincerely,

ROY O. WOODRUFF, Michigan; CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Iowa; BEN GUILL, Texas; DONALD L. JACKSON, California; KENNETH B. KEATING, New York; CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan; JOHN J. ALLEN, JR., California; GLENN R. DAVIS, Wisconsin; RICHARD M. NIXON, California; WALTER NORBLAD, Oregon; DONALD W. NICHOLSON, Massachusetts; BEN F. JENSEN, Iowa; JOHN PHILLIPS, California; JOHN M. VORYS, Ohio; THOMAS A. JENKINS, Ohio; FRANCES P. BOLTON, Ohio; MERLIN HULL, Wisconsin; WESLEY A. D'EWART, Montana; JACK Z. ANDERSON, California; JOHN W. BYRNES, Wisconsin; J. GLENN BEALL, Maryland; FRANK A. BARRETT, Wyoming; FRANK FELLOWS, Maine; HAROLD C. HAGEN, Minnesota; FRED I. CRAWFORD, Michigan; HOMER D. ANGELL, Oregon; PAUL W. SHAFER, Michigan; HAL HOLMES, Washington; H. CARL ANDERSEN, Minnesota; WILLIAM S. HILL, Colorado; WALTER H. JUDD, Minnesota; CLARENCE E. KILBURN, New York; GEORGE A. DONDERO, Michigan; HENRY O. TALLE, Iowa; DANIEL A. REED, New York; NORRIS POULSON, California; CHALES A. HALLECK, Indiana; JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Massachusetts; CLARENCE J. BROWN, Ohio; JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, New Jersey; HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., Pennsylvania; CHARLES W. VURSELL, Illinois; CLIFFORD R. HOPE, Kansas; AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Minnesota; KARL STEFAN, Nebraska; HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Oregon; JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Hawaii; LESLIE C. ARENDS, Illinois; J. CALEB BOGGS, Delaware; NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire; ROBERT HALE, Maine; GERALD R. FORD, Jr., Michigan; LOWELL STOCKMAN, Oregon; CECIL M. HARDEN, Indiana; PAUL CUNNINGHAM, Iowa; HAROLD O. LOVRE, South Dakota; THOMAS E. MARTIN, Iowa; CLIFF CLEVENGER, Ohio; RUSSELL V. MACK, Washington; ANGIER L. GOODWIN, Massachusetts; JOHN TABER, New York; W. STERLING COLE, New York; ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT, California; CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska; WALT HORAN, Washington; JOHN W. HESELTON, Massachusetts; CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, Massachusetts; R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, New York; RALPH A. GAMBLE, New York; JOHN B. BENNETT, Michigan; ROBERT F. RICH, Pennsylvania; THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Washington.

Power Trust Attack on TVA Backfires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the American people are constantly bombarded with private power interests' attacks on the Tennessee Valley Authority, and other public projects throughout the country.

Mr. Frank M. Wilkes, head of the Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., of Shreveport, La., recently stated that the TVA has $500,000,000 invested in power facilities, that it grossed $18,000,000 last year, paid $2,000,000 in lieu of taxes, and $570,000 in interest; and that the Southwestern Gas & Electric Co. by contrast has $62,000,000 invested, grossed $16,000,000 last year, paid $3,000,000 in taxes, and expended $3,250,000 in interest on its obligations, and that therefore the TVA is not paying its share of taxes.

That statement was so ridiculous that I referred it to the Tennessee Valley Authority, and received the following reply:

The conclusion of the editorial, that TVA should pay more to counties and municipalities in lieu of taxes, is based on untenable comparisons. There are a couple of good reasons why the operations of the TVA and the Southwestern Gas and Electric Co. are not comparable. For one thing, TVA is entirely a wholesaler of power, whereas the company sells power at retail. For another, Mr. Wilkes attempts to compare the TVA's payments in lieu of taxes to States and counties, based on former ad valorem taxes, with the total payments of the company including Federal income taxes.

As you know, the TVA payments in lieu of taxes are based upon a percentage of revenues from sales of power (except that used by Federal agencies) and the minimum payments are the former taxes on all power properties which TVA has purchased and on reservoir lands allocated to power. In the fiscal year 1949, TVA payments in lieu of taxes amounted to $2,050,000, or some $550,000 more than the total of former taxes on all power properties and all reservoir lands which it has purchased. The payments of TVA plus the taxes and tax equivalents of the distributors totaled $4,956,000, as compared with former taxes of $3,128,000 on power properties purchased either by the distributors or TVA and on all reservoir lands. In the 1950 fiscal year, TVA payments totaled $2,470,000, or nearly a million dollars more than former taxes, while the combined payments of TVA and the distributors amounted to about $6,000,000 or about $2,840,000 more than former taxes.

A statement is enclosed showing the payments made by TVA in lieu of taxes, together with the estimated payments of distributors.

TVA, being a Federal agency wholly owned by the Government, does not pay Federal income taxes, since its entire net income amounting in the fiscal year 1949 to $21,000,000, is the property of the Federal Government anyway. Nothing would be gained by dividing up this net income and calling one part taxes, another part revenue, and another part something else.

The TVA net income of $21,000,000 in 1949 amounted to about 36 percent of operating revenues of $58,000,000. The net income plus the payments in lieu of taxes amounted to practically 40 percent of operating revenues,

whereas the Edison Electric Institute reported that private utility taxes in the calendar year 1949 amounted to 19.4 percent of operating revenues.

Even if interest were assumed on the entire net TVA power investment at a rate of 2 percent, or about the average cost of money to the Government during the period the system was being built, the remainder amounts to nearly 25 percent of gross revenues.

As to the question of interest raised in the editorial, TVA pays interest only on its outstanding bonds, as does any utility or other business. However, TVA's net income before interest in the fiscal year 1949, amounting to about $21,500,000, represented a return of about 5 percent on the net average investment in TVA power facilities. Over the entire period of TVA operations, including the early developmental period when its sales of power were hamstrung by injunctions and other obstructive tactics, the average annual return has been 4 percent. Over the same period, as noted above, the cost of money to the Government has averaged 2 percent.

The editor (who published Mr. Wilkes' statement) seems to be under a misapprehension as to TVA tax payments in relation to municipalities. The TVA Act does not provide for payments to municipalities, but only to States and counties. As shown by the enclosed table, TVA last year paid Clay County, Miss., of which West Point is the county seat, $5,160 in lieu of taxes, representing the former taxes on properties which TVA has acquired there. Municipalities own the distributing facilities which serve them, and these local systems make tax equivalent payments. In the fiscal year 1949, the West Point municipal system paid nearly $8,800 to the city in tax equivalents. The system also earned a net income, after all expenses including the tax payments, of more than $19,500. Earnings of municipal systems, of course, are not subject to Federal income tax.

The facts stated in the foregoing communication constitute a complete answer to such organized attacks as the one to which I have just referred.

The TVA is not a burden on the taxpayers of the United States, and never will be. It is being paid for through the sale of its electric power, which now amounts to about 17,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year.

You will note that in 1949 the TVA paid $550,000 more in lieu of taxes than the total of former taxes on all power properties and all reservoir lands which it had purchased.

In addition to that, the TVA has supplied a yardstick showing the American people what electricity is worth.

If it had not been for that yardstick, the chances are that the 36,000,000 residential consumers, who are now paying electric bills every month, would pay anywhere from three to five times as much as they are now paying—if they used the same amount of electricity they use now.

When I first came to Congress the American people were using only 37,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. Last year they used more than 300,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. There are 394,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power now going to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries every year which should be developed and used for the benefit of the American people, and not to pay dividends on watered stocks.

Remember, the TVA does not distribute its electricity, but sells it wholesale to municipalities and cooperative power associations, which distribute it to the ultimate consumers.

At this point I am inserting a statement issued by the Tennessee Valley Authority, showing the amount paid by the TVA in lieu of taxes to States and counties during the fiscal year 1950, which states that—

Approximately $6,000,000 will be paid by TVA and by distributors of TVA power as payments for taxes or in lieu of taxes to State, county, and municipal governments during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, George F. Gant, TVA General Manager, announced today. This is about $2,840,000 more than former property taxes on all reservoir lands and on all privately owned power properties acquired by TVA and the distributing agencies.

TVA payments in lieu of taxes under the TVA Act to 7 States and 135 counties will total $2,470,692, an increase of $420,255 over similar payments for the fiscal year 1949, Mr. Grant said. He explained that the sizable increase over last year's payments resulted from increased power revenues.

Payments have been made monthly during the fiscal year to date on the basis of a preliminary schedule, and adjustments will be made where necessary in the checks for the months of May and June so that the sum of the 12 payments during the fiscal year will equal the amounts finally determined to be payable to each of the States and counties.

In addition to the direct TVA payments, it is estimated that municipal and cooperative distributors of TVA power will pay State and local taxes and make payments in lieu of taxes amounting to approximately $3,500,000 for the 1950 fiscal year. Nearly half the total TVA payments for the current fiscal year will be distributed among 135 counties, the remainder going to the State governments in the Tennessee Valley region. The amounts to be paid to each State and its counties are shown below:

State	Payments to States	Payments to counties	Total payments
Alabama	$455,420	$41,457	$496,877
Georgia	14,084	54,042	68,126
Kentucky	183,222	31,524	214,746
Mississippi	33,203	33,689	66,892
North Carolina	119,503	9,098	128,601
Tennessee	576,453	908,997	1,485,450
Virginia	9,178	822	10,000
Total	1,391,063	1,079,629	2,470,692

Tennessee Valley Authority—Payments to individual counties year ending June 30, 1950

	Annual amount
Alabama:	
Cherokee	$326.47
Colbert	[1] 4,047.29
DeKalb	[1] 1,227.09
Franklin	730.40
Jackson	[1] 5,029.04
Lauderdale	[1] 5,713.70
Lawrence	[1] 2,854.72
Limestone	[1] 4,233.70
Madison	[1] 6,045.28
Marshall	[1] 6,993.74
Morgan	[1] 4,256.02
Total	41,457.45
Georgia:	
Fannin	53,286.17
Towns	[1] 465.24
Union	[1] 290.70
Total	54,042.11

[1] Includes reservoir land.

Tennessee Valley Authority—Payments to individual counties year ending June 30, 1950—Continued

	Annual amount
Kentucky:	
Allen	$24.79
Barren	45.51
Calloway	[1] 3,962.19
Christian	3,028.08
Edmonson	14.41
Fulton	219.03
Graves	4,704.11
Hickman	339.00
Livingston	[1] 395.66
Logan	6,195.31
Lyon	[1] 495.84
Marshall	[1] 2,806.99
Metcalfe	6.11
Simpson	402.06
Todd	3,797.77
Trigg	[1] 817.40
Warren	4,269.55
Total	31,523.81
Mississippi:	
Alcorn	4,378.34
Chickasaw	1,408.72
Choctaw	777.88
Clay	5,160.04
Itawamba	160.80
Lee	5,332.94
Lowndes	3,041.39
Monroe	2,305.87
Neshoba	1,171.58
Noxubee	497.24
Oktibbeha	2,606.02
Prentiss	1,333.91
Tippah	430.15
Tishomingo	[1] 2,662.59
Union	203.27
Webster	738.65
Winston	1,479.59
Total	33,688.98
North Carolina:	
Avery	297.84
Cherokee	[1] 2,957.29
Clay	[1] 1,130.21
Graham	[1] 540.79
Swain	[1] 4,171.61
Total	9,097.74
Tennessee:	
Anderson	[1] 16,150.87
Bedford	5,563.6[illegible]
Benton	[1] 5,038.4[illegible]
Bledsoe	15,984.89
Blount	[1] 11,963.55
Bradley	[1] 32,251.05
Campbell	[1] 18,958.93
Cannon	7,174.8[illegible]
Carroll	[1] 11.70
Carter	[1] 34,669.38
Claiborne	[1] 2,491.43
Cocke	[1] 6,865.66
Coffee	2,698.92
Crockett	186.12
Cumberland	1,034.95
Davidson	10,979.61
Decatur	[1] 9,904.31
DeKalb	106.55
Dickson	1,356.60
Dyer	258.30
Franklin	9,356.56
Gibson	112.54
Giles	2,141.59
Grainger	[1] 6,022.24
Greene	20,586.36
Grundy	5,209.01
Hamblen	[1] 3,074.69
Hamilton	[1] 40,797.10
Hardin	[1] 7,070.95
Hawkins	[1] 3,012.82
Haywood	1,345.36
Henderson	[1] 2,671.90
Henry	[1] 4,811.40
Hickman	13,062.19

[1] Includes reservoir land.

Tennessee Valley Authority—Payments to individual counties year ending June 30, 1950—Continued

Tennessee—Continued	Annual amount
Houston	[1] $1,108.59
Humphreys	[1] 10,655.49
Jefferson	[1] 16,026.19
Johnson	[1] 2,572.71
Knox	[1] 21,242.54
Lauderdale	1,045.86
Lawrence	2,300.74
Lewis	11,067.02
Lincoln	3,397.96
Loudon	[1] 18,136.74
Madison	1,919.44
Marion	[1] 81,765.20
Marshall	7,943.63
Maury	10,221.20
McMinn	[1] 42,203.90
McNairy	2,438.46
Meigs	[1] 3,904.24
Monroe	22,386.17
Montgomery	762.74
Moore	1,376.66
Morgan	[1] 3,801.73
Obion	400.94
Perry	[1] 3,542.84
Polk	[1] 112,128.09
Putman	1,287.43
Rhea	[1] 6,605.30
Roane	[1] 21,731.30
Robertson	652.95
Rutherford	15,188.38
Sequatchie	7,375.42
Sevier	[1] 8,940,21
Shelby	8,091.61
Smith	2,502.79
Stewart	[1] 1,862.58
Sullivan	[1] 14,212.14
Sumner	704.14
Tipton	1,486.06
Unicoi	504.13
Union	[1] 7,139.86
Van Buren	9,108.76
Warren	37,895.47
Washington	12,483.63
Wayne	[1] 19,180.89
Weakley	1,112.30
White	33,156.86
Williamson	5,410.04
Wilson	7,090.90
Total	908,996.68
Virginia: Washington	[1] 822.49
Total	822.49
Grand total 135 counties	1,079,629.26

[1] Includes reservoir land.

In addition to that, the municipalities that distribute TVA power, as a rule, pay more in lieu of taxes than is paid by a private power company in municipalities of the same size.

Representatives of the private power interests continue to accuse the TVA, and other public-power agencies, of engaging in a private business in competition with private enterprise.

The truth is that the power business is a public business. Electricity has become a necessity of our modern life. It must be handled by a monopoly, since it would be unthinkable to have a half-dozen different outfits distributing electricity to the people of one city, town, or community. The overhead expenses would be so great the people could not stand it. Besides, electricity has become a necessity of our modern life. Any monopoly of a necessity is a public business and not a private business, and, besides, the water power in our navigable streams and their tributaries already belongs to the Federal Government. It was so decided by the United States Supreme Court in both the Ashwander case and the Appalachian Power case.

Therefore, instead of the Federal Government, the municipalities, and cooperative power associations engaging in "a private business," we have the private power interests attempting to monopolize the power business, including the Nation's water power, and plunder the American people of billions of dollars annually to pay dividends on watered stocks.

Students for Democratic Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article for a forthcoming issue of the Columbia University SDA Newsletter by Dick Givens, chairman of Columbia University chapter of SDA.

At a time when the youth of America are again being called upon to make great sacrifices for democracy, it is reassuring to know that so many of them have undertaken to express their political convictions actively through organizations like the Students for Democratic Action.

The article follows:

[Article for Columbia University SDA Newsletter of September 1950]

Students for Democratic Action favor expanded freedom and well-being for all people everywhere. To get this, we must fight a two-front political battle against reaction from either the right or the left.

Our weapon is not suppression or McCarthyism, but reform to strengthen the rights of the ordinary citizen. If we can show that people can have both freedom and security within western democracy, we will be proof against totalitarian propaganda. A bold program of strong reforms, rejecting the extremes of both right and left, will prove that democracy can fulfill human needs better than any form of dictatorship, whether Communist or Fascist.

That is why SDA favors the civil-rights program and other items of the New and Fair Deals. Every American must have equal rights regardless of race, creed, color, sex, origin, political opinions, or economic position. And every student must have full access to student life, regardless of race, religion, nationality, views, or economic status. In working for these goals, we join with anyone sincerely supporting democracy; but we cannot support any movement whose real aim is dictatorship, whether or not it gives lip service to reform.

The student movement is of vital importance in the drive for an expanding democracy. This is where SDA comes in, with its goal of a constructive alternative to both conservatism and communism. In SDA, students learn how politics works first hand, as well as from textbooks. We have an important task of educating for liberalism and thinking ahead of headlines. Further, when some campus clubs are limited to Caucasians, students cannot be expected to take seriously speeches on education for citizenship. Education is carried on in the actual set-up of student life as well as in class; hence, SDA's campaign for expanded academic freedom, student rights, and nondiscrimination. Also, students must do concrete work in election and legislative campaigns, to back up what they believe in—with action as well as talk.

An example of what students can do is the program of the Columbia University SDA during the 1949–50 academic year. As well as sponsoring educational meetings on the German situation and United States atomic policy, SDA ran a drive against any aid to the Franco regime in Spain, worked in the LEHMAN campaign for Senator, and, by means of an initiative petition, secured student body approval for a plan to end bias clauses in all Columbia College organizations, including fraternities.

Politics can no longer be left to the machines, the special interests, and the totalitarians. Peace cannot be built by apathy. We tried apathy in the twenties. Let's not try it again. SDA can go far in giving students a chance to do their part in proving that democracy works better than any form of dictatorship, and that we can have both freedom and security.

Air-Mail Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on Saturday, July 29, with regard to separating air-mail payments from Government support of the airlines:

AIR-MAIL PAYMENTS

The full House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will soon vote on the question of separating air mail payments from Government support of the airlines. Such segregation should be made in the interests of business-like handling of this phase of the Post Office Department activities and in the true interests of the airlines, whose development and soundness must be maintained for the sake of both national defense and economic well-being. The President, in his budget message to Congress last January, asked immediate action in this matter. The proposal has been supported by the Secretary of Commerce, the Postmaster General, the committee for the Hoover report, and many others. The question of the desirability of segregation seems to have been determined by a strong weight of evidence. These spokesmen have declared themselves in favor of the bill H. R. 2908, which would establish immediately such separation of air mail payments and subsidies.

Nevertheless, at the coming hearing, the Commerce Committee will be asked to choose between this bill and House Joint Resolution 331, which would require the Civil Aeronautics Board to make a further study of the desirability of segregation and proposes that $500,000 be appropriated for the purpose. Its adoption would effectively kill the whole matter for this session of Congress and probably for the first session of the next Congress. We believe that H. R. 2908 should be voted out by the committee and passed without further delay.

Know Your Waterways—Only 6 Percent of a Total of Amount

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 30, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit a copy of an article by the Marine News, of New York, published in the Washington Post, as follows:

KNOW YOUR WATERWAYS—ONLY 6 PERCENT OF A TOTAL

The amount reported recently in chapter IX of the General Appropriation Act, 1951 for new river and harbor work is $132,554,500. Approximately $86,554,500 is for lock and dam and miscellaneous other work. The amount remaining for channel and harbor improvements is only about $46,000,000, or just about 6 percent of the total amount reported for all civil functions, Department of the Army. Other items in the bill are Quartermaster Corps, Signal Corps, rivers and harbors maintenance, operation and care of locks, dams and canals, flood control, general; flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries; flood control, Sacramento River; and Panama Canal. When the final total is approved by Congress, most of the press will label it the rivers and harbors or pork barrel bill. Such distortion works against one of the Nation's most useful and vital assets, during either peace or war—its harbors and channels.

When continued development of harbors and channels will strengthen the Nation for peace or war, benefit the people, and aid other systems of transportation through transshipment, why is a reasonable amount for such improvements bitterly opposed from certain quarters year after year?

MARINE NEWS,
GEORGE H. PALMER,
President and Publisher.
NEW YORK, N. Y.

Oh for Those Steel Stand-By Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of misinformed discussion about the fixing of responsibility for some of the difficulties we face today.

Members of this House might well read the attached article by Richard L. Strout of the Christian Science Monitor before indulging in such further discussions. Titled "Oh for Those Steel Stand-By Plants," the article appeared in the July 26 issue of that distinguished independent newspaper. It is a lucid examination of the foresight exhibited by President Truman and his economic counselors since 1946.

It makes clear the role of the Republican dominated Eightieth Congress in weakening our economic structure with its untimely income-tax revisions. It fixes the responsibility for the present high price structure, too.

Most important of all the article points out that President Truman, his economic advisers, and those of us who introduced the Economic Expansion Act in this Congress were right when we said steel-plant expansion was vital to the future of this Nation. We are getting it now, too little and too late.

Mr. Strout's article should make interesting reading for those in Congress who saw something "socialistic" about building enough steel plants to take care of our national needs in both peace and war. The article follows:

OH FOR THOSE STEEL STAND-BY PLANTS—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—President Truman has been issuing 6-month economic reports to Congress now for over 3 years, and Congress sometimes seems to take real delight in knocking his proposals on the head.

Mr. Truman objected to the killing of OPA. Congress killed it. Mr. Truman said prices would soar. His opponents said: "Not so." The anti-OPA sentiment whipped up became so strong, and the unpopularity of continued curbs on civilian buying so intense that they affected the 1946 congressional election where Mr. Truman's party lost control of the House.

Prices soared as Mr. Truman predicted. His Council of Economic Advisers in their January, 1948, statement reported: "The abolition of OPA (was followed) * * * by the sharp rise of wholesale prices between June and December, 1946. This was at the annual rate of almost 50 percent, one of the steepest rises ever recorded. Consumers prices rose at an annual rate of 30 percent."

Then again, Mr. Truman repeatedly opposed tax reduction. The excess-profits tax had been removed when the war ended and corporation profits were soaring. The economic report of January, 1948, mentioned that corporate profits had reached "a new peak" in 1947; the report a year later again noted that corporate profits for 1948 had "surpassed all previous records." Mr. Truman argued that some of the profits should be skimmed off to pay the cost of the war and that the budget was not too solidly balanced anyway.

Congress went ahead and cut taxes. It overrode a Presidential veto the third try. The tax cut was about $5,000,000,000 at a time of heavy inflation, Mr. Truman commented in his July, 1949, report. He deplored the "present deficit" of the Treasury and attributed this to "the untimely tax reduction of $5,000,000,000 during the height of the inflation against which I so strongly advised."

Another field is steel. Almost from the start of the economic reports Mr. Truman and his Economic Advisers have had a running controversy with the steel industry. Repeatedly the administration has urged steel (1) not to increase prices; and (2) to expand production to prevent a bottleneck for American industry, of which it is the mainspring. On the bottleneck thesis, the CEA was recommending substantial increases in the output of such basic commodities as steel in January 1948.

Again in its July 1948 report the CEA mentioned the shortages which the national defense program will in due course accentuate and mentioned that steel is another case in point.

Mr. Truman went so far in his January 1949 state of the Union message to Congress as to ask priorities and allocations for key materials in short supply. Specifically he urged an immediate study of the adequacy of production facilities for materials in critically short supply, such as steel. He wound up with the proposal that Government loans be made available if found to be needed to relieve such shortages, and with the unprecedented recommendation that, in extreme circumstances, the Government itself should engage in the construction of such facilities directly if action by private industry fails to meet our needs.

In his simultaneous 1949 economic report, Mr. Truman declared, "There are shortages of supply in certain critical areas which are so serious as to impede maximum production * * * and to limit programs related to national security."

Did Congress grant Mr. Truman's recommendations? No. No study of production facilities was made, and the unprecedented proposal to set up stand-by steel plants was roundly denounced as socialistic, which in a sense it was. Such stand-by plants would, of course, be of prime military advantage today.

Fortunately, the steel industry did expand its own facilities to some degree. And shortly after the Korean outbreak the big industry announced, January 19, a great billion-dollar steel-expansion program. This will be completed toward the end of 1952, which will be fine if the Russians are willing to wait. One difficulty is that it takes steel to expand steel. The steel expansion program will compete for steel with the armed forces and civilians in the emergency scramble.

Thirty Days To Save the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune of July 21, 1950, contained an article by Dr. Peter Viereck, of Mount Holyoke College, urging a specific warning by the President and Congress that the United States will fight if Yugoslavia or west Berlin is invaded.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that Communist aggression at these two points and others too would be resisted by the United States and the United Nations with all their resources and that a united America would support such action, fully understanding that the result would be total war. Dr. Viereck's article contributes importantly to the clarification of the issues. Its full text is set out below, followed by an editorial comment on the article which appeared in the same issue of the New York Herald Tribune:

THIRTY DAYS TO SAVE THE PEACE—EUROPE IS THE REAL WAR AIM OF THE SOVIET-SPONSORED INVASION OF SOUTH KOREA

(By Peter Viereck)

Europe is the real war aim of the Soviet-sponsored invasion of South Korea. Korea has always been in the bag for Soviet Russia. A glance at the map shows that this tiny peninsula, off Communist China, would in any case be untenable to the West in case of war with the Communist world of Russia and China. It would always be easily overrun by the overwhelming Chinese manpower.

Then why should Russia bother antagonizing world opinion by unleashing its Korean war dogs for a prize already in the bag?

The answer is: The real prize is by no means in the bag. The real prize is Europe. The Korean war is a feint. In a feint boxers may lead with their left in order to score a knockout with their right. Soviet Russia is leading with its left in Asia to score a knockout with its right in Europe.

According to my working hypothesis, the Korean feint is planned, if successful, to lead a Soviet conquest of Yugoslavia, and of west Berlin before the end of 1950. If America, as Russia hopes, stands by and permits the Soviet conquest of Yugoslavia and Berlin with merely the usual note of protest, this would mean the Soviet conquest of Europe.

If, on the other hand, America does not idly stand by and does stop the Soviet conquest of Yugoslavia and Berlin with armed force, that would mean World War III. The lethal consequences of such a ghastly atomic war would destroy European civilization just as much as would European collaboration with Soviet invaders, no matter which side won.

In other words, once the Soviet attack on Yugoslavia or Berlin is already under way, the alternatives left us are both unthinkably horrible: (1) War or (2) abandonment of all Europe, the heart and source of our western civilization, to the total barbarism of the new Genghis Khan from the East. Peaceful submission to the Red army would not long save western Europe from a destruction equal to what war would bring. The mentality of free individualism and of ethical humaneness is what can never be tolerated by the Hitler-Stalin twins of totalitarianism.

In order to wipe out the mentality of individual freedom, it is not too fantastic to imagine all educated adults of France and Italy being herded in endless cattle cars to death or to the Siberian Arctic wastes. Then all western Europe would be resettled with millions of unfree hordes from, say, Uzbekistan or Soviet Mongolia, to whom the words "Shakespeare," "Dante," "Bill of Rights"—in short, "Europe"—would mean absolutely nothing. The spark of freedom cherished over the centuries from ancient Athens to our day, and preserved in World War II from the terrors of Hitler, would thus succumb after 2,500 years to Hitler's ex-ally and political twin in the East.

These words sound alarmist. But it is the facts themselves that are alarming. Had we been more alarmist about Hitler, America might have stopped him sooner and with less bloodshed. Once upon a time anyone who predicted that Hitler meant war and atrocities was accused by the ostrich fringe of being hysterical. It is the ostriches who were proved hysterical—hysterically escapist—when Hitler did bring a bigger war and bigger atrocities than the wildest alarmists predicted. Similarly, in the case of predicting Soviet war plans and atrocities, the ostriches again are calling the alarmists hysterical. Let us hope the poor ostriches are right this time. Logic and a study of the Kremlin mentality sustain the alarmist position. Let us hope this position proves wrong; but let us meanwhile keep our powder dry.

Why is it that attempts at winning Soviet friendship are doomed from the start? Why the failure of every such attempt, no matter how sincere and generous? Why our failure to win reciprocal good will with lend-lease, the postwar United Nations Rehabilitation Relief Administration relief to the Ukraine, the concessions at Yalta, all our earnest acts of sympathy for the Russian people that Byrnes described in Speaking Frankly? Why was Trygve Lie, who took the Soviet position on admitting Communist China, denounced on July 8 as a capitalist warmonger by the very government he was in effect appeasing? There is one answer to all these questions. It is the same reason that Henry Wallace would have been denounced by the Soviets as a capitalist warmonger if fate had made him President in 1945 instead of Truman and if Wallace had then tried out his friendship program. The answer is that friendly relations with America and the democratic west are the one thing that the Soviet ruling class can under no circumstances afford.

The friendlier the western wooing, as even pro-Communist American idealists are learning, the ruder the Soviet rebuffs. Russia's anti-Socialist National Bolshevist ruling class cannot afford friendly relations abroad any more than can any exploiting and power-monopolizing despotism, whose slaves are forbidden to strike and are ruled by the triple-lashed knout of secret police, propaganda, and forced labor. Since time immemorial, any such despotic bureaucracy can keep its slaves drugged only by inciting to the point of paranoia their fear of an encircling, persecuting enemy. So long as this fear remains, the masses will not revolt against the class-line system of palaces for the rulers and five-in-a-room for the masses; an enormous surplus value of profits for bureaucrats (a relatively higher percentage of profits than in capitalistic America), with no consumer goods for the masses; class differences vaster in terms of economic security than in any western country, capitalist or Socialist.

The escapist voices continue to plead, sincerely enough, "Why cannot we somehow by some new concession or by some new direct conversation, improve Russian-American relations?" The answer continues to be: The Russian ruling class cannot risk improving relations, lest it lose the imaginary plotting enemy who keeps it in power. In short, the democratic Americans are Stalin's non-Aryans. German fascism needed an innocent Jewish scapegoat as an outlet for the propaganda-incited hate and paranoia which keeps fascism in power.

Yet if the Soviet rulers cannot afford friendly foreign relations, they probably cannot afford war either. Whenever possible, they will seek their objectives by means short of a world war. Here they differ from Hitler. They are more realistic, more slow moving, more cautious and calculating. They are prejudiced in favor of going on living, just as we are. And here is the real hope for peace. Their aim, in which they have succeeded brilliantly, is a middle stage which equally avoids peace and a major hot war. They will perpetrate a Pearl Harbor only if it does not destroy them also. That is, only if we continue to be so vacillating and so scandalously disarmed.

Since the alternatives of war or appeasement are equally suicidal to the West, is there any solution to the problem of Soviet mobilization against Yugoslavia and Berlin? There is a peace solution, but it takes a speed and decisiveness such as America has rarely shown so far. The solution is for America immediately—not in 3 months but in these crucial 30 days—to announce that we will fight if Yugoslavia or West Berlin are invaded.

Our justified opposition to aggression against Yugoslavia does not imply our ideological approval of the Tito dictatorship, any more than democracy's justified sympathies with Ethiopia against Italian aggression in the thirties implied ideological approval of the undemocratic Haile Selassie monarchy. The point is that the collective security of UN must preserve peace by halting aggression against any nation whatever, even when it is governed by so despotic and antidemocrat as Tito.

Once Soviet troops have actually entered Yugoslavia or Berlin, our announcement of protection will be too late. At such a time our protection would mean war, as Soviet troops would be unlikely to withdraw without firing a shot. But, if our announcement precedes any Soviet invasion (and hence the need for speed), then probably such a Soviet invasion will never take place; war will be averted. Had mighty America backed England in announcing full military protection of Poland in August 1939 Hitler would probably not have struck in September 1939 and World War II would have been averted. Similarly atomic war, the horrors of which are by now apparent to any one except maniacs, can be averted by America's calculated risk of announcing an absolutely unambiguous guaranty of Yugoslavia and Berlin. To this guaranty, threatened Iran should be added also, to complete our peace cordon.

Such an announcement, accompanied by the decree of an American national emergency which will activate it, will solve the short-range, immediate, specific war danger. Meanwhile, for the long-range general dangers, these negative and material steps should be accompanied by a positive and ethical mobilization of the conscience of mankind, under the banner of that exciting, really meaningful democracy which only a sincerely practiced world brotherhood can provide.

To my proposal about Yugoslavia, it may be objected that UN, like the League before it, has in any case outlawed aggression against its members and that America has already condemned Russian expansion in general. But it is precisely such vague generalities and pious ambiguous platitudes that failed to prevent war in the past and failed to prevent the Korean invasion. What is needed is America's specific, immediate stand on the specific, immediate danger points.

Such an announcement, which would serve the interests of the peace-loving common people of Russia, would have no weight unless Russia's non-peace-loving ruling class knows we really mean it. A mere announcement by the President or Secretary of State does not prove a united America means it. As in the case of our Atlantic Pact, both Houses of Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike, must pass such a statement in overwhelming unison (no longer divided by those irresponsible suspicion mongers who unwittingly serve communism by calling everybody else a Red). If this happens, and happens not with our usual slowness but within approximately the next 30 days, then these will be the 30 days that unshook the world. These will be 30 days that restore the hope of peace to war-excruciated humanity.

Point of No Return

Elsewhere on this page appears an article by Dr. Peter Viereck, urging that a specific warning, by joint action of the President and Congress, be given the Soviet Union to forestall any new aggressive moves in Europe. It is printed here as a contribution to a discussion which is of paramount importance to the world. What, precisely, is the point of no return on Russia's crabwise progress toward a new global war? Where is the line across which the Communists cannot move their armies without precipitating a catastrophe for humanity? Can the United States avert, by more solemn and explicit declarations, the drift toward chaos?

It is clear that piecemeal war cannot continue indefinitely. Large portions of the world are already united to resist aggression in the regions covered by the Atlantic and American Defense Pacts. Western Berlin has been repeatedly declared (despite Dr. Viereck's concern) out of bounds to the Russians; any move there would be resisted automatically by the Allied troops on the spot—and that would mean war. And, in a more general sense, President Truman's statement to Congress—which was made after Dr. Viereck's communication was written—greatly extends the area in which local adventures could lead to unrestricted war. "I am sure," said the President, "that

those who have it in their power to unleash or withhold acts of armed aggression must realize that new recourse to aggression in the world today might well strain to the breaking point the fabric of world peace."

In the conventional language of diplomacy, the meaning of these words is unmistakable. What is more, there is the example of Korea to give them point. Without formal guaranties, the United States and the United Nations intervened there with speed and growing efficiency against the troops of a Russian satellite. Mr. Truman's warning on Wednesday was addressed to the Kremlin itself—and if the reaction of Europe is any criterion, the Kremlin can be under no illusions as to its gravity. The Politburo has received notice that the Russians cannot count indefinitely on waging "peripheral wars," with, in Senator LODGE's words, "no cost in manpower to themselves." The precise point of no return is not set down in so many words, but Russia is very near to it now. "The free world has made it clear, through the United Nations," Mr. Truman said, "that lawless aggression will be met with force. This is the significance of Korea—and it is a significance whose importance cannot be overestimated."

Economic Stabilization Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a letter sent on July 30 by the Honorable Chester Bowles, Governor of Connecticut, to Senator MAYBANK, proposing an economic stabilization program to avoid complete price and wage controls in the present situation.

The letter follows:

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D. C.:

I understand that the Banking and Currency Committee is considering on Monday afternoon, legislation dealing with prices and allocations. I am taking the liberty of writing to you in advance of this meeting.

I am deeply concerned, as I know you must be, by the rapid increase in prices since the fighting began in Korea. In my own State of Connecticut, as in other parts of the country, housewives and businessmen are already feeling the pinch of rising costs of food and many other basic commodities.

I know of no valid reason for these drastic price increases. But I do know that this situation demands action—immediate, bold, and nonpolitical.

The upward price trend is clearly a warning signal to all who remember the early days of World War II and our even more recent experience when price controls were prematurely abandoned in 1946. Unless that trend is reversed, and quickly, we will soon find ourselves faced with the familiar inflationary pattern with prices and wages chasing each other upward in an ever-rising spiral.

If we fail to stop this vicious pattern, the great bulk of our people will face a savage cut in their living standards, our defense bill and other Government costs will be needlessly multiplied, production efficiency will drop, and there may develop deep resentment on the part of millions of our people at a time when, above all others, we must work and pull together.

Many sincere people who are keenly aware of the explosiveness of the present situation believe that there is only one answer. They propose that we place our entire economy under complete control at once with manpower controls, rationing, and a direct freeze of wages and prices.

These people may be correct in their conviction that prices cannot be kept down in the face of the present inflationary pressure, without applying broad controls. Certainly if the present mobilization program is expanded there will be no other alternative.

But the establishment of a regimented economy should be accepted only as a last resort. Because I know so intimately the many inevitable hardships, red tape and inequities that are involved, I believe that we should not adopt this sweeping solution until we have made a vigorous and genuine effort to keep our economy in balance largely through organized voluntary action.

If the voluntary approach is to have a reasonable chance of success, however, we must devise strong incentives for every individual, business and labor group to roll back prices which have already risen and to refrain from future increases.

The program I have in mind calls for immediate but limited actions in specific areas of our economy where the price problem is particularly acute.

Following these immediate emergency actions it then places the issue of all-out controls squarely up to the American people by providing the incentives and the machinery for the most determined possible voluntary price control effort.

If voluntary actions fail, the program which I shall propose will not leave us unprotected and scrambling to catch up. On the contrary, we will be fully equipped to protect our people from rising prices by more drastic means. If this ultimate step should become necessary, we will at least have the satisfaction of knowing that we have not needlessly assumed the burden of all-out controls.

Briefly, I recommend that the Congress enact into law the following four-point program:

POINT I. SELECTIVE CONTROL OF NONCONSUMER PRICES

Immediate authority for the President to roll back to June 15 levels the wholesale or producer prices of basic commodities like steel, feed grains, lead, copper, zinc, and building materials. The President would be authorized to take these steps at once.

This particular authority would not include any immediate control over the prices consumers pay in the store. It would provide a limited economic weapon which can be used where needed in support of voluntary efforts to keep prices down.

POINT II. PRIORITIES AND ALLOCATION

The President should be given, in line with his request, full authority to allocate scarce materials in industrial production and to impose direct production controls whenever necessary for the mobilization effort or for the national welfare. In such industries as steel, metal-working and building, such allocations are already essential to full production.

In the construction industry, first priority must obviously go to the expansion of plants to produce more goods for the Armed Forces and for consumer use. Close behind, however, must come our pressing needs for more houses and for expanded schools and institutional facilities.

Where building materials are scarce, nonessential construction must give way to these high priority building needs. We cannot permit the defense emergency to be used as an excuse for turning our backs on these urgent requirements.

In addition, authority should be granted to the Commodity Credit Corporation to release gradually supplies of food held in storage, where necessary to maintain a level of food prices which will be equitable to farmers and consumers alike.

POINT III. A VOLUNTARY PRICE-CONTROL ORGANIZATION

The Congress should authorize immediately, in one of the existing Federal agencies or elsewhere in the Government, an organization, adequately staffed, to mobilize, direct, and coordinate our voluntary efforts to bring general prices in line at all levels—producer, wholesale, and retail.

This organization should be headed by leaders in business and labor who, I am sure, could be quickly recruited on an emergency volunteer basis. They must be men in whom businessmen and workers as well as the public have complete trust and confidence.

In the business field, for instance, I am confident that we could get the full cooperation of the 700 OPA price advisory boards set up during the war. These boards cover every industry in the country. Their members are fully awake to the necessity of keeping our economy on an even keel. They would be of inestimable value in any voluntary price-control effort.

Conferences should be held at once with the leaders of those industries in which prices have risen since the outbreak of the Korean fighting or in which price rises threaten in the future. This voluntary program should have the support of full subpena and investigating power so that the complete facts about cases of profiteering can be dug out and presented to the public.

POINT IV. THE "TEETH" BEHIND VOLUNTARY PRICE CONTROL

We cannot, however, depend on a voluntary program standing alone. Even the most determined voluntary effort to control prices cannot succeed without the clearest and most pressing incentive to every businessman, worker, and housewife.

I recommend therefore that the Congress enact immediately a new kind of stand-by price-control law which will provide the "teeth" which are essential to the success of our voluntary program. In addition, it will provide us with the machinery to move swiftly to roll back prices by law if the voluntary effect should fail.

This stand-by price-control law should provide that if at any time after 60 days following the passage of the act the consumer-price level as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics rises—say 5 percent above the level of June 15, 1950—a complete program of economic controls would automatically go into effect. This program would include:

1. A return of all prices, including consumer prices, to the level of June 15, 1950. Adjustments above that level should be strictly limited to special cases.

2. Whatever wage controls may be necessary to maintain these prices.

3. Authority to ration consumer commodities in short supply. In my opinion, based on several years of wartime experience, consumer rationing is definitely not needed now. I doubt that it will become necessary in the future unless our military requirements approach those of World War II.

4. Authority to allocate manpower. Again this is only a last-ditch possibility.

5. An excess-profits tax, retroactive to July 1, 1950, with rates high enough to eliminate all profiteering.

The program outlined above, in my judgment, provides our best hope of avoiding complete price and wage controls in the present situation. Although it contains some essential immediate controls, it is basically a voluntary system with teeth.

It presents a clear opportunity to private business and organized labor to avoid the imposition of direct price and wage controls, and the adoption of stiff taxes on excessive profits.

When government, under this program, asks an industry not to raise prices it will be more than a pious prayer. When government asks labor to keep its wage demands compatible with the existing price structure, it will not be an idle gesture.

This program draws a clear line beyond which we will not permit rising prices to pass. We will be equipped with a complete arsenal of tested economic weapons to protect our people from unreasonable price increases.

Unless it becomes necessary to increase the present strain on our economy still further by additional mobilization, there is a reasonable chance that this voluntary effort will succeed.

If for any reason it fails and all-out controls become necessary, the terms upon which such controls and taxes will go into effect will be definite and understandable to every man and woman in America.

As Governor of Connecticut I have had the opportunity to see at first hand the intolerable hardship which higher prices have already inflicted upon our families. I have talked to housewives, retailers, businessmen, and many others. They are united in looking to the Congress for bold leadership in providing effective answers to the present situation.

I earnestly hope that such action will be forthcoming.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Governor.

A European View of the President's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's message to Congress recently concerning the aggression in Korea and the task for the United States and the free world has evoked widespread approval in Europe. His message was well understood by the European peoples and has made a lasting impression on them concerning American aims and American determination.

Characteristic of European reaction to the President's message is the article which appeared in the Paris newspaper Le Figaro, on July 22. A translation of that article was published in the Washington Post on July 30. I feel certain that my colleagues will want to read this brief article which follows:

A FRENCH VIEW—GRAVE WORDS WERE SPOKEN SO SIMPLY

(By Francois Mauriac)

Everything has been said about President Truman's message, except perhaps that never have such grave words been spoken so simply. We have been impressed by the simple tone and by its text, the historical importance of which defies any comparison.

President Truman has understood that he had no need of convincing anybody. Totalitarian aggression, whether it be that of Hitler, of Mussolini, or of Stalin—there is no man of our lifetime who has not suffered from it in his own flesh and mind, who does not know its prodromes, its torturous ways, its outbursts, its bloody consequences. Anybody else but the American President may perhaps have given in to the demon of eloquence. I admire the fact that the Chief of one of the strongest empires of the world should say to the other: "You shall not go further," without raising his voice.

We shall now have to wait for the effects and envisage them all. There is, however, one (of these effects) which will be a happy one, and that depends on us and only on us. What would without doubt not have been achieved by great phrases full of wind, this message so sober and so grave will achieve perhaps: it will awaken France and, through her, Europe. Our apathy has sometimes seemed that of an old goat hypnotized by a python. Will the old goat move at last?

It is the intellectuals, and among them the best informed de omni re scibili et quibusdam aliis, who have caressed the idea of a neutral France and a neutral Europe in the world of Stalin, devourer of small nations, while they know that in the case of a brusque attack the French troops would be pushed around at the same time as the Anglo-Saxon armies, and while they know that the British Empire would enter the conflict at the first second and, consequently, the coasts of the Northern Sea and of the Atlantic would be the main objective to hold for both adversaries.

And, finally, it is again intellectuals among the Members of Parliament whom the thunderclap of Korea did not cause even to turn their heads, so busy were they with their personal and petty affairs. If we kept quiet at that moment, it is because indignation and mockery had been surpassed; it is because we had the feeling that it was a matter of the complicated game of a certain breed of animals subjected to the laws of their own species, as though no celestial power would have been capable of stopping these mosquitoes from hovering over this open abyss.

No cry, even the most pathetic, may have awakened us out of this slumber, but this message whispered in a half voice will awaken us; these simple words of President Truman, the most simple that have ever changed the course of human history.

Aunt Sylvia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tribute to a faithful nurse, daughter of slave parents, who gained the love of a whole community by her good works. This article appeared in the Herald, of Union Springs, Ala., on June 15, 1950:

"AUNT SYLVIA" CALLED HOME

The bells of the First Baptist Church (colored) in this city tolled with an unusual sadness on Sunday morning as they called their members to the funeral service for Sylvania Davie Johnson, known and loved throughout the community as "Aunt Sylvia."

She was among the early graduate nurses of Tuskegee Institute and rendered professional services in Union Springs, the vicinity and other places for more than 50 years. Records show that she actually nursed 2,025 infants of both races. Sylvania was born June 18, 1873, a daughter of George and Nancy Davie, both slaves, and by her precepts of deep spirituality, hard work, and good service made for herself a place of abiding love in the hearts of all who knew her. Few white homes there are in Union Springs in which she has not left the imprint of her great kindness, and her passing is mourned by many.

A beautiful funeral service was held in the church of which she had been a member since childhood, with the pastor, Rev. D. L. Motley, officiating, assisted by Rev. S. W. Wilson. Precious Lord, Take My Hand was sung with a spiritual pathos and harmony as only those of the colored race can render. The singing of this great spiritual was led by Rev. M. Davie with earnestness and emotion.

A tribute to the deceased as a citizen, Christian, and friend was paid by Mary Phillips. Floy Lee Crowley read a well-prepared obituary and spoke of her beautiful life. The minister, Reverend Motley, closed his eulogy by saying, "We live our lives as a tale that is told. Sylvania Davie Johnson's life was a story of unselfish devotion to the service of others."

Aunt Sylvia has a sister, Catherine Davie, now living and still serving. Many years ago they were paid a deserved tribute by Mrs. R. E. L. Cope, Jr., which was published in the Union Springs Herald. I quote for you two paragraphs from this which express so well the high regard in which they are held: "Aunt Sylvia and Aunt Catherine are as integral a part of this small southern town as the Confederate monument or the town council, and indeed they are more widely known and loved. They are extremely religious and their religion is the background of their service and philosophy. If there is such a place as a heaven with star-studded crowns as a reward for the righteous, then these two will be among the first to find their crowns and they will be bright with many stars."

The deceased is survived by a daughter, Mozelle Borders, of Detroit, Mich., in whose home she passed away on June 7, 1950; a sister, Catherine Davie; a brother, George Davie Comings; six nieces, seven nephews, and many other relatives of Union Springs. Interment followed the service in the Masonic Cemetery.

A floral blanket and many other beautiful flowers sent by friends of both races surrounded her bier. Pews were reserved in the church for her "Little Missus," who were there to pay their last respects.

Teamed for Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I present herewith a timely address entitled "Teamed for Defense" delivered by our former colleague, the Honorable Clifton A. Woodrum, on Armed Forces Day, May 20, 1950, at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va.

As an advocate of universal military training, this student of government calls upon our country for adequate national defense. I am pleased to have this

privilege to present Mr. Woodrum's views to the House:

TEAMED FOR DEFENSE

(By Clifton A. Woodrum)

My subject today is Teamed for Defense. It is an interesting theme and most timely. May I hasten to say that our defense team is a good team—a strong team—but not strong enough. There is a weak link—a tragically weak link, as I shall endeavor to point out to you.

THE TIME

This is another critical hour in the history of the world. There have been many other critical hours, but assuredly no period could have been more laden with momentous problems—problems economic, political, international, social—problems that challenge the faith, the ingenuity of those who love freedom, and labor for peace.

AMERICA FOR PEACE

America is a peace-loving Nation. There is no territory we wish to acquire. We have no enemies we wish to punish. All we require is to be permitted to live our own lives, and in our own way, according to our traditions and customs. Never in our long career have we waged aggressive war though many times have we been compelled to spend American lives and American dollars in defense of the principles we profess. In the cruel crucible of bloody war we have learned how costly it is to be unprepared. By heartbreaking experience we have learned that truly eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

THE AMERICAN PATTERN

In our conception of national preparedness we in America have developed quite a distinct and characteristic pattern. In times of peace we shut our eyes to actual world conditions; we seem to lapse into sort of a sentimental coma in which we love everybody, trust everybody, and drift out on the wings of idealism until the blast from some Pearl Harbor awakens and unifies us. We have done that consistently. After World War I we dismantled our Navy and demobilized our Army. We refused to see or hear what was happening until the crash of December 7, 1941. By the grace of God we had time then to prepare—although that preparation was costly in lives and dollars.

To a great extent we have followed that same pattern after the recent unpleasantness. Now, suddenly realizing the dangers of another conflict, we again feverishly set about rebuilding our Military Establishment.

IS WAR IMMINENT?

Are we about to get into another shooting war? How long will the cold war stay cold? Just what is the point where taut nerves and strained patience will break? I do not know the answer to these questions. Do you? I, for one, am not willing to gamble on the answer. Are you?

I must remember December 1941. Prior to December 7, the Lindberghs, the Wheelers, and countless others were shouting from the housetops that there was no danger of any war, that Hitler had no designs on America, and that all of the fuss being kicked up by the President and some of the Congress about preparedness was just hysteria—then came Pearl Harbor.

WHAT'S GOING ON, ANYWAY?

As Will Rogers once said: "All I know is what I read in the papers." The conflicting statements on international affairs nowadays leave me cold and in a state of utter confusion. For instance, Secretary of State Acheson recently said there will be no shooting war. What do we mean no shooting? The Russians have just shot down an American Navy plane. They say it was on a spy mission. A United States Congressman who is not given to irresponsible utterances has publicly declared that the American Navy has destroyed several Russian submarines engaged in spy activities. Naturally, no confirmation by our Department of Defense. So there you are.

In a public address in Washington on May 3, United States Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, Democrat, Maryland, chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, said:

"I doubt if the Russians want war now. I know we don't. But if you start shooting down planes, if you start sending hundreds of thousands of youths from the Russian to the western zone accidentally the powder keg may go off."

The press further quoted him as saying it will be remarkable if the United States and Russia can weather their disagreements without a conflagration.

Respecting our state of preparedness the news account of his address says:

"He painted a picture of sharp contrast between American and Russian preparedness. The United States, he said, has 8 divisions, Russia 100; we have no divisions in reserve, Russia has another 100; we are spending 6 or 7 percent of our total national income on defense. Russia is spending 25 percent of hers."

In line with what the Senator has said is the action of the House Armed Services Committee in unanimously reporting legislation to extend the Selective Service Act for 2 years, otherwise it expires June 24. However, nothing can be done under the act as reported by the committee until Congress declares an emergency. Therefore, insofar as actual preparedness is concerned the extension of the draft is practically nothing but a gesture. Again, I must remember the past. In the summer of 1941, 5 months before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, the life of the draft was extended in the House by a single vote.

Now, in contrast to all of this anxiety, I see by the papers that our President has spoken on the subject. The day after the Tydings speech, namely, May 5, the Washington Post has the following to say:

"President Truman, a self-styled optimist, is not alarmed over the world situation. He thinks there is less chance of a shooting war between the United States and Russia than there was 4 years ago. Accordingly, the defense budget will be smaller next year.

"He said at a news conference yesterday that he thought Senator TYDINGS (Democrat, Maryland) was unduly alarmed in a speech here Wednesday. TYDINGS, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, told the Rotary Club that it would be "remarkable" if the United States and Russia "can weather their disagreements without a conflagration."

So, I say, what's going on? As for me, I wish America to be prepared. And I want the world which includes any potential enemies, to know that we are prepared. Adequate preparation as I conceive it, means not only ships and planes and industrial power, but trained manpower.

If America is to be a potent force in pointing the way to peace—if our voice is to have authority, and our influence is to be stabilizing—we must be a strong nation. There is only one language the dictator understands and that is the language of strength.

THE TEAM

This team that we speak of today is composed of the several segments of our military establishments, namely, the regulars, or professionals of our land, sea, and air forces. These regulars are divided into combat components and a large segment devoted to training, administrative, and supply operations.

Next come the organized Reserves of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine, and Coast Guard, and other supporting units. These Reserves have periodic seasons of training.

The next line of our defense is our civilian population. Here may be found our research and technical components. This third line is indispensable—not only does it furnish technicians and industrial mobilization so necessary but it backs up our team with that faith and confidence—with that spirit of devotion and determination—without which our troops in the field could not hope to succeed.

THE NEGLECTED LINE OF DEFENSE

Now, there is yet another line of defense, without which our team will be under the very greater disadvantage, even if it can win in a future conflict. We, in America, have too long neglected this essential element of military strength. We have paid for our neglect in blood and lives. If we shall continue to blind our eyes and turn deaf ears, we shall imperil our ability to protect ourselves against those who would destroy us. I refer to our steadfast and persistent refusal to set up and maintain some appropriate system of universal military training. I am quite aware that the subject is controversial but I will say that after listening attentively to the pros and cons of arguments for weeks—a responsible committee of the House of Representatives seriously and deliberately recommended that such action be taken.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

I should now like very briefly for the record to refer to some proceedings in the House of Representatives. On March 8, 1944, Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, one of the great strong men of the Congress, from the Forty-first District of New York, introduced House Resolution 465. It provided for the appointment of a special committee to be known as the Committee on Postwar Military Policy. The resolution was passed unanimously in the House on the 28th of March 1944 and the Speaker set up a committee of 22 Members containing the ranking Members on the House Committee on Military and Naval Affairs as well as members from related committees. I had the honor of being chosen chairman of this committee. The committee conducted hearings from time to time until December 12, 1945, when it made its final report. It reported on a single department of armed services, research and development, supplies, and materials, and universal military training. These records are, of course, a part of the permanent archives of the House of Representatives. The part of these proceedings to which I desire to direct your special attention are the hearings on universal military training. These hearings were conducted in June 1945 and the report was filed in the House of Representatives on July 5, 1945 (Rept. No. 857, 79th Cong., 1st sess.).

During the course of these hearings there appeared before our committee a great array of witnesses who represented practically every segment of the social, business, and professional life of America. There also appeared all of the leading officials of our armed services and Department of State. There was much testimony pro and con. Generally speaking, the educators were opposed to the idea. They largely feared that the school life of the young men would be interrupted; that to interrupt at this period would take them out of school and that they would not very likely be interested in returning after a period of a year's military service. I might add here, parenthetically, that in this regard our educators were in for a big surprise. One of the marvels of the time has been that the American soldiers after the war embraced the opportunity given them by the Government to return to school and complete their education. Almost without exception our colleges and institutions of learning bear testimony to the fine record and the serious purpose of these young soldiers.

Many of our religious leaders opposed the idea of universal military training; labor unions without exception were opposed and there were a few isolated cases of opposition

from veterans' organizations. But, I will say that the preponderance of the evidence was favorable.

On the affirmative side of the question, there appeared the Secretary of State, the Chief of Staff, the commanding general of the European Theater and without exception every commanding officer of the armed services upon whom we were relying to bring victory to American arms. I wish time permitted a detailed analysis of these convincing statements. The record contains many strong statements of splendid thoughtful people, who advocated this peacetime program. But I shall have to content myself upon this occasion with giving quotations to you very briefly from five witnesses. Their names, their stations, their records will cause you, I am sure, to pay heed to their advice.

HENRY L. STIMSON

First and foremost I wish to call on the then Secretary of State, Henry L. Stimson. Perhaps no other citizen in America has had the unique experience of this distinguished man. He was Secretary of War from 1911 to 1913 in the Cabinet of President Taft; he was Secretary of State from 1929 to 1933 in the Cabinet of President Hoover. He was again Secretary of War under President Roosevelt in 1945, and at the time of these hearings. In addition to these Cabinet positions he had served in many capacities of a highly confidential nature under various administrations. I quote to you briefly from the statement given before our committee by Mr. Stimson:

"I believe that a necessary foundation on which to build the security of the United States is a system of universal military training. And in saying this I intend the broadest meaning of the term 'security.' I mean not merely protection against the physical invasion of our territory. I mean the security which goes with the strong and tested character of the citizenship of a Nation, giving to that Nation a leadership among the peoples of the world and a well-founded respect for it on their part which swells its power and influence.

"This is not a new belief with me. It is a deep conviction which I as an individual American citizen have held for many years of a pretty long life. From 1914 to 1917, the 3 years of uncertainty and anxiety which preceded our entry into the First World War, I was constantly engaged, in company with and under the leadership of those great American citizens, Theodore Roosevelt and Leonard Wood, in traveling throughout this country and explaining to a reluctant people the imperative need of preparedness for the danger of the great war which we believed was coming to our Nation, and explaining the necessity of universal training of our young men as a primary part of that preparedness.

"In the three decades since that time my convictions have been intensified by my own experience in public affairs and by the ominous course of world events. And so again speaking simply as an American citizen, I restate here my earnest belief that unless we are now willing to adopt a permanent program of universal military training, we shall be gambling with the future security of our national inheritance."

JAMES V. FORRESTAL

The late James V. Forrestal, then just appointed Secretary of the Navy, appeared and advocated the system.

GEN. GEORGE MARSHALL

The next witness I wish to call is a man who is loved and appreciated by all Americans for his great service to his country, Gen. George Marshall. At the time of this hearing he was Chief of Staff. Later, as you know, he became Secretary of State. Here is what General Marshall had to say on the subject of universal military training.

"A large standing Army is not an acceptable solution for three reasons: Its cost would be prohibitive; the necessary men to fill its ranks could not be hired in time of peace; and it would be repugnant to the American people. Therefore some other solution must be found.

"To support our determination to maintain the peace, the world must recognize our military power as realistic and not as a remote potential.

"Whatever military system we plan we must have a thorough understanding of the practicability of obtaining the annual appropriations necessary.

"I know of no system other than universal military training that will meet the requirements I have just outlined, together with an effective program for industrial mobilization and continuous scientific research.

DR. DOUGLAS SOUTHALL FREEMAN

Let us leave the military at this point and turn to a great historian. One of our most impressive witnesses was Dr. Douglas Southall Freeman, Pulitzer prize winner, military historian and then editor of the Richmond (Va.) News Leader. I quote from Dr. Freeman:

"In such matters as this, where literally the life and liberty of America are at stake, anyone who dogmatizes is by that very fact discredited. The most that anyone can hope to do is to study the record, to integrate dispassionately the conclusions he draws from it, and at the end, to voice an opinion. If, in this spirit, I were asked what lesson, above all others, the examination of American military history makes clear, I would say it is, in my opinion, this: The old cycle of disarmament, negligence, and frenzied preparation for war has cost our Nation unreckonable billions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of lives; compulsory military service, properly administered, has been proved to be the surest, most democratic, and most economical system of essential national defense."

DR. DANIEL A. POLING

Many of our religious leaders opposed the idea of universal military training. There were, however, notable and outstanding exceptions. I wish to quote now from a gentleman who is, in my judgment, one of the most beloved Protestant religious leaders in America. I refer to Dr. Daniel A. Poling, editor of the Christian Herald, president of the World's Christian Endeavor Union and former minister of the Baptist Temple in Philadelphia. Dr. Poling is the author of the new popular inspirational book, "Faith Is Power—For You." Following is a quotation from Dr. Poling's statement before the committee:

"I speak today as an American citizen and as editor of the Christian Herald, but in no other representative capacity.

"I believe in the principle of universal military training because I believe in universal participation in government and because I believe that without universal participation, democratic government cannot survive. I believe in universal military training because I believe that all citizens and future citizens should enjoy the privileges accorded under free government, and also participate in the duties of free government, duties which must be accepted and fulfilled if the privileges are to continue. Also, I believe in universal military training because I believe that American youth should receive the maximum physical, mental, and moral preparation for life and citizenship.

"Universal military training is not universal military service. It is not peacetime conscription and it is not a complete economic, educational, or social panacea. Universal military training is not the entrance to utopia but, gentlemen of the committee, I believe that universal training will make our young men physically stronger and healthier, morally more self-reliant and better disciplined, socially more dependable, and that it will add to their over-all stature.

"Observation and experience justify me in saying that it will help mature the emotional life of youth and also that it will help youth find himself in the field of a life vocation. I believe that it will teach youth to be tolerant, and give youth an appreciation of other racial and religious cultures than his own. I have watched men of all faiths and racial strains under all circumstances of armed conflict, and I believe that universal training will help give to America in the peace what our united services have given to us in the war—a united Nation."

I wish time permitted me to read every word of Dr. Poling's great statement, but in addition to what I have quoted let me say this to you that in Dr. Poling's statement there is much more than the printed word. Not only did Dr. Poling give of his time and talent during the war in visiting our battle fronts, oftentimes under fire, but he made a supreme sacrifice. He gave to the cause a fine son who was a Protestant chaplain and who voluntarily gave his life to save the life of an unknown unidentified soldier. I will tell you more about that in just a moment.

THE COMMITTEE REPORT

I have given you a very brief glimpse of some of the testimony heard by the Committee on Postwar Military Policy on the subject of universal military training.

The committee after serious deliberations filed on July 5, 1945, its report (Rept. 857, 79th Cong., 1st sess.). I quote a few paragraphs from the report.

In the light of these hearings and of the deliberations by its members on this subject, the committee deems the following propositions to be true:

1. The eminent position of the United States in the family of nations is supported by her balanced elements of greatness, one of which is commensurate military power.

2. The future security of the United States, as a sovereign Nation, depends upon the continuing willingness and ability of our people to protect, by force if necessary, the principles and ideals which inspired the formation of the World Security Organization.

3. Because the success of the World Security Organization will depend upon the continuing efforts and abilities of the member nations to discharge the obligations jointly and mutually undertaken in the United Nations Charter, a retrogression by the United States to her previous state of military unpreparedness would defeat the objects and purposes of peace-loving peoples throughout the world.

4. The retention by the United States of a degree of military power, in being or in reserve, adequate to her needs depends upon several component factors, an indispensable one of which is an alert and trained citizenry capable of prompt mobilization to meet and deal with any national or international emergency.

5. It is traditional in the United States that in time of peace our regular or standing Armed Forces are reduced to a minimum; that in time of emergency our ablebodied citizens of military age join with the Regular forces in bearing arms in the preservation of the national security. This tradition should be maintained and preserved.

6. Future military and naval operations, whether they are to be employed in the defense of the Nation against aggression or in the implementation by force of the decisions of the World Security Organization, cannot be conducted effectively by raw recruits or by partially trained men. In view of the technological advances in methods of warfare and of the intricacy of the weapons now in use and to be used, those who will be subject to military service in the future will

require thorough training in order to be able to serve their country well and with a reasonable chance of survival.

7. There is no sound or safe basis for assuming that, before a future aggressor strikes, the United States will be given warning and an adequate interval to train her men and build up her military readiness. Yet the safeguarding of world security, if not the survival of the Nation, may well depend on prompt and successful participation by the United States in large-scale military and naval operations.

8. It is not feasible to rest the future security of the United States upon a large standing armed force; its cost would be prohibitive, the necessary men to fill its ranks could not be hired in time of peace, and it would be repugnant to the American people. "A trained citizenry is only one of several elements necessary to a respectable military posture for our Nation in the postwar period. A program of continuing scientific research and development, recommended by this committee on May 2, 1945, is likewise a vital element. A state of convertibility of our vast industrial machine to military production should be preserved. We must have a highly trained regular armed force, minimum in size but with modern mobile strength on the ground, on the sea, and in the air. Yet, without minimizing the importance of any of these elements, this committee is convinced that the plan for giving adequate military training to all citizens is perhaps the most vital element of all."

Thus we see that 5 years ago, the Congress was urged to take action. Since then, the armed services have again expressed their concern, and the President has asked for action. To date, there has been no action on the question of a universal military training program.

DISCIPLINE-TRAINING

America has fought all of its wars with untrained or half-trained soldiers and in every war thousands of these young men have needlessly died because they were not taught how to live. Mothers have lost sons forever because they were unwilling to spare them for a few months of rudimentary training in peace time. America's unwillingness to prepare itself for war has always resulted in its soldiers being required to learn to fight by fighting. And always the primary essential to survival in battle is discipline. Discipline is accepted because it is understood—but too often it is neglected as we rush to arms unprepared.

Now, I wish to tell you a little story and by that story I will demonstrate to you more forcefully than any eloquence at my command the necessity for peace-time training.

THE DORCHESTER

On February 3, 1943, at the height of the war, the American troop transport *Dorchester* was sailing through icy waters in the battle area. There were four chaplains aboard—a Catholic, a Jew, and two Protestants. They moved among the men, consoling, quieting and encouraging them. An enemy torpedo found a vital spot in the transport and it began to sink.

On every transport one supposedly inflexible requirement was that every man must wear his life belt at all times unless asleep and then it was to be with him in his bunk. It was an order which always required unceasing vigilance in enforcement among the hastily and inadequately trained officers and men of the war-time Army. More properly trained men know how to obey orders and do obey them. Not always so with the war-time recruits. When the ship began to sink the chaplains opened the chests containing the life belts and passed them to the men who had none—to the men who had not obeyed orders. When the box was empty, they removed their own life belts and gave them to four soldiers. When the ship plunged under the sea the four heroic chaplains were seen standing on the forecastle, their arms linked and their voices joined in prayer. One of the Protestant chaplains was a son of Dr. Poling.

This, I think, is one of the most gallant acts of the last war—they gave their lives for four of their soldier boys. It has never been revealed who the four men were who were saved by this heroic act of the chaplains but it is safe to assume had they been trained soldiers knowing the first rudiments of military service, namely to obey orders, they would have been wearing their life belts and the *Dorchester* chaplains would not have been sacrificed.

THE MESSAGE

My message, ladies and gentlemen, is a plea for a strong, virile, America.

The Situation in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address over the Columbia Broadcasting System, July 30, 1950:

Mr. CRONKITE. And now for an analysis of the news, we take you to CBS Tokyo, Bill Costello reporting.

Mr. COSTELLO. This is a report on what I saw and heard last week in Korea. It does not pretend to be authoritative nor complete, but it represents as honestly as possible one reporter's composite impression of an American dilemma which is just as puzzling to the soldier in the field as it is to the plain citizen at home. It may contain some disagreeable surprises. For example, it would be wrong to omit the remark of a senior officer who said soberly: "There are not enough divisions in the United States Army today to win a clear-cut victory in Korea." Well, that officer may be wrong. In the bitterness and humiliation of retreat he may be exaggerating, but more and more observers are coming to a similar conclusion, and if they are right the President's mobilization program had better produce more fighting men, quickly, or the United States may find itself sandbagged in a dark alley.

The most depressing impression of all is that the United States was in no way, militarily, politically, or intellectually, prepared for this or any other war. We've been spending $14,000,000,000 a year and we thought we were buying some tolerable measure of security. In reality we were supporting the dead weight of moth-balled equipment, ground installations in all parts of the world and a top-heavy housekeeping force. The number of real fighting men ready for quick action had been cut to the bone. That was an error of judgment more political than military. And where political decisions are involved, it is the American voter, ultimately, who is responsible. That's why the Korean war is being recognized today as a matter of paramount significance not only to potential draftees but to every American who votes policymakers into office. What has happened in Korea might conceivably happen again in Indochina, next week or next month.

We were not even prepared in so elementary a subject as human geography for a war in Korea. I discovered that sitting on a little knoll overlooking a new airstrip, where the rumble of bulldozers mingled with the roar of fighters taking off on bombing sorties. Seeing all this activity, I asked the construction officer whether he found it possible to use the services of Korean workmen. He gestured toward one corner of the field. "We have a few," he said, "but we keep them in small groups, with a guard for every group. We don't know whom to trust." Surely, there is something incongruous in the fact that the United States has had troops and an advisory mission in Korea for more than 4 years; yet we have learned so little about the people in the south, that in a crisis we cannot distinguish friend from foe.

There's a school of thought which blandly dismisses all Asiatics as nonpolitical. They say, "Koreans have no convictions; they will always be on the side of the conqueror, the man with the most power." Before you accept that statement, ask yourself; which side in Korea is receiving support from guerrilla bands? The communiques will tell you there are Communist guerrillas in the south, but no one has ever heard mention of a republican guerrilla in the north. Why are there no republican guerrillas? There must be a reason. And the first to suggest itself is that no one has enough faith in the republican government of Syngman Rhee to consider it worth risking his neck in enemy territory. In other words, Koreans and all other Asiatics do have political convictions when they are cleverly appealed to. The fact is we don't understand the Korean for whom the GI's are risking and sacrificing their lives. Perhaps we have tried to, but we have not succeeded.

I ran across half a dozen illustrations of our predicament. There was the officer who tried to name for me half a dozen really competent officers in the South Korean Army. He mentioned three or four, and finally burst out: "Of course, we know of other good officers, men who are competent in a military sense, but some of them are so cruel that no American could recommend them as commanders."

On another occasion I met an officer who had been assigned as military adviser to a Korean regiment. I noticed his hands were swollen—and I asked why. He said, "It embarrasses me to tell you this, but the truth is my hands were bruised in beating up a Korean major and a captain who refused to take proper care of their men. They tried to run out and abandon their outfits." This officer was actually incredulous at his own conduct. It baffled him to know why he had to use force against one of his own allies to hammer home a moral issue.

On another occasion, 2 weeks ago, a Korean battalion commander was found sleeping under a bridge, with a squad guarding him. At that very moment his battalion was heavily engaged with the enemy a few miles up the road and was in disorderly retreat. To the American on the scene, it was utterly incomprehensible that a responsible officer could be so grossly negligent of his men and so apparently indifferent to the fate of the war effort.

Nor is it only the South Korean officers who lack moral fiber. Last week on a hospital train carrying American wounded back from the front, a Korean youth was ostensibly lending a friendly hand as he loafed about. Suddenly the youth seized the canteen and cartridge belt of a wounded GI and raced from the car. Americans who witnessed his action were aghast at the moral degeneration which could steal water from a wounded soldier.

It is a curious fact, however, that notwithstanding these and hundreds of similar disillusionments, there is an almost universal feeling among our troops in Korea that they are fighting a just war in a good cause. They don't quite understand why Korea should have been picked as a scene of conflict. Neither the country nor the people

seem particularly worth fighting for. But I found absolutely no disposition at all to give up the fight.

All of this seems to add up to an indictment—not of the Korean people themselves, but of the American failure to know what makes them tick. If we are fighting for and in the midst of a people whom we distrust, it cannot be wholly their fault. It is a patent fact that we have not aroused any real patriotic fervor among the people there. Men are not trooping enthusiastically to the colors. Except for a few divisions of professional soldiers, who are fighting extraordinarily well under every kind of adverse circumstance, the South Korean populace has been dismally apathetic. We do not even have well-trained intelligence agents, Korean spies, capable of slipping back and forth across the lines to bring us information on enemy movements.

Now, all this may not be a crucial matter in Korea. We may win a military victory in spite of all the obstacles. But what is significant is this; if we have so little understanding of Koreans and their ways, if we do not know how to rouse them and train them in the defense of their own lives and freedom, what would happen if we allowed ourselves to become embroiled in other Asiatic wars against communism? We know even less about the Viet Namese, the Indonesians, the Burmese, Indians, and Pakistanis. The indictment is against us as a people for knowing so little about a billion and a quarter people in the Far East. And if we learn anything at all as a result of this terrible struggle in Korea, it ought to be that the time is long overdue to find out concretely why Asiatics ignore the political catch-phrases which we so glibly swallow in the western world.

The North Koreans have been aroused to a fanatical pitch of fighting fury. We are bound to ask ourselves why we have failed so miserably in the south.

Within a few hours after my arrival in Korea, it became apparent to me that we were just as unprepared militarily as we were politically to fight a war in Korea. I found the American Army is having to unlearn a whole specious doctrine, a theory which was propounded for me nearly 2 years ago by a very high-ranking officer in the Air Force. He said, "There can't be a major land war in Asia; you can't fight positional wars with mass armies in rice paddies and mountains where there are no roads." That theory had a plausible ring, but even the Air Force now admits it has been completely exploded. Airmen used to have visions of dominating the whole continent from a few offshore bases. All such visions have now been discarded. It is recognized because it has been demonstrated that Asia is no different from any other part of the globe. A hostile army can be subdued only by foot soldiers.

Right now, officers in Korea are beginning to compare the war there to the campaigns against the Indians or to the long British struggle to subdue the northwest frontiers of India. Our tactics have undergone a drastic change. At the start we tried to hold back the advancing Korean Reds by setting up road blocks, taking up positions in the valleys and trying to block the passes. It didn't take long to discover the fallacy of that method. The mountains of Korea are not high, but they are steep and rugged. Our troops didn't like climbing them, but the Koreans had no such hesitancy. They circled the mountains, fell on us in the rear and destroyed our road blocks. Now we, too, are taking to the hills. Unfortunately we are not equipped for a campaign in the hills. Observers say what we need now is fewer trucks and more pack mules. Instead of long-range self-propelled guns, we need the mountain howitzers which we discarded a few years ago as obsolete. We need the kind of mobility that can get away from the roads and the kind of fire-power which can blast with deadly accuracy at short-range over the top of a ridge. In particular, we need more small arms, especially tommy-guns and similar automatics, which can mow down rows of fanatically charging infantry.

The narrow dirt roads up the main front in Korea are already jammed with vehicles. And if there should have to be a sudden withdrawal there would probably be an indescribable scene of confusion. The trouble with American military concepts is that they have become too modern for the rest of the world. It remains to be seen whether the Pentagon and the Capitol can now relearn the arts of war in time to stave off disaster—not only in Korea but in all Asia.

Why Not Check Communism in the United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the brutal Communist aggression in Korea warns that the Kremlin's program of world domination through upheaval and revolution is now supported by strong military forces directed by Russian tactical commanders. The cold war has become a shooting war. Secretary Acheson's concept of "total diplomacy" is now described in terms of billions more for defense. Has not the time arrived, then, when communism in the United States should be brought under effective national control?

We spend billions a year in Marshall plan assistance, plus other billions for military assistance abroad, plus billions more for national defense. Yet President Truman and his legislative leaders in the House and Senate will not permit enactment of the Mundt-Nixon bill, the one piece of legislation really needed to put an effective check-rein on Communists in our own Government departments, in some of our colleges, movies, labor unions, press. With men and dollars we are fighting communism in every part of the world—except in the United States of America.

During the last 5 years—that is, for the fiscal years 1947 through 1951—we have appropriated $64,000,000,000 for national defense, plus $29,000,000,000 for foreign aid, and $3,000,000,000 for the development of atomic energy. Now the President has budgeted an additional $10,000,000,000 in defense funds for the Korean crisis. These four-budget items total about $105,000,000,000 poured into the fight to check communism during the five fiscal years ending June 30, 1951. Yet we cannot get final action on a bill which would provide effective control over the Communist wreckers within the very borders of our own country.

Why is President Truman so vigorous and militant to stem communism in Italy, France, or Indonesia, while refusing support to a real drive against communism in the United States?

The Senate Judiciary Committee approved the Mundt-Nixon bill (S. 2311) on March 21, 1950. Four months have elapsed since that favorable report. Yet the administration leaders in the Senate have steadfastly refused to permit a vote on the bill. As late as July 10, 1950, the Democratic leader in the Senate publicly berated and humiliated the Senate author of this bill for his attempt to force it to a vote. This violent attack on the Mundt-Nixon bill may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 10, 1950, at page 9775. Then, within the space of 3 short weeks, the Democratic leadership became alarmed and began to write their own bill—a measure to soften the Mundt-Nixon bill. This new bill was their belated attempt to flee before the whirlpool of public indignation over the snuffing out of the Mundt-Nixon bill throughout 1949 and the first 6 months of 1950.

The Mundt-Nixon bill would require all Communist agents in the United States to register with the Department of Justice. All Communist publications would be marked to show their Communist affiliation, as a condition of eligibility for United States mailing.

The central provision of the bill is a requirement that Communist political organizations and Communist-front organizations shall register with the Attorney General of the United States—

The Senate Committee reported—Senate Report 1358, Eighty-first Congress, second session, March 21, 1950.

The purpose of the registration is to expose the Communist movement and protect the public against innocent and unwilling collaboration with it.

The Republican Eightieth Congress took the first step toward outlawing communism. The original form of the Mundt-Nixon bill, H. R. 5852, was passed by the House of Representatives on May 19, 1948. The House vote was 319 to 48. The measure was referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee, where hearings began, but Congress adjourned in June, before the Senate report could be completed.

Despite this overwhelming congressional expression in favor of national controls over godless communism throughout the 48 States, the Truman Administration never has permitted the Mundt-Nixon bill to come to a vote in either the House or Senate during the 2 years of the Eighty-first Congress. In the House and Senate the combined hearings on these two forms of the Mundt-Nixon bill make more than 1,300 printed pages of testimony, supported by literally tons of subversive literature gathered as evidence by the FBI, and the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The need for legislation to control Communist activities in the United States cannot be questioned—

The Senate committee said in its 1950 report.

Ten years of investigation by the House Committee on Un-American Activities have established beyond question that the Communist movement in the United States is foreign controlled, and that its ultimate objective is to overthrow our free American

institutions in favor of a Communist totalitarian dictatorship, to be controlled from Moscow. * * * The Communist program of conquest through treachery, deceit, infiltration, espionage, sabotage, corruption, and terrorism has been carried out in country after country.

To resist Communist aggression abroad with billions while ignoring its clear and present danger at home is to betray the national security.

Truman apologists excuse their indifference to the Mundt-Nixon bill with the specious argument that it seeks to limit or abridge freedom of speech and freedom of assembly. But the fact is that the bill imposes no restrictions of any kind save upon known agents of a foreign power—traitors in time of war. The Constitution was framed, and is enforced, to protect and defend the rights of Americans. It was never intended that the Constitution should defend and protect agents of foreign governments—spies.

As long ago as April 1, 1947, the House Committee on Un-American Activities reported in House Report No. 209:

From its inception in September 1919, to the present day, the Communist movement in the United States has been an organization operating under centralized discipline subordinated to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union—a section of the World Communist Party, controlled by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

In 1947, we find this totaltarian bridgehead firmly entrenched in the labor movement, the Government, political parties, the press, radio and films, the schools and colleges, the churches and social organizations.

This report then recalled the treacherous Communist absorption of Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Poland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. To this list now have been added tragic China and war-torn Korea.

Our own country is far from immune to the operations of the subversive and aggressive Communist movement—

The House committee's report continued.

In the light of our own highly integrated and sensitive society, it is well within the bounds of practical possibility, that if the present potentialities of the American Communist movement were fully mobilized for a supreme subversive effort, and if these potentialities were given substantial aid from a strong foreign power, they could seriously dislocate our economic and social life, and even the effectiveness of our Armed Forces.

More than 3 years have passed since that grave warning was published in an official report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Yet during those 3 years the administration has had but one reply to charges that Communists have found shelter within the very structure of our own Federal departments and agencies. "Red herring," says President Truman.

Alger Hiss has been convicted. Judith Coplon has been convicted. Marzinni has gone to jail. Gerhardt Eisler has fled to Communist protection in Berlin. More than 300 secret war documents removed from the Government departments in Washington for transmission to Moscow, have been disclosed in the public record. Our atom bomb secrets have been stolen and handed to Moscow. President Truman himself announced the first atomic explosion in Russia, on September 23, 1949. China's 400,000,000 people have been placed under the cruel yoke of aggressive communism. And now the sputtering fuse of world war III has been lighted in Korea—again by the brutal aggression of godless communism.

Our national security demands immediate enactment and vigorous enforcement of the Mundt-Nixon bill. We dare not temporize longer with Communist cells throughout America, particularly while American men and arms are fighting communism in distant Korea. The threat of Communist sabotage to our emergency military-production program is immediate. To longer neglect this vital salient of the home front would be to invite disaster. The time has come to wipe out communism in America. Then, and only then, will we be in a position to turn our full might and power upon the economic defense of freedom and order in other lands.

Some Historic Facts About Korea and the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein a statement containing much information on Korea and the Far East. In view of the conflict now raging in Korea, in which we are engaged, this data should prove of interest.

The statement was not prepared by me but by one in whom I have the utmost confidence. I urge every Member of the House to read it.

The statement is as follows:

We have come to a point in our relations with Russia and the Far East where it will pay us to recapitulate. Today we are fighting in Korea against the same combination of forces that Japan had fought against since 1894. It has taken 56 years for us to realize two very basic facts. One is that in international politics a vacuum invites aggression. The other is that Russia is basically an aggressor who can only be stopped by force.

In 1894 Korea was a weak, corrupt, and vacillating Government which constituted a vacuum between three strong powers. Russia, on the north, was seeking an outlet in warm water in order to build herself into a maritime power that would challenge British supremacy on the high seas. Checkmated by Britain in Europe, she was prodding south in Asia. China, whose vast population made her apparently the dominant power in Asia wanted Korea as a jumping off place for the ultimate conquest of Japan, whose modern armies were a cause of concern. Japan wanted to build Korea into a strong independent buffer state as a protection against the Russians and the Chinese. The result was conflict.

Japan defeated China in a whirlwind campaign in Korea and Manchuria and was pressing at the gates of Peking when the Chinese sued for peace. As reparations, China ceded Formosa and the Laiotung Peninsula, the southern tip of Manchuria to Japan. Russia, Germany and France, all of whom had been looking for concessions in China, were taken aback at Japan's success. The fox-terrior had defeated the mastiff. Combining, the three European powers "suggested" to Japan that instead of the Liaotung Peninsula, which would give Japan a foothold on the mainland of Asia, and spell the end of their ambitions to partition China among themselves, Japan accept a money indemnity. Japan looked in vain for support from the United States and England. But England was also interested in Chinese territory and while she did not join the triumverate, saw no reason to help Japan. The United States, interested only in Chinese trade, would give no help to Japan's ambitions in Asia. As a result Japan, though victorious over China, was forced to accept the money indemnity. And China, looking around for a way to pay it, found that Russia was ready for a deal. In return for the money with which she paid Japan, China gave Russia, secretly, the right to extend the Trans-Siberian Railroad, just being completed to Lake Baikal, and to build it across North Manchuria to Vladivostok, thus saving thousands of miles by not having it follow the Amur, which was the northern boundary of Manchuria.

The defeat of China at the hands of Japan, however, indicated the early break-up of the Chinese Empire. The nations of Europe entered into a mad scramble for Chinese territory. France seized Yunnan. Germany seized Shantung. Britain seized Chefoo, as a wedge between the German and Russian spheres. Then came the Boxer Rebellion. A movement of a secret society, called the "closed fists" or "boxers," was started against the Manchu dynasty which ruled China. The Dowager Empress adroitly turned the movement against the foreigners, and the foreigners were murdered and raped by the thousands. The legations at Peking were beseiged by the Boxers. The Empress Dowager fled to the hills. And the powers formed an international army which landed at Tientsin and marched to the relief of the legations. This was 1900. The Boxers were defeated and huge indemnities were levied against China to pay for the relief expedition. China could not pay and Britain took control of the customs to collect the money to pay the indemnities. We took ours but eventually turned it into a fund to educate Chinese students in the United States. Russia agreed to take hers, but made another secret deal with China,. This time she was given the right to build a branch of the Chinese Eastern Railroad south to the tip of the Liaotung Peninsula, to build the port of Dairen and to fortify Port Arthur. These were the property, which 45 years later at Yalta, she told Franklin D. Roosevelt, were hers and which Japan had stolen.

Japan, now thoroughly aroused at the Russian encroachment in Manchuria prepared for war. England also, at long last, realizing that the Russian menace, once she attained an ice-free port on the Gulf of Pechili, had grave implications, entered into an alliance with Japan. Each agreed to come to the other's defense if attacked by a third nation. Japan attacked Russia in 1904, took Port Arthur and drove Russia north. Both sides were near exhaustion when "Teddy" Roosevelt, then President, brought about the Peace of Portsmouth, N. H. At the peace settlement Japan inherited Russia's possessions in Manchuria and also got back the southern half of Sakalin, which Russia had taken from her soon after Perry had opened Japan in the middle of the nineteenth century.

Japan now entered upon an era of expansion and conquest. Refusing the Harriman proposals of 1909 to neutralize the South Manchurian Railroad (which meant to add

it to the Harriman Empire). Japan annexed Korea in 1911. Three years later when World War I broke out, Japan lined herself up against Germany and took over Shantung and the German possessions in the Pacific. Later she received these possessions as a mandate from the League of Nations and they formed the nucleus of her ultimate attempts to conquer Australia in World War II. President Wilson was defeated in his attempts to get us to join the League, however, mainly on the Shantung issue. Chinese speakers trailed him in this last great effort in favor of the Versailles Peace and denounced the awarding of Shantung to Japan in that settlement. As a result the treaty failed of ratification through the efforts of Senator Lodge and a little band of willful men.

Soon after this Russia, now Communist controlled since 1917, began in the footprints of the Czar a new conquest of China. Sending Borodin to Canton in 1920, the third internationale sought to get control of the Kwo Ming Tang party of Sun Yat-sen. Sun Yat-sen had approached the House of Morgan for money to carry out what were considered his visionary schemes for the development of China. But the Morgans slammed the door in his face by establishing the New Consortium of international bankers, whose objective was "No loans to China," repulsed Sun turned to the only offer he had—that from Soviet Russia. By 1925, before his death, Sun had accepted Russia's price for his schemes to modernize China. When he died, however, his brother-in-law Chiang Kai-shek did not follow his brother-in-law's lead. He repelled Russian boring from within and the Russian dominated Communist marched all the way from Canton to Kalgan in Northwest China in order to be nearer their friends, the Russians. From 1927 on Chiang became the intrepid foe of communism and of Russia in her attempts to dominate China. He still is today.

In Manchuria, however, Japan had to deal with the ex-bandit Chang Tso Lin, who, to all intents and purposes had inherited the Manchu power there. When he died and his opium-addicted son, Chang Tseu Liang took over, things became more difficult. Chang Tseu Liang became a Red. In an effort to dislodge Japan from Manchuria in 1931 he perpetrated the murder of a Japanese Captain Nakamura and blew up the South Manchurian Railroad. Japan drove him out of Manchuria and his troops became affiliated with the Communists of northwest China. Russia was working, it will be observed, not openly but through her satellites, to Japan's defeat. The boycotts against Japan's trade in China were instituted, but Japan was loath to act against China. The League of Nations, however, sent a commission to investigate her actions in Manchuria, and when its Lytton Report was adopted by the League, Japan walked out of the League.

Meanwhile we had been particularly offensive to Japan in 1924 by passing the Immigration Act which excluded all aliens who could not become citizens. This offended China as well and all the nations in the barred zone, from the Persian Gulf to the Pacific. Japan, poised between fascism and communism, swung violently to fascism. Chang Tseu Liang, with the Japanese at the Great Wall, now invited Chiang Kai-shek to a conference. Chiang accepted, and when he was in Chang Tseu Liang's power he was threatened with death if he did not agree to fight Japan. Chiang Kai-shek agreed in order to save his life. The Marco Polo Bridge incident started the incident. Japan did not call it a police action but the implication was the same. To call it war would have invoked the Nine Power Treaty, which Japan had signed in 1922 at the Washington Conference, and which restated the Hay doctrine of equal opportunity and territorial integrity for China. The incident lasted for 8 years, but the important thing to remember is that it was begun through the machinations of Soviet Russia, working through the puppet Chang Tseu Liang, for if Chiang Kai-shek had not been kidnapped and forced into attacking Japan, there would have been no "incident" and perhaps no war between Japan and the United States. Russia realized that Japan in Manchuria was a watchdog on her borders, ready to spring at the least aggressive move into China. By subversive methods, therefor, Russia contrived to get us into a position where we would have to pull the teeth of our own bulldog. For, all Russian propaganda to the contrary, Japan's objectives and our objectives in China were similar; namely, to contain communism. Had we realized this in 1941, and had Japan realized it, millions of American lives and of Japanese lives would have been saved, and Russia would not be in the dominant position in Asia she is in today. But we pinned our hopes on China rather than Japan, and we recognized Soviet Russia and took her dubious word that she would not attempt subversion within our borders. We sowed the wind and we are reaping the whirlwind.

The Russian objective is to wear down her opponents one by one. When the Communists took control in 1917 they had many strong foes. England, Germany, Italy, the United States, Japan stood between her and the conquest of the world. Today only the United States and a Socialist England, that sells its gasoline and recognizes Red China, are left. Russia has made great strides in the past 33 years toward her goal of ruling the world.

Today we are in exactly the position Japan was in in Korea in 1894. Unless we profit by the lessons of history there is little hope for us. Unless we realize, at long last, that our whole sacrifice in the Pacific was in vain; that our billions of lend-lease to Soviet Russia, in our attempts to defeat Germany, furnished Russia with weapons that are being used against us in Korea at this moment; that Japan and we were common foes of communism, but that we beat our potential ally against communism to her knees; that China, whom we sought to protect and strengthen in her fight against the Reds, despite the efforts of Stilwell, Wallace, Service, Vincent, Lattimore, and Marshall to force Chiang Kai-shek to take the armed commies into his government, was betrayed on July 1, 1946, when we withdrew and left her to the Reds; that France has her hands full in Indochina and Britain in Malaya, and cannot help us; if we listen to Acheson and recognize Red China; if we do not act to stem the Communists in this country who are not Americans, but to all intents and purposes, Russians in our midst; if we treat this as a police action and hesitate at the thirty-eighth parallel to push our victory, when and if it comes, to establish Korea as a unified republic; if we then make a peace treaty with Japan and withdraw our troops, relying upon our Navy and a few bases like Guam to keep Russia from her unrelenting aggression in Asia; if we refuse until it is too late to suppress incipient communism in French Indochina; if we hedge and dawdle in Iran; if we suspect that Russia has no further designs on Greece and Turkey and cease our vigil and preparedness there; if we hesitate in our efforts to rearm Europe; in short if we delude ourselves that we are not already in world war III and prepare ourselves accordingly; then this Nation, fighting with its back to the wall, in the last of the defensive breastworks against world domination by the Soviet, will go down to ignominious defeat.

This impasse in world affairs cannot be blamed on any one man. No one can be made the scapegoat. A series of tragic and fateful mistakes has been made. We have misjudged our enemies and destroyed our friends. We stand alone at Armageddon, face to face with the beast, the anti-Christ, the destroyer of the world. Let us face the facts before it is too late.

Criticism of American Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, in answer to some criticisms that have been directed toward the rank and file of the American forces in World War II, I want to include a letter from Hon. Frank Miles, of Des Moines, Iowa, a soldier of two wars, a candidate for Governor of Iowa a few years ago, a high officer of both the American Legion and the Veterans' of Foreign Wars at different times, and a man whose standing in Iowa is not questioned. The letter appeared in the Des Moines Evening Tribune and reads as follows:

REPLIES TO CRITICISM OF AMERICAN SOLDIERS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TRIBUNE:

Hanson Baldwin's criticism of American soldiers and arms in his article in the Saturday Evening Post, an abridgement of which was published in the Tribune, does much more harm than good, especially at this time.

Baldwin starts with the statement that Americans are not the best soldiers in the world—"in many particulars not by a damn sight."

That's disgusting but of course forceful with slackers and enemies within and without.

He says we did not win World War II because we were "best" in soldiering, in generalship, or in equipment; that on the contrary we were often woefully second best, sometimes a poor third or fourth.

MAN FOR MAN, THE FINEST

Our enemies did have a few weapons superior to ours but never for long. Baldwin admits our production during the war was unequaled.

A few enemy officers might have been better than some of ours, but on the whole our leaders excelled others both mentally and physically and with rare exceptions had superb courage.

A few enemy soldiers were better than some of ours, but American GI's and gobs man for man again and again proved to be the finest fighting men the world had ever seen.

We are not a militaristic people. Prior to World War II only a few of our youths were taught to fight in war. Many of them swallowed huge draughts of pacifism, some of the peace-at-any-price brand.

QUICKLY BECAME EFFICIENT

But our boys were on the whole better educated than their foes and thereby able to master military training swiftly. That along with the physical conditioning they had received in athletics in school and outdoor sports elsewhere enabled them to quickly become efficient soldiers and sailors. As to their courage in combat, any one who says that more than 90 percent of them were not as brave as humans could be is either uninformed, misinformed, or malevolent.

Baldwin cites that the Japanese would fight to the death regardless, and made what struck me as a sarcastic assertion when he said, "There were no Japanese Bataans."

Americans are not fanatics and fools. They will fight so long as they think they have a chance to win, and when they decide they can't, they are smart enough to quit alive 'n determination to try again some time.

MOST WENT WILLINGLY

Another unwarranted and unkind observation of the swivel chair, newspaper military expert was that "most of our men fought because they were drafted and had to fight; they did no more than they had to."

To induct men in wartime is the American way. We don't have universal military training in this country. Most of the drafted men went willingly, did their duties as they saw them—yes, did what they had to do—but gladly and proudly. To question the spirit of most of the inductees is to insult millions of fine, upstanding, patriotic young Americans.

Baldwin uses captured enemy documents to substantiate his contention that American infantrymen lacked aggressiveness. It is to wonder if he believes everything enemies write and say against us. The facts are that most of the "doughs" when the chips were down tore into their foes like so many furies.

AMERICANS NEVER ROBOTS

Among Baldwin's most ridiculous charges is that "given equal armament and equal numbers, the enemy usually won."

That is simply untrue and it is to be noted he doesn't name a single battle in support of his falsehood.

Americans on equal footing with people of other nations in peacetime activities outstrip them, so why wouldn't they in wartime?

As for discipline, most Americans in uniform, like those out, are never robots. They perform better generally when allowed to do some thinking and acting for themselves.

To say Washington, Lee, and Jackson—great as they were—were superior to Eisenhower, Bradley, MacArthur, and other World War II generals is to reflect that reactionary contention of so many present-day old fuds that boys of today ain't what they used to be.

FIGHTING FAR FROM HOME

Facts and records show that Americans of today are mightier in all respects than Americans of the yesterdays. If they are not, those who had the responsibility of moulding them in efforts to make our country progress failed, and I am sure they didn't.

This thought enters here. Washington, Lee, and Jackson and their men were fighting in their homelands, almost, if not actually, in sound of the voices of their loved ones. They could be expected under those conditions to reach lofty heights of valor and willingness to give their all if need be. Eisenhower and other generals and their men were far away from home and some of them might have been affected by the knowledge that thousands of civilians were profiteering while they were struggling, sacrificing, and suffering.

CAN GET WHAT WE NEED

Baldwin says Japan and Germany—not the United States—built the most powerful battleships in the world and that in over-all effectiveness the Russian tactical air force is better than ours.

Facts belie those statements.

True, we haven't so many of some kinds of weapons and fighting machines as some other nations but that's nothing to worry about. We can get what we need—and fast.

Hanson Baldwin's writings sound like those of an egotist piqued because he hasn't been accorded more attention on subjects on which he mistakenly thinks he is the highest authority. Maybe we made a frightful error in not placing him in command of all of our forces in World War II, and maybe he will be made supreme commander in the present situation.

FRANK MILES.

DES MOINES.

Army Chaplains' Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE

Wednesday, July 26, 1950

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., July 26, the following editorial from the Lynn 1950:

SERVICE AND SACRIFICE

The Nation is again reminded of the twin virtues of service and sacrifice through which Army chaplains have contributed so vitally to our Armed Forces, as the United States Army Chaplains' Corps commemorates its one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary on Saturday.

The first blood of the American War for Independence was shed at Westminster, Vt., in 1775. There followed in succession the great battles of Concord and Lexington, Ticonderoga and Bunker Hill. In all of these engagements clergymen joined their parishioners to be present with religious ministrations. Their heroic work led to their formal recognition and the establishment of the Office of Chaplain by the Continental Congress. Rev. John Hurt is acknowledged to be the Army's first legal chaplain. Through the Nation's history these men have continued to share in the ordeals and casualties of our soldiers in all wars in which the United States has been engaged.

During World War I some 2,000 chaplains were on duty at the peak of the battles, and again in World War II over 8,000 chaplains dedicated themselves to the noble task of bringing spiritual comfort and counsel to the men who fought. Chaplains do not fight, but they do get killed in battle. Only the Air Forces and Infantry have suffered a higher proportion of casualties among their officers than the Army Chaplain Corps.

The chaplain's field of action knows no limits. It may be the base hospital for the chaplain of the medical regiment. A river where a pontoon bridge is being repaired under shell fire is the field of action for the chaplain of an engineer regiment. The area from which the batteries are firing is the field of action for the chaplain of artillery. The foxholes, jungles of hedges where the men of his regiment are fighting, being wounded or killed, is the field of action for the chaplain of the infantry regiment.

On land or sea, especially whenever and wherever there is the likelihood of anxiety, suffering, and death, the chaplain is found with his men.

A glorious chapter in the history of our Armed Forces was written early in the last war when the troop transport *Dorchester* was torpedoed off Greenland. Those four chaplains aboard moved among the distracted soldiers, encouraging them and assisting them into lifeboats and lifejackets, calming their fears, and, finally, removing their own lifejackets and giving them to the soldiers. In so doing, as is now history, they sacrificed their own lives. The men who had that last glimpse of the four as the ship was sinking by the bow, arms linked and voice raised in prayer, carry an indelible picture of courage and love with them. America, who claims them, has immortalized their deeds as an eternal inspiration.

In time of peace the chaplain is an important member of the Army's family. He serves as pastor and friend to those in his care all over the world. In Germany and Austria, in Japan, Korea, China, and the Philippines, in Hawaii, and dozens of other outposts, and in every one of the 48 States, American clergymen, members of the Chaplains Corps, are teaching and guiding men to put on the "whole armor of God."

In all that they have done since the day this great corps was founded they have furthered the ideal expressed in Washington's prayer for the Nation, which he wrote at his headquarters in Newburgh, N. Y., in 1783: "Almighty God, make our earnest prayer that Thou wilt keep the United States in Thy holy protection."

Domestic and Foreign Production of Watches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL T. WAGNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly concerned in recent weeks by the appearance of printed material in various publications which strongly imply a sly, malicious campaign to the detriment not only of a large and important segment of American skilled labor but also to the diplomatic and economic interests of this country. These misleading articles, obviously inspired and intended to create misunderstanding, support an effort by certain watch manufacturers to increase by 50 percent the duties on jeweled watch movements imported from Switzerland.

I rise now, Mr. Speaker, to warn this House of a grave danger, particularly under the cloud of a great war such as now overhangs us, if this effort to dislocate our commerce with Switzerland should be successful. I should not speak thus forcefully were there no danger to an indigenous industry, to investments, or of dissipating a source of trained workers vital to our war preparedness. Such is not the case; in fact, the reverse is true.

In my own city, on famed Time Hill, in Cincinnati, there are several thousands of workers, many of them highly skilled and long experienced, whose employment may be in jeopardy. I speak for them, of course, but I speak also for all the other thousands similarly endangered across the whole breadth of our country.

The premise of those who advocate action which might result in abrogation of our trade agreement with Switzerland is that there are two watch industries in the United States, a domestic industry and a foreign industry. That is not true. There is one industry composed of assemblers of watches—those who use imported jeweled movements—and those who use domestically manufactured movements with relatively fewer Swiss parts. The assemblers using Swiss movements, in fact, are the larger part of the industry.

The contention of the so-called American segment is that lower labor costs in Switzerland create an unfair merchandizing advantage for the assemblers and that a higher, protective tariff is necessary for the benefit of these American manufacturers. It is easily demonstrated that there is no basis in fact to support such a contention. In a

market where 7,000,000 jeweled watches are sold, the share of the domestic manufacturers is approximately 2,000,000 and they do not have the capacity to fill the void if new levies priced the so-called Swiss watches off the market.

American companies have a maximum capacity only slightly in excess of 3,000,000 movements a year. The economy of the United States is built on plenty, not on scarcity. It is unthinkable for this Government to be made a party to creating a shortage which would add to the consumers' burden. I can recall the spiraling prices only a few years back when there was an inadequate supply of consumer goods and imagine the effect on the price of watches if there were an unsatisfiable demand by up to 4,000,000 customers.

Actually, the average cost of a domestically fabricated movement is about $10 and that of a Swiss-made movement, including existing import taxes, also is close to $10. The movement cost is only a small part of the total cost of the watch—less than 50 percent in the cheapest jeweled watch and progressively less as the total cost rises. American-made and American-assembled watches, as far as their jeweled movements are involved, compete on relatively equal terms in the consumer markets. The lower hourly rate of wages in Switzerland, on which the American manufacturers lay great stress, is approximately equalized by the tariff and by the greater number of hours necessary to manufacture a movement in Switzerland than in this country.

Now, then, why should the American manufacturers seek to upset a trade relationship which has existed profitably for this country—and for themselves—since 1936? I can only suspect that they hope to create a gap between the demand for watches and the supply and, through prohibitive tariffs, preserve that margin until they are able to expand their facilities and supply it.

What would be the effect if such a strategy were successful? First, the American manufacturers would add approximately $2,000,000 a year to their profits. This is fine, of course, and there would be no objection if the American manufacturers were operating unprofitably or if there were no other evil consequences. But even that is not the case. The American firms are profitable operations and one, Elgin, increased its profits in 1949 over 1948 while the market for jeweled watches was shrinking in this country and the principal importers of Swiss movements were experiencing substantial reductions in their profits.

It is necessary here, unfortunately, to speak some plain truths which the articles inspired by the manufacturers gloss over. I refer to the lamentable situation of the Waltham Watch Co., which is now being made a martyr to the cause of protective tariffs. It is regrettable, of course, that Waltham has become bankrupt, but it is totally unsusceptible of proof that tariffs were in any way responsible. It has been established, I think, beyond any challenge that the Waltham company failed because of bad judgment and poor management. I might point out parenthetically here that for several years the Swiss have produced a self-winding, automatic watch movement, but that as yet no American firm has entered the market. It takes, at most, 1 year to set up the necessary tools and dies. There was, similarly, a long lapse between the introduction of men's wrist watches in the United States and also of the tiny baguette women's wrist watches before American manufacturers produced similar commodities.

If the American manufacturers are seeking tariff relief to protect them because of their own inertia, it would seem to me an abuse of the regulative powers of this Government to accede to such a request.

The $2,000,000 which would be added to the revenues of the American manufacturers from a 50-percent increase in the tariff on imported jeweled movements would add 10 times that amount, $20,000,000, to the price the American consumer would be compelled to pay for the same number of watches. Actually, of course, there would be fewer watches sold, because the watch industry must compete against television sets, automobiles, washing machines, and other commodities before it can compete within itself, watch against watch. American production cannot now replace American-assembled watches if an upward revision of the tariff forced them out of the market. There is a bottom to the pocketbooks even of American consumers. Loss of revenue to the United States Government because of curtailed imports resulting from higher tariffs would be inevitable, but there are other more far-reaching and graver effects which also would be inevitable.

I am particularly concerned about the possible loss of an important labor pool. To produce an American-assembled watch requires a large, skilled labor force. There are, in fact, some 45,000 workers engaged in this field as against less than 10,000 in the manufacture of domestic watch movements. Swiss movements are placed in American-made cases, regulated in American plants, completed with American-made faces, American-made dials, American-made straps and bracelets, and distributed in American-made boxes.

I have mentioned the thousands of trained workers employed on Time Hill, by the Gruen Co. These 45,000 are spread, however, over most of the industrial centers of the United States, on Long Island, in New York City, in Rhode Island, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and elsewhere. They are an important, intrinsic part of the economy of many centers of manufacturing.

From this industry was supplied, in World War II, the high type of precision work required to manufacture fuzes, telescopes, firing pins, pinions, watches, altimeters, rate of climb indicators, and other fine mechanisms. This is difficult work, requiring equally as high a degree of skill, training, experience, and patience as the manufacture of movements alone.

Obviously, there would be great unemployment within this reservoir of critically valuable trained labor and consequent loss of vital skills if an upward revision of duties on Swiss-made movements achieved its obvious purpose.

There are, in the United States, some 25,000 retail outlets for watches. By far the largest single group among these are jewelers who derive 40 percent of their gross income from watch sales and watch repairs. The major part of this revenue, approximately 28 percent of their gross business, is produced from sales and service of watches assembled from Swiss-made movements. It is palpably evident, therefore, that disruption of the traffic in Swiss-made movements would affect not only a major part of the American watch industry, with a substantial investment and employing the largest labor force, but also would injure all the corollary jewelry and merchandising industries whose investment and employment is staggering to imagine.

There are other important implications. If the American market for Swiss watch movements were to contract, it is inconceivable that other markets abroad could absorb Swiss output. Yet the Swiss would be under great need to provide outlets for the products of their great technical skill and would become a potential supplier of fine precision equipment to the Soviet Union. Between Switzerland and Russia, such traffic in delicate military instruments could be maintained by air under almost any conditions of warfare. It is almost imperative, from the military interests of this country, that the mechanical genius of Switzerland be kept occupied supplying us.

The existing tariff agreement with Switzerland has been in existence since 1936. During that period, trade has flourished not only in the watch industry but generally. Commerce between this country and Switzerland, in the period prior to the reciprocal trade agreements, had come to a virtual standstill because of insurmountable tariff barriers. The reinstitution of protective tariffs, as sought by a few American watch manufacturers, is contrary to United States policy as well as United States self-interest—especially where it is unnecessarily or hurtfully applied against American business.

The existing balance of trade between Switzerland and the United States is heavily in favor of this country. Switzerland takes from us virtually the same dollar value of automotive and other machinery as she sends us in watch movements. In addition, Switzerland takes from the United States substantially the same dollar value in tobacco, grains, and other agricultural products as she sends us in watch movements.

This was the situation that Cordell Hull, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and this Congress espoused in reducing prohibitive tariff walls. If we reconstruct them, of course, Switzerland will not have the dollars with which to buy the products of our factories and farms. I need not elaborate on this, I know, for the Members of this House, but I should like merely to observe here that our trade with Switzerland, though small in the over-all volume of American commerce, is important because Switzerland is not one of those countries receiving Marshall plan and similar economic support from us.

These are the facts which do not appear in the published material urging us

to renounce our agreement with Switzerland. I believe it is of urgent import that they be spread upon the record. These facts, I am sure, will result in the retention of a far different policy from that urged in this campaign of half-truths to which I have referred earlier.

Be Thankful for General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we have reason to be thankful that in Tokyo we have General Douglas MacArthur, a man not only of ability but of experience, directing the efforts in opposition to communistic Russia's war—at the moment localized in Korea.

Unfortunately, he is again called upon to make an effort to salvage our forces and our prestige which have been damaged by the policies of our State Department.

We know that inadequately supported he and his men will do their utmost to stem the tide.

From the pen of Stanley R. Banyon, publisher and editor of the News-Palladium, of Benton Harbor, Mich., comes an editorial under date of July 31 which indicates the confidence the American people have in General MacArthur and which reads as follows:

THE STONE THE BUILDERS REJECTED

Just 2 years ago this summer—it was in late June—the Republican National Convention was in session at Philadelphia.

Dewey won the nomination and went on to a defeat in November.

General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur was a candidate for the nomination Governor Dewey captured. General Wainwright, hero of the last and ill-fated stand which the pitiful remnant of Americans made in beleaguered Corregidor after the Japs invaded the Philippines, came back from retirement to nominate General MacArthur.

It was 3 o'clock in the morning when MacArthur's name was tossed into the arena of campaign politics. But the hot, tired, and sleepy convention delegates knew that the general who was then holding the line against Communists in Tokyo, along with other occupational chances, didn't stand a Chinaman's chance of getting the coveted nomination. Long hours before the formal nominating speeches were made Dewey's adroit and aggressive organization had actually captured the prize.

Probably no general could have been nominated. Possibly the popular General Eisenhower might have stampeded his way to the nomination if he had consented to run. High command Democrats, not wanting Truman, had tried for months to induce General Eisenhower to consent to take the Democratic nomination.

The American public, as a matter of fact, didn't want a soldier in the White House. There was no crystallized demand for a "brass hat" as President. Only 3 years before the Japs had surrendered and the war was over. The GI's were home, the first contingent of our war dead was beginning to come back, folks wanted to forget war and all of its horrors and sacrifices.

Nonwarlike America wanted peace and plenty of it.

Today—only 2 years later—all America, and all of the free world for that matter, has its eyes glued on a narrow triangle of land in southeast Korea. There embattled Americans are fighting a last-ditch stand against North Korean Communist forces who have been egged on, trained, and equipped by Red Russia.

Red Russia, if she dared, would like to throw in her own military weight to win this battle. It would not only inflame and encourage Red China and Red elements throughout all of Asia, but to the Russian plotters it would be a smashing blow to the prestige, reputation, and respect which MacArthur has in the Far East.

There are good grounds for this intense Russian hatred of General MacArthur, for as commander-in-chief of the Japanese occupation he hasn't permitted any of the nonsense that has long been under way in Berlin. When Russia asked to have a token occupation force in Japan, MacArthur said "No" emphatically. He has cracked down on the Jap Communists who have tried to raise hell in Japan, and he has done much to improve the Japanese economy to the end that if there was peace in that area of the Orient today a treaty of peace could be effected, as MacArthur has long hoped and worked for.

One might well ponder today—as the country girds for another conflict the size and cost and sacrifice no soul can estimate—what would have happened if MacArthur had been nominated 2 years ago and elected.

For one thing, there would have been no Korean debacle which we have known for the past month. MacArthur would have been ready for the Korean Reds. The situation, too, in Red China might have been far different than it is today.

Does anybody doubt, either, that the Reds wouldn't have been chased out of Washington with MacArthur in the White House? Or that Dean Acheson would have been Secretary of State?

Or that "Old Joe" Stalin's plottings and deviltry in Europe in general and Berlin in particular wouldn't have been sternly dealt with?

All this of course is idle speculation, for after all the quirks of political fate scratched MacArthur off the winning list at Philadelphia.

But the American people can give thanks today to that providence which for nearly two centuries has guided the destinies of the Republic that Douglas MacArthur—the stone the builders rejected at Philadelphia—is on guard today as the Red forces of the world force thousands of their fanatics to die in what is an initial military test of military strength between American freedom and Communist slavery.

Oregon Water Laws and CVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Oswald West, former Governor of Oregon and a resident of Portland, Oreg., in my congressional district, who has performed outstanding service for our State and Nation and who is one of the best informed men in Oregon on the water laws of the State, as well as many other subjects of public interest, recently wrote a guest editorial which appeared in the Oregon Daily Journal in its issue of July 29, 1950, which I include herewith:

CVA AND WATER LAWS

(By Oswald West, former Governor of Oregon)

In making a study of the CVA bill now before Congress, one should need to determine in what respect, if any, our State's water laws and well settled water rights would be affected through the exercise of powers which it is proposed to confer upon the authority.

Unfortunately, however, but very few of the loudest local advocates of the CVA know much, if anything, about our State's water rights—and seem to care less. They would find such a study both interesting and profitable.

As stated by United States Senator O'MAHONEY in a recent discussion of certain provisions of the bill: "The situation in the Tennessee Valley is far different from that * * * found in any of the western arid land States. My State of Wyoming was admitted to the Union under an act of Congress (1890) which conveyed to the State jurisdiction over its waters and, ever since * * * our State courts have adjudicated our water rights; and I have no desire to transfer that local authority * * * to a valley authority, or whatever name it may be called."

The settlers of early Oregon, like the colonists of the Atlantic States, coming from a country where the common law prevailed to one without organized government, brought with them, as their birthright, the principles of that common law. So the jurisprudence of Oregon was based thereon.

Under the common law rule, a riparian owner of land bordering upon a stream had a right to the flow of its waters as a natural incident to his estate, and they could not lawfully be diverted without his consent.

This rule, however, barred the path of progress—a path leading to the development of the mineral and arid sections of the West. And but for the rifle of the miner and the shotgun of the early settler, the gates would have been closed completely to western development and progress.

To correct this situation, Congress, through the desert land act of March 3, 1877, declared that "the waters of all lakes, rivers and other sources of water supply, upon the public lands, and not navigable, shall remain and be held free for the appropriation and use of the public irrigation, mining and manufacturing purposes, subject to existing rights."

SOUND WATER CODE ENACTED

At that time most of the lands in the arid sections of the western States remained unpatented and, therefore, were to profit by the provisions of the desert land act. Oregon profited only to a limited extent, as most of her agricultural lands had been settled upon and patented at an earlier date. Their owners could, therefore, command the old common-law rule as to riparian rights. But through this forward-looking act of Congress, constructive acts of our legislature, and the cooperation of our courts, our State was able to adopt a sound water code, under which the waters of an entire stream could be adjudicated at a set hearing and the rights of each and every water claimant determined and certificated.

The Federal Government having thus legislated, the waters of most western streams (as to their appropriation and application to a beneficial use) are subject to State jurisdiction, and that fact is fully recognized by the Federal Government—as a compliance with State laws is imposed as a condition precedent to the leasing of Government lands in connection with waterpower development.

The CVA bill (S. 1645), under the subhead "Reclamation provisions," provides:

"SEC. 10 (a). No provision for work of irrigation in or under this act shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect, or in any way interfere with, the laws of any State relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used for domestic, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes, or any vested right acquired thereunder."

In the bill's earlier stages this section 10 (a) covered only "irrigation," the words "domestic," "mining," and "industrial purposes" having been added later.

ARMY ENGINEERS PRAISED

As pointed out by our State attorney general's office, this section having been placed under the subhead "Reclamation provisions," "would, undoubtedly, be construed to relate only to State laws pertinent to the reclamation of lands."

And the attorney general asks: "If it were intended that the laws of this State relating to the appropriation and use of water generally were to be saved * * * it is difficult to understand why the following general clause which appeared in H. R. 408, Sixty-fourth Congress (Ferris public lands bill) was not included in the proposed CVA legislation:

" 'SEC. 13. That nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or in any way interfere with the laws of any State relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water.' "

And let us not forget that it was the Army engineers and Bureau of Reclamation—not a political CVA—that built the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams, respectively, and that the Reclamation Service will construct the vast system of reclamation to be served by Grand Coulee; and that McNary and Detroit Dams and numerous flood-control projects are being efficiently handled by Army engineers.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from a series of articles on communism by Frank C. Waldrop:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The Communists have recently set up their own "loyalty boards," around the United States, and are quite evidently preparing for something big.

Orders have gone out that not more than three Communists are to gather at one place at one time, except on instructions from superior authority.

The most publicly known conspiratorial hacks around New York, Washington, Chicago and other such major centers, still show up at their regular places of trouble-making and carry on much as usual.

But new Communists are particularly trained to keep their status secret and to go completely on what might properly be called a war footing.

This program actually is not new. As far back as 1949, according to information given Congress by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Communists in the United States of America, were directed to decentralize their working forces, to stop issuing cards of identification and to adopt a new code of communication.

This is a reversion to the methods perfected in Russia between 1870 and 1917, when the police and the Communists each had agents in the other's forces.

The next prospect in this country, therefore, must be the rest of the technique, violence, sabotage and to raise money for operations, bank robbery, theft and fraud.

The signs are plain and clear that Moscow has ordered its force in America to go on a war footing and prepare for action.

In each State, investigating committees have been set up to search out the FBI's agents within the ranks and in New York City an executive committee of 13 most hardened and experienced Communist secret police have begun to enforce these instructions.

Within the executive committee of 13, a subcommittee of 3 are on the job of investigating the investigating committee. The members have been required to write out everything they have done in their lives, sign and—in whatever manner Communists do so—take oath to the facts.

That last, incidentally, throws a curious light on the very basis of communism as a system.

In our kind of world, the law requires citizens taking public office, giving testimony in courts of record, or certifying to the truth of claims, to swear that what they say is true.

Whoever so swears falsely can be fined or imprisoned.

The law thus takes advantage of a custom older than the law itself. For in the original, an oath or a swearing to a claim of any kind was a religious act.

One who swore to something did so acknowledging that a lie would blacken him in the records of God, and put the liar in the shadow of eternal damnation. It was a serious matter, for the heavenly reckoning would be sure and certain. Nobody could buy or bribe or argue his way out of it.

But once a citizen loses his fear of hell, a lie no longer matters unless the civil law catches him at it in cases specifically against the law's purposes and interest.

A Communist is one who has no fear of hell. He has decided there is no reckoning in eternity, only a savage struggle here and now.

Thus, to a Communist, signing a document and attesting to the truth of it only involves one point: Will the authorities of communism catch him in lies?

Others may have the same kind of worry, whether the authorities of the law may catch them. But they have added worry. At what point can they be sure they have really escaped the consequences?

I will deal with this question again, for it is basic in the whole realm of communism and its meaning in the world. But for the moment, let's continue with the Communists' own loyalty problems.

The FBI has further advised Congress that communism in the United States of America, has set up apparatus for secret printing plants, for special identification of operatives moved from one region to another and for raising money by methods other than the traditional public appeals to fools.

Thus, it is clear that Moscow is preparing in the United States for operations of the kind carried on in Russia itself in the years preceding the 1917-18 revolution.

There will be violence in America as this sort of affair develops. And at such operations, the Communists have had many years of experience and practice. One of the classes at the Lenin University in Moscow deals with these undertakings as calmly, coldly, and thoroughly as American universities teach medicine, law, or language.

The Communists mean business. Does the United States of America?

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from a series of articles on communism by Frank C. Waldrop:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Here is a combat estimate of communism's operations and power in the United States of America, today, as given by J. Edgar Hoover.

Hoover knows his business, and he does not lie about it.

Therefore, any citizen who is concerned for the Nation's safety in these times can take the quotations here given as literal guides for his own thoughts and actions. They follow:

"The Communists possess a well-knit, closely disciplined, destructive force of approximately 55,000 members in the United States * * *

"The actual strength of the Communist movement in the United States is not something that can be accurately stated in just so many figures. It has to be measured largely by the general mass influence of the party and its program.

"We no longer measure the importance of revolutionary organizations by size. In some places where there are only one or two men, more results are obtained than where they have larger organizations.

"But, behind this force of traitorous Communists, stand a half million fellow travelers and sympathizers ready to do the Communist bidding.

"These individuals, though not identified as Communists, are extremely dangerous to the internal security of this Nation, because as hypocrites and moral swindlers they seek the protection of the freedoms which they constantly seek to destroy.

"They represent, for the Communist movement a source of wealth: financial resources; the creation of valuable contacts; levers of social, economic, and political pressures; recruiting grounds for espionage information and agents.

"Moreover, they do their work anonymously, in front organizations, and wherever they can exert the greatest influence, each doing his share to the best of his ability.

"These individuals are difficult to detect. They are disdainful of the very tolerance which enables them to betray their country. They practice their double-dealing, double-minded, doubled-tongued, and double-faced tactics on all fronts of our American life, whether it be in politics, in labor, in the press, in radio, in motion pictures, in the schools or even in some of our churches.

"The Communists have their membership concentrated in certain key areas of the United States—primarily in strategic industrial and population centers. This membership is coordinated through a national leadership and a dedication to an alien hate which looks abroad for its direction.

"If additional personnel, perhaps for a political pressure campaign, for infiltration into a labor union, or for a militant educational program, is needed, national headquarters of the Communist Party will peremptorily transfer members, temporarily or permanently, into the strategic area.

"Communist members, body and soul, are the property of the party. They scorn the standards of American democracy. They

function like puppets on a string ready at a moment's bidding to execute the will of the directing master—the Red 'Hitler' at Moscow.

"The party, thereby, through mobility, central direction, and the disciplined fanaticism of its converts can, at any given moment, achieve power and strength in a limited sector. At times, this pressure is so well organized and expertly supervised that the Communists achieve gains out of all proportion to their numerical strength. That is the secret of Communist success; the tragedy of democratic resistance."

That is an impressive summation—or should be—and it is from one citizen whose opinion is supported by some 32 years' experience.

Hoover began to investigate and analyze and understand communism in 1918, as the Department of Justice assigned him to prepare briefs on deportation proceedings for undesirable aliens.

He has been on the job ever since and has made the FBI the one law-enforcement agency the Communists really fear.

Thus, his declaration means something. But the shocking fact is that the combat estimate above given is not new even though the words are from a speech Hoover made in New York City on May 2, 1950.

But they are the same things he has been saying over and over, to my personal knowledge, for 20 years straight. He has never been afraid to speak his mind on communism, and his mind has not changed.

I have heard him say everything in the above, time and again, in public and private, in Washington and all over the country. So has everybody else who cared to listen.

Yet communism has thrived in Washington these 20 years past in spite of this proved patriot's authoritative warnings.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from a series of articles on communism by Frank C. Waldrop:

COMMUNISM

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

How is communism to be defeated in its battle for the world. This is the question of the day and the hour. The survival of the United States depends on its answer.

And this final installment of this long and winding survey is devoted to an attempt to state the principles on which every man must seek his own answer.

The first principle is this: Communism is an unchanging and unchangeable endeavor. It could not change if it wanted to.

It is built on the idea that there is such a thing as a scientific law of human behavior, which will predict the conduct and attitude of any individual under a given circumstance.

On this basis, Karl Marx constructed his notion of scientific socialism in the middle years of the nineteenth century when it was the intellectual fashion to discover laws of nature for everything under the sun.

Now, if there is anything the twentieth century has demonstrated, it is that whatever laws there may be in nature they are not so easily seen and applied as the nineteenth century thought.

Thus it is Darwin's laws of natural selection have in our time been made to look ever more crude. Newton's even older laws of gravity have been shown to be poor instruments for describing and predicting what really happens in the real world of mass and movement.

Glib phrases, such as "survival of the fittest" have not stood up, under analysis. What do you mean by "fittest?"

A young man of dazzling health and intelligence, a golden genius may be killed dead by a bullet in Korea and a rattling consumptive with feeble mind in feeble body may live for 60 years in a hospital.

Which of these two would you call the fittest?

Thus, in considering communism it must be kept in mind that we are confronted here with a crude and shallow idea of how human society should be organized.

But that is not to say it is ineffectual as a political weapon.

Look at its 40-year rise from gutter to throne. That is a reality and it must be met. The important truth is that it not only must be met, but can be defeated, destroyed, and devastated. The requirements are less of guns than of character, supported by brains.

The second fundamental principle for dealing with communism, therefore, is to hire for public office only people who understand what communism is, does, and aims for.

It is not enough for a man merely to say that he has learned his lesson. He must not be merely repentant, as Secretary of State Acheson says he is, today.

He must be intelligent enough to have seen through communism from the start. And that Acheson cannot claim with a straight face. To give him the very best interpretation of his record, he has been dumb.

And we cannot afford men in office who are dumb about communism. David Lilienthal was a prime example of that. When he was with the Tennessee Valley Authority, he let Communists play all around him and he never once resisted.

Thus, when he came on to be considered for head of the Atomic Energy Commission, I, for one, opposed him. My reasons, and they were stated on the record, were that Lilienthal didn't understand communism and that if it could fool him once it could do it again.

Well, what happened? Senator HICKENLOOPER disclosed Lilienthal had even granted atomic scholarships to Communists with the money of the United States taxpayers.

We cannot afford that kind of stupidity.

The third principle is this: Neither intelligence nor power nor wealth nor war can save the world from communism or anything else.

The world must save itself.

Communism is founded on a false idea of the human destiny. For Karl Marx laid it down as a "scientific fact" that man does not live for God.

Communism couldn't last a minute as a governing force among people who have any feeling on religion.

What do you think life on this earth means? Where has it come from? Where does it lead? Be honest with yourself.

Communism's real power is in the idea that man has no soul and no debt to eternity. People who do not care what will be reckoned against them after they are what we call "dead," care less about what they do to other people now.

Thus it is, communism can and does exercise such massive despotism in the world. Its governing members have the cold and detached methods of laboratory researchers, in deciding how to exercise power.

They are due to run out of gas, sooner or later, however, for human life is not "science" as they think it.

And the world is not all there is to the universe. This I believe, and on that account I also believe the final necessity against communism, therefore, is something in the human heart. Does America still have it? We did, once.

Old "Oregon" in New Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, news reports now disclose that the E. M. Ricker Co. is seeking to recover $139,750 for the value of the metal in the hull of the old *Oregon* which was repossessed by the Government for World War II purposes. The old battle wagon had been sold for scrap material to this company for the full sum of $35,000. Reports to me disclose that the War Shipping Administration paid the Edward M. Ricker Co. $93,278.63 for salvage material taken from the *Oregon* after it was sold to the company and paid in addition $8,453.10 on account of payment for the hull, making the aggregate total of $101,731.73 paid to the company by Government agencies for salvage material from the *Oregon*, for which the company paid only $35,000. Now the company is pursuing a claim in the courts for an additional sum of $139,750 from the Government.

This whole sordid business has a disagreeable odor. I discussed with some detail on the floor of the House on January 19, 1950—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 682—the history of the U. S. S. *Oregon* which performed such heroic service in the Spanish-American War and which after being retired from service was turned over to Oregon to be maintained as a shrine and meeting place for various patriotic groups, Boy Scouts and veterans' organizations. The State of Oregon, the city of Portland and the school children, as well as private citizens expended over $200,000 in providing for the site, rehabilitation and maintenance of the battleship *Oregon* in the Portland harbor where a permanent home was provided for the battleship. It was also used as a museum for housing the valuable relics and historic objects collected on the battleship *Oregon* through its long career.

Notwithstanding the battleship was performing a greater service for the Nation in inspiring patriotism and love of country in the school children than it could otherwise perform, the Federal Government ruthlessly took the old battleship from its permanent memorial harbor and condemned it to the junk yard. This destruction of the ship was made over the protest of Oregon citizens interested in its preservation and against the advice of the Navy Department

which had the ship under its control. At the time I sent the following telegram to the Secretary of War:

PORTLAND, OREG.,
October 16, 1942.

HON. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.:

Oregon cooperating 100 percent in war effort. Will to sacrifice old *Oregon* battleship so near our hearts that the old ship may again in a new form perform gallantly as she did in her memorable fight. We hope you will see that the ship be not sold to dealers but may go through to war needs without profit to anyone. Please advise if this can be done.

HOMER D. ANGELL,
Member of Congress.

In reply to this telegram I received the following letter under date of October 24, 1942, from the Navy Department to which my telegram had been referred:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF PUBLIC RELATIONS,
Washington, October 24, 1942.

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As an official news release indicated, the USS *Oregon* is to be dismantled under the strict supervision of the War Production Board and the Navy Department.

I am advised, however, by the Salvage Construction Section of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, that it cannot be guaranteed to have the ship wrecked without profit by anyone.

The only way she can be dismantled is by a qualified wrecker. The project is an enormous one. It is regarded as being next to impossible to obtain the services of a wrecker who will do this job without profit and for sentiment only. Unless you, or perhaps someone else, knows of a person or a company on the west coast who will warrant to wreck the *Oregon* without profit, there is no alternative to proceeding as contemplated.

Please be assured that your feelings about the *Oregon* are fully appreciated. Every effort will be exerted by all concerned to wreck her in accordance with the spirit of your wishes.

Sincerely yours,

R. W. BERRY,
Commander, United States Navy,
Deputy Director.

In response to a request by me to the Secretary of the Navy for a report on the salvage operations of the *Oregon*, on August 17, 1949, I received the following letter:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, August 17, 1949.

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: In my letter of July 15, 1949, I advised you that I would take steps to assemble certain information concerning the *Oregon*, desired by you, and would forward it when it had been compiled.

As you are aware, the Department of the Navy was most reluctant to scrap this ship. On numerous occasions it expressed the belief that the ship could best serve the interests of the country by remaining a relic. For example, Mr. Forrestal, in his letter to Mr. Paul C. Cabot, Deputy Director of the Conservation Division of the War Production Board, stated on August 6, 1942:

"The great need of all available metal for use in the war effort is realized. However, it is considered that memorials such as the battleship *Oregon* constitute a distinct morale factor and should be preserved until all other sources of material have been exhausted."

On September 7, 1942, Mr. Bard stated to the commander of Marin-Sonoma County Council, VFW, of San Rafael, Calif.:

"It is, therefore, the present intention of the Navy Department to retain the *Oregon* on the Navy list to remain in the possession of the State of Oregon under a loan status."

On July 22, 1942, Mr. Forrestal wrote the Governor of Oregon as follows:

"Your letter of July 16, 1942, enclosing correspondence with Mr. C. W. Wendle of the War Production Board in regard to the use of the battleship *Oregon* as salvage material, is greatly appreciated.

"Your answer to Mr. Wendle regarding the status of the *Oregon* was correct. The vessel can be disposed of only by the Navy Department and by that agency only in accordance with the existing laws concerning the disposition of naval vessels.

"The action of the Seattle office of the War Production Board was taken without the knowledge of the Navy Department.

"The great need of all available metal for use in the war effort is realized. However, it is considered that memorials, such as the battleship *Oregon*, representing in their being the spirit and traditions of the Navy and of the country it represents, constitute a distinct morale factor and should be preserved until all other sources of material have been exhausted."

Other examples could be cited.

The scrapping of the *Oregon* was directed by the President on October 26, 1942. The ship was sold to the Edward M. Ricker & Co., of Portland, Oreg., for scrapping, and the contract provided that the removal of material would be under the direction or approval of the War Production Board and/or the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Navy Department.

In the spring of 1944 an operational use developed for the hull of the ship, which had not been scrapped, and on April 11, 1944, the War Shipping Administration directed that the hull be requisitioned for the Navy, pursuant to section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 as amended. The ship was delivered to the Navy by the War Shipping Administration on April 19, 1944, and was subsequently fitted for use in the Pacific campaigns, and was so used.

As requested by you, there is forwarded herewith a list of materials removed from the ship up to the time it was requisitioned by the War Shipping Administration, together with its value and disposition.

At the time the ship was requisitioned a cost inspection was made, covering the execution of the contract by the scrapping company. The inspection indicated that the contractor, to that time, had received from sales of material the amount of $189,629.35, and the allowable costs and expenses of the contractor to that time (including the purchase price of the ship of $35,000) was $161,811.03.

Section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act of June 29, 1936 (46 U. S. C. 1242), under which the *Oregon* was requisitioned from the scrapping contractor for use in the Pacific, places the determination of compensation for the seizure in the hands of the Maritime Commission. It is understood that this determination has not been finally made, and accordingly any fiscal data subsequent to the cost inspection made at the time the ship was requisitioned is not available. I suggest that inquiries in regard to this settlement with the wrecker be addressed to the Maritime Commission.

I trust the above information adequately answers the request for information contained in your letter of July 7.

Sincerely yours,

DAN A. KIMBALL,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, this whole operation of the salvaging of the battleship *Oregon* is a sad ending for this great ship which played such an important role in the Spanish-American War. While it will not dim the glory of the old battleship, it adds little credit to this great Government as this final chapter is written.

As part of these remarks, I include an editorial from the Oregonian under date of April 3, 1950, and a newspaper item from the Oregon Journal of July 29, 1950:

[From the Oregonian of April 3, 1950]

THE OTHER CHAPTERS, PLEASE

What happened to the battleship *Oregon*? From time to time newspaper stories have appeared about the hull's repose at Guam, of its ghostly voyage toward the Philippines, and its return to the naval base. But what happened to the rest of it? Did the metal go to war? Where are the many parts?

Congressman HOMER D. ANGELL, of the Third District, made a report in Congress January 19. He included the Navy records he was able to obtain. He said, in part: "The United States Government disposed of the ship [to the Edward M. Ricker Co.] for $35,000, but paid back to the purchaser $101,731.73 for purchases of a portion of the salvage material from the ship, and is still subject to a suit for additional amounts claimed by the company as payment for the hull taken over by the Government."

But the Navy records relate only chapter 1. It is comparable to a householder selling a neighbor a stove, who in turn takes it apart and sells the pieces to several junk dealers. What did they do with it? Ricker dismantled the ship and sold the parts to many firms and Government agencies. The parts did not end there as the Navy records would imply. The scrap was sold again—usually to smelters where the metal could be melted down and be used for new war contracts. Or the usable metal and machinery were sold to firms eligible for critical war matériel.

One only can wonder what happened to the 63,104 pounds of copper that the War Shipping Administration paid $15,926 for. How much did the WSA get for it? Ricker sold to the William Shenker Co. of Portland "the remaining armor plate, teakwood, nonferrous metals, lead, boilers, pumps * * * but exclusive of the hull itself * * * for the sum of $27,000." The Navy lists only one sale afterward—two duplex hydraulic pumps which sold for $1,500 to the WSA. Then what?

"The steel from the *Oregon* was especially valuable," said R. W. Hargis, of the Isaacson Iron Works, of Seattle. "Our company received only the armor plate which was around the hull and turrets and what must have been the powder elevators. This armor had a nickel content of 3½ percent and was about the only known source of nickel steel in this area during the critical years of the war. This scrap was used only for combat ships and on those parts that required such an alloy."

But that information is not in the Navy annals as entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The people of Oregon would feel a little better about the *Oregon* had they more such information. It may be impossible to prove that part of the *Oregon* sailed again on the *Franklin*, the *Essex*, et cetera. But it would erase a little of the hurt. Though an unsavory odor hangs over the disposition of the once proud *Oregon*, we think the Navy owes publication of all the battleship *Oregon* records—not only to the people of Oregon, but to the people of the whole United States. Where did the parts end up? How much was paid for them? Chapter 1 is not answer enough.

[From the Oregon Journal of July 29, 1950]

IN THICK OF NEW BATTLE—OLD "OREGON" IN COURT OVER VALUE AS JUNK

The historic old battleship *Oregon* was in the thick of a new battle Friday—but it was a courtroom fray over the value of the famed vessel as junk.

William Shenker, president of the William Shenker Co., at Oregon shipyard, which had purchased part of the steel plates and fittings, testified that material from the *Oregon* was very high grade.

"FAIR VALUE"

Shenker testified at a United States Court of Claims hearing in Seattle Thursday, in which the Edwin M. Ricker & Co., of Kalama, Wash., is seeking $139,750 as "just compensation" for the fair value of the metal in the hull when the *Oregon*, partly scrapped, was reclaimed by the Maritime Commission in April 1944, to be used as a Navy barge at Guam, according to an Associated Press dispatch.

Shenker, not a litigant in the present action, was called to help clarify what material his company had purchased from the Ricker Co. The propellers, anchor, windlass, 1,500 tons of armor plate, and a quantity of other materials had not been removed from the hull when the Government reclaimed the *Oregon*, Shenker said. He testified that new brass and copper fittings and valves such as were on the hulk were impossible to get on the market without priorities.

DECISION LATER

The case will be continued in San Francisco Tuesday, and a decision will be made later in Washington, D. C.

The 10,000-ton *Oregon*, long remembered for its record-breaking dash around Cape Horn to join Dewey's fleet at Manila, served for many years as a floating museum of Spanish-American War memories here.

Under pressure of World War II needs for vital scrap metal, the ship was sold to the Ricker Co. to be scrapped for its materials.

The Statist Line—An Anglo-American Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the greatest internal problem facing the nations of the west is how to achieve maximum progress in social welfare and economic development without sacrificing the liberty of the individual.

A growing number of thoughtful citizens are devoting increased attention to this problem. Among the most distinguished of these is Dr. Peter Viereck, associate professor of history at Mount Holyoke College, a scholar, poet, and philosopher, as well as a historian of the first rank. The following article by Dr. Viereck which appeared in the New Leader for July 1, 1950, is an important contribution to our thinking on this vital subject:

THE STATIST LINE—AN ANGLO-AMERICAN DILEMMA

(By Peter Viereck)

The real tragedy, according to the great historian Lord Acton, is not when right fights wrong, but when two different kinds of right fight each other. A conflict of the first type is that between democracy and tyranny, which now divides West and East just as it earlier divided the west from Germany. The second type—right versus right—is exemplified by the tragedy rending the West internally today, above all in the British elections last spring. It is right to want humane social legislation. It is also right to want freedom from governmental powers because, to quote Acton again, "All power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

No sane Republican and no British Conservative is against all welfare laws. The important task is to determine at precisely what point healthful welfare laws become the unhealthful bureaucratic dictatorship of "statism." This point will vary from country to country and from epoch to epoch. The electoral verdict in England suggests that perhaps British voters feel they have reached this point.

But the difficulty of precisely determining it does not make the point nonexistent or unimportant. On the contrary, nothing is more important to the West today. Both sides are "right" because both are equally custodians of different halves of our democratic heritage. This makes the debate so much more exasperating than our clear-cut abhorrence of the Nazi and Stalinist dictatorships.

Just as economists have to rely on the margin of diminishing utility, so I have recently suggested (in my book Conservatism Revisited) coining for the politicians the phrase "the statist margin" or "the statist line." Briefly, I would define the statist line as the margin of diminishing returns for humanitarianism. Beyond it, the gain in local working conditions—though in itself desirable—is less than the loss in liberty, so that the balance sheet holds a net loss for society as a whole.

Civil liberty—meaning not merely free speech for intellectuals but something as close to all citizens as fair trial by jury—is as precious to the industrial workers as to anybody else. Nothing is more snobbishly undemocratic than the assumption of certain leftist intellectuals that political liberty interests only a few bourgeois highbrows and that only economic democracy interests the worker, so that we should stop worrying about freedom and go full-speed ahead to whatever is the latest brave new social experiment. On the contrary, the sacrifice of liberty to total statism is a loss which the workers themselves are the first to suffer, as open-minded American trade unionists like Reuther realized in that disillusioning moment when they visited the land of proletarian dictatorship.

The industrial worker is increasingly coming to realize this. Despite the half-worshipful, half-patronizing effort of the leftist ideologue to oversimplify the worker into a mythical Noble Savage (a Rousseauistic primitif of the industrial jungle), the worker is becoming aware that liberty is no bourgeois abstraction but just as real as bread and butter. It was not the petty-bourgeois Nazis, now holding high posts in the Soviet zone, who went on strike against the Russians in last summer's railway battle of Berlin, but the ordinary protetarian trade unions. And the issue which has rallied the Berlin masses behind the American stand is not materialism alone but personal freedom.

The ordinary people of New Zealand and Australia have comprehended the danger of statism in voting out their labor governments. Will the English do the same after the temporary stalemate of their inconclusive February election? The answer to this riddle depends not only on labor but on the Conservatives and what they have to offer instead. Conservatives and Republicans must not let fear of crossing the statist line stampede them so far away from the line that they feel nostalgia for the immoral, inhumane working conditions of the industrial revolution. Such anti-historical nostalgia afflicts those Republicans who opposed even the humane Housing Act of their own not-exactly-radical Senator TAFT. It would pay enlightened Conservatives and Republicans to criticize such reactionaries as sharply as they criticized the socialists, for the irresponsibility of the right is often to blame for the triumph of the left. The failure to achieve social evolution is more to blame for the triumph of revolution than the conspiracies of revolutionaries.

To vary the metaphor, the statist line is a tight rope on which western man must walk. On one side is the abyss of irresponsible laissez-faire chaos, which helped bring on the crash of 1929. On the other side is the abyss of regimentation, whose ultimate outcome is Hitler, Stalin, and 1984. To keep society from toppling into either abyss, liberal conservatives and conservative liberals must unite on some form of Schlesingerian vital center, each making the generous concessions which the emergency of an ever-imminent Soviet attack demands. Peace can only be saved by internal unity sufficient to discourage any Soviet plan for an anti-western Pearl Harbor. Right and left should freely and vigorously debate the issue of the statist line, agreeing to disagree in parliamentary fashion. But if the debate turns into civil war—or civil chaos, as it threatens to do in France and Italy—then the west is practically inviting attack.

The Labor Party program announced before the February balloting advocated nationalizing cement, sugar refining, waterworks, meat slaughtering and wholesaling, and perhaps shipbuilding and chemicals, in addition to the industries already taken over. No matter where exactly we draw the statist line, it is unreasonable to deny that it will be crossed with seven-league boots if a more sweeping electoral victory later this year puts this Labor platform into effect and vindicates Labor's extremist wing. A really exuberant Laborite would not deny but glorify the fact of crossing the line. And the effect on America of such a development might be a radical increase of the statist minority within the Fair Deal, which so far has perpetrated no nationalization of industry.

DOES ENGLAND CROSS THE LINE?

So far, despite the confused improvisations of its mediocre personnel, the Fair Deal is more often reformist-gradualist than Socialist-statist. When wolf-crying Republicans do understand this distinction, they will again win elections. To compare America's non-Socialist and nondoctrinaire Fair Deal with the dangerously doctrinaire socialism of such English Laborites as Cripps, is a tempting analogy but a false one. Your typical Fair Dealer is not an anticapitalist Don Quixote with messianic cliches about class war, but a strictly suburban YMCA secretary with dowdily virtuous cliches about boosting the Community Chest.

The New Deal (plus Fair Deal) has tried to introduce—belatedly and more naively—those necessary humane working conditions which the British Tories, from Shaftesbury on, introduced a century ago. In the 1870's, Disraeli's Conservative Party, against the opposition of Gladstone's Liberal Party, legalized and aided the persecuted trade-unions and passed workers' welfare laws. The true analogy between English and American politics cuts across American party lines. For example, in his stand on factory laws and economic planning, the Conservative Winston Churchill resembles both the Democrat Truman and the Republican Thomas Dewey and does not resemble—is a century ahead

of—the Republican Old Guard. The Old Guard's pseudo-conservatism in economics (actually sheer anarchism) resembles not the British Conservative Party, with its solid mass base in all classes, but the discredited laissez-faire economics and pseudo-individualism of England's narrowly middle-class Liberal Party. The latter's decline is a warning for our GOP; and America urgently needs a vastly stronger—and more responsible—Republican antistatist party.

England's second midcentury election will be the most important in recent history, because it will determine whether or not England strides irrevocably across the statist line. The two leading parties differ on other issues as well, but not basically. A policy of humanitarianism and social progress for labor, and of respect for trade-unionism, has been accepted not only by the Laborites but also by all except a reactionary minority of Conservatives. Here the party disputes are often only a matter of tempo and degree, differences exaggerated by demagogues on both sides. (Churchill, after all, was already introducing prolabor minimum-wage laws when many of the Labor Party's present tribunes of the people were still in swaddling clothes.) Likewise, in foreign policy, Labor-Conservative disagreements are—unhappily for Joseph Stalin—not basic.

In short, the fundamental issue is whether unbridled statism is to replace that stress on private freedom which for centuries produced in England a creative culture and a way of civilized living that is the glory of the human race. At present, the Labor Government, still awaiting a more decisive popular verdict than that of February, can establish nothing irrevocable. In some spheres, since 1945, it has achieved more good than harm. But another 5 years of Labor bureaucratizing, accelerated by mass approval and against a discredited opposition, would very likely commit England to statism beyond recall, unless the mixed-economy Keynesians within the Labor Party can restrain the doctrinaire Crippsian Socialists from overcentralizing. Even the overcentralizing and overregulating of a liberal will eventually, as Churchill points out, require a gestapo to enforce it.

THE DOUBLE THREAT

Statism of the left is no greater (nor less) a threat to personal freedom than statism of the right. It is hypocrisy to resist solely the former (or solely the latter). It is hypocrisy to resist the pernicious overcentralization of socialist labor parties while defending dictatorial monopolies and clamoring for higher tariffs and more statist favors to industrialists. The word "conservative" is unpopular in America; nearly everybody likes to boast how liberal he is. Yet a conservative opposition in both America and England can become the savior of democracy as the watchdog of antistatism, welcoming necessary reforms but growling ominously as soon as either leftist or rightist prowlers get too near the statist line. Meanwhile, the watchdog of antistatism must not degenerate into the lapdog of big business. American Rpublicans and British Conservatives must convince the voting public of their sincerity in defending personal freedom equally against capital and labor, or suffer the consequences once again at the polls.

Personal freedom is no monopoly of either right or left. Today the greater danger stems from the left and from the Labor Party. The contrary was true in the Munich Pact nightmare of 1938 and may some day be true again. The precarious health of liberty decreases proportionately whenever the polar extremes of right and left increase. These extremes increase whenever the reasonable, moderate, evolutionary forces of the center are unable to strike a workable balance between the urgent need for social reform (which, if carried to extremes, leads to oppressive socialist statism) and the equally urgent need for personal freedom (which, if confused with laissez-faire anarchy, leads to capitalist oppression). The great statesman is not the great inciter but the greater healer. For the humanistic conservative, responsible statesmanship means stabilizing the future by balancing two equally urgent needs—security and individualism—instead of swinging the pendulum too far in either direction and inviting a violent counterswing.

The Creeping Shadow of Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by George E. Stringfellow, of East Orange, N. J., before the Rotary Club of Wichita Falls, Tex., on August 3, 1950:

THE CREEPING SHADOW OF SOCIALISM

I'm highly complimented to be asked to speak before such a fine group of public-spirited, liberty-loving citizens. It is you and men such as you who have made America great, and it is you and men such as you who will keep it great, if it is to remain what our forefathers envisioned.

Since politics invades every segment of our human family, I shall speak of politics and its influence on our lives. I shall not speak in the narrow partisan sense, but rather I shall speak in the sense defined by Webster as "the science of government." I shall suggest what we citizens must do to influence our public servants to save our way of life.

I have selected as my subject The Creeping Shadow of Socialism. Extravagance and deficit spending always produce inflation and inflation always produces stateism in one difference between socialism and communism The difference between capitalism, socialism, and communism is one of principle. The difference between socialism and communism is one of degree. Socialism is the bridge over which capitalism passes to communism. Captialism produces things for people to divide. Socialism divides the product of capitalism until there is nothing left; then communism takes over and chaos reigns.

I would like to remind you of a very forceful statement in George Washington's Farewell Address. It is: "Cherish public credit and avoid the accumulation of debt."

If we continue the accumulation of debt, we shall destroy public credit. The destruction of public credit would end our form of government. The danger of deficit spending, which, of course, means the accumulation of public debt, was pointed out very forcefully by President Franklin D. Roosevelt during the early part of his first term when he said, "A government, like a family, can spend a little more than it earns for a year or so, but you and I know that the continuation of that habit means the poorhouse." Our Federal Government has continued that habit for almost a fifth of a century.

Governments go to the poorhouse when they habitually spend more than they earn. When governments go to the poorhouse they take their citizens with them.

It was Lenin, that patron saint of communism, who said, "Sooner or later we will force the United States to spend her way to destruction." It seems to me that during the past 20 years we have done much to spend our way to destruction. During the past 20 years we have done much to destroy ourselves financially. The cost of Federal Government 20 years ago was less than $5,000,000,000. The cost of Federal Government for this fiscal year, excluding the cost of the war with Korea, will be more than $45,000,000,000. The national debt 20 years ago was less than $20,000,000,000. Today it exceeds $257,000,000,000, and the President budgeted a $5,000,000,000 deficit before the war with Korea. Our Federal budget has been balanced but once in the last 20 years. It was balanced by the Eightieth Congress.

If our business were in the red, as the Federal Government is and has been for almost a fifth of a century, and we told our stockholders that we could not balance our budget until the volume of business increased (as the President tells us—his stockholders) our stockholders would say, "Cut your cost or we'll find new management."

When a business runs a deficit for several years, it gets into financial difficulty and then the courts appoint a receiver who is responsible to the courts. The receiver takes over and liquidates the corporation's assets, pays its bills, and, if there is anything left, reorganizes and staffs it with a set of officers who have enough business intelligence to live within the corporation's income. If there's nothing left after paying the bills, the firm folds up, the employees lose their jobs, and the stockholders lose all they invested in the business.

When a government runs a deficit for a long period of time as ours has, it builds up an unmanageable debt, it gets into financial difficulty, and, of course, there is no court of law to appoint a receiver for a government as in the case of a business. A self-appointed dictator arises and takes over. Dictators are responsible only to their own whims. Under such circumstances, the people lose their savings, they lose their property, and, what is more important, they lose their liberty. Their way of life is prescribed for them by a self-appointed dictator. History bears mute evidence to the fact that when a government habitually spends more than it takes in, inflation follows as surely as night follows day. The thing that alarms me is that we have been unable to balance our budget in the height of peaceful prosperity. If we can't balance our budget when the Nation is at peace and prosperity reigns, we certainly cannot balance it in a depression or in a war. However, even in war we can and must reduce waste. We must reduce waste if we are to avoid inflation, for it will avail us nothing to win the war with Russia and lose our way of life through inflation.

We know that it was inflation that produced Mussolini; it was inflation that produced Hitler; it was inflation that produced Stalin; and inflation is certain to produce a dictator in America. The buying power of the American dollar is worth about 50 cents today compared with what it was 20 years ago. At the rate it is losing its value, it will not take long for the dollar to drop to zero. Then we shall have a worthless dollar and, of course, inflation. Then we shall lose our republic and all the benefits which our citizens enjoy thereunder.

On leaving Independence Hall in Philadelphia in the late afternoon of September 17, 1787, following the signing of the Constitution of the United States, Benjamin Franklin was asked, "What have we got?" The wise old man replied, "We have got a republic, if we can keep it." If we are to keep our republic, the greatest form of government ever conceived by the mind of man, we must avoid inflation.

Twenty years ago the annual cost of Federal Government was about 75 percent of the annual income of all the citizens of the State of California. The annual cost of Federal

Government this year, excluding the cost of the Korean war, will equal the total income of every citizen of the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, and 11 percent of the income of the people of Minnesota.

This creeping shadow of socialism, motivated by Government extravagance, will cover the entire country at an early date unless our citizens rise up and rebel against it. This creeping shadow of socialism, if it isn't turned back, will produce the kind of state socialism here which Britain has today. The Hoover Commission has shown the President and the Congress how to save $4,000,000,000 a year without affecting our war effort. That is 75 percent of the annual cost of Government 20 years ago. I would suggest that each of you contact the President, contact your Congressmen, and contact your two United States Senators and urge them to work for the enactment of the Hoover Commission's recommendations and thus reduce the cost of government by $4,000,000,000 a year. This will help stem the creeping shadow of socialism.

I submit that the Chief Executive of this republic should be a symbol of economy. It is he who should set the example for the Nation and especially for his fellow administrators of Government. During the last year of the Hoover administration, the White House payroll was $127,200. During the last year of the Roosevelt administration, the White House payroll was $256,431. During the last year of the Truman administration, the White House payroll was $998,254. Many of you recall the President's recent "nonpolitical" trip to the Pacific Northwest which cost the taxpayers more than a quarter of a million dollars. That, I submit, was a wanton waste of our money.

President Truman would lead us to believe that he is against socialism, yet every move he makes leads in that direction. "We in this country," said the Honorable HARRY FLOOD BYRD, senior United States Senator from Virginia, one of the ablest statesmen of our time, "will be irrevocably committed to state socialism if Congress adopts the following Fair Deal proposals advocated by the President: (1) Socialized medicine, (2) socialized agriculture, and (3) socialized housing."

Of course, the President does not call these projects socialism. His leftist advisors who would socialize and communize America have other names for them. To call them what they are—socialism—would be too forthright and too revealing to the public.

Only you and others like you can roll back this creeping shadow of socialism by demanding that the Government reduce nondefense expenditures and eliminate waste wherever humanly possible in the prosecution of the war. We should demand that our Government desist from buying votes with the taxpayers' money through subsidies and desist from making RFC political loans, such as Lustron, Rattlesnake, and for building of gambling joints.

We have, in my opinion, reached the period in our history where men worthy of their heritage must lift their voices in defense of the principles of government for which our forefathers worked, bled, and gave their lives. Sixty years ago someone asked James Russell Lowell, "How long will the American Republic endure?" That great statesman responded "As long as the ideals of the men who made it continue dominant." Those who would socialize our people, destroy their initiative, and confiscate their wealth through deficit spending are not imbued with the ideals that made America great.

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues. * * * We must make the choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude," said Jefferson. "If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, the people will be happy," concluded that great statesman.

The politicians of this Republic have in recent years tried to teach our citizens to believe that our Government is something to live on instead of under. It is that philosophy which has given impetus to the creeping shadow of socialism. It is that philosophy which is accumulating the great public debt which will destroy public credit and produce inflation. It is our duty as citizens to tell our administrators of government at all levels, regardless of political label that they must eliminate extravagance and live within the Government's income. We must tell our public officials very forcefully that the way to cherish public credit is to avoid the accumulation of debt. That is plainly our duty.

"Duty," said Robert E. Lee, that great American patriot, "is the sublimest word in the English language. Do your duty in all things," charged this great patriot, "you cannot do more and you should never wish to do less."

It is plainly our duty to force our public servants at all levels of Government, from the President down, to eliminate waste, thus avoiding confiscatory taxes. Over 100 years ago, Karl Marx said, "There is only one way to kill capitalism * * * by taxes, taxes, and more taxes." Marx knew what he was talking about. He had studied history. Waste means high taxes. High taxes destroy incentives; high taxes produce socialism; and socialism produces communism.

The President seems to think the way to prevent inflation is to take the moneys away from the people through high taxes made necessary by the wastage of public funds. The way to avoid inflation is to reduce the cost of Government, but this never dawns on politicians.

I should like now to say a few words about the threat of communism. The President's Loyalty Board recently stated that they uncovered only 200 Communists in the Government departments in recent years. Someone has said that if we could put 200 GI's in and about the Kremlin, Stalin would be whistling Dixie in a few months.

You perhaps recall that two of our Associate Justices of the Supreme Court recently testified as character witnesses for Alger Hiss who was subsequently convicted in a court of law of lying about giving State Department papers to Whittaker Chambers, a self-confessed Communist courier. At the time Hiss gave those confidential papers to Chambers he was on the payroll of the State Department. After Alger Hiss had been found guilty by a jury of his peers, the Secretary of State Dean Acheson, proclaimed that he would not turn his back on his friend—a man who had turned traitor to his country.

Acheson has refused to take a definite stand against recognition of Red China. He has refused to take a stand against seating Joe Stalin's Chinese representatives in the Security Council of the United Nations. He did all he could to discredit the Chinese Natonalist Government which was favorable to us and thereby helped Joe Stalin take over China and place in slavery 400,000,000 people. Of great significance, I think, is the fact that the Daily Worker, the principal Communist publication in this country, has from time to time been very complimentary of our Secretary of State.

David Demarest Lloyd, formerly a member of the Washington Cooperative Book Shop, which is on the Attorney General's list as a subversive organization and who was for a number of years a member of the National Lawyers Guild which is listed by the Un-American Activities Committee as a Communist-front organization, at present has an office in the White House and is one of President Truman's speech writers.

Since resigning from the Washington Cooperative Book Shop and the National Lawyers Guild, Lloyd has written a complimentary articles about the traitor Alger Hiss.

Most of you will recall that while in search of "liberal votes" President Truman referred to one of the most notorious and despicable characters of our time, Joe Stalin, as "good old Joe." And during that address he expressed a fondness for that godless man who would rule the world by saying, "I like old Joe."

When Alger Hiss was under investigation by the Un-American Activities Committee, President Truman referred to that investigation as "red baiting" and he characterized it as "red herring." Little wonder that our people are not too much impressed with the President's most recent appeal to our citizens to report any Communists or other subversives to the FBI.

I have no doubt but that Stalin's agents in our Government are reporting to the Kremlin daily on our activities and our plans. I have no doubt but that Stalin's advisers look over these reports daily and make their plans accordingly. It is my feeling that we have more to fear from the Communists in our Government than from the Communists in Moscow.

We have, I think, reached a period in our history where the basic principles upon which our Government was founded are threatened. They are threatened from within as much, if not more, than from without. We should therefore support those men in public office and those men who seek public office who are animated by a sincere desire to preserve our way of life. It should make no difference with us whether those men call themselves Democrats, Republicans or Dixiecrats.

Only you and others like you who place the welfare of our republic above partisan politics can keep the light of liberty alive in America.

May I close my address with this prayer: "Oh, God, our Father, let us not be content to wait and see what will happen, but give us the determination to make the right things happen. Give us the courage to stand for something lest we fall for anything."

Retirement of Representative J. Hardin Peterson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MONROE M. REDDEN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, I was not on the floor of the House when several Members commented on the retirement of Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON, chairman of our Public Lands Committee. For that reason I have asked permission to insert my remarks in the RECORD, as I wish to associate myself with the overwhelming majority of the Members of the House who feel that the Congress and the Nation are sustaining a great loss by reason of his retirement.

Soon after I entered Congress in January 1947 I became acquainted with HARDIN PETERSON, and my admiration for him increased rapidly. He has served as chairman of the Public Lands Committee, of which I am a member, since the early days of the Eighty-first Congress.

No member of the committee is more highly regarded, more respected, or more dearly loved than HARDIN PETERSON. To me he is one of the most lovable characters I have ever known. He possesses a temperament for leadership, and a character that blossoms in the presence of his fellow man.

Recognized as one of the hardest working Members of Congress, he will be missed by his colleagues on the committee for many years to come. He is not only a hard worker, but a great counselor. All of us go to him for assistance and guidance, and he is never too busy to spare whatever time is necessary to give us the benefit of his broad experience.

I feel that my personal life has been enriched by my association with HARDIN PETERSON. We need more men like him in our National Congress. These perilous times call for that type of leadership and that type of character to safely guide us over the pitfalls.

Hershey's Bar Slightly Nutty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with my own remarks I am extending in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Cartersville Daily Tribune-News for the 21st day of July 1950, by Charles Skinner.

While I do not altogether agree with the editorial, nevertheless, it deals with a problem which we must face and decide, and I am glad to present the editor's viewpoint:

HERSHEY'S BAR SLIGHTLY NUTTY

Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, head of the Selective Service for the United States, has issued an order that only the names of actual inductees are to be released to the press, and then only as they are ordered into the service. The names of men called for examinations—even the names of those who pass both the physical and mental tests—will not be released, General Hershey commands.

Of all the sheer poppycock spewing forth from the red-tape cluttered halls of the Pentagon, this close-mouthed attitude takes the cake.

The Tribune News is told that General Hershey is afraid someone might be embarrassed if his name were printed and he then failed to pass the examination. He is also fearful, we are instructed, that those actually inducted from the first call this September might become angry if they knew which of their fellow-draftees were to be deferred. He is afraid they might rebel against going if they knew, ahead of induction time, that others would be for good and sufficient reasons allowed to stay at home.

It surpasses reasoning to try and figure out how even a general's thinking could become so confused. Thirty men in Bartow County have received orders to report Wednesday for examination at Fort McPherson. We wish the general would kindly tell us how many of each man's friends and acquaintances don't already know he has been called. And unless the general wants a rotten system of under-the-table deferments, why shouldn't inductees—why shouldn't everybody—know who is being deferred?

The Tribune News distinctly remembers a number of cases during the last war where questions were hurled at would-be slackers, brought into the bright light of publicity, and where the finger of scorn reformed the draft-dodgers. They stopped trying to wriggle out of their duty and later served their country well.

This newspaper has had some of these men, once under suspicion, tell us that the rule of pitiless publicity was all that made them toe the mark back in the 1941–45 era. And, by the beard of the prophet, if the illumination of newspaper print is what it takes to make a slacker do his duty then General Hershey should take his silly, idealistic order and throw it into the nearest Pentagon waste basket.

A thing of this kind simply cannot be kept a secret. The Tribune News is an eternal exponent of the fullest publicity for every single act of a public official. If such matters are allowed to be kept secret, favoritism of the rankest, rottenest sort is certain to result.

You let a thing like this be kept hidden—with lists made up in the back room at midnight—and foul, stenching favoritism will push its ugly head into the graft pot, despite all of General Hershey's faith in his county draft board clerks and the sum total of their denials.

The high brass allowed this Nation to be caught with its pants down in Korea.

Is it going to blunder again—so soon?

Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 2 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we are shortly to vote on the Byrd-Bridges amendment, to effect a 10-percent reduction in nonessential spending for the 1952 fiscal year. It is my earnest hope that this amendment will, indeed, be agreed to, although we all recognize that in every single instance of recent attempts to cut down on spending, we who have voted for economy have unfortunately been outvoted and overridden by as much as 2 to 1.

The fact, however, that we are going to spend $10,000,000,000 as the minimum for the prosecution of the Korean war emphasizes anew how essential it is that we husband our resources on less essential appropriation fronts.

Of course, within each agency, there are some functions which must be continued virtually intact. I consider one such example the matter of vital health research, particularly, for example, into causes of mental disturbances which affect our veterans.

At the same time, however, while crucial appropriations must be maintained, there is more than enough room in the Federal peacetime budget for economy. The Milwaukee Sentinel, in its issue of July 27, rightly pointed out that it is inconsistent for the administration to be asking sacrifices on the part of the American people while continuing its own prodigal spending on the home front.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the Milwaukee Sentinel editorial, and that it be followed by the text of another factual editorial published in the Chippewa Falls Herald-Telegram in its issue of the very same day.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel of July 27, 1950]

THE ADMINISTRATION'S DUTY

President Truman is asking Congress to provide $10,486,976,000 in new military funds, and to meet part of the requisition by levying $5,000,000,000 in new or increased taxes.

The President wants the $10,000,000,000 because, as the little war in Korea suddenly demonstrated, our national defense is inadequate, although we have expended in 4 years of peace $50,000,000,000 for military purposes.

Our unreadiness to meet promptly a so-called police action in an area as limited as South Korea indicates that the administration has made no wise use of the immense funds it has already had.

So the administration wants more money to do what it should have done before.

And, of course, Congress will assign the funds, if no better way can be found.

But there is a better way—or at least one that should have priority.

For how has it happened that the administration now calls for war taxes to meet its military needs?

Actually, we have continued on a war-tax basis all during the peace—or cold war—period.

The excise war taxes have never been repealed or reduced.

The personal-income and corporation taxes have remained at high levels.

Pay-roll taxes still flow into the Treasury.

Consequently, new war taxes must be added to the war taxes already in effect, which have been retained ever since the last war ceased.

This happens partly because of the New Deal's gross mismanagement of defense expenditures.

It happens more largely because of the New Deal's extravagant expenditures for nonmilitary purposes.

Obviously—and in view of the administration's current deficit—the primary defense need is to eliminate all unnecessary expenditures and put to defense uses the sums retrieved.

If this be done, no tax increase would be justifiable at this time, since the administration would have in hand the $5,000,000,000 which it seeks in new taxes.

If the job were well done, the administration might have even the whole $10,000,000,000 desired for military requirements—and perhaps enough besides to balance the budget.

Until the administration is willing to make some political sacrifices for the national security, its demands for sacrifices by the public are made with very ill grace.

[From the Chippewa Falls Herald-Telegram of July 27, 1950]

ECONOMY FIGHT IN SENATE

As the latest of a series of bulletins on "Federal spending facts" the Washington Research Bureau of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce presents an enlightening analysis of the Omnibus Appropriations bill before the Senate. The analysis

indicates the Senate Appropriations Committee majority has been less minded about the need for economy in non-defense expenditures than its counterpart in the House.

The bill that the House finally approved totaled $27,346,700,000, exclusive of foreign aid and certain other items such as interest on the public debt. By two amendments, however, the House provided for a horizontal cut of $600,000,000 and an estimated pay-roll saving of $371,000,000.

But what did the Senate committee do? Not only did it restore most of the reductions which the House made in departmental operating funds, but it also increased the House-approved appropriation for nonwar public works projects from $599,145,000 to $731,546,000. The council's research bureau properly stigmatizes this action "an irresponsible capitulation to selfish, short-sighted local interests, contractors, and 'pork-barrel' politicians."

That is only half the story. With the Senate committee's approved-line items adding up to some $300,000,000 more than the House's total, the economy-minded minority in the committee offered a proposal that it considered a more workable version of the House's two economy amendments. The committee majority summarily rejected them, so the bill as reported actually exceeded the House's total by from $896,000,000 to more than $1,250,000,000.

Such is the background to the fight being waged on the Senate floor to reduce most nonmilitary spending by 10 percent below amounts voted by the committee. The move has aroused the ire of Majority Leader LUCAS against "arbitrary, capricious meat-ax cuts." Ordinarily that would be a sound objection, but in this period of crisis the essential need is checking the profligate spenders. The country is less concerned about the method of accomplishment.

The People Must Oppose Too Much Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mansfield (Pa.) Advertiser of July 26, 1950:

THE PEOPLE MUST OPPOSE TOO MUCH CONTROL

There is danger of Congress voting too much control to President Truman, simply because the war scare makes people amenable to passing on to some one else responsibilities that they should take themselves.

Recently, when the hoarding started, there was talk that if people did not stop hoarding it would be necessary for Congress to give President controls over production, distribution, wages, labor and capital. This is not a new story, although heretofore it has not been tacked on to a hoarding situation. President Truman has asked several times for stand-by controls, without telling the people what he feared that would make it necessary. One of his assistants, named Symington, has had a control program ready to submit to Congress for some weeks, long before the situation developed in Korea, although probably amended since that.

It has looked for some time as if President Truman and those around him have sort of gone off the deep end on controls. They have been asking for controls simply for the sake of controlling.

And they have not shown any great aptitude for controlling much of anything, if we are to judge by the farm program that produced huge surpluses of food, or the war program that finds us less prepared than any of our citizens dreamed.

But the worst of controls is that they seem to be progressive. Once a group is given control in one line they want to spread it to others, until finally you have almost a totalitarian government. It was by this same method of progressive controls that the people of Russia, Germany and Italy were brought under such absolute control by one man or group of men.

In our own Government, you have only to consider the controls that were fastened onto us as war measures and have not yet been lifted. Although a definite date has been given for the end of some controls, when that date arrives you find a lot of propaganda for continuing them for another 6 months, or a year or even more.

We are not in favor of giving too much control to any political official, elected or appointed, or to any party or group. We would not hand such controls to the best Republican president we ever had any more than we are in favor of giving them to Democrat officials. In our own State of Pennsylvania, there has been too much control centered in Harrisburg, and we find so many people who have been filled with propaganda until they think controls are necessary. Then, too, there is the younger generation who were brought up under some of these controls and who do not know the freedom that our people had until the First World War.

Sesquicentennial of the Library of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 2 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, this year marks the sesquicentennial of the city of Washington and also of the Library of Congress. In that connection, the President of the United States addressed a letter to the Librarian of Congress in which he draws attention not only to the extent of the collections of the Library, but also to the extent of the services rendered by the Library to the American people. Although the letter was written some time ago, I feel it should receive larger circulation than it would in a publication of the Library. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 13, 1950.

Dr. LUTHER H. EVANS,
Librarian of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. EVANS: The passage of the first 150 years of the Library of Congress, to be marked on April 24, deserves the grateful attention of the American people and their Government. It deserves this grateful attention because the history of the Library exemplifies the history of our American institutions; it is tangible evidence, not of endurance only, but of the strength, the energy, and the capacity for growth which our institutions have demonstrated so well.

A steadfast servant of the Congress, the Library's treasures of knowledge have been brought to bear in the shaping of the laws which govern the whole people and have great influence upon the world. With a spirit of service, the Library has provided resources of study for executive agencies, and has thrown open its doors to scholars from every land, thus aiding in generous measure in the essential work of extending the boundaries of knowledge and new learning for the benefit of the whole of mankind. A partner of all libraries of whatever dimension and whatever kind, it has shared with them its experience, its skills, and its products. With them, it has been an affirmation of the power of enlightenment. It has stoutly defended the freedom of the mind and the right of the quiet voice of truth to be heard.

Neither the Library's collections, which numerically may exceed the collections of other repositories, nor its services, which some believe unparalleled, could ever have been fashioned without the power of the principle of free inquiry and the support of that principle by the people and the Congress. Once a few wagons transported the Library of Congress from Monticello to a burned-out Capitol. Remembering this, I am confident that the spirit of Thomas Jefferson joins with me in congratulating the American people upon their Library's sesquicentennial.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The Effect of the Korean Situation on Relations Between Political Parties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 2 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "War in Korea Stimulates Party Warfare at Home," written by Gould Lincoln, and published in the Washington Evening Star. I call the article to the attention of my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, because I think it is very timely and may be of some value to them.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL—WAR IN KOREA STIMULATES PARTY WARFARE AT HOME—DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS BUSILY PASS THE BUCK

(By Gould Lincoln)

The Democratic congressional committee, an dits ally, the CIO's PAC, are staging propaganda drives to convince the voters that the Republicans in Congress are responsible for the Red attack on Korea and our involvement in war. The butter they have spread is mighty thin. But they are out to spread it as fast and as far as they can to prevent a Democratic debacle in the coming elections. Powerful and well-financing propaganda agencies, with enough distortion, can sometimes be effective.

Here is the nub of the Democratic—CIO argument—that Republicans in the House in 1949 voted in large number against a $150,000,000 economic-aid bill for Southern Korea. It's a fact they did. But the Demo-

crats and the CIO did not explain that the Republicans advocated amending the bill so that this money could be used for military aid for the Korean Republic—and the State Department turned thumbs down on the amendment. The economic-aid bill was beaten by one vote on its first try in the House—but it later became law. The Republicans not only urged that this money be used to build up military strength in South Korea, but they argued that to build Korea up economically and leave it ripe for the Reds to grab was folly—just throwing money down a rat hole.

MINORITY REPORT ON BILL

The Republican minority report on the Korean aid bill predicted just what has happened in Korea. This is what it said:

"The flanks and frontiers of South Korea are open to attack at any time by the militantly hostile forces of Communist aggression. It is reported from Seoul under date of July 6 last (1948) that Soviet troops, attached to North Korea puppet government armies, are in positions of command as well as acting advisers. This development may well presage the launching of a full-scale military drive across the thirty-eighth parallel. Unless this Nation is prepared to meet force with comparable force, economic assistance cannot of itself insure the safety and integrity of South Korea."

The Republican National Committee asks pertinently: "Would it not have been better to have used some of the $150,000,000 for tanks and equipment of our soldiers?" And it continues: "What happened to the $10,500,000 Congress voted for military aid to Korea in a separate bill September 28, 1949—9 months ago? Why was only $200 of it in signal equipment sent to South Korea?"

TOUGH TO MAKE GOOD CASE

With such a record, it's going to be mighty tough for the Democrats and the CIO to make a case against the Grand Old Party, especially as it is widely reported that the administration did not intend to defend Korea anyway—and only at the eleventh hour took up the Red challenge.

While the Democrats make this drive against the Republicans—for purely political reasons—there are insistent reports that some of Mr. Truman's advisers are proposing he follow the precedent set by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1940 and put a couple of Republicans in his Cabinet. The names of Senator Bridges, of New Hampshire; Senator Saltonstall, of Massachusetts; Governor Dewey, of New York; and President Harold E. Stassen, of the University of Pennsylvania, have been mentioned as possible selectees for such a draft. Why not General Eisenhower, unless the Democrats choose to consider him one of their party or fear to build him up for 1952? If General Eisenhower should accept, however, it might be one way of effectively tying his hands 2 years hence.

At least one of these Republicans has been approached. The belief is, however, no such move will be made unless the situation worsens materially or until after the November elections.

Union Now Foresighted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 2 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the second of a series of five articles by Clarence Streit, editor of the magazine Freedom and Union, published at 700 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C., and author of Union Now, which have appeared in various newspapers in the United States and Canada, pointing up the urgent lesson I find Korea teaches, namely, that the Atlantic Union resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 57, cannot be agreed to and passed too soon.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREA'S LESSON: THE FREE MUST FEDERATE SOONER

(By Clarence K. Streit)

Speaking of the Korean war, the majority leader, Senator SCOTT LUCAS, said in the Senate on June 27: "This is a time for action, and not time for words. * * * It is amazing how men with hindsight are able to tell you what should have been done, if a mistake was made, and yet had they been in a position to make the decision, it is doubtful that any different conclusion would have been reached."

He is right; this is no time for hindsight. But it is no time, either, for more action without foresight. Foresight needs to be distinguished from hindsight. Let me cite some evidence of foresight.

As early as November 25, 1934, I gave a full page of facts and figures in the New York Times proving that the Atlantic democracies, if "united," would be, "within human limits, almighty on this planet."

"They are united in cherishing the rights of men," I wrote. "They practice the democratic principle of cooperation by common consent, the principle that in union there is strength, and peace and freedom, too. But they do not practice this principle beyond their borders, even with one another, even to preserve it against those who believe in bullets, not ballots. United, these * * * advanced western peoples would be self-sufficing, secure, impregnable, irresistible. But they are not united."

"Disunion among a few democracies," I said then, as I have been saying ever since, is "the real disease to be cured."

In 1938 Union Now gave a detailed analysis showing not only why leagues and alliances would not prevent war, but why a federal union of the Atlantic democracies would. It included even an illustrative constitution to show in detail how they might effectively federate. Union Now pleaded that the President lead in calling a convention to work out a constitution, as a necessity that was "urgent most for Americans."

"Under the pressure of cutting costs, machines have developed tremendously since the depression, and nowhere so much as with us," it pointed out. "We more than others must be swift to foresee and make allowance in our political calculations for the speed of this machine development increasing in future. * * * If we compare each decade of the past 30 years with the decade before it we shall have some clue to the accumulating speed with which the machine will be making our world one during the next decade—if our failure to provide it with a governor does not meanwhile wreck machine and us." That was years before the advent of the jet plane and atom bomb.

"Catastrophe threatens," Union Now warned in its opening sentence. Its first chapter concluded: "If we will not do this little for men's freedom and vast future (federate), we cannot hope that others will; catastrophe must come and there is no one to blame but ourselves."

That was a year before World War II. And now?

Recently I received a smuggled letter from a man behind the iron curtain, from a Hungarian, whose only hope lies in Atlantic Union now. He wrote:

"I am reading your book right now and remember the words in it: 'The outstanding change is that all along the line the catastrophe is developing on a greater scale and at a faster rate, and moving * * * nearer, nearer, nearer to ourselves.' What is the difference between the Hitler danger and the present? It is a difference in scale, to the advantage of the latter."

Korea proves it is truer now than it was in 1938: The free cannot federate too soon.

National Minerals Advisory Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 31, my colleague, Congressman JENSEN, of Iowa, expressed his concern on the floor of the House over a 2-day postponement of a schedled meeting of the National Minerals Advisory Council. The meeting was postponed, according to the gentleman, so that it could be attended by C. Girard Davidson, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Mineral Resources. Secretary Davidson is out of Washington on what my friend terms "a political junket."

I want to assure this House that neither the prosecution of the fighting in Korea nor the stimulation of defense production is being neglected. The facts show quite the contrary to be the case.

I am advised that the meeting of the National Minerals Advisory Council was postponed so that Secretary Davidson could have preliminary conferences with minerals producers in the Rocky Mountain States. He made this trip so that he could have up-to-date authentic information on the current situation to present to the Council when it meets tomorrow.

On this trip, Secretary Davidson has met with representatives of the Rocky Mountain Oil and Gas Association in Denver Colo. He has conferred with mine owners and operators in Boise, Idaho. He has discussed with zinc and copper producers in Spokane, Wash., the problems affecting these extremely critical materials.

I share with my colleague from Iowa the opinion that the minerals industry has a big job ahead of it in order to make its contribution to the defense effort. Production of strategic and critical minerals must be increased, exploration for these minerals must be encouraged, and our stockpiles must be quickly filled.

I am pleased to note that the men in the Government who are charged with assisting the industry to do this job are working closely with industry leaders and are getting on-the-spot understanding of industry problems. I am confident that the several days spent by Secretary Davidson in the Northwest

conferring with mining officials preliminary to the National Minerals Advisory Council meeting will make that meeting more productive.

Recognize War Now, or Lose to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville (Ind.) News for July 25, 1950:

RECOGNIZE WAR NOW, OR LOSE TO RUSSIA

The Korean war is not an international incident.

It is war—dirty, bloody, heart-rending and soul-terrifying war. It is the opening of the hot phase of world war three. And the third world war can be lost by the United States and whatever allies this Nation can rally to her side.

The American people are not being told the whole truth by their Government in the matter of what almost certainly lies before them. Washington is breaking the news gradually. We fail to understand what all the pussyfooting is about. This is war and our chances of winning will be multiplied by the rapidity with which the enormous fact is made known and thoroughly realized by every man and every woman in the United States.

American men are dying in Korea. They are dying in the air and on battlefields wet with their blood and the blood of the enemy. If that is not war, then what is?

We had better recognize a few facts, and recognize them now—not tomorrow, or next week, or next month, but right now. We cannot wait for Washington to tell us about the need for the cooperation of every citizen in the prosecution of a war. We must realize right now that our cooperation is a must.

We must realize right now that our major opponent—Soviet Russia—is a bragging, boasting, lying bully. Communism in the world today makes no attempt to understand the true meaning of human freedom. It is prepared only to lie and bulldoze its bloody slavery into every nation stupid enough and weak enough to remain helplessly complacent.

There are, however, a few things that Russia can and does understand and respect. Chief among these are power and determination. The United States faces the tremendous task of becoming militarily powerful. Despite everything to the contrary, our military strength at the present time is so small as to make us tremble at the prospect of a great war. Military strength must be built over the long months of the future. But as for determination to resist the forces of evil and to carry on to eventual victory—that is something that we can and must develop now.

Our military intelligence reports indicate that Russia thinks we are unwilling to fight really hard. It is up to every American to show Communist Russia that she is wrong.

The ears of Russian spies, to be found in every Communist-line organization in this Nation—and there are many such—are tuned to the American attitude. What we say and what we do as a people, follows the shortest possible course to the Kremlin. In this respect, there is a way to give Stalin and his henchmen an earfull.

What a set-back the Kremlin's superbureaucrats would get if millions of American men and women bombarded Washington with letters and telegrams to the President and to Members of Congress, declaring all-out determination to carry the fight to the enemy.

Since the days of the American war for independence, the American people never have really known the meaning of total war. American men died in other wars, including World War I and World War II. And in many respects their Nation gave them admirable home-front support. But the United States has never found it necessary to fight, back to the wall, for its very existence. It is highly probable, however, that the latter eventuality may be discovered in world war three.

This is a Government of the people, and the time has come when the people must speak to the whole world as a single great voice. This can best be done by letting our Members of Congress and our President know right now that we are determined that our way of life shall be preserved. If this is done, and done immediately, there still is a chance that Russia will think twice before setting off a conflagration to engulf the world. Even Russia may well tremble before the kind of power and determination of which the American people are capable.

Now is the time to recognize the facts, and to back them up with action.

The Need Is for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of August 2, 1950:

THE NEED IS FOR ACTION

Lest there might be any question about his attitude, President Truman let it be known yesterday that he was quite willing to accept stand-by powers to control prices and wages, provided only that these were reasonably flexible. In a letter to Senator MAYBANK, chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, the President set forth his position briefly but clearly. He had no objection to assuming this authority, he said, subject to four reservations. These he enumerated as follows: (1) The additional powers should be supplementary to, and not a substitute for, the production and credit controls he has already requested; (2) they must not delay action on the latter; (3) they should not involve any rigid formula which would tie his hands in advance, and (4) they should leave open the question of the method of administration.

We think the President is to be congratulated on the soundness of his position on this controversial point and for the clarity with which he has defined it. But we think that he is perhaps even more to be applauded for perceiving and emphasizing, as he does, the urgency of prompt action on the proposals already in the hands of Congress. Two weeks have now passed since Mr. Truman asked for this legislation and since it was introduced in the two Houses—2 weeks which have seen it bogged down by political maneuvering and by time-consuming debate over whether it should or should not be supplemented with other and more drastic controls. This, in our opinion, is a situation in which it is less important precisely what type of controls are made available than it is that they be made available with all possible dispatch. Now that Mr. Truman has removed any possible fear that he will oppose stand-by controls on prices and wages as supplementary legislation, we hope Congress will be persuaded of the importance of putting his original program, as such, on the statute books without any further delay.

Construction of Modern Naval Vessels and Repair of Merchant Marine Reserve Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, with each succeeding day it becomes more and more apparent there is much that must be done to bring our national defense up to a point of efficiency that will meet the present and any future emergency that may arise.

Recognizing the distant points at which our Armed Forces are now engaged and might be engaged in the future, it is of prime importance that our Navy, and its supporting merchant marine, shall be brought up to a high state of efficiency immediately.

It is encouraging to realize that Congress is acting promptly. The bill authorizing the expenditure of $350,000,000 for the construction of modern naval vessels has already passed both Houses of Congress and today has been sent to the President for his approval. There is no doubt that it will receive his approval.

The purpose of this bill is to modernize the United States Navy. The end of World War II left the Navy with many ships of numerous types. Most of these vessels were designed, developed, and tested in service prior to 1941. The greater proportion were built in the war years. Under the terms of the bill some will be converted.

World War II at sea was fought successfully by the carrier task force which destroyed opposing fleets and by the amphibious forces which carried the ground soldier to the beaches in order to reach the enemy. The submarines of the Navy exacted a tremendous toll of enemy ships by the steady and relentless pressure of a lonely war under the sea. Five years have passed and there is a pressing need for the vessels which will take the place of those needed for another day now passed.

Since the end of the war the Navy has maintained a modest shipbuilding and conversion program in the fiscal years, 1948, 1949 and 1950. The present bill authorizes the construction of not to exceed 50,000 tons of modern Naval vessels in the following categories:

(a) Combatant vessels, 30,000 tons.
(b) Auxiliary vessels, 10,000 tons.

(c) Experimental types, 10,000 tons.

In addition to the above named categories the President is authorized to convert not to exceed 200,000 tons of existing naval vessels, from among those vessels on the Navy list determined to be best fitted for conversion, to modern Naval vessels of the following categories:

(a) Combatant vessels, 125,000 tons.

(b) Auxiliary vessels, 75,000 tons.

Five years have passed since the end of hostilities, and there has been little or no construction or conversion of vessels designed to keep the Navy abreast of changes required by scientific and strategic developments. This bill is primarily intended to require the Navy to initiate a modest modernization program through the construction of new prototype vessels and the conversion of existing vessels. The majority of these vessels will be prototypes capable of being produced in large quantities in the event of need. Evidence introduced in closed hearings before the subcommittee clearly showed the necessity for the Navy to proceed in such a program.

The program for the construction and conversion of vessels which would be initially undertaken by the authority of this bill was presented by the Chief of Naval Operations. It represents the annual increment of the Navy's requirements for ship construction and conversion to keep abreast of modern developments in an orderly manner.

The initial program calls for a total of 112 ships and craft is proposed for the construction program. The total tonnage for the new construction is about 14,466 tons. A total of 29 ships is listed for conversion. The total tonnage for conversion under the program is about 96,695 tons.

The estimated cost for the construction of the new types of vessels is just under $130,000,000. The estimated cost of the conversion of existing vessels to the new program's type is a little over $184,000,000.

It has also become apparent from examinations and studies made since the introduction of my bill authorizing the expenditure of $25,000,000 for repair and modernization of our merchant marine reserve fleet that a larger amount will be necessary.

In the first place it has been developed that the ships are in need of more general repairs than at first had been thought necessary, and, secondly, the cost of material has increased since the original estimate, and, to this must be added the additional cost of repairing more ships than had previously been expected. I am of the opinion now that it may cost as much as $50,000,000 and probably even more. However, whatever the cost it must be done. Without the support of mechant vessels as an auxiliary to our Navy we would be at a great disadvantage.

The shipbuilding program which will come as a result of legislation recently passed gives promise of reviving the shipbuilding industry. The industry needs work badly at the present time. Otherwise its working force of trained and skilled mechanics will disintegrate. A strong shipbuilding industry is absolutely necessary to fight a successful war.

The Camden yards and others along the Delaware River are well equipped and ready and anxious to go. The record of achievement by the workers in this area in the past has demonstrated their ability to construct either new ships or modernize present ships. The activity of the New York Shipbuilding Co., located at Camden, N. J., extending over 50 years has covered both the construction of naval and merchant vessels, and its ability to construct well and quickly has been demonstrated time and again. It stands ready for the call as do others along the Delaware River.

An Editorial Smear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chattanooga Times of July 28, 1950:

AN EDITORIAL SMEAR

Debate in the House on Monday brought out a reprehensible bit of journalistic trickery on the part of the Reader's Digest. (We recently called attention to a misquotation by the Digest of a book review from the New York Times of John T. Flynn's volume. The magazine had said the Times called Flynn's book one of the two most important of the year; actually the comment was that it was important as showing the endemic hysteria now prevalent.)

In the present instance the Digest was summarizing an article by Leslie A. Miller, former governor of Wyoming, What Does CVA Mean to You? He is violently against the Columbia River Valley Authority, which is certainly his right, although in his piece he was guilty of some preposterous bunk in discussing the TVA and the alleged stranglehold the TVA has upon the people of our region.

The Digest changed Miller's article to say that he called the distinguished Dr. Paul J. Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power, a Socialist. That is a familiar smear. But Miller denies to the Portland Oregonian and to Dr. Raver that he wrote such an accusation. He declared that he had not used that phrase, and Representative JACKSON, on the floor of the House, said that the Reader's Digest admitted writing the phrase into the article.

Representative MANSFIELD came to Dr. Raver's defense. He said the Miller article declared that Raver had refused to make a long-term contract for power with any private company. But Dr. Raver had already made a long-term contract with the Montana Power Co.—the first contract of any kind to be signed—and the power company has indicated its complete satisfaction with the arrangement.

This is the way smears and rumors travel. According to Mr. JACKSON the Digest defended its action in writing the smear of "Socialist" into the Miller article and said that this was common practice. It is not, in self-respecting journalistic circles, and we believe the Digest knows that it is not.

War Makes Civil Rights Law Enactment Urgent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting an article from the Pittsburgh Courier of July 29, 1950:

PRESIDENT TOLD BY CONGRESSMAN DAVENPORT: "WAR MAKES CIVIL RIGHTS LAWS ENACTMENT URGENT"—MESSAGE SENT TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN BY ALLEGHENY COUNCIL FOR CIVIL RIGHTS—NUMEROUS LOCAL GROUPS REPRESENTED

President Truman was told Tuesday by Congressman HARRY DAVENPORT that now, with the war going on in Korea, is the critical time for quick action on civil rights. He carried to the President a message from the Allegheny Council for Civil Rights calling for a four-point civil-rights action program.

"The fighting in Korea," DAVENPORT told the President, "has clearly shown the need of enacting the civil rights measures into law during the Eighty-first Congress."

CITES EXCLUSION ACT

Under the Oriental Exclusion Act of 1924, DAVENPORT pointed out, Koreans are not permitted to immigrate into the United States and those who are here are ineligible to become American citizens.

"Unless this harsh law is repealed," stated DAVENPORT, "the Communists have a strong propaganda weapon to prevent us from winning friends in Asia."

NEGRO FIGHTERS

The Congressman called attention to the reports of the victory of Negro troops in Korea and asked, "What better way to lend larger purpose to their brave deeds than to strengthen existing civil-rights laws here at home?

"Discrimination has no place," Mr. DAVENPORT added, "in an America fighting to extend individual liberty and freedom from government tyranny throughout the world."

DELIVERS MESSAGE

The letter to the President from the Civil Rights Council was signed by the Reverend L. B. Moseley and the Reverend Robert Pierre Johnson, cochairmen. It read:

"On behalf of the 40 organizations in the council, we wish to call to your attention proposals which are basic to the success of the United Nations action in Korea.

"As persons of all races, creeds. and national origins, we believe it is urgent that the United States demonstrate to people everywhere that democracy works effectively.

"Every American wants to share in the responsibilities as well as the privileges of democracy. To accomplish this we urge you to use your office to insure the most efficient utilization of the Nation's human resources. We urge you to consider the following proposals:

"1. That you continue to accelerate the policy of nonsegregation in the Armed Forces;

"2. That you issue an order comparable to the FEPC Executive order which eliminated discrimination in industrial employment during World War II;

"3. That you encourage the earliest possible ratification of the Genocide Convention;

"4. That you take steps to end the oriental exclusion policy of our immigration laws.

"These actions will demonstrate clearly to the peoples of the world the validity of our claim to the democratic way of life."

The Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 2 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the meaning of the Korean war is clearly and pointedly set forth by Drew Pearson in his excellent column of July 29. His interpretation of the place of the struggle in Korea should be considered by all Americans. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—The other day I suggested that President Truman, who is not exactly the persuasive leader Franklin Roosevelt was, needed a lot of support from the rest of us in the current crisis, which is a lot worse than most people have realized. One thing he needs is some help in making the country understand what the Korean War is all about.

As my own contribution, I should like to set down a few reminiscences regarding other international efforts to stop war, which I have watched during some years of experience as a newspaperman.

The Korean War is basically an international gamble aimed at heading off a greater war; and, while it may fail, you have to look back 25 years to understand what progress the world has made in the painfully difficult job of making men and nations work together to set up international machinery for peace.

As a young newspaperman in 1928, I went down to Habana with Calvin Coolidge, his Secretary of State, Frank B. Kellogg, and Charles Evans Hughes, all Republicans in good standing with the party. At Habana, they put forward to the Pan-American nations a policy of keeping the peace by international arbitration.

This was not a revolutionary plan. When trouble occurred between nations, they proposed the common-sense idea of going to court. But when the treaty later got back to the United States Senate, the sparks flew. And some Republican isolationists called Coolidge, Hughes, and Kellogg just as vitriolic names as MCCARTHY has called the State Department.

CONSULT RE WAR

Two years later, I accompanied a new Republican Secretary of State, Henry L. Stimson, to London Naval Conference. There Stimson did his best to put across a consultative pact—again not a revolutionary proposal. It merely provided that, if war threatened, the United States would agree to consult with the other nations of the world regarding ways of stopping war. Stimson made absolutely no promises or commitments, beyond the promise that we would merely sit down and talk.

Compared with the United Nations of today, the Stimson proposal sounds almost juvenile. But when he proposed it privately at London in 1930—just 20 years ago—Herbert Hoover, then President of the United States, nearly had kittens. He was so agitated that he called a press conference and emphatically informed the world that "no consultative pact has been considered at any time during the course of the London conference."

Simultaneously in London, Secretary Stimson, not knowing that rock-ribbed Republicans were scared stiff over even a tiny bit of international cooperation, was holding his own press conference stating exactly the opposite of his chief in the White House. A consultative pact, he said, was definitely under discussion.

In the end, Hoover showed who was boss. The consultative pact was killed; and with it the entire naval treaty.

WORLD WAR II BEGINS

One year later—1931—the Japanese invaded Manchuria and Secretary Stimson once again tried to secure international cooperation to head off what he knew to be the beginning of a world war. And in an effort to prod and encourage the League of Nations into a cooperative move to stop war, Stimson took the relatively mild step of ordering the United States consul in Geneva to sit in on council sessions—only as an observer.

An immediate howl of protest went up from members of Stimson's own Republican Party. They were so vigorous, and his chief, Herbert Hoover, got so nervous, that the United States consul was finally replaced by Charles G. Dawes, whom the GOP isolationists trusted.

EUROPE COOLS

Even more important, however, was the negative reaction of European members of the League of Nations. The French press screamed that they did not want the United States butting into League affairs. The British foreign office, long in sympathy with Japan, deftly undercut Stimson's crackdowns on Tokyo. Mussolini, fearing his turn would be next, was distinctly cool to American cooperation.

And Jap diplomats, foreseeing the day when they would go on to further aggressions, took diabolical pleasure in ridiculing Stimson, and slowly breaking down the peace machinery of the world.

For months, the League debated. But instead of the 48-hour decision made by the United Nations in the Korean crisis, it took one solid year for the League to get a report from an international commission on the Manchurian incident.

By that time, it was too late. The Jap warlords were firmly entrenched. The seeds of World War II were well planted. And, most important of all, every other would-be aggressor realized that he could thumb his nose at international law, and the League would do nothing.

An age was dying; an age of international optimism, isolationism, and Harding normalcy. An age was dying and Henry L. Stimson struggled almost alone to give it renewed life.

Leaving a sickbed in the spring of 1932, he sailed for Paris determined to warn the statesmen of Europe that they were sealing their own doom. Renting a villa at Geneva, he called in the Prime Ministers of Western Europe and argued that Japan's far-away aggression against China could be a greater threat to them than any menace in Europe.

He urged that they take a firm stand to bolster the world's peace machinery in order to head off war in the future.

But he failed.

1931 VERSUS 1950

Those were dark days in Stimson's villa Besinge on Lake Geneva. His room looked out on an old garden sheltered by high trees, in which roosted flocks of birds. And sometimes, when he could not sleep and work dragged endlessly, Stimson stood at his window looking out upon the trees and the moon and the shadows they cast upon the garden, and remembered the world war days when he was a colonel of artillery in France.

Out among the poplars he saw again that line of men from the fields, the factories, the sea, going forward; and the line of women, wounded men, exhausted men, going back. A panorama of his life lay before him then, the latter years having been given to rebuilding equity and understanding among the peoples of the world.

And he had failed.

The importance of Korea is that in exactly the same part of the world, a few miles from the spot where the Jap war lords invaded Manchuria, Russia, 20 years later, has launched her first move in world war III.

But this time, the newly formed peace machinery of the world functioned overnight. This time Republican Senators, previously isolationist, supported the United Nations. Perhaps it was because TAFT, KNOWLAND, and GOP colleagues had been shouting about Truman's failure in the Far East that caused them to reverse their previous isolation.

Whatever the reason, this time both the United Nations and the United States Senate acted in union. That's why Korea may be a milestone in the path of a war-weary world toward a day when we can prevent wars altogether.

We All Are To Blame in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of August 1, 1950:

WE ALL ARE TO BLAME IN KOREA—MIRROR OF WORLD OPINION

We aren't doing well in Korea. Our forces, undermanned and underequipped, are still being pushed back. Our soldiers are dying, needlessly in many cases, it seems.

Whose fault is this?

A lot of people seem to think they know. They blame the President, the State Department, or the military. They blame our intelligence services. Some blame Congress. Republicans blame Democrats and Democrats blame Republicans. Certain sections of the press are trying to find a scapegoat.

It seems to us there is enough blame to go around, with a share for everybody, including the American citizenry.

The President may not have been outspoken enough in warning of the military menace of communism, or in demanding big enough military expenditures. The military may have failed to prepare for the kind of opposition we are meeting in Korea. The intelligence services may have been misled about the possibility of trouble there. Congress certainly has not been generous in voting funds to strengthen southern Korea.

But behind all these things—in fact, the direct cause of most of them—is the fact that the American people have not gone all-out in the strife against communism. We have failed to face up to the menace represented by Soviet Russia. That country has continued on a war basis since 1945, has continued to strengthen itself, has kept up its aggressive proddings around the world and has maintained its agents at their given

tasks of subversion and conspiracy within the free nations.

It was the American people who demanded, after VJ-day, that the Government break up, quickly, the most magnificent military machine ever assembled. We brought the boys home. We cut our military budgets. We hurried back to as near a normal peacetime existence as was possible. We were, as a people, cool to what was going on in Korea, Iran, Indochina, and a dozen other places.

The picture today is a familiar one. We saw it in the early days of the last two wars. We are not a warlike people. We do not prepare for war. Aggression catches us unprepared. It would seem that we must pass through the tragic days of our Wake Islands, our Bataans, and our Chociwons before we rally, with one mind and one spirit, for the struggle.

This is not to say that past mistakes should not be studied or that negligence, if proved, should not be punished. It does mean that recriminations of a superficial and political nature are valueless and that those who indulge in them should be scorned. There is tough fighting to be done in Korea without senselessly fighting among ourselves about errors of the past. (The Milwaukee Journal.)

United States Policy in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Stanley Earl, a distinguished citizen of my State of Oregon, has recently returned from South Korea, having resigned from the American mission in Korea, and I include herewith a newspaper article in the July 29, 1950, issue of the Oregonian in which is set forth facts with reference to the Korean problem as viewed by Mr. Earl on the ground, which are worthy of careful consideration:

EARL REITERATES CRITICISM OF UNITED STATES POLICIES IN KOREA

Stanley Earl returned from Washington, D. C., Friday and removed any doubt that he has changed his views on Korea and his criticism of American pre-invasion policy there before a packed city club audience in Portland. Earl reiterated his belief that the American mission in Korea should be subject to a congressional investigation.

"For the record I have not changed my views on Korea and I have not received any money," Earl said, referring to newspaper clippings he had received on his return home. Earl said that if the invasion had not occurred he was fully confident that there would have been an internal rebellion because of oppression by the Rhee government.

He declared that "some people ask what can be done in Korea for the South Koreans. One thing is to assure that they will not be subjected to the same sort of thing they have been subjected to since May 28, 1948." (That was the date of establishment of the South Korean government.)

NO REFORMS OFFERED

He said the Korean Government had not put land reforms in effect or put into effect any sort of social legislation. Earl, who was in Korea as labor adviser to the chief of the American mission, said that he had worked to correct the situation in which the unions were a political organ of the government.

Earl said the United States must look to other countries receiving economic aid to assure itself that the same sort of thing was not going on in the rest of the world. "You cannot support corrupt government and defeat communism, and Korea is a living example of it," he said.

He stated that the American Government could have required the Korean Government to correct its errors. "Unless we get our feet on the ground on what we are going to support we are going to lose morally," he declared.

At the end of the session Earl answered questions on Korea. In answer to one question he said that "I think the State Department was fully aware of the situation in Korea and what it would take to remedy it." He said the Koreans are very patriotic people "when they have something to be patriotic for."

He declared the Korean country must be unified and the thirty-eighth parallel removed as a boundary.

DUTY TO SPEAK, INSISTS EARL—FRANK COMMENTS ON KOREA DEFENDED

Stanley Earl, who resigned this week from the American Mission in Korea, reiterated in Portland Friday many of the things he said in interviews and a radio program on his return from Korea and added some more. Earl, who was criticized in Washington for his frank comments on the Korean situation, said he "felt so deeply and personally about things that happened in Korea" that he considered it his duty to speak out.

He said he also considered himself at the time of the Portland interviews as a "free agent," since he had signed a termination slip handed him 2 hours before he boarded a plane for the United States.

NO IMPROVEMENT NOTED

Earl said it was not true that economic conditions had improved in Korea before the invasion. "The economic condition for the mass of people had gone down," he said.

Earl said he had requested to return home on May 25 and had received a passport for June 27, which turned out to be the day he left Korea, but under different circumstances.

"The reason for the letter was that conditions had deteriorated to such an extent that I considered it highly unlikely that the American labor movement would support with money and manpower conditions in the Korean Government contrary to what the American labor movement stands for.

KOREAN PATRIOTISM LACKING

"I belong to that school of thought that believes the people who pay the bills should know for what their money is spent," he said. "There is another school that says, 'It's true, but you shouldn't say it.'"

Earl said he does not believe the South Korean people showed any patriotism at all toward the Rhee government.

"There is a lot of talk about fighting for the minds of men," he said. "It is time to start fighting for their bellies a little."

He said the thirty-eighth parallel, cutting Korea in two on an arbitrary line, was the basic reason for the economic condition of Korea; South Korea with 21,000,000 people was the rice bowl while North Korea had all the electric power.

"The economic condition of South Korea was getting an artificial shot in the arm," he said. "If ECA aid had been withdrawn the Government of Korea would have fallen within a week. I believe an internal revolution would have occurred."

NO COMMUNISTS FOUND

Earl said he had been unable to find one Communist among the people he knew in Korea, but the Government was manufacturing Communists faster than our dollars could cure them.

Pointing out that Japanese in their 40-year rule of Korea had never allowed Koreans to hold responsible positions, he said, "Turning the Government of Korea over to Koreans was like turning dynamite over to a bunch of high-school kids."

The former Oregon CIO secretary said he believes Russia is entirely responsible for the North Korean invasion.

"The North Koreans would not have attacked South Korea without permission of their uncle," he said.

"There is no greater privilege than to be an American citizen and have the right of free speech," he concluded. "To be an American citizen is the highest heritage there is, believe me."

What Congress Can Do

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON D. McKINNON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article appearing recently in the Washington Post, which deserves the attention of every Member of Congress:

WHAT CONGRESS CAN DO

(By Bernard Weitzer)

The brutal invasion of South Korea by the North Korean puppets of the Soviet Politburo makes plain, for all to see, our true military needs. Apparently only a physical aggression is sufficient to prod our Congress into adequate action.

For more than 30 years, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America have urged a universal military-training program. In the Eightieth Congress, after the House Armed Services Committee had held hearings and unanimously approved a universal military-training program as recommended by the Compton Committee, the then chairman of the House Rules Committee refused to give the bill a rule. Favorable action at that time might well have served notice on the Soviets, or on any other potential aggressor, which would have forestalled this adventure in Korea and the many other adventures which they no doubt have ready. Even now such a universal military-training program would provide adequate, well-trained reserves of 19- and 20-year-olds without disturbing industry's capacity to meet war-matériel requirements. The immediate needs for replacements to take care of the military requirements in Korea will, of course, have to be provided by Selective Service.

The renewal of the Selective Service Act which was not finally passed until after southern Korea was invaded, had been before the Congress for nearly 5 months after the appropriate congressional committees held extensive hearings. Surely the Congress will not dilly-dally now with the measures which are essential to meet the Korean aggression and push the North Koreans beyond the thirty-eighth parallel.

There are nonmilitary measures of the utmost importance now before the Congress which require no less prompt and vigorous action than does the Korean crisis. Among them are the appropriations for the European Cooperation Administration, military assistance program, Voice of America, and the point 4 program. The first three already have proved their worth. The reactions of the nations of the world outside the iron curtain are an assurance that point 4 will be equally successful.

For each of these activities the Congress should vote the full appropriations requested by the President for they are as vital to the battles on the psychological front as are the men and the war matériel on the Korean front. This is no time to act like the home owner who would not repair his leaky roof when the sun shone and claimed he could not when it rained.

One more step which the Senate should take promptly is to ratify the Genocide Convention which may well serve as a warning and help to save the lives of some 600,000 Korean Christians who may be extirpated as brutally as were the 6,000,000 Jews in Europe. Ratification will also add to the strength of the United Nations which approved the Genocide Convention at the urging of our delegates.

For years "too little and too late" has been the label which the nations who are our natural allies in the ideological and physical conflict actually being waged, could properly attach to our efforts. The Congress haggles over dimes, and ultimately must appropriate untold sums to repair the damage. Let the Congress remember that if we wait until physical aggression is actually committed against us, it may be too late.

The veteran groups are neither jingoistic nor warmongers. However, as those who saw the full cost of war, they are in the best position to urge the Nation not to forget the warnings of the founding fathers. Preparedness now—as then—is the prime necessity and must be our watchword and slogan till this danger, too, shall pass.

"Mariposa" and "Monterey"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee may shortly consider a problem involving the settlement of difficulties between the Government and the owners of two great ocean liners. The ships have been tied up in San Francisco Bay since the end of their service as troop transports in World War II. The work of reconverting to trans-Pacific passenger service has never been completed. During that war they transported something over 370,000 troops. They would be very useful now. They could be back in operating condition in a very few months.

The following article which appeared in the Washington Daily News of August 1 gives some background information concerning the situation:

TWO BIG TRANSPORTS GATHER BARNACLES

(By Richard MacFarlane)

SAN FRANCISCO, August 1.—As the military services urgently assemble ships to carry troops and supplies to the Korean war front, two of the largest and fastest potential troop transports on the Pacific lie idle.

They are the big 26,000-ton Matson liners *Mariposa* and *Monterey*, prewar glamour queens of the Pacific, whose rebuilding for postwar passenger service to Hawaii and the South Seas was stopped in July 1947.

Since then they have been in the Maritime Administration shipyard at Alameda. Their interiors were stripped to bare steel and exteriors covered with red lead, while Matson and the Government negotiated over a deal to complete the *Mariposa* and dispose of the *Monterey*.

THREE-MONTH JOB

With their sistership, the *Lurline*, in Hawaiian service, they are the biggest and fastest ships on the Pacific. They have a 21-knot speed and a troop capacity of 7000-plus each.

While many months of work lie ahead to complete the big liners for peacetime luxury service, Matson engineers guess the *Mariposa* and *Monterey* could be completed for troop duty in about 3 months at a cost of between $3,000,000 and $3,500,000 each.

Rebuilding of the *Mariposa* is more than half completed. The only major work necessary to finish her as a transport would be installation of troop berths, mess rooms, galleys, and incidental machinery.

The *Monterey* is about one-third completed.

WORLD WAR II SERVICE

Stripped and converted to transports immediately after Pearl Harbor, the *Monterey* and *Mariposa* performed illustrious service during the war, carrying troops to every combat area of the world.

When their military service ended, they were returned to Matson Line where plans had been made to rebuild them into virtually new ships for postwar service. Rising costs and the uncertain future of Pacific passenger service stopped work on the *Mariposa* and *Monterey* in 1947, and only the *Lurline* was completed, at a cost of $18,500,000.

Matson later worked out a plan whereby Government money due the line on both ships would be applied to completing the *Mariposa* as a luxury liner, and the Government would acquire the *Monterey* for whatever service it wished. This plan was rejected by Congress last year.

UP TO CONGRESS

A modified plan along the same lines was proposed, approved by the Maritime Administration and finally, after much delay and red tape, reached the House Merchant Marine Committee, where it is today.

The next move is up to Congress. Whether the *Mariposa* is to be completed as a luxury liner, or both ships as transports, they are doing nobody any good gathering barnacles.

These War Vultures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be with us always those who profit by the misfortunes of others, even in time of war. I am including the following timely editorial by Spencer Canary, editor of the Sentinel Tribune, of Bowling Green, Ohio:

THESE WAR VULTURES

Justice William Douglas, of the Supreme Court, in his book, Of Men and Mountains, points out that the vultures of eastern Washington perform a real service by devouring dead animals.

Those who visit Florida note these ugly-looking red-necked birds flying about in numbers. They do much to maintain a healthy climate. Carrion is their meat. What turns the stomachs of humans is a delicious morsel to them.

But what about the human vultures who thrive on the tragedy of war? These are big leaders of industry who raise prices of their products at once. The war in Korea was only a month old Tuesday, yet these presumably brainy men have begun raising their prices. There is just as much steel as before the North Koreans descended on the South; and it had been selling at big profits, according to reports just made to stockholders by United States Steel Corp. and Bethlehem. Scarcity might prevail for some manufacturers using steel, but the steel companies can sell as much as ever. There is just as much tobacco. Why should there be an increase in the selling price of cigarettes?

And these leaders are followed by the little fellows, like the coyotes of the west compete for spoils with the vultures. Both are stabbing our fighters in the back. The Korean guerrillas that lurk behind trees and underbrush to snipe our boys in uniform are no more dangerous to our men's welfare than the price vultures. They are starting to make the United States the same difficult place to earn a living that our veterans of the last war have been experiencing.

While our Nation is fighting communism, these price vultures are making the country more fertile for Communistic propaganda. Can't these greedy men see it? They might be the dispossessed kulaks of the future.

Ten Days With the Armed Forces Recommended Diet for Defense Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Douglas MacArthur recently told us that the situation in Korea would likely get even worse before it gets better, but that he was completely confident that it would get better.

There is an old saying to the same effect that it is always darkest before the dawn.

I am reminded of both these thoughts with regard to the erstwhile castigations of our Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Louis A. Johnson. For some months we read bitter criticisms, though mostly from a single source, of Secretary Johnson's efforts. Then came Korea; the political harpies came swooping out of their otherwise dormant dens to subvert unity of purpose, which so grave a crisis demanded, to selfish ambitious headline-grabbing. The worst of these were not content alone with decrying the misfortune of the moment; they had to dig back into the past to besmirch and becloud the present. They unshelved "unification," dusted off "the B-36 investigation" and "Johnsonian economy."

But as the first smoke-screens cleared and our leaders settled down to meeting the crisis at hand, a gradual trickling of sound appraisal of our defense setup began to be manifested in the press and in these halls. And despite our Korean reverses to date, the repeated assurances from our military chiefs over there and the unavoidable feeling of somber, restrained optimism that stems from the arrival of more and more fresh troops and equipment, have given rise to

a louder recognition of our Defense leaders and their ability to rise to so grim an occasion.

I have just read a most brilliant attestation to our defense team. That it comes as an unsolicited and unbiased tribute to Secretary Johnson, Deputy Defense Secretary Early, Air Force Secretary Finletter, Army Secretary Pace, Generals Collins and Vandenberg and others, is in and of itself refreshing. But that it comes of a personal visit with the Armed Forces is even worthier of note. The author of the article, the well-known writer and critic, Bennett Cerf, gives his impressions based on Ten Days with the Armed Forces, the title of his article in his weekly column Trade Winds, appearing in the July 22, 1950, Saturday Review of Literature.

The 10 days to which Mr. Cerf refers were spent as an invitee of the Department of Defense's Seventh Joint Orientation Conference. I not only commend the article to some erstwhile Defense critics; I commend to them 10 days with the Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I should like to include the following article to which I have referred:

TRADE WINDS

TEN DAYS WITH THE ARMED FORCES

(By Bennett Cerf)

If any of us suspected we were beginning to forget the horror of coming home from a lazy summer week end in the country to discover that Hitler had made another of his sudden, unprovoked, sickeningly thorough attacks on a defenseless neighbor, the invasion of South Korea drove the cobwebs from our minds in a single flash. "No, no!" we told ourselves. Our generation has suffered enough. The whole bloody business can't be beginning all over again—and so soon, so very soon. The pattern was identical—down to the last detail of attack, the last cynical lying phrase of the invader's propaganda machine. Bitter experience at least had taught us one lesson: You either say "No" to this sort of thing at the very start or it goes on and on indefinitely—and gets worse. We are committed to saving Korea because there simply was no other course open to us.

It's become fashionable to remember just where you were or what you were doing when the news broke about Pearl Harbor. Should the invasion of South Korea prove an equally fateful moment in world history, I for one will have no trouble remembering where I heard about it. I was on the hangar deck of the *Midway*, the queen of the United States Navy's carriers, steaming to sea for a rendezvous with Task Force 23 and a brief but intensive series of naval operations in the 1950 manner. It was a stunning climax to a session of talks by top Government officials at the Pentagon Building, a display of new weapons and infantry tactics at Fort Benning, Ga., and an inspiring show of the latest equipment and striking power of the Air Force at Eglin Base, Fla. The program was arranged for the seventh joint orientation conference, and that I was invited to be a member of it I consider one of the biggest honors and luckiest breaks of my career. If you've never heard of the joint orientation program this is as good a time as any for you to learn the particulars.

The first JOC was the brainchild of Jim Forrestal when he served as Secretary of Defense. His notion was to gather a geographic cross section of representatives of American business, finance, labor, religion, education, publishing, and the professions, let them see and hear at first hand how the unification of our Army, Navy, and Air Force was progressing, how the Department of Defense was carrying out its own obligations and integrating with other branches of the Government—and count on his guests to spread the good word as loudly and vehemently as they knew how. It worked like a charm. Each JOC has been a more resounding success. The four-hundred-odd guests of the seven conferences held to date have gone home enlightened and imbued with a new confidence in the men responsible for the safeguarding of American democracy. What's more, they've had the time of their lives in the process. At first it wasn't easy to pry important citizens away from their jobs for a fortnight and expose them to the rigors (and 5:45 a. m. reveilles) of the military life. Today there's a waiting list of thousands begging for invitations. If conditions permit, there will be four more Joint Orientation Conferences every year.

Before going on to some of the details of my own JOC tour I'd like to sum up my over-all impressions:

1. This country has taken enormous strides in the past 2 years in readying itself for whatever military adventures it may be forced to undertake. Our Armed Forces are in no sense on a peacetime basis today. Admittedly inadequate for full-scale warfare at the moment, we at least are aware of their deficiencies, and on the way to overcoming them. In 6 months' time I believe we will be prepared—or almost prepared—for anything. Our basic equipment is superb. Stockpiles are growing. The most cursory inspection is enough to dispel that sinking feeling of helplessness scare headlines have given us all and replaces it with a heady sense of renewed confidence.

2. Our men in the field are absolute tops. That most of us already knew. But here's one thing more. The men in Washington seem just as good. They're young: they're full of vigor and enthusiasm; they appear to be on the ball every minute of the time. My group was in no sense a lot of dreamy-eyed optimists or men likely to be impressed by titles and trappings. It included hard-bitten realists like Hugh Ferry, president of Packard; Tom Millsop, president of Weirton Steel; Frank Schroth, publisher of the Brooklyn Eagle; George Cross, president of the University of Oklahoma; Father Robert Gannon, of Fordham fame; Col. Tom Barton, of Lion Oil; Bill Wasserman, of Wall Street; Phil Zenner, of the McBride Co.; Hugh Moffett, of Life magazine; Arthur Adams, new president of the American Council on Education; Max Fillet, of Pepsi-Cola; Webster N. Jones, dean of Carnegie Tech; L. R. Vaniman, vice president of Fruehauf; Mark Ellingson, president of Rochester Tech; John Algeo, vice president of Hazel-Atlas; Dr. William Brooks, one of the leaders of the Presbyterian Church; Fred Atkinson, of R. H. Macy's; and Editors Ferger of Cincinnati, Hall of Mason City, Kerney of Trenton, and Ashworth of Columbus (I mention those whom I had the opportunity of meeting most intimately). I think all of us were particularly impressed by Frank Pace, Secretary of the Army; Gen. J. Lawton (Lightning Joe) Collins, Army Chief of Staff; Tom Finletter, new Secretary of the Air Force, and his dynamic Chief of Staff, Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg; William Webster, chairman of the Research and Development Board, and Sumner Pike, storm center of the Atomic Energy Commission. Mr. Pike's recent victory in the Senate was a triumph for good government over sordid and petty political considerations.

3. Unification is really working. Deeply ingrained jealousies are not eliminated overnight. A certain amount of healthy rivalry between the Army, Navy, and Air Force is, in fact, highly desirable. But that we now have a single team, operating with constantly increasing smoothness under alert, capable leadership, is something that is apparent to the veriest tyro.

4. Steve Early, Deputy Secretary of Defense, is, of course, one of the best men in Washington, but what delighted me most on this tour was the multiplying evidence of the efficiency of the much maligned Secretary himself, Louis Johnson. Just back from a wearying trip to Japan, Mr. Johnson flew down to Norfolk the very next day to address the JOC aboard the *Midway*. His sincerity seemed unmistakable. This is no truckler to public acclaim, no diplomat to insure a good press for himself by fanning the egomaniacal urges of famous syndicated columnists. He goes about his business as he sees it, and if they damn him for it, takes it philosophically as one of the penalties for entering public life in Washington today. Mr. Johnson sums up the job of Secretary of Defense as deciding: (a) what you have to do, (b) what it takes, (c) who does it. Korea will provide the test of Mr. Johnson's judgment. Incidentally, he says he has a fourth job—very difficult indeed—and that is to cut out the expense of maintaining useless anachronisms like old Civil War forts and outmoded Coast Guard installations. Every economy move in that direction wins him a new quota of virulent and articulate enemies.

It was an interesting study in human behavior to watch 60 total strangers, who eyed one another like fighting cocks when first they met at the Statler in Washington, jell into a homogeneous unit, vowing lifelong friendships, as a result of 10 days of common experiences and thrills shared on sun-baked fields in the South and at sea aboard a mighty carrier. Like every group, the Seventh Joint Orientation Conference had its "life of the party," an irrepressible, puckish legal light named Robert Walker, from Iowa, who delighted everybody from four-star generals to tough noncoms. Walker succeeded in getting lost one night under the noses of the entire Third Infantry Division, turning up inexplicably in a town called Phoenix City, Ala., where he had been proposed for mayor. Led back into captivity, Walker promptly endorsed Hugh Ferry's recipe for a hangover: squeeze the juice from two quarts of Scotch. He first won the group's attention at the Pentagon Building. "If our enemies have the atomic bomb," predicted someone, "I'll bet they'll drop the first one right here." "What?" cried Walker, "and destroy all this confusion?"

Most of the generals and admirals at the Pentagon (nobody lower than a colonel ever dares venture out of the cracks in the woodwork) make it clear they are there through no choice of their own. One said he could not decide which gave him the worst pain in the same place: the wooden bleachers at Fort Benning or life in the Pentagon. Covering the Pentagon beat for The New York Times, incidentally, is Austin Stevens, late of the book department. Frank Pace, Secretary of the Army, told of his first day in the field with a regiment of tough veterans. A sergeant watched him dig a foxhole without saying a word. "How'm I doing?" demanded Pace finally. The sergeant allowed, "A couple of live shells would improve your technique." A private with an open camera watched Pace, too, but made no move to snap his picture. "Camera broken?" asked Pace. "Not at all," answered the private. "You see, Mr. Secretary, that's my foxhole and I want to get your picture when you've finished digging it."

F. J. Lawton, director of the Bureau of the Budget, made this sobering comparison: A Russian private gets about $18 a year; an American GI $1,080. A Russian general earns $2,000 a year, an American general $11,000. He says an official once asked a Russian general, "How do you provide for your privates in wintertime?" The general explained, "We just turn 'em loose in the forest, tell 'em to

take care of themselves and come back in the spring." Felix Larkin, general counsel of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, reminded the JOC that the Berlin air lift, in 462 days, made 276,211 flights, fed two and a half million people, and transported 2,322,242 tons of food and fuel! Larkin's description of unification in 1947: "The Army was an overardent bridegroom, the Navy an overreluctant bride. The Air Force was born on the day of the marriage."

At Fort Benning, Ga. (the population of the post exceeds 30,000; the area comprises 282 square miles), the JOC had its first taste of life in the field, and the sounding of reveille at 5:45 a. m. provoked a stream of reminiscences of World War I which were, unfortunately, listened to by nobody.

A display of our remarkable new recoilless weapons (and other arms still considered secret) had the audience gasping. There also were exploded shells with four different colors of smoke (for signaling purposes)—red, green, yellow, and violet. "Good heavens," exclaimed one JOC-ing eye. "They're making war beautiful." The disgust of Archy Alexander, Under Secretary of the Army, was only exceeded by that of the first-year class of West Point (also present at the demonstration) when the regimental band bravely struck up the refrain of the Notre Dame football song. The airborne troops begin their parachute training in a control tower exactly like the one that packed them in at the New York World's Fair and is now operating at Steeplechase Park. The stunts they perform just 5 weeks later give you goose pimples. Inevitably, somebody told the story of the parachutist who stuttered. When his group made its first jump the instructions were, "Count 10, then pull the handle that releases your parachute." The stutterer's companions were floating gently to the ground when he plummeted by, his parachute unopened. "The poor bastard," mourned his pal. "I knew he couldn't count to 10."

One of the guests of honor at the official reception in the officers' mess was the retired head of the infantry school, Gen. P. B. Malone, a peppery 78, with a disconcerting habit of referring to the incumbent commandant, Major General Burress, as Pinky. General Malone remarked, "So you're Bennett Cerf of Random House." "Yes," I said, "and I'm proud to make your acquaintance." "The hell you are," said General Malone. "You turned down my novel." I think I persuaded him to resubmit it to me personally.

It was at our next stop, Eglin Air Force Base, Fla., that I had my unforgettable ride in a jet fighter plane. It all began over cocktails with Hal Stuart, dashing young Assistant Secretary of the Air Force and classmate of my wife, Phyllis, at good old Classon High, in Oklahoma City. Hal decided to tell a story about a farmer who owned a very tough ram but discovered that music soothed its savage breast. Headed for town one day, the farmer reminded his son, "If that ram gets rambunctious just put a record on the victrola." When he returned home he discovered that the ram had plunged against an iron fence and committed suicide. "Did you plan music like I told you?" he demanded of the son. "I sure did," said the boy, "but the record I chose seemed to drive him crazy. It was Frank Sinatra singing 'There'll Never Be Another Ewe.'"

I told Stuart, "If I've got to listen to jokes like that I demand a ride in a jet plane as retribution." To my horror, he took me seriously. The next afternoon, Capt. Jack Fallon, of the Three Thousand Two Hundredth Fighter Test Squadron, equipped me with a Mae West and a parachute, clapped a crash helmet over my head, and strapped me into a two-seated F-80 Shooting Star jet plane. "If we have to bail out," he counseled me, "push this button. It will eject you and the seat you're strapped to from the plane. Then count 'one thousand—two thousand—three thousand—' and pull your parachute buckle." I was too plumb scared to answer. With a roar we were off over the Gulf of Mexico at the modest speed of 510 miles an hour. I had just about recovered my breath when we zoomed up to a cloud bank. "Wonder how it will feel to go through the clouds in this thing," I asked myself. But we didn't go through. Suddenly we headed straight up to the sky. I felt a pressure against the back of my neck and we shot from 3,000 feet to 10,000 in about 15 seconds flat. At the crest of the cloud bank good old Captain Jack drove downward, revolving the plane completely three times in the process. My discovery of a small mirror in front of and above me just about saved the day for me. I've seen expressions of sheer, stark terror in my life, but the face that looked back at me from that mirror was in a class by itself. The crash helmet jammed down over my glasses just about completed the picture. I burst out laughing. "How'd you like that?" asked Captain Fallon cheerfully through the speaking tube. I managed to reply weakly, "Get me out of here, you so and so." By this time we must have been above the outskirts of New Orleans. Later it occurred to me that we might have had dinner at Antoine's. At the moment I wasn't thinking about food. Thirty-one minutes later we swooped back onto the field (at an angle of 90 degrees), came to a stop, and a squad of about 10 or 15 succeeded in extricating me from the plane. There was nothing wrong with me that three straight mint juleps couldn't cure. That night I made a speech that sent all the others clamoring for jet rides. The air was full of petrified VIP's the next day. I must have cost the Air Force a pretty penny.

Well, after that jet ride, a tour through the climatic hangar (the temperature there was 40 degrees below zero; when I came out my glasses remained frozed over for 15 minutes) was routine stuff. I even failed to respond when a tailor lost a pair of my sports pants and three colonels were dispatched to look for them. The last thing we saw at Eglin was a B-36 (two and a half times the size of a B-29) drop a stick of bombs that destroyed a series of targets 5 miles long. It was an awesome sight—and I only hope some of our potential enemies have seen it. Our best and jolliest meal at Eglin was served at the Non-Com Club (which has just loaned the Officers Club $18,000 to help keep it afloat).

The next day we boarded the *Midway* and the Navy's famous Capt. Jimmy Flatley told us about the Korean attack as we steamed out to sea. Planes landed on the carrier deck and took off moments later, submarines submerged and snorkeled, a drone was catapulted from the deck and sunk by amazingly accurate ship fire, and night operations were more spectacular still. But how much excitement can you absorb in 10 short days?

I came home revitalized and simply busting to shout from the housetops this deep-felt conviction; when and if a war comes with Russia or anybody else this country is blessed with the basic equipment and leadership to knock hell out of them. We need more fighter planes and more carriers. We need more men in the Armed Forces. Our intelligence and propaganda departments need bolstering most of all. The money already allotted to defense has been, on the whole, wisely spent. In light of day-to-day news developments, increased appropriations are not only a wise investment but an absolute must. When your life is at stake, you don't haggle over the cost.

What Does CVA Mean to You?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 2 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on Saturday, July 22, 1950, the junior Senator from Utah and C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, engaged in a discussion of the question "What Does CVA Mean to You?" This discussion was conducted over the American Forum of the Air under the direction of Theodore Granik. There have been a number of requests made for copies of the discussion. For that reason I ask unanimous consent to have the discussion printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT DOES CVA MEAN TO YOU?

(Discussion by Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS and C. Girard Davidson)

ANNOUNCER. The National Broadcasting Co. presents the American Forum of the Air, founded 22 years ago by Theodore Granik, and dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues, coming to you from the NBC Theater in Washington, D. C.

Now here is your moderator, Theodore Granik.

Chairman GRANIK. One of America's leading magazines, Reader's Digest, which each month reaches some 50,000,000 readers throughout the world, features a most provocative article in its new August issue just out yesterday. It is entitled "What Does CVA Mean to You?" written by Leslie A. Miller, former Governor of Wyoming. I would like to quote from the Digest article:

"The CVA means plenty to you. It is just one more step," writes Governor Miller, "in an ambitious plan to socialize the electric-power industry as a big stride toward socialism. And while the Government may dig the dirt out of some distant State, it will dig the billions the project will cost out of everybody's pocket, including yours."

However, those supporting President Truman's proposal for the Columbia Valley Administration contend that the CVA means greater employment, greater industrial and business development, and a higher standard of living in the Pacific Northwest; that today the threat of war and the increased importance of aluminum and atomic-energy plants gives the Pacific Northwest Nationwide significance.

In view of the widespread national interest in this vital subject, the American Forum of the Air, in cooperation with Reader's Digest, is pleased to present this discussion by Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Republican, of Utah, and C. Girard Davidson, of Oregon, Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Now, Mr. Secretary, what does CVA mean to you?

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Granik, the Columbia Valley Administration proposed by President Truman will provide a more efficient method of managing the Federal Government's part of the job of river-basin development and resource conservation in the Pacific Northwest States. The Government has heavy responsibilities in that region, vitally important to the Nation. Among other things, it supplies half of the Nation's electric power

in that region, and half of the aluminum of the Nation comes from that part of the country. It also supplies the power for the atomic-energy installations and other national defense establishments.

If military requirements call for the expansion of aluminum and atomic energy, the Federal Government has to generate electricity in the Northwest in a hurry. The Federal Government is not now moving fast enough in that region with its job of river development and conservation. It is held back by a horse-and-buggy system of divided responsibilities among more than 20 different Federal agencies, all involved in Federal resource development.

But, by contrast, in the Tennessee Valley Authority we have the only completely controlled river basin in the world. It is a model praised all over the world, and there in the Tennessee Valley they have accomplished this by pulling together the Federal agencies, locating the headquarters of the agency in the region itself, and putting on a business-like basis the Federal operations in that area; and those same principles should be applied in the Pacific Northwest.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator WATKINS?

Senator WATKINS. At the outset, I want it distinctively understood that I stand for the fullest possible development of all of our river resources and river systems for the maximum benefit of all of the people in the United States. My record supports this stand, I am glad to say.

Now, back in 1902 it was found necessary to inaugurate a reclamation program to bring waters from western streams to desert lands so that homes could be built. This only happened when the investigation, the planning, and the construction of reclamation projects wes beyond the ability of the people to carry, themselves. Then the Federal Government came into the picture, and provided a program wherein the Federal Government advanced the cost for investigation, planning and constructon of irrigation and incidental power projects. The people getting the projects signed repayment contracts wherein they agreed to repay the costs of the project on an amortized basis. As soon as the projects or units of projects were built, the people agreed to take over their operation, and it was understood that when the projects were paid for, the water users would own and operate them in perpetuity.

Under this program, the Federal Government only did those things for the people which the people could not do for themselves. These projects are now a thing of the past. Multiple-purpose projects on interstate rivers are about the only ones left to be built.

Now, these remaining projects should be built in accordance with the same basic policy of the original Reclamation Act. Instead of small water users' associations within a State, it will now be necessary to organize interstate water and power associations under Federal charter to sign the repayment contracts, to operate and to maintain and own, in behalf of the members of the association, the interstate projects when completed. But all we do is expand an original program that we had, the same basic, sound policy adopted by Theodore Roosevelt in the original Reclamation Act. And it will work on an interstate basis if we provide the people with that interstate association under Federal charter to sign the contracts.

It is not necessary to have a CVA to do any of the wonderful things that the President thinks we ought to have done, and that my good friend, Mr. Davidson, has outlined here today.

Mr. DAVIDSON. I think that we have made considerable progress since the 1902 Reclamation Act. In 1939 the Reclamation Act was changed so as to provide the Federal Government could go in and construct these dams which provide a multiple-purpose use and provide for various uses on the river. But I think now we have gone further. I think the need of speeding up our system of resource development by the Federal Government now requires that the various Federal agencies which are working in that region, coordinate their efforts, come together under one program. There is no sense in having three Federal agencies, the Army engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and Bonneville Power Administration, doing one job in the region and having three agencies. The CVA would combine those three agencies into one, and ask it to do the job.

Senator WATKINS. I would be perfectly willing to eliminate one, and that is the Bonneville Administration. That is the agency the Federal Government has set up to take control and management and ownership of the project after it is once built. We could get rid of that to good advantage, but retain the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers. They are fully staffed, and they have a great deal of experience in both organizations, and there are plenty of projects there to keep them busy until doomsday. And in this emergency it would take a long time to get a CVA organized and set up. It would probably take 2 years. In the meantime, these agencies could go ahead.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Senator WATKINS, the Bonneville Power Administration is the agency set up to sell the power from the dams constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers. Last year, after paying all operating expenses and return on investment, that agency turned in to the Treasury of the United States over $10,000,000. It has turned over something like $142,000,000 net since 1939 when it started. That is from the sale of power in the region from these other two agencies, but they are all involved in producing the power, and there is no sense in having three agencies doing it when one would suffice.

I believe in economy in government, and I believe that we should put it on an efficient basis; and there is no sense in having the the three agencies when one will do. And a CVA will perform that function.

Senator WATKINS. I think the CVA would still have to have a department of reclamation and a department of flood control; it would simply mean another boss. Instead of having the boss here in Washington, we would have the boss out in Washington State or Oregon under this three-man set-up.

But let me say about the Bonneville Administration, which transmits the power and sells the power and collects the money only, we can do away with that. I did not mean that we are not going to have someone to do that job. I intend, under the legislation which I have introduced—and which is more popularly known as S. 3376—we propose to have the people organize their own organization out there to sell that power and to own and operate those projects, for after all, it is the people out there who are going to pay for these projects, and it is the people out there who paid the $10,000,000 into the Bonneville Administration, and it is the same people out there in that industrial Northwest who are paying in $143,000,000. It is home rule, grass-roots control against Federal control, and I don't care whether you put the Federal Government into the power business in the guise of a CVA or a three-man Valley Authority, or whether you call it the Bonneville Administration, it is still the same old gentleman with the whiskers; it is the United States. And it is nationalization, and in my book it is socialism. You cannot have all of that——

Chairman GRANIK. Could the Secretary answer that?

Mr. DAVIDSON. There are two or three things I have got to answer on that. First, we are not discussing Senator WATKIN'S bill tonight.

Senator WATKINS. That is what we are going to discuss before we get through.

Mr. DAVIDSON. We are discussing the CVA proposal. I agree with him that it is desirable to bring operations closer to the people, but what you are proposing under your bill, Senator, is a much more radical thing of turning over Federal investment to the States and to local people.

Senator WATKINS. Why not let the people do it?

Mr. DAVIDSON. The CVA bill is not that radical. Your bill would do absolutely nothing to eliminate the present conflicts which now exist among Federal agencies. It would do nothing, and it would further impair, actually, unified operation of a river system. It would turn over publicly financed multiple-purpose projects to groups dominated by local interests. And in the CVA proposal we suggest that the headquarters be located out in the Pacific Northwest; that one agency be set up to coordinate all of the problems that the Federal Government now handles; that its headquarters be located there in the region; and that the directors be residents of the region at the time that they are appointed. Of course, they are appointed by the President and approved by the Senate, and the President is given the executive responsibility under this Government to handle the Federal Government's function.

Senator WATKINS. I think that he has not answered all of my questions, but when I speak of the kind of an organization I propose, I am only following well-established Federal practice. For many years, when we started out with the reclamation program, we had incidental power projects, and every one of those were turned over to the people, and they paid for them. Uncle Sam was in the position of a lender of money and a lender of facilities, a lender of help. These people did not have the means, and the projects became too big; they built all of the easy ones and they built 85 percent of the irrigation and power projects in the West up to date. But now they have arrived at a period when they must have some help.

Now, this help can come without taking away any of the rights of the people in the communities. Uncle Sam loans money all over the world, billions of dollars, and he doesn't even ask for most of it back from Europe; he gives it to them, but he never attempts to control it after he gives it to them. He will not go into France and operate that great electric power project they are now building on ECA dollars. Out West all we want them to do is to follow the reclamation program, loan us the money, help us with the investigations, sign up the contracts with our interstate associations which are provided for in my bill. You do not need a CVA, you will have a unified operation of every one of those streams, and it will all be done under one head; the people will own it and operate it and pay for it. Then the creditor, the United States Government, can step out just as has been done historically. It is only recently that they have sneaked in and gradually grabbed control and ownership of power.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Would you be willing to pay back the flood-control costs and the navigation costs to the Federal Government?

Senator WATKINS. May I say that under your program, they will never be paid back.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Under my program they are not paid back anyway, and they are not paid back in the South or New York——

Senator WATKINS. I agree with you 100 percent on that.

Mr. DAVIDSON. But I wanted to know, there the Federal Government does get the money back——

Senator WATKINS. All of the reimbursable costs.

Mr. DAVIDSON. —from the sale of power and the sale of irrigation water, but then

there is also a return to the Federal Government over and above that, which helps to pay the cost of flood control and navigation; and under your bill, would you pay those costs?

Senator WATKINS. I think under my bill, if you turn over that entire river and its resources to the people of the West who really own those resources, who should have them—they do not belong to the National Government, they belong to the people—now, if you let us have all that, yes, we can pay for the flood control, every project built by the Army engineers. We do not have to pay for the navigation. That is a charge against the General Treasury, and we should not pay for fish and wildlife propagation or preservation, because that cost should go to the Federal Treasury, and we should not pay for any of these other items that benefit everybody in the country. But for the water, which belongs to the West—and under the Flood Control Act of 1944 it provides that there shall be priority for the consumptive uses, for domestic uses.

Chairman GRANIK. May the Secretary answer?

Senator WATKINS. I have not finished my answer yet, but I suppose it is all right.

Mr. DAVIDSON. You made a couple of statements, and so did Mr. Granik at the beginning, quoting the Reader's Digest, and you said it would be socialism in your book.

I just want to point out that the electric companies did a public-opinion survey not long ago, and this Reader's Digest article follows that line exactly.

I am glad that this is on television, because all of you can see this chart. It shows that, of the people asked in the survey, 63 percent approve of the TVA and only 10 percent disapprove. Even 55 percent of the Republicans approve, as well as 83 percent of the educators and editors. And the survey says, "These are the people who read, and get around, and think." As for creating TVA's in other parts of the country, 63 percent think it is a good idea, and only 15 percent think it is a bad idea.

Then the survey asks, "Would socialism be a good thing or bad thing for the United States?" And 69 percent of the people said it would be a bad thing, and 15 percent said a good thing.

And this is what the electric companies concluded:

"From the preceding chart it is apparent that to link our fight to the TVA question would run us into a lot of opposition, and most of it based on lack of knowledge; but to link our fight to socialism is something else again. The people do not want socialism. We are on favorable grounds there.

"The electric companies' advertising programs in magazines and on the radio will stress the fight against the socialistic state more in the future. It should be stressed, too, on the local level in speeches, radio talks, interviews and other public expressions of management opinion."

And the Reader's Digest follows that line by calling the Columbia Valley Administration creeping socialism. I will let you draw your own conclusions.

Senator WATKINS. If the word "socialism" offends my good friend and these advocates of the TVA model and the rest of it, they can take it out, but it is nationalization and it is the Federal Government down there. In that situation three men are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. They hold their power directly under congressional act. They do not represent the people. My plan will have all of the advantages of the TVA without any of its disadvantages. Instead of the control coming from the top, from the President of the United States, down through Congress, it will come from the people and they will organize as they have done historically in the past under the Reclamation Act, and organize their own interstate associations, which my bill will authorize. They will then sign these contracts and they will then perform all of these things, and whether they want public or private power will be left entirely to the people.

Under that situation, one town can have public power and another one can have private power, and there is no argument about that at all.

I hold no brief for the electric companies. As a matter of fact they do not happen to like my bill because it does provide that the people themselves down at the grass roots in this democracy, where the people should rule, are the ones who are going to decide those questions. I am perfectly willing to leave it there. But I do say that when Uncle Sam advances the money and loans it to us and he loans his services, either through the Bureau of Reclamation or the Army engineers, or where, under the Hoover program, they have a consolidated construction organization, they construct one of these projects and they get it ready, they then should turn it over to us. We have the brains to run it out there. We have done it in the past, we are doing it now, and we can do it again.

Mr. DAVIDSON. I want it distinctly understood that I am in favor of all of the grass roots and local control you can get.

Senator WATKINS. Then you ought to be for my bill.

Mr. DAVIDSON. There are some points in your bill which I think are very well taken, and those I like. But the thing that we are talking about is the Columbia Valley Administration. The Columbia Valley Administration proposes to take the powers away from the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, here in Washington, and vest them out in the region, and place them closer to the people where the people themselves can have something to say about it. That is what the CVA does.

Chairman GRANIK. May I take a question from the audience? I see that Senator MURRAY from Montana is here with a question.

Senator MURRAY. Mr. Davidson, I have always found that when a person does not have a logical argument against a proposal, the thing he is apt to do is to smear it with a name like "socialism" or "communism."

Senator WATKINS. I wonder if this is a speech or a question.

Chairman GRANIK. Can you put it in the form of a question?

Senator MURRAY. I am going to ask a question. I was smeared all over the State of Montana, but I found that I received a higher vote in my last election than I have ever had before. I was smeared because I was proposing the Missouri Valley Authority, which is similar to the CVA. Now, Mr. Davidson, you were in Montana a short time ago. What did you find as to the sentiment there among the Democrats and the Republicans as well?

Mr. DAVIDSON. I found, Senator MURRAY, that the people I talked to in that region felt that something needed to be done to pull together the resource development activities of the Federal Government, to place them on a sounder basis so that we could speed up our job of building dams and developing power, and also taking care of the resources in the region. Therefore the people there, the Governor and the other people in Montana, told me that they thought the CVA would go a long way to helping out in that way.

Senator WATKINS. I would like to say that I did not know that this debate was going to get away from the merits, whether CVA is good or bad, and amount to a counting of the noses of who is for it or who is against it. Apparently the argument is now that the people of Montana want it and therefore it is a good thing. We have heard a lot of things that the people have wanted. The Germans wanted Hitlerism, but it did not turn out so well.

Here we should discuss the merits of the program. I want to state that this program that I am setting up, that I have called for, has all of the good qualities of the TVA. There are some advantages of a unified river system and control, but my program does not have the liabilities of CVA. It does not put the United States into the position of wanting to control and then controlling practically all of the big river systems of the United States. That will happen if we extend this program as it logically should be extended; if it is good for the Columbia Valley it ought to be good for the others. My program is a substitute for that without any of its disadvantages, and it brings it nearer home.

Now, my good friend——

Chairman GRANIK. May he answer?

Senator WATKINS. Let me answer the other part.

Mr. DAVIDSON. The trouble is that you are not going to be able to get that through, with all of the people in the East and the people in the South, because you want to turn over Federal investment to local people and people in the area. Now, I am saying, let us try to make the Federal Government efficient in the fundamental laws which it now executes and operates. That is what the CVA proposes to do, to try to put together present Federal responsibilities.

There are absolutely no new powers granted under the CVA bill, but to put the present Federal functions on an efficient and unified basis of management. Then if you want to get around to changing fundamental principles of law as your bill does, then that is a further step to be taken at some later time which will require further consideration. I have not considered all of the merits of that.

Senator WATKINS. My bill does not change any fundamentals. It is based on fundamentals. What you are trying to do now is just gradually sneak in a little further. It used to be, as I said, in the original reclamation projects, that the power went with the water and it is one of the byproducts of the water. The water belongs to those people. It is their falling water from which power is developed, and now Uncle Sam has gradually sneaked in to take over. The contracts used to say that electric power went to the water users. I have been an attorney for the water users and I know what they do. But in some of the last contracts, do you know what they are putting in? They are saying, "Well, the power now will be left to the disposal of Congress." They do not say it is Uncle Sam's yet. They do not say it is Uncle Sam's investment. The United States never intended to go out there and make investments in the beginning. They went out there to help those people. It was a loan and not an investment.

Now they are trying to turn around and put the United States into the power business, when there is no necessity for it.

Mr. DAVIDSON. The Federal Government is doing this for what it will do to allow free private enterprise to go to work. Out there in the Pacific Northwest now, the two dams which now exist have allowed an investment of over $200,000,000 to come in in industrial plants.

Senator WATKINS. That is a very good thing and I agree with that.

Chairman GRANIK. I see a Member of Congress, Congressman MITCHELL, from the State of Washington. Do you have a question?

Mr. MITCHELL. Senator WATKINS, we now have a program headed up by one man, the President of the United States, who is having difficulty coordinating the agencies working in the Federal Government. I would like to know how you are going to coordinate the seven governors?

Senator WATKINS. I would not need to coordinate the seven governors. When this organization is set up, they have to form compacts and they have to get together or they do not get the projects. They have been able to get together in the past and they will do it again. I think as a matter of fact they can coordinate themselves much better than the President can coordinate himself. But as a matter of fact what I propose——

Mr. DAVIDSON. Now, Senator WATKINS——

Senator WATKINS. You have had most of the time and now let me have a chance at this. Between you and your colleagues down there, I do not get a look at this. But I want to say that there is not going to be any difficulty on that score. In the upper Colorado where we have had plenty of fights, we have reached an agreement and we have formed our compacts. If we are going to get these projects working we would a whole lot rather work it out ourselves and then let us own and operate it. We can do everything that the Government is talking about except finance it. They will loan us the money. And surely they can loan us as much as they will loan somebody over in Timbuktu or over in north Africa, or over in Europe, and there they do not even call for it back. We will pay it all back. We can pay for all of that. We can do it under our scheme and under our own system of reclamation and power projects, and the United States does not have to go into the power business, not for 1 minute, to accomplish all of these things needed.

Mr. DAVIDSON. You said the President could coordinate the various agencies and pull them together. I would like to say that because the Congress of the United States has passed laws setting up each one of these twenty-odd Federal agencies out there, and as much as the President has tried to pull them together, and he has gone to the top of his power, all he can do in trying to get the agencies together—he cannot do it unless the Congress will give him the necessary legislation. That is the reason.

Senator WATKINS. The 1948 Reorganization Act takes care of that.

Mr. DAVIDSON. He asked for the act setting up the Columbia River Administration, and if you give him that authority he will do a job. But you just cannot do it without it.

Chairman GRANIK. Can we have another question?

Question. Mr. Davidson, you just said that the CVA would bring the planning of the Columbia Basin closer to the people by moving the office that would administer it up in the Pacific Northwest. Why do the opponents always say that the CVA would give greater power to Washington?

Mr. DAVIDSON. I have no idea.

Senator WATKINS. Let me answer that. That was a feeder question for Mr. Davidson, to put up some more of his arguments. As a matter of fact, the control is still in Washington, and they cannot fool us out West by sending out three men appointed by the President, three men who are under his direct orders, and telling us that they are making it any easier for us, when they have full and complete power over these projects. That does not fool us at all. They have the Bureau of Reclamation out there, and they have the regional offices of the Army engineers, and they have bureau after bureau there. They are in each other's way, as a matter of fact, and yet they are all controlled from Washington. You do not fool anybody by this talk that just because they are going to have another office out there that they are not going to be run by Washington.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is run by Washington. I am on the Senate Public Works Committee and on the Interior Committee and I see it every day. They come here for their money and they come here for their orders. The people down there do not run them. They run the people.

Mr. DAVIDSON. You are proposing a fundamental change in our constitutional system and I thought the President was responsible for the running of the executive establishment.

Senator WATKINS. I do not propose to put anything into the executive establishment.

Mr. DAVIDSON. You are going to make the Federal Government turn over all of their funds to the States and the localities.

Chairman GRANIK. I think it is time for summaries. Your summary, please.

Senator WATKINS. Well, in the first place we can have all the benefits of a unified river control under the private ownership by the people themselves through interstate water and power associations, provided for in my bill, S. 3376. The Federal Government should go on as was originally contemplated before the New Dealers and the Socialists worked in to try to take over the control of all of our western rivers and western resources through the so-called power deal. It is not necessary to do that. Uncle Sam has been loaning us the money all of these years, and Senator MURRAY and these other men know it. We worked for those things and we built up all of that gigantic system of dams out West that the President was so proud of, and which he goes out there every little while to dedicate and rededicate and all of that sort of thing. We built that policy up in the past, and it has worked very well. But now they propose to set up a new agency. And they mean to tell us now that they can set up this new agency and get it going and get the bill passed for an emergency. Even if the people of Montana are for it, it is not passed yet. I will assure my friend that my proposed measure is coming up, too, but if they can get their project set up within 2 years they will have done very well indeed. We do not need a change. We need to expand our present law to meet the need of interstate rivers.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you. Now your summary, Mr. Davidson.

Mr. DAVIDSON. I am sorry that Mr. WATKINS does not like the Democratic administration continuing to dedicate dams, but as long as we are doing a job for the people I think they will keep us there to dedicate the dams. The CVA is an administrative reorganization job of the Federal Government to continue what it is doing out there in the Pacific Northwest in order to get the resource development and conservation job of the Federal Government achieved faster, more democratically and more efficiently. We need a CVA now in order to meet the needs of the fast-growing region and of a nation basically short of commodities essential to national security.

The CVA proposal is based on three time-tested principles of management. The first is to combine the work of related agencies to do away with time-consuming duplication and waste. The second is to decentralize operations to insure on the ground grass roots management. Third, put Federal water and power operation on a businesslike basis as recommended by the Hoover Commission, to require strict accountability to the President and the Congress. The Nation needs a CVA right now.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, gentlemen, thank you very much.

Just a Reminder—America's Adventure Into World Power Politics—What Will the Harvest Be?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include just as a reminder the following speech I made in the House of Representatives on March 13, 1945:

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the Committee today is one which every Member of the House should give more than passing attention. Before voting upon it, every one of us should ponder our fantastic national debt and also the fact that, before the wars in which we are engaged are over, it will be one to stagger the imagination.

Mr. Chairman, I volunteered and served through the Spanish War as a corporal of Company G, Thirty-third Michigan Volunteer Infantry, this being the Owosso Company in that regiment of the National Guard. We were a part of the expeditionary forces and were in action at the Battle of Santiago.

I volunteered and served for 2 years in the First World War as an infantry officer, serving 11½ months in that capacity with our expeditionary forces in France; returning to this country with the rank of major. When I volunteered I left at home a wife, a daughter of 11, and a son of 9. That son of mine is now a major in the United States Army, serving somewhere in the Philippines. I have not been informed as to the exact area of his activity. At the time of Pearl Harbor he had been very happily married for 10 years. Within a few days after that tragic event he volunteered for service and was accepted. He has an excellent record in the Army, and I am very proud of him. Early in life I taught him that every person who accepts the privileges of citizenship takes upon himself also the responsibilities of citizenship. With men those responsibilities include an obligation to defend the country, in the way they can best serve during great national emergencies. That is and should be inescapable to those physically capable of service .

MAKING THE WORLD SAFE FOR DEMOCRACY

I volunteered for service in the First World War, believing I was helping to make the world safe for democracy, and that out of it all would grow a better understanding and relationship between nations. I had always believed that nations could get together, compromise their differences, and live at peace with each other if only the rulers and ruling classes of those nations would approach the agreement in a spirit of unselfishness and a determination to understand the problems of others.

After my return from France for demobilization in August 1919, I immediately returned to Europe on business and remained there for 6 months. During this time my business brought me in contact with the public officials of eight different countries. Very much to my surprise I found the ruling officials and classes had learned exactly nothing as a result of their participation in the war. The same suspicion of each other; the same sordid selfishness controlling their every action, and a total lack of knowledge gained from their experience was evident wherever I went. I will cite one case

as typical. I made two trips to Poland from Paris in the winter of 1919–20. This was when Paderewski was Premier. My business was with the Government and brought me in contact with the Minister of Finance, a man by the name of Bielinski, a Galician Pole. You perhaps will recall that, after Poland was partitioned by Russia, Germany, and Austria in 1795, neither Russia nor Germany permitted a Pole to have anything whatsoever to do with government. Austria, wisely I think, utilized the services of outstanding Poles in governmental as well as other activities. Galicia was made a part of the Austrian loot at the time of partitioning.

At the outbreak of World War I in 1914, Minister of Finance Bielinski was a high official of the Austrian Government, and as such was one of the three men who signed the declaration of war against Serbia, such action precipitating the world's First World War. One would think that a man, whose hand had signed the document that had plunged nearly the whole world into war, thereby signing the death warrant of 10,000,000 of the world's finest young men and more than 40,000,000 civilians who died as a result of the war—and who had lived to see the government and nation of which he was a part completely dismembered, and destroyed economically, would have perceived something of the futility of war. Not so in the case of Mr. Bielinski, however.

When I was in Poland it was in the dead of winter and bitterly cold. Conditions were desperate. Bread lines everywhere. Poland had been the battleground over which the Russians and Germans had fought back and forth, each retreating army removing from the land all that could in any way be helpful to the pursuing army. The result was that every living thing was removed from the farms of the country. On my two trips there I rode for hours through some of the finest farming lands I have ever seen. I saw not one sign of life on any farm. There was no food for man or beast. The farmers had flocked into the cities, because it was there only that food was available in sufficient quantities to sustain life. Warsaw, a city of 700,000 prior to the war, had doubled in population because of these conditions. To show how completely denuded of animals Poland had become, it is only necessary to recall that in the bitter cold of winter such coal as was to be had was delivered by men hauling and pushing wagons through the streets. Apparently this was the only medium of fuel delivery in that great city. I saw women tramping through the snow with nothing on their feet but little slippers; no stockings and no overgarments that could protect them. Men were similarly ill-clad. Conditions were as desperate as they could possibly be.

Notwithstanding this, however, controlling Polish officials, not satisfied with the boundary lines as laid down by the Versailles Peace Conference, had raised and poorly equipped an army of a million men. This army was pushing into Bolshevik territory seeking to reestablish the boundary lines that existed at the time of the partitioning previously mentioned. The fact that they had neither sufficient supplies nor arms to wage war successfully was apparently given little consideration.

I cannot believe that the Polish people who had suffered the ravages of war, as had few other peoples in all history, could possibly have approved this further war adventure. They, however, were powerless to prevent it.

In a conference with Mr. Bielinski one day I suggested that Poland probably was creating a great deal of unnecessary trouble for herself. Said he, "What do you mean by that?" "Your armies are pushing into Bolshevik territory," I responded, "and when spring comes and the Russians can move their armies and matériel against you they will drive you into the sea." The old gentleman with the utmost complacency and assurance declared, "Oh, that is not possible." This gentleman was highly intelligent, yet seemingly even his intelligence had enabled him to learn nothing as a result of one of the most disastrous wars that any nation had ever experienced. It is interesting to note in this connection that the following spring the Russians did drive the Poles out of Russia and invade Poland. They nearly captured Warsaw and would have overrun the country had it not been for the aid extended by France. As I said before, the attitude of Bielinski typified that of others in like positions with whom I came in contact in the countries I visited.

DREAMS OF WORLD PEACE

It had been with great hopes for future world peace that I watched the proceedings at Versailles, but when the final draft of the treaty was published I finally realized that within the structure of the treaty itself was written what amounted to a prohibition of future peace.

The following quotation from the book, The Peace Negotiations, a personal narrative by Robert Lansing, Secretary of State under Woodrow Wilson during the Versailles Peace Conference, seems timely:

"The League of Nations, created by the treaty is relied upon to preserve the artificial structure which has been erected by compromise of the conflicting interests of the great powers and to prevent the germination of the seeds of war which are sown in so many articles and which under normal conditions would soon bear fruit. The League might as well attempt to prevent the growth of plant life in a tropical jungle. Wars will come sooner or later.

"It must be admitted in honesty that the League is an instrument of the mighty to check the normal growth of national power and national aspirations among those who have been rendered impotent by defeat. Examine the treaty and you will find peoples delivered against their wills into the hands of those whom they hate, while their economic resources are torn from them and given to others. Resentment and bitterness, if not desperation, are bound to be the consequences of such provisions. It may be years before these oppressed peoples are able to throw off the yoke, but as sure as day follows night the time will come when they will make the effort.

"This war was fought by the United States to destroy forever the conditions which produced it. Those conditions have not been destroyed. They have been supplanted by other conditions equally productive of hatred, jealousy, and suspicion. In place of the Triple Alliance and the Entente has arisen the quintuple alliance which is to rule the world. The victors in this war intend to impose their combined will upon the vanquished and to subordinate all interests to their own."

Mr. Chairman, the prophets of old could not have looked into the future more clearly than did Mr. Lansing, who was at the elbow of President Wilson all during the conference.

It was a most significant fact that we were the only Nation of the many represented at Versailles that asked for nothing, except that the nations of the world live at peace with one another. Every other nation represented there reached out with greedy hands and clutched everything they could possibly secure. There was not a single exception to this. If anything further were needed to convince me that the ruling classes of the world were not yet ready for permanent peace, it was my experience in Europe and my contacts with the ruling classes thereof.

FRANCE WAS BLED WHITE

I had been in France on business shortly after we entered the war in April 1917. I returned to this country in time to enter the second officers' training camp. While in Paris, Georges Despret, French delegate minister of commerce, said to me: "Mr. WOODRUFF, when the United States came into this war we were defeated. We were bled white. It is only the fact that your armies are coming that gives us the courage to hang on until you get here." Other French citizens told me the same thing. What they said was confirmed by what I saw when I was on the train between Bordeaux and Paris. Everywhere old men, women, and little children were working in the fields. One occasionally would see among them a man in uniform, evidently a soldier either on furlough or recovering from wounds. Every able-bodied man was in the army. France had fought a gallant fight. Her casualties could be counted by the millions. Her resources were expended. She was defeated, and she knew it. There can be no question that our getting into the war saved France. With her out of it, Britain could not possibly have won. The war would speedily have ended disastrously for both nations.

OUR CONTRIBUTION TO ALLIED SUCCESS IN WORLD WAR I

When once we entered the war we did so wholeheartedly. We loaned our allies billions "on the cuff." We moved our armies and supplies to the western front and to other battle areas. It was not long before we had 2,000,000 fighting men in France. We built and equipped railroads. We built harbors and docks. We established a complete telephone and telegraph system that covered every area throughout France in which our troops were located; in fact, we provided every facility we needed for the efficient functioning of our Army of 2,000,000, all of which facilities we left in France. These things had cost us more than $2,000,000,000. France offered us $400,000,000 for the whole lot. It was only a promise. She never paid us a dollar on the account and presumably is still using the equipment and facilities. We also moved our Navy to European waters, thus helping to close the seas to the German Navy.

Our losses were: 39,362 killed in action; 14,009 died of wounds; 75,460 died of disease; 1,297 died of accidents and other causes; 192,369 were wounded in action; 726,738 have since died, many of them from disabilities incurred in their service. It has cost us $13,721,000,000 for these disabled veterans and their dependents since the war. It will cost us $1,300,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1945. This includes relief to veterans of the present war and their beneficiaries. These costs will skyrocket before the present war ends.

WE ASKED FOR NOTHING

We knew our costs down the years growing out of the war would be staggering. Yet we asked for nothing at Versailles—not one dollar of indemnity, not one foot of territory. Naturally we expected the loans, which Congress cut more than in half when the final settlement was agreed upon, would be paid. We reduced the interest rate to the point where it was almost nonexistent. Our debtor nations agreed this was a fair settlement. Notwithstanding this, however, it was not long before the French named us "Uncle Shylock" and the British led all other debtor nations, except Finland, in their repudiation of the debts.

At no time did our former allies so conduct themselves as to cause us to believe honesty or gratitude had any place in their thinking. Are we justified in believing our experience in this war will be greatly different, except in increased degree, than it was during and following the other one, unless we proceed with care and confine our activities and efforts to cooperating with our allies, and not permit ourselves to continue to be persuaded to carry far more than our proper share of the burdens past, present, and future?

THE PRESENT SITUATION AS COMPARED TO THAT OF WORLD WAR I

The present situation differs from the other in that from the very first the beneficiaries of lend-lease, so-called, were not asked either to pay for or to return the supplies, matériel, and money we have placed in their hands. We will not be repaid for any part of our contributions of money or goods.

In a report which came to our desks a few days ago, I learn we have disposed of thirty-six of the seventy-four billions of the one-time available lend-lease funds—$36,000,000,000. A lot of money you will agree. I think also that, if no further appropriations are made, there is an ample balance to more than take care of any justified expenditures.

Such supplies as have been delivered by us to the beneficiaries, with the exception of Canada, who has not accepted lend-lease, New Zealand and Australia—both of whom have about offset our contributions to them—constitute token payments only. Already we are being urged to recognize the blessings which would follow a continuation of lend-lease after the war.

MORE POSTWAR BILLIONS TO EUROPEAN NATIONS

We are now informed that it is the purpose of high authority to leave in Europe everything we have over there, including all supplies and equipment for our own armies—supplies, railroad, and other equipment of value in peacetime, war supplies and equipment, including all ordnance and ammunition. Whether this includes all our warplanes is not clear. From usually reliable sources we hear that we already are committed to the further gift of five billions in lend-lease to Russia and six billions to Great Britain after the armistice. We also hear of six billions to China. Recently it was officially announced by the State Department that we have signed up with France to extend lend-lease in the amount of $2,575,000,000 to be used also after the war. While the billions are being passed around how many are to go to Belgium, Holland, Greece, Italy, and all the other nations which have suffered from this war? It was only a few days ago that General De Gaulle affronted our President by refusing to see him. Can the $2,575,000,000 be considered a peace offering? What in heaven's name are we coming to?

"GIVE US THE TOOLS AND WE WILL DO THE JOB"

You will remember that Mr. Churchill told us, "Just give us the tools and we will do the job." He well knew that if we embarked on that program it would be but another short step to furnishing the armies also. The fact that we now have 3,000,000 fighting men in Europe and that they are doing the major share of the fighting on the western front in that area seems to prove the point.

BOONDOGGLING IN CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA

Our expenditures in the Central and South American Republics on boondoggling and other projects are fantastic. A program of six billions over a period of 3 years is now under way. This was disclosed by Senator BUTLER, of Nebraska, after a tour of investigation there. This was vigorously denied in the Senate by the New Deal Senators, but after an audit by James A. Councilor & Co., Washington, certified public accountants, no further denials have been heard. What other commitments, not yet disclosed, we may have around the world only the Supreme Being knows.

Under UNRRA we will be expected to carry the load in restoring the war-devastated countries—to rebuild electric lighting and water works systems, transportation, and other facilities; restore the old and supply new manufacturing plants, feed, and clothe the people until such time as they can supply themselves.

NO THOUGHT GIVEN TO AMERICAN TAXPAYERS

Apparently no one in the administration gives serious thought to the American taxpayer who must pay for all this. In 1932, when he was a candidate for the office he still holds, Mr. Roosevelt said: "Taxes are paid in the sweat of the man who labors." No man ever spoke more accurately. Taxes are paid across the counter. If we spend beyond the national income, whatever we spend, wherever we spend it, whatever we spend it for, a debt is created which the American taxpayer must sometime pay. No other nation will do it for us. Our past experience should teach us that at least.

Little thought apparently is given to the ability of other nations to rehabilitate themselves. Little thought is given to the fact that our national debt is greater than that of all our allies combined, and that it is increasing much more rapidly. Congress is now asked to extend the debt limit to $300,000,000,000. It will be again increased. Certainly it will be much larger than the amount now asked for before we will have finished with our adventure into world power politics. It is high time that every one of us should open our eyes to what is going on in this world and what it will mean to all of us if a halt is not called to the fantastic policies that mean national bankruptcy.

FALSE PROPAGANDA

When I volunteered in World War I, I was 41 years old—past the draft age. I was shocked beyond words by the stories of the horrible atrocities perpetrated on the Belgians by the Germans, appearing almost daily on the front pages of our newspapers and on our billboards. Many of these stories stemmed directly from the British white papers. As they were official, it was natural that our people should believe them. During the 6 months I was in Europe, following my demobilization, I made several trips into Belgium, and while there made it my business to investigate the reports we had received such as "cutting off the hands of little boys that they might not later become members of the armed forces," "the crucifixion of Canadian soldiers," "the processing of the bodies of our dead from which fats could be secured with which to manufacture more powder to kill more young Americans," "the ravishing of Belgian women by German officers in the occupied areas," to mention only a few. Everywhere I went I talked with business people and others. I talked with hundreds about these stories. Not in one single instance did I find verification for any one of them. No one had ever heard of them. In the last-named instance the answer invariably was the same: "We never heard of anything like that, but we do know many Belgian women married German officers."

Those stories of atrocities with which we daily were regaled were made up of whole cloth. There was not a shred of evidence anywhere in substantiation of them. They were sent to us for the sole purpose of arousing our people to the point where we would enter the war against the Central Powers. That the efforts were successful is history. I was among the deluded.

A book, Falsehood in Wartime, by Arthur Ponsonby, a very prominent member of the British Parliament, was published by George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., in London in 1922. It was republished in 1923 by E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., New York. It is an amazing collection of carefully documented lies circulated in Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and America. It completely exposes the falsity of the propaganda which so aroused our people and demonstrates the theory that "self-preservation is the first law of nature," and that it applies to nations as well as to individuals. Neither stop at anything to preserve life.

If anyone questions the prominence, the integrity or the high-standing in British official life of Mr. Ponsonby, I refer him to the Encyclopedia Britannica. In the concluding paragraph in his book, he states:

"Is further proof needed that international war is a monster born of hypocrisy, fed on falsehood, fattened on humbug, kept alive by superstition, directed to the death and torture of millions, succeeding in no high purpose, degrading to humanity, endangering civilization and bringing forth in its travail a hideous brood of strife, conflict, and war, more war? Yet statesmen still hesitate to draw the sword of their wits to destroy it."

THE ATLANTIC CHARTER AND THE FOUR FREEDOMS—MR. CHURCHILL'S POSITION

I think every intelligent and unselfish human being was stirred to his depths when the Atlantic Charter with its four freedoms was announced to the world. We were informed that the compact was signed, sealed, and delivered, and that it was the purpose of the Allied Powers to bring these freedoms to the peoples of the world. It was not long, however, before disillusionment took place. Mr. Churchill, in a speech to the lord mayor of London, in November 1942, stated:

"Let me, however, make this clear, in case there should be any mistake about it in any quarter. We mean to hold our own. I have not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire."

At Yalta when the question of nation's colonies came up it was suggested that this matter be held in abeyance until the United Nations Conference at San Francisco. Prime Minister Churchill dissented, stating that he preferred not to have the question of colonies decided upon at the United Nations Conference. "I," said Churchill, "will not have the fumbling fingers of 52 nations meddling in the heritage of Britain." It must be clear that if the British will tolerate no meddling with her colonies, certainly colonies of other nations will be treated likewise.

That Britain is determined to hold on to her colonies was rather graphically substantiated on the Island of Tarawa, after the island had been taken from the Japs by our marines, when the British commissioner, on November 24, went ashore and hoisted the British flag. There had not been one British fighting man on the island while the fighting for the beachhead was going on. Our losses were 988 killed and 2,163 wounded, but there was the commissioner on the job to protect the British sovereignty of the island as soon as it was safe to go ashore. Good taste and some degree of decency would have delayed that ceremony for a time at least.

On February 17, 1942, not long after we had entered the present war, in a speech in Parliament, Mr. Churchill said:

"When I survey and compute the power of the United States and its vast resources, and feel that now they are in it with us, in with the British Commonwealth of Nations altogether, however long it lasts, till death or victory, I cannot believe there is any other fact in the whole world which can compare with that. That is what I have dreamed of, aimed at, and worked for, and now it has come to pass."

Such candor is rarely found in world-famous statesmen. That Mr. Churchill was deeply impressed is also shown by his statement that he considered this to be his greatest accomplishment in all the years of his service for the Empire.

The Churchill speech to the lord mayor of London was delivered on November 10, 1942. This was about the time when it seemed probable the Japs were to invade

India. There was a growing and insistent demand on the part of the people of that country for some degree of freedom—for at least a step toward self-government. The country seemed really aroused and anything might have happened. The speech served two purposes. First, it notified the rebellious Indians that Great Britain would not yield an inch at any time, especially while the war was on; that any attempt at rebellion would be put down with an iron hand.

Second, it constituted due notice to the people of the United States and of the world that, regardless of the declared agreement as to the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms, such activity will not be permitted to even remotely touch the people of the British possessions. In response to suggestions from outside the Empire touching its administration, Mr. Churchill also stated that "no interference from any source whatever will be tolerated in handling the affairs of the Empire."

STALIN'S POSITION ON THE FOUR FREEDOMS

On February 23, 1942, Stalin listed Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and a part of Poland as Soviet land. Not only has no responsible official so far contradicted the claims of many Russian authorities that the Soviet Union means to take and keep those small unfortunate areas, but also Finland and Rumania, lands which have become victims of Russian aggression. From the more recent Soviet activities the expansion program appears far more ambitious than was indicated by Mr. Stalin in his original statement. It must be clear even to the most obtuse that Mr. Stalin will not permit the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms to interfere with his plans for expanding the Russian Empire. It seems, Mr. Chairman, that in the last analysis, the United States constitutes the only powerful nation which appears to be still supporting the Atlantic Charter and its four freedoms. We will find that, if we have not already done so, we will later bend to the will of Stalin and Churchill on this most important question, after which future negotiations will be conducted on a frank and open basis of world power politics, the end of which will be—future wars.

CLEMENCEAU, LLOYD GEORGE, AND WILSON IN 1918—STALIN, CHURCHILL, AND ROOSEVELT NOW

All this is reminiscent of the closing days of World War I. Woodrow Wilson was then President of the United States. He was a far-seeing, highly intelligent, and idealistic gentleman. In seeking peace he kept one thought ever before him—that of reaching a peace based upon terms that would permit all nations to live at peace with each other; that would give to each nation a place in the economic sun that would enable its people to live on a basis of freedom and a reasonable prosperity. Great Britain and France agreed to Mr. Wilson's 14 points—in principle. At the Peace Conference in Versailles neither would agree to anything that even remotely approached Mr. Wilson's demands. Instead, our President was finally compelled to agree to the treaty which eventually was promulgated. He returned home bitterly disappointed, his health ruined, and he finally died knowing his efforts for future peace had failed completely, and that future wars were inevitable.

It seems very clear that Mr. Roosevelt now finds himself in the same position that Mr. Wilson earlier found himself. At the coming peace conference he will find himself faced with two individuals just as inexorable, just as detemined to promote the power of their respective countries as were Clemenceau and Lloyd George a quarter of a century ago. He will have brought home to him anew the fact that "when the devil is sick, the devil a saint would be, but when he gets well, a devil again is he," and that this applies to nations as well as individuals.

Certainly Churchill has let it be known that not for one moment will he agree to anything which will prevent the British Empire doing exactly what he believes it should do to perpetuate its present organization and power. If he expects to gain further colonies or possessions he has not as yet let it be known. Stalin's position differs from Churchill's only in the fact that he openly proposes not only to maintain Russia's present holdings, power, and influence, but also to extend the same to a point not yet disclosed.

We are living in a very practical world. The human animal is a selfish one. Wars stem directly from the selfishness in human hearts. Judging from the fact recorded history tells us that from 1500 B. C. to 1860 A. D. more than 8,000 treaties of peace, meant to remain in force forever, were concluded, and that the average time they remained in force was 2 years, the ephemeral character of treaties and the futility of wars as a medium of settling disputes between nations is obvious.

There have been nearly 300 wars in the three centuries of the modern-state system. The settlement of the more important ones, in most instances, because of the selfishness written into peace agreements, have been followed by other wars of greater magnitude and more horrible death-dealing methods.

Certainly if we continue our wars and improvement of weapons and methods of destroying human life the human race will revert to the depths of the Dark Ages. Civilization simply cannot survive unless we radically change our ways.

All this leads me to the question, What are we going to do about it? I would have kept us out of the present war if I had found it possible to do so. It seemed clear we were continuing a policy of perpetuating the British Empire, which we began in 1917. It seemed a disastrous course to follow. I am for the perpetuation of the United States of America. I am against this country becoming entangled in a web of international power politics, and would have kept us out of them. However, we are in up to our necks. Now that we are in, the only way out for us is to fight our way out, and I am for this program to the end. I will do everything in my power to help win the war in the shortest possible time. Every other method of establishing and preserving peace in the world having failed, I shall go along with the program of disarming the belligerent nations and keeping them disarmed until they are ready to live in comity with their neighbors.

It follows, therefore, of course, that I must oppose with all the strength that God may give me any scheme which can work out only to draw us and the world into more wars in the future. It does not matter if the war plan is labeled a peace plan. Mr. Roosevelt's policies have all been termed peace policies. Power politics is power politics under any label, and the only plans that have thus far come from this administration involve a disguised variety of the same power politics which have always led to war. The only difference is that in the future, unless we watch our step, we will be leading instead of following the procession into war.

I shall continue to do everything I can to help preserve this as the greatest land of opportunity for the common man this world has ever known. If it is to be preserved, it will be through a return to constitutional government, under which any man, no matter how lowly born, can aspire to the highest office in the land or a measure of prosperity which is possible only in this America of ours.

Because We Are at War Why Not Forego FDIC Cut Till It Is Over?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the July 25, 1950, issue of the American Banker is indeed apropos. I wonder if the bankers of our country will follow the suggestion:

BECAUSE WE ARE AT WAR WHY NOT FOREGO FDIC CUT TILL IT IS OVER?

At first thought the suggestion we want to make today may seem hard to take. But, like the medicine grandma used to offer, it may, on second thought, look good for you, and very wise for banking to consider as a possible major national public relations gesture from which vast future good would be derived.

We are at war. Men are giving up their lives and all they hold dear on this earth in Korea. What can anyone do to match that?

Our suggestion for banking is that it tell Congress that the Federal Deposit Insurance assessment cut can wait. Let it wait until we see the end of this United Nations police action in defense of the liberty of all nations including our own. Let Congress go ahead and agree on a bill and send it to the President as planned. But include a proviso that the effective date of the assessment rebate plan shall be, let us say, 6 months after peace has been restored, in Korea, and any other part of the world where American troops may be engaged.

The action in Korea will be expensive. But it is only a down payment on the real cost of security and defense against the menace which is now out in the open against the peace we desire so much. Anything which American banks can contribute toward absorbing this cost is important. Even more important, however, is leadership in measures against the inflation which can result from piling new defense expenditures on top of the present rate of other spending, both national and consumeral.

For banks to forego temporarily the rebate on FDIC assessment contained in the bill now awaiting passage by the House would be a double-barreled gesture. It would help in absorbing Government spending and it would be leadership in the kind of business and personal self-restraint that is necessary to fight inflation.

It won't hurt at all for the FDIC to have some more millions in its reserves. Bank deposits are growing and the inflationary expansion that has swollen business and banking since peace with Japan contains seeds of deflation in which a fatter FDIC won't hurt public confidence, and as long as the prospect is for good business loan volume and added United States Government securities holdings while the defense crisis lasts, few, if any, banks will feel the lack of FDIC rebates.

It will be a multi-million-dollar gesture by a multi-million-dollar industry if banking announces that it will forego the FDIC assessment cut in the present crisis. But we can't think of any move that would be more in keeping with the spirit of American banks or with American public sentiment today.

Anything which any of us in business and industry can do is insignificant alongside

of the supreme sacrifice which the hometown boys of America are making today for us. We do not know a single American banker or bank stockholder who would not give up the bank itself, no matter how large, if by doing so he could save one American boy's life, perhaps his own son's, in Korea.

Wherefor our suggestion that banking would be wise indeed to consider telling Congress and the American people that the FDIC assessment rebates can wait until the present unpleasantness east of the iron curtain has been disposed of.

That's our thinking. What do you think? We'd appreciate your answer by letter—pro or con—in confidence or for publication.

Change of Tax Laws Could Cut Down Organized Crime in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am including an article from the editorial page of the recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post by Alan R. Vogeler, a prominent lawyer of Cincinnati, Ohio. In this article Mr. Vogeler points out, among other things, that Nation-wide crime could at least be curbed if our revenue were amended and properly applied.

The article follows:

CHANGE IN TAX LAWS COULD CUT DOWN ORGANIZED CRIME IN AMERICA

The recent senatorial investigation of Nation-wide crime, and Attorney General McGrath's proposal to prohibit interstate shipment of slot machines and the transmission of horse-race results by wire, except to newspapers, suggests that we are becoming aware that organized crime is a big business that must be stopped. Not only is it immoral, it is expensive. The cost of gambling has been estimated at $10,000,000,000 a year.

How can we best stop this wasteful drain? The legislation so far proposed is not the answer. While prohibiting interstate shipment of slot machines might help, it is practically impossible to patrol all the highways in the country to enforce such legislation, as prohibition proved. Prohibiting transmission of racing results, except to newspapers, would probably see the syndicates purchasing newspapers or finding other ways to spread such information.

There is no more effective way to take the profit out of an enterprise than by Federal taxation. Many people complain that the present high tax rates already hinder honest private enterprise. How, then, can we tax organized crime out of existence? I suggest the best method is to deny to any business operated in violation of the criminal laws of the State or Federal Government the right under the Internal Revenue Code to deduct from gross receipts any expenses or losses incurred in producing those receipts. If operators of illegal organizations could not deduct expenses, such as salaries, equipment, and wire-service costs, or wagers won by patrons, their total receipts would be taxable income, and, at today's maximum rate of 77 percent of net income, their taxes would equal or exceed the actual take-home pay.

Deductions for some expenses deemed contrary to public policy are already denied by the courts. Tony Stralla, who operated the gambling ship *Rex* off California a number of years ago, was not permitted by the United States Tax Court to deduct from his gambling income the cost of protracted litigation to prevent California from interfering with his illegal business.

G. A. Comeaux, Ralph Polk, and Fred Clemons, all operating gambling halls near Wichita, Kans., were denied deductions from their illegal incomes for moneys paid for protection against prosecution by State or county officials. But denying only this type of deduction is not enough. There remains one loophole in the tax law for criminals—the so-called legitimate expenses of an illegitimate business. The court allowed Comeaux and his pals substantial deductions for salaries and other expenses in operating the business. Stralla was allowed to deduct from the $1,164,000 income of his gambling ship $720,000 as operating expenses.

In 1924 the Commissioner of Internal Revenue issued rulings denying all expense and loss deductions to illegal business, but his determinations were overruled by the Board of Tax Appeals in 1925. Since then, although the Supreme Court has often stated that no deductions from income are allowable which are not specifically provided for by law of Congress, the commissioner has been unable to persuade the courts to deny deductions for ordinary expenses and offsetting losses incurred in the operation of an illegal business.

Well, why shouldn't Congress make losses and expenses of unlawful business nondeductible if that will drive racketeers out of business? The sixteenth amendment to the Constitution provides that "Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived." The Supreme Court has held that "all income, whether net or gross, may be taxed by Congress, and the deductions allowed from gross income are given as a matter of grace."

When racketeers realized that under such amendments the profit was gone from their operations if correct tax returns were filed, they might begin to falsify those returns. This, of course, would require the Bureau of Internal Revenue to expand considerably in order to obtain the necessary evidence to convict them of filing fraudulent returns. But after enough convictions had been obtained in the courts to impress upon these criminals that they can't beat Uncle Sam out of his taxes, their returns would either be correct or they would go out of business.

Aid to Medical Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken before of the great and urgent need for aid to medical education. Today I want to place in the pages of this RECORD the most eloquent statement of that need I have seen. This letter from Dr. P. J. Carroll, dean of the school of medicine of Creighton University at Omaha, Nebr., has the final eloquence of fact, of knowledge based on experience.

Not only is Dr. Carroll a distinguished medical school administrator, he is a veteran of 30 years in the Army Medical Corps who has served in two World Wars. He knows what the Korean crisis and our mounting mobilization mean in terms of the health and medical care of both the military and the civilian populations. He knows what they mean in terms of the demand for medical and other trained health personnel. And, as an administrator, he knows the desperate plight of our medical schools, unable even to meet our present requirements.

The Members of this House will find no better analysis of this critical situation than Dr. Carroll's letter. They will find no better informed person on the whole situation than Dr. Carroll.

The statement follows:

CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY,
Omaha, Nebr.

The Honorable ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIEMILLER: I have just received a copy of H. R. 8886 which was introduced by you on June 20, 1950, to provide Federal aid to medical education.

There is a shortage of physicians at the present time and with a partial or complete mobilization of our armed forces there will be a greater shortage because our physicians will be spread over a much larger area of the world. There will be a shortage for both military and civilian populations.

In the event of another world war we will not be able to leave the civilian population without adequate medical services as was done during the last war. There was no conflict or even a threat of conflict within our borders. The next war will be different. Our large cities will be enemy targets and a large part of the population will be evacuated. It will be necessary to disperse our civilian population in small concentrations away from military installations because of the dangers of bombing by enemy planes and guided missiles. The greater the dispersion of our people the greater will be the need for more physicians.

If we were sure that Russia would not go to war we would not be required to keep a large defense force. As we cannot be sure we must be prepared at all times and this means for years to come. We need well-trained physicians and will need more and more of them. Their training requires years, so why wait until we are in a very dangerous position and then suddenly awaken to the fact that our medical schools are deficient in teachers, physical facilities, and equipment all because of the lack of adequate funds?

I must again call to your attention the fact that most of the privately owned medical schools are facing a crisis due to the lack of funds. It is not hard to understand this when one considers the fact that a student's tuition pays for just one-fourth of the cost of his medical education. The medical school must pay the other three-fourths of this cost from private funds and very few schools have the funds to continue to meet this deficit. They must have help from some source if they are to remain open. The closing of any of our medical schools would be a great blow to our country's needs and it must not happen. No national defense program is of any value without an adequate medical service and only medical schools can provide physicians.

The American Medical Association has no responsibility whatsoever for the financing of the medical schools. Each school is an individual unit and must meet its own obligations. The medical schools alone can speak for their needs and I can assure you

that they are urgent. Federal aid to medical education should in no way be considered a political issue. Race or religion should play no part. It is a vital necessity for our national defense.

I am speaking from experience, both as a civilian and a soldier who has served 30 years in the Medical Corps of the Army. I served with the American Expeditionary Forces in Mexico in 1916, 14 months in France in World War I, and was on duty in Manila when the Japs attacked in December 1941. General MacArthur appointed me chief surgeon of the southwest Pacific during World War II. For the first 2 years in this theater of war there was a shortage of physicians and dentists and we were extended to the limit to give even satisfactory services to our troops. They should always receive the best medical care.

The morale of troops and civilians is much higher when they know that they are going to be properly cared for by a good medical service. Certainly we owe it to them.

If our privately owned medical schools are not given financial help immediately they cannot continue to operate much longer and our country will be dealt a serious blow because of the fact some of our elected Representatives in Congress have not been sufficiently cognizant of the seriousness of the situation. The State medical schools are operated by tax funds paid by the people of the State and are, therefore, not in such dire financial straits as the privately owned schools.

If further authentic information is desired regarding the financial difficulties of the privately owned medical schools I suggest that your committee invite the deans of these schools to appear before you.

For the best interest of our country I urge that you work for passage of H. R. 8886, even though its provisions for funds fall short of the needs. Our defense forces and civilian communities will require a larger number of physicians and dentists for years to come and certainly these needs will not be met if some of the privately owned schools, which comprise approximately 42 of a total of 78 medical schools, are required to close their doors because of the lack of funds.

Sincerely yours,

P. J. CARROLL, M. D.,
Dean, School of Medicine.

Death Penalty for Spies and Saboteurs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 2, 1950

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith a letter from Judge L. A. Pickard, of Kennett, Mo., together with the newspaper article from the Commercial Appeal referred to in the letter. I believe that I am expressing the opinion of the majority of the people in the Tenth District of Missouri when I say that I concur in the attitude of the writer of this letter and in the endorsement of the legislation referred to.

The letter and article follow:

KENNETT, MO., *July 28, 1950.*

Hon. PAUL C. JONES,
Member of Congress,
Tenth District of Missouri,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PAUL: Herewith attached news item from Commercial Appeal today stating that Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi, is promoting a bill in the Senate which will provide the death penalty for spies, etc.

In the earlier period of this country ordinary horse thieves were disposed of quickly and effectively to such an extent that the practice was broken up, and it is my personal opinion that any person in a position of confidence and trust who betrays this country is many times worse than the ordinary horse thief. I am glad to see this effort to fix the punishment to fit the crime, and I sincerely hope when this bill gets around to the House that you will vote for it.

This may be a drastic attitude on the part of an ordinary citizen, but I am convinced that when your boys and my boys and millions of others are charged with the duty of protecting this country the least we can do at home is to take care of the termites who bore from within.

Yours truly,

L. A. PICKARD.

EASTLAND ASKS DEATH FOR SPIES, SABOTEURS—INTRODUCES BILL WHICH WOULD BRING LAW UP TO DATE

WASHINGTON, July 27.—The death penalty would be made to apply to spies and saboteurs under terms of a bill introduced Thursday by Senator EASTLAND (Democrat, Mississippi).

Under the present law, the heaviest penalty that can be given spies and their kind is 20 years in prison. The death penalty applies during time of war.

Senator EASTLAND said he was offering the bill in an effort to bring the espionage laws up to date.

"There has been no formal declaration of war, but every one knows that we are at war now," he declared. "Formal declarations of war are as out of date as the bow and arrow. But under the present law spies can get off with a prison sentence unless there has been a formal declaration of war, This should be changed immediately. Anyone attempting to damage this country by spying or by sabotage should be subject to the death penalty. The knowledge that they could be put to death if caught would serve as a deterrent for some who might otherwise spy on their country."

The bill would be in effect 2 years from the time it was signed by the President.

Senator EASTLAND said he expects the bill to be approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee at its meeting next Monday. He said that he may attempt to pass the bill as a separate measure or offer it as an amendment to the internal-security bill if the latter measure reaches the floor first.

Allocation of Steel During the Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 3 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, one of our foremost Americans is Admiral Ben Moreell. His contributions in the naval service of our country and toward the economic welfare of our Nation stamp him as a man of intelligence, courage, and farsightedness.

In the current issue of United States News there is published an interview with Admiral Moreell on the all-important question of allocations of steel during the emergency. Believing that the reading of this discussion would be of considerable interest to Members of Congress and the American people generally, I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIVIDING UP STEEL IN EMERGENCY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Is steel, basic product of modern nations, to be short again in this critical period? Does the industry face controls in order to assure top output for support of our Armed Forces? Admiral Moreell (retired), president of Jones & Laughlin Corp., who knows the steel industry from the point of view of a military man using its products and also from the point of view of an industrial leader producing steel, is a top authority on the problems of providing enough goods for war at the same time that the economy tries to meet civilian needs. United States News and World Report invited Admiral Moreell to its conference rooms to discuss these problems and their possible solution. The questions and his answers follow. Admiral Ben Moreell (pronounced "Morell") has been a builder all his life. A graduate engineer, he worked 4 years for the city of St. Louis, went into the Navy in 1917. Twenty years later, at 45, he was the Navy's Chief of Civil Engineers. His work in the Navy brought him in close touch with the building trades, made him an expert in the use of concrete and in industrial relations. World War II and the Seabees, which he organized, helped to make him a four-star admiral. In 1946 he became Coal Mines Administrator, when the Government seized the struck soft-coal mines. Later that year he resigned from the Navy, and in 1947 became head of Jones & Laughlin, the Nation's fourth largest producer of steel.)

Question. Do you think, Admiral, that voluntary controls of steel production would be better for the country at this time than a system of mandatory rationing?

Answer. I feel very strongly that a system of voluntary allocations of available steel production would be much better for the country.

Question. Why do you think that?

Answer. Principally because of past experience and the temperament of our people. The London Economist in an editorial not long ago stated, "The human donkey requires either a carrot in front or a stick behind to goad it into activity." American industry works best under the incentive system, i. e., the attraction of the carrot. Americans respond poorly to the stick.

We tried a system of steel distribution by voluntary industry cooperation in 1948 and 1949 under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce. The record shows that it worked very well. This was under authority of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, December 30, 1947.

Question. Was that different from the one you operated under during wartime?

Answer. Yes. The allocation system during wartime was directed by the War Production Board. It was the result of an evolutionary process. You will recall that there were several predecessors to the War Production Board. That Board did a fine job, eventually, but there was a lot of lost time and lost motion in finally obtaining efficient procedures. In the ultimate analysis, the effectiveness of the procedures followed by the War Production Board was entirely dependent upon the wholehearted cooperation of industry. Unless that cooperation is obtained, we will have considerably less than maximum efficiency.

That conclusion is confirmed by the experience under Public Law 395 to which I have referred. Industry wanted to prove that a system of voluntary allocations operated by able men from the industry will

work. There is a report to the Secretary of Commerce on the functioning of this voluntary system. That report indicates a high degree of success.

I believe that the steel industry has earned a chance to show what it can do before it is placed under a rigid, mandatory allocation system.

Question. At what capacity is the steel industry running now?

Answer. The rated capacity is now a little over 100,000,000 ingot tons and the industry is actually operating at slightly more than rated capacity.

Question. So that actually you have in excess of 18,000,000 more tons available than when we started our war program in 1939?

Answer. That is correct and, in addition, the industry has scheduled and has actually under constructoin approximately 6,000,000 tons of additional capacity, which will come into production progressively and will all be available by the end of 195 . So that we will have, at that time, 24,000,000 tons more than in 1939.

Question. And so the amount the military will need should not make as much difference as it did when we started with controls?

ALLOCATION BY INDUSTRY OUTLINED—GRAY MARKET: WHY HIGHER OUTPUT OF INGOTS, IMPROVING LABOR RELATIONS

Answer. That is right. The industry has today a capacity 11,000,000 tons greater than it was required to produce in 1944, the peak year of World War II. And by 1952 it will be 17,000,000 tons greater.

There is another point which I think is quite important. In 1939, we had a large reserve labor pool. There was considerable unemployment. Therefore, labor was available, not only for increasing production in the steel industry, but also for those industries which fabricated the steel into war products. At present, there is comparatively little surplus labor, so that labor needed to fabricate war products will have to be taken, in large part, from industries now operating at top speed. Therefore, those industries would no longer be able to use the steel which is going to them.

For example, it is reasonable to assume that the automobile industry will be called upon, as it was in the last war, to fabricate war material with present equipment and personnel. As a result, the automobile industry will not be able to make motorcars and trucks at the same rate as at present and, consequently, demands for steel for these purposes will be very much reduced.

The building up of the Armed Forces is going to take from industry a considerable number of our best productive workers. The bottleneck will be the availability of workers in the fabricating industries. There will be a redistribution of workers to those industries that are fabricating war material. This means that the pressure for steel from those industries which the workers leave will no longer exist.

Question. You are assuming that various industries will have allocations also?

Answer. Yes, wherever there is a shortage which indicates the necessity of a well-studied distribution of the available supply.

Question. That means that other industries will have a diminished demand for civilian goods and an increased consumption of their products for war purposes?

Answer. That is correct.

BETTER ALLOCATIONS THROUGH INDUSTRY

Question. And, if that is the case, you will naturally be redistributing your steel to meet the new military requirements?

Answer. Yes. My point is that the people who can do that kind of a job best are those who are thoroughly informed on the operations of both the steel-producing and the steel-consuming industries. These people are the steel producers themselves. They can distribute the available steel with a minimum of disruption to industry, avoiding waste and unemployment. Arbitrary orders from Government agencies, based on incomplete or inaccurate information, might result in unemployment and waste of productive tool-hours.

Question. Well, isn't one reason given for mandatory allocations by Government the fear that favoritism might arise in the distribution to nonwar consumers?

Answer. Yes; that fear exists, but it did not work out that way when industry was given the responsibility for operating the allocations in 1948 and 1949 and when we were not impelled by what amounts to a war emergency.

I cannot speak for the steel industry, but I can speak for the character of the men who are its managers. Those men, if given the opportunity, will see to it that steel is made available for the essential needs of the Armed Forces and for all vital civilian needs, and the distribution will be made without fear or favor and without regard to political consequences.

I am more inclined to fear that with mandatory Government allocations there would be greater likelihood of political favoritism.

Question. So the danger of abuse may lie in a different direction?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Who are the biggest users of steel today?

Answer. The biggest single user of steel today is the automobile industry. At the present time it is using about 20 percent of the steel production, although I must add that the automobile industry is making cars at a rate far in excess of normal.

IMPACT OF A NEW CONVERSION

Question. Broadly speaking, would you say that the conversion of your industry from normal operation to a system of voluntary allocations would be rapidly accomplished or gradually accomplished?

Answer. As far as the steel industry itself is concerned, the transformation could be done quite quickly, but the time schedule would depend largely upon the ability of the consumers of steel to adapt themselves to the manufacture of war material. It would take some time for some of these to tool up for large-scale production.

Question. Isn't there danger of unnecessary unemployment as a result of failure to mesh the program of steel production with the readiness of other industries to use steel for war purposes?

Answer. Yes; that is a very real danger. It is one of the reasons why I feel so strongly that this program of allocations should be operated by the people in the steel industry under the supervision of the Secretary of Commerce. That combination worked before because, as I have stated, the industry knows most about steel production and steel consumption.

You see, we have been operating for several years in an economy of large steel demand. That has forced steel producers to inform themselves as to the ability of fabricators to consume steel in order that we might be able to distribute the available supply to our customers equitably.

Question. Then you have had experience with it?

Answer. We have had a great deal of experience. One of the causes of the so-called gray market has been that some fabricators built up large inventories because they feared that they would run out of steel. When they found that these inventories were excessive they sold steel on the gray market. The steel producers found out pretty quickly what was happening and they began to keep a sharp eye on inventories and on the ability of fabricators to consume steel. The steel producers know pretty well what the fabricators can do.

Question. Is there some kind of gray market now?

Answer. Yes; on a small scale. There have been sporadic indications of a gray market over the past 6 months.

Question. Even apart from the Korean crisis?

Answer. Yes.

PRESIDENT'S POWER TO BOOST OUTPUT

Question. That was due to the fact that the demands were greater than the supply?

Answer. That is correct. I believe it is important to remember when we are considering this question of allocations of steel that the President already has a very effective tool for obtaining production of scarce material for war purposes and for the Atomic Energy Commission. This is the Selective Service Act of June 24, 1948, as extended, which gives the President authority to seize and operate any production facility where the managers of that facility are unable or unwilling to produce the required articles for the armed services or the Atomic Energy Commission.

I believe that the combination of this authority, which the President already has, and the authority for organizing a system of voluntary allocations to be operated by private industry under the supervision of the Secretary of Commerce, such as was provided under Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, would be the most effective tools to serve the desired purposes.

This combination would afford the greatest degree of flexibility as it would enable the people in closest contact with the day-to-day operations of industry to adjust their programs to the needs and abilities of the moment.

Question. What would you say is going to be the labor situation in view of this new crisis?

Answer. In time of war, two things happen. You subtract from the available labor market a large group of able-bodied, vigorous young people who are used either in the Armed Forces or in the civilian components which support them. To offset that, you draw into the labor market some people who are either not working at all or who are working part time. In addition, you work people overtime. There is a limit to which you can work overtime. There is a point of diminishing returns beyond which you decrease total production instead of increasing it.

Many women and people with physical infirmities are drawn into the labor market. When there is no large surplus of labor, as at the present time, those drawn into the labor market will hardly compensate for those who are taken by the military service.

HOW TO IMPROVE LABOR RELATIONS

Question. Now what about the possibility of labor disputes in the coming era?

Answer. That is a tremendously important matter. You can pass all the laws you want but, in the ultimate analysis, with our American philosophy of living, efficient production will depend on our ability to understand each other and to work together voluntarily. I believe that if we realize that we all have an identity of interest in this national emergency, we can minimize our labor difficulties.

Question. Do you think labor-management relationships have an impact on the trend of Government?

Answer. I do. I don't like to use the word "socialism" or the expression "concentration of power in the hands of centralized Government," which, of course, means the same thing. As labor-management relations become more involved and more discordant, the natural tendency is for one or both parties to seek the advantage of legal restraints on the other party. That brings politics into the picture. Then decisions are made not on the merits of the matter under consideration but in the light of their probable political effects. Then power-hungry politicians begin to outpromise each other.

If we are going to take power away from centralized Government, or at least stop further concentration of such power, this is a good place to start. We can do it by setting up procedures for conducting labor-management relationships without the intervention of Government.

Question. Would the employers and unions promote adequately the welfare of the worker?

Answer. I believe so, when they get the spirit of the thing. I believe that when a man comes to work for my company we assume a certain measure of responsibility for his welfare. We are not absolutely responsible because no one, not even the Government, should be absolutely responsible for the welfare of an individual. He should be responsible for his own welfare. Just as soon as you relieve a person of that responsibility, he begins to deteriorate.

Question. Would the unions take the same view?

Answer. I think so. One mistake we have made in labor-management relations is to assume that labor and management must always be antagonistic. The philosophy which we preach to our people and to their duly elected representatives, the union officials, is that our interests are mutual—we have much to gain by working together as members of a team. We conceive of the team as the owners of the business (shareholders) the management, and the workers, who are represented by unions. We believe we can prove to open-minded people that we have a mutuality of interests. And in times like these it becomes quite clear that we have an over-riding identity of interest with respect to the national security. If we can approach a condition of complete industrial harmony, we will have gone a long way toward strengthening our national security against any aggressor.

Question. Do you think strikes are preventable?

Answer. I think they are. I think if we can once establish that mutuality of interest I have spoken about, and complete confidence in each other's integrity, we will have a working atmosphere that will prevent or at least minimize strikes.

Question. Do you think the legislation on the statute books today has helped or hindered sound relations with business?

Answer. I suppose you refer to the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, the so-called Wagner Act, and the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, the so-called Taft-Hartley Act.

The Wagner Act was designed to correct certain bad practices and injustices. There is nothing wrong with the intent of the act. But it runs counter to the basic principle that labor relations should be removed from politics. Political administration is inherently inefficient. The administration of the Wagner Act is a good example of distortion of the law to achieve political objectives. The Wagner Act was abused by maladministration. This is what always happens when you try to make people good by act of Congress. You exchange one set of evils for another which is worse. So we are tempted into a correction by resorting to more law, thus adding to the evil. We want less government in labor relations, not more. When management and labor depend on Government to resolve their differences, they relinquish a large measure of their freedom to political administrators.

VALUE OF LONG-TERM CONTRACTS

Question. What do you think of the idea of long-term contracts such as the one entered into by General Motors recently? Do you think they will be accepted by other segments of industry, and, if so, do you think they will be a stabilizing influence in labor relations?

Answer. There are pros and cons with respect to long-term contracts such as the General Motors contract. There is no doubt a stabilizing effect on labor-management relations resulting from such a contract. There is a greater feeling of security on the part of the workers. This is indicated by the boom in sales of household furnishings and other consumer goods as well as in house repairs in General Motors workers' communities, which occurred immediately after the contract was announced.

Question. What do you see as its benefits to industry?

Answer. I believe one of the important benefits is that the contract indicates recognition by both management and labor of the essentiality of technological improvement. It establishes a formula for the worker's share in such improvements even before they are made. This constitutes an incentive to management to effect the improvements in order to avoid paying out money that has not been earned.

The annual wage increase provided by the contract can only be justified by continuing technological improvements and complete worker cooperation. It can serve as a basis for establishing that industrial teamwork which I have stated is so essential to progress. It is important that the workers recognize that only by means of better tools which result in greater productivity per man-hour can real wages be increased and the standard of living raised for all. Worker cooperation in carrying out this principle can help materially in making a company competitive and increasing job security for its employees.

GAMBLES FOR MANAGEMENT

Question. It's really somewhat of a gamble, isn't it?

Answer. Every labor contract, even a 1-year contract, is a gamble in the sense that management assumes certain fixed obligations that might become very onerous if business falls off materially during the period of the contract. Obviously a 2-year contract is more of a gamble than a 1-year contract. And a 5-year contract is an even greater gamble. It is not a pleasant prospect to have to raise wages when business falls off badly and every effort is being made to reduce costs and prices and thus to stimulate demand. Also, increasing wages at the same time that dividends are being reduced, or even eliminated, is not likely to make shareholders happy. Perhaps it would be practicable to have some kind of escape clause which would provide temporary relief to the company when earnings drop below a stated minimum.

Question. Will the GM plan be widely applied?

Answer. It is up to management to weigh the pros and cons of long-term contracts and to decide as their best judgment dictates. Evidently General Motors believes the pros outweigh the cons in their particular situation. Whether other segments of industry will follow their lead is anyone's guess. There is a great deal of individuality in American industry and you will find widely varying opinions. This is as it should be. It makes for progress. The incurring of calculated risks is an essential part of our free dynamic economy.

A long-term contract is likely to cause little difficulty in a constantly rising market. When business falls off badly, it might become very onerous. Perhaps at that time, if mutuality of interest had been sufficiently well established, it would be possible to have all members of the team, the shareholders, the management and the employees, pull in their belts a notch or two to safeguard the enterprise until the storm had been weathered.

Investigation of Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 3 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Doris Fleeson published in the Star of this date.

The article is objective and factual. It refers to a subcommittee composed of seven of the ablest Members of the Senate. This outstanding group, serving in this capacity gives assurance to the Nation of a more effective war effort in support of our Armed Forces. Likewise their services assure the American people that they will have a better picture of the great day-by-day contribution of American industry.

Mr. President, the services of this subcommittee will help materially in improving the morale of our gallant men and women in the Armed Forces and build a greater confidence in the hearts of all our people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSON VERSUS JOHNSON—DEFENSE SECRETARY FACES QUESTIONS IN SENATE ARMED SERVICES PROBE

(By Doris Fleeson)

Congressional policing of the new war effort begins this week with the appearance of Defense Secretary Johnson before the Senate Armed Services Investigating Subcommittee whose chairman is Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas.

Because an obscure Senator named Harry Truman parlayed an innocuous resolution for similar policing of World War II into the Presidency of the United States, unusual interest attaches both to the subcommittee's plans and the personality of its chairman.

It is already being said that LYNDON JOHNSON wants to be President, which is legal. It can be added that ever since he entered the House in 1938 his bright brown eyes have been fixed on America's defenses from a front-row seat.

NEVER LOOKED BACK

This was the doing of his special patrons, Speaker RAYBURN and Franklin Roosevelt, who persuaded shrewd CARL VINSON that they had just the man for Mr. VINSON'S select Naval Affairs Committee. Thus the astonished House on the Senator's first day in Congress saw him popped on the powerful Vinson committee without that usual boring interlude on printing or disposition of executive papers. He has never looked back. A freshman Senator by grace of 87 Texans (his majority was 87), he is on both the Armed Services and Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees now.

Obviously in a strategic spot, Senate Armed Services is strongly manned; and it very quickly moved into the Korean crisis with a formal demand for explanations. This demand was seized on by the quick-witted Mr. JOHNSON as the band wagon for a new Truman committee. Within 24 hours his resolution for a "watchdog group" was before his colleagues, who naturally were not averse to so interesting and historically fateful a task.

For a suspenseful week, Chairman TYDINGS toyed with the idea of heading the subcommittee himself. Fortunately for Mr. JOHNSON, Chairman TYDINGS had just had his fill of a sour investigation (the McCarthy charges) and he bowed out.

The subcommittee also includes Senators BRIDGES, SALTONSTALL, and MORSE, Republicans, and CHAPMAN, KEFAUVER, and HUNT, Democrats. Senator BRIDGES, a Truman committee alumnus and senior Republican, may feel impelled to speak up for the GOP occasionally. Senator SALTONSTALL is notably nonpartisan on vital questions like defense, and incidentally is one of the best liked men in the Senate. Senator MORSE is famously independent. The three Democrats can be counted upon for full cooperation.

FULFILLS CONDITIONS

The Johnson committee thus fulfills the conditions Senator Truman laid down when he approached Majority Leader BARKLEY in 1942 in behalf of the Truman resolution. Mr. Truman said the investigation ought to be made while the war was going on, and made by people friendly to what the administration was trying to accomplish.

Chairman JOHNSON has announced what he will and will not do in the new effort to help run the war in the interests of victory and efficiency.

"We want to make sure that enough is done, soon enough, to assure the defeat of aggression wherever it may appear. Our attention can be turned beneficially on any phase of the preparedness effort that lags. We shall begin with a survey of the armed services plans for build-up of both manpower and material and their plans for fighting any other fires that may break out in the world.

"We will not hunt headlines or exploit the sensational or play politics. Above all, we must not try to establish this subcommittee as a Monday morning quarterback club, second-guessing battle-front strategy. We were not created to tell generals and admirals how to fight but rather to make sure that they have what they need to win their battles."

The chairman cordially invites people everywhere to assist the committee with information which would be useful in making their efforts successful.

The Eyes of Asia Are Upon United States Envoy in Manila

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 3 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a very interesting article describing our able envoy at Manila, Ambassador Myron M. Cowen, who is doing a splendid job in helping to advise the Philippine Government in its economic planning toward complete recovery and rehabilitation. All of us recognize that the Philippines are a model testing ground of America's good will toward the people of Asia. Five years ago on July 4, the anniversary of our own independence, we freed the Philippine Republic, but since then it has been beset by terrific problems arising out of the war, and in particular arising out of the continued activities of the Communist-led Huks. These well-armed, well-led guerrillas have carried on a murderous campaign throughout the islands and have given our defense planners terrific concern.

It is our prayer that through the fine efforts of effective diplomats like Ambassador Cowen we will be able to keep the Philippine Government and people in a strong, sound, prosperous condition.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article in the Chicago Tribune be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Sunday Tribune of July 9, 1950]

THE EYES OF ASIA ARE UPON UNITED STATES ENVOY IN MANILA—COWEN IS TOO BUSY TO BE STRIPED-PANTS DIPLOMAT

(By David Boguslav)

MANILA, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, July 8.—The United States maintains here one of the largest and most complex diplomatic missions in its Foreign Service.

Its head Ambassador, Myron M. Cowen, 51, is about as far removed as possible from the striped-pants diplomat. He cannot afford to waste time on many of the traditional forms of diplomacy.

Under his direct control are 361 Americans and 1,996 Filipinos. Their jobs range from the primary one of the Embassy, protection of American nationals and interests, to operating a fish and wildlife project, a public-roads program, and the cultural activity of the United States information service. This office maintains in downtown Manila a library of 10,000 volumes, and operates a 157,750-watt radio transmitter which beams the Voice of America to Indonesia, China, Korea, Manchuria, and eastern Russia.

HAS UNIQUE RESPONSIBILITY

One of Cowen's responsibilities is unique in the sense that he is the only American diplomat who has this function—to assist the Philippine Government in planning and carrying out its economic development.

This burden is made necessary by the special relationship which exists between the United States and its former ward. No other Embassy has such a problem. It stems directly from the fact that while political connections between the United States and the Philippines were severed on July 4, 5 years ago, the economic and to a great extent, the social relations between the two peoples remained unbroken.

The sprawling white building on the shore of Manila bay now houses an ambassador and not a high commissioner or a governor general—the representative of a friendly, not a sovereign power. But almost as many Filipinos as old-time Americans must, from time to time, be gently but firmly reminded of the fact. Many on both sides still find it hard to remember that there is no longer an appeal to Washington.

ALL AREA WATCHES

The Philippine Republic is the model of a nationhood toward which all Asia's millions are striving and naturally Cowen's activities are watched throughout Asia. Politically free since 1946, the Philippines is economically prostrate, as a result of the war. Much remains to be done to complete the economic independence without which political freedom is meaningless.

It is this task which the American Ambassador must press with all possible vigor, chiefly because he is the spokesman of the nation which alone can help make economic independence possible.

Yet, because the Filipinos are sensitively proud of their independence, and are quick to challenge the slightest appearance of dictation, America's representative must chart his course with the greatest care.

Cowen was born in Logan, Iowa. After graduating from high school in Des Moines, he attended Wofford College at Spartansburg, S., C., and took his law degree at Drake University, Des Moines, in 1918.

Cowen began his public career in 1926, when he was appointed to the Court of Claims in Washington. He served there as Commissioner until 1933, when he returned to private practice, in Washington. He returned to public life when he was appointed Ambassador to Australia on July 1, 1948. In February 1949, he was named to the Philippines.

Among the mass of Filipinos, with whom he maintains contact through frequent trips about the archipelago, Cowen has built up a solid structure of friendliness. And in Manila itself the Cowen family—including Mrs. Dorothy Cowen and teen-age daughter, Sandra—have through their interest in social movements established a record for number and diversity of friendships. Mrs. Cowen's load of board activities and speaking engagements have led to the quip that the United States is getting two ambassadors for the price of one.

Potatoes: Return Engagement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a recent article from the Boston Globe which contains much plain talk and good common sense. I submit this item for the consideration of the Members of Congress:

POTATOES: RETURN ENGAGEMENT

The latest act in what appears to be an endless drama of wasting both the fruits of the earth and the taxpayers' money has opened formally for its annual run at Washington. The curtain-raiser is provided by the Department of Agriculture's crop forecast for 1950. The hero is the great American potato. In the sustaining role—appropriately so called—is, of course, the American consumer. The theme is surpluses.

This year, according to the crop estimates published by the Department of Agriculture, it seems that we are going to have more than 65,000,000 bushels of potatoes nobody wants. They represent a prospective crop in excess of every conceivable need of existing markets anywhere on earth. And it is going to cost the American public, which foots the bills in these matters, in the vicinity of $63,000,000 to have the Department of Agriculture buy up these surplus potatoes and dump them. (Dump, in current usage at Washington, means destroy, or get rid of for a pittance, if any pittance can be found.)

In 1948, close to a quarter of a billion dollars was lost by the Government on price supports for the American potato crop. The loss sustained in the same operation during 1949 is not as yet entirely tabulated, but as of June 1 it had reached another $78,000,000. Add the prospective bill for 1950 and count 10, slowly. Then glance at the needs of your State for public schools, and figure out how many could be built for $368,000,000.

Already, pursuant of the policy of price support for potatoes required by act of Congress, the Department of Agriculture has

purchased more than 3,500,000 bushels of surplus new potatoes, mostly in the South, so as to maintain prices in the consumer market at a level sufficiently high to protect the growers. Almost simultaneously—dumping has begun to the tune of hundreds of thousands of bushels.

Why is it that, despite the scandals attending the potato support program of 1949, when between 25,000,000 and 35,000,000 bushels of surplus potatoes purchased by the government were "dumped," this fantastic absurdity is continued? With food prices climbing so high as to cause acute difficulties for more than 40 percent of the American public, how does it happen that our Government is proceeding down this familiar and discredited course? Why, when potatoes can be utilized as a source of alcohol needed in the production of synthetic rubber, is a policy pursued of destroying them with chemicals, heaping them up to rot, or peddling them almost gratis for hog feed? Why these staggering annual orgies in excess production?

The basic thesis of the Federal Government's farm price support policy is eminently sound. That policy seeks, through congressional direction, to place a price floor under a selected list of important farm crops which form the foundation of our agricultural economy. The difficulties experienced by the Department of Agriculture in executing the program are, of course, numerous. Accordingly, under the law now in effect, some discretion is given the Secretary of Agriculture in the matter of price support.

But not much. Inevitably, Congress responds to political pressures. In the price-support program these are exercised by the great farm organizations. If the range in which supports operate is closely fixed by law, the Secretary of Agriculture can only function within that range. And if the support levels are fixed too high, the responsibility lies not with him, but with Congress.

Last winter, though worried because of the public uproar over the potato scandal, Congress nevertheless evaded the issue. It did not tackle head-on the potato surplus problem. Instead, it fell back on a favorite maneuver; lightly tying the potato problem with wisps of verbal mist. It came down strongly on what it might do the year after, to all potato growers—unless. But meantime, potatoes were to continue under a somewhat reduced level of support during 1950.

And so they have. The obvious recourse of increasing production on more limited acreage has resulted. For instance: the average production per acre in this country during the past 5 years was 154.6 bushels. The average for 1949 was 211.4. The average now estimated for 1950 is 213.8. There are, so to speak, no flies on potato growers.

Apparently nothing short of a major explosion of public opinion will bring Congress to its senses in this matter.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

The Way To Fight a War and Preserve Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 3 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Mr. DeWitt Emery, president of the National Small-Business Men's Association, which was published in the July issue of the association's monthly publication Pulling Together.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MESSAGE FROM OUR PRESIDENT

(By DeWitt Emery)

This Korean thing has most people a whole lot more worried than they care to admit. They aren't worried because of what may happen in Korea—I believe everyone feels that situation can and will be handled just as soon as we get enough stuff over there to give General MacArthur a chance to do the kind of a job we all know he's capable of doing—but they are deeply concerned over what may happen elsewhere. Russia definitely has the initiative and may break out any time in one or more of a half dozen other spots.

Personally, I'm most concerned over what may happen to this country if the shooting is not confined to Korea. It's a well-known fact that plans have been drawn to conscript everything and everybody in the United States in the event of another world war. In a recent speech, Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker said, "Men, women, and children will be drafted. Capital will be drafted and once in the clutches of such dictatorship you will never get out from under it."

I agree with Captain Rickenbacker. If the absolute dictatorship which is now on the legislative drafting boards—just in case—is ever established, none of us, no, not even our children or our grandchildren will live long enough to see freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of opportunity, and all the other freedoms we now enjoy, restored in this country.

If this is true—you may depend on it that it is—then shouldn't each and everyone of us carefully examine the situation to see if there isn't some other way for this country to fight an all-out war, if that should be necessary, without destroying at home the liberty and freedom we would supposedly be fighting to protect. I'm sure there is another way if we'll keep our heads and not be carried away by a wild flight of blind hysteria.

American lives have been and are being sacrificed on the battlefield. If the war spreads the casualties will be terrific and in this case there would be very heavy casualties on the home front as no matter how good our defense, some American cities would be bombed. The loss of life and the destruction of property would be beyond anything any of us can imagine. These things, terrible as they are, can be endured as they represent the fortunes of war.

Heretofore when the killing and destruction was over, those who survived took up more or less where they left off. They resumed the pattern of their lives in the American way. They were free to work where and when they wished, to worship as they pleased, to speak their minds on any subject, to meet with their fellow men for any peaceful purpose, to be secure in their possessions, and to have their day in a free court. This time, if there is a "this" time and if the military and defense planners have their way, all this would be wiped out in the very beginning; freedom, opportunity, and justice would perish from the United States for a long, long time if not forever. This is what we must avoid even though we may not at this late date be able to avoid being forced into another war.

I can understand why, if we get into a full-scale war, wages, salaries, and prices should be frozen immediately. In World War II wages never were frozen. This was a serious and very costly mistake which certainly should not be repeated. Also, the time lag on freezing prices which occurred before should not be permitted again, so I'd say a freeze on wages, salaries, and prices is in order immediately if war is declared or if the shooting spreads with or without a declaration of war. This can be done within the framework of our constitutional government as well as making whatever increase in taxes may be necessary to take the profit out of war.

I also understand why rationing of civilian goods and allocation of the materials of production in a total war effort is both necessary and desirable and this, too, can be done without destroying our Republican form of government. Up to this point I am in full agreement with the war planners. From here on I disagree.

I don't believe, for example, that when you chain a man to a machine or a bench, or for that matter behind the wheel of a truck, that you'll get as much production or service from him as you would if he were a free agent. Yet that is exactly what conscripting manpower means. It means further that the bureaucrats would have the power and authority to force you to mine coal in West Virginia while your wife was forced to go to Connecticut to run a punch press in a war factory and you'd both do as you were told or else. There is no such thing as a benevolent or humane dictator. The only way a dictatorship can function is on the basis of absolute power. This means that the dictator has the power of life or death over everyone in the country he controls.

Conscription of wealth means that the government takes whatever you have that it wants by simply telling you to turn it over. Due process of law and just compensation are out of the window.

Maybe some of you don't like the name dictator as applied to this country. I don't either. But if the War Powers Act as now drafted should be passed by Congress, it would conscript manpower and wealth, and if that wouldn't set the President up as an absolute dictator, you'll have to tell me what it would do.

I know I'll be accused of overstating the case, of painting the picture blacker than it would be. I'm sorry to say that is not true. My presentation of what would happen may be a little brutal, but that is as it should be. The time for pussyfooting has passed and if I can jar some of my readers out of their lethargy, awaken them to the facts, then I have accomplished my purpose.

It is not necessary, desirable or in any sense practical to conscript manpower or wealth. All history shows that free men outproduce slaves—a conscript is a slave whether you like it or not—by a very, very wide margin. Also, the American people have never failed to oversubscribe every war bond or victory bond offering made to them and they always will as long as they understand the need and are a free people.

The way then to fight a war, if that becomes necessary, without changing our form of government is to increase taxes, to freeze wages, salaries and prices at once and immediately put rationing of civilian goods and allocation of materials into effect. Then put on the biggest and the best sales campaign the United States has ever seen to get everyone in the country to do his or her job better and faster than ever before and to buy bonds as they are offered. This will get the job done quicker and much better than any other method. We'll retain our freedom and come out of it with our Republic intact.

Whether you realize it or not, our form of government is the greatest blessing ever bestowed on mankind any place on the face of God's earth.

Radio Station at Shreveport, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House the distressing plight of a radio station in my home town of Shreveport, La. The plight of this station is just as likely to be the fate of any other station in the congressional district of my colleagues; that is, if present conditions are permitted to continue. I refer to the intolerable interference with radio station KENT, Shreveport, La., by a Mexican station with call letters XENT. This interference which radio station KENT is presently experiencing will ruin this station if it is permitted to continue.

In this connection, I wish to include in my remarks copies of telegrams which I have received from Mayor R. L. Williams, of Arcadia, La.; and Mayor C. M. Terry of Vivian, La. I wish, further, to call attention to the fact that these telegrams are only two out of a large number of similar messages which I have received from people through the great area served by radio station KENT; and all of these telegrams complain bitterly about the "road-hog" tactics of this Mexican Station XENT, which has been set up on the border just immediately south of the Rio Grande and pours out its full vial of noxious entertainment and propaganda all night long with no restrictions whatsoever. There are apparently no restrictions on the use which they make of the wave channel. While KENT is restricted to 500 watts at night and is forced to go directional to protect the Mexican border, this Mexican Station XENT is operating on 20,000 watts nighttime, however, about September they propose to go to 50,000 watts operating 24 hours a day. XENT acts as though it has full freedom and license of the ether waves, both as to North and to Central America.

This Government has an agreement with Mexico as to usage of the air waves. It is true this agreement has run out; but by mutual consent, it is being carried over until such time as a new agreement can be worked out between the two countries; and we have most carefully and patiently restrained our own stations from violating any of the provisions of this international agreement. We have curbed, and even put out of business, certain stations rather than let them violate the sanctity of these stipulations with Mexico, and we have literally done our very best to live up to both the spirit and the letter of the agreement so that the numerous radio stations in the United States will not completely close out every channel to the people of Mexico and Canada.

As previously stated, radio station KENT is located at Shreveport, La., where it has been in operation for a number of years, licensed by the Federal Communications Commission to operate on its assigned frequency of 1550 but required to protect the Mexican border. At the time the license was granted KENT, this Mexican Station XENT at Nuevo Laredo was operating on 1140. The only station in Mexico operating on 1550 before the expiration of the treaty was XEML a 1,000-watt station located at Mexico City and it was this station that KENT was required to go directional to protect. XENT at Nuevo Laredo was causing interference to a 50,000-watt CBS station located in the State of Virginia. After numerous vigorous protests, XENT at Nuevo Laredo on 1140 changed frequencies with XEML at Mexico City on 1550 in violation of the terms of the treaty and the laws of the United States to radio station KENT. Station XENT is breaking, violating, and flouting the laws of Mexico and the United States; and it boasts over the radio that it is a station which is not controlled by law.

I have repeatedly appealed to the State Department for help; and the State Department apparently is vigorous in its protestations, without avail. It is apparent that something more is needed than formal protests in order to remove this Goliath of the ether waves from its predatory position south of the Rio Grande border, from which vantage point it seeks to exploit the ether waves crossing the United States with the purpose of selling propaganda and wares to the people of the United States.

I am making this statement that our people may be acquainted with this situation and may realize that no radio channel in this country is safe from monstrosities such as these foreign stations which arbitrarily seize the radio wave which for the moment best serves its purpose and uses it without recourse to the established rights and investments of the citizens of the United States.

Lobbying Against Human Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should by all means contain the factual data compiled by the Committee for the Nation's Health which discloses the concentration of reactionary forces alined against health insurance, and other progressive proposals of the Truman administration intended to benefit the people.

It is evident that the virulent stream of poisonous propaganda leveled against the people can only be sustained in its flood-tide proportions by the expenditure of millions of dollars of corrupt money. By the way, it is interesting to note that the propaganda which is being whispered into the ears of dying patients, by those who should instead be giving advice and succor at that moment, is being paid for in part from insurance company revenues. The premiums the public pays are now being used against the welfare of the policyholder. It may be something for Congress to look into at the first opportunity and to prescribe appropriate remedies.

Instead of squandering the policyholders assets, the insurance companies should reduce their premium loading. The cash diverted for vicious antipublic purposes should be invested to increase the dividends of the insured. These unscrupulous and purblind guardians of the policyholders in these alleged mutual companies had better take pause for sound reflection lest the consequence of their illegal acts catch up with them.

I append at this point Bulletin No. 14 issued by the Committee for the Nation's Health:

[From the Committee for the Nation's Health, Bulletin No. 14]

LOBBYING AGAINST HUMAN NEEDS

Organized medicine and its allies—big business, insurance, and real-estate lobbies—averaged close to $10,000 a day every day from January 1 to March 31 of this year fighting President Truman's Fair Deal program.

This quartet poured out an average of close to 100,000 pamphlets a day every day during the first 3 months of this year. At least 62 lobbyists pounded the walks of Congress, pressuring Senators and Representatives.

The staggering figures of 8,996,934 pieces of propaganda and $866,403 spent against the Fair Deal were pieced together from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 14, where they were publicly printed for the first time.

One hundred and seventy-six pages of fine print boiled down to this story of what lobbies are spending how much against the President's program to build a healthier and better America:

Organization	Number of lobbyists	Amount spent	Propaganda distributed
Medical	15	$369,526	6,049,311
Life insurance	7	49,276	83,098
Real estate	5	31,735	1,200
Big-business lobbies	35	415,866	2,863,325
Total	62	866,403	8,996,934

Heading list again this quarter, as it did in previous quarters, is the medical lobby. Led by its $100,000-a-year antilabor publicity team, Whitaker & Baxter, the AMA spent $322,045 in 90 days, and used the services of 7 lobbyists. Not a cent of this money went to medical research, scholarships for qualified would-be doctors or nurses, or the furthering of scientific progress to end needless suffering. Individual State medical societies—most registering for the first time—spent an additional $47,481 and hired eight lobbyists.

All this money was spent for the political objectives outlined by Whitaker & Baxter at their second big campaign meeting in Chicago last February. In blocking such vitally needed legislation as Federal aid to train more doctors, disability insurance, and health services bill for school children, the AMA lobbyists were not concerned with the merits of each proposal. Their primary concern was stopping the administration's measures. Thus, the AMA blocked S. 1805—a bill to aid voluntary health plans in rural areas—with this blunt statement:

"There is nothing in this bill which we feel would advance our cause, and there is

much in it that would lead to socialization of medicine, so we must oppose it."

That word "socialization," again—now applied even to voluntary plans.

The AMA lobby callously labels, then attacks, this needed legislation as "a form of guerrilla warfare * * * fringe bills * * * disarming in language but dangerous in their provisions * * * the back door approach."

These quotes come from the AMA's second national conference of its national education campaign. The document has not been available for public distribution.

Organized medicine is now accustomed to dealing out political medicine in large doses. Last year it topped all other lobbies, having budgeted over $2,000,000 against the President's program. It distributed 55,000,000 pieces of propaganda during those 12 months.

Although the lobbying figures of the vested powers fighting the President's program may seem astronomical, undoubtedly they are but a portion of the real amounts spent. The figures abstracted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD represent only the information the lobbies have chosen to yield. Since the lobbying law has no teeth, there are no real penalties facing those who want to conceal the scope of their opposition to current legislation. Since there is no real challenge, the favorite dodge of these lobbyists is to describe their activities as "educational" and admit to only a fraction of their time as devoted to legislative interests.

Medical lobby

Organization	Lobbyists	Versus National health insurance	Versus social-security extension	Versus other Fair Deal legislation	Spent Jan. 1 to Mar. 31, 1950	Literature distributed
American Medical Association (AMA) lobby combined with Whitaker & Baxter.	7	Yes	Yes	Federal aid to medical schools, school health program, etc.	$322,045	5,957,281
North Carolina Medical Society	1	Yes	Yes	do	1,750	(1)
Medical Society of New Jersey	1	Yes	Yes	do	(2)	(1)
Medical Society of District of Columbia	1	Yes	Yes	do	16,175	6,000
Medical Society of Vermont	1	Yes	Yes	do	142	1,230
Pennsylvania Medical Society	1	Yes	Yes	do	470	500
Indiana Medical Society	1	Yes	Yes	do	5,548	(1)
American Dental Association	1	Yes	Yes	do	16,758	80,000
American Hospital Association	1	Yes	Yes	do	6,638	4,300
Medical lobby, total	15				369,526	6,049,311

[1] None listed.
[2] Not given.

Big business lobby

Organization	Lobbyists	Versus National health insurance	Versus social-security extension	Versus other Fair Deal legislation	Spent Jan. 1 to Mar. 31, 1950	Literature distributed
Chamber of Commerce of the United States	1	Yes	Yes	Aid to education, Brannan plan, housing bill	$44,073	2,739,025
Ohio Chamber of Commerce	1	Yes	Yes	Unemployment and disability compensation	2,500	(1)
National Economic Council (Merwin K. Hart)	1	Yes	Yes	Civil rights legislation	13,211	12,000
Committee for Constitutional Government	3	Yes	Yes	All Fair Deal legislation	291,660	(2)
American Retail Federation	4	Yes	Yes	Unemployment compensation, FEPC	32,308	3,800
Associated Retail Bakers	1	Yes	Yes	FEPC	Not given	8,500
American Pulpwood Association	11			Fair Labor Standards Act	898	[3] 12,000
Interstate Manufacturing Association	7		Yes		1,500	(4)
Socony-Vacuum Co	1	Yes	Yes		$1,730.00	(4)
Council of State Chambers of Commerce	2	Yes	Yes		12,128.24	19,000
American Petroleum Institute	1		Yes		2,000	(4)
Bureau of Salesmen's National Associations			Yes		600	(2)
National Association of Direct Selling	1		Yes		3,921	9,000
National Associated Businessmen	1		Yes	Taft-Hartley	9,337	60,000
Big business lobby, total	35				415,866	2,863,325

[1] None published.
[2] Not printed on record in Clerk's office.
[3] Approximate.
[4] None listed.

Insurance lobby

Organization	Lobbyists	Versus National health insurance	Versus social-security extension	Versus other Fair Deal legislation	Spent Jan. 1 to Mar. 31, 1950	Literature distributed
Prudential Insurance Co	2		Yes		$2,500	(1)
Insurance Economics Society	1	Yes	Yes		28,175	(?) 175
National Association of Insurance Agents	1		Yes		4,206	27,923
National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents	1		Yes		350	(2)
Association of Casualty & Surety Cos	2		Yes		6,500	(3)
American Life Convention			Yes		4,847	(3)
National Association of Life Underwriters			Yes		2,698	55,000
Insurance lobby, total	7				49,276	83,098

[1] No publications.
[2] Monthly bulletins to association members occasionally contain information re pending legislation.
[3] None listed.

Real estate lobby

Organization	Lobbyists	Versus national health insurance	Versus social-security extension	Versus other Fair Deal legislation	Spent Jan. 1 to Mar. 31, 1950	Literature distributed
National Association of Real Estate Boards	3	Yes	Yes	Unemployment, housing, rent control	$30,000	1,200
Realtors Washington committee combined with Washington Real Estate Board.	2	Yes		do	1,735	(1)
Real estate lobby, total	5				31,735	1,200

[1] None listed.

Lake Success Front Holds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a very interesting and timely editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., Wednesday, August 2, 1950:

LAKE SUCCESS FRONT HOLDS

If the Russian return to the United Nations Security Council was impelled by the possibility that the Soviet delegate could find crevices in the united western stand against aggression in Korea, then it represents a major miscalculation by Soviet tacticians. The western front is firmer than ever.

The renewed Soviet effort to deny membership in the Council to the Nationalist Chinese regime failed even more signally than the attempt which preceded the Russian walkout from the Council last January. Two powers which abstained from the voting at that time cast clear votes this time against the Russian move.

These two, Britain and Norway, have recognized the Communist regime in China. It may be that this divided attitude in the West, in which some nations refuse to recognize the Chinese Communists while others grant them recognition, led the Russians to false hopes.

Only the most abstract sort of logic would imply that the British and Norwegian votes are inconsistent with their earlier actions in recognizing Red China. The struggle in the Council at this moment does not concern which Chinese regime shall eventually be seated. It concerns the question whether the Russians can make the seating of the Chinese Communists the price for calling off their North Korean war dogs.

The tirade which the Soviet delegate let loose against the United States indicates pretty well that the Soviet Union has decided for the time being that if it cannot win diplomatic victories in the UN, that body is still valuable to Russia for propaganda.

The propaganda is running true to form. It charges warmongering to ruling cliques in the United States, and aims to stir up discontent and distrust of American intentions throughout Asia. We can be sure it will seek also to exploit any fears or suspicions among the masses of people in the Atlantic Pact countries of Europe who are being called upon to make new sacrifices and take life-and-death risks for western defense.

What besides propaganda the Russians may or may not accomplish through their walkback to the United Nations Security Council is something on which no expert on UN procedures would venture a firm prediction. There is wide latitude under the Charter for diplomatic maneuver, for delay, obstruction, and surprise-by-formula. The power of this last, the ingeniously worded formula, can never be safely discounted in advance.

The western delegates must therefore remain intently alert throughout this session of the Council. It seems hardly possible that Soviet diplomacy would venture on the UN stage after 7 months unless armed with a strategy beyond any shown in early stages of the Council meeting.

The risks the West must prepare for may arise from the possibility of Russia's having a workable plan to seize the initiative in the UN struggle, though she seems to have lost it at the outset. Or those risks may come from the very fact that Russia's position in the UN is hopeless. For example, if the Russians should ever be convinced that the UN can serve them no longer, an important checkrein on possible aggression elsewhere than in Korea would be removed. The western powers even now must beware lest the Russian return to the Council sets the stage for a new military adventure and a Russian veto against UN action.

So the resounding defeat administered to Soviet machinations in the Security Council is not only heartening but sobering as well. In peace, as in war, the winning of the last rather than the first battle must be the chief objective.

Korea and the UN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to set forth in the RECORD a letter I have today addressed to the President of the United States:

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I wish to direct your attention to the fact that our present situation in Korea and in the United Nations is completely incongruous, possibly very dangerous, and would be silly if it were not a matter of such deadly seriousness.

We are fighting the war in Korea at the request of the United Nations to preserve freedom in the world. General MacArthur has been designated as the Commander in Chief of the United Nations Forces in Korea. He, therefore, presumably is responsible and must report to the Security Council of the United Nations. The Security Council is presided over by Russian delegate Jacob A. Malik. You have publicly charged Russia with instigating the Korean War of Aggression and have labeled her the arch enemy of freedom in the world; yet she is part of the United Nations; and General MacArthur technically represents her too.

Under this amazing and preposterous state of facts, can General MacArthur be directed to furnish the Security Council, and through Malik, our avowed enemy Russia with the details of our military operations in Korea? Can he be directed to tell our avowed enemy the disposition of our troops, the strength of our forces, and our strategic plans? While this sounds ridiculous, it would appear that Russia would have the legal right to obtain such information through the United Nations.

I believe that the time has come to honestly face the fact that we are in a world-wide struggle with Russia and adopt the Hoover proposal to organize a United Nations of the free peoples of the world, leaving out Russia and her satellites.

It is time we recognized that we cannot be in a deadly war with Russia and in bed with her at the same time.

Respectfully yours,

HENRY J. LATHAM,
Member of Congress, Third District, New York.

Delegation of Powers to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, I believe every thinking American wants our economy stabilized. The great problem is just how it should be accomplished. Certainly the situation confronting us, the Korean war, should not be made the excuse for investing unnecessary controls over the lives of our citizens. The problem before us is one of the most serious we have faced in the 8 years I have served in this body. To be honest I am, at this moment, not satisfied with any of the legislation that is before us. The boys fighting in Korea are making every sacrifice. The field order of General Walker, to fight to death, should be our keynote here at home. If this Korean affair is the beginning of an all-out war, we must legislate for total mobilization. I am not for giving the President the full power to pull the trigger. The Congress must provide safeguards. Citizens today have lost faith in some of our administration chiefs; therefore, Congress has a real responsibility, and it is not the time to pass the buck. This is certainly not the time to give the President a blank check to put controls on our economy at will. Price controls, for instance, without controls on wages would be ruinous. The boys in Korea are fighting to preserve the American way of living with freedom and liberty. I am sure that they would not cherish our giving any one man totalitarian powers, and that is exactly what some of this legislation is asking us to do. Time limits must be put on this legislation and opportunity given for congressional review and approval.

We have seen what Mr. Malik again sought at Lake Success on last Tuesday. It certainly was not an olive branch. Instead it was a bitter attack on the United States as being the aggressor in the Korean war. Last night it was my privilege along with some other Congressmen to hear Josef Zack, a former Russian Communist, speak on "Stalin's international apparatus." His whole discourse pertained to the ideological methods used by the Kremlin. For 30 years they have planned on infiltrating the various branches of the Government here and in other countries, through secret organizations and other methods to gain their goal. Now is the time for us to stop mollycoddling any Communists in our country enjoying the same liberties that millions of true full-blooded Americans enjoy. Our diplomats have failed to sell our democratic way of life to the Reds.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a time for idle talk. We owe our fighting men in Korea the assurance that while they are fighting to preserve democracy, we at home are fighting to save America and the

freedoms for which it has always stood. So let us work as a team here in Congress to give the President only those powers necessary to successfully carry on the war and preserve a strong economy so necessary if we are to maintain our leading place among the nations.

Totalitarian Ideologies and the American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 3 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as the breach between totalitarian ideologies and the American way of life widens, I am reminded of the prophetic warning given to this Nation by the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] as far back as March 21, 1949. On that day the Senator from New Hampshire addressed the American Association of University Women on the topic The Way We Are Going. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from the address delivered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The way we, as a nation, are going is not hard to find. There are only two ways open to us: Statism with the immediate and deceptive efficiency and promptness which it has to offer, or Christian individualism, with its rich history of personal liberty, freedom of religion, of speech, and of opportunity for the pursuit of happiness. Those terms are exclusive of each other. Christian individualism has no more chance of survival in a regimented state than the proverbial snowball in Hades.

In the aftermath of the world's greatest conflict, the nations of the world are rapidly traveling down one or the other way. The countries behind the Iron Curtain have chosen, under the lash of Soviet Russia, it is true, the way of statism. In those countries, the individual is no longer free. He can no longer speak his mind. He is denied the avenues and sources of truth. He must read the Kremlin's or Politburo-dominated newspapers. None other is made available to him. It is a capital crime for him to listen to foreign broadcasts. Man has been reduced to a mere cog in a grinding machine which grinds out more and more edicts while crushing the self-respect of the individual.

Other nations have tried to mitigate the evils of statism in its pure form as exemplified by Communist Russia and have been lured by the inducements of a milder form of statism called socialism. The immediate effects are less drastic, but the end results threaten to become the same; namely, the gradual extinction of human rights.

The way we are following must steer clear of communism and socialism. We must redeclare the state to be a servant of the community and the guardian angel of the inalienable rights of the individual.

Churchill's Estimate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which should be of great interest to every Member:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—CHURCHILL'S ESTIMATE

(By Walter Lippmann)

Just before it adjourned last week, Parliament had a discussion, in which Mr. Churchill took the leading part, about the strategic situation in Europe. On the facts there was no disagreement between Mr. Churchill and Mr. Shinwell, the Minister of Defense. Western Europe, they said, has almost no immediate defense if Russia decided to attack except the deterrent effect of American superiority in atomic weapons.

Mr. Churchill had asked for a secret session, presumably to discuss the conclusions to be drawn from this estimate of the situation. Mr. Attlee refused to have a secret session, and, therefore, Mr. Churchill's views were bound to be stated cryptically: "Between having the secret and making any large number of bombs there is undoubtedly a considerable interval. It is this interval which we must not waste. We must endeavor to make up the melancholy leeway in military preparations which are pressing us today, and we must never abandon the hope that a peaceful settlement may be reached with the Soviet government if a resolute effort is made, not upon our present weakness but upon American atomic strength."

The British picture of the European situation, as expressed publicly by the Minister of Defense and by Mr. Churchill, is in broad terms as follows: The Soviet Union has 175 active divisions which in a few months could be raised to over 300 divisions. On the assumption, which in view of the proved fighting capacity of the Chinese and of the North Koreans is optimistic, that only half of the active divisions could be used in Europe, the Russians can still launch over 80 divisions upon us without any further mobilization.

Of the active divisions one-third are said to be mechanized or armored, which would mean that at least 25 are available in the West. Mr. Churchill made an informed guess that on or near the western front the Russians had 4,000 or 5,000 tanks in organized formations. Against this he said that the British, the French, the Belgians, and the Americans have a total of 12 divisions, of which less than 2 are armored, against anything from 25 to 30 on the Russian side. The odds against us in ground troops on the western front are, on the British figures, at least 4 to 1 and it may be as much as 9 to 1. The tactical air position is not much better, and at sea, said Mr. Churchill, "it is probably true to say that the Russian U-boat menace to our transoceanic lifeline and world communications, covering all American reinforcements for Europe, would be far more severe than were the German U-boats in 1939 and 1940, and that seemed quite enough then."

Mr. Churchill's estimate is grim, so grim that its effect on the Continent will be profoundly demoralizing unless the United States can convince the people of the Continent (1) that we are prepared to commit all our resources and (2) that we intend to commit them primarily to reinforcing our own deterrent power and (3) that we shall use the deterrent power we have and all that we can add to it, to support a policy which is neither appeasement nor a demand for Russian unconditional surrender, but is a policy of settlement by negotiation on the principle of the coexistence of the Communist orbit and of the Atlantic community.

A maximum effort to achieve greater military power quickly is imperative. But, on the British estimate of the strategic situation, our maximum effort will not be enough to achieve the security of the Atlantic community unless it is focused and directed rightly so as to be deterrent, and unless our diplomatic objectives are reduced to realizable proportions.

The European picture, as drawn by Mr. Churchill, and our own experience in Korea prove conclusively that while we have the power to deter the Soviet Union, we do not have the power to contain all the revolutionary forces around the periphery of the Soviet Union. The Pentagon has always known that. The policy of containment was dreamed up by civilians. A strategy of military containment is, for a country or an alliance that is numerically inferior, nonsense. Thus it may be possible for 80 men to surround and contain 12 men. But 12 men cannot surround and contain 80 men. This truism is being given a fearful demonstration in South Korea, where the Americans have been unable to contain the North Koreans because there have never been enough Americans. The alternative to a strategy of containment is the strategy of the deterrent striking force. That does not mean building nothing but B-36's. It does mean the organization and the reenforcement and the continual perfecting of task forces designed to penetrate the defenses of the Soviet Union itself. The American power to strike inside the Soviet Union is what now protects Europe, which is otherwise virtually disarmed. That is what must protect Europe while it goes through the painful effort to develop some independent military power of its own against Soviet military action to interrupt European rearmament.

There is every reason for thinking that this is substantially the Soviet estimate too. Their propaganda has been concentrated on an effort to neutralize our superiority in atomic weapons—on an effort to bring about American atomic disarmament. Their diplomacy has been concentrated on keeping the Atlantic community embroiled in the Far East, fighting second-class satellites in Indochina, Malaya, and Korea. If they could manage both to disarm the United States of the only kind of weapon in which we have decisive superiority, and could at the same time involve us in a first-rate secondary war, they could begin to dictate political terms to the undefended and terrified people of Europe.

They will, of course, not succeed with their propaganda against our atomic superiority. But they stand a fair chance of diverting our main energies, which need to be focused on the defense of the Atlantic community, into difficult and expensive secondary wars that cost Russia nothing in blood and nothing in prestige, and almost nothing in treasure.

An Invitation to Wonderful Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 3 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have pre-

pared on the subject of the invitation by my State to the people of the Nation to visit wonderful Wisconsin. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF GREETINGS TO AMERICAN TOURISTS

Wonderful Wisconsin invites the people of our Nation to come and relax within its borders. A paradise for fishermen—our 10,000 miles of spring-fed, well-stocked streams await you, as do 22 State parks with 14,000 picturesque acres, 224,000 acres of State forests—nature's playground.

Today, more than ever before, the people of our country need a place to get away from their cares and worries.

Brave American boys are making the supreme sacrifice in the muddy foxholes of Korea against superior numbers of the Communist enemy. We here, however, on the home front will not be adequate to our challenges to back up our fighting forces unless we are refreshed and relaxed. If you and I are tense, nervous, worried, anxious, fearful, if our nerves are strained to the breaking point, we cannot do a good job in the factories, in the offices, in the homes, in the mines, or on the farms.

COME ON TO WISCONSIN, MR. CONGRESSMAN

I want to invite my colleagues, therefore, in the Senate and House of Representatives to visit America's Dairyland this year. You will find vacation pleasures there that are superior to anything found anywhere else in the Nation. Naturally I feel a deep pride in my native State; but it is a pride that is more than borne out by the fact of our great resources and tourist facilities.

WE'RE PROUD OF OUR STATE

It was Abe Lincoln who said:

"I always like to see a man proud of the place from which he comes; and I like to see a man live so that the place from which he comes may be proud of him."

We of Wisconsin are indeed proud of our birthplace. We're proud that tourists honor us with their presence and with their expenditure of $300,000,000 a year for vacation fun.

We're proud of the sincere hospitality we show them. We make them feel right at home. Why? Because there's a little bit of all the world—all of its variety—within our borders. We're a blend of many peoples, and we get along just fine with everybody. We rejoice in our tradition of friendship.

You'll find Wisconsin agrees with you, too.

We have the outdoor scenery that has been given to us by Almighty God * * * beautiful lakes, forests, the good green earth; and we have magnificent man-made facilities to warm a man's or woman's or youngster's heart.

When you have a fighting muskie at the other end of your fishing line, you can forget your ulcers and your high blood pressure and just enjoy life as it is meant to be enjoyed.

In each previous year, as the summer season and recess approach, I have invited Members of the Senate and House to come out to Wisconsin. This year, the Congress will be in session almost continuously and we will not be able to get away except for brief week ends, if at all. Whether, however, it is a 48-hour visit to one of our 7,500 lakes, or a full week driving around and seeing some of our beautifully well-kept 175,000 dairy farms, I know that you are going to have the time of your life in Wisconsin. You'll enjoy our well-kept hotels, motels, lodges, and cabins. You will find a vacation to fit your budget and every variety of wholesome enjoyment to fit your taste. You'll enjoy our good cooking, our neatness, and tidiness.

You will enjoy visiting our cities, too, which are famed throughout the Nation for their model municipal management. In those cities, you may want to see some of the 3,000 factories which give employment to 440,000 production, office, and executive employees with an annual payroll of one and a quarter billion dollars. Those factories did a superb job in World War II and they'll do it again.

TRAVEL EDITORS PRAISED WISCONSIN

Recently, some of the Nation's foremost travel editors visited Wisconsin and they were completely delighted to note the tremendous variety of tourist facilities there.

The Washington (D. C.) Evening Star sent its travel editor to visit Wisconsin and he wrote a glowing report which I later commended in a special letter to the Evening Star.

It's no wonder, too, that Life magazine pictured the superb fishing in our lake country as a delight to any Waltonian.

It was over 50 years ago that there was first brought to my attention the beautiful lakes of Wisconsin. I traveled with my parents by horse and buggy over the then rough, narrow dirt roads up to the various lakes. Now these roads are among the finest in the Nation. They are widened, well graded, well surfaced. In those days there were but rough cabins around the lakes. Now there are beautiful resorts. Wisconsin lakes are the same and the forests along the banks of the streams and around the shores of the lakes are practically as abundant as they were in those early days.

One hears an Irishman telling about the natural beauties of Killarney, or a Scotsman telling about the beautiful scenes of Scotland. Well, I am not of Scotch or Irish ancestry, but I do want to tell you about the lovely lakes and rivers and hills and beautifully wooded valleys, the well-kept farms of Wisconsin, particularly up there in the lake region, because it is a scenic gem equal to that of Erin or the highlands of Scotland.

Here is opportunity for rest, here is opportunity for superb fishing, and lodging and board are very reasonable. Here is the quietness of the inland lakes, with their wooded hills, with the blue sky above, one can rest in peace and rebuild one's energies.

Yes, as one drifts along in a canoe on a mirror-like lake, the days of youth return and when one feels the tug of the line and pulls in a nice bass, or a northern pike, or a walleye, he is a boy again.

The Wisconsin Trail Club said:

"Our forests are made for weary men
That they might find their souls again,
And rustling leaves are hung on trees
To whisper of old memories;
Our waters with mirrored shadows black
Are placed there just to lead men back
Beyond the pitfalls of success
To boyhood peace and happiness."

This is the traveler's trail for rest and rejuvenation. The traveler is every conscious of the youth, not the antiquity of this country.

Up there in that region among the pine and the hemlock there is a freshness of the air; there is the tang that comes from the fir; there is plenty of ozone to reinvigorate and rebuild the tired bodies and tired nerves. And let me repeat, there are beautiful cottages and resorts, good food at modest cost. There are guides to show one about if you want that service. There is no feeling of rush and intensity that you find in the cities. There you will find demonstrated the science of living. Folks are courteous, civil, and very anxious to be of service.

THE PANORAMA OF BADGERLAND

So, come on out, folks. Come by car, by plane, by train. Come with the family—you'll find sports for mom, dad, junior, and sis. Visit the scenic southwestern area near the lordly Mississippi. Visit the Lake Michigan shore and Door County's cherryland. Try a sample of northeastern Wisconsin—the most concentrated lake region in the world. How about the awe-inspiring Apostle Islands in Lake Superior or the famed Indianhead country of northwestern Wisconsin? Don't miss the lakeland region of the southern part of the State.

We've got the cool delightful climate. We've got the cheese, the rich creamery butter, the Old World and New World recipes to sample. We've got the swimming, horseback riding, golf, sailing.

Write to our State conservation department at Madison and you'll receive beautiful vacation literature by return mail. Write to Senator ALEX WILEY, Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D. C., if you'd like more copies of this statement for your friends. They're yours for the asking.

And when you're in our borders, don't forget to look up our ever-present, ever-helpful American Automobile Association offices. Brother, you "ain't seen" courtesy of the type those cheerful AAA'sters always show you.

This is straight stuff, folks—no hokum, no baloney. We eat baloney, we don't talk it. We're glad to welcome you, glad to show you the time of your life. Welcome to wonderful Wisconsin.

Need for Real Leadership in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing an editorial written by Ralph Disler, general manager of the Mansfield News-Journal.

I am hoping that every Member of this Congress will read this editorial. Mr. Disler sets forth facts as they are and certainly gives us recommendations that are worthy of our immediate consideration and action.

After you have read this editoral I believe you will agree with me when I say to Ralph Disler, "A job well done":

TRAGIC EVENTS IN KOREA POINT TO NEED FOR REAL UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP—NOW

Outnumbered, outgunned, and outarmored, American fighting men are being killed, maimed, tortured, and murdered in Korea.

Pitifully few and poorly supported Yank forces in Korea are being blasted with high-explosive shells from the guns of monster Russian-built tanks, ripped by slugs from rapid-fire, Russian-made machine guns and picked off by snipers whose rifles came from Soviet arms plants.

Counterattacking GI's fighting grimly for their own lives, are sickened to find cold, twisted bodies of comrades in arms, murdered by fiendish orientals who trussed up captured Americans and then cold-bloodedly fired pistol bullets into their heads.

This is no army of strangers, no fighting force from some far away place which is being whittled, hacked, and blown to pieces. The men going through the agonies of death and forced retreat in South Korea were, a few months ago, young men of Mansfield, Shelby, Galion, and other Ohio towns. They

are from American families, many of them veterans of the horrors of the last war. The casualty lists—the messages notifying mothers, wives, and fathers of those killed, missing, or wounded in action—tell who they are.

The world situation today indicates that Korea may be but a foretaste of what is to come. The heroic men of the United States Eighth Army are paying only the first installment on the fearful price that yet may be exacted from the American people for having in Washington a bungling, politics-first, crony-get-the-jobs Government.

Where are the weapons, the tanks, guns, planes, ships, and power which Americans generally and those battered, bleeding troops in particular, might reasonably have expected were ready for instant action if they were to believe Defense Secretary Louis Johnson in his assertion that Russia could be stopped in a matter of hours if the Kremlin launched a war of aggression?

Where is the United Nations' power which Americans might reasonably have expected to appear in Korea within a month at most after the outbreak of hostilities?

In the last 4 years of "cold war" $50,000,000,000—fifty thousand millions of United States taxpayers' dollars—have been spent, presumably to build up an adequate American defense machine. What did the money buy? Where did it go?

The United States News and World Report gives an answer.

The report states that spending on combat equipment has been less than enough to replace worn-out items. There are no new tanks, no new, fast hard-hitting navy, no big mobile guns. The few tanks that United States soldiers have in Korea are not larger than 20-ton machines, probably remodeled World War II veterans. The North Koreans, meanwhile, spearhead their drives with 60-ton land battleships provided by Russia.

The United States News says that only $1 out of each $7 of the fifty billions of defense spending went for actual combat equipment. Charitably, the report states that the rest went for salaries, supplies, freight and other "services" performed.

Meanwhile the President has gone blithely on, following a course laid down by crackpot social planners. He has spent billions on welfare experiments, to meet pressure-group demands and to otherwise tinker with the economy. He smilingly pours millions upon millions into fulfilling the campaign promises he made to gain election after a political accident brought him a part of a term in the Nation's highest office.

Our President is a genius at surrounding himself—and burdening the Nation—with second-raters in jobs of the heaviest responsibility and most sacred trust.

This Nation no longer can afford the luxury of having President Truman and his cronies at the helm. We cannot be guided safely, whether in war or in peace, by a Government shot through with incompetence, suspicion, secrecy, jealously, Pendergastism, and at best, mediocrity.

We cannot even hope for a semblance of effectiveness in our National Government when its chief administrator's record proves that he could not make a success of even a small haberdashery business. Must America go on with this leadership, even though a small war now is being fought, explosive situations are building up at other points, an all-out war is possible and the peace of world and safety of this Nation is in real and constant jeopardy?

There is a decent and honorable way out for President Harry S. Truman. And there is ample precedent for the action he should take. Let the President recognize his own lack of ability. Let him take stock of his limitations and of those about him. Having done so, let him realize that the United States right now needs the full services of the finest brain resources we have. Let him call upon those brains to give their priceless service in this time of crisis. Surely, they have but to be called, and they will serve.

Let the President form an advisory committee, a board of perhaps five men whose ability has been proved by their own success. Let him replace politicians and failures with men of success and ability. The men on his advisory board should be those whose records make clear the reason for their selection. Let them be gathered in Washington, and then let the President act on their advice—to the letter.

Anyone who has watched the course of events of the last 25 years could suggest members for a five-man committee which could bring good domestic government, could evolve an effective and stable foreign policy and above all, could bring about those things vital to our security.

These might be suggested:

Bernard M. Baruch, adviser to several Presidents, expert on government, economics, international affairs, domestic economy and basic matters of defense. A man who by long service and many tests has been proved to possess one of the keenest minds in the world today.

James F. Byrnes, whose experience includes service as a United States Senator, Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Director of Economic Stabilization and of war mobilization in World War II, and finally who has had actual experience as Secretary of State.

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, leader of the minority Republican Party, whose bitterest enemies do not question the scope of his mentality, his sincerity, nor his honest and straight-forward aim to do what is best for the Nation.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, now in his seventeenth year in the United States Senate, who has served 22 years as a Democratic national commiteeman and who possesses an exceptional understanding of government.

Alfred P. Sloan, head of General Motors Corp., who has demonstrated that he is one of the world's outstanding masters of organization and administration.

These five would form a bipartisan board of outstanding Democrats and Republicans. It is not yet too late to call upon such men, but each passing day is precious time lost. By merely forming such a board, getting the advice of its members, and then following that advice, President Truman might yet carve for himself a place of credit in United States history. We pray that he will.

Political Blunder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1950

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday afternoon of this week the Department of Defense phoned the office of each Representative from the States of California, Oklahoma, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to tell us that the National Guard troops from our States had been called to active duty. This was in line with the custom of various departments in the past, particularly the Navy, which has always been thoughtful and courteous of letting the Representatives know in advance of any action affecting the districts they represent. I suspect that all of us, like myself, appreciated the phone call, but thought naturally that the official notice to the press, as in the past, when it would follow, would be announced as from the office of the Secretary of Defense.

I asked a member of my staff, who is a former newspaperman himself, to phone the largest daily paper in my home county to see if it had received the news release direct. This he did, at exactly 4 o'clock, the release time given us in the phone message. To his profound astonishment, and mine, as it will be to the other Members of this House, he discovered that the papers had already received the release, over the wires, and that, please listen to this, Mr. Speaker, the release announced that the gentlewoman from California, identifying her by name, announced today that the various National Guard units were being called out.

Mr. Speaker, this is either a crude or a thoughtless political trick. It stands out, even in my 18 years of observing professional politicians try to put their own good above the public good. Whether the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON] or the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is to represent California in the other body after January of next year is a matter for the voters of my State to decide at the polls in November. It has not yet been decided. For the political propagandists of Washington to make the gentlewoman from California the spokesman now for all 23 California districts is premature, to put it mildly, and is to assume in advance a success in November which is not indicated in any political analysis from home.

I repeat, it was a political trick, even though it may have been a thoughtless one, unworthy of the administration, or of the Department of Defense, or of the gentlewoman from California. It was particularly unfortunate in view of the fact the administration has repeatedly asked for a truce to politics in the face of the Korean crisis. I suggest that the Department of Defense make a public statement that it was not responsible for the release in that form, and I suggest respectfully to the gentlewoman from California, my colleague, that she immediately and publicly disassociate herself from this political blunder, if she does not wish it to result in the loss of more votes than it will gain her.

I have asked permission to extend my remarks and include an editorial on this subject which appeared in the Washington News for August 2, with which I am in complete accord:

POLITICAL BLUNDER

President Truman's decision to call four National Guard divisions to active duty is wise.

The method used in making that decision known to the public was not.

First word that guardsmen from Pennsylvania, California, Oklahoma, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont had been ordered to mobilize was given out by Members of Congress from those States.

And most of the Senators and Representatives who gave it out are Democrats.

There is, perhaps, some color of excuse for permitting faithful Democrats in Congress

to reap whatever publicity and political advantage they can out of being first to announce ordinary Government projects of special benefit to their States or districts.

There is no excuse for parceling out official news important to the whole country—news which may mean that men must fight and die—to be broken by favored Congressmen.

Whoever in the Government decided to parcel out this news that way blundered badly.

Hereafter, let such news come from the President or the military leaders.

The Korean War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 1, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, many people, including a great number of our men on the fighting front, are asking how we got into the present conflict and what we are fighting for. They want to know what is involved, what is at stake, and what the implications are. Most certainly everyone is concerned with the possibility of a third world war. A brief résumé of the events leading up to the present situation might be helpful to a better understanding of what is taking place.

OUR POLITICAL COMMITMENTS IN KOREA

There is no single political commitment which necessitates our being in Korea. Over a period of some 6 years, however, beginning with our declaration at Cairo on December 1, 1943, along with Great Britain and China, we have entered into various political agreements and our officials have uttered various political statements which have very definitely committed us to the establishment and protection of a free and democratic Korea. Perhaps the most significant of these political commitments is the Moscow agreement of December 27, 1945, in which the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and later China, agreed to form a trusteeship over Korea and establish eventually an all-Korean provisional government.

Upon Russia's entry into the late war against Japan, a military decision was made between the chiefs of United States and Russia providing that the Japanese forces in Korea north of the thirty-eighth parallel should surrender to the Soviet Union and those troops south of the thirty-eighth parallel should surrender to the United States. Unfortunately, after the war this military decision was interpreted by Russian occupation officials as their authority to create a permanent military zone of their own north of the thirty-eighth parallel. All efforts to create an over-all Korean Government have failed because of the refusal of Russian authorities to cooperate in the program. The United States, therefore, presented the question to the United Nations General Assembly in September of 1947.

After a very thorough investigation by the UN Temporary Commission in Korea, the UN Interim Committee passed a resolution on February 26, 1948, providing that, if free elections could not be held for all of Korea, they should be held for as much of Korea as possible. Lt. Gen. John R. Hodge, the United States commander in Korea, under provision of the UN resolution, issued a proclamation requiring free elections in South Korea. These elections took place on May 10, 1948, under the observation of the United Nations. By August 24, 1948, President Rhee, of Korea, and General Hodge signed an interim agreement providing for the transfer of the jurisdiction under the security forces from the United States Army to the Provisional Government of Korea. Under this agreement the United States was to assist the new government in training and equipping the security forces of South Korea.

On August 26, 1948, President Truman announced that the Economic Cooperation Administration would take over the relief and rehabilitation responsibilities in South Korea previously assumed by the Department of the Army. Aid agreements were negotiated and Korea became a major recipient of the United States Economic Assistance. To date some $400,000,000 of economic aid has been made available to South Korea.

On July 1, 1949, the United States Army announced the withdrawal of American occupation forces. After that date there remained in Korea only a small contingent of American officers and men for training Korean forces. Korea was included among the nations eligible to receive military aid under the Mutual Defense Act of 1949.

UNITED STATES RESPONSIBILITIES IN KOREA

Our responsibilities in Korea, where we have been the chief sponsor and protector of the South Korean Republic, have arisen from our efforts to strengthen the independence and stability of free nations. We are heavily committed in this respect in Korea because of our pledge at Cairo that "in due course Korea shall become free and independent." The material which we have already given to the Koreans through the ECA and the Mutual Defense Assistance plan also binds us closely to the South Korean Republic.

Then, as recently as July 19, 1950, John Foster Dulles, special adviser to the Secretary of State, assured Korea of continued United States support. In a speech to the Korean National Assembly, Mr. Dulles stated, "You will never be alone."

REACTION TO COMMUNIST INVASION

The invasion of South Korea by the Communists North Korean Army brought immediate reaction from the United States and the United Nations. The UN Security Council immediately issued a cease-fire order. When this was ignored by the Communists, a second resolution was passed on June 27, 1950, calling on United Nations members to furnish to the Republic of Korea such assistance as might be necessary to repel the armed attack. On the same day President Truman announced that he had ordered United States sea and air forces to give cover and protection to South Korean troops. Subsequently United States ground forces were committed, until today we are engaged in full-scale military action against the Communists in Korea. In other words, we are participating in the conflict as a member of the United Nations at the request of the UN Security Council pursuant to its resolution.

It should be made perfectly clear that we are not merely fighting the North Koreans as such. What we are actually doing is resisting armed aggression at the instigation of Soviet Russia. A tacit admission that the Kremlin controls the North Korean forces is found in Russia's answer to a suggested truce by Nehru, Prime Minister of India. Russia stated that it would stop the fighting on condition that Red China be admitted to the United Nations. Aside from this, all informed sources concede that what is happening in Korea is further attempted aggression by Communist Russia. It is part of the Communist program of ultimate world domination which the United States is trying to stop, both in its own interest and in the interest of the free peoples of the world. It is this aggression which the United States has resisted throughout the period of the so-called cold war. The foreign-aid programs of our Nation have been a part of that resistance.

Now the cold war has grown hot and threatens to grow hotter. Our immediate objective in the shooting war is to help preserve the freedom and liberty of the South Koreans. Our long-range objective is the preservation of our own liberty and our own way of life which Communist Russia seeks to destroy. We must go all out to prevent her from doing so. Let no person think that this will be an easy task. It will call for unlimited effort and sacrifice on the part of every freedom-loving citizen. The fact that the outbreak in Korea might have been avoided by the administration following a different foreign policy in the Far East is of little moment now. Likewise our military unpreparedness despite the expenditure of an estimated $70,000,000,000 for that purpose in the past few years. The people will assess and fix the responsibility at the appropriate time. Now we are in a war which we cannot afford to lose because we have too much at stake. Let us devote our time and energy to winning this present conflict. If some controls are necessary, let us have them to the extent that the occasion demands. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that each citizen is willing and ready to assume his full share of the task ahead once he undertands what is involved.

America's Power Program Described to World Power Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD excerpts

of an address delivered by William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, for water and power, before the Fourth World Power Conference in London on July 13, 1950.

Speaking at the conference banquet, Mr. Warner told 1,500 delegates from all parts of the world of the advances in America's power program. He described the way in which the great multi-purpose dams of the TVA, as well as the Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams, have become the backbone of the industrial and economic development of the Tennessee Valley and the Pacific Northwest.

I commend this address to my colleagues:

Since the First World Power Conference was held in 1923, the United States has made great progress in enlarging its electric power plant. The very large expansion of power-producing capacity which has taken place over the last quarter of a century has been required to meet the needs of a growing population and an expanding industry and agriculture. The magnitude of this expansion of power capacity suggests the increasing importance of electricity in industrial and agricultural production and in the conservation of manpower and natural resources, as well as the vital role which electric energy plays in raising living levels.

In 1936 when the Third World Power Conference met in Washington, most of the delegates visited the then new TVA or the Columbia River Valley where the great Grand Coulee Dam was then under construction. High hopes were held for these two bold projects. I should like to report that our hopes were justified.

The impact of abundant low-cost power supplies upon the growth of these two regions may be clearly seen by comparing power development and income trends there with the average figures for the United States and with those for the New England region, where power is largely generated in steam plants and marketed at higher rates. Using the years 1929 to 1947 as a yardstick, power-generating capacity in the New England States increased 48 percent, for the country as a whole 77 percent, for the Tennessee Valley States 140 percent, and for the Pacific Northwest States 146 percent. Over this same period, total income in New England rose 91 percent, while the average increase for the United States was 129 percent, for the Tennessee Valley 198 percent, and for the Pacific Northwest 202 percent.

The Tennessee Valley is a region of about 41,000 square miles, an area roughly the size of Bulgaria or Portugal. It covers parts of seven States. In 1933, as you know, a Tennessee Valley Authority was created as an agency of the Federal Government to accomplish the integrated development, on a broad scale, of the water, soil, forest, and mineral resources of the river basin. Since then, the river has been controlled by a system of 27 dams, together with other works, used for the development of hydroelectric power, the control of floods, and the improvement of navigation. The integrated power system of the TVA, with a capacity of 2,700,000 kilowatts, produced 17,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity in 1949. This power was distributed, largely through 145 municipal and cooperative electric systems, to more than 1,000,000 consumers—homes, farms, business firms, and industries—over an area nearly double the size of the valley.

The people of the Tennessee Valley today use in their homes more than 4½ times as much electric power as they did in 1933—an average of about 2,870 kilowatt-hours per residential consumer in 1949—and about 70 percent more than the average residential consumer in the United States. For that power they pay a little over 1½ cents per kilowatt-hour, or slightly more than half as much as the average cost for electricity in the homes of the United States.

Rural and farm electrification have proceeded rapidly in the Tennessee Valley, and the amount of electricity used on farms last year was nearly 50 times what it was in 1933, before TVA. The expansion of rural-electric service, together with farm mechanization and improved farm practices, have enabled the farmers of the region to step up their production, although in 1947 there were 93,000 fewer farm workers than in 1933.

At the same time, industrial expansion and increasing urbanization have opened up many thousands of new job opportunities. Manufacturing plants in the valley employed 158,000 more workers in 1947 than they did in 1933. This was an increase of 147 percent in employment and is to be compared with an average increase of 119 percent for the United States as a whole. During the same 15-year period, income of proprietors and workers in these factories multiplied about seven and one-half times from about $83,000,000 to about $623,000,000 a year.

The number of workers in trades and service enterprise rose by 145,000 between 1933 and 1947. Income of proprietors and workers in this field grew from about $146,000,000 to $910,000,000, or an increase of 525 percent, as compared to an average 307 percent gain for the entire country. In the field of mining enterprises, employment gained 45 percent, as compared with a national gain of 24 percent. Income of mine proprietors and workers rose 663 percent during the 15-year period, nearly twice the average national increase of 348 percent.

The recent history of the Tennessee Valley can be even more clearly understood by considering what has happened to the small town of Decatur, Ala. A little more than 15 years ago, Decatur was a one-industry town, where 2,000 workers were employed, and cotton was its only farm crop. By 1940, there were 61 manufacturing firms, employing over 2,800 people, and with an annual payroll of more than $3,000,000. In 1948, the number of plants had risen to 87, employment had reached 5,200, and the payroll amounted to well over $12,000,000. Instead of one industry, the town today manufactures products ranging from steel screws to felt hats, from brick and tile to structural iron products, from furniture to concrete pipe. Burgeoning industry has created new markets for farm products and has brought about both an increase and a diversification in agricultural production. Last year, cash farm income in the area surrounding Decatur amounted to $43,000,000.

The use of increasing amounts of TVA electric power by more and more people at lower and lower rates goes far toward explaining the transformation of Decatur's economy. In 1939, there were 3,800 consumers of electricity in the town, last year there were more than 6,900. Whereas the average price of electricity to residential consumers in Decatur a decade ago was 3 cents a kilowatt-hour, last year it was just above 1 cent—the second lowest residential rate in the United States.

Electric power, obviously, has not been solely responsible for the rapid development of the economy either of Decatur or of the Tennessee Valley as a whole. But the evidence is unmistakable that plentiful power at low rates has been a major stimulant, if not the primary cause, of extraordinary regional growth.

In the Pacific Northwest, as in the Tennessee Valley, large-scale power production has been the key to remarkable regional economic and social progress. Power development in that region centers around the Columbia River which, because it drops over 5,500 feet within a distance of a thousand miles, provides, with its tributaries, the largest electric power potential of the river basins of the United States. Because the Pacific Northwest is deficient in all three of the major industrial fuels—coal, oil, and natural gas—its future is closely tied to the development of its hydroelectric resources.

The Pacific Northwest region comprises the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and that part of Montana which lies west of the Continental Divide. In size, it compares roughly to Turkey or Burma. Basin-wide planning and development of natural resources in this region are by no means as well advanced as in the Tennessee Valley, although proposals for unified and coordinated development through a Columbia Valley Administration are now before the Congress of the United States. Electric power facilities are, however, highly integrated. Federal power plants are in operation at Bonneville Dam, completed in 1938, and at Grand Coulee Dam, completed in 1940. Although additional generators remain to be installed, the power plant at Grand Coulee has a present capacity of 1,400,000 kilowatts, making it the largest single hydroelectric installation in the world. A 3,400-mile high-voltage transmission grid links these plants with the generating facilities of private and municipally owned utilities, into a single Northwest power pool, and carries electricity to load centers throughout the region and in Canada. Last year the two Federal plants generated about 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity and supplied about 4,000,000,000 of this amount to the pool for service to the customers of other utilities. Total output of the pool last year was nearly 23,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours—about 8 percent of the total electrical energy generated in the United States.

The huge blocks of electric power made available in the Pacific Northwest, sold at the lowest average rates in the country, have provided a firm foundation for exceptional regional growth. Between 1940 and 1949, the population of the region increased by 44 percent. This was a faster rate of growth than in any other region and was far above the national average of 13 percent. Oregon led all States in growth, with a population increase of more than 59 percent.

Until a decade ago, the Pacific Northwest depended almost entirely upon its forests and its farms for a livelihood. But low-cost power in large amounts, combined with other advantages of the region, has reshaped the regional economy, attracting electro-process and other industries in large numbers. Today the region produces half of all the aluminum ingots produced in the United States. In addition, it produces large amounts of ferro-alloys, calcium carbide, powdered metals, abrasives, chlorine, caustic soda, and electrolytic zinc.

Chiefly because of the establishment of these electro-process industries, electric power consumption per worker in industry is close to the highest in the United States. Manufacturing enterprises in Oregon and Washington used about 2½ times as much electricity per worker in 1946 as the average for the country as a whole, and average use by residential and farm consumers is among the highest in the United States. Domestic consumers use a large number of electrical appliances, and Seattle, Wash., a city of about 450,000 has more electric ranges in use than any other city in the world. Ninety-six percent of the farms in the region are now electrified, and widespread use of electric milking machines, poultry brooders, feed grinders, hay dryers, and other power-driven equipment has taken much of the drudgery out of farm life and made possible substantial increases in agricultural production.

The backbone transmission network in the Pacific Northwest has made it possible to adopt what is called the postage-stamp rate policy for electric power sold at wholesale by

the Federal Government. Under this policy, the basic Federal rate for electricity is the same anywhere in the region, whether power is used a few miles from the dams or in the farthest corners of the area served by transmission lines. Postage stamp rates have encouraged the decentralization of industry and, as a result, have significantly influenced community development. This method of marketing electric power, along with a greatly increased domestic consumption of electricity, is doing much to improve standards of living and the general well-being of the people of the region.

Since the end of World War II, neither the Federal nor non-Federal power systems in the Pacific Northwest have been able to keep pace with rapidly expanding power requirements, and the region has been suffering from an acute shortage of power. Because of a lag in building dams, no firm power for industrial expansion has been available since 1947, and no large amounts will become available until several years hence, when new dams now being built by the Government are completed. Sawmills and other industrial power users have had to shut down from time to time because of interruptions in electric service. Newspaper advertisements have carried appeals for power conservation, and utilities have actually refused to install electric water heaters and other appliances. A considerable number of electro-process firms which would have built new plants in the region, or expanded existing plants, have been unable to do so. Thus, in a region where more power has been developed in a shorter time, and sold at lower rates, than anywhere else in the United States, lack of sufficient electricity today is stunting industrial and general economic growth. I know of no better proof of the statement that use of low-cost electricity begets use, and that low-cost power is a powerful instrument for use in building up underdeveloped regions of the world.

Large-scale power production has had almost magical effects on the peacetime economies of the Pacific Northwest and the Tennessee Valley. But in time of war, dams like those of the TVA and in the Columbia Basin have a crucial role to play. During World War II these dams provided much of the power needed to expand aluminum output and to build the weapons with which we armed ourselves and our allies. Without the large blocks of power which supplied Oak Ridge in the Tennessee Valley, and Hanford in the Pacific Northwest, it would have taken us much longer to produce the atomic bombs that ended the war at Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The United States has found in power production the key with which the priceless resources of our river valleys can be unlocked. Revenues from power sales can be used to help pay the cost of achieving other vital conservation objectives—making water available for irrigating farms and for domestic water supply, controlling floods, improving navigation and opening up channels of commerce, creating new recreational opportunities, and enhancing fish and wildlife resources.

The challenge ahead is even greater than I have indicated. Power agencies, public and private, must develop the energy resources of the United States, in the interests of regional and national strength and of a better world society. But, in addition, they must pool their technical knowledge with that of other countries to advance the wise development of the world's resources. Point 4 and the technical assistance programs of the United Nations offer unparalleled opportunities for making progress in the long, hard job of transforming the underdeveloped areas of the whole world. The development of electric power resources, abroad as in the United States, is basic to economic and social progress. By means of this and other technical assistance measures, including health, education and agricultural development, underdeveloped areas will be aided in achieving full partnership in the world community. I am confident that the power agencies of the United States, which have much to contribute, will do their full part in carrying out this great undertaking which will underpin the structure of world peace and progress.

Flip-Flop in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1950

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of August 1, 1950:

FLIP-FLOP ON KOREA

With American military intervention in Korea by Presidential order following within a year of American military withdrawal from Korea, the Truman administration's policy in that country is about as clear as mud. In 1948 every diplomatic and military authority agreed that it would be best to get the American occupation garrison which had been in Korea since 1945 out of the country. Everybody then agreed that, in the event of a Communist attack from the Sovietized area above the thirty-eighth parallel, there would be no purpose in American military intervention.

Now we are fighting a full-scale war in the defense of South Korea against Red aggression from North Korea.

Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, presented the whole record of inconsistency in an address to the House. The Wisconsin Congressman cited testimony before the committee by Gen. George C. Marshall, then Secretary of State; by four Pentagon generals, Maj. Gen. Charles G. Helmick, Maj. Gen. Charles L. Bolte, Brig. Gen. Thomas S. Timberman, and Brig. Gen. Pierpont M. Hamilton; by a naval expert, Admiral Edmund T. Woolridge, and by George F. Kennan, then director of State Department policy planning. All agreed that the best course was to get out of Korea and stay out.

Representatitve SMITH cited the testimony of the experts. In February 1948, General Marshall was questioned by Representative JUDD, of Minnesota:

"Mr. JUDD. The economic aid can do no good if the governments go down; is that not correct?

"Secretary MARSHALL. That is correct.

"Mr. JUDD. If North Korea and Manchuria should be taken over and organized by the Communists, do you think our position in Korea would long be tenable?

"Secretary MARSHALL. I think it would not be tenable."

During hearings on aid for Korea in June 1949, General Helmick was interrogated by Congressmen as follows:

"Mr. CHIPERFIELD. If we would draw our troops out of South Korea, is there anything that would stop the Russians from taking over South Korea if they decided to do so?

"General HELMICK. If the Russians decided to do so, they could take over South Korea without any great military difficulty, sir. They are right there with large armies. Any troops that we have there would suffer another Bataan.

"Mrs. BOLTON. General, you made a remark that this would prove militarily another Bataan if Russia were to move down. Does that mean that you feel it is just a matter of time before they would simply move on?

"General HELMICK. If the Russians decided, military force on a peninsula like that would be out of luck with an overwhelming force coming down from the north. I think Russia could do it any time that she decided it was worth while.

"Mrs. BOLTON. That might well happen at any time if she made up her mind. Now that she has all of northern China, she would want that little peninsula to hop off to Japan with?

"General HELMICK. I think she would have to estimate the effects of her doing it.

"Mr. JACKSON. Now, it has been said so often that Korea is absolutely untenable, or would be, in the face of any determined opposition, whether that opposition be military or whether it be by infiltration. That is a fair statement, is it not, General?

"General HELMICK. From a military point of view, yes."

Mr. Kennan and General Bolte responded to a question of Representative HELEN G. DOUGLAS as follows:

"Mrs. DOUGLAS. Is it sound to withdraw United States troops from Korea July 1, having only technical forces to further train the Korean army?

"Mr. KENNAN. I do not think myself that the retention of American troops there will be what it takes to do the thing we want to have done in the next year in Korea.

"General BOLTE. With respect to whether the tactical units should come out now or whether they should remain for an additional period of, say, a year, we feel that they should come out now. * * * We feel that they not only could come out, but that they should come out, and their place be taken by the Korean military advisory group.

General Bolte testified as director of the plans and operations division of the Department of the Army. Other Congressmen had questions:

"Mr. LODGE. Mr. Kennan, there is an interesting article in Time magazine on Korea. * * * I understood you to say that you thought in a battle between north and south, the South Koreans would have a pretty fair chance. Do you suggest that this information in Time magazine is erroneous or do you think that 300,000 North Koreans would have a very difficult time against 100,000 armed South Koreans?

"Mr. KENNAN. I would like to refer that question to General Bolte.

"General BOLTE. I believe that is an exaggeration. * * * We feel that the forces in South Korea are far better equipped than the North Korean troops."

As events have developed, this estimate was far from the fact. General Bolte continued:

"If I may, I would like to make three comments in the interest of clarification. * * * First, that the Army, as the executive agent for the Joint Chiefs of Staff for the Far East, is not only agreeable to the withdrawal of the tactical formations from Korea, but is heartily in favor of it, as it feels that the point has been reached in the development of the South Korean forces and in the supplying of material aid as well as advisory aid to the South Korean forces, that it has reached a point where the tactical units can and should be withdrawn.

"The second point I should like to make * * * is that we have provided very substantial material aid to the South Korean forces in the way of small arms and other military equipment."

This military aid has been estimated at $125,000,000.

"Mr. SMATHERS. I understood Mr. Kennan to say that it was the policy, General, to

withdraw what small troops (13,000—editor) we have in Korea. Is that right?

"General BOLTE. Yes, but the Army is definitely in favor of it for other military reasons.

"Mr. LODGE. You feel that the Korean Government is able to fill the vacuum caused by the withdrawal of the occupation forces?

"General BOLTE. Definitely."

General Timberman volunteered these statements:

"From the Army point of view on the military significance or impact upon our position in the Far East that attends the tactical withdrawal of our forces in Korea, we will be in much better shape militarily when the tactical forces have been withdrawn from Korea."

And again:

"If we left troops in Korea, I do not think anyone would suggest that we enter into combat with the Korean forces."

"Mr. SMITH. Yes, but I have asked you from a military standpoint how will this [economic] aid program increase our security * * * In what way?"

After discussion off the record, the exchange continued:

"Mr. SMITH. It seems to me that you have just admitted that from a military standpoint it does not affect our national security.

"General TIMBERMAN. No; it does not. As an agency of the Government, we help where we can. I do not think the military part of the matter enters into the economic aid at all; besides, we might get into trouble later on, after we are in there militarily, which would be unfortunate."

General Hamilton then testified:

"Mr. SMITH. Assuming it [Korea] went down because we did not give the aid, would it follow from that, that we might have to go in there with military force and defend ourselves or our national security?

"General HAMILTON. No, sir; I do not think it is a question of direct military security in that sense. I do not think, unless we were to put absolutely inordinate forces in Korea, that we could guarantee by military force against economic collapse. The military phases are over."

Examination of General Timberman, General Hamilton, and Admiral Woolridge proceeded as follows:

"Mr. RICHARDS. I just want to ask one question: Is it your position * * * that it would not be wise to keep troops in Korea?

"General TIMBERMAN. Yes, sir; it would not be wise.

"Admiral WOOLRIDGE. I concur.

"General HAMILTON. I concur fully and that has been the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It has been unanimous. There has been no difference so far as I know.

"Mrs. DOUGLAS. I would like to ask the representatives of the Joint Chiefs of Staff this question: Do I understand correctly that the Chiefs of Staff advise the withdrawal of troops from Korea at this time?

"General HAMILTON. That is correct.

"Admiral WOOLRIDGE. That is correct.

"General TIMBERMAN. That is correct.

"Mrs. DOUGLAS. The Army, Navy, and Air Force?

"General HAMILTON. That is correct."

Questioning of Mr. Johnson, a representative of the Marshall plan, present to support economic aid for Korea, brought forth this:

"Mr. JUDD. You do not deny that the Army has wanted to get out for a long, long time?

"Mr. JOHNSON. No, sir.

"General HAMILTON. It has undoubtedly been decided long since by the Joint Chiefs of Staff that there is nothing further that we should do militarily.

"Mr. JUDD. I believe sincerely that the Korea economic program, accompanied by military withdrawal and without a program to keep the Chinese Communists busy, does not have more than a 25-percent chance of success, and therefore I question whether we are justified in approving this.

"Mr. JOHNSON. I think this committee will admit that I have been very honest and candid with you. I frankly believe this program has a 90-percent chance of success."

So the record demonstrates that Mr. Truman's military and diplomatic advisers were unanimous in believing that it was advisable to withdraw American troops from Korea, that that position was untenable in the event of determined Communist assault, and that if this were to occur no purpose would be served in committing American forces to the battle.

Having adopted this judgment, and having acted upon it, to the extent that Secretary of State Acheson last January 12 announced that Korea was not included in America's defense plans, thus admitting that we would not fight for it, Mr. Truman in the outcome reversed himself completely, decreed that we must fight for Korea, and send troops back there, even though the position had been declared untenable by his military experts.

Now the chairman of the Democratic congressional campaign committee, Representative KIRWAN, is advising New Deal candidates in the fall election to tell the voters that Republicans of the isolationist bloc of the House must shoulder the responsibility for the Communist attack on South Korea.

The record speaks. Let the people judge.

Go Easy on Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, from the columns of the Altoona Mirror, central Pennsylvania's leading newspaper, comes a timely warning to Members of Congress to go easy in the giving of wartime powers to the President of the United States.

The article, dated August 2, 1950, which follows, contains a lot of good advice and warrants the reading on the part of each Member of Congress:

GO EASY ON POWERS

The American people should scan very carefully the various proposals that now are being made to delegate great wartime powers to the President. In effect they will be giving power not to the President but to unknown persons whom he will appoint to operate the various bureaus and agencies which will enforce the rulings that will come out of the delegation of these powers.

Our elected representatives who are in close touch with the people back home should retain as much power as is necessary for the conduct of war and preparation for war. When they delegate these powers to the executive branch of the Government, to be in turn delegated to indviduals and bureaus over which we as voters have no control, they admit their own inability to handle the situation and indirectly show a lack of confidence in the democratic system of government.

It is interesting to note that some of the foremost advocates of the delegation of vast powers to the executive branch of the Government are men who have spent much of their adult lives in foreign lands. These internationalists are to be respected for their broad point of view. They are not necessarily correct in their advice. Perhaps if they had spent more of their time in the interior sections of America they might have an even broader and more intelligent viewpoint. It could be that too much of America's trouble with her foreign policy is that too much of that policy has been determined by men whose lives have been spent in our great eastern cities and in Europe and too little of their time spent in the industrial and agricultural heart lands of their own country.

Americans of all walks of life are needed to win any war. All-out cooperation is needed and those who hoard food and essential supplies should be heartily ashamed of themselves. Those who seek to make abnormal profits out of war do not deserve to be called Americans. Laws do not correct these evils, however, but public opinion can correct them. The hoarders already have bought their supplies in anticipation of rationing. Any law restricting or allocating materials which are not in critical short supply will only aid and comfort the hoarders for they will get just the same amount of food or material as those who were patriotic enough to forego the hoarding.

America's great capacity to produce has been built upon her freedom of action. Restrictive wartime power can cripple that production. The very enforcement of rationing requires the time and attention of a number of able-bodied people who might otherwise devote their time to greater production of things needed to prosecute the war effort and produce more food and goods for domestic consumption.

Bureaus, once created, are hard to get rid of. To the people who staff them and especially to those who head them up they represent jobs and opportunities to gain national headlines and national fame. These opportunities are not relinquished without a struggle. Many of the extravagances of the postwar era can be traced directly to governmental bureaus and staffs set up to manage or mismanage our wartime economy. Some of them seemed to provide very good places for men and women who were directly involved in attempts to harm the American system and the American people through the powers delegated to them by our Congress.

Alger Hiss, Judith Coplon, Harry Gold, and scores of others who within recent months have faced American courts for actions which were not in the best interests of the American people were not elected by the American voters. They were not selected by the people who represent us in Congress. But they were in position where they could do a great deal of damage to the United States.

Internationalists argue that we must learn to live with the other people of the earth if we are to have peace. Before we can hope to achieve that plane of learning we must first of all learn to live with folks at home. What profit shall it be to the American people if they must spend their blood and substance abroad in a war of ideologies which may last for decades if during those decades they lose the very liberty they are spending their lives and substance to retain?

The great Americans have had faith in the common people of America. Those who have not had faith in the common people of America have been those who have negotiated treaties without our knowledge and imposed restrictions upon us which we were willing to bear because we thought that the restrictions would help the war effort. Is it not about time that we tell our elected representatives that we are Americans and that we are capable of coming up with the right answers most of the time? At least we cannot have a lower batting average than those who have taken it upon themselves to act for us at the so-called peace conference held in foreign lands. It seems to us that the American people as a whole, acting through their elected representatives, will write better terms for America than those

written by experts with a leaning toward the other side.

If our present representatives are not capable of handling these affairs for us, perhaps we had better elect more capable ones at the elections which will be held this fall.

Are We Inviting Disaster?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, an article in the August 2 issue of the Hartford (Conn.) Courant entitled "Are We Inviting Disaster?" very effectively points out the deficiencies in our system of intelligence gathering and evaluation.

That there is a complete lack of coordination and efficiency is evident to even the most casual observer. I have, in the past, referred to the intelligence service as "our first line of defense," as all military operations are predicated upon prior knowledge of an enemy's intentions.

Even in the light of past failures, which have been instrumental in bringing about military disasters, there seems to be no disposition on the part of the American Government to remedy our inadequacies in this field.

I have proposed, in view of my past experience, that an independent, coordinated intelligence service be organized. I repeat that proposal at this time.

There is available to our country a distinguished and capable citizen who could more effectively bring order out of chaos than any other, to my present knowledge. Gen. William "Wild Bill" Donovan posseses the attributes essential to performing this great task. General Donovan enjoys the complete confidence of those who have been associated with him in his varied accomplishments. A former Attorney General, a distinguished attorney, a tried and true leader of military operations and, above all, experienced in intelligence activities, "Wild Bill" Donovan would be the perfect choice to head up an efficient and coordinated intelligence system, which this Nation so desperately needs.

It is too late to flounder further with respect to our intelligence needs; too many lives have already been lost because of ineptitude. Too many excuses have been offered in an attempt to explain away our unpreparedness. Let us not continue to sacrifice the lives of American soldiers for fear of embarrassing our military planners. President Truman, I ask respectfully and sincerely that you call upon "Wild Bill" Donovan to once again serve this Nation in its hour of need.

The article referred to follows:

ARE WE INVITING DISASTER?

(By Ogden R. Reid and Robert S. Bird)

Behind America's costly and belated effort to rebuild its crumbled national defense lies a history of failure in one of the most essential arms of the Nation's Military Establishment—the intelligence services.

A country's intelligence machinery ideally ought to furnish the information on which national policy and military planning can build toward sound objectives. If the United States lacks reliable intelligence, it will flounder in the dark, dissipating its enormous power.

Korea brought home the weakness and misuse of American intelligence and demonstrated the immediate need for improving these services.

Even before Korea, our past intelligence score shows five major failures:

1. The fall of Czechoslovakia—we thought this would be a routine change in government, not the downfall of a free Czechoslovakia.

2. Tito's defection—we had no knowledge or forewarning of this important break in the Russian satellite alliance. The G–2 Army intelligence officer in charge of the Yugoslav desk at the time was busy analyzing Yugoslavia in terms of Tito's fondness for ballot.

3. The fall of the Chinese Nationalists—All our intelligence services save G–2 discounted the capabilities of the Communists to overrun China.

4. Palestine—the military abilities of the Arabs were embarrassingly overrated by the intelligence groups.

5. Bogota—Of painful memory was the intelligence fiasco at Bogota in April, 1948, when a Colombian revolution exploded without notice under the noses of the International Conference of American States and the chief United States delegate, Secretary of State George C. Marshall. It was explained later that intelligence had reported that there might be some picketing, but not shooting.

In all these five intelligence breakdowns we had ample numbers of agents on the scene; we do not have the same opportunity with Russia.

The raw materials of our intelligence services flow into Washington from sources all over the globe. Some of it comes from foreign scientific journals; some from our "deep cover" agents, from military attachés, from nationals of other countries who have defected, from embassies and missions, and other sources.

Each of the three military services and the State Department has its own intelligence machinery, and standing outside all these is the major organization—Central Intelligence Agency—supposedly the coordinating body under the direction of the National Security Council.

SIX SEPARATE INTELLIGENCE SERVICES

Separately another intelligence office, the Joint Intelligence Group, services intelligence for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Thus the American Government has the eyes and ears of six different intelligence branches to keep it informed on all the myriad activities that should be the vital concern of any world power.

In this country, intelligence weaknesses begin in the field. Too many agents depend, in the first place, on a thin State Department and Army "cover," which not only is easily unmasked but incurs the risk of early departure from the foreign country when trouble starts. State Department and Army people are among the first to go when tension verges on war, just the time good intelligence is most needed.

A further serious weakness in this nuclear age is the lack of scientifically trained agents in the field; men and women who know what to look for and when to recognize a matter of scientific import to this country.

A top scientist in this country's planning councils makes the point, in this connection, that a well-trained scientist can tell from an aerial view of an atomic plant its production within 10 percent.

Lesser faults that arouse criticism among the officials whose work is based on intelligence reports involve the extensive duplication of effort in the field. Examples are the interrogation of persons who have information to give.

Often three or more American services will process such a person to a point where he dries up in anger or frustration. Around the fluid zone boundaries of Germany, where much of the intelligence from Russia is gathered from refugees who have fled that country, fumbling techniques of this kind become a serious matter.

When the intelligence conveyor belts from around the world converge in their respective offices in Washington, the same duplication occurs—in the examination of basic documents (CIA's Office of Reports and Estimates examines the same documents being scrutinized by the Army's G–2, the Air Force's A–2, the Office of Naval Intelligence, and the State Department), in the monitoring of foreign radio broadcasts (both CIA and the Defense Department have large, expensive monitoring set-ups), and in the interrogation of Americans or other nationals returning from overseas.

But most inexcusable of all, and most fateful for the Nation, are the muddles in intelligence evaluation and coordination, the interpretations placed on the evaluated materials, and the lack of dissemination of raw and finished intelligence to interested customers.

It is the duty of CIA under the direction of the National Security Council to correlate and evaluate intelligence touching national security. This has not and is not being done except in haphazard fashion.

The Joint Intelligence Group has tried to put together the service intelligence points of view and then cross-check their finished reports with the Joint Intelligence Committee (composed of the service intelligence chiefs), the State Department, and CIA. This has only resulted in cross-checks of finished papers, but not in an initial putting together of all intelligence material before the papers are written.

A top five-man board, freed of all other duties save that of carefully collating and evaluating all material bearing on the national security, was recommended by the Hoover Commission to fill the gap. But after 2 years nothing has been done.

This is no small oversight because many of the most serious failures of intelligence in recent years have not been in getting the needed information but in testing its validity and analyzing its means. Eyes and ears are valueless without mind.

In March 1948, for example, the Defense Department got intelligence from Gen. Lucius D. Clay in Germany indicating the likelihood of a Russian invasion of Europe. The late Secretary of Defense James Forrestal summoned all intelligence chiefs to his office over a 2-day period and by sheer force of personality under the threat of serious danger fused their best thinking on the subject. They reached a majority agreement that the suspicious troop movements in eastern Germany were not the forerunners of an invasion but a build-up for the blockade.

This evaluation was correct, but it was reached only after all intelligence available on the matter had been presented and reconciled, with some dissent.

Up to now the services still withhold planning and operational information from CIA. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have ruled that none of their 2,000 super-secret strategic papers that are the basis for the Nation's overall planning—and would be the blueprints for action in countless different areas—can be turned over to CIA.

Furthermore, it has only been in the last 3 weeks that CIA representatives have been allowed in the Joint Chiefs of Staff situation room where current United States and enemy operations information is posted.

This mistrust of CIA is abetted by the State Department, which does not admit the Agency to its top policy councils, and recently the State Department refused to turn

over to CIA the cables from our Embassy in Moscow relative to the talks between the British Ambassador, Sir David V. Kelly, and Andrei Gromyko over Korea.

Because of this poor interchange of all intelligence, the Nation's Cabinet officers have very little confidence in intelligence in general, and in particular in CIA's product. They tend to rely on the intelligence of their own services.

The separate military services base much of their operational planning on their own intelligence estimates, not on CIA reports or on joint briefings.

Even the President does not always utilize either the joint service briefings or the CIA report.

During the early days of the Korean crisis the President was briefed by an Army G–2 colonel at 6:10 a. m. when he awoke, and it was only after Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, suggested that a more coordinated form of briefing might make more sense that the President received his briefings from General Bradley.

FIVE BASIC STEPS TO REFORM

Intelligence officers of long standing and experience say that the following steps must be taken before the United States can have basic confidence in its intelligence.

1. The National Security Council should give CIA the power to collate and coordinate all relevant intelligence, and should delineate clear lines of intelligence responsibility among the services and the State Department.

2. CIA should be headed by a civilian or a retired service officer, who will make the Agency his life work. He should be assisted by three military deputies.

3. A top five-man board to collate all national intelligence, evaluate it, and reach considered interpretations should be set up within CIA. The members of this board should have no other administrative duties.

4. CIA should weed out much of its second-rate personnel acquired during its rapid expansion.

5. Compartmentation within CIA's five offices should be reduced to promote better working liaison and to avoid duplication.

6. CIA should get ample funds to provide realistic cover for their agents. The United States could purchase foreign business concerns where necessary and advisable for this purpose. The British—long considered professionals in intelligence—have spared no expense in this direction.

7. Military service civilian intelligence personnel should be hired on the basis of their intelligence, experience, and qualifications. All too frequently trained intelligence people in the employ of the services have been let go because they were not able to meet civil-service permanent status and seniority qualifications. Persons of no intelligence experience but with long civil-service seniority were hired in their place.

8. The military services should give more attention to the possibilities of setting up career intelligence branches covering cryptographers (code experts) and military attachés. Officers destined for G–2 duty should be assured of adequate intelligence training along with their command experience.

Responsibility for Military Weakness Pinned on Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the questions are being asked throughout the Nation who is responsible for the situation in Korea? The cause of the Red invasion? The deplorable state of our defenses? Where did the $50,000,000,000 go that Congress appropriated to build up our defenses during the past 4 years?

I want to tell the Members of the House these questions must be answered and as a step in that direction I want to call the attention of the House to a most factual article written by the well-know columnist Ray Tucker on August 2, 1950. The heading of Mr. Tucker's article is "Responsibility for military weakness pinned on Truman."

In calling attention to Ray Tucker's article which follows I also want to make mention of the fact that the always alert and able defense champion CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, and his committee members have been proven once again correct in their advocating at all times an adequate national defense.

When one reads Ray Tucker's article I am certain he will agree there is a sharp contrast between the sound stand and the sound policies of Mr. VINSON and the Armed Services Committee and Mr. Truman, his Budget Bureau, and the planners in the State and Defense Departments.

The article follows:

NATIONAL WHIRLIGIG—RESPONSIBILITY FOR MILITARY WEAKNESS PINNED ON TRUMAN

(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON.—Basic and ultimate responsibility for today's alarming weakness of the Nation's fighting forces at home and overseas has finally been pinned on President Truman, operating through the Bureau of the Budget as his personal financial agency and legislative clearing house.

In a series of strange floor and committee exchanges that began with the North Koreans' attack and our sharp set-backs, Democratic and Republican Members of the House have examined the postwar record of maintenance and expansion of the Military Establishment.

They conducted this autopsy for their own self-protection because they realize that the Korean tragedy will be the most serious issue raised against them in November campaigns.

IMPOUNDED

With facts and figures hitherto unknown, Chairman CARL VINSON, of the House Armed Services Committee, the acknowledged Capitol Hill authority on this general subject, exonerated Congress, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and even National Defense Secretary Louis A. Johnson of short-changing the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Organized Reserves, and the stockpiling authorities. He did it reluctantly, for he is a loyal Georgia Democrat.

But when he explained how the Joint Chiefs of Staff had insisted on a more powerful defense organization, in view of Truman-Acheson diplomatic commitments around the world, only to have their requests rejected and pared down by the Budget Bureau at Mr. Truman's direction, and how funds appropriated by Congress had been impounded and unspent at White House orders, he received a standing ovation from every Member present on both sides of the aisle.

It was extremely significant that, although he indicted Harry S. Truman for our defenselessness and Korean defeats, neither Speaker RAYBURN nor Majority Leader MCCORMACK took the floor in defense of the administration. If they had, they would have been howled down.

BOTTLENECK

As he has done so many times during the postwar years when he has had to haggle and fight for every defense penny with the White House and the Budget Bureau, Mr. VINSON warned against delegating too much authority over these matters to the executive branch.

But in the same breath he made it clear that, after Congress has voted the money, it has no voice or control on how it shall be spent, or whether it shall be spent at all. That is entirely up to the Chief Executive, he noted.

Another bottleneck is the House Appropriations Committee, which is headed by a Presidential pal, the dour CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri. Frequently, as Mr. VINSON explained, his committee has authorized a more powerful defense force, but Mr. CANNON's committee, at White House request, has refused to appropriate sufficient funds to implement the authorizations.

Besides criticizing the administration for its progressive postwar destruction of our World War II might, Chairman VINSON declared that he was unsatisfied with Mr. Truman's proposed expansion program because he considers it too conservative. He wants more aircraft carriers, planes, marines, antisubmarine devices, etc.

On the very day after his restrained criticism the White House ordered that 48 warships and 204,000 men be added to the fleet.

HOW

Before detailing the list of severe cuts the White House and Budget Bureau have made in the Military Establishment it is necessary to describe just how the Government goes about getting a fighting force, if any:

First, the Joint Chiefs of Staff—Army, Air, Navy men—estimate their needs in men and weapons and translate them into dollars-and-cents terms. Then they submit their conclusions to the National Defense Secretary. As a rule, he agrees and forwards the package to the Bureau of the Budget.

With the exception of "Hell 'n Maria" Charles G. Dawes, Budget Directors are usually Presidential stooges, another name being "advisers." When the Budget Director has received all the financial requests from departments and bureaus he presents them to the President. Then the two of them usually hack the figures to make an economy record, or to spend the money for welfare-state schemes.

MONEY

It is estimated that at least $25,000,000,000 requested for defense by the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been eliminated as "not in accordance with my policies" (that is the conventional phrase) by Mr. Truman in the last 4 years.

Mr. VINSON'S committee has upped the White House budget totals by many billions in their authorizations. But an authorization is only a declaration of intent. It has no force unless Chairman CANNON'S appropriations committee allows enough money to execute the authorization. Mr. CANNON has usually sided with his fellow-Missourian in the White House as against Mr. VINSON.

That is why Chairman VINSON, in contrasting his demands with current shortages, told the House:

"The point is that there are certain things which the Armed Services Committee has been fighting for. Only 90 days [2 months—editor's note] before Korea, we pointed out certain things. But we could not get the money. We did not get the money."

SUMMARY

Keeping in mind this Presidentially dominated procedure, here is only a brief summary of the shortages and delinquencies which have resulted from Mr. Truman's mili-

tary economy and Secretary Acheson's calculated risks.

	Allowed by White House
Recommended by Congress:	
Super aircraft carrier	Scrapped
70 Army air groups	48
Armed Forces personnel of—	
2,005,882	1,507,000
Army, 837,000	630,000
Navy, 666,882	461,000
Air, 502,000	416,000
Organized Reserves:	
1,977,000	522,000
Army, 520,000	250,000
Navy, 1,103,000	204,000
Air, 354,000	68,000
Stockpiling (percent) 60	38

Strategic Idiocy and Moral Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am inserting an article by Mr. George Morgenstern which appeared in Human Events for July 19. This article deals with the matter of our policy in the Far East and especially as it is related to Korea. Mr. Morgenstern is the man who wrote Pearl Harbor—the Story of the Secret War. I commend the following article to all of the membership:

STRATEGIC IDIOCY AND MORAL PRINCIPLE

(By George Morgenstern)

Deep concern afflicted our global salvationists when early reports from Korea told of a succession of American reverses. The missionary undertaking (with hardware and explosives) was not being well received by those we were intent on saving. Almost at once the crusaders on the home front fell prey to doubts lest Soviet ideology possess a superior attraction.

We were solemnly informed that Russia had succeeded in investing the North Korean Communists with a fighting faith and will. Misguided they might be, but there it was. What to do? Senator BENTON came forward, to great applause from the internationalist gallery, with the suggestion that we embark upon "a Marshall plan of ideas." We should export righteousness by radio and persuade the lesser breeds that our moral principles and material assistance were a better bargain in the long run than anything Russia had to offer.

General Eisenhower, nicely accommodating the military and academic, called for an ideological general staff. Secretary of State Acheson minted a phrase by referring to the "struggle for men's minds and allegiances." General Marshall, Bernard Baruch, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, Gen. David Sarnoff, and other leading thinkers nodded in asseveration that only a "propaganda of truth" would serve.

Strangely missing from this seminar was the pragmatic professor from Harvard, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., who might have reduced the discussion to its lowest common denominator by applying to Asiatics the counsel he recently tendered Republicans: "The dictate of true conservatism would be to bribe the masses, if you will, by assuring them the basic decencies of living."

II

Now the obvious thing about Russia is that its military and political expansion is based upon interior lines of communication. We do not need Prof. Owen Lattimore to remind us that bolshevism's primary attractive force is exercised upon its closest neighbors. When it has engorged a fresh satellite, it has a new frontier presenting one or more additional prospects for conversion to communism by means of the techniques of infiltration and pressure at which Stalin is so skilled.

"People's republics" are not found thousands of miles away from the U. S. S. R. in such places as Nigeria, the Andaman Islands, or Patagonia. They are found in proximity to Russia. There are, of course, Communists in all countries, and armed Communists in some, but none has succeeded to the extent of becoming the governing force in any land that is not contiguous to the area in which Stalin has consolidated his power.

Among the comparative primitives of Asia, it is possible communism possesses a superior attraction, even though it may be doubted that one Korean Marxist in 10,000 has read a line of the Marxian scriptures. But, at any rate, Stalinism is the handiest ideology and, in redivision of the land and a full rice bowl, may offer more immediately, than Senator BENTON can cram into a Voice of America commercial.

This matter of interior lines may engage the attention of the American military, but it obviously plays no part in the calculations of our politicians and salvationists. Distance has never impeded such people when a job of world-saving was to be done. It was once fashionable among them to say that the Atlantic was a ditch which Hitler would vault in a trice. He never did, but the fact is indisputable that twice the influence of the salvationists was sufficient to dispatch an American expeditionary force across the ocean in the reverse direction.

These, of course, were moral crusades, as the speeches of Wilson and Roosevelt attest. A crusade need not be an action taken in the national interest, and, judging from the results of those undertaken by western Europe in the Middle Ages and by the United States in the twentieth century, they rarely are. All of these adventures called the participants a long way from home, with results not fortunate.

The Korean imbroglio was immediately invested with the same moral content. It involved distances and logistical problems which might easily have given pause to persons making it a habit to stop and think—not characteristically an American habit. From San Francisco to Seoul is some 5,700 miles. This is 1,700 miles farther than from New York to the iron curtain on the Oder, and 1,300 miles more distant than from Times Square to the European frontier of the U. S. S. R. itself.

It was evident that the line of communication from the continental United States was long and tenuous, and, even if General MacArthur happened by a fortunate chance to be nearby in Japan, his resources were limited in comparison to Stalin's abundance of Asiatic cannon fodder, easily armed with surplus production from Soviet arsenals.

Nevertheless, Mr. Truman, the salvationists, and, a trifle late, the United Nations discovered a familiar moral imperative, and Americans awakened to find their sons involved in "a police action" against "a bunch of bandits."

III

The President assigned American forces to this exacting task in the same happy-go-lucky spirit in which the AEF had been sent abroad, the marines dispatched to Guadalcanal, and the American Army introduced to the North African landscape and made acquainted with the beaches of Normandy. Strategic considerations were dismissed as casually as when Ambassador Winant agreed to the boundaries of the zones of occupation in Germany and the sectors of occupation in Berlin, denying us, in the one, the use of a seaport for reinforcement or retreat, and allowing us no guaranteed access of any sort to the other.

At the same time that Mr. Truman committed himself to the mission of "liberating" the unprofitable Republic of South Korea, he was restrained—this being a moral crusade—from effecting any constructive result, always assuming that we should win. The United Nations let it be known that we might drive the invader back over the thirty-eighth parallel, but that we ourselves should be in the position of an aggressor if we engaged in further pursuit. For some days, as a consequence, Mr. Truman hesitated to allow air strikes over the parallel into Communist country, but he finally was impelled to do so.

Even assuming a victory south of the parallel, we shall be exactly where we were before, with the Communists tenaciously installed in their former holdings, with a ravaged country on our hands, a discredited Korean Government, and a Korean army impotent to fight its own battles. We shall have expended some thousands of lives, some hundreds of millions of dollars, at the least, and a great deal of war material will have been shot away, lost, or irreparably damaged. We shall have to place South Korea on a permanent dole and garrison the country as long as we expect it to remain out of Communist hands.

Meanwhile, Stalin will have inflicted great damage upon us at no cost to himself. The trick that worked once can be worked again. He was very cautious in World War II to heed the admonition of the German military philosophers which Hitler ignored and to confine himself to one war at a time on one front. But, by Communist revolutions and armed forays on the Soviet periphery, singly or in groups, he can commit us, if he chooses, to wars on a dozen fronts in succession or at once. And, while we are engaged, we shall not even scratch at the real adversary.

IV

Now, out of all this it should be possible to distill some rational precept for future national guidance—irrationality (usually referred to as experience) being judged the best teacher. It should be apparent that only three courses are open to us: (1) A policy of withdrawal, invariably termed isolationism by global salvationists; (2) the kind of policy we are now pursuing—intervention with a high moral content (by our own definition), but with little or no prospective accrual to the national interest; or (3) a policy patterned upon that of Russia itself, requiring that we convert ourselves into a military empire frankly bent upon world power, aggrandizement, and exploitation of everyone else, Russians included.

A practical statesman, seeing little possibility of the acceptance of policy No. 1 (isolationism) in view of the successful saturation techniques of salvationist propaganda, and fearing the consequences of policy No. 2 (salvationism without profit), would probably incline toward policy No. 3 (American military empire).

It is only fair to warn, however, that this policy entails manifest sacrifices and some risks. Our Constitution, our liberties, and our representative Republic would have to go, as the successful Russian example shows that a going military empire thrives best when all power is centered in the hands of a restricted, hard bitten, elite leadership. We do not seem to be well equipped, at the moment, with candidates for dictator, or, for that matter, with any leadership at all.

In the struggle (with propaganda and hardware) for men's minds, we shall probably be advised to employ such slogans and techniques as have proved particularly successful, in the estimation of Senator BENTON and other experts, when invoked by the Soviets. Our conquering armies will thus

go forward to the persuasive slogan of "land, bread, peace," carrying with them portraits, suitable for framing, of Roosevelt and Truman or whoever big brother happens to be.

After our triumph, we will enrich ourselves with the treasures and resources of the earth, and, in our slave labor camps, convert the liberated billions to the joys of virtuous toil in our service. The millenium will be here, and, in time, we daresay, the State will wither away and New Deal wars and taxation will be an almost forgotten memory.

The Remarkable Thing Is Not How Bad but How Good a Job the Government of Korea Was Doing Considering the Magnitude of Its Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Marquis Childs from the Washington Post of July 29, 1950. It is gratifying that he sees through the Communist-inspired propaganda designed to divert us from our own national interests by concentrating our attention on the weaknesses in South Korea, rather than on the extraordinary strengths considering the difficulties there. I wish he had also seen through and exposed, instead of passing on exactly the same sort of Communist-inspired propaganda from 1943 on regarding the Government of China, playing up the weaknesses, ignoring the strengths. Now in both places we have to try, at terrible cost, to retrieve a lot that we should never have lyost. The article follows:

UNFAIR CRITICISM OF RHEE FORCES

(By Marquis Childs)

A number of letters that have come to me indicate confusion on the question of North Korean aggressiveness versus South Korean resistance or the lack of it. Americans are dismayed because their side had done so well and our side so poorly.

A stereotype is ready at hand to explain it. This piece of rubber-stamp thinking goes more or less as follows:

The North Korean armies are eager to fight because they are fighting for a government that gave them something to fight for—land reforms, higher standards of living. By contrast the South Korean Government was run by reactionaries out of the past who were unwilling to make concessions to democratic self-government.

That stereotype owes a great deal to years of Communist propaganda. This propaganda has sought to make it appear that the western democracies were decadent and helpless while communism was a dynamic force that must inevitably triumph. The extent to which that propaganda has seeped into peoples' minds is shown by the readiness of many to accept the rubber stamp on Korea.

The truth is always so much more complicated than any propaganda line. And that goes double or triple for this nasty business in Korea.

It should be said, first of all, that the South Korean Army, in spite of almost overwhelming handicaps and appalling initial reverses, is giving a much better account of itself than most American newspaper readers are aware of. That is chiefly because American war correspondents assume that American readers are interested almost solely in what American troops are doing. But military reports to the Pentagon indicate that at one point recently the South Koreans were holding three to four times as much of the line as were American forces.

Equally noteworthy is the fact that the Government of the South Korean Republic seems to have held together even though it has been driven from town to town southward down the peninsula. Logically one might have expected utter break-down, chaos, and perhaps major defections to the enemy.

After centuries of feudalism and more than 40 years of oppressive Japanese rule the Koreans were very new to the concept of democratic self-government. Add to this the lack of knowledge of American military commanders who occupied the country south of the thirty-eighth parallel in 1945 and who may have made initial mistakes.

The wonder is not that the government of crabbed old Syngman Rhee had faults and weaknesses. The wonder is that South Korea could hold a free election on May 30 of this year: an election which showed heavy losses for the pro-Government and opposition parties and significant gains for the "middle-of-the-roaders." After all, we in this country have been in the business of self-government for 150 years or more, and I think there would be few to argue that we have achieved perfection.

Another factor too often overlooked is that everything that happened in South Korea happened in a goldfish bowl. The mistakes, the fumbles, the false starts, everything was reported in both the Communist and non-Communist halves of the world.

In contrast North Korea was sealed away even from a commission of the United Nations. All that came out was propaganda. But we know very well that what went on in North Korea was not the trial and error method of democracy.

It was a completely hard-boiled operation conducted under the cloak of a wholly deceptive propaganda using words such as "peace" and "democracy" that the west takes on faith. A fighting force was built up with all the techniques of indoctrination, intimidation, bribe and reward, threat and reprisal. Then, this force was equipped with the modern weapons of aggression.

On the score of trying to help Asian peoples to self-government the efforts of this country have been pretty good since the end of World War II. American influence may have been the decisive factor in gaining independence for Indonesia without a long, bloody, and destructive struggle. At any rate the Dutch blame the United States for a step for which, as the Dutch see it, the Indonesians were not prepared.

The method of communism in an area such as North Korea is brute, ruthless, totalitarian—a gangster operation conducted behind a screen of propaganda. The method of democracy is slow and often painful. The United States may be criticized for having tried to introduce too abruptly the difficult tenets of democracy where peoples had lived so long in colonialism. But it is only through this slow and painful process that true independence and freedom can ever be achieved.

Address by Senator Sparkman Before the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 3 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia, at its twenty-second annual convention on July 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR JOHN SPARKMAN BEFORE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, THIRTY-SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION, JULY 20, 1950

Since my good friend, your department commander, Charlie Dunn, some weeks ago, invited me to be with you tonight, our country has become faced with a momentous and sad trial. A scheming, totalitarian power has forced an attack which threatens the peace of the world and the lives of many Americans, including you and me.

You know, of course, that I refer to the invasion of South Korea by Communist North Korean troops. This invasion, launched on Sunday, June 25, as the world knows, was planned and prompted by the mad men of Moscow. You have kept up with developments since that tragic Sunday, so I shall not review them here.

It is worth while, perhaps, to summarize very briefly the high spots of Korean happenings during the postwar years up to the Communist invasion. To do so points to the unmistakable fact that Russia's intent is not security, but to engulf the whole world with Communist ideology.

As early as December 1943 the United States, Great Britain, and China agreed that "in due course Korea shall become free and independent." This pledge was reaffirmed in the Potsdam Declaration in July 1945. When on August 8, Russia declared war on Japan, she subscribed to the Potsdam Declaration and thus joined in the pledge that Korea was to be free and independent. In December 1945 the United States, Great Britain, Russia (and later China) agreed to establish a trusteeship over Korea and to form a Korean provisional Government through the activities of a joint United States-Russian commission. It will be remembered that the United States was occupying Korea south of the thirty-eighth parallel and Russia, north of the thirty-eighth parallel.

During 1946, this country made every reasonable effort—all without success—to establish with Russia an economic and administrative coordination of the two zones of occupation. These efforts were continued in 1947 until finally, in September of that year, the United Nations General Assembly placed the Korean problem on its agenda. In November 1947, the United Nations General Assembly passed a resolution stating that the Korean people themselves through free and secret election of representatives should create a provisional government. The election was to be observed by a United Nations temporary commission on Korea.

This commission arrived in Seoul, January 1948. Russia refused its admission into North Korea and declined to participate in any of its activities. In May, an election was held in the southern zone and Syngman Rhee was elected chairman of the Korean National Assembly. In August 1948, the Government of the Republic of Korea was formally inaugurated and the military government in Korea was terminated. President Truman gave assurance that the Economic Cooperation Administration would assist in the rehabilitation of southern Korea.

In September, the Soviets, without, of course, conferring with the United Nations, set up a supreme National Assembly in North Korea. In December, the United Nations General Assembly, by a vote of 48 to 6, adopted the report of its temporary commission, recognizing the Government of South Korea as the official Korean Government and also created a new United Nations Commission on Korea.

During all this time, more than 2 years, Russia was building up an indoctrinated army composed in the main of Korean forces, but supplied with Russian matériel and trained by Russian military leaders. The year 1949 and the first half of 1950 were months of continuous agitation and disturbance by the Russian inspired forces of North Korea. Sporadic raids on South Korean territory were made by these puppets in preparation for the full-scale invasion that was to come later. While in South Korea only a national police force had been established, a strong, well-trained, and well-led invasion force had been set up in the north.

This force, designed for aggression, lashed out in full strength on the South Korean defense position on Sunday morning, June 25. Thus, there began the action to which Russia had been pointing ever since 1945. A similar pattern of noncooperation in building for peace and democratic living has been and is being pursued by Russia in strategic areas all over the world. Continuous and fanatical efforts are being made by Moscow leaders to create dissension and to aid dissatisfied elements and native Communist converts to seize government power.

We do not need to be reminded of the seriousness of the situation as it exists in Korea today. The headlines in the daily newspapers point to the reverses which our outnumbered but brave men have suffered. We simply did not build up in South Korea a force strong enough to repel the northern invaders. We have been further handicapped by the fact that South Koreans are mostly farmers and have not been military minded. Also, while we supplied the South Koreans with a great deal of light armament, we know now that we did not equip them with armament heavy enough to enable them to meet the North Koreans on equal terms. These conditions have added to the danger confronting the American forces who have been able to get to Korea. Of course, we are now making every possible effort to supply our men with weapons of the highest quality and calibre to meet the thrust of Russian-built armor.

There are other factors which add to our difficulties. In spite of the twelve to fifteen billion dollars annual expenditure for defense purposes, we are not adequately prepared to move with great forces to several danger spots simultaneously. The fact that several danger spots exist has necessarily forced us to spread thin our present military strength.

Berlin, Greece, Iran, and the Philippine Islands are a few of the "powder kegs" which may explode any moment. These dangers make it unwise for us to concentrate a great portion of our strength in Korea, and yet we may have to do just that if we are to succeed in pushing back the Communist troops.

One hears criticism that other members of the United Nations are not carrying their fair share of the burden. This is a problem which requires an analysis before a fair appraisal can be made.

It has been recognized since the end of World War II that any struggle in the future to preserve democracy would have to be waged primarily by the United States. This is certainly true until other democratic countries of the world can be rehabilitated. The countries on our side in the Korean conflict simply do not have a great deal of military strength to contribute. What force they do have are largely committed in other important areas. The responsibility of the French in Indochina and of Great Britain in Malaya are examples of what I mean. The Russian army of occupation in east Germany and the millions of mobilized troops in Russia make it imperative that Britain and France not further denude themselves in Europe.

On the other hand, Australian and New Zealand Air Forces have been fighting with American Air Forces from the very beginning. Units of the British Navy are under the command of MacArthur. Other members of the United Nations have made offers of help. We must guard against a too hasty condemnation of other members of the United Nations. To quarrel among ourselves would be to play into the hands of our common enemy.

The quick action of the United Nations in ordering the Communist forces to withdraw from South Korea and in calling on member nations to take necessary action to stop the invaders is one of the bright spots of the Korean problem. The importance of the united spirit of the 52 cooperating nations of the United Nations cannot be overestimated. If we—and we must—get through the Korean ordeal successfully, the United Nations may have very well been set on a course that will insure peace for years to come. If somehow the Korean conflict does not spread, and the will of the United Nations can succeed in that area, there will have been established a great unifying force among most of the people of the world that portends unlimited good for future generations.

Regardless of the outcome in Korea, the action that has been taken was necessary and wise. If the United Nations had hesitated, and if America, the strongest democratic power, had held back it surely would have meant the death of the United Nations. Our word, our guaranty, and that of the United Nations itself, could no longer have been depended upon by anti-Communists in any part of the world. The time had come when piece-meal appeasement had to cease in the Pacific and everywhere else.

Another gratifying condition is the generally bipartisan support of our Korean efforts. There are a few diehard isolationists in opposition and I suppose we shall always have them. However, the great majority of Senators and Congressmen and of citizens all over the country have responded favorably to the United States support of the United Nations in accepting the challenge of Communist forces in Korea.

A similar response has been made to the request made yesterday by the President and Commander in Chief. The program he has outlined thus far is not just his. Neither is it the program of the Democrats nor of the Republicans. It is the Nation's program, and while everyone may not be in complete accord with every part of it, it does represent the minimum, in my opinion, we should undertake at this time.

No one can tell at this moment what we shall be called upon to do before the danger has passed. We may have to come to full mobilization. We certainly are headed in that direction now. We may have to set up a greatly restricted economy. Just how stringent such measures will be depends upon the American people themselves. Already, certain unnecessary, and I even add unpatriotic, practices are becoming widespread. I refer to hoarding of essential civilian supplies, and the sharp uncalled-for price increases which have occurred in recent days.

Profiteering when the life of the Nation is at stake is a form of sabotage that can be just as helpful to the enemy as sabotage of plants and factories. We are sending our men to face the enemy on the firing line. We shall be aiding the enemy if we add to our men's worries concern over the welfare of their families back home. I have hoped that the Government would not be forced to adopt price controls, but we cannot avoid doing so if the trends of the past few days are not immediately reversed.

If the war spreads, the immensity of the job will require a supreme effort and great sacrifices from each of us. Some idea of the job to be done is seen when it is realized that today the Kremlin controls about 16,000,000 square miles of land and about 755,000,000 soldiers. She is spending about 14 percent of her national income on direct defense, while we spend only about 7 percent. She will be fighting from inside lines, while we shall be scattered around the world. She has several times more troops under arms than we, and they are ready to move at a moment's notice.

Even if the conflict is limited to Korea, we shall have to tighten our belts to pay the costs already imposed. It is my opinion also that we shall have to step up our defense forces for the future in order to stay adequately prepared to extinguish any flames which threaten our national security. We shall also have to increase our help in rearming friendly powers. These things, at least, we shall have to do unless and until Russia also decides that she wants to live in a world of peace. Thus, anyway you look at it, Korea has already cost this Nation several billion dollars, in addition to the lives of fine American men.

Certainly America is challenged as strongly as at any time in her long and glorious history. I feel confident that the American Legion will play a leading part in helping to meet this challenge. You have always done so in the past. I have said often, and I repeat it here, that I do not know of any organization that has exhibited stronger patriotism or has more consistently supported what I consider to be sound legislation than has the American Legion.

From its formation immediately following World War I the Legion has recognized that America could not live isolated from the rest of the world. It has consistently supported those programs of international cooperation designed to build a peaceful world. The Legion has been aware that the United States has had no real choice except to assume the lead in this goal.

You who are attending this convention know of the leadership which the Legion has given in such programs as the Marshall plan, aid to Greece and Turkey, the Atlantic Pact, and military aid to member countries of the pact. Each of these programs has strengthened the cause of freedom. I believe that without them, all Europe would today be ruled from Moscow. They constitute an enlightened and typically American enterprise in the building of a safe and prosperous world. In fact, their success in helping to wage the so-called cold war may very well account in a great part for the armed conflict now raging in Korea. Russia may have come to the conclusion that eventually she

will lose this war through propaganda and infiltration alone, and that it has now become essential for her to fight with armed troops as well as with lies and trained propagandists.

Just a few weeks ago the Legion's National Foreign Relations Committee reaffirmed its faith in such programs and added a plea for the point 4 plan to supply American technical assistance in helping underdeveloped nations to build up their agricultural and industrial pursuits. This particular program seems to me to be especially commendable. I believe it offers potentially the maximum good for the minimum expense. I was gratified when the Senate Appropriations Committee on Monday of this week reversed its previous decision to recommend a reduction in funds the State Department had originally requested, and voted to support the full amount. Through it, we can help to replace sickness with health, illiteracy with education, poverty with higher standards of living, and thereby make a tremendous contribution to the growth of freedom and to the defeat of Communist imperialism which threatens the millions of people who live in underdeveloped areas of the world.

The Legion's Foreign Relations Committee also recommended an expansion of America's information and education program in reaching the minds of people outside the United States. At this time serious consideration is being given in Congress to a resolution introduced by Senator BENTON for himself and several other Senators, including myself, which would provide a larger and more intensive information program than ever attempted heretofore. This resolution holds great hope for telling the truth about America and about our aspirations for other peoples of the world. I hope that the American Legion will give serious consideration to throwing its support behind the thoughts proposed in that resolution.

It is elementary to tell you that these and other programs of international cooperation cost money. They are a part of our over-all defense efforts, and have been requiring from five to seven billion dollars annually. This amount is much less than we would have been forced to spend without them on our own necessarily enlarged Armed Forces. Besides, they have helped to keep our economy on a prosperous level.

However, one point that has concerned me regarding these worth-while peace programs has been the failure of some of our most responsible citizens to face squarely the fact that these and other defense measures account for nearly three-fourths of the total Federal budget. There has been much criticism of high taxes and big Federal budgets without a fair analysis of for what purposes the tax money has been spent.

Many have blamed high taxes almost completely on Government waste, and "politics as usual." The facts simply do not prove this to be true. Actually, a much less percentage of our total income during postwar years has been spent for non-war-connected functions than during prewar years.

Of course, there is some waste in Government as there is in any big operation. I wish every unnecessary expenditure could be avoided and every bit of waste could be eliminated. However, there is enough justified complaint on these matters for all of us to tell the full truth about high taxes and large expenditures.

We are now faced with more of both, and another duty which Legionnaires can perform for their country is to make all facts concerning them understood by your fellowmen.

The influence of the American Legion has exercised in building a strong America and in encouraging our Government to cooperate with other nations in building a peaceful world has been in keeping with the purposes of the Legion as stated in the preamble of our constitution. These purposes are inspiring ones. Listen to them:

"For God and country, we associate ourselves together for the following purposes: To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to maintain law and order; to foster and perpetuate a 100-percent Americanism; to preserve the memories and incidents of our associations in the great wars; to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation; to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses; to make right the master of might; to promote peace and good will on earth; to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy; to consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness."

Contrast those aims with the teachings and goals of communism—the most dangerous ideological enemy of civilization today. As written on a plaque which I read recently, here are a few of the beliefs of communism:

"The Communists believe there is no God and that all churches should be abolished.

"They believe that all commercial, civic, fraternal, and patriotic organizations, such as Rotary, Lions, Exchange, Optimist, and the Kiwanis clubs, the chambers of commerce and trade organizations, the Masons, Elks, Knights of Columbus, Knights of Pythias, and the Odd Fellows, the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, United Spanish War Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Veterans of World War II, all school fraternities, the American Red Cross, and the Salvation Army should be dissolved and prohibited.

"They believe that all medical and dental care, including hospitals, both private and public, all medicines and professional medical services should be placed under government control and administered under a central government agency.

"They believe that all free labor organizations should be abolished and workers forced to join a federally controlled trade union.

"The Communists believe that newspapers, press services, magazines, and radio-broadcasting stations should be taken over and operated by the Federal Government, placing all news under a federal censorship board, and that public forums be abolished.

"They believe the Federal Government should take over all banks, stocks and bonds, investment houses, insurance companies; all public utilities, such as power, light, gas, telephone and telegraph companies; oil and gas fields; railroads, bus, and airlines.

"They believe that farm lands should be taken over and owned by the Federal Government and that all farmers be forced to work for the Government as sharecroppers.

"They believe that the profit system should be abolished and that no citizen receive more than is needed for housing, food, and clothing.

"They believe that all schools, both public and private, should be controlled by the Federal Government and administered by a central government agency.

"The Communists believe that the Government of the United States should be taken over by force and ruled under a foreign dictator."

When we consider these aims we understand why regardless of the cost involved the idea of democracy must win out over that of communism. The achievement of any one of these goals would eventually lead to the complete loss of our freedoms. As much as any other group, Legionnaires have recognized this fact and have been in the vanguard of those working constructively to defeat the evil force of communism.

In the dangerous days that lie ahead, the Legion, I am sure, will continue to play a steady role in encouraging the leaders of our Government and the citizens of this country in putting forth every effort necessary to attain what must continue to be our goal—a strong America—and a world of peace and stability.

Taxes: Problem of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 3 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Taxes: Problem of Small Business" delivered by Hon. J. CALEB BOGGS, of Delaware, at the annual convention of the National Candy Wholesalers Association, in New York, on June 1, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXES: PROBLEM OF SMALL BUSINESS

(By Hon. J. CALEB BOGGS)

In spite of the evident growth and progress which has been made, it is, nevertheless, good practice to make an audit or an inventory or a review of the situation at this midcentury point. Having done so, will, I am sure, provide a sounder foundation for meeting existing problems of today and such challenges as may be forthcoming in the months and years ahead.

In my opinion, there has always been general recognition of the part played by small business in our national economy. I also believe, however, that much greater recognition of small business now exists than ever before. This is certainly as it should be when we consider the fact that more than 90 percent of the business concerns in our country are usually classified as small and when we also consider the fact that these small businesses provide approximately one-half of all the private nonfarm employment in the Nation.

In view of those facts, it becomes unquestionably clear that small business is indeed one of the keystones of our whole national economy. Wholesalers such as the members of your organization exercise a vital function in that economy by planning and maintaining the operation of channels of distribution which enable manufactured products to flow swiftly and surely into the retail outlets where they are available to the consuming public.

As friend of small business, I am sure that I may say to you without being misunderstood that small business is not, however, an isolated group. Small business and big business are integral parts of our economic structure and each is to a considerable degree interdependent upon the other just as each serves to complement the other. The purpose of each is to serve the public interest in an efficient and necessary manner. To do so properly in the public interest implies immediately, however, the absence of monopolistic or unfair trade practices.

PROBLEMS CONFRONTING BUSINESS

I now want to discuss with you from my viewpoint as a legislator some of the problems with which business—and especially small business—is confronted. We know that although we have today a very high level of business activity and a high level of employment throughout the Nation, that we must constantly seek even greater expansion of businesses, especially those which we broadly classify as small. It is essential to our overall national economy that we constantly seek greater growth, development, expansion, production and consumption. At the same time we must safeguard the independence of free, private, competitive enterprise.

I am naturally an optimist, but even optimists must at all times be aware of factors and forces having, or potentially having, detrimental effects upon the desirable goals which we seek. I feel sure that you all agree with my previous statement that business, and especially small business, must constantly seek to expand and to attain ever higher goals of production and consumption which in themselves will produced greater monetary returns for all concerned—including the wage-earners—and which will thus bring about not only a higher level of business activity, but a higher standard of living for all of us.

In order to do so it is generally agreed that small business—independent business—must have available adequate capital. Capital for small business comes principally from personal savings and from profits. If this statement is true, as the majority of experts in the field of economics and finance believe it to be, then we must do everything possible to prevent any significant reduction in personal savings and profits. At the present time, in the opinion of many qualified persons, personal savings and profits—from which the funds for the expansion of small business are principally derived—are retarded and seriously threatened by the present high rate of Federal income taxes.

FEDERAL TAXES OUTSTRIPPING PERSONAL SAVINGS

With respect to personal savings, some very interesting and highly significant statistics have only recently come to my attention. Based upon information released by the Treasury and Commerce Departments of our Federal Government, we find that a startling situation has come about during the past 4 years with respect to the personal savings of the American people. These figures show that it has been customary in the United States for personal savings of the American people as a whole to be at least two or three times as much each year as they paid annually in Federal income taxes. For example, we find that for the 4-year period 1925–29 the American people saved $3.40 for every dollar which they paid in Federal income taxes. For the 4-year period ending in 1939 they had personal savings—available for investment purposes or future purchases of goods and services—personal savings averaging $2.83 annually for every dollar paid in Federal income taxes. During the past 4 years, however, that desirable situation has been drastically and dangerously altered. In each of those years the American people as a whole paid much more in Federal income taxes than they were able to set aside in personal savings. Specifically, they were able to save in 1949 only 65 cents for every dollar paid in Federal income taxes—and that figure of 65 cents is the highest for the 4-postwar years. I wish to emphasize the fact that the taxes I am speaking about in this connection are only Federal individual income taxes and do not include other Federal taxes such as excises or any State or local taxation.

In view of the foregoing, it is immediately obvious that the ratio of personal savings to Federal income-tax payments by individuals is seriously dwindling. This situation cannot but have a serious effect on the establishment of independent, private, small businesses, and the necessary expansion of already established small businesses.

TAXATION AND SMALL BUSINESS

The problem of small business is chiefly the problem of taxation. The large and steady flow of equity capital which supported business expansions after World War I has practically disappeared since the end of World War II. If free enterprise is to continue to be both private and independent, it is essential that business be able to depend upon a substantial and constant stream of venture capital emanating from private sources. It is almost axiomatic that too high a tax on risk capital retards business expansion and employment. As a matter of fact, our present system of taxation seems almost to have been designed to discourage rather than to encourage risks. Our present system of taxation is operating like a brake, for it appears that the greater the reward is to the investor the greater is the penalty imposed by the Government in the form of taxation.

Support of these statements is becoming increasingly evident. For example, many of you probably read only 3 or 4 days ago of the conclusions reached by the Brookings Institution as a result of a careful study it made, based on reports from business firms. Among many other things the Brookings report stated:

1. A tax policy that will promote economic expansion and high-level income is imperative.

2. A tax system designed to facilitate the reasonably free operation of economic incentives is of fundamental importance for the Nation.

3. Small- and medium-sized businesses are seriously retarded from expansion by high taxes, for their earnings are virtually the only source of needed capital for expansion.

4. The volume of money savings available for investment is profoundly reduced by personal income taxes.

TRUMAN PLAN DANGEROUS

Within the past month our Chief Executive submitted a message to the Congress concerning the major problems of small and independent businesses. His proposals—which, of course, must be given serious consideration—involve principally easier credit and additional loans. Nearly all other proposals for aiding small business revolve around the same things—namely, more loans and greater extension of credit. Nevertheless, consideration must be given to the fact that a heavy debt for a small business frequently retards that business, stifles its opportunities for expansion, and may lead to ultimate failure.

It is possible that you may also have noticed in the public press statements opposing the President's suggestions which, surprisingly enough, came from officials of a Government corporation—the RFC.

Said one RFC official, who was not identified: "The Government is taking all the cream of business; that's the big reason for small-business troubles. The sound thing to do would be to let small business keep a little fat and get a little meat on its bones." He also added, and again I quote: "Small business ought to be given a chance to stand on its own feet, not just a temporary crutch."

Still another unidentified RFC official stated, and again I quote: "What small business needs is incentive, not loans. If you really want to help small business you should give it some tax relief. A loan is like an aspirin, it cures the pain temporarily but doesn't do any real good."

In addition to recommending the establishment of a Government-administered easy-loan insurance plan covering commercial bank loans to small business in sums not exceeding $25,000, the President also requested authorization for the establishment of a Nation-wide network of capital banks which would buy the stock of small corporations in order to provide them with additional funds.

The reaction of another RFC official to this proposal of the President's was not only interesting, but seemed to me to be of the greatest significance. Said this official, "in our experience in making loans to small business, we've found a terrific tendency for businessmen to want to run their own affairs without a bank or some other outside authority telling them how. They would resist a capital bank buying a large chunk of their company."

SMALL BUSINESS SEEKS INDEPENDENCE

To my mind that last statement represents not only an important expression of opinion, but something else which is vital and fundamental to Americans. It focuses attention on the fact that Americans organize their own small businesses not only because they think they can operate a profitable venture, but because they seek independence. The ownership of a considerable portion of a company's stock by a lending agency would of necessity limit and restrict, if not actually eliminate, the fact of independent operation of the borrower's business.

And thus I return to the statement I made some minutes ago that the principal independent sources of capital for small businesses are personal savings and profits. When either or both of these two sources are dried up, the alternatives are clear. Those alternatives are inability to grow and expand, or the borrowing of additional funds from private or Government sources, thus increasing the company's debt and fixed charges.

Since the principal reason for the drying up of profits and personal savings is taxation, then it appears to be not only logical, but imperative that appropriate action be taken at an early date to remedy the situation—by reducing taxes and revising our system of taxation.

Here, however, we run into still another problem—our tremendous national debt of $256,000,000,000 which is expected to be increased between 10 or 15 more billions of dollars by the end of the next fiscal year in June 1951. Taxation, national debt, and deficit spending are all tied together in our Federal fiscal policy.

Gentlemen, it is time for us to be realistic. If we want small business to be able to expand, we must reduce taxes. However, continuing to be realistic, we cannot reduce taxes while we increase spending and add further to our national debt burden.

In other words, as I see the picture, we must have enough public support for reduced spending and balanced budget to bring about actual and substantial reductions in appropriations. Having accomplished that, we will then be in a position to give tax relief to individuals and to business. And, having accomplished that, profits and personal savings will increase; incentive for capital investments in small businesses will be restored. The result will be the real opportunity for the expansion of business activity; the steady employment of more and more of our manpower; greater returns to investors, management and workers; and a sound, stable, expanding national economy through the preservation and promotion of free, independent private enterprise.

In closing, I want to say that I have read with much interest the editorial entitled "Better Acquainted," which appeared in the May 1950 issue of your excellent magazine,

National Candy Wholesaler. Said the editorial in part, referring to better understanding between manufacturers and wholesalers: "There are times when men, like nations, feel they must cry out against each other and shake the accusing finger, but it is safe to assume that these differences will become less and less important and the mutual problems easier to solve as they come to know each other better."

That very fine statement causes me to ask these questions: How many of you gentlemen are personally acquainted with your respective Members of Congress? How many of you as individuals have discussed national affairs and private business problems with your congressional Representatives?

I feel certain that a personal relationship between you and your Congressman and a frank discussion with him of your problems will be tremendously and mutually advantageous. Please believe me when I say that your Congressman wants to know what these problems are and what solutions you deem practicable and desirable. And, on the other hand, he will welcome an opportunity to discuss with you the relationship of your problems with the over-all national problems.

Inasmuch as the Government of the United States is, in the last analysis, the people of the United States, I am convinced that only national as well as individual good can result from such a relationship by each of you with your respective Representative in Congress.

Mr. Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1950

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith insert an editorial from the Bridgeport Post concerning Francis S. Murphy, the distinguished publisher of the Hartford Times and one of Connecticut's outstanding citizens, which editorial is as follows:

MR. AVIATION

Connecticut spends a deal of money annually at which the taxpayers grumble but the State also gets a large amount of free service, concerning which the taxpayers know very little. What the same service would cost the State if compensated at strictly commercial rates we cannot say, but we are sure that the total sum would make the finance department dizzy.

As an example we might consider the reappointment by Governor Bowles of Francis S. Murphy, publisher of the Hartford Times, to the State Aeronautics Commission. When it comes to promoting aviation for the benefit of Connecticut Mr. Murphy is a one-man whirlwind. He has headed the aeronautics commission since 1946 and far from profiting by the arrangement, has given endlessly of his time, and has spent substantially of his own funds in promoting the cause.

Frank Murphy was responsible to a large degree for the development of Bradley Field near Hartford and recently gave a party there, at which General Eisenhower was the guest of honor, to celebrate the breaking of ground for the new headquarters building. The purpose of the party was not mere jubilation but to impress visitors from other parts of the State with the facilities available at Bradley Field and to invite the maximum use of such facilities.

But being a Hartford man doesn't limit Commissioner Murphy in his geographical outlook. He is equally interested in the promotion of the most modern means of transportation in every part of Connecticut. The commission of which he is chairman—a commission made up of other volunteer citizens like himself—hopes to keep Connecticut in the forefront of aviation not only because the State needs the best transportation facilities possible but because Connecticut industry is a large factor in aviation. The State's industrial payrolls benefit correspondingly.

For this, so far as we know, nobody has said, "Thank you, Mr. Murphy." He doesn't expect to be thanked. A wise person in public service never does.

The President and the State Department, Not the Defense Department, Must Take Responsibility for the Policies Leading to the Korean Debacle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Sokolsky, whose record of foresight with respect to things Asian has been as conspicuously accurate as the State Department's has been inaccurate:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of July 28, 1950]

Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer was sent on a mission to the Far East in 1947 to report on conditions there and to help to devise a policy. On September 19, 1947, he presented a report on China and Korea to the President of the United States. This report was suppressed for nearly 2 years and when partially issued, was included in the so-called white paper on China of the State Department and was there lost.

Had General Wedemeyer's report been heeded and his recommendations followed, we should today not be fighting in Korea. For he had the wisdom to recognize that the conquest of China would lead to the attempted conquest of Asia.

General Wedemeyer for his pains was reduced from Deputy Chief of Staff to a routine job of running the Presidio in San Francisco. One of our ablest generals, he twiddles his thumbs at this moment when the country sorely needs a competent authority on the far eastern situation.

The first two paragraphs of his report to the President read:

"China's history is replete with examples of encroachment, arbitrary action, special privilege, exploitation, and usurpation of territory on the part of foreign powers. Continued foreign infiltration, penetration, or efforts to obtain spheres of influence in China, including Manchuria and Taiwan (Formosa), could be interpreted only as a direct infringement and violation of China's sovereignty and a contravention of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

"It is mandatory that the United States and those other nations subscribing to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations should combine their efforts to insure the unimpeded march of all peoples toward goals that recognize the dignity of man and his civil rights and, further, definitely provide the opportunity to express freely how and by whom they will be governed.

"Those goals and the lofty aims of freedom-loving peoples are jeopardized today by forces as sinister as those that operated in Europe and Asia during the 10 years leading to World War II. The pattern is familiar—employment of subversive agents; infiltration tactics; incitement of disorder and chaos to disrupt normal economy and thereby to undermine popular confidence in government and leaders; seizure of authority without reference to the will of the people—all the techniques skillfully designed and ruthlessly implemented in order to create favorable conditions for the imposition of totalitarian ideologies. This pattern is present in the Far East, particularly in the areas contiguous to Siberia."

There is a tendency abroad, undoubtedly stimulated and accelerated by the friends of Dean Acheson, to blame our unreadiness to meet the onslaught in Korea on the Department of Defense, on Louis Johnson, and on Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

This attack is obviously unfair and even dishonest and for these reasons:

1. The foreign policy of the United States is composed by the President and implemented by the Secretary of State. From Teheran (1943) until Soviet Russia attacked us in Korea (June 1950), that policy was one of abject appeasement of Soviet Russia.

The Secretary of Defense does not make the foreign policy. It has been known ever since he took office that Louis Johnson has been opposed to the general policy on the Far East pursued by the State Department.

That policy supported the Communists in China, insisted upon the withdrawal of our forces from Korea and our eventual withdrawal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and his forces from Japan. It practically proposed the abandonment of the Japan-Okinawa-Philippines line.

Louis Johnson and the Department of Defense opposed this policy. Their ideas were based to a large extent on the Wedemeyer report which the State Department and the President rejected.

Louis Johnson continued throughout this period to oppose the abandonment of Formosa. In the record as it now stands the Department of Defense was correct.

2. The fiscal policy of this country is made by the President, the Director of the Budget, and the Secretary of the Treasury. The Department of Defense was praised generally when it sought to utilize its allotted funds to the greatest advantage by eliminating traditional waste.

The current attack on Louis Johnson that the economies practiced by the Department of Defense are responsible for our lack of troops and supplies in Korea will not stand up under investigation.

The troops and supplies were withdrawn, not because of economies but because of a policy to appease Russia.

Vital Importance of American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 3, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith excerpts from letters received from eminent high-ranking officials of the United States Military Establishment giving expression to their appreciation of the tremendous and indispensable services performed, in maintenance of our national

security, by the American merchant marine.

"I know from many personal experiences that no praise could be too high for the valorous deeds and wonderful work which was performed by the American merchant marine" (William C. Chase, major general, Chief of Staff, Third Army).

"The victories won by the Armed Forces of the United States could not have been possible without the support and assistance so ably and generously rendered by our merchant marine" (Alvan C. Gillem, Jr., lieutenant general, U. S. Army, commanding, Third Army).

"It was indeed a pleasure for me to be able to discuss the outstanding record of the American merchant marine during World War II. I am most sincere in my feeling that we must maintain a strong and a ready merchant marine" (J. H. Cassady, vice admiral, U. S. Navy, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air)).

"I appreciate the importance of the American merchant marine and agree with you that it must be kept strong in time of peace in order that it will be ready to operate efficiently should a national emergency occur." (Edward F. Witsell, major general, U. S. Army, The Adjutant General).

"This is a fitting occasion to pay tribute to the heroic deeds and achievements of the American merchant marine during World Wars I and II. The outstanding record of the great American merchant marine during World War II in the transportation of personnel, armaments, munitions, and supplies is still fresh in the mind of every man who bore arms in the service of our country" (L. O. Grice, brigadier general, U. S. Army).

"The marvelous assistance rendered by the American merchant marine during both world wars contributed greatly to the ultimate victory and will be remembered and appreciated by all members of the armed services" (B. E. Gates, brigadier general, U. S. Air Force).

"I am well aware of the vital part played by the American merchant marine in time of war and I welcome the opportunity, not only on National Maritime Day but on every appropriate speaking engagement throughout the year to make public recognition of that contribution" (Oscar C. Badger, vice admiral, U. S. Navy, commander, Eastern Sea Frontier).

"In compliance with the request contained in your letter of May 15, 1950, I referred to the necessity of having a strong American merchant marine as part of our national defense program" (William D. Old, major general, U. S. Air Force, Deputy Inspector General).

"The American merchant marine's outstanding record in World War II is well known to all Americans and there is no doubt that it will continue to play a vital role in maintaining the peace" (A. C. McAuliffe, major general, Chief, Chemical Corps).

"I was out of the city the week before my speech at Grand Rapids on Armed Forces Day and therefore did not receive your letter until this morning. I shall be happy, however, to mention the American merchant marine whenever appropriate in future appearances before the public" (Kenneth P. McNaughton, major general, U. S. Air Force).

"Secretary Pace has asked me to thank you for the suggestion in your letter of May 15 and wants to assure you that he shares your belief in the importance of our national security of a strong, healthy, American merchant marine" (James F. King, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Army).

"We in the armed services, and particularly in the Navy, are acutely conscious of the part played by the American merchant marine in keeping our country strong economically and militarily, not only during war periods but in peacetime as well. I know that Armed Forces Day speakers throughout the country will remember the record of the merchant marine in two world wars, and I extend you my best wishes for the success of National Maritime Day" (J. Carey Jones, rear admiral, U. S. Navy, commandant, Ninth Naval District).

"In response to your letter of May 15, you may rest assured that I shall find an opportunity to mention the American merchant marine in my address this evening in observance of Armed Forces Day" (Hugh M. Milton, president., New Mexico Military Institute).

"I am to make an address in Colorado Springs on the 20th and will take occasion to mention the American merchant marine. I was in a distant theater during the war and well appreciate the valuable contribution of the American merchant marine in the last war" (S. J. Chamberlain, lieutenant general, U. S. Army, commanding Fifth Army).

"I have always made it a policy in many of my speeches to do just as you suggest, as I consider a strong merchant marine as being a vitally essential part of our national defense" (Felix B. Stump, vice admiral, U. S. Navy, commander, Air Force, Atlantic Fleet).

"You may be sure that I am well aware of the extremely important role of the merchant marine in our national security and will emphasize that thought whenever I have an opportunity in the future" (George H. Weems, brigadier general, U. S. Army, commanding Georgia Military District).

"I assure you of my earnest and sincere appreciation of our merchant marine. It is fully as important and vital a part of this Nation's sea power as the military forces of our Navy" (Forrest Sherman, admiral, U. S. Navy, Chief of Naval Operations).

"I am aware, as most of us in the Armed Forces are who traveled overseas during the war, of the fine contribution to our war effort made by the American merchant marine. I appreciate your bringing this matter to my attention at this time, however. My remarks on Armed Forces Day included an appropriate summary of the World War II American merchant marine activities." (James M. Gavin, major general, U. S. Army.)

"I would like to quote the following from the speech I gave in Knoxville, Tenn., on Armed Forces Day: 'I do not know how many more men from Tennessee gave their lives or returned with shattered bodies from duty with the American merchant marine—which, coincidentally, is celebrating National Maritime Day just 2 days from now, on May 22. It is hardly necessary for me to enumerate the services performed by your fellow citizens of Tennessee and the 47 other States in this most vital part of our sea power—a force which I sincerely hope will also be kept strong during the years of peace, so that it will be ready along with the Armed Forces if war should again be thrust upon us.'" (W. M. Fechteler, admiral, U. S. Navy, commander in chief, U. S. Atlantic Fleet.)

"I agree with you that the American merchant marine performs a most useful function in time of emergency. During my comments in making a speech in Houston on Armed Forces Day, I included a reference to the necessity for maintaining a strong merchant marine in peacetime as one of our necessary resources, in case of war." (LeRoy Lutes, lieutenant general, U. S. Army, commanding, Fourth Army.)

"Unfortunately your letter of May 15 did not arrive until I had already departed on a speaking tour. I shall be most happy to bring out the service of the American merchant marine the next time I speak." (A. D. Bruce, major general, U. S. Army, deputy Army commander, Fourth Army.)

"We in the service have an appreciation of the job which the American merchant marine did in World War II and it is gratfying to know that your organization is working toward greater public support of the American merchant marine to insure its ability to act successfully in any future emergency." (Robert W. Harper, major general, U. S. Air Force, commanding, Headquarters Air Training Command.)

"In response to your letter of May 15 I will say that I shall be most happy to include mention of our merchant marine in my talk on Armed Forces Day." (W. G. Schindler, rear admiral, U. S. Navy.)

"I appreciate your great interest in our defense problems and assure you that nobody realizes the importance of an efficient merchant marine more than I do. Therefore its importance in our defense pattern has been included in my Armed Forces Day address." (Clift Andrus, major general, U. S. Army, deputy commander, Second Army.)

"I appreciate your letter of May 15 suggesting the merchant marine be mentioned in my Armed Forces Day talk. It happens that I had already done so in the draft of my talk, pointing out that in peacetime we should have a healthy merchant marine, an adequate reserve of merchant shipping, and a healthy shipbuilding industry ready to expand rapidly on outbreak of war." (Thomas G. W. Settle, rear admiral, U. S. Navy, Vice Chief of Navy Material.)

"I have been on an inspection trip since the beginning of Armed Forces Week and have not had an opportunity to answer your letter of May 15. I received it prior to my departure, however, and was very careful to be sure that in all of my speeches I mentioned the importance of the American merchant marine, its performance during World War II, and the necessity that it must remain strong in the future. I feel that the American people are not yet sufficiently informed regarding the necessity for keeping our sea lanes open at all times. They may be willing to vote funds for a strong Navy if they think that the other fellow's Navy is getting stronger, but they don't realize that there is not much use in having a strong Navy if the merchant marine of our country is not able to bring us the materials we must have and on which the economic life of the country depends. You may be assured that I always bear this in mind and that at every opportunity I'll call it to the attention of the officers and men of my command and the people to whom I talk." (A. K. Doyle, rear admiral, U. S. Navy, Chief of Naval Air Reserve Training.)

Accurate Wording and History of Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag Is Repeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 31, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, when I was home in the great Eighteenth Congressional District of California just prior to the June 6 election, I had the pleasure and honor of meeting with and speaking to the members of the Dominguez Rotary Club. This was one of several such patriotic groups which it was my pleasure to meet with during the short time I was thereabouts.

At this Dominguez meeting they were having an interesting discussion about the history of the pledge of allegiance to the flag. They wondered what the exact wording of the pledge of allegiance was and so I was pleased to ask the Legislative Reference Service of our great

Library of Congress for the accurate information and for the history of the pledge of allegiance as we now use it. I am pleased to herewith give it to you, my colleagues, for your information and advices:

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The pledge of allegiance to the flag—"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all"—is to be rendered by standing with the right hand over the heart. However, civilians will always show full respect to the flag when the pledge is given by merely standing at attention, men removing the headdress. Persons in uniform shall render the military salute.

The pledge was written (August 1892) by Francis Bellamy, a member of the staff of the Youths Companion in Boston, Mass.

The family of James B. Upham—one of the owners of the Youths Companion—also claimed authorship of the original pledge for Upham. To determine, in the interest of historical accuracy and certainty, the authorship of the original pledge, the United States Flag Association appointed a committee of three university professors to award th honor. The committee heard all the evidence submitted by the Bellamy and Upham families and unanimously decided (May 18, 1939) that the honor belonged to Bellamy.

The Dairy Industry in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 4 (legislative day of Thursday, July 20), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a series of articles describing Wisconsin's position as the leading dairy State in the Nation, famed throughout the country particularly for her delicious and nutritious cheese.

As we all know, the dairy farmers of America will obviously be called upon to do a tremendous job to meet the needs for increased consumption at home and abroad in the present emergency.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, to have several articles printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The first one describes an interesting meeting held in Fond du Lac, Wis., by Wisconsin and Federal officials with regard to the impact of the present world situation on dairy production.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURAL LEADERS, AUTHORITIES, AND OFFICIALS MEET WITH PMPC RESOLUTION COMMITTEE TO ASSIST IT IN FORMULATING POLICIES

Dairy producers will suffer if price ceilings are established because of war, the resolutions committee of Pure Milk Products Cooperative agreed when it met in Fond du Lac on July 20.

The committee members met in all-day session at Hotel Retlaw with representatives of the University of Wisconsin's College of Agriculture and State and national agricultural departments joining them. The session was a prelude to the annual conclave, usually held in the fall.

The group said it believed that controls and allocations are bound to come if the present (Korea) situation continues. The over-all agricultural picture is likely to shift from price support to price controls. Dairy producers will suffer from the controls because of the wide differentials in prices with other products, according to the committee.

PREDICTIONS REVIEWED

At the beginning of 1950, the Federal Bureau of Economics forecast 10 percent lower prices for farm products and also expected a one-third decline in farm income, speakers said. Upward pressure on prices and the war fervor, however, may cause a revision in these estimates.

Unlimited demand during war always increases their income, it was pointed out. After a war, prices drop and demand decreases. But the dairy farmer, who has increased his milk production during the emergency, is unable to shut off his supply as other industries can do. Adjustments must be made from high war productions developed to current demands. This, the committee contended, can most successfully be accomplished through organization and bargaining.

Matters discussed by the group during the day included changes in the status of Federal marketing administrators and their jurisdiction, uniform milk laws with respect to sanitation, surplus disposal, chemical substitutes, Bangs' disease, legislation affecting the dairy industry, and the impact of the Korean war on the industry.

GUESTS ATTEND PARLEY

William F. Groves, Lodi, president, opened the meeting. Committee members and guests were welcomed by William O. Perdue, general manager.

Participating in the conclave were Walter Ebling, State department of agriculture statistician; Asher Hobson, State department of agricultural economics expert; Robert Marsh and William Black, Washington, research marketing administration; Raymond J. Penn, R. K. Froker, and W. W. Clark, State college of agriculture; Bushrod Allen, Washington, Federal Bureau of Agricultural Economics; Walter Katterhenry, State production and marketing administration; Ralph Peterson, Berlin, PMPC local board member; Gordon B. Reuhl, Madison, American Dairy Association; W. W. Knox, editor, and Eugene Meyer, of Hoard's Dairyman, Fort Atkinson; A. W. Colebank, Chicago, market administrator; Peter Mays, State agricultural council; County Agent George F. Massey and Charles Brace, Lone Rock, Pure Bred Holstein Association.

WISCONSIN DOMINATES CHEESE MARKET; NATURAL CHEESE PRODUCTION AT TOP

Wisconsin's dominant place in the nation's cheese market has been built on the production and marketing of natural cheese. Natural cheese production is still the biggest segment of our agricultural industry.

From the earliest days some cheese was made in the pioneer farm homes of Wisconsin. Ann Pickett, Lake Mills, is recognized as one of the first to attempt the semicommercial manufacture of cheese in her home as early as 1837. She has been described as the forerunner of the "factory system" of cheese making in the state. The first commercial manufacture of cheese was begun by John J. and Hiram Smith, Sheboygan County, in 1858 and 1859, respectively. In 1865 the State had 30 cheese factories producing about 500,000 pounds of cheese a year. By 1885, factory cheese production had climbed to 32,000,000 pounds and in 1905 it passed the 100,000,000 mark. Today we produce about 525,000,000 pounds each year.

Wisconsin's nation-wide natural cheese promotion was started at the Centennial Exposition held in Philadelphia in 1876. At this exposition 284 packages of Wiscinson cheese were exhibited, winning 20 awards. In proportion to the number of exhibits entered, Wisconsin won more cheese awards than any other State.

Other early cheese promotion included exhibits at the New York International Dairy Fair in 1878 and the Cotton Centennial at New Orleans in 1884. At the New Orleans show Wisconsin exhibitors won 50 out of the 55 cheese awards offered.

These successful national exhibits were made possible by a quality cheese campaign launched by the Wisconsin Dairymens Association. The work was continued by the Dairy and Food Commission and quality improvement is still one of the major services of the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture.

Wisconsin cheese is natural cheese. For this product we have built a national demand. The extent to which Wisconsin cheese dominates the nation's markets is shown by a survey of cheese receipts at ten terminal markets. They cover the United States from coast to coast and from the Gulf of Mexico to the Canadian border.

In 1948 these ten markets received approximately 286,446,000 pounds of cheese. Wisconsin supplied 58 percent of their total cheese receipts, or 166,484,000 pounds. These shipments represent one-third of the cheese manufactured in Wisconsin during the year.

Wisconsin is dependent on these national markets for the sale of its cheese. These markets will not buy our cheese unless there is consumer demand for the product. This means that Wisconsin dairymen are dependent upon consumer demand for natural cheese in all of the nation's large commercial and industrial centers.

Wisconsin has built its cheese industry upon the production and marketing of quality natural cheese. Consistent promotion of this product among consumers of the United States is the most important means of preserving this extremely important outlet for Wisconsin's leading manufactured dairy product.

WISCONSIN NOW HAS 2,274 DAIRY PLANTS; NUMBER INCREASED BY 24 OVER LAST YEAR

An increase of 24 in the number of Wisconsin dairy plants is shown by the 1950 report of the State department of Agriculture.

Last year there were 2,250 plants operating in the State, while as of June 21, 1950, licenses had been issued to 2,274 plants. During the current year, licenses have also been issued to 5,334 food manufacturing and cold storage plants.

Since many Wisconsin dairy plants manufacture more than one product, the number of operations for which licenses were issued show a total of 3,600 operations.

Following is the report of licenses issued this year:

DAIRY

Dairy plants	2,274
Butter factories	316
Cheese factories	1,278
Receiving station	334
Condensaries	101
Powdering establishments	126
Ice cream plants 205, counter freezers 449	654
Milk distributor	571
Process plants	15
Cheese food compounds	9
Cottage cheese manufacturer	177
Cooked cheese manufacturer	9
Concentrated whey manufacturer	17
Canned cream	1
Dairy products dealer	449
Cheese makers	2,937
Limburger cheese makers	43
Butter makers	846

FOOD

Bakeries	956
Confectionaries	239
Cold storage warehouses and lockers	694
Soda water beverages	796
Food processing plants	1,315
Oleomargarine	1,334